

Generalized cohomology quotients of the symmetric functions

Darij Grinberg (Drexel University, USA)

2026-05-26

Stockholms universitet

slides:

<https://darijgrinberg.gitlab.io/algebra/su2026.pdf>

paper:

<https://darijgrinberg.gitlab.io/algebra/basisquot.pdf>

overview (old):

<https://darijgrinberg.gitlab.io/algebra/fpsac19.pdf>

What is this about?

- From a modern point of view, **Schubert calculus** (a.k.a. classical enumerative geometry, or Hilbert's 15th problem) is about two cohomology rings:

$$H^* \left(\underbrace{\text{Gr}(k, n)}_{\text{Grassmannian}} \right) \text{ and } H^* \left(\underbrace{\text{Fl}(n)}_{\text{flag variety}} \right)$$

(both varieties over \mathbb{C}).

What is this about?

- From a modern point of view, **Schubert calculus** (a.k.a. classical enumerative geometry, or Hilbert's 15th problem) is about two cohomology rings:

$$H^* \left(\underbrace{\text{Gr}(k, n)}_{\text{Grassmannian}} \right) \text{ and } H^* \left(\underbrace{\text{Fl}(n)}_{\text{flag variety}} \right)$$

(both varieties over \mathbb{C}).

- In this talk, we are concerned with the first.

What is this about?

- From a modern point of view, **Schubert calculus** (a.k.a. classical enumerative geometry, or Hilbert's 15th problem) is about two cohomology rings:

$$H^* \left(\underbrace{\text{Gr}(k, n)}_{\text{Grassmannian}} \right) \text{ and } H^* \left(\underbrace{\text{Fl}(n)}_{\text{flag variety}} \right)$$

(both varieties over \mathbb{C}).

- In this talk, we are concerned with the first.
- Classical result: as rings,

$$\begin{aligned} H^*(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \\ \cong (\text{symmetric polynomials in } x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \text{ over } \mathbb{Z}) \\ \quad / (h_{n-k+1}, h_{n-k+2}, \dots, h_n)_{\text{ideal}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the h_i are complete homogeneous symmetric polynomials (to be defined soon).

- (Small) **Quantum cohomology** is a deformation of cohomology from the 1980–90s. For the Grassmannian, it is

$$QH^*(Gr(k, n))$$

$$\cong (\text{symmetric polynomials in } x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \text{ over } \mathbb{Z}[q])$$

$$\Big/ \left(h_{n-k+1}, h_{n-k+2}, \dots, h_{n-1}, h_n + (-1)^k q \right)_{\text{ideal}}.$$

- (Small) **Quantum cohomology** is a deformation of cohomology from the 1980–90s. For the Grassmannian, it is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{QH}^*(\text{Gr}(k, n)) \\ & \cong (\text{symmetric polynomials in } x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k \text{ over } \mathbb{Z}[q]) \\ & \quad / \left(h_{n-k+1}, h_{n-k+2}, \dots, h_{n-1}, h_n + (-1)^k q \right)_{\text{ideal}}. \end{aligned}$$

- Many properties of classical cohomology still hold here. In particular: $\text{QH}^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ has a $\mathbb{Z}[q]$ -module basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ of (projected) Schur polynomials (to be defined soon), with λ ranging over all partitions with $\leq k$ parts and each part $\leq n - k$. The structure constants are the **Gromov–Witten invariants**. References:

- Aaron Bertram, Ionut Ciocan-Fontanine, William Fulton, *Quantum multiplication of Schur polynomials*, 1999.
- Alexander Postnikov, *Affine approach to quantum Schubert calculus*, 2005.

- **Goal:** Deform $H^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ using k parameters instead of one, generalizing $QH^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$.

- **Goal:** Deform $H^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ using k parameters instead of one, generalizing $QH^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$.
- The new ring has no geometric interpretation known so far, but various properties suggesting such an interpretation likely exists.

- **Goal:** Deform $H^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ using k parameters instead of one, generalizing $QH^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$.
- The new ring has no geometric interpretation known so far, but various properties suggesting such an interpretation likely exists.
- Almost all the work here is 6+ years old. All specific conjectures except for a positivity one have been resolved. Yet I feel that the “actual story” is still hidden. In particular, the proofs are long, computational and case-heavy. There must be reasons behind these results!

- **Goal:** Deform $H^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ using k parameters instead of one, generalizing $QH^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$.
- The new ring has no geometric interpretation known so far, but various properties suggesting such an interpretation likely exists.
- Almost all the work here is 6+ years old. All specific conjectures except for a positivity one have been resolved. Yet I feel that the “actual story” is still hidden. In particular, the proofs are long, computational and case-heavy. There must be reasons behind these results!
- I will now start from scratch and define the deformed cohomology ring algebraically.

A more general setting: \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S}

- Let \mathbf{k} be a commutative ring.
Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

A more general setting: \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S}

- Let \mathbf{k} be a commutative ring.
Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
- Let $\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{k}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k]$ be the polynomial ring in k indeterminates over \mathbf{k} .

A more general setting: \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S}

- Let \mathbf{k} be a commutative ring.
Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
- Let $\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{k}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k]$ be the polynomial ring in k indeterminates over \mathbf{k} .
- For each k -tuple $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, let α_i be the i -th entry of α . Same for infinite sequences.

A more general setting: \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S}

- Let \mathbf{k} be a commutative ring.
Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
- Let $\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{k}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k]$ be the polynomial ring in k indeterminates over \mathbf{k} .
- For each k -tuple $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, let α_i be the i -th entry of α . Same for infinite sequences.
- For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$, let x^α be the monomial $x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_k^{\alpha_k}$, and let $|\alpha|$ be the degree $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_k$ of this monomial.

A more general setting: \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S}

- Let \mathbf{k} be a commutative ring.
Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
- Let $\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{k}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k]$ be the polynomial ring in k indeterminates over \mathbf{k} .
- For each k -tuple $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, let α_i be the i -th entry of α . Same for infinite sequences.
- For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$, let x^α be the monomial $x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_k^{\alpha_k}$, and let $|\alpha|$ be the degree $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_k$ of this monomial.
- Let \mathcal{S} denote the ring of *symmetric* polynomials in \mathcal{P} .
These are the polynomials $f \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = f(x_{\sigma(1)}, x_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(k)})$$

for all permutations σ of $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

A more general setting: \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S}

- Let \mathbf{k} be a commutative ring.
Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
- Let $\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{k}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k]$ be the polynomial ring in k indeterminates over \mathbf{k} .
- For each k -tuple $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, let α_i be the i -th entry of α . Same for infinite sequences.
- For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$, let x^α be the monomial $x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_k^{\alpha_k}$, and let $|\alpha|$ be the degree $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_k$ of this monomial.
- Let \mathcal{S} denote the ring of *symmetric* polynomials in \mathcal{P} .
These are the polynomials $f \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = f(x_{\sigma(1)}, x_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(k)})$$

for all permutations σ of $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

- **Theorem (Artin ≤ 1944):** The \mathcal{S} -module \mathcal{P} is free with basis

$$(x^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i} \quad (\text{or, informally: } \left(x_1^{<1} x_2^{<2} \cdots x_k^{<k} \right)).$$

A more general setting: \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{S}

- Let \mathbf{k} be a commutative ring.
Let $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$.
- Let $\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{k}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k]$ be the polynomial ring in k indeterminates over \mathbf{k} .
- For each k -tuple $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, let α_i be the i -th entry of α . Same for infinite sequences.
- For each $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$, let x^α be the monomial $x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_k^{\alpha_k}$, and let $|\alpha|$ be the degree $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_k$ of this monomial.
- Let \mathcal{S} denote the ring of *symmetric* polynomials in \mathcal{P} .
These are the polynomials $f \in \mathcal{P}$ satisfying

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) = f(x_{\sigma(1)}, x_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(k)})$$

for all permutations σ of $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$.

- **Theorem (Artin ≤ 1944):** The \mathcal{S} -module \mathcal{P} is free with basis

$$(x^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i} \quad (\text{or, informally: } "(x_1^{<1} x_2^{<2} \cdots x_k^{<k})").$$

Example: For $k = 3$, this basis is $(1, x_3, x_3^2, x_2, x_2x_3, x_2x_3^2)$.

- The ring \mathcal{S} of symmetric polynomials in $\mathcal{P} = \mathbf{k}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k]$ has several bases, usually indexed by certain sets of (integer) partitions.

First, let us recall what partitions are:

- A *partition* means a **weakly decreasing** sequence of nonnegative integers that has only finitely many nonzero entries.

- A *partition* means a **weakly decreasing** sequence of nonnegative integers that has only finitely many nonzero entries.

Examples: $(4, 2, 2, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$ and $(3, 2, 0, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$ and $(5, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$ are three partitions.
 $(2, 3, 2, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$ and $(2, 1, 1, 1, \dots)$ are not.

k -partitions: definition

- A *k -partition* means a **weakly decreasing** k -tuple $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$.

- A *k -partition* means a **weakly decreasing** k -tuple $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$.

Examples: $(4, 2, 2)$ and $(3, 2, 0)$ and $(5, 0, 0)$ are three 3-partitions.

$(2, 3, 2)$ is not.

- A *k -partition* means a **weakly decreasing** k -tuple $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$.

Examples: $(4, 2, 2)$ and $(3, 2, 0)$ and $(5, 0, 0)$ are three 3-partitions.

$(2, 3, 2)$ is not.

- Thus there is a bijection

$$\{k\text{-partitions}\} \rightarrow \{\text{partitions with at most } k \text{ nonzero entries}\},$$
$$\lambda \mapsto (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k, 0, 0, 0, \dots).$$

k -partitions: definition

- A k -partition means a **weakly decreasing** k -tuple $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$.
Examples: $(4, 2, 2)$ and $(3, 2, 0)$ and $(5, 0, 0)$ are three 3-partitions.
 $(2, 3, 2)$ is not.
- If $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}^k$ is a k -partition, then its **Young diagram** $Y(\lambda)$ is defined as a table made out of k left-aligned rows, where the i -th row has λ_i boxes.

Example: If $k = 6$ and $\lambda = (5, 5, 3, 2, 0, 0)$, then

$$Y(\lambda) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square & & \\ \hline \square & \square & & & \\ \hline \square & \square & & & \\ \hline \square & \square & & & \\ \hline \square & \square & & & \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

(Empty rows are invisible.)

k -partitions: definition

- A k -partition means a **weakly decreasing** k -tuple $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$.

Examples: $(4, 2, 2)$ and $(3, 2, 0)$ and $(5, 0, 0)$ are three 3-partitions.

$(2, 3, 2)$ is not.

- If $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}^k$ is a k -partition, then its **Young diagram** $Y(\lambda)$ is defined as a table made out of k left-aligned rows, where the i -th row has λ_i boxes.

Example: If $k = 6$ and $\lambda = (5, 5, 3, 2, 0, 0)$, then

$$Y(\lambda) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square & & \\ \hline \square & \square & & & \\ \hline \square & \square & & & \\ \hline \square & \square & & & \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

(Empty rows are invisible.)

- The same convention applies to partitions.

Symmetric polynomials: the e -basis

- For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let e_m denote the m -th *elementary symmetric polynomial*:

$$e_m = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_m \leq k} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^k; \\ |\alpha|=m}} x^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}.$$

(Thus, $e_0 = 1$, and $e_m = 0$ when $m < 0$.)

Symmetric polynomials: the e -basis

- For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let e_m denote the m -th *elementary symmetric polynomial*:

$$e_m = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_m \leq k} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^k; \\ |\alpha|=m}} x^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}.$$

(Thus, $e_0 = 1$, and $e_m = 0$ when $m < 0$.)

- For each $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ (e.g., a k -partition when $\ell = k$), set

$$e_\nu = e_{\nu_1} e_{\nu_2} \cdots e_{\nu_\ell} \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Symmetric polynomials: the e -basis

- For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let e_m denote the m -th *elementary symmetric polynomial*:

$$e_m = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_m \leq k} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^k; \\ |\alpha|=m}} x^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}.$$

(Thus, $e_0 = 1$, and $e_m = 0$ when $m < 0$.)

- For each $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ (e.g., a k -partition when $\ell = k$), set

$$e_\nu = e_{\nu_1} e_{\nu_2} \cdots e_{\nu_\ell} \in \mathcal{S}.$$

- **Theorem (Gauss):** The commutative \mathbf{k} -algebra \mathcal{S} is freely generated by the elementary symmetric polynomials e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k . (That is, it is generated by them, and they are algebraically independent.)

Symmetric polynomials: the e -basis

- For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let e_m denote the m -th *elementary symmetric polynomial*:

$$e_m = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_m \leq k} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^k; \\ |\alpha|=m}} x^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}.$$

(Thus, $e_0 = 1$, and $e_m = 0$ when $m < 0$.)

- For each $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ (e.g., a k -partition when $\ell = k$), set

$$e_\nu = e_{\nu_1} e_{\nu_2} \cdots e_{\nu_\ell} \in \mathcal{S}.$$

- **Theorem (Gauss):** The commutative \mathbf{k} -algebra \mathcal{S} is freely generated by the elementary symmetric polynomials e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k . (That is, it is generated by them, and they are algebraically independent.)
- **Equivalent restatement:** $(e_\lambda)_\lambda$ is a partition whose entries are $\leq k$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S} .

Symmetric polynomials: the e -basis

- For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let e_m denote the m -th *elementary symmetric polynomial*:

$$e_m = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_m \leq k} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \{0,1\}^k; \\ |\alpha|=m}} x^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}.$$

(Thus, $e_0 = 1$, and $e_m = 0$ when $m < 0$.)

- For each $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ (e.g., a k -partition when $\ell = k$), set

$$e_\nu = e_{\nu_1} e_{\nu_2} \cdots e_{\nu_\ell} \in \mathcal{S}.$$

- Theorem (Gauss):** The commutative \mathbf{k} -algebra \mathcal{S} is freely generated by the elementary symmetric polynomials e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k . (That is, it is generated by them, and they are algebraically independent.)
- Equivalent restatement:** $(e_\lambda)_\lambda$ is a partition whose entries are $\leq k$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S} .
- Note that $e_m = 0$ when $m > k$.

- For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let h_m denote the m -th *complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial*:

$$h_m = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_m \leq k} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \\ |\alpha| = m}} x^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}.$$

(Thus, $h_0 = 1$, and $h_m = 0$ when $m < 0$.)

- For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let h_m denote the m -th *complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial*:

$$h_m = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_m \leq k} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \\ |\alpha| = m}} x^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}.$$

(Thus, $h_0 = 1$, and $h_m = 0$ when $m < 0$.)

- For each $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ (e.g., a k -partition when $\ell = k$), set

$$h_\nu = h_{\nu_1} h_{\nu_2} \cdots h_{\nu_\ell} \in \mathcal{S}.$$

- For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let h_m denote the m -th *complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial*:

$$h_m = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_m \leq k} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \\ |\alpha| = m}} x^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}.$$

(Thus, $h_0 = 1$, and $h_m = 0$ when $m < 0$.)

- For each $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ (e.g., a k -partition when $\ell = k$), set

$$h_\nu = h_{\nu_1} h_{\nu_2} \cdots h_{\nu_\ell} \in \mathcal{S}.$$

- **Theorem:** The commutative \mathbf{k} -algebra \mathcal{S} is freely generated by the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomials h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k .

- For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let h_m denote the m -th *complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial*:

$$h_m = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_m \leq k} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \\ |\alpha| = m}} x^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}.$$

(Thus, $h_0 = 1$, and $h_m = 0$ when $m < 0$.)

- For each $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ (e.g., a k -partition when $\ell = k$), set

$$h_\nu = h_{\nu_1} h_{\nu_2} \cdots h_{\nu_\ell} \in \mathcal{S}.$$

- **Theorem:** The commutative \mathbf{k} -algebra \mathcal{S} is freely generated by the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomials h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k .
- **Equivalent restatement:** $(h_\lambda)_\lambda$ is a partition whose entries are $\leq k$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S} .

Symmetric polynomials: the h -bases

- For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let h_m denote the m -th *complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial*:

$$h_m = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_m \leq k} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_m} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \\ |\alpha| = m}} x^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}.$$

(Thus, $h_0 = 1$, and $h_m = 0$ when $m < 0$.)

- For each $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_\ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^\ell$ (e.g., a k -partition when $\ell = k$), set

$$h_\nu = h_{\nu_1} h_{\nu_2} \cdots h_{\nu_\ell} \in \mathcal{S}.$$

- **Theorem:** The commutative \mathbf{k} -algebra \mathcal{S} is freely generated by the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomials h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k .
- **Equivalent restatement:** $(h_\lambda)_\lambda$ is a partition whose entries are $\leq k$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S} .
- **Theorem:** $(h_\lambda)_\lambda$ is a k -partition is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S} . (Another basis!)

Symmetric polynomials: the s -basis (Schur polynomials)

- For each k -partition λ , we let s_λ be the λ -th Schur polynomial:

$$s_\lambda = \frac{\det \left(\left(x_i^{\lambda_j + k - j} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)}{\det \left(\left(x_i^{k-j} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)} \quad (\text{alternant formula})$$

$$= \det \left((h_{\lambda_i - i + j})_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right) \quad (\text{Jacobi-Trudi}).$$

Symmetric polynomials: the s -basis (Schur polynomials)

- For each k -partition λ , we let s_λ be the λ -th Schur polynomial:

$$s_\lambda = \frac{\det \left(\left(x_i^{\lambda_j + k - j} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)}{\det \left(\left(x_i^{k - j} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)} \quad (\text{alternant formula})$$

$$= \det \left((h_{\lambda_i - i + j})_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right) \quad (\text{Jacobi-Trudi}).$$

- Theorem:** The equality above holds, and s_λ is a symmetric polynomial with nonnegative coefficients. Explicitly,

$$s_\lambda = \sum_{\substack{T \text{ is a semistandard } \lambda\text{-tableau} \\ \text{with entries } 1, 2, \dots, k}} \prod_{i=1}^k x_i^{(\text{number of } i\text{'s in } T)},$$

where a *semistandard λ -tableau with entries $1, 2, \dots, k$* is a way of putting an integer $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ into each box of $Y(\lambda)$ such that the entries **weakly** increase along rows and **strictly** increase along columns.

Symmetric polynomials: the s -basis (Schur polynomials)

- For each k -partition λ , we let s_λ be the λ -th Schur polynomial:

$$s_\lambda = \frac{\det \left(\left(x_i^{\lambda_j + k - j} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)}{\det \left(\left(x_i^{k - j} \right)_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)} \quad (\text{alternant formula})$$

$$= \det \left((h_{\lambda_i - i + j})_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right) \quad (\text{Jacobi-Trudi}).$$

- **Theorem:** The equality above holds, and s_λ is a symmetric polynomial with nonnegative coefficients.
- **Theorem:** $(s_\lambda)_{\lambda \text{ is a } k\text{-partition}}$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S} .

- If λ and μ are two k -partitions, then the product $s_\lambda s_\mu$ can be again written as a \mathbf{k} -linear combination of Schur polynomials (since these form a basis):

$$s_\lambda s_\mu = \sum_{\nu \text{ is a } k\text{-partition}} c_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu} s_\nu,$$

where the $c_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu}$ lie in \mathbf{k} . These $c_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu}$ are called the *Littlewood-Richardson coefficients*.

- If λ and μ are two k -partitions, then the product $s_\lambda s_\mu$ can be again written as a \mathbf{k} -linear combination of Schur polynomials (since these form a basis):

$$s_\lambda s_\mu = \sum_{\nu \text{ is a } k\text{-partition}} c_{\lambda, \mu}^\nu s_\nu,$$

where the $c_{\lambda, \mu}^\nu$ lie in \mathbf{k} . These $c_{\lambda, \mu}^\nu$ are called the *Littlewood-Richardson coefficients*.

- **Theorem:** These Littlewood-Richardson coefficients $c_{\lambda, \mu}^\nu$ are nonnegative integers (and count something).

- We have defined

$$s_\lambda = \det \left((h_{\lambda_i - i + j})_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)$$

for k -partitions λ .

Apply the same definition to arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^k$.

- We have defined

$$s_\lambda = \det \left((h_{\lambda_i - i + j})_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)$$

for k -partitions λ .

Apply the same definition to arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^k$.

- **Proposition:** If $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, then s_α is either 0 or equals $\pm s_\lambda$ for some k -partition λ .
(So we get nothing really new.)

- We have defined

$$s_\lambda = \det \left((h_{\lambda_i - i + j})_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)$$

for k -partitions λ .

Apply the same definition to arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^k$.

- **Proposition:** If $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, then s_α is either 0 or equals $\pm s_\lambda$ for some k -partition λ .

More precisely: Let

$$\beta = (\alpha_1 + (k - 1), \alpha_2 + (k - 2), \dots, \alpha_k + (k - k)).$$

- We have defined

$$s_\lambda = \det \left((h_{\lambda_i - i + j})_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)$$

for k -partitions λ .

Apply the same definition to arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^k$.

- **Proposition:** If $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, then s_α is either 0 or equals $\pm s_\lambda$ for some k -partition λ .

More precisely: Let

$$\beta = (\alpha_1 + (k-1), \alpha_2 + (k-2), \dots, \alpha_k + (k-k)).$$

- If β has a negative entry, then $s_\alpha = 0$.
- If β has two equal entries, then $s_\alpha = 0$.
- Otherwise, let γ be the k -tuple obtained by sorting β in decreasing order, and let σ be the permutation of the indices that causes this sorting. Let λ be the k -partition $(\gamma_1 - (k-1), \gamma_2 - (k-2), \dots, \gamma_k - (k-k))$. Then, $s_\alpha = (-1)^\sigma s_\lambda$.

- We have defined

$$s_\lambda = \det \left((h_{\lambda_i - i + j})_{1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq k} \right)$$

for k -partitions λ .

Apply the same definition to arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^k$.

- **Proposition:** If $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, then s_α is either 0 or equals $\pm s_\lambda$ for some k -partition λ .

More precisely: Let

$$\beta = (\alpha_1 + (k-1), \alpha_2 + (k-2), \dots, \alpha_k + (k-k)).$$

- If β has a negative entry, then $s_\alpha = 0$.
- If β has two equal entries, then $s_\alpha = 0$.
- Otherwise, let γ be the k -tuple obtained by sorting β in decreasing order, and let σ be the permutation of the indices that causes this sorting. Let λ be the k -partition $(\gamma_1 - (k-1), \gamma_2 - (k-2), \dots, \gamma_k - (k-k))$. Then, $s_\alpha = (-1)^\sigma s_\lambda$.
- Also, the alternant formula still holds if all $\lambda_i + (k-i)$ are ≥ 0 .

A more general setting: a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k and J

- Pick any integer $n \geq k$.

A more general setting: a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k and J

- Pick any integer $n \geq k$.
- Let $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\deg a_i < n - k + i$ for all i .
(For example, this holds if $a_i \in \mathbf{k}$.)

A more general setting: a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k and J

- Pick any integer $n \geq k$.
- Let $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\deg a_i < n - k + i$ for all i .
(For example, this holds if $a_i \in \mathbf{k}$.)
- Let J be the ideal of \mathcal{P} generated by the k differences

$$h_{n-k+1} - a_1, \quad h_{n-k+2} - a_2, \quad \dots, \quad h_n - a_k.$$

A more general setting: a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k and J

- Pick any integer $n \geq k$.
- Let $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\deg a_i < n - k + i$ for all i .
(For example, this holds if $a_i \in \mathbf{k}$.)
- Let J be the ideal of \mathcal{P} generated by the k differences

$$h_{n-k+1} - a_1, \quad h_{n-k+2} - a_2, \quad \dots, \quad h_n - a_k.$$

- **Theorem (G.):** The \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{P}/J is free with basis

$$\begin{aligned} & (\overline{x^\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < n-k+i \text{ for each } i} \\ & \left(\text{informally: } \overline{\left(x_1^{<n-k+1} x_2^{<n-k+2} \dots x_k^{<n} \right)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the overline $\overline{\quad}$ means “projection” onto whatever quotient we need (here: from \mathcal{P} onto \mathcal{P}/J).

(This basis has $n(n-1)\cdots(n-k+1)$ elements.)

A slightly less general setting: symmetric a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k and J

- **FROM NOW ON, assume that $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in \mathcal{S}$.**

A slightly less general setting: symmetric a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k and J

- **FROM NOW ON, assume that** $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in \mathcal{S}$.
- Let I be the ideal of \mathcal{S} generated by the k differences

$$h_{n-k+1} - a_1, \quad h_{n-k+2} - a_2, \quad \dots, \quad h_n - a_k.$$

(Same differences as for J , but we are generating an ideal of \mathcal{S} now.)

A slightly less general setting: symmetric a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k and J

- **FROM NOW ON, assume that** $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in \mathcal{S}$.
- Let I be the ideal of \mathcal{S} generated by the k differences

$$h_{n-k+1} - a_1, \quad h_{n-k+2} - a_2, \quad \dots, \quad h_n - a_k.$$

(Same differences as for J , but we are generating an ideal of \mathcal{S} now.)

- Let $\omega = \underbrace{(n-k, n-k, \dots, n-k)}_{k \text{ entries}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} P_{k,n} &= \{ \lambda \text{ is a } k\text{-partition} \mid \lambda_1 \leq n-k \} \\ &= \{ k\text{-partitions } \lambda \subseteq \omega \}. \end{aligned}$$

- Here, for two k -partitions α and β , we say that $\alpha \subseteq \beta$ if and only if $\alpha_i \leq \beta_i$ for all i .
- **Theorem (G.):** The \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis

$$(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}.$$

- **FROM NOW ON, assume that $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in \mathbf{k}$.**

- **FROM NOW ON, assume that** $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in \mathbf{k}$.
- This setting still is general enough to encompass ...
 - **classical cohomology:** If $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{Z}$ and $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_k = 0$, then \mathcal{S}/I becomes the cohomology ring $H^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$; the basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ corresponds to the Schubert classes.
 - **quantum cohomology:** If $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{Z}[q]$ and $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_{k-1} = 0$ and $a_k = -(-1)^k q$, then \mathcal{S}/I becomes the quantum cohomology ring $\text{QH}^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$.

- **FROM NOW ON, assume that** $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k \in \mathbf{k}$.
- This setting still is general enough to encompass ...
 - **classical cohomology:** If $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{Z}$ and $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_k = 0$, then \mathcal{S}/I becomes the cohomology ring $H^*(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))$; the basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ corresponds to the Schubert classes.
 - **quantum cohomology:** If $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{Z}[q]$ and $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_{k-1} = 0$ and $a_k = -(-1)^k q$, then \mathcal{S}/I becomes the quantum cohomology ring $\mathrm{QH}^*(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))$.
- The above theorem lets us work in these rings (and more generally) without relying on geometry.

- Recall that $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I .

- Recall that $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I .
For each $\mu \in P_{k,n}$, let $\text{coeff}_\mu : \mathcal{S}/I \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ send each element to its $\overline{s_\mu}$ -coordinate wrt this basis.

- Recall that $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I .
For each $\mu \in P_{k,n}$, let $\text{coeff}_\mu : \mathcal{S}/I \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ send each element to its $\overline{s_\mu}$ -coordinate wrt this basis.

- For every k -partition $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_k) \in P_{k,n}$, we define

$$\nu^\vee := (n - k - \nu_k, n - k - \nu_{k-1}, \dots, n - k - \nu_1) \in P_{k,n}.$$

This k -partition ν^\vee is called the *complement* of ν .

- Recall that $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I . For each $\mu \in P_{k,n}$, let $\text{coeff}_\mu : \mathcal{S}/I \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ send each element to its $\overline{s_\mu}$ -coordinate wrt this basis.

- For every k -partition $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_k) \in P_{k,n}$, we define

$$\nu^\vee := (n - k - \nu_k, n - k - \nu_{k-1}, \dots, n - k - \nu_1) \in P_{k,n}.$$

This k -partition ν^\vee is called the *complement* of ν .

- For any three k -partitions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in P_{k,n}$, let

$$g_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} := \text{coeff}_{\gamma^\vee} (\overline{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \in \mathbf{k}.$$

These generalize the Littlewood–Richardson coefficients and (3-point) Gromov–Witten invariants.

- Recall that $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I .
For each $\mu \in P_{k,n}$, let $\text{coeff}_\mu : \mathcal{S}/I \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ send each element to its $\overline{s_\mu}$ -coordinate wrt this basis.

- For every k -partition $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_k) \in P_{k,n}$, we define

$$\nu^\vee := (n - k - \nu_k, n - k - \nu_{k-1}, \dots, n - k - \nu_1) \in P_{k,n}.$$

This k -partition ν^\vee is called the *complement* of ν .

- For any three k -partitions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in P_{k,n}$, let

$$g_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} := \text{coeff}_{\gamma^\vee} (\overline{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \in \mathbf{k}.$$

These generalize the Littlewood–Richardson coefficients and (3-point) Gromov–Witten invariants.

- Theorem (G.):** For any $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in P_{k,n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} &= g_{\alpha,\gamma,\beta} = g_{\beta,\alpha,\gamma} = g_{\beta,\gamma,\alpha} = g_{\gamma,\alpha,\beta} = g_{\gamma,\beta,\alpha} \\ &= \text{coeff}_\omega (\overline{s_\alpha s_\beta s_\gamma}). \end{aligned}$$

- Recall that $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I .
For each $\mu \in P_{k,n}$, let $\text{coeff}_\mu : \mathcal{S}/I \rightarrow \mathbf{k}$ send each element to its $\overline{s_\mu}$ -coordinate wrt this basis.

- For every k -partition $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_k) \in P_{k,n}$, we define

$$\nu^\vee := (n - k - \nu_k, n - k - \nu_{k-1}, \dots, n - k - \nu_1) \in P_{k,n}.$$

This k -partition ν^\vee is called the *complement* of ν .

- For any three k -partitions $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in P_{k,n}$, let

$$g_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} := \text{coeff}_{\gamma^\vee} (\overline{s_\alpha s_\beta}) \in \mathbf{k}.$$

These generalize the Littlewood–Richardson coefficients and (3-point) Gromov–Witten invariants.

- Theorem (G.):** For any $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in P_{k,n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} &= g_{\alpha, \gamma, \beta} = g_{\beta, \alpha, \gamma} = g_{\beta, \gamma, \alpha} = g_{\gamma, \alpha, \beta} = g_{\gamma, \beta, \alpha} \\ &= \text{coeff}_\omega (\overline{s_\alpha s_\beta s_\gamma}). \end{aligned}$$

- Equivalent restatement:** Each $\nu \in P_{k,n}$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}/I$ satisfy $\text{coeff}_\omega (\overline{s_\nu} f) = \text{coeff}_{\nu^\vee} (f)$.

- **Theorem (G.):** The \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis

$$(\overline{h_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}.$$

- **Theorem (G.):** The \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis

$$(\overline{h_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}.$$

- The transfer matrix between the two bases $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ and $(\overline{h_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ is unitriangular wrt the “size-then-anti-dominance” order, but seems hard to describe.

- **Theorem (G.):** The \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis

$$(\overline{h_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}.$$

- The transfer matrix between the two bases $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ and $(\overline{h_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ is unitriangular wrt the “size-then-anti-dominance” order, but seems hard to describe.
- **Proposition (G.):** Let m be a positive integer. Then,

$$\overline{h_{n+m}} = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (-1)^j a_{k-j} \overline{s_{(m,1^j)}},$$

where $(m, 1^j) := (m, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{j \text{ ones}}, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$ (a hook-shaped k -partition).

The Pieri rule for symmetric polynomials

- If α and β are two k -partitions, then we say that α/β is a *horizontal strip* if and only if the Young diagram $Y(\alpha)$ is obtained from $Y(\beta)$ by adding some (possibly none) extra boxes with no two of these new boxes lying in the same column.

Example: If $k = 4$ and $\alpha = (5, 3, 2, 1)$ and $\beta = (3, 2, 2, 0)$, then α/β is a horizontal strip, since

$$Y(\beta) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline & & \\ \hline & & \\ \hline & & \\ \hline \end{array} \subseteq \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & X & X \\ \hline & & & X & \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline & & & X & \\ \hline \end{array} = Y(\alpha)$$

with no two X 's in the same column.

The Pieri rule for symmetric polynomials

- If α and β are two k -partitions, then we say that α/β is a *horizontal strip* if and only if the Young diagram $Y(\alpha)$ is obtained from $Y(\beta)$ by adding some (possibly none) extra boxes with no two of these new boxes lying in the same column.
- Equivalently, α/β is a horizontal strip if and only if

$$\alpha_1 \geq \beta_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \beta_2 \geq \alpha_3 \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_k \geq \beta_k.$$

The Pieri rule for symmetric polynomials

- If α and β are two k -partitions, then we say that α/β is a *horizontal strip* if and only if the Young diagram $Y(\alpha)$ is obtained from $Y(\beta)$ by adding some (possibly none) extra boxes with no two of these new boxes lying in the same column.

- Equivalently, α/β is a horizontal strip if and only if

$$\alpha_1 \geq \beta_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \beta_2 \geq \alpha_3 \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_k \geq \beta_k.$$

- Furthermore, given $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that α/β is a *horizontal j -strip* if α/β is a horizontal strip and $|\alpha| - |\beta| = j$.

The Pieri rule for symmetric polynomials

- If α and β are two k -partitions, then we say that α/β is a *horizontal strip* if and only if the Young diagram $Y(\alpha)$ is obtained from $Y(\beta)$ by adding some (possibly none) extra boxes with no two of these new boxes lying in the same column.

- Equivalently, α/β is a horizontal strip if and only if

$$\alpha_1 \geq \beta_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \beta_2 \geq \alpha_3 \geq \cdots \geq \alpha_k \geq \beta_k.$$

- Furthermore, given $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that α/β is a *horizontal j -strip* if α/β is a horizontal strip and $|\alpha| - |\beta| = j$.
- **Theorem (Pieri).** Let λ be a k -partition. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,

$$s_\lambda h_j = \sum_{\substack{\mu \text{ is a } k\text{-partition;} \\ \mu/\lambda \text{ is a} \\ \text{horizontal } j\text{-strip}}} s_\mu.$$

- Theorem (G.):** Let $\lambda \in P_{k,n}$. Let $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n - k\}$.
 Then,

$$\overline{s_\lambda h_j} = \sum_{\substack{\mu \in P_{k,n}; \\ \mu/\lambda \text{ is a} \\ \text{horizontal } j\text{-strip}}} \overline{s_\mu} - \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^i a_i \sum_{\nu \subseteq \lambda} c_{(n-k-j+1, 1^{i-1}), \nu}^\lambda \overline{s_\nu}.$$

- Theorem (G.):** Let $\lambda \in P_{k,n}$. Let $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n - k\}$.
 Then,

$$\overline{s_\lambda h_j} = \sum_{\substack{\mu \in P_{k,n}; \\ \mu/\lambda \text{ is a} \\ \text{horizontal } j\text{-strip}}} \overline{s_\mu} - \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^i a_i \sum_{\nu \subseteq \lambda} c_{(n-k-j+1, 1^{i-1}), \nu}^\lambda \overline{s_\nu}.$$

- This generalizes the h-Pieri rule from Bertram, Ciocan-Fontanine and Fulton, but note that $c_{(n-k-j+1, 1^{i-1}), \nu}^\lambda$ may be > 1 .

- **Example:** For $n = 7$ and $k = 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{s_{(4,3,2)}} h_2 &= \overline{s_{(4,4,3)}} + a_1 (\overline{s_{(4,2)}} + \overline{s_{(3,2,1)}} + \overline{s_{(3,3)}}) \\ &\quad - a_2 (\overline{s_{(4,1)}} + \overline{s_{(2,2,1)}} + \overline{s_{(3,1,1)}} + 2\overline{s_{(3,2)}}) \\ &\quad + a_3 (\overline{s_{(2,2)}} + \overline{s_{(2,1,1)}} + \overline{s_{(3,1)}}) .\end{aligned}$$

A Pieri rule for \mathcal{S}/l : example

- **Example:** For $n = 7$ and $k = 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{s_{(4,3,2)}} h_2 &= \overline{s_{(4,4,3)}} + a_1 (\overline{s_{(4,2)}} + \overline{s_{(3,2,1)}} + \overline{s_{(3,3)}}) \\ &\quad - a_2 (\overline{s_{(4,1)}} + \overline{s_{(2,2,1)}} + \overline{s_{(3,1,1)}} + 2\overline{s_{(3,2)}}) \\ &\quad + a_3 (\overline{s_{(2,2)}} + \overline{s_{(2,1,1)}} + \overline{s_{(3,1)}}) .\end{aligned}$$

- Multiplying by e_j appears harder: For $n = 5$ and $k = 3$, we have

$$\overline{s_{(2,2,1)}} e_2 = a_1 \overline{s_{(2,2)}} - 2a_2 \overline{s_{(2,1)}} + a_3 (\overline{s_{(2)}} + \overline{s_{(1,1)}}) + a_1^2 \overline{s_{(1)}} - 2a_1 a_2 \overline{s_{()}} .$$

A Pieri rule for \mathcal{S}/l : example

- **Example:** For $n = 7$ and $k = 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{s_{(4,3,2)}} h_2 &= \overline{s_{(4,4,3)}} + a_1 (\overline{s_{(4,2)}} + \overline{s_{(3,2,1)}} + \overline{s_{(3,3)}}) \\ &\quad - a_2 (\overline{s_{(4,1)}} + \overline{s_{(2,2,1)}} + \overline{s_{(3,1,1)}} + 2\overline{s_{(3,2)}}) \\ &\quad + a_3 (\overline{s_{(2,2)}} + \overline{s_{(2,1,1)}} + \overline{s_{(3,1)}}) .\end{aligned}$$

- Multiplying by e_j appears harder: For $n = 5$ and $k = 3$, we have

$$\overline{s_{(2,2,1)}} e_3 = -a_2 \overline{s_{(2,2)}} + a_3 \overline{s_{(2,1)}} + a_1^2 \overline{s_{(2)}} - 2a_1 a_2 \overline{s_{(1)}} + a_2^2 \overline{s_{()}} .$$

So, even multiplying by e_k can give a mess...

A “rim hook algorithm”

- For $QH^*(Gr(k, n))$, Bertram, Ciocan-Fontanine and Fulton give a “rim hook algorithm” that rewrites an arbitrary \overline{s}_μ as $(-1)^{\text{something}} q^{\text{something}} \overline{s}_\lambda$ with $\lambda \in P_{k,n}$.
Is there such a thing for \mathcal{S}/I ?

A “rim hook algorithm”

- For $\text{QH}^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$, Bertram, Ciocan-Fontanine and Fulton give a “rim hook algorithm” that rewrites an arbitrary \overline{s}_μ as $(-1)^{\text{something}} q^{\text{something}} \overline{s}_\lambda$ with $\lambda \in P_{k,n}$.

Is there such a thing for \mathcal{S}/I ?

If $n = 6$ and $k = 3$, then

$$\overline{s}_{(4,4,3)} = a_2^2 \overline{s}_{(1)} - 2a_1 a_2 \overline{s}_{(2)} + a_1^2 \overline{s}_{(3)} + a_3 \overline{s}_{(3,2)} - a_2 \overline{s}_{(3,3)}.$$

Looks hopeless...

A “rim hook algorithm”

- For $QH^*(Gr(k, n))$, Bertram, Ciocan-Fontanine and Fulton give a “rim hook algorithm” that rewrites an arbitrary $\overline{s_\mu}$ as $(-1)^{\text{something}} q^{\text{something}} \overline{s_\lambda}$ with $\lambda \in P_{k,n}$.

Is there such a thing for \mathcal{S}/I ?

If $n = 6$ and $k = 3$, then

$$\overline{s_{(4,4,3)}} = a_2^2 \overline{s_{(1)}} - 2a_1 a_2 \overline{s_{(2)}} + a_1^2 \overline{s_{(3)}} + a_3 \overline{s_{(3,2)}} - a_2 \overline{s_{(3,3)}}.$$

- **Theorem (G.):** Let μ be a k -partition with $\mu_1 > n - k$. Let

$$W = \left\{ \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k \mid \lambda_1 = \mu_1 - n \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \lambda_i - \mu_i \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for all } i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\} \right\}.$$

(Not all elements of W are k -partitions, but all belong to \mathbb{Z}^k , so we know how to define s_λ for them.)

A “rim hook algorithm”

- For $QH^*(Gr(k, n))$, Bertram, Ciocan-Fontanine and Fulton give a “rim hook algorithm” that rewrites an arbitrary \overline{s}_μ as $(-1)^{\text{something}} q^{\text{something}} \overline{s}_\lambda$ with $\lambda \in P_{k,n}$.

Is there such a thing for \mathcal{S}/I ?

If $n = 6$ and $k = 3$, then

$$\overline{s_{(4,4,3)}} = a_2^2 \overline{s_{(1)}} - 2a_1 a_2 \overline{s_{(2)}} + a_1^2 \overline{s_{(3)}} + a_3 \overline{s_{(3,2)}} - a_2 \overline{s_{(3,3)}}.$$

- **Theorem (G.):** Let μ be a k -partition with $\mu_1 > n - k$. Let

$$W = \left\{ \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^k \mid \lambda_1 = \mu_1 - n \right. \\ \left. \text{and } \lambda_i - \mu_i \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for all } i \in \{2, 3, \dots, k\} \right\}.$$

Then,

$$\overline{s}_\mu = \sum_{j=1}^k (-1)^{k-j} a_j \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in W; \\ |\lambda| = |\mu| - (n-k+j)}} \overline{s}_\lambda.$$

- **Conjecture:** Let $b_i = (-1)^{n-k-1} a_i$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Let $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in P_{k,n}$. Then, $(-1)^{|\lambda|+|\mu|-|\nu|} \text{coeff}_\nu(\overline{s_\lambda s_\mu})$ is a polynomial in b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k with coefficients in \mathbb{N} .
- Verified for all $n \leq 8$ using SageMath.
- This would generalize positivity of Gromov–Witten invariants.

- **Theorem (G.):** The \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis

$$(\overline{m_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}},$$

where

$$m_\lambda = \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{the sum of all distinct permutations of} \\ \text{the monomial } x_1^{\lambda_1} x_2^{\lambda_2} \cdots x_k^{\lambda_k} \end{array} \right)$$

is a *monomial symmetric polynomial*.

- **Theorem (G.):** The \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis

$$(\overline{m_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}},$$

where

$$m_\lambda = \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{the sum of all distinct permutations of} \\ \text{the monomial } x_1^{\lambda_1} x_2^{\lambda_2} \cdots x_k^{\lambda_k} \end{array} \right)$$

is a *monomial symmetric polynomial*.

- What are the structure constants?

- **Theorem (G.):** The \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis

$$(\overline{m_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}},$$

where

$$m_\lambda = \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{the sum of all distinct permutations of} \\ \text{the monomial } x_1^{\lambda_1} x_2^{\lambda_2} \cdots x_k^{\lambda_k} \end{array} \right)$$

is a *monomial symmetric polynomial*.

- What are the structure constants?
- The family $(\overline{p_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ built of the power-sum symmetric functions p_λ is not generally a basis (not even if $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{Q}$ and $a_i = 0$).

- **Theorem (G.):** The \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis

$$(\overline{m_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}},$$

where

$$m_\lambda = \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{the sum of all distinct permutations of} \\ \text{the monomial } x_1^{\lambda_1} x_2^{\lambda_2} \cdots x_k^{\lambda_k} \end{array} \right)$$

is a *monomial symmetric polynomial*.

- What are the structure constants?
- The family $(\overline{p_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ built of the power-sum symmetric functions p_λ is not generally a basis (not even if $\mathbf{k} = \mathbb{Q}$ and $a_i = 0$).
- What about other bases? Forgotten symmetric functions?

More questions

- **Question:** Does \mathcal{S}/I have a geometric meaning? If not, why does it behave so nicely?

More questions

- **Question:** Does \mathcal{S}/I have a geometric meaning? If not, why does it behave so nicely?
- **Question:** What if we replace the generators $h_{n-k+i} - a_i$ of our ideals by $p_{n-k+i} - a_i$?

More questions

- **Question:** Does \mathcal{S}/I have a geometric meaning? If not, why does it behave so nicely?
- **Question:** What if we replace the generators $h_{n-k+i} - a_i$ of our ideals by $p_{n-k+i} - a_i$?

Andrew Weinfeld (PRIMES project 2019,
[arXiv:1911.07152v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.07152v1)): The basis theorem still holds!

- **Question:** Does \mathcal{S}/I have a geometric meaning? If not, why does it behave so nicely?
- **Question:** What if we replace the generators $h_{n-k+i} - a_i$ of our ideals by $p_{n-k+i} - a_i$?
Andrew Weinfeld (PRIMES project 2019, [arXiv:1911.07152v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.07152v1)): The basis theorem still holds!
- **Question:** Do other properties of $\mathrm{QH}^*(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))$ generalize to \mathcal{S}/I ?

- **Question:** Does \mathcal{S}/I have a geometric meaning? If not, why does it behave so nicely?
- **Question:** What if we replace the generators $h_{n-k+i} - a_i$ of our ideals by $p_{n-k+i} - a_i$?

Andrew Weinfeld (PRIMES project 2019, [arXiv:1911.07152v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.07152v1)): The basis theorem still holds!

- **Question:** Do other properties of $\mathrm{QH}^*(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))$ generalize to \mathcal{S}/I ?

Computations show that Postnikov's "curious duality" and "cyclic hidden symmetry" and Bertram et al's $\mathrm{Gr}(k, n) \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(n-k, n)$ duality do not generalize (at least not in any straightforward way).

- **Question:** Does \mathcal{S}/I have a geometric meaning? If not, why does it behave so nicely?
- **Question:** What if we replace the generators $h_{n-k+i} - a_i$ of our ideals by $p_{n-k+i} - a_i$?

Andrew Weinfeld (PRIMES project 2019, [arXiv:1911.07152v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.07152v1)): The basis theorem still holds!

- **Question:** Do other properties of $\text{QH}^*(\text{Gr}(k, n))$ generalize to \mathcal{S}/I ?

Computations show that Postnikov's "curious duality" and "cyclic hidden symmetry" and Bertram et al's $\text{Gr}(k, n) \leftrightarrow \text{Gr}(n-k, n)$ duality do not generalize (at least not in any straightforward way).

- **Question:** Is there an analogous generalization of $\text{QH}^*(\text{Fl}(n))$? Is it connected to Fulton's "universal Schubert polynomials"?

- **Question:** Does \mathcal{S}/I have a geometric meaning? If not, why does it behave so nicely?
- **Question:** What if we replace the generators $h_{n-k+i} - a_i$ of our ideals by $p_{n-k+i} - a_i$?

Andrew Weinfeld (PRIMES project 2019, [arXiv:1911.07152v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.07152v1)): The basis theorem still holds!

- **Question:** Do other properties of $\mathrm{QH}^*(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))$ generalize to \mathcal{S}/I ?

Computations show that Postnikov's "curious duality" and "cyclic hidden symmetry" and Bertram et al's $\mathrm{Gr}(k, n) \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(n-k, n)$ duality do not generalize (at least not in any straightforward way).

- **Question:** Is there an analogous generalization of $\mathrm{QH}^*(\mathrm{Fl}(n))$? Is it connected to Fulton's "universal Schubert polynomials"?
- **Question:** Is there an equivariant analogue?

- **Question:** Does \mathcal{S}/I have a geometric meaning? If not, why does it behave so nicely?
- **Question:** What if we replace the generators $h_{n-k+i} - a_i$ of our ideals by $p_{n-k+i} - a_i$?

Andrew Weinfeld (PRIMES project 2019, [arXiv:1911.07152v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.07152v1)): The basis theorem still holds!

- **Question:** Do other properties of $\mathrm{QH}^*(\mathrm{Gr}(k, n))$ generalize to \mathcal{S}/I ?

Computations show that Postnikov's "curious duality" and "cyclic hidden symmetry" and Bertram et al's $\mathrm{Gr}(k, n) \leftrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(n-k, n)$ duality do not generalize (at least not in any straightforward way).

- **Question:** Is there an analogous generalization of $\mathrm{QH}^*(\mathrm{Fl}(n))$? Is it connected to Fulton's "universal Schubert polynomials"?
- **Question:** Is there an equivariant analogue?
- **Question:** What about quotients of the quasisymmetric polynomials?

- The symmetric group S_k acts on \mathcal{P} , with invariant ring \mathcal{S} .
- What is the S_k -module structure on \mathcal{P}/J ?

- The symmetric group S_k acts on \mathcal{P} , with invariant ring \mathcal{S} .
- What is the S_k -module structure on \mathcal{P}/J ?
- **Corollary of a known result (G., needs to be checked):**
Assume that \mathbf{k} is a \mathbb{Q} -algebra. Then, as S_k -modules,

$$\mathcal{P}/J \cong (\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}^+) \times \binom{n}{k} \cong \left(\underbrace{\mathbf{k}S_k}_{\text{regular rep}} \right) \times \binom{n}{k},$$

where $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{S}^+$ is the ideal of \mathcal{P} generated by symmetric polynomials with constant term 0.

(The known result in question is saying that \mathcal{P} as a left $\mathcal{S}[S_k]$ -module is isomorphic to the regular representation. Is there a good reference?)

Deforming symmetric functions, 1

- Let us recall symmetric **functions** (not polynomials) now; we'll need them soon anyway.

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\text{symmetric polynomials in } x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\};$$

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\text{symmetric functions in } x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots\}.$$

Deforming symmetric functions, 1

- Let us recall symmetric **functions** (not polynomials) now; we'll need them soon anyway.

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\text{symmetric polynomials in } x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\};$$

$$\Lambda := \{\text{symmetric functions in } x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots\}.$$

- We use standard notations for symmetric functions, but in boldface:

e = elementary symmetric,

h = complete homogeneous,

s = Schur (or skew Schur).

Deforming symmetric functions, 1

- Let us recall symmetric **functions** (not polynomials) now; we'll need them soon anyway.

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\text{symmetric polynomials in } x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\};$$

$$\Lambda := \{\text{symmetric functions in } x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots\}.$$

- We use standard notations for symmetric functions, but in boldface:

e = elementary symmetric,

h = complete homogeneous,

s = Schur (or skew Schur).

- We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &\cong \Lambda / (\mathbf{e}_{k+1}, \mathbf{e}_{k+2}, \mathbf{e}_{k+3}, \dots)_{\text{ideal}}, & \text{thus} \\ \mathcal{S}/I &\cong \Lambda / (\mathbf{h}_{n-k+1} - a_1, \mathbf{h}_{n-k+2} - a_2, \dots, \mathbf{h}_n - a_k, \\ &\quad \mathbf{e}_{k+1}, \mathbf{e}_{k+2}, \mathbf{e}_{k+3}, \dots)_{\text{ideal}}. \end{aligned}$$

Deforming symmetric functions, 1

- Let us recall symmetric **functions** (not polynomials) now; we'll need them soon anyway.

$$\mathcal{S} := \{\text{symmetric polynomials in } x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\};$$

$$\Lambda := \{\text{symmetric functions in } x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots\}.$$

- We use standard notations for symmetric functions, but in boldface:

e = elementary symmetric,

h = complete homogeneous,

s = Schur (or skew Schur).

- We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S} &\cong \Lambda / (\mathbf{e}_{k+1}, \mathbf{e}_{k+2}, \mathbf{e}_{k+3}, \dots)_{\text{ideal}}, & \text{thus} \\ \mathcal{S}/I &\cong \Lambda / (\mathbf{h}_{n-k+1} - a_1, \mathbf{h}_{n-k+2} - a_2, \dots, \mathbf{h}_n - a_k, \\ &\quad \mathbf{e}_{k+1}, \mathbf{e}_{k+2}, \mathbf{e}_{k+3}, \dots)_{\text{ideal}}. \end{aligned}$$

- So why not replace the **e**_j by **e**_j - b_j too?

- **Theorem (G.):** Assume that $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k$ as well as $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{b}_3, \dots$ are elements of Λ such that

$$\deg \mathbf{a}_i < n - k + i \quad \text{and} \quad \deg \mathbf{b}_i < k + i.$$

Then,

$$\Lambda / (\mathbf{h}_{n-k+1} - \mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{h}_{n-k+2} - \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{h}_n - \mathbf{a}_k, \\ \mathbf{e}_{k+1} - \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{e}_{k+2} - \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{e}_{k+3} - \mathbf{b}_3, \dots)_{\text{ideal}}$$

is a free \mathbf{k} -module with basis $(\overline{\mathbf{s}}_\lambda)_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$.

- Proofs of all the above (except for the S_k -action) can be found in
 - Darij Grinberg, *A basis for a quotient of symmetric polynomials (draft)*, <https://darijgrinberg.gitlab.io/algebra/basisquot.pdf> , arXiv:1910.00207 (website version is newer!).

- Proofs of all the above (except for the S_k -action) can be found in
 - Darij Grinberg, *A basis for a quotient of symmetric polynomials (draft)*, <https://darijgrinberg.gitlab.io/algebra/basisquot.pdf> , arXiv:1910.00207 (website version is newer!).
- **Main ideas:**
 - Use Gröbner bases to show that \mathcal{P}/J is free with basis $(\overline{x^\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < n-k+i \text{ for each } i}$. (This was already outlined in Aldo Conca, Christian Krattenthaler, Junzo Watanabe, *Regular Sequences of Symmetric Polynomials*, 2009.)

- Proofs of all the above (except for the S_k -action) can be found in
 - Darij Grinberg, *A basis for a quotient of symmetric polynomials (draft)*, <https://darijgrinberg.gitlab.io/algebra/basisquot.pdf> , arXiv:1910.00207 (website version is newer!).
- **Main ideas:**
 - Use Gröbner bases to show that \mathcal{P}/J is free with basis $(\overline{x^\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < n-k+i \text{ for each } i}$. (This was already outlined in Aldo Conca, Christian Krattenthaler, Junzo Watanabe, *Regular Sequences of Symmetric Polynomials*, 2009.)
 - Using that + Jacobi–Trudi, show that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$.

- Proofs of all the above (except for the S_k -action) can be found in
 - Darij Grinberg, *A basis for a quotient of symmetric polynomials (draft)*, <https://darijgrinberg.gitlab.io/algebra/basisquot.pdf> , arXiv:1910.00207 (website version is newer!).
- **Main ideas:**
 - Use Gröbner bases to show that \mathcal{P}/J is free with basis $(\overline{x^\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k}$; $\alpha_i < n - k + i$ for each i . (This was already outlined in Aldo Conca, Christian Krattenthaler, Junzo Watanabe, *Regular Sequences of Symmetric Polynomials*, 2009.)
 - Using that + Jacobi–Trudi, show that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$.
 - As for the rest, compute in Λ ... a lot.

- A brief introduction to Gröbner bases is appropriate here.

- A brief introduction to Gröbner bases is appropriate here.
- Gröbner bases are “particularly uncomplicated” generating sets for ideals in polynomial rings.
(But take the word “basis” with a grain of salt – they can have redundant elements, for example.)

- A *monomial order* is a total order on the monomials in \mathcal{P} with the properties that
 - $1 \leq m$ for each monomial m ;
 - $a \leq b$ implies $am \leq bm$ for any monomials a, b, m ;
 - the order is well-founded (i.e., we can do induction over it).

- A *monomial order* is a total order on the monomials in \mathcal{P} with the properties that
 - $1 \leq m$ for each monomial m ;
 - $a \leq b$ implies $am \leq bm$ for any monomials a, b, m ;
 - the order is well-founded (i.e., we can do induction over it).
- The *degree-lexicographic order* is the monomial order defined as follows: Two monomials $a = x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_k^{\alpha_k}$ and $b = x_1^{\beta_1} x_2^{\beta_2} \cdots x_k^{\beta_k}$ satisfy $a > b$ if and only if
 - either $\deg a > \deg b$
 - or $\deg a = \deg b$ and the smallest i satisfying $\alpha_i \neq \beta_i$ satisfies $\alpha_i > \beta_i$.

- A *monomial order* is a total order on the monomials in \mathcal{P} with the properties that
 - $1 \leq m$ for each monomial m ;
 - $a \leq b$ implies $am \leq bm$ for any monomials a, b, m ;
 - the order is well-founded (i.e., we can do induction over it).
- The *degree-lexicographic order* is the monomial order defined as follows: Two monomials $a = x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_k^{\alpha_k}$ and $b = x_1^{\beta_1} x_2^{\beta_2} \cdots x_k^{\beta_k}$ satisfy $a > b$ if and only if
 - either $\deg a > \deg b$
 - or $\deg a = \deg b$ and the smallest i satisfying $\alpha_i \neq \beta_i$ satisfies $\alpha_i > \beta_i$.
- Given a monomial order,
 - each nonzero polynomial $f \in \mathcal{P}$ has a well-defined *leading monomial* (= the highest monomial appearing in f).

- A *monomial order* is a total order on the monomials in \mathcal{P} with the properties that
 - $1 \leq m$ for each monomial m ;
 - $a \leq b$ implies $am \leq bm$ for any monomials a, b, m ;
 - the order is well-founded (i.e., we can do induction over it).
- The *degree-lexicographic order* is the monomial order defined as follows: Two monomials $a = x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_k^{\alpha_k}$ and $b = x_1^{\beta_1} x_2^{\beta_2} \cdots x_k^{\beta_k}$ satisfy $a > b$ if and only if
 - either $\deg a > \deg b$
 - or $\deg a = \deg b$ and the smallest i satisfying $\alpha_i \neq \beta_i$ satisfies $\alpha_i > \beta_i$.
- Given a monomial order,
 - each nonzero polynomial $f \in \mathcal{P}$ has a well-defined *leading monomial* (= the highest monomial appearing in f).
 - a polynomial f is called *quasi-monic* if the coefficient of its leading term in f is invertible.

- If \mathcal{I} is an ideal of \mathcal{P} , then a *Gröbner basis* of \mathcal{I} (for a fixed monomial order) means a family $(f_i)_{i \in G}$ of quasi-monic polynomials that
 - generates \mathcal{I} , and
 - has the property that the leading monomial of any nonzero $f \in \mathcal{I}$ is divisible by the leading monomial of some f_i .

- If \mathcal{I} is an ideal of \mathcal{P} , then a *Gröbner basis* of \mathcal{I} (for a fixed monomial order) means a family $(f_i)_{i \in G}$ of quasi-monic polynomials that
 - generates \mathcal{I} , and
 - has the property that the leading monomial of any nonzero $f \in \mathcal{I}$ is divisible by the leading monomial of some f_i .
- **Example:** Let $k = 3$, and rename x_1, x_2, x_3 as x, y, z . Use the degree-lexicographic order. Let \mathcal{I} be the ideal generated by $x^2 - yz, y^2 - zx, z^2 - xy$. Then:

- If \mathcal{I} is an ideal of \mathcal{P} , then a *Gröbner basis* of \mathcal{I} (for a fixed monomial order) means a family $(f_i)_{i \in G}$ of quasi-monic polynomials that
 - generates \mathcal{I} , and
 - has the property that the leading monomial of any nonzero $f \in \mathcal{I}$ is divisible by the leading monomial of some f_i .
- **Example:** Let $k = 3$, and rename x_1, x_2, x_3 as x, y, z . Use the degree-lexicographic order. Let \mathcal{I} be the ideal generated by $x^2 - yz, y^2 - zx, z^2 - xy$. Then:
 - The triple $(x^2 - yz, y^2 - zx, z^2 - xy)$ is not a Gröbner basis of \mathcal{I} , since its leading monomials are x^2, yz, xy , but the leading term y^3 of the polynomial $y^3 - z^3 \in \mathcal{I}$ is not divisible by any of them.

Gröbner bases, 2: What is a Gröbner basis?

- If \mathcal{I} is an ideal of \mathcal{P} , then a *Gröbner basis* of \mathcal{I} (for a fixed monomial order) means a family $(f_i)_{i \in G}$ of quasi-monic polynomials that
 - generates \mathcal{I} , and
 - has the property that the leading monomial of any nonzero $f \in \mathcal{I}$ is divisible by the leading monomial of some f_i .
- **Example:** Let $k = 3$, and rename x_1, x_2, x_3 as x, y, z . Use the degree-lexicographic order. Let \mathcal{I} be the ideal generated by $x^2 - yz, y^2 - zx, z^2 - xy$. Then:
 - The triple $(x^2 - yz, y^2 - zx, z^2 - xy)$ is not a Gröbner basis of \mathcal{I} , since its leading monomials are x^2, yz, xy , but the leading term y^3 of the polynomial $y^3 - z^3 \in \mathcal{I}$ is not divisible by any of them.
 - The quadruple $(y^3 - z^3, x^2 - yz, xy - z^2, xz - y^2)$ is a Gröbner basis of \mathcal{I} . (Thanks SageMath, and whatever packages it uses for this.)

- Note: Our definition of Gröbner basis is a straightforward generalization of the usual one, since \mathbf{k} may not be a field. Note that some texts use different generalizations!

- Note: Our definition of Gröbner basis is a straightforward generalization of the usual one, since \mathbf{k} may not be a field. Note that some texts use different generalizations!
- **Theorem (Buchberger's first criterion).** Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal of \mathcal{P} .

Let $(f_i)_{i \in G}$ be a family of quasi-monic polynomials that generates \mathcal{I} .

Assume that the leading monomials of all the f_i are mutually coprime (i.e., each indeterminate appears in the leading monomial of f_i for at most one $i \in G$).

Then, $(f_i)_{i \in G}$ is a Gröbner basis of \mathcal{I} .

- Note: Our definition of Gröbner basis is a straightforward generalization of the usual one, since \mathbf{k} may not be a field. Note that some texts use different generalizations!
- Theorem (Buchberger's first criterion).** Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal of \mathcal{P} .

Let $(f_i)_{i \in G}$ be a family of quasi-monic polynomials that generates \mathcal{I} .

Assume that the leading monomials of all the f_i are mutually coprime (i.e., each indeterminate appears in the leading monomial of f_i for at most one $i \in G$).

Then, $(f_i)_{i \in G}$ is a Gröbner basis of \mathcal{I} .

- Example:** Let $k = 3$, and rename x_1, x_2, x_3 as x, y, z . Use the degree-lexicographic order. Let \mathcal{I} be the ideal generated by $x^3 - yz, y^3 - zx, z^3 - xy$. Then, $(x^3 - yz, y^3 - zx, z^3 - xy)$ is a Gröbner basis of \mathcal{I} , since its leading monomials x^3, y^3, z^3 are mutually coprime.

- **Theorem (Macaulay's basis theorem).** Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal of \mathcal{P} that has a Gröbner basis $(f_i)_{i \in G}$. A monomial \mathfrak{m} will be called *reduced* if it is not divisible by the leading term of any f_i . Then, the projections of the reduced monomials form a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} .

- **Theorem (Macaulay's basis theorem).** Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal of \mathcal{P} that has a Gröbner basis $(f_i)_{i \in G}$. A monomial m will be called *reduced* if it is not divisible by the leading term of any f_i . Then, the projections of the reduced monomials form a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} .
- **Example:** Let $k = 3$, and rename x_1, x_2, x_3 as x, y, z . Use the degree-lexicographic order. Let \mathcal{I} be the ideal generated by $x^3 - yz, y^3 - zx, z^3 - xy$. Then, $(x^3 - yz, y^3 - zx, z^3 - xy)$ is a Gröbner basis of \mathcal{I} . Thus, $(\overline{x^i y^j z^\ell})_{i,j,\ell < 3}$ is a basis of \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} .

- Theorem (Macaulay's basis theorem).** Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal of \mathcal{P} that has a Gröbner basis $(f_i)_{i \in G}$. A monomial m will be called *reduced* if it is not divisible by the leading term of any f_i . Then, the projections of the reduced monomials form a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} .
- Example:** Let $k = 3$, and rename x_1, x_2, x_3 as x, y, z . Use the degree-lexicographic order. Let \mathcal{I} be the ideal generated by $x^3 - yz, y^3 - zx, z^3 - xy$. Then, $(x^3 - yz, y^3 - zx, z^3 - xy)$ is a Gröbner basis of \mathcal{I} .
Thus, $(\overline{x^i y^j z^\ell})_{i,j,\ell < 3}$ is a basis of \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} .
- Example:** Let $k = 3$, and rename x_1, x_2, x_3 as x, y, z . Use the degree-lexicographic order. Let \mathcal{I} be the ideal generated by $x^2 - yz, y^2 - zx, z^2 - xy$. Then, $(y^3 - z^3, x^2 - yz, xy - z^2, xz - y^2)$ is a Gröbner basis of \mathcal{I} .
Thus, $(\bar{x}) \cup (\overline{y^j z^\ell})_{j < 3}$ is a basis of \mathcal{P}/\mathcal{I} .

- It is easy to prove the identity

$$h_p(x_{i..k}) = \sum_{t=0}^{i-1} (-1)^t e_t(x_{1..i-1}) h_{p-t}(x_{1..k})$$

for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$.

Here, $x_{a..b}$ means x_a, x_{a+1}, \dots, x_b .

- Use this to show that

$$\left(h_{n-k+i}(x_{i..k}) - \sum_{t=0}^{i-1} (-1)^t e_t(x_{1..i-1}) a_{i-t} \right)_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}}$$

is a Gröbner basis of the ideal J wrt the degree-lexicographic order.

- Thus, Macaulay's basis theorem shows that

$(\overline{x^\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < n-k+i \text{ for each } i}$ is a basis of the \mathbf{k} -module \mathcal{P}/J .

On the proofs, 3: the first basis of \mathcal{S}/I

- How to prove that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$?

On the proofs, 3: the first basis of \mathcal{S}/I

- How to prove that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$?
- Jacobi–Trudi lets you recursively reduce each $\overline{s_\lambda}$ with $\lambda \notin P_{k,n}$ into smaller $\overline{s_\mu}$'s.

On the proofs, 3: the first basis of \mathcal{S}/I

- How to prove that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$?
- Jacobi–Trudi lets you recursively reduce each $\overline{s_\lambda}$ with $\lambda \notin P_{k,n}$ into smaller $\overline{s_\mu}$'s.
 $\implies (\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ spans \mathcal{S}/I .

On the proofs, 3: the first basis of \mathcal{S}/I

- How to prove that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$?
- Jacobi–Trudi lets you recursively reduce each $\overline{s_\lambda}$ with $\lambda \notin P_{k,n}$ into smaller $\overline{s_\mu}$'s.
 $\implies (\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ spans \mathcal{S}/I .
- On the other hand, $(x^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans \mathcal{P} as an \mathcal{S} -module (Artin).

On the proofs, 3: the first basis of \mathcal{S}/I

- How to prove that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$?
- Jacobi–Trudi lets you recursively reduce each $\overline{s_\lambda}$ with $\lambda \notin P_{k,n}$ into smaller $\overline{s_\mu}$'s.
 $\implies (\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ spans \mathcal{S}/I .
- On the other hand, $(x^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans \mathcal{P} as an \mathcal{S} -module (Artin).
- Combining these yields that $(\overline{s_\lambda x^\alpha})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}; \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans $\mathcal{P}/I\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}/J$.

On the proofs, 3: the first basis of \mathcal{S}/I

- How to prove that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$?
- Jacobi–Trudi lets you recursively reduce each $\overline{s_\lambda}$ with $\lambda \notin P_{k,n}$ into smaller $\overline{s_\mu}$'s.
 $\implies (\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ spans \mathcal{S}/I .
- On the other hand, $(x^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans \mathcal{P} as an \mathcal{S} -module (Artin).
- Combining these yields that $(\overline{s_\lambda x^\alpha})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}; \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans $\mathcal{P}/I\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}/J$.
- But we also know that the family $(\overline{x^\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < n-k+i \text{ for each } i}$ is a basis of \mathcal{P}/J .

On the proofs, 3: the first basis of \mathcal{S}/I

- How to prove that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$?
- Jacobi–Trudi lets you recursively reduce each $\overline{s_\lambda}$ with $\lambda \notin P_{k,n}$ into smaller $\overline{s_\mu}$'s.
 $\implies (\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ spans \mathcal{S}/I .
- On the other hand, $(x^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans \mathcal{P} as an \mathcal{S} -module (Artin).
- Combining these yields that $(\overline{s_\lambda x^\alpha})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}; \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans $\mathcal{P}/I\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}/J$.
- But we also know that the family $(\overline{x^\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < n-k+i \text{ for each } i}$ is a basis of \mathcal{P}/J .
- What can you say if a \mathbf{k} -module has a basis $(a_v)_{v \in V}$ and a spanning family $(b_u)_{u \in U}$ of the same finite size ($|U| = |V| < \infty$)?

On the proofs, 3: the first basis of \mathcal{S}/I

- How to prove that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$?
- Jacobi–Trudi lets you recursively reduce each $\overline{s_\lambda}$ with $\lambda \notin P_{k,n}$ into smaller $\overline{s_\mu}$'s.
 $\implies (\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ spans \mathcal{S}/I .
- On the other hand, $(x^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans \mathcal{P} as an \mathcal{S} -module (Artin).
- Combining these yields that $(\overline{s_\lambda x^\alpha})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}; \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans $\mathcal{P}/I\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}/J$.
- But we also know that the family $(\overline{x^\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < n-k+i \text{ for each } i}$ is a basis of \mathcal{P}/J .
- What can you say if a \mathbf{k} -module has a basis $(a_v)_{v \in V}$ and a spanning family $(b_u)_{u \in U}$ of the same finite size ($|U| = |V| < \infty$)?
Easy exercise: You can say that $(b_u)_{u \in U}$ is also a basis.

On the proofs, 3: the first basis of \mathcal{S}/I

- How to prove that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$?
- Jacobi–Trudi lets you recursively reduce each $\overline{s_\lambda}$ with $\lambda \notin P_{k,n}$ into smaller $\overline{s_\mu}$'s.
 $\implies (\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ spans \mathcal{S}/I .
- On the other hand, $(x^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans \mathcal{P} as an \mathcal{S} -module (Artin).
- Combining these yields that $(\overline{s_\lambda x^\alpha})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}; \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans $\mathcal{P}/I\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}/J$.
- But we also know that the family $(\overline{x^\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < n-k+i \text{ for each } i}$ is a basis of \mathcal{P}/J .
- What can you say if a \mathbf{k} -module has a basis $(a_v)_{v \in V}$ and a spanning family $(b_u)_{u \in U}$ of the same finite size ($|U| = |V| < \infty$)?
Easy exercise: You can say that $(b_u)_{u \in U}$ is also a basis.
- Thus, $(\overline{s_\lambda x^\alpha})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}; \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ is a basis of \mathcal{P}/J .

On the proofs, 3: the first basis of \mathcal{S}/I

- How to prove that \mathcal{S}/I is free with basis $(\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$?
- Jacobi–Trudi lets you recursively reduce each $\overline{s_\lambda}$ with $\lambda \notin P_{k,n}$ into smaller $\overline{s_\mu}$'s.
 $\implies (\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ spans \mathcal{S}/I .
- On the other hand, $(x^\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans \mathcal{P} as an \mathcal{S} -module (Artin).
- Combining these yields that $(\overline{s_\lambda x^\alpha})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}; \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ spans $\mathcal{P}/I\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}/J$.
- But we also know that the family $(\overline{x^\alpha})_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < n-k+i \text{ for each } i}$ is a basis of \mathcal{P}/J .
- What can you say if a \mathbf{k} -module has a basis $(a_v)_{v \in V}$ and a spanning family $(b_u)_{u \in U}$ of the same finite size ($|U| = |V| < \infty$)?
Easy exercise: You can say that $(b_u)_{u \in U}$ is also a basis.
- Thus, $(\overline{s_\lambda x^\alpha})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}; \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k; \alpha_i < i \text{ for each } i}$ is a basis of \mathcal{P}/J .
- $\implies (\overline{s_\lambda})_{\lambda \in P_{k,n}}$ is a basis of \mathcal{S}/I .

- The rest of the proofs are long computations inside Λ , using various identities for symmetric functions.

- The rest of the proofs are long computations inside Λ , using various identities for symmetric functions.
- Maybe the most important one:

Bernstein's identity: Let λ be a partition. Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $m \geq \lambda_1$. Then,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (-1)^i \mathbf{h}_{m+i}(\mathbf{e}_i)^\perp \mathbf{s}_\lambda = \mathbf{s}_{(m, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots)}.$$

Here, $\mathbf{f}^\perp \mathbf{g}$ means “ \mathbf{g} skewed by \mathbf{f} ” (so that $(\mathbf{s}_\mu)^\perp \mathbf{s}_\lambda = \mathbf{s}_{\lambda/\mu}$).

- **Sasha Postnikov** for the paper that gave rise to this project in 2013.
- **Filip Jonsson Kling** for the invitation.
- **Dongkwan Kim, Maxim Kontsevich, Victor Reiner, Tom Roby, Travis Scrimshaw, Mark Shimozono, Josh Swanson, Kaisa Taipale, Anders Thorup, and Andrew Weinfeld** for enlightening discussions.
- **you** for your patience.