

# Quotients of Special Classes of Positroids

Zhixing Chen<sup>\*</sup>, Yumou Fei<sup>†</sup>, Jiyang Gao<sup>‡</sup>, Yuxuan Sun<sup>§</sup>, and Yuchong Zhang<sup>¶</sup>

January 9, 2024

## Abstract

In this paper, we give a complete characterization of rank  $k - 1$  positroids that are quotients of the uniform matroid  $U_{k,n}$ , completing a partial result by Benedetti-Chavez-Jiménez. Furthermore, we show that any pair of concordant positroids with adjacent ranks are related by a cyclic shift on their decorated permutations. We also use the concept of coneclakes to give a full characterization of concordant lattice path matroids (LPMs).

**keywords:** positroids, matroids, matroid quotients, concordance, lattice path matroids, Grassmann necklaces, decorated permutations

## 1 Introduction

Positroids are an important class of matroids that can be represented by the columns of a full-rank matrix with nonnegative maximal minors. They were first introduced by Postnikov in [16] during his study of the totally nonnegative Grassmannian, where he provided a stratification, the cells of which are indexed by positroids. Recently, there have been many applications of positroids in cluster algebra [15] and physics [10].

The class of positroids has many nice properties. They are closed under matroid dual and cyclic shifts. They are also in bijection with many combinatorial objects, for example Grassmann necklaces and decorated permutations [16, 12].

Given two matroids  $M_1, M_2$  on the same ground set,  $M_1$  is a quotient of  $M_2$  if every circuit of  $M_2$  is a union of circuits of  $M_1$ . In [12], Oh asks the following question:

Is there a combinatorial criterion to determine if  
one positroid is a quotient of another?

---

<sup>\*</sup>Fudan University, Shanghai 20307110030@fudan.edu.cn

<sup>†</sup>Peking University, Beijing feiym2002@stu.pku.edu.cn

<sup>‡</sup>Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138 jgao@math.harvard.edu

<sup>§</sup>University of Minnesota Twin Cities, Minneapolis, MN 55455 sun00816@umn.edu

<sup>¶</sup>University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48104 zongxun@umich.edu

There have been many attempts towards answering this question [13, 2, 3, 6]. In Section 5, we give a complete characterization of rank  $k-1$  positroids that are quotients of the uniform matroid  $U_{k,n}$  in terms of their decorated permutations (Theorem 5.2), completing a partial result of Benedetti, Chavez, and Jiménez [2].

In Section 3, we give two necessary conditions for one positroid to be a quotient of another in terms of Grassmann necklaces and Grassmann conecklaces. Although these necessary conditions are not sufficient in general, we show that they are sufficient when we restrict to a subclass of positroids called lattice path matroids (LPMs) (Theorem 3.5). This yields a criterion different from the work of Benedetti and Knauer [3].

In Section 4, we study the *freeze-shift-decorate* operation on decorated permutations introduced by [2]. We provide a better understanding for such operation by proving it is equivalent to the component-wise containment of Grassmann necklaces when the ranks of the positroids differ by 1 (Theorem 4.4). As a corollary, we prove that any pair of concordant positroids with adjacent ranks are related by a cyclic shift on their decorated permutations (Theorem 4.15), resolving a conjecture in [2].

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we provide the necessary background on positroids and quotients of matroids, and define Grassmann conecklaces. In Section 3, Section 4, and Section 5, we prove the aforementioned results. In Section 6, we conclude with some conjectures for positroid quotients of  $U_{k,n}$  in arbitrary rank.

## 2 Preliminaries

In Section 2.1, we review the definitions and some fundamental properties of matroids and quotients. To formally state and prove our theorems in later sections, we provide constructions and bijections related to positroids in Section 2.2.

### 2.1 Quotients of Matroids

Matroids are structures abstracting and generalizing the concept of linear independence. In this subsection, we introduce terminology of matroids to give several equivalent definitions of matroid quotients.

**Definition 2.1.** A *matroid*  $M$  consists of two data  $(E, \mathcal{B})$ , where  $E$  is a finite set called the *ground set* of  $M$ , and  $\mathcal{B}$  is the set of *bases*, a collection of subsets  $B \subseteq E$ . They satisfy the following properties.

1.  $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$ ;
2. **(Exchange Property)** Take any distinct  $B, B' \in \mathcal{B}$ . For any  $x \in B \setminus B'$ , there exists  $y \in B' \setminus B$  such that  $(B' \cup \{x\}) \setminus \{y\} \in \mathcal{B}$ .

We use  $\mathcal{B}(M)$  to denote the set of bases of a matroid  $M$ .

**Example 2.2.** Consider a matroid

$$M = ([4], \mathcal{B} = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 4\}, \{3, 4\}\}).$$

Take  $B = \{1, 2\}, B' = \{1, 3\}$ . Note that  $B \setminus B' = \{2\}, B' \setminus B = \{3\}$ , so the exchange property is satisfied for such  $B$  and  $B'$ :  $(B' \cup \{2\}) \setminus \{3\} = B$ . Readers could verify that the basis is legal by verifying all other possible pairs of  $B, B'$ .

Given a matroid  $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$ , a subset  $I \subseteq E$  is said to be an *independent set* of  $M$ , if it is contained in some basis of  $M$ . If otherwise, we say  $I$  is *dependent*. We use  $\mathcal{I}_M$  to denote the set of all independent sets of a matroid  $M$ .

Two concepts of a matroid we use in the paper are listed below.

1. **(Rank Function)** We define the *rank function*  $\text{rk} : 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  of a matroid  $M$  by  $\text{rk}(S) := \max\{|I| \mid I \subseteq S, I \in \mathcal{I}_M\}$ . Note that  $\text{rk}$  is order-preserving. The rank of  $M$  is defined to be  $\text{rk}(E)$ , and is denoted  $\text{rk}(M)$ . This is equal to the cardinality of every basis;
2. **(Circuit)** A *circuit* of  $M$  is a dependent set  $C \subseteq E$ , such that  $C \setminus \{c\}$  is an independent set for any  $c \in C$ .

**Example 2.3.** Consider the matroid  $M$  in Example 2.2. The subsets of  $\{1, 4\}$  which are independent are  $\{1\}$  and  $\{4\}$ , thus  $\text{rk}(\{1, 4\}) = 1$ .  $\{1, 2, 3\}$  is a circuit of  $M$ , because deleting any element results in an independent set.  $\{1, 2, 4\}$  is not a circuit of  $M$ , because deleting 2 results in  $\{1, 4\}$ , which is dependent. For reference, circuits of  $M$  are  $\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 4\}$  and  $\{2, 3, 4\}$ .

**Definition 2.4.** Given a matroid  $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$ , the *dual* of  $M$ , denoted by  $M^*$ , is the matroid  $(E, \mathcal{B}^*)$ , where  $\mathcal{B}^* = \{E \setminus B \mid B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ .

It is straightforward to check that  $M^*$  remains a matroid. Note that taking dual is an involution. In other words,  $(M^*)^* = M$ .

**Example 2.5.** Consider the matroid  $M$  in Example 2.2. We have

$$M^* = ([4], \{\{3, 4\}, \{2, 4\}, \{1, 4\}, \{1, 3\}, \{1, 2\}\}).$$

There is an intrinsic relationship between the rank functions of a matroid and its dual, which is listed below.

**Proposition 2.6** ([14], Proposition 2.1.9). *Let  $\text{rk}_M$  be the rank function of  $M$  on the ground set  $E$ , and  $\text{rk}_{M^*}$  be rank function of  $M^*$ . Then we have*

$$\text{rk}_{M^*}(S) = \text{rk}_M(E \setminus S) + |S| - \text{rk}_M(S).$$

**Definition 2.7.** A matroid is *representable* over a field  $k$ , if there is a matrix over  $k$ , say  $A = A_{l \times n}$ , such that  $|E| = n$ , and after fixing a bijection  $f : E \rightarrow [n]$ , the independent sets of  $E$  is in bijection with the set of multi-index of  $k$ -linearly independent column vectors.

Now we define some partial orders that appear in the definitions of matroid quotients and positroids in section 2.2.

**Definition 2.8.** A *total order*  $<_G$  on  $[n]$  is a partial order given by

$$a_1 <_G \cdots <_G a_n,$$

where  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  is a rearrangement of  $[n]$ .

Note that there are  $n!$  distinct rearrangements of  $[n]$ , so correspondingly, there are  $n!$  distinct total orders on  $[n]$ . We list below some specific total orders.

**Definition 2.9.** The  *$i$ -th total order* on  $[n]$  is defined to be

$$i <_i i + 1 <_i \cdots <_i n <_i 1 <_i \cdots <_i i - 1.$$

We say  $a \leq_i b$  if  $a <_i b$  or  $a = b$ .

**Definition 2.10.** Let  $<_G$  be a total order on  $[n]$ . The *Gale order* induced by  $<_G$  is a partial order on subsets of  $[n]$ : for two subsets  $A, B \in \binom{[n]}{k}$ , we say  $A \leq_G B$  if  $a_l \leq_G b_l$  for every  $l \in [k]$ , where  $A = \{a_1 <_G \cdots <_G a_k\}$  and  $B = \{b_1 <_G \cdots <_G b_k\}$ . In particular, if the total order  $<_G$  is the  $i$ -th total order  $<_i$ , the corresponding Gale order is called the  *$i$ -th Gale order*.

For two matroids  $M$  and  $N$  on the same ground set  $[n]$ , we say  $M$  is a *quotient* of  $N$  if every circuit of  $N$  is a union of circuits of  $M$ . There are many equivalent definitions for matroid quotients.

**Proposition 2.11** ([8], Definition.6.4; [7], Theorem 1.7.1). *For two matroids  $M$  and  $N$  on the same ground set  $[n]$ , the following are equivalent.*

1.  $N$  is a quotient of  $M$ : Every circuit of  $M$  is a union of circuits of  $N$ ;
2. For any  $B \subseteq A \subseteq [n]$ ,  $\text{rk}_N(A) - \text{rk}_N(B) \leq \text{rk}_M(A) - \text{rk}_M(B)$ ;
3. For every Gale order  $<_G$  on  $[n]$ , the inclusion  $\min_{<_G} \{\mathcal{B}(N)\} \subseteq \min_{<_G} \{\mathcal{B}(M)\}$  holds.

We use  $N <_q M$  to denote that  $N$  is a quotient of  $M$ . If one matroid is a quotient of another, then these two matroids are said to be *concordant*.

**Example 2.12.** Consider the matroid  $M$  in Example 2.2. For a matroid

$$N = ([4], \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{4\}\}),$$

its circuits are  $\{3\}, \{2, 4\}, \{1, 4\}$ , and  $\{1, 2\}$ . Readers could use Example 2.3 to check that  $N$  is not a quotient of  $M$ .

Fixing a matroid  $M = (E, \mathcal{B})$ , an element  $x \in E$  is said to be a *loop*, if  $\text{rk}(\{x\}) = 0$ . A *coloop* is a loop in  $M^*$ . An equivalent description of coloops is the elements which are contained in all bases of  $M$ . Note that a loop in  $M$  will be a coloop in  $M^*$ , and a coloop in  $M$  will be a loop in  $M^*$ . The proof of the following facts is straightforward and follows directly from definitions.

**Proposition 2.13.** *Given two matroids  $M, N$  on the same ground set. If  $N$  is a quotient of  $M$ , then*

1. *Every loop of  $N$  is a loop of  $M$ ;*
2. *Every coloop of  $M$  is a coloop of  $N$ ;*
3. *If  $M$  and  $N$  have the same rank, then  $M = N$ .*

## 2.2 Positroids, Necklaces and Conecklaces

This subsection concentrates on a specific class of representable matroids, referred to as positroids. Additionally, we introduce three combinatorial structures bijectively associated with positroids: Grassmann necklaces, decorated permutations, and Grassmann conecklaces.

**Definition 2.14** ([16], Definition 3.2). A representable matroid  $M$  is said to be a *positroid* if  $M$  can be represented by a nonnegative matrix, that is, every maximal minor of the matrix has a nonnegative determinant. We denote the set of positroids on  $[n]$  by  $\text{Pos}(n)$ .

For example, the following matrix has nonnegative maximal minors:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -3 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 4 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The bases of the matroid are  $\{1, 2\}$ ,  $\{1, 3\}$ ,  $\{2, 3\}$ ,  $\{2, 4\}$  and  $\{3, 4\}$ . This is the same as Example 2.2.

The concept of positroids is first introduced in [16]. Here we list some subclasses of positroids.

**Definition 2.15.** A *uniform matroid*  $U_{k,n}$  is a matroid on  $[n]$  with the set of bases  $\mathcal{B} = \binom{[n]}{k}$ . We denote the set of uniform matroids on  $[n]$  by  $\text{Uni}(n)$ .

**Definition 2.16** ([4], Definition 3.1). A *lattice path matroid* (LPM for short)  $M[U, L]$  on the ground set  $[n]$ , where  $U, L \in \binom{[n]}{k}$  and  $U \leq_1 L$ , is a matroid on  $[n]$  with the set of bases  $\mathcal{B} = \left\{ B \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid U \leq_1 B \leq_1 L \right\}$ . If moreover,  $L = \{i \in [n] \mid n - k + 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ , then we say such LPM is a *Schubert matroid*. We denote the set of LPMs (respectively, Schubert matroids) on  $[n]$  by  $\text{Lpm}(n)$  (respectively,  $\text{Sch}(n)$ ).

We have the following inclusion:

$$\text{Uni}(n) \subseteq \text{Sch}(n) \subseteq \text{Lpm}(n) \subseteq \text{Pos}(n).$$

By definition, uniform matroids is a subclass of Schubert matroids, and Schubert matroids is a subclass of LPMs. Moreover, by [12, Lemma 21], LPMs is a subclass of positroids.

In the paper [16], the author establishes the first combinatorial model for positroids, as is shown below.

**Definition 2.17** ([16], Definition 16.1). A *Grassmann necklace* of type  $(n, k)$  is a sequence  $I = (I_i)_{i \in [n]}$ , where for each  $i \in [n]$ , we have  $I_i \subseteq [n]$  and  $|I_i| = k$ . Moreover, under the convention  $I_{n+1} = I_1$ , we have:

- If  $i \in I_i$ , then  $I_{i+1} = (I_i \setminus \{i\}) \cup \{j\}$  for some  $j \in [n]$ ;
- If  $i \notin I_i$ , then  $I_{i+1} = I_i$ .

For simplicity, we call Grassmann necklaces by “*necklaces*”, and we denote the set of all necklaces on  $[n]$  by  $\text{GrNeck}(n)$ . The correspondence between positroids and Grassmann necklaces is as follows.

**Proposition 2.18** ([16], Theorem 17.1). *There is a bijection between positroids on  $[n]$  of rank  $k$  and Grassmann necklaces of type  $(n, k)$  by the following mutually inverse mappings.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Pos}(n) & \xleftrightarrow{1:1} & \text{GrNeck}(n) \\ P & \longmapsto & \mathcal{I}(P) := \left( \min_{\leq i}(\mathcal{B}(P)) \right)_{i \in [n]} \\ \mathcal{P}(I) & \longleftarrow & I, \end{array}$$

where  $\mathcal{P}(I) := \left( [n], \bigcap_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{B}_i \right)$ , and  $\mathcal{B}_i := \left\{ A \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid A \geq_i I_i \right\}$ .

Note that the mapping  $\mathcal{I}$  is well-defined for all matroids on  $[n]$ . However,  $\mathcal{I}$  is not injective when applied to all matroids on  $[n]$ .

**Example 2.19.** Let  $E = [7]$ . Consider a positroid  $P$  with the following bases:

$$\{1, 2, 7\}, \{1, 4, 7\}, \{1, 5, 7\}, \{1, 6, 7\}, \{2, 4, 7\}, \{2, 5, 7\}, \{2, 6, 7\}.$$

Its Grassmann necklace under the bijection is

$$I = (\{1, 2, 7\}, \{2, 4, 7\}, \{4, 7, 1\}, \{4, 7, 1\}, \{5, 7, 1\}, \{6, 7, 1\}, \{7, 1, 2\}).$$

In the paper [16], the author also introduces decorated permutations, which are in bijection with Grassmann necklaces. To illustrate the bijection, we first provide the definition of decorated permutations.

**Definition 2.20** ([16], Definition 13.3). A *decorated permutation* on a ground set  $[n]$  consists of data  $(\pi, \text{col})$ , where  $\pi \in S_n$  and  $\text{col} : [n] \rightarrow \{0, \pm 1\}$ , such that  $\text{col}^{-1}(0)$  is the set of unfixed points of  $\pi$ . We denote the set of decorated permutations on  $[n]$  by  $D_n$ .

Following the convention of [16], we add underlines to elements in  $\text{col}^{-1}(-1)$ , overlines to  $\text{col}^{-1}(1)$ , and nothing to other elements instead of using a map “col”. Elements in  $\text{col}^{-1}(1)$  are said to be *loops*, and elements in  $\text{col}^{-1}(-1)$  are said to be *coloops*. It is worth mentioning that under the correspondence in the following content, we can see the loops of a positroid are the loops of the corresponding decorated permutation, and the coloops of a positroid are the coloops of the corresponding decorated permutation.

**Example 2.21.** For the decorated permutation  $\pi^\cdot = (\pi, \text{col}) = 41\overline{3}56\overline{2}\underline{7}$ , its corresponding permutation  $\pi = 4135627$ . Moreover,  $\text{col}^{-1}(0) = \{4, 1, 5, 6\}$ ,  $\text{col}^{-1}(1) = \{3\}$ , and  $\text{col}^{-1}(-1) = \{7\}$ . Thus, its loop is 3, and its coloop is 7.

In order to explicitly describe the bijection between Grassmann necklaces and decorated permutations, the author of [16] introduces the concept of *anti-exceedences*.

**Definition 2.22** ([16]). For a decorated permutation  $\pi^\cdot = (\pi, \text{col})$ , we define the set of  $i$ -anti-exceedences to be

$$W_i := \{j \in [n] \mid j <_i \pi^{-1}(j) \text{ or } \text{col}(j) = -1\}.$$

A fundamental fact regarding anti-exceedences is shown as follows.

**Lemma 2.23** ([16]). *For a decorated permutation  $\pi^\cdot = (\pi, \text{col})$  on the ground set  $[n]$  and every  $i, j \in [n]$ , we have  $|W_i| = |W_j|$ . So we can define the rank of a decorated permutation  $\text{rk}(\pi^\cdot)$  to be  $|W_1|$ .*

The bijection between Grassmann necklaces and decorated permutations is given by the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.24** ([16], Lemma 16.2). *On the ground set  $[n]$ , there is a bijection between Grassmann necklaces and decorated permutations. Explicitly, given a decorated permutation  $\pi^\cdot \in D_n$ , the corresponding Grassmann necklace  $I = (I_i)_{i \in [n]}$  is defined by*

$$I_i = \{i\text{-anti-exceedences of } \pi^\cdot\}.$$

*Conversely, given a Grassmann necklace  $I$ , under the convention  $I_{n+1} = I_1$ , the corresponding decorated permutation*

$$\pi^\cdot = (\pi, \text{col})$$

*is defined by:*

- *If  $I_{i+1} = (I_i \setminus \{i\}) \cup \{j\}$  with  $i \neq j$ , then  $\pi(i) = j$  and  $\text{col}(i) = 0$ ;*

- If  $I_{i+1} = I_i$  and  $i \in I_i$ , then  $\pi(i) = i$  and  $\text{col}(i) = -1$ ;
- If  $I_{i+1} = I_i$  and  $i \notin I_i$ , then  $\pi(i) = i$  and  $\text{col}(i) = 1$ .

Moreover, the necklace  $I$  corresponding to a given decorated permutation  $\pi^i = (\pi, \text{col})$  satisfies the following property.

- If  $i \in I_i$ , then  $I_{i+1} = I_i \setminus \{i\} \cup \{\pi(i)\}$ ;
- If  $i \notin I_i$ , then  $I_{i+1} = I_i$ .

In order to describe concordant positroids, we also introduce a concept dual to Grassmann necklaces, named *Grassmann conecklaces*.

**Definition 2.25.** A *Grassmann conecklace* of type  $(n, k)$  is a sequence  $J = (J_i)_{i \in [n]}$ , where for each  $i \in [n]$ , we have  $J_i \subseteq [n]$  and  $|J_i| = k$ . Moreover, under the convention  $J_{n+1} = J_1$ , we have:

- If  $i \notin J_i$ , then  $J_{i+1} = (J_i \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\}$  for some  $j \in [n]$ ;
- If  $i \in J_i$ , then  $J_{i+1} = J_i$ .

**Remark 2.26.** On the verge of finishing this paper, we discovered that the term “Grassmann conecklace” is the same as “upper Grassmann necklace” in [12].

For simplicity, we call Grassmann conecklaces by “*conecklaces*”. There exists a set-theoretic connection between Grassmann necklaces and Grassmann conecklaces.

**Lemma 2.27.** Let  $(I_i)_{i \in [n]}$  be a necklace on  $[n]$ , then  $(J_i) = ([n] - I_i)_{i \in [n]}$  forms a conecklace over  $[n]$ . Similarly, the componentwise complement of a conecklace is a necklace.

*Proof.* If  $i \notin J_i$ , then  $i \in I_i$ . Thus there exists  $j \in [n]$  s.t.  $I_{i+1} = (I_i \setminus \{i\}) \cup \{j\}$ . Therefore

$$J_{i+1} = [n] \setminus I_{i+1} = [n] \setminus ((I_i \setminus \{i\}) \cup \{j\}) = (([n] \setminus I_i) \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\}.$$

If  $i \in J_i$ , then  $i \notin I_i$ , in which case  $I_{i+1} = I_i$ . Therefore,  $J_{i+1} = J_i$  in this case. Both situations satisfies the definition of a conecklace.  $\square$

We denote the set of Grassmann conecklaces on  $[n]$  by  $\text{GrCoNeck}(n)$ . Similarly, we obtain the dual of Proposition 2.18 for conecklaces.

**Proposition 2.28.** There is a bijection between positroids on  $[n]$  of rank  $k$  and Grassmann conecklaces of type  $(n, k)$  by the following mutually inverse mappings.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pos}(n) &\xleftrightarrow{1:1} \text{GrCoNeck}(n) \\ P &\longmapsto \mathcal{J}(P) := \left( \max_{\leq i}(\mathcal{B}(P)) \right)_{i \in [n]} \\ \mathfrak{P}(J) &\longleftarrow J, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathfrak{P}(J) := \left( [n], \bigcap_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{B}_i \right)$ , and  $\mathcal{B}_i := \left\{ A \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k} \mid A \leq_i J_i \right\}$ .

*Proof.* We do some preparations first. For a given permutation  $\pi^\cdot = (\pi, \text{col})$  and the positroid  $P$  defined by  $\pi^\cdot$ , we point out that

$$\mathcal{J}(P)_i = \{j \in [n] \mid \pi^{-1}(j) <_i j \text{ or } (\pi^{-1}(j) = j \text{ and } \text{col}(j) = -1)\}.$$

Note that  $B \leq_i \mathcal{J}(P)_i$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(P)$  implies  $[n] \setminus B \geq_i [n] \setminus \mathcal{J}(P)_i$  for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}(P)$ . Since the dual matroid  $P^* = ([n], \{[n] \setminus B \mid B \in \mathcal{B}\})$  defines a positroid by [1, Proposition 3.5], we know that  $([n] \setminus \mathcal{J}(P)_i)_{i \in [n]}$  forms the necklace of  $P^*$  by definition. Moreover, by [1, Proposition 3.5], the permutation of  $P^*$  is just  $(\pi^{-1}, -\text{col})$ , which means that

$$\begin{aligned} [n] \setminus \mathcal{J}(P)_i &= \{j \in [n] \mid j <_i (\pi^{-1})^{-1}(j) \text{ or } (\pi^{-1}(j) = j \text{ and } -\text{col}(j) = -1)\} \\ &= \{j \in [n] \mid j <_i \pi(j) \text{ or } (\pi^{-1}(j) = j \text{ and } \text{col}(j) = 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

By taking complement, we find that

$$\mathcal{J}(P)_i = \mathcal{J}(P)_i = \{j \in [n] \mid \pi^{-1}(j) <_i j \text{ or } (\pi^{-1}(j) = j \text{ and } \text{col}(j) = -1)\}.$$

A direct consequence is that  $\mathcal{J}(P)_i = \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{I}(P)_i)$  for any  $i \in [n]$ .

Next, we prove that for a Grassmann conecklace  $J$  of type  $(n, k)$ ,  $\mathfrak{P}(J)$  is a positroid on  $[n]$  of rank  $k$ . Instead of proving this directly, we show that the dual  $P := \mathfrak{P}(J)$  is matroid, and moreover, a positroid. Note again that  $B \leq_i B'$  is equivalent to  $[n] \setminus B \geq_i [n] \setminus B'$ . Thus,  $B \in \bigcap_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{B}_i$  is equivalent to  $[n] \setminus B \in \bigcap_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{B}'_i$ , where

$$\mathcal{B}'_i := \{[n] \setminus B' \mid B' \in \mathcal{B}_i\} = \left\{ A \in \binom{[n]}{n-k} \mid A \geq_i [n] \setminus J_i \right\}.$$

Now we define  $I' = (I'_i)_{i \in n} := ([n] \setminus J_i)_{i \in n}$ . By Lemma 2.27,  $I'$  is a necklace. So by Proposition 2.18, we have  $\mathcal{P}(I') = ([n], \bigcap_{i \in [n]} \mathcal{B}'_i)$  is a positroid on  $[n]$  of rank  $n-k$ . Moreover, by [1, Proposition 3.5], the dual of a positroid remains a positroid. Note that  $\mathfrak{P}(J) = \mathcal{P}(I')^*$ , and thereby,  $\mathfrak{P}(J)$  is a positroid on  $[n]$  of rank  $k$ .

Then, we prove that for a positroid on  $[n]$  of rank  $k$ ,  $\mathcal{J}(P)$  is a Grassmann conecklace of type  $(n, k)$ . We denote  $\mathcal{J}(P)_i$  by  $J_i$  for simplicity. Let  $\pi^\cdot = (\pi, \text{col})$  be the permutation corresponding to  $P$ . Note that  $i \in I_i$  if and only if  $\pi^{-1}(i) \in J_i$  by the description indicated at the very beginning. Thus

$$J_i \setminus \{\pi^{-1}(i)\} \cup \{i\} = \pi^{-1}(I_i \setminus \{i\} \cup \{\pi(i)\}) = \pi^{-1}(I_{i+1}) = J_{i+1}.$$

By Definition 2.25,  $\mathcal{J}(P)$  is a conecklace of type  $(n, k)$ .

Now we show that the two mappings are mutually inverse. First, we show that  $\mathfrak{P}(\mathcal{J}(P)) = P$  for every positroid  $P$ , that is, the bases of a positroid  $P$  is obtained by intersecting  $\tilde{B}_i$  for all  $i \in [n]$ , where

$$\tilde{B}_i := \left\{ B \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid B \leq_i J_i \right\}, \quad J_i = \max_{\leq_i} \{\mathcal{B}(P)\}.$$

This follows from [12, Theorem 19]. Second, we show that  $\mathcal{J}(\mathfrak{P}((J_i)_{i \in [n]})) = (J_i)_{i \in [n]}$ . This is straightforward since we have already shown in the second paragraph that

$$\bigcap_{i \in [n]} \left\{ B \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid B \leq_i J_i \right\}$$

is a positroid. Note that by definition,  $J_i$  is the maximal basis of  $\mathfrak{P}((J_i)_{i \in [n]})$  with respect to the  $i$ -th Gale order, hence we have completed our proof.  $\square$

Also, we have the following property regarding coneclaces. The proof is straightforward and follows directly from definitions.

**Proposition 2.29.** *For a decorated permutation  $\sigma \in D_n$ , let  $(J_1, \dots, J_n)$  be the corresponding coneclace. Then for each  $i \in [n]$ ,  $a \in J_i$  if and only if  $\sigma(a) <_i a$  or  $a$  is a coloop in  $\sigma$ .*

Our main focus is to give a combinatorial description of concordant positroids. In the following sections, we explain the use of coneclaces in positroids.

### 3 A Concise Criterion on Concordant LPMs

In this section, we denote a subset of  $[n]$  by a sequence of numbers for simplicity. As an example,  $\{1, 2, 7\} \subseteq [7]$  is denoted by 127.

By Proposition 2.11 (3), for any two concordant positroids, say  $P <_q P'$ , we have the containment of Grassmann necklaces. That is,  $\mathcal{I}(P)_i \subseteq \mathcal{I}(P')_i$  for any  $i \in [n]$ . Similarly, there is also a containment of Grassmann coneclaces.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Given  $P, P' \in \text{Pos}(n)$ , where  $P <_q P'$ . Let  $I = (I_1, \dots, I_n)$  and  $I' = (I'_1, \dots, I'_n)$  be their Grassmann necklaces respectively, while  $J = (J_1, \dots, J_n)$  and  $J' = (J'_1, \dots, J'_n)$  be their Grassmann coneclaces respectively, then  $I_i \subseteq I'_i$  and  $J_i \subseteq J'_i$  for all  $i \in [n]$ .*

*Proof.* We only need to prove the case of coneclaces. This is because  $P <_q P'$  implies  $P'^* <_q P^*$ . By the case of necklaces, we have  $[n] - J'_i \subseteq [n] - J_i$ , and hence  $J_i \subseteq J'_i$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** In general, the converse of Proposition 3.1 is not true for positroid quotients. For example, let  $N$  be a positroid given by the decorated permutation 261534 and take  $M$  to be the uniform positroid  $U_{4,6}$ . The necklace and coneclace of  $M$  are (134, 234, 346, 461, 561, 613) and (356, 561, 562, 623, 234, 235) respectively. For  $N$ , they are (1234, 2345, 3456, 4561, 5612, 6123) and (3456, 4561, 5612, 6123, 1234, 2345). Obviously, they satisfy the containment conditions. However,  $\text{rk}_N([6]) - \text{rk}_N(1245) = 1$  while  $\text{rk}_M([6]) - \text{rk}_M(1245) = 0$ . This means  $N$  is *not* a quotient of  $M$ , since the rank condition of quotient in Proposition 2.11 is violated. Furthermore, the counterexample above also disproves the “if” part of Conjecture 3.3 (The “only if” part is proved in [13, Proposition 6.2]).

**Conjecture 3.3** ([13], Conjecture 6.3). *Define the CCW-arrows of a (non-decorated) permutation  $\tau$  to be cyclic intervals of the form  $[i, \tau^{-1}(i)]$  for  $i \in [n]$ . Suppose two positroids  $N$  and  $M$  of rank  $a$  and  $b$  ( $a < b$ ) are given by the permutations  $\pi$  and  $\mu$  (without loops or coloops), then  $N <_q M$  if and only if every CCW-arrow of  $\mu$  is the union of some CCW-arrows of  $\pi$ .*

In the counterexample given in Remark 3.2, observe that all CCW-arrows of  $N$  have cardinality of at least 3, while all cyclic intervals of cardinality 3 are CCW-arrows of  $M$ .

The containment of necklaces and conecklaces only gives a necessary condition of two positroids being concordant. But in special classes of positroids, like LPMs, the converse remains true.

In the following text, given two LPMs  $M[U, L] \in \text{Lpm}(n)$  and  $M'[U', L'] \in \text{Lpm}(n)$ , we denote them by  $M$  and  $M'$  for simplicity. Moreover, we denote their Grassmann necklaces by  $I = (I_1, \dots, I_n)$  and  $I' = (I'_1, \dots, I'_n)$ , and denote their Grassmann conecklaces by  $J = (J_1, \dots, J_n)$  and  $J' = (J'_1, \dots, J'_n)$ , respectively. To simplify our narrative, we also give the following definitions.

**Definition 3.4.** Given  $M, M' \in \text{Lpm}(n)$  satisfying  $U \subseteq U'$  and  $L \subseteq L'$ , we denote the *eliminating set* of  $M'$  by  $M$  as  $(\Delta U, \Delta L)$ , where  $\Delta U := U' \setminus U$ , and  $\Delta L := L' \setminus L$ .

**Theorem 3.5** (Main Theorem 1). *Given  $M, M' \in \text{Lpm}(n)$ ,  $M <_q M'$  if and only if  $I_i \subseteq I'_i$  and  $J_i \subseteq J'_i$  for all  $i \in [n]$ .*

The “only if” part of the theorem is proved in Proposition 3.1. To prove the “if” part of the theorem, our strategy is to prove that the containment of necklaces and conecklaces implies the characterization given in [3].

**Definition 3.6** ([3], Definition 10 and Definition 15). Given an LPM  $M = M[U, L] \in \text{Lpm}(n)$  of rank  $d$ , where

$$U = \{u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_d\}, \quad L = \{l_1 < l_2 < \dots < l_d\}.$$

Let  $1 \leq i, j \leq d$ . We say that  $(u_i, l_j)$  is a *good pair* if both of the following conditions are satisfied:

- $j \leq i$
- $u_i - l_j \leq i - j$ .

Now we take subsets  $S \subseteq U$ ,  $T \subseteq L$  satisfying  $|S| = |T|$ . Denote

$$S := \{u_{i_1} < u_{i_2} < \dots < u_{i_k}\}, \quad T := \{l_{j_1} < l_{j_2} < \dots < l_{j_k}\}.$$

If for every  $1 \leq z \leq k$ ,  $(u_{i_z}, l_{j_z})$  is a good pair, then we say that  $(S, T)$  has a *good greedy pairing*.

**Theorem 3.7** ([3], Theorem 18). *Given  $M, M' \in \text{Lpm}(n)$ ,  $M <_q M'$  if and only if  $U \subseteq U', L \subseteq L'$ , and  $(\Delta U, \Delta L)$  has a good greedy pairing.*

Before proving Theorem 3.5, we first introduce *LPM diagrams*, in which we can visualize LPMs. Also, we explain how to visualize good pairs, Grassmann necklaces, and Grassmann conecklaces in LPM diagrams.

**Observation 3.8** (LPM diagram). An LPM  $M = M[U, L]$  can be thought of a diagram in the Cartesian coordinate system. At first, we set a starting point (usually  $(0, 0)$ ). Each basis  $B = i_1 i_2 \dots i_k \in \mathcal{B}(M)$  corresponds to a sequence of moves (that is, a path) from the starting point. For  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , if  $j \in B$ , then the  $j$ -th move is an upward move, which is adding  $(1, 1)$  to the original coordinate. Otherwise, if  $j \notin B$ , then the  $j$ -th move is a downward move, which is adding  $(1, -1)$  to the original coordinate. For  $M \in \text{Lpm}(n)$ , if the starting point of the LPM diagram is  $(0, 0)$ , then the ending point is  $(n, 2 \text{rk}(M) - n)$ .

For an LPM  $M$ , we denote the LPM diagram of  $M$  with the starting point  $(0, 0)$  as  $\text{Diag}(M)$ . Without ambiguity, given  $B \in \mathcal{B}(M)$ , we denote the path corresponding to  $B$  by  $\text{Diag}(B)$  in the LPM diagram of  $M$ . In the following content, for a given point  $P$  in the LPM diagram, we denote its first coordinate by  $x_P$ , and its second coordinate by  $y_P$ .

**Example 3.9.** Figure 1 is the diagram of  $M[1357, 3789] \in \text{Lpm}(9)$  with rank 4.




Figure 1

**Remark 3.10.** While many papers use the legal moves  $(0, 1)$  and  $(1, 0)$  for visualizing LPMs [3, 4, 5, 9], we employ  $(1, 1)$  and  $(1, -1)$ . Our choice provides certain advantages, especially while proving Theorem 3.5.

The following example explains how to visualize good pairs in LPM diagrams.

**Example 3.11.** Given an LPM  $M[1357, 3789]$  on  $[9]$ , fix  $5 \in U$ . In Figure 2, we label it in red. Then  $3, 7, 8 \in L$ , labelled in orange, can form good pairs with  $5 \in U$ . And  $9 \in L$ , labelled in green, cannot form a good pair with  $5 \in U$ .




Figure 2

The following lemma explains how to visualize Grassmann necklaces in LPM diagrams.

**Lemma 3.12.** *Given  $M \in \text{Lpm}(n)$  and  $t \in [n]$ . In  $\text{Diag}(M)$ , denote the intersection of the line  $x = t - 1$  and  $\text{Diag}(L)$  by  $P$ . Then  $\text{Diag}(I_t)$ , the path corresponding to the  $i$ -th term of the Grassmann necklace of  $M$ , is the uppermost path passing through  $P$ .*

*Proof.* Denote the uppermost path passing through  $P$  by  $\text{Diag}(B)$ , where  $B$  is the corresponding basis of  $M$ . Denote  $S := \{x = t - 1\} \cap \text{Diag}(I_t)$ , we first show that  $S = P$ . Suppose  $y_S > y_P$ , then the upward moves on the right of  $S$  on  $\text{Diag}(I_t)$  is less than the upward moves on the right of  $P$  on  $\text{Diag}(B)$ , which implies  $|I_t \cap [t, n]| < |B \cap [t, n]|$ , contradicting with  $I_t \leq_t B$ . Next, we show that the part of  $\text{Diag}(I_t)$  on the right of  $P$  is the same as  $\text{Diag}(B)$ . This is because  $I_t \leq_t B$  implies  $|I_t \cap [t, r]| \geq |B \cap [t, r]|$  for every  $t \leq r \leq n$ , and hence  $\text{Diag}(I_t)$  cannot get lower than  $\text{Diag}(B)$  on the right of  $P$ . Finally, we show that the part of  $\text{Diag}(I_t)$  on the left of  $P$  is the same as  $\text{Diag}(B)$ . Note that  $I_t \leq_t B$  and  $I_t \cap [t, n] = B \cap [t, n]$ , so we get  $|I_t \cap [1, r]| \geq |B \cap [1, r]|$  for every  $1 \leq r \leq t - 1$ , and hence  $\text{Diag}(I_t)$  cannot get lower than  $\text{Diag}(B)$  on the left of  $P$ . As a sum, we get  $\text{Diag}(I_t) = \text{Diag}(B)$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Example 3.13.** Figure 3 is an example of visualizing  $I_4 = \{1, 3, 4, 6\}$  in  $M[1357, 3789] \in \text{Lpm}(9)$ , where  $\text{Diag}(I_4)$  is labeled in purple.




Figure 3

Also, we can visualize Grassmann coneclaces in a dual way.

**Lemma 3.14.** *Given  $M \in \text{Lpm}(n)$  and  $t \in [n]$ . In  $\text{Diag}(M)$ , denote the intersection of the line  $x = t - 1$  and  $\text{Diag}(U)$  by  $Q$ . Then  $\text{Diag}(J_t)$ , the path corresponding to the  $i$ -th term of the Grassmann coneclace of  $M$ , is the lowermost path passing through  $Q$ .*

The proof is analogous to Lemma 3.12 and is left to the readers.

**Example 3.15.** Figure 4 is an example of visualizing  $J_4 = \{2, 3, 8, 9\}$  in  $M[1357, 3789] \in \text{Lpm}(9)$ , where  $\text{Diag}(J_4)$  is labeled in green.




Figure 4

In addition, we have the following observation for the dual of a given LPM, which is straightforward to check by the definition of dual matroid.

**Remark 3.16.** Given an LPM  $M$  and its diagram  $\text{Diag}(M)$ . Then the diagram of the dual of  $M$ ,  $\text{Diag}(M^*)$ , is the reflection image of  $\text{Diag}(M)$  over the  $x$ -axis. We denote the

Grassmann necklace of  $M$  by  $I = (I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n)$ , and the Grassmann conecklace of  $M^*$  to be  $J^* = (J_1^*, J_2^*, \dots, J_n^*)$ . Then the reflection image of  $\text{Diag}(I_t)$  is  $\text{Diag}(J_t^*)$  for all  $t \in [n]$ .

Now we have completed all the preparatory work, and we split the proof of Theorem 3.5 into the following three lemmas. In these lemmas, we assume  $M, M' \in \text{Lpm}(n)$  satisfy  $U \subseteq U'$  and  $L \subseteq L'$ , and we denote the eliminating sets by

$$\Delta U = \{u_{i_1} < u_{i_2} < \dots < u_{i_k}\}, \quad \Delta L = \{l_{j_1} < l_{j_2} < \dots < l_{j_k}\}.$$

**Lemma 3.17.** *Suppose  $(\Delta U, \Delta L)$  doesn't have a good greedy pairing, then at least one of the following two propositions holds.*

- *There exists a line  $y = -x + c$ ,  $c \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ , such that*

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2i_m \leq c\}| > |\{m \in [k] \mid 2j_m \leq c\}|;$$

- *There exists a line  $y = x - c$ ,  $c \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ , such that*

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2l_{j_m} - 2j_m \leq c\}| > |\{m \in [k] \mid 2u_{i_m} - 2i_m \leq c\}|.$$

*Proof.* Note that we can label the pairs which are not good by

$$\text{BadPair} = \{m \in [k] \mid j_m > i_m\} \cup \{m \in [k] \mid u_{i_m} - l_{j_m} > i_m - j_m\}.$$

Case 1: There exists some  $m_1 \in [k]$ , such that  $j_{m_1} > i_{m_1}$ . In this case, let  $c = 2i_{m_1}$ . Note that now

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2i_m \leq c\}| = |[m_1]| = m_1, \quad |\{m \in [k] \mid 2j_m \leq c\}| < |[m_1]| = m_1.$$

Thus we have

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2i_m \leq c\}| > |\{m \in [k] \mid 2j_m \leq c\}|.$$

The intuition of case 1 is shown in Figure 5. The blue dot line is  $y = -x + c$ . Denote the point on  $\{y = -x + c\} \cap \text{Diag}(L')$  which has the maximal  $x$ -coordinate by  $P'$ , and the point on  $\{y = -x + c\} \cap \text{Diag}(U')$  which has the maximal  $x$ -coordinate by  $Q'$ . Then  $\{u_{i_m} \in \Delta U \mid 2i_m \leq c\}$  corresponds to the elements in  $\Delta U$  on the left of the point  $Q'$ , and  $\{l_{j_m} \in \Delta L \mid 2j_m \leq c\}$  corresponds to the elements in  $\Delta L$  on the left of the point  $P'$ . Hence

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2i_m \leq c\}| > |\{m \in [k] \mid 2j_m \leq c\}|$$

means that the elements in  $\Delta U$  on the left of  $Q'$  are more than the elements in  $\Delta L$  on the left of  $P'$ .




Figure 5

Case 2: There exists some  $m_2 \in [k]$ , such that  $u_{i_{m_2}} - l_{j_{m_2}} > i_{m_2} - j_{m_2}$ . That is,  $u_{i_{m_2}} - i_{m_2} > l_{j_{m_2}} - j_{m_2}$ . Now let  $c = 2l_{j_{m_2}} - 2j_{m_2}$ , and we have

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2l_{j_m} - 2j_m \leq c\}| = |[m_2]| = m_2, \quad |\{m \in [k] \mid 2u_{i_m} - 2i_m \leq c\}| < |[m_2]| = m_2.$$

Thus we have

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2l_{j_m} - 2j_m \leq c\}| > |\{m \in [k] \mid 2u_{i_m} - 2i_m \leq c\}|.$$

The intuition of case 2 is shown in Figure 6. The blue dot line is  $y = x - c$ . Denote the point on  $\{y = x - c\} \cap \text{Diag}(L')$  which has the maximal  $x$ -coordinate by  $P'$ , and the point on  $\{y = x - c\} \cap \text{Diag}(U')$  which has the maximal  $x$ -coordinate by  $Q'$ . Then  $\{l_{j_m} \in \Delta L \mid 2l_{j_m} - 2j_m \leq c\}$  corresponds to the elements in  $\Delta L$  on the left of the point  $P'$ , and  $\{u_{i_m} \in \Delta U \mid 2u_{i_m} - 2i_m \leq c\}$  corresponds to the elements in  $\Delta U$  on the left of the point  $Q'$ . Hence

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2l_{j_m} - 2j_m \leq c\}| > |\{m \in [k] \mid 2u_{i_m} - 2i_m \leq c\}|$$

means that the elements in  $\Delta L$  on the left of  $P'$  are more than the elements in  $\Delta U$  on the left of  $Q'$ .




Figure 6

□

**Lemma 3.18.** *If there exists a line  $y = x - c$ ,  $c \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ , such that*

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2l_{j_m} - 2j_m \leq c\}| > |\{m \in [k] \mid 2u_{i_m} - 2i_m \leq c\}|,$$

*then  $I_t \not\subseteq I'_t$  for some  $t$ .*

*Proof.* Denote the point on  $\{y = x - c\} \cap \text{Diag}(L')$  which has the maximal  $x$ -coordinate by  $P'$ , and the point on  $\{y = x - c\} \cap \text{Diag}(U')$  which has the maximal  $x$ -coordinate by  $Q'$ . Denote  $P := \{x = x_{P'}\} \cap \text{Diag}(L)$ , and  $Q := \{x = x_{Q'}\} \cap \text{Diag}(U)$ . Then we have

$$y_{P'} - y_P = 2k_1, \text{ where } k_1 := |\{m \in [k] \mid 2l_{j_m} - 2j_m \leq c\}|;$$

and

$$y_{Q'} - y_Q = 2k_2, \text{ where } k_2 := |\{m \in [k] \mid 2u_{i_m} - 2i_m \leq c\}|.$$

This is because  $(y_{P'} - y_P)/2$  equals the number of upward moves on the left of  $P'$  on  $\text{Diag}(L')$  which become downward moves on  $\text{Diag}(L)$ , and this number is  $k_1$ ; moreover,  $(y_{Q'} - y_Q)/2$  equals the number of upward moves on the left of  $Q'$  on  $\text{Diag}(U')$  which become downward moves on  $\text{Diag}(U)$ , and this number is  $k_2$ .

By our assumption, we have  $k_1 > k_2$ . So  $y_{P'} - y_P > y_{Q'} - y_Q$ . Denote

$$T := (x_{Q'}, y_{Q'} + y_P - y_{P'}).$$

Note that

$$y_{Q'} + y_P - y_{P'} < y_{Q'} + y_Q - y_{Q'} = y_Q,$$

so  $T$  is below  $Q$ . That is,  $T$  is below  $\text{Diag}(U)$ .

Let  $t = x_{P'} + 1$ , we consider  $I'_t$  and  $I_t$ . By Lemma 3.12 and the definition of  $Q'$ , we have  $x_{Q'} + 1 \notin I'_t$ .

Note that  $T$  is below the upper boundary  $\text{Diag}(U)$ , so we have  $R := T + (1, 1)$  is in  $\text{Diag}(M)$  (including boundary). By Lemma 3.12, we have  $x_R \in I_t$ . Moreover,  $x_R = x_{T+1} = x_{Q'} + 1$ , and we have already shown that  $x_{Q'} + 1 \notin I'_t$ , so  $x_{Q'} + 1 \in I_t \setminus I'_t$ , and we get  $I_t \not\subseteq I'_t$ , as desired.

The idea of the proof is shown in Figure 7 and Figure 8. Figure 7 is  $\text{Diag}(M')$  and Figure 8 is  $\text{Diag}(M)$ . The blue dot line in Figure 7 is  $y = x - c$ . The purple paths in the two figures are  $\text{Diag}(I'_t)$  and  $\text{Diag}(I_t)$  respectively. Our proof shows that the pink move is a downward move in  $\text{Diag}(I'_t)$ , but is an upward move in  $\text{Diag}(I_t)$ . So there exists an element lying in  $I_t \setminus I'_t$ , and hence  $I_t \not\subseteq I'_t$ .




Figure 7




Figure 8

□

The next lemma is a dual version of Lemma 3.18 with respect to conecklaces.

**Lemma 3.19.** *If there exists a line  $y = -x + c$ ,  $c \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ , such that*

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2i_m \leq c\}| > |\{m \in [k] \mid 2j_m \leq c\}|,$$

*then  $J_t \not\subseteq J'_t$  for some  $t$ .*

*Proof.* The idea of the proof of Lemma 3.19 is similar to Lemma 3.18. Denote the point on  $\{y = -x + c\} \cap \text{Diag}(U')$  which has the maximal  $x$ -coordinate by  $Q'$ , and the point on  $\{y = -x + c\} \cap \text{Diag}(L')$  which has the maximal  $x$ -coordinate by  $P'$ . Denote  $Q := \{x = x_{Q'}\} \cap \text{Diag}(U)$ , and  $P := \{x = x_{P'}\} \cap \text{Diag}(L)$ . Then we have

$$y_{Q'} - y_Q = 2k_1, \text{ where } k_1 = |\{m \in [k] \mid 2i_m \leq c\}|;$$

and

$$y_{P'} - y_P = 2k_2, \text{ where } k_2 = |\{m \in [k] \mid 2j_m \leq c\}|.$$

By our assumption, we have  $k_1 > k_2$ . So  $y_{Q'} - y_Q > y_{P'} - y_P$ . Denote

$$T := (x_{P'}, y_{P'} + y_Q - y_{Q'}).$$

Note that

$$y_{P'} + y_Q - y_{Q'} < y_{P'} + y_P - y_{P'} = y_P,$$

so  $T$  is below  $P$ . That is,  $T$  is below  $\text{Diag}(L)$ .

Let  $t = x_{Q'} + 1$ , we consider  $J'_t$  and  $J_t$ . By Lemma 3.14, we have

$$\{x_{Q'} + 1, x_{Q'} + 2, \dots, x_{P'}\} \cap J'_t = \emptyset.$$

Note that  $x_{P'} + y_{P'} = x_{Q'} + y_{Q'}$ , so we have

$$x_{P'} + (y_{P'} + y_Q - y_{Q'}) = y_Q + (x_{P'} + y_{P'}) - y_{Q'} = y_Q + x_{Q'} = y_Q + x_Q,$$

hence  $T$  lies on the line of slope  $-1$  passing through  $Q$ . Since  $T$  is below  $\text{Diag}(L)$ , we have either  $x_Q = x_P$ , or

$$\{x_Q + 1, x_Q + 2, \dots, x_P\} \cap J_t \neq \emptyset.$$

We claim that the case  $x_Q = x_P$  couldn't happen. Suppose otherwise,  $x_Q = x_P$  implies  $x_{Q'} = x_{P'}$ , then we have  $Q' = P'$ . Hence

$$y_P = y_{P'} + y_P - y_{P'} > y_{P'} + y_Q - y_{Q'} = y_Q.$$

That is to say,  $P$  and  $Q$  has the same  $x$ -coordinate, but  $y_P > y_Q$ . Note that  $P \in \text{Diag}(L)$ ,  $Q \in \text{Diag}(U)$ , so  $M[U, L]$  is not well-defined, and we get a contradiction.

So we have

$$\{x_Q + 1, x_Q + 2, \dots, x_P\} \cap J_t \neq \emptyset.$$

Note that  $x_{Q'} = x_Q, x_{P'} = x_P$ , so

$$\{x_{Q'} + 1, x_{Q'} + 2, \dots, x_{P'}\} \cap J_t \not\subseteq \{x_{Q'} + 1, x_{Q'} + 2, \dots, x_{P'}\} \cap J'_t,$$

and hence  $J_t \not\subseteq J'_t$ , as desired.

The idea of the proof is shown in Figure 9 and Figure 10. Figure 9 is  $\text{Diag}(M')$  and Figure 10 is  $\text{Diag}(M)$ . The blue dot line in Figure 9 is  $y = -x + c$ . The green paths in the two figures are  $\text{Diag}(J'_t)$  and  $\text{Diag}(J_t)$  respectively. Our proof shows that there exists a pink move on the line segment  $Q'P'$ , which is a downward move in  $\text{Diag}(J'_t)$ , but is an upward move in  $\text{Diag}(J_t)$ . So there exists an element lying in  $J_t \setminus J'_t$ , and hence  $J_t \not\subseteq J'_t$ .




Figure 9




Figure 10

□

It is worth mentioning that one can use Remark 3.16 and Lemma 3.18 to give an alternative proof of Lemma 3.19.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.5.

*Proof of Theorem 3.5.* We only need to show the “if” part. Suppose  $M \not\prec_q M'$ . Note that  $I_1 \subseteq I'_1$  and  $J_1 \subseteq J'_1$ , we have  $U \subseteq U'$  and  $L \subseteq L'$ . By assumption and Theorem 3.7,  $(\Delta U, \Delta L)$  doesn't have a good greedy pairing. So by Lemma 3.17, at least one of the following two propositions holds.

- There exists a line  $y = -x + c$ ,  $c \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ , such that

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2i_m \leq c\}| > |\{m \in [k] \mid 2j_m \leq c\}|;$$

- There exists a line  $y = x - c$ ,  $c \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ , such that

$$|\{m \in [k] \mid 2l_{j_m} - 2j_m \leq c\}| > |\{m \in [k] \mid 2u_{i_m} - 2i_m \leq c\}|.$$

In the first case, Lemma 3.19 implies there exists some  $t$ , such that  $J_t \not\subseteq J'_t$ . In the second case, Lemma 3.18 implies there exists some  $t$ , such that  $I_t \not\subseteq I'_t$ . As a sum, we obtain a contradiction. So  $M \prec_q M'$ . □

**Remark 3.20.** It is worth mentioning that neither necklace containment nor conecklace containment alone guarantees two LPMS to be concordant. A counterexample for necklaces is  $M[14, 57]$  and  $M'[145, 467]$ . In this case, we have

$$I = (14, 24, 34, 45, 56, 16, 17) \quad \text{and} \quad I' = (145, 245, 345, 456, 156, 167, 147).$$

So we have  $I_i \subseteq I'_i$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 7$ , but  $M$  is not a quotient of  $M'$  by Theorem 3.7. By examining the dual of this counterexample, one can obtain a counterexample for conecklaces.

## 4 Concordant Positroids with Adjacent Rank

In Section 4.1, we firstly introduce the concept of cyclic shifts, following the definition in [2]. Next, in Section 4.2, we prove Theorem 4.4, which asserts that for any two positroids, the containment of their respective Grassmann necklaces holds if and only if we can transform one into the other through a cyclic shift. Then, in Section 4.3, with the help of several lemmas, we prove Theorem 4.15, which constructs the cyclic shift between the decorated permutations of two concordant positroids.

### 4.1 Cyclic Shifts

In the paper [2], the authors firstly posed the concept of *cyclic shifts*, motivated by their discovery of the features of decorated permutations corresponding to a pair of concordant positroids with ranks differed by 1.

**Definition 4.1** ([2], Definition 2.3). Given a decorated permutation  $\pi^\cdot = (\pi, \text{col}_\pi) \in D_n$  and a subset  $A \subseteq [n]$ , we define a new decorated permutation  $(\sigma, \text{col}_\sigma) = \overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi^\cdot)$  as follows.

1. For all  $i \in A$ , let  $\sigma(i) = \pi(i)$  and  $\text{col}_\sigma(i) = \text{col}_\pi(i)$ ;
2. For  $i \notin A$ , let  $\sigma(i) = \pi(j)$ , where  $j$  is the maximum element of  $[n] \setminus A$  under the  $<_i$  order;
3. For  $i \notin A$ , let  $\text{col}_\sigma(i) = 1$  whenever  $\sigma(i)$  is defined to have value  $i$ . Otherwise define  $\text{col}_\sigma(i) = 0$ .

We call this the *cyclic shift* with respect to a subset  $A$ .

Intuitively, the operation  $\overrightarrow{\rho}_A$  first freezes all positions in  $A$ . Then, among the remaining positions, it cyclically shifts the values one place to the right. Finally, it decorates all the new fixed points as loops.

**Example 4.2.** Let  $\pi^\cdot = 165\underline{4}23\overline{7}$ , then  $\overrightarrow{\rho}_{247}(\pi^\cdot) = 3614\underline{5}2\overline{7}$ .

For any two decorated permutations  $\sigma^\cdot$  and  $\pi^\cdot$ , define  $\sigma^\cdot \triangleleft \pi^\cdot$  if the positroids represented by  $\sigma^\cdot$  and  $\pi^\cdot$ , say  $M$  and  $N$ , satisfy

- $M$  is a quotient of  $N$ ;
- $\text{rk}(N) = \text{rk}(M) + 1$ .

It is conjectured in [2] that if  $\sigma^\cdot \triangleleft \pi^\cdot$  then there exists  $A \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sigma^\cdot = \overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi^\cdot)$ . In Section 4, we give an affirmative answer to the conjecture:

**Theorem 4.3.** *If  $\sigma^\cdot \triangleleft \pi^\cdot$ , then there is a subset  $A \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sigma^\cdot = \overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi^\cdot)$ .*

In fact, we prove the following stronger result:

**Theorem 4.4.** *Let  $M$  and  $N$  be two positroids, and  $\text{rk}(M) = \text{rk}(N) - 1$ . Let  $\sigma^\cdot$  and  $\pi^\cdot$  be the decorated permutations of  $M$  and  $N$ , respectively. Let  $I^\sigma$  and  $I^\pi$  be the Grassmann necklaces of  $M$  and  $N$ , respectively. Then, the following are equivalent:*

1.  $I_i^\sigma \subseteq I_i^\pi$  for each  $i \in [n]$ ;
2. There exists  $A \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sigma^\cdot = \overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi^\cdot)$ .

## 4.2 Proof of Theorem 4.4

This subsection is devoted to proving Theorem 4.4. We assume throughout the subsection that  $\text{rk}(\sigma^\cdot) = \text{rk}(\pi^\cdot) - 1$  and  $I^\sigma$  (respectively  $I^\pi$ ) is the Grassmann necklace of  $\sigma^\cdot$  (respectively  $\pi^\cdot$ ). Moreover, we denote the indicator function of a condition  $C$  by  $\mathbb{1}\{C\}$ , that is

$$\mathbb{1}\{C\} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } C \text{ is true;} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Grassmann necklaces and cyclic shifts are both combinatorial concepts that have clear connections to decorated permutations. However, their relationship with each other is more intricate and requires new insights. To understand their relationship better, we define several sets of vectors as intermediaries that serve to bridge them together.

**Definition 4.5.** For each  $i \in [n]$ , let  $u^{(i)} = (u_j^{(i)})_{j \in [n]}$  be a length  $n$  vector defined by

$$u_j^{(i)} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sigma(i) = i \text{ and } \text{col}_\sigma(i) = -1; \\ \mathbb{1}\{i <_j \sigma^{-1}(i)\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Similarly we define a sequence of vectors  $v^{(i)}$  for  $i \in [n]$  based on  $\pi^\cdot$ .

In the following content, we denote  $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$  by  $\mathbf{1}$ , and denote  $(0, 0, \dots, 0)$  by  $\mathbf{0}$ .

**Example 4.6.** We can interpret  $u^{(i)}$  in the following equivalent way.

$$u^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \text{indicator vector for cyclic interval } (\sigma^{-1}(i), i], & \text{if } \sigma(i) \neq i; \\ \mathbf{1}, & \text{if } \sigma(i) = i \text{ and } \text{col}_\sigma(i) = -1; \\ \mathbf{0}, & \text{if } \sigma(i) = i \text{ and } \text{col}_\sigma(i) = 1. \end{cases}$$

For example, if  $\sigma^\cdot = 2461\underline{5}3$ , then

$$u^{(4)} = \text{indicator vector of } (2, 4] = (0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0).$$

In this proof, we adopt the following convention: for two real-valued vectors  $u = (u_j)_{j \in [n]}$  and  $v = (v_j)_{j \in [n]}$ , we write  $u \preceq v$  if  $u_j \leq v_j$  for all  $j \in [n]$ . The following lemma translates the necklace containment condition into a corresponding condition on the newly defined vectors.

**Lemma 4.7.** *The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $I_i^\sigma \subseteq I_i^\pi$  for each  $i \in [n]$ ;
- (2)  $u^{(i)} \preceq v^{(i)}$  for each  $i \in [n]$ .

*Proof.* For any  $i, j \in [n]$ , we know directly from Definition 4.5 that  $u_j^{(i)} = 1$  if and only if the element  $i$  is a  $j$ -anti-exceedance in  $\sigma$ . By Proposition 2.24, this is in turn equivalent to  $i \in I_j^\sigma$ . So for  $i, j \in [n]$ , we have the equivalence

$$u_j^{(i)} = 1 \text{ if and only if } i \in I_j^\sigma. \quad (1)$$

Consequently, we have the desired equivalence

$$\begin{aligned} I_j^\sigma \subseteq I_j^\pi \text{ for each } j \in [n] &\Leftrightarrow \{(i, j) \in [n]^2 : i \in I_j^\sigma\} \subseteq \{(i, j) \in [n]^2 : i \in I_j^\pi\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \{(i, j) \in [n]^2 : u_j^{(i)} = 1\} \subseteq \{(i, j) \in [n]^2 : v_j^{(i)} = 1\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow u^{(i)} \preceq v^{(i)} \text{ for each } i \in [n]. \end{aligned}$$

□

One nice property of the vectors  $u^{(i)}$  and  $v^{(i)}$  is that their sums reflect the ranks of the positroids, as demonstrated by the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.8.** *For each  $j \in [n]$ , we have  $\sum_{i=1}^n u_j^{(i)} = \text{rk}(\sigma^\cdot)$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n v_j^{(i)} = \text{rk}(\pi^\cdot)$ .*

*Proof.* By (1) we directly have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n u_j^{(i)} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{i \in I_j^\sigma\} = |I_j^\sigma| = \text{rk}(\sigma^\cdot),$$

where we use Proposition 2.24 in the last equality. The second identity  $\sum_{i=1}^n v_j^{(i)} = \text{rk}(\pi^\cdot)$  follows by symmetry. □

After establishing connections with Grassmann necklaces, we now turn our attention to establishing connections with cyclic shifts. To accomplish this, we introduce a new set of vectors closely related to cyclic shift operations.

**Definition 4.9.** For each  $i \in [n]$ , let  $w^{(i)} = \left( w_j^{(i)} \right)_{j \in [n]}$  be a vector defined by

$$w_j^{(i)} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sigma(i) = \pi(i) = i \text{ and } \text{col}_\sigma(i) = 1 \text{ but } \text{col}_\pi(i) = -1; \\ \mathbb{1} \{ \sigma^{-1}(i) <_j \pi^{-1}(i) \}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Example 4.10.** We can interpret  $w^{(i)}$  in the following equivalent way.

$$w^{(i)} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{1}, & \text{if } \sigma(i) = \pi(i) = i \text{ and } \text{col}_\sigma(i) = 1 \text{ but } \text{col}_\pi(i) = -1; \\ \text{indicator vector for } (\sigma^{-1}(i), \pi^{-1}(i)], & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For example, if  $\sigma = 456123$  and  $\pi = 246153$ , then

$$w^{(5)} = \text{indicator vector of } (2, 5] = (0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 0).$$

The relations between the three set of vectors are demonstrated by the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.11.** For each  $i \in [n]$  we have

$$w^{(i)} = \begin{cases} v^{(i)} - u^{(i)}, & \text{if } u^{(i)} \preceq v^{(i)}; \\ v^{(i)} - u^{(i)} + \mathbf{1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We divide into several cases.

Case 1:  $i$  is a coloop in  $\pi$  and a loop in  $\sigma$ . In this case  $v^{(i)} = w^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$  and  $u^{(i)} = \mathbf{0}$ , satisfying the desired conclusion.

Case 2:  $i$  is a coloop in  $\pi$  and not a loop in  $\sigma$ . In this case  $v^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$  and  $u_j^{(i)} = \mathbb{1} \{ i \leq_j \sigma^{-1}(i) \}$ , while  $w_j^{(i)} = \mathbb{1} \{ \sigma^{-1}(i) \leq_j i \}$ , so we clearly have  $w^{(i)} + u^{(i)} = \mathbf{1} = v^{(i)}$ , satisfying the desired conclusion.

Case 3:  $i$  is a coloop in  $\sigma$  and not a coloop in  $\pi$ . In this case  $u^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$  and  $v_j^{(i)} = \mathbb{1} \{ i <_j \pi^{-1}(i) \}$ . The relation  $u^{(i)} \preceq v^{(i)}$  does not hold since  $v_i^{(i)} = 0$ . The conclusion then follows since we also have  $w_j^{(i)} = \mathbb{1} \{ i <_j \pi^{-1}(i) \} = v_j^{(i)} = v_j^{(i)} - u_j^{(i)} + 1$  for all  $j \in [n]$ .

Case 4:  $i$  is not a coloop in either  $\sigma$  or  $\pi$ . In this case we see from Definition 4.5 that  $\text{supp}(u^{(i)}) = (\sigma^{-1}(i), i]$ ,  $\text{supp}(v^{(i)}) = (\pi^{-1}(i), i]$ , and  $\text{supp}(w^{(i)}) = (\pi^{-1}(i), \sigma^{-1}(i)]$ .

The relation between the vectors then depends on the relative order of the elements  $i, \sigma^{-1}(i)$  and  $\pi^{-1}(i)$  on the circle. If  $\sigma^{-1}(i) \leq_{\pi^{-1}(i)} i$ , then we have

$$\text{supp}(v^{(i)}) = \text{supp}(u^{(i)}) \sqcup \text{supp}(w^{(i)}).$$

This means  $v^{(i)} = u^{(i)} + w^{(i)}$ , proving the conclusion. Otherwise,  $i <_{\pi^{-1}(i)} \sigma^{-1}(i)$  and we have

$$\text{supp}(u^{(i)}) = \text{supp}(v^{(i)}) \sqcup (\sigma^{-1}(i), \pi^{-1}(i)],$$

while  $(\sigma^{-1}(i), \pi^{-1}(i))$  is exactly  $[n] \setminus \text{supp}(w^{(i)})$ . This means  $u^{(i)} = v^{(i)} + (\mathbf{1} - w^{(i)})$ , also proving the conclusion.  $\square$

**Example 4.12.** Let  $\sigma^\cdot = 456123$  and  $\pi^\cdot = 246153$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} u^{(2)} &= \text{indicator vector of } (\sigma^{-1}(2), 2] = (1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1) \\ v^{(2)} &= \text{indicator vector of } (\pi^{-1}(2), 2] = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0) \\ w^{(2)} &= u^{(2)} - v^{(2)} = (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

The next lemma finally establishes a connection between the vectors and the cyclic shift operation.

**Lemma 4.13.** *The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) *There exists a set  $A \subseteq [n]$  such that  $\sigma^\cdot = \overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi^\cdot)$*
- (2)  $\sum_{i=1}^n w^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$ .

*Proof.* First, we assume that  $\sigma^\cdot = \overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi^\cdot)$  for some  $A \subseteq [n]$ . If  $|A| = n$  then  $\sigma^\cdot = \pi^\cdot$ , contradicting the assumption  $\text{rk}(\sigma^\cdot) = \text{rk}(\pi^\cdot) - 1$ . If  $|A| = n - 1$ , then the shift operation is performed on only one entry of the permutation. According to Definition 4.1, the only possibility of  $\sigma^\cdot \neq \pi^\cdot$  is the shifted element turns from a coloop to a loop. If  $i$  is the only shifted element, then according to Definition 4.9, we have  $w^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$  and  $w^{(j)} = \mathbf{0}$  for any  $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$ , and consequently statement (2) holds.

Now assume  $|A| \leq n - 2$ . Let  $[n] \setminus A = \{i_1, \dots, i_\ell\}$ , where  $i_1 <_1 \dots <_1 i_\ell$ . Denote  $i_{\ell+1} = i_1$ . Then we know from Definition 4.1 that  $\pi(A)$  are the shifted numbers. For each  $i \notin \pi(A)$ , by Definition 4.9 we must have  $w^{(i)} = \mathbf{0}$ . We also know from Definition 4.1 that  $\sigma^{-1}(\pi(i_r)) = i_{r+1}$  for each  $r \in [\ell]$ . So

$$[n] = \bigsqcup_{r=1}^{\ell} (i_r, i_{r+1}] = \bigsqcup_{r=1}^{\ell} (\pi^{-1}(\pi(i_r)), \sigma^{-1}(\pi(i_r))) = \bigsqcup_{r=1}^{\ell} \text{supp} \left( w^{(\pi(i_r))} \right) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^n \text{supp} \left( w^{(i)} \right).$$

This means  $\sum_{i=1}^n w^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$ .

Conversely, assuming that  $\sum_{i=1}^n w^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$  holds, we prove statement (1). Let  $B = \{i \in [n] : \pi^{-1}(i) \neq \sigma^{-1}(i)\}$ . For  $i \in [n] \setminus B$ , by Definition 4.9  $w^{(i)} \neq \mathbf{0}$  only if  $i$  is a coloop in  $\pi^\cdot$  and a loop in  $\sigma^\cdot$ , in which case we have  $w^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$ .

Case 1: there is such an index  $i_0 \in [n] \setminus B$  with  $w^{(i_0)} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , we must have

$$\sum_{i \in B} w^{(i)} \preceq \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus i_0} w^{(i)} = \mathbf{1} - w^{(i_0)} = \mathbf{0}.$$

On the other hand, for  $i \in B$  we must have  $w^{(i)} \neq \mathbf{0}$  since  $w_{\sigma^{-1}(i)}^{(i)} = 1$  by definition. So we must have  $B = \emptyset$ , and consequently  $\sigma^\cdot = \overrightarrow{\rho}_{\{i_0\}}(\pi^\cdot)$ .

Case 2:  $w^{(i)} = \mathbf{0}$  for all  $i \in [n] \setminus B$ , and hence  $\mathbf{1} = \sum_{i \in B} w^{(i)}$ . For  $i \in B$ , by definition we have  $w_{\pi^{-1}(i)}^{(i)} = 0$ . So we must have  $|B| \geq 2$ . Let  $A = \sigma^{-1}(B) = \{i_1, \dots, i_\ell\}$ , where

$i_1 <_1 \cdots <_1 i_\ell$ . Since  $B$  is the collection of non-fixed-points of the bijection  $\pi \circ \sigma^{-1}$ , it follows that  $A$  is the collection of non-fixed-points of  $\sigma^{-1} \circ \pi$ . In particular  $A = \sigma^{-1}(\pi(A))$ . So  $\sigma^{-1}(\pi(i_r)) \in A \setminus \{i_r\} = \{i_1, \dots, i_{r-1}, i_{r+1}, \dots, i_\ell\}$ . Consequently, the element  $i_{\ell+1}$  must lie in the cyclic interval

$$(i_\ell, \sigma^{-1}(\pi(i_\ell))] = \text{supp} \left( w^{(\pi(i_\ell))} \right),$$

Since  $i_{\ell+1}$  also lies in the cyclic interval

$$(\pi^{-1}(\sigma(i_{\ell+1})), i_{\ell+1}] = \text{supp} \left( w^{(\sigma(i_{\ell+1}))} \right),$$

if  $\pi(i_r) \neq \sigma(i_{r+1})$ , then  $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i^{(i)} \geq 2$ , contradicting the assumption  $\sum_{i=1}^n w^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$ . Therefore, for any  $r \in [\ell]$  we must have  $\pi(i_r) = \sigma(i_{r+1})$ . This almost implies  $\sigma^\cdot = \vec{\rho}_A(\pi^\cdot)$ , except that we need to show for each  $i \in A$  that  $i$  is not a coloop in  $\sigma^\cdot$ .

If  $i_0 \in A$  is a coloop in  $\sigma^\cdot$ , then  $u^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$ , and since  $\pi^{-1}(i_0) = \pi^{-1}(\sigma(i_0)) \neq i_0$ , we have  $v^{(i)} \neq \mathbf{1}$ . By Definition 4.9 we have  $w^{(i_0)} = v^{(i_0)} - u^{(i_0)} + \mathbf{1}$ . So using Definition 4.9 and Lemma 4.8, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w^{(i)} \succeq \sum_{i=1}^n \left( v^{(i)} - u^{(i)} \right) + \mathbf{1} = (\text{rk}(\pi^\cdot) - \text{rk}(\sigma^\cdot)) \cdot \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{1} = 2 \cdot \mathbf{1},$$

a contradiction. □

Now we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 4.4.

*Proof of Theorem 4.4.* In light of Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.13, it suffices to show that  $\sum_{i=1}^n w^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$  if and only if  $u^{(i)} \preceq v^{(i)}$  for all  $i$ . We have by Definition 4.9 and Lemma 4.8 the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n w^{(i)} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( v^{(i)} - u^{(i)} + \mathbb{1} \left\{ u^{(i)} \not\preceq v^{(i)} \right\} \cdot \mathbf{1} \right) \\ &= \left( \text{rk}(\pi^\cdot) - \text{rk}(\sigma^\cdot) + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1} \left\{ u^{(i)} \not\preceq v^{(i)} \right\} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1} \\ &= \mathbf{1} + \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1} \left\{ u^{(i)} \not\preceq v^{(i)} \right\} \right) \cdot \mathbf{1} \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $\sum_{i=1}^n w^{(i)} = \mathbf{1}$  holds if and only if none of the indicators  $\mathbb{1} \left\{ u^{(i)} \not\preceq v^{(i)} \right\}$  equals 1, or equivalently  $u^{(i)} \preceq v^{(i)}$  holds for all  $i$ . □

### 4.3 Characterizing the Shifted Positions using Coneclaces

**Lemma 4.14.** *Assume  $\sigma^\cdot = (\sigma, \text{col}_\sigma)$  and  $\pi^\cdot = (\pi, \text{col}_\pi)$  are decorated permutations on  $[n]$ , and let  $J^\sigma$  and  $J^\pi$  be the Grassmann coneclaces of  $\sigma^\cdot$  and  $\pi^\cdot$ , respectively. If  $J_i^\sigma \subseteq J_i^\pi$  for each  $i \in [n]$ , then we have*

$$\{a \in [n] : \sigma(a) \neq \pi(a) \text{ or } \text{col}_\sigma(a) \neq \text{col}_\pi(a)\} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n (J_i^\pi \setminus J_i^\sigma).$$

*Proof.* We first assume  $a \in J_i^\pi \setminus J_i^\sigma$  for some  $i \in [n]$ . Then from Proposition 2.29 we know that  $\pi(a) <_i a$  or  $\text{col}_\pi(a) = -1$ , and that  $a <_i \sigma(a)$  or  $\text{col}_\sigma(a) = 1$ . If  $\pi(a) <_i a$ , then since  $a \leq_i \sigma(a)$  we know  $\pi(a) \neq \sigma(a)$ . Otherwise we have  $\text{col}_\pi(a) = -1$ , in which case  $\sigma(a) = \pi(a)$  only if  $\text{col}_\sigma(a) = 1$ , so either  $\sigma(a) \neq \pi(a)$  or  $\text{col}_\sigma(a) \neq \text{col}_\pi(a)$  holds.

Conversely, assume  $a \in [n]$ , such that  $\sigma(a) \neq \pi(a)$  or  $\text{col}_\sigma(a) \neq \text{col}_\pi(a)$ ; we prove that  $a \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n (J_i^\pi \setminus J_i^\sigma)$ . We divide the proof into several cases.

Case 1:  $a$  is a coloop in  $\pi^\cdot$ . In this case  $a$  cannot be a coloop of  $\sigma^\cdot$ . It follows from Proposition 2.29 that  $a \in J_a^\pi$  but  $a \notin J_a^\sigma$ , and thus  $a \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n (J_i^\pi \setminus J_i^\sigma)$ .

Case 2:  $a$  is a coloop in  $\sigma^\cdot$ . In this case  $a$  cannot be a coloop of  $\pi^\cdot$ . It follows from Proposition 2.29 that  $a \in J_a^\sigma$  but  $a \notin J_a^\pi$ , contradicting the assumption that  $J_i^\sigma \subseteq J_i^\pi$  for each  $i \in [n]$ .

Case 3:  $a$  is not a coloop in either  $\sigma^\cdot$  or  $\pi^\cdot$ . We must have  $\sigma(a) \neq \pi(a)$ , since otherwise one of  $\text{col}_\sigma(a)$  and  $\text{col}_\pi(a)$  would be  $-1$ .

Case 3.1: If  $\sigma(a) <_a \pi(a)$ , then  $a \leq_{\pi(a)} \sigma(a)$  and hence  $a \notin J_{\pi(a)}^\sigma$ . But since  $a \leq_a \sigma(a) <_a \pi(a)$ , we have  $\pi(a) <_{\pi(a)} a$  and hence  $a \in J_{\pi(a)}^\pi$ . So  $a \in \bigcup_{i=1}^n (J_i^\pi \setminus J_i^\sigma)$ .

Case 3.2: If  $\pi(a) <_a \sigma(a)$ , then similarly we know  $a \in J_{\sigma(a)}^\sigma$  but  $a \notin J_{\sigma(a)}^\pi$ , contradicting the assumption that  $J_i^\sigma \subseteq J_i^\pi$  for each  $i \in [n]$ .  $\square$

Combining Proposition 3.1, Theorem 4.4 and Lemma 4.14, we directly arrive at the second main theorem in our paper.

**Theorem 4.15** (Main Theorem 2). *Let  $M$  and  $N$  be two positroids, where  $M$  is a quotient of  $N$  with rank differed by 1. If  $\sigma^\cdot$  and  $\pi^\cdot$  represent the decorated permutations of  $M$  and  $N$  respectively, then  $\sigma^\cdot = \overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi^\cdot)$ , where  $A = [n] \setminus \bigcup_{i \in [n]} (J_i^\pi \setminus J_i^\sigma)$ . Here  $(J_i^\sigma)_{i \in [n]}$  and  $(J_i^\pi)_{i \in [n]}$  are the coneclaces of  $M$  and  $N$  respectively.*

**Example 4.16.** On the ground set  $[6]$ , let  $\sigma^\cdot = 315642$ , then all the positroid quotients of  $\sigma^\cdot$  with adjacent rank are 235641 and 314562. The first is the result of fixing the position enumerated by 3, 4 and 5 (that is, the positions filled by numbers 5, 6 and 4), while the second is 1, 2 and 6 (that is, the positions filled by numbers 3, 1 and 2). The computation is done by SageMath [17].

**Remark 4.17.** However, as presented in Example 4.16, cyclic shift does not always produce a quotient. It can be easily verified using SageMath, that 135642 is not a quotient of  $\sigma^\cdot$ , but is a result of cyclic shift by fixing the last four positions.

Given the example, a question follows from Theorem 4.15 now is that for any given  $\pi^\cdot$ , can we give a condition on  $A$ , such that  $\overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi^\cdot)$  is a quotient of  $\pi^\cdot$ ?

## 5 Positroid Quotients of Uniform Matroids

A complete description of concordant positroids, where ranks differ by 1, has not yet been characterized. However, if the positroid of larger rank is a uniform matroid on  $[n]$  of rank  $k$ , then we can give a complete description of such positroids.

For every proper subset  $A \subseteq [n]$ , there is a unique way to write  $A$  as a union  $[a_1, b_1] \sqcup \cdots \sqcup [a_s, b_s]$ , where  $[a_1, b_1], \dots, [a_s, b_s]$  are disjoint cyclic intervals, and  $a_i - b_{i+1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ . We call each of these cyclic intervals a *cyclic component* of  $A$ , and  $A = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^s [a_i, b_i]$  the *cyclic interval decomposition* of  $A$ .

**Example 5.1.** Let  $A \subseteq [9]$  be  $\{1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9\}$ , then the cyclic interval decomposition of  $A$  is  $A = \{4\} \cup [6, 7] \cup [9, 2]$ .

We denote by  $\pi_{k,n}^\cdot$  the decorated permutation of the uniform matroid  $U_{k,n}$ . Specifically, when  $k = 0$  or  $n$ ,  $\pi_{0,n}^\cdot = \overline{1 \dots n}$  and  $\pi_{n,n}^\cdot = \underline{1 \dots n}$ , otherwise  $\pi_{k,n}^\cdot(i) \equiv n - k + i \pmod{n}$ . By using the concept of cyclic components, we can state the main theorem of this section.

**Theorem 5.2** (Main Theorem 3). *Let  $P$  be a positroid with the decorated permutation  $\sigma^\cdot$ . Then  $P$  is a quotient of  $U_{k,n}$  of rank  $k - 1$  if and only if  $\sigma^\cdot = \overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi_{k,n}^\cdot)$  for some  $A \subseteq [n]$ , where no cyclic component of  $A$  has length greater than  $k - 1$ , and the sum of the lengths of every two distinct cyclic components of  $A$  does not exceed  $k - 1$ .*

Before proving Theorem 5.2, we state some propositions and lemmas. By using the concept of cyclic components, we first give a criterion of rank  $k - 1$  positroids of the form  $\overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi_{k,n}^\cdot)$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** *Given a subset  $A \subseteq [n]$ , the positroid represented by  $\sigma^\cdot = \overrightarrow{\rho}_A(\pi_{k,n}^\cdot)$  has rank  $k - 1$  if and only if every cyclic component of  $A$  has length  $\leq k - 1$ .*

*Proof.* The “ $\Leftarrow$ ” direction is proven in [2, Theorem 26]. For the other direction, assume  $\sigma^\cdot$  has rank  $k - 1$ , then Theorem 4.4 tell us that there are containments of Grassmann necklaces  $I_i^\sigma \subseteq I_i^\pi$  for every  $i \in [n]$ . Notice that  $I_i^\pi = [i, i + k - 1]$ . If there exists a cyclic component of  $A$ , denoted  $[a, b - 1] \subseteq A$ , has length  $\geq k$ , we find a contradiction by showing that there exists an  $i \in [n]$  such that  $I_i^\sigma \not\subseteq I_i^\pi$ . There are two cases.

Case 1: If  $A = [n]$ , then  $\sigma^\cdot = \pi_{k,n}^\cdot$ , and the rank does not change.

Case 2: Otherwise  $A \neq [n]$ . Originally  $\pi_{k,n}^\cdot(b) = b + k$ , and by the definition of the operator  $\overrightarrow{\rho}_A$ , after the shift  $\sigma^\cdot(b) = a - 1 + k$ . Now we claim that  $a - 1 + k \in I_b^\sigma$ . This is because the length of  $[a, b - 1]$  is  $\geq k$ . As a result,  $a - 1 + k \in [a, b - 1]$ , so  $b <_b a \leq_b a - 1 + k$ . Therefore  $a - 1 + k$  is a  $b$ -anti-exceedance of  $\sigma^\cdot$ . In the meantime, we claim that  $a - 1 + k \notin I_b^\pi$ ,

where  $I_b^\pi = [b, b-1+k]$ . This is because the length of  $[b, a-1+k]$  is greater than the length of  $[a, a-1+k]$ , which is  $k$ . As a result,  $b-1+k <_b a-1+k$ , which implies  $a-1+k \notin I_b^\pi$ . Therefore  $I_b^\sigma \not\subseteq I_b^\pi$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

In the paper [2], the authors prove the following theorem, which gives a description of the circuits of rank  $k-1$  positroids of the form  $\vec{\rho}_A \left( \pi_{k,n}^\dagger \right)$ .

**Theorem 5.4** ([2], Theorem 29). *Suppose the positroid represented by  $\sigma^\dagger = \vec{\rho}_A \left( \pi_{k,n}^\dagger \right)$  has rank  $k-1$ . Let  $A = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^m [a_i, b_i] \subseteq [n]$  be the cyclic interval decomposition of  $A \subseteq [n]$  with lengths of cyclic components given by  $l_1, \dots, l_m$  respectively. Denote  $[b_i+1, b_i+k-l_i]$  by  $L_i$  for  $i \in [m]$ . Then the set of circuits of the positroid represented by  $\sigma^\dagger$  is*

$$\mathcal{C}_A = \{L_i \mid i \in [m]\} \cup \left\{ C \in \binom{[n]}{k} \mid L_i \not\subseteq C, \forall i \in [m] \right\}.$$

Finally, we need the following lemma about cyclic intervals:

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $A$  and its subsets  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m \subseteq A$  be cyclic intervals of  $[n]$ , and  $A \neq [n]$ . If  $A_i \cap A_j \neq \emptyset$  for every  $i, j \in [m]$ , then  $\bigcap_{i \in [m]} A_i \neq \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* It is straightforward to prove that the intersection of two cyclic intervals  $A_i \subseteq A$  and  $A_j \subseteq A$  is also a cyclic interval contained by  $A$ , and that  $A_i \cap A_k \neq \emptyset, A_j \cap A_k \neq \emptyset$  implies  $(A_i \cap A_j) \cap A_k \neq \emptyset$  for a cyclic interval  $A_k \subseteq A$ . By induction on  $m$ , we complete the proof. It is worth mentioning that the condition  $A \neq [n]$  is necessary.  $\square$

Now we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 5.2.

*Proof of Theorem 5.2.* Recall that the set of basis of  $U_{k,n}$  is  $\binom{[n]}{k}$ , and the set of circuits is  $\binom{[n]}{k+1}$ . Suppose  $P$  is a quotient of  $U_{k,n}$  of rank  $k-1$ . By Theorem 4.15, we know  $P$  must be represented by a decorated permutation of the form  $\sigma^\dagger = \vec{\rho}_A \left( \pi_{k,n}^\dagger \right)$ . By Proposition 5.3, no cyclic component of  $A$  has length greater than  $k-1$ .

We use the notations in Theorem 5.4. If there exists  $i \neq j \in [m]$ , such that  $l_i + l_j \geq k$ , then

$$|L_i| + |L_j| = |[b_i+1, b_i+k-l_i]| + |[b_j+1, b_j+k-l_j]| = 2k - l_i - l_j \leq k.$$

First, we prove that  $L_i \cap L_j = \emptyset$ . Suppose the contrary, then

$$|L_i| + |L_j| \geq |L_i \cup L_j| + 1 = |[b_i+1, b_j+k-l_j]| + 1 \geq |[a_j, b_j+k-l_j]| + 1 = k+1,$$

which is a contradiction. Now we take  $S \in \binom{[n]}{k}$  satisfying  $S \supseteq L_i \sqcup L_j$ . Note that  $S$  is a basis of  $U_{k,n}$  and  $P$  is a quotient of  $U_{k,n}$  with  $\text{rk}(P) = k-1$ , so  $S$  contains a basis of  $P$  with size  $k-1$  by Proposition 2.11(3). But since  $L_i$  and  $L_j$  are disjoint, every  $k-1$  element

subset of  $S$  contains at least one of  $L_i$  and  $L_j$ . By Theorem 5.4,  $L_i$  and  $L_j$  are circuits of  $P$ , so every  $(k-1)$ -element subset of  $S$  is dependent, and we get a contradiction. So the sum of the lengths of any two cyclic components of  $A$  does not exceed  $k-1$ .

Conversely, suppose  $A$  satisfies the condition. Proposition 5.3 implies that  $P$  is of rank  $k-1$ . To prove that  $P$  is a quotient of  $U_{k,n}$ , it suffices to show that every  $S \in \binom{[n]}{k+1}$  is a union of some circuits of  $P$ . We split our proof into three cases.

Case 1: If  $S = \bigcup_{i \in I} L_i$  for some  $I \subseteq [m]$ , then  $S$  is already a union of some circuits of  $P$  by Theorem 5.4.

Case 2: If  $S$  doesn't contain any  $L_i$ , then every  $k$ -element subset of  $S$  doesn't contain any  $L_i$ . By Theorem 5.4, every  $k$ -element subset of  $S$  is a circuit of  $P$ .  $S$  is the union of these circuits.

Case 3: Otherwise, let  $I := \{i \in [m] \mid L_i \subseteq S\}$ . We claim that  $\bigcap_{i \in I} L_i \neq \emptyset$ . First, we show that for every  $i, j \in I$ ,  $L_i \cap L_j \neq \emptyset$ . This is because if  $L_i \cap L_j = \emptyset$ , then  $|L_i| + |L_j| \geq k+1$  implies  $S = L_i \cup L_j$ , which is covered in Case 2. Let  $L := \bigcup_{i \in I} L_i$ , then  $J$  is a cyclic interval, and  $L \neq [n]$ . By Lemma 5.5, we have  $\bigcap_{i \in I} L_i \neq \emptyset$ . Now we pick  $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} L_i$  and take  $S' = S \setminus \{x\}$ , then  $S = S' \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I} L_i)$  is a union of some circuits in  $P$  by Theorem 5.4.  $\square$

Here we give some examples.

**Example 5.6.** Consider the uniform positroid  $U_{8,4}$  given by the decoration  $\pi_{4,8} = 56781234$ . If  $A = \{3\} \cup \{5\} \cup [8, 1]$  or  $A = \{3\} \cup \{6\} \cup \{8\}$ , then in either case, the union of any two components does not exceed  $3 = 4 - 1$ . By Theorem 5.2, we know both two cyclic shifts give a positroid quotient of  $U_{4,8}$ .

If  $A = \{5\} \cup [8, 2]$ , then the union of two components  $\{5\}$  and  $[8, 2]$  has size 4, violating the condition. As a result,  $\vec{\rho}_A(\pi_{4,8})$  does not produce a quotient of  $U_{4,8}$ .

## 6 Future Work

In this paper, we have shown that any pair of concordant positroids with ranks differed by 1 must take the form  $\tau^\cdot = \vec{\rho}_A^\rightarrow(\sigma^\cdot)$ . But the converse is not true in general, as presented in Example 4.16. A problem posed in the last part of Section 4 is

**Problem 6.1.** Let  $\tau^\cdot = \vec{\rho}_A^\rightarrow(\sigma^\cdot)$ , what is the sufficient and necessary condition for  $A$  such that  $\tau^\cdot$  is a quotient of  $\sigma^\cdot$  with rank differed by 1?

A second question worth a trial is:

**Problem 6.2.** Let  $\mathcal{P}_n$  be the poset of positroids on  $[n]$  with order defined by quotient, then is  $\mathcal{P}_n$  a graded poset?

In the paper [3], the authors prove that the poset of LPM on  $[n]$ , with an order defined by quotient, is graded. This is established as a corollary of the fact that a truncation of

a greedy pairing remains a greedy pairing. So far, Problem 6.2 has been computationally verified for  $n = 6$ . We conjecture that the answer to the problem is affirmative.

If we solve Problem 6.1 and Problem 6.2, then the sufficient and necessary condition for two positroids being concordant can be described as a consecutive combination of cyclic moves with certain restrictions. However, solving these problems is anticipated to be challenging. For instance, considering Problem 6.1, a full characterization of how  $A$  appears is equivalent to converting the condition  $\min_{\leq_G} \{\mathcal{B}(\tau)\} \subseteq \min_{\leq_G} \{\mathcal{B}(\sigma)\}$  for all  $n!$  different Gale orders. Yet, there is a relatively less complex problem that we can consider:

**Problem 6.3.** Characterize the positroid quotients of  $U_{k,n}$  for arbitrary  $0 \leq k \leq n$ .

While [13, Conjecture 6.3] has been disproved by Remark 3.2, we maintain the possibility that a succinct description of Problem 6.3 exists. The new characterization might involve the use of CW-arrows, which are cyclic intervals represented as  $[x, \pi(x)]$ . This approach is in line with the ideas presented in [11] and [13].

## 7 Acknowledgements

This research was carried out as part of the PACE program in the summer of 2023 at Peking University, Beijing. We thank the program and the university for providing a nurturing academic atmosphere that significantly contributed to the progression of the research. We also thank Shiliang Gao for his valuable participation in the discussion.

## References

- [1] Federico Ardila, Felipe Rincón, and Lauren Williams. Positroids and non-crossing partitions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 368(1):337–363, 2016.
- [2] Carolina Benedetti, Anastasia Chavez, and Daniel Tamayo Jiménez. Quotients of uniform positroids. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 29(1):Paper No. 1.13, 20, 2022.
- [3] Carolina Benedetti and Kolja Knauer. Lattice path matroids and quotients, 2022.
- [4] Joseph Bonin, Anna de Mier, and Marc Noy. Lattice path matroids: enumerative aspects and Tutte polynomials. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 104(1):63–94, 2003.
- [5] Joseph E. Bonin and Anna de Mier. Lattice path matroids: structural properties. *European J. Combin.*, 27(5):701–738, 2006.
- [6] Jonathan Boretsky, Christopher Eur, and Lauren Williams. Polyhedral and tropical geometry of flag positroids, 2022.
- [7] Alexandre V. Borovik, I. M. Gelfand, and Neil White. *Coxeter matroids*, volume 216 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston MA, 2003.

- [8] Amanda Cameron, Rodica Dinu, Mateusz Michał ek, and Tim Seynnaeve. Flag matroids: algebra and geometry. In *Interactions with lattice polytopes*, volume 386 of *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, pages 73–114. Springer, Cham, [2022] ©2022.
- [9] Kolja Knauer, Leonardo Martínez-Sandoval, and Jorge Luis Ramírez Alfonsín. On lattice path matroid polytopes: integer points and ehrhart polynomial. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 60:698–719, 2018.
- [10] Yuji Kodama and Lauren Williams. KP solitons and total positivity for the Grassmannian. *Invent. Math.*, 198(3):637–699, 2014.
- [11] Robert Mcalmon, Suho Oh, and David Xiang. Flats of a positroid from its decorated permutation. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 82B:Art. 43, 12, 2020.
- [12] Suho Oh. Positroids and Schubert matroids. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 118(8):2426–2435, 2011.
- [13] SuHo Oh and David Xiang. The facets of the matroid polytope and the independent set polytope of a positroid. *J. Comb.*, 13(4):545–560, 2022.
- [14] James Oxley. *Matroid theory*, volume 21 of *Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, second edition, 2011.
- [15] Miguel F. Paulos and Burkhard U. W. Schwab. Cluster algebras and the positive Grassmannian. *J. High Energy Phys.*, (10):031, front matter+22, 2014.
- [16] Alexander Postnikov. Total positivity, grassmannians, and networks, 2006.
- [17] The Sage Developers. *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System*.