

For  $GL_2$  : (see § 2 for details)

- ground field :  $\mathbb{K}$  (any field containing  $(\mathbb{Q})q$ )
- weight lattice :  $X = \mathbb{Z}^l$
- group algebra :  $\mathbb{K}X \cong \mathbb{K}[x_i^\pm, x_i^\pm, \dots, x_l^\pm]$   $(a_1, \dots, a_l) \longleftrightarrow x_1^{a_1} x_2^{a_2} \cdots x_l^{a_l}$
- Weyl group :  $W = S_l$
- roots :  $\alpha_{ij} = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j$  for  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq l$
- positive roots :  $\alpha_{ij} = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j$  for  $1 \leq i < j \leq l$   $R^+(GL_2) := \{\alpha_{ij} : 1 \leq i < j \leq l\} = \text{set of all positive roots}$
- simple roots :  $\alpha_i = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq l-1$

Def: The Demazure-Lusztig operators is defined as

$$T_i = q s_i + (1-q) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} (s_i - 1) \quad 1 \leq i \leq l-1$$

They generate an action of the Hecke algebra  $H(S_l)$  on  $\mathbb{K}[x_1^\pm, \dots, x_l^\pm]$ .

Note:  $(T_i - q)(T_i + 1) = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Proof: } T_i - q &= \left[ q + (1-q) \frac{1}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} \right] (s_i - 1) = \frac{1 - q \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} (s_i - 1) \\ T_i + 1 &= q s_i + \frac{s_i - q s_i + q x_i - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} = q s_i + \frac{(1-q)s_i + q - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} \\ (T_i - q)(T_i + 1) &= \left( \frac{1 - q \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} (s_i - 1) \right) \left( q s_i + \frac{(1-q)s_i + q - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1 - q \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} \left( q(1-s_i) + \frac{1-q + q s_i - \frac{x_i}{x_{i+1}} s_i}{1 - \frac{x_i}{x_{i+1}}} - \frac{(1-q)s_i + q - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1 - q \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} \left( q - q s_i + \frac{x_{i+1} - q x_{i+1} + x_{i+1} q s_i - s_i}{x_{i+1} - x_i} + \frac{x_i(x_i - q s_i) + q x_i - x_{i+1}}{x_{i+1} - x_i} \right) \\ &= \frac{1 - q \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}}{1 - \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i}} \left( q - q s_i + \frac{q(x_i - x_{i+1}) + (x_{i+1} - x_i)q s_i}{x_{i+1} - x_i} \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Alternative:

$$\begin{aligned} T_i &= q T_i - s_i \theta_i \quad (T_i: \text{key operator}, \theta_i = \tau_{i-1} = \text{atom operator}) \\ (T_i - q)(T_i + 1) &= (q(\tau_{i-1} - s_i \theta_i))(q T_i - s_i \theta_i + 1) \\ &= (q - s_i)\theta_i (q \theta_i \tau_{i-1} - \theta_i s_i \theta_i + \theta_i) = (q - s_i)(-\theta_i + \theta_i) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

For  $w \in S_l$  with reduced expression  $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_m}$ , define  $T_w := T_{i_1} T_{i_2} \cdots T_{i_m}$  (well-defined because  $T_i$ 's satisfy the braid relations  $T_i T_m T_i = T_m T_i T_m$ )

\*  $\{T_w : w \in S_l\}$  form a  $\mathbb{K}$ -basis of the Hecke algebra.

and  $T_i T_j = T_j T_i \quad \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq l$

Set  $R_+ = R^+(GL_2)$  (positive roots)

$$Q = \mathbb{Z}\{\alpha_{ij} : 1 \leq i < j \leq l\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^l a_i \epsilon_i : a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \sum_{i=1}^l a_i = 0 \right\} \quad (\text{root lattice})$$

$$Q_+ = \text{SPAN}_{\mathbb{R}} \{ \alpha_{ij} : 1 \leq i < j \leq l \} \quad (\text{cone in the root lattice } Q)$$

Recall:  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l) \in \mathbb{Z}^l$  : dominant if  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_l$

: regular if  $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j \quad \forall i \neq j$

has trivial stabilizer in  $S_l$

For dominant weights, we define

$\mu \geq \lambda \quad \text{if } \mu - \lambda \in Q_+$  (if  $\lambda, \mu$  are partitions, this is the same as dominance order on partitions)

e.g.  $(4, 4, 3, 2) \geq (4, 3, 3, 2, 2)$  in dominance order

$$(4, 4, 3, 2) - (4, 3, 3, 2, 2) = (0, 1, 1, 0, -2) = \alpha_{25} + \alpha_{35} \in Q_+$$

Notation: For  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^l$ , denote  $\lambda^+ = \text{dominant weight in the orbit } S_l \cdot \lambda$  (i.e. permute entries st. they are weakly decreasing).

Let  $\text{conv}(S_l \cdot \lambda)$  be the convex hull of the orbit  $S_l \cdot \lambda$  in the coset  $\lambda + Q$  of the root lattice, i.e. the set of weights that occur with nonzero multiplicity in the irreducible character  $\chi_{\lambda^+}$

e.g.  $\lambda = 2$ ,  $Q = \{(a, -a) : a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Take  $\lambda = (10, -2)$   $\therefore \lambda = \lambda_+$  (same result if we choose  $\lambda = (-2, 10)$ )

Then  $S_Q \cdot \lambda = \{(10, -2), (-2, 10)\}$

$$\lambda + Q = \{(10+a, -2-a) : a \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Hence orbit  $S_Q \cdot \lambda$  has endpoints with  $a=0$  and  $a=-10$ .

$$\therefore \text{conv}(S_Q \cdot \lambda) = \{(10+a, -2-a) : -10 \leq a \leq 0\}$$

$$= \{(-a, 10), (-1, 9), (0, 8), (1, 7), (2, 6), (3, 5), (4, 4), (5, 3), (6, 2), (7, 1), (8, 0), (9, -1), (10, -2)\}$$

$$\text{Note that } X_{\lambda_+} = X_1^{10}X_2^{-2} + X_1^9X_2^{-1} + X_1^8X_2^0 + X_1^7X_2^1 + X_1^6X_2^2 + X_1^5X_2^3 + X_1^4X_2^4 + X_1^3X_2^5 + X_1^2X_2^6 + X_1X_2^7 + X_1^0X_2^8 + X_1^{-1}X_2^9 + X_1^{-2}X_2^{10}$$

$$= \sum_{(a,b) \in \text{conv}(S_Q \cdot \lambda)} X_1^a X_2^b \quad (\text{Hence these terms are the non-vanishing terms in } X_{\lambda_+})$$

Note that  $\text{conv}(S_Q \cdot \lambda) \subseteq \text{conv}(S_Q \cdot \mu)$  iff  $\lambda_+ \leq \mu_+$  (b/c  $S_Q \cdot \lambda_+ \subseteq \text{conv}(S_Q \cdot \mu)$  iff  $\lambda_+ \leq \mu_+$ )

e.g.  $\mu = (12, -4) > \lambda = (10, -2)$  b/c  $\mu - \lambda = (2, -2) = 2(a_2, -a_1) \in Q_+$  ( $\mu_+ = \mu$  in this case)

$$S_Q \cdot \mu = \{(12, -4), (-4, 12)\}$$

$$\mu + Q = \{(12+a, -4-a) : a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

Hence orbit  $S_Q \cdot \mu$  has endpoints with  $a=0$  and  $a=-16$

$$\text{conv}(S_Q \cdot \mu) = \{(12+a, -4-a) : -16 \leq a \leq 0\}$$

$$= \{(-4, 12), (-3, 11), (-2, 10), (-1, 9), (0, 8), (1, 7), (2, 6), (3, 5), (4, 4), (5, 3), (6, 2), (7, 1), (8, 0), (9, -1), (10, -2), (11, -3), (12, -4)\}$$

$$= \{(-4, 12), (-3, 11), (11, -3), (12, -4)\} \sqcup \text{conv}(S_Q \cdot \lambda)$$

$$\therefore \text{conv}(S_Q \cdot \lambda) \subseteq \text{conv}(S_Q \cdot \mu)$$

Each orbit  $S_Q \cdot \lambda_+$  has a partial ordering induced by the Bruhat ordering on  $S_Q$ .

This ordering is the transitive closure of the relation  $s_i \lambda > \lambda$  if  $\langle a_i^\vee, \lambda \rangle > 0$ .

$$\text{e.g. } \lambda = (2, 4, 1, 5, 2) \quad \langle a_1^\vee, \lambda \rangle = 2-4 = -2 < 0, \quad \langle a_2^\vee, \lambda \rangle = 4-1 = 3 > 0, \quad \langle a_3^\vee, \lambda \rangle = 1-5 = -4 < 0, \quad \langle a_4^\vee, \lambda \rangle = 5-2 = 3 > 0$$

Hence  $S_Q \cdot \lambda > \lambda$  and  $s_i \lambda > \lambda$

$$\text{i.e. } (2, 1, 4, 5, 2) > (2, 4, 1, 5, 2) \text{ and } (2, 4, 1, 2, 5) > (2, 4, 1, 5, 2)$$

$$\text{Similarly, } (1, 2, 4, 5, 2) > (2, 1, 4, 5, 2) > (2, 4, 1, 5, 2)$$

We extend this to all of  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  (instead of just within  $S_Q \cdot \lambda$ ) by defining

$$\lambda \leq \mu \text{ if } \lambda_+ < \mu_+ \text{ or } (\lambda_+ = \mu_+ \text{ and } \lambda \leq \mu \text{ in the Bruhat order on } S_Q \cdot \lambda_+)$$

e.g. We know  $(2, 4, 1, 5, 2) \lessdot (2, 4, 1, 2, 5)$  b/c  $\langle a_4^\vee, (2, 4, 1, 5, 2) \rangle = 5-2 = 3 > 0 \Rightarrow (2, 4, 1, 2, 5) \gtrdot (2, 4, 1, 5, 2)$

• Take  $\lambda = (2, 4, 1, 5, 2)$ ,  $\mu = (3, 5, 1, 5, 2)$

Then  $\lambda_+ = (5, 4, 2, 2, 1)$ ,  $\mu_+ = (5, 5, 3, 2, -1)$

$$\mu_+ - \lambda_+ = (0, 1, 1, 0, -2) = a_{25} + a_{35} \in Q_+ \Rightarrow \mu_+ > \lambda_+$$

Hence  $(2, 4, 1, 5, 2) \lessdot (3, 5, 1, 5, 2)$ .

Suppose  $\langle a_i^\vee, \lambda \rangle > 0$ .

$$\text{Case I) } \langle a_i^\vee, \lambda \rangle = 0 \text{ i.e. } s_i \lambda = \lambda. \text{ Then } T_i x^\lambda = g x^\lambda \quad (\text{b/c } (s_i - 1)\lambda = 0 \Rightarrow T_i x^\lambda = g s_i x^\lambda = g \frac{x^{\lambda}}{g} = g x^\lambda) \quad \begin{matrix} T_i \\ a=b \\ (a,b) \end{matrix} \quad \begin{matrix} \frac{g}{g} \\ (a,b) \end{matrix}$$

$$\text{Case II) } \langle a_i^\vee, \lambda \rangle > 0. \text{ Then } T_i x^\lambda = g x^{\lambda_i} + \left(\frac{g}{b}\right) \sum_{k=0}^{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}} \lambda_{i+1} \dots \lambda_{n-1} X_k$$

$$T_i x^{\lambda_i} = x^{\lambda_i} + \left(\frac{1-g}{b}\right) \sum_{k=1}^{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}} \lambda_{i+1} \dots \lambda_{n-1} X_k$$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & & & \\ & \overset{g-1}{\bullet} & \overset{g-1}{\bullet} & & & & \\ & (a,b) & (a-1,b+1) & \dots & (b+(a-1),b,a) & & \\ & \overset{0}{\bullet} & \overset{-g}{\bullet} & & & & \\ & (a,b) & (a-1,b+1) & \dots & (b+(a-1),b,a) & & \\ & \overset{g}{\bullet} & \overset{g}{\bullet} & & & & \\ & (b,a) & (b-1,a+1) & \dots & (a+(b-1),a,b) & & \end{array}$$

These are strictly inside  $\text{conv}(S_Q \cdot \lambda)$

Consider  $\mu$  s.t.  $s_i \mu \leq s_i \lambda$

- If  $\mu_+ < (s_i \lambda)_+$ , since  $(s_i \mu)_+ = \mu_+$ , we have  $(s_i \mu)_+ < (s_i \lambda)_+$  and hence  $s_i \mu < s_i \lambda$ .
- If  $\mu_+ = (s_i \lambda)_+$  and  $\mu \leq s_i \lambda$  in Bruhat order on  $S_{\mathbb{Z}} \cdot \mu_+$ , and if  $\langle \alpha_i^\vee, \mu \rangle > 0$ , then  $\langle \alpha_i^\vee, s_i \mu \rangle \geq 0$  and hence  $s_i \mu < \mu \leq s_i \lambda$ .  
If  $\langle \alpha_i^\vee, \mu \rangle > 0$ , then as  $\langle \alpha_i^\vee, \lambda \rangle > 0$ , we know  $\langle \alpha_i^\vee, s_i \lambda \rangle < 0$ . Hence  $\langle \alpha_i^\vee, \mu \rangle > 0$  and  $\mu \leq s_i \lambda$  with  $\langle \alpha_i^\vee, \lambda \rangle < 0$  means  $s_i \mu < s_i \lambda$ .

Hence  $s_i \mu \leq s_i \lambda$ .

As a result, the set  $\{x^\mu : \mu \leq s_i \lambda\}$  is  $s_i$ -invariant.

Given any root  $\nu$ ,  $(\nu + \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i) \cap \{\mu : \mu \leq s_i \lambda\}$  is convex, i.e. if  $\nu + k_1 \alpha_i, \nu + k_2 \alpha_i \leq s_i \lambda$  for some  $k_1 \leq k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $\nu + k \alpha_i \leq s_i \lambda$  if  $k_1 \leq k \leq k_2$ .

↪ b/c  $(\nu + k \alpha_i) \leq (\nu + k_1 \alpha_i)_+ \leq s_i \lambda$

Hence  $\text{lk}_i(\{x^\mu : \mu \leq s_i \lambda\})$  is closed under  $T_i$ .

∴ For  $\langle \alpha_i^\vee, \lambda \rangle > 0$  and  $c_\mu \in \text{lk}_i(\{x^\mu : \mu \leq s_i \lambda\})$ , we have:

$$T_i(x^\lambda + \sum_{\mu < \lambda} c_\mu x^\mu) = g x^{s_i \lambda} + \sum_{\mu \leq s_i \lambda} d_\mu x^\mu \quad \text{for some } d_\mu \in \text{lk}_i$$

Then  $\mu < \lambda \leq s_i \lambda$

(b/c there is a path from  $\mu$  to  $s_i \lambda$   
and  $s_i$  must be involved in the path  
b/c  $\mu_+ > \lambda_+$  but  $(s_i \mu)_+ < (s_i \lambda)_+$ .  
Then there is a path with the same  
length that starts with  $s_i$  from  $\mu$  to  
 $s_i \mu$  and hence  
 $s_i \mu \leq s_i \lambda$ )