

# A MONOTONICITY PROPERTY FOR THE NEW BASIS OF $\mathbf{C}[(\mathbf{Z}/2)^D]$

G. LUSZTIG

## INTRODUCTION

**0.1.** Let  $V_D$  be a vector space of finite even dimension  $D \geq 2$  over a field  $F$  endowed with a nondegenerate symplectic form  $(, ) : V_D \times V_D \rightarrow F$  and with a collection of vectors  $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_D, e_{D+1}$  such that

$(e_i, e_j) = 1$  if  $j = i + 1 \pmod{D + 1}$ ,  $(e_i, e_j) = -1$  if  $i = j + 1 \pmod{D + 1}$  and  $\langle e_i, e_j \rangle = 0$  for all other pairs  $i, j$ .

Such a collection is called a “circular basis”. (It always exists and satisfies  $\sum_{i=1}^{D+1} e_i = 0$ .)

Let  $\mathbf{C}[V_D]$  be the  $\mathbf{C}$ -vector space with basis  $\{\boxed{x}; x \in V_D\}$ .

**0.2.** In the rest of the paper (except in 3.1 and 3.7) we assume that  $F$  is the field with two elements. In this case the definition of circular basis appeared in [L20a].

In [L20a],[L23] a new basis of  $\mathbf{C}[V_D]$  was defined in terms of a circular basis of  $V_D$ . (This new basis was in fact defined earlier in [L20] in a less symmetric way.) The elements of the new basis are characteristic functions of certain isotropic subspaces of  $V_D$ . They can be expressed in terms of the old basis by a matrix which is upper triangular with respect to a certain partial order  $\leq$  on the new basis. In this paper we prove a monotonicity property of the new basis, namely that if  $B, B'$  in the new basis satisfy  $B \leq B'$  then the dimensions  $d, d'$  of the corresponding isotropic subspaces satisfy  $d \leq d'$ . The proof is based on a construction given in §1 which extends and simplifies results in [L20, 1.18].

In §3 we state a conjecture (unrelated to the monotonicity property) on the entries of the Fourier transform  $\mathbf{C}[V_D] \rightarrow \mathbf{C}[V_D]$  with respect to the new basis.

**0.3. Notation** For  $i, j$  in  $\mathbf{Z}$  we set  $[i, j] = \{z \in \mathbf{Z}; i \leq z \leq j\}$ . For a finite set  $?$  we denote by  $|?|$  the cardinal of  $?$ .

---

Supported by NSF grant DMS-2153741

1. THE ASSIGNMENT  $B \mapsto B[i]$ 

**1.1.** For any  $I \subset [1, D+1]$  we set  $e_I = \sum_{s \in I} e_s \in V_D$ .

Let  $\mathcal{I}$  be the set of all  $I \subset [1, D+1]$  of the form  $[i, j]$  or  $[1, D+1] - [i, j]$  with  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq D$ . (Such sets are called intervals.) We have  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}^0 \sqcup \mathcal{I}^1$  where  $\mathcal{I}^0 = \{I \in \mathcal{I}; |I| \equiv 0 \pmod{2}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{I}^1 = \{I \in \mathcal{I}; |I| \equiv 1 \pmod{2}\}$ . For  $I, I'$  in  $\mathcal{I}^1$  we write  $I \prec I'$  whenever  $I \not\subseteq I'$  and  $I' - I = I_1 \sqcup I_2$  with  $I_1 \in \mathcal{I}, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$ . For  $I, I'$  in  $\mathcal{I}^1$  we write  $I \spadesuit I'$  whenever  $I \cap I' = \emptyset$  and  $I \cup I' \notin \mathcal{I}$ . For  $I \in \mathcal{I}^1$  let  $I^{ev}$  be the set of all  $i \in I$  such that  $I - \{i\} = I' \sqcup I''$ , with  $I' \in \mathcal{I}^1, I'' \in \mathcal{I}^1, I' \spadesuit I''$ . Let  $I^{odd} = I - I^{ev}$ . We have  $|I^{ev}| = (|I| - 1)/2$ .

Let  $R$  be the set whose elements are finite unordered sequences of objects of  $\mathcal{I}^1$ .

For  $B \in R$  let  $\langle B \rangle$  be the subspace of  $V_D$  generated by  $\{e_I; I \in B\}$ .

For  $i \in [1, D+1]$ ,  $B \in R$  we set  $B_i = \{I \in B; i \in I\}$ ,

$$g_i(B) = |B_i|$$

and

$$\epsilon_i(B) = (1/2)g_i(B)(g_i(B) + 1) \in F.$$

For  $B \in R$  we set

$$\epsilon(B) = \sum_{i \in [1, D+1]} \epsilon_i(B) e_i \in V_D.$$

Following [L23] we define  $\phi(V_D)$  to be the set consisting of all  $B \in R$  such that  $(P_0), (P_1)$  below hold.

$(P_0)$  If  $I \in B, I' \in B$ , then  $I = I'$ , or  $I \spadesuit I'$ , or  $I \prec I'$ , or  $I' \prec I$ .

$(P_1)$  Let  $I \in B$ . There exist  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  in  $B$  such that  $I^{ev} \subset I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \dots \cup I_k$  (disjoint union),  $I_1 \prec I, I_2 \prec I, \dots, I_k \prec I$ .

For  $B', B$  in  $\phi(V_D)$  we say that  $B' \leq B$  if there exist  $B^0, B^1, B^2, \dots, B^k$  in  $\phi(V_D)$  such that  $B^0 = B', B^k = B$ ,

$$\epsilon(B^0) \in \langle B^1 \rangle, \epsilon(B^1) \in \langle B^2 \rangle, \dots, \epsilon(B^{k-1}) \in \langle B^k \rangle.$$

By [L20],[L23],

(a)  $\leq$  is a partial order on  $\phi(V_D)$ ;

(b)  $\epsilon: \phi(V_D) \rightarrow V_D$  is a bijection and  $\epsilon(B) \in \langle B \rangle$  for any  $B \in \phi(V_D)$ ;

(c) For  $B \in \phi(V_D)$ ,  $\{e_I; I \in B\}$  is a basis of  $\langle B \rangle$ ; hence  $\dim \langle B \rangle = |B|$ .

For  $x \in V_D$  we define  $B(x) \in \phi(V_D)$  by  $\epsilon(B(x)) = x$ . For  $x, y$  in  $V_D$  we write  $x \leq y$  whenever  $B(x) \leq B(y)$ . By (a), this is a partial order on  $V_D$ ; it follows that

(d)  $\{\langle B \rangle; B \in \phi(V_D)\}$  is a “new” basis of  $\mathbf{C}[V_D]$  related to the basis  $\{\underline{x}; x \in V_D\}$  by an upper triangular matrix with 1 on diagonal.

Let  $x \in V_D$ . We have  $0 \leq x$  for any  $x \in V_D$ . Hence the set of sequences

$$\{0 = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k = x \text{ in } V_D \text{ such that } x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_k\}$$

is nonempty and we must have  $k \leq |V_D|$  (since  $\leq$  is a partial order). Hence we can define  $\nu(x) \in \mathbf{N}$  as the maximum value of  $k$  over all sequences as above.

**1.2.** Let  $B \in \phi(V_D), i \in [1, D+1]$  be such that  $\{i\} \in B$ . We can arrange the elements of  $B_i$  in a sequence  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  with  $\{i\} = I_1 \prec I_2 \prec \dots \prec I_k$ ,  $k = g_i(B) \geq 1$ . We show:

(a) *If  $k \geq 2$ , then  $i \in I_2^{ev}$ .*

Assume that  $i \in I_2^{odd}$ . Then we have either  $I_2 - \{i\} \in \mathcal{I}$  (contradicting  $\{i\} \prec I_2$ ) or  $I_2 - \{i\} = I' \sqcup I''$  where  $I' \in \mathcal{I}^0, I'' \in \mathcal{I}^0$ . In this last case we set  $i' = i + 1$  (if  $i \in [1, D]$ ),  $i' = 1$  (if  $i = D + 1$ ). We have  $i' \in I'$  or  $i' \in I''$ . We can assume that  $i' \in I'$ . Since  $i \in I_2^{odd}$  we have  $i' \in I_2^{ev}$ . Hence there exists  $J \in B$  such that  $J \prec I_2$ .  $i' \in J$ . By the choice of  $i'$  we have  $J \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{I}$ . If  $i \notin J$  then by (P1) we have  $\{i\} \spadesuit J$  so that  $J \cup \{i\} \notin \mathcal{I}$ ; this is a contradiction. We see that  $i \in J$ . Since  $J \in B_i$  and  $J \prec I_2$ , we must have  $J = \{i\}$ . This contradicts  $i' \in J$ ; (a) is proved.

We show:

(b) *If  $k \geq 3$ , then  $i \in I_3^{odd}$ .*

We can find  $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_s$  in  $B$  such that  $I_3^{ev} \subset J_1 \cup J_2 \cup \dots \cup J_s$  (disjoint union),  $J_1 \prec I_3, J_2 \prec I_3, \dots, J_s \prec I_3$ . From the definitions we have

(c)  $J_1^{ev} \cup J_2^{ev} \cup \dots \cup J_s^{ev} \subset I_3^{odd}$ .

We have  $i \in J_1 \cup J_2 \cup \dots \cup J_s$ . We can assume that  $i \in J_1$  so that  $J_1 \in B_i$ . Since  $J_1 \prec I_3$  we have  $J_1 = I_2$  or  $J_1 = I_1 = \{i\}$ .

Assume first that  $J_1 = I_2$ . Since  $i \in I_2^{ev} = J_1^{ev}$  (see (a)), we see from (c) that  $i \in I_3^{odd}$ , as desired.

In the rest of the proof we assume that  $J_1 = I_1 = \{i\}$ . Since  $\{i\} \prec I_2$  we have  $|I_2| \geq 3$ . Hence there are well defined elements  $j \neq j'$  in  $I_2$  such that  $I_2 - \{j\} \in \mathcal{I}^0, I_2 - \{j'\} \in \mathcal{I}^0$ .

Assume now that  $j \in I_3^{odd}$ . Since  $I_2 \prec I_3$  we can find  $h \in I_3^{ev}$  such that  $h \notin I_2, \{h, j\} \in \mathcal{I}^0$ . By (P<sub>1</sub>) we can find  $t \in [1, s]$  such that  $J_t \prec I_3, h \in J_t$ . Since  $h \in J_t, h \notin I_2$  we see that  $J_t \not\subset I_2$ . We have  $I_2 \not\subset J_t$ . (If  $I_2 \subset J_t$ , we would have  $J_1 = I_1 \subset J_t$  hence  $t = 1$  so that  $J_t = \{i\}$  and  $h = i$  contradicting  $h \notin I_2$ ). From (P<sub>0</sub>) we now see that  $J_t \spadesuit I_2$ . But this contradicts  $h \in J_t, \{h, j\} \in \mathcal{I}^0, j \in I_2$ .

We see that  $j \in I_3^{ev}$ . Similarly we have  $j' \in I_3^{ev}$ . Since  $i \in I_2^{ev}$ , this implies that  $i \in I_3^{odd}$ . This completes the proof of (b).

**1.3.** Let  $B \in \phi(V), i \in [1, D+1]$  be such that  $\{i\} \in B$ . We arrange the elements of  $B_i$  in a sequence  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k$  as in 1.2. Recall that  $k = g_i(B) \geq 1$ . We define  $B[i] \in R$  as follows. If  $g_i(B) = 1$  then  $B[i] = B - \{i\}$ . If  $g_i(B) \geq 2$  then  $B[i] = (B \sqcup \{H\} \sqcup \{H'\}) - (\{I_1\} \sqcup \{I_2\})$  where  $H, H'$  in  $\mathcal{I}^1$  are defined by  $I_2 - \{i\} = H \sqcup H'$ .

(Here we use that  $i \in I_2^{ev}$ , see 1.2(a) and that  $H \notin B, H' \notin B$  since neither  $H, I_1$  or  $H', I_1$  satisfy (P<sub>0</sub>)). We show:

(a)  $B[i] \in \phi(V)$ .

We first show:

(b) *any  $I, I'$  in  $B[i]$  satisfy (P<sub>0</sub>).*

If  $g_i(B) = 1$  then (b) is obvious. We now assume that  $g_i(B) \geq 2$ . If  $I$  and  $I'$  are not in  $\{H, H'\}$  then (b) is obvious. Assume that  $I \notin \{H, H'\}, I' \in \{H, H'\}$ . Then  $I \neq I'$ . If  $I \spadesuit I_2$  then  $I \spadesuit I'$ . If  $I_2 \prec I$  then  $I' \prec I$ . If  $I \prec I_2$  and  $i \notin I$  then

$I \subset H$  or  $I \subset H'$ ; moreover if  $I \subset H$  we have  $I \prec H$  unless  $I \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{I}^0$  (but this would contradict  $(P_0)$  for  $I, I_1$ ). Thus if  $I \prec I_2$  and  $i \notin I$  then  $I \prec H$  or  $\prec H'$ . If  $I \prec I_2$  and  $i \in I$  then  $I = I_1$  so that  $I \notin B[i]$ . If  $I_2 \spadesuit I$  then  $I \spadesuit H$  and  $I \spadesuit H'$ . We see that in our case (b) is satisfied. The same argument applies when  $I \in \{H, H'\}, I' \notin \{H, H'\}$ . Assume now that  $I \in \{H, H'\}, I' \in \{H, H'\}$ . Then we have either  $I = I'$  or else  $I \spadesuit I'$ . This proves (b).

We show:

(c) any  $I \in B[i]$  satisfies  $(P_1)$ .

Assume first that  $g_i(B) = 1$ . We have  $I \in B, I \neq \{i\}$ . Let  $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$  be as in  $(P_1)$  for  $I$  (relative to  $B$ ). Since  $g_i(B) = 1$  and we have  $i \notin I$  hence  $i \notin J_1, i \notin J_2, \dots, i \notin J_k$ . Thus  $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$  are as in  $(P_1)$  for  $I$  (relative to  $B[i]$ ). This proves (c) in our case.

Next we assume that  $g_i(B) \geq 2$ . Assume that  $I \in B, I \neq I_2, I \neq I_1$ . Let  $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$  be as in  $(P_1)$  for  $I$  (relative to  $B$ ). If all  $J_s$  are different from  $I_2, I_1$  then  $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$  are as in  $(P_1)$  for  $I$  (relative to  $B[i]$ ). If one  $J_s$  (say  $J_1$ ) is equal to  $I_2$  (so that  $J_2, \dots, J_k$  are different from  $I_1$  since  $I_1 \subset I_2$ ) then we must have  $I_2 \prec I$  hence  $I$  is one of  $I_3, I_4, \dots$ . If  $i \in I^{\text{odd}}$  then the collection  $H, H', J_2, J_3, \dots, J_k$  is as in  $(P_1)$  for  $I$  (relative to  $B[i]$ ). If  $i \in I^{\text{ev}}$  (so that, by 1.2(b), we have  $I \neq I_3$  that is  $I$  is one of  $I_4, I_5, \dots$ ), then the collection  $I_3, J_2, J_3, \dots$  satisfies the conditions of  $(P_1)$  for  $I$  (relative to  $B[i]$ ) except that the condition of “disjoint support” may not be satisfied. But if from this collection we remove those  $J_s$  which are contained in  $I_3$ , the resulting collection satisfies the conditions of  $(P_1)$  for  $I$  (relative to  $B[i]$ ).

Next we assume that  $I = H$ . Let  $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$  be as in  $(P_1)$  for  $I_2$  (relative to  $B$ ). Let  $j \in H^{\text{ev}}$ . Then  $j \in I_2^{\text{ev}}$  hence we can find  $s$  such that  $j \in J_s^{\text{odd}}$ . If  $i \in J_s$ , then  $J_s$  must be  $\{i\}$  so that  $j = i$ , a contradiction. Thus we have  $i \notin J_s$ . It follows that  $J_s \subset H$  or  $J_s \subset H'$ . Since  $j \in H \cap J_s$ , we see that  $J_s \subset H$ . Using this and the inclusions  $j \in J_s^{\text{odd}}, j \in H^{\text{ev}}$ , we deduce  $J_s \prec H$ . We have  $J_s \neq \{i\}$  since  $i \notin H$  and  $J_s \neq I_2$  since  $J_s \prec I_2$ . Thus  $J_s \in B[i]$ . We see that  $H^{\text{ev}}$  is contained in the union of a subcollection of  $J_1, J_2, \dots, J_k$  which shows that  $(P_1)$  holds for  $H$  (relative to  $B[i]$ ). The same argument applies to  $I = H'$ . This completes the proof of (c).

**1.4.** Let  $B \in \phi(V_D), i \in [1, D+1]$  be such that  $\{i\} \in B$ .

If  $g_i(B) = 1$  then  $g_i(B[i]) = 0$  hence

$$(1/2)g_i(B[i])(g_i(B[i]) + 1) = (1/2)g_i(B)(g_i(B) + 1) + 1 \pmod{2}.$$

(that is  $0 = 1 + 1 \pmod{2}$ ).

If  $g_i(B) \geq 2$  then  $g_i(B[i]) = g_i(B) - 2$  hence

$$(1/2)g_i(B[i])(g_i(B[i]) + 1) = (1/2)g_i(B)(g_i(B) + 1) + 1 \pmod{2}.$$

If  $j \in [1, D+1] - \{i\}$  then  $g_j(B[i]) = g_j(B)$  hence

$$(1/2)g_j(B[i])(g_j(B[i]) + 1) = (1/2)g_j(B)(g_j(B) + 1).$$

It follows that

$$\epsilon(B[i]) = \epsilon(B) + e_i \in F.$$

**1.5.** Let  $B \in \phi(V_D), i \in [1, D + 1]$ . The following two conditions are equivalent:  
 (1)  $\{i\} \in B$ . (2)  $g_i(B) \geq 1$  and  $g_{i-1}(B) = g_{i+1}(B) = g_i(B) - 1$ . (When  $i = 1$  we interpret  $g_0(B)$  as  $g_{D+1}(B)$ ; when  $i = D + 1$  we interpret  $g_{D+2}(B)$  as  $g_1(B)$ .)

## 2. A MONOTONICITY PROPERTY

**2.1.** We now assume that  $D \geq 4$ . Let

$$V_{D-2}, (, ) : V_{D-2} \times V_{D-2} \rightarrow F, e'_1, \dots, e'_{D-2}, e'_{D-1}$$

be the analogues of  $V_D, (, ), e_1, \dots, e_D, e_{D+1}$  in 1.1 when  $D$  is replaced by  $D - 2$ . For any  $j \in [1, D + 1]$  let  $\tau_j : V_{D-2} \rightarrow V_D$  be the linear map which takes  $e'_1, \dots, e'_{D-2}, e'_{D-1}$  (in the order written) to:

$$\begin{aligned} & e_3, e_4, \dots, e_D, e_{D+1} + e_1 + e_2 \text{ if } j = 1, \\ & e_1, \dots, e_{j-2}, e_{j-1} + e_j + e_{j+1}, e_{j+2}, \dots, e_{D+1} \text{ if } j = 2, 3, \dots, D, \\ & e_D + e_{D+1} + e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots, e_{D-1} \text{ if } j = D + 1. \end{aligned}$$

This map is injective and compatible with  $(, )$ . Its image is a complement of the line  $Fe_j$  in  $\{x \in V_D; (x, e_j) = 0\}$ .

For any  $E \subset V_D$  we set  $\boxed{E} = \sum_{x \in E} \boxed{x} \in \mathbf{C}[V_D]$ . For  $E' \subset V_{D-2}$  we define  $\boxed{E'} \in \mathbf{C}[V_{D-2}]$  in a similar way.

Let  $\theta_j : \mathbf{C}[V_{D-2}] \rightarrow \mathbf{C}[V_D]$  be the linear map defined by  $\theta_j(\boxed{x'}) = \boxed{\tau_j(x')} + \boxed{\tau_j(x') + e_j}$  for any  $x' \in V_{D-2}$ .

**2.2.** Following [L20a] we define a collection  $\phi'(V_D)$  of subspaces of  $V_D$  by induction on  $D$ .

If  $D = 2$ ,  $\phi'(V_D)$  consists of the 4 subspaces of dimension  $\leq 1$  of  $V_D$ .

If  $D \geq 4$ , a subspace  $E$  of  $V_D$  is in  $\phi'(V_D)$  if either  $E = 0$  or if there exists  $E' \in V_{D-2}$  and  $j \in [1, D + 1]$  such that  $E = \tau_j(E') \oplus Fe_j$ . We then have

$$(a) \quad \theta_j(\boxed{E'}) = \boxed{E}$$

The following is proved in [L23].

(b) *The map  $B \mapsto \langle B \rangle$  is a bijection  $\phi(V_D) \xrightarrow{\sim} \phi'(V_D)$ .*

For  $B' \in \phi(V_{D-2})$  and  $j \in [1, D + 1]$  we define  $t_j(B') \in \phi(V_D)$  by

(c)  $\langle t_j(B') \rangle = \tau_j(\langle B' \rangle) \oplus Fe_j$ .

Using (a) we then have

$$(d) \theta_j \langle bx \langle B' \rangle \rangle = \boxed{\langle t_j(B') \rangle}.$$

For  $x' \in V_{D-2}, x \in V_D$  such that  $B(x) = t_j(B'(x'))$  we show:

$$(e) \theta_j(\boxed{x'}) = \boxed{x} + \boxed{x + e_j}.$$

Indeed, let  $\epsilon' : \phi(V_{D-2}) \rightarrow V_{D-2}$  be the bijection analogue to  $\epsilon : \phi(V_D) \rightarrow V_D$ . From [L20, 1.9(b)] we have  $\epsilon(B(x)) = \tau_j(\epsilon'(B'(x'))) + ce_j$  for some  $c \in F$ . In

other words we have  $x = \tau_j(x') + ce_j$ . It follows that  $\boxed{\tau_j(x')} + \boxed{\tau_j(x') + e_j} = \boxed{x} + \boxed{x + e_j}$  so that (e) holds.

**2.3.** For any  $A \in \phi(V_D)$  we have

$$(a) \quad \boxed{\langle A \rangle} = \sum_{A' \in \phi(V_D)} d_A^{A'} \boxed{\epsilon^{-1}(A')}$$

where  $d_A^{A'} = 1$  if  $\epsilon^{-1}(A') \in \langle A \rangle$  and  $d_A^{A'} = 0$  if  $\epsilon^{-1}(A') \notin \langle A \rangle$ ; in particular we have  $d_A^{A'} \neq 0 \implies A' \leq A$ . Moreover we have  $d_A^A = 1$ .

It follows that for any  $C \in \phi(V_D)$  we have

$$(b) \quad \boxed{\epsilon^{-1}(C)} = \sum_{B \in \phi(V_D)} r_C^B \boxed{\langle B \rangle}$$

with  $r_C^B \in \mathbf{Z}$  uniquely determined and such that  $r_C^B \neq 0 \implies B \leq C$ ; moreover we have  $r_C^C = 1$ .

We deduce that for  $A' \leq A$  in  $\phi(V_D)$  we have

$$(c) \quad d_A^{A'} = \sum (-1)^k r_{A_0}^{A_1} r_{A_1}^{A_2} \cdots r_{A_{k-1}}^{A_k}$$

where the sum is taken over all sequences  $A = A_0 > A_1 > A_2 > \cdots > A_k = A'$  in  $\phi(V_D)$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *If  $C \in \phi(V_D)$ ,  $B \in \phi(V_D)$  satisfy  $r_C^B \neq 0$  then  $|B| \leq |C|$ .*

We argue by induction on  $D$ . If  $D = 2$  the result is obvious. We now assume that  $D \geq 4$ . Let  $x = \epsilon^{-1}(C)$ . We shall use a second induction on  $\nu(x)$  (see 1.1). If  $\nu(x) = 0$  then  $x = 0$  and  $B = C = \emptyset$  so that  $|C| = |B| = 0$  and the desired result holds. Now assume that  $\nu(x) \neq 0$  that is  $x \neq 0$ . Then for some  $j \in [1, D+1]$  we have  $\langle C \rangle = \tau_j \langle C' \rangle \oplus F e_j$  for some  $C' \in \phi(V_{D-2})$  (In particular we have  $\{j\} \in C$ .) Let  $\epsilon' : \phi(V_{D-2}) \rightarrow V_{D-2}$  be as in 2.2 and let  $x' = \epsilon'(C')$ . By the first induction hypothesis we have

$$\boxed{x'} = \sum_{B' \in \phi(V_{D-2}); |B'| \leq |C'|} r'_{C', B'} \boxed{\langle B' \rangle}$$

with  $r'_{C', B'} \in \mathbf{Z}$ . Here the boxed entries refer to  $V_{D-2}$ . Applying  $\theta_j$  (see 2.1) we deduce

$$\boxed{\tau_j(x')} + \boxed{\tau_j(x') + e_j} = \sum_{B' \in \phi(V_{D-2}); |B'| \leq |C'|} r'_{C', B'} \boxed{\langle t_j(B') \rangle}.$$

Using 2.2(e) this becomes

$$\boxed{x} + \boxed{x + e_j} = \sum_{B' \in \phi(V_{D-2}); |B'| \leq |C'|} r'_{C', B'} \boxed{\langle t_j(B') \rangle}.$$

Note that  $|t_j(B')| = |B'| + 1$ . Similarly,  $|C| = |C'| + 1$ . We see that

(a)  $\boxed{x} + \boxed{x + e_j}$  is a linear combination of elements  $\boxed{\langle B \rangle}$  with  $B \in \phi(V_D)$  such that  $|B| \leq |C|$ .

Since  $\{j\} \in C$ , we see that  $x + e_j \in \langle C \rangle$  so that  $x + e_j < x$ . This implies that  $\nu(x + e_j) < \nu(x)$  (see 1.1). By the second induction hypothesis we see that

(b)  $\boxed{x + e_j}$  is a linear combination of elements  $\boxed{\langle B \rangle}$  with  $B \in \phi(V_D)$  such that  $|B| \leq |\epsilon^{-1}(x + e_j)|$ .

Combining (a),(b), it remains to show that

(c)  $|\epsilon^{-1}(x + e_j)| \leq |C|$ .

Since  $\{\triangleright\} \in C$ , the object  $C[j] \in \phi(V_D)$  is defined as in §1; it satisfies  $\epsilon(C[j]) = \epsilon(C) + e_j = x + e_j$ , see 1.4. Thus,  $\epsilon(C[j]) = \epsilon(\epsilon^{-1}(x + e_j))$ . Using the fact that  $\epsilon : \phi(V_D) \rightarrow V_D$  is a bijection, we deduce that  $C[j] = \epsilon^{-1}(x + e_j)$  so that  $|C[j]| = |\epsilon^{-1}(x + e_j)|$ . From definitions we have  $|C[j]| = |C| - 1$  (if  $g_j(C) = 1$ ) and  $|C[j]| = |C|$  (if  $g_j(C) \geq 2$ ). In particular we have  $|C[j]| \leq |C|$  and (c) follows. The theorem is proved.

**Corollary 2.5.** *If  $A', A$  in  $\phi(V_D)$  satisfy  $A' \leq A$ , then  $|A'| \leq |A|$ .*

We can assume that  $\epsilon^{-1}(A') \in \langle A \rangle$  so that  $d_A^{A'} = 1$  (notation of 2.3). Using 2.3(c) we deduce that there exists a sequence  $A = A_0 > A_1 > A_2 > \dots > A_k = A'$  in  $\phi(V_D)$  such that  $r_{A_0}^{A_1} \neq 0, r_{A_1}^{A_2} \neq 0, \dots, r_{A_{k-1}}^{A_k} \neq 0$ . Using 2.4, we see that

$$|A_0| \geq |A_1| \geq |A_2| \geq \dots \geq |A_k|$$

so that  $|A| \geq |A'|$ , as desired.

### 3. MATRIX ENTRIES OF THE FOURIER TRANSFORM

**3.1.** In this subsection  $F$  (in 0.1) is assumed to be a finite field with  $q$  elements. Let  $\psi : F \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^*$  be a nontrivial homomorphism. Recall that the Fourier transform  $\mathcal{F}_\psi : \mathbf{C}[V_D] \rightarrow \mathbf{C}[V_D]$  is the linear map given by  $\mathcal{F}_\psi(\boxed{x}) = q^{-D/2} \sum_{y \in V_D} \psi((x, y)) \boxed{y}$  for all  $x \in V_D$ .

**3.2.** We now return to the setup of 0.2. Then  $\psi$  in 3.1 is uniquely determined and we write  $\mathcal{F}$  instead of  $\mathcal{F}_\psi$ . We are interested in the entries of the matrix of  $\mathcal{F}$  with respect to the new basis, that is in the complex numbers  $n_{B, B'}$  given by

$$\mathcal{F}_D(\boxed{\langle B \rangle}) = \sum_{B' \in \phi(V_D)} n_{B, B'} \boxed{\langle B' \rangle}$$

for any  $B \in \phi(V_D)$ .

We have the following result.

(a) If  $n_{B, B'} \neq 0$  and  $B \neq B'$  then  $B < B'$  and  $|B| < |B'|$ .

The fact that  $|B| < |B'|$  is proved in [L20a, 1.6]. A similar argument shows that  $B < B'$ . Indeed, we can assume that  $D \geq 4$ . As in *loc.cit.*, it is enough to

prove the following statement: if  $B_1 < B'_1$  in  $\phi(V_{D-2})$  and  $j \in [1, D+1]$  then  $t_j(B_1) < t_j(B'_1)$  (compare [L20, 1.20(b)]).

From (a) we see that the matrix  $(n_{B,B'})$  is upper triangular. Its diagonal entries are  $\pm 1$  since  $\mathcal{F}^2 = 1$ .

For  $B \in \phi(V_D)$  we have

$$\mathcal{F}_D(\boxed{\langle B \rangle}) = 2^{|B|-(D/2)} \boxed{\langle B \rangle^\perp},$$

where  $\langle B \rangle^\perp = \{x \in V_D; (x, \langle B \rangle) = 0\}$  (since  $\langle B \rangle$  is an isotropic subspace). In particular we have

$$2^{-D/2} \boxed{V_D} = \sum_{B' \in \phi(V_D)} n_{\emptyset, B'} \boxed{\langle B' \rangle}.$$

**3.3.** For a sequence  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k$  in  $[1, D+1]$  (identified with  $\mathbf{Z}/(D+1)$ ) we write

$$[i_1 i_2 \dots i_k] = \sum_J \boxed{\langle \epsilon^{-1}(e_J) \rangle} \in \mathbf{C}[V_D]$$

where the sum is taken over all distinct subsets  $J$  of  $\mathbf{Z}/(D+1)$  of the form  $\{i_1 + h, i_2 + h, \dots, i_k + h\}$  for some  $h \in \mathbf{Z}/(D+1)$ .

When  $D \leq 8$ , the element  $\boxed{V_D} \in \mathbf{C}[V_D]$  can be written as follows.

$$[1] - 2[-] \text{ if } D = 2,$$

$$[123] - 4[-] \text{ if } D = 4,$$

$$[1245] + [1235] + [1236] - 2[123] - 2[135] + 4[13] - 4[1] + 8[-] \text{ if } D = 6,$$

$$\begin{aligned} & [1246] + [123467] + [124567] - 2[1234567] + 2[123457] + 2[134567] + 2[123567] \\ & - 2[13457] - 2[12357] - 2[13567] - 4[12345] + 4[1235] + 4[1238] + 4[147] \\ & - 8[123] + 8[13] - 8[14] + 16[-] \end{aligned}$$

if  $D = 8$ .

Here  $-$  denotes the empty sequence.

We state:

**Conjecture 3.4.** *For any  $B, B'$  we have either  $n_{B,B'} = 0$  or  $n_{B,B'} = \pm 2^{-t}$  for some  $t \in [0, D/2]$ .*

One can show that for  $B, B'$  in  $\phi(V_D)$ , the coefficient  $n_{B,B'}$  is either 0 or is equal to some  $n_{\emptyset, B'_1}$  where  $B'_1 \in \phi(\langle B \rangle^\perp / \langle B \rangle)$  (note that by [L22],  $\langle B \rangle^\perp / \langle B \rangle$  inherits from  $V_D$  a structure similar to that of  $V_D$ ). In this way we see that it is enough to prove the conjecture in the special case where  $B = \emptyset$ . (This argument is similar to that in [L20a, 1.5, 1.6].) Using this and the results in 3.2 we see that the conjecture holds for  $D \leq 8$ .



**3.5.** We describe the matrix  $(n_{B,B'})$  assuming that  $D = 2$  or  $D = 4$ .

If  $D = 2$  the matrix is

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

If  $D = 4$  the matrix is

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/4 & 1/4 & 1/4 & 1/4 & 1/4 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

**3.6.** The examples in 3.3 suggest that when  $n_{\emptyset,B'} \neq 0$  then the number  $t$  in 3.4 is  $(D/2) - k$  where  $k$  is largest number such that  $B' = B'_0 < B'_1 < \dots < B'_k$  for some  $B'_1, \dots, B'_k$  in  $\phi(V_D)$ . It would be interesting to find a criterion for when  $n_{\emptyset,B'}$  is  $< 0, 0$  or  $> 0$ .

**3.7.** In the setup of 3.1, it would be interesting to extend the definition of the new basis of  $\mathbf{C}[V_D]$  to the case where  $q > 2$  in such a way that the Fourier transform in 3.1 is again triangular with respect to this basis.

REFERENCES

[L20] G.Lusztig, *The Grothendieck group of unipotent representations: a new basis*, Represent.Th. **24** (2020), 178-209.  
 [L20a] G.Lusztig, *Fourier transform as a triangular matrix*, Represent.Th. **24** (2020), 470-482.  
 [L22] G.Lusztig, *A parametrization of unipotent representations*, Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin. **17** (2022), 249-307.  
 [L23] G.Lusztig, *Families of isotropic subspaces in a symplectic  $Z/2$ -vector space*, arxiv:2307.09453. ■