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Abstract

In this short note we show explicitly how to decompose a generalized permutohedron into semi-polytopes.

1 Introduction

Given a polytope, assume we have disjoint open cells whose closures sum up to be the entire polytope. A question of naturally assigning each of the remaining points (possibly in multiple closures) to a cell has appeared in [1] for studying regular matroids and zonotopes and in [2] for studying h-vectors and Q-polytopes. In other words, we are trying to determine ownership of lattice points on boundaries of multiple polytopes. In this note, we study a more general case of doing the same for a Generalized permutohedron, a polytope that can be obtained by deforming the usual permutohedron. We will show explicitly how to construct a semi-polytope decomposition of a trimmed generalized permutohedron.

2 Generalized permutohedron $P_G$ and its fine mixed subdivision

Let $\Delta_{[n]} = \text{ConvexHull}(e_1, \ldots, e_n)$ be the standard coordinate simplex in $\mathbb{R}^n$. For a subset $I \subset [n]$, let $\Delta_I = \text{ConvexHull}(e_i | i \in I)$ denote the face of $\Delta_{[n]}$. Let $G \subseteq K_{m,n}$ be a bipartite graph with no isolated vertices. Label the vertices of $G$ by $1, \ldots, m, \bar{1}, \ldots, \bar{n}$ and call $1, \ldots, m$ the left vertices and $\bar{1}, \ldots, \bar{n}$ the right vertices. We identify the barred indices with usual non-barred cases when it is clear we are dealing with the right vertices. For example when we write $\Delta_{\{\bar{1}, \bar{3}\}}$ we think of it as $\Delta_{\{1, 3\}}$. We associate this graph with the collection $I_G$ of subsets $I_1, \ldots, I_m \subseteq [n]$ such that $j \in I_i$ if and only if $(i, \bar{j})$ is an edge of $G$. Let us define the polytope $P_G(y_1, \ldots, y_m)$ as:

$$P_G(y_1, \ldots, y_m) := y_1 \Delta_{I_1} + \cdots + y_m \Delta_{I_m},$$

where $y_i$ are nonnegative integers. This lies on a hyperplane $\sum_{i \in [n]} x_i = \sum_{j \in [m]} y_j$. An example of a coordinate simplex $\Delta_{[3]}$, a bipartite graph $G$ and a generalized permutohedron $P_G(1, 2, 3)$ is given in Figure 1.

**Definition 2.1** ([3], Definition 14.1). Let $d$ be the dimension of the Minkowski sum $P_1 + \cdots + P_m$. A **Minkowski cell** in this sum is a polytope $B_1 + \cdots + B_m$ of dimension $d$ where $B_i$ is the convex hull of some subset of vertices of $P_i$. A **mixed subdivision** of the sum is the decomposition into union of Minkowski cells such that intersection of any two cells is their common face. A mixed subdivision is **fine** if for all cells $B_1 + \cdots + B_m$, all $B_i$ are simplices and $\sum \text{dim} B_i = d$.

All mixed subdivisions in our note, unless otherwise stated, will be referring to fine mixed subdivisions. We will use the word **cell** to denote the Minkowski cells. Beware that our cells are all closed polytopes.
Fine Minkowski cells can be described by spanning trees of $G$. When we are looking at a fixed generalized permutohedron $P_G(y_1, \ldots, y_m)$, we will use $\prod_J$ to denote $y_1\Delta_{J_1} + \cdots + y_m\Delta_{J_m}$ where $J = (J_1, \ldots, J_m)$. We say that $J$ is a tree if the associated bipartite graph is a tree.

**Lemma 2.2** ([3], Lemma 14.7). Each fine mixed cell in a mixed subdivision of $P_G(y_1, \cdots, y_m)$ has the form $\prod_T$ such that $T$ is a spanning tree of $G$.

An example of a fine mixed subdivision of the polytope considered in Figure 1 is given in Figure 2.

We can say a bit more about the lattice points in each $\prod_T$:

**Proposition 2.3** ([3], Proposition 14.12). Any lattice point of a fine Minkowski cell $\prod_T$ in $P_G(y_1, \cdots, y_m)$ is uniquely expressed (within $\prod_T$) as $p_1 + \cdots + p_m$ where $p_i$ is a lattice point in $y_i\Delta_{T_i}$.
3 Semi-polytope decomposition

A mixed subdivision of $P_G$ divides the polytope into cells. In this section, we show that from a mixed subdivision of $P_G$, one can obtain a way to decompose the set of lattice points of $P_G$.

**Definition 3.1** (11.2). The trimmed generalized permutohedron $P_G^-$ is defined as:

$$P_G^-(y_1, \ldots, y_m) := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n | x + \Delta_{[n]} \subseteq P_G \}.$$  

This is a more general class of polytopes than generalized permutohedra $P_G(y_1, \ldots, y_m)$. With a slight abuse of notation, we will let $I \setminus j$ stand for $I \setminus \{j\}$.

**Definition 3.2** (Theorem 11.3). The coordinate semi-simplices are defined as:

$$\Delta^*_i \subseteq \Delta_I \setminus \Delta_{I \setminus j}$$

for $j \in I \subseteq [n]$.

For each cell $\prod_T$, we are going to turn it into a semi-polytope of the form $y_1 \Delta^*_{j_1, j_1} + \cdots + y_m \Delta^*_{j_m, j_m}$. This will involve deciding which cell takes ownership of the lattice points on several cells at the same time.

We denote the point $((m - 1)c + \sum_i y_i - c, \ldots, -c)$ for $c$ sufficiently large as $\infty_1$. For a facet of a polytope, we say that it is negative if the defining hyperplane of the facet (inside the space $\sum_{i \in [n]} x_i = \sum_{j \in [m]} y_j$ which the polytope lies in) separates the point $\infty_1$ and the interior of the polytope. Otherwise, we say that it is positive. We will say that a point of a polytope is good if it is not on any of the positive facets of the polytope.

**Lemma 3.3.** Fix $T$, a spanning tree of $G \subseteq K_{n,n}$. Let $T_i$ be the set of neighbors of $i$. For each $i$ such that $1 \not\in T_i$, there exists a unique element $t_i$ in $T_i$ such that there exists a path to 1 not passing through $i$.

**Proof.** There exists such an element since $T$ is a spanning tree of $T$. There cannot be more than one such element since otherwise, we get a cycle in $T$. 

In cases where $T_i$ does contain 1, we set $t_i$ to be 1.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let $\prod_T$ be a fine mixed cell. Removing the positive facets gives us $\sum_i \Delta^*_{t_i, t_i}$.

To prove this, we first introduce a tool that will be useful for identifying which hyperplanes the facets lie on. Let $\prod_T$ be a fine mixed cell so $T$ a spanning tree. For any edge $e$ of $T$ that is not connected to a leaf on the left side, $T \setminus e$ has two components. Let $I_e$ denote the set of right vertices of a component that contains 1. Let $c_e$ be the sum of $y_i$'s for left vertices contained in that component. Notice that $I_e$ cannot be $[n]$ since otherwise $e$ would have a leaf as its left endpoint.

**Lemma 3.5.** Let $\prod_T$ be a fine mixed cell. For any edge $e$ of $T$ that is not connected to a leaf on the left side, $\prod_T \setminus e$ is a facet of $\prod_T$ that lies on $\sum_{j \in I_e} x_j = c_e$. If the right endpoint of $e$ is in $I_e$, then $\prod_T$ lies in half-space $\sum_{j \in I_e} x_j \geq c_e$. Otherwise it lies in $\sum_{j \in I_e} x_j \leq c_e$.

**Proof.** The dimension difference between $\prod_T$ and $\prod_T \setminus e$ is at most one, and all endpoints of $\prod_T \setminus e$ lie on $\sum_{j \in I_e} x_j = c_e$. If the right endpoint of $e$ is in $I_e$, that means we can find a point $x$ using $e$ so that $\sum_{j \in I_e} x_j > c_e$. If not, that means we can find a point $x$ using $e$ so that $\sum_{j \in I_e} x_j < c_e$.

**Proof of Lemma 3.4.** If $\prod_T \setminus e$ is a positive facet of $\prod_T$, then Lemma 3.5 tells us that the right endpoint of $e = (i, j)$ is in $I_e$. From definition of $t_i$, we have $j = t_i$. In other words we are removing sets of form $\Delta_{T_1} + \cdots + \Delta_{T \setminus t_i} + \cdots + \Delta_{T_m}$. At the end we end up with $\sum_i (\Delta_{T_i} \setminus \Delta_{T_i \setminus t_i})$. 


Let $\prod_T$ and $\prod'_T$ be two cells inside a mixed subdivision of $P_G$ that share a facet $F$. The sign of $F$ in $\prod_T$ and the sign of $F$ in $\prod'_T$ has to be different, since $\infty_1$ can be on exactly one side of the defining hyperplane of $F$. This implies that all lattice points of $P_G$ are good in at most one cell of $P_G$.

**Lemma 3.6.** $p \in P_G^- \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ if and only if $p + e_i$ is a good point of $P_G$.

**Proof.** Having $p \in P_G^- \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ implies from definition that $p + e_i \in P_G$ for each $i \in [n]$. Assume for sake of contradiction $p + e_1$ is on some positive facet $x_I = c_I$ with $1 \in I$. Any $p + e_i$ is either on that facet or is on the same side as $\infty_1$. Hence $I = [n]$ and we get a contradiction.

Now look at the case when $p + e_1$ is a good point of $P_G$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $p + e_j$ is not in $P_G$ for some $j \in [n]$. Then $p + e_1$ is on a facet of $P_G$, whose corresponding hyperplane is given by $x_I = c_I$ where $1 \in I$ and $j \not\in I$. This hyperplane separates the interior of $P_G$ with $p + e_j$. Since $j \not\in I$, the point $\infty_1$ has to be on opposite side of $p + e_j$. This is a positive facet and we get a contradiction. 

Combining what we have so far, we state the main result of our note on how to do the semi-polytope decomposition with an explicit way to obtain each of the semi-polytopes:

**Theorem 3.7.** Identify the lattice points of $P_G^-$ with points not lying on any of the positive facets of $P_G$ via the map $p \rightarrow p + e_1$ (as in Lemma 3.6). Pick any full mixed subdivision of $P_G$. For each cell $\prod_T$, construct a semi-polytope by $\sum_i \Delta^+_{T_i, t_i}$ (where $t_i$ is chosen as in Lemma 3.3). Then the (disjoint) union of the semi-polytopes is exactly $P_G$ minus the positive facets. Each lattice point of $P_G^-$ with the above identification is contained in exactly one semi-polytope.

An example of a semi-polytope decomposition of the generalized permutohedron considered in Figure 1 and in Figure 2 is given in Figure 3.

### 4 Application to Erhart theory

In this section we show how the semi-polytope decomposition can be used in Erhart theory as guided in [3]. Given any subgraph $T$ in $G$, define the **left degree vector** $ld(T) = (d_1 -
1, \ldots, d_n − 1) and the right degree vector \( rd(T) = (d'_1, \ldots, d'_m − 1) \) where \( d_i \) and \( d'_j \) are the degree of the vertex \( i \) and \( j \) respectively. The raising powers are defined as \( (y)_a := y(y+1) \cdots (y+a−1) \) for \( a \geq 1 \) and \( (y)_0 := 1 \).

**Corollary 4.1.** Fix a fine mixed subdivision of \( P_G(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \) where \( y_i \)’s are nonnegative integers. The number of lattice points in the trimmed generalized permutohedron \( P_{G}^-(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \) equals \( \sum (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \prod_i \frac{(y_i)_{a_i}}{a_i!} \) where the sum is over all left-degree vectors of fine mixed cells inside the subdivision.

**Proof.** Obtain a semi-polytope decomposition as in Theorem 3.7. Then each lattice point of \( P_{G}^-(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \) is in exactly one semi-polytope. The claim follows since the number of lattice points of a semi-polytope \( y_1 \Delta_{t_1,t_1}^* + \cdots + y_m \Delta_{t_m,t_m}^* \) (thanks to Proposition 2.3 different sum gives a different point) is given by \( \prod_i \frac{(y_i)_{|T_i|−i}}{|T_i|−i)!} \).

The expression in Corollary 4.1 is called the **Generalized Erhart polynomial** of \( P_{G}^-(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \) by [3]. As foretold in [3], Theorem 3.7 gives us a pure counting proof of Theorem 11.3 of [3].

**Definition 4.2** ([3], Definition 9.2). Let us say that a sequence of nonnegative integers \( (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \) is a **G-draconian sequence** if \( \sum a_i = n − 1 \) and, for any subset \( \{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\} \subseteq [m] \), we have \( |I_{i_1} \cup \cdots \cup I_{i_k}| \geq a_{i_1} + \cdots + a_{i_k} + 1 \).

**Theorem 4.3** ([3], Theorem 11.3). For nonnegative integers \( y_1, \ldots, y_m \), the number of lattice points in the trimmed generalized permutohedron \( P_{G}^-(y_1, \ldots, y_m) \) equals \( \sum (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \prod_i \frac{(y_i)_{a_i}}{a_i!} \), where the sum is over all G-draconian sequences \( (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \).

**Proof.** Thanks to Corollary 4.1 all we need to do is show that the set of G-draconian sequences is exactly the set of left-degree vectors of the cells inside a fine mixed subdivision of \( P_G \). Lemma 14.9 of [3] tells us that the right degree vectors of the fine cells is exactly the set of lattice points of \( P_{G}^-(1, \ldots, 1) \) where \( G^* \) is obtained from \( G \) by switching left and right vertices. Then Lemma 11.7 of [3] tells us that the set of G-draconian sequences is exactly the set of lattice points of \( P_{G}^-(1, \ldots, 1) \).

This approach has an advantage that the generalized Erhart polynomial is obtained from a direct counting method, without using any comparison of formulas.
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