*Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire* **78B** (2017) Article #7, 12 pp.

# Pattern avoidance and fiber bundle structures on Schubert varieties

## Timothy Alland\* and Edward Richmond<sup> $\dagger$ </sup>

Department of Mathematics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, USA

**Abstract.** We give a permutation pattern avoidance criteria for determining when the projection map from the flag variety to a Grassmannian induces a fiber bundle structure on a Schubert variety. In particular, we show that a Schubert variety has such a fiber bundle structure if and only if the corresponding permutation avoids the split patterns 3|12 and 23|1. We also show that a Schubert variety is an iterated fiber bundle of Grassmannian Schubert varieties if and only if the corresponding permutation avoids (non-split) patterns 3412, 52341, and 635241.

**Résumé.** Nous donnons un schéma de permutation des critères d'évitement pour déterminer quand la carte de projection du drapeau de la variété à un Grassmannienne induit une structure de faisceau de fibres sur une variété de Schubert. En particulier, nous montrons qu'une variété de Schubert a une telle structure de faisceau de fibres si et seulement si la permutation correspondante évite les motifs fendus 3/12 et 23/1. Nous montrons aussi qu'une variété de Schubert est un faisceau de fibres itéré de variétés Grassmannienne Schubert si et seulement si la permutation correspondante évite (non-fractionnées) modèles 3412, 52341 et 635241.

Keywords: Permutation pattern avoidance, Schubert varieties

# 1 Introduction

Let K be an algebraically closed field and let

$$F\ell(n) := \{V_{\bullet} = V_1 \subset V_2 \subset \cdots \subset V_{n-1} \subset \mathbb{K}^n \mid \dim(V_i) = i\}$$

denote the complete flag variety on  $\mathbb{K}^n$ . For each  $r \in \{1, ..., n-1\}$ , let Gr(r, n) denote the Grassmannian of *r*-dimensional subspaces of  $\mathbb{K}^n$  and consider the natural projection map

$$\pi_r: \mathrm{F}\ell(n) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}(r, n) \tag{1.1}$$

given by  $\pi_r(V_{\bullet}) = V_r$ . It is easy to see that the projection  $\pi_r$  is a fiber bundle on  $F\ell(n)$  with fibers isomorphic to  $F\ell(r) \times F\ell(n-r)$ . The goal of this paper is to give a pattern

<sup>\*</sup>tim.alland@okstate.edu

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>edward.richmond@okstate.edu

avoidance criteria for when the map  $\pi_r$  restricted to a Schubert variety of  $F\ell(n)$  is also a fiber bundle.

Fix a basis  $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$  of  $\mathbb{K}^n$  and let  $E_i := \operatorname{span}\langle e_1, \ldots, e_i \rangle$ . Each permutation  $w = w(1) \cdots w(n)$  of the symmetric group  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  defines a Schubert variety

$$X_w := \{ V_{\bullet} \in \mathcal{F}\ell(n) \mid \dim(E_i \cap V_j) \ge r_w[i, j] \}$$

where  $r_w[i, j] := \#\{k \le j \mid w(k) \le i\}$ . For details on the geometry of the map  $\pi_r$  restricted to  $X_w$ , see Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.6.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let r < n and  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ . The projection  $\pi_r$  restricted to  $X_w$  is a Zariski-locally trivial fiber bundle if and only if w avoids the split patterns 3|12 and 23|1 with respect to position r.

If a permutation avoids a split pattern with respect to every position r < n, then that permutation avoids the pattern in the classical sense. For a precise definition of split pattern avoidance, see Definition 2.2. Pattern avoidance has been used to combinatorially describe many geometric properties of Schubert varieties. Most notably, Lakshmibai and Sandhya prove that a Schubert variety  $X_w$  is smooth if and only if w avoids the patterns 3412 and 4231 [3]. Pattern avoidance has been used to characterize many other geometric properties on Schubert varieties as well. For a survey of these results see [1].

#### **1.1** Complete parabolic bundle structures

For any positive integer *n*, define the set  $[n] := \{1, ..., n\}$ . The varieties  $F\ell(n)$  and Gr(r, n) are the extreme examples in the collection of partial flag varieties on  $\mathbb{K}^n$ . For any subset  $\mathbf{a} := \{a_1 < \cdots < a_k\} \subseteq [n-1]$ , define the partial flag variety

$$\mathrm{F}\ell(\mathbf{a},n):=\{V_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}:=V_{a_{1}}\subset V_{a_{2}}\subset\cdots\subset V_{a_{k}}\subseteq\mathbb{K}^{n}\mid \dim(V_{a_{i}})=a_{i}\}.$$

If  $\mathbf{b} \subseteq \mathbf{a}$ , then there is a natural projection map  $\pi_{\mathbf{b}}^{\mathbf{a}} : F\ell(\mathbf{a}, n) \twoheadrightarrow F\ell(\mathbf{b}, n)$  given by  $\pi_{\mathbf{b}}^{\mathbf{a}}(V_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{a}}) = V_{\bullet}^{\mathbf{b}}$ . Note that the map  $\pi_r = \pi_{\{r\}}^{[n-1]}$  from (1.1). Any permutation  $\sigma = \sigma(1) \cdots \sigma(n-1) \in \mathfrak{S}_{n-1}$  defines a collection of nested subsets

$$\sigma_1 \subset \sigma_2 \subset \cdots \subset \sigma_{n-2} \subset \sigma_{n-1} = [n-1]$$
 where  $\sigma_i := \{\sigma(1), \ldots, \sigma(i)\}$ 

The maps  $\pi_{\sigma_{i-1}}^{\sigma_i}$  induce an iterated fiber bundle structure on the complete flag variety

$$F\ell(n) \xrightarrow{\pi_{\sigma_{n-2}}^{[n-1]}} F\ell(\sigma_{n-2}, n) \xrightarrow{\pi_{\sigma_{n-3}}^{\sigma_{n-2}}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\pi_{\sigma_{2}}^{\sigma_{3}}} F\ell(\sigma_{2}, n) \xrightarrow{\pi_{\sigma_{1}}^{\sigma_{2}}} F\ell(\sigma_{1}, n) \to pt$$
(1.2)

where the fibers of each map  $\pi_{\sigma_{i-1}}^{\sigma_i}$  are isomorphic to Grassmannians.

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ . We say  $X_w$  has a **complete parabolic bundle structure** if there is a permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n-1}$  such that the maps  $\pi_{\sigma_{i-1}}^{\sigma_i}$  induce an iterated fiber bundle structure on the Schubert variety

$$X_{w} = X_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\pi_{\sigma_{n-2}}^{[n-1]}} X_{n-2} \xrightarrow{\pi_{\sigma_{n-3}}^{\sigma_{n-2}}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\pi_{\sigma_{2}}^{\sigma_{3}}} X_{2} \xrightarrow{\pi_{\sigma_{1}}^{\sigma_{2}}} X_{1} \longrightarrow pt$$
(1.3)

where  $X_i := \pi_{\sigma_i}^{[n-1]}(X_n) \subseteq F\ell(\sigma_i, n)$ . In other words, each map  $\pi_{\sigma_{i-1}}^{\sigma_i} : X_i \twoheadrightarrow X_{i-1}$  is a Zariski-locally trivial fiber bundle.

Some Schubert varieties do not have complete parabolic bundle structures. The smallest such Schubert variety is  $X_{3412}$ . When  $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ , Ryan showed that any smooth Schubert variety has complete parabolic bundle structure [6]. Wolper later generalized this result to include Schubert varieties over any algebraically closed field [7]. Combining these results with the Lakshmibai-Sandhya smoothness criteria, we have:

**Theorem 1.3.** ([6, 7, 3]) If w avoids patterns 3412 and 4231, then  $X_w$  has a complete parabolic bundle structure.

An analogous result to Theorem 1.3 holds true for rationally smooth Schubert varieties of any finite type [5]. We remark that the converse of Theorem 1.3 is false. For example, the permutation  $\sigma = 213$  induces a complete parabolic bundle structure on  $X_{4231}$ . One application of Theorem 1.1 is a pattern avoidance characterization of Schubert varieties that have complete parabolic bundle structures.

**Theorem 1.4.** The permutation w avoids patterns 3412, 52341 and 635241 if and only if the Schubert variety  $X_w$  has a complete parabolic bundle structure.

The key property used to prove both Theorems 1.1 and 1.4 is the notion of a Billey-Postnikov (BP) decomposition w = vu of a permutation (see Proposition 2.6 for the definition). The term BP decomposition was originally used in [4] to describe a certain factorization condition on the Poincaré polynomials of w, v, u observed by Billey and Postnikov in [2]. Since then, several equivalent conditions have been given to describe this property (see [5, Section 4]).

### 2 Preliminaries

For any integers m < n, define the interval  $[m, n] := \{m, m + 1, ..., n\}$  and let [n] := [1, n]. We now denote the symmetric group  $W := \mathfrak{S}_n$  and will denote permutations  $w \in W$  using one-line notation  $w = w(1)w(2)\cdots w(n)$ . Diagrammatically, we draw a representation of the permutation matrix of w with nodes marking the points (w(i), i) using the convention that (1, 1) marks the upper left corner.

#### **Example 2.1.** The permutation w = 436125 corresponds to the matrix:



A **split pattern**  $w = w_1 | w_2 \in W$  is a divided permutation where  $w_1 = w(1) \cdots w(j)$ and  $w_2 = w(j+1) \cdots w(n)$  for some  $j \in [n-1]$ . We use split patterns to make the following modified definition of pattern containment and avoidance.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $k, r \le n$ . Let  $w = w(1) \cdots w(n)$  and  $u = u(1) \cdots u(j)|u(j+1) \cdots u(k)$ . We say w contains the split pattern u with respect to position r if there exists a sequence  $(i_1 < \cdots < i_k) \subseteq [n]$  such that

- 1.  $w(i_1) \cdots w(i_k)$  has the same relative order as u
- 2.  $i_j \leq r < i_{j+1}$ .

If w does not contain u with respect to position r, then we say w **avoids the split pattern** u with respect to position r.

**Example 2.3.** Let w = 426135 and u = 34|12. Then w contains the split pattern u with respect to position r = 3, but avoids the split pattern u with respect to all other positions.



Note that part (1) of Definition 2.2 is the usual definition of pattern containment. It is easy to see that if w avoids a split pattern u with respect to all  $r \in [n - 1]$ , then w avoids the non-split pattern u in the usual sense.

We now go over some notation and properties of W as a Coxeter group. Let  $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_{n-1}\}$  denote the set of simple generators of W. Let  $\ell : W \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  denote the length function and  $\leq$  denote the Bruhat partial order on W. For any  $w \in W$ , define

$$S(w) := \{s \in S \mid s \le w\}$$
  

$$D_L(w) := \{s \in S \mid \ell(sw) < \ell(w)\}$$
  

$$D_R(w) := \{s \in S \mid \ell(ws) < \ell(w)\}$$

to be the **support**, **left descent set**, **and right descent set** of *w*, respectively. For any subset  $J \subseteq S$ , let  $W_I$  denote the parabolic subgroup generated by *J* and let  $W^J$  denote the

set of minimal length coset representatives of  $W/W_J$ . For each  $w \in W$  and  $J \subseteq S$ , there is a unique **parabolic decomposition** w = vu where  $v \in W^J$  and  $u \in W_J$ . The parabolic decompositions with respect to  $J = S \setminus \{s_r\}$  can be described explicitly in terms of split patterns.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $w = w_1|w_2 = w(1) \cdots w(r)|w(r+1) \cdots w(n) \in W$  and w = vu be the parabolic decomposition with respect to  $J = S \setminus \{s_r\}$ . Then

- 1.  $v = v_1 | v_2$  where  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  respectively consist of the entries of  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  arranged in increasing order.
- 2.  $u = u_1 | u_2$  where  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are respectively the unique permutations on [1, r] and [r+1, n] with relative orders of  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ .

*Proof.* The lemma follows from the fact that  $D_R(v) \subseteq \{s_r\}$  and that  $s_r \notin S(u)$ .

**Example 2.5.** Let w = 541|623. If w = vu is the parabolic decomposition with respect to  $J = S \setminus \{s_3\}$ , then v = 145|236 and u = 321|645.



In the case  $J = S \setminus \{s_r\}$ , each  $v \in W^J$  corresponds to a unique Schubert variety in the Grassmannian Gr(r, n). In particular, define the Schubert variety

$$X_v^j := \{ V \in \operatorname{Gr}(r, n) \mid \dim(V \cap E_j) \ge r_v[i, j] \}.$$

Geometrically, restricting  $\pi_r$  to  $X_w$  gives the projection  $\pi_r : X_w \rightarrow X_v^J$  where the generic fiber is isomorphic to the Schubert variety  $X_u$ . We now give a combinatorial characterization for when  $\pi_r$  is a fiber bundle.

**Proposition 2.6.** ([5, Theorem 3.3, Proposition 4.2]) Let  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  and r < n. Let w = vu be the parabolic decomposition with respect to  $J = S(w) \setminus \{s_r\}$ . Then the following are equivalent.

- 1. w = vu is a **BP** decomposition with respect to J.
- 2.  $S(v) \cap J \subseteq D_L(u)$ .
- 3. The projection  $\pi_r : X_w \to X_v^J$  is a Zariski-locally trivial  $X_u$ -fiber bundle.

The equivalencies in Proposition 2.6 are proved in [5] and for this paper, we will take either parts (2) or (3) of Proposition 2.6 as the definition of BP decomposition (note that this definition corresponds to a "Grassmannian BP decomposition" in [5]). The goal of Theorem 1.1 is to give a pattern avoidance criteria on the permutation w for any of these equivalent conditions.

Finally, we say w has a **complete BP decomposition** if we can write  $w = v_k \cdots v_1$ where for every  $i \in [k-1]$ , we have  $|S(v_i \cdots v_1)| = i$  and  $v_i(v_{i-1} \cdots v_1)$  is a BP decomposition with respect to  $S \setminus \{s_{r_i}\}$  where  $s_{r_i}$  is the unique simple generator in  $S(v_i) \setminus S(v_{i-1} \cdots v_1)$ .

Observe that the maps  $\pi_r = \pi_{\{r\}}^{[n-1]}$  are not of the form  $\pi_{\sigma_{i-1}}^{\sigma_i}$  used in Definition 1.2. The next proposition gives the connection between BP decompositions and complete parabolic bundle structures on Schubert varieties. The proposition follows directly from [5, Lemma 4.3] and the proof of [5, Corollary 3.7].

**Proposition 2.7.** ([5, Lemma 4.3, Corollary 3.7]) *The permutation* w *has a complete BP decomposition if and only if*  $X_w$  *has a complete parabolic bundle structure.* 

## **3 Proof of Main theorems**

In this section we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.4. We begin with two important well-known lemmas on permutations and leave the proofs as exercises.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let  $v = v(1) \cdots v(n) \in W^J$  where  $J = S \setminus \{s_r\}$ . Then

$$S(v) = \{s_k \in S \mid v(r+1) \le k < v(r)\}$$

**Lemma 3.2.** Let  $u = u(1) \cdots u(n) \in W$ . Then  $D_L(u) = \{s_k \in S \mid u^{-1}(k+1) < u^{-1}(k)\}$ .

In the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.4, we will often refer to sub-matrices or rectangular regions of a permutation matrix. Let *A* be the permutation matrix of  $w = w(1) \cdots w(n)$ . We say a region *R* of *A* is **empty** if the interior of *R* contains no nodes of the form (w(i), i). We say a region *R* is **decreasing** if for every pair (w(i), i), (w(j), j)in *R*, we have i < j implies w(i) > w(j). Empty regions in a permutation matrix will be denoted by a shaded background and decreasing regions with be decorated (counter intuitively) with a northeast arrow. Finally, we say a pair of nodes (w(i), i), (w(j), j) are **increasing** if i < j and w(i) < w(j).

*Proof of Theorem* 1.1. Fix r < n and let  $w = w(1) \cdots w(n) \in W$ . Let w = vu be the parabolic decomposition with respect to  $J = S \setminus \{s_r\}$ . By Proposition 2.6, it suffices to prove that w avoids the split patterns 3|12 and 23|1 with respect to position r if and only if  $S(v) \cap J = S(v) \setminus \{s_r\} \subseteq D_L(u)$ . Note that if  $S(v) = \emptyset$ , then the theorem immediately follows and hence we will assume that v is not the identity.

Let

$$m := \max\{w(k) \mid k \le r\} \quad \text{and} \quad l := \min\{w(k) \mid k > r\}.$$

The nodes  $(m, w^{-1}(m))$  and  $(l, w^{-1}(l))$  partition the permutation matrix of w into regions labeled A - H as in Figure 1. By definition of m and l, the regions D and E must be empty. Moreover, Lemma 2.4 part (1) and Lemma 3.1 imply that

$$S(v) = \{s_k \mid l \le k < m\}.$$
(3.1)

Similarly, the permutation matrix of u partitions into regions A' - H' as in Figure 1. Observe that since v is not the identity, we have  $l \leq r$ . By Lemma 2.4 part (2), the nodes in each region labeled A - H maintain the same relative order of those in A' - H' respectively. In particular,  $(r, w^{-1}(m))$  and  $(r + 1, w^{-1}(l))$  are nodes in the permutation matrix of u. Furthermore, since regions D and E are empty, the sizes of regions A and H are the same as the size of regions A' and H'.

Now suppose *w* avoids the patterns 3|12 and 23|1 with respect to position *r*. Then regions *B*, *G* must be empty and regions *C*, *F* must be decreasing in the permutation matrix of *w*. Thus regions *B'*, *G'* are empty and regions *C'*, *F'* are decreasing in the permutation matrix of *u* (See Figure 2). Now Lemma 3.2 and (3.1) imply that  $D_L(u)$  contains  $S(v) \setminus \{s_r\}$  and hence w = vu is a BP decomposition.



**Figure 1:** Permutation matrices of *w* and *u* partitioned by  $(m, w^{-1}(m))$  and  $(l, w^{-1}(l))$ .

Conversely, suppose  $S(v) \setminus \{s_r\} \subseteq D_L(u)$ . In particular, Lemma 3.2 and (3.1) say that  $u^{-1}(k+1) < u^{-1}(k)$  for all  $k \in [l, r-1] \sqcup [r+1, m-1]$ . This implies that regions B', G' are empty and regions C', F' are decreasing in the permutation matrix of u. Hence regions B, G are empty and regions C, F are decreasing in the permutation matrix of w. Thus w avoids both split patterns 3|12 and 23|1 with respect to position r. This completes the proof.



**Figure 2:** Permutation matrices of *w* and *u* with *w* avoiding 3|12 and 23|1 with respect to position *r* or equivalently,  $S(v) \setminus \{s_r\} \subseteq D_L(u)$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** If  $w \in W$  avoids 3412, 52341 and 635241, then there exists r < n such that w avoids 3|12 and 23|1 with respect to position r. Furthermore, if  $S(w) \neq \emptyset$ , then we can choose r such that  $s_r \in S(w)$ .

*Proof.* We prove the first part of Proposition 3.3 by contradiction. Suppose for every position r < n, w contains either 3|12 or 23|1. In particular, w contains 3|12 with respect to position r = 1. Any w(1)w(i)w(j) in relative position 3|12 partitions the permutation matrix of w into regions labelled A - K as in Figure 3. Moreover, we can choose nodes (w(i), i), (w(j), j) such that regions E, F, J are empty. Since w avoids 3412, region D must also be empty and regions C and I must be decreasing.



**Figure 3:** Permutation matrix of *w* containing 3|12 with respect to position r = 1.

Now *w* contains either pattern 3|12 or 23|1 with respect to position r = i. We consider several cases depending on if region *I* is empty or nonempty and if *w* contains 3|12 or 23|1 with respect to position *i*.

**Case 1:** Suppose the region *I* is nonempty and *w* contains 3|12 with respect to position *i*. Since regions *D*, *E*, *F* and *J* are empty and *I* is decreasing, the permutation matrix of

w must contain two increasing nodes in region G as in Figure 4. This implies w contains the pattern 52341 which is a contradiction.



**Figure 4:** Permutation matrix of *w* containing 3|12 with respect to r = i and region *I* is nonempty.

**Case 2:** Suppose the region *I* is nonempty and *w* contains 23|1 with respect to position *i*. If region *A* has a node belonging to the pattern 23|1, then *w* contains the pattern 52341. Otherwise, since region *C* is decreasing, *w* must contain a pair of increasing nodes in region *B* or  $B \cup C$ . If the nodes are in region *B*, then *w* contains 52341 and if the nodes are in region  $B \cup C$ , then *w* contains 635241. See Figure 5 for an illustration of these three subcases.



**Figure 5:** Permutation matrix of *w* containing 23|1 with respect to r = i and region *I* is nonempty.

**Case 3:** Suppose the region *I* is empty. Since region *C* is decreasing, it is not possible for *w* to contain 23|1 with respect to position *i*. Hence *w* contains 3|12 and thus region *G* must contain a pair of increasing nodes. These nodes partition region  $G \cup H$  into sub-regions labeled A' - K' as in Figure 6. Choose increasing nodes (w(i'), i') and (w(j'), j') in region *G*, so that regions E', F' and J' are empty. Also, since *w* avoids 3412 and 52341,

we can further assume that regions A' and D' are empty and that regions C' and I' are decreasing.



**Figure 6:** Permutation matrix of *w* containing 3|12 with respect to position r = i and region *I* is empty.

Now *w* contains 3|12 or 23|1 with respect to position r = i'. First, if *w* contains 3|12, then, since region I' is decreasing, *w* must have a pair of increasing nodes in region G'. This implies *w* contains 52341.



**Figure 7:** Permutation matrix of *w* containing 3|12 with respect to position r = i'.

If *w* contains 23|1, then the fact that regions *C* and *C'* are decreasing implies that *w* has a pair of increasing nodes in either regions  $B', B' \cup C', C \cup B'$  or  $C \cup C'$ . If *w* contains increasing nodes in regions *B'* or  $B' \cup C'$ , then *w* contains 52341 or 635241 respectively as in Figure 8.

Finally, if *w* contains increasing nodes in regions  $C \cup B'$  or  $C \cup C'$ , then we have the following three possibilities as in Figure 9.



**Figure 8:** Permutation matrix of *w* containing 23|1 with respect to position r = i' using regions *B*' and  $B' \cup C'$ .



**Figure 9:** Permutation matrix of *w* containing 23|1 with respect to position r = i' using regions  $C \cup B'$  and  $C \cup C'$ .

We can see that w contains 52341, 635241 and 3412 respectively for each of these possibilities. This completes the first part of the proof.

For the second part, if  $w \in W$  avoids the patterns 3412, 52341 and 635241, then there exists r < n where the parabolic decomposition w = vu with respect to  $J = S \setminus \{s_r\}$  is a BP decomposition. If  $s_r \in S(w)$ , then we are done. Otherwise,  $s_r \notin S(w)$  which implies w = u. Write  $w = w_1|w_2$  split at position r. If  $J_1 = \{s_1, \dots, s_{r-1}\}$  and  $J_2 = J \setminus J_1$ , then Lemma 2.4 implies that  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  also avoid 3412, 52341 and 635241 as permutations in  $W_{J_1} \simeq S_r$  and  $W_{J_2} \simeq S_{n-r}$  respectively. Since either r or n - r is greater than 1 we will assume, without loss of generality, that r > 1 and  $S(w_1) \neq \emptyset$ . By induction, there exists r' < r for which  $s_{r'} \in S(w_1)$  and  $w_1$  avoids 3|12 and 23|1 with respect to position r'. But  $S(w_1) \subseteq S(w)$  and hence  $s_{r'} \in S(w)$ . This completes the proof.

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Theorem 1.4 follows directly by induction on the length of w using Proposition 3.3.

# Acknowledgements

The first author was partially supported by Oklahoma State University's Koslow Undergraduate Math Research Experience Scholarship. The second author was partially supported by a NSA Young Investigator's Grant and an Oklahoma State University Dean's Incentive Grant. The program SAGE was used to collect data on BP decompositions of permutations in relation to pattern avoidance.

# References

- H. Abe and S. C. Billey. "Consequences of the Lakshmibai-Sandhya Theorem: the ubiquity of permutation patterns in Schubert calculus and related geometry". To appear in *Adv. Studies of Pure Math.* 2014. arXiv:1403.4345.
- [2] S. C. Billey and A. Postnikov. "Smoothness of Schubert varieties via patterns in root subsystems". Adv. in Appl. Math. 34 (2005), pp. 447–466. DOI.
- [3] V. Lakshmibai and B. Sandhya. "Criterion for smoothness of Schubert varieties in Sl(n)/B". *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci.* 100 (1990), pp. 45–52. DOI.
- [4] S. Oh and H. Yoo. "Bruhat order, rationally smooth Schubert varieties, and hyperplane arrangements". 22nd International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics. DMTCS Proceedings, 2010, pp. 965–972. URL.
- [5] E. Richmond and W. Slofstra. "Billey-Postnikov decompositions and the fibre bundle structure of Schubert varieties". *Math. Ann.* **366** (2016), pp. 31–55. DOI.
- [6] K. M. Ryan. "On Schubert varieties in the flag manifold of Sl(n, C)". Math. Ann. 276 (1987), pp. 205–224. DOI.
- [7] J. S. Wolper. "A combinatorial approach to the singularities of Schubert varieties". Adv. Math. 76 (1989), pp. 184–193. DOI.