

NEWTON POLYTOPES IN ALGEBRAIC COMBINATORICS

CARA MONICAL, NERIMAN TOKCAN, AND ALEXANDER YONG

ABSTRACT. A polynomial has *saturated Newton polytope* (SNP) if every lattice point of the convex hull of its exponent vectors corresponds to a monomial. We compile instances of SNP in algebraic combinatorics (some with proofs, others conjecturally): skew Schur polynomials; symmetric polynomials associated to reduced words, Redfield–Pólya theory, Witt vectors, and totally nonnegative matrices; resultants; discriminants (up to quartics); Macdonald polynomials; key polynomials; Demazure atoms; Schubert polynomials; and Grothendieck polynomials, among others.

Our principal construction is the *Schubitope*. For any subset of $[n]^2$, we describe it by linear inequalities. This generalized permutahedron conjecturally has positive Ehrhart polynomial. We conjecture it describes the Newton polytope of Schubert and key polynomials. We also define *dominance order* on permutations and study its poset-theoretic properties.

1. INTRODUCTION

The **Newton polytope** of a polynomial $f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n} c_{\alpha} x^{\alpha} \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is the convex hull of its exponent vectors, i.e.,

$$\text{Newton}(f) = \text{conv}(\{\alpha : c_{\alpha} \neq 0\}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Definition 1.1. f has **saturated Newton polytope** (SNP) if $c_{\alpha} \neq 0$ whenever $\alpha \in \text{Newton}(f)$.


Example 1.2. f = the determinant of a generic $n \times n$ matrix. The exponent vectors correspond to permutation matrices. $\text{Newton}(f)$ is the *Birkhoff polytope* of $n \times n$ doubly stochastic matrices. SNPness says there are no additional lattice points, which is obvious here. (The Birkhoff-von Neumann theorem states all lattice points are vertices.) \square

Generally, polynomials are not SNP. Worse still, SNP is not preserved by basic polynomial operations. For example, $f = x_1^2 + x_2x_3 + x_2x_4 + x_3x_4$ is SNP but f^2 is not (it misses $x_1x_2x_3x_4$). Nevertheless, there are a number of families of polynomials in algebraic combinatorics where every member is (conjecturally) SNP. Examples motivating our investigation include:

- The *Schur polynomials* are SNP. This rephrases R. Rado’s theorem [Ra52] about permutahedra and dominance order on partitions; cf. Proposition 2.5.
- Classical *resultants* are SNP (Theorem 2.20). Their Newton polytopes were studied by I. M. Gelfand–M. Kapranov–A. Zelevinsky [GeKaZe90]. (Classical *discriminants* are SNP up to quartics — but not quintics; see Proposition 2.23.)
- *Cycle index polynomials* from Redfield–Pólya theory (Theorem 2.30)
- C. Reutenauer’s symmetric polynomials linked to the free Lie algebra and to Witt vectors [Re95] (Theorem 2.32)
- J. R. Stembridge’s symmetric polynomials associated to totally nonnegative matrices [St91] (Theorem 2.28)

- R. P. Stanley’s symmetric polynomials [St84], introduced to enumerate reduced words of permutations (Theorem 5.8)
- Any generic (q, t) -evaluation of a *symmetric Macdonald polynomial* is SNP; see Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.6.
- The *key polynomials* are (∞, ∞) -specializations of *non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials*. These also seem to be SNP. We give two conjectural descriptions of the Newton polytopes. We determine a list of vertices of the Newton polytopes (Theorem 3.12) and conjecture this list is complete (Conjecture 3.13).
- *Schubert polynomials* (Conjecture 5.1). We conjecturally describe the Newton polytope (Conjecture 5.13).
- Inhomogeneous versions of Schuberts/keys are also conjecturally SNP (Conjectures 5.5 and 5.6).

The core part of our study concerns the Schubert and key polynomials. We conjecture a description of their Newton polytopes in terms of a new family of polytopes.



A **diagram** D is a subset boxes of an $n \times n$ grid. Fix $S \subseteq [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and a column $c \in [n]$. Let $\text{word}_{c,S}(D)$ be formed by reading c from top to bottom and recording


- $($ if $(r, c) \notin D$ and $r \in S$,
- $)$ if $(r, c) \in D$ and $r \notin S$, and
- \star if $(r, c) \in D$ and $r \in S$.

Let

$$\theta_D^c(S) = \#\text{paired } ()\text{'s in } \text{word}_{c,S}(D) + \#\star\text{'s in } \text{word}_{c,S}(D).$$

Set $\theta_D(S) = \sum_{c \in [n]} \theta_D^c(S)$. For instance, $\theta_D(\{2, 4\}) = 4$ above. Define the **Schubitope** as

$$\mathcal{S}_D = \left\{ (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = \#D \text{ and } \sum_{i \in S} \alpha_i \leq \theta_D(S) \text{ for all } S \subset [n] \right\}.$$



Fix a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$. The **λ -permutahedron**, denoted \mathcal{P}_λ , is the convex hull of the S_n -orbit of λ in \mathbb{R}^n . The Schubitope is a generalization of the permutahedron (Proposition 5.23). We conjecture that the Schubitope for a *skyline diagram* and for a *Rothe diagram* respectively are the Newton polytopes of a key and Schubert polynomial. The figure to the left depicts $\mathcal{S}_{D_{21543}}$, which is a three-dimensional convex polytope in \mathbb{R}^4 . Conjecture 5.19 asserts that *Ehrhart polynomials* of Schubitopes \mathcal{S}_{D_w} have positive coefficients; cf. [CaLi15, Conjecture 1.2].

A cornerstone of the theory of symmetric polynomials is the combinatorics of *Littlewood-Richardson coefficients*. An important special case of these numbers are the *Kostka coefficients*

$K_{\lambda,\mu}$. The nonzeroness of $K_{\lambda,\mu}$ is governed by *dominance order* which is defined by the linear inequalities (2). Alternatively, Rado’s theorem [Ra52, Theorem 1] states this order characterizes when $\mathcal{P}_\mu \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda$. These two viewpoints on dominance order are connected since \mathcal{P}_λ is the Newton polytope of the Schur polynomial $s_\lambda(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$.

For Schubert polynomials, there is no analogous Littlewood-Richardson rule. However, with a parallel in mind, we propose a “dominance order for permutations” *via* Newton polytopes. The inequalities of the Schubertope generalize (2); see Proposition 5.23.

Organization. Section 2 develops and applies basic results about SNP symmetric polynomials. Section 3 turns to flavors of Macdonald polynomials and their specializations, including the key polynomials and *Demazure atoms*. Section 4 concerns quasisymmetric functions. *Monomial quasisymmetric* and *Gessel’s fundamental quasisymmetric polynomials* are not SNP, but have equal Newton polytopes. The *quasisymmetric Schur polynomials* [HLMvW11] are also not SNP, which demonstrates a qualitative difference with Schur polynomials. Section 5 discusses Schubert polynomials and a number of variations. We define dominance order for permutations and study its poset-theoretic properties. We connect the Schubertope to work of A. Kohnert [Ko90] and explain a salient contrast (Remark 5.21).

2. SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

2.1. Preliminaries. The **monomial symmetric polynomial** for a partition λ is

$$m_\lambda = \sum_{\alpha} x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$$

where the sum is over distinct rearrangements of λ . The set $\{m_\lambda\}_{\ell(\lambda) \leq n}$ forms a \mathbb{Z} -basis of Sym_n , the ring of symmetric polynomials in x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n (here $\ell(\lambda)$ is the number of nonzero parts of λ).

Identify a partition λ with its Young diagram (in English notation). A **semistandard Young tableau** T is a filling of λ with entries from $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ that is weakly increasing along rows and strictly increasing down columns. The **content** of T is $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n)$ where μ_i is the number of i ’s appearing in T . The **Schur polynomial** is

$$(1) \quad s_\lambda = \sum_{\mu} K_{\lambda,\mu} m_\mu$$

where $K_{\lambda,\mu}$ is the number of semistandard Young tableaux of shape λ and content μ .

Let $\text{Par}(d) = \{\lambda : \lambda \vdash d\}$ be the set of partitions of size d . **Dominance order** \leq_D on $\text{Par}(d)$ is defined by

$$(2) \quad \mu \leq_D \lambda \quad \text{if} \quad \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1.$$

Recall this result about tableaux (see e.g., [St99, Proposition 7.10.5 and Exercise 7.12]):

$$(3) \quad K_{\lambda,\mu} \neq 0 \iff \mu \leq_D \lambda.$$

Since $K_{\lambda,\lambda} = 1$, it follows from (1) and (3) combined that $\{s_\lambda\}_{\ell(\lambda) \leq n}$ also forms a basis of Sym_n .

Setting $x_{n+1} = 0$ defines a surjective homomorphism $\text{Sym}_{n+1} \rightarrow \text{Sym}_n$ for each $n \geq 0$. Let Sym denote $\varprojlim_n \text{Sym}_n$, the ring of symmetric functions in x_1, x_2, \dots . We refer the reader to [St99, Chapter 7] for additional background.

2.2. Basic facts about SNP. Given $f \in \text{Sym}$, let $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \text{Sym}_n$ be the specialization that sets $x_i = 0$ for $i \geq n+1$. Whether $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is SNP depends on n (e.g., $f = \sum_i x_i^2$).

Definition 2.1. $f \in \text{Sym}$ is SNP if $f(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ is SNP for all $m \geq 1$.

Proposition 2.2 (Stability of SNP). *Suppose $f \in \text{Sym}$ has finite degree. Then f is SNP if there exists $m \geq \deg(f)$ such that $f(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ is SNP.*

Proof. We first show that if $f(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ is SNP, $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is SNP for any $n \leq m$. Suppose $\alpha \in \text{Newton}(f(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \subseteq \text{Newton}(f(x_1, \dots, x_m))$. Since $f(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ is SNP, x^α is a monomial of $f(x_1, \dots, x_m)$. However, since $\alpha \in \text{Newton}(f(x_1, \dots, x_n))$, α only uses the first n positions and thus x^α is a monomial of $f(x_1, \dots, x_n, 0, \dots, 0)$.

To complete the proof, we now show if $f(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ for $m \geq \deg(f)$ is SNP, then $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is SNP for all $n \geq m$. Suppose $\alpha \in \text{Newton}(f(x_1, \dots, x_n))$ and thus

$$(4) \quad \alpha = \sum_i c_i \beta^i$$

where x^{β^i} is a monomial of f . Since $m \geq \deg(f)$, there are at most m coordinates where $\alpha_j > 0$, say j_1, \dots, j_m . Furthermore, since each β^i is nonnegative, if $c_i > 0$, $\beta_j^i = 0$ for $j \neq j_1, \dots, j_m$. Choose $w \in S_n$ such that $w(j_c) = c$ for $c = 1, \dots, m$. Applying w to (4) gives

$$w(\alpha) = \sum_i c_i w(\beta^i).$$

So nonzero coordinates of $w(\alpha)$ only occur in positions $1, \dots, m$. Since $f \in \text{Sym}$, each $x^{w(\beta^i)}$ is a monomial of $f(x_1, \dots, x_m)$, and so $w(\alpha) \in \text{Newton}(f(x_1, \dots, x_m))$. Since $f(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ is SNP, $[x^{w(\alpha)}]f \neq 0$. Again, $f \in \text{Sym}$ implies $[x^\alpha]f \neq 0$. Hence, $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is SNP. \square

Remark 2.3. In the proof of Proposition 2.2, w is chosen so that the nonzero components of the vectors α and $w(\alpha)$ are in the same relative order. Thus the result extends to the quasisymmetric case of Section 4. \square

Remark 2.4. The stabilization constant $\deg(f)$ is tight. Let $f = s_\lambda - f^\lambda m_{(1^{|\lambda|})}$. Here $f^\lambda = [m_{(1^{|\lambda|})}]s_\lambda$ (=the number of standard Young tableaux of shape λ .) Then $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is SNP for $n < |\lambda| = \deg(f)$ but not SNP for $n \geq |\lambda|$. One can see this from the ideas in the next proposition.

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose $f \in \text{Sym}_n$ is homogeneous of degree d such that*

$$f = \sum_{\mu \in \text{Par}(d)} c_\mu s_\mu.$$

Suppose there exists λ with $c_\lambda \neq 0$ and $c_\mu \neq 0$ only if $\mu \leq_D \lambda$. If $n < \ell(\lambda)$, $f = 0$. Otherwise:

- (I) $\text{Newton}(f) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.
- (II) The vertices of $\text{Newton}(f)$ are rearrangements of λ .
- (III) If moreover $c_\mu \geq 0$ for all μ , f has SNP.

Proof. If $\mu \leq_D \lambda$, $\ell(\mu) \geq \ell(\lambda)$. Thus if $n < \ell(\lambda)$, $s_\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n) \equiv 0$ for all μ such that $c_\mu \neq 0$. Otherwise, suppose $n \geq \ell(\lambda)$.

(I): Since $f = \sum_{\mu \leq_D \lambda} c_\mu s_\mu$, by (3) we have

$$f = \sum_{\mu \leq_D \lambda} d_\mu m_\mu.$$

Clearly,

$$(5) \quad \text{Newton}(m_\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = \mathcal{P}_\mu \subset \mathbb{R}^n$$

(by the definitions of both). Also,

$$\text{Newton}(f + g) = \text{conv}(\text{Newton}(f) \cup \text{Newton}(g)).$$

Hence,

$$\text{Newton}(f) = \text{conv} \left(\bigcup_{\mu \leq_D \lambda} \text{Newton}(m_\mu) \right) = \text{conv} \left(\bigcup_{\mu \leq_D \lambda} \mathcal{P}_\mu \right).$$

R. Rado's theorem [Ra52, Theorem 1] states:

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{P}_\mu \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda \iff \mu \leq_D \lambda.$$

Now $\text{Newton}(f) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda$ holds by (6), proving (I).

(II): In view of (I), it suffices to know this claim for \mathcal{P}_λ . This is well-known, but we include a proof for completeness.

Since \mathcal{P}_λ is the convex hull of the S_n -orbit of λ , any vertex of \mathcal{P}_λ is a rearrangement of λ . It remains to show that every such rearrangement β is in fact a vertex. Thus it suffices to show there is no nontrivial convex combination

$$(7) \quad \beta = \sum_{\gamma} c_\gamma \gamma,$$

where the sum is over distinct rearrangements $\gamma \neq \beta$ of λ .

Let $\lambda = (\Lambda_1^{k_1} \dots \Lambda_m^{k_m})$ with $\Lambda_1 > \Lambda_2 > \dots > \Lambda_m$. Since β is a rearrangement of λ , let $i_1^1, \dots, i_{k_1}^1$ be the positions in β of the k_1 parts of size Λ_1 . Since $\gamma_{i_j^1} \leq \Lambda_1$ for all γ we have that $c_\gamma = 0$ whenever γ satisfies $\gamma_{i_j^1} \neq \Lambda_1$ for any $1 \leq j \leq k_1$.

Let $i_1^2, \dots, i_{k_2}^2$ be the positions in β of the k_2 parts of size Λ_2 . Similarly, $c_\gamma = 0$ whenever γ satisfies $\gamma_{i_j^2} \neq \Lambda_2$ for any $1 \leq j \leq k_2$. Continuing, we see that $c_\gamma = 0$ for all $\gamma \neq \beta$. That is, there is no convex combination (7), as desired.

(III): Suppose α is a lattice point in $\text{Newton}(f) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $\lambda(\alpha)$ be the rearrangement of α into a partition. By symmetry, $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda(\alpha)} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda$. Then by (6), $\lambda(\alpha) \leq_D \lambda$ and so by (3), $K_{\lambda, \lambda(\alpha)} \neq 0$. Since x^α appears in $m_{\lambda(\alpha)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, x^α appears in $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ (here we are using the Schur positivity of f and the fact $\ell(\lambda(\alpha)) \leq n$). Thus f is SNP. \square

Example 2.6 (Schur positivity does not imply SNP). Let

$$f = s_{(8,2,2)} + s_{(6,6)}.$$

It is enough to show $f(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is not SNP. Now, $m_{(8,2,2)}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ and $m_{(6,6)}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ appear in the monomial expansion of $f(x_1, x_2, x_3)$. However, $m_{(7,4,1)}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is not in

$f(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ since $(7, 4, 1)$ is not \leq_D -comparable with $(8, 2, 2)$ nor $(6, 6, 0)$. Yet, $(7, 4, 1) = \frac{1}{2}(8, 2, 2) + \frac{1}{2}(6, 6, 0) \in \text{Newton}(f(x_1, x_2, x_3))$. Hence f is not SNP. \square

Example 2.7. The Schur positivity assumption in Proposition 2.5(III) is necessary:

$$f = s_{(3,1)}(x_1, x_2) - s_{(2,2)}(x_1, x_2) = x_1^3 x_2 + x_1 x_2^3$$

is not SNP. \square

Example 2.8. $f \in \text{Sym}$ can be SNP without a unique \leq_D -maximal term. For example,

$$f = s_{(2,2,2)} + s_{(3,1,1,1)}$$

is SNP but $(2, 2, 2)$ and $(3, 1, 1, 1)$ are \leq_D -incomparable. An instance of this from “nature” is found in Example 2.34. \square

Proposition 2.9 (Products of Schur polynomials are SNP). $s_{\lambda^{(1)}} s_{\lambda^{(2)}} \cdots s_{\lambda^{(N)}} \in \text{Sym}$ is SNP for any partitions $\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(N)}$.

Proof. We have

$$s_{\lambda} s_{\mu} = \sum_{\nu} \text{LR}_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu} s_{\nu} \in \text{Sym},$$

where $\text{LR}_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is the **Littlewood-Richardson coefficient**. By homogeneity, clearly $\text{LR}_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu} = 0$ unless $|\nu| = |\lambda| + |\mu|$. Let $\lambda + \mu = (\lambda_1 + \mu_1, \lambda_2 + \mu_2, \dots)$. It suffices to show $\nu \leq_D \lambda + \mu$ whenever $\text{LR}_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu} \geq 0$. Actually, we show $s_{\lambda + \mu}$ is the unique \leq_D -maximal term in the Schur expansion of $s_{\lambda} e_{\mu'}$. Indeed, since $e_{\mu'} = s_{\mu} +$ (positive sum of Schur functions), this will suffice. The strengthening holds by an easy induction on the number of nonzero parts of μ and the Pieri rule (in the form of [St99, Example 7.15.8]). Alternatively, this is straightforward to prove from the Littlewood-Richardson rule. Iterating this argument shows that $s_{\lambda^{(1)}} \cdots s_{\lambda^{(N)}}$ has unique \leq_D maximal term $s_{\lambda^{(1)} + \dots + \lambda^{(N)}}$ and hence is SNP. \square

Let

$$p_k = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^k$$

be the **power sum symmetric polynomial**. Moreover, let

$$p_{\lambda} := p_{\lambda_1} p_{\lambda_2} \cdots$$

Proposition 2.10. *Let*

$$f = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} c_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} \in \text{Sym}$$

be not identically zero. Assume $c_{\lambda} \geq 0$ for all λ , and that f is Schur positive. Then f is SNP.

Proof. Recall, (n) indexes the trivial representation of S_n that sends each $\pi \in S_n$ to the 1×1 identity matrix. The character value $\chi^{(n)}(\mu)$, being the trace of this matrix, is independent of π 's conjugacy class $\mu \vdash n$. Hence $\chi^{(n)}(\mu) = 1$.

We have

$$p_{\mu} = \sum_{\lambda} \chi^{\lambda}(\mu) s_{\lambda}.$$

Therefore,

$$f = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} c_{\lambda} p_{\lambda} = \left(\sum_{\lambda \vdash n} c_{\lambda} \right) s_{(n)} + \sum_{\lambda \neq (n)} d_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}.$$

By hypothesis, each $c_\lambda \geq 0$. Since $f \neq 0$, some $c_\lambda > 0$ and hence $s_{(n)}$ appears. Now, (n) is the (unique) maximum in $(\text{Par}(n), \leq_D)$. Also, since f is Schur positive, each $d_\lambda \geq 0$. Hence the result follows from Proposition 2.5(III). \square

Let

$$\omega : \text{Sym} \rightarrow \text{Sym}$$

be the involutive automorphism defined by

$$\omega(s_\lambda) = s_{\lambda'},$$

where λ' is the shape obtained by transposing the Young diagram of λ .

Example 2.11 (ω does not preserve SNP). Example 2.6 shows $f = s_{(8,2,2)} + s_{(6,6)} \in \text{Sym}$ is not SNP. Now

$$\omega(f) = s_{(3,3,1,1,1,1,1,1)} + s_{(2,2,2,2,2,2)} \in \text{Sym}.$$

To see that $\omega(f)$ is SNP, it suffices to show that any partition ν that is a linear combination of rearrangements of $\lambda = (3, 3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ and $\mu = (2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)$ satisfies $\nu \leq_D \lambda$ or $\nu \leq_D \mu$. We leave the details to the reader. \square

2.3. Examples and counterexamples.

Example 2.12 (Monomial symmetric and forgotten symmetric polynomials). It is immediate from (5) and (6) that

$$m_\lambda \in \text{Sym} \text{ is SNP} \iff \lambda = (1^n).$$

The **forgotten symmetric functions** are defined by

$$f_\lambda = \varepsilon_\lambda \omega(m_\lambda)$$

where $\varepsilon_\lambda = (-1)^{|\lambda| - \ell(\lambda)}$.

Proposition 2.13. $f_\lambda \in \text{Sym}$ is SNP if and only if $\lambda = (1^n)$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) If $\lambda = (1^n)$ then $m_\lambda = s_{(1^n)}$ and $f_\lambda = s_{(n,0,0,\dots,0)}$ which is SNP.

(\Rightarrow) We use the following formula [St99, Exercise 7.9]:

$$f_\lambda = \sum_{\mu} a_{\lambda\mu} m_\mu$$

where $a_{\lambda\mu}$ is the number of distinct rearrangements $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{\ell(\lambda)})$ of $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)})$ such that

$$(8) \quad \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^i \gamma_s : 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\lambda) \right\} \supseteq \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^j \mu_t : 1 \leq j \leq \ell(\mu) \right\}.$$

Suppose $\lambda \neq (1^n)$. If $\mu = (1^n)$ then

$$\left\{ \sum_{t=1}^j \mu_t : 1 \leq j \leq \ell(\mu) \right\} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}.$$

On the other hand, $\ell(\lambda) < n$ and hence the set on the lefthand side of (8) has size strictly smaller than n . Thus $a_{\lambda, (1^n)} = 0$.

Now, $(1^n) \in \mathcal{P}_\mu$ for all $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) \vdash n$. Then since f_λ is m -positive, $(1^n) \in \text{Newton}(f_\lambda)$ so long as we are working in at least $\deg(f_\lambda)$ many variables. If $\lambda \neq (1^n)$

then $a_{\lambda, (1^n)} = 0$ means (1^n) is not an exponent vector of f_λ . This proves the contrapositive of (\Rightarrow) . \square

Example 2.14 (Elementary and complete homogeneous symmetric polynomials). The **elementary symmetric polynomial** is defined by

$$e_k(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_k}.$$

Also define

$$e_\lambda = e_{\lambda_1} e_{\lambda_2} \cdots$$

The **complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial** $h_k(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is the sum of all degree k monomials. Also define

$$h_\lambda = h_{\lambda_1} h_{\lambda_2} \cdots$$

Proposition 2.15. *Each e_λ and h_λ is SNP.*

Proof. Since $e_k = s_{(1^k)}$ and $h_k = s_{(k)}$ the claim holds by Proposition 2.9. \square

The **Minkowski sum** of two polytopes \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} is

$$\mathcal{P} + \mathcal{Q} = \{p + q : p \in \mathcal{P}, q \in \mathcal{Q}\}.$$

Thus,

$$\text{Newton}(f \cdot g) = \text{Newton}(f) + \text{Newton}(g).$$

By the Pieri rule,

$$e_{(1)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)^k = \sum_{\lambda} f^\lambda s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

In particular $s_{(k, 0, \dots, 0)}$ appears on the right hand side. Since $\lambda \leq_D (k)$ for all $\lambda \vdash k$, by Proposition 2.5(I) one recovers that the Minkowski sum of k regular simplices in \mathbb{R}^n is $\mathcal{P}_{(k, 0, \dots, 0)}$. Similarly, by the argument of Proposition 2.9, $\mathcal{P}_\lambda = \text{Newton}(e_\lambda)$ and hence one recovers that \mathcal{P}_λ is a Minkowski sum of hypersimplices. For earlier work see, e.g., [Po05, Co10, AgMo09]. \square

Example 2.16 (e -positivity does not imply SNP). $f \in \text{Sym}$ is **e -positive** if $f = \sum_{\lambda} a_{\lambda} e_{\lambda}$ where $a_{\lambda} \geq 0$ for every λ . (Since

$$e_{\lambda} = \sum_{\mu} K_{\mu', \lambda} s_{\mu},$$

e -positivity implies Schur positivity.) Look at

$$f = e_{(3, 3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)} + e_{(2, 2, 2, 2, 2)} \in \text{Sym}.$$

In the monomial expansion, $m_{(8, 2, 2)}$ and $m_{(6, 6)}$ appear. However, $m_{(7, 4, 1)}$ does not appear. This implies f is not SNP. \square

Example 2.17 (More on power sum symmetric polynomials). Recall the power sum symmetric polynomials defined immediately before Proposition 2.10. Clearly p_k is not SNP if $k > 1$ and $n > 1$. Also, p_{λ} is not SNP for $n > 1$ whenever $\lambda_i \geq 2$ for all i . This is since $x_1^{|\lambda|}$ and $x_2^{|\lambda|}$ both appear as monomials in p_{λ} but $x_1^{|\lambda|-1} x_2$ does not. Furthermore:

Proposition 2.18. $p_{\lambda} \in \text{Sym}_n$ for $n > \ell(\lambda)$ is SNP if and only if $\lambda = (1^k)$.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) If $\lambda = (1^k)$, $p_\lambda = e_\lambda$ which is SNP by Proposition 2.15.

(\Rightarrow) Suppose $\lambda_1 \geq 2$ and let $\ell = \ell(\lambda)$. Then since $n > \ell$, $x_1^{\lambda_1} x_2^{\lambda_2} \cdots x_\ell^{\lambda_\ell}$ and $x_2^{\lambda_2} \cdots x_\ell^{\lambda_\ell} x_{\ell+1}^{\lambda_1}$ are monomials in p_λ . Thus,

$$(\lambda_1 - 1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell, 1) = \frac{\lambda_1 - 1}{\lambda_1}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell, 0) + \frac{1}{\lambda_1}(0, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell, \lambda_1) \in \text{Newton}(p_\lambda).$$

However, this point cannot be an exponent vector since it has $\ell + 1$ nonzero components whereas every monomial of p_λ uses at most ℓ distinct variables. \square

Example 2.19 (The resultant, the Gale-Ryser theorem and $(0, 1)$ -matrices). Let

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i z^i \text{ and } g = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i z^i$$

be two polynomials of degree m and n respectively and with roots $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ respectively (not necessarily distinct). The **resultant** is

$$R(f, g) = a_m^n b_n^m \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (x_i - y_j).$$

This polynomial is separately symmetric in the x and y variables. In [GeKaZe90] the Newton polytope of $R(f, g)$ is determined; see also the book [GeKaZe94]. However, we are not aware of the following result appearing explicitly in the literature:

Theorem 2.20. $R(f, g)$ is SNP.

Proof. Consider

$$F = \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + x_i y_j).$$

In fact, $[x^\alpha y^\beta]F$ equals the number of $(0, 1)$ -matrices of dimension $m \times n$ whose row sums are given by α and column sums are given by β ; see, e.g., [St99, Proposition 7.4.3]. Let $M(\alpha, \beta)$ equal the number of these matrices. The Gale-Ryser theorem states

$$(9) \quad M(\alpha, \beta) > 0 \iff \lambda(\beta) \leq_D \lambda(\alpha)',$$

where $\lambda(\gamma)$ is the partition obtained by sorting a nonnegative integer sequence in decreasing order. Call a pair of vectors $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{m+n}$ a **GR pair** if it satisfies either of the equivalent conditions in (9).

In fact F is SNP. Suppose

$$(\alpha^{(1)}, \beta^{(1)}), (\alpha^{(2)}, \beta^{(2)}), \dots, (\alpha^{(N)}, \beta^{(N)})$$

are GR pairs and

$$(\alpha, \beta) = \sum_{t=1}^N d_t (\alpha^{(t)}, \beta^{(t)})$$

with $d_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{t=1}^N d_t = 1$ be a convex combination. The SNPness of F is equivalent to the claim (α, β) is a GR pair whenever $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{m+n}$. The latter claim is immediate from [Ba12, Theorem 3, part 1] which establishes the ‘‘approximate log-concavity’’ of $M(\alpha, \beta)$. We thank A. Barvinok for pointing out this reference to us.

Now notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
F \text{ is SNP} &\iff \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + x_i y_j^{-1}) \text{ is SNP} \\
&\iff y_1^m y_2^m \cdots y_n^m \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + x_i y_j^{-1}) \text{ is SNP} \\
&\iff \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (x_i + y_j) \text{ is SNP} \\
&\iff \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^n (x_i - y_j) \text{ is SNP} \\
&\iff R(f, g) \text{ is SNP.}
\end{aligned}$$

The final equivalence is true since $a_0, b_0 \neq 0$ and the previous equivalence holds since the polynomials in the third and fourth lines clearly share the same monomials. This relation between F and $R(f, g)$ appears in [GeKaZe90] where the authors use it to obtain a formula for the monomials of $R(f, g)$ in terms of counts for $(0, 1)$ -matrices. \square

Conjecture 5.2 claims a generalization of Theorem 2.20; see Example 5.4. \square

Example 2.21 (Powers of the Vandermonde). The **Vandermonde determinant** is

$$a_{\delta_n} = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_i - x_j).$$

(This polynomial is only skew-symmetric.) It is known that

$$\text{Newton}(a_{\delta_n}) = \mathcal{P}_{(n-1, n-2, \dots, 2, 1, 0)} \subset \mathbb{R}^n;$$

see e.g., [Po05, Proposition 2.3].

Proposition 2.22. a_{δ_n} is SNP if and only if $n \leq 2$.

The classical **discriminant** is $\Delta_n = \alpha_{\delta_n}^2$. Its Newton polytope was also determined by in work of I. M. Gelfand-M. Kapranov-A. V. Zelevinsky [GeKaZe90].

Proposition 2.23. Δ_n is SNP if and only if $n \leq 4$.

Proposition 2.23 is a curious coincidence with the Abel-Ruffini theorem.

Our proofs of Propositions 2.22 and 2.23 will use this lemma:

Lemma 2.24. If $a_{\delta_n}^k$ is not SNP, then $a_{\delta_{n+1}}^k$ is not SNP.

Proof. Suppose $a_{\delta_n}^k$ is not SNP. There exists a lattice point $\alpha \in \text{Newton}(a_{\delta_n}^k)$ that is not an exponent vector of $a_{\delta_n}^k$. Hence we have a convex combination

$$\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \beta^i$$

where β^i is an exponent vector. For $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $\gamma' = (\gamma, kn) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. Since

$$a_{\delta_{n+1}}^k = a_{\delta_n}^k \times \prod_{i=1}^n (x_i - x_{n+1})^k,$$

each $(\beta^i)'$ is an exponent vector of $a_{\delta_{n+1}}^k$ and hence α' is a lattice point of $\text{Newton}(a_{\delta_{n+1}}^k)$. Since $x^{\alpha'} = x^\alpha x_{n+1}^{kn}$ and x_{n+1} does not appear in $a_{\delta_n}^k$, if α' is an exponent vector of $a_{\delta_{n+1}}^k$, α is an exponent vector of $a_{\delta_n}^k$, a contradiction. Thus $a_{\delta_{n+1}}^k$ is not SNP. \square

Proof of Propositions 2.22 and 2.23: Clearly, a_{δ_n} is SNP for $n = 1, 2$. One checks that $(1, 1, 1) \in \text{Newton}(a_{\delta_3})$ but is not an actual exponent vector.

Separately, one checks Δ_n is SNP for $n \leq 4$. Also Δ_5 is not SNP. In fact, the only lattice points that are not exponent vectors are all $5!$ rearrangements of $(1, 3, 4, 5, 7)$.

Now apply Lemma 2.24 to complete an induction argument for each of the two propositions being proved. \square

Conjecture 2.25. For all k , there exists N_k such that $a_{\delta_n}^k$ is not SNP for any $n \geq N_k$.

More precisely, for $1 \leq j \leq 4$ we computed $N_{2j-1} = 3$ and moreover that $(1, 3j-2, 3j-2)$ is a lattice point that is not an exponent vector. Moreover, $N_2 = 5, N_4 = 4, N_6 = 4, N_8 = 3$. For more on (higher) powers of the Vandermonde, see, e.g., [ScThWy94, Ba11]. \square

Example 2.26 (q -discriminant). The q -**discriminant** is $\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_i - qx_j)$. At $q = -1$,

$$f_n = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_i + x_j) \in \text{Sym}_n.$$

It is known that

$$f_n = s_{\rho_n}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \quad \text{where } \rho_n = (n-1, n-2, \dots, 3, 2, 1, 0).$$

Hence f_n is SNP and $\text{Newton}(f_n) = \mathcal{P}_{\rho_n} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. \square

Example 2.27 (Totally nonnegative matrices). Let

$$M = (m_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$$

be an $n \times n$ **totally nonnegative real matrix**. That is, every determinant of a square submatrix is nonnegative. Define

$$F_M = \sum_{w \in S_n} \left(\prod_{i=1}^n m_{i, w(i)} \right) p_{\lambda(w)},$$

where $\lambda(w)$ is the cycle type of w .

Theorem 2.28. F_M is SNP.

Proof. By assumption, $m_{ij} \geq 0$. A theorem of J. R. Stembridge [St91] (cf. [St99, Exercise 7.92]) states that F_M is also Schur positive. Now apply Proposition 2.10. \square

Example 2.29 (Redfield–Pólya theory). Let G be a subgroup of S_n . The **cycle index polynomial** is

$$Z_G = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} p_{\lambda(g)},$$

where $\lambda(g)$ is the cycle type of g .

Theorem 2.30. Z_G has SNP. \square

Proof. It is true that

$$Z_G = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\lambda} s_{\lambda},$$

where each $c_{\lambda} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$; see [St99, pg. 396]: this positivity is known for representation-theoretic reasons (no combinatorial proof is available). Now use Proposition 2.10. \square

Example 2.31 (C. Reutenauer's q_{λ} basis). C. Reutenauer [Re95] introduced a new basis $\{q_{\lambda}\}$ of symmetric polynomials, recursively defined by setting

$$\sum_{\lambda \vdash n} q_{\lambda} = s_{(n)},$$

where $q_{\lambda} = q_{\lambda_1} q_{\lambda_2} \cdots$.

Theorem 2.32. q_{λ} has SNP.

Proof. Reutenauer in *loc. cit.* conjectured that $-q_{(n)}$ is Schur positive for $n \geq 2$. Indeed,

$$q_{(1)} = s_{(1)}, q_{(2)} = -s_{(1,1)}, q_{(3)} = -s_{(2,1)}.$$

Reutenauer's conjecture was later established by W. M. Doran IV [Do96]. The proof sets

$$f(n, k) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n, \min(\lambda_i) \geq k} q_{\lambda}.$$

The argument inducts on n and proceeds by showing that

$$-f(n, k) = s_{(n-1,1)} + \sum_{2 \leq i < k} (-f(i, i))(-f(n-i, i)).$$

His induction claim is that $-f(n, k)$ is Schur positive for $k \geq 2$. Let us strengthen his induction hypothesis, and assume $-f(n, k)$ is Schur positive with $s_{(n-1,1)}$ as the unique \leq_D maximal term. In the induction step, note each s_{α} appearing in $-f(i, i)$ has $\alpha_1 \leq i-1$ and each s_{β} in $-f(n-i, i)$ has $\beta_1 \leq n-i-1$. Thus, by the argument of Proposition 2.9, if s_{γ} appears in $s_{\alpha} s_{\beta}$ then $\gamma_1 \leq n-2$, implying the strengthening we need.

It follows from the above argument and the Littlewood-Richardson rule that if $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\ell}, 1^r)$ where each $\lambda_i \geq 2$ then q_{λ} has a unique \leq_D -leading term $s_{a,b}$ where $a = |\lambda| - \ell$ and $b = \ell$. Thus, q_{λ} has SNP by Proposition 2.5(III). \square

Example 2.33 (Stanley's chromatic symmetric polynomial). For a graph G , let $c_G(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be Stanley's chromatic symmetric polynomial [St95]. If $G = K_{1,3}$,

$$c_G(x_1, x_2, \dots) = x_1^3 x_2 + x_1 x_2^3 + \cdots$$

is not SNP. \square

Example 2.34 (Kronecker product of Schur polynomials). The **Kronecker product** is

$$s_{\lambda} * s_{\mu} = \sum_{\nu} \text{Kron}_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu} s_{\nu} \in \text{Sym}.$$

$\text{Kron}_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu}$ is the **Kronecker coefficient**, the multiplicity of the S_n -character χ^{ν} appearing in $\chi^{\lambda} \otimes \chi^{\mu}$. We conjecture that $s_{\lambda} * s_{\mu}$ is SNP. We have verified this for all $\lambda, \mu \in \text{Par}(n)$ for $1 \leq n \leq 7$. Consider

$$s_{(4,2)} * s_{(2,2,1,1)} = s_{(1,1,1,1,1,1)} + s_{(2,1,1,1,1)} + 2s_{(2,2,1,1)} + s_{(3,1,1,1)} + 2s_{(3,2,1)} + s_{(3,3)} + s_{(4,1,1)}.$$

Notice $(3, 3)$ and $(4, 1, 1)$ are both \leq_D -maximal. Hence in this case, SNPness cannot be blamed on Proposition 2.5(III); cf. [AvVa10, Lemma 3.2] and [Va00]. \square

Example 2.35 (Lascoux-Leclerc-Thibon (LLT) polynomials). A. Lascoux-B. Leclerc-J. Y. Thibon [LaLeTh97] introduced $G_\lambda^{(m)}(X; q)$. $G_\lambda^{(m)}(X; 1)$ is a product of Schur polynomials. Hence $G_\lambda^{(m)}(X; 1)$ is SNP by Proposition 2.9. $G_\lambda^{(m)}(X; q) \in \text{Sym}_n[q]$ is not always SNP. One example is

$$G_{(3,3)}^{(2)}(x_1, x_2; q) = q^3(x_1^3 + x_1^2x_2 + x_1x_2^2 + x_2^3) + q(x_1^2x_2 + x_2^2x_1).$$

LLT polynomials arise in the study of Macdonald polynomials, the topic of Section 3. (Another related topic is *affine Schubert calculus*; see the book [LLMSSZ14].) \square

3. MACDONALD POLYNOMIALS

3.1. Symmetric and nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. In [Ma88], I. G. Macdonald introduced a family of polynomials depending of parameters q and t . Define an inner product $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle_{q,t}$ on Sym by

$$\langle p_\lambda, p_\mu \rangle_{q,t} = \delta_{\lambda,\mu} z_\lambda(q, t),$$

where

$$z_\lambda(q, t) = z_\lambda \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} \frac{1 - q^\lambda}{1 - t^\lambda},$$

and

$$z_\lambda = \prod_{r \geq 1} r^{m_r} m_r!$$

for $\lambda = (1^{m_1} 2^{m_2} \dots)$. **Macdonald polynomials** $\{P_\mu(X; q, t)\}$ are uniquely determined by

$$(10) \quad P_\lambda(X; q, t) = m_\lambda(X) + \sum_{\mu <_D \lambda} c_{\lambda,\mu}(q, t) m_\mu(X)$$

where $c_{\lambda,\mu}(q, t) \in \mathbb{Q}(q, t)$, together with

$$\langle P_\lambda, P_\mu \rangle_{q,t} = 0 \text{ if } \lambda \neq \mu.$$

Theorem 3.1. $P_\lambda(X; q = q_0, t = t_0)$ is SNP, and $\text{Newton}(P_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n; q = q_0, t = t_0)) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ whenever $n \geq \ell(\lambda)$, for any (q_0, t_0) in a Zariski open subset of \mathbb{C}^2 .

Lemma 3.2. $\text{Newton}(P_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n; q = q_0, t = t_0)) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ whenever $n \geq \ell(\lambda)$, for any $(q_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2$.

Proof. This is by (10) and Proposition 2.5(I). Since $n \geq \ell(\lambda)$, $s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n) \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 3.3. Fix $q_0, t_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. $P_\lambda(X; q = q_0, t = t_0)$ is SNP if and only if $c_{\lambda,\mu}(q_0, t_0) \neq 0$ for all $\mu <_D \lambda$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) By Lemma 3.2, $\text{Newton}(P_\lambda(X; q = q_0, t = t_0)) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda$. Thus each $\mu <_D \lambda$ appears as a lattice point of $\text{Newton}(P_\lambda(X; q = q_0, t = t_0))$. Since we assume $P_\lambda(X; q = q_0, t = t_0)$ is SNP, $[x^\mu]P_\lambda(X; q = q_0, t = t_0) \neq 0$. Among monomial symmetric functions, x^μ only appears in m_μ . Hence $c_{\lambda,\mu}(q_0, t_0) \neq 0$, as desired.

The proof of (\Leftarrow) just reverses the above argument, using the fact that

$$\mu \in \text{Newton}(P_\lambda(X; q = q_0, t = t_0)) \iff \alpha \in \text{Newton}(P_\lambda(X; q = q_0, t = t_0))$$

for any rearrangement α of $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1: The Newton polytope assertion is by Lemma 3.2. Now

$$P_\lambda(X; 0, 0) = s_\lambda(X)$$

and m_μ appears in s_λ for every $\mu <_D \lambda$. Hence $c_{\lambda, \mu}(q, t) \neq 0$. Now choose q, t that is neither a pole nor a root of any of these rational functions (for $\mu <_D \lambda$). Therefore the SNP assertion follows from Lemma 3.3. □

The **Hall-Littlewood polynomial** is $P_\lambda(X; t) := P_\lambda(X, q = 0, t)$. One has

$$P_\lambda(X; t) = \sum_{\mu} K_{\lambda, \mu}(t) s_{\mu}(X)$$

where $K_{\lambda, \mu}(t)$ is the **Kostka-Foulkes polynomial**. It is known that

$$K_{\lambda, \mu}(t) = \sum_T t^{\text{charge}(T)}.$$

The sum is over all semistandard tableau T of shape λ and content μ . It is true that $\text{charge}(T) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Since these tableaux can only occur if $\mu \leq_D \lambda$, $K_{\lambda, \mu}(t) \neq 0$ if and only if $\mu \leq_D \lambda$. Hence we immediately obtain:

Proposition 3.4. *If $t_0 > 0$ then $P_\lambda(X; t = t_0) \in \text{Sym}$ is SNP and $\text{Newton}(P_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n; t = t_0)) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ whenever $n \geq \ell(\lambda)$.*

The **Schur P -polynomial** is

$$SP_\lambda(X) = \sum_T x^T.$$

The sum is over shifted semistandard Young tableaux of a partition λ with distinct parts. There is also the **Schur Q -polynomial**,

$$SQ_\lambda(X) = 2^{\ell(\lambda)} SP_\lambda.$$

Proposition 3.5. *$SP_\lambda(X)$ and $SQ_\lambda(S)$ are SNP and*

$$\text{Newton}(SP_\lambda(X)) = \text{Newton}(SQ_\lambda(X)) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda.$$

Proof. In fact,

$$SP_\lambda(X) = P_\lambda(X; t = -1);$$

see [St89]. Also $K_{\lambda, \lambda}(t) = 1$. Now, SP_λ is Schur-positive; see, e.g., [St89, p. 131–132]. Thus the result follows from Proposition 2.5(III). □

The *modified Macdonald polynomial* $\tilde{H}_\lambda(X; q, t)$ is a certain transformation of $P_\lambda(X; q, t)$ also introduced in [Ma88].

Proposition 3.6. *For any $q_0, t_0 > 0$, $\tilde{H}_\lambda(X; q = q_0, t = t_0)$ is SNP and $\text{Newton}(\tilde{H}_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n; q = q_0, t = t_0)) = \mathcal{P}_{|\lambda|} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ whenever $n \geq |\lambda|$.*

Proof. A formula of J. Hagland-M. Haiman-N. Loehr [HHL05] states that

$$\tilde{H}_\lambda(X; q, t) = \sum_{\sigma: \lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} x^\sigma q^{\text{inv}(\sigma)} t^{\text{maj}(\sigma)},$$

where σ is any assignment of positive integers to the boxes of λ . Also, $\text{inv}(\sigma)$ and $\text{maj}(\sigma)$ are certain combinatorially defined statistics, whose specifics we do not need here. Thus, for $q, t > 0$, every monomial of degree $|\lambda|$ appears. \square

However, $\tilde{H}_{(3,1,1)}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5; q, t)$ is not SNP as it misses the monomial $qt x_3 x_4^4$.

Example 3.7 (modified q, t -Kostka polynomials are not SNP). Consider the expansion

$$\tilde{H}_\lambda(X; q, t) = \sum_{\mu} \tilde{K}_{\lambda, \mu}(q, t) s_{\mu}(X).$$

The coefficients $\tilde{K}_{\lambda, \mu}(q, t)$ are the **(modified) q, t -Kostka coefficients**. Now,

$$\tilde{K}_{(2,2,2), (2,1,1,1)}(q, t) = qt^7 + t^8 + qt^5 + t^6 + qt^4.$$

Hence, $\tilde{K}_{\lambda, \mu}(q, t)$ need not be SNP. \square

Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$. There is the **nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomial** $E_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t)$; see [HHL08] for details.

It is part of a definition that

$$E_\alpha(X; q, t) = x^\alpha + \sum_{\beta <_S \alpha} d_{\alpha, \beta}(q, t) x^\beta$$

where $d_{\alpha, \beta}(q, t) \in \mathbb{Q}(q, t)$. S. Sahi [Sa00] proved each $d_{\alpha, \beta}(q, t) \neq 0$. Here $<_S$ is the ordering whose covering relations are that if $\alpha_i < \alpha_j$ then $t_{ij}(\alpha) <_S \alpha$ (where $t_{ij}(\alpha)$ swaps positions i and j of α). If also $\alpha_j - \alpha_i > 1$ then $\alpha + e_i - e_j <_S t_{ij}(\alpha)$; see [HHL08, Section 2.1]. Let $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\alpha$ be the convex hull of all $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that $\beta \leq_S \alpha$. Thus $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_\alpha$ is the Newton polytope of $E_\alpha(X; q = q_0, t = t_0)$ for any generic choice of $(q_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{C}^2$. The conjecture below says $E_\alpha(X; q, t)$ is “generically SNP”:

Conjecture 3.8. *If $\beta \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_\alpha$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ then $\beta \leq_S \alpha$.*

Conjecture 3.8 has been checked for $n \leq 7$ and whenever $|\alpha| \leq 7$.

3.2. Keys and Demazure atoms. Complementing the above analysis, we now investigate SNP for two specializations of $E_\alpha(X; q, t)$. The first is $\kappa_\alpha = E_\alpha(X; q = \infty, t = \infty)$ [Io03, Theorem 3]. The **Demazure operator** is

$$\pi_i(f) = \partial_i(x_i \cdot f), \quad \text{for } f \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2, \dots].$$

Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\infty$ and suppose that $|\alpha| = \sum_i \alpha_i < \infty$. Define the **key polynomial** κ_α to be

$$x^\alpha := x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \dots, \quad \text{if } \alpha \text{ is weakly decreasing.}$$

Otherwise, set

$$(11) \quad \kappa_\alpha = \pi_i(\kappa_{\hat{\alpha}}) \text{ where } \hat{\alpha} = (\dots, \alpha_{i+1}, \alpha_i, \dots) \text{ and } \alpha_{i+1} > \alpha_i.$$

The key polynomials form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2, \dots]$; see work of V. Reiner–M. Shimozono [ReSh95] (and references therein) for more on κ_α .

Define D_α to be the “skyline” diagram with a left-justified row of α_i boxes in row i .

Conjecture 3.9. $S_{D_\alpha} = \text{Newton}(\kappa_\alpha)$.

We have a proof (omitted here) of the “ \supseteq ” part of Conjecture 3.9. See Remark 5.22.

Conjecture 3.10. κ_α has SNP.

We have a second conjectural description of $\text{Newton}(\kappa_\alpha)$. Let

$$m_{ij}(\alpha) = \alpha + e_i - e_j.$$

Then for any composition α , let $\beta <_\kappa \alpha$ if β can be generated from α by applying a sequence of the moves t_{ij} for $\alpha_i < \alpha_j$, and m_{ij} if $\alpha_j - \alpha_i > 1$.

Conjecture 3.11. $\kappa_\alpha = x^\alpha + \sum_{\beta <_\kappa \alpha} \text{Key}_{\alpha,\beta} x^\beta$ with $\text{Key}_{\alpha,\beta} > 0$ for all $\beta <_\kappa \alpha$.

(Observe that $\beta <_\kappa \alpha$, then $\beta <_S \alpha$. However, the converse fails as $11 <_S 20$ but one does not have $11 <_\kappa 20$.)

For two compositions γ and α we write

$$\gamma \preceq \alpha \text{ if } \lambda(\gamma) = \lambda(\alpha) \text{ and } w(\gamma) \leq w(\alpha) \text{ in Bruhat order.}$$

Here $\lambda(\gamma)$ is the partition obtained by resorting the parts of γ . Also $w(\gamma)$ is the shortest length permutation that sends $\lambda(\gamma)$ to γ . (Strong) Bruhat order refers to the ordering on permutations obtained as the closure of the relation $w \leq wt_{ij}$ if $\ell(wt_{ij}) = \ell(w) + 1$ and t_{ij} is a transposition.

Theorem 3.12. If $\beta \preceq \alpha$ then β is a vertex of $\text{Newton}(\kappa_\alpha)$.

Conjecture 3.13. The converse of Theorem 3.12 holds.

Our proof of Theorem 3.12 uses the other specialization of interest, namely $E_\alpha(X; q = 0, t = 0)$. Let

$$\widehat{\pi}_i := \pi_i - \text{id}$$

and define the **Demazure atom** $A_\alpha = x^\alpha$ if α is weakly decreasing. Otherwise $A_\alpha = \widehat{\pi}_i(A_{\widehat{\alpha}})$ where $\widehat{\alpha}$ is defined as in (11). By the way,

Conjecture 3.14. A_α has SNP.

That $E_\alpha(X; q = 0, t = 0) = A_\alpha$ is [Ma09, Theorem 1.1].

The five conjectures above, namely Conjectures 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.13 and 3.14 have been checked for $|\alpha| \leq 7$ where α has at most three parts of size zero.

We will also use

$$(12) \quad \kappa_\alpha = \sum_{\gamma \preceq \alpha} A_\gamma$$

One reference for (12) is [Ma09, Section 1]; a proof is found in [Pu16, Lemma 3.5].

Proposition 3.15. Suppose $\beta \preceq \alpha$. Let $\lambda = \lambda(\beta) = \lambda(\alpha)$. Then

$$\{\lambda\} \subseteq \text{Newton}(\kappa_\beta) \subseteq \text{Newton}(\kappa_\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where n is the position of the last nonzero part of α .

Proof. Using (12) twice, we have

$$\kappa_\alpha = \sum_{\gamma \preceq \alpha} A_\gamma = \sum_{\gamma \preceq \beta} A_\gamma + \sum_{\substack{\gamma \preceq \alpha \\ \gamma \not\preceq \beta}} A_\gamma = \kappa_\beta + \sum_{\substack{\gamma \preceq \alpha \\ \gamma \not\preceq \beta}} A_\gamma.$$




FIGURE 1. The permutahedron for $\lambda = (2, 1, 0)$. The shaded region is $\text{Newton}(\kappa_{1,0,2})$. See Proposition 3.15.

Since each A_γ is monomial positive [Ma09, Theorem 1.1],

$$\text{Newton}(\kappa_\beta) \subseteq \text{Newton}(\kappa_\alpha).$$

Now, λ is \preceq -minimum among rearrangements of λ . By definition $\kappa_\lambda = x^\lambda$. This explains the leftmost containment.

Let $\lambda^{\text{rev}} = (0, 0, \dots, 0, \dots, \lambda_3, \lambda_2, \lambda_1) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Then λ^{rev} is the \preceq -maximum among rearrangements of λ in \mathbb{Z}^n . Also, we have $\kappa_{\lambda^{\text{rev}}} = s_\lambda$ (see, e.g., [Ma09, Section 4] and references therein). However we know $\text{Newton}(s_\lambda) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda$. \square

Lemma 3.16. *Suppose \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} are polytopes such that $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$. If v is a vertex of \mathcal{Q} and $v \in \mathcal{P}$, then v is a vertex of \mathcal{P} .*

Proof. v is a vertex of \mathcal{Q} if and only if there is a separating hyperplane H , i.e., there exists a vector c such that $c \cdot v < c \cdot y$ for all $y \in \mathcal{Q}$. Since $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$, H works for \mathcal{P} also. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.12: Now,

$$\kappa_\alpha = x^\alpha + (\text{positive sum of monomials});$$

see, e.g., [ReSh95, Corollary 7]. Hence, α is in $\text{Newton}(\kappa_\alpha)$. By Proposition 3.15,

$$\beta \in \text{Newton}(\kappa_\beta) \subseteq \text{Newton}(\kappa_\alpha) \text{ if } \beta \preceq \alpha.$$

Again applying Proposition 3.15 we have that $\text{Newton}(\kappa_\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\lambda(\alpha)}$. Now we are done by combining Proposition 2.5(II) and Lemma 3.16. \square

4. QUASISYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

A power series $f \in \mathbb{Z}[[x_1, x_2, \dots]]$ is **quasisymmetric** if

$$[x_1^{a_1} x_2^{a_2} \cdots x_k^{a_k}] f = [x_{i_1}^{a_1} x_{i_2}^{a_2} \cdots x_{i_k}^{a_k}] f$$

for any natural numbers $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k$. As with Sym, define a quasisymmetric function f to be SNP if $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m, 0, 0, \dots)$ is SNP for all $m \geq 1$. In view of Remark 2.3, f is SNP if $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m, 0, 0, \dots)$ is SNP for any $m \geq \deg(f)$.

Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^k$. The **monomial quasisymmetric function** is defined as

$$M_\alpha = \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k} x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_{i_k}^{\alpha_k}.$$

Let QSym be the \mathbb{Q} -span of all M_α .

Example 4.1 (M_α need not be SNP). $M_{(2)} = p_2 = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots$ does not have SNP. \square

Another basis of QSym is given by **Gessel's fundamental quasisymmetric functions**

$$(13) \quad F_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \rightarrow \alpha} M_\beta.$$

Here, $\beta \rightarrow \alpha$ means that α is obtained by successively adding adjacent parts of β .

For a composition γ , let γ^+ be the composition formed by removing parts of size zero from γ .

Theorem 4.2. $\text{Newton}(F_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = \text{Newton}(M_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The vertices of this polytope are $\{\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n : \gamma^+ = \alpha\}$.

Proof. Each M_β is a positive sum of monomials. Also, $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha$ so M_α appears in the expansion (13). Therefore,

$$\text{Newton}(F_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \supseteq \text{Newton}(M_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)).$$

Suppose $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^k$ and $\widehat{\beta} \rightarrow \beta$ where

$$\widehat{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta'_i, \beta''_i, \dots, \beta_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^{k+1}$$

and $\beta_i = \beta'_i + \beta''_i$.

We wish to show

$$(14) \quad \text{Newton}(M_{\widehat{\beta}}(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \subseteq \text{Newton}(M_\beta(x_1, \dots, x_n)).$$

By induction, this implies the remaining containment

$$\text{Newton}(F_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \subseteq \text{Newton}(M_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)).$$

Suppose

$$\widetilde{\beta} = (\widetilde{\beta}_1, \dots, \widetilde{\beta}_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \text{ where } (\widetilde{\beta})^+ = \widehat{\beta}.$$

Thus,

$$\widetilde{\beta} = (0, \dots, 0, \beta_1, 0, \dots, 0, \beta_2, \dots, \beta'_i, 0, \dots, 0, \beta''_i, 0, \dots, 0, \dots, \beta_k, 0, \dots, 0)$$

where we are depicting the additional 0's inserted between components of $\widehat{\beta}$ to obtain $\widetilde{\beta}$.

In particular, $x^{\widetilde{\beta}}$ appears in $M_{\widetilde{\beta}}$.

Now let

$$\beta^\circ = (0, \dots, 0, \beta_1, 0, \dots, 0, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_i, 0, \dots, 0, 0, \dots, 0, \dots, \beta_k, 0, \dots, 0)$$

and

$$\beta^\bullet = (0, \dots, 0, \beta_1, 0, \dots, 0, \beta_2, \dots, 0, 0, \dots, 0, \beta_i, 0, \dots, 0, \dots, \beta_k, 0, \dots, 0).$$

That is β° and β^\bullet differ from $\tilde{\beta}$ only by replacing β'_i and β''_i by β_i , respectively.

Since $\beta'_i, \beta''_i \geq 0$, we have that

$$\tilde{\beta} = \frac{\beta'_i}{\beta_i} \beta^\circ + \frac{\beta''_i}{\beta_i} \beta^\bullet$$

is a convex combination. This proves (14) and hence the asserted equality of Newton polytopes.

Every monomial of $M_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a monomial of $m_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Therefore,

$$\text{Newton}(M_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \subseteq \text{Newton}(m_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)).$$

Recall,

$$\text{Newton}(m_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = \mathcal{P}_{\lambda(\alpha)} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n.$$

One knows the vertices of $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda(\alpha)}$ are all rearrangements of α (thought of as a vector in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, where we concatenate 0's as necessary); cf. Proposition 2.5(II). Thus, every exponent vector of $m_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is also a vertex of $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda(\alpha)}$. Hence to obtain the final claim of the theorem we may appeal to Lemma 3.16. \square

Example 4.3 (F_α need not be SNP). One can also check that

$$F_{(2,2)} = M_{(2,2)} + M_{(2,1,1)} + M_{(1,1,2)} + M_{(1,1,1,1)}.$$

Thus, $(0, 1, 2, 1) = \frac{1}{2}(0, 2, 2, 0) + \frac{1}{2}(0, 0, 2, 2) \in \text{Newton}(F_{(2,2)})$. However, $(0, 1, 2, 1)$ is not an exponent vector of $F_{(2,2)}$. Hence $F_{(2,2)}$ is not SNP. \square

J. Hagland-K. Luoto-S. Mason-S. van Willigenburg [HLMvW11] introduced the **quasisymmetric Schur polynomial**:

$$S_\alpha = \sum_{\gamma} A_\gamma$$

where the sum is over all compositions γ such that $\gamma^+ = \alpha$ and where γ^+ is the composition γ with any 0 parts removed. QSym is also spanned by $\{S_\alpha\}$. Also, recall A_γ is the Demazure atom defined in Section 3.2.

Many aspects of quasi-Schur theory are parallel to Schur theory [HLMvW11]. For instance, consider the transition between the S and M bases of QSym:

$$S_\alpha = \sum_{\beta} \bar{K}_{\alpha,\beta} M_\beta.$$

It is proved in *loc. cit.* that $\bar{K}_{\alpha,\beta}$ counts *composition tableaux*. Hence $\bar{K}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is an analogue of the Kostka coefficient. However, there are divergences from the perspective of Newton polytopes as seen in the next three examples:

Example 4.4 (S_α need not be SNP). An example is $S_{(2,1,3)}$. In at least four variables, $x_1 x_2^2 x_3^2 x_4$ does not appear but $x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3^2$ and $x_2^2 x_3^2 x_4^2$ both do. Nonetheless, it should be interesting to describe the Newton polytope, and to characterize when S_α is SNP. \square

Example 4.5. In the symmetric function case,

$$\text{Newton}(s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = \text{Newton}(m_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n.$$

However,

$$(0, 0, 2, 2) \in \text{Newton}(S_{(1,3)}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)) \text{ but } (0, 0, 2, 2) \notin \text{Newton}(M_{(1,3)}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)).$$

Hence $\text{Newton}(S_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n)) \neq \text{Newton}(M_\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_n))$ in general. \square

Example 4.6. We may define a dominance order \preceq'_D on strict compositions by $\alpha \preceq'_D \beta$ if $\text{Newton}(M_\alpha) \subseteq \text{Newton}(M_\beta)$. The above example shows that $\bar{K}_{\alpha,\beta} > 0$ if and only if $\beta \preceq'_D \alpha$ is not generally true. This is in contrast with (6). \square

5. SCHUBERT POLYNOMIALS AND VARIATIONS

5.1. The Schubert SNP conjectures. A. Lascoux–M.-P. Schützenberger [LaSc82a] introduced **Schubert polynomials**. If $w_0 = n \ n - 1 \ \cdots \ 2 \ 1$ (in one-line notation) is the longest length permutation in S_n then

$$\mathfrak{S}_{w_0}(x_1, \dots, x_n) := x_1^{n-1} x_2^{n-2} \cdots x_{n-1}.$$

Otherwise, $w \neq w_0$ and there exists i such that $w(i) < w(i+1)$. Then one sets

$$\mathfrak{S}_w(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \partial_i \mathfrak{S}_{ws_i}(x_1, \dots, x_n), \text{ where } \partial_i f := \frac{f - s_i f}{x_i - x_{i+1}},$$

and s_i is the simple transposition swapping i and $i+1$. Since ∂_i satisfies

$$\partial_i \partial_j = \partial_j \partial_i \text{ for } |i - j| > 1, \text{ and } \partial_i \partial_{i+1} \partial_i = \partial_{i+1} \partial_i \partial_{i+1},$$

the above description of \mathfrak{S}_w is well-defined. In addition, under the inclusion $\iota : S_n \hookrightarrow S_{n+1}$ defined by $w(1) \cdots w(n) \mapsto w(1) \cdots w(n) \ n + 1$, we have $\mathfrak{S}_w = \mathfrak{S}_{\iota(w)}$. Thus one unambiguously refers to \mathfrak{S}_w for each $w \in S_\infty = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} S_n$.

Conjecture 5.1. \mathfrak{S}_w has SNP.

We have checked Conjecture 5.1 for all $w \in S_n$ where $n \leq 8$.

Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots\}$. The **double Schubert polynomial** $\mathfrak{S}_w(X; Y)$ is defined by setting

$$\mathfrak{S}_{w_0}(X; Y) = \prod_{i+j \leq n} (x_i - y_j)$$

and recursively determining $\mathfrak{S}_w(X; Y)$ for $w \neq w_0$ precisely as for $\mathfrak{S}_w(X)$.

We have also checked for $n \leq 5$ (and many other cases) that:

Conjecture 5.2. $\mathfrak{S}_w(X; Y)$ is SNP.

Since $\mathfrak{S}_w(X; 0) = \mathfrak{S}_w(X)$, Conjecture 5.2 implies Conjecture 5.1.

Example 5.3 (∂_i and π_i does not preserve SNP). This polynomial is SNP:

$$f = x_1^4 + x_1^3 x_2 + x_1^2 x_2^2 + 2x_1 x_2^3.$$

However

$$\partial_1(f) = x_1^3 + x_2^3$$

is not SNP.

Since $\pi_i(g) = \partial_i(x_i \cdot g)$, if we set

$$g = x_1^3 + x_1^2 x_2 + x_1 x_2^2 + 2x_2^3$$

we have $\pi_1(g) = \partial_1(f)$. Hence, π_i does not preserve SNP. \square

Example 5.4 (Double Schubert polynomials are generalized resultants). Pick w to be the “dominant” permutation $n + 1 \ n + 2 \ \cdots \ n + m \ 1 \ 2 \ \cdots \ n \in S_{n+m}$. Then

$$\mathfrak{S}_w(X; Y) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^m (x_i - y_j).$$

(One reference is [Ma01, Proposition 2.6.7].) This has the same Newton polytope as $R(f, g)$. Thus Conjecture 5.2 is proposes a generalization of Theorem 2.20. \square

A. Lascoux–M.-P. Schützenberger also introduced the family of **Grothendieck polynomials** [LaSc82b]. These polynomials are defined using

$$\bar{\pi}_i(f) = \partial_i((1 - x_{i+1})f).$$

For $w_0 \in S_n$ declare

$$\mathfrak{G}_{w_0}(X) = x_1^{n-1} x_2^{n-2} \cdots x_{n-1}.$$

If $w \in S_n$ and $w \neq w_0$, let

$$\mathfrak{G}_w(X) = \bar{\pi}_i(\mathfrak{G}_{ws_i})$$

if i is an ascent of w . This is an inhomogenous analogue of the Schubert polynomial since

$$\mathfrak{G}_w(X) = \mathfrak{S}_w(X) + (\text{higher degree terms}).$$

Like the Schubert polynomials, $\mathfrak{G}_w = \mathfrak{G}_{\iota(w)}$, where $\iota : S_n \hookrightarrow S_{n+1}$ is the natural inclusion. Hence it make sense to define \mathfrak{G}_w for $w \in S_\infty$.

Conjecture 5.5. \mathfrak{G}_w has SNP.

Conjecture 5.5 has been exhaustively checked for $n \leq 7$. Conjecture 5.5 generalizes Conjecture 5.1 since

$$\text{Newton}(\mathfrak{G}_w) = \text{Newton}(\mathfrak{S}_w) \cap \left\{ (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = \#D_w \right\}.$$

Grothendieck polynomials arise in combinatorial K -theory. Another family of polynomials from this topic was introduced by A. Lascoux in [La00]. He defines Ω_α for $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\infty$ by replacing π_i in the definition of κ_α with

$$\tau_i(f) = \partial_i(x_i(1 - x_{i+1})f).$$

The initial condition is $\Omega_\alpha = x^\alpha (= \kappa_\alpha)$, if α is weakly decreasing. Ω_α is an inhomogeneous analogue of κ_α .

Conjecture 5.6. Ω_α has SNP.

The **Lascoux atom** \mathcal{L}_α is defined [Mo16] by replacing π_i in the definition of κ_α with

$$\hat{\tau}_i(f) = (\tau_i - 1)f.$$

Conjecture 5.7. \mathcal{L}_α has SNP.

\mathcal{L}_α is an inhomogeneous analogue of A_α .

Conjectures 5.6 and 5.7 have been verified for $|\alpha| \leq 7$ where α has at most three parts of size zero.

5.2. Stanley polynomials and the stable limit of Conjecture 5.1. For $w \in S_n$, let $1^t \times w \in S_{t+n}$ be the permutation defined by $1^t \times w(i) = i$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$ and $1^t \times w(i) = n + i$ for $t + 1 \leq i \leq t + n$. The **Stanley symmetric polynomial** (also known as the **stable Schubert polynomial**) is defined by

$$F_w = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathfrak{S}_{1^t \times w} \in \text{Sym}.$$

This power series is well-defined.

F_w was originally introduced by R. P. Stanley in [St84]. Every $w \in S_n$ can be expressed as a product of simple transpositions

$$w = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_\ell}.$$

When $\ell = \ell(w)$ is the number of inversions of w , this factorization is **reduced**. Then $s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_\ell}$, or equivalently (i_1, \dots, i_ℓ) , is a **reduced word** for w . Let $\#\text{Red}(w)$ be the number of reduced words of w . In *loc. cit.* it is shown that

$$\#\text{Red}(w) = [x_1 \cdots x_{\ell(w)}] F_w.$$

The next result is a “stable limit” version of Conjecture 5.13.

Theorem 5.8. $F_w \in \text{Sym}$ is SNP.

Our proof rests on:

Theorem 5.9 (Theorems 3.2, 4.1, [St84]). For

$$F_w = \sum_{\lambda} a_{w,\lambda} s_{\lambda},$$

$a_{w,\lambda} \geq 0$ and there exists $\lambda(w)$ and $\mu(w)$ such that if $a_{w,\lambda} \neq 0$, then $\lambda(w) \leq_D \lambda \leq_D \mu(w)$.

Proof of Theorem 5.8: Combine Theorem 5.9 and Proposition 2.5(III). □

Corollary 5.10. Any skew-Schur polynomial $s_{\lambda/\mu}(X)$ has SNP.

Proof. To every skew shape λ/μ there is a 321-avoiding permutation $w_{\lambda/\mu}$ with the property that $F_{w_{\lambda/\mu}}(X) = s_{\lambda/\mu}$ [BiJoSt93]. Now apply Theorem 5.8. □

Let

$$S_{\infty,\ell} = \{w \in S_{\infty} : \ell(w) = \ell\}.$$

Declare

$$u \preceq_D v \text{ for } u, v \in S_{\infty,\ell} \text{ if } \text{Newton}(\mathfrak{S}_u) \subseteq \text{Newton}(\mathfrak{S}_v).$$

Given a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k > 0)$, define $w_{\lambda,k} \in S_{\lambda_1+k}$ to be the unique permutation that satisfies

$$w_{\lambda,k}(i) = \lambda_{k-i+1} + i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k$$

and is **Grassmannian**, i.e., it has at most one descent, at position k . Then one has

$$\mathfrak{S}_{w_{\lambda,k}} = s_{\lambda}(x_1, \dots, x_k).$$

We now show that (S_{∞}, \preceq_D) extends $(\text{Par}(n), \leq_D)$:

Proposition 5.11. Suppose $\lambda, \mu \in \text{Par}(n)$ and let $k = \max\{\ell(\lambda), \ell(\mu)\}$. Then $\lambda \leq_D \mu$ if and only if $w_{\lambda,k} \preceq_D w_{\mu,k}$.

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{S}_{w_{\lambda,k}}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ and $\mathfrak{S}_{w_{\mu,k}}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = s_\mu(x_1, \dots, x_k)$,

$$\mathcal{P}_\lambda = \text{Newton}(s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_k)) = \text{Newton}(\mathfrak{S}_{w_{\lambda,k}}(x_1, \dots, x_k)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k.$$

The same statement holds where we replace λ by μ . Now apply Rado's theorem (6). \square

Figure 2 shows part of $(S_{\infty,2}, \preceq_D)$. From this one can see that the poset is not graded, just like dominance order \leq_D on partitions. Unlike \leq_D , it is not a lattice: in Figure 2, the elements 231456 and 312456 do not have a unique least upper bound as 142356 and 214356 are incomparable minimal upper bounds.

Theorem 5.12. *Every two elements $u, v \in S_{\infty,\ell}$ have an upper bound under \preceq_D .*

Proof. Suppose $\{\alpha_i\}$ and $\{\beta_j\}$ are the exponent vectors of \mathfrak{S}_u and \mathfrak{S}_v , respectively. It suffices to show there exists $w \in S_{\infty,\ell}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{S}_w = \sum_i x^{\alpha_i} + \sum_j x^{\beta_j} + (\text{positive sum of monomials}).$$

We first show that there is a F_w such that each $s_{\lambda(\alpha_i)}$ and $s_{\lambda(\beta_j)}$ appear (possibly with multiplicity). A theorem of S. Fomin-C. Greene [FoGr98] states that

$$F_w = \sum_\nu a_{w,\nu} s_\nu$$

where $a_{w,\nu}$ is the number of semistandard tableaux of shape ν such that the top-down, right-to-left reading word is a reduced word for w . Let

$$w = s_1 s_3 s_5 \cdots s_{2\ell-1}.$$

Clearly this is a reduced word. All reduced words of w are obtained by permuting the simple transpositions.

Filling *any* shape of size ℓ by successively placing $1, 3, 5, \dots, 2\ell - 1$ along rows in left to right order gives a semistandard tableaux. Thus every s_μ where $\mu \vdash \ell$ appears in F_w . In particular each $s_{\lambda(\alpha_i)}$ and each $s_{\lambda(\beta_j)}$ appears. Since $x^{\lambda(\alpha_i)}$ appears in $s_{\lambda(\alpha_i)}$, by symmetry of $s_{\lambda(\alpha_i)}$, x^{α_i} appears as well. That is, x^{α_i} appears in F_w . Similarly x^{β_j} appears in F_w .

By definition, for any monomial x^γ appearing in F_w , there is a finite N_γ such that x^γ appears in $\mathfrak{S}_{1^{N_\gamma} \times w}$. It suffices to pick N larger than all N_{α_i} and N_{β_j} . \square

5.3. Conjectural inequalities for the Newton(\mathfrak{S}_w). Let

$$D_w = \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i, j \leq n, w(i) > j \text{ and } w^{-1}(j) > i\}$$

be the **Rothe diagram** of a permutation $w \in S_n$.

Conjecture 5.13. $\mathcal{S}_{D_w} = \text{Newton}(\mathfrak{S}_w)$.

This has been checked for all $w \in S_8$, as well as many larger instances. Notice that Conjecture 5.13 is equivalent to the assertion that $w \preceq_D v$ if and only if $\theta_{D_w}(S) \leq \theta_{D_v}(S)$ for all $S \subseteq [n]$.

Example 5.14. Suppose $w = 21543$, the Rothe diagram D_w is given by





FIGURE 2. The S_6 part of the Hasse diagram of $(S_{\infty,2}, \leq_D)$



One can check that the defining inequalities are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 &= 4 \\ \alpha_1 &\leq 3, \alpha_2 \leq 2, \alpha_3 \leq 2, \alpha_4 \leq 1 \\ \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 &\leq 4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_3 \leq 4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_4 \leq 4, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \leq 3, \alpha_2 + \alpha_4 \leq 3, \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 \leq 3 \\ \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 &\leq 4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_4 \leq 4, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 \leq 3 \\ \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 &\leq 4. \end{aligned}$$

together with $\alpha_i \geq 0$ for each i . The polytope is depicted in Section 1. □

One can uniquely reconstruct $u \in S_\infty$ with the defining inequalities.

Proposition 5.15. *If $u, v \in S_n$ are of the same length and $\theta_{D_u}(S) = \theta_{D_v}(S)$ for all $S = \{i, i + 1, \dots, n\}$ where $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $u = v$.*

Proof. Let

$$c_i(\pi) = \#\{j : (i, j) \in D_\pi\}.$$

Thus $(c_1(\pi), c_2(\pi), \dots)$ is the **Lehmer code** of π . The Lehmer code uniquely determines $\pi \in S_\infty$; see, e.g., [Ma01, Proposition 2.1.2]. Hence it suffices to show the codes of u and v are the same. This follows from:

$$\sum_{j=1}^i c_j(u) = \ell - \theta_{D_u}(\{i+1, i+2, \dots, n\}) = \ell - \theta_{D_v}(\{i+1, i+2, \dots, n\}) = \sum_{j=1}^i c_j(v),$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. □

The inequalities of \mathcal{S}_D are in general redundant. If

$$(15) \quad \theta_D(S) = \theta_D(T) \text{ and } S \supseteq T$$

then the inequality

$$\sum_{i \in T} \alpha_i \leq \theta_D(T)$$

is unnecessary. Similarly, if

$$(16) \quad S = \sqcup_i T_i \text{ and } \theta_D(S) = \sum_i \theta_D(T_i)$$

then the S -inequality is implied by the T_i inequalities.

Problem 5.16. Give the minimal set of inequalities associated to D_w (or more generally, any D).

Example 5.17. Continuing Example 5.14, minimal inequalities are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 &= 4 \\ \alpha_1 &\leq 3, \alpha_2 \leq 2, \alpha_3 \leq 2, \alpha_4 \leq 1 \\ \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 &\leq 4, \alpha_1 + \alpha_3 \leq 4, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \leq 3, \\ \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 &\leq 3, \end{aligned}$$

combined with positivity. This minimization is obtained using reductions (15) and (16).

Example 5.18. If $w = 23154$ then using the reductions (15) and (16) leaves:

$$\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 3, \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 \leq 1, \alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 \leq 2, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 \leq 2.$$

However, $\alpha_3 + \alpha_4 \leq 1$ is actually not necessary. □

Given a polytope P , recall its *Ehrhart polynomial*, denoted $L_P(t)$, is the polynomial such that for $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $L_P(t)$ equals the number of lattice points in the polytope tP . Ehrhart [Eh62] showed that for a polytope of dimension d in \mathbb{R}^n , $L_P(t)$ is in fact a polynomial of degree d . For more see, e.g., [BR07].

Conjecture 5.19. If $L_{N(\mathcal{S}_D)}(t) = c_d t^d + \dots + c_0$, then $c_i > 0$ for $i = 0, \dots, d$.

Conjecture 5.19 also seems true for \mathcal{S}_D where D is arbitrary. We have exhaustively checked this for $n = 4$ and many random cases for $n = 5$.

Below we give some data about the positive dimensional Schubitopes \mathcal{S}_{D_w} for $w \in S_4$:

w	\mathfrak{S}_w	$\dim \mathcal{S}_{D_w}$	vertices of \mathcal{S}_{D_w}	$L_{\mathcal{S}_{D_w}}(t)$
1243	$x_1 + x_2 + x_3$	2	$(1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)$	$\frac{1}{2}t^2 + \frac{3}{2}t + 1$
1324	$x_1 + x_2$	1	$(1, 0), (0, 1)$	$t + 1$
1342	$x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + x_2x_3$	2	$(1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1)$	$\frac{1}{2}t^2 + \frac{3}{2}t + 1$
1423	$x_1^2 + x_1x_2 + x_2^2$	1	$(2, 0), (0, 2)$	$2t + 1$
1432	$x_1^2x_2 + x_1x_2^2 + x_1^2x_3$ $+ x_1x_2x_3 + x_2^2x_3$	2	$(2, 0, 1), (1, 2, 0),$ $(2, 1, 0), (0, 2, 1)$	$\frac{3}{2}t^2 + \frac{5}{2}t + 1$
2143	$x_1^2 + x_1x_2 + x_1x_3$	2	$(2, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1)$	$\frac{1}{2}t^2 + \frac{3}{2}t + 1$
2413	$x_1^2x_2 + x_1x_2^2$	1	$(2, 1), (1, 2)$	$t + 1$
2431	$x_1^2x_2x_3 + x_1x_2^2x_3$	1	$(2, 1, 1), (1, 2, 1)$	$t + 1$
3142	$x_1^2x_2 + x_1^2x_3$	1	$(2, 1, 0), (2, 0, 1)$	$t + 1$
4132	$x_1^3x_2 + x_1^3x_3$	1	$(3, 1, 0), (3, 0, 1)$	$t + 1$

5.4. Relationship of the Schubitope to Kohnert's rule. A. Kohnert [Ko90] conjectured a combinatorial rule for $\mathfrak{S}_w(X)$. Starting from D_w one moves the rightmost box in any row up to the southmost unoccupied square of $n \times n$. Repeating this gives a finite set of diagrams $\text{Koh}(w) = \{D\}$. Define

$$\text{Kohwt}(D) = \prod x_i^{\#\text{boxes of } D \text{ in row } i}.$$

Let

$$\mathfrak{K}_w = \sum_{D \in \text{Koh}(w)} \text{Kohwt}(D).$$

The conjecture is that $\mathfrak{S}_w = \mathfrak{K}_w$. For a proof see work of R. Winkel [Wi99] and of S. Assaf [As17]. With this in hand, one obtains part of Conjecture 5.1, i.e.,

Proposition 5.20. $\mathcal{S}_{D_w} \supseteq \text{Newton}(\mathfrak{K}_w)$.

Proof. Consider a diagram $D \in \text{Koh}(w)$ such that $\text{Kohwt}(D) = \alpha$. Each Kohnert move preserves the number of boxes. Hence $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = \#D_w$ holds.

Now fix a column c and $S \subseteq [n]$. Compare the positions of the boxes of D to the boxes of D_w . Let

$$T_{D,S,c} = \#\text{boxes of } D \text{ in the rows of } S \text{ and column } c.$$

Also, let $U_{D,S,c}$ be the number of pairs (r, r') , with no coordinate repeated, such that

$$r \in S, r' \notin S, r < r', (r, c) \notin D_w \text{ but } (r', c) \in D_w.$$

Since Kohnert moves only bring boxes in from lower rows into higher rows (i.e., boxes migrate from the south),

$$T_{D,S,c} \leq T_{D_w,S,c} + U_{D_w,S,c}.$$

Now it is easy to check that

$$\theta_D^c(S) = T_{D_w,S,c} + U_{D_w,S,c}.$$

Since α_i counts the number of boxes in row i of D , we have

$$\sum_{i \in S} \alpha_i = \sum_c T_{D,S,c} \leq \sum_c T_{D_w,S,c} + U_{D_w,S,c} = \sum_c \theta_D(S) = \theta_D(S),$$

as required. \square

Remark 5.21. Unlike the computation of each $\theta_D^c(s)$, the Kohnert moves are not column independent. Perhaps surprisingly, Conjecture 5.1 says that the *a priori* coarse upper bound on $\sum_{i \in S} \alpha_i$ captures all monomials appearing in the Schubert polynomial. \square

Remark 5.22. Kohnert's rule extends to key polynomials (with proof). Hence a similar argument (which we omit) establishes the " \supseteq " containment of Conjecture 3.9. \square

Fix a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n)$. Let D_λ be the Young diagram for λ (in French notation) placed flush left in $n \times n$ (hence row n has λ_1 boxes).

Proposition 5.23 (The Schubitope is a generalized permutahedron). $\mathcal{S}_{D_\lambda} = \mathcal{P}_\lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$.

Lemma 5.24. If $w(i) < w(i+1)$, \mathcal{S}_{D_w} is symmetric about i and $i+1$. That is,

$$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathcal{S}_{D_w} \iff (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}, \alpha_i, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathcal{S}_{D_w}.$$

Proof. Suppose $S \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in S, i+1 \notin S$. Let S' be the set formed from S by replacing i with $i+1$. Then it suffices to show for any column c ,

$$\theta_{D_w}^c(S) = \theta_{D_w}^c(S').$$

Since $w(i) < w(i+1)$, if $(i, c) \in D_w$, then $(i+1, c) \in D_w$ as well. There are three cases:

Case 1: $((i, c), (i+1, c) \in D_w)$: in $\text{word}_{c,S}(D_w)$, rows $i, i+1$ contributes \star) whereas in $\text{word}_{c,S'}(D_w)$ the contribution is $)\star$. The $)$ does not change whether or not it is paired and thus $\theta_{D_w}^c(S) = \theta_{D_w}^c(S')$.

Case 2: $((i, c) \notin D_w, (i+1, c) \in D_w)$: in $\text{word}_{c,S}(D_w)$, rows $i, i+1$ contributes $()$. In $\text{word}_{c,S'}(D_w)$, the contribution is only \star' . Both contribute 1 to $\theta_{D_w}^c(S)$ and $\theta_{D_w}^c(S')$ respectively. Hence $\theta_{D_w}^c(S) = \theta_{D_w}^c(S')$.

Case 3: $((i, c), (i+1, c) \notin D_w)$: in both $\text{word}_{c,S}(D_w)$ for rows $i, i+1$ and $\text{word}_{c,S'}(D_w)$, rows i and $i+1$ contribute $()$. The $()$ does not change whether or not it is paired and so $\theta_{D_w}^c(S) = \theta_{D_w}^c(S')$. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.23: By Proposition 2.5(I),

$$(17) \quad \text{Newton}(s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n)) = \mathcal{P}_\lambda \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$$

Let $w_{\lambda,n}$ be the Grassmannian permutation associated to λ . This permutation only has descent at position n . Then

$$(18) \quad \mathfrak{S}_{w_{\lambda,n}} = s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

We next show that

$$(19) \quad \mathcal{S}_{D_{w_{\lambda,n}}} = \text{Newton}(\mathfrak{S}_{w_{\lambda,n}}).$$

The " \supseteq " containment of (19) is given by Proposition 5.20. In the case at hand, this proposition can be deduced from A. Kohnert's work [Ko90] who proved his conjecture for Grassmannian permutations. Below we will use that in *loc cit.*, A. Kohnert proved the Grassmannian case by giving a weight-preserving bijection $\phi : \text{SSYT}(\lambda, [n]) \rightarrow \text{Koh}(w_{\lambda,n})$, where $\text{SSYT}(\lambda, [n])$ is the set of semistandard tableaux of shape λ with fillings using $1, 2, \dots, n$.

We now obtain the other containment of (19). Let $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathcal{S}_{D_{w_{\lambda,n}}}$. In fact, $D_{w_{\lambda,n}}$ differs from D_λ by removing empty columns and left justifying. Hence it is clear from the definition of $\theta_{D_\lambda}(S)$ that

$$(20) \quad \sum_{i=1}^t \alpha_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \text{ for } t = 1, \dots, n.$$

Lemma 5.24 implies that $D_{w_{\lambda,n}}$ has an S_n -action by permutation of the coordinates. Hence if $\beta = \lambda(\alpha)$ is the decreasing rearrangement of α , then β also satisfies (20), where β replaces α . That is, $\beta \leq_D \lambda$.

Therefore by (3), $K_{\lambda,\beta} \neq 0$ and there exists a semistandard tableau of shape λ and content β . By symmetry of $s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ (and the fact it is the weight-generating series for $\text{SSYT}(\lambda, [n])$), there is a semistandard tableau U of shape λ and content α .

Now apply Kohnert's bijection ϕ to contain $D \in \text{Koh}(w_{\lambda,n})$ with $\text{Kohwt}(D) = \alpha$, as desired. This completes the proof of (19).

Since D_w and D_λ only differ by a column permutation $\mathcal{S}_{D_\lambda} = \mathcal{S}_{D_{w_{\lambda,n}}}$. Now combine this with (19), (18) and (17). \square

The above result can be also deduced by comparing the inequalities of \mathcal{S}_{D_λ} with those for \mathcal{P}_λ . However, the above argument has elements that might apply more generally.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Alexander Barvinok, Laura Escobar, Sergey Fomin, Allen Knutson, Melinda Lanius, Fu Liu, Mark Shimozono, John Stembridge, Sue Tolman and Anna Weigandt for very helpful conversations. We thank Bruce Reznick specifically for his example of $f = x_1^2 + x_2x_3 + \dots$ we used in the introduction. AY was supported by an NSF grant. CM and NT were supported by UIUC Campus Research Board Grants. We made significant use of SAGE during our investigations.

REFERENCES

- [AgMo09] G. Agnarsson and W. D. Morris, *On Minkowski Sums of Simplices*, Ann. Comb. (2009) 13: 271.
- [As17] S. Assaf, *Combinatorial models for Schubert polynomials*, preprint, 2017. arXiv:1703.00088
- [AvVa10] D. Avella-Alaminosa and E. Vallejo, *Kronecker products and the RSK correspondence*, Discrete Math., Volume 312, Issue 8, 28 April 2012, Pages 1476–1486.
- [Ba11] C. Ballantine, *Powers of the Vandermonde determinant, Schur Functions, and recursive formulas*, DMTCS proc. **FPSAC '11**, 2011, 87–98. Proceedings of the Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (FPSAC), 2011.
- [Ba12] A. Barvinok, *Matrices with prescribed row and column sums*, Linear Algebra and its Applications, **436**(2012) 820–844.
- [BR07] M. Beck and S. Robins, *Computing the Continuous Discretely*, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2007.
- [BiJoSt93] S. Billey, W. Jockush and R. Stanley, *Some Combinatorial Properties of Schubert Polynomials*, J. of Algebraic Comb. Vol. 2 Num. 4, 1993, 345–374.
- [CaLi15] F. Castillo and F. Liu, *Berline-Vergne valuation and generalized permutohedra*, preprint, 2015. arXiv:1509.07884
- [Co10] D. Croitoru, *Mixed Volumes of Hypersimplices, Root Systems and Shifted Young Tableaux*, MIT PhD thesis, 2010.
- [Do96] W. M. Doran IV, *A proof of Reutenauer's $-q_{(n)}$ conjecture*, J. Comb. Th. Ser. A, **74**(1996), 342–344.

- [Eh62] E. Ehrhart, *Sur les polyèdres rationnels homothétiques à n dimensions*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **254**(1962), 616–618.
- [FoGr98] S. Fomin and C. Greene, *Noncommutative Schur functions and their applications*, Discrete Math. **193**(1998), 179–200, Selected papers in honor of Adriano Garsia (Taormina, 1994).
- [FoKi96] S. Fomin and A. N. Kirillov, *Combinatorial B_n -analogues of Schubert polynomials*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **348** (1996), 3591–3620.
- [GeKaZe90] I. M. Gelfand, M. M. Kapranov, and A. V. Zelevinsky, *Newton polytopes of the classical resultant and discriminant*, Adv. Math. **84**(1990), 237–254.
- [GeKaZe94] ———, *Discriminants, Resultants and Multi-Dimensional Determinants*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.
- [HHL05] J. Haglund, M. Haiman and N. Loehr, *A Combinatorial Formula for Macdonald Polynomials*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **18** (2005), 735–761.
- [HHL08] ———, *A combinatorial formula for non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials* Amer. J. Math. **130**, No. 2 (2008), 359–383.
- [HLMvW11] J. Haglund, K. Luoto, S. Mason and S. van Willigenburg, *Quasisymmetric Schur functions*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **118**, 463–490.
- [Io03] B. Ion, *Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials and Demazure characters*, Duke Math. J. **116** (2003). 299–318.
- [Ko90] A. Kohnert, *Weintrauben, Polynome, Tableaux*, Bayreuth Math. Schrift. **38**(1990), 1–97. *k-Schur Functions and Affine Schubert Calculus*
- [LLMSSZ14] T. Lam, L. Lapointe, J. Morse, A. Schilling, M. Shimozono and M. Zabrocki, *k-Schur Functions and Affine Schubert Calculus*, Fields Institute Monographs, Volume 33, Springer-Verlag New York, 2014.
- [La00] A. Lascoux, *Transition on Grothendieck polynomials*, Physics and Combinatorics, 2000 (Nagoya), pp. 164–179, World Scientific Publishing, River Edge (2001).
- [LaLeTh97] A. Lascoux, B. Leclerc and J. Y. Thibon, *Ribbon tableaux, Hall-Littlewood functions, quantum affine algebras, and unipotent varieties*, J. Math. Phys. **38**(1997), no. 2, 1041–1068.
- [LaSc82a] A. Lascoux and M.-P. Schützenberger, *Polynômes de Schubert*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **294** (1982), 447–450
- [LaSc82b] ———, *Structure de Hopf de l’anneau de cohomologie et de l’anneau de Grothendieck d’une variété de drapeaux*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, **295** (1982), 629–633.
- [Ma88] I. G. Macdonald, *A new class of symmetric functions*, Actes du 20e Séminaire Lotharingien, vol. 372/S-20, Publications I.R.M.A., Strasbourg, 1988, pp. 131–171.
- [Ma01] L. Manivel, *Symmetric functions, Schubert polynomials and degeneracy loci*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [Ma09] S. Mason, *An explicit construction of type A Demazure atoms*, J. Algebraic Combin., **29** (2009), 295–313.
- [Mo16] C. Monical *Set-Valued Skyline Fillings*, preprint, 2016. arXiv:1611.08777
- [Po05] A. Postnikov, *Permutohedra, associahedra, and beyond*, arXiv: math.CO/0507163v1, 2005.
- [Pu16] A. Pun, *A deposition of the product of Demazure atoms and Demazure characters*, preprint, 2016. arXiv:1606.02291
- [Ra52] R. Rado, *An inequality*, Journal of the London Math. Soc., **27**(1952), 1–6.
- [ReSh95] V. Reiner and M. Shimozono, V. Reiner and M. Shimozono, *Key polynomials and a flagged Littlewood-Richardson rule*, J. Comb. Theory. Ser. A., **70**(1995), 107–143.
- [Re95] C. Reutenauer, *On symmetric functions, related Witt vectors, and the free Lie algebra*, Adv. Math. **110**(1995), 234–246.
- [Sa00] S. Sahi, *Some properties of Koornwinder polynomials, q -series from a contemporary perspective*, (South Hadley, MA, 1998), Contemp. Math., vol. 254, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000, pp. 395–411.
- [ScThWy94] T. Scharf, J. Thibon and B. G. Wybourne, *Powers of the Vandermonde determinant and the quantum Hall effect*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **27** 4211–4219, 1994.
- [St84] R. P. Stanley, *On the number of reduced decompositions of elements of coxeter groups*, European Journal of Combinatorics **5** (1984), no. 4, 359 – 372.
- [St95] ———, *A symmetric function generalization of the chromatic polynomial of a graph*, Adv. Math., **111**(1995), 166–194.

- [St99] ———, *Enumerative Combinatorics, Volume 2* (with an appendix by S. Fomin), Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [St89] J. R. Stembridge, *Shifted tableaux and the projective representation of Symmetric groups*, *Adv. Math.*, **74**(1989), 87–134.
- [St91] ———, *Immanants of totally positive matrices are nonnegative*, *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 23 (1991), no. 5, 422–428.
- [Va00] E. Vallejo, *Plane partitions and characters of the symmetric group*, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **11**(2000) 79–88.
- [Wi99] R. Winkel, *Diagram rules for the generation of Schubert polynomials*, *J. Combin. Th. A.*, **86**(1999), 14–48.

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, U. ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, URBANA, IL 61801, USA

E-mail address: cmonica2@illinois.edu, tokcan2@illinois.edu, ayong@uiuc.edu