

# Tensor product of holomorphic discrete series representations of $U(p, q)$ and quivers

Velleda Baldoni and Michèle Vergne

**Abstract** Consider the convex cone of holomorphic orbits in the Lie algebra of  $U(p, q)$ . As in the classical case of Hermitian matrices, the set of elliptic orbits obtained contained in the sum of two holomorphic orbits can be described by “Horn inequalities”. Using representations of quivers, we give another proof of these Horn recursion inequalities obtained by P-E Paradan. We recall the implications of these inequalities for decomposition of tensor product of two representations of the holomorphic discrete series of the group  $U(p, q)$ .

## 1 Introduction

Let  $(\lambda, \mu)$  be a couple of dominant weights for the compact group  $G = U(n)$ . One wants to describe the irreducible representations  $V_\nu$  of  $G$  occurring with non zero multiplicity  $c_{\lambda, \mu}^\nu$  in  $V_\lambda \otimes V_\mu$ . Here  $V_\lambda, V_\mu, V_\nu$  are the irreducible representations of  $U(n)$  (or  $GL(n)$ ) with highest weights  $\lambda, \mu, \nu$  respectively.

Let  $\text{Lie}(G)$  be the Lie algebra of  $G$ . Then the space  $\sqrt{-1} \text{Lie}(G)$  is the space of  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrices. Let  $T$  be the Cartan subgroup of  $G$  consisting of  $n \times n$  diagonal matrices with entries of modulus 1. If  $a = (a(1), \dots, a(n))$  is a sequence of  $n$  real numbers, we denote also by  $a \in \sqrt{-1} \text{Lie}(T)$  the diagonal  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrix with coefficients  $a(i)$  on the diagonal. Using the inner product  $\text{tr}(AB)$  on matrices, we may consider  $a$  as an element of  $(\sqrt{-1} \text{Lie}(G))^*$ . Then the Weyl chamber  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} = \{a = (a(1) \geq a(2) \geq \dots \geq a(n))\}$  is a set of

---

Velleda Baldoni

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli studi di Roma Tor Vergata, Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1-00133 Roma, Italy, e-mail: [baldoni@mat.uniroma2.it](mailto:baldoni@mat.uniroma2.it)

Michèle Vergne

Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu-Paris Rive Gauche, Université Paris-Cité, Campus Sophie Germain, Paris 13, France, e-mail: [michele.vergne@imj-prg.fr](mailto:michele.vergne@imj-prg.fr)

representatives of the coadjoint orbits of  $G$  in  $(\sqrt{-1}\text{Lie}(G))^*$ . Denote by  $O_a$  the coadjoint orbit of  $a$ . The orbit  $O_a$  is provided with a  $G$ -invariant Kähler structure.

Let  $\lambda = (\lambda(1) \geq \lambda(2) \geq \dots \geq \lambda(n))$  be a dominant weight, that is an element of  $\mathfrak{t}_{\geq 0}$  with integral coefficients. Since the representation  $V_\lambda$  of  $U(n)$  is obtained by geometric quantization of the corresponding coadjoint orbit  $O_\lambda$ , a geometric analogue of the property  $V_\nu \subset V_\lambda \otimes V_\mu$  for  $(\lambda, \mu, \nu)$  a triple of dominant weights is the property  $O_c \subset O_a + O_b$  for  $(a, b, c)$  a triple of  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrices. Let  $\text{Cone}(n) \subset \mathfrak{t}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{t}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{t}_{\geq 0}$  be the set of such triples  $(a, b, c)$ . The cone  $\text{Cone}(n)$  is a polyhedral cone, and A. Horn ([13]) conjectured a series of recursive inequalities describing this cone. Knutson-Tao ([15]) proved Horn conjecture together with the famous saturation conjecture: one has  $c_{\lambda, \mu}^\nu \neq 0$  if and only if there exists an integer  $N \geq 1$  such that  $c_{N\lambda, N\mu}^{N\nu} \neq 0$ . Equivalently  $c_{\lambda, \mu}^\nu \neq 0$  if and only if  $(\lambda, \mu, \nu) \in \text{Cone}(n)$ .

Consider now the non compact group  $G = U(p, q) \subset GL(p+q)$  of pseudo-unitary transformations, and let  $n = p+q$ . The group  $G$  has a compact Cartan subgroup  $T$ : the space of  $n \times n$  diagonal matrices with entries of modulus one. There is a series  $\pi_\lambda$  of unitary irreducible representations of  $G$  called the holomorphic discrete series associated to a subset of characters of  $T$ . Such a representation  $\pi_\lambda$  is similarly indexed by a sequence of slowly decreasing integers

$$\lambda = (\lambda(1) \geq \dots \geq \lambda(p) \geq \lambda(p+1) \geq \dots \geq \lambda(p+q)),$$

with a gap between  $\lambda(p)$  and  $\lambda(p+1)$  (see Section 4, Ex.4). It is easy to prove that the tensor product of two representations  $\pi_\lambda$  and  $\pi_\mu$  of the holomorphic discrete series decomposes as a sum with finite multiplicities of representations  $\pi_\nu$  belonging to the holomorphic discrete series:

$$\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi_\mu = \oplus_\nu m_{\text{hol}}^\nu(\lambda, \mu) \pi_\nu. \quad (1)$$

Thus a natural question is to describe the triples  $(\lambda, \mu, \nu)$  such that  $\pi_\nu \subset \pi_\lambda \otimes \pi_\mu$ .

Let

$$A = (A(1) \geq \dots \geq A(p) \geq A(p+1) \geq \dots \geq A(p+q))$$

be a sequence of slowly decreasing real numbers. We also denote by  $A \in \sqrt{-1}\text{Lie}(T)$  the diagonal matrix with coefficients  $A(i)$  on the diagonal. Using again the bilinear form  $\text{tr}(AB)$ , we may consider  $A$  as an element of  $(\sqrt{-1}\text{Lie}(G))^*$ . Let  $O_A^{nc}$  be the corresponding (non compact) coadjoint orbit of  $A$  by the action of  $U(p, q)$ . Then  $O_A^{nc}$  is provided with a  $U(p, q)$ -invariant Kähler structure and we say that  $O_A^{nc}$  is an holomorphic orbit. The representation  $\pi_\lambda$  of  $U(p, q)$  of the holomorphic discrete series is obtained by geometric quantization of the corresponding (non compact) coadjoint holomorphic orbit  $O_\lambda^{nc}$ . So the geometric analogue of the property  $\pi_\nu \subset \pi_\lambda \otimes \pi_\mu$  is the property  $O_C^{nc} \subset O_A^{nc} + O_B^{nc}$ . Let  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(p, q)$  be the set of such triples  $(A, B, C)$ .

In ([19]), P-E Paradan described inductive necessary and sufficient conditions for  $(A, B, C)$  to belong to  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(p, q)$ , similar to the Horn conditions in the definite case. Using Derksen-Weyman saturation theorem ([7]), one deduces that the saturation conjecture holds for discrete series representations: there exists an integer  $N \geq 1$  such that  $m_{\text{hol}}^{N\nu}(N\lambda, N\mu) \neq 0$  if and only if  $m_{\text{hol}}^{\nu}(\lambda, \mu) \neq 0$ . So inequalities for the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(p, q)$  give inductive necessary and sufficient conditions for  $m_{\text{hol}}^{\nu}(\lambda, \mu)$  to be non zero.

In this article, we give another proof of Paradan conditions by relating  $m_{\text{hol}}^{\nu}(\lambda, \mu)$  to quivers. One benefit is that the inductive conditions appear very naturally in this setting. Furthermore, some symmetries are visible which are not seen in the initial problem (see Proposition 2). We also sketch another proof (based on Rossmann formula for Fourier transform of orbits ([4])) that the cone generated by the triples  $(\lambda, \mu, \nu)$  with  $m_{\text{hol}}^{\nu}(\lambda, \mu) > 0$  is equal to the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(p, q)$ , as it should be.

Recall the general quiver setting. Let  $Q = (Q_0, Q_1)$  be a quiver, where  $Q_0$  is the finite set of vertices and  $Q_1$  the finite set of arrows. A *dimension vector* for  $Q$  is a vector  $\mathbf{n} = (n_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  of nonnegative integers (if vertices are labeled  $\{1, 2, \dots, q_0\}$ , we adopt also the notation  $\mathbf{n} = [n_1, \dots, n_{q_0}]$ ). We consider the family of complex vector spaces  $\mathcal{E} = (E_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  with  $E_x = \mathbb{C}^{n_x}$ . The space of *representations* of the quiver  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{E}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E}) := \bigoplus_{a: x \rightarrow y \in Q_1} \text{Hom}(E_x, E_y).$$

The Lie group  $\text{GL}_Q(\mathbf{n}) = \prod_{x \in Q_0} \text{GL}(n_x)$  acts naturally on  $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ , and so acts naturally on the space  $\text{Sym}^*(\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E}))$  of polynomial functions on  $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ . Decompose

$$\text{Sym}^*(\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})) = \bigoplus_{\lambda} m_Q(\lambda) V_{\lambda},$$

where  $V_{\lambda}$  denotes the irreducible representation of  $\text{GL}_Q(\mathbf{n})$  with highest weight  $\lambda$ . If  $Q$  has no cycles, the multiplicity  $m_Q(\lambda)$  is finite.

When  $Q$  is the Horn quiver  $\mathcal{H}_2$

$$1 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 2 \tag{2}$$

and the dimension vector is  $\mathbf{n} = [n, n, n]$ , then  $m_Q([\lambda, \mu, \nu]) = c_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu^*}$  where  $\nu^* = (-\nu(n) \geq \dots \geq -\nu(1))$  indexes the dual representation  $V_{\nu^*}$ .

One can decide if  $m_Q(\lambda) > 0$  by studying the Schubert positions of general subrepresentations of a representation of  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{E}$ . One obtains a natural inductive criterium ([2]) which coincides for the quiver  $\mathcal{H}_2$  with Belkale inductive criterium ([3]) for intersection of Schubert cells.

The action of the compact group  $K = \text{U}_Q(\mathbf{n}) = \prod_{x \in Q_0} \text{U}(n_x)$  on  $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  leads to a moment map with values in  $(\sqrt{-1} \text{Lie}(K))^*$  and to a ‘‘moment cone’’  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  parameterizing coadjoint orbits of  $K$  contained in the image of the moment map. The saturation theorem of Derksen-Weyman is equivalent to

the statement that  $m_Q(\lambda) > 0$  if and only if  $\lambda$  belongs to the moment cone  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ .

Consider the quiver  $Q = Q_{3,3}$  with 6 vertices  $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$  and arrows  $1 \rightarrow 3, 2 \rightarrow 3, 4 \rightarrow 3, 4 \rightarrow 5, 4 \rightarrow 6$ , see Fig: 1. Families of objects parameterized by  $Q_0$  will be written as lists.




Fig. 1

Consider the dimension vector  $\beta = [p, p, p, q, q, q]$  and let

$$\mathcal{E} = [\mathbb{C}^p, \mathbb{C}^p, \mathbb{C}^p, \mathbb{C}^q, \mathbb{C}^q, \mathbb{C}^q].$$

We denote the moment cone  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  by  $\text{Cone}_Q(p, q)$ . It is contained in  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^6 \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}^{(i)}$ , where  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}^{(i)}$  is the positive Weyl chamber for the compact group  $U(\beta_i)$ .

**Example 1;**  $p = 2, q = 1$ .

Let  $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6] \in \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$ :

$$a_1 = (a_1(1) \geq a_1(2)),$$

$$a_2 = (a_2(1) \geq a_2(2)),$$

$$a_3 = (a_3(1) \geq a_3(2)),$$

$$a_4 = (a_4(1)),$$

$$a_5 = (a_5(1)),$$

$$a_6 = (a_6(1)).$$

Then  $\mathbf{a}$  belongs to  $\text{Cone}_Q(2, 1)$  if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1(1) + a_1(2) + a_2(1) + a_2(2) + a_3(1) + a_3(2) + a_4(1) + a_5(1) + a_6(1) &= 0, \\
a_1(2) \geq 0, a_2(2) \geq 0, a_5(1) \leq 0, a_6(1) \leq 0, \\
a_1(2) + a_2(2) + a_3(2) + a_4(1) + a_5(1) + a_6(1) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(1) + a_1(2) + a_2(1) + a_2(2) + a_3(1) + a_3(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(1) + a_2(2) + a_3(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(2) + a_2(1) + a_3(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(2) + a_2(2) + a_3(1) &\leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $\lambda = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6]$  be a dominant weight for  $U_Q(\beta)$ . If  $m_Q(\lambda) > 0$ , it follows that  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3^*$  indexes polynomial representations of  $GL(p)$ ,  $\lambda_4^*, \lambda_5, \lambda_6$  dual of polynomial representations of  $GL(q)$ . We can consider the concatenated sequences  $A = (\lambda_1, \lambda_5)$ ,  $B = (\lambda_2, \lambda_6)$ ,  $C = (\lambda_3^*, \lambda_4^*)$ . They are slowly decreasing sequences of  $n$  integers. Then the main remark of this article is that

**Proposition 1.**

$$m_Q(\lambda) = m_{\text{hol}}^C(A, B).$$

Thus we can read on the equations of the cone  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  when  $m_{\text{hol}}^C(A, B) > 0$ , or equivalently when  $\mathcal{O}_C^{nc} \subset \mathcal{O}_A^{nc} + \mathcal{O}_B^{nc}$ .

**Continuation of Example 1**

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= (A(1) \geq A(2) \geq A(3)), \\
B &= (B(1) \geq B(2) \geq A(3)), \\
C &= (C(1) \geq C(2) \geq C(3)),
\end{aligned}$$

be a triple of slowly decreasing sequence of real numbers indexing holomorphic orbits in  $U(2, 1)$ . Using Proposition 1, we reobtain (see [19])

$$\mathcal{O}_C^{nc} \subset \mathcal{O}_A^{nc} + \mathcal{O}_B^{nc}$$

if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}
A(1) + A(2) + A(3) + B(1) + B(2) + B(3) &= C(1) + C(2) + C(3), \\
A(1) + B(1) &\geq C(2), \\
A(1) + A(2) + B(1) + B(2) &\leq C(1) + C(2), \\
A(2) + B(2) &\leq C(2), \\
A(2) + B(1) &\leq C(1), \\
A(1) + B(2) &\leq C(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Here is the outline of this article.

In Section 2, we recall our results ([2]) on general subrepresentations of representations of quivers and the general inductive algorithm to determine inequalities of moment cones  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ .

In Section 3, we explain in more details the algorithm, and some of its simplifications in the particular situation of the quiver  $\mathcal{Q}_{3,3}$ . We point out the existence of symmetries in the problem.

In Section 4, we recall the definition of the holomorphic discrete series for a general Hermitian symmetric space  $G/K$ . We recall that the multiplicity of a representation  $\pi_\nu$  in the tensor product of two representations  $\pi_\lambda, \pi_\mu$  of the holomorphic discrete series can be computed as a multiplicity for the action of the maximal compact subgroup  $K$  of  $G$  in an explicit representation.

In Section 5, we state the geometric analogue for the description of the sum of two holomorphic orbits. As obtained by P.E. Paradan, the set of orbits contained in the sum of two holomorphic orbits  $\mathcal{O}_A^{nc}, \mathcal{O}_B^{nc}$  can be described as a moment cone for an action of  $K$  on a (non compact) Hamiltonian space. We sketch a more direct proof based on Rossmann formula for Fourier transforms of orbits.

In Section 6, we consider  $G = U(p, q)$  and relate multiplicities  $m_{\text{hol}}^\nu(\lambda, \mu)$  to  $m_Q(\lambda)$ , where  $Q = \mathcal{Q}_{3,3}$  is the particular quiver described above. This is the main observation of this article.

In Section 7, we compare our inequalities with the ones obtained by P.E. Paradan.

In Section 8, we give some more examples of our inequalities.

The content of this article was presented in the conference "Symmetry in geometry and analysis" (Reims, June 2022). We hope that this contribution to the problem of branching rules is an appropriate way of honoring Toshiyuki KOBAYASHI.

As we pointed out, results of this article are due to P.E. Paradan. But we wished to show that quivers can be useful for some special problems in representations of non compact groups. In particular, at least in low dimensions, it is easy to guess and visualize the corresponding "Horn inequalities".

We thank Jean-Louis Clerc, and David Vogan for their comments during the conference. We thank Michel Duflo for many comments and references.

## Notations and conventions

All vector spaces will be finite-dimensional complex vector spaces. Given a vector space  $E$ , we write  $\dim E$  for its (complex) dimension and we denote by  $\text{Gr}(r, E)$  the Grassmannian of subspaces of dimension  $r$  of  $E$ , where  $0 \leq r \leq \dim E$ . We use calligraphic or bold letters to denote families of objects labeled by the vertex set  $Q_0$  of a quiver. For example,  $\mathcal{E} = (E_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  will be a family of vector spaces indexed by  $Q_0$ ,  $\mathbf{n} = (n_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  will be a family of natural numbers. If  $Q_0$  is labeled as a set  $\{1, 2, \dots, q_0\}$  of consecutive integers, families of objects labeled by the vertex set  $Q_0$  will be written as lists. For example, the dimension vector  $[3, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1]$  for the quiver  $Q_{3,3}$  means  $\mathbf{n} = (n_x)$  with  $n_1 = 3, n_2 = 1, n_3 = 2, n_4 = 1, n_5 = 1, n_6 = 1$ .

## 2 Space of representations of a quiver $Q$

Let  $Q = (Q_0, Q_1)$  be a quiver, where  $Q_0$  is the finite set of vertices and  $Q_1$  the finite set of arrows. We use the notation  $a : x \rightarrow y$  for an arrow  $a \in Q_1$  from  $x \in Q_0$  to  $y \in Q_0$ . We allow  $Q$  to have multiple arrows between two vertices but no cycles. Let  $\mathbf{n} = (n_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  be a dimension vector. We consider a family of complex vector spaces  $\mathcal{E} = (E_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  of dimension vector  $\mathbf{n}$  that is  $\dim E_x = n_x$ . Conversely, a family  $\mathcal{E} = (E_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  of vector spaces indexed by  $Q_0$  defines the dimension vector  $\dim \mathcal{E} = (\dim E_x)_{x \in Q_0}$ . So the expression dimension vector will refer indifferently to a family of nonnegative integers or to a family of complex vector spaces.

The space of *representations* of the quiver  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{E}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E}) := \bigoplus_{a: x \rightarrow y \in Q_1} \text{Hom}(E_x, E_y), \quad (3)$$

whose elements are families  $r = (r_a)_{a \in Q_1}$  of linear maps  $r_a : E_x \rightarrow E_y$ , one for each arrow  $a : x \rightarrow y$  in  $Q_1$ . The Lie group  $\text{GL}_Q(\mathcal{E}) = \prod_{x \in Q_0} \text{GL}(E_x)$  acts naturally on  $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ . For  $g \in \text{GL}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ , and  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ , the action is  $(g \cdot r)_{a: x \rightarrow y \in Q_1} = g_y r_a g_x^{-1}$ .

Thus the group  $\text{GL}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  acts naturally on the space  $\text{Sym}^*(\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E}))$  of polynomial functions on  $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ . Describing the irreducible representations of  $\text{GL}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  occurring with non zero multiplicities in  $\text{Sym}^*(\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E}))$  is related to the study of subrepresentations of a representation  $r$ . Let us recall some of the relevant results.

Let  $\alpha, \beta$  be two dimension vectors. Consider the Ringel bilinear form

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \sum_{x \in Q_0} \alpha_x \beta_x - \sum_{a: x \rightarrow y \in Q_1} \alpha_x \beta_y.$$

Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  be a dimension vector such that  $\alpha_x \leq \dim E_x$ . We say that  $\alpha$  is a *subdimension vector* for  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Define the expected dimension  $\text{edim}_Q$  by the formula:

$$\text{edim}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E}) = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \quad (4)$$

where  $\beta$  is the dimension vector defined by  $\beta_x = \dim E_x - \alpha_x$ .

We write  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$  if  $\mathcal{S} = (S_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  is a family of subspaces  $S_x \subseteq E_x$ . The family  $\mathcal{S}$  is called a *subrepresentation* of  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  if  $r_a S_x \subseteq S_y$  for every arrow  $a: x \rightarrow y$  in  $Q_1$ ; we abbreviate this condition by  $r\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ .

Schofield ([23]) characterized (inductively) the subdimension vectors  $\alpha$  such that any  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  has a subrepresentation  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $\dim \mathcal{S} = \alpha$ . We call such a dimension vector a *Schofield subdimension vector* for  $\mathcal{E}$  and denote this property by  $\alpha \leq_Q \mathbf{n}$ , where  $\dim \mathcal{E} = \mathbf{n}$ . We also write  $\alpha <_Q \mathbf{n}$  if in addition at least one of the inequalities  $\alpha_x \leq n_x$  is strict. The condition  $\alpha \leq_Q \beta$  is transitive. It is easy to see that a necessary condition for  $\alpha$  to be a *Schofield subdimension vector* for  $\mathcal{E}$  is that  $\text{edim}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E}) \geq 0$ . In [2], we proved the following natural criterium, which refines Schofield criterium:

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a subdimension vector for  $\mathcal{E}$ . Then  $\alpha \leq_Q \dim \mathcal{E}$  if and only if*

1.  $\text{edim}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E}) \geq 0$ .
2. If  $\beta <_Q \alpha$ , then  $\beta <_Q \dim \mathcal{E}$  (transitivity).

Consider

$$\text{Gr}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E}) := \prod_{x \in Q_0} \text{Gr}_Q(\alpha_x, E_x)$$

where  $\text{Gr}(\alpha_x, E_x)$  denotes the Grassmannian of subspaces of  $E_x$  of dimension  $\alpha_x$ . The dimension of  $\text{Gr}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E})$  is  $\sum_{x \in Q_0} \alpha_x \beta_x$ , where  $\beta$  is the dimension vector defined by  $\beta_x = \dim E_x - \alpha_x$ . Thus, we have

$$\text{edim}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E}) = \dim(\text{Gr}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E})) - \sum_{a: x \rightarrow y \in Q_1} \alpha_x \beta_y. \quad (5)$$

Given a representation  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  and a dimension vector  $\alpha$ , we define the corresponding *quiver Grassmannian* by

$$\text{Gr}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E})_r := \{\mathcal{S} \in \text{Gr}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E}) : r\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}\}.$$

In this language, a Schofield subdimension vector is a subdimension vector  $\alpha$  such that  $\text{Gr}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E})_r \neq \emptyset$  for every representation  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ . If  $\alpha$  is a

Schofield subdimension vector, then the "expected dimension"  $\text{edim}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E})$  is the dimension of the variety  $\text{Gr}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E})_r$  for generic  $r$ .

Choose now a Borel subgroup  $B$  of  $GL_Q(\mathcal{E})$  (or a complete filtration of  $\mathcal{E}$ ). If  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ , the Borel subgroup of  $\mathcal{E}$  determines a Borel subgroup of  $GL_Q(\mathcal{S})$ , still denoted by  $B$ . By definition, a Schubert variety  $\Omega$  is the closure of the  $B$  orbit of an element  $\mathcal{S}$  in  $\text{Gr}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E})$  (thus  $\Omega = (\Omega_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  is the product of Schubert varieties  $\Omega_x$  in  $\text{Gr}_Q(\alpha_x, E_x)$ ). Given a representation  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ , and  $\Omega$  a Schubert variety, define

$$\Omega_r := \text{Gr}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E})_r \cap \Omega = \{\mathcal{S} \in \Omega : r\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}\}.$$

**Definition 1.** We say that  $\Omega$  is  $Q$ -intersecting if  $\Omega_r$  is non empty for every  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ .

In other words,  $\Omega$  is  $Q$ -intersecting if, for every  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ , the Schubert variety  $\Omega$  contains a subrepresentation of  $r$  (it is enough to consider generic representations  $r$ ). If  $\Omega$  is the closure of the  $B$ -orbit of  $\mathcal{S}$ , we write  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq_{Q,B} \mathcal{E}$  if  $\Omega$  is  $Q$ -intersecting. We write  $\mathcal{S} \subset_{Q,B} \mathcal{E}$ , if  $\mathcal{S} \neq \mathcal{E}$ . Clearly, a necessary condition for  $\Omega$  to be  $Q$ -intersecting is that  $\alpha$  is a Schofield subdimension vector.

If  $Q$  is the Horn quiver  $\mathcal{H}_2$

$$1 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 2 \tag{6}$$

and the vector dimension  $[n, n, n]$ , a triple  $\Omega = [\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3]$  of Schubert varieties in the Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}(r, n)$  is  $Q$ -intersecting if and only if the Schubert varieties  $(\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3)$  intersect in the homological sense. So this explains our terminology.

Our inductive criterion for  $\Omega$  to be  $Q$ -intersecting is based on a numerical quantity: the expected dimension  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\Omega, \mathcal{E})$  generalizing (5).

$$\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\Omega, \mathcal{E}) := \dim \Omega - \sum_{a: x \rightarrow y \in Q_1} \alpha_x \beta_y. \tag{7}$$

(So when  $\Omega = \text{Gr}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E})$  is the closure of the big cell,  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\Omega, \mathcal{E}) = \text{edim}_Q(\alpha, \mathcal{E})$ ).

If  $\Omega$  is the closure of the  $B$ -orbit of  $\mathcal{S}$ , we write  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E})$  instead of  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\Omega, \mathcal{E})$ .

If  $\Omega$  is  $Q$ -intersecting, then it is easy to see that the expected dimension  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\Omega, \mathcal{E})$  is the dimension of the variety  $\Omega_r$  for generic  $r$ . So a necessary condition for  $\Omega$  to be  $Q$ -intersecting in  $\mathcal{E}$  is that  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\Omega, \mathcal{E}) \geq 0$  (but this condition is not sufficient).

Our main result ([1], [2]) is the following inductive criterium:

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a family of vector spaces, and  $\mathcal{S}$  a family of subspaces of  $\mathcal{E}$ . Then  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq_{Q,B} \mathcal{E}$  if and only if*

1.  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E}) \geq 0$ ,

2.  $\mathcal{T} \subset_{Q,B} \mathcal{E}$  for every  $\mathcal{T} \subset_{Q,B} \mathcal{S}$  (transitivity).

Let us recall the consequences of this theorem for multiplicities.

For  $x \in Q_0$ , let  $E_x = \mathbb{C}^{n_x}$ , with standard basis  $(e_j)_{1 \leq j \leq n_x}$ , and consider the Borel subgroup  $B_x$  that consists of the upper-triangular matrices in  $GL(E_x) = GL(n_x)$ . Let  $U_x$  be the maximally compact subgroup of  $GL(n_x)$  consisting of unitary operators, with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{u}_x$ . We identify  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{u}_x)^*$  with the space of Hermitian operators on  $E_x$  as in the introduction. Consider the Weyl chamber  $C_x \subset (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{u}_x)^*$  which may be identified to the cone of slowly decreasing sequences  $a$  of  $n_x$  real numbers  $a = (a_x(1) \geq \dots \geq a_x(n_x))$ . A  $\mathbb{Z}$ -valued element of  $C_x$  is a dominant weight:  $\lambda_x = (\lambda_x(1) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_x(n_x))$ .

The irreducible representations of  $GL_Q(\mathcal{E})$  are of the form  $V_\lambda = \bigotimes_{x \in Q_0} V_{\lambda_x}$ , where  $\lambda = (\lambda_x)_{x \in Q_0}$ ; here  $\lambda_x$  is a dominant weight, and  $V_{\lambda_x}$  is the irreducible representation of  $GL(E_x)$  with highest weight  $\lambda_x$ .

Write

$$\text{Sym}^*(\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})) = \bigoplus_{\lambda} m_Q(\lambda) V_\lambda.$$

Consider the one parameter subgroup  $(e^{i\theta} \text{Id}_{E_x})_x$ . It acts trivially in  $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ . Thus for  $m_Q(\lambda)$  to be positive, we need

$$\sum_{x \in Q_0} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \lambda_x(j) = 0.$$

We will refer to this equation as the center equation.

By definition, the cone  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  is the cone (in the Weyl chamber  $\bigoplus_{x \in Q_0} C_x$ ) generated by the dominant weights  $\lambda$  with  $m(\lambda) > 0$ . It is easy (as pointed out to us by Ressayre, [22]) to deduce from Derksen-Weyman [7] the saturation property for the coefficients  $m_Q(\lambda)$ , namely  $m_Q(\lambda) > 0$  if and only if there exists a positive integer  $N$  with  $m_Q(N\lambda) > 0$ .

The cone  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  has an alternate description in terms of a moment map in the sense of symplectic geometry. The moment map for the action of the maximally compact subgroup  $U(\mathcal{E}) = \prod_{x \in Q_0} U_x$  on  $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  with value in  $\bigoplus_x (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{u}_x)^*$  is given by

$$\mu: \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \bigoplus_x (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{u}_x)^*, \quad r = (r_a)_{a \in Q_1} \mapsto \mu(r) = (\mu_x(r))_{x \in Q_0},$$

where  $\mu_x(r)$  is the Hermitian matrix  $\sum_{y,b:y \rightarrow x} r_b r_b^* - \sum_{y,a:x \rightarrow y} r_a^* r_a$ .

If  $n$  is an integer, we denote by  $[n]$  the list  $[1, 2, \dots, n]$ . If  $K$  is a subset of  $[n]$  with  $r$  elements, we write  $K \subseteq [n]$  and also  $K = \{K(1), K(2), \dots, K(r)\}$  the corresponding sublist of  $[n]$  indexed as an increasing list of integers.

Let  $|K| = r$  be the cardinal of the set  $K$ . If  $J \subseteq [K]$  is a subset of  $[1, 2, \dots, r]$  with  $s$  elements, we can compose  $K$  and  $J$  and obtain the subset  $\{K(J(1)), \dots, K(J(s))\}$  of  $[n]$  with  $s$  elements.

Any subset  $K \subseteq [n]$  of cardinal  $r$  determines the subspace  $S = \oplus_{i \in K} e_i$  (where  $e_i$  denotes the standard basis of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ ) of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and hence a Schubert variety  $\Omega$  in  $\text{Gr}(r, n)$ . The empty subset  $K = \{\}$  indexes the subspace  $S = \{0\}$  of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . The subset  $K = \{1\}$  indexes  $\Omega = \{\mathbb{C}e_1\}$ , that is the  $B$  fixed point in  $\text{Gr}(1, n)$ . The subset  $K = \{n\}$  indexes  $\Omega = \text{Gr}(1, n)$ , etc....

We now consider families of such sets. If  $\mathbf{n} = (n_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  is a dimension vector, we denote by  $[\mathbf{n}] = ([n_x])_{x \in Q_0}$  the family of the lists  $[1, \dots, n_x]$ . Any family  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq [\mathbf{n}]$ , by which we mean that  $\mathcal{K} = (K_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  consists of subsets  $K_x \subseteq \{1, \dots, n_x\}$ , determines the family  $\mathcal{S} = (S_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  of subspaces  $S_x = \oplus_{i \in K_x} e_i$ , and hence a Schubert variety  $\Omega$ . Any Schubert variety is indexed by a family  $\mathcal{K}$ . Let us write  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq_{Q,B} [\mathbf{n}]$  to denote that  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq_{Q,B} \mathcal{E}$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the family of subspaces determined by  $\mathcal{K}$ . We denote by  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})$  the numerical quantity  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{E})$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the subspace indexed by  $\mathcal{K}$ .

We now recall:

**Theorem 3.** *For any dominant weight  $\lambda = (\lambda_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  of  $\text{GL}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ , the following are equivalent:*

1.  $-\lambda$  is in the image of the moment map,
2.  $\lambda \in \text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ ,
3.  $V_\lambda \subseteq \text{Sym}^*(\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E}))$ ,
4.  $\sum_{x \in Q_0} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \lambda_x(j) = 0$  and  $\sum_{x \in Q_0} \sum_{j \in K_x} \lambda_x(j) \leq 0$  for all  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq_{Q,B} [\mathbf{n}]$ .

The equivalence of (1) and (2) is due to Mumford ([16]) and Guillemin-Sternberg ([10],[11]). The equivalence of (2) and (3) follows from the saturation properties of the coefficients  $m_Q(\lambda)$ . The equivalence of (3) and (4) follows from Ressayre's conditions for general GIT, the explicit version for this case being discussed in [1], [24]. In the inequalities (4), it is sufficient to consider the families  $\mathcal{K}$  such that  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) = 0$ . Even with this restriction, one usually obtains a redundant set of inequalities for the description of the polyhedral cone  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ .

**Definition 2.** We denote by  $\text{Horn}(Q, \mathcal{E})$  the set of  $\mathcal{J}$  such that  $\mathcal{J} \subseteq_{Q,B} [\mathbf{n}]$  and by  $\text{Horn}_0(Q, \mathcal{E})$  the subset of those  $\mathcal{J}$  with  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{E}) = 0$ . We call an element  $\mathcal{J}$  in  $\text{Horn}(Q, \mathcal{E})$  a  $Q$ -intersecting set. For  $\mathcal{A}$  a subset of  $Q_1$ , denote by  $\text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, Q, \mathcal{E})$  the subset of  $Q$ -intersecting sets  $\mathcal{J}$  such that  $|J_x| = |J_y|$  when there is an arrow  $a : x \rightarrow y \in \mathcal{A}$ , and by  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, Q, \mathcal{E})$  the subset of those  $\mathcal{J} \in \text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, Q, \mathcal{E})$  with  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}(\mathcal{J}, \mathcal{E}) = 0$ .

As a consequence of Theorem 3, to describe explicitly the cone  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  by inequalities, we only need to determine the "Horn set"  $\text{Horn}_0(Q, \mathcal{E})$ . Theorem 2 translates immediately into an inductive numerical criterion that we explicit in Section 3.

Let us make some remarks on the conditions  $\Omega \subseteq_{Q,B} \mathcal{E}$ .

*Remark 1.* Let  $\Omega = (\Omega_x)_{x \in Q_0}$  be a family of Schubert varieties. Let  $P \subset Q$  be a subquiver, and  $\Omega_P = (\Omega_x)_{x \in P}$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_P = (E_x)_{x \in P}$ . Clearly a necessary condition for  $\Omega$  to be  $Q$ -intersecting in  $\mathcal{E}$  is that  $\Omega_P$  is  $P$ -intersecting in  $\mathcal{E}_P$ .

*Remark 2.* Let us give a few elements in  $\text{Horn}_0(Q, \mathcal{E})$  which are always present.

- The full list  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{full}}$  with  $K_x = [n_x]$  for any  $x \in Q_0$ , with corresponding space  $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{E}$ .

- Let  $v$  be a maximal vertex. Let  $K_x = \{\}$  for  $x \neq v$ , and  $K_v = \{1\}$ . This indexes the family  $\mathcal{S}$  with  $S_x = \{0\}$ , for  $x \neq v$ , while  $S_v = \mathbb{C}e_1$  in  $E_v$ . Clearly  $\mathcal{S}$  is a subrepresentation of any  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ . So for any maximal vertex  $v$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{max}}^{(v)} = (K_{x, x \neq v} = \{\}, K_v = \{1\})$  is always in  $\text{Horn}_0(Q, \mathcal{E})$ .

In particular for  $Q = Q_{3,3}$  and dimension vector  $\mathbf{n}$ ,

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{max}}^{(5)} = [\{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{1\}, \{\}]$$

and

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{max}}^{(6)} = [\{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{1\}]$$

are  $Q$ -intersecting sets.

- Let us consider now  $u$  a minimal vertex. Let  $K_u = \{1, 2, \dots, n_u - 1\}$  while  $K_x = \{1, 2, \dots, n_x\}$  if  $x \neq u$ . This indexes the family  $S_u = \mathbb{C}^{n_u - 1}$  (a stable subspace under  $B$ ), and  $S_x = \mathbb{C}^{n_x}$  for  $x \neq u$ . So for any minimal vertex  $u$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{min}}^{(u)} = (K_{x, x \neq u} = \{1, 2, \dots, n_x\}, K_u = \{1, 2, \dots, n_u - 1\})$  is always in  $\text{Horn}_0(Q, \mathcal{E})$ . In particular for  $Q_{3,3}$  and dimension vector  $\mathbf{n} = [n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4, n_5, n_6]$ ,

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{min}}^{(1)} = [\{1, 2, \dots, n_1 - 1\}, \{1, 2, \dots, n_2\}, \{1, 2, \dots, n_3\}, \dots, \{1, 2, \dots, n_6\}]$$

and

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{min}}^{(2)} = [\{1, 2, \dots, n_1\}, \{1, 2, \dots, n_2 - 1\}, \{1, 2, \dots, n_3\}, \dots, \{1, 2, \dots, n_6\}]$$

are  $Q$ -intersecting sets.

We will denote by  $E(\mathcal{J})$  the linear form  $\lambda \mapsto \sum_{x \in Q_0} \sum_{j \in J_x} \lambda_x(j)$  associated to a family of subsets  $J_x \subseteq [1, 2, \dots, n_x]$ . Thus the linear form  $E(\mathcal{K}_{\text{full}})$  is the linear form  $\lambda \mapsto \sum_{x \in Q_0} \sum_{j=1}^{n_x} \lambda_x(j)$ , that is, is the center equation.

As a consequence of Theorem 3, the cone  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  is described by the inequalities  $E(\mathcal{J}) \leq 0$  when  $\mathcal{J} \in \text{Horn}_0(Q, \mathcal{E})$  and the equality  $E(\mathcal{K}_{\text{full}}) = 0$ . Thus for an explicit description of  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ , we determine the set  $\text{Horn}_0(Q, \mathcal{E})$ , by “direct observation” for low dimensions, or using the algorithm described in the next section. We then use elimination of redundant inequalities to obtain the description of  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  by essential inequalities.

**Example  $Q_{3,3}$  with dimension vector  $\mathbf{n} = [p, p, p, q, q, q]$ .**

Denote by  $\text{Horn}_0(p, q)$  the Horn set  $\text{Horn}_0(Q_{3,3}, \mathbf{n})$  (Definition 2). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the subset consisting of the 4 arrows  $1 \rightarrow 3$ ,  $2 \rightarrow 3$  and  $4 \rightarrow 5$ ,  $4 \rightarrow 6$ . We denote by  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$  the set  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, Q_{3,3}, \mathbf{n})$ . It consists of  $Q$ -intersecting subsets  $\mathcal{K} = [K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, K_5, K_6]$  such that the cardinal of the sets  $K_1, K_2, K_3$  coincide, as well as the cardinal of the sets  $K_4, K_5, K_6$ . Lemma 1 reduces the description of  $\text{Horn}_0(p, q)$  to the description  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$ , so we call this last set **Non trivial**.

There are two obvious symmetries by exchanging  $1 \leftrightarrow 2$  and  $5 \leftrightarrow 6$ , as they correspond to exchange vertices  $1 \leftrightarrow 2$  and  $5 \leftrightarrow 6$  in the quiver. So the sets  $\text{Horn}_0(p, q)$  are invariant by this group of symmetries.

We also denote by  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$  the group of symmetries permuting the vertices  $1, 2, 3$  as well as the vertices  $4, 5, 6$ . The set  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$  is invariant by  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$ , as proved the next section.

**Example  $Q_{3,3}$  with  $\mathbf{n} = [2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1]$**

Here is the list of sets in  $\text{Horn}_0(2, 1)$ .

**Full**

$$[\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1\}, \{1\}, \{1\}]$$

**Extremal**

$$\mathcal{K}_{\max}^{(5)} = [\{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{1\}, \{\}],$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\max}^{(6)} = [\{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{1\}],$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\min}^{(1)} = [\{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1\}, \{1\}, \{1\}],$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\min}^{(2)} = [\{1, 2\}, \{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1\}, \{1\}, \{1\}].$$

**Non Trivial**

$$[\{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{1\}, \{1\}],$$

$$[\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}],$$

$$[\{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}],$$

$$[\{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}],$$

$$[\{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}].$$

Remark that the set **Non Trivial** =  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, 2, 1)$  is invariant by  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$ .

Let  $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6]$  as in Example 1. The inequalities  $E(\mathcal{J})$  for  $\mathcal{J}$  belonging to the set **Extremal** imply the equations

$$a_5(1) \leq 0, a_6(1) \leq 0,$$

and the equations

$$a_1(2) \geq 0, a_2(2) \geq 0,$$

using the center equation  $E(\mathcal{K}_{\text{full}}) = a_1(1) + a_1(2) + a_2(1) + a_2(2) + a_3(1) + a_3(2) + a_4(1) + a_5(1) + a_6(1) = 0$ .

The set **Non Trivial** account for the remaining 5 inequalities in Example 1.

**Example  $Q_{3,3}$  with  $n = [2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2]$**

Here is the list of sets in  $\text{Horn}_0(2, 2)$ .

**Full**

$$[\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}]$$

**Extremal**

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{max}}^{(5)} = [\{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{1\}, \{\}],$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{max}}^{(6)} = [\{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{1\}],$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{min}}^{(1)} = [\{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}],$$

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{min}}^{(2)} = [\{1, 2\}, \{1\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}].$$

**Non Trivial**

$$[\{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}], [\{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}], [\{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}],$$

$$[\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}],$$

$$[\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], [\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}], [\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}],$$

$$[\{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], [\{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], [\{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}],$$

$$[\{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], [\{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], [\{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}].$$

Remark that the set **Non Trivial** =  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, 2, 2)$  is stable by the group of symmetry  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$ . So to describe it, we may only describe a list of representatives of  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, 2, 2)$  modulo permutations in  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$ . Here is a set of such representatives:

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}], \\
& [\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}], \\
& [\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], \\
& [\{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], \\
& [\{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}].
\end{aligned}$$

Let us see how we can justify the above list with general arguments. Consider the quiver  $Q_{3,3}$  with dimension vector  $\mathbf{n} = [2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2]$ .  $Q_{3,3}$  contains a subquiver  $P_1$  isomorphic to the quiver  $\mathcal{H}_2$  described in (2) and a subquiver  $P_2$  where we changed orientations of arrows in  $\mathcal{H}_2$ . Indeed consider the arrow  $a : 3 \rightarrow 4$  and the two subquivers  $P_1$  on the left with points 1, 2, 3 and  $P_2$  on the right with points 4, 5, 6, obtained by considering suppressing the arrow  $a$  in  $Q_{3,3}$ , see Fig.2. Thus the proper  $Q_{3,3}$ -




Fig. 2

intersecting sets not in **Extremal** are necessarily (see Lemma 1) of the form  $\mathcal{J} = [I_1, I_2, I_3, J_1, J_2, J_3]$  where  $(I_1, I_2, I_3)$  parameterize intersecting Schubert cells of  $\text{Gr}(r_1, \mathbb{C}^2)$  and  $(J_1, J_2, J_3)$  parameterize intersecting Schubert cells of  $\text{Gr}(r_2, \mathbb{C}^2)$  (with  $r_1, r_2 \in \{1, 0\}$ ) if  $|I_1| = |I_2| = |I_3| = r_1$  and  $|J_1| = |J_2| = |J_3| = r_2$  (where the dimension of the intersection may be greater than 0). Short arguments on  $\text{edim}_{Q,B}$  allows to eliminate other cases that the ones listed above. Then it is directly easy to see that any element of the list above gives indeed  $Q$ -intersecting sets. For example, let us prove that  $[\{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}]$  is  $Q$ -intersecting. Given  $r = (r_a) \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  generic (so we may assume all the  $2 \times 2$  matrices  $r_a$  invertible), a subrepresentation  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $r$  in position  $[\{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}]$  exists and is uniquely determined. Indeed, we are forced to take  $\mathcal{S}_4 = \mathbb{C}e_1$ . Since  $\{2\}$  is indexing the full projective space  $\text{Gr}(1, \mathbb{C}^2)$ , there are no restrictions at the other vertices. So we construct  $\mathcal{S} = [\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3, \mathcal{S}_4, \mathcal{S}_5, \mathcal{S}_6]$  by taking the images or reciprocal images of  $\mathcal{S}_4$  by consecutive maps  $r_a$  connecting a vertex  $i$  to 4.

### 3 The algorithm

A set  $\mathcal{K} \in \text{Horn}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{E})$  produces always a valid inequality for the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E})$ , namely the inequality

$$E(\mathcal{K}) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{Q}_0} \sum_{k \in K_x} \lambda_x(k) \leq 0.$$

Thus to determine the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E})$ , we have to determine the sets  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq_{\mathcal{Q}, B} [\mathbf{n}]$ .

Let  $\mathcal{K} = (K_x)_{x \in \mathcal{Q}_0}$ . Let  $\mathbf{k} = (k_x)_{x \in \mathcal{Q}_0}$  be the family of cardinals of the set  $K_x$ . It is easy to see that if  $K_x(1) < \dots < K_x(k_x)$  are the elements of  $K_x$ , then the dimension of the Schubert variety determined by  $\mathcal{K}$  is

$$\dim \Omega = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{Q}_0} \sum_{j=1}^{k_x} (K_x(j) - j). \quad (8)$$

Any family  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq [\mathbf{k}]$  can be composed with  $\mathcal{K}$  and give rise to a family  $\mathcal{T} = (T_x)_{x \in \mathcal{Q}_0}$  of subspaces

$$T_x = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{l_x} e_{K_x(L_x(j))} \subseteq S_x,$$

where  $L_x(1) < \dots < L_x(l_x)$  are the elements of  $L_x$  and  $l_x = |L_x|$ . We have thus

$$\text{edim}_{\mathcal{Q}, B}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{Q}_0} \sum_{j=1}^{l_x} (K_x(L_x(j)) - j) - \sum_{a: x \rightarrow y \in \mathcal{Q}_1} l_x(n_y - l_y) \quad (9)$$

with  $l_x = |L_x|$  and  $l_y = |L_y|$ .

Accordingly, Theorem 2 translates into the following inductive numerical criterion:

**Theorem 4.** ([5])

$\mathcal{K} \subseteq_{\mathcal{Q}, B} [\mathbf{n}]$  if and only if

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{Q}_0} \sum_{j=1}^{l_x} (K_x(L_x(j)) - j) \geq \sum_{a: x \rightarrow y \in \mathcal{Q}_1} l_x(n_y - l_y) \quad (10)$$

for all  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq_{\mathcal{Q}, B} [\mathbf{k}]$ .

The criterion in (10) is easy to test numerically. One may further restrict the families  $\mathcal{L}$  that need to be considered as we will see in a moment.

In ([5]), we proved that it is sufficient to test on the  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq_{\mathcal{Q}, B} [\mathbf{k}]$ , such that  $\text{edim}_{\mathcal{Q}, B}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{k}) = 0$ .

Given a subset  $\mathcal{A}$  of the set of arrows, we defined  $\text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{E})$  to be the set of those  $\mathcal{K} \in \text{Horn}(\mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{E})$  such that  $|K_x| = |K_y|$  for every arrow  $x \rightarrow y$

in the subset  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1$ . Then we proved [5] that the set  $\text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{E})$  is determined inductively by testing on the  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq_{\mathcal{Q}, B} [\mathbf{k}]$  satisfying the same dimension condition (i.e.  $|L_x| = |L_y|$  for every arrow  $x \rightarrow y \in \mathcal{A}$ ) and with  $\text{edim}_{\mathcal{Q}, B}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{k}) = 0$ .

We now specialize our result to the quiver  $\mathcal{Q}_{3,3}$ , dimension vector  $[p, p, p, q, q, q]$  and vertices  $[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]$ .

Consider the set  $\mathcal{A} = \{1 \rightarrow 3, 2 \rightarrow 3, 4 \rightarrow 5, 4 \rightarrow 6\}$  of arrows in  $\mathcal{Q}_{3,3}$ . We define

$$\text{Horn}(p, q) = \text{Horn}(\mathcal{Q}_{3,3}, [p, p, p, q, q, q]), \quad \text{Horn}_0(p, q) = \text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{Q}_{3,3}, [p, p, p, q, q, q]),$$

$$\text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, p, q) = \text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Q}_{3,3}, [p, p, p, q, q, q]), \quad \text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, p, q) = \text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{Q}_{3,3}, [p, p, p, q, q, q]).$$

Let  $\lambda = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5, \lambda_6]$  in the Weyl chamber for  $GL(p)^3 \times GL(q)^3$ . Consider the following set of four inequalities

$$\mathbf{Extremal} = \{\lambda_1(p) \geq 0, \lambda_2(p) \geq 0, \lambda_5(1) \leq 0, \lambda_6(1) \leq 0\}.$$

If  $\lambda$  is a weight, the equations in **Extremal** just say that  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  index polynomial representations of  $GL(p)$ , while  $\lambda_5, \lambda_6$  index dual of polynomial representations of  $GL(q)$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_{3,3}$ ,  $\mathbf{n} = [p, p, p, q, q, q]$  and  $\mathcal{E} = [\mathbb{C}^p, \mathbb{C}^p, \mathbb{C}^p, \mathbb{C}^q, \mathbb{C}^q, \mathbb{C}^q]$ . Consider the set  $\mathcal{A} = \{1 \rightarrow 3, 2 \rightarrow 3, 4 \rightarrow 5, 4 \rightarrow 6\}$ . Then the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E})$  is the cone defined by the center equation  $E(\mathcal{K}_{\text{full}})$ , the inequalities  $E(\mathcal{K})$  with  $\mathcal{K} \in \text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$  together with the four inequalities in **Extremal**.*

*Proof.* Let  $U_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E}) = U(p)^3 \times U(q)^3$ . Let  $\mu : \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E}) \rightarrow (\sqrt{-1} \text{Lie}(U_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E})))^*$  be the moment map. Let  $\mathfrak{t}$  be the Cartan subalgebra of  $U_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E})$ . Then  $\mathfrak{t} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^6 \mathfrak{t}_j$ , where  $\mathfrak{t}_j$  is of dimension  $p$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and of dimension  $q$  for  $j \in \{4, 5, 6\}$ . Let  $h_k$  be the diagonal  $p \times p$  (or  $q \times q$ ) matrix with 1 at the  $k$ -th place, 0 at other places.

Let  $\mathcal{J} = [J_1, J_2, \dots, J_6]$  be a collection of subsets of integers, with  $J_1, J_2, J_3 \subseteq [p]$  and  $J_4, J_5, J_6 \subseteq [q]$ . Let  $v$  be a vertex of  $\mathcal{Q}_{3,3}$ . We define  $X_{\mathcal{J}}$  be the element of  $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}$  with its component  $X_v$  in  $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}_v$  given by  $\sum_{j \in J_v} h_j$  (if  $J_v$  is empty,  $X_v = 0$ ).

For example if  $p = 2, q = 2$  and  $\mathcal{J} = [\{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}]$ , then

$$X_{\mathcal{J}} = \left[ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right].$$

Let  $\lambda \in (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$ . Then  $E(\mathcal{J})(\lambda) = \langle X_{\mathcal{J}}, \lambda \rangle$ .

For  $\mathbf{X} = (X_v)$  in  $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}$ , we consider the subspace  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{X})$  of  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E})$  given by

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{X}) = \{r \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E}); r_a X_v = X_w r_a\}$$

for  $a : v \rightarrow w$  in  $Q_1$ , that is  $\mathcal{H}(X)$  is the subspace of  $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  annihilated by the infinitesimal action of  $X$  on  $\mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ . Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be  $Q$ -intersecting, then  $\{E(\mathcal{J}) = 0\} \cap \text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  is a face of  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  since  $E(\mathcal{J}) \leq 0$  is a valid inequation. Any point  $\lambda \in \{E(\mathcal{J}) = 0\} \cap \text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  is of the form  $-\mu(r)$  with  $r \in \mathcal{H}(X_{\mathcal{J}})$ . This follows from properties of walls of a Kirwan polyhedron. See for example ([24]).

Assume that  $\mathcal{J}$  is not in  $\text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, Q, \mathcal{E})$ . For example  $|J_1| \neq |J_3|$ , for the arrow  $a : 1 \rightarrow 3$ . Let  $\lambda = -\mu(r)$  with  $r \in \mathcal{H}(X_{\mathcal{J}})$ . Then the component  $r_a$  of  $r$  is not invertible, since otherwise the equation  $r_a X_{J_1} = X_{J_3} r_a$  would imply that  $X_{J_1}$  and  $X_{J_3}$  are conjugated, and so  $|J_1| = |J_3|$ . But then the component  $\lambda_1 = -\mu(r)[1]$  is the non negative Hermitian matrix  $r_a^* r_a$  with determinant 0. It follows that  $\lambda_1(p) = 0$ , (since  $\lambda_1(p) \geq 0$ ), and the face  $\{E(\mathcal{J}) = 0\} \cap \text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  is contained in the face  $\{\lambda_1(p) = 0\} \cap \text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  of  $\text{Cone}_Q(\mathcal{E})$ . The proof is similar in all other cases.

Denote also by **Extremal** the subset

$$\mathbf{Extremal} = \{\mathcal{K}_{\max}^{(6)}, \mathcal{K}_{\max}^{(5)}, \mathcal{K}_{\min}^{(1)}, \mathcal{K}_{\min}^{(2)}\}$$

of  $\text{Horn}_0(p, q)$  giving rise to the 4 extremal inequalities listed above.

Let  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$  be the group of symmetries permuting the vertices 1, 2, 3 as well as the vertices 4, 5, 6.

**Proposition 2.** *We have*

$$\text{Horn}(p, q) = \mathcal{K}_{\text{full}} \cup \mathbf{Extremal} \cup \text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, p, q).$$

Furthermore,  $\text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$  is invariant by  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{K} = [K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, K_5, K_6]$ . Clearly the numerical quantity  $\text{edim}_{Q, \mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E})$  is invariant by  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$  when  $|K_1| = |K_2| = |K_3|$  and  $|K_4| = |K_5| = |K_6|$ . Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be such that  $|K_1| = |K_2| = |K_3| = p'$  and  $|K_4| = |K_5| = |K_6| = q'$ . To decide if  $\mathcal{K} \in \text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$ , we need to test (as proved in [5]) that  $\mathcal{L}$  composed with  $\mathcal{K}$  is in  $\text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$  on proper subsets  $\mathcal{L} \in \text{Horn}(\mathcal{A}, p', q')$ . So by induction, Theorem 4, and invariance of  $\text{edim}_{Q, \mathcal{B}}$  by symmetry, we obtain our proposition.

## 4 Holomorphic discrete series and tensor product

Let  $G$  be a connected semisimple Lie group, with finite center and maximal compact subgroup  $K$ . The representation of  $G$  in  $L^2(G)$  has a discrete series if and only of  $\text{rank}(G) = \text{rank}(K)$ . If furthermore  $G/K$  is an hermitian symmetric space, within the discrete series, we have a series of representations called the holomorphic discrete series. The realization of a representation belonging to the holomorphic discrete series is very simple both analytically and algebraically. We will though adopt the algebraic point of view.

We thus assume that  $G/K$  is provided with a  $G$ -invariant complex structure. We start by introducing some general notation. We denote by capital latin letters the groups involved and by the corresponding german letters the corresponding Lie algebras. We use the superscript  $*$  for dual spaces and the subscript  $\mathbb{C}$  for complexifications; for example, we write  $\mathfrak{g}^*$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$  be the Cartan decomposition of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The complex structure of  $G/K$  determines the  $K$ -invariant decomposition  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{p}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{p}_-$  where  $\mathfrak{p}_+$ ,  $\mathfrak{p}_-$  are abelian subalgebras of  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ . There exists  $z \in \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k}$  central in  $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$  such that  $\mathfrak{p}^+ = \{X \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, [z, X] = X\}$ . This element  $z$  is uniquely determined modulo an element of the center of  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ .

**Example**  $G = U(2, 3)$ .

The maximal compact subgroup is  $K = U(2) \times U(3)$ . The Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{u}(2, 3)$  in block form is given as  $\mathfrak{g} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b^* & d \end{pmatrix} \right\}$  where  $a \in \mathfrak{u}(2)$ ,  $d \in \mathfrak{u}(3)$ ,  $b$  is any  $3 \times 2$  complex matrix and  $b^*$  is the matrix conjugate transpose of  $b$ . The Cartan decomposition is given by  $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{u}(2) \oplus \mathfrak{u}(3) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix} \right\}$  and  $\mathfrak{p} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ b^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$ .

The complexification of  $\mathfrak{g}$  is  $\mathfrak{gl}(5, \mathbb{C})$ . We have  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{p}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{p}_-$  where a matrix in  $\mathfrak{p}_+$  have the block form  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & * \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and a matrix in  $\mathfrak{p}_-$  have the block form  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ . Each  $\mathfrak{p}_{\pm}$  is stable under the adjoint action of  $K_{\mathbb{C}} = GL(2, \mathbb{C}) \times GL(3, \mathbb{C})$ . More explicitly  $\mathfrak{p}_+$  identifies to

$$\text{Hom}(\mathbb{C}e_3 \oplus \mathbb{C}e_4 \oplus \mathbb{C}e_5, \mathbb{C}e_1 \oplus \mathbb{C}e_2)$$

with action of  $K_{\mathbb{C}} = GL(2, \mathbb{C}) \times GL(3, \mathbb{C})$  given by  $g_1 r g_2^{-1}$  if  $r \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{C}e_3 \oplus \mathbb{C}e_4 \oplus \mathbb{C}e_5, \mathbb{C}e_1 \oplus \mathbb{C}e_2)$ . Similarly for  $\mathfrak{p}_-$ .

Let  $T$  be a Cartan subgroup of  $K$ , thus  $T$  is also a Cartan subgroup of  $G$ . Let  $\Lambda \subset (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k})^*$  be the lattice of weights of  $T$ . The central element  $z$  belongs to  $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k}$ . We denote by  $W_K$  the Weyl group of  $K$ . Let  $\Delta = \Delta(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}, \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}})$  be the roots of  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$ . We write  $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}} \oplus \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}$  for the root space decomposition. If  $\alpha \in \Delta$ , its coroot  $H_{\alpha}$  is in  $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k}$  and satisfies  $\alpha(H_{\alpha}) = 2$ . The roots are called compact or noncompact depending whether the root space is in  $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$  or in  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{C}}$ . We denote by  $\Delta_c, \Delta_n$  the set of compact and noncompact roots, with  $\Delta_n$  decomposed in  $\Delta_n^+ \cup \Delta_n^-$ , according to the decomposition  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{p}_+ \oplus \mathfrak{p}_-$ . Choose a system  $\Delta_c^+$  of positive compact roots, and let  $\Delta^+ = \Delta_c^+ \cup \Delta_n^+$ . Let  $\lambda \in (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k})^*$  such that  $\lambda(H_{\alpha}) \geq 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \Delta^+$ . Then  $\langle \lambda, z \rangle \geq 0$  since  $\lambda \in \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \alpha$ , and  $\alpha(z) = 0$  for  $\alpha$  compact, while  $\alpha(z) = 1$  for  $\alpha$  non compact positive.

Let  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  be such that  $\lambda(H_{\alpha}) \geq 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \Delta_c^+$ . We denote by  $V_{\lambda}$  the irreducible representation of  $K$  (or  $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ ) with highest weight  $\lambda$ . Consider  $\pi_{\lambda}$  the generalized Verma module defined as

$$\pi_\lambda = \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{C}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{t}_\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathfrak{p}_-)} V_\lambda$$

where  $V_\lambda$  is the  $K$ -module of highest weight  $\lambda$  and we extend it to be a  $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{p}_-)$  module by making  $\mathfrak{p}_-$  acting trivially (here  $\mathcal{U}$  stands for the universal enveloping algebra). Thus the representation  $\pi_\lambda$  has highest weight  $\lambda$ , for the system  $\Delta_c^+ \cup -\Delta_n^+$ , and as a  $K$ -module,

$$\pi_\lambda = \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}_+) \otimes V_\lambda. \quad (11)$$

Remark that the action of  $z$  in  $\pi_\lambda$  have non negative eigenvalues, namely the set of eigenvalues is  $\{\langle \lambda, z \rangle + n, n \geq 0\}$ , and each eigenvalue has finite multiplicity.

If  $\rho = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \alpha$ ,  $\rho_c = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_c^+} \alpha$ ,  $\rho_n = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_n^+} \alpha$ , then the infinitesimal character of  $\pi_\lambda$  is  $\lambda + \rho_c - \rho_n$ . If  $\langle \lambda + \rho_c - \rho_n, H_\alpha \rangle > 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \Delta^+$ , then Harish-Chandra has constructed a unitary irreducible representation of  $G$  with corresponding  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$  module  $\pi_\lambda$ . Such representation belongs to the **holomorphic discrete series** and we denote it still by  $\pi_\lambda$ . The name holomorphic comes from the fact that it can be realized as a subspace of the space of holomorphic sections of the holomorphic bundle  $G \times_K V_\lambda$  on  $G/K$ , the condition  $\langle \lambda + \rho_c - \rho_n, H_\alpha \rangle > 0$  assuring the existence of square integrable holomorphic sections.

**Example**  $U(p, q)$  Consider  $U(p, q)$ , with  $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}$  consisting of diagonal  $(p+q) \times (p+q)$  matrices with real entries. Let  $h_k$  be the diagonal  $(p+q) \times (p+q)$  matrix with 1 at the  $k$ -th place, 0 at other places. Then  $(h_k)_{k=1}^{p+q}$  is a basis of  $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}$ . We denote by  $\epsilon^k$  the dual basis. The Weyl group  $W_K$  is the product of the permutation groups  $\Sigma_p \times \Sigma_q$ .

Consider the standard system of positive roots

$$\Delta^+ = \{\epsilon^i - \epsilon^j, 1 \leq i < j \leq p+q\}.$$

Then

$$\Delta_c^+ = \{\epsilon^i - \epsilon^j, 1 \leq i < j \leq p\} \cup \{\epsilon^i - \epsilon^j, p+1 \leq i < j \leq p+q\}.$$

$$\Delta_n^+ = \{\epsilon^i - \epsilon^j, 1 \leq i \leq p, p+1 \leq j \leq p+q\}.$$

Then  $\rho_n = \frac{1}{2}(q \sum_{i=1}^p \epsilon^i - p \sum_{j=1}^{q-p} \epsilon^{j+p})$  and  $(\rho_n - \rho_c)(h_p - h_{p+1}) = (p+q) - 1$ . Let  $\lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{p+q} \lambda_i \epsilon^i$  in  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$  with integral coefficients. The condition  $\langle \lambda + \rho_c - \rho_n, H_\alpha \rangle > 0$  for all compact roots gives separately

$$\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_p,$$

$$\lambda_{p+1} \geq \lambda_{p+2} \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{p+q},$$

and  $\langle \lambda + \rho_c - \rho_n, H_{\epsilon^p - \epsilon^{p+1}} \rangle > 0$  gives the condition  $\lambda_p > \lambda_{p+1} + p + q - 1$ .

Let  $\lambda, \mu, \nu$  be dominant weights for  $K$ . Define  $m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu)$  to be the multiplicity of the representation  $V_\nu$  in the representation  $V_\lambda \otimes V_\mu \otimes \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}_+)$  of  $K$

Recall the following theorem [20],[14].

**Theorem 5.** *The tensor product of two representations  $\pi_\lambda, \pi_\mu$  belonging to the holomorphic discrete series is a direct sum, with finite multiplicities, of representations belonging to the holomorphic discrete series:*

$$\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi_\mu = \otimes_\nu m_{\text{hol}}^\nu(\lambda, \mu) \pi_\nu.$$

We have:

$$m_{\text{hol}}^\nu(\lambda, \mu) = m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu). \quad (12)$$

In other words, if the parameters  $\lambda, \mu$  satisfy Harish-Chandra inequalities, and if  $m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu)$  is not zero, then the parameter  $\nu$  satisfy also Harish-Chandra inequalities and  $m_{\text{hol}}^\nu(\lambda, \mu) = m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu)$ .

(If the parameters  $\lambda, \mu$  do not satisfy Harish-Chandra inequalities, then the  $(\mathfrak{g}, K)$  module  $\pi_\lambda$  may not be irreducible, nor unitarizable. However there is a Jordan-Hölder series for  $\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi_\mu$  by modules  $\pi_\nu$  and with multiplicity  $m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu)$ .)

Let us give a rapid check (not a proof, but the proof is not difficult) of the consistency of the formula by restricting both members to  $K$ . The decomposition of the left hand side of Eq.12 restricted to  $K$  is

$$(\pi_\lambda \otimes \pi_\mu)|_K = \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}_+) \otimes V_\lambda \otimes \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}_+) \otimes V_\mu.$$

The decomposition of the right hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_\nu m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu) \pi_\nu|_K &= \sum_\nu m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu) (V_\nu \otimes \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}_+)) \\ &= \left( \sum_\nu m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu) V_\nu \right) \otimes \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}_+). \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\sum_\nu m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu) V_\nu = V_\lambda \otimes V_\mu \otimes \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}_+)$$

by definition of  $m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu)$ . So the right hand side is

$$V_\lambda \otimes V_\mu \otimes \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}_+) \otimes \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}_+)$$

and thus Eq. 12 is true with respect to the  $K$  action.

## 5 Geometric analogue

As in the preceding section, we consider an hermitian symmetric space  $G/K$ , and the choice of the positive root system  $\Delta^+ = \Delta_c^+ \cup \Delta_n^+$ . Consider  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} = \{\lambda \in (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*, \lambda(H_\alpha) \geq 0; \alpha \in \Delta^+\}$ , the corresponding Weyl chamber. **In this section, we do not assume  $\lambda$  in the lattice of weights.** If  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$  we denote by  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \subset (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*$  its coadjoint orbit under the action of  $G$ . Moment maps for  $G$ -Hamiltonian spaces (or  $K$ -Hamiltonian spaces) are valued in  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*$  (or  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k})^*$ ). In particular, if the compact group  $K$  acts on a complex vector space  $E$  provided with a  $K$ -invariant Hermitian form  $\langle, \rangle$  that we take antilinear in the first variable, the moment map  $\mu : E \rightarrow (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k})^*$  is given by  $\mu(r)(X) = \langle r, Xr \rangle$ , for  $r \in E$  and  $X \in (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k})$ .

Recall that  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}$  is a (non compact)  $G$ -Hamiltonian manifold, the moment map  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \rightarrow (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*$  being the inclusion. Since  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}$  is provided with a  $G$ -invariant Kähler structure, we will call  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}$  an holomorphic orbit. The set  $G\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$  is a convex cone in  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*$ , as proved by Vinberg ([25]) (see [12]). So the sum  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} + \mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc}$  of two holomorphic orbits is an union of holomorphic orbits.

We denote by  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}^K = \{\lambda \in (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*, \lambda(H_\alpha) \geq 0; \alpha \in \Delta_c^+\}$ , the Weyl chamber for  $K$ .

Let  $z$  in the center of  $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k}$  such that  $\mathfrak{p}^+ = \{X \in \mathfrak{p}_\mathbb{C}, [z, X] = X\}$ . If  $f \in (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*$ , the value  $\langle f, z \rangle$  is real. The geometric analogue of the fact that, in a representation  $\pi_\lambda$  of the holomorphic discrete series, the eigenvalues of  $z$  are positive and the corresponding eigenspace is with finite multiplicity is the content of the following proposition (see [8]).

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$ , let  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}$  its coadjoint orbit, and let  $f \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \subset (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*$ . Then*

1.  $\langle f, z \rangle \geq \langle \lambda, z \rangle \geq 0$ .
2. For any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , the set

$$\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}(t) = \{\xi \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}, \langle f, z \rangle = t\}$$

is a compact subset of  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}$ .

In other words, the function  $p : \mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  given by  $p(f) = \langle f, z \rangle$  is bounded from below by  $\langle \lambda, z \rangle \geq 0$ . Furthermore the fiber of  $p$  is compact.

The proof uses the decomposition of  $G$  as  $KAK$  and Harish-Chandra description of a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{p}$  by strongly orthogonal roots.

Let  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$ . The moment map for the diagonal action of  $G$  on the product  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \times \mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc}$  is the addition  $A : \mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \times \mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc} \rightarrow \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g}^* : A(f_1, f_2) = f_1 + f_2$ . It is easy to see that  $A$  is proper.

The geometric analogue of the fact that a tensor product of representation of the holomorphic discrete series is a direct sum of holomorphic discrete

series, each one occurring with finite multiplicity, is the following proposition, which is a direct consequence of the fact that  $G\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$  is a convex cone and of Proposition 3.

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $\lambda, \mu$  in  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$ , and  $O_\lambda^{nc}, O_\mu^{nc}$  be the corresponding coadjoint orbits. Then*

1.  $O_\lambda^{nc} + O_\mu^{nc}$  is an union of orbits of elements of  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$ .
2. For any  $\xi \in (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*$ , the set

$$(O_\lambda^{nc} \times O_\mu^{nc})(\xi) = \{(f_1, f_2) \in O_\lambda^{nc} \times O_\mu^{nc}; f_1 + f_2 = \xi\}$$

is a compact subset of  $O_\lambda^{nc} \times O_\mu^{nc}$ .

Define  $P(\lambda, \mu) = (O_\lambda^{nc} + O_\mu^{nc}) \cap \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$ . It is a set parameterizing the moment map image  $A(O_\lambda^{nc} \times O_\mu^{nc})$  modulo the action of  $G$ .

We now consider the case where  $\langle \lambda, H_\alpha \rangle > 0, \langle \mu, H_\alpha \rangle > 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \Delta_n^+$ . Let  $O_\lambda, O_\mu$  be the (compact) coadjoint  $K$ -orbits of  $\lambda, \mu$ . Consider  $\mathfrak{p}^+$ . This is a  $K$ -Hamiltonian space with moment map  $\Phi_+ : \mathfrak{p}^+ \rightarrow (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k})^*$ . Thus the product  $O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+$  is a  $K$ -Hamiltonian space, with moment map  $\phi : O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+ \rightarrow \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k}^*$  given by  $\phi(\xi_1, \xi_2, Y) = \xi_1 + \xi_2 + \Phi_+(Y)$ . Let  $\text{Kir}(O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+)$  be the intersection of  $\phi(O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+)$  with the positive Weyl chamber  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}^K$ . It is a rational polyhedron.

The following proposition, due to P.E. Paradan [19], is the geometric analogue of Theorem 5. It can be deduced from Theorem 5 using Paradan's proof of the “[ $Q, R$ ] = 0” theorem in the case of holomorphic discrete series [18]. We sketch another proof based on Fourier transforms of orbits.

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $\langle \lambda, H_\alpha \rangle > 0$ , and  $\langle \mu, H_\alpha \rangle > 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \Delta_n^+$ . Then*

$$P(\lambda, \mu) = \text{Kir}(O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+).$$

*Proof.* We will work with equivariant volumes. If  $M$  is a  $G$ -Hamiltonian space with Liouville measure  $d\beta_M$  and proper moment map  $\Phi : M \rightarrow (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*$ , the Duistermaat-Heckman measure of the  $G$ -Hamiltonian space  $M$  is (by definition)  $\Phi_* d\beta_M$ . The  $G$ -equivariant volume of  $M$  is the generalized function of  $X \in \mathfrak{g}$  defined by

$$I_M(X) = \int_M e^{\langle \Phi(m), X \rangle} d\beta_M = \int_{(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*} e^{\langle \xi, X \rangle} \Phi_*(d\beta_M),$$

so is the Fourier transform of  $\Phi_*(d\beta_M)$ .

Similarly, if  $N$  is a  $K$ -Hamiltonian space with Liouville measure  $d\beta_N$  and proper moment map  $\phi : N \rightarrow (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{k})^*$ , the Duistermaat-Heckman measure of the  $K$ -Hamiltonian space  $N$  is  $\phi_*(d\beta_N)$ . The  $K$ -equivariant volume of  $N$  is the generalized function of  $X \in \mathfrak{k}$  defined by

$$I_N(X) = \int_N e^{\langle \phi(n), X \rangle} d\beta_N = \int_{(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*} e^{\langle \xi, X \rangle} \phi_*(d\beta_N),$$

so is the Fourier transform of  $\phi_*(d\beta_N)$ .

In the case of  $M = \mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \times \mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc}$  (resp.  $N = \mathcal{O}_\lambda \times \mathcal{O}_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+$ ), the measure  $\Phi_*(d\beta_M)$  is easy to compute directly. Equivalently, it is easy to give explicit formula for its Fourier transform. Since the function  $m \mapsto \langle \Phi(m), z \rangle$  on  $M$  (resp.  $n \mapsto \langle \phi(n), z \rangle$  on  $N$ ) is a proper map, the restriction to  $\mathfrak{t}$  (even to  $\mathbb{R}z \subset \mathfrak{t}$ ) of the equivariant volumes of the non compact spaces  $M$  or  $N$  are well defined as generalized functions.

We will also use the Fourier transform on  $\mathfrak{t}$  and the following result. Let  $m$  be a locally polynomial measure on  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$  and let us consider  $\mathcal{F}(m)(X) = \int_{\xi \in (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*} e^{\langle X, \xi \rangle} dm(\xi)$  its Fourier transform as a generalized function on  $\mathfrak{t}$ . Assume that there exists a set  $\{l_k \in \mathfrak{t}^*, k = 1, \dots, s\}$  of non zero linear forms on  $\mathfrak{t}$  such that  $\prod_{k=1}^s l_k(X) \mathcal{F}(m)(X)$  is analytic. Assume furthermore that  $m$  is supported on the closed halfspace  $\langle \xi, z \rangle \geq 0$ . Then the equation  $\prod_{k=1}^s l_k \mathcal{F}(m) = 0$  imply that  $\mathcal{F}(m) = 0$ , thus  $m = 0$ .

Let  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$ . Let

$$I_\lambda(X) = \int_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}} e^{\langle \xi, X \rangle} d\beta_\lambda$$

be the equivariant volume of  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}$ , that is the Fourier transform of the orbit  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}$  with its Liouville measure  $d\beta_\lambda$ . The equivariant volume of the  $G$ -Hamiltonian space  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \times \mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc}$  is the product  $I_\lambda(X)I_\mu(X)$  of the equivariant volumes  $I_\lambda(X)$ ,  $I_\mu(X)$  of  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc}$ . The product is well defined since the addition map  $A : \mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} + \mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc} \rightarrow (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*$  is a proper map. Let  $d\beta = d\beta_\lambda d\beta_\mu$  be the product of the Liouville measures. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & I_\lambda(X)I_\mu(X) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc}} \int_{\mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc}} e^{\langle f_1, X \rangle} e^{\langle f_2, X \rangle} d\beta = \int_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \times \mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc}} e^{\langle f_1 + f_2, X \rangle} d\beta \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \times \mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc}} e^{\langle A(f_1, f_2), X \rangle} d\beta = \int_{(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*} e^{\langle \xi, X \rangle} DH(\xi) \end{aligned}$$

with  $DH = A_*(d\beta)$  is the Duistermaat-Heckman measure for the  $G$ -Hamiltonian space  $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} \times \mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc}$  with moment map  $A$ . So, by definition of  $P(\lambda, \mu)$ , the support of  $DH$  is

$$\mathcal{O}_\lambda^{nc} + \mathcal{O}_\mu^{nc} = G \cdot (P(\lambda, \mu))$$

with  $P(\lambda, \mu) \subset \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \subset (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$ . Remark that for every  $\xi \in P(\lambda, \mu)$ ,  $\langle \xi, z \rangle \geq 0$ . We now use the Weyl integration formula on  $G\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \subset (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{g})^*$ . Desintegrating the measure  $DH$  by the Liouville measures of the  $G$ -orbits  $G\xi$  with  $\xi \in P(\lambda, \mu)$ , we obtain a measure  $S$  on  $P(\lambda, \mu) \subset \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \subset (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$ . We consider the action of the compact Weyl group  $W_K$  on  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$  and the antiinvariant

measure  $\text{ant}(S) = \sum_{w \in W_K} \epsilon(w)w \cdot S$  on  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$ . Since  $z$  is a central element in  $\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}$ ,  $\text{ant}(S)$  is still supported on  $\langle z, \xi \rangle \geq 0$ . We have the following formula: For  $X \in \mathfrak{t}$ :

$$\left( \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle \right) I_\lambda(X) I_\mu(X) = \int_{\xi \in (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*} e^{\langle \xi, X \rangle} \text{ant}(S)(\xi).$$

We now consider the  $K$ -Hamiltonian space  $N = O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+$ , and its moment map  $\phi : N \rightarrow (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$ . We see similarly that  $\langle \phi(n), z \rangle \geq \langle \lambda, z \rangle + \langle \mu, z \rangle$  for any  $n \in N$ , and that the moment map  $\phi$  is proper.

Consider the equivariant volume of  $N$ :

$$I_N(X) = \int_N e^{\langle X, \phi(n) \rangle} d\beta_N = \int_{\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}^*} e^{\langle X, \xi \rangle} \phi_*(d\beta_N).$$

So  $N$  gives rise to a  $K$ -invariant Duistermaat-Heckman measure  $DH_N = \phi_*(d\beta_N)$  on  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$  supported on  $\phi(N)$ . By definition of  $\text{Kir}(O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+)$ ,

$$\phi(N) = K \cdot (\text{Kir}(O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+))$$

with  $\text{Kir}(O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+) \subset \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}^K \subset \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}^*$ .

Similarly desintegrating the measure  $DH_N = \phi_*(d\beta_N)$  by the Liouville measures of the  $K$ -orbits  $K\xi$  with  $\xi \in \text{Kir}(O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+)$ , and using Weyl integration formula on  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$ , we obtain a measure  $S'$  supported on  $\text{Kir}(O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+)$ . Let  $\text{ant}(S')$  be the anti-invariant measure defined by  $\text{ant}(S') = \sum_{w \in W_K} \epsilon(w)w \cdot S'$  on  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$ . We have the following formula. For  $X \in \mathfrak{t}$ :

$$\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle I_N(X) = \int_{(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*} e^{\langle \xi, X \rangle} \text{ant}(S')(\xi).$$

Both measures  $\text{ant}(S)$  and  $\text{ant}(S')$  are supported on the closed halfspace  $\langle \xi, z \rangle \geq 0$  and are locally polynomial measures on  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t})^*$ . It is equivalent to prove that  $S = S'$  or that  $\text{ant}(S) = \text{ant}(S')$  since  $S, S'$  are both supported in the Weyl chamber  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}^K$ , so no cancelation can occur. It is easy to see that both  $(\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle) \mathcal{F}(S)(X)$  and  $(\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle) \mathcal{F}(S')(X)$  are analytic (see for example Proposition 32 of [9]). We thus can prove that  $S = S'$  by proving that  $\mathcal{F}(\text{ant}(S))(X) = \mathcal{F}(\text{ant}(S'))(X)$  on the open set of  $X \in \mathfrak{t}$  such that  $\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle \neq 0$ . Now, for such  $X$ , all equivariant volumes occurring can be computed by an (easy) case of the Berline-Vergne localization formula for the corresponding possibly non compact Hamiltonian spaces with proper moment maps. We give the formulae in the case where  $\langle \lambda, H_\alpha \rangle \neq 0$  and  $\langle \mu, H_\alpha \rangle \neq 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \Delta^+$ , since they are easier to state.

We have by Rossmann formula ([4]):

$$I_\lambda(X) I_\mu(X)$$

$$= \left( \sum_{w_1 \in W_K} \epsilon(w_1) \frac{e^{\langle w_1 \lambda, X \rangle}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle} \right) \left( \sum_{w_2 \in W_K} \epsilon(w_2) \frac{e^{\langle w_2 \mu, X \rangle}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle} \right).$$

Thus we obtain:

$$\mathcal{F}(\text{ant}(S))(X) = \frac{\sum_{w_1, w_2 \in W_K \times W_K} \epsilon(w_1) \epsilon(w_2) e^{\langle w_1 \lambda + w_2 \mu, X \rangle}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle}. \quad (13)$$

We now compute the equivariant volume of  $N$ , that is the product of the equivariant volumes of the compact  $K$ -orbits  $O_\lambda$ ,  $O_\mu$  and of the symplectic space  $\mathfrak{p}^+$ . The list of weights of the action of  $T$  on  $\mathfrak{p}^+$  is the list  $\Delta_n^+$ . The equivariant volume of  $\mathfrak{p}^+$  is thus given, for  $X \in \mathfrak{t}$  such that  $\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_n^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle \neq 0$ , by  $\frac{1}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_n^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle}$ . The equivariant volumes of the compact  $K$ -orbits  $O_\lambda$ ,  $O_\mu$  are given by Harish-Chandra formula. So we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}(\text{ant}(S'))(X) = \frac{1}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_n^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle} \left( \frac{\sum_{w_1, w_2 \in W_K \times W_K} \epsilon(w_1) \epsilon(w_2) e^{\langle w_1 \lambda + w_2 \mu, X \rangle}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_c^+} \langle \alpha, X \rangle} \right)$$

and we conclude that  $\mathcal{F}(\text{ant}(S))(X) = \mathcal{F}(\text{ant}(S'))(X)$  on the open set of  $X \in \mathfrak{t}$  such that  $\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta} \langle \alpha, X \rangle \neq 0$ , and so everywhere. The measure  $S$  and  $S'$  are thus equal, so their support  $P(\lambda, \mu)$  and  $\text{Kir}(O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+)$  are equal.

Denote by  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(G) \subset \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$  to be the set of triples  $(A, B, C)$  such that  $O_C^{nc} \subset O_A^{nc} + O_B^{nc}$ .

An important corollary of the discussion above is the following proposition

**Proposition 6.** ([19]) *The cone  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(G)$  is the cone generated by the weights  $(\lambda, \mu, \nu)$  such that  $m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu) > 0$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from theorems on Kirwan polyhedron ([16],[11]) for representations of compact groups that  $\{(\lambda, \mu, \nu); \nu \in \text{Kir}(O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+)\}$  is the polyhedron generated by the triples of dominant weights  $(\lambda, \mu, \nu)$  such that  $V_\nu \subset V_\lambda \otimes V_\mu \otimes \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ .

So as it should be, by Proposition 5, the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(G)$  in  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$  generated by the  $(\lambda, \mu, \nu)$  such that  $O_\nu \subset O_\lambda + O_\mu$  coincide with the cone generated by  $(\lambda, \mu, \nu)$  parameters for the holomorphic discrete series with  $m_{\text{hol}}^\nu(\lambda, \mu) > 0$ . This is in accordance with the general philosophy  $[Q, R] = 0$  (and conversely is a corollary of  $[Q, R] = 0$  for holomorphic quantizable orbits, as proved by P-E-Paradan ([18])).

*Remark 3.* Consider the  $G$ -Hamiltonian space  $O_\lambda^{nc} \times O_\mu^{nc}$  and the induced  $G$ -Hamiltonian space  $G \times_K (O_\lambda \times O_\mu \times \mathfrak{p}^+)$ . A more satisfying proof of Proposition 5 would be to prove (in the spirit of Deltour [6]) that these two  $G$ -Hamiltonian spaces are isomorphic.

## 6 The quiver representation

The aim of this section is to relate tensor products of holomorphic discrete series for  $U(p, q)$  with representations of the quiver  $Q_{3,3}$ . We consider the quiver  $Q_{3,3}$  described in Fig.3, but now label the vertices as  $x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3$ . A couples  $(x_i, y_i)$  will parameterize an object for  $i$ -th copy of  $U(p, q)$  in  $U(p, q)^3$ . See 3.




Fig. 3

Given an integer  $s$ , we label the dominant weights for  $U(s)$  by a sequence  $\lambda$  of  $s$  slowly decreasing integers ( $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_s$ ). If  $\lambda_s \geq 0$ , we simply write  $\lambda \geq 0$ . If  $\lambda_1 \leq 0$ , we write  $\lambda \leq 0$ . Let  $V_\lambda$  be the representation of  $U(s)$  with highest weight  $\lambda$ . The dual representation  $V_\lambda^*$  is indexed by  $\lambda^* = (-\lambda_s \geq \dots \geq -\lambda_1)$ . Remark that if  $\lambda \geq 0$ , then  $\lambda^* \leq 0$ .

We choose  $E_{x_i} = \mathbb{C}^p$ ,  $E_{y_i} = \mathbb{C}^q$ , and  $\mathcal{E} = (E_{x_1}, E_{x_2}, E_{x_3}, E_{y_1}, E_{y_2}, E_{y_3})$ . The space  $H(Q_{3,3})$  associated to  $\mathcal{E}$  is

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^2 \text{Hom}(E_{x_i}, E_{x_3}) \oplus \text{Hom}(E_{y_3}, E_{x_3}) \oplus \bigoplus_{j=1}^2 \text{Hom}(E_{y_3}, E_{y_j}).$$

Then  $\text{Sym}^*(H(Q_{3,3}))$  is a representation space for  $GL(\mathcal{E}) = GL(E_{x_1}) \times GL(E_{x_2}) \times GL(E_{x_3}) \times GL(E_{y_1}) \times GL(E_{y_2}) \times GL(E_{y_3})$ .

Write its decomposition

$$\text{Sym}^*(H(Q_{3,3}))$$

$$= \bigoplus_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3} m_Q(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) V_{\alpha_1}^{x_1} \otimes V_{\alpha_2}^{x_2} \otimes V_{\alpha_3}^{x_3} \otimes V_{\beta_1}^{y_1} \otimes V_{\beta_2}^{y_2} \otimes V_{\beta_3}^{y_3}$$

where  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$  are dominant weights for  $U(p)$ , while  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$  are dominant weights for  $U(q)$ .

For  $\lambda, \mu, \nu$ , a triple of dominant weights of  $U(p) \times U(q)$  (so  $\lambda$  is a couple  $(\alpha, \beta)$  where  $\alpha$  is a dominant weight for  $U(p)$  and  $\beta$  for  $U(q)$ , etc.), recall that  $m_D^\nu(\lambda, \mu)$  is the multiplicity of  $V_\nu$  in  $V_\lambda \otimes V_\mu \otimes \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{p}^+)$ , where  $\mathfrak{p}^+ = \text{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^q, \mathbb{C}^p)$ .

**Lemma 2.** *If  $m_Q(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) > 0$ , then  $\alpha_1 \geq 0$ ,  $\beta_1 \leq 0$ ,  $\alpha_2 \geq 0$ ,  $\beta_2 \leq 0$ , and  $\alpha_3 \leq 0, \beta_3 \geq 0$ . Furthermore,*

$$m_Q(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) = m_D^Y(\lambda, \mu),$$

where

$$V_\lambda = V_{\alpha_1} \otimes V_{\beta_1}, \quad V_\mu = V_{\alpha_2} \otimes V_{\beta_2}, \quad V_\nu = V_{\alpha_3^*} \otimes V_{\beta_3^*}.$$

*Proof.*

We give the proof in the case where  $p \leq q$ . We write

$$\text{Sym}^*(\mathcal{H}_{Q_{3,3}}) = A \otimes B \otimes C$$

with

$$A = \text{Sym}^*(\text{Hom}(E_{x_1}, E_{x_3})) \otimes \text{Sym}^*(\text{Hom}(E_{x_2}, E_{x_3})),$$

$$B = \text{Sym}^*(\text{Hom}(E_{y_3}, E_{x_3})),$$

$$C = \text{Sym}^*(\text{Hom}(E_{y_3}, E_{y_1})) \otimes \text{Sym}^*(\text{Hom}(E_{y_3}, E_{y_2})).$$

We recall the Cauchy formula :

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $N, n$  be positive integers, and assume that  $N \geq n$ . The decomposition of  $\text{Sym}(\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^N)$  with respect to the natural action of  $U(n) \times U(N)$  is given by the Cauchy formula*

$$\text{Sym}(\mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^N) = \bigoplus_{\nu \geq 0} V_\nu^{U(n)} \otimes V_{\tilde{\nu}}^{U(N)}. \quad (14)$$

Here  $\tilde{\nu}$  is the sequence  $\nu$  to which we add on the right  $N - n$  zeros.

Using the identification

$$\text{Hom}(V, W) = V^* \otimes W$$

and looking at the decomposition of  $A, C$ , above, we obtain

$$\text{Sym}^*(\mathcal{H}_{Q_{3,3}})$$

$$\sum_{\alpha_1 \geq 0, \alpha_2 \geq 0, \beta_1 \leq 0, \beta_2 \leq 0} V_{\alpha_1}^{x_1} \otimes V_{\alpha_2}^{x_2} \otimes \text{Middle}_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2} \otimes V_{\beta_1}^{y_1} \otimes V_{\beta_2}^{y_2}$$

where  $\text{Middle}_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2}$  is the representation of  $U(E_{x_3}) \times U(E_{y_3})$  equal to

$$V_{\alpha_1^*}^{x_3} \otimes V_{\alpha_2^*}^{x_3} \otimes \text{Sym}^*(\text{Hom}(E_{y_3}, E_{x_3})) \otimes V_{\beta_1^*}^{y_3} \otimes V_{\beta_2^*}^{y_3}.$$

So

$$\text{Middle}_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2} = V_\lambda^* \otimes V_\mu^* \otimes \text{Sym}^*(\text{Hom}(E_{y_3}, E_{x_3}))$$

$$= (V_\lambda \otimes V_\mu \otimes \text{Sym}(\text{Hom}(E_{y_3}, E_{x_3})))^*,$$

with

$$V_\lambda = V_{\alpha_1} \otimes V_{\beta_1}, \quad V_\mu = V_{\alpha_2} \otimes V_{\beta_2}.$$

By definition of  $m_D$ , this is

$$\sum_{\nu} m_D^{\nu}(\lambda, \mu) V_{\nu}^* = \sum_{\nu} m_D(\nu^*, \lambda, \mu) V_{\nu}$$

Replacing  $\text{Middle}_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2}$  by this last expression, we obtain our formula.

## 7 Cone inequalities and comparison with P.E. Paradan's list

Let  $G = U(p, q)$  and  $n = p + q$ . Let  $K = U(p) \times U(q)$  be the maximal compact subgroup of  $G$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  be the Cartan subalgebra of  $\text{Lie}(G)$  consisting of diagonal matrices with imaginary entries. An element  $\xi \in (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{h})^*$  is written as  $\sum_{i=1}^{p+q} \xi(i)\epsilon^i$  with  $\xi(i)$  reals, using the notations of Example 4. Let

$$\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} = \{\xi; \xi(1) \geq \dots \geq \xi(p) \geq \xi(p+1) \geq \dots \geq \xi(p+q)\}.$$

Recall that the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(p, q)$  consists of the triples  $(A, B, C)$  such that  $\mathcal{O}_C^{nc} \subset \mathcal{O}_A^{nc} + \mathcal{O}_B^{nc}$ . Equivalently (following [19] and Proposition 6), it is the cone generated by the weights  $\lambda, \mu, \nu$  in  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $m_D^{\nu}(\lambda, \mu) > 0$ .

Let  $\mathcal{J} = [J_1, J_2, \dots, J_6]$  be a collection of subsets of integers, with  $J_1, J_2, J_3 \subseteq [p]$  and  $J_4, J_5, J_6 \subseteq [q]$ . Consider a triple  $(A, B, C)$  in  $(\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{h})^* \oplus (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{h})^* \oplus (\sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{h})^*$ . We define the linear form  $e(\mathcal{J})$  by

$$\begin{aligned} & e(\mathcal{J})(A, B, C) \\ &= \sum_{i \in J_1} A(i) + \sum_{i \in J_2} B(i) - \sum_{i \in J_3} C(p+1-i) - \sum_{i \in J_4} C(p+q-i+1) + \sum_{i \in J_5} A(p+i) + \sum_{i \in J_6} B(p+i). \end{aligned}$$

We now consider the quiver  $Q_{3,3}$  and index its vertices by  $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ . A family of objects indexed by  $Q_0$  is written as a list in the order  $1 \rightarrow 6$ . So an element  $[J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4, J_5, J_6] \in \text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$  is a sequence of sets such that  $J_1, J_2, J_3 \subseteq [p]$  and  $J_4, J_5, J_6 \subseteq [q]$  with  $|J_1| = |J_2| = |J_3|$  and  $|J_4| = |J_5| = |J_6|$ .

**Proposition 7.** *The cone  $\text{C}_{\text{hol}}(p, q) \subset \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$  is the cone defined by the equation*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p+q} A(i) + \sum_{i=1}^{p+q} B(i) = \sum_{i=1}^{p+q} C(i)$$

and the inequalities  $e(\mathcal{J})(A, B, C) \leq 0$  for all  $\mathcal{J} \in \text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$ .

*Proof.*

Let  $(A, B, C)$  in  $\mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0} \oplus \mathfrak{c}_{\geq 0}$ . Let  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  be a real number. Consider  $t \text{Id}_n = t(\sum_{k=1}^n h_k)$  in  $\sqrt{-1} \text{Lie}(G)$ . It is in the center of  $\text{Lie}(G)_{\mathbb{C}}$ . Thus  $r_t = \sum_{k=1}^n t \epsilon^k$  is invariant by the coadjoint action of  $U(p, q)$ . Thus we see that the translations

$$(A, B, C) \rightarrow (A + r_{t_1}, B + r_{t_2}, C - r_{t_1} - r_{t_2})$$

leaves the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(p, q)$  invariant, for any  $(t_1, t_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ .

Since the sets  $J_1, J_2, J_3$  as well as the sets  $J_4, J_5, J_6$  have same cardinality, the linear form  $e(\mathcal{J})$  is invariant by the same two parameter group of translations. We can find  $t_1, t_2$  such that  $A = (A(1) \geq \dots \geq A(p) \geq 0 \geq A(p+1) \geq \dots \geq A(p+q))$  and  $B = (B(1) \geq \dots \geq B(p) \geq 0 \geq B(p+1) \geq \dots \geq B(p+q))$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= (A(1), \dots, A(p)), \\ a_5 &= (A(p+1), \dots, A(p+q)), \\ a_2 &= (B(1), \dots, B(p)), \\ a_6 &= (B(p+1), \dots, B(p+q)), \\ a_3 &= (-C(p), \dots, -C(1)), \\ a_4 &= (-C(p+q), \dots, -C(p+1)). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Then  $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6]$  is in the Weyl chamber for the group  $U_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E}) = U(p)^3 \times U(q)^3$ .

Furthermore, by our choice,  $a_1, a_2 \geq 0$  and  $a_5, a_6 \leq 0$ . It is easy to see that  $e(\mathcal{J})(A, B, C) = E(\mathcal{J})(\mathbf{a})$ . Thus if  $(A, B, C)$  satisfy the equations  $e(\mathcal{J}) \leq 0$ , the element  $\mathbf{a}$  is in the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E})$  since the four inequalities in **Extremal** are satisfied by our choice and the other inequalities describing  $\text{Cone}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E})$  are  $E(\mathcal{J}) \leq 0$  for  $\mathcal{J} \in \text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$  (Lemma 1). Assume that  $(A, B, C)$  are with integral coefficients, then  $m_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbf{a}) > \mathbf{0}$ , and so  $m_{\mathcal{D}}^{\nu}(\lambda, \mu) > 0$  with  $V_{\lambda} = V_{a_1} \otimes V_{a_5}$ ,  $V_{\mu} = V_{a_2} \otimes V_{a_6}$ ,  $V_{\nu} = V_{a_3}^* \otimes V_{a_4}^*$ , considered as irreducible representations of  $K = U(p) \times U(q)$ . From Proposition 1, this in turn implies that  $(A, B, C) \in \text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(p, q)$ . This proves the proposition.

We now give the example of  $\text{Cone}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E})$  for  $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_{3,3}$  and dimension vector  $[2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2]$ . The inequalities corresponding to the elements in  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, 2, 2)$  are thus

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1(1) + a_2(2) + a_3(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(2) + a_2(1) + a_3(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(2) + a_2(2) + a_3(1) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(1) + a_1(2) + a_2(1) + a_2(2) + a_3(1) + a_3(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(2) + a_2(2) + a_3(2) + a_4(1) + a_5(2) + a_6(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(2) + a_2(2) + a_3(2) + a_4(2) + a_5(1) + a_6(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(2) + a_2(2) + a_3(2) + a_4(2) + a_5(2) + a_6(1) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(1) + a_2(2) + a_3(2) + a_4(2) + a_5(2) + a_6(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(2) + a_2(1) + a_3(2) + a_4(2) + a_5(2) + a_6(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(2) + a_2(2) + a_3(1) + a_4(2) + a_5(2) + a_6(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(1) + a_1(2) + a_2(1) + a_2(2) + a_3(1) + a_3(2) + a_4(1) + a_5(2) + a_6(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(1) + a_1(2) + a_2(1) + a_2(2) + a_3(1) + a_3(2) + a_4(2) + a_5(1) + a_6(2) &\leq 0, \\
a_1(1) + a_1(2) + a_2(1) + a_2(2) + a_3(1) + a_3(2) + a_4(2) + a_5(2) + a_6(1) &\leq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

It turns out that all the inequalities are essential.

Using the transformation defined in (15)  $(A, B, C) \rightarrow (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6)$ , we reobtain that the inequalities of  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(2, 2)$  are the ones obtained in [19] and that we list here:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4 + B_1 + B_2 + B_3 + B_4 &= C_1 + C_2 + C_3 + C_4, \\
A_1 + A_2 + B_1 + B_2 &\leq C_1 + C_2, \\
A_2 + B_2 &\leq C_2, \quad A_2 + B_1 \leq C_1, \quad A_1 + B_2 \leq C_1, \\
A_3 + B_3 &\geq C_3, \quad A_3 + B_4 \geq C_4, \quad A_4 + B_3 \geq C_3, \\
A_2 + A_4 + B_2 + B_4 &\leq C_1 + C_4, \quad A_2 + A_4 + B_2 + B_4 \leq C_2 + C_3, \\
A_2 + A_4 + B_1 + B_4 &\leq C_1 + C_3, \quad A_1 + A_4 + B_2 + B_4 \leq C_1 + C_3, \\
A_2 + A_4 + B_2 + B_3 &\leq C_1 + C_3, \quad A_2 + A_3 + B_2 + B_4 \leq C_1 + C_3.
\end{aligned}$$

## 8 Some more examples

We give some more examples of  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$  which in turn determines the inequalities of the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{E})$  or equivalently the inequalities of the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\text{hol}}(p, q)$ . To obtain the full set  $\text{Horn}_0(p, q)$ , we need to add  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{full}}$  (giving an equality) and the 4 additional sets  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{max}}^{(6)}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{max}}^{(5)}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{min}}^{(1)}$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{min}}^{(2)}$  corresponding to the extremal vertices 1, 2, 5, 6.

Here are some facts allowing to compute by ‘‘hand’’ the examples below.

Recall (Proposition 2) that the set  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$  is invariant by  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$ .

Furthermore, recall Remark 1. Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the set of arrows  $1 \rightarrow 3, 2 \rightarrow 3$  of the quiver  $\mathcal{H}_2$ . Consider  $P_1$  the subquiver of  $\mathcal{Q}_{3,3}$  with vertices  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ , and  $P_2$  with vertices  $\{4, 5, 6\}$  described in Fig.2. So  $P_1$  is the quiver  $\mathcal{H}_2$  and  $P_2$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{H}_2$  with opposite orientations. If  $\mathcal{K} = [K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, K_5, K_6]$

are in  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, p, q)$ , and  $|K_1| = |K_2| = |K_3| = r_1$ ,  $|K_4| = |K_5| = |K_6| = r_2$ , then necessarily  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{left}} = [K_1, K_2, K_3]$  is  $P_1$ -intersecting in  $\mathcal{E}_{P_1}$ , and  $\mathcal{K}_{\text{right}} = [K_4, K_5, K_6]$  is  $P_2$ -intersecting in  $\mathcal{E}_{P_2}$ . This means that the Schubert varieties determined by  $K_1, K_2, K_3$  are intersecting in  $\text{Gr}(r_1, p)$ , and the Schubert varieties determined by  $K_4, K_5, K_6$  are intersecting in  $\text{Gr}(r_2, q)$ .

To help the reader checking our lists, we list the elements  $\mathcal{J} = [J_1, J_2, J_3] \in \text{Horn}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{H}_2, [2, 2, 2])$  and  $\text{Horn}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{H}_2, [3, 3, 3])$ , for the quiver  $\mathcal{H}_2$  with  $|J_1| = |J_2| = |J_3| = r$  together with their  $\dim = \text{edim}_{Q, \mathcal{B}}$  which computes the dimension of the homological intersection of the corresponding Schubert varieties  $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3$ .

The set  $\text{Horn}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{H}_2, [2, 2, 2])$  is invariant by permutations of the vertices 1, 2, 3. So we list representatives grouping them by the cardinality  $r$  of the sets  $J_i$ .

$r = 1$

$$[\{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], \dim = 0$$

$r = 2$

$$[\{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}], \dim = 1$$

The set  $\text{Horn}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{H}_2, [3, 3, 3])$  is invariant by permutations of the vertices 1, 2, 3. So we list representatives grouping them by the cardinality  $r$  of the sets  $J_i$ . Since the Grassmannians  $\text{Gr}(r, n)$  is isomorphic to  $\text{Gr}(n - r, r)$ , the list of  $\mathcal{H}_2$ -intersecting sets for  $r = 2$  is immediately deduced from the list for  $r = 1$ , which is evident since we are in the projective space.

$r = 1$  representatives:

$$[\{1\}, \{3\}, \{3\}], \dim = 0,$$

$$[\{2\}, \{2\}, \{3\}], \dim = 0,$$

$$[\{2\}, \{3\}, \{3\}], \dim = 1,$$

$$[\{3\}, \{3\}, \{3\}], \dim = 2.$$

$r = 2$  representatives:

$$[\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}], \dim = 0,$$

$$[\{1, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}], \dim = 0,$$

$$[\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}], \dim = 1,$$

$$[\{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}], \dim = 2.$$

We also relate the numerical quantity  $\text{edim}_{Q, \mathcal{B}}$  for  $Q = Q_{3,3}$  to the  $\text{edim}_{Q, \mathcal{B}}$  of the subquivers  $P_i$  by the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{E} = [\mathbb{C}^p, \mathbb{C}^p, \mathbb{C}^p, \mathbb{C}^q, \mathbb{C}^q, \mathbb{C}^q]$  and let  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{edim}_{Q_{3,3,B}}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) = \\ \text{edim}_{P_{1,B}}(\mathcal{K}_{\text{left}}, [p, p, p]) + \text{edim}_{P_{2,B}}(\mathcal{K}_{\text{right}}, [q, q, q]) - |K_4|(p - |K_3|). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

*Proof.* If  $\mathcal{K} = (K_x)_{x \in Q_0} \subset_{Q,B} [\mathbf{n}]$ ,  $k_x = |K_x|$ , and  $\Omega$  is the Schubert variety determined by  $\mathcal{K}$ , the general formula ( see 9)

$$\text{edim}_{Q_{3,3,B}}(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{E}) = \dim \Omega - \sum_{a: x \rightarrow y \in Q_1} k_x(n_y - k_y).$$

implies the formula of the lemma.

Thus using these properties, it is easy to compute the following examples.

**Example**  $Q_{3,3}$  with dimension vector  $[3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2]$

There are 38 elements in  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, 3, 2)$ . This set is invariant by the group  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$ . So we list only a set of representatives up to permutations belonging to  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & [\{1\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}], \\ & [\{2\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}], \\ & [\{2\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], \\ & [\{3\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], \\ & [\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}], \\ & [\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], \\ & [\{1, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}], \\ & [\{1, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], \\ & [\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}], \\ & [\{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 2\}], \\ & [\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}], \\ & [\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}]. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the element  $[\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}]$  gives rise to 9  $Q$ -intersecting sets by permuting separately the elements  $[\{1\}, \{2\}, \{2\}]$  and  $[\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}]$ . So we indeed obtain 38 elements given by  $3 \times 8 + 9 + 2 + 3$ . Again, it is possible to see directly that we can construct “by hand” a subrepresentation of a generic  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  with the Schubert positions as required.

Let us give an example. Consider  $\mathcal{K} = [\{2\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{2\}]$  and let us see that for generic  $r$ , there is a unique subrepresentation  $\mathcal{S}$  of  $r$  in this position. Indeed we are forced to take  $S_3 = r_{4 \rightarrow 3}(\mathbb{C}^2) \cap r_{1 \rightarrow 3}(\mathbb{C}^2)$  a subspace of dimension 1, and we follow  $S_3$  by the maps  $r_a$  or their inverse.

It is also easy to check the inductive criterium.

**Example**  $Q_{3,3}$  with dimension vector  $[3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3]$

The list of elements in  $\text{Horn}_0(\mathcal{A}, 3, 3)$  contains 103 elements. As it is invariant under permutations in  $\Sigma_3 \times \Sigma_3$ , we list only representatives modulo this group, there are 23 representatives.

$[\{1\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{2\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{3\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{1\}, \{3\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{3\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}],$   
 $[\{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}],$   
 $[\{1\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}],$   
 $[\{2\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}],$   
 $[\{2\}, \{3\}, \{3\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}],$   
 $[\{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}],$   
 $[\{1, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1\}, \{3\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{\}, \{\}, \{\}],$   
 $[\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1\}, \{3\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{2\}, \{2\}, \{3\}],$   
 $[\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}].$

So indeed we have 103 elements obtained as  $103 = 16 \times 3 + 9 \times 6 + 1$ . As in the previous example it is possible to see directly that we can construct “by hand” a subrepresentation of a generic  $r \in \mathcal{H}_Q(\mathcal{E})$  with the Schubert positions as required.

Let us give an example. Consider  $\mathcal{K} = [\{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 3\}]$ . The set  $\mathcal{K}$  indexes  $\mathbf{\Omega} = [\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_6]$  with  $\Omega_1 = \Omega_4 = \{X \subset \text{Gr}(2, 3), \mathbb{C}e_1 \subset X\}$  and  $\Omega_2 = \Omega_3 = \Omega_5 = \Omega_6 = \text{Gr}(2, 3)$ . Indeed  $\Omega_1$  is the  $B$  orbit of  $\mathbb{C}e_1 \oplus \mathbb{C}e_3$  and  $e_1$  is invariant by  $B$ , etc... Let us see that for generic  $r$ , there is a unique subrepresentation  $\mathcal{S} = [S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5, S_6]$  of  $r$  with  $S_i \in \Omega_i$ . Indeed, we

are forced to take  $S_3 = r_{1 \rightarrow 3}(e_1) \cup r_{4 \rightarrow 3}(e_1)$  a subspace of dimension 2, ( $r$  is generic) and we follow  $S_3$  by the maps  $r_a$  or their inverse as before.



## References

- [1] Velleda Baldoni, Michèle Vergne, and Michael Walter, *Horn inequalities and quivers* [arXiv:1804.00431](#) (2018).
- [2] Velleda Baldoni, Michèle Vergne, and Michael Walter, *Horn conditions for quiver subrepresentations and the moment map* [arXiv:1901.07194](#) (2019). To appear in Pure Appl. Math. Q.
- [3] Prakash Belkale, *Geometric proofs of Horn and saturation conjectures*, J. Algebraic Geom. **15** (2006), 133–173.
- [4] Nicole Berline and Michèle Vergne, *Fourier transforms of orbits of the coadjoint representation*, Representation theory of reductive groups (Park City, Utah, 1982), Progr. Math., vol. 40, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1983, pp. 53–67.
- [5] Nicole Berline, Michèle Vergne, and Michael Walter, *The Horn inequalities from a geometric point of view*, Enseign. Math. **63** (2017), 403–470.
- [6] Guillaume Deltour, *Kirwan polyhedron of holomorphic coadjoint orbits*, Transform. Groups **17** (2012), no. 2, 351–392.
- [7] Harm Derksen and Jerzy Weyman, *Semi-invariants of quivers and saturation for Littlewood-Richardson coefficients*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (2000), 467–479.
- [8] Michel Duflo, Esther Galina, and Jorge A. Vargas, *Square integrable representations of reductive Lie groups with admissible restriction to  $SL_2(\mathbb{R})$* , J. Lie Theory **27** (2017), no. 4.
- [9] Michel Duflo and Michèle Vergne, *Orbites coadjointes et cohomologie équivariante*, The orbit method in representation theory (Copenhagen, 1988), Progr. Math., vol. 82, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990, pp. 11–60 (French).
- [10] Victor Guillemin and Shlomo Sternberg, *Convexity properties of the moment mapping*, Invent. math. **67** (1982), 419–513.
- [11] ———, *Geometric quantization and multiplicities of group representations*, Invent. math. **67** (1982), 515–538.
- [12] Joachim Hilgert, Karl-Hermann Neeb, and Bent Ørsted, *The geometry of nilpotent coadjoint orbits of convex type in Hermitian Lie algebras*, J. Lie Theory **4** (1994), no. 2, 185–235. MR1337191
- [13] Alfred Horn, *Eigenvalues of sums of Hermitian matrices*, Pacific J. Math. **12** (1962), 225–241.
- [14] Hans Plesner Jakobsen and Michèle Vergne, *Restrictions and expansions of holomorphic representations*, J. Functional Analysis **34** (1979), no. 1, 29–53.
- [15] Allen Knutson and Terence Tao, *The honeycomb model of  $GL_n(\mathbb{C})$  tensor products. I. Proof of the saturation conjecture*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **12** (1999), 1055–1090.

- [16] Linda Ness, *A stratification of the null cone via the moment map*, Amer. J. Math. **106** (1984), 1281–1329. With an appendix by David Mumford.
- [17] Grigorii Iosifovich Olshanski, *Invariant cones in Lie algebras, Lie semigroups and the holomorphic discrete series*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **15** (1981), no. 4 (Russian).
- [18] Paul-Emile Paradan, *Quantization commutes with reduction in the non-compact setting: the case of holomorphic discrete series*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **17** (2015), no. 4, 955–990.
- [19] ———, *Horn( $p, q$ )* [arXiv:2006.08989](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.08989) (2020).
- [20] Joe Repka, *Tensor products of holomorphic discrete series representations*, Canadian J. Math. **31** (1979), no. 4, 836–844.
- [21] Nicolas Ressayre, *Geometric invariant theory and the generalized eigenvalue problem*, Invent. Math. **180** (2010), 389–441.
- [22] ———, *private communication*, 2018.
- [23] Aidan Schofield, *General representations of quivers*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **65** (1992), 46–64.
- [24] Michèle Vergne and Michael Walter, *Inequalities for Moment Cones of Finite-Dimensional Representations*, J. Symplectic Geom. **15** (2017), 1209–1250.
- [25] Ernest Borisovitch Vinberg, *Invariant convex cones and orderings in Lie groups*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **14** (1980), no. 1, 1–13, 96 (Russian).

