

Schubert varieties, inversion arrangements, and Peterson translation

William Slofstra

► **To cite this version:**

William Slofstra. Schubert varieties, inversion arrangements, and Peterson translation. Louis J. Billera and Isabella Novik. 26th International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (FPSAC 2014), 2014, Chicago, United States. Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, DMTCS Proceedings vol. AT, 26th International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (FPSAC 2014), pp.715-726, 2014, DMTCS Proceedings. <hal-01207554>

HAL Id: hal-01207554

<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01207554>

Submitted on 1 Oct 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Rationally smooth Schubert varieties, inversion hyperplane arrangements, and Peterson translation

William Slofstra*

Department of Mathematics, UC Davis, Davis, CA, USA

Abstract. We show that an element w of a finite Weyl group W is rationally smooth if and only if the hyperplane arrangement $\mathcal{I}(w)$ associated to the inversion set of w is inductively free, and the product $(d_1 + 1) \cdots (d_l + 1)$ of the coexponents d_1, \dots, d_l is equal to the size of the Bruhat interval $[e, w]$. We also use Peterson translation of coconvex sets to give a Shapiro-Steinberg-Kostant rule for the exponents of w .

Résumé. Nous montrons qu'un élément w d'un groupe de Weyl fini est rationnellement lisse si et seulement si l'arrangement des hyperplans associé à l'ensemble d'inversion de w est libre, et le produit $(d_1 + 1) \cdots (d_l + 1)$ des coexposants d_1, \dots, d_l est égal à la cardinalité de l'intervalle $[e, w]$ pour l'ordre de Bruhat. Nous donnons une règle de Shapiro-Steinberg-Kostant pour calculer les exposants de w en utilisant traduction de Peterson sur des sous-ensembles coconvexes.

Keywords: rational smoothness, Schubert varieties, inversion sets, inversion arrangements, hyperplane arrangements, Peterson translation

1 Introduction

Let R be a crystallographic root system in a Euclidean space V , and let R^+ be the subset of positive roots. If we identify V with V^* using the inner product, then the vectors of R^+ cut out a hyperplane arrangement in V . It is well-known that the characteristic polynomial $\chi(t)$ of this arrangement is equal to a product $\prod_{i=1}^l (t - m_i)$, where l is the rank of R . The integers m_1, \dots, m_l that appear in this factorization are called the exponents of R , and arise in many other contexts. In particular, if W is the Weyl group of R , and ℓ is the length function on W , then the Poincaré polynomial $P(q) = \sum_{w \in W} q^{\ell(w)} = \prod_{i=1}^l [m_i + 1]_q$, where $[m]_q$ is the q -integer $(1 + q + \dots + q^{m-1})$. If X is the generalized flag variety of R , then $P(q^2) = \sum_i q^i \dim H^i(X)$, so the exponents can be used to calculate the Betti numbers of X . The exponents can also be calculated directly from R via the Shapiro-Steinberg-Kostant rule: the multiplicity of m as an exponent of R is the number of positive roots of height m minus the number of positive roots of height $m + 1$.

*Email: wslofstra@math.ucdavis.edu

In this paper (an extended abstract of [Slo13b] and [Slo13a]), we show that the picture above extends to any rationally smooth Schubert variety of the flag variety X . Furthermore, by combining the condition that the inversion arrangement be free with a condition introduced by Hultman, Linusson, Shareshian, and Sjöstrand, we can characterize the Schubert varieties which are rationally smooth.

The Schubert varieties $X(w)$ of X are indexed by the elements w of the Weyl group W . Let \leq denote the Bruhat order on W , and let $[e, w]$ denote the interval in Bruhat order between the identity e and the element w . The Poincaré polynomial of w is the polynomial

$$P_w(q) = \sum_{x \in [e, w]} q^{\ell(x)}.$$

Note that $P_w(q)$ has degree $\ell(w)$. As with the flag variety, $P_w(q^2) = \sum_i q^i \dim H^i(X(w))$. A theorem of Carrell and Peterson states that $X(w)$ is rationally smooth if and only if $P_w(q)$ is palindromic, meaning that $q^{\ell(w)} P_w(q^{-1}) = P_w(q)$ [Car94]. We say that $w \in W$ is rationally smooth if this latter condition is satisfied. By combining deep results of Gasharov, Billey, Billey-Postnikov, and Akyildiz-Carrell, we get the following result:

Theorem 1.1 ([Gas98], [Bil98], [BP05], [AC12]). *Let W be a finite Weyl group. An element $w \in W$ is rationally smooth if and only if*

$$P_w(q) = \prod_{i=1}^l [m_i + 1]_q$$

for some collection of non-negative integers m_1, \dots, m_l .

Theorem 1.1 allows us to make the following definition:

Definition 1.2. *Let W be a finite Weyl group. If $w \in W$ is rationally smooth, then the exponents of w are the integers m_1, \dots, m_l appearing in Theorem 1.1.*

Given an element $w \in W$, the inversion set of w is the set

$$I(w) = \{\alpha \in R^+ : w^{-1}\alpha \in R^-\},$$

where R^- is the set of negative roots of R . The inversion hyperplane arrangement $\mathcal{I}(w)$ of w is the hyperplane arrangement in V cut out by the elements of $I(w)$. If w_0 is the longest element of W , then $X(w_0) = X$, $I(w_0) = R^+$, and $\mathcal{I}(w_0)$ is the arrangement cut out by R^+ mentioned above.

Given an arrangement $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(T)$ in V cut out by a set of vectors T , let $V_{\mathbb{C}} = V \otimes \mathbb{C}$, $R = S^*V_{\mathbb{C}}$, and Q be the polynomial $\prod_{\alpha \in T} \alpha$ in R cutting out \mathcal{A} . Let $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ be the set of derivations of R which preserve the ideal generated by Q . The set $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ is an R -module, called the module of derivations of \mathcal{A} . The arrangement \mathcal{A} is said to be free if $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ is a free R -module. In this case, $\text{Der}(\mathcal{A})$ has a homogeneous basis, and the polynomial degrees d_1, \dots, d_l of the elements of this basis are called the coexponents of \mathcal{A} . When \mathcal{A} is free, a theorem of Terao [Ter81] states that the characteristic polynomial $\chi(\mathcal{A}; t)$ of \mathcal{A} factors as

$$\chi(\mathcal{A}; t) = \prod_i (t - d_i).$$

It is well-known that the arrangement $\mathcal{I}(w_0)$ cut out by R^+ is free, with coexponents corresponding to the exponents of R . We can now state the main theorem:

Theorem 1.3. *Let W be a finite Weyl group. An element $w \in W$ is rationally smooth if and only if the inversion hyperplane arrangement $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is free, and the product $\prod_i (1 + d_i)$ of the coexponents d_1, \dots, d_l is equal to the size of the Bruhat interval $[e, w]$. Furthermore, if w is rationally smooth then the coexponents d_1, \dots, d_l are equal to the exponents of w .*

When $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is free, the product $\prod_i (1 + d_i) = (-1)^l \chi(\mathcal{I}(w); -1)$ is equal to the number of chambers of $\mathcal{I}(w)$. The condition that the number of chambers of $\mathcal{I}(w)$ be equal to the size of the Bruhat interval $[e, w]$ has previously been studied by Hultman, Linusson, Shareshian, and Sjöstrand (type A, [HLSS09]) and Hultman (all finite Coxeter groups, [Hul11]). Accordingly, we call this the HLSS condition (see Section 5).

As an immediate corollary of Theorem 1.3, we have:

Corollary 1.4. *Let W be a finite Weyl group. If $w \in W$ is rationally smooth, then*

$$\chi(\mathcal{I}(w); t) = \prod_{i=1}^l (t - m_i),$$

where m_1, \dots, m_l are the exponents of w .

In type A, Corollary 1.4 has previously been proved by Oh, Postnikov, and Yoo [OPY08]. Their proof implicitly shows that $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is free. The general case of Corollary 1.4 answers a conjecture of Yoo [Yoo11, Conjecture 1.7.3]. Oh, Postnikov, and Yoo also show, in type A, that w is rationally smooth if and only if the Poincaré polynomial $P_w(q)$ is equal to the wall-crossing polynomial of $\mathcal{I}(w)$. This result has been extended to all finite-type Weyl groups by Oh and Yoo [OY10], using what we will call chain Billey-Postnikov (BP) decompositions (this is a modest variation on the terminology in [OY10]).

Inspired by [OY10], we list the rationally smooth elements in finite type which do not have a chain BP decomposition. We also show that an element w of an arbitrary finite Coxeter group has a chain BP decomposition if and only if $\mathcal{I}(w)$ has a modular coatom of a certain form. From these two results, we show that $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is inductively free when w is rationally smooth, with coexponents equal to the exponents of w . To prove that w is rationally smooth when $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is free and the HLSS condition holds, we use the root-system pattern avoidance criterion for rational smoothness due to Billey and Postnikov [BP05].

The roots in R^+ can be ordered by dominance order \succeq , so $\alpha \succeq \beta$ if and only if $\beta - \alpha$ is a sum of simple positive roots. Given a lower order ideal $T \subset R^+$ with respect to dominance order, let h_i be the number of roots in T of height i . Since T is a lower order ideal, we always have $h_i \geq h_{i+1}$. Let $\text{Exp}(T)$ be the multiset which contains i with multiplicity $h_i - h_{i+1}$. One example of a lower order ideal is the set $-\Omega T_e X(w)$, where $\Omega T_e X(w) \subset R^-$ is the set of torus weights of the Zariski tangent space of $X(w)$ at the identity. A theorem of Akyildiz-Carrell states that when $X(w)$ is smooth (a stronger condition than being rationally smooth), the set $\text{Exp}(-\Omega T_e X(w))$ is precisely the set of exponents of w [AC12]. This gives an analogue of the Shapiro-Steinberg-Kostant rule for the exponents of a smooth Schubert variety w . A theorem of Summers-Tymoczko [ST06] and Abe-Barakat-Cuntz-Hoge-Terao [ABC⁺13] states that the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(T)$ cut out by the elements of a lower order ideal $T \subset R^+$ is always free, with coexponents equal to $\text{Exp}(T)$. Thus when $T = -\Omega T_e X(w)$ and w is smooth, we get that $\mathcal{I}(w)$ and $\mathcal{A}(T)$ are free with the same coexponents. In Section 6, we show that any inversion set $I(w)$ can be transformed into a lower order ideal T using a combinatorial version of Peterson translation. In the simply-laced types and type B, if $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is free then the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(T)$ is free, and $\mathcal{I}(w)$ and $\mathcal{A}(T)$ have the same coexponents. Thus for these types we get an analogue of the Shapiro-Steinberg-Kostant rule for calculating the exponents of a rationally smooth element $w \in W$.

2 Chain Billey-Postnikov decompositions

Let S be the set of simple generators of W . Given a subset $J \subset S$, we let W_J denote the parabolic subgroup generated by J , W^J denote the set of minimal length left coset representatives, and JW denote the set of minimal length right coset representatives. Every element $w \in W$ can be written uniquely as $w = vu$, where $v \in W^J$ and $u \in W_J$. This factorization is called the right parabolic decomposition of w . Left parabolic decompositions are defined similarly. If $v \in W^J$, then the Poincaré polynomial of v relative to J is the polynomial

$$P_v^J(q) = \sum_{x \in [e, v] \cap W^J} q^{\ell(v)}.$$

If $w = vu$ is the parabolic decomposition of w with respect to $J \subset S$, then multiplication gives an injective map

$$([e, v] \cap W^J) \times [e, u] \rightarrow [e, w]. \quad (1)$$

If $x = v_1u_1$ is the parabolic decomposition of an element $x \in [e, w]$, then $v_1 \leq v$. However, it is not necessarily true that $u_1 \leq u$, even though $u_1 \leq w$ and $u_1 \in W_J$.


Let $S(w) \subset S$ denote the support set of an element $w \in W$ (i.e. the set of simple generators which appear in some reduced decomposition of w), and let $D_L(w)$ denote the left descent set.

Lemma 2.1 ([BP05], [OY10], [RS13]). *Let $w = vu$ be the parabolic decomposition of w with respect to J . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *The map in equation (1) is surjective (hence bijective).*
- (b) *u is the maximal element of $[e, w] \cap W_J$.*
- (c) *$S(v) \cap J \subseteq D_L(u)$.*
- (d) *$P_w(q) = P_v^J(q)P_u(q)$.*

If any of the equivalent conditions of Lemma 2.1 are satisfied, then we say that $w = vu$ is a (right) Billey-Postnikov (BP) decomposition with respect to J . If in addition $[e, v] \cap W^J$ is a chain, or equivalently $P_v^J(q) = [\ell(v) + 1]_q$, then we say that $w = vu$ is a chain BP decomposition. Left BP decompositions and left chain BP decompositions are defined similarly. Note that a left parabolic (resp. BP) decomposition of w is the same as a right parabolic (resp. BP) decomposition of w^{-1} .

Deep results of Gasharov [Gas98], Billey [Bil98], and Billey-Postnikov [BP05] imply that every rationally smooth element $w \in W$ has either a left or right BP decomposition. In addition, most rationally smooth elements have a chain BP decomposition. In this section, we list the few exceptions. To do so, we use the following labelling for the Dynkin diagram of E_8 :



We write elements of E_8 as products of the simple generators s_i , $i = 1 \dots, 8$, where s_i corresponds to the node in the Dynkin diagram labelled by i . For this section, we let $S_k = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$, and take the convention that E_6 and E_7 are embedded in E_8 as W_{S_6} and W_{S_7} respectively. Finally, we let $J_k = S_k \setminus \{s_2\}$, \tilde{u}_k be the maximal element of W_{J_k} , and \tilde{v}_k be the maximal element of $W_{S_k}^{J_k}$.

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose that $w \in W$ is a rationally smooth element of a finite Weyl group W , that $\ell(w) \geq 2$, and that w has no (left or right) chain BP decomposition. Then w is one of the following elements:*

- *The maximal element of D_n , $n \geq 4$.*
- *The maximal element of E_n , $n = 6, 7, 8$.*
- *The element $w_{kl} = \tilde{v}_l \tilde{u}_k$ in E_8 , or its inverse w_{kl}^{-1} , where $5 \leq l < k \leq 8$.*
- *The maximal element of F_4 .*

For the proof of Theorem 2.2 in the classical types, we refer to [Gas98] and [Bil98], as well as the summary of this work in [OY10]. For the exceptional types it is possible to check Theorem 2.2 by computer. We give a human-readable proof based on the existence theorems of [BP05] (which also use computer verification) in [Slo13b].

Theorem 2.2 allows us to give a direct proof of Theorem 1.1. If w is rationally smooth and has a chain BP decomposition $w = vu$ or $w = uv$, then $P_w(q) = [\ell(v) + 1]_q P_u(q)$. The element u is also rationally smooth, and we can proceed by induction. As mentioned in the introduction, Theorem 1.1 for maximal elements is well-known. Furthermore, $P_w(q) = P_{w^{-1}}(q)$, so we only need to check Theorem 1.1 for the elements w_{kl} . If \tilde{w}_l is the maximal element of W_{S_l} , then $P_{w_{kl}}(q) = P_{\tilde{v}_l}^{J_l}(q) P_{\tilde{u}_k}(q) = P_{\tilde{w}_l}(q) P_{\tilde{u}_k}(q) P_{\tilde{w}_l}^{-1}(q)$, where the last equality uses the fact that $\tilde{w}_l = \tilde{v}_l \tilde{u}_l$. The Poincaré polynomials $P_{\tilde{w}_l}(q)$ and $P_{\tilde{u}_k}(q)$ are well-known, so it is easy to check that $P_{w_{kl}}(q)$ is a product of q -integers as desired. For example, the exponents of w_{87} are 1, 6, 7, 9, 11, 11, 13, 17.

3 The HLSS condition and nbc-sets

In this section we give some background on the Hultman-Linusson-Shareshian-Sjöstrand (HLSS) condition which is necessary for the proof of Theorem 1.3. If $s \in S$ is a simple generator, let α_s denote the corresponding simple root. Conversely, let $t_\alpha \in W$ denote the reflection corresponding to a root $\alpha \in R$. Given an order $<$ on a set T of vectors in V , a broken circuit is defined to be an ordered subset $\{v_1 < \dots < v_k\}$ of T such that there is $v_{k+1} > v_k$ for which $\{v_1, \dots, v_{k+1}\}$ is a minimal linearly dependent set in T . An nbc-set is an ordered subset of T which does not contain a broken circuit. The number of nbc-sets is equal to the number of chambers in the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(T)$. In particular, the number of nbc-sets does not depend on the chosen order.

If $s_1 \cdots s_k$ is a reduced expression for an element $w \in W$, we can order the inversion set $I(w)$ by $\beta_1 < \dots < \beta_{\ell(w)}$, where $\beta_i = s_1 \cdots s_{i-1} \alpha_{s_i}$. A total order on $I(w)$ constructed in this way is called a convex order. Let $2^{I(w)}$ denote the power set of $I(w)$. Given a convex order, we can define a surjective map

$$\phi : 2^{I(w)} \rightarrow [e, w] : \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k\} \mapsto t_{\beta_1} \cdots t_{\beta_k} w, \text{ where } \beta_1 < \dots < \beta_k.$$

Theorem 3.1 (Hultman-Linusson-Shareshian-Sjöstrand [HLSS09]). *Choose a convex order for $I(w)$, and let $\text{nbc}(I(w))$ denote the set of nbc-sets of $I(w)$ with respect to the chosen order. Then the restriction of ϕ to $\text{nbc}(I(w))$ is injective.*

In particular, the number of nbc-sets of $I(w)$ is less than the size of the Bruhat interval. The restriction of ϕ to $\text{nbc}(I(w))$ will be surjective if and only if the number of nbc-sets is equal to the size of the Bruhat interval. As mentioned in the introduction, when the restriction of ϕ is surjective we say that w

satisfies the HLSS condition. A theorem of Hultman-Linusson-Shareshian-Sjöstrand (type A [HLSS09]) and Hultman (all finite Coxeter groups [Hul11]) characterizes when this condition holds in terms of the directed Bruhat graph of $[e, w]$. In particular, the HLSS condition is weaker than being rationally smooth:

Theorem 3.2 ([Hul11]). *If w is rationally smooth, then w satisfies the HLSS condition.*

4 Chain BP decompositions and modular flats

Given an arrangement \mathcal{A} , let $L(\mathcal{A})$ denote the intersection lattice of \mathcal{A} . By convention, the maximal element of \mathcal{A} is the center $\bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}} H$ of \mathcal{A} . A coatom is a flat of $L(\mathcal{A})$ of rank one more than the center. If $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$, the localization of \mathcal{A} at X is the arrangement \mathcal{A}_X containing all hyperplanes H of \mathcal{A} such that $X \subset H$. We let \mathcal{A}^X denote the restriction of \mathcal{A} to X , and $\mathcal{A} \setminus H$ the deletion by H , which is the arrangement containing all hyperplanes of \mathcal{A} except H . An arrangement is said to be inductively free if either (a) \mathcal{A} contains no hyperplanes (in which case all coexponents are zero) or (b) there is some hyperplane $H \subset \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A} \setminus H$ is inductively free with coexponents $d_1, \dots, d_l - 1$, and \mathcal{A}^H is inductively free with coexponents d_1, \dots, d_{l-1} . Any inductively free arrangement is free. The following lemma gives a useful sufficient criterion for \mathcal{A} to be inductively free.

Lemma 4.1. *If X is a modular coatom of $L(\mathcal{A})$, and \mathcal{A}_X is inductively free with coexponents $0, m_1, \dots, m_{l-1}$, then \mathcal{A} is inductively free with coexponents $m_1, \dots, m_{l-1}, m_l = |\mathcal{A}| - |\mathcal{A}_X|$.*

Here $|\mathcal{A}|$ denotes the number of hyperplanes in \mathcal{A} . We use the following characterization of modular coatoms:

Lemma 4.2 ([CDF⁺09], Lemma 3.20). *Let \mathcal{A} be an arrangement, and for each hyperplane $H \in \mathcal{A}$ let α_H be a normal vector to H . Let $X \subset L(\mathcal{A})$ be a coatom. Then X is modular if and only if for every distinct pair $H_1, H_2 \notin \mathcal{A}_X$, there is $H_3 \in \mathcal{A}_X$ such that $\alpha_{H_1}, \alpha_{H_2}, \alpha_{H_3}$ are linearly dependent.*

Recall that V is the ambient Euclidean space containing R . Given $J \subset S$, let $V_J \subset V$ be the subspace spanned by $\{\alpha_s : s \in J\}$, and let $R_J = R \cap V_J$ be the root system for W_J . The following lemma is easy to prove:

Lemma 4.3. *The linear span of the inversion set $I(w)$ in V is $V_{S(w)}$, where $S(w)$ is the support set of w . The center of the inversion hyperplane arrangement $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is the orthogonal complement of $V_{S(w)}$.*

Lemma 4.3 implies that the rank of $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is the size of the support set $S(w)$, so a coatom of $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is an element of $L(\mathcal{I}(w))$ of rank $|S(w)| - 1$. If $w = uv$ is a left parabolic decomposition, then the inversion set $I(w)$ is the disjoint union of $I(u)$ and $uI(v)$, and

$$X = \bigcap_{\alpha \in I(u)} \ker \alpha \tag{2}$$

is a flat of $L(\mathcal{I}(w))$. This flat has rank $|S(u)|$, and hence X will be a coatom if and only if $|S(u)| = |S(w)| - 1$.

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose that $w = uv$ is a left parabolic decomposition with respect to J , so $u \in W_J$ and $v \in {}^J W$. Let $X \in L(\mathcal{I}(w))$ be defined as in Equation (2). Then $w = uv$ is a chain BP decomposition if and only if X is a modular coatom of $L(\mathcal{I}(w))$.*

Theorem 4.4 holds for any element $w \in W$, where W is an arbitrary finite Coxeter group. However, the proof is lengthy, and will be left for [Slo13b]. We give a shorter proof of Theorem 4.4 when w and u both satisfy the HLSS condition, as this assumption is sufficient to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 4.4. If $w = uv$ is a chain BP decomposition, then $|S(w) \cap J| = |S(w)| - 1$, and $S(v) \cap J \subset S(u)$, so $|S(u)| = |S(w)| - 1$. Hence we can assume throughout that X is a coatom. The set $I(u) = I(w) \cap V_J$, and $w \in {}^JW$ if and only if $I(w) \cap V_J$ is empty. The hyperplanes of $\mathcal{I}(w)$ which do not contain X correspond precisely to the roots of $I(w)$ in $uI(v)$.

Suppose that $w = uv$ is a chain BP decomposition, and that u satisfies the HLSS condition. Order $I(w)$ so that all the elements of $I(u)$ come after the elements of $uI(v)$. Every element $\alpha \in uI(v)$ is independent from the span of $I(u)$. Thus if $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k\}$ is an nbc-set for $I(u)$, then $\{\alpha, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k\}$ is an nbc-set for $I(w)$. Consequently

$$|\text{nbc}(I(w))| \geq (1 + \ell(v)) \cdot |\text{nbc}(I(u))|.$$

Since u satisfies the HLSS condition, $|\text{nbc}(I(u))| = |[e, u]|$, while $|\text{nbc}(I(w))| \leq |[e, w]|$. But $w = uv$ is a chain BP decomposition, so

$$|[e, w]| = P_w(1) = (1 + \ell(v))|[e, u]| = (1 + \ell(v)) \cdot |\text{nbc}(I(u))|.$$

We conclude that all nbc-sets of $I(w)$ are either nbc-sets of $I(u)$, or of the form $\{\alpha, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k\}$ for $\alpha \in uI(v)$ and $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k\}$ an nbc-set of $I(u)$.

In particular, if $\alpha, \beta \in uI(v)$, $\alpha < \beta$, then $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ is not an nbc-set, and hence there must be some $\gamma \in I(w)$, $\gamma > \beta$, such that α, β, γ is linearly dependent. If $\gamma \notin I(u)$ we can repeat this process by replacing α, β with β, γ until we find $\gamma' \in I(u)$ such that β, γ, γ' is linearly dependent. This implies that γ' is in the span of β and γ , and since γ is in the span of α and β , we get that α, β, γ' is linearly dependent. By Lemma 4.2, X is modular.

Now suppose that X is modular. If we assume that u and w satisfy the HLSS condition, then

$$|[e, w]| = |\text{nbc}(I(w))| = |\text{nbc}(I(u))| \cdot (|\mathcal{A}| - |\mathcal{A}_X| + 1) = |[e, u]| \cdot (\ell(v) + 1).$$

On the other hand, $[e, w] \geq |[e, u]| \cdot |[e, v] \cap {}^JW|$, and $[e, v] \cap {}^JW \geq \ell(v) + 1$. So we must have $[e, v] \cap {}^JW = \ell(v) + 1$. But $[e, v] \cap {}^JW$ contains a chain of size $\ell(v) + 1$, so $[e, v] \cap {}^JW$ is a chain. Furthermore, the multiplication map $[e, u] \times ([e, v] \times {}^JW) \rightarrow [e, w]$ will be surjective, so $w = uv$ is a BP decomposition. □

We now prove one direction of Theorem 1.3:

Corollary 4.5. *If $w \in W$ is rationally smooth then $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is inductively free, and the coexponents of $\mathcal{I}(w)$ are equal to the exponents of w .*

Proof. The proof is by induction on $|S(w)|$. Clearly the corollary is true if $|S(w)| \leq 1$. Suppose w has a chain BP decomposition. The element w is rationally smooth if and only if w^{-1} is rationally smooth, and since $I(w^{-1}) = -w^{-1}I(w)$, the arrangements $\mathcal{I}(w)$ and $\mathcal{I}(w^{-1})$ are linearly equivalent. Thus we can assume without loss of generality that w has a left chain BP decomposition $w = uv$. Then u is also rationally smooth, and $P_w(q) = [\ell(v) + 1]_q P_u(q)$, so if the exponents of u are $0, m_1, \dots, m_{l-1}$, then the exponents of w are $m_1, \dots, m_{l-1}, m_l = \ell(v)$. The coatom X corresponding to $\mathcal{I}(u)$ is modular by

Theorem 4.4, and the arrangement $\mathcal{I}(w)_X$ is simply $\mathcal{I}(u)$, which by induction is inductively free with coexponents $0, m_1, \dots, m_{l-1}$. Finally, $|\mathcal{I}(w)| - |\mathcal{I}(w)_X| = \ell(w) - \ell(u) = \ell(v)$. By Lemma 4.1, the arrangement $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is inductively free with coexponents equal to m_1, \dots, m_l .

This leaves the possibility that w is one of the elements listed in Theorem 2.2. If w is the maximal element of D_n , E_n , or F_4 , then Barakat and Cuntz have shown that $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is inductively free [BC12]. Again, without loss of generality we only need to check that the corollary holds for the elements w_{kl} , and this is done on a computer (we defer to [Slo13b] for details of the computation). \square

5 The flattening map

Let U be a subspace of V . The intersection $R_U = R \cap U$ is also a root system, with positive and negative roots $R_U^+ = R^+ \cap U$ and $R_U^- = R^- \cap U$ respectively. Let W_U be the Weyl group of R_U . Note that W_U is the parabolic subgroup of W generated by the reflections t_β for $\beta \in R_U^+$, or equivalently is the subgroup of W which acts identically on the orthogonal complement of U in V .

A subset $I \subset R^+$ is convex if $\alpha, \beta \in I$, $\alpha + \beta \in R^+$ implies that $\alpha + \beta \in I$. The subset I is coconvex if $R^+ \setminus I$ is convex, and I is biconvex if it is both convex and coconvex. A subset I is biconvex if and only if it is the inversion set $I(w)$ for some $w \in W$. Since biconvexity is a linear condition, the intersection $I(w) \cap U$ is biconvex, and hence there is an element $w' \in W_U$ such that $I(w') = I(w) \cap U$. The element w' is called the flattening of w , and is denoted by $\text{fl}_U(w)$ [BP05]. If $U = V_J$, then $\text{fl}_U(w) = u$, where $w = uv$ is the left parabolic decomposition of W with respect to J . We use the following lemma:

Lemma 5.1 ([BB03]). *If $u \in W_U$, $w \in W$, then $\text{fl}_U(uw) = u \text{fl}_U(w)$.*

Recall from the definition of the HLSS condition that a convex order on an inversion set $I(w)$ is an order coming from a reduced expression for w . An arbitrary total order $<$ on $I(w)$ is convex if and only if it satisfies two conditions [Pap94]:

- if $\alpha < \beta$ and $\alpha + \beta \in R^+$, then $\alpha < \alpha + \beta < \beta$, and
- if $\alpha \in I(w)$, $\beta \notin I(w)$, and $\alpha - \beta \in R^+$, then $\alpha - \beta < \alpha$.

Because these conditions are linear, we immediately get the following lemma:

Lemma 5.2. *If $<$ is a convex order on $I(w)$, then the induced order on $I(\text{fl}_U(w)) = I(w) \cap U$ is also convex.*

Proposition 5.3. *Let $U \subset V$ be any subspace. If w satisfies the HLSS condition, then so does $\text{fl}_U(w)$.*

Proof. The absolute length $\ell'(w)$ of an element $w \in W$ is the smallest integer k such that w can be written as a product of k reflections. If $w = t_{\beta_1} \cdots t_{\beta_m}$, then clearly the fixed point space of w contains the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m\}$. A theorem of Carter states that the fixed point space of w is equal to the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m\}$ if and only if $\ell'(w) = m$, and furthermore $\ell'(w) = m$ if and only if β_1, \dots, β_m are linearly independent [Car72].

Choose a convex order $<$ on $I(w)$, and take the induced convex order on $I(\text{fl}_U(w))$. If $x \in [e, \text{fl}_U(w)]$, we can always find $u = t_{\beta_1} \cdots t_{\beta_m}$, where $\beta_1 < \dots < \beta_m$ in $I(\text{fl}_U(w))$ such that $x = u \text{fl}_U(w)$. To show that $\text{fl}_U(w)$ satisfies the HLSS condition, we want to show that we can take $\{\beta_1 < \dots < \beta_m\}$ to be an nbc-set with respect to the given convex order. Now $x' = uw$ is less than w in Bruhat order, and since w satisfies the HLSS condition, we can find an nbc-set $\{\gamma_1 < \dots < \gamma_m\}$ such that $x' = yw$, where

$y = t_{\gamma_1} \cdots t_{\gamma_k}$. Let V_0 denote the fixed point space of y . Then $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m\}$ is linearly independent, so V_0 is the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m\}$. Since $yw = uw$, we have $y = u$, so the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k\}$ is contained in V_0 . It follows that $\text{span}\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m\} \subset \text{span}\{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k\}$, and hence $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m \in R_U$. We conclude that $y \in W_U$.

Now $\{\gamma_1 < \dots < \gamma_k\}$ is an nbc-set in $I(\text{fl}_U(w))$, and $x = u \text{fl}_U(w) = \text{fl}_U(uw) = \text{fl}_U(yw) = y \text{fl}_U(w)$ by Lemma 5.1. We conclude that the map from $2^{I(\text{fl}_U(w))} \rightarrow [e, \text{fl}_U(w)]$ restricts to a surjective map on $\text{nbc}(I(\text{fl}_U(w)))$, and hence $\text{fl}_U(w)$ satisfies the HLSS condition. \square

Given an arrangement \mathcal{A} in V and a subspace U_0 of the center of \mathcal{A} , we let \mathcal{A}/U_0 denote the quotient arrangement in V/U_0 . It is easy to see that \mathcal{A} is free if and only if \mathcal{A}/U_0 is free.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $U \subset V$ be any subspace. If $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is free, then so is $\mathcal{I}(\text{fl}_U(w))$.*

Proof. Let U^\perp be the orthogonal complement to U , and let

$$X = \bigcap_{\alpha \in I(w) \cap U} \ker \alpha \in L(\mathcal{I}(w)).$$

Then $U^\perp \subset X$, and $\mathcal{I}(\text{fl}_U(w))$ is isomorphic to the localization $\mathcal{I}(w)_X/U^\perp$. It is well-known that localization preserves freeness (see [OT92, Theorem 4.37]), so if $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is free then $\mathcal{I}(w)_X$ is free, and consequently $\mathcal{I}(w)_X/U^\perp$ is free. \square

Let R' be another root system with Weyl group $W(R')$, and let $w' \in W(R')$. An element $w \in W$ is said to contain the pattern (w', R') if there is a subspace $U \subset V$ such that R_U is isomorphic to R' , and $\text{fl}_U(w) = w'$ when R_U is identified with R' . If this does not happen for any subspace U , then w is said to avoid (w', R') . This notion of root system pattern avoidance due to Billey and Postnikov generalizes the usual notion of pattern avoidance for permutations [BP05]. We can now prove the main theorem:

Proof of Theorem 1.3. One direction of the theorem has already been proved in Corollary 4.5. Suppose that $\mathcal{I}(w)$ is free, and the product of the coexponents $\prod_i (1 + d_i)$ is equal to the size of the Bruhat interval. This latter condition implies that w satisfies the HLSS condition. We want to show that w is rationally smooth. The main result of [BP05] states that w is rationally smooth if and only if w avoids a finite list of bad patterns in the root systems $R' = A_3, B_3, C_3$, and D_4 . If (w', R') is a pattern in this list (there are 17 bad patterns, since the patterns for B_3 and C_3 are equivalent), then either $\mathcal{I}(w')$ is not free, or w' does not satisfy the HLSS condition. By Propositions 5.3 and 5.4, $\mathcal{I}(\text{fl}_U(w))$ is free and $\text{fl}_U(w)$ satisfies the HLSS condition for any subspace $U \subset V$. We conclude that w must avoid all the bad patterns, and hence w is rationally smooth. \square

6 Peterson translation

In this section we assume that R has no components of type C or F_4 . Given $\alpha \in R^+$, an α -string is a subset of R^+ of the form $\{\beta, \beta + \alpha, \dots, \beta + k\alpha\}$, where $\beta - \alpha \notin R^+$ and $\beta + (k+1)\alpha \notin R^+$. The set of α -strings partitions R^+ . The Peterson translate of a subset $T \subset R^+$ compresses each α -string:

Definition 6.1. *Given $T \subset R^+$, $\alpha \in R^+$, we define the Peterson translate $\tau(T, \alpha)$ of T by α as follows:*

- *If T is a subset of an α -string $\{\beta, \beta + \alpha, \beta + k\alpha\}$, so $T = \{\beta + i_1\alpha, \dots, \beta + i_r\alpha\}$, then $\tau(T, \alpha) = \{\beta, \beta + \alpha, \dots, \beta + (r-1)\alpha\}$.*

- For a general subset T of R^+ , let $T = \bigcup T_i$ be the partition of T induced by the partition of R^+ into α -strings. Then $\tau(T, \alpha) = \bigcup \tau(T_i, \alpha)$.

This definition is equivalent to the geometric Peterson translate defined by Carrell and Kuttler [CK03].

Theorem 6.2. *Let T be a coconvex set in R^+ , where R has no components of type C or F_4 . Then:*

- The Peterson translate $\tau(T, \alpha)$ is coconvex for every $\alpha \in R^+$.*
- If $\mathcal{A}(T)$ is free and $\alpha \in R^+$ then $\mathcal{A}(\tau(T, \alpha))$ is free with the same coexponents as $\mathcal{A}(T)$.*
- If T is not a lower order ideal, then there is $\alpha \in T$ such that $\tau(T, \alpha)$ is not equal to T .*

Proof sketch. Part (c) of the theorem follows from the definition of coconvex set and lower order ideal. We use a computer to check that parts (a) and (b) hold for the root systems $R = A_3, B_3,$ and G_2 . The key idea of the proof for general R is that Peterson translation is local, in the sense that if U is a subspace of V , and $\alpha \in U$, then $\tau(T, \alpha) \cap U = \tau(T \cap U, \alpha)$, where the latter refers to Peterson translation in R_U . Since part (a) holds for all root systems of rank ≤ 3 , and $T \cap U$ is a coconvex subset of R_U for any subspace U , we conclude that $\tau(T, \alpha) \cap U$ is coconvex for all subspaces $U \subseteq V$ of rank 3 with $\alpha \in U$. But to check that $\tau(T, \alpha)$ is coconvex, we only need to check that $\tau(T, \alpha) \cap U$ is coconvex for subspaces $U' \subset V$ of rank 2, so part (a) holds for all root systems.

If an arrangement \mathcal{A} is free, then the Ziegler multiarrangement $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^H$ is free for any hyperplane $H \in \mathcal{A}$ [Zie89]. Abe and Yoshinaga have recently proved a converse to Zeigler's theorem: if $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^H$ is free for some $H \in \mathcal{A}$, then \mathcal{A} is free if and only if \mathcal{A}_X is free for every flat $X \subset H$ of corank 3.

Now given a subspace U in V spanned by elements of T , we can take the flat $X \in L(\mathcal{A}(T))$ cut out by the elements of $U \cap T$. The corank of X is the rank of U , and $X \subset \ker \alpha$ if and only if $\alpha \in U$. If $\mathcal{A}(T)$ is free, then the Zeigler multirestriction of $\mathcal{A}(T)$ to $\ker \alpha$ is also free. Since the elements of T and $\tau(T, \alpha)$ only differ by translation by α , the Zeigler multirestriction of $\mathcal{A}(T)$ to $\ker \alpha$ is isomorphic to the Zeigler multirestriction of $\mathcal{A}(\tau(T, \alpha))$. Since part (b) holds for every root system of rank ≤ 3 , we know that $\mathcal{A}(\tau(T, \alpha))_X = \mathcal{A}(\tau(T, \alpha) \cap U)$ is free for every corank 3 flat $X \subset \ker \alpha$. Hence we can apply Abe and Yoshinaga's theorem to prove that $\mathcal{A}(\tau(T, \alpha))$ is free. The coexponents of $\mathcal{A}(\tau(T, \alpha))$ can easily be recovered from the coexponents of the Ziegler multirestriction, so $\mathcal{A}(\tau(T, \alpha))$ has the same coexponents as $\mathcal{A}(T)$. \square

Peterson translation decreases the heights of roots, so part (c) of Theorem 6.2 implies that we can repeatedly translate any coconvex set T until we get an order ideal T' . As mentioned in the introduction, $\mathcal{A}(T')$ is free with coexponents $\text{Exp}(T')$ [ST06] [ABC⁺13], and Theorem 6.2 implies that if $\mathcal{A}(T)$ is free, then $\mathcal{A}(T)$ and $\mathcal{A}(T')$ have the same exponents. If $T = I(w)$ is the inversion set of a rationally smooth element w , then T is a coconvex set and $\mathcal{A}(T)$ is free, so we get an analogue of the Shapiro-Steinberg-Kostant rule for calculating the exponents of w .

Example 6.3. *Let $w = s_1 s_2 s_3 s_2$ in the Weyl group of A_3 , where s_1 and s_3 are the simple generators corresponding to the leaves of the Dynkin diagram. If α_i is the simple root corresponding to s_i , then*

$$I(w) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3\},$$

so $I(w)$ is not an order ideal. But

$$T = \tau(I(w), \alpha_1) = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3\}$$

is an order ideal, with $\text{Exp}(T) = \{1, 1, 2\}$. Since w is rationally smooth, we conclude that the exponents of w are 1, 1, 2.

If $X(w)$ is smooth, it follows from [CK03] that there is a sequence of translations that sends $I(w)$ to the lower order ideal $-\Omega T_e X(w)$, and thus we can use Theorem 6.2 to directly compare $\mathcal{I}(w)$ and $\mathcal{A}(-\Omega T_e X(w))$. In [Slo13a], Theorem 6.2 is used to give a root-system pattern avoidance criterion for the arrangement $\mathcal{A}(T)$ to be free, assuming that T is coconvex.

Acknowledgements

I thank Jim Carrell for explaining his results, which inspired this project. I thank Ed Richmond for many helpful discussions. I thank Alejandro Morales, Suho Oh, and Hwanchul Yoo for helpful conversations.

References

- [ABC⁺13] Takuro Abe, Mohamed Barakat, Michael Cuntz, Torsten Hoge, and Hiroaki Terao. The freeness of ideal subarrangements of Weyl arrangements. 2013. arXiv:1304.8033.
- [AC12] Ersan Akyildiz and James Carrell. Betti numbers of smooth Schubert varieties and the remarkable formula of Kostant, Macdonald, Shapiro, and Steinberg. *Michigan Math. J.*, 61(3):543–553, 2012.
- [BB03] Sara Billey and Tom Braden. Lower bounds for Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials from patterns. *Transformation Groups*, 8(4):321–332, 2003.
- [BC12] Mohamed Barakat and Michael Cuntz. Coxeter and crystallographic arrangements are inductively free. *Advances in Mathematics*, 229(1):691–709, 2012.
- [Bil98] Sara C. Billey. Pattern avoidance and rational smoothness of Schubert varieties. *Adv. Math.*, 139(1):141–156, 1998.
- [BP05] Sara Billey and Alexander Postnikov. Smoothness of Schubert varieties via patterns in root subsystems. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 34(3):447–466, 2005.
- [Car72] R. W. Carter. Conjugacy classes in the Weyl group. *Compositio Math.*, 25:1–59, 1972.
- [Car94] James B. Carrell. The Bruhat graph of a Coxeter group, a conjecture of Deodhar, and rational smoothness of Schubert varieties. In *Algebraic groups and their generalizations: classical methods (University Park, PA, 1991)*, volume 56 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 53–61. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.
- [CDF⁺09] Dan Cohen, Graham Denham, Michael Falk, Hal Sheck, Alex Suciu, Hiro Terao, and Sergey Yuzvinsky. *Complex Arrangements: Algebra, Geometry, Topology*. 2009. In preparation.
- [CK03] James B. Carrell and Jochen Kuttler. Smooth points of T -stable varieties in G/B and the Peterson map. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 151(2):353–379, 2003.
- [Gas98] Vesselin Gasharov. Factoring the Poincaré polynomials for the Bruhat order on S_n . *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 83(1):159–164, 1998.

- [HLSS09] Axel Hultman, Svante Linusson, John Shareshian, and Jonas Sjöstrand. From Bruhat intervals to intersection lattices and a conjecture of Postnikov. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 116(3):564–580, 2009.
- [Hul11] Axel Hultman. Inversion arrangements and Bruhat intervals. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 118(7):1897–1906, 2011.
- [OPY08] Suho Oh, Alexander Postnikov, and Hwanchul Yoo. Bruhat order, smooth Schubert varieties, and hyperplane arrangements. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 115(7):1156–1166, 2008.
- [OT92] Peter Orlik and Hiroaki Terao. *Arrangements of hyperplanes*. Springer, July 1992.
- [OY10] Suho Oh and Hwanchul Yoo. Bruhat order, rationally smooth Schubert varieties, and hyperplane arrangements. *DMTCS Proceedings*, FPSAC, 2010.
- [Pap94] Paolo Papi. A characterization of a special ordering in a root system. *Proc. AMS*, 120(3):661–665, 1994.
- [RS13] Edward Richmond and William Slofstra. Billey-Postnikov decompositions and the fibre bundle structure of Schubert varieties. 2013. In preparation.
- [Slo13a] William Slofstra. Pattern avoidance criterion for free inversion arrangements. 2013. In preparation.
- [Slo13b] William Slofstra. Rationally smooth Schubert varieties and inversion hyperplane arrangements. 2013. arXiv:1312.7540.
- [ST06] Eric Sommers and Julianna Tymoczko. Exponents for B -stable ideals. *Trans. AMS*, 358(8):3493–3509, 2006.
- [Ter81] Hiroaki Terao. Generalized exponents of a free arrangement of hyperplanes and Shepherd-Todd-Brieskorn formula. *Inv. math.*, 63(1):159–179, 1981.
- [Yoo11] Hwanchul Yoo. *Combinatorics in Schubert varieties and Specht modules*. PhD thesis, MIT, 2011.
- [Zie89] G. M. Ziegler. Multiarrangements of hyperplanes and their freeness. In *Singularities (Iowa City, IA, 1986)*, pages 345–359. Amer. Math. Soc, 1989.