

# Poset Structure concerning Cylindric Diagrams

Kento Nakada\*, Takeshi Suzuki† and Yoshitaka Toyosawa‡

## Abstract

The purpose of the present paper is to give a realization of a cylindric diagram as a subset of root systems of type  $A_{\kappa-1}^{(1)}$  and several characterization of its poset structure. Furthermore, the set of order ideals of a cylindric diagram is described as a weak Bruhat interval of the Weyl group.

## Introduction

A *periodic (Young) diagram* is a Young diagram consisting of infinitely many cells in  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  which is invariant under parallel translations generated by a certain vector  $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  called the period (see Figure 1). The image of a periodic diagram under the natural projection onto the cylinder  $\mathbb{Z}^2/\mathbb{Z}\omega$  is called a *cylindric diagram*. Diagrams given as a set-difference of two cylindric diagrams are called cylindric skew diagrams.

We note that cylindric skew diagrams have been known to parameterize a certain class of irreducible modules over the Cherednik algebras (double affine Hecke algebras) ([12, 13]) and the (degenerate) affine Hecke algebras ([1, 6]) of type  $A$ , where standard tableaux on those diagrams also appear.

Let  $\omega = (m, -\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\leq -1}$  and let  $\theta$  be a cylindric diagram in  $\mathbb{Z}^2/\mathbb{Z}\omega$ . The lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  admits a partial order  $\leq$  defined by

$$(a, b) \leq (c, d) \iff a \geq c \text{ and } b \geq d,$$

which induces a poset structure on  $\mathbb{Z}^2/\mathbb{Z}\omega$  and also on  $\theta$ . Together with the content map  $\mathbf{c} : \theta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}$ , where  $\mathbf{c}(a, b) = b - a \pmod{\kappa}$  and  $\kappa = \ell + m$ , the cylindric digram  $\theta$  is a locally finite  $\mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}$ -colored  $d$ -complete poset in the sense of [9, 10].

The purpose of the present paper is to investigate the poset  $(\theta, \leq)$  as well as the poset  $(\mathcal{J}(\theta), \subset)$ , where  $\mathcal{J}(\theta)$  denotes the set of cylindric skew diagrams (or proper order ideals) included in  $\theta$ .

---

\*Graduate School of Education, Okayama University, Japan e-mail address: nakada@okayama-u.ac.jp

†Graduate School of Natural Science and Technology, Okayama University, Japan e-mail address: suzuki@math.okayama-u.ac.jp

‡e-mail address: prkr5rq9@s.okayama-u.ac.jp




Figure 1: A periodic diagram of period  $\omega = (4, -5)$ .

We briefly review a description in the classical case. Let  $\lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$  be a finite Young diagram. The associated Grassmannian permutation  $w_\lambda$  is an element of the Weyl group of the root system  $R$  of type  $A_n$  where  $n = \#\{\mathbf{c}(x) \mid x \in \lambda\}$ . It is known that the poset  $(\lambda, \leq)$  is dually isomorphic to the poset  $(R(w_\lambda^{-1}), \leq^{\text{or}})$ , where  $R(w_\lambda^{-1}) := R_+ \cap w_\lambda^{-1}R_-$  and  $\leq^{\text{or}}$  is the ordinary order (or the standard order) defined by

$$\alpha \leq^{\text{or}} \beta \iff \beta - \alpha \in \sum_{i \in [1, n]} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha_i$$

for  $\alpha, \beta \in R(w_\lambda)$  with  $\Pi$  being the set of simple roots ([7]).

Let  $\theta$  be a cylindric diagram in  $\mathbb{Z}^2/\mathbb{Z}\omega$ . We would like to describe the poset  $(\theta, \leq)$  in terms of the root system of type  $A_{\kappa-1}^{(1)}$  with  $\kappa = \ell + m$ .

A key ingredient in our approach is the *colored hook length* ([2, 4]), given by

$$\mathbf{h}(x) = \sum_{y \in H(x)} \alpha_{\mathbf{c}(y)} \quad (x \in \theta),$$

where  $H(x)$  denotes the hook at  $x$  and  $\alpha_i$  are simple roots. (See Section 2.1 for precise definitions.) We will show that the map  $\mathbf{h}$  embeds the cylindric diagram  $\theta$  into the set  $R_+$  of positive (real) roots, and that the image  $\mathbf{h}(\theta)$  is given by the inversion set  $R(w_\theta)$  associated with a semi-infinite word  $w_\theta$ , which can be thought as an analogue of the Grassmannian permutation. Moreover, we show that the image  $\mathbf{h}(\theta)$  is also characterized as the subset of  $R_+$  consisting of those elements satisfying

$$\langle \zeta_\theta, \alpha^\vee \rangle = -1,$$

where  $\zeta_\theta$  is a predominant integral weight determined by  $\theta$  (see Section 2.2 and 2.3 for details).

Unlike the classical case, the ordinary order in  $R(w_\theta)$  does not lead a poset isomorphism, and we need to introduce a modified order  $\leq$  in  $R(w_\theta)$  by

$$\alpha \leq \beta \iff \beta - \alpha \in \sum_{\gamma \in \Pi_\theta} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \gamma,$$

to obtain a poset isomorphism  $(\theta, \leq) \cong (R(w_\theta), \trianglelefteq)$ , where  $\Pi_\theta$  is a certain subset of the affine root system (see Section 3.1).

Another description of the poset  $\theta$  is given by a linear extension or (reverse) standard tableau  $\mathfrak{t}$  on  $\theta$ , which is by definition a bijective order preserving map  $\theta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . A linear extension  $\mathfrak{t} : \theta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  brings a poset structure to  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  and the resulting poset is an infinite analogue of the heap, which is originally introduced by Stembridge [7]. In summary, we have the following:

**Theorem** (Theorem 3.13 and Proposition 3.16). *The followings are poset isomorphisms:*

$$(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \leq_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\text{hp}}) \xleftarrow{\mathfrak{t}} (\theta, \leq) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{h}} (R(w_\theta), \trianglelefteq).$$

Another goal of this paper is to describe the poset structure  $\mathcal{J}(\theta)$ . For a finite Young diagram  $\lambda$ , it is known that the set  $\mathcal{J}(\lambda)$  of order ideals of  $\lambda$  is isomorphic to the interval  $[e, w_\lambda] = \{u \in W \mid e \preceq u \preceq w_\lambda\}$  with weak right Bruhat order ([4, Proposition I]). For a cylindric diagram  $\theta$ , we define a “semi-infinite Bruhat interval”  $[e, w_\theta)$ , and we have the following:

**Theorem** (Theorem 4.6). *The map*

$$\Phi : (\mathcal{J}(\theta), \subset) \rightarrow ([e, w_\theta), \preceq)$$

*given by  $\Phi(\xi) = w_\xi$  is a poset isomorphism.*

# 1 Cylindric diagrams

## 1.1 Cylindric diagrams as posets

Let  $(P, \leq)$  be a poset. For  $x, y \in P$ , define an *interval*  $[x, y]$  by

$$[x, y] = \{z \in P \mid x \leq z \leq y\}.$$

We say that  $y$  *covers*  $x$  if  $[x, y] = \{x, y\}$ .

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $(P, \leq)$  be a poset. A subset  $J$  of  $P$  is called an *order filter* (resp. *order ideal*) if the following condition holds:

$$x \in J, x \leq y \implies y \in J \quad (\text{resp. } x \in J, x \geq y \implies y \in J).$$

An order filter (resp. order ideal)  $J$  is said to be *proper* if  $J \neq P$ , and it is said to be *non-trivial* if  $J \neq P$  nor  $J \neq \emptyset$ .

For  $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\leq -1}$ , we let  $\mathbb{Z}\omega$  denote the subgroup of (the additive group)  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  generated by  $\omega$ , and define the cylinder  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$  by

$$\mathcal{C}_\omega = \mathbb{Z}^2 / \mathbb{Z}\omega.$$

Let  $\pi : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_\omega$  be the natural projection. The cylinder  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$  inherits a  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -module structure via  $\pi$ .

Define a poset structure on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  by

$$(a, b) \leq (a', b') \iff a \geq a' \text{ and } b \geq b' \text{ as integers.}$$

For  $x, y \in \mathcal{C}_\omega$ , write  $x \leq y$  if there exists  $\tilde{x}, \tilde{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$  such that  $\pi(\tilde{x}) = x$ ,  $\pi(\tilde{y}) = y$  and  $\tilde{x} \leq \tilde{y}$ . It is not difficult to see the following:

**Lemma 1.2.** *Let  $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\leq -1}$ . Then the relation  $\leq$  on  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$  is a partial order, and the projection  $\pi$  is order preserving.*

In the rest of this section, we fix  $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\leq -1}$ .

**Definition 1.3.** (1) A non-trivial order filter of  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$  is called a *cylindric diagram*.

(2) A non-trivial order filter  $\Theta$  of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is called a *periodic diagram of period  $\omega$*  if  $\Theta + \omega = \Theta$ .

**Lemma 1.4.** (1) *For a cylindric diagram  $\theta$  in  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$ , the inverse image  $\pi^{-1}(\theta)$  is a periodic diagram of period  $\omega$ .*

(2) *For a periodic diagram  $\Theta$  of period  $\omega$ , the image  $\pi(\Theta)$  is a cylindric diagram in  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$ .*

Figure 1 indicates a periodic diagram of period  $\omega = (4, -5)$ . The set consisting of colored cells is a fundamental domain with respect to the action of  $\mathbb{Z}\omega$ , and it is in one to one correspondence with the associated cylindric diagram.

**Definition 1.5.** Let  $m, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . A non-increasing sequence  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$  of (possibly negative) integers is called a *generalized partition of length  $m$* . For  $\omega = (m, -\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\leq -1}$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{P}_\omega$  the set of generalized partitions of length  $m$  satisfying

$$\lambda_1 - \lambda_m \leq \ell.$$

For  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m) \in \mathcal{P}_\omega$ , we define

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid 1 \leq a \leq m, b \leq \lambda_a\},$$

$$\hat{\lambda} = \boldsymbol{\lambda} + \mathbb{Z}\omega,$$

$$\mathring{\lambda} = \pi(\hat{\lambda}).$$

Note that  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \hat{\lambda} \cap ([1, m] \times \mathbb{Z})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  is a fundamental domain of  $\hat{\lambda}$  with respect to the action of  $\mathbb{Z}(m, -\ell)$ .

If  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\omega$  then  $\hat{\lambda}$  is a periodic diagram of period  $\omega$  and  $\mathring{\lambda}$  is a cylindric diagram. Moreover, any periodic (resp. cylindric) diagram of period  $\omega$  is of the form  $\hat{\lambda}$  (resp.  $\mathring{\lambda}$ ) for some  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\omega$ .

For a poset  $P$  and its order filter  $J$ , we denote the set-difference  $P \setminus J$  also by  $P/J$ . It is easy to see the following:

**Proposition 1.6.** For a subset  $\xi$  of  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$ , the following conditions are equivalent :

- (i)  $\xi$  is a proper order ideal of a cylindric diagram in  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$ .
- (ii)  $\xi$  is a set-difference  $\theta/\eta$  of two cylindric diagrams  $\theta, \eta$  in  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$  with  $\theta \supset \eta$ .
- (iii)  $\xi$  is an intersection of a proper order ideal and a proper order filter of  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$ .
- (iv)  $\xi$  is a finite subset of  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$  and satisfies the following condition:

$$x, y \in \xi \implies [x, y] \subset \xi.$$

- (v)  $\xi$  is a finite subset of  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$  and satisfies the following condition:

$$x, x + (1, 1) \in \xi \implies x + (0, 1), x + (1, 0) \in \xi \quad (\text{the skew property})$$

**Definition 1.7.** A subset  $\xi$  of  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$  is called a *cylindric skew diagram* if it satisfies one of the conditions (i)–(v) in Proposition 1.6.




Figure 2: A cylindric skew diagram.

We denote the set of proper order ideals of  $\theta$  by  $\mathcal{J}(\theta)$  and regard it as a poset with the inclusion relation. Note that any  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}(\theta)$  is a finite set and thus  $\mathcal{J}(\theta) = \bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}_n(\theta)$ , where we put

$$\mathcal{J}_n(\theta) = \{\xi \in \mathcal{J}(\theta) \mid |\xi| = n\}.$$

## 1.2 Standard tableaux

In the rest of present section, fix a cylindric diagram  $\theta$  in  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$ .

**Definition 1.8.** (1) For a cylindric diagram  $\theta$ , a *standard tableau* (or *linear extension*) of  $\theta$  is a bijection  $\mathbf{t} : \theta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  satisfying

$$x < y \implies \mathbf{t}(x) < \mathbf{t}(y).$$

We denote by  $\text{ST}(\theta)$  the set of standard tableaux of  $\theta$ .

(2) For a finite poset  $P$  with  $|P| = n$ , a standard tableau of  $P$  is a bijection  $\mathbf{t} : P \rightarrow [1, n]$  satisfying

$$x < y \implies \mathbf{t}(x) < \mathbf{t}(y).$$

We denote by  $\text{ST}(P)$  the set of standard tableaux of  $P$ .




Figure 3:

**Remark 1.9.** Our standard tableaux are usually referred to as reverse standard tableaux.  $\diamond$

Let  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$ . It is easy to see that the subset  $\mathfrak{t}^{-1}([1, n])$  of  $\theta$  is a proper order ideal, and moreover the restriction  $\mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{t}^{-1}([1, n])}$  is a standard tableau on  $\mathfrak{t}^{-1}([1, n])$ . Conversely, for  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}_n(\theta)$ , any standard tableau on  $\xi$  can be extended to a standard tableau on  $\theta$ . In summary, we have the following:

**Lemma 1.10.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . The correspondence  $\mathfrak{t} \mapsto \mathfrak{t}^{-1}([1, n])$  gives a surjective map*

$$\text{ST}(\theta) \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_n(\theta).$$

*Moreover, for each  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$ , the restriction  $\mathfrak{t} \mapsto \mathfrak{t}|_{\mathfrak{t}^{-1}([1, n])}$  gives a surjective map*

$$\text{ST}(\theta) \rightarrow \text{ST}(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}([1, n])).$$

### 1.3 Content map and bottom set

Let  $\Theta$  be a periodic diagram of period  $\omega$ . Define the *content map*

$$\mathbf{c} : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

by  $\mathbf{c}(a, b) = b - a$ . Put  $\kappa = |\mathbf{c}(\omega)|$ . Let  $\theta = \pi(\Theta)$ . Since  $\mathbf{c}(x + \omega) = \mathbf{c}(x) - \kappa$ , the content map  $\mathbf{c}$  induces the map

$$\theta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z},$$

which we denote by the same symbol  $\mathbf{c}$ . It is easy to show the following:

**Proposition 1.11.** *For  $x, y \in \theta$ , the followings hold:*

- (1) *If  $\mathbf{c}(x) - \mathbf{c}(y) \equiv 0, \pm 1 \pmod{\kappa}$ , then  $x$  and  $y$  are comparable.*
- (2) *If  $x$  is covered by  $y$ , then  $\mathbf{c}(x) - \mathbf{c}(y) \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{\kappa}$ .*

**Remark 1.12.** By Proposition 1.6 and Proposition 1.11, cylindric diagrams are infinite (locally finite) “ $\mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}$ -colored  $d$ -complete posets” in the sense of [9, 10].  $\diamond$

Let  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}$ . By Proposition 1.11 (1), the inverse image  $\mathbf{c}^{-1}(i)$  is non-empty totally ordered subset of  $\theta$ . Let  $b_i$  denote the minimum element in  $\mathbf{c}^{-1}(i)$ .

**Definition 1.13.** Define the *bottom set*  $\Gamma$  of  $\theta$  by

$$\Gamma = \{b_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Figure 4 indicates the periodic diagram  $\hat{\lambda}$  with  $\lambda = (5, 4, 4, 2) \in \mathcal{P}_{(4,-5)}$ . The number in each cell is the content with modulo 9. Yellowed cells forms the bottom set of  $\hat{\lambda} = \pi(\hat{\lambda})$ .




Figure 4:

## 1.4 Root systems and affine Weyl groups of type $A_{\kappa-1}^{(1)}$

Let  $\kappa \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ . In the rest, we often identify  $\mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}$  with  $\{0, 1, \dots, \kappa - 1\}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  be a  $(\kappa + 1)$ -dimensional vector space and choose elements  $\alpha_i^\vee$  ( $i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}$ ) and  $d$  of  $\mathfrak{h}$  so that

$$\{\alpha_0^\vee, \alpha_1^\vee, \dots, \alpha_{\kappa-1}^\vee, d\}$$

forms a basis for  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{h}^*$  be the dual space of  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Define elements  $\alpha_j$  ( $j \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}$ ) and  $\varpi_0$  of  $\mathfrak{h}^*$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \alpha_j, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle &= a_{ij}, & \langle \varpi_0, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle &= \delta_{i0} \quad (i, j \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}), \\ \langle \alpha_j, d \rangle &= \delta_{j0}, & \langle \varpi_0, d \rangle &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathfrak{h}^* \times \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is the natural pairing and the integer  $a_{ij}$  is defined by

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } i = j \\ -1 & \text{if } i - j = \pm 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for  $\kappa \geq 3$  and

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } i = j \\ -2 & \text{if } i \neq j \end{cases}$$

for  $\kappa = 2$ . Then  $\{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\kappa-1}, \varpi_0\}$  forms a basis for  $\mathfrak{h}^*$ . Define  $\varpi_i \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, \kappa-1$ ) by

$$\langle \varpi_i, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle = \delta_{ij}, \quad \langle \varpi_i, d \rangle = 0 \quad (j \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}).$$

The weights  $\varpi_0, \varpi_1, \dots, \varpi_{\kappa-1}$  are called fundamental weights. Put  $\delta = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_{\kappa-1}$  (resp.  $\delta^\vee = \alpha_0^\vee + \alpha_1^\vee + \dots + \alpha_{\kappa-1}^\vee$ ), which is called the null root (resp. the null coroot).

For  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}$ , define the simple reflection  $s_i \in GL(\mathfrak{h}^*)$  by

$$s_i(\zeta) = \zeta - \langle \zeta, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \alpha_i \quad (\zeta \in \mathfrak{h}^*).$$

Define the *affine Weyl group*  $W$  of type  $A_{\kappa-1}^{(1)}$  as the subgroup of  $GL(\mathfrak{h}^*)$  generated by simple reflections:

$$W = \langle s_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z} \rangle.$$

The following is well-known:

**Proposition 1.14.** *The group  $W$  has the following fundamental relations:*

$$s_i^2 = 1, \tag{1.1}$$

$$s_i s_j = s_j s_i \quad (i - j \neq 0, \pm 1), \tag{1.2}$$

$$s_i s_{i+1} s_i = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1}. \tag{1.3}$$

For  $w \in W$ , we define the *length*  $\ell(w)$  of  $w$  as the smallest  $r$  for which an expression (or a word)

$$w = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_r} \in W \quad (i_j \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z})$$

exists. An expression  $w = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_r}$  is said to be reduced if  $\ell(w) = r$ .

Define the action of  $W$  on  $\mathfrak{h}$  by

$$s_i(h) = h - \langle \alpha_i, h \rangle \alpha_i^\vee \quad (h \in \mathfrak{h}).$$

We put

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi &= \{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\kappa-1}\}, \quad \Pi^\vee = \{\alpha_0^\vee, \alpha_1^\vee, \dots, \alpha_{\kappa-1}^\vee\}, \\ Q &= \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}} c_i \alpha_i \mid c_i \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}, \quad Q_+ = \left\{ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}} c_i \alpha_i \mid c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The set  $\Pi$  (resp.  $\Pi^\vee$ ) is called the set of simple roots (resp. the set of simple coroots), and  $Q$  is called the root lattice. Put

$$R = W\Pi \subset \mathfrak{h}^*, \quad R^\vee = W\Pi^\vee \subset \mathfrak{h}.$$

Then  $R$  (resp.  $R^\vee$ ) is the set of real roots (resp. coroots) and  $R \sqcup \mathbb{Z}\delta$  is the affine root system. Define the set  $R_+$  of positive (real) roots and the set  $R_-$  of negative (real) roots by

$$R_+ = R \cap Q_+ = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\kappa-1} c_i \alpha_i \in R \mid c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \right\}, \quad R_- = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{\kappa-1} c_i \alpha_i \in R \mid c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0} \right\}.$$



For  $\beta = \sum_{i=0}^{\kappa-1} k_i \alpha_i \in R$ , define  $\beta^\vee = \sum_{i=0}^{\kappa-1} k_i \alpha_i^\vee \in R^\vee$ . Then the correspondence  $\beta \mapsto \beta^\vee$  gives a bijection  $R \rightarrow R^\vee$ . Define the set of positive (resp. negative) coroots  $R_+^\vee$  (resp.  $R_-^\vee$ ) as the image of  $R_+$  (resp.  $R_-$ ) by this bijection.

For  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $i < j$ , we define

$$\alpha_{ij} = \sum_{i \leq k \leq j-1} \alpha_{\bar{k}},$$

where  $\bar{k} = k \bmod \kappa \mathbb{Z} \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa \mathbb{Z}$ . The followings are well-known:

$$R_+ = \{\alpha_{ij} \mid i < j, j - i \notin \kappa \mathbb{Z}\} \tag{1.4}$$

$$= \{\alpha_{ij} + k\delta \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq \kappa, k \geq 0\} \sqcup \{-\alpha_{ij} + k\delta \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq \kappa, k \geq 1\}, \tag{1.5}$$

$$R_- = -R_+, \quad R = R_+ \sqcup R_-.$$

From the description of  $R$  above, the following two lemmas follow easily and they will be used later:

**Lemma 1.15.** *If  $\alpha \in R$ , then  $\alpha + k\delta \in R$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ .*

**Lemma 1.16.** *Let  $\alpha \in R \sqcup \mathbb{Z}\delta$  and  $\beta \in R$ . Then  $\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle = 2$  if and only if  $\alpha \equiv \beta \pmod{\delta}$ .*

## 2 Hooks in cylindric diagrams

### 2.1 Colored hook length

In this section, we will introduce colored hook length, which is a key ingredient in this paper.

Fix  $\kappa, m, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  with  $\kappa = m + \ell$  and let  $\theta$  be a cylindric diagram in  $\mathcal{C}_{(m, -\ell)}$ .

In the rest of this paper, we use the following notations:

$$\alpha(x) = \alpha_{\mathbf{c}(x)}, \quad s(x) = s_{\mathbf{c}(x)} \quad \text{for } x \in \theta.$$

**Definition 2.1.** For  $x \in \theta$ , put

$$\text{Arm}(x) = \{x + (0, k) \in \theta \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\},$$

$$\text{Leg}(x) = \{x + (k, 0) \in \theta \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\},$$

and define

$$\mathbf{h}(x) = \alpha(x) + \sum_{y \in \text{Arm}(x)} \alpha(y) + \sum_{y \in \text{Leg}(x)} \alpha(y).$$

We call  $\mathbf{h}(x)$  the *colored hook length* at  $x$ .

For  $x \in \mathcal{C}_{(m, -\ell)} \setminus \theta$ , we set  $\mathbf{h}(x) = 0$  for convenience. It is easy to see that for  $x \in \theta$

$$\mathbf{h}(x - (0, \ell)) = \mathbf{h}(x - (m, 0)) = \mathbf{h}(x) + \delta$$

and

$$\mathbf{h}(x) = \alpha_{ij} \text{ for some integers } i < j. \tag{2.1}$$




Figure 5: The sets  $\text{Arm}(x)$  and  $\text{Leg}(x)$  for  $x$  in the cylindrical diagram.

**Example 2.2.** (See Figure 5.) Let  $\omega = (4, -5)$ . Then  $\lambda = (5, 3, 3, 1) \in \mathcal{P}_\omega$ . For a cell  $x = \pi(2, -4) \in \lambda$ , we have  $\mathbf{c}(x) = 3 + 9\mathbb{Z} \in \mathbb{Z}/9\mathbb{Z}$ . The colored hook length at  $x$  is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{h}(x) &= \alpha_{-6} + (\alpha_{-5} + \alpha_{-4} + \alpha_{-3} + \alpha_{-2} + \alpha_{-1} + \alpha_0 + \alpha_1) \\
&\quad + (\alpha_{-7} + \alpha_{-8} + \alpha_{-9} + \alpha_{-10} + \alpha_{-11} + \alpha_{-12}) \\
&= \alpha_3 + (\alpha_4 + \alpha_5 + \alpha_6 + \alpha_7 + \alpha_8 + \alpha_0 + \alpha_1) + (\alpha_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_0 + \alpha_8 + \alpha_7 + \alpha_6) \\
&= \delta + \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_6 + \alpha_7 + \alpha_8,
\end{aligned}$$

which can be expressed as  $\mathbf{h}(x) = \alpha_{-12,2}$ .

**Remark 2.3.** (1) For  $x \in \theta$ , the “multiset”  $H(x) := \{x\} \sqcup \text{Arm}(x) \sqcup \text{Leg}(x)$  is a cylindrical analogue of the hook at  $x$ .

(2) A conjectural hook formula concerning the number of standard tableaux on cylindrical skew diagrams is proposed in [11], where the hook length at  $x \in \theta$  is given by  $|H(x)| = |\text{Arm}(x)| + |\text{Leg}(x)| + 1$ .

For  $\alpha \in Q_+$ , define

$$N(\alpha) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \alpha - k\delta \in Q_+\}.$$

**Lemma 2.4.** For  $x \in \theta$ , it holds that

$$N(\mathbf{h}(x)) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x + k(0, \ell) \in \theta\}.$$

*Proof.* We put  $N(x) = \max\{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x + k(0, \ell) \in \theta\}$  and will show  $N(\mathbf{h}(x)) = N(x)$ .

Let  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Suppose that  $x + k(0, \ell) \in \theta$ . Then,  $\mathbf{h}(x) - k\delta = \mathbf{h}(x + k(0, \ell)) \in Q_+$  and thus  $N(\mathbf{h}(x)) \geq N(x)$ .

Suppose that  $x - k(0, \ell) \notin \theta$ . Noting that  $x - k(0, \ell) = x + k(m, 0)$ , we have

$$|\text{Arm}(x)| \leq k\ell - 1, \quad |\text{Leg}(x)| \leq km - 1.$$

Thus we have  $|\{x\} \cup \text{Arm}(x) \cup \text{Leg}(x)| \leq k(\ell + m) - 1$  and hence  $\mathbf{h}(x) - k\delta \notin Q_+$ . This means  $N(\mathbf{h}(x)) \leq N(x)$ .  $\square$

Let  $\Gamma = \{b_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}\}$  be the bottom set of  $\theta$ , where  $b_i$  is the minimum element of  $\mathbf{c}^{-1}(i)$  as before.

For  $\alpha = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}} c_i \alpha_i \in Q_+$ , define its *support* by

$$\text{Supp}(\alpha) = \{b_i \mid c_i > 0 \ (i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z})\} \subset \Gamma.$$

For example, we have  $\text{Supp}(\delta) = \Gamma$ . Let  $x \in \theta$  with  $N(\mathbf{h}(x)) = 0$ . Then  $\text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(x))$  is a non-empty, proper and connected subset of  $\Gamma$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $x \in \theta$ . Then  $\mathbf{h}(x) \in R_+$ .*


*Proof.* By (1.4) and (2.1), it is enough to show that  $\mathbf{h}(x) \notin \mathbb{Z}\delta$ .

Put  $k = N(\mathbf{h}(x))$  and  $x_0 = x + k(0, \ell)$ . Then  $x_0 \in \theta$  by Lemma 2.4 and  $N(\mathbf{h}(x_0)) = 0$ . Since  $\emptyset \neq \text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(x_0)) \subsetneq \Gamma$ , we have  $\mathbf{h}(x_0) \notin \mathbb{Z}\delta$  and thus  $\mathbf{h}(x) = \mathbf{h}(x_0) + k\delta \notin \mathbb{Z}\delta$ .  $\square$

Let  $\Gamma_{\max}$  (resp.  $\Gamma_{\min}$ ) denote the set of maximal (resp. minimal) elements in  $\Gamma$ . Note that  $|\Gamma_{\max}| = |\Gamma_{\min}|$ . One can easily see the following lemma. (See the figure below.)

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $\alpha \in R_+$  with  $N(\alpha) = 0$ . Then  $\alpha = \mathbf{h}(x)$  for some  $x \in \theta$  if and only if*

$$|\text{Supp}(\alpha) \cap \Gamma_{\max}| + 1 = |\text{Supp}(\alpha) \cap \Gamma_{\min}|.$$



## 2.2 Predominant weights and hooks

**Definition 2.7.** We define  $\zeta_\theta \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  by

$$\zeta_\theta = \sum_{i=0}^{\kappa-1} a_i \varpi_i, \tag{2.2}$$

$$\text{where } a_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b_i \in \Gamma_{\max} \\ -1 & \text{if } b_i \in \Gamma_{\min} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that maximal and minimal elements are lined up alternatively in  $\Gamma$ . This implies that the weight  $\zeta_\theta$  is predominant, namely,  $\langle \zeta_\theta, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq -1$  for all  $\alpha^\vee \in R_+^\vee$ . Define

$$D(\zeta_\theta) = \{\alpha \in R_+ \mid \langle \zeta_\theta, \alpha^\vee \rangle = -1\}.$$

**Theorem 2.8.** *The correspondence  $x \mapsto \mathbf{h}(x)$  gives a bijection*

$$\mathbf{h} : \theta \rightarrow D(\zeta_\theta).$$

*Proof.* First we will show that  $\mathbf{h}(\theta) = D(\zeta_\theta)$ . Let  $\alpha \in R_+$  and put  $\bar{\alpha} = \alpha - N(\alpha)\delta$ . It follows from Lemma 2.4,

$$\alpha \in \mathbf{h}(\theta) \Leftrightarrow \bar{\alpha} \in \mathbf{h}(\theta).$$

On the other hand, as  $\langle \zeta_\theta, \delta^\vee \rangle = 0$ , it holds that

$$\alpha \in D(\zeta_\theta) \Leftrightarrow \bar{\alpha} \in D(\zeta_\theta).$$

Now we have  $\mathbf{h}(\theta) = D(\zeta_\theta)$  by Lemma 2.6.

We will show the injectivity. Suppose that  $\mathbf{h}(x) = \mathbf{h}(y)$ . Then  $N(\mathbf{h}(x)) = N(\mathbf{h}(y))$ . Put  $x_0 = x + N(\mathbf{h}(x))(0, \ell)$ ,  $y_0 = y + N(\mathbf{h}(y))(0, \ell)$ . Then we have  $N(\mathbf{h}(x_0)) = N(\mathbf{h}(y_0)) = 0$  and thus  $\mathbf{h}(x_0) = \mathbf{h}(y_0)$ . Now we have  $\text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(x_0)) = \text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(y_0))$  and this implies  $x_0 = y_0$  and hence  $x = y$ .  $\square$

## 2.3 Weyl group elements and their inversion sets

The following proposition gives an alternative expression for  $\mathbf{h}(x)$ .

**Proposition 2.9.** *For any  $x \in \theta$  and  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbf{h}(x) = s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(1))s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(2)) \cdots s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(n-1))\alpha(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(n)), \quad (2.3)$$

where  $n = \mathbf{t}(x)$ .

The proof of Proposition 2.9 will be given in the next section. In the rest of this section, we will see some consequences of the proposition.

Let  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , we define an element  $w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}[n]$  of  $W$  by

$$w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}[n] = s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(1))s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(2)) \cdots s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(n)), \quad (2.4)$$

and we set  $w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}[0] = e$ .

**Example 2.10.** Let  $\lambda = (5, 4)$  and  $\omega = (2, -3)$ . For  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\overset{\circ}{\lambda})$  displayed in figure 6, we have  $w_{\overset{\circ}{\lambda}, \mathbf{t}}[6] = s_4 s_2 s_1 s_3 s_0 s_2$ .

**Proposition 2.11.** *The expression (2.4) is reduced.*

*Proof.* Put  $p_k = \mathbf{t}^{-1}(k)$  for  $k \geq 1$ . By Proposition 2.9 and Theorem 2.8, we have

$$\mathbf{h}(p_k) = s(p_1)s(p_2) \cdots s(p_{k-1})\alpha(p_k) = w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}[k-1]\alpha(p_k) \in R_+$$

for all  $k \in [1, n]$ . This implies that

$$\ell(w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}[k-1]s(p_k)) > \ell(w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}[k-1]) \quad (k \in [1, n]).$$

Therefore we have  $\ell(w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}[n]) = n$  and thus the expression (2.4) is reduced.  $\square$




Figure 6:

For  $w \in W$ , the set

$$R(w) = R_+ \cap wR_-$$

is called the *inversion set* of  $w$ . It is known for any reduced expression  $w = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_\ell}$  that  $\ell(w) = |R(w)|$  and

$$R(w) = \{\alpha_{i_1}, s_{i_1} \alpha_{i_2}, s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \alpha_{i_3}, \dots, s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{\ell-1}} \alpha_{i_\ell}\}.$$

By (2.3), (2.4) and Proposition 2.11, we obtain the following proposition:

**Proposition 2.12.** *Let  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . Then it holds that*

$$R(w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}}[n]) = \{\mathbf{h}(x) \mid x \in \mathfrak{t}^{-1}([1, n])\}.$$

*In particular, it holds that  $R(w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}}[n]) \subset D(\zeta_\theta)$ .*

Define

$$R(w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}}) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} R(w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}}[n]).$$

Then

$$R(w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}}) = \{\mathbf{h}(x) \mid x \in \theta\} = D(\zeta_\theta).$$

In particular,  $R(w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}})$  is independent of  $\mathfrak{t}$  and we will denote it just by  $R(w_\theta)$  in the rest.

**Remark 2.13.** The set  $R(w_\theta)$  can be thought as the “inversion set” associated with the semi-infinite word

$$w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}} := s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(1))s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(2)) \cdots \cdots \cdots$$

**Definition 2.14.** Let  $\zeta \in P$  be an integral weight.

(1) An element  $w$  of  $W$  is said to be  $\zeta$ -*pluscule* if

$$\langle \zeta, \alpha^\vee \rangle = -1 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in R(w).$$

(2) An element  $w$  of  $W$  is said to be  $\zeta$ -*minuscule* if

$$\langle \zeta, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 1 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in R(w^{-1}).$$

**Definition 2.15.** An element  $w \in W$  is said to be *fully commutative* if any reduced expression of  $w$  can be obtained from any other by using only the relations (1.2).

**Remark 2.16.** (1) An element  $w \in W$  is  $\zeta$ -pluscule if and only if  $w$  is  $(w^{-1}\zeta)$ -minuscule.  
(2) It is known that if  $w$  is  $\zeta$ -minuscule for some integral weight  $\zeta$  then  $w$  is fully commutative ([8]).

By Proposition 2.12, we have the following:

**Proposition 2.17.** Let  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . Then  $w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}[n]}$  is  $\zeta_{\theta}$ -pluscule and fully commutative.

## 2.4 Proof of Proposition 2.9

For  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$  and  $x \in \theta$ , we put

$$\gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x) = s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(1))s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(2)) \cdots s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(n-1))\alpha(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(n)), \quad (2.5)$$

where  $n = \mathfrak{t}(x)$ .

For  $x \in \theta$ , put  $x^S = x + (1, 0)$ ,  $x^E = x + (0, 1)$ ,  $x^{SE} = x + (1, 1) \in \mathcal{C}_{\omega}$ . We will use the following lemma later:

**Lemma 2.18.** Let  $x \in \theta$ .

(1) If  $x \notin \Gamma$ , then  $x^S, x^E, x^{SE} \in \theta$  and

$$\gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x) = \gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x^S) + \gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x^E) - \gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x^{SE}). \quad (2.6)$$

(2) If  $x \in \Gamma$ , then  $x^{SE} \notin \theta$  and

$$\gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x) = \begin{cases} \alpha(x) + \gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x^S) + \gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x^E) & \text{if } x^S, x^E \in \theta \\ \alpha(x) + \gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x^S) & \text{if } x^S \in \theta, x^E \notin \theta \\ \alpha(x) + \gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x^E) & \text{if } x^E \in \theta, x^S \notin \theta \\ \alpha(x) & \text{if } x^S, x^E \notin \theta. \end{cases} \quad \begin{matrix} (2.7) \\ (2.8) \\ (2.9) \\ (2.10) \end{matrix}$$

*Proof.* We put  $p_k = \mathfrak{t}^{-1}(k)$  ( $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ ).

(1) Let  $x = p_j$ ,  $x^{SE} = p_i$ ,  $x^E = p_{k_1}$  and  $x^S = p_{k_2}$ . Then  $j > k_1, k_2 > i$  and we may assume that  $k_2 < k_1$ . Put  $\mathbf{c}(x) = r$ . Then  $\mathbf{c}(x^E) = r - 1$ ,  $\mathbf{c}(x^S) = r + 1$ . We have

$$\gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x) = w_1 s(p_i) w_2 s(p_{k_1}) w_3 s(p_{k_2}) w_4 \alpha(p_j) = w_1 s_r w_2 s_{r+1} w_3 s_{r-1} w_4 \alpha_r,$$

where  $w_1 = s(p_1) \cdots s(p_{i-1})$ ,  $w_2 = s(p_{i+1}) \cdots s(p_{k_1-1})$ ,  $w_3 = s(p_{k_1+1}) \cdots s(p_{k_2-1})$  and  $w_4 = s(p_{k_2+1}) \cdots s(p_{j-1})$ .

Note that  $\mathbf{c}(p_d) - r \neq 0, \pm 1$  for all  $d \in [i+1, j-1] \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}$ . Actually, if  $\mathbf{c}(p_d) - r = 0, \pm 1$  then  $p_d$  is comparable with  $p_j$  and  $p_i$ , and hence  $p_j > p_d > p_i$ . But such  $d$  must be  $k_1$  or  $k_2$ . Now we have

$$\gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}(x) = w_1 s_r w_2 s_{r+1} w_3 s_{r-1} w_4 \alpha_r = w_1 s_r w_2 s_{r+1} w_3 s_{r-1} \alpha_r$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= w_1 s_r w_2 s_{r+1} w_3 (\alpha_{r-1} + \alpha_r) = \gamma_t(x^S) + w_1 s_r w_2 s_{r+1} w_3 \alpha_r \\
&= \gamma_t(x^E) + w_1 s_r w_2 s_{r+1} \alpha_r = \gamma_t(x^E) + w_1 s_r w_2 (\alpha_r + \alpha_{r+1}) \\
&= \gamma_t(x^S) + \gamma_t(x^E) + w_1 s_r w_2 \alpha_r = \gamma_t(x^S) + \gamma_t(x^E) + w_1 s_r \alpha_r \\
&= \gamma_t(x^S) + \gamma_t(x^E) - \gamma_t(x^{SE}).
\end{aligned}$$

(2) Suppose that  $x^S, x^E \notin \theta$ , or equivalently, suppose that  $x$  is minimal element in  $\Gamma$ . Let  $x = p_j$ . Then  $p_d$  ( $d \in [1, j-1]$ ) is not comparable with  $p_j$ . Hence

$$\gamma_t(x) = s(p_1) \cdots s(p_{j-1}) \alpha(p_j) = \alpha(p_j)$$

The other cases are reduced to the case where  $x$  is minimal in  $\Gamma$ , via a similar argument as in the proof of the statement (1), □

*Proof of Proposition 2.9.* Let  $x \in \theta$ . Put  $x^S = x + (1, 0)$ ,  $x^E = x + (0, 1)$ ,  $x^{SE} = x + (1, 1)$ . It is easy to see the following:

$$\mathbf{h}(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{h}(x^S) + \mathbf{h}(x^E) - \mathbf{h}(x^{SE}) & \text{if } x \notin \Gamma \\ \alpha(x) + \mathbf{h}(x^S) + \mathbf{h}(x^E) & \text{if } x \in \Gamma \text{ and } x^S, x^E \in \theta \\ \alpha(x) + \mathbf{h}(x^S) & \text{if } x \in \Gamma \text{ and } x^S \in \theta, x^E \notin \theta \\ \alpha(x) + \mathbf{h}(x^E) & \text{if } x \in \Gamma \text{ and } x^E \in \theta, x^S \notin \theta \\ \alpha(x) & \text{if } x \in \Gamma \text{ and } x^S, x^E \notin \theta \end{cases} \quad (2.11)$$

On the other hand, we have shown that  $\gamma_t(x)$  satisfies the same recurrence relations in Lemma 2.18. □

## 3 Poset structure of cylindric diagrams

### 3.1 Partial orders on the inversion set

Recall that  $Q$  denote the root lattice:  $Q = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Define the partial order  $\leq^{\text{or}}$  on  $Q$  by

$$\alpha \leq^{\text{or}} \beta \iff \beta - \alpha \in Q_+ = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha_i$$

The order  $\leq^{\text{or}}$  is called the *ordinary order*.

The restriction of the ordinary order defines a poset structure on  $R(w_\theta)$ .

Let  $\theta$  be a cylindric diagram in  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$  with  $|\omega| = \kappa$ . We have introduced a poset structure on  $\theta$  and also have seen that the map  $\mathbf{h}$  gives a bijection between  $\theta$  and  $R(w_\theta)$ . Remark that this is not a poset isomorphism as seen in the following example:

**Example 3.2.** Let  $\lambda = (4, 2)$ ,  $\omega = (2, -2)$  and consider the cylindric diagram  $\mathring{\lambda}$  in  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$ . Then  $x = \pi(1, 2)$  and  $y = \pi(2, 1)$  are incomparable in  $\mathring{\lambda}$ . On the other hand,  $\mathbf{h}(x) = \delta + \alpha_3$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3$ , and hence  $\mathbf{h}(x) - \mathbf{h}(y) = \alpha_1 + \alpha_3$ . This implies  $\mathbf{h}(y) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(x)$ .

We will introduce a modified ordinary order  $\trianglelefteq$ , for which we will have  $(\theta, \leq) \cong (R(w_\theta), \trianglelefteq)$ .

Let  $\Gamma = \{b_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}/\kappa\mathbb{Z}\}$  be the bottom set of  $\theta$ , where  $b_i$  is the element such that  $\mathbf{c}(b_i) = i$ . Let  $\Gamma_{\max}$  (resp.  $\Gamma_{\min}$ ) denote the set of maximal (resp. minimal) elements in  $\Gamma$ .

**Definition 3.3.** Define

$$\Pi_\theta = \Pi_\theta^0 \sqcup \Pi_\theta^{\text{arm}} \sqcup \Pi_\theta^{\text{leg}}.$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_\theta^0 &= \{\alpha(x) \mid x \in \Gamma \setminus (\Gamma_{\max} \sqcup \Gamma_{\min})\}, \\ \Pi_\theta^{\text{arm}} &= \left\{ \alpha(x) + \sum_{y \in \text{Arm}(x)} \alpha(y) \mid x \in \Gamma_{\max} \right\}, \\ \Pi_\theta^{\text{leg}} &= \left\{ \alpha(x) + \sum_{y \in \text{Leg}(x)} \alpha(y) \mid x \in \Gamma_{\max} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\Pi_\theta \subset R_+ \sqcup \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\delta$ .

**Example 3.4.** For the cylindric diagram described in Fig. 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_\theta^0 &= \{\alpha_3, \alpha_5, \alpha_7\}, \\ \Pi_\theta^{\text{arm}} &= \{\alpha_6 + \alpha_7 + \alpha_8, \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4, \alpha_0 + \alpha_1\}, \\ \Pi_\theta^{\text{leg}} &= \{\alpha_4 + \alpha_5 + \alpha_6, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \alpha_0 + \alpha_8\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Example 3.5.** Let  $\lambda = (n)$  and  $\omega = (1, -n + 1)$ . Then, for the corresponding cylindric diagram  $\mathring{\lambda}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{\mathring{\lambda}}^0 &= \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{n-2}\}, \\ \Pi_{\mathring{\lambda}}^{\text{arm}} &= \{\delta\}, \\ \Pi_{\mathring{\lambda}}^{\text{leg}} &= \{\alpha_0 + \alpha_{n-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 3.6.** Define the partial order  $\trianglelefteq$  on  $R(w_\theta)$  by

$$\alpha \trianglelefteq \beta \iff \beta - \alpha \in \sum_{\gamma \in \Pi_\theta} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\gamma = \left\{ \sum_{\gamma \in \Pi_\theta} k_\gamma \gamma \mid k_\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} (\forall \gamma \in \Pi_\theta) \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

**Proposition 3.7.** Let  $x, y \in \theta$ . Then

$$x \leq y \implies \mathbf{h}(x) \trianglelefteq \mathbf{h}(y).$$

In other words, the bijection

$$\mathbf{h} : (\theta, \leq) \rightarrow (R(w_\theta), \trianglelefteq)$$

is order preserving.



*Proof.* We assume that  $y$  covers  $x$ , and will show that  $\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x) \in \Pi_\theta$  by induction on  $y$  concerning the poset structure on  $\theta$ .

Put  $y^S = y + (1, 0)$ ,  $y^E = y + (0, 1)$ ,  $y^{SE} = y + (1, 1)$ . Then  $x = y^S$  or  $x = y^E$ .

When  $y \in \Gamma$ , it follows from (2.11) that  $\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x) \in \Pi_\theta$ .

Suppose that  $y \notin \Gamma$ . Note that  $y^{SE} \in \theta$ . Since  $y^E$  covers  $y^{SE}$  and  $y > y^E$ , we have  $\mathbf{h}(y^E) - \mathbf{h}(y^{SE}) \in \Pi_\theta$  by induction hypothesis. By the recursion relation (2.11), we have

$$\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(y^S) = \mathbf{h}(y^E) - \mathbf{h}(y^{SE}) \in \Pi_\theta.$$

Similar argument implies  $\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(y^E) \in \Pi_\theta$ . In both cases, we have  $\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x) \in \Pi_\theta$ . Therefore, the statement is proved.  $\square$

It is easy to see that

$$\alpha \trianglelefteq \beta \implies \alpha \leq^{\text{or}} \beta$$

for any  $\alpha, \beta \in R(w_\theta)$ . Thus we have the following:

**Corollary 3.8.** *Let  $x, y \in \theta$ . Then*

$$x < y \implies \mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y).$$

## 3.2 Poset isomorphism

Our next goal is to prove that the order preserving map

$$\mathbf{h} : (\theta, \leq) \rightarrow (R(w_\theta), \trianglelefteq)$$

is actually a poset isomorphism. We start with some preparations.

As before, we denote by  $\text{Supp}(\alpha)$  the support of  $\alpha \in Q$ . The following lemma is almost obvious from Definition 3.3.

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $\alpha \in \Pi_\theta$ . Then*

$$|\text{Supp}(\alpha) \cap \Gamma_{\max}| = |\text{Supp}(\alpha) \cap \Gamma_{\min}| = \begin{cases} 0 & (\alpha \in \Pi_\theta^0) \\ 1 & (\alpha \in \Pi_\theta^{\text{arm}} \sqcup \Pi_\theta^{\text{leg}}). \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

It is easy to see the next lemma:

**Lemma 3.10.** (1) *Let  $\alpha \in R_+$ . Then  $N(\alpha) = \max\{N \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \alpha - N\delta \in R_+\}$ .*

(2) *Let  $x, y \in \theta$ . If  $x < y$  then  $N(\mathbf{h}(x)) \leq N(\mathbf{h}(y))$ .*

*Proof.* (1) Follows from Lemma 1.15.

(2) Suppose  $x < y$ . By Corollary 3.8, we have  $N(\mathbf{h}(x))\delta \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y)$ .

As  $\mathbf{h}(y) - N(\mathbf{h}(x))\delta$  is in  $R$  by Lemma 1.15, it must be a positive root. This means  $N(\mathbf{h}(x)) \leq N(\mathbf{h}(y))$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.11.** *Let  $x, y \in \theta$  such that  $N(\mathbf{h}(x)) = N(\mathbf{h}(y)) = 0$ . Then*

$$x < y \iff \mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y).$$

*In particular, if  $x$  and  $y$  are incomparable, then  $\mathbf{h}(x)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y)$  are also incomparable with respect to  $\leq^{\text{or}}$ .*

*Proof.* By Corollary 3.8, we have

$$x < y \implies \mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y).$$

We shall prove the opposite implication. Suppose  $\mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y)$ . Then noting that  $0 <^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(x)$ ,  $\mathbf{h}(y) <^{\text{or}} \delta$ , we have  $\text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(x)) \subset \text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(y)) \not\subseteq \Gamma$ . This implies  $x < y$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.12.** *Let  $x, y \in \theta$ . Suppose that  $x$  and  $y$  are incomparable in  $\theta$ . Then  $N(\mathbf{h}(y)) - N(\mathbf{h}(x)) = 1, 0$  or  $-1$ . Moreover the followings hold:*

(1) *If  $N(\mathbf{h}(y)) - N(\mathbf{h}(x)) = 1$ , then*

$$\mathbf{h}(y) - \delta \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y).$$

(2) *If  $N(\mathbf{h}(y)) - N(\mathbf{h}(x)) = -1$ , then*

$$\mathbf{h}(x) - \delta \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(x).$$

(3) *If  $N(\mathbf{h}(y)) - N(\mathbf{h}(x)) = 0$ , then  $\mathbf{h}(x)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y)$  are incomparable with respect to  $\leq^{\text{or}}$ .*

*Proof.* In this proof, we denote  $N(\mathbf{h}(x))$  by  $N(x)$  for  $x \in \theta$ . Put

$$x_k = x + (N(x) - k)(0, \ell), \quad y_k = y + (N(y) - k)(0, \ell)$$

for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Then  $N(x_k) = N(y_k) = k$ . Putting  $n = N(x)$ , one can see that

$$\theta \setminus (\{z \in \theta \mid z \geq x\} \sqcup \{z \in \theta \mid z \leq x\}) = [x_{n-1} - (1, 1), x_{n+1} + (1, 1)].$$

As  $x$  and  $y$  are incomparable,  $y$  belongs to this interval and hence

$$x_{n-1} < y < x_{n+1} \tag{3.3}$$

and  $n - 1 \leq N(y) \leq n + 1$  by Lemma 3.10. Namely, we have  $N(y) - N(x) = -1, 0$  or  $1$ .

(1) Suppose that  $N(y) - N(x) = 1$ . In this case,

$$\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x) = \mathbf{h}(y_0) + \delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0).$$

By definition,  $\mathbf{h}(x_0)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y_0)$  are positive roots. By Lemma 1.15,  $\mathbf{h}(x_0) - \delta$  is also a root and it is not positive. Therefore  $\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0) \in R_+$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x)$  is a sum of two positive roots. This implies  $\mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y)$ . Combining with (3.3), we have  $x - \delta \leq^{\text{or}} y \leq^{\text{or}} x$ .

(2) Follows from (1).

(3) Suppose that  $N(y) - N(x) = 0$ . Note that  $x_0$  and  $y_0$  are incomparable this case, and it follows from Lemma 3.11 that  $\mathbf{h}(y_0)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(x_0)$  are also incomparable with respect to  $\leq^{\text{or}}$ . Now we have

$$\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x) = \mathbf{h}(y_0) + N(y)\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0) - N(x)\delta = \mathbf{h}(y_0) - \mathbf{h}(x_0).$$

and hence  $\mathbf{h}(x)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y)$  are incomparable with respect to  $\leq^{\text{or}}$ .  $\square$




Figure 7: The cells in the shadow are incomparable with  $x = x_n$ .

**Theorem 3.13.** *The map*

$$\mathbf{h} : (\theta, \leq) \rightarrow (R(w_\theta), \trianglelefteq)$$

*is a poset isomorphism.*

*Proof.* By Proposition 3.7, we have

$$x \leq y \implies \mathbf{h}(x) \trianglelefteq \mathbf{h}(y),$$

$$y \leq x \implies \mathbf{h}(y) \trianglelefteq \mathbf{h}(x).$$

Thus the statement follows if we prove that

$$x \text{ and } y \text{ are incomparable} \implies \mathbf{h}(x) \text{ and } \mathbf{h}(y) \text{ are incomparable with respect to } \trianglelefteq.$$

Suppose that  $x$  and  $y$  are incomparable. Then, putting  $n = N(\mathbf{h}(x))$ , we have  $N(\mathbf{h}(y)) = n + 1, n$  or  $n - 1$  by Lemma 3.12.

First we assume that  $N(y) = n$ . Then Lemma 3.12 implies that  $\mathbf{h}(x)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y)$  must be incomparable.

Next, assume that  $N(y) = n + 1$ . Then

$$\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x) = \mathbf{h}(y_0) + \delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0),$$

where  $x_0 = x + n(0, \ell)$  and  $y_0 = y + (n + 1)(0, \ell)$ . By Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(y_0)) \cap \Gamma_{\max}| + 1 &= |\text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(y_0)) \cap \Gamma_{\min}|, \\ |\text{Supp}(\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0)) \cap \Gamma_{\max}| &= |\text{Supp}(\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0)) \cap \Gamma_{\min}| + 1. \end{aligned}$$

They are not compatible with Lemma 3.9 and thus we have

$$\mathbf{h}(y_0) \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Pi_\theta, \quad \delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0) \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Pi_\theta \tag{3.4}$$




Figure 8:

We need to show that  $\mathbf{h}(y_0) + (\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0)) \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Pi_\theta$ . It follows from Lemma 3.12 that

$$0 \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y_0) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(x_0) \leq^{\text{or}} \delta$$

and thus we have

$$0 \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y_0) + (\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0)) \leq^{\text{or}} \delta,$$

and

$$\text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(y_0) + (\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0))) = \text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(y_0)) \sqcup \text{Supp}(\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0)).$$

By (3.3), it holds that  $y = y_{n+1} < x_{n+1}$ . Thus  $y_0 < x_0$  and moreover  $x_0$  and  $y_0$  are not located in the same row or column. Hence

$$x_0^{\text{arm}}, x_0^{\text{leg}} \notin \text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(y_0) + (\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0))), \quad (3.5)$$

where  $x_0^{\text{arm}}$  (resp.  $x_0^{\text{leg}}$ ) is the minimal element in  $\{x_0\} \cup \text{Arm}(x_0)$  (resp.  $\{x_0\} \cup \text{Leg}(x_0)$ ).

Suppose that

$$\mathbf{h}(y_0) + (\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0)) = \sum_{i=1}^r \beta_i$$

with  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \in \Pi_\theta$ . Then  $0 \leq^{\text{or}} \beta_i \leq^{\text{or}} \delta$  ( $i = 1, \dots, r$ ),  $0 \leq^{\text{or}} \sum_{i=1}^r \beta_i \leq^{\text{or}} \delta$  and

$$\text{Supp}\left(\sum_{i=1}^r \beta_i\right) = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^r \text{Supp}(\beta_i).$$

Note that each  $\text{Supp}(\beta_i)$  is an interval in  $\theta$ . Combining with (3.5), this implies that

$$\text{Supp}(\beta_i) \subset \text{Supp}(\mathbf{h}(y_0)) \quad \text{or} \quad \text{Supp}(\beta_i) \subset \text{Supp}(\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0)).$$

Thus there exist  $i_1, \dots, i_s$  for which we have  $\mathbf{h}(y_0) = \beta_{i_1} + \dots + \beta_{i_s}$ , but this contradicts (3.4). Therefore  $\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x) = \mathbf{h}(y_0) + (\delta - \mathbf{h}(x_0))$  cannot be a sum of elements in  $\Pi_\theta$ , and thus  $\mathbf{h}(x)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y)$  are incomparable with respect to  $\trianglelefteq$ .

The same argument implies that  $\mathbf{h}(x)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y)$  are incomparable also in the case where  $N(\mathbf{h}(y)) = n - 1$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.14.** *Let  $\alpha, \beta \in R(w_\theta)$  with  $\alpha \trianglelefteq \beta$ . Then there exists a sequence*

$$\alpha = \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_k = \beta$$

*in  $R(w_\theta)$  such that  $\gamma_{i+1} - \gamma_i \in \Pi_\theta$  ( $i = 1, \dots, k - 1$ ).*

*In other words, the partial order  $\trianglelefteq$  on  $R(w_\theta)$  coincides with the transitive closure of the relations*

$$\alpha \trianglelefteq \beta \text{ whenever } \beta - \alpha \in \Pi_\theta. \quad (3.6)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\trianglelefteq^{\text{tc}}$  denote the transitive closure of the relations above. It follows from the same argument in the proof of Proposition 3.7 that

$$x \leq y \implies \mathbf{h}(x) \trianglelefteq^{\text{tc}} \mathbf{h}(y)$$

for any  $x, y \in \theta$ . It is clear that

$$\mathbf{h}(x) \trianglelefteq^{\text{tc}} \mathbf{h}(y) \implies \mathbf{h}(x) \trianglelefteq \mathbf{h}(y).$$

Combining with Theorem 3.13, the statement follows.  $\square$

### 3.3 Heaps

Let  $\theta$  be a cylindric diagram. Recall that standard tableaux on  $\theta$  have been defined as order preserving bijection from  $(\theta, \leq)$  to  $(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \leq)$ . Through the bijection  $\mathbf{t}$ , the set  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  inherits a partial order from  $\theta$ , which we will investigate in this section.

**Definition 3.15.** Let  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$ . Define a partial order  $\preceq_{\mathbf{t}}$  on  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  as the transitive closure of the relations

$$a \preceq_{\mathbf{t}} b \text{ whenever } a \leq b \text{ and either } s_{i_a} s_{i_b} = s_{i_b} s_{i_a} \text{ or } i_a = i_b.$$

where  $i_k = \mathbf{c}(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(k))$  for  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The poset  $(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \preceq_{\mathbf{t}})$  is called the *heap* of  $w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}$ .

**Proposition 3.16.** *Let  $\theta$  be a cylindric diagram and  $\mathbf{t}$  a standard tableau on  $\theta$ . Then, the map  $\mathbf{t} : \theta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  gives a poset isomorphism*

$$(\theta, \leq) \cong (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \preceq_{\mathbf{t}}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in \theta$ . Suppose that  $x < y$  is a covering relation in  $\theta$ . Then  $y = x - (1, 0)$  or  $y = x - (0, 1)$  and it is easy to see that  $\mathbf{t}(x) < \mathbf{t}(y)$  and  $s(x)s(y) \neq s(y)s(x)$ . Hence  $\mathbf{t}(x) \preceq_{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{t}(y)$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\mathbf{t}(x) \prec_{\mathbf{t}} \mathbf{t}(y)$  is a covering relation in  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . Then  $s(x)s(y) \neq s(y)s(x)$  or  $\mathbf{c}(x) = \mathbf{c}(y)$ , and hence  $\mathbf{c}(x) - \mathbf{c}(y) \neq 0, \pm 1$ . By Proposition 1.11 (1),  $x$  and  $y$  are comparable. Since  $\mathbf{t}$  is order preserving, we must have  $x < y$ , and hence  $\mathbf{h}$  is a poset isomorphism.  $\square$

The posets  $(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}, \preceq_t)$  are thought as semi-infinite analogue of heaps introduced by Stembridge [8]. Stembridge also introduced the heap order on the inversion sets. We treat a slightly modified version of heap order by Nakada [2].

**Definition 3.17.** Define a partial order  $\leq^{\text{hp}}$  on  $R(w_\theta)$  as the transitive closure of the relations

$$\alpha \leq^{\text{hp}} \beta \text{ whenever } \alpha \leq^{\text{or}} \beta \text{ and } \langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle \neq 0.$$

**Proposition 3.18.** *The map  $\mathbf{h} : \theta \rightarrow R(w_\theta)$  gives a poset isomorphism*

$$(\theta, \leq) \cong (R(w_\theta), \leq^{\text{hp}}).$$

*In other words, the partial order  $\leq^{\text{hp}}$  and  $\leq$  on  $R(w_\theta)$  coincide.*

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in \theta$ . Suppose that  $x < y$  is a covering relation in  $\theta$ . Then  $\mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x) \in \Pi_\theta \subset R \sqcup \mathbb{Z}\delta$ . We have

$$\langle \mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x), \mathbf{h}(y)^\vee \rangle = 2 - \langle \mathbf{h}(x), \mathbf{h}(y)^\vee \rangle.$$

If  $\langle \mathbf{h}(y), \mathbf{h}(x)^\vee \rangle = 0$  then  $\mathbf{h}(y) - \mathbf{h}(x) \equiv \mathbf{h}(y) \pmod{\mathbb{Z}\delta}$  by Lemma 1.16, and thus  $\mathbf{h}(x) = k\delta$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . This is a contradiction. Therefore  $\langle \mathbf{h}(x), \mathbf{h}(y)^\vee \rangle \neq 0$ , from which it follows that  $\mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{hp}} \mathbf{h}(y)$ .

Next, suppose that  $\mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{hp}} \mathbf{h}(y)$  is a covering relation. Put  $x_0 = x + N(\mathbf{h}(x))(0, \ell)$  and  $y_0 = x + N(\mathbf{h}(y))(0, \ell)$ . Then  $\mathbf{h}(x_0) = \mathbf{h}(x) - N(\mathbf{h}(x))\delta$ ,  $\mathbf{h}(y_0) = \mathbf{h}(y) - N(\mathbf{h}(y))\delta$  and

$$\langle \mathbf{h}(x_0), \mathbf{h}(y_0)^\vee \rangle = \langle \mathbf{h}(x), \mathbf{h}(y)^\vee \rangle \neq 0 \tag{3.7}$$

by assumption.

We assume that  $x$  and  $y$  are incomparable. Then as  $\mathbf{h}(x) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(y)$ , we have  $N(\mathbf{h}(y)) = N(\mathbf{h}(x)) + 1$  and

$$\mathbf{h}(y_0) \leq^{\text{or}} \mathbf{h}(x_0) \leq^{\text{or}} \delta \tag{3.8}$$

by Lemma 3.12. Moreover, by (3.5) in the proof of Theorem 3.13, we have

$$y_0 \notin \text{Arm}(x_0) \cup \text{Leg}(x_0). \tag{3.9}$$

(See also Figure 8.)

Recall that positive roots  $\mathbf{h}(x_0)$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y_0)$  can be expressed as  $\mathbf{h}(x_0) = \alpha_{ij}$  and  $\mathbf{h}(y_0) = \alpha_{kl}$  for some  $i, j, k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $i < j$ ,  $k < l$ . By (3.8) and (3.9), the indices  $i, j, k$  and  $l$  can be chosen in such a way that they satisfy  $j - i \leq \kappa - 1$  and  $i < k < l < j$ . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{h}(x_0), \mathbf{h}(y_0)^\vee \rangle &= \langle \alpha_{ij}, \alpha_{kl}^\vee \rangle = \langle \alpha_{k-1l+1}, \alpha_{kl}^\vee \rangle \\ &= \langle \alpha_{k-1}, \alpha_{kl}^\vee \rangle + \langle \alpha_k, \alpha_{kl}^\vee \rangle + \sum_{d=k+1}^{l-1} \langle \alpha_d, \alpha_{kl}^\vee \rangle + \langle \alpha_{l-1}, \alpha_{kl}^\vee \rangle + \langle \alpha_l, \alpha_{kl}^\vee \rangle \\ &= -1 + 1 + 0 + 1 - 1 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts (3.7). Therefore  $x$  and  $y$  are comparable, and thus  $x < y$  as  $\mathbf{h}(x) < \mathbf{h}(y)$ .  $\square$

## 4 Poset structure of the set of order ideals

### 4.1 Standard tableaux on cylindric skew diagrams

For a poset  $P$ , let  $\mathcal{J}(P)$  denote the set of proper order ideals and regard  $\mathcal{J}(P)$  as a poset with the inclusion relation.

Let  $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\leq -1}$  and fix a cylindric diagram  $\theta$  in  $\mathcal{C}_\omega$ . In this section, we will investigate the poset structure of the set  $\mathcal{J}(\theta)$  of order ideals of  $\theta$ , in other words, cylindric skew diagrams included in  $\theta$ .

Recall that any cylindric skew diagram  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}(\theta)$  is a finite set and  $\mathcal{J}(\theta) = \bigsqcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}_n(\theta)$ , where

$$\mathcal{J}_n(\theta) = \{\xi \in \mathcal{J}(\theta) \mid |\xi| = n\}.$$

For  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}_n(\theta)$  and  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\xi)$ , define a word  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}}$  by

$$w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}} = s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(1))s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(2)) \cdots s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(n)). \quad (4.1)$$

We sometimes regard  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}}$  as a Weyl group element.

**Proposition 4.1.** *The word  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}}$  is reduced. As an element of Weyl group,  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}}$  is fully commutative and independent of  $\mathbf{t}$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from Lemma 1.10 that the standard tableau  $\mathbf{t}$  on  $\xi$  can be extended to a standard tableau  $\tilde{\mathbf{t}}$  on  $\theta$ , for which we have  $w_{\theta, \tilde{\mathbf{t}}}[n] = w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}}$ . By Proposition 2.11 and Proposition 2.17, the right hand side of (4.1) is a reduced expression and  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}}$  is a fully commutative element of  $W$ . It follows from Proposition 2.12 that

$$R(w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}}) = \{\mathbf{h}(x) \mid x \in \xi\}.$$

Hence the set  $R(w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}})$  is independent of  $\mathbf{t}$  and so is  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}}$ . □

We denote by  $w_\xi$  the Weyl group element determined by the word  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}}$  for a/any standard tableau  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\xi)$ .

**Lemma 4.2** (See [8, Theorem 3.2]). *The map*

$$\mathbf{t} \mapsto w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}} = s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(1))s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(2)) \cdots s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(n))$$

*gives a bijection from  $\text{ST}(\xi)$  to the set of reduced expressions for  $w_\xi$ .*

*Proof.* First, we prove that the correspondence is injective. For  $\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2 \in \text{ST}(\xi)$ , consider two words  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}_1} = s(p_1)s(p_2) \cdots s(p_n)$  and  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}_2} = s(q_1)s(q_2) \cdots s(q_n)$ , where  $p_k = \mathbf{t}_1^{-1}(k)$  and  $q_k = \mathbf{t}_2^{-1}(k)$ . Assume that  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}_1} = w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}_2}$  as words. Then  $\mathbf{c}(p_1) = \mathbf{c}(q_1)$  and it holds that  $p_1$  and  $q_1$  are minimal elements of  $\xi$ . Hence we have  $p_1 = q_1$ . Inductively, we have  $p_k = q_k$  for any  $k \in [1, n]$  by similar argument.

Next, we prove that the map is surjective. Take  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\xi)$  and put  $p_j = \mathbf{t}^{-1}(j)$  ( $j \in [1, n]$ ). Then  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}} = s(p_1)s(p_2) \cdots s(p_n)$ , which is a reduced expression of  $w_\xi$ .

Suppose that  $s(p_k)s(p_{k+1}) = s(p_{k+1})s(p_k)$ . Then  $\mathbf{c}(p_k) - \mathbf{c}(p_{k+1}) \neq \pm 1$ , and thus  $p_k$  is not covered by  $p_{k+1}$ . This means that  $p_k$  and  $p_{k+1}$  are incomparable. Define the map  $\mathbf{t}^{(k)} : \xi \rightarrow [1, n]$  by

$$\mathbf{t}^{(k)}(p_j) = \begin{cases} k+1 & \text{if } j = k, \\ k & \text{if } j = k+1, \\ j & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then  $\mathbf{t}^{(k)} \in \text{ST}(\xi)$  and  $w_{\xi, \mathbf{t}^{(k)}} = s(p_1)s(p_2) \cdots s(p_{k+1})s(p_k) \cdots s(p_n)$ . Now fully-commutativity of  $w_\xi$  implies the surjectivity.  $\square$

## 4.2 Bruhat intervals

For  $v, w \in W$ , we write  $v \prec w$  if  $\ell(w) = \ell(v) + 1$  and  $w = vs_i$  for some simple reflection  $s_i$ . Write  $v \prec w$  if there is a sequence  $v = w_0 \prec w_1 \prec \cdots \prec w_n = w$ . It is clear that the relation  $\preceq$  is a partial order of  $W$ , and it is called the *weak right Bruhat order*.

For  $w \in W$ , we define

$$[e, w] = \{x \in W \mid e \preceq x \preceq w\}.$$

Note that when  $\ell(w) = n$ , we have

$$[e, w] = \left\{ s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_k} \in W \mid \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq k \leq n \text{ and there exist } i_{k+1}, \dots, i_n \text{ such that} \\ s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_k} s_{i_{k+1}} \cdots s_{i_n} \text{ is a reduced expression for } w \end{array} \right\}. \quad (4.2)$$

Let  $\theta$  be a cylindric diagram. For  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$ , we define

$$[e, w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}] = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [e, w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}[n]].$$

We will see that the ‘‘semi-infinite Bruhat interval’’  $[e, w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}}]$  is actually independent of  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{t}_1$  and  $\mathbf{t}_2$  be two standard tableaux on  $\theta$ . Then for each  $n \geq 1$ , there exist  $r \geq n$  and  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$  for which it holds that  $w_{\theta, \mathfrak{s}}[r] = w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}_1}[r]$  as elements of  $W$  and  $w_{\theta, \mathfrak{s}}[n] = w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}_2}[n]$  as words.*

*Proof.* Choose  $r \geq n$  such that  $\mathbf{t}_2^{-1}[1, n] \subset \mathbf{t}_1^{-1}[1, r]$ . Put  $\xi_1 = \mathbf{t}_1^{-1}[1, r]$  and  $\xi_2 = \mathbf{t}_2^{-1}[1, n]$ . Note that  $\xi_1 \setminus \xi_2$  is an order ideal of the cylindric diagram  $\theta \setminus \xi_2$ . Take  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta \setminus \xi_2)$  such that  $\mathbf{t}^{-1}[1, r-n] = \xi_1 \setminus \xi_2$  (Lemma 1.10). Define a map  $\mathfrak{s} : \theta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  by

$$\mathfrak{s}(p) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{t}(p) + n & (p \in \theta \setminus \xi_2) \\ \mathbf{t}_2(p) & (p \in \xi_2) \end{cases}$$

Then we have  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$ , which satisfies the desired conditions by Proposition 4.1.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{t}_1$  and  $\mathbf{t}_2$  be two standard tableaux of  $\theta$ . Then*

$$[e, w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}_1}] = [e, w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}_2}] \text{ as subsets of } W.$$



*Proof.* Let  $n \geq 1$ . By Lemma 4.3, there exist  $r \geq n$  and  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$  such that  $w_{\theta, \mathfrak{s}}[r] = w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_1}[r]$  and  $w_{\theta, \mathfrak{s}}[n] = w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_2}[n]$ . Now we have

$$[e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_2}[n]] = [e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{s}}[n]] \subset [e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{s}}[r]] \subset [e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_1}[r]].$$

Hence we obtain

$$[e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_2}) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_2}[n]] \subset [e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_1}).$$

Similarly, we obtain  $[e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_1}) \subset [e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_2})$ , and hence  $[e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_1}) = [e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}_2})$ .  $\square$

We denote  $[e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}})$  just by  $[e, w_{\theta})$  in the rest. We have

$$[e, w_{\theta}) = \bigcup_{\xi \in \mathcal{J}(\theta)} [e, w_{\xi}]$$

by the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $v \in W$ . Then  $v \in [e, w_{\theta})$  if and only if  $v = w_{\xi}$  for some  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}(\theta)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $v \in [e, w_{\theta})$ . Then  $v \in [e, w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}}[n]]$  for some  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$  and  $n$ . By Lemma 4.2, there exist  $\mathfrak{t}' \in \text{ST}(\theta)$  and  $k$  such that  $v = w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}'}[k]$ . Putting  $\xi = \mathfrak{t}'^{-1}[1, k]$ , we have  $v = w_{\xi}$ .

Let  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}(\theta)$ . Then there exist  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$  and  $n$  such that  $w_{\xi} = w_{\theta, \mathfrak{t}}[n]$ . Therefore  $w_{\xi} \in [e, w_{\theta})$ .  $\square$

The following theorem can be seen as a semi-infinite version of the results established in [8] (see also [3, 5]).

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $\theta$  be a cylindric Young diagram in  $\mathcal{C}_{\omega}$ .*

(1) *The map*

$$\Phi : (\mathcal{J}(\theta), \subset) \rightarrow ([e, w_{\theta}), \preceq)$$

*given by  $\Phi(\xi) = w_{\xi}$  is a poset isomorphism.*

(2) *The map*

$$\Psi : ([e, w_{\theta}), \preceq) \rightarrow (\mathcal{J}(R(w_{\theta})), \subset)$$

*given by  $\Psi(w) = R(w)$  is a poset isomorphism.*

*Proof.* We will show (1) and (2) together. Note that the poset isomorphism  $\mathbf{h} : \theta \rightarrow R(w_{\theta})$  induces a poset isomorphism  $\mathcal{J}(\theta) \rightarrow \mathcal{J}(R(w_{\theta}))$ , under which  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}(\theta)$  corresponds to

$$\{\mathbf{h}(x) \mid x \in \xi\} = R(w_{\xi}) = \Psi \circ \Phi(\xi).$$

Hence  $\Psi \circ \Phi$  is bijective and thus  $\Phi$  is injective. As  $\Phi$  is surjective by Lemma 4.5,  $\Phi$  is bijective. Thus  $\Psi$  is also bijective.

We will show that  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are order preserving.

Suppose that  $\xi'$  covers  $\xi$ , or equivalently that  $\xi' = \xi \sqcup \{x\}$  for a maximal element  $x$  of  $\xi'$ . Then there exists  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\xi')$  satisfying  $\mathbf{t}^{-1}(n) = x$ , for which we have

$$w_{\xi'} = s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(1))s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(2)) \cdots s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(n-1))s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(n)) = w_{\xi}s(x),$$

This implies that  $w_{\xi'}$  covers  $w_{\xi}$ . Hence  $\Phi$  is order preserving.

It is easy to see that  $v \preceq w$  implies  $R(v) \subset R(w)$ . Hence  $\Psi$  is order preserving.

As we know that  $(\Psi \circ \Phi)^{-1}$  is order preserving, it holds that  $\Phi^{-1}$  and  $\Psi^{-1}$  are also order preserving.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $\theta$  be a cylindric diagram. Then*

$$[e, w_{\theta}) = \{w \in W \mid w \text{ is } \zeta_{\theta}\text{-pluscule}\}$$

*Proof.* It follows from Proposition 2.17 that any element of  $[e, w_{\theta})$  is  $\zeta_{\theta}$ -pluscule.

Let  $w \in W$  be  $\zeta_{\theta}$ -pluscule and  $w = s_{i_1}s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_n}$  its reduced expression. We will show that  $w \in [e, w_{\theta})$  by induction on  $n = \ell(w)$ . By induction hypothesis,  $v := s_{i_1}s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{n-1}}$  belongs to  $[e, w_{\theta})$ , and thus  $v = w_{\xi}$  for some  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}(\theta)$ .

Let  $x$  be the minimum element of  $\mathbf{c}^{-1}(i_n) \cap (\theta \setminus \xi)$  and put  $\xi' = \xi \sqcup \{x\}$ . Take  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\xi')$  such that  $\mathbf{t}(n) = x$ . Then  $w = s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(1))s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(2)) \cdots s(\mathbf{t}^{-1}(n))$ . Since  $w$  is  $\zeta_{\theta}$ -pluscule, if  $i_n = i_k$  then there exist  $j_+, j_- \in [k, n]$  such that  $j_+ = i_n + 1$  and  $j_- = i_n - 1$  by [7, Proposition 2.3]. This implies that the subset  $\xi'$  satisfies the condition (v) in Proposition 1.6. Therefore  $\xi'$  is a cylindric skew diagram in  $\theta$  and  $w = w_{\xi \sqcup \{x\}}$ . Therefore  $w \in [e, w_{\theta})$ .  $\square$

### 4.3 Skew diagrams and classical case

Let  $\theta$  be a cylindric diagram in  $\mathcal{C}_{\omega}$ . Let  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}_n(\theta)$  and take  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\theta)$  such that  $\xi = \mathbf{t}^{-1}[1, n]$ . Then we have  $w_{\theta, \mathbf{t}[n]} = w_{\xi}$  and  $\mathbf{h}(\xi) = R(w_{\xi})$ . Thus the next theorem follows easily from Theorem 3.13:

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}_n(\theta)$ .*

- (1) *The map  $\mathbf{h} : (\xi, \leq) \rightarrow (R(w_{\xi}), \trianglelefteq)$  is a poset isomorphism.*
- (2) *For  $\mathbf{t} \in \text{ST}(\xi)$ , the map  $\mathbf{t} : (\xi, \leq) \rightarrow ([1, n], \leq_{\mathbf{t}}^{\text{hp}})$  is a poset isomorphism.*

Note that  $\mathcal{J}(\xi) = \{\eta \in \mathcal{J}(\theta) \mid \eta \subset \xi\}$ . Theorem 4.6 implies the following:

**Theorem 4.9.** *Let  $\xi \in \mathcal{J}(\theta)$ .*

- (1) *The map  $\Phi : (\mathcal{J}(\xi), \subset) \rightarrow ([e, w_{\xi}], \preceq)$  given by  $\Phi(\eta) = w_{\eta}$  is a poset isomorphism.*
- (2) *The map  $\Psi : ([e, w_{\xi}], \preceq) \rightarrow (\mathcal{J}(R(w_{\xi})), \subset)$  given by  $\Psi(w) = R(w)$  is a poset isomorphism.*

In the rest, we will see that description for non-cylindric diagrams can be deduced from the results above. Let  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  and let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m)$ ,  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$  be partitions such that  $\lambda_i \geq \mu_i \geq 0$  ( $i \in [1, m]$ ). Under the notation in Section 1.1, the associated classical skew Young diagram is represented as the subset  $\lambda/\mu$  of  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ :

$$\lambda/\mu = \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid a \in [1, m], b \in [\mu_a + 1, \lambda_a]\}.$$

Note that the classical normal Young diagram associated with  $\lambda$  is a special skew diagram  $\lambda/\phi$  with  $\phi = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ .

To connect classical diagrams and cylindric diagrams, we take  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  such that

$$\ell \geq \lambda_1 - \mu_m.$$

Then the partitions  $\lambda, \mu$  are  $\ell$ -restricted, and moreover it is easy to see that the skew diagram  $\lambda/\mu$  is isomorphic to the cylindric skew diagram  $\overset{\circ}{\lambda}/\overset{\circ}{\mu} = \pi(\lambda/\mu)$  as a poset. Under this identification  $\lambda/\mu = \overset{\circ}{\lambda}/\overset{\circ}{\mu}$ , Theorem 4.8 and Lemma 3.11 for the order ideal  $\overset{\circ}{\lambda}/\overset{\circ}{\mu}$  of the cylindric diagram  $\overset{\circ}{\lambda}$  imply the followings:

$$([1, n], \leq_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\text{hp}}) \cong (\lambda/\mu, \leq) \cong (R(w_{\lambda/\mu}), \trianglelefteq) = (R(w_{\lambda/\mu}), \leq^{\text{or}})$$

for each  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{ST}(\lambda/\mu) = \text{ST}(\overset{\circ}{\lambda}/\overset{\circ}{\mu})$ , and it follows from Theorem 4.9 that

$$(\mathcal{J}(\lambda/\mu), \subset) \cong ([e, w_{\lambda/\mu}], \preceq) \cong (\mathcal{J}(R(w_{\lambda/\mu})), \subset).$$

Remark that by redefining the content as

$$\mathbf{c}(a, b) = b - a + m - \mu_m,$$

we have  $\mathbf{c}(\lambda/\mu) \subset [1, \kappa - 1]$ , and

$$w_{\lambda/\mu} \in \bar{W}, \quad R(w_{\lambda/\mu}) \subset \bar{R},$$

where  $\bar{W}$  and  $\bar{R}$  denote the Weyl group and the root system of type  $A_{\kappa-1}$  respectively.

We will see the relation between the results above and preceding works. Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  and  $\lambda$  be a partition of  $n$ . Fix  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{ST}(\lambda/\phi)$  and put

$$w_{\lambda} := w_{\lambda/\phi} = s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(n))s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(n-1)) \cdots s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(1)).$$

The element  $w_{\lambda}$  is independent of  $\mathfrak{t}$  and it is called the Grassmannian permutation associated with  $\lambda$ .

It has been shown in [7, 3] that the map

$$\mathbf{coh} : \lambda/\phi \rightarrow R(w_{\lambda}^{-1})$$

given by

$$\mathbf{coh}(x) = s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(n))s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(n-1)) \cdots s(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(k+1))\alpha(\mathfrak{t}^{-1}(k)), \quad (4.3)$$

where  $k = \mathfrak{t}^{-1}(x)$ , leads an *dual isomorphism* of posets:

$$\mathbf{coh} : (\lambda/\phi, \leq) \rightarrow (R(w_{\lambda}^{-1}), \leq^{\text{or}}), \quad (4.4)$$

where  $\leq^{\text{or}}$  is the ordinary order as before.

On the other hand, as a classical version of Theorem 4.8, we have a poset isomorphism

$$\mathbf{h} : (\lambda/\phi, \leq) \rightarrow (R(w_{\lambda}), \trianglelefteq). \quad (4.5)$$

Now define the map  $\iota : R \rightarrow R$  by  $\iota(\alpha) = -w_{\lambda}^{-1}\alpha$ . Then it follows immediately from the expression (2.3) and (4.3) that  $\iota \circ \mathbf{h}(x) = \mathbf{coh}(x)$  for all  $x \in \lambda/\phi$ . Therefore we have the following:

**Proposition 4.10.** *The restriction of  $\iota$  gives a dual poset isomorphism*

$$\iota : (R(w_\lambda), \trianglelefteq) \rightarrow (R(w_\lambda^{-1}), \leq^{\text{or}})$$

and moreover  $\iota \circ \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{coh}$ . In other words, the following diagram of poset isomorphisms commutes :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\boldsymbol{\lambda}/\boldsymbol{\phi}, \leq) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{h}} & (R(w_\lambda), \trianglelefteq) \\ \mathbf{coh} \downarrow & \swarrow \iota & \\ (R(w_\lambda^{-1}), \leq^{\text{or}})^{\text{op}} & & \end{array} \quad (4.6)$$

where  $(R(w_\lambda^{-1}), \leq^{\text{or}})^{\text{op}}$  denotes the poset obtained from  $(R(w_\lambda^{-1}), \leq^{\text{or}})$  by reversing the order.

## References

- [1] A. Kleshchev, *Completely splittable representations of symmetric groups*, J. Algebra **181** (1996), no. 2, 584–592.
- [2] K. Nakada, *Colored hook formula for a generalized Young diagram*, Osaka J. Math., **45** (2008), 1085–1120.
- [3] H. Naruse and S. Okada, *Skew hook formula for  $d$ -complete posets via equivariant  $K$ -theory*, Algebr. Comb. **2** (2019), no. 4, 541–571.
- [4] R. A. Proctor,  *$d$ -Complete Posets Generalize Young Diagrams for the Hook Product Formula: Partial Presentation of Proof*, RIMS Kôkyûroku, **1913** (2014), 120–140.
- [5] R. A. Proctor, *Minuscule elements of Weyl groups, the numbers game, and  $d$ -complete posets*, J. Algebra **213** (1999), no. 1, 272–303.
- [6] O. Ruff, *Completely splittable representations of symmetric groups and affine Hecke algebras*, J. Algebra **305** (2006), no. 2, 1197–1211.
- [7] J. R. Stembridge, *Minuscule elements of Weyl groups*, J. Algebra **235** (2001), 722–743.
- [8] J. R. Stembridge, *On the fully commutative elements of Coxeter groups*, J. Algebr. Comb. **5** (1996), no. 4, 353–385.
- [9] M. Strayer, *Unified characterizations of minuscule Kac–Moody representations built from colored posets*, Electronic J. Comb., **27** (2020), no. 2, #P2.42.
- [10] M. Strayer, *Classifications of  $\Gamma$ -colored  $d$ -complete posets and upper  $P$ -minuscule Borel representations*, Electronic J. Comb., **28** (2021), no. 1, #P1.15.
- [11] T. Suzuki, Y. Toyosawa, *On hook formulas for cylindric skew diagrams*, Math J. Okayama Univ. **64** (2022), 191–213.

- [12] Takeshi Suzuki, *Rational and trigonometric degeneration of double affine Hecke algebras of type A*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2005), no. 37, 2249–2262.
- [13] Takeshi Suzuki and Monica Vazirani, *Tableaux on periodic skew diagrams and irreducible representations of the double affine Hecke algebra of type A*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2005), no. 27, 1621–1656.