

SIGNED POSET POLYTOPES

MATTHIAS BECK AND MAX HLAVACEK

ABSTRACT. Stanley introduced in 1986 the order polytope and the chain polytope for a given finite poset. These polytopes contain much information about the poset and have given rise to important examples in polyhedral geometry. In 1993, Reiner introduced signed posets as natural type-B analogues of posets. We define and study signed order and chain polytopes. Our results include convex-hull and halfspace descriptions, unimodular triangulations, Ehrhart h^* -polynomials and their relations to signed permutation statistics, and a Gorenstein characterization of signed order and chain polytopes.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the seminal paper [8], Stanley introduced two geometric incarnations of a given finite partially ordered set (*poset*) Π :

Definition 1.1. The *order polytope* of Π is given by

$$\mathcal{O}(\Pi) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^\Pi : 0 \leq x_p \leq 1 \text{ for all } p \in \Pi \text{ and } x_a \leq x_b \text{ when } a \leq_\Pi b\}.$$

Definition 1.2. The *chain polytope* of Π is given by

$$\mathcal{C}(\Pi) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^\Pi : x_p \geq 0 \text{ for all } p \in \Pi \text{ and } x_{c_1} + \dots + x_{c_k} \leq 1 \text{ for every chain } c_1 <_\Pi \dots <_\Pi c_k\}.$$

There is also a natural unbounded conical analogue of an order polytope:

Definition 1.3. The *order cone* of Π is given by

$$\mathcal{H}(\Pi) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^\Pi : 0 \leq x_p \text{ for all } p \in \Pi \text{ and } x_a \leq x_b \text{ when } a \leq_\Pi b\}.$$

These polyhedra contain much information of the given poset, e.g., about its filters, chains, and linear extensions. Conversely, order polytopes (and, to a lesser extent, chain polytopes) have given a fertile ground in polyhedral and discrete geometry as a class of 0/1-polytopes with many, sometimes extreme, at other times only conjectured, properties; see, e.g., [2, Chapter 6].

It is a short step (which we will detail in Section 2 below) to think about a given partial order on $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ as a certain subset of the type- A root system $A_n := \{e_i - e_j : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$, where e_j is the j th unit vector in \mathbb{R}^n . Here we need the following notion of the positive linear closure of a subset of a root system:

Definition 1.4. Let Φ be a root system. For a subset $S \subset \Phi$, let $\overline{S}^{\text{PLC}}$ be the set of positive linear combinations of elements in S .

In [6], Reiner generalised the Coxeter description of a classical poset to type B and named these objects *signed posets*.

Definition 1.5. Let B_n be the root system $\{\pm e_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{\pm e_i \pm e_j : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$. A signed poset P (on n elements) is a subset $P \subset B_n$ satisfying

Date: 7 November 2023.

Key words and phrases. Order polytope, order cone, chain polytope, signed poset, h^* -polynomial, Gorenstein polytope, P -partition.

- (1) $\alpha \in P$ implies $-\alpha \notin P$;
- (2) $\bar{P}^{\text{PLC}} = P$.

Reiner proved several type- B analogues of classical posets results, e.g., on order ideals, permutation statistics, and P -partitions. While [6] has given rise to further work in algebraic combinatorics, the analogous polyhedral constructions seem to not have been introduced/studied. (An exception of sorts is [10], and we indicate its relation to the present article below.) Our goal is to remedy this situation and explore the geometry of signed posets. We define order polytopes and order cones for signed posets, modeled after the Coxeter-group descriptions of these objects for classical posets.

Definition 1.6. Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. Then

$$\mathcal{K}_P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in P\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}_P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in P\} \cap [-1, 1]^n.$$

In Section 2 we give detailed connections between (signed) posets, Coxeter groups, bidirected graphs, permutation statistics, and the resulting polyhedral objects. Section 3 contains convex-hull and halfspace description of signed order polytopes, as well as canonical triangulations. In Section 4 we compute the Ehrhart h^* -polynomial of a signed polytope, encoding the integer-point structure in dilates of the polytope. Analogous to classical posets, this is related to permutation statistics (now of type B). Section 5 gives a characterization of signed order polytopes that are Gorenstein; as a consequence these polytopes have a symmetric and unimodal h^* -polynomial. Finally, in Section 6 we propose one definition of a signed chain polytope and study its properties, giving yet another new class of Gorenstein polytopes.

2. SIGNED POSETS, THEIR CONES, AND THEIR POLYTOPES

We start by detailing the interpretation of a poset in terms of type- A root systems, as introduced by Reiner [6].

Proposition 2.1. Let f be the following map from the set of posets on $[n]$ to subsets of A_n :

$$f(\Pi) := \{e_j - e_i : i <_{\Pi} j\}$$

Then f gives a bijection between partial orders of $[n]$ and subsets $P \subseteq A_n$ satisfying

- (1) $\alpha \in P$ implies $-\alpha \notin P$;
- (2) $\bar{P}^{\text{PLC}} = P$.

The first property comes from the antisymmetry property of a poset, and the second from the transitivity property.

Remark. In several works, including [6], the map from posets to subsets of A_n is defined as $f(\Pi) = \{e_i - e_j : i <_{\Pi} j\}$. We switched the direction of the inequality to make our upcoming description of order cones consistent with the description of P -partitions found in [6].

Classically-defined order cones and order polytopes can be reformulated via the Coxeter group description of the poset. Let Π be a poset and recall that $f(\Pi) = \{e_j - e_i : i <_{\Pi} j\}$. Then

$$\mathcal{K}(\Pi) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\Pi} : \langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in f(\Pi)\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}(\Pi) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\Pi} : \langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in f(\Pi)\} \cap [0, 1]^{\Pi}.$$

We often visually view signed posets as bi-directed graphs, using the definitions found in [11].

Definition 2.2. Let $\Gamma = (V, E)$ be a graph. The *incidence set* $I(\Gamma)$ of Γ consists of all pairs (e, v) for $v \in e$.

Definition 2.3. A *bidirected graph* is a graph Γ together with a *bidirection* σ , which is defined as any map $I(\Gamma) \rightarrow \{+, -\}$.

We view a signed poset P on $[n]$ as a bidirected graph with vertex set $[n]$: the elements of P are the edges of the bidirected graph, and the bidirection σ is defined so that

- e_j corresponds to a loop e on j with $\sigma(e, j) = +$,
- $-e_j$ corresponds to a loop e on j with $\sigma(e, j) = -$,
- $e_i + e_j$ corresponds to an edge $e = ij$ with $\sigma(e, i) = \sigma(e, j) = +$,
- $-e_i - e_j$ corresponds to an edge $e = ij$ with $\sigma(e, i) = \sigma(e, j) = -$,
- $e_i - e_j$ corresponds to an edge $e = ij$ with $\sigma(e, i) = +$ and $\sigma(e, j) = -$, and
- $-e_i + e_j$ corresponds to an edge $e = ij$ with $\sigma(e, i) = -$ and $\sigma(e, j) = +$.

Example 2.4. The left image in Figure 1 shows a bidirected graph representing the signed poset $P = \{e_1 + e_2, -e_1 + e_2, e_2\}$. A discussion in [6, p. 329] states that every signed poset has a unique minimal representation, i.e., a minimal subset whose positive linear closure is the whole signed poset. However, finding this minimal representation is not as straightforward as finding the cover relations of a classical poset. The minimal representation of P is shown in the right image in Figure 1.




FIGURE 1. The left hand side shows the bidirected graph representation of $P = \{-e_1 + e_2, e_1 + e_2, e_2\}$. The right hand side indicates that the unique minimal representation of P is $\{-e_1 + e_2, e_1 + e_2\}$. Since $e_2 = \frac{1}{2}(-e_1 + e_2) + \frac{1}{2}(e_1 + e_2)$, we see that e_2 is in the positive linear closure of the other two elements, and thus is not in the minimal representation of P . This is indicated on the right hand side by using a dotted loop instead of a solid loop to represent e_2 .

Reiner also gave a notion of homomorphism of signed posets in [6]. Before we discuss this definition, we establish some facts and definitions pertaining to S_n^B , mostly following the notation set in [1].

Definition 2.5. A *signed permutation* on $[n]$ is a bijection ω on $\{\pm 1, \pm 2, \dots, \pm n\}$ such that $\omega(-i) = -\omega(i)$ for all $i \in [n]$. We refer to the group of all such bijections as S_n^B , the signed permutation group on $[n]$, where the group operation is composition.

We will use one-line notation for an element $\omega \in S_n^B$; later we will also use the notation $\omega = (\pi, \varepsilon)$ where $\pi \in S_n$ is defined by $\pi_i := |\omega(i)|$ and $\varepsilon \in \{1, -1\}^n$ is defined via $\varepsilon_i := \text{sign}(\omega(i))$. We will also use the following fact.

Proposition 2.6. *The set $\{s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}, s_0\}$ generates S_n^B , where $s_i := [1, \dots, i-1, i+1, i, \dots, n]$ for $i \in [n-1]$ and $s_0 := [-1, 2, \dots, n]$*

The elements of S_n^B have a natural action on the type- B root system.

Definition 2.7. The elements of S_n^B have a linear action on B_n generated as follows, where $i, j \in [n]$. If $\omega(i) = j$, then $\omega e_i = e_j$. If $\omega(i) = -j$, then $\omega e_i = -e_j$.

Definition 2.8. Let P_1 and P_2 be signed posets on $[n]$. Then P_1 and P_2 are *isomorphic* if there exists $\omega \in S_n^B$ such that $\omega P_1 = P_2$.

Example 2.9. We see from Figure 2 that there are many more combinatorial types of order polytopes in the signed poset setting than in the classical poset setting, even in two dimensions. The order polytopes shown come from the following signed posets:

- (A) $P = \{e_1, e_2\}$
- (B) $P = \{\}$
- (C) $P = \{e_2\}$
- (D) $P = \{e_1 + e_2, -e_1 + e_2, e_1, e_2\}$
- (E) $P = \{-e_1 + e_2\}$
- (F) $P = \{-e_1 + e_2, e_1 + e_2, e_2\}$
- (G) $P = \{e_2, e_1 + e_2\}$

The polytope labeled (F) is the order polytope of the signed poset illustrated in Figure 1. Note that the supporting hyperplanes of this polytope are given by $x_2 = 1$ and $\langle \alpha, x \rangle = 0$, where α is an element of the unique minimal representation described in Example 1.6. We will generalize this observation below.




FIGURE 2. Some order polytopes for signed posets on two elements.

We note that our geometric constructions play nicely with Reiner's definition of signed poset isomorphism.

Definition 2.10. Two lattice polytopes Q and Q' are *unimodularly equivalent* if there is an affine lattice isomorphism of the ambient lattices mapping Q' onto Q .

Proposition 2.11. Suppose P and P' are isomorphic signed posets on $[n]$. Then \mathcal{O}_P and $\mathcal{O}_{P'}$ are unimodularly equivalent.

Proof. Since P' is isomorphic to P , then $P' = \omega P$ for some $\omega \in S_n^B$. By Proposition 2.6, it suffices to verify Proposition 2.11 for the cases in which ω is equal to the generators $s_i = [1, \dots, i-1, i+1, i, \dots, n]$, and $s_0 = [-1, 2, \dots, n]$.

Suppose $\omega = s_i$ for $i \in [n-1]$. Then

$$\mathcal{O}_P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in P\} \cap [-1, 1]^n$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}'_P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle s_i \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in P\} \cap [-1, 1]^n.$$

From this description, we see that the hyperplanes defining \mathcal{O}'_P are reflections of the hyperplanes defining \mathcal{O}_P about the hyperplane $x_i = x_{i+1}$ (since the cube $[-1, 1]^n$ is symmetric about this hyperplane). This is an affine lattice isomorphism, so \mathcal{O}_P and \mathcal{O}'_P are unimodularly equivalent.

Similarly, for $\omega = s_0$, the hyperplanes defining \mathcal{O}'_P are reflections of the hyperplanes defining \mathcal{O}_P about the hyperplane $x_1 = 0$, which is again an affine lattice isomorphism. \square

We note that the order cone of a classical poset is always pointed. This is not the case for order cones of signed posets. This makes it so that one cannot always write down a rational generating function for the integer point transform of such an order cone. However, we can construct a pointed cone encoding the same information by homogenizing the order polytope, defined below following, e.g., [2]. As is the case for classical posets, the order polytope is related to the order cone of a signed poset as follows:

Definition 2.12. Let Q be a polytope in \mathbb{R}^n . The *homogenization* of Q is given by

$$\text{Hom}(Q) := \{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \mathbf{x} \in tQ\}.$$

Proposition 2.13. For a signed poset P with n elements, $\text{hom}(\mathcal{O}_P) = K_{\hat{P}}$, where \hat{P} is given by $P \cup \{e_{n+1} \pm e_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$.

Proof. Both $\text{hom}(\mathcal{O}_P)$ and $K_{\hat{P}}$ are given by

$$\{(\mathbf{x}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : -t \leq x_i \leq t \text{ for all } i \in [n] \text{ and } \langle \alpha, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in P\}. \quad \square$$

We now show that \mathcal{K}_P (and thus \mathcal{O}_P) is full dimensional:

Proposition 2.14. Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. Then $\dim(\mathcal{K}_P) = n$.

Proof. We prove that we can construct a point $\phi : [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the interior of \mathcal{K}_P . We argue inductively on n . The base case $n = 1$ holds, since the order cone is either the non-negative ray, the non-positive ray, or \mathbb{R} .

Now suppose we have a signed poset P on $[n]$ with $n \geq 2$. Let P' be the signed poset on $[n-1]$ obtained from restricting P to the set $\{\pm e_i : 1 \leq i \leq n-1\} \cup \{\pm e_i \pm e_j : 1 \leq i < j \leq n-1\}$. By our inductive hypothesis, there exists a point $\phi' : [n-1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the interior of $\mathcal{K}_{P'}$. Our strategy is to show that we can extend ϕ' to a point ϕ in the interior of \mathcal{K}_P . We first let $\phi(i) = \phi'(i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. We now need to show that there exists a choice of $\phi(n)$ such that ϕ is in the interior of \mathcal{K}_P . To make the following equations easier to look at, let $\phi(n) = x$.

The only way in which there is no viable choice for x is if the hyperplanes defining \mathcal{K}_P together with the choice of ϕ' give rise to inequalities of the form $a < x < b$ for some $a \geq b$. We first list the ways that we could get a restriction of the form $x > a$:

- (i) Suppose $e_n - e_j \in P$ where $j \neq n$. Then $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_P^\circ$ implies $x > \phi(j)$.
- (ii) Suppose $e_n + e_j \in P$ where $j \neq n$. Then $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_P^\circ$ implies $x > -\phi(j)$.
- (iii) Suppose $e_n \in P$. Then $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_P^\circ$ implies $x > 0$.

We next list the ways that we could get a restriction of the form $x < b$.

- (iv) Suppose $-e_n + e_k \in P$ where $k \neq n$. Then $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_P^\circ$ implies $x < \phi(k)$.

(v) Suppose $-e_n - e_k \in P$ where $k \neq n$. Then $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_P^\circ$ implies $x < -\phi(k)$.

(vi) Suppose $-e_n \in P$. Then $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_P^\circ$ implies $x < 0$.

We now show that in all cases in which we have a restriction of the form $x < b$ and a restriction of the form $x > a$, we get that $a < b$. (And thus, there is a solution for x).

Case 1: We have situations (i) and (iv) above and thus the restriction $\phi(j) < x < \phi(k)$. Since $e_n - e_j, -e_n + e_k \in P$, we know that $e_k - e_j$ is in P and P' . Now $\phi' \in \mathcal{K}_P^{\prime\circ}$ implies $\phi(j) < \phi(k)$.

Case 2: We have situations (i) and (v), and thus $\phi(j) < x < -\phi(k)$. Since $e_n - e_j, -e_n - e_k \in P$, we know that $-e_j - e_k$ is in both P and P' . Since ϕ' was chosen to be in $\mathcal{K}_P^{\prime\circ}$, we have $\phi(j) < -\phi(k)$.

Case 3: We have the situations (i) and (vi) and thus $\phi(j) < x < 0$. Since $e_n - e_j, -e_n \in P$, we know that $-e_j \in P, P'$ and so $\phi(j) < 0$.

Cases 4–8: The arguments for the situations (ii) and (iv), (ii) and (v), (ii) and (vi), (iii) and (iv), (iii) and (v) are similar as the previous three cases.

Case 9: We have the situations (iii) and (vi). This would imply that $e_n, -e_n \in P$, which violates the asymmetry property of a signed poset.

Thus, in all viable cases it is possible to choose a value of $\phi(n)$ so that $\phi \in \mathcal{K}_{Pa}^\circ$. \square

The map $\phi(x)$ constructed above can be modified to give a signed permutation in the Jordan–Hölder set of P , which will be necessary below when we describe triangulations of \mathcal{K}_P .

Definition 2.15. Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. The *Jordan–Hölder set* $\text{JH}(P)$ of P is the set of signed permutations $\omega \in S_n^B$ such that ω is order-preserving, that is, $\langle \omega, \alpha \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in P$, where we think of ω as the point $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Remark. Reiner gives a definition of Jordan–Hölder set in [6] that is in the same spirit, but slightly different to the one here. He defines the Jordan–Hölder set of a signed poset P on $[n]$ as the set of all $\sigma \in B_n$ such that $\alpha \in \sigma B_n^+$ for all $\alpha \in P$. Here, B_n^+ refers to the set $\{e_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{e_i \pm e_j : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\}$, the *positive roots* of B_n . Our definition $\text{JH}(P)$ can be rewritten similarly, as the set of all $\sigma \in B_n$ such that $\alpha \in \sigma S$, where $S = \{e_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{e_i \pm e_j : 1 \leq j \leq i \leq n\}$. The difference between our definition and Reiner’s is analogous to the slight differences in our early definitions discussed in Remark 2.

To get from the point ϕ described in the proof of Proposition 2.13 to the corresponding signed permutation $\omega \in \text{JH}(P)$, do the following: Consider the coordinates of ϕ and determine which one has the highest absolute value. Replace this one with n or $-n$, corresponding to the sign of this coordinate. Repeat with the remaining coordinates, this time replacing with $n - 1$ or $-(n - 1)$. Repeat until you have replaced every coordinate. Call this point p . Then the corresponding signed permutation is the unique element of $\omega \in S_n^B$ such that $(\omega(1), \dots, \omega(n)) = p$.

We now introduce the idea of a naturally labeled signed poset, mimicking a similar notion for classical posets.

Definition 2.16. Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$, and let $\text{id} \in S_n^B$ be the identity element. We say P is *naturally labeled* if and only if $\text{id} \in \text{JH}(P)$.

Proposition 2.17. *Every signed poset is isomorphic to a naturally labeled signed poset.*

Proof. Let P be a signed poset. As a consequence of the proof of Proposition 2.14, there exists some $\omega \in \text{JH}(P)$. Consider $\omega^{-1}P$ which, by definition, is isomorphic to P . To show that $\text{id} \in \text{JH}(\omega^{-1}P)$, it suffices to show that $\langle \text{id}, \omega^{-1}\alpha \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in P$.

For any α in the type- B root system and any $\omega \in S_n^B$, we have $\langle \text{id}, \omega^{-1}\alpha \rangle = \langle \omega, \alpha \rangle$. This can be shown by noting that $\langle \text{id}, \omega^{-1}e_i \rangle = \langle \omega, e_i \rangle = \omega(i)$ and then using linearity.

Thus, for any $\alpha \in P$, $\langle \text{id}, \omega^{-1}\alpha \rangle = \langle \omega, \alpha \rangle \geq 0$, since $\omega \in \text{JH}(P)$. \square

3. ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTIONS OF \mathcal{H}_P AND \mathcal{O}_P

We now discuss a few other descriptions of the order cones and polytopes of signed posets. Definition 1.6 gives a hyperplane description of \mathcal{O}_P and \mathcal{H}_P , but this hyperplane description may be redundant. This is also true for the definition of classical order polytopes and cones. The following proposition from [8] gives an irredundant representation for the order polytopes of classical posets.

Proposition 3.1 (Stanley [8]). *Let Π be a classical poset. Then, an irredundant representation of $\mathcal{O}(\Pi)$ is given by*

$$\mathcal{O}(\Pi) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^\Pi : \begin{array}{ll} x_a \leq x_b & \text{if } a < b \\ x_a \geq 0 & \text{if } a \text{ is a minimal element} \\ x_a \leq 1 & \text{if } a \text{ is a maximal element} \end{array} \right\},$$

where $a <_\Pi b$ means that $a \leq_\Pi b$ is a cover relation in Π .

As hinted in Example 2.9, we can give a similar irredundant hyperplane representation for order polytopes of signed posets. First, we need a few propositions and definitions. The next proposition from [6] was briefly described earlier in Example 2.4.

Proposition 3.2 (Reiner [6]). *Let P be a signed poset. Then there exists a unique minimal subset of P , called the minimal representation of P and denoted $\text{minrep}(P)$, such that*

$$\overline{\text{minrep}(P)}^{\text{PLC}} = P.$$

Note that the relations in $\text{minrep}(P)$ are analogous to the cover relations of a classical poset, since both give an irredundant description of the (signed) poset up to transitivity. We now give a definition for two types of maximal elements of a signed poset.

Definition 3.3. Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. We say $i \in [n]$ is a *positive maximal element* of P if and only if every relation adjacent to i is of the form e_i or $e_i \pm e_j$, i.e., the e_i portion of the adjacent relations is positive. We denote the set of positive maximal elements of P as $\text{pmax}(P)$. We say $i \in [n]$ is a *negative maximal element* of P if and only if every relation adjacent to i is of the form $-e_i$ or $-e_i \pm e_j$, i.e., the e_i portion of the adjacent relations is negative. We denote the set of negative maximal elements of P as $\text{nmax}(P)$.

We can now give an irredundant representation of \mathcal{O}_P .

Proposition 3.4. *Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. Then an irredundant representation of \mathcal{O}_P is given by*

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{O}_P = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{array}{ll} \langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0 & \text{if } \alpha \in \text{minrep}(P) \\ x_i \leq 1 & \text{if } i \in \text{pmax}(P) \\ x_i \geq -1 & \text{if } i \in \text{nmax}(P) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Proof. We first show that (1) does indeed describe \mathcal{O}_P . Since (1) consists of a subset of the inequalities listed in Definition 1.6, it suffices to show that each inequality in Definition 1.6 is implied by the inequalities listed in (1). First of all, each inequality of the form $\langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0$ for $\alpha \in P$ is implied by the inequalities of the form $\langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0$ for $\alpha \in \text{minrep}(P)$ from the definition of $\text{minrep}(P)$.

We now show that the inequalities $-1 \leq x_i \leq 1$ for all $i \in [n]$ are implied by the inequalities listed in the proposition. It suffices to show that for each $i \in [n]$, one of the following holds (to ensure that $x_i \leq 1$):

- (i) $i \in \text{pmax}(P)$,
- (ii) $-e_i \in P$, since $x_i \leq 0$ implies $x_i \leq 1$,
- (iii) $-e_i + e_p \in P$, where $p \in \text{pmax}(P)$,
- (iv) $-e_i - e_n \in P$, where $n \in \text{nmax}(P)$,

and one of the following holds (to ensure that $-1 \leq x_i$):

- (v) $i \in \text{nmax}(P)$,
- (vi) $e_i \in P$, since $x_i \geq 0$ implies $x_i \geq -1$,
- (vii) $e_i + e_p \in P$, where $p \in \text{pmax}(P)$,
- (viii) $e_i - e_n \in P$, where $n \in \text{nmax}(P)$.

We show by induction on n that this is always true. It is true for $n = 1$ since in that case one of (i) or (ii) must be true, and one of (v) or (vi) must be true.

Now, consider some $i \in P$, and let P' be the signed poset on $[n] - \{i\}$ with all relations adjacent to i removed (similarly as in the proof of Proposition 2.13). We first show that i satisfies (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv). Assume that i does not satisfy (i) or (ii), with the aim to show that i satisfies (iii) or (iv). By our assumptions, i must be adjacent to a relation of the form $-e_i + e_j$ or $-e_i - e_j$.

Case 1: Assume i is adjacent to a relation of the form $-e_i + e_j$. We know by our inductive hypothesis that within P' , j must satisfy (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv). We go through each of these subcases.

- Suppose j satisfies (i) and is thus an element of $\text{pmax}(P')$. We show that j is also an element of $\text{pmax}(P)$. The only obstruction to this is if $-e_i - e_j$ or $e_i - e_j$ are in P . However, $e_i - e_j$ cannot be in P since its opposite $-e_i + e_j$ was already assumed to be in P . Suppose $-e_i - e_j$ is in P . Then, by transitivity with $-e_i + e_j$, we have that $-e_i$ is in P which is not the case since we assumed i does not satisfy (ii). Thus, j is an element of $\text{pmax}(P)$, so i satisfies (iii).
- Now suppose j satisfies (ii), so $-e_j$ is an element of P' and thus P . However, by transitivity with $-e_i + e_j$, $-e_i$ is in P , which again is not possible by our assumptions.
- Now suppose j satisfies (iii). Then $-e_j + e_p$ is in P' and thus P , where p is in $\text{pmax}(P')$. We first note that by transitivity, $-e_i + e_p$ is in P . We now show that p is not only in $\text{pmax}(P')$, but also in $\text{pmax}(P)$. The only obstructions to this are if $-e_i - e_p$ or $e_i - e_p$ are in P . Note that $e_i - e_p$ cannot be in P since we already established that its opposite, $-e_i + e_p$, is in P . We also see that $-e_i - e_p$ cannot be in P since by transitivity then $-e_i$ would be in P , which we assumed was not the case. Thus, $p \in \text{pmax}(P)$ and so i satisfies (iii).
- Now suppose j satisfies (iv). Then $-e_j - e_n$ is in P' and thus P , for some n in $\text{nmax}(P')$. By transitivity, we see that $-e_i - e_n$ is in P . It suffices to show that n is not only in $\text{nmax}(P')$ but also in $\text{nmax}(P)$. The only obstructions to this are if $-e_i + e_n$ or $e_i + e_n$ are in P . We see that $e_i + e_n$ cannot be in P because we already established that its opposite $-e_i - e_n$ is. If $-e_i + e_n$ is in P , then by transitivity with $-e_i - e_n$, $-e_i$ is in P , which we assumed was not the case. So n is in $\text{nmax}(P)$ and thus i satisfies (iv).

Case 2: Assume i is adjacent to a relation of the form $-e_i - e_j$. We know by our inductive hypothesis that within P' , j must satisfy (v),(vi),(vii), and (viii). We go through each of these subcases and show that each case implies i satisfies (iii) or (iv).

- Suppose j satisfies (v) and thus is an element of $\text{nmax}(P')$. We show that j is also an element of $\text{nmax}(P)$. The only possible obstructions to this are $-e_i + e_j$ or $e_i + e_j$ being in P . We know its impossible for $e_i + e_j$ to be in P since its opposite is. If $-e_i + e_j$ were to be in P , then by transitivity $-e_i$ would be in P which we assumed was not the case much earlier. So j is an element of $\text{nmax}(P)$ and thus i satisfies (iv).
- Suppose j satisfies (vi) and thus e_j is in P' and thus P . However, by transitivity with $-e_i - e_j$ this implies that $-e_i$ is in P , which we earlier assumed was not the case.
- Suppose j satisfies (vii) and thus $e_j + e_p$ is in P , where $p \in \text{pmax}(P')$. By transitivity, we see that $-e_i + e_p \in P$. It suffices to show that p is in $\text{pmax}(P)$. Suppose not. Then either $e_i - e_p$ or $-e_i - e_p$ is in P . We see that $e_i - e_p$ cannot be in $\text{pmax}(P)$ since its opposite $-e_i + e_p$ was already shown to be in P . If $-e_i - e_p$ is in P , then by transitivity with $-e_i + e_p$ we get that $-e_i$ is in P , which we assumed much earlier not to be the case. Thus, p is in $\text{pmax}(P)$ and thus i satisfies (iii).

- Suppose j satisfies (viii) and $e_j - e_n$ is in P , where n is in $\text{nmax}(P')$. By transitivity, we know that $-e_i - e_n$ is in P . To show i satisfies (iv), it suffices to show that n is in $\text{nmax}(P)$. The only obstructions to this are $-e_i + e_n$ or $e_i + e_n$ being in P . We see that $e_i + e_n$ cannot be in P because we already established that its opposite is. Suppose that $-e_i + e_n$ is in P . Then by transitivity with $-e_i - e_n$, we know that $-e_i$ is in P , which we already assumed was not the case. Thus, n must be in $\text{nmax}P$ and so i satisfies (iv).

Thus, in all cases, (i) must satisfy at least one of (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv). The proof that the i must satisfy at least one of (v), (vi), (vii), or (viii) is similar.

We have thus shown that the given inequalities in this proposition do describe \mathcal{O}_P . We now argue that this set of inequalities is a minimal set describing \mathcal{O}_P . From the definition of $\text{minrep}(P)$, we see that we cannot remove any of the hyperplanes of the form $\langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0$ without changing \mathcal{O}_P . Now let $i \in \text{pmax}(P)$. All of the adjacent relations to i must be of the form $e_i - e_j$, $e_i + e_j$, or e_i . So all of restrictions on x_i coming from rest of the poset are of the form $x_i \geq x_j$, $x_i \geq -x_j$ and $x_i \geq 0$. No combination of these can imply $x_i \leq 1$, so this inequality is necessary in this description of \mathcal{O}_P . \square

In order to describe a convex hull description of \mathcal{O}_P , we first need the idea of filters. For classical posets, they are defined as follows, as appears in, e.g., [2].

Definition 3.5. Let Π be a classical poset. Then, a filter is a subset F of Π such that for $a \leq_{\Pi} b$, $a \in F$ implies $b \in F$.

The filters give a vertex description of K_{Π} through the following proposition, which again appeared in [8].

Proposition 3.6 (Stanley [8]). *The vertex set of $\mathcal{O}(\Pi)$ is the set of all e_F , where F is a filter of Π and $e_F : \Pi \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the point in \mathbb{R}^{Π} given by*

$$e_F(a) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \in F, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that the filters are exactly the points $x \in \{0, 1\}^{\Pi}$ such that $\langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in f(\Pi)$. (Recall that f is the map from a classical poset to its corresponding subset of the type- A root system). This observation allows for a similar definition for signed posets. The following definition appears in [6].

Definition 3.7. Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. Then $x \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^n$ is a *signed filter* of P if $\langle \alpha, x \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in P$.

Note that in [6], due to the earlier mentioned difference in convention (up to a sign) in defining the map from classical posets to subsets of the type- A root system, Reiner calls these objects signed order ideals instead of signed filters.

We can now give a convex hull description of \mathcal{O}_P .

Proposition 3.8. *Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$ and let F be the set of signed filters on P . Then $\mathcal{O}_P = \text{conv}(F)$.*

Remark. A signed filter may not necessarily be a vertex of \mathcal{O}_P (in contrast to classical order polytopes). For example $x = (0, \dots, 0)$ is always a signed filter of \mathcal{O}_P , but need not be a vertex (as seen in Figure 2).

Before we give the proof of this proposition, we need to discuss a specific unimodular triangulation of \mathcal{O}_P for any signed poset. Along the way, we discuss a way of dividing \mathbb{R}^n into cones indexed by elements of the signed permutation group S_n^B .

Definition 3.9. Consider a signed permutation $\sigma = (\pi, \varepsilon) \in S_n^B$. The simplicial cone associated with σ is

$$K_{\sigma} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 \leq \varepsilon_1 x_{\pi_1} \leq \dots \leq \varepsilon_n x_{\pi_n}\}.$$

These simplicial cones induce a triangulation on the $[-1, 1]^n$ cube, as described in [1, Proof of Theorem 6.9]. Each maximal face of this triangulation is of the form $\Delta_\sigma := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 \leq \varepsilon_1 x_{\pi_1} \leq \dots \leq \varepsilon_n x_{\pi_n} \leq 1\}$. Note that the defining hyperplanes of \mathcal{O}_P are a subset of the union of the set of hyperplanes defining the described triangulation of $[-1, 1]^n$. Thus, restricting this triangulation to \mathcal{O}_P gives a triangulation of \mathcal{O}_P . We will refer to this triangulation as \mathcal{T} . Later, we will use the fact the maximal faces \mathcal{T} are exactly the set Δ_σ , where $\sigma \in \text{JH}(P)$.

Now, we will use this triangulation to prove Proposition 3.8.

Proof. First, by definition, all the points in F are in \mathcal{O}_P , and thus the convex hull of F is in \mathcal{O}_P .

We now show that $\mathcal{O}_P \subseteq \text{conv}(F)$. Suppose we have some point $x \in \mathcal{O}_P$. Then, x must be in one of the full-dimensional simplices of \mathcal{T} , i.e., $x \in \Delta_\omega$ for some $\omega \in S_n^B$, and thus can be written as a convex combination of the vertices of Δ_ω . These vertices have entries of 0, 1, -1 , and thus are filters of P . \square

4. COMPUTING THE h^* -POLYNOMIAL OF \mathcal{O}_P

In 1962, for a lattice polytope $P \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, Ehrhart [4] introduced and proved polynomiality of the counting function $\text{ehr}_P(t) = |tP \cap \mathbb{Z}|$. Here the t^{th} dilate of P is $tP := \{tP \in \mathbb{R}^n : P \in P\}$.

Theorem 4.1. (*Ehrhart's Theorem*) *For any d -dimensional lattice polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, the quantity $\text{ehr}_P(t) = |tP \cap \mathbb{Z}^n|$ agrees with a polynomial of degree d .*

This *Ehrhart polynomial* can be seen as a discrete measure of volume. In general, the coefficients of the Ehrhart polynomial of a lattice polytope are rational numbers that can be negative. The generating series $\text{Ehr}(P; z)$ of a d -dimensional lattice polytope can be written as

$$\text{Ehr}(P; z) = 1 + \sum_{t \geq 1} \text{ehr}_P(t) z^t = \frac{h_0^* + h_1^* z + \dots + h_{d+1}^* z^d}{(1-z)^{d+1}}.$$

The numerator of this expression is called the h^* -polynomial of P and denoted $h^*(P; z)$. It can be helpful to view the information encoded by the Ehrhart polynomial in this form. For example, unlike the Ehrhart polynomial, the coefficients of the h^* -polynomial of a lattice polytope are always non-negative integers [7]. Thus, one area of research in Ehrhart theory is to give combinatorial interpretations of these coefficients for specific families of polytopes. For classical order polytopes, we can describe the h^* -polynomial in terms of permutation statistics in the following way, as outlined, e.g. in [2, Chapter 5]. The Jordan–Hölder set of a classical poset is defined similarly as for a signed poset.

Definition 4.2. Let Π be a classical poset on $[n]$. The Jordan–Hölder set of Π is the set of permutations $\omega \in S_n$ that are order-preserving, that is, $\langle \alpha, \omega \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in f(\Pi)$, where f is the map described in Proposition 2.1 and where we think of ω as the point $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 4.3. Let $\omega = \omega_1 \omega_2 \dots \omega_n \in S_n$. A *descent* is a position i such that $\omega_i > \omega_{i+1}$. The *descent set* of ω is $\text{Des}(\omega) := \{i : i \text{ is a descent of } \omega\}$, and the *descent statistic* of ω is $\text{des}(\omega) := |\text{Des}(\omega)|$.

See, for example, [9, Section 3.12] for a more complete discussion of permutation statistics and other equivalent definitions of the classical Jordan–Hölder set, relating for linear extensions of posets.

Proposition 4.4. *Let Π be a naturally labeled poset with Jordan–Hölder set $\text{JH}(\Pi) \subset S_n$. Then*

$$h_{O_\Pi}^*(z) = \sum_{\tau \in \text{JH}(\Pi)} z^{\text{des}(\tau)}.$$

In this section, we use the triangulation \mathcal{T} described in Section 3 to give an analogous description of the h^* -polynomial of \mathcal{O}_P in terms of statistics on the type- B permutation group S_n^B . We first introduce some background on half-open polytopes and half-open decompositions of polytopes. A more complete treatment

of this material can be found in [2, Chapter 5]. We first define what it means for a point to be beyond a face F of a polytope P in the special case in which F is a facet of P . For more generality, see [2, Chapter 3].

Definition 4.5. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a full-dimensional polytope, and let F be a facet of P with defining hyperplane $\langle a, x \rangle = b$ such that P lies in the half space $\langle a, x \rangle \leq b$. Then $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is *beyond* F if $\langle a, p \rangle > b$.

This concept of a point being beyond a facet is used to construct half-open polytopes.

Definition 4.6. Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a full-dimensional polytope with facets F_1, \dots, F_m . Let $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be generic relative to P , i.e., q does not lie on any facet-defining hyperplane of P . Then we define

$$\mathbb{H}_q P := P \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I} F_i,$$

where $I := \{i \in [m] : q \text{ beyond } F_i\}$. We call $\mathbb{H}_q P$ a *half-open polytope*.

Applying this construction to a triangulation of P allows us to write P as a disjoint union of half-open simplices.

Lemma 4.7 (see, e.g., [2]). *Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a full-dimensional polytope with dissection $P = P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \dots \cup P_m$. If $q \in P^\circ$ is generic relative to each P_j , then*

$$P = \mathbb{H}_q P_1 \uplus \mathbb{H}_q P_2 \uplus \dots \uplus \mathbb{H}_q P_m.$$

We can apply these results to the unimodular triangulation \mathcal{T} of \mathcal{O}_P described in the previous section in order to write \mathcal{O}_P as a disjoint union of half-open unimodular simplices. These simplices can be described in terms of the naturally ordered descent statistic of S_n^B . For more information about various statistics (including several definitions of the descent set) of B_n , see, e.g., [1].

Definition 4.8. For $\sigma \in S_n^B$, the *naturally ordered descent set* of σ is

$$\text{NatDes}(\sigma) := \{i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} : \sigma(i) > \sigma(i+1)\},$$

where we use the convention that $\sigma(0) = 0$. The *natural descent statistic* of σ is $\text{natdes}(\sigma) := |\text{NatDes}(\sigma)|$.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $\sigma = (\pi, \varepsilon) \in S_n^B$ and $p := (\frac{1}{n+1}, \frac{2}{n+1}, \dots, \frac{n}{n+1})$. Then*

$$\mathbb{H}_p \Delta_\sigma = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^\Pi : \begin{array}{ll} 0 \leq \varepsilon_1 x_{\pi_1} \leq \dots \leq \varepsilon_n x_{\pi_n} \leq 1 & \text{if } i \in \text{NatDes}(\sigma) \\ \varepsilon_i x_{\pi_i} < \varepsilon_{i+1} x_{\pi_{i+1}} & \\ 0 < \varepsilon_1 x_{\pi_1} & \text{if } 0 \in \text{NatDes}(\sigma) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Proof. We identify the facets of Δ_σ that are removed in the half-open polytope $\mathbb{H}_p \Delta_\sigma$, starting with the facets of the form $\varepsilon_i x_{\pi_i} = \varepsilon_{i+1} x_{\pi_{i+1}}$ for $i \in [n-1]$. These facets are removed when p is beyond the facet, which occurs exactly when $\varepsilon_i p_{\pi_i} > \varepsilon_{i+1} p_{\pi_{i+1}}$. Substituting our expressions for the coordinates of p yields

$$\varepsilon_i \frac{\pi_i}{n+1} > \varepsilon_{i+1} \frac{\pi_{i+1}}{n+1},$$

which simplifies to $\sigma(i) > \sigma(i+1)$. Thus, we see that a facet of Δ_σ of the form $\varepsilon_i x_{\pi_i} = \varepsilon_{i+1} x_{\pi_{i+1}}$ is removed exactly when $i \in \text{NatDes}(\sigma)$.

We now consider the facet given by $\varepsilon_1 x_{\pi_1} = 0$. We know that p is beyond this facet exactly when $\varepsilon_1 p_{\pi_1} < 0$. Since all the coordinates of p are positive, this holds exactly when $\varepsilon_1 < 0$, which coincides with the cases in which $0 \in \text{NatDes}(\sigma)$.

We finally consider the facet given by $\varepsilon_n x_{\pi_n} = 1$. Since $-1 \leq p_i \leq 1$ for any $i \in [n]$, we know that p is never beyond this facet. Thus, this facet is never removed in $\mathbb{H}_p \Delta_\sigma$. \square

A classical result (see, e.g., [2]) gives the h^* -polynomials of half-open unimodular simplices.

Lemma 4.10. *Let $\mathbb{H}_p\Delta$ be a unimodular half open simplex with k missing facets. Then, $h_{\mathbb{H}_p\Delta}^*(z) = z^k$.*

We can now describe the h^* -polynomial of \mathcal{O}_P for any naturally ordered signed poset P in terms of descent statistics in a statement analogous to Proposition 4.4.

Proposition 4.11. *Let P be a naturally labeled signed poset on $[n]$ with Jordan–Hölder set $\text{JH}(P) \subset B_n$. Then*

$$h_{\mathcal{O}_P}^*(z) = \sum_{\tau \in \text{JH}(P)} z^{\text{natdes}(\tau)}.$$

Proof. Since P is naturally labeled, we know that $p = (\frac{1}{n+1}, \dots, \frac{n}{n+1})$ is an interior point of \mathcal{O}_P . Thus, we can use the triangulation \mathcal{T} restricted to \mathcal{O}_P to decompose \mathcal{O}_P into a disjoint union of half-open simplices. Using Lemma 4.7 with respect to the point p and this triangulation, we obtain

$$\mathcal{O}_P = \bigsqcup_{\sigma \in \text{JH}(P)} \mathbb{H}_p\Delta_\sigma.$$

From Proposition 4.9, we know that $\mathbb{H}_p\Delta_\sigma$ is a unimodular half-open simplex with $\text{natdes}(\sigma)$ missing facets. From Lemma 4.10, we know that the h^* -polynomial of such an object is $z^{\text{natdes}(\sigma)}$. Since the h^* -polynomials of disjoint half-open polytopes are additive,

$$h_{\mathcal{O}_P}^*(z) = \sum_{\tau \in \text{JH}(P)} z^{\text{natdes}(\tau)}. \quad \square$$

Remark. This result gives a description of the h^* -polynomial only for naturally labeled signed posets. However, since unimodularly equivalent polytopes have identical h^* -polynomials, this encompasses all the unique h^* -polynomials corresponding to signed posets by Propositions 2.11 and 2.17.

5. WHICH SIGNED ORDER POLYTOPES ARE GORENSTEIN?

We now review a classification of Gorenstein order polytopes in the classical case and discuss how it extends to signed order polytopes.

Definition 5.1. A lattice polytope is *Gorenstein* if there exists a positive integer k such that $(k-1)P^\circ \cap \mathbb{Z}^d = \emptyset$, $|kP^\circ \cap \mathbb{Z}^d| = 1$, and $|tP^\circ \cap \mathbb{Z}^d| = |(t-k)P^\circ \cap \mathbb{Z}^d|$ for all integers $t > k$.

This is equivalent to the polytope having a symmetric h^* -vector. For classical posets, the following result is well known (see, e.g., [2]):

Proposition 5.2. *The order polytope of a poset P is Gorenstein if and only if P is graded (i.e., all maximal chains have the same length).*

In this section, we will develop an analogue of this result for signed posets; we begin with a representation of a signed poset on $[n]$ as a classical poset on $[2n+1]$ that satisfies certain properties, first introduced in [5].

Definition 5.3. Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. The *Fischer representation* $\hat{G}(P)$ is a poset on $[-n, n] = \{-n, -(n-1), \dots, -1, 0, 1, \dots, n-1, n\}$ whose relations are the transitive closure of the following:

$$\begin{array}{ll} i < j \text{ and } -j < -i & \text{for } -e_i + e_j \in P \\ i < -j \text{ and } j < -i & \text{for } -e_i - e_j \in P \\ -i < j \text{ and } -j < i & \text{for } e_i + e_j \in P \\ i < 0 \text{ and } 0 < -i & \text{for } -e_i \in P \\ -i < 0 \text{ and } 0 < i & \text{for } e_i \in P. \end{array}$$

Figure 3 shows an example of the bidirected graph representation and the Fischer representation of the same signed poset.




FIGURE 3. The left side shows the bidirected graph representation of $P := \{e_1, e_2, e_1 + e_2\}$ and the right side shows the Fischer representation of P .

Remark. This definition has all the inequalities reversed from Fischer's original definition to make this poset consistent with our definition of signed order polytopes.

The following proposition from [5] classifies exactly when a poset on $[-n, n]$ equals $\hat{G}(P)$ for some signed poset P on $[n]$.

Proposition 5.4. *A poset on $[-n, n]$ is $\hat{G}(P)$ for some signed poset P if and only if*

- $i < j$ if and only if $-j < -i$ for all $i, j \in [-n, n]$;
- if $-i < i$ then $-i < 0 < i$ for all $i \in [-n, n]$.

Next, we establish how we can view the previously defined signed order polytopes through this lens.

Proposition 5.5. *Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. Define a polytope $\mathcal{O}_{\hat{G}(P)} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ via the following inequalities:*

- $-1 \leq x_i \leq 1$ for all $i \in [n]$;
- $-x_i \leq x_j$ for all $-i \leq j$, where $i, j \in [n]$;
- $x_i \leq -x_j$ for all $i \leq -j$, where $i, j \in [n]$;
- $x_i \leq x_j$ for all $i \leq j$ where $i, j \in [n]$;
- $x_i \geq 0$ for all $i \geq 0$ where $i \in [n]$;
- $x_i \leq 0$ for all $i \leq 0$ where $i \in [n]$.

(Note that some of these inequalities will be equivalent to each other.) Then $\mathcal{O}_P = \mathcal{O}_{\hat{G}(P)}$.

Proof. Starting with a signed poset P , constructing \mathcal{O}_P and $\mathcal{O}_{\hat{G}(P)}$ yields polytopes defined by exactly the same set of inequalities. \square

We can now give the following analogue to Proposition 5.2.

Proposition 5.6. *Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. The signed order polytope \mathcal{O}_P is Gorenstein if and only if $\hat{G}(P)$ is graded.*

Proof. Suppose $\hat{G}(P)$ is graded. We first briefly establish some facts about its maximal chains. The element 0 must be in one of the maximal chains; consider the part of the chain $0 < c_1 \cdots < c_k$. Because of Proposition 5.4, the chain $-c_k < \cdots < -c_1 < 0$ must also exist in $\hat{G}(P)$, and when extended into a maximal chain must not contain any other elements below 0, otherwise $0 < c_1 \cdots < c_k$ could be similarly extended. Thus, $-c_k < -c_{k-1} < \cdots < -c_1 < 0 < c_1 < \cdots < c_{k-1} < c_k$ is a maximal chain. Thus, all maximal chains in $\hat{G}(P)$ are of the same even length.

Suppose $\hat{G}(P)$ is graded with maximal chains of length $2k - 2$ and rank function $\rho : \hat{G}(P) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. We show that \mathcal{O}_P is Gorenstein of degree k . We first verify that $(k - 1)\mathcal{O}_P$ has no interior points. Consider a maximal chain $c_{-(k-1)} < c_{-(k-2)} < \cdots < c_0 < \cdots < c_{k-2} < c_{k-1}$ of $\hat{G}(P)$. In order for a point q to be in the interior

of $(k-1)\mathcal{O}_P$, by Proposition 5.5, q must satisfy $-(k-1) < q_{c_{-(k-1)}} < q_{c_{-(k-2)}} < \dots < q_{c_0} < \dots < q_{c_{k-2}} < q_{c_{k-1}} < k-1$. This is not possible, since there are not $2k-1$ distinct integers between $-(k-1)$ and $(k-1)$.

We now construct a point $p \in k\mathcal{O}_P$ and show that it is the unique interior point of $k\mathcal{O}_P$. If in $\hat{G}(P)$, $\rho(i) = \rho(0)$ for some $i \in [n]$, we note that because of the symmetries outlined in Proposition 5.4, it must also be true that $\rho(-i) = \rho(0)$. In this case, we set $p_i = 0$. Suppose $\rho(i) - \rho(0) = \ell$. Then, we assign $p_i = \ell$. Note that $-(k-1) \leq \ell \leq k-1$, so p satisfies the strict inequality $-(k-1) < x_i < k-1$ for all $i \in [n]$. By construction, the coordinates of p satisfy the other strict inequalities in $k\mathcal{O}_{\hat{G}(P)}$. Thus p is an interior point of $k\mathcal{O}_P$.

We now show that such an interior point must be unique. As described above, since p is an interior point of $k\mathcal{O}_P$, for every maximal chain in $\hat{G}(P)$, $c_{-(k-1)} < c_{-(k-2)} < \dots < c_0 < \dots < c_{k-2} < c_{k-1}$, p must satisfy $-k < q_{c_{-(k-1)}} < q_{c_{-(k-2)}} < \dots < q_{c_0} < \dots < q_{c_{k-2}} < q_{c_{k-1}} < k$, so each coordinate corresponding to this maximal chain is uniquely determined. Since every element in a poset is part of a maximal chain, every coordinate of p is uniquely determined.

Finally, for all integers $t \geq k$, we establish a bijection between the sets $t\mathcal{O}_P^\circ \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $(t-k)P \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$. Let $p \in (t-k)P \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ and consider $\phi(p) = p + (\rho(1) - \rho(0), \dots, \rho(n) - \rho(0))$. First, we know that $t < \phi(p)_i < t$, since $t-k \leq p_i \leq t-k$ and $-k < \rho(i) - \rho(0) < k$. Furthermore, since p satisfies the inequalities of $k\hat{G}(P)$ and $(\rho(1) - \rho(0), \dots, \rho(n) - \rho(0))$ satisfy the strict inequalities, their sum $\phi(p)$ also satisfies the strict inequalities, so $\phi(p)$ is indeed an interior point of $t\mathcal{O}_P$. We now need to show that $\phi : (t-k)\mathcal{O}_P \rightarrow t\mathcal{O}_P^\circ$ is bijective. It suffices to show that the map is surjective. Suppose we have a point $q \in t\mathcal{O}_P^\circ$, and consider $q' = q - (\rho(1) - \rho(0), \dots, \rho(n) - \rho(0))$, so that $\phi(q') = q$. Note that since $-(t-1) \leq q_i \leq t-1$ and $-(k-1) \leq \rho(i) - \rho(0) \leq k-1$, $-(t-k) \leq q'_i \leq t-k$. Now, suppose $i \leq j \in \hat{G}(P)$. Then, since q is in the relative interior of $t\mathcal{O}_P$, $q_i - \rho(i) \leq q_j - \rho(j)$, which implies $q'_i \leq q'_j$. So q' is indeed in $(t-k)\mathcal{O}_P$.

We now suppose that $\hat{G}(P)$ is not graded, and show that \mathcal{O}_P cannot be Gorenstein. For \mathcal{O}_P to be Gorenstein of degree k , the interior points of the cone $\text{hom } \mathcal{O}_P$ must be the integer points of the shifted cone $\text{hom } \mathcal{O}_P + (p, k)$, where p is the unique interior point of $k\mathcal{O}_P$. Let $2a-2$ be the length of the longest maximal chain in $\mathcal{O}_{\hat{G}(P)}$. Based on an argument above, we know that there are no interior points in $b\mathcal{O}_P$ for any nonnegative integer $b < a$. We now consider $a\mathcal{O}_P$, the first dilate with at least one interior point p . However, since $\hat{G}(P)$ is not graded, there must be a maximal chain of a length k where $k < 2a-2$, $c_1 < \dots < c_k$. Without loss of generality, let $p_{c_1} = -(a-1)$ and $p_{c_k} = a-1$, which is always possible since there are no elements above c_k nor below c_1 . Since the maximal chain we are considering has length less than $2a-a$, we know that there is some $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ such that $p_{c_{i+1}} - p_{c_i} > 1$. We now construct an interior point p' of $(a+1)\mathcal{O}_P$, where we add 1 to all the coordinates p_j where $j \geq c_i$ in $\hat{G}(P)$ except for $p_{c_{i+1}}$. Note that $(p', a+1) \in \text{hom } \mathcal{O}_P$ is formed from adding a point that is not compatible with the ordering to (p, a) , so $(p', a+1)$ is an interior point of $\text{hom } \mathcal{O}_P$ that does not lie in the shifted version. Thus, \mathcal{O}_P is not Gorenstein. \square

The following result applies to our situation.

Theorem 5.7 (Bruns–Römer [3]). *A Gorenstein lattice polytope P with a regular unimodular triangulation has a unimodal h^* -vector.*

Corollary 5.8. *Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. If $\hat{G}(P)$ is graded, then the h^* -polynomial of P is unimodal.*

Stembridge [10] extended Reiner’s work with signed posets to any root system. He defines a generalization of order cones and signed order cones for other root systems, calling these Coxeter cones.

Definition 5.9 (Stembridge [10]). Let Φ be any root system in \mathbb{R}^n , and let Ψ be a subset of Φ . Then the *Coxeter cone* of Ψ is

$$\Delta(\Psi) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, \beta \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for any } \beta \in \Psi\}.$$

Viewing these cones as simplicial complexes and defining a general notion of when these complexes are graded, he used algebraic methods to give a condition on when the h -vectors of these cones are symmetric and unimodal.

Theorem 5.10 (Stembridge [10]). *If a Coxeter cone is graded, then its h -polynomial is symmetric and unimodal.*

The definition of *graded* is quite technical; for a full definition see [10].

Proposition 5.6 can be seen as an Ehrhart-theoretic interpretation of the type- B case of Theorem 5.10, using a geometric proof method as opposed to the algebraic proof method in [10]. Below, we summarize the connection between Proposition 5.6 and Theorem 5.10.

We first interpret Theorem 5.10 in the type- B case. In Examples 5.2(b) and 6.4(b), Stembridge notes that his definition of a graded Coxeter cone, when restricted to the type- B case, results in exactly the Coxeter cones of type B corresponding to signed posets with a graded Fischer representation. Thus, these Coxeter cones result in simplicial complexes with a symmetric and unimodal h -polynomial.

We then make the transition from the h -polynomial of a type- B Coxeter cone to the h^* -polynomial of \mathcal{O}_P of the corresponding signed poset P . In Section 4 of [10], Stembridge notes that the h -polynomial of his type A and B Coxeter cones are identical to the h^* -polynomial of a certain lattice polytope. His construction in the type- B case, described in algebraic terms, gives the same polytope as \mathcal{O}_P . Thus we see that Proposition 5.6 can be seen as a special case of the broad algebraic result in [10].

6. CHAIN POLYTOPES

In [8], Stanley establishes some properties of chain polytopes.

Definition 6.1. Let Π be a poset. An *antichain* of Π is a subset I of the elements of Π such that for any $i, j \in I$, neither $i < j$ nor $j < i$ in Π .

Proposition 6.2 (Stanley [8]). *The vertices of $\mathcal{C}(\Pi)$ are given by the $\{0, 1\}$ -indicator vectors of the antichains of Π .*

Theorem 6.3 (Stanley [8]). *Let Π be a poset on $[n]$.*

- $\mathcal{C}(\Pi)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\Pi)$ have the same h^* -polynomial.
- $\mathcal{C}(\Pi)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\Pi)$ are combinatorially equivalent if and only if Π does not contain the poset shown in Figure 4 as a subposet.




FIGURE 4. The forbidden poset in Theorem 6.3.

In this section, we suggest a definition for signed chain polytopes and examine the properties of said polytopes. (We do not claim this is the only sensible definition for the concept of a signed chain polytope.) First, we define a chain of a signed poset.

Definition 6.4. A chain on a signed poset P on $[n]$ is an ordered pair (C, S) , where $C = (c_1, \dots, c_m) \in [n]^m$ and $S = (s_1, \dots, s_{m-1}) \in \{-1, 1\}^{m-1}$ such that for each $i \in [m-1]$ there exists $\alpha_i \in P$ that satisfy:

- if $s_i = 1$, then $\alpha_i = \pm(e_{c_i} - e_{c_{i+1}})$, and if $s_i = -1$, then $\alpha_i = \pm(e_{c_i} + e_{c_{i+1}})$;
- $\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+1} \in P$.

We now give one definition of a chain polytope.

Definition 6.5. The *signed chain polytope* \mathcal{C}_P of a signed poset P on $[n]$ is the intersection of inequalities of the form

$$-1 \leq x_{c_1} + s_1 x_{c_2} + s_1 s_2 x_{c_3} + \dots + s_1 s_2 \dots s_{m-1} x_{c_m} \leq 1$$

for each chain (C, S) of P .

We note that, in the definition of the chain polytope for a classical poset, it suffices to have an inequality for each *maximal* chain, since the other inequalities are implied by these. The equivalent statement is not true for chain polytopes of signed posets.

We also introduce another useful class of polytopes, directly related to Gorenstein polytopes.

Definition 6.6. A lattice polytope is *reflexive* if its hyperplane description can be written as $Ax \leq 1$ for an integral matrix A .

There are many equivalent definitions of reflexive polytopes, for example relating to the *duals* of polytopes. A reflexive polytope can also be described as a Gorenstein polytope with Gorenstein index 1. For a full description, see, for example, [12].

Directly from the definitions above, we make the following observation:

Proposition 6.7. *For any signed poset P , the signed chain polytope \mathcal{C}_P is reflexive, and thus Gorenstein.*

Proof. From the definition, we can see that \mathcal{C}_P is defined by a linear system $Ax \leq 1$ for an integral matrix A . \square

One consequence of this is that it allows us to associate a Gorenstein polytope with every classical poset, since every classical poset can be viewed as a signed poset.

Similarly to Proposition 6.2, we can give a convex hull description of \mathcal{C}_P in terms of antichains of P , defined below.

Definition 6.8. Let P be a signed poset on $[n]$. An element of $a = (a_1 \dots a_n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^n$ is an antichain of P if for each element $\alpha \in P$ of the form $\pm e_i \pm e_j$ or $\pm e_i \mp e_j$, $\langle \alpha, a \rangle \neq 0$ unless $a_i = a_j = 0$.

Example 6.9. Figure 5 shows a signed poset, with a chain indicated in blue. This chain $(C, S) = ((1, 2, 3), (1, -1))$ is the longest chain in this signed poset.

There are many antichains of this signed poset, one of which is $a = (1, 0, 1, -1)$. It might seem like since 1 and 3 are related, they shouldn't both have a nonzero entry in the antichain, but the way the signs are arranged makes a fit the definition.

Proposition 6.10. *The set of antichains of a signed poset P are exactly the integer points in \mathcal{C}_P .*

Proof. Suppose a point $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is an integer point of $\mathcal{C}(P)$. Then p must satisfy all the inequalities specified in Definition 6.5; in particular:

- Suppose $\alpha \in P$ is of the form $\pm e_i \pm e_j$. Then, $(C, S) = (\{i, j\}, \{-1\})$ is a signed chain of P , and p must satisfy the inequalities $-1 \leq p_i - p_j \leq 1$. Thus, either $p_i = p_j = 0$, $p_i = \pm 1$ and $p_j = 0$, $p_i = 0$ and $p_j = \pm 1$, or $p_i = p_j = \pm 1$. In the latter three cases, it is true that $\langle p, \alpha \rangle \neq 0$.




FIGURE 5. A bidirected graph representation of a signed poset on 4 elements, with a chain highlighted in blue.

- Suppose $\alpha \in P$ is of the form $\pm e_i \mp e_j$. Then, $(C, S) = (\{i, j\}, \{1\})$ is a signed chain of P , and p must satisfy the inequalities $-1 \leq p_i + p_j \leq 1$. Thus, either $p_i = p_j = 0$, $p_i = \pm 1$ and $p_j = 0$, $p_i = 0$ and $p_j = \pm 1$, or $p_i = -p_j = \pm 1$. In the latter three cases, it is true that $\langle p, \alpha \rangle \neq 0$.

Thus p satisfies all the properties of being an antichain of P .

Suppose p is not an integer point of $\mathcal{C}(P)$. Then there must be some chain $(\{c_1, \dots, c_m\}, \{s_1, \dots, s_{m-1}\})$ such that

$$p_{c_1} + s_1 p_{c_2} + s_1 s_2 p_{c_3} + \dots + s_1 s_2 \dots s_{m-1} p_{c_m} \leq -2$$

or

$$2 \leq p_{c_1} + s_1 p_{c_2} + s_1 s_2 p_{c_3} + \dots + s_1 s_2 \dots s_{m-1} p_{c_m}.$$

This implies that for some $i, j \in [m]$, $2 \leq s_1 \dots s_i p_i + s_1 \dots s_j p_j$ or $s_1 \dots s_i p_i + s_1 \dots s_j p_j \leq -2$. From this, we can determine that $s_1 \dots s_i p_i = s_1 \dots s_j p_j = \pm 1$. We have the following two cases:

- If $s_1 \dots s_j = s_1 \dots s_i$, then $p_i = p_j$. We also know that either $e_i - e_j \in P$ or $-e_i + e_j \in P$ from the transitivity of signed posets and the definition of signed chains. Since $\langle p, \pm e_i \mp e_j \rangle = 0$, we deduce that p cannot be an antichain of P .
- If $s_1 \dots s_j = -s_1 \dots s_i$, then $p_i = -p_j$. We also know that either $e_i + e_j \in P$ or $-e_i - e_j \in P$ from the transitivity of signed posets and the definition of signed chains. Since $\langle p, \pm e_i \pm e_j \rangle = 0$, we deduce that p cannot be an antichain of P . \square

We note that there is no nice analogue for Theorem 6.3, since generally \mathcal{C}_P and \mathcal{O}_P are neither combinatorially equivalent nor Ehrhart equivalent. One example of the latter is the example in which P contains an element of the form $\pm e_i$. Observe that \mathcal{O}_P has no interior lattice points, since the defining inequality $\pm x_i \geq 0$ prevents the origin from being an interior point and there are no other possibilities for an interior point of a polytope that is a subset of $[-1, 1]^n$. From the definition, we can see that \mathcal{C}_P always has the origin as an interior point. Thus in this case, these two polytopes cannot have the same Ehrhart polynomial.

REFERENCES

1. Matthias Beck and Benjamin Braun, *Euler–Mahonian statistics via polyhedral geometry*, Adv. Math. **244** (2013), 925–954.
2. Matthias Beck and Raman Sanyal, *Combinatorial Reciprocity Theorems: An Invitation to Enumerative Geometric Combinatorics*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 195, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2018.
3. Winfried Bruns and Tim Römer, *h-vectors of Gorenstein polytopes*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **114** (2007), no. 1, 65–76.
4. Eugene Ehrhart, *Sur un problème de géométrie diophantienne linéaire. i. polyèdres et réseaux*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **226** (1967), 1–29.
5. Steven D. Fischer, *Signed poset homology and q-analog Möbius functions*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1993.
6. Victor Reiner, *Signed posets*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **62** (1993), no. 2, 324–360.

7. Richard P. Stanley, *Decompositions of rational convex polytopes*, Ann. Discrete Math **6** (1980), no. 6, 333–342.
8. ———, *Two poset polytopes*, Discrete & Computational Geometry **1** (1986), no. 1, 9–23.
9. ———, *Enumerative Combinatorics. Volume 1*, second ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 49, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
10. John R. Stembridge, *Coxeter cones and their h -vectors*, Advances in Mathematics **217** (2008), no. 5, 1935–1961.
11. Thomas Zaslavsky, *Orientation of signed graphs*, European J. Combin. **12** (1991), no. 4, 361–375.
12. Günter M Ziegler, *Lectures on polytopes*, vol. 152, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94132, U.S.A.
Email address: becksfsu@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & STATISTICS, POMONA COLLEGE, CLAREMONT, CA 91711, U.S.A.
Email address: max.hlavacek@pomona.edu