



HAL
open science

Eigenvalues, singular values, and the O'Shea-Sjamaar Theorem

Paul-Emile Paradan

► **To cite this version:**

Paul-Emile Paradan. Eigenvalues, singular values, and the O'Shea-Sjamaar Theorem. 2023. hal-04037272v1

HAL Id: hal-04037272

<https://hal.science/hal-04037272v1>

Preprint submitted on 20 Mar 2023 (v1), last revised 13 Nov 2023 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Eigenvalues, singular values, and the O’Shea-Sjamaar Theorem

Paul-Emile Paradan*

March 20, 2023

Abstract

The main focus of this work is the study of several cones relating the eigenvalues or singular values of a matrix to those of its off-diagonal blocks. Some of these cones were studied by Fomin-Fulton-Li-Poon in [15, 6], but we will explain why their description is incomplete and how we can remedy it using the O’Shea-Sjamaar theorem.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Reminder of some classical results	5
2.1	Singular values	5
2.2	Augmented matrices	5
2.3	Horn inequalities	5
2.4	The cone $LR(U, \tilde{U})$	6
2.5	The cone $LR(m, n)$	10
2.6	Proof of Theorem 2.8	11
2.7	A consequence of the O’Shea-Sjamaar Theorem	14
3	The cone $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$	15
3.1	Complexification and antiholomorphic involution	15
3.2	Orthogonal projection of orbits	15
3.3	Inequalities determining $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$	16
3.4	Examples	17
4	The cone $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$	19
4.1	Complexification, antiholomorphic involution and orthogonal projection . .	19
4.2	Description of $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$ through $LR(n, n)$	20
4.3	Inequalities determining $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$	21

*IMAG, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, email : paul-emile.paradan@umontpellier.fr

5	The cone $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$	21
5.1	A subcone of $LR(n, n)$	21
5.2	Description of $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$	22
5.3	Description of $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$ proposed by Fomin-Fulton-Li-Poon	22
6	The cone $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$	24
6.1	Complexification, antiholomorphic involution and orthogonal projection . .	25
6.2	Description of $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$ through $LR(2p, 2q)$	25
6.3	Inequalities determining $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$	26
6.4	Interlacing inequalities for singular values	26

1 Introduction

Let $p \geq q \geq 1$ and $n = p + q$. Let us denote by $Herm(n)$ the vector space of Hermitian n -square matrices. The spectrum of $X \in Herm(n)$ is denoted by $e(X) = (e_1 \geq \dots \geq e_n)$ and the singular spectrum of a matrix $Y \in M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$ is denoted by $s(Y) = (s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_q \geq 0)$.

The main purpose of this article is the description of the following cones:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(p, q) &= \left\{ (e(X), s(X_{12})), X \in Herm(n) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{S}(p, q) &= \left\{ (s(X), s(X_{12}), s(X_{21})), X \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C}) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{T}(p, q) &= \left\{ (s(X), s(X_{11}), s(X_{22})), X \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, a n -square complex matrix X is written by blocs $X = \begin{pmatrix} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ X_{21} & X_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ where $X_{12} \in M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$ and $X_{21} \in M_{q,p}(\mathbb{C})$.

In the 1970s, Thompson gave some inequalities satisfied by the elements of $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$ [24], and more recently Fomin, Fulton, Li and Poon obtained sets of inequalities that (should) describe the cones $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$ and $\mathcal{E}(p, q) := \mathcal{S}(p, q) \cap \{s(X_{12}) = s(X_{21})\}$ [15, 6].

Indeed, in [15, 6] the authors state that an element (λ, s) belongs to $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$ if and only if

$$(1) \quad \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i - \sum_{j \in J^o} \lambda_j \geq 2 \sum_{k \in K} s_k$$

holds for all triple (I, J, K) of subsets of $[q] = \{1, \dots, q\}$ that belongs to $\bigcup_{r \leq q} LR_r^q$. Here LR_r^q denotes the list of triples of cardinal r defined inductively by Horn [8], and we have denoted $J^o = \{n + 1 - \ell, \ell \in J\}$.

The main purpose of this work is to explain how a direct application of O’Shea-Sjamaar’s theorem [18] gives complete sets of inequalities for the cones $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$, $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$, $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$ and $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$. In addition, we will explain why the descriptions of the cones $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$ and $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$ given in [15, 6] are incomplete.

Nevertheless, this application of the O'Shea-Sjamaar theorem does not allow to describe these cones in an optimal way, because it leads to a large number of redundancies in the list of inequalities. In a future work [20], we give a more efficient method to describe these inequality sets, using the main result of [19].

In §3, we show that $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$ is described by the following inequalities:

$$(2) \quad \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i - \sum_{j \in J^o} \lambda_j \geq 2 \sum_{k \in K \cap [q]} s_k - 2 \sum_{k \in K^o \cap [q]} s_k$$

where the triplets (I, J, K) belongs to $\bigcup_{r < n} \text{LR}_r^n$. In [20], we improve this result by showing that this system can be restricted to the triplets (I, J, K) satisfying the following additional conditions: I, J, K are of cardinal $r \leq q$, $I \cap J^o = \emptyset$ and $K = K_+ \cup (K_-)^o$ where K_+, K_- are disjoint subsets of $[q]$.

The example $\mathcal{A}(3, 3)$ that we detail in §3.4.2 permits to see that inequalities (1) given by Fomin, Fulton, Li and Poon in [15, 6] are not sufficient to define $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$. We find here two inequalities of the type (2) which are independent of those of the type (1):

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_5 - \lambda_6 &\geq 2(s_1 - s_2 - s_3) \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_5 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 - \lambda_6 &\geq 2(s_1 - s_2 - s_3). \end{aligned}$$

The independence of the last inequalities is ensured by the example $s_0 = (1, 0, 0)$ and $\lambda_0 = (1, 1, 1, 1, -1, -1)$. The element (λ_0, s_0) does not verify the inequality (3), and then $(\lambda_0, s_0) \notin \mathcal{A}(3, 3)$, whereas it verifies all the inequalities of the type (1).

In [6], the authors pose the question of finding the collection of linear inequalities that describes $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$ (Problem 1.15). We answer this problem in §4. Here, the list of inequalities is parametrized by some Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. Recall that one associates to an increasing sequence $A = \{a_1 < \dots < a_p\}$ of positive integers the partition $\mu(A) = (a_p - p \geq \dots \geq a_1 - 1 \geq 0)$.

Our main result of §4 states that an element $(\gamma, s, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^q$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$ if and only the following set of inequalities are satisfied:

$$(4) \quad \gamma = (\gamma_1 \geq \dots \geq \gamma_n \geq 0), \quad s = (s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_q \geq 0), \quad t = (t_1 \geq \dots \geq t_q \geq 0),$$

$$(5) \quad \gamma_\ell \geq s_\ell, \quad \gamma_\ell \geq t_\ell, \quad \forall \ell \in [q],$$

$$(6) \quad \sum_{i \in A \cap [n]} \gamma_i - \sum_{i \in A^o \cap [n]} \gamma_i \geq \sum_{j \in B \cap [q]} s_j - \sum_{j \in B^o \cap [q]} s_j + \sum_{k \in C \cap [q]} t_k - \sum_{k \in C^o \cap [q]} t_k,$$

for any triplets (A, B, C) satisfying the following requirements:

- B, C are strict subsets of $[n]$,
- $A \subset [2n]$ and $\#A = \#B + \#C \leq n$,

- the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A)}$ is non-zero.

In §5, we study the subcone $\mathcal{E}(p, q) = \{(\gamma, s) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^q, (\gamma, s, s) \in \mathcal{S}(p, q)\}$. Our previous result allows us to assert that (γ, s) belongs to $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$ if and only if (γ, s, s) satisfies (4), (5) and (6). We will show how to refine this result: on the one hand the conditions (5) are not necessary, and on the other hand, for the inequalities (6), it is sufficient to restrict ourselves to those where $B = C$. At the end of §5, we compare our result on $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$ with that of Fomin, Fulton, Li and Poon in [6]. We will then explain why their description requires further explanation since they use their erroneous description of $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$ to get it.

In the last section, we give a set of inequalities describing the cone $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$. In the case $\mathcal{T}(p, 1)$, we recover the interlacing inequalities of the singular values obtained by Thompson [23].

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Nicolas Ressayre for the interesting discussions we had on this subject. I am also grateful to Michèle Vergne and Velleda Baldoni for giving me the LR₃⁶ list, and to my colleague Bijan Mohammadi for providing me the example (λ_0, s_0) .

Notations

Throughout the paper :

- We fix $p \geq q \geq 1$ and $n = p + q$.
- We write 0_{ab} for the zero matrix of size $a \times b$.
- Let $M_{a,b}(\mathbb{C})$ be the vector space of complex $a \times b$ matrices.
- \mathbb{R}_+^ℓ is the set of sequences $x = (x_1 \geq \dots \geq x_\ell)$ of real numbers.
- \mathbb{R}_{++}^ℓ is the set of sequences $x = (x_1 \geq \dots \geq x_\ell \geq 0)$ of non-negative real numbers.
- For any positive integer ℓ , let $[\ell]$ be the set $\{1, \dots, \ell\}$.
- If $x \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ and $A \subset [\ell]$, we write $|x|_A = \sum_{a \in A} x_a$ and $|x| = \sum_{i=1}^\ell x_i$.
- For $A \subset [\ell]$, we define $A^o := \{\ell + 1 - a, a \in A\}$ and $A^c := [\ell] \setminus A$.
- If $x \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$, let $\text{Diag}(x)$ be the diagonal $\ell \times \ell$ matrix with diagonal entries equal to x_1, \dots, x_ℓ .

2 Reminder of some classical results

We recall some classical facts that we will need later.

2.1 Singular values

Let X be a rectangular matrix, say $m \times n$, with complex entries, and denote by X^* the complex conjugate transpose of X . Let $\mu_1(X) \geq \dots \geq \mu_m(X) \geq 0$ denote the eigenvalues of the positive semidefinite matrix XX^* . Notice that $\mu_k(X) = 0$ when $k > p := \inf\{m, n\}$.

The singular values of the matrix X are the coordinates of the vector

$$s(X) := \left(\mu_1(X)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \dots, \mu_p(X)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^p.$$

Consider the canonical action of the unitary group $U_m \times U_n$ on $M_{m,n}(\mathbb{C})$: $(g, h) \cdot X = gXh^{-1}$, $\forall (g, h) \in U_m \times U_n$. The singular values map $s : M_{m,n}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{++}^p$ induces a bijective application

$$s : M_{m,n}(\mathbb{C})/U_m \times U_n \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{R}_{++}^p.$$

2.2 Augmented matrices

If X is a n -square matrix, we denote by \widehat{X} the $2n$ -square Hermitian matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0_{nn} & X \\ X^* & 0_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$. It is easy to check that the spectrum of \widehat{X} is equal to $\widehat{\mu} := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n, -\mu_n, \dots, -\mu_1) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2n}$, where $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$ is the singular spectrum of X .

If Y is a $p \times q$ matrix, we denote by $\widehat{Y}^{p,q}$ the n -square Hermitian matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0_{pp} & Y \\ Y^* & 0_{qq} \end{pmatrix}$. Here the spectrum of $\widehat{Y}^{p,q}$ is equal to $\widehat{s}^{p,q} := (s_1, \dots, s_q, 0, \dots, 0, -s_q, \dots, -s_1) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, where $s \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$ is the singular spectrum of Y .

If Z is a $q \times p$ matrix, we denote by $\widehat{Y}^{q,p}$ the n -square Hermitian matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 0_{qq} & Z \\ Z^* & 0_{pp} \end{pmatrix}$. Here also the spectrum of $\widehat{Z}^{q,p}$ is equal to $\widehat{t}^{p,q}$, where $t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$ is the singular spectrum of Z .

2.3 Horn inequalities

Recall that $e(X) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ denotes the vector of eigenvalues of a n -square Hermitian matrix X . We consider the Horn cone

$$\text{Horn}(n) := \left\{ (e(X), e(Y), e(X + Y)); X, Y \in \text{Herm}(n) \right\}.$$

Denote the set of cardinality r -subsets $I = \{i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r\}$ of $[n]$ by \mathcal{P}_r^n .

Definition 2.1 To any $1 \leq r < n$, LR_r^n refers to the set of triplet $(I, J, K) \in (\mathcal{P}_r^n)^3$ such that $(\mu(I), \mu(J), \mu(K)) \in \text{Horn}(r)$.

The following theorem was conjectured by Horn [8] and proved by a combination of the works of Klyachko [10] and Knutson-Tao [13].

Theorem 2.2 *The triplet $(x, y, z) \in (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^3$ belongs to $\text{Horn}(n)$ if and only if the following conditions holds:*

- $|x| + |y| = |z|$,
- $|x|_I + |y|_J \geq |z|_K$, for any $r < n$ and any $(I, J, K) \in \text{LR}_r^n$.

In the following sections, we will use the Littlewood Richardson coefficients to parameterize some inequalities. Let us recall their definition. Let λ, μ , and ν be three partitions of length less than $n \geq 1$. We associate to them the irreducible representations V_λ, V_μ and V_ν of the unitary group U_n . The Littlewood Richardson coefficient $c_{\mu, \nu}^\lambda$ can be characterized by the relation $c_{\mu, \nu}^\lambda = \dim [V_\lambda^* \otimes V_\mu \otimes V_\nu]^{U_n}$. Thanks to the saturation Theorem of Knutson and Tao [13], we know that $c_{\mu, \nu}^\lambda \neq 0 \iff (\mu, \nu, \lambda) \in \text{Horn}(n)$.

The following kind of duality is used in the next sections: for all $(I, J, K) \in (\mathcal{P}_r^n)^3$, we have

$$(7) \quad c_{\mu(I), \mu(J)}^{\mu(K)} \neq 0 \iff c_{\mu((I^o)^c), \mu((J^o)^c)}^{\mu((K^o)^c)} \neq 0.$$

Since the relation $|x|_{(I^o)^c} + |y|_{(J^o)^c} \geq |z|_{(K^o)^c}$ is equivalent to $|x|_{I^o} + |y|_{J^o} \leq |z|_{K^o}$, in Theorem 2.2, we can rewrite the last condition by requiring that

$$|x|_I + |y|_J \geq |z|_K \quad \text{and} \quad |x|_{I^o} + |y|_{J^o} \leq |z|_{K^o}$$

for any $r \leq \frac{n}{2}$ and any $(I, J, K) \in \text{LR}_r^n$.

2.4 The cone $LR(U, \tilde{U})$

Let $\iota : U \hookrightarrow \tilde{U}$ be two connected compact Lie groups. We choose an invariant scalar product $(-, -)$ on the Lie algebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}$ of \tilde{U} , and we denote by $\pi : \tilde{\mathfrak{u}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}$ the orthogonal projection.

Select maximal tori T in U and \tilde{T} in \tilde{U} such that $T \subset \tilde{T}$, and Weyl chambers $\mathfrak{t}_+ \subset \mathfrak{t}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_+ \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}$, where \mathfrak{t} and $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}$ denote the Lie algebras of T , resp. \tilde{T} . The aim of this section is to recall the description of the following cone obtained in [4, 21]:

$$LR(U, \tilde{U}) = \left\{ (\xi, \tilde{\xi}) \in \mathfrak{t}_+ \times \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_+, U\xi \subset \pi(\tilde{U}\tilde{\xi}) \right\}.$$

Consider the lattice $\wedge := \frac{1}{2\pi} \ker(\exp : \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow T)$ and the Weyl groups $\tilde{W} = N_{\tilde{U}}(\tilde{T})/\tilde{T}$ and $W = N_U(T)/T$. We denote by $w_o \in W$ the longest element. A vector $\gamma \in \mathfrak{t}$ is called *rational* if it belongs to the \mathbb{Q} -vector space $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ generated by \wedge . We will see that the cone $LR(U, \tilde{U})$ is completely described by inequalities of the form

$$(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{w}\gamma) \geq (\xi, w_o w\gamma)$$

with γ rational anti-dominant and $(w, \tilde{w}) \in W \times \tilde{W}$.

2.4.1 Admissible elements

We let $\Sigma(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u}) \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$ denote the set of weights relative to the T -action on $(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u}) \otimes \mathbb{C}$. If $\gamma \in \mathfrak{t}$, we denote by $\Sigma(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u}) \cap \gamma^\perp$ the subset of weights vanishing against γ .

Definition 2.3 *A rational element $\gamma \in \mathfrak{t}$ is said admissible when*

$$(8) \quad \text{Vect}(\Sigma(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u}) \cap \gamma^\perp) = \text{Vect}(\Sigma(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u})) \cap \gamma^\perp.$$

We work under the following assumption.

Assumption 2.4 *The subspace $\mathfrak{z} := \{X \in \mathfrak{t}, \alpha(X) = 0, \forall \alpha \in \Sigma(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u})\}$ is contained in the center $Z_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}}$ of $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}$.*

This assumption means that any ideal of $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}$ contained in \mathfrak{u} is a subspace of $Z_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}} \cap \mathfrak{u}$.

Let $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{z} \oplus \mathfrak{t}_1$ be a rational decomposition. Let us denote by $\Sigma(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u})'$ the image of $\Sigma(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u})$ through the projection $\mathfrak{t}^* \rightarrow (\mathfrak{t}_1)^*$: thanks to our assumption, $\Sigma(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u})'$ generates $(\mathfrak{t}_1)^*$. Any rational element $\gamma \in \mathfrak{t}$ can be written $\gamma = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1$ where γ_0 is a rational element of \mathfrak{z} and γ_1 is a rational element of \mathfrak{t}_1 . We see then that a rational element γ is admissible if and only if γ_1 is admissible. The later condition is equivalent to asking that the hyperplane $(\gamma_1)^\perp \subset (\mathfrak{t}_1)^*$ is generated by a finite subset of $\Sigma(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u})'$. Thus, there are a finite number of choices for γ_1 (up to multiplication by $\mathbb{Q}^{>0}$).

2.4.2 Polarized trace

Let $\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{u})$ and $\mathfrak{R}(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}})$ be the set of roots associated to the Lie algebras \mathfrak{u} and $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}$. The choice of the Weyl chambers \mathfrak{t}_+ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_+$ define subsets of positive roots $\mathfrak{R}^+ \subset \mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{u})$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{R}}^+ \subset \mathfrak{R}(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}})$.

For a rational element $\gamma \in \mathfrak{t}$ and $(w, \tilde{w}) \in W \times \tilde{W}$, we will use the following condition to parameterize the inequalities of $LR(U, \tilde{U})$:

$$(9) \quad \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}^+ \\ \langle \alpha, w\gamma \rangle > 0}} \langle \alpha, w\gamma \rangle + \sum_{\substack{\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{R}}^+ \\ \langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{w}\gamma \rangle < 0}} \langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{w}\gamma \rangle = 0$$

2.4.3 Schubert calculus

Let $\iota : U_{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow \tilde{U}_{\mathbb{C}}$ be the complexification of $\iota : U \hookrightarrow \tilde{U}$. To any non-zero rational element $\gamma \in \mathfrak{t}$, we associate the parabolic subgroups

$$(10) \quad \tilde{P}_\gamma = \{g \in \tilde{U}_{\mathbb{C}}, \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \exp(-it\gamma)g \exp(it\gamma) \text{ exists}\} \quad \text{and} \quad P_\gamma = \tilde{P}_\gamma \cap U_{\mathbb{C}}.$$

We consider the projective varieties $\mathcal{F}_\gamma := U_{\mathbb{C}}/P_\gamma$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\gamma := \tilde{U}_{\mathbb{C}}/\tilde{P}_\gamma$, with the canonical embedding $\iota : \mathcal{F}_\gamma \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\gamma$. Let $B \subset U_{\mathbb{C}}$ (resp. $\tilde{B} \subset \tilde{U}_{\mathbb{C}}$) be the Borel subgroup associated to the choice of the Weyl chamber \mathfrak{t}_+ (resp. $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_+$).

We associate to $(w, \tilde{w}) \in W \times \widetilde{W}$, the Schubert cells

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w}, \gamma}^o := \tilde{B}[\tilde{w}] \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{X}_{w, \gamma}^o := B[w] \subset \mathcal{F}_\gamma.$$

The corresponding Schubert varieties are $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w}, \gamma} := \overline{\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w}, \gamma}^o}$ and $\mathfrak{X}_{w, \gamma} := \overline{\mathfrak{X}_{w, \gamma}^o}$.

We consider the cohomology¹ rings $H^*(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\gamma, \mathbb{Z})$ and $H^*(\mathcal{F}_\gamma, \mathbb{Z})$. Let

$$\iota^* : H^*(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\gamma, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H^*(\mathcal{F}_\gamma, \mathbb{Z})$$

be the pull-back map in cohomology. If Y is an irreducible closed subvariety of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\gamma$, we denote by $[Y] \in H^{2n_Y}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\gamma, \mathbb{Z})$ its cycle class in cohomology : here $n_Y = \text{codim}_{\mathbb{C}}(Y)$. Recall that the cohomology class $[pt]$ associated to a singleton $Y = \{pt\} \subset \mathcal{F}_\gamma$ is a basis of $H^{\max}(\mathcal{F}_\gamma, \mathbb{Z})$.

In the next section we will consider a rational element $\gamma \in \mathfrak{t}$ and $(w, \tilde{w}) \in W \times \widetilde{W}$ satisfying the relation $[\mathfrak{X}_{w, \gamma}] \cdot \iota^*([\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w}, \gamma}]) = k[pt]$ in $H^*(\mathcal{F}_\gamma, \mathbb{Z})$, with $k \geq 1$. This cohomological condition implies in particular that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{X}_{w, \gamma}) = \text{codim}_{\mathbb{C}}(\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w}, \gamma})$ which is equivalent to the relation

$$(11) \quad \# \{ \alpha \in \mathfrak{A}^+, \langle \alpha, w\gamma \rangle > 0 \} = \# \{ \tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{A}}^+, \langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{w}\gamma \rangle < 0 \}.$$

We finish this section by considering the particular case where $U_{\mathbb{C}} = GL_n(\mathbb{C})$ is embedded diagonally in $\tilde{U}_{\mathbb{C}} = GL_n(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_n(\mathbb{C})$. For $1 \leq r < n$, the vector $\gamma_r = \underbrace{(-1, \dots, -1, 0, \dots, 0)}_{r \text{ times}} \in \mathbb{R}^n \simeq \mathfrak{t}$ is admissible and the flag manifolds \mathcal{F}_{γ_r} and $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{\gamma_r}$ admits a canonical identifications respectively with the Grassmanians $\mathbb{G}(r, n)$ and $\mathbb{G}(r, n) \times \mathbb{G}(r, n)$. The map $\iota : \mathcal{F}_\gamma \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\gamma$ corresponds to the diagonal embedding $\iota : \mathbb{G}(r, n) \rightarrow \mathbb{G}(r, n) \times \mathbb{G}(r, n)$.

For $w \in W \simeq \mathfrak{S}_n$, the Schubert variety $\mathfrak{X}_{w, \gamma_r} \subset \mathbb{G}(r, n)$, which depends only of the subset $K = w([r]) \subset [n]$, is denoted \mathfrak{X}_K . Similarly, for $w = (w_1, w_2) \in \widetilde{W} \simeq \mathfrak{S}_n \times \mathfrak{S}_n$, the Schubert variety $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w}, \gamma_r} \subset \mathbb{G}(r, n) \times \mathbb{G}(r, n)$ is equal to $\mathfrak{X}_I \times \mathfrak{X}_J$, where $I = w_1([r])$ and $J = w_2([r])$.

In this setting, we have the following classical result.

Lemma 2.5 *The following statements are equivalent:*

- $[\mathfrak{X}_{w, \gamma}] \cdot \iota^*([\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w}, \gamma}]) = \ell[pt]$ in $H^*(\mathcal{F}_\gamma, \mathbb{Z})$, with $\ell \geq 1$.
- $[\mathfrak{X}_I] \cdot [\mathfrak{X}_J] \cdot [\mathfrak{X}_K] = \ell[pt]$ in $H^*(\mathbb{G}(r, n), \mathbb{Z})$, with $\ell \geq 1$.
- *The Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c_{\mu(I^o), \mu(J^o)}^{\mu(K)}$ is non-zero.*

¹Here, we use singular cohomology with integer coefficients.

2.4.4 Description of $LR(U, \tilde{U})$

We can finally describe the cone $LR(U, \tilde{U})$.

Theorem 2.6 *Let $(\xi, \tilde{\xi}) \in \mathfrak{t}_+ \times \tilde{\mathfrak{t}}_+$. We have $U\xi \in \pi(\tilde{U}\tilde{\xi})$ if and only if*

$$(12) \quad \langle \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{w}\gamma \rangle \geq \langle \xi, w_ow\gamma \rangle$$

for any $(\gamma, w, \tilde{w}) \in \mathfrak{t} \times W \times \tilde{W}$ satisfying the following properties:

- a) γ is admissible antidominant.
- b) $[\mathfrak{X}_{w,\gamma}] \cdot \iota^*([\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w},\gamma}]) = [pt]$ in $H^*(\mathcal{F}_\gamma, \mathbb{Z})$.
- c) Identity (9) holds.

The result still holds if we replace b) by the weaker condition

$$b') \quad [\mathfrak{X}_\gamma] \cdot \iota^*([\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w},\gamma}]) = \ell[pt], \ell \geq 1 \quad \text{in} \quad H^*(\mathcal{F}_\gamma, \mathbb{Z}).$$

Remark 2.7 *Suppose that there exists $c_\gamma > 0$ such that $|\langle \alpha, w\gamma \rangle|$ and $|\langle \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{w}\gamma \rangle|$ belongs to $\{0, c_\gamma\}$, $\forall (w, \tilde{w}) \in W \times \tilde{W}$, $\forall (\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}) \in \mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{u}) \times \mathfrak{R}(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}})$. Then condition c) follows from condition b) (see (11)).*

When the closed connected subgroups $\iota : U \subset \tilde{U}$ satisfy Assumption 2.4 the subspace $\mathfrak{z} := \{X \in \mathfrak{t}, \alpha(X) = 0, \forall \alpha \in \Sigma(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u})\}$ is equal to $Z_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}} \cap \mathfrak{u}$. Let $\mathfrak{t} = Z_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}} \cap \mathfrak{u} \oplus \mathfrak{t}_1$ be a rational decomposition. Any rational element $\gamma \in \mathfrak{t}$ can be written $\gamma = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1$ where $\gamma_0 \in Z_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}} \cap \mathfrak{u}$ and $\gamma_1 \in \mathfrak{t}_1$ are rational. Two cases occur :

- If $\gamma_1 = 0$, then γ satisfies conditions a), b) and c). The inequalities (12) given by these central elements shows that $\tilde{\xi} - \xi$ is orthogonal to $Z_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}} \cap \mathfrak{u}$.
- If $\gamma_1 \neq 0$ then it is immediate to see that γ satisfies a), b) and c) if and only if γ_1 does also. Moreover, as $\tilde{\xi} - \xi$ is orthogonal to $Z_{\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}} \cap \mathfrak{u}$, $\langle \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{w}\gamma \rangle \geq \langle \xi, w_ow\gamma \rangle$ if and only if $\langle \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{w}\gamma_1 \rangle \geq \langle \xi, w_ow\gamma_1 \rangle$.

Many people contribute to Theorem 2.6. The first input was given by Klyachko [10] with a refinement by Belkale [1], in the case of $SL(n) \hookrightarrow (SL(n))^s$. The case $U_{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow (U_{\mathbb{C}})^s$ was treated by Kapovich-Leeb-Millson [9] following an analogous slightly weaker result proved by Berenstein-Sjamaar [4]. Condition c) is related to the notion of Levi-movability introduced by Belkale-Kumar [2]. Finally Ressayre [21, 22] considered the general case and proved furthermore the irredundancy of the list of inequalities.

We refer the reader to the survey articles [7, 5, 11] for details.

2.5 The cone $LR(m, n)$

Let $m, n \geq 1$. Let us write an $m+n$ -square matrix X by blocs $X = \begin{pmatrix} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ X_{21} & X_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ where $X_{11} \in M_{m,m}(\mathbb{C})$ and $X_{22} \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C})$. In this section, we are interested in the following cone:

$$LR(m, n) := \{(e(X), e(X_{11}), e(X_{12})); X \in Herm(m+n)\}$$

Thanks to the theorem 2.6, we obtain the following description of $LR(m, n)$. The details are given in the next section.

Theorem 2.8 *The triplet $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m+n} \times \mathbb{R}_+^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^n$ belongs to $LR(m, n)$ if and only if the following conditions holds:*

- $|x| = |y| + |z|$,
- $x_{n+k} \leq y_k \leq x_k, \forall k \in [m]$,
- $x_{m+\ell} \leq z_\ell \leq x_\ell, \forall \ell \in [n]$,
- $|x|_A \geq |y|_B + |z|_C$, for any triplet A, B, C satisfying:
 1. $B \subset [m]$ and $C \subset [n]$ are strict subsets,
 2. $A \subset [m+n]$ and $\sharp A = \sharp B + \sharp C$,
 3. the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A)}$ is non-zero.

Moreover, the condition $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A)} \neq 0$ is equivalent to $(\mu(A), \mu(B), \mu(C)) \in LR(u, v)$, where $u = \sharp B$ and $v = \sharp C$.

Remark 2.9 *In Theorem 2.8, we can strenghten the condition by requiring that $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A)} = 1$.*

We will see in the next section that $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A)} \neq 0$ if and only $c_{\mu((B^o)^c), \mu((C^o)^c)}^{\mu((A^o)^c)} \neq 0$. Since the relation $|x|_{(A^o)^c} \geq |y|_{(C^o)^c} + |z|_{(C^o)^c}$ is equivalent to $|x|_{A^o} \leq |y|_{C^o} + |z|_{C^o}$, in Theorem 2.8, we can rewrite the last condition by requiring that

$$(13) \quad |x|_A \geq |y|_B + |z|_C \quad \text{and} \quad |x|_{A^o} \leq |y|_{C^o} + |z|_{C^o}$$

for all strict subsets $A \subset [m+n]$, $B \subset [m]$, $C \subset [n]$ that satisfy $\sharp A = \sharp B + \sharp C \leq \frac{1}{2}(m+n)$ and $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A)} \neq 0$.

2.6 Proof of Theorem 2.8

We work with the unitary group $\tilde{U} = U_{m+n}$ and the subgroup $U = U_m \times U_n$ embedded diagonally. We consider the orthogonal projection $\pi_0 : \text{Herm}(m+n) \rightarrow \text{Herm}(m) \times \text{Herm}(n)$ that sends X to $\pi_0(X) = (X_{11}, X_{22})$. The cone $LR(m, n)$ is formed by the triplet $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m+n} \times \mathbb{R}_+^m \times \mathbb{R}_+^n$ satisfying

$$U_m \cdot \text{Diag}(y) \times U_n \cdot \text{Diag}(z) \subset \pi_0(U_{m+n} \cdot \text{Diag}(x)).$$

Thus $LR(m, n) = LR(U_m \times U_n, U_{m+n})$.

2.6.1 Admissible elements

We work with the maximal torus $T \subset U$ of diagonal matrices. The set of roots relatively to the action of T on $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}/\mathfrak{u} \simeq M_{m,n}(\mathbb{C})$ is $\Sigma := \{e_i^* - f_j^*; i \in [m], j \in [n]\}$.

The center of $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}$ is generated by $\gamma_o := (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \simeq \mathfrak{t}$. For any $(r, s) \in \{0, \dots, m\} \times \{0, \dots, n\}$, we define

$$\gamma_{r,s} = \underbrace{(-1, \dots, -1)}_{r \text{ times}}, 0, \dots, 0 \oplus \underbrace{(-1, \dots, -1)}_{s \text{ times}}, 0, \dots, 0 \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \simeq \mathfrak{t}.$$

Lemma 2.10 *Let $\gamma \in \mathfrak{t}$ be an admissible element. There exists $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}^{\geq 0}$, $(w, w') \in \mathfrak{S}_m \times \mathfrak{S}_n$, and (r, s) such that $\gamma = a\gamma_o + b(w, w')\gamma_{r,s}$. The couple (r, s) must satisfy the auxiliary conditions: either $0 < r < m$ and $0 < s < n$ or $(r, s) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (m-1, n), (n, m-1)\}$.*

Proof : Consider an admissible vector $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m; \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_n)$ that is linearly independent to γ_o . The relation $\text{Vect}(\Sigma \cap \gamma^\perp) = \text{Vect}(\Sigma) \cap \gamma^\perp$ means that $(\Sigma \cap \gamma^\perp)^\perp$ is a subspace of dimension 2. Here $\Sigma \cap \gamma^\perp$ is the set of vectors $e_i^* - f_j^*$ such that $\gamma_i = \gamma'_j$. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $[m]_\alpha := \{i \in [m], \gamma_i = \alpha\}$ and $[n]_\alpha := \{j \in [n], \gamma'_j = \alpha\}$. Hence $\Sigma \cap \gamma^\perp$ is parameterized by $\coprod_{\alpha \in L} [m]_\alpha \times [n]_\alpha$ where $L = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, [m]_\alpha \neq \emptyset \text{ and } [n]_\alpha \neq \emptyset\}$ is a finite set.

Consider first the case where $\cup_{\alpha \in L} [m]_\alpha \neq [m]$. Let $k \notin \cup_{\alpha \in L} [m]_\alpha$. Then $(\Sigma \cap \gamma^\perp)^\perp$, which is of dimension 2, contains the vectors γ_o, γ and e_k . Hence, γ is a linear combination of γ_o and e_k : we check easily that there exists $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$, $w \in \mathfrak{S}_m$, and $(r, s) \in \{(1, 0), (m-1, n)\}$ such that $\gamma = a\gamma_o + bw\gamma_{r,s}$.

If $\cup_{\alpha \in L} [n]_\alpha \neq [n]$, we prove similarly that $\gamma = a\gamma_o + bw'\gamma_{r,s}$ for $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$, $w' \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, and $(r, s) \in \{(0, 1), (m, n-1)\}$.

Let us consider the last case where $\cup_{\alpha \in L} [m]_\alpha = [m]$ and $\cup_{\alpha \in L} [n]_\alpha = [n]$. Then $\gamma = \sum_{\alpha \in L} \alpha V_\alpha$ with $V_\alpha = \sum_{(i,j) \in [m]_\alpha \times [n]_\alpha} e_i + f_j$. The vectors $\{V_\alpha, \alpha \in L\}$ defines an independent family of the subspace $(\Sigma \cap \gamma^\perp)^\perp$ which is of dimension 2, hence $\#L \leq 2$. As γ is linearly independent to γ_o , the set L is of cardinal 2. Now we see that there exists $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$, $(w, w') \in \mathfrak{S}_m \times \mathfrak{S}_n$, and $r < m, s < n$ such that $\gamma = a\gamma_o + b(w, w')\gamma_{r,s}$. \square

Here, the remark 2.7 applies, so condition c) will follow from condition b).

2.6.2 Cohomological conditions and inequalities

The Lie algebra \mathfrak{t} is identified with $\mathbb{R}^{m+n} \simeq \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

First case: The two vectors $\pm\gamma_o$ are admissible elements which satisfy conditions a), b) and c) of Theorem 2.6 in an obvious way. In this cases, the corresponding inequalities $\pm(x, \gamma_o) \geq \pm((y, z), w_o\gamma_o)$ are equivalent to $|x| = |y| + |z|$.

Second case: We work now with the admissible element $\gamma_{r,s}$ in the situation where $r \in [m-1]$ and $s \in [n-1]$. The flag manifold $GL_m(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_n(\mathbb{C})/P_{\gamma_{r,s}}$ admits a natural identification with the product of Grassmannians $\mathbb{G}(r, m) \times \mathbb{G}(s, n)$. Similarly, the flag manifold $GL_{m+n}(\mathbb{C})/\tilde{P}_{\gamma_{r,s}}$ is isomorphic to the Grassmannian $\mathbb{G}(r+s, m+n)$. The map $\iota_{\mathbb{C}} : GL_m(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow GL_{m+n}(\mathbb{C})$ factorises to a smooth map $\iota_{r,s} : \mathbb{G}(r, m) \times \mathbb{G}(s, n) \rightarrow \mathbb{G}(r+s, m+n)$ defined by $\iota_{r,s}(V_1, V_2) = V_1 \oplus V_2$.

Let $w = (w_1, w_2) \in W \simeq \mathfrak{S}_m \times \mathfrak{S}_n$ and let $B = w_1([r]) \subset [m]$ and $C = w_2([s]) \subset [n]$ be the corresponding subsets. The associated Schubert variety is $\mathfrak{X}_{w, \gamma_{r,s}} = \mathfrak{X}_B \times \mathfrak{X}_C \subset \mathbb{G}(r, m) \times \mathbb{G}(s, n)$.

In the same way, to $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{W} \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{m+n}$, we associate the subset $A = \tilde{w}([r]) \cup \tilde{w}([s] + m) \subset [m+n]$ and the Schubert variety $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w}, \gamma_{r,s}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_A \subset \mathbb{G}(r+s, m+n)$.

Lemma 2.11 *The following identities are equivalent:*

1. $[\mathfrak{X}_{w, \gamma}] \cdot \iota^*([\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w}, \gamma}]) = \ell[pt], \ell \geq 1,$
2. $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A^o)} = \ell \geq 1,$
3. $c_{\mu((B^o)^c), \mu((C^o)^c)}^{\mu(A^c)} = \ell \geq 1.$

Proof: Recall that we associate a partition $\lambda(A) = (\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r)$ with a subset $A = \{a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_r\} \subset [n]$ of cardinal r , by posing $\lambda_k = n - r + k - a_k, \forall k \in [r]$.

Let $\Lambda_r[x] = \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_r]^{\mathfrak{S}_r}$ be the rings of symmetric polynomials, with integral coefficients, in r variables. For any partition ν of length r , we associate its Schur polynomial $\mathbf{s}_\nu(x) \in \Lambda_r[x]$. The family (\mathbf{s}_ν) determine a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $\Lambda_r[x]$.

Let us recall the following classical fact (see §3.2.2 in [17]). The map $\phi_r : \Lambda_r[x] \rightarrow H^*(\mathbb{G}(r, m))$ defined by the relations

$$\phi_r(\mathbf{s}_\nu) = \begin{cases} \sigma_\nu & \text{if } \nu_1 \leq m - r, \\ 0 & \text{if } \nu_1 > m - r. \end{cases}$$

is a ring morphism. Here σ_ν denotes the cohomology class $[\mathfrak{X}_D]$ defined by a subset $D \subset [m]$ of cardinal r such that $\nu = \lambda(D)$. In the same way we consider the ring $\Lambda_{r+s}[x, y] = \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_s]^{\mathfrak{S}_{r+s}}$ and the morphism $\phi_{r+s} : \Lambda_{r+s}[x, y] \rightarrow H^*(\mathbb{G}(r+s, m+n))$. Let us denote by $R : \Lambda_{r+s}[x, y] \rightarrow \Lambda_r[x] \otimes \Lambda_s[y]$ the restriction morphism. It is not hard

to check that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\bigwedge_r[x] & \otimes & \bigwedge_s[y] \xleftarrow{R} \bigwedge_{r+s}[x, y] \\
\downarrow \phi_r & & \downarrow \phi_s \qquad \qquad \downarrow \phi_{r+s} \\
H^*(\mathbb{G}(r, m)) & \otimes & H^*(\mathbb{G}(s, n)) \xleftarrow{j^*} H^*(\mathbb{G}(r+s, m+n)).
\end{array}$$

As $[\mathfrak{X}_{w,r}] = \sigma_{\lambda(B)} \otimes \sigma_{\lambda(C)}$ and $[\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w},r}] = \sigma_{\lambda(A)}$, the previous diagram tell us that the integer ℓ such that $[\mathfrak{X}_{w,r}] \cdot \iota_r^*([\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_{\tilde{w},r}]) = \ell[pt]$ is equal to the coefficient of $R(\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda(A)}(x, y))$ relatively to $\mathfrak{s}_{\lambda(B^o)}(x) \otimes \mathfrak{s}_{\lambda(C^o)}(y)$: in other words ℓ is equal to the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c_{\lambda(B^o), \lambda(C^o)}^{\lambda(A)} = c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A^o)}$ (see [16], §I.5). The equivalence between 1. and 2. is proved.

Let us consider r', s' such that $r + r' = m$ and $s + s' = n$. The canonical bilinear form on \mathbb{C}^{m+n} permits to define the map $\delta : \mathbb{G}(r' + s', m + n) \rightarrow \mathbb{G}(r + s, m + n)$ that sends a subspace $F \subset \mathbb{C}^{m+n}$ to its orthogonal F^\perp . Let $\delta^* : H^*(\mathbb{G}(r + s, m + n)) \rightarrow H^*(\mathbb{G}(r' + s', m + n))$ denotes the pullback map in cohomology. If we consider the similar maps $\delta^* : H^*(\mathbb{G}(r, m)) \rightarrow H^*(\mathbb{G}(r', m))$ and $\delta^* : H^*(\mathbb{G}(s, n)) \rightarrow H^*(\mathbb{G}(s', n))$, we have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H^*(\mathbb{G}(r, m)) & \otimes & H^*(\mathbb{G}(s, n)) \xleftarrow{j^*} H^*(\mathbb{G}(r+s, m+n)) \\
\downarrow \delta^* & & \downarrow \delta^* \qquad \qquad \downarrow \delta^* \\
H^*(\mathbb{G}(r', m)) & \otimes & H^*(\mathbb{G}(s', n)) \xleftarrow{j^*} H^*(\mathbb{G}(r'+s', m+n)).
\end{array}$$

This allows us to see that $\sigma_{\lambda(B)} \otimes \sigma_{\lambda(C)} \cdot j^*(\sigma_{\lambda(A)}) = \ell[pt]$, $k \geq 1$ if and only if $\delta^*(\sigma_{\lambda(B)}) \otimes \delta^*(\sigma_{\lambda(C)}) \cdot j^*(\delta^*(\sigma_{\lambda(A)})) = \ell[pt]$, $k \geq 1$. As in general $\delta^*(\sigma_{\lambda(X)}) = \sigma_{\mu(X^c)}$, we see that the previous relation is equivalent to $c_{\mu((B^o)^c), \mu((C^o)^c)}^{\mu(A^c)} = \ell \geq 1$. The equivalence between 2. and 3. is proved. \square

The inequalities associated to $\gamma_{r,s}$ are

$$-|x|_A = \langle x, \tilde{w}\gamma_{r,s} \rangle \geq \langle (y, z), w_o w \gamma \rangle = -|y|_{B^o} - |z|_{C^o}$$

Using $|x| = |y| + |z|$, we obtain $|x|_{A^c} \geq |y|_{(B^o)^c} + |z|_{(C^o)^c}$ for any strict subsets $A \subset [m+n]$, $B \subset [m]$ and $C \subset [n]$ satisfying $\#A = \#B + \#C$ and $c_{\mu((B^o)^c), \mu((C^o)^c)}^{\mu(A^c)} = \ell \geq 1$.

Third case: $(r, s) \in \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (m-1, n), (n, m-1)\}$. We use here the same type of argument as before.

$(r, s) = (1, 0)$: we obtain the inequalities $x_{n+k} \leq y_k, \forall k \in [m]$.

$(r, s) = (0, 1)$: we obtain the inequalities $x_{m+\ell} \leq z_\ell, \forall \ell \in [n]$.

$(r, s) = (m-1, n)$: we obtain the inequalities $y_k \leq x_k, \forall k \in [m]$.

$(r, s) = (m, n-1)$: we obtain the inequalities $z_\ell \leq x_\ell, \forall \ell \in [n]$.

The proof of Theorem 2.8 is completed. \square

2.7 A consequence of the O'Shea-Sjamaar Theorem

2.7.1 First setting: compact Lie groups with involution

Let \tilde{U} be a compact connected Lie group equipped with an involution σ . The Lie algebra of \tilde{U} admit the decomposition $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{u}}^\sigma \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{u}}^{-\sigma}$ that is invariant under the action of the subgroup \tilde{U}^σ . We start with a basic but important fact (see [18], Example 2.9).

Lemma 2.12 *For any adjoint orbit $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{u}}$, the intersection $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \cap \tilde{\mathfrak{u}}^{-\sigma}$ is either empty or an orbit of the connected subgroup $\tilde{K} := (\tilde{U}^\sigma)_0$.*

Let $U \subset \tilde{U}$ be a subgroup invariant under σ . Let us choose an invariant scalar product $(-, -)$ on the Lie algebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}$ of \tilde{U} such that $\sigma \in O(\tilde{\mathfrak{u}})$. At the level of Lie algebras, we consider the orthogonal projection $\pi : \tilde{\mathfrak{u}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{u}$ relatively to the scalar product $(-, -)$.

One of the main tool used in this paper is the following result, which is a consequence of the O'Shea-Sjamaar Theorem (see [18], Section 3). Let K be the connected component of U^σ .

Proposition 2.13 *Let $\xi \in \mathfrak{u}^{-\sigma}$ and $\tilde{\xi} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{u}}^{-\sigma}$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. $U\xi \subset \pi(\tilde{U}\tilde{\xi})$,
2. $K\xi \subset \pi(\tilde{K}\tilde{\xi})$.

2.7.2 Second setting: real reductive Lie groups

Let $\iota : G \hookrightarrow \tilde{G} \subset GL_N(\mathbb{R})$ be two connected real reductive Lie groups admitting a complexification $\iota_{\mathbb{C}} : G_{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}} \subset GL_N(\mathbb{C})$. It is for example the case when G and \tilde{G} are semisimple (see [12], §VII.1). Let us denote by

- $K = G \cap SO_N(\mathbb{R})$ and $\tilde{K} = \tilde{G} \cap SO_N(\mathbb{R})$ the maximal compact subgroups of G and \tilde{G} . Their Lie algebras are denoted by $\iota : \mathfrak{k} \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{k}}$.
- $U = G_{\mathbb{C}} \cap U_N$ and $\tilde{U} = \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}} \cap U_N$ the maximal compact subgroups of $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Their Lie algebras are denoted by $\iota : \mathfrak{u} \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{u}}$.

Consider the Cartan decompositions, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{k}} \oplus \tilde{\mathfrak{p}}$, of G and \tilde{G} . At the level of Lie algebras, we have $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}} = \tilde{\mathfrak{k}} \oplus i\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus i\mathfrak{p}$. The complex conjugation on $GL_N(\mathbb{C})$ defines an involution σ on $U \hookrightarrow \tilde{U}$ such that $K \hookrightarrow \tilde{K}$ are respectively equal to the connected components of U^σ and \tilde{U}^σ . We see also that $\mathfrak{u}^{-\sigma} = i\mathfrak{p}$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{u}}^{-\sigma} = i\tilde{\mathfrak{p}}$.

Let $\pi : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ be the orthogonal projection relatively to the Hermitian norm $\text{Tr}(X^*X)^{1/2}$ on $\mathfrak{gl}_N(\mathbb{C})$.

Proposition 2.14 *Let $X \in \mathfrak{p}$ and $\tilde{X} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{p}}$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. $UX \subset \pi(\tilde{U}\tilde{X})$,
2. $KX \subset \pi(\tilde{K}\tilde{X})$.

Proof: It follows from Proposition 2.13 and the fact that the projection $\pi : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbb{C}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is complex linear. \square

3 The cone $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$

We work with the reductive real Lie groups $G := U(p, q)$ and $\tilde{G} := GL_n(\mathbb{C})$. Let us denote by $\iota : G \rightarrow \tilde{G}$ the canonical embedding. The unitary group $\tilde{K} := U_n$ is a maximal compact subgroup of \tilde{G} . Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{p}} := \text{Herm}(n) \subset \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be the subspace of Hermitian matrices.

The subgroup $K := \tilde{K} \cap U(p, q) \simeq U_p \times U_q$ is a maximal compact subgroup of G , and the map $Y \mapsto \hat{Y}^{p,q} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{pp} & Y \\ Y^* & 0_{qq} \end{pmatrix}$ defines an identification between $M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$ and the subspace $\mathfrak{p} := \tilde{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \mathfrak{g}$.

3.1 Complexification and antiholomorphic involution

The complexification of the group G is $G_{\mathbb{C}} := GL_n(\mathbb{C})$. We consider the antiholomorphic involution σ on $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined by $\sigma(g) = I_{p,q}(g^*)^{-1}I_{p,q}$, where $I_{p,q} = \text{Diag}(I_p, -I_q)$. The subgroup G is the fixed point set of σ .

The complexification of the group \tilde{G} is $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}} := GL_n(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_n(\mathbb{C})$. The inclusion $\tilde{G} \hookrightarrow \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$ is given by the map $g \mapsto (g, \bar{g})$. We consider the antiholomorphic involution $\tilde{\sigma}$ on $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined by $\tilde{\sigma}(g_1, g_2) = (\overline{g_2}, \overline{g_1})$. The subgroup \tilde{G} corresponds to the fixed point set of $\tilde{\sigma}$.

The embedding $\iota : G \hookrightarrow \tilde{G}$ admits a complexification $\iota_{\mathbb{C}} : G_{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined by $\iota_{\mathbb{C}}(g) = (g, \overline{\sigma(g)})$: notice that $\iota_{\mathbb{C}} \circ \sigma = \tilde{\sigma} \circ \iota_{\mathbb{C}}$.

The groups $U = U_n$ and $\tilde{U} = U_n \times U_n$ are respectively maximal compact subgroups of $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$. The embedding $\iota_{\mathbb{C}} : U \hookrightarrow \tilde{U}$ is defined by $\iota_{\mathbb{C}}(k) = (k, I_{p,q}\bar{k}I_{p,q})$. The fixed point subgroups of the involutions are $U^{\sigma} = K$ and $\tilde{U}^{\tilde{\sigma}} = \tilde{K}$.

At the level of Lie algebra, we have a morphism $\iota_{\mathbb{C}} : \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ defined by $\iota_{\mathbb{C}}(X) = (X, \overline{\sigma(X)})$, where $\sigma(X) = -I_{p,q}X^*I_{p,q}$.

3.2 Orthogonal projection of orbits

We use on $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ the euclidean norm $\|(X, Y)\|^2 = \text{Tr}(XX^*) + \text{Tr}(YY^*)$. The subspace orthogonal to the image of $\iota_{\mathbb{C}}$ is $\{(X, -\overline{\sigma(X)}), X \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})\}$. Hence the orthogonal projection

$$\pi : \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}),$$

is defined by the relations $\pi(X, Y) = \frac{1}{2}(X + \overline{\sigma(Y)})$. Note that π commutes with the involutions : $\pi \circ \tilde{\sigma} = \sigma \circ \pi$.

If $X \in Herm(n)$, the corresponding adjoint orbit $U_n \cdot X$, which is entirely determined by the spectrum $e(X)$, is denoted by $\mathcal{O}_{e(X)}$. If $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, we denote by λ^* the vector $(-\lambda_n, \dots, -\lambda_1)$: we see that $e(-X) = e(X)^*$ for any $X \in Herm(n)$.

The subspace $\tilde{\mathfrak{p}} \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ is identified with $\{(X, \overline{X}), X \in Herm(n)\} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$. For any $X \in Herm(n)$, the image by the projection π of the orbit $\tilde{U} \cdot (X, \overline{X})$ is equal to

$$\frac{1}{2}(U_n \cdot X + U_n \cdot \sigma(X)) = \frac{1}{2}(U_n \cdot X + U_n \cdot (-X)) = \frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{O}_\lambda + \mathcal{O}_{\lambda^*}),$$

where $\lambda = e(X)$.

If $Y \in M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$ has singular spectrum $s \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$, the spectrum of the Hermitian matrix $\widehat{Y}^{p,q}$ is equal to $\widehat{s}^{p,q}$, hence $U \cdot \widehat{Y}^{p,q}$ is equal to $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{s}^{p,q}}$. At this stage, we have proved that for any $(X, Y) \in Herm(n) \times M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$ the following statements are equivalents:

- $U \cdot \widehat{Y}^{p,q} \subset \pi(\tilde{U} \cdot (X, \overline{X}))$,
- $2\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{s}^{p,q}} \subset \mathcal{O}_\lambda + \mathcal{O}_{\lambda^*}$,
- $(\lambda, \lambda^*, 2\widehat{s}^{p,q}) \in \text{Horn}(n)$,

where $\lambda = e(X)$ and $s = s(Y)$.

The group $K \simeq U_p \times U_q$ acts canonically $M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C}) \simeq \mathfrak{p}$. For any $Y \in M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$, the orbit $K \cdot \widehat{Y}^{p,q} \subset \mathfrak{p}$ is entirely determined by the singular spectrum $s(Y)$. If one restricts the projection $\pi : \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ to the subspace $\tilde{\mathfrak{p}} = Herm(n)$, we obtain the map $\pi : \tilde{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}$ that sends an Hermitian matrix $X = \begin{pmatrix} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ X_{12}^* & X_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ to $\widehat{X}_{12}^{p,q} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{pp} & X_{12} \\ X_{12}^* & 0_{qq} \end{pmatrix}$.

Since the orbit $\tilde{K} \cdot X$ is equal to $\mathcal{O}_{e(X)}$, we see then that $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$ can be defined as follows: $(\lambda, s) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$ belongs to the cone $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$ if and only if for any $(X, Y) \in Herm(n) \times M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$ satisfying $\lambda = e(X)$ and $s = s(Y)$, we have $K \cdot \widehat{Y}^{p,q} \subset \pi(\tilde{K} \cdot X)$.

3.3 Inequalities determining $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$

The computations done in the previous section, together with Proposition 2.14, gives us the following result.

Proposition 3.1 *Let $(\lambda, s) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$, and let $(X, Y) \in Herm(n) \times M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\lambda = e(X)$ and $s = s(Y)$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- $(\lambda, s) \in \mathcal{A}(p, q)$,
- $K \cdot \widehat{Y}^{p,q} \subset \pi(\tilde{K} \cdot X)$,
- $U \cdot \widehat{Y}^{p,q} \subset \pi(\tilde{U} \cdot (X, \overline{X}))$,

- $(\lambda, \lambda^*, 2\widehat{s}^{p,q}) \in \text{Horn}(n)$.

Thanks to the description of the Horn cone $\text{Horn}(n)$ given in Theorem 2.2, we can conclude with the following description of $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$.

Theorem 3.2 *An element $(\lambda, s) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$ if and only if*

$$(\star)_{I,J,K} \quad |\lambda|_I - |\lambda|_{J^c} \geq 2|s|_{K \cap [q]} - 2|s|_{K^c \cap [q]}$$

for any $r < n$ and any $(I, J, K) \in \text{LR}_r^n$.

Remark 3.3 *In the formulation of the previous theorem we have used that $|\lambda^*|_J = -|\lambda|_{J^c}$ and $|\widehat{s}^{p,q}|_K = |s|_{K \cap [q]} - |s|_{K^c \cap [q]}$.*

Remark 3.4 *As we have said in the introduction, we can restrict the system of inequalities in Theorem 3.2 by considering uniquely triplets $(I, J, K) \in \text{LR}_r^n$ with $r \leq q$ (see [20]).*

3.4 Examples

3.4.1 Computation of $\mathcal{A}(2, 2)$

The set LR_1^4 corresponds to the set of triplets (i, j, k) of elements of $[4]$ such that $i + j = k + 1$: the corresponding (non-trivial) inequalities are

$$\lambda_1 - \lambda_4 \geq 2s_1, \quad \lambda_2 - \lambda_4 \geq 2s_2, \quad \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 \geq 2s_2.$$

The set LR_2^4 corresponds to the set of triplets $(I = \{i_1 < i_2\}, J = \{j_1 < j_2\}, K = \{k_1 < k_2\})$ of subsets of $[4]$ satisfying Horn's conditions:

1. $i_1 + i_2 + j_1 + j_2 = k_1 + k_2 + 3$,
2. $i_1 + j_1 \leq k_1 + 1, \quad i_1 + j_2 \leq k_2 + 1, \quad i_2 + j_1 \leq k_2 + 1$.

Here the inequality $(\star)_{I,J,K}$ is non trivial only in one case: when $I = J = K = \{1, 2\}$ we obtain $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 \geq 2(s_1 + s_2)$.

We summarize our computations as follows.

Proposition 3.5 *An element $(\lambda, s) \in \mathbb{R}_+^4 \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}(2, 2)$ if and only if the following conditions holds*

- $\lambda_1 - \lambda_4 \geq 2s_1, \quad \lambda_2 - \lambda_4 \geq 2s_2, \quad \lambda_1 - \lambda_3 \geq 2s_2$.
- $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 \geq 2(s_1 + s_2)$.

3.4.2 Computation of $\mathcal{A}(3, 3)$

The non-trivial inequalities associated to LR_1^6 are

$$(14) \quad \begin{array}{ll} \lambda_1 - \lambda_6 \geq 2s_1 & \lambda_1 - \lambda_5 \geq 2s_2 \\ \lambda_2 - \lambda_6 \geq 2s_2 & \lambda_1 - \lambda_4 \geq 2s_3 \\ \lambda_2 - \lambda_5 \geq 2s_3 & \lambda_3 - \lambda_6 \geq 2s_3. \end{array}$$

The non-trivial inequalities associated to LR_2^6 are

$$(15) \quad \begin{array}{l} \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_5 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_1 + s_2) \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_4 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_1 + s_3) \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 - \lambda_5 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_1 + s_3) \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_4 - \lambda_5 \geq 2(s_2 + s_3) \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_2 + s_3) \\ \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \lambda_5 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_2 + s_3). \end{array}$$

Note that the inequality $\lambda_1 + \lambda_4 - \lambda_5 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_2 + s_3)$ is not valid, even if it looks like the previous ones, since the triplet $(\{1, 4\}, \{1, 2\}, \{2, 3\})$ does not belong to LR_2^6 .

The non-trivial inequalities associated to LR_3^6 are

$$(16) \quad \begin{array}{l} \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_5 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_1 - s_2 - s_3) \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_5 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_1 - s_2 - s_3) \\ \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 - \lambda_5 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_1 + s_2 + s_3). \end{array}$$

In the case of LR_3^6 , the *trivial* inequalities are those induced by inequalities obtained with LR_1^6 and LR_2^6 . For example, the inequalities corresponding to the triplets $(\{1, 2, 5\}, \{2, 3, 4\}, \{2, 3, 6\})$ and $(\{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4\})$ of LR_2^6 are respectively

$$\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 \geq 2(-s_1 + s_2 + s_3) \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_5 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_1 + s_2 - s_3).$$

The former is induced by $\lambda_1 - \lambda_4 \geq 2s_3$ obtained with LR_1^6 and $\lambda_2 - \lambda_3 \geq 0 \geq s_2 - s_1$ while the latter is induced by $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_5 - \lambda_6 \geq 2(s_1 + s_2)$ obtained with LR_2^6 and $s_3 \geq 0$.

Proposition 3.6 *An element $(\lambda, s) \in \mathbb{R}_+^6 \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^3$ belongs to $\mathcal{A}(3, 3)$ if and only if the inequalities listed in (14), (15) and (16) are satisfied.*

Remark 3.7 *The cone $\mathcal{A}(3, 3) \subset \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ corresponds to the intersection of the Horn cone $\text{Horn}(6) \subset \mathbb{R}^{18}$ with the subspace $\{(\lambda, \lambda^*, 2\widehat{\mathcal{S}}^{p,q}), (\lambda, s) \in \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3\}$. It is striking that $\mathcal{A}(3, 3)$ is determined by 23 inequalities while $\text{Horn}(6)$ is described with a minimal list of 536 inequalities.*

4 The cone $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$

We work with the real reductive Lie groups $G := U(p, q) \times U(q, p)$ and $\tilde{G} := U(n, n)$. The embedding $\iota : G \rightarrow \tilde{G}$ is defined as follows:

$$(17) \quad \iota(g, h) = \begin{pmatrix} g_{11} & 0_{pn} & g_{12} \\ 0_{np} & h & 0_{nq} \\ g_{21} & 0_{qn} & g_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{when} \quad g = \begin{pmatrix} g_{11} & g_{12} \\ g_{21} & g_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here $g_{11} \in M_{p,p}(\mathbb{C})$, $g_{12} \in M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$, $g_{2,1} \in M_{q,p}(\mathbb{C})$ and $g_{22} \in M_{q,q}(\mathbb{C})$.

The unitary group $\tilde{K} := U_n \times U_n$ is a maximal compact subgroup of \tilde{G} . The subspace $\tilde{\mathfrak{p}} := \{\hat{X}, X \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C})\} \subset \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ admits a canonical action of \tilde{K} . The subgroup $K = K_1 \times K_2$, with $K_1 \simeq U_p \times U_q$ and $K_2 \simeq U_q \times U_p$, is a maximal compact subgroup of G , and the subspace $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \times \mathfrak{p}_2$ admits a natural identification with $M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C}) \times M_{q,p}(\mathbb{C})$:

$$(Y, Z) \in M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C}) \times M_{q,p}(\mathbb{C}) \longmapsto (\hat{Y}^{p,q}, \hat{Z}^{q,p}) \in \mathfrak{p}_1 \times \mathfrak{p}_2.$$

See §2.2 for the notations \hat{X} , $\hat{Y}^{p,q}$, and $\hat{Z}^{q,p}$.

4.1 Complexification, antiholomorphic involution and orthogonal projection

The complexification of the group G is $G_{\mathbb{C}} := GL_n(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_n(\mathbb{C})$. We consider the antiholomorphic involution σ on $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined by $\sigma(g, h) = (I_{p,q}(g^*)^{-1}I_{p,q}, I_{q,p}(h^*)^{-1}I_{q,p})$, where $I_{p,q} = \text{Diag}(Id_p, -Id_q)$. The subgroup \tilde{G} is the fixed point set of σ .

The complexification of the group \tilde{G} is $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}} := GL_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$. We consider the antiholomorphic involution $\tilde{\sigma}$ on $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined by $\tilde{\sigma}(g) = I_{n,n}(g^*)^{-1}I_{n,n}$. The subgroup \tilde{G} corresponds to the fixed point set of $\tilde{\sigma}$.

The groups $U = U_n \times U_n$ and $\tilde{U} = U_{2n}$ are respectively maximal compact subgroups of $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$. The fixed point subgroups of the involutions are $U^{\sigma} = K$ and $\tilde{U}^{\tilde{\sigma}} = \tilde{K}$.

The embedding $\iota : G \hookrightarrow \tilde{G}$ admits a complexification $\iota_{\mathbb{C}} : G_{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$. At the level of Lie algebra, we have a morphism $\iota_{\mathbb{C}} : \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$, still defined by (17).

The orthogonal projection $\pi : \mathfrak{gl}_{2n}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ dual to the morphism $\iota_{\mathbb{C}}$ is defined by the relations :

$$(18) \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & A_{23} \\ A_{31} & A_{32} & A_{33} \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \pi(A) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{13} \\ A_{31} & A_{33} \end{pmatrix}, A_{22} \right).$$

Here the matrix $A \in \mathfrak{gl}_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$ is written by blocs relatively to the decomposition $2n = p + n + q$.

We work also we another projection $\pi_0 : \mathfrak{gl}_{2n}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ defined by the relations :

$$(19) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \pi_0(B) = (B_{11}, B_{22}).$$

Here each matrix B_{ij} belongs to $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$.

Lemma 4.1 *For any U_{2n} -orbit $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$, we have $\pi(\mathcal{O}) = \pi_0(\mathcal{O})$.*

Proof: Consider the permutation w_0 of $[2n]$ defined as follows: $w_0(k) = k$ if $1 \leq k \leq p$, $w_0(k) = k + q$ if $p + 1 \leq k \leq n + p$ and $w_0(k) = k - n$ if $n + p + 1 \leq k \leq 2n$. We check now that $\pi = \pi_0 \circ \text{Ad}(w_0)$. Our lemma follows from this relation. \square

4.2 Description of $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$ through $LR(n, n)$

For $t \in \mathbb{R}^q$, we consider the n -square Hermitian matrix

$$(20) \quad Y(t) := \begin{pmatrix} 0_{qq} & 0_{q,p-q} & \text{Diag}(t) \\ 0_{p-q,q} & 0_{p-q,p-q} & 0_{p-q,q} \\ \text{Diag}(t) & 0_{q,p-q} & 0_{qq} \end{pmatrix} \subset \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \mathfrak{p}_2.$$

Notice that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$, we have:

- the orbit $U(p) \times U(q) \cdot Y(t)$ is equal to $\{\widehat{Y}^{p,q} \in \mathfrak{p}_1, s(Y) = t\}$,
- the orbit $U(q) \times U(p) \cdot Y(t)$ is equal to $\{\widehat{Y}^{q,p} \in \mathfrak{p}_2, s(Y) = t\}$,
- the orbit $U(n) \cdot Y(t)$ is equal to $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{t}^{p,q}} := \{Z \in \text{Herm}(n), e(Z) = \widehat{t}^{p,q}\}$.

Here is the main application of the Proposition 2.14.

Proposition 4.2 *Let $(\gamma, s, t) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$. The following statements are equivalent:*

1. $(\gamma, s, t) \in \mathcal{S}(p, q)$,
2. $\exists A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C})$, such that $s(A) = \gamma$, $s(A_{12}) = s$, and $s(A_{21}) = t$,
3. $\exists X \in \widehat{\mathfrak{p}}$, with $\pi(X) = (X_1, X_2)$, s.t. $e(X) = \widehat{\gamma}$, $e(X_1) = \widehat{s}^{p,q}$ and $e(X_2) = \widehat{t}^{p,q}$,
4. $\pi \left(U(n) \times U(n) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(\gamma) \right)$ contains $(U(p) \times U(q) \cdot Y(s)) \times (U(q) \times U(p) \cdot Y(t))$.
5. $\pi \left(U(2n) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(\gamma) \right)$ contains $U(n) \cdot Y(s) \times U(n) \cdot Y(t)$.
6. $\pi_0(U(2n) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(\widehat{\gamma}))$ contains $\mathcal{O}_{\widehat{t}^{p,q}} \times \mathcal{O}_{\widehat{s}^{p,q}}$.
7. $(\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{s}^{p,q}, \widehat{t}^{p,q}) \in LR(n, n)$.

Proof: 4. \iff 5. follows from Proposition 2.14, and 5. \iff 6. is a consequence of Lemma 4.1 and the fact that the orbit $U(2n) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(\gamma)$ is equal to $U(2n) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(\widehat{\gamma})$. The other equivalences are left to the reader. \square

4.3 Inequalities determining $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$

Thanks to Proposition 4.2 and Theorem 2.8, we obtain the following description of the cone $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$.

Theorem 4.3 *An element $(\gamma, s, t) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$ belongs to $\mathcal{S}(p, q)$ if and only if, $\gamma_k \geq s_k$ and $\gamma_k \geq t_k, \forall k \in [q]$, and*

$$(21) \quad |\gamma|_{A \cap [n]} - |\gamma|_{A^\circ \cap [n]} \geq |s|_{B \cap [q]} - |s|_{B^\circ \cap [q]} + |t|_{C \cap [q]} - |t|_{C^\circ \cap [q]},$$

holds for any triplets (A, B, C) satisfying the following conditions :

- B, C are strict subsets of $[n]$,
- $A \subset [2n]$ and $\sharp A = \sharp B + \sharp C$,
- the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A)}$ is non-zero.

Let us use some duality to minimize the number of equations (see (13)). The equation (21) means that $(\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{s}^{p,q}, \widehat{t}^{p,q})$ satisfies $|x|_A \geq |y|_B + |z|_C$, that is $|\widehat{\gamma}|_A \geq |\widehat{s}^{p,q}|_B + |\widehat{t}^{p,q}|_C$. If we apply $(\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{s}^{p,q}, \widehat{t}^{p,q})$ to the relation $|x|_{A^\circ} \leq |y|_{C^\circ} + |z|_{C^\circ}$, we get $|\widehat{\gamma}|_{A^\circ} \leq |\widehat{s}^{p,q}|_{B^\circ} + |\widehat{t}^{p,q}|_{C^\circ}$ which is equivalent to (21) since $|\widehat{\gamma}|_{A^\circ} = -|\widehat{\gamma}|_A, |\widehat{s}^{p,q}|_{B^\circ} = -|\widehat{s}^{p,q}|_B$ and $|\widehat{t}^{p,q}|_{C^\circ} = -|\widehat{t}^{p,q}|_C$.

We can therefore rewrite Theorem 4.3, by requiring that (21) holds for all strict subsets $A \subset [2n], B, C \subset [n]$, which satisfy $\sharp A = \sharp B + \sharp C \leq n$ and $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A)} \neq 0$.

5 The cone $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$

Recall that $\mathcal{E}(p, q) = \{(\gamma, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q, (\gamma, s, s) \in \mathcal{S}(p, q)\}$. Theorem 5.2 gives a description of the cone $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$ in terms of a finite set of inequalities: $\mathcal{E}(p, q) = \{(\gamma, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q, (\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{s}^{p,q}, \widehat{s}^{p,q}) \in LR(n, n)\}$. In the next section, we explain how to improve this result.

5.1 A subcone of $LR(n, n)$

We start by defining the following subcone of $LR(n, n)$:

$$\mathcal{E}(n) := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}_+^n, (x, y, y) \in LR(n, n)\}.$$

By definition, $(x, y) \in \mathcal{E}(n)$ if there exists an $2n$ -square Hermitian matrix of the form

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} X_{11} & Z \\ Z^* & X_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad e(X) = x \quad \text{and} \quad e(X_{11}) = e(X_{22}) = y.$$

Theorem 2.8 gives the following description: $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}_+^n$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}(n)$ if and only if the following conditions holds:

1. $|x| = 2|y|$,
2. $x_{n+k} \leq y_k \leq x_k, \forall k \in [n]$,
3. $|x|_A \geq 2|y|_B + 2|y|_C$ and $|x|_{A^o} \leq 2|y|_{B^o} + 2|y|_{C^o}$, for any triplet A, B, C satisfying: $B, C \subset [n]$ and $A \subset [2n]$ are strict subsets such that $\sharp A = \sharp B + \sharp C \leq n$, and $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A)}$ is non-zero.

In fact, condition 2. is not necessary and for the inequalities $|x|_A \geq |y|_B + |y|_C$ it is enough to restrict to those where $B = C$. The following refinement is proved in [20].

Theorem 5.1 $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}_+^n$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}(n)$ if and only if $|x| = 2|y|$ and if the following relations holds

$$|x|_A \geq 2|y|_B \quad \text{and} \quad |x|_{A^o} \leq 2|y|_{B^o}$$

for any couple A, B satisfying:

- $A \subset [2n]$ and $B \subset [n]$ satisfy $\sharp A = 2\sharp B \leq n$
- $(\mu(A), \mu(B)) \in \mathcal{E}(r)$ for $r = \sharp B \leq \frac{n}{2}$.

5.2 Description of $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$

Thanks to Theorem 5.1, we obtain the following description of the cone $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$.

Theorem 5.2 An element $(\gamma, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$ belongs to $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$ if and only if

$$|\gamma|_{A \cap [n]} - |\gamma|_{A^o \cap [n]} \geq 2(|s|_{B \cap [q]} - |s|_{B^o \cap [q]})$$

holds for any couple (A, B) satisfying the following conditions :

- $A \subset [2n]$ and $B \subset [n]$ satisfy $\sharp A = 2\sharp B \leq n$
- the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c_{\mu(B), \mu(B)}^{\mu(A)}$ is non-zero.

5.3 Description of $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$ proposed by Fomin-Fulton-Li-Poon

In [6], the authors work with a cone FFLP(p, q) that is defined as follows. If $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_r\}$ is an increasing sequence of positive integers we define $2I = \{2i_1, \dots, 2i_r\}$ and $2I - 1 = \{2i_1 - 1, \dots, 2i_r - 1\}$.

Definition 5.3 FFLP(p, q) is the set of couple $(\gamma, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$ satisfying

$$|\gamma|_{2I} + |\gamma|_{2J-1} \geq 2|s|_K,$$

for any $r \leq q$ and any $(I, J, K) \in \text{LR}_r^q$.

The following property is proved in [6].

Proposition 5.4 *We have $\mathcal{E}(p, q) \subset \text{FFLP}(p, q)$.*

Proof: We recall the arguments given in [6]. If I and J are two subsets of $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ of the same cardinal $r \geq 1$, we define $\tau(I, J) = 2I \cup 2J - 1$. We will use the following property (see [6], Proposition 1.19):

$$(22) \quad (I, J, K) \in \text{LR}_r^n \implies (\tau(I, J), \tau(I, J), \tau(K, K)) \in \text{LR}_{2r}^{2n}.$$

If $s \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$, let us write $d(s) = (s_1, s_1, \dots, s_q, s_q, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{p-q \text{ times}}) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$. We consider the following subsets of $\mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$:

- $\mathfrak{A}_1 := \left\{ (\gamma, s); (\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\gamma}, 2\widehat{d}(s)) \in \text{Horn}(2n) \right\}$
- $\mathfrak{A}_2 := \left\{ (\gamma, s); |\widehat{\gamma}|_A \geq |\widehat{d}(s)|_B, \forall (A, A, B) \in \text{LR}_r^{2n}, \forall r < 2n \right\}$
- $\mathfrak{A}_3 := \left\{ (\gamma, s); |\widehat{\gamma}|_A \geq |\widehat{d}(s)|_B, \forall (A, A, B) \in \text{LR}_{2r}^{2n}, \forall r < n \right\}$
- $\mathfrak{A}_4 := \left\{ (\gamma, s); |\widehat{\gamma}|_{\tau(I, J)} \geq |\widehat{d}(s)|_{\tau(K, K)}, \forall (I, J, K) \in \text{LR}_r^n, \forall r < n \right\}$
- $\mathfrak{A}_5 := \left\{ (\gamma, s); |\widehat{\gamma}|_{\tau(I, J)} \geq |\widehat{d}(s)|_{\tau(K, K)}, \forall (I, J, K) \in \text{LR}_r^q, \forall r \leq q \right\}$

The proof of the proposition follows from the next lemma.

Lemma 5.5 *The following relations hold*

$$\mathcal{E}(p, q) \subset \mathfrak{A}_1 \subset \mathfrak{A}_2 \subset \mathfrak{A}_3 \subset \mathfrak{A}_4 \subset \mathfrak{A}_5 = \text{FFLP}(p, q).$$

Proof of the Lemma : The inclusions $\mathfrak{A}_2 \subset \mathfrak{A}_3$ and $\mathfrak{A}_4 \subset \mathfrak{A}_5$ are immediate, $\mathfrak{A}_1 \subset \mathfrak{A}_2$ follows from Theorem 2.2, $\mathfrak{A}_3 \subset \mathfrak{A}_4$ is due to (22), and $\mathfrak{A}_5 = \text{FFLP}(p, q)$ follows from the fact that the relation $|\widehat{\gamma}|_{\tau(I, J)} \geq |\widehat{d}(s)|_{\tau(K, K)}$ is equivalent to $|\gamma|_{2I} + |\gamma|_{2J-1} \geq 2|s|_K$, when $I, J, K \subset [q]$.

The inclusion $\mathcal{E}(p, q) \subset \mathfrak{A}_1$ is obtained through the following construction. Let $(\gamma, s) \in \mathcal{E}(p, q)$: there exists a n -square complex matrix of the form $M = \begin{pmatrix} Z & X \\ Y & T \end{pmatrix}$, with $X \in M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$, $Y \in M_{p,q}(\mathbb{C})$ satisfying the relations $s(M) = \gamma$ and $s(X) = s(Y) = s$.

Let us define the matrices $N = \begin{pmatrix} -Z & X \\ Y & -T \end{pmatrix}$ and $P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & X \\ Y & 0 \end{pmatrix}$: we see that $M + N = 2P$ with $s(N) = \gamma$ and $s(P) = d(s)$. Finally, the relation $\widehat{M} + \widehat{N} = 2\widehat{P}$ of $2n$ -square hermitians matrices shows that $(\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\gamma}, 2\widehat{d}(s)) \in \text{Horn}(2n)$ since $e(\widehat{M}) = e(\widehat{N}) = \widehat{\gamma}$ and $e(\widehat{P}) = \widehat{d}(s)$. \square

In [6], the authors claim that $\mathcal{E}(p, q) = \text{FFLP}(p, q)$ by showing that the inverse inclusion $\text{FFLP}(p, q) \subset \mathcal{E}(p, q)$ is always true. But their proof of the latter inclusion is not correct because they use their erroneous description of $\mathcal{A}(p, q)$ to obtain it (see [6], §1.5). Note also that the equality $\mathcal{E}(p, q) = \text{FFLP}(p, q)$ would imply the identities $\mathcal{E}(p, q) = \mathfrak{A}_1 = \mathfrak{A}_2 = \mathfrak{A}_3 = \mathfrak{A}_4 = \mathfrak{A}_5$, which are far from obvious.

In the previous sections, we have proven that $\mathcal{E}(p, q)$ is equal to

$$\text{PEP}(p, q) := \{(\gamma, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q; (\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{s}^{p,q}, \widehat{s}^{p,q}) \in \text{LR}(n, n)\}.$$

Let us finish this section with the following remark.

Lemma 5.6 *We have $\text{PEP}(p, q) \subset \mathfrak{A}_1$.*

Proof: We follow the same strategy as for the inclusion proof $\mathcal{E}(p, q) \subset \mathfrak{A}_1$. Let $(\gamma, s) \in \text{PEP}(p, q)$: there exists a $2n$ -square Hermitian matrix of the form $M = \begin{pmatrix} X & Z \\ Z^* & Y \end{pmatrix}$, with $X, Y \in \text{Herm}(n)$ satisfying the relations $e(M) = \widehat{\gamma}$ and $e(X) = e(Y) = \widehat{s}^{p,q}$.

Now, we define the matrices $N = \begin{pmatrix} X & -Z \\ -Z^* & Y \end{pmatrix}$ and $P = \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & Y \end{pmatrix}$: we see that $N + M = 2P$ with $e(N) = e(M) = \widehat{\gamma}$ and $e(P) = \widehat{d}(s)$. Finally, we have shown that $(\widehat{\gamma}, \widehat{\gamma}, 2\widehat{d}(s)) \in \text{Horn}(2n)$. Hence, $(\gamma, s) \in \mathfrak{A}_1$. \square

By this way, we can conclude that $\text{PEP}(p, q) \subset \text{FFLP}(p, q)$, but the question of whether these cones are equal remains open.

6 The cone $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$

We work with the real reductive Lie groups $G := U(p, p) \times U(q, q)$ and $\widetilde{G} := U(n, n)$. The embedding $\iota : G \rightarrow \widetilde{G}$ is defined as follows:

$$(23) \quad \iota(g, h) = \begin{pmatrix} g_{11} & 0_{p,2q} & g_{12} \\ 0_{2q,p} & h & 0_{2q,p} \\ g_{21} & 0_{p,2q} & g_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{when} \quad g = \begin{pmatrix} g_{11} & g_{12} \\ g_{21} & g_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here $g_{ij} \in M_{p,p}(\mathbb{C})$ and $h \in U(q, q) \subset M_{2q,2q}(\mathbb{C})$.

The unitary group $\widetilde{K} := U_n \times U_n$ is a maximal compact subgroup of \widetilde{G} . The subspace $\widetilde{\mathfrak{p}} := \{\widehat{X}, X \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C})\} \subset \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ admits a canonical action of \widetilde{K} . The subgroup $K = K_1 \times K_2$, with $K_1 \simeq U_p \times U_p$ and $K_2 \simeq U_q \times U_q$, is a maximal compact subgroup of G , and the subspace $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \times \mathfrak{p}_2$ admits a natural identification with $M_{p,p}(\mathbb{C}) \times M_{q,q}(\mathbb{C})$:

$$(Y, Z) \in M_{p,p}(\mathbb{C}) \times M_{q,q}(\mathbb{C}) \longmapsto (\widehat{Y}, \widehat{Z}) \in \mathfrak{p}_1 \times \mathfrak{p}_2.$$

See §2.2 for the notations \widehat{X} .

6.1 Complexification, antiholomorphic involution and orthogonal projection

The complexification of the group G is $G_{\mathbb{C}} := GL_{2p}(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_{2q}(\mathbb{C})$. We consider the antiholomorphic involution σ on $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined by $\sigma(g, h) = (I_{p,p}(g^*)^{-1}I_{p,p}, I_{q,q}(h^*)^{-1}I_{q,q})$, where $I_{\ell,\ell} = \text{Diag}(Id_{\ell}, -Id_{\ell})$. The subgroup G is the fixed point set of σ .

The complexification of the group \tilde{G} is $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}} := GL_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$. We consider the antiholomorphic involution $\tilde{\sigma}$ on $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$ defined by $\tilde{\sigma}(g) = I_{n,n}(g^*)^{-1}I_{n,n}$. The subgroup \tilde{G} corresponds to the fixed point set of $\tilde{\sigma}$.

The groups $U = U_{2p} \times U_{2q}$ and $\tilde{U} = U_{2n}$ are respectively maximal compact subgroups of $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$. The fixed point subgroups of the involutions are $U^{\sigma} = K$ and $\tilde{U}^{\tilde{\sigma}} = \tilde{K}$.

The embedding $\iota : G \hookrightarrow \tilde{G}$ admits a complexification $\iota_{\mathbb{C}} : G_{\mathbb{C}} \hookrightarrow \tilde{G}_{\mathbb{C}}$. At the level of Lie algebra, we have a morphism $\iota_{\mathbb{C}} : \mathfrak{gl}_{2p}(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_{2q}(\mathbb{C}) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$, still defined by (23).

The orthogonal projection $\pi : \mathfrak{gl}_{2n}(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_{2p}(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_{2q}(\mathbb{C})$ dual to the morphism $\iota_{\mathbb{C}}$ is defined by the relations :

$$(24) \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & A_{23} \\ A_{31} & A_{32} & A_{33} \end{pmatrix} \quad \longmapsto \quad \pi(A) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{13} \\ A_{31} & A_{33} \end{pmatrix}, A_{22} \right).$$

Here the matrix $A \in \mathfrak{gl}_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$ is written by blocs relatively to the decomposition $2n = p + 2q + p$.

Let us consider another projection $\pi_0 : \mathfrak{gl}_{2n}(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_{2p}(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathfrak{gl}_{2q}(\mathbb{C})$ defined by the relations :

$$(25) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad \longmapsto \quad \pi_0(B) = (B_{11}, B_{22}).$$

Here $B_{11} \in \mathfrak{gl}_{2p,2p}(\mathbb{C})$ and $B_{22} \in \mathfrak{gl}_{2q,2q}(\mathbb{C})$

Lemma 6.1 *For any U_{2n} -orbit $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$, we have $\pi(\mathcal{O}) = \pi_0(\mathcal{O})$.*

Proof: Same type of proof as for the lemma 4.1. \square

6.2 Description of $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$ through $LR(2p, 2q)$

Here is the main application of the Proposition 2.14. Recall that for $(\gamma, s, t) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^p \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$, we define $\hat{\gamma} := (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n, -\gamma_n, \dots, -\gamma_1)$, $\hat{s} := (s_1, \dots, s_p, -s_p, \dots, -s_1)$ and $\hat{t} := (t_1, \dots, t_q, -t_q, \dots, -t_1)$

Proposition 6.2 *Let $(\gamma, s, t) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^p \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$. The following statements are equivalent:*

1. $(\gamma, s, t) \in \mathcal{T}(p, q)$,

2. $\exists A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C})$, such that $s(A) = \gamma$, $s(A_{11}) = s$, and $s(A_{22}) = t$,
3. $\exists X \in \tilde{\mathfrak{p}}$, with $\pi(X) = (X_1, X_2)$, s.t. $e(X) = \hat{\gamma}$, $e(X_1) = \hat{s}$ and $e(X_2) = \hat{t}$,
4. $\pi \left(U(n) \times U(n) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(\gamma) \right)$ contains $\left(U(p) \times U(p) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(s) \right) \times \left(U(q) \times U(q) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(t) \right)$.
5. $\pi \left(U(2n) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(\gamma) \right)$ contains $U(2p) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(s) \times U(2q) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(t)$.
6. $\pi_0 \left(U(2n) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(\hat{\gamma}) \right)$ contains $U(2p) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(\hat{s}) \times U(2q) \cdot \widehat{\text{Diag}}(\hat{t})$.
7. $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{s}, \hat{t}) \in LR(2p, 2q)$.

Proof: 4. \iff 5. follows from Proposition 2.14, and 5. \iff 6. is a consequence of Lemma 4.1. The other equivalences are left to the reader. \square

6.3 Inequalities determining $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$

Thanks to Proposition 6.2 and Theorem 2.8, we obtain the following description of the cone $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$.

Theorem 6.3 *An element $(\gamma, s, t) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^p \times \mathbb{R}_{++}^q$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}(p, q)$ if and only if the following inequalities hold:*

1. $\gamma_k \geq s_k, \forall k \leq p$,
2. $\gamma_j \geq t_j, \forall j \leq q$,
3. $\gamma_{2q+\ell} \leq s_\ell, \forall \ell \leq p - q$,
4. we have $|\gamma|_{A \cap [n]} - |\gamma|_{A^\circ \cap [n]} \geq |s|_{B \cap [p]} - |s|_{B^\circ \cap [p]} + |t|_{C \cap [q]} - |t|_{C^\circ \cap [q]}$

for any triplets (A, B, C) satisfying the following conditions :

- $B \subset [2p]$ and $C \subset [2q]$ are strict subsets,
- $A \subset [2n]$ and $\sharp A = \sharp B + \sharp C \leq n$,
- the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c_{\mu(B), \mu(C)}^{\mu(A)}$ is non-zero.

6.4 Interlacing inequalities for singular values

Let us consider the case where $p \geq q = 1$.

Let $\gamma_1 \geq \dots \geq \gamma_{p+1} \geq 0$ be the singular values of a $p + 1$ -square complex matrix X . Let X' be the p -square submatrix of X obtained by deleting a row and a column: we denote by $s_1 \geq \dots \geq s_p \geq 0$ its singular spectrum.

Points 1. and 3. of Theorem 6.3 yields interlacing inequalities which were first observed by Thompson [23]:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \gamma_3 \leq s_1 \leq \gamma_1, \\
& \gamma_4 \leq s_2 \leq \gamma_2, \\
& \dots \\
& \gamma_{j+2} \leq s_j \leq \gamma_j, \quad 1 \leq j \leq p-2, \\
& \dots \\
& \gamma_p \leq s_{p-2} \leq \gamma_{p-2}, \\
& \quad s_{p-1} \leq \gamma_{p-1}, \\
& \quad s_p \leq \gamma_p.
\end{aligned}$$

References

- [1] P. Belkale : Geometric proofs of Horn and saturation conjectures. *J. Algebraic Geom.* **15**, 133–173 (2006).
- [2] P. Belkale and S. Kumar : Eigenvalue problem and a new product in cohomology of flag varieties. *Invent. Math.* **166**, 185–228 (2006).
- [3] P. Belkale and S. Kumar : Eigencone, saturation and Horn problems for symplectic and odd orthogonal groups. *Journal of Algebraic Geometry* **19**, 199–242 (2010).
- [4] A. Berenstein and R. Sjamaar : Coadjoint orbits, moment polytopes, and the Hilbert-Mumford criterion. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **13**, 433–466 (2000).
- [5] M. Brion : Restriction de représentations et projections d’orbites coadjointes. *Séminaire Bourbaki*, (2012).
- [6] S. Fomin, W. Fulton, C.-K. Li and Y.-T. Poon : Eigenvalues, singular values, and Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. *American Journal of Mathematics* **127**, 101–127 (2005).
- [7] W. Fulton : Eigenvalues, invariant factors, highest weights, and Schubert calculus. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* **37**, 209–249 (2000).
- [8] A. Horn : Eigenvalues of sums of Hermitian matrices. *Pacific J. Math.* **12**, 225–241 (1962).
- [9] M. Kapovich B. Leeb and J. Millson : The generalized triangle inequalities in symmetric spaces and buildings with applications to algebra, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **192** , no. 896, (2008).
- [10] A. Klyachko : Stable bundles, representation theory and Hermitian operators, *Selecta Mathematica* **4**, 419–445 (1998).
- [11] S. Kumar : A survey of the additive eigenvalue problem (with appendix by M. Kapovich), *Transformation Groups* **19**, 1051–1148 (2014).

- [12] A.W. Knapp : Lie groups beyond an introduction, Progress in Math. **140**, Birkhäuser, Springer (2004).
- [13] A. Knutson and T. Tao : The honeycomb model of $GL_n(\mathbb{C})$ tensor products I : Proof of the saturation conjecture. Journal of the A.M.S. **12**, 1055–1090 (1999).
- [14] A. Knutson, T. Tao and C. Woodward : The honeycomb model of $GL_n(\mathbb{C})$ tensor products II: Puzzles determine facets of the Littlewood-Richardson cone. Journal of the A.M.S. **17**, 19–48 (2004).
- [15] C.-K. Li and Y.-T. Poon : Off-diagonal submatrices of a Hermitian matrix. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society **132**, 2849–2856 (2004).
- [16] I. G. Macdonald : Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials. Oxford university press, 1998.
- [17] L. Manivel : Fonctions symétriques, polynômes de Schubert et lieux de dégénérescence. Cours spécialisés **3**, S.M.F. (1998).
- [18] L. O’Shea and R. Sjamaar : Moment maps and Riemannian symmetric pairs. Mathematische Annalen **317**, 415–457 (2000).
- [19] P.-E. Paradan : Moment polytopes in real symplectic geometry II: applications to singular value inequalities. arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.13399.
- [20] P.-E. Paradan : Moment polytopes in real symplectic geometry III: examples. *in preparation*
- [21] N. Ressayre : Geometric invariant theory and the generalized eigenvalue problem. Inventiones mathematicae **180**, 389–441 (2010).
- [22] N. Ressayre : Geometric invariant theory and generalized eigenvalue problem II. Annales de L’institut Fourier **61**, 1467–1491 (2011).
- [23] R. C. Thompson : Principal submatrices IX: Interlacing inequalities for singular values of submatrices. Linear Algebra and its Applications **5**, 1–12 (1972).
- [24] R. C. Thompson : Singular value inequalities for matrix sums and minors, Linear Algebra and its Applications **11**, 251–269 (1975).