

THE PERMUTO-ASSOCIAHEDRON REVISITED

FEDERICO CASTILLO AND FU LIU

ABSTRACT. A classic problem connecting algebraic and geometric combinatorics is the realization problem: given a poset, determine whether there exists a polytope whose face lattice is the poset. In 1990s, Kapranov defined a poset as a hybrid between the face poset of a permutohedron and that of an associahedron, and he asked whether this poset is realizable. Shortly after his question was posed, Reiner and Ziegler provided a realization. Based on our previous work on the nested braid fan, we provide in this paper a different realization of Kapranov's poset by constructing the vertex set and the normal fan of a permuto-associahedron simultaneously.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *polytope* is the convex hull of finitely many points in an Euclidean space. Equivalently, a polytope can also be defined as a bounded solution set of a finite system of linear inequalities. Either definition provides a direct geometric embedding of a given polytope. However, sometimes people are more interested in combinatorial properties of a polytope, which is captured by its face poset. The *face poset* of a polytope P , denote $\mathcal{F}(P)$, is the poset of all faces of P ordered by inclusion. This leads to a classic question: given a poset \mathcal{F} , determine whether there exists a polytope P such that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(P)$. If the answer is yes, we say \mathcal{F} is *realizable*, and P is a *realization* of \mathcal{F} . We say a polytope arises or is defined *abstractly* if it was initially constructed as an answer to a realization problem.

Two of the most studied polytopes in geometric combinatorics are the *permutohedron* and the *associahedron*, where the former was constructed by providing a geometric embedding, and the latter arised abstractly. Research on their connections with algebra, geometry, and combinatorics has been explored [1, 9, 11, 13, 20] and several generalizations have been developed [10, 12, 14, 21, 27, 33].

1.1. Motivation: Realizing Kapranov's poset. In 1993, Kapranov [19] defined a poset (See Definition 5.4) which is a hybrid between the face poset of a permutohedron and that of an associahedron. The main purpose of this paper is to give a realization of Kapranov's poset. Before giving more details about Kapranov's poset, we give a brief introduction to permutohedra and associahedra.

Permutohedron. A d -dimensional *permutohedron* is the convex hull of all coordinate permutations of a fixed (generic) point in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . After being first introduced and studied by Schoute in 1911 [29], the family of permutohedra naturally appeared in many different fields of mathematics. They can be described as the set of diagonal vectors of hermitian matrices with a fixed spectrum (Schur-Horn Theorem [3, Chapter II.6]), as simple zonotopes [34, Section 7] or as the Newton polytopes of the Schur polynomials [4]. It is known that the face poset of a d -permutohedron is poset of the ordered set partitions of $[d+1] := \{1, 2, \dots, d+1\}$ [3, Chapter VI, Proposition 2.2].

Associahedron. A d -dimensional *associahedron* is a polytope defined by the following property: its vertices v_B are in bijection with full bracketings B on $(\ell_1 * \ell_2 * \cdots * \ell_{d+2})$, and two vertices v_B and $v_{B'}$ form an edge if and only if the bracketings B and B' are related by a single application of the associative law. We want to mention that a different but equivalent way of defining a d -associahedron abstractly is also well-known: its vertices v_T are in bijection with triangulations T of a $(d + 3)$ -gon and two vertices v_T and $v_{T'}$ form an edge if and only if the triangulations T and T' differ by a flip. Both descriptions above only define vertices and edges of associahedra.

A complete description of the face poset of the associahedron will be given in Definition 3.2 using the language of trees (which by Remark 3.5 has a clear connection to the description involving bracketings).

The associahedron was initially defined abstractly by Stasheff [31] and for a while whether there exists a geometric realization was an open problem. See [8] for an historical account. After decades of insights by many mathematicians, several realizations of the associahedron have been found. Below we mention two that are relevant to this paper:

- (a) Gelfand, Kapranov and Zelevinsky [16, Chapter 7] provided a realization by considering regular triangulations of polytopes of arbitrary dimension. This realization was further generalized by Billera and Sturmfels [5] in their construction of fiber polytopes.
- (b) Loday gave a realization by providing explicit coordinates for vertices of associahedra [22] and showed that this realization is a deformation of the regular permutohedron. His construction recovers the realization of Stasheff and Shnider [32, Appendix B] of associahedra that proceeds by truncating faces of a standard simplex. Later Postnikov [26] showed that Loday’s associahedron can be expressed as a Minkowski sum of simplices.

Permuto-associahedron. Motivated by providing a geometric proof for MacLane’s coherence theorem for associativities and commutativities in monoidal categories [23], Kapranov constructed a poset whose elements are ordered set partitions with bracketings and ordered by either removing bracketings or merging blocks. (See Definition 5.4 for a precise definition for this poset.) He then showed that his poset can be realized as a CW-ball. Using this, he provided a very short proof for MacLane’s coherence theorem. In the introduction of [19], Kapranov asked a natural question: does his poset have a geometric realization as a polytope?

Shortly after Kapranov’s question was posed, Reiner and Ziegler [28] gave an affirmative answer with an explicit construction. They used Gelfand, Kapranov, and Zelevinsky’s realization of the associahedron mentioned above. We briefly review Reiner and Ziegler’s realization of permuto-associahedra in Section 7.3. We remark that they also extended their construction to both type- B and type- D , and showed that the permuto-associahedron (which correspond to type- A) arises as a facet of their type- B version.

1.2. Our construction. In our previous work [7], we have defined and studied a family of polytopes called *nested permutohedra*, which interpolate the structures of two permutohedra of consecutive dimensions. In the present paper we use the tools and ideas developed in [7] to construct a permuto-associahedron as a *deformation* of a nested permutohedron. In other words, we obtain a permuto-associahedron by altering the inequality description of a nested permutohedron without overrunning any vertex. We call our realization the *nested permuto-associahedron*.

Our main strategy for constructions in both this article and [7] involves a primal/dual argument which we lay out below: Suppose we want to construct a polytope whose vertices are in bijection with a certain set S (e.g., if we try to realize a poset \mathcal{F} , then S is the set of rank-1 elements of \mathcal{F}). Then we do the following steps:

- (1) Define a point v_s for each $s \in S$.
- (2) Define a cone σ_s for each $s \in S$, and let \mathcal{N} be the fan induced by the set $\{\sigma_s\}$. (If we want to realize a poset \mathcal{F} , we need to make sure that the face poset of \mathcal{N} is dual to the poset \mathcal{F} .)
- (3) Verify that the set $\{v_s\}$ and the set $\{\sigma_s\}$ “match”. (See the hypothesis in Lemma 2.5 for a precise statement.)

After the above procedure, particularly after the last verification step, we can immediately conclude that the set $\{v_s\}$ constructed in step (1) and the fan \mathcal{N} constructed in step (2) are the vertex set and the normal fan respectively of the desired polytope. Moreover, we can immediately apply Lemma 2.6 to obtain an inequality description of the constructed polytope, which is another benefit of our construction strategy.

In this paper, we first describe a realization of the associahedron using the 3-step method outlined above. Explicit coordinates for Step (1) are given as a generalization of Loday’s construction, and the cones in Step (2) are given by *braid cones* [25]. We then combine this realization with our previous results on nested permutohedra [7] to give a realization of Kapranov’s poset which we call *nested permuto-associahedra*.

Both our realization and Reiner and Ziegler’s of Kapranov’s poset embed an associahedron in a space of an appropriate dimension, symmetrize it, and take convex hull to obtain a permuto-associahedron. In the last part of this paper we show that not every associahedron (in fact, no generic ones) can be symmetrized to a permuto-associahedron.

We finish this part by mentioning two other constructions of permuto-associahedra. Gaiffi [15] constructed a permuto-associahedron that is closely related to our realization; however, he focuses on the more general case of root systems and nestohedra.

Recently Baralic, Ivanovic, and Petric [2] constructed a *simple* permuto-associahedron, which clearly has a different combinatorial structure from Kapranov’s permuto-associahedron since the latter is not simple. However, Baralic, Ivanovic, and Petric also show that the existence of their simple permuto-associahedron provides another short topological proof to MacLane’s coherence theorem, just like Kapranov’s permuto-associahedron does.

Organization of the paper. After reviewing basic preliminary material in Section 2 we proceed, in Sections 3 and 4, to describe a realization of the associahedron. In Sections 5 and 6, we use the results of previous sections together with results on nested permutohedra [7] to realize Kapranov’s poset. Finally in Section 7 we develop the idea of symmetrization, and show that both our construction and Reiner and Ziegler’s can be obtained using this idea.

Acknowledgements. The second author is partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation #426756. This project began when the authors were attending the program “Geometric and Topological Combinatorics” at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute in Berkeley, California, during the Fall 2017 semester, and they were partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1440140.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Recall that $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for any positive integer n and $[a, b]$ denotes the *integer interval* $\{z \in \mathbb{Z} : a \leq z \leq b\}$ for any integers a and b satisfying $a - 1 \leq b$. By convention $[a, a - 1]$ denotes the *empty integer interval*.

2.1. Preorder and preposet. Let A be a finite set. A *preorder* \leq on A is a binary relation that is both reflexive and transitive. If $i \leq j$ and $j \leq i$, we write $i \equiv j$. The relation \equiv is an equivalence relation on A , and thus it decomposes A into equivalence classes. We denote by \bar{i} the equivalence class of i and A/\equiv the set of equivalence classes. A *preposet* is an ordered pair (A, \leq) where \leq is a preorder on A . A *poset* is a preposet such that $i \equiv j$ if and only if $i = j$.

Note that if a preorder \leq is antisymmetric, which implies that $i \equiv j$ if and only if $i = j$, then \leq is a partial order on A , and the preposet (A, \leq) is a poset. (See [30, Chapter 3] for concepts related to partial orders and posets.)

One sees that a preorder \leq on A induces a partial order on A/\equiv in which $\bar{i} \leq \bar{j}$ if $i \leq j$ in A . The poset $(A/\equiv, \leq)$ and the preposet (A, \leq) are closely related. Hence, we can conveniently extend many concepts for the former to the latter: A *covering relation* $i \prec j$ in the preposet (A, \leq) is a pair of elements (i, j) such that \bar{i} is covered by \bar{j} in the poset $(A/\equiv, \leq)$. The *Haase diagram* of a preposet (A, \leq) is the Haase diagram of the poset $(A/\equiv, \leq)$ except that for convenience when we mark vertices with equivalence classes \bar{i} , we omit the parentheses around sets, see Figure 6 for an example.

Suppose \leq_1 and \leq_2 are two preorders on A . We say the preorder \leq_1 is a *contraction* of the preposet \leq_2 if the Haase diagram of the former is obtained by contracting some edges of the Haase diagram of the latter and merging the corresponding equivalence classes.

An *order-preserving* map from a preposet (A_1, \leq_1) to another preposet (A_2, \leq_2) is a bijection $f : A_1 \rightarrow A_2$ such that $f(i) \leq_2 f(j)$ whenever $i \leq_1 j$ for any $i, j \in A_1$. An order-preserving map is an *isomorphism* if it is invertible and its inversion is order-preserving as well. Two preposets are *isomorphic* if there exists an isomorphism between them.

Note that any subset C of \mathbb{Z} (or \mathbb{R}) as is totally ordered with respect to \leq and thus can be considered as a preposet (or a poset); we use the letter C alone to indicate the preposet (C, \leq) for simplicity.

Suppose (A, \leq) is a poset. An order-preserving map from the poset (A, \leq) to the set $\{1, 2, \dots, |A|\}$ is called a *linear extension* of (A, \leq) . We denote by $L[A, \leq]$ the set of linear extensions of (A, \leq) .

A poset (A, \leq) is *graded* if there exists a function $\rho : A \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\rho(i) = 0$ for every minimal element of the poset and $\rho(j) = \rho(i) + 1$ whenever $i \prec j$ is a covering relation. We call ρ (which is uniquely defined) the *rank function* of (A, \leq) , and $\rho(i)$ the *rank* of i for each element i . The *rank* of a graded poset (A, \leq) is defined as $r(A, \leq) := \max_{i \in A} \rho(i)$.

We denote by $\hat{0}$ and $\hat{1}$ the minimum and maximum of a poset (if they exist).

Our setup: In our paper, we will mostly fix $A = [n]$ where n is either d or $d + 1$. Hence, when n is fixed, the preorder \leq on $[n]$ is the only variable that changes. Whenever it is clear that \leq is a partial order on $A = [n]$, we will omit A and just write $L[\leq]$ for the set of linear extensions of $([n], \leq)$. Note that $L[\leq]$ is a subset of the symmetric group \mathfrak{S}_n .

2.2. Polytopes and fans. Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$ be a d -dimensional vector space in the D -dimensional Euclidean space and W is the dual space of V which consists of all linear functionals on V . Thus, we may consider W is a quotient space of \mathbb{R}^D , and the perfect pairing between V and $W : \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : W \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is just the dot product on \mathbb{R}^n .

Let $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^D$ be an affine space that is a translation of V . A *polyhedron* $P \subseteq U$ is the solution set of a finite set of linear inequalities:

$$(2.1) \quad P = \{\mathbf{x} \in U : \langle \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq b_i, \quad i \in I\},$$

An inequality $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq b$ is *facet-defining* on P if the corresponding equality defines a facet of P , i.e., $\{\mathbf{x} \in P : \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = b\}$ is face of P of dimension $\dim(P) - 1$.

Suppose a polyhedron P is defined by (2.1). We say (2.1) is a *facet-defining inequality description* for P if each inequality in (2.1) is facet-defining. (However, it is possible multiple inequalities determine a same facet.) We say (2.1) is a *minimal inequality description* if P has exactly $|I|$ facets. Thus, when (2.1) is minimal, the equality obtained for each $i \in I$ determines exactly one facet of P .

A *polytope* is a bounded polyhedron. A k -dimensional polytope is *simple* if each vertex is incident to exactly k edges.

A (*polyhedral*) *cone* is a polyhedron defined by homogeneous linear inequalities. A cone is *pointed* if it does not contain a line. A k -dimensional cone is *simplicial* if it is spanned by exactly k (linearly independent) rays. Note that any simplicial cone is pointed.

A *face* of a polyhedron is a subset $F \subseteq P$ such that there exists $\mathbf{w} \in W$ such that

$$F = \{\mathbf{x} \in P : \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y} \rangle, \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in P\}.$$

In addition we always consider \emptyset to be a face of P . The set of all faces of P partially ordered by inclusion forms the *face poset* $\mathcal{F}(P)$ of P .

A *fan* in W is a collection Σ of cones that is a simplicial complex. The collection together with the partial order given by inclusion forms a poset $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma)$ called its *face poset*. A fan Σ is *simplicial* if every cone in it is simplicial. A fan Σ in W is *complete* if the union of its cones is W . The following definition gives a standard example of complete fans that arises from polytopes.

Definition 2.1. Let $P \subseteq U$ be a polytope, and F a nonempty face of P . The *normal cone* of P at F is defined to be

$$\text{ncone}(F, P) := \{\mathbf{w} \in W : \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y} \rangle, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in F, \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in P\}.$$

Therefore, $\text{ncone}(F, P)$ is the collection of linear functionals \mathbf{w} in W such that \mathbf{w} attains maximum value at F over all points in P . The *normal fan* of P , denoted by $\Sigma(P)$, is the collection of all normal cones of P as we range over all nonempty faces of P .

Lemma 2.2. *The map $F \mapsto \text{ncone}(F, P)$ for nonempty faces F induces an poset isomorphism from $\mathcal{F}(P) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ to the dual¹ poset of $\mathcal{F}(\Sigma(P))$.*

If Q is a polytope such that $\Sigma(Q)$ is a coarsening of $\Sigma(P)$, i.e., if every cone in the former is a union of cones in the latter, we say that Q is a *deformation* of P .

As we mentioned above, $\Sigma(P)$ is always a complete fan in W . Moreover, any fan that is a normal fan of a polytope is called a *projective fan*. Once we know that a projective fan Σ

¹The *dual* of a poset $\mathcal{F} = (A, \leq)$ is the poset $\mathcal{F}^* = (A, \leq^*)$ on A where $i \leq^* j$ if and only if $j \leq i$.

is the normal fan of a polytope, one can check that the polytope is full-dimensional if and only if $0 \in \Sigma$, i.e., all cones in Σ are pointed.

Given a fan Σ in W , the set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \Sigma$ of maximal cones (in terms of dimension) determines Σ . More precisely, the set of cones in \mathcal{M} , together with all their faces, forms the fan Σ . In this case, we say Σ is *induced* by \mathcal{M} . Therefore, we often focus on the description of the maximal cones of a fan, which has the property of being the conic dissection of W .

Definition 2.3. A *conic dissection* of W is a set \mathcal{M} of full-dimensional cones satisfying:

(1) The union $\bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{M}} \sigma = W$, and

(2) for any distinct $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, their relative interiors σ_1° and σ_2° have no intersection.

We say a conic dissection \mathcal{M} is *pointed* (and *simplicial* resp.) if all the cones in \mathcal{M} are *pointed* (and *simplicial* resp.)

Remark 2.4. A conic dissection does not necessarily induce a fan, since cones in the dissection may not intersect in proper faces.

The primal/dual argument in the following lemma was used in the proof of Proposition 3.5 of our previous work [7]. We summarize it here since it will be our main tool in verifying the constructions of associahedra and permuto-associahedra.

Lemma 2.5. Let $\mathcal{M} = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k\}$ be a conic dissection of W and $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k\} \subseteq U$ a set of points such that for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ we have

$$(2.2) \quad \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle > \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_j \rangle \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in \sigma_i^\circ \text{ and } j \neq i.$$

Let P be the polytope defined by $P := \text{ConvexHull}\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k\}$. Then the followings are true:

(1) The set $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k\}$ is the vertex set of P .

(2) For each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, we have $\sigma_i = \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}_i, P)$.

As a consequence, the conic dissection \mathcal{M} induces the normal fan $\Sigma(P)$ of P , which is a complete projective fan in W . Moreover, if \mathcal{M} is pointed, then $0 \in \Sigma(P)$ and thus P is full-dimensional in U .

Proof. For each $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, it follows from condition (2.2) that \mathbf{v}_i does not lie in $\text{ConvexHull}(\mathbf{v}_j : j \neq i)$, and thus \mathbf{v}_i must be a vertex of P . Hence, (1) follows. Next, condition (2.2) also implies that for each i ,

$$(2.3) \quad \sigma_i \subseteq \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}_i, P).$$

However, since both $\{\sigma_i\}$ and $\{\text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}_i, P)\}$ are conic dissections of W , the equality must hold in (2.3). \square

Lemma 2.6. Suppose P is a full-dimensional polytope in U with vertex set $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k\}$, and $\sigma_i = \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}_i, P)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $\{\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_m\}$ be the set of one dimensional cones in $\Sigma(P)$ and for each $1 \leq j \leq m$, let \mathbf{n}_j be a nonzero vector in the cone ρ_j (or equivalently a generator for ρ_j). Then the polytope P has the following minimal inequality description:

$$P = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in U : \langle \mathbf{n}_j, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \langle \mathbf{n}_j, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle, \quad 1 \leq j \leq m \right\}.$$

Moreover, for each $1 \leq j \leq m$, if we choose i_j such that $\rho_j \subseteq \sigma_{i_j}$, then

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \langle \mathbf{n}_j, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle = \langle \mathbf{n}_j, \mathbf{v}_{i_j} \rangle.$$

Our setup. In this paper, we always have $D = d + 1$ where D is the dimensional of the ambient space \mathbb{R}^D and d is the dimension of the polytopes we consider. The d -dimensional vector space we use is $V_d = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and its dual space is $W_d = \mathbb{R}^{d+1}/\mathbf{1}$, where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ denotes the all-one vector in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . Note that the standard basis $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{d+1}\}$ of \mathbb{R}^{d+1} is a canonical spanning set for W_d although it is not a basis.

For $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, let

$$(2.4) \quad U_d^\alpha := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \alpha_i \right\}$$

be a translation of V_d . Our polytopes will be defined in these affine spaces.

Given a strictly increasing sequence $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, for any $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}$, we use the notation below, following [7]:

$$(2.5) \quad v_\pi^\alpha := (\alpha_{\pi(1)}, \alpha_{\pi(2)}, \dots, \alpha_{\pi(d+1)}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \alpha_i \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(i)}.$$

Then we define the *usual permutohedron*

$$\text{Perm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \text{ConvexHull}(v_\pi^\alpha : \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}) \subseteq U_d^\alpha.$$

It is well-known that $\text{Perm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is a full-dimensional polytope in U_d^α , and it has the following minimal inequality description, writing $\mathbf{e}_S := \sum_{i \in S} \mathbf{e}_i$:

$$(2.6) \quad \text{Perm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in U_d^\alpha : \langle \mathbf{e}_S, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \sum_{i=d+2-|S|}^{d+1} \alpha_i, \quad \forall \emptyset \neq S \subsetneq [d+1] \right\}.$$

A *generalized permtuhohedron* is a deformation of a usual permutohedron $\text{Perm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ for some $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$.

Definition 2.7. For each $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}$, we define the *braid cone* associated to π to be:

$$(2.7) \quad \sigma(\pi) := \{\mathbf{w} \in W_d : w_{\pi^{-1}(1)} \leq w_{\pi^{-1}(2)} \leq \dots \leq w_{\pi^{-1}(d+1)}\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{B}_d := \{\sigma(\pi) : \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}\}$ be the collection of braid cones in W_d .

One checks that the relative interior of $\sigma(\pi)$ is

$$(2.8) \quad \sigma^\circ(\pi) := \{\mathbf{w} \in W_d : w_{\pi^{-1}(1)} < w_{\pi^{-1}(2)} < \dots < w_{\pi^{-1}(d+1)}\}.$$

Thus, we clearly have the following:

Lemma 2.8. *The collection of braid cones $\mathcal{B}_d = \{\sigma(\pi) : \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}\}$ forms a simplicial conic dissection of W_d .*

As an example of the usefulness of Lemma 2.5, we verified in [7] that the collection of braid cones \mathcal{B}_d and the set of points $\{v_\pi^\alpha : \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}\}$ satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma. Consequently, we proved that \mathcal{B}_d induces the well-known *braid fan* Br_d , and that the braid fan Br_d is the normal fan of the usual permutohedron $\text{Perm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Thus a polytope P is a generalized permutohedron if and only if its normal fan coarsens the braid fan Br_d for some d .

2.3. Preorder cones. In [25, Section 3.4], the authors defined a *braid cone* as a polyhedral cone in W_{n-1} whose defining inequalities are of the form $w_i \leq w_j$ for some $i, j \in [n]$. By Equation (2.7) this notion of braid cone generalizes Definition 2.7.

Definition 2.9. For each preorder \leq on the set $[n]$, we define the *preorder cone* associated to \leq to be

$$\sigma_{\leq} := \{\mathbf{w} \in W_{n-1} : w_i \leq w_j \text{ if } i \leq j\}.$$

It is clear from the definition that a preorder cone is a braid cone and that every face of a preorder cone is itself a preorder cone.

Remark 2.10. For any $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, the braid cone $\sigma(\pi)$ is a special case of preorder cone. More precisely, $\sigma(\pi) = \sigma_{\leq}$, where \leq is the total order on $[n]$ given by

$$\pi^{-1}(1) \prec \pi^{-1}(2) \prec \dots \prec \pi^{-1}(n).$$

We state the following facts from [25] that will be useful in our constructions.

Lemma 2.11 (Proposition 3.5 in [25]). *Let \leq be a preorder on the set $[n]$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (1) *The set of braid cones in W_{n-1} is in bijection with the set of preorders \leq on $[n]$.*
- (2) *The preorder cone σ_{\leq} is full-dimensional in the affine space $W_{\leq} := \{\mathbf{w} \in W_{n-1} : w_i = w_j \text{ if } i \equiv j\}$. Hence, the dimension of σ_{\leq} is $|\mathbb{I}[n]| - 1$, the number of equivalence classes minus 1.*
- (3) *The preorder cone has the following facet-defining inequality description:*

$$(2.9) \quad \sigma_{\leq} = \{\mathbf{w} \in W_{\leq} : w_i \leq w_j \text{ if } i \prec j\}.$$

Thus, the relative interior of σ_{\leq} is

$$(2.10) \quad \sigma_{\leq}^{\circ} = \{\mathbf{w} \in W_{\leq} : w_i < w_j \text{ if } i \prec j\}.$$

- (4) *The preorder cone σ_{\leq} is simplicial if and only if the Hasse diagram of \leq is a tree. (Recall that a tree is a connected acyclic graph.)*
- (5) *The preorder cone $\sigma_{\leq'}$ is a face of σ_{\leq} if and only if \leq' is a contraction of \leq .*
- (6) *Suppose \leq is a partial order on $[n]$. Then its associated cone σ_{\leq} is a union of braid cones. More precisely,*

$$(2.11) \quad \sigma_{\leq} = \bigcup_{\pi \in \mathbb{L}[\leq]} \sigma(\pi).$$

Definition 2.12. For later use, we define a modified version of preorder cones that are also in bijection with preorders:

$$(2.12) \quad \tilde{\sigma}_{\leq} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : x_i \leq x_j \text{ if } i \leq j\}.$$

Remark 2.13. The proof of Lemma 2.11 (1) can be easily modified to show that the map $\leq \mapsto \tilde{\sigma}_{\leq}$ is an injection from the set of all preorders on $[n]$ to the set of cones in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$.

Remark 2.14. Inequality description (2.9) is facet-defining but not necessarily minimal, because if $i_1 \equiv i_2$ and $j_1 \equiv j_2$, then $i_1 \prec j_1$ if and only if $i_2 \prec j_2$, and moreover inequalities $w_{i_1} \leq w_{j_1}$ and $w_{i_2} \leq w_{j_2}$ determine the same facet of σ_{\leq} . If for each covering relation between equivalence classes $\bar{i} \prec \bar{j}$, we only take one inequality $w_i \leq w_j$, then we will obtain a minimal inequality description for σ_{\leq} .




FIGURE 1. Example of unlabeled plane rooted trees that are strictly branching

3. TREES AND THE ASSOCIAHEDRON

In this section, we will review the combinatorics of the associahedron and develop results that will be needed in our constructions of associahedra and permutoassociahedra. As mentioned in the introduction, instead of using bracketings, we will define the face poset of the associahedron in terms of trees.

3.1. Strictly branching trees. We assume the readers are familiar with terminologies on graphs as presented in [30, Appendix], and review ones that are relevant to our paper.

A *rooted tree* is tree with a special vertex which is called the *root* of the tree. For any edge $\{i, j\}$ of a rooted tree T , if i is closer to the root of T than j , then we say i is the *parent* of j and j is a child of i . We call a vertex of a rooted tree a *leaf* if it has no children, and an *internal vertex* otherwise. An edge of a rooted tree is *internal* if it connects two internal vertices.

A rooted tree is *strictly branching* if each of its internal vertex has at least two children. An *unlabeled plane rooted tree* T is a rooted tree whose vertices are considered to be indistinguishable, but the subtrees at any vertex are linearly ordered.

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let \mathcal{T}_n be the set of unlabeled plane rooted trees that are strictly branching and have $n + 1$ leaves. For $0 \leq k \leq n$, let $\mathcal{T}_{n,k}$ be the set of trees in \mathcal{T}_n that has k internal vertices. Note that $\mathcal{T}_{n,0} = \emptyset$ unless $n = 0$, and $\mathcal{T}_0 = \mathcal{T}_{0,0}$ consists of the only rooted tree on one vertex. It is easy to see that for any positive integer n the followings are true:

- (1) $\mathcal{T}_n = \bigcup_{k=1}^n \mathcal{T}_{n,k}$.
- (2) $\mathcal{T}_{n,1}$ consists of only one tree in which the root is the only internal vertex.
- (3) $\mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ consists of all the complete binary trees with $n + 1$ leaves. Recall that a *complete binary tree* is an unlabeled plane rooted tree whose internal vertices all have exactly two children. For each internal vertex of a complete binary tree, we call its first child its *Left* child, and second child its *Right* child, and as a consequence, we call the two corresponding subtrees its *Left* subtree and *Right* subtree.

See Figure 1 for examples: the tree on the left is a complete binary tree in $\mathcal{T}_{8,8}$ and the tree on the right is a plane rooted tree in $\mathcal{T}_{8,5}$. The leaves of both trees were enumerated by left-to-right order.

3.2. Flips on complete binary trees. Let $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ be two complete binary trees. We say T is obtained from T' by a *flip (of an internal edge)* and T' is obtained from T by a *flip (of an internal edge)* if there exist internal vertices v of T and v' of T' such that the followings are true:

- (1) The Left subtree of the Left child of v in T is the same as the Left subtree of v' in T' .
- (2) The Right subtree of the Left child of v in T is the same as the Left subtree of the Right child of v' in T' .
- (3) The Right subtree of v in T is the same as the Right subtree of the Right child of v' in T' .
- (4) After removing the subtree of T that is rooted at v and removing the subtree of T' that is rooted at v' , we obtain two identical plane rooted trees.

The tree discussed in (2) is called the *critical tree of the flip*, as this is the only component moved between the Left subtree of T and the Right subtree of T' by the flips.

See Figure 2 for a demonstration of how a flip of an internal edge works. In particular, the part labeled by C is the critical tree of the flips.




FIGURE 2. Flips are represented by trees in $\mathcal{T}_{d+1,d}$

3.3. The associahedron. We can now define associahedron abstractly. Here we replace n with $d + 1$ in \mathcal{T}_n or $\mathcal{T}_{n,k}$.

Definition 3.1. An d -associahedron is a d -dimensional polytope such that its vertices are in bijection with complete binary trees in $\mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}$, and two vertices form an edge if and only if their corresponding complete binary trees are obtained from one another by a flip.

Every complete binary tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}$ has exactly d internal edges, and thus is connected with exactly d complete binary trees in $\mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}$ via flips. This means that an associahedron is a simple polytope. A classical result of Blind and Mani [6] (with a very short alternative proof given by G.Kalai in [18]) states that the graph² of a simple polytope determines its face poset.³ As a consequence, all realizations of d -associahedra share the same face poset which we describe below.

Definition 3.2. We define a partial order \leq_K on the set $\mathcal{T}_{d+1} \cup \{\hat{0}\}$ by declaring $T_1 \leq_K T_2$ whenever $T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1}$ is obtained from $T_1 \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1}$ by contracting *internal edges*, and $\hat{0} \leq_K T$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1}$.

²The graph $G(P) = (V, E)$ of a polytope P is defined by taking V be the vertex set of P and two vertices are joined by an edge if they form a one dimensional face of P .

³By duality we have that the facet-ridge graph of a simplicial polytope determines the rest of the face poset. In [6, Question 1] it is asked whether the same property hold for simplicial spheres. To our best knowledge this generalization remains open to this day.

We denote the poset $(\mathcal{T}_{d+1} \cup \{\hat{0}\}, \leq_K)$ by \mathcal{K}_d .

It is easy to verify that the poset \mathcal{K}_d is graded of rank $d + 1$ with a unique minimal element $\hat{0}$. For each $1 \leq k \leq d + 1$, the set $\mathcal{T}_{d+1,k}$ consists of all elements of \mathcal{K}_d of rank $d + 2 - k$. In particular, the only tree in $\mathcal{T}_{d+1,1}$ is the unique maximal element of \mathcal{K}_d .

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose P is a polytope whose face poset is \mathcal{K}_d . Then P is a d -associahedron.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{K}_d is the face poset of P , its rank-1 elements - complete binary trees in $\mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}$ - are in bijection with vertices of P , and its rank-2 elements - trees in $\mathcal{T}_{d+1,d}$ - are in bijection with edges of P . Hence, it is left to verify the followings are true:

- (i) If two complete binary trees $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}$ are obtained from one another by a flip, then they are covered by a $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d}$ in \mathcal{K}_d .
- (ii) In \mathcal{K}_d , any $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d}$ covers exactly two complete binary trees $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}$, and T_1 and T_2 are obtained from one another by a flip.

Suppose $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}$ are obtained from one another by a flip as shown in Figure 2. Then we see that contracting the red edges in T_1 and T_2 result in a same tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d}$, which is drawn in the middle of Figure 2. So (i) follows.

Suppose $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d}$. Then there exists a unique internal vertex of T that has three children (when every other internal vertex has two children). Thus, we may assume T looks like the tree in middle of Figure 2 where this unique internal vertex is colored red. Hence, we let T_1, T_2 be the other two trees in the figure, and see that (ii) follows. □

In Section 4, we will construct a polytope, and show its face poset is isomorphic to \mathcal{K}_d . Then the above lemma tells us our construction gives a realization for the d -associahedron.

3.4. Enumerating leaves and labeling internal vertices. For each tree in \mathcal{T}_n , we canonically enumerate its leaves by left-to-right order, denoted by $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, \dots, \ell_{n+1}$. For each tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$, we also assign labels $1, 2, \dots, n$ to its internal vertices: If an internal vertex v is the closest common ancestor of ℓ_i and ℓ_{i+1} we label v with i .

Suppose T' is a subtree of T . We denote by $I_T(T')$ the collection of labels on the internal vertices of T' (as a subtree of T').

Example 3.4. In Figure 3 we depict the internal vertices of the trees of Figure 1 together with the labelings with the set $[8]$. Let T be the tree on the left of Figure 3, and T' the right subtree of T . Then $I_T(T') = \{7, 8\}$.

Remark 3.5. The name associahedron historically comes from the interpretation of vertices as bracketings and flips as applications of associativity, see Remark 3.5 below.

The labeling on the leaves gives a canonical bijection between \mathcal{T}_n and the set of all possible “bracketings” on $(\ell_1 * \ell_2 * \dots * \ell_{n+1})$, which induces a bijection between complete binary trees in $\mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ and “full bracketings” on $(\ell_1 * \ell_2 * \dots * \ell_{n+1})$. Furthermore, flipping internal edges on complete binary trees correspond to applying “associative law” on full bracketings on $(\ell_1 * \ell_2 * \dots * \ell_{n+1})$.

For example, the two complete binary trees in Figure 4 correspond to the full bracketings

$$\left(\left(\left((\ell_1 * \ell_2) * \ell_3 \right) * \left(\ell_4 * \ell_5 \right) * \ell_6 \right) * \left(\ell_7 * \left(\ell_8 * \ell_9 \right) \right) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\left(\left(\left((\ell_1 * \ell_2) * \ell_3 \right) * \left(\ell_4 * \ell_5 \right) \right) * \ell_6 \right) * \left(\ell_7 * \left(\ell_8 * \ell_9 \right) \right) \right),$$

which are connected by applying one associative law.




FIGURE 3. Internal labelings associated to Figure 1.

The following lemma states properties of the labels on the internal vertices of trees in \mathcal{T}_n . The proof of it is straightforward, and thus is omitted.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$.*

- (1) *Each internal vertex of T is labeled by a nonempty set of numbers, and each number in $[n]$ appears exactly once.*

Thus, if $T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$, then each internal vertex gets a unique label.

- (2) *Let T' be a subtree of T . Then $I_T(T')$ - the collection of the labels of its internal vertices - is an integer interval, and it is empty if and only if T' is a leaf of T .*

Furthermore, suppose T' is rooted at an internal vertex of T , thus $I_T(T') = [a, b]$ for some integers $a \leq b$. Then the labels of internal vertices of T' when we treat it as a rooted tree by itself are obtained from subtracting $(a - 1)$ from those when we treat it as a subtree of T .

- (3) *Suppose T_1 and T_2 are two subtrees below an internal vertex of T . If T_1 is to the left of T_2 , then any label appearing on an internal vertex of T_1 is smaller than any label appearing on an internal vertex of T_2 .*
- (4) *Suppose T' is obtained from T by contracting one internal edge $\{x, y\}$, and we call the new vertex z . Then the internal vertex labeling of T' can be obtained from that of T by labeling z with the union of the labels for x and y and keeping labels for all the other internal vertices.*
- (5) *Suppose $T' \in \mathcal{T}_n$ is obtained from T by contracting internal edges (which is equivalent to say that $T \leq_K T'$ in \mathcal{K}_{n-1}). Then for any subtree T_1 of T' at an internal vertex, there exists a subtree T_2 of T such that $I_T(T_2) = I_{T'}(T_1)$, i.e. the set of labels on the internal vertices of T_2 (as a subtree of T) is the same as that of T_1 (as a subtree of T').*

We want to note that given a tree in \mathcal{T}_n or $\mathcal{T}_{n,n}$, the labels we put on its leaves (and internal vertices) are uniquely determined. Hence, those labels do not carry extra information. However, we can now be more specific on the definition of flips of internal edges given in §3.2.

Definition 3.7. Suppose T , T' , v and v' are as given in §3.2, and v as an internal vertex of T is labeled by i and its child is labeled by j . Then we say T' is obtained from T by an (i, j) -flip.

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$. Then T' is obtained from T by an (i, j) -flip if and only if T is obtained from T' by a (j, i) -flip.*

Example 3.9. Figure 4 shows an instance of flipping internal edges on two complete binary trees with vertices labeled as we indicated above. One sees that we have a $(3, 5)$ -flip from the tree on the left to the tree on the right, and a $(5, 3)$ -flip in the other direction.




FIGURE 4. Complete binary trees connected by a flip

3.5. From trees to cones. We finish this section by defining a cone for each of our trees together with some basic properties.

Definition 3.10. Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$. We define $G(T)$ to be the induced subtree of T on its internal vertices, together with the labeling for internal vertices we described above. One sees that $G(T)$ is the Hasse diagram of a preorder on $[n]$, which we denote by \leq_T . Recall that we have defined linear extensions and preorder cones in §2.1. For convenience and brevity, we denote

$$(3.1) \quad L[T] := L[[n], \leq_T], \text{ and } \sigma(T) := \sigma_{\leq_T}.$$

Lemma 3.11. *Let $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_n$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) T' is a contraction of T (i.e., $T \leq_K T'$).
- (2) The preorder $\leq_{T'}$ is a contraction of \leq_T .
- (3) The cone $\sigma(T')$ is a face of $\sigma(T)$.

Proof. The equivalence between 1 and 2 follows directly from definitions. The equivalence of 2 and 3 follows from Lemma 2.11 (5). \square

The next lemma gives a connection between permutations and complete binary trees.

Lemma 3.12. *Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. For every $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, there exists a unique complete binary tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ such that $\pi \in L[T]$.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on n . Clearly, the lemma holds for $n = 0$ and $n = 1$. Now assume that for some positive integer n_0 , the lemma holds for any nonnegative integer $n \leq n_0$. We consider the case when $n = n_0 + 1$.

Let $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. We show that there exists a unique way to construct a tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ satisfying $\pi \in L[T]$ by exploring necessary properties of such a tree. More specifically, we will show that there is a unique way to construct the Left subtree T_l and the Right subtree T_r of T .

Let $M = \pi^{-1}(n)$. By the definition of linear extensions, one sees that M has to be the label of the root of T . Therefore, by Lemma 3.6 (1)(2)(3), we must have that

$$I_l := I_T(T_l) = [1, M - 1], \text{ and } I_r := I_T(T_r) = [M + 1, n].$$

Let $C_l := \pi(I_l)$ and $C_r := \pi(I_r)$.

We now focus on T_l . By Lemma 3.6 (2), labels of internal vertices of T_l remain the same when when tree T_l as a rooted tree. Hence, the restriction map $\pi|_{I_l}$ is an order-preserving map from the preposet $([M - 1], \leq_{T_l})$ to C_l .

Let $\phi_l : C_l \rightarrow [1, M - 1] = [M - 1]$ be the unique order-preserving map from C_l to $[M - 1]$. One sees that $\phi_l \circ \pi|_{I_l}$ is in both \mathfrak{S}_{M-1} and $L[T_l]$. Note that the choice or construction of M , I_l and ϕ_l are all determined by the permutation π . Thus, $\phi_l \circ \pi|_{I_l}$ is determined by π . Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, the Left subtree T_l of T exists uniquely.

Similarly, if we let $\phi_r : C_r \rightarrow [n - M]$ be the unique order-preserving map from C_r to $[n - M]$ and let $\varphi : [n - M] \rightarrow I_r$ be the map that adds M to each element, then we can show that $\phi_r \circ \pi|_{I_r} \circ \varphi$ is in both \mathfrak{S}_{n-M} and $L[T_r]$. Thus, it follows from the induction hypothesis again that the Right subtree T_r of T exists uniquely as well. \square

4. REALIZATION OF THE ASSOCIAHEDRON

In this section, we follow the method outlined in the introduction to construct an associahedron.

4.1. Vertices of Loday Associahedra. We begin by defining a set of points that are the candidates for vertices of the polytope.

Definition 4.1. Suppose $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_{m,m}$ where $1 \leq m \leq n$. Define

$$(4.1) \quad \text{val}(\alpha, T) := \sum_{k=1}^t \alpha_k - \sum_{k=1}^a \alpha_k - \sum_{k=1}^b \alpha_k,$$

where t , a , and b are the number of total internal vertices in T , the Left subtree of T , and the Right subtree of T , respectively. (Note that we have $t = a + b + 1$.)

Given a (strictly increasing) sequence $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$, we define

$$\mathbf{v}_T^\alpha := \sum_{i=1}^n \text{val}(\alpha, T_{(i)}) \mathbf{e}_i = (\text{val}(\alpha, T_{(1)}), \text{val}(\alpha, T_{(2)}), \dots, \text{val}(\alpha, T_{(n)})),$$

where $T_{(i)}$ denotes the subtree of T that is rooted at the internal vertex labeled by i .

We remark that some of the definitions and results in this section will be stated using the variable n in which case the readers can assume $n = d + 1$ (where d is the dimension of the constructed associahedron). The reason to do this is that in later sections we used these ideas with $n = d$.

Example 4.2. Let $\alpha = (2, 5, 6, 14, 17, 21, 22, 24)$ and T be the complete binary tree on the left of Figure 4. Then $T_{(3)}$ is the Left subtree of the root of T . It has 5 internal vertices, and both of its Left subtree and right subtree have 2 internal vertices. Hence,

$$\text{val}(\alpha, T_{(3)}) = \sum_{k=1}^5 \alpha_k - \sum_{k=1}^2 \alpha_k - \sum_{k=1}^2 \alpha_k = 44 - 7 - 7 = 30,$$

which gives the 3rd entry of \mathbf{v}_T^α . We can compute the other entries similarly, and get $\mathbf{v}_T^\alpha = (2, 5, 30, 2, 5, 60, 5, 2)$.

We can check that the sum of coordinates of v_T^α is 111 which is the same as that of α . Hence, $v_T^\alpha \in U_7^\alpha$. This is true in general, as we state in the lemma below.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$. Let T' be a subtree of T with t internal vertices, and suppose (by Lemma 3.6 (2)) that $I_T(T') = [c, c + t - 1]$ for some integer c . Then*

$$(4.2) \quad \sum_{i=c}^{c+t-1} \text{val}(\alpha, T_{(i)}) = \sum_{k=1}^t \alpha_k.$$

In particular, if $T' = T$, we obtain that sum of the coordinates of v_T^α is $\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k$. Hence, v_T^α is a point in U_{n-1}^α . (Recall the affine space U_d^α is defined in (2.4).)

Remark 4.4. If we let $I = I_T(T')$, then (4.2) can be rewritten as

$$(4.3) \quad \langle e_I, v_T^\alpha \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{|I|} \alpha_k.$$

Proof of Lemma 4.3. We prove by induction on t , the number of internal vertices in T' . If $t = 0$, we have that $I_T(T') = \emptyset$ or $[c, c - 1]$. So (4.2) clearly holds.

Suppose $t \geq 1$ and (4.2) holds for any T' with less than t internal vertices. Now we consider T' has t internal vertices. Let T_L and T_R be the Left and Right subtrees of T' respectively, and suppose a and b are the number of internal vertices of T_L and T_R . (Note we have $t = a + b + 1$.) Then by Lemma 3.6 (specifically numerals (1),(2), and(3)), we must have that $T' = T_{(c+a)}$ is the subtree of T rooted at the internal vertex with label $c + a$, and

$$I_T(T_L) = [c, c + a - 1] \quad \text{and} \quad I_T(T_R) = [c + a + 1, c + a + b] = [c + a + 1, c + t - 1].$$

Since both T_L and T_R have less than t internal vertices, by induction hypothesis,

$$\sum_{i=c}^{c+a-1} \text{val}(\alpha, T_{(i)}) = \sum_{k=1}^a \alpha_k \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=c+a+1}^{c+t-1} \text{val}(\alpha, T_{(i)}) = \sum_{k=1}^b \alpha_k.$$

Summing these two equations and

$$\text{val}(\alpha, T_{(c+a)}) = \text{val}(\alpha, T') = \sum_{k=1}^t \alpha_k - \sum_{k=1}^a \alpha_k - \sum_{k=1}^b \alpha_k,$$

we obtain (4.2). □

Definition 4.5. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a strictly increasing sequence. We define the following polytope

$$(4.4) \quad \text{LodAsso}(\alpha) := \text{ConvexHull}\{v_T^\alpha : T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}\} \subseteq U_d^\alpha.$$

The polytope $\text{LodAsso}(\alpha)$ is called the *Loday associahedron* in reference of Jean-Louis Loday who first study it in the case $\alpha = (1, 2, \dots, d + 1)$. The following is the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a strictly increasing sequence. Then the face poset of the Loday associahedron $\text{LodAsso}(\alpha)$ is \mathcal{K}_d . (Recall that \mathcal{K}_d is defined in Definition 3.2.) Moreover, $\text{LodAsso}(\alpha)$ is a d -dimensional associahedron, and is a generalized permutohedron as well.*

4.2. Normal fan of Loday associahedra. In this part we construct a conic dissection of W_d and then apply Lemma 2.5 to show that the conic dissection induces the normal fan of $\text{LodAsso}(\alpha)$.

Recall that in Definition 3.10 we define a cone $\sigma(T) \subset W_{n-1}$ for each tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_n$. The following result gives us the conic dissection we need.

Lemma 4.7. *Each cone $\sigma(T)$ for $T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ is a union of braid cones. Furthermore the collection of cones $\mathcal{M}_{n-1} := \{\sigma(T) : T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}\}$ is a simplicial conic dissection of W_{n-1} .*

Proof. Note that for $T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$, the preorder \leq_T on $[n]$ is a partial order. Hence, the first statement follows from Lemma 2.11 (6). Then the second statement follows from part (4) of Lemma 2.11, and Lemmas 3.12 and 2.8. \square

We need two preliminary lemmas before establishing the condition we need on \mathcal{M}_{n-1} and $\{v_T^\alpha\}$ in order to apply Lemma 2.5.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a strictly increasing sequence and $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ are complete binary trees, where T' is obtained from T by an (i, j) -flip. Then $v_T^\alpha - v_{T'}^\alpha = \lambda(e_i - e_j)$ for some $\lambda > 0$.*

Proof. First observe that for any k that is nor i or j , we have

$$\text{val}(\alpha, T_{(k)}) = \text{val}(\alpha, T'_{(k)}).$$

Hence, we just need to show that

$$\text{val}(\alpha, T_{(i)}) - \text{val}(\alpha, T'_{(i)}) = \text{val}(\alpha, T'_{(j)}) - \text{val}(\alpha, T_{(j)}) > 0.$$

By Lemma 3.8, without loss of generality, we may assume that T is as shown on the left of Figure 2 and T' is as shown on the right of the same figure. Let a, b, c be the number of internal vertices in trees A, B, C in Figure 2. Then we can compute that

$$\text{val}(\alpha, T_{(i)}) - \text{val}(\alpha, T'_{(i)}) = \sum_{x=0}^a \sum_{y=0}^b (\alpha_{x+y+c+2} - \alpha_{x+y+c+1}).$$

By symmetry, one sees that $\text{val}(\alpha, T'_{(j)}) - \text{val}(\alpha, T_{(j)})$ also equals to the quantity on the right hand side of the above equality. Finally, this expression is positive as α is strictly increasing. \square

Lemma 4.9. *Let $T \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ and $w \in \sigma_T^\circ$. For every $T' \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ that is different from T , there exists T'' obtained from T' by a flip of an internal edge such that*

$$\langle w, v_{T'}^\alpha \rangle < \langle w, v_{T''}^\alpha \rangle.$$

Proof. Let $w \in \sigma^\circ(T)$. Lemma 4.7 states that \mathcal{M}_{n-1} is a conic dissection of W_{n-1} . Hence, given that $T' \neq T$, we must have that $w \notin \sigma_{T'}$. Using the description of a preorder cone given in Lemma 2.11 (3), we conclude that there exists a covering relation $j \prec_{T'} i$ in $\leq_{T'}$

such that $x_i < x_j$. Now we let T'' be the tree obtained from T' by an (i, j) -flip. By Lemma 4.8, we have $\mathbf{v}_{T'}^\alpha - \mathbf{v}_{T''}^\alpha = \lambda(\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j)$ for some $\lambda > 0$. Thus,

$$\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_{T'}^\alpha - \mathbf{v}_{T''}^\alpha \rangle = \langle \mathbf{w}, \lambda(\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{e}_j) \rangle = \lambda(x_i - x_j) < 0. \quad \square$$

Corollary 4.10. *Let $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ be two complete binary trees. Then for every $\mathbf{w} \in \sigma^\circ(T)$, we have $\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_{T'}^\alpha \rangle \geq \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_T^\alpha \rangle$, where the equality holds if and only if $T = T'$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.9 that we can construct a sequence of complete binary trees in $\mathcal{T}_{n,n}$:

$$T_0 = T', T_1, T_2, \dots,$$

such that for each i ,

$$\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_{T_i}^\alpha \rangle < \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_{T_{i+1}}^\alpha \rangle.$$

The construction can continue as long as $T_i \neq T$. Since $\mathcal{T}_{n,n}$ is finite, this procedure must end with a tree $T_k = T$. Then the conclusion follows. \square

The following proposition is the key result of this section, characterizing the vertex set and the normal fan of the Loday associahedron. It also provides the main ingredients we need for proving Theorem 4.6.

Proposition 4.11. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a strictly increasing sequence.*

- (1) *The Loday associahedron $\text{LodAsso}(\alpha)$ is full-dimensional in U_d^α and its vertex set is $\{v_T^\alpha : T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}\}$.*
- (2) *For each $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}$, we have $\sigma(T) = \text{ncone}(v_T^\alpha, \text{LodAsso}(\alpha))$.*
- (3) *The normal fan of $\text{LodAsso}(\alpha)$ is $\Lambda_d := \{\sigma(T) : T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1}\}$. Hence, Λ_d is a complete projective fan in W_d .*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.7 and Corollary 4.10 that the set of cones $\mathcal{M}_d = \{\sigma(T) : T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}\}$ in W_d and the set of points $\{v_T^\alpha : T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}\}$ in U_d^α satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 2.5. Hence, we conclude that (1) and (2) are true, and that the \mathcal{M}_d induces the normal fan of $\text{LodAsso}(\alpha)$. Therefore, it is left to show that Λ_d is induced by \mathcal{M}_d . However, this easily follows from Lemma 2.11 (5), Lemma 3.11, and the fact that \mathcal{T}_{d+1} consists of all contractions of $\mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}$. \square

Because of the results given above, we call

$$(4.5) \quad \Lambda_d := \{\sigma(T) : T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1}\}.$$

the *Loday fan*. The following lemma gives a characterization of the Loday fan.

Lemma 4.12. *The Loday fan Λ_d has the following properties:*

- (1) *The set $\{\sigma(T) : T \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,k}\}$ consists of all the $(k-1)$ -dimensional cones in Λ_d .*
- (2) *For any $T, T' \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1}$, we have that $\sigma_{T'}$ is a face of σ_T if and only if T' is obtained from T by contracting internal edges of T .*
- (3) *The face poset of Λ_d is isomorphic to the poset dual to $\mathcal{K}_d \setminus \hat{0}$.*
- (4) *The Loday fan Λ_d is a simplicial fan.*
- (5) *The Loday fan Λ_d is a coarsening of the braid fan Br_d .*

Proof. One sees that (1), (2), and (4) follow from Lemma 2.11 and the definition of $\sigma(T)$. Item (3) follows from (2) and the definition of \mathcal{K}_d in Definition 3.2. By Lemma 4.7, each cone in \mathcal{M}_d is a union of braid cones. Since Λ_d is induced by \mathcal{M}_d , it must coarsen Br_d . \square

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 4.6. By Proposition 4.11 (3) and Lemmas 4.12 (3) and 2.2, we have that the face poset of $\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is \mathcal{K}_d . Moreover, by Lemma 3.3, we conclude that $\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is a d -associahedron. Finally, it follows from Proposition 4.11 (3) and Lemma 4.12 (5) that $\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is a generalized permutohedron. \square

4.3. Inequality description for Loday associahedra. It follows from Proposition 4.11 that we can apply Lemma 2.6 to find an inequality description for the Loday associahedron $\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Note that by Lemma 4.12 (1), the set $\{\sigma(\mathbb{T}) : \mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,2}\}$ consists of all one dimensional cones of Λ_d . Thus, our first step is to choose a generator for each of the cones in this set.

Definition 4.13. Let $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,2}$. Since \mathbb{T} has two internal vertices, it has a unique non-root internal vertex, say v . Then by Lemma 3.6 (2), the labels of v is a nonempty integer interval, denoted by $\text{Itv}(\mathbb{T})$, and called the *defining interval* of \mathbb{T} .

Proposition 4.14. *The map $\mathbb{T} \mapsto \text{Itv}(\mathbb{T})$ gives a one-to-one correspondence between the set $\mathcal{T}_{d+1,2}$ and the set*

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{I}_d := \{I : I \text{ is an integer interval and } \emptyset \neq I \subsetneq [d+1]\}$$

Moreover, for each $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,2}$, if let $I = \text{Itv}(\mathbb{T})$, then the one-dimensional cone $\sigma_{\mathbb{T}} \in \Lambda_d$ is generated by $\mathbf{e}_{\bar{I}}$, where $\bar{I} := [d+1] \setminus I$ is the complement of I .

Proof. First, by Lemma 3.6 (1)(2), we have that $\text{Itv}(\mathbb{T}) \in \mathcal{I}_d$ for any $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,2}$. Hence, Itv is a well-defined a map from $\mathcal{T}_{d+1,2}$ to \mathcal{I}_d . Next, given $I \in \mathcal{I}_d$, one sees that there is a unique way to construct a $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,2}$ such that the unique non-root internal vertex of \mathbb{T} is labeled by I and the root of \mathbb{T} is labeled by \bar{I} . Hence, the first conclusion follows.

Let $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,2}$ and $I = \text{Itv}(\mathbb{T})$. Then preorder $\leq_{\mathbb{T}}$ on $[d+1]$ has two equivalence classes I and \bar{I} , and satisfies that $i <_{\mathbb{T}} j$ if $i \in I$ and $j \in \bar{I}$.

Hence, its associated preorder cone $\sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$ consists of all vectors $\mathbf{x} \in W_d$ in the form of $a\mathbf{e}_I + b\mathbf{e}_{\bar{I}}$ for some real numbers $a \leq b$. Recall that in W_d the vector $\mathbf{1}$ is trivial. Thus, $a\mathbf{e}_I + b\mathbf{e}_{\bar{I}} = (b-a)\mathbf{e}_{\bar{I}}$ in W_d . Therefore, $\sigma(\mathbb{T})$ is generated by $\mathbf{e}_{\bar{I}}$. \square

Theorem 4.15. *Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a strictly increasing sequence. Then we have the following minimal inequality description for $\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$:*

$$(4.7) \quad \text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) = \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in U_d^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} : \langle \mathbf{e}_{\bar{I}}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \sum_{i=|I|+1}^{d+1} \alpha_i, \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{I}_d \right\}.$$

Proof. Applying the first part of Lemma 2.6 together with Proposition 4.14, one sees that it is left to show for any $\mathbb{T}' \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,2}$, if we let $I = \text{Itv}(\mathbb{T}')$, then $\max_{\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}} \langle \mathbf{e}_{\bar{I}}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \rangle = \sum_{i=|I|+1}^{d+1} \alpha_i$.

We choose $\mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}_{d+1,d+1}$ such that $\mathbb{T} \leq_K \mathbb{T}'$ in \mathcal{K}_d , equivalently, \mathbb{T}' can be obtained from \mathbb{T} by contracting internal edges. Thus, by Lemma 4.12 (2), we have $\sigma_{\mathbb{T}'}$ is a face of $\sigma_{\mathbb{T}}$, where the latter is the normal cone of $\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ at $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{T}}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$. Therefore, by the second part of Lemma

2.6, we just need to show

$$(4.8) \quad \langle \mathbf{e}_I, \mathbf{v}_T^\alpha \rangle = \sum_{i=|I|+1}^{d+1} \alpha_i.$$

Now by the definition of I and Lemma 3.6 (5), there exists a subtree T_0 of T such that $I = I_T(T_0)$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.3 and Remark 4.4, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{e}_I, \mathbf{v}_T^\alpha \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{|I|} \alpha_k. \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{v}_T^\alpha \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} \alpha_k.$$

Thus, (4.8) follows. \square

Following terminology from V.Pilaud [24], if a polytope is defined by a subset of a system of linear inequalities that defines a permutohedron $\text{Perm}(\alpha)$, then we call it an α -removohedron.

Corollary 4.16. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a strictly increasing sequence. Then the associahedron $\text{LodAsso}(\alpha)$ is an α -removohedron.*

Proof. Comparing the inequality description obtained in Theorem 4.15 with the inequality description for $\text{Perm}(\alpha)$ given in Equation (2.6), we see the conclusion follows. \square

Corollary 4.17. *Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a strictly increasing sequence and $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_d)$, where $\delta_k = \alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1}$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, d+1$, the vector of first differences (and setting $\alpha_0 = 0$). We have the following description using Mikowski sums*

$$(4.9) \quad \text{LodAsso}(\alpha) = \delta_{d+1} \Delta_{[d+1]} + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_d} \delta_{|I|} \Delta_I,$$

where $\Delta_I := \text{ConvexHull}\{\mathbf{e}_i : i \in I\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

Proof. Following [26, Proposition 6.3],

we can express the Minkowski sum of simplices in the right hand side of Equation (4.9) as the solution to the following system of inequalities:

$$(4.10) \quad \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : \begin{array}{l} \langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = z_{[d+1]} \\ \langle \mathbf{e}_I, \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq z_I, \quad \forall \emptyset \neq I \subsetneq [d+1] \end{array} \right\},$$

where

$$z_I := \sum_{J: \text{nonempty subinterval of } I} \delta_{|J|}.$$

If $I \subseteq [d+1]$ is an integer interval of size k , then the number of nonempty subintervals of I of size ℓ is $k+1-\ell$ and thus

$$z_I = \sum_{\ell=1}^k (k+1-\ell) \delta_\ell = \sum_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{i=\ell}^k \delta_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{\ell=1}^i \delta_\ell = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i = \sum_{i=1}^{|I|} \alpha_i.$$

Suppose $I \subseteq [d+1]$ is not an integer interval. Then we may assume it is the disjoint union of integer intervals I_1, \dots, I_m , in this case, we can show that

$$z_I = z_{I_1} + \dots + z_{I_m}.$$

This implies that the inequality $\langle \mathbf{e}_I, \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq z_I$ is redundant in (4.10), and thus can be omitted.

Since $\langle \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x} \rangle = z_{[d+1]} = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \alpha_i$ if and only if $\mathbf{x} \in U_{\alpha}^d$, and \mathcal{I}_d consists of all nonempty integer intervals $I \subsetneq [d+1]$, one sees that we can rewrite (4.10) as

$$(4.11) \quad \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in U_d^{\alpha} : \langle \mathbf{e}_I, \mathbf{x} \rangle \geq \sum_{i=1}^{|I|} \alpha_i, \quad \forall I \in \mathcal{I}_d \right\},$$

One observes that the description of (4.11) is equivalent to the right hand side of Equation (4.7). This completes the proof. \square

Notice that in the statement of Corollary 4.17 each δ_k is positive except for δ_1 which may be negative. Since polytopes Δ_I when I has size one are points, adding the summand $\sum_{i=1}^d \delta_1 \Delta_{\{i\}}$ only provides a translation. Thus, if we impose the restriction that $\delta_1 = \alpha_1 > 0$, we still obtain all the Loday Associahedra (up to translations).

In [8] the authors called any polytope of the form $\sum_I a_I \Delta_I$, where $a_I > 0$ summed over all integer intervals, a *Postnikov associahedron*. This family of polytopes contains Loday associahedra defined in this paper, but is strictly larger, since in Equation (4.9) the scalar factors are the same for integer intervals of the same size. Furthermore, Corollary 4.16 is not valid for Postnikov associahedra.

5. KAPRANOV POSET, PARTITION LABELED TREES AND THEIR ASSOCIATED CONES

In this section we define the Kapranov poset in terms of trees labeled by partitions. Then we associate cones to these trees by using our ideas from [7]. Finally, we prove some basic properties of these cones which are fundamental for our construction of the permutohedron in the next section.

5.1. The Kapranov poset. In this part, we will introduce the poset defined by Kapranov as a hybrid of the face poset of a permutohedron and the face poset of an associahedron. We start by introducing elements in constructing the face poset of a permutohedron.

Definition 5.1. We say the ordered tuple $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_k)$ is an *ordered (set) partition* of $[d+1]$ with k blocks if S_1, \dots, S_k are k disjoint sets whose union is $[d+1]$.

We denote by \mathcal{O}_{d+1} the set of all ordered partitions of $[d+1]$ and by $\mathcal{O}_{d+1,k}$ the set of all ordered partitions of $[d+1]$ with k parts.

We define a partial order \preceq on the set $\mathcal{O}_{d+1} \cup \{\hat{0}\}$ by declaring $\mathcal{S}_1 \preceq \mathcal{S}_2$ if $\mathcal{S}_1 \in \mathcal{O}_{d+1}$ refines $\mathcal{S}_2 \in \mathcal{O}_{d+1}$ and $\hat{0} \preceq \mathcal{S}$ for all $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{O}_{d+1}$. We denote the poset $(\mathcal{O}_{d+1} \cup \{\hat{0}\}, \preceq)$ by \mathcal{O}_{d+1} .

One can verify that \mathcal{O}_{d+1} is a graded poset of rank $d+1$. It has a unique minimal element $\hat{0}$ by definition. For each $1 \leq k \leq d+1$, the set $\mathcal{O}_{d+1,k}$ consists of all elements of \mathcal{O}_{d+1} of rank $d+2-k$. In particular, the only element $([d+1])$ in $\mathcal{O}_{d+1,1}$ is the unique maximal element of \mathcal{O}_{d+1} . Finally, the set $\mathcal{O}_{d+1,1}$ of rank 1 elements of \mathcal{O}_{d+1} is in bijection with \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} . More precisely, for each permutation $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}$, we let

$$(5.1) \quad \mathcal{S}(\pi) := (\{\pi^{-1}(1)\}, \{\pi^{-1}(2)\}, \dots, \{\pi^{-1}(d+1)\}).$$

to be the ordered set partition that corresponds to π . Clearly, $\pi \mapsto \mathcal{S}(\pi)$ is a bijection from \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} to $\mathcal{O}_{d+1,1}$.

Notation 5.2. When we write examples of ordered partitions involving only single digit numbers, we will omit set parentheses and write numbers in each block together to make notation shorter. For example, $(\{1, 2, 3\}, \{4\}, \{5, 6\})$ will be written as $(123, 4, 56)$. It is

important to keep in mind that the numbers in each part form a set, hence their order is irrelevant.

Theorem 5.3. [3, Section VI.2] *Suppose $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is a strictly increasing sequence. Then the face poset of the usual permutohedron $\text{Perm}(\alpha)$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{O}_{d+1} .*

Recall the face poset \mathcal{K}_d of a d -associahedron is provided in Definition 3.2 using strictly branching trees in \mathcal{T}_{d+1} . Below we construct Kapranov's poset as a poset on pairs of ordered set partitions and these trees.

Definition 5.4. Let $\mathcal{T}_{\leq d} := \bigcup_{i=0}^d \mathcal{T}_i$ be the set of strictly branching trees with at most $d+1$ leaves. A $[d+1]$ -partition labeled tree consists of a pair $(\mathcal{S}, T) \in \mathcal{O}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{\leq d}$, where the tree T has $k \leq d+1$ leaves and the partition \mathcal{S} has k blocks S_1, \dots, S_k that we use to label the leaves of T from left to right. The set of all $[d+1]$ -partition labeled trees is denoted \mathcal{P}_d .

For any $(\mathcal{S}_1, T_1), (\mathcal{S}_2, T_2)$ in \mathcal{P}_d , we define $(\mathcal{S}_1, T_1) \prec_{KP} (\mathcal{S}_2, T_2)$ if one of the following two conditions hold:

- i. The tree T_2 is obtained from T_1 by contracting a single internal edge of T_1 , and $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}_2$.
- ii. There exists a minimal⁴ internal vertex p of T_1 such that T_2 is obtained from T_1 by contracting all edges between p and its children in T_1 while labeling this new leaf with the union of the labels of the children of p in T_1 .

This relation \prec_{KP} extends to a partial order \leq_{KP} on \mathcal{P}_d where \prec_{KP} is the covering relation. We also add a minimum element $\{\hat{0}\}$ by declaring $\hat{0} \leq_{KP} (\mathcal{S}, T)$ for any $(\mathcal{S}, T) \in \mathcal{P}_d$. Finally, we denote the poset $(\mathcal{P}_d \cup \{\hat{0}\}, \leq_{KP})$ by $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$ and call it the *Kapranov poset*.

Example 5.5. In Figure 5 we present two elements of \mathcal{P}_8 with partition labelings $(3, 7, 4, 8, 9, 6, 1, 5, 2)$ and $(374, 89, 6, 1, 5, 2)$ respectively. The one on the left is smaller than the one on the right in the Kapranov poset.




FIGURE 5. Two $[9]$ -partition labeled trees

The next lemma collects useful facts about the Kapranov poset. Some are proven in [19] in a different language and some are straightforward, so we omit proofs.

Lemma 5.6. *The Kapranov poset $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$ is graded of rank $d+1$. Furthermore, the following facts hold for its elements:*

- (1) *The rank of a $[d+1]$ -partition labeled tree (\mathcal{S}, T) is $d - i(T) + 1$, where $i(T)$ is the number of internal vertices of the tree.*

⁴An internal vertex is *minimal* internal vertex if all of its children are leaves.

- (2) It has a unique maximum element $(\mathcal{S}_0, \mathbb{T}_0)$ where \mathcal{S}_0 is the trivial partition $([d+1])$, and \mathbb{T}_0 is the only rooted tree on a single vertex which is the unique element in \mathcal{T}_0 .
- (3) The elements of rank 1 are in bijection with $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$. More precisely, each $(\pi, \mathbb{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$ defines a rank-1 element $(\mathcal{S}(\pi), \mathbb{T})$ of $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$, and every rank-1 element arises this way. (Recall that $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ is defined in (5.1).)
- (4) The elements of rank d are in bijection with $\mathcal{O}_{d+1} := \bigcup_{k=2}^{d+1} \mathcal{O}_{d+1,k}$, the set of all non-trivial ordered partitions of $[d+1]$. More precisely, each $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{O}_{d+1,k}$ (for some $2 \leq k \leq d+1$) defines a rank- d element $(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}_k)$ of $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$, where \mathbb{T}_k is the unique tree with one internal vertex and k leaves, and every rank- d element of $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$ arises this way (for some k).

Definition 5.7. A d -permuto-associahedron is a d -dimensional polytope whose face poset is isomorphic to $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$.

5.2. **Nested combinatorics.** In this part, we will review results on nested permutohedra and nested braid cones obtained in [7]. Recall that $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{d+1}\}$ is the standard basis for \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . For any permutation $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}$ and integer $i \in [d]$, we define the vectors

$$\mathbf{f}_i^\pi := \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(i+1)} - \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(i)},$$

and the linear transformations $D^\pi : \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ as

$$D^\pi \mathbf{w} := (D_1^\pi \mathbf{w}, D_2^\pi \mathbf{w}, \dots, D_d^\pi \mathbf{w}),$$

where the i th coordinate is

$$D_i^\pi \mathbf{w} := \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{f}_i^\pi \rangle = w_{\pi^{-1}(i+1)} - w_{\pi^{-1}(i)}.$$

If π is the identity permutation, we may omit π and write $D\mathbf{w}$ instead.

It is easy to verify that $D^\pi(\mathbf{w}) = D^\pi(\mathbf{w} + k\mathbf{1})$ for any $k \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, we may consider the domain of the map D^π is W_d . In some cases it is convenient to consider D^π as a map from W_d to W_{d-1} .

We note that with the above definition, the braid cone can be expressed as

$$\sigma(\pi) = \{\mathbf{w} \in W_d : D^\pi \mathbf{w} \geq 0\}.$$

Example 5.8. Let $\pi = 791386245$. Then $\pi^{-1} = 374896152$. Thus $\mathbf{w} \in \sigma(\pi)$ means that

$$\begin{aligned} D_1^\pi \mathbf{w} = w_7 - w_3 \geq 0, \quad D_3^\pi \mathbf{w} = w_8 - w_4 \geq 0, \quad D_5^\pi \mathbf{w} = w_6 - w_9 \geq 0, \quad D_7^\pi \mathbf{w} = w_2 - w_1 \geq 0, \\ D_2^\pi \mathbf{w} = w_4 - w_7 \geq 0, \quad D_4^\pi \mathbf{w} = w_9 - w_8 \geq 0, \quad D_6^\pi \mathbf{w} = w_1 - w_6 \geq 0, \quad D_8^\pi \mathbf{w} = w_5 - w_2 \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently,

$$w_3 \leq w_7 \leq w_4 \leq w_8 \leq w_9 \leq w_6 \leq w_1 \leq w_5 \leq w_2.$$

For convenience, for $\mathbf{w} \in \sigma(\pi)$, we often let $u_i = w_{\pi^{-1}(i)}$ for each i , which allows us to express \mathbf{w} as

$$(5.2) \quad \mathbf{w} = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} u_i \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(i)}.$$

Then one sees that $D^\pi \mathbf{w} = D\mathbf{u}$ (where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_{d+1})$).

Given strictly increasing sequences $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for any $(\pi, \tau) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathfrak{S}_d$, we define

$$(5.3) \quad \mathbf{v}_{\pi, \tau}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} := \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \alpha_i \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(i)} + \sum_{i=1}^d \beta_i \mathbf{f}_{\tau^{-1}(i)} \in U_d^\alpha.$$

We call $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ an *appropriate pair* (of strictly increasing sequences) if for any (π, τ) , when we write $\mathbf{v}_{\pi, \tau}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} = \sum \gamma_i \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(i)}$ we have $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \dots < \gamma_{d+1}$. It is not hard to see, by scaling the vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ if necessary, that appropriate pairs exist. Then for any appropriate pair $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, we define the *usual nested permutohedron* (associated with the pair $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$) to be

$$(5.4) \quad \text{Perm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) := \text{ConvexHull} \left(\mathbf{v}_{\pi, \tau}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} : (\pi, \tau) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathfrak{S}_d \right).$$

A *generalized nested permtuhohedron* is a deformation of a usual nested permutohedron.

Definition 5.9. For each $(\pi, \tau) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathfrak{S}_d$, we define the *nested braid cone* $\sigma(\pi, \tau)$ to be

$$(5.5) \quad \sigma(\pi, \tau) := \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W_d : \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{w} \in \sigma(\pi), \\ D^\pi \mathbf{w} \in \sigma(\tau). \end{array} \right\}$$

Note here $\sigma(\pi)$ is in W_d and $\sigma(\tau)$ is in W_{d-1} .

One can check that $\sigma(\pi, \tau)$ is a well-defined d -dimensional cone in W_d , and has a minimal inequality description:

$$\sigma(\pi, \tau) = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W_d : 0 \leq D_{\tau^{-1}(1)}^\pi \mathbf{w} \leq D_{\tau^{-1}(2)}^\pi \mathbf{w} \leq \dots \leq D_{\tau^{-1}(d)}^\pi \mathbf{w} \right\}.$$

Therefore, the relative interior of $\sigma(\pi, \tau)$ is given by

$$\sigma^\circ(\pi, \tau) = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W_d : 0 < D_{\tau^{-1}(1)}^\pi \mathbf{w} < D_{\tau^{-1}(2)}^\pi \mathbf{w} < \dots < D_{\tau^{-1}(d)}^\pi \mathbf{w} \right\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{B}_d^2 := \{\sigma(\pi, \tau) : (\pi, \tau) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathfrak{S}_d\}$ be the collection of nested braid cones in W_d . In [7] we proved that \mathcal{B}_d^2 induces a projective fan Br_d^2 which we call the *nested braid fan*. More precisely, in [7, Proposition 4.6] we prove that for any appropriate pair $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, the normal fan of $\text{Perm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is equal to Br_d^2 . Thus a polytope P is a generalized nested permutohedron if and only if its normal fan coarsens the nested braid fan Br_d^2 for some d .

Analogous to Lemma 2.8 we have the following.

Lemma 5.10. *The collection of braid cones \mathcal{B}_d^2 forms a conic dissection of W_d .*

Recall we define $\mathbf{e}_S = \sum_{i \in S} \mathbf{e}_i$ for each $S \subseteq [d+1]$. For each element $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_k) \in \mathcal{O}_{d+1}$, we define

$$(5.6) \quad \mathbf{e}_\mathcal{S} := \sum_i i \mathbf{e}_{S_i}.$$

We also define the *type* of \mathcal{S} , denoted by $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$, to be the sequence $(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{k-1})$, where

$$t_i = \sum_{j=1}^i |S_j|, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq i \leq k.$$

The following theorem gives inequality descriptions for usual nested permutohedra, recalling that $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_{d+1} = \bigcup_{i=2}^{d+1} \mathcal{O}_{d+1, i}$ is the set of all non-trivial ordered partitions of $[d+1]$:

Theorem 5.11 (Theorem 4.20 in [7]). *Suppose $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is a pair of strictly increasing sequences $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ that is appropriate. Suppose $\mathbf{b} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}}$ is defined as follows: for each $\mathcal{S} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}}$, if $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S}) = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{k-1})$, let*

$$(5.7) \quad b_{\mathcal{S}} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k i \sum_{j=t_{i-1}+1}^{t_i} \alpha_j \right) + \sum_{j=d+2-k}^d \beta_j,$$

where by convention we set $t_0 = 0$ and $t_k = d + 1$. Then we have the following minimal inequality description for $\text{Perm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$:

$$(5.8) \quad \text{Perm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \{ \mathbf{x} \in U_d^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} : \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq b_{\mathcal{S}}, \quad \forall \mathcal{S} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}} \}.$$

5.3. Cones associated to partition labeled trees. Let $(\mathcal{S}, T) \in \mathcal{P}_d$. Suppose $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k)$ and $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S}) = (t_1, \dots, t_{k-1})$. Hence, T has k leaves. Recall in Section 3.4, we describe a way to label internal vertices of T with the set $[k-1]$. We apply the same procedure on T first, and then replace each label i with t_i . Hence, we obtain a labeling on internal vertices of T with the set $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{k-1}\}$. Let $G(\mathcal{S}, T)$ be the induced subtree of T on its internal vertices together with the new labeling. One sees that $G(\mathcal{S}, T)$ is the Hasse diagram of a preorder on $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{k-1}\}$, which we denote by $\leq_{(\mathcal{S}, T)}$. For convenience, we also treat $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$ as a set, and thus we can say that $\leq_{(\mathcal{S}, T)}$ is a preorder on $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$.

Example 5.12. Suppose (\mathcal{S}, T) is the [9]-partition labeled tree on the right of Figure 5. Then $\mathcal{S} = (374, 89, 6, 1, 2, 5)$ and $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S}) = (3, 5, 6, 7, 8)$. In Figure 6, on the left we show T together with its old internal vertex labeling considered in Section 3.4, and in the middle we show T with its internal vertices labeled by $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$, and finally the right side is $G(\mathcal{S}, T)$, which defines the preorder $\leq_{(\mathcal{S}, T)}$.




FIGURE 6. An example of the construction of $G(\mathcal{S}, T)$.

Remark 5.13. Given the way we construct the labeling of T using the set $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$, one sees that a lot of properties we discussed in Section 3.4 on internal vertex labelings of T , e.g., Lemma 3.6, can be modified to a version that works for the current version of labeling.

For each $(\mathcal{S}, T) \in \mathcal{P}_d$, we will define a preorder cone associated to it using the preorder $\leq_{(\mathcal{S}, T)}$. We need a preliminary lemma before giving such a definition.

For any $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_k) \in \mathcal{O}_{d+1}$, it determines a unique preorder $\leq_{\mathcal{S}}$ on $[d+1]$ by letting

$$(5.9) \quad i \leq_{\mathcal{S}} j \text{ if } i \in S_a, j \in S_b \text{ with } a \leq b.$$

Let

$$(5.10) \quad W_{\mathcal{S}} := \{ \mathbf{w} \in W_d : w_i = w_j, \text{ if } i \equiv_{\mathcal{S}} j \}.$$

Recall $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ is defined in (5.1).

Lemma 5.14. *Suppose $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{O}_{d+1}$ and $\pi, \pi' \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}$. If $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\pi')$ both refine \mathcal{S} , then for any $\mathbf{w} \in W_{\mathcal{S}}$, we have*

$$D_i^\pi \mathbf{w} = D_i^{\pi'} \mathbf{w}, \text{ for all } i.$$

We won't give a proof for the above lemma, which is straightforward by checking the definition. Instead, we will give an example to demonstrate why it is true.

Example 5.15. Let $\mathcal{S} = (374, 89, 6, 1, 2, 5)$. Then $\mathbf{w} \in W_{\mathcal{S}}$ if and only if

$$(5.11) \quad w_3 = w_7 = w_4 \quad \text{and} \quad w_8 = w_9.$$

Let $\pi = 791386245$ and $\pi' = 793286145$. Then $\mathcal{S}(\pi) = (3, 7, 4, 8, 9, 6, 1, 5, 2)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\pi') = (7, 4, 3, 8, 9, 6, 1, 5, 2)$, both of which refine \mathcal{S} . Clearly, for each $4 \leq i \leq 8$, we have $D_i^\pi \mathbf{w} = D_i^{\pi'} \mathbf{w}$ for any $\mathbf{w} \in W_d$. Now if $\mathbf{w} \in W_{\mathcal{S}}$, we have $D_i^\pi \mathbf{w} = 0 = D_i^{\pi'} \mathbf{w}$ for $i = 1, 2$, and

$$D_3^\pi \mathbf{w} = w_8 - w_4 = w_8 - w_3 = D_3^{\pi'} \mathbf{w}.$$

Lemma 5.14 allows us to give the following definition.

Definition 5.16. Let $(\mathcal{S}, T) \in \mathcal{P}_d$. Choose $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}$ such that $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ refines \mathcal{S} . Then we define

$$(5.12) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{S}, T) := \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W_{\mathcal{S}} : \begin{array}{l} D_i^\pi \mathbf{w} \leq D_j^\pi \mathbf{w}, \text{ if } i \leq_{(\mathcal{S}, T)} j \\ D_\ell^\pi \mathbf{w} \geq 0, \text{ if } \ell \text{ is a minimal element of } \leq_{(\mathcal{S}, T)} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Note that by Lemma 5.14, the definition of $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T)$ does not depend on the choice of π as long as $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ refines \mathcal{S} .

Example 5.17. Let (\mathcal{S}, T) be the [9]-partition labeled tree on the right of Figure 5. Then $\mathcal{S} = (374, 89, 6, 1, 2, 5)$ and its preorder $\leq_{(\mathcal{S}, T)}$ has been discussed in Example 5.12. We choose $\pi = 791386245$ which we have shown that $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ refines \mathcal{S} . Thus, we have that $\mathbf{w} \in \sigma(\mathcal{S}, T)$ if and only if both condition (5.11) and the condition below hold:

$$(5.13) \quad 0 \leq D_3^\pi \mathbf{w} = D_5^\pi \mathbf{w} \leq D_6^\pi \mathbf{w} = D_7^\pi \mathbf{w} \text{ and } 0 \leq D_8^\pi \mathbf{w} \leq D_6^\pi \mathbf{w}.$$

5.4. Face structure of $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T)$. In Section 6, we will show (in Proposition 6.6) that the collection of cones

$$(5.14) \quad \Xi_d := \{\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T) : (\mathcal{S}, T) \in \mathcal{P}_d\}$$

is the normal fan of the permuto-associahedron that we construct. Therefore, we call Ξ_d the *nested Loday fan*. In the remaining of this section, we will explore properties of $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T)$ and Ξ_d . The main goal of this subsection is to prove the following proposition, which establishes the connection between Ξ_d and the Kapranov poset.

Proposition 5.18. *The map $(\mathcal{S}, T) \mapsto \sigma(\mathcal{S}, T)$ gives a bijection from \mathcal{P}_d to Ξ_d . Furthermore, for any $(\mathcal{S}_1, T_1), (\mathcal{S}_2, T_2) \in \mathcal{P}_d$, we have that $(\mathcal{S}_1, T_1) \leq_{KP} (\mathcal{S}_2, T_2)$ in the Kapranov poset $K\Pi_d$ if and only if the cone $\sigma(\mathcal{S}_2, T_2)$ is a face of $\sigma(\mathcal{S}_1, T_1)$.*

First we prove the following lemma with various technical but basic facts about the cones $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T)$.

Lemma 5.19. *Let $(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) \in \mathcal{P}_d$ and choose $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}$ such that $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ refines \mathcal{S} . Recall $W_{\mathcal{S}}$ is defined in (5.10). We define the affine space*

$$(5.15) \quad W_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} := \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W_{\mathcal{S}} : D_i^\pi \mathbf{w} = D_j^\pi \mathbf{w}, \text{ if } i \equiv_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} j \right\} = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W_d : \begin{array}{l} w_i = w_j, \text{ if } i \equiv_{\mathcal{S}} j \\ D_i^\pi \mathbf{w} = D_j^\pi \mathbf{w}, \text{ if } i \equiv_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} j \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then the cone $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ has the following inequality description:

$$(5.16) \quad \sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} : \begin{array}{l} D_i^\pi \mathbf{w} \leq D_j^\pi \mathbf{w}, \text{ if } i \prec_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} j \\ D_\ell^\pi \mathbf{w} \geq 0, \text{ if } \ell \text{ is a minimal element of } \leq_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Moreover, the following statements hold:

- (1) *The cone $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ is full-dimensional in $W_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})}$, whose dimension is equal to the number of internal vertices of \mathbb{T} .*
- (2) *The inequality description (5.16) for $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ is facet-defining.*
- (3) *For every facet F of $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$, there exists $(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$ covering $(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ in $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$ such that $F = \sigma(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$. Conversely, for every $(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$ in $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$ that covers $(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$, its associated cone $\sigma(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$ is a facet of $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$.*

Proof. First, we observe that given the definition of $W_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})}$, the inequality description (5.16) clearly defines $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$. Hence, it is left to verify statements (1)–(3).

In order to make notation easy, we let $V(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ and $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ be the images of $W_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})}$ and $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ under the map $D^\pi : W_d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. Then

$$V(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) = \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \begin{array}{l} u_\ell = 0, \text{ if } \ell \notin \text{Type}(\mathcal{S}) \\ u_i = u_j, \text{ if } i \equiv_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} j \end{array} \right\},$$

and

$$(5.17) \quad K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) = \left\{ \mathbf{u} \in V(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) : \begin{array}{l} u_i \leq u_j, \text{ if } i \prec_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} j \\ u_\ell \geq 0, \text{ if } \ell \text{ is a minimal element of } \leq_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} \end{array} \right\}.$$

One important observation is that the linear map D^π is an isomorphism from W_d to \mathbb{R}^d . Hence, it suffices to show the following three corresponding statements:

- (C1) *The cone $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ is full-dimensional in $V(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$, whose dimension is equal to the number of internal vertices of \mathbb{T} .*
- (C2) *The inequality description (5.17) for $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ is facet-defining.*
- (C3) *For every facet K of $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$, there exists $(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$ covering $(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ in $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$ such that $K = K(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$. Conversely, for every $(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$ in $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$ that covers $(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$, the cone $K(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$ is a facet of $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$.*

We prove (C1) first. Recall that $\leq_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})}$ is a preorder on $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$. One sees that $V(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) \cong \{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{\text{Type}(\mathcal{S})} : u_i = u_j, \text{ if } i \equiv_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} j \}$. Clearly, the dimension of the latter is the number of equivalence classes in $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S}) / \equiv_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})}$, which is exactly the number of internal vertices of \mathbb{T} .

We now show that $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ is full-dimensional in $V(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$. Given that $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ is described by (5.17), it is enough to show there exists $\mathbf{u} \in V(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ such that

- (a) $u_i < u_j$, if $i \prec_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})} j$ and (b) $u_k > 0$ if k is a minimal element of $\leq_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})}$.

We can construct such a \mathbf{u} easily: First set $u_k = 0$ for each $k \in [d] \setminus \text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$. Next, noticing that the Haase diagram $G(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ for the preorder $\leq_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})}$ without labels is just \mathbb{T} which is a rooted tree, we set $u_i = d - k$ for each $i \in \text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$ that is a label for an internal vertex

that is k -distance away from the root of T . It is easy to see a vector \mathbf{u} constructed this way satisfies the desired conditions. Thus, $K(\mathcal{S}, T)$ is full-dimensional in $V(\mathcal{S}, T)$ (whose dimension is the number of internal vertices of T .) Hence, statement (C1) holds.

Next we prove (C2). There are two kinds of inequalities in (5.17). We treat them separately.

- i. Suppose $i \prec_{(\mathcal{S}, T)} j$, and assume that i and j are labels of the internal vertices x and y of T . Let T' be the tree obtained from T by contracting the internal edge $\{x, y\}$ and let $\mathcal{S}' := \mathcal{S}$. Clearly, we have $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S}') = \text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$, and thus $\preceq_{(\mathcal{S}, T)}$ and $\preceq_{(\mathcal{S}', T')}$ are two preorders on the same set. By Lemma 3.6 (4) and Remark 5.13, we conclude that $\preceq_{(\mathcal{S}', T')}$ is obtained from $\preceq_{(\mathcal{S}, T)}$ by merging the equivalence classes \bar{i} and \bar{j} . Hence, one sees that

$$K(\mathcal{S}, T) \cap \{\mathbf{u} : u_i = u_j\} = K(\mathcal{S}', T').$$

Since T' has one less internal vertex than T , it follows from property (C1) that $K(\mathcal{S}', T')$ is a facet of $K(\mathcal{S}, T)$. Therefore, the inequality $u_i \leq u_j$ is facet-defining.

- ii. Suppose ℓ is a minimal element of $\preceq_{(\mathcal{S}, T)}$, and assume ℓ is a label of the internal vertex p of (\mathcal{S}, T) . Clearly, p is a minimal internal vertex of T .

Let (\mathcal{S}', T') be the partition labeled tree obtained from (\mathcal{S}, T) by contracting all edges between p and its children in T while labeling this new leaf with the union of the labels of the children of p in T . More precisely, suppose $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k)$, and assume the children of p are labeled by S_a, S_{a+1}, \dots, S_b , then

$$\mathcal{S}' = (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{a-1}, \bigcup_{i=a}^b S_i, S_{b+1}, S_{b+2}, \dots, S_k).$$

Hence, if $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S}) = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{k-1})$ then $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S}') = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{a-1}, t_b, t_{b+1}, \dots, t_{k-1})$. One checks that $G(\mathcal{S}', T')$ is obtained from $G(\mathcal{S}, T)$ by removing p together with its adjacent edge and its labeling (which is $\{t_a, t_{a+1}, \dots, t_{b-1}\}$). Finally, using all these, we can verify that

$$K(\mathcal{S}, T) \cap \{\mathbf{u} : u_\ell = 0\} = K(\mathcal{S}', T').$$

Similarly, since T' has one less internal vertex than T , we have that $K(\mathcal{S}', T')$ is a facet of $K(\mathcal{S}, T)$, and thus the inequality $u_\ell \geq 0$ is facet-defining.

Finally, we prove (C3). Note that in the proof of (C2), the partition labeled tree (\mathcal{S}', T') we constructed in each case covers (\mathcal{S}, T) in $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$, and every (\mathcal{S}', T') covers (\mathcal{S}, T) arises from one of the inequality discussion. Therefore, (C3) follows. \square

Example 5.20. Let (\mathcal{S}, T) the [9]-partition labeled tree on the left of Figure 5. Since T has 8 internal vertices, by Lemma 5.19 (1), we have that $\dim \sigma(\mathcal{S}, T) = 8$. Recall there are two types, type i and type ii, of covering relations in $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$ defined in Definition 5.4. In the poset $\mathcal{K}\Pi_8$, our partition labeled tree (\mathcal{S}, T) are covered by 10 elements, 7 of which are obtained from (\mathcal{S}, T) by contracting a single internal edge of T and the remaining 3 are obtained by contracting the pairs of leaves $\{3, 7\}$, $\{8, 9\}$, $\{5, 2\}$ in T , respectively. By Lemma 5.19 (3), the cone $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T)$ has 10 facets, hence it is not simplicial.

Lemma 5.21. *If $(\mathcal{S}, T), (\mathcal{S}', T') \in \mathcal{P}_d$ are distinct, then $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T) \neq \sigma(\mathcal{S}', T')$ as cones in W_d .*

Proof. Suppose $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T) = \sigma(\mathcal{S}', T')$. We need to show $(\mathcal{S}, T) = (\mathcal{S}', T')$.

We first prove that $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}'$. Suppose $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_k)$. It follows from Lemma 5.19 that for any \mathbf{w} in the interior of $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$, we have $w_i = w_j$ if $i, j \in S_a$ for some a , and $w_i < w_j$ if $i \in S_a$ and $j \in S_b$ for some $a < b$. Since $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) = \sigma(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$, they have exactly the same interior. Thus, we must have that $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}'$.

Next, we show $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}'$. We choose π such that $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ refines $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}'$, and let $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) = D^\pi(\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}))$ and $K(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}') = D^\pi(\sigma(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}'))$ as defined in the proof of Lemma 5.19. Since $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) = \sigma(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$, we must have that $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) = K(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')$. Recall that $\leq_1 := \leq_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})}$ and $\leq_2 := \leq_{(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')}$ are preorders on $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S}) = \text{Type}(\mathcal{S}')$. We consider the modified version of preorder cones

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{\leq \ell} = \{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\text{Type}(\mathcal{S})} : u_i \leq u_j, \text{ if } i \leq_\ell j\}, \quad \ell = 1, 2,$$

defined in Definition 2.12. By description of $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ given in the proof of Lemma 5.19, one sees that $K(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) \cong \tilde{\sigma}_{\leq_1}$ and $K(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}') \cong \tilde{\sigma}_{\leq_2}$. Thus, $\tilde{\sigma}_{\leq_1} = \tilde{\sigma}_{\leq_2}$. Then it follows from Remark 2.13 that $\leq_1 = \leq_{(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})}$ and $\leq_2 = \leq_{(\mathcal{S}', \mathbb{T}')}$ are the same preorder on $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$. Since we can recover the tree from the Hasse diagram of the preorder, we must have that $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}'$, completing the proof. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.18. By the definition of Ξ_d , the map $(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) \mapsto \sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T})$ clearly is a surjection from \mathcal{P}_d to Ξ_d . Moreover, by Lemma 5.21, the map is injective. Therefore, the first conclusion of the proposition follows.

The second conclusion follows from Lemma 5.19 (3) and the transitivity of the poset. \square

5.5. Nested Loday fan. Recall the nested Loday fan Ξ_d is defined Equation (5.14). (As we mentioned before, the proof for that Ξ_d is fan will be completed in the next section. However, for convenience we still refer to Ξ_d as the nested Loday fan.) In this subsection, we explore further properties of Ξ_d , and summarize useful results that will be used in Section 6.

Let $\mathcal{K}_d \subseteq \Xi_d$ be the set of maximal cones (in terms of dimension). It then follows from Proposition 5.18 that the set Ξ_d is induced by \mathcal{K}_d . By Lemma 5.19 (1) and Lemma 5.6 (3), we see that

$$\mathcal{K}_d = \{\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) : (\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}) \text{ is a rank-1 element of } \mathcal{K}\Pi_d\} = \{\sigma(\mathcal{S}(\pi), \mathbb{T}) : (\pi, \mathbb{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}\},$$

and each cone has dimension d (and thus is full-dimensional in W_d). For ease of notation we define for any pair $(\pi, \mathbb{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$,

$$(5.18) \quad \sigma(\pi, \mathbb{T}) := \sigma(\mathcal{S}(\pi), \mathbb{T}).$$

Then for these maximal dimensional cones in \mathcal{K}_d , their descriptions in Definition 5.16 and expressions for their interiors can be simplified, recalling that $\sigma(\pi)$, $\sigma(\mathbb{T})$ and $\sigma^\circ(\pi)$ are described in (2.7), (3.1), and (2.8), respectively:

$$(5.19) \quad \sigma(\pi, \mathbb{T}) = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W_d : \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{w} \in \sigma(\pi) \\ D^\pi \mathbf{w} \in \sigma(\mathbb{T}) \end{array} \right\}, \text{ and } \sigma^\circ(\pi, \mathbb{T}) = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W_d : \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{w} \in \sigma^\circ(\pi) \\ D^\pi \mathbf{w} \in \sigma^\circ(\mathbb{T}) \end{array} \right\},$$

where by Lemma 2.11 (3),

$$(5.20) \quad \sigma^\circ(\mathbb{T}) = \{\mathbf{w} \in W_{d-1} : w_i < w_j \text{ if } i \prec_{\mathbb{T}} j\}.$$

Lemma 5.22. *Each cone $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_d$ is a union of nested braid cones. Furthermore, the collection of cones \mathcal{K}_d is a pointed conic dissection of W_d .*

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{K}_d$. Then $\sigma = \sigma(\pi, T)$ for some $(\pi, T) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$. By Lemma 2.11 (5) we know that $\sigma(T) = \bigcup_{\tau \in L[T]} \sigma(\tau)$, so combining Equation (5.19) together with the definition of nested braid cone as in Equation (5.5) we obtain

$$(5.21) \quad \sigma(\pi, T) = \bigcup_{\tau \in L[T]} \sigma(\pi, \tau).$$

Furthermore, for each fixed $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}$, it follows from Lemma 3.12 that each permutation $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_d$ appears in the above expression for exactly one $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$. By Lemma 5.10 the collection $\{\sigma(\pi, \tau) : (\pi, \tau) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathfrak{S}_d\}$ is a conic dissection of W_d , so we conclude that so is \mathcal{K}_d . Finally, by (5.19), we see that for any $(\pi, T) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$, the cone $\sigma(\pi, T) \subseteq \sigma(\pi)$. Since the latter is pointed, so is the former. \square

Lemma 5.24 below summarizes properties of Ξ_d , recalling $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}} = \bigcup_{k=2}^{d+1} \mathcal{O}_{d+1,k}$ is the set of all non-trivial ordered partitions of $[d+1]$.

Notation 5.23. For any $\mathcal{S} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}}$, if \mathcal{S} has k blocks, we define $T_{\mathcal{S}}$ to be the unique tree with one internal vertex and k leaves.

Lemma 5.24. *The nested Loday fan Ξ_d has the following properties:*

- (1) *The set $\mathcal{K}_d = \{\sigma(\pi, T) : (\pi, T) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}\}$ consists of all the d -dimensional cones in Ξ_d .*
- (2) *The set $\{\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T_{\mathcal{S}}) : \mathcal{S} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}}\}$ consists of all the 1-dimensional cones of Ξ_d . Moreover, for each $\mathcal{S} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}}$, the vector $\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{S}} \in W_d$ is a generator for the 1-dimensional cone $\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T_{\mathcal{S}})$.*
- (3) *The face poset of Ξ_d is isomorphic to the poset dual to $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d \setminus \hat{0}$.*
- (4) *The nested Loday fan Ξ_d is not simplicial for $d \geq 3$.*
- (5) *The nested Loday fan Ξ_d is a coarsening of the nested braid fan Br_d^2 .*

Proof. Condition (1) follows from our discussion on maximal dimensional cones, condition (3) follows from Proposition 5.18, and condition (5) follows from Lemma 5.22.

The first assertion in (2) follows from Lemma 5.19 (1) and Lemma 5.6 (4). Suppose $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k) \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1,k}}$. Then it is easy to check that

$$\sigma(\mathcal{S}, T_{\mathcal{S}}) = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in W_d : \begin{array}{l} w_i = w_j \text{ if } i, j \in S_a \text{ for some } a \\ w_i \leq w_j \text{ if } i \in S_a, j \in S_{a+1} \text{ for some } a \\ w_j - w_i = w_\ell - w_k \text{ if } i \in S_a, j \in S_{a+1}, k \in S_b, \ell \in S_{b+1} \text{ for some } a, b \end{array} \right\}.$$

One can verify that the vector $\mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a nonzero vector in the above cone. Therefore, the second assertion in (2) follows.

Example 5.20 shows a particular example which is not simplicial. In general it follows from Lemma 5.19 (3) that the number of facets of a d -dimensional cone $\sigma(\pi, T) \in \mathcal{K}_d$ is $a + b$ where a is the number of internal edges of T and b is the number of vertices adjacent to exactly two leaves. One checks that any tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$ has $a = 2d - (d + 1) = d - 1$, and if $d \geq 3$, there exists $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$ such that $b \geq 2$. Hence, there exist non simplicial cones for every $d \geq 3$. \square

6. REALIZATION OF THE PERMUTO-ASSOCIAHEDRON

Recall that a d -permuto-associahedron is a d -dimensional polytope whose face poset is isomorphic to $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$. Similar to Section 4, we follow the method outlined in the introduction to construct a realization for the permuto-associahedron.

6.1. Vertices of the nested permuto-associahedron. In this part, we will give a set of points that are vertex candidates of our realization. We start by adapting notation from Definition 4.1.

Notation 6.1. For any $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$, we let

$$\beta_{T,i} := \text{val}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, T_{(i)}).$$

Therefore, $\mathbf{v}_T^\beta = \sum_{i=1}^d \beta_{T,i} \mathbf{e}_i$.

Given strictly increasing sequences $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, for any $(\pi, T) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$, we define

$$(6.1) \quad \mathbf{v}_{\pi,T}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})} := \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \alpha_i \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(i)} + \sum_{i=1}^d \beta_{T,i} \mathbf{f}_i^\pi.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbf{v}_{\pi,T}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})}$ lies in U_d^α since the sum of its coordinates is $\sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \alpha_i$.

After rearranging coordinates in (6.1), we get the following expression:

$$(6.2) \quad \mathbf{v}_{\pi,T}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})} = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} (\alpha_i + (\beta_{T,i-1} - \beta_{T,i})) \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(i)},$$

where by convention we let $\beta_{T,0} = \beta_{T,d+1} = 0$. Parallel to Section 5.2, we say that $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is a \mathcal{T} -appropriate pair (of strictly increasing sequences), if for any complete binary tree $T \in \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$, the coefficients of $\mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(i)}$ in the above expansion increase strictly as i increases.

Remark 6.2. We remark that being an “appropriate pair” and being a “ \mathcal{T} -appropriate pair” are not equivalent. We can show for $d = 3$ that any \mathcal{T} -appropriate pair $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is an appropriate pair. We suspect that this implication is true in general; however, we do not have a proof. Since this is not relevant to the discussion of this paper, we leave it to interested readers. In any case, it is not hard to see that by scaling $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ with a sufficiently large factor, we can make $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ both “appropriate” and “ \mathcal{T} -appropriate”.

Definition 6.3. Suppose $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is a \mathcal{T} -appropriate pair of strictly increasing sequences. We define the *nested permuto-associahedron*

$$(6.3) \quad \text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) := \text{ConvexHull} \left(\mathbf{v}_{\pi,T}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})} : (\pi, T) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d} \right).$$

The next result is the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 6.4. *Let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ be a \mathcal{T} -appropriate pair of strictly increasing sequences. Then the face poset of the nested permuto-associahedron $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is the Kapranov poset $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$. Moreover, $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is a d -dimensional permuto-associahedron, and is a generalized nested permutohedron as well.*

6.2. Normal fan of nested permuto-associahedra. Recall that in §5.5 we have defined \mathcal{K}_d to be the set of maximal cones in Ξ_d , and have shown that \mathcal{K}_d is a conic dissection of W_d (see Lemma 5.22). The goal of this part is to use Lemma 2.5 to show that \mathcal{K}_d induces the normal fan of $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, as well as confirm the set of points $\left\{v_{\pi, \mathbb{T}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})}\right\}$ defined above is indeed the vertex set of $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$.

Lemma 6.5. *Suppose $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ is a \mathcal{T} -appropriate pair of strictly increasing sequences. Let $(\pi, \mathbb{T}), (\pi', \mathbb{T}') \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$. Then for every $\mathbf{w} \in \sigma^\circ(\pi, \mathbb{T})$, we have*

$$(6.4) \quad \left\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_{\pi, \mathbb{T}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} \right\rangle \geq \left\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_{\pi', \mathbb{T}'}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} \right\rangle$$

where the equality holds if and only if $(\pi, \mathbb{T}) = (\pi', \mathbb{T}')$.

Proof. We will prove the inequality by introducing an intermediate product and showing

$$(6.5) \quad \left\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_{\pi, \mathbb{T}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} \right\rangle \geq \left\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_{\pi, \mathbb{T}'}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} \right\rangle \geq \left\langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}_{\pi', \mathbb{T}'}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} \right\rangle,$$

where the first equality holds if and only if $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}'$ and the second equality holds if and only if $\pi = \pi'$.

We let $u_i = w_{\pi^{-1}(i)}$ for each i , which allows us to express \mathbf{w} as in (5.2) and have $D^\pi \mathbf{w} = D\mathbf{u}$. Then because $\mathbf{w} \in \sigma^\circ(\pi, \mathbb{T})$, we have the following conditions from Equation (5.19):

- (1) $D\mathbf{u} > 0$, which is equivalent to $u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_{d+1}$, and
- (2) $D_i \mathbf{u} < D_j \mathbf{u}$ if $i \prec_{\mathbb{T}} j$.

Expression (5.2), together with (6.2), allows us to compute products in (6.5) easily. Since the pair $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is \mathcal{T} -appropriate, we have that $(\alpha_i + (\beta_{\mathbb{T}', i-1} - \beta_{\mathbb{T}, i}))$ strictly increases as i increases. This, together with condition (1) above and the Rearrangement Inequality [17, Theorem 368] gives us the second inequality in (6.5) and that the equality holds if and only if $\pi = \pi'$.

Next we see that the first inequality in (6.5) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d+1} (\beta_{\mathbb{T}, i-1} - \beta_{\mathbb{T}, i}) u_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} (\beta_{\mathbb{T}', i-1} - \beta_{\mathbb{T}', i}) u_i.$$

After rearranging summations, the above inequality becomes

$$(6.6) \quad \left\langle D\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{T}}^\beta \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} (u_{i+1} - u_i) \beta_{\mathbb{T}, i} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} (u_{i+1} - u_i) \beta_{\mathbb{T}', i} = \left\langle D\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathbb{T}'}^\beta \right\rangle.$$

Then because $D\mathbf{u} \in \sigma^\circ(\mathbb{T})$, it follows from Corollary 4.10 that the inequality (6.6) holds and its equality holds if and only if $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{T}'$. \square

The following proposition is the key result of this subsection, characterizing the vertex set and the normal fan of the nested permuto-associahedron. It also provides the main ingredients we need for proving Theorem 6.4.

Proposition 6.6. *Let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ be a \mathcal{T} -appropriate pair of strictly increasing sequences.*

- (1) *The nested permuto-associahedron $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is full-dimensional in U_d^α and its vertex set is $\left\{v_{\pi, \mathbb{T}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} : (\pi, \mathbb{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}\right\}$.*

- (2) For each $(\pi, \mathsf{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$, we have $\sigma(\pi, \mathsf{T}) = \text{ncone} \left(v_{\pi, \mathsf{T}}^{(\alpha, \beta)}, \text{PermAsso}(\alpha, \beta) \right)$.
- (3) The normal fan of $\text{PermAsso}(\alpha, \beta)$ is $\Xi_d = \{\sigma(\mathcal{S}, \mathsf{T}) : (\mathcal{S}, \mathsf{T}) \in \mathcal{P}_d\}$. Hence, Ξ_d is a complete projective fan in W_d .

Proof. It follows from Lemmas 5.22 and 6.5 that the set of cones $\mathcal{K}_d = \{\sigma(\pi, \mathsf{T}) : (\pi, \mathsf{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}\}$ in W_d and the set of points $\{v_{\pi, \mathsf{T}}^{(\alpha, \beta)} : (\pi, \mathsf{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}\}$ in U_d^α satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 2.5. Hence, we conclude that the first two statements are true, and that the \mathcal{K}_d induces the normal fan of $\text{PermAsso}(\alpha, \beta)$. However, since \mathcal{K}_d contains all the maximal cones in Ξ_d , by Proposition 5.18, we have that Ξ_d is induced by \mathcal{K}_d . Therefore, (3) follows. \square

We can now prove our main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 6.4. By Proposition 6.6 (3) and Lemmas 5.24 (3) and 2.2, we have that the face poset of $\text{PermAsso}(\alpha, \beta)$ is the Kapranov poset $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$. Hence, we conclude that $\text{PermAsso}(\alpha, \beta)$ is a d -permuto-associahedron. Finally, it follows from Proposition 6.6 (3) and Lemma 5.24 (5) that $\text{PermAsso}(\alpha, \beta)$ is a generalized nested permutohedron. \square

6.3. Inequality description for nested permuto-associahedra. It follows from Proposition 6.6 that we can apply Lemma 2.6 to find an inequality description for the nested permuto-associahedron $\text{PermAsso}(\alpha, \beta)$.

Theorem 6.7. Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ be a \mathcal{T} -appropriate pair of strictly increasing sequences $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{\overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}}}$ is defined as follows: for each $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k) \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}}$, if $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S}) = (t_0, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k)$, let

$$(6.7) \quad b_{\mathcal{S}} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^k i \sum_{j=t_{i-1}+1}^{t_i} \alpha_j \right) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j - \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{|S_i|} \beta_j \right).$$

Then we have the following facet-defining inequality description for $\text{PermAsso}(\alpha, \beta)$:

$$(6.8) \quad \text{PermAsso}(\alpha, \beta) = \{ \mathbf{x} \in U_d^\alpha : \langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq b_{\mathcal{S}}, \quad \forall \mathcal{S} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}} \}.$$

Proof. Recall $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ and $\mathsf{T}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is defined in (5.1) and Notation 5.23, respectively. Applying Lemma 2.6 together with Proposition 5.18, Lemma 5.24 (1)(2), and Proposition 6.6 (2) one sees it is left to show that for any $\mathcal{S} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_{d+1}}$, if we choose $(\pi, \mathsf{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$ such that $(\mathcal{S}(\pi), \mathsf{T}) \leq_{KP} (\mathcal{S}, \mathsf{T}_{\mathcal{S}})$ in the Kapranov poset, then

$$(6.9) \quad \left\langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathbf{v}_{\pi, \mathsf{T}}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right\rangle = b_{\mathcal{S}},$$

where $b_{\mathcal{S}}$ is given by Equation (6.7).

We compute from the definitions in Equations (6.1) and (5.6):

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \left\langle \mathbf{e}_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathbf{v}_{\pi, \mathsf{T}}^{(\alpha, \beta)} \right\rangle &= \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^k i \mathbf{e}_{S_i}, \sum_{j=1}^{d+1} \alpha_j \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(j)} + \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_{\mathsf{T}, j} \mathbf{f}_j^\pi \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^k i \mathbf{e}_{S_i}, \sum_{j=1}^{d+1} \alpha_j \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(j)} \right\rangle + \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^k i \mathbf{e}_{S_i}, \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_{\mathsf{T}, j} \mathbf{f}_j^\pi \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We will show that the two terms in (6.10) are equal to the two terms in (6.7).

Note that the leaves of the partition labeled tree $(\mathcal{S}(\pi), \mathbb{T})$ are labeled by $\mathcal{S}(\pi) = (\{\pi^{-1}(1)\}, \{\pi^{-1}(2)\}, \dots, \{\pi^{-1}(d+1)\})$ from left to right. Since $(\mathcal{S}(\pi), \mathbb{T}) \leq_{KP} (\mathcal{S}, \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{S}})$, by the definition of the covering relation of the Kapranov poset, the followings are true:

(i) $\mathcal{S}(\pi)$ refines \mathcal{S} . Hence,

$$(6.11) \quad \pi^{-1}(j) \in S_i \text{ if and only if } t_{i-1} + 1 \leq j \leq t_i.$$

(ii) For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, there exists a subtree \mathbb{T}_i of \mathbb{T} such that the leaves of \mathbb{T}_i are labeled by $\{\pi^{-1}(j) : t_{i-1} + 1 \leq j \leq t_i\}$. Thus, $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}}(\mathbb{T}_i) = \{j : t_{i-1} + 1 \leq j \leq t_i - 1\}$.

Clearly, by (6.11), the first term in (6.10) is equal to the first term in (6.7).

Next, applying (6.11) again, we obtain that $\left\langle \sum_i i e_{S_i}, \mathbf{f}_j^\pi \right\rangle$ is 1 if $j \in \text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$ and is 0 otherwise. Therefore, the second term in (6.10) is equal to $\sum_{j \in \text{Type}(\mathcal{S})} \beta_{\mathbb{T}, j}$. By condition (ii) above, the set of labels for internal vertices of \mathbb{T} that do not appear in any of $\mathbb{T}_1, \dots, \mathbb{T}_k$ is exactly $\text{Type}(\mathcal{S})$. Therefore,

$$\sum_{j \in \text{Type}(\mathcal{S})} \beta_{\mathbb{T}, j} = \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_{\mathbb{T}, j} - \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}}(\mathbb{T}_i)} \beta_{\mathbb{T}, j}.$$

By Lemma 4.3, we have that

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \beta_{\mathbb{T}, j} = \sum_{j=1}^d \beta_j \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbb{T}}(\mathbb{T}_i)} \beta_{\mathbb{T}, j} = \sum_{j=1}^{|S_i|} \beta_j.$$

Therefore, we conclude that the second term in (6.10) is equal to the second term in (6.7), completing the proof. \square

Notice in particular that the set of facets of $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ and $\text{Perm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ are in bijection; in contrast to Corollary 4.16, the nested permuto-associahedron $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ cannot be obtained by removing facets from a nested permutohedron. We also remark that we do not have a Minkowski sum decomposition as in Corollary 4.17 for $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$.

7. SYMMETRIZATION

In this section we start by introducing the idea of symmetrization and derive basic results about it. We show that the nested permuto-associahedron can be obtained using this idea. Meanwhile, through examples we show that most associahedra cannot be symmetrized to permuto-associahedra. In the final part we briefly mention similarities and differences with Reiner and Ziegler's construction.

7.1. Symmetrizing polytopes. The main idea we will develop here is to start with a $(d-1)$ -dimensional polytope P in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , and construct a symmetrization of P that is d -dimensional with certain desired properties. We will explore necessary conditions for this construction and describe the normal fan of the symmetrization. This construction will be used in subsequent sections to recover our realization of permuto-associahedron and Reiner and Ziegler's realization.

Definition 7.1. We call a polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ *homogeneous* if the linear functional $\langle \mathbf{1}, \cdot \rangle$ is constant on P . In other words, P is homogeneous if and only if it is contained in the affine subspace U_d^α for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

We consider the permutation action of the symmetric group \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} on \mathbb{R}^{d+1} given by

$$\pi \mathbf{e}_i := \mathbf{e}_{\pi^{-1}(i)}, \text{ for each } \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \text{ and each } i \in [d+1].$$

Every affine subspace U_d^α is invariant under this action. Since $W_d = \mathbb{R}^{d+1}/\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{1}$ is \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} -invariant, then the permutation action is also well-defined on W_d .

We also define the *symmetrization* of a polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ to be the polytope

$$\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P) = \text{ConvexHull}\{\pi \mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} \in P, \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}\}.$$

Note that if α is a strictly increasing sequence, $\pi \alpha$ is exactly the same as v_π^α defined in (2.5), and $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(\alpha)$ is the usual permutohedron $\text{Perm}(\alpha)$, which is always full-dimensional in the d -dimensional space U_d^α . If $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is an arbitrary sequence of numbers, it is known that $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(\mathbf{x})$ is full-dimensional in $U_d^\mathbf{x}$ if \mathbf{x} contains at least two distinct entries.

The following lemma gives a necessary condition for a polytope P such that P and its symmetrization have the desired dimensions.

Lemma 7.2. *Let P be a $(d-1)$ -dimensional polytope in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . If $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)$ is a d -dimensional polytope, then P is homogeneous.*

Proof. Assume P is $(d-1)$ -dimensional and $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)$ is d -dimensional. We see that there exists $\mathbf{x} \in P$ that contains at least two distinct entries. (Otherwise, all points in P are multiples of $\mathbf{1}$, and then $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P) = P$ which is a contradiction to the dimension assumption.) Since $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(\mathbf{x})$ is full-dimensional in the d -dimensional space $U_d^\mathbf{x}$, the convex hull of $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(\mathbf{x})$ with any other point that is not in $U_d^\mathbf{x}$ is of dimension $d+1$. Therefore, any point in P must be in $U_d^\mathbf{x}$ and P is homogeneous. \square

From now on, every $(d-1)$ -dimensional polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ we use to symmetrize will be assumed to be homogeneous. Hence, P and $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)$ both live in U_d^α for some α and we consider their normal cones and normal fans are in W_d . Since P is codimension-1 in the space U_d^α , the following lemma is immediate.

Lemma 7.3. *Suppose $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is a homogeneous polytope of dimension $(d-1)$. Then there exists a unique nonzero $\gamma \in W_d$ (up to scalar) such that the linear functional $\langle \gamma, \cdot \rangle$ is constant on P .*

Next, we will construct the collection of cones that are candidates for maximal cones in the normal fan of $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)$.

Definition 7.4. Suppose $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is a homogeneous polytope of dimension $(d-1)$. For each vertex $\mathbf{v} \in P$, we define

$$\kappa(\pi, \mathbf{v}) := \sigma(\pi) \cap \pi[\text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, P)].$$

We then define

$$\mathcal{K}_P = \{\kappa(\pi, \mathbf{v}) : \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \text{ and } \mathbf{v} \text{ is a vertex of } P\}$$

to be the collection of these cones.

The braid cone associated to the identity permutation is called the *fundamental chamber* of Br_d and it is denoted Φ_d . It is easy to verify that $\pi\Phi_d = \sigma(\pi)$. Therefore,

$$(7.1) \quad \kappa(\pi, \mathbf{v}) = \pi\Phi_d \cap \pi[\text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, P)] = \pi(\Phi_d \cap \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, P)).$$

Lemma 7.5. *Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a homogeneous polytope of dimension $(d-1)$ and let $\gamma \in W_d$ be the linear functional obtained from Lemma 7.3. (So $\langle \gamma, \cdot \rangle$ is constant on P .)*

If $\gamma \in \Phi_d^\circ$, then the collection of cones \mathcal{K}_P is a pointed conic dissection of W_d .

Proof. For any $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}$ and any vertex \mathbf{v} of P , the cone $\kappa(\pi, \mathbf{v})$ is contained in the pointed cone $\sigma(\pi)$, and hence is pointed as well. We will verify that \mathcal{K}_P satisfies the properties of being a conic dissection given in Definition 2.3.

We first show that for each vertex \mathbf{v} of P and each $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}$, we have that the cone $\kappa(\pi, \mathbf{v})$ is full-dimensional in W_d . By Expression (7.1) and the fact that π is an isomorphism from W_d to W_d , it is enough to show that $\Phi_d \cap \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, P)$ is full-dimensional. Since $\langle \gamma, \cdot \rangle$ is constant on P , we have that $\gamma \in \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, P)$. Given that $\gamma \in \Phi_d^\circ$, we conclude that $\Phi_d^\circ \cap \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, P)$ is nonempty. This together with the fact that both Φ_d and $\text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, P)$ are full-dimensional cones in W_d implies that $\Phi_d \cap \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, P)$ is full-dimensional. Therefore, \mathcal{K}_P is a set of full-dimensional cones in W_d .

To finish the proof, we need to verify that \mathcal{K}_P satisfies Properties (1) and (2) in Definition 2.3. However, these follow immediately from the definition of $\kappa(\pi, \mathbf{v})$ and the fact that $\{\sigma(\pi) : \pi \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}\}$ and $\{\text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, P) : \mathbf{v} \text{ is a vertex of } P\}$ are both conic dissections of W_d . \square

We remark that without the assumption that $\gamma \in \Phi_d^\circ$, Lemma 7.5 is not true.

Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a homogeneous polytope. We say P is *appropriate* if every point in P has strictly increasing entries. Notice that to verify a polytope P is appropriate, it is enough to check that every vertex of P has strictly increasing entries.

Proposition 7.6. *Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a homogeneous and appropriate polytope of dimension $(d-1)$ with vertex set \mathbf{V} , and let $\gamma \in W_d$ be the linear functional obtained from Lemma 7.3.*

Suppose $\gamma \in \Phi_d^\circ$. Then the following statements are true.

- (1) *The symmetrization $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)$ is a homogeneous polytope of dimension d and its vertex set is*

$$\mathfrak{S}\mathbf{V} := \{\pi\mathbf{v} : (\pi, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathbf{V}\}.$$

- (2) *For each $(\pi, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathbf{V}$, we have*

$$(7.2) \quad \text{ncone}(\pi\mathbf{v}, \mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)) = \kappa(\pi, \mathbf{v}) = \sigma(\pi) \cap \pi[\text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, P)].$$

Proof. Since P is homogeneous, there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ such that $P \subseteq U_d^\alpha$. Clearly, $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)$ is a homogeneous polytope in the d -dimensional space U_d^α . Hence, the first part of Statement (1) is equivalent to that $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)$ is a full-dimensional polytope in U_d^α .

We claim that for any distinct pairs $(\pi, \mathbf{v}), (\pi', \mathbf{v}') \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathbf{V}$, we have that

$$(7.3) \quad \langle \mathbf{w}, \pi\mathbf{v} \rangle > \langle \mathbf{w}, \pi'\mathbf{v}' \rangle \quad \forall \mathbf{w} \in \kappa^\circ(\pi, \mathbf{v}).$$

Assuming the claim, one sees that the set of cones $\mathcal{K}_P = \{\kappa(\sigma, \mathbf{v}) : (\sigma, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathbf{V}\}$ and the set of points $\mathfrak{S}\mathbf{V}$ satisfy the hypothesis of Lemma 2.5. Thus, both statements of this proposition follow Lemma 2.5. Therefore, it is left to verify our claim.

We prove (7.3) by introducing an intermediate product and showing

$$(7.4) \quad \langle \mathbf{w}, \pi \mathbf{v} \rangle \geq \langle \mathbf{w}, \pi \mathbf{v}' \rangle \geq \langle \mathbf{w}, \pi' \mathbf{v}' \rangle$$

where the first equality holds if and only if $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}'$ and the second equality holds if and only if $\pi = \pi'$. Applying π^{-1} on all the entries in (7.4) and letting $\mathbf{u} = \pi^{-1} \mathbf{w}$, we obtain an equivalent form

$$(7.5) \quad \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \geq \langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}' \rangle \geq \langle \mathbf{u}, \pi^{-1} \pi' \mathbf{v}' \rangle.$$

By the Expression (7.1), one sees that $\mathbf{w} \in \kappa^\circ(\pi, \mathbf{v})$ implies that $\mathbf{u} \in \Phi_d^\circ \cap \text{ncone}^\circ(\mathbf{v}, P)$. Because $\mathbf{u} \in \text{ncone}^\circ(\mathbf{v}, P)$, we conclude that the first inequality in (7.5) holds and the equality hold if and only if $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}'$.

Since P is appropriate, the vertex \mathbf{v}' has strictly increasing sequence. This together with the fact that $\mathbf{u} \in \Phi_d^\circ$ and the Rearrangement Inequality [17, Theorem 368] implies the second inequality in (7.5) and that the equality hold if and only if $\pi = \pi'$. \square

In the next two subsections, we show how both our nested permutio-associahedron and Reiner and Ziegler's permutio-associahedron are symmetrizations of carefully chosen $(d-1)$ -dimensional associahedra. We will see that the symmetrization idea alone is not enough to complete the realization of Kapranov's poset. In fact we will show low dimensional examples in § 7.2.1 that indicate that the symmetrization of an arbitrary $(d-1)$ -dimensional associaheron is rarely a d -permutio-associahedron.

7.2. Examples of symmetrization. We start this part by recovering our construction of nested permutio-associahedra with this symmetrization point of view. Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. For each $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{i=1}^d x_i \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define

$$\phi^\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \sum_{i=1}^d x_i (\mathbf{e}_{i+1} - \mathbf{e}_i).$$

Clearly, ϕ^α is an invertible affine transformation from $\mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow U_d^\alpha$.

Let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ be an appropriate pair of strictly increasing sequences. Recall the vertex set of $\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ is given by $\{\mathbf{v}_T^\beta : T \in \mathcal{T}_{d,d}\}$ (see Definition 4.1 and Notation 6.1) and the definition of $\mathbf{v}_{\text{id},T}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})}$ in (6.1). Let id be the identity permutation in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} . One can verify that

$$\phi^\alpha(\mathbf{v}_T^\beta) = \mathbf{v}_{\pi,T}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})}, \quad \forall T \in \mathcal{T}_{d,d}.$$

Hence, $\phi^\alpha(\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))$ is a $(d-1)$ -dimensional associahedron embedded in U_d^α and its vertex set is

$$\{\mathbf{v}_{\text{id},T}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})} : T \in \mathcal{T}_{d,d}\}.$$

Finally, by direct inspection on Equation (6.1) again, we see that the symmetrization of $\phi^\alpha(\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))$ is:

$$\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(\phi^\alpha(\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))) = \text{ConvexHull} \left\{ \mathbf{v}_{\pi,T}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta})} : (\pi, T) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d} \right\}$$

which is exactly the nested permutio-associahedron $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ defined in (6.3). Now we apply Proposition 7.6 to recover a couple results on $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ that we have obtained before.

Corollary 7.7. *Let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ be an appropriate pair of strictly increasing sequences. Then the following statements are true.*

(1) $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is homogeneous polytope of dimension d and its vertex set is

$$\left\{ \mathbf{v}_{\pi, \mathbb{T}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} : (\pi, \mathbb{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d} \right\}.$$

(2) For each $(\pi, \mathbb{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d}$, we have

$$(7.6) \quad \text{ncone} \left(\mathbf{v}_{\pi, \mathbb{T}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})}, \text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right) = \sigma(\pi) \cap \pi [\phi^\alpha(\sigma(\mathbb{T}))].$$

Proof. Let $P = \phi^\alpha(\text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))$. Since $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is an appropriate pair, one verifies that P is appropriate. This together with our early discussion gives that P is a homogeneous and appropriate polytope of dimension $(d-1)$ with vertex set $\mathbf{V} = \left\{ \mathbf{v}_{\text{id}, \mathbb{T}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} : \mathbb{T} \in \mathcal{T}_{d,d} \right\}$. Note that

$$(7.7) \quad \mathbf{v}_{\text{id}, \mathbb{T}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})} = \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \sum_{i=1}^d \beta_{\mathbb{T}, i} (\mathbf{e}_{i+1} - \mathbf{e}_i),$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (1, 2, 3, \dots, d+1) \in \Phi_d^\circ$. Since $\langle \boldsymbol{\gamma}, (\mathbf{e}_{i+1} - \mathbf{e}_i) \rangle = 1$ for each i , it follows from Lemma 4.3 that the linear functional $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is constant on each vertex in \mathbf{V} and thus is constant on P . Therefore, the hypothesis of Proposition 7.6 is satisfied, and the conclusions of this lemma follow from the fact that $\text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{id}, \mathbb{T}}^{(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})}, \text{LodAsso}(\boldsymbol{\beta})) = \sigma(\mathbb{T})$ and that ϕ^α is an isomorphism. \square

One can check that the right hand of (7.6) is exactly $\sigma(\pi, \mathbb{T})$ given in (5.19). Hence, this corollary recovers the first two statements in Proposition 6.6. The second statement tells us that the normal fan of $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is induced by the set of cones:

$$(7.8) \quad \{ \sigma(\pi) \cap \pi [\phi^\alpha(\sigma(\mathbb{T}))] : (\pi, \mathbb{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d} \} = \{ \sigma(\pi, \mathbb{T}) : (\pi, \mathbb{T}) \in \mathfrak{S}_{d+1} \times \mathcal{T}_{d,d} \}.$$

However, this is not enough to conclude that $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ realizes Kapranov's poset $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d$ as the corollary does not tell us the face structure of the normal fan. One still needs to show that the face poset of the fan induced by the set (7.8) is isomorphic to the poset dual to $\mathcal{K}\Pi_d \setminus \hat{0}$. So our discussion in §5.4 and §5.5 cannot be avoided.

The general idea is to construct a d -permuto-associahedron as a homogeneous polytope in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} by symmetrizing an appropriate homogeneous $(d-1)$ -associahedron A . Below we will work on examples with $d=3$ and show that most choices for A will not work.

7.2.1. Examples with $d=3$. By Proposition 7.6, the intersections of the normal cones of a $(d-1)$ -dimensional appropriate homogeneous polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ with the fundamental chamber Φ_d determine the normal fan of $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)$. So we call this set of intersections

$$\{ \Phi_d \cap \sigma : \sigma \in \Sigma(P) \},$$

which is a (non-complete) fan, the *fundamental fan* of P . Since the normal fan of $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)$ is the symmetrization of the fundamental fan of P , by looking at the latter we can already determine whether $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(P)$ is a permuto-associahedron or not.

We will focus on $d=3$ and depict the corresponding fundamental fans in two dimensions by taking an affine slice. Note that two-dimensional associahedra are simply pentagons. In examples below, We will see how different pentagons $A \subseteq U$ are symmetrized to combinatorially different polytopes. We call an $(d-1)$ associahedron *good* if its symmetrization is

a d -permuto-associahedron, otherwise we call it *bad*. In particular, a pentagon is *good* if its symmetrization is a 3-permuto-associahedron, and is *bad* otherwise.

All pentagons in our examples are contained in the affine subspace

$$U := U_3^\alpha \text{ with } \alpha := (4, 8, 12, 16),$$

and can be shown to be appropriate (which we won't prove).

Example 7.8. We start by analyzing a good pentagon. Let $B = \text{LodAsso}(1, 2, 3) \subseteq U_2^{(1,2,3)}$, which is a removedhedron obtained from $\text{Perm}(1, 2, 3)$, and let $A = \phi^\alpha(B) \subseteq U$ be the image of B under ϕ^α . By Corollary 7.7, we know that the symmetrization of A is the permuto-associahedron $\text{PermAsso}(\alpha, (1, 2, 3))$. Hence, A is a good pentagon.

On the left hand side of Figure 7 we see the pentagon A together with an affine slice of its fundamental fan, and on the right hand side, we see its symmetrization which is a permuto-associahedron. Notice how the combinatorics of the pictures in the left and right match each other: On the left, the slice of the cone $\Phi_3 \cap \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, A)$ is a quadrilateral in which two edges are on the boundary. This corresponds to the fact that on the right, this vertex is adjacent to two vertices that belong to other pentagons. For any vertex $\mathbf{v}' \neq \mathbf{v}$ of A , the slice of the cone $\Phi_3 \cap \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}', A)$ is a triangle in which only one edge is on the boundary, corresponding to the fact that the vertex \mathbf{v}' is only adjacent to one vertex in a pentagon other than A .




FIGURE 7. An associahedron that symmetrizes to a permuto-associahedron.

Example 7.9. A removedhedron in $U_2^{(1,2,3)}$ embedded in U using ϕ^α is not always good. Let B be the removedhedron obtained from $\text{Perm}(1, 2, 3)$ by removing the edge $\{(312), (213)\}$, and let $A = \phi^\alpha(B)$. In practice A is equal to a 60° rotation of $\phi^\alpha(\text{LodAsso}(1, 2, 3))$. However, the fundamental chamber Φ_3 is not invariant under such rotation. We can see in Figure 8 the combinatorics of the fundamental fan of A is different from that in the last Example: for any vertex \mathbf{v} of A , the slice of the cone $\Phi_3 \cap \text{ncone}(\mathbf{v}, A)$ is a triangle in which only one edge is on the boundary, corresponding to the fact that the vertex is only adjacent to one

vertex in a pentagon other than A . The right hand side of Figure 8 is the symmetrization of A , which is not a permutto-associahedron. Hence, A is a bad pentagon.




FIGURE 8. A bad generalized permutohedron.

Suppose A is a good pentagon. So $\mathfrak{S}_4(A)$ is a 3-dimensional permutto-associahedron. For each vertex v of A , we define the *outside degree* of v to be the number of vertices in $\mathfrak{S}_4(A)$ that are not vertices of A but are adjacent to v . Let X be the sum of *outside degrees* of all vertices of A . We call X the *total outside degree* of A . With an easy calculation, one sees that the number of edges of $\mathfrak{S}_4(A)$ is equal to $12X + 120$. However, by looking at Kapranov's poset $\mathcal{K}\Pi_3$, one sees that the f -vector of a 3-dimensional permutto-associahedron is $(1, 120, 192, 74, 1)$. Hence,

$$12X + 120 = 192 \implies X = 6.$$

The above discussion gives us a necessary condition for a pentagon A to be good: the total outside degree is 6. Using the language of fans, we need that its fundamental fan to have 6 two-dimensional cones on the boundary, which are corresponding to the 6 edges on the boundary of a slice of it fundamental fan. This is the case for pentagon in Example 7.8, but not the pentagon in Example 7.9.

Unfortunately, this condition is not sufficient as we will see in the following example.

Example 7.10. In Figure 9, we see a small perturbation A of the pentagon in Figure 8. The corresponding fundamental fan has the desired property. This implies that the symmetrization of A has the same number of vertices and edges (and thus the same f -vector) of a 3-permutto-associahedron but one can check in the picture on the right hand side that the resulting polytope is not combinatorially isomorphic to the polytope in Figure 7b.

Even though the necessary condition we derived above is not sufficient, it is still easy to use it to eliminate certain bad pentagons quickly as we show in the next two examples.




FIGURE 9. A curious example.

Example 7.11. All regular pentagons in U are bad: Consider a regular pentagon together with a slice of its fundamental fan, as shown in Figure 10. Any rotation of it induces 7 or 8 edges on the boundary.




FIGURE 10. A regular pentagon in U_3

Example 7.12. A generic (appropriate) pentagon in U is bad: One can check that a slice of its fundamental fan has 8 edges on the boundary.

7.3. Symmetrizing secondary polytopes. As we have seen in Example 7.12, a generic homogeneous $(d-1)$ -dimensional associahedron in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} does not symmetrize to a d -permutassociahedron. We verified in §7.2 that our nested permutassociahedron $\text{PermAsso}(\alpha, \beta)$ is the symmetrization of a carefully chosen associahedron. In [28], Reiner and Ziegler constructed a d -permutassociahedron [28] which can also be understood using the symmetrization idea (even though they did not introduce this concept). We will briefly discuss this construction below.

As mentioned in the introduction one of the earliest realizations of the d -associahedron was given by Gelfand, Kapranov, and Zelevinsky as the secondary polytope of a polygon with $(d + 2)$ vertices [16]. In Reiner-Ziegler's work, they choose the cyclic polygon

$$(7.9) \quad C_{d+1} = \text{ConvexHull}\{(0, 0), (1, 1), (2, 4), \dots, (d, d^2)\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2,$$

and construct a $(d - 1)$ -associahedron, denoted by A_{d-1}^{GKZ} , as the secondary polytope of C_{d+1} . One can verify that the associahedron A_{d-1}^{GKZ} is a homogeneous polytope in \mathbb{R}^{d+2} .

Reiner and Ziegler then apply a linear transformation to convert A_{d-1}^{GKZ} into a homogenous $(d - 1)$ -dimensional associahedron, denoted A_{d-1}^{RZ} , in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . One can check that the linear function $\gamma = (0, 1, \dots, d) \in W_d$ is constant on A_{d-1}^{RZ} . (Note that existence of γ is assumed by Lemma 7.3.) Finally they construct their permuto-associahedron as the symmetrization $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(A_{d-1}^{\text{RZ}})$ of A_{d-1}^{RZ} .

In [34, Theorem 9.15], Reiner and Ziegler give an explicit formula for the coordinates of the vertices of A_{d-1}^{RZ} . Using this formula it is not clear if A_{d-1}^{RZ} is appropriate, that is, if the coordinates of each of its vertices are strictly increasing. However, this follows from their description of the vertex-to-facets incidences of $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(A_{d-1}^{\text{RZ}})$: Their results imply that the polytope A_{d-1}^{RZ} is the facet of $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(A_{d-1}^{\text{RZ}})$ that maximizes the linear functional $\gamma = (0, 1, 2, \dots, d)$. It follows from the Rearrangement Inequality that each vertex of A_{d-1}^{RZ} has nondecreasing coordinates. Finally, the coordinates have to be strictly increasing because $\#\text{Vertices}(\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(A_{d-1}^{\text{RZ}})) = (d + 1)! \#\text{Vertices}(A_{d-1}^{\text{RZ}})$.

Now we know that $A_{d-1}^{\text{RZ}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is a homogeneous and appropriate polytope of dimension $d - 1$ which means that it satisfies the conditions of Proposition 7.6. However, as we've discussed this alone is not enough to conclude that $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(A_{d-1}^{\text{RZ}})$ is a d -permuto-associahedron. To prove that $\mathfrak{S}_{d+1}(A_{d-1}^{\text{RZ}})$ realizes Kapranov's poset, Reiner and Ziegler use a strategy highlighted in [28, Lemma 20] (see also the proof of [34, Theorem 9.15] for an overview of the main ideas); they compute its vertices and facet inequalities and then show that the incidence graph (between vertices and facets) is the right one.




FIGURE 11. Reiner and Ziegler's construction in dimension three.

Remark 7.13. The linear map Reiner and Ziegler use to transform A_{d-1}^{GKZ} into A_{d-1}^{RZ} is constructed based on the fact that A_{d-1}^{GKZ} is the secondary polytope of the cyclic polygon defined in Equation (7.9). If A is the secondary polytope of a different polygon, Reiner and Ziegler’s map could fail to make it homogeneous in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} . Hence, we do not always obtain a good associahedron.

Reiner and Ziegler’s construction and ours have different normal fans. In fact, the sets of rays of these two normal fans are different: Both normal fans have a ray generator for each ordered set partition. Suppose $\mathcal{S} = (S_1, \dots, S_k) \in \mathcal{O}_{d+1}$ with type vector (t_1, \dots, t_{k-1}) . Reiner and Ziegler associate \mathcal{S} with the ray spanned by $\sum_{i=1}^k (t_i + t_{i-1})\mathbf{e}_{S_i} \in W_d$, where by convention $t_0 = 0$ and $t_k = d + 1$. On the other hand, we associate \mathcal{S} with the ray spanned by $\sum_{i=1}^k i\mathbf{e}_{S_i} \in W_d$.

One more difference we want to mention is that Reiner and Ziegler’s construction is surprisingly *inscribable* (all vertices lie on a sphere), whereas ours never is. Indeed any nested permuto-associahedron $\text{PermAsso}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ of dimension greater than one will have a Loday pentagon as a face and these pentagons are never inscribable.

We close with two questions about realizations of the permuto-associahedron.

Question 7.14. Can any $(d - 1)$ -dimensional associahedron A be linearly mapped into a good associahedron in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} ? By Remark 7.13 this is not even clear if A is a secondary polytopes constructed from arbitrary polygons.

Question 7.15. Can we *prescribe* a $(d - 1)$ -dimensional associahedron A appearing a facet of a d -permuto-associahedron in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} ? That is, can any $(d - 1)$ -associahedron $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be a facet of a d -permuto-associahedron in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} ? By Example 7.11 the answer is no if we only consider permuto-associahedra arising as symmetrizations of associahedra, but there may be other realizations without using the idea of symmetrization.

REFERENCES

- [1] Marcelo Aguiar and Federico Ardila. Hopf monoids and generalized permutahedra, 2017.
- [2] Djordje Baralić, Jelena Ivanović, and Zoran Petrić. A simple permutoassociahedron. *Discrete Math.*, 342(12):111591, 18, 2019.
- [3] Alexander Barvinok. *A course in convexity*, volume 54 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [4] Margaret Bayer, Bennet Goeckner, Su Ji Hong, Tyrrell McAllister, McCabe Olsen, Casey Pinckney, Julianne Vega, and Martha Yip. Lattice polytopes from schur and symmetric grothendieck polynomials, 2020.
- [5] Louis J Billera and Bernd Sturmfels. Fiber polytopes. *Annals of Mathematics*, 135(3):527–549, 1992.
- [6] Roswitha Blind and Peter Mani-Levitska. Puzzles and polytope isomorphisms. *Aequationes Math.*, 34(2-3):287–297, 1987.
- [7] Federico Castillo and Fu Liu. Deformation Cones of Nested Braid Fans. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 06 2020. rnaa090.
- [8] Cesar Ceballos, Francisco Santos, and Günter M. Ziegler. Many non-equivalent realizations of the associahedron. *Combinatorica*, 35(5):513–551, 2015.
- [9] Frédéric Chapoton. Algèbres de Hopf des permutahédres, associahédres et hypercubes. *Adv. Math.*, 150(2):264–275, 2000.
- [10] Frédéric Chapoton, Sergey Fomin, and Andrei Zelevinsky. Polytopal realizations of generalized associahedra. volume 45, pages 537–566. 2002. Dedicated to Robert V. Moody.
- [11] M. Davis, T. Januszkiewicz, and R. Scott. Fundamental groups of blow-ups. *Adv. Math.*, 177(1):115–179, 2003.

- [12] Sergey Fomin and Nathan Reading. Generalized cluster complexes and Coxeter combinatorics. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (44):2709–2757, 2005.
- [13] Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky. Cluster algebras. II. Finite type classification. *Invent. Math.*, 154(1):63–121, 2003.
- [14] Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky. Y -systems and generalized associahedra. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 158(3):977–1018, 2003.
- [15] Giovanni Gaiffi. Permutonestohedra. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 41(1):125–155, 2015.
- [16] I. M. Gel'fand, M. M. Kapranov, and A. V. Zelevinsky. *Discriminants, resultants, and multidimensional determinants*. Mathematics: Theory & Applications. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1994.
- [17] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya. *Inequalities*. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1952. 2d ed.
- [18] Gil Kalai. A simple way to tell a simple polytope from its graph. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 49(2):381–383, 1988.
- [19] Mikhail M. Kapranov. The permutostohedron, Mac Lane’s coherence theorem and asymptotic zones for the KZ equation. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 85(2):119–142, 1993.
- [20] Ralph M. Kaufmann and R. Schwell. Associahedra, cyclohedra and a topological solution to the A_∞ Deligne conjecture. *Adv. Math.*, 223(6):2166–2199, 2010.
- [21] Carsten Lange and Vincent Pilaud. Associahedra via spines. *Combinatorica*, 38(2):443–486, 2018.
- [22] Jean-Louis Loday. Realization of the Stasheff polytope. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 83(3):267–278, 2004.
- [23] Saunders Mac Lane. Natural associativity and commutativity. *Rice Univ. Stud.*, 49(4):28–46, 1963.
- [24] Vincent Pilaud. Which nestohedra are removalhedra? *Rev. Colombiana Mat.*, 51(1):21–42, 2017.
- [25] Alex Postnikov, Victor Reiner, and Lauren Williams. Faces of generalized permutohedra. *Doc. Math.*, 13:207–273, 2008.
- [26] Alexander Postnikov. Permutohedra, associahedra, and beyond. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (6):1026–1106, 2009.
- [27] Nathan Reading. Cambrian lattices. *Adv. Math.*, 205(2):313–353, 2006.
- [28] Victor Reiner and Günter M. Ziegler. Coxeter-associahedra. *Mathematika*, 41(2):364–393, 1994.
- [29] Pieter Hendrik Schoute. *Analytical treatment of the polytopes regularly derived from the regular polytopes*, volume 11. J. Müller, 1913.
- [30] Richard P. Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics. Volume 1*, volume 49 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2012.
- [31] James Dillon Stasheff. Homotopy associativity of H -spaces. I, II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 108 (1963), 275–292; *ibid.*, 108:293–312, 1963.
- [32] Jim Stasheff. From operads to “physically” inspired theories. In *Operads: Proceedings of Renaissance Conferences (Hartford, CT/Luminy, 1995)*, volume 202 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 53–81. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.
- [33] Salvatore Stella. Polyhedral models for generalized associahedra via Coxeter elements. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 38(1):121–158, 2013.
- [34] Günter M. Ziegler. *Lectures on polytopes*, volume 152 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

FEDERICO CASTILLO, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DE CHILE, SANTIAGO, CHILE

Email address: federico.castillo@mat.uc.cl

FU LIU, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS, ONE SHIELDS AVENUE, DAVIS, CA 95616 USA.

Email address: fuliu@math.ucdavis.edu