

# NEWTON–OKOUNKOV POLYTOPES OF BOTT–SAMELSON VARIETIES AS MINKOWSKI SUMS

VALENTINA KIRITCHENKO

ABSTRACT. We compute the Newton–Okounkov bodies of line bundles on a Bott–Samelson resolution of the complete flag variety of  $GL_n$  for a geometric valuation coming from a flag of translated Schubert subvarieties. The Bott–Samelson resolution corresponds to the decomposition  $(s_1)(s_2s_1)(s_3s_2s_1)(\dots)(s_{n-1}\dots s_1)$  of the longest element in the Weyl group, and the Schubert subvarieties correspond to the terminal subwords in this decomposition. We prove that the resulting Newton–Okounkov polytopes for semiample line bundles satisfy the additivity property with respect to the Minkowski sum. In particular, they are Minkowski sums of Newton–Okounkov polytopes of line bundles on the complete flag varieties for  $GL_2, \dots, GL_n$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Newton–Okounkov convex bodies provide a tool for extending toric geometry to non-toric varieties. For instance, Newton–Okounkov polytopes of flag varieties were used to build a positive convex geometric model for Schubert calculus where intersection of faces corresponds to the intersection product of cycles [Ki10, KST, Ki16]. Another motivation to study such polytopes comes from representation theory. String polytopes of Berenstein–Zelevinsky and Littelmann (in particular, Gelfand–Zetlin polytopes), Feigin–Fourier–Littelmann–Vinberg polytopes and Nakashima–Zelevinsky polyhedral realizations were exhibited as Newton–Okounkov polytopes of flag varieties for certain geometric valuations [FFL14, FaFL15, Ka, Ki17, FO].

An essential feature of Newton polytopes of toric varieties is the additivity property with respect to the Minkowski sum. Let  $\Delta_v(X, L)$  denote the Newton–Okounkov convex body of a line bundle  $L$  on a variety  $X$  with respect to a valuation  $v$  on the field  $\mathbb{C}(X)$  of rational functions. By the *additivity property* we mean that

$$\Delta_v(X, L_1 \otimes L_2) = \Delta_v(X, L_1) + \Delta_v(X, L_2)$$

for any two semiample line bundles  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  on  $X$  (cf. [KaKh]). If  $X$  is toric, then there is a natural valuation  $v_0$  on  $\mathbb{C}(X)$  that assigns to every Laurent polynomial its lowest degree term. The resulting polytopes  $\Delta_{v_0}(X, L)$  are called *Newton polytopes* and satisfy the additivity property. In particular, this property is used in the famous Bernstein–Kouchnirenko theorem to identify intersection indices of divisors in toric

---

*Key words and phrases.* Newton–Okounkov body, Bott–Samelson variety, Minkowski sum. The study has been funded by the Russian Academic Excellence Project '5-100'.

varieties with mixed volumes of Newton polytopes. In general, the additivity property does not necessarily hold for Newton–Okounkov convex bodies (see Section 2.2 for more details). A natural problem for non-toric varieties  $X$  is to find a valuation  $v_0$  on  $\mathbb{C}(X)$  such that the resulting Newton–Okounkov bodies  $\Delta_{v_0}(X, L)$  still satisfy the additivity property.

In this preprint, we establish additivity property for a geometric valuation on Bott–Samelson varieties considered in [An, Ki17]. Recall that Bott–Samelson resolutions  $R_I$  of Schubert varieties depend on the choice of a sequence  $I$  of simple roots and are constructed as towers of successive  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -fibrations (see Section 2.1 for a reminder). If  $I$  encodes a reduced decomposition  $w_I$  of the longest word in the Weyl group then  $R_I$  is birationally isomorphic to the complete flag variety  $G/B$ , that is,  $\mathbb{C}(R_I) \simeq \mathbb{C}(G/B)$ . Let  $d$  denote the dimension of  $G/B$ . In [Ki17], we dealt with a geometric valuation  $v_0$  on  $\mathbb{C}(G/B)$  coming from the flag of translated Schubert subvarieties

$$w_0 X_{\text{id}} \subset w_0 w_{d-1}^{-1} X_{w_{d-1}} \subset w_0 w_{d-2}^{-1} X_{w_{d-2}} \subset \dots \subset w_0 w_1^{-1} X_{w_1} \subset X,$$

where  $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{d-1}$  are terminal subwords of the decomposition  $w_I$  (see Section 2.2 for a precise definition). We now consider the same valuation on the Bott–Samelson variety  $R_I$ .

Let  $G = GL_n$ , and  $I = (\alpha_1; \alpha_2, \alpha_1; \alpha_3, \alpha_2, \alpha_1; \dots; \alpha_{n-1}, \dots, \alpha_1)$  where  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}$  are simple roots. Then

$$w_I = (s_1)(s_2 s_1)(s_3 s_2 s_1)(\dots)(s_{n-1} \dots s_1).$$

In [Ki17], valuation  $v_0$  was used to compute Newton–Okounkov polytopes  $\Delta_{v_0}(R_I, L)$  for all semiample line bundles  $L$  coming from the complete flag variety  $GL_n/B_n$ . In the present preprint, we extend this computation to all semiample line bundles on  $R_I$ . By construction,  $R_I$  admits projections to  $n - 1$  flag varieties  $GL_2/B_2, \dots, GL_n/B_n$ , and pullbacks of semiample line bundles from these flag varieties span the semigroup of semiample divisors on  $R_I$  [LT, Corollary 3.3].

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $L$  be a semiample line bundle on  $R_I$ , and  $L = L_1 \otimes \dots \otimes L_{n-1}$  its decomposition into line bundles coming from the flag varieties  $GL_2/B_2, \dots, GL_n/B_n$ . Then*

$$\Delta_{v_0}(R_I, L) = \Delta_{v_0}(R_I, L_1) + \dots + \Delta_{v_0}(R_I, L_{n-1}),$$

*that is, Newton–Okounkov polytopes satisfy additivity property.*

Together with [Ki17, Theorem 2.1] this theorem yields a description of Newton–Okounkov polytopes for all semiample line bundles on  $R_I$  as Minkowski sums of Feigin–Fourier–Littelmann–Vinberg polytopes. For  $n = 3$ , this agrees with computation in [An, Section 6.4] (see Example 3.2). The proof of Theorem 1.1 uses divided difference operators on polytopes defined in [Ki16II], in particular, their additivity with respect to the Minkowski sum.

Note that Bott–Samelson varieties are topologically the same as smooth toric varieties whose Newton polytopes are multidimensional trapezoids called *Grossberg–Karshon cubes* [GK]. There are valuations on  $R_I$  that produce Grossberg–Karshon cubes as Newton–Okounkov polytopes of  $R_I$  for certain class of very ample line bundles on  $R_I$  [HY, Fu]. However, these polytopes do not satisfy additivity property already for  $R_{121}$  in the  $GL_3$  case (cf. [HY, Examples 4.1-4.3] and [Fu, Example B1]).

## 2. REMINDER ON BOTT–SAMELSON VARIETIES, NEWTON–OKOUNKOV CONVEX BODIES AND FEIGIN–FOURIER–LITTELMANN–VINBERG POLYTOPES

In this section, we recall the definition of the Bott–Samelson variety  $R_I$ , and describe its Picard group using [LT, Theorem 3.1]. We also recall the definition of Newton–Okounkov convex bodies and their superadditivity property [KaKh, Proposition 2.32]. Finally, we recall an elementary definition of Feigin–Fourier–Littelmann–Vinberg (FFLV) polytopes in type  $A$  following [FFL].

**2.1. Bott–Samelson varieties.** Let  $G$  be a connected complex reductive group with simple roots  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ , and  $B \subset G$  a Borel subgroup. Denote by  $P_i$  the minimal parabolic subgroup corresponding to the root  $\alpha_i$ . Let  $\pi_i : G/B \rightarrow G/P_i$  be the projection of the complete flag variety to the partial flag variety. In what follows, we mostly deal with the case  $G = GL_n(\mathbb{C})$ . In this case,  $r = n - 1$  and  $G/B = \{(V^1 \subset V^2 \subset \dots \subset V^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^n)\}$  is the variety of complete flags in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . The projection  $\pi_i$  to the variety of partial flags  $G/P_i = \{(V^1 \subset \dots \subset V^{i-1} \subset V^{i+1} \subset \dots \subset V^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^n)\}$  forgets the  $i$ -th subspace  $V^i$ .

Let  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_\ell)$  denote a sequence of numbers such that  $i_j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , that is,  $I$  defines a sequence of simple roots  $(\alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_\ell})$ . A *Bott–Samelson variety*  $R_I$  together with a map  $r_I : R_I \rightarrow G/B$  is defined inductively as a tower of successive  $\mathbb{P}^1$ -fibrations:

$$R_\emptyset \leftarrow R_{(i_1)} \leftarrow R_{(i_1, i_2)} \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow R_{I^\ell} \leftarrow R_I,$$

where  $I^\ell$  denotes  $(i_1, \dots, i_{\ell-1})$ . Put  $R_\emptyset = \{pt\}$ . Assume that  $r_{I^\ell} : R_{I^\ell} \rightarrow X$  is already defined and define  $R_I$  as the fiber product  $R_{I^\ell} \times_{G/P_{i_\ell}} G/B$ , that is,

$$R_I = \{(x, y) \in R_{I^\ell} \times G/B \mid r_{I^\ell}(x) = \pi_{i_\ell}(y)\}.$$

The map  $r_I : R_I \rightarrow X$  is defined as the projection to the second factor. By construction,  $\dim X_I = \ell$ .

Alternatively,  $R_I = \mathbb{P}(r_{I^\ell}^* \pi_{i_\ell}^* E_{i_\ell})$  where  $E_i$  is a rank two vector bundle on  $G/P_i$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(E_i) = G/B$ . For instance, one can take  $E_i = \pi_{i*} L_\rho$  as a uniform choice for all  $i$ . Here  $\rho$  denotes the sum of all dominant weights of  $G$ , and  $L_\rho$  the line bundle on  $G/B$  corresponding to  $\rho$ .

It is easy to check that  $r_I : R_I \rightarrow G/B$  is a resolution of singularities for the Schubert variety  $X_{w_I}$  whenever  $w_I := s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_\ell}$  is reduced. Here  $s_i$  denotes the simple reflection corresponding to the root  $\alpha_i$ . For  $GL_n$ , we identify simple reflections with elementary transpositions, that is,  $s_i := (i \ i + 1)$ . By construction, the projection  $r_I : R_I \rightarrow X_{w_I}$  gives an isomorphism between the open Schubert cell  $U_{w_I}$  in  $X_{w_I}$  and

its preimage  $r_I^{-1}(U_{w_I})$  in  $R_I$ . In general,  $\pi(R_I)$  is the Schubert variety corresponding to the *Demazure product* of  $s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_\ell}$  (see [An15] for more details). In particular, if  $w_I$  is not reduced then  $\dim r_I(R_I) < \ell$ .

*Example 2.1.* Let  $n = 3$  and  $I = (1, 2, 1)$ . Identify subspaces in  $\mathbb{C}^3$  with their projectivizations in  $\mathbb{CP}^2$ . Then  $R_\emptyset \hookrightarrow G/B$  can be thought of as a fixed flag ( $a_0 \in \lambda_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ ), where  $a_0$  is a point and  $l_0$  is a line. Hence,  $R_1 = \{a_1 \in \mathbb{P}^2 | a_1 \in l_0\}$ , and  $R_{12} = \{(a_1 \in l) \subset \mathbb{P}^2 | a_1 \in l_0, a_1 \in l\}$ . Finally, the Bott–Samelson variety  $R_I$  consists of all triples  $(a_1, l, a_2)$ , where  $a_1, a_2$  are points and  $l$  is a line such that  $a_1, a_2 \in l$  and  $a_1 \in l_0$ . The projection  $R_I \rightarrow G/B$  forgets  $a_1$ .

In the case  $G = GL_n$ , fix the decomposition

$$\overline{w_0} = (s_1)(s_2s_1)(s_3s_2s_1) \dots (s_{n-1} \dots s_1)$$

of the longest element  $w_0 \in S_n$ . In what follows,  $X_{\overline{w_0}}$  denotes the Bott–Samelson variety  $X_{I(n)}$  for  $I(n) := (1; 2, 1; 3, 2, 1; \dots; n-1, \dots, 1)$ . Since  $\overline{w_0}$  is reduced, the map  $r_{I(n)} : X_{\overline{w_0}} \rightarrow G/B$  is a birational isomorphism. Similarly to Example 2.1, points of  $X_{\overline{w_0}}$  can be identified with collections of subspaces in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  that satisfy certain incidence relations (see [Ki17, Section 2.2]).

By construction, the Bott–Samelson variety  $X_{\overline{w_0}}$  admits  $(n-1)$  projections  $p_1, \dots, p_{n-1}$  to flag varieties. Indeed, by definition  $I(n)$  contains  $I(n-i+1)$  as an initial subword, hence, there is a projection  $R_{I(n)} \rightarrow R_{I(n-i+1)}$ . Define  $p_i : X_{\overline{w_0}} \rightarrow GL_{n-i+1}/B_{n-i+1}$  as the composition of this projection with  $r_{I(n-i+1)}$ . Recall that the Picard group of the flag variety  $GL_n/B_n$  is spanned by the line bundles  $L_\Lambda$  corresponding to the dominant weights  $\Lambda$  of  $GL_n$  (see [B, Remark 1.4.2] for more details). Using [LT, Corollary 3.3] and induction it is easy to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** *The semigroup of semiample divisors on  $X_{\overline{w_0}}$  is spanned by  $p_1^*L_{\Lambda_1}, \dots, p_{n-1}^*L_{\Lambda_{n-1}}$  where  $\Lambda_i$  runs through dominant weights of  $GL_{n-i+1}$ .*

**2.2. Newton–Okounkov convex bodies.** Let  $X$  be a projective variety of dimension  $d$ , and  $L$  a very ample line bundle on  $X$ . By fixing a global section  $s_0$  of  $L$  we can identify the space of global sections  $H^0(X, L)$  with a subspace of the field of rational functions  $\mathbb{C}(X)$ . Let  $v : \mathbb{C}(X) \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$  be a surjective valuation. For instance, one can choose local coordinates  $x_1, \dots, x_d$  on  $X$  and assign to every polynomial its lowest order term with respect to some ordering on  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . More geometrically, take a full flag of subvarieties  $\{x_0\} = X_0 \subset X_1 \subset \dots \subset X_d = X$  at a smooth point  $x_0 \in X$  and assign to every rational function its (properly defined) orders of vanishing along  $X_i$  considered as a hypersurface in  $X_{i+1}$  (see [KaKh, Examples 2.12, 2.13] for more details).

*Example 2.3.* Our main example will be the Bott–Samelson variety  $X = R_I$  under the assumption that  $w_I := s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_\ell}$  is reduced. By construction  $R_I$  contains an affine space  $U \simeq \mathbb{C}^\ell$ , namely, the preimage of the open Schubert cell  $U_{w_I} \subset G/B$

under the projection  $R_I \rightarrow X_{w_I}$ . Denote by  $w_k := s_{i_k} \dots s_{i_\ell}$  the  $k$ -th terminal subword of  $w_I$ . Consider the flag

$$w_I U_{\text{id}} \subset w_I w_{\ell-1}^{-1} U_{w_{\ell-1}} \subset w_I w_{\ell-2}^{-1} U_{w_{\ell-2}} \subset \dots \subset w_I w_1^{-1} U_{w_1} \subset U_{w_I},$$

of translated Schubert cells. It defines the lowest term valuation on the open Schubert cell  $U_{w_I}$ , and hence on its preimage  $U$  in  $R_I$ . Denote this valuation by  $v_I$ .

In what follows, we focus on the case  $G = GL_n$  and  $I = I(n)$  (that is,  $R_I = X_{\overline{w_0}}$ ).

*Definition 1.* For  $G = GL_n$  and  $\overline{w_0} = (s_1)(s_2 s_1)(s_3 s_2 s_1) \dots (s_{n-1} \dots s_1)$ , define  $v_0$  as the valuation  $v_{I(n)}$  on the Bott–Samelson variety  $X_{\overline{w_0}} = R_{I(n)}$ . That is,  $v_0$  is the lowest term valuation corresponding to the flag of translated Schubert cells (defined in Example 2.3) for terminal subwords of  $\overline{w_0}$ .

A more explicit definition of  $v_0$  using natural geometric coordinates on  $X_{\overline{w_0}}$  can be found in [Ki17, Section 2.2].

The *Newton–Okounkov convex body*  $\Delta_v(X, L)$  is defined as the closure of the convex hull of the set  $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{v(s/s_0^k)}{k} \mid s \in H^0(X, L^{\otimes k}) \right\} \subset \mathbb{Z}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . Explicit description of  $\Delta_v(X, L)$  (e.g., by inequalities) is usually a challenging task. Sometimes, it is enough to compute

$$\Delta_v^1(X, L) = \text{conv} \{ v(s/s_0) \mid s \in H^0(X, L) \},$$

that is, the first polytope approximation of  $\Delta_v(X, L)$ . By [KaKh, Corollary 3.2], we have that  $\Delta_v^1(X, L) = \Delta_v(X, L)$  whenever the volume of  $\Delta_v^1(X, L)$  times  $d!$  coincides with the degree of  $X$  embedded into  $\mathbb{P}(H^0(X, L)^*)$  (this argument will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1). Note that if  $X$  is a toric variety and  $v$  is any valuation defined using standard coordinates on the open torus orbit  $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d \subset X$ , then  $\Delta_v(X, L)$  coincides with the classical Newton (or moment) polytope of  $X$ .

Newton–Okounkov polytopes satisfy the following *superadditivity property*:

$$\Delta_v(X, L_1) + \Delta_v(X, L_2) \subset \Delta_v(X, L_1 \otimes L_2)$$

(see [KaKh, Proposition 2.32] for more details). In general, it is not true that

$$\Delta_v(X, L_1) + \Delta_v(X, L_2) = \Delta_v(X, L_1 \otimes L_2).$$

For instance, if  $X = R_{121}$  is the Bott–Samelson variety from Example 2.3, and  $v$  is either a valuation considered in [HY] or the one in [Fu], then  $\Delta_v(R_{121}, L_1) + \Delta_v(R_{121}, L_2) \neq \Delta_v(X, L_1 \otimes L_2)$  for  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  that come from  $GL_2/B_2$  and  $GL_3/B_3$  (see [HY, Examples 4.1–4.3] and [Fu, Example B1] for more details). Some general results on representation of Newton–Okounkov polytopes as Minkowski sums can be found in [SchS].

**2.3. FFLV polytopes.** Recall that a dominant weight of  $GL_n$  is a non-decreasing collection of integers  $\Lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , that is,  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ . For every dominant  $\Lambda$ , we now define the FFLV polytope  $FFLV(\Lambda)$ . Put  $d := \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$

Label coordinates in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by  $(u_{n-1}^1; u_{n-2}^2, u_{n-2}^1; \dots; u_1^{n-1}, u_1^{n-2}, \dots, u_1^1)$ . Arrange the coordinates into the table

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc}
 \lambda_1 & & \lambda_2 & & \lambda_3 & & \dots & & \lambda_n \\
 & u_1^1 & & u_2^1 & & \dots & & & u_{n-1}^1 \\
 & & u_1^2 & & \dots & & & & u_{n-2}^2 \\
 & & & \ddots & & \ddots & & & \\
 & & & & u_1^{n-2} & & u_2^{n-2} & & \\
 & & & & & u_1^{n-1} & & & 
 \end{array} \tag{FFLV}$$

The polytope  $FFLV(\Lambda)$  is defined by inequalities  $u_m^l \geq 0$  and

$$\sum_{(l,m) \in D} u_m^l \leq \lambda_i - \lambda_j$$

for all Dyck paths going from  $\lambda_i$  to  $\lambda_j$  in table (FFLV) where  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$  (see [FFL] for more details).

In what follows, we consider simultaneously several FFLV polytopes for different  $n$ . To do this we use a flag of subspaces

$$\mathbb{R}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \subset \dots \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_i} \subset \dots \subset \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where  $d_i := \frac{(n-i+1)(n-i)}{2}$ , and  $\mathbb{R}^{d_i}$  is the coordinate subspace given by vanishing of the first  $(n-1) + \dots + (n-i+1)$  coordinates, that is, by equations  $u_1^1 = \dots = u_{i-1}^{n-i+1} = 0$  if  $i > 1$ . If  $i = 1$ , then  $d_1 = d$  and  $\mathbb{R}^{d_1}$  is the whole space  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We assume that  $FFLV(\Lambda_i)$  for a dominant weight  $\Lambda_i$  of  $GL_{n-i+1}$  lives in the subspace  $\mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ .

### 3. MAIN RESULT

We now describe Newton–Okounkov polytopes of semiample line bundles on the Bott–Samelson variety  $X_{\overline{w_0}}$  for the lowest term valuation  $v_0$  (see Definition 1). By Lemma 2.2, any semiample line bundle  $L$  on  $X_{\overline{w_0}}$  is the tensor product  $L(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{n-1}) := p_1^* L_{\Lambda_1} \otimes \dots \otimes p_{n-1}^* L_{\Lambda_{n-1}}$  where  $L_{\Lambda_i}$  is the semiample line bundle on the flag variety  $GL_{n-i+1}/B_i$  corresponding to a dominant weight  $\Lambda_i$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *The Newton–Okounkov polytope  $\Delta_{v_0}(X_{\overline{w_0}}, L(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{n-1}))$  is equal to the Minkowski sum of FFLV polytopes*

$$FFLV(\Lambda_1) + FFLV(\Lambda_2) + \dots + FFLV(\Lambda_{n-1}).$$

It would be interesting to describe explicitly the inequalities that define the Minkowski sum of FFLV polytopes in the theorem, e.g., by using Dyck paths that do not necessarily start at the first row.

*Example 3.2.* cf. [An, Section 6.4] Let  $n = 3$ . If  $\Lambda_1 = (\lambda_1^1, \lambda_2^1, \lambda_3^1)$  and  $\Lambda_2 = 0$ , then the 3-dimensional polytope  $\Delta_v(X_{\overline{w_0}}, L(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2))$  is given by 6 inequalities

$$0 \leq u_1^1 \leq \lambda_1^1 - \lambda_2^1; \quad 0 \leq u_2^1 \leq \lambda_2^1 - \lambda_3^1; \quad 0 \leq u_1^2; \quad u_1^1 + u_1^2 + u_2^1 \leq \lambda_1^1 - \lambda_3^1.$$

If  $\Lambda_1 = 0$  and  $\Lambda_2 = (\lambda_1^2, \lambda_2^2)$ , then  $\Delta_v(X_{\overline{w_0}}, D(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2))$  is the segment

$$0 \leq u_2^1 \leq \lambda_2^2 - \lambda_1^2; \quad u_1^1 = u_1^2 = 0.$$

In general, the polytope  $\Delta_v(X_{\overline{w_0}}, L(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2))$  is the Minkowski sum of the polytope  $FFLV(\Lambda_1)$  and the segment  $FFLV(\Lambda_2)$ . It is given by 7 non-redundant inequalities if  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$  are strictly dominant.

For  $\Lambda_1 = (1, 0, -1)$ ,  $\Lambda_2 = (0, 0)$  and for  $\Lambda_1 = (1, 0, -1)$ ,  $\Lambda_2 = (1, 0)$  we get the polytopes depicted on [An, Figure 3(a)] and [An, Figure 3(b)], respectively.

**3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.1.** The main ingredient of the proof is the construction of Gelfand–Zetlin (GZ) polytopes using convex geometric divided difference operators  $D_1, \dots, D_{n-1}$  (see [Ki16II, Theorem 3.4] for the details). These operators act on convex polytopes in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  by mimicking Demazure operators. By definition they satisfy the following additivity property with respect to Minkowski sum of polytopes:

$$D_i(P + Q) = D_i(P) + D_i(Q)$$

for any pair of polytopes  $P$  and  $Q$  for which  $D_i(P)$  and  $D_i(Q)$  are well-defined (results of [Ki16II] are formulated in the more general context of convex chains but here we will restrict ourselves to the case of polytopes). In what follows, we use notation and definitions of [Ki16II].

By the superadditivity property of Newton–Okounkov convex bodies we have the inclusion

$$\Delta_{v_0}(GL_n/B_n, L_{\Lambda_1}) + \dots + \Delta_{v_0}(GL_2/B_2, L_{\Lambda_{n-1}}) \subset \Delta_{v_0}(X_{\overline{w_0}}, L(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{n-1})).$$

Since  $\Delta_{v_0}(GL_{n-i+1}, L_{\Lambda_i}) = FFLV(\Lambda_i)$  by [Ki17, Theorem 2.1] this implies the inclusion

$$FFLV(\Lambda_1) + FFLV(\Lambda_2) + \dots + FFLV(\Lambda_{n-1}) \subset \Delta_{v_0}(X_{\overline{w_0}}, L(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{n-1})).$$

By [KaKh, Corollary 3.2], the above inclusion of polytopes is equality if and only if the volume of the left hand side times  $d!$  is equal to the degree of  $X_{\overline{w_0}}$  in the embedding given by the line bundle  $L(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{n-1})$ .

To complete the proof we compare the degree and the volume in two steps. First, we identify the degree of  $X_{\overline{w_0}}$  with the normalized volume of the Minkowski sum of GZ polytopes using generalized Demazure theorem. Second, we compare volumes of Minkowski sums of FFLV and GZ polytopes. These steps are conducted in Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4, respectively.

**Lemma 3.3.** *The volume of the Minkowski sum  $GZ(\Lambda_1) + GZ(\Lambda_2) + \dots + GZ(\Lambda_{n-1})$  of GZ polytopes is equal to  $d!$  times the degree of the Bott–Samelson variety  $X$  in the embedding given by the line bundle  $L(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{n-1})$  (assuming that the latter is very ample).*

*Proof.* For every dominant weight  $\Lambda_i = (\lambda_1^i, \dots, \lambda_{n-i+1}^i)$  of  $GL_{n-i+1}$  define the point  $a_{\Lambda_i} = (0, \dots, 0, \lambda_2^i, \dots, \lambda_{n-i+1}^i; \lambda_3^i, \dots, \lambda_{n-i+1}^i; \dots; \lambda_{n-i+1}^i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ . The additivity property of  $D_i$  implies immediately the following identity:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(D_2D_1)(\dots)(D_{n-1} \dots D_1)(a_{\Lambda_1}) + D_1(D_2D_1)(\dots)(D_{n-2} \dots D_1)(a_{\Lambda_2}) + \\ \dots + D_1(D_2D_1)(a_{\Lambda_{n-2}}) + D_1(a_{\Lambda_{n-1}}) = \\ = D_1\Pi_{\Lambda_{n-1}}(D_2D_1)\Pi_{\Lambda_{n-2}}(\dots)\Pi_{\Lambda_2}(D_{n-1} \dots D_1)(a_{\Lambda_1}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Pi_v$  is the operator of the parallel transport by a vector  $v$ , in particular,  $\Pi_v(P) = v + P$  for any polytope  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ .

Combining the above identity with [Ki16I, Theorem 3.4] we can interpret the Minkowski sum of GZ polytopes as follows:

$$GZ(\Lambda_1) + GZ(\Lambda_2) + \dots + GZ(\Lambda_{n-1}) = D_1\Pi_{\Lambda_{n-1}}(D_2D_1)\Pi_{\Lambda_{n-2}}(\dots)\Pi_{\Lambda_2}(D_{n-1} \dots D_1)(a_{\Lambda_1}).$$

Hence, by [Ki16I, Theorem 3.2] the character of  $GZ(\Lambda_1) + GZ(\Lambda_2) + \dots + GZ(\Lambda_{n-1})$  coincides with

$$T_1 e^{\Lambda_{n-1}} (T_2 T_1) e^{\Lambda_{n-2}} (\dots) e^{\Lambda_2} (T_{n-1} \dots T_1) e^{\Lambda_1},$$

where  $T_i$  denotes the Demazure operator corresponding to the  $i$ -th simple root of  $GL_n$ . By generalized Demazure theorem [LLM, Theorem 5] this is exactly the Demazure character of the  $B$ -module  $H^0(X_{\overline{w_0}}, L(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{n-1}))^*$ . In particular, the Ehrhart polynomial of  $GZ(\Lambda_1) + GZ(\Lambda_2) + \dots + GZ(\Lambda_{n-1})$  coincides with the Hilbert polynomial of  $X_{\overline{w_0}}$  in the embedding given by the line bundle  $L(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{n-1})$ . This implies the statement of the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *The Minkowski sums  $GZ(\Lambda_1) + GZ(\Lambda_2) + \dots + GZ(\Lambda_{n-1})$  and  $FFLV(\Lambda_1) + FFLV(\Lambda_2) + \dots + FFLV(\Lambda_{n-1})$  have the same volume.*

*Proof.* It is not hard to extend arguments of [Ki16I, Section 4] on comparison of FFLV and GZ polytopes so that they also work for Minkowski sums of these polytopes. Namely, one can show that the polytopes  $GZ(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{n-1}) := GZ(\Lambda_1) + \dots + GZ(\Lambda_{n-1})$  and  $FFLV(\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{n-1}) := FFLV(\Lambda_1) + \dots + FFLV(\Lambda_{n-1})$  have the same Ehrhart polynomial by constructing both of them recursively as in [Ki17, Section 4].  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [An] D. ANDERSON, *Okounkov bodies and toric degenerations*, Math. Ann., **356** (2013), no. 3, 1183–1202
- [An15] —, *Effective divisors on Bott-Samelson varieties*, arXiv:1501.00034 [math.AG] J. of Comb. Theory, Series A **118** (2011), no.8, 2454–2462
- [B] M. BRION, *Lectures on the geometry of flag varieties*, Topics in cohomological studies of algebraic varieties, 33–85, Trends Math., Birkhäuser, Basel, 2005
- [FaFL15] X. Fang, Gh. Fourier, P. Littelmann, *Essential bases and toric degenerations arising from generating sequences*, arXiv:1510.02295 [math.AG]
- [FFL] E. FEIGIN, GH. FOURIER, P. LITTELMANN, *PBW filtration and bases for irreducible modules in type  $A_n$* , Transform. Groups **165** (2011), no. 1, 71–89

- [FFL14] —, *Favourable modules: Filtrations, polytopes, Newton-Okounkov bodies and flat degenerations*, Transform. Groups, **22** (2017), no. 2, 321–352
- [FK] PH. FOTH, S. KIM, *Row Convex Tableaux and Bott-Samelson Varieties*, J. of the Austr. Math. Soc., **97** (2014), no. 3, 315–330
- [Fu] N. FUJITA, *Newton-Okounkov bodies for Bott-Samelson varieties and string polytopes for generalized Demazure modules*, arXiv:1503.08916 [math.RT]
- [FO] N. FUJITA, H. OYA, *A comparison of Newton-Okounkov polytopes of Schubert varieties*, arXiv:1610.08783v2 [math.AG], to appear in J. London Math. Soc. (2)
- [GK] M. GROSSBERG AND Y. KARSHON, *Bott towers, complete integrability, and the extended character of representations*, Duke Math. J., **76** (1994), no. 1, 23–58
- [HY] M. HARADA, J. YANG, *Newton-Okounkov bodies of Bott-Samelson varieties and Grossberg-Karshon twisted cubes*, Michigan Math. J., **65** (2016), no. 2, 413–440
- [Ka] K. KAVEH, *Crystal basis and Newton-Okounkov bodies*, Duke Math. J. **164** (2015), no. 13, 2461–2506
- [KaKh] K. KAVEH, A. KHOVANSKII, *Newton convex bodies, semigroups of integral points, graded algebras and intersection theory*, Ann. of Math.(2), **176** (2012), no.2, 925–978
- [Ki10] V. KIRITCHENKO, *Gelfand-Zetlin polytopes and geometry of flag varieties*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2010), no. 13, 2512–2531
- [Ki16II] V. KIRITCHENKO, *Divided difference operators on convex polytopes*, Adv. Studies in Pure Math., **71** (2016), 161–184
- [Ki16I] V. KIRITCHENKO, *Geometric mitosis*, Math. Res. Lett., **23** (2016), no. 4, 1069–1096
- [Ki17] V. KIRITCHENKO, *Newton-Okounkov polytopes of flag varieties*, Transform. Groups, **22** (2017), no. 2, 387–402
- [KST] V. KIRITCHENKO, E. SMIRNOV, V. TIMORIN, *Schubert calculus and Gelfand-Zetlin polytopes*, Russian Math. Surveys, **67** (2012), no.4, 685–719
- [LT] N. LAURITZEN AND J. F. THOMSEN, *Line bundles on Bott-Samelson varieties*, J. Algebraic Geom., **13** (2004), 461–473
- [LM] R. LAZARUSFELD, M. MUSTATA, *Convex Bodies Associated to Linear Series*, Annales Scientifiques de l'ENS, **42** (2009), no. 5, 783–835
- [LLM] V. LAKSHMIBAI, P. LITTELMANN, P. MAGYAR, *Standard Monomial Theory for Bott-Samelson Varieties*, Compositio Math, **130** (2002), no. 3, 293–318
- [SSch] W.F. Sawin, D. Schmitz, *On numerical Newton-Okounkov bodies and the existence of Minkowski bases*, arXiv:1607.03667 [math.AG]
- [SchS] D. SCHMITZ AND H. SEPPANEN, *Global Okounkov bodies for Bott-Samelson varieties*, J. of Algebra, **490** (2017), 518–554

*E-mail address:* vkiritch@hse.ru

LABORATORY OF ALGEBRAIC GEOMETRY AND FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, USACHEVA STR. 6, 119048 MOSCOW, RUSSIA

INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS, MOSCOW, RUSSIA