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Abstract

In the case of \( sl_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}) \), we enumerate (a) the set \( P_{\geq -1}^{\theta_n} \) of pre-dominant integral weights whose diagrams contain the highest root \( \theta_n \) of \( sl_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}) \), and (b) the set \( SM \) of dominant minuscule elements \( w \) in the Weyl group for which there exist unique (dominant) integral weights \( \Lambda \) such that \( w \) is \( \Lambda \)-minuscule. We prove that there exists a bijection between (a) and (b). In addition, as an application, we give a dimension formula for certain Demazure modules.

1 Introduction.

The notion of (dominant) minuscule elements in the Weyl group was introduced by Peterson [2]; for the definition, see Definition 3.1 below. Using them, he studied the number of reduced expressions. Nakada [6] proved that there exists a canonical bijection \( F : \tilde{M} \to P_{\geq -1}^{\text{fin}} \), \( (\Lambda, w) \mapsto w(\Lambda) \), from the set \( \tilde{M} \) of pairs \( (\Lambda, w) \) of dominant integral weights \( \Lambda \) and \( \Lambda \)-minuscule elements \( w \) onto the set \( P_{\geq -1}^{\text{fin}} \) of (finite) pre-dominant integral weights; for the definitions of pre-dominant integral weights and their diagrams, see Definition 2.2. Then he proved Peterson’s hook length formula by use of this bijection.

In this paper, we study the following special classes of pre-dominant integral weights and dominant minuscule elements in the case of \( g = sl_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}) \):

(a) the set \( P_{\geq -1}^{\theta_n} \) of (finite) pre-dominant integral weights whose diagrams contain the highest root \( \theta_n \) of \( sl_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}) \), and

(b) the set \( SM \) of dominant minuscule elements \( w \) in the Weyl group of \( sl_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}) \) for which there exist unique dominant integral weights \( \Lambda \) (which we denote by \( \Lambda_w \)) such that \( w \) is \( \Lambda \)-minuscule; we call an element of \( SM \) a strong minuscule element.
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We prove that \( \#P^n_{\geq 1} = 2^{n-1} \) (Proposition 5.3), and that \( \#\mathcal{SM} = 2^{n-1} \) (Theorem 5.4). Also, we prove that \( w(\Lambda) \in P^n_{\geq 1} \) for \( w \in \mathcal{SM} \) (Proposition 5.1). Combining these results, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** (= Theorem 5.2). If we regard \( \mathcal{SM} \) as a subset of \( \tilde{M} \) by \( w \mapsto (\Lambda, w) \), then the restriction

\[
F|_{\mathcal{SM}} : \mathcal{SM} \to P^n_{\geq 1}, \quad (\Lambda, w) \mapsto w(\Lambda)
\]

of the map \( F : \tilde{M} \to P^n_{\geq 1} \) is bijective.

In the proof of the equality \( \#\mathcal{SM} = 2^{n-1} \), we show that the cardinality of the subset \( \mathcal{SM}_k := \{ w \in \mathcal{SM} \mid \Lambda_w = \Lambda_k \} \) of \( \mathcal{SM} \) is equal to \( \binom{n}{k-1} \) (Proposition 5.4). As an application of this result, we obtain the following dimension formula of Demazure modules. Let and fix \( 1 \leq k \leq n \), and set \( J_k := \{ s_1, \ldots, s_n \} \setminus \{ s_k \} \), where \( s_i \in W \) is the simple reflection in \( \alpha_i \). We set \( v_k := s_n s_{n-1} \cdots s_{k+1} s_k \cdots s_{k-1} s_k \), and \( \overline{w}_k := w_0 v_k w J_k, 0 \), where \( w_0 \) (resp., \( w J_k, 0 \)) is the longest element in \( W \) (resp., the parabolic subgroup of \( W \) generated by \( J_k \)).

**Theorem 1.2** (= Theorem 5.6). It holds that \( \dim E_{\overline{\nu}}(\Lambda_k) = \binom{n}{k-1} \), where \( E_{\overline{\nu}}(\Lambda_k) := U(\mathfrak{n}_+ L(\Lambda_k))_{\overline{\nu}(\Lambda_k)} \) is the Demazure module of the lowest weight \( \overline{\nu}(\Lambda_k) \) (for the definition, see Subsection 5.3) in the finite-dimensional irreducible \( \mathfrak{g} \)-module \( L(\Lambda_k) \) of highest weight \( \Lambda_k \).
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## 2 Pre-dominant integral weights.

For \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \), we set \( [i] := \{ 1, 2, \ldots, i \} \). We fix \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \). Throughout this paper, \( \mathfrak{g} \) is the finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra of type \( \mathfrak{a}_n \) over \( \mathbb{C} \), that is, \( \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{l}_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}) \). Let \( \mathfrak{h} \) be its Cartan subalgebra, and set \( \mathfrak{h}^* := \text{Hom}_\mathbb{C}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathbb{C}) \). We denote by \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathfrak{h}^* \times \mathfrak{h} \to \mathbb{C} \) the standard pairing. Denote by \( \Pi = \{ \alpha_i \mid i \in [n] \} \) (resp., \( \Pi^\vee = \{ \alpha_i^\vee \mid i \in [n] \} \) the set of simple roots (resp., simple coroots); the Dynkin diagram for \( \mathfrak{g} \) is as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \cdots & \alpha_{n-1} & \alpha_n
\end{array}
\]

Let \( P = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{Z} \Lambda_i \) (resp., \( P^+ = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \Lambda_i \)) be the set of integral weights (resp., dominant integral weights), where \( \Lambda_i \) is the fundamental weight. We denote by \( W = \langle s_i \mid i \in [n] \rangle \subset GL(\mathfrak{h}^*) \) the Weyl group of \( \mathfrak{g} \), where \( s_i \) is the simple reflection in \( \alpha_i \), and denote by \( \ell : W \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) the length function on \( W \). Denote by \( \Phi \) (resp., \( \Phi^+ \)) the set of roots (resp., positive roots) for \( \mathfrak{g} \); recall that

\[
\Phi = \{ \pm(\alpha_l + \alpha_{l+1} + \cdots + \alpha_m) \mid 1 \leq l \leq m \leq n \}.
\]
\[
\Phi_+ = \{ \alpha_l + \alpha_{l+1} + \cdots + \alpha_m \mid 1 \leq l \leq m \leq n \}.
\]

Let \( \theta_n := \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_n \in \Phi_+ \) be the highest root of \( g \). Also, for \( \beta \in \Phi \), \( \beta^\vee \) denotes the coroot of \( \beta \); note that if \( \alpha = \pm (\alpha_l + \cdots + \alpha_m) \), then \( \alpha^\vee = \pm (\alpha_l^\vee + \cdots + \alpha_m^\vee) \)

**Remark 2.1.** For each \( i \in [n] \), the fundamental weight \( \Lambda_i \) is a minuscule weight in the sense that \( \langle \Lambda_i, \beta^\vee \rangle \in \{0, \pm 1\} \) for all \( \beta \in \Phi \).

**Definition 2.2** ([6, Definitions 1 and 2]). An integral weight \( \lambda \) is said to be pre-dominant if \( \langle \lambda, \beta^\vee \rangle \geq -1 \) for all \( \beta \in \Phi_+ \). The set of pre-dominant integral weights is denoted by \( P_{\geq -1} \). For \( \lambda \in P_{\geq -1} \), the set \( D(\lambda) := \{ \beta \in \Phi_+ \mid \langle \lambda, \beta^\vee \rangle = -1 \} \) is called the diagram of \( \lambda \).

We set
\[
P^{\theta_n}_{\geq -1} := \{ \lambda \in P_{\geq -1} \mid \theta_n \in D(\lambda) \}.
\] (2.1)

### 3 Minuscule elements in the Weyl group.

**Definition 3.1** (see [2], [7]). Let \( \Lambda \in P \). A Weyl group element \( w \in W \) is said to be \( \Lambda \)-minuscule if there exists a reduced expression \( w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r} \) such that
\[
\langle s_{i_{p+1}} \cdots s_{i_r}(\Lambda), \alpha_{i_{ip}}^\vee \rangle = 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \leq p \leq r.
\] (3.1)

If \( w \in W \) is \( \Lambda \)-minuscule for some integral weight \( \Lambda \in P \) (resp., dominant integral weight \( \Lambda \in P^+ \)), then we say that \( w \) is minuscule (resp., dominant minuscule). The set of minuscule (resp., dominant minuscule) elements is denoted by \( M \) (resp., \( M^+ \)).

**Remark 3.2.** If \( w \in W \) is \( \Lambda \)-minuscule, then condition (3.1) holds for every reduced expression for \( w \). Hence the definition of \( \Lambda \)-minuscule element is independent of the choice of a reduced expression for \( w \).

We set
\[
\tilde{M} := \{ (\Lambda, w) \in P^+ \times W \mid w \text{ is } \Lambda \text{-minuscule} \}.
\] (3.2)

**Theorem 3.3** ([6, Proposition 10.1]). If \( (\Lambda, w) \in \tilde{M} \), then \( w(\Lambda) \in P_{\geq -1} \). Moreover, the map
\[
F : \tilde{M} \to P_{\geq -1}, \quad (\Lambda, w) \mapsto w(\Lambda),
\] (3.3)
is bijective.
4 Strong minuscule elements.

**Definition 4.1.** A dominant minuscule element \( w \in W \) is said to be *strong minuscule* if there exists a unique dominant integral weight \( \Lambda \in P^+ \) (which we denote by \( \Lambda_w \)) such that \( w \) is \( \Lambda \)-minuscule. The set of strong minuscule elements is denoted by \( SM \).

**Remark 4.2.** We regard the set \( SM \) of strong minuscule elements as a subset of \( \widetilde{M} \) by \( SM \hookrightarrow \widetilde{M} \), \( w \mapsto (\Lambda_w, w) \).

**Proposition 4.3.** Let \( w \in SM \), and \( w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r} \) be a reduced expression for \( w \). Then, \( \# \{ 1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = i \} \geq 1 \) for each \( i \in [n] \). Namely, each of the simple reflections \( s_1, \ldots, s_n \) appears at least once in each reduced expression for \( w \).

**Proof.** Suppose, for a contradiction, that \( s_j \) does not appear in the reduced expression \( w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r} \) for some \( j \in [n] \). In this case, since \( s_{i_{p+1}} \cdots s_{i_r} (\Lambda_j) = \Lambda_j \) and \( \langle \Lambda_j, \alpha_{i_p}^\vee \rangle = 0 \) for all \( 1 \leq p \leq r \), we see that \( w \) is also \( (\Lambda_w + \Lambda_j) \)-minuscule. Because \( \Lambda_w + \Lambda_j \in P^+ \), this contradicts the assumption that \( w \in SM \). \( \square \)

5 Main Results.

**Proposition 5.1** (will be proved in §6). If \( w \in SM \), then \( w(\Lambda_w) \in P^\geq -1 \).

Recall from Remark 4.2 that \( SM \) is regarded as a subset of \( \widetilde{M} \).

**Theorem 5.2.** The restriction
\[
F|_{SM} : SM \to P^\geq -1, \quad (\Lambda_w, w) \mapsto w(\Lambda_w),
\]
(5.1)
of the map \( F : \widetilde{M} \to P^\geq -1 \) in (4.2) is bijective.

The injectivity of \( F|_{SM} \) follows immediately from the injectivity of \( F \). For the surjectivity of \( F|_{SM} \), it suffices to prove the following; remark that both of \( SM \) and \( P^\geq -1 \) are finite sets.

**Proposition 5.3** (will be proved in §7). It holds that \( \# P^\geq -1 = 2n-1 \).

**Theorem 5.4** (will be proved in §8). It holds that \( \# SM = 2n-1 \).

6 Proof of Proposition 5.1.

**Lemma 6.1.** Let \( w \in SM \), and fix a reduced expression \( w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r} \) for \( w \). Fix \( 2 \leq k \leq n - 1 \); recall from Proposition 1.3 that \( \# \{ 1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = k \} \geq 1 \). We set \( a := \max \{ 1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = k \} \). Then,
\[
\# \{ 1 \leq p \leq a - 1 \mid i_p = k + 1 \text{ or } k - 1 \} \geq 1, \quad (6.1)
\]
\[
\# \{ a + 1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = k + 1 \text{ or } k - 1 \} \leq 1. \quad (6.2)
\]
Proof. We set \( \gamma_d := \alpha_{i_d} + \alpha_{i_{d+1}} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_r} \) for \( 1 \leq d \leq r \), and \( \gamma_{r+1} := 0 \). Because \( w \) is \( \Lambda_w \)-minuscule, we have \( \langle \Lambda_w - \gamma_{d+1}, \alpha_{i_d}^\vee \rangle = 1 \) for every \( 1 \leq d \leq r \). Thus it follows that

\[
0 \leq \langle \Lambda_w, \alpha_k^\vee \rangle = \langle \Lambda_w, \alpha_k^\vee \rangle = 1 + \langle \gamma_{d+1}, \alpha_k^\vee \rangle,
\]

and hence \( \langle \gamma_{d+1}, \alpha_k^\vee \rangle \geq -1 \). Here we note that

\[
\langle \gamma_{d+1}, \alpha_k^\vee \rangle = -\#\{a + 1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = k - 1\} - \#\{a + 1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = k + 1\};
\]

recall that \( a = \max\{1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = k\} \). Therefore, \( A + B \leq 1 \), which implies that \( \#\{a + 1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = k + 1 \} \leq 1 \). Also, since \( A, B \geq 0 \), we have \( A = 0 \) or \( B = 0 \). If \( A = 0 \) (resp., \( B = 0 \)), then it follows from Proposition 4.3 that \( \#\{1 \leq p \leq a - 1 \mid i_p = k - 1\} \geq 1 \) (resp., \( \#\{1 \leq p \leq a - 1 \mid i_p = k + 1\} \geq 1 \)). Thus we have proved the lemma. \( \square \)

For \( i \in [n] \), we set

\[
v_i := s_{n}s_{n-1} \cdots s_{i+1}s_1s_2 \cdots s_{i-1}s_i; \quad (6.3)
\]

remark that \( \ell (v_i) = n \).

Lemma 6.2. Let \( w \in \mathcal{M} \), and let \( w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r} \) be a reduced expression for \( w \). Set \( k := i_r \in [n] \). Then, \( w \) is a strong minuscule element if and only if there exists \( u \in W \) such that \( w = uv_k \) and \( \ell (w) = \ell (u) + n \). Moreover, it holds that \( \Lambda_w = \Lambda_k \) in this case.

Proof. Assume that \( w \in \mathcal{M} \). First, we show by (descending) induction on \( 1 \leq p \leq k \) (starting from \( p = k \)) that \( w \) has a reduced expression of the form

\[
w = \cdots s_p s_{p+1} \cdots s_{k-1} s_k. \quad (6.4)
\]

If \( p = k \), then the assertion is obvious by assumption. Assume that \( 1 < p \leq k \); by the induction hypothesis, we have a reduced expression for \( w \) of the form:

\[
w = \cdots s_p s_{p+1} \cdots s_{k-1} s_k. \quad (6.5)
\]

By Proposition 4.3, \( s_{p-1} \) appears in this reduced expression. Let us take the right-most \( s_{p-1} \):

\[
w = \cdots s_{p-1} \cdots s_p s_{p+1} \cdots s_{k-1} s_k; \quad (6.6)
\]

\((*)\)

there is no \( s_{p-1} \) in \((*)\). Also, by 6.2, neither \( s_p \) nor \( s_{p-2} \) appears in \((*)\), which implies that every simple reflection in \((*)\) commutes with \( s_{p-1} \). Hence, we get a reduced expression for \( w \) of the form:

\[
w = \cdots s_{p-1} s_p s_{p+1} \cdots s_{k-1} s_k, \quad (6.7)
\]
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Thus we get that such that for a contradiction, that \( \{ \) is similar. Note that such that \( w \) is \( \Lambda \)-minuscule. In particular, we obtain a reduced expression of the form

\[
\ell = \cdots s_{n-1} \cdots s_{k+2} s_{k+1} s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{k-1} s_k.
\]  

Similarly, we can show by induction on \( k \leq q \leq n \) that \( w \) has a reduced expression of the form:

\[
w = \cdots s_q \cdots s_{k+2} s_{k+1} s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{k-1} s_k.
\]

In particular, we obtain a reduced expression of the form

\[
w = \cdots s_n s_{n-1} \cdots s_{k+2} s_{k+1} s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{k-1} s_k : \]

\[
= : u = v_k
\]

If we set \( u := wv_k^{-1} \), then we have \( w = uv_k \) with \( \ell(w) = \ell(u) + n \), as desired.

Conversely, assume that \( \langle w \in \mathcal{M} \rangle \) there exists \( u \in \mathcal{W} \) such that \( w = uv_k \) with \( \ell(w) = \ell(u) + n \); note that \( w \) has a reduced expression of the form (6.3).

Let \( \Lambda \in P \) be such that \( w \) is \( \Lambda \)-minuscule, and write it \( \Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \Lambda_i \) with \( c_i \in \mathbb{Z} \). Since \( \langle \Lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 1 \) by the assumption that \( w \) is \( \Lambda \)-minuscule (see also Remark 6.2), we get \( c_k = 1 \). Also, we see that \( \langle \Lambda - \alpha_k, \alpha_{k-1}^\vee \rangle = 1 \), which implies that \( c_{k-1} = 0 \). Repeating this argument, we get \( c_{k-1} = c_{k-2} = \cdots = c_1 = 0 \). Similarly, we see that \( \langle \Lambda - \alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1} - \cdots - \alpha_1, \alpha_{k+1}^\vee \rangle = 1 \), which implies that \( c_{k+1} = 0 \). Repeating this argument, we get \( c_{k+2} = c_{k+3} = \cdots = c_n = 0 \). Therefore, we conclude that \( \Lambda = \Lambda_k \in P^+ \); in particular, \( w \) is dominant minuscule. Furthermore, the argument above shows the uniqueness of \( \Lambda \in P^+ \) such that \( w \) is \( \Lambda \)-minuscule.

**Remark 6.3.** For \( k \in [n] \), we set \( \mathcal{SM}_k := \{ w \in \mathcal{SM} \mid \Lambda_w = \Lambda_k \} \). By Lemma 6.2 we have

\[
\mathcal{SM} = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^{n} \mathcal{SM}_k.
\]  

**Lemma 6.4.** Let \( w \in \mathcal{SM} \), and let \( w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_p} \) be a reduced expression for \( w \). Then, \# \{ \{ 1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = k \} \} = 1 \) for \( k = 1, n \).

**Proof.** We give a proof only for the case of \( k = 1 \); the proof for the case of \( k = n \) is similar. Note that \# \{ \{ 1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = 1 \} \} \geq 1 \) by Proposition 4.3. Suppose, for a contradiction, that \# \{ \{ 1 \leq p \leq r \mid i_p = 1 \} \} \geq 2 \). Take \( 1 \leq p_1 < q_1 \leq r \) such that \( i_{p_1} = i_{q_1} = 1 \), and \( i_t \neq 1 \) for all \( p_1 + 1 \leq t \leq q_1 - 1 \). We set \( \gamma_d := \alpha_{i_d} + \alpha_{i_{d+1}} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_t} \) for \( 1 \leq d \leq r \), and \( \gamma_{r+1} := 0 \). Then, we see (as in the proof of Lemma 6.1) that

\[
\langle \Lambda_w - \gamma_{p_1+1}, \alpha_1^\vee \rangle = 1, \quad \langle \Lambda_w - \gamma_{q_1+1}, \alpha_1^\vee \rangle = 1.
\]  

Thus we get \( \langle \gamma_{p_1+1} - \gamma_{q_1+1}, \alpha_1^\vee \rangle = 0 \), and hence

\[
\langle \alpha_1, \alpha_1^\vee \rangle + \cdots + \langle \alpha_{i_{q_1}-1}, \alpha_1^\vee \rangle + \underbrace{\langle \alpha_{i_{q_1}}, \alpha_1^\vee \rangle}_{=0} = 0.
\]
Since \(-1 \leq a_{ij} = \langle \alpha_j, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \leq 0\) when \(j \neq 1\), it follows that \(\#\{p_1 < p < q_1 \mid i_p = 2\} = 2\). Take \(p_1 < p_2 < q_2 < q_1\) such that \(i_{p_2} = i_{q_2} = 2\); note that \(\{p_2 \leq p \leq q_2 \mid i_p = 2\} = \{p_2, q_2\}\). By the same argument as for \((6.12)\), we deduce that \(\langle \alpha_{i_{p_2+1}}, \alpha_2^\vee \rangle + \cdots + \langle \alpha_{i_{q_2-1}}, \alpha_2^\vee \rangle + 2 = 0\). Since \(i_p \neq 1\) for all \(p \leq q_1 - 1\), it follows that \(\#\{p_2 < p < q_2 \mid i_p = 3\} = 2\). Take \(p_2 < p_3 < q_3 < q_2\) such that \(i_{p_3} = i_{q_3} = 3\); note that \(\{p_3 \leq p \leq q_3 \mid i_p = 3\} = \{p_3, q_3\}\). Repeating this argument, we obtain a sequence \(p_1 < \cdots < p_n < q_n < \cdots < q_1\) such that \(\{p_k \leq p \leq q_k \mid i_p = k\} = \{p_k, q_k\}\) for \(k \in [n]\). Remark that \(q_n \neq p_n + 1\) since \(i_{q_n} = n = i_{p_n} \neq i_{p_n+1}\) by the assumption that \(w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r}\) is a reduced expression. Let \(p_n < b < q_n\), and set \(k := i_b\). Then, \(\{p_k \leq p \leq q_k \mid i_p = k\} \supseteq \{p_k, q_k, b\}\), which is a contradiction. 

We are ready to prove Proposition \[5.1\]. Let \(w \in SM\), and let \(w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r}\) be a reduced expression for \(w\); by Lemma \[6.2\] \(\Lambda_w = \Lambda_{i_r}\). We need to show that \(\theta_n \in D(w(\Lambda_w)) = D(w(\Lambda_{i_r}))\), or equivalently, \(\langle w(\Lambda_{i_r}), \theta_n^\vee \rangle = -1\). Since \(w\) is \(\Lambda_{i_r}\)-minuscule, we see that \(w(\Lambda_{i_r}) = \Lambda_{i_r} - \sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_{i_j}\). Hence, by Lemma \[6.4\] and the fact that \(\langle \alpha_k, \theta_n^\vee \rangle = 0\) for \(2 \leq k \leq n - 1\), we have

\[
\langle w(\Lambda_{i_r}), \theta_n^\vee \rangle = \langle \Lambda_{i_r}, \theta_n^\vee \rangle - \sum_{j=1}^r \langle \alpha_{i_j}, \theta_n^\vee \rangle
= 1 - \#\{j \in [r] \mid i_j = 1\} - \#\{j \in [r] \mid i_j = n\} = -1.
\]

Therefore, we obtain \(\theta_n \in D(w(\Lambda_{i_r}))\), as desired.

7 Proof of Proposition \[5.3\]

Let \(\Lambda \in P_n^{\Phi^+}\), and write it as \(\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \Lambda_i\) with \(c_i \in \mathbb{Z}\). Then we have \(c_i = \langle \Lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \geq -1\) for \(i \in [n]\). We set

\[
[n]_{-1}^\Lambda := \{i \in [n] \mid c_i = -1\}, \\
[n]_0^\Lambda := \{i \in [n] \mid c_i = 0\}, \\
[n]_+^\Lambda := \{i \in [n] \mid c_i > 0\}.
\]

Because \(\langle \Lambda, \theta_n^\vee \rangle = -1\), we have \(k := \#[n]_{-1}^\Lambda \geq 1\), write \([n]_{-1}^\Lambda\) as \([n]_{-1}^\Lambda = \{i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k\}\). We claim that \(\#[n]_+^\Lambda = k - 1\), and for each \(1 \leq p \leq k - 1\), there exists unique \(j_p \in [n]_+^\Lambda\) such that \(i_p < j_p < i_{p+1}\). Indeed, if \(k = 1\), then the assertion is obvious. Assume that \(k \geq 2\). For \(1 \leq p \leq k - 1\), we set \(\beta_p := \sum_{i=i_p}^{i_{p+1}} \alpha_i \in \Phi^+\). Because

\[
-1 \leq \langle \Lambda, \beta_p^\vee \rangle = \sum_{i=i_p}^{i_{p+1}} c_i = -2 + \sum_{i_p < i < i_{p+1}} c_i,
\]
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there exists \( j_p \in [n]^+ \) such that \( i_p < j_p < i_{p+1} \). For each \( 1 \leq p \leq k - 1 \), we take arbitrary \( j_p \in [n]^+ \) such that \( i_p < j_p < i_{p+1} \) and then set \( J := \{ j_1 < \cdots < j_{k-1} \} (\subset [n]^+) \); it suffices to show that \( J = [n]^+ \). Then, 

\[
-1 = \langle \Lambda, \theta_n^+ \rangle = \sum_{j \in [n]^+} c_j + \sum_{j \in [n]^0} c_j + \sum_{j \in [n]^+} c_j \\
= (-1) \times \# [n]_1^+ + 0 \times \# [n]_0^+ + \sum_{j \in [n]^+ \cup J} c_j + \sum_{j \in J} c_j \geq (-k) + 0 + 0 + (k - 1) = -1.
\]

Hence, \( \sum_{j \in [n]^+ \cup J} c_j = 0 \) and \( \sum_{j \in J} c_j = \# J = k - 1 \). Since \( c_j > 0 \) for \( j \in [n]^+ \), it follows that \([n]_1^+ \setminus J = \emptyset \). Therefore, we get \( J = [n]_1^+ \), as desired (in addition, we see that \( c_j = 1 \) for all \( j \in J = [n]_1^+ \)). The claim above associates each \( \Lambda \in P_{\geq -1}^\theta \) to the sequence \( i_1 < j_1 < i_2 < j_2 < \cdots < j_{k-1} < i_k \) of elements in \([n] \), in which an element in \([n]_1^+ = \{ i_1 < \cdots < i_k \} \) and an element in \([n]_1^+ = \{ j_1 < \cdots < j_{k-1} \} \) appear alternately. Conversely, for a sequence \( i_1 < j_1 < i_2 < j_2 < \cdots < j_{k-1} < i_k \) of elements in \([n] \), we set 

\[
c_i := \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } i \in \{ j_1, \ldots, j_{k-1} \}, \\
-1 & \text{if } i \in \{ i_1, \ldots, i_k \}, \\
0 & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

Then, we see that \( \Lambda := \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \Lambda_i \) is an element of \( P_{\geq -1}^\theta \) with \([n]_1^+ = \{ i_1 < \cdots < i_k \} \) and \([n]_1^+ = \{ j_1 < \cdots < j_{k-1} \} \). Hence, \( \# P_{\geq -1}^\theta \) is equal to the number of sequences of elements in \([n] \) of odd length. Therefore, we obtain \( \# P_{\geq -1}^\theta = 2^{n-1} \), as desired.

## 8 Proof of Theorem 5.4

Recall that the Weyl group \( W \) of \( \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}) \) is generated by \( S := \{ s_1, \ldots, s_n \} \). For \( J \subset S \), let \( W_J \) be the (parabolic) subgroup of \( W \) generated by \( J \). Let \( W^J \cong W/W_J \) be the set of minimal-length coset representatives of cosets in \( W/W_J \) (see [1] Corollary 2.4.5). Put \( J_i := S \setminus \{ s_i \} (\subset S) \) for \( i \in [n] \). Also, we set \( w_j(l_j) := s_{j-l_j+1} \cdots s_{j-1} s_j \) for \( 1 \leq j \leq n \) and \( 0 \leq l_j \leq j \); note that \( \ell(w_j(l_j)) = l_j \).

**Proposition 8.1 ([1] Theorem 2).** For \( i \in [n] \), we have 

\[
W^J_i = \{ w_n(l_n)w_{n-1}(l_{n-1}) \cdots w_i(l_i) \mid 0 \leq l_n \leq \cdots \leq l_i \leq i \};
\]

notice that if \( (l_n, \ldots, l_i) \neq (l'_n, \ldots, l'_i) \), then \( w_n(l_n) \cdots w_i(l_i) \neq w_n(l'_n) \cdots w_i(l'_i) \).
Remark 8.2. For every \( i \in [n] \) and \( 0 \leq l_n \leq \cdots \leq l_i \leq i \), the expression \( w_n(l_n) \cdots w_i(l_i) \) satisfies

\[
\ell(w_n(l_n) \cdots w_i(l_i)) = \ell(w_n(l_n)) + \cdots + \ell(w_i(l_i)) = l_n + \cdots + l_i.
\] (8.1)

Indeed, we can show (8.1) by the induction on \( l := l_n + \cdots + l_i \). If \( l = 0 \), then (8.1) is obvious. Assume that \( l \geq 1 \); note that \( 1 \leq l_i \), and \( w_n(l_n) \cdots w_{i+1}(l_{i+1}) \) \( w_i(l_i) = w_n(l_n) \cdots w_{i+1}(l_{i+1}) w_{i-1}(l_i-1)s_i \). Since (8.1) holds for \( w_n(l_n) \cdots w_{i+1}(l_{i+1}) w_{i-1}(l_i-1) \) by the induction hypothesis, it is enough to show that

\[
\beta := w_n(l_n) \cdots w_{i+1}(l_{i+1}) w_{i-1}(l_i-1)(\alpha_i) \in \Phi_+;
\]

by direct computation, we see that \( \beta = \alpha_i - l_{i+1} + \cdots + \alpha_n \in \Phi_+ \).

Proposition 8.3. For \( i \in [n] \), the set \( \mathcal{SM}_i = \{ w \in \mathcal{SM} \mid \Lambda_w = \Lambda_i \} \) (see Remark 8.2) is contained in \( W^{J_i} \). Moreover,

\[
\mathcal{SM}_i = \{ w_n(l_n) \cdots w_{i+1}(l_{i+1}) w_i(l_i) \mid 1 \leq l_n \leq \cdots \leq l_{i+1} \leq l_i = i \}.
\]

Proof. Let \( w \in \mathcal{SM}_i \). By Lemma 8.2 in any reduced expression for \( w \), the right-most generator is \( s_i \). Hence, we have \( w \in W^{J_i} \) by [1, Lemma 2.4.3]. By Proposition 8.1 we can write \( w = w_n(l_n) \cdots w_i(l_i) \) with \( 0 \leq l_n \leq \cdots \leq l_i \leq i \). Suppose, for a contradiction, that \( l_j = 0 \) for some \( i \leq j \leq n \). Then we have \( l_n = l_{n-1} = \cdots = l_j = 0 \). By Remark 8.2, there exists a reduced expression for \( w \) in which \( s_n \) does not appear. This contradicts Proposition 4.3. Hence, \( l_j \geq 1 \) for all \( i \leq j \leq n \). By Proposition 4.3, \( s_1 \) must appear in any reduced expression for \( w \). By this fact and Remark 8.2, we see that \( l_i = i \).

Conversely, let \( w = w_n(l_n) \cdots w_i(l_i) \) with \( 1 \leq l_n \leq \cdots \leq l_{i+1} \leq l_i = i \). By Proposition 8.1, we have \( w \in W^{J_i} \). We claim that \( w \) is \( \Lambda_i \)-minuscule. Indeed, let \( w = s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_1} \) be a reduced expression for \( w \). Then, for any \( 1 \leq p \leq r-1 \), we have

\[
\langle s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}(\Lambda_i), \alpha_{i_{p+1}}^\vee \rangle = \langle \Lambda_i, (s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}(\alpha_{i_{p+1}}))^\vee \rangle \geq 0.
\]

Suppose, for a contradiction, that \( \langle s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}(\Lambda_i), \alpha_{i_{p+1}}^\vee \rangle = 0 \) for some \( 1 \leq p \leq r-1 \). Then, we have \( s_{i_{p+1}}s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}(\Lambda_i) = s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}(\Lambda_i) \). If we set \( W_{\Lambda_i} := \{ v \in W \mid v(\Lambda_i) = \Lambda_i \} \), then we have \( s_{i_{p+1}}s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}W_{\Lambda_i} = s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}W_{\Lambda_i} \). Here we recall that \( W_{\Lambda_i} = \langle s_k \mid \langle \Lambda_i, \alpha_k^\vee \rangle = 0 \rangle = W_{J_i} \). Therefore,

\[
wW_{J_i} = s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_{p+2}}s_{i_{p+1}}s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}W_{J_i} = s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_{p+2}}s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}W_{J_i}.
\]

However, this contradicts the fact that \( w \) is an element of the set \( W^{J_i} \) of minimal-length representatives. Hence, for any \( 1 \leq p \leq r-1 \), we have \( \langle s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}(\Lambda_i), \alpha_{i_{p+1}}^\vee \rangle > 0 \). Combining this fact with Remark 8.4, we see that \( \langle s_{i_p} \cdots s_{i_1}(\Lambda_i), \alpha_{i_{p+1}}^\vee \rangle = 1 \) for all \( 1 \leq p \leq r-1 \), which implies \( w \) is \( \Lambda_i \)-minuscule. Finally, let us show that \( w = w_n(l_n) \cdots w_{i+1}(l_{i+1})w_i(l_i) \) is a strong minuscule element. In the expression \( w = w_n(l_n) \cdots w_{i+1}(l_{i+1})w_i(l_i) \), we move the right-most \( s_j \) in each
$w_j(l_j)$ to the right position, by using the commutation relation $s_ps_q = s_qs_p$ for $p, q \in [n]$ with $|p - q| \geq 2$, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
w_n(l_n) &= w_{n-1}(l_{n-1}) = s_{n-1}w_{n-2}(l_{n-2}) \cdots w_i(l_i) \\
\text{these commute with } s_n
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
= (w_n(l_n)s_n)(w_{n-1}(l_{n-1})s_{n-1})s_{n-2}w_{n-3}(l_{n-3}) \cdots w_i(l_i) \\
\text{these commute with } s_n, s_{n-1}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
= (w_n(l_n)s_n)(w_{n-1}(l_{n-1})s_{n-1})(w_{n-2}(l_{n-2})s_{n-2})s_{n-3}w_{n-4}(l_{n-4}) \cdots w_i(l_i) \\
\text{\ldots}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
= (w_n(l_n)s_n)(w_{n-1}(l_{n-1})s_{n-1}) \cdots (w_{i+1}(l_{i+1})s_{i+1})s_{i+2}w_i(l_i).
\end{align*}
\]

For example, assume that $n = 5$, $i = 2$, and

\[
\begin{align*}
w_5(1) &= w_4(2) = w_3(2) = w_2(2) = w_1(2) \\
&= s_5s_3s_4s_2s_3s_1s_2 = s_3s_5s_4s_2s_3s_1s_2 = 8_8^3s_5s_4s_3s_1s_2.
\end{align*}
\]

By Remark 8.2 we see that

\[
\ell(w) = l_n + \cdots + l_i = (l_{n-1}) + \cdots + (i+1 - 1) + (n-i+1)
\]

\[
\geq \ell(u) + \ell(v_i) \geq \ell(uv_i) = \ell(w),
\]

and hence $\ell(w) = \ell(u) + \ell(v_i)$. Therefore it follows from Lemma 8.2 that $w$ is a strong minuscule element.

**Proposition 8.4.** It holds that $\#SM_i = \binom{n-1}{i-1}$ for $i \in [n]$.

**Proof.** By Proposition 8.3 the cardinality of $SM_i$ is equal to the number of sequences $(l_n, l_{n-1}, \ldots, l_{i+1})$ of integers satisfying $1 \leq l_n \leq l_{n-1} \leq \cdots \leq l_{i+1} \leq i$ ($= l_i$). Therefore, $\#SM_i = \binom{n-1}{i-1}$.

By Remark 8.3 and Proposition 8.4 we have

\[
\#SM = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \#SM_k = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \binom{n-1}{k-1} = 2^{n-1}.
\]

Thus we have proved Theorem 5.4, thereby completing the proof of Theorem 5.2.
9 Application to Demazure modules.

9.1 Bruhat order.

We denote by $\leq$ the Bruhat order on $W$ (see, e.g., [1] Chapter 2]). For $u, w \in W$, we set $[u, w] := \{v \in W \mid u \leq v \leq w\}$. Denote by $w_0$ the longest element in $W$; note that $w \leq w_0$ for all $w \in W$. Let $J \subset S$; recall from Section 8 that $W^J(\subset W)$ denotes the set of minimal-length coset representatives of cosets in $W/W_J$. Let $w_0^J \in W^J$ be such that $w_0^J \in w_0 W_J$. Then, $w \leq w_0^J$ for all $w \in W^J$ (see [1] Section 2.5)). For $u, w \in W^J$, we set $[u, w]^J := [u, w] \cap W^J$.

**Proposition 9.1.** Let $i \in [n]$, and let $SM_i$ be as in Remark 8.3 (see also Proposition 8.3). It holds that $SM_i = [v_i, w_0^J]^J$.

**Proof.** Let $w \in SM_i$. By Proposition 8.3 we have $w \in W^J$. Hence, we have $w \leq w_0^J$. By Lemma 6.2 there exists $u \in W$ such that $w = uv_i$ with $\ell(w) = \ell(u) + \ell(v_i)$. Hence, by the subword property of the Bruhat order (see, e.g., [1] Theorem 2.2.2)), we have $v_i \leq w$. Therefore, we conclude that $w \in [v_i, w_0^J]^J$.

Conversely, let $w \in [v_i, w_0^J]^J = [v_i, w_0^J] \cap W^J$. By Proposition 8.1 there exist $0 \leq p_n \leq \cdots \leq p_i \leq i$ such that $w = w_n(p_n) \cdots w_i(p_i)$; recall that this expression satisfies (8.1). Since $v_i \leq w$ by assumption, it follows from the subword property that both $s_1$ and $s_n$ appear in any reduced expression for $w$. Observe that for $i < j \leq n$, the element $w_j(p_j)$ does not have a reduced expression in which $s_1$ appears, and that the element $w_i(p_i)$ has a reduced expression in which $s_1$ appears if and only if $p_i = i$. Thus we conclude that $p_i = i$. Also, observe that for $i \leq j < n$, the element $w_j(p_j)$ does not have a reduced expression in which $s_n$ appears, and that the element $w_n(p_n)$ has a reduced expression in which $s_n$ appears if and only if $p_n \geq 1$. Thus we conclude that $p_n \geq 1$. Therefore, by Proposition 8.3 we have $w \in SM_i$, as desired. \qed

**Remark 9.2.** In general, $[v_i, w_0^J]^J \subset [v_i, w_0^J]$. Indeed, in the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$, we see that $s_2 v_3 = s_2 s_1 s_2 s_1 s_3 \in [v_3, w_0^J] \setminus [v_3, w_0^J]^J$; note that this element is not a minuscule element, and hence Lemma 6.2 is not valid for this element.

9.2 Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths.

Let $\Lambda \in P^+$, and set $W_\Lambda := \{w \in W \mid w(\Lambda) = \Lambda\}$; recall that $W_\Lambda = \langle J_\Lambda \rangle$, where $J_\Lambda := \{s_i \in S \mid \langle \Lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 0\}$.

**Definition 9.3.** Let $\tau, \tau' \in W^J \cong W/W_J = W/W_\Lambda$, and let $0 < a < 1$ be a rational number. A decreasing sequence $\tau = \sigma_0 > \sigma_1 > \cdots > \sigma_u = \tau'$ of elements in $W^J$ (with respect to the Bruhat order) is called an $a$-chain for $(\tau, \tau')$ if it satisfies the following conditions (i) and (ii):

(i) $\ell(\sigma_i) = \ell(\sigma_{i-1}) - 1$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, u$; note that by this condition, there exists unique $\beta_i \in \Phi_+$ such that $\sigma_i = s_{\beta_i} \sigma_{i-1}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, u$,
where $s_{\beta_i} \in W$ denotes the reflection in $\beta_i$.

(ii) $a\langle \sigma_i(\Lambda), \beta_i^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, u$.

**Definition 9.4.** A pair $\pi = (\tau, a)$ of a decreasing sequence $\tau : \tau_1 > \tau_2 > \cdots > \tau_s$ of elements in $W^{\Lambda}$ and a sequence $a : 0 = a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_s = 1$ of rational numbers is called a Lakshmibai-Seshadri path (L-S path for short) of shape $\Lambda$ if it satisfies the condition that there exists an $a_i$-chain for $(\tau_i, \tau_{i+1})$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s - 1$. The set of L-S paths of shape $\Lambda$ is denoted by $B(\Lambda)$.

For $\pi = (\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_s; a) \in B(\Lambda)$, we set $\phi(\pi) := \tau_1$. For $\tau \in W^{\Lambda}$, we set $B_\tau(\Lambda) := \{\pi \in B(\Lambda) | \phi(\pi) \leq \tau\}$.

### 9.3 Demazure modules.

For $\Lambda \in P^+$, let $L(\Lambda)$ denote the finite-dimensional irreducible $g$-module of highest weight $\Lambda$, with $L(\Lambda) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in P} L(\Lambda)_\mu$ the weight space decomposition; recall that $\dim L(\Lambda)_{\tau(\Lambda)} = 1$ for all $\tau \in W$. Denote by $\mathfrak{n}_+$ the subalgebra of $g$ generated by the root spaces corresponding to $\Phi_+$. For $\tau \in W$, we denote by $E_\tau(\Lambda)$ the $\mathfrak{n}_+$-submodule of $L(\Lambda)$ generated by $L(\Lambda)_{\tau(\Lambda)}$, which we call the Demazure module of lowest weight $\tau(\Lambda)$. The next theorem follows immediately from [3, Theorem 5.2].

**Theorem 9.5.** Let $\Lambda \in P^+$, and $\tau \in W^{\Lambda}$. Then, $\dim E_\tau(\Lambda) = \#B_\tau(\Lambda)$.

### 9.4 Dimension of certain Demazure module.

Let and fix $i \in [n]$; note that $J_{\Lambda_i} = \{s_j \in S | \langle \Lambda_i, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle \} = S \setminus \{s_i\} = J_i$. For $\tau \in W^{J_i}$, we set $\bar{\tau} := w_0\tau w_{J_i,0}$, where $w_{J_i,0} \in W_{J_i}$ is the longest element of $W_{J_i}$. Then we see by [1, Proposition 2.5.4] that $\bar{\tau} \in W^{J_i}$, and that the map $\bar{\tau} : W^{J_i} \to W^{J_i}$, $\tau \mapsto \bar{\tau}$, is an order-reversing involution on $W^{J_i}$.

**Theorem 9.6.** It holds that $\dim E_{\bar{\tau}}(\Lambda_i) = \left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ i-1 \end{array}\right)$ for each $i \in [n]$.

**Proof.** First we determine the set $B(\Lambda_i)$ of L-S paths of shape $\Lambda_i$. As mentioned in Remark 2.1, we have $\langle \sigma(\Lambda_i), \beta_i^\vee \rangle \in \{0, \pm 1\}$ for all $\sigma \in W^{J_i}$ and $\beta \in \Phi$. Hence, for any $\tau, \tau' \in W^{J_i}$ with $\tau \neq \tau'$ and $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $0 < a < 1$, there is no $a$-chain for $(\tau, \tau')$. Therefore, $B(\Lambda_i) = \{(\sigma; 0, 1) | \sigma \in W^{J_i}\}$, and hence $\dim E_{\bar{\tau}}(\Lambda_i) = \#\left[ e, \bar{\tau}_i \right]^{J_i}$ by Theorem 9.5.

Now, we see that

$$[v_i, w_0^{J_i}]^{J_i} = [w_0^{J_i}, \bar{v}_i]^{J_i} = [w_0 w_0^{J_i} w_{J_i,0}, \bar{v}_i]^{J_i} = [w_0, \bar{v}_i]^{J_i} = [e, \bar{v}_i]^{J_i}.$$  

Hence, $\#\left[ e, \bar{v}_i \right]^{J_i} = \#\left[ e, \bar{v}_i \right]^{J_i}$. Because we have $\#\left[ v_i, w_0^{J_i} \right]^{J_i} = \#SM_i = \left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ i-1 \end{array}\right)$ by Propositions 8.4 and 9.1, we conclude that $\dim E_{\bar{\tau}}(\Lambda_i) = \#\left[ e, \bar{v}_i \right]^{J_i} = \#\left[ v_i, w_0^{J_i} \right]^{J_i} = \#SM_i = \left(\begin{array}{c} n-1 \\ i-1 \end{array}\right)$, as desired. \qed
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