

On some Grothendieck expansions

Eric MARBERG

Department of Mathematics
Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
emarberg@ust.hk

Jiayi WEN

Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
jiayiw@usc.edu

Abstract

The complete flag variety admits a natural action by both the orthogonal group and the symplectic group. Wyser and Yong defined orthogonal Grothendieck polynomials $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ and symplectic Grothendieck polynomials $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{Sp}}$ as the K -theory classes of the corresponding orbit closures. There is an explicit formula to expand $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{Sp}}$ as a nonnegative sum of Grothendieck polynomials $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$, which represent the K -theory classes of Schubert varieties. Although the constructions of $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{Sp}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ are similar, finding the $\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)}$ -expansion of $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ or even computing $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ is much harder. If z is vexillary then $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ has a nonnegative $\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)}$ -expansion, but the associated coefficients are mostly unknown. This paper derives several new formulas for $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ and its $\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)}$ -expansion when z is vexillary. Among other applications, we prove that the latter expansion has a nontrivial stability property.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Grothendieck polynomials	2
1.2	Orthogonal Grothendieck polynomials	3
1.3	Symplectic Grothendieck polynomials	4
1.4	Grothendieck expansions	5
2	Preliminaries	6
2.1	Divided difference operators	6
2.2	Product formulas and recurrences	7
2.3	Vexillary involutions and weak order	7
2.4	Involution Grothendieck polynomials	11

3	Expansions for quasi-dominant involutions	13
3.1	Grothendieck expansions in the quasi-dominant case	13
3.2	Transition formulas and applications	16
3.3	Examples and conjectures	20
4	Expansions for vexillary involutions	23
4.1	Setting up the main theorem	23
4.2	Proof of Theorem 4.5	26
4.3	Shift invariance and stable limits	35
4.4	Grassmannian identities	39

1 Introduction

This article is concerned with combinatorial formulas for expansions of three different families of *Grothendieck polynomials* related to K -theory classes of Schubert varieties. We first briefly introduce these polynomials in the context of *matrix Schubert varieties*. We will then discuss the central problem of interest and some of our partial solutions.

1.1 Grothendieck polynomials

Let n be a positive integer. Write S_n for the group of permutations of the integers \mathbb{Z} with support in $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Let $\text{Mat}_{n \times n}$ be the affine variety of complex $n \times n$ matrices.

For $w \in S_n$, the *matrix Schubert variety* MX_w is the set of matrices $M \in \text{Mat}_{n \times n}$ whose upper $i \times j$ sub-matrices $M_{[i][j]}$ satisfy

$$\text{rank}(M_{[i][j]}) \leq |\{t \in [i] : w(t) \leq j\}| \quad \text{for all } i, j \in [n].$$

Results in [16] identify an equivariant K -theory class

$$[MX_w] \in \mathbb{Z}[a_1^{\pm 1}, a_2^{\pm 1}, \dots, a_n^{\pm 1}] \cong K_T(\text{Mat}_{n \times n}).$$

The *Grothendieck polynomial* $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ introduced in [8] can be formed from $[MX_w]$ by substituting $a_i \mapsto 1 + \beta x_i$ for all $i \in [n]$ and dividing by $(-\beta)^{\text{codim}(MX_w)}$.

Example 1.1. The Grothendieck polynomial of the reverse permutation $w_0 = n \cdots 321 \in S_n$ is the monomial $\mathcal{G}_{w_0}^{(\beta)} = x_1^{n-1} x_2^{n-2} \cdots x_{n-1}$. As will be explained in Section 2.2, all other instances of $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ for $w \in S_n$ can be computed by applying certain *divided difference operators* to $\mathcal{G}_{w_0}^{(\beta)}$. When $n = 3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{123}^{(\beta)} &= 1, & \mathcal{G}_{132}^{(\beta)} &= x_1 + x_2 + \beta x_1 x_2, & \mathcal{G}_{312}^{(\beta)} &= x_1^2, \\ \mathcal{G}_{231}^{(\beta)} &= x_1, & \mathcal{G}_{213}^{(\beta)} &= x_1 x_2, & \mathcal{G}_{321}^{(\beta)} &= x_1^2 x_2. \end{aligned}$$

The Grothendieck polynomial $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ always belongs to $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots]$ and is homogeneous of degree $\text{codim}(MX_w)$ if we consider β to have $\deg \beta = -1$. This degree coincides with the value of the usual Coxeter length function

$$\ell(w) := |\{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : i < j \text{ and } w(i) > w(j)\}|. \quad (1.1)$$

In turn, if $w \in S_\infty := \bigcup_{m \geq 1} S_m$ then the value of $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ does not depend on the choice of n with $w \in S_n$. Finally, it is known [25, Cor. 3.3] that the set of polynomials $\{\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} : w \in S_\infty\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}[\beta]$ -basis for $\mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots]$.

1.2 Orthogonal Grothendieck polynomials

The main subject of this article are the following analogues of Grothendieck polynomials studied in [24, 29]. Let

$$I_n = \{z \in S_n : z = z^{-1}\} \quad \text{and} \quad I_\infty = \bigcup_{m \geq 1} I_m = \{z \in S_\infty : z = z^{-1}\}$$

be the sets of involutions in S_n and S_∞ . For $z \in I_n$ define

$$\text{Mat}_{n \times n}^{\text{O}} = \{X \in \text{Mat}_{n \times n} : X^T = X\} \quad \text{and} \quad MX_z^{\text{O}} = MX_z \cap \text{Mat}_{n \times n}^{\text{O}}.$$

Results in [24] identify an equivariant K -theory class

$$[MX_z^{\text{O}}] \in \mathbb{Z}[a_1^{\pm 1}, a_2^{\pm 1}, \dots, a_n^{\pm 1}] \cong K_T(\text{Mat}_{n \times n}^{\text{O}}).$$

Similar to $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$, the *orthogonal Grothendieck polynomial* \mathcal{G}_z^{O} is formed from $[MX_z^{\text{O}}]$ by substituting $a_i \mapsto 1 + \beta x_i$ for all i and dividing by $(-\beta)^{\text{codim}(MX_z^{\text{O}})}$. These polynomials were introduced in [29] with a slightly different geometric interpretation, as K -theory representatives for the orbit closures of the orthogonal group acting on the complete flag variety.

Each \mathcal{G}_z^{O} belongs to $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ and does not depend on the choice of n with $z \in I_n$. If we consider β to have $\deg \beta = -1$ then \mathcal{G}_z^{O} is homogeneous of degree $\text{codim}(MX_z^{\text{O}})$. This degree can be computed by setting

$$\text{cyc}(z) := |\{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : a < z(a)\}| \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{\text{inv}}(z) := \frac{\ell(z) + \text{cyc}(z)}{2}. \quad (1.2)$$

Then [28, Lem. 5.4] we have $\text{codim}(MX_z^{\text{O}}) = \ell_{\text{inv}}(z) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Example 1.2. If $w_0 = n \cdots 321 \in I_n$ then there is an explicit product formula

$$\mathcal{G}_{w_0}^{\text{O}} = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n-i} (x_i + x_j + \beta x_i x_j). \quad (1.3)$$

When $z \in I_n$ is *verillary* in the sense of being 2143-avoiding, then \mathcal{G}_z^{O} can be computed by certain applying divided difference operators to $\mathcal{G}_{w_0}^{\text{O}}$, as will be

explained in Section 2.2. For $n = 3$ such computations give the formulas

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{G}_1^{\mathcal{O}} &= 1 = \mathcal{G}_{123}^{(\beta)}, \\
\mathcal{G}_{(1,2)}^{\mathcal{O}} &= 2x_1 + \beta x_1^2 = 2\mathcal{G}_{213}^{(\beta)} + \beta\mathcal{G}_{312}^{(\beta)}, \\
\mathcal{G}_{(2,3)}^{\mathcal{O}} &= 2x_2 + 2x_1 + \beta x_2^2 + 4\beta x_1 x_2 + \beta x_1^2 + 2\beta^2 x_1 x_2^2 + 2\beta^2 x_1^2 x_2 + \beta^3 x_1^2 x_2^2 \\
&= 2\mathcal{G}_{132}^{(\beta)} + \beta\mathcal{G}_{231}^{(\beta)} + \beta\mathcal{G}_{1423}^{(\beta)} + \beta^2\mathcal{G}_{2413}^{(\beta)}, \\
\mathcal{G}_{(1,3)}^{\mathcal{O}} &= 2x_1 x_2 + 2x_1^2 + 3\beta x_1^2 x_2 + \beta x_1^3 + \beta^2 x_1^3 x_2 \\
&= 2\mathcal{G}_{231}^{(\beta)} + 2\mathcal{G}_{312}^{(\beta)} + 3\beta\mathcal{G}_{321}^{(\beta)} + \beta\mathcal{G}_{4123}^{(\beta)} + \beta^2\mathcal{G}_{4213}^{(\beta)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For involutions $z \in I_{\infty}$ that are not vexillary, no simple algebraic method is available for computing $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$. However, at least in the vexillary case, it is known [27, Prop. 3.29] that $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ is a linear combination of ordinary Grothendieck polynomials $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\beta]$. The nontrivial part of this fact is the non-negativity of the coefficients, which follows from a general geometric result of Brion [2]. It is an open problem to describe the $\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)}$ -expansion of $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ explicitly. This problem is our focus here.

1.3 Symplectic Grothendieck polynomials

It is instructive to contrast this problem with what is known about the following *symplectic Grothendieck polynomials*. Let I_n^{fpf} be the set of fixed-point-free involutions of \mathbb{Z} sending $i \mapsto i - 1$ for all even $i \notin [n]$. For $z \in I_n^{\text{fpf}}$ define

$$\text{Mat}_{n \times n}^{\text{Sp}} = \{X \in \text{Mat}_{n \times n} : X^{\top} = -X\} \quad \text{and} \quad MX_z^{\text{Sp}} = MX_z \cap \text{Mat}_{n \times n}^{\text{Sp}}.$$

As in the previous two cases, there an equivariant K -theory class [24]

$$[MX_z^{\text{Sp}}] \in \mathbb{Z}[a_1^{\pm 1}, a_2^{\pm 1}, \dots, a_n^{\pm 1}] \cong K_T(\text{Mat}_{n \times n}^{\text{Sp}}).$$

The *symplectic Grothendieck polynomial* $\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{Sp}}$ is formed from the class $[MX_z^{\text{Sp}}]$ by substituting $a_i \mapsto 1 + \beta x_i$ for all $i \in [n]$ and dividing by $(-\beta)^{\text{codim}(MX_z^{\text{Sp}})}$. Like $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$, these polynomials were first considered in [29] as K -theory representatives for a certain set of orbit closures in the complete flag variety, now for the action of the symplectic group.

As before, the polynomial $\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{Sp}}$ always belongs $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots]$, is homogeneous of degree $\text{codim}(MX_z^{\text{Sp}})$ if we consider $\deg \beta = -1$, and does not depend on the choice of n with $z \in I_n^{\text{fpf}}$.

The polynomials $\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{Sp}}$ are more tractable than $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ in several respects. Each $\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{Sp}}$ can be determined inductively by applying divided difference operators to a product formula corresponding to the reverse permutation [29, §2.1]. There is also a positive $\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)}$ -expansion of each $\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{Sp}}$. Unlike for $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$, this expansion can be constructed explicitly in the following way.

Write $w_i = w(i)$ for $w \in S_\infty$. Then let \approx be the transitive closure of the relation on S_∞ with $v^{-1} \approx w^{-1}$ if some $i \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $a < b < c < d$ have

$$\{v_{i+1}v_{i+2}v_{i+3}v_{i+4}, w_{i+1}w_{i+2}w_{i+3}w_{i+4}\} \subseteq \{adbc, bcad, bdac\},$$

while $v_j = w_j$ for all $j \notin \{i+1, i+2, i+3, i+4\}$. For example,

$$(152634)^{-1} \approx (153624)^{-1} \approx (153426)^{-1} \approx (341526)^{-1} \approx (351426)^{-1}.$$

Given $z \in I_n^{\text{fpf}}$ let $a_1 < a_2 < \dots$ be the integers with $0 < a_i < b_i := z(a_i)$ and define $\alpha_{\text{fpf}}(z)$ to be inverse of $a_1 b_1 a_2 b_2 \dots \in S_\infty$. Then we have [24, Thm. 3.12]

$$\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{Sp}} = \sum_{w \approx \alpha_{\text{fpf}}(z)} \beta^{\ell(w) - \ell_{\text{fpf}}(z)} \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} \quad \text{where } \ell_{\text{fpf}}(z) := \ell(\alpha_{\text{fpf}}(z)). \quad (1.4)$$

In particular, for each $z \in I_n^{\text{fpf}}$ there is a map $\text{GC}_z^{\text{Sp}} : S_\infty \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with

$$\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{Sp}} = \sum_{w \in S_\infty} \text{GC}_z^{\text{Sp}}(w) \cdot \beta^{\ell(w) - \ell_{\text{fpf}}(z)} \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}. \quad (1.5)$$

1.4 Grothendieck expansions

As $\{\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} : w \in S_\infty\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}[\beta]$ -basis for $\mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots]$, there is a unique coefficient function $\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}} : S_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ for each $z \in I_\infty$ with

$$\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}} = \sum_{w \in S_\infty} \text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}(w) \cdot \beta^{\ell(w) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}. \quad (1.6)$$

The support $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}) := \{w \in S_\infty : \text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}(w) \neq 0\}$ is always a finite set of permutations. In contrast to GC_z^{Sp} , no simple method is known to compute this set in an efficient way.

When $z \in I_\infty$ is vexillary, as noted earlier, the function GC_z^{O} takes all values in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. More precisely, define the *visible descent set* of $z \in I_\infty$ to be

$$\text{Des}_V(z) := \{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : z(i) > z(i+1) \leq i\}. \quad (1.7)$$

Then for any vexillary $z \in I_\infty$ with $\text{Des}_V(z) \subseteq [n]$, one has [27, Prop. 3.29]

$$\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\beta]\text{-span} \left\{ \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} : \text{Des}_R(w) \subseteq [n] \right\} = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]. \quad (1.8)$$

Unlike GC_z^{Sp} which takes all values in $\{0, 1\}$, results in this paper will show that the maximum value of GC_z^{O} is unbounded as z varies over all vexillary involutions.

We mention that if one sets $\beta = 0$ then $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$, \mathcal{G}_y^{O} , and $\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{Sp}}$ turn into the (*involution*) *Schubert polynomials* \mathfrak{S}_w , $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_y$, and $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_z^{\text{fpf}}$ studied in [11, 22, 29], for which the relevant expansions are all much simpler. Both $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_y$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_z^{\text{fpf}}$ are equal to a constant times a multiplicity-free sum of Schubert polynomials \mathfrak{S}_w . Moreover, the terms that appear are predicted by a general formula of Brion [3] and are described combinatorially in [6].

This work contains the first concrete results about the $\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)}$ -expansion of $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$. Our main theorems can be summarized as follows. After some preliminaries in Section 2, we use Section 3 to derive two exact, though not obviously positive formulas for $\text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ when z is any *quasi-dominant* involution (see Theorems 3.2 and 3.16). Several ingredients are needed to prove these theorems, including the *transition formulas* in [18, 20] and new identities for certain *involution Grothendieck polynomials* introduced in [26]. Section 3.3 also presents a general conjecture about the support of $\text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ for any vexillary $z \in I_{\infty}$.

Then in Section 4 we explain a new formula for $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ that applies when z is any vexillary involution (see Theorem 4.5). This result is complementary to a complicated Pfaffian formula for $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ that was derived for all vexillary involutions z in [24]. Our new identity follows by an inductive argument using the results in Section 3 as the base case.

As an application, we show that $\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)}$ -expansion of $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ has a nontrivial *shift invariance* property when z is vexillary (see Theorem 4.11). These results lead to a new proof of the existence of *stable limits* of orthogonal Grothendieck polynomials. We also derive a number of interesting formulas for $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ in special cases. For example, the identities in Section 4.4 that apply when z is *I-Grassmannian* give a non-symmetric generalization of the main theorem in [7].

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by Hong Kong RGC grants 16306120 and 16304122. We thank Brendan Pawlowski for useful conversations.

2 Preliminaries

This section reviews some facts about divided difference operators and related formulas for $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ and $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$. Then we develop some properties of a natural *weak order* on vexillary involutions. Finally, we discuss a variant of $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ from [26].

2.1 Divided difference operators

Continue to let β and x_i be commuting indeterminates. The group S_{∞} acts on $\mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots]$ by permuting the x_i variables. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ the *divided difference operators* ∂_i and $\partial_i^{(\beta)}$ act on $\mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots]$ by the formulas

$$\partial_i f = \frac{f - s_i f}{x_i - x_{i+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_i^{(\beta)} f = \partial_i((1 + \beta x_{i+1})f) = -\beta f + (1 + \beta x_i)\partial_i f. \quad (2.1)$$

These operators satisfy the Coxeter braid relations for S_{∞} along with $\partial_i \partial_i = 0$ and $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \partial_i^{(\beta)} = -\beta \partial_i^{(\beta)}$. There is a useful product formula

$$\partial_i^{(\beta)}(fg) = (s_i f) \cdot (\partial_i^{(\beta)} g + \beta g) + (\partial_i^{(\beta)} f) \cdot g \quad (2.2)$$

which holds for any $f, g \in \mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots]$. This implies that if $s_i f = f$ then

$$\partial_i^{(\beta)}(fg) = f \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)} g. \quad (2.3)$$

2.2 Product formulas and recurrences

The *Rothe diagram* of a permutation $w \in S_\infty$ is the set $D(w)$ of positive integer pairs (i, j) satisfying both $i < w^{-1}(j)$ and $j < w(i)$. A *partition* is a weakly decreasing sequence of nonnegative integers $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0)$ with finite sum.

A permutation $w \in S_\infty$ is *dominant* if there is a partition λ such that $D(w) = D_\lambda$ where $D_\lambda := \{(i, j) : 1 \leq j \leq \lambda_i\}$. In this case we say that w is dominant of shape λ . Every dominant permutation is 132-avoiding [22, Ex. 2.2.2] and therefore also vexillary.

There is a unique dominant $w \in S_\infty$ of each partition shape λ , and results in [8] show that the Grothendieck polynomial of this permutation is

$$\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} = \prod_{(i,j) \in D_\lambda} x_i. \quad (2.4)$$

Let $\text{Des}_R(w) := \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : w(i) > w(i+1)\}$ be the *right descent set* of a permutation $w \in S_\infty$. Then for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $w \in S_\infty$ we have [8]

$$\partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}_{ws_i}^{(\beta)} & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}_R(w) \\ -\beta \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}_R(w). \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

Combined with (2.4), this recursive formula determines $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ for all $w \in S_\infty$.

The dominant permutation z of shape λ belongs to I_∞ if and only if $\lambda = \lambda^\top$ is a *symmetric* partition, since $D(z) = D(z^{-1}) = D(z)^\top$. In this case

$$\mathcal{G}_z^\circ = \prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in D_\lambda \\ i \leq j}} x_i \oplus x_j \quad \text{where } x \oplus y := x + y + \beta xy \quad (2.6)$$

by [24, Thm. 3.8]. Moreover, if $z \in I_\infty$ is vexillary then

$$\partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_z^\circ = \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}_{s_i z s_i}^\circ & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}_R(z) \\ -\beta \mathcal{G}_z^\circ & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}_R(z) \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $s_i z s_i$ is also vexillary and not equal to z [24, Prop. 3.23]. The recurrence (2.7) combined with the product formula (2.6) can be used to calculate \mathcal{G}_z° for any vexillary $z \in I_\infty$. This claim is not obvious, but will be a consequence of Theorem 2.2 in the next subsection.

For involutions $z \in I_\infty$ that are not vexillary, no simple algebraic method using divided difference operators is known for computing \mathcal{G}_z° . See the discussion in [29, §2.2], especially [29, Examples 2.5 and 2.6].

2.3 Vexillary involutions and weak order

Let I_∞^{vex} be the subset of vexillary elements of I_∞ , that is, involutions in S_∞ that are 2143-avoiding. This section discusses some concrete ways of identifying the elements of this set. Both [9] and [28, §4] are useful references for this material.

Note that $z \in I_\infty$ is completely determined by $D(z)$, which by symmetry is itself determined by $\hat{D}(z)$.

It is useful to recall that a permutation $w \in S_\infty$ is vexillary if and only if the family of sets $\{D_i(w) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$ is totally ordered under inclusion [28, §2]. In addition, an involution $z \in I_\infty$ is vexillary if and only if $\text{Ess}(\hat{D}(z))$ is totally ordered under the partial order that has $(i, j) \preceq (k, l)$ whenever $i \geq k$ and $j \leq l$ [28, Lem. 4.18].

Fix $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ and define $c(z) := (c_1, c_2, c_3, \dots)$ where $c_i := |D_i(z)|$. It is well-known that the *code* $c(z)$ uniquely determines z . One has $c_i \leq c_{i+1}$ if and only if $z(i) < z(i+1)$, with equality when $z(i) + 1 = z(i+1)$. If z is dominant of shape λ then $c(z) = \lambda$.

Assume z is not dominant. Let $m := \max\{c_{i+1} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \text{ and } c_i < c_{i+1}\}$ and $j := \min\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : c_i < c_{i+1} = m\}$. We call j the *distinguished ascent* of z .

Lemma 2.3. If $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ is not dominant, then its distinguished ascent j is defined and it holds that $j < \max\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : z(i) \neq i\}$ and $z \xrightarrow{j} s_j z s_j \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$.

Proof. Suppose $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ is not dominant and let $q = \max\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : z(i) \neq i\}$, so that $z \in S_q$ and $D(z) \subset [q] \times [q]$. Define m and j as above, and let

$$N = \max(D_{j+1}(z)).$$

Because $c_{l+1} = 0$ for all $l \geq q$, we must have $j < q$. As $c_j < c_{j+1}$, we must also have $z(j) < z(j+1)$ and there exists some $(j+1, l) \in D(z)$ such that $z(j) < l < z(j+1)$. We claim that $j \leq z(j)$. To show this, we first check that

$$\emptyset \neq \{z(j) + 1, z(j) + 2, \dots, N - 1\} = D_{j+1}(z) \setminus D_j(z). \quad (2.11)$$

Because z is vexillary, the family of sets $\{D_i(z) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$ is totally ordered. Hence $c_j < c_{j+1}$ implies that $D_j(z) \subset D_{j+1}(z)$, and it suffices to show that

$$\{z(j) + 1, z(j) + 2, \dots, N - 1\} \subset D_{j+1}(z)$$

because $z(j) > \max(D_j(z))$. If $i < j$ and $z(j) \in D_i(z)$, then $D_{j+1}(z) \subset D_i(z)$ and so $z(i) > N$. However, if $i < j$ and $z(j) \notin D_i(z)$ then $z(i) < z(j)$. Therefore (2.11) holds.

Now we prove that $j \leq z(j)$ by assuming $z(j) < j$ and deriving a contradiction. By the preceding paragraph, we have

$$(j+1, z(j)+1) \in D_{j+1}(z) \quad \text{and also} \quad (z(j)+1, j+1) \in D(z)$$

by the symmetry of $D(z)$. Since $z(j) \notin D_{j+1}(z)$, we must have $c_{z(j)+1} > c_{j+1}$. Because $z(j) < j$ is not the distinguished ascent of z , we must also have

$$c_{z(j)} \geq c_{z(j)+1} \quad \text{and therefore} \quad D_{z(j)+1}(z) \subset D_{z(j)}(z).$$

But this is impossible as $(z(j), j+1) \in D(z)$ and $j+1 > j = z(z(j))$. Therefore our claim that $j \leq z(j)$ must hold.

Finally, we prove that $s_j z s_j \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ by showing that $\text{Ess}(\hat{D}(s_j z s_j))$ is totally ordered under \preceq . We observe that $D(s_j z s_j)$ and $D(z)$ differ only in the rows and columns indexed by j and $j+1$. Because $z(j) \geq j$ and $z(j+1) > j+1$, the half-diagrams $\hat{D}(z)$ and $\hat{D}(s_j z s_j)$ have the same columns j and $j+1$. Moreover,

$$\hat{D}_{j+1}(s_j z s_j) = \hat{D}_j(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{D}_j(s_j z s_j) = \hat{D}_{j+1}(z) \cup \{z(j)\}.$$

Because $(j, z(j)+1) \in \hat{D}(s_j z s_j)$, the pair $(j, z(j))$ cannot be in $\text{Ess}(\hat{D}(s_j z s_j))$ and $\text{Ess}(\hat{D}(s_j z s_j)) \setminus \text{Ess}(\hat{D}(z))$ has at most an element. In fact:

- If $(j+1, N) \notin \text{Ess}(\hat{D}(z))$ then $\text{Ess}(\hat{D}(z)) = \text{Ess}(\hat{D}(s_j z s_j))$.
- If $(j+1, N) \in \text{Ess}(\hat{D}(z))$ then (j, N) is in $\text{Ess}(\hat{D}(s_j z s_j))$, but this set is still totally ordered as any $(k, l) \succeq (j+1, N)$ must have $k < j$ and $l \geq N$.

We conclude that $\text{Ess}(\hat{D}(s_j z s_j))$ is totally ordered under \preceq so $s_i z s_i \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$. \square

Now suppose $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ is dominant and has $p > 0$ nontrivial cycles. Define

$$\hat{D}_i(z) := \{j : (i, j) \in \hat{D}(z)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{c}(z) := (\hat{c}_1, \hat{c}_2, \hat{c}_3, \dots) \quad (2.12)$$

where $\hat{c}_i := |\hat{D}_i(z)|$. Because z is dominant, we have

$$D_i(z) = [i-1 + \hat{c}_i] \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{D}_i(z) = i-1 + [\hat{c}_i] \quad \text{for all } i \leq p, \quad (2.13)$$

along with $\hat{c}_i = 0$ and $z(i) \leq i$ for all $i > p$. Continue to define q as in (2.8). Then we must have $D(z) \subseteq \{(i, j) : i+j \leq q\}$ so $\hat{c}_i \leq q - 2i + 1$ for all $i \in [p]$, with equality for all i if and only if $z = \text{dom}_{pq}$.

Hence, if z is dominant but not equal to dom_{pq} then some minimal $i \in [p]$ has $\hat{c}_i < q - 2i + 1$; we refer to $j := z(i)$ as the *dominant ascent* of z . Let \mathbf{e}_i be the tuple with 1 in position i and zeros in all other positions.

Lemma 2.4. Let $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}} \setminus \{1\}$ be dominant. Define p and q as in (2.8) and assume $z \neq \text{dom}_{pq}$. Let j be the dominant ascent of z and set $i = z(j)$. Then $j \leq q-i$ and $s_j z s_j$ is dominant with $\ell(s_j z s_j) = \ell(z) + 2$ and $\hat{c}(s_j z s_j) = \hat{c}(z) + \mathbf{e}_i$.

Proof. Since $\hat{c}_t = q - 2t + 1$ for each $t \in [i-1]$, we must have $z(t) = q - t + 1$ for all $t \in [i-1]$. Then, in order to have $\hat{c}_i < q - 2i + 1$, we must also have $j = z(i) < q - i + 1$.

Every $t \in [p]$ must have $t < z(t)$ since z has p nontrivial cycles but $z(t) \leq t$ for all $t > p$. Therefore $i < z(i) = j$ since $i \in [p]$. As $\ell(z) = |D(z)|$, it suffices to show that $D(s_j z s_j) = D(z) \sqcup \{(i, j)\} \sqcup \{(j, i)\}$ since the union on the right is the diagram of a symmetric partition.

The diagrams $D(z)$ and $D(s_j z s_j)$ only differ in the rows and columns indexed by $j, j+1, z(j) = i$, and $z(j+1)$. Because $D(z)$ is of partition shape, we must have $z(k) < j$ for any $i < k < z(j+1)$. Hence $z(j+1) \geq j+1$ and $(i, j) \in D(s_j z s_j)$, but $D(s_j z s_j)$ has no pairs of the form (k, j) with $k > i$. By the symmetry of the Rothe diagram, $D(s_j z s_j)$ contains (j, i) and no pairs of the form (j, k) with $k > i$. Because $i < j$ and $j+1 \leq z(j+1)$, the diagrams $\hat{D}_j(s_j z s_j)$ and $\hat{D}_j(z)$ have the same column i and same column $z(j+1)$ unless $z(j+1) = j+1$. Thus $D(s_j z s_j) = D(z) \sqcup \{(i, j)\} \sqcup \{(j, i)\}$ as needed. \square

We can now give a short proof of Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. If z is not dominant, or dominant but not equal to dom_{pq} , then we can apply Lemma 2.3 or 2.4 to find $j \in [q-1]$ with $z \xrightarrow{j} s_j z s_j \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$. As the values of p and q do not change when z is replaced by $s_j z s_j$, this one-step path can be extended by induction to one of the desired form.

Say that z is *quasi-dominant* if $i < z(i)$ for all $i \in [p]$. In this case $z(i) \leq i$ for all $i > p$, so $\ell(s_p z s_p) \leq \ell(z)$. Thus, if z is quasi-dominant then we can only have $z \xrightarrow{j} v \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ if $j \neq p$, and then v is quasi-dominant with $\text{cyc}(v) = \text{cyc}(z) = p$, so by induction any path $z \xrightarrow{i_1} \dots \xrightarrow{i_k} \text{dom}_{pq}$ must have $p \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$. \square

2.4 Involution Grothendieck polynomials

There is another family of polynomials indexed by involutions $z \in I_\infty$ that share several favorable algebraic properties with $\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{Sp}}$. We shall see that these *involution Grothendieck polynomials* are closely related to \mathcal{G}_z^{O} , although they do not currently have a geometric interpretation by themselves.

Let \leq denote the *(strong) Bruhat order* on S_∞ , which is the transitive closure of the relation with $v < w$ whenever $\ell(v) < \ell(w)$ and $w = vt$ for any transposition $t = (i, j) \in S_\infty$. For each $u, v \in S_\infty$ there is a unique element $w \in S_\infty$ such that the set-wise product $\{x \in S_\infty : x \leq u\} \{x \in S_\infty : x \leq v\}$ is equal to $\{x \in S_\infty : x \leq w\}$. If we set $u \circ v := w$ then \circ gives an associative operation $S_\infty \times S_\infty \rightarrow S_\infty$, often called the *Demazure product*.

Standard properties of the Bruhat order [1, §2.2] imply that $u \circ v = uv$ if and only if $\ell(uv) = \ell(u) + \ell(v)$, that $s_i \circ s_i = s_i$ for all simple transpositions $s_i := (i, i+1) \in S_\infty$, and that $(u \circ v)^{-1} = v^{-1} \circ u^{-1}$. It follows that

$$s_i \circ w = \begin{cases} s_i w & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}_R(w) \\ w & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}_R(w) \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad w \circ s_i = \begin{cases} w s_i & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}_R(w) \\ w & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}_R(w) \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

for all $w \in S_\infty$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, where $\text{Des}_L(w) := \text{Des}_R(w^{-1})$.

Remark 2.5. There is a monomial-positive formula for $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ that can be stated using this notation. In what follows, we use the term *word* to mean a finite sequence of positive integers $a = a_1 a_2 \dots a_k$. Given such a word, we set $\ell(a) = k$ and $x^a = x_{a_1} x_{a_2} \dots x_{a_k}$.

A pair of words (a, i) with $\ell(a) = \ell(i)$ is a *compatible sequence* if i is weakly increasing such that $i_j < i_{j+1}$ whenever $a_j \leq a_{j+1}$. Such a compatible sequence is *bounded* if $i_j \leq a_j$ for all j .

Given $w \in S_\infty$, let $\mathcal{H}(w)$ be the set of *Hecke words* $a = a_1 a_2 \dots a_k$ with $w = s_{a_1} \circ s_{a_2} \circ \dots \circ s_{a_k}$. Then [17, Cor. 5.4] one has $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} = \sum_{(a,i)} \beta^{\ell(a) - \ell(w)} x^i$ where the sum is over all bounded compatible sequences (a, i) with $a \in \mathcal{H}(w)$.

Combining the identities in (2.14) shows that if $z \in I_\infty$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ then

$$s_i \circ z \circ s_i = \begin{cases} zs_i & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}_R(z) \text{ and } zs_i = s_i z \\ s_i z s_i & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}_R(z) \text{ and } zs_i \neq s_i z \\ z & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}_R(z). \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

Note that $zs_i = s_i z$ if and only if $\{i, i+1\} = \{z(i), z(i+1)\}$. The formula (2.15) implies that $w \mapsto w^{-1} \circ w$ is a surjective map $S_\infty \rightarrow I_\infty$, so the set

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z) := \{w \in S_\infty : w^{-1} \circ w = z\} \quad (2.16)$$

is nonempty for $z \in I_\infty$.

Definition 2.6. The *involution Grothendieck polynomial* of $z \in I_\infty$ is

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z := \sum_{w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)} \beta^{\ell(w) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\beta][x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots].$$

The set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ was extensively studied in [12] and the polynomials $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z$ were introduced in [26, §4].

Like $\mathcal{B}_{\text{fpf}}(z)$, the set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ can be efficiently generated using a certain equivalent relation. Let \sim be the transitive closure of the relation on S_∞ that has $v^{-1} \sim w^{-1}$ if there is an index $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and integers $a < b < c$ such that

$$\{v_i v_{i+1} v_{i+2}, w_i w_{i+1} w_{i+2}\} \subset \{cba, cab, bca\}$$

while $v_j = w_j$ for all $j \notin \{i, i+1, i+2\}$. This is the transitive relation with

$$(\dots cab \dots)^{-1} \sim (\dots cba \dots)^{-1} \sim (\dots bca \dots)^{-1} \quad \text{for all } a < b < c,$$

where corresponding ellipses “ \dots ” mask identical subsequences.

For $z \in I_\infty$ let $a_1 < a_2 < \dots$ be the positive integers with $a_i \leq b_i := z(a_i)$. Define $\alpha_{\text{inv}}(z)$ to be inverse of the permutation whose one-line notation is formed by removing the repeated letters from $b_1 a_1 b_2 a_2 b_3 a_3 \dots$. Then [12, §6.1] we have

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z) = \{w \in S_\infty : w \sim \alpha_{\text{inv}}(z)\}. \quad (2.17)$$

Recall the definition of $\ell_{\text{inv}}(z)$ from (1.2). It is also known [11, §3] that

$$\ell_{\text{inv}}(z) = \ell(\alpha_{\text{inv}}(z)) = \min\{\ell(w) : w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)\} = |\widehat{D}(z)|. \quad (2.18)$$

From (1.2) and (2.15) we get

$$\ell_{\text{inv}}(s_i \circ z \circ s_i) = \begin{cases} \ell_{\text{inv}}(z) & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}_R(z) \\ \ell_{\text{inv}}(z) + 1 & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}_R(z). \end{cases} \quad (2.19)$$

Example 2.7. If $z = (1, 4)(2, 5) \in I_\infty$ then $\alpha_{\text{inv}}(z) = 41523^{-1} = 24513$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z) &= \{24513, 25413, 25314, 35214, 35124\} \\ &= \{41523^{-1}, 41532^{-1}, 41352^{-1}, 43152^{-1}, 34152^{-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

3 Expansions for quasi-dominant involutions

Recall that an element $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ is *quasi-dominant* if $i - 1 < z(i - 1)$ whenever $1 < i < z(i)$. Every dominant involution is quasi-dominant. This section proves two new formulas for $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ when z is quasi-dominant; see Theorems 3.2 and 3.16. We then present a general conjecture about the support of $\text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ for any $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$.

3.1 Grothendieck expansions in the quasi-dominant case

For any element $z \in I_\infty$ we define

$$k(z) := \min\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} : z(j) \leq j \text{ for all } j > i\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Since $D(z)$ is invariant under transpose when $z \in I_\infty$, we also have

$$k(z) = \min\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} : (j, j) \notin D(z) \text{ for all } j > i\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Proposition 3.1. Let $z \in I_\infty$. Then it holds that $k(z) \geq \text{cyc}(z)$, with equality if and only if z is quasi-dominant.

Proof. As $\{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : a < z(a)\} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, k(z)\}$ we must have $\text{cyc}(z) \leq k(z)$, with equality only if z is quasi-dominant. Conversely, if z is quasi-dominant then $z(j) \leq j$ for all $j > \text{cyc}(z)$, so $k(z) \leq \text{cyc}(z)$ whence $k(z) = \text{cyc}(z)$. \square

The goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. If $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ is quasi-dominant then $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}} = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z \prod_{i=1}^{k(z)} (2 + \beta x_i)$.

The proof of this result appears at the end of this section. Before giving this argument, we need to derive a few new properties of the polynomials $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z$.

Theorem 3.3. Suppose $z \in I_\infty$. Then for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ it holds that

$$\partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z = \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{zs_i} & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}_R(z) \text{ and } z(i) = i + 1 \\ \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{s_i z s_i} & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}_R(z) \text{ and } z(i) \neq i + 1 \\ -\beta \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}_R(z). \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $z \in I_\infty$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. If $i \notin \text{Des}_R(z)$ then $z \neq s_i \circ z \circ s_i$ by (2.15) and every $w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ has $w \circ s_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(s_i \circ z \circ s_i)$. In this case, since $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(s_i \circ z \circ s_i)$ are disjoint sets, every $w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ must have $w \neq w \circ s_i$, which means that $i \notin \text{Des}_R(w)$ and $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} = -\beta \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ so $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z = -\beta \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z$.

Instead suppose $i \in \text{Des}_R(z)$. Define $y \in I_\infty$ to be $zs_i = s_i z$ if $z(i) = i + 1$ or else $s_i z s_i$ if $z(i) \neq i + 1$. Then it follows from (2.15) that

$$(a) \text{ one has } \{y, z\} = \{v \in I_\infty : z = s_i \circ v \circ s_i\} \text{ and } \ell_{\text{inv}}(z) = \ell_{\text{inv}}(y) + 1.$$

Next, choose any $w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$. If $i \in \text{Des}_R(w)$ then $ws_i \circ s_i = w$ so

$$s_i \circ (ws_i)^{-1} \circ (ws_i) \circ s_i = (ws_i \circ s_i)^{-1} \circ (ws_i \circ s_i) = w^{-1} \circ w = z.$$

Alternatively, if $i \notin \text{Des}_R(w)$ then $ws_i = w \circ s_i$ so

$$s_i \circ (ws_i)^{-1} \circ (ws_i) \circ s_i = s_i \circ s_i \circ w^{-1} \circ w \circ s_i \circ s_i = s_i \circ z \circ s_i = z.$$

Given these identities we conclude from property (a) that

$$(b) \text{ if } w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z) \text{ then } ws_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y) \sqcup \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z).$$

Finally, if $v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y)$ then we certainly have $v \circ s_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ as

$$(v \circ s_i)^{-1} \circ (v \circ s_i) = s_i \circ v^{-1} \circ v \circ s_i = s_i \circ y \circ s_i = z.$$

As $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ are disjoint, we must also have $v \neq v \circ s_i = vs_i$ so

$$(c) \text{ if } v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y) \text{ then } i \notin \text{Des}_R(v) \text{ and } vs_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z).$$

Items (b) and (c) imply that $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z) = \mathcal{C} \sqcup \mathcal{D} \sqcup \mathcal{E}$ is the union of the disjoint sets

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &:= \{vs_i : v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y)\}, \\ \mathcal{D} &:= \{w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z) : i \notin \text{Des}_R(w)\}, \\ \mathcal{E} &:= \{ws_i : w \in \mathcal{D}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We can therefore write

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z &= \sum_{w \in \mathcal{C} \sqcup \mathcal{D} \sqcup \mathcal{E}} \beta^{\ell(w) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} \\ &= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y)} \beta^{\ell(vs_i) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_{vs_i}^{(\beta)} + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{D}} \beta^{\ell(w) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \left(\partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} + \beta \partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_{ws_i}^{(\beta)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The last expression is equal to $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_y$, since (2.5) implies that if $v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y)$ then

$$\beta^{\ell(vs_i) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_{vs_i}^{(\beta)} = \beta^{(\ell(v)+1) - (\ell_{\text{inv}}(y)+1)} \mathcal{G}_v^{(\beta)} = \beta^{\ell(v) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(y)} \mathcal{G}_v^{(\beta)}$$

while if $w \in \mathcal{D}$ then $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} + \beta \partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_{ws_i}^{(\beta)} = -\beta \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} + \beta \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} = 0$. \square

The next result is closely related to [26, Thm. 4.5]. The latter theorem gives a general formula for $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z$ as a sum of polynomial weights attached to certain *involution Hecke pipe dreams* for $z \in I_\infty$. It will turn out that this sum has only one term in the case when $z \in I_\infty$ is dominant, but to explain this we must briefly recall a few definitions.

Recall that $\text{SubDiag} = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : i \geq j\}$. Write $(i, j) \prec (i', j')$ if $i < i'$ or if $i = i'$ and $j > j'$. For any subset $D \subset \text{SubDiag}$ let $\text{word}(D)$ be the sequence formed by listing the numbers $i + j - 1$ as (i, j) runs over D in the total order \prec . For example, $\text{word}(\{(1, 2), (1, 1), (2, 3)\}) = 214$.

Let $D \subset \text{SubDiag}$ and write $\text{word}(D) = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k$. Then D is an *involution Hecke pipe dream* for $z \in I_\infty$ if $s_{w_1} \circ s_{w_2} \circ \cdots \circ s_{w_k} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$. In this case we say that D is *reduced* if its size $|D| = k$ is equal to $\ell_{\text{inv}}(z)$. By [10, Thm. 5.8] every $z \in I_\infty$ has at least one reduced involution Hecke pipe dream.

Lemma 3.4. Suppose D is an involution Hecke pipe dream for $z \in I_\infty$ and $(i, j) \in D$. Then z has a reduced involution Hecke pipe dream containing (i, j) .

Proof. Suppose $\text{word}(D) = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_l$. Define $z_0 = 1$ and $z_k = s_{w_k} \circ z_{k-1} \circ s_{w_k}$ for $k \in [l]$. If D is reduced then the desired property is immediate, so assume D is not reduced. Then it follows from (2.19) that some $q \in [l]$ has $w_q \in \text{Des}_R(z_{q-1})$. If q is chosen to be minimal, then $q > 1$ and the ‘‘exchange property’’ stated as [14, Prop. 3.10] implies that there exists an index $p \in [q-1]$ such that

$$s_{w_1} \circ \cdots \circ s_{w_p} \circ \cdots \circ \widehat{s_{w_q}} \circ \cdots \circ s_{w_l} = s_{w_1} \circ \cdots \circ \widehat{s_{w_p}} \circ \cdots \circ s_{w_q} \circ \cdots \circ s_{w_l} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z).$$

The letters w_p and w_q correspond to two different positions in D . Only one of these positions can be (i, j) , so by removing the other we obtain an involution Hecke pipe dream for z that still contains (i, j) while having strictly fewer elements. From this point, the lemma follows by induction on the size of D . \square

Lemma 3.5. Suppose $z \in I_\infty$ is dominant of shape λ . Then $D_\lambda \cap \text{SubDiag}$ is the unique involution Hecke pipe dream for z .

Proof. [10, Thm. 3.9 and Prop. 4.15] show that $D_\lambda \cap \text{SubDiag}$ is the unique reduced involution Hecke pipe dream for z . By Lemma 3.4, every involution Hecke pipe dream for z is contained in, and hence equal to, this set. \square

The $\beta = 0$ case of the following product formula appears in [11, Thm. 3.26].

Theorem 3.6. If $z \in I_\infty$ is dominant of shape λ then

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z = \prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in D_\lambda \\ i=j}} x_i \prod_{\substack{(i,j) \in D_\lambda \\ i < j}} x_i \oplus x_j \quad \text{where } x \oplus y := x + y + \beta xy.$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.5, this result is a special case of [26, Thm. 4.5], which states that if $z \in I_\infty$ then $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z = \sum_D \left(\prod_{(i,j) \in D, i=j} x_i \prod_{(i,j) \in D, i \neq j} x_i \oplus x_j \right)$ where D runs over all involution Hecke pipe dreams for z . \square

Example 3.7. Let $z = (1, 4)(2, 5) \in I_\infty$. Then z is dominant of shape $(3, 3, 2)$, so from Example 2.7 and Theorem 3.6 we get the two expressions

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z &= \mathcal{G}_{24513}^{(\beta)} + \beta \mathcal{G}_{25413}^{(\beta)} + \mathcal{G}_{25314}^{(\beta)} + \beta \mathcal{G}_{35214}^{(\beta)} + \mathcal{G}_{35124}^{(\beta)} \\ &= x_1 x_2 (x_1 \oplus x_2) (x_1 \oplus x_3) (x_2 \oplus x_3). \end{aligned}$$

We may now deliver the postponed proof of Theorem 3.2.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Let $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ be quasi-dominant with $p = \text{cyc}(z) = k(z)$. Set $q = \max\{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : z(i) \neq i\}$. By Theorem 2.2, there is a directed path $z \xrightarrow{i_1} \cdots \xrightarrow{i_k} \text{dom}_{pq}$ in the vexillary weak order graph with $p \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$, so

$$\mathcal{G}_z^{\circ} = \partial_{i_1}^{(\beta)} \cdots \partial_{i_k}^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_{\text{dom}_{pq}}^{\circ} = \partial_{i_1}^{(\beta)} \cdots \partial_{i_k}^{(\beta)} \left(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{dom}_{pq}} \prod_{i=1}^p (2 + \beta x_i) \right)$$

by (2.6), (2.7), and Theorem 3.6. As $\prod_{i=1}^p (2 + \beta x_i)$ is symmetric in x_i and x_{i+1} when $i \neq p$, we can use (2.3) and Theorem 3.3 to rewrite the last expression as the desired product $(\partial_{i_1}^{(\beta)} \cdots \partial_{i_k}^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\text{dom}_{pq}}) \prod_{i=1}^p (2 + \beta x_i) = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z \prod_{i=1}^p (2 + \beta x_i)$. \square

3.2 Transition formulas and applications

Results in [18, 20] give explicit *transition formulas* for certain products of Grothendieck polynomials. We review these here and then use them to derive an expression for $\text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ when z is quasi-dominant. Following [20], we write

$$v \xrightarrow{(a,b)} w \quad \text{for } v, w \in S_{\infty} \text{ and positive integers } a < b$$

to indicate that $w = v(a, b)$ and $\ell(w) = \ell(v) + 1$, meaning that w covers v in the Bruhat order on S_{∞} . The length condition holds precisely when $v(a) < v(b)$ and no i with $a < i < b$ has $v(a) < v(i) < v(b)$.

Theorem 3.8 (Lenart [18, Thm. 3.1]). If $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $v \in S_{\infty}$ then

$$(1 + \beta x_k) \mathcal{G}_v^{(\beta)} = \sum_{\gamma} (-1)^p \cdot \beta^{p+q} \cdot \mathcal{G}_{\text{end}(\gamma)}^{(\beta)}$$

where the sum is over all saturated chains γ in Bruhat order on S_{∞} of the form

$$v = v_0 \xrightarrow{(a_1, k)} \dots \xrightarrow{(a_p, k)} v_p \xrightarrow{(k, b_1)} \dots \xrightarrow{(k, b_q)} v_{p+q} = \text{end}(\gamma) \quad (3.3)$$

with $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $a_p < a_{p-1} < \dots < a_1 < k < b_q < b_{q-1} < \dots < b_1$.

A permutation $w \in S_{\infty}$ is *n-Grassmannian* if $w(i) < w(i+1)$ for all positive integers $i \neq n$. We say that an element of S_{∞} is *Grassmannian* if it is *n-Grassmannian* for some n . The identity permutation is the unique element of S_{∞} that is *n-Grassmannian* for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Remark 3.9. The polynomials $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ indexed by *n-Grassmannian* permutations are a $\mathbb{Z}[\beta]$ -basis for the subring of S_n -invariants in $\mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ by [19, Thm. 2.2]. In particular, $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ is a symmetric element of $\mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ if and only if w is *n-Grassmannian*.

Given a partition λ with at most n nonzero parts, there is a unique *n-Grassmannian* permutation $w \in S_{\infty}$ with $(w(1) - 1, w(2) - 2, \dots, w(n) - n) = (\lambda_n, \dots, \lambda_2, \lambda_1)$. We denote this permutation using the notation $[\lambda \mid n]$.

Example 3.10. In one-line notation we have $[1^n \mid n] = 234 \dots (n+1)1$ and

$$[n \mid n] = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n-1, 2n, n, n+1, n+2, \dots, 2n-1,$$

along with $[\emptyset \mid n] = 1$ for all n . For $0 < j < n$ we have

$$[1^{n-j} \mid n] = 1, 2, 3, \dots, j, j+2, j+3, j+4, \dots, n+1, j+1.$$

In the following lemma, we interpret $[1^0 \mid n]$ as the permutation $[\emptyset \mid n] = 1$.

Lemma 3.11. If $0 \leq j \leq n$ then

$$(1 + \beta x_{n+1}) \mathcal{G}_{[1^j \mid n]}^{(\beta)} = \sum_{i=j}^n (-\beta)^{i-j} \mathcal{G}_{[1^i \mid n]}^{(\beta)} - \sum_{i=j+1}^{n+1} (-\beta)^{i-j} \mathcal{G}_{[1^i \mid n+1]}^{(\beta)}.$$

Proof. By inspecting Example 3.10, we see that if $v_0 = [1^j \mid n]$ and $k = n + 1$, then the only way to construct a saturated chain in Bruhat order

$$v_0 \xrightarrow{(a_1, k)} v_1 \xrightarrow{(a_2, k)} \cdots \xrightarrow{(a_p, k)} v_p \xrightarrow{(k, b_1)} v_{p+1} \xrightarrow{(k, b_2)} \cdots \xrightarrow{(k, b_q)} v_{p+q}$$

with $a_p < a_{p-1} < \cdots < a_1 < k < b_q < b_{q-1} < \cdots < b_1$ is to have

$$a_i = n - j + 1 - i \text{ for all } i \in [p] \quad \text{and} \quad q \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad b_1 = k + 1 = n + 2.$$

Under these conditions, the end of the chain is $v_{p+q} = [1^{j+p+q} \mid n + q]$. Thus, Theorem 3.8 gives $(1 + \beta x_{n+1}) \mathcal{G}_{[1^j \mid n]}^{(\beta)} = \sum_{p=0}^{n-j} \sum_{q=0}^1 (-1)^p \beta^{p+q} \mathcal{G}_{[1^{j+p+q} \mid n+q]}^{(\beta)}$ which is equivalent to the desired formula. \square

Fix a positive integer k . The *k -Bruhat order* on S_∞ is transitive closure of the relation with $v <_k w$ whenever $v \xrightarrow{(a, b)} w$ and $a \leq k < b$.

Definition 3.12. An *unmarked k -Pieri chain* between from $v \in S_\infty$ to $w \in S_\infty$ is a saturated chain in k -Bruhat order of the form

$$v = v_0 \xrightarrow{(a_1, b_1)} v_1 \xrightarrow{(a_2, b_2)} \cdots \xrightarrow{(a_q, b_q)} v_q = w \quad (3.4)$$

satisfying $1 \leq a_i \leq k < b_i$ for all $i \in [q]$ along with the following two conditions:

- (P0) if $a_j = a_i > a_{i+1}$ for some $1 \leq j < i < q$ then $b_i > b_{i+1}$; and
- (P1) $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \cdots \geq b_q$.

An essential and non-obvious property of this definition is that for any permutations $v, w \in S_\infty$ at most one unmarked k -Pieri chain exists from v to w [20, Thm. 2.2]. Following [20], we write $v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w$ if such a chain exists. The reference [20] gives an explicit algorithm to find the unique chain $v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w$, but we will not review this here.

Suppose $v, w \in S_\infty$ are such that $v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w$, and assume that the unique unmarked k -Pieri chain from v to w has the form (3.4). Define $F_k(v, w)$ to be the number of indices $i \in [q]$ such that either

- $b_1 = b_2 = \cdots = b_i$ and $a_1 > a_2 > \cdots > a_i$, or
- $i < q$ and $b_i = b_{i+1}$ and $a_i > a_{i+1}$.

Then define $P_k(v, w)$ to be the number of indices $i \in [q]$ such that

- $a_j = a_i$ for some $1 \leq j < i$.

Notice that we have $F_k(v, w) \geq 1$ if $v \neq w$ and that

$$F_k(v, w) + P_k(v, w) \leq \ell(w) - \ell(v) \quad \text{and} \quad k \leq \ell(w) - \ell(v) - P_k(v, w). \quad (3.5)$$

Theorem 3.13 (Lenart–Sottile [20, Cor. 1.16]). If $0 < p \leq k$ and $v \in S_\infty$ then

$$\mathcal{G}_{[1^p|k]}^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_v^{(\beta)} = \sum_{v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w} \binom{\ell(w) - \ell(v) - F_k(v,w) - P_k(v,w)}{p - F_k(v,w)} \cdot \beta^{\ell(w) - \ell(v) - p} \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$$

where the sum is over all permutations $w \in S_\infty$ such that $v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w$.

We note one more formula, which is a special case of the previous result:

Theorem 3.14 (Lenart [19, Thm. 3.1]). Suppose $0 < p \leq k$ and λ is a partition with at most k parts. Then

$$\mathcal{G}_{[1^p|k]}^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_{[\lambda|k]}^{(\beta)} = \sum_{\mu} \binom{\text{cols}(\mu/\lambda) - 1}{|\mu/\lambda| - p} \cdot \beta^{|\mu/\lambda| - p} \cdot \mathcal{G}_{[\mu|k]}^{(\beta)}$$

where the summation ranges over all partitions μ with $\ell(\mu) \leq k$ obtained by adding a vertical strip to λ of weight at least p , and where $|\mu/\lambda|$ and $\text{cols}(\mu/\lambda)$ respectively denote the numbers of cells and columns in $D_\mu \setminus D_\lambda$.

We can now turn Theorem 3.2 into an exact, though not manifestly positive, formula for the coefficient function $\text{GC}_z^O : S_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ from Section 1.4.

Lemma 3.15. For all positive integers k it holds that

$$\prod_{i=1}^k (2 + \beta x_i) = 2^k - \sum_{j=1}^k 2^{k-j} \cdot (-\beta)^j \cdot \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k]}^{(\beta)}.$$

Proof. Our argument is by induction on k . Since $\mathcal{G}_{[1^1|1]}^{(\beta)} = x_1$, the base case when $k = 1$ is immediate. When $k > 1$, we may assume by induction that

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^k (2 + \beta x_i) &= (2 + \beta x_k) \left(2^{k-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} 2^{k-1-j} (-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k-1]}^{(\beta)} \right) \\ &= (2 + \beta x_k) \left(2^k - \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} 2^{k-1-j} (-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k-1]}^{(\beta)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we interpret $[1^0|k-1] = 1$. By Lemma 3.11 we have

$$\begin{aligned} (2 + \beta x_k) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} 2^{k-1-j} (-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k-1]}^{(\beta)} &= \\ \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} 2^{k-1-j} \left((-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k-1]}^{(\beta)} + \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} (-\beta)^i \mathcal{G}_{[1^i|k-1]}^{(\beta)} - \sum_{i=j+1}^k (-\beta)^i \mathcal{G}_{[1^i|k]}^{(\beta)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The coefficient of $(-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k-1]}^{(\beta)}$ in the last expression is

$$2^{k-1-j} + (2^{k-1} + 2^{k-2} + \dots + 2^{k-1-j}) = 2^k$$

for each $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$, while the coefficient of $(-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k]}^{(\beta)}$ is

$$2^{k-1} + 2^{k-2} + \dots + 2^{k-1-(j-1)} = 2^k - 2^{k-j}$$

for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Thus $(2 + \beta x_k) \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} 2^{k-1-j} (-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k-1]}^{(\beta)}$ is equal to

$$2^k + 2^k \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k-1]}^{(\beta)} - \sum_{j=1}^k (2^k - 2^{k-j}) (-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k]}^{(\beta)}.$$

Lemma 3.11 also shows that $(2 + \beta x_k) 2^k = (2 + \beta x_k) 2^k \mathcal{G}_{[1^0|k-1]}^{(\beta)}$ is equal to

$$2^{k+1} + 2^k \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k-1]}^{(\beta)} - 2^k \sum_{j=1}^k (-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k]}^{(\beta)}.$$

These expressions have difference $\prod_{i=1}^k (2 + \beta x_i) = 2^k - \sum_{j=1}^k 2^{k-j} (-\beta)^j \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|k]}^{(\beta)}$. \square

For $v, w \in S_\infty$, recall the definitions of $F_k(v, w)$ and $P_k(v, w)$ from Theorem 3.13 and Set $\epsilon_k(v, v) = 1$ and $\rho_k(v, v) = 2^k$, and for $v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w \neq v$ define

$$\epsilon_k(v, w) = (-1)^{1+F_k(v, w)} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_k(v, w) = 2^{k+\ell(v)-\ell(w)+P_k(v, w)}. \quad (3.6)$$

Set $\epsilon_k(v, w) = \rho_k(v, w) = 0$ when we do not have $v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w$.

Theorem 3.16. Suppose $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ is quasi-dominant and $k = k(z)$. Then

$$\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}(w) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)} \epsilon_k(v, w) \rho_k(v, w) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } w \in S_\infty.$$

Proof. We start with the formula $\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}} = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_z \prod_{i=1}^k (2 + \beta x_i)$ from Theorem 3.2. Substituting in Lemma 3.15 and applying Theorem 3.13 turns this to

$$\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}} = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)} \left(2^k \cdot \beta^{\ell(v)-\ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \cdot \mathcal{G}_v^{(\beta)} - \sum_{\substack{w \in S_\infty \\ v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w}} \Sigma_{v, w}^k \cdot \beta^{\ell(w)-\ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} \right)$$

where for $v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w$ we define

$$\Sigma_{v, w}^k := \sum_{p=1}^k (-1)^p 2^{k-p} \binom{\ell(w)-\ell(v)-F_k(v, w)-P_k(v, w)}{p-F_k(v, w)}.$$

If $v = w$ then $\ell(w) - \ell(v) = F_k(v, w) = P_k(v, w) = 0$ so $\epsilon_k(v, w) \rho_k(v, w) = 2^k$ and $\Sigma_{v, w}^k = 0$. If $v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w$ but $v \neq w$ then we must have $F_k(v, w) \geq 1$, so in view of (3.5) we can rewrite $\Sigma_{v, w}^k$ as

$$\Sigma_{v, w}^k = (-1)^{F_k(v, w)} 2^{k-F_k(v, w)} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} (-1/2)^m \binom{\ell(w)-\ell(v)-F_k(v, w)-P_k(v, w)}{m}$$

which transforms via the binomial theorem to $\Sigma_{v, w}^k = -\epsilon_k(v, w) \rho_k(v, w)$.

Using these identities, our expression above for \mathcal{G}_z^{O} becomes the desired formula $\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}} = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)} \sum_{w \in S_\infty} \epsilon_k(v, w) \rho_k(v, w) \cdot \beta^{\ell(w)-\ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$. \square

3.3 Examples and conjectures

Fix $1 \neq z \in I_\infty$, define $k = k(z)$ as in (3.1), and let

$$j = j(z) := \max\{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : z(i) = i \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq j\}. \quad (3.7)$$

For the identity permutation we set $j(1) = 1$ and $k(1) = 0$.

Definition 3.17. Fix $z \in I_\infty$ and set $j = j(z)$ and $k = k(z)$. For permutations $v, w \in S_\infty$ we write $v \xrightarrow{[z]} w$ if there exists an unmarked k -Pieri chain

$$v = v_0 \xrightarrow{(a_1, b_1)} v_1 \xrightarrow{(a_2, b_2)} \cdots \xrightarrow{(a_q, b_q)} v_q = w$$

as in Definition 3.12, such that for each $i \in [q]$ it additionally holds that

$$j \leq a_i \leq k < b_i \quad \text{and} \quad a_i < z(a_i) \text{ or } z(b_i) < b_i.$$

Finally, let $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z) := \left\{ w \in S_\infty : v \xrightarrow{[z]} w \text{ for some } v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z) \right\}$.

Example 3.18. If $z = 1 \in I_\infty$ then $j(z) = 1 > 0 = k(z)$ so only empty chains satisfy the conditions in Definition 3.17. Therefore $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(1) = \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(1) = \{1\}$.

Based on computations and the preceding theorem, the set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ appears to give a good approximation for $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}})$. In particular:

Corollary 3.19. If $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ is quasi-dominant and $k = k(z)$ then

$$\text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z) = \left\{ w \in S_\infty : v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w \text{ for some } v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z) \right\}.$$

Proof. In this case $j(z) = 1$ and $k(z) = k$, so $a < z(a)$ for all $j \leq a \leq k$. Thus all unmarked k -Pieri chains from v to w satisfy the conditions in Definition 3.17, \square

If a and b are integers then let $[a, b] = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : a \leq i \leq b\}$. For $w \in S_\infty$ let

$$\text{supp}(w) := \{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : w(i) \neq i\}. \quad (3.8)$$

Proposition 3.20. If $z \in I_\infty$ has $\text{supp}(z) \subseteq [a, b]$ for integers $a \leq b$, then

$$\text{supp}(v) \subseteq [a, b] \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(w) \subseteq [a-1, b+1]$$

for all $v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$.

Proof. If $z = 1$ then $\text{supp}(z) = \text{supp}(v) = \text{supp}(w) = \emptyset$ for all $v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ and $w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ so the result holds trivially. Assume $z \neq 1$.

Let $j = j(z)$ and $k = k(z)$ and suppose $v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$. Since $\alpha_{\text{inv}}(z)$ fixes all integers $i \notin [a, b]$, it follows from (2.17) that we have $\text{supp}(v) \subseteq [a, b]$. Therefore, if $c \leq k$ and $b+1 < d$ then we must have $\ell(v(c, d)) \neq \ell(v)+1$, since if $v(c) < v(d)$ then it also holds that $v(c) < b+1 = v(b+1) < d = v(d)$.

Hence, if there exists any unmarked k -Pieri chain of the form (3.4) from v to $w \in S_\infty$, then this chain must have $b+1 \geq b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \cdots \geq b_q > k$. Since to have $v \xrightarrow{[z]} w$ we also require that $j \leq a_i$ for all i , we conclude that $v \xrightarrow{[z]} w$ implies $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq [j, b+1]$. The result follows since $a-1 \leq j$ as $\text{supp}(z) \subseteq [a, b]$. \square

We have used a computer to verify the following for all vexillary $z \in I_{11}$:

Conjecture 3.21. If $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ then $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z) \subseteq \text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$.

Both containments in this conjecture can be strict, but in some notable cases we actually have equality $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}) = \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$.

Example 3.22. Suppose $z = t_n := (1, n) \in I_n$. Then z is dominant of shape $\lambda = (n-1, 1^{n-2})$ and $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ consists of the permutations in S_n whose inverses in one-line notation are the shuffles of $n1$ and $234 \cdots (n-1)$ with at most one letter between n and 1 . The larger set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ consists of the permutations in S_{n+1} whose inverses in one-line notation are the shuffles of the words $n1$ and $234 \cdots (n-1)(n+1)$ with at most two letters between n and 1 , excluding the inverse of $234 \cdots (n-1)(n+1)n1$. We shall see below that $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}) = \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$.

We can generalize this example. Let $\text{Sh}(n)$ denote the set of words obtained by shuffling the 2-letter word $n2$ with then $(n-1)$ -letter word

$$1\widehat{2}3 \cdots (n-1)\widehat{n}(n+1) = 1345 \cdots (n-3)(n-2)(n-1)(n+1).$$

Define $\mathcal{X}(n)$ to be the subset of words in $\text{Sh}(n)$ for which

- the first letter is 1 while the last letter is $n+1$; and
- at most one letter appears between n and 2.

Define $\mathcal{Y}(n) \subset \text{Sh}(n)$ be the set of words with exactly one or exactly two letters between n and 2. Note that $\mathcal{X}(n)$ and $\mathcal{Y}(n)$ have nonempty intersection.

Example 3.23. We have $\mathcal{X}(3) = \{\underline{1324}\}$, $\mathcal{Y}(3) = \{\overline{3124}, \underline{1342}, \overline{3142}\}$, and

$$\text{Sh}(3) = \left\{ \begin{array}{cccc} \overline{3214}, & & \underline{1324}, & \underline{1432} \\ & \overline{3124}, & & \underline{1342}, \\ & & \overline{3142} & \end{array} \right\}.$$

Define $c_4 = (1, 4, 5, 2) = 41352 \in S_5$ and for $n \geq 5$ let

$$c_n = (1, n, n-1, n-2, \dots, 7, 6, 5, 2) = n1342567 \cdots (n-2)(n-1) \in S_n.$$

Finally set $\mathcal{Z}(n) = \emptyset$ for $n \leq 3$ and $\mathcal{Z}(n) = \{c_n\}$ for $n \geq 4$.

Proposition 3.24. Let $n > 2$ and $z = (2, n) \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$. Then the following holds:

- (a) $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z) = \{w^{-1} : w \in \mathcal{X}(n)\}$.
- (b) $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z) = \{w^{-1} : w \in \mathcal{X}(n) \cup \mathcal{Y}(n) \sqcup \mathcal{Z}(n)\}$.
- (c) The orthogonal Grothendieck polynomial of z is

$$\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}} = \sum_{w^{-1} \in \mathcal{X}(n)} 2 \cdot \beta^{w(2)-w(n)-1} \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} + \sum_{w^{-1} \in \mathcal{Y}(n)} \beta^{w(2)-w(n)-1} \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$$

and consequently $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}) = \{w^{-1} : w \in \mathcal{X}(n) \cup \mathcal{Y}(n)\}$.

By the results in Section 4.3, this proposition determines $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$, $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$, and $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ for all transpositions $z = (i, j) \in I_{\infty}$. For these elements, Conjecture 3.21 holds but $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z) \setminus \text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}})$ contains one extra element if $1 < i < i + 1 < j$.

Proof. Part (a) is straightforward to derive from (2.17), and part (b) then follows as an exercise from the definitions. We omit the details.

Let $\text{Sh}_1(n)$ denote the set of shuffles of $n1$ and $2345 \cdots (n+1)$, viewed as permutations in one-line notation. Then define $\mathcal{X}_1(n)$ to be the subset of words in $\text{Sh}_1(n)$ for which the last letter is $n+1$ and at most one letter appears between n and 1 . Finally let $\mathcal{Y}_1(n)$ be the subset of words in $\text{Sh}_1(n)$ for which exactly one or exactly two letters appear between n and 1 .

Now set $y = (1, n) \in I_{\infty}$. We shall first use Theorem 3.16 to prove that

$$\mathcal{G}_y^{\mathcal{O}} = \sum_{w^{-1} \in \mathcal{X}_1(n)} 2 \cdot \beta^{w(1)-w(n)-1} \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} + \sum_{w^{-1} \in \mathcal{Y}_1(n)} \beta^{w(1)-w(n)-1} \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}. \quad (3.9)$$

It follows from (2.17) that $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y) = \{w^{-1} : w \in \mathcal{X}_1(n)\}$. Therefore, if $v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y)$ and $1 < i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < \dots$ are the indices i with $v(1) < v(i)$, then we must have $v(1) < v(i_1) < v(i_2) < v(i_3) < \dots$ and also $v(i_1) = v(1) + 1$.

Set $j := v(1)$ and $k := k(y) = 1$. Given the previous paragraph, we see that if $v \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y)$ then a chain $v \xrightarrow{c(k)} w$ is either trivial with $v = w$ or a single Bruhat cover of the form $v \xrightarrow{(1,b)} w$ where $w = v(1, b) = s_j v$. For chains of the first type we have $\varepsilon_k(v, w) = 1$ and $\rho_k(v, w) = 2$, and $w^{-1} = v^{-1}$ gives an arbitrary element of $\mathcal{X}_1(n)$. For chains of the second type we have $\varepsilon_k(v, w) = 1$ and $\rho_k(v, w) = 1$, and the permutations w range over exactly the set of inverses of the elements of $\mathcal{Y}_1(n)$.

The only thing left to show to deduce (3.9) from Theorem 3.16 is that if $w \in S_{\infty}$ has $w^{-1} \in \mathcal{X}_1(n) \cup \mathcal{Y}_1(n)$ then $\ell(w) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(y) = w(1) - w(n) - 1$. This holds since in such a permutation w it must hold that $w(n) < w(n+1)$, so w^{-1} has $w(1) - 1$ inversions involving 1 , along with $n - 1 - (w(n) - 1)$ inversions involving n , and a single inversion involving both 1 and n , which gives

$$\ell(w) = \ell(w^{-1}) = w(1) - 1 + n - 1 - (w(n) - 1) - 1 = w(1) - w(n) + n - 2.$$

As we have $\ell_{\text{inv}}(y) = n - 1$ by (1.2), the identity (3.9) follows.

Let $z = (2, n) \in I_{\infty}$. To prove part (c) we apply $\partial_1^{(\beta)}$ to both sides of (3.9). On the left side we get $\partial_1^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_y^{\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ by (2.7). To evaluate $\partial_1^{(\beta)}$ applied to the right side of (3.9), fix $w \in S_{\infty}$ with $w^{-1} \in \mathcal{X}_1(n) \cup \mathcal{Y}_1(n)$. Then observe that $w(1) < w(2)$ if and only if $w^{-1} = n1234 \cdots (n-1) \in \mathcal{X}_1(n)$, and in this case it holds that $(ws_1)^{-1} = n2134 \cdots (n-1) \in \mathcal{X}_1(n)$ and

$$\partial_1^{(\beta)} \left(\beta^{ws_1(1)-w(n)-1} \mathcal{G}_{ws_1}^{(\beta)} + \beta^{w(1)-w(n)-1} \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} \right) = \partial_1^{(\beta)} \left(\beta \mathcal{G}_{ws_1}^{(\beta)} + \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} \right) = 0.$$

The map $w \mapsto s_1 w$ defines a bijection $\mathcal{Y}_1(n) \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}(n)$ as well as a bijection

$$\mathcal{X}_1(n) \setminus \{n1234 \cdots (n-1), n2134 \cdots (n-1)\} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}(n),$$

so it follows from (2.5) that $\partial_1^{(\beta)}$ transforms (3.9) to the formula in part (c). \square

It can be useful to represent $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ as the following directed graph. For $v, w \in S_\infty$ we write $v \triangleleft_L w$ when $\ell(w) = \ell(v) + 1$ and $w = s_i v$ for some $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We turn $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ into a directed graph by adding edges $v \rightarrow w$ whenever $v \triangleleft_L w$. Figure 1 shows some instances of this graph.

Example 3.25. Suppose $z = g_n := (1, n+1)(2, n+2) \cdots (n, 2n) \in I_{2n}$. Then z is dominant of shape $\lambda = (n^n)$ and the set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ consists of the single element whose inverse is $(n+1)1(n+2)2 \cdots (2n)n \in S_{2n}$. One can show that the larger set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ consists of the 2^n permutations whose inverses have the form $(n+1)a_1 b_1 a_2 b_2 \cdots a_n b_n \in S_{2n+1}$ where $\{a_i, b_i\} = \{i, n+1+i\}$ for $i \in [n]$.

The previous example has an extension analogous to Proposition 3.24, which shows that $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}) = \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ whenever $z = g_n$; see Proposition 4.21.

Example 3.26. Finally let $w_0 = n \cdots 321 \in I_n$ be the longest element of S_n . Then w_0 is dominant of shape $\lambda = (n-1, \dots, 3, 2, 1)$. The set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(w_0)$ does not seem to have any description simpler than (2.17). One can check that the larger set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(w_0)$ contains the permutations in S_{n+1} whose inverses in one-line notation have the form $u_1 \cdots u_i (n+1) u_{i+1} \cdots u_n$ where $u = u_1 u_2 \dots u_n$ is the inverse of an element of $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(w_0)$ and $i \in [n]$ has $n \geq 2u_j$ for each $i < j \leq n$.

Extending this example, let

$$w_{ij} := (i, j)(i+1, j-1)(i+2, j-2) \cdots (i+k, j-k) \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}} \quad (3.10)$$

for any integers $1 \leq i < j$ where $k = \lfloor \frac{j-i-1}{2} \rfloor$. Computer calculations support the following conjecture. The case when $i = 1$ has been checked for all $j \leq 11$.

Conjecture 3.27. One has $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_{w_{ij}}^{\text{O}}) = \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(w_{ij})$ if $i = 1$ or $j - i$ is odd.

When $i > 1$ and $j - i$ is even, the set $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(w_{ij})$ is typically much larger than $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_{w_{ij}}^{\text{O}})$. We do not have any conjecture for $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_{w_{ij}}^{\text{O}})$ in these cases.

4 Expansions for vexillary involutions

The first main result of this section is a generalization of Theorem 3.2 that holds any vexillary involution; see Theorem 4.5. This formula is more complicated than in the quasi-dominant case, and we use Section 4.1 to explain the relevant notation. The rest of the section derives some interesting consequences.

4.1 Setting up the main theorem

A generic vexillary involution $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ has cycle notation

$$z = (a_1, b_1)(a_2, b_2) \cdots (a_q, b_q)$$

where $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_q < \min\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_q\}$. We refer to the numbers a_i as *left endpoints* and to the numbers b_i as *right endpoints*.




Figure 1: The digraphs $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ when z is $t_4 = (1, 4)$ (left), $g_3 = (1, 4)(2, 5)(3, 6)$ (middle), or $w_0 = 4321$ (right). The data in each box is $\boxed{w : \text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}(w)}$, with w given in inverse one-line notation. The blue vertices are the elements of $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$. As $\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}(w)$ is always nonzero, one has $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}) = \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ in these cases.

The *left segments* of z are the maximal subsets of consecutive left endpoints, that is, the equivalence classes in $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q\}$ under the transitive closure of the relation with $a_i \sim a_j$ if $|a_j - a_i| \leq 1$. There is at most one left segment containing 1, which we refer to as the *immobile segment*. All other left segments are *mobile*.

Suppose L is a mobile left segment of z and define $c_0 = \min(L) - 1$. Notice that we must have $c_0 = z(c_0) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Now, for any subset $S \subseteq \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q\}$ define $\sigma_{S,L} \in S_\infty$ to be the cyclic permutation

$$\sigma_{S,L} = (c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k) \quad \text{where } S \cap L = \{c_1 < c_2 < \dots < c_k\}. \quad (4.1)$$

This is the identity element when $S \cap L$ is empty. The conjugated permutation

$$(\sigma_{S,L})^{-1} \cdot z \cdot \sigma_{S,L}$$

is not always vexillary, but its arc diagram is obtained from z by simply replacing each edge $\{c_i < z(c_i)\}$ for $i \in [k]$ with $\{c_{i-1} < z(c_i)\}$. Also define

$$\sigma_S = \prod_L \sigma_{S,L} \quad (4.2)$$

where the product is over all mobile left segments of z . This product can be taken in any order since as L varies the permutations $\sigma_{S,L}$ have disjoint supports.

Example 4.1. Suppose our vexillary involution is

$$z = (2, 7)(3, 8)(4, 6)(5, 9) = \begin{array}{cccccccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & \end{array}$$

This permutation has a unique left segment $L = \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$, which is mobile. For the subset $S = \{2, 4, 5\}$ we have $\sigma_{S,L} = (1, 2, 4, 5)$ and

$$(\sigma_{S,L})^{-1} \cdot z \cdot \sigma_{S,L} = (1, 7)(2, 6)(3, 8)(4, 9) = \begin{array}{cccccccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & \end{array}$$

Suppose a_i and a_j are left endpoints of z in the same left segment with $i < j$. We say that a_j is a *crossing bound* of a_i if $\{i\} = \{t : i \leq t < j \text{ and } b_t < b_j\}$. Now, given a subset $S \subseteq \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q\}$ we define $\Pi_{z,S} = \prod_{i \in [q]} \Pi_{z,S}^{(a_i)}$ where

$$\Pi_{z,S}^{(a)} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } a \in S \text{ and } S \text{ contains any crossing bound of } a \\ 2 + \beta x_a & \text{if } a \notin S \\ 1 + \beta x_a & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.3)$$

We also let $\text{crb}_z(a_i)$ denote the set of crossing bounds of a_i .

Example 4.2. If $z = (2, 7)(3, 8)(4, 6)(5, 9)$ is as in Example 4.1 then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{z,\emptyset} &= (2 + \beta x_2)(2 + \beta x_3)(2 + \beta x_4)(2 + \beta x_5), \\ \Pi_{z,\{2,4,5\}} &= -(1 + \beta x_2)(2 + \beta x_3)(1 + \beta x_5). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 4.3. A set $S \subseteq \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q\}$ is *shiftable* relative to z if both

- (1) no element of S is in the left segment of z containing 1, and
- (2) if some $a_i \notin S$ then S does not contain any crossing bound of a_i .

Let $\text{shiftable}(z)$ be the set of all such subsets, and for each $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ define

$$\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} := \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_v \quad \text{where } v := (\sigma_S)^{-1} \cdot z \cdot \sigma_S.$$

Example 4.4. When $z = (2, 7)(3, 8)(4, 6)(5, 9)$ there are 9 shiftable subsets of left endpoints, given by $\emptyset, \{2\}, \{4\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 4\}, \{4, 5\}, \{2, 3, 4\}, \{2, 4, 5\}$, and $\{2, 3, 4, 5\}$, and it turns out that \mathcal{G}_z° can be expressed as a sum of 9 terms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_z^{\circ} &= (2 + \beta x_2)(2 + \beta x_3)(2 + \beta x_4)(2 + \beta x_5) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{(2,7)(3,8)(4,6)(5,9)} \\ &\quad + \beta \cdot (1 + \beta x_2)(2 + \beta x_3)(2 + \beta x_4)(2 + \beta x_5) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{(1,7)(3,8)(4,6)(5,9)} \\ &\quad + \beta \cdot (2 + \beta x_2)(2 + \beta x_3)(1 + \beta x_4)(2 + \beta x_5) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{(1,6)(2,7)(3,8)(5,9)} \\ &\quad - \beta^2 \cdot (1 + \beta x_3)(2 + \beta x_4)(2 + \beta x_5) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{(1,7)(2,8)(4,6)(5,9)} \\ &\quad + \beta^2 \cdot (1 + \beta x_2)(2 + \beta x_3)(1 + \beta x_4)(2 + \beta x_5) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{(1,7)(2,6)(3,8)(5,9)} \\ &\quad - \beta^2 \cdot (2 + \beta x_2)(2 + \beta x_3)(1 + \beta x_5) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{(1,6)(2,7)(3,8)(4,9)} \\ &\quad - \beta^3 \cdot (1 + \beta x_3)(1 + \beta x_4)(2 + \beta x_5) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{(1,7)(2,8)(3,6)(5,9)} \\ &\quad - \beta^3 \cdot (1 + \beta x_2)(2 + \beta x_3)(1 + \beta x_5) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{(1,7)(2,6)(3,8)(4,9)} \\ &\quad + \beta^4 \cdot (1 + \beta x_3)(1 + \beta x_5) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{(1,7)(2,8)(3,6)(4,9)}. \end{aligned}$$

These terms correspond to the right side of the following formula.

Theorem 4.5. If $z \in I_{\infty}^{\text{ex}}$ then $\mathcal{G}_z^{\circ} = \sum_{S \in \text{shiftable}(z)} \Pi_{z,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}$.

We give the proof of this theorem in the next section. This result should be compared with [24, Thm. 3.26], which presents a quite different formula for \mathcal{G}_z° in the vexillary case in terms of certain Pfaffians. Our new formula in Theorem 4.5 is arguably much more explicit and easier to compute.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.5

We continue the setup of the previous section, so $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ is a vexillary involution with left endpoints $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_q$ and right endpoints b_1, b_2, \dots, b_q . We begin with three technical lemmas about shiftable subsets.

Lemma 4.6. Let $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$. Choose a left segment L of z with $i \in S \cap L$. Write j for the smallest element $j \in S$ with $i < j$, when this exists.

- (a) If $\text{crb}_z(i) \cap S = \emptyset$ and $i \neq \max(S \cap L)$ then $z(i) > z(j)$.
- (b) If $\text{crb}_z(i) \cap S \neq \emptyset$ then $i \neq \max(S \cap L)$ and $z(i) < z(j)$.

Proof. First suppose $\text{crb}_z(i) \cap S = \emptyset$ and $i \neq \max(S \cap L)$ but the smallest $j \in S$ with $i < j$ has $z(i) < z(j)$. Then since j cannot be a crossing bound of i , the maximal t with $i \leq t < j$ and $z(t) < z(j)$ must be greater than i . But then $j \in \text{crb}_z(t)$ so we must have $t \in S$ since $j \in S$ and S is shiftable. This contradicts the minimality of j and proves part (a).

For part (b), suppose $\text{crb}_z(i) \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Then some $k \in S \cap L$ has $i < k$ and $i \in \text{crb}_z(k)$, so $i \neq \max(S \cap L)$. If $j = k$ then $z(i) < z(j)$ by the definition of a crossing bound. If $j < k$ then since $\{i\} = \{t : i \leq t < k \text{ and } z(t) < z(k)\}$, we must have $z(i) < z(k) < z(j)$. \square

Lemma 4.7. Suppose L is a left segment of z and $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$. Assume $i < j$ are left endpoints with $i \in S \cap L$ and $j \in L \setminus S$. If every integer t with $i \leq t < j$ has $z(t) > z(j)$, then $S \sqcup \{j\} \in \text{shiftable}(z)$.

Proof. We argue by induction on i . The union $S \sqcup \{j\}$ can only fail to be shiftable if some left endpoint $h \in L$ has $h \notin S$ and $j \in \text{crb}_z(h)$. Such an element must have $z(h) < z(j)$ so $h < i$, and then every t with $h < t < j$ must have $z(t) > z(j)$. This is impossible if $i = \min(L)$, so the lemma holds in that base case.

Assume $i > \min(L)$ and such an h exists. As we cannot have $i \in \text{crb}_z(h)$ since $h \notin S$ and $i \in S$, there is some maximal t with $h < t < i$ and $z(j) < z(t) < z(i)$. Then by construction $i \in \text{crb}_z(t)$ so $t \in S \cap L$ since S is shiftable. But this means the hypotheses of the lemma are satisfied if we replace i by the smaller left endpoint t , so we conclude by induction that $S \sqcup \{j\} \in \text{shiftable}(z)$. \square

Lemma 4.8. Suppose L is a left segment of z that intersects $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$. Let $m := \min(S \cap L)$ and assume $i \in L \setminus S$ has $i < m$. Then $z(m) < z(i)$.

Proof. Suppose instead that $z(i) < z(m)$. Since S is shiftable but does not contain i , the left endpoint m cannot be a crossing bound for i . Hence the maximal left endpoint $t \in L$ with $i \leq t < m$ and $z(t) < z(m)$ is greater than i . But then m is a crossing bound for t , so we must have $t \in S$ since S is shiftable and contains m . This contradicts the minimality of $m = \min(S \cap L)$. \square

We now begin the main proof of this section.

Proof of Theorem 4.5. The basic strategy in this long proof is fairly straightforward. We will argue by reverse induction on the length of z , the base case being when z is dominant. Then, z only has one left segment, which is immobile, so only the empty set is shifttable, and the desired formula for $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ reduces to the one given in Theorem 3.2.

Now assume that $z \in I_{\infty}^{\text{vex}}$ is such that $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}} = \sum_{S \in \text{shifttable}(z)} \Pi_{z,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}$. Suppose $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ has $z(i) > z(i+1)$ and $z \neq s_i z s_i \in I_{\infty}^{\text{vex}}$. Set

$$y := s_i z s_i \in I_{\infty}^{\text{vex}}.$$

Then $\mathcal{G}_y^{\mathcal{O}} = \partial_i^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ by (2.7), so by Theorem 2.2 it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{S \in \text{shifttable}(y)} \Pi_{y,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S} = \sum_{S \in \text{shifttable}(z)} \beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)} (\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}). \quad (4.4)$$

The argument to check this splits into several cases according to how i and $i+1$ are distributed among the left endpoints, right endpoints, and fixed points of z .

Since i is a descent of z , it cannot occur that i and $i+1$ are both fixed points of z , or that i is a fixed point and $i+1$ is a left endpoint, or that i is a right endpoint and $i+1$ is a fixed point. Also, since y and z are distinct and both vexillary, it cannot occur that i is a right endpoint and $i+1$ is a left endpoint, or that i is a left endpoint and $i+1$ is a right endpoint. These considerations exclude 5 of 9 cases, leaving 4 possibilities:

- (a) The number i is a fixed point of z while $i+1$ is a right endpoint.
- (b) Both i and $i+1$ are right endpoints of z .
- (c) Both i and $i+1$ are left endpoints of z .
- (d) The number i is a left endpoint of z while $i+1$ is a fixed point.

We explain why (4.4) holds in each of these cases below.

- (a) Suppose i is a fixed point of z and $i+1$ is a right endpoint.

In this case y and z have the same left segments, crossing bounds, and shifttable subsets. Suppose $S \in \text{shifttable}(y) = \text{shifttable}(z)$. As i must be greater than the largest left endpoint of $z \in I_{\infty}^{\text{vex}}$, it follows that $\partial_i^{(\beta)}$ commutes with $\Pi_{y,S} = \Pi_{z,S}$ and s_i commutes with σ_S . Moreover, i is still a fixed point and $i+1$ is still a right endpoint of $(\sigma_S)^{-1} \cdot z \cdot \sigma_S$, so we have $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S}$ and

$$\partial_i^{(\beta)} (\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = \Pi_{y,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S}. \quad (4.5)$$

Substituting this formula turns the left side of (4.4) into the right.

- (b) Suppose i and $i+1$ are both right endpoints of z .

In this case i is again greater than the largest left endpoint of z , so $\partial_i^{(\beta)}$ commutes with $\Pi_{z,S}$ for all $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$. Since i is a descent of z , for some indices $1 \leq j < k \leq q$ it holds that $z(i+1) = a_j$ and $z(i) = a_k$. If a_j and a_k are not in the same left segment of z , or are both in the unique immobile left segment (when this exists), then the argument to deduce (4.4) is the same as in case (a), since then y and z have the same left segments, crossing bounds, and shiftable subsets, so (4.5) again holds.

Instead assume that a_j and a_k belong to the same mobile left segment of z . Then $y = s_i z s_i$ has the same left segments as z , and almost the same nontrivial cycles: the only difference is that $(a_j, i+1)$ and (a_k, i) have been replaced by (a_j, i) and $(a_k, i+1)$. This means that the crossing bounds for the left endpoints of y are the same as for z , with one exception: if $i+1 < b_t$ for all $j < t < k$ then a_k will be a crossing bound for a_j in y but not in z . If this exception does not occur then (4.5) again holds for all $S \in \text{shiftable}(y) = \text{shiftable}(z)$, which suffices to prove (4.4). For the exceptional case, we make a claim:

Claim 1. Assume we are in the case when $i+1 < b_t$ for all $j < t < k$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &:= \{S \in \text{shiftable}(z) : a_j \notin S \text{ and } a_k \in S\}, \\ \mathcal{F} &:= \{S \in \text{shiftable}(z) : a_j, a_k \in S \text{ and } a_t \notin S \text{ for all } j < t < k\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\text{shiftable}(y) = \text{shiftable}(z) \setminus \mathcal{E}$ and $S \mapsto S \sqcup \{a_j\}$ is a bijection $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$.

Proof of the claim. We can always remove a_j from $T \in \mathcal{F}$ to obtain a shiftable set $T \setminus \{a_j\} \in \mathcal{E}$, since such a set T contains no crossing bounds for a_j , as these would have to be of the form a_t for some $j < t < k$. On the other hand, if $S \in \mathcal{E}$ then any left endpoint a_t that has a_j as a crossing bound in z must also have a_k as a crossing bound, and therefore is already in S , so we can add a_j to get a shiftable subset $S \sqcup \{a_j\} \in \text{shiftable}(z)$.

Now we check that $a_t \notin S$ for all $j < t < k$ if $a_j \notin S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$. This follows by induction on t as each a_t is a crossing bound for one of $a_j, a_{j+1}, \dots, a_{t-1}$ as $b_j = i+1 < b_t$. Hence if $a_j, a_{j+1}, \dots, a_{t-1} \notin S$ then also $a_t \notin S$. We conclude that if $S \in \mathcal{E}$ then the union $S \sqcup \{a_j\}$ is shiftable and contained in \mathcal{F} . \square

Continue to assume $i+1 < b_t$ for all $j < t < k$, so that the claim applies. If $S \in \text{shiftable}(y) \setminus \mathcal{F}$ then S contains neither a_j nor a_k so $\Pi_{y,S} = \Pi_{z,S}$. If instead $S \in \mathcal{F}$ then we obtain $\Pi_{y,S}$ from $\Pi_{z,S} = \prod_{t \in [q]} \Pi_{z,S}^{(a_t)}$ by replacing the single factor $\Pi_{z,S}^{(a_j)} = 1 + \beta x_{a_j}$ by $\Pi_{y,S}^{(a_j)} = -1$. This means that if $S \in \mathcal{F}$ then

$$\Pi_{y,S} = \Pi_{z,S} - \Pi_{z,T} \quad \text{for } T := S \setminus \{a_j\} \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (4.6)$$

Finally, we observe that if $S \in \text{shiftable}(y) = \text{shiftable}(z) \setminus \mathcal{E}$ then

$$\beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = \Pi_{z,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} = \Pi_{z,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S} \quad (4.7)$$

while if $T \in \mathcal{E}$ and $S := T \sqcup \{a_j\} \in \mathcal{F}$ then, as $a_t \notin T$ for $j < t < k$, we have

$$\beta^{|T|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,T} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T}) = \Pi_{z,T} \cdot \beta^{|T|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T} = -\Pi_{z,T} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S}. \quad (4.8)$$

Since $T \mapsto T \sqcup \{a_j\}$ is a bijection $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$, substituting (4.7) and (4.8) into the right side of (4.4) and then using (4.6) gives the left side (4.4), as needed.

(c) Suppose i and $i + 1$ are both left endpoints of z .

In this case y and z have the same left endpoints and left segments, and the numbers i and $i + 1$ belong to the same left segment. Notice that the set $\text{crb}_z(i)$ of crossing bounds for i in z is empty since whenever $i < t$ and $z(i) < z(t)$ we also have $z(i + 1) < z(t)$.

Our proof of (4.4) in this case reduces to two somewhat technical claims, which we state and prove below.

Claim 2. Continue to assume i and $i + 1$ are both left endpoints of z . Then

$$\sum_{\substack{S \in \text{shiftable}(z) \\ i \in S}} \beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = 0.$$

Proof. If i is part of a left segment of z containing 1, then the equality holds trivially because the sum is empty. We may therefore assume that i and $i + 1$ belong to a left segment that does not contain 1. (This assumption is not actually used in any part of the following argument, however.) To prove the claim, it suffices to verify the following three statements:

(1) If $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ has $i, i + 1 \in S$ and $S \cap \text{crb}_z(i + 1) = \emptyset$ then

$$\beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = \Pi_{z,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T}$$

for the set $T := S \setminus \{i + 1\}$, which belongs to $\text{shiftable}(z)$ and satisfies

$$\beta^{|T|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,T} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T}) = -\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T}.$$

(2) If $T \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ has $i \in T$ and $i + 1 \notin T$ then $S := T \sqcup \{i + 1\}$ satisfies

$$i, i + 1 \in S \in \text{shiftable}(z) \quad \text{and} \quad S \cap \text{crb}_z(i + 1) = \emptyset.$$

(3) If $i, i + 1 \in S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ and $S \cap \text{crb}_z(i + 1) \neq \emptyset$ then $\partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = 0$.

To show (1), choose $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ with $i, i + 1 \in S$ and $S \cap \text{crb}_z(i + 1) = \emptyset$ and define $T := S \setminus \{i + 1\}$. Since S does not contain any crossing bounds for $i + 1$, it is evident that $T \in \text{shiftable}(z)$. Since $\text{crb}_z(i) = \emptyset$, we have

$$\Pi_{z,S}^{(i)} \Pi_{z,S}^{(i+1)} = (1 + \beta x_i)(1 + \beta x_{i+1})$$

so $\partial_i^{(\beta)}$ commutes with $\Pi_{z,S}$. It follows from Lemma 4.6(a) that

$$\partial_i^{(\beta)}(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T}) = -\beta \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T}.$$

Therefore, we conclude from (2.2) that

$$\beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = \Pi_{z,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T}$$

and

$$\beta^{|T|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,T} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T}) = (\partial_i^{(\beta)} \Pi_{z,T}) \cdot \beta^{|S|-1} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,T}.$$

It remains to check that $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \Pi_{z,T} = -\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \beta$. As we have

$$\Pi_{z,T}^{(i)} \Pi_{z,T}^{(i+1)} = (1 + \beta x_i)(2 + \beta x_{i+1})$$

the desired identity follows by checking that

$$\partial_i^{(\beta)}((1 + \beta x_i)(2 + \beta x_{i+1})) = -\beta(1 + \beta x_i)(1 + \beta x_{i+1}).$$

This proves item (1).

We proceed to item (2). Assume $T \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ has $i \in T$ and $i + 1 \notin T$. Define $S := T \sqcup \{i + 1\}$. Since T is shiftable, we must have $T \cap \text{crb}_z(i + 1) = \emptyset$, so it also holds that $S \cap \text{crb}_z(i + 1) = \emptyset$. Finally, Lemma 4.7 shows that $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ as needed.

For item (3), assume $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ has $i, i + 1 \in S$ and $S \cap \text{crb}_z(i + 1) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\Pi_{z,S}^{(i)} \Pi_{z,S}^{(i+1)} = -1 - \beta x_i$ so $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \Pi_{z,S} = 0$. It suffices in view of (2.2) to check that $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} = -\beta \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}$, and this follows by Lemma 4.6(b). \square

Our second claim involves the following definitions. Given $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$, let m_S be the smallest element of S with $i + 1 < m_S$, if this exists. Then let

$$\mathcal{A} := \{S \in \text{shiftable}(z) : i, i + 1 \notin S\},$$

$$\mathcal{B} := \{S \in \text{shiftable}(z) : i \notin S, i + 1 \in S, S \cap \text{crb}_z(i + 1) = \emptyset\},$$

$$\mathcal{C} := \{S \in \text{shiftable}(z) : i \notin S, i + 1 \in S, S \cap \text{crb}_z(i + 1) \neq \emptyset, z(m_S) < z(i)\},$$

$$\mathcal{D} := \{S \in \text{shiftable}(z) : i \notin S, i + 1 \in S, S \cap \text{crb}_z(i + 1) \neq \emptyset, z(i) < z(m_S)\}.$$

Lemma 4.6 ensures that m_S is defined in the formulas for \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} . If X and Y are two sets then we let $X \Delta Y := (X \setminus Y) \sqcup (Y \setminus X)$. To establish (4.4), it suffices to combine our first claim above with the following claim below:

Claim 3. Continue to assume i and $i + 1$ are both left endpoints of z . Then

$$\text{shiftable}(y) = \mathcal{A} \sqcup \{S \Delta \{i, i + 1\} : S \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{C}\} \sqcup \{S \sqcup \{i\} : S \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{C} \sqcup \mathcal{D}\}.$$

Moreover, if $S \in \mathcal{A} \sqcup \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{C} \sqcup \mathcal{D}$ and $T := S \Delta \{i, i + 1\}$ and $U := S \sqcup \{i\}$, then

$$\beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = \begin{cases} \Pi_{y,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S} & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{A} \\ \Pi_{y,T} \cdot \beta^{|T|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T} + \Pi_{y,U} \cdot \beta^{|U|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,U} & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{C} \\ \Pi_{y,U} \cdot \beta^{|U|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,U} & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{D}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We can derive the formula for $\beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S})$ directly from (2.2), since the setup determines the value of $\Pi_{z,S}^{(i)} \Pi_{z,S}^{(i+1)}$ in each case and Lemma 4.6 tells us how to evaluate $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}$ via Theorem 3.3. The argument is similar to the proof of Claim 2 (and also to the proofs of Claims 5 and 6 below) so we omit the details.

The nontrivial statement left to prove is the desired expression for $\text{shiftable}(y)$. To show this, we start by observing that while $\text{crb}_z(i) = \emptyset$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{crb}_y(i) &= \{i+1\} \sqcup \{t \in \text{crb}_z(i+1) : z(i+1) < z(t) < z(i)\}, \\ \text{crb}_y(i+1) &= \{t \in \text{crb}_z(i+1) : z(i) < z(t)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, for any other left endpoint t , the set of crossing bounds $\text{crb}_y(t)$ is either equal to $\text{crb}_z(t)$, or formed from $\text{crb}_z(t)$ by removing i or $i+1$, and the second case only occurs when $\text{crb}_z(t)$ already contains at least i . Specifically, for any left endpoint $t \notin \{i, i+1\}$, we are in one of the following cases:

(i) when $t < i$ and $z(t) < z(i+1)$, it can happen that

$$i, i+1 \in \text{crb}_z(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{crb}_y(t) = \text{crb}_z(t) \setminus \{i+1\}.$$

(ii) when $t < i$ and $z(i+1) < z(t) < z(i)$, it can happen that

$$i \in \text{crb}_z(t), \quad i+1 \notin \text{crb}_z(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{crb}_y(t) = \text{crb}_z(t) \setminus \{i\}.$$

(iii) if cases (i) or (ii) do not apply, then $i, i+1 \notin \text{crb}_y(t) = \text{crb}_z(t)$.

It follows that if S is a set containing neither i nor $i+1$, then $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ if and only if $S \in \text{shiftable}(y)$.

On the other hand, if $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ and $i \notin S$, then the only way $S \sqcup \{i\}$ can fail to be in $\text{shiftable}(y)$ is if some left endpoint $t \notin S$ has $i \in \text{crb}_y(t)$. In view of (i), (ii), and (iii), this can only happen when $i+1 \in \text{crb}_z(t)$, which would mean that $i+1 \notin S$. Thus, if $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ has $i \notin S$ and $i+1 \in S$, so that $S \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{C} \sqcup \mathcal{D}$, then we have $S \sqcup \{i\} \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ and this union contains both i and $i+1$.

Conversely, if $U \in \text{shiftable}(y)$ has $i, i+1 \in U$ then since $\text{crb}_z(i) = \emptyset$, the only way $U \setminus \{i\}$ can fail to be in $\text{shiftable}(z)$ is if some left endpoint $t \notin U$ has $i+1 \notin \text{crb}_y(t)$ but $i+1 \in \text{crb}_z(t)$. Inspecting (i) and (ii) shows that this situation is impossible, so if $U \in \text{shiftable}(y)$ has $i, i+1 \in U$ then $U \setminus \{i\} \in \text{shiftable}(z)$.

Finally suppose S is a set containing $i+1$ but not i . Form $T := S \Delta \{i, i+1\}$ by removing $i+1$ and adding i . It is not possible for a left endpoint t to have $i \in \text{crb}_y(t)$ and $i+1 \notin \text{crb}_z(t)$, so if $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ then we can only fail to have $T \in \text{shiftable}(y)$ if $S \cap \text{crb}_y(i+1) \neq \emptyset$. This only occurs if S contains some $t \in \text{crb}_z(i+1)$ with $z(i) < z(t)$, but then we must have $t = m_S$ or $z(i) < z(t) < z(m_S)$. We conclude that if $S \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{C}$ then $T \in \text{shiftable}(y)$.

Conversely, since $\text{crb}_z(i) = \emptyset$, if $T \in \text{shiftable}(y)$ then we can only fail to have $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ if there is some left endpoint $t \notin T$ with $i \notin \text{crb}_y(t)$ and

$i + 1 \in \text{crb}_z(t)$. Inspecting (i) and (ii) shows that this situation is impossible, so if $T \in \text{shiftable}(y)$ then $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$. In fact, if $T \in \text{shiftable}(y)$ then $S \in \mathcal{B} \sqcup \mathcal{C}$, since $i + 1 \in S$ and if m_S is defined then $y(m_S) < y(i + 1)$ by Lemma 4.8 so $z(m_S) = y(m_S) < y(i + 1) = z(i)$.

This argument shows that the given union is contained in $\text{shiftable}(y)$, and that each element of $\text{shiftable}(y)$ —except those containing $i + 1$ but not i —is contained in this union. As no set in $\text{shiftable}(y)$ contains $i + 1$ but not i since $i + 1 \in \text{crb}_y(i)$, this completes the proof of our claim. \square

The identity (4.4) in case (c) is immediate from Claims 2 and 3. This leaves just one final case to consider:

(d) Suppose i is a left endpoint of z and $i + 1$ is a fixed point.

In this case i is the last element of its left segment in z , so $\text{crb}_z(i) = \emptyset$. However, the left endpoints for y are no longer the same as for z . Compared to z , the set of left endpoints for y loses i and gains $i + 1$.

This means that the left segments of y also differ from z . Let L be the left segment of z containing i . If $i + 2$ is not a left endpoint of z , then the left segments of y are formed from those of z by replacing L by $L \setminus \{i\}$ and adding a new singleton segment $\{i\}$. If $i + 2$ is a left endpoint of z , then it begins a new left segment M of z . In this event, the left segments of y are formed from those of z by replacing L by $L \setminus \{i\}$ and M by $\{i + 1\} \sqcup M$.

These sub-cases require slightly different arguments, which we handle as usual through a series of claims. To start, we have this close relative of Claim 2:

Claim 4. Continue to assume that $i < z(i)$ and $i + 1 = z(i + 1)$. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{S \in \text{shiftable}(z) \\ i \in S}} \beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = 0.$$

Proof. This holds for a much simpler reason than Claim 2. Assume $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ has $i \in S$. Since i is the last element of its left segment, we have $\text{crb}_z(i) = \emptyset$, so $\Pi_{z,S}^{(i)} = 1 + \beta x_i$ and $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \Pi_{z,S} = 0$. At the same time, it is also clear that $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} = -\beta \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}$ so in fact $\partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = 0$ by (2.2). \square

We now have two variants of Claim 3. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{S \in \text{shiftable}(z) : i \notin S\}$.

Claim 5. If i but not $i + 2$ is a left endpoint of z , and $i + 1 = z(i + 1)$, then

$$\text{shiftable}(y) = \mathcal{X} \sqcup \{S \sqcup \{i + 1\} : S \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

Moreover, in this case, if $S \in \mathcal{X}$ and $T := S \sqcup \{i + 1\}$ then

$$\beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = \Pi_{y,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S} + \Pi_{y,T} \cdot \beta^{|T|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T}.$$

Proof. In this case $\text{crb}_y(t) = \text{crb}_z(t) \setminus \{i\}$ for all left endpoints $t \neq i$, although the set difference may often satisfy $\text{crb}_z(t) \setminus \{i\} = \text{crb}_z(t)$. This property makes it clear that $\mathcal{X} \subset \text{shiftable}(y)$. Then, since $\{i\}$ is a left segment in y , it also follows that $\{S \sqcup \{i+1\} : S \in \mathcal{X}\} \subset \text{shiftable}(y)$.

Conversely, if $S \in \text{shiftable}(y)$ then $i \notin S$ as i is not a left endpoint of y , and the same observation about crossing bounds implies that $S \setminus \{i+1\} \in \mathcal{X}$. This proves our formula for $\text{shiftable}(y)$.

Now let $S \in \mathcal{X}$ and $T := S \sqcup \{i+1\}$. Let $\mathcal{Q} = \prod_{a \neq i, i+1} \Pi_{z,S}^{(a)} = \prod_{a \neq i, i+1} \Pi_{y,S}^{(a)}$ where the products are over the left endpoints a shared by y and z . Then

$$\Pi_{z,S} = (2 + \beta x_i) \mathcal{Q}, \quad \Pi_{y,S} = (2 + \beta x_{i+1}) \mathcal{Q}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{y,T} = (1 + \beta x_{i+1}) \mathcal{Q}.$$

As \mathcal{Q} does not involve the variables x_i or x_{i+1} , we have

$$s_i(\Pi_{z,S}) = \Pi_{y,S} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S}) = -\beta \mathcal{Q},$$

so we can compute that

$$s_i(\Pi_{z,S}) \cdot \beta + \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S}) = \beta \cdot ((2 + \beta x_{i+1}) - 1) \cdot \mathcal{Q} = \beta \cdot \Pi_{y,T}.$$

Since it is clear that $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T}$ and $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S}$, the desired expression for $\beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S})$ follows from (2.2) using the preceding identities. \square

Now suppose that i and $i+2$ are both left endpoints of z while $i+1 = z(i+1)$. As above let M be the left segment of z containing $i+2$. Then define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} &= \{S \in \mathcal{X} : S \cap M = \emptyset \text{ or } z(i) > z(\min(S \cap M))\}, \\ \mathcal{W} &= \{S \in \mathcal{X} : S \cap M \neq \emptyset \text{ and } z(i) < z(\min(S \cap M))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here is our second variant of Claim 3:

Claim 6. Assume i and $i+2$ are left endpoints of z while $i+1 = z(i+1)$. Then

$$\text{shiftable}(y) = \mathcal{V} \sqcup \{S \sqcup \{i+1\} : S \in \mathcal{V} \sqcup \mathcal{W} = \mathcal{X}\}.$$

Moreover, if $S \in \mathcal{V} \sqcup \mathcal{W}$ and $T := S \sqcup \{i+1\}$ then

$$\beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = \begin{cases} \Pi_{y,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S} + \Pi_{y,T} \cdot \beta^{|T|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T} & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{V} \\ \Pi_{y,T} \cdot \beta^{|T|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T} & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{W}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The proof of this statement is similar to Claim 5, and only slightly more complicated. As in the earlier proof, we have $\text{crb}_y(t) = \text{crb}_z(t) \setminus \{i\}$ for all left endpoints $t \neq i$, though it may often hold that $\text{crb}_z(t) \setminus \{i\} = \text{crb}_z(t)$. Whereas $\text{crb}_z(i) = \emptyset$, the set of crossing bound $\text{crb}_y(i+1)$ may be a nonempty subset of the left segment M .

Suppose $S \in \mathcal{X}$. Then it is clear from the previous paragraph and the definition of a shiftable set that $S \sqcup \{i+1\} \in \text{shiftable}(y)$. Moreover, the only way we can fail to have $S \in \text{shiftable}(y)$ is if $S \cap \text{crb}_y(i+1) \neq \emptyset$.

If $S \cap M$ is empty, then this is impossible so $S \in \text{shiftable}(y)$. Assume instead that $S \cap M \neq \emptyset$. Let $m = \min(S \cap M)$ and suppose $z(m) < z(i)$. Then $y(m) = z(m) < z(i) = y(i+1)$, which means that $m \notin \text{crb}_y(i+1)$, and also that no $t \in \text{crb}_y(i+1)$ is greater than m , since if $m < t$ and $y(i+1) < y(t)$ then $y(m) < y(i+1) < y(t)$. In other words, it follows that $S \cap \text{crb}_y(i+1) = \emptyset$, so $S \in \text{shiftable}(y)$. We conclude that if $S \in \mathcal{V}$ then $S \in \text{shiftable}(y)$.

This shows that $\text{shiftable}(y)$ contains the given union. Conversely, suppose $T \in \text{shiftable}(y)$ and let $S := T \setminus \{i+1\}$. Then $i \notin S$ since i is not a left endpoint of y , and it follows from our earlier observations about the crossing bounds of y versus z that $S \in \mathcal{X}$.

Assume $i+1 \notin T$ so that $S = T$. It remains only to check that $S \in \mathcal{V}$. For this, observe that if $S \cap M \neq \emptyset$ and $m = \min(S \cap M) = \min(T \cap M)$, then we have $y(m) < y(i+1)$ by Lemma 4.8 and therefore $z(m) = y(m) < y(i+1) = z(i)$. This completes our proof of the formula for $\text{shiftable}(y)$.

We now compute $\beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S})$ using (2.2). The argument is almost the same as in the proof of Claim 5. Choose $S \in \mathcal{X}$ and set $T := S \sqcup \{i+1\}$. Again let $\mathcal{Q} = \prod_{a \neq i, i+1} \Pi_{z,S}^{(a)} = \prod_{a \neq i, i+1} \Pi_{y,S}^{(a)}$ where the products are over the left endpoints a shared by y and z . Then we have

$$\begin{cases} \Pi_{z,S} = (2 + \beta x_i) \mathcal{Q} \\ \Pi_{y,S} = (2 + \beta x_{i+1}) \mathcal{Q} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi_{y,T} = \begin{cases} (1 + \beta x_{i+1}) \mathcal{Q} & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{V} \\ -\mathcal{Q} & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{W}, \end{cases}$$

using Lemma 4.6 for the second identity. As \mathcal{Q} does not involve x_i or x_{i+1} ,

$$s_i(\Pi_{z,S}) = \Pi_{y,S} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S}) = -\beta \mathcal{Q}.$$

Observe that $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T}$ for all $S \in \mathcal{X}$ along with $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S}$ for $S \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\partial_i^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} = -\beta \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}$ for $S \in \mathcal{W}$. Thus, if $S \in \mathcal{V}$ then (2.2) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) &= \beta^{|S|} \cdot \mathcal{P}_{y,S} \cdot \left(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S} + \beta \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T} \right) - \beta^{|S|} \cdot \beta \mathcal{Q} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T} \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{y,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S} + ((2 + \beta x_{i+1}) - 1) \cdot \mathcal{Q} \cdot \beta^{|T|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T} \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{y,S} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,S} + \mathcal{P}_{y,T} \cdot \beta^{|T|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T} \end{aligned}$$

whereas if $S \in \mathcal{W}$ then (2.2) gives

$$\beta^{|S|} \cdot \partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi_{z,S} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}) = \beta^{|S|} \cdot (-\beta \mathcal{Q}) \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S} = \Pi_{y,T} \cdot \beta^{|T|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y,T}$$

as needed. \square

The identity (4.4) in case (d) is immediate from Claims 4, 5, 6: the first claim simplifies the sum on the right, and then whichever of the other two claims applies (according to whether $i+2$ is a left endpoint) transforms the remaining terms to the sum on the left. This completes our proof by induction. \square

4.3 Shift invariance and stable limits

In this section we consider how $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$, $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_y$, and $\mathcal{G}_z^{(\beta)}$ vary when we apply natural shifting operations to the indexing permutations. This will allow us to state some additional results about the *stable limits* of these polynomials.

Define $\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]} : \mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots]$ to be the $\mathbb{Z}[\beta]$ -algebra homomorphism sending $x_1 \mapsto 0$ and $x_{i+1} \mapsto x_i$.

Recall that we view permutations $w \in S_\infty$ as maps $w : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ with $w(i) = i$ for $i \leq 0$. Given $w \in S_\infty$ and an integer $n \geq 0$, define $w \downarrow n$ to be the permutation of \mathbb{Z} that sends $i \mapsto w(i+n) - n$. Notice for $w \in S_\infty$ that $w \downarrow n \in S_\infty$ if and only if w fixes each $i \in [n]$, and in this case $\ell(w \downarrow n) = \ell(w)$.

Proposition 4.9. If $w \in S_\infty$ then $\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}_{w \downarrow 1}^{(\beta)} & \text{if } w(1) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } w(1) \neq 1. \end{cases}$

Proof. This identity is possibly well-known, and in any case follows from Remark 2.5, upon noting two observations. First, if $w(1) = 1$ then all letters of all Hecke words for w are at least 2, and the operation on words that decrements every letter by one is a bijection $\mathcal{H}(w) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(w \downarrow 1)$. Second, if $w(1) \neq 1$ then every Hecke word for w must have some letter equal to 1, so in any bounded compatible sequence (a, i) for w it must hold that $i_1 = a_1 = 1$. \square

If $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ fixes each $i \in [n]$ then the permutation $z \downarrow n$ is also in I_∞^{ex} .

Proposition 4.10. Suppose $y \in I_\infty$ and $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$. Then

$$\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_y) = \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{y \downarrow 1} & \text{if } y(1) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } y(1) \neq 1 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}_{z \downarrow 1}^{\text{O}} & \text{if } z(1) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } z(1) \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. One can deduce from (2.17) that if $y(1) = 1$ then every $w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y)$ has $w(1) = 1$ and $w \mapsto w \downarrow 1$ is a length-preserving bijection $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y \downarrow 1)$. Likewise, if $y(1) \neq 1$ then every $w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(y)$ also has $w(1) \neq 1$. The identity for $\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_y)$ is immediate from Proposition 4.9 given these observations.

For $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$ let $S \downarrow 1 = \{s - 1 : s \in S\}$. As $\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}$ is an algebra homomorphism, Theorem 4.5 implies that

$$\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}}) = \sum_{S \in \text{shiftable}(z)} \text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\Pi_{z,S}) \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S}).$$

Suppose $z(1) = 1$. Let L be the left segment of z containing 2 or set $L = \emptyset$ if $z(2) = 2$. Then our first identity implies that $\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S})$ is zero when $S \cap L \neq \emptyset$ and equal to $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z \downarrow 1, S \downarrow 1}$ when $S \cap L = \emptyset$, in which case we also have $\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\Pi_{z,S}) = \Pi_{z \downarrow 1, S \downarrow 1}$. As $S \mapsto S \downarrow 1$ is evidently a bijection

$$\{S \in \text{shiftable}(z) : S \cap L = \emptyset\} \rightarrow \text{shiftable}(z \downarrow 1),$$

we conclude that $\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}}) = \mathcal{G}_{z \downarrow 1}^{\text{O}}$.

Alternatively, if $z(1) \neq 1$ then $y := (\sigma_S)^{-1} \cdot z \cdot \sigma_S$ has $y(1) \neq 1$ for all $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$, so $\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{z,S})$ is always zero and $\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}}) = 0$. \square

Given $w \in S_\infty$, define $1 \times w \in S_\infty$ to be the permutation that sends $1 \mapsto 1$ and $i + 1 \mapsto w(i) + 1$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For positive integers n we inductively define $1^n \times w \in S_\infty$ to be $1 \times w$ if $n = 1$ or $1 \times (1^{n-1} \times w)$ if $n > 1$. Note that

$$(1^n \times w) \downarrow n = w \quad \text{for all } w \in S_\infty.$$

Now define $\text{shift}_{[\uparrow]} : \mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots]$ to be the $\mathbb{Z}[\beta]$ -linear map sending $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} \mapsto \mathcal{G}_{1 \times w}^{(\beta)}$ for $w \in S_\infty$. By Proposition 4.9, we have

$$\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]} \circ \text{shift}_{[\uparrow]} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{shift}_{[\uparrow]} \circ \text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} & \text{if } w(1) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } w(1) \neq 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

Note, however, that $\text{shift}_{[\uparrow]}$ is not an algebra homomorphism, and thus differs from the more familiar right inverse of $\text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}$ sending $x_i \mapsto x_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Our main theorem of this section is the following. Comparing this with Proposition 3.20 gives some heuristic support for Conjecture 3.21.

Theorem 4.11. Let $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$. If $\text{supp}(z) \subseteq [a, b]$ for integers $a \leq b$, then

$$\text{supp}(w) \subseteq [a - 1, b + 1] \quad \text{for all } w \in \text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}).$$

Moreover, if $z(1) = 1$ then $\text{shift}_{[\uparrow]}(\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}}) = \mathcal{G}_{1 \times z}^{\text{O}}$.

Before proving this theorem we consider an example and state one lemma.

Example 4.12. The hypothesis $z(1) \neq 1$ in the last part of Theorem 4.11 is necessary. For example, we have $\mathcal{G}_{(1,2)}^{\text{O}} = 2\mathcal{G}_{21}^{(\beta)} + \beta\mathcal{G}_{312}^{(\beta)}$ but

$$\mathcal{G}_{1 \times (1,2)}^{\text{O}} = \mathcal{G}_{(2,3)}^{\text{O}} = 2\mathcal{G}_{132}^{(\beta)} + \beta\mathcal{G}_{1423}^{(\beta)} + \beta\mathcal{G}_{231}^{(\beta)} + \beta^2\mathcal{G}_{2413}^{(\beta)} \neq \text{shift}_{[\uparrow]}(\mathcal{G}_{(1,2)}^{\text{O}}).$$

On the other hand, it does hold that

$$\mathcal{G}_{1 \times (2,3)}^{\text{O}} = \mathcal{G}_{(3,4)}^{\text{O}} = 2\mathcal{G}_{1243}^{(\beta)} + \beta\mathcal{G}_{12534}^{(\beta)} + \beta\mathcal{G}_{1342}^{(\beta)} + \beta^2\mathcal{G}_{13524}^{(\beta)} = \text{shift}_{[\uparrow]}(\mathcal{G}_{(2,3)}^{\text{O}}).$$

Given $v = v_1 v_2 v_3 \dots \in S_\infty$ with $v_j = 1$, define $v^\natural = v_1^\natural v_2^\natural v_3^\natural \dots \in S_\infty$ to be the permutation with $v_1^\natural = 2$, $v_{j+1}^\natural = 1$, and $v_{i+1}^\natural = 1 + v_i$ for all $i \neq j$. If

$$v = 3467125 \quad \text{then} \quad v^\natural = 24578136 \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \times v = 14578236.$$

Notice that $v^\natural = (1, 2) \cdot (1 \times v) = s_1 \cdot (1 \times v)$.

Lemma 4.13. Fix integers $1 < i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l$ and let

$$\Pi = \prod_{j \in [l]} (1 + \beta x_{i_j}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi^+ = \prod_{j \in [l]} (1 + \beta x_{1+i_j}).$$

Suppose $w \in S_\infty$ has $w(1) = 1$. Let $a_v, b_v \in \mathbb{Z}[\beta]$ for $v \in S_\infty$ be such that

$$\Pi \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} = \sum_{v \in S_\infty} a_v \cdot \mathcal{G}_v^{(\beta)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi^+ \cdot \mathcal{G}_{1 \times w}^{(\beta)} = \sum_{v \in S_\infty} b_v \cdot \mathcal{G}_v^{(\beta)}.$$

Then for all $v \in S_\infty$ it holds that $b_{v^\natural} = \begin{cases} -a_v & \text{if } v(1) \neq 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } v(1) = 1. \end{cases}$

We point out that as $\mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ is homogeneous if we view β as having degree -1 , the coefficients a_v and b_v in this lemma are always integers times $\beta^{\ell(v)-\ell(w)}$.

Proof. Since $1 \times w$ fixes 1 and 2 and since Π^+ does not involve x_1 or x_2 , it follows from (2.2) and Theorem 3.3 that $\partial_i^{(\beta)}(\Pi^+ \cdot \mathcal{G}_{1 \times w}^{(\beta)}) = -\beta \cdot \Pi^+ \cdot \mathcal{G}_{1 \times w}^{(\beta)}$. In view of (2.5), this is only possible if $b_u = 0$ whenever $u(1) > u(2)$. The latter condition holds whenever $u = v^\natural$ for some $v \in S_\infty$ with $v(1) = 1$.

Next, let $i = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l)$ and $i^+ = (1 + i_1, 1 + i_2, \dots, 1 + i_l)$. Define an *i -chain* to be an ascending chain in Bruhat order formed by starting with a chain of the form (3.3) with $k = i_l$, then appending chains of the same form with $k = i_{l-1}, i_{l-2}, \dots, i_1$ in succession. We say that an i -chain is *odd* (respectively, *even*) if the sum of the values of p from (3.3) corresponding to the l segments of the chain is odd (respectively, even).

Finally, fix $v \in S_\infty$ with $v(1) \neq 1$. If we use Theorem 3.8 to multiply $\mathcal{G}_{1 \times w}^{(\beta)}$ first by $(1 + \beta x_{i_l})$, then by $(1 + \beta x_{i_{l-1}})$, then by $(1 + \beta x_{i_{l-2}})$, and so, to ultimately obtain the $\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)}$ -expansion of $\Pi^+ \cdot \mathcal{G}_{1 \times w}^{(\beta)}$, then we see that the coefficient b_{v^\natural} is exactly the difference between the numbers of even and odd i^+ -chains from $1 \times w$ to v^\natural . Similarly, the coefficient a_v in the $\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)}$ -expansion of $\Pi \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ is the difference between the numbers of even and odd i -chains from w to v .

The key idea of this proof rests in the following observations. Because $1 \times w$ fixes 1 and 2 while $v^\natural(1) = 2$, in any i^+ -chain γ from $1 \times w$ to v^\natural , there must be an ascent of the form $\xrightarrow{(2, i_j)}$ (as otherwise we will have $\text{end}(\gamma)(1) = 1$) and the first such ascent must be followed immediately an ascent of the form $\xrightarrow{(1, i_j)}$ (as otherwise 2 will never return to the first position in the one-line representation of $\text{end}(\gamma)$), and then all other ascents in the chain $\xrightarrow{(a, b)}$ must have $a > 1$ (as any such ascent with $a = 1$ must come later in the chain, but if there is such a later ascent then we will have $\text{end}(\gamma)(1) > 2$). In view of these properties, we deduce that removing $\xrightarrow{(1, i_j)}$ and then replacing all other ascents $\xrightarrow{(a, b)}$ by $\xrightarrow{(a-1, b-1)}$ transforms γ to an i -chain from w to v . Conversely, by considering the natural inverse operation we see that every i -chain from w to v arises in this way for a unique choice of γ .

As the bijection just given between i^+ -chains from $1 \times w$ to v^\natural and i -chains from w to v reverses parity, we conclude that $b_{v^\natural} = -a_v$ as needed. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 4.11.

Proof of Theorem 4.11. Assume $z(1) = 1$. Then the formula for $\mathcal{G}_{1 \times z}^{\mathcal{O}}$ in Theorem 4.5 expands as a sum of terms of the form $\Pi \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ as in Lemma 4.13, and the corresponding formula for $\mathcal{G}_{1^2 \times z}^{\mathcal{O}}$ is obtained by replacing each term $\Pi \cdot \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}$ by $\Pi^+ \cdot \mathcal{G}_{1 \times w}^{(\beta)}$. It therefore follows from Lemma 4.13 that if $v \in S_\infty$ has $v(1) \neq 1$ then $\text{GC}_{1^2 \times z}^{\mathcal{O}}(v^\natural) = -\text{GC}_{1 \times z}^{\mathcal{O}}(v)$. As $\text{GC}_{1 \times z}^{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\text{GC}_{1^2 \times z}^{\mathcal{O}}$ both only take non-negative values [27, Prop. 3.29], we must have $\text{GC}_{1 \times z}^{\mathcal{O}}(v) = 0$ if $v(1) \neq 1$. We

conclude from Proposition 4.10 and (4.9) that

$$\mathcal{G}_{1 \times z}^{\mathcal{O}} = \text{shift}_{[\uparrow]} \circ \text{shift}_{[\downarrow]}(\mathcal{G}_{1 \times z}^{\mathcal{O}}) = \text{shift}_{[\uparrow]}(\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}).$$

We now drop the assumption that $z(1) = 1$ but suppose $\text{supp}(z) \subseteq [a, b]$ for integers $a \leq b$. Define p and q as in Theorem 2.2, so that $q \leq b$, and let $\delta = \text{dom}_{pq}$. It follows from Corollary 3.19 and Proposition 3.20 that $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq [1, q+1]$ for all $w \in \text{supp}(\text{GC}_{\delta}^{\mathcal{O}})$. Since $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{G}_{\delta}^{\mathcal{O}}$ by applying a sequence of divided difference operators $\partial_i^{(\beta)}$ with $i < q$, we also have $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq [1, q+1] \subseteq [1, b+1]$ for all $w \in \text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}})$.

It remains to check that $\text{supp}(w) \subseteq [a-1, \infty)$ for all $w \in \text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}})$. This is trivial unless $a \geq 3$, and then the desired containment follows immediately from the identity $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}} = \text{shift}_{[\uparrow]}^{a-2}(\mathcal{G}_y^{\mathcal{O}})$, which holds for $y := z \downarrow (a-2) \in I_{\infty}^{\text{ex}}$ by the part of the theorem shown in the first paragraph. \square

For $z \in I_{\infty}$ we extend the domain of the Grothendieck coefficient function $\text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ by setting $\text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}}(w) = 0$ if $w \notin S_{\infty}$. The following identities are immediate from Proposition 4.10 and Theorem 4.11.

Corollary 4.14. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $z \in I_{\infty}^{\text{ex}}$.

- (a) If $z \downarrow n \in S_{\infty}$ then $\text{GC}_{z \downarrow n}^{\mathcal{O}}(w) = \text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}}(1^n \times w)$ for all $w \in S_{\infty}$.
- (b) If $z(1) = 1$ then $\text{GC}_{1^n \times z}^{\mathcal{O}}(w) = \text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}}(w \downarrow n)$ for all $w \in S_{\infty}$.

The properties in this corollary are consistent with Conjecture 3.21 since it is easy to show that if $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $z \in I_{\infty}^{\text{ex}}$ has $z(1) = 1$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(1^n \times z) &= \{w \in S_{\infty} : w \downarrow n \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(1^n \times z) &= \{w \in S_{\infty} : w \downarrow n \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

In fact, the identity for $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(1^n \times z)$ holds even if $z(1) \neq 1$.

Theorem 4.11 has an application concerning the ‘‘stable limit’’ of $\mathcal{G}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$. The *symmetric Grothendieck function* of $w \in S_{\infty}$ is

$$G_w := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}_{1^n \times w}^{(\beta)} \quad (4.11)$$

where the limit is taken in the sense of formal power series. This means the limit exists precisely when the coefficients of any fixed monomial in $\mathcal{G}_{1^n \times w}^{(\beta)}$ is eventually a constant sequence.

It is known [4, 5, 8] that G_w always exists and is a formal power series that is symmetric in the x_i variables. Moreover, every symmetric power series over $\mathbb{Z}[\beta]$ is given by a unique, possibly infinite $\mathbb{Z}[\beta]$ -linear combination of G_w ’s [4, Thm. 6.12]. Consulting Remark 2.5, one obtains the explicit generating function $G_w = \sum_{(a,i)} \beta^{\ell(a) - \ell(w)} x^i$ where the sum is over all (not necessarily bounded) compatible sequences (a, i) with $a \in \mathcal{H}(w)$.

Following [24], for $z \in I_{\infty}^{\text{ex}}$ we define an analogous power series limit

$$GQ_z := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{G}_{1^n \times z}^{\mathcal{O}}. \quad (4.12)$$

We can immediately see that this limit converges to a symmetric function:

Corollary 4.15. If $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ has $z(1) = 1$ then

$$GQ_z = \sum_{w \in S_\infty} \text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}(w) \cdot \beta^{\ell(w) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \cdot G_w.$$

Moreover, it holds for any $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ that $GQ_z = GQ_{1 \times z}$.

Proof. If $z(1) = 1$ then $\mathcal{G}_{1^n \times z}^{\text{O}} = \sum_{w \in S_\infty} \text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}(w) \cdot \beta^{\ell(w) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \cdot \mathcal{G}_{1^n \times w}^{(\beta)}$ holds by Theorem 4.11 and the corollary follows by taking the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

A stronger result about GQ_z is known: if $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ then GQ_z is equal to the *K-theoretic Schur Q-function* GQ_μ defined in [15] when $\mu = \text{sh}(z)$ is the *involution shape* of z [24, Thm. 4.11]. The involution shape $\text{sh}(z)$ is the transpose of the partition that sorts the sequence of numbers $\hat{c}(z)$ from (2.12). One can view Corollary 4.15 as a new G -positive expansion of GQ_μ .

It is an open problem to show that (4.12) converges when $z \in I_\infty$ is not vexillary. By contrast, it is clear from (4.10) that for any $z \in I_\infty$ we have

$$GP_z := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{1^n \times z} = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)} \beta^{\ell(w) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} G_w \quad (4.13)$$

converges to a symmetric function. In fact, it is known [23, Thm. 1.9] that the power series GP_z are all $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\beta]$ -linear combinations of the *K-theoretic Schur P-functions* GP_μ defined in [15].

We can derive one other formula for GQ_z using this notation and Theorem 4.5. Given $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ and $S \in \text{shiftable}(z)$, define $GP_{z,S} := GP_y$ where $y := (\sigma_S)^{-1} \cdot z \cdot \sigma_S$ and form $\Pi_{z,S}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ from $\Pi_{z,S}$ by setting $x_1 = x_2 = \dots = 0$.

Corollary 4.16. If $z \in I_\infty^{\text{ex}}$ has $z(1) = 1$ then

$$GQ_z = \sum_{S \in \text{shiftable}(z)} \Pi_{z,S}^{(0)} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot GP_{z,S}.$$

Proof. Form $\Pi_{z,S}^{\uparrow n}$ from $\Pi_{z,S}$ by applying the $\mathbb{Z}[\beta]$ -algebra homomorphism that sends $x_i \mapsto x_{i+n}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Theorem 4.5 implies that if $z(1) = 1$ then $\mathcal{G}_{1^n \times z}^{\text{O}} = \sum_{S \in \text{shiftable}(z)} \Pi_{z,S}^{\uparrow n} \cdot \beta^{|S|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{1^n \times (\sigma_S)^{-1} \cdot z \cdot \sigma_S}$. The result follows by taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, which turns $\Pi_{z,S}^{\uparrow n}$ into $\Pi_{z,S}^{(0)}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{1^n \times (\sigma_S)^{-1} \cdot z \cdot \sigma_S}$ into $GP_{z,S}$. \square

4.4 Grassmannian identities

There is an interesting special case when the formulas for \mathcal{G}_z^{O} and GQ_z in the previous sections become considerably more explicit. We explain this below after defining some additional notation.

Recall the definition of the visible descent set $\text{Des}_V(z)$ from (1.7). Following [13], we say $z \in I_\infty$ is *n-I-Grassmannian* if $\text{Des}_V(z) \subseteq \{n\}$. An element of I_∞ is *I-Grassmannian* if it is *n-I-Grassmannian* for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

For a *strict* partition $\mu = (\mu_1 > \mu_2 > \dots > \mu_r > 0)$ with $r > 0$ nonzero parts and largest part $\mu_1 \leq n$, define $\langle \mu \mid n \rangle \in I_\infty$ to be the permutation

$$(n+1 - \mu_1, n+1)(n+1 - \mu_2, n+2) \cdots (n+1 - \mu_r, n+r) \in I_\infty. \quad (4.14)$$

Additionally, when going across the correspondence $S \leftrightarrow \langle \lambda \mid n \rangle$, one has $|S| = |\lambda/\mu|$, while the number of factors $\Pi_{z,S}^{(a)}$ equal to -1 is $|\lambda/\mu| - \text{cols}(\lambda/\mu)$ and the product of the other factors $\Pi_{z,S}^{(a)}$ is exactly $\Pi_{\lambda/\mu}^{(n)}$.

Verifying these claims is a straightforward exercise, and then the desired formula for $\mathcal{G}_{\langle \mu \mid n \rangle}^{\circ}$ is immediate from Theorem 4.5. \square

Example 4.19. If we fix $n = 4$ and write $\langle \mu_1 \mu_2 \cdots \mu_r \rangle$ instead of $\langle \mu \mid 4 \rangle$ then

$$\mathcal{G}_{\langle 32 \rangle}^{\circ} = (2 + \beta x_2)(2 + \beta x_3) \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\langle 32 \rangle} + (1 + \beta x_2)(2 + \beta x_3) \beta \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\langle 42 \rangle} - (1 + \beta x_3) \beta^2 \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\langle 43 \rangle}.$$

Corollary 4.18 is a non-symmetric generalization of [7, Thm. 1.1], which one recovers by taking stable limits in the following way. Let μ be a strict partition with $\mu_1 \leq n$. Observe that $1^m \times \langle \mu \mid n \rangle = \langle \mu \mid m+n \rangle$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Therefore

$$\mathcal{G}_{1^m \times \langle \mu \mid n \rangle}^{\circ} = \sum_{\lambda} (-1)^{\text{cols}(\lambda/\mu)} \cdot \Pi_{\lambda/\mu}^{(m+n)} \cdot (-\beta)^{|\lambda/\mu|} \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{1^m \times \langle \lambda \mid n \rangle} \quad (4.16)$$

where the sum is over strict partitions λ as in Corollary 4.18.

We have $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \Pi_{\lambda/\mu}^{(m+n)} = 2^{|\{i \in [r]: \lambda_i = \mu_i\}|} = 2^{\ell(\mu) - |\lambda/\mu|}$ with convergence in the sense of formal power series, where $\ell(\mu)$ denotes the number of nonzero parts of μ . Hence, taking the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$ of both sides above gives

$$GQ_{\langle \mu \mid n \rangle} = \sum_{\lambda} (-1)^{\text{cols}(\lambda/\mu)} \cdot 2^{\ell(\mu) - |\lambda/\mu|} \cdot (-\beta)^{|\lambda/\mu|} \cdot GP_{\langle \lambda \mid n \rangle} \quad (4.17)$$

where the sum is over strict partitions λ as in Corollary 4.18. This identity is nearly the same as [7, Thm. 1.1], which asserts the same equation but with “ $GQ_{\langle \mu \mid n \rangle}$ ” and “ $GP_{\langle \lambda \mid n \rangle}$ ” replaced by “ GQ_{μ} ” and “ GP_{λ} ”.

The subtle difference between these statements, which is obscured by our notation, is that $GQ_{\langle \mu \mid n \rangle}$ and $GP_{\langle \lambda \mid n \rangle}$ are instances of the stable limits (4.12) and (4.13), while GQ_{λ} and GP_{λ} are the symmetric functions defined in a quite different way in [15]. However, as briefly mentioned earlier, it is actually already known [24, Thm. 4.11] that $GQ_{\langle \mu \mid n \rangle} = GQ_{\text{sh}(\langle \mu \mid n \rangle)} = GQ_{\mu}$. To complete the circle, it would suffice to have the analogous identity $GP_{\langle \mu \mid n \rangle} = GP_{\mu}$. This does not seem to have appeared in the literature, but we can prove it here:

Proposition 4.20. If μ is a strict partition and $n \geq \mu_1$ then $GP_{\langle \mu \mid n \rangle} = GP_{\mu}$.

Proof. Our argument is very similar to the proofs of [25, Prop. 4.14] and [27, Prop. 3.37]. Suppose μ has r nonzero parts, so that $\langle \mu \mid n \rangle$ is the involution $(\phi_1, n+1)(\phi_2, n+2) \cdots (\phi_r, n+r)$ where $\phi_i = n+1 - \mu_i$. Then

$$x^{\mu} \prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{j=i+1}^n \frac{x_i \oplus x_j}{x_i} = x_1^{1-\phi_1} x_2^{2-\phi_2} \cdots x_r^{r-\phi_r} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_w$$

for the dominant permutation $w := (1, n+1)(2, n+2) \cdots (r, n+r)$, since by Theorem 3.6 it holds that $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_w = \prod_{i=1}^r x_i \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{j=i+1}^n x_i \oplus x_j$.

Define $\pi_i^{(\beta)} f := \partial^{(\beta)}(x_i f)$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$; see [25, §4.2] for the basic properties of these *isobaric divided difference operators*. For integers $0 < a \leq b$ let

$$\pi_{b \searrow a}^{(\beta)} := \pi_{b-1}^{(\beta)} \pi_{b-2}^{(\beta)} \cdots \pi_a^{(\beta)} \quad (4.18)$$

so that $\pi_{a \searrow a}^{(\beta)} = 1$, and define $\partial_{b \searrow a}^{(\beta)}$ analogously. Exactly as in the proofs of [25, Prop. 4.14] or [27, Prop. 3.37], one can check by an easy calculation that

$$\pi_{\phi_j \searrow j}^{(\beta)} \pi_{\phi_{j+1} \searrow j+1}^{(\beta)} \cdots \pi_{\phi_r \searrow r}^{(\beta)} \left(x_1^{1-\phi_1} x_2^{2-\phi_2} \cdots x_r^{r-\phi_r} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_w \right)$$

is fixed by $\pi_i^{(\beta)}$ for all $j-1 < i < \phi_{j-1} < \phi_j$, and so is equal to

$$\partial_{\phi_1 \searrow 1}^{(\beta)} \partial_{\phi_2 \searrow 2}^{(\beta)} \cdots \partial_{\phi_r \searrow r}^{(\beta)} \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_w = \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\langle \mu | n \rangle}$$

by [25, Lem. 4.16] and Theorem 3.3.

Let $\mathbf{stab}_n = \pi_{2 \searrow 1}^{(\beta)} \pi_{3 \searrow 1}^{(\beta)} \pi_{4 \searrow 1}^{(\beta)} \cdots \pi_n^{(\beta)}$. Since every $w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ for $z \in I_\infty$ has $\text{Des}_R(w) \subseteq \text{Des}_R(z)$ by (2.15), it follows from [27, Lem. 3.7] that

$$G_w(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \mathbf{stab}_n(G_w^{(\beta)}) \quad \text{for all } w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(\langle \mu | n \rangle).$$

Next, it is known [27, Eq. (3.17)] that

$$GP_\mu(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \mathbf{stab}_n \left(x^\mu \prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{j=i+1}^n \frac{x_i \oplus x_j}{x_i} \right).$$

Finally, one has $\mathbf{stab}_n \pi_i = \mathbf{stab}_n$ if $i \in [n-1]$ since the π_i operators are idempotent and obey the braid relations for S_∞ [25, §4.2]. Combining these observations with (4.13) shows that

$$GP_\mu(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \mathbf{stab}_n(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\langle \mu | n \rangle}) = GP_{\langle \mu | n \rangle}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n).$$

If $N \geq n$ then $GP_{\langle \mu | n \rangle} = GP_{1^{N-n} \times \langle \mu | n \rangle} = GP_{\langle \mu | N \rangle}$ so

$$GP_\mu(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N) = GP_{\langle \mu | n \rangle}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N).$$

On taking the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ we conclude that $GP_\mu = GP_{\langle \mu | n \rangle}$. \square

There is one case where we can turn Corollary 4.18 into an explicit positive formula. Define $g_{ij} = (i, j+1)(i+1, j+2)(i+3, j+4) \cdots (j, 2j-i+1)$ for any integers $0 < i < j$. This coincides with the I -Grassmannian involution $\langle \mu | j \rangle$ for $\mu = (m, m-1, m-2, \dots, 1)$ and $m = j-i+1$. By [11, Thm. 3.35 and Cor. 3.36], the involutions g_{ij} are the only elements of I_∞^{vex} that are 321-avoiding, that is, both vexillary and *fully commutative*.

Notice that $1^n \times g_{ij} = g_{i+n, j+n}$. Thus, to compute $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(g_{ij})$, $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(g_{ij})$, and $\mathcal{G}_{g_{ij}}^\circ$ for arbitrary integers $0 < i < j$, it suffices by the results in Section 4.3 to consider just the case when $i = 2$. For this purpose, given any $w \in S_\infty$ recall that $\text{Des}_L(w) = \text{Des}_R(w^{-1})$ and let $\text{ODes}_L(w) := \{i \in \text{Des}_L(w) : i \text{ is odd}\}$.

Proposition 4.21. Assume $n > 2$ and define $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ to be the involution

$$z = g_{2n} = \langle (n-1, \dots, 3, 2, 1) \mid n \rangle = (2, n+1)(3, n+2) \cdots (n, 2n-1).$$

Then the following properties hold:

- (a) $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}(z)$ contains only the inverse of $1(n+1)2(n+2)3 \cdots (2n-1)n(2n)$.
- (b) $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ consists of the 2^n permutations whose inverses in one-line notation have the form $a_1 b_1 a_2 b_2 \cdots a_n b_n$ where $\{a_i, b_i\} = \{i, n+i\}$ for each $i \in [n]$.
- (c) If $u_{\text{max}} \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ is the inverse of $(n+1)1(n+2)2 \cdots (2n)n$ then

$$\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}} = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)} 2^{n-1-|\text{ODes}_L(w)|} \beta^{|\text{ODes}_L(w)|} \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)} + \frac{1}{2} (-\beta)^n \mathcal{G}_{u_{\text{max}}}^{(\beta)}$$

and consequently

$$\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}(w) = \begin{cases} 2^{n-1-|\text{ODes}_L(w)|} & \text{if } u_{\text{max}} \neq w \in \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z) \\ 1 & \text{if } u_{\text{max}} = w \text{ and } n \text{ is even} \\ 0 & \text{if } u_{\text{max}} = w \text{ and } n \text{ is odd, or } w \notin \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z). \end{cases}$$

See Figure 2 for an illustration of this proposition.

Proof. Part (a) is immediate from (2.17) and part (b) follows as an easy exercise from the definitions. We omit the details.

We may prove part (c) in the following way. First, it is straightforward using Remark 2.1 to check that $s_i z s_i$ and z are vexillary for $i \in [n-1]$. Because $\text{Des}_R(z) = \text{Des}_V(z) = \{n\}$, we have $\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}} \in \mathbb{Z}[\beta][x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ by (1.8) and $\partial_i^{(\beta)}(\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}}) = -\beta \mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}}$ for all $i \in [n-1]$ by (2.7). The latter identity implies that \mathcal{G}_z^{O} is symmetric in x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n . By Remark 3.9, we therefore have

$$\mathcal{G}_z^{\text{O}} = \sum_{\mu} \text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}([\mu \mid n]) \cdot \beta^{|\mu| - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \cdot \mathcal{G}_{[\mu \mid n]}^{(\beta)}$$

where the sum is over partitions μ with at most n nonzero parts. On the other hand, as $z \in I_\infty^{\text{vex}}$ has $z(1) = 1$, Corollary 4.15 implies that

$$GQ_z = \sum_{\mu} \text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}([\mu \mid n]) \cdot \beta^{|\mu| - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \cdot G_{[\mu \mid n]}.$$

Since the polynomial $G_{[\mu \mid n]}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ obtained from $G_{[\mu \mid n]}$ by setting the variables $x_{n+1} = x_{n+2} = \cdots = 0$ is equal to $\mathcal{G}_{[\mu \mid n]}^{(\beta)}$ for all partitions μ with at most n parts (compare [4, Thm. 6.12] and [19, Thm. 2.2]), we have

$$GQ_z(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{\mu} \text{GC}_z^{\text{O}}([\mu \mid n]) \cdot \beta^{|\mu| - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z)} \cdot \mathcal{G}_{[\mu \mid n]}^{(\beta)}. \quad (4.19)$$

Hence, it suffices to compute the $\mathcal{G}^{(\beta)}$ -expansion of $GQ_z(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$.

We can accomplish this by assembling some miscellaneous identities from [7, 15, 21, 24]. First, [24, Thm. 4.11] tells us that GQ_z is equal to the K -theoretic

Schur Q -function indexed by $\rho_{n-1} = (n-1, n-2, \dots, 3, 2, 1)$, which can be expanded in terms of K -theoretic Schur P -functions via [7, Thm. 1.1] as

$$GQ_z = 2^{n-1}GP_{\rho_{n-1}} - 2^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (-\beta/2)^j GP_{\rho_{n-1}+1^j}.$$

Next, it follows from [15, Prop. 2.3] that

$$GP_{\rho_{n-1}+1^j}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = GP_{\rho_{n-1}}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)G_{1^j}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n).$$

Since by [21, Thm. 6.8] we have $GP_{\rho_{n-1}} = G_{\rho_{n-1}}$, we can rewrite this as

$$GP_{\rho_{n-1}+1^j}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \mathcal{G}_{[\rho_{n-1}|n]}^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|n]}^{(\beta)}.$$

If I is a subset of $[n]$ then we let $\mu_I = \rho_{n-1} + \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{e}_i$. Theorem 3.14 says that

$$\mathcal{G}_{[\rho_{n-1}|n]}^{(\beta)} \mathcal{G}_{[1^j|n]}^{(\beta)} = \sum_{p=j}^n \sum_{|I|=p} \binom{p-1}{p-j} \cdot \beta^{p-j} \cdot \mathcal{G}_{[\mu_I|n]}^{(\beta)}.$$

Thus, if $|I| = p < n$ then the coefficient of $\mathcal{G}_{[\mu_I|n]}^{(\beta)}$ in $GQ_z(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is

$$-2^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^p \left(-\frac{\beta}{2}\right)^j \beta^{p-j} \binom{p-1}{p-j} = 2^{n-2} \beta^p \underbrace{\sum_{j=0}^{p-1} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{-j} \binom{p-1}{p-1-j}}_{=(-\frac{1}{2}+1)^{p-1}=2^{1-p}} = 2^{n-1-|I|} \beta^{|I|}.$$

If $I = [n]$ then $\mu_I = \rho_n$ and the coefficient of $\mathcal{G}_{[\rho_n|n]}^{(\beta)}$ in $GQ_z(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ is

$$-2^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(-\frac{\beta}{2}\right)^j \beta^{n-j} \binom{n-1}{n-j} = 2^{n-2} \beta^n (2^{1-n} - (-2)^{1-n}) = \begin{cases} \beta^n & n \text{ is even} \\ 0 & n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

The desired formula for $\text{GC}_z^{\mathcal{O}}$ follows from these computations via (4.19) since the elements of $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ described in part (b) are precisely the Grassmannian permutations $[\mu_I | n]$ for $I \subseteq [n]$, and it holds that $u_{\max} = [\rho_n | n]$ along with

$$\ell([\mu_I | n]) - \ell_{\text{inv}}(z) = |\mu_I| - |\rho_{n-1}| = |I| = \text{ODes}([\mu_I | n]).$$

This completes our proof of the proposition. \square

Using Corollary 4.14, we see from this proposition that Conjecture 3.21 holds if $z = g_{ij}$ for any integers $0 < i < j$. In fact, we have $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_{g_{ij}}^{\mathcal{O}}) = \mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(g_{ij})$ unless $i > 1$ and $j - i$ is odd, in which case $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(g_{ij})$ contains one extra element.

References

- [1] A. Björner and Francesco B. *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*. Vol. 231. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2005, pp. xiv+363.




Figure 2: The digraphs $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ when z is $g_{23} = (2, 4)(3, 5)$ (left) and $g_{24} = (2, 5)(3, 6)(4, 7)$ (right), presented using the conventions as in Figure 1. Here the grey box indicates the unique elements of $\mathcal{B}_{\text{inv}}^+(z)$ that is not in $\text{supp}(\text{GC}_z^{\text{O}})$.

- [2] M. Brion. “Positivity in the Grothendieck group of complex flag varieties”. In: *J. Algebra* 258.1 (2002). Special issue in celebration of Claudio Procesi’s 60th birthday, pp. 137–159.
- [3] M. Brion. “The behaviour at infinity of the Bruhat decomposition”. In: *Comment. Math. Helv.* 73.1 (1998), pp. 137–174.
- [4] A. S. Buch. “A Littlewood-Richardson rule for the K -theory of Grassmannians”. In: *Acta Math.* 189 (2002), pp. 37–78.
- [5] A. S. Buch et al. “Stable Grothendieck polynomials and K-theoretic factor sequences”. In: *Math. Ann.* 340 (2008), pp. 359–382.
- [6] M. B. Can, M. Joyce, and B. Wyser. “Chains in weak order posets associated to involutions”. In: *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 137 (2016), pp. 207–225.
- [7] Y. C. Chiu and E. Marberg. “Expanding K-theoretic Schur Q-functions”. In: *Algebraic Combinatorics* 6.6 (2023), pp. 1419–1445.
- [8] S. Fomin and A. Kirillov. “Grothendieck polynomials and the Yang-Baxter equation”. In: *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference in Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics, DIMACS* (1994), pp. 183–190.
- [9] O. Guibert, E. Pergola, and R. Pinzani. “Vexillary involutions are enumerated by Motzkin numbers”. In: *Ann. Comb.* 5.2 (2001), pp. 153–174.
- [10] Z. Hamaker, E. Marberg, and B. Pawlowski. “Involution pipe dreams”. In: *Canad. J. Math.* 74.5 (2022), pp. 1310–1346.
- [11] Z. Hamaker, E. Marberg, and B. Pawlowski. “Involution words: counting problems and connections to Schubert calculus for symmetric orbit closures”. In: *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 160 (2018), pp. 217–260.

- [12] Z. Hamaker, E. Marberg, and B. Pawlowski. “Involution words II: braid relations and atomic structures”. In: *J. Algebraic Combin.* 45.3 (2017), pp. 701–743.
- [13] Z. Hamaker, E. Marberg, and B. Pawlowski. “Schur P-positivity and involution Stanley symmetric functions”. In: *IMRN* 17 (2019), pp. 5389–5440.
- [14] A. Hultman. “The combinatorics of twisted involutions in Coxeter groups”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 359.6 (2007), pp. 2787–2798.
- [15] T. Ikeda and H. Naruse. “K-theoretic analogues of factorial Schur P- and Q- functions”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 243 (2013), pp. 22–66.
- [16] A. Knutson and E. Miller. “Gröbner geometry of Schubert polynomials”. In: *Ann. of Math.* 161.3 (2005), pp. 1245–1318.
- [17] A. Knutson and E. Miller. “Subword complexes in Coxeter groups”. In: *Adv. Math.* 184 (2004), pp. 161–176.
- [18] C. Lenart. “A K -theory version of Monk’s formula and some related multiplication formulas”. In: *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 179.1-2 (2003), pp. 137–158.
- [19] C. Lenart. “Combinatorial aspects of the K -theory of Grassmannians”. In: *Annals of Combinatorics* 4 (2000), pp. 67–82.
- [20] C. Lenart and F. Sottile. “A Pieri-type formula for the K -theory of a flag manifold”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 359.5 (2007), pp. 2317–2342.
- [21] J. B. Lewis and E. Marberg. “Enriched set-valued P -partitions and shifted stable Grothendieck polynomials”. In: *Math. Z.* 299 (2021), pp. 1929–1972.
- [22] L. Manivel. *Symmetric functions, Schubert polynomials and degeneracy loci*. Vol. 6. SMF/AMS Texts and Monographs. Translated from the 1998 French original by John R. Swallow, Cours Spécialisés, 3. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI and Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2001, pp. viii+167.
- [23] E. Marberg. “A symplectic refinement of shifted Hecke insertion”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A* 173 (2020), p. 105216.
- [24] E. Marberg and B. Pawlowski. “ K -theory formulas for orthogonal and symplectic orbit closures”. In: *Adv. Math.* 372 (2020), pp. 107299, 43.
- [25] E. Marberg and B. Pawlowski. “On some properties of symplectic Grothendieck polynomials”. In: *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 225.1 (2021), Paper No. 106463, 22.
- [26] E. Marberg and B. Pawlowski. “Principal specializations of Schubert polynomials in classical types”. In: *Algebr. Comb.* 4.2 (2021), pp. 273–287.
- [27] E. Marberg and T. Scrimshaw. *Key and Lascoux polynomials for symmetric orbit closures*. Preprint (2023), [arXiv:2302.04226](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.04226).
- [28] B. Pawlowski. “Universal graph Schubert varieties”. In: *Transformation Groups* 26 (2021), 1417–1461.

- [29] B. Wyser and A. Yong. “Polynomials for symmetric orbit closures in the flag variety”. In: *Transform. Groups* 22.1 (2017), pp. 267–290.