

ON BOTT–SAMELSON RINGS FOR COXETER GROUPS

TAO GUI, LIN SUN, SHIHAO WANG, AND HAOYU ZHU

ABSTRACT. We study the cohomology ring of the Bott–Samelson variety. We compute an explicit presentation of this ring via Soergel’s result, which implies that it is a combinatorial invariant. We use the presentation to introduce the Bott–Samelson ring associated with a word in arbitrary Coxeter system by generators and relations. In general, it is a split quadratic complete intersection algebra with a triangular pattern of relations. By a result of Tate, it follows that it is a Koszul algebra and we provide a quadratic (reduced) Gröbner basis. Furthermore, we prove that it satisfies the whole Kähler package, including the Poincaré duality, the hard Lefschetz theorem, and the Hodge–Riemann bilinear relations.

1. INTRODUCTION

Bott–Samelson varieties are smooth projective varieties introduced firstly by Bott and Samelson [6, 7] as smooth manifolds, which are useful in studying the topology of compact Lie groups and symmetric spaces. Hansen [24] and Demazure [11] considered them as algebraic varieties and used them to construct resolutions of Schubert varieties, which are certain (usually) singular subvarieties of flag varieties and are important in the Schubert calculus and the representation theory of Lie-theoretic objects.

Motivated by the Kazhdan–Lusztig positivity conjecture on the Kazhdan–Lusztig polynomials and by seeking an algebraic proof of the celebrated Kazhdan–Lusztig conjecture on the characters of simple highest weight modules of complex semi-simple Lie algebras [25], Soergel [29, 30, 31, 32] in the 1990s and 2000s developed his theory what are known today as Soergel bimodules, which gives a purely algebraic/combinatorial description of the (equivariant) intersection cohomology of Schubert varieties and works for arbitrary Coxeter groups with (currently) no geometric interpretation.

The starting point of the theory of Soergel bimodules based on a purely algebraic/combinatorial description of the cohomology of the Bott–Samelson varieties (see (2.2) and Remark 2.3) and modeled on the fundamental decomposition theorem of Beilinson, Bernstein, Deligne and Gabber [4]. Elias and Williamson [16] proved a purely algebraic version of the decomposition theorem for Soergel bimodules by establishing remarkable Hodge theoretic properties of Soergel bimodules, hence proving the Kazhdan–Lusztig conjectures and completing the program initiated by Soergel. See [17] for a good survey. In addition, they gave a presentation of the category of Bott–Samelson bimodules by generators and relations using planar

Date: August 20, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 20F55, 14D07, 16S37, 14M15.

Key words and phrases. Bott–Samelson ring, Coxeter groups, Koszul algebra, Gröbner basis, hard Lefschetz theorem, Hodge–Riemann bilinear relations.

diagrammatics, hence a presentation of the category of Soergel bimodules by taking Karoubi envelope [18], which is very useful in doing computations.

In this paper, we study the *ring structure* of the Bott–Samelson module for arbitrary Coxeter groups. We compute an explicit presentation of this ring via Soergel’s result (see Section 2.3 for the definition of this ring as iterated tensor products by Soergel).

Theorem 1.1. *For the expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ in an arbitrary Coxeter system (W, S) , the Bott–Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$, defined in (2.2), has the following quadratic presentation:*

$$(1.1) \quad \overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) \cong \frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]}{(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n)},$$

where $\{q_m \mid m = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is given by

$$(1.2) \quad q_m := x_m^2 - \left(\sum_{l=1}^{m-1} q_{lm} x_l \right)^2 = x_m^2 - \sum_{i,j=1}^{m-1} (2 - \delta_{ij}) q_{im} q_{jm} x_i x_j.$$

Here q_{lm} is defined in (3.3) and δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta.

We use the above theorem to introduce the Bott–Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ associated with a word \underline{w} in an arbitrary Coxeter system by generators and relations, see section 3. In general, it can be seen from the above presentation that it is a split¹ quadratic complete intersection algebra with a triangular pattern of relations, see section 4. By a result of Tate, it follows that it is a Koszul algebra (Theorem 4.3) and we provide a quadratic (reduced) Gröbner basis for the defining ideal of relations (Proposition 4.6). Furthermore, we show that these rings “behave as the cohomology of a Bott–Samelson variety” even though no Bott–Samelson variety exists for most (more precisely, non-crystallographic, see Remark 2.2) Coxeter systems, by proving that they satisfy the whole Kähler package of Hodge theory, including the Poincaré duality, the hard Lefschetz theorem, and the Hodge–Riemann bilinear relations.

Theorem 1.2. *For any expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ in an arbitrary Coxeter system (W, S) , there exists a sequence $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^n$ with $c_i > 0$, such that the following Kähler package holds with respect to $\ell_n = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} c_i x_i \in \overline{\text{BS}}^1(\underline{w})$.*

- (1) (Poincaré duality theorem) *For every non-negative $k \leq n/2$, the bilinear pairing defined by*

$$\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w}) \times \overline{\text{BS}}^{n-k}(\underline{w}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (\eta_1, \eta_2) \longmapsto \deg(\eta_1 \eta_2)$$

*is non-degenerate, where the degree isomorphism $\deg : \overline{\text{BS}}^n(\underline{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by taking the coefficient of the monomial $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$.*²

- (2) (Hard Lefschetz theorem) *For every non-negative $k \leq n/2$, the multiplication map*

$$\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w}) \longrightarrow \overline{\text{BS}}^{n-k}(\underline{w}), \quad \eta \longmapsto \ell_n^{n-2k} \eta$$

is an isomorphism.

¹This means that the generating polynomials of the defining ideal split into a product of linear factors.

²In geometric setting, this bilinear pairing coincides with the Poincaré pairing, defined by taking cup product of two cohomology classes and evaluating on the fundamental class.

- (3) (*Hodge–Riemann relations*) For every non-negative $k \leq n/2$, the bilinear form defined by

$$\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w}) \times \overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (\eta_1, \eta_2) \longmapsto \deg(\ell_n^{n-2k} \eta_1 \eta_2)$$

is $(-1)^k$ -definite when restricted to the primitive subspace

$$P_{\ell_n}^k = \ker(\ell_n^{n-2k+1}) \subset \overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w}).$$

After completing our work, we became aware of the paper [27]. In their study, the authors considered the Bott–Samelson ring for a finite reflection group (generated by reflections of finite order) over a field. They computed a presentation of the ring and showed that it has the strong Lefschetz property. Their motivation stemmed from questions regarding embeddings of complete intersections and the inheritance of the strong Lefschetz property. In contrast, the aim of the present paper is to study the Bott–Samelson ring for general Coxeter groups, which, of course, includes infinite ones. By focusing on this setting, we achieve a more uniform and concrete presentation determined by the Coxeter data, which implies the combinatorial invariance. Additionally, we prove the Koszul property, provide a quadratic (reduced) Gröbner basis, and establish the whole Kähler package, especially the Hodge–Riemann bilinear relations, which were not addressed in their paper.

One of the motivations of this paper is the hope of the first author for understanding and explaining the parallels between the world of Coxeter groups and the world of matroids discovered recently by several people. Given a (complex) hyperplane arrangement, the (now-called) “matroid Schubert variety” is a natural compactification of the hyperplane arrangement complement, which is usually singular. De Concini and Procesi [10] constructed canonical resolutions of matroid Schubert varieties called the wonderful models. Feichtner and Yuzvinsky [21] computed a presentation of the cohomology ring of the wonderful model which depends only on the underlying combinatorial (that is, “matroid”) structure, hence developing a combinatorial cohomology theory for matroids known today as the Chow ring of a matroid. Adiprasito, Huh, and Katz [2] proved that the Chow ring of any matroid satisfies the Hodge theory, regardless of whether it has a geometric origin (that is, comes from a hyperplane arrangement) or not, hence developing a “smooth” combinatorial Hodge theory for matroid. They used the Hodge–Riemann relations to resolve the Heron–Rota–Welsh conjecture for arbitrary matroid. Dot-senko [12] conjectured that the Chow ring of any matroid is Koszul, which is proven by Matthew Mastroeni and Jason McCullough [26]. This paper can be seen as to exploit a parallel combinatorial cohomology theory and a “smooth” combinatorial Hodge theory for arbitrary Coxeter groups. We hope that this paper could shed some light on the comparison of the two worlds and might be helpful in pursuing some benefits from each other, see 6 for more directions on this perspective.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the notations and some preliminary results. In Section 3, we compute the presentation of Bott–Samelson ring. In Section 4, we prove that Bott–Samelson rings are Koszul and provide a quadratic Gröbner basis for the defining ideal of relations. In Section 5, we prove that Bott–Samelson rings satisfy Kähler packages. In Section 6, we present some future directions and state some open questions.

Acknowledgments. The first author would like to express his gratitude to Geordie Williamson for valuable communications and would like to thank Ben Elias for helpful discussions. This research was carried out as part of the PACE program in the summer of 2024 at Peking University, Beijing. We thank Yibo Gao who organized the program and the university for providing a nurturing academic atmosphere that significantly contributed to the progression of the research.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we collect our notations and some preliminary results for later use. A good reference for this section is [15, Part I].

2.1. Coxeter Systems and the Geometric Representation. A *Coxeter system* (W, S) is a group W and a finite set $S \subset W$ of generators of W , such that

$$W = \langle s \in S \mid (st)^{m_{st}} = \text{id for any } s, t \in S \text{ with } m_{st} < \infty \rangle,$$

where $m_{ss} = 1$ for each $s \in S$, and $m_{st} = m_{ts} \in \{2, 3, \dots\} \cup \{\infty\}$ for $s \neq t \in S$. It follows that m_{st} is precisely the order of the element st , and when $m_{st} = \infty$, there is no corresponding relation between s and t . The elements of S are called *simple reflections*. For each $w \in W$, one can write $w = s_1 \cdots s_k$ for some $s_1, \dots, s_k \in S$. The sequence (s_1, \dots, s_k) is called an *expression* or a *word* for w . We use a notational shorthand \underline{w} to denote the sequence (s_1, \dots, s_k) , when the product $s_1 \cdots s_k$ is equal to w . The *length* of w , denoted by $\ell(w)$, is the minimal k for which w admits an expression (s_1, \dots, s_k) . Any expression for w with this minimal length $\ell(w)$ is called a *reduced expression*. In particular, $\ell(w) = 0$ if and only if $w = \text{id}$.

Let V be the real vector space with basis $\{\alpha_s \mid s \in S\}$ indexed by the finite set S of simple reflections of a Coxeter system (W, S) . These basis elements α_s are known as *simple roots*. Equip V with the symmetric bilinear form $(-, -)$ determined by

$$(\alpha_s, \alpha_t) = -\cos \frac{\pi}{m_{st}}.$$

When $m_{st} = \infty$, we use the convention that $\frac{\pi}{m_{st}} = 0$, so that in this case $(\alpha_s, \alpha_t) = -1$. Note that $(\alpha_s, \alpha_s) = 1$. The *geometric representation* of the Coxeter system (W, S) is the representation V of W defined to be the action of W on V , where each simple reflection $s \in S$ acts by reflection along α_s . That is,

$$s(\lambda) = \lambda - 2(\lambda, \alpha_s)\alpha_s, \quad \forall \lambda \in V$$

It follows that the symmetric bilinear form $(-, -)$ on V is W -invariant for the geometric representation. It is known that for any Coxeter system (W, S) , the geometric representation is faithful, and W is finite if and only if the bilinear form $(-, -)$ is positive definite.

2.2. Invariant polynomials and Demazure operators. For a \mathbb{Z} -graded vector space $M := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} M^i$, we use the notation $M(d)$ for the graded vector space with graded pieces $M(i)^j := M^{i+j}$.³

Fix a Coxeter system (W, S) , let

$$R = \text{Sym}(V) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \text{Sym}^i(V)$$

³That is, if one imagine the graded pieces of M arranged vertically, then $M(1)$ is obtained by shifting M down.

be the symmetric algebra of the geometric representation V , we view it as a graded algebra with the convention⁴ that $\deg(V) = 1$. In other words, R is the polynomial ring

$$R = \mathbb{R}[\alpha_s \mid s \in S]$$

with grading

$$\deg \alpha_s = 1$$

for all $s \in S$. The W -action on V induces a W -action on R via

$$w \cdot \prod_{s \in S} \alpha_s^{k_s} = \prod_{s \in S} (w(\alpha_s))^{k_s}$$

on monomials, and then extended linearly to polynomials.

Let R^W be the subring of W -invariant polynomials in R and let R^s be the subring of s -invariant polynomials in R . It is not difficult to show that for every $s \in S$, R^s is generated by α_s^2 and the elements

$$\alpha_t + \left(\cos \frac{\pi}{m_{st}} \right) \alpha_s \quad \text{for all } t \in S \setminus \{s\}$$

For $s \in S$, the *Demazure operator* ∂_s (also called the *BGG operator*, or the *divided difference operator*) is the graded map

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_s : R &\rightarrow R^s(-1), \\ f &\mapsto \frac{f - s(f)}{\alpha_s}. \end{aligned}$$

It is not difficult to see that ∂_s is well-defined.

The Demazure operator is useful in constructing projection operators in a decomposition of R as an graded R^s -module into a direct sum $R \simeq R^s \oplus R^s \cdot \alpha_s$ into s -invariants and s -anti-invariants, given by

$$\begin{aligned} (2.1) \quad f &= \frac{f + s(f)}{2} + \frac{f - s(f)}{2} \\ &= \partial_s \left(f \frac{\alpha_s}{2} \right) + \frac{\alpha_s}{2} \partial_s(f). \end{aligned}$$

We collect here some important properties of Demazure operators that will be used later.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $s \in S$. Then ∂_s satisfies the following properties.*

- (1) $\partial_s(\alpha_t) = -2 \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{st}}$ for any $t \in S$. In particular, $\partial_s(\alpha_s) = 2$.
- (2) Let $p_s : R \simeq R^s \oplus R^s \cdot \alpha_s \rightarrow R^s$ be the projection map, that is, for $f \in R$ we have $p_s(f) = \frac{f + s(f)}{2}$. Then $p_s(\alpha_t) = \alpha_t + \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{st}} \alpha_s$.
- (3) ∂_s is an R^s -bimodule map.

Proof. One directly checks that

$$\partial_s(\alpha_t) = \frac{\alpha_t - (\alpha_t + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{st}} \alpha_s)}{\alpha_s} = -2 \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{st}}$$

and

$$p_s(\alpha_t) = \frac{\alpha_t + (\alpha_t + 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{st}} \alpha_s)}{2} = \alpha_t + \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{st}} \alpha_s.$$

⁴Note that our convention is different with the one used in [15].

For $f \in R$ and $g \in R^s$, $\partial_s(gf) = \frac{gf-s(gf)}{2} = \frac{gf-g \cdot s(f)}{2} = g\partial_s(f)$ and similarly $\partial_s(fg) = \partial_s(f)g$, which shows that ∂_s is an R^s -bimodule map. \square

2.3. Bott–Samelson rings as iterated tensor products. Given an expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ in a Coxeter system (W, S) , the corresponding *Bott–Samelson ring*, denoted by $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$, is the graded \mathbb{R} -algebra given by

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w}) &:= \mathbb{R} \otimes_R R \otimes_{R^{s_1}} R \otimes_{R^{s_2}} \cdots \otimes_{R^{s_n}} R \\ &= \mathbb{R} \otimes_{R^{s_1}} R \otimes_{R^{s_2}} \cdots \otimes_{R^{s_n}} R, \end{aligned}$$

where the R -module structure on \mathbb{R} is given by natural quotient map $R \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

The multiplicative structure is defined component-wise by

$$(a \otimes f_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes f_n) \cdot (b \otimes g_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes g_n) = (ab) \otimes (f_1 g_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes (f_n g_n),$$

where $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f_1, \dots, f_n, g_1, \dots, g_n \in R$.

Remark 2.2. When (W, S) is a crystallographic Coxeter system, that is, $m_{st} \in \{2, 3, 4, 6, \infty\}$ for all $s \neq t \in S$ (for example, when W is a Weyl group or affine Weyl group), one can define a representation of W over \mathbb{Z} rather than over \mathbb{R} by modifying the simple roots in the geometric representation with possibly different lengths (for example, simple roots of non-simply-laced type Lie algebras). This integral representation can be realized on the Cartan subalgebra of the corresponding complex semisimple Lie algebra. However, as W -representations, this representation is isomorphic to the geometric representation over \mathbb{R} . It is not difficult to see that if one uses this representation other than the geometric representation to define the Bott–Samelson ring, one would get an isomorphic ring. Since the geometric representation behaves in a uniform way for all Coxeter systems, we stick to the geometric representation to define the Bott–Samelson ring.

Remark 2.3. When (W, S) is a crystallographic Coxeter system, a theorem of Soergel says that the Bott–Samelson ring is isomorphic to the cohomology ring of the corresponding Bott–Samelson variety. This observation is the starting point of the beautiful theory of Soergel bimodules [29, 30, 31, 32].

3. A QUADRATIC PRESENTATION AND GENERATORS-RELATIONS DEFINITION OF BOTT–SAMELSON RINGS FOR ARBITRARY COXETER GROUPS

Given an expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ in a Coxeter system (W, S) , define the simple tensor $x_i \in \overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ as

$$x_i = 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \alpha_{s_i} \otimes \cdots \otimes 1,$$

where α_{s_i} is in the $(i+1)$ -th plot. We will give $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ a quadratic presentation in the last of this section, and we will use it as the generators-relations definition of the Bott–Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$.

For convenience and intuition, we may use $a \mid_{s_1} f_1 \mid_{s_2} \cdots \mid_{s_n} f_n$ as in [15] instead of $a \otimes f_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes f_n$, with “ \mid ” meaning a “wall” allowing only R^s -invariant elements to pass through. Also in our case, for $i \in [n]$, we denote \mid_i to mean \mid_{s_i} , and similarly

$$\partial_i := \partial_{s_i}, \quad p_i := p_{s_i} \quad \text{and} \quad r_{ij} := \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{s_i s_j}}.$$

For a homogeneous polynomial $f \in R$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$, by repeatedly using the decomposition (2.1) to move f all the way to the left, we get

$$1|1| \cdots 1 \mid f \mid 1 \cdots 1 \mid 1 = 1 \cdot f_0 |1|1 \cdots + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \left(\sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq m-1} d_{i_1 \cdots i_k}^{m-1}(f) x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_k} \right),$$

where $f_0 = p_1 \circ p_2 \circ \cdots \circ p_{m-1}(f)$ and

$$d_{i_1 \cdots i_k}^{m-1}(f) = p_1 \circ \cdots \circ p_{i_1-1} \circ \frac{\partial_{i_1}}{2} \circ p_{i_1+1} \circ \cdots \circ p_{i_2-1} \circ \frac{\partial_{i_2}}{2} \circ \cdots (f) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The above equations hold because repeatedly using the decomposition (2.1) to move f all the way to the left creates 2^{m-1} terms. In each time of the decompositions, the invariant part $p_i(-)$ cross the wall, while $\frac{\partial_i}{2}(-)$ in the anti-invariant part cross the wall leaving α_i behind. The indices $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq m-1$ record the elements of the subset of $[2]^{m-1}$ choosing anti-invariant part.

Note that $1 \cdot f_0 = 0$. If f is of degree 1, then $d_{i_1 \cdots i_k}^{m-1}(f) = 0$ if $k \geq 2$. In this case, we write

$$1|1| \cdots 1 \mid f \mid 1 \cdots = \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} d_l^{m-1}(f) x_l.$$

By definition, one directly checks that

$$d_l^{m-1}(f) = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial_{m-1} f}{2} & , l = m-1; \\ \frac{\partial_l}{2} (p_{l+1} \circ \cdots \circ p_{m-1}(f)) & , l < m-1. \end{cases}$$

We are especially concerned with the case that $f = \alpha_{s_m}$. Actually, we have the following computation.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $l < m-1$, then*

$$(3.1) \quad p_{l+1} \circ \cdots \circ p_{m-1}(\alpha_{s_m}) = \sum_{k=l+1}^{m-1} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{m-1-k} \sum_{k=j_0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_s < j_{s+1}=m} \prod_{\alpha=0}^s r_{j_\alpha j_{\alpha+1}} \right) \alpha_{s_k} + \alpha_{s_m}$$

and

$$(3.2) \quad d_l^{m-1}(\alpha_{s_m}) = - \sum_{s=0}^{m-1-l} \left(\sum_{l=j_0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_s < j_{s+1}=m} \prod_{\alpha=0}^s r_{j_\alpha j_{\alpha+1}} \right).$$

In addition, (3.2) holds when $l = m-1$.

Proof. We prove (3.1) by induction. Firstly, (3.1) holds when $l = m-2$: $p_{m-1}(\alpha_{s_m}) = \alpha_{s_m} + r_{m-1, m} \alpha_{s_{m-1}}$. Suppose (3.1) holds for $l < m-1$, then using (2.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & p_l \circ \cdots \circ p_{m-1}(\alpha_{s_m}) \\ &= \sum_{k=l+1}^{m-1} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{m-1-k} \sum_{k=j_0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_s < j_{s+1}=m} \prod_{\alpha=0}^s r_{j_\alpha j_{\alpha+1}} \right) (\alpha_{s_k} + r_{lk} \alpha_{s_l}) + (\alpha_{s_m} + r_{lm} \alpha_{s_l}) \\ &= \sum_{k=l}^{m-1} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{m-1-k} \sum_{k=j_0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_s < j_{s+1}=m} \prod_{\alpha=0}^s r_{j_\alpha j_{\alpha+1}} \right) \alpha_{s_k} + \alpha_{s_m}, \end{aligned}$$

implying (3.1) holds for $l-1$. Hence (3.1) holds by induction.

Clearly (3.2) holds when $l = m - 1$ by Lemma 2.1(1). If $l < m - 1$, using (3.1) and Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_l^{m-1}(\alpha_{s_m}) &= \frac{\partial_l}{2} \circ p_{l+1} \circ \cdots \circ p_{m-1}(\alpha_{s_m}) \\ &= - \sum_{k=l+1}^{m-1} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{m-1-k} \sum_{k=j_0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_s < j_{s+1} = m} r_{lk} \prod_{\alpha=0}^s r_{j_\alpha j_{\alpha+1}} \right) - r_{lm} \\ &= - \sum_{s=0}^{m-1-l} \left(\sum_{l=j_0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_s < j_{s+1} = m} \prod_{\alpha=0}^s r_{j_\alpha j_{\alpha+1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

An observation goes as follows: consider the matrix $\tilde{R}_{\underline{w}} = (\tilde{r}_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$, where

$$\tilde{r}_{ij} := \begin{cases} 0, & i \geq j; \\ r_{ij} = \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{s_i s_j}}, & i < j. \end{cases}$$

Then for $s+1 \in [m-l]$, $\sum_{l=j_0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_s < j_{s+1} = m} \prod_{\alpha=0}^s r_{j_\alpha j_{\alpha+1}}$ is exactly the (l, m) -entry of $\tilde{R}_{\underline{w}}^{s+1}$. Therefore $-d_l^{m-1}(\alpha_{s_m})$ is the (l, m) -entry of $(\tilde{R}_{\underline{w}} + \tilde{R}_{\underline{w}}^2 + \cdots + \tilde{R}_{\underline{w}}^{m-l})$. Since $\tilde{R}_{\underline{w}}$ is an upper-triangular nilpotent matrix with nilpotent index n , $-d_l^{m-1}(\alpha_{s_m})$ is the (l, m) -th entry of

$$(3.3) \quad Q_{\underline{w}} = (q_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} := \tilde{R}_{\underline{w}} + \tilde{R}_{\underline{w}}^2 + \cdots + \tilde{R}_{\underline{w}}^n.$$

We note that $|q_{lm}| \leq \sum_{s=0}^{m-1-l} \binom{m-1-l}{s} = 2^{m-1-l}$. Besides, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$, then $x_m^2 = \left(\sum_{l=1}^{m-1} q_{lm} x_l \right)^2$ in $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} x_m^2 &= 1 \Big| \begin{array}{c} 1 \cdots 1 \\ 1 \quad m-1 \end{array} \Big| \alpha_{s_m}^2 \Big| \begin{array}{c} m \\ m \end{array} \Big| \cdots = \left(1 \Big| \begin{array}{c} 1 \cdots 1 \\ 1 \quad m-1 \end{array} \Big| \alpha_{s_m} \Big| \begin{array}{c} m \\ m \end{array} \Big| \cdots \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_{l=1}^{m-1} d_l^{m-1}(\alpha_{s_m}) x_l \right)^2 = \left(\sum_{l=1}^{m-1} q_{lm} x_l \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem-Definition 3.3. *For the expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ in an arbitrary Coxeter system (W, S) , the Bott-Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$, defined in (2.2), has the following quadratic presentation, which is served as the generators-relations definition of the Bott-Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$:*

$$(3.4) \quad \overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) \cong \frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]}{(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n)},$$

where $\{q_m \mid m = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is given by

$$q_m := x_m^2 - \left(\sum_{l=1}^{m-1} q_{lm} x_l \right)^2 = x_m^2 - \sum_{i,j=1}^{m-1} (2 - \delta_{ij}) q_{im} q_{jm} x_i x_j.$$

Here q_{lm} is defined in (3.3) and δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta.

Proof. From the discussions above, we have a well-defined graded algebra homomorphism from $\frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]}{(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n)} \rightarrow \overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$ sending x_i to the simple tensor $1 \otimes 1 \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{s_i} \otimes \dots \otimes 1$. Since $R \simeq R^{s_n} \oplus R^{s_n} \cdot \alpha_s$ as graded left R^{s_n} -modules, we have the following isomorphism as graded real vector spaces:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) &= \mathbb{R} \otimes_R R \otimes_{R^{s_1}} R \otimes_{R^{s_2}} \dots \otimes_{R^{s_n}} R \\ &\cong \mathbb{R} \otimes_{R^{s_1}} R \otimes \dots \otimes_{R^{s_n}} (R^{s_n} \oplus R^{s_n} \cdot \alpha_s) \\ &\cong \overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}) \oplus \overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1})(-1), \end{aligned}$$

which has dimension 2^n by induction and has graded basis $\{1 \otimes \alpha_{s_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \otimes \alpha_{s_2}^{\varepsilon_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \alpha_{s_n}^{\varepsilon_n} \mid \varepsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}, i \in [n]\}$. Also it is not difficult to see that $\frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]}{(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n)}$ has real dimension 2^n as well, with $\{x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \dots x_n^{\varepsilon_n} \mid \varepsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}, i \in [n]\}$ being a graded basis, see also Proposition 4.6. Since we have an \mathbb{R} -algebra homomorphism between \mathbb{R} -algebras of the same real dimension mapping basis to basis bijectively, it is a graded \mathbb{R} -algebra isomorphism. \square

Example 3.4. When $n = 1$, $\overline{\text{BS}}(s_1) \cong \frac{\mathbb{R}[x]}{(x^2)}$. When $n = 2$, $\overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2) \cong \frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2]}{(x_1^2, x_2^2)}$.

When $n = 3$, for the expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$ in a Coxeter system (W, S) , the Bott-Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ has the following presentation:

$$\overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, s_3) \cong \frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, x_3]}{\left(x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2 - 2 \left(\cos \frac{\pi}{m_{s_1 s_3}} \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{s_2 s_3}} + \cos \frac{\pi}{m_{s_1 s_2}} \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{m_{s_2 s_3}} \right) x_1 x_2 \right)}.$$

The above theorem has the following immediate corollary, which says that the Bott-Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ only depends on m_{st} 's for those simple reflections appearing in the expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$. This is not obvious from the iterated tensor products definition of $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$, since the geometric representations of two different Coxeter groups have nothing related at all!

Corollary 3.5. (Combinatorial invariance) Let $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ be an expression in a Coxeter system (W, S) , and $\underline{w}' = (s'_1, \dots, s'_n)$ be another expression in a possibly different Coxeter system (W', S') , if the two matrices $M_w := (m_{s_i s_j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n}$ and $M_{w'} := (m_{s'_i s'_j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n}$ are equal, then we have

$$\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w}) \cong \overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w}').$$

Remark 3.6. It is natural to ask if two arbitrary expressions of the same length are related by braid relations (that is, one can apply a sequence of braid relations to obtain one from the other), whether or not the associated Bott-Samelson rings are isomorphic. It is straightforward to verify that if the length of the expressions are at most 3, or if the two expressions involve only two distinct simple reflections s and t appearing alternatively for $m_{st} < \infty$ times related by a single braid relation, then

the corresponding Bott–Samelson rings are isomorphic. However, it is not always the case in general. For example, consider the Coxeter system $(S_3, \{s_1, s_2\})$ and two expressions $\underline{w} = (s_1, s_2, s_1, s_2)$ and $\underline{w}' = (s_1, s_1, s_2, s_1)$. Then one checks that

$$\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w}) \cong \frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]}{(x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2 + \frac{3}{4}x_1x_2, x_4^2 - \frac{3}{8}x_1x_2 + \frac{3}{8}x_1x_3 + \frac{3}{4}x_2x_3)}$$

and

$$\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w}') \cong \frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]}{(x_1^2, x_2^2, x_3^2, x_4^2 + \frac{3}{4}x_2x_3)}.$$

One can show that they can not be isomorphic as graded \mathbb{R} -algebras and we leave it as an exercise to the interested readers.

4. BOTT–SAMELSON RINGS ARE KOSZUL AND A QUADRATIC GRÖBNER BASIS

In this section we prove that Bott–Samelson rings are Koszul and use the presentation (3.4) to construct a quadratic (reduced) Gröbner basis for the defining ideal of relations.

We expand the quadratic term in (1.2):

$$(4.1) \quad q_m = x_m^2 - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m-1} c_{i,j}^m x_i x_j,$$

where $c_{i,j}^m = (2 - \delta_{ij})q_{im}q_{jm}$. Since $|q_{lm}| \leq 2^{m-l-1}$, $|c_{i,j}^m| \leq 2^{1-\delta_{ij}} \cdot 2^{2m-i-j-2} < 4^m$.

To show Bott–Samelson rings are Koszul, we need the following definition of the complete intersection ring.

Definition 4.1. *Let A be a finitely generated algebra over a field k . Say A is a complete intersection ring, if $A \cong k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(f_1, \dots, f_l)$, where the polynomial sequence (f_1, \dots, f_l) is a regular sequence in $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, which means that $f_1 \neq 0$ and f_{i+1} is not a zero divisor in $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(f_1, \dots, f_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq l-1$.*

A finitely generated algebra A over a field k is said to be a *quadratic algebra* if $A \cong k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(f_1, \dots, f_l)$ and all f_i with $1 \leq i \leq l$ are quadratic forms over k . Clearly, the Bott–Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ is a quadratic algebra over \mathbb{R} .

Now we introduce the definition of Koszul algebra.

Definition 4.2. *A Koszul algebra A over k is a graded k -algebra such that the ground field k has a linear (graded) free resolution, that is, there is an exact sequence*

$$(4.2) \quad \cdots \rightarrow (A(-i))^{b_i} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow (A(-1))^{b_1} \rightarrow A \rightarrow k \rightarrow 0$$

for some non-negative integers b_i . Recall that $A(-j)$ is the graded algebra A with grading shifted up by j . The chain maps are all given by matrices with entries being 0 or linear forms after a choice of bases.

A typical example of a Koszul algebra is a polynomial ring over a field, for which the Koszul complex gives the minimal graded free resolution of the ground field.

It is well-known that any Koszul algebra is a quadratic algebra, see [5, Proposition 1.2.3]. Conversely, a theorem of Tate [33] says that any quadratic complete intersection k -algebra is Koszul, see also [8, Remark 1.12.] for an easier argument.

Now we prove that any Bott–Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ is Koszul.

Theorem 4.3. *For the expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ in an arbitrary Coxeter system (W, S) , the Bott–Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$, defined in (3.4), is a Koszul \mathbb{R} -algebra.*

Proof. By Tate’s Theorem, we only need to verify that, for arbitrary $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ as above, $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ is a complete intersection (since it is clear quadratic), that is, we need to show that (q_1, \dots, q_n) is a regular sequence in $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. We proceed from definition and only need to show that q_{i+1} is not a zero divisor in $Q_i := \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(q_1, \dots, q_i)$.

Note that $Q_i = (\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_i]/(q_1, \dots, q_i))[x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n]$, since q_1, \dots, q_i are polynomials with indeterminates x_1, \dots, x_i . In terms of expression (4.1), we can write q_{i+1} as $x_{i+1}^2 + s_i$, with $s_i \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_i]$. We order polynomials in Q_i by graded (with respect to the total degree in x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) lexicographical order induced by $x_n > \dots > x_{i+2} > x_{i+1}$.

Denote the ideal $S_i := (q_1, \dots, q_i)\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, which is the equivalent class of 0 in Q_i . Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that q_{i+1} is a zero divisor in Q_i . In other words, there exists some $g \in Q_i$ but $g \notin S_i$ such that $gq_{i+1} \in S_i$. Write

$$g = \sum_{J=(j_1, \dots, j_{n-i})} g_J x_{i+1}^{j_1} \cdots x_n^{j_{n-i}},$$

where $g_J \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_i]$ and we can assume all of them are not in S_i by removing those in S_i since S_i is an ideal. Similarly, gq_{i+1} is in the form of

$$\sum_{J=(j_1, \dots, j_{n-i})} f_J x_{i+1}^{j_1} \cdots x_n^{j_{n-i}}$$

with all $f_J \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_i]$. One can easily deduce from $gq_{i+1} \in S_i$ that $f_J \in S_i$ for all J .

Let $g_0 = g_{J_0} x_{i+1}^{j_{0,1}} \cdots x_n^{j_{0,n-i}}$ be the leading monomial of g with respect to the above graded lexicographical order. According to the expression (4.1), the leading monomial of gq_{i+1} equals $g_{J_0} x_{i+1}^{j_{0,1}+2} \cdots x_n^{j_{0,n-i}}$. However, g_{J_0} here, inherited from g_0 , does not belong to S_i , which contradicts to the fact that $f_J \in S_i$ for all J . \square

Example 4.4. *Consider an expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n)$ in a Coxeter system (W, S) such that all m_{s_i, s_j} ’s are equal to 2, that is, any s_i and s_j commute if $i \neq j$. Then the Bott–Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ has the following presentation:*

$$\overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n) \cong \frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]}{(x_1^2, x_2^2, \dots, x_n^2)}.$$

It is well known that this ring is Koszul, see, for example [20, Example 6.3].

Inductively, using q_1, \dots, q_i to eliminate square terms x_1^2, \dots, x_i^2 in q_{i+1} for all i , we can get a class of new generators of the ideal (q_1, \dots, q_n) , denoted by $\{q'_1, \dots, q'_n\}$. We can express all of them as the following form:

$$(4.3) \quad q'_k = x_k^2 - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k-1} d_{i,j}^k x_i x_j, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

where $d_{i,j}^k$ ’s are some real numbers whose explicit values are not needed in this paper.

We claim the above $\{q'_1, \dots, q'_n\}$ gives a reduced Gröbner basis of the ideal (q_1, \dots, q_n) .

Definition 4.5. Let $A = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field k and fix a monomial ordering. Let I be an ideal of A and let G be a finite generating set of I . The set G is called a Gröbner basis of I (with respect to the monomial ordering) if the ideal generated by the leading monomials of the polynomials in I equals the ideal generated by the leading monomials of the polynomials in G . A Gröbner basis G is reduced if every leading monomial of the polynomials in G is monic and does not divide any other monomials of the polynomials in G .

It is known that reduced Gröbner basis of an ideal I (for a fixed monomial ordering) is unique [1, Theorem 1.8.7.] and the monomials in A that are not divided by any leading monomials of the polynomials in the reduced Gröbner basis form a basis of the k -vector space A/I [1, [Proposition 2.1.6.].

We have the following proposition, which gives another proof that the Bott–Samelson rings are Koszul, since it is well known that a quadratic algebra is Koszul if the defining ideal of relations have a quadratic Gröbner basis, see for example [22, Section 4]. Note that a quadratic complete intersection may not have a quadratic Gröbner basis with respect to any system of coordinates and any term order, see [14].

Proposition 4.6. $\{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ is a Gröbner basis and $\{q'_1, \dots, q'_n\}$ is the reduced Gröbner basis of the ideal (q_1, \dots, q_n) with respect to the lexicographical order induced by $x_n > \dots > x_2 > x_1$. As a corollary, $\frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]}{(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n)}$ has a basis $\{x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \dots x_n^{\varepsilon_n} \mid \varepsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}, i \in [n]\}$.

Proof. The leading monomial of q_k as well as q'_k is clearly x_k^2 . x_k^2 and x_j^2 with $k \neq j$ have no common factors except constants. Hence by [3, Lemma 5.66 and Theorem 5.68], the generating set $\{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$ and $\{q'_1, \dots, q'_n\}$ are both Gröbner bases.

For the monic quadratic x_k^2 in q'_k , all other monomials of the polynomials in $\{q'_1, \dots, q'_n\}$ are either x_j^2 with $j \neq k$ or $d_{i,l}^m x_i x_l$ with $i \neq l$. So $\{q'_1, \dots, q'_n\}$ satisfies the definition of reduced Gröbner basis. \square

5. HODGE THEORY OF BOTT–SAMELSON RINGS

In this section we prove that Bott–Samelson Rings satisfy properties in the Kähler package. We refer to [16, Section 2], [15, Chapter 17], and [23, Section 2] for these properties in the linear algebra context.

For the expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ in an arbitrary Coxeter system (W, S) , the Bott–Samelson ring $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ is a graded ring of the form (3.4). It has a graded basis $\{x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \dots x_n^{\varepsilon_n} \mid \varepsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}, i \in [n]\}$ when seen as a graded vector space over \mathbb{R} (see Proposition 4.6). So given any degree d homogeneous polynomial, it can be expressed uniquely as a real linear combination of some degree d elements in the above basis of $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$. In particular, any monomial with degree greater than n must be equal to 0 in $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$. Note that the map $\overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k) \hookrightarrow \overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ induced by the natural map $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_k] \longrightarrow \overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ is an embedding for any $k \leq n$, we will identify $\overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k)$ with its image in $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ under this embedding.

We define the degree map $\text{deg}: \overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by sending any $\eta \in \overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ to the coefficient of $x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$ when expressing η as an \mathbb{R} -linear combination of the above basis. We are ready to prove the Poincaré duality for $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2(1). For any $k \leq n/2$, we denote $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_n$ the bilinear pairing

$$\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w}) \times \overline{\text{BS}}^{n-k}(\underline{w}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

by associating a pair $(\eta_1, \eta_2) \in \overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ to $\deg(\eta_1 \eta_2)$.

We want to show that $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_n$ is non-degenerate for any $k \leq n/2$.

For an arbitrary subset I of $[n]$, we define $x^I := x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots x_n^{\varepsilon_n}$, where $\varepsilon_i = 1$ if $\varepsilon_i \in I$ and $\varepsilon_i = 0$ if $\varepsilon_i \notin I$. Note that we can rewrite the basis defined above as $B_n := \{x^I \mid I \subset [n]\}$ and one can easily see that a basis of $\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w})$ is $B_n^k := \{x^I \mid I \subset [n] \mid |I| = k\}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$.

For a pair of basis elements $(x^I, x^J) \in \overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w}) \times \overline{\text{BS}}^{n-k}(\underline{w})$, we claim that $\deg(x^I x^J) = 1$ if $J = [n] \setminus I$, $\deg(x^I x^J) = 0$ if otherwise. This claim implies the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_n$ is non-degenerate for all $k \leq n/2$, since we have dual basis under each pairing.

We prove the claim now. If $J = [n] \setminus I$, $x^I x^J$ is exactly $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$, so $\deg(x^I x^J) = 1$ by definition. For the remaining case, suppose t is the largest index such that $t \in I \cap J$, then $x^I x^J$ is of the form $x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots x_t^2 x_{t+1}^{\varepsilon_{t+1}} \cdots x_n^{\varepsilon_n}$, where $\varepsilon_{t+1}, \dots, \varepsilon_n \leq 1$ and $x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots x_t^2$ is of degree $\geq t$. We expand x_t^2 as a linear combination of $x_i x_j$'s with $i, j < t$ by (4.3). So $x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots x_t^2$ can be written as a linear combination of monomials with respect to x_1, \dots, x_{t-1} , and each of the monomial has degree $\geq t$. Hence $x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots x_t^2$ is equal to 0 in $\overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{t-1})$. Identify $\overline{\text{BS}}(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{t-1})$ with its image under the embedding above, then $x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots x_t^2 = 0$ also holds in $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$, which implies $x^I x^J = x_1^{\varepsilon_1} x_2^{\varepsilon_2} \cdots x_t^2 x_{t+1}^{\varepsilon_{t+1}} \cdots x_n^{\varepsilon_n} = 0 \in \overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$. \square

To complete the proof of hard Lefschetz theorem (hL) and Hodge–Riemann relations (HR), we need the following lemma (in our degree convention), see [16, Lemma 5.2] and [15, Lemma 18.31].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $V = \bigoplus_{i=0}^n V^i$ and $W = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{n-1} W^i$ be two finite-dimensional graded vector spaces, equipped with graded non-degenerate forms and Lefschetz operators $(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V, L_V)$ and $(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_W, L_W)$ satisfying the hard Lefschetz theorem. Assume that for each i , $\dim V^i = \dim W^i + \dim W^{i-1}$ and if for all $k \leq n/2$, the signature of $(\cdot, \cdot)_{L_W}$ on $P_{L_W}^k$ equals the signature of $(\cdot, \cdot)_{L_V}$ on all of V^k , then $\text{HR}(V, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V, L_V)$ and $\text{HR}(W, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_W, L_W)$ are equivalent.*

Proof of 1.2(2)(3). We use induction on $n = \ell(\underline{w})$. One directly checks that (hL) and (HR) are satisfied for any expression $\underline{w} = (s_1)$ in an arbitrary Coxeter system (W, S) whenever $c_1 > 0$. Fix any expression $\underline{w} = (s_1, \dots, s_n)$ in a Coxeter system (W, S) and $k \leq n/2$, we denote (s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}) by \underline{w}' . By induction, there exists $\{c_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ with $c_i > 0$, such that (hL) and (HR) hold in $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w}')$ with respect to $\ell_{n-1} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} c_i x_i$.

Since we have proved the Poincaré duality for $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$, the Hodge–Riemann relations for $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$ are stronger and imply the hard Lefschetz theorem for $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w})$. By Lemma 5.1 and induction, it suffices to show that there exists some $c_n > 0$, such that for all $k \leq n/2$, $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\ell_{n-1}}$ on $P_{\ell_{n-1}}^k$ has the same signature as $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\ell_n}$ on $\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w})$.

If $k = n/2$, then $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\ell_{n-1}}$ has signature 0 on $P_{\ell_{n-1}}^k$ since $P_{\ell_{n-1}}^k = 0$ for $\overline{\text{BS}}(\underline{w}')$, and the Gram matrix of $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\ell_n}$ (which is actually the Poincaré pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and is

independent of ℓ_n) on $\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w})$ with respect to basis B_n^k is

$$\begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & & \ddots & \\ & 1 & & \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

(by orthogonality of the basis), which is of signature 0.

Now suppose $k < n/2$, we have

$$\ell_n^{n-2k} = (\ell_{n-1} + c_n x_n)^{n-2k} = \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k} + (n-2k)c_n x_n \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} + c_n^2 \tilde{\ell}_n,$$

where $\tilde{\ell}_n \in \overline{\text{BS}}^{n-2k-2}(\underline{w})$ depends polynomially on c_n . We decompose $\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w})$ into the direct sum of three subspaces: $P_{\ell_{n-1}}^k$, $\ell_{n-1}(\overline{\text{BS}}^{k-1}(\underline{w}'))$ and $\overline{\text{BS}}^{k-1}(\underline{w}')x_n$. That is,

$$\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w}) = P_{\ell_{n-1}}^k \oplus \ell_{n-1}(\overline{\text{BS}}^{k-1}(\underline{w}')) \oplus \overline{\text{BS}}^{k-1}(\underline{w}')x_n.$$

Choose bases B'_1 and B'_2 of $P_{\ell_{n-1}}^k$ and $\overline{\text{BS}}^{k-1}(\underline{w}')$, respectively. Then $B' = B'_1 \cup \ell_{n-1}B'_2 \cup B'_2x_n$ forms a basis of $\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w})$. Here $\ell_{n-1}B'_2 := \{\ell_{n-1}\eta \mid \eta \in B'_2\}$ and B'_2x_n is similarly defined.

Now consider the bilinear form $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\ell_n}$ on $\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w})$.

For $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in B'_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta_1, \eta_2)_{\ell_n} &= \left\langle \left(\ell_{n-1}^{n-2k} + (n-2k)c_n x_n \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} + c_n^2 \tilde{\ell}_n \right) \eta_1, \eta_2 \right\rangle_n \\ (5.1) \quad &= (n-2k)c_n \langle \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} \eta_1 \cdot x_n, \eta_2 \rangle_n + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle_n \\ &= (n-2k)c_n \langle \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle_{n-1} + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle_n \\ &= (n-2k)c_n (\eta_1, \eta_2)_{\ell_{n-1}} + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle_n. \end{aligned}$$

The second equation follows from that $\ell_{n-1}^{n-2k} \eta_1 = 0$ since $\eta_1 \in P_{\ell_{n-1}}^k$.

For $\eta_1 \in B'_1$ and $\eta_2 \in B'_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2)_{\ell_n} &= \left\langle \left(\ell_{n-1}^{n-2k} + (n-2k)c_n x_n \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} + c_n^2 \tilde{\ell}_n \right) \eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2 \right\rangle_n \\ (5.2) \quad &= (n-2k)c_n \langle \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k} \eta_1 \cdot x_n, \eta_2 \rangle_n + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2 \rangle_n \\ &= c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2 \rangle_n \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta_1, \eta_2 x_n)_{\ell_n} &= \left\langle \left(\ell_{n-1}^{n-2k} + (n-2k)c_n x_n \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} + c_n^2 \tilde{\ell}_n \right) \eta_1, \eta_2 x_n \right\rangle_n \\ (5.3) \quad &= (n-2k)c_n \langle \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} \eta_1 \cdot x_n, \eta_2 \cdot x_n \rangle_n + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \eta_1, \eta_2 x_n \rangle_n \\ &= c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \eta_1, \eta_2 x_n \rangle_n. \end{aligned}$$

We note that the third equation of (5.3) holds due to the orthogonal basis of the Poincaré pairing and that both $\ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} \eta_1 x_n$ and $\eta_2 x_n$ contain x_n .

For $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in B'_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.4) \quad (\ell_{n-1}\eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2)_{\ell_n} &= \left\langle \left(\ell_{n-1}^{n-2k+1} + (n-2k)c_n x_n \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k} + c_n^2 \tilde{\ell}_n \ell_{n-1} \right) \eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2 \right\rangle_n \\
&= (n-2k)c_n \langle \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k} \eta_1 \cdot x_n, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2 \rangle_n + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \ell_{n-1} \eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2 \rangle_n \\
&= (n-2k)c_n \langle \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k+1} \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle_{n-1} + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \ell_{n-1} \eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2 \rangle_n \\
&= (n-2k)c_n (\eta_1, \eta_2)_{\ell_{n-1}} + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \ell_{n-1} \eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2 \rangle_n,
\end{aligned}$$

note that $\langle \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k+1} \eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2 \rangle_n = 0$ since neither $\ell_{n-1}^{n-2k+1} \eta_1$ nor $\ell_{n-1}\eta_2$ contains x_n . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.5) \quad (\ell_{n-1}\eta_1, \eta_2 x_n)_{\ell_n} &= \left\langle \left(\ell_{n-1}^{n-2k+1} + (n-2k)c_n x_n \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k} + c_n^2 \tilde{\ell}_n \ell_{n-1} \right) \eta_1, \eta_2 x_n \right\rangle_n \\
&= \langle \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k+1} \eta_1, \eta_2 x_n \rangle_n + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \ell_{n-1} \eta_1, \eta_2 x_n \rangle_n \\
&= \langle \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k+1} \eta_1, \eta_2 \rangle_{n-1} + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \ell_{n-1} \eta_1, \eta_2 x_n \rangle_n \\
&= (\eta_1, \eta_2)_{\ell_{n-1}} + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \ell_{n-1} \eta_1, \ell_{n-1}\eta_2 \rangle_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.6) \quad (\eta_1 x_n, \eta_2 x_n)_{\ell_n} &= \left\langle \left(\ell_{n-1}^{n-2k} + (n-2k)c_n x_n \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} + c_n^2 \tilde{\ell}_n \right) \eta_1 x_n, \eta_2 x_n \right\rangle_n \\
&= (n-2k)c_n \langle \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} x_n^2 \eta_1, \eta_2 x_n \rangle_n + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \eta_1 x_n, \eta_2 x_n \rangle_n \\
&= (n-2k)c_n \left\langle \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n-1} c_{i,j}^n x_i x_j \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} \eta_1, \eta_2 \right\rangle_{n-1} + c_n^2 \langle \tilde{\ell}_n \eta_1 x_n, \eta_2 x_n \rangle_n,
\end{aligned}$$

where $c_{i,j}^n$ is defined in (4.1).

From (5.1) to (5.6) above, we deduce that the Gram matrix of $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\ell_n}$ on $\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w})$ with respect to B' has the following form:

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{pmatrix} (n-2k)c_n G_{11} + c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{11} & c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{12} & c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{13} \\ c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{21} & (n-2k)c_n G_{22} + c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{22} & G_{23} + c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{23} \\ c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{31} & G_{32} + c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{32} & (n-2k)c_n G_{33} + c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{33} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The meanings of G_{ij} 's and \tilde{G}_{ij} 's are as follows: G_{11} is the Gram matrix of $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\ell_{n-1}}$ on $P_{\ell_{n-1}}^k$ with respect to the basis B'_1 . $G_{22} = G_{23} = G_{32}$ is the Gram matrix of $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\ell_{n-1}}$ with respect to the basis B'_2 . G_{33} is the Gram matrix of

$$\left\langle \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n-1} \ell_{n-1}^{n-2k-1} c_{i,j}^n x_i x_j \right) \cdot, \cdot \right\rangle_{n-1} : \overline{\text{BS}}^{k-1}(\underline{w}') \times \overline{\text{BS}}^{k-1}(\underline{w}') \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

with respect to the basis B'_2 . (\tilde{G}_{ij}) is the Gram matrix of $(\cdot, \cdot)_{\tilde{\ell}_n}$ on $\overline{\text{BS}}^k(\underline{w})$ with respect to the basis B' .

By construction, \tilde{G}_{ij} is bounded as $c_n \rightarrow 0$. By induction, G_{11} is $(-1)^k$ -definite. Hence so is $(n-2k)c_n G_{11} + c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{11}$ as $c_n \rightarrow 0$. We reduce the matrix displayed

in (5.7) to the following form after congruent transformations when $c_n > 0$ is sufficiently small:

$$\begin{pmatrix} (n-2k)c_n G_{11} + c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{11} & O & O \\ O & (n-2k)c_n G_{22} + c_n^2 M_{22} & G_{23} + c_n^2 M_{23} \\ O & G_{32} + c_n^2 M_{32} & (n-2k)c_n G_{33} + c_n^2 M_{33} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is not hard to see that M_{ij} 's are also bounded as $c_n \rightarrow 0$ by looking at the order of c_n . Let $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$ be the signature of a given matrix. When $c_n > 0$ is sufficiently small, we get

$$\text{sgn} \begin{pmatrix} (n-2k)c_n G_{22} + c_n^2 M_{22} & G_{23} + c_n^2 M_{23} \\ G_{32} + c_n^2 M_{32} & (n-2k)c_n G_{33} + c_n^2 M_{33} \end{pmatrix} = \text{sgn} \begin{pmatrix} O & G_{23} \\ G_{32} & O \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$

since by induction $G_{23} = G_{32}$ is an invertible symmetric matrix, and $\text{sgn} \begin{pmatrix} O & G_{23} \\ G_{32} & O \end{pmatrix} = 0$ is from basic linear algebra since we can assume $G_{23} = G_{32}$ is diagonal after changing of basis.

Also as $c_n \rightarrow 0$, the following identities of signatures hold:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{sgn} \begin{pmatrix} (n-2k)c_n G_{11} + c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{11} & O & O \\ O & (n-2k)c_n G_{22} + c_n^2 M_{22} & G_{23} + c_n^2 M_{23} \\ O & G_{32} + c_n^2 M_{32} & (n-2k)c_n G_{33} + c_n^2 M_{33} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \text{sgn} \left((n-2k)c_n G_{11} + c_n^2 \tilde{G}_{11} \right) \\ & \quad + \text{sgn} \begin{pmatrix} (n-2k)c_n G_{22} + c_n^2 M_{22} & G_{23} + c_n^2 M_{23} \\ G_{32} + c_n^2 M_{32} & (n-2k)c_n G_{33} + c_n^2 M_{33} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \text{sgn} G_{11}, \end{aligned}$$

which complete the proof. \square

6. QUESTIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We would like to finish with some questions and conjectures. Since the Kähler package and Koszulness are quite strong restrictions of a graded ring, we would like to ask the following

Question 6.1. *Do the Kähler package and Koszulness of the Bott–Samelson rings have some implications for the study of Coxeter systems?*

In [28], the authors studied the isomorphism problem for Schubert varieties in the full flag variety of Kac–Moody type and gave a beautiful necessary and sufficient criterion for when two such Schubert varieties (from potentially different flag varieties) are isomorphic, in terms of the Cartan matrix and reduced words for the indexing Weyl group elements. Since we prove that the cohomology ring of the Bott–Samelson variety is a combinatorial invariant which only depends on the word in the Weyl group, it is natural to ask the following

Question 6.2. *When are two Bott–Samelson varieties (associated with words from potentially different Weyl groups) isomorphic?*

In [19], the author studied a special fiber of the map of some Bott–Samelson variety into the flag variety in general types, known today as the “brick manifolds”. She showed that a subfamily of brick manifolds give a resolution of singularities for (closed) Richardson varieties X_u^v , which are certain (usually) singular varieties

formed by the intersection of Schubert varieties and opposite Schubert varieties within a flag variety. For $u = e$ and v a Coxeter element in type A, it is showed in [13] that the corresponding brick manifold is a non-commutative analogue of the compactified Deligne–Mumford moduli spaces $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n+1}$ and also can be viewed as projective wonderful model of certain hyperplane arrangement with respect to its minimal building set in the sense of de Concini and Procesi [10]. Therefore, the cohomology ring of the brick manifold in this special case is isomorphic to the Chow ring of intersection lattice of the hyperplane arrangement with respect to the minimal building set in the sense of Feichtner and Yuzvinsky [21], hence it satisfies the Kähler packages and it has a quadratic Gröbner basis hence is Koszul by a result of Coron on supersolvable lattices [9]. It is reasonable to hope that some analogs of the results in this paper hold in this more general setting.

Question 6.3. *Can one compute a presentation of the cohomology rings of brick manifolds? Are they combinatorial invariants? Do the results of Kähler package and Koszulness of the Bott–Samelson rings hold for the “brick rings”?*

REFERENCES

1. William W. Adams and Philippe Loustau, *An introduction to Gröbner bases*, Grad. Stud. Math., vol. 3, Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 1994 (English).
2. Karim Adiprasito, June Huh, and Eric Katz, *Hodge theory for combinatorial geometries*, Annals of Mathematics **188** (2018), no. 2, 381–452.
3. Thomas Becker and Volker Weispfenning, *Gröbner bases: a computational approach to commutative algebra. In cooperation with Heinz Kredel*, Grad. Texts Math., vol. 141, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1993 (English).
4. Alexander Beilinson, Joseph Bernstein, Pierre Deligne, and Ofer Gabber, *Faisceaux pervers. Actes du colloque “Analyse et Topologie sur les Espaces Singuliers”. Partie I*, 2nd edition ed., Astérisque, vol. 100, Paris: Société Mathématique de France (SMF), 2018 (French).
5. Alexander Beilinson, Victor Ginzburg, and Wolfgang Soergel, *Koszul duality patterns in representation theory*, J. Am. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), no. 2, 473–527 (English).
6. Raoul Bott and Hans Samelson, *The cohomology ring of G/T* , Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **41** (1955), no. 7, 490–493.
7. ———, *Applications of the theory of Morse to symmetric spaces*, American Journal of Mathematics **80** (1958), no. 4, 964–1029.
8. Aldo Conca, Sandra Di Rocco, Jan Draisma, June Huh, Bernd Sturmfels, Filippo Viviani, and Aldo Conca, *Koszul algebras and their syzygies*, Combinatorial Algebraic Geometry: Levico Terme, Italy 2013, Editors: Sandra Di Rocco, Bernd Sturmfels (2014), 1–31.
9. Basile Coron, *Supersolvability of built lattices and Koszulness of generalized Chow rings*, preprint, arXiv:2302.13072, 2023.
10. C. De Concini and C. Procesi, *Wonderful models of subspace arrangements*, Sel. Math., New Ser. **1** (1995), no. 3, 459–494 (English).
11. Michel Demazure, *Desingularisation des variétés de Schubert généralisées*, Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) **7** (1974), 53–88 (French).
12. Vladimir Dotsenko, *Homotopy invariants for $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}$ via Koszul duality*, Invent. Math. **228** (2022), no. 1, 77–106 (English).
13. Vladimir Dotsenko, Sergey Shadrin, and Bruno Vallette, *Toric varieties of Loday’s associahedra and noncommutative cohomological field theories*, J. Topol. **12** (2019), no. 2, 463–535 (English).
14. David Eisenbud, Alyson Reeves, and Burt Totaro, *Initial ideals, Veronese subrings, and rates of algebras*, Adv. Math. **109** (1994), no. 2, 168–187 (English).
15. Ben Elias, Shotaro Makisumi, Ulrich Thiel, and Geordie Williamson, *Introduction to Soergel bimodules*, RSME Springer Ser., vol. 5, Cham: Springer, 2020 (English).
16. Ben Elias and Geordie Williamson, *The Hodge theory of Soergel bimodules.*, Ann. Math. (2) **180** (2014), no. 3, 1089–1136 (English).

17. ———, *Kazhdan-Lusztig conjectures and shadows of Hodge theory*, Arbeitstagung Bonn 2013. In memory of Friedrich Hirzebruch. Proceedings of the meeting, Bonn, Germany, May, 22–28, 2013, Basel: Birkhäuser/Springer, 2016, pp. 105–126 (English).
18. ———, *Soergel calculus*, Represent. Theory **20** (2016), 295–374 (English).
19. Laura Escobar, *Brick manifolds and toric varieties of brick polytopes*, Electron. J. Comb. **23** (2016), no. 2, research paper p2.25, 18 (English).
20. Eleonore Faber, Martina Juhnke-Kubitzke, Haydee Lindo, Claudia Miller, Rebecca Rebhuhn-Glanz, and Alexandra Seceleanu, *Canonical resolutions over Koszul algebras*, Women in commutative algebra. Proceedings of the 2019 WICA workshop, Banff, Alberta, Canada, October 20–25, 2019, Cham: Springer, 2022, pp. 281–301 (English).
21. Eva Maria Feichtner and Sergey Yuzvinsky, *Chow rings of toric varieties defined by atomic lattices*, Inventiones mathematicae **155** (2004), no. 3, 515–536.
22. R. Fröberg, *Koszul algebras*, Advances in commutative ring theory. Proceedings of the 3rd international conference, Fez, Morocco, New York, NY: Marcel Dekker, 1999, pp. 337–350 (English).
23. Tao Gui and Rui Xiong, *Equivariant log-concavity and equivariant Kähler packages*, J. Algebra **657** (2024), 379–401 (English).
24. Hans Christian Hansen, *On cycles in flag manifolds*, Mathematica Scandinavica **33** (1973), no. 2, 269–274.
25. David Kazhdan and George Lusztig, *Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras*, Inventiones mathematicae **53** (1979), no. 2, 165–184.
26. Matthew Mastroeni and Jason McCullough, *Chow rings of matroids are Koszul*, Mathematische Annalen **387** (2023), no. 3, 1819–1851.
27. Chris McDaniel and Larry Smith, *Equivariant coinvariant rings, Bott-Samelson rings and Watanabe’s bold conjecture*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **225** (2021), no. 5, 50 (English), Id/No 106524.
28. Edward Richmond and William Slofstra, *The isomorphism problem for Schubert varieties*, preprint, arXiv:2103.08114, 2021.
29. Wolfgang Soergel, *Kategorie O , perverse garben und moduln über den koinvarianten zur Weyl gruppe*, J. Am. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), no. 2, 421–445 (German).
30. ———, *The combinatorics of Harish-Chandra bimodules*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **429** (1992), 49–74 (English).
31. ———, *Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials and a combinatorics for tilting modules*, Represent. Theory **1** (1997), 83–114 (English).
32. ———, *Kazhdan-Lusztig-polynome und unzerlegbare bimoduln über polynomringen*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **6** (2007), no. 3, 501–525 (German).
33. John Tate, *Homology of Noetherian rings and local rings*, Illinois Journal of Mathematics **1** (1957), no. 1, 14–27.

(TAO GUI)

BEIJING INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR MATHEMATICAL RESEARCH, PEKING UNIVERSITY, No. 5
YIHEYUAN ROAD, HAIDIAN DISTRICT, BEIJING 100871, P.R. CHINA
Email address: `guitao18(at)mails(dot)ucas(dot)ac(dot)cn`

(LIN SUN)

FUDAN UNIVERSITY, 220 HANDAN ROAD, YANGPU DISTRICT, SHANGHAI 200433, P.R. CHINA
Email address: `lsun21(at)m(dot)fudan(dot)edu(dot)cn`

(SHIHAO WANG)

TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY, No. 30 HAIDIAN DISTRICT, BEIJING 100084, P.R. CHINA
Email address: `wangshih21(at)mails(dot)tsinghua(dot)edu(dot)cn`

(HAOYU ZHU)

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS (ZHUHAI), SUN YAT-SEN UNIVERSITY, ZHUHAI 519082, GUANGDONG,
P.R. CHINA
Email address: `zhuhy86(at)mails(dot)syus(dot)edu(dot)cn`