

(HURWITZ–)BRILL–NOETHER GENERAL MARKED GRAPHS VIA THE DEMAZURE PRODUCT

NATHAN PFLUEGER

ABSTRACT. This paper gives a novel and compact proof that a metric graph consisting of a chain of loops of torsion order 0 is Brill–Noether general (a theorem of Cools–Draisma–Payne–Robeva), and a finite or metric graph consisting of a chain of loops of torsion order k is Hurwitz–Brill–Noether general in the sense of splitting loci (a theorem of Cook–Powell–Jensen). In fact, we prove a generalization to (metric) graphs with two marked points, that behaves well under vertex gluing. The key construction is a way to associate permutations to divisors on twice-marked graphs, simultaneously encoding the ranks of every twist of the divisor by the marked points. Vertex gluing corresponds to the Demazure product, which can be formulated via tropical matrix multiplication.

1. INTRODUCTION

Combinatorial Brill–Noether theory, as inaugurated in [Bak08, §3],[CDPR12] concerns the census of all pairs $(\deg D, r(D))$ of degrees and ranks of divisors on a metric graph or finite graph Γ , often with the aim of studying algebraic curves that specialize to Γ . Hereafter, “graph” refers agnostically to either a metric or finite graph, and “points” of a graph are vertices for a finite graph, or any point along an edge for a metric graph. A *divisor* on a graph is a \mathbb{Z} -linear combination of points, which is commonly viewed as a configuration of chips, some of which represent debt. An *effective divisor* is a chip configuration with no debt; the *degree* is the total number of chips; divisors are sorted into *linear equivalence classes* via chip-firing moves, and the (*Baker–Norine*) *rank* measures the degrees of freedom among the effective divisors in a given class. These definitions mirror analogous definitions for divisors on algebraic curves. The geometric and combinatorial versions of this census have a robust interface via specialization from curves to graphs, and lifting from graphs to curves, resulting in a rich intermingling of geometry, algebra, and combinatorics. We focus herein on the combinatorial story; geometric analogs of this content will appear in forthcoming work¹.

From the beginning, *chains of loops* are celebrities in this story; these method actors perfectly assume their role as “general algebraic curves,” when the loops have general torsion order (Definition 2.4). More recently, they have starred in the new topic of Hurwitz–Brill–Noether theory, where torsion orders are taken to be the integer $k \geq 2$, and the chain gives an uncanny performance a “general degree- k cover of \mathbb{P}^1 .” A very brief overview of Hurwitz–Brill–Noether theory, and references, are given in Section 5.

Newcomers often ask: *why these graphs, specifically?* This paper offers an answer to that question. In a word: it is not chains of loops that are well-adapted to (Hurwitz–)Brill–Noether theory, but *vertex gluings*. Define the vertex gluing of two twice-marked graphs $(\Gamma_1, v_1, w_2), (\Gamma_2, v_2, w_2)$ to be (Γ, v_1, w_2) , where Γ is obtained by gluing w_1 to v_2 ; see Figure 1. The chain of loops is simply the end of the road: a graphs that is decomposed as much as possible via vertex gluing. Our approach neatly folds together the Hurwitz–Brill–Noether story and Brill–Noether story. We formulate in Definition 1.9 a genericity condition for twice-marked graphs called *k -general transmission*. This paper’s main results are as follows.

Date: March 2, 2022.

¹Although this forthcoming work is not finished, I am happy to provide a draft to interested readers.




FIGURE 1. An example of a vertex gluing.

Theorem A. *If two twice-marked graphs have k -general transmission, then so does their vertex gluing. A genus 1 graph has k -general transmission if and only if it has torsion order k . In particular, a chain of k -torsion loops has k -general transmission. (Proof on page 10)*

Theorem B. *If (Γ, v, w) has 0-general transmission, then it is Brill–Noether general in the following sense: for every degree- d divisor D on Γ , if $r(D) = r$ and D has vanishing sequences $(a_i)_{i=0}^r$ and $(b_i)_{i=0}^r$ at v and w respectively, then the adjusted Brill–Noether number is nonnegative:*

$$\rho = g - (r + 1)(g - d + r) - \sum_{i=0}^r (a_i - i) - \sum_{i=0}^r (b_i - i) \geq 0.$$

Here, the vanishing sequence of a divisor D at a point u is the sequence $(a_i)_{0 \leq i \leq r(D)}$ defined by $a_i = \max\{a \in \mathbb{Z} : r(D - au) \geq r - i\}$. (Proof on page 11)

Theorem C. *If $k \geq 2$ and (Γ, v, w) has k -general transmission, then $kv \sim kw$, $r(kv) \geq 1$, and (Γ, v, w) is Hurwitz–Brill–Noether general, in the following sense: every divisor D on Γ belongs to a splitting type locus $W^\mu(\Gamma)$ with respect to $F = kv$ such that $|\mu| \leq g$. See Section 5 for terminology on splitting loci. (Proof on page 12)*

Remark 1.1. Theorem B shows that 0-general transmission implies Brill–Noether generality, but the converse is false; 0-general transmission is a strictly stronger condition. Indeed, a chain of loops is Brill–Noether general provided that the torsion orders are either 0 or sufficiently large; see [CDPR12, Pfl17b] for precise statements.

A weaker form of Theorem B, incorporating vanishing orders at only one marked point, is proved in [Pfl17b]. By discarding all the vanishing order terms except $(a_r - r)$, Theorem B implies the Brill–Noether generality condition proved for chains of loops in [CDPR12, Theorem 1.1]; in particular, it implies that the Brill–Noether rank $w_d^r(\Gamma)$ in the sense of [LPP12] is at most ρ . The Hurwitz–Brill–Noether generality condition in Theorem C was proved for chains of loops by Cook–Powell and Jensen [CPJ20, Theorem 1.2]; a weaker form, without the splitting loci terminology, was proved in [Pfl17a, Corollary 3.6]

The basis of our analysis is a way to associate permutations, which we call *transmission permutations* to divisors on twice-marked graphs. These permutations contain all the information needed to compute ranks of divisors on chains of such twice-marked graphs. A crucial advantage of the transmission permutation point of view is that it behaves well under vertex gluing, and thereby provides a route to constructing new (Hurwitz–)Brill–Noether general graphs of any genus: if a few more lower-genus graphs with k -general transmission are identified, then these can be mixed and matched like beads on a string to build personal, Brill–Noether general gifts for your special someone. One of my principal hopes in writing this paper is that it will lead to the identification of a broader class of (Hurwitz–)Brill–Noether general graphs.

1.1. How do you quantify how special a divisor is? Brill–Noether theory of curves or graphs concerns the categorization of divisor classes according to “how special” they are, and predicts the codimension, within the Picard group, of the locus of equally special divisors. The word “codimension” can be taken literally within the Picard group of a curve or a metric graph, but must be taken figuratively for a finite graph.

The subject began by categorizing divisor classes by degree and rank, or equivalently (using Riemann–Roch) by the two numbers $r(D)$ and $r(K - D)$, where K denotes the canonical divisor. The expected codimension is $(r(D) + 1)(r(K - D) + 1)$; if $r = r(D)$, $d = \deg D$, and g is the genus, this is equal to $(r + 1)(g - d + r)$, an expression near and dear to acolytes of Brill–Noether theory. Since the advent of limit linear series in the 1980s, it is common to refine this classification by further sorting divisors according to their vanishing sequences at one or more marked points p_1, \dots, p_n , which amounts to recording not just $r(D)$ but all values $r(D - np_i)$ for $n \geq 0$. More recently, the subject of *Hurwitz–Brill–Noether theory* aims to study the categorization of divisors on curves that have a degree- k map $C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$, or alternatively curves with a chosen degree- k divisor F of degree k and $r(F) \geq 1$. In this context, one classifies divisors according not just to $r(D)$, but $r(D - nF)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (both positive and negative). Both variations develop a theme: divisors are classified according to the ranks of some collection of “twists.”

The present paper develops the theme further: if u, v are two marked points, then we may categorize divisors according to the ranks $r(D + au - bv)$, $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, of all twists at the marked points. This can be used to study Hurwitz–Brill–Noether theory if the divisor F is a combination of u and v . This is a function of two variables, but for certain divisors, which we will call *submodular* (see Section 2), it is conveniently encoded in a permutation. The curious sign choice, writing $+au - bv$, is made so that more generic divisors have fewer inversions in their transmission permutations, and to simplify the later discussion of the Demazure product. In particular, the “most generic” divisors of degree g give the identity permutation, and these divisors do not change the transmission permutation of another divisor on another twice-marked graph when attached by vertex gluing.

Definition 1.2. The *transmission permutation* of D on (Γ, v, w) , if it exists, is the unique permutation $\tau_D^{v,w} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that the following two equivalent equations hold for all $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$.

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & r(D + av - bw) + 1 = \#\{n \geq b : \tau_D^{v,w}(n) \leq a\} \\ (2) \quad & r(K_\Gamma - D - av + bw) + 1 = \#\{n < b : \tau_D^{v,w}(n) > a\} \end{aligned}$$

Example 1.3. The “most generic” transmission permutations are those with no inversions at all, i.e. increasing permutations. Indeed, suppose that D is a degree d divisor on a genus g graph such that all “twists” $D' = D + av - bw$ are nonspecial (that is, either $|D'| = \emptyset$ or $|K_\Gamma - D'| = \emptyset$). Then $\tau_D^{v,w}(n) = n + g - d$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$; we will refer to this increasing permutation as ι_{d-g} . In particular, the identity permutation corresponds to the “most generic possible” divisors with $d = g$.

Example 1.4. Consider the simple transposition of m and $m + 1$; we denote this later by σ_m^0 . This permutation has one inversion, and $\tau_D^{v,w} = \sigma_m^0$ if and only if $\deg D = g$, $r(D + mv - (m + 1)w) = 0$, and all other twists $D' = D + av - bw$ are nonspecial. If Γ is a cycle and $v - w$ is nontorsion, then there is a unique such divisor class D , given by a single point $w_m \in \Gamma$. These points form an equally spaced sequence, with $w_{-1} = v$ and $w_0 = w$ (cf. Figure 2). If $v - w$ is torsion, we obtain instead an affine permutation σ_m^k , as defined below. See Section 2.1 for a complete analysis for transmission permutations in genus 1, from which the claims in this example follow.

Remark 1.5. As stated above, Equations (1) and (2) are equivalent. This can be seen as follows. Since $r(D + av - bw) \rightarrow -1$ as $b \rightarrow \infty$, Equation (1) is equivalent to the difference equation

$$r(D + av - bw) - r(D + av - (b + 1)w) = \delta(\tau_D^{v,w}(b) \leq a) \text{ for all } a, b \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

By Riemann-Roch, this is equivalent to a dual difference equation

$$r(K_\Gamma - D - av + (b+1)w) - r(K_\Gamma - D - av + bw) = \delta(\tau_D^{v,w}(b) > a) \text{ for all } a, b \in \mathbb{Z},$$

which similarly is equivalent to Equation (2). Also, these equations imply that the function $\tau_D^{v,w}$ is necessarily a *permutation*, since for any $b \ll 0$, Riemann-Roch implies

$$\#\{n \geq b : \tau_D^{v,w}(n) = a\} = r(D + av - bw) - r(D + (a-1)v - bw) = 1.$$

The transmission permutation has many pleasant properties. First, the “expected codimensions” from all variations of Brill–Noether theory described above are equal to the cardinality of some subset of the *inversions* of $\tau_D^{u,v}$. Second, transmission permutations are extremely well-suited to vertex gluing. There is an associative product \star , called the *Demazure product*, such that when a divisor D on a vertex gluing is split across the two graphs as $D_1 + D_2$, then we have an identity (Theorem 3.11)

$$\tau_D^{v_1, w_2} = \tau_{D_1}^{v_1, w_2} \star \tau_{D_2}^{v_2, w_2},$$

provided that all divisors involved are submodular. This identity is the basis for all the analysis in this paper, and the specific definition of $\tau_D^{v,w}$ made above (including the sign choice) is engineered to keep it as naturally stated as possible.

1.2. The groups $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$. We are interested in twice-marked graphs in which transmission permutations belong to a specific family of groups. Example 3.16 will show that in fact the group $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$ is precisely the set of transmission permutations that occur on chains of k -torsion cycles.

Definition 1.6. Let $\tilde{\Sigma}_0$ denote the group of permutations $\alpha : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ with finitely many inversions. For $k \geq 2$, let $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$ denote the group of permutations $\alpha : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\alpha(n+k) = \alpha(n) + k$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The groups $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$ for $k \geq 2$ are called *extended affine symmetric groups*².

If (Γ, v, w) is twice-marked graph with $kv \sim kw$, then one can show that $\tau_D^{v,w}(n+k) = \tau_D^{v,w}(n) + k$ for all submodular divisors D and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$; this is why the groups $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$ arise naturally in our context.

Definition 1.7. An *inversion* of a permutation α is a pair $(u, v) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $u < v$ and $\alpha(u) > \alpha(v)$. The set of inversions of α is denoted $\text{Inv}(\alpha)$. If $\alpha \in \tilde{\Sigma}_k$, call two inversions $(u, v), (u', v')$ k -equivalent if there is an integer n such that $(u', v') = (u + nk, v + nk)$. Denote by $\text{inv}_k(\alpha)$ the number of k -equivalence classes of $\text{Inv}(\alpha)$. More concretely, $\text{inv}_0(\alpha)$ is the number of inversions, and for $k \geq 2$, $\text{inv}_k(\alpha)$ is the number of inversions (u, v) with $0 \leq v < k$.

The number inv_k measures word length for a convenient system of generators.

Definition 1.8. Denote by ι_m the shift permutation $\iota_m(n) = n - m$. Let $\sigma_m^k \in \tilde{\Sigma}_k$ denote the permutation exchanging n and $n+1$ for all $n \equiv m \pmod{k}$, and fixing all other integers (when $k=0$, congruence means equality). We call the permutations σ_m^k *simple reflections*.

Note that $\text{inv}_k(\iota_m) = 0$, and $\text{inv}_k(\sigma_m^k) = 1$. In fact, for all $\alpha \in \tilde{\Sigma}_k$,

$$(3) \quad \text{inv}_k(\alpha \sigma_m^k) = \text{inv}_k(\alpha) + \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha(m) < \alpha(m+1) \\ -1 & \text{if } \alpha(m) > \alpha(m+1). \end{cases}$$

Equation (3) shows that $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$ is generated by ι_1 and $\{\sigma_m^k : m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$; this could have been our definition of $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$, and it shows more clearly why $\tilde{\Sigma}_0$ belongs to the same family as $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$ for $k \geq 2$.

²The (un-extended) *affine symmetric group* is the subgroup \tilde{S}_k of $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$ in which $\sum_{n=0}^{k-1} (\alpha(n) - n) = 0$. This is equivalent to $\{n \geq 0 : \alpha(n) < 0\} = \{n < 0 : \alpha(n) \geq 0\}$. Equations (1) and (2) imply that, if such an α is $\tau_D^{v,w}$, then $r(D-v) - r(K_\Gamma - D + v) = 0$, and thus $\deg D - g = 0$ by Riemann-Roch. So the (unextended) affine permutations are those that can arise via divisors with degree equal to the genus.

1.3. **k -general transmission.** If τ is a transmission permutation on (Γ, v, w) the number $\rho = g - \text{inv}_k(\tau)$ plays the role of the ‘‘Brill–Noether number,’’ and $\text{inv}_k(\tau)$ is the ‘‘expected codimension.’’ This is reflected in the key definition of this paper:

Definition 1.9. Let $k \geq 0$, with $k \neq 1$. A genus- g twice-marked graph (Γ, v, w) has k -general transmission if every divisor D on Γ is submodular, and satisfies $\tau_D^{v,w} \in \tilde{\Sigma}_k$ and $\text{inv}_k \tau_D^{v,w} \leq g$.

1.4. **Conventions.** Throughout this paper, the word *graph* refers *either* to a connected metric graph or a finite connected graph with no loop edges, unless stated otherwise. A *twice-marked graph* (Γ, v, w) is a graph with two chosen points (vertices, if Γ is a finite graph). We denote the canonical divisor by K_Γ , linear equivalence by $D \sim E$, and the Baker-Norine rank by $r(D)$. When a graph Γ is clear from context, g will denote its genus.

The symbol \mathbb{N} denotes the set of *nonnegative* numbers. The symbol δ will always be used for an indicator function; e.g. $\delta(n \geq 5)$ is 1 if $n \geq 5$ and 0 otherwise.

2. SUBMODULAR DIVISORS

This section gives a convenient description of the divisors which possess transmission permutations as well as a handy formula for computing the permutations, and apply it to completely describe the situation in genus 1.

Definition 2.1. For any divisor on (Γ, v, w) , denote for convenience

$$\Delta(D) = r(D) - r(D - v) - r(D - w) + r(D - v - w)$$

The divisor D is *submodular*³ with respect to v, w if $\Delta(D') \geq 0$ for all twists $D' = D + av - bw$.

Remark 2.2. Since $r(D') - r(D' - w) \in \{0, 1\}$, submodularity is equivalent to the implication

$$\text{for all twists } D' = D + av - bw, \quad r(D' - w) = r(D') \Rightarrow r(D' - v - w) = r(D' - v).$$

This is always true for a divisor on an *algebraic curve* C , since if every divisor in the complete linear series $|D'|$ contains w , then so does every divisor in $|D' - v|$ (assuming $v \neq w$).

Proposition 2.3. *The transmission permutation $\tau_D^{v,w}$ exists if and only if D is submodular with respect to v, w . If D is submodular, then $\tau_D^{v,w}$ is given by the formula*

$$\tau_D^{v,w}(b) = \min\{a \in \mathbb{Z} : r(D + av - bw) > r(D + av - (b + 1)w)\}.$$

Equivalently, $\tau_D^{v,w}(b)$ is the unique $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ for which $\Delta(D + av - bw) = 1$.

Proof. Suppose that $\tau_D^{v,w}$ exists. Equation (1) and an inclusion-exclusion argument shows that $\Delta(D + av - bw) = \delta(\tau_D^{v,w}(b) = a) \geq 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, hence D is submodular.

Conversely, suppose that D is submodular with respect to v, w , and define $\tau : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by $\tau(b) = \min\{a \in \mathbb{Z} : r(D + av - bw) > r(D + av - (b + 1)w)\}$. Remark 2.2 implies that

$$(4) \quad r(D + av - bw) = r(D + av - (b + 1)w) + \delta(\tau(b) \leq a)$$

which implies $\tau = \tau_D^{v,w}$ by Remark 1.5. □

³The reader might object that this should be called ‘‘supermodular’’ given the direction of the inequality. The reason is that the function $(a, b) \mapsto r(D + av - bw)$, and *that* function is submodular. See also Remark 3.10.




FIGURE 2. Examples of transmission permutations on a genus 1 twice-marked graph, with torsion order 7.

2.1. **The base case: genus 1.** Let (Γ, v, w) be a twice-marked graph of genus 1, with $v \not\sim w$.

Definition 2.4. The torsion order of (Γ, v, w) is the nonnegative integer k such that $nv \sim nw$ if and only if $n \in k\mathbb{Z}$. By our assumption that $v \not\sim w$, $k \neq 1$.

More concretely, if Γ is a loop (also known as a cycle), and the two edges from v to w have lengths ℓ_1, ℓ_2 , then k is the minimum positive integer such that $k\ell_1 \in (\ell_1 + \ell_2)\mathbb{Z}$, or 0 if no such m exists. If Γ is not a loop, then it contains a loop as a subgraph (the *skeleton*), and one can define ℓ_1, ℓ_2 by contracting v, w to the skeleton.

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose (Γ, v, w) has torsion order k , and let D be a degree d divisor on Γ . Then D is submodular, and*

- (1) *If there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $D \sim mw + (d - m)v$, then $\tau_D^{v,w} = \iota_{d-1}\sigma_{m-1}^k$.*
- (2) *If no such m exists, then $\tau_D^{v,w} = \iota_{d-1}$.*

See Figure 2 for an illustration of this Lemma, in the case $k = 7$. A divisor of degree 1 is linearly equivalent to a unique single point on the skeleton. There is an equally spaced sequence of points giving the transmission permutations σ_m^k , and any point not in this sequence has transmission permutation ι_0 . Divisors of degree other than 1 are equivalent to a multiple of v plus a single point on the skeleton, and the transmission permutation is as describe before, but shifted by $d - 1$.

Proof. For any $D' = D + av - bw$, Riemann-Roch implies $r(D') = -1 + \max\{0, \deg D'\} + \delta(D' \sim 0)$, and therefore, in the notation of Definition 2.1, we deduce the following equations for $\Delta(D')$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \deg D' \leq 0, \text{ then } \Delta(D') &= (-1 + \delta(D' \sim 0)) - (-1) - (-1) + (-1) \\ &= \delta(D' \sim 0) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \deg D' = 1, \text{ then } \Delta(D') &= 0 - (-1 + \delta(D' - v \sim 0)) + (-1 + \delta(D' - w \sim 0)) + (-1) \\ &= 1 - \delta(D' \sim v) - \delta(D' \sim w) \\ &= \delta(D' \not\sim v, w) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \deg D' \geq 2, \text{ then } \Delta(D') &= 1 - 0 - 0 + (-1 + \delta(D' - v - w \sim 0)) \\ &= \delta(D' \sim v + w) \end{aligned}$$

So D is submodular, and by Proposition 2.3

$$\tau_D^{v,w}(b) = \begin{cases} b - d & \text{if } D + (b - d)v - bw \sim 0, \\ b - d + 2 & \text{if } D + (b - d + 2)v - bw \sim v + w, \\ b - d + 1 & \text{if } D + (b - d + 1)v - bw \not\sim v, w. \end{cases}$$

Define $\Lambda = \{m \in \mathbb{Z} : D \sim mw + (d - m)v\}$. This is either empty, or an arithmetic progression $m + k\mathbb{Z}$ for some m . The formula above may be conveniently rewritten

$$\tau_D^{v,w}(b) = b - d + 1 - \delta(b \in \Lambda) + \delta(b + 1 \in \Lambda).$$

This is precisely $\iota_{d-1}\sigma_{m-1}^k(b)$ if $\Lambda = m + k\mathbb{Z}$, and ι_{d-1} otherwise, which establishes the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.5 shows that (Γ, v, w) has k -general transmission. In fact, it also shows that (Γ, v, w) does *not* have k' -general transmission for any $k' \neq k$, because for example $\tau_w^{v,w} = \sigma_0^k$; if $k \nmid k'$ then $\sigma_0^k \notin \tilde{\Sigma}_{k'}$, while if $k \mid k'$ then $\text{inv}_{k'} \sigma_0^k = k'/k \geq 2$.

Corollary 2.6. (Γ, v, w) has k -general transmission if and only if it has torsion order k .

3. DEMAZURE PRODUCTS

The heart of this paper is the observation that transmission permutations (when they exist) behave well under vertex gluing: we will prove in Theorem 3.11 that they compose according to a certain associative operation which we refer to as the *Demazure product*. This operation plays the role in this paper that displacement of partitions plays in [Pfl17b, CPJ19, CPJ20].

Definition 3.1. For any permutation $\tau : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and integers a, b define

$$s_\tau(a, b) = \#\{n \geq b : n < a\}.$$

Call τ *almost-sign-preserving* if $s_\tau(0, 0)$ and $s_{\tau^{-1}}(0, 0)$ are finite. This is equivalent to saying that both $s_\tau(a, b), s_{\tau^{-1}}(a, b)$ are finite for *all* $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, i.e. s_τ is a function $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 3.2. If a divisor D on (Γ, v, w) is submodular with $\tau = \tau_D^{v,w}$, then in this notation,

$$r(D + av - bw) + 1 = s_\tau(a + 1, b) \text{ and } r(K_\Gamma - D - av + bw) + 1 = s_{\tau^{-1}}(b, a + 1).$$

The “+1”s are due to the strict inequality $n < a$ in the definition of s_τ .

Definition 3.3. For any two functions $s_1, s_2 : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, define a function $s_1 \star s_2$ by

$$s_1 \star s_2(a, b) = \min_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} s_1(a, \ell) + s_2(\ell, b).$$

For two almost-sign-preserving permutations α, β , the *Demazure product* $\alpha \star \beta$, if it exists, is the unique almost-sign-preserving permutation satisfying $s_{\alpha \star \beta} = s_\alpha \star s_\beta$.

Every Coxeter group possesses a product called either the *0-Hecke product* or *Demazure product*, which is obtained by setting $q = 0$ in the Hecke algebra, as defined for example in [BB05, §6]. We will prove below that, when restricted to a symmetric group or affine symmetric group (which are Coxeter groups), our definition of \star recovers this usual Demazure product.

This formula for $s_1 \star s_2$ may be viewed as tropical matrix multiplication of two infinite matrices s_1, s_2 , with rows and columns indexed by \mathbb{Z} . The fact that the usual Demazure product on the symmetric group can be characterized by tropical matrix multiplication is discussed in [CP19] in slightly different notation and without full details, but as far as I can tell it was not previously known. A forthcoming paper will prove that in fact $\alpha \star \beta$ exists for *all* almost-sign-preserving α, β . To simplify the present paper, we will only prove its existence on $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$; this is done in Section 3.1.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose α, β are almost-sign-preserving and $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. The minimum value $s_{\alpha \star \beta}(a, b)$ of $\{s_\alpha(a, \ell) + s_\beta(\ell, b) : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is obtained for some ℓ such that $\beta^{-1}(\ell - 1) < b \leq \beta^{-1}(\ell)$.*

Proof. Denote $L = \{\ell \in \mathbb{Z} : s_\alpha \star s_\beta(a, b) = s_\alpha(a, \ell) + s_\beta(\ell, b)\}$. This set is bounded above; choose $\ell_0 \in L$ such that $\ell_0 + 1 \notin L$. Since $s_\alpha(a, \ell_0 + 1) \leq s_\alpha(a, \ell_0)$, we have $s_\beta(\ell_0 + 1, b) > s_\beta(\ell_0, b)$, i.e. $\beta^{-1}(\ell_0) \geq b$. Now, let ℓ be the minimum integer such that all of $\beta^{-1}(\ell), \beta^{-1}(\ell + 1), \dots, \beta^{-1}(\ell_0)$ are at least b . Then $s_\beta(\ell, b) < \dots < s_\beta(\ell_0, b)$, or equivalently $s(\ell, b) = s(\ell_0, b) - (\ell_0 - \ell)$. Since

$\ell(a, \ell) \leq \ell(a, \ell_0) + (\ell_0 - \ell)$, we have $s_\alpha(a, \ell) + s_\beta(\ell, b) \leq s_\alpha(a, \ell_0) + s_\beta(\ell_0, b)$ and therefore $\ell \in L$ as well. By construction, $\beta^{-1}(\ell - 1) < b \leq \beta^{-1}(\ell)$. \square

Lemma 3.5. *For all almost-sign-preserving α and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\alpha \star \iota_m$ exists and is $\alpha \iota_m$.*

Proof. Given $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, the only ℓ for which $\iota_m^{-1}(\ell - 1) < b \leq \iota_m^{-1}(\ell)$ is $\ell = b - m$. Therefore Lemma 3.4 implies $s_\alpha \star s_{\iota_m}(a, b) = s_\alpha(a, b - m) + s_{\iota_m}(b - m, b) = s_\alpha(a, b - m) = s_{\alpha \iota_m}(a, b)$. \square

3.1. Demazure products in $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$. Fixed $k \geq 0$ with $k \neq 1$. We prove in this subsection

Theorem 3.6. *If $\alpha, \beta \in \tilde{\Sigma}_k$, then the Demazure product $\alpha \star \beta$ exists, lies in $\tilde{\Sigma}_k$, and satisfies $\text{inv}_k \alpha \star \beta \leq \text{inv}_k \alpha + \text{inv}_k \beta$. It is characterized on generators by the equations*

$$(5) \quad \alpha \star \iota_m = \alpha \iota_m \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha \star \sigma_m^k = \begin{cases} \alpha \sigma_m^k & \text{if } \alpha(m) < \alpha(m+1), \\ \alpha & \text{if } \alpha(m) > \alpha(m+1). \end{cases}$$

The second part of Equation (5), along with associativity, can be taken as the *definition* of the standard Demazure product on (affine) symmetric groups, and (with appropriate modifications) Coxeter groups more generally; see e.g. [BB05, §6.1]. So Theorem 3.6 confirms that our definition of \star , via tropical matrix multiplication, extends the usual one on (affine) symmetric groups.

Lemma 3.7. *If α is almost-sign-preserving, then for any simple reflection σ_m^k ,*

$$(6) \quad s_\alpha \star s_{\sigma_m^k}(a, b) = \begin{cases} s_\alpha(a, b) & \text{if } b \not\equiv m+1 \pmod{k}, \\ \min\{s_\alpha(a, b-1), s_\alpha(a, b+1) + 1\} & \text{if } b \equiv m+1 \pmod{k}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. First suppose $b \not\equiv m+1 \pmod{k}$. Then $\sigma_m^k(\ell) \geq b$ if and only if $\ell \geq b$, so $\sigma_m^k(\ell - 1) < b \leq \sigma_m^k(\ell)$ if and only if $\ell = b$. Since $s_{\sigma_m^k}(b, b) = 0$, Lemma 3.4 implies that $s_\alpha \star s_{\sigma_m^k}(a, b) = s_\alpha(a, b)$.

Now suppose $b \equiv m+1 \pmod{k}$. Then $\sigma_m^k(\ell) \geq b$ if and only if $\ell = b-1$ or $\ell \geq b+1$. Therefore $\sigma_m^k(\ell - 1) < b \leq \sigma_m^k(\ell)$ if and only if $\ell \in \{b-1, b+1\}$. By definition of $s_{\sigma_m^k}$, $s_{\sigma_m^k}(b-1, b) = 0$ and $s_{\sigma_m^k}(b+1, b) = 1$. So Lemma 3.4 implies the desired equation. \square

Lemma 3.8. *For $\alpha \in \tilde{\Sigma}_k$ and any σ_m^k , $s_\alpha \star s_{\sigma_m^k} = \begin{cases} s_{\alpha \sigma_m^k} & \text{if } \alpha(m) < \alpha(m+1), \\ s_\alpha & \text{if } \alpha(m) > \alpha(m+1). \end{cases}$*

Proof. First, observe that $s_{\alpha \sigma_m^k}(a, b) = \#\{n : \sigma_m^k(n) \geq b \text{ and } \alpha(n) < a\}$, and $\{n : \sigma_m^k(n) \geq b\}$ is either $\{n : n \geq b\}$ or $\{n : n \geq b\} \setminus \{b\} \cup \{b-1\}$, depending on whether $b \equiv m+1 \pmod{k}$. Hence

$$(7) \quad s_{\alpha \sigma_m^k}(a, b) = s_\alpha(a, b) + \delta(b \equiv m+1 \pmod{k} \text{ and } \alpha(b-1) < a \leq \alpha(b)) \\ - \delta(b \equiv m+1 \pmod{k} \text{ and } \alpha(b) < a \leq \alpha(b-1)).$$

Observe that $s_\alpha(a, b-1) = s_\alpha(a, b) + \delta(\alpha(b-1) < a)$ and $s_\alpha(a, b+1) + 1 = s_\alpha(a, b) + \delta(\alpha(b) \geq a)$. This implies $\min\{s_\alpha(a, b-1), s_\alpha(a, b+1) + 1\} = s_\alpha(a, b) + \delta(\alpha(b-1) < a \leq \alpha(b))$, and therefore

$$(8) \quad s_\alpha \star s_{\sigma_m^k}(a, b) = s_\alpha(a, b) + \delta(b \equiv m+1 \pmod{k} \text{ and } \alpha(b-1) < a \leq \alpha(b)).$$

If $\alpha(m) > \alpha(m+1)$, then $\alpha \in \tilde{\Sigma}_k$ implies that $\alpha(b-1) > \alpha(b)$ for all $b \equiv m+1 \pmod{k}$, so Equation (8) shows that $s_\alpha \star s_{\sigma_m^k} = s_\alpha$ in that case. On the other hand, if $\alpha(m) < \alpha(m+1)$ then $\alpha(b-1) < \alpha(b)$ for all such b , and Equation (7) implies that $s_\alpha \star s_{\sigma_m^k} = s_{\alpha \sigma_m^k}$ in this case. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.6. The existence of $\alpha \star \iota_m$ and $\alpha \star \sigma_m^k$, and the formulas in Equation (5), follow from Lemmas 3.5 and 3.8. It remains to show that for all $\alpha, \beta \in \tilde{\Sigma}_k$, $\alpha \star \beta$ exists and $\text{inv}_k \alpha \star \beta \leq \text{inv}_k \alpha + \text{inv}_k \beta$. We prove this by induction on $\text{inv}_k \beta$. If $\text{inv}_k \beta = 0$, then $\beta = \iota_m$ for

some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, and we have already considered this case. If $\text{inv}_k \beta > 0$, then by Equation (3) there exists a simple reflection σ_m^k such that $\beta' = \beta \sigma_m^k$ satisfies $\text{inv}_k \beta' = \text{inv}_k \beta - 1$ and $s_\beta = s_{\beta'} \star s_{\sigma_m^k}$. By inductive hypothesis, $\alpha \star \beta'$ exists, so $s_\alpha \star s_\beta = s_\alpha \star s_{\beta'} \star s_{\sigma_m^k} = s_{\alpha \star \beta'} \star s_{\sigma_m^k}$. By Lemma 3.8, this is either $s_{(\alpha \star \beta') \sigma_m^k}$ or $s_{\alpha \star \beta'}$; either way $\alpha \star \beta$ exists, and $\text{inv}_k(\alpha \star \beta) \leq \text{inv}_k(\alpha \star \beta') + 1 \leq \text{inv}_k(\alpha) + \text{inv}_k(\beta)$. \square

3.2. Vertex gluing. We now relate the Demazure product to transmission permutations, and prove Theorem A. The following notation will be useful.

Definition 3.9. The *transmission function* of D with respect to v, w is $s_D^{v,w} : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ defined by

$$s_D^{v,w}(a, b) = r(D + (a - 1)v - bw) + 1.$$

Remark 3.10. The divisor D is submodular if and only if $s_D^{v,w}(a, b) - s_D^{v,w}(a + 1, b) - s_D^{v,w}(a, b + 1) + s_D^{v,w}(a + 1, b + 1) \leq 0$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, which is why we use that word. If $s_D^{v,w}$ is submodular, then

$$s_D^{v,w} = s_{\tau_D^{v,w}}.$$

The seemingly unnecessary “ -1 ” in the definition of $s_D^{v,w}$ is included to keep this statement clean.

Fix two twice-marked graphs (Γ_1, v_1, w_1) and (Γ_2, v_2, w_2) , and let (Γ, v_1, w_2) be the vertex gluing. In what follows, we will be working with divisors on Γ_1, Γ_2 , and Γ , so we will use subscripts to clarify the graph in question, e.g. we write $r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1)$ to indicate the rank of D_1 when it is viewed as a divisor on D_1 . To declutter the prose, we follow a convention: when we write “ $D = D_1 + D_2$,” we mean implicitly that D_i is supported on Γ_i . We will deduce Theorem A from the following.

Theorem 3.11. For any divisor $D = D_1 + D_2$ on the vertex gluing (Γ, v_1, w_2) described above,

$$s_D^{v_1, w_2} = s_{D_1}^{v_1, w_1} \star s_{D_2}^{v_2, w_2}.$$

In particular, if D_1, D_2 and D are submodular, then

$$\tau_D^{v_1, w_2} = \tau_{D_1}^{v_1, w_1} \star \tau_{D_2}^{v_2, w_2}.$$

In both equations, terms involving D_i ($i \in 1, 2$) are understood to refer to it as a divisor on Γ_i .

Lemma 3.12. Let $D = D_1 + D_2$ and $E = E_1 + E_2$ be two divisors on Γ , with $\deg D_i = \deg E_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $D \sim_\Gamma E$ if and only if both $D_1 \sim_{\Gamma_1} E_1$ and $D_2 \sim_{\Gamma_2} E_2$.

Proof. This follows from the observations that a divisor on Γ is principal if and only if it is the sum of a principal divisor on Γ_1 and a principal divisor on Γ_2 . \square

Lemma 3.13. A divisor $D = D_1 + D_2$ on Γ has $r_\Gamma(D) \geq 0$ if and only if there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that both $r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - \ell w_1) \geq 0$ and $r_{\Gamma_2}(D_2 + \ell v_2) \geq 0$.

Proof. If $E = E_1 + E_2$ is effective of the same degree as D , and $\ell = \deg D_1 - \deg E_1$, then Lemma 3.12 shows that $D \sim_\Gamma E$ if and only if both $D_1 - \ell w_1 \sim_{\Gamma_1} E_1$ and $D_2 + \ell v_2 \sim_{\Gamma_2} E_2$. \square

Lemma 3.14. Let $D = D_1 + D_2$ be a divisor on Γ . For any integer r , $r_\Gamma(D) \geq r$ if and only if for all integers $u \in \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$, there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - \ell w_1) \geq u$ and $r_{\Gamma_2}(D_2 + \ell v_2) \geq r - u$.

Proof. The inequality $r_\Gamma(D) \geq r$ means that for all divisors $E = E_1 + E_2$, where E_1, E_2 are both effective, $r_\Gamma((D_1 - E_1) + (D_2 - E_2)) \geq 0$. Let $f(E_1)$ denote the maximum $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - \ell w_1 - E_1) \geq 0$, and let $g(E_2)$ denote the minimum $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $r_{\Gamma_2}(D_2 + \ell v_2 - E_2) \geq 0$. Lemma 3.14 shows that $r_\Gamma(D - E) \geq 0$ if and only if $f(E_1) \geq g(E_2)$.

For $u \in \{0, \dots, r\}$, let $S(u)$ be the statement: for all $E = E_1 + E_2$, with E_1, E_2 effective of degrees $u, r - u$, $r_\Gamma(D - E) \geq r$. So $r_\Gamma(D) \geq r$ if and only if all of $S(0), \dots, S(r)$ are true. Then $S(u)$ is true if and only if $f(E_1) \geq g(E_2)$ for all degree u E_1 and degree $r - u$ E_2 . Since E_1, E_2 can be chosen independently, $S(u)$ is true if and only if there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $f(E_1) \geq \ell \geq g(E_2)$ for all such E_1, E_2 , which is equivalent to the pair of inequalities $r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - \ell w_1) \geq u, r_{\Gamma_2}(D_2 + \ell v_2) \geq r - u$. \square

The following result provides the basic tool for studying divisors on vertex gluings, which may be understood as saying that ranks of such divisors can be computed as a tropical dot product. Special cases of this result have previously been used in [Pfl17b, Lemma 3.14] and [Bor21, Proposition 5.1].

Proposition 3.15. *For a divisor $D = D_1 + D_2$ on Γ ,*

$$r_\Gamma(D) = \min_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - (\ell + 1)w_1) + r_{\Gamma_2}(D_2 + \ell v_2) + 1.$$

Proof. First note that Lemma 3.14 remains true if we replace “ $u \in \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$ ” with “ $u \geq 0$ ” since for any $u \geq r + 1$, the inequality $r_{\Gamma_2}(D_2 + \ell v_2) \geq r - u$ is true for all $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. For all $u \geq 0$, define

$$f(u) = \max\{\ell \in \mathbb{Z} : r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - \ell w_1) = u\}.$$

There exists *some* ℓ such that $r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - \ell w_1) \geq u$ and $r_{\Gamma_2}(D_2 + \ell v_2) \geq r - u$ if and only if $\ell = f(u)$ is such an integer. Therefore we may rewrite

$$r_\Gamma(D) = \min_{u \geq 0} u + r_{\Gamma_2}(D_2 + f(u)v_2).$$

Turning to the right side of the claimed equation, consider the function

$$s(\ell) = r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - (\ell + 1)w_1) + r_{\Gamma_2}(D_2 + \ell v_2) + 1.$$

For all $u \geq 0$, the maximality of $f(u)$ implies $r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - (f(u) + 1)w_1) = u - 1$, so $s(f(u)) = u + r_{\Gamma_2}(D_2 + f(u)v_2)$. On the other hand, if ℓ is an integer that is *not* equal to $f(u)$ for any $u \geq 0$, then $r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - (\ell + 1)w_1) = r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 - \ell w_1)$, and therefore $s(\ell - 1) \leq s(\ell)$. It follows that $\min_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} s(\ell) = \min_{u \geq 0} s(f(u))$. We have seen that the right side is equal to $r_\Gamma(D)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.11. For all $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, we may split $D + (a - 1)v_1 - bw_2$ across Γ_1 and Γ_2 as $(D_1 + (a - 1)v_1) + (D_2 - bw_2)$. Proposition 3.15 implies

$$s_D^{v_1, w_2}(a, b) = \min_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} r_{\Gamma_1}(D_1 + (a - 1)v_1 - (\ell + 1)w_1) + r(D_2 + \ell v_2 - bw_2),$$

and this is $\min_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} s_{D_1}^{v_1, w_1}(a, \ell + 1) + s_{D_2}^{v_2, w_2}(\ell + 1, b) = s_{D_1}^{v_1, w_1} \star s_{D_2}^{v_2, w_2}(a, b)$. \square

Proof of Theorem A. Suppose that (Γ_1, v_1, w_1) and (Γ_2, v_2, w_2) both have general transmission. Let g_i be the genus of Γ_i ; the genus of Γ is then $g_1 + g_2$. By Theorems 3.6 and 3.11 every divisor $D = D_1 + D_2$ is submodular, its transmission permutation lies in $\widetilde{\Sigma}_k$, and $\text{inv}_k \tau_D^{v_1, w_2} \leq \text{inv}_k \tau_{D_1}^{v_1, w_1} + \text{inv}_k \tau_{D_2}^{v_2, w_2} \leq g_1 + g_2$, so (Γ, v_1, w_2) has k -general transmission. Corollary 2.6 verified that k -general transmission is equivalent to k -torsion in genus 1; by induction a chain of k -torsion loops has k -general transmission. \square

Example 3.16. Consider the chain (Γ, v_1, w_g) of k -torsion loops considered in [Pfl17a, JR21, CPJ19, CPJ20], consisting of a chain of marked cycles (E_i, v_i, w_i) , $i = 1, \dots, g$, in which there is a path of length 1 and a path of length $k - 1$ between v_i and w_i in cycle E_i , and w_i is glued to v_{i+1} for $i = 1, \dots, g - 1$. For now, regard Γ as a *finite* graph. Denote by $\langle \xi \rangle_i \in E_i$ the point located i units clockwise from w_i (when the length 1 path to v_i is drawn on top); note that $\langle \xi \rangle_i \sim w_i + \xi(w_i - v_i)$ as a degree-1 divisor on E_i . Every degree g divisor on Γ is linearly equivalent to a unique *break divisor* of the form $D = \sum_{i=1}^g \langle \xi_i \rangle_i$, consisting of a single chip on each cycle. Combining Lemma 2.5 and Theorem 3.11 gives the following formula.

$$(9) \quad \tau_D^{v_1, w_g} = \sigma_{\xi_1}^k \star \sigma_{\xi_2}^k \star \dots \star \sigma_{\xi_g}^k$$

In particular, if τ is in the affine symmetric group, then the set of divisors with $\tau_D^{v_1, w_g} = \tau$ is in bijection with reduced words for τ in the generators $\sigma_1^k, \dots, \sigma_k^k$. In particular, every element $\tau \in \widetilde{\Sigma}_k$ occurs as a transmission permutation on such a chain.




FIGURE 3. The sets in Lemma 4.1. In this example, $r = 3$, $g - d + r = 2$, and $(a_0, a_1, a_2, a_3) = (0, 1, 2, 3)$ and $(b_0, b_1, b_2, b_3) = (0, 2, 5, 6)$.

If we instead regard Γ as a *metric* graph, we must allow ξ_i to take non-integer values, but the only change needed to Equation (9) is that $\sigma_{\xi_i}^k$ should be regarded as the identity permutation when ξ_i is not an integer. This analysis generalizes in a straightforward manner to any chain of loops, including those with varying torsion orders. One must show that the Demazure products are well-defined in this case, which will be done in a forthcoming paper.

4. 0-GENERAL TRANSMISSION AND BRILL-NOETHER GENERALITY

We now focus on $k = 0$ and demonstrate that 0-general transmission implies a form of Brill-Noether generality. Theorem B follows immediately from the definition of 0-general transmission, and the following.

Lemma 4.1. *Let D be a divisor on Γ that is submodular with respect to v, w , let $r = r(D)$, and abbreviate $\tau_D^{v,w}$ by τ . Let $(a_i)_{0 \leq i \leq r}, (b_i)_{0 \leq i \leq r}$ be the vanishing sequences at v, w respectively. Then*

$$\text{inv}_0 \tau \geq (r + 1)(g - d + r) + \sum_{i=0}^r (a_i - i) + \sum_{i=0}^r (b_i - i).$$

Proof. The sets of vanishing orders are $\{a_0, \dots, a_r\} = \{a \geq 0 : r(D - av) > r(D - (a + 1)v)\}$ and $\{b_0, \dots, b_r\} = \{b \geq 0 : r(D - bw) > r(D - (b + 1)w)\}$. By Equation (1), these sets are $\{n \geq 0 : \tau^{-1}(-n) \geq 0\}$ and $\{n \geq 0 : \tau(n) \leq 0\}$, respectively. Let $T = \{(n, \tau(n)) : n \geq 0 \text{ and } \tau(n) \leq 0\}$. It follows that there is a permutation σ of $\{0, \dots, r\}$ such that $T = \{(b_i, -a_{\sigma(i)}) : 0 \leq i \leq r\}$.

Fix a choice $0 \leq i \leq r$. We will bound the number of integers n such that $(n, b_i) \in \text{Inv}_0(\tau)$. The set of such n certainly includes each of the following three disjoint sets, illustrated in Figure 3.

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \{n < 0 : \tau(n) > 0\} \\ A_i &= \{n < 0 : 0 \geq \tau(n) > \tau(b_i)\} \\ B_i &= \{n \geq 0 : n < b_i, \tau(n) > 0\} \end{aligned}$$

Equation (2) implies that $|S| = g - d + r$, and our description of the sets of vanishing orders above implies that $|A_i| = a_{\sigma(i)} - \sigma(i)$ and $|B_i| = b_i - i$. Summing over i gives $\text{inv}_0(\tau) \geq \sum_{i=0}^r (|S| + |A_i| + |B_i|) = \sum_{i=0}^r (g - d + r) + \sum_{i=0}^r (a_{\sigma(i)} - \sigma(i)) + \sum_{i=0}^r (b_i - i)$ and therefore $\text{inv}_0(\tau) \geq (r + 1)(g - d + r) + \sum_{i=0}^r (a_i - i) + \sum_{i=0}^r (b_i - i)$, as desired. \square

5. k -GENERAL TRANSMISSION AND SPLITTING LOCI

This section briefly summarizes the notion of *splitting type loci* on graphs, which play the role of W_d^r in Hurwitz-Brill-Noether theory. Initial work on Hurwitz-Brill-Noether theory [CM99,

CM02, Pfl17a, JR21] concerned the same census as Brill–Noether theory, but for a general k -gonal curve: which degrees and ranks occur? Later, Cook–Powell–Jensen [CPJ19, CPJ20] and Larson [Lar21] independently realized that this census could be refined, and one should instead classify the *splitting types* of divisors on k -gonal curves. This means that line bundles \mathcal{L} on a curve with degree- k cover $\pi : C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ are classified by the isomorphism class of $\pi_*\mathcal{L}$. This is a rank- k vector bundle on \mathbb{P}^1 , so there exists a unique nondecreasing k -tuple $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$ such that $\pi_*\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{O}_C(\mu_1) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{O}_C(\mu_k)$. This k -tuple $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, called the splitting type, determines the rank and degree of \mathcal{L} and considerably more information. Splitting types also have the virtue of determining irreducible loci. For a comprehensive discussion of Hurwitz–Brill–Noether theory, see the recent *tour de force* [LLV20], which also makes systematic use of the affine symmetric group and explains its role in detail. On the combinatorial side, “splitting” cannot be taken so literally, but it is still possible to define splitting type loci numerically.

Definition 5.1. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$ be a nondecreasing k -tuple of integers. Define

$$x_m(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \max\{0, \mu_i + m + 1\}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, and let $d(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = g - 1 + \sum_{i=1}^k (\mu_i + 1)$.

Let D be a divisor on a graph Γ , and F a degree- k divisor with $r(F) \geq 1$. We say that D has *splitting type* $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ (with respect to F) if its class belongs to the *splitting type locus*

$$W^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\Gamma) = \{[D] \in \text{Pic}^{d(\boldsymbol{\mu})}(\Gamma) : r(D + mF) = x_m(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - 1 \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

The *expected codimension* of this locus is $|\boldsymbol{\mu}| = \sum_{i < j} \max\{0, \mu_j - \mu_i - 1\}$.

It is not obvious that every divisor D on a graph even *has* a splitting type, and indeed this may not be true! The issue is analous the the issue that not all divisors on twice-marked graphs are submodular: a splitting type $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ such that $[D] \in W^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\Gamma)$ exists if and only if the difference $r(D + mF) - r(D + (m - 1)F)$ is nondecreasing in m . Part of Theorem C is that k -general transmission guarantees that all divisors D meet this condition.

We now specialize to our application: suppose (Γ, v, w) is a twice-marked graph with k -general transmission, and let $F = kv$.

Lemma 5.2. *With the assumptions above, $kv \sim kw$ and the rank of $F = kv$ is at least 1.*

Proof. Note that $kv \sim kw$ is equivalent to $r(kv - kw) \geq 0$, so we must show that $r(kv - kw) \geq 0$ and $r(kv) \geq 1$. Since Γ has k -general transmission, the empty divisor $D = 0$ has a transmission permutation $\tau \in \tilde{\Sigma}_k$. Since $r(D) = 0$, it follows that there is a (unique) $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $m \geq 0, \tau(m) \leq 0$. Since $\tau(m + k) = \tau(m) + k$, it follows that $m + k \in \{n \geq k : \tau(n) \leq k\}$ and $\{m, m + k\} \subseteq \{n \geq 0 : \tau(n) \leq k\}$. Equation (1) implies that $r(kv - kw) \geq 0$ and $r(kv) \geq 1$. \square

Proof of Theorem C. Suppose (Γ, v, w) has k -general transmission. The first two claims of the theorem are proved in Lemma 5.2. It suffices to prove that for every divisor D on Γ with transmission permutation τ , D belongs to a splitting type locus $W^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\Gamma)$ such that $|\boldsymbol{\mu}| \leq \text{inv}_k \tau$. Fix a divisor D on Γ , and let $\tau = \tau_D^{v,w}$. Define, for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $x_m = r(D + mF)$. Then $x_m - x_{m-1} = \#\{n : 0 \leq n < k, \tau(n) \leq mk\}$. The sets in this last expression are nested, so $x_m - x_{m-1}$ is nondecreasing in m . By the discussion above Lemma 5.2, there exists a splitting type $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ such that $r(D + mF) = x_m(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - 1$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. This implies that $\deg D = d(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, since for $m \gg 0$ we have $r(D + mF) = \deg D + mk - g$ and $x_m(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i + mk + k = d(\boldsymbol{\mu}) + mk - g$. Therefore $[D] \in W^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\Gamma)$. It remains to prove that $|\boldsymbol{\mu}| \leq \text{inv}_k \tau$.

For every $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, define the following subset of $\text{Inv}(\tau)$, which are illustrated in Figure 4.




FIGURE 4. The construction of S_m in the proof of Theorem C. In this example, $k = 3$, and $\tau(0) = -3$, $\tau(1) = 5$, $\tau(2) = 1$.

$$S_m = \left\{ (i, j) : i < 0 \leq j < k, \left\lfloor \frac{\tau(j) - 1}{k} \right\rfloor < m = \left\lfloor \frac{\tau(i) - 1}{k} \right\rfloor \right\}$$

The definition immediately implies that the S_m are pairwise disjoint. Their cardinalities are:

$$\begin{aligned} |S_m| &= \#\{i < 0 : mk < \tau(i) \leq (m+1)k\} \cdot \#\{j : 0 \leq j < k, \tau(j) \leq mk\} \\ &= (k - \#\{i \geq 0 : mk < \tau(i) \leq (m+1)k\}) \cdot \#\{j : 0 \leq j < k, \tau(j) \leq mk\} \\ &= (k - r(D + (m+1)kv) + r(D + mkv)) \cdot (r(D + mkv) - r(D + mkv - kw)) \\ &= (k - x_{m+1} + x_m) \cdot (x_m - x_{m-1}) \end{aligned}$$

By definition of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$, $x_m - x_{m-1} = \#\{i : \mu_i \geq -m\}$, and similarly $x_{m+1} - x_m = \#\{i : \mu_i \geq -m-1\}$, so $k - x_{m+1} + x_m = \#\{i : \mu_i < -m-1\}$. Therefore $|S_m| = \#\{(i, j) : \mu_i < -m-1 < \mu_j\}$. Summing these numbers for all m , the pair (i, j) is counted precisely $\max\{\mu_j - \mu_i - 1, 0\}$ times, so $\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} |S_m| = |\boldsymbol{\mu}|$, and $\text{inv}_k \tau \geq |\boldsymbol{\mu}|$ as desired. \square

6. QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER WORK

We conclude with a few questions naturally suggested by the two-pointed Brill–Noether theory of graphs studied in this paper.

Question 6.1. Which permutations $\tau : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ occur as transmission permutation on graphs? The methods of this paper imply that all permutations with finitely many inversions and all extended affine permutations occur, but many other permutations are certainly possible, even for chains of loops (by choosing different torsion orders on different loops).

Question 6.2. The Brill–Noether existence question for *finite* graphs [Bak08, Conjecture 3.10(1)] is still widely open; let’s open it even wider. If $\tau \in \widetilde{\Sigma}_0$, does every twice-marked *finite* graph (Γ, v, w) of genus $g \geq \text{inv}_0 \tau$ possess a divisor D with $s_D^{v,w}(a, b) \geq s_\tau(a, b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$?

Question 6.3. Are there natural criteria under which a submodular divisor on a graph lifts to a divisor with the *same* transmission permutation on an algebraic curve? For the chain of loops with general torsion, lifting results have been obtain in [CJP15] for the case with no marked points, and [He18] in the one-marked point case. For a chain with k -torsion, lifting results for certain splitting loci were obtained in [JR21].

Question 6.4. Is it possible to classify (in some reasonable sense) the twice-marked graphs for which all divisors are submodular? Such twice-marked graphs better reflect the behavior of twice-marked algebraic curves.

Question 6.5. Which transmission functions $s_D^{v,w}$ can occur for non-submodular divisors?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by a Miner D. Crary Sabbatical Fellowship from Amherst College. I am grateful to Sam Payne for conversations that encouraged me to write this paper, and Dave Jensen for helpful comments on an early draft.

REFERENCES

- [Bak08] Matthew Baker, *Specialization of linear systems from curves to graphs*, Algebra Number Theory **2** (2008), no. 6, 613–653, With an appendix by Brian Conrad. 1, 13
- [BB05] Anders Björner and Francesco Brenti, *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 231, Springer, New York, 2005. 7, 8
- [Bor21] Alessio Borzì, *Weierstrass sets on finite graphs*, arXiv:2104.07121, 2021. 10
- [CDPR12] Filip Cools, Jan Draisma, Sam Payne, and Elina Robeva, *A tropical proof of the Brill-Noether theorem*, Adv. Math. **230** (2012), no. 2, 759–776. 1, 2
- [CJP15] Dustin Cartwright, David Jensen, and Sam Payne, *Lifting divisors on a generic chain of loops*, Canad. Math. Bull. **58** (2015), no. 2, 250–262. 13
- [CM99] M. Coppens and G. Martens, *Linear series on a general k -gonal curve*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg **69** (1999), 347–371. 12
- [CM02] Marc Coppens and Gerriet Martens, *On the varieties of special divisors*, Indag. Math. (N.S.) **13** (2002), no. 1, 29–45. 12
- [CP19] Melody Chan and Nathan Pflueger, *Relative richardson varieties*, arXiv:1909.12414, 2019. 7
- [CPJ19] Kaelin Cook-Powell and David Jensen, *Components of Brill–Noether loci for curves with fixed gonality*, arXiv:1907.08366, 2019. 7, 10, 12
- [CPJ20] ———, *Tropical methods in Hurwitz–Brill–Noether theory*, arXiv:2007.13877, 2020. 2, 7, 10, 12
- [EH86] David Eisenbud and Joe Harris, *Limit linear series: basic theory*, Invent. Math. **85** (1986), no. 2, 337–371.
- [He18] Xiang He, *Lifting divisors with imposed ramifications on a generic chain of loops*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **146** (2018), no. 11, 4591–4604. 13
- [JR21] David Jensen and Dhruv Ranganathan, *Brill–Noether theory for curves of a fixed gonality*, Forum Math. Pi **9** (2021), Paper No. e1, 33. 10, 12, 13
- [Lar21] Hannah K. Larson, *A refined Brill–Noether theory over Hurwitz spaces*, Invent. Math. **224** (2021), no. 3, 767–790. 12
- [LLV20] Eric Larson, Hannah Larson, and Isabel Vogt, *Global brill–noether theory over the hurwitz space*, arXiv:2008.10765, 2020. 12
- [LPP12] Chang Mou Lim, Sam Payne, and Natasha Potashnik, *A note on Brill–Noether theory and rank-determining sets for metric graphs*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2012), no. 23, 5484–5504. 2
- [Oss14] Brian Osserman, *A simple characteristic-free proof of the Brill–Noether theorem*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **45** (2014), no. 4, 807–818.
- [Pfl17a] Nathan Pflueger, *Brill–Noether varieties of k -gonal curves*, Adv. Math. **312** (2017), 46–63. 2, 10, 12
- [Pfl17b] ———, *Special divisors on marked chains of cycles*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **150** (2017), 182–207. 2, 7, 10

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, AMHERST COLLEGE
 Email address: npflueger@amherst.edu