

# Schubert polynomials and patterns in permutations

Peter L. Guo and Zhuowei Lin

## Abstract

This paper investigates the number of supports of the Schubert polynomial  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x)$  indexed by a permutation  $w$ . This number also equals the number of lattice points in the Newton polytope of  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x)$ . We establish a lower bound for this number in terms of the occurrences of patterns in  $w$ . The analysis is carried out in the general framework of dual characters of flagged Weyl modules. Our result considerably improves the bounds for principal specializations of Schubert polynomials or dual flagged Weyl characters previously obtained by Weigandt, Gao, and Mészáros–St. Dizier–Tanjaya. Some problems and conjectures are discussed.

**Keywords:** Schubert polynomial, key polynomial, flagged Weyl module, dual character, support, principal specialization

**AMS Classifications:** 05E10, 05E14, 05A19, 14N15

## 1 Introduction

As usual, let  $S_n$  be the symmetric group of permutations of  $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Given a permutation  $w \in S_n$ , let  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x)$  denote the associated Schubert polynomial. They were introduced by Lascoux and Schützenberger [13] to represent Schubert classes in the cohomology ring of the flag manifold. Schubert polynomials can be defined in a recursive procedure. For the longest permutation  $w_0 = n \cdots 21$ , set  $\mathfrak{S}_{w_0}(x) = x_1^{n-1} x_2^{n-2} \cdots x_{n-1}$ . For  $w \neq w_0$ , locate a position  $1 \leq i < n$  such that  $w(i) < w(i+1)$ , and set  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x) = \partial_i \mathfrak{S}_{ws_i}(x)$ , where  $ws_i$  is obtained from  $w$  by swapping  $w(i)$  and  $w(i+1)$ , and  $\partial_i$  is the divided difference operator acting on a polynomial  $f(x)$  by

$$\partial_i f(x) = \frac{f(x) - f(x)|_{x_i \leftrightarrow x_{i+1}}}{x_i - x_{i+1}}.$$

For a (weak) composition  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ , write  $x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$ . Then one can express

$$\mathfrak{S}_w(x) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n} a_\alpha x^\alpha.$$

It is famously known that  $a_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  [14]. We say that  $\alpha$  is a support of  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x)$  if  $a_\alpha > 0$ . By the work of Fink, Mészáros and St. Dizier [5] (first conjectured by Monical, Tokcan and Yong [19]), the supports of  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with lattice points in its Newton polytope. Recall that the Newton polytope of a polynomial  $f$  in  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  is the convex hull in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  generated by the supports of  $f$ .

We use  $\theta_w$  to stand for the number of supports of  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x)$ , or equivalently, the number of lattice points in the Newton polytope of  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x)$ . Given  $u = u(1) \cdots u(m) \in S_m$  with  $m \leq n$ , we say that a subsequence  $w(i_1) \cdots w(i_m)$  of  $w$  is a  $u$  pattern if  $w(i_1) \cdots w(i_m)$  has the same relative order as  $u$ . Let  $p_u(w)$  denote the number of appearances of  $u$  patterns in  $w$ . For example, we have  $p_{132}(1432) = 3$ .

Our first main result is an attempt to establish a lower bound for  $\theta_w$  in terms of the numbers  $p_u(w)$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *For  $w \in S_n$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_w \geq & 1 + p_{132}(w) + p_{1432}(w) + p_{13254}(w) + 3p_{14253}(w) \\ & + p_{14352}(w) + 4p_{15243}(w) + p_{15324}(w) + 2p_{15342}(w) \\ & + p_{15432}(w) + p_{24153}(w) + 2p_{25143}(w) + p_{35142}(w). \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

As comparison, the principal specialization  $\nu_w := \mathfrak{S}_w(x)|_{x_i=1}$  of  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x)$  has received much attention in recent years. By definition, it is clear that  $\theta_w \leq \nu_w$ . The equality holds if and only if  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x)$  is zero-one, that is, each coefficient  $a_\alpha$  is equal to either 0 or 1. A criterion for zero-one Schubert polynomials was first given by Fink, Mészáros and St. Dizier [6].

A classical formula due to Macdonald [14], see also [7, 10], states that

$$\nu_w = \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{(a_1, \dots, a_\ell) \in \text{Red}(w)} a_1 \cdots a_\ell,$$

where  $\ell$  is the length of  $w$ , and the sum runs over reduced words of  $w$ . It is well known that  $\nu_w = 1$  if and only if  $w$  is dominant, that is,  $w$  has no 132 pattern. Stanley [21] conjectured that  $\nu_w = 2$  if and only if  $w$  has exactly one 132 pattern. This conjecture was confirmed by Weigandt [22] by proving a lower bound

$$\nu_w \geq 1 + p_{132}(w). \quad (1.2)$$

This bound was later strengthened by Gao [8, Theorem 2.1], where it was shown that

$$\nu_w \geq 1 + p_{132}(w) + p_{1432}(w). \quad (1.3)$$

Both proofs in [8, 22] make use of the pipe dream model of Schubert polynomials.

Because of  $\theta_w \leq \nu_w$ , Theorem 1.1 immediately yields a lower bound for  $\nu_w$  which largely improves the bound in (1.3).

**Corollary 1.2.** *For  $w \in S_n$ ,  $\nu_w$  is bounded below by the right-hand side of (1.1).*

We deal with Theorem 1.1 in the general setting of dual characters of flagged Weyl modules associated to diagrams in the square grid  $[n] \times [n]$ . A diagram  $D$  means a subset of boxes in  $[n] \times [n]$ . The associated flagged Weyl module  $\mathcal{M}_D$  is a representation of the Borel group  $B$  of invertible upper-triangular complex matrices [11, 12, 15]. Let  $\chi_D(x) = \chi_D(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  denote the dual character of  $\mathcal{M}_D$ . As will be explained in

Section 2,  $\chi_D(x)$  specializes to a Schubert polynomial (resp., key polynomial) when  $D$  is the Rothe diagram of a permutation (resp., skyline diagram of a composition).

We use  $\theta_D$  to represent the number of supports of  $\chi_D(x)$ , which also equals the number of lattice points in the Newton polytope, called Schubitope, of  $\chi_D(x)$  [5]. We deduce a lower bound for  $\theta_D$  by using the appearances of certain subdiagrams of  $D$ . Precisely, consider the configurations in Figure 1.1, where a blank/shaded box means the absence/presence. Let  $(i, j)$  denote the box of  $[n] \times [n]$  in row  $i$  and column  $j$  in




Figure 1.1. Configurations for Theorem 1.3.

matrix coordinate. Define

- $r_1(D)$ : the number of subdiagrams of  $D$  which are equal to the configuration (A) in Figure 1.1;
- $r_2(D)$ : the number of subdiagrams of  $D$  which are equal to the configuration (B), or (B') in Figure 1.1;
- $r_3(D)$ : the number of subdiagrams of  $D$  which are equal to the configuration (C), or (C'), or (C'') in Figure 1.1;

To avoid confusion, we explain the above notions in more details. For example, a subdiagram of  $D$  which is equal to the configuration (C) in Figure 1.1 means a subset

$$\{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_1), (i_3, j_2), (i_4, j_2)\}$$

of boxes in  $[n] \times [n]$  such that (1)  $i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4$  and  $j_1 < j_2$ , and (2) exactly two of the boxes,  $(i_2, j_1)$  and  $(i_4, j_2)$ , belong to  $D$ .

The statistic  $r_1(D)$  has been investigated by Mészáros, St. Dizier and Tanjaya [17], where it is called the rank of  $D$  and is denoted  $\text{rank}(D)$ . Let  $\chi_D(1, \dots, 1) := \chi_D(x)|_{x_i=1}$  be the principal specialization of  $\chi_D(x)$ . Note that  $\chi_D(1, \dots, 1) \geq \theta_D$ . A criterion for the equality was conjectured in [17] and proved recently in [9]. As shown in [17, Theorem 2],  $\chi_D(1, \dots, 1)$  is bounded below by  $1 + r_1(D)$ , which recovers the bound in (1.2) by Weigandt [22] when  $D$  is the Rothe diagram of a permutation.

We prove the following lower bound for  $\theta_D$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** *For any diagram  $D$ , we have*

$$\theta_D \geq 1 + r_1(D) + r_2(D) + r_3(D). \quad (1.4)$$

Theorem 1.3 leads to a strengthen of the above mentioned bound for  $\chi_D(1, \dots, 1)$  by Mészáros, St. Dizier and Tanjaya [17, Theorem 2].

**Corollary 1.4.** *For any diagram  $D$ ,  $\chi_D(1, \dots, 1)$  is bounded below by the right-hand side of (1.4).*

When restricting to the skyline diagram  $D(\alpha)$  of a composition  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ , Theorem 1.3 yields a lower bound for the number of supports of the key polynomial  $\kappa_\alpha(x)$ . Key polynomials, also called the Demazure characters, are the characters of a Demazure modules for the general linear group [2, 3]. Key polynomials can also be defined in a recursive manner. If  $\alpha = (\alpha_1 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n)$  is weakly decreasing, then set  $\kappa_\alpha(x) = x^\alpha$ . Otherwise, choose  $1 \leq i < n$  such that  $\alpha_i < \alpha_{i+1}$ , and set  $\kappa_\alpha(x) = \partial_i x_i \kappa_{s_i \alpha}(x)$ , where  $s_i \alpha$  is obtained from  $\alpha$  by swapping  $\alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_{i+1}$ .

**Theorem 1.5.** *For any (weak) composition  $\alpha$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_\alpha(1, \dots, 1) \geq \theta_{D(\alpha)} \geq & 1 + \sum_{\text{inv}_1(\alpha)} (\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_1}) + \sum_{\text{inv}_2(\alpha)} (\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_3}) \cdot (\alpha_{i_3} - \alpha_{i_1}) \\ & + \sum_{\text{inv}_3(\alpha)} (\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_1}) \cdot (\alpha_{i_4} - \alpha_{i_3}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{inv}_1(\alpha) = \{(i_1, i_2) : i_1 < i_2, \alpha_{i_1} < \alpha_{i_2}\}$ ,  $\text{inv}_2(\alpha) = \{(i_1, i_2, i_3) : i_1 < i_2 < i_3, \alpha_{i_1} < \alpha_{i_3} < \alpha_{i_2}\}$ , and  $\text{inv}_3(\alpha) = \{(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) : i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4, \alpha_{i_1} < \alpha_{i_2}, \alpha_{i_3} < \alpha_{i_4}\}$ .

Taking only the first summation, Theorem 1.5 reduces to the following lower bound by Mészáros, St. Dizier and Tanjaya [17, Corollary 20]:

$$\kappa_\alpha(1, \dots, 1) \geq 1 + \sum_{\text{inv}_1(\alpha)} (\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_1}).$$

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 lays out basic information that we need about the dual characters of flagged Weyl modules. Section 3 is devoted to a proof of Theorem 1.3, based on which we complete the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.5 in Section 4. We conclude in Section 5 with some problems and conjectures. We put some tables that are needed in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in the appendix section.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Yibo Gao for helpful comments. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12371329) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (No. 63243072).

## 2 Dual characters of flagged Weyl modules

In this section, we review some necessary background on flagged Weyl modules, and explain how their dual characters specialize to Schubert and key polynomials.

Recall that a diagram  $D$  is a subset of boxes in  $[n] \times [n]$ . Write  $D = (D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n)$ , where, for  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ,  $D_j$  denotes the  $j$ -th column of  $D$ . We also represent  $D_j$  by a subset of  $[n]$ , that is,  $i \in D_j$  if and only if the box  $(i, j)$  belongs to  $D$ . For example, the diagram in Figure 2.2 can be expressed as  $D = (\{2, 3, 4\}, \emptyset, \{1, 2\}, \{3\})$ .




Figure 2.2. A diagram in  $[4] \times [4]$ .

Let  $R = \{r_1 < \dots < r_k\}$  and  $S = \{s_1 < \dots < s_k\}$  be two  $k$ -element subsets of  $[n]$ . We say  $R \leq S$  if  $r_i \leq s_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . This defines a partial order on all  $k$ -element subsets of  $[n]$ , which is usually called the Gale order. For two diagrams  $C = (C_1, \dots, C_n)$  and  $D = (D_1, \dots, D_n)$ , denote  $C \leq D$  if  $C_j \leq D_j$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq n$ .

Let  $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$  be the general linear group of  $n \times n$  invertible complex matrices, and  $B$  the Borel subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$  which consists of upper-triangular matrices. We use  $Y$  to denote the upper-triangular matrix of variables  $y_{ij}$  with  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ :

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} y_{11} & y_{12} & \dots & y_{1n} \\ 0 & y_{22} & \dots & y_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & y_{nn} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let  $\mathbb{C}[Y]$  be the linear space of polynomials in  $\{y_{ij}\}_{i \leq j}$  over  $\mathbb{C}$ . Define the (right) action of  $B$  on  $\mathbb{C}[Y]$  by  $f(Y) \cdot b = f(b^{-1} \cdot Y)$ , where  $b \in B$  and  $f \in \mathbb{C}[Y]$ . For two subsets  $R$  and  $S$  of  $[n]$  with the same cardinality, let  $Y_S^R$  be the submatrix of  $Y$  with rows indexed by  $R$  and columns indexed by  $S$ . Note that  $\det(Y_S^R) \neq 0$  if and only if  $R \leq S$ . For  $C = (C_1, \dots, C_n)$  and  $D = (D_1, \dots, D_n)$  with  $C \leq D$ , denote

$$\det(Y_D^C) = \prod_{j=1}^n \det(Y_{D_j}^{C_j}).$$

The flagged Weyl module associated to  $D$  is the subspace

$$\mathcal{M}_D = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathbb{C}} \{ \det(Y_D^C) : C \leq D \},$$

which is a  $B$ -module with the action inherited from the action of  $B$  on  $\mathbb{C}[Y]$ .

Let  $X = \mathrm{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  be the diagonal matrix. The character of  $\mathcal{M}_D$  is defined as

$$\mathrm{char}(\mathcal{M}_D)(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \mathrm{tr}(X: \mathcal{M}_D \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_D).$$

It is readily checked that  $\det(Y_D^C)$  for  $C \leq D$  is an eigenvector of  $X$  with eigenvalue

$$\prod_{j=1}^n \prod_{i \in C_j} x_i^{-1}.$$

The dual character is defined to be  $\chi_D(x) := \text{char}(\mathcal{M}_D)(x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_n^{-1})$ . The weight vector  $\text{wt}(C) = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  of a diagram  $C = (C_1, \dots, C_n)$  is defined by letting  $\alpha_i$  be the number of appearances of  $i$  in  $C_1, \dots, C_n$ . Geometrically,  $\alpha_i$  is the number of boxes lying in row  $i$ . The diagram in Figure 2.2 has weight vector  $(1, 2, 2, 1)$ . By the above arguments, we have the following characterization on the supports of  $\chi_D(x)$ , see Adve, Robichaux and Yong [1] for discussions about the computational complexity for deciding the supports.

**Proposition 2.1.** *The set of supports of  $\chi_D(x)$  is  $\{\text{wt}(C) : C \leq D\}$ .*

The Rothe diagram  $D(w)$  of a permutation  $w \in S_n$  can be constructed as follows. For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , place a dot in row  $i$  and column  $w(i)$ . Then  $D(w)$  is obtained by ignoring all boxes to the right of a dot in the same row, and all boxes below a dot in the same column. The skyline diagram  $D(\alpha)$  of a composition  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  consists of the leftmost  $\alpha_i$  boxes for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Figure 2.3 displays the Rothe diagram of  $w = 1432$  and the skyline diagram of  $\alpha = (1, 3, 0, 2)$ . As specializations, it is well known that




Figure 2.3. The Rothe diagram of  $w = 1432$  and the skyline diagram of  $\alpha = (1, 3, 0, 2)$ .

$\chi_{D(w)}(x) = \mathfrak{S}_w(x)$  [11, 12] and  $\chi_{D(\alpha)}(x) = \kappa_\alpha(x)$  [3].

### 3 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Let  $D$  be a given diagram in  $[n] \times [n]$ . For simplicity, we denote  $r_i = r_i(D)$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . To finish the proof of Theorem 1.3, by Proposition 2.1, it suffices to construct  $r_1 + r_2 + r_3$  diagrams less than  $D$  which have distinct weight vectors. To accomplish this, we shall design three algorithms to produce such diagrams.

#### 3.1 The first algorithm

The first algorithm produces a chain  $C^1 < C^2 < \dots < C^{r_1} < D$ , including  $r_1$  diagrams less than  $D$ . It essentially obeys a similar idea to that in the proof of [17, Lemma 17].

For  $(i, j) \in D$ , denote by  $r_1(i, j)$  the number of blank boxes above  $(i, j)$  in the same column, namely,

$$r_1(D; i, j) = \#\{i' : i' < i, (i', j) \notin D\}.$$

By definition, it follows that

$$r_1 = \sum_{(i,j) \in D} r_1(D; i, j).$$

**Algorithm 1.** First, we construct  $C^{r_1}$ . Among the boxes  $(i, j)$  of  $D$  such that  $r_1(D; i, j) > 0$ , choose the top-left most one, say  $(i_0, j_0)$ . Note that the box  $(i_0 - 1, j_0)$  right above it must be blank. Set  $C^{r_1} = D \setminus \{(i_0, j_0)\} \cup \{(i_0 - 1, j_0)\}$ . It is clear that  $C^{r_1} < D$  and  $r_1(C^{r_1}) = r_1(D) - 1$ . Replacing  $D$  by  $C^{r_1}$ , we are given  $C^{r_1-1} < C^{r_1}$  with  $r_1(C^{r_1-1}) = r_1(C^{r_1}) - 1$ . Repeating this procedure yields the desired chain  $C^1 < C^2 < \dots < C^{r_1} < D$ . An illustration for this algorithm is depicted in Figure 3.4, where the position marked with a crossing means the box of  $D$  which is moved up.




Figure 3.4. An illustration for performing Algorithm 1.

**Remark 3.1.** *The subdiagrams produced by Algorithm 1 are generally different from the subdiagrams constructed in [17, Lemma 17]. The reason that we adopt Algorithm 1 is that we need to produce subdiagrams whose weight vectors are distinct from those generated by Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 in the next two subsections.*

**Proposition 3.2.** *The weight vectors of the  $r_1$  diagrams generated in Algorithm 1 are distinct.*

*Proof.* As explained in [17, Lemma 18], if  $C < D$ , then  $C$  and  $D$  have distinct weight vectors. This allows us to conclude the proof. ■

### 3.2 The second algorithm

The second algorithm will give rise to  $r_2$  diagrams less than  $D$  with distinct weight vectors. Moreover, these weight vectors are distinct from the weight vectors of diagrams generated by Algorithm 1.

Given a pair of row indices  $1 < i_1 < i_2 \leq n$  and a pair of column indices  $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n$ , let  $r_2(D; i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2)$  denote the number of row indices  $i$  with  $i < i_1$  such that the subdiagram of  $D$ , which includes the six boxes restricted to rows  $\{i, i_1, i_2\}$  and columns

$\{j_1, j_2\}$ , is either the configuration (B), or (B') in Figure 1.1. Summing over all possible row and column index pairs, we see that

$$r_2 = \sum_{\substack{1 < i_1 < i_2 \leq n \\ 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n}} r_2(D; i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2).$$

The second algorithm will be well understood via an example by taking  $D$  to be the diagram in Figure 3.5.




Figure 3.5. A diagram  $D$  in  $[6] \times [6]$ .

**Algorithm 2.** The algorithm will be performed for any given pair of row indices  $1 < i_1 < i_2 \leq n$ . Running over all row index pairs, we receive the desired  $r_2$  diagrams less the  $D$  with distinct weights.

Step 0: Let us fix  $1 < i_1 < i_2 \leq n$ . Set  $S_{i_1, i_2}(D) = \emptyset$ . For each column of  $D$ , consider the boxes of  $D$  above row  $i_1$ . Move these boxes up along the column such that they occupy the topmost positions. For example, if we take  $(i_1, i_2) = (4, 5)$ , then the resulting diagram of  $D$  after Step 0 is illustrated in Figure 3.6.





Figure 3.6. An illustration for Step 0 in Algorithm 2.

Notice that after Step 0, for any  $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n$ , the boxes  $(i_1 - m, j_1)$  and  $(i_1 - m, j_2)$  for every  $1 \leq m \leq r_2(D; i_1, i_2; j_1, j_2)$  are blank boxes.

Step 1: Locate the leftmost column index, say column  $j$ , such that

- (1) the two boxes  $(i_1, j)$  and  $(i_2, j)$  form the configuration ;
- (2) there exists (at least) one column index  $j'$  such that (i) both  $(i_1, j')$  and  $(i_2, j')$  belong to  $D$ , and (ii)  $r_2(D; i_1, i_2; j, j') > 0$  if  $j < j'$ , or  $r_2(D; i_1, i_2; j', j) > 0$  if  $j' < j$ .



We call the box  $(i_1, j)$  a pivot. For the right picture in Figure 3.6, the pivot box is  $(4, 1)$ . Set  $m := 1$ . If there is no pivot box, then the algorithm is done, and output  $S_{i_1, i_2}(D)$ .

Step 2: Locate all the column indices  $j'$  such that (i) both  $(i_1, j')$  and  $(i_2, j')$  belong to  $D$ , and (ii)  $r_2(D; i_1, i_2; j, j') \geq m$  if  $j < j'$ , or  $r_2(D; i_1, i_2; j', j) \geq m$  if  $j' < j$ . Suppose that there are  $k$  such column indices, say  $j_1 < \dots < j_k$ . For  $1 \leq t \leq k$ , let  $C^t$  be the diagram obtained by moving the boxes  $(i_2, j_1), \dots, (i_2, j_t)$  up along the columns to the positions  $(i_1 - m, j_1), \dots, (i_1 - m, j_t)$ . Set

$$S_{i_1, i_2}(D) := S_{i_1, i_2}(D) \cup \{C^1, \dots, C^k\}.$$

For the pivot  $(4, 1)$ , we have  $k = 2$  and  $(j_1, j_2) = (2, 6)$ . The two diagrams  $C^1$  and  $C^2$  generated in this step are listed in Figure 3.7.




Figure 3.7. An illustration for Step 2 in Algorithm 2.

Step 3: Place all the  $k$  boxes moved in Step 2 back to their original positions in row  $i_2$  (thus recovering the diagram considered in Step 1). If there is some  $r_2(D; i_1, i_2; j, j') > m$  for  $j < j'$ , or  $r_2(D; i_1, i_2; j', j) > m$  for  $j' < j$ , then set  $m := m + 1$  and return back to Step 2. Otherwise, move the pivot  $(i_1, j)$  up by one unit to the position  $(i_1 - 1, j)$ , and return to Step 1.

Continue the above example. For the pivot  $(4, 1)$ , we have

$$r_2(D; 4, 5; 1, 2) = r_2(D; 4, 5; 1, 6) = 1.$$

So, in Step 3, we do not need to go back to Step 2. What we do is to move the pivot  $(4, 1)$  up to the position  $(3, 1)$  and then turn back to Step 1. Therefore, the diagram, that will be considered in Step 1 in the second round of iteration, is as depicted in Figure 3.8.




Figure 3.8. The diagram by moving the pivot up by a unit.

We move on to the second round of iteration, starting with Step 1. Now the pivot box is  $(4, 5)$ . Notice that

$$r_2(D; 4, 5; 2, 5) = r_2(D; 4, 5; 5, 6) = 2.$$

So, after Step 2, we get two diagrams, as given in Figure 3.9. This time, in Step 3, we




Figure 3.9. The first two diagrams generated in the second round of iteration.

need to skip back to Step 2, generating two more diagrams as shown in Figure 3.10.




Figure 3.10. The second two diagrams generated in the second round of iteration.

In the third round of iteration, there is no pivot any more, and so the algorithm terminates. Hence, for the diagram  $D$  in Figure 3.6 and  $(i_1, i_2) = (4, 5)$ , Algorithm 2 produces a set  $S_{4,5}(D)$  consisting of six diagrams less than  $D$ , as illustrated in Figures 3.7, 3.9 and 3.10.

We next show that after applying Algorithm 2 to all pairs  $1 < i_1 < i_2 \leq n$ , the resulting diagrams have distinct weights. Moreover, these diagrams have different weights from the diagrams generated by Algorithm 1.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $1 < i_1 < i_2 \leq n$ . Then the diagrams in  $S_{i_1, i_2}(D)$  have distinct weight vectors. Moreover, for  $1 < i'_1 < i'_2 \leq n$  with  $(i'_1, i'_2) \neq (i_1, i_2)$ , the diagrams in  $S_{i_1, i_2}(D)$  and  $S_{i'_1, i'_2}(D)$  have distinct weight vectors.*

*Proof.* Let  $C$  be any given diagram in  $S_{i_1, i_2}(D)$ , and let  $C' \in S_{i_1, i_2}(D)$  with  $C' \neq C$  and  $C'' \in S_{i'_1, i'_2}(D)$ . We first check that  $C$  and  $C'$  have different weights. Suppose that  $C$  is generated prior to  $C'$ . The arguments are divided into two cases.

Case 1.  $C$  and  $C'$  correspond to the same pivot. By the construction of Algorithm 2,  $C$  and  $C'$  are obtained from a same diagram by moving some boxes in row  $i_2$  up to the same row or two different rows. Keep in mind that  $C$  appears earlier than  $C'$ . If the boxes are moved up to the same row, say row  $i$ , then  $C$  has less boxes than  $C'$  in row

*i.* If the boxes are moved up to two different rows, then it is clear that  $C$  and  $C'$  have different numbers of boxes in these two rows. In both situations,  $C$  and  $C'$  have distinct weights.

Case 2.  $C$  and  $C'$  correspond to distinct pivots. In this case, notice that  $C$  has less boxes than  $C'$  in row  $i_1$ . So  $C$  and  $C'$  have distinct weights.

We next check that  $C$  and  $C''$  have distinct weights. We also have two cases.

Case 1':  $i_1 \neq i'_1$ . Assume  $i_1 < i'_1$  without loss of generality. Let

$$k = \# \{1 \leq j \leq n: r_1(D; i_1, j) > 0\}.$$

Concerning  $C''$ , Step 0 moves all boxes of  $D$  above row  $i'_1$  to the topmost rows, and so one moves exactly  $k$  boxes in row  $i_1$  to higher rows. However, by the construction of Algorithm 2 applied to the pair  $(i_1, i_2)$ , it is not hard to observe that there are at most  $k - 1$  boxes of  $D$  (lying in row  $i_1$  or  $i_2$ ) that are moved up to rows higher than row  $i_1$  (because the last pivot in row  $i_1$  will not be moved up). So the weights of  $C$  and  $C''$  cannot be the same.

Case 2':  $i_1 = i'_1$ , but  $i_2 \neq i'_2$ . Suppose that  $i_2 < i'_2$ . Then  $C''$  has less boxes than  $C$  in row  $i'_2$ . So  $C$  and  $C''$  have distinct weights. This completes the proof. ■

**Proposition 3.4.** *For  $1 < i_1 < i_2 \leq n$ , the diagrams in  $S_{i_1, i_2}(D)$  and the diagrams generated by Algorithm 1 have distinct weight vectors.*

*Proof.* Let  $C \in S_{i_1, i_2}(D)$ , and  $C'$  be any diagram generated by Algorithm 1. Suppose to the contrary that  $C$  and  $C'$  have the same weight vector. Note that  $C$  has less boxes than  $D$  in row  $i_2$ . Thus some boxes of  $D$  in row  $i_2$  must be moved up to form  $C'$ . This meanwhile tells that in the construction of  $C'$ , the boxes of  $D$  lying above row  $i_2$  are moved up to the topmost positions. Particularly, there are  $k$  boxes of  $D$  in row  $i_1$  that are moved up to higher rows, where, as in Case 1' in Proposition 3.3,

$$k = \# \{1 \leq j \leq n: r_1(D; i_1, j) \neq 0\}.$$

However, as explained in Case 1' in Proposition 3.3, there are at most  $k - 1$  boxes of  $D$ , that are moved up to the places above row  $i_1$ , to form  $C$ . This implies that  $C'$  has more boxes above row  $i_1$  than  $C$ , leading to a contradiction. ■

### 3.3 The third algorithm

We lastly describe the third algorithm which will produce  $r_3$  diagrams with weights different from those produced by Algorithm 1 or Algorithm 2.

Denote by  $D_{>i}$  the subdiagram of  $D$  which includes the boxes of  $D$  below row  $i$ . A box  $(i, j)$  of  $D$  is called a PIVOT if  $r_1(D; i, j) > 0$  (equivalently, there is at least one blank box above  $(i, j)$  in the same column). Here we use capital letters to distinguish with the pivots defined in Subsection 3.2.

**Lemma 3.5.** *We have*

$$r_3 = \sum_{(i,j)} r_1(D; i, j) \times r_1(D_{>i}),$$

where the sum ranges over all PIVOTs of  $D$ , and  $r_1(D_{>i})$  is the number of subdiagrams of  $D_{>i}$  which are equal to the configuration (A) in Figure 1.1.

*Proof.* Consider the subdiagrams of  $D$  which is equal to the configuration (C), or (C'), or (C'') in Figure 1.1. Note that the second box in each subdiagram is a PIVOT. Given a PIVOT  $(i, j)$ , the subdiagrams, whose second box is  $(i, j)$ , are counted by  $r_1(D; i, j) \times r_1(D_{>i})$ , and so the proof is complete. ■

**Algorithm 3.** Fix a PIVOT box  $(i, j) \in D$ . This algorithm will produce  $r_1(D; i, j) \times r_1(D_{>i})$  diagrams less than  $D$ .

Step 0. Move the boxes of  $D$  above row  $i_1$ , along with the boxes of  $D$  in row  $i_1$  to the left of  $(i, j)$ , up along the column such that they occupy the positions in the topmost rows. See Figure 3.11 for an illustration. Notice that in the resulting diagram, there are  $r_1(D; i, j)$  blank boxes right above  $(i, j)$ .




Figure 3.11. An illustration for Step 0 in Algorithm 3.

Step 1. Apply Algorithm 1 to  $D_{>i}$ . This gives rise to a chain of  $r_1(D_{>i})$  diagrams less than  $D$ , say  $C^1 < C^2 < \dots < C^k$ , where  $k = r_1(D_{>i})$ . For  $1 \leq p \leq k$  and  $1 \leq q \leq r_1(D; i, j)$ , let  $C^{p,q}$  be the diagram obtained from  $C^p$  by moving the PIVOT  $(i, j)$  up to the position  $(i - q + 1, j)$ . This is well defined since there are  $r_1(D; i, j)$  blank boxes right above  $(i, j)$ . Note that  $C^{p,1} = C^p$ . Set

$$T_{i,j}(D) = \{C^{p,q} : 1 \leq p \leq k, 1 \leq q \leq r_1(D; i, j)\}.$$

**Proposition 3.6.** *Running over all PIVOTs of  $D$ , the diagrams generated by Algorithm 3 have distinct weight vectors.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $C \in T_{i,j}(D)$  and  $C' \in T_{i',j'}(D)$ . We show that  $C$  and  $C'$  have distinct weights. We consider the following two cases separately.

Case 1:  $(i, j) = (i', j')$ . This can be seen as follows. For  $1 \leq q \leq r_1(D; i, j)$ , notice that

$$C^{1,q} < C^{2,q} < \dots < C^{k,q},$$

where  $k = r_1(D_{>i})$  as in Step 1. As explained in Proposition 3.2, we can conclude that  $C^{1,q}, \dots, C^{k,q}$  have distinct weights. Moreover, by the construction in Step 1, it is obvious that the weights of  $C^{p,q}$  and  $C^{p',q'}$  for  $p \neq p'$  are distinct. This verifies the assertion for  $(i, j) = (i', j')$ .

Case 2:  $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $i < i'$  or  $i = i', j < j'$ . We assert that in row  $i - r_1(D; i, j)$ ,  $C'$  has more boxes than  $C$ . To see this, a key observation is that when Step 0 in Algorithm 3 is applied to the PIVOT  $(i', j')$ , the box  $(i, j)$  is moved up to the position  $(i - r_1(D; i, j), j)$ . However, when Algorithm 3 is applied to the PIVOT  $(i, j)$ , Step 1 contributes no box to row  $i - r_1(D; i, j)$  since the box  $(i, j)$  can be moved up at most to the position  $(i - r_1(D; i, j) + 1, j)$  (that is,  $(i - r_1(D; i, j), j)$  is a blank box in  $C$ ). This implies that  $C'$  has at least one more box than  $C$  in row  $i - r_1(D; i, j)$ , and so  $C$  and  $C'$  have distinct weights. ■

**Proposition 3.7.** *For any PIVOT  $(i, j)$ , the diagrams in  $T_{i,j}(D)$  and the diagrams generated by Algorithm 1 have distinct weight vectors.*

*Proof.* Let  $C \in T_{i,j}(D)$ . Write

$$C^1 < C^2 < \dots < C^{r_1} < D$$

for the chain of diagrams produced by Algorithm 1. Let  $1 \leq \ell \leq r_1$  be the index such that  $C^\ell$  is the diagram obtained from its preceding diagram  $C^{\ell+1}$  by moving  $(i, j)$  up to the position  $(i - 1, j)$  (here we set  $C^{r_1+1} = D$ ). Notice that

- $C^{\ell+1}$  is exactly the resulting diagram after applying Step 0 in Algorithm 3 to  $D$ ;
- for  $1 \leq s < r_1(D; i, j)$ , the diagram  $C^{\ell+1-s}$  is obtained from  $C^{\ell+1}$  by moving  $(i, j)$  up to the position  $(i - s, j)$ .

The arguments are divided into two cases.

Case 1.  $\ell + 1 - r_1(D; i, j) < t \leq r_1$ . In this case, note that  $(C^t)_{>i} = D_{>i}$ . However,  $C_{>i}$  and  $D_{>i}$  have different weights, and so the weights of  $C$  and  $C^t$  are distinct.

Case 2.  $1 \leq t \leq \ell + 1 - r_1(D; i, j)$ . In this case, during the construction of  $C^t$ , the box  $(i, j)$  of  $D$  is moved up to the position  $(i - r_1(D; i, j), j)$ . For the analogous reason to the proof of the  $(i, j) \neq (i', j')$  case in Proposition 3.6,  $C^t$  has more boxes than  $C$  in row  $i - r_1(D; i, j)$ . This completes the proof. ■

**Proposition 3.8.** *For any PIVOT  $(i, j)$  and any row indices  $i_1 < i_2$ , the diagrams in  $T_{i,j}(D)$  and the diagrams in  $S_{i_1, i_2}(D)$  generated by Algorithm 2 have distinct weight vectors.*

*Proof.* Let  $C \in T_{i,j}(D)$  and  $C' \in S_{i_1, i_2}(D)$ . We have two cases.

Case 1:  $i \neq i_1$ . If  $i < i_1$ , then we can show that  $C'$  has at least one more box than  $C$  in row  $i - r_1(D; i, j)$ . The arguments are completely similar to Case 2 in the proof of Proposition 3.6, and so is omitted. If  $i > i_1$ , then, as in Case 1' in the proof of Proposition 3.3, let

$$k = \# \{1 \leq j \leq n : r_1(D; i_1, j) \neq 0\}.$$

In the construction of  $C$ , there are  $k$  boxes of  $D$  in row  $i_1$  that are moved up to the area higher than row  $i_1$ . While, in the construction of  $C'$ , there are at most  $k - 1$  boxes (from row  $i_1$  or  $i_2$ ) of  $D$  that are moved up to the area higher than row  $i_1$ . So we see that

$C$  has more boxes than  $C'$  in the area above row  $i_1$ , and thus  $C$  and  $C'$  have distinct weights.

Case 2:  $i = i_1$ . In this case, note that  $C_{>i}$  has the same number of boxes as  $D_{>i}$ , while  $(C')_{>i}$  has less boxes than  $D_{>i}$ . This implies that  $C$  and  $C'$  must have distinct weights. So the proof is complete.  $\blacksquare$

To conclude this section, we see that Algorithms 1, 2 and 3 could be used to produce a total of  $r_1 + r_2 + r_3$  diagrams that are less than  $D$ . Combined with the propositions in Subsections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, these diagrams have distinct weight vectors. This provides a proof of Theorem 1.3.

## 4 Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.5

In this section, we specialize  $D$  in Theorem 1.3 to a Rothe diagram or a skyline diagram, thereby completing the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.5.

### 4.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this subsection, we let  $D = D(w)$  be the Rothe diagram of a permutation  $w \in S_n$ . It suffices to prove the following.

**Theorem 4.1.** *For  $w \in S_n$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} r_1(D(w)) + r_2(D(w)) + r_3(D(w)) &\geq p_{132}(w) + p_{1432}(w) + p_{13254}(w) + 3p_{14253}(w) \\ &\quad + p_{14352}(w) + 4p_{15243}(w) + p_{15324}(w) + 2p_{15342}(w) \quad (4.1) \\ &\quad + p_{15432}(w) + p_{24153}(w) + 2p_{25143}(w) + p_{35142}(w). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* For each permutation  $u$  appearing on the right-hand side of (4.1), let  $P_u(w)$  denote the set of  $u$  patterns in  $w$ , and  $a_u$  be the coefficient of  $p_u(w)$ . For every  $u$  pattern in  $P_u(w)$ , we shall construct  $a_u$  subdiagrams of  $D(w)$ , each of which is equal to one of the configurations in Figure 1.1. Then we conclude the proof by explaining that such constructed subdiagrams are different from each other.

We first look at the construction of subdiagrams of  $D(w)$  for  $u = 132$  or  $1432$ . Let  $w(i_1)w(i_2)w(i_3) \in P_{132}(w)$ . The subdiagram of  $D(w)$  generated by  $w(i_1)w(i_2)w(i_3)$  is defined as  $\{(i_1, w(i_2)), (i_2, w(i_2))\}$ , which is the configuration (A) in Figure 1.1. The construction is displayed in the first line of Table 1, where the boxes forming the subdiagram are marked with  $\checkmark$ . This correspondence has appeared in the proof of [17, Corollary 19], which is in fact a bijection between  $P_{132}(w)$  and the set of subdiagrams of  $D(w)$  which are equal to the configuration (A) in Figure 1.1.

We next turn to the pattern  $w(i_1)w(i_2)w(i_3)w(i_4) \in P_{1432}(w)$ . The subdiagram of  $D(w)$  generated by this pattern is defined as

$$\{(i_1, w(i_4)), (i_1, w(i_3)), (i_2, w(i_4)), (i_2, w(i_3)), (i_3, w(i_4)), (i_3, w(i_3))\},$$

patterns	subdiagrams
 132 pattern	 (A)
 1432 pattern	 (B)

Table 1. Subdiagrams generated by 132 or 1432 patterns.

which forms the configuration (B) in Figure 1.1. See the second line of Table 1 for an illustration of the construction.

There are 10 permutations  $u$  in  $S_5$  appearing on the right-hand side of (4.1). We put the constructions of subdiagrams of  $D(w)$  for these  $u$  patterns in Tables 4 and 5 in the appendix.

Let  $\text{Sub}(D(w))$  denote the collection (as multiset) of all subdiagrams of  $D(w)$  which could be produced by the  $u$  patterns of  $w$  as displayed in Tables 1, 4 and 5. The remaining work is to check that the subdiagrams in  $\text{Sub}(D(w))$  are different. To do this, a crucial feature that we can observe from Tables 1, 4 and 5 is that for any given subdiagram, say  $D_{\text{sub}}$ , in  $\text{Sub}(D(w))$ , we are able to recover the (unique) pattern in  $w$  from which  $D_{\text{sub}}$  is generated. To be specific, we have the following explanations.

- $D_{\text{sub}}$  is the configuration (A) in Figure 1.1. In this case,  $D_{\text{sub}}$  has two boxes. Assume that the boxes lie in rows  $\{i_1 < i_2\}$  and column  $j$ . Then the corresponding 132 pattern of  $w$  includes the entries of  $w$  at the positions  $\{i_1, i_2, w^{-1}(j)\}$ , where  $w^{-1}$  is the inverse of  $w$ .
- $D_{\text{sub}}$  is the configuration (B), or (B') in Figure 1.1. Assume that the six boxes in  $D_{\text{sub}}$  lie in rows  $\{i_1 < i_2 < i_3\}$  and columns  $\{j_1 < j_2\}$ . Then the corresponding pattern of  $w$  includes the entries of  $w$  at the positions  $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, w^{-1}(j_1), w^{-1}(j_2)\}$ . It should be noted that there may happen that  $i_3 = w^{-1}(j_2)$ , and in this case the pattern is a 1432 pattern.
- $D_{\text{sub}}$  is the configuration (C), or (C'), or (C'') in Figure 1.1. Assume that the four boxes in  $D_{\text{sub}}$  lie in rows  $\{i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4\}$ , and among the four boxes, the lowest two lie in column  $j$ . Then the corresponding pattern of  $w$  includes the entries of  $w$  at the positions  $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4, w^{-1}(j)\}$ .

In view of the above observations, give two subdiagrams, say  $D_{\text{sub}}^1$  and  $D_{\text{sub}}^2$ , in  $\text{Sub}(D(w))$ , we can verify  $D_{\text{sub}}^1 \neq D_{\text{sub}}^2$  by contradiction. Suppose otherwise that  $D_{\text{sub}}^1 = D_{\text{sub}}^2$ . Then they are generated by the same  $u$  pattern in  $w$ . This only possibly happens

in the case of the  $u = 15342$  pattern in Table 5. However, the two subdiagrams generated by a  $u = 15342$  pattern are obviously distinct. This arrives at a contradiction. So the proof is complete. ■

**Remark 4.2.** We remark that there may possibly exist instances of subdiagrams of  $D(w)$ , which are equal to the configurations in Figure 1.1, but cannot be produced by the patterns of  $w$  listed in Tables 1, 4, or 5. For example, consider the Rothe diagram  $D(w)$  for  $w = 162435$ . Take the subdiagram consisting of the boxes with check marks. This subdiagram




Figure 4.12. A subdiagram of  $D(162435)$ .

cannot be generated by any  $u \in S_5$  pattern of  $w$ . If it were generated by a  $u$  pattern, then the  $u$  pattern of  $w$  would be 16243 and so  $u = 15243$ . However, in view of the construction in Table 4, the four subdiagrams of  $D(162435)$  generated by the pattern 16243 do not include the one we are considering.

## 4.2 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Here we let  $D = D(\alpha)$  in Theorem 1.3 be the skyline diagram of a weak composition  $\alpha$ . We obtain a proof of Theorem 1.5 by verifying the following equality.

**Theorem 4.3.** For any (weak) composition  $\alpha$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_1(D(\alpha)) + r_2(D(\alpha)) + r_3(D(\alpha)) &= \sum_{\text{inv}_1(\alpha)} (\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_1}) + \sum_{\text{inv}_2(\alpha)} (\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_3}) \cdot (\alpha_{i_3} - \alpha_{i_1}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\text{inv}_3(\alpha)} (\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_1}) \cdot (\alpha_{i_4} - \alpha_{i_3}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

*Proof.* It is obvious that

$$r_1(D(w)) = \sum_{(i_1, i_2) \in \text{inv}_1(\alpha)} (\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_1}).$$

We next check that

$$r_2(D(w)) = \sum_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3) \\ \in \text{inv}_2(\alpha)}} (\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_3}) \cdot (\alpha_{i_3} - \alpha_{i_1}). \quad (4.3)$$

This can be seen as follows. First, since  $D(\alpha)$  is left-justified, there is no subdiagram of  $D(\alpha)$  which is the configuration (B'). We are now left with the enumeration of subdiagrams



of  $D(\alpha)$  which are equal to the configuration (B). Compute such subdiagrams which lie in rows  $\{i_1 < i_2 < i_3\}$ . Clearly, we have  $\alpha_{i_1} < \alpha_{i_3} < \alpha_{i_2}$ . Observe that for each such subdiagram, the column index of its left three boxes is greater than  $\alpha_{i_1}$  but less than or equal to  $\alpha_{i_3}$ , while the column index of its right three boxes is greater than  $\alpha_{i_3}$  but less than or equal to  $\alpha_{i_2}$ . So there are a total of  $(\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_3}) \cdot (\alpha_{i_3} - \alpha_{i_1})$  subdiagrams, which are the configuration (B), lying in rows  $\{i_1 < i_2 < i_3\}$ . This justifies (4.3).

Using similar analysis, one can readily verify that

$$r_3(D(\alpha)) = \sum_{\substack{(i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) \\ \in \text{inv}_3(\alpha)}} (\alpha_{i_2} - \alpha_{i_1}) \cdot (\alpha_{i_4} - \alpha_{i_3}).$$

This completes the proof of (4.2). ■

## 5 Concluding remarks

In this section, we investigate some conjectures and problems concerning  $\theta_w$ .

### 5.1 The maximum value of $\theta_w$

Let  $\alpha_n$  be the largest principal specialization for Schubert polynomials:

$$\alpha_n = \max\{\nu_w : w \in S_n\}$$

Merzon and Smirnov [16] predicted that the maximum value  $\alpha_n$  is achieved on layered permutations. For positive integers  $b_1, \dots, b_k$  summing up to  $n$ , the associated layered permutation  $w(b_1, \dots, b_k)$  in  $S_n$  is defined as the concatenation  $w^1 \dots w^k$  of  $k$  words, where  $w^i$  is obtained by permuting the entries in the interval  $[b_1 + \dots + b_{i-1} + 1, b_1 + \dots + b_i]$  decreasingly. Here we set  $b_0 = 0$ . For example,  $w(2, 3, 2, 1) = 21543768$ .

**Conjecture 5.1** (Merzon–Smirnov [16]). *For  $n \geq 1$ , the permutations in  $S_n$  attaining  $\alpha_n$  are layered permutations.*

Consider the largest value of  $\theta_w$  with  $w \in S_n$ :

$$\beta_n = \max\{\theta_w : w \in S_n\}$$

Computer evidence suggests that  $\beta_n$  is also achieved on layered permutations.

**Conjecture 5.2.** *For  $n \geq 1$ , the permutations in  $S_n$  attaining the maximum value  $\beta_n$  are layered permutations.*

Conjecture 5.2 has been verified for  $n$  up to 9. Note that this conjecture is equivalent to saying that the permutations in  $S_n$  whose Newton polytopes have the largest number of lattice points are layered permutations. In Table 2, we list the values of  $\alpha_n$  and  $\beta_n$  for  $n \leq 9$ , together with the permutations achieving these maximum values. From the table, we see that for each  $n = 1, 2, \dots, 9$  except for  $n = 7$ , there exists (at least) one common layered permutation which reaches both  $\alpha_n$  and  $\beta_n$ .

$n$	$\alpha_n$	permutations attaining $\alpha_n$	$\beta_n$	permutations attaining $\beta_n$
1	1	1	1	1
2	1	12, 21	1	12, 21
3	2	132	2	132
4	5	1432	5	1432
5	14	12543, 15432, 21543	14	15432
6	84	126543, 216543	65	126543, 216543
7	660	1327654	347	1276543, 2176543
8	9438	13287654	2151	13287654
9	163592	132987654	17319	132987654

Table 2. The values of  $\alpha_n$  and  $\beta_n$  for  $n \leq 9$ .

**Problem 5.3.** *For  $n$  large, does there always exist a (layered) permutation in  $S_n$  that achieves the maximum values  $\alpha_n$  and  $\beta_n$  simultaneously.*

The asymptotic behavior of  $\alpha_n$  was first sought by Stanley [21].

**Conjecture 5.4** (Stanely [21]). *There exists a limit*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \alpha_n}{n^2}.$$

Morales, Pak and Panova [20] showed that there is a limit when restricted to layered permutations. That is, letting

$$\gamma_n = \max\{\nu_w : w \text{ are layered permutations in } S_n\},$$

there exists a limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_2 \gamma_n}{n^2} \approx 0.2932362762.$$

Zhang [23] recently considered the asymptotic property for the largest value of  $\mathfrak{S}_w(x)|_{x_i=q^{i-1}}$  with  $q = -1$  for multi-layered permutations.

**Problem 5.5.** *Does there exist an asymptotic behavior for  $\beta_n$  similar to Conjecture 5.4.*

## 5.2 A positivity conjecture

For  $w \in S_n$ , we may write

$$\nu_w = 1 + \sum_{\substack{u \in S_m \\ m \leq n}} c_u p_u(w),$$

where the coefficients  $c_u$  for  $u \in S_m$  are determined recursively by

$$c_u = \nu_u - 1 - \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_\ell \\ \ell < m}} c_\sigma p_\sigma(u).$$

As observed by Gao [8, Lemma 3.1], the coefficients  $c_u$  own the stability property, that is,  $c_u = 0$  for  $u \in S_m$  with  $u(m) = m$ . The following appealing conjecture appears as [8, Conjecture 3.2].

**Conjecture 5.6** (Gao [8]). *For any permutation  $u$ , we have  $c_u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .*

The above conjecture has been confirmed for permutations avoiding both 1432 and 1423 patterns by Mészáros and Tanjaya [18], and for permutations avoiding 1243 patterns by Dennin [4].

Similarly, for  $w \in S_n$ , one may express

$$\theta_w = 1 + \sum_u d_u p_u(w).$$

The coefficients  $d_u$  can be similarly computed in a recursive procedure:

$$d_u = \theta_u - 1 - \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_\ell \\ \ell < m}} d_\sigma p_\sigma(u).$$

Imitating the arguments in the proof of [8, Lemma 3.1], we can show that  $d_u = 0$  for  $u \in S_m$  with  $u(m) = m$ .

**Conjecture 5.7.** *For any permutation  $u$ , we have  $d_u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .*

Conjecture 5.7 has been verified for  $n$  up to 8. The data imply that

- when  $1 \leq n \leq 5$ , we have  $0 \leq d_u \leq c_u$ , and  $d_u > 0$  if and only if  $c_u > 0$ ;
- when  $n = 6, 7$ , we still have  $0 \leq d_u \leq c_u$ . But there exist two permutations in  $S_6$ ,  $u^1 = 136245$  and  $u^2 = 146235$ , such that  $d_{u^1} = d_{u^2} = 0$  but  $c_{u^1} = c_{u^2} = 1$ ;
- when  $n = 8$ , we no longer have  $0 \leq d_u \leq c_u$ . The only exception is  $u = 13452786$  for which  $c_u = 3$  and  $d_u = 4$ .

In Table 3, we list the values of  $c_u > 0$  (or  $d_u > 0$ ) for permutations  $u \in S_m$  with  $m \leq 5$ , where the permutations appearing in the lower bound in Theorem 1.1 are underlined.

From Table 3, we see that there are 13 permutations in  $S_5$  that do not appear in the lower bound in Theorem 1.1. Among the 12 permutations appearing in the lower bound, the coefficients for  $p_{13254}(w)$  and  $p_{15432}(w)$  are not optimal if assuming Conjecture 5.7. New algorithms or tools are needed to explore for further improving the lower bound established in Theorem 1.1.

**Problem 5.8.** *Strengthen the lower bound in Theorem 1.1.*

As an attempt to enhance the bound, it would be interesting to establish a bound for  $\theta_w$  encompassing all  $p_u(w)$  for  $u$  being permutations listed in Table 3.

permutation	$c_u$	$d_u$	permutation	$c_u$	$d_u$
<u>132</u>	1	1	<u>1432</u>	1	1
12453	1	1	<u>15342</u>	2	2
12534	1	1	15423	1	1
12543	5	4	<u>15432</u>	3	3
<u>13254</u>	3	2	21453	1	1
13524	3	2	21534	1	1
13542	4	3	21543	5	4
<u>14253</u>	3	3	<u>24153</u>	1	1
<u>14352</u>	1	1	<u>25143</u>	2	2
14523	1	1	31524	1	1
14532	1	1	31542	2	2
<u>15243</u>	4	4	<u>35142</u>	1	1
<u>15324</u>	1	1			

Table 3. Permutations in  $S_m$  for  $m \leq 5$  with nonzero values of  $c_u$  and  $d_u$ .

## References

- [1] A. Adve, C. Robichaux and A. Yong, An efficient algorithm for deciding vanishing of Schubert polynomial coefficients, *Adv. Math.* 383 (2021), Paper No. 107669, 38 pp.
- [2] M. Demazure, Désingularisation des variétés de Schubert généralisées, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* 7 (1974), 53–88.
- [3] M. Demazure, Une nouvelle formule des caractères, *Bull. Sci. Math.* 98 (1974), 163–172.
- [4] H. Dennin, Pattern bounds for principal specializations of  $\beta$ -Grothendieck polynomials, [arXiv:2206.10017](https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.10017), 2022.
- [5] A. Fink, K. Mészáros and A. St. Dizier, Schubert polynomials as integer point transforms of generalized permutahedra, *Adv. Math.* 332 (2018), 465–475.
- [6] A. Fink, K. Mészáros and A. St. Dizier, Zero-one Schubert polynomials, *Math. Z.* 297 (2021), 1023–1042.
- [7] S. Fomin and R.P. Stanley, Schubert polynomials and the nil-Coxeter algebra, *Adv. Math.* 103 (1994), 196–207.
- [8] Y. Gao, Principal specializations of Schubert polynomials and pattern containment, *European J. Combin.* 94 (2021), Paper No. 103291, 12 pp.
- [9] P.L. Guo, Z. Lin and S.C.Y. Peng, Zero-one dual characters of flagged Weyl modules, [arXiv:2411.10933v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.10933v1), 2024.

- [10] Z. Hamaker, O. Pechenik, D.E. Speyer and A. Weigandt, Derivatives of Schubert polynomials and proof of a determinant conjecture of Stanley, *Algebraic Combin.* 3 (2020), 301–307.
- [11] W. Kraśkiewicz and P. Pragacz, Foncteurs de schubert, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* 304 (1987), 209–211.
- [12] W. Kraśkiewicz and P. Pragacz, Schubert functors and Schubert polynomials, *European J. Combin.* 25 (2004), 1327–1344.
- [13] A. Lascoux, M.-P. Schützenberger, Polynômes de Schubert, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* 294 (1982), 447–450.
- [14] I.G. Macdonald, Notes on Schubert Polynomials, Laboratoire de combinatoire et d’informatique mathématique (LACIM), Université du Québec à Montréal, Montreal, 1991.
- [15] P. Magyar, Schubert polynomials and Bott–Samelson varieties, *Comment. Math. Helv.* 73 (1998), 603–636.
- [16] G. Merzon and E. Smirnov, Determinantal identities for flagged Schur and Schubert polynomials, *European J. Math.* 2 (2016), 227–245.
- [17] K. Mészáros, A. St. Dizier and A. Tanjaya, Principal specialization of dual characters of flagged Weyl modules, *Electron. J. Combin.* 28 (2021), Paper No. 4.17, 12 pp.
- [18] K. Mészáros and A. Tanjaya, Inclusion-exclusion on Schubert polynomials, *Algebraic Combin.* 5 (2022), 209–226.
- [19] C. Monical, N. Tokcan and A. Yong, Newton polytopes in algebraic combinatorics, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* 25 (2019), no. 5, Paper No. 66.
- [20] A.H. Morales, I. Pak and G. Panova, Asymptotics of principal evaluations of Schubert polynomials for layered permutations, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 147 (2019), 1377–1389.
- [21] R. Stanley, Some Schubert shenanigans, arXiv:1704.00851v2, 2017.
- [22] A. Weigandt, Schubert polynomials, 132-patterns, and Stanley’s conjecture, *Algebr. Combin.* 1 (2018), no.4, 415–423.
- [23] N. Zhang, Principal specializations of Schubert polynomials, multi-layered permutations and asymptotics, *Adv. Appl. Math.* 163 (2025), 102806, 19 pp.

## 6 Appendix
















patterns	subdiagrams
 <p>13254 pattern</p>	 <p>(C)</p>
 <p>14253 pattern</p>	 <p>(B')</p>  <p>(C)</p>  <p>(C'')</p>
 <p>14352 pattern</p>	 <p>(B)</p>
 <p>15243 pattern</p>	 <p>(B')</p>  <p>(C)</p>  <p>(C')</p>  <p>(C'')</p>
 <p>15324 pattern</p>	 <p>(B)</p>

Table 4. Subdiagrams in the proof of Theorem 1.1 generated by  $u$  patterns with  $u \in S_5$ .













patterns	subdiagrams	
 15342 pattern	 (B)	 (B)
 15432 pattern	 (B)	
 24153 pattern	 (C'')	
 25143 pattern	 (C')	 (C'')
 35142 pattern	 (C')	

Table 5. Subdiagrams in the proof of Theorem 1.1 generated by  $u$  patterns with  $u \in S_5$  (continued).

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

*Email address:* lguo@nankai.edu.cn

(ZHUOWEI LIN) CENTER FOR COMBINATORICS, NANKAI UNIVERSITY, LPMC, TIANJIN 300071, P.R. CHINA

*Email address:* zwlin0825@163.com