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Abstract

We give an explanation for the Pieri coefficients for the stable and dual stable Grothendieck polynomials; their non-leading terms are obtained by taking an alternating sum of meets (or joins) of their leading terms.

1 Introduction

The stable Grothendieck polynomials $G_\lambda$ and the dual stable Grothendieck polynomials $g_\lambda$ are certain families of inhomogeneous symmetric functions parametrized by integer partitions $\lambda$. They are certain $K$-theoretic deformations of the Schur functions and dual to each other via the Hall inner product.

Historically the stable Grothendieck polynomials (parametrized by permutations) were introduced by Fomin and Kirillov [FK96] as a stable limit of the Grothendieck polynomials of Lascoux–Schützenberger [LS82]. In [Buc02] Buch gave a combinatorial formula for the stable Grothendieck polynomials $G_\lambda$ for partitions using so-called set-valued tableaux, and showed that their span $\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{Z}G_\lambda$ is a bialgebra and its certain quotient ring is isomorphic to the $K$-theory of the Grassmannian $\text{Gr} = \text{Gr}(k, \mathbb{C}^n)$.

The dual stable Grothendieck polynomials $g_\lambda$ were introduced by Lam and Pylyavskyy [LP07] as generating functions of reverse plane partitions, and shown to be the dual basis for $G_\lambda$ via the Hall inner product. They also showed there that $g_\lambda$ represent the $K$-homology classes of ideal sheaves of the boundaries of Schubert varieties in the Grassmannians.

The Pieri rule for $G_\lambda$ (1) was given in [Len00], and that for $g_\lambda$ (2) was given in [Buc02] as a formula for coproduct structure constants of $G_\lambda$. Both formulas involve certain binomials coefficients, and we show in this paper that these coefficients are the values of the Möbius functions of certain posets of horizontal strips (Lemma 3.1) and hence the Pieri formulas are written as alternating sums of meets/joins of the leading terms (Proposition 3.2 and 3.3). We also explain in Section 2.2 that the linear map $g_\lambda \mapsto \sum_{\mu \subseteq \lambda} g_\mu$ ($=: \tilde{g}_\lambda$) is a ring automorphism and the linear map $G_\lambda \mapsto \sum_{\mu \supseteq \lambda} G_\mu$ ($=: \tilde{G}_\lambda$) is a multiplication map. With these bases, the Pieri rules are rewritten as certain multiplicity-free sums ((6) and (9) in Proposition 3.2 and 3.3).
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2 Stable and dual stable Grothendieck polynomials

For basic definitions for symmetric functions, see for instance [Mac95, Chapter I].
Let \( P \) be the set of integer partitions. For partitions \( \lambda, \mu \in P \), the inclusion \( \lambda \subset \mu \) means \( \lambda_i \leq \mu_i \) for all \( i \), and \( \lambda \cap \mu \) and \( \lambda \cup \mu \) are given by \((\lambda \cap \mu)_i = \min(\lambda_i, \mu_i) \) and \((\lambda \cup \mu)_i = \max(\lambda_i, \mu_i) \) for all \( i \). In other words, \( \cap \) and \( \cup \) are the meet and join of the poset \((P, \subset)\).

Let \( \Lambda \) be the ring of symmetric functions, namely consisting of all symmetric formal power series in variable \( x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots) \) with bounded degree. Let \( \Lambda \) be its completion, consisting of all symmetric formal power series (with unbounded degree).

In [Buc02 Theorem 3.1] Buch gave a combinatorial description of the stable Grothendieck polynomial \( G_\lambda \) as a (signed) generating function of so-called set-valued tableaux. We do not review the detail here and just recall some of its properties: \( G_\lambda \in \hat{\Lambda} \) (although \( G_\lambda \notin \Lambda \)), \( G_\lambda \) is an infinite linear combination of the Schur functions \( \{ s_\mu \}_{\mu \in P} \) and its lowest degree component is \( s_\lambda \) (hence \( \hat{\Lambda} = \prod_{\lambda \in P} \mathbb{Z}G_\lambda \)). Moreover the span \( \bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathbb{Z}G_\lambda \subset \hat{\Lambda} \) is a bialgebra, in particular the expansion of the product \( G_\mu G_\nu = \sum_c c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda G_\lambda \) and the coproduct \( \Delta(G_\lambda) = \sum_{\mu,\nu} d_{\mu\nu}^\lambda G_\mu \otimes G_\nu \) are finite.

The dual stable Grothendieck polynomial \( g_\lambda \) (for \( \lambda \in P \)) is defined in [LP07] as the generating function of so-called reverse plane partitions of shape \( \lambda \). It is also shown there that \( g_\lambda \in \Lambda \) and \( g_\lambda \) has the highest degree component \( s_\lambda \) and thus forms a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-basis of \( \Lambda \). Moreover \( g_\lambda \) is dual to \( G_\lambda \): it holds \( \langle G_\lambda, g_\mu \rangle = \delta_{\lambda\mu} \) where \( \langle , \rangle : \hat{\Lambda} \times \Lambda \to \mathbb{Z} \) is the Hall inner product. Hence the product (resp. coproduct) structure constants for \( G_\lambda \) coincide with the coproduct (resp. product) structure constants for \( g_\lambda \): it holds \( g_\mu g_\nu = \sum_c c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda g_\lambda \) and \( \Delta(g_\lambda) = \sum_{\mu,\nu} d_{\mu\nu}^\lambda g_\mu \otimes g_\nu \).

### 2.1 Pieri rules

The (row) Pieri formula for \( G_\lambda \) was given by Lenart [Len00 Theorem 3.2]: for any partition \( \lambda \in P \) and integer \( a \geq 0 \),

\[
G_{(a)}G_\lambda = \sum_{\mu/\lambda: \text{horizontal strip}} (-1)^{|\mu/\lambda| - a} \binom{r(\mu/\lambda) - 1}{|\mu/\lambda| - a} G_\mu, \tag{1}
\]

where \( r(\mu/\lambda) \) denotes the number of the rows in the skew shape \( \mu/\lambda \). Subsequently, the (row) Pieri formula for \( g_\lambda \) is given in [Buc02 Corollary 7.1] (as a formula for \( d_{\lambda,(a)}^\mu \), the coproduct structure constants for \( G_\lambda \)):

\[
g_{(a)}g_\lambda = \sum_{\mu/\lambda: \text{horizontal strip}} (-1)^{a - |\mu/\lambda|} \binom{r(\lambda/\mu)}{a - |\mu/\lambda|} g_\mu, \tag{2}
\]

where \( \mu = (\mu_2, \mu_3, \ldots) \).

### 2.2 Their sums

For \( \lambda \in P \) we let \( \bar{g}_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \subset \lambda} g_\mu \) (\( \in \Lambda \)), \( \bar{G}_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \supset \lambda} G_\mu \) (\( \in \hat{\Lambda} \)).

It is known (see [Buc02 Section 8]) that \( (1 - G_{1})^{-1} = \sum_{\lambda \in P} G_\lambda \) and

\[
(1 - G_{1})^{-1}G_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \supset \lambda} G_\mu \quad (\mathcal{G}_\lambda). \tag{3}
\]

It is also easy to see that \( 1 - G_{1} = \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i e_i \) and hence \( (1 - G_{1})^{-1} = \sum_{i \geq 0} h_i =: H(f) \), where \( e_i \) and \( h_i \) are the elementary and complete symmetric functions.

Recall the notation \( F^\perp(f) = \sum (F; f_1) f_2 \) for \( F \in \hat{\Lambda}, f \in \Lambda \) and \( \Delta(f) = \sum f_1 \otimes f_2 \) with the Sweedler notation, and that the multiplication map by \( F \) is the dual map of \( F^\perp \). From this, \( \mathcal{G}_\lambda \) and \( g_\lambda \) are dual, we see that \( H(1)^\perp(g_\lambda) = \bar{g}_\lambda \). Besides it is known (see [Mac95 Chapter 1.5, Example 29]) that \( H(1)^\perp(f(x_1, x_2, \ldots)) = f(1, x_1, x_2, \ldots) \) for any \( f \) in \( \Lambda \), and hence \( H(1)^\perp \) is a ring morphism. Since \( F^\perp G^\perp = (GF)^\perp \) in general, that \( H(1)^\perp \) is invertible implies that so is \( H(1)^\perp \). Hence we have
Proposition 2.1. Let $H(1) = \sum_{i \geq 0} h_i$. The map $H(1)^\perp : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ is a ring automorphism and

$$g_\lambda(x) = H(1)^\perp (g_\lambda(x)) = g_\lambda(1, x).$$

where we write $f(x) = f(x_1, x_2, \cdots)$ and $f(1, x) = f(1, x_1, x_2, \cdots)$.

Note that we can directly show $\tilde{g}_\lambda(x_1, x_2, \cdots) = g_\lambda(1, x_1, x_2, \cdots)$ from the fact that $g_\lambda$ is a generating function of reverse plane partitions; see [Taka] for more details. As seen in Section 2.3 below, $\tilde{g}_\lambda$ correspond to the classes in $K$-homology of the structure sheaves of Schubert varieties in the Grassmannian.

2.3 $K$-(co)homology of Grassmannians

We recall geometric interpretations of $G_\lambda$ and $g_\lambda$. Let $Gr(k, n)$ be the Grassmannian of $k$-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^n$, $R = (n - k)^k$ the rectangle of shape $(n - k) \times k$, and $O_\lambda$ (for $\lambda \subset R$) the structure sheaves of Schubert varieties of $Gr(k, n)$. The $K$-theory $K^*(Gr(k, n))$, the Grothendieck group of algebraic vector bundles on $Gr(k, n)$, has a basis $\{[O_\lambda]\}_{\lambda \subset R}$, and the surjection $\bigoplus_{\lambda \subset R} \mathbb{Z}G_\lambda \rightarrow K^*(Gr(k, n)) = \bigoplus_{\lambda \subset R} \mathbb{Z}[O_\lambda]$ maps $G_\lambda$ to $[O_\lambda]$ (which is considered as 0 if $\lambda \not\subset R$) is an algebra homomorphism [Buc02].

There is another basis of $K^*(Gr(k, n))$ consisting of the classes $[I_\lambda]$ of ideal sheaves of boundaries of Schubert varieties. In [Buc02] Section 8 it is shown that the bases $\{[O_\lambda]\}_{\lambda \subset R}$ and $\{[I_\lambda]\}_{\lambda \subset R}$ relates to each other by $[O_\lambda] = \sum_{\mu \subset \lambda \subset R} [I_\mu]$ and that they are dual: more precisely $([O_\lambda], [I_\mu]) = \delta_{\lambda\mu}$ where $\tilde{\mu} = (n - k - \mu_1, \cdots, n - k - \mu_k)$ is the rotated complement of $\mu \subset R$ and the pairing $(,)$ is defined by $(\alpha, \beta) = \rho_* (\alpha \otimes \beta)$ where $\rho_*$ is the pushforward to a point.

The $K$-homology $K_*(Gr(k, n))$, the Grothendieck group of coherent sheaves, is naturally isomorphic to $K^*(Gr(k, n))$. Lam and Pylyavskyy proved in [LP07] Theorem 9.16 that the surjection $\lambda = \bigoplus_{\mu \subset \lambda} \mathbb{Z}g_\mu \rightarrow K_*(Gr(k, n)) = \bigoplus_{\mu \subset \lambda} \mathbb{Z}[I_\mu]$ that maps $g_\mu$ to $[I_\mu]$ (which is considered as 0 if $\lambda \not\subset R$) identifies the coproduct and product on $\lambda$ with the pushforwards of the diagonal embedding map and the direct sum map.

Since $\lambda \subset \mu \iff \tilde{\mu} \supset \tilde{\lambda}$, under this identification we see that $\sum_{\mu \subset \lambda} g_\mu \in \Lambda$ corresponds to $[O_\lambda] \in K_*(Gr(k, n))$.

3 Description for the Pieri coefficients

In this section we give an explanation for the Pieri coefficients for $G_\lambda$ [11] and $g_\lambda$ [2]; their non-leading terms (higher-degree terms for the case of $G_\lambda$; lower-degree terms for the case of $g_\lambda$) are obtained by taking an alternating sum of meets/joins of the leading terms ([3] and [11]). Another equivalent description is that the product $G_\lambda G_\mu$ (resp. $g_\lambda g_\mu$) is expanded into a certain multiplicity-free sum of $G_\mu$ (resp. $g_\mu$) ([11] and [3]).

The key fact is that the coefficients in the Pieri rule [11] and [2] are values of the Möbius functions of certain posets of horizontal strips over $\lambda$: for $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let

$$HS(\lambda) = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P} \mid \mu/\lambda \text{ is a horizontal strip}\},$$

$$HS_{\leq a}(\lambda) = \{\mu \in HS(\lambda) \mid |\mu/\lambda| \leq a\}, \quad \tilde{HS}_{\leq a}(\lambda) = HS_{\leq a}(\lambda) \sqcup \{\hat{1}\},$$

$$HS_{\geq a}(\lambda) = \{\mu \in HS(\lambda) \mid |\mu/\lambda| \geq a\}, \quad \tilde{HS}_{\geq a}(\lambda) = HS_{\geq a}(\lambda) \sqcup \{\hat{0}\}.$$

Here $\hat{0}$ and $\hat{1}$ are the minimum and maximal elements. For a poset $P$, let $\mu_P$ denote its Möbius function (see Appendix [A]). Then we have

$$\text{Lemma 3.1.} \ (1) \text{ For any } \mu \in HS_{\geq a}(\lambda), \text{ we have } c_{\lambda,(a)}^{\mu} = -\mu_{\tilde{HS}_{\leq a}(\lambda)}(\hat{0}, \mu). \text{ That is,}$$

$$\sum_{\mu \geq \nu \in HS_{\geq a}(\lambda)} c_{\lambda,(a)}^{\mu} = 1. \quad (4)$$
(2) For any \( \mu \in \text{HS}_{\leq a}(\lambda) \), we have \( d^\mu_{\lambda(a)} = -\mu_{\text{HS}_{\leq a}(\lambda)}(\mu, \hat{1}) \). That is,

\[
\sum_{\mu \subseteq \nu \in \text{HS}_{\leq a}(\lambda)} d^\nu_{\lambda(a)} = 1. \tag{5}
\]

Before proving Lemma 3.1 we show the following propositions. Let \( \lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)}, \ldots \) be the list of all horizontal strips over \( \lambda \) of size \( a \). Then

**Proposition 3.2.** We have

\[
\tilde{g}(a)\tilde{g}_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \subseteq \lambda^{(i)} \text{ for } \exists i} g_\mu \tag{6}
\]

\[
= \sum_i \tilde{g}(\mu^{(i)}) - \sum_{i < j} \tilde{g}(\mu^{(i)} \cap \mu^{(j)}) + \sum_{i < j < k} \tilde{g}(\mu^{(i)} \cap \mu^{(j)} \cap \mu^{(k)}) - \cdots, \tag{7}
\]

and

\[
g(a)g_\lambda = \sum_i g(\lambda^{(i)}) - \sum_{i < j} g(\lambda^{(i)} \cap \lambda^{(j)}) + \sum_{i < j < k} g(\lambda^{(i)} \cap \lambda^{(j)} \cap \lambda^{(k)}) - \cdots. \tag{8}
\]

**Proposition 3.3.** We have

\[
G(\mu)\tilde{G}_\lambda = \sum_{\mu \subseteq \lambda^{(i)} \text{ for } \exists i} G_\mu \tag{9}
\]

\[
= \sum_i \tilde{G}(\lambda^{(i)}) - \sum_{i < j} \tilde{G}(\lambda^{(i)} \cup \lambda^{(j)}) + \sum_{i < j < k} \tilde{G}(\lambda^{(i)} \cup \lambda^{(j)} \cup \lambda^{(k)}) - \cdots, \tag{10}
\]

and

\[
G(a)\tilde{G}_\lambda = \sum_i G(\lambda^{(i)}) - \sum_{i < j} G(\lambda^{(i)} \cup \lambda^{(j)}) + \sum_{i < j < k} G(\lambda^{(i)} \cup \lambda^{(j)} \cup \lambda^{(k)}) - \cdots. \tag{11}
\]

Note that the left-hand side of (9) is not \( G(\mu)\tilde{G}_\lambda \) but \( G(\mu)\tilde{G}_\lambda \) while that of (10) is \( \tilde{g}(a)\tilde{g}_\lambda \), reflecting the fact that the map \( G(\mu) \rightarrow \tilde{G}_\lambda \) is a module morphism while \( g(\mu) \rightarrow \tilde{g}_\lambda \) is a ring morphism.

**Remark 3.4.** (6) and (7) are mere specializations of corresponding results for *affine dual stable Grothendieck polynomials* \( g^{(k)}_\lambda \) shown in [Takb], but here we give another proof since it is easier and also applicable to \( G(\mu) \). It is also notable that in the affine case (that is, for \( g^{(k)}_\lambda \)) equations of the form (6) and (7) hold but (8) does not.

In an earlier version of this paper\(^1\) there was an exposition of the proof of (6) and (7) that is adopted from [Takb] and optimized for the non-affine case, and by using this and the argument of Lemma 3.1 the fact that \( g(\mu) \rightarrow \tilde{g}_\lambda \) is a ring morphism was derived. Later, a simpler proof for this was found (as given in Section 2.2) and the exposition became unnecessary and therefore has been removed.

**Proof of Proposition 3.2** The right-hand sides of (6) and (7) are equal by the Inclusion-Exclusion Principle, and (7) and (8) are equivalent by Proposition 2.1.

Let \( P \) be the order ideal of \( \mathcal{P} \) generated by \( \{\lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)}, \cdots\} \) (i.e. the set of \( \mu \in \mathcal{P} \) satisfying \( \mu \subseteq \lambda^{(i)} \) for some \( i \)) and \( \hat{P} = P \cup \{\hat{1}\} \) where \( \hat{1} \) is the maximum element. Note that \( \{\lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)}, \cdots\} \) is the set of coatoms
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in $\hat{P}$ and $\hat{\text{HS}}_{\leq a}(\lambda) \subset \hat{P}$ is closed under meet. Then

$$\bar{g}_\lambda \bar{g}(a) = \sum_\nu \lambda(\nu) \bar{g}_\nu$$

(2) and Proposition 2.1

$$= - \sum_\nu \mu_{\text{HS}_{\leq a}(\lambda)}(\nu, 1) \bar{g}_\nu$$

(Lemma 3.1 (2))

$$= - \sum_\nu \mu_P(\nu, 1) \bar{g}_\nu$$

(Lemma A.1 (3))

$$= \sum_{\mu \in P} g_\mu.$$  

(Lemma A.1 (1))

Hence (6) follows.

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Similarly to Proposition 3.2, the equivalence of (9), (10) and (11) follows and we have by (1), (3), Lemma 3.1 (1) and Lemma A.1 (with all ordering reversed)

$$\bar{G}_\lambda G(a) = \sum_\nu \lambda(\nu) \bar{G}_\nu = \sum_{\mu \in Q} G_\mu,$$

where $Q$ is the order filter of $P$ generated by $\{\lambda(1), \lambda(2), \ldots\}$, i.e. the set of $\mu \in P$ satisfying $\mu \supset \lambda(i)$ for some $i$. Hence (9) follows.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Fix $\lambda \in P$. Let $r_0 < r_1 < \cdots < r_t$ be the row indices for which rows there are addable corners of $\lambda$, i.e. $\lambda_{r_i - 1} > \lambda_{r_i}$ (we consider $\lambda_0 = \infty$, whence $r_0 = 1$). Let $n_i = \lambda_{r_i - 1} - \lambda_{r_i}$, i.e. the number of boxes that can be added to $\lambda$ in the $r_i$-th row (we consider $n_0 = \infty$). Then

$$\text{HS}(\lambda) \simeq \{(b_0, \ldots, b_t) \in \mathbb{Z}^{t+1} \mid 0 \leq b_i \leq n_i \text{ (for } 0 \leq i \leq t)\},$$

where $(b_0, \ldots, b_t)$ in the right-hand side corresponds to the partition obtained by adding $b_i$ boxes to $\lambda$ in the $r_i$-th row.

Under this correspondence $\mu \mapsto (b_0, \ldots, b_t)$ and $\nu \mapsto (c_0, \ldots, c_t)$, we have $\nu \subset \mu \iff c_i \leq b_i$ (for all $i$) and

$$|\nu/\lambda| = \sum_{i=0}^t c_i, \quad r(\nu/\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^t \delta[c_i > 0], \quad r(\lambda/\nu) = \sum_{i=1}^t \delta[c_i < n_i],$$  

(12)

where we use the notation $\delta[P] = 1$ if $P$ is true and $\delta[P] = 0$ if $P$ is false for a condition $P$.

Now we prove (4). For $\mu \in \text{HS}_{\geq a}(\lambda)$ by (12) we have

$$(\text{LHS of (4)}) = \sum_{\nu \in \text{HS}_{\geq a}(\lambda)} (-1)^{|\nu/\lambda| - a} \left( \frac{r(\nu/\lambda) - 1}{|\nu/\lambda| - a} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{0 \leq c_0 \leq b_0} \sum_{0 \leq c_1 \leq b_1} \ldots \sum_{0 \leq c_t \leq b_t} \delta \left[ \sum_{i=0}^t c_i \geq a \right] (-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^t c_i - a} \left( \frac{\sum_{i=0}^t \delta[c_i > 0] - 1}{\sum_{i=0}^t c_i - a} \right).$$  

(13)

5
Applying Lemma 3.5 below to simplify the summation on \( c_t \), we have

\[
= \sum_{0 \leq c_0 \leq b_0} \ldots \sum_{0 \leq c_{t-1} \leq b_{t-1}} \delta \left[ b_t + \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} c_i \geq a \right] (-1)^{b_t + \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} c_i - a} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \delta \left[ c_i > 0 \right] - 1 \right).
\]

Repeating this to simplify the summations on \( c_0, \ldots, c_{t-1} \), we have

\[
= \ldots = \delta \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{t} b_i \geq a \right] (-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^{t} b_i - a} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} b_i - a \right) = \delta [\|\mu/\lambda\| \geq a] = 1.
\]

Hence (4) is proved.

Next we prove (5). By similar arguments we have

\[
\text{(LHS of (5))} = \sum_{b_0 \leq c_0 \leq n_0} b_1 \leq c_1 \leq n_1 \ldots \sum_{b_t \leq c_t \leq n_t} \delta \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{t} c_i \leq a \right] (-1)^{a - \sum_{i=0}^{t} c_i} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{t} \delta \left[ c_i < n_i \right] \right).
\]

Note that this is actually a finite sum despite \( n_0 = \infty \), and we can replace \( n_0 \) with a sufficiently large positive integer without changing the value of (14). Noticing \( \delta \left[ c_0 < n_0 \right] = 1 \) for any \( c_0 \) that contributes to the summation (14), and letting \( b'_i = n_i - b_i, c'_i = n_i - c_i \) and \( a' = (\sum_{i=0}^{t} n_i) - a \), we have

\[
\text{(14)} = \sum_{0 \leq c'_0 \leq b'_0} \ldots \sum_{0 \leq c'_t \leq b'_t} \delta \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{t} c'_i \geq a' \right] (-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^{t} c'_i - a'} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{t} \delta \left[ c'_i > 0 \right] - 1 \right).
\]

Since this summation is of the same form as (14), by the same arguments we have

\[
= \delta \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{t} b'_i \geq a' \right] = \delta \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{t} b_i \leq a \right] = \delta [\|\mu/\lambda\| \leq a] = 1.
\]

Hence (5) is proved. \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.5.** For \( R, q, b, b' \in \mathbb{Z} \) with \( b' \leq b \), we have

\[
\sum_{b' \leq x \leq b} \delta \left[ x \geq R \right] (-1)^{x - R} \left( q + \delta \left[ x > b' \right] \right) = \delta \left[ b \geq R \right] (-1)^{b - R} \left( q \left( \frac{b}{b'} - R \right) \right),
\]

where we use the notation \( \delta \left[ P \right] = 1 \) if \( P \) is true and \( \delta \left[ P \right] = 0 \) if \( P \) is false for a condition \( P \).

**Proof.** We carry induction on \( b' - b \). The lemma is clear when \( b' = b \). When \( b' < b \), it is easy to check

\[
-\delta \left[ b' \geq R \right] \left( \frac{q}{b' - R} \right) + \delta \left[ b' + 1 \geq R \right] \left( \frac{q + 1}{b' + 1 - R} \right) = \delta \left[ b' + 1 \geq R \right] \left( \frac{q}{b' + 1 - R} \right).
\]

Hence we can replace \( b' \) with \( b' + 1 \), completing the proof. \( \square \)
A M"obius function of a poset

For basic definitions for posets we refer the reader to [Sta12, Chapter 3].

For a locally finite (i.e. every interval is finite) poset $P$, the M"obius function $\mu_P(x, y)$ (for $x, y \in P$ with $x \leq y$) is characterized by

$$\sum_{x \leq z \leq y} \mu_P(x, z) = \delta_{xy} \quad \text{for any } x \leq y,$$

or equivalently

$$\sum_{x \leq z \leq y} \mu_P(z, y) = \delta_{xy} \quad \text{for any } x \leq y.$$

Lemma A.1. Let $\hat{P}$ be a locally finite poset with the maximum element $\hat{1}$. Let $P = \hat{P} \setminus \{\hat{1}\}$ and $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ be the maximal elements in $P$, i.e. the coatoms in $\hat{P}$. Consider formal variables $\{g(s) \mid s \in \hat{P}\}$ and let $\tilde{g}(t) = \sum_{s \leq t} g(s)$ for $t \in \hat{P}$.

(1) We have

$$\sum_{s \in P} g(s) = -\sum_{s \in P} \mu_{\hat{P}}(s, \hat{1}) \tilde{g}(s).$$

(2) Assume that $P$ admits the meet operation $\wedge$. Then

$$\sum_{s \in P} g(s) = \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{i_1 < \cdots < i_m} \tilde{g}(x_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge x_{i_m})$$

$$= \sum_{i} \tilde{g}(x_i) - \sum_{i<j} \tilde{g}(x_i \wedge x_j) + \sum_{i<j<k} \tilde{g}(x_i \wedge x_j \wedge x_k) - \cdots,$$

(3) In the same situation as (2), $\mu_{\hat{P}}(s, \hat{1}) = 0$ unless $s$ is of the form $s = x_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge x_{i_l}$, and

$$\mu_{\hat{P}}(s, \hat{1}) = \mu_{\hat{P}'}(s, \hat{1})$$

for any subposet $\hat{P}'$ of $\hat{P}$ that contains all elements of the form $x_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge x_{i_l}$ (including $\hat{1}$ as the meet of an empty set).

Proof. It is known (see [Sta12, Proposition 3.7.1] for example) that

$$g(t) = \sum_{s \leq t} \mu_{\hat{P}}(s, t) \tilde{g}(s) \quad (\text{for all } t \in \hat{P}).$$

Hence we have

$$\sum_{s \in P} g(s) = \tilde{g}(\hat{1}) - \tilde{g}(\hat{1}) = \tilde{g}(\hat{1}) - \sum_{s \in P} \mu_{\hat{P}}(s, \hat{1}) \tilde{g}(s) = -\sum_{s \in P} \mu_{\hat{P}}(s, \hat{1}) \tilde{g}(s),$$

proving (1). (2) is by the Inclusion-Exclusion Principle. (3) follows from (1) and (2).

References


Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, the University of Tokyo, Japan

E-mail address: takigiku@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp