

Gröbner geometry for skew-symmetric matrix Schubert varieties

Eric Marberg
eric.marberg@gmail.com

Brendan Pawlowski
br.pawlowski@gmail.com

Abstract

Matrix Schubert varieties are the closures of the orbits of $B \times B$ acting on all $n \times n$ matrices, where B is the group of invertible lower triangular matrices. Extending work of Fulton, Knutson and Miller identified a Gröbner basis for the prime ideals of these varieties. They also showed that the corresponding initial ideals are Stanley-Reisner ideals of shellable simplicial complexes, and derived a related primary decomposition in terms of reduced pipe dreams. These results lead to a geometric proof of the Billey-Jockusch-Stanley formula for a Schubert polynomial, among many other applications.

We define skew-symmetric matrix Schubert varieties to be the nonempty intersections of matrix Schubert varieties with the subspace of skew-symmetric matrices. In analogy with Knutson and Miller's work, we describe a natural generating set for the prime ideals of these varieties. We then compute a related Gröbner basis. Using these results, we identify a primary decomposition for the corresponding initial ideals involving certain fpf-involution pipe dreams. We show that these initial ideals are likewise the Stanley-Reisner ideals of shellable simplicial complexes. As an application, we give a geometric proof of an explicit generating function for symplectic Grothendieck polynomials. Our methods differ from Knutson and Miller's and can be used to give new proofs of some of their results, as we explain at the end of this article.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	5
2.1	Initial ideals	5
2.2	Permutations	7
2.3	Involutions	8
3	Skew-symmetric matrix Schubert varieties	10
3.1	Matrix Schubert varieties	10
3.2	Bruhat orders	12
3.3	Pfaffian generators for prime ideals	14
3.4	Growth diagrams and rank tables	17
3.5	Monomial generators for initial ideals	21
3.6	Initial terms of Pfaffians	22
4	Transition equations for ideals	27
4.1	The inductive argument	28
4.2	The key lemma	30

4.3	Pipe dreams	32
4.4	Stanley-Reisner ideals and K -polynomials	34
5	New proofs of classical results	40

1 Introduction

Let \mathbb{K} be an algebraically closed field and write $B_n \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_n := \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{K})$ for the Borel group of $n \times n$ invertible lower triangular matrices over \mathbb{K} . The *flag variety* over \mathbb{K} is the quotient GL_n/B_n equipped with the structure of a projective variety. If $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, then a subvariety $X \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_n/B_n$ determines a class $[X]$ in the cohomology ring $H^*(\mathrm{GL}_n/B_n, \mathbb{Z})$, which Borel identified with a quotient of $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$. One can therefore ask for a polynomial representing $[X]$.

When $K \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_n$ is an algebraic subgroup, the Zariski closures of the K -orbits on GL_n/B_n give a particularly interesting family of subvarieties. For $K = B_n$, there are finitely many orbits, naturally indexed by the elements of the symmetric group S_n . The closures of these orbits are the *Schubert varieties* and their cohomology classes can be represented by the family of *Schubert polynomials* $\{\mathfrak{S}_w : w \in S_n\}$. Other subgroups K acting with finitely many orbits (the so-called *spherical subgroups*) include the symplectic group Sp_n when n is even, the orthogonal group O_n , and the block diagonal subgroups $\mathrm{GL}_p \times \mathrm{GL}_q$ for $p + q = n$.

The K -orbits on GL_n/B_n are in bijection with the B_n -orbits on GL_n/K , as well as with the $B_n \times K$ -orbits on GL_n , and it can be fruitful to consider the orbits from these alternate points of view. For example, take $K = B_n$ and consider the $B_n \times B_n$ -action on the space of all $n \times n$ matrices $\mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n} := \mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{K})$, by $(g, h) \cdot A = gAh^T$. The orbits for this action are called *matrix Schubert cells*, and their Zariski closures are the *matrix Schubert varieties*.

The $B_n \times B_n$ orbits contained in the open dense subset $\mathrm{GL}_n \subset \mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}$ are in bijection with Schubert varieties via pulling back along the quotient map $\mathrm{GL}_n \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n/B_n$. It is useful to consider the full space $\mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}$ since matrix Schubert varieties are then affine subvarieties of an affine space, and one can work with their ideals using tools of commutative algebra that are unavailable in the flag variety setting.

Let u_{ij} for $i, j \in [n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be commuting indeterminates and write \mathcal{U} for the $n \times n$ matrix with u_{ij} in position (i, j) . We identify the coordinate ring $\mathbb{K}[\mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}]$ with $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : 1 \leq i, j \leq n]$. Given a closed subvariety $X \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}$, let $I(X) \subseteq \mathbb{K}[\mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}]$ be the ideal of polynomials vanishing on X . If A is an $n \times n$ matrix and $R, C \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, then we write A_{RC} for the submatrix $[A_{ij}]_{(i,j) \in R \times C}$. Finally, let X_A denote the closure of the $B_n \times B_n$ -orbit of $A \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}$. Each orbit closure X_A is a subvariety, and one can describe the ideal $I(X_A)$ explicitly as follows.

Theorem 1.1 ([22, Thms. A and B]). For each $A \in \mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}$, the collection of minors $\det(\mathcal{U}_{RC})$, for all $R \subseteq [i]$ and $C \subseteq [j]$ with $|R| = |C| = \mathrm{rank} A_{[i][j]} + 1$ for some $i, j \in [n]$, generates the (prime) ideal $I(X_A)$ and forms a Gröbner basis with respect to any *antidiagonal term order*.

In this statement, a *term order* on a polynomial ring means a total ordering of the monomials in which 1 is minimal and multiplication by a fixed monomial preserves order. For the ring $\mathbb{K}[\mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}] = \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : 1 \leq i, j \leq n]$, a term order is *antidiagonal* if the initial term (defined as the maximal monomial with nonzero coefficient) of any minor $\det(\mathcal{U}_{RC})$ is the product of the antidiagonal entries of \mathcal{U}_{RC} . The prototypical example of an antidiagonal term order on $\mathbb{K}[\mathrm{Mat}_{n \times n}]$ is (*graded*) *reverse lexicographic order*, whose definition is reviewed in Example 2.2.

If I is an ideal, then a generating set $S \subseteq I$ is a *Gröbner basis* when the initial terms of the elements of S are a generating set for the *initial ideal* $\text{in}(I)$ generated by the initial terms of all elements of I . The assertion in Theorem 1.1 that the minors $\det(\mathcal{U}_{RC})$ generate $I(X_A)$ is originally due to Fulton [13, Prop. 3.3]. Knutson and Miller [22] reprove this result using different techniques to obtain the stronger statement that these minors form a Gröbner basis.

If a subvariety $X \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{C})$ is invariant under the left B_n -action, then it defines a class $[X]_{B_n}$ in the equivariant cohomology ring $H_{B_n}^*(\text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{C})) \simeq \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. The polynomial $[X]_{B_n}$ can also be computed algebraically as the *multidegree* of the ideal $I(X)$, and this definition works more generally over any algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} .

Identify a permutation $w \in S_n$ with the $n \times n$ permutation matrix with 1 in each position $(i, w(i))$ and 0 everywhere else. The $B_n \times B_n$ -orbits contained in $\text{GL}_n \subseteq \text{Mat}_{n \times n}$ are precisely the closures of the matrix Schubert varieties $\{X_w : w \in S_n\}$. For simplicity, and to emphasize the connection to Schubert varieties in GL_n/B_n , we state the next two theorems only for those orbits; both statements can be generalized to all matrix Schubert varieties without serious difficulty. When we write $\text{in}(I(X_w))$ we mean the initial ideal under any fixed antidiagonal term order.

Theorem 1.2 ([22, Thms. A and B]). If $w \in S_n$ then $[X_w]_{B_n}$ is equal to the polynomial \mathfrak{S}_w , and the initial ideal of $I(X_w)$ has primary decomposition $\text{in}(I(X_w)) = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{RP}(w)} (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$, where $\mathcal{RP}(w) \subseteq \binom{[n] \times [n]}{\ell(w)}$ is the set of (*reduced*) *pipe dreams* for w (see §4.3), and $(u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$ denotes the (prime) ideal of $\mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_{n \times n}]$ generated by u_{ij} for all $(i, j) \in D$.

As an application of this theorem, by using an algebraic interpretation of $[X_w]_{B_n}$ as the multidegree of $I(X_w)$, Knutson and Miller provide a geometric proof of the Billey-Jockusch-Stanley formula [4, Thm. 1.1] for the Schubert polynomial \mathfrak{S}_w . Knutson and Miller extract more detailed information about the ideals $I(X_w)$, such as their K -polynomials, from this related result:

Theorem 1.3 ([23]). For each $w \in S_n$, the ideal $\text{in}(I(X_w))$ is square-free (that is, it contains f if it contains f^2) and equal to the Stanley-Reisner ideal of a shellable simplicial complex.

Our goal in this paper is to prove similar theorems about the analogues of matrix Schubert varieties in another space of fundamental interest, namely, the subspace of all skew-symmetric matrices in $\text{Mat}_{n \times n}$. The rest of this introduction outlines our main new results in this direction.

Over an arbitrary field \mathbb{K} , an $n \times n$ matrix A is *skew-symmetric* if $A_{ij} = -A_{ji}$ and $A_{ii} = 0$ for all $i, j \in [n]$; note that the second condition is redundant if $\text{char}(\mathbb{K}) \neq 2$. Let $\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}} := \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}(\mathbb{K})$ denote the subset of such matrices in $\text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{K})$. We define the *skew-symmetric matrix Schubert variety* associated to $A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$ to be the intersection $X_A^{\text{ss}} := X_A \cap \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$.

Identify the coordinate ring $\mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}]$ with $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : n \geq i > j \geq 1]$, and write \mathcal{U}^{ss} for the $n \times n$ skew-symmetric matrix with $\mathcal{U}_{ij}^{\text{ss}} = u_{ij} = -\mathcal{U}_{ji}^{\text{ss}}$ for $i > j$ and $\mathcal{U}_{ii}^{\text{ss}} = 0$ for all i . Each X_A^{ss} is the zero locus of the obvious skew-symmetric analogue of the minors in Theorem 1.1, that is, the family consisting of $\det(\mathcal{U}_{RC}^{\text{ss}})$ for all $R \subseteq [i]$ and $C \subseteq [j]$ with $|R| = |C| = \text{rank } A_{[i][j]} + 1$ for some $i, j \in [n]$. These polynomials do not always generate the ideal $I(X_A^{\text{ss}})$, however. There is nevertheless a natural generating set for $I(X_A^{\text{ss}})$, which we describe as follows:

Theorem 1.4 (See Definition 3.13 and Theorem 4.5). For each $A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$, the collection of Pfaffians $\text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{RR}^{\text{ss}})$, as R ranges over all even sized subsets of $[n]$ such that $R \subseteq [i]$ and $|R \cap [j]| > \text{rank } A_{[i][j]}$ for some $i, j \in [n]$ with $i \geq j$, generate the (prime) ideal $I(X_A^{\text{ss}})$.

In another point of departure from ordinary matrix Schubert varieties, finding a generating set for $I(X_A^{\text{ss}})$ does not immediately lead to a Gröbner basis. For example, the generating set in the preceding theorem is generally *not* a Gröbner basis for $I(X_A^{\text{ss}})$ relative to an antidiagonal term order. This is because the initial ideal $\text{in}(I(X_A^{\text{ss}}))$ can have generators divisible by $u_{ab}u_{ac}$ for some $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$, which cannot be the leading term of any Pfaffian $\text{pf}(U_{RR}^{\text{ss}})$; see Example 3.28.

Our second main result resolves the nontrivial problem of finding a Gröbner basis for $I(X_A^{\text{ss}})$. Specifically, in Theorem 4.6 we show that a Gröbner basis for $I(X_A^{\text{ss}})$ with respect to the reverse lexicographic term order is provided by the Pfaffians of the block diagonal matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} U_{CC}^{\text{ss}} & U_{CR}^{\text{ss}} \\ U_{RC}^{\text{ss}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

for certain subsets $R, C \subseteq [n]$. Experimental evidence suggests that these Pfaffians may also form a Gröbner basis for other antidiagonal term orders. This more general claim does not follow from our present methods, however, and will not be pursued in this article.

Suppose n is even and $z \in S_n$ is a fixed-point-free involution, that is, a permutation with $z(z(i)) = i \neq z(i)$ for all $i \in [n]$. Associated to such a permutation is a set $\mathcal{FP}(z)$ of *fpf-involution pipe dreams*, whose elements are certain subsets of $\{(i, j) \in [n] \times [n] : i > j\}$; see Definition 4.11 for the full details. We let $X_z^{\text{ss}} := X_A^{\text{ss}}$ where A is the skew-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix with $A_{ij} = 1$ if $z(j) = i < j = z(i)$ and $A_{ij} = -1$ if $z(j) = i > j = z(i)$. Whenever we write $\text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}))$, we mean the initial ideal under the reverse lexicographic term order defined in Example 2.2.

Theorem 1.5 (See Theorems 4.3 and 4.15). For each fixed-point-free involution $z \in S_n$, the initial ideal of $I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ has primary decomposition $\text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}})) = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$, where $(u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$ denotes the (prime) ideal of $\mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}]$ generated by u_{ij} for all $(i, j) \in D$.

The varieties X_z^{ss} as z ranges over the fixed-point-free involutions in S_n are exactly the B_n -orbit closures in $\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}} \cap \text{GL}_n$, which is nonempty only if n is even. For simplicity, we have stated Theorem 1.5 only for these special cases of X_A^{ss} . Theorem 4.15 below will extend this result to all skew-symmetric matrix Schubert varieties in Mat_n^{ss} and all positive integers n .

Using Theorem 1.5, one can show that $[X_z^{\text{ss}}]_{B_n} = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} \prod_{(i, j) \in D} (x_i + x_j)$ under the identification $H_{B_n}^*(\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. This formula was proven combinatorially in [16]. It was also shown in [16] that the polynomials $[X_z^{\text{ss}}]_{B_n}$ are the same as the *fpf-involution Schubert polynomials* introduced by Wyser and Yong [36], which represent the ordinary cohomology classes of the $\text{Sp}_n(\mathbb{C})$ -orbit closures on $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})/B_n$. Briefly, the connection to our situation is that $\text{Sp}_n(\mathbb{C})$ -orbits on $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})/B_n$ are in bijection with B_n -orbits on $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})/\text{Sp}_n(\mathbb{C})$, which can be identified with $\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}(\mathbb{C}) \cap \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$.

Finally, we prove a skew-symmetric version of Theorem 1.3. As with Theorem 1.5, we state the next result just for the special case when $X_A^{\text{ss}} \subseteq \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}} \cap \text{GL}_n$, but we will extend the theorem in Section 4.4 to all skew-symmetric matrix Schubert varieties.

Theorem 1.6 (See Theorems 4.22 and 4.25). For each fixed-point-free involution $z \in S_n$, the ideal $\text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}))$ is square-free and equal to the Stanley-Reisner ideal of a shellable simplicial complex.

We use this result to give a new geometric proof of a combinatorial formula [31, Thm. 4.5] for the B_n -equivariant K -theory representative of X_z^{ss} ; see Theorem 4.28.

Ideals generated by Pfaffians of a generic skew-symmetric matrix have been well-studied [8, 9, 18, 20, 34], and there is some overlap between our results and prior work. For example, Herzog and

Trung showed in [18] that for a fixed positive integer r , the Pfaffians of all $2r \times 2r$ submatrices of a generic skew-symmetric matrix form a Gröbner basis with respect to an appropriate term order. De Negri and Sbarra [9] considered a larger family of ideals which, translated into our language, turns out to be a subfamily of the ideals $I(X_A^{\text{ss}})$ for $A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$; see Remark 3.15 for a precise description. They observed that the Pfaffian generators of Theorem 1.4 need not form a Gröbner basis with respect to an antidiagonal term order, and then classified the ideals that do enjoy this property. Raghavan and Upadhyay [34] examined the same family of ideals, computing their initial ideals and realizing the latter as Stanley-Reisner ideals of shellable complexes, as we do in Theorems 1.5 and 1.6. There is no easy way to translate between their results and ours, however, because they use term orders which are far from antidiagonal.

The techniques we use to prove Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 differ from those in [22], and in fact lead to new proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. We discuss these applications in Section 5. Knutson and Miller use a method in [22] called *Bruhat induction*, which is an induction on weak Bruhat order on S_n leveraging divided difference recurrences for Schubert classes. We instead induct on (strong) Bruhat order and use the transition recurrences of Lascoux and Schützenberger from [27]. A similar inductive approach to studying matrix Schubert varieties appears in [17].

The questions studied here are equally interesting to consider for *symmetric matrix Schubert varieties*, where Mat_n^{ss} is replaced by the space of symmetric matrices in $\text{Mat}_{n \times n}$. A number of technical difficulties arise in that setting, however. For example, the expected analogue of Theorem 1.5 no longer gives a pure primary decomposition into ideals of the same dimension, and this poses a fundamental obstruction to the techniques of Knutson and Miller from [22]. We hope that a variation of our new inductive approach can be adapted in future work to avoid these issues.

Acknowledgements

The first author was partially supported by Hong Kong RGC Grant ECS 26305218. We thank Zach Hamaker for a much improved proof of Proposition 3.22 and for many other helpful conversations. We are also grateful to Allen Knutson for explaining his perspective on Schubert transition recurrences, which inspired some of the key techniques used here.

2 Preliminaries

Throughout, we write \mathbb{Z} for the set of integers, $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ for the set of natural numbers, and $[n] = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : 0 < i \leq n\}$ for the first n positive integers.

2.1 Initial ideals

In this section we work over an arbitrary field \mathbb{K} . (Outside this section, we will always assume that \mathbb{K} is algebraically closed.) Suppose x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N are commuting variables, and consider the polynomial ring $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}] := \mathbb{K}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]$. For us, a *monomial* in $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ is an element $x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_l}$ for some possibly empty sequence of (not necessarily distinct) indices $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l \in [N]$.

A *term order* on $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ is a total order on the set of all monomials, such that 1 is the unique minimum and such that if $\text{mon}_1, \text{mon}_2, \text{mon}_3$ are monomials and $\text{mon}_1 \leq \text{mon}_2$, then $\text{mon}_1 \text{mon}_3 \leq \text{mon}_2 \text{mon}_3$. If $N = 1$ then there is a unique term order, namely, $1 < x_1 < x_1^2 < \dots$.

Example 2.1. The *lexicographic term order* on $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ declares that $x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_N^{a_N} \leq x_1^{b_1} \cdots x_N^{b_N}$ whenever $(a_1, \dots, a_N) \leq (b_1, \dots, b_N)$ in lexicographic order. The *(graded) reverse lexicographic term order* declares that $x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_N^{a_N} \leq x_1^{b_1} \cdots x_N^{b_N}$ whenever $\sum_i a_i \leq \sum_i b_i$ and $(a_N, \dots, a_1) \geq (b_N, \dots, b_1)$ in lexicographic order; note the double reversal.

Fix a term order and suppose $f = \sum_{\text{mon}} c_{\text{mon}} \cdot \text{mon} \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ where the sum is over monomials mon and each $c_{\text{mon}} \in \mathbb{K}$. If f is nonzero, then its *initial term* (or *leading term*) is the maximal monomial mon such that $c_{\text{mon}} \neq 0$. If $f = 0$ then its initial term is also defined to be zero. In either case, we write $\text{in}(f)$ for the corresponding initial term.

The *initial ideal* of an ideal I in $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ is then $\text{in}(I) := \mathbb{K}\text{-span}\{\text{in}(f) : f \in I\}$. This abelian group is itself an ideal in $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$. A *Gröbner basis* G for an ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$, relative to a fixed term order, is a generating set whose set of initial terms $\{\text{in}(g) : g \in G\}$ generates $\text{in}(I)$.

Example 2.2. In our applications, we will usually take x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N to be either the commuting variables u_{ij} indexed by all positions $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ for some m and n , or the subset of these variables indexed by positions strictly below the main diagonal.

An *antidiagonal term order* on $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]]$ is one with the property that the initial monomial of the determinant of any square submatrix A of $[u_{ij}]_{(i,j) \in [m] \times [n]}$ is the product of the antidiagonal entries of A . Under an antidiagonal term order, one has, for example,

$$\text{in} \left(\det \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} & u_{13} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} & u_{23} \\ u_{31} & u_{32} & u_{33} \end{bmatrix} \right) = u_{13}u_{22}u_{31}.$$

The prototypical example of an antidiagonal term order is the (graded) reverse lexicographic order from Example 2.2 with u_{ij} identified with $x_{n(i-1)+j}$. This means that we order the variables u_{ij} lexicographically, so that $u_{ij} < u_{i'j'}$ if $i < i'$ or if $i = i'$ and $j < j'$. Then, we declare that $\text{mon}_1 < \text{mon}_2$ if either $\deg(\text{mon}_1) < \deg(\text{mon}_2)$ or $\deg(\text{mon}_1) = \deg(\text{mon}_2)$ and the following holds: there is some variable u_{ij} whose exponent e_1 in mon_1 differs from its exponent e_2 in mon_2 , and when u_{ij} is the (lexicographically) largest such variable one has $e_1 > e_2$. If mon_1 and mon_2 are both square-free of the same degree, then we have $\text{mon}_1 < \text{mon}_2$ if and only if there is some variable u_{ij} that does not divide both monomials, and the largest such variable divides mon_1 but not mon_2 . We refer to this order as the *reverse lexicographic term order* on $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]]$.

Remark. Unless otherwise indicated, all results concerning initial ideals for subrings of $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]]$ will be relative to the reverse lexicographic term order just described.

We note a few basic facts in the generic setting of $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ with a fixed term order.

Lemma 2.3. Every strictly descending chain of monomials in a term order on $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ is finite.

Proof. Since $1 \leq \text{mon}$ for any monomial, it follows that $\text{mon}_1 \leq \text{mon}_2$ whenever $\text{mon}_1, \text{mon}_2 \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ are monomials with $\text{mon}_1 \mid \text{mon}_2$. Dickson's lemma asserts that if v_1, v_2, \dots is an infinite sequence in \mathbb{N}^N , then there are indices $i < j$ such that $v_i \leq v_j$ component-wise. Applying this to the exponent vectors of an infinite sequence of monomials $\text{mon}_1, \text{mon}_2, \dots \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ shows that there are always indices $i < j$ with $\text{mon}_i \mid \text{mon}_j$, so an infinite sequence is not strictly descending. \square

Proposition 2.4. Suppose I and J are ideals in $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$. Fix a term order on $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$. Then:

- (a) If $I \subseteq J$, then $\text{in}(I) \subseteq \text{in}(J)$.
- (b) It holds that $\text{in}(I) + \text{in}(J) \subseteq \text{in}(I + J)$.
- (c) It holds that $\text{in}(I \cap J) \subseteq \text{in}(I) \cap \text{in}(J)$.
- (d) If $I \subseteq J$ and $\text{in}(I) = \text{in}(J)$, then $I = J$.

Proof. Part (a) is clear. It implies $\text{in}(I) \subseteq \text{in}(I + J)$ and $\text{in}(J) \subseteq \text{in}(I + J)$, so part (b) follows. Similarly, part (a) implies $\text{in}(I \cap J) \subseteq \text{in}(I)$ and $\text{in}(I \cap J) \subseteq \text{in}(J)$, so part (c) follows.

For part (d), suppose the hypotheses hold and $f \in J$. Since $\text{in}(f) \in \text{in}(I)$, there is some $g \in I$ with $\text{in}(g) = \text{in}(f)$. For some $c \in \mathbb{K}$, $cf - g$ will therefore have a smaller initial term than f . Since $cf - g \in J$, we can iterate this process. Lemma 2.3 implies that the process must terminate, and when it does we will have written f as a linear combination of elements of I , so $J \subseteq I$. \square

Lemma 2.5. Suppose I and J are homogeneous ideals in $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$. If $\text{in}(I + J) = \text{in}(I) + \text{in}(J)$ relative to a given term order on $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$, then $\text{in}(I \cap J) = \text{in}(I) \cap \text{in}(J)$.

Proof. The *Hilbert series* of a graded vector space $V = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} V_n$ with each $\dim V_n$ finite is the generating function $\mathcal{H}(V) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \dim(V_n)t^n \in \mathbb{Z}[[t]]$. A homogeneous ideal I in $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ is a graded vector space of finite graded dimension, as is its initial ideal, and it holds that $\mathcal{H}(\text{in}(I)) = \mathcal{H}(I)$ [10, Theorem 15.3]. Since $\text{in}(I \cap J) \subseteq \text{in}(I) \cap \text{in}(J)$ by Proposition 2.4, we may consider the quotient $\text{in}(I) \cap \text{in}(J) / \text{in}(I \cap J)$, which is itself a graded vector space.

If $0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow V \rightarrow W \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence of degree-preserving linear maps between graded vector spaces, then $\mathcal{H}(U) = \mathcal{H}(V) - \mathcal{H}(W)$. Using this fact with the exact sequences $0 \rightarrow A \hookrightarrow B \rightarrow B/A \rightarrow 0$ (when $A \subseteq B$) and $0 \rightarrow A \cap B \xrightarrow{x \mapsto (x, -x)} A \oplus B \rightarrow A + B \rightarrow 0$, it is straightforward to check that $\mathcal{H}\left(\frac{\text{in}(I) \cap \text{in}(J)}{\text{in}(I \cap J)}\right) = \mathcal{H}(I \oplus J) - \mathcal{H}(I \cap J) - \mathcal{H}(\text{in}(I) + \text{in}(J))$. If $\text{in}(I + J) = \text{in}(I) + \text{in}(J)$, then the last term becomes $\mathcal{H}(\text{in}(I + J)) = \mathcal{H}(I + J) = \mathcal{H}(I \oplus J) - \mathcal{H}(I \cap J)$ and the whole expression simplifies to zero, which can only happen if $\text{in}(I) \cap \text{in}(J) = \text{in}(I \cap J)$. \square

Given an element $f \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$, let (f) denote the principal ideal it generates.

Lemma 2.6. Suppose $J \subseteq I$ are homogeneous ideals in $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$. Let $f \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ be a non-constant homogeneous polynomial such that $I \cap (f) = fI$ and $I + (f) = J + (f)$. Then $I = J$.

Proof. Write $I = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} I_n$ where I_n is the set of homogeneous elements of I with degree n . Write $J = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} J_n$ where J_n is defined similarly. Choose $i \in I_n$ for some n , and assume by induction that $I_m = J_m$ for $m < n$. By hypothesis we can write $i = j + fg$ for some $j \in J$ and $g \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$. The homogeneous parts of j and fg outside degree n must sum to zero. As f is homogeneous, we can therefore assume that j is homogeneous of degree n and that g is homogeneous of degree $n - \deg(f)$. Now we have $fg = i - j \in I \cap (f) = fI$, so $g \in I_{n - \deg f}$. Since f is non-constant, we may assume by induction that $g \in J_{n - \deg f}$, and hence $i = j + fg \in J_n$. \square

2.2 Permutations

Let S_∞ be the group of permutations of the positive integers \mathbb{N} that fix all but finitely many points. We realize S_n as the subgroup of permutations $w \in S_\infty$ with $w(i) = i$ for all $i > n$. Let $s_i = (i, i+1)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then S_∞ and S_n are Coxeter groups relative to the simple generating sets $\{s_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{s_i : i \in [n-1]\}$, respectively.

Most of the time we will work with elements of S_∞ or S_n , but some relevant constructions make sense for arbitrary permutations w of \mathbb{N} . For example, the descent sets of w are defined as

$$\text{Des}_R(w) := \{i : w(i) > w(i+1)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Des}_L(w) := \text{Des}_R(w^{-1}), \quad (2.1)$$

and the *Rothe diagram* of w is

$$D(w) := \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : 0 < j < w(i) \text{ and } 0 < i < w^{-1}(j)\}. \quad (2.2)$$

For example, $D(3142) = \{(1, 1), (1, 2), (3, 2)\}$ is the set of $\mathbf{0}$'s in the permutation matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

A permutation w of \mathbb{N} belongs to S_∞ if and only if $D(w)$ is a finite set, in which case the length function of S_∞ has value $\ell(w) = |D(w)|$. Given integers $m, n \geq 0$, we define

$$S_\infty^{m,n} := \{w \in S_\infty : \text{Des}_R(w) \subseteq [m] \text{ and } \text{Des}_L(w) \subseteq [n]\}. \quad (2.3)$$

This set (which is not a subgroup) has a simple characterization in terms of Rothe diagrams:

Proposition 2.7. One has $S_\infty^{m,n} = \{w \in S_\infty : D(w) \subseteq [m] \times [n]\}$.

We include a short, self-contained proof.

Proof. Let $w \in S_\infty$. For $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$, consider the set of pairs (i, y) with $j \leq y$ plus all pairs (x, j) with $i \leq x$. The result follows as a straightforward exercise on observing that $D(w)$ is the complement in $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ of the union of these “hooks” as (i, j) ranges over all pairs with $j = w(i)$. \square

A *partial permutation matrix* is a $(0, 1)$ -matrix with at most one 1 in each row and column. The $m \times n$ *partial permutation matrix* of an arbitrary permutation w of \mathbb{N} is the $m \times n$ partial permutation matrix whose nonzero entries occur in the positions $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ with $j = w(i)$. We denote this matrix by $w_{[m][n]}$. One can check that the (non-injective) map $w \mapsto w_{[m][n]}$ restricts to a bijection from $S_\infty^{m,n}$ to the set of all $m \times n$ partial permutation matrices.

Remark. This notion of partial permutation matrix is ubiquitous in the literature. Note that the map sending $w \in S_n$ to its $n \times n$ partial permutation matrix is an antiautomorphism, however.

2.3 Involutions

We write $\mathcal{I}_n := \{w \in S_n : w^2 = 1\}$ for the set of involutions in S_∞ fixing all $i > n$, and $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FPF}}$ for the set of elements in \mathcal{I}_n with no fixed points in $[n]$. The latter set is nonempty only if n is even, in which case it is the S_n -conjugacy class of $(1, 2)(3, 4) \cdots (n-1, n)$. Define $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ to be the set of permutations that are conjugate by an element of S_∞ to the involution

$$1_{\text{FPF}} := (1, 2)(3, 4)(5, 6)(7, 8) \cdots, \text{ i.e., the map sending } i \mapsto i - (-1)^i. \quad (2.4)$$

More explicitly, the set $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ consists of the fixed-point-free involutions of \mathbb{N} that agree with 1_{FPF} at all sufficiently large inputs—in other words, all products of the form

$$z \cdot (2m+1, 2m+2)(2m+3, 2m+4)(2m+5, 2m+6) \cdots$$

where $z \in \mathcal{I}_{2m}^{\text{FPF}}$ and $m \geq 0$. Note that the sets $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FPF}} \subset \mathcal{I}_n \subset S_n \subset S_\infty$ are disjoint from $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$.

Definition 2.8. Suppose $z \in \mathcal{I}_n$ has fixed points $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k$ in $[n]$. The *fixed-point-free standardization* of z is the product $\text{FPF}_n(z) := z \cdot z' \cdot z''$ where

$$\begin{aligned} z' &= (i_1, n+1)(i_2, n+2) \cdots (i_k, n+k) \\ z'' &= (n+k+1, n+k+2)(n+k+3, n+k+4)(n+k+5, n+k+6) \cdots \end{aligned}$$

Since k and n have the same parity, $n+k+1$ is odd so $\text{FPF}_n(z) \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$.

For example, if $z = (1, 4) \in \mathcal{I}_5$ then $\text{FPF}_5(z) = (1, 4)(2, 6)(3, 7)(5, 8)(9, 10)(11, 12) \cdots$. If $y \in \mathcal{I}_m^{\text{FPF}}$ and $z \in \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FPF}}$ for $m \leq n$, then $\text{FPF}_m(y) = \text{FPF}_n(z)$ if and only if $z = y s_{m+1} s_{m+3} \cdots s_{n-1}$. There are more interesting situations in which one can have $\text{FPF}_m(y) = \text{FPF}_n(z)$ if y or z have fixed points in $[m]$ and $[n]$.

There are at least two natural ways of characterizing the image of $\text{FPF}_n : \mathcal{I}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$. First, say that a positive integer i is a *visible descent* of $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ if $z(i+1) < \min\{i, z(i)\}$.

Proposition 2.9. The map FPF_n is a bijection from \mathcal{I}_n to the set of elements in $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ with no visible descents greater than n .

Proof. If we write $\text{FPF}_n(z) = (a_1, b_1) \cdots (a_p, b_p)(c_1, n+1)(c_2, n+2) \cdots$ where $a_i, b_i \in [n]$ for each i , then z can be recovered as $\text{FPF}_n(z) \cdot (c_1, n+1)(c_2, n+2) \cdots = (a_1, b_1) \cdots (a_p, b_p)$, so FPF_n is injective. Next, observe that if $y \in \mathcal{I}_n$ then $\text{FPF}_n(y)$ has no visible descents greater than n .

Assume conversely that $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ has no visible descents greater than n . One has $z(a) \in \{a-1, a+1\}$ for all sufficiently large integers a . If a is maximal with $z(a)+1 < a$, then some i with $z(a) \leq i < a$ must have $z(i+1) < \min\{i, z(i)\}$. Therefore if $n \leq z(a) < a$ then $a = z(a) + 1$. Let i be maximal with $z(n+i) \leq n$, or set $i = 0$ if no such integer exists. Then we must have $z(n+1) < z(n+2) < \dots < z(n+i) \leq n$ since otherwise some element of $\{n+1, n+2, \dots, 2n-1\}$ would be a visible descent. In this case $z = \text{FPF}_n(y)$ for the element $y \in \mathcal{I}_n$ with $y(j) = z(j)$ for integers $j \in [n] \setminus \{z(n+1), z(n+2), \dots, z(n+i)\}$ and $y(j) = j$ for all other j . \square

Remark. The image $\text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ of the map in Proposition 2.9 turns out to be the natural skew-symmetric analogue of $S_\infty^{m,n}$ and will frequently recur throughout this article. We stick to the slightly cumbersome notation “ $\text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ ” when referring to this, since anything more concise risks confusion with the set of all fixed-point-free involutions in S_n .

Next, define the *skew-symmetric Rothe diagram* of an arbitrary involution $z = z^{-1}$ of \mathbb{N} to be

$$D^{\text{ss}}(z) := \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : 0 < j < z(i) \text{ and } j < i < z(j)\}.$$

Since we assume $z = z^{-1}$, we can also write $D^{\text{ss}}(z) = D(z) \cap \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : i > j\}$. The set $D^{\text{ss}}(z)$ is denoted as $\hat{D}_{\text{FPF}}(z)$ in [15] and as $D^{\text{Sp}}(z)$ in [29, 30].

Proposition 2.10. It holds that $\text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n) = \{z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}} : D^{\text{ss}}(z) \subseteq [n] \times [n]\}$.

Proof. By [15, Lemma 5.2], the index of the last nonempty row in $D^{\text{ss}}(z)$ is the largest visible descent of z , so this result follows from Proposition 2.9. \square

3 Skew-symmetric matrix Schubert varieties

Here, we give the definitions and then examine the basic properties of our key objects of interest, which consist of the *skew-symmetric matrix Schubert varieties* and some related ideals. Throughout, m and n are fixed positive integers and \mathbb{K} is any algebraically closed field. We write $\text{Mat}_{m \times n} = \text{Mat}_{m \times n}(\mathbb{K})$ for the set of $m \times n$ matrices over \mathbb{K} , and A^T for the transpose of A .

In this setting, an element $A \in \text{Mat}_{n \times n}$ is *skew-symmetric* if $A^T = -A$ and all diagonal entries of A are zero. The second condition is redundant if $\text{char}(\mathbb{K}) \neq 2$. Let $\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}} = \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}(\mathbb{K})$ be the set of skew-symmetric matrices in $\text{Mat}_{n \times n}$. Finally, write $\text{GL}_n = \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{K})$ for the $n \times n$ general linear group over \mathbb{K} and write B_n for its Borel subgroup of invertible lower triangular matrices.

3.1 Matrix Schubert varieties

The main results in this article concern certain varieties of skew-symmetric matrices. One is led to study such spaces for their analogy with the following classical objects:

Definition 3.1. Given a permutation w of \mathbb{N} , the associated $m \times n$ *matrix Schubert cell* \mathring{X}_w and $m \times n$ *matrix Schubert variety* X_w are the subsets of $\text{Mat}_{m \times n}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathring{X}_w &:= \{A \in \text{Mat}_{m \times n} : \text{rank } A_{[i][j]} = \text{rank } w_{[i][j]} \text{ for } (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]\}, \\ X_w &:= \{A \in \text{Mat}_{m \times n} : \text{rank } A_{[i][j]} \leq \text{rank } w_{[i][j]} \text{ for } (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{rank } w_{[i][j]}$ is just the number of nonzero entries in the $i \times j$ partial permutation matrix of w . The product group $\text{GL}_m \times \text{GL}_n$ acts on $\text{Mat}_{m \times n}$, by the formula $(g, h) : A \mapsto gAh^T$ and matrix Schubert cells arise as the orbits of this action restricted to $B_m \times B_n$:

Theorem 3.2 (See [32, Ch. 15]). Let w be a permutation of \mathbb{N} . Then \mathring{X}_w is the $B_m \times B_n$ -orbit of the $m \times n$ partial permutation matrix of w . Moreover, X_w is the Zariski closure of \mathring{X}_w and is an irreducible variety. Finally, each $B_m \times B_n$ -orbit in $\text{Mat}_{m \times n}$ is equal to \mathring{X}_w for a unique $w \in S_\infty^{m, n}$.

The last part of the theorem shows that we lose no generality in our definition of X_w by restricting the index w to the set $S_\infty^{m, n}$, and this will be our usual practice. Matrix Schubert varieties have been extensively studied, for example, in [13, 22, 32].

We are interested in the following related varieties:

Definition 3.3. Given an involution $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$, the associated $n \times n$ *skew-symmetric matrix Schubert cell* $\mathring{X}_z^{\text{ss}}$ and $n \times n$ *skew-symmetric matrix Schubert variety* X_z^{ss} are the intersections

$$\begin{aligned}\mathring{X}_z^{\text{ss}} &= \{A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}} : \text{rank } A_{[i][j]} = \text{rank } z_{[i][j]} \text{ for } i, j \in [n]\} = \mathring{X}_z \cap \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}, \\ X_z^{\text{ss}} &= \{A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}} : \text{rank } A_{[i][j]} \leq \text{rank } z_{[i][j]} \text{ for } i, j \in [n]\} = X_z \cap \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}.\end{aligned}$$

These definitions would still make sense if z were an arbitrary permutation of \mathbb{N} , but then it could happen that $\mathring{X}_z^{\text{ss}} = \emptyset$. We require $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ to exclude this degenerate case. As in the classical setting, skew-symmetric matrix Schubert cells arise as the orbits of a certain group action. Specifically, observe that the general linear group GL_n acts on Mat_n^{ss} by $g : A \mapsto gAg^T$.

Remark. This formula obviously preserves Mat_n^{ss} when $\text{char}(\mathbb{K}) \neq 2$. If $\text{char}(\mathbb{K}) = 2$, then it is still clear that $(gAg^T)^T = -gAg^T$ for all $g \in \text{GL}_n$ and $A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$, and for $i \in [n]$ one has $(gAg^T)_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n g_{ij}g_{ik}A_{jk}$. This is zero since $A_{jj} = 0$ and $A_{jk} = -A_{kj}$, so $gAg^T \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$.

One can check that if $(g, h) \in \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ then $gAh^T \in \mathrm{Mat}_n^{\mathrm{ss}}$ for all $A \in \mathrm{Mat}_n^{\mathrm{ss}}$ if and only if $g = \lambda h$ for some $0 \neq \lambda \in \mathbb{K}$. If $g = \lambda h$ for $0 \neq \lambda \in \mathbb{K}$, then there exists $\mu \in \mathbb{K}$ with $\mu^2 = \lambda$ since \mathbb{K} is algebraically closed, so we can define $\tilde{g} := \mu h$ and then have $gAh^T = \tilde{g}A\tilde{g}^T$ for all $A \in \mathrm{Mat}_n^{\mathrm{ss}}$. Thus, the GL_n -orbits in $\mathrm{Mat}_n^{\mathrm{ss}}$ for the action $g : A \mapsto gAg^T$ are the same as the orbits of the subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ stabilizing $\mathrm{Mat}_n^{\mathrm{ss}}$.

Given any permutation w of \mathbb{N} , let $\mathrm{ss}_n(w)$ be the $n \times n$ matrix whose entry in position (i, j) is 1 if $w(j) = i < j = w(i)$, -1 if $w(j) = i > j = w(i)$, and 0 otherwise; see Example 3.5.

Theorem 3.4 ([7]). Suppose $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\mathrm{FPF}}$. Then $\mathring{X}_z^{\mathrm{ss}}$ is the B_n -orbit of the skew-symmetric matrix $\mathrm{ss}_n(z)$. Moreover, X_z^{ss} is the Zariski closure of $\mathring{X}_z^{\mathrm{ss}}$ and an irreducible variety. Finally, each B_n -orbit in $\mathrm{Mat}_n^{\mathrm{ss}}$ is equal to $\mathring{X}_z^{\mathrm{ss}}$ for a unique element $z \in \mathrm{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$.

We include a short proof sketch to explain how to extract our statement from [7].

Proof sketch. The discussion in [7, §2] shows that the matrices $\mathrm{ss}_n(y)$ for $y \in \mathcal{I}_n$ represent the distinct B_n -orbits in $\mathrm{Mat}_n^{\mathrm{ss}}$. Cherniavsky works over the complex numbers but his arguments apply equally well over arbitrary fields. Since $\mathrm{ss}_n(y) = \mathrm{ss}_n(\mathrm{FPF}_n(y))$ for $y \in \mathcal{I}_n$, it follows that the B_n -orbits in $\mathrm{Mat}_n^{\mathrm{ss}}$ are equivalently represented by $\mathrm{ss}_n(z)$ for $z \in \mathrm{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$. The set $\mathring{X}_z^{\mathrm{ss}}$ is the B_n -orbit of $\mathrm{ss}_n(z)$ by [7, Prop. 4.2], and [7, Prop 4.3] asserts that X_z^{ss} is the closure of $\mathring{X}_z^{\mathrm{ss}}$. The orbit $\mathring{X}_z^{\mathrm{ss}}$ is irreducible since it is the image of the irreducible variety B_n under the algebraic map $b \mapsto b \cdot \mathrm{ss}_n(z) \cdot b^T$, so its closure X_z^{ss} is also irreducible. \square

Example 3.5. Suppose $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & a & b \\ -a & 0 & c \\ -b & -c & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{Mat}_3^{\mathrm{ss}}$. If $a \neq 0$, then adding an appropriate multiple of row 1 to row 3 and adding the same multiple of column 1 to column 3 transforms A into $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & a & b' \\ -a & 0 & 0 \\ -b' & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$; further operations clear out the entries $\pm b'$ and rescale a to 1. Thus:

- If $a \neq 0$, then A is in the B_3 -orbit of $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \mathrm{ss}_3((1, 2))$.

Similarly:

- If $a = 0 \neq b$, then A is in the B_3 -orbit of $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \mathrm{ss}_3((1, 3))$.
- If $a = b = 0 \neq c$, then A is in the B_3 -orbit of $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \mathrm{ss}_3((2, 3))$.
- If $a = b = c = 0$, then A is in the B_n -orbit of $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \mathrm{ss}_3(1)$.

In each case A belongs to the orbit of $\mathrm{ss}_3(y)$ for some $y \in \mathcal{I}_3$; this orbit is $\mathring{X}_z^{\mathrm{ss}}$ for $z = \mathrm{FPF}_3(y)$.

Remark 3.6. A corollary of Theorems 3.2 and 3.4 is that if v is any permutation of \mathbb{N} and y is any element of $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\mathrm{FPF}}$, then there are unique elements $w \in S_\infty^{m,n}$ and $z \in \mathrm{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ such that $\mathrm{rank} v_{[i][j]} = \mathrm{rank} w_{[i][j]}$ for all $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ and $\mathrm{rank} y_{[i][j]} = \mathrm{rank} z_{[i][j]}$ for all $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$. This is not hard to show directly. We will encounter a few other objects described in terms of these rank conditions. As with X_w and X_z^{ss} , such objects may be defined for arbitrary permutations or involutions, but they will always be uniquely indexed by finite sets like $S_\infty^{m,n}$ or $\mathrm{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$. Beyond this subsection we will usually stick to the unique indexing sets.

Many of the rank conditions defining X_w and X_z^{ss} are redundant, and it is sometimes useful to work with a smaller set of sufficient conditions. The *essential set* $\text{Ess}(D)$ of $D \subseteq \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ is the subset of pairs $(i, j) \in D$ such that $(i+1, j) \notin D$ and $(i, j+1) \notin D$.

Proposition 3.7 ([13, 29]). If $w \in S_{\infty}^{m,n}$ and $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ then

$$\begin{aligned} X_w &= \{A \in \text{Mat}_{m \times n} : \text{rank } A_{[i][j]} \leq \text{rank } w_{[i][j]} \text{ for } (i, j) \in \text{Ess}(D(w))\}, \\ X_z^{\text{ss}} &= \{A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}} : \text{rank } A_{[i][j]} \leq \text{rank } z_{[i][j]} \text{ for } (i, j) \in \text{Ess}(D^{\text{ss}}(z))\}. \end{aligned}$$

The formula for X_w here is [13, Lem. 3.10]; the formula for X_z^{ss} is included in [29, Prop. 2.16].

3.2 Bruhat orders

Recall that $\ell(w) = |D(w)|$ is the length of $w \in S_{\infty}$. The *Bruhat order* on S_{∞} is the transitive closure $<$ of the relation with $v < w$ if $w = v(i, j)$ for positive integers $i < j$ and $\ell(w) = \ell(v) + 1$. This order is related to matrix Schubert varieties by the following well-known proposition.

Proposition 3.8. For all $v, w \in S_{\infty}^{m,n}$, the following properties are equivalent:

- (a) One has $v \geq w$ in the Bruhat order on S_{∞} .
- (b) It holds that $\text{rank } v_{[i][j]} \leq \text{rank } w_{[i][j]}$ for all $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$.
- (c) We have the containment $X_v \subseteq X_w$ of matrix Schubert varieties.

Proof sketch. The equivalence of (a) and (b) follow as a straightforward consequence of the *tableau criterion* for Bruhat order on symmetric groups [5, Thm. 2.6.3.]. Properties (b) and (c) are equivalent since the matrix Schubert cells X_v and X_w are nonempty. \square

There is a skew-symmetric analogue of this proposition. This will involve a version of Bruhat order for the set $\mathcal{I}_{\infty}^{\text{FPF}}$, which we introduce after the following technical lemma. Here, for any permutation w of \mathbb{N} and integers $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbf{r}_w(i, j) := \text{rank } w_{[i][j]}$.

Lemma 3.9. Suppose $y, z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ are involutions with $\mathbf{r}_y(i, j) \leq \mathbf{r}_z(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$. Then $\mathbf{r}_y(i, j) \leq \mathbf{r}_z(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [2n]$.

Proof. Consider the numbers $b_i := \mathbf{r}_z(i, n)$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$. Let $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k$ be the indices $i \in [n]$ with $b_i = b_{i-1}$ where $b_0 := 0$, so that $b_n = n - k$. Then the permutation matrix of z has an entry equal to 1 in positions $(i_j, n + j)$ and $(n + j, i_j)$ for each $j \in [k]$ and in positions $(i, i + 1)$ and $(i + 1, i)$ for each (odd) index $i \in \{n + k + 1, n + k + 3, \dots, 2n - 1\}$, and zeros in all other positions $(i, j) \in ([2n] \times [2n]) \setminus ([n] \times [n])$. It follows that

- $\mathbf{r}_z(i, n + j) = \min\{i, b_i + j\}$ for $i, j \in [n]$,
- $\mathbf{r}_z(n + i, n + j) = b_n + i + \min\{j, k\}$ for $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [n]$,
- $\mathbf{r}_z(n + i + k, n + j + k) = n + k + \mathbf{r}_{1_{\text{FPF}}}(i, j)$ if $i, j \in [n - k]$, with $1_{\text{FPF}} \in \mathcal{I}_{\infty}^{\text{FPF}}$ as in (2.4).

This tells us how to compute $\mathbf{r}_z(i, j)$ whenever $\max\{i, n+1\} \leq j \leq 2n$.

Now let $a_0 = 0$ and $a_i = \mathbf{r}_y(i, n)$ for $i \in [n]$, and suppose $a_i = a_{i-1}$ for exactly l indices $i \in [n]$. Since $a_n = n - l \leq n - k = b_n$, we have $k \leq l$. The itemized formulas above immediately imply that $\mathbf{r}_y(i, n+j) \leq \mathbf{r}_z(i, n+j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$ and that $\mathbf{r}_y(n+i, n+j) \leq \mathbf{r}_z(n+i, n+j)$ for all $i, j \in [k]$. Checking that $\mathbf{r}_y(i, j) \leq \mathbf{r}_z(i, j)$ for the remaining values of $i, j \in [2n]$ is straightforward using the above formulas.

Here are the explicit details. When $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [n] \setminus [k]$ we have $\mathbf{r}_y(n+i, n+j) = a_n + i + \min\{j, l\} \leq n + i = \mathbf{r}_z(n+i, n+j)$ since $a_n = n - l$ and $b_n = n - k$. Also, it is easy to see that $\mathbf{r}_y(n+i+l, n+j+l) = \mathbf{r}_z(n+i+l, n+j+l) = n + l + \mathbf{r}_{1_{\text{FPF}}}(i, j)$ for $i, j \in [n-l]$. It remains to check that $\mathbf{r}_y(n+i+k, n+j+k) \leq \mathbf{r}_{1_{\text{FPF}}}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_z(n+i+k, n+j+k)$ for $i \in [l-k]$ and $j \in [n-k]$ with $i \leq j$. Since in this regime we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}_y(n+i+k, n+j+k) &= n - l + i + k + \min\{j+k, l\}, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{r}_z(n+i+k, n+j+k) &= n + k + \mathbf{r}_{1_{\text{FPF}}}(i, j), \end{aligned}$$

the desired inequality is equivalent to $i + \min\{j - (l-k), 0\} \leq \mathbf{r}_{1_{\text{FPF}}}(i, j)$. This holds when $i \in [l-k]$ and $j \in [n-k]$ and $i \leq j$, since then $\mathbf{r}_{1_{\text{FPF}}}(i, j) = i$ unless $i = j$ is odd, in which case $\mathbf{r}_{1_{\text{FPF}}}(i, j) = i - 1$ and $j < l - k$. Combining these observations confirms that $\mathbf{r}_y(i, j) \leq \mathbf{r}_z(i, j)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j \leq 2n$, so by symmetry the same inequality holds for all $i, j \in [2n]$. \square

Define $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) = |D^{\text{ss}}(z)|$ for any involution z of \mathbb{N} . This is guaranteed to be a finite quantity if $z \in S_\infty$ or $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$. One can show that ℓ_{FPF} restricts to the unique map $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ with $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(1_{\text{FPF}}) = 0$ and $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(szs) = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) + 1$ whenever $s = (i, i+1)$ and $z(i) < z(i+1)$; see [15, §2.3 and §4].

The *Bruhat order* on $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ is the partial order $<$ given as the transitive closure of the relation with $z < tzt$ if $t = (i, j) \in S_\infty$ is a transposition and $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(tzt) = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) + 1$. For our applications, all we need to know about this order is summarized by the following lemma.

Lemma 3.10 ([14, §4]). Fix positive integers $i < j$. The following properties then hold:

- (P1) If $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ then we have $z < (i, j)z(i, j)$ if and only if $z(i) < z(j)$.
- (P2) If $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ then we have $\ell_{\text{FPF}}((i, j)z(i, j)) = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) + 1$ only if no integer e exists with $i < e < j$ and $z(i) < z(e) < z(j)$.
- (P3) If $y, z \in \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FPF}} \subset S_\infty$ for some $n \in 2\mathbb{N}$, then $\text{FPF}_n(y) \leq \text{FPF}_n(z)$ in the Bruhat order on $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ if and only if $y \leq z$ in the Bruhat order on S_∞ .

Remark. In this lemma, property (P1) follows from [14, Cor. 4.10] and property (P2) follows from [14, Prop. 4.9]. Property (P3) follows from [14, Thm. 4.6], which summarizes some specific consequences of the general theory of quasiparabolic sets developed in [35].

Here is our skew-symmetric analogue of Proposition 3.8:

Proposition 3.11. For all $y, z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$, the following properties are equivalent:

- (a) One has $y \geq z$ in the Bruhat order on $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$.
- (b) It holds that $\text{rank } y_{[i][j]} \leq \text{rank } z_{[i][j]}$ for all $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$.

(c) We have the containment $X_y^{\text{ss}} \subseteq X_z^{\text{ss}}$ of skew-symmetric matrix Schubert varieties.

Proof. We have $y = \text{FPF}_{2n}(y')$ and $z = \text{FPF}_{2n}(z')$ for some permutations $y', z' \in \mathcal{I}_{2n}^{\text{FPF}}$, and property (P3) in Lemma 3.10 asserts that $y \geq z$ in the Bruhat order on $\mathcal{I}_{\infty}^{\text{FPF}}$ if and only if $y' \geq z'$ in the Bruhat order on S_{2n} . The latter holds if and only if $\mathbf{r}_{y'}(i, j) \leq \mathbf{r}_{z'}(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [2n]$ by Proposition 3.8. By Lemma 3.9, this is equivalent to having $\mathbf{r}_y(i, j) \leq \mathbf{r}_z(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$, as $\mathbf{r}_y(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_{y'}(i, j)$ and $\mathbf{r}_z(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_{z'}(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [2n]$. This shows that properties (a) and (b) are equivalent. Properties (b) and (c) are obviously equivalent since the cells X_y^{ss} and X_z^{ss} are nonempty; this equivalence is also noted as [7, Cor. 4.4]. \square

3.3 Pfaffian generators for prime ideals

As in the introduction, we identify the coordinate ring $\mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}]$ with $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$ where u_{ij} represents the function $A \mapsto A_{ij}$. If A is a matrix and I and J are subsets of indices, then we write $A_{IJ} := [A_{ij}]_{(i,j) \in I \times J}$ for the corresponding $|I| \times |J|$ submatrix. We often apply this notation to the $n \times n$ skew-symmetric matrix of variables \mathcal{U}^{ss} with entries defined by

$$\mathcal{U}_{ij}^{\text{ss}} = \begin{cases} -u_{ji} & \text{if } i < j \\ u_{ij} & \text{if } i > j \\ 0 & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

If A is a matrix then $\text{rank } A \leq r$ if and only if all size $r + 1$ minors of A vanish. Hence, by Proposition 3.7, X_z^{ss} is the zero locus of the ideal in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$ generated by all size $\text{rank } z_{[i][j]} + 1$ minors of $\mathcal{U}_{[i][j]}^{\text{ss}}$ for $(i, j) \in \text{Ess}(D^{\text{ss}}(z))$. This ideal is often *not* prime, however.

Example 3.12. Take $n = 6$ and let z be the image of $(1, 2)(3, 5)(4, 6) \in \mathcal{I}_6^{\text{FPF}}$ under FPF_6 . Then

$$\text{Ess}(D^{\text{ss}}(z)) = D^{\text{ss}}(z) = \{(4, 3)\} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \right\} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \right\} \cap \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

so $X_z^{\text{ss}} = \{A \in \text{Mat}_6^{\text{ss}} : \text{rank } A_{[4][3]} \leq 2\}$ by Proposition 3.7. The ideal described above is therefore generated by the four 3×3 minors in $\mathcal{U}_{[4][3]}^{\text{ss}}$, one of which is

$$\det(\mathcal{U}_{\{1,2,4\},\{1,2,3\}}^{\text{ss}}) = \det \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -u_{21} & -u_{31} \\ u_{21} & 0 & -u_{32} \\ u_{41} & u_{42} & u_{43} \end{bmatrix} = u_{21}(u_{21}u_{43} - u_{31}u_{42} + u_{32}u_{41}).$$

This ideal, being generated by homogeneous polynomials of degree 3, cannot contain either of the factors u_{21} or $u_{21}u_{43} - u_{31}u_{42} + u_{32}u_{41}$, and therefore is not prime.

In this section, we identify a different set of natural generators for an ideal I_z^{ss} whose zero locus is X_z^{ss} . Later, in Section 4, we will show that I_z^{ss} is actually the prime ideal $I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ of the variety X_z^{ss} . The key idea in our construction is to replace minors of matrices by Pfaffians. Recall that the *Pfaffian* of a skew-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix A is

$$\text{pf}(A) = \sum_{z \in \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FPF}}} (-1)^{\ell_{\text{FPF}}(z)} \prod_{z(i) < i \in [n]} A_{z(i), i} \quad (3.2)$$

where once again $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) = |D^{\text{ss}}(z)|$. For example, we have $\text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{[2][2]}^{\text{ss}}) = \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -u_{21} \\ u_{21} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = -u_{21}$. If n is odd then the outer summation in (3.2) is empty so $\text{pf}(A) = 0$. This is consistent with the well-known fact that $\text{pf}(A)^2 = \det(A)$, which is zero if A is skew-symmetric of odd size.

Definition 3.13. Given $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$, let I_z^{ss} be the ideal in $\mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}] = \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$ generated by the Pfaffians $\text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{RR}^{\text{ss}})$ for all nonempty sets $R \subseteq [n]$ of even size for which there exist indices $i, j \in [n]$ with $i \geq j$ such that $R \subseteq [i]$ and $|R \cap [j]| > \text{rank } z_{[i][j]}$.

We discuss an example where we can compute directly that $I_z^{\text{ss}} = I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$.

Example 3.14. Suppose $n = 6$ and z is the image of $(1, 4)(2, 6)(3, 5) \in \mathcal{I}_6^{\text{FPF}}$ under FPF_6 . Then

$$[\text{rank } z_{[i][j]}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq 6} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ 0 & \boxed{0} & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 1 & \boxed{1} & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \end{bmatrix}$$

where the boxed cells correspond to the positions in $\text{Ess}(D^{\text{ss}}(z))$. The rank condition at position $(i, j) = (3, 2)$ says that $\text{rank } A_{[3][2]} = 0$ for all $A \in X_z^{\text{ss}}$, so X_z^{ss} is contained in the zero locus of the ideal (u_{21}, u_{31}, u_{32}) in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : 6 \geq i > j \geq 1]$. Thus every matrix $A \in X_z^{\text{ss}}$ has the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -A_{41} & -A_{51} & -A_{61} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -A_{42} & -A_{52} & -A_{62} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -A_{43} & -A_{53} & -A_{63} \\ A_{41} & A_{42} & A_{43} & 0 & -A_{54} & -A_{64} \\ A_{51} & A_{52} & A_{53} & A_{54} & 0 & -A_{65} \\ A_{61} & A_{62} & A_{63} & A_{64} & A_{65} & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The rank condition at position $(i, j) = (5, 2)$ says that if $A \in X_z^{\text{ss}}$ then $\text{rank } A_{[5][2]} \leq 1$, which holds if and only if $\det \begin{bmatrix} A_{41} & A_{42} \\ A_{51} & A_{52} \end{bmatrix} = 0$. We conclude that X_z^{ss} is the zero locus of the ideal $(u_{21}, u_{31}, u_{32}, u_{41}u_{52} - u_{42}u_{51})$ in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : 6 \geq i > j \geq 1]$. This ideal turns out to be prime, so it is in fact equal to the ideal $I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ of the (irreducible) variety X_z^{ss} .

We now describe the ideal I_z^{ss} . The generators of I_z^{ss} corresponding to position $(i, j) = (3, 2)$ have the form $\text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{RR}^{\text{ss}})$ for all subsets $R \subseteq \{1, 2, 3\}$ of size 2 such that $|R \cap \{1, 2\}| > 0$; the last condition is vacuous so R can be any of $\{1, 2\}$, $\{2, 3\}$, or $\{1, 3\}$, giving generators

$$\text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -u_{21} \\ u_{21} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = -u_{21}, \quad \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -u_{23} \\ u_{32} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = -u_{32}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -u_{31} \\ u_{31} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = -u_{31}.$$

The generators of I_z^{ss} corresponding to position $(i, j) = (5, 2)$ have the form $\text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{RR}^{\text{ss}})$ for all subsets $R \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ of size 2 or 4 such that $|R \cap \{1, 2\}| > 1$: these are $\{1, 2\}$, $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{1, 2, 3, 5\}$, and $\{1, 2, 4, 5\}$, giving generators $\text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{\{1,2\},\{1,2\}}^{\text{ss}}) = \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -u_{21} \\ u_{21} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = -u_{21}$ along with

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{\{1,2,3,4\},\{1,2,3,4\}}^{\text{ss}}) &= \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -u_{21} & -u_{31} & -u_{41} \\ u_{21} & 0 & -u_{32} & -u_{42} \\ u_{31} & u_{32} & 0 & -u_{43} \\ u_{41} & u_{42} & u_{43} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = u_{21}u_{43} - u_{31}u_{42} + u_{41}u_{32}, \\ \text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{\{1,2,3,5\},\{1,2,3,5\}}^{\text{ss}}) &= \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -u_{21} & -u_{31} & -u_{51} \\ u_{21} & 0 & -u_{32} & -u_{52} \\ u_{31} & u_{32} & 0 & -u_{53} \\ u_{51} & u_{52} & u_{53} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = u_{21}u_{53} - u_{31}u_{52} + u_{51}u_{32}, \\ \text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{\{1,2,4,5\},\{1,2,4,5\}}^{\text{ss}}) &= \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -u_{21} & -u_{41} & -u_{51} \\ u_{21} & 0 & -u_{42} & -u_{52} \\ u_{41} & u_{42} & 0 & -u_{54} \\ u_{51} & u_{52} & u_{54} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = u_{21}u_{54} - u_{41}u_{52} + u_{51}u_{42}. \end{aligned}$$

One can check that these Pfaffians are already a generating set for I_z^{ss} . (In fact, by mimicking the proof of [13, Lem. 3.10], one can show that I_z^{ss} is always generated by the generators in Definition 3.13 corresponding to just the essential positions $(i, j) \in \text{Ess}(D^{\text{ss}}(z))$, but we will not need this in any arguments.) For this example, one can compute directly that

$$\begin{aligned} I_z^{\text{ss}} &= (-u_{21}, -u_{32}, -u_{31}, u_{21}u_{43} - u_{31}u_{42} + u_{41}u_{32}, u_{21}u_{53} - u_{31}u_{52} + u_{51}u_{32}, u_{21}u_{54} - u_{41}u_{52} + u_{51}u_{42}) \\ &= (u_{21}, u_{32}, u_{31}, -u_{41}u_{52} + u_{51}u_{42}) \\ &= I(X_z^{\text{ss}}). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.15. One can show that the Pfaffian ideals considered in [9, 34] are precisely the ideals I_z^{ss} indexed by all $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ for which the essential set of the skew-symmetric Rothe diagram has the following property: one can write $\text{Ess}(D^{\text{ss}}(z)) = \{(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_k, b_k)\}$ such that the sequences of numbers a_i , b_i , and $\text{rank } z_{[a_i][b_i]}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ are respectively decreasing, increasing, and increasing (weakly in each case). Such conditions appear in certain geometric contexts [1, 24], as well as combinatorially: the permutations $w \in S_\infty$ such that $\text{Ess}(D(w))$ has the above property are exactly the ones that are *vexillary* (i.e., 2143-avoiding). Fixed-point-free involutions z satisfying our conditions also arise from geometry [33], but are no longer always vexillary permutations.

To show that I_z^{ss} is the prime ideal of X_z^{ss} , we first need to prove that $I_z^{\text{ss}} \subseteq I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$. For this, it suffices to check that $A \in X_z^{\text{ss}}$ if and only if $f(A) = 0$ for all $f \in I_z^{\text{ss}}$.

It is well-known that if B is the matrix obtained from a skew-symmetric matrix A by multiplying row i and column i by a scalar c , then $\text{pf}(B) = c \cdot \text{pf}(A)$. Likewise, if A^v , A^w , and A^{v+w} are skew-symmetric matrices that are equal outside row and column i , and it holds that column i contains vectors v , w , and $v + w$ in the three respective matrices, then $\text{pf}(A^{v+w}) = \text{pf}(A^v) + \text{pf}(A^w)$. More generally, we have $\text{pf}(XAX^T) = \det(X) \text{pf}(A)$ as long as X and A are square matrices of the same size with A skew-symmetric.

Lemma 3.16. Fix integers $i, j \in [n]$ with $i \geq j$ and $r \geq 0$. If $A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$ then $\text{rank } A_{[i][j]} \leq r$ if and only if $\text{pf}(A_{RR}) = 0$ for all subsets $\emptyset \neq R \subseteq [i]$ of even size with $|R \cap [j]| > r$.

Proof. First assume that $A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$ is a *monomial matrix*, that is, a product of a permutation matrix and a diagonal matrix. Suppose $\text{rank } A_{[i][j]} > r$. Then there exist nonzero entries of $A_{[i][j]}$ in some positions $(i_0, j_0), (i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_r, j_r)$ such that $R = \{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_r\}$ and $S = \{j_0, j_1, \dots, j_r\}$ both have size $r + 1$. The skew-symmetry of A means that every row and column of $A_{R \cup S, R \cup S}$ contains a nonzero entry. Since $A_{R \cup S, R \cup S}$ is again monomial, this means that $|R \cup S|$ is even and $\text{pf}(A_{R \cup S, R \cup S}) \neq 0$, but in this case we have $|(R \cup S) \cap [j]| \geq |S \cap [j]| = |S| = r + 1 > r$. Conversely, suppose that $\text{rank } A_{[i][j]} \leq r$. Then, since A is a monomial matrix, any selection of more than r columns of $A_{[i][j]}$ must include a zero column. In particular, if $|R \cap [j]| > r$ and $R \subseteq [i]$ then A_{RR} has a zero column, so $\text{pf}(A_{RR}) = 0$.

This proves the lemma when $A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$ is a monomial matrix. We now explain how to reduce the general form of the lemma to the monomial case.

Say that a set R is *valid* if $\emptyset \neq R \subseteq [i]$ and $|R|$ is even and $|R \cap [j]| > r$. Let \mathcal{V} be the vector space with a basis given by the collection of all valid sets. For a matrix $A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$, let $[A]_R := \text{pf}(A_{RR})$ and define $[A] \in \mathcal{V}$ to be formal linear combination $\sum_R [A]_R \cdot R$ over all all valid sets R . In this notation, what we wish to show is that $\text{rank } A_{[i][j]} \leq r$ if and only if $[A]$ is the zero vector in \mathcal{V} . Using the properties of Pfaffians noted above, we observe that for any indices $n \geq a > b \geq 1$:

- (i) If $X \in B_n$ is the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with $v \in \mathbb{K}$ in position (a, a) and all other diagonal entries 1, then $[XAX^T] = v \sum_{a \in R} [A]_R \cdot R + \sum_{a \notin R} [A]_R \cdot R$, both sums over valid sets R .

- (ii) If R is a valid set with $a \in R$ and $b \notin R$, then the set $(R \setminus \{a\}) \cup \{b\}$ is also valid.
- (iii) If $X = 1 + E_{ab} \in B_n$ is the $n \times n$ lower triangular matrix with 1's on the diagonal, with 1 in position (a, b) , and with 0's in all other positions, then

$$[XAX^T] = \sum_{a \in R \text{ and } b \notin R} ([A]_R \pm [A]_{(R \setminus \{a\}) \cup \{b\}}) \cdot R + \sum_{a \notin R \text{ or } b \in R} [A]_R \cdot R,$$

with both sums over valid sets R . More precisely, the sign \pm is $(-1)^{|R \cap \{a-1, a-2, \dots, b+1\}|}$.

Any matrix in B_n is a product of matrices of the form described in item (i) or (iii). Thus, we deduce that for each $X \in B_n$ there exists an invertible linear map $L_X : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$ with $L_X([A]) = [XAX^T]$ and $(L_X)^{-1} = L_{X^{-1}}$. Fix $A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$. Then for any given $X \in B_n$ we have $[A] = 0$ if and only if $[XAX^T] = 0$. In view of Theorem 3.4, there exists $X \in B_n$ such that XAX^T is the monomial matrix $\text{ss}_n(z)$ for some $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$. By the monomial case, this means that $[A] = 0$ if and only if $\text{rank}(XAX^T)_{[i][j]} \leq r$. However, $\text{rank}(XAX^T)_{[i][j]} = \text{rank } A_{[i][j]}$ for all $X \in B_n$. \square

We can now briefly derive the following result, which implies that $I_z^{\text{ss}} \subseteq I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$.

Theorem 3.17. If $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ then the zero locus of I_z^{ss} in Mat_n^{ss} is X_z^{ss} .

Proof. The zero locus of I_z^{ss} in Mat_n^{ss} is the zero locus of the generating set in Definition 3.13. By Lemma 3.16, this is just the set of all $A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}$ satisfying the rank conditions defining X_z^{ss} . \square

3.4 Growth diagrams and rank tables

We would also like to describe the initial ideal of I_z^{ss} (with respect to the reverse lexicographic term order), which will turn out to be the initial ideal of $I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$. In preparation for this, we take a short digression to prove some technical facts about *growth diagrams* and *rank tables*.

Given integer partitions $\mu = (\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq 0)$ and $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0)$, we write $\mu \subseteq \lambda$ if $\mu_i \leq \lambda_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. When this occurs we write $\lambda/\mu := \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : \mu_i < j \leq \lambda_i\}$ for the corresponding skew shape. Finally, let $\ell(\lambda) := \max(\{0\} \sqcup \{i \in \mathbb{N} : \lambda_i \neq 0\})$.

Suppose X is an $m \times n$ matrix with nonnegative integer entries. As first defined by Fomin [11], the *growth diagram* of X is the unique family of partitions $\lambda(i, j)$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $j \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ satisfying the following inductive rules. First, if $i = 0$ or $j = 0$ then $\lambda(i, j) := \emptyset$. If $i > 0$ and $j > 0$, then we write

$$\begin{bmatrix} \rho & \mu \\ \nu & \lambda \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \lambda(i-1, j-1) & \lambda(i-1, j) \\ \lambda(i, j-1) & \lambda(i, j) \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.3)$$

and define $\lambda = \lambda(i, j)$ by the following algorithm:

- (F0) Set $\text{CARRY} := X_{ij}$ and $k := 1$.
- (F1) Set $\lambda_k := \max\{\mu_k, \nu_k\} + \text{CARRY}$.
- (F2) If $\lambda_k = 0$, then return $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{k-1})$. Otherwise, set $\text{CARRY} := \min\{\mu_k, \nu_k\} - \rho_k$ and then set $k := k + 1$ and go back to step (F1).

See [25, §4.1] for further discussion and examples. One can check directly that in the notation of (3.3), one always has $\rho \subseteq \mu$ and $\rho \subseteq \nu$ such that μ/ρ and ν/ρ are horizontal strips, so

$$\ell(\mu) - \ell(\rho) \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(\nu) - \ell(\rho) \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$\ell(\mu) = \ell(\nu) = \ell(\rho) + 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \ell(\lambda) = \ell(\rho) + 2. \quad (3.5)$$

An essential nontrivial property of the growth diagram is this analogue of Greene's theorem:

Lemma 3.18 ([25, Thm. 8]). For each $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$, the number of parts $l = \ell(\lambda(i, j))$ is the length of the longest sequence of nonzero positions $(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2), \dots, (i_l, j_l)$ in X with $i \geq i_1 > i_2 > \dots > i_l \geq 1$ and $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_l \leq j$.

We will need one other lemma related to this general setup.

Lemma 3.19. Suppose $m = n$ and $X = X^T$ is symmetric. Then for each $i \in [n]$, the number of odd columns in the partition $\lambda(i, i)$ is $X_{11} + X_{22} + \dots + X_{ii}$.

Proof. Fix $i \in [n]$. It is clear that $\lambda(j, k) = \lambda(k, j)$, so we can write

$$\begin{bmatrix} \rho & \mu \\ \mu & \lambda \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} \lambda(i-1, i-1) & \lambda(i-1, i) \\ \lambda(i, i-1) & \lambda(i, i) \end{bmatrix}$$

and in steps (F1) and (F2) to compute λ one can replace $\max\{\mu_k, \nu_k\}$ and $\min\{\mu_k, \nu_k\}$ by just μ_k . Now consider the sequence of partitions $\lambda^0, \lambda^1, \lambda^2, \dots$ where λ^k is formed by replacing the first k parts of ρ by $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$, so that $\lambda^0 = \rho$. Let $\text{OC}(\lambda^k)$ be the number of odd columns in λ^k . If α and β are two partitions all of whose parts are equal except that $\alpha_i < \beta_i$ for some i , then $\text{OC}(\beta) - \text{OC}(\alpha) = (-1)^{i+1}(\beta_i - \alpha_i)$. Thus $\text{OC}(\lambda^1) - \text{OC}(\lambda^0) = X_{ii} + (\mu_1 - \rho_1)$ and for $k > 1$ it follows by examining (F1) and (F2) that $\text{OC}(\lambda^k) - \text{OC}(\lambda^{k-1}) = (-1)^{k+1}((\mu_{k-1} - \rho_{k-1}) + (\mu_k - \rho_k))$. Since $\lambda = \lambda^k$ for the first value of k with $\rho_k - \mu_k = \rho_{k+1} - \mu_{k+1} = 0$, adding things up gives

$$\text{OC}(\lambda) - \text{OC}(\rho) = \sum_{j=1}^k (\text{OC}(\lambda^j) - \text{OC}(\lambda^{j-1})) = X_{ii}$$

and in turn $\text{OC}(\lambda(i, i)) = \sum_{j=1}^i (\text{OC}(\lambda(j, j)) - \text{OC}(\lambda(j-1, j-1))) = \sum_{j=1}^i X_{jj}$. \square

We define a *rank table* to be a map $\mathbf{r} : \{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \times \{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ satisfying $\mathbf{r}(0, 0) = \mathbf{r}(i, 0) = \mathbf{r}(0, j) = 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. We have already seen that a permutation w of \mathbb{N} defines a rank table by the formula $\mathbf{r}_w(i, j) = \text{rank } w_{[i][j]}$ for $i, j > 0$. Recall that $\mathbf{r}_w(i, j)$ is just the number of nonzero entries in the $i \times j$ partial permutation matrix $w_{[i][j]}$.

Lemma 3.20. Let \mathbf{r} be a rank table. There exists $w \in S_{\infty}^{m,n}$ with $\mathbf{r}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_w(i, j)$ for all $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ if and only if for each $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ both of the following conditions hold:

- (a) One has $\mathbf{r}(i, j) - \mathbf{r}(i, j-1) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\mathbf{r}(i, j) - \mathbf{r}(i-1, j) \in \{0, 1\}$.
- (b) If $\mathbf{r}(i-1, j) - \mathbf{r}(i-1, j-1) = 1$, then $\mathbf{r}(i, j) - \mathbf{r}(i, j-1) = 1$.

Proof. First assume \mathbf{r} satisfies the given conditions. Say that $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ is *marked* if $\mathbf{r}(i, j) - \mathbf{r}(i, j-1) = 1$ but $\mathbf{r}(i-1, j) - \mathbf{r}(i-1, j-1) = 0$. Let X be the $m \times n$ matrix with 1 in each marked position and 0 everywhere else. Condition (b) implies that each column of X contains at most nonzero entry. If some row i contains two marked positions $(i, j), (i, k)$ with $j < k$, and there are no marked positions between these two, then we have

$$\mathbf{r}(i, j') - \mathbf{r}(i, j' - 1) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{r}(i-1, j') - \mathbf{r}(i-1, j' - 1) & \text{if } j < j' < k \\ \mathbf{r}(i-1, j') - \mathbf{r}(i-1, j' - 1) + 1 & \text{if } j' \in \{j, k\} \end{cases}$$

which implies that $\mathbf{r}(i, k) - \mathbf{r}(i-1, k) \geq 2$. This contradicts condition (a), so each row of X must also contain at most one nonzero entry, and X is an $m \times n$ partial permutation matrix.

Let $w \in S_{\infty}^{m,n}$ be the element whose $m \times n$ partial permutation matrix is X . Condition (b) implies that $\mathbf{r}(i, j) - \mathbf{r}(i, j-1) = 1$ if and only if (exactly) one of the positions $(i-1, j), (i-2, j), \dots, (1, j)$ is marked, so $\mathbf{r}(i, j) = \sum_{j'=1}^j (\mathbf{r}(i, j') - \mathbf{r}(i, j' - 1))$ for $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ is exactly the number of marked positions $(i', j') \in [i] \times [j]$. That is, we have $\mathbf{r}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_w(i, j)$ for $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$, as desired. If conversely there exists $w \in S_{\infty}^{m,n}$ with $\mathbf{r}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_w(i, j)$ for all $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$, then it is straightforward to check that conditions (a) and (b) hold. \square

Rank tables also arise from monomials in polynomial rings. As above, let $\{u_{ij}\}$ be a family of commuting indeterminates indexed by $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$. If $A = \{a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_r\}$ and $B = \{b_0 < b_1 < \dots < b_r\}$ are two sets of $r+1$ positive integers, then we let

$$A \odot B := \{(a_0, b_r), (a_1, b_{r-1}), \dots, (a_r, b_0)\} \quad \text{and} \quad u_{AB} := \prod_{(a,b) \in A \odot B} u_{ab}. \quad (3.6)$$

Given a set S and an integer $r \geq 0$, let $\binom{S}{r}$ denote the set of r -element subsets of S .

Definition 3.21. For a monomial $M \in \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}]$, let \mathbf{r}_M be the rank table in which $\mathbf{r}_M(i, j)$ for $i, j > 0$ is the largest value r such that $u_{AB} \mid M$ for some $(A, B) \in \binom{[i]}{r} \times \binom{[j]}{r}$.

For example, if $M = u_{21}u_{31}$ then

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}_M(1,1) & \mathbf{r}_M(1,2) & \mathbf{r}_M(1,3) \\ \mathbf{r}_M(2,1) & \mathbf{r}_M(2,2) & \mathbf{r}_M(2,3) \\ \mathbf{r}_M(3,1) & \mathbf{r}_M(3,2) & \mathbf{r}_M(3,3) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and we have $\mathbf{r}_M(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_M(3, j)$ for $i \geq 3$ and $\mathbf{r}_M(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_M(i, 3)$ for $j \geq 3$.

Proposition 3.22. If $M \in \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i \in [m], j \in [n]]$ is a monomial then there exists $w \in S_{\infty}^{m,n}$ such that $\mathbf{r}_M(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_w(i, j)$ for all $i \in [m]$ and $j \in [n]$.

Proof. Consider the growth diagram $\{\lambda(i, j)\}_{i \in \{0,1,\dots,m\}, j \in \{0,1,\dots,n\}}$ associated to the $m \times n$ matrix whose entry in position (i, j) is 1 if u_{ij} divides M and 0 otherwise. Lemma 3.18 implies that $\mathbf{r}_M(i, j) = \ell(\lambda(i, j))$ for all $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$. With this interpretation, the conditions in Lemma 3.20 obviously hold in view of properties (3.4) and (3.5). \square

We will need a skew-symmetric version of \mathbf{r}_M , whose definition is slightly more involved. If A and B are finite subsets of \mathbb{N} with $|A| = |B|$, then we let

$$u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if some } (a, b) \in A \odot B \text{ has } a = b \\ \prod \{u_{ij} : i > j, (i, j) \text{ in } A \odot B \text{ or } B \odot A\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For example, if $A = \{3, 4\}$ and $B = \{1, 2\}$ then $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = u_{A \sqcup B, A \sqcup B}^{\text{ss}} = u_{AB} = u_{41}u_{32}$. In general, if $\phi : \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i > j]$ is the ring homomorphism with

$$\phi(u_{ij}) = \begin{cases} u_{ij} & \text{if } i > j \\ u_{ji} & \text{if } i < j \\ 0 & \text{if } i = j, \end{cases}$$

then $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = \text{rad}(\phi(u_{AB}))$ where $\text{rad}(f)$ is the square-free radical of a polynomial f .

Definition 3.23. For a monomial $M \in \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i > j]$, let \mathbf{r}_M^{ss} be the rank table in which $\mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(i, j)$ for $i, j > 0$ is the largest value r such that $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \mid M$ for some $(A, B) \in \binom{[i]}{r} \times \binom{[j]}{r}$.

The rank table \mathbf{r}_M^{ss} is always *symmetric* in the sense that $\mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(j, i)$ for all i, j .

Example 3.24. If $M = u_{21}u_{31}$ then

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(1, 1) & \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(1, 2) & \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(1, 3) \\ \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(2, 1) & \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(2, 2) & \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(2, 3) \\ \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(3, 1) & \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(3, 2) & \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(3, 3) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We have $\mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(1, 1) = 0$ since 0 does not divide M , and we have $\mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(1, 2) = \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(2, 1) = 1$ and $\mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(2, 2) = 2$ since $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = u_{21}$ for $A = \{1\}$ and $B = \{2\}$ (or vice versa) as well as for $A = B = \{1, 2\}$.

Let $\text{dbl} : \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}]$ be the ring homomorphism with $\text{dbl}(u_{ij}) = u_{ij}u_{ji}$.

Lemma 3.25. Suppose $A, B \in \binom{[n]}{r}$ for some $r \in [n]$ and $M \in \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i > j]$ is a monomial. Then $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \mid M$ if and only if $u_{AB} \mid \text{dbl}(M)$.

Proof. If $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = 0$ then we have both $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \nmid M$ and $u_{AB} \nmid \text{dbl}(M)$, since no variable of the form u_{ii} divides $\text{dbl}(M)$. Assume $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \neq 0$. Let $u'_{AB} = \prod_{(i,j) \in A \odot B, i > j} u_{ij}$ and $u''_{AB} = \prod_{(i,j) \in A \odot B, i < j} u_{ij}$ so that $u_{AB} = u'_{AB} \cdot u''_{AB}$ and $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = \text{rad}(u'_{AB} \cdot \phi(u''_{AB}))$. Write N for the image of M under the ring homomorphism sending each $u_{ij} \mapsto u_{ji}$, so that $\text{dbl}(M) = MN$. Clearly $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \mid M$ if and only if $u'_{AB} \mid M$ and $u''_{AB} \mid N$, which holds if and only if $u_{AB} \mid \text{dbl}(M)$. \square

Our main use of the previous lemma is to prove this analogue of Proposition 3.22.

Proposition 3.26. If $M \in \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i > j]$ is a monomial then there exists $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ such that $\mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_z(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$.

Proof. By Proposition 3.22, there exists an element $w \in S_{\infty}^{n,n}$ with $\mathbf{r}_{\text{dbl}(M)}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_w(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$, and we have $\mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_{\text{dbl}(M)}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_w(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$ by Lemma 3.25. Since the rank table $\mathbf{r}_{\text{dbl}(M)}$ is symmetric, we may assume that $w = w^{-1}$. We claim that $w(i) \neq i$ for $i \in [n]$. Indeed, we can only have $w(i) = i$ for some $i \in [n]$ if

$$\mathbf{r}_w(i-1, i-1) = \mathbf{r}_w(i, i-1) = \mathbf{r}_w(i-1, i) < \mathbf{r}_w(i, i). \quad (3.7)$$

To exclude this possibility, consider the symmetric $n \times n$ matrix Y whose entry in position (i, j) is 1 if u_{ij} or u_{ji} divides M , and 0 otherwise. If $\{\lambda(i, j)\}_{i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}}$ is the growth diagram associated to Y , then we have $\mathbf{r}_w(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_{\text{dbl}(M)}(i, j) = \ell(\lambda(i, j))$ for all $i, j \in [n] \times [n]$ by the argument in the proof of Proposition 3.22. Since Y is symmetric with all zeros on the main diagonal, Lemma 3.19 implies that $\mathbf{r}_w(i, i)$ is even for all $i \in [n]$. As adjacent entries in \mathbf{r}_w differ by at most one, we conclude that (3.7) cannot occur. Now define $y \in \mathcal{I}_n$ to have $y(i) = w(i)$ if it holds that $\{i, w(i)\} \subseteq [n]$ and $y(i) = i$ otherwise. As w has no fixed points in $[n]$, the element $z = \text{FPF}_n(y)$ satisfies $\mathbf{r}_z(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_w(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$. \square

3.5 Monomial generators for initial ideals

We can now describe explicitly a monomial ideal in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$ that will turn out to be the initial ideal $\text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$ of I_z^{ss} under the reverse lexicographic term order.

Definition 3.27. For a symmetric rank table \mathbf{r} , let $J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}}$ be the ideal in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$ generated by all monomials of the form u_{AB}^{ss} , where $(A, B) \in \binom{[i]}{q} \times \binom{[j]}{q}$ for some $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$ with $i \geq j$ and $q = \mathbf{r}(i, j) + 1$. If $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$, then we define $J_z^{\text{ss}} := J_{\mathbf{r}_z}^{\text{ss}}$.

It can be shown that in the definition of J_z^{ss} above, one only needs those generators corresponding to $(i, j) \in \text{Ess}(D^{\text{ss}}(z))$. We will not prove this fact since we do not need it for any arguments, but we do assume it in the next example.

Example 3.28. Take $n = 6$ and let z be the image of $(1, 2)(3, 6)(4, 5) \in \mathcal{I}_6^{\text{FPF}}$ under FPF_6 . Then

$$D^{\text{ss}}(z) = \{(4, 3), (5, 3)\} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \right\} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \square & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \square & \square & \square & 1 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \square & \square & 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \right\} \cap \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

so $\text{Ess}(D^{\text{ss}}(z)) = \{(5, 3)\}$ and $X_z^{\text{ss}} = \{A \in \text{Mat}_6^{\text{ss}} : \text{rank } A_{[5][3]} \leq 2\}$ by Proposition 3.7. The ideal J_z^{ss} is generated by u_{AB}^{ss} where A ranges over the ten 3-element subsets of $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and $B = \{1, 2, 3\}$, the unique 3-element subset of $\{1, 2, 3\}$. The relevant monomials are listed below:

A	u_{AB}	$\phi(u_{AB})$	u_{AB}^{ss}
$\{1, 2, 3\}$	$u_{13}u_{22}u_{31}$	0	0
$\{1, 2, 4\}$	$u_{13}u_{22}u_{41}$	0	0
$\{1, 2, 5\}$	$u_{13}u_{22}u_{51}$	0	0
$\{1, 3, 4\}$	$u_{13}u_{32}u_{41}$	$u_{31}u_{32}u_{41}$	$u_{31}u_{32}u_{41}$
$\{1, 3, 5\}$	$u_{13}u_{32}u_{51}$	$u_{31}u_{32}u_{51}$	$u_{31}u_{32}u_{51}$
$\{1, 4, 5\}$	$u_{13}u_{42}u_{51}$	$u_{31}u_{42}u_{51}$	$u_{31}u_{42}u_{51}$
$\{2, 3, 4\}$	$u_{23}u_{32}u_{41}$	$u_{32}^2u_{41}$	$u_{32}u_{41}$
$\{2, 3, 5\}$	$u_{23}u_{32}u_{51}$	$u_{32}^2u_{51}$	$u_{32}u_{51}$
$\{2, 4, 5\}$	$u_{23}u_{42}u_{51}$	$u_{32}u_{42}u_{51}$	$u_{32}u_{42}u_{51}$
$\{3, 4, 5\}$	$u_{33}u_{42}u_{51}$	0	0

In particular, $J_z^{\text{ss}} = (u_{32}u_{41}, u_{32}u_{51}, u_{31}u_{42}u_{51}) \subseteq \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [6], i > j]$ is the ideal generated by the righthand column. The ideal I_z^{ss} in this case is generated by the Pfaffians of the submatrices of $\mathcal{U}_6^{\text{ss}}$ with row and column sets $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $\{1, 2, 3, 5\}$, which are the polynomials

$$f := u_{32}u_{41} - u_{31}u_{42} + u_{21}u_{43} \quad \text{and} \quad g := u_{32}u_{51} - u_{31}u_{52} + u_{21}u_{53}.$$

The set $\{f, g\}$ is *not* a Gröbner basis under the reverse lexicographic term order, as the ideal $(\text{in}(f), \text{in}(g)) = (u_{32}u_{41}, u_{32}u_{51})$ does not contain $u_{31}u_{42}u_{51} = \text{in}(u_{41}g - u_{51}f) \in \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$. It does hold that $u_{31}u_{42}u_{51} \in J_z^{\text{ss}}$ and one can check directly for this example that $J_z^{\text{ss}} = \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$.

We state three basic properties of the ideals $J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}}$ before proving a more substantial identity.

Proposition 3.29. If M is a monomial in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$ and $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}$, then $M \notin J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}}$.

Proof. The monomials in $J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}}$ are those divisible by some u_{AB}^{ss} where $A \subseteq [i]$, $B \subseteq [j]$ and $|A| = |B| = \mathbf{r}(i, j) + 1$ for some i, j . All such monomials dividing M have degree at most $\mathbf{r}(i, j)$. \square

Proposition 3.30. If $y, z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and $y \leq z$, then $J_y^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_z^{\text{ss}}$.

Proof. If $y \leq z$ then $\mathbf{r}_y(i, j) \geq \mathbf{r}_z(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$ by Proposition 3.11, and it is clear from the definitions that this implies that $J_y^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_z^{\text{ss}}$. \square

Given rank tables \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{s} , let $\min(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})$ be the rank table mapping $(i, j) \mapsto \min\{\mathbf{r}(i, j), \mathbf{s}(i, j)\}$.

Proposition 3.31. If \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{s} are symmetric rank tables then $J_{\min(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})}^{\text{ss}} = J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}} + J_{\mathbf{s}}^{\text{ss}}$.

Proof. It is clear that $J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}}$ and $J_{\mathbf{s}}^{\text{ss}}$ are both contained in $J_{\min(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})}^{\text{ss}}$, so $J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}} + J_{\mathbf{s}}^{\text{ss}} \subseteq J_{\min(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})}^{\text{ss}}$. Conversely, suppose M is a monomial in $J_{\min(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})}^{\text{ss}}$. Then M is divisible by some u_{AB}^{ss} where $A \subseteq [i]$, $B \subseteq [j]$ and $|A| = |B| = \min(\mathbf{r}(i, j), \mathbf{s}(i, j)) + 1$ for some i and j . But this means that M is in either $J_{\mathbf{s}}^{\text{ss}}$ or $J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}}$ depending on whether $\mathbf{r}(i, j)$ exceeds $\mathbf{s}(i, j)$ or not. \square

We will need the following theorem to prove the key lemma in Section 4.2.

Theorem 3.32. Let \mathbf{r} be a symmetric rank table. Then $J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}} = \bigcap_z J_z^{\text{ss}}$ where z runs over the elements of $\text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ that are Bruhat-minimal among those with $\mathbf{r}_z(i, j) \leq \mathbf{r}(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$.

Proof. It is clear that $J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}}$ is contained in $J_{\mathbf{s}}^{\text{ss}}$ for any rank table \mathbf{s} with $\mathbf{s}(i, j) \leq \mathbf{r}(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$. Conversely, suppose M is a monomial in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$ that is not contained in $J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}}$. We must have $\mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}}(j, i) \leq \mathbf{r}(i, j) = \mathbf{r}(j, i)$ for each $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$ with $i \geq j$, since otherwise M would be divisible by a monomial u_{AB}^{ss} with $(A, B) \in \binom{[i]}{r} \times \binom{[j]}{r}$ for $r = \mathbf{r}(i, j) + 1$, which would imply that $M \in J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}}$. By Propositions 3.26 and 3.29, we have $\mathbf{r}_M^{\text{ss}} = \mathbf{r}_z$ for some $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and $M \notin J_z^{\text{ss}}$. This means that M is also not contained in the intersection given in the theorem statement.

We conclude that $J_{\mathbf{r}}^{\text{ss}} = \bigcap_z J_z^{\text{ss}}$ where z runs over all (not necessarily Bruhat-minimal) elements of $\text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ satisfying $\mathbf{r}_z(i, j) \leq \mathbf{r}(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$. By Proposition 3.30, this intersection is unchanged if we require z to be Bruhat-minimal with the desired property. \square

3.6 Initial terms of Pfaffians

We continue to write $\text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$ for the initial ideal of I_z^{ss} relative to the reverse lexicographic term order on $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$. Our ultimate goal is to prove that $J_z^{\text{ss}} = \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$. At this point, however, it is not even clear that $J_z^{\text{ss}} \subseteq \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$, since the leading terms of the defining generators of I_z^{ss} do not generate J_z^{ss} . We devote this subsection to proving this containment.

This section is the only place where our results depend on specific properties of the reverse lexicographic term order on $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$, as opposed to properties of term orders in general. The reader may wish to review the definition of this term order from Example 2.2.

Our strategy is to identify another set of elements in I_z^{ss} whose leading terms recover the generators $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \in J_z^{\text{ss}}$ (and which we will eventually prove to be a Gröbner basis for I_z^{ss}). Suppose A and B are finite sets of positive integers with $|A| \leq |B|$. Recall the definition of the matrix \mathcal{U}^{ss} from (3.1) and define g_{AB} to be the Pfaffian of the skew-symmetric block matrix

$$g_{AB} := \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}_{BB}^{\text{ss}} & \mathcal{U}_{BA}^{\text{ss}} \\ \mathcal{U}_{AB}^{\text{ss}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i > j]. \quad (3.8)$$

For example, if $A = \{1, 6, 7\}$ and $B = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ then

$$g_{AB} = \text{pf} \left[\begin{array}{ccccc|ccc} 0 & -u_{21} & -u_{31} & -u_{41} & -u_{51} & 0 & -u_{61} & -u_{71} \\ u_{21} & 0 & -u_{32} & -u_{42} & -u_{52} & u_{21} & -u_{62} & -u_{72} \\ u_{31} & u_{32} & 0 & -u_{43} & -u_{53} & u_{31} & -u_{63} & -u_{73} \\ u_{41} & u_{42} & u_{43} & 0 & -u_{54} & u_{41} & -u_{64} & -u_{74} \\ u_{51} & u_{52} & u_{53} & u_{54} & 0 & u_{51} & -u_{65} & -u_{75} \\ \hline 0 & -u_{21} & -u_{31} & -u_{41} & -u_{51} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ u_{61} & u_{62} & u_{63} & u_{64} & u_{65} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ u_{71} & u_{72} & u_{73} & u_{74} & u_{75} & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right].$$

To show that (some of) these polynomials belong to I_z^{ss} , we need an alternate formula expressing each g_{AB} as a sum of products of Pfaffians. This requires a little more notation.

Given a finite set of integers $T = \{t_1 < t_2 < \dots < t_m\}$, let $\text{sort}(T)$ denote the word $t_1 t_2 \dots t_m$. When $S \subseteq T$, define $\text{sgn}\binom{T}{S}$ to be the sign of the permutation taking $\text{sort}(T)$ to $\text{sort}(T \setminus S) \text{sort}(S)$. By counting inversions, one checks that if $S = \{t_i : i \in I\}$ for some set $I \subseteq [m]$, then

$$\text{sgn}\binom{T}{S} = (-1)^{|S||T| + \binom{|S|}{2} + \sum I}. \quad (3.9)$$

We will need this identity in the proof of the following:

Proposition 3.33. If A, B are finite sets of positive integers with $|A| \leq |B|$, then

$$g_{AB} = \sum_{\substack{S \subseteq A \setminus B \\ |B \sqcup S| \text{ even}}} (-1)^{|A \setminus S|/2} \text{sgn}\binom{A}{S} \text{sgn}\binom{B \sqcup S}{S} \text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{A \setminus S, A \setminus S}^{\text{ss}}) \text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{B \sqcup S, B \sqcup S}^{\text{ss}}).$$

Proof. Write $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_{|A|}\}$ and set $m = |A| + |B|$. If X and Y are two $m \times m$ skew-symmetric matrices, then [19, Corollary 2.2] states that

$$\text{pf}(X + Y) = \sum_{\substack{[m] = I \sqcup J \\ |I| \text{ even}}} (-1)^{|I|/2 + \sum I} \text{pf}(X_{II}) \text{pf}(Y_{JJ}) \quad (3.10)$$

where the sum is over disjoint decompositions of $[m]$. Fix a decomposition $[m] = I \sqcup J$ with $|I|$ even. The result will follow by applying (3.10) to

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}_{BB}^{\text{ss}} & \mathcal{U}_{BA}^{\text{ss}} \\ \mathcal{U}_{AB}^{\text{ss}} & \mathcal{U}_{AA}^{\text{ss}} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{U}_{AA}^{\text{ss}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

For these matrices, we have $\text{pf}(Y_{JJ}) = 0$ unless $J \subseteq |B| + [|A|]$. Assume this holds and let $S = \{a_i : i + |B| \notin J\}$. Then $Y_{JJ} = -\mathcal{U}_{A \setminus S, A \setminus S}^{\text{ss}}$ so

$$\text{pf}(Y_{JJ}) = (-1)^{|A \setminus S|/2} \text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{A \setminus S, A \setminus S}^{\text{ss}}). \quad (3.11)$$

If $S \cap B$ is nonempty, then X_{II} has two repeated rows so $\text{pf}(X_{II}) = 0$. Assume further that $S \cap B = \emptyset$. Then $S \subseteq A \setminus B$ and $|S| = |A| - |J| = |I| - |B| \equiv |B| \pmod{2}$, so

$$(-1)^{|I|/2} = (-1)^{\frac{|B| + |S|}{2}} = (-1)^{\binom{|B|+1}{2} + \binom{|S|}{2}}. \quad (3.12)$$

As X_{II} is obtained from $\mathcal{U}_{B \sqcup S, B \sqcup S}^{\text{ss}}$ by applying the permutation taking the word $\text{sort}(B \sqcup S)$ to $\text{sort}(B) \text{sort}(S)$ to all row and column indices, we have

$$\text{pf}(X_{II}) = \text{sgn}\left(\begin{smallmatrix} B \sqcup S \\ S \end{smallmatrix}\right) \text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{B \sqcup S, B \sqcup S}^{\text{ss}}). \quad (3.13)$$

Finally, since $\sum_{i \in I} i = \binom{|B|+1}{2} + |B||S| + \sum_{a_i \in S} i$, it follows from (3.9) that

$$(-1)^{\sum I} = (-1)^{\binom{|B|+1}{2} + |B||S| + |A||S| + \binom{|S|}{2}} \text{sgn}\left(\begin{smallmatrix} A \\ S \end{smallmatrix}\right). \quad (3.14)$$

Combining (3.11), (3.12), (3.13), and (3.14), we can rewrite the right hand side of (3.10) as

$$\sum_{\substack{S \subseteq A \setminus B \\ |B \sqcup S| \text{ even}}} (-1)^{|A \setminus S|/2 + |A||S| + |B||S|} \text{sgn}\left(\begin{smallmatrix} A \\ S \end{smallmatrix}\right) \text{sgn}\left(\begin{smallmatrix} B \sqcup S \\ S \end{smallmatrix}\right) \text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{A \setminus S, A \setminus S}^{\text{ss}}) \text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{B \sqcup S, B \sqcup S}^{\text{ss}}).$$

Finally, we can replace the sign by $(-1)^{|A \setminus S|/2}$ since all Pfaffians in the sum are zero unless $|A| \equiv |B| \pmod{2}$, in which case $(-1)^{|A||S| + |B||S|} = 1$. \square

If A and B are finite sets of positive integers with $|A| = |B|$, then we write

$$A \ominus B := \{a \in A : \text{there is no } b \text{ with } (a, b) \in A \odot B \text{ and } (b, a) \in A \odot B\}. \quad (3.15)$$

For example, if $A = \{2 < 3 < 4 < 5\}$ and $B = \{6 > 4 > 3 > 1\}$ then $A \ominus B = \{2, 5\}$. Next, let

$$f_{AB} := g_{A \ominus B, B} \in \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i > j]. \quad (3.16)$$

Corollary 3.34. Suppose $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$. Choose $k, l \in [n]$ with $k \geq l$, write $q = \text{rank } z_{[k][l]} + 1$, and let $(A, B) \in \binom{[k]}{q} \times \binom{[l]}{q}$. Then $f_{AB} \in I_z^{\text{ss}}$.

Proof. If $S \subseteq (A \ominus B) \setminus B$ and $|B \sqcup S|$ is even, then $B \sqcup S \subseteq [k]$ and $|(B \sqcup S) \cap [l]| \geq |B \cap [l]| = |B| = q$, so $\text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{B \sqcup S, B \sqcup S}^{\text{ss}}) \in I_z^{\text{ss}}$ by definition and $f_{AB} = g_{A \ominus B, B} \in I_z^{\text{ss}}$ by Proposition 3.33. \square

If our sets $(A, B) \in \binom{\mathbb{N}}{q} \times \binom{\mathbb{N}}{q}$ are $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_q\}$ and $B = \{b_1 > b_2 > \dots > b_q\}$, then we say that (A, B) is *untwisted* if it never holds that $b_i > a_j > a_i > b_j$ for any $1 \leq i < j \leq q$. This property fails when $A = \{2 < 3 < 4 < 5\}$ and $B = \{6 > 4 > 3 > 1\}$ as in our example above, but it does hold for the interchanged sets $A = \{1 < 3 < 4 < 6\}$ and $B = \{5 > 4 > 3 > 2\}$.

In the following lemma and any similar statements, the notation $\text{in}(f)$ means the initial term of f relative to the reverse lexicographic term order on $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$.

Lemma 3.35. If the pair $(A, B) \in \binom{\mathbb{N}}{q} \times \binom{\mathbb{N}}{q}$ is untwisted, then $\text{in}(f_{AB}) = \pm u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$.

For example, if $A = \{2 < 3 < 4 < 5\}$ and $B = \{6 > 4 > 3 > 1\}$ then $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = u_{BA}^{\text{ss}} = u_{43}u_{62}u_{51}$ while $\text{in}(f_{AB}) = \text{in}(g_{\{2,5\}, \{1,3,4,6\}}) = -u_{53}u_{61}u_{42} \neq \pm u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$. On the other hand, the pair (B, A) is untwisted and $\text{in}(f_{BA}) = \text{in}(g_{\{1,6\}, \{2,3,4,5\}}) = -u_{BA}^{\text{ss}}$ as the lemma predicts.

Proof. The set $A \odot B$ contains a pair (a, b) with $a = b$ if and only if $|A \ominus B| + |B|$ is odd. The lemma holds in this case since then $f_{AB} = 0$, being the Pfaffian of an odd sized matrix, and $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = 0$ by definition. Instead assume that $A \odot B$ contains no pairs (a, b) with $a = b$.

Let $\mathcal{V}_{BB}^{\text{ss}}$ denote the $q \times q$ matrix formed from $\mathcal{U}_{BB}^{\text{ss}}$ by replacing all entries in row i or in column i by zeros whenever $b_i \in (A \ominus B) \cap B$. Then the basic properties of Pfaffians imply that

$$f_{AB} := \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}_{BB}^{\text{ss}} & \mathcal{U}_{B,A \ominus B}^{\text{ss}} \\ \mathcal{U}_{A \ominus B, B}^{\text{ss}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{V}_{BB}^{\text{ss}} & \mathcal{U}_{B,A \ominus B}^{\text{ss}} \\ \mathcal{U}_{A \ominus B, B}^{\text{ss}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.17)$$

Now recall that a *matching* is an undirected graph in which no vertex belongs to two edges. Define \mathcal{M}_{AB} to be the set of matchings with $2q$ vertices labeled $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q, b_1, b_2, \dots, b_q$ such that

- each $a_i \in A \setminus (A \ominus B)$ is an isolated vertex;
- each $a_i \in A \ominus B$ is connected to some $b_j \in B$;
- each $b_i \in B \cap (A \ominus B)$ is connected to some $a_j \in (A \ominus B) \setminus \{b_i\}$;
- each $b_i \in B \setminus (A \ominus B)$ is connected to some $a_j \in A \ominus B$ or some $b_j \in B \setminus (A \ominus B)$.

For example, if $A = \{2 < 3 < 4 < 5\}$ and $B = \{5 > 4 > 3 > 1\}$, then $A \ominus B = \{2, 5\}$ and \mathcal{M}_{AB} has only three elements, which we represent by the following pictures:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{cccc} 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ | & \text{---} & | & \\ 5 & 4 & 3 & 1 \end{array} & \begin{array}{cccc} 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ | & \text{---} & \diagup & \\ 5 & 4 & 3 & 1 \end{array} & \begin{array}{cccc} 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ | & \diagdown & \text{---} & \\ 5 & 4 & 3 & 1 \end{array} \end{array} \quad (3.18)$$

To each edge $\{i > j\}$ we associate the variable u_{ij} . We then define u_{AB}^M to be the product of the variables corresponding to all edges in $M \in \mathcal{M}_{AB}$. Comparing the definition of a generic Pfaffian (3.2) with (3.17) shows that $f_{AB} = \sum_{M \in \mathcal{M}_{AB}} \varepsilon(M) u_{AB}^M$ for some map $\varepsilon : \mathcal{M}_{AB} \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$. Indeed, in our running example, $f_{\{2 < 3 < 4 < 5\}, \{6 > 4 > 3 > 1\}} = -u_{43}u_{52}u_{51} + u_{41}u_{53}u_{52} - u_{54}u_{52}u_{31}$. In principle there might be further cancellations among the terms in this formula for f_{AB} , but this will not affect our argument.

Observe that if $a_i \in A \setminus (A \ominus B)$ then there is a unique index $j \neq i$ with $b_i = a_j \in A \setminus (A \ominus B)$ and $b_j = a_i$; let \mathcal{P} denote the set of such pairs (i, j) and write \mathcal{I} for the set of indices $i \in [q]$ with $a_i \in A \ominus B$. In our example with $A = \{2 < 3 < 4 < 5\}$ and $B = \{5 > 4 > 3 > 1\}$, we have $\mathcal{P} = \{(2, 3), (3, 2)\}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 4\}$ since $a_2 = b_3 = 3$ and $a_3 = b_2 = 4$. Next let $M_0 \in \mathcal{M}_{AB}$ be the matching whose edges consist of $\{a_i, b_i\}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ along with $\{b_i, b_j\}$ for each $(i, j) \in \mathcal{P}$. For our running example, M_0 is the left-most matching shown in (3.18). We always have $u_{AB}^{M_0} = u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \neq 0$ since we assume that $A \odot B$ does not intersect the main diagonal.

It suffices to show that if $M \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{M_0\}$ then $u_{AB}^M < u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$ in the reverse lexicographic term order. Fix such a matching $M \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \{M_0\}$ and consider the edge $\{r > s\}$ in M_0 whose associated variable u_{rs} is maximal in lexicographic order. We first prove that either $u_{AB}^M < u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$ in the reverse lexicographic term order or $\{r > s\}$ is also an edge in M . The variable u_{rs} is $\pm u_{ab}$ for either $(a, b) = (a_1, b_1)$ or $(a, b) = (a_q, b_q)$. Exactly one of the following must therefore hold:

- (a) We have $(1, q) \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\{r > s\} = \{b_1 > b_q\}$.
- (b) We have $q \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\{r > s\} = \{a_q > b_q\}$.
- (c) We have $1 \in \mathcal{I}$ and $\{r > s\} = \{b_1 > a_1\}$.

We consider each case in turn.

If we are in case (a) then $b_q = a_1 < \dots < a_q = b_1$, so if $\{b_1 > b_q\}$ were not an edge in M then the variable associated to the edge incident to b_1 would exceed $u_{rs} = u_{b_1 b_q}$ in lexicographic order, giving $u_{AB}^M < u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$ in the reverse lexicographic term order.

Suppose we are in case (b). Then we must have $(1, q) \notin \mathcal{P}$ and $a_q \geq b_1$ to avoid cases (a) and (c). Thus, as the edge of M incident to a_q must have the form $\{a_q > b_i\}$, if this edge is not $\{a_q > b_q\}$ then $u_{AB}^M < u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$.

Finally suppose we are in case (c). This case is where our untwisted hypothesis plays a role. To avoid cases (a) and (b), we must have $(1, q) \notin \mathcal{P}$ and $b_1 \geq a_q$, and if $b_1 = a_q$ then $b_q < a_1$. As $\{b_1, a_q\}$ cannot be an edge in M if $b_1 = a_q$, it follows that $u_{AB}^M < u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$ whenever M has an edge of the form $\{b_1 > a_i\}$ with $i > 1$. It remains to show that the same holds whenever M has an edge of the form $\{b_1 > b_i\}$ with $1 < i \leq q$. If $b_1 = a_q$ then $b_1 \in (A \ominus B) \cap B$ since $(1, q) \notin \mathcal{P}$; in this case M can have no edges of the form $\{b_1 > b_i\}$ so what we want to show holds vacuously. Instead suppose $b_1 > a_q$. Since (A, B) is untwisted, we must have $a_1 \leq b_i$ for all $1 < i \leq q$. This can only hold if $a_1 < b_i$ for all $1 < i < q$ and $a_1 \leq b_q$. Thus if $\{b_1 > b_i\}$ is an edge in M with $1 < i < q$ or if $\{b_1 > b_q\}$ is an edge with $a_1 < b_q$, then we have $u_{AB}^M < u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$ in the reverse lexicographic term order. The only remaining possibility is that $a_1 = b_q$, but then $b_q \in (A \ominus B) \cap B$ so $\{b_1 > b_q\}$ cannot be an edge in M by definition. Thus our claim also holds in case (c).

To finish the proof of the lemma, define

$$A' = \begin{cases} A \setminus \{a_1, a_q\} & \text{in case (a)} \\ A \setminus \{a_1\} & \text{in case (b)} \\ A \setminus \{a_q\} & \text{in case (c)} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad B' = \begin{cases} B \setminus \{b_1, b_q\} & \text{in case (a)} \\ B \setminus \{b_1\} & \text{in case (b)} \\ B \setminus \{b_q\} & \text{in case (c)}. \end{cases}$$

The pair (A', B') is untwisted and $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = u_{rs} \cdot u_{A'B'}^{\text{ss}}$. Moreover, it follows from our claim that either $u_{AB}^M < u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$ or $u_{AB}^M = u_{rs} \cdot u_{A'B'}^{M'}$ for some matching $M' \in \mathcal{M}_{A'B'}$. But this alternative implies that $u_{AB}^M < u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$ in the reverse lexicographic term order in all cases, since we may assume by induction that $u_{A'B'}^{M'} < u_{A'B'}^{\text{ss}}$ as we originally chose $M \neq M_0$. \square

Let $\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_q \\ b_1 & b_2 & \dots & b_q \end{pmatrix}$ stand for the pair of sets

$$(A, B) = (\{a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_q\}, \{b_1 > b_2 > \dots > b_q\}). \quad (3.19)$$

Given a set of indices $S = \{s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_t\} \subseteq [q]$, define

$$(A, B)^S = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_q \\ b_1 & b_2 & \dots & b_q \end{pmatrix}^S := \begin{pmatrix} a'_1 & a'_2 & \dots & a'_q \\ b'_1 & b'_2 & \dots & b'_q \end{pmatrix}$$

where $a'_1 a'_2 \dots a'_q$ is obtained from $a_1 a_2 \dots a_q$ by replacing the subword $a_{s_1} a_{s_2} \dots a_{s_t}$ with $b_{s_t} \dots b_{s_2} b_{s_1}$, and likewise $b'_1 b'_2 \dots b'_q$ is obtained from $b_1 b_2 \dots b_q$ by replacing the subword $b_{s_1} b_{s_2} \dots b_{s_t}$ with $a_{s_t} \dots a_{s_2} a_{s_1}$. For example, $\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & a_4 & a_5 \\ b_1 & b_2 & b_3 & b_4 & b_5 \end{pmatrix}^{\{1,3,4\}} = \begin{pmatrix} b_4 & a_2 & b_3 & b_1 & a_5 \\ a_4 & b_2 & a_3 & a_1 & b_5 \end{pmatrix}$. Write \equiv for the relation on $\binom{\mathbb{Z}}{q} \times \binom{\mathbb{Z}}{q}$ that is the transitive closure of the relations $(A, B) \equiv (A, B)^S$ for all $S \subseteq [q]$ such that the top word of $(A, B)^S$ is strictly increasing and bottom word is strictly decreasing.

Lemma 3.36. Suppose $(A, B) \in \binom{[k]}{q} \times \binom{[l]}{q}$ for positive integers $k \geq l$. Then there exists an untwisted $(A', B') \in \binom{[k]}{q} \times \binom{[l]}{q}$ with $(A, B) \equiv (A', B')$.

Proof. Write $[k_1, k_2] := \{i \in \mathbb{Z} : k_1 \leq i \leq k_2\}$. Fix positive integers $k_1 \leq k_2$ and $l_1 \leq l_2$ with $k_1 \leq l_1 \leq l_2 \leq k_2$. We recursively define a map

$$\text{untwist} : \binom{[k_1, k_2]}{q} \times \binom{[l_1, l_2]}{q} \rightarrow \binom{[k_1, k_2]}{q} \times \binom{[l_1, l_2]}{q}$$

with the property that $(A, B) \equiv \text{untwist}(A, B)$ for all pairs (A, B) . Fix $(A, B) \in \binom{[k_1, k_2]}{q} \times \binom{[l_1, l_2]}{q}$ and write $(A, B) = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_q \\ b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_q \end{pmatrix}$ as in (3.19). If $q < 2$ or $b_1 < a_2$ then we set $\text{untwist}(A, B) := (A, B)$. Otherwise, there exists a maximal index $1 < i \leq q$ such that $b_1 \geq a_i$. Note that $b_1 < a_{i+1}$ if $i < q$. Set $(A', B') := (A, B)$ if $a_1 < b_i$ or else define

$$(A', B') := \begin{pmatrix} b_i & \cdots & b_2 & b_1 & a_{i+1} & \cdots & a_q \\ a_i & \cdots & a_2 & a_1 & b_{i+1} & \cdots & b_q \end{pmatrix}.$$

This gives a well-defined element of $\binom{[k_1, k_2]}{q} \times \binom{[l_1, l_2]}{q}$ with $(A', B') \equiv (A, B)$. Write $\begin{pmatrix} a'_1 & a'_2 & \cdots & a'_q \\ b'_1 & b'_2 & \cdots & b'_q \end{pmatrix} := (A', B')$ and note that $a'_1 < b'_i$ and $\max\{b'_1, a'_i\} < a'_{i+1}$, where we set $a'_{q+1} := k_2 + 1$ if $i = q$. Let

$$k'_1 := a'_1 + 1 \leq k'_2 := a'_{i+1} - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad l'_1 := b'_i \leq l'_2 := b'_1 - 1.$$

Then $k'_1 \leq l'_1 \leq l'_2 \leq k'_2$ so we can recursively construct

$$\begin{pmatrix} a''_2 & a''_3 & \cdots & a''_i \\ b''_2 & b''_3 & \cdots & b''_i \end{pmatrix} := \text{untwist} \begin{pmatrix} a'_2 & a'_3 & \cdots & a'_i \\ b'_2 & b'_3 & \cdots & b'_i \end{pmatrix} \in \binom{[k'_1, k'_2]}{i-1} \times \binom{[l'_1, l'_2]}{i-1}$$

and then define

$$\text{untwist}(A, B) := \begin{pmatrix} a'_1 & a''_2 & a''_3 & \cdots & a''_i & a'_{i+1} & \cdots & a'_q \\ b'_1 & b''_2 & b''_3 & \cdots & b''_i & b'_{i+1} & \cdots & b'_q \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is an element of $\binom{[k_1, k_2]}{q} \times \binom{[l_1, l_2]}{q}$ that is equivalent to (A, B) under \equiv .

To prove the lemma, we just need to check that $\text{untwist}(A, B)$ is untwisted, as our notation suggests. For the pair (A', B') , observe that one can only have $b'_s > a'_t > a'_s > b'_t$ for some $s < t$ if $1 < s < t \leq i$. It follows that $\text{untwist}(A, B)$ is untwisted if and only if $\begin{pmatrix} a''_2 & a''_3 & \cdots & a''_i \\ b''_2 & b''_3 & \cdots & b''_i \end{pmatrix}$ is untwisted, and we can assume that the latter property holds by induction. \square

Putting everything together, we can finally prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.37. For all $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$, the ideal J_z^{ss} is contained in the initial ideal $\text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$ defined relative to the reverse lexicographic term order on $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$.

Proof. Choose $k, l \in [n]$ with $k \geq l$ and let $(A, B) \in \binom{[k]}{q} \times \binom{[l]}{q}$ for $q := \text{rank } z_{[k][l]} + 1$. Since J_z^{ss} is generated by all such elements u_{AB}^{ss} (see Definition 3.27), it suffices to show that $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \in \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$. By Lemma 3.36, there is an untwisted pair $(A', B') \in \binom{[k]}{q} \times \binom{[l]}{q}$ with $(A, B) \equiv (A', B')$ and $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = u_{A'B'}^{\text{ss}}$. Finally, we have $u_{A'B'}^{\text{ss}} = \pm \text{in}(f_{A'B'})$ by Lemma 3.35 and $f_{A'B'} \in I_z^{\text{ss}}$ by Corollary 3.34. \square

4 Transition equations for ideals

In this section we prove our main results, relating I_z^{ss} , J_z^{ss} , and $I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$. Here is a quick outline of the content that follows. We show in Section 4.1 that $J_z^{\text{ss}} = \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$ and $I_z^{\text{ss}} = I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$, relying on a technical lemma that is proved in Section 4.2. Section 4.3 gives an explicit primary decomposition for J_z^{ss} involving the *involution pipe dreams* studied in [16]. In Section 4.4 we discuss some applications related to K -theory representatives for X_z^{ss} . Section 5, finally, sketches how to adapt our arguments to get new proofs of the results of Knutson and Miller mentioned in the introduction.

4.1 The inductive argument

The *dominant component* of an arbitrary permutation z of \mathbb{N} is the set

$$\text{dom}(z) = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : \text{rank } z_{[i][j]} = 0\}. \quad (4.1)$$

This is always the Young diagram of a partition. For a strict partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_k > 0)$, let

$$\text{SD}_\lambda = \{(i, i + j - 1) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : 1 \leq j \leq \lambda_i\}.$$

As explained in [16, §4.3], if $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ then there is a strict partition λ with

$$\{(i, j) \in \text{dom}(z) : i > j\} = \{(j + 1, i) : (i, j) \in \text{SD}_\lambda\}.$$

An *outer corner* of $\text{dom}(z)$ is a pair $(i, j) \in (\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}) \setminus \text{dom}(z)$ with

$$(i - 1, j) \in \text{dom}(z) \sqcup (\{0\} \times \mathbb{N}) \quad \text{and} \quad (i, j - 1) \in \text{dom}(z) \sqcup (\mathbb{N} \times \{0\}). \quad (4.2)$$

It is clear that if (i, j) is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(z)$ then $z(i) = j$.

Example 4.1. Suppose $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ is the image of $(1, 5)(2, 4)(3, 6)$ under FPF_6 . Then

$$\text{dom}(z) = \left\{ \begin{array}{cccc} \square & \square & \square & \square & 1 & \cdot \\ \square & \square & \square & \square & 1 & \cdot \\ \square & \square & \square & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \\ \square & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} \right\}$$

and $\{(i, j) \in \text{dom}(z) : i > j\} = \{(j + 1, i) : (i, j) \in \text{SD}_\lambda\}$ for the strict partition $\lambda = (3, 1)$. The outer corners of $\text{dom}(z)$ are the pairs $(5, 1)$, $(4, 2)$, $(2, 4)$, and $(1, 5)$.

Given $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ and a positive integer p , define

$$\Psi(z, p) = \left\{ y = (p, r)z(p, r) \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}} : p < r \text{ and } \ell_{\text{FPF}}(y) = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) + 1 \right\} \quad (4.3)$$

where $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) = |D^{\text{ss}}(z)|$ as in Section 3.2. These sets will play a key role in the inductive proof of our main theorem, via the formulas in the following lemma. Here, we write (u_{pq}) for the principal ideal of $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : n \geq i > j \geq 1]$ generated by u_{pq} for $n \geq p > q \geq 1$. Let J_z^{ss} be as in Section 3.5, and recall that $I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ is the ideal of all polynomials in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : n \geq i > j \geq 1]$ vanishing on the set X_z^{ss} , where u_{ij} is identified with the function on skew-symmetric matrices sending $A \mapsto A_{ij}$.

Lemma 4.2. Suppose $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and (p, q) is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(z)$ with $n \geq p > q$. Then $\Psi(z, p) \subseteq \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$, $I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) + (u_{pq}) \subseteq \bigcap_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} I(X_v^{\text{ss}})$, and $J_z^{\text{ss}} + (u_{pq}) = \bigcap_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} J_v^{\text{ss}}$.

We postpone the proof of this lemma to Section 4.2. Here is our first main theorem.

Theorem 4.3. If $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ then $J_z^{\text{ss}} = \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}}) = \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}))$, where both initial ideals are computed with respect to the reverse lexicographic term order from Example 2.2.

Proof. Let $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ so that $D^{\text{ss}}(z)$ is a subset of $\triangleleft_n := \{(i, j) \in [n] \times [n] : i > j\}$ by Proposition 2.10. We prove the theorem by induction on the size of the complement of the skew-symmetric Rothe diagram $\triangleleft_n \setminus D^{\text{ss}}(z)$.

The unique element $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ with $D^{\text{ss}}(z) = \triangleleft_n$, which indexes the containment-minimal skew-symmetric matrix Schubert variety defined by the all-zeros rank table, is the involution

$$z_{\square} := \text{FPF}_n(1) = (1, n+1)(2, n+2) \cdots (n, 2n) \cdot \prod_{i=n}^{\infty} (2i+1, 2i+2). \quad (4.4)$$

If $n \geq i > j \geq 1$, then $u_{ij} = u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \in J_{z_{\square}}^{\text{ss}}$ and $u_{ij} = -\text{pf}(\mathcal{U}_{RR}^{\text{ss}}) \in I_{z_{\square}}^{\text{ss}}$ for $A = \{i\}$, $B = \{j\}$, and $R = \{i, j\}$, so $J_{z_{\square}}^{\text{ss}} = I_{z_{\square}}^{\text{ss}} = I(X_{z_{\square}}^{\text{ss}}) = (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in \triangleleft_n)$. Thus the theorem holds in this base case.

For the inductive step, suppose $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n) \setminus \{z_{\square}\}$. Then the set $\text{dom}(z)$ is invariant under transpose and not all of $[n] \times [n]$, so it has an outer corner $(p, q) \in [n] \times [n]$ with $p \geq q$. We must have $p > q$ since z has no fixed points and $z(p) = q$, as noted above. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}})) + (u_{pq}) &\subseteq \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) + (u_{pq})) && [\text{by Prop. 2.4(b)}] \\ &\subseteq \text{in} \left(\bigcap_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} I(X_v^{\text{ss}}) \right) && [\text{by Lem. 4.2}] \\ &\subseteq \bigcap_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} \text{in}(I(X_v^{\text{ss}})) && [\text{by Prop. 2.4(c)}] \\ &= \bigcap_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} J_v^{\text{ss}} && [\text{by induction}] \\ &= J_z^{\text{ss}} + (u_{pq}). && [\text{by Lem. 4.2}] \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

The appeal to induction on the penultimate line is valid since every $v \in \Psi(z, p)$ belongs to $\text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ by Lemma 4.2 and has $|D^{\text{ss}}(v)| = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(v) = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) + 1 = |D^{\text{ss}}(z)| + 1$.

On the other hand, we have $J_z^{\text{ss}} \subseteq \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$ by Lemma 3.37, and $I_z^{\text{ss}} \subseteq I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ by Theorem 3.17. Therefore $J_z^{\text{ss}} \subseteq \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}}) \subseteq \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}))$, so all inclusions in (4.5) must be equalities and $\text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) + (u_{pq})) = \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}})) + (u_{pq})$. By Lemma 2.5, this implies that

$$\text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) \cap (u_{pq})) = \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}})) \cap (u_{pq}). \quad (4.6)$$

Now suppose $f \in I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) \cap (u_{pq})$, so $f = u_{pq}g$ for some g . Since u_{pq} is not identically zero on X_z^{ss} , as the permutation matrix of z has a 1 at the outer corner (p, q) of $\text{dom}(z)$, we have $u_{pq} \notin I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$. But $I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ is a prime ideal as X_z^{ss} is irreducible by Theorem 3.4, so $u_{pq}g \in I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ forces us to have $g \in I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$. This proves that $I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) \cap (u_{pq}) = u_{pq}I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$, so

$$\text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}})) \cap (u_{pq}) = \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) \cap (u_{pq})) = \text{in}(u_{pq}I(X_z^{\text{ss}})) = u_{pq} \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}})). \quad (4.7)$$

The chain of equalities (4.5) shows that

$$\text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}})) + (u_{pq}) = J_z^{\text{ss}} + (u_{pq}). \quad (4.8)$$

Applying Lemma 2.6, whose hypotheses hold by (4.7) and (4.8), gives $\text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}})) = J_z^{\text{ss}}$. Since $J_z^{\text{ss}} \subseteq \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}}) \subseteq \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}))$, both inclusions are equalities. \square

Corollary 4.4. If $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and (p, q) is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(z)$ with $n \geq p > q$, then $J_z^{\text{ss}} \cap (u_{pq}) = u_{pq}J_z^{\text{ss}}$.

Proof. Since now we know that $\text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}})) = J_z^{\text{ss}}$, this is just (4.7). \square

We state two more significant consequences of Theorem 4.3 as the following theorems.

Theorem 4.5. If $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ then $I_z^{\text{ss}} = I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$, which is a prime ideal.

Proof. We have $I_z^{\text{ss}} \subseteq I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ by Theorem 3.17 and $\text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}}) = \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}))$ by Theorem 4.3, so Proposition 2.4(d) implies that $I_z^{\text{ss}} = I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$, which is prime since X_z^{ss} is irreducible. \square

Given sets $A = \{a_1 < \dots < a_q\}$ and $B = \{b_1 > \dots > b_q\}$, recall from (3.16) that we define

$$f_{AB} := \text{pf} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{U}_{BB}^{\text{ss}} & \mathcal{U}_{B, A \ominus B}^{\text{ss}} \\ \mathcal{U}_{A \ominus B, B}^{\text{ss}} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i > j]$$

where $A \ominus B$ is the set of $a \in A$ for which no b exists with $\{(a, b), (b, a)\} \subset \{(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_q, b_q)\}$, and \mathcal{U}^{ss} is the skew-symmetric matrix whose (i, j) entry is u_{ij} if $i > j$. We also repeat that the pair of sets (A, B) is *untwisted* if it never holds that $b_i > a_j > b_j$ for any $1 \leq i < j \leq q$.

Theorem 4.6. If $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ then the elements f_{AB} , as (i, j) ranges over all pairs in $[n] \times [n]$ with $i \geq j$ and (A, B) ranges over all untwisted pairs in $\binom{[i]}{q} \times \binom{[j]}{q}$ for $q = \text{rank } z_{[i][j]} + 1$, form a Gröbner basis for $I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ with respect to the reverse lexicographic term order.

Proof. Each such f_{AB} belongs to $I_z^{\text{ss}} = I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ by Corollary 3.34, and by the argument in the proof of Lemma 3.37 the initial terms of these polynomials generate $J_z^{\text{ss}} = \text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}))$. \square

4.2 The key lemma

In this subsection we prove Lemma 4.2. Write $<$ for the Bruhat order on $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ from Section 3.2.

Lemma 4.7. Suppose $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ and (p, q) is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(z)$ with $p > q$. Assume $i, j, r \in \mathbb{N}$ are integers such that $i < j$, $p < r$, and $z < (i, j)z(i, j) < (p, r)(i, j)z(i, j)(p, r)$. Then there are integers $i', j', r' \in \{i, j, p, r, z(i), z(j), z(p), z(r)\}$ with $i' < j'$, $p < r'$, and

$$z < (p, r')z(p, r') < (i', j')(p, r')z(p, r')(i', j') = (p, r)(i, j)z(i, j)(p, r).$$

Proof. Let $S = \{i, j, p, r, z(i), z(j), z(p), z(r)\}$ and write $\phi : [n] \rightarrow S$ and $\psi : S \rightarrow [n]$ for the unique order-preserving bijections where $n = |S|$. Note that $n \leq 8$. We have $z(p) = q$, so $(p', q') := (\psi(p), \psi(q)) \in [n] \times [n]$ is an outer corner of $z' := \psi \circ z \circ \phi \in \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FPF}}$ with $p' > q'$. If the lemma fails for z and (p, q) then it must also fail for z' and (p', q') , but it is a finite calculation to check that the lemma holds when $z \in \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FPF}}$ and $n \leq 8$. \square

Lemma 4.8. Suppose $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ and (p, q) is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(z)$ with $p > q$. Then $\Psi(z, p)$ is the subset of Bruhat-minimal elements in the set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}(z, p) &:= \left\{ v \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}} : v \geq z, \text{rank } v_{[i][j]} = 0 \text{ for } (i, j) \in [p] \times [q] \right\} \\ &= \left\{ v \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}} : v \geq z, \text{dom}(v) \supseteq [p] \times [q] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, if $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and $p \in [n]$ then $\Psi(z, p) \subseteq \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$.

Proof. As noted above, we have $z(p) = q$ so $([p] \times [q]) \setminus \{(p, q)\} \subseteq \text{dom}(z)$ and $z \notin \mathcal{X}(z, p)$. Properties (P1) and (P2) of the Bruhat order on $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ from Lemma 3.10, along with Proposition 3.11, imply that if $i < j$ are positive integers with $z < (i, j)z(i, j)$, then $[p] \times [q] \subseteq \text{dom}((i, j)z(i, j))$ if and only if $i \in \{p, q\}$. Since $\Psi(z, p) \supseteq \Psi(z, q)$ by [14, Lem. 4.15], this shows that

$$\Psi(z, p) = \{v \in \mathcal{X}(z, p) : \ell_{\text{FPF}}(v) = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) + 1\}.$$

This is a subset of Bruhat-minimal elements in $\mathcal{X}(z, p)$. Using Proposition 2.10 and property (P2) from Lemma 3.10, it is likewise straightforward to deduce that if $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and $p \in [n]$, then $\Psi(z, p) \subset \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$.

Now suppose $w \in \mathcal{X}(z, p)$ and $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(w) - \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) \geq 2$. We argue by induction that w is not Bruhat-minimal in $\mathcal{X}(z, p)$. There must exist some positive integers $i < j$ such that if $v := (i, j)y(i, j)$ then $z < v < w$ and $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(v) = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) + 1$. If we have $i \in \{p, q\}$ then $v \in \mathcal{X}(z, p)$ in which case w is not Bruhat-minimal in $\mathcal{X}(z, p)$. Assume $i \notin \{p, q\}$. Then (p, q) is an outer corner of v and $w \in \mathcal{X}(v, p)$. If $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(w) - \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) = 2$, then $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(w) - \ell_{\text{FPF}}(v) = 1$, so $w \in \Psi(v, p)$ and $w = (p, r)v(p, r)$ for some $r > p$. In this case, Lemma 4.7 asserts that

$$w = (i', j')(p, r')z(p, r')(i', j') > (p, r')z(p, r') \in \Psi(z, p) \subseteq \mathcal{X}(z, p)$$

for some integers $p < r'$ and $i' < j'$, so w is not Bruhat-minimal in $\mathcal{X}(z, p)$. Alternatively, if $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(w) - \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) \geq 3$, then $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(w) - \ell_{\text{FPF}}(v) \geq 2$ so by induction w is neither Bruhat-minimal in $\mathcal{X}(v, p)$ nor in $\mathcal{X}(z, p)$. \square

Given $(p, q) \in [n] \times [n]$ with $p > q$, consider the linear subspace

$$X_{p,q}^{\text{ss}} := \{A \in \text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}} : A_{ij} = 0 \text{ for all } (i, j) \in ([p] \times [q]) \cup ([q] \times [p])\}.$$

Since $X_{p,q}^{\text{ss}}$ is closed, irreducible, and B_n -stable, it is a single skew-symmetric matrix Schubert variety. Moreover, $I(X_{p,q}^{\text{ss}})$ is the ideal $(u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [p] \times [q], i > j) \subset \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$.

Corollary 4.9. Let $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and suppose (p, q) is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(z)$ with $n \geq p > q$. Then $X_z^{\text{ss}} \cap X_{p,q}^{\text{ss}} = \bigcup_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} X_v^{\text{ss}}$.

Although the equality here is meant set-theoretically, the proof of Theorem 4.3 implies $I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) + (u_{pq}) = I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) + I(X_{p,q}^{\text{ss}}) = \bigcap_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} I(X_v^{\text{ss}})$, so this corollary also holds at the level of schemes.

Proof. The intersection $X_z^{\text{ss}} \cap X_{p,q}^{\text{ss}}$ is closed and B -stable, so it is a union of X_v^{ss} for certain $v \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$. It follows from Proposition 3.11 and Lemma 4.8 that if $v \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ then $X_v^{\text{ss}} \subseteq X_z^{\text{ss}} \cap X_{p,q}^{\text{ss}}$ if and only if $v \in \Psi(z, p)$. \square

We may now prove our key lemma.

Proof of Lemma 4.2. Let $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and suppose (p, q) is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(z)$ with $n \geq p > q$. The fact that $\Psi(z, p) \subseteq \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ was noted in Lemma 4.8.

One has $\bigcap_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} I(X_v^{\text{ss}}) = I(\bigcup_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} X_v^{\text{ss}})$ so Corollary 4.9 implies that this intersection contains $I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) + I(X_{p,q}^{\text{ss}})$. Since $I(X_{p,q}^{\text{ss}})$ is generated by the variables u_{ij} for $(i, j) \in [p] \times [q]$ with $i > j$, all of which are in $I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ except for u_{pq} , we therefore have

$$\bigcap_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} I(X_v^{\text{ss}}) \supseteq I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) + I(X_{p,q}^{\text{ss}}) = I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) + (u_{pq}).$$

This proves the desired formula for $I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) + (u_{pq})$.

Next, let $\mathbf{r}_{p,q}$ be the rank table with $\mathbf{r}_{p,q}(i, j) = 0$ whenever $(i, j) \in [p] \times [q]$ or $(i, j) \in [q] \times [p]$ and with $\mathbf{r}_{p,q}(i, j) = n$ for all other positive integer pairs (i, j) . Suppose $v \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$. As $\mathbf{r}_v(i, j) \leq \min(\mathbf{r}_z, \mathbf{r}_{p,q})(i, j)$ for all $i, j \in [n]$ if and only if $v \geq z$ and $\text{rank } v_{[i][j]} = 0$ for $(i, j) \in [p] \times [q]$, we have $J_{\min(\mathbf{r}_z, \mathbf{r}_{p,q})}^{\text{ss}} = \bigcap_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} J_v^{\text{ss}}$ by Theorem 3.32 and Lemma 4.8. Proposition 3.31 shows that $J_{\min(\mathbf{r}_z, \mathbf{r}_{p,q})}^{\text{ss}} = J_z^{\text{ss}} + J_{\mathbf{r}_{p,q}}^{\text{ss}}$. The ideal $J_{\mathbf{r}_{p,q}}^{\text{ss}}$ is generated by the variables u_{ij} for $(i, j) \in [p] \times [q]$ with $i > j$, and all of these except u_{pq} are contained in J_z^{ss} . We conclude that

$$\bigcap_{v \in \Psi(z, p)} J_v^{\text{ss}} = J_{\min(\mathbf{r}_z, \mathbf{r}_{p,q})}^{\text{ss}} = J_z^{\text{ss}} + J_{\mathbf{r}_{p,q}}^{\text{ss}} = J_z^{\text{ss}} + (u_{pq})$$

which is the desired formula for $J_z^{\text{ss}} + (u_{pq})$. \square

4.3 Pipe dreams

In this subsection, we derive an alternate expression for J_z^{ss} as an intersection of certain natural ideals indexed by the *involution pipe dreams* corresponding to z , as introduced in [16].

Define the *pipe dream reading word* of a finite set $D \subset \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ to be the word whose letters list the numbers $i + j - 1$ as (i, j) ranges over all elements of D in the order that makes $(i, -j)$ increase lexicographically, that is, reading the rows in order but going right to left. For example, the pipe dream reading word of $D = \{(1, 4), (1, 3), (2, 6), (5, 5), (5, 4), (5, 3)\}$ is 437987. We write $\text{word}(D)$ to denote the pipe dream reading word of D .

Definition 4.10. A (*reduced*) *pipe dream* for a permutation $w \in S_\infty$ is a finite set $D \subset \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ whose pipe dream reading word is a reduced word for w , that is, a sequence of positive integers $i_1 i_2 \cdots i_l$ of shortest possible length such that $w = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_l}$.

This definition first appeared in work of Bergeron and Billey [3], who referred to pipe dreams as *rc-graphs*. The set $D = \{(1, 4), (1, 3), (2, 6), (5, 5), (5, 4), (5, 3)\}$ is a pipe dream for the permutation $w = (3, 5, 4)(7, 10, 9)$. Let $\mathcal{RP}(w)$ denote the set of all pipe dreams for $w \in S_\infty$.

Recall that $\mathcal{I}_m^{\text{FPF}}$ is the set of involutions $y = y^{-1} \in S_m$ with no fixed points in $[m]$, and that $\text{FPF}_m(y) = y \cdot (m+1, m+2)(m+3, m+4)(m+5, m+6) \cdots$ for $y \in \mathcal{I}_m^{\text{FPF}}$ if m is even.

Definition 4.11. Suppose $z = \text{FPF}_m(y) \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ for some even $m \in 2\mathbb{N}$ and $y \in \mathcal{I}_m^{\text{FPF}}$. The set of (*fpf-involution*) *pipe dreams* for z is then $\mathcal{FP}(z) := \{D \cap \triangle : D^T = D \in \mathcal{RP}(y)\}$ where $\triangle := \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : i > j\}$ and D^T is the transpose of D .

The set $\mathcal{FP}(z)$ where $z = \text{FPF}_6((1, 2)(3, 6)(4, 5))$ is given in Example 4.23 below.

Every element $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ arises as $z = \text{FPF}_m(y)$ for some choice of $m \in 2\mathbb{N}$ and $y \in \mathcal{I}_m^{\text{FPF}}$, and our definition $\mathcal{FP}(z)$ might seem to depend on this choice. However, if $y_1 \in \mathcal{I}_m^{\text{FPF}}$ and $y_2 \in \mathcal{I}_{m+2}^{\text{FPF}}$ are such that $\text{FPF}_m(y_1) = \text{FPF}_{m+2}(y_2)$, then we must have $y_2 = y_1 s_{m+1}$ and therefore

$$\mathcal{RP}(y_2) = \{D \sqcup \{(i, j)\} : D \in \mathcal{RP}(y_1) \text{ and } i + j - 1 = m + 1\}.$$

It follows that $\{D \cap \triangle : D^T = D \in \mathcal{RP}(y_1)\} = \{D \cap \triangle : D^T = D \in \mathcal{RP}(y_2)\}$ so $\mathcal{FP}(z)$ is independent of the choice of $y \in \mathcal{I}_m^{\text{FPF}}$ with $z = \text{FPF}_m(y)$.

Remark. In [16, Def. 1.4], a set of pipe dreams $\mathcal{FP}(y)$ is defined for each $y \in \mathcal{I}_m^{\text{FPF}}$. This set is what we call $\mathcal{FP}(z)$ for $z = \text{FPF}_m(y)$. It is straightforward to translate the results in [16] about pipe dreams for elements of $\mathcal{I}_m^{\text{FPF}}$ to statements for elements of $\mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ via the preceding discussion, and we will not comment further on these unimportant differences in notation.

Proposition 4.12. If $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ then every $D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$ is a subset of $\triangleleft_n := \triangleleft \cap ([n] \times [n])$ with size $|D| = |D^{\text{ss}}(z)| = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z)$.

Proof. Let $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$, so that $D^{\text{ss}}(z) \subseteq \triangleleft_n$. By [16, Thm. 5.15], there exists an element $\hat{D}_{\text{bot}}^{\text{FPF}} \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$ and a partial order $\leq_{\mathcal{FP}}$ on finite subsets of \triangleleft such that $\mathcal{FP}(z) = \{E \subseteq \triangleleft : \hat{D}_{\text{bot}}^{\text{FPF}} \leq_{\mathcal{FP}} E\}$. The partial order has the property that if $D \subseteq \triangleleft_n$ and $D \leq_{\mathcal{FP}} E$ then $|D| = |E|$ and $E \subseteq \triangleleft_n$. But it is clear from [16, Eq. (5.5)] that $|\hat{D}_{\text{bot}}^{\text{FPF}}| = |D^{\text{ss}}(z)|$ and $\hat{D}_{\text{bot}}^{\text{FPF}} \subseteq \triangleleft_n$ if $D^{\text{ss}}(z) \subseteq \triangleleft_n$. \square

Given a set $D \subseteq \triangleleft_n$, we write $(u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$ to denote the ideal in the coordinate ring $\mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}] = \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n], i > j]$ generated by u_{ij} for all $(i, j) \in D$.

Lemma 4.13. If $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and $D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$, then $J_z^{\text{ss}} \subseteq (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D) \subseteq \mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}]$.

Proof. Fix $i, j \in [n]$ with $i > j$. Let $q = \text{rank } z_{[i][j]} + 1$ and choose sets $(A, B) \in \binom{[i]}{q} \times \binom{[j]}{q}$. Let

$$S = \{(a, b) : a > b \text{ and } A \odot B \text{ contains } (a, b) \text{ or } (b, a)\},$$

so that $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = \prod_{(a,b) \in S} u_{ab}$ is a generator of J_z^{ss} . It suffices to show that $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \in (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$. If $A \odot B$ contains a diagonal position then this is obvious since $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} = 0$, so assume that $A \odot B$ does not intersect the main diagonal.

By definition, there exists some $y \in \mathcal{I}_m^{\text{FPF}}$ and $E = E^T \in \mathcal{RP}(y)$ such that $z = \text{FPF}_m(y)$ and $D = E \cap \triangleleft$. The fact that $\prod_{(a,b) \in A \odot B} u_{ab}$ belongs to the ideal of $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : i, j \in [n]]$ generated by all u_{ij} with $(i, j) \in E$ is a consequence of [22, Theorem B], which means that $E \cap (A \odot B)$ is nonempty. Since $A \odot B$ contains no element (i, i) by hypothesis, this implies that $D \cap S$ is also nonempty, so $u_{ij} \mid u_{AB}^{\text{ss}}$ for some $(i, j) \in D$, proving that $u_{AB}^{\text{ss}} \in (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$. \square

For us, a *monomial ideal* is an ideal in a commutative polynomial ring generated by monomials.

Lemma 4.14. If I, J, K are monomial ideals, then $I + (J \cap K) = (I + J) \cap (I + K)$.

This lemma follows as a basic exercise; we include a proof for completeness.

Proof. The inclusion $I + (J \cap K) \subseteq (I + J) \cap (I + K)$ always holds. The collection of monomial ideals is closed under sum and intersection, so it suffices to assume that $\text{mon} \in (I + J) \cap (I + K)$ is a monomial and show that $\text{mon} \in I + (J \cap K)$. Since mon is a monomial and I, J, K are monomial ideals, $\text{mon} \in I + J$ implies that $\text{mon} \in I$ or $\text{mon} \in J$; likewise $\text{mon} \in I + K$ implies that $\text{mon} \in I$ or $\text{mon} \in K$. That is, we either have $\text{mon} \in I$ or $\text{mon} \in J \cap K$, so $\text{mon} \in I + (J \cap K)$. \square

We arrive at the main theorem of this subsection.

Theorem 4.15. Let $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$. Then $J_z^{\text{ss}} = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D) \subseteq \mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}]$.

Proof. Given $D \subseteq \triangleleft_n$, let $\text{Ideal}(D)$ stand for the ideal $(u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$ in $\mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}]$. As in the proof of Theorem 4.3, we use downward induction on the size of $\triangleleft_n \setminus D^{\text{ss}}(z)$, starting at the element $z_{\square} \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ defined by (4.4). Since $D^{\text{ss}}(z_{\square}) = \triangleleft_n$, it follows from Proposition 4.12 that $\mathcal{FP}(z_{\square}) = \{\triangleleft_n\}$. Moreover, as noted in the proof of Theorem 4.3, we have $J_{z_{\square}}^{\text{ss}} = \text{Ideal}(\triangleleft_n)$. Thus, the desired formula holds for $z = z_{\square}$.

Assume $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n) \setminus \{z_{\square}\}$. Then, as in the proof of Theorem 4.3, there exists an outer corner $(p, q) \in \triangleleft_n$ of $\text{dom}(z)$. By the second formula in Lemma 4.2 and induction, we have

$$J_z^{\text{ss}} + (u_{pq}) = \bigcap_{y \in \Psi(z, p)} J_y^{\text{ss}} = \bigcap_{y \in \Psi(z, p)} \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(y)} \text{Ideal}(D)$$

The technical result [16, Thm. 4.33] asserts that (p, q) is not in any pipe dream of z , and that $D \mapsto D \sqcup \{(p, q)\}$ is a bijection $\mathcal{FP}(z) \rightarrow \bigcup_{y \in \Psi(z, p)} \mathcal{FP}(y)$. Hence, we can rewrite the right side of the preceding displayed equation as

$$\bigcap_{y \in \Psi(z, p)} \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(y)} \text{Ideal}(D) = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} \text{Ideal}(D \sqcup \{(p, q)\}) = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} (\text{Ideal}(D) + (u_{pq})).$$

By Lemma 4.14, the last expression is just $\bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} \text{Ideal}(D) + (u_{pq})$. Thus, we have shown that

$$J_z^{\text{ss}} + (u_{pq}) = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} \text{Ideal}(D) + (u_{pq}).$$

Our last step is to apply Lemma 2.6 with $J = J_z^{\text{ss}}$, $I = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} \text{Ideal}(D)$, and $f = u_{pq}$ to conclude that $J_z^{\text{ss}} = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} \text{Ideal}(D)$. To invoke this lemma, the necessary hypotheses are that $J \subseteq I$ and $I \cap (u_{pq}) = u_{pq}I$, and checking these conditions is straightforward: the containment $J \subseteq I$ is Lemma 4.13, and $(u_{pq}) \cap I = u_{pq}I$ holds as $(p, q) \notin D$ for all $D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$. \square

4.4 Stanley-Reisner ideals and K -polynomials

In this section we observe that J_z^{ss} is the Stanley-Reisner ideal of a shellable simplicial complex, and then use this fact to give a new proof of a combinatorial formula for the torus-equivariant K -theory class of X_z^{ss} from [31]. Our approach is modeled after Knutson and Miller's study of subword complexes and the resulting combinatorial formulas for Grothendieck polynomials [23].

Suppose $R = \mathbb{K}[u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N]$ is a polynomial ring that is graded by a free abelian group G , so that there is a decomposition $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g$ where $R_g R_h \subseteq R_{gh}$. We assume each variable u_i is homogeneous and thus contained in R_g for some $g \in G$, in which case we set $\deg(u_i) = g$. We further assume that the grading is *positive*, meaning that there is a homomorphism $\phi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\phi(\deg(u_i)) > 0$ for all i . This condition ensures that all degrees $\deg(u_1), \deg(u_2), \dots, \deg(u_N)$ lie strictly on one side of a hyperplane in G .

Now suppose $M = \bigoplus_{g \in G} M_g$ is a finitely generated G -graded R -module, so that $R_g M_h \subseteq M_{gh}$ for all $g, h \in G$. One can show that $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(M_g)$ is always finite [32, Thm. 8.6], and we define the G -graded Hilbert series of M to be $\mathcal{H}(M) = \sum_{g \in G} \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(M_g)g$.

We view $\mathcal{H}(M)$ as a formal generating function in the completion of the group ring $\mathbb{Z}[G]$. The obvious formula extending the ring structure on $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ defines a $\mathbb{Z}[G]$ -module structure on this completion. This means it is well-defined to multiply $\mathcal{H}(M)$ by finite linear combinations of elements of G .

An ideal $I \subseteq R$ is G -homogeneous if it is generated by a set of homogeneous elements. Such an ideal is a G -graded abelian group, so the quotient R/I is a G -graded R -module with its own well-defined G -graded Hilbert series.

Definition 4.16. The K -polynomial of a G -homogeneous ideal $I \subseteq R$ is the formal generating function $\mathcal{K}(I) = \mathcal{H}(R/I) \prod_{i=1}^N (1 - \deg(u_i))$.

One can show that $\mathcal{K}(I)$ is a Laurent polynomial in $\deg(u_1), \dots, \deg(u_N)$ [32, Thm. 8.20]. Fix an arbitrary term order on R and define $\text{in}(I)$ for an ideal $I \subseteq R$ relative to this order.

Lemma 4.17. If $I \subseteq R$ is a G -homogeneous ideal, then $\mathcal{K}(I) = \mathcal{K}(\text{in}(I))$.

Proof. This holds since $\mathcal{H}(I) = \mathcal{H}(\text{in}(I))$ [10, Thm. 15.3]. \square

This result is useful since in many cases it is easier to compute $\mathcal{K}(\text{in}(I))$ than $\mathcal{K}(I)$ directly.

Example 4.18. Suppose $R = k[x_1, x_2]$, $G = \mathbb{Z}t_1 \oplus \mathbb{Z}t_2$, $\deg x_i = t_i$, and $I = (x_1^2)$. A homogeneous basis for R/I is $\{x_1^i x_2^j + I : 0 \leq i \leq 1, 0 \leq j\}$, so $\mathcal{H}(R/I) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (1+t_1)t_2^j = \frac{1+t_1}{1-t_2}$ and $\mathcal{K}(I) = \frac{1+t_1}{1-t_2}(1-t_1)(1-t_2) = 1-t_1^2$. If $J = (x_1^2 + x_2)$ and $\text{in}(x_1^2 + x_2) = x_1^2$, then a homogeneous basis for R/J is $\{x_1^i x_2^j + J : 0 \leq i \leq 1, 0 \leq j\}$, so we have $I = \text{in}(J)$ and $\mathcal{K}(J) = \mathcal{K}(I) = \mathcal{K}(\text{in}(J))$.

Let $T_n \subseteq B_n \subseteq \text{GL}_n$ denote the torus of diagonal matrices. Write a_i for the character $T_n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^\times$ sending $t \in T_n$ to t_{ii} . The subgroup T_n acts on Mat_n^{ss} by the formula $t \cdot A := tAt$ for $t \in T_n$. The corresponding weight space decomposition of Mat_n^{ss} is $\bigoplus_{n \geq i > j \geq 1} \mathbb{K}(E_{ij} - E_{ji})$ where E_{ij} is the $n \times n$ matrix with a 1 in position (i, j) and 0 in all other positions. Since $t \cdot (E_{ij} - E_{ji}) = t_{ii}t_{jj}(E_{ij} - E_{ji})$, every $A \in \mathbb{K}(E_{ij} - E_{ji})$ has weight $a_i a_j$.

Let G be the multiplicative group generated by a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n . The distinct elements of G are the products $a_1^{e_1} a_2^{e_2} \cdots a_n^{e_n}$ with $e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, so G is free abelian and the completion of its group ring may be identified with the formal power series ring $\mathbb{Z}[[a_1, a_2, \dots]]$. The coordinate ring $\mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_n^{\text{ss}}] = \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : n \geq i > j \geq 1]$ has a unique positive G -grading in which $\deg(u_{ij}) = a_i a_j$. Since a skew-symmetric matrix Schubert variety X_z^{ss} is B_n -stable, it is also T_n -stable, and so its ideal $I(X_z^{\text{ss}})$ is homogeneous under this grading.

Definition 4.19. The *symplectic Grothendieck polynomial* associated to $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ is the K -polynomial $\mathfrak{G}_z^{\text{Sp}} := \mathcal{K}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}))$.

Although *a priori* one only knows that $\mathfrak{G}_z^{\text{Sp}} \in \mathbb{Z}[[a_1, a_2, \dots]]$, it turns out that this formal generating function always has only finitely many nonzero terms. Moreover, although each $z \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ belongs to $\text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ for infinitely many values of n and the definition of X_z^{ss} depends on this value, the polynomial $\mathfrak{G}_z^{\text{Sp}}$ is independent of the choice of n such that $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ [36, Thm. 4].

The functions $\mathfrak{G}_z^{\text{Sp}}$ are the same as the polynomials $\Upsilon_{\pi, (\text{GL}_{2n}, \text{Sp}_{2n})}^K$ given in [36] as representatives for the ordinary K -theory classes of the $\text{Sp}_n(\mathbb{C})$ -orbit closures on $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})/B_n$. Symplectic Grothendieck polynomials also appear in [29, 30] (after making the change of variables $a_i \mapsto 1 - x_i$) as representatives for the T -equivariant K -theory classes of the varieties X_z^{ss} . The latter polynomials (in $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2, \dots]$) have well-defined “stable limits” converging to symmetric functions that expand positively in terms of Ikeda and Naruse’s K -theoretic Schur P -functions (with parameter $\beta = -1$); see [28, Thm. 1.9] and [29, Thm. 1.6].

Example 4.20. Let D be a subset of $\triangleleft_n = \{(i, j) \in [n] \times [n] : i > j\}$. As in the proof of Theorem 4.15, write $\text{Ideal}(D) = (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D) \subset \mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : n \geq i > j \geq 1] =: R$. The set of monomials $\prod_{(i,j) \in D^c} u_{ij}^{m_{ij}}$ where $D^c := \triangleleft_n \setminus D$ descends to a basis for $R/\text{Ideal}(D)$. Accordingly,

$$\mathcal{H}(R/\text{Ideal}(D)) = \prod_{(i,j) \in D^c} \sum_{m_{ij} \geq 0} (a_i a_j)^{m_{ij}} = \prod_{(i,j) \in D^c} \frac{1}{1 - a_i a_j}$$

and

$$\mathcal{K}(\text{Ideal}(D)) = \prod_{(i,j) \in D^c} \frac{1}{1 - a_i a_j} \prod_{n \geq i > j \geq 1} (1 - a_i a_j) = \prod_{(i,j) \in D} (1 - a_i a_j).$$

If $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ is *fpf-dominant* in the sense that $D^{\text{ss}}(z) = \text{dom}(z) \cap \triangleleft_n$, then $D^{\text{ss}}(z)$ is the unique element of $\mathcal{FP}(z)$ [16, Lem. 4.29] and $I(X_z^{\text{ss}}) = \text{Ideal}(D^{\text{ss}}(z))$ by Theorem 4.15. We conclude that $\mathfrak{G}_z^{\text{Sp}} = \prod_{(i,j) \in D^{\text{ss}}(z)} (1 - a_i a_j)$, which recovers the skew-symmetric half of [29, Thm. 3.8].

K -polynomials satisfy the inclusion-exclusion formula $\mathcal{K}(I \cap J) = \mathcal{K}(I) + \mathcal{K}(J) - \mathcal{K}(I + J)$. From this and Lemma 4.14 one deduces that $\mathcal{K}(\bigcap_{i=1}^m I_i) = \sum_{S \subseteq [m]} (-1)^{|S|-1} \mathcal{K}(\sum_{i \in S} I_i)$ for any monomial ideals I_1, I_2, \dots, I_m . In particular, Theorem 4.15 implies that

$$\mathfrak{G}_z^{\text{Sp}} = \mathcal{K}(\bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} \text{Ideal}(D)) = \sum_{S \subseteq \mathcal{FP}(z)} (-1)^{|S|-1} \prod_{(i,j) \in \bigcup S} (1 - a_i a_j). \quad (4.9)$$

This formula involves too much cancellation to be efficient: for $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ the size of $\mathcal{FP}(z)$ can be exponential in n , in which case the number of terms in (4.9) is doubly exponential.

To get something more practical, we will simplify the formula (4.9) using inclusion-exclusion on the poset $\{\bigcup S : S \subseteq \mathcal{FP}(z)\}$ ordered by inclusion—or more precisely, by taking complements and studying the structure of the simplicial complex generated by facets $\{\Delta_n \setminus D : D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)\}$. For us, a *simplicial complex with vertex set V* means a collection of subsets of V (which we refer to as *faces*) closed under taking subsets. We do not require $\{v\}$ to be a face for every element $v \in V$. The containment-maximal faces of a simplicial complex are its *facets*.

Definition 4.21. The *fpf-subword complex* associated to $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and a subset $Q \subseteq \Delta_n$ is the simplicial complex with vertices Q and faces

$$\Sigma(z, Q) = \{S \subseteq Q : Q \setminus S \text{ contains an fpf-involution pipe dream for } z\}.$$

This closely mirrors Knutson and Miller's definition of a *subword complex* in [23, §2].

Given a set V , let $\mathbb{K}[x_v : v \in V]$ be the polynomial ring generated by a set of commuting indeterminates indexed by V . The *Stanley-Reisner ideal* of a simplicial complex Δ with vertex set V is the ideal in $\mathbb{K}[x_v : v \in V]$ generated by the elements $\prod_{v \in N} x_v$ for all $N \subseteq V$ with $N \notin \Delta$.

Theorem 4.22. If $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ then J_z^{ss} is the Stanley-Reisner ideal of $\Sigma(z, \Delta_n)$.

Proof. Theorem 4.15 says that $J_z^{\text{ss}} = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)} (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$; now apply [32, Thm. 1.7]. \square

Example 4.23. Let $n = 6$ and define z to be the image of $(1, 2)(3, 6)(4, 5)$ under FPF_6 , so that

$$z = (1, 2)(3, 6)(4, 5)(7, 8)(9, 10)(11, 12) \cdots \in \text{FPF}_6(\mathcal{I}_6) \subset \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}.$$


Suppose $Q = \{(3, 1), (3, 2), (4, 1), (4, 2), (5, 1)\}$, so that, abbreviating the pair (i, j) as ij , we have

$$Q = \left\{ \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdot & & & & & & \\ 31 & 32 & \cdot & & & & \\ 41 & 42 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \\ 51 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \end{array} \right\}.$$

The set of pipe dreams $\mathcal{FP}(z)$ is

$$\mathcal{FP}(z) = \left\{ \left\{ \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdot & & & & & & \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \\ + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \\ + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdot & & & & & & \\ \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \\ + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \\ + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdot & & & & & & \\ \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \\ + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \\ + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdot & & & & & & \\ \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \\ + & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \\ + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \end{array} \right\} \right\},$$

and the facets of $\Sigma(z, Q)$ are $\{31, 32, 42\}$, $\{31, 41, 42\}$, $\{31, 41, 51\}$, and $\{41, 42, 51\}$. The collection of all subsets of these four facets gives $\Sigma(z, Q)$, which we can draw as



The minimal non-faces of $\Sigma(z, Q)$ are $\{\{32, 41\}, \{32, 51\}, \{31, 42, 51\}\}$. If $v \in \Delta_n \setminus Q$ then v appears in no fpf-involution pipe dream of z , and hence appears in every maximal face of $\Sigma(z, \Delta_n)$. This implies that $\Sigma(z, \Delta_n)$ and $\Sigma(z, Q)$ have the same minimal non-faces. We can therefore deduce from Theorem 4.22 that $J_z^{\text{ss}} = (u_{32}u_{41}, u_{32}u_{51}, u_{31}u_{42}u_{51})$ in accordance with Example 3.28. It is clear from the picture above that $\Sigma(z, Q)$ is homeomorphic to a closed ball as predicted by Lemma 4.27.

If Δ is a simplicial complex with vertex set V and $F \subseteq V$, then the *link* of F in Δ is the simplicial complex $\text{lk}_F \Delta := \{E \in \Delta : E \cap F = \emptyset, E \cup F \in \Delta\}$ with vertex set $V \setminus F$.

Lemma 4.24. For any $Q, D \subseteq \Delta_n$ and $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$, we have $\text{lk}_D \Sigma(z, Q) = \Sigma(z, Q \setminus D)$.

Proof. The conditions $F \cap D = \emptyset$ and $F \cup D \in \Sigma(z, Q)$ hold precisely when $F \subseteq Q \setminus D$ and $(Q \setminus D) \setminus F$ contains a pipe dream in $\mathcal{FP}(z)$, which says exactly that $F \in \Sigma(z, Q \setminus D)$. \square

If Δ is a simplicial complex with vertex set V , then the *deletion* of $F \subseteq V$ is the simplicial complex $\text{del}_F \Delta := \{E \in \Delta : E \cap F = \emptyset\}$ with vertex set $V \setminus F$. A complex Δ with non-empty vertex set V is *vertex-decomposable* if it is *pure* (in the sense that all containment-maximal faces have the same dimension) and there is $v \in V$ such that $\text{del}_{\{v\}} \Delta$ and $\text{lk}_{\{v\}} \Delta$ are vertex-decomposable; as a base case, the complexes $\{\emptyset\}$ and \emptyset are both vertex-decomposable. Results in [2] show that any vertex-decomposable complex is *shellable* in the sense of [23, Def. 2.4].

The next two proofs will use one other concept: an *fpf-involution word* for $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ is a minimal-length sequence of positive integers $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_l$ such that $z = s_{a_l} \cdots s_{a_2} s_{a_1} 1_{\text{FPF}} s_{a_1} s_{a_2} \cdots s_{a_l}$. Every such word has length $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(z)$, and a subset $D \subseteq \Delta_n$ belongs to $\mathcal{FP}(z)$ if and only if its pipe dream reading word is an fpf-involution word for z [16, Thm. 3.12].

Theorem 4.25. Suppose $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and $Q \subseteq \Delta_n$. Then $\Delta(z, Q)$ is vertex-decomposable and therefore shellable.

Proof. Our argument is similar to the proof of [23, Thm. 2.5]. Lemma 4.24 shows that $\text{lk}_{\{\square\}} \Sigma(z, Q) = \Sigma(z, Q \setminus \{\square\})$ for any $\square \in Q$, and we will check that also $\text{del}_{\{\square\}} \Sigma(z, Q) = \Sigma(z', Q \setminus \{\square\})$ for some $z' \leq z$. By induction on the size of Q , this will prove that $\Sigma(z, Q)$ is vertex-decomposable.

To this end, we number the elements of $Q = \{(i_1, j_1) \prec (i_2, j_2) \prec \cdots \prec (i_l, j_l)\}$ in the order $\cdots \prec (1, 3) \prec (1, 2) \prec (1, 1) \prec \cdots \prec (2, 3) \prec (2, 2) \prec (2, 1) \prec \cdots$ that makes $(i, -j)$ increase lexicographically. Set $\square = (i_l, j_l)$, $q = i_l + j_l - 1$, and $Q' = Q \setminus \{\square\}$. There are two cases:

- Assume $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(s_q z s_q) > \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z)$. If there exists a pipe dream $D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$ with $D \subseteq Q$ and $\square \in D$, then the pipe dream reading word $\text{word}(D)$ ends in q , which means z has an fpf-involution word ending with q . This contradicts our hypothesis for this case, so \square is not contained in any $D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$ with $D \subseteq Q$. We deduce that $\text{del}_{\{\square\}} \Sigma(z, Q) = \Sigma(z, Q')$.
- Assume instead that $\ell(s_q z s_q) \leq \ell(z)$. We wish to show that $\text{del}_{\{\square\}} \Sigma(z, Q) = \Sigma(s_q z s_q, Q')$.

Suppose $E \subseteq Q'$ is a set contained in $\text{del}_{\{\square\}} \Sigma(z, Q)$. Then $D \subseteq Q \setminus E$ for some $D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$, and we have $Q' \setminus E \supseteq D' := D \setminus \{\square\}$. If $\square \in D$, then $z = s_q y s_q$ where $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(y) = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) - 1$. In this case we cannot have $s_q z s_q = z$ so it holds that $D' \in \mathcal{FP}(s_q z s_q) = \mathcal{FP}(y)$. On the other hand, if $\square \notin D$, then $D = D'$ contains an element of $\mathcal{FP}(s_q z s_q)$ by [16, Lem. 4.31] since $s_q z s_q \leq z$ in Bruhat order. Either way, $Q' \setminus E$ contains an element of $\mathcal{FP}(s_q z s_q)$, so $E \in \Sigma(s_q z s_q, Q')$ and we conclude that $\text{del}_{\{\square\}} \Sigma(z, Q) \subseteq \Sigma(s_q z s_q, Q')$.

Conversely, suppose $E \in \Sigma(s_q z s_q, Q')$, so that $D \subseteq Q' \setminus E$ for some $D \in \mathcal{FP}(s_q z s_q)$. If $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(s_q z s_q) < \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z)$, then $D \sqcup \{\square\} \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$ and $D \sqcup \{\square\} \subseteq Q \setminus E$, while if $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(s_q z s_q) = \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z)$ then $s_q z s_q = z$ and $D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$. Thus $Q \setminus E$ contains an element of $\mathcal{FP}(z)$ and $E \in \text{del}_{\{\square\}} \Sigma(z, Q)$, so we have $\text{del}_{\{\square\}} \Sigma(z, Q) = \Sigma(s_q z s_q, Q')$.

Thus $\text{del}_{\{\square\}} \Sigma(z, Q) = \Sigma(z', Q')$ for $Q' = Q \setminus \{\square\}$ and some $z' \leq z$. As noted above, this lets us conclude by induction that $\Sigma(z, Q)$ is vertex-decomposable and therefore shellable via [2]. \square

Remark. Our definition of “vertex-decomposable” differs slightly from that in [2] and [23]: first, we include not only the complex $\{\emptyset\}$ but also \emptyset ; second, we allow for the possibility that the vertex v for which $\text{del}_{\{v\}} \Delta$ and $\text{lk}_{\{v\}} \Delta$ are vertex-decomposable is not a face of Δ . Except for the inclusion of the complex \emptyset , the definitions are equivalent, because if $\{v\} \notin \Delta$, then $\text{del}_{\{v\}} \Delta = \Delta$ and $\text{lk}_{\{v\}} \Delta = \emptyset$. A close reading of the proof of [23, Thm. 2.5] suggests that our convention may in fact be what was originally intended in [23], in any case.

If $z \in \{1\} \sqcup \mathcal{I}_{\infty}^{\text{FPF}}$ and $s = s_i = (i, i + 1) \in S_{\infty}$, then we define

$$z * s = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (i, i + 1) \text{ is a cycle of } z \\ z & \text{if } z = 1 \text{ or } z(i) > z(i + 1) \\ s z s & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that if $z \in \mathcal{I}_{\infty}^{\text{FPF}}$ then either $z * s \in \mathcal{I}_{\infty}^{\text{FPF}}$ or $z * s = 1$, but we always have $1 * s = 1$. The operation $*$ extends to a right action of the 0-Hecke monoid of S_{∞} but not to a group action. If $i_1 i_2 \cdots i_l$ is a word, define $\delta_{\text{FPF}}(i_1 i_2 \cdots i_l) = (\cdots ((1_{\text{FPF}} * s_{i_1}) * s_{i_2}) \cdots) * s_{i_l}$.

Definition 4.26. An *extended (fpf-involution) pipe dream* for $z \in \mathcal{I}_{\infty}^{\text{FPF}}$ is a subset $D \subseteq \sqcup$ whose pipe dream reading word $i_1 i_2 \cdots i_l$ satisfies $z = \delta_{\text{FPF}}(i_1 i_2 \cdots i_l)$. Let $\mathcal{FP}^+(z)$ be the set of all extended pipe dreams for z .

The set $\mathcal{FP}^+(z)$ is called $\text{InvDreams}(z)$ in [31]. Each $D \in \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$ has $|D| \geq \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z)$, with equality if and only if $D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$ [16, Thm. 3.12]. The containment $\mathcal{FP}(z) \subset \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$ is strict unless $z = 1_{\text{FPF}}$.

In the next lemma, we consider the complex $\{\emptyset\}$ to be a (-1) -dimensional sphere and \emptyset to be a ball. These conventions may appear somewhat *recherché*. Ultimately, however, all we need out of the lemma are the reduced Betti numbers $\dim \tilde{H}_i(\Sigma(z, Q); \mathbb{K})$ as computed via simplicial homology, and one checks that these are $\delta_{i, -1}$ and 0 when $\Sigma(z, Q)$ is $\{\emptyset\}$ or \emptyset , respectively.

Lemma 4.27. Suppose $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ and $Q \subseteq \sqcup_n$. Then $\Sigma(z, Q)$ is homeomorphic to a sphere of dimension $|Q| - \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) - 1$ when $Q \in \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$ and to a closed ball when $Q \notin \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$.

Proof. The facets of $\Sigma(z, Q)$ are the sets $Q \setminus D$ for all $D \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$ such that $D \subseteq Q$. Let F be a codimension one face of $\Sigma(z, Q)$, that is, a face contained in a facet of size $|F| + 1$. Then $Q \setminus F$ is a

set of size $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) + 1$ from which one (not necessarily unique) cell can be removed to form a pipe dream in $\mathcal{FP}(z)$.

As explained in [22, §3], since $\Sigma(z, Q)$ is shellable by Theorem 4.25, it suffices by [6, Prop. 4.7.22] to check (a) that F is contained in at most two facets of $\Sigma(z, Q)$, (b) that F is contained in exactly two facets of $\Sigma(z, Q)$ if $Q \in \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$, and (c) if $Q \notin \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$ then there is some choice of F that is contained in a unique facet.

To prove (a), we observe that if F were contained in three distinct facets, then $Q \setminus F$ would contain three distinct pipe dreams in $\mathcal{FP}(z)$. This would mean that there are three distinct letters that can be deleted from the pipe dream reading word of F , which has length $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) + 1$, to form an fpf-involution word for z . It is a basic exercise to show that this is impossible; the argument is the same as what is needed to prove that if $w \in S_\infty$, then a word of length $\ell(w) + 1$ may contain at most two distinct subwords that are reduced words for w .

Claim (b) follows immediately from [14, Lem. 4.21], which asserts that if $Q \in \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$ then there are exactly two cells $c \in Q \setminus F$ with $Q \setminus F \setminus \{c\} \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$. Finally, to prove (c), suppose $Q \notin \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$. It remains to show that some F is contained in exactly one facet.

We have defined the complex \emptyset to be a ball, so we may assume that $\Sigma(z, Q)$ is non-empty and that Q contains some element of $\mathcal{FP}(z)$. Take D to be maximal under inclusion such that $D \subseteq Q$ and $D \in \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$. Since $D \neq Q$ as $Q \notin \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$, there exists $D \subseteq D' \subseteq Q$ with $|D' \setminus D| = 1$. By maximality, we have $z \neq \delta_{\text{FPF}}(\text{word}(D')) \in \{1\} \sqcup \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$, so there are two possibilities.

- (i) Suppose $\delta_{\text{FPF}}(\text{word}(D')) \neq 1$. Since $\text{word}(D')$ contains an fpf-involution word for z by hypothesis, the subword criterion for the Bruhat order on S_∞ and Lemma 3.10 imply that $z < \delta_{\text{FPF}}(\text{word}(D')) \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$. We therefore can choose $z' \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ with $\delta_{\text{FPF}}(\text{word}(D')) \geq z' > z$ and $\ell_{\text{FPF}}(z') = \ell(z) + 1$. Then D' contains some $E \in \mathcal{FP}(z')$ by [16, Lem. 4.31], and we take $F = Q \setminus E$. This is a codimension one face and we claim that it is contained in a unique facet. Indeed, if F were contained in two facets of $\Sigma(z, Q)$ then $\text{word}(E)$, which is an fpf-involution word for z' , would contain two distinct subwords that were fpf-involution words for z . But this is impossible; the argument is the same as the proof that if $w, w' \in S_\infty$ and $\ell(w') = \ell(w) + 1$, then a reduced word for w' may contain at most one subword that is a reduced word for w .
- (ii) Suppose $\delta_{\text{FPF}}(\text{word}(D')) = 1$. This only happens if we can write $\text{word}(D') = aqb$ where a and b are subwords with $\text{word}(D) = ab$, q is a positive integer, and the subset $A \subseteq D'$ contributing the subword a belongs to $\mathcal{FP}^+(y)$ for some $y \in \mathcal{I}_\infty^{\text{FPF}}$ with $y(q) = q + 1$. Let \square be the element of D' corresponding to the letter q in $\text{word}(D') = aqb$. Since $D \in \mathcal{FP}^+(z)$, there is $E \subseteq D$ with $E \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$, and we can further assume that $E \cap A \in \mathcal{FP}(y)$.

The set $F = Q \setminus (E \sqcup \{\square\})$ is a codimension one face contained in $Q \setminus E$, and we claim it is contained in no other facet. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $E \sqcup \{\square\}$ contains some $E' \in \mathcal{FP}(z)$ distinct from E . Writing $\text{word}(E \sqcup \{\square\}) = a_1 \cdots a_k q b_1 \cdots b_l$ and $\text{word}(E) = a_1 \cdots a_k b_1 \cdots b_l$, where $\text{word}(E \cap A) = a_1 \cdots a_k$, we have either $\text{word}(E') = a_1 \cdots a_k q b_1 \cdots \widehat{b}_i \cdots b_l$ or $\text{word}(E') = a_1 \cdots \widehat{a}_i \cdots a_k q b_1 \cdots b_l$ for some i . The first case implies

$$\begin{aligned} z &= s_{b_l} \cdots s_{b_1} s_{a_k} \cdots s_{a_1} 1_{\text{FPF}} s_{a_1} \cdots s_{a_k} s_{b_1} \cdots s_{b_l} \\ &= s_{b_l} \cdots \widehat{s}_{b_i} \cdots s_{b_1} s_q s_{a_k} \cdots s_{a_1} 1_{\text{FPF}} s_{a_1} \cdots s_{a_k} s_q s_{b_1} \cdots \widehat{s}_{b_i} \cdots s_{b_l} \end{aligned}$$

but if this holds then it is easy to deduce from $y = s_{a_k} \cdots s_{a_1} 1_{\text{FPF}} s_{a_1} \cdots s_{a_k}$ that

$$z = s_{b_l} \cdots \widehat{s}_{b_i} \cdots s_{b_1} s_{a_k} \cdots s_{a_1} 1_{\text{FPF}} s_{a_1} \cdots s_{a_k} s_{b_1} \cdots \widehat{s}_{b_i} \cdots s_{b_l}$$

which contradicts the fact that $a_1 \cdots a_k b_1 \cdots b_l$ is an fpf-involution word for z .

Similarly, in the second case we have

$$\begin{aligned} z &= s_{b_l} \cdots s_{b_1} s_{a_k} \cdots s_{a_1} 1_{\text{FPF}} s_{a_1} \cdots s_{a_k} s_{b_1} \cdots s_{b_l} \\ &= s_{b_l} \cdots s_{b_1} s_q s_{a_k} \cdots \widehat{s}_{a_i} \cdots s_{a_1} 1_{\text{FPF}} s_{a_1} \cdots \widehat{s}_{a_i} \cdots s_{a_k} s_q s_{b_1} \cdots s_{b_l}. \end{aligned}$$

Canceling the factors s_{b_j} gives

$$y = s_{a_k} \cdots s_{a_1} 1_{\text{FPF}} s_{a_1} \cdots s_{a_k} = s_q s_{a_k} \cdots \widehat{s}_{a_i} \cdots s_{a_1} 1_{\text{FPF}} s_{a_1} \cdots \widehat{s}_{a_i} \cdots s_{a_k} s_q.$$

As $a_1 \cdots a_k$ is an fpf-involution word for y , this implies that $a_1 \cdots \widehat{a_i} \cdots a_k q$ is another fpf-involution for y . But this is also impossible since $s_q y s_q = y$.

In each case, we have identified a codimension one face that is contained in a unique facet of $\Sigma(z, Q)$. This verifies claim (c) and completes our proof of the lemma. \square

We conclude with this application:

Theorem 4.28 ([31, Thm. 4.5]). Let $z \in \text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$. Then

$$\mathfrak{G}_z^{\text{Sp}} = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{FP}^+(z)} (-1)^{|D| - \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z)} \prod_{(i,j) \in D} (1 - a_i a_j).$$

Remark. Our first proof of this result in [31] was by a direct algebraic method, proceeding from an explicit generating function for $\mathfrak{G}_z^{\text{Sp}}$ similar to the Billey-Jockusch-Stanley formula [4, Thm. 1.1]. The identity given here is the specialization of [31, Thm. 4.5] with $x_i = 1 - a_i$ and $\beta = -1$. We recover the original theorem by setting $a_i = 1 + \beta x_i$ and then dividing both sides by $(-\beta)^{\ell_{\text{FPF}}(z)}$.

Proof. We have $\mathfrak{G}_z^{\text{Sp}} = \mathcal{K}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}})) = \mathcal{K}(\text{in}(I(X_z^{\text{ss}}))) = \mathcal{K}(J_z)$ by Theorem 4.3 and Lemma 4.17. The fact that J_z is the Stanley-Reisner ideal of $\Sigma(z, \triangleleft_n)$ by Theorem 4.22 implies that

$$\mathfrak{G}_z^{\text{Sp}} = \sum_{D \subseteq \triangleleft_n} -\tilde{\chi}(\text{lk}_{D^c} \Sigma(z, \triangleleft_n)) \prod_{(i,j) \in D} (1 - a_i a_j),$$

where $D^c := \triangleleft_n \setminus D$ and $\tilde{\chi}$ is the reduced Euler characteristic over \mathbb{K} , by the discussion in [22, §4]. We have $\text{lk}_{D^c} \Sigma(z, \triangleleft_n) = \Sigma(z, D)$ by Lemma 4.24. The theorem follows by substituting the identity

$$-\tilde{\chi}(\text{lk}_{D^c} \Sigma(z, \triangleleft_n)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } D \notin \mathcal{FP}^+(z) \\ (-1)^{|D| - \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z)} & \text{if } D \in \mathcal{FP}^+(z), \end{cases}$$

which holds since in the first case $\Sigma(z, D)$ is homeomorphic to a ball and in the second case $\Sigma(z, D)$ is homeomorphic to a sphere of dimension $|D| - \ell_{\text{FPF}}(z) - 1$ by Lemma 4.27. \square

5 New proofs of classical results

The inductive strategy used to derive our main theorems can be adapted to give new proofs of the results of Knutson and Miller [22] that we presented in an abridged form as Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in the introduction. We briefly indicate how this is done, omitting the details that are similar to the skew-symmetric case. This approach is likely already known to experts, but we believe it has not been written down explicitly in any prior literature.

Fix $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and identify the coordinate ring $\mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_{m \times n}]$ with $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]]$ by viewing u_{ij} as the map $A \mapsto A_{ij}$. Write \mathcal{U} for the matrix of variables $[u_{ij}]_{(i,j) \in [m] \times [n]}$.

Definition 5.1. Given $w \in S_\infty^{m,n}$, let I_w be the ideal in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]]$ generated by the minors $\det(\mathcal{U}_{AB})$, where $(A, B) \in \binom{[i]}{q} \times \binom{[j]}{q}$ for some $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ with $q = \text{rank}(w_{[i][j]}) + 1$.

Since $\text{rank } A \leq r$ if and only if all size $r + 1$ minors of A vanish, X_w is the zero locus of I_w . In contrast to the skew-symmetric case, where the analogue of I_w is not always prime (see Example 3.12), the ideal I_w will turn out to be the (prime) ideal of the variety X_w [22].

Definition 5.2. For a rank table \mathbf{r} , let $J_{\mathbf{r}}$ be the ideal in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]]$ generated by all monomials u_{AB} as defined in (3.6), where $(A, B) \in \binom{[i]}{q} \times \binom{[j]}{q}$ for some $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ with $q = \mathbf{r}(i, j) + 1$. If $w \in S_\infty^{m,n}$, then we define $J_w := J_{\mathbf{r}_w}$.

From this point on, we fix an arbitrary antidiagonal term order on $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]]$. This could be the reverse lexicographic term order from Example 2.2 once again, but other choices are possible. For any such term order, it holds that $u_{AB} = \text{in}(\det(\mathcal{U}_{AB}))$, so the ideal J_w is automatically a subset of $\text{in}(I_w)$. We will see shortly that this inclusion is equality [22].

Example 5.3. Suppose $m = n = 3$ and $w = 2143 \in S_4 \cap S_\infty^{3,3}$. It follows from Proposition 3.7 that X_{2143} is the set of matrices $A \in M_{3,3}$ with $\text{rank } A_{[1][1]} \leq 0$ and $\text{rank } A_{[3][3]} \leq 2$. One can show that similarly $I_w = (\det \mathcal{U}_{[1][1]}, \det \mathcal{U}_{[3][3]})$ (see [13, Lem. 3.10]) and $J_w = (u_{11}, u_{31}u_{22}u_{13})$. Our definitions of these ideals involve many other generators that turn out to be redundant.

The following results have the same proofs as their skew-symmetric versions (namely, Propositions 3.29, 3.30, and 3.31), *mutatis mutandis*. We omit the details.

Proposition 5.4. If M is a monomial in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]]$ and $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_M$ is the rank table defined before Proposition 3.22, then $M \notin J_{\mathbf{r}}$.

Proposition 5.5. If $v, w \in S_\infty^{m,n}$ and $v \leq w$, then $J_v \subseteq J_w$.

Proposition 5.6. If \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{s} are rank tables then $J_{\min(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s})} = J_{\mathbf{r}} + J_{\mathbf{s}}$.

Using these statements in place of Propositions 3.29, 3.30, and 3.31, while swapping out relevant notation, one can repeat the proof of Theorem 3.32 verbatim to derive the following identity.

Theorem 5.7. Let \mathbf{r} be a rank table. Then $J_{\mathbf{r}} = \bigcap_w J_w$ where w runs over the elements of $S_\infty^{m,n}$ that are Bruhat-minimal among those with $\mathbf{r}_w(i, j) \leq \mathbf{r}(i, j)$ for all $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$.

Given $w \in S_\infty$ and a positive integer p , define

$$\Phi(w, p) = \{w(p, r) \in S_\infty : p < r \text{ and } \ell(w(p, r)) = \ell(w) + 1\},$$

Recall that an outer corner of $\text{dom}(w)$ is a pair $(i, j) \in (\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}) \setminus \text{dom}(w)$ satisfying (4.2).

Lemma 5.8. Suppose $w \in S_\infty$ and (p, q) is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(w)$. Then $w(p) = q$ and $\Phi(w, p)$ is the set of Bruhat-minimal elements of

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}(w, p) &= \{v \in S_\infty : v \geq w, \text{ rank } v_{[i][j]} = 0 \text{ for } (i, j) \in [p] \times [q]\} \\ &= \{v \in S_\infty : v \geq w, \text{ dom}(v) \supseteq [p] \times [q]\}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, if $w \in S_\infty^{m,n}$ and $(p, q) \in [m] \times [n]$ then $\Phi(w, p) \subset S_\infty^{m,n}$.

Proof sketch. As in the proof of Lemma 4.8, one first checks that $\Phi(w, p) = \{v \in \mathcal{W}(w, p) : \ell(v) = \ell(w) + 1\}$ using basic properties of the Bruhat order and Proposition 3.8. Next, one argues that if $u \in \mathcal{W}(w, p)$ and $\ell(u) - \ell(w) \geq 2$ then u is not a Bruhat-minimal element. One can deduce this claim by repeating the second half of the proof of Lemma 4.8, changing the obvious things needing to be changed, and replacing Lemma 4.7 by Lemma 5.9 below. \square

Lemma 5.9. Suppose $w \in S_\infty$ and (p, q) is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(w)$. Assume i, j, r are positive integers with $i < j$, $p < r$, and $w < w(i, j) < w(i, j)(p, r)$. Then there are integers $i', j', r' \in \{i, j, p, r\}$ with $i' < j'$, $p < r'$, and $w < w(p, r') < w(p, r')(i', j') = w(i, j)(p, r)$.

Proof. Write $\phi : [n] \rightarrow \{p, r, i, j\}$ and $\psi : \{w(p), w(r), w(i), w(j)\} \rightarrow [n]$ for the unique order-preserving bijections where $n := |\{p, r, i, j\}| \leq 4$. Then $(p', q') := (\phi^{-1}(p), \psi(q)) \in [n] \times [n]$ is an outer corner of $w' := \psi \circ w \circ \phi \in S_n$, and if the lemma fails for w and (p, q) then it must fail for w' and (p', q') . But a finite calculation shows that the lemma holds whenever $w \in S_n$ and $n \leq 4$. \square

Corollary 5.10. Let $w \in S_\infty^{m,n}$ and suppose $(p, q) \in [m] \times [n]$ is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(w)$. Then $X_w \cap X_{p,q} = \bigcup_{v \in \Phi(w,p)} X_v$ for $X_{p,q} := \{A \in \text{Mat}_{m \times n} : A_{ij} = 0 \text{ for all } (i, j) \in [p] \times [q]\}$.

This follows by the proof of Corollary 4.9, *mutatis mutandis*, via Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 5.8. The same is true of the following result compared to Lemma 4.2: the proof is the same after replacing $\text{FPF}_n(\mathcal{I}_n)$ by $S_\infty^{m,n}$, $\Psi(z, p)$ by $\Phi(w, p)$, and the symbols $X^{\text{ss}}, I^{\text{ss}}, J^{\text{ss}}$ by X, I, J , and then citing the relevant results in this subsection in place of their skew-symmetric predecessors.

Lemma 5.11. Suppose $w \in S_\infty^{m,n}$ and $(p, q) \in [m] \times [n]$ is an outer corner of $\text{dom}(w)$. Then it holds that $I(X_w) + (u_{pq}) \subseteq \bigcap_{v \in \Phi(w,p)} I(X_v)$ and $J_w + (u_{pq}) = \bigcap_{v \in \Phi(w,p)} J_v$, where (u_{pq}) denotes the principal ideal of $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]]$ generated by u_{pq} .

Putting all of this together, we recover the following results from [22].

Theorem 5.12 ([22, Thms. A and B]). Let $w \in S_\infty^{m,n}$. Then $J_w = \text{in}(I_w) = \text{in}(I(X_w))$ and $I_w = I(X_w)$. Thus I_w is a prime ideal, with a Gröbner basis given by the set of minors $\det(\mathcal{U}_{AB})$ with (A, B) ranging over all pairs in $\binom{[i]}{q} \times \binom{[j]}{q}$ for $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ with $q = \text{rank } w_{[i][j]} + 1$.

Proof sketch. The identity $J_w = \text{in}(I_w) = \text{in}(I(X_w))$ is an analogue of Theorem 4.3, and its proof is essentially the same. We argue by induction on the size of the complement of $D(w)$ in $[m] \times [n]$. The base case corresponds to $w_\square = (n+1)(n+2) \cdots (n+m)12 \cdots n$, which has $D(w_\square) = [m] \times [n]$. If $w = w_\square$ then it is easy to see that $I_w = J_w = I(X_w)$ is the ideal of $\mathbb{K}[\text{Mat}_{m \times n}]$ generated by all the variables u_{ij} for $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$, so $J_w = \text{in}(I_w) = \text{in}(I(X_w))$. The inductive step follows by the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 4.3, changing what needs to be changed and using Lemma 5.11 in place of Lemma 4.2. While in the skew-symmetric case it was nontrivial to show that $J_z^{\text{ss}} \subseteq \text{in}(I_z^{\text{ss}})$, now we have $J_w \subseteq \text{in}(I_w)$ by definition.

The claim that $I_w = I(X_w)$ is prime corresponds to Theorem 4.5 and likewise follows from Proposition 2.4(d), since we already know that $I_w \subseteq I(X_w)$ and that X_w is irreducible. The last statement, which gives a version of Theorem 4.6, is equivalent to $J_w = \text{in}(I(X_w))$. \square

We also sketch an alternate proof of the classical version of Theorem 4.15. Modifying our earlier notation, given a subset $D \subseteq [m] \times [n]$, we write $(u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$ for the corresponding ideal in $\mathbb{K}[u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n]]$. We have such an ideal for each pipe dream of each $w \in S_\infty^{m,n}$, since if $D \in \mathcal{RP}(w)$ then $D \subseteq [m] \times [n]$ by [3, Thm. 3.7], and by definition $|D| = |D(w)| = \ell(w)$.

Theorem 5.13 ([22, Thm. B]). Let $w \in S_{\infty}^{m,n}$. Then $J_w = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{RP}(w)} (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$.

Proof sketch. We apply our usual inductive strategy. The base case corresponds to $w_{\square} = (n+1)(n+2) \cdots (n+m)12 \cdots n$, for which $J_{w_{\square}} = (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in [m] \times [n])$ and $\mathcal{RP}(w_{\square}) = \{[m] \times [n]\}$ by [3, Thm. 3.7]. If $w \in S_{\infty}^{m,n} \setminus \{w_{\square}\}$, then $\text{dom}(w)$ has an outer corner $(p, q) \in [m] \times [n]$ and we wish to show that $J_w + (u_{pq}) = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{RP}(w)} (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D) + (u_{pq})$. Our argument is the same as in the proof of Theorem 4.15, except we swap out $z, J_z^{\text{ss}}, \mathcal{FP}(z), \Psi(z, p)$ for $w, J_w, \mathcal{RP}(w), \Phi(w, p)$, and then replace Lemma 4.2 by Lemma 5.11 and [16, Thm. 4.33] by [21, Lem. 3.3]. The latter result implies that $D \mapsto D \sqcup \{(p, q)\}$ is a well-defined bijection $\mathcal{RP}(w) \rightarrow \bigcup_{v \in \Phi(w, p)} \mathcal{RP}(v)$.

We now wish to apply Lemma 2.6 with $J = J_w, I = \bigcap_{D \in \mathcal{RP}(w)} (u_{ij} : (i, j) \in D)$, and $f = u_{pq}$. Checking the hypothesis $I \cap (f) = fI$ for this lemma is straightforward. What remains is to provide an analogue of Lemma 4.13 showing that $J \subseteq I$. We outline a mostly self-contained proof of this property. Consider a pipe dream $D \in \mathcal{RP}(w)$ and choose a pair $(A, B) \in \binom{[i]}{q} \times \binom{[j]}{q}$ for some $(i, j) \in [m] \times [n]$ with $q = \text{rank } w_{[i][j]} + 1$, so that u_{AB} is an arbitrary generator of J_w . It suffices to show that $u_{ij} \mid u_{AB}$ for some $(i, j) \in D$, and for this is enough to check that the largest antidiagonal contained in $([i] \times [j]) \setminus D$ has size less than q .

To prove this claim, consider the permutation $v \in S_{\infty}^{m,n}$ with Rothe diagram $[q, i] \times [q, j]$. The permutation matrix of v is formed from the identity matrix by shifting rows q, \dots, i to the right by $j+1-q$ columns and then shifting rows $i+1, \dots, i+j+1-q$ to the left by $i+1-q$ columns. Because v is 321-avoiding, none of its reduced words are connected by any nontrivial braid relations, and it follows from [3, Thm. 3.7] that every pipe dream for v is obtained by starting with the *bottom pipe dream* $D_{\text{bot}}(v) := [q, i] \times [j+1-q]$ and applying a sequence of *basic ladder moves* that each replace a single element of the form $(a+1, a)$ by $(a, a+1)$ if the pairs $(a, a), (a, a+1), (a+1, a+1)$ are all not present.

The largest antidiagonal in $([i] \times [j]) \setminus E$ has size less than q if $E = D_{\text{bot}}(v) = [q, i] \times [j+1-q]$, and this property is preserved by all basic ladder moves. On the other hand, one can check using Proposition 3.11 that $v \leq w$ in Bruhat order, so the subword characterization of Bruhat order implies that each pipe dream $D \in \mathcal{RP}(w)$ contains some pipe dream $E \in \mathcal{RP}(v)$ as a subset (see [16, Lem. 4.8]). But if $E \subseteq D$ then the size of largest antidiagonal in $([i] \times [j]) \setminus D$ cannot exceed that of $([i] \times [j]) \setminus E$, which is already less than q as desired. \square

References

- [1] D. Anderson and W. Fulton, Chern class formulas for classical-type degeneracy loci, *Compos. Math.* **154** (2018), 1746–1774.
- [2] L. J. Billera and J. S. Provan, A decomposition property for simplicial complexes and its relation to diameters and shellings, Second International Conference on Combinatorial Mathematics, New York Acad. Sci., New York, 1979, 82–85.
- [3] N. Bergeron and S. Billey, RC-graphs and Schubert polynomials, *Experiment. Math.* **2** (1993), no. 4, 257–269.
- [4] S. C. Billey, W. Jockusch, and R. P. Stanley, Some combinatorial properties of Schubert polynomials, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **2** (1993), 345–374.
- [5] A. Björner and F. Brenti, *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, Graduate Texts in Maths. 231. Springer, New York, 2005.

- [6] A. Björner, M. Las Vergnas, B. Sturmfels, N. White, and G. M. Ziegler, *Oriented matroids*, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1999.
- [7] Y. Cherniavsky, On involutions of the symmetric group and congruence B -orbits of anti-symmetric matrices, *J. Algebra Comput.* **21** (2011), 841–856.
- [8] E. De Negri, Pfaffian ideals of ladders, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **125** (1998), 141–153.
- [9] E. De Negri and E. Sbarra, Gröbner bases of ideals cogenerated by Pfaffians, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **215** (2011), 812–821.
- [10] D. Eisenbud, *Commutative algebra with a view toward algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 150, Springer, New York, 1995.
- [11] S. V. Fomin, Generalized Robinson-Schensted-Knuth correspondence, *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)* **155** (1986) (in Russian); translation in *J. Soviet Math.* **41** (1988), 979–991.
- [12] S. Fomin and A. N. Kirillov, Grothendieck polynomials and the Yang-Baxter equation, *Proceedings of the Sixth Conference in Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics*.
- [13] W. Fulton, Flags, Schubert polynomials, degeneracy loci, and determinantal formulas, *Duke Math. J.* **65** (1991), 381–420.
- [14] Z. Hamaker, E. Marberg, and B. Pawlowski. Transition formulas for involution Schubert polynomials, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* **24** (2018), no. 4, 2991–3025.
- [15] Z. Hamaker, E. Marberg, and B. Pawlowski, Fixed-point-free involutions and Schur P -positivity, *J. Combinatorics* **11** (2020), no. 1, 65–110.
- [16] Z. Hamaker, E. Marberg, and B. Pawlowski, Involution pipe dreams, *Canad. J. Math.*, to appear.
- [17] Z. Hamaker, O. Pechenik, A. Weigandt, Gröbner geometry of Schubert polynomials through ice, *Adv. Math.* **398** (2022), 108228.
- [18] J. Herzog and N. V. Trung, Gröbner bases and multiplicity of determinantal and Pfaffian ideals, *Adv. Math.* **96** (1992), 1–37.
- [19] M. Ishikawa and M. Wakayama, Minor summation formulas of Pfaffians, survey and a new identity, *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.* **28** (2000), 133–142.
- [20] J. Jonsson and V. Welker, A spherical initial ideal for Pfaffians, *Illinois J. Math.* **51** (2007), 1397–1407.
- [21] A. Knutson, Schubert polynomials, pipe dreams, equivariant classes, and a co-transition formula, preprint (2019), arXiv:1909.13777.
- [22] A. Knutson and E. Miller, Gröbner geometry of Schubert polynomials, *Ann. Math.* **161** (2005), 1245–1318.

- [23] A. Knutson and E. Miller, Subword complexes in Coxeter groups, *Adv. Math.* **184** (2004), 161–176.
- [24] A. Knutson, E. Miller, and A. Yong, Gröbner geometry of vertex decompositions and of flagged tableaux, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **630** (2009), 1–31.
- [25] C. Krattenthaler, Growth diagrams, and increasing and decreasing chains in fillings of Ferrers shapes, *Advances in Applied Mathematics* **37** (2006), 404–431.
- [26] A. Lascoux and M-P. Schützenberger, Structure de Hopf de l’anneau de cohomologie et de l’anneau de Grothendieck d’une variété de drapeaux, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **295** (1982), 629–633.
- [27] A. Lascoux and M-P. Schützenberger, Schubert polynomials and the Littlewood-Richardson rule, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **10** (1985), 111–124.
- [28] E. Marberg, A symplectic refinement of shifted Hecke insertion, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **173** (2020), 105216.
- [29] E. Marberg and B. Pawlowski, K -theory formulas for orthogonal and symplectic orbit closures, *Adv. Math.* **372** (2020), 107299.
- [30] E. Marberg and B. Pawlowski, On some properties of symplectic Grothendieck polynomials, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **225** (2021), no. 1, 106463.
- [31] E. Marberg, and B. Pawlowski, Principal specializations of Schubert polynomials in classical types, *Algebr. Comb.* **4** (2021), no. 2, 273–287.
- [32] E. Miller and B. Sturmfels, *Combinatorial commutative algebra*, vol. 227, Springer Science & Business Media, 2004.
- [33] B. Pawlowski, Universal graph Schubert varieties, *Transform. Groups* **26** (2021), 1417–1461.
- [34] K. N. Raghavan and S. Upadhyay, Initial ideals of tangent cones to Schubert varieties in orthogonal Grassmannians, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **116** (2009), 663–683.
- [35] E. M. Rains and M. J. Vazirani, Deformations of permutation representations of Coxeter groups, *J. Algebr. Comb.* **37** (2013), 455–502.
- [36] B. Wyser and A. Yong, Polynomials for symmetric orbit closures in the flag variety, *Transform. Groups* **22** (2017), 267–290.