A Continuous Family of Marked Poset Polytopes

Christoph Pegel

Institut für Algebra, Zahlentheorie und Diskrete Mathematik
Leibniz Universität Hannover

March 12, 2018

joint with Xin Fang, Ghislain Fourier and Jan–Philipp Litza

Outline

Poset Polytopes (Order and Chain Polytopes)

GT and FFLV Polytopes

Marked Poset Polytopes

A Continuous Family

Poset Polytopes (Order and Chain Polytopes)

Given a finite poset P with $\widehat{0}$ and $\widehat{1}$, Stanley introduced two *poset polytopes* in $\mathbb{R}^{\widetilde{P}}$, where $\widetilde{P} = P \setminus \{\widehat{0}, \widehat{1}\}$.

- The *order polytope*

$$\mathcal{O}(P) = \left\{ x \in [0,1]^{\widetilde{P}} \,\middle|\, x_p \leq x_q \text{ for } p < q \right\},$$

- and the *chain polytope*

$$\mathcal{C}(P) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\widetilde{P}} \,\middle|\, x_{p_1} + \cdots + x_{p_k} \leq 1 \text{ for } p_1 < \cdots < p_k \right\}.$$

Example

Consider the poset P =



P:



For the order polytope $\mathcal{O}(P) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\{p,q,r\}}$ we just need to consider inequalities given by covering relations:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq x_p, \\ 0 &\leq x_q, \\ x_p &\leq x_r, \\ x_q &\leq x_r, \\ x_r &\leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

$\mathcal{O}(P)$:





For the chain polytope $\mathcal{O}(P) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{\{p,q,r\}}$ we just need to consider inequalities given by maximal chains:

$$x_p + x_r \leq 1,$$
$$x_q + x_r \leq 1,$$

as well as all coordinates being non-negative:

$$0 \leq x_p,$$
$$0 \leq x_q,$$
$$0 \leq x_r.$$



What about the face structure of $\mathcal{O}(P)$ and $\mathcal{C}(P)$?

- The face structure of $\mathcal{O}(P)$ has an elegant description in terms of *connected*, *compatible* partitions of P.
- The face structure of $\mathcal{C}(P)$ ...

  "A description of the faces of $\mathcal{C}(P)$ analogous to Theorem 1.2 seems messy and will not be pursued here."

  —R. P. Stanley, Two Poset Polytopes, 1986

However, there is a piecewise-linear bijection called the *transfer map* $\varphi\colon \mathcal{O}(P) \to \mathcal{C}(P)$ given by

$$\varphi(x)_p = x_p - \max_{q \prec p} x_q.$$

This allows to transfer some properties from $\mathcal{O}(P)$ to $\mathcal{C}(P)$ ...

The transfer map $\varphi\colon \mathcal{O}(P) \to \mathcal{C}(P)$ ...

- ... restricts to a bijection

$$\text{vertices of } \mathcal{O}(P) \longrightarrow \text{vertices of } \mathcal{C}(P)$$

  sending indicator functions of filters to indicator functions of anti-chains.
- ... yields an Ehrhart equivalence $\mathrm{Ehr}(\mathcal{O}(P)) = \mathrm{Ehr}(\mathcal{C}(P))$.
- ... preserves a unimodular triangulation with simplices corresponding to linear extensions of P.

The last statement yields a geometric proof that the number of linear extensions of P is determined by its comparability graph!

GT and FFLV Polytopes

- For a given tuple of integers $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n)$, there is an irreducible representation $V(\lambda)$ of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ with highest weight λ.
- It admits a *Gelfand–Tsetlin basis* with elements enumerated by integral *GT-patterns*. For example, when $\lambda = (5, 3, 3, 1)$, a GT-pattern would be:



Each blue entry has to be between the two neighboring numbers to the right.

$\rightsquigarrow$ Lattice points in the *Gelfand–Tsetlin polytope* $\mathrm{GT}(\lambda)$.

Note that the description of $\mathrm{GT}(\lambda)$ is very similar to that of an order polytope!

- The irreducible representation $V(\lambda)$ of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ has another basis called the *Feigin–Fourier–Littelmann–Vinberg basis* with elements enumerated by integral patterns of another kind:



For each *Dyck path* between two red entries, the sum of the blue entries along the path should be at most the difference of the two red entries. In this case:

$$1+0+0+1+0 \leq 5-1$$

$\rightsquigarrow$ Lattice points in the *Feigin–Fourier–Littelmann–Vinberg polytope* $\mathrm{FFLV}(\lambda)$.

Note that the description of $\mathrm{FFLV}(\lambda)$ is very similar to that of a chain polytope!

Marked Poset Polytopes

To generalize $\mathcal{O}(P)$, $\mathcal{C}(P)$, $\mathrm{GT}(\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{FFLV}(\lambda)$, Ardila, Bliem and Salazar introduced *marked poset polytopes* in 2011.

To a finite poset P, a subset $A \subseteq P$ containing all extremal elements, and an order-preserving *marking* $\lambda\colon A \to \mathbb{R}$, associate two polytopes in $\mathbb{R}^{\widetilde{P}}$, where $\widetilde{P} = P \setminus A$:

- The *marked order polytope*

$$\mathcal{O}(P,\lambda) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{\widetilde{P}} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{rl} x_p \leq x_q & \text{for } p < q, \\ \lambda(a) \leq x_p & \text{for } a < p, \\ x_p \leq \lambda(a) & \text{for } p < a \end{array} \right\},$$

- and the *marked chain polytope*

$$\mathcal{C}(P,\lambda) = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{\widetilde{P}} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{ll} \sum_i x_{p_i} \leq \lambda(b) - \lambda(a) & \text{for } a < p_1 < \cdots < p_k < b \\ x_p \geq 0 & \text{for all } p \in \widetilde{P} \end{array} \right\}.$$

- For a poset P with $\hat{0}$ and $\hat{1}$ we recover $\mathcal{O}(P)$ and $\mathcal{C}(P)$ as $\mathcal{O}(P,\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{C}(P,\lambda)$ with the marking

$$\lambda\colon \{\hat{0},\hat{1}\} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \qquad \hat{0} \longmapsto 0, \qquad \hat{1} \longmapsto 1.$$

- $\mathrm{GT}(\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{FFLV}(\lambda)$ are the marked poset polytopes associated to the marked poset



$(n = 4)$.

What about the face structure of $\mathcal{O}(P,\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{C}(P,\lambda)$?

- The face structure of $\mathcal{O}(P,\lambda)$ has a combinatorial description using *face partitions* of P. [Jochemko–Sanyal '14, P. '16]
- The face structure of $\mathcal{C}(P,\lambda)$ ... seems even messier.

However, there is a piecewise-linear bijection called the *transfer map* $\varphi\colon \mathcal{O}(P,\lambda) \to \mathcal{C}(P,\lambda)$ given by

$$\varphi(x)_p = x_p - \max_{q \prec p} \begin{cases} x_q & \text{if } q \in \widetilde{P}, \\ \lambda(q) & \text{if } q \in A. \end{cases}$$

This allows to transfer some (but less) results from $\mathcal{O}(P,\lambda)$ to $\mathcal{C}(P,\lambda)$ ...

The transfer map $\varphi\colon \mathcal{O}(P,\lambda) \to \mathcal{C}(P,\lambda)$ ...

- ... does not preserve vertices. In fact, in general $f_0(\mathcal{O}(P,\lambda))$ will not be equal to $f_0(\mathcal{C}(P,\lambda))$. ("$\leq$"is an open conjecture).
- ... yields an Ehrhart equivalence of $\mathcal{O}(P,\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{C}(P,\lambda)$ for integral markings. [ABS '11]
- ... preserves a subdivision into products of simplices with cells corresponding to "marking compatible" saturated chains of order ideals. [JS '14]

A Continuous Family

First Idea

Parametrize the transfer-map with $t \in [0,1]$ as

$$\varphi_t(x)_p = x_p - t \max_{q \prec p} \begin{cases} x_q & \text{if } q \in \widetilde{P}, \\ \lambda(q) & \text{if } q \in A. \end{cases}$$

This piecewise-linear map is still injective and we get the following result:

Theorem (P.)

The image $\mathcal{O}_t(P,\lambda) := \varphi_t(\mathcal{O}(P,\lambda))$ is always a polytope and its combinatorial type is constant for $t \in (0,1)$.



Second Idea

Parametrize the transfer-map with $t \in [0,1]^{\widetilde{P}}$ as

$$\varphi_t(x)_p = x_p - t_p \max_{q \prec p} \begin{cases} x_q & \text{if } q \in \widetilde{P}, \\ \lambda(q) & \text{if } q \in A. \end{cases}$$

This piecewise-linear map is still injective and we get the following result:

Theorem (Fang, Fourier, P.)

The image $\mathcal{O}_t(P,\lambda) := \varphi_t(\mathcal{O}(P,\lambda))$ is always a polytope and its combinatorial type is constant along the relative interiors of faces of the hypercube $[0,1]^{\widetilde{P}}$.



- When all $t_p = 0$, we have $\mathcal{O}_t(P, \lambda) = \mathcal{O}(P, \lambda)$.
- When all $t_p = 1$, we have $\mathcal{O}_t(P, \lambda) = \mathcal{C}(P, \lambda)$.
- When $\widetilde{P} = C \sqcup O$ where C is an order ideal in $\widetilde{P}$, letting $t = \chi_C$, we recover the *marked chain-order polytopes* introduced by Fang and Fourier in 2016.

Since we have a transfer map $\mathcal{O}(P, \lambda) \to \mathcal{O}_t(P, \lambda)$ by construction, we can use it to get a straightforward proof of the following theorem.

Theorem (Fang, Fourier, P.)

For an integrally marked poset (P, λ), the polytopes $\mathcal{O}_t(P, \lambda)$ for $t \in \{0, 1\}^{\widetilde{P}}$ form an Ehrhart-equivalent family of integrally closed lattice polytopes.

Since the combinatorial type of $\mathcal{O}_t(P, \lambda)$ is fixed along relative interiors of faces of $[0,1]^{\widetilde{P}}$, we may think of all marked poset polytopes as continuous degenerations of the *generic marked poset polytope* for $t \in (0,1)^{\widetilde{P}}$.

Goal

Understand the face structure of the generic marked poset polytope and figure out how it degenerates to the rest of the marked poset polytopes.

This might still "be messy", but ...

- we have a common H-description of all $\mathcal{O}_t(P, \lambda)$ and
- we can describe the vertices of the generic marked poset polytope by means of a polyhedral subdivision.

We can describe the marked poset polytope $\mathcal{O}_t(P, \lambda)$ for $t \in [0,1]^{\widetilde{P}}$ as the set of points in $\mathbb{R}^{\widetilde{P}}$ satisfying the following linear inequalities:

- For each saturated chain $a \prec p_1 \prec \cdots \prec p_k \prec b$ with $a, b \in A$ and all $p_i \in \widetilde{P}$ an inequality

$$t_{p_1} \cdots t_{p_k} \lambda(a) + t_{p_2} \cdots t_{p_k} x_{p_1} + \cdots + x_{p_k} \leq \lambda(b)$$

- For each saturated chain $a \prec p_1 \prec \cdots \prec p_k \prec p_{k+1}$ with $a \in A$ and all $p_i \in \widetilde{P}$ an inequality

$$(1 - t_{p_{k+1}})(t_{p_1} \cdots t_{p_k} \lambda(a) + t_{p_2} \cdots t_{p_k} x_{p_1} + \cdots + x_{p_k}) \leq x_{p_{k+1}}.$$

Definition

The marked order polytope $\mathcal{O}(P, \lambda)$ has a polyhedral subdivision into maximal regions of linearity with respect to the transfer map φ. Call this the *tropical subdivision*.

Why tropical?

- The regions are determined by the loci of non-differentiability of the tropical affine linear forms

$$\max_{q \prec p} \begin{cases} x_q & \text{if } q \in \widetilde{P}, \\ \lambda(q) & \text{if } q \in A \end{cases} = \bigoplus_{q \prec p} \begin{cases} 0 \odot x_q & \text{if } q \in \widetilde{P}, \\ \lambda(q) & \text{if } q \in A. \end{cases}$$

- Hence, we are intersecting $\mathcal{O}(P, \lambda)$ with the chambers of an affine tropical hyperplane arrangement.

- By construction the tropical subdivision of $\mathcal{O}(P, \lambda)$ transfers to all $\mathcal{O}_t(P, \lambda)$ via the transfer map φ_t.
- Using the combinatorial descriptions of the face structures of $\mathcal{O}(P, \lambda)$ and the associated tropical hyperplane arrangement, we obtain the following result.

Theorem (Litza, P.)

When $t \in (0,1)^{\widetilde{P}}$, the vertices that appear in the tropical subdivision of $\mathcal{O}_t(P, \lambda)$ are exactly the vertices of $\mathcal{O}_t(P, \lambda)$.

...let us visualize this theorem in an Example.

Example



$(P, \lambda) =$ 

$t_r = 0$

Example



$(P, \lambda) \quad =$



$t_r = 0$

Example



$(P, \lambda) \quad =$



$$t_r = \frac{1}{4}$$

Example



$(P, \lambda) =$



$$t_r = \frac{1}{2}$$

Example



$(P, \lambda) \;=$



$$t_r = \frac{3}{4}$$

Example



$(P, \lambda) =$



$$t_r = 1$$

Example



$(P, \lambda) \;=$



$$t_r = 1$$

Some open questions . . .

- For a vertex of the generic polytope ($t \in (0,1)^{\widetilde{P}}$), how to decide if it still is a vertex for a given $t \in \{0,1\}^{\widetilde{P}}$?
- For a vertex of the generic polytope ($t \in (0,1)^{\widetilde{P}}$), is there always some $t \in \{0,1\}^{\widetilde{P}}$ such that we still have a vertex?
- When is the given H-description of $\mathcal{O}_t(P,\lambda)$ non-redundant, i.e., describes the facets?
- How to describe faces of other dimensions?

Thanks for your attention!