

# K-ORBIT CLOSURES AND BARBASCH-EVENS-MAGYAR VARIETIES

LAURA ESCOBAR, BENJAMIN J. WYSER, AND ALEXANDER YONG

ABSTRACT. *Barbasch-Evens-Magyar varieties* are defined as a fiber product of generalized flag varieties. They are isomorphic to the desingularizations of (multiplicity-free) symmetric orbit closures of [D. Barbasch-S. Evens '94]. This parallels [P. Magyar '98]'s construction of the *Bott-Samelson variety* [H. C. Hansen '73, M. Demazure '74]. A graphical description in type  $A$ , stratification into closed subvarieties of the same kind, and determination of the torus-fixed points is provided. These manifolds inherit a natural symplectic structure with Hamiltonian torus action. The moment polytope is expressed in terms of the moment polytope of a Bott-Samelson variety.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Background on K-orbits	3
3. The Barbasch-Evens-Magyar varieties in type $A$	5
4. The general case	8
5. Moment polytopes	13
6. Further analysis in the $GL_p \times GL_q$ case	16
Acknowledgements	24
References	24

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $X = G/B$  be a generalized flag variety, where  $G$  is a complex reductive algebraic group and  $B$  is a Borel subgroup of  $G$ . The left action of  $B$  on  $X$  has finitely many orbits  $BwB/B$ , where  $w$  is a Weyl group element. The **Schubert variety**  $X_w$  is the closure  $\overline{BwB/B}$  of the  $B$ -orbit. The study of Schubert variety singularities is of interest; see, e.g., [4, 8, 1] and the references therein.

In the 1970s, H.C. Hansen [21] and M. Demazure [13] constructed a *Bott-Samelson variety*  $BS^Q$  for each reduced word  $Q$  of  $w$ , building on ideas of R. Bott-H. Samelson [6]. These manifolds are resolutions of singularities of  $X_w$ . In recent years, Bott-Samelson varieties have been used, e.g., in studies of Schubert calculus (M. Willems [42]), Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials (B. Jones-A. Woo [25]), Standard Monomial Theory (V. Lakshmibai-P. Littelmann-P. Magyar [32]), Newton-Okounkov bodies (M. Harada-J. Yang [22]), and matroids over valuation rings (A. Fink-L. Moci [17]).

---

*Date:* August 21, 2017.

In 1983, A. Zelevinsky [49] gave a different resolution for Grassmannian Schubert varieties, presented as a configuration space of vector spaces prescribed by dimension and containment conditions. In 1998, P. Magyar [33] gave a new description of  $BS^Q$  in the same spirit, replacing the quotient by group action definition by a fiber product.

Similar constructions have been used subsequently in, e.g.,

- (1) P. Polo's proof that every polynomial  $f \in 1 + q\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[q]$  is a Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial (in type  $A$ ) [40];
- (2) A. Cortez's proof of the singular locus theorem for Schubert varieties in type  $A$  [12] (cf. [34, 5, 26]);
- (3) N. Perrin's extension of Zelevinsky's resolution to minuscule Schubert varieties [36] (one application is [37]);
- (4) A. Woo's classification of "short" Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials [43];
- (5) the definition of the *brick variety*, which provides resolutions of singularities of Richardson varieties [15]; and
- (6) the connection [16] of Magyar's definition to S. Elnitsky's rhombic tilings [14].

We are interested in a parallel where orbit closures for symmetric subgroups replace Schubert varieties. A **symmetric subgroup**  $K$  of  $G$  is a group comprised of the fixed points  $G^\theta$  of a holomorphic involution  $\theta$  of  $G$ . Like  $B$ ,  $K$  is **spherical**, meaning that it has finitely many orbits  $\mathcal{O}$  under the left action on  $X$ . The study of the singularities of the  $K$ -orbit closure  $Y = \overline{\mathcal{O}}$  is relevant to the theory of Kazhdan-Lusztig-Vogan polynomials and Harish-Chandra modules for a certain real Lie group  $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ . This may be compared with the connection of Schubert varieties to Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials and the representation theory of complex semisimple Lie algebras.

In 1994, D. Barbasch-S. Evens [3] constructed a smooth variety, using a quotient description that extends the one for Bott-Samelsons from [21, 13]. This provides a desingularization of symmetric orbit closures in the *multiplicity-free* case.

This paper introduces and initiates our study of the *Barbasch-Evens-Magyar variety* (BEM variety) and its applications. Just as [33] describes, *via* a fiber product, a variety that is equivariantly isomorphic to a Bott-Samelson variety, the BEM variety reconstructs the manifold of [3] (Theorem 4.2(I)).

Many uses of the Zelevinsky/Magyar-type construction of the Bott-Samelson variety should have BEM versions. For instance, the new definition naturally gives the following general type results:

- a stratification (in the sense of [29, Section 1.1.2]) into smaller BEM varieties (Corollary 4.8);
- description of its torus fixed points (Proposition 5.3);
- a symplectic structure with Hamiltonian torus action as well as analysis of the moment map image, i.e., the *BEM polytope*, as the convex hull of certain Weyl group reflections of a Bott-Samelson moment polytope (Theorem 5.1); and
- an analogue of the brick variety (Theorem 4.2(II)).

In type  $A$  we give a diagrammatic description of the resolution (Section 3) in linear algebraic terms, avoiding the algebraic group generalities. For example, we obtain more specific results (Section 6) in the prototypical case of  $K = GL_p \times GL_q$  acting on  $GL_{p+q}/B$ . We show (Theorem 6.2) that the study of BEM polytopes can be reduced to the " $+\cdots+$

– . . . –” special case. We then determine the torus weights in this situation (Theorem 6.4) which permits us to partially understand the vertices (Corollary 6.6). We also give a combinatorial characterization of the dimension of the BEM polytope (Theorem 6.8).

## 2. BACKGROUND ON K-ORBITS

As in the introduction,  $G$  is a complex reductive algebraic group and  $B$  is a Borel subgroup of  $G$  containing a maximal torus  $T$ . Let  $W = N_G(T)/T$  be the Weyl group. Let  $r$  be the rank of the root system of  $G$ . Let  $\Delta = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\}$  be the system of simple roots corresponding to  $B$ , with  $\{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_r\}$  the corresponding fundamental weights. Denote the simple reflection corresponding to the simple root  $\alpha_i$  by  $s_i$ . Thus,  $W$  is generated by the simple reflections  $\{s_j \mid 1 \leq j \leq r\}$ . We will later be concerned about the action of  $S := T \cap K$ , the maximal torus in  $K$ , on  $Y$  and on its BEM varieties.

Given  $I \subseteq \Delta$ ,  $P_I$  is the standard parabolic subgroup of  $G$  corresponding to  $I$ ; namely,

$$(1) \quad P_I = B \cup \left( \bigcup_{i: \alpha_i \in I} B s_i B \right).$$

$P_I$  is a **minimal parabolic** if  $I = \{\alpha_i\}$ ; it is a **maximal parabolic** if  $I = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \widehat{\alpha}_i, \dots, \alpha_r\}$ . These are denoted  $P_i$  and  $P_{\widehat{i}}$ , respectively.

The **Richardson-Springer monoid structure**  $\mathcal{M}(W)$  uses the **Demazure product**  $\star$  defined inductively by

$$s_i \star w = \begin{cases} s_i w & \text{if } \ell(s_i w) > \ell(w) \\ w & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $\ell(w)$  is the Coxeter length of  $w$ .

A **word** is an ordered tuple of numbers from  $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ , i.e.,  $Q = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_N)$ . Let

$$\text{Dem}(Q) = s_{j_1} \star s_{j_2} \star \dots \star s_{j_N}.$$

If  $\text{Dem}(Q) = w$ , then  $Q$  is a **Demazure word** for  $w$ .

Suppose  $K$  is a connected, spherical subgroup of  $G$ . Given a  $K$ -orbit closure  $Y$  on  $G/B$  and a simple reflection  $s_i \in W$ ,

$$s_i \star Y := \pi_i^{-1}(\pi_i(Y))$$

is a  $K$ -orbit closure; here  $\pi_i : G/B \rightarrow G/P_i$  is the natural projection. This extends to an  $\mathcal{M}(W)$ -action on the set of  $K$ -orbit closures: given a Demazure word  $Q = (s_{j_1}, \dots, s_{j_N})$  for  $w$ , define

$$w \star Y = s_{j_1} \star (s_{j_2} \star \dots \star (s_{j_N} \star Y) \dots).$$

The  $K$ -orbit closure  $w \star Y$  is independent of the choice of Demazure word  $Q$  for  $w$ .

The **weak order** on the set of  $K$ -orbit closures is defined by

$$Y \leq Y' \iff Y' = w \star Y$$

for some  $w \in \mathcal{M}(W)$ . The minimal elements of this order are the **closed orbits**, i.e., those  $Y_0 = \mathcal{O} = \overline{\mathcal{O}}$ . The following is well-known; see, e.g., [7, Proposition 2.2(i)]:

**Lemma 2.1.**  $Y_0$  is isomorphic to  $K/B'$  where  $B'$  is a Borel subgroup of  $K$ . □

The running example of this paper is  $(G, K) = (\mathrm{GL}_{p+q}, \mathrm{GL}_p \times \mathrm{GL}_q)$ . Let  $n = p + q$ , and consider the involution  $\theta$  of  $G = \mathrm{GL}_n$  defined by conjugation using the diagonal matrix having  $p$ -many 1's followed by  $q$ -many  $-1$ 's. Then

$$K = G^\theta \cong \mathrm{GL}_p \times \mathrm{GL}_q,$$

embedded as block diagonal matrices with an upper-left invertible  $p \times p$  block, a lower-right invertible  $q \times q$  block, and zeros outside of these blocks.

The orbits in this case are parametrized by **clans**. A clan is a string of characters  $\gamma = c_1 \dots c_n$ , where each  $c_i \in \{+, -\} \cup \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , such that

- if a natural number appears in  $\gamma$ , then it appears exactly twice; and
- the number of  $+$ 's minus the number of  $-$ 's is  $p - q$ .

Let  $\mathrm{Clans}_{p,q}$  be the set of these clans.

The closed orbits are indexed by **matchless clans**, that is, clans using only  $+$ ,  $-$ . Lemma 2.1 implies these closed orbits are isomorphic to  $\mathrm{Flags}(\mathbb{C}^p) \times \mathrm{Flags}(\mathbb{C}^q)$ .

We now explicitly describe the orbit closures  $Y_\gamma$ . Fix  $\gamma = c_1 \dots c_n \in \mathrm{Clans}_{p,q}$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , define:

- $\gamma(i; +)$  = the total number of  $+$ 's and matchings among  $c_1 \dots c_i$ ; and
- $\gamma(i; -)$  = the total number of  $-$ 's and matchings among  $c_1 \dots c_i$ .

For  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ , define

- $\gamma(i; j) = \#\{k \in [1, i] \mid c_k = c_\ell \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } \ell > j\}$ .

Let  $E_p = \mathrm{span}\{\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2, \dots, \vec{e}_p\}$  be the span of the first  $p$  standard basis vectors, and let  $E^q = \mathrm{span}\{\vec{e}_{p+1}, \vec{e}_{p+2}, \dots, \vec{e}_n\}$  be the span of the last  $q$  standard basis vectors. Let  $\rho : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow E_p$  be the projection map onto the subspace  $E_p$ .




Figure 1:  $Y_{1+-1}$

Suppose  $\gamma \in \mathrm{Clans}_{p,q}$  and  $\theta \in \mathrm{Clans}_{r,s}$ . Then  $\theta = \theta_1 \dots \theta_{r+s}$  (**pattern**) **avoids**  $\gamma = \gamma_1 \dots \gamma_{p+q}$  if there are no indices  $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{p+q}$  such that:

- (1) if  $\gamma_j = \pm$  then  $\theta_{i_j} = \gamma_j$ ; and
- (2) if  $\gamma_k = \gamma_\ell$  then  $\theta_{i_k} = \theta_{i_\ell}$ .

A clan  $\gamma$  is **noncrossing** if  $\gamma$  avoids 1212.

**Theorem 2.2** ([45, Corollary 1.3], [47, Remark 3.9]).  $Y_\gamma$  is the set of flags  $F_\bullet$  such that:

- (1)  $\dim(F_i \cap E_p) \geq \gamma(i; +)$  for all  $i$ ;
- (2)  $\dim(F_i \cap E^q) \geq \gamma(i; -)$  for all  $i$ .
- (3)  $\dim(\rho(F_i) + F_j) \leq j + \gamma(i; j)$  for all  $i < j$ .

If  $\gamma$  is noncrossing, the third condition is redundant.

**Example 2.3.** Let  $p = q = 2$  and  $\gamma = 1 + -1$  (a noncrossing clan). In fact,  $Y_\gamma = s_1 \star s_3 \star s_2 \star Y_{+--+}$  and

$$Y_\gamma = \{(F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathrm{Gr}(1, 4) \times \mathrm{Gr}(2, 4) \times \mathrm{Gr}(3, 4) \mid \dim(F_2 \cap E_2) \geq 1, \dim(F_3 \cap E^2) \geq 1\}.$$

A projectivized depiction of a generic point in this orbit closure is given in Figure 1. The blue and red lines represent  $E_2$  and  $E^2$  respectively. The moving flag  $(F_1, F_2, F_3)$  is the (black point, black line, front face).  $\square$




Figure 2:  $Y_{++--}$

W. McGovern characterized the singular orbit closures:

**Theorem 2.4** ([35]).  $Y_\gamma$  is smooth if and only if  $\gamma$  avoids the patterns  $1 + -1$ ,  $1 - +1$ ,  $1212$ ,  $1 + 221$ ,  $1 - 221$ ,  $122 + 1$ ,  $122 - 1$ ,  $122331$ .

*Example 2.5.* By Theorem 2.4,  $Y_{1+-1}$  is singular. One computes (e.g. using the methods of [44]) that singular locus is the closed orbit  $Y_{++--}$  where  $F_2 = E_2$  (the black and blue lines agree). In Figure 1, the generic picture of  $Y_{1+-1}$ , the black line  $F_2$  has three degrees of freedom to move. Now consider the picture of  $Y_{++--}$  (Figure 2). Pick any point of the blue line  $E_2$ . Then the black line  $F_2$  has two degrees of freedom to pivot and remain inside  $Y_{1+-1}$ . This is true of any other point as well. Informally,

this additional degree of freedom is singular behavior.  $\square$

When  $G = \text{GL}_n$ , we may take the simple roots to be


$$\Delta = \{\alpha_i = \vec{e}_i - \vec{e}_{i+1} | 1 \leq i \leq n - 1\},$$

where  $\vec{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the standard basis vector. With this choice of root system embedding, we may identify the fundamental weight  $\omega_i$  with the vector  $\sum_{k=1}^i \vec{e}_k$ .

$W = \mathfrak{S}_n$  is identified with the symmetric group of permutations on  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Thus,  $s_i$  is the simple transposition interchanging  $i$  and  $i + 1$ . Given  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ ,  $\ell(w)$  computes the number of inversions of  $w$ , that is, the number of positions  $i$  such that  $w(i) > w(i + 1)$ .

### 3. THE BARBASCH-EVENS-MAGYAR VARIETIES IN TYPE A

We now describe, using diagrams, the configuration spaces for the symmetric pairs  $(G, K)$  where  $G$  is a general linear group.



A point of the configuration space is a collection of vector spaces forming a diagram such as the one appearing to the left. The edges describe containment relations among the vector spaces. In the example, we have  $\mathbb{C}^0 \subset F_1 \subset F_2 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ , as well as  $\mathbb{C}^0 \subset V_2 \subset V_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ , etc.

The diagram is determined from a word  $Q = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_N)$  as follows. Initialize with a vertical chain whose  $n + 1$  vertices are labelled by the vector spaces  $\mathbb{C}^0, F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{n-1}, \mathbb{C}^n$ , from south to north (a flag in  $Y_0$ ).

The **dimension** of a vertex is the dimension of the labelling vector space. At the start, this chain is declared to be the **right border of the diagram**.

Consider the last letter  $j_N$  of  $Q$ . Introduce a new vertex, labelled by  $V_N$  of dimension  $j_N$  with edges between the vertices of dimension  $j_N - 1$  and  $j_N + 1$  (thus indicating the

containment relation  $F_{j_{N-1}} \subset V_N \subset F_{j_{N+1}}$ ). We modify the current right border by replacing the vertex of the current right border of dimension  $j_N$  with the new vertex labelled by  $V_N$ . Now repeat successively with  $j_{N-1}, j_{N-2}, \dots, j_2, j_1$ . At step  $k$ , a new vertex labelled by  $V_{N-k+1}$  is added, of dimension  $j_{N-k+1}$ , and becomes the new member of the right border, replacing the unique vertex of dimension  $j_{N-k+1}$  of the current right border. The example to the left corresponds to  $Q = (2, 1, 2, 1)$ . The map from  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  to  $Y$  takes the rightmost flag (corresponding to the rightmost border) in the diagram. Thus the point of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  depicted by the example diagram above maps to the flag  $\mathbb{C}^0 \subset V_2 \subset V_1 \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ .

The above diagram is the same as that used for the configuration space description of the Bott-Samelson variety from [33]. The difference is that for Bott-Samelson varieties, the initial chain corresponds to a point (usually the standard basis flag), while here we take any point of  $Y_0$ .

The following result interprets the  $G = \text{GL}_n$  case of Theorem 4.2(I):


**Theorem 3.1.**  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is isomorphic as a  $K$ -variety to the desingularizations of [3].

We delay our proof until the end of Section 5 (after we have developed prerequisites).

A complete description of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  requires a description of the flags in the closed orbit  $Y_0$ , i.e., which flags may occur on the left hand side of the diagram.

In the case  $(G, K) = (\text{GL}_{p+q}, \text{GL}_p \times \text{GL}_q)$  the closed orbits are indexed by **matchless clans**, i.e.,  $\gamma$  consists of  $p$   $+$ 's and  $q$   $-$ 's. The description of these orbits is given by Theorem 2.2. Since matchless clans are clearly noncrossing, the third condition is redundant.

*Example 3.2.* The diagram for  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  where  $Y_0 = Y_{++--}$  and  $Q = (1, 3, 2)$  is



The depiction of this resolution is given in Figure 3. Here  $V_1, V_3, V_2$  are given by the (projectivized) green point, line and plane respectively. The green spaces have the same incidence relations as the moving (black) flag in  $Y_{1+-1}$ . Thus, the projection forgetting all except the green spaces is maps to  $Y_{1+-1}$ .  $\square$

The torus  $T \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$  in  $\text{GL}_n$  consists of invertible diagonal matrices. In the case at hand,

$$T = S = T \cap K.$$

There is a natural  $K$ -action on  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ , described in Section 4, which induces an  $S$ -action. Let us describe this action in the present setting. A matrix in  $K$  acts on the Grassmannian of  $m$ -dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  by change of basis. We extend this to an action of  $K$  on  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  diagonally:

$$k \cdot (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{n-1}, V_1, V_2, \dots, V_N) = (k \cdot F_1, k \cdot F_2, \dots, k \cdot F_{n-1}, k \cdot V_1, k \cdot V_2, \dots, k \cdot V_N),$$




Figure 3:  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_{+--+},(1,3,2)}$ : the green flag maps to  $Y_{1+-1}$

where  $k \in K$ .

In Section 6, to study the moment polytopes, we need the  $S$ -fixed points of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ . Each letter of  $Q$  corresponds to a quadrangle of the associated diagram. A **subword** of  $Q = (j_1, \dots, j_N)$  is a list  $P = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N)$  such that  $\beta_i \in \{-, j_i\}$ . A subword  $P$  corresponds to a coloring of a size  $\#P$  subset of these quadrangles. For each colored quadrangle, require the two vertices associated to vector spaces of equal dimension to be the same space. For each uncolored quadrangle, insist those same vector spaces be different. Call such an assignment given a left border associated to a flag  $F_\bullet$  a  $P$ -growth of  $F_\bullet$ .

Given a matchless clan  $\gamma$ , a permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{p+q}$  is  $\gamma$ -**shuffled** if it assigns

- $1, 2, \dots, p$  in any order to the  $+$ 's;
- $p+1, p+2, \dots, n$  in any order to the  $-$ 's.

Hence there are  $p!q!$  such permutations (independent of  $\gamma$ ).

Associated to any  $\gamma$ -shuffled permutation define  $F_\bullet^{\gamma, \sigma}$  to be the  $\sigma$ -permuted coordinate flag, i.e., the one whose  $d$ -dimensional subspace is  $\langle \vec{e}_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \vec{e}_{\sigma(d)} \rangle$ .

We will use this result, due to A. Yamamoto:

**Proposition 3.3** ([48]). *The  $S$ -fixed points of  $Y_\gamma$  are flags  $F_\bullet^{\gamma, \sigma}$  where  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{p+q}$  is  $\gamma$ -shuffled.*

**Proposition 3.4** ( $S$ -fixed points of  $(\mathrm{GL}_{p+q}, \mathrm{GL}_p \times \mathrm{GL}_q)$ ). *The set of  $S$ -fixed points of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  correspond to  $P$ -growth diagrams whose initial vertical chain is  $F_\bullet^{\gamma, \sigma}$  (where  $Y = Y_\gamma$ ).*

*Proof.* The following is straightforward:

**Claim 3.5.** *Fix a coordinate flag  $F_\bullet$  for the initial vertical chain. There exists exactly one  $P$ -growth of  $F_\bullet$  which uses only coordinate subspaces.*

Clearly any such diagram is a  $S$ -fixed point of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ . Conversely, consider any diagram giving an  $S$ -fixed point. The left border is an  $S$ -fixed point of  $Y = Y_\gamma$ . The result then holds by Proposition 3.3 together with Claim 3.5.  $\square$

Proposition 5.3 gives a general form of Proposition 3.4.

**Corollary 3.6.**  $\# (\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q})^S = p!q!2^{|Q|}$ .

Similar descriptions can be given for the other two symmetric pairs of the form  $(\mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{K})$ . In these cases  $\mathrm{T} \neq \mathrm{S}$ , however it is known that the fixed points in the respective flag varieties agree (see [7, pg. 128]). In brief, in the (multiplicity-free) case  $(\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{K}) = (\mathrm{GL}_{2n}, \mathrm{Sp}_{2n})$ , there is a unique closed orbit which corresponds to the fixed point-free involution  $w_0$ , the long element of  $\mathfrak{S}_{2n}$  [41]. This closed orbit is isomorphic to the flag variety for  $\mathrm{K} = \mathrm{Sp}_{2n}$  by Lemma 2.1. As elements of  $\mathfrak{S}_{2n}$ , these  $\mathrm{S}$ -fixed points correspond to “mirrored” permutations, i.e. those permutations  $w$  having the property that

$$w(2n + 1 - i) = 2n + 1 - w(i)$$

for each  $i$ ; this is described in detail in [46]. Similarly, in the (non-multiplicity-free) case of  $(\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{K}) = (\mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{O}_n)$ , there is a unique closed orbit, again corresponding to the involution  $w_0$  [41]. This orbit is isomorphic to the flag variety for  $\mathrm{O}_n$ . These fixed points correspond to mirrored elements of  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ , as described in [46]. We refer the reader to [46, Section 2] and the references therein for a linear algebraic description of the points of the closed orbits in these cases.

In [16] one considers Bott-Samelson varieties in relation to zonotopal tilings of an *Elt-nitsky* polygon. This puts a poset structure on Bott-Samelson varieties (in type  $A$ ) by introducing generalized Bott-Samelson varieties for which the fibers are larger flag varieties rather than  $\mathbb{P}^1$ 's. The diagram definition of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  permits one to obtain similar definitions and results here *mutatis mutandis*.

#### 4. THE GENERAL CASE

We begin with the quotient by group action definition of the manifold of D. Barbasch-S. Evens [3, Section 6].

If  $\mathrm{B}^{k-1}$  acts on  $X_1 \times \cdots \times X_k$  by

$$(2) \quad (b_1, \dots, b_k) \cdot (x_1, \dots, x_k) = (x_1 b_1, b_1^{-1} x_2 b_2, \dots, b_{k-1}^{-1} x_k),$$

then  $X_1 \times^{\mathrm{B}} \cdots \times^{\mathrm{B}} X_k$  denotes the quotient of  $X_1 \times \cdots \times X_k$  by this action. Let  $Y_0$  be a closed orbit and  $Q = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_N)$ . The manifold of [3] is

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} = \tilde{Y}_0 \times^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{P}_{j_N} \times^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{P}_{j_{N-1}} \times^{\mathrm{B}} \cdots \times^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{P}_{j_1} / \mathrm{B},$$

where  $\tilde{Y}_0$  denotes the preimage of  $Y_0$  in  $\mathrm{G}$  under  $\mathrm{G} \rightarrow \mathrm{G}/\mathrm{B}$ .  $\mathrm{K}$  acts on  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  by

$$(4) \quad \mathbf{k} \cdot [\mathfrak{g}, p_N, \dots, p_1 \mathrm{B}] = [\mathbf{k}\mathfrak{g}, p_N, \dots, p_1 \mathrm{B}].$$

There is a map  $\beta : \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} \rightarrow Y$  given by

$$(5) \quad [\mathfrak{g}, p_N, \dots, p_1 \mathrm{B}] \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathfrak{g} p_N \cdots p_1 \mathrm{B}.$$

Indeed, both the action (4) and the map (5) are well-defined, i.e., independent of choice of representative of the equivalence class  $[\mathfrak{g}, p_N, \dots, p_1]$ . This description is taken from [30]; the original work of [3] states this same result only slightly differently.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Actually, to obtain a resolution it is not necessary to take  $Y_0$  to be a closed orbit. We need only take  $Y_0$  to be a smooth orbit closure underneath  $Y$  in weak order [30], or take  $Y_0$  to be the closure of a “distinguished” orbit [3]. However, closed orbits are both smooth and distinguished. Taking them as a starting point seems closest in spirit to the construction of the Bott-Samelson resolution.



R. W. Richardson-T. A. Springer [41] proved that for any  $Y$ , there is a closed orbit  $Y_0$  (possibly non-unique) below it in weak order. That is, there is some reduced word

$$w = s_{j_1} \cdots s_{j_\ell}$$

(where  $\ell = \ell(w)$ ) such that

$$(6) \quad Y = w \star Y_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \dim(Y) = \ell(w) + \dim(Y_0).$$

Let  $Y$  and  $w$  be as above and  $Q = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_\ell)$ . By [3, Proposition 6.4] (see also [30, Lemma 5.1]),  $\beta : \mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q} \rightarrow Y$  resolves singularities of  $Y$  whenever  $Y$  is **multiplicity-free**, meaning that

$$[Y] = \sum_{w \in W} a_w [X_w] \in H^*(X, \mathbb{Q}), \quad \text{where } a_w \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for all } w \in W.$$

The Schubert classes  $\{[X_w] : w \in W\}$  form an additive basis of  $H^*(X, \mathbb{Q})$ , the multiplicity-free notion is well-defined. (In the non-multiplicity-free cases,  $\beta$  is still a generically finite map [3, Section 6].)

We remark that, unlike [3], we allow  $Q$  to be possibly nonreduced in (3).

*Definition 4.1* (Barbasch-Evens-Magyar variety). Suppose that

$$Q = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_N)$$

is a Demazure word for  $w$  (not necessarily reduced). Let

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} := Y_0 \times_{G/P_{j_N}} G/B \times_{G/P_{j_{N-1}}} \cdots \times_{G/P_{j_1}} G/B.$$

Recall that if  $X_1 \xrightarrow{f} Y$  and  $X_2 \xrightarrow{g} Y$  are two varieties mapping to the same variety  $Y$ , then

$$(8) \quad X_1 \times_Y X_2 = \{(x_1, x_2) \in X_1 \times X_2 \mid f(x_1) = g(x_2)\}$$

denotes the **fiber product**. In (7), each map of (8) is the natural projection  $G/B \rightarrow G/P_{j_i}$  defined by  $gB \mapsto gP$  (or, in the case of  $Y_0$ , the restriction of said projection).

Evidently,  $K$  acts diagonally on  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ . Our next theorem asserts that the projection

$$\begin{aligned} \theta : \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} &\rightarrow G/B \\ (x_{N+1}, x_N, \dots, x_1) &\mapsto x_1 \end{aligned}$$

maps into  $Y$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** *Suppose that  $Y = w \star Y_0$  for a closed orbit  $Y_0$ .*

(I)

$$\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} \cong \mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}$$

*as  $K$ -varieties. Furthermore if  $Q$  corresponds to a reduced word for  $w$ ,  $\dim(Y) = \ell(w) + \dim(Y_0)$ , and  $Y$  is multiplicity-free then, by [3, Proposition 6.4],  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} \rightarrow Y$  is a resolution of singularities.*

(II) *Suppose  $Y$  is the closure of the  $K$ -orbit  $\mathcal{O} = KgB$ . For a Demazure word  $Q$ , the fiber of  $\theta$  over a point of  $KgB$  of  $Y$  is smooth of dimension  $\dim(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}) - \dim(Y)$ .*

*Proof.* We prove (I) by mild modification of the argument of P. Magyar in the Schubert setting. The map

$$(9) \quad \phi : \mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q} \rightarrow Y_0 \times (\mathbf{G}/\mathbf{B})^N$$

$$(10) \quad [g, p_N, p_{N-1}, \dots, p_1 \mathbf{B}] \mapsto (g\mathbf{B}, gp_N\mathbf{B}, gp_N p_{N-1}\mathbf{B}, \dots, gp_N p_{N-1} \dots p_1 \mathbf{B}),$$

is well defined (independent of choice of representative),  $\mathbf{K}$ -equivariant, and

$$\phi(\mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}) \subseteq \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$$

since  $p_i \in \mathbf{P}_{j_i}$ .

$\phi$  is injective: If

$$\phi([g, p_N, p_{N-1}, \dots, p_1 \mathbf{B}]) = \phi([g', p'_N, p'_{N-1}, \dots, p'_1 \mathbf{B}]),$$

then there exist  $b_0, b_1, \dots, b_N \in \mathbf{B}$  such that

$$g = g'b_0, \quad gp_N = g'p'_N b_N, \quad \dots, \quad gp_N \dots p_1 = g'p'_N \dots p'_1 b_1.$$

Combining these equations with the definition of  $\mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}$  (specifically (2)),

$$\begin{aligned} [g, p_N, p_{N-1}, \dots, p_1 \mathbf{B}] &= [g'b_0, b_0^{-1}p'_N b_N, b_N^{-1}p'_{N-1} b_{N-1}, \dots, b_2^{-1}p'_1 b_1 \mathbf{B}] \\ &= [g', p'_N, p'_{N-1}, \dots, p'_1 \mathbf{B}], \end{aligned}$$

establishing injectivity.

$\phi$  is surjective: Let

$$(g\mathbf{B}, p_N\mathbf{B}, p_{N-1}\mathbf{B}, \dots, p_1\mathbf{B}) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}.$$

**Claim 4.3.**  $[g, g^{-1}p_N, p_N^{-1}p_{N-1}, \dots, p_2^{-1}p_1 \mathbf{B}] \in \mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}$ .

*Proof of Claim:* First, by definition  $g \in \tilde{Y}_0$ , as desired. Second, by (7) and (8) combined we have

$$g\mathbf{P}_{j_N} = p_N\mathbf{P}_{j_N} \implies g^{-1}p_N \in \mathbf{P}_{j_N}.$$

Similarly, in general

$$p_i\mathbf{P}_{j_{i+1}} = p_{i+1}\mathbf{P}_{j_{i+1}} \implies p_i^{-1}p_{i+1} \in \mathbf{P}_{j_{i+1}},$$

as required. □

Combining the claim with

$$\phi(g, g^{-1}p_N, p_N^{-1}p_{N-1}, \dots, p_2^{-1}p_1 \mathbf{B}) = (g\mathbf{B}, p_N\mathbf{B}, p_{N-1}\mathbf{B}, \dots, p_1\mathbf{B}),$$

we obtain

$$\phi(\mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}) = \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}.$$

$\theta$  maps into  $Y$ : Since  $\beta$  maps into  $Y$ ,

$$\beta \circ \phi^{-1}(g\mathbf{B}, p_N\mathbf{B}, p_{N-1}\mathbf{B}, \dots, p_1\mathbf{B}) = \beta(g, g^{-1}p_N, p_N^{-1}p_{N-1}, \dots, p_2^{-1}p_1 \mathbf{B}) = p_1\mathbf{B} \in Y.$$

However, by definition

$$\theta(g\mathbf{B}, p_N\mathbf{B}, p_{N-1}\mathbf{B}, \dots, p_1\mathbf{B}) = p_1\mathbf{B}$$

and so  $\theta$  maps into  $Y$  as well.

Since  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is smooth (and thus normal) and  $\mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}$  is irreducible, the bijective morphism (of  $\mathbb{C}$ -varieties) above is an isomorphism of varieties by Zariski's main theorem (see, e.g., [24]).

For (II), we apply:

**Theorem 4.4.** [23, Corollary 10.7] *Let*

$$f : X \rightarrow Y$$

*be a morphism of varieties over an algebraically closed field  $k$  of characteristic 0, and assume that  $X$  is nonsingular. There is a nonempty open subset  $V \subset Y$  such that*

$$f : f^{-1}(V) \rightarrow V$$

*is smooth. In the case in which  $f^{-1}(V) \neq \emptyset$ , the fiber  $f^{-1}(v)$  is nonsingular and*

$$\dim(f^{-1}(v)) = \dim(X) - \dim(Y)$$

*for all  $v \in V$ .*

Let  $f$  be the projection map  $\theta : \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} \rightarrow Y$ . Since  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is nonsingular, by Theorem 4.4 applied to this  $f$ , there exists a nonempty  $V \subset Y$  such that  $f$  restricted to  $f^{-1}(V)$  is smooth. If  $v \in V$  then said theorem says  $\dim(f^{-1}(v))$  is of the desired dimension.

However, we want the above to be true for  $p \in K\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{B}$ . To see this, note that everything said above holds for  $f^{-1}(kV)$  for all  $k \in K$  since  $f$  is  $K$ -equivariant and multiplication by  $k$  is a smooth morphism. Let  $p \in K\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{B}$  be a general point. Since  $Kp\mathfrak{B}$  is dense in  $Y$ ,  $Y \cap kV \neq \emptyset$  for all  $k \in K$ . Now we can pick  $k$  so that  $p \in kV$ , completing the argument.  $\square$

The generic fibers of part (II) of the theorem may be considered an analogue of the *brick variety* of [15], which is the generic fiber of the Bott-Samelson map (this generic fiber being nontrivial only when  $Q$  is not a reduced word). See *loc. cit.* for a connection to the *brick polytope* of [38, 39] and the associahedron.

**Proposition 4.5.**  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  *is an iterated  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle over  $Y_0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $Q = (j_1, \dots, j_N)$  and consider the sequence of projections

$$\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, (j_1, \dots, j_N)} \rightarrow \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, (j_2, \dots, j_N)} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, (j_N)} \rightarrow Y_0,$$

where each map forgets the last coordinate. The fiber of  $(x_{N+1}\mathfrak{B}, x_N\mathfrak{B}, \dots, x_{i+1}\mathfrak{B})$  under

$$\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, (j_i, \dots, j_N)} \rightarrow \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, (j_{i+1}, \dots, j_N)}$$

consists of all the points of the form  $(x_{N+1}\mathfrak{B}, x_N\mathfrak{B}, \dots, x_{i+1}\mathfrak{B}, y_i\mathfrak{B})$  such that  $y_i\mathfrak{P}_{j_{N-i+1}} = x_{i+1}\mathfrak{P}_{j_{N-i+1}}$  so the fiber is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{P}_{j_{N-i+1}}/\mathfrak{B} \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ . This is also true for the map  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, (j_N)} \rightarrow Y_0$ . Therefore each fiber is a  $\mathbb{P}^1$  so  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is an iterated  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -bundle.  $\square$

Actually, that  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  has the property of Proposition 4.5 is near tautological. Given this one can also see Proposition 4.5 by using Theorem 4.2(I).

Let

$$p_{Y, Q}(z) = \sum_{k \geq 0} z^k \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} H^{2k}(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}; \mathbb{Q}),$$

and

$$r_Y(z) = \sum_{k \geq 0} z^k \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} H^{2k}(Y; \mathbb{Q})$$

be the Poincaré polynomials of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  and  $Y$ , respectively.

**Corollary 4.6.**  $p_{Y, Q}(z) = r_{Y_0}(z)(1+z)^N$ .

*Proof.* In view of Proposition 4.5, the claim follows by repeated applications of the Leray-Hirsch theorem.  $\square$

Each closed orbit  $Y$  is isomorphic to the flag variety of  $K$ . Hence  $r_Y(z)$  is known. For example, if

$$[i]_z! = [1]_z [2]_z \cdots [i]_z$$

where

$$[j]_z = 1 + z + z^2 + \cdots + z^{j-1}$$

then we have:

**Proposition 4.7.** For  $K = \mathrm{GL}_p \times \mathrm{GL}_q$ ,  $r_{Y_0}(z) = [p]_z! [q]_z!$ , for any choice of closed orbit  $Y_0$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.1,

$$Y_0 \cong \mathrm{Flags}(\mathbb{C}^p) \times \mathrm{Flags}(\mathbb{C}^q)$$

and therefore the formula follows from by the Künneth formula.  $\square$

Following [30, Section 1.1.2], a **stratification by closed subvarieties** of a space  $X$  is a decomposition

$$X = \bigcup_{\xi} \mathcal{S}_{\xi}$$

into closed strata  $\mathcal{S}_{\xi}$  such that the intersection of any two closed stratum is the union of strata. We have a stratification of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  with strata given by subwords  $P$  of  $Q$ . A **subword** of  $Q = (j_1, \dots, j_N)$  is a list  $P = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N)$  such that  $\beta_i \in \{-, j_i\}$ .

**Corollary 4.8** (of Theorem 4.2).  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is stratified with strata given by subwords  $P$  of  $Q$ . The stratum corresponding to a subword  $P$  is

$$\mathcal{S}(P) = \{(x_{N+1}, \dots, x_1) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} \mid x_i = x_{i+1} \text{ if } \beta_{N+1-i} = -\}$$

This stratum is canonically isomorphic to  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, \mathrm{flat}(P)}$  where  $\mathrm{flat}(P)$  is the word which deletes all  $-$  appearing in  $P$ .

*Proof.* The union of these strata covers  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  because

$$\mathcal{S}(Q) = \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}.$$

For  $P = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N)$  and  $P' = (\beta'_1, \dots, \beta'_N)$  define the subword

$$P \vee P' = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N)$$

where  $\gamma_i = -$  if  $\beta_i$  or  $\beta'_i$  equals  $-$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(P) \cap \mathcal{S}(P') &= \{(x_{N+1}, \dots, x_1) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} \mid x_i = x_{i+1} \text{ if } \beta_{N+1-i} = - \text{ or } \beta'_{N+1-i} = -\} \\ &= \mathcal{S}(P \vee P'). \end{aligned}$$

The isomorphism from  $\mathcal{S}(P)$  to  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, \mathrm{flat}(P)}$  is the projection that deletes all components of  $\mathcal{S}(P)$  associated to a  $-$ .  $\square$

## 5. MOMENT POLYTOPES

The projective space  $\mathbb{P}^d$  is a symplectic manifold with *Fubini-Study* symplectic form. Following [10, Section 6.6], consider the restriction of the action of  $T^d = (\mathbb{C}^*)^d$  on  $\mathbb{P}^d$  to the compact real subtorus

$$T_{\mathbb{R}}^d = \{(e^{i\theta_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_d}) \in (\mathbb{C}^*)^d \mid \theta_i \in \mathbb{R} \text{ for all } i\}.$$

As explained in [29, Example 4] the action of  $T_{\mathbb{R}}^d$  on  $\mathbb{P}^d$  has a moment map. That is  $\mathbb{P}^d$  is a Hamiltonian  $T_{\mathbb{R}}^d$ -manifold.

Now let  $X$  be a smooth algebraic variety with an action of a torus  $T \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$  with  $n \leq \dim(X)$ . Assume  $X$  has a  $T$ -equivariant embedding into  $\mathbb{P}^d$ . Again, we restrict the  $T$ -action to the compact real subtorus  $T_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Since  $T$  is isomorphic to a subgroup of  $T^d$  then [28, p. 64; point 1.] tells us that  $\mathbb{P}^d$  is also a Hamiltonian  $T_{\mathbb{R}}$ -manifold. Smoothness says  $X$  is a  $T$ -invariant submanifold of  $\mathbb{P}^d$ . By [28, p. 64; point 1.], it is a Hamiltonian  $T_{\mathbb{R}}$ -manifold. Hence there are finitely many fixed points which are isolated and  $X$  has a *moment map*

$$\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^*,$$

where  $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^* \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$  is the dual of the Lie algebra of  $T_{\mathbb{R}}$ . By [2, 20], the image  $\Phi(X)$  is a polytope in  $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^*$ ; namely, it is the convex hull of the image under  $\Phi$  of the  $T_{\mathbb{R}}$ -fixed points.  $\Phi(X)$  is known as the *moment polytope* of  $X$ . A primer on moment maps which outlines their most important properties, including the ones we will use, can be found in [28, Section 2.2]. From now on, we will omit the subscript  $\mathbb{R}$  from  $T$  and the Lie algebra.

Moment map images provide a source of polytopes. It is natural to consider  $\Phi(BS^Q)$  which is the moment polytope of the Bott-Samelson variety  $BS^Q$ . To our best knowledge, the first analysis of this polytope in the literature is [15]. We will show in Theorem 5.1 that  $\Phi(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q})$  is the convex hull of certain reflections of  $\Phi_S(BS^Q)$ , where  $\Phi_S$  denotes the moment map of  $BS^Q$  for the  $S$ -action. The proof exploits the comparable descriptions of the manifolds.

In order to compute  $\Phi(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q})$  we embed  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  into a product of  $G/P_{\hat{i}}$ . By [31], the Grassmannian  $G/P_{\hat{i}}$  is a coadjoint orbit. Therefore, to compute  $\Phi(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q})$  it is not necessary to explicitly embed  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  into projective space (via generalized Plücker embeddings followed by the Segre map). This is since the coadjoint orbit  $G/P_{\hat{i}}$  is already a Hamiltonian  $T$ -manifold with *Kostant-Kirillov-Souriau* symplectic form and moment map

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi_i : G/P_{\hat{i}} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r \\ (gP_{\hat{i}}) &\mapsto g\omega_i. \end{aligned}$$

Actually, if we embed  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  into projective space as indicated above we wouldn't get a different polytope anyway. This is because the Kostant-Kirillov-Souriau form coincides with the pullback of the Fubini-Study form to  $G/P_{\hat{i}}$  under the  $T$ -equivariant embedding given by the line bundle  $\mathcal{L}(\omega_i)$ , see [11, Remark 3.5].

Thinking of the fundamental weights  $\omega_i \in \mathfrak{t}^*$  as functions  $\omega_i : \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\omega_i|_{\mathfrak{s}}$  is the restriction of  $\omega_i$  to  $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{t}$ .

**Theorem 5.1.**  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  has an embedding into a product of generalized Grassmannians as a symplectic submanifold with Hamiltonian  $S$ -action; the corresponding moment polytope is

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}) &= \text{conv} \left\{ x \left( \sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i|_S + \sum_{i=|Q|}^1 s_{j_{|Q|}} \cdots s_{j_i} \omega_i|_S \right) \mid x \in Y_0^S \text{ and } (j_1, \dots, j_{|Q|}) \subseteq Q \right\} \\ &= \text{conv} \{ x \cdot \Phi_S(BS^Q) \mid x \in Y_0^S \}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.*  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  embeds into a product of generalized Grassmannians, as follows:

**Proposition 5.2.**

$$(12) \quad \delta : \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} \hookrightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G/P_{\hat{i}} \times \prod_{j=1}^{|Q|} G/P_{\widehat{i_{|Q|-j+1}}}$$

$$(13) \quad (xB, g_{|Q|}B, \dots, g_1B) \mapsto (xP_{\hat{1}}, \dots, xP_{\hat{r}}, g_{|Q|}P_{\widehat{i_{|Q|}}}, g_{|Q|-1}P_{\widehat{i_{|Q|-1}}}, \dots, g_1P_{\widehat{i_1}}).$$

*Proof.* First we see that  $\delta$  is injective. Suppose

$$\delta(xB, a_{|Q|}B, \dots, a_1B) = \delta(yB, b_{|Q|}B, \dots, b_1B),$$

then

$$xP_{\hat{i}} = yP_{\hat{i}} \quad (1 \leq i \leq r) \implies xy^{-1} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^r P_{\hat{i}} = B.$$

Thus,

$$xB = yB.$$

Next, the assumption

$$(14) \quad a_{|Q|}P_{\widehat{i_{|Q|}}} = b_{|Q|}P_{\widehat{i_{|Q|}}} \implies a_{|Q|}b_{|Q|}^{-1} \in P_{\widehat{i_{|Q|}}}.$$

Also, using the definition of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  (8),

$$(15) \quad a_{|Q|}P_{i_{|Q|}} = xP_{i_{|Q|}} = yP_{i_{|Q|}} = b_{|Q|}P_{i_{|Q|}} \implies a_{|Q|}b_{|Q|}^{-1} \in P_{i_{|Q|}}.$$

Combining (14) and (15) gives

$$a_{|Q|}b_{|Q|}^{-1} \in P_{\widehat{i_{|Q|}}} \cap P_{i_{|Q|}} = B \implies a_{|Q|}B = b_{|Q|}B.$$

Reasoning similarly, we see that

$$a_kB = b_kB$$

for all  $k = |Q| - 1, |Q| - 2, \dots, 1$ , as required. Thus  $\delta$  is injective.

It is well known that the map

$$G/B \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r G/P_{\hat{i}} : xB \mapsto (xP_{\hat{1}}, \dots, xP_{\hat{r}})$$

is an embedding of algebraic varieties. Consequently, the map

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa : (G/B)^{|Q|+1} &\hookrightarrow \prod_{m=1}^{|Q|+1} \prod_{i=1}^r G/P_{\hat{i}} \\ (x_{|Q|+1}B, x_{|Q|}B, \dots, x_1B) &\mapsto ((x_{|Q|+1}P_{\hat{1}}, \dots, x_{|Q|+1}P_{\hat{r}}), \dots, (x_1P_{\hat{1}}, \dots, x_1P_{\hat{r}})) \end{aligned}$$

is also an embedding. Let  $Q = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_N)$ . The image of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} \subset (G/B)^{|Q|+1}$  under  $\kappa$  satisfies

$$(16) \quad x_m P_{\hat{i}} = x_{m+1} P_{\hat{i}}$$

whenever  $i \neq q_m$ , for  $m = 1, 2, \dots, |Q|$ . Thus  $\delta$  factors:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} & \xrightarrow{\kappa} & \prod_{m=1}^{|Q|+1} \prod_{i=1}^r G/P_{\hat{i}} \\ & \searrow \delta & \downarrow \psi \\ & & \prod_{i=1}^r G/P_{\hat{i}} \times \prod_{j=1}^{|Q|} G/P_{\widehat{i_{|Q|-j+1}}} \end{array}$$

where  $\psi$  is the projection that forgets the repetitions of (16). Thus,  $\delta$  is an embedding.  $\square$

$Gr := \prod_{i=1}^r G/P_{\hat{i}} \times \prod_{j=1}^{|Q|} G/P_{\widehat{i_{|Q|-j+1}}}$  is naturally a symplectic manifold, and is Hamiltonian with respect to the (diagonal) action of  $T$ . By [28, p. 64; point 1.] the same is true for this action restricted to the subtorus  $S$ . As a submanifold of  $Gr$ ,  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is also symplectic, and is clearly stable under the  $S$ -action. From this it follows (cf. [28, p. 65; point 4.]) that the  $S$ -action is Hamiltonian, whence  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  has a moment map  $\Phi$ . Then one sees from [28, p. 64; point 1. and p. 65; point 3.] that  $\Phi$  is given by

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} \hookrightarrow Gr \xrightarrow{\sum_{i=1}^r \Phi_i} \mathfrak{t}^* \longrightarrow \mathfrak{s}^*,$$

where

$$\Phi_i : G/P_{\hat{i}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^*$$

is the moment map for  $G/P_{\hat{i}}$  and  $\mathfrak{t}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{s}^*$  is induced from the inclusion  $S \subset T$ . The second map restricts functions  $\mathfrak{t} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathfrak{s}$ . Therefore, by (11) and (17) combined, the moment map  $\Phi : \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q} \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^*$  is given by

$$(18) \quad (xB, g_{|Q|}B, \dots, g_1B) \mapsto x \sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i|_{\mathfrak{s}} + \sum_{i=1}^{|Q|} g_i \omega_i|_{\mathfrak{s}}.$$

**Proposition 5.3** ( $S$ -fixed points of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ ). *The  $S$ -fixed points of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  are indexed by pairs  $(xB, J)$ , where  $xB \in Y_0$  is a  $S$ -fixed point of  $Y_0$ , and  $J = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{|Q|})$  is a subword of  $Q$ . Indeed, the fixed points are precisely*

$$(19) \quad p_{(xB, J)} := (xB, x s_{\beta_{|Q|}} B, x s_{\beta_{|Q|}} s_{\beta_{|Q|-1}} B, \dots, x s_{\beta_{|Q|}} \cdots s_{\beta_1} B) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q},$$

where  $s_{\beta_i}$  is the identity if  $\beta_i = -$ .

*Proof.* We first verify that

$$p_{(xB, J)} \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}.$$

Note that for  $i = 1, \dots, |Q|$ , since by (1),  $B s_{\beta_i} B \in P_{j_i}$ , in particular  $s_{\beta_i} \in P_{j_i}$  and hence

$$x s_{\beta_{|Q|}} \cdots s_{\beta_i} P_{\beta_i} = x s_{\beta_{|Q|}} \cdots s_{\beta_{i-1}} P_{\beta_i}.$$

Therefore  $(x s_{\beta_{|Q|}} \cdots s_{\beta_{i-1}}, x s_{\beta_{|Q|}} \cdots s_{\beta_i})$  satisfies (8) for  $i = 1, \dots, |Q|$ , as needed.

Since

$$(20) \quad (G/B)^S = (G/B)^T$$

(see [7, pg. 128]), the  $S$ -fixed points of  $Y_0$  are of the form  $x\mathbf{B}$  where  $x \in N_G(\mathbf{T})$ . Therefore,

$$(21) \quad xs_{\beta_{|Q|}} \cdots s_{\beta_i} \in N_G(\mathbf{T}).$$

Moreover, since  $S \subset \mathbf{T}$ , for  $t \in S$  we have by (21) that

$$t \cdot xs_{\beta_{|Q|}} \cdots s_{\beta_i} \mathbf{B} = xs_{\beta_{|Q|}} \cdots s_{\beta_i} \mathbf{B},$$

so  $p_{(x\mathbf{B}, J)}$  is an  $S$ -fixed point.

Conversely, suppose  $(x_{|Q|+1}\mathbf{B}, x_{|Q|}\mathbf{B}, \dots, x_1\mathbf{B})$  is an  $S$ -fixed point of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ . Clearly,

$$x_{|Q|+1}\mathbf{B} \in (Y_0)^S.$$

By (20), each  $x_i\mathbf{B}$  is a  $\mathbf{T}$ -fixed point so we may assume

$$(22) \quad x_i \in N_G(\mathbf{T}).$$

By the definition (8) of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ ,  $x_i P_{j_i} = x_{i-1} P_{j_i}$ . Thus,  $x_{i-1}^{-1} x_i \in P_{j_i}$ . Hence, in view of (22) we may further assume that

$$x_{i-1}^{-1} x_i \in \{id, s_{\alpha_{j_i}}\}.$$

Therefore  $(x_{|Q|+1}\mathbf{B}, x_{|Q|}\mathbf{B}, \dots, x_1\mathbf{B})$  is of the form  $p_{(x\mathbf{B}, J)}$ , as asserted.  $\square$

Since  $\Phi(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q})$  is the convex hull of  $\Phi$  applied to this set of points, the first equality of the theorem holds by Proposition 5.3 combined with (18).

Similar arguments [15] show the moment polytope of a Bott-Samelson variety is

$$(23) \quad \Phi(BS^Q) = \text{conv} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i + \sum_{i=|Q|}^1 s_{\beta_{|Q|}} \cdots s_{\beta_i} \omega_i \mid (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{|Q|}) \subseteq Q \right\}.$$

The second equality follows by restricting the weights to  $\mathfrak{s}$ .  $\square$

Define the **BEM polytope**  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}$  as  $\Phi(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q})$ .

We remark it would be interesting to study the polytopes coming from the  $K$ -action on  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ .  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is a Hamiltonian  $K$ -manifold and therefore has a moment map  $\Phi_K$ . [28, Section 2.5] describes two polytopes which are associated with the image of  $\Phi_K$ . One of these is the intersection of the image of  $\Phi_K$  with the positive Weyl chamber. Kirwan's noncommutative convexity Theorem [27] states that this intersection is a polytope.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* In type  $A$ , the map  $\delta$  may be interpreted as listing the vector spaces on the flags of successive right borders of the diagram for  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ , but avoiding redundancy by listing only the additional new vector space introduced at each step. Therefore the isomorphism of Theorem 3.1 is the composition of the maps in Theorem 4.2 and Proposition 5.2.  $\square$


## 6. FURTHER ANALYSIS IN THE $GL_p \times GL_q$ CASE

*Example 6.1.* Let

$$Q = (3, 2) \text{ and } Y_0 = Y_{++---}.$$

Following the construction in Section 3, and applying Theorem 2.2,  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is described by the following diagram.





By Corollary 3.6,  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  has  $4 \cdot 2^2 = 16$   $S$ -fixed points. We apply Theorem 5.1 to construct the moment polytope. First, by (23),  $\Phi(BS^Q)$  is the convex hull of the following points:

$(\beta_1, \beta_2)$	$\sum_{i=1}^r \omega_i + \sum_{i= Q }^1 s_{\beta_{ Q }} \cdots s_{\beta_i} \omega_i$
$(-, -)$	$(5, 4, 2, 0) = (3, 2, 1, 0) + s_- \cdot (1, 1, 0, 0) + s_- s_- \cdot (1, 1, 1, 0)$
$(3, -)$	$(5, 4, 1, 1) = (3, 2, 1, 0) + s_- \cdot (1, 1, 0, 0) + s_- s_3 \cdot (1, 1, 1, 0)$
$(-, 2)$	$(5, 3, 3, 0) = (3, 2, 1, 0) + s_2 \cdot (1, 1, 0, 0) + s_2 s_- \cdot (1, 1, 1, 0)$
$(3, 2)$	$(5, 2, 3, 1) = (3, 2, 1, 0) + s_2 \cdot (1, 1, 0, 0) + s_2 s_3 \cdot (1, 1, 1, 0)$

The polytope  $\Phi(BS^Q)$  is the white quadrilateral in Figure 4. We consider the reflections of  $\Phi(BS^Q)$  by the  $T$ -fixed points of  $Y_0$ , corresponding to the  $++--$  shuffled permutations:

$$[1, 2, 3, 4], [2, 1, 3, 4], [1, 2, 4, 3], \text{ and } [2, 1, 4, 3].$$

By Theorem 5.1,  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}$  is the convex hull of the following reflections

$$\begin{aligned}
[1, 2, 3, 4] \cdot \Phi(BS^Q) &= \text{conv}\{(5, 4, 2, 0), (5, 4, 1, 1), (5, 3, 3, 0), (5, 2, 3, 1)\}, \\
[2, 1, 3, 4] \cdot \Phi(BS^Q) &= \text{conv}\{(4, 5, 2, 0), (4, 5, 1, 1), (3, 5, 3, 0), (2, 5, 3, 1)\}, \\
[1, 2, 4, 3] \cdot \Phi(BS^Q) &= \text{conv}\{(5, 4, 0, 2), (5, 4, 1, 1), (5, 3, 0, 3), (5, 2, 1, 3)\}, \text{ and} \\
[2, 1, 4, 3] \cdot \Phi(BS^Q) &= \text{conv}\{(4, 5, 0, 2), (4, 5, 1, 1), (3, 5, 0, 3), (2, 5, 1, 3)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the discussion of Section 2, the number of choices of closed orbits  $Y_0 = Y_\gamma$  equals  $\binom{p+q}{p}$ , i.e., the number of matchless clans in  $\text{Clans}_{p,q}$ . However, for a fixed  $Q$ , all the BEM-polytopes are isometric, being reflections of one other:

**Theorem 6.2** (Reduction to  $++\cdots+-\cdots-$  case).  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_\gamma, Q}$  is a  $w$ -reflection of  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_{+\dots+ - \dots -}, Q}$  where  $w$  is the smallest permutation such that  $w \cdot (+\dots+ - \dots -) = \gamma$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $\gamma \in \text{Clans}_{p,q}$  is matchless and there exists an  $i$  such that  $\gamma_i = -$  and  $\gamma_{i+1} = +$ . Let  $\gamma' \in \text{Clans}_{p,q}$  be obtained by interchanging  $-+ \mapsto +-$  at those positions.

By Proposition 3.3, the  $T$ -fixed points of  $Y_\gamma$  are the  $\gamma$ -shuffled permutations; call this set  $\mathcal{A}$ . Similarly, the  $T$ -fixed points of  $Y_{\gamma'}$  are the  $\gamma'$ -shuffled permutations; call this set  $\mathcal{B}$ .

**Claim 6.3.**  $\mathcal{A}s_i = \mathcal{B}$ .




Figure 4:  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}$  for  $Y_0 = Y_{+-}$  and  $Q = (3, 2)$  is the convex hull of four reflections in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  of the Bott-Samelson polytope (white). We have labelled some of the points  $\Phi(p_{(x, J)})$  using  $x, J$ ; all other points can be inferred from these.

*Proof of claim:* Let  $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}$ . Since  $\gamma_i = -$ , by definition  $\sigma(i) \in \{p+1, p+2, \dots, n\}$ . Also, since  $\gamma_{i+1} = +$ ,  $\sigma(i+1) \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ . Thus if  $\sigma' = \sigma s_i$  then  $\sigma'(i) \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$  and  $\sigma'(i+1) \in \{p+1, p+2, \dots, n\}$ , as is required for  $\sigma' \in \mathcal{B}$ . The claim follows.  $\square$

The claim, combined with Proposition 3.4 imply that the  $T$ -fixed points of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_{\gamma'}, Q}$  are the  $s_i$ -reflection of those of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_{\gamma}, Q}$ . Since the moment map images are determined by these  $T$ -fixed points, the respective polytopes must be an  $s_i$  reflection of one another.

Now iterate this process down to the case  $++ \dots + -- \dots -$ .  $\square$

The other two cases  $G = \mathrm{GL}_n$  cases mentioned only have one closed orbit, so no analogous claim is needed for them.

The Table 6 summarizes some information about the resulting polytopes for  $p = q = 2$ . In view of Theorem 6.2, we only need to consider  $\gamma = ++--$ . We have restricted to  $Q$  reduced and  $|Q| \leq 3$  for brevity. Actually, based on such calculations, it seems true that if  $Q$  and  $Q'$  are Demazure words for the same  $w$  then the BEM polytopes are combinatorially equivalent. For example,  $Q = (1), (1, 1), (1, 1, 1)$  are all two dimensional with  $(V, E, F) = (4, 4, 1)$ . However, we have no proof of this at present.

Let  $X$  be a projective algebraic variety with a torus action  $T$ . Suppose  $p \in X^T$ . Let  $T_p(X)$  be the tangent space; this too carries a  $T$  action and a  $T_{\mathbb{R}}$  action. The  $T_{\mathbb{R}}$ -decomposition is

$$T_p(X) = \bigoplus_{\alpha} E_{\alpha},$$

where  $E_{\alpha}$  dimension one eigenspaces with eigenvalues  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ . These  $\{\alpha\}$  are the **T-weights**. The nonnegative cone spanned by these  $T$ -weights of  $T_p(X)$  is equal to the cone spanned by the edges of the moment polytope  $\Phi(X)$  incident to  $\Phi(p)$ , [19, p. 87; Proposition 1].

For  $w = s_{j_1} s_{j_2} \dots s_{j_\ell}$  a reduced expression of  $w$  we define

$$\mathrm{inv}(w) := \{\alpha_{j_1}, s_{j_1}(\alpha_{j_2}), \dots, s_{j_1} s_{j_2} \dots s_{j_{\ell-1}}(\alpha_{j_\ell})\}.$$

**Theorem 6.4** (Combinatorial description of  $T$ -weights). *Let  $Q = (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_N)$  be a word and  $J = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_N)$  be a subword of  $Q$ . The  $T$ -weights of the tangent space of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_{++ \dots + -- \dots -}, Q}$*

$Q$	dim	$V$	$E$	$F$
(1)	2	4	4	1
(2)	3	8	12	6
(3)	2	4	4	1
(1, 2)	3	12	18	8
(1, 3) $\equiv$ (3, 1)	2	4	4	1
(2, 1)	3	8	12	6
(2, 3)	3	8	12	6
(3, 2)	3	12	18	8
(1, 2, 1) $\equiv$ (2, 1, 2)	3	12	18	8
(1, 2, 3)	3	12	18	8
(1, 3, 2) $\equiv$ (3, 1, 2)	3	8	12	6
(2, 1, 3) $\equiv$ (2, 3, 1)	3	8	12	6
(2, 3, 2)	3	12	18	8
(3, 2, 1)	3	12	18	8
(3, 2, 3)	3	12	18	8

TABLE 1. BEM polytope data for  $(\mathrm{GL}_4, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2)$  where  $Q$  is reduced and  $|Q| \leq 3$

at  $p_{(uB, J)}$ , where  $uB$  is a  $T$ -fixed point of  $Y_{+ \dots + - \dots -}$ , are

$$u \cdot (-\mathrm{inv}(w)) \cup u \cdot \{s_{\beta_N} \cdot (-\alpha_{j_N}), s_{\beta_N} s_{\beta_{N-1}} \cdot (-\alpha_{j_{N-1}}), \dots, s_{\beta_N} \cdots s_{\beta_1} \cdot (-\alpha_{j_1})\},$$

where  $w = [p, p-1, \dots, 1, n, n-1, \dots, p+1]$ .

*Proof.* We apply:

**Theorem 6.5.** [18, Corollary 3.11] *Let  $Q_0, \dots, Q_n$  be subgroups of an algebraic group  $G$  and let  $T$  be a torus in  $G$ . Suppose that  $R_0, \dots, R_n$  are subgroups of  $G$  with  $R_i \subset Q_{i-1} \cap Q_i$  for  $i > 0$  and  $R_0 \subset Q_0$ . Let*

$$X = Q_n \times^{R_n} Q_{n-1} \times^{R_{n-1}} \cdots \times^{R_2} Q_1 \times^{R_1} Q_0 / R_0$$

and  $[q_n, \dots, q_0] \in X$  a  $T$ -fixed point. Assume in addition that for every  $i$ ,  $q_i^{-1} \cdots q_n^{-1}$  is in the normalizer of  $T$ . Then the weights of  $T$  acting on the tangent space  $T_{[q_n, \dots, q_0]} X$  is the multiset union of

$$q_n q_{n-1} \cdots q_i \cdot \{\text{weights of } T \text{ acting on } Q_i / R_i\}$$

where  $i$  runs from  $n$  to  $0$ .

More precisely, we apply this result to  $T$  and

$$\mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q} = \tilde{Y}_0 \times^B P_{j_N} \times^B P_{j_{N-1}} \times^B \cdots \times^B P_{j_1} / B,$$

where  $\tilde{Y}_0$  is the preimage of  $Y_0 = Y_{+ \dots + - \dots -}$  in  $G$  under  $G \rightarrow G/B$ .

Let us verify that  $\mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}$  satisfies the required hypotheses. The orbit

$$Y_{+ \dots + - \dots -} = \{\mathbb{C}^0 \subset F_1 \subset \cdots \subset F_{p-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^p \subset F_{p+1} \subset \cdots \subset \mathbb{C}^{p+q}\}.$$

Therefore  $\tilde{Y}_0$  is the maximal parabolic subgroup  $P_{\hat{p}}$ . We then have that  $\tilde{Y}_0, P_{j_N}, \dots, P_{j_1}$  are subgroups of  $\mathrm{GL}_n$ . Since  $B$  is a Borel subgroup then  $B \subset \tilde{Y}_0 \cap P_{j_N}$  and  $B \subset P_{j_{t-1}} \cap P_{j_t}$  for  $1 \leq t \leq N$ .

The  $T$ -fixed point of  $\mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}$  corresponding to  $p_{(uB, J)}$  is  $[u, s_{\beta_N}, s_{\beta_{N-1}}, \dots, s_{\beta_1} B]$ , where  $u \in N(T)$ . Therefore  $(us_{\beta_N} s_{\beta_{N-1}} \dots s_{\beta_i})^{-1}$  is in the normalizer of  $T$  for all  $i$ . We have now verified that  $\mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}$  satisfies the required hypotheses.

Since  $Y_0$  is the Schubert variety for  $w$ , the  $T$ -weights of  $\tilde{Y}_0/B = Y_0$  at  $B$  are the negatives of the inversions of  $w$ . The  $T$ -weight of  $P_{\alpha_i}/B$  at  $B$  is the simple root  $\alpha_i$ . By Theorem 6.5, the  $T$ -weights of  $\mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}$  at the fixed point  $[u, s_{\beta_N}, s_{\beta_{N-1}}, \dots, s_{\beta_1}]$  is the following multiset-union

$$u \cdot (-\text{inv}(w)) \cup \{us_{\beta_N} \cdot (-\alpha_{j_N})\} \cup \{us_{\beta_N} s_{\beta_{N-1}} \cdot (-\alpha_{j_{N-1}})\} \cup \dots \cup \{us_{\beta_N} \dots s_{\beta_1} \cdot (-\alpha_{j_1})\}$$

By Theorem 4.2, the  $T$ -weights for the tangent spaces of  $\mathcal{BE}^{Y_0, Q}$  are the same as those for  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 6.6.** *The point  $\Phi(p_{(uB, J)})$  is a vertex of  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_{++\dots+-----}, Q}$  if and only if  $\Phi(p_{(B, J)})$  is a vertex of  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_{++\dots+-----}, Q}$ .*

*Proof.*  $\Phi(p_{(uB, J)})$  is a vertex whenever there is not a line in the cone spanned by the  $T$ -weights of the tangent space  $T_{p_{(uB, J)}}(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_{++\dots+-----}, Q})$ . By Theorem 6.4,

$$T\text{-weights of } T_{p_{(uB, J)}}(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_{++\dots+-----}, Q}) = u \cdot (T\text{-weights of } T_{p_{(B, J)}}(\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_{++\dots+-----}, Q})).$$

The claim follows since a cone contains a line if and only any reflection contains a line.  $\square$

*Example 6.7.* Consider the BEM polytope  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}$  of Example 6.1 and Figure 4. The vertices of  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}$  adjacent to  $\Phi(p_{(B, (3, 2))})$  are

$$\Phi(p_{(B, (-, 2))}), \quad \Phi(p_{([1, 2, 4, 3]B, (3, 2))}), \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(p_{([2, 1, 3, 4]B, (3, 2))}).$$

The cone spanned by the edges of  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}$  incident to  $\Phi(p_{(B, (3, 2))})$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pos}\{\Phi(p_{(B, (-, 2))}) - \Phi(p_{(B, (3, 2))}), \Phi(p_{(s_3 B, (3, 2))}) - \Phi(p_{(B, (3, 2))}), \Phi(p_{([s_1 B, (3, 2))}) - \Phi(p_{(B, (3, 2))})\} \\ = \text{pos}\{(0, 0, -1, 1), (0, 1, 0, -1), (-1, 1, 0, 0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us compute the  $T$ -weights for the tangent space of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  at  $p_{(B, (3, 2))}$ . We have that  $w = [2, 1, 4, 3] = s_1 s_3$  so

$$\text{inv}(w) = \{\alpha_1, s_1(\alpha_3)\} = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_3\} = \{(1, -1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, -1)\}.$$

Since  $J = (3, 2)$ , then by Theorem 6.4 the  $T$ -weights are

$$\begin{aligned} \{-\alpha_1, -\alpha_3\} \cup \{s_2(-\alpha_2), s_2 s_3(-\alpha_3)\} = \{-\alpha_1, -\alpha_3, \alpha_2, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3\} \\ = \{(-1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, -1, 1), (0, 1, -1, 0), (0, 1, 0, -1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The cone spanned by the  $T$ -weights coincides with the cone spanned by the edges incident to  $\Phi(p_{(B, (3, 2))})$ . Since this cone does not contain a line it follows that  $\Phi(p_{(B, (3, 2))})$  is a vertex of  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}$ .

Now consider the  $T$ -fixed point  $p_{(B, (3, -))}$ . The  $T$ -weights for the tangent space of  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  at  $p_{(B, (3, -))}$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \{-\alpha_1, -\alpha_3\} \cup \{s_-(-\alpha_2), s_- s_3(-\alpha_3)\} = \{-\alpha_1, -\alpha_3, -\alpha_2, \alpha_3\} \\ = \{(-1, 1, 0, 0), (0, 0, -1, 1), (0, -1, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1, -1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 6.4 the cone spanned by these vectors is the cone spanned by the edges incident to  $\Phi(p_{(B, (3, -))})$ . Since this cone contains the line spanned by  $\alpha_3$  then this point is not a vertex of  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}$ .  $\square$

Although we have not done so here, it should be possible to give a combinatorial description of the vertices of  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}$ . Doing so is equivalent to classifying the  $T$ -fixed points for which the cone spanned by the  $T$ -weights does not contain a line.

We conclude this paper with:

**Theorem 6.8** (Dimension of  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}$ ). For  $(G, K) = (\mathrm{GL}_{p+q}, \mathrm{GL}_p \times \mathrm{GL}_q)$ ,

$$\dim(\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}) = \begin{cases} p + q - 1, & \text{if } p \text{ is in } Q, \text{ and} \\ p + q - 2, & \text{if } p \text{ is not in } Q. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* A  $T$ -action on a space  $X$  is *effective* if each element of  $T$ , other than the identity, moves at least one point of  $X$ . In the proof of [9, Corollary 27.2] it is shown that for an effective Hamiltonian  $T$ -action the dimension of the corresponding moment polytope equals the dimension of the torus. If the  $T$ -action is not effective it is known that it can be reduced to an effective action with the same moment polytope. The *stabilizer* of the  $T$ -action is the normal subgroup

$$S_T := \{t \in T \mid t \cdot x = x \text{ for all } x \in X\}.$$

The  $T$ -action on  $X$  reduces to the effective action of  $T/S_T$  given by  $tS_T \cdot x := t \cdot x$ .

To prove the Theorem we will consider the cases in which  $p$  is in  $Q$  and when it isn't separately. In each case we will explicitly write an  $m$ -dimensional subtorus  $\mathbb{T}_m$  of  $\mathbb{T}$ , where  $m$  is the appropriate dimension, such that  $\mathbb{T}/S_{\mathbb{T}} \cong \mathbb{T}_m$  and the isomorphism commutes with the action. From this and the previous paragraph it will follow that  $\dim(\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}) = m$ . The claim  $\mathbb{T}/S_{\mathbb{T}} \cong \mathbb{T}_m$  will follow by verifying that the  $\mathbb{T}_m$ -action is effective and that for every  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  there exists  $t' \in \mathbb{T}_m$  such that  $t \cdot x = t' \cdot x$  for every  $x \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ .

In view of Theorem 6.2, from now on we assume without loss of generality, that  $Y_0 = Y_{+++++-----}$ . This implies that any element

$$(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{n-1}, V_1, V_2, \dots, V_N) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$$

must satisfy  $F_p = \mathbb{C}^p$ .

Case 1: [there is a  $k$  such that  $j_k = p$ , where  $Q = (j_1, \dots, j_N)$ ] We will show that the  $T$ -action is equivalent to the action of

$$\mathbb{T}_{n-1} := \{(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathbb{T} \mid t_1 = 1\},$$

which is effective. For  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  and  $I$  the identity matrix, we have that  $\frac{1}{t_1}It \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ . Moreover, for any  $x \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$

$$\frac{1}{t_1}It \cdot x = t \cdot x.$$

Therefore the two actions are equivalent.

To prove that the action is effective, we show that given  $t \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ , where  $t$  is not the identity, there exists  $x \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  such that  $t \cdot x \neq x$ .

Given  $(1, t_2, \dots, t_n) \in \mathbb{T}_{n-1}$  there is  $i$  such that  $t_i \neq 1$ . We assume  $i$  is the smallest with this property.

Subcase 1.a: [ $1 < i < p$ ] Let

$$F_{k'} := \mathbb{C}^{k'} \text{ for } k' \geq p, \text{ and}$$

$$F_{k'} := \mathrm{span}\{\vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_2, \vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_3, \dots, \vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_{k'+1}\} \text{ for } k' < p.$$

It is straightforward from Section 3 that the following holds:

$$(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{n-1}, F_{j_1}, F_{j_2}, \dots, F_{j_N}) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}.$$

Furthermore,

$$(1, t_2, \dots, t_n) \cdot F_{i-1} = \text{span}\{\vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_2, \vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_3, \dots, \vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_{i-1}, \vec{e}_1 + t_i \vec{e}_i\} \neq F_{i-1},$$

so

$$(1, t_2, \dots, t_n) \cdot (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{n-1}, F_{j_1}, F_{j_2}, \dots, F_{j_N}) \neq (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{n-1}, F_{j_1}, F_{j_2}, \dots, F_{j_N}).$$

Subcase 1.b: [ $i = p$ ] Recall that  $j_k = p$ ; if there are many such  $k$  take the largest one. Let

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k'} &:= \mathbb{C}^{k'} \text{ for } 1 \leq k' \leq n, \text{ and} \\ V_k &:= \text{span}\{\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2, \dots, \vec{e}_{p-2}, \vec{e}_{p-1} + \vec{e}_p, \vec{e}_{p+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward from Section 3 that the following holds:

$$(F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}, F_{j_1}, \dots, F_{j_{k-1}}, V_k, F_{j_{k+1}}, \dots, F_{j_N}) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} (1, t_2, \dots, t_n) \cdot V_k &= \text{span}\{\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2, \dots, \vec{e}_{p-2}, \vec{e}_{p-1} + t_p \vec{e}_p, t_{p+1} \vec{e}_{p+1}\} \\ &= \text{span}\{\vec{e}_1, \vec{e}_2, \dots, \vec{e}_{p-2}, \vec{e}_{p-1} + t_p \vec{e}_p, \vec{e}_{p+1}\} \neq V_k \end{aligned}$$

then  $(F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}, F_{j_1}, \dots, F_{j_{k-1}}, V_k, F_{j_{k+1}}, \dots, F_{j_N})$  is moved by  $(1, t_2, \dots, t_n)$ .

Subcase 1.c: [ $i = p + 1$ ] Now let

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k'} &:= \mathbb{C}^{k'} \text{ for } 1 \leq k' \leq n, \text{ and} \\ V_k &:= \text{span}\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_{p-1}, \vec{e}_p + \vec{e}_{p+1}\} \end{aligned}$$

Here we finish as in Subcase 1.b by considering  $(1, 1, \dots, 1 = t_p, t_{p+1}, \dots, t_n) \cdot V_k \neq V_k$  and  $(F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}, F_{j_1}, \dots, F_{j_{k-1}}, V_k, F_{j_{k+1}}, \dots, F_{j_N}) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ .

Subcase 1.d: [ $p + 1 < i \leq n$ ] Now let

$$\begin{aligned} F_t &:= \mathbb{C}^t \text{ for } t \leq p, \text{ and} \\ F_{k'} &:= \text{span}\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_p, \vec{e}_{p+1} + \vec{e}_{p+2}, \vec{e}_{p+1} + \vec{e}_{p+3}, \dots, \vec{e}_{p+1} + \vec{e}_{k'+1}\} \text{ for } p + 1 \leq k' < n \\ F_n &:= \mathbb{C}^n \end{aligned}$$

Conclude as in Subcase 1.a by considering  $(1, \dots, 1 = t_{p+1}, \dots, 1 = t_{i-1}, t_i, t_{i+1}, \dots, t_n) \cdot F_{i-1}$  and  $(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{n-1}, F_{j_1}, F_{j_2}, \dots, F_{j_N}) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ .

Summarizing, the  $\mathbb{T}_{n-1}$ -action on  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is effective and  $\dim(\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}) = p + q - 1$  when  $p$  is in  $Q$ .

Case 2: [ $j_i \neq p$  for all  $i$  where  $Q = (j_1, \dots, j_N)$ ] The points

$$(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{n-1}, V_1, V_2, \dots, V_N) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$$

must satisfy

$$(24) \quad F_p = \mathbb{C}^p,$$

$$(25) \quad V_k \subset \mathbb{C}^p \text{ if } j_k < p, \text{ and}$$

$$(26) \quad V_k \supset \mathbb{C}^p \text{ if } j_k > p.$$

Let  $V$  be such that  $V \subset E_p$  or  $E_p \subset V$ . Since  $E_p$  is a  $\mathbb{T}$ -fixed point then for any  $t \in \mathbb{T}$  we have that  $t \cdot V \subset E_p$  or  $t \cdot V \supset E_p$ . Consider the torus

$$\mathbb{T}_{n-2} := \{(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathbb{T} \mid t_1 = t_n = 1\}.$$

Denote by  $D(a, b)$  the matrix with first  $p$  diagonal entries equal to  $a$  and last  $q$  diagonal entries equal to  $b$ . For any  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^*$

$$D(a, b) \cdot V = V.$$

By these two observations,

$$\begin{aligned} (t_1, \dots, t_n) \cdot V &= D(t_1^{-1}, t_n^{-1}) \cdot ((t_1, \dots, t_n) \cdot V) \\ &= (D(t_1^{-1}, t_n^{-1})(t_1, \dots, t_n)) \cdot V \\ &= (1, t'_2, \dots, t'_{n-1}, 1) \cdot V, \end{aligned}$$

where  $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \mathbb{T}$ ,  $t'_i := t_1^{-1}t_i$  if  $i \leq p$  and  $t'_i := t_n^{-1}t_i$  if  $i > p$ . Combining this with (24)-(26) it follows that

$$(t_1, \dots, t_n) \cdot (F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}, V_1, \dots, V_N) = (1, t'_2, \dots, t'_{n-1}, 1) \cdot (F_1, \dots, F_{n-1}, V_1, \dots, V_N).$$

Therefore, the  $\mathbb{T}$ -action on  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is equivalent to the  $\mathbb{T}_{n-2}$ -action.

Now, to prove that the action is effective, we show that given  $t \in \mathbb{T}_{n-2}$  there exists  $x \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  such that  $t \cdot x \neq x$ . Let  $(1, t_2, \dots, t_{n-1}, 1) \in \mathbb{T}_{n-2}$  not be the identity, i.e.,  $t_i \neq 1$ . As in Case 1, we may take  $i$  to be the smallest index such that  $t_i \neq 1$ .

Subcase 2.a: [ $1 < i < p$ ] We use the same argument as Subcase 1.a. (Note that argument did not use  $p \in Q$ .)

Subcase 2.b: [ $i = p$ ] Let

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k'} &:= \mathbb{C}^{k'} \text{ for } k' \geq p, \text{ and} \\ F_{k'} &:= \text{span}\{\vec{e}_1 + \vec{e}_p, \vec{e}_2 + \vec{e}_p, \dots, \vec{e}_{k'} + \vec{e}_p\} \text{ for } k' < p. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $(1, 1, \dots, 1, t_p, t_{p+1}, \dots, t_n) \cdot F_1 \neq F_1$  and  $(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{n-1}, F_{j_1}, F_{j_2}, \dots, F_{j_N}) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  so this case follows.

Subcase 2.c: [ $i = p + 1$ ] Here we take

$$\begin{aligned} F_{k'} &:= \mathbb{C}^{k'} \text{ for } k' \leq p, \text{ and} \\ F_{p+1} &:= \text{span}\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_p, \vec{e}_{p+1} + \vec{e}_n\} \\ F_{k'} &:= \text{span}\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_p, \vec{e}_{p+1} + \vec{e}_n, \vec{e}_{p+2}, \dots, \vec{e}_{k'}\} \text{ for } p+1 < k' \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Look at  $(1, 1, \dots, 1, t_{p+1}, \dots, t_{n-1}, 1) \cdot F_{p+1} \neq F_{p+1}$  and  $(F_1, F_2, \dots, F_{n-1}, F_{j_1}, F_{j_2}, \dots, F_{j_N}) \in \mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$ .

Subcase 2.d: [ $p+1 < i \leq n$ ] Now use the same argument as Subcase 1.d. (Again, the argument did not use  $p \in Q$ .)

Concluding, the  $\mathbb{T}_{n-2}$ -action on  $\mathcal{BEM}^{Y_0, Q}$  is effective and  $\dim(\mathcal{P}_{Y_0, Q}) = p + q - 2$  when  $p$  is not in  $Q$ .  $\square$

*Example 6.9.* The data of Table 6 is consistent with Theorem 6.8. Furthermore, note that the dimension characterization only depends on  $p$  and not  $q$ . Indeed, if  $p = 2$  and  $q = 3$ , one can check  $\mathcal{P}_{Y_{++++, (3)}}$  has dimension 3, also in agreement with the theorem.  $\square$

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank B. Elek, W. Graham, A. Knutson, E. Lerman, L. Li, J. Pascaleff, and A. Woo for helpful conversations. AY was supported by an NSF grant.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Hiraku Abe and Sara Billey. Consequences of the Lakshmibai-Sandhya theorem: the ubiquity of permutation patterns in Schubert calculus and related geometry. *Proceedings of the Mathematical Society of Japan, to appear*, 2017.
- [2] Michael F. Atiyah. Convexity and commuting Hamiltonians. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 14(1):1–15, 1982.
- [3] Dan Barbasch and Sam Evens.  $K$ -orbits on Grassmannians and a PRV conjecture for real groups. *J. Algebra*, 167(2):258–283, 1994.
- [4] Sara Billey and V. Lakshmibai. *Singular loci of Schubert varieties*, volume 182 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2000.
- [5] Sara C. Billey and Gregory S. Warrington. Maximal singular loci of Schubert varieties in  $SL(n)/B$ . *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355(10):3915–3945, 2003.
- [6] Raoul Bott and Hans Samelson. Applications of the theory of Morse to symmetric spaces. *Amer. J. Math.*, 80:964–1029, 1958.
- [7] M. Brion. Rational smoothness and fixed points of torus actions. *Transform. Groups*, 4(2-3):127–156, 1999. Dedicated to the memory of Claude Chevalley.
- [8] Michel Brion. Lectures on the geometry of flag varieties. In *Topics in cohomological studies of algebraic varieties*, Trends Math., pages 33–85. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2005.
- [9] Ana Cannas da Silva. *Lectures on symplectic geometry*, volume 1764 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [10] Ana Cannas da Silva. Symplectic toric manifolds. <https://people.math.ethz.ch/~acannas/Papers/toric.pdf>, 2011.
- [11] Alexander Caviedes Castro. Upper bound for the Gromov width of coadjoint orbits of compact Lie groups. *J. Lie Theory*, 26(3):821–860, 2016.
- [12] Aurélie Cortez. Singularités génériques et quasi-résolutions des variétés de Schubert pour le groupe linéaire. *Adv. Math.*, 178(2):396–445, 2003.
- [13] Michel Demazure. Désingularisation des variétés de Schubert généralisées. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 7:53–88, 1974. Collection of articles dedicated to Henri Cartan on the occasion of his 70th birthday, I.
- [14] Serge Elnitsky. Rhombic tilings of polygons and classes of reduced words in Coxeter groups. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 77(2):193–221, 1997.
- [15] Laura Escobar. Brick manifolds and toric varieties of brick polytopes. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 23(2):Paper 2.25, 18, 2016.
- [16] Laura Escobar, Oliver Pechenik, Bridget Tenner, and Alexander Yong. Rhombic tilings and bott-samelson varieties. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, to appear, 2017.
- [17] Alex Fink and Luca Moci. Polyhedra and parameter spaces for matroids over valuation rings. *Preprint*, arxiv:1707.01026, 2017.
- [18] William Graham and R. Zierau. Smooth components of Springer fibers. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 61(5):2139–2182 (2012), 2011.
- [19] Victor Guillemin. *Moment maps and combinatorial invariants of Hamiltonian  $T^n$ -spaces*, volume 122 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1994.
- [20] Victor Guillemin and Shlomo Sternberg. Convexity properties of the moment mapping. *Invent. Math.*, 67(3):491–513, 1982.
- [21] H. C. Hansen. On cycles in flag manifolds. *Math. Scand.*, 33:269–274 (1974), 1973.
- [22] Megumi Harada and Jihyeon Jessie Yang. Newton-Okounkov bodies of Bott-Samelson varieties and Grossberg-Karshon twisted cubes. *Michigan Math. J.*, 65(2):413–440, 2016.
- [23] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. Springer-Verlag, New York. Heidelberg, 1977.
- [24] Akhil Mathew (<https://mathoverflow.net/users/344/akhil-mathew>). Isomorphism between varieties of char 0. MathOverflow. URL:<https://mathoverflow.net/q/73348> (version: 2011-08-21).



- [25] Brant Jones and Alexander Woo. Mask formulas for cograssmannian Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials. *Ann. Comb.*, 17(1):151–203, 2013.
- [26] Christian Kassel, Alain Lascoux, and Christophe Reutenauer. The singular locus of a Schubert variety. *J. Algebra*, 269(1):74–108, 2003.
- [27] Frances Kirwan. Convexity properties of the moment mapping. III. *Invent. Math.*, 77(3):547–552, 1984.
- [28] Allen Knutson. The symplectic and algebraic geometry of Horn’s problem. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 319(1–3):61–81, 2000. Special Issue: Workshop on Geometric and Combinatorial Methods in the Hermitian Sum Spectral Problem (Coimbra, 1999).
- [29] Allen Knutson. Frobenius splitting, point-counting, and degeneration. *Preprint*, arxiv:0911.4941, 2009.
- [30] Allen Knutson. K-orbits on  $G/B$ . <http://www.math.cornell.edu/~allenk/courses/12fall/KGBcourse.pdf>, 2012.
- [31] Bertram Kostant. Quantization and unitary representations. I. Prequantization. In *Lectures in modern analysis and applications, III*, pages 87–208. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 170. Springer, Berlin, 1970.
- [32] Venkatramani Lakshmibai, Peter Littelmann, and Peter Magyar. Standard monomial theory for Bott-Samelson varieties. *Compositio Math.*, 130(3):293–318, 2002.
- [33] Peter Magyar. Schubert polynomials and Bott-Samelson varieties. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 73(4):603–636, 1998.
- [34] L. Manivel. Le lieu singulier des variétés de Schubert. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (16):849–871, 2001.
- [35] William M. McGovern. Closures of  $K$ -orbits in the flag variety for  $U(p, q)$ . *J. Algebra*, 322(8):2709–2712, 2009.
- [36] Nicolas Perrin. Small resolutions of minuscule Schubert varieties. *Compos. Math.*, 143(5):1255–1312, 2007.
- [37] Nicolas Perrin. The Gorenstein locus of minuscule Schubert varieties. *Adv. Math.*, 220(2):505–522, 2009.
- [38] Vincent Pilaud and Francisco Santos. The brick polytope of a sorting network. *European J. Combin.*, 33(4):632–662, 2012.
- [39] Vincent Pilaud and Christian Stump. Brick polytopes of spherical subword complexes and generalized associahedra. *Adv. Math.*, 276:1–61, 2015.
- [40] Patrick Polo. Construction of arbitrary Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials in symmetric groups. *Represent. Theory*, 3:90–104, 1999.
- [41] R. W. Richardson and T. A. Springer. The Bruhat order on symmetric varieties. *Geom. Dedicata*, 35(1–3):389–436, 1990.
- [42] Matthieu Willems.  $K$ -théorie équivariante des tours de Bott. Application à la structure multiplicative de la  $K$ -théorie équivariante des variétés de drapeaux. *Duke Math. J.*, 132(2):271–309, 2006.
- [43] Alexander Woo. Permutations with Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial  $P_{id,w}(q) = 1 + q^b$ . *Electron. J. Combin.*, 16(2, Special volume in honor of Anders Björner):Research Paper 10, 32, 2009. With an appendix by Sara Billey and Jonathan Weed.
- [44] Alexander Woo, Benjamin Wyser, and Alexander Yong. Governing singularities of symmetric orbit closures. *Preprint*, arxiv:1701.02774, 2017.
- [45] B. Wyser. The Bruhat order on clans. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 44(3):495–517, 2016.
- [46] Benjamin J. Wyser. K-orbit closures on  $G/B$  as universal degeneracy loci for flagged vector bundles with symmetric or skew-symmetric bilinear form. *Transform. Groups*, 18(2):557–594, 2013.
- [47] Benjamin J. Wyser. Schubert calculus of Richardson varieties stable under spherical Levi subgroups. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 38(4):829–850, 2013.
- [48] Atsuko Yamamoto. Orbits in the flag variety and images of the moment map for classical groups. I. *Represent. Theory*, 1:329–404, 1997.
- [49] A. V. Zelevinskiĭ. Small resolutions of singularities of Schubert varieties. *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.*, 17(2):75–77, 1983.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, URBANA, IL 61801, USA

*E-mail address:* lescobar@illinois.edu, bwyser@illinois.edu, ayong@uiuc.edu