

POSITIVITY IN WEIGHTED FLAG VARIETIES

WILLIAM GRAHAM AND SCOTT JOSEPH LARSON

ABSTRACT. We study the torus-equivariant cohomology of weighted flag varieties, and prove a positivity property in the equivariant cohomology and Chow groups of weighted flag varieties, analogous to the non-weighted positivity proved in [22]. Our result strengthens and generalizes the positivity proved for weighted Grassmannians by Abe-Matsumura [1]. The positivity property is expressed in terms of weighted roots, which are used to describe weights of torus equivariant curves in weighted flag varieties. This provides a geometric interpretation of the parameters used in [1]. We approach weighted flag varieties from a uniform Lie-theoretic point of view, providing a more general definition than has appeared previously, and prove other general results about weighted flag varieties in this setting, including a Borel presentation of the equivariant cohomology. In addition, we generalize some results obtained for weighted Grassmannians or more generally type A ([1], [6]); in particular, we obtain a weighted Chevalley formula, descriptions of restrictions to fixed points, the GKM description of the cohomology, and a weighted Chevalley formula.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Equivariant cohomology and Chow groups of partial quotients	4
3. Weighted flag varieties	16
4. Weighted Schubert calculus	29
5. Examples	37
References	45

1. INTRODUCTION

Weighted flag varieties are a generalization of flag varieties and weighted projective spaces, introduced by Grojnowski, Corti and Reid [13]. Although they are not generally homogeneous varieties, they admit an action of a torus with isolated fixed points, and as with flag varieties, their equivariant cohomology rings admit a Schubert basis. Abe and Matsumura [1] proved that the equivariant cohomology of weighted Grassmannians has a positivity property analogous to the positivity for flag varieties proved in [22]. This positivity is expressed using certain parameters, and the authors write that, in contrast to the situation, for non-weighted flag varieties, “we do not have the geometric or representation-theoretic interpretation of those parameters”. The main result of this paper extends the

positivity statement to all weighted flag varieties. The parameters in the statement are weighted roots, which describe the weights of torus-invariant curves through a torus fixed point in a weighted flag variety. This formulation gives a geometric meaning to the parameters in the positivity statement of [1]: in our language, their parameters are negative roots at the longest element of the Weyl group.

The approach taken in this paper is to study weighted flag varieties from a uniform Lie-theoretic point of view. Besides our main theorem, we prove some other results which we hope will be useful in the future study of weighted flag varieties, including Chevalley-type formulas, and descriptions of restrictions to fixed points, extending work of [1] for weighted Grassmannians, and [6] for more general type A flag varieties. We also provide a Borel presentation of the equivariant cohomology of weighted flag varieties, which appears to be new. We define the weighted Schubert classes as Poincaré dual classes to closures of weighted Schubert cells. This provides a direct geometric interpretation of the weighted Schubert classes. Our classes are positive integer multiples of the classes considered in [1] and [6], and we determine these integers, which depend on the orders of certain stabilizer groups. Our results are valid in the setting of equivariant Chow groups as well as equivariant cohomology.

To state our main result we need some notation. Let G be a connected reductive complex algebraic group. In the definition of weighted flag varieties given in [13], G is taken to be of the form $G' \times \mathbf{C}^\times$, but it is convenient to work more generally (the relation of the definition in [13] to the definition in this paper is discussed in Remark 3.6). Let H be a Cartan subgroup of G , and $B = HN$ a Borel subgroup containing H with unipotent radical N . Let \mathfrak{g} , \mathfrak{b} , \mathfrak{h} and \mathfrak{n} denote the Lie algebras of G, B, H and N , respectively. We denote by $\Lambda \cong \mathbf{Z}^{m+1}$ and $\Lambda^\vee \cong \mathbf{Z}^{m+1}$ the character and cocharacter groups of H , respectively; let $\Lambda^+ \subset \Lambda$ denote the set of dominant weights. Given a nonzero element $\chi = (n_1, \dots, n_{m+1}) \in \Lambda^\vee$, we write $\gcd(\chi)$ for the greatest common divisor of the n_i . Equivalently, $\gcd(\chi)$ is the largest integer k such that $\frac{1}{k}\chi$ is in Λ^\vee . Fix a field \mathbf{F} of characteristic zero (this will serve as the coefficient field for homology and cohomology). Let $\mathbb{H} = \Lambda^\vee \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{F}$, and let \mathbb{H}^* be the dual \mathbf{F} -module; if $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{C}$, then $\mathbb{H} = \mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathbb{H}^* = \mathfrak{h}^*$. We use similar notation for other tori. We write the natural pairing between \mathbb{H} and \mathbb{H}^* as a dot product. If $\lambda \in \Lambda$, let $\mathbb{H}_\lambda \subset \mathbb{H}$ denote the kernel of λ , with dual space \mathbb{H}_λ^* . If V is a (complex) representation of H , let $\Phi(V) \subset \Lambda$ denote the weights of V .

Let $\Phi = \Phi(\mathfrak{g})$ denote the set of roots of \mathfrak{h} in \mathfrak{g} , with positive system $\Phi^+ = \Phi(\mathfrak{n})$, and let Δ denote the corresponding set of simple roots. Let W denote the Weyl group of G , equipped with the Bruhat order. Fix a dominant weight $\lambda \in \Lambda$, and let $P = LU$ be the parabolic subgroup containing B , such that the Levi factor L contains H , and such that the coroots of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{l} of L are orthogonal to λ . The Weyl group of L is denoted W_P . Let W^P denote the set of maximal length coset representatives of W/W_P . Let $\chi : \mathbf{C}^\times \rightarrow H$ be a cocharacter of H , and let S denote the subgroup $\chi(\mathbf{C}^\times)$ of H . Let \mathbb{T}^* denote the orthogonal complement of χ in \mathbb{H}^* .

For each $w \in W^P$, define $a_w := \gcd(\chi)^{-1} w \lambda \cdot \chi$. We assume that each $a_w > 0$ (cf. [13, Remark 3.1]). This assumption implies that G is not semisimple (see Proposition 3.1).

The character λ of H extends to a character of P which is trivial on U ; let \mathbf{C}_λ be the corresponding 1-dimensional representation. Let L_λ be the kernel in L of λ ; then $Q = L_\lambda U \subset P$ is the kernel in P of λ . Let $Z = G/Q$. Since $P/Q \cong \mathbf{C}^\times$, we can identify Z with the mixed space $G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$.

We define the weighted flag variety as $X = S \backslash Z$. The relation with the definition in [13] is explained in Remark 3.6. Our assumptions on λ and a_w imply that X is a projective algebraic variety with at worst orbifold singularities, and with an action of $T = S \backslash H$ (see Section 3). For every $w \in W^P$, there is a weighted Schubert variety $X_w \subset X$. The fundamental classes $[X_w]$ form a basis over H_T^* of the equivariant Borel-Moore homology $H_*^T(X)$. There is a corresponding Poincaré dual basis $\{\delta_{X_w}^T\}$ of $H_T^*(X)$ (q.v. (2.25)). The elements of this basis are integral multiples of the weighted Schubert classes considered in [1] and [6]. We use these classes because of their direct geometric connection to X .

For each $w \in W^P$, we define a set $\Phi(w)$ of characters of T which we call weighted roots at w . Each $w \in W^P$ corresponds to a T -fixed point $p_w \in X$, and the T -weights of the T -invariant curves in X through p_w form a subset of $\Phi(w)$. An explicit formula for the weighted roots at w is given in Proposition 3.21.

Given $u, v, w \in W^P$, let $\mathcal{S}(u, v; w) = [w, u] \cap [w, v]$, where the notation denotes Bruhat intervals. In other words,

$$\mathcal{S}(u, v; w) = \{x \in W^P \mid w \leq x \leq u \text{ and } w \leq x \leq v\}.$$

Our main result about positivity is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that λ is dominant and χ is antidominant. For every $u, v \in W^P$, write*

$$\delta_{X_u}^T \delta_{X_v}^T = \sum_{w \in W^P} c_{uv}^w \delta_{X_w}^T, \quad (1.1)$$

where $c_{uv}^w \in H_T^* = S(\mathbb{T}^*)$. Then each c_{uv}^w is a nonnegative linear combination of monomials of the form $\nu_1(x_1) \cdots \nu_k(x_k)$, where the ν_1, \dots, ν_k are distinct negative roots, and each $x_i \in \mathcal{S}(u, v; w)$.

The method of proof of Theorem 1.1 also yields a positivity result about classes of subvarieties of weighted flag varieties (Theorem 4.12), which extends the corresponding result in the non-weighted case (see [3, Theorem 19.3.1], [22, Theorem 3.2]).

Theorem 1.1 implies that the coefficients c_{uv}^w are square-free in a certain sense. But because weighted roots at different x may occur in the same monomial, this is not the same as the usual meaning of square-free, which means with respect to a fixed set of generators. Since a weighted root at $x \in W$ can be expressed as linear combinations of weighted roots at any other $y \in W$, it is possible to expand c_{uv}^w as a sum of monomials in negative roots at a single fixed y . However, such an expansion need not be square-free (see Remark 4.9).

We say that c_{uv}^w is nonnegative at $y \in W^P$ if c_{uv}^w is a nonnegative linear combination of monomials in negative roots at y . If $y \geq x$, then by Lemma 3.24, a negative simple root at x is a nonnegative linear combination of negative simple roots at y . Therefore, as a consequence of Theorem 1.1, we obtain:

Corollary 1.2. *With the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1, each c_{uv}^w is nonnegative at any y such that $y \geq x$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}(u, v; w)$. In particular, this holds if $y \geq u$ and $y \geq v$.*

In the case of the weighted Grassmannian, this implies the positivity result of Abe and Matsumura, since their parameters are positive scalar multiples of the negative simple roots at the maximal element w_0 of W .

It is natural to ask whether Theorem 1.1 can be strengthened to say that c_{uv}^w is nonnegative at w . Example 5.3 shows that this is false for arbitrary antidominant χ , but can hold for certain antidominant χ . In Example 5.3, this is true provided the entries of χ satisfy certain inequalities. We refer to this example for further discussion.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 relies on a striking product formula (Lemma 4.2) proved using the the non-weighted Chevalley formula, together with the non-weighted positivity result of [22]. The assumption that λ is dominant (or antidominant) is used to show that the weighted flag variety X exists as a separated scheme, and for positivity. However, many of the results of the paper do not depend on X ; they can be formulated and proved in terms of the space Z , without assuming either that λ is dominant or χ is antidominant. As observed in [1], the assumption χ is antidominant in the positivity statement can be removed by using a Schubert basis with respect to a Borel subgroup with respect to which χ is antidominant (see Remark 4.11).

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank Arik Wilbert for contributing to the discussions in the early stages of this project, and Allen Knutson for asking if the weighted structure constants are square-free. This material is based upon work supported by a grant from the Institute for Advanced Study School of Mathematics.

2. EQUIVARIANT COHOMOLOGY AND CHOW GROUPS OF PARTIAL QUOTIENTS

We work with schemes over \mathbf{C} which can be equivariantly embedded in a smooth scheme. Throughout this paper, we work with (equivariant) cohomology and Borel-Moore homology groups with coefficients in a field \mathbf{F} of characteristic zero; the notation $H_*(X)$ and $H_*^G(X)$ denotes Borel-Moore homology groups (rather than singular homology groups) with coefficients in \mathbf{F} . As discussed in Section 2.2, our results are also valid in the setting of equivariant Chow groups (again with coefficients in \mathbf{F}). Background on equivariant cohomology and Borel-Moore homology can be found in [3]; some basic properties of these theories are also summarized in [22]. References for the non-equivariant versions of these theories are [18, Appendix B] and the appendix to Chapter 13 of [14]. Basic definitions and results for equivariant Chow groups can be found in [17]. In this section, the notations G , H , Z , etc. are specific to this section; in particular we do not restrict to the case of

weighted flag varieties. In subsequent sections, the notation has the meaning given in the introduction.

In this section, Z will denote a variety with an action of an algebraic torus H such that the restriction of this action to a subtorus S is proper. Let $T = H/S$, and let $X = S \backslash Z$. We refer to X as a partial quotient, since it is a quotient by a subgroup; it has an action of the quotient group T . Abe and Matsumura showed that there is a pullback isomorphism between the equivariant cohomology groups $H_T^*(X)$ and $H_H^*(Z)$ (see [1, Lemma 3.3]). In this paper we work with classes which are Poincaré dual to classes of fundamental classes of subvarieties. For weighted flag varieties, these are scalar multiples of the classes studied in [1].

Section 2.1 contains some general results we use to identify these classes. Proposition 2.7 relates pullbacks of Poincaré dual classes to orders of stabilizer groups; the first part of this proposition gives an alternative proof of [1, Lemma 3.3]. In addition, we relate these results to equivariant Borel-Moore homology, and show that the Poincaré duals of the closures of cells of an orbifold paving form a basis for equivariant cohomology (Proposition 2.9 and Corollary 2.11).

Section 2.2 proves versions of these results for equivariant Chow groups. Proposition 2.13 extends [17, Theorem 3] to partial quotients of torus actions. The proof of this proposition does not rely on [17, Theorem 3], and in fact provides an alternative proof of that theorem in the special case of torus actions. Proposition 2.15 extends [17, Theorem 4] to partial quotients in the case of torus actions, and in addition gives a more precise relation between the pullbacks in equivariant Chow cohomology and homology. The results of this section imply that our results about weighted flag varieties hold in the setting of equivariant Chow groups.

2.1. Equivariant cohomology, partial quotients, and Poincaré duality. We recall the definition of the Poincaré dual class of a subvariety. If X is irreducible and rationally smooth of dimension n , there is a cap product isomorphism $\cap[X] : H^i(X) \rightarrow H_{2n-i}(X)$ ([14, Prop. 13.A.4]); for completeness, a proof is given in the appendix to this paper. If in addition X has an action of a linear algebraic group G , then the map $\cap[X] : H_G^i(X) \rightarrow H_{2n-i}^G(X)$ is an isomorphism as well. Given a closed subvariety $Y \subset X$, the Poincaré dual class to Y is the class $\delta_Y \in H^*(X)$ mapping to $[Y] \in H_*(X)$ under the cap product isomorphism. If Y is G -invariant, δ_Y^G is the class in $H_G^*(X)$ mapping to $[Y] \in H_*^G(X)$. More generally, given any $C \in H_*(X)$ (resp. $H_*^G(X)$), we can define $\delta_C \in H^*(X)$ (resp. δ_C^G) in the same way.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that $\eta : Z \rightarrow Z'$ is a finite morphism of rationally smooth irreducible algebraic varieties. Suppose further that $\eta_* : H_*(Z) \rightarrow H_*(Z')$ is an isomorphism of vector spaces. Then $\eta^* : H^*(Z') \rightarrow H^*(Z)$ satisfies*

$$\eta^*(\delta_C) = \frac{d_Z}{d_C} \delta_Y, \tag{2.1}$$

where $Y' \subset Z'$ is a subvariety, $C \in H_*(Z)$ satisfies $\eta_* C = d_C [Y']$, and $\eta_* [Z] = d_Z [Z']$.

Proof. We have

$$\eta_*(\eta^*(\delta_{Y'}) \cap [Z]) = \delta_{Y'} \cap \eta_*[Z] = \delta_{Y'} \cap d_Z[Z'] = d_Z[Y'] = \eta_*\left(\frac{dZ}{d_C}C\right). \quad (2.2)$$

Therefore, since η_* is an isomorphism,

$$\eta^*(\delta_{Y'}) \cap [Z] = \frac{dZ}{d_C}C = \frac{dZ}{d_C}\delta_C \cap [Z], \quad (2.3)$$

so $\eta^*(\delta_{Y'}) = \frac{dZ}{d_C}\delta_C$, as claimed. \square

Remark 2.2. In the setting of Lemma 2.1, suppose that $C = [Y]$ is the fundamental cycle of the scheme-theoretic inverse image $Y = \eta^{-1}(Y')$. Then Y is equidimensional, by [5, Theorem 5.11]. Each component of Y maps surjectively onto Y' , so $\eta_*[Y] = d_Y[Y']$ for some integer d_Y . In this case, we will write d_Y for d_C .

Lemma 2.3. *Let Z be a variety with an action of a finite abelian group F , and let F^Z denote the stabilizer in F of a general point of Z . The degree of the map $Z \rightarrow Z' = F \backslash Z$ is $|F/F^Z|$.*

Proof. The group F^Z acts trivially on Z , and $Z' = (F/F^Z) \backslash Z$. Since there is an open subset of Z where the action of the quotient group F/F^Z is free, the quotient map has degree $|F/F^Z|$. \square

Suppose that H is an algebraic torus with character group Λ . The equivariant cohomology of a point is denoted by H_H^* , and is isomorphic to the symmetric algebra $S(\mathbb{H}^*)$, where $\mathbb{H} = \Lambda \otimes \mathbf{F}$. Suppose that H is a torus and S is a subtorus of H . The projection $\phi: H \rightarrow T = H/S$ induces a pullback map $H_T^* \rightarrow H_H^*$.

As above, Z denotes a variety with an action of an algebraic torus H . Suppose that the restriction of this action to a subtorus S is proper, that is, the map $S \times Z \rightarrow Z \times Z$ taking (s, z) to (z, sz) is proper. This implies that a quotient $X = S \backslash Z$ exists in general as a separated algebraic space ([30], [28]); under some additional hypotheses (for example if Z is quasiprojective with a linearized S -action), X is a scheme. Since S acts properly, the stabilizer group S^z of any point in Z is finite. Given a subvariety Y of Z , there is an open subset of Y such that the stabilizer group S^y is the same for any point in this subset. Let $S^Y = S^y$ for such a point y ; in other words, S^Y is the stabilizer group of a general point in Y . Let $e_Y = |S^Y|$ denote the number of elements in S^Y .

Let $\pi: Z \rightarrow X$ and $\pi: H \rightarrow T$ denote the quotient maps (although we have used the same notation π for both maps, the context will indicate which is meant). There is a map $\pi^*: H_T^*(X) \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$, as observed in [1]. Here we use the definition of this map given in [3], which uses the fact that π is π -equivariant (that is, $\pi(hx) = \pi(h)\pi(x)$). We recall briefly the definition of this map. Let E_H and E_T be models for the universal spaces for H and T such that there is a π -equivariant map $E_H \rightarrow E_T$. We obtain a map

$$E_H \times^H Z \longrightarrow E_T \times^T X. \quad (2.4)$$

The spaces $E_H \times^H Z$ and $E_T \times^T X$ are examples of “mixed spaces”; we often denote them by Z_H and X_T . By definition, $H_H^*(Z) = H^*(Z_H)$ and $H_T^*(X) = H^*(X_T)$, and the map

$\pi^* : H_T^i(X) \rightarrow H_H^i(Z)$ is by definition the pullback $H^i(X_T) \rightarrow H^i(Z_H)$. This map is independent of the choices of E_H and E_T and the map $E_H \rightarrow E_T$ (see [3, Exercise 2.1]). The map π^* is H_T^* -linear. Thus, $H_H^*(Z)$ has an H_T^* -module structure obtained from the H_H^* -module structure via the map $H_T^* \rightarrow H_H^*$.

Remark 2.4. We can find a subtorus T_1 of H such that the composition $T_1 \rightarrow H \xrightarrow{\pi} T = H/S$ is an isomorphism. Then $H \cong S \times T_1$. By identifying T_1 with T we may assume $H = S \times T$. Then $E_H = E_S \times E_T$ and the map $E_H \rightarrow E_T$ is projection on the second factor. If H acts on Z , the T -action on Z obtained by the identification of T with T_1 depends on the choice of T_1 , but the T -action on $X = S \backslash Z$ does not.

Remark 2.5. The $T = H/S$ -action on $X = S \backslash Z$ induces an H -action via the map $H \rightarrow T$. The map $Z \rightarrow X$ is H -equivariant, so we obtain a pullback $H_H^*(X) \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$. To avoid confusion with the map π^* defined above, we denote this map by π_H^* . The maps π^* and π_H^* are closely related. The map (2.4) factors as

$$E_H \times^H Z \longrightarrow E_H \times^H X \xrightarrow{p} E_T \times^T X. \quad (2.5)$$

Therefore, $\pi^* = \pi_H^* \circ p^*$. We can identify H with $S \times T$, and then $H_H^*(X) = H_S^* \otimes H_T^*(X)$. Under this identification, $p^*(c) = 1 \otimes c$, so $\pi^*(c) = \pi_H^*(1 \otimes c)$.

Lemma 2.6. *With notation as above, let F be the subgroup of S generated by the stabilizer groups of all $z \in Z$. Then F is finite. Let $S' = S/F$ and $Z' = F \backslash Z$. Then S acts on Z' with constant stabilizer group F . The S' -action on Z' is free, and*

$$S' \backslash Z' \cong S \backslash Z' \cong S \backslash Z = X.$$

Proof. There are only finitely many subgroups of S which occur as the stabilizer group of a point in Z . Each is a finite group, so the subgroup F they generate is finite.

We claim that S acts on Z' with constant stabilizer group F . Indeed, suppose $z' = Fz$ is an element of $Z' = F \backslash Z$. The inclusion $F \subset S^{z'}$ is immediate, so we must prove the reverse inclusion. Suppose $s \in S^{z'}$. Then $sz = fz$ for some $f \in F$. Hence $f^{-1}s \in S^z \subset F$, so $s \in F$. We conclude that $S^{z'} \subset F$, proving the claim. This implies that the S -action on Z' yields an action of $S/F = S'$ on Z' , and then $S' \backslash Z' \cong S \backslash Z' \cong X$. The S' -action on Z' is proper (since the S -action on Z is proper) and has trivial stabilizers, so it is free ([17, Lemma 8]). \square

We remark that if X is a scheme, then so is Z' ; this can be deduced from the fact that the quotient map $\pi : Z \rightarrow X$ is affine.

The first part of the following proposition is an analogue of [1, Lemma 3.3], with a different proof. The technique used in the proof of taking the quotient by a finite subgroup F to reduce to a free action of a quotient group is not new; it appears for example in [16].

Proposition 2.7. *With notation as above, we have:*

- (1) $\pi^* : H_T^i(X) \rightarrow H_H^i(Z)$ is an isomorphism.

(2) Suppose that Z is rationally smooth and that Y is an S -invariant subvariety of Z . Let $\bar{Y} = S \setminus Y \subset X$. Then

$$\pi^*(\delta_{\bar{Y}}^T) = \frac{e_Y}{e_Z} \delta_Y^H \in H_H^*(Z). \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. Let $H' = H/F$, and as in the previous lemma, let $Z' = F \setminus Z$, $S' = S/F$. Factor the map (2.4) as

$$E_H \times^H Z \xrightarrow{f} E_H \times^H Z' \xrightarrow{g} E_{H'} \times^{H'} Z' \xrightarrow{h} E_T \times^T X. \quad (2.7)$$

These maps induce pullbacks

$$H_T^*(X) \xrightarrow{h^*} H_{H'}^*(Z') \xrightarrow{g^*} H_H^*(Z') \xrightarrow{f^*} H_H^*(Z). \quad (2.8)$$

We will prove that each of f^* , g^* , and h^* are isomorphisms, so their composition $\pi^* = f^* \circ g^* \circ h^*$ is as well.

Step 1. The map f is the quotient map

$$E_H \times^H Z \longrightarrow E_H \times^H (F \setminus Z) \cong F \setminus (E_H \times^H Z),$$

where the F -action on $E_H \times^H Z$ is defined as the action on the second factor Z . Therefore, the pullback map gives an isomorphism $f^* : H_{H'}^*(Z') \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)^F$. The induced action of F on $H^*(E_H \times^H Z) = H_H^*(Z)$ is trivial. Indeed, the F -action is the restriction of an action of the connected group S and the action of a connected group induces a trivial action on cohomology (as the map induced by any element of the group is homotopic to the identity map). We conclude that $f^* : H_{H'}^*(Z') \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$ is an isomorphism.

Step 2. We can factor the map g as follows. Let E be a model for E_H , and E' a model for $E_{H'}$. Then H acts on E' via the map $H \rightarrow H'$, and $E \times E'$, with the product action of H , is also a model for E_H . Then g can be written as the composition

$$(E \times E') \times^H Z' \xrightarrow{p} (E/F \times E') \times^H Z' = (E/F \times E') \times^{H'} Z' \xrightarrow{q} E' \times^{H'} Z', \quad (2.9)$$

where the middle equality is because the subgroup F acts trivially on $(E/F \times E')$ and on Z' . The map q is a fiber bundle with fibers E/F . Since the cohomology of E/F vanishes in positive degrees, q^* is an isomorphism in cohomology. The map p is a quotient map by F , and arguing as in Step 1 shows that p^* is an isomorphism. Hence $g^* : H_{H'}^*(Z') \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$ is an isomorphism.

Step 3. As in Remark 2.4, we may assume $H' = S' \times T$ and $E_{H'} = E_{S'} \times E_T$. Then

$$E_{H'} \times^{H'} Z' = (E_{S'} \times E_T) \times^{S' \times T} Z' \cong E_{S'} \times^{S'} (E_T \times^T Z').$$

Also,

$$E_T \times^T X \cong E_T \times^T (Z'/S') = (E_T \times^T Z')/S'.$$

Therefore, h can be identified with the map

$$E_{S'} \times^{S'} (E_T \times^T Z') \longrightarrow (E_T \times^T Z')/S'.$$

So h^* can be identified with the pullback $h^* : H^*((E_T \times^T Z')/S') \rightarrow H_{S'}^*(E_T \times^T Z')$. Since S' acts freely on Z' , it acts freely on $E_T \times^T Z'$, and therefore the pullback is an isomorphism.

Combining the results of Steps 1-3, we see that $\pi^* = f^* \circ g^* \circ h^*$ is an isomorphism. This proves (1).

We now prove (2). Let $Y' = F \setminus Y$, so $\overline{Y} = S \setminus Y = S' \setminus Y'$. We have $\pi^*(\delta_{\overline{Y}}^T) = f^* \circ g^* \circ h^*(\delta_{\overline{Y}}^T)$. Since S' acts freely on $E_T \times^T Z'$, the map h is an S' -principal bundle map, so it is smooth. Under a smooth map, the pullback of the Poincaré dual of a variety is the Poincaré dual of the inverse image. Hence,

$$h^* \delta_{E_T \times^T \overline{Y}} = \delta_{E_{S'} \times^{S'} (E_T \times^T Y')} = \delta_{E_{H'} \times^{H'} Y'}.$$

In the language of equivariant cohomology, this states that $h^* \delta_{\overline{Y}}^T = \delta_{Y'}^{H'}$.

Next, using the factorization (2.9) of the map g , we see that

$$g^* \delta_{E_{H'} \times^{H'} Y'} = p^* q^* \delta_{E' \times^{H'} Y'} = p^* \delta_{(E/F \times E') \times^{H'} Y'} = \delta_{(E \times E') \times^{H'} Y'}.$$

Here, the second equality is because q is a smooth map. The third equality follows from Lemma 2.1, because p is a quotient map where the group F acts with trivial stabilizers. In equivariant language, we see that $g^* \delta_{Y'}^{H'} = \delta_{Y'}^H$.

Finally, the degree of the map $f : E_H \times^H Z \rightarrow E_H \times^H (F \setminus Z)$ is the same as the degree of the map $Z \rightarrow F \setminus Z$, which by Lemma 2.3 is $|F/F^Z|$. Similarly, the degree of $E_H \times^H Y \rightarrow E_H \times^H (F \setminus Y)$ is $|F/F^Y|$. Hence, by Lemma 2.1,

$$f^* \delta_{E_H \times^H Y'} = \frac{|F|/|F^Z|}{|F|/|F^Y|} \delta_{E_H \times^H Y} = \frac{|F^Y|}{|F^Z|} \delta_{E_H \times^H Y} = \frac{e_Y}{e_Z} \delta_{E_H \times^H Y},$$

where the last equality is because $|F^Y| = |S^Y| = e_Y$ and $|F^Z| = |S^Z| = e_Z$. In equivariant language, this says that $f^* \delta_{Y'}^H = \frac{e_Y}{e_Z} \delta_Y^H$.

Combining what we have proved, we see that

$$\pi^*(\delta_{\overline{Y}}^T) = f^* g^* h^*(\delta_{\overline{Y}}^T) = f^* g^*(\delta_{Y'}^{H'}) = f^*(\delta_{Y'}^H) = \frac{e_Y}{e_Z} \delta_Y^H,$$

proving (2). □

With notation as above, assume that Z (and therefore X) are rationally smooth. Then there are isomorphisms $\cap[X]_T : H_T^*(X) \rightarrow H_*^T(X)$ and $\cap[Z]_H : H_H^*(Z) \rightarrow H_*^H(Z)$. Define the homology pullback $\pi^* : H_*^T(X) \rightarrow H_*^H(Z)$ so that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_H^*(Z) & \xrightarrow{\cap[Z]_H} & H_*^H(Z) \\ \pi^* \uparrow & & \uparrow \pi^* \\ H_T^*(X) & \xrightarrow{\cap_{|S^Z|}[X]_T} & H_*^T(X). \end{array} \quad (2.10)$$

The factor of $\frac{1}{|S^Z|}$ appears for compatibility with equivariant Chow groups (see Section 2.2). It means that

$$(\pi^* \alpha) \cap [Z]_H = \frac{1}{e_Z} \pi^*(\alpha \cap [X]_T). \quad (2.11)$$

Taking $\alpha = \delta_{\overline{Y}}^T$, the left side equals $\frac{e_Y}{e_Z} [Y]_H$, while the right side is $\frac{1}{e_Z} \pi^*[\overline{Y}]_T$. Hence

$$\pi^*[\overline{Y}]_T = e_Y [Y]_H, \quad (2.12)$$

which is consistent with the pullback (2.14) for equivariant Chow groups.

A variety X is said to be paved by subvarieties U_{pq} if X has a filtration $X_0 \subset X_1 \subset \dots \subset X_r = X$ by closed subvarieties X_p such that $X_p \setminus X_{p-1}$ is a disjoint union of the subvarieties U_{pq} . We call this an orbifold paving if each U_{pq} is a quotient of the affine space $\mathbb{A}^{k_{pq}}$ by a finite group F_{pq} . If in addition T acts on X preserving the paving, and the T -action on U_{pq} is induced by a linear action of T on $\mathbb{A}^{k_{pq}}$ which commutes with the F_{pq} action, we call this a T -invariant orbifold paving. The U_{pq} are called cells of the paving.

Remark 2.8. In our applications to weighted flag varieties, the sets U_{pq} will arise as $S \backslash (C \times \mathbf{C}_\mu^*)$. Here C is isomorphic to affine space with a linear H -action and $\mu : H \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^*$ is a character of H which is nontrivial on S . Then H acts on $C \times \mathbf{C}_\mu^*$, so T acts on the quotient $S \backslash (C \times \mathbf{C}_\mu^*)$. Observe that $\mathbf{C}_\mu^* \cong H/H_1 = S/F$, where H_1 is the kernel of μ , and $F = S \cap H_1$ is finite. Therefore

$$S \backslash (C \times \mathbf{C}_\mu^*) \cong S \backslash (C \times S/F) \cong F \backslash C,$$

where the second isomorphism is given by the map $S(c, sF) \mapsto Fs^{-1}c$. This exhibits $S \backslash (C \times \mathbf{C}_\mu^*)$ as a quotient of affine space by a finite group.

If X is a G -variety such that $H_*^G(X)$ is the free H_G^* -module generated by $[X]_G$, then we call X a G -acyclic variety.

Proposition 2.9. *Suppose X is a T -variety admitting a T -invariant paving by T -acyclic subvarieties U_{pq} . Let V_{pq} denote the closure of U_{pq} in X . Then $H_*^T(X)$ is a free H_T^* -module with basis given by the fundamental classes $[V_{pq}]$. If X is rationally smooth, then $H_T^*(X)$ is a free H_T^* -module with basis given by $\delta_{V_{pq}}^T$.*

Proof. The first statement follows from the long exact sequence in equivariant Borel-Moore homology (cf. [22, Prop. 2.1(a)]). If in addition X is rationally smooth, applying equivariant Poincaré duality to the homology result yields the cohomology result. \square

The next proposition proves acyclicity of the varieties discussed in Remark 2.8.

Proposition 2.10. *Let $S \subset H$ be a subtorus acting transitively and properly on H/H_1 , where $H_1 \subset H$ is a closed subgroup. Let C be a smooth H_1 -acyclic H -variety. Then $S \backslash (C \times H/H_1)$ is T -acyclic, where $T = H/S$.*

Proof. By Poincaré duality, it suffices to show that $H_T^*(S \backslash (C \times H/H_1))$ is a free H_T^* -module generated by δ_M^T , where $M = S \backslash (C \times H/H_1)$.

Since S acts transitively on H/H_1 , the map $S \times H_1 \rightarrow H$ is surjective. It is also finite, since the properness of the action implies that the intersection $F = S \cap H_1$ is finite. Therefore, the composition $H_1 \hookrightarrow H \rightarrow T = H/S$ is a finite surjective map. This composition induces maps

$$H_T^* \xrightarrow{\pi^*} H_H^* \longrightarrow H_{H_1}^*;$$

the composition is an isomorphism.

Since C is smooth, via Poincaré duality, we can identify $H_{H_1}^*(C)$ with $H_*^{H_1}(C)$. Since C is H_1 -acyclic, $H_{H_1}^*(C)$ is the free $H_{H_1}^*$ -module generated by $\delta_C^{H_1}$. Since $H/H_1 \cong S/F$,

we see that $M = S \setminus (C \times H/H_1) \cong F \setminus C$ is rationally smooth, so we can identify $H_T^*(M)$ with $H_*^T(M)$. It suffices to show that $H_T^*(M)$ is the free H_T^* -module generated by δ_M^T .

We have

$$H_T^*(M) = H_T^*(S \setminus (C \times H/H_1)) \cong H_H^*(C \times H/H_1) \cong H_{H_1}^*(C), \quad (2.13)$$

where the first isomorphism is by Proposition 2.7, and the second is a change of groups isomorphism. The composition of these isomorphisms takes δ_M^T to $\delta_C^{H_1}$, and moreover, is compatible with the H_T^* -module structures (the $H_{H_1}^*$ -module structure on $H_{H_1}^*(C)$ is obtained from the isomorphism $H_T^* \rightarrow H_{H_1}^*$). The result follows. \square

The following is a direct consequence of Propositions 2.9 and 2.10.

Corollary 2.11. *Suppose Z is an H -variety admitting a paving by subvarieties of the form $C_i \times H/H_i$, where C_i is a smooth H_i -acyclic H -variety. Suppose S is a subtorus of H acting properly on Z and transitively on each H/H_i . Let $X = S \setminus Z$ and $T = H/S$. Then $H_*^T(X)$ is a free H_T^* -module with basis given by the fundamental classes of $X_i = S \setminus (C_i \times H/H_i)$. If in addition X is rationally smooth, then $H_T^*(X)$ is free with basis given by the classes $\delta_{X_i}^T$.*

We will see below that weighted flag varieties admit pavings of the form described in Corollary 2.11; as discussed in Remark 2.8, these are orbifold affine pavings.

2.2. Equivariant Chow groups. In this section, we work with Chow groups with coefficients in \mathbf{F} , and write $A_*(X)$ to mean the Chow groups of X tensored with \mathbf{F} . If G is an algebraic group acting on M , the equivariant Chow groups are defined by $A_i^G(M) = A_{i+r}(E_G \times^G M)$. Here, E_G denotes a finite-dimensional model of the universal space for G , chosen depending on the degree i , and $r = \dim E_G - \dim G$. The space $E_G \times^G M$ is referred to as a mixed space and the action of G on $E_G \times M$ as the mixing action. Similarly, there are operational equivariant Chow groups $A_G^i(M)$, defined in analogy to the operational Chow groups of [18]. There is a cycle map $\text{cl}: A_i^G(M) \rightarrow H_{2i}^G(M)$. We refer to [17] for details. To simplify the exposition, we will simply write $M_G = E_G \times^G M$ and $A_*^G(M) = A_*(M_G)$, although to be precise, we would need to choose a particular model of E_G , depending on the degree of the Chow groups. We define $B_G = E_G/G$, and then $A_G^* = A^*(B_G)$. Since B_G is nonsingular, there is a cap product isomorphism $\cap[B_G]: A^*(B_G) \rightarrow A_*(B_G)$. Since we are taking coefficients in a field \mathbf{F} of characteristic 0, there is a natural isomorphism $A_G^* \cong H_G^*$. The Chow groups $A_*^G(M)$ are A_G^* -modules.

If α is a character of G , then α defines a line bundle $\mathcal{L}_\alpha^G = E_G \times^G \mathbf{C}_\alpha$. This line bundle pulls back to a line bundle $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, M}$ on the mixed space M_G , and the action of α on $A_*^G(M)$ is by cap product with the Chern class $c_1(\mathcal{L}_{\alpha, M}^G)$.

Lemma 2.12. *Suppose $\beta \in A_G^* = A^*(B_G)$ satisfies $\beta \cap [B_G] = \sum a_i [Q_i/G]$, where $a_i \in \mathbf{F}$, and Q_i are closed G -invariant subvarieties of E_G . Let M be a G -scheme and $N \subset M$ a closed G -invariant subscheme. Then*

$$\beta \cap [N]_G = \sum a_i [Q_i \times^G N] \in A_*(E_G \times^G M) = A_*^G(M).$$

Proof. By the functorial properties of Chow groups, we may assume $N = M$. The projection $p : E_G \times^G M \rightarrow B_G$ is flat. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \cap [M]_G &= (p^* \beta) \cap [E_G \times^G M] = (p^* \beta) \cap p^*(B_G) \\ &= p^*(\beta \cap [B_G]) = p^*(\sum a_i [Q_i/G]) = \sum a_i [Q_i \times^G M]; \end{aligned}$$

here we have used the compatibility between flat pullback and pullbacks of operational Chow groups. \square

As in the previous subsection, H denotes a torus acting on a variety Z , S is a subtorus of H such that the action of S on Z is proper, and $X = S \backslash Z$. The map $H \rightarrow T \cong S \backslash H$ yields an injective map $A_T^* \rightarrow A_H^*$. Using this injection, we view A_T^* as a subset of A_H^* , so we obtain an A_T^* -module structure on H -equivariant Chow groups.

The next proposition is an equivariant Chow homology analogue of Proposition 2.7. If $S = H$ is trivial, it reduces to the case of [17, Theorem 3] where the group S is a torus. The proposition could be proved by applying [17, Theorem 3] to appropriate mixed spaces. However, we instead give an argument along the lines of the proof of Proposition 2.7.

Proposition 2.13. *There is an A_T^* -linear isomorphism $\pi^* : A_*^T(X) \rightarrow A_*^H(Z)$ such that if Y is an H -invariant subvariety of Z , and $\overline{Y} = S \backslash Y$, then*

$$\pi^* [\overline{Y}]_T = e_Y [Y]_H. \quad (2.14)$$

If Z is rationally smooth, then this pullback is compatible under the cycle map with the pullback $\pi^ : H_*^T(X) \rightarrow H_*^H(Z)$ defined in (2.11).*

Proof. We adopt the notation of Proposition 2.7, and again use the following sequence of maps of mixed spaces:

$$E_H \times^H Z \xrightarrow{f} E_H \times^H Z' \xrightarrow{g} E_{H'} \times^{H'} Z' \xrightarrow{h} E_T \times^T X. \quad (2.15)$$

We will define maps f^* , g^* , and h^* , fitting into a sequence

$$A_*^T(X) \xrightarrow{h^*} A_*^{H'}(Z') \xrightarrow{g^*} A_*^H(Z') \xrightarrow{f^*} A_*^H(Z), \quad (2.16)$$

and define $\pi^* = h^* \circ g^* \circ f^*$. In contrast to cohomology, arbitrary maps of schemes do not induce pullback maps on Chow groups, so we need to define the pullback maps.

Step 1. Since f is a quotient map by a finite group, [18, Ex. 1.7.6] provides an isomorphism

$$f^* : A^*(E_H \times^H Z') \rightarrow A^*(E_H \times^H Z)^F = A^*(E_H \times^H Z).$$

The last equality is because the action of F on $A^*(E_H \times^H Z)$ is trivial. The reason is that the action of F on $E_H \times^H Z$ is the restriction of an action of the torus S , and the action of any $s \in S$ on the Chow groups is trivial, since s can be connected by a sequence of rational curves to the identity element of S .

Step 2. Since we are working with coefficients in \mathbf{F} , the map $H \rightarrow H' = H/F$ induces a pullback identification of $A_{H'}^*$ with A_H^* . Brion ([10, Theorem 2.1] gave a presentation of $A_{H'}^*(Z')$ as an A_H^* -module: it is generated by the fundamental classes $[Y]_H$, where Y is an H -invariant subvariety of Z' , subject to the relations $\text{div}_Y(r) - \gamma \cdot [Y]_{H'}$, where r

is a rational function on Y which is an H -eigenvector of weight γ . Note that γ is an element of $A_H^* = A_{H'}^*$. The presentation of $A_{H'}^*(Z')$ is almost the same, with $[Y]_{H'}$ in place of $[Y]_H$. Since the action of H on Z' is induced from the H' -action by the projection $H \rightarrow H'$, the invariant subvarieties and eigenvectors for H and H' are the same. We define $g^* : A_{H'}^*(Z') \rightarrow A_H^*(Z')$ by $g^*(\sum \gamma_i [Y_i]_{H'}) = \sum \gamma_i [Y_i]_H$. It follows from Brion's result that g^* is an isomorphism.

Step 3. As noted in the proof of Proposition 2.7, the map h can be identified with the map

$$E_{S'} \times^{S'} (E_T \times^T Z') \longrightarrow (E_T \times^T Z')/S'.$$

This map is an S' -principal bundle map, so flat pullback induces an isomorphism $h^* : A_*(E_T \times^T Z')/S \rightarrow A_*^S(E_T \times^T Z')$ (see [17, Prop.8]). This map takes $[(E_T \times^T Y)/S] = [E_T \times^T \bar{Y}]$ to $[E_T \times^T Y]_S$. In other words, we obtain an isomorphism $h^* : A_*^T(X) \xrightarrow{h^*} A_{H'}^*(Z')$ satisfying $h^*([\bar{Y}]_T) = [Y]_{H'}$.

The equation (2.14) holds because

$$\pi^*[Y]_T = f^*g^*h^*([\bar{Y}]_T) = f^*g^*([Y]_{H'}) = f^*([Y]_H) = e_Y[Y]_H. \quad (2.17)$$

Here, the first equality is by definition, the second was proved in the preceding paragraph, and the third follows from the definition of g^* . It remains to prove the last equality. By assumption, Y is an S -invariant subvariety of Z , and $Y' = F \setminus Y \subset Z'$. Under the map $Z \rightarrow Z'$, the inverse image of Y' is Y . The reason is that F transitively permutes the irreducible components of the inverse image, but Y is stable under S , so it is stable under F ; thus Y is the entire inverse image. The subgroup of F acting trivially on $E_H \times Y$ is the subgroup F^Y , and similarly with Z in place of Y . Therefore, applying the definition of f^* from [18, Ex. 1.7.6], we have

$$f^*[E_H \times^H Y'] = |F^Y| [E_H \times^H Y'].$$

As noted in the proof of Proposition 2.7, $|F^Y| = |S^Y| = e_Y$. Using this equality, and translating the displayed equation into equivariant language, we see that $f^*[Y'_H] = e_Y[Y]_H$. This proves the last equality of (2.17).

We now check that π^* is A_T^* -linear. As above, we view A_T^* as a subset of $A_H^* \cong A_{H'}^*$. We will show that the map h^* is A_T^* -linear, and that g^* and f^* are A_H^* -linear, hence (as $A_T^* \subseteq A_H^*$) A_T^* -linear. This suffices, since $\pi^* = h^* \circ g^* \circ f^*$.

It suffices to check that each of the maps f^* , g^* , and h^* is A_T^* -linear. The map h^* is A_T^* -linear because h^* is defined as flat pullback, which is compatible with the action of Chern classes on Chow groups, and $h^* \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, X}^T = \mathcal{L}_{\alpha, Z'}^{H'}$. Thus, h^* is compatible with the action of a character α of T ; since these characters generate A_T^* , we see that h^* is compatible with the A_T^* -action. The A_H^* -linearity of g^* is immediate from the definition of this map. Finally, we check A_H^* -linearity of f . Since $A_H^*(Z')$ is generated as an A_H^* -module by the fundamental classes of H -invariant subvarieties of Z' , Suppose that $\beta \in A_H^*$ and W' is a closed H -invariant subvariety of Z' . Arguing as above shows that the inverse image of W' in Z is an irreducible variety W . It suffices to show that

$$f^*(\beta \cap [W']_H) = \beta \cap f^*([W']_H) = e_W \beta \cap [W]_H. \quad (2.18)$$

By Lemma 2.12, if $\beta \cap [B_H]$ satisfies $\sum a_i [Q_i/H]$, then $\beta \cap [W']_H = \sum a_i [Q_i \times^H W']$. Let e be the order of the subgroup of F fixing a general point of $Q_i \times^H W$. By definition, $f^*[Q_i \times^H W'] = e[Q_i \times^H W]$. Since the action of F on $Q_i \times^H W$ is on the second factor, $e = |F^W| = e_W$. Therefore

$$f^*(\beta \cap [W']_H) = \sum a_i f^*([Q_i \times^H W']) = e_W \sum a_i [Q_i \times^H W] = e_W \beta \cap [W]_H,$$

where the last equality is by Lemma 2.12. This proves (2.18). We conclude that π^* is A_T^* -linear.

Finally, π^* is compatible with the cycle map because equations (2.11) and (2.14) are the same, except that the first equation is interpreted as an equality in equivariant Borel-Moore homology and the second as an equality in equivariant Chow groups. \square

Remark 2.14. The map π^* could be defined by starting with the formula (2.14) and extending by A_T^* -linearity. Brion's presentation of torus-equivariant Chow groups implies that this is a well-defined map of equivariant Chow groups. However, it would remain to show that π^* is an isomorphism, which is why we have proceeded differently.

In the setting of cohomology and Borel-Moore homology, we first deduced the isomorphism on cohomology and constructed the map on Borel-Moore homology from that (under the assumption that Z is smooth). In the Chow setting, we reverse the order: having shown the isomorphism on the Chow homology, we now show that there is a compatible isomorphism of equivariant operational Chow groups, which correspond to equivariant cohomology.

The projection $\pi : Z_H \rightarrow X_T$ induces a map $\pi^* : A^*(X_T) \rightarrow A^*(Z_H)$. Since $A^*(X_T) \cong A_T^*(X)$ and $A^*(Z_H) \cong A_H^*(Z)$ (see [17, Theorem 2]), we obtain a map $\pi^* : A_T^*(X) \rightarrow A_H^*(Z)$.

The following proposition is a Chow version of (2.10).

Proposition 2.15. *The following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_H^*(Z) & \xrightarrow{\cap[Z]_H} & A_*^H(Z) \\ \pi^* \uparrow & & \uparrow \pi^* \\ A_T^*(X) & \xrightarrow{\cap_{e_Z}^{\frac{1}{e}}[X]_T} & A_*^T(X). \end{array} \tag{2.19}$$

The vertical maps are isomorphisms, and if Z is smooth, the horizontal maps are isomorphisms as well.

Proof. We deduce this result by applying the results of [17] to appropriate mixed spaces. We may assume $H = S \times T$, so $E_H = E_S \times E_T$. Then we can identify Z_H with $(Z_T)_S$, and

X_T with $(Z_T)/S$. With these identifications, the diagram (2.19) becomes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A_S^*(Z_T) & \xrightarrow{\cap [Z_T]_S} & A_*^S(Z_T) \\ \pi^* \uparrow & & \uparrow \pi^* \\ A^*((Z_T)/S) & \xrightarrow{\cap \frac{1}{e_Z} [(Z_T)/S]} & A_*((Z_T)/S). \end{array} \quad (2.20)$$

By [17], the vertical maps are isomorphisms, and if Z is smooth, the horizontal maps are isomorphisms as well. We now verify that the diagram commutes. If $c \in A^*((Z_T)/S)$, the class $\pi^* c \cap [Z_T]_S$ is represented by the class $\pi^* c \cap [(Z_T)_S]$. We need to show that

$$\frac{1}{e_Z} \pi^*(c \cap [(Z_T)/S]) = \pi^* c \cap [(Z_T)_S]. \quad (2.21)$$

We have

$$\pi^*(c \cap [(Z_T)/S]) = \pi^* c \cap \pi^* [(Z_T)/S] = e_{Z_T} | \pi^* c \cap [Z_T]_S = e_Z \pi^* c \cap [Z_T]_S,$$

Here, the first equality holds by [17, Lemma 6], and the second holds by the definition of π^* . We conclude that (2.21) holds, as desired. \square

If Z is smooth, the cycle map may be interpreted as a map $\text{cl} : A_H^*(Z) \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$ by using the Poincaré duality identifications of cohomology with homology. With this interpretation, [19, Corollary 19.2], applied to the mixed space Z_H , implies that cl is a ring homomorphism. The pullback homomorphisms $\pi^* : H_T^*(X) \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$ and $\pi^* : A_T^*(X) \rightarrow A_H^*(Z)$ are pullbacks on appropriate mixed spaces, so standard properties of cohomology imply that they are ring homomorphisms as well.

For weighted flag varieties, the next proposition implies that the cycle map is an isomorphism. This proposition is a Chow homology analogue of Proposition 2.9. We use the notation of that proposition.

Proposition 2.16. *Assume that the hypotheses of Proposition 2.9 hold, and assume in addition that $A_*^T(U_{pq})$ is the free A_T^* -module generated by $[U_{pq}]_T$. Then $A_*^T(X)$ is a free A_T^* -module with basis given by the fundamental classes $[V_{pq}]$, and the cycle map $\text{cl} : A_*^T(X) \rightarrow H_*^T(X)$ is an isomorphism. This holds if the U_{pq} are the cells of a T -invariant orbifold paving.*

Proof. The first statement follows from the arguments of [19, Example 19.1.11]. Now suppose that the U_{pq} are the cells of a T -invariant orbifold paving. Using mixed spaces and [18, Ex. 1.7.6], one can see $A_*^T(U_{pq}) \cong A_*^T(\mathbb{A}^{k_{pq}})^{F_{pq}}$. The equivariant Chow groups $A_*^T(\mathbb{A}^{k_{pq}})$ are a free A_T^* -module generated by $[\mathbb{A}^{k_{pq}}]_T$. The group F_{pq} acts trivially on $A_*^T(\mathbb{A}^{k_{pq}})$, since the action of F_{pq} commutes with the action of T and preserves the fundamental class $[\mathbb{A}^{k_{pq}}]_T$. Hence $A_*^T(\mathbb{A}^{k_{pq}})^{F_{pq}} = A_*^T(\mathbb{A}^{k_{pq}})$. \square

In light of the results of this section, our results about weighted flag varieties are valid in the setting of equivariant Chow groups.

2.3. Appendix: Poincaré duality. With respect to rational cohomology, rationally smooth varieties behave much like smooth varieties, and in particular they satisfy Poincaré duality (see for example, [14, Section 12.4]). For reference, we provide a brief justification of Poincaré duality in this setting. We recall facts about sheaves from [21] in the following discussion. Given a complex of sheaves \mathcal{F} , let $\mathbf{D}(\mathcal{F})$ denote the Borel-Moore dual complex of \mathcal{F} . For brevity, for any algebraic variety Q , we set $\mathbf{D}_Q = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{F}_Q)$ the dual complex of the constant sheaf. Hypercohomology gives $\mathbf{H}^k(\mathbf{F}_Q) = H^k(Q)$ singular cohomology and $\mathbf{H}^{-k}(\mathbf{D}_Q) = H_k(Q)$ Borel-Moore homology. A \mathbf{F} -orientation for Q is a chosen quasi-isomorphism

$$\mathbf{D}_U \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_U[2n] \tag{2.22}$$

where $U \subset Q$ is the smooth locus, and n is the complex dimension of Q . By [21, §5.1] there are unique morphisms

$$\mathbf{F}_Q[2n] \rightarrow IC_Q \rightarrow \mathbf{D}_Q \tag{2.23}$$

such that restrictions to U are isomorphisms – the composition giving an inverse of (2.22). The second morphism in (2.23) is (up to shift) \mathbf{D} of the first morphism, where Verdier duality gives $IC_Q = \mathbf{D}(IC_Q)[2n]$ by [21, §6.1]. Hypercohomology of (2.23) gives rise to homomorphisms

$$H^k(Q) \rightarrow IH_{2n-k}(Q) \rightarrow H_{2n-k}(Q), \tag{2.24}$$

for every $0 \leq 2n-k \leq 2n$. The cap product with fundamental class of Borel-Moore homology factors through (2.24).

Assume that Q is rationally smooth; i.e., $\mathbf{F}_Q[2n] = IC_Q$ (cf. [9, §1.4]). It follows that $IC_Q = \mathbf{D}_Q$, hence (2.23) and (2.24) are isomorphisms. Given any rationally smooth variety Q and subvariety $Y \subset Q$, let $\delta_Y \in H^*(Q)$ be the unique class (possibly zero) such that

$$\delta_Y \cap [Q] = [Y], \tag{2.25}$$

where \cap is the action of $H^*(Q)$ on Borel-Moore homology $H_*(Q)$.

3. WEIGHTED FLAG VARIETIES

The purpose of this section is to collect some basic results about the geometry of weighted flag varieties. Most of the results of this section are not essentially new; the basic geometry of weighted flag varieties was presented in [13], and, with some additional results, in [1] and [6]. Unlike this previous work, we do not assume that the group we are using is the product of \mathbf{C}^\times with a reductive group. This leads to a slightly larger class of varieties (see Remark 3.6). Also, it allows for a more uniform Lie-theoretic presentation, which turns out to be helpful in understanding positivity and related results. The new results in this section are mainly contained in Section 3.5. In particular, the definition of weighted roots and the identification of the weights of T -fixed curves in weighted flag varieties seem to be new, although they are closely related to the GKM descriptions of cohomology given in [1] and [6] (see Remark 3.26).

3.1. Definitions and notation. We refer to the introduction for the definition of weighted flag varieties and basic notation. We now make some additional definitions which will be used in the remainder of the paper.

Recall that Φ , $\Phi^+ = \Phi(\mathfrak{n})$, and Δ denote (respectively) the set of roots of H in G , a choice of positive system, and the corresponding set of simple roots. As in the introduction, $m+1 = \dim H$. Let n denote the semisimple rank of G , and let $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ be an ordering of the simple roots. We will see below that G cannot be semisimple, so $m \geq n$. Let Φ^\vee denote the set of coroots. If $\alpha \in \Phi$, we denote by r_α the corresponding reflection in W . We will abuse notation and use the same letter to denote both an element of $W = N_G(H)/H$ and a representative in $N_G(H)$. The longest element of W is denoted w_0 .

Given $\mu \in \Lambda$, set $\Phi^\mu = \{\alpha \in \Phi \mid \mu \cdot \alpha^\vee > 0\}$. Recall that we have fixed a dominant character $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, and a cocharacter $\chi \in \Lambda^\vee$. By assumption, L is a Levi subgroup such that the coroots of L are orthogonal to λ . Let $P = LU$ denote the corresponding standard parabolic subgroup; then $\Phi^\lambda \subseteq \Phi(\mathfrak{u})$, with equality if the coroots of \mathfrak{l} are exactly the coroots orthogonal to λ . By definition, W^P consists of maximal length representatives of left W_P cosets. If $w \in W^P$, then the minimal length element in wW_P is $w_{min} = ww_0^P$, where w_0^P is the longest element in W_P . Given $w \in W^P$, let $\Phi_w^P = \Phi^+ \cap w_{min}\Phi^- = \{\alpha \in \Phi \mid \alpha > 0, w_{min}^{-1}\alpha < 0\}$. Note that $\Phi_w^P = \Phi^+ \cap w\Phi(\mathfrak{u}^-)$.

We will use the following notation for the covering relations in the Bruhat order. Given $v, w \in W$, write $w < v$ if $\ell(v) = \ell(w) + 1$ and $v = wr_\gamma = r_\beta w$ for some positive root γ ; in this case $\beta = w(\gamma)$ is also positive. If v and w are both assumed to be in W^P , we write $w <_P v = wr_\gamma$. The poset W^P is connected by covering relations (this is an immediate consequence of the analogous result of Deodhar for minimal coset representatives ([15, Cor. 3.8]; see [8, Prop. 2.6]).

3.2. Projectivity of weighted flag varieties. In [13], weighted flag varieties are constructed as closed subvarieties of weighted projective space, so they are projective. Because our definition is slightly more general than the one used in [13], we give the proof of this result in our setting.

For any weight γ , define $a_\gamma = \gcd(\chi)^{-1}\gamma \cdot \chi$. For $w \in W$, we set $a_w = a_{w\lambda}$. Observe that if λ is dominant and χ is antidominant, then $w \mapsto a_w$ is an increasing function on the Weyl group. As in the introduction, we assume that for every $w \in W$, we have

$$a_w > 0. \tag{3.1}$$

This assumption implies that G is not semisimple. More generally, we have:

Proposition 3.1. *If there exists $\mu \in \Lambda$ such that $a_{w\mu} > 0$ for each $w \in W$, then G is not semisimple (that is, $m > n$). Moreover, μ is not in the span of the roots.*

Proof. We argue by contradiction. Suppose G is semisimple, and identify \mathfrak{h} with \mathfrak{h}^* by a nondegenerate W -invariant symmetric form. Choose w_1 and w_2 so that $w_1\mu$ is dominant and $w_2\chi$ is antidominant. If $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ are the fundamental dominant weights, then $w_1\mu = \sum c_i\lambda_i$ and $w_2\chi = \sum d_i\lambda_i$, where each $c_i \geq 0$ and $d_i \leq 0$. If $w = w_2^{-1}w_1$, then $\gcd(\chi)a_{w\mu} =$

$w_2^{-1}w_1\mu \cdot \chi = w_1\mu \cdot w_2\chi \leq 0$, since each $\lambda_i \cdot \lambda_j \geq 0$ (as follows from [24, Ex. 13.8]). This contradicts our assumption that $a_{w\mu} > 0$. We conclude that G is not semisimple.

Let $\mathfrak{h}^* = \mathfrak{h}_0^* \oplus \mathfrak{h}_1^*$ be the W -isotypic decomposition of \mathfrak{h}^* , where \mathfrak{h}_1^* is the span of the roots, and let $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{h}_1$ be the corresponding decomposition of \mathfrak{h} . Write $\chi = \chi_0 + \chi_1$, where $\chi_i \in \mathfrak{h}_i$. Observe that \mathfrak{h}_1 is a Cartan subalgebra of the semisimple Lie algebra $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$. If $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}_1$, then we would have $w\mu \cdot \chi = w\mu \cdot \chi_1 > 0$ for all $w \in W$, but this is impossible by the argument of the preceding paragraph. Therefore $\mu \notin \mathfrak{h}_1^*$. \square

As in the introduction, we write L_λ for the kernel of λ on L , $Q = L_\lambda U$, and $Z = Z = G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times \cong G/Q$. The weighted flag variety is $X = S \backslash Z$. Write $\pi : Z \rightarrow X$ for the quotient map.

Proposition 3.2. *$X = S \backslash Z$ is a geometric quotient in the category of schemes. The quotient is a projective algebraic variety.*

Proof. First assume that the coroots of L are exactly the coroots of G which are orthogonal to λ . Let V_λ denote the irreducible representation of G with highest weight λ . The subgroup $S = \chi(\mathbf{C}^\times)$ of H acts on V_λ . Since the weights of V_λ are in the convex hull of the weights $w\lambda$ for $w \in W$, and $a_w = w\lambda \cdot \chi > 0$, the weights of S on V_λ are strictly positive. Therefore, the quotient $\mathbf{P} = S \backslash (V_\lambda \setminus \{0\})$ is a weighted projective space. This is a geometric quotient of $V_\lambda \setminus \{0\}$ by S . Our assumption on L implies that Q is the stabilizer of a highest weight vector v_λ in V_λ . The orbit $G \cdot v_\lambda \cong G/Q = Z$ is an S -invariant closed subvariety of $V_\lambda \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore $S \backslash Z$ is a closed subvariety of the weighted projective space \mathbf{P} , and $X = S \backslash Z$ is a geometric quotient of Z by S .

More generally, P is contained in a parabolic subgroup P' satisfying the hypothesis of the first sentence of the proof. The map $\pi : Z = G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda \rightarrow Z' = G \times^{P'} \mathbf{C}_\lambda$ is projective (with fibers isomorphic to P'/P) and S -equivariant. Because the quotient $X' = S \backslash Z'$ is projective, it follows from [34, Prop. 2.18] that Z is the stable locus of some S -equivariant ample line bundle, and therefore a quasi-projective geometric quotient $X = S \backslash Z$ exists in the category of schemes ([34, Ch. 1.4]). We claim that the map $\rho : X \rightarrow X'$ is proper. This suffices, for then X is complete (as X' is), so X is projective. We now prove the claim. By the results of Section 3.3, we can cover Z' by S -invariant open sets of the form $C \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^* \cong C \times S/F$, where $F = \ker(w\lambda)|_S$. The inverse image in Z is isomorphic to $C \times wP'/P \times S/F$. The map $C \times wP'/P \times S/F \rightarrow C \times S/F$ induces a map on the quotients by S , which is isomorphic to the map $F \backslash (C \times wP'/P) \rightarrow F \backslash C$. Since P'/P is projective and F is finite, this map is proper. Thus, we can cover X by open sets of the form $F \backslash C$ such that the map $\rho^{-1}(F \backslash C) \rightarrow F \backslash C$ is proper. Hence, ρ is proper. \square

Remark 3.3. If the coroots of L are exactly the coroots of G which are orthogonal to λ , then the weighted flag variety X could be defined by the Proj construction as follows. For every $\mu \in \Lambda^+$, let V_μ be the irreducible representation of G of highest weight μ , and let μ^* be the highest weight of V_μ^* . Recall that

$$\mathbf{C}[G] = \bigoplus_{\mu \geq 0} V_\mu \otimes V_{\mu^*} \quad (3.2)$$

by, e.g., [25]. The Q -invariant functions on G are

$$A = \mathbf{C}[G]^Q = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} V_{k\lambda^*} \otimes \mathbf{C}_{k\lambda} \quad (3.3)$$

Observe that A is a $\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -graded \mathbf{C} -algebra via the action of S on Z . We have $G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda \rightarrow \overline{Z}$, where $\overline{Z} = Z \cup \{0\} \subset V_\lambda$. By [26, §8.13], $A = \mathbf{C}[G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda] = \mathbf{C}[\overline{Z}]$ as left G -modules. Write 0 for the point of $\text{Spec}(A)$ corresponding to the irrelevant maximal ideal. Then $\text{Proj}(A)$ is the geometric quotient of $\text{Spec}(A) \setminus \{0\}$ by S , since $A_0 = \mathbf{C}$ (cf. [33]). We have $Z = \text{Spec}(A) \setminus \{0\}$, so X is a projective algebraic variety defined as a geometric quotient of Z by S .

Remark 3.4. The argument in Remark 3.3 shows that if $G \neq Q$, then $Z = G/Q$ is quasiaffine if and only if λ is dominant or antidominant and the coroots of L are exactly the coroots of G which are orthogonal to λ . Indeed, if L does not satisfy this condition, then let $P' = L'U'$ be as in the proof of Proposition 3.2 and let $Q' = L'_\lambda U'$. Then $Q \not\subseteq Q'$, and $G/Q \rightarrow G/Q' \rightarrow \text{Spec}(\mathbf{C}[G]^{Q'})$ shows that $G/Q \rightarrow \text{Spec}(\mathbf{C}[G]^Q)$ is not an immersion, since $\mathbf{C}[G]^Q = \mathbf{C}[G]^{Q'}$ by (3.3) (or more directly since $G/Q \rightarrow G/Q'$ is proper). If λ is not dominant or antidominant, then $\mathbf{C}[G]^Q = \mathbf{C}$ is one dimensional by the calculation in (3.3); since the only term remaining is when $k = 0$. In this case, if $G/Q \subset \text{Spec}(\mathbf{C}[G]^Q)$ then $G = Q$.

Remark 3.5. Every G -equivariant line bundle on a flag variety has the same embedded principal \mathbf{C}^\times -bundle (defined as the complement of the 0-section) as the dual line bundle, since $G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times = G \times^P \mathbf{C}_{-\lambda}^\times$ are both equal to G/Q . Hence weighted flag varieties are projective varieties when λ is dominant or antidominant.

Generalized flag varieties are a special case of weighted flag varieties. Indeed, by Proposition 3.1, λ is not in the span of the roots, so there exists a rank one subtorus S_0 of the center of G such that λ restricts nontrivially to S_0 . Define χ_0 to be an isomorphism of \mathbf{C}^\times with S_0 such that χ_0 pairs positively with the restriction of λ to S_0 . If we consider χ_0 as a cocharacter of H , then χ_0 satisfies (3.1), and $S_0 \backslash G/Q = G/P$ since $P = S_0 Q$. Therefore the weighted flag variety $S_0 \backslash G/Q$ is the generalized flag variety G/P . We refer to this as the non-weighted case. We fix χ_0 from now on; we write $Y = S_0 \backslash G/Q = G/P$ for the non-weighted generalized flag variety, and $\pi_0 : Z \rightarrow Y$ for the quotient map. Set $G_0 = G/S_0$, $P_0 = P/S_0$, and $T_0 = H/S_0$. Note that T_0 is a maximal torus of G_0 , and $Y = G/P = G_0/P_0$.

The maps $\pi : Z \rightarrow X$ and $\pi_0 : Z \rightarrow Y$ induce isomorphisms $\pi^* : H_T^*(X) \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$ and $\pi_0^* : H_{T_0}^*(Y) \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$, as follows from Proposition 2.7. This isomorphism is described more precisely in Corollary 3.16.

The weighted flag variety is covered by quotients of affine space by finite groups (see Section 3.3), so X is normal with rational singularities, \mathbf{Q} -factorial [31, §5.1], rationally smooth, and has orbifold singularities [4]. Although X need not be homogeneous, it does admit an action of any subgroup of G centralizing S . In particular, X admits an H -action; since the subgroup S acts trivially, this action induces an action of $T = H/S$.

Remark 3.6. The construction of weighted flag varieties in [13] can be described in our notation as follows. Let $G = G' \times \mathbf{C}^*$, where G' is reductive. Then λ is of the form (λ', u) ,

where λ' is dominant for G' , and $u \in \mathbb{N}$. The cocharacter χ is of the form $(\chi', 1)$, where χ' is a cocharacter of G' , and 1 corresponds to the identity cocharacter of \mathbf{C}^* . Let V_λ denote the representation of highest weight λ for G . The weights of S on V_λ are given by $\mu' \cdot \chi' + u$. These weights are assumed to be strictly positive, which can be ensured by taking u large enough. This corresponds to our assumption that $a_w > 0$ for all $w \in W$. The G -orbit of a highest weight vector v_λ is $G \cdot v_\lambda = G/Q$. The weighted flag variety is $S \backslash G/Q$, which is a closed subvariety of the weighted projective space $\mathbf{P} = S \backslash (V_\lambda \setminus \{0\})$. The construction in this paper is slightly more general in that G is not assumed to be of the form $G' \times \mathbf{C}^\lambda$, and Q is only assumed to be contained in the stabilizer of v_λ .

The following example shows that without the positivity of the a_w , the quotient $X = S \backslash Z$ need not be separated (hence not projective).

Example 3.7. Let $G = SL_2$, with B and H the subgroups of upper triangular and diagonal matrices, respectively. Let $\lambda = 1 = \chi$, where we identify Λ and Λ^\vee with \mathbf{Z} so that the dominant weights correspond to nonnegative integers. Write $W = \{1, s\}$. Then $a_1 = 1$ and $a_s = -1$; in particular, (3.1) is not satisfied. The action of $S \cong \mathbf{C}^\times$ on $Z \cong \mathbf{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is with weights 1 and -1 , so the action is closed (that is, the S -orbits are closed). By [34, Proposition 1.9], a universal geometric quotient exists. The quotient $X = S \backslash Z$ is not separated since the orbits through the axes form a doubled origin in the quotient. In this example, $Z \cong \mathbf{C}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is covered by the S -invariant open sets U_i where the i -th coordinate is nonzero. Although S acts properly on each U_i , the action of S on Z is not proper. This example shows that locally proper actions need not glue to a globally proper action. Note that if we fix $\lambda = 1$, then there is no choice of χ satisfying (3.1).

Example 3.8. Let $G = SL_2 \times \mathbf{C}^\times$ and $\lambda = (1, 1)$. Then $\chi = (0, 1)$ gives $a_0 = 1 = a_1$ and hence (3.1) is satisfied. We have $X \cong \mathbf{P}^1$, the flag variety for SL_2 .

3.3. An open covering and stabilizers. In this section we describe a covering of a weighted flag variety by open sets isomorphic to affine space modulo a finite group, as is done in [13]. We show that all stabilizers of Z in S are contained in a finite subgroup \mathbf{Z}_{a_w} of S , depending on the neighborhood $U_w \subset Z$. In the next section we describe generic stabilizers for each weighted Schubert cell.

Recall that $P = LU$ is the Levi decomposition of our parabolic subgroup such that $H \subset L$. Let U^- be the unipotent radical of the opposite parabolic P^- with respect to H . Given $w \in W$, let ${}^wU^- = wU^-w^{-1}$, and let $h^w = w^{-1}hw$. The map

$$\varphi: {}^wU^- \rightarrow G/P, \quad wuw^{-1} \mapsto wuP/P, \quad (3.4)$$

takes ${}^wU^-$ isomorphically onto its image, which we denote by C_w . Let $\zeta: G \rightarrow G/P$ denote the projection. Then $\zeta^{-1}(C_w) = {}^wU^- \times wP \subset G$, where ${}^wU^- \times wP$ is identified with its image in G under the multiplication map. This image is invariant under left multiplication by H , which corresponds to the action of H on ${}^wU^- \times wP$ given by

$$h(wuw^{-1}, wp) = (wh^w u (h^w)^{-1} w^{-1}, wh^w p). \quad (3.5)$$

Let U_w denote $\pi_0^{-1}({}^wU^-) \subset Z$.

Lemma 3.9. *Suppose $w \in W^P$. As H -varieties, we have*

$$U_w \cong {}^wU^- \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. We have

$$U_w = \pi_0^{-1}({}^wU^-) \cong ({}^wU^- \times {}^wP) \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times \quad (3.7)$$

The action of $H \subset G$ on U_w corresponds by (3.5) to the action of H on $({}^wU^- \times {}^wP) \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$ given by

$$h[(wuw^{-1}, wp), v] = [(wh^w u (h^w)^{-1} w^{-1}, wh^w p), v]. \quad (3.8)$$

The isomorphism $({}^wU^- \times {}^wP) \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times \rightarrow {}^wU^- \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times$ given by $[(wuw^{-1}, wp), v] \mapsto (wuw^{-1}, \lambda(p)v)$ is H -equivariant. The lemma follows. \square

Recall that $a_\mu = \gcd(\chi)^{-1} \mu \cdot \chi$ for any weight $\mu \in \Lambda$, and $a_w = a_{w\lambda}$ for $w \in W$. For $s \in S$, write $s^{a_\mu} = \mu(s)$, and $s^{a_w} = s^{a_{w\lambda}}$. Under the identification of S with \mathbf{C}^\times given by $\mathbf{C}^\times \cong \mathbf{C}^\times / \ker \chi \rightarrow S$, the map $s \mapsto s^{a_\mu}$ is just the map raising s to the power a_μ . Let \mathbf{Z}_{a_w} denote the finite group $\ker(w\lambda|_S)$. Because the action of S on Z is proper, S acts on Z with finite stabilizers; this is also a consequence of the following result, which gives more precise information.

Corollary 3.10. *The stabilizer in S of any $z \in U_w$ is contained in \mathbf{Z}_{a_w} . Hence S acts on Z with finite stabilizers. Moreover, for $w \in W^P$, the map ${}^wU^- \rightarrow S \backslash U_w$ defined by*

$$u \mapsto S(u, 1) \quad (3.9)$$

induces an isomorphism

$$\mathbf{Z}_{a_w} \backslash {}^wU^- \cong S \backslash U_w. \quad (3.10)$$

The $S \backslash U_w$ form an open cover of X by quotients of affine space by finite groups. Hence X is rationally smooth.

Proof. Lemma 3.9 implies that the stabilizer group S^z (for $z \in U_w$) is contained in \mathbf{Z}_{a_w} . This lemma also implies that (3.9) induces the isomorphism (3.10). Since the C_w form an open cover of G/P , their inverse images U_w in Z form an open cover of Z . Each ${}^wU^-$ is isomorphic to affine space, and since $Z \rightarrow X = S \backslash Z$ is a geometric quotient, the $S \backslash U_w \cong \mathbf{Z}_{a_w} \backslash {}^wU^-$ form an open cover of X by quotients of affine space by finite groups. \square

3.4. Weighted Schubert varieties. Recall that $\pi : Z \rightarrow X$ and $\pi_0 : Z \rightarrow Y = G/P$ denote the natural projections. Suppose $w \in W^P$. By definition, the Schubert cell Y_w^0 corresponding to w in Y is the B -orbit $B \cdot {}^wP$. The map $u \mapsto uP$ gives an isomorphism of ${}^wU^- \cap U$ onto this cell. Define $Z_w^0 = \pi_0^{-1}(Y_w^0) = ({}^wU^- \cap U) \cdot {}^wP \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$. Lemma 3.9 implies that $Z_w^0 \cong ({}^wU^- \cap U) \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times$ as H -varieties. We define the weighted Schubert cell $X_w^0 \subset X$ by

$$X_w^0 = S \backslash Z_w^0 \cong S \backslash (({}^wU^- \cap U) \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times).$$

The weighted Schubert variety X_w is the closure of X_w^0 in X .

Proposition 3.11. *The weighted Schubert cells X_w^0 form a paving of X by affine spaces modulo finite groups. The equivariant cohomology $H_T^*(X)$ is a free H_T^* -module with basis $\delta_{X_w}^T$.*

Proof. The Schubert cells form a paving of Y , so their inverse images Z_w^0 form a paving of Z . As $\pi : Z \rightarrow X$ is a geometric quotient, the quotient varieties $S \backslash Z_w^0 = X_w^0$ form a paving of X . Since $X_w^0 = S \backslash Z_w^0 \cong \mathbf{Z}_{a_w} \backslash ({}^wU^- \cap U)$, each X_w^0 is isomorphic to affine space modulo a finite group. Each X_0^w is T -acyclic, by Proposition 2.10 (cf. Remark 2.8). Since X is rationally smooth, the statement about cohomology follows from Corollary 2.11. \square

We now determine the generic stabilizers of S on Z_w^0 . The *support* of the S -action on Z , denoted by $\sigma(S)$, is the set of all $s \in S$ such that $sz = z$ for some $z \in Z$. We have

$$\sigma(S) = \bigcup_{w \in W} \mathbf{Z}_{a_w}. \quad (3.11)$$

Indeed, $\sigma(S) \subset \bigcup_{w \in W} \mathbf{Z}_{a_w}$ by Corollary 3.10; the reverse inclusion holds since $S^{[w,1]} = \mathbf{Z}_{a_w}$ for all $w \in W$.

Let $w \in W^P$, and choose an ordering β_1, \dots, β_r of the roots in $\Phi_w^P = \Phi^+ \cap w\Phi(u^-)$. For each root β , the corresponding root subgroup U_β is isomorphic to \mathbf{C} . We have isomorphisms of algebraic varieties $\mathbf{C}^r \cong \prod_i U_{\beta_i} \cong {}^wU^- \cap U$, where the second isomorphism is given by the product map. If $u = \prod u_{\beta_i}$, we can view the u_{β_i} as complex numbers giving the coordinates of $u \in {}^wU^- \cap U$ under the isomorphism $\mathbf{C}^r \cong {}^wU^- \cap U$. Let $({}^wU^- \cap U)^{gen}$ be the Zariski open subset of ${}^wU^- \cap U$ consisting of the elements u whose coordinates u_{β_i} are all nonzero. Define the Zariski open subset Z_w^{gen} of Z_w^0 by

$$Z_w^{gen} = ({}^wU^- \cap U)^{gen} \cdot wP \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times \cong ({}^wU^- \cap U)^{gen} \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times.$$

For any subset $\mathcal{S} \subset \Lambda$, write $a_{\mathcal{S}} = \{a_\mu \mid \mu \in \mathcal{S}\}$. Write $\gcd(a_w, a_{\Phi_w^P})$ for the greatest common divisor of the elements of $\{a_w\} \cup a_{\Phi_w^P}$.

Proposition 3.12. *Let $w \in W^P$. For all z in Z_w^{gen} , we have $S^z = \mathbf{Z}_d$, where $d = \gcd(a_w, a_{\Phi_w^P})$.*

Proof. The point $z = (u, z) \in Z_w^{gen}$ is fixed by $s \in S$ if and only if $s^{a_{\beta_i}} = 1$ for all i , and $s^{a_w} = 1$. This is equivalent to the statement that $s^d = 1$, where $d = \gcd(a_w, a_{\Phi_w^P})$, which is equivalent to the statement that $s \in \mathbf{Z}_d$. \square

The weight λ is said to be *minuscule* if every $\alpha \in \Phi$ satisfies $|\lambda \cdot \alpha^\vee| \leq 1$. Let \leq_P denote the restriction of the Bruhat order on W to W^P . The next proposition provides an alternative description of the stabilizer groups if λ is minuscule.

Proposition 3.13. *For every $w \in W^P$, we have*

$$\gcd(a_w, a_{\Phi_w^P}) \mid \gcd(a_x \mid x \leq_P w). \quad (3.12)$$

If λ is minuscule, then (3.12) is an equality.

Proof. The proposition is true for the minimal element w_0^P of W^P , since both sides of (3.12) are equal to $a_{w_0^P}$. Since W^P is connected by covering relations (see Section 3.1), it suffices to show that for every $x \leq_P w$ such that $\ell(x) = \ell(w) - 1$, we have

$$\gcd(a_w, a_{\Phi_w^P}) \mid \gcd(a_x, a_{\Phi_x^P}). \quad (3.13)$$

Indeed, by induction on $\ell(w)$, $\gcd(a_x, a_{\Phi_x^P})$ will divide $\gcd(a_y \mid y \leq_P x)$, so it will follow that $\gcd(a_w, a_{\Phi_w^P})$ divides

$$\gcd(\gcd(a_y \mid y \leq_P x_1), \dots, \gcd(a_y \mid y \leq_P x_d), a_w) = \gcd(a_x \mid x \leq_P w),$$

where x_1, \dots, x_d index all of the divisors in Y_w .

Let $\alpha > 0$ such that $w = r_\alpha x$, where $x, w \in W^P$. We claim that $\alpha \in \Phi_w^P$. It suffices to show that $w^{-1}(\alpha) \in \Phi(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. Since $r_\alpha w < w$, we have $w^{-1}\alpha < 0$. Moreover, since $x \in W^P$, if $w^{-1}\alpha \in \Phi(\mathfrak{l})$, then $xw^{-1}\alpha$ and $w^{-1}\alpha$ would have opposite signs, so $xw^{-1}\alpha = -\alpha$ would be positive, which is a contradiction. Therefore $w^{-1}(\alpha) \in \Phi(\mathfrak{u}^-)$, proving the claim.

We now prove (3.13). Suppose that d divides a_w and a_β for each $\beta \in \Phi_w^P$. It suffices to show that d divides a_x and a_γ for each $\gamma \in \Phi_x^P$. Since $x = r_\alpha w$, we have $a_x = a_w - (w\lambda \cdot \alpha^\vee)a_\alpha$. Since $\alpha \in \Phi_w^P$, d divides a_x . The set of weights of H on $T_x Y_x$ is equal to Φ_x^P , and by [12, (10.4)], the set of weights of H on $T_x Y_w$ is equal to $r_\alpha \Phi_w^P$. It follows that $\Phi_x^P \subset r_\alpha \Phi_w^P$, since $Y_x \subset Y_w$. Therefore, if $\gamma \in \Phi_x^P$, a_γ is a linear combination of a_α and a_β for some $\beta \in \Phi_w^P$, so d divides a_γ . This proves (3.13).

Now suppose that λ is minuscule. To show that (3.12) is an equality, we must show that if $d|a_x$ for all $x \leq_P w$, then $d|a_\beta$ for all $\beta \in \Phi_w^P$. As above, let $\alpha > 0$ be such that $w = r_\alpha x$, where $x, w \in W^P$, and $\ell(x) = \ell(w) - 1$. We have $a_x = a_w - (w\lambda \cdot \alpha^\vee)a_\alpha$. Now, $w\lambda \cdot \alpha^\vee = \lambda \cdot w^{-1}\alpha^\vee = -1$ since $w^{-1}\alpha \in \Phi(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. Therefore, since d divides a_w and a_x , it divides a_α . $\Phi_w^P = r_\alpha \Phi_x^P \cup \{\alpha\}$ (since the left side of this equation contains the right side, and $|\Phi_w^P| = |\Phi_x^P| + 1$). By induction, if $\nu \in \Phi_x^P$ then $d|a_\nu$; since $d|a_\alpha$, we see that $d|a_{r_\alpha\nu}$. We conclude that $d|a_\beta$ for all $\beta \in \Phi_w^P$, as desired. \square

Remark 3.14. Weighted Grassmannians are a case where the weight λ can be taken to be minuscule, and then the previous proposition implies that (3.12) is an equality.

Example 3.15. Let $G = GL_2$. Identifying Λ with \mathbf{Z}^2 as usual, let $\lambda = (2, 0)$, $\chi = (2, 3)$. The positive root is $\alpha = (1, -1)$, and the nontrivial Weyl group element is $w = r_\alpha$. We have $\Phi_w = \{\alpha\}$ and $w\lambda = (0, 2)$. Also, $a_\alpha = -1$, $a_w = 6$, and $a_e = 4$. We have $\gcd(a_w, a_{\Phi_w}) = 1$ and $\gcd(a_w, a_e) = 2$, so (3.12) need not be an equality.

Let $w_0 \in W$ be the longest element of W , which is also the longest element of W^P . Define positive integers q_w for $w \in W^P$ by the formula

$$q_w = \frac{\gcd(a_w, a_{\Phi_w^P})}{\gcd(a_{w_0}, a_{\Phi_{w_0}^P})}. \quad (3.14)$$

Corollary 3.16. *The isomorphisms $\pi^* : H_T^*(X) \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$ and $\pi_0^* : H_{T_0}^*(Y) \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$ satisfy*

$$\pi^*(\delta_{X_w}^T) = q_w \delta_{Z_w}^H. \quad (3.15)$$

and

$$\pi_0^*(\delta_{Y_w}^{T_0}) = \delta_{Z_w}^H. \quad (3.16)$$

Proof. The equality (3.15) follows by combining Proposition 3.12 and (2.6). The equality (3.16) follows from (2.6) since S_0 acts with constant stabilizers on Z . \square

3.5. Fixed points, invariant curves and weighted roots. In this section we describe the T -fixed points and T -invariant curves on X . To describe the weights of these curves, we introduce the notion of weighted roots at an element w of W^P .

For $w \in W^P$, let $p_w = S \setminus (wP \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times)$. Note that as an H -variety, $wP \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times$.

Proposition 3.17. *We have $X^T = \{p_w \mid w \in W^P\}$.*

Proof. The inverse image in Z of a T -fixed point on X is a 1-dimensional H -orbit, so it suffices to show that the 1-dimensional H -orbits on Z are the $wP \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$. Any H -orbit is contained in an open subset U_w of Z for some $w \in W^P$. The subset U_w is H -equivariantly isomorphic to ${}^wU^- \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times$, and under this isomorphism, $wP \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$ corresponds to the 1-dimensional H -orbit $\{1\} \times \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$. Since λ is not in the span of the roots, the stabilizer in H of $(u, z) \in {}^wU^- \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times$ will have codimension at least 2 if $u \neq 1$, so $\dim H \cdot (u, z) \geq 2$. Hence $\{1\} \times \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$ is the only 1-dimensional H -orbit in ${}^wU^- \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times$. The result follows. \square

Lemma 3.18. *Suppose M is a H -invariant subvariety of Z . Let $N_0 = S_0 \setminus M \subset Y$, and $N = S \setminus M \subset X$. Then $wP \in N_0$ if and only if $p_w \in N$.*

Proof. Arguing as in Proposition 3.17 shows that $(G/P)^{T_0}$ consists of the points $S_0 \setminus (wP \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times)$. Thus, $wP \in N_0 \Leftrightarrow wP \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$ is contained in $M \Leftrightarrow p_w \in N$. \square

Let $w \in W$. Define a map $\mathbb{H}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^*$, $\mu \mapsto \bar{\mu}(w)$, by the formula

$$\bar{\mu}(w) = \mu - \frac{a_\mu}{a_w} w\lambda. \quad (3.17)$$

(note that $\bar{\mu}(w)$ is in \mathbb{T}^* since it is orthogonal to χ). Since W_P fixes λ , $\bar{\mu}(w)$ only depends on the coset wW_P . Given $\beta \in \Phi$, we define the weighted root corresponding to β at w by the formula

$$\beta(w) = \frac{a_w}{\gcd(a_w, a_\beta)} \bar{\beta}(w) = \frac{1}{\gcd(a_w, a_\beta)} (a_w \beta - a_\beta w\lambda). \quad (3.18)$$

Since a_w is positive by hypothesis, $\frac{a_w}{\gcd(a_w, a_\beta)} > 0$, so $\beta(w)$ and $\bar{\beta}(w)$ are positive scalar multiples of each other. Although the weighted roots $\beta(w)$ are geometrically natural, we will frequently use the $\bar{\beta}(w)$ for convenience. Although the map $\beta \mapsto \beta(w)$ is not linear, if $\alpha = -\beta$, then $\alpha(w) = -\beta(w)$. If β is a negative root, then $c = \frac{a_\beta}{a_w}$ is nonnegative, since by hypothesis, $a_w > 0$, and because χ is antidominant, $a_\beta \geq 0$. Hence, $\beta = \bar{\beta}(w) + c \cdot w\lambda$ where $c \geq 0$

We record the following simple lemma for reference.

Lemma 3.19. *The maps $\mu \mapsto a_\mu$ and $\mu \mapsto \bar{\mu}(w)$ (for fixed $w \in W$) are linear.*

Proof. The first statement holds because $a_\mu = \mu \cdot \chi$, and the second follows from this and the formula for $\bar{\mu}(w)$. \square

Lemma 3.20. *Let $\alpha \in \Phi$. Then $\alpha(r_\alpha w) = \alpha(w)$. Hence if $\beta = -\alpha$, then $\beta(r_\alpha w) = -\alpha(w)$.*

Proof. Let $c = w\lambda \cdot \alpha^\vee$, so $r_\alpha w\lambda = w\lambda - c\alpha$. Let $d = \gcd(a_w, a_\alpha) = \gcd(a_{r_\alpha w}, a_\alpha)$. Then $\alpha(w) = \frac{1}{d}(a_w\alpha - a_\alpha w\lambda)$, and

$$\alpha(s_\alpha w) = \frac{1}{d}(a_{r_\alpha w}\alpha - a_\alpha r_\alpha w\lambda) = \frac{1}{d}((a_w - ca_\alpha)\alpha - a_\alpha(w\lambda - c\alpha)) = \alpha(w),$$

proving the first statement. The second statement follows immediately. \square

The following proposition will be used to show that the weighted roots are the weights of T -invariant curves in X . In fact, this proposition was the motivation for the definition of weighted roots.

Proposition 3.21. *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$ be such that a_α and a_β are nonzero. Let*

$$\gamma = \frac{a_\beta\alpha - a_\alpha\beta}{\gcd(a_\alpha, a_\beta)}. \quad (3.19)$$

Then as H -spaces,

$$S \backslash (\mathbf{C}_\alpha \times \mathbf{C}_\beta^\times) \cong \begin{cases} \mathbf{C}_\gamma & \text{if } a_\beta > 0 \\ \mathbf{C}_{-\gamma} & \text{if } a_\beta < 0. \end{cases}$$

In particular, if $\beta = w\lambda$, then $\gamma = \alpha(w)$.

Proof. We prove the result for the case $a_\beta > 0$; the case $a_\beta < 0$ is similar. The group $S \cong \mathbf{C}^\times$ acts on $\mathbf{C}_\alpha \times \mathbf{C}_\beta^\times$ with weights $a = a_\alpha$ and $b = a_\beta$. Since \mathbf{C}^\times is a reductive group acting properly on an affine variety, the universal geometric quotient exists and is an affine variety given by Spec of the ring of invariant functions (see [34, Ch. 1, §2]). We identify $\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{C}_\alpha \times \mathbf{C}_\beta^\times]$ with $\mathbf{C}[x, y, y^{-1}]$, where S acts on $\mathbf{C}[x, y, y^{-1}]$ by

$$(sf)(x, y) = f(s^{-a}x, s^{-b}y). \quad (3.20)$$

Suppose the monomial $f(x, y) = x^k y^{-\ell}$ is S -invariant; then $ak = b\ell$. First suppose $a > 0$. Since $k \geq 0$, both ak and $b\ell$ must equal $c \cdot \text{lcm}(a, b)$ for some nonnegative integer c . Since $\text{lcm}(a, b) = \frac{ab}{\gcd(a, b)}$, we see that

$$k = c \frac{b}{\gcd(a, b)}, \quad \ell = c \frac{a}{\gcd(a, b)}. \quad (3.21)$$

On the other hand, if $a < 0$, then both ak and $b\ell$ must equal $-c \cdot \text{lcm}(a, b)$ for some nonnegative integer c . Since $\text{lcm}(a, b) = -\frac{ab}{\gcd(a, b)}$, we see that k and ℓ are again given by (3.21). This implies that $\mathbf{C}[x, y, y^{-1}]^S = \mathbf{C}[z]$, where $z = x^{b \gcd(a, b)^{-1}} y^{-a \gcd(a, b)^{-1}}$. Since z is an H -weight vector of weight $-\gamma$, we see that as H -spaces,

$$\mathbf{C}[\mathbf{C}_\alpha \times \mathbf{C}_\beta^\times]^S = \text{Spec } \mathbf{C}[z] \cong \mathbf{C}_\gamma.$$

The last statement of the lemma follows from the definition of $\alpha(w)$. \square

Suppose V is a 2-dimensional representation of H with weights μ_1 and μ_2 . In this case, we say H acts on $\mathbf{P}^1 = \mathbf{P}(V)$ with weight $\alpha = \mu_1 - \mu_2$. With this definition, an action on \mathbf{P}^1 of weight α is also an action of weight $-\alpha$.

Proposition 3.22. *The irreducible closed T -invariant curves in X are the curves $C = S \backslash (\overline{U_\alpha w P \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda})$ for $\alpha \in w\Phi(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. These are the closures of the 1-dimensional T -orbits on X . Each such curve is H -equivariantly isomorphic to \mathbf{P}^1 , where H acts on \mathbf{P}^1 with weight $\alpha(w)$. The T -fixed points on C are p_w and $p_{r_\alpha w}$.*

Proof. Let C be an irreducible closed T -invariant curve in X . Let $M = \pi^{-1}(C)$ and $C_0 = S_0 \backslash M$. Then M is an irreducible 2-dimensional H -stable 2-dimensional subvariety of Z . For some $w \in W^P$, the intersection $U_w \cap M$ is a nonempty open subset of M , and hence a closed 2-dimensional H -invariant subvariety of U_w . Arguing as in the proof of Proposition 3.17 shows that $U_w \cap M = U_\alpha w P \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$ for some $\alpha \in w\Phi(\mathfrak{u}^-)$. Hence $\pi_0(U_w \cap M) = U_\alpha w P$, so $C_0 = \overline{U_\alpha w P}$. Therefore, by a result of Carrell and Peterson (see [11]), the T_0 -fixed points in C_0 are wP and $r_\alpha w P$. By Lemma 3.18, the T -fixed points in C are p_w and $p_{r_\alpha w}$. Since $M = \pi_0^{-1}(C_0)$, it is covered by the open sets $U_\alpha w P \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$ and $U_\beta r_\alpha w P \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times$, where $\beta = -\alpha$. These sets are H -equivariantly isomorphic to $U_\alpha \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times$ and $U_\beta \times \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times$, respectively. Proposition 3.21 implies that the quotients of these sets by S are isomorphic to $\mathbf{C}_{\alpha(w)}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\beta(r_\alpha w)} \cong \mathbf{C}_{-\alpha(w)}$, respectively, where the last isomorphism follows from Lemma 3.20. These open sets glue along their intersection to yield a \mathbf{P}^1 on which H acts with weight $\alpha(w)$. \square

3.6. More about weighted roots. Let β_1, \dots, β_n denote the set of negative simple roots. This section contains some results about the $\overline{\beta}_i(w)$, which are positive scalar multiples of the weighted roots $\beta_i(w)$ (see (3.18)).

The following lemma is a version of a well-known fact; for the convenience of the reader we include a proof. As usual, the weight λ is assumed dominant.

Lemma 3.23. *Let $w \geq v$ be elements of W . Then $w\lambda - v\lambda = \sum e_i \beta_i$, where all $e_i \geq 0$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the lemma in the case $w = vr_\alpha > v$, where α is a positive root. Write $w\lambda - v\lambda = \sum e_i \beta_i$. We have

$$w\lambda = vr_\alpha \lambda = v(\lambda - (\lambda \cdot \alpha^\vee)\alpha) = v\lambda - (\lambda \cdot \alpha^\vee)v\alpha.$$

Therefore $w\lambda - v\lambda = -(\lambda \cdot \alpha^\vee)v\alpha = \sum e_i \beta_i$. Since $w > v$, we have $v\alpha > 0$, and since λ is dominant, $(\lambda \cdot \alpha^\vee) \geq 0$. Hence each $e_i \geq 0$. \square

The following lemma provides a way to express a weighted root at v in terms of weighted roots at w .

Lemma 3.24. *Let $w, v \in W^P$, and suppose that $w\lambda - v\lambda = \sum_i e_i \beta_i$, where the β_i are the negative simple roots. Then*

$$\overline{w\lambda}(v) = \frac{a_w}{a_v} \sum_i e_i \overline{\beta}_i(w), \quad (3.22)$$

and for $\beta \in \mathbb{H}^*$,

$$\overline{\beta}(v) = \overline{\beta}(w) + \frac{a_\beta}{a_v} \sum_i e_i \overline{\beta}_i(w). \quad (3.23)$$

Hence, if β is a negative root and $w \geq v$, then $\overline{\beta}(v)$ is a nonnegative linear combination of $\overline{\beta}_i(w)$.

Proof. A straightforward computation shows that

$$a_v \overline{w\lambda}(v) = -a_w \overline{v\lambda}(w). \quad (3.24)$$

For (3.22), by linearity of the map $\mu \mapsto \overline{\mu}(w)$, we have

$$\overline{w\lambda}(w) - \overline{v\lambda}(w) = \sum_i e_i \overline{\beta}_i(w).$$

Equation (3.22) follows from this equation, (3.24), and the equality $\overline{w\lambda}(w) = 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\beta}(v) &= \beta - \frac{a_\beta}{a_v} v\lambda = \overline{\beta}(w) + \frac{a_\beta}{a_w} w\lambda - \frac{a_\beta}{a_v} v\lambda \\ &= \overline{\beta}(w) + \frac{a_\beta}{a_w} \overline{w\lambda}(v) = \overline{\beta}(w) + \frac{a_\beta}{a_w} \frac{a_w}{a_v} \sum_i e_i \overline{\beta}_i(w) \\ &= \overline{\beta}(w) + \frac{a_\beta}{a_v} \sum_i e_i \overline{\beta}_i(w), \end{aligned}$$

proving (3.23). Finally, if β is a negative root then $\beta = \sum f_i \beta_i$ where $f_i \geq 0$; also, $a_v > 0$ by hypothesis, and $a_\beta \geq 0$ as χ is antidominant. If $w \geq v$ then $e_i \geq 0$. Thus, in the expression

$$\overline{\beta}(v) = \sum_i (f_i + \frac{a_\beta}{a_v} e_i) \overline{\beta}_i(w), \quad (3.25)$$

all coefficients on the right hand side are non-negative. \square

3.7. GKM description of cohomology. Let $j : X^T = \{p_w\} \hookrightarrow X$ be the inclusion, and $j^* : H_T^*(X) \rightarrow H_T^*(X^T) = \bigoplus_{w \in W^P} H_T^*(p_w)$ the pullback. We identify $H_T^*(p_w)$ with H_T^* . The next proposition gives the GKM description of $H_T^*(X)$, generalizing the descriptions given in [1] for the case of weighted Grassmannians and in [6] for type A weighted flag varieties.

Proposition 3.25. *The pullback $j^* : H_T^*(X) \rightarrow H_T^*(X^T) = \bigoplus_{w \in W^P} H_T^*(p_w)$ is injective, and the image of j^* consists of tuples $(f_w)_{w \in W^P}$ such that for each α , $f_w - f_{r_\alpha w}$ is divisible by the weighted root $\alpha(w)$.*

Proof. Since X has vanishing odd cohomology, it is equivariantly formal (see [20]). In light of the description of T -invariant curves and their weights given in Proposition 3.22, the proposition is an immediate consequence of [20, Theorem 1.2.2]. \square

Remark 3.26. In contrast to the proof given here, the proofs of the GKM description in [1] and [6] (for the weighted Grassmannian and type A) do not proceed by identifying the weights of T -invariant curves in X . Instead, they use the GKM description of $H_{T_0}^*(Y)$, and the relation between the pullback $j^* : H_T^*(X) \rightarrow H_T^*(X^T)$ and the non-weighted pullback $i^* : H_{T_0}^*(Y) \rightarrow H_{T_0}^*(Y^{T_0})$. (We discuss the relationship between these pullbacks in the next section.) Although [1] and [6] do not explicitly relate their GKM descriptions to invariant curves, the GKM descriptions of the cohomology, together with the fact that there are finitely many 1-dimensional T -orbits, are enough (by [20, Theorem 1.2.2]) to describe the weights of the T -invariant curves up to scaling,

3.8. Comparison of restrictions to fixed points. In this section we relate the weighted and non-weighted restrictions to fixed points. In particular, we prove Proposition 3.27, which expresses the weighted restriction in terms of the non-weighted restriction. The key diagram (3.27) was first considered in [1, (4.6)]; see also [6] for $G = GL_n \times \mathbf{C}^\times$.

The sets of T -fixed points on X and of T_0 -fixed points of Y can each be identified with W^P . The maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X & \xleftarrow{j} & W^P \\
 \pi \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 Z & \xleftarrow{k} & \bigcup_{w \in W^P} \mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times \\
 \pi_0 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 Y & \xleftarrow{i} & W^P
 \end{array}
 \quad (3.26)$$

$\begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ pt \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ pt \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array}$

give the homomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 H_T^*(X) & \xrightarrow{j^*} & H_T^*(W^P) \\
 \pi^* \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi \\
 H_H^*(Z) & \xrightarrow{k^*} & \bigoplus_{w \in W^P} H_H^*(\mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times) \\
 \pi_0^* \uparrow & & \uparrow \psi \\
 H_{T_0}^*(Y) & \xrightarrow{i^*} & H_{T_0}^*(W^P)
 \end{array}
 \quad (3.27)$$

$\begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ H_T^* \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array}$
 $\begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ H_{T_0}^* \\ \curvearrowleft \end{array}$

We can write $\varphi = \oplus \varphi_w$ and $\psi = \oplus \psi_w$, where the sums are over $w \in W^P$. Let $H_{w\lambda}$ denote the kernel of the character $w\lambda$ of H , with identity component $H_{w\lambda}^0$. The inclusion $H_{w\lambda}^0 \hookrightarrow H_{w\lambda}$ induces an isomorphism $H_{H_{w\lambda}}^* \rightarrow H_{H_{w\lambda}^0}^*$ which we use to identify these rings. Since $\mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times = H/H_{w\lambda}$ as H -spaces, $H_H^*(\mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times) \cong H_{H_{w\lambda}}^*$. Write

$$\varphi_w : H_T^* \cong H_T^*(p_w) \rightarrow H_H^*(\mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times) \cong H_{H_{w\lambda}}^*$$

for the pullback induced via (2.4) by the projection from $\mathbf{C}_{w\lambda}^\times$ to a point. The map φ_w is equal to the composition

$$H_T^* \rightarrow H_H^* \rightarrow H_{H_{w\lambda}}^* \quad (3.28)$$

induced by the following maps of tori:

$$H_{w\lambda}^0 \hookrightarrow H \rightarrow T. \quad (3.29)$$

These maps of tori induce maps of symmetric algebras:

$$S(\mathbb{T}^*) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}^*) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}_{w\lambda}^*), \quad (3.30)$$

which coincide with (3.28) under the identification of the torus-equivariant cohomology of a point with the symmetric algebra on the dual of the Lie algebra. Similarly, replacing T with T_0 , we see that ψ_w can be identified as the composition $H_{T_0}^* \rightarrow H_H^* \rightarrow H_{H_{w\lambda}}^*$ which coincides with the corresponding composition of maps of symmetric algebras:

$$S(\mathbb{T}_0^*) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}^*) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}_{w\lambda}^*), \quad (3.31)$$

We can view $S(\mathbb{T}^*)$ and $S(\mathbb{T}_0^*)$ as the subsets of $S(\mathbb{H}^*)$ consisting of polynomials which vanish on \mathbb{S} and \mathbb{S}_0 , respectively. Under this identification, we can describe the isomorphism $\varphi_w^{-1} \circ \psi_w(\mu_0) : S(\mathbb{T}_0^*) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{T}^*)$ as follows.

Proposition 3.27. *Let $w \in W^P$ and $\mu_0 \in \mathbb{T}_0^*$, and let $\mu = \varphi_w^{-1} \circ \psi_w(\mu_0)$. Then $\mu = \overline{\mu_0}(w)$.*

Proof. Since μ and μ_0 agree when restricted to $\mathbb{H}_{w\lambda}$, we have $\mu = \mu_0 + c \cdot w\lambda$ for some constant c . Since μ vanishes on \mathbb{S} , we have

$$0 = \mu \cdot \chi = \mu_0 \cdot \chi + c(w\lambda \cdot \chi) = a_{\mu_0} + ca_w.$$

Hence $c = -a_{\mu_0}/a_w$. □

Remark 3.28. The element $i_x^*(\delta_{Y_w}^{T_0})$ can be calculated, using a formula due to Anderson-Jantzen-Soergel and Billey (see [2], [7]), or a different formula due to Kumar [32]). These formulas, together with Proposition 3.27, mean that we can calculate $j_x^* \delta_{X_w}^T$. Indeed, the commutativity of the diagram (3.27), together with the definition of the weighted Schubert classes, implies that $j_x^* \delta_{X_w}^T = q_w \varphi_x^{-1} \circ \psi_x(i_x^*(\delta_{Y_w}^{T_0}))$.

4. WEIGHTED SCHUBERT CALCULUS

The basic problem of weighted Schubert calculus is to expand a product in $H_T^*(X)$ as an H_T^* -linear combination of elements of the H_T^* -basis $\delta_{X_w}^T$. This section contains our main results about weighted Schubert calculus, including a weighted Chevalley formula and our main positivity theorem (Theorem 1.1). We also describe a Borel presentation of the equivariant cohomology, which is used in the proof of Proposition 4.4.

4.1. Structure constants and relation to non-weighted Schubert calculus. The relation between the weighted and non-weighted Schubert calculus can be described as follows. Recall that $\pi_0^* \delta_{Y_w}^{T_0} = \delta_{Z_w}^H$ and $\pi^* \delta_{X_w}^T = q_w \delta_{Z_w}^H$ (Corollary 3.16). The ring $H_H^*(Z)$ can be considered as a module over either of the rings $H_{T_0}^*$ or H_T^* (as well as H_H^*). On the other hand, $H_T^*(X)$ and $H_{T_0}^*(Y)$ acquire H_H^* -module structures via the isomorphisms π^* and π_0^* .

Expanding products in $H_H^*(Z)$ in terms of the basis $\delta_{Z_w}^H$, with coefficients in $H_{T_0}^*$, is the problem of non-weighted Schubert calculus. Expanding products in $H_H^*(Z)$ in terms of

the basis $q_w \delta_{Z_w}^H$, with coefficients in H_T^* , is the problem of weighted Schubert calculus. The significant difference is that the coefficients are in different rings: $H_{T_0}^*$ in the non-weighted case; H_T^* in the weighted case.

There are various ways of presenting formulas for the structure constants. Depending on which basis one uses, factors of q_w (which can be computed by (3.14)) may or may not occur in the formulas, but these are easily dealt with. Precisely, if we write

$$\delta_{X_u}^T \delta_{X_v}^T = \sum_w c_{uv}^w \delta_{X_w}^T$$

and

$$\delta_{Z_u}^H \delta_{Z_v}^H = \sum_w d_{uv}^w \delta_{Z_w}^H,$$

where c_{uv}^w and d_{uv}^w are in H_T^* , we see that

$$c_{uv}^w = \frac{q_u q_v}{q_w} d_{uv}^w. \quad (4.1)$$

Thus, we can easily obtain structure constants in one basis from structure constants in the other basis. In particular, we can obtain formulas in the basis $\{\delta_{Z_w}^H\}$ from formulas in the basis $\{\delta_{X_w}^T\}$ by setting all the q_u equal to 1. For convenience, we will often use the basis $\{\delta_{Z_w}^H\}$. Similarly, we have introduced elements $\bar{\beta}(w)$ (3.17), which are related to the weighted roots $\beta(w)$ by a positive scalar factor (see (3.18)). This equation can be used to translate formulas from the $\bar{\beta}(w)$ to the $\beta(w)$, and conversely. Although the weighted roots are geometrically natural, we often use the $\bar{\beta}(w)$ for simplicity.

Finally, the formula of (3.23) can be used to translate formulas given in terms of $\bar{\beta}(v)$ into $\bar{\beta}(w)$ for $v, w \in W$. In particular, taking $w = w_0$, we can obtain formulas in the parameters used in [1] for the weighted Grassmannian.

4.2. Borel presentation. Since $H_T^*(X) \cong H_H^*(Z)$, the next proposition gives a Borel presentation of the T -equivariant cohomology of a weighted flag variety. Although the proof is simple, the result does not previously seem to have appeared. Recall that $\mathbb{H}_\lambda = \ker \lambda \subset \mathbb{H}$; the dual space is \mathbb{H}_λ^* .

Proposition 4.1. *We have*

$$H_H^*(Z) \cong S(\mathbb{H}^*) \otimes_{S(\mathbb{H}^*)^W} S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W_P}. \quad (4.2)$$

Proof. Recall that $Q = L_\lambda U \subset P$, where L_λ is the kernel of the character of λ of L . Since $Z \cong G/Q$, applying [3, Ch. 15, Prop. 6.5] yields

$$H_H^*(Z) \cong H_H^*(G/Q) \cong H_H^* \otimes_{H_G^*} H_Q^* \cong S(\mathbb{H}^*) \otimes_{S(\mathbb{H}^*)^W} S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W_P},$$

as desired. \square

In terms of the Borel presentation, the left action of $r \in H_H^* = S(\mathbb{H}^*)$ on $H_H^*(Z)$ is given by multiplication by $r \otimes 1$. The right action of $S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W_P}$ on $H_H^*(Z)$ can be described as follows. A representation V of H_λ may be viewed as an H_λ -equivariant vector bundle over a point. The H_λ -equivariant Chern class $c_i^{H_\lambda}(V)$ is an element of $S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)$. If V is

the restriction to H_λ of a representation of L_λ , then $c_i^H(V)$ is in $S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W_P}$. The element $1 \otimes c_i^H(V) \in H_H^*(Z)$ is the i -th equivariant Chern class of the H -equivariant line bundle $G \times^Q V$, where as usual the L_λ -module structure on V is extended to a $Q = L_\lambda U$ -module structure by defining U to act trivially.

Given $\mu \in \mathbb{H}^*$, let $\tilde{\mu}$ denote the image of μ under the map $\mathbb{H}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_\lambda^*$. Suppose $\mu \in \Lambda$. Then $\tilde{\mu}$ is W_P -invariant if and only if μ is. In this case, we obtain 1-dimensional representations $\mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mu}}$ of L_λ and \mathbf{C}_μ of L . As usual, we extend these representations to Q and P , respectively, by defining U to act trivially. The line bundle $G \times^Q \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mu}}$ on $Z = G/Q$ is the pullback via π_0^* of the line bundle $G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\mu$. In terms of the Borel presentation, $c_1^H(G \times^Q \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\mu}}) = 1 \otimes \tilde{\mu}$. Note that $\tilde{\lambda} = 0$, reflecting the fact that the pullback of $G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda$ is H -equivariantly trivial on Z .

4.3. Module structure and a Chevalley formula. As is apparent from the Borel presentation, $H_T^*(X) \cong H_H^*(Z)$ has the structure of a $S(\mathbb{H}^*) \otimes S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)$ -module. In this section we describe the module structure in terms of the weighted Schubert basis (Proposition 4.3). As a consequence, we obtain a Chevalley formula for the multiplication of a weighted Schubert class in terms of a weighted Schubert divisor (Proposition 4.4). For weighted flag varieties of cominuscule type, the formula can be simplified; see Corollary 4.6, which in the case of the weighted Grassmannian recovers the formula of [1, Prop. 5.2] The proofs of these propositions are deduced from results for non-weighted flag varieties, as is Lemma 4.2, which also plays a key role in the proof of our positivity theorem.

Via the pullback isomorphisms $\pi^* : H_T^*(X) \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$ and $\pi_0^* : H_{T_0}^*(Y) \rightarrow H_H^*(Z)$, the ring $H_H^*(Z)$ acquires the structure of a module for H_T^* and for $H_{T_0}^*$. Lemma 4.2 illustrates that although the Schubert classes form a basis of $H_H^*(Z)$ as a module over H_T^* or over $H_{T_0}^*$, they are not linearly independent over H_H^* .

Lemma 4.2. *If $v \in W^P$, then*

$$(v\lambda) \delta_{Z_v}^H = \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \prec_P v}} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{Z_w}^H, \quad (4.3)$$

where the sum is over positive roots γ such that $vr_\gamma \prec_P v$.

Proof. For $\mu \in \mathbb{H}^*$, we have, using H -equivariant classes on Y (cf. Remark 2.5):

$$c_1^H(G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\mu) \delta_{Y_v}^H = v\mu \delta_{Y_v}^H - \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \prec_P v}} (\mu \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{Y_w}^H, \quad (4.4)$$

where again the sum is over positive γ . See, for example, [10] or [3]. (In accord with our convention that \mathfrak{b} contains the positive root spaces, the sign in front of the sum is negative: the line bundle $G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\mu$ is positive if μ is antidominant.) Setting $\mu = \lambda$ and pulling back along $\pi_0 : Z \rightarrow Y$ gives (4.3), since $c_1(G \times^Q \mathbf{C}_{\tilde{\lambda}}) = 0$, where $\tilde{\lambda}$ is the restriction of λ to Q . \square

The ring $H_T^*(X)$ is a free H_T^* -module with a basis given by the $\delta_{X_w}^T$. For $\mu \in \mathbb{H}^*$, the next proposition gives expansions for $\mu \cdot \delta_{X_v}^T$ and $(1 \otimes \mu) \cdot \delta_{X_v}^T$ in this basis, with coefficients

in $H_T^* = S(\mathbb{T}^*)$. Recall that for $\eta \in \mathbb{H}^*$ and $w \in W$, the element $\bar{\eta}(w) = \eta - \frac{a_w}{a_v} w \lambda$ defined in (3.17) lies in the subspace \mathbb{T}^* of \mathbb{H}^* .

Proposition 4.3. *For every $\mu \in \mathbb{H}^*$ and for every $v \in W^P$, we have*

$$\mu \delta_{X_v}^T = \bar{\mu}(v) \delta_{X_v}^T + \frac{a_\mu}{a_v} \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \in P^v}} \frac{q_v}{q_w} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{X_w}^T, \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$(1 \otimes \tilde{\mu}) \delta_{X_v}^T = \overline{(v\mu)}(v) \delta_{X_v}^T + \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \in P^v}} \frac{q_v}{q_w} \left(\left(\frac{a_{v\mu}}{a_v} \lambda - \mu \right) \cdot \gamma^\vee \right) \delta_{X_w}^T. \quad (4.6)$$

In both formulas, the sum is over positive roots γ such that $vr_\gamma \in P^v$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.2 and the relation $\pi^* \delta_{X_w}^T = q_w \delta_{Z_w}^H$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \delta_{X_v}^T &= \left(\mu - \frac{a_\mu}{a_v} v \lambda \right) \delta_{X_v}^T + \frac{a_\mu}{a_v} v \lambda \delta_{X_v}^T \\ &= \bar{\mu}(v) \delta_{X_v}^T + \frac{a_\mu}{a_v} \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \in P^v}} \frac{q_v}{q_w} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{X_w}^T, \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

proving (4.5).

We now prove (4.6). By the non-weighted Chevalley formula (4.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 \otimes \tilde{\mu}) \delta_{Z_v}^H &= v \mu \delta_{Z_v}^H - \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \in P^v}} (\mu \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{Z_w}^H \\ &= \left(v \mu - \frac{a_{v\mu}}{a_v} v \lambda \right) \delta_{Z_v}^H + \frac{a_{v\mu}}{a_v} v \lambda \delta_{Z_v}^H - \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \in P^v}} (\mu \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{Z_w}^H. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Applying Lemma 4.2 to the middle term and simplifying, we obtain

$$(1 \otimes \tilde{\mu}) \delta_{Z_v}^H = \overline{(v\mu)}(v) \delta_{Z_v}^H + \sum_{w=vr_\gamma} \left(\left(\frac{a_{v\mu}}{a_v} \lambda - \mu \right) \cdot \gamma^\vee \right) \delta_{Z_w}^H.$$

Equation (4.6) follows from this formula by again using $\pi^* \delta_{X_w}^T = q_w \delta_{Z_w}^H$ (and similarly with v in place of w). \square

Note that if $\mu = \lambda$, then both sides of (4.6) are zero.

The next proposition gives a formula for the product of a weighted Schubert divisor with a weighted Schubert class. In this formula and elsewhere, we can take ω_α to be any element of \mathbb{H}^* satisfying

$$\omega_\alpha \cdot \beta^\vee = \delta_{\alpha, \beta} \quad (4.9)$$

for positive simple roots α, β . This condition does not uniquely determine ω_α since G is not semisimple. For example, if $G = \mathbf{C}^* \times G_1$, then ω_α could be any element of the form $x_0 + \omega_{1, \alpha}$, where $\omega_{1, \alpha}$ is defined in terms of G_1 , and x_0 is a character of the first factor \mathbf{C}^* . (This occurs in the examples in Sections 5.2 and 5.3.) However, if ω'_α were another weight satisfying (4.9), then $\omega_\alpha - \omega'_\alpha$ is W -invariant, so $w_0 \omega_\alpha - v \omega_\alpha = w_0 \omega'_\alpha - v \omega'_\alpha$. Thus, the formula of Proposition 4.4 is unchanged.

Proposition 4.4. *Let α be a simple root with $r_\alpha \notin W_P$, and let $u_\alpha = w_0 r_\alpha \in W^P$. For every $v \in W^P$, we have*

$$\delta_{X_{u_\alpha}}^T \delta_{X_v}^T = q_{u_\alpha} \overline{(w_0 \omega_\alpha - v \omega_\alpha)}(v) \delta_{X_v}^T + \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \triangleleft_P v}} \frac{q_{u_\alpha} q_v}{q_w} \left(\left(\frac{a_{w_0 \omega_\alpha - v \omega_\alpha}}{a_v} \lambda + \omega_\alpha \right) \cdot \gamma^\vee \right) \delta_{X_w}^T, \quad (4.10)$$

where the sum is over positive roots γ such that $vr_\gamma \triangleleft_P v$.

Proof. Since $\delta_{Z_{u_\alpha}}^H = \pi_{0,H}^* \delta_{Y_{u_\alpha}}^H$, applying $\pi_{0,H}^*$ to the formula of [3, §16 Lemma 2.6] yields $\delta_{Z_{u_\alpha}}^H = (w_0 \omega_\alpha \otimes 1) - (1 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_\alpha)$, where $\tilde{\omega}_\alpha$ is the restriction to \mathbb{H}_λ^* of ω_α . Note that the right hand side of this formula does not depend on the choice of ω_α satisfying (4.9). Therefore, since $\pi^* \delta_{X_{u_\alpha}}^T = q_{u_\alpha} \delta_{Z_{u_\alpha}}^H$, we have

$$\delta_{X_{u_\alpha}}^T = q_{u_\alpha} ((w_0 \omega_\alpha \otimes 1) - (1 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_\alpha)).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{X_{u_\alpha}}^T \delta_{X_v}^T &= q_{u_\alpha} ((w_0 \omega_\alpha \otimes 1) - (1 \otimes \tilde{\omega}_\alpha)) \delta_{X_v}^T \\ &= q_{u_\alpha} \overline{w_0 \omega_\alpha}(v) \delta_{X_v}^T + \frac{a_{w_0 \omega_\alpha}}{a_v} \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \triangleleft_P v}} \frac{q_{u_\alpha} q_v}{q_w} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{X_w}^T \\ &\quad - q_{u_\alpha} \overline{v \omega_\alpha}(v) \delta_{X_v}^T - \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \triangleleft_P v}} \frac{q_{u_\alpha} q_v}{q_w} \left(\frac{a_{v \omega_\alpha}}{a_v} \lambda - \omega_\alpha \right) \cdot \gamma^\vee \delta_{X_w}^T. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

This implies (4.10). \square

Remark 4.5. In the special case $u = u_\alpha$, Proposition 4.4 implies directly that the c_{uv}^w are nonnegative at v . Equation (4.10) implies that the structure constants $c_{u_\alpha v}^w$ can be nonzero only for $w = vr_\gamma \triangleleft_P v$ (in which case the structure constant is a scalar), or for $w = v$. The nonnegativity of the scalar $c_{u_\alpha v}^{vr_\gamma}$ can be deduced as follows. We have $w_0 \omega_\alpha - v \omega_\alpha = \sum b_i \beta_i$, where the β_i are the negative simple roots and $b_i \geq 0$. Hence, since χ is antidominant, $a_{w_0 \omega_\alpha - v \omega_\alpha} \geq 0$. Also, $a_v > 0$ by hypothesis, and since γ^\vee is a positive coroot, both $\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee$ and $\omega_\alpha \cdot \gamma^\vee$ are non-negative. These observations and (4.10) imply that $c_{u_\alpha v}^{vr_\gamma} \geq 0$. The $c_{u_\alpha v}^v$ are nonnegative at v , since $\overline{(w_0 \omega_\alpha - v \omega_\alpha)}(v) = \sum b_i \overline{\beta_i}(v)$.

Sections 5.2 (on the weighted Grassmannian, considered by [1]) and 5.3 consider examples of weighted flag varieties for which $\lambda = \omega_\alpha$ (that is, λ satisfies the condition (4.9)). In this case, multiplication by a weighted Schubert divisor can be put in the following form.

Corollary 4.6. *Keep the hypotheses of Proposition 4.4, and assume $\lambda = \omega_\alpha$. Then*

$$\delta_{X_{u_\alpha}}^T \delta_{X_v}^T = q_{u_\alpha} \overline{w_0 \omega_\alpha}(v) \delta_{X_v}^T + \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \triangleleft_P v}} \frac{q_{u_\alpha} q_v a_{w_0}}{q_w a_v} (\omega_\alpha \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{X_w}^T.$$

Proof. Our hypothesis on λ implies that

$$\overline{(w_0 \omega_\alpha - v \omega_\alpha)}(v) = \overline{(w_0 \lambda - v \lambda)}(v) = \overline{w_0 \lambda}(v) = \overline{w_0 \omega_\alpha}(v).$$

Also, $\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee = \omega_\alpha \cdot \gamma^\vee$, and

$$\frac{a_{w_0 \omega_\alpha - v \omega_\alpha}}{a_v} = \frac{a_{w_0 \lambda - v \lambda}}{a_v} = \frac{a_{w_0} - a_v}{a_v} = \frac{a_{w_0}}{a_v} - 1.$$

The corollary follows from these observations and Proposition 4.3. \square

In the case of the weighted Grassmannian, this corollary appears as [1, Prop. 5.2] (although some translation is required to convert the formula from that paper into the formula of the above corollary). Note that the Chevalley formula given for type A in [6, Theorem 5.1] is not correct (it does not specialize to the formula of [1]).

Remark 4.7. In [1], the parameters used are $\overline{\beta}(w_0)$ for negative simple roots β . In terms of these parameters, the formula of Corollary 4.6 can be rewritten as follows. Define nonnegative integers e_i by the equation $w_0\lambda - v\lambda = \sum_i e_i\beta_i$. For simplicity write $\overline{\beta}_i = \overline{\beta}_i(w_0)$. We have $\lambda = \omega_\alpha$, and Lemma 3.24 implies that $\overline{w_0\lambda}(v) = \frac{a_{w_0}}{a_v} \sum e_i\overline{\beta}_i$. Hence

$$\delta_{X_{u\alpha}}^T \delta_{X_v}^T = q_{u\alpha} \frac{a_{w_0}}{a_v} \left(\left(\sum_i e_i \overline{\beta}_i \right) \delta_{X_v}^T + \sum_{\substack{w=vr_\gamma \\ w \prec_P v}} \frac{q_v}{q_w} (\omega_\alpha \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{X_w}^T \right).$$

4.4. Positivity. In this section we prove our general positivity theorem. We first record a lemma about the (non-weighted) equivariant structure constants. The first statement follows from the type of support argument in [3, Section 19.1]), and it seems likely that the second statement is known as well, but for lack of reference, we provide a proof.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose $\delta_{Y_u}^{T_0} \delta_{Y_v}^{T_0} = \sum_{w \in W^P} b_{uw}^w \delta_{Y_w}^{T_0}$, with $b_{uw}^w \in H_{T_0}^*$. If $b_{uw}^w \neq 0$, then $w \leq u$ and $w \leq v$. Conversely, if w is a maximal element among the elements in W^P that are less than or equal to both u and v , then $b_{uw}^w \neq 0$.*

Proof. Let $x \in W^P$. Then $i_x^* \delta_{Y_w}^{T_0}$ is nonzero if and only if $x \leq w$. Indeed, if $x \not\leq w$, then $xP_0 \not\leq Y_w$ so $i_x^* \delta_{Y_w}^{T_0} = 0$; conversely, if $x \leq w$, then $xP_0 \in Y_w$ and there is an explicit formula for the pullback $i_x^* \delta_{Y_w}^{T_0}$ showing that it is nonzero. (The formula is due to Anderson-Jantzen-Soergel [2] and Billey [7]; for a discussion of conventions see [23, Appendix B].) Hence, $i_x^*(\delta_{Y_u}^{T_0} \delta_{Y_v}^{T_0})$ is nonzero if and only if $x \leq u$ and $x \leq v$.

Suppose that $b_{uw}^w \neq 0$. We wish to show that $w \leq u$ and $w \leq v$. We may assume that $w \in W^P$ is a maximal element among the $y \in W^P$ with $b_{uy}^y \neq 0$. In this case,

$$i_w^*(\delta_{Y_u}^{T_0} \delta_{Y_v}^{T_0}) = i_w^* \left(\sum_{y \in W^P} b_{uy}^y \delta_{Y_y}^{T_0} \right) = b_{uw}^w i_w^* \delta_{Y_w}^{T_0}.$$

Since the right hand side is nonzero, so is the left hand side, so $w \leq u$ and $w \leq v$.

Conversely, if w is maximal among the elements in W^P that are less than or equal to both u and v , then

$$i_w^* \left(\sum_{y \in W^P} b_{uy}^y \delta_{Y_y}^{T_0} \right) = b_{uw}^w i_w^* \delta_{Y_w}^{T_0} = i_w^*(\delta_{Y_u}^{T_0} \delta_{Y_v}^{T_0}) \neq 0,$$

where the first equality follows from the preceding paragraph. We conclude that $b_{uw}^w \neq 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By the discussion in Section 4.1, it suffices to consider structure constants in terms of the elements $\delta_{Z_u}^H$ and to work with the $\overline{\beta}_i(x)$ since these are positive

multiples of the weighted roots $\beta_i(x)$. Therefore, it suffices to show that

$$\delta_{Z_u}^H \delta_{Z_v}^H = \sum_{w \in W^P} d_{uv}^w \delta_{Z_w}^H, \quad (4.12)$$

such that each d_{uv}^w is a nonnegative linear combination of $\bar{\nu}_1(x_1) \cdots \bar{\nu}_k(x_k)$, where the ν_i are distinct negative roots, and $x_i \in \mathcal{S}(u, v; w)$.

By positivity for the non-weighted structure constants, we can write

$$\delta_{Z_u}^H \delta_{Z_v}^H = \sum_{w \in W^P} \sum_I b(u, v, w; I) \beta_I \delta_{Z_w}^H, \quad (4.13)$$

where I is a set of negative roots (not necessarily simple), β_I is the product of the roots in I (in particular, square-free), and $b(u, v, w; I)$ is a nonnegative integer. See [22] and [3, Cor. 19.4.7]. By Lemma 4.8, the only nonzero terms in the sum occur for w such that $w \leq u$ and $w \leq v$.

To prove the theorem, it suffices to prove the following assertion: For all $w \in W^P$, we have $\beta_I \delta_{Z_w}^H = \sum_{y \leq_P w} f_{y,I} \delta_{Z_y}^H$, where each $f_{y,I}$ is a nonnegative linear combination of monomials $\bar{\nu}_1(x_1) \cdots \bar{\nu}_k(x_k)$, where the ν_1, \dots, ν_k are distinct elements of I , and $x_i \in \mathcal{S}(u, v; y)$. We prove the assertion by induction on $|I|$. If $|I| = 1$, then $\beta_I = \beta$ for some negative root β . Since $\beta = \bar{\beta}(w) + \frac{a_\beta}{a_w} w \lambda$, applying Lemma 4.2 yields

$$\beta \delta_{Z_w}^H = \bar{\beta}(w) \delta_{Z_w}^H + \frac{a_\beta}{a_w} \sum_{\substack{y = w r_\gamma \\ y <_P w}} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{Z_y}^H.$$

which is of the desired form. Suppose now that $I = I' \sqcup \{\beta\}$ (disjoint union), and suppose that the assertion holds for I' . It suffices to show that

$$f_{y,I} = \bar{\beta}(y) f_{y,I'} + \sum_{\substack{z = y r_\gamma \\ z >_P y}} \frac{a_\beta}{a_z} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) f_{z,I'}. \quad (4.14)$$

The reason is that since $\beta \notin I'$, each term in the product $\bar{\beta}(y) f_{y,I'}$ is of the desired form, and for z in the sum, $\mathcal{S}(u, v; z) \subset \mathcal{S}(u, v; y)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_I \delta_{Z_w}^H &= \sum_y f_{y,I'} \beta \delta_{Z_y}^H = \sum_y f_{y,I'} \left(\bar{\beta}(y) \delta_{Z_y}^H + \frac{a_\beta}{a_y} \sum_{\substack{z = y r_\gamma \\ z <_P y}} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{Z_z}^H \right) \\ &= \sum_y f_{y,I'} \bar{\beta}(y) \delta_{Z_y}^H + \sum_y \frac{a_\beta}{a_y} \sum_{\substack{z = y r_\gamma \\ z <_P y}} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) f_{y,I'} \delta_{Z_z}^H. \end{aligned}$$

If we reindex the second sum by switching the roles of y and z , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_I \delta_{Z_w}^H &= \sum_y \bar{\beta}(y) f_{y,I'} \delta_{Z_y}^H + \sum_z \frac{a_\beta}{a_z} \sum_{\substack{y = z r_\gamma \\ y <_P z}} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) f_{z,I'} \delta_{Z_y}^H \\ &= \sum_y \left(\bar{\beta}(y) f_{y,I'} + \sum_{\substack{z = y r_\gamma \\ z >_P y}} \frac{a_\beta}{a_z} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) f_{z,I'} \right) \delta_{Z_y}^H. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (4.14); Theorem 1.1 follows. \square

Remark 4.9. Example 5.3 shows that for a fixed x , it may not be possible to obtain a square-free expansion of the d_{uv}^w in terms of square-free monomials in negative roots at x . For example, this is the case for the coefficient of $\delta_{Z_2}^H$ in $(\delta_{Z_2}^H)^2$, when expanded at v_3 . The corresponding non-weighted expansion is square-free because $\beta_2 + \beta_3$ is a root. However, the weighted expansion at v_3 is not square-free: $\frac{a_4}{a_2}\bar{\beta}_2(v_3) + \bar{\beta}_3(v_3)$ is not a multiple of a weighted root, so the expansion of the coefficient in terms of monomials needs to be $\frac{a_3 a_4}{a_1 a_2}\bar{\beta}_2(v_3)^2 + \frac{a_4}{a_2}\bar{\beta}_2(v_3)\bar{\beta}_3(v_3)$.

Remark 4.10. Example 5.3 shows that d_{uv}^w need not be nonnegative at w . The reason can be seen in the last displayed line of the proof: $f'_{y,I}$ contributes to the coefficient of $\delta_{Z_z}^H$, but $z > y$, so the weighted negative roots at z are not generally nonnegative linear combinations of weighted roots at y .

Remark 4.11. As noted in the introduction, Abe and Matsumura [1, Remark 5.8] observed that χ is antidominant in the positivity statement can be removed by using a different Schubert basis. Indeed, if χ is fixed, one can realize the variety Z with respect to a choice of Borel subgroup $B' = wBw^{-1}$ (for $w \in W$) with respect to which χ is antidominant. The groups P and Q would be replaced by $P' = wPw^{-1}$ and $Q' = wQw^{-1}$ and the character λ by $\lambda' = w\lambda$; if λ is dominant with respect to B , then λ' is dominant with respect to B' . Then $Z = G/Q \cong G/Q'$, and the positivity theorem applies with respect to the realization of Z as $G/Q' = G \times^{P'} \mathbf{C}_{\lambda'}$.

As noted in the introduction, the method of proof of Theorem 1.1 yields the following positivity result about classes of subvarieties in weighted flag varieties. In this result, in contrast to Theorem 1.1, the positivity is in terms of the positive weighted roots, and we need to assume that χ is dominant. The assumption that the a_w are positive remains in force.

Theorem 4.12. *Suppose M is a T -invariant subvariety of the weighted flag variety X . Then*

$$\delta_M^T = \sum c_w \delta_{X_w}^T,$$

where each c_w is a nonnegative linear combination of products of the form $\mu_1(x_1) \cdots \mu_k(x_k)$. Here the μ_i are distinct positive roots, and $x_i \in W^P$.

Proof. Let $\tilde{M} = \pi^{-1}(M)$. As in the proof of Theorem 1.1, it suffices to show that

$$\delta_{\tilde{M}}^H = \sum d_w \delta_{Z_w}^H,$$

where each d_w is a nonnegative linear combination of monomials of the form $\bar{\mu}_1(x_1) \cdots \bar{\mu}_k(x_k)$, where the μ_1, \dots, μ_k are distinct positive roots and $x_i \in W^P$.

By [22, Theorem 3.2] or [3, Theorem 19.3.1], we can write

$$\delta_{\tilde{M}}^H = \sum_I a(w; I) \alpha_I \delta_{Z_w}^H,$$

where I is a set of positive roots, α_I is the product of the elements of I , and $a(w, I)$ is a nonnegative integer. (Square-freeness is not stated in either reference, but it follows from the proof of [22, Theorem 3.2], cf. the discussion preceding [3, Cor. 19.4.7].) It

suffices to prove that for all $w \in W^P$, we have $\alpha_I \delta_{Z_w}^H = \sum_{y \leq_P w} f_{y,I} \delta_{Z_y}^H$, where each $f_{y,I}$ is a nonnegative linear combination of monomials of the form $\bar{\mu}_1(x_1) \cdots \bar{\mu}_k(x_k)$, where the μ_1, \dots, μ_k are distinct elements of I , and $x_i \in W^P$. This is proved in the same way as the analogous assertion in the proof of Theorem 1.1, using the equation

$$\alpha \delta_{Z_w}^H = \bar{\alpha}(w) \delta_{Z_w}^H + \frac{a_\alpha}{a_w} \sum_{\substack{y=wr\gamma \\ y \leq_P w}} (\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee) \delta_{Z_y}^H.$$

Since χ is dominant, each $a_\alpha \geq 0$, and by hypothesis, each $a_w > 0$. The remainder of the proof is similar to the argument given in Theorem 1.1; we omit further details. \square

5. EXAMPLES

5.1. Weighted projective space. We describe from our perspective weighted projective space (cf. [27], [1, Example 5.11]), realized as a quotient of the group GL_{m+1} . Let $G = GL_{m+1}$ and let H denote the Cartan subgroup of diagonal matrices. Let $\{y_0, \dots, y_m\}$ be the standard basis of \mathfrak{h} , and $\{x_0, \dots, x_m\}$ the dual basis of \mathfrak{h}^* . The weight lattice Λ is isomorphic to \mathbf{Z}^{m+1} ; we sometimes denote the element $\sum c_i x_i$ by (c_0, \dots, c_m) . The set of dominant weights is

$$\Lambda^+ = \{\lambda = (c_0, \dots, c_m) \in \Lambda \mid c_0 \geq \dots \geq c_m\}.$$

Let $\lambda = x_0 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, and let $V = \mathbf{C}^{m+1}$ denote the standard representation of G , which has highest weight λ . Observe that $\lambda = \omega_\alpha$, where α is the simple root $x_0 - x_1$. Identify the highest weight space of V with \mathbf{C}_λ , and let P be the subgroup of G preserving this space. There is an isomorphism

$$\mu: Z = G \times^P \mathbf{C}_\lambda^\times \rightarrow V^\times, \quad [g, v] \mapsto gv, \quad (5.1)$$

where $V^\times = V \setminus \{0\}$. In what follows, we identify Z with V^\times via (5.1).

We view the Weyl group $W \cong S_{m+1}$ as the set of permutations of the set $\{0, \dots, m\}$. Then W_P is identified with the subgroup $\{0\} \times S_m$. Define $v_k \in W$ to be the element given in 1-line notation as $v_k = (k, m, m-1, \dots, k+1, k-1, \dots, 0)$. The set of maximal coset representatives is $W^P = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_m\}$, which we can identify with the set $\{0, \dots, m\}$ via $k \mapsto v_k$. The longest element of W is $w_0 = v_m$. Let $\chi = (a_0, \dots, a_m)$ be an antidominant cocharacter, so $a_0 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_m$. We have $a_{v_k} = a_k$, and the condition (3.1) implies that $a_k > 0$ for $0 \leq k \leq m$. We denote the corresponding weighted flag variety $X = S \backslash Z$ (which in this case is weighted projective space) by $\mathbf{P}(a_0, \dots, a_m)$. Write $Z_k = Z_{v_k}$ and $X_k = X_{v_k}$.

The subspace \mathbb{H}_λ of \mathbb{H} is defined by the equation $x_0 = 0$. The restriction map $S(\mathbb{H}^*)^W \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W_\lambda}$ is given by $e_i(x_0, \dots, x_m) \mapsto e_i(x_1, \dots, x_m)$. This map is surjective, so the following lemma applies.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose the restriction map $S(\mathbb{H}^*)^W \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W_\lambda}$ is surjective, with kernel I , so*

$$S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W_\lambda} \cong S(\mathbb{H}^*)^W / I. \quad (5.2)$$

Then

$$H_T^*(X) \cong S(\mathbb{H}^*) / IS(\mathbb{H}^*). \quad (5.3)$$

Proof. This follows from the Borel presentation of $H_H^*(Z) \cong H_T^*(X)$ (Proposition 4.1 \square)

The lemma implies that for weighted projective space, we have

$$H_T^*(\mathbf{P}(a_0, \dots, a_m)) \cong \mathbf{F}[x_0, \dots, x_m] / \langle x_0 \cdots x_m \rangle. \quad (5.4)$$

For each $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m-1\}$, we have

$$\delta_{Z_k}^H = x_{k+1}x_{k+2}\cdots x_m, \quad (5.5)$$

and $\delta_{Z_m}^H = 1$. To see this, observe that if V_k is the subspace of V defined by $V_k = \{(c_0, \dots, c_k, 0, \dots, 0) \mid c_i \in \mathbf{C}\} \subseteq V$, then $Z_k = V_k^\times$. This implies that $\delta_{Z_k}^H$ is the H -equivariant top Chern class of the representation V/V_k , which equals $x_{k+1}\cdots x_m$.

By Corollary 3.16, the weighted Schubert classes are given by the formula $\pi^* \delta_{X_k}^T = q_{v_k} \delta_{Z_k}^H$, where q_{v_k} is defined as in (3.14). We now calculate q_{v_k} . Observe that

$$\Phi_{v_k}^P = \Phi^+ \cap w\Phi(\mathbf{u}^-) = \{x_0 - x_k, x_1 - x_k, \dots, x_{k-1} - x_k\}.$$

Therefore

$$\gcd(a_{v_k}, a_{\Phi_{v_k}^P}) = \gcd(a_k, a_0 - a_k, a_1 - a_k, \dots, a_{k-1} - a_k) = \gcd(a_0, \dots, a_k).$$

Since $w_0 = v_m$, we have $\gcd(w_0, a_{\Phi_{w_0}^P}) = \gcd(a_0, \dots, a_m) = \gcd(\chi)$. Hence

$$q_{v_k} = \frac{\gcd(a_{v_k}, a_{\Phi_{v_k}^P})}{\gcd(w_0, a_{\Phi_{w_0}^P})} = \frac{\gcd(a_0, \dots, a_k)}{\gcd(\chi)}. \quad (5.6)$$

Therefore, the weighted Schubert classes are given by

$$\delta_{X_k}^T = \frac{\gcd(a_0, \dots, a_k)}{\gcd(\chi)} x_{k+1}\cdots x_m. \quad (5.7)$$

We now calculate $\delta_{Z_{u_\alpha}}^H \delta_{Z_{v_k}}^H$ using Corollary 4.6. We have $\lambda = \omega_\alpha$ where $\alpha = x_0 - x_1$, so $u_\alpha = v_{m-1}$. Also, $w_0\omega_\alpha - v_k\omega_\alpha = \gamma_k$, where γ_k is the negative root $x_m - x_k$. The only root γ occurring on the right hand side of the formulas in Corollary 4.6 is $\gamma = x_0 - x_{m-k+1}$, and $v_k r_\gamma = v_{k-1}$. We have $\omega_\alpha \cdot \gamma^\vee = 1$, and $\frac{a_{w_0}}{a_{v_k}} = \frac{a_m}{a_k}$. Therefore, Corollary 4.6 and Remark 4.7 yield

$$\delta_{Z_{m-1}}^H \delta_{Z_k}^H = \bar{\gamma}_k(v_k) \delta_{X_k}^T + \frac{a_m}{a_k} \delta_{Z_{k-1}}^H \quad (5.8)$$

$$= \frac{a_m}{a_k} (\bar{\gamma}_k(w_0) \delta_{X_k}^T + \delta_{Z_{k-1}}^H). \quad (5.9)$$

We remark that although our formula for $\delta_{Z_{m-1}}^H \delta_{Z_k}^H$ was derived using Corollary 4.6, the product can be calculated directly, using the formula $\delta_{Z_k}^H = x_{k+1}x_{k+2}\cdots x_m$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{Z_{m-1}}^H \delta_{Z_k}^H &= x_m \cdot x_{k+1}\cdots x_m = \left(x_m - \frac{a_m}{a_k}x_k + \frac{a_m}{a_k}x_k\right)x_{k+1}\cdots x_m \\ &= \left(x_m - \frac{a_m}{a_k}x_k\right)x_{k+1}\cdots x_m + \frac{a_m}{a_k}x_kx_{k+1}\cdots x_m \\ &= \bar{\gamma}_k(v_k) \delta_{Z_k}^H + \frac{a_m}{a_k} \delta_{Z_{k-1}}^H, \end{aligned}$$

recovering our first formula for the product. The second formula follows from this, since calculating from the definitions shows that $\bar{\gamma}_k(v_k) = \frac{a_m}{a_k} \bar{\gamma}_k(w_0)$.

Remark 5.2. Weighted projective space can be realized as a weighted flag variety for other groups G besides $GL(m+1)$, for example, for G equal to $\mathbf{C}^* \times SL(m+1)$ or $\mathbf{C}^* \times GL(m+1)$. Computations involving different realizations, while related, are not exactly the same, since the tori involved are different. For example, in this section we took $G = GL_{m+1}$; in this case, T_0 is a maximal torus of PGL_{m+1} . This torus is a quotient of the torus T_0 for $\mathbf{C}^* \times SL_{m+1}$, which is a maximal torus of SL_{m+1} . Therefore, some care is needed when comparing computations using different realizations. Note that weighted projective space, realized for the group $\mathbf{C}^* \times GL(m)$, is the special case $d = 1$ of the weighted Grassmannians considered in the next section.

Example 5.3. Corollary 1.2 implies that c_{uv}^w can be expressed as monomials in negative weighted roots at x with nonnegative coefficients, provided that $x \geq u$ and $x \geq v$. The example of weighted $X = \mathbb{P}^4$ shows that in general, for arbitrary antidominant χ , it is not possible to retain this positivity while using negative weighted roots at $x \leq w$. Below, we calculate $(\delta_{Z_2}^H)^2$. We comment briefly on the calculation. The weighted structure constants at any x in W^P can be calculated from the nonweighted structure constants, using the method of the proof of Theorem 1.1. Using this method, we start with coefficients in $H_{T_0}^*$ and convert to coefficients in H_T^* , which adds a layer of complication. To avoid this, we use the weighted Chevalley formula (5.8) to deduce a formula for $(\delta_{Z_2}^H)^2$ with coefficients in H_T^* . We obtain:

$$(\delta_{Z_2}^H)^2 = \frac{a_3}{a_4} (\bar{\gamma}_2(v_2) - \bar{\gamma}_3(v_3)) \bar{\gamma}_2(v_2) \delta_{Z_2}^H + \frac{a_3}{a_2} (\bar{\gamma}_1(v_1) + \bar{\gamma}_2(v_2) - \bar{\gamma}_3(v_3)) \delta_{Z_1}^H + \frac{a_3 a_4}{a_1 a_2} \delta_{Z_0}^H. \quad (5.10)$$

In the tables below, we record expressions for the coefficients of $\delta_{Z_2}^H$ and $\delta_{Z_1}^H$ in terms of the negative simple roots at each $x \in W^P$. These expressions were obtained from (5.10) by using (3.25), which for any $v, w \in W$, allows us to express a weighted root at v in terms of weighted roots at any w . There is no table for the coefficient of $\delta_{Z_0}^H$ since this coefficient is a constant (in fact, it is the coefficient in the non-equivariant product).

W^P	Coefficient of $\delta_{Z_2}^H$ in $(\delta_{Z_2}^H)^2$
unweighted	$\beta_2(\beta_2 + \beta_3)$
v_4	$\frac{a_3}{a_2} \left(\frac{a_4}{a_2} \bar{\beta}_2(v_4) + \left(\frac{a_4}{a_2} - \frac{a_4}{a_3} \right) \bar{\beta}_3(v_4) \right) (\bar{\beta}_2(v_4) + \bar{\beta}_3(v_4))$
v_3	$\frac{a_3}{a_1} \bar{\beta}_2(v_3) \left(\frac{a_4}{a_2} \bar{\beta}_2(v_3) + \bar{\beta}_3(v_3) \right)$
v_2	$\bar{\beta}_2(v_2) (\bar{\beta}_2(v_2) + \bar{\beta}_3(v_2))$
v_1	$\left(\left(1 - \frac{a_3}{a_2} \right) \bar{\beta}_1(v_1) + \bar{\beta}_2(v_1) \right) \left(\left(1 - \frac{a_4}{a_2} \right) \bar{\beta}_1(v_1) + \bar{\beta}_2(v_1) + \bar{\beta}_3(v_1) \right)$
v_0	$\left(\left(1 - \frac{a_3}{a_2} \right) (\bar{\beta}_0(v_0) + \bar{\beta}_1(v_0)) + \bar{\beta}_2(v_0) \right) \left(\left(1 - \frac{a_4}{a_2} \right) (\bar{\beta}_0(v_0) + \bar{\beta}_1(v_0)) + \bar{\beta}_2(v_0) + \bar{\beta}_3(v_0) \right)$

W^P	Coefficient of $\delta_{Z_1}^H$ in $(\delta_{Z_2}^H)^2$
unweighted	$\beta_1 + 2\beta_2 + \beta_3$
v_4	$\frac{a_3}{a_2} \left(\frac{a_4}{a_1} \bar{\beta}_1(v_4) + \left(\frac{a_4}{a_1} + \frac{a_4}{a_2} \right) \bar{\beta}_2(v_4) + \left(\frac{a_4}{a_1} + \frac{a_4}{a_2} - \frac{a_4}{a_3} \right) \bar{\beta}_3(v_4) \right)$
v_3	$\frac{a_3}{a_2} \left(\frac{a_4}{a_1} \bar{\beta}_1(v_3) + \left(\frac{a_4}{a_1} + \frac{a_4}{a_2} \right) \bar{\beta}_2(v_3) + \bar{\beta}_3(v_3) \right)$
v_2	$\frac{a_3}{a_2} \left(\frac{a_4}{a_1} \bar{\beta}_1(v_2) + \left(\frac{a_4}{a_3} + 1 \right) \bar{\beta}_2(v_2) + \bar{\beta}_3(v_2) \right)$
v_1	$\frac{a_3}{a_2} \left(\left(\frac{a_4}{a_3} - \frac{a_4}{a_2} + 1 \right) \bar{\beta}_1(v_1) + \left(\frac{a_4}{a_3} + 1 \right) \bar{\beta}_2(v_1) + \bar{\beta}_3(v_1) \right)$
v_0	$\frac{a_3}{a_2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{a_4}{a_1} - \frac{a_4}{a_2} + \frac{a_4}{a_3} \right) \bar{\beta}_0(v_0) + \left(1 - \frac{a_4}{a_2} + \frac{a_4}{a_3} \right) \bar{\beta}_1(v_0) + \left(1 + \frac{a_4}{a_3} \right) \bar{\beta}_2(v_0) + \frac{a_4}{a_3} \bar{\beta}_3(v_0) \right)$

We observe that for $x \geq v_2$, the coefficients of $\delta_{Z_2}^H$ and $\delta_{Z_1}^H$ are nonnegative at x . The coefficient of $\delta_{Z_2}^H$ is nonnegative at v_1 only if χ (which is still assumed antidominant) is highly singular—in fact, the entries of χ must satisfy $a_2 = a_3 = a_4$. In this case, $a_{\beta_2} = a_{\beta_3} = 0$, so $\bar{\beta}_i(v_1) = \beta_i$ for $i = 2, 3$, and we see that the weighted coefficient is the same as the non-weighted coefficient. In contrast, the coefficient of $\delta_{Z_1}^H$ is nonnegative at v_1 provided that $\frac{a_4}{a_3} - \frac{a_4}{a_2} + 1 \geq 0$. This is equivalent to the condition $\frac{1}{a_2} - \frac{1}{a_3} \leq \frac{1}{a_4}$. We see that there are antidominant regular χ such that the coefficient of $\delta_{Z_1}^H$ is nonnegative at v_1 .

5.2. Weighted Grassmannians. In this section, we discuss weighted Grassmannians from our point of view, and provide a dictionary to translate between our notation (GL) and that in Abe-Matsumura [1] (AM). In particular, we interpret the positivity statement in [1] precisely in terms of our parameters.

Let $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m$ denote the standard basis of \mathbf{C}^m . Set $G = \mathbf{C}^\times \times GL_m$, so $n = m - 1$ and $H = \mathbf{C}^{\times(m+1)}$. Let x_0, \dots, x_m denote the standard basis of the character group $\Lambda \cong \mathbf{Z}^{m+1}$ of H ; as in the previous section, we sometimes denote the element $\sum c_i x_i$ by (c_0, \dots, c_m) . The Weyl group $W \cong S_m$ acts on Λ ; if $w = (w_1 \dots w_m)$, then $wx_0 = x_0$, and $wx_i = x_{w_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Let $\lambda = (1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0) = x_0 + x_1 + \dots + x_k$. Let $P = \mathbf{C}^\times \times P_0$, where P_0 is the block upper triangular subgroup of GL_m with diagonal blocks of sizes k and $m - k$. We have $W_P = W_\lambda = S_k \times S_{m-k}$, and W^P is the set of permutations $w = (w_1, \dots, w_m)$ such that $w_1 > w_2 > \dots > w_k$ and $w_{k+1} > w_{k+2} > \dots > w_m$. Let $\binom{m}{k}$ denote the collection of k -element subsets of $\{1, \dots, m\}$. We identify W^P with $\binom{m}{k}$ by the map $I : w \mapsto \{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$. The covering relations in W^P are as follows. Let $\gamma = x_p - x_q$ where $p \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and $q \in \{k+1, \dots, m\}$. Then $w = vr_\gamma \prec_P v$ if and only if $v_p = v_q + 1$.

The group G acts transitively on the Grassmannian $Gr(k, m)$ of k -planes in \mathbf{C}^m , and P is the stabilizer of the plane spanned by the first k coordinate vectors $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k$, so $G/P \cong Gr(k, m)$. Under this isomorphism, the point wP corresponds to the plane spanned by $\varepsilon_{w_1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{w_k}$. For later use, we remark that if $P' = w_0 P w_0^{-1}$, then P' is the block lower triangular subgroup of GL_m with blocks of sizes $m - k$ and k . Since P' is the stabilizer of the plane spanned by the last k coordinate vectors, we can identify $Gr(k, m)$ with G/P' .

The map $G/P \rightarrow G/P'$, $gP \mapsto gw_0P'$, is an isomorphism compatible with the identifications of G/P and G/P' with $Gr(k, m)$.

Let $\chi = (a_0, \dots, a_m)$, where for every $w \in W^P$, we have

$$a_w = a_0 + a_{w(1)} + \dots + a_{w(k)} > 0, \quad (5.11)$$

so (3.1) is satisfied. Then χ is antidominant if and only if

$$a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_m. \quad (5.12)$$

The weighted Grassmannian is $wGr(k, m) = S \setminus Z$. If we take $\chi_0 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, then $S_0 \setminus Z \cong G/P \cong G_0/P_0 = Gr(k, m)$.

In this setting, the Chevalley formula takes a simple form. The only Schubert divisor corresponds to u_α , with $\alpha = \alpha_k = x_k - x_{k+1}$. We can take $\omega_\alpha = \lambda = x_0 + x_1 + \dots + x_k$. Then for any $v \in W$, we have $v\lambda = x_0 + x_{v_1} + \dots + x_{v_k}$. Similarly, $a_v = a_0 + a_{v_1} + \dots + a_{v_k}$. Taking $\gamma = x_p - x_q$ where $p \leq k$ and $q \geq k+1$, we have $\lambda \cdot \gamma^\vee = \omega_\alpha \cdot \gamma^\vee = 1$. Corollary 4.6 applies, so

$$\delta_{Z_{u_\alpha}}^H \delta_{Z_v}^H = \overline{w_0 \omega_\alpha}(v) \delta_{Z_v}^H + \frac{a_{w_0}}{a_v} \sum_{w \leq_P v} \delta_{Z_w}^H. \quad (5.13)$$

We remark that since there is only one Schubert divisor, Lemma 4.2 implies that $\delta_{Z_{u_\alpha}}^H = (w_0 \lambda) \delta_{Z_{w_0}}^H = w_0 \lambda$.

We now explain the relation between our notation (GL) and the notation of [1] (AM). Some of the notation of [1] is drawn from [29], where more explanation can be found. Abe and Matsumura parametrize Schubert varieties in $Gr(k, m)$ by $\lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k\} \in \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} m \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$. (Their use of the symbol λ bears no relation to ours; also, they work with $Gr(k, n)$, but we have changed their n to m to be consistent with this section.) Corresponding to $\lambda \in \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} m \\ k \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ there is a plane, which we denote here by F_λ , spanned by the coordinate vectors $\varepsilon_{\lambda_1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{\lambda_k}$. The B -orbit $B \cdot F_\lambda = \Omega_\lambda^0 \subset Gr(k, m)$ is a Schubert cell whose closure is the Schubert variety Ω_λ . In our notation, the point wP in $G/P \cong Gr(k, m)$ corresponds to the plane spanned by $\varepsilon_{w_1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{w_k}$. Therefore, our Y_w coincides with $\Omega_{I(w)}$. Note that although we view $Y_w = \overline{B \cdot wP} \subset G/P$, their terminology is consistent with the identification $\Omega_{I(w)} = \overline{B \cdot I(w)w_0P'} \subset G/P'$, where $P' = w_0Pw_0^{-1}$ as above. Thus, they denote by id the set $\{n-k+1, \dots, n\} = I(w_0)$, and by w_0 the set $\{1, \dots, k\} = I(k, \dots, 1, m, \dots, k+1)$.


We identify the larger torus H with $\mathbf{C}^* \times T_0$, while their torus is (in effect) $T_0 \times \mathbf{C}^*$. We have used $\chi = (a_0, \dots, a_n)$ to denote the cocharacter defining the torus S , whereas they are taking the quotient by a torus wD corresponding to a cocharacter (w_1, \dots, w_n, a) (their w does not denote an element of W). In our notation, their cocharacter corresponds to $a_0 = a$ and $a_i = w_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

This correspondence can be continued. In Table 1, we record a list of notations from this paper, along with the corresponding notation from [1]. In this table, $\lambda = I(w)$. In this table, the d_{uv}^w are as in (4.12), i.e., the structure constants with regard to the basis $\delta_{Z_w}^H$. Observe that the weighted root wu_α of [1] corresponds to our $\overline{\alpha}(w_0)$, so our positivity statement recovers theirs. Similarly, the Pieri-Chevalley formula (5.13) can be seen to recover their Proposition 5.2.

TABLE 1. A dictionary to [1]

GL	AM
H	K
$\chi = (a_0, \dots, a_m)$	$\rho = (a, w_1, \dots, w_m)$
S	wD
T	T_w
Z	$aPl(d, m)^\times$
X	$wGr(d, m)$
$w \in W^P$	$\lambda \in \begin{Bmatrix} m \\ d \end{Bmatrix}$
$w_0 \in W^P$	$id \in \begin{Bmatrix} m \\ d \end{Bmatrix}$
a_w	w_λ
$Y_{w_0} = G/P$	$\Omega_{id} = G/P'$
$Y_w = \overline{BwP}/P$	$\Omega_\lambda = \overline{B \cdot I(w)w_0P'}/P'$
P/P	$\Omega_{(1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)}$
Z_w	$a\Omega_\lambda$
X_w	$w\Omega_\lambda$
$\delta_{Z_w}^H$	$\tilde{S}_\lambda = a\tilde{S}_\lambda = w\tilde{S}_\lambda$
$\delta_{Z_{u_\alpha}}^H = w_0\lambda$	$a\tilde{S}_{div}$
d_{uv}^w	$w\tilde{c}_{\lambda\mu}^\nu$
$S(\mathbb{H}^*)$	$\mathbf{Q}[z, y_1, \dots, y_m]$
$S(\mathbb{T}^*)$	$\mathbf{Q}[y_1^w, \dots, y_m^w]$
$\alpha = x_i - x_j$	$u_\alpha = y_i - y_j$
$\bar{\alpha}(w_0)$	wu_α
$\bar{\alpha}_i(w_0)$	wu_i

We conclude this section by looking more closely at the case where $m = 4$ and $k = 2$. Identifying W^P with $\begin{Bmatrix} 4 \\ 2 \end{Bmatrix}$, we can depict (W^P, \leq) as



The maximal element is $w_0 = \{3, 4\}$. As above, let $\{x_0, \dots, x_4\}$ denote the standard basis of \mathbb{H}^* , and let $y_i = x_i | \ker \lambda \in \mathbb{H}_\lambda^*$. We have $\lambda = x_0 + x_1 + x_2$, and $S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*) = \mathbf{F}[y_0, \dots, y_4] / \langle y_0 + y_1 + y_2 \rangle$. Thus, $y_0 = -(y_1 + y_2)$, and $S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W^P} \cong \mathbf{F}[y_1 + y_2, y_3 + y_4]$. We have $S(\mathbb{H}^*) =$

$\mathbf{F}[x_0, \dots, x_4]$ and $S(\mathbb{H}^*)^W = \mathbf{F}[x_0, e_1, \dots, e_4]$, where e_i is the i -th elementary symmetric function in x_1, \dots, x_4 . The map $\mathbb{H}_\lambda/W^\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{H}/W$ is not injective (for example, the points $W_\lambda(0, 0, 0, -1, 1)$ and $W_\lambda(0, -1, 1, 0, 0)$ are distinct in $W_\lambda \backslash \mathbb{H}_\lambda$, but map to the same element in \mathbb{H}/W). Hence $S(\mathbb{H}^*)^W \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W_P}$ is not surjective, so Lemma (5.1) does not apply.

The table below gives formulas for the classes $\delta_{Z_w}^H$. For simplicity, we write simply $Z_{\{a,b\}}$ for the class $\delta_{Z_{\{a,b\}}}^H$.

Class in $H_H^*(Z)$	Formula in $S(\mathbb{H}^*) \otimes_{S(\mathbb{H}^*)^W} S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W_\lambda}$
$Z_{\{3,4\}}$	1
$Z_{\{2,4\}}$	$w_{\{3,4\}}\lambda = x_0 + x_3 + x_4$
$Z_{\{1,4\}}$	$(x_0 + x_2)(x_0 + x_3 + x_4) + x_3x_4 - y_1y_2$
$Z_{\{2,3\}}$	$(x_4 - y_1)(x_4 - y_2)$
$Z_{\{1,3\}}$	$(x_0 + x_2 + x_3)(x_4 - y_1)(x_4 - y_2)$
$Z_{\{1,2\}}$	$(x_3 - y_1)(x_4 - y_1)(x_3 - y_2)(x_4 - y_2)$

5.3. A Weighted Lagrangian. Let $G = \mathbf{C}^\times \times Sp(4)$, where $Sp(4)$ is the subgroup of $GL(2)$ preserving the symplectic form ω on \mathbf{C}^4 corresponding to the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -I & 0 \end{bmatrix}$; here I is the 2×2 identity matrix. Let $H = \mathbf{C}^* \times T_0$, where T_0 is the set of diagonal matrices in $Sp(4)$. In the notation of Section 3.1, we have $m = n = 2$. Let x_0, x_1, x_2 denote the standard basis of \mathbb{H}^* , and write (c_0, c_1, c_2) for $\sum c_i x_i$. The root system Φ is of type C_2 and is described, for example, in [24]. We take as simple roots $\alpha_1 = (0, 1, -1)$ and $\alpha_2 = (0, 0, 2)$, with corresponding coroots $\alpha_1^\vee = (0, 1, -1)$ and $\alpha_2^\vee = (0, 0, 1)$. The set of dominant characters is $\Lambda^+ = \{\lambda = (c_0, c_1, c_2) \in \Lambda \mid c_1 \geq c_2 \geq 0\}$. The Weyl group W is identified with the set of signed permutations on 2 elements. Let $P = \mathbf{C}^* \times P_0$, where $P_0 \subset Sp(4)$ is the stabilizer of the Lagrangian 2-plane in \mathbf{C}^4 spanned by the first 2 coordinate vectors. Then $Y = G/P = LG(2, 4)$, the Grassmannian of Lagrangian 2-planes in \mathbf{C}^4 . We have $W_P = \{1, r_{\alpha_1}\} \cong S_2$. Following the notation of [8] for signed permutations, we write \bar{a} for $-a$. We have $W^P = \{w_0, w_1, w_2, w_3\}$, where $w_0 = (\bar{1}, \bar{2})$, $w_1 = (\bar{1}, 2)$, $w_2 = (\bar{2}, 1)$, $w_3 = (2, 1)$. If we write $Y_k = Y_{w_k}$, then the Schubert variety Y_k has codimension k in Y . Let $\lambda = (1, 1, 1) = \omega_{\alpha_2} \in \Lambda^+$. If $w \in W$, then $wx_0 = x_0$, and $wx_i = x_{w(i)}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Let $\chi = (a_0, a_1, a_2)$; then $a_w = a_0 + a_{w(1)} + a_{w(2)}$; we assume χ is antidominant. In these formulas, our convention is that $x_{\bar{k}} = -x_k$ and $a_{\bar{k}} = -a_k$.

Let y_i denote the restriction of x_i to \mathbb{H}_λ , so $y_0 + y_1 + y_2 = 0$, and $S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*) = \mathbf{F}[y_0, y_1, y_2]/\langle y_0 + y_1 + y_2 \rangle \cong \mathbf{F}[y_1, y_2]$. Under this identification, the restriction homomorphism $S(\mathbb{H}^*) \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)$ satisfies $x_0 \mapsto -(y_1 + y_2)$, $x_i \mapsto y_i$ for $i \geq 1$. The induced homomorphism $S(\mathbb{H}^*)^W \rightarrow S(\mathbb{H}_\lambda^*)^{W_\lambda}$ is the corresponding map $\mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1^2 + x_2^2, x_1^2 x_2^2] \rightarrow \mathbf{F}[y_1 + y_2, y_1 y_2]$. This map is surjective, and one can show that the kernel is generated by $\prod w_i \lambda$. It follows that

$$H_H^*(Z) = \frac{\mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]}{\langle w_0 \lambda \cdot w_1 \lambda \cdot w_2 \lambda \cdot w_3 \lambda \rangle}. \quad (5.15)$$

The homomorphism $k^* : H_H^*(Z) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{w \in WP} S(\mathbb{H}_{w\lambda}^*)$ from (3.27) is the natural map from (5.15) to

$$\frac{\mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]}{\langle w_0\lambda \rangle} \oplus \frac{\mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]}{\langle w_1\lambda \rangle} \oplus \frac{\mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]}{\langle w_2\lambda \rangle} \oplus \frac{\mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]}{\langle w_3\lambda \rangle}. \quad (5.16)$$

We claim that

$$\delta_{Z_3}^H = \frac{1}{2} w_2\lambda \ w_1\lambda \ w_0\lambda. \quad (5.17)$$

Since k^* is injective, it suffices to show that the left hand side and the right hand side have the same image under k_v^* for all $v \in W^P$. If $v \neq w_3$, then k_v^* takes both sides of (5.17) to 0, so it suffices to show that $k_{w_3}^* \delta_{Z_3}^H = \frac{1}{2} w_2\lambda \ w_1\lambda \ w_0\lambda$ in $\mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]/\langle w_3\lambda \rangle = \mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]/\langle \lambda \rangle$. Observe that $\psi_{w_3} : H_{T_0}^* \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{H}_{w_3\lambda}}^*$ takes $i_{w_3}^* \delta_{Y_3}^{T_0}$ to $k_{w_3}^* \delta_{Z_3}^H$. Since Y_3 is the B -fixed point in $Y = G/P$, $i_{w_3}^* \delta_{Y_3}^{T_0}$ is the product of the weights of $T_{eP}Y \cong \mathfrak{u}^-$, so

$$i_{w_3}^* \delta_{Y_3}^{T_0} = -\alpha_2 \cdot (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)(2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) = -4(x_1 + x_2)x_1x_2 \in H_{T_0}^* = \mathbf{F}[x_1, x_2].$$

The map $\psi_{w_3} : H_{T_0}^* \rightarrow H_{\mathbb{H}_{w_3\lambda}}^*$ takes this element to its image in $\mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]/\langle \lambda \rangle$. Hence, $k_{w_3}^* \delta_{Z_3}^H = -4(x_1 + x_2)x_1x_2 \in \mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]/\langle \lambda \rangle$. In $\mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]/\langle \lambda \rangle$, we have the relation $x_0 = -(x_1 + x_2)$, so in this ring, $w_2\lambda = x_0 + x_1 - x_2 = -2x_2$, $w_1\lambda = x_0 - x_1 + x_2 = -2x_1$, and $w_0\lambda = x_0 - x_1 - x_2 = -2(x_1 + x_2)$. The claim follows from these calculations.

Formulas for the remaining Schubert classes can be obtained using the formula $\partial_\alpha \delta_{Z_w} = \delta_{Z_{r_\alpha w}}$, where α is a simple root such that $w < r_\alpha w$. Here ∂_α denotes the divided difference operator acting on H_H^* , defined by the formula $\partial_\alpha f = \frac{r_\alpha f - f}{\alpha}$ for $f \in H_H^*$. The resulting formulas are recorded in the table below.

Class in $H_H^*(Z)$	Formula in $\mathbf{F}[x_0, x_1, x_2]/(\prod w_k\lambda)$
δ_{Z_0}	1
δ_{Z_1}	$w_0\lambda$
δ_{Z_2}	$\frac{1}{2} w_1\lambda \ w_0\lambda$
δ_{Z_3}	$\frac{1}{2} w_2\lambda \ w_1\lambda \ w_0\lambda$

Since $\lambda = x_0 + \omega_{\alpha_2}$, we can compute products with with the divisor class $\delta_{Z_1}^H = \delta_{Z_{w\alpha_2}}^H$ in terms of negative simple roots at w_0 using the version of the Chevalley formula given in Remark 4.7. We briefly describe the inputs to the calculation. We have

$$a_{w_0} = a_0 - a_1 - a_2, \quad a_{w_1} = a_0 - a_1 + a_2, \quad a_{w_2} = a_0 + a_1 - a_2, \quad a_{w_3} = a_0 + a_1 + a_2.$$

Let $c_i = \frac{a_{w_0}}{a_{w_i}}$. Because $w \mapsto a_w$ is an increasing positive function on W^P , we have $0 < c_0 \leq c_1 \leq c_2 \leq c_3$. The nonweighted case corresponds to $a_0 = 1$, $a_1 = a_2 = 0$, and then each $c_i = 1$.

Write $\beta_i = -\alpha_i$ for the negative simple roots, and $\bar{\beta}_i = \beta_i(w_0)$. In computing $\delta_{Z_1}^H \delta_{Z_i}^H$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$, there is only one root $\gamma = \gamma_i$ which occurs in the Chevalley formula; this root satisfies $w_i r_{\gamma_i} = w_{i+1}$. We have $\gamma_0 = 2x_2 = \alpha_2$; $\gamma_1 = x_1 + x_2 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$; and $\gamma_2 = 2x_1 = 2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. The corresponding coroots are $\gamma_0^\vee = x_2 = \alpha_2^\vee$, $\gamma_1^\vee = x_1 + x_2 = \alpha_1^\vee + 2\alpha_2^\vee$, and $\gamma_2^\vee = x_1 = \alpha_1^\vee + \alpha_2^\vee$. Hence $\omega_{\alpha_2} \cdot \gamma_0^\vee = \omega_{\alpha_2} \cdot \gamma_2^\vee = 1$ and $\omega_{\alpha_2} \cdot \gamma_1^\vee = 2$. Using these inputs, the Chevalley formula yields the following table of products (we omit the product with $\delta_{Z_0}^H$, which is the identity

element).

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{Z_1}^H \delta_{Z_1}^H &= c_1 (\bar{\beta}_2 \delta_{Z_1}^H + 2\delta_{Z_2}^H) \\ \delta_{Z_1}^H \delta_{Z_2}^H &= c_2 ((2\bar{\beta}_1 + \bar{\beta}_2) \delta_{Z_2}^H + \delta_{Z_3}^H) \\ \delta_{Z_1}^H \delta_{Z_3}^H &= 2c_3 (\bar{\beta}_1 + \bar{\beta}_2) \delta_{Z_3}^H. \end{aligned}$$

Using this table, one can compute the other products $(\delta_{Z_2}^H)^2$, $\delta_{Z_2}^H \delta_{Z_3}^H$, and $(\delta_{Z_3}^H)^2$. For example,

$$(\delta_{Z_2}^H)^2 = \frac{c_2}{2} (2\bar{\beta}_1 + \bar{\beta}_2) \left[\frac{2c_2}{c_1} \beta_1 + \left(\frac{c_2}{c_1} - 1 \right) \bar{\beta}_2 \right] \delta_{Z_2}^H + \frac{c_2}{2c_1} [2(c_2 + c_3) \bar{\beta}_1 + (c_2 + 2c_3 - c_1) \bar{\beta}_2] \delta_{Z_3}^H.$$

The non-weighted products are recovered by taking each $c_i = 1$ and $\bar{\beta}_i = \beta_i$.

The formulas for the products $\delta_{X_i}^T \delta_{X_j}^T$ can be obtained from the corresponding H -equivariant product formulas by inserting appropriate factors involving q_{w_i} . We will not write down the general formulas, but as an example, we provide the following table recording the q_{w_i} for a few χ : the entry (a_0, a_1, a_2) is the cocharacter χ , and below are the corresponding q_{w_i} .

$w \in W^P$	$(8, -1, -1)$	$(3, -1, 0)$	$(11, -4, 3)$
w_0	1	1	1
w_1	1	1	1
w_2	1	2	2
w_3	3	2	4

REFERENCES

- [1] Hiraku Abe and Tomoo Matsumura, *Equivariant cohomology of weighted Grassmannians and weighted Schubert classes*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **9** (2015), 2499–2524.
- [2] H. H. Andersen, J. C. Jantzen, and W. Soergel, *Representations of quantum groups at a p th root of unity and of semisimple groups in characteristic p : independence of p* , Astérisque **220** (1994), 321.
- [3] David Anderson and William Fulton, *Equivariant cohomology in algebraic geometry*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 210, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2024.
- [4] Enrique Artal Bartolo, Jorge Martín-Morales, and Jorge Ortigas-Galindo, *Cartier and Weil divisors on varieties with quotient singularities*, Internat. J. Math. **25** (2014), no. 11, 1450100, 20.
- [5] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald, *Introduction to commutative algebra*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont., 1969.
- [6] Haniya Azam, Shaheen Nazir, and Muhammad Imran Qureshi, *The equivariant cohomology of weighted flag orbifolds*, Math. Z. **294** (2020), no. 3-4, 881–900.
- [7] Sara C. Billey, *Kostant polynomials and the cohomology ring for G/B* , Duke Math. J. **96** (1999), no. 1, 205–224.
- [8] Brian D. Boe and William Graham, *A lookup conjecture for rational smoothness*, Amer. J. Math. **125** (2003), no. 2, 317–356.
- [9] Walter Borho and Robert MacPherson, *Partial resolutions of nilpotent varieties*, Analysis and topology on singular spaces, II, III (Luminy, 1981), 1983, pp. 23–74.
- [10] M. Brion, *Equivariant Chow groups for torus actions*, Transform. Groups **2** (1997), no. 3, 225–267.
- [11] James B. Carrell, *The Bruhat graph of a Coxeter group, a conjecture of Deodhar, and rational smoothness of Schubert varieties*, Algebraic groups and their generalizations: classical methods (University Park, PA, 1991), 1994, pp. 53–61.
- [12] ———, *On the smooth points of a Schubert variety*, Representations of groups (Banff, AB, 1994), 1995, pp. 15–33.

- [13] Alessio Corti and Miles Reid, *Weighted Grassmannians*, Algebraic geometry, 2002, pp. 141–163.
- [14] David A. Cox, John B. Little, and Henry K. Schenck, *Toric varieties*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 124, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.
- [15] Vinay V. Deodhar, *Some characterizations of Bruhat ordering on a Coxeter group and determination of the relative Möbius function*, Invent. Math. **39** (1977), no. 2, 187–198.
- [16] J. J. Duistermaat and G. J. Heckman, *On the variation in the cohomology of the symplectic form of the reduced phase space*, Invent. Math. **69** (1982), no. 2, 259–268.
- [17] Dan Edidin and William Graham, *Equivariant intersection theory*, Invent. Math. **131** (1998), no. 3, 595–634.
- [18] William Fulton, *Young tableaux*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 35, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997. With applications to representation theory and geometry.
- [19] ———, *Intersection theory*, Second, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], vol. 2, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [20] Mark Goresky, Robert Kottwitz, and Robert MacPherson, *Equivariant cohomology, Koszul duality, and the localization theorem*, Invent. Math. **131** (1998), no. 1, 25–83.
- [21] Mark Goresky and Robert MacPherson, *Intersection homology. II*, Invent. Math. **72** (1983), no. 1, 77–129.
- [22] William Graham, *Positivity in equivariant Schubert calculus*, Duke Math. J. **109** (2001), no. 3, 599–614.
- [23] William Graham and Victor Kreiman, *Excited Young diagrams, equivariant K-theory, and Schubert varieties*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), no. 9, 6597–6645.
- [24] James E. Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 9, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1978. Second printing, revised.
- [25] Jens Carsten Jantzen, *Representations of algebraic groups*, Second, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 107, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.
- [26] ———, *Nilpotent orbits in representation theory*, Lie theory, 2004, pp. 1–211.
- [27] Tetsuro Kawasaki, *Cohomology of twisted projective spaces and lens complexes*, Math. Ann. **206** (1973), 243–248.
- [28] Seán Keel and Shigefumi Mori, *Quotients by groupoids*, Ann. of Math. (2) **145** (1997), no. 1, 193–213.
- [29] Allen Knutson and Terence Tao, *Puzzles and (equivariant) cohomology of Grassmannians*, Duke Math. J. **119** (2003), no. 2, 221–260.
- [30] János Kollár, *Quotient spaces modulo algebraic groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **145** (1997), no. 1, 33–79.
- [31] János Kollár and Shigefumi Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 134, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. With the collaboration of C. H. Clemens and A. Corti, Translated from the 1998 Japanese original.
- [32] Shrawan Kumar, *The nil Hecke ring and singularity of Schubert varieties*, Invent. Math. **123** (1996), no. 3, 471–506.
- [33] Shigeru Mukai, *An introduction to invariants and moduli*, Japanese, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 81, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.
- [34] D. Mumford, J. Fogarty, and F. Kirwan, *Geometric invariant theory*, Third, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (2) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (2)], vol. 34, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA 30602

Email address: wag@uga.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA 30602

Email address: Scott.Larson@uga.edu