

A PIERI TYPE FORMULA FOR MOTIVIC CHERN CLASSES OF SCHUBERT CELLS IN GRASSMANNIANS

NEIL J.Y. FAN, PETER L. GUO, CHANGJIAN SU, AND RUI XIONG

ABSTRACT. We prove a Pieri formula for motivic Chern classes of Schubert cells in the equivariant K-theory of Grassmannians, which is described in terms of ribbon operators on partitions. Our approach is to transform the Schubert calculus over Grassmannians to the calculation in a certain affine Hecke algebra. As a consequence, we derive a Pieri formula for Segre motivic classes of Schubert cells in Grassmannians. We apply the Pieri formulas to establish a relation between motivic Chern classes and Segre motivic classes, extending a well-known relation between the classes of structure sheaves and ideal sheaves. As another application, we find a symmetric power series representative for the class of the dualizing sheaf of a Schubert variety.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Geometric background	5
3.	Affine Hecke algebras and Schubert representations	13
4.	Schubert calculus on Grassmannians	16
5.	Pieri type formulas	22
6.	Proofs of Theorems A, B, D and E	28
7.	Pieri formulas for other classes	36
	Appendix A. Equivalences between ribbon Schubert operators	38
	References	41

1. INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of this paper is to build a Pieri type formula for motivic Chern classes of Schubert cells in the equivariant K-theory of Grassmannians. The notion of motivic Chern classes was defined by Brasselet, Schürmann and Yokura [9] as a generalization of the total λ classes of the cotangent bundle to singular varieties. Its equivariant version was constructed by Fehér, Rimányi, and Weber [20], see also Aluffi, Mihalcea, Schürmann and Su [3]. Motivic Chern classes specialize to other important characteristic classes for singular varieties in homology, including for example Chern classes by MacPherson [42], Todd classes by Yokura [53], and L -classes by Cappell and Shaneson [13].

We shall focus on (equivariant) motivic Chern classes of Schubert cells in the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)$ or the (complete) flag variety $\mathrm{Fl}(n)$. Motivic Chern classes of Schubert cells are equivalent to K-theoretic stable envelopes introduced by Okounkov [47], see [3, 20, 29, 30], and can be computed via the Demazure–Lusztig operators [3]. They are also related, for example, to generalized oriented cohomology [37], mixed Hodge modules [9, 5], Tarasov–Varchenko weight functions [20, 48], Casselman basis [3], and Whittaker functions [45]. We refer the readers to [4] for several ‘folklore properties’ about motivic Chern classes of Schubert cells. The Chevalley formula for motivic Chern classes has been obtained recently in [44].

Our main result is a Pieri type formula for equivariant motivic Chern classes of Schubert cells in $\text{Gr}(k, n)$, which will be described in Theorem A below. Building upon this, we obtain a Pieri formula for equivariant Segre motivic classes of Schubert cells, the dual basis of motivic Chern classes with respect to the Poincaré pairing, see Theorem B.

The Pieri formulas lead to two applications. First, guided by the similarity of the Pieri formulas in Theorem A and Theorem B, we deduce a surprising relation between equivariant motivic Chern classes and Segre motivic classes, see Theorem D. This generalizes a well-known relation concerning the classes of structure sheaves and ideal sheaves for Grassmannians. Second, we apply Theorem A to find a symmetric power series representative for the class of the dualizing sheaf of an opposite Schubert variety, see Theorem E. The symmetric power series is constructed by means of the image of stable Grothendieck polynomials under the omega involution investigated first by Lam and Pylyavskyy [33] from a combinatorial point of view.

To state Theorem A, we need to introduce the notion of *ribbon Schubert operators* on partitions inside the $k \times (n - k)$ rectangle $(n - k)^k$. We do not distinguish a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_k \geq 0)$ with its Young diagram, a left-justified array with λ_i boxes in row i . A *ribbon* (also called rim hook, or border strip) is a nonempty connected skew shape $\eta = \mu/\lambda$, containing no 2×2 squares $\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array}$. The *head* (resp., *tail*) of η is the box at its top right (resp., lower left) end. The *height* $\text{ht}(\eta)$ (resp., *width* $\text{wd}(\eta)$) of η is the number of rows (resp., columns) of η . For a ribbon $\eta = \mu/\lambda$ with head in row i and tail in row j , let

$$\mathbf{h}(\eta) = \mu_i + k + 1 - i, \quad \mathbf{t}(\eta) = \lambda_j + k + 1 - j. \quad (1.1)$$

Fix a partition $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$. For $i = 1, \dots, k$, the (head-valued) *ribbon Schubert operator*, denoted by $|i\mathfrak{z} \rightarrow \lambda$, is defined as follows

$$|i\mathfrak{z} \rightarrow \lambda = t_c \cdot \lambda + \sum_{\mu} (\hbar - (p - q)t_{\mathbf{h}(\mu/\lambda)}) p^{\text{ht}(\mu/\lambda)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\mu/\lambda)-1} \cdot \mu, \quad (1.2)$$

where the sum is taken over all $\mu \subseteq (n - k)^k$ such that μ/λ is a ribbon with head in row i , $c = \lambda_i + k + 1 - i$, and p, q, \hbar are parameters. The ribbon Schubert operators may be regarded as generalizations of the classical Schur operators [21, 22], the K-theory operators [33], and the ribbon Schur operators [32]. Below is an example of the ribbon Schubert operator for $n = 7$, $k = 3$, $\lambda = (3, 1, 0)$, and $i = 2$.

$$\begin{aligned} |2\mathfrak{z} \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} &= t_3 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_4) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_5) q \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array} \\ &+ (\hbar - (p - q)t_4) pq \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_5) pq^2 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array}. \end{aligned}$$

For $0 \leq r \leq k$, let $c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \in K_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ be the r -th equivariant Chern class of the dual tautological bundle over $\text{Gr}(k, n)$.

Theorem A. *For $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$, let $\text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \in K_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))[y]$ be the equivariant motivic Chern class indexed by the opposite Schubert cell $Y(\lambda)^\circ$ in $\text{Gr}(k, n)$. Set $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, -y, 1 + y)$. Then, for $0 \leq r \leq k$, we have*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq k} |i_r\mathfrak{z} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow |i_1\mathfrak{z} \rightarrow \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ). \quad (1.3)$$

Here, the notation

$$|i\mathfrak{z} \rightarrow \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = t_c \cdot \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) + (1 + y) \sum_{\mu} (1 - t_{\mathbf{h}(\mu/\lambda)}) (-y)^{\text{wd}(\mu/\lambda)-1} \cdot \text{MC}_y(Y(\mu)^\circ)$$


is defined in the same manner as (1.2) (in the case $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, -y, 1 + y)$), except that here we replace λ by $\text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)$, and μ by $\text{MC}_y(Y(\mu)^\circ)$.

The strategy to prove Theorem A is to transform the Schubert calculus over Grassmannians to the determination of products in a certain affine Hecke algebra. This will be done through Sections 3–5.

For an example to illustrate Theorem A, let us take $n = 5$, $k = 2$, $\lambda = (2, 0)$, and $r = 2$. By (1.3), we see that

$$c_2(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{MC}_y(Y(2, 0)^\circ) = |2\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow |1\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow \text{MC}_y(Y(2, 0)^\circ).$$

The following depicts the procedure of $|2\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow |1\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow \lambda = (2, 0)$.



So, with the abbreviation $M_\lambda = \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} c_2(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot M_{(2,0)} &= t_1 t_4 \cdot M_{(2,0)} + (1+y)(1-t_2)t_4 \cdot M_{(2,1)} - y(1+y)(1-t_3)t_4 \cdot M_{(2,2)} \\ &\quad + (1+y)t_1(1-t_5) \cdot M_{(3,0)} + (1+y)^2(1-t_2)(1-t_5) \cdot M_{(3,1)} \\ &\quad - y(1+y)^2(1-t_3)(1-t_5) \cdot M_{(3,2)} + y^2(1+y)^2(1-t_4)(1-t_5) \cdot M_{(3,3)} \\ &\quad + y^2(1+y)t_4(1-t_5) \cdot M_{(3,3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Based on Theorem A, we can derive a Pieri formula for Segre motivic classes, which live in the localized equivariant K-theory of the Grassmannian, denoted by $\mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$. The formulation requires tail-valued ribbon Schubert operators, denoted by $\blacktriangleright i] \rightarrow \lambda$, which has the same formulation as $|i\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow \lambda$ defined in (1.2), except that the variable $t_{\mathfrak{h}(\mu/\lambda)}$ is replaced by $t_{\mathfrak{t}(\mu/\lambda)}$ (the subscript $\mathfrak{t}(\mu/\lambda)$ is defined in (1.1)).

Theorem B. *Set $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, -y, 1 + y)$. For $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$, the equivariant Segre motivic class $\text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \in \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ satisfies the following Pieri formula:*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \blacktriangleright i_r] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \blacktriangleright i_1] \rightarrow \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ). \quad (1.4)$$

Since $\text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)|_{y=0} = [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}]$ and $\text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)|_{y=0} = [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}]$, setting $y = 0$ in Theorem A and B, we obtain Pieri formulas for the classes of ideal sheaves and structure sheaves, whose non-equivariant version was due to Lenart [36] (see Remark 7.5).

Corollary C. *The non-equivariant motivic Chern classes and non-equivariant Segre motivic classes enjoy completely the same Pieri formula, which is obtained respectively from (1.3) and (1.4) by replacing $|i\bar{\mathfrak{J}}$ and $\blacktriangleright i]$ with the operator $|i]$. More precisely, $|i]$ is obtained from (1.2) by letting $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, -y, 1 + y)$ and $t = 0$:*

$$|i] \rightarrow \lambda = (1 + y) \sum_{\mu/\lambda = \eta} (-y)^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \mu$$

with μ ranging over partitions in $(n - k)^k$ such that μ/λ is a ribbon with head in row i .

The similarity between the Pieri formulas in Theorems A and B indicates that there should be some relation between motivic Chern classes and Segre motivic classes. Recall that the total λ -class of the cotangent bundle in $K_T(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))[y]$ is

$$\lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)}^\vee) = \sum_{r \geq 0} y^r [\Lambda^r \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)}^\vee].$$

Theorem D. *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$. Over $\mathbb{K}_T(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))$, we have*

$$\lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)}^\vee) \cdot \frac{(1 - [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}]) \cdot \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)}{1 - [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}]_\lambda} = \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ), \quad (1.5)$$

where $[\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}]$ is the class of the structure sheaf for a single box \square , and $\cdot|_\lambda$ is the restriction map (see Section 6.2 for detailed information). In the non-equivariant case, we get

$$\lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)}^\vee) \cdot (1 - [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}]) \cdot \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ). \quad (1.6)$$

Setting $y = 0$ in (1.6) we obtain the following relation in the ordinary K-theory due to Buch [11, §8]:

$$(1 - [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}]) \cdot [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}] = [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}].$$

This was generalized to the equivariant K-theory, see, for example, [12, Prop. 4.2],

$$\frac{(1 - [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}]) \cdot [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}]}{1 - [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}]_\lambda} = [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}],$$

which is an immediate consequence of (1.5) by setting $y = 0$.

As another application of Theorem A, we find a symmetric power series representative of the class $[\omega_{Y(\lambda)}] \in K(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))$ of the dualizing sheaf of the opposite Schubert variety $Y(\lambda)$. To be specific, let $G_\lambda(x)$ be the stable Grothendieck polynomial, which is a symmetric power series introduced by Fomin and Kirillov [23] as the limit of the Grothendieck polynomials for Grassmannian permutations. Buch [11] showed that $G_\lambda(x)$ can be interpreted as the generating function of set-valued tableaux of shape λ . Let $J_\lambda(x)$ be the image of $(-1)^{|\lambda|} G_\lambda(-x_1, -x_2, \dots)$ under the omega involution which sends elementary symmetric functions $e_r(x)$ to homogeneous symmetric functions $h_r(x)$. As proved by Lam and Pylyavskyy [33, §9.7], $J_\lambda(x)$ can be combinatorially generated by weak set-valued tableaux of shape λ .

Define an algebra homomorphism

$$\rho: \hat{\Lambda} \longrightarrow K(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)), \quad e_r(x) \longmapsto \begin{cases} c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee), & r \leq k, \\ 0, & r > k. \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

from the ring $\hat{\Lambda}$ of symmetric power series to $K(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))$. The following theorem reveals the geometric meaning of $J_\lambda(x)$.

Theorem E. *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$, and λ' be its conjugate partition. Then*

$$\rho((1 - G_\square(x))^n J_{\lambda'}(x)) = [\omega_{Y(\lambda)}]. \quad (1.8)$$

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide the necessary geometric background. In Section 3, we define an affine Hecke algebra \hat{H}_n depending on parameters p , q and \hbar , and demonstrate that Schubert classes, classes of ideal sheaves and structure sheaves, Chern–Schwartz–MacPherson classes, and motivic Chern classes can be realized as basis in particular representations of \hat{H}_n . In Section 4, we prove the equivalence between Schubert calculus over Grassmannians and the computation of certain products in \hat{H}_n . In Section 5, we show that the products in \hat{H}_n that we need to calculate can be formulated in terms of the ribbon Schubert operators [13]. Section 6 is devoted to proofs of the theorems listed in the

introduction. In Section 7, by taking specific values of p , q and \hbar , we further exhibit Pieri formulas for Schubert classes, classes of ideal sheaves and structure sheaves, Chern–Schwartz–MacPherson classes, and Segre–MacPherson classes. From this point of view, our approach provides a unified way to deal with Pieri type formulas. The appendix section proves the equivalences between different types of ribbon Schubert operators.

Acknowledgements. We are grateful to Cristian Lenart and Leonardo Mihălcă for valuable discussions and suggestions. N.F. was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12071320) and Sichuan Science and Technology Program (No. 2023ZYD0012), P.G. was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 11971250, 12371329), and R.X. acknowledges the partial support from the NSERC Discovery grant RGPIN-2015-04469, Canada.

2. GEOMETRIC BACKGROUND

This section lays down the geometric preliminaries. Here and throughout, we assume that $G = GL_n(\mathbb{C})$, $P = \begin{pmatrix} GL_k & * \\ & GL_{n-k} \end{pmatrix}$ is a standard parabolic subgroup, and $B \subset P$ is the Borel subgroup consisting of upper triangular matrices of G . The Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(k, n)$ of k -dimensional subspaces in \mathbb{C}^n is a homogeneous variety isomorphic to G/P . The flag variety $\text{Fl}(n)$ is the variety of (complete) flags $\{0\} = V_0 \subsetneq V_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq V_n = \mathbb{C}^n$ of \mathbb{C}^n , which is isomorphic to G/B .

2.1. Schubert cells and varieties. Let T be the torus of diagonal matrices of G . The associated Weyl group $\mathcal{S}_n = N_G(T)/T$ is the symmetric group of permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For $1 \leq i < n$, let $s_i = (i, i + 1)$ be the simple transposition interchanging i and $i + 1$. Then $\{s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}\}$ constitutes a generating set of \mathcal{S}_n , satisfying $s_i^2 = 1$ and the braid relations: $s_i s_j = s_j s_i$ for $|i - j| > 1$, $s_i s_{i+1} s_i = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1}$. Each $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ can be decomposed into a product of simple transpositions, and its length $\ell(w)$ is the minimum ℓ such that $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_\ell}$. Combinatorially, $\ell(w)$ equals the number of inversions of w :

$$\ell(w) = |\{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n, w(i) > w(j)\}|.$$

For $u, w \in \mathcal{S}_n$, we say $u \leq w$ in the *Bruhat order* if u can be obtained by erasing some factors of a reduced decomposition of w .

Let $\mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$ be the maximal parabolic subgroup of \mathcal{S}_n generated by $\{s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}\} \setminus \{s_k\}$. That is, $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$ if and only if $\{w(i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\} = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Each $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ admits a unique *parabolic decomposition*

$$w = w_\lambda v, \tag{2.1}$$

where $v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$, and w_λ is a *Grassmannian permutation* indexed by a partition λ inside $(n - k)^k$ (which is the minimal coset representative of the left coset of $\mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$ with respect to w). To be precise, w_λ is the permutation obtained from w by rearranging the first k values as well as the last $n - k$ values in increasing order, with λ being determined by

$$w_\lambda(k + 1 - i) = \lambda_i + k + 1 - i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k. \tag{2.2}$$

The correspondence in (2.2) describes a bijection between partitions inside $(n - k)^k$ and Grassmannian permutations of \mathcal{S}_n with descent at position k . Notice that $\ell(w_\lambda) = |\lambda|$, which is the number of boxes in λ , and that $\ell(w) = \ell(w_\lambda) + \ell(v) = |\lambda| + \ell(v)$. We shall adopt the notation $\text{Gr}(w) = \lambda$. For example, for $k = 3$ and $w = 4165273 \in \mathcal{S}_7$, we have $w_\lambda = 1462357$ with $\text{Gr}(w) = \lambda = (3, 2, 0)$, and $v = 2136475 \in \mathcal{S}_3 \times \mathcal{S}_4$.

The Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(k, n) = G/P$ is a disjoint union of *Schubert cells* indexed by partitions inside $(n - k)^k$. To each $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$, the associated Schubert cell is $X(\lambda)^\circ = Bw_\lambda P/P$.

The *Schubert variety* $X(\lambda) = \overline{X(\lambda)^\circ}$ is its closure. The *opposite* Schubert cell and variety are defined accordingly as $Y(\lambda)^\circ = B^- w_\lambda P/P$ and $Y(\lambda) = \overline{Y(\lambda)^\circ}$, where B^- is the opposite Borel subgroup consisting of lower triangular matrices of G .

The flag variety $\text{Fl}(n) = G/B$ has a decomposition into Schubert cells indexed by permutations of \mathcal{S}_n . The Schubert cell indexed by $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is $X(w)^\circ = BwB/B$, whose closure is the Schubert variety $X(w) = \overline{X(w)^\circ}$. Similarly, the opposite Schubert cell and variety in G/B are $Y(w)^\circ = B^-wB/B$ and $Y(w) = \overline{Y(w)^\circ}$. Let

$$\pi: G/B \longrightarrow G/P \quad (2.3)$$

be the natural projection. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(X(w)^\circ) &= X(\text{Gr}(w))^\circ, & \pi(X(w)) &= X(\text{Gr}(w)), \\ \pi(Y(w)^\circ) &= Y(\text{Gr}(w))^\circ, & \pi(Y(w)) &= Y(\text{Gr}(w)). \end{aligned}$$

2.2. Equivariant cohomology and Schubert classes. This subsection is mainly a brief overview of the equivariant cohomology of $\text{Gr}(k, n)$ or $\text{Fl}(n)$, as well as the basis of Schubert classes of Schubert varieties. The readers are referred to [6, 10] for more details.

Let $\mathbb{E}_N = (\mathbb{C}^N \setminus 0)^n$ equipped with the action of torus T . For a nonsingular T -variety X , the equivariant cohomology of X is a graded ring whose i -th component is

$$H_T^i(X) := H^i(\mathbb{E} \times^T X),$$

where $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{E}_N$ for $N \gg 0$. A T -equivariant vector bundle \mathcal{V} over X induces a bundle $\mathcal{V}' = \mathbb{E} \times^T \mathcal{V}$ over $\mathbb{E} \times^T X$. For $i \geq 0$, the i -th equivariant Chern class is defined by

$$c_i(\mathcal{V}) := c_i(\mathcal{V}') \in H^{2i}(\mathbb{E} \times^T X) = H_T^{2i}(X).$$

A T -equivariant subvariety $Y \subset X$ of codimension d defines a subvariety $Y' = \mathbb{E} \times^T Y \subset \mathbb{E} \times^T X$ of the same codimension, its *equivariant fundamental class* is

$$[Y] := [Y'] \in H^{2d}(\mathbb{E} \times^T X) = H_T^{2d}(X).$$

Denote by $\text{pt} = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}$ a single \mathbb{C} -point. Following the historical convention in Schubert calculus, we write

$$t_i = c_1(\mathbb{C}_{-z_i}) \in H_T^2(\text{pt}),$$

where \mathbb{C}_{-z_i} is the bundle corresponding to the character

$$T \ni \text{diag}(z_1, \dots, z_n) \longmapsto z_i^{-1} \in \mathbb{C}^\times.$$

Then $H_T^\bullet(\text{pt})$ is naturally isomorphic to the ring of polynomials in t_1, \dots, t_n :

$$H_T^\bullet(\text{pt}) = \mathbb{Q}[t_1, \dots, t_n].$$

Now we consider the case when X is $\text{Gr}(k, n)$ or $\text{Fl}(n)$. Over the Grassmannian, we have the *tautological bundle* \mathcal{V} whose total space is $\{(V, v) \in \text{Gr}(k, n) \times \mathbb{C}^n : v \in V\}$. Let \mathcal{V}^\vee be the *dual* tautological bundle of \mathcal{V} . For $0 \leq r \leq k$, let

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \in H_T^{2r}(G/P) \quad (2.4)$$

be the r -th equivariant Chern class of \mathcal{V}^\vee . Similarly, over the flag variety, we have the *tautological flag* $0 = \mathcal{V}_0 \subsetneq \mathcal{V}_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathcal{V}_n = \mathcal{O}^{\oplus n}$, where the total space of \mathcal{V}_i is $\{(V_\bullet, v) \in \text{Fl}(n) \times \mathbb{C}^n : v \in V_i\}$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let

$$x_i = c_1((\mathcal{V}_i/\mathcal{V}_{i-1})^\vee) \in H_T^2(G/B) \quad (2.5)$$

be the first equivariant Chern class of $(\mathcal{V}_i/\mathcal{V}_{i-1})^\vee$. Denote by

$$\pi^*: H_T^\bullet(G/P) \longrightarrow H_T^\bullet(G/B) \quad (2.6)$$

the pullback algebra homomorphism induced by (2.3). By the Whitney product formula of Chern classes, it is not hard to obtain that

$$\pi^* c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) = e_r(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in H_T^\bullet(G/B),$$

where

$$e_r(x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}$$

is the r -th elementary symmetric polynomial in x_1, \dots, x_k .

Theorem 2.1 (Borel [8]). *We have*

- (i) *The algebra $H_T^\bullet(G/B)$ is generated by x_1, \dots, x_n over $H_T^\bullet(\text{pt})$;*
- (ii) *The algebra $H_T^\bullet(G/P)$ is generated by $c_1(\mathcal{V}^\vee), \dots, c_k(\mathcal{V}^\vee)$ over $H_T^\bullet(\text{pt})$;*
- (iii) *The pullback π^* defined in (2.6) is an injective algebra homomorphism.*

Schubert varieties are T -equivariant, and the corresponding equivariant fundamental classes

$$\begin{aligned} [X(\lambda)], [Y(\lambda)] &\in H_T^\bullet(G/P), & \lambda &\subseteq (n-k)^k, \\ [X(w)], [Y(w)] &\in H_T^\bullet(G/B), & w &\in \mathcal{S}_n, \end{aligned}$$

are known as equivariant *Schubert classes*. We next collect some properties about Schubert classes. The *BGG Demazure operator* over $H_T^\bullet(G/B)$ [7] is defined by

$$\partial_i = \frac{\text{id} - s_i}{x_i - x_{i+1}}, \tag{2.7}$$

where s_i is the right Weyl group action exchanging x_i and x_{i+1} . These operators satisfy the relations $\partial_i^2 = 0$, $\partial_i \partial_j = \partial_j \partial_i$ for $|i - j| > 1$, and $\partial_i \partial_{i+1} \partial_i = \partial_{i+1} \partial_i \partial_{i+1}$. Hence, for $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$, one may define $\partial_w = \partial_{i_1} \cdots \partial_{i_\ell}$ for any reduced decomposition $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_\ell}$.

We also recall the restriction map. Denote $e = 1 \cdot B/B \in G/B$. Since e is a torus fixed point, we have the restriction map

$$\cdot|_e : H_T^\bullet(G/B) \longrightarrow H_T^\bullet(e) \cong H_T^\bullet(\text{pt}).$$

This map satisfies

$$x_i|_e = t_i, \quad t_i|_e = t_i.$$

Proposition 2.2 (see for example [6]). *We have*

- (i) $\{[Y(w)] : w \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$ *forms a basis of $H_T^\bullet(G/B)$ over $H_T^\bullet(\text{pt})$;*
- (ii) $[Y(w)] = \partial_{w^{-1}w_0}[Y(w_0)]$;
- (iii) $[Y(w)]|_e \neq 0$ *if and only if $w = \text{id}$.*

Let us turn to the Grassmannian case. Recall the *Poincaré pairing*

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \int_{G/P} \alpha \cup \beta \in H_T^\bullet(\text{pt})$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in H_T^\bullet(G/P)$. Denote by w_0^L the left Weyl group action on $H_T^\bullet(G/P)$ for the longest element $w_0 = n \cdots 21$. It satisfies

$$w_0^L c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) = c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \quad (1 \leq r \leq k), \quad w_0^L t_i = t_{n+1-i} \quad (1 \leq i \leq n).$$

For $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, the dual partition $\bar{\lambda} = (\bar{\lambda}_1, \dots, \bar{\lambda}_k)$ of λ is complement of λ in the rectangle $(n-k)^k$, that is,

$$\lambda_i + \bar{\lambda}_{k+1-i} = n - k, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, k. \tag{2.8}$$

Proposition 2.3 (see for example [6]). *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$, and $\bar{\lambda}$ be its dual. Then*

- (i) $\pi^*[Y(\lambda)] = [Y(w_\lambda)]$;
- (ii) $[X(\lambda)]$ is dual to $[Y(\lambda)]$ with respect to the Poincaré pairing;
- (iii) $[X(\lambda)] = w_0^L[Y(\bar{\lambda})]$.

Remark 2.4. The Schubert classes $[Y(w)]$ can be represented by the double Schubert polynomials $\mathfrak{S}_w(x, t)$ due to Lascoux and Schützenberger [34], which are defined by

$$\mathfrak{S}_w(x, t) = \partial_{w^{-1}w_0} \prod_{i+j \leq n} (x_i - t_j).$$

In the case when $w = w_\lambda$ is a Grassmannian permutation, $\mathfrak{S}_{w_\lambda}(x, t)$ reduces to the double Schur polynomial $s_\lambda(x, t)$, representing the Schubert class $[Y(\lambda)]$.

2.3. Equivariant K-theory and classes of structure/ideal sheaves. Let X be a non-singular T -variety. The T -equivariant K-group $K_T(X)$ of X is the Grothendieck group of the category of T -equivariant coherent sheaves on X . To be specific, $K_T(X)$ is generated by the symbols $[\mathcal{F}]$ for all T -equivariant coherent sheaves modulo the relation $[\mathcal{F}] = [\mathcal{F}_1] + [\mathcal{F}_2]$ for all short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_2 \rightarrow 0$ of equivariant coherent sheaves. With the assumption that X is non-singular, there is a well-defined product structure such that $[\mathcal{F}] \otimes [\mathcal{G}] = [\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{G}]$ when \mathcal{F} is flat. For a reference of the equivariant K-theory, see for example [14].

For any T -equivariant vector bundle \mathcal{V} of rank k over X , we denote the r -th *equivariant Chern class* by $c_r(\mathcal{V}) \in K_T(X)$, in the sense of algebraic cobordism [38]. They are characterized by

$$\sum_{r=0}^k q^r c_r(\mathcal{V}) = \sum_{r=0}^k (1+q)^{k-r} (-q)^r [\Lambda^r \mathcal{V}^\vee] \in K_T(X)[q],$$

where q is a formal variable. For example, for a line bundle \mathcal{L} , the first Chern class is $c_1(\mathcal{L}) = 1 - [\mathcal{L}]^{-1}$, see [38, Example 1.1.5]. Note that $c_r(\mathcal{V})$ satisfies the Whitney product formula [38, Prop 4.1.15 (3)] and the splitting principle [38, Remark 4.1.12]. Moreover, under the Chern character, the lowest degree component of $c_r(\mathcal{V})$ is the usual Chern class in cohomology.

Let

$$t_i = c_1(\mathbb{C}_{-z_i}) = 1 - [\mathbb{C}_{z_i}] \in K_T(\text{pt}).$$

As before, \mathbb{C}_{-z_i} is the bundle corresponding to the character

$$T \ni \text{diag}(z_1, \dots, z_n) \mapsto z_i^{-1} \in \mathbb{C}^\times.$$

Then $K_T(\text{pt})$ is isomorphic to

$$K_T(\text{pt}) = \mathbb{Q}[t_1, \frac{-t_1}{1-t_1}, \dots, t_n, \frac{-t_n}{1-t_n}].$$

We turn to the case when X is $\text{Gr}(k, n) = G/P$ or $\text{Fl}(n) = G/B$. Similar to the equivariant cohomology, consider the r -th equivariant Chern class of \mathcal{V}^\vee

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \in K_T(G/P), \tag{2.9}$$

where \mathcal{V} is the tautological bundle over G/P . For $i = 1, \dots, n$, write

$$x_i = c_1((\mathcal{V}_i/\mathcal{V}_{i-1})^\vee) = 1 - [\mathcal{V}_i/\mathcal{V}_{i-1}] \in K_T(G/B). \tag{2.10}$$

Denote by

$$\pi^*: K_T(G/P) \longrightarrow K_T(G/B) \tag{2.11}$$

the algebra homomorphism induced by (2.3). By the Whitney product formula, we have

$$\pi^* c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) = e_r(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in K_T(G/B).$$

Theorem 2.5 ([31]). *We have*

- (i) *The algebra $K_T(G/B)$ is generated by x_1, \dots, x_n over $K_T(\text{pt})$;*
- (ii) *The algebra $K_T(G/P)$ is generated by $c_1(\mathcal{V}^\vee), \dots, c_k(\mathcal{V}^\vee)$ over $K_T(\text{pt})$;*
- (iii) *The map π^* defined in (2.11) is an injective algebra homomorphism.*

In equivariant K-theory, we consider the classes of structure sheaves

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{O}_{X(w)}], [\mathcal{O}_{Y(w)}] &\in K_T(G/B), & w \in \mathcal{S}_n, \\ [\mathcal{O}_{X(\lambda)}], [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}] &\in K_T(G/P), & \lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$\mathcal{I}_{\partial X(w)} = \mathcal{O}_{X(w)}(-\partial X(w)) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{X(w)},$$

which is the pushforward of the ideal sheaf of $\partial X(w) = X(w) \setminus X(w)^\circ$. In the same manner, we can define $\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w)}$, $\mathcal{I}_{\partial X(\lambda)}$, and $\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}$. Their corresponding classes are

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{I}_{\partial X(w)}], [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w)}] &\in K_T(G/B), & w \in \mathcal{S}_n, \\ [\mathcal{I}_{\partial X(\lambda)}], [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}] &\in K_T(G/P), & \lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k. \end{aligned}$$

For $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, the *Demazure operators* on $K_T(G/B)[15]$ are

$$\pi_i = \frac{(1-x_{i+1})\text{id} - (1-x_i)s_i}{x_i - x_{i+1}}, \quad \hat{\pi}_i = (1-x_i) \frac{\text{id} - s_i}{x_i - x_{i+1}} = \pi_i - \text{id}. \quad (2.12)$$

Note that π_i 's are geometrically induced by push-pull, see [31]. These operators satisfy $\pi_i^2 = \pi_i$, $\hat{\pi}_i^2 = -\hat{\pi}_i$, as well as the braid relations. Thus π_w and $\hat{\pi}_w$ for $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ are well defined. We similarly denote

$$\cdot|_e : K_T(G/B) \longrightarrow K_T(e) \cong K_T(\text{pt}), \quad x_i|_e = t_i, \quad t_i|_e = t_i.$$

Proposition 2.6 ([24]). *We have*

- (i) $\{[\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w)}] : w \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$ *forms a basis of $K_T(G/B)$ over $K_T(\text{pt})$;*
- (ii) $[\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w)}] = \hat{\pi}_{w^{-1}w_0}[\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w_0)}]$;
- (iii) $[\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w)}]|_e \neq 0$ *if and only if $w = \text{id}$.*

We now consider the case of $\text{Gr}(k, n) = G/P$. Recall the *Poincaré pairing*

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle = \chi(G/P, \alpha \otimes \beta) \in K_T(\text{pt})$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in K_T(G/P)$, where χ is induced by the pushforward to a point. Recall that the left Weyl group action w_0^L of w_0 on $K_T(G/P)$ satisfies

$$w_0^L c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) = c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \quad (1 \leq r \leq k), \quad w_0^L t_i = t_{n+1-i} \quad (1 \leq i \leq n). \quad (2.13)$$

Proposition 2.7 ([24]). *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, and $\bar{\lambda}$ be its dual. Then*

- (i) $\pi^*[\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}] = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w)}]$ *and* $\pi^*[\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}] = [\mathcal{O}_{Y(w_\lambda)}]$;
- (ii) $[\mathcal{I}_{\partial X(\lambda)}]$ *is dual to* $[\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}]$ *with respect to the Poincaré pairing;*
- (iii) $[\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}]$ *is dual to* $[\mathcal{O}_{X(\lambda)}]$ *with respect to the Poincaré pairing;*
- (iv) $[\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}] = w_0^L[\mathcal{I}_{\partial X(\bar{\lambda})}]$;

$$(v) [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}] = w_0^L[\mathcal{O}_{X(\bar{\lambda})}].$$

The above proposition can be illustrated by the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}] & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Weyl action}} & [\mathcal{I}_{\partial X(\lambda)}] \\ & \swarrow \quad \searrow & \\ & \text{Poincaré dual} & \\ & \swarrow \quad \searrow & \\ [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}] & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Weyl action}} & [\mathcal{O}_{X(\lambda)}] \end{array}$$

Remark 2.8. The classes of structure sheaves $[\mathcal{O}_{Y(w)}]$ can be represented by the double Grothendieck polynomials $\mathfrak{G}_w(x, t)$ also defined by Lascoux and Schützenberger [35]: for $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$,

$$\mathfrak{G}_w(x, t) = \pi_{w^{-1}w_0} \prod_{i+j \leq n} \frac{x_i - t_j}{1 - t_i}.$$

When $w = w_\lambda$ is a Grassmannian permutation, $\mathfrak{G}_{w_\lambda}(x, t)$ represents the class $[\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}]$.

2.4. Chern–Schwartz–MacPherson classes and Segre–MacPherson class. For any algebraic variety X over \mathbb{C} , let $\text{Fun}(X)$ denote the space of constructible functions over X with values in \mathbb{Z} . For any proper morphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$, we define $f_*: \text{Fun}(X) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(Y)$ such that for any $\varphi \in \text{Fun}(X)$

$$(f_*\varphi)(y) = \sum_{q \in \text{im } \varphi} \chi_c(f^{-1}(y) \cap \varphi^{-1}(q))q,$$

where χ_c stands for the Euler characteristic of compact support. It was conjectured by Grothendieck and Deligne and confirmed by MacPherson [42] that there is a natural transformation

$$c_*: \text{Fun}(-) \longrightarrow H_\bullet(-)$$

from the functor of rational constructible functions to Borel–Moore homology such that when X is nonsingular, the constant constructible function $\mathbf{1}_X$ is sent to the total Chern class of tangent bundle, namely,

$$c_*(\mathbf{1}_X) = c(\mathcal{T}_X) \cap [X].$$

The class $c_*(\mathbf{1}_X)$ (possibly for singular X) was later shown to coincide with a class defined earlier by Schwartz [49, 50]. This transformation is extended to the equivariant setting by Ohmoto [46].

Assume further that X is a complete nonsingular T -variety. We can identify the Borel–Moore homology with the cohomology through Poincaré duality. Denote by

$$\mathbb{H}_T(-) = H_T^\bullet(-)_{\mathbb{F}}$$

the localized equivariant cohomology of X , where $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is the fraction field of $H_T^\bullet(\text{pt})$. For a T -equivariant constructible subset W , we denote the *Chern–Schwartz–MacPherson (CSM) class* and *Segre–MacPherson class* by

$$c_{\text{SM}}(W) = c_*(\mathbf{1}_W) \in \mathbb{H}_T(X), \quad s_{\text{SM}}(W) = \frac{c_*(W)}{c(\mathcal{T}_X)} \in \mathbb{H}_T(X),$$

where $\mathbf{1}_W$ is the characteristic function of W , and $c(\mathcal{T}_X)$ is the total Chern class of the tangent bundle of X .

Restricting to the case $X = G/B$ or G/P , one can define

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\text{SM}}(X(w)^\circ), c_{\text{SM}}(Y(w)^\circ), s_{\text{SM}}(X(w)^\circ), s_{\text{SM}}(Y(w)^\circ) &\in \mathbb{H}_T(G/B), \\ c_{\text{SM}}(X(\lambda)^\circ), c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ), s_{\text{SM}}(X(\lambda)^\circ), s_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ) &\in \mathbb{H}_T(G/P). \end{aligned}$$

For $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, the *Demazure–Lusztig operator* on $\mathbb{H}_T(G/B)$ is

$$\mathcal{T}_i = \partial_i - s_i. \quad (2.14)$$

They satisfy $\mathcal{T}_i^2 = \text{id}$ and the braid relations, and so \mathcal{T}_w for $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is well defined.

Proposition 2.9 ([1, 2]). *We have*

- (i) $\{c_{\text{SM}}(Y(w)^\circ) : w \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$ is a basis of $\mathbb{H}_T(G/B)$ over $\mathbb{H}_T(\text{pt})$;
- (ii) $c_{\text{SM}}(Y(w)^\circ) = \mathcal{T}_{w^{-1}w_0} c_{\text{SM}}(Y(w_0)^\circ)$;
- (iii) $c_{\text{SM}}(Y(w)^\circ)|_e \neq 0$ if and only if $w = \text{id}$.

Let us denote

$$\pi_* : H_T^\bullet(G/B) \longrightarrow H_T^\bullet(G/P) \quad (2.15)$$

the pushforward induced by (2.3).

Proposition 2.10 ([2]). *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, and $\bar{\lambda}$ be its dual. Then*

- (i) $\pi_* c_{\text{SM}}(Y(w)^\circ) = c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\text{Gr}(w))^\circ)$;
- (ii) $c_{\text{SM}}(X(\lambda)^\circ)$ is dual to $s_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ)$ with respect to the Poincaré pairing;
- (iii) $c_{\text{SM}}(X(\lambda)^\circ) = w_0^L c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\bar{\lambda})^\circ)$;
- (iv) $s_{\text{SM}}(X(\lambda)^\circ) = w_0^L s_{\text{SM}}(Y(\bar{\lambda})^\circ)$.

The relations in Proposition 2.10 can be summarized as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ) & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Weyl action}} & c_{\text{SM}}(X(\lambda)^\circ) \\ & \swarrow \text{Poincaré dual} \searrow & \\ s_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ) & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Weyl action}} & s_{\text{SM}}(X(\lambda)^\circ) \end{array}$$

2.5. Motivic Chern classes and Segre motivic classes. Let X be an algebraic variety. Define the *Grothendieck group* $G_0(X)$ to be the group generated by $[Z \xrightarrow{\varphi} X]$ for all morphisms $\varphi : Z \rightarrow X$ modulo the relation

$$[Z \xrightarrow{\varphi} X] = [U \xrightarrow{\varphi} X] + [Z \setminus U \xrightarrow{\varphi} X]$$

for an open subset $U \subseteq Z$. For a proper morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$, define $f_* : G_0(X) \rightarrow G_0(Y)$ by

$$f_*[Z \xrightarrow{\varphi} X] = [Z \xrightarrow{\varphi} X \xrightarrow{f} Y].$$

By [9], there exists a unique natural transformation

$$\text{MC}_y : G_0(-) \longrightarrow K(-)[y]$$

such that when X is nonsingular, the identity morphism is sent to the total λ -class of cotangent bundle

$$\text{MC}_y([X \xrightarrow{\text{id}} X]) = \lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_X^\vee) := \sum_{r \geq 0} y^r [\Lambda^r \mathcal{T}_X^\vee].$$

Here y is a formal variable. The equivariant version was established in [20, 3].

Assume that X is a complete nonsingular T -variety. Denote

$$\mathbb{K}_T(X) = K_T(X)_{\mathbb{F}},$$

where $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, \dots, t_n, y)$ is the fraction field of $K_T(\mathbf{pt})[y]$. Let W be an equi-dimensional T -equivariant constructible subset. The equivariant *motivic Chern class* and *Segre motivic class* of W are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{MC}_y(W) &= \mathrm{MC}_y([W \hookrightarrow X]) \in \mathbb{K}_T(X), \\ \mathrm{SMC}_y(W) &= (-y)^{\dim W} \frac{\mathcal{D}(\mathrm{MC}_y(W))}{\lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_X^\vee)} \in \mathbb{K}_T(X), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{D} is induced by the Serre duality functor $R\mathcal{H}om(-, \omega_X[\dim X])$.

Restricting to the case $X = G/B$ or G/P , we can consider equivariant motivic Chern classes and Segre motivic classes of Schubert cells:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{MC}_y(X(w)^\circ), \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(w)^\circ), \mathrm{SMC}_y(X(w)^\circ), \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(w)^\circ) &\in \mathbb{K}_T(G/B), \\ \mathrm{MC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ), \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ), \mathrm{SMC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ), \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) &\in \mathbb{K}_T(G/P). \end{aligned}$$

For $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, the *Demazure–Lusztig operator* on $\mathbb{K}_T(G/B)$ is

$$\mathfrak{T}_i = \left(1 + y \frac{1-x_i}{1-x_{i+1}}\right) \pi_i - \mathrm{id}. \quad (2.16)$$

The operators satisfy $(\mathfrak{T}_i + 1)(\mathfrak{T}_i + y) = 0$ and the braid relations, and thus \mathfrak{T}_w for $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is well defined.

Proposition 2.11 ([3]). *We have*

- (i) $\{\mathrm{MC}_y(Y(w)^\circ) : w \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$ forms a basis of $\mathbb{K}_T(G/B)$ over $\mathbb{K}_T(\mathbf{pt})$;
- (ii) $\mathrm{MC}_y(Y(w)^\circ) = \mathfrak{T}_{w^{-1}w_0} \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(w_0)^\circ)$;
- (iii) $\mathrm{MC}_y(Y(w)^\circ)|_e \neq 0$ if and only if $w = \mathrm{id}$.

Similarly, denote by

$$\pi_* : K_T(G/B) \longrightarrow K_T(G/P) \quad (2.17)$$

the pushforward induced by (2.3).

Proposition 2.12 ([3, 43]). *We have*

- (i) $\pi_* \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(w)^\circ) = (-y)^{\binom{k}{2} + \binom{n-k}{2} - \ell(w) + |\mathrm{Gr}(w)|} \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\mathrm{Gr}(w))^\circ)$;
- (ii) $\mathrm{MC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ)$ is dual to $\mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)$ with respect to the Poincaré pairing;
- (iii) $\mathrm{MC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ) = w_0^L \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\bar{\lambda})^\circ)$;
- (iv) $\mathrm{SMC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ) = w_0^L \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\bar{\lambda})^\circ)$.

We use the following diagram to illustrate Proposition 2.12:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Weyl action}} & \mathrm{MC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ) \\ & \swarrow \text{Poincaré dual} \quad \searrow & \\ \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) & \xleftrightarrow{\text{Weyl action}} & \mathrm{SMC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ) \end{array}$$

Remark 2.13. By [3] and [43], if we specialize $y = 0$, then we have

$$\mathrm{MC}_y(Y(w)^\circ)|_{y=0} = [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w)}], \quad \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(w)^\circ)|_{y=0} = [\mathcal{O}_{Y(w)}],$$

and

$$\mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)|_{y=0} = [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}], \quad \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)|_{y=0} = [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}].$$

3. AFFINE HECKE ALGEBRAS AND SCHUBERT REPRESENTATIONS

In this section, we introduce an affine Hecke algebra \widehat{H}_n , and define the Schubert representation of \widehat{H}_n . We illustrate how motivic Chern classes, as well as three other classes in Section 2, are incorporated naturally in this setting.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Q}[p, q]$ be the ring of polynomials over \mathbb{Q} in two parameters p and q . The (type A) Hecke algebra H_n over \mathcal{A} is the associative algebra with generators T_i ($1 \leq i \leq n-1$), subject to the relations

$$(T_i + p)(T_i - q) = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

$$T_i T_j = T_j T_i, \quad |i - j| > 1, \tag{3.2}$$

$$T_i T_{i+1} T_i = T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1}. \tag{3.3}$$

Due to the braid relations in (3.2) and (3.3), one can define $T_w = T_{i_1} \cdots T_{i_{\ell(w)}}$ for $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$, where $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{\ell(w)}}$ is any reduced decomposition of w . Then H_n is a free \mathcal{A} -module with basis $\{T_w : w \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$. The relation in (3.1) can be rewritten as $T_i^2 = -(p - q)T_i + pq$. The basis elements satisfy the following multiplication rule

$$T_i T_w = \begin{cases} T_{s_i w}, & \text{if } \ell(s_i w) > \ell(w), \\ -(p - q)T_w + pqT_{s_i w}, & \text{if } \ell(s_i w) < \ell(w). \end{cases}$$

Denote $\overline{T}_i = T_i + p - q$. It is direct to check that \overline{T}_i 's satisfy

$$(\overline{T}_i + q)(\overline{T}_i - p) = 0, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\overline{T}_i \overline{T}_j = \overline{T}_j \overline{T}_i, \quad |i - j| > 1, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\overline{T}_i \overline{T}_{i+1} \overline{T}_i = \overline{T}_{i+1} \overline{T}_i \overline{T}_{i+1}. \tag{3.6}$$

Thus, we may write $\overline{T}_w = \overline{T}_{i_1} \cdots \overline{T}_{i_{\ell(w)}}$ for any reduced decomposition $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{\ell(w)}}$ of $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$. Then $\{\overline{T}_w : w \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$ is also an \mathcal{A} -basis of H_n .

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{A}_\hbar = \mathcal{A}[\hbar]$. The affine Hecke algebra \widehat{H}_n over \mathcal{A}_\hbar is the algebra generated by T_1, \dots, T_{n-1} and x_1, \dots, x_n , with relations (3.1)–(3.3) together with

$$x_i x_j = x_j x_i, \tag{3.7}$$

$$T_i x_j = x_j T_i, \quad j \neq i, i + 1, \tag{3.8}$$

$$T_i x_i = x_{i+1} T_i + (\hbar - (p - q)x_i), \tag{3.9}$$

$$T_i x_{i+1} = x_i T_i - (\hbar - (p - q)x_i). \tag{3.10}$$

Notice that \widehat{H}_n can be viewed as a free \mathcal{A}_\hbar -module

$$\widehat{H}_n = \mathcal{A}_\hbar[x_1, \dots, x_n] \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} H_n,$$

including $\mathcal{A}_\hbar[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and H_n as subalgebras. For $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, write $x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$. Then both

$$\{x^\alpha T_w : w \in \mathcal{S}_n, \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{x^\alpha \overline{T}_w : w \in \mathcal{S}_n, \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\}$$

are \mathcal{A}_\hbar -basis of \widehat{H}_n .

Remark 3.2. Here are some remarks about H_n and \widehat{H}_n .

- Our definition of H_n is a special case of generic Hecke algebras in type A , see [25, §7.1], *loc. cit.*, $a = q - p$ and $b = pq$. The classical Hecke algebra [27, 28] is the case with $p = 1$ and with q inverted. Another popular convention is the case when $q = -v$ and $p = -v^{-1}$ [51].
- The basis element \overline{T}_w is the image of T_w under Goldman involution introduced by Iwahori [26]. For $p = -v^{-1}$ and $q = -v$, it coincides with the image under the bar involution in [51]. For $p = 1$, \overline{T}_w is the same as $q_w \overline{T}_w$ in [28].
- The affine Hecke algebra \widehat{H}_n in Definition 3.1 is a generalization of graded affine Hecke algebras defined by Drinfeld [17] (extended to any type by Lusztig [40]). If we denote $X_i = \hbar - (p - q)x_i$, then it can be checked that $T_i X_j = X_j T_i$ for $j \neq i, i + 1$ and $T_i X_{i+1} T_i = pq X_i$, specializing the Bernstein relations of type A [39].

Taking specific values of the parameters p, q, \hbar , the relations satisfied by T_i and x_j in (3.1)–(3.3) as well as in (3.8)–(3.10) are compatible with the relations satisfied by the operators appearing in Section 2. The details are listed in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *Via direct computations, one can check that*

- (i) *The operator ∂_i in (2.7) corresponds to $(p, q, \hbar) = (0, 0, 1)$;*
- (ii) *The operator $\widehat{\pi}_i$ in (2.12) corresponds to $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, 0, 1)$;*
- (iii) *The operator \mathcal{T}_i in (2.14) corresponds to $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, 1, 1)$;*
- (iv) *The operator \mathfrak{S}_i in (2.16) corresponds to $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, -y, 1 + y)$.*

Motivated by Proposition 3.3, we define the Schubert representation of \widehat{H}_n as follows.

Definition 3.4. Let \mathbb{V} be a representation of \widehat{H}_n over $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Q}(t_1, \dots, t_n)$. We say that \mathbb{V} is a *Schubert representation* if

- There exists a distinguished element $\mathcal{Y}_{w_0} \in \mathbb{V}$ ($w_0 = n \cdots 21$ is the longest permutation), such that the elements, called *generic Schubert classes*, defined by

$$\mathcal{Y}_w = T_{w^{-1}w_0} \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{w_0} \in \mathbb{V}, \quad w \in \mathcal{S}_n,$$

form a basis of \mathbb{V} over \mathbb{F} .

- There exists an \mathbb{F} -linear *evaluation map* $\text{ev}: \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ such that

$$\text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_w) \neq 0 \iff w = \text{id}.$$

- There exist *equivariant parameters* $t_1, \dots, t_n \in \mathbb{F}$, such that for any $\mathcal{Y}_w \in \mathbb{V}$,

$$\text{ev}(x_i \cdot \mathcal{Y}_w) = t_i \text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_w). \tag{3.11}$$

Combining Proposition 3.3 and Propositions 2.2, 2.6, 2.9 and 2.11, we illustrate in the following example concrete Schubert representations that we need.

Example 3.5. *Choose*

$$\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{H}_T(G/B), \quad \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{H}_T(\text{pt}), \quad \text{ev} = -|_e,$$

or

$$\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{K}_T(G/B), \quad \mathbb{F} = \mathbb{K}_T(\text{pt}), \quad \text{ev} = -|_e.$$

We have the following setups:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (p, q, \hbar) &= (0, 0, 1), & T_i &= \partial_i, & x_i &\text{ in (2.5),} & \mathcal{Y}_w &= [Y(w)] \in \mathbb{H}_T(G/B), \\
 (p, q, \hbar) &= (1, 0, 1), & T_i &= \hat{\pi}_i, & x_i &\text{ in (2.10),} & \mathcal{Y}_w &= [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w)}] \in \mathbb{K}_T(G/B), \\
 (p, q, \hbar) &= (1, 1, 1), & T_i &= \mathcal{T}_i, & x_i &\text{ in (2.5),} & \mathcal{Y}_w &= c_{\text{SM}}(Y(w)^\circ) \in \mathbb{H}_T(G/B), \\
 (p, q, \hbar) &= (1, -y, 1 + y), & T_i &= \mathfrak{T}_i, & x_i &\text{ in (2.10),} & \mathcal{Y}_w &= \text{MC}_y(Y(w)^\circ) \in \mathbb{K}_T(G/B).
 \end{aligned}$$

In the remaining of this section, we clarify the equivalence between the product $\overline{T}_w f$ and the action $f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_w$ for $f \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Its Grassmannian analogue will be our main task in Section 4.

Theorem 3.6. *Let \mathbb{V} be a Schubert representation of \widehat{H}_n . For $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ and $f \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, assume that*

$$\overline{T}_w f = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{S}_n} P_{u,w}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \overline{T}_u \in \widehat{H}_n, \quad (3.12)$$

where $P_{u,w} \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then

$$f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_w = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{S}_n} P_{u,w}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \mathcal{Y}_u \in \mathbb{V}.$$

The proof of Theorem 3.6 is based on the following property.

Proposition 3.7. *Let \mathbb{V} be a Schubert representation of \widehat{H}_n . For $u, v \in \mathcal{S}_n$,*

$$\text{ev}(\overline{T}_u \cdot \mathcal{Y}_v) = \begin{cases} \text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}}), & u = v, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.13)$$

Moreover, for $\mathcal{Y} \in \mathbb{V}$, we have

$$\mathcal{Y} = \frac{1}{\text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}})} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}_n} \text{ev}(\overline{T}_w \cdot \mathcal{Y}) \mathcal{Y}_w. \quad (3.14)$$

The proof of the above proposition needs a classical identity in Hecke algebras [28], and here we include a proof for completeness. Denote by $\epsilon: H_n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ the operation of taking the coefficient of T_{w_0} .

Lemma 3.8. *For $u, v \in \mathcal{S}_n$,*

$$\epsilon(\overline{T}_u T_v) = \begin{cases} 1, & uv = w_0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We use induction on $\ell(u)$. This is clear for $u = \text{id}$. We next consider $\ell(u) \geq 1$. By definition, it is easily seen that for $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$,

$$\overline{T}_w = T_w + \sum_{y < w} a_{y,w} T_y,$$

where $a_{y,w} \in \mathbb{Q}[p, q]$, and $<$ is the Bruhat order. So the assertion is true when $\ell(u) \leq \ell(w_0) - \ell(v)$. Now we are left with the case when $\ell(u) > \ell(w_0) - \ell(v)$. In this case, we have $uv \neq w_0$, and so we need to verify $\epsilon(\overline{T}_u T_v) = 0$. Notice that for $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$,

$$\overline{T}_i T_w = \begin{cases} pq T_{s_i w}, & \ell(s_i w) < \ell(w), \\ (p-q) T_w + T_{s_i w}, & \ell(s_i w) > \ell(w). \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

Since $\ell(u) \geq 1$, we may pick an index i such that $\ell(us_i) < \ell(u)$. By (3.15),

$$\epsilon(\overline{T}_u T_v) = \epsilon(\overline{T}_{us_i} \overline{T}_i T_v) = \begin{cases} pq\epsilon(\overline{T}_{us_i} T_{s_i v}), & \ell(s_i v) < \ell(v), \\ \epsilon(\overline{T}_{us_i} T_{s_i v}) + (p - q)\epsilon(\overline{T}_{us_i} T_v), & \ell(s_i v) > \ell(v). \end{cases}$$

Since $us_i s_i v = uv \neq w_0$, we have $\epsilon(\overline{T}_{us_i} T_{s_i v}) = 0$ by induction. To conclude the proof, we need to check that $\epsilon(\overline{T}_{us_i} T_v) = 0$. Suppose to the contrary that $\epsilon(\overline{T}_{us_i} T_v)$ is non-zero, that is, $us_i v = w_0$ by induction. However, this would lead to

$$\ell(v) = \ell(s_i v) - 1 = \ell(w_0) - \ell(u) - 1,$$

contradicting the assumption that $\ell(v) > \ell(w_0) - \ell(u)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.7. For $u, v \in \mathcal{S}_n$, it follows from Definition 3.4 that

$$\text{ev}(\overline{T}_u \cdot \mathcal{Y}_v) = \text{ev}(\overline{T}_u T_{v^{-1}w_0} \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{w_0}) = \epsilon(\overline{T}_u T_{v^{-1}w_0}) \text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}}).$$

By Lemma 3.8, $\epsilon(\overline{T}_u T_{v^{-1}w_0})$ equals 1 if $u = v$, and vanishes otherwise. This proves (3.13). To verify (3.14), write $\mathcal{Y} = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}_n} c_w \mathcal{Y}_w$. By (3.13),

$$\text{ev}(\overline{T}_u \cdot \mathcal{Y}) = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}_n} c_w \text{ev}(\overline{T}_u \cdot \mathcal{Y}_w) = c_u \text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}}),$$

which justifies (3.14). \square

Proof of Theorem 3.6. By (3.14), we see that

$$f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_u = \frac{1}{\text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}})} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}_n} \text{ev}(\overline{T}_w f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_u) \mathcal{Y}_w,$$

which, along with (3.12), leads to

$$f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_u = \frac{1}{\text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}})} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}_n} \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_n} \text{ev}(P_{v,w}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \overline{T}_v \cdot \mathcal{Y}_u) \right) \mathcal{Y}_w. \quad (3.16)$$

In view of (3.11) and (3.13), one can simplify (3.16) as

$$\begin{aligned} f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_u &= \frac{1}{\text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}})} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}_n} P_{u,w}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}}) \mathcal{Y}_w \\ &= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{S}_n} P_{u,w}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \mathcal{Y}_w. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

4. SCHUBERT CALCULUS ON GRASSMANNIANS

The aim of this section is to relate the Schubert calculus (in particular, the Pieri formula case) over Grassmannians to the computation in the affine Hecke algebra \widehat{H}_n . The result is described in Theorem 4.5, which can be regarded as a Grassmannian analogue of Theorem 3.6.

4.1. Main result. We start with some definitions and notation.

Definition 4.1. Let \mathbb{V} be a Schubert representation of \widehat{H}_n with basis $\{\mathcal{Y}_w : w \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$. For $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$, the *generic Grassmannian Schubert class* is defined by

$$\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} p^{\ell(v)} \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda v} = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} p^{\ell(w) - |\lambda|} \mathcal{Y}_w. \quad (4.1)$$

Here, recall that w_λ is defined in (2.1).

By taking specific values of (p, q, \hbar) as illustrated in Example 3.5, we obtain the concrete realizations of generic Grassmannian Schubert classes.

Example 4.2. (i) *Schubert classes:* $(p, q, \hbar) = (0, 0, 1)$. In this case, by Example 3.5, we have $\mathcal{Y}_w = [Y(w)]$. Since $p = 0$, the only basis element appearing in (4.1) is \mathcal{Y}_{w_λ} , and so we have $\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda} = [Y(w_\lambda)]$. Along with Proposition 2.3(i), we see that

$$\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = [Y(w_\lambda)] = \pi^*[Y(\lambda)].$$

(ii) *Classes of ideal sheaves:* $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, 0, 1)$. In this case, we have $\mathcal{Y}_w = [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w)}]$. So, by (4.1) and Proposition 2.7(i),

$$\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} \mathcal{Y}_w = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(w)}] = \pi^*[\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}].$$

(iii) *CSM classes:* $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, 1, 1)$. In this case, we have $\mathcal{Y}_w = c_{\text{SM}}(Y(w)^\circ)$. It follows from (4.1) that

$$\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} \mathcal{Y}_w = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} c_{\text{SM}}(Y(w)^\circ) = c_{\text{SM}} \left(\bigcup_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} Y(w)^\circ \right).$$

(iv) *Motivic Chern classes:* $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, -y, 1+y)$. In this case, we have $\mathcal{Y}_w = \text{MC}_y(Y(w)^\circ)$. It follows from (4.1) that

$$\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} \text{MC}_y(Y(w)^\circ) = \text{MC}_y \left(\bigcup_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} Y(w)^\circ \right).$$

For a nonnegative integer m , the *quantum number* refers to

$$[m] = \frac{p^m - q^m}{p - q}, \quad [m]! = [m][m-1] \cdots [1].$$

Here we follow the usual convention $[0]! = 1$.

Definition 4.3. The *quantum symmetrizer* is defined as the following element in H_n :

$$\Sigma_k^n = \frac{1}{[k]![n-k]!} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} q^{d-\ell(v)} \bar{T}_v, \quad (4.2)$$

where $d = \binom{k}{2} + \binom{n-k}{2} = \ell(v_0)$ with $v_0 = k \cdots 1 n \cdots (k+1)$ being the longest permutation in $\mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$. With this notation, for $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, we define the *generic Grassmannian Hecke operator* by

$$\bar{T}_\lambda = \bar{T}_{w_\lambda} \Sigma_k^n. \quad (4.3)$$

More concretely,

$$\bar{T}_\lambda = \frac{1}{[k]![n-k]!} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} q^{d-\ell(v)} \bar{T}_{w_\lambda v} = \frac{1}{[k]![n-k]!} \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} q^{d-\ell(w)+|\lambda|} \bar{T}_w.$$

Remark 4.4. • The structures in Definition 4.3 were essentially investigated by Deodhar [16] in his study of the parabolic analogue of Kazhdan–Lusztig polynomials.

- The coefficient in Σ_k^n is a normalization due to the following identity (see for example [41, Chapter III (1.3)]):

$$\frac{1}{[k]![n-k]!} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} q^{d-\ell(v)} p^{\ell(v)} = 1. \quad (4.4)$$

Our main result in this section can now be stated as follows.

Theorem 4.5. *Let \mathbb{V} be a Schubert representation of \widehat{H}_n with basis $\{\mathcal{Y}_w : w \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$. Assume that $f \in \mathcal{A}_{\hbar}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is symmetric under $\mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$, that is, f is symmetric both in x_1, \dots, x_k and in x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n .*

- (i) *For $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$, the product $\overline{T}_\mu f$ in \widehat{H}_n can be expressed as*

$$\overline{T}_\mu f = \sum_{\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \overline{T}_\lambda, \quad (4.5)$$

where $P_{\lambda, \mu}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{A}_{\hbar}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

- (ii) *For $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, the action $f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda$ in \mathbb{V} is determined by (4.5), that is,*

$$f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}(t_1, \dots, t_n) \mathcal{Y}_\mu. \quad (4.6)$$

For our purpose of deriving Pieri type formulas, we pay attention to the case of elementary symmetric polynomials $f = e_r(x_1, \dots, x_k)$. We adopt the abbreviation $e_r(x_{[k]}) := e_r(x_1, \dots, x_k)$. Based upon the observations in Examples 3.5 and 4.2, one may transform the determination of Pieri formulas to the computation of the action in (4.6), as explained below.

Proposition 4.6. (i) *Schubert classes: $(p, q, \hbar) = (0, 0, 1)$. In this case, $\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \pi^*[Y(\lambda)]$. Suppose that*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot [Y(\lambda)] = \sum_{\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}^{(1)}(t) [Y(\mu)].$$

Applying the injection π^ to both sides yields that*

$$e_r(x_{[k]}) \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}^{(1)}(t) \mathcal{Y}_\mu.$$

- (ii) *Classes of ideal sheaves: $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, 0, 1)$. In this case, $\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \pi^*[\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y}(\lambda)]$. Suppose that*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \mathcal{I}_{\partial Y}(\lambda) = \sum_{\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}^{(2)}(t) \mathcal{I}_{\partial Y}(\mu).$$

Applying the injection π^ to both sides yields that*

$$e_r(x_{[k]}) \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}^{(2)}(t) \mathcal{Y}_\mu.$$

- (iii) *CSM classes: $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, 1, 1)$. In this case,*

$$\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} c_{\text{SM}}(Y(w)^\circ).$$

Using Proposition 2.10(i), we obtain that

$$\pi_* \mathcal{Y}_\lambda = k!(n-k)! \cdot c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ).$$

Suppose that

$$e_r(x_{[k]}) \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}^{(3)}(t) \mathcal{Y}_\mu.$$

By the projection formula,

$$\begin{aligned} c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ) &= \frac{1}{k!(n-k)!} c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \pi_* \mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \frac{1}{k!(n-k)!} \pi_*(e_r(x_{[k]}) \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda) \\ &= \frac{1}{k!(n-k)!} \sum_{\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}^{(3)}(t) \pi_* \mathcal{Y}_\mu \\ &= \sum_{\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}^{(3)}(t) c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\mu)^\circ). \end{aligned}$$

(iv) *Motivic Chern classes:* $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, -y, 1 + y)$. In this case,

$$\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} \text{MC}(Y(w)^\circ).$$

By Proposition 2.12(i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_* \mathcal{Y}_\lambda &= \left(\sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{S}_n \\ \text{Gr}(w) = \lambda}} (-y)^{\binom{k}{2} + \binom{n-k}{2} - \ell(w) + |\text{Gr}(w)|} \right) \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \\ &= \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} (-y)^{\binom{k}{2} + \binom{n-k}{2} - \ell(v)} \right) \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \\ &= \left(\sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} (-y)^{\ell(v)} \right) \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that

$$e_r(x_{[k]}) \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}^{(4)}(t) \mathcal{Y}_\mu.$$

Still, as in (iii), using the projection formula, we obtain that

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = \sum_{\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k} P_{\lambda, \mu}^{(4)}(t) \text{MC}_y(Y(\mu)^\circ).$$

4.2. Proof of Theorem 4.5. In order to give a proof of Theorem 4.5, we first demonstrate several lemmas, which we think might possibly be known to experts in affine Hecke algebras.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $f \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. If f is symmetric in x_i and x_{i+1} , then*

$$\overline{T}_i f = f \overline{T}_i. \tag{4.7}$$

Proof. By (3.8), this is clear for $f \in \mathcal{A}_\hbar[x_j : j \neq i, i + 1]$. Since f is symmetric in x_i and x_{i+1} , “the fundamental theorem of symmetric functions” tells that f can be expressed as a polynomial in $e_1(x_i, x_{i+1}) = x_i + x_{i+1}$ and $e_2(x_i, x_{i+1}) = x_i x_{i+1}$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{A}_\hbar[x_j : j \neq i, i + 1]$.

Hence it suffices to verify (4.7) for $f = x_i + x_{i+1}$ or $f = x_i x_{i+1}$. It follows from (3.9) and (3.10) that

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{T}_i x_i &= x_{i+1} \bar{T}_i + (\hbar - (p - q)x_{i+1}), \\ \bar{T}_i x_{i+1} &= x_i \bar{T}_i - (\hbar - (p - q)x_{i+1}),\end{aligned}$$

from which we can directly check that $\bar{T}_i(x_i + x_{i+1}) = (x_i + x_{i+1})\bar{T}_i$ and $\bar{T}_i(x_i x_{i+1}) = (x_i x_{i+1})\bar{T}_i$. \square

Lemma 4.8. *For $v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$, we have*

$$\Sigma_k^n \bar{T}_v = \bar{T}_v \Sigma_k^n = p^{\ell(v)} \Sigma_k^n. \quad (4.8)$$

In particular, if $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ has the parabolic decomposition $w = w_\lambda v$, then

$$\bar{T}_w \Sigma_k^n = \bar{T}_{w_\lambda} \bar{T}_v \Sigma_k^n = p^{\ell(v)} \bar{T}_\lambda. \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. To conclude (4.8), it suffices to check that for $v = s_i$ with $1 \leq i < k$ or $k < i < n$,

$$\Sigma_k^n \bar{T}_i = \bar{T}_i \Sigma_k^n = p \Sigma_k^n.$$

To justify $\Sigma_k^n \bar{T}_i = p \Sigma_k^n$, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_k^n &= \frac{1}{[k]![n-k]!} \left(\sum_{v(i) < v(i+1)} q^{d-\ell(v)} \bar{T}_v + \sum_{v(i) < v(i+1)} q^{d-\ell(v)-1} \bar{T}_v \bar{T}_i \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{[k]![n-k]!} \left(\sum_{v(i) < v(i+1)} q^{d-1-\ell(v)} \bar{T}_v \right) (\bar{T}_i + q).\end{aligned}$$

Since $(\bar{T}_i + q)\bar{T}_i = p(\bar{T}_i + q)$, we deduce that $\Sigma_k^n \bar{T}_i = p \Sigma_k^n$. Similarly, we obtain $\bar{T}_i \Sigma_k^n = p \Sigma_k^n$ by noticing

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_k^n &= \frac{1}{[k]![n-k]!} \left(\sum_{v^{-1}(i) < v^{-1}(i+1)} q^{d-\ell(v)} \bar{T}_v + \sum_{v^{-1}(i) < v^{-1}(i+1)} q^{d-1-\ell(v)} \bar{T}_i \bar{T}_v \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{[k]![n-k]!} (\bar{T}_i + q) \left(\sum_{v^{-1}(i) < v^{-1}(i+1)} q^{d-1-\ell(v)} \bar{T}_v \right)\end{aligned}$$

and $\bar{T}_i(\bar{T}_i + q) = p(\bar{T}_i + q)$. \square

The third lemma concerns another *quantum symmetrizer*

$$\Pi_k^n = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} p^{d-\ell(v)} T_v,$$

where, as before, $d = \binom{k}{2} + \binom{n-k}{2}$ is the length of the longest permutation in $\mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$.

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose that $w \in \mathcal{S}_n$ has the parabolic decomposition $w = w_\lambda v$ with respect to $\mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$. Then, for the basis element \mathcal{Y}_w in \mathbb{V} ,*

$$\Pi_k^n \cdot \mathcal{Y}_w = q^{d-\ell(v)} \mathcal{Y}_\lambda.$$

Proof. Similar to Lemma 4.8, we can deduce that for any $v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$,

$$\Pi_k^n T_v = T_v \Pi_k^n = q^{\ell(v)} \Pi_k^n. \quad (4.10)$$

If $w = w_\lambda v_0$ with v_0 being the longest element of $\mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_k^n \cdot \mathcal{Y}_w &= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} p^{d-\ell(v)} T_v \cdot \mathcal{Y}_w = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} p^{d-\ell(v)} \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda v_0 v^{-1}} \\ &= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} p^{\ell(v)} \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda v} = \mathcal{Y}_\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

In general, note that

$$\mathcal{Y}_w = T_{v^{-1}v_0} \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda v_0}.$$

This, combined with (4.10) and the above case for $w_\lambda v_0$, gives

$$\Pi_k^n \cdot \mathcal{Y}_w = \Pi_k^n \cdot (T_{v^{-1}v_0} \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda v_0}) = q^{\ell(v^{-1}v_0)} \Pi_k^n \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda v_0} = q^{d-\ell(v)} \mathcal{Y}_\lambda.$$

This completes the proof. \square

We still need a Grassmannian analogue of Theorem 3.7.

Theorem 4.10. *For $\mu, \nu \subseteq (n-k)^k$, we have*

$$\text{ev}(\overline{T}_\mu \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\nu) = \begin{cases} \text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}}), & \mu = \nu, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, for any \mathbb{F} -linear combination f of \mathcal{Y}_λ 's, we have

$$f = \frac{1}{\text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}})} \sum_{\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k} \text{ev}(\overline{T}_\lambda \cdot f) \mathcal{Y}_\lambda. \quad (4.11)$$

Proof. By the definitions of \overline{T}_μ and \mathcal{Y}_ν , we see that

$$\text{ev}(\overline{T}_\mu \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\nu) = \frac{1}{[k]![n-k]!} \sum_{v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} q^{d-\ell(v_1)} p^{\ell(v_2)} \text{ev}(\overline{T}_{w_\mu v_1} \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{w_\nu v_2}),$$

which, in conjunction with Theorem 3.7, reduces to

$$\delta_{\mu\nu} \frac{\text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}})}{[k]![n-k]!} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}} q^{d-\ell(v)} p^{\ell(v)},$$

and can be further simplified to $\delta_{\mu\nu} \text{ev}(\mathcal{Y}_{\text{id}})$ by means of (4.4). The proof of the expansion in (4.11) is completely the same as that in Theorem 3.7, and thus is omitted. \square

We are now in a position to finish the proof of Theorem 4.5.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. Since $f \in \mathcal{A}_h[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is symmetric under $\mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$, by Lemma 4.7, we see that f commutes with \overline{T}_v for each $v \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$, and thus $\Sigma_k^n f = f \Sigma_k^n$. In particular,

$$\overline{T}_\mu f = \overline{T}_{w_\mu} \Sigma_k^n f = \overline{T}_{w_\mu} f \Sigma_k^n \in \widehat{H}_n \cdot \Sigma_k^n = \sum_{\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k} \mathcal{A}_h[x_1, \dots, x_n] \cdot \overline{T}_\lambda,$$

where the last equality is implied by (4.9). This shows that $\overline{T}_\mu f$ can be expanded as a form given in (4.5).

We next show that $f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda$ has an expansion in (4.6). Let $v_0 \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$ be the longest element. By Lemma 4.9, we have $\mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \Pi_k^n \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda v_0}$. Similar to Lemma 4.7, we can deduce $\Pi_k^n f = f \Pi_k^n$. Thus,

$$f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda = f \cdot (\Pi_k^n \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda v_0}) = \Pi_k^n \cdot (f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda v_0}).$$

Expanding $f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_{w_\lambda v_0}$ in the basis $\{\mathcal{Y}_w : w \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$ and using Lemma 4.9, we see that $f \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda$ can be expanded in the form of (4.6). Finally, we invoke Theorem 4.10, and then use the same manner as in the proof of Theorem 3.6 to conclude that the coefficients in (4.5) and (4.6) coincide. \square

5. PIERI TYPE FORMULAS

To establish our Pieri formulas, it follows from Theorem 4.5 and Proposition 4.6 that we need to evaluate the action $e_r(x_{[k]}) \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda$, or equivalently, the product $\overline{T}_\mu e_r(x_{[k]})$, which is the goal of this section.

5.1. Main result. Recall that for $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$,

$$|\mathfrak{I}\rangle \rightarrow \lambda = t_c \cdot \lambda + \sum_{\mu/\lambda=\eta} (\hbar - (p-q)t_{\mathfrak{h}(\eta)}) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \mu, \quad (5.1)$$

where $c = \lambda_i + k + 1 - i$, $\mathfrak{h}(\eta) = \mu_i + k + 1 - i$, and the sum runs over $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ such that μ/λ is a ribbon with head in row i . Replacing λ and μ respectively by \mathcal{Y}_λ and \mathcal{Y}_μ in (5.1), we are led to the notation

$$|\mathfrak{I}\rangle \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\lambda.$$

The main theorem is as follows.

Theorem 5.1. *Let \mathbb{V} be a Schubert representation of \widehat{H}_n with basis $\{\mathcal{Y}_w : w \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$. For $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$, we have*

$$e_r(x_{[k]}) \cdot \mathcal{Y}_\lambda = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} |\mathfrak{I}_{i_r}\rangle \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |\mathfrak{I}_{i_1}\rangle \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_\lambda. \quad (5.2)$$

By Theorem 4.5, the proof of Theorem 5.1 is equivalent to the determination of $\overline{T}_\mu e_r(x_{[k]})$. To expand $\overline{T}_\mu e_r(x_{[k]})$, we need the dual version of the ribbon Schubert operator in (5.1). That is, for $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, let

$$\mu \rightarrow |\mathfrak{I}\rangle = t_c \cdot \mu + \sum_{\lambda/\mu=\eta} (\hbar - (p-q)t_{\mathfrak{h}(\eta)}) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \lambda, \quad (5.3)$$

where $c = \mathfrak{h}(\eta) = \mu_i + k + 1 - i$, and the sum is over $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$ such that λ/μ is a ribbon with head in row i . Similarly, let

$$\overline{T}_\mu \rightarrow |\mathfrak{I}\rangle$$

be defined by replacing μ and λ respectively by \overline{T}_μ and \overline{T}_λ in (5.3).

Theorem 5.2. *For $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$, we have*

$$\overline{T}_\mu e_r(x_{[k]}) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \overline{T}_\mu \rightarrow |\mathfrak{I}_{i_r}\rangle \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |\mathfrak{I}_{i_1}\rangle. \quad (5.4)$$

Using Theorem 4.5 and comparing the definitions in (5.1) and (5.3), it can be seen that once Theorem 5.2 is true, we arrive at a proof of Theorem 5.1. By Lemma 4.7, we notice that

$$\overline{T}_\mu e_r(x_{[k]}) = \overline{T}_{w_\mu} \Sigma_k^n e_r(x_{[k]}) = \overline{T}_{w_\mu} e_r(x_{[k]}) \Sigma_k^n.$$

In fact, we have the following refinement, which may also be regarded as an algebraic interpretation of ribbon Schubert operators.

Theorem 5.3. *For $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ and a subset $I = \{i_1 < \dots < i_r\}$ of $\{1, \dots, k\}$, we have*

$$\overline{T}_{w_\mu} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r} \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_\mu \rightarrow |k+1-i_1\rangle \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |k+1-i_r\rangle.$$

Summing over all subsets $\{i_1 < \dots < i_r\}$ of $\{1, \dots, k\}$, Theorem 5.3 implies Theorem 5.2, because of the correspondence between $i_1 < \dots < i_r$ and $k+1-i_r < \dots < k+1-i_1$.

The rest of this section will be devoted to a proof of Theorem 5.3. Our approach is to use induction on k . For simplicity, we use the following notation: for $i > 0$ and $j \geq 0$,

$$\overline{T}_i^{[j]} = \overline{T}_{i+j-1} \cdots \overline{T}_{i+1} \overline{T}_i.$$

Here, for $j = 0$, we adopt the convention that $\overline{T}_i^{[0]} = T_{\text{id}}$. If letting

$$s_i^{[j]} = s_{i+j-1} \cdots s_{i+1} s_i,$$

then for $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, w_λ has the following reduced decomposition

$$w_\lambda = s_1^{[\lambda_k]} s_2^{[\lambda_{k-1}]} \cdots s_k^{[\lambda_1]}.$$

Thus

$$\overline{T}_{w_\lambda} = \overline{T}_1^{[\lambda_k]} \overline{T}_2^{[\lambda_{k-1}]} \cdots \overline{T}_k^{[\lambda_1]}.$$

For example, when $k = 3$, $n = 8$ and $\lambda = (4, 2, 1)$, we have $w_\lambda = 24713568$, and so

$$w_{(4,2,1)} = s_1 \cdot s_3 s_2 \cdot s_6 s_5 s_4 s_3, \quad \overline{T}_{w_{(4,2,1)}} = \overline{T}_1 \cdot \overline{T}_3 \overline{T}_2 \cdot \overline{T}_6 \overline{T}_5 \overline{T}_4 \overline{T}_3.$$

We now present a proof of Theorem 5.3. In the proof, we shall need results in several lemmas whose proofs will be given in Subsection 5.2

Proof of Theorem 5.3. As promised, we use induction on k . We first check the case of $k = 1$, namely, $\mu = (\mu_1)$. We need to justify

$$\overline{T}_{w_\mu} x_1 \Sigma_1^n = \overline{T}_\mu \rightarrow |1\mathfrak{J},$$

which is exactly the statement of Lemma 5.6 in the case when $k = 1$ and $j = \mu_1$.

Now assume that $k > 1$. Denote by $\mu^- = (\mu_2, \dots, \mu_k)$ the partition obtained from μ by removing μ_1 . Then μ^- belongs to the $(k-1) \times \mu_2$ rectangle $(\mu_2)^{k-1}$. Let $m = k-1 + \mu_2$. So w_{μ^-} is a Grassmannian permutation of \mathcal{S}_m . Notice that $\overline{T}_{w_\mu} = \overline{T}_{w_{\mu^-}} \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]}$.

Case 1. $k \notin I$, that is, $i_r < k$. By Lemma 5.5 and induction,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{T}_{w_\mu} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r} \Sigma_k^n &= \overline{T}_{w_{\mu^-}} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r} \Sigma_{k-1}^m \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} \Sigma_k^n \\ &= (\overline{T}_{\mu^-} \rightarrow |k-i_1\mathfrak{J} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow |k-i_r\mathfrak{J}) \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} \Sigma_k^n. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

For each \overline{T}_ν appearing in $\overline{T}_{\mu^-} \rightarrow |k-i_1\mathfrak{J} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow |k-i_r\mathfrak{J}$, by (5.16), we find that $\overline{T}_\nu \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_{\nu^+}$, where $\nu^+ = (\mu_1, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_{k-1}) \subseteq (n-k)^k$ is obtained from ν by adding μ_1 as the largest part. So, (5.5) can be reformulated as

$$\overline{T}_\mu \rightarrow |k+1-i_1\mathfrak{J} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow |k+1-i_r\mathfrak{J}.$$

Case 2. $k \in I$, that is, $i_r = k$. By Lemma 5.5 and induction,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{T}_{w_\mu} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r} \Sigma_k^n &= \overline{T}_{w_{\mu^-}} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}} \Sigma_{k-1}^m \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n \\ &= (\overline{T}_{\mu^-} \rightarrow |k-i_1\mathfrak{J} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow |k-i_{r-1}\mathfrak{J}) \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n. \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Assume that

$$\overline{T}_{\mu^-} \rightarrow |k-i_1\mathfrak{J} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow |k-i_{r-1}\mathfrak{J} = \sum_{\nu \subseteq (\mu_2)^{k-1}} c_\nu \overline{T}_\nu. \quad (5.7)$$

We have to consider the product

$$\overline{T}_\nu \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_{w_\nu} \Sigma_{k-1}^m \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n.$$

By Lemma 5.4,

$$\Sigma_{k-1}^m \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n,$$

and so

$$\overline{T}_\nu \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_{w_\nu} \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n.$$

Applying Lemma 5.6 to $\overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n$ on the right-hand side, we obtain that

$$\overline{T}_\nu \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_{w_\nu} \left(x_{k+\mu_1} \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} \Sigma_k^n + \sum_{a+b=\mu_1-1} (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+\mu_1}) q^b \overline{T}_k^{[a]} \Sigma_k^n \right). \quad (5.8)$$

Since ν is in the rectangle $(\mu_2)^{k-1}$, it follows from (3.8) that \overline{T}_{w_ν} and $x_{k+\mu_1}$ commute, and so (5.8) can be rewritten as

$$\overline{T}_\nu \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n = x_{k+\mu_1} \overline{T}_{w_\nu} \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} \Sigma_k^n + \sum_{a+b=\mu_1-1} (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+\mu_1}) q^b \overline{T}_{w_\nu} \overline{T}_k^{[a]} \Sigma_k^n. \quad (5.9)$$

Let $\nu^+ = (\mu_1, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_{k-1}) \subseteq (n-k)^k$. It is clear that

$$\overline{T}_{w_\nu} \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_{w_{\nu^+}} \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_{\nu^+}. \quad (5.10)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 5.8, we obtain that

$$q^b \overline{T}_{w_\nu} \overline{T}_k^{[a]} \Sigma_k^n = q^{\text{wd}(\nu^+/\nu')-1} p^{\text{ht}(\nu^+/\nu')-1} \overline{T}_{\nu'},$$

where ν^+/ν' is the ribbon with head in the first row and with width equal to $\mu_1 - a = b + 1$. Therefore, the total contribution of the summation term in (5.9) is exactly

$$\sum_{\nu'} (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+\mu_1}) p^{\text{ht}(\nu^+/\nu')-1} q^{\text{wd}(\nu^+/\nu')-1} \overline{T}_{\nu'}, \quad (5.11)$$

ranging over ν' obtained from ν^+ by deleting a ribbon with head in the first row. In view of (5.10) and (5.11), (5.9) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{T}_\nu \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n &= x_{k+\mu_1} \overline{T}_{\nu^+} + \sum_{\nu'} (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+\mu_1}) p^{\text{ht}(\nu^+/\nu')-1} q^{\text{wd}(\nu^+/\nu')-1} \overline{T}_{\nu'} \\ &= \overline{T}_{\nu^+} \rightarrow |1\mathfrak{J}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Collecting (5.6), (5.6) and (5.12), we finally conclude that

$$\overline{T}_{w_\mu} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}} x_k \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_\mu \rightarrow |k+1-i_1\mathfrak{J} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow |k+1-i_r\mathfrak{J} \rightarrow |1\mathfrak{J}.$$

This completes the proof of Case 2. \square

5.2. Lemmas for the proof of Theorem 5.3.

Lemma 5.4. *For $1 \leq k \leq m < k+j \leq n$ and any polynomial $f(x_k)$ in x_k , we have*

$$\Sigma_{k-1}^m \overline{T}_k^{[j]} f(x_k) \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_k^{[j]} f(x_k) \Sigma_k^n.$$

Proof. We first check that for $v \in \mathcal{S}_{k-1} \times \mathcal{S}_{m-k+1}$,

$$\overline{T}_v \overline{T}_k^{[j]} f(x_k) \Sigma_k^n = p^{\ell(v)} \overline{T}_k^{[j]} f(x_k) \Sigma_k^n. \quad (5.13)$$

It suffices to justify (5.13) for $v = s_i$ with $1 \leq i < k-1$ or $k-1 < i < m$. To do this, we notice that

$$\overline{T}_i \overline{T}_k^{[j]} f(x_k) = \begin{cases} \overline{T}_k^{[j]} \overline{T}_i f(x_k), & 1 \leq i < k-1, \\ \overline{T}_k^{[j]} \overline{T}_{i+1} f(x_k), & k-1 < i < m, \end{cases} \quad (5.14)$$

where the first equality follows directly from (3.5), and the second equality can be obtained by applying the braid relations in (3.5) and (3.6):

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{T}_i \overline{T}_k^{[j]} &= \overline{T}_i (\cdots \overline{T}_{i+1} \overline{T}_i \cdots) = \cdots \overline{T}_i \overline{T}_{i+1} \overline{T}_i \cdots \\ &= \cdots \overline{T}_{i+1} \overline{T}_i \overline{T}_{i+1} \cdots = (\cdots \overline{T}_{i+1} \overline{T}_i \cdots) \overline{T}_{i+1}.\end{aligned}$$

In the above derivation, the condition $m < k + j$ ensures that there must appear the factor \overline{T}_{i+1} in $\overline{T}_k^{[j]}$. By the commutative relation in (3.8), (5.14) can be written as

$$\overline{T}_i \overline{T}_k^{[j]} f(x_k) = \begin{cases} \overline{T}_k^{[j]} f(x_k) \overline{T}_i, & 1 \leq i < k-1, \\ \overline{T}_k^{[j]} f(x_k) \overline{T}_{i+1}, & k-1 < i < m. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 4.8, we obtain

$$\overline{T}_i \overline{T}_k^{[j]} f(x_k) \Sigma_k^n = p \overline{T}_k^{[j]} f(x_k) \Sigma_k^n.$$

This verifies (5.13) for $v = s_i$, and thereby for general $v \in \mathcal{S}_{k-1} \times \mathcal{S}_{m-k+1}$. We can now conclude the lemma by combining (5.13) and (4.4). \square

Lemma 5.5. For $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ and a monomial $x_1^{d_1} \cdots x_k^{d_k}$,

$$\overline{T}_{w_\mu} x_1^{d_1} \cdots x_k^{d_k} \Sigma_k^n = \overline{T}_{w_{\mu^-}} x_1^{d_1} \cdots x_{k-1}^{d_{k-1}} \Sigma_{k-1}^m \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k^{d_k} \Sigma_k^n, \quad (5.15)$$

where $m = k-1 + \mu_2$, and $\mu^- = (\mu_2, \dots, \mu_k)$ is the partition in the rectangle $(\mu_2)^{k-1}$ by removing μ_1 from μ . In particular, when $d_1 = \cdots = d_k = 0$, we have

$$\overline{T}_\mu = \overline{T}_{\mu^-} \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} \Sigma_k^n. \quad (5.16)$$

Proof. This can be done via straightforward computation:

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{T}_{w_\mu} x_1^{d_1} \cdots x_k^{d_k} \Sigma_k^n &= \overline{T}_{w_{\mu^-}} \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_1^{d_1} \cdots x_k^{d_k} \Sigma_k^n \\ &= \overline{T}_{w_{\mu^-}} x_1^{d_1} \cdots x_{k-1}^{d_{k-1}} \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k^{d_k} \Sigma_k^n \\ &= \overline{T}_{w_{\mu^-}} x_1^{d_1} \cdots x_{k-1}^{d_{k-1}} \Sigma_{k-1}^m \overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k^{d_k} \Sigma_k^n,\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is clear from (3.8), and the last equality follows from Lemma 5.4. \square

The next lemma reformulates the factor $\overline{T}_k^{[\mu_1]} x_k^{d_k} \Sigma_k^n$ in (5.15) in the case $d_k = 1$. Its proof requires the following identities

$$\overline{T}_i x_i = x_{i+1} \overline{T}_i + (\hbar - (p-q)x_{i+1}), \quad (5.17)$$

$$\overline{T}_i (\hbar - (p-q)x_i) = (\hbar - (p-q)x_{i+1}) T_i, \quad (5.18)$$

which can be easily deduced from (3.9) and (3.10).

Lemma 5.6. For $k+j \leq n$,

$$\overline{T}_k^{[j]} x_k \Sigma_k^n = x_{k+j} \overline{T}_k^{[j]} \Sigma_k^n + \sum_{a+b=j-1} (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+j}) q^b \overline{T}_k^{[a]} \Sigma_k^n. \quad (5.19)$$

Proof. This is obvious for $j = 0$ since both sides are just $x_k \Sigma_k^n$. When $j = 1$, (5.19) follows from (5.17). Assume that the assertion is true for j . Consider the situation for $j + 1$ with $j \geq 1$ and $k + j + 1 \leq n$. By induction,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{T}_k^{[j+1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n &= \overline{T}_{k+j} \overline{T}_k^{[j]} x_k \Sigma_k^n \\ &= \overline{T}_{k+j} \left(x_{k+j} \overline{T}_k^{[j]} \Sigma_k^n + \sum_{a+b=j-1} (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+j}) q^b \overline{T}_k^{[a]} \Sigma_k^n \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

We need the following evaluations. By (5.17), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{T}_{k+j} x_{k+j} \overline{T}_k^{[j]} &= (x_{k+j+1} \overline{T}_{k+j} + (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+j+1})) \overline{T}_k^{[j]} \\ &= x_{k+j+1} \overline{T}_k^{[j+1]} + (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+j+1}) \overline{T}_k^{[j]}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.21)$$

By (5.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{T}_{k+j} (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+j}) q^b \overline{T}_k^{[a]} \Sigma_k^n &= (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+j+1}) \overline{T}_{k+j} q^b \overline{T}_k^{[a]} \Sigma_k^n \\ &= (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+j+1}) q^b (\overline{T}_{k+j} - (p-q)) \overline{T}_k^{[a]} \Sigma_k^n. \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

Since $a \leq j - 1$, \overline{T}_{k+j} and $\overline{T}_k^{[a]}$ commute. So (5.22) can be rewritten as

$$(\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+j+1}) q^b \overline{T}_k^{[a]} (\overline{T}_{k+j} - (p-q)) \Sigma_k^n. \quad (5.23)$$

By the assumption that $j \geq 1$ and $k + j + 1 \leq n$, we have $s_{k+j} \in \mathcal{S}_k \times \mathcal{S}_{n-k}$. So, by (4.8), we see that $\overline{T}_{k+j} \Sigma_k^n = p \Sigma_k^n$, and hence (5.23) can be simplified as

$$(\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+j+1}) q^{b+1} \overline{T}_k^{[a]} \Sigma_k^n. \quad (5.24)$$

Putting (5.21) and (5.24) into (5.20), we are given

$$\overline{T}_k^{[j+1]} x_k \Sigma_k^n = x_{k+j+1} \overline{T}_k^{[j+1]} \Sigma_k^n + \sum_{a+b=j} (\hbar - (p-q)x_{k+j}) q^b \overline{T}_k^{[a]} \Sigma_k^n.$$

This confirms the assertion for $j + 1$, completing the proof. \square

The following lemma will be used in the proof of Lemma 5.8.

Lemma 5.7. *For $i \geq 2$ and $a > b$,*

$$\overline{T}_{i-1}^{[a]} \overline{T}_i^{[b]} = \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b]} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[a]}.$$

Proof. We complete the proof by induction on b . It is obvious when $b = 0$. We next consider the case of $b \geq 1$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[a]} \overline{T}_i^{[b]} &= \left(\overline{T}_{i+b}^{[a-b-1]} \overline{T}_{i+b-1} \overline{T}_{i+b-2} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b-1]} \right) \left(\overline{T}_{i+b-1} \overline{T}_i^{[b-1]} \right) \\ &= \overline{T}_{i+b}^{[a-b-1]} \left(\overline{T}_{i+b-1} \overline{T}_{i+b-2} \overline{T}_{i+b-1} \right) \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b-1]} \overline{T}_i^{[b-1]} \\ &= \overline{T}_{i+b}^{[a-b-1]} \left(\overline{T}_{i+b-2} \overline{T}_{i+b-1} \overline{T}_{i+b-2} \right) \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b-1]} \overline{T}_i^{[b-1]} \\ &= \overline{T}_{i+b}^{[a-b-1]} \overline{T}_{i+b-2} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b+1]} \overline{T}_i^{[b-1]}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

Applying induction to $\overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b+1]} \overline{T}_i^{[b-1]}$ gives

$$\overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b+1]} \overline{T}_i^{[b-1]} = \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b-1]} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b+1]}. \quad (5.26)$$

Substituting (5.26) into (5.25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[a]} \overline{T}_i^{[b]} &= \overline{T}_{i+b}^{[a-b-1]} \overline{T}_{i+b-2} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b-1]} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b+1]} \\ &= \overline{T}_{i+b}^{[a-b-1]} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b]} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b+1]}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

Noticing that $\overline{T}_{i+b}^{[a-b-1]}$ and $\overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b]}$ are commutable, (5.27) can be rewritten as

$$\overline{T}_{i-1}^{[a]} \overline{T}_i^{[b]} = \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b]} \overline{T}_{i+b}^{[a-b-1]} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b+1]} = \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[b]} \overline{T}_{i-1}^{[a]},$$

as required. \square

Lemma 5.8. *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$. For $0 \leq a_i < \lambda_i$,*

$$\overline{T}_1^{[\lambda_k]} \dots \overline{T}_{k-i}^{[\lambda_{i+1}]} \overline{T}_{k+1-i}^{[a_i]} \overline{T}_{k+2-i}^{[\lambda_{i-1}]} \dots \overline{T}_k^{[\lambda_1]} \Sigma_k^n = p^{\text{ht}(\lambda/\nu)-1} \overline{T}_\nu, \quad (5.28)$$

where ν is the partition obtained from λ by deleting a ribbon with head in the i -th row and of width $\lambda_i - a_i$.

Proof. The proof is divided into two cases.

Case 1. $a_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$. In this case, the sequence obtained from λ by replacing λ_i with a_i is still a partition in $(n-k)^k$, which is exactly the partition ν . So the left-hand side of (5.28) is \overline{T}_ν , which equals the right-hand side of (5.28) since the ribbon λ/ν has exactly one row.

Case 2. $a_i < \lambda_{i+1}$. We see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{T}_1^{[\lambda_k]} \dots \overline{T}_{k-i}^{[\lambda_{i+1}]} \overline{T}_{k+1-i}^{[a_i]} \overline{T}_{k+2-i}^{[\lambda_{i-1}]} \dots \overline{T}_k^{[\lambda_1]} \Sigma_k^n \\ &= \overline{T}_1^{[\lambda_k]} \dots \overline{T}_{k-i}^{[a_i]} \overline{T}_{k-i}^{[\lambda_{i+1}]} \overline{T}_{k+2-i}^{[\lambda_{i-1}]} \dots \overline{T}_k^{[\lambda_1]} \Sigma_k^n \\ &= \overline{T}_1^{[\lambda_k]} \dots \overline{T}_{k-i}^{[a_i]} \overline{T}_{k+1-i}^{[\lambda_{i+1}-1]} \overline{T}_{k-i} \overline{T}_{k+2-i}^{[\lambda_{i-1}]} \dots \overline{T}_k^{[\lambda_1]} \Sigma_k^n \\ &= \overline{T}_1^{[\lambda_k]} \dots \overline{T}_{k-i}^{[a_i]} \overline{T}_{k+1-i}^{[\lambda_{i+1}-1]} \overline{T}_{k+2-i}^{[\lambda_{i-1}]} \dots \overline{T}_k^{[\lambda_1]} \overline{T}_{k-i} \Sigma_k^n \\ &= p \left(\overline{T}_1^{[\lambda_k]} \dots \overline{T}_{k-i}^{[a_i]} \overline{T}_{k+1-i}^{[\lambda_{i+1}-1]} \overline{T}_{k+2-i}^{[\lambda_{i-1}]} \dots \overline{T}_k^{[\lambda_1]} \Sigma_k^n \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.29)$$

where the first equality is by Lemma 5.7, the third equality holds since \overline{T}_{k-i} commutes with $\overline{T}_{k+2-i}^{[\lambda_{i-1}]}, \dots, \overline{T}_k^{[\lambda_1]}$, and the last equality follows from the fact $\overline{T}_{k-i} \Sigma_k^n = p \Sigma_k^n$ according to (4.8).

We proceed by comparing a_i and λ_{i+2} . If $a_i \geq \lambda_{i+2}$, then

$$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i-1}, \lambda_{i+1} - 1, a_i, \lambda_{i+2}, \dots, \lambda_k)$$

is exactly the partition ν , and so (5.29) equals $p \overline{T}_\nu$, which is the right-hand side of (5.28) by noticing that the ribbon λ/ν has two rows. Otherwise, we may continue the same procedure as in (5.29). The process will stop until meeting a part, say λ_j , such that $a_i \geq \lambda_j$ (here we set $\lambda_j = 0$ for $j = k+1$). In other words, j is the smallest index satisfying $a_i \geq \lambda_j$. The left-hand side of (5.28) eventually becomes

$$p^{j-i-1} \left(\overline{T}_1^{[\lambda_k]} \dots \overline{T}_{k+1-j}^{[\lambda_j]} \overline{T}_{k+2-j}^{[a_i]} \overline{T}_{k+3-j}^{[\lambda_{j-1}-1]} \dots \overline{T}_{k+1-i}^{[\lambda_{i+1}-1]} \overline{T}_{k+2-i}^{[\lambda_{i-1}]} \dots \overline{T}_k^{[\lambda_1]} \Sigma_k^n \right). \quad (5.30)$$

It is easily checked that ν is the partition

$$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i-1}, \lambda_{i+1} - 1, \dots, \lambda_{j-1} - 1, a_i, \lambda_j, \dots, \lambda_k).$$

So (5.30) is equal to $p^{j-i-1}\overline{T}_\nu$. We reach (5.28) since there are $j-i$ rows in the ribbon λ/ν . \square

6. PROOFS OF THEOREMS A, B, D AND E

In this section, we finish the proofs of the theorems given in Introduction. The descriptions of Theorems A and B are in terms of the operators $[i\overrightarrow{\mathfrak{z}}$ and $\overrightarrow{\mathfrak{z}}i]$. We shall first define more types of ribbon Schubert operators, which will be used for the proof of Theorem B, as well as for deriving Pieri formulas for other classes in Section 7.

Let us recall that

$$\begin{aligned} |i\overrightarrow{\mathfrak{z}} \rightarrow \lambda &= t_c \cdot \lambda + \sum_{\mu/\lambda=\eta} (\hbar - (p-q)t_{\mathbf{h}(\eta)}) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \mu, \\ \overrightarrow{\mathfrak{z}}i \rightarrow \lambda &= t_c \cdot \lambda + \sum_{\mu/\lambda=\eta} (\hbar - (p-q)t_{\mathbf{t}(\eta)}) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \mu, \end{aligned}$$

where $c = \lambda_i + k + 1 - i$, $\mathbf{h}(\eta)$ and $\mathbf{t}(\eta)$ are as defined in (1.2). If the ribbons added to λ are required to have tails in row i , then we reach the following notation:

$$[i\overrightarrow{\mathfrak{z}} \rightarrow \lambda = t_c \cdot \lambda + \sum_{\mu/\lambda=\eta} (\hbar - (p-q)t_{\mathbf{h}(\eta)}) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \mu, \quad (6.1)$$

$$\overrightarrow{\mathfrak{z}}i \rightarrow \lambda = t_c \cdot \lambda + \sum_{\mu/\lambda=\eta} (\hbar - (p-q)t_{\mathbf{t}(\eta)}) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \mu, \quad (6.2)$$

where the statistics c , $\mathbf{h}(\eta)$ and $\mathbf{t}(\eta)$ are the same as above, with the exception that now the sum is over $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ such that μ/λ is a ribbon with tail in row i . We remark that in (6.2), there holds that $c = \mathbf{t}(\eta)$.

The dual versions of the above four operators are a procedure of deleting ribbons, as already encountered in (5.3). For $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$, define

$$\mu \rightarrow |i\overrightarrow{\mathfrak{z}} = t_c \cdot \mu + \sum_{\mu/\lambda=\eta} (\hbar - (p-q)t_{\mathbf{h}(\eta)}) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \lambda, \quad (6.3)$$

$$\mu \rightarrow \overrightarrow{\mathfrak{z}}i = t_c \cdot \mu + \sum_{\mu/\lambda=\eta} (\hbar - (p-q)t_{\mathbf{t}(\eta)}) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \lambda, \quad (6.4)$$

$$\mu \rightarrow [i\overrightarrow{\mathfrak{z}} = t_c \cdot \mu + \sum_{\mu/\lambda=\eta} (\hbar - (p-q)t_{\mathbf{h}(\eta)}) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \lambda, \quad (6.5)$$

$$\mu \rightarrow \overrightarrow{\mathfrak{z}}i = t_c \cdot \mu + \sum_{\mu/\lambda=\eta} (\hbar - (p-q)t_{\mathbf{t}(\eta)}) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \lambda, \quad (6.6)$$

where $c = \mu_i + k + 1 - i$, and the sum goes over $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$ such that in (6.3) and (6.4) (resp., in (6.5) and (6.6)), μ/λ is a ribbon with head (resp., tail) in row i . We also remark that in (6.3), there holds that $c = \mathbf{h}(\eta)$.

Example 6.1. Let $k = 3$, $n = 7$, $\lambda = (3, 1, 0)$, and $i = 2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 |2\bar{3} \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} &= t_3 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_4) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_5) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 &+ (\hbar - (p - q)t_4)pq \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_5)pq^2 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \\
 \dagger 2 \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} &= t_3 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_3) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_3) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 &+ (\hbar - (p - q)t_1)pq \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_1)pq^2 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \\
 [2\bar{\dagger} \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} &= t_3 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_4) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 &+ (\hbar - (p - q)t_5)q \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_7)pq^2 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}, \\
 \bar{\dagger} 2 | \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} &= t_3 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_3) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 &+ (\hbar - (p - q)t_3)q \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_3)pq^2 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}. \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} &\rightarrow |2\bar{3} = t_3 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_3) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} &\rightarrow \dagger 2 = t_3 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_2) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} &\rightarrow [2\bar{\dagger} = t_3 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_3) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} + pq^2(\hbar - (p - q)t_6) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \bullet \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} &\rightarrow \bar{\dagger} 2 | = t_3 \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} + (\hbar - (p - q)t_2) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array} + pq^2(\hbar - (p - q)t_2) \cdot \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \bullet \\ \hline \end{array}
 \end{aligned}$$

6.1. Proofs of Theorems A and B. Clearly, Theorem A is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.6 and Theorem 5.1. To prove Theorem B, we first notice the following Pieri formula for equivariant motivic Chern classes of Schubert cells.

Theorem 6.2. Set $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, -y, 1 + y)$. For $\mu \subseteq (n - k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$, the equivariant motivic Chern classes for $\text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ) \in K_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))[y]$ satisfies the following Pieri formula:

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ) \rightarrow \bar{\dagger} i_r | \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \bar{\dagger} i_1 |. \quad (6.7)$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.12(iii), we have $\text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ) = w_0^L \text{MC}_y(Y(\bar{\mu})^\circ)$. In view of the Weyl action in (2.13), it is easy to check that for $1 \leq i \leq k$,

$$\text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ) \rightarrow \bar{\dagger} i | = w_0^L (|k + 1 - i\bar{3} \rightarrow \text{MC}_y(Y(\bar{\mu})^\circ)).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ) \rightarrow \mathfrak{f}i_r | \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathfrak{f}i_1 | \\
&= w_0^L \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} |k+1-i_1 \mathfrak{f} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |k+1-i_r \mathfrak{f} \rightarrow \text{MC}_y(Y(\bar{\mu})^\circ) \\
&= w_0^L \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_r \leq k} |j_r \mathfrak{f} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |j_1 \mathfrak{f} \rightarrow \text{MC}_y(Y(\bar{\mu})^\circ),
\end{aligned}$$

which, along with Theorem A, becomes

$$w_0^L (c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{MC}_y(Y(\bar{\mu})^\circ)) = c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ).$$

This completes the proof of (6.7). \square

Based on Theorem 6.2, we obtain a Pieri formula for equivariant Segre motivic classes of opposite Schubert cells, which is formulated in terms of the operator $\mathfrak{f}i |$.

Theorem 6.3. *Set $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, -y, 1 + y)$. For $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$, the equivariant Segre motivic class $\text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \in \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ satisfies the following Pieri formula:*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \mathfrak{f}i_r | \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathfrak{f}i_1 | \rightarrow \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ). \quad (6.8)$$

Proof. The proof of (6.8) is equivalent to showing that the coefficient of $\text{SMC}_y(Y(\mu)^\circ)$ in the expansion of $c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)$ is equal to the coefficient of $\text{MC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ)$ in the expansion of $c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ)$. This can be seen as follows. By Proposition 2.12(ii), $\text{MC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ)$ is dual to $\text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)$ under the Poincaré pairing. So the coefficient of $\text{SMC}_y(Y(\mu)^\circ)$ in $c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)$ is

$$\langle \text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ), c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \rangle = \langle c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ), \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \rangle,$$

which is just the coefficient of $\text{MC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ)$ in $c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{MC}_y(X(\mu)^\circ)$. \square

We can now present a proof of Theorem B.

Proof of Theorem B. Using (A.2) in the appendix, we see that (6.8) can be described equivalently in terms of the operator $\mathfrak{f}i]$, which is exactly what we need in Theorem B. \square


Example 6.4. *Let $n = 5$, $k = 3$, $r = 2$, and $\lambda = (1, 1, 0)$. We compute $c_2(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(1, 1, 0)^\circ)$. The answer will be given by*

$$(\mathfrak{f}2] \rightarrow \mathfrak{f}1] \rightarrow (1, 1, 0)) + (\mathfrak{f}3] \rightarrow \mathfrak{f}1] \rightarrow (1, 1, 0)) + (\mathfrak{f}3] \rightarrow \mathfrak{f}2] \rightarrow (1, 1, 0)).$$

We use the abbreviation $S_\lambda = \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
c_2(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot S_{(1,1,0)} &= (t_1 t_3 + t_1 t_4 + t_3 t_4) \cdot S_{(1,1,0)} + (1+y)(t_1 + t_3)(1-t_4) \cdot S_{(2,1,0)} \\
&\quad + (1+y)(t_3 + t_4)(1-t_1) \cdot S_{(1,1,1)} + (1+y)^2(1-t_1)(1-t_4) \cdot S_{(2,1,1)} \\
&\quad + [(1+y)^2(1-t_3)(1-t_4) + (1+y)(1-t_3)(t_1 + t_4)] \cdot S_{(2,2,0)} \\
&\quad + (1+y)^2(1-t_1)(1-t_3) \cdot S_{(2,2,1)} + [-y(1+y)(1-t_1)(t_3 + t_4) \\
&\quad - y(1+y)^2(1-t_1)(1-t_4) - y(1+y)^2(1-t_1)(1-t_3)] \cdot S_{(2,2,2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The diagram illustration is as follows.



6.2. **Proof of Theorem D.** For $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$, let

$$\cdot|_{\lambda}: K_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \longrightarrow K_T(\text{pt})$$

be the restriction map at the fixed point $w_{\lambda}P/P \in G/P = \text{Gr}(k, n)$. Denote

$$\mathcal{D} = 1 - c_1(\mathcal{V}^{\vee}) + \cdots + (-1)^k c_k(\mathcal{V}^{\vee}) = [\det \mathcal{V}] \in K_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)).$$

As $\pi^* \mathcal{D} = (1 - x_1) \cdots (1 - x_k)$, one has

$$\mathcal{D}_{\lambda} := \mathcal{D}|_{\lambda} = (1 - t_{w_{\lambda}(1)}) \cdots (1 - t_{w_{\lambda}(k)}) \in K_T(\text{pt}).$$

In particular, $\mathcal{D}_{\emptyset} = (1 - t_1) \cdots (1 - t_k)$. Note that both \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}_{λ} are units in $K_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$. By [35], the following relations hold:

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_{\emptyset} \cdot (1 - [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}]), \quad \mathcal{D}_{\lambda} = \mathcal{D}_{\emptyset} \cdot (1 - [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}|_{\lambda}]). \quad (6.9)$$

With (6.9), Theorem D is equivalent to the following statement.

Theorem 6.5. *In $\mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$, we have*

$$\lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\text{Gr}(k, n)}^{\vee}) \cdot \mathcal{D} \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^{\circ}) = \mathcal{D}_{\lambda} \cdot \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^{\circ}).$$

Proof. Define a $\mathbb{K}_T(\text{pt})$ -linear map $\varphi: \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ by

$$\varphi(\text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^{\circ})) = \mathcal{D}_{\lambda} \cdot \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^{\circ}).$$

We claim that for any $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$,

$$\beta \cdot \varphi(\gamma) = \varphi(\beta \cdot \gamma), \quad (6.10)$$

that is, φ is a $\mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ -module homomorphism. It suffices to show that

$$\varphi(c_r(\mathcal{V}^{\vee}) \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^{\circ})) = c_r(\mathcal{V}^{\vee}) \cdot \varphi(\text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^{\circ})). \quad (6.11)$$

Notice that for a ribbon $\eta = \mu/\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$, it is direct to check that

$$(1 - t_{\mathfrak{t}(\eta)}) \cdot \mathcal{D}_{\mu} = (1 - t_{\mathfrak{h}(\eta)}) \cdot \mathcal{D}_{\lambda}.$$

Thus the factor \mathcal{D}_{λ} intertwines the operators $\mathfrak{f}i|$ and $|i\mathfrak{f}$ (with the setting $(p, q, \mathfrak{h}) = (1, -y, y + 1)$). Specifically,

$$L \circ (\mathfrak{f}i| \rightarrow) = (|i\mathfrak{f} \rightarrow) \circ L,$$

where L is the linear operator sending ν to $\mathcal{D}_{\nu} \cdot \nu$ for any $\nu \subseteq (n - k)^k$. As a result,

$$L \circ \left(\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \mathfrak{f}i_r | \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathfrak{f}i_1 | \rightarrow \right) = \left(\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} |i_r \mathfrak{f} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow |i_1 \mathfrak{f} \rightarrow \right) \circ L. \quad (6.12)$$

Now we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\bigoplus_{\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k} \mathbb{K}_T(\text{pt}) \cdot \lambda & \xrightarrow{\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \mathbf{e}_{i_r} | \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathbf{e}_{i_1} | \rightarrow} & \bigoplus_{\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k} \mathbb{K}_T(\text{pt}) \cdot \lambda \\
\downarrow L & \begin{array}{c} \swarrow \lambda \mapsto \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \\ \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \xrightarrow{c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee)} \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \\ \downarrow \varphi \\ \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \xrightarrow{c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee)} \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \\ \swarrow \lambda \mapsto \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \end{array} & \downarrow L \\
\bigoplus_{\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k} \mathbb{K}_T(\text{pt}) \cdot \lambda & \xrightarrow{\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} |i_r\rangle \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |i_1\rangle \rightarrow} & \bigoplus_{\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k} \mathbb{K}_T(\text{pt}) \cdot \lambda \\
& \begin{array}{c} \swarrow \lambda \mapsto \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \\ \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \xrightarrow{c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee)} \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \\ \downarrow \varphi \\ \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \xrightarrow{c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee)} \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \\ \swarrow \lambda \mapsto \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \end{array} &
\end{array}$$

Consider the diagram as a cube with six faces. The commutativity of the front face (that is, the face with long solid arrows) follows from (6.12), while the left and right faces commute by the definition of φ . The upper and lower faces commute by Theorem A and Theorem B. Since all dashed arrows are isomorphisms, the back face also commutes, which implies (6.11). This proves the claim in (6.10).

Now setting $\beta = \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)$ and $\gamma = 1$ in (6.10), we obtain

$$\varphi(1) \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = \varphi(\text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)). \quad (6.13)$$

Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ be such that

$$\varphi(1) = \alpha \cdot \lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\text{Gr}(k, n)}) \cdot \mathcal{D}.$$

Then (6.13) becomes

$$\alpha \cdot \lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\text{Gr}(k, n)}) \cdot \mathcal{D} \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = \mathcal{D}_\lambda \cdot \text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ), \quad (6.14)$$

for any λ . To finish the proof, it is enough to check that $\alpha = 1$. By Lemma 6.6 below, we see that $\alpha|_\lambda = 1$ for any $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, and hence $\alpha = 1$. \square

Lemma 6.6. *For $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, we have*

$$\text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)|_\lambda = \lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\text{Gr}(k, n)}^\vee)|_\lambda \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)|_\lambda \neq 0.$$

Proof. Since $\langle \text{MC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ), \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) \rangle = 1$, the localization formula gives

$$\text{MC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ)|_\lambda \cdot \text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)|_\lambda = \lambda_{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{\text{Gr}(k, n)}^\vee)|_\lambda \neq 0.$$

On the other hand, by [3, Lemma 9.1(b)] and the transversality of the intersection of $X(\lambda)$ and $Y(\lambda)$ at the fixed point $w_\lambda P \in \text{Gr}(k, n)$, we get

$$\text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)|_\lambda \cdot \text{MC}_y(X(\lambda)^\circ)|_\lambda = \lambda_{-1}(\mathcal{T}_{\text{Gr}(k, n)}^\vee)|_\lambda \cdot \lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\text{Gr}(k, n)}^\vee)|_\lambda.$$

This finishes the proof of the Lemma. \square

Remark 6.7. Lemma 6.6 holds for any partial flag varieties with the same proof, however, the existence of the class α not depending on λ in (6.14) would no longer be ensured in general.

Example 6.8. For $\mathrm{Gr}(1, 2) = \mathbb{P}^1$, we have

$$K(\mathrm{Gr}(1, 2)) = \mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^2), \quad x = 1 - [\mathcal{O}(-1)].$$

Note that

$$\lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^1}^\vee) = 1 + y[\mathcal{O}(-2)] = 1 + y(1 - x)^2 = (1 + y) - 2yx \pmod{x^2}.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\emptyset)}] &= 1, & \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\emptyset)^\circ) &= (1 + y) - (2y + 1)x, & \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\emptyset)^\circ) &= 1 + \frac{y}{1 + y}x, \\ [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}] &= x, & \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\square)^\circ) &= x, & \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\square)^\circ) &= \frac{1}{1 + y}x. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^1}^\vee) \cdot (1 - [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}]) \cdot \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\emptyset)^\circ) &= ((1 + y) - 2yx) \cdot (1 - x) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{y}{1 + y}x\right) \\ &= (1 + y) - (2y + 1)x \pmod{x^2} \\ &= \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\emptyset)^\circ), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_y(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{P}^1}^\vee) \cdot (1 - [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\square)}]) \cdot \mathrm{SMC}_y(Y(\square)^\circ) &= ((1 + y) - 2yx) \cdot (1 - x) \cdot \frac{1}{1 + y}x \\ &= x \pmod{x^2} \\ &= \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\square)^\circ). \end{aligned}$$

6.3. Proof of Theorem E. We start with some terminology. The ring $\Lambda = \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathbb{Q} \cdot s_{\lambda}(x)$ of symmetric functions is the linear span of Schur functions $s_{\lambda}(x)$. The completion of Λ , denoted $\hat{\Lambda}$, consists of all infinite linear combinations of Schur functions, or equivalently,

$$\hat{\Lambda} = \mathbb{Q}[[e_1(x), e_2(x), \dots]] = \mathbb{Q}[[h_1(x), h_2(x), \dots]],$$

where

$$e_r(x) = s_{(1^r)}(x) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}, \quad h_r(x) = s_{(r)}(x) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_r} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r},$$

are respectively the elementary and complete symmetric functions.

The stable Grothendieck polynomial $G_{\lambda}(x) \in \hat{\Lambda}$ is the stable limit of the single Grothendieck polynomial $\mathfrak{G}_{w_{\lambda}}(x, 0)$. Buch [11] showed that $G_{\lambda}(x)$ can be interpreted as the generating function of set-valued tableaux of shape λ . For two finite nonempty subsets A and B of positive integers, write $A < B$ if $\max A < \min B$, and $A \leq B$ if $\max A \leq \min B$. A *set-valued tableau* of shape λ is a filling of the boxes of λ with finite nonempty subsets of positive integers such that the subsets are weakly increasing along each row, and are strictly increasing along each column. For a set-valued tableau T , write $|T|$ for the total number of integers in T , and $x^T = \prod_i x_i^{a_i}$ where a_i is the number of occurrences of i in T . Buch's formula for $G_{\lambda}(x)$ is

$$G_{\lambda}(x) = \sum_T (-1)^{|T| - |\lambda|} x^T, \tag{6.15}$$

where the sum is over all set-valued tableaux of shape λ .

Let $\tilde{K}_{\lambda}(x)$ be obtained from $G_{\lambda}(x)$ by ignoring the sign, that is,

$$\tilde{K}_{\lambda}(x) = \sum_T x^T,$$

where the sum is taken over all set-valued tableaux of shape λ . As usual, denote by $\omega: \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ the ring involution which sends $e_r(x)$ to $h_r(x)$ for $r \geq 0$ [52, Chapter 7]. Denote $J_{\lambda}(x) =$

$\omega\tilde{K}_\lambda(x)$. Lam and Pylyavskyy [33, Theorem 9.22] proved that $J_\lambda(x)$ is the generating function of weak set-valued tableaux of shape λ . A *weak set-valued tableau* of shape λ is a filling of the boxes of λ with finite nonempty *multisets* of positive integers (this means repeated integers are allowed in each box), with now however the restriction that the rows are strictly increasing and the columns are weakly increasing. In the following figure, the left one is a set-valued tableau, while the right one is a weak set-valued tableau.

1	123	35	6
234	46		
5			

11	334	55	6
12	4		
223			

We turn to the geometric side. Since $Y(\lambda)$ is Cohen–Macaulay [31, 8.22(e)], it admits a dualizing sheaf $\omega_{Y(\lambda)}$. By [4, Theorem 5.1], one knows that

$$\mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = y^{k(n-k)-|\lambda|}[\omega_{Y(\lambda)}] + \text{classes of lower } y\text{-degree.} \quad (6.16)$$

That is,

$$[\omega_{Y(\lambda)}] = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} y^{|\lambda|-k(n-k)} \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ).$$

By the Pieri formula for motivic Chern classes and (6.16), we obtain the following Pieri formula for $[\omega_{Y(\lambda)}]$, which is the key observation that directs us towards Theorem E.

Corollary 6.9. *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$. Over $K(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))$, we have*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot [\omega_{Y(\lambda)}] = \sum_{\mu} (-1)^{|\mu/\lambda|-r} \cdot [\omega_{Y(\mu)}],$$

where the sum is over $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ such that μ/λ is a skew shape with exactly r nonempty rows.

Proof. By Corollary C, the Pieri formula for non-equivariant motivic Chern classes is

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} [i_r] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow [i_1] \rightarrow \mathrm{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ), \quad (6.17)$$

where

$$[i] \rightarrow \lambda = (1+y) \sum_{\mu/\lambda=\eta} (-y)^{\mathrm{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \mu.$$

Take the coefficient of $y^{k(n-k)-|\lambda|}$ on both sides of (6.17). By (6.16), the left-hand side is $c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot [\omega_{Y(\lambda)}]$. To reach the highest degree of y on the right-hand side, the ribbons added in each step must be of height one. As a result, the coefficient of $y^{k(n-k)-|\lambda|}$ contains the terms $[\omega_{Y(\mu)}]$ (with sign $(-1)^{|\mu/\lambda|-r}$) for partitions that are obtained from λ by adding consecutively r single nonempty rows from up to down. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 6.10. Notice that the Pieri formula in Corollary 6.9 can be described in term of the ribbon Schubert operator in (1.2) by setting $t = 0$ and $(p, q, \hbar) = (0, -1, 1)$.

Define an algebra homomorphism

$$\rho: \hat{\Lambda} \longrightarrow K(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)), \quad \text{by extending } e_r(x) \longmapsto \begin{cases} c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee), & r \leq k, \\ 0, & r > k. \end{cases} \quad (6.18)$$

This is well defined since $\rho(f)$ is nilpotent for f without constant terms by the dévissage property [14, Proposition 5.9.5]. Note that

$$\pi^*(\rho(f)) = f(x_1, \dots, x_k) \in K(\mathrm{Fl}(n)).$$

Remark 6.11. It should be pointed out that when restricted to the subring $\Gamma = \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathbb{Q} \cdot G_{\lambda}(x)$ of $\hat{\Lambda}$, it can be shown that the map ρ sends $G_{\lambda}(x)$ to $[\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}]$, which has been investigated by Buch [11, Section 8]. Since we do not use this fact for our purpose, the details will not be discussed here.

Lemma 6.12. *We have*

$$\rho((1 - G_{\square}(x))^n) = [\omega_{\text{Gr}(k,n)}].$$

Proof. Recall from [18, Theorem 3.5] that $\mathcal{T}_{\text{Gr}(k,n)} = \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{Q}) = \mathcal{V}^{\vee} \otimes \mathcal{Q}$ where \mathcal{Q} is the universal quotient bundle satisfying the following short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{V} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}^{\oplus n} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Q} \longrightarrow 0.$$

It follows that $\det(\mathcal{V}) \otimes \det(\mathcal{Q}) \cong \mathcal{O}$. This implies

$$\omega_{\text{Gr}(k,n)} = \det(\mathcal{T}_{\text{Gr}(k,n)}^{\vee}) = \det(\mathcal{V})^{\otimes(n-k)} \otimes \det(\mathcal{Q}^{\vee})^{\otimes k} = \det(\mathcal{V})^{\otimes n}.$$

It is known (for example, from (6.15)) that $G_{\square}(x) = e_1(x) - e_2(x) + \dots$. So we have

$$[\omega_{\text{Gr}(k,n)}] = [\det(\mathcal{V})]^n = (1 - c_1(\mathcal{V}^{\vee}) + c_2(\mathcal{V}^{\vee}) - \dots)^n = \rho((1 - G_{\square}(x))^n). \quad \square$$

We can now provide a proof of Theorem E.

Theorem 6.13 (=Theorem E). *Over $K(\text{Gr}(k, n))$, we have*

$$\rho((1 - G_{\square}(x))^n J_{\lambda'}(x)) = \begin{cases} [\omega_{Y(\lambda)}], & \lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6.19)$$

where λ' is the conjugate of λ .

Proof. Note that

$$(1 - G_{\square}(x)) \cdot J_{\lambda}(x) = s_{\lambda'}(x) + (\text{higher degrees}).$$

So each $f \in \hat{\Lambda}$ can be written as a (possibly infinite) linear combination of $(1 - G_{\square}(x)) \cdot J_{\lambda}(x)$'s. Hence we can define a map $\varphi: \hat{\Lambda} \rightarrow K(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ by letting

$$(1 - G_{\square}(x))^n J_{\lambda'}(x) \mapsto \begin{cases} [\omega_{Y(\lambda)}], & \lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and then extending linearly to $\hat{\Lambda}$. Our task is to prove $\varphi = \rho$. Note that for $\lambda = \emptyset$, by Lemma 6.12,

$$\varphi((1 - G_{\square}(x))^n) = [\omega_{Y(\emptyset)}] = [\omega_{\text{Gr}(k,n)}] = \rho((1 - G_{\square}(x))^n). \quad (6.20)$$

It suffices to show that for any $f, g \in \hat{\Lambda}$,

$$\varphi(fg) = \rho(f) \cdot \varphi(g), \quad (6.21)$$

i.e., φ is a $\hat{\Lambda}$ -module morphism. This is because once (6.21) is given, together with (6.20), we see that for any $g \in \hat{\Lambda}$,

$$\varphi(g) = \rho(g(1 - G_{\square}(x))^{-n}) \cdot \varphi((1 - G_{\square}(x))^n) = \rho(g(1 - G_{\square}(x))^{-n}) \cdot \rho((1 - G_{\square}(x))^n) = \rho(g).$$

To prove (6.21), it is enough to verify the case when $f = e_r(x)$ and $g = (1 - G_{\square}(x))^n J_{\lambda'}(x)$, that is,

$$\varphi(e_r(x) \cdot (1 - G_{\square}(x))^n \cdot J_{\lambda'}(x)) = \rho(e_r(x)) \cdot [\omega_{Y(\lambda)}]. \quad (6.22)$$

Let us first compute the left-hand side of (6.22). By [36, Equation (3.3)],

$$h_r(x) \cdot \tilde{K}_{\lambda}(x) = \sum_{\mu} (-1)^{|\mu/\lambda| - r} \tilde{K}_{\mu}(x)$$

with the sum over all $\mu \supset \lambda$ such that μ/λ has exactly r nonempty columns. Applying the involution ω to both sides and multiplied by $(1 - G_{\square}(x))^n$, we obtain that

$$e_r(x) \cdot (1 - G_{\square}(x))^n \cdot J_{\lambda}(x) = \sum_{\mu} (-1)^{|\mu/\lambda| - r} \cdot (1 - G_{\square}(x))^n \cdot J_{\mu}(x)$$

with the sum over all $\mu \supset \lambda$ such that μ/λ has exactly r nonempty columns. Therefore, the left-hand side of (6.22) can be expressed as

$$\varphi(e_r(x) \cdot (1 - G_{\square}(x))^n \cdot J_{\lambda'}(x)) = \sum_{\mu} (-1)^{|\mu/\lambda| - r} \cdot \varphi((1 - G_{\square}(x))^n \cdot J_{\mu'}(x)), \quad (6.23)$$

where the sum is taken over $\mu \supset \lambda$ such that μ/λ has exactly r nonempty rows.

When $r > k$, each μ appearing in (6.23) has strictly more than k rows, and so (6.23) equals zero, implying (6.22). When $r \leq k$, (6.23) becomes

$$\varphi(e_r(x) \cdot (1 - G_{\square}(x))^n \cdot J_{\lambda'}(x)) = \sum_{\mu} (-1)^{|\mu/\lambda| - r} \cdot [\omega_{Y(\mu)}], \quad (6.24)$$

where the sum is taken over $\mu \subseteq (n - k)^k$ such that μ/λ has exactly r nonempty rows. In view of Corollary 6.9, we see that (6.24) is equal to $c_r(\mathcal{V}^{\vee}) \cdot [\omega_{Y(\lambda)}] = \rho(e_r(x)) \cdot [\omega_{Y(\lambda)}]$. This justifies the correctness of (6.22) in the case of $r \leq k$. So the proof is complete. \square

Example 6.14. Consider the case $\text{Gr}(1, 2) = \mathbb{P}^1$. Recall that

$$K(\text{Gr}(1, 2)) = \mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^2), \quad x = 1 - [\mathcal{O}(-1)].$$

Under this identification, the map ρ is given by sending $f \in \hat{\Lambda}$ to $f(x, 0, \dots) \bmod (x^2) \in K(\text{Gr}(1, 2))$. Notice that

$$[\omega_{Y(\emptyset)}] = 1 - 2x, \quad [\omega_{Y(\square)}] = x.$$

Moreover, we have $G_{\emptyset}(x) = J_{\emptyset}(x) = 1$, and

$$G_{\square}(x) = - \sum_A (-1)^{-|A|} x^A = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - x_i), \quad J_{\square}(x) = \sum_B x^B = -1 + \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 - x_i},$$

where the first (resp., the second) sum goes over nonempty sets A (resp., multisets B) of positive integers. Thus

$$(1 - G_{\square}(x))^2 \cdot J_{\emptyset}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - x_i)^2, \quad (1 - G_{\square}(x))^2 \cdot J_{\square}(x) = - \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - x_i)^2 + \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - x_i).$$

This yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho((1 - G_{\square}(x))^2 \cdot J_{\emptyset}(x)) &= 1 - 2x = [\omega_{Y(\emptyset)}], \\ \rho((1 - G_{\square}(x))^2 \cdot J_{\square}(x)) &= -(1 - 2x) + 1 - x = x = [\omega_{Y(\square)}]. \end{aligned}$$

7. PIERI FORMULAS FOR OTHER CLASSES

In this section, we exhibit the Pieri formulas for other classes as introduced in Section 2. As direct consequences of Proposition 4.6 and Theorem 5.1, we are given the Pieri formulas for the classes $[Y(\lambda)]$, $[Z_{Y(\lambda)}]$, and $c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^{\circ})$. Using the Poincaré pairing and the Weyl action, we may further obtain the Pieri formulas for the classes $[\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}]$ and $s_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^{\circ})$.

7.1. Schubert Classes. This corresponds to $(p, q, \hbar) = (0, 0, 1)$. In this case, for $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, it is clear that

$$|i\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow [Y(\lambda)] = t_c \cdot [Y(\lambda)] + [Y(\mu)],$$

where $\mu \subseteq (n - k)^k$ (if any) is obtained from λ by adding a single box in row i .

Corollary 7.1. *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$. Over $H_T^\bullet(\text{Gr}(k, n))$, we have*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot [Y(\lambda)] = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} |i_r\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |i_1\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow [Y(\lambda)]. \quad (7.1)$$

Remark 7.2. A skew shape μ/λ is called a *vertical strip* if it has at most one box in the same row. Letting $t = 0$ in (7.1), it is easy to see that $[Y(\mu)]$ appears in the expansion if and only if μ/λ is a vertical strip with r boxes. That is, the non-equivariant version of (7.1) is

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot [Y(\lambda)] = \sum_{\mu} [Y(\mu)], \quad (7.2)$$

where the sum is over $\mu \subseteq (n - k)^k$ such that μ/λ is a vertical strip with r boxes. It is well known that the Schur polynomial $s_\lambda(x)$ (which is equal to the single Schubert polynomial $\mathfrak{S}_{w_\lambda}(x)$) is a polynomial representative of $[Y(\lambda)]$. So (7.2) is the same as the classical Pieri formula for Schur polynomials.

7.2. Classes of ideal sheaves and structure sheaves. For the classes of ideal sheaves, we set $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, 0, 1)$. In this case, the ribbons added in each step are restricted to those with width one, namely, *connected* vertical strips. Formally, for $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$,

$$|i\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}] = t_c \cdot [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}] + \sum_{\mu} (1 - t_{\mathfrak{h}(\mu/\lambda)}) \cdot [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\mu)}],$$

ranging over $\mu \subseteq (n - k)^k$ such that μ/λ is a connected vertical strip with head in row i .

Corollary 7.3. *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$. Over $K_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$, we have*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}] = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} |i_r\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |i_1\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}].$$

By Remark 2.13, we have $\text{MC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)|_{y=0} = [\mathcal{I}_{\partial Y(\lambda)}]$, and so Corollary 7.3 can also be obtained from Theorem A by setting $y = 0$.

Still, it follows from Remark 2.13 that $\text{SMC}_y(Y(\lambda)^\circ)|_{y=0} = [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}]$, and so we obtain a Pieri formula for the classes of structure sheaves from Theorem B by putting $y = 0$. Let

$$\dagger i\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}] = t_c \cdot [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}] + \sum_{\mu} (1 - t_{\mathfrak{t}(\mu/\lambda)}) \cdot [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\mu)}], \quad (7.3)$$

ranging over $\mu \subseteq (n - k)^k$ such that μ/λ is a connected vertical strip with head in row i .

Corollary 7.4. *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$. Over $K_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$, we have*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}] = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \dagger i_r\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \dagger i_1\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}]. \quad (7.4)$$

Remark 7.5. Consider the non-equivariant version of (7.4). When $t = 0$, (7.3) becomes

$$|i\bar{\mathfrak{J}} \rightarrow [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}] = \sum_{\mu} [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\mu)}].$$

So, over $K(\text{Gr}(k, n))$, we have

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}] = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} |i_r] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |i_1] \rightarrow [\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}]. \quad (7.5)$$

Hence $[\mathcal{O}_{Y(\mu)}]$ appears on the right-hand side of (7.5) if and only if μ is obtained from λ by adding consecutively r connected vertical strips from up to down. Equivalently, μ is obtained from λ by adding a vertical strip, satisfying that μ/λ can be partitioned into r connected vertical strips. Just like the role that Schur polynomials play in cohomology, the symmetric Grothendieck polynomial $\mathfrak{G}_\lambda(x) = \mathfrak{G}_{w_\lambda}(x)$ represents the class $[\mathcal{O}_{Y(\lambda)}]$. Hence (7.5) is equivalent to the formula [36, (3.1)] by Lenart.

7.3. CSM classes and Segre–MacPherson classes. This time we take $(p, q, \hbar) = (1, 1, 1)$. Then

$$|i] \rightarrow c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = t_c \cdot c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ) + \sum_{\mu} c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\mu)^\circ),$$

where the sum is over $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ such that μ/λ is a ribbon with head in row i .

Corollary 7.6. *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$. Over $\mathbb{H}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$, we have*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} |i_r] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |i_1] \rightarrow c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ). \quad (7.6)$$

Remark 7.7. A Pieri formula for non-equivariant CSM classes was first given in [19, Theorem 7.3], which can be obtained from (7.6) by replacing $|i]$ by $[i\uparrow$ (by Theorem A.1) and then letting $t = 0$.

Let

$$\uparrow i] \rightarrow s_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = t_c \cdot c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ) + \sum_{\mu} c_{\text{SM}}(Y(\mu)^\circ),$$

where the sum is over $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ such that μ/λ is a ribbon with head in row i . Note that in the case $p = q = 1$, the two operators $|i]$ and $\uparrow i]$ have no difference since they are independent of $\mathfrak{h}(\mu/\lambda)$ and $\mathfrak{t}(\mu/\lambda)$.

Using Corollary 7.6 and the facts (ii), (iv) in Proposition 2.10, we obtain the following Pieri formula for Segre–MacPherson classes.

Corollary 7.8. *Let $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$ and $0 \leq r \leq k$. Over $\mathbb{H}_T(\text{Gr}(k, n))$, we have*

$$c_r(\mathcal{V}^\vee) \cdot s_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \uparrow i_r] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \uparrow i_1] \rightarrow s_{\text{SM}}(Y(\lambda)^\circ).$$

APPENDIX A. EQUIVALENCES BETWEEN RIBBON SCHUBERT OPERATORS

This appendix gives equivalent formulations concerning the eight ribbon Schubert operators we defined in this paper.

Theorem A.1. *For $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, we have*

$$\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} |i_r] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |i_1] \rightarrow \lambda = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} [i_r\uparrow \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow [i_1\uparrow \rightarrow \lambda, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \uparrow i_r] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \uparrow i_1] \rightarrow \lambda = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \uparrow i_r | \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \uparrow i_1 | \rightarrow \lambda. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Dually, for $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$, we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \mu \rightarrow |i_r \bar{\updownarrow} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |i_1 \bar{\updownarrow} = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \mu \rightarrow [i_r \updownarrow \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow [i_1 \updownarrow, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \mu \rightarrow \updownarrow i_r] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \updownarrow i_1] = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} \mu \rightarrow \bar{\updownarrow} i_r | \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \bar{\updownarrow} i_1 |. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

We will present a proof of the equality in (A.1), and the remaining equalities in Theorem A.1 can be concluded along the same line. To this end, we defined the *refined ribbon Schubert operators* v_{ab} with $a \leq b$ by specifying the head and tail values. Let $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$.

(i) If $a < b$, then set

$$v_{ab} \cdot \lambda = \begin{cases} (\bar{h} - (p-q)t_b) p^{\text{ht}(\eta)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\eta)-1} \cdot \mu, & (*), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $(*)$ holds if there exists a (unique) $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ such that $\mu/\lambda = \eta$ is a ribbon with $\mathbf{h}(\mu/\lambda) = b$ and $\mathbf{t}(\mu/\lambda) = a$ (the verification of the uniqueness is left to the reader).

(ii) If $a = b$, then set

$$v_{aa} \cdot \lambda = \begin{cases} t_a \cdot \lambda, & a \in \{\lambda_i + k + 1 - i : 1 \leq i \leq k\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Comparing with the definitions of $|i \bar{\updownarrow}$ and $[i \updownarrow$, we notice that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} |i_r \bar{\updownarrow} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow |i_1 \bar{\updownarrow} \rightarrow \lambda = \sum_{\substack{b_r < \dots < b_1 \\ a_r, \dots, a_1}} v_{a_r b_r} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot \lambda, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq k} [i_r \updownarrow \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow [i_1 \updownarrow \rightarrow \lambda = \sum_{\substack{a'_r < \dots < a'_1 \\ b'_r, \dots, b'_1}} v_{a'_r b'_r} \cdots v_{a'_1 b'_1} \cdot \lambda. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Proof of Theorem A.1. It suffices to show that the right-hand sides of (A.5) and (A.6) are the same. We do this by establishing an explicit bijection

$$\phi: \{v_{a_r b_r} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot \lambda \neq 0 : b_r < \dots < b_1\} \longrightarrow \{v_{a'_r b'_r} \cdots v_{a'_1 b'_1} \cdot \lambda \neq 0 : a'_r < \dots < a'_1\}.$$

To describe ϕ , we need the following two claims.

Claim 1. For any given $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, assume that $v_{a'b'} \cdot v_{ab} \cdot \lambda \neq 0$ with $b' < b$. Then (1) $a \neq a'$, and (2) if $a < a'$, then $v_{a'b'} \cdot v_{ab} \cdot \lambda = v_{ab} \cdot v_{a'b'} \cdot \lambda$.

Proof. The arguments are divided into two cases.

(1) $a = b$ or $a' = b'$. This case has three subcases.

- (i) $a = b$ and $a' = b'$. In this situation, the assertions in (1) and (2) are trivial.
- (ii) $a = b$ and $a' < b'$. In this situation, the assertion in (1) is clear. Assume that $b = \lambda_i + k + 1 - i$, and let $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ be such that μ/λ is the unique ribbon with $\mathbf{h}(\eta_1) = b'$ and $\mathbf{t}(\eta_1) = a'$. Since $b' < b$, we see that the head of μ/λ is strictly below row i . This implies that v_{ab} and $v_{a'b'}$ commute, and so we have the assertion in (2).

(iii) $a < b$ and $a' = b'$. In this situation, let $\mu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ be such that μ/λ is the unique ribbon with $\mathbf{h}(\eta_1) = b$ and $\mathbf{t}(\eta_1) = a$. Assume that the ribbon μ/λ has head in row i and tail in row j , and that $b' = \mu_{i'} + k + 1 - i'$. Since $b' < b$, we have $i' > i$. If $i' > j$, then we see that $a > a'$, and v_{ab} and $v_{a'b'}$ commute, and so the assertions in (1) and (2) are checked.


We now consider the case of $i < i' \leq j$. Now it is clear that $a < a'$, and so the assertion in (1) is true. Moreover, we notice that $b' = \lambda_{i'-1} + k + 1 - (i' - 1)$. Thus both $v_{a'b'} \cdot v_{ab} \cdot \lambda$ and $v_{ab} \cdot v_{a'b'} \cdot \lambda$ are equal to

$$t_{b'} (\hbar - (p-q)t_b) p^{\text{ht}(\mu/\lambda)-1} q^{\text{wd}(\mu/\lambda)-1} \cdot \mu.$$

This verifies the assertion in (2).

(2) $a < b$ and $a' < b'$. This means there exist $\lambda \subset \mu \subset \nu \subseteq (n-k)^k$ such that $\eta_1 = \mu/\lambda$ (resp., $\eta_2 = \nu/\mu$) is a ribbon with $\mathbf{h}(\eta_1) = b$ and $\mathbf{t}(\eta_1) = a$ (resp., $\mathbf{h}(\eta_2) = b'$ and $\mathbf{t}(\eta_2) = a'$). Let us first check $a \neq a'$. If the tail of η_2 is strictly below the tail of η_1 , then we have $a' < a$, and otherwise we have $a' > a$. This verifies $a \neq a'$.

It remains to prove the assertion in (2). Since $a < a'$ and $b' < b$, we see that the head of η_2 is strictly below the head of η_1 , and the tail of η_2 is weakly above the tail of η_1 . Let η'_2 be the ribbon contained in η_1 which is obtained by sliding η_2 upwards along the north-west to south-east diagonal by one unit, as illustrated below.



Notice that $\mathbf{h}(\eta'_2) = b'$ and $\mathbf{t}(\eta'_2) = a'$. Set $\mu' = \lambda \cup \eta'_2$. Clearly, $\eta'_1 = \nu/\mu'$ is a ribbon with $\mathbf{h}(\eta'_1) = b$ and $\mathbf{t}(\eta'_1) = a$. Moreover, notice that η'_1 (resp., η'_2) has the same height and width as η_1 (resp., η_2). Thus we have $v_{a'b'} \cdot v_{ab} \cdot \lambda = v_{ab} \cdot v_{a'b'} \cdot \lambda$, concluding the assertion in (2). \square

Claim 2. For any given $\lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, if $v_{a_r b_r} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot \lambda \neq 0$ with $b_r < \cdots < b_1$, then the values a_1, \dots, a_r are distinct.

Proof. The proof is by induction on r . This is trivial when $r = 1$. Assume now that $r > 1$. Let $m = \max\{a_1, \dots, a_r\}$. If there were two indices $1 \leq i < j \leq r$ such that $a_i = a_j = m$ (with the assumption that $a_k < m$ for $i < k < j$), then we could repeatedly apply (2) in Claim 1 to move $v_{a_j b_j}$ right to obtain that

$$v_{a_r b_r} \cdots v_{a_j b_j} \cdots v_{a_i b_i} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot \lambda = v_{a_r b_r} \cdots \widehat{v_{a_j b_j}} \cdots v_{a_j b_j} \cdot v_{a_i b_i} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot \lambda,$$

which would vanish because $v_{a_j b_j} v_{a_i b_i} = 0$ by (1) in Claim 1. So there is only one index, say t_1 , such that $a_{t_1} = m$. We now again use (2) in Claim 1 to move $v_{a_{t_1} b_{t_1}}$ to the rightmost, yielding that

$$v_{a_r b_r} \cdots v_{a_{t_1} b_{t_1}} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot \lambda = v_{a_r b_r} \cdots \widehat{v_{a_{t_1} b_{t_1}}} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot v_{a_{t_1} b_{t_1}} \cdot \lambda \neq 0. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Letting $\lambda' = v_{a_{t_1} b_{t_1}} \cdot \lambda \subseteq (n-k)^k$, we apply induction to $v_{a_r b_r} \cdots \widehat{v_{a_{t_1} b_{t_1}}} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot \lambda'$, concluding that the elements in $\{a_1, \dots, a_r\} \setminus \{a_{t_1} = m\}$ are distinct. So a_1, \dots, a_r are distinct. \square

We can now describe the map ϕ . In fact, the arguments in the proof of Claim 2 already imply the construction. Given $v_{a_r b_r} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot \lambda \neq 0$ with $b_r < \cdots < b_1$, it follows from Claim 2 that we can rearrange a_1, \dots, a_r in increasing order, say $a_{t_r} < \cdots < a_{t_1}$. Using (2) in Claim

1, we are able to move $v_{a_{t_1} b_{t_1}}$ to the rightmost, as given in (A.7). Implementing the same procedure to $v_{a_r b_r} \cdots \widehat{v_{a_{t_1} b_{t_1}}} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1}$, we can eventually rewrite $v_{a_r b_r} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot \lambda$ as

$$v_{a_{t_r} b_{t_r}} \cdots v_{a_{t_1} b_{t_1}} \cdot \lambda,$$

which is defined as the image of $v_{a_r b_r} \cdots v_{a_1 b_1} \cdot \lambda$ under ϕ .

Imitating the above construction, the inverse of ϕ can be easily obtained based on the following two facts, and we omit the details here.

Claim 1’. For any given $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$, assume that $v_{a'b'} \cdot v_{ab} \cdot \lambda \neq 0$ with $a' < a$. Then (1) $b \neq b'$, and (2) if $b < b'$, then $v_{a'b'} \cdot v_{ab} \cdot \lambda = v_{ab} \cdot v_{a'b'} \cdot \lambda$.

Claim 2’. For any given $\lambda \subseteq (n - k)^k$, if $v_{a'_r b'_r} \cdots v_{a'_1 b'_1} \cdot \lambda \neq 0$ with $a'_r < \cdots < a'_1$, then the values b'_1, \dots, b'_r are distinct. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Aluffi and L. Mihalcea, *Chern–Schwartz–MacPherson classes for Schubert cells in flag manifolds*, Compos. Math. 152 (2016), 2603–2625. 11
- [2] P. Aluffi, L. Mihalcea, J. Schürmann and C. Su, *Shadows of characteristic cycles, Verma modules, and positivity of Chern–Schwartz–MacPherson classes of Schubert cells*, Duke Math. J. 172 (17) (2023), 3257–3320. 11
- [3] P. Aluffi, L. Mihalcea, J. Schürmann and C. Su, *Motivic Chern classes of Schubert cells, Hecke algebras, and applications to Casselman’s problem*, to appear in Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér., arXiv:1902.10101v3. 1, 11, 12, 32
- [4] P. Aluffi, L. Mihalcea, J. Schürmann and C. Su, *From motivic Chern classes of Schubert cells to their Hirzebruch and CSM classes*, arXiv:2212.12509. 1, 34
- [5] P. Aluffi, L. Mihalcea, J. Schürmann and C. Su, *Equivariant motivic Chern classes via mixed Hodge modules on the cotangent bundle*, in preparation. 1
- [6] D. Anderson and W. Fulton, *Equivariant Cohomology in Algebraic Geometry*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2023 (A preliminary version is available at <https://people.math.osu.edu/anderson.2804/ecag/index.html>). 6, 7, 8
- [7] I. Bernšteĭn, I. Gel’fand and S. Gel’fand, *Schubert cells, and the cohomology of the spaces G/P* , Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 28 (1973), 3–26. 7
- [8] A. Borel, *Sur la cohomologie des espaces fibrés principaux et des espaces homogènes de groupes de Lie compacts*, Ann. Math. 57 (1953), 115–207. 7
- [9] J. Brasselet, J. Schürmann and S. Yokura, *Hirzebruch classes and motivic Chern classes for singular spaces*, J. Topol. Anal. 2 (2010), 1–55. 1, 11
- [10] M. Brion, *Equivariant cohomology and equivariant intersection theory*, Representation theories and algebraic geometry (Montreal, PQ, 1997), NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C: Math. Phys. Sci., vol. 514, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1998, pp. 1–37. 6
- [11] A. Buch, *A Littlewood–Richardson rule for the K -theory of Grassmannians*, Acta Math. 189 (2002), 37–78. 4, 33, 35
- [12] A. Buch, P. Chaput, L. Mihalcea and N. Perrin, *A Chevalley formula for the equivariant quantum K -theory of cominuscule varieties*, Algebr. Geom. 5 (2018), 568–595. 4
- [13] S. Cappell and J. Shaneson, *Stratifiable maps and topological invariants*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 4 (1991), 521–551. 1
- [14] N. Chriss and V. Ginzburg, *Representation theory and complex geometry*, Boston: Birkhäuser, 1997. 8, 34
- [15] M. Demazure, *Désingularisation des variétés de Schubert généralisées*, Annales scientifiques de l’École Normale Supérieure 7 (1) (1974), 53–88. 9
- [16] V. Deodhar, *On some geometric aspects of Bruhat orderings II, The parabolic analogue of Kazhdan–Lusztig polynomials*, J. Algebra 111 (1987), 483–506. 17
- [17] V. Drinfeld, *Degenerate affine Hecke algebras and Yangians*, Funktsional’nyi Analiz i ego Prilozheniya, 20(1) (1986), 69–70. 14
- [18] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris, *3264 and all that: A second course in algebraic geometry*, Cambridge University Press, 2016. 35
- [19] N. Fan, P. Guo and R. Xiong, *Pieri and Murnaghan–Nakayama type rules for Chern classes of Schubert cells*, arXiv:2211.06802v1. 38

- [20] L. Fehér, R. Rimányi and A. Weber, *Motivic Chern classes and K-theoretic stable envelopes*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 122 (2021), 153–189. 1, 11
- [21] S. Fomin, *Schur operators and Knuth correspondences*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 72 (1995), 277–292. 2
- [22] S. Fomin and C. Greene, *Noncommutative Schur functions and their applications*, Discrete Math. 193 (1998), 179–200. 2
- [23] S. Fomin and A. Kirillov, *The Yang–Baxter equation, symmetric functions, and Schubert polynomials*, Discrete Math. 153 (1996), 123–43. 4
- [24] W. Graham and S. Kumar, *On positivity in T-equivariant K-theory of flag varieties*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2008), rnn093. 9
- [25] J. Humphreys, *Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups*, Cambridge University Press, 1992. 14
- [26] N. Iwahori, *On the structure of a Hecke ring of a Chevalley group over a finite field*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. I 10 (1964), 215–236. 14
- [27] N. Iwahori and H. Matsumoto, *On some Bruhat decomposition and the structure of the Hecke rings of p-adic Chevalley groups*, Publications Mathématiques de l’IHÉS 25 (1965), 5–48. 14
- [28] D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig, *Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras*, Invent. Math. 53 (1979), 165–184. 14, 15
- [29] J. Koncki, *Comparison of motivic Chern classes and stable envelopes for cotangent bundles*, J. Topology 15 (2022), 168–203. 1
- [30] J. Koncki and A. Weber, *Twisted motivic Chern class and stable envelopes*, Advances in Mathematics, 404, Part A, 2022 1
- [31] B. Kostant and S. Kumar, *T-equivariant K-theory of generalized flag varieties*, J. Diff. Geom. 32 (1990), 549–603. 9, 34
- [32] T. Lam, *Ribbon Schur operators*, Europ. J. Combin. 29 (2008), 343–359. 2
- [33] T. Lam and P. Pylyavskyy, *Combinatorial Hopf algebras and K-homology of Grassmannians*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 9 (2007), rnm125. 2, 4, 34
- [34] A. Lascoux and M.-P. Schützenberger, *Polynômes de Schubert*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér. I Math. 294 (1982), 447–450. 8
- [35] A. Lascoux and M.-P. Schützenberger, *Structure de Hopf de l’anneau de cohomologie et de l’anneau de Grothendieck d’une variété de drapeaux*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 295 (1982), 629–633. 10, 31
- [36] C. Lenart, *Combinatorial aspects of the K-theory of Grassmannians*, Ann. Combin. 4 (2000), 67–82. 3, 35, 38
- [37] C. Lenart, C. Su, K. Zainoulline and C. Zhong, *Geometric properties of the Kazhdan–Lusztig Schubert basis*, Algebra & Number Theory 17 (2) (2023), 435–464. 1
- [38] M. Levine and F. Morel, *Algebraic cobordism*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2007. 8
- [39] G. Lusztig, *Some examples of square integrable representations of semisimple p-adic groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 277 (1983), 623–653. 14
- [40] G. Lusztig, *Affine Hecke algebras and their graded version*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. 2 (3) (1989), 599–635. 14
- [41] I. Macdonald, *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*, second edition, Oxford Math. Mon., 1995. 18
- [42] R. MacPherson, *Chern classes for singular algebraic varieties*, Ann. Math. 100 (1974), 423–432. 1, 10
- [43] L. Mihalcea, H. Naruse and C. Su, *Left Demazure–Lusztig operators on equivariant (quantum) cohomology and K-theory*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 16 (2022), 12096–12147. 12
- [44] L. Mihalcea, H. Naruse and C. Su, *Chevalley formulae for the motivic Chern classes of Schubert cells and for the stable envelopes*, arXiv:2312.17200. 1
- [45] L. Mihalcea, C. Su and D. Anderson, *Whittaker functions from motivic Chern classes*, Transform. Groups 27 (3) (2022), 1045–1067. 1
- [46] T. Ohmoto, *Equivariant Chern classes of singular algebraic varieties with group actions*, Math. Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. 140 (2006), 115–134. 10
- [47] A. Okounkov, *Lectures on K-theoretic computations in enumerative geometry*, Geometry of moduli spaces and representation theory, 251–V380, IAS/Park City Math. Ser., 24, AMS, 2017. 1
- [48] R. Rimányi, *\hbar -Deformed Schubert Calculus in equivariant cohomology, K-theory, and elliptic cohomology*, Singularities and their interaction with geometry and low dimensional topology: In honor of András Némethi (2021), 73–96. 1
- [49] M. Schwartz, *Classes caractéristiques définies par une stratification d’une variété analytique complexe, I*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 260 (1965), 3262–3264. 10
- [50] M. Schwartz, *Classes caractéristiques définies par une stratification d’une variété analytique complexe, II*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, 260 (1965), 3535–3537. 10
- [51] W. Soergel, *Kazhdan–Lusztig polynomials and a combinatoric for tilting modules*, Represent. Theory 1 (6) (1997), 83–114. 14

- [52] R. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics, Vol. 2*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999. 33
- [53] S. Yokura, *A singular Riemann–Roch theorem for Hirzebruch characteristics*, Banach Center Publ. 44 (1998), 257–268. 1

(Neil J.Y. Fan) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SICHUAN UNIVERSITY, CHENGDU, SICHUAN 610065, P.R. CHINA

Email address: fan@scu.edu.cn

(Peter L. Guo) CENTER FOR COMBINATORICS, LPMC, NANKAI UNIVERSITY, TIANJIN 300071, P.R. CHINA

Email address: lguo@nankai.edu.cn

(Changjian Su) YAU MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES CENTER, TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, BEIJING, CHINA

Email address: changjiansu@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn

(Rui Xiong) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, 150 LOUIS-PASTEUR, OTTAWA, ON, K1N 6N5, CANADA

Email address: rxion043@uottawa.ca