Abstract

We prove the existence of several different families of solvable lattice models whose partition functions give the double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials and the dual double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials for arbitrary permutations. Moreover, we introduce a new family of double “biaxial” $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials depending on a pair of permutations which simultaneously generalize both the double and dual double polynomials. We then use these models and their Yang-Baxter equations to reprove Fomin-Kirillov’s Cauchy identity for $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials, generalize it to a new Cauchy identity for biaxial $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials, and prove a new branching rule for double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials.

1 Introduction

In statistical mechanics, solvable lattice models are used to infer global behavior of a system from the local properties of nearest-neighbor particle interactions. Here we use the adjective “solvable” to mean that there exists a family of (quantum) Yang-Baxter equations which allow one to solve the model; that is, to determine sufficiently many recursive relations to explicitly evaluate the generating function made from weighted sums of potential particle configurations. This generating function is called the partition function of the model and it is summed over certain admissible states. This terminology and additional tools for (two-dimensional) solvable lattice models are reviewed at the outsets of Sections 3 and 4.

A growing collection of recent papers (see for example [4, 6, 20, 29, 33, 34]) has demonstrated the utility of solvable lattice models to represent important polynomial functions in Schubert calculus and its many generalizations. Roughly speaking, solvable lattice models are effective tools because, on one hand, the admissible states are in bijection with certain combinatorial objects—such as tableaux, Gelfand-Tsetlin-type patterns, or, in our case, pipe dreams—and are thus equipped with a rich set of tools for studying algebraic invariants. On the other hand, their solutions to the Yang-Baxter equation, called $R$-matrices, are known to satisfy braid and quadratic relations which give rise to an action of a Hecke algebra on the lattice model. As we will see, manipulating the lattice model according to a certain diagrammatic calculus allows one to move between these interpretations, via a sort of graphical analogue of Schur-Weyl duality, leading to new identities and new proofs of known identities involving the partition function. In the present paper, we add to the list by showing that the double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials and their duals are expressible as partition functions of solvable lattice models, and use these models and their Yang-Baxter equations to prove Cauchy-type identities and a branching rule.

Before describing our results in more detail, we give a concise overview of Grothendieck polynomials, with precise definitions to follow in Section 2. Let $X$ be the set of complete flags in $\mathbb{C}^n$, a
smooth, projective complex variety with an action of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ induced from the standard action on complex vectors. Let $K(X)$ denote the Grothendieck ring of algebraic vector bundles over $X$. It has an additive basis given by $K$-theoretic Schubert classes $[\mathcal{O}_{X_w}]$ with $w \in S_n$. Here $X_w$ denotes the closure of a corresponding $B$-orbit in $X$, where $B$ denotes the Borel subgroup of lower triangular matrices in $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$, and $\mathcal{O}_X$ is the structure sheaf of $X$. The generalized Littlewood-Richardson problem is to determine an explicit formula for the structure constants for multiplication with respect to this basis. That is, one would like to determine the integer coefficients $C^w_{u,v}$ appearing in

$$[\mathcal{O}_{X_u}] \cdot [\mathcal{O}_{X_v}] = \sum_{w \in S_n} C^w_{u,v} [\mathcal{O}_{X_w}],$$

analogous to the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients for the ordinary cohomology of $X$. Brion famously showed that these structure constants had a predictable sign. If $\ell(w)$ denotes the length of $w$ as a reduced word in simple reflections, then he showed that $(-1)^{\ell(w)-\ell(u)-\ell(v)} C^w_{u,v}$ is non-negative for all $u, v, w$ in $S_n$.

Lascoux and Schützenberger introduced polynomial representatives for these classes known as Grothendieck polynomials, denoted $G_w$ to any permutation $w$. That is, Grothendieck polynomials model the multiplication in $K(X)$ according to

$$G_u \cdot G_v = \sum_{w \in S_n} C^w_{u,v} G_w.$$

These were later generalized by Fomin and Kirillov, who defined $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials depending on a deformation parameter $\beta$, which simultaneously generalize the prior Grothendieck polynomials ($\beta = -1$) and Schubert polynomials ($\beta = 0$). We will denote these by $G_w^{(\beta)}$.

Much later, a geometric interpretation of $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials was described by Hudson in [14]. In fact, Hudson works in slightly greater generality: just as Schubert and Grothendieck polynomials admit generalizations to two sets of variables, there are also double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials. These represent connective $K$-theory classes of degeneracy loci of flag bundles, or, equivalently, Schubert classes in the $T$-equivariant connective $K$-theory ring of the flag variety, where $T$ is the torus of diagonal matrices. (See e.g. [2] for a nice example of how results about degeneracy loci translate into statements about equivariant cohomology.) As is also true in the single variable case, these have a natural recursive description in terms of pullback and pushforward maps in the Bott-Samelson resolution of singularities in the flag variety, which leads to the definition of $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials in terms of divided difference operators described in Section 2, and which will manifest in the action of $R$-matrices on our lattices in later sections.

One of the most striking examples of the interplay between the Yang-Baxter equation and combinatorial identities is the paper of Zinn-Justin which, by interpreting Knuston-Tao puzzles in the context of solvable lattice models, gives a new proof of the Littlewood-Richardson rule for the structure constants of Schur functions. This method was subsequently generalized by Wheeler and Zinn-Justin to Grassmannian Grothendieck polynomials, and by Knutson and Zinn-Justin to Grothendieck polynomials whose associated permutations have few descents. As noted above, finding and proving a Littlewood-Richardson type rule for the structure constants of general ($\beta$-) Grothendieck polynomials is a long-standing open problem, and based on the success in the certain special cases described above, one might hope that this general problem can also be approached from the lattice models defined in the present paper.

Indeed, our lattice models give Grothendieck polynomials for arbitrary permutations. The key insight is to use a generalization of the ice-type six-vertex model inspired by earlier work of Borodin
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and Wheeler [4]. Unlike Borodin-Wheeler, who use color to refine certain partition functions of lattice models from symmetric functions into their nonsymmetric pieces, our models use color to move from permutations with one descent to those with arbitrarily many descents. As a nod to this similarity, we refer to our models as “chromatic” rather than “colo(u)red.” As a further distinction, the associated quantum group module for our solutions of the Yang-Baxter equation (at least in the specialization $\beta = -1$) is a Drinfeld twist of the standard $U_q(sU_n)$ module, while those in [4] arise from symmetric powers of $U_q(su_2)$ modules (see Remark 4.2).

We conclude by outlining the structure of the subsequent sections. In Section 2, we present two different definitions for double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials which reflect the Hecke algebra point of view and the combinatorial generating function point of view discussed earlier. Then in Section 3 we introduce two similar, but not bijectively equivalent, lattice models whose partition functions give the double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials. By allowing more general boundary conditions indexed by a pair of partitions, we obtain what we call the “biaxial” model, which will turn out to simultaneously generalize both the double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials and their duals. In Section 4 we describe the Yang-Baxter equations and $R$-matrices associated to each model, and in Section 5 we use these solutions to compute the partition functions. We also briefly discuss the correspondence between the states of the models and pipe dreams. In Section 6 we provide a branching rule that describes how to express a double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomial for any permutation in $S_n$ as a sum over double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials for permutations in $S_{n-1}$.
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Authors’ Note: In the final stages of writing, we were informed of another, independent work by Buciumas and Scrimshaw [8] which provides solvable lattice models for Grothendieck polynomials. Their models are naturally connected to so-called “bumless” pipe dreams of Lam, Lee, and Shimozono [22]. So while their Boltzmann weights look similar in nature, there are important differences which prevent direct comparison of their lattice model to ours. Indeed, it is likewise difficult on the combinatorial generating function side to compare Fomin-Kirillov pipe dreams to bumphless ones. This provides yet another example of the mutable nature of these solvable lattice models - the methods are flexible enough to apply to a wide array of special functions, but the analysis of each particular model presents unique challenges.

2 Grothendieck Polynomials

In this section, we present multiple definitions for double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials and their duals, beginning with the original definition in Fomin and Kirillov [11]. These authors were motivated, in part, by attempts to classify exponential solutions to the Yang-Baxter equation. Their definition of $G^{(\beta)}_w$ is given in terms of $\beta$-deformed divided difference operators:

$$
\pi^\beta_i f(x_1, x_2, \ldots) = \frac{(1 + \beta x_{i+1}) f(\ldots, x_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots) - (1 + \beta x_i) f(\ldots, x_{i+1}, x_i, \ldots)}{x_i - x_{i+1}}.
$$

(1)

More succintly, we may write $\pi^\beta_i = \partial_i \circ (1 + \beta x_{i+1})$ where $\partial_i$ is the usual divided difference operator. The $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials may now be defined recursively with respect to length
\( \ell \) in the symmetric group, beginning from the long element \( w_0 \). One may analogously define double \( \beta \)-Grothendieck polynomials in two sets of variables \( x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) and \( y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n) \) where we understand that the divided difference operators \( \pi_i^{(\beta)} \) defined above continue to act on the variables \( x \) alone. We often use the following notation, suggesting a formal group law addition, in our definitions:

\[
x \oplus y := x + y + \beta xy.
\]

**Definition 2.1** (Lascoux-Schützenberger, Fomin-Kirillov). Given a fixed positive integer \( n \) and a permutation \( w \), define the double \( \beta \)-Grothendieck polynomials \( G_w^{(\beta)}(x; y) := G_w^{(\beta)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n; y_1, \ldots, y_n) \) as follows.

- Set

\[
G_{w_0}^{(\beta)}(x; y) = \prod_{i+j \leq n} (x_i + y_j).
\]

- For \( w \) and a simple reflection \( s_i = (i \ i+1) \) in \( S_n \) with \( \ell(ws_i) = \ell(w) - 1 \), set

\[
G_{ws_i}^{(\beta)}(x; y) = \pi_i^{(\beta)} G_w^{(\beta)}(x; y).
\]

Note the above polynomials are well-defined since the operators \( \pi_i^{(\beta)} \) satisfy the braid relations \( \pi_i^{(\beta)} \pi_{i+1}^{(\beta)} \pi_i^{(\beta)} = \pi_{i+1}^{(\beta)} \pi_i^{(\beta)} \pi_{i+1}^{(\beta)} \) [23]. The single variable \( \beta \)-Grothendieck polynomials are recovered by \( G_w^{(\beta)}(x; 0) \). See the appendix to [14] for a nice exposition of the relation between Fomin-Kirillov’s definition of double Grothendieck polynomials via the exponential Yang-Baxter equation solutions and the divided difference operator definition given above.

We caution the reader that other notions of Grothendieck polynomials appear in the literature. For example in [16][17], Kirillov sets \( G_w^{(\beta)}(x; y) \) equal to \( \prod_{i+j \leq n} (x_i + y_j) \), using the additive formal group as opposed to our multiplicative one depending on \( \beta \). Moreover, many authors work only with Grassmannian Grothendieck polynomials, for which the corresponding permutation \( w \) has a unique descent and so may be recorded as a partition, and the adjective “Grassmannian” is often dropped for brevity.

**Definition 2.2** (Lascoux-Schützenberger [20]). Given a fixed positive integer \( n \) and a permutation \( w \), define the dual double \( \beta \)-Grothendieck polynomials \( H_w^{(\beta)}(x; y) := H_w^{(\beta)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n; y_1, \ldots, y_n) \) by the formula

\[
H_w^{(\beta)}(x; y) := \sum_{w_0 \geq v \geq w} \beta^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)} H_v^{(\beta)}(x; y).
\]

The dual polynomials are sometimes referred to as \( H \)-polynomials. Equivalently, we may define them recursively, setting \( H_{w_0}^{(\beta)} = g_{w_0}^{(\beta)} \), with respect to the divided difference operators \( \mu_i^{(\beta)} := (1 + \beta x_i) \partial_i \). The dual polynomials may be seen to be adjoint to the \( G_w^{(\beta)} \) with respect to an inner product on the Grothendieck ring \( K(X) \) defined in terms of the \( \pi_i^{(\beta)} \) operators (see Equation 7.1 in [26]). Strictly speaking, this exact definition seems to have not appeared explicitly in the literature, but see Section 6 of [27] for a detailed survey of their properties in the special case \( \beta = -1 \) and [17] for a definition that agrees except for the initial \( H_{w_0}^{(\beta)} \).

A second definition of Grothendieck polynomials as a weighted sum over a combinatorially defined set may be given in terms of “pipe dreams.” Fomin and Kirillov [12] defined reduced
pipe dreams (under the name “generalized configurations”) to represent products in a Yang-Baxter algebra, and used them to study Schubert polynomials. Reduced pipe dreams are also known as rc-graphs, as in [3].

Knutson and Miller [18, 19] coined the name “pipe dreams,” defined nonreduced pipe dreams, and gave a formula for Grothendieck polynomials in terms of these more general objects. Lenart, Robinson, and Sottile [27] gave a correspondence between pipe dreams and chains in the $k$-Bruhat order, which they used to find formulas for both $G_w$ and $H_w$.

We mostly follow [30] for our definition. A pipe dream is a tiling of an $n \times n$ grid with the tiles \[ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \times \times \times \\ \hline \end{array} \] and \[ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square \square \square \\ \hline \end{array} \] such that every \[ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \times \\ \hline \end{array} \] appears above the anti-diagonal. Any undrawn tiles are assumed to be of the type \[ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array} \]. These tiles form a collection of pipes originating on the left boundary of the grid and terminating along the top boundary. We number the pipes according to the row of their origination, increasing from top to bottom. A pipe dream is said to be reduced if no two pipes cross more than once. Given a nonreduced pipe dream $P$ we can form an associated reduced pipe dream, called the reduction of $P$, in the following way: pipe by pipe, starting with pipe 1, remove any multiple crossings with another pipe after the initial crossing. We denoted the reduction of $P$ by $\text{red}(P)$. The number of crossings removed in this process is the excess of $P$, written $\text{ex}(P)$.

To each pipe dream we can associate a permutation. The permutation of a reduced pipe dream is the permutation sending $i$ to the column (indexed in increasing order from left to right) of the termination of pipe $i$. The permutation of a nonreduced pipe dream is the permutation associated to its reduction; it is often difficult to read the permutation from a nonreduced pipe dream. Given a permutation $w$, let $PD(w)$ be the collection of all pipe dreams with permutation $w$. The weight of a pipe dream $P$ is $\text{wt}(P) := \prod(x_i \oplus y_j)$, where the product is over all \[ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array} \] tiles, and the variable subscripts $i$ (resp. $j$) refer to the row (resp. column) in which the crossing tile appears (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Two pipe dreams that both correspond to the permutation $w = 1432$. On the left is an unreduced pipe dream, and on the right is its reduction. The weight of the nonreduced pipe dream is $(x_1 \oplus y_2)(x_1 \oplus y_3)(x_2 \oplus y_1)(x_3 \oplus y_1)$, and its excess is 1. The weight of the reduced pipe dream is $(x_1 \oplus y_3)(x_2 \oplus y_1)(x_3 \oplus y_1)$.](image)

Double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials can be written as a sum over pipe dreams [18, 27] using the statistics defined above:

\[
G_w^{(\beta)}(x; y) = \sum_{P \in PD(w)} \text{wt}(P) \beta^{\text{ex}(P)}. \tag{2}
\]

**Remark 2.3.** Our definition of pipe dreams is actually a slight generalization of others we’ve found in the literature since our pipe dreams have both row and column variables, and general $\beta$. The formula in [27] has $\beta = -1$, and the formula in [30] has only row variables $x$. We have not been able to find the formula [2] in the literature for double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials, although surely it is well-known. Our Proposition 5.8 can be taken as a proof of (2).
Remark 2.4. Pipe dreams can be seen as combinatorial realizations of products in the Yang-Baxter algebras of [11, 12]. Each tile represents a generator of the Yang-Baxter algebra, and tiles correspond to generators of a 0-Hecke algebra. Reduction of a pipe dream corresponds to applying quadratic relations in the 0-Hecke algebra, and the braid relations in the Yang-Baxter algebra ensure that the reduction of a pipe dream is well-defined and associated to a unique permutation.

A different approach to the one we use here is to consider bumpless pipe dreams, which are pipe dreams with some extra allowed tiles. These were introduced by Lam, Lee, and Shimozono [22]. Lascoux [24] proved a formula for Grothendieck polynomials as a sum over alternating sign matrices. Weigandt [32] then showed that Lascoux’s formula implies a summation formula similar to (2) for double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials in terms of bumpless pipe dreams. However, there is no weight-preserving bijection between Weigandt’s formula and (2) in the double set of variables.

These bumpless pipe dreams and the work of Weigandt were the motivation for the aforementioned contemporaneous work of Buciumas and Scrimshaw [8] on lattice models for Grothendieck polynomials. As one of our models will be seen to relate to (ordinary) pipe dreams, this is a further indication of the fundamental difference between the models that will appear here and those of [8].

3 Constructing Chromatic Lattice Models

In this section, we define several examples of Chromatic Lattice Models whose partition functions are connected to (double and dual double) $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials in Section 5.

There will be three separate models defined in this section, and each illuminates a different aspect of the theory of $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials. The solvability of the Chromatic Demazure Model will connect to $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials via Demazure operators, the Chromatic Pipe Model is seen to match $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials via pipe dreams, and the Chromatic Biaxial Models give a set of different polynomial families that simultaneously generalize $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials and their duals. Before detailing the specifics of each lattice model, we present several common features of the models and introduce terminology that will be used throughout.

For each model, given a fixed positive integer $n$, we form a square grid with $n$ rows and $n$ columns, whose intersection points are called vertices. In particular, each vertex has four adjacent edges. The vertices are labeled by parameters $x_i, y_j$ depending on the row ($i$) and column ($j$) in which they appear. Columns will always be numbered from left to right starting with column 1. Depending on the model, rows may be numbered from top to bottom or from bottom to top, always using the set $[1,n]$. (For diagrammatic elegance and readability, we will often abbreviate the vertex labels $x_i, y_j$ as $z_{i,j}$.)

Each edge has a label taken from the set $\{+1,2,\ldots,n\}$. This strange choice of label set comes from its connection to the six-vertex model, where edges are labeled with $+$ or $-$ and we think of $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ as expanding the set of possible labels on six-vertex model states formerly labeled with a $-$. In figures, the labels $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ on edges will be depicted with colors while edges labeled with a $+$ label will be considered uncolored. This is where the name “chromatic lattice model” comes from, and we may think of the classical six-vertex model as the special case of a monochrome (i.e., one color) model. Color has been used before to generalize lattice models, and we caution the reader that the use of color here is different from the so-called “colo(u)red lattice models” in [4,6,9]. While our diagrams appear visually similar to those of colored lattice models, the colored models refine the uncolored partition functions into smaller “atoms,” while our labels generalize the monochrome models. Thus we have chosen the adjective \textit{chromatic} to reflect this difference.
Figure 2: Boundary conditions for the system $S_{B12}$ in the Chromatic Demazure Model.

We assign a Boltzmann weight to each vertex in the model. The weights are allowed to depend on the labels of the four edges adjacent to the vertex, the parameters $x_i, y_j$ assigned to the vertex, and the parameter $\beta$. In particular, adjacent edge labels determine whether a Boltzmann weight will be non-zero, and those vertices whose adjacent edge labeling has non-zero weight will be called admissible vertices. In all our tables of Boltzmann weights for vertices, we report only on the admissible vertices; all other possible labelings around a vertex are understood to have weight 0. A system $S$ is a fixed boundary condition for the grid, together with Boltzmann weights for the vertices. We often adorn $S$ with additional subscripts and superscripts to indicate a particular choice of boundary and set of Boltzmann weights.

An admissible state of a system will be a labeled $n \times n$ grid in which each vertex is admissible. As we will see in the subsequent sections, the Boltzmann weights on the vertices have been chosen so that admissible states consist of colored paths or “strands” along the edges of the lattice which begin and end along particular boundaries. The Boltzmann weight $B(s)$ of an (admissible) state $s$ is defined as the product of the Boltzmann weights of its vertices. Finally, given a system $S$, the partition function $Z(S)$ is defined to be the sum of Boltzmann weights of the (admissible) states in the system, i.e.

$$Z(S) = \sum_{s \in S} B(s).$$

3.1 Chromatic Demazure Model

The first of three models, the Chromatic Demazure Model (or “Model D” for short), is so named because it will be shown to be solvable in Section 4 with $R$-matrix leading to the Demazure-like $\beta$-deformed divided difference operators in (1) that define Grothendieck polynomials. The Boltzmann weights for (admissible) vertices are presented in Figure 3, noting that in Model D, the rows are indexed from 1 to $n$ increasing from top to bottom as in Figure 2. It remains to describe boundary
Figure 3: The Boltzmann weights for the Model D at a vertex in row \( i \) and column \( j \), where \( x_i \oplus y_j \) denotes the formal group law \( x_i + y_j + \beta x_i y_j \), \( a < b \), and \( c \) is any color. Note that types \( a_2^\dagger, b_1, \) and \( c_1 \) will never appear in an admissible state with our boundary conditions, but they are necessary for the Yang-Baxter equation. The names of the vertices (here and in subsequent figures) are based on the underlying six-vertex model if all colors are sent to \(-\).

conditions for this model depending on a permutation \( w \in S_n \).

- All edges on the right and bottom boundaries are labeled with +.
- Edges on the top boundary are labeled, from left to right, with colors 1, 2, \ldots, \( n \).
- Edges on the left boundary are labeled, from top to bottom, with colors \( w(1), \ldots, w(n) \).

The resulting system with Model D Boltzmann weights and boundary corresponding to \( w \) will be denoted \( \mathcal{G}_D^w \). Owing to the labeling defined above, it is often convenient to write our permutations in one-line notation. For example, the boundary conditions along the left in Figure 2 correspond to \( w = 4312 = (1423) \) in cycle notation.

**Example 3.1.** Let \( w = 4321 \). The system \( \mathcal{G}_w^D \) has only one admissible state, which is shown in Figure 4. The weight of the first row is \((x_1 \oplus y_1)(x_1 \oplus y_2)(x_1 \oplus y_3)\), since each of the first three vertices is of type \( a_2^\dagger \) and the fourth is of type \( c_2 \). Continuing similarly, we get that the full weight of this state, and thus this system, is \((x_1 \oplus y_1)(x_1 \oplus y_2)(x_1 \oplus y_3)(x_2 \oplus y_1)(x_2 \oplus y_2)(x_3 \oplus y_1)\).

### 3.2 Chromatic Pipe Model

Our second chromatic model is closely connected to the realization of Grothendieck polynomials as a generating function on pipe dreams. Hence we've named it the **Chromatic Pipe Model**. As we will show, the lattice model construction elegantly combines aspects of reduced and nonreduced pipe dreams. One of the difficulties with the nonreduced pipe dream construction for Grothendieck and \( \beta \)-Grothendieck polynomials is that it is not immediately possible to read the permutation off a given pipe dream, and hence it is necessary to consider multiple boundary conditions in order to determine all the non-reduced pipe dreams corresponding to a particular permutation. By absorbing the reduction process into the weights of the lattice model using the \( \beta \) parameter, we will see that we may avoid this difficulty and obtain a model in which the boundary conditions precisely determine the permutation and vice versa.

For the Chromatic Pipe Model, which we shall nickname “Model P”, the Boltzmann weights of admissible vertices are given in Figure 5. As before, the variable indices in the table reflect the row and column indices and rows are again indexed by 1 through \( n \) from top to bottom. (Note that
types $a_2^1$ and $b$ are different in this set of weights). For a permutation $w \in S_n$, we then set boundary conditions in Model P as follows:

- All edges on the right and bottom boundaries are labeled $+.$
- Edges on the left boundary are labeled, from top to bottom, with colors $1, \ldots, n$.
- Edges on the top boundary are labeled, from left to right, by $w^{-1}(1), \ldots, w^{-1}(n)$.

For instance, the labels on the top boundary in Figure 6 correspond to $w = 3124 = (132)$. The associated systems with the weights and boundary as above will be denoted $S_P^w$ for each permutation $w$.

Figure 5: The Boltzmann weights for Model P at a vertex in row $i$ and column $j$, again with $a < b$. Recall that the Boltzmann weight of any other configuration is zero. As in Model D, types $a_2^0, b_2$, and $c_1$ will never appear in an admissible state with our boundary conditions, but are necessary for our other purposes.

Remark 3.2. These two models appear to be very similar, but there is no obvious map between them. While at first sight, one might see that the weights in Figure 5 can be obtained by reflecting
Figure 6: Boundary conditions for the system $S_{3124}$ (note, $3124^{-1} = 2314$) in the Chromatic Pipe Model.

those of Figure 3 over the anti-diagonal (i.e. $y = -x$), the boundary conditions given do not satisfy that property. Hence, even though we will prove that both Model D and Model P both obtain $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials as their partition function, there is something more interesting going on here than mere diagrammatic manipulation. Instead, these models are related by a fundamental underlying property of $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials, which we will discuss in Section 5.

Example 3.3. Let $w = 2431 = (124)$. The system $S_w$ has two admissible states, which are shown in Figure 7. The left hand state has weight $(x_1 \oplus y_1)(1 + \beta(x_1 \oplus y_1))(x_2 \oplus y_1)(x_2 \oplus y_2)(x_3 \oplus y_1)$ and the right hand state has weight $(x_1 \oplus y_1)(x_1 \oplus y_3)(x_2 \oplus y_1)(x_3 \oplus y_1)$, which combine to give the polynomial

$$Z(S_w) = (x_1 \oplus y_1)(x_2 \oplus y_1)(x_3 \oplus y_1) \cdot (x_1 \oplus y_3 + x_2 \oplus y_2 + \beta(x_1 \oplus y_3)(x_2 \oplus y_2)).$$

3.3 Chromatic Biaxial Model

The third model we shall define requires a pair of permutations to describe the boundary conditions. The Chromatic Demazure Model has left boundary dictated by a permutation and we can view the top boundary as labeled with color according to the identity permutation. In the Chromatic Pipe Model we reverse those roles. Thus it is natural to consider models in which both left and top boundaries are assigned according to a pair of permutations $v, w \in S_n$. This family of models provides a double family of polynomials indexed by partitions $v, w \in S_n$; we call these the Chromatic Biaxial Model(s) or Model B for short. For particular choices of $v, w$, we will see that this model generalizes the Chromatic Demazure model, so its partition function generalizes the $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials into a double family of polynomials. As we will show in Section 5, this model also specializes to give the double dual polynomials for the $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials, so we have a simultaneous generalization of double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials and their double duals.

For Model B, the Boltzmann weights of admissible vertices are presented in Figure 8. Here the variables are denoted by column indices increasing from left to right, and row indices increasing...
Figure 7: The two admissible states of system $\mathcal{S}_{2341}^B$. Note that $2431^{-1} = 4132$.

from bottom to top. Then, for a pair of permutations $v, w \in S_n$, we set our boundary conditions for the system $\mathcal{S}_{v,w}^B$ as follows:

- All edges on the right and top boundaries are labeled with +.
- Edges on the bottom boundary are labeled, from left to right, by colors $v(1), \ldots, v(n)$.
- Edges on the left boundary are labeled, from bottom to top, by colors $w(1), \ldots, w(n)$.

Example 3.4. Let $w = 321$ and $v = 132$. The system $\mathcal{S}_{v,w}^B$ has one admissible state, shown in Figure 10. The weight of this admissible state is $\left(x_2 + y_1\right)\left(x_1 + y_1\right)\left(1 + \beta(x_1 + y_2)\right)$. Note this is equal to $\mathcal{H}_{231}^{(1)}(x; y)$.

Remark 3.5. Setting $v$ to be the trivial permutation, the Biaxial Model becomes equivalent to the Demazure Model, upon flipping the lattice model vertically. That is, there is a bijection between states in the respective systems given by flipping the lattice vertically which respects the partition functions. The particular choice of orientation for Model B here will better facilitate the applications we present in Section 6.
**Proposition 3.6.** Many choices of pairs of permutations for Model B will have partition function equal to 0. One may show that $Z(S_{v,w}^B) = 0$ unless $v \leq w$ in the (strong) Bruhat order on $S_n$.

**Proof.** We prove this by observing the allowed crossings of colored paths travelling in through the bottom boundary of Model B and out through the left boundary in an admissible state. We begin with strands labeled by $v = v(1), ..., v(n)$ from left to right, and we compare $v$ to the permutation at the end of the strands in this first row, counting the color that exited out the left boundary as place 1. Examining possible first row vertices involving two strands of color labels, we see that types $a^\flat_2$ and $a^\sharp_2$ do not cross strands, and thus leave the permutation unchanged. Vertices $a^\dagger_2$ cross strands only when the left strand (labeled $a$ in Figure 8) is smaller than the right strand (labeled $b$ in Figure 8); therefore, a vertex of type $a^\dagger_2$ in column $i$ swaps strands $v(i)$ and $v(i + 1)$, acting on the right of $v$ by $s_i$, but only if the swap increases the length of the permutation. Note that if two sets of strands cross in the same row, we apply these transpositions to $v$ reading across columns from right to left to reflect the braid action on the strands, and each transposition must increase the length of the permutation from that point. Therefore, our ending permutation after the first row is greater than or equal to $v$ in the strict Bruhat order. Repeating the process over each row $i$, counting the $i$ left boundary labels below or at row $i$ as the first $i$ entries in the ending permutation, we see that each subsequent row either preserves the permutation or adds length-increasing transpositions on the right, so to produce a system with an admissible state we must have $v \leq w$ in the strong Bruhat order. \hfill $\square$

### 4 Solvability of the Lattice Models

We now show that the models in Section 3 are *solvable*, meaning that they satisfy a family of (quantum) Yang-Baxter equations for every pair of adjacent rows or columns. We say that a set of Boltzmann weights for vertices has a row *Yang-Baxter equation* in rows $i$ and $j$ if there exists a set
of vertex weights $R_{i,j}$ such that, for any choice of boundary labels $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon$ and $\eta$, equality holds for the partition functions of the following systems:

$$R_{i,j} R_{i,j} = R_{i,j} R_{i,j}.$$  \hfill (3)

Analogously, we say that a set of Boltzmann weights for vertices has a column Yang-Baxter equation if instead there exists a set of vertex weights $R_{i,j}$ such that for any choice of boundary conditions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon$ and $\eta$ equality holds for the partition functions of the following:

$$R_{i,j} R_{i,j} = R_{i,j} R_{i,j}.$$  \hfill (4)

Here we have drawn the solution weights $R_{i,j}$ to the Yang-Baxter equation by rotating the earlier vertex diagrams by 45 degrees, thereby indicating that it is a different kind of vertex with a different set of Boltzmann weights. Colloquially, we refer to this rotated vertex as an $R$-vertex and readers familiar with the algebraic interpretation of the above diagrams will note that the $R$-vertex Boltzmann weights are entries of the $R$-matrix solving the Yang-Baxter equation as an endomorphism of
a triple tensor product of vector spaces. We sometimes refer to our earlier vertices that comprise the square grid as rectangular vertices in contrast with the \( R \)-vertices.

**Theorem 4.1.** The Model D Boltzmann weights from Figure 3 satisfy a row Yang-Baxter equation with \( R \)-vertex weights given by the first row of Figure 11 and a column Yang-Baxter equation with \( R \)-vertex weights in the second row of Figure 11. Thus, Model D is solvable in both row and column variables.

**Proof.** Because \( n \) (the size of our grid, of the permutation, and of the set of colored labels) is arbitrary, then in principle the number of colors appearing in the diagrams associated to the Yang-Baxter is unbounded. However, the Boltzmann weights of the rectangular vertices depend only on the relative ordering of the labels, and at most two colors can be present. Thus it suffices to check for a solution in two colors (and the label \(+\)). This is easily accomplished by a computer algebra system or a very lengthy hand calculation. In our case, the \( R \)-vertex weights were calculated with SageMath. □

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demazure Model ( R )-vertex weights:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row Yang-Baxter equation</strong> ( R )-vertex weights:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( + )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_i, x_j )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1 + \beta x_i )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Column Yang-Baxter equation** \( R \)-vertex weights: |
| \( a_1 \) | \( c_1 \) | \( b_2 \) | \( c_2 \) | \( a_2 \) | \( a_1 \) | \( a_2 \) | \( a_1 \) |
| \( + \) | \( + \) | \( + \) | \( + \) | \( + \) | \( + \) | \( + \) | \( + \) |
| \( y_i, y_j \) | \( y_i, y_j \) | \( y_i, y_j \) | \( y_i, y_j \) | \( y_i, y_j \) | \( y_i, y_j \) | \( y_i, y_j \) | \( y_i, y_j \) |
| \( 1 + \beta y_i \) | \( 1 + \beta y_i \) | \( y_j - y_i \) | \( 1 + \beta y_i \) | \( 1 + \beta y_i \) | \( y_j - y_i \) | \( 1 + \beta y_i \) | \( 1 + \beta y_i \) |

Figure 11: The Model D \( R \)-vertex weights that swap strands \( i \) and \( j \), where \( a < b \) and \( c \) is any color. The first set of weights satisfies the row Yang-Baxter equation, and the second satisfies the column Yang-Baxter equation.

**Remark 4.2.** In the case where \( \beta = -1 \), the matrices of Boltzmann weights for both Model D and Model P are related to (limits of) two different Drinfeld twists of the \( R \)-matrix for \( U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}) \) acting on tensor products of the standard representation. Our preferred reference for this \( R \)-matrix is [21], but it was computed originally in [15] and in Proposition 4.1 of [13]. We do not know of any quantum group interpretation in the case of more general \( \beta \).

**Remark 4.3.** Note that the row \( R \)-vertex weights in Figure 11 can be obtained from the Model D Boltzmann weights in Figure 3 by replacing \( x_i \oplus y_j \) with \( x_i \odot x_j := \frac{x_i - x_j}{1 + \beta x_j} \), scaling all weights uniformly by \( 1 + \beta x_j \) and rotating each Boltzmann weight 45 degrees clockwise (which swaps the
roles of $i$ and $j$ from the definition of the R-vertex in (3)). Similarly, the column $R$-vertex weights can be obtained from the Model D Boltzmann weights by replacing $x_i \oplus y_j$ with $y_j \ominus y_i$, scaling by $1 + \beta y_i$, and rotating each Boltzmann weight $45$ degrees anticlockwise (which does not swap the roles of $i$ and $j$).

**Example 4.4.** We provide an illustrative example that the column Yang-Baxter equation holds for a particular choice of boundary conditions. With boundary conditions as in Figure 12, there are two admissible states of the first system in the column Yang-Baxter equation (4) with $R$-vertex weights as in Figure 11 and rectangular weights from Model D in Figure 3. The partition function is $(y_j - y_i)(1 + \beta (x \oplus y_i)) + (1 + \beta y_i)(x \oplus y_i)$. On the other hand, there is one admissible state of the second system with weight $(x \oplus y_j)(1 + \beta y_i)$. And indeed, $(y_j - y_i)(1 + \beta (x \oplus y_i)) + (1 + \beta y_i)(x \oplus y_i) = y_j + y_j \beta (x \oplus y_i) - y_i + x \oplus y_i = (x \oplus y_j)(1 + \beta y_i)$.

Figure 12: The three admissible states that appear in the column Yang-Baxter equation (see 41) with the chosen boundary conditions, and rectangular Boltzmann weights as in Model D.

Through symmetry of the various models, one can conclude that Model P and Model B are also solvable. Since the Boltzmann weights for Model P are obtained from Model D Boltzmann weights by a reflection across a diagonal, $R$-vertex weights satisfying the row (resp. column) Yang-Baxter equations for Model P are obtained by performing the same transformation on the $R$-vertices for the column (resp. row) Yang-Baxter equation of Model D. Similarly, the Model B Boltzmann weights are obtained from Model D by reflection across a vertical axis, so Model B is also solvable in both row and column variables. For completeness, we include the $R$-vertex weights that satisfy the row and column Yang-Baxter equations for each of the models in the appendix at the end of this paper.

Furthermore, we can show that these different sets of weights interact according to similarly nice strand-swapping rules. Specifically, there exists a set of $R$-vertices designed to swap a Model P row strand with a Model B row strand, which we will use to great effect in Section 6. We call these the **rhombus R-vertices** since the swapping of strands with different weights is analogous to operations encoded by the rhomboid tiles of Knutson-Tao puzzles (see, e.g. 33).

**Theorem 4.5.** For any choice of boundary conditions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \epsilon, \eta$ the partition functions of the following two states are equal, where $x_i^P$ is one of the Boltzmann weights for Model P at row $i$ (see Figure 7) with column variable set to zero, $x_j^B$ a Boltzmann weight for the Biaxial Model at row $j$ (see Figure 8) with column variable zero, and $R_{i,j}$ one of the $R$-vertex weights from Figure
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That is, the partition functions of the following two states are equal:

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma & = 1 + \beta (x_i^P \oplus x_j^B) & \delta & = 1 + \beta (x_i^P \oplus x_j^B) \\
\alpha & = x_i^P & \eta & = x_i^P \\
\beta & = x_j^B & \epsilon & = x_j^B
\end{align*}
\]

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we need only check for a solution in two colors and the label +, which we accomplished via SageMath.

Figure 13: The rhombus R-vertex weights, where a < b and c is any color. This YBE requires that strand \( x_i \) must attach to vertices in Model P, and strand \( x_j \) must attach to vertices in Model B.

### 5 Evaluating Partition Functions of the Models

In this section, we use the Yang-Baxter equations from Section 4 to calculate the partition functions from Section 3. We first address Model D and Model P, the partition functions of which both give the \( \beta \)-Grothendieck polynomials defined in Section 2. We then take a brief detour into the connection between Model P and pipe dreams, before ending the section with an exploration of the vast generality of the Biaxial Model, giving a generic expression for its partition function and showing that a certain specialization results in the dual \( \beta \)-Grothendieck polynomials.

#### 5.1 Demazure and Pipe model partition functions are Double \( \beta \)-Grothendieck Polynomials

First, for the Demazure model, we will see that the row YBE gives rise to the action of the operators \( \pi_i^{(\beta)} \) on the partition function, thereby allowing us to show inductively that this model gives the double \( \beta \)-Grothendieck polynomials.

**Theorem 5.1.** For any positive integer \( n \) and any \( w \in S_n \),

\[
Z(\mathcal{G}_w^D) = \mathcal{G}_w^{(\beta)}(x; y).
\]
To prove this, we begin by considering the base case \( w = w_0 = n \ n - 1 \ \cdots \ 2 \ 1 \) and calculating the partition function of its system \( \mathcal{S}^D_{w_0} \).

**Lemma 5.2.** Let \( n \) be any positive integer. With Boltzmann weights as defined in Figure 3, \[
Z(\mathcal{S}^D_{w_0}) = \prod_{i+j \leq n} (x_i \oplus y_j).
\]

**Proof.** We induct on \( n \), noting that for any \( n \) the system \( \mathcal{S}^D_{w_0} \) always has a single admissible state. We will omit the \( D \) superscript from this proof, in order to occasionally denote \( Z(\mathcal{S}_{w_0}) \) by \( Z(\mathcal{S}^n_{w_0}) \) when we need to emphasize in which symmetric group we are working. For the base case \( n = 1 \), the sole admissible state is a single vertex of type \( c_2 \), so \( Z(\mathcal{S}^1_{w_0}) = 1 \) and the statement holds.

Supposing the statement holds for all \( k \leq n - 1 \), we then consider the single admissible state for \( w_0 \in S_n \). It is perhaps illustrative to consult Figure 3 which displays this state for \( w_0 \in S_4 \). Since color \( n \) appears in row 1 on the left boundary, it must travel straight across the row 1 before exiting the top boundary in column \( n \). Therefore, row 1 consists of \( n - 1 \) vertices of type \( b_1^\dagger \) as color \( n \) crosses each of colors \( 1, \ldots, n - 1 \), in columns \( 1, \ldots, n - 1 \) respectively, and one vertex of type \( c_2 \) in column \( n \). Furthermore, the remaining vertices in column \( n \) must all be of type \( a_1 \). If we remove row 1 and column \( n \) from our state, the remaining \( n - 1 \times n - 1 \) grid has precisely the boundary conditions for the long word \( w_0 \in S_{n-1} \), so we have

\[
Z(\mathcal{S}^n_{w_0}; x_1, \ldots, x_n; y_1, \ldots, y_n) = \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (x_1 \oplus y_j) \cdot Z(\mathcal{S}^{n-1}_{w_0}; x_2, \ldots, x_n; y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}).
\]

And thus the statement of the lemma holds upon applying the inductive hypothesis. \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.3.** For any \( w \in S_n \) and any simple reflection \( s_i \) such that \( \ell(ws_i) = \ell(w) - 1 \),

\[
(x_{i+1} - x_i)Z(\mathcal{S}^D_{w_{s_i}}; \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) + (1 + \beta x_{i+1})Z(\mathcal{S}^D_{w}; \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) = (1 + \beta x_i)Z(\mathcal{S}^D_{w}; s_i \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}).
\]

**Proof.** Write \( w \) in one line notation as \( w = c_1c_2 \cdots c_n \). Since \( \ell(ws_i) = \ell(w) - 1 \), we must have \( c_i > c_{i+1} \). We begin by evaluating the partition function of the following system:

```
\[
\begin{array}{cccc|c}
   & c_1 & x_1 & x_i & x_i & + \\
\hline
   & x_{i+1} & x_{i+1} & x_{i+1} & x_{i+1} & \text{.}
\end{array}
\]
```

Consulting the table of \( R \)-vertex weights for Model D (Figure 3), we see that we have two options for the \( R \)-vertex on the left, namely type \( a_2^\dagger \) and type \( a_2^\ddagger \). States with an \( R \)-vertex of type \( a_2^\ddagger \) don’t flip the boundary conditions \( c_i \) and \( c_{i+1} \) on the other side of the \( R \)-vertex, so they will have boundary conditions \( \mathcal{S}^D_{w_0} \) on the remaining grid and will thus jointly contribute \( (1 + \beta x_{i+1})Z(\mathcal{S}^D_{w_0}; \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \) to the partition function. States with an \( R \)-vertex of type \( a_2^\dagger \) will flip the boundary conditions \( c_i \) and \( c_{i+1} \) on the other side of the \( R \)-vertex, so they will have boundary conditions \( \mathcal{S}^D_{w_{s_i}} \) on the remaining grid and will contribute in total \( (x_{i+1} - x_i)Z(\mathcal{S}^D_{w_{s_i}}; \mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) \), yielding the left hand side of the equation.
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By Theorem 4.1, we may repeatedly apply the Yang-Baxter equation to move the $R$-vertex to the right, column by column, according to the familiar train argument, to obtain the following lattice whose partition function matches that of the above system:

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\textbf{c}_i} \quad x_{i+1} \quad x_i \quad x_{i+1} \quad x_i \quad x_{i+1} \\
\text{\textbf{c}_{i+1}} \quad x_i \quad x_i \quad x_i \quad x_i \quad +
\end{array}
$$

Referring again to Figure 11, there is only one possibility for the $R$-vertex on the right, namely type $a_1$. Therefore, the $R$-vertex always has weight $(1 + \beta x_i)$ and the rest of the system has boundary conditions for $\text{SD}_w^D$, but with parameters $x_i$ and $x_{i+1}$ flipped, yielding the right hand side of the desired equality in the statement of the Lemma.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Combining Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3, we see that the partition functions for the Demazure Model satisfy the same base case and recursion formulas as the $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials.

Remark 5.4. If we repeat the argument of Lemma 5.3 in the case where $c_{i+1} > c_i$, we obtain the identity

$$(1 + \beta x_i)Z(\mathcal{E}_w^D; x, y) = (1 + \beta x_i)Z(\mathcal{E}_w^D; s, x, y).$$

Therefore, when $c_{i+1} > c_i$, the $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomial is symmetric in the variables $x_i$ and $x_{i+1}$.

We now exploit another symmetry of the $\beta$-polynomials to show that Model P also calculates the $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials.

Theorem 5.5. For any positive integer $n$ and any $w \in S_n$, $Z(\mathcal{E}_w^P) = G_w^{(\beta)}(x, y)$.

Proof. Start with the Model P boundary conditions for the permutation $w$ and reflect them over the diagonal $y = -x$. This flips the location of $w^{-1}$ and id, switches the row variables with the column variables, and changes the weights so that they now (up to switching the row/column variables) equal the weights of the Demazure Model. In short, this flipped model still has partition function $Z(\mathcal{E}_w^P)$, but it also matches the Demazure model for the permutation $w^{-1}$ with row and column parameters switched. By Theorem 5.1 we know that the partition function of this system is $G_w^{(\beta)}(y, x)$. To complete the proof, we apply the following identity for $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials (see for example the Appendix of [14]):

$$G_w^{(\beta)}(x, y) = G_{w^{-1}}^{(\beta)}(y, x),$$

which proves that $Z(\mathcal{E}_w^P) = G_w^{(\beta)}(x, y)$. 

As we consider the row Yang-Baxter equation acting recursively on a Demazure Model system in Theorem 4.1, we may examine the action of the column Yang-Baxter equation on the Model P. Since the top boundary of a Model P system is labeled with the permutation $w^{-1}$, twisting the strands of the top boundary via the Model P column YBE (see Appendix) again provides a recursive relation in $w$. However, as we are twisting columns, rather than rows, this recursion involves the $y$
variables rather than the $x$ ones. Furthermore, having the inverse $w^{-1}$ on the boundary, rather than $w$, means that the recursion acts on the left of the permutation $w$ instead of the right. Applying a train argument à la Theorem 4.1 results in the following proposition, which we may also prove succinctly using the identity (5).

**Proposition 5.6.** We obtain an alternate recursive definition for the $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials via left actions. That is, if we define $\pi_{i,y}^{(\beta)}$ to be the $\beta$-deformed divided difference operator acting on the $y$ variables (as opposed to the $x$-variable definition in Section 2), we have

$$G^{(\beta)}_{s_iw}(x; y) = \pi_{i,y}^{(\beta)}(G^{(\beta)}_w(x; y))$$

whenever $\ell(s_iw) = \ell(w) - 1$.

**Proof.** Apply $\pi_{i}^{(\beta)}$ to $G^{(\beta)}_{w^{-1}}(y; x)$. This gives us

$$G^{(\beta)}_{w^{-1}s_i}(y; x) = \pi_{i}^{(\beta)}G^{(\beta)}_{w^{-1}}(y; x) = \frac{(1 + \beta y_{i+1})G^{(\beta)}_{w^{-1}}(y; x) - (1 + \beta y_{i})G^{(\beta)}_{w^{-1}s_i}(y_i; x)}{y_i - y_{i+1}}.$$ 

Then by (5), this becomes

$$G^{(\beta)}_{s_iw}(x; y) = \frac{(1 + \beta y_{i+1})G^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y) - (1 + \beta y_{i})G^{(\beta)}_{s_iw}(x; s_iy)}{y_i - y_{i+1}} = \pi_{i,y}^{(\beta)}G^{(\beta)}_w(x; y).$$

### 5.2 Correspondence with Pipe Dreams

Theorems 5.1 and 5.5 of the prior section allow us to prove that our models give the $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials according to Definition 2.1 which uses divided difference operators. In this section, we explain the correspondence between our models and pipe dreams, thus providing another way of seeing that the pipe dream and divided difference definitions of Grothendieck polynomials are equivalent. In particular, the admissible states of both models biject easily with reduced pipe dreams. The partition functions of our $P$ and $D$ models account for different sets of nonreduced pipe dreams, corresponding to the two different (yet equivalent) methods for reducing pipe dreams. See Section 6 of [27] for an explanation of the equivalence of the two reductions.

**Proposition 5.7.** For $w \in S_n$, there exists a bijection between lattice model states in $\mathcal{S}_w^P$ and reduced pipe dreams for $w$.

**Proof.** Given a reduced pipe dream for a permutation $w$, overlay it on a square lattice grid. Then label pipes on the left boundary by $1, 2, \ldots, n$ from the top to bottom. Assign a label of $i$ on an edge if the edge is along the path of pipe $i$, and label $+$ if no pipe travels along that edge. Depending on the labels of the pipes involved, bent tiles will form vertices of types $a_1^\perp, a_2^\perp,$ or $c_2$. Crossing tiles give vertices of type $a_1^\perp$, since we have at most one crossing of any pair of pipes and according to our labeling, these crossings must be a larger pipe over a smaller pipe. Blank tiles will give vertices of type $a_1$. Furthermore, in the pipe dream definition, the permutation $w = w(1)w(2)w(3)\cdots w(n)$ corresponds to the $x$-coordinates of pipes on the top boundary; examining the newly-built lattice model, we see that color $i$ will appear in the $w(i)$-th place on the top boundary, giving top boundary labels $w^{-1}$, so this state is in $\mathcal{S}_w^P$.

Conversely, given an admissible state of $\mathcal{S}_w^P$, the lack of a vertex of type $b_1$ in Model P forces the colored paths to only tile on or above above the diagonal, and thus they correspond to a pipe.
dream. Moreover, since Model P has no vertex where a smaller color on vertical edges can cross a larger color on horizontal edges (i.e. type $\alpha^1_2$ in Model D), then any pair of pipes can cross at most once, so this pipe dream is reduced. The same argument as before tells us that this is a pipe dream for $w$, so we obtain a bijection between admissible states of $\mathcal{S}_w^P$ and reduced pipe dreams for $w$. \qed

One of the advantages of the Chromatic Pipe lattice model is that we can use a single state to account for nonreduced pipe dreams as well as reduced ones by using the Boltzmann weights. In particular, one of the drawbacks of a pipe dream phrasing of the $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials is that it is difficult to immediately read off the permutation corresponding to a nonreduced pipe dream and, relatedly, to obtain all nonreduced pipe dreams corresponding to a certain permutation. By incorporating the reduction process into the weights, we remove that difficulty. That is, our set of weights is constructed such that the weight of an admissible state of $\mathcal{S}_w^P$ is equal to the sum of the weights of all pipe dreams with reduction equal to its corresponding reduced pipe dream. An example of this correspondence is seen in Figure 15, while Figure 14 gives an example with a particularly subtle reduction.

**Proposition 5.8** (See [18, 27]). For any $w \in S_n$,

$$G_w^{(\beta)}(x; y) = \sum_{P \in PD(w)} wt(P) \beta^{ex(P)}.$$

**Proof.** Consider the paths in a state $s$ of $\mathcal{S}_w$: by Proposition 5.7 these form a unique reduced pipe dream $P$ associated to $w$. In this bijection, a vertex of weight $x_i \oplus y_j$ in $s$ corresponds to a crossing tile in row $i$ and column $j$ of $P$ (we call this location $(i, j)$). In addition, the vertices of weight $1 + \beta(x_i \oplus y_j)$ correspond to tiles in $P$ where there is no crossing, but where the two pipes on the tile have already crossed further southwest. Swapping this tile out for a crossing tile produces a nonreduced pipe dream that reduces to $P$ with one extra crossing in location $(i, j)$, thus with excess 1 and weight $wt(P) \cdot (x_i \oplus y_j)$.

This swapping may be done independently at all the vertices with weights $1 + \beta(x_i \oplus y_j)$; swapping any such tiles in locations $(i_1, j_1), \ldots, (i_m, j_m)$ to crossing tiles corresponds to a pipe dream $P'$ that reduces to $P$ with excess $m$ and weight $wt(P') = wt(P) \cdot \prod_{k=1}^{m} (x_{i_k} \oplus y_{j_k})$. Conversely, every pipe dream that reduces to $P$ can be constructed in this way, by adding back in an extra crossing of a pair of pipes.

In other words, flipping one of these tiles at a vertex of weight $1 + \beta(x_i \oplus y_j)$ corresponds, in the partition function, to choosing the $\beta(x_i \oplus y_j)$ part of the weight. Whereas not flipping the tile corresponds to choosing the 1 part of the weight. The binomial theorem tells us that

$$wt(s) = \sum_{P' \rightarrow P} wt(P') \beta^{ex(P')},$$

where the sum is over all pipe dreams $P'$ that reduce to $P$. Since every pipe dream has exactly one reduction, and since reduced pipe dreams are in bijection with states in our lattice model, we can sum over states and (combining with the result of Theorem 5.5) arrive at our result:

$$G_w^{(\beta)}(x; y) = Z(\mathcal{S}_w^P) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}_w^P} wt(s) = \sum_{P \in PD(w)} wt(P) \beta^{ex(P)}.$$

**Example 5.9.** We follow the same convention as [30] for pipe dream reduction, in which we consider each pair of pipes and eliminate all crossings between them except for the most southwestern crossing.
One problem that arises is the order in which we reduce pipes. Consider the nonreduced pipe dream from Figure 1 reproduced on the far left in Figure 14. It is not immediately clear which pair of pipes we should consider first, as there are double crossings of pipes 2 and 4 as well as pipes 3 and 4 (following the naming convention of Proposition 5.7). As the reader may verify, this choice drastically affects what reduced pipe dream we obtain and thus to what permutation the nonreduced pipe dream corresponds. The lattice model eliminates the need to define a convention for choice of pairs, since it starts from the reduced pipe dream. However, it “sees” the eliminated crossing of pipes 2 and 4 in the corresponding reduced pipe dream, and the weight of that vertex \((1 + \beta(x_1 \oplus y_2))\) gives a term for the reduced pipe dream (coming from the monomial 1) and a term for the nonreduced pipe dream (coming from \(\beta(x_1 \oplus y_2)\)).

![Diagram](image)

Figure 14: From left to right: a nonreduced pipe dream with subtle reduction, its reduced pipe dream, and the corresponding lattice model state that encapsulates both pipe dreams, for \(w = 1432\).

A similar bijection between reduced pipe dreams for a permutation and admissible states of \(S^D_w\) can be made. This time, the edges of the system are labeled by \(w(i)\) if the edge is along the path of pipe \(i\). This correspondence is compatible with a different kind of reduction, where all but the northeast most crossing is removed. In this correspondence, the weight of an admissible state of \(S^D_w\) has weight equal to the sum of the weights of all pipe dreams whose reduction under this different method is the pipe dream corresponding to the admissible state. Figure 15 gives an example for the permutation 132.

### 5.3 Description of the Biaxial Model Partition Functions

As mentioned in Section 3.3, the systems \(S^B_{v,w}\) generalize the systems \(S^D_w\). Since we have proved in Section 5.1 that the partition functions of the latter give the \(\beta\)-Grothendieck polynomials, we thus have a generalization of the \(\beta\)-Grothendieck polynomials themselves. Accordingly, we name these polynomials **biaxial \(\beta\)-Grothendieck polynomials** and denote them

\[
G^{(\beta)}_{v,w}(x; y) := Z(S^B_{v,w}).
\]

We will spend this section exploring different specializations and properties of these polynomials. In particular, we shall show that a specialization gives the dual double \(\beta\)-Grothendieck polynomials
Figure 15: The correspondence between pipe dreams and admissible states for the Model P when \( w = 132 \). Here, the reduced pipe dream \( P_1 \) corresponds to state \( s_1 \), and the reduced pipe dream \( P_3 \) corresponds to \( s_2 \). Notice that \( B(s_1) = \text{wt}(P_1) + \text{wt}(P_2) \) and \( B(s_2) = \text{wt}(P_3) \). Thus, the weight of the single nonreduced pipe dream \( P_2 \) is accounted for by the lattice state corresponding to its reduction.

**Theorem 5.10.** For any \( v \in S_n \) and any simple reflection \( s_i \) such that \( \ell(vs_i) = \ell(v) + 1 \), the following recursion for \( Z(\mathcal{G}_{v,w}^B) \) holds:

\[
(1 + \beta y_i)Z(\mathcal{G}_{v,w}^B; x; y) + (y_{i+1} - y_i)Z(\mathcal{G}_{vs_i,w}^B; x; y) = (1 + \beta y_i)Z(\mathcal{G}_{v,w}^B; s_i x; y)
\]

and thus

\[
\mathcal{G}_{v,w}^{(B)}(x; y) = \mu_{i,y}^{(B)} \mathcal{G}_{v,w}^{(B)}(x; y),
\]

where \( \mu_{i,y}^{(B)} \) is the version of the divided difference operator \( \mu_{i,y}^{(B)} \), defined in Section 2, which acts on the \( y \) variables. For any \( w \in S_n \) and any simple reflection \( s_i \) such that \( \ell(ws_i) = \ell(w) - 1 \), we have the following recursion:

\[
(1 + \beta x_{i+1})Z(\mathcal{G}_{v,w}^B; x; y) + (x_{i+1} - x_i)Z(\mathcal{G}_{v,ws_i}^B; x; y) = (1 + \beta x_i)Z(\mathcal{G}_{v,w}^B; s_i x; y)
\]

and therefore

\[
\mathcal{G}_{v,w}^{(B)}(x; y) = \pi_i^{(B)} \mathcal{G}_{v,w}^{(B)}(x; y).
\]

**Proof.** We apply a train argument, as in Lemma 5.3, to the columns of the Biaxial Model. If we write \( v \) in one-line notation, the length condition on \( v \) happens precisely when \( c_i < c_{i+1} \). The left side of the recursion follows from using the weights in Figures 8 for Model B and the column YBE given in the Appendix for Model B to evaluate the partition function of the system on the left in (6). We have two options for the \( R \)-vertex: type \( a_2 \) gives the first term and type \( a_3 \) gives the second term.
To obtain the right side, we apply the YBE to push the $R$-vertex out the top and then evaluate the partition function of the system on the right in (6), which has only type $a_1$ as a possible $R$-vertex.

Thus the recursion follows. Rearranging, we obtain the second equation in the statement of the theorem.

To obtain the second recursion, we use the train argument in Lemma 5.3 verbatim, since the row YBE for the Biaxial Model derives from a vertical flip of that for Model D. Then we rearrange to solve for $G_{c,w,s}^{(x,y)}(x;y)$.

**Proposition 5.11.** We may specialize the biaxial $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials to obtain the dual double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials $H_w^{(x,y)}(x;y)$. Specifically,

$$H_w^{(x,y)}(y;x) = G_{w_0 w_0}^{(x,y)}(x;y).$$
Proof. In Theorem 5.10 we show that \( G^{(β)}_{s^i v, w} = μ_{i,y}^{(β)} G^{(β)}_{v,w} \) when \( ℓ(v s_i) = ℓ(v) + 1 \). Substituting \( w_0 v \) for \( v \), we have that if \( ℓ(w_0 v s_i) = ℓ(w_0 v) - 1 \), then \( G^{(β)}_{w_0 v s_i, w} = μ_{i,y}^{(β)} G^{(β)}_{w_0 v, w} \), which is the desired recursion relation in the \( y \) variables. It remains to show that we have the correct base case for \( w = w_0 \), i.e. that \( G^{(β)}_{1,v,0} (x; y) = H^{(β)}_{w_0} (y; x) \). By Remark 3.5, \( Z(\mathcal{G}^D_{w_0}) = Z(\mathcal{G}^S_{w_0}) \), and by Theorem 5.11 this equals \( G^{(β)}_{w_0} (x; y) = H^{(β)}_{w_0} (x; y) \). However, by (5), we have that \( G^{(β)}_{w_0} (x; y) = G^{(β)}_{w_0} (y; x) \), so the partition function in question also equals \( H^{(β)}_{w_0} (y; x) \) and our base case holds. \( \square \)

We now prove a relation between the dual polynomials and the \( β \)-Grothendieck polynomials. This identity was proven for Grothendieck polynomials (\( β = -1 \)) by Lenart, Robinson, and Sottile [27, Corollary 6.26], inspired by a similar identity proven by Lascoux [23]. Recall that our formal group law notation, as appearing in Remark 1.3 implies that \( ω_j := \frac{-β_j}{1 + β_j} \).

**Theorem 5.12.** The dual \( β \)-Grothendieck polynomials and the \( β \)-Grothendieck polynomials satisfy the following relation:

\[
H^{(β)}_{w} (y; x) = (-1)^{ℓ(w)} \prod_{i+j≤n} (1 + β(x_i ⊕ y_j)) G^{(β)}_{w} (y; ω).
\]

Proof. We will achieve this equality by applying transformations to \( \mathcal{G}^B_{w_0 v, w_0} \) and comparing this to \( \mathcal{G}^D_{w} \). First, we rotate the system \( \mathcal{G}^B_{w_0 v, w_0} \) ninety degrees clockwise. We rotate the weights, the row and column labels, and boundary conditions, so that the partition function is left unchanged. The new top boundary is assigned labels according to \( w_0 \) going from left to right. We multiply this top boundary on the left by \( w_0 \), so it is now the identity, and in order to leave the partition function unchanged, we multiply the left boundary conditions, labeled using \( w_0 \), by \( w_0 \) on the left as well, and also apply \( w_0 \) to the colors of our rectangular vertices.

We now have a new system, with the same partition function as \( \mathcal{G}^B_{w_0 v, w_0} \), defined by the following:

- Rows are numbered increasing from top to bottom with parameters \( y \).
- Columns are numbered increasing from left to right with parameters \( x \).
- Edges on the right and bottom boundaries have label +.
- Edges on the top boundary are labeled increasing from left to right with colors 1, 2, ..., \( n \).
- Labels on the left boundary assigned from top to bottom according to \( w \).
- Boltzmann weights are defined in Figure 17.

Example boundary conditions and row and column numbering is shown in Figure 17 along with the weights of the system.

Notice that this system is the system \( \mathcal{G}^D_{w} \), but with the role of column and row variables switched, and the weights of \( a_1^z \) and \( a_2^z \) exchanged. Note that \( ( ω x_i) ⊕ ( y_j) = \frac{-y_j}{1 + β(x_i ⊕ y_j)} \) and \( 1 + β(( ω x_i) ⊕ ( y_j)) = \frac{1}{1 + β(x_i ⊕ y_j)} \). Hence, the change of variables \( x_i → ω x_i \) and \( y_j → y_j \) followed by scaling the partition function by \( (-1)^{ℓ(w)} \prod_{i+j≤n} 1 + β(x_i ⊕ y_j) \) has the same effect on the partition function of \( \mathcal{G}^D_{w} \) as exchanging the weights of \( a_1^z \) and \( a_2^z \). Thus, the desired identity holds. \( \square \)

Combining Theorem 5.12 with (5), we obtain a similar identity to (3) for the dual \( β \)-Grothendieck polynomials, since our multiplicative factor in Theorem 5.12 is symmetric in \( x \) and \( y \).
Figure 17: The system for the transformed biaxial system in the proof of Theorem 5.12, where the vertex is in row $i$ and column $j$. Note the similarities between this and Model D.

Corollary 5.13. The dual $\beta$-Grothendieck Polynomials satisfy:

$$H^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y) = H^{(\beta)}_{w-1}(y; x).$$

Therefore,

$$H^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y) = G^{(\beta)}_{w-1,y_{i},y_{j}}(x; y).$$

In a similar manner to how we did for $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials, we may use this identity to uncover a second recursive definition for the dual $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials.

Corollary 5.14. As in Proposition 5.6 for the $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials, we obtain a recursive definition for the dual double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials via action on the left. That is, if we let $\mu^{(\beta)}_{i,y}$ be the divided difference operators $\mu^{(\beta)}_{i}$ acting on the $y$-variables instead of the $x$-variables, we obtain

$$H^{(\beta)}_{w-1,s_{i}}(y; x) = \mu^{(\beta)}_{i,y} H^{(\beta)}_{w-1}(y; x).$$

in the case that $\ell(s_{i}w) = \ell(w) - 1$.

Proof. Apply $\mu^{(\beta)}_{i,y}$ to $H^{(\beta)}_{w-1}(y; x)$. This gives us

$$H^{(\beta)}_{w-1,s_{i}}(y; x) = \mu^{(\beta)}_{i,y} H^{(\beta)}_{w-1}(y; x) = (1 + \beta y_{i}) \frac{H^{(\beta)}_{w-1}(y; x) - H^{(\beta)}_{w-1,s_{i}}(s_{i}y; x)}{y_{i} - y_{i+1}}.$$

Then by Corollary 5.13 this becomes

$$H^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y) = (1 + \beta y_{i}) \frac{H^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y) - H^{(\beta)}_{w,s_{i}}(x; s_{i}y)}{y_{i} - y_{i+1}} = \mu^{(\beta)}_{i,y} H^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y).$$

25
6 Generalized Cauchy Identity

Given an integer partition $\lambda$, let $s_\lambda$ denote the corresponding Schur function. The classical (dual) Cauchy identity for Schur polynomials states that

$$\prod_{i,j} (1 + x_i y_j) = \sum_\lambda s_\lambda(x) s_{\lambda'}(y),$$

where $\lambda'$ is the conjugate partition of $\lambda$. It may be viewed as a result on tensor products of $GL_n$ representations, a symmetric functions identity, or a biproduct of the Boson-Fermion correspondence. The identity allows one to conclude that the Schur polynomials form a self-dual orthogonal basis of symmetric functions with respect to the Hall inner product.

Generalized Cauchy formulas similarly allow one to obtain dual bases in $\lambda$-rings (see [25]). Such formulas have been obtained for many classes of polynomials, including Macdonald and LLT polynomials, factorial Schur functions, $k$-Schur functions, and various skew generalizations among them. See, for example, [28] for a statement of the Cauchy formula for Schubert polynomials; this Cauchy identity describes structure in the cohomology ring of vector bundles on products of flag varieties [1]. Fomin and Kirillov proved a Cauchy identity for $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials [11] by proving relations between products in Yang-Baxter algebras.

In this section, we give a lattice model proof of Fomin and Kirillov’s Cauchy identity that relies heavily on the solvability of the model. In fact, we’ll prove a generalized Cauchy identity for our biaxial polynomials and show that this specializes to the earlier identity for $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials. Earlier Bump, McNamara, and Nakasuji gave a proof of the dual Cauchy identity for factorial Schur functions [10] and our proof is in much the same spirit. We finish the section by generalizing one step further to give an analogous Cauchy identity for the biaxial $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials.

**Theorem 6.1** (Generalized Cauchy Identity). For any $w \in S_n$,

$$G_w^{(\beta)}(x; y) = \sum_{v \in S_n} G_v^{(\beta)}(y) G_{v^{-1} w}(x).$$

We obtain this identity by introducing yet another system of lattice models built from earlier systems, and then we evaluate its partition function in two different ways. Given any permutation $w$, let $\mathcal{R}_w(x; y)$ be the lattice model system with $2n$ rows and $n$ columns under the following set of conditions (see Figure 18):

- Row parameters, from top to bottom, are $x_n, ..., x_1, y_1, ..., y_n$. (Because of repeated indices, we refer to rows as “row $x_i$,” etc.)
- Column parameters are identically set to zero.
- Boundary labeling conditions on the top, right, and bottom boundaries are all +.
- For boundary conditions on the left boundary, the top $n$ rows are labeled by $w$ from bottom to top; the bottom $n$ rows are labeled with the identity permutation from top to bottom.
- The top $n$ rows take weights in Model B (Figure 8), while the bottom $n$ rows take weights in Model P (Figure 5).
Proposition 6.2. For \( w \in S_n \), \( Z(\mathcal{R}_w(x y)) = G_w(x y) \).

This proposition essentially follows from repeated use of the now familiar train argument. However, the base case \( w = w_0 \) in our recursive argument is surprisingly difficult. For this, we’ll need a pair of lemmas in increasing levels of generality. The proof of both lemmas makes use of a new statistic on colored edge labels called content. To define it, we need an absolute numbering on rows and columns independent of the row and column parameter indices of each particular model. We number columns ascending from left to right and rows ascending from bottom to top. Note that each horizontal edge of the lattice occurs in a row \( i \) and between columns \( j \) and \( j + 1 \) (where we can extend the numbering to include boundary edges), so we may assign coordinates to the horizontal edge of the form \( (i, j + \frac{1}{2}) \). Similarly, vertical edges lie between rows, so their coordinates are of the form \( (i + \frac{1}{2}, j) \). For each colored edge in an admissible state, define the content of that edge to be the integer given by the sum of its coordinates minus \( \frac{1}{2} \). An example of the content of colored edges in a state of Model B is given in Figure 19.

Lemma 6.3. If we change the right boundary edge in the system \( \mathcal{R}_w(x y) \) by replacing a label + in row \( x_i \) with color \( c \) and a label + in row \( y_j \) with label \( c \) for any choice of \( i, j \in [1, n] \), then the resulting system has no admissible states.

Proof. Consider only the Model B part of this modified system (the upper half), whose vertices have Boltzmann weights as in Figure 8. We may view colored paths as entering the top half of the lattice (the Model B half) from two sources: the bottom half (i.e., along the dotted line in Figure 18) or...
from the newly colored right boundary edge with color \( c \). Paths travel up and to the left through Model B according to the admissible vertices. There is some ambiguity about how to record paths at an \( a_2 \) vertex with all adjacent edges the same color; for simplicity, we assume in the present context that the path moving upward on the south edge travels left to the west edge at the vertex, while the path on the east edge travels up to the north edge at the vertex (though either choice would work here). With these conventions, colored edges in a given path may thus be ordered from their entry in Model B to their exit out the left boundary. For each vertex in a given colored strand, consider what happens to the content of the next edge in the strand as we move past the vertex. Traveling through each vertex either increases the content of the next colored label by 1 (in type \( b_1 \), or type \( a_1 \) if \( c \) is the smaller color); decreases the content of the next colored label by 1 (in type \( a_1 \) if \( c \) is the larger color); or leaves the content of the next colored label unchanged (noting our conventions on \( a_2 \) vertices above).

Consider now the total content of all the colors as we move along all strands at once up and to the left. A vertex of type \( a_2 \) increases the content by one for the strand of smaller color, but decreases it by one for the strand of larger color. Thus the only vertex that changes the total content of all the strands is \( b_1 \), which increases the total by 1. Therefore, the total content at the end of the strands (left side of Model B) must be greater than or equal to the total content at the beginning of the strands (right/bottom side of Model B). The total ending content of all colored edges on the left boundary of the Model B portion is \( 1 + 2 + \ldots + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \). To compute a lower bound on the total starting content along the bottom and right of Model B, note that colored paths move rightward and upward in Model P according to the set of admissible vertices. The path with color \( c \) must then enter from the left boundary in Model P and exit at the lone edge labeled \( c \) in the right boundary at row \( y_j \). The remaining colored paths travel up to the top half of the lattice (that is, through the bottom boundary of Model B) and their total content is at least \( 1 + 2 + \ldots + n - 1 \). Finally we have an additional colored path with color \( c \) entering on the right boundary of the top half of the model, whose content is at least \( n + 1 \). So the total starting content in the Model B half is at least \( 1 + 2 + \ldots + n - 1 + n + 1 = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + 1 \). This is more than the total ending content, giving a contradiction, so no admissible state is possible.

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
\text{column:} & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline
\text{row:} & 3 & + & + & + \\
3 & 1 & + & 2_{1} & 3_{1} & + & 3_{2} & + & 3_{3} & + \\
2 & 2 & 2_{1} & - & 2_{2} & + & 2_{3} & - & 2_{3} & + \\
1 & 3 & 3_{1} & 3 & 3_{2} & 3_{3} & + \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \end{array}
\]

Figure 19: A reprisal of the unique admissible state in \( G_{132,321}^R \). The content (the sum of coordinates \(-\frac{1}{2}\)) is the number above or to the left of the color.
Lemma 6.4. Let \( R_1(x; y) \) be the system with \( 2n \) rows and \( n \) columns:

- Row parameters, from top to bottom, are \( x_n, \ldots, x_1, y_1, \ldots, y_n \).
- Column parameters are identically set to zero.
- The top, right, and bottom boundary edges are all labeled +.
- \( n \) of the rows take weights in Model B (Figure 8), while the other \( n \) rows take weights in Model P (Figure 5).
- On the left boundary, the \( n \) Model B rows are labeled with colors 1, \ldots, \( n \), in any order; the \( n \) Model P rows are also labeled with colors 1, \ldots, \( n \), in any order.
- For a given color \( i \), the Model B row with label \( i \) on its left boundary is higher than the Model P row with label \( i \) on its left boundary.

Let \( R_2(x; y) \) be the system \( R_1(x; y) \) with two + labels on the right boundary replaced by a certain label \( c \) between 1 and \( n \) such that:

- Of the two rows, one takes weights in Model B, while the other takes weights in Model P.
- The Model B row is higher than the Model P row.

Then \( R_2(x; y) \) has no admissible states.

Proof. This is a generalization of Lemma 6.3 and will again make use of the total content of all colored edges in the lattice. Consider first the system \( R_1(x; y) \). In any admissible state, our final condition on the location of colors along the left boundary ensures that each colored strand begins on the left boundary at a Model P row and travels upwards (moving left and right through the model) and exits on the left of a Model B row. Let’s consider the increase in total content from all colored strands as we move along the path from entry to exit.

Let \( r_P(i) \) (resp. \( r_B(i) \)) be the row in which color \( i \) appears on the left boundary in Model P (resp. Model B), counting from the top down. On one hand, the total content in \( R_1(x; y) \) must increase by precisely

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} (r_P(i) - r_B(i)) = n^2 - 2s,
\]

where \( s \) is the number of pairs of a Model P row and a Model B row where the Model B row is higher.

On the other hand, we will show that this content increase is the minimum that we could expect. Recall from Lemma 6.3 that no vertex in Model B reduces the total content. Now, in Model P, vertices \( b_2, c_1, \) and \( c_2 \) increase the total content by 2, while any type of \( a_2 \) vertex increases the total content by 4. On the other hand, vertices \( a_2^\uparrow, a_2^\downarrow \) move two colors up half a row, vertices \( c_1, c_2 \) move one color up half a row, and vertices \( a_2^\uparrow, a_2^\downarrow \) move one color up one row. In other words, the increase in content for every vertex except \( b_2 \) is precisely twice the number of rows risen by strands through the vertex; for \( b_2 \), the content increases but there is no rise.

Since every strand begins in a Model P row and moves upwards to a Model B row, the strands altogether need to rise \( n^2 - 2s \) rows, of which \( \frac{n^2}{2} - s \) are Model P rows (if a strand rises one row from a Model P row to a Model B row, say, we consider half that rise to take place in each row). Since
the total content increase must be $n^2 - 2s$, we must have exactly the minimum content increases at each vertex: none in Model B rows, and 2 per row crossed in Model P rows.

Now we consider $\mathcal{R}_2(x; y)$. Note that the $c$ strand from the right boundary of a Model B row travels leftward and upward through the top half of the lattice and exits on the left boundary. The $c$ strand from the right boundary of a Model P row is the exit point of the $c$-colored strand moving upward and rightward from a lower spot on the left boundary. This means that the former strand ends on the left of a Model B row, while the latter ends on the left of a Model P row.

Consider now the total content of all the strands ending on the left side of Model B rows. In other words, we consider only the higher of the two $c$ strands for each $c$. We will show that the total content must be higher in this scenario than in $\mathcal{R}_1(x; y)$; as in Lemma 6.3 this will give a contradiction. Since the endpoints of all our (considered) strands are the same as in $\mathcal{R}_1(x; y)$, it suffices to consider the effect of the new starting point of the $c$ strand. Let $r'(c)$ be the row of Model B that has $c$ on its right boundary. Then the content at the start of strand $c$ in $\mathcal{R}_2(x; y)$ is $C := n + r_P(c) - r'(c)$ higher than the content at the start of strand $c$ in $\mathcal{R}_1(x; y)$.

If $r'(c) < r_P(c)$, then $r'(c)$ is higher in the diagram than $r_P(c)$ (recall we label our rows from the top down), so the $c$ strand may cross as many as $\min\{r_P(c) - r'(c) - \frac{1}{2}, n - \frac{1}{2}\}$ fewer P rows (the $\frac{1}{2}$ arises because the $c$ strand starts in Model B and ends in Model P). Since each strand crossing each Model P strand increases the content by (at least) 2, this can decrease the total content at the end of the strands by at most $D_1 := \min\{2r_P(c) - 2r'(c) - 1, 2n - 1\}$. However,

$$C - D_1 = \max\{1 + (n - r_P(c) + r'(c)), 1 - (n - r_P(c) + r'(c))\} \geq 1,$$

so the total content at the end of the strands of $\mathcal{R}_2(x; y)$ must be higher than the total content at the end of the strands of $\mathcal{R}_1(x; y)$.

If $r'(c) > r_P(c)$, then $r'(c)$ is lower in the diagram than $r_P(c)$, and the $c$ strand must cross at least $\min\{r'(c) - r_P(c) - n + \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\}$ more P rows, which will increase the total content at the end of the strands by at least $D_2 := \min\{2r'(c) - 2r_P(c) - 2n + 1, 0\}$. Therefore,

$$C + D_2 = \min\{1 + (r'(c) - r_P(c) - n), 1 - (r'(c) - r_P(c) - n)\} \geq 1,$$

which is again a contradiction, so $\mathcal{R}_2(x; y)$ has no admissible states. \hfill \Box

Lemma 6.5. Proposition 6.2 holds for $w = w_0$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on $n$: for $n = 1$, there is only one state for the system $\mathcal{R}_1(x_1; y_1)$, shown below, which has partition function 1:

Suppose that the claim holds for $w_0 \in S_{n-1}$. Consider the boundary conditions $\mathcal{R}_{w_0}(x; y)$ and attach a rhombus R-vertex to the right boundary in our now familiar train argument.

We apply Theorem 4.3 to push the $R$-vertex to the left boundary, where it emerges with external edges assigned label 1 (row $y_1$) and $n$ (row $x_1$) as in the right side of Figure 20. Referring back to
the $R$-vertices in Figure 13, we then evaluate the partition functions of both sides: on the right hand side, the $R$-vertex could be of type $a_1$ or type $c_2$. Lemma 6.3 rules out type $c_2$, so this $R$-vertex must be of type $a_1$. Since the remaining boundary conditions to the left of the $R$-vertex mimic exactly those of $R_{w_0}(x; y)$, this partition function is still $Z(R_{w_0}(x; y))$.

On the left hand side, there is only one $R$-vertex possible – that of type $a_1^+$ – which has weight $x_1 \oplus y_1$, and the boundary conditions on the left of that vertex have swapped one row of Model P with one row of Model B. Thus we obtain the relation depicted in Figure 20:

$$Z(R_{w_0}(x; y)) = (x_1 \oplus y_1) \cdot Z(R_{w_0}(x; y) \text{ with rows } x_1 \text{ and } y_1 \text{ swapped}).$$

We may continue to attach $R$-vertices and apply the train argument to move row $x_1$ downward, pushing it down past almost every Model P row until it sits as the second-to-last row. By the same reasoning as above,

$$Z(R_{w_0}(x; y)) = \prod_{i<n} (x_1 \oplus y_i) \cdot Z(R_{w_0}(x; y) \text{ with row } x_1 \text{ swapped with rows } y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{n-1}).$$

If we examine closely the remaining boundary conditions, we see that on the left of the diagram, our boundary labels read $1 \ 2 \ \cdots \ n-1 \ 1 \ 2 \ \cdots \ n-1 \ n \ n$ from top to bottom, with parameters $x_n, x_{n-1}, \ldots, x_2, y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{n-1}, x_1, y_n$. That is, if we chop off the bottom two rows, we have the boundary conditions for $R_{w_0}(x_2, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1})$ in the $n-1$ case. Furthermore, the bottom two rows must have weight 1, since the $n$-colored strand cannot travel north or further east in the penultimate row (which is in Model B); it must turn immediately south and exit west out the last row in order to give an admissible state.

By induction, we then have that

$$Z(R_{w_0}(x; y)) = \prod_{i<n} (x_1 \oplus y_i) \prod_{k+j\leq n-1} (x_{j+1} \oplus y_k).$$

Therefore,

$$Z(R_{w_0}(x; y)) = \prod_{i+j\leq n} (x_i \oplus y_j) = G_{w_0}^{(\beta)}(x; y).$$

Example 6.6. Let $n = 3$. Figure 21 shows the entire step-by-step process from Lemma 6.3 including all the steps within the induction. In each step, we push an extra vertex attached from the right side of the system to the left. First, we attach a vertex between rows $y_1$ and $x_1$ and move through to the left via repeated application of the Yang-Baxter equation in Theorem 13. This has the effect on the main rectangular part of the diagram of swapping rows $x_1$ and $y_1$ and the labels 1 and 3. We do the same to rows $x_2$ and $y_1$ followed by $x_1$ and $y_2$. 

Figure 20: The first stage of the train argument in the Cauchy identity.
Proof of Proposition 6.2. In the case \( w = w_0 \), this is Lemma 6.5. So we need only show that Cauchy lattice model satisfies the defining recursive relation of the \( \beta \)-Grothendieck polynomials,

\[
Z \left( R_{w_i}(x; y) \right) = \pi_i^{(\beta)} \left( Z \left( R_w(x; y) \right) \right), \quad \text{when } \ell(w_i) = \ell(w) - 1.
\]

Suppose the length condition holds. If we write \( w \) in one-line notation as \( c_1c_2 \cdots c_n \), this occurs precisely when \( c_i > c_{i+1} \). As in Lemma 5.3, we apply a train argument to rows \( x_i \) and \( x_{i+1} \). See the Appendix for the weights of the Biaxial Model row \( R \)-vertices, noting that the strand running southwest to northeast, labeled \( x_i \) in those weights, has parameter \( x_{i+1} \) in this case, and the other strand, labeled \( x_j \) in the diagram, is \( x_i \) in this case. If we attach an \( R \)-vertex to the left side of our system, we have two possible \( R \)-vertex types, \( a^\dagger_2 \) and \( a_2^\flat \). In the first case, the boundary conditions to the right of the \( R \)-vertex swap and we get partition function \((x_i + 1 - x_i)Z(\mathcal{R}_{w_i}(x; y))\). In the second case, the boundary conditions to the right of the \( R \)-vertex remain the same, yielding partition function \((1 + \beta x_i)Z(\mathcal{R}_w(x; y))\).

Moving the \( R \)-vertex through according to the Yang-Baxter equation, we have only one possibility for the \( R \)-vertex on the right side (type \( a_1 \)) so the partition function has weight \((1 + \beta x_i)Z(\mathcal{R}_w(s_i x; y))\).
Solving for $Z(\mathcal{R}_{w,s}(x; y))$, we see that the recursive relation holds. Therefore, the partition functions of these two systems are equal, and thus we have that $Z(\mathcal{R}_{w}(x; y)) = G^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y)$ for all $w \in S_n$. □

**Proof of Theorem 6.1.** By Proposition 6.2, $Z(\mathcal{R}_{w}(x; y)) = G^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y)$. On the other hand, we can evaluate this partition function in another way, by splitting the system $\mathcal{R}_{w}(x; y)$ at the middle (the dotted line in Figure 18) and evaluating each piece separately. Since each of the strands must pass up through this line in a different column, we can split the partition function into cases depending on which permutation appears on that line. Considering one of these cases, let $v^{-1}$ be the permutation at the dotted line. Then we see that the boundary conditions for the bottom half are precisely the system $G^{(\beta)}_{v}$ using weights $P$, so the partition function of the bottom half is $G^{(\beta)}_{v}(y; 0) = G^{(\beta)}_{v}(y)$. For the top half, the boundary conditions are precisely $G^{(\beta)}_{v^{-1},w}$, so the partition function of the top half is $G^{(\beta)}_{v^{-1},w}(x; 0) = G^{(\beta)}_{v^{-1},w}(x)$. Summing over possible midline permutations, we achieve the desired identity. □

In the case $w = w_0$, by Proposition 5.11, $G^{(\beta)}_{v^{-1},w_0}(x) = H^{(\beta)}_{v,w_0}(x)$. Thus Theorem 6.1 becomes the following more familiar Cauchy identity involving Grothendieck polynomials and their duals.

**Corollary 6.7 (Fomin-Kirillov [11]).**

$$G_{w_0}^{(\beta)}(x; y) = \sum_{v \in S_n} G^{(\beta)}_{v}(y)H^{(\beta)}_{v,w_0}(x).$$

In general, diagrams of the type depicted in Figure 22 will result in Cauchy-style identities. By varying the boundary conditions, we obtain different sets of polynomials involved in such equations. Our final theorem of this section is the most general such identity we may prove by such a method.

![Figure 22: Boundary conditions for $\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y)$ defined in Proposition 6.9 when $n = 3$.](image-url)
Theorem 6.8. *(Generalized Cauchy Identity for Biaxial Polynomials)*

\[ G^{(β)}_{v,w}(x; y) = \sum_{u \in S_n} G^{(β)}_{v,u}(0; x)G^{(β)}_{u,w}(y; 0). \]

Proposition 6.9. For \( v, w \in S_n \), let \( \mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y) \) be the lattice model system with 2\( n \) rows and \( n \) columns under the following set of conditions (see Figure 22). Then \( Z(\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y)) = G^{(β)}_{v,w}(x; y) \).

- Row parameters, from top to bottom, are \( x_n, \ldots, x_1, y_1, \ldots, y_n \).
- Column parameters are identically set to zero.
- Boundary label conditions on the top, right, and bottom boundaries are all +.
- For boundary conditions on the left boundary, the top \( n \) rows are labeled by \( w \) from bottom to top; the bottom \( n \) rows are labeled with the \( v \) from top to bottom.
- The top \( n \) rows take weights in the Biaxial Model (Figure 8), while the bottom \( n \) rows take weights in Model P (Figure 5).

Proof. Observe first that this system is precisely \( \mathcal{R}_{v}(x; y) \) with a different permutation (namely \( v \)) across the lower half of the left boundary. As such, the recursion established in the \( x \) variables for \( w \) in the proof of Lemma 6.5 holds for \( \mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y) \) by the same argument. So we have already that when \( ℓ(ws_i) = ℓ(w) - 1 \),

\[ Z(\mathcal{R}_{v,w,s_i}(x; y)) = π^{(β)}_i(Z(\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y))). \]

We may also establish a recursion in the \( y \) variables using a train argument with the YBE for Model P. Suppose that \( ℓ(vs_i) = ℓ(v) + 1 \). If we write \( v \) in one line notation \( c_1 c_2 \ldots c_n \), this occurs precisely when \( c_i < c_{i+1} \). Starting with the partition function of the following system, we observe that the \( R \)-vertex on the left has two possibilities: type \( a_2^1 \) or type \( a_2^2 \). In the former case, we will get a contribution of \( (y_{i+1} - y_i)Z(\mathcal{R}_{w,s_i,w}(x; y)) \), and in the latter a contribution of \( (1 + βy_i)Z(\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y)) \).

Applying the Yang-Baxter equation, we obtain the following system. Here, the only possibility for the \( R \)-vertex is type \( a_4 \), giving the partition function \( (1 + βy_i)Z(\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x, s_i y)) \).
Then if $\ell(vs_i) = \ell(v) + 1$, we have the recursion

$$Z(\mathcal{R}_{vs_i,w}(x; y)) = \mu^{(\beta)}_{i,y}(Z(\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y))).$$

Combining both of these recursive steps with the base case $\mathcal{R}_{1,x_0}(x; y)$ proven in Lemma 6.5, we have precisely the defining conditions for $G^{(\beta)}_{v,w}(x; y)$ laid out in Theorem 5.10. Therefore,

$$Z(\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y)) = G^{(\beta)}_{v,w}(x; y). \quad \square$$

**Proof of Theorem 6.8.** We evaluate $Z(\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y))$ in two ways as in the proof of Theorem 6.1. By Proposition 6.9, we know that $Z(\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y)) = G^{(\beta)}_{v,w}(x; y)$.

On the other hand, we can split the system $\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y)$ across its horizontal midline (the dotted line of Figure 22) and sum over permutations $u$ that appear on that split (reading off $u$ from left to right). On the top half, as in Theorem 6.1, we have the system $G^{(\beta)}_{u,w}(x; 0)$. On the bottom half, we have a system with left boundary $v$, top boundary $u$, and other boundary edges all labeled $+$, using the Model P weights (Figure 5). Examining these weights in comparison with the Model B weights (Figure 8), we see that the Model P weights are a 90 degree clockwise rotation of the Model B weights (except for the vertex $a^2$, which doesn’t appear in any admissible state of $\mathcal{R}_{v,w}(x; y)$). Therefore, the bottom half of the partition function is actually a rotated Model B system $S^{B}_{v,u}(0; y)$ with the roles of row and column parameters swapped. Thus, its partition function is $Z(S^{B}_{v,u}(0; y)) = G^{(\beta)}_{v,u}(0; y)$.

Summing over permutations $u$ on the midline, we obtain the desired identity,

$$G^{(\beta)}_{v,w}(x; y) = \sum_{u \in S_n} G^{(\beta)}_{v,u}(0; y) G^{(\beta)}_{u,w}(x; 0). \quad \square$$

**Remark 6.10.** Recalling that $G^{(\beta)}_{v,w}(x; y) = 0$ unless $v \leq w$ in the strong Bruhat order on $S_n$, we may rephrase the sum in Theorem 6.8 to remove zero terms as follows:

$$G^{(\beta)}_{v,w}(x; y) = \sum_{u \in S_n, \, v \leq u \leq w} G^{(\beta)}_{v,u}(0; y) G^{(\beta)}_{u,w}(x; 0).$$

### 7 A branching rule for double $\beta$-Grothendieck polynomials

In this section, we will give a branching rule for the Grothendieck polynomial $G^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y)$. If $w \in S_n$, our rule gives a formula for $G^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y)$ in terms of Grothendieck polynomials for permutations in $S_{n-1}$. We choose the name “branching rule” because this process is reminiscent of branching rules from representation theory, and because for lattice models that encode characters of representations, the process we describe indeed does give a representation-theoretic branching rule (see [7]).

In Section 7.1 we will give a condition using the weak and strong Bruhat orders which determines when the one-row partition function in Model P is non-zero. In Section 7.2 we will show that this generalizes the interleaving condition for non-chromatic 5-vertex models, and in Section 7.3 we will use our generalized interleaving condition to determine a branching rule for $G^{(\beta)}_{w}(x; y)$ (Corollary 7.12).
7.1 Generalized Interleaving Condition

We give a rule for when the one-row partition function is nonzero, which generalizes the interleaving condition from non-chromatic 5-vertex models to the chromatic case. We will work with Model P for this computation (see Figures 5, 6). We use the symbols $\leq, \leq_L \leq_R$ to denote the strong Bruhat order, left (weak) Bruhat order, and right (weak) Bruhat order, respectively.

Let $w \in S_n$, and let $w_i := w^{-1}(i)$, so $\eta_w := \eta(w_1w_2 \cdots w_n)$ is the one-line notation of $w^{-1}$. We then a natural left action of $S_n$ on this one-line notation by

$$s_i \cdot (w_1 \cdots w_iw_{i+1} \cdots w_n) = w_1 \cdots w_{i+1}w_i \cdots w_n,$$

and thus,

$$v \cdot \eta_w = \eta_{vw}.$$  \hfill (7)

For $w \in S_n$, define the permutations

$$w_{\max} := s_1s_2 \cdots s_{k-1}w, \quad \text{where } k = w(1), \quad \text{and}$$

$$w^- := w_{\max|2, \ldots, n} \in S_{n-1},$$

and let $w^+$ be the image of $w$ in $S_{n+1}$ via the map $\{1, \ldots, n\} \rightarrow \{2, \ldots, n+1\}, i \mapsto i + 1$. The permutation $w^-$ is well-defined since $w_{\max}(1) = 1$. Note that $(w^-)^+ = w_{\max}$ and $(w^+)^- = w$.

In terms of one-line notation, $\eta_{w^-}$ is obtained from $\eta_w$ by removing 1 and decreasing all entries by 1, $\eta_{w^+}$ is obtained from $\eta_w$ by adding 1 to the front and increasing all other entries by 1, and $\eta_{w_{\max}}$ is obtained from $\eta_w$ by shifting 1 to the front.

Further, define $w_{\min} \in S_n$ to be the permutation

$$w_{\min} = s_{\delta_1} \cdots s_{\delta_{n-1}}w,$$

where

$$\delta_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if there exists } j > i \text{ such that } w_i > w_j \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

In other words, $w_{\min}$ is the minimal permutation in the left Bruhat order obtained from left multiplying $w$ by a subexpression of $s_1 \cdots s_{n-1}$.

An equivalent definition for $\delta_i$ is

$$\delta_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if there exists } j > i \text{ such that } w_i > w_j \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Example 7.1. If $w = s_1s_2s_3s_2s_1s_5 = (14)(56)$, then $\eta_w = 423165, \eta_{w^-} = 31254, \eta_{w^+} = 1534276, \eta_{w_{\max}} = 142365$, and $\eta_{w_{\min}} = 142356$.

We will prove the following result:

Theorem 7.2. Let $w, v \in S_n$ with $v(1) = 1$. The one-line partition function $T(w, v)$ in Figure 24 is nonzero if and only if $w_{\min} \leq v \leq_L w_{\max}$.

Our first step in proving this theorem is the following lemma.

Lemma 7.3. For a given $w \in S_n$ the permutations $v \in S_n$ such that the partition function in Figure 25 is nonzero form the set

$$A_w = \left\{ v \in S_n \mid v(1) = 1, \ v = s_{\epsilon_1}^\ell \cdots s_{\epsilon_{n-1}}^\ell w, \text{ where } \epsilon_i \in \{0, 1\}, \ l(w) = l(v) + \sum \epsilon_i \right\}.$$
Proof of Theorem 7.2. It is clear from the definitions that \( w_{\min} \) and \( w_{\max} \) are elements of \( A_w \). Let \( v = s_{1}^{\epsilon_{1}} \cdots s_{n}^{\epsilon_{n-1}} w \in A_w \). We show that \( w_{\min} \leq v \leq w_{\max} \).

If \( \epsilon_{i} = 1 \), then the application of \( s_{i} \) to \( v_{i+1} := s_{i+1}^{\epsilon_{i+1}} \cdots s_{n-1}^{\epsilon_{n-1}} w \) must be length decreasing. Since \( v_{i+1}^{-1}(i) = w_{i} \) and \( v_{i+1}^{-1}(i+1) = w_{j} \) for some \( j > i \), we must have \( w_{i} > w_{j} \) for some \( i < j \). Therefore, \( \epsilon_{i} \leq \delta_{i} \) for all \( i \), so \( w_{\min} \leq v \).

On the other hand, \( v(1) = 1 \), so if \( w_{k} = 1 \) (i.e. \( w(1) = k \)), then we must have \( \epsilon_{i} = 1 \) for \( i < k \), but \( \epsilon_{k} = 0 \). Therefore, \( s_{1}^{\epsilon_{1}} \cdots s_{k-1}^{\epsilon_{k-1}} v \) commutes with the other \( s_{i}^{\epsilon_{i}} \), so we can write

\[
v = s_{k+1}^{\epsilon_{k+1}} \cdots s_{n-1}^{\epsilon_{n-1}} s_{1}^{\epsilon_{1}} \cdots s_{k-1}^{\epsilon_{k-1}} w = s_{k+1}^{\epsilon_{k+1}} \cdots s_{n-1}^{\epsilon_{n-1}} w_{\max},
\]

so \( v \leq w_{\max} \).

Conversely, suppose that \( w_{\min} \leq v \leq w_{\max} \). Since \( v \leq w_{\max} \), \( v(1) = 1 \). Furthermore, \( v \leq w_{\max} \leq w_{\max} \), so we can write \( v = w_{\max} \), where \( l(u) + l(v) = l(w) \). We want to show that \( u \) has a reduced expression of the form \( s_{1}^{\epsilon_{1}} \cdots s_{n-1}^{\epsilon_{n-1}} \). Consider the left (resp. right) Bruhat interval of elements less than \( w \), which we call \([1,w]_{L}\) (resp. \([1,w]_{R}\)). By [31] Proposition 3.12, the map \( \Phi_{w} : [1,w]_{L} \rightarrow [1,w]_{R}, \sigma \mapsto w\sigma^{-1} \) is an order-reversing bijection for both the weak and strong orders. In other words, we have

\[
\Phi_{w}(w_{\max}) = s_{k-1} \cdots s_{1} \leq R \Phi_{w}(v) \leq \Phi_{w}(w_{\min}) = s_{n-1} \cdots s_{1}^{l}.
\]

In other words, \( \Phi_{w}(v) \) can be written \( s_{n-1}^{\epsilon_{n-1}} \cdots s_{1}^{\epsilon_{1}} \), where \( \epsilon_{i} \leq \delta_{i} \), so

\[
v = \Phi_{w}(v)^{-1} w = s_{1}^{\epsilon_{1}} \cdots s_{n-1}^{\epsilon_{n-1}} w,
\]

and since everything above is a reduced expression, \( v \in A_w \).
Corollary 7.4. If \( w \in S_n \), we have

\[
Z(S^P_w) = \sum_{w_{\min} \leq v \leq L} W_{\max} Z(S^P_v) T(w, v),
\]

and every \( T(w, v) \) that appears is nonzero.

Remark 7.5. Everything in this subsection depends only on which vertices are admissible, and not their precise weights. Therefore, our results hold for any chromatic lattice model that has the same boundary conditions and admissible vertices as Model P. Thus, we can think of Corollary 7.4 as a statement about an arbitrary chromatic 5-vertex model.

7.2 Reduction to the non-chromatic case

Now we show that Theorem 7.2 generalizes the interleaving condition for the non-chromatic 5-vertex model.

A Grassmannian permutation is a permutation \( w \) with at most one descent. Say that this descent is at \( b = \beta_w \), so \( w(1) < w(2) < \ldots < w(b) > w(b+1) < w(b+2) < \ldots < w(n) \); equivalently, \( 1, \ldots, b \) forms a subword of \( \eta_w \), and so does \( b+1, \ldots, n \). We can associate to \( w \) the partition \( \lambda_w \), where \( \ell(\lambda_w) \leq b \) and \( \lambda_{b+1-i} = w(i) - i \).

Definition 7.6. We say that two partitions \( \mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_b) \) and \( \nu = (\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_b) \) satisfy the interleaving condition relative to \( b \) if \( \nu_b = 0 \), and for all \( i \), \( \mu_i \geq \nu_i \geq \nu_{i+1} \).

Remark 7.7. Definition 7.6 is the condition needed for the following partition function to be nonzero: referring to Figure 24, we have that each part \( \mu_i \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq b \) corresponds to a \( - \) in column \( \mu_i + i \), and each part \( \nu_i \) corresponds to a \( - \) in column \( \nu_i + i - 1 \) (column 0 is taken to be the circle to the left of the row). Note that we consider \( \nu \) to have \( b \) parts since this matches better with the chromatic model, whereas it is more standard [7] to consider it to have \( b-1 \) parts.

![Figure 24: The one-row partition function for Model P, where the top and bottom boundaries are Grassmannian permutations.](image)

Lemma 7.8. If \( u, v \in S_n \) are Grassmannian permutations, both with descent at \( b \), then \( u \leq_L v \) if and only if \( u \leq v \).

Proof. Suppose that \( u \leq v \), and since \( v \) is Grassmannian, \( v \) has a reduced expression of the form

\[
v = s_{v(1)} s_{v(1)-1} \cdots s_{1} s_{v(2)} s_{v(2)-1} \cdots s_{2} \cdots s_{v(b)} s_{v(b)-1} \cdots s_{b},
\]
The half-strong-half weak Bruhat interval $[\beta, \eta]$ is a subword of $\gamma$. Therefore, there exists some reduced expression of a Grassmannian permutation that contains the subword of $\eta$, and call it the $k$-block of $\eta$.

Therefore, the reduced word $\pi$ is obtained by setting the $\ell$-th block of $\pi$ to the front. In other words, the reduced word $u = s_\ell \cdots s_1$ is obtained by moving 1 to the front of $u$.

Proposition 7.10. If $\pi = s_{\ell-1} \cdots s_1$ are Grassmannian permutations with a descent at $\ell$, then and only if $\pi = s_{\ell-1} \cdots s_1$ are Grassmannian permutations, Theorem 7.2 is equivalent to the following proposition shows that for Grassmannian permutations.

Theorem 7.9. If $\pi = s_{\ell-1} \cdots s_1$, then
\[ s_\ell \cdots s_1 \pi = s_\ell \cdots s_1. \]

The following proposition shows that for Grassmannian permutations, Theorem 7.2 is equivalent to the condition that $u \leq \pi$.

Proof. Let $\pi = s_{\ell-1} \cdots s_1$ be a reduced word.

and this is a reduced expression, so $u \leq \pi$.

Therefore, there exists some reduced expression of a Grassmannian permutation that contains the subword of $\eta$, and call it the $k$-block of $\eta$.

Therefore, the reduced word $\pi$ is obtained by setting the $\ell$-th block of $\pi$ to the front. In other words, the reduced word $u = s_\ell \cdots s_1$ is obtained by moving 1 to the front of $u$.

Proposition 7.10. If $\pi = s_{\ell-1} \cdots s_1$ are Grassmannian permutations with a descent at $\ell$, then and only if $\pi = s_{\ell-1} \cdots s_1$ are Grassmannian permutations, Theorem 7.2 is equivalent to the following proposition shows that for Grassmannian permutations, Theorem 7.2 is equivalent to the condition that $u \leq \pi$.

Proof. Let $\pi = s_{\ell-1} \cdots s_1$ be a reduced word.

and this is a reduced expression, so $u \leq \pi$.

Therefore, there exists some reduced expression of a Grassmannian permutation that contains the subword of $\eta$, and call it the $k$-block of $\eta$.

Therefore, the reduced word $\pi$ is obtained by setting the $\ell$-th block of $\pi$ to the front. In other words, the reduced word $u = s_\ell \cdots s_1$ is obtained by moving 1 to the front of $u$.

Proposition 7.10. If $\pi = s_{\ell-1} \cdots s_1$ are Grassmannian permutations with a descent at $\ell$, then and only if $\pi = s_{\ell-1} \cdots s_1$ are Grassmannian permutations, Theorem 7.2 is equivalent to the following proposition shows that for Grassmannian permutations, Theorem 7.2 is equivalent to the condition that $u \leq \pi$.

Proof. Let $\pi = s_{\ell-1} \cdots s_1$ be a reduced word.

and this is a reduced expression, so $u \leq \pi$.

Therefore, there exists some reduced expression of a Grassmannian permutation that contains the subword of $\eta$, and call it the $k$-block of $\eta$.

Therefore, the reduced word $\pi$ is obtained by setting the $\ell$-th block of $\pi$ to the front. In other words, the reduced word $u = s_\ell \cdots s_1$ is obtained by moving 1 to the front of $u$.
Proposition 7.11. The one-row partition function of Model P, using the weights from Figure 5, is
\[ T(w, v) = \begin{cases} 
\prod_{i=1}^{n} d_i, & \text{if } v \in I_w \\
0, & \text{if } v \notin I_w,
\end{cases} \]
where
\[ d_i = \begin{cases} 
x_1 \oplus y_i, & \text{if } w(i) = v(i+1) \\
1, & \text{if } w(i) < v(i+1) \\
1 + \beta(x_1 \oplus y_i), & \text{if } w(i) > v(i+1).
\end{cases} \]

Proof. By Theorem 7.2, the one-row partition function \( T(w, v) \) has exactly one nonzero state if \( v \in I_w \), and none if \( v \notin I_w \).

If \( v \in I_w \), column \( i \) of \( T(w, v) \) contains a vertex of type \( a^\dagger_2 \) precisely when \( w(i) = v(i+1) \), a vertex of type \( a^\flat_2 \) precisely when \( w(i) < v(i+1) \), and a vertex of type \( a^\sharp_2 \) precisely when \( w(i) > v(i+1) \).

Corollary 7.12. The \( \beta \)-Grothendieck polynomials obey the following branching rule:
\[ G^{(\beta)}_w(x_1, \ldots, x_n; y_1, \ldots, y_n) = \sum_{v \in I_w} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n} d_i \right) G^{(\beta)}_v(x_2, \ldots, x_n; y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}). \] (8)

Proof. Let us view the row below the top boundary to be a fixed permutation \( v \) (see Figure 25). Note that for a given \( v \in I_w \), the lower \( n-1 \) rows of Model P have partition function \( G^{(\beta)}_v(x_2, \ldots, x_n; y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}) \). The result now follows from Theorem 7.2 and Proposition 7.11.

Remark 7.13. If we do the same process for Model D, and remove the first column, we obtain the following identity:

![Figure 25: The branching rule computation in Corollary 7.12. The partition function \( Z(S^P_w) \) can be given as the sum over \( v \in I_w \) of the partition function of this diagram. The top piece is \( T(W, v) \), while the bottom piece is \( G^{(\beta)}_v(x; y) \).](image-url)
\[
G_{\beta,w}^{(\beta)}(x_1, \ldots, x_n; y_1, \ldots, y_n) = \sum_{w_{\text{min}} \leq v \leq w_{\text{max}}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n} f_i \right) G_{\beta,v}^{(\beta)}(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}; y_2, \ldots, y_n),
\]

where

\[
f_i = \begin{cases} 
  x_i \oplus y_1, & \text{if } w^{-1}(i) = v^{-1}(i+1) \\
  1, & \text{if } w^{-1}(i) < v^{-1}(i+1) \\
  1 + \beta(x_i \oplus y_1), & \text{if } w^{-1}(i) > v^{-1}(i+1)
\end{cases}
\]

and \( v = (v^{-1})^{-1} \).

We can alternatively obtain this formula by “conjugating” the involution by the involution \( (8) \).

Remark 7.14. A similar branching rule to Corollary 7.12 may be possible for the biaxial polynomial \( G_{\beta,w}(x; y) \), using Model B. We have not yet attempted to find such a rule.

Appendix: \( R \)-vertex weights

Each of the models introduced is solvable in both the row and column variables; that is, they satisfy both a row and column Yang-Baxter equation. Because the Boltzmann weights of the Pipe Dreams Model and the Biaxial Model can be obtained from the Boltzmann weights of the Demazure Model by appropriate reflections, the \( R \)-vertex weights satisfying the row and column Yang-Baxter equations for these models can be easily determined from the \( R \)-vertex weights of the Demazure model, as described in Section 4. For completeness, we provide the weights here. In all sets of weights, \( a < b \) and \( c \) is any color.

**Demazure Model \( R \)-vertex weights:**

**Row Yang-Baxter equation \( R \)-vertex weights:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( a_1 )</th>
<th>( c_2 )</th>
<th>( b_1 )</th>
<th>( c_1 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( x_i, x_j )</td>
<td>( x_i, x_j )</td>
<td>( x_i, x_j )</td>
<td>( x_i, x_j )</td>
<td>( x_i, x_j )</td>
<td>( x_i, x_j )</td>
<td>( x_i, x_j )</td>
<td>( x_i, x_j )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1 + \beta x_i )</td>
<td>( 1 + \beta x_i )</td>
<td>( x_j - x_i )</td>
<td>( 1 + \beta x_j )</td>
<td>( 1 + \beta x_i )</td>
<td>( x_j - x_i )</td>
<td>( 1 + \beta x_i )</td>
<td>( 1 + \beta x_j )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Column Yang-Baxter equation \( R \)-vertex weights:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( a_1 )</th>
<th>( c_1 )</th>
<th>( b_2 )</th>
<th>( c_2 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
<th>( a_2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
<td>( + )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( y_i, y_j )</td>
<td>( y_i, y_j )</td>
<td>( y_i, y_j )</td>
<td>( y_i, y_j )</td>
<td>( y_i, y_j )</td>
<td>( y_i, y_j )</td>
<td>( y_i, y_j )</td>
<td>( y_i, y_j )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 1 + \beta y_i )</td>
<td>( 1 + \beta y_j )</td>
<td>( y_j - y_i )</td>
<td>( 1 + \beta y_i )</td>
<td>( 1 + \beta y_j )</td>
<td>( y_j - y_i )</td>
<td>( 1 + \beta y_j )</td>
<td>( 1 + \beta y_i )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pipe Model $R$-vertex weights:

Row Yang-Baxter equation $R$-vertex weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$c_2$</th>
<th>$b_1$</th>
<th>$c_1$</th>
<th>$a_2^1$</th>
<th>$a_1^1$</th>
<th>$a_2^2$</th>
<th>$a_1^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 + \beta x_i, 1 + \beta x_i, x_j - x_i, 1 + \beta x_i, x_j - x_i, 1 + \beta x_i, 1 + \beta x_i, 1 + \beta x_i$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column Yang-Baxter equation $R$-vertex weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$c_1$</th>
<th>$b_2$</th>
<th>$c_2$</th>
<th>$a_2^1$</th>
<th>$a_1^1$</th>
<th>$a_2^2$</th>
<th>$a_1^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 + \beta y_i, 1 + \beta y_i, y_j - y_i, 1 + \beta y_i, y_j - y_i, 1 + \beta y_i, 1 + \beta y_i, 1 + \beta y_i$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Biaxial Model $R$-vertex weights:

Row Yang-Baxter equation $R$-vertex weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$c_2$</th>
<th>$b_1$</th>
<th>$c_1$</th>
<th>$a_2^1$</th>
<th>$a_1^1$</th>
<th>$a_2^2$</th>
<th>$a_1^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_j$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 + \beta x_i, 1 + \beta x_i, x_j - x_i, 1 + \beta x_i, x_j - x_i, 1 + \beta x_i, 1 + \beta x_i, 1 + \beta x_i$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column Yang-Baxter equation $R$-vertex weights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$a_1$</th>
<th>$c_1$</th>
<th>$b_2$</th>
<th>$c_2$</th>
<th>$a_2^1$</th>
<th>$a_1^1$</th>
<th>$a_2^2$</th>
<th>$a_1^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
<td>$y_1, y_j$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 + \beta y_i, 1 + \beta y_i, y_j - y_i, 1 + \beta y_i, y_j - y_i, 1 + \beta y_i, 1 + \beta y_i, 1 + \beta y_i$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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