N. L. Gordeev, E. W. Ellers, Big and small elements in Chevalley groups, *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. POMI*, 2011, Volume 386, 203–226

Записки научных
семинаров ПОМИ
Том 386, 2011 г.

N. L. Gordeev, E. W. Ellers

BIG AND SMALL ELEMENTS IN CHEVALLEY GROUPS

Abstract. Let $\widetilde{G}$ be a reductive algebraic group which is defined and split over a field K. Here we consider the Zariski open subset $\mathfrak{B}$ of the group $\widetilde{G}$ which consists of elements such that their conjugacy classes intersect the Big Bruhat Cell. In particular, we give a description of the set $\mathfrak{B}(K)$ in the case $\widetilde{G} = \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{SL}_n$.

1. Introduction

Let $\widetilde{G}$ be a reductive algebraic group that is defined and split over a field K and let $\widetilde{B}$ be a fixed Borel subgroup of $\widetilde{G}$ that is defined over K. Further, let $G = \widetilde{G}(K)$ and $B = \widetilde{B}(K)$. The groups $\widetilde{G}$ and G have Bruhat decompositions

$$\widetilde{G} = \bigcup_{w \in W} \widetilde{B}\dot{w}\widetilde{B}, \quad G = \bigcup_{w \in W} B\dot{w}B,$$

where W is the Weyl group corresponding to $\widetilde{G}$ and $\dot{w}$ is a preimage of $w \in W$ in the normalizer of a fixed maximal torus of $\widetilde{B}$ (we assume $\dot{w} \in G$). The question "when does a given conjugacy class of $\widetilde{G}$ (respectively, G) intersects a given Bruhat cell $\widetilde{B}\dot{w}\widetilde{B}$ (respectively, $B\dot{w}B$)?" is investigated, in particular, in [4-6, 8–10, 14–16]. The complete solution of this problem seems to be very complicated. Here we are interested in the following part of the question "when is $\widetilde{C} \cap \widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B} \neq \varnothing$ (respectively, $C \cap B\dot{w}_0B \neq \varnothing$), where $\widetilde{C}$ (respectively, C) is a conjugacy class of $\widetilde{G}$ (respectively, G) and w_0 is the longest element of the Weyl group?" that is, "when does a conjugacy class of a Chevalley group intersect the big Bruhat cell?".

Key words and phrases: reductive algebraic group, Chevalley group, conjugacy class, Big Bruhat Cell.

This work was finished during the visit of the second author to the MPIM (Bonn) in 2010. Both authors were supported in part by NSERC Canada Grant A7251 and the second author also by the grants RFFI 08-01-00756-a, 10-01-90016-Bel_a.

However, even this particular question seems to be difficult to answer. Here we give an answer only for the cases $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(K), \mathrm{SL}_n(K)$. Namely, the conjugacy class C_g of an element $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n(K)$ (respectively, $g \in \mathrm{SL}_n(K)$) intersects the big Bruhat cell of $\mathrm{GL}_n(K)$ (respectively, $\mathrm{SL}_n(K)$) if and only if

$$\mathrm{rank}\,(g - \alpha E_n) \geq [\frac{n}{2}] \quad \text{for every} \quad \alpha \in K^*; \qquad (*)$$

(here E_n is the identity matrix of $GL_n(K)$ and $[x] = \max\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid m \leq x\}$). For an algebraically closed field K this result was obtained in [4]. It is easy to extend this result to the case where K is an infinite field (see, Theorem 2.3, below). However for finite fields such extension cannot be obtained by the same arguments.

Here we give a proof of $(*)$ which holds for all fields.

The proof is based on the following construction. Let Φ be a simple root system corresponding to $\widetilde{G}$ and let $w_\alpha, w \in W$, where w_α is the reflection that corresponds to the root $\alpha \in \Phi$. Further, let $w' = w_\alpha w w_\alpha$. We say that there is *a short descent* $w \to w'$ if $l(w') \leq l(w)$; (here $l(w)$ is the length of w with respect to the set of basic reflections $\{w_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$). A *descent* $w \to w'$ is a sequence of short descents $w \to w_1 \to \cdots \to w_n = w'$. We say that a short descent $w \to w'$ is *strict* if $l(w') < l(w)$. In the latter case, we have two *jumps* $w \rightsquigarrow w_\alpha w,\ w \rightsquigarrow w w_\alpha$. We say that there is *a way* $w \mapsto w'$, where $w' \in W$, if there is a sequence $w_1, \dots, w_m \in W_n$ such that $w_1 = w$, $w_m = w'$, and for every pair w_i, w_{i+1} there is a descent $w_i \to w_{i+1}$ or a jump $w_i \rightsquigarrow w_{i+1}$. If $w \mapsto w'$ is a way, then for a conjugacy class C of G

$$C \cap B\dot{w}'B \neq \varnothing \Rightarrow C \cap B\dot{w}B \neq \varnothing$$

(see [6, Propositions 2.2 and 2.10]; note, that in [6] we considered only jumps of the form $w \rightsquigarrow w w_\alpha$, but Proposition 2.2 in [6] shows that we also may consider the jumps $w \rightsquigarrow w_\alpha w$). Thus, to show for a conjugacy class C of G (with condition $(*)$) that $C \cap B\dot{w}_0 B \neq \varnothing$, we construct a way $w_0 \mapsto w$ to an appropriate element of W such that $C \cap B\dot{w}B \neq \varnothing$. This gives us the sufficiency of $(*)$. The necessity of $(*)$ follows from a simple observation on matrices belonging to $\dot{w}_0 B$.

The problem of describing the elements whose conjugacy classes intersect the big Bruhat cell can be reformulated as follows. For an element $g \in \widetilde{G}$ put

$$\mathfrak{B}_g = g(\widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B})g^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_g = \widetilde{G} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_g.$$

We define the sets

$$\mathfrak{B} = \bigcup_{g \in \widetilde{G}} g(\widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B})g^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathfrak{B}} = \widetilde{G} \setminus \mathfrak{B} = \bigcap_{g \in \widetilde{G}} \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_g,$$

which we call the *set of big elements* and the *set of small elements* of $\widetilde{G}$, respectively. The set $\mathfrak{B}$ is an open subset of $\widetilde{G}$; it consists of the elements $g \in \widetilde{G}$ such that the conjugacy class C_g of g has a nonempty intersection with the big Bruhat cell $\widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B}$, and the set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ is the closed subset of $\widetilde{G}$ that consists of the elements whose conjugacy classes have no intersection with the big cell. We also define an open and a closed subset of $\widetilde{G}$

$$\mathfrak{B}_K = \bigcup_{g \in G} g(\widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B})g^{-1} \text{ and } \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K = \widetilde{G} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_K = \bigcap_{g \in G} \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_g,$$

which we call the *set of K-big elements* and the *set of K-small elements* of $\widetilde{G}$, respectively. We show that the closed subsets $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ and $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$ are defined over K, and if K is an infinite field, $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}} = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$. This implies, in particular, if K is an infinite field and $x \in G$, then

$$gxg^{-1} \in \widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B} \quad \text{for some} \quad g \in \widetilde{G} \Leftrightarrow gxg^{-1} \in B\dot{w}_0B \quad \text{for some} \quad g \in G.$$

We also describe the closed set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$ for $\widetilde{G} = \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{SL}_n, \mathrm{Sp}_4$.

Throughout the paper we use the notation that we established in the Introduction.

We identify the group $\widetilde{G}$ with the group of points $\widetilde{G}(\mathfrak{K})$ for some algebraically closed field $\mathfrak{K} \supset K$; all fields considered below are assumed to be subfields of $\mathfrak{K}$.

Further, $\overline{F}$ is the algebraic closure of a field F;

$\overline{Y}$ is the Zariski closure of a subset $Y \subset X$ of an algebraic variety X;

e is the identity of G;

E_n is the identity matrix in GL_n;

$\mathbf{0}_{k \times m}$ is the zero $k \times m$-matrix;

$C_\Gamma(x)$ is the centralizer of an element x in the group Γ;

F_p is the field consisting of p elements, where p is a prime.

2. The sets $\mathfrak{B}$, $\mathfrak{B}_K$, $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$, $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$

Proposition 2.1. *For $g \in G$ the closed subset $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_g$ of $\widetilde{G}$ is defined over K. Moreover,*

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_g(K) = \bigcup_{w \neq w_0} g(B\dot{w}B)g^{-1}.$$

Proof. Since the map $x \to gxg^{-1}$ is an isomorphism of the affine variety $\widetilde{G}$ onto itself that is defined over K, it suffices to deal with the case $g = e$. Consider the closed subset

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e = \widetilde{G} \setminus \mathfrak{B}_e = \bigcup_{w \neq w_0} \widetilde{B}\dot{w}\widetilde{B}$$

of $\widetilde{G}$ (we assume $\dot{w} \in G$). For every extension F/K we have

$$\bigcup_{w \neq w_0} \widetilde{B}(F)\dot{w}\widetilde{B}(F) \subset \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e \cap \widetilde{G}(F), \quad \widetilde{B}(F)\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B}(F) \subset \mathfrak{B}_e \cap \widetilde{G}(F), \tag{2.1}$$

$$\widetilde{G}(F) = \left(\bigcup_{w \neq w_0} \widetilde{B}(F)\dot{w}\widetilde{B}(F) \right) \cup (\widetilde{B}(F)\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B}(F)). \tag{2.2}$$

From (2.1) and (2.2),

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e \cap \widetilde{G}(F) = \bigcup_{w \neq w_0} \widetilde{B}(F)\dot{w}\widetilde{B}(F), \quad \mathfrak{B}_e \cap \widetilde{G}(F) = \widetilde{B}(F)\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B}(F). \tag{2.3}$$

Let F be an infinite field. Since $\widetilde{G}$ is a split group, the group $\widetilde{B}$ is a connected, split, solvable group, thus the group $\widetilde{B}$ is a unirational variety (see [12, Theorem 14.3.8]) and therefore the set $\widetilde{B}(F)$ is dense in $\widetilde{B}$ ([12, 13.2.6]). Thus, $\overline{\widetilde{B}(F)} = \widetilde{B}$ and, by (2.3),

$$\overline{\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e \cap \widetilde{G}(F)} = (\overline{\bigcup_{w \neq w_0} \widetilde{B}(F)\dot{w}\widetilde{B}(F)}) \supset (\bigcup_{w \neq w_0} \overline{\widetilde{B}(F)}\dot{w}\overline{\widetilde{B}(F)}) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e. \tag{2.4}$$

Thus, if K is an infinite field we may put $F = K$ and get a dense subset $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e \cap \widetilde{G}(K)$ in $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e$ (this follows from (2.4)) and therefore the closed set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e$ is defined over K ([12, 11.2.4, ii]). Now let K be a finite field and put $F = \overline{K}$. Again (2.4) implies that $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e$ is defined over $\overline{K}$ and $\mathfrak{B}_e(\overline{K})$ is a dense subset of $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e$. Also, the set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e(\overline{K})$ is $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{K}/K)$-stable. Hence, $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e$ is K-defined (see [12, 11.2.8]).

The second assertion of the proposition follows from (2.3). □

Proposition 2.2. *The closed subsets* $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$, $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$ *of* $\widetilde{G}$ *are defined over* K.

Proof. Let char $K = p \neq 0$. Since $\widetilde{G}$ is split over K we may assume that $\widetilde{G}$ is defined and split over the prime field F_p. For the algebraically closed field $\mathfrak{K}$ the map $\gamma : \mathfrak{K} \to \mathfrak{K}$ given by the formula $\gamma(a) = a^p$ is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{K}$. If $\Gamma = \langle\gamma\rangle$, then $\mathfrak{K}^\Gamma = F_p$.

Now we assume that $\widetilde{G}$ is a closed subset of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathfrak{K})$ and the corresponding embedding $i : \widetilde{G} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathfrak{K})$ is an F_p-defined morphism.

Let $F_p[\mathrm{GL}_n]$ be the coordinate ring of the F_p-group GL_n. The automorphism

$$l \otimes f \to \gamma(l) \otimes f$$

of $\mathfrak{K}[\mathrm{GL}_n] = \mathfrak{K} \otimes_{F_p} F_p[\mathrm{GL}_n]$, where $l \in \mathfrak{K}$ and $f \in F_p[\mathrm{GL}_n]$, will also be denoted by γ. Thus, the group $\Gamma = \langle\gamma\rangle$ acts on $\mathfrak{K}[\mathrm{GL}_n]$. Consider the map

$$\widetilde{\gamma} : \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathfrak{K}) \to \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathfrak{K})$$

such that $\widetilde{\gamma}(\{a_{ij}\}) = \{a_{ij}^p\}$. Since the group $\widetilde{G}$ is F_p-defined,

$$\widetilde{\gamma}(\widetilde{G}) = \widetilde{G}, \quad \widetilde{\gamma}(G) \subset G.$$

Let

$$I_g = \{f \in \mathfrak{K}[\mathrm{GL}_n] \quad | \quad f_{|\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_g} \equiv 0\}$$

be the ideal of functions vanishing on $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_g$. If $g = e$ this ideal is generated by polynomials with coefficients in F_p. Hence the ideal I_g of functions vanishing on $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_g = g\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_e g^{-1}$ is generated by polynomials whose coefficients are rational functions of entries in the matrix $i(g) \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathfrak{K})$. Now $\gamma(I_g) = I_{\widetilde{\gamma}(g)}$ and $\widetilde{\gamma}(g) \in \widetilde{G}$ (respectively, $\widetilde{\gamma}(g) \in G$ if $g \in G$). Hence, the ideal $I = \sum_{g\in\widetilde{G}} I_g$ (respectively, $I_K = \sum_{g\in G} I_g$) is Γ-invariant, and, therefore, the ideal I (respectively, I_K) is generated as a vector subspace of $\mathfrak{K}[\mathrm{GL}_n]$ by elements from $F_p[\mathrm{GL}_n]$, because $\mathfrak{K}^\Gamma = F_p$ (see [12, 11.1.4]). Since $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}} = V(I)$ (respectively, $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K = V(I_K)$) and since F_p is a perfect field, the set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ (respectively, $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$) is defined over F_p (see [7, 34.1]) and therefore it is defined over K.

Let char $K = 0$. Then K is a perfect field and therefore the intersection of K-defined closed sets $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_g = \bigcup_{w\neq w_0} g(B\dot{w}B)g^{-1}$, $g \in G$, (Proposition 2.1) is also K-defined (see [12, 11.2.13]). Thus, the closed set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$ is K-defined.

Further, since $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$ is K-defined, the set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K(\overline{K})$ is dense in $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$.

Now we show the implication

$$x \in \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K(\overline{K}) \Rightarrow x \in \widehat{\mathfrak{B}} \cap \widetilde{G}(\overline{K}). \tag{2.5}$$

Suppose $x \notin \widehat{\mathfrak{B}} \cap \widetilde{G}(\overline{K})$. Then $x \in \mathfrak{B} \cap \widetilde{G}(\overline{K})$ and therefore $gxg^{-1} \in \widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B}$ for some $g \in \widetilde{G}$ (by the definition of $\mathfrak{B}$). Hence the conjugacy class $\widetilde{C}_x$ of the element x in $\widetilde{G}$ has a nontrivial intersection U_x with the open subset $\widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B}$, and therefore, the set U_x contains an open subset of the closure of $\widetilde{C}_x$. Hence the subset U_x of the conjugacy class $\widetilde{C}_x$ has a nontrivial intersection with any dense subset of $\widetilde{C}_x$. But the set $V_x = \{g^{-1}xg \mid g \in G\}$ is dense in $\widetilde{C}_x = \{g^{-1}xg \mid g \in \widetilde{G}\}$, because K is an infinite field and, therefore, G is dense in $\widetilde{G}$ (see [1, 18.3]). Thus $U_x \cap V_x \neq \varnothing$. If $g^{-1}xg \in U_x \cap V_x$, then $x \in g\widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B}g^{-1}$, where $g \in G$. Hence $x \in \mathfrak{B}_K$ and therefore $x \notin \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$, which contradicts our assumption. This confirms (2.5).

Since $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}} \subset \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$, the implication (2.5) yields

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K(\overline{K}) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}} \cap \widetilde{G}(\overline{K}). \tag{2.6}$$

The set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}} \cap \widetilde{G}(\overline{K})$ is dense in $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ (this follows from (2.6) and the density of $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K(\overline{K})$ in $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K \supset \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$). Thus $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ is $\overline{K}$-defined (see [1, AG, 14.4]). Now let $\Gamma = \mathrm{Gal}\,(\overline{K}/K)$ be the Galois group of the extension $\overline{K}/K$. The set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K(\overline{K}) = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}} \cap \widetilde{G}(\overline{K})$ is Γ-stable. Hence $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ is K-defined (see [12, 11.2.8, i]). □

Theorem 2.3. *If K is an infinite field, then*

(i) $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K = \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$;

(ii) *for $\sigma \in G$ the following statements are equivalent:*

(a) $g\sigma g^{-1} \in \widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B}$ *for some* $g \in \widetilde{G}$;

(b) $g\sigma g^{-1} \in B\dot{w}_0 B$ *for some* $g \in G$.

Proof. (i) We may apply here the same arguments as in the proof of (2.5). Namely, if $x \in \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$, then the conjugacy class C_x of x in $\widetilde{G}$ intersects $\widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B}$ trivially (otherwise, we get a contradiction to the assumption $x \in \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$ as we did in the proof of (2.5)), and therefore we get $x \in \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$. Since $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}} \subset \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}_K$ we get (i).

(ii) The implication (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) is obvious. Now we assume (a). Then $\sigma \in \mathfrak{B}$. Hence $\sigma \in \mathfrak{B}_K$ and therefore $g\sigma g^{-1} \in \widetilde{B}\dot{w}_0\widetilde{B}$ for some $g \in G$. Since $g\sigma g^{-1} \in G = \cup_{w \in W} B\dot{w}B$ and $B = \widetilde{B}(K) \subset \widetilde{B}$, the element $g\sigma g^{-1}$ can belong only to the Bruhat cell $B\dot{w}_0B$. This establishes (b). □

3. Example I: $\widetilde{G} = \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{SL}_n$

Let G be $\mathrm{GL}_n(K)$ or $\mathrm{SL}_n(K)$ and let $w_0 \in W \approx S_n$ be the element of maximal length. Consider the big Bruhat cell $B\dot{w}_0B$ of G. Note that a conjugacy class C_g of $g \in G$ intersects $B\dot{w}_0B$ if and only if it intersects the set $\dot{w}_0B$, which is the set of matrices of the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & a_{1n} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & a_{2\,n-1} & a_{2n} \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \\ 0 & a_{n-1\,2} & \cdots & a_{n-1\,n-1} & a_{n-1\,n} \\ a_{n\,1} & a_{n\,2} & \cdots & a_{n\,n-1} & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.1}$$

Now, if a matrix $g \in G$ has the form (3.1), then

$$\operatorname{rank}(g - \alpha E_n) \geq \left[\frac{n}{2}\right] \tag{3.2}$$

for every $\alpha \in K^*$.

In particular, if g is a split semisimple element, the condition (3.2) means that the multiplicity of eigenvalues of g is less than or equal to $[\frac{n+1}{2}]$.

Theorem 3.1. *For $g \in G$,*

$$C_g \cap B\dot{w}_0B \neq \varnothing \quad \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{rank}(g - \alpha E_n) \geq \left[\frac{n}{2}\right] \quad \textit{for every} \quad \alpha \in K^*.$$

Proof. We use the following notation:

We denote the symmetric group corresponding to the interval $[1, n]$ by S_n and also by $S[1, n]$ to identify imbeddings of symmetric subgroups of smaller degree. For instance, the symmetric subgroup S_k of degree $k < n$ can be identified with any subgroup of all permutations of the subinterval $[i, j] \subset [1, n]$, where $j - i = k - 1$. In this case, we denote such subgroup by $S[i, j]$. Thus, if $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, $j - i = k - 1$ we have the imbedding

$$S_k \hookrightarrow S[i, j] \leq S[1, n] = S_n.$$

We also identify the symmetric group S_n with the Weyl group $W_n = W(A_{n-1})$ with the standard set of simple reflections $w_{\alpha_1}, w_{\alpha_2}, \ldots, w_{\alpha_{n-1}}$, where $\Phi = \{\alpha_1 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1} = \epsilon_{n-1} - \epsilon_n\}$ is the standard simple root system (see [2, Table I]). We also identify w_{α_i} with the transposition $(i\, i+1)$ and for every root $\alpha = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_j$, we write $w_\alpha = (ij)$.

We denote the length of $w \in W_n = S_n$ with respect to the generating set $\{w_{\alpha_1}, \dots, w_{\alpha_{n-1}}\}$ by $l(w)$. The number of nonunit eigenvalues of the element $w \in W_n$, which is considered as a linear operator in the standard linear representation of $W_n = S_n$ induced by permutations of a basis of the n-dimensional linear space, will be denoted by $i(g)$. Let

$$w_0 = \begin{cases} (1\ n)(2\ n-1)\cdots(l \quad l+1) & \text{if } \ n = 2l, \\ (1\ n)(2\ n-1)\cdots(l \quad l+2) & \text{if } \ n = 2l+1. \end{cases}$$

Then w_0 is the element of maximal length $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ and $i(w_0) = [\frac{n}{2}]$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $w \in W_n$. If $i(w) \geq [\frac{n}{2}]$, then there is a way $w_0 \mapsto w'$, where $w' \in W_n$ is an element that is in the conjugacy class C_w of w in W, and $l(w') = \min\{l(w'') \mid w'' \in C_w\}$.*

Proof. Now we state the assumption of the induction:

♭: Let $\omega' \in W_m = S[1, m] = \langle w_{\alpha_1}, \dots, w_{\alpha_{m-1}} \rangle$, $1 < m < n$, be an element satisfying the following conditions:

(a) $i(\omega') \geq [\frac{m}{2}]$.

(b) Let e be the number of stable points of the permutation ω'. There exists an element $\omega \in S[e+1, m]$, which is conjugate to ω' in W_m and which satisfies the following conditions:

1. there is a way $w_0' \mapsto \omega$ where w_0' is the element of maximal length in W_m with respect to the generating set $\{w_{\alpha_1}, \dots, w_{\alpha_{m-1}}\}$;

2. $\omega = \prod\limits_{\alpha \in X} w_\alpha$, where $X \subset \{\alpha_{e+1}, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}\}$ and each $w_\alpha, \alpha \in X$, occurs only once;

3. if $\omega = \omega_1 \omega_2 \cdots \omega_d$ is the decomposition of ω into a product of disjoint cycles of lengths $r_1, \dots, r_d$, respectively, then $r_1 = \min\{r_i\}$ and $\omega_1 \in S[e+1, e+r_1]$. □

For $n = 2, 3$ and 4 the assumption ♭ can be checked by simple calculation.

We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $1 \leq i < j \leq m$. Further, let $\omega = \mu\nu \in W_m$, where $\mu \in S[i, j]$ and where $\nu \in W_m$ is an element that stabilizes every element* *in $[i,j]$. If there is a way $\mu \mapsto \mu' \in S[i,j]$ in the group $S[i,j]$, then there is a way $\omega \mapsto \mu'\nu$ in the group W_m.*

Proof. Let $\zeta \to \zeta' = w_{\alpha_l}\zeta w_{\alpha_l}$ be a descent in $S[i,j]$. We may assume $\zeta(\alpha_l) \neq \alpha_l$ (otherwise, $\zeta\nu \to w_{\alpha_l}\zeta\nu w_{\alpha_l} = \zeta\nu$ is a nonstrict descent). Then either $\zeta(\alpha_l) < 0$ or $\zeta^{-1}(\alpha_l) < 0$ (see [3, Prop. 2.2.8]). Since ν stabilizes every element in $[i,j]$ and $\nu(\alpha_l) = \alpha_l$, either $\zeta\nu(\alpha_l) = \zeta(\alpha_l) < 0$ or $(\zeta\nu)^{-1}(\alpha_l) = \zeta^{-1}(\alpha_l) < 0$ and therefore $\omega \to \mu'\nu$ is a descent.

Now suppose $\zeta \to \zeta' = w_{\alpha_l}\zeta w_{\alpha_l}$ is a strict descent. Then $\zeta = w_{\alpha_l}\zeta_1 w_{\alpha_l}$, where $0 < \zeta_1(\alpha_l) \neq \alpha_l$, $0 < \zeta_1^{-1}(\alpha_l) \neq \alpha_l$ (see [3, Prop. 2.2.8]). Furthermore $0 < \zeta_1\nu(\alpha_l) \neq \alpha_l$, $0 < \zeta_1^{-1}\nu^{-1}(\alpha_l) \neq \alpha_l$ and therefore $\zeta\nu \to w_{\alpha_l}\zeta\nu w_{\alpha_l} = \zeta_1\nu$ is a strict descent and $\zeta\nu \rightsquigarrow w_{\alpha_1}\zeta\nu$ and $\zeta\nu \rightsquigarrow \zeta\nu w_{\alpha_1}$ are jumps. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\omega \in W_m = S[1,m]$ be an element satisfying the conditions $\flat$: (b) $2,3$; (here e is the number of stable points of ω). If $e \geq 1$, then in the group $W_{m+1} = S[1,m+1]$ there is a descent*

$$(1 \quad m+1)\omega \to (e \quad e+r_1+1)\omega_1\widetilde{\omega},$$

where $\widetilde{\omega} \in S[e+r_1+2, m+1]$ is the product of disjoint cycles of lengths $r_2, \dots, r_d$. Moreover,

$$\widetilde{\omega} = \prod_{\alpha \in X'} w_\alpha,$$

where $X' \subset \{\alpha_{e+r_1+2}, \dots, \alpha_m\}$ and each w_α, $\alpha \in X'$, occurs only once.

Proof. Let $i < e$, $\alpha_i = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1}$. Clearly

$$[(i\ m+1)\omega](\alpha_i) = \epsilon_{m+1} - \epsilon_{i+1} < 0 \Rightarrow$$

$$\Rightarrow l(w_{\alpha_i}[(i\ m+1)\omega]w_{\alpha_i}) \leq l([(i \quad m+1)\omega]) \Rightarrow$$

$$\Rightarrow [(i\ m+1)\omega] \to w_{\alpha_i}[(i\ m+1)\omega]w_{\alpha_i} = (i+1\ m+1)\omega.$$

Thus

$$(1 \quad m+1)\omega \to (e \quad m+1)\omega$$

is a descent.

Now let $e+r_1+2 \leq j \leq m+1$. Put

$$D_j = \{e+r_1+1, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, m+1\}$$

(if $j = m+1$, then $D_j = \{e + r_1 + 1, \dots, m\}$).

Suppose there is a descent

$$(e\ m+1)\omega \to (ej)\omega_1\widetilde{\omega}',$$

where $\widetilde{\omega}'$ is a permutation of the set D_j that is conjugate to $\omega_2\omega_3\cdots\omega_d$ in W_m. Moreover, we suppose that $\widetilde{\omega}'$ is a product of transpositions of type w_{α_k}, where $k \neq j-1$, j and, possibly, the transposition $(j-1\ j+1)$ and each such transposition can occur not more than once. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}[(ej)\omega_1\widetilde{\omega}']^{-1}(\epsilon_{j-1} - \epsilon_j) = \epsilon_l - \epsilon_e, \quad l > e \Rightarrow \\ \Rightarrow l(w_{\alpha_{j-1}}[(ej)\omega_1\widetilde{\omega}']w_{\alpha_{j-1}}) \leq l([(ej)\omega_1\widetilde{\omega}']) \Rightarrow \\ \Rightarrow [(ej)\omega_1\widetilde{\omega}'] \to w_{\alpha_{j-1}}[(ej)\omega_1\widetilde{\omega}']w_{\alpha_{j-1}} = (e\ j-1)\omega_1\widetilde{\omega}''.\end{aligned}$$

Here $\widetilde{\omega}'' = w_{\alpha_{j-1}}\widetilde{\omega}'w_{\alpha_{j-1}}$. Note that among the factors of $\widetilde{\omega}'$ only $w_{\alpha_{j-2}}$ and $(j-1 \quad j+1)$ do not commute with $w_{\alpha_{j-1}}$. But

$$\begin{aligned}w_{\alpha_{j-1}}w_{\alpha_{j-2}}w_{\alpha_{j-1}} &= (j-2 \quad j), \\ w_{\alpha_{j-1}}(j-1 \quad j+1)w_{\alpha_{j-1}} &= (j \quad j+1) = w_{\alpha_j}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the element $\widetilde{\omega}''$ is a product of transpositions of type w_{α_k}, where $k \neq j-2$, $j-1$ and, possibly, the transposition $(j-2\ j)$, and each such transposition can occur only once.

Thus we get a descent

$$(e\ m+1)\omega \to (e \quad e + r_1 + 1)\omega_1\widetilde{\omega},$$

where $\widetilde{\omega}$ satisfies the condition of the lemma. □

Lemma 3.5. *If $\nu = (1m)\nu' \in W_m$, where $\nu' \in S[2, m-1]$ is an $(m-2)$-cycle with $m - 2 \geq 2$, then there is a way $\nu \mapsto \mu$, where μ is an m-cycle and $l(\mu) > m - 1$.*

Proof. Clearly $\nu(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2) = \epsilon_m - \epsilon_k < 0$ and therefore $l(\nu w_{\alpha_1}) < l(\nu)$. Further, $(\nu w_{\alpha_1})^{-1}(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2) = \epsilon_m - \epsilon_{k'} < 0$. Hence $l(w_{\alpha_1}\nu w_{\alpha_1}) < l(\nu w_{\alpha_1})$ and $\nu \rightsquigarrow \mu = w_{\alpha_1}\nu$ is a jump.

Further, the transposition $(1m)$ is the representative of the minimal length of the coset $(1m)S[2, m-1]$, because $(1m)(\alpha_k) = \alpha_k$ for every $k = 2, \dots, m-2$ and therefore $l(\nu) = l((1m)) + l(\nu')$ (see [3, Prop. 2.3.3]). Clearly

$$l(\nu) = l((1m)) + l(\nu') \geq 2m - 3 + m - 3 = 3m - 6 \geq m + 2.$$

Hence $l(\mu) \geq m + 1$. □

Lemma 3.6. *If $\mu \in W_m$ is an m-cycle with $l(\mu) > m-1$, then there is a way $\mu \mapsto \widetilde{\mu} \in S[2,m]$, where $\widetilde{\mu}$ is an $(m-1)$-cycle and $l(\widetilde{\mu}) = m-2$.*

Proof. Since $\mu \mapsto \mu'$ where μ' is an m-cycle with $l(\mu') = m-1$ (see [5, Proposition 3.3]), we may assume $l(\mu) = m+1$. Hence

$$\mu = w_\alpha \mu' w_\alpha$$

for some $\alpha \in \Phi$, where $\Phi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}\}$ is the standard simple root system and for some m-cycle μ' with $l(\mu') = m-1$. Further, there exists a partition $\Phi = \Phi_1 \cup \Phi_2 \cup \{\alpha\}$, where Φ_1, $\Phi_2 \neq \varnothing$, $\Phi_1 \cap \Phi_2 = \varnothing$, $\alpha \notin \Phi_1$, Φ_2, such that

$$\mu = w_\alpha \Big(\prod_{\beta \in \Phi_1} w_\beta \Big) w_\alpha \Big(\prod_{\gamma \in \Phi_2} w_\gamma \Big) w_\alpha.$$

Note,

$$w_\alpha \Big(\prod_{\beta \in \Phi_1} w_\beta \Big) \neq \Big(\prod_{\beta \in \Phi_1} w_\beta \Big) w_\alpha, \quad w_\alpha \Big(\prod_{\gamma \in \Phi_2} \gamma \Big) \neq \Big(\prod_{\gamma \in \Phi_2} w_\gamma \Big) w_\alpha,$$

because otherwise $l(\mu) = m-1$. Hence $w_\alpha \neq (12)$, $(m\ m-1)$, and if $w_\alpha = (i\ i+1)$, $i \neq 1, m-1$, then each set

$$\{w_\beta\}_{\beta \in \Phi_1}, \quad \{w_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Phi_2}$$

contains only one transposition in the set $\{(i-1\ i), (i+1\ \ i+2)\}$ (because only those simple transpositions do not commute with $(i\ i+1)$).

Put

$$\mu_1 = \begin{cases} w_\alpha \Big(\prod_{\beta \in \Phi_1} w_\beta \Big) w_\alpha \Big(\prod_{\gamma \in \Phi_2} w_\gamma \Big) & \text{if} \quad (i-1\ i) \in \{w_\beta\}_{\beta \in \Phi_1}, \\ \Big(\prod_{\beta \in \Phi_1} w_\beta \Big) w_\alpha \Big(\prod_{\gamma \in \Phi_2} w_\gamma \Big) w_\alpha & \text{if} \quad (i-1\ i) \in \{w_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Phi_2}. \end{cases}$$

Then there is a jump $\mu \rightsquigarrow \mu_1$, where μ_1 is an $(m-1)$-cycle in the set $\{1, 2, \dots, i-1, i+1, \dots, m\}$. Moreover, $l(\mu_1) = m$ and

$$\mu_1 = \Big(\prod_{\beta \in \Psi_1} w_\beta \Big) (i-1 \quad i+1) \Big(\prod_{\gamma \in \Psi_2} w_\gamma \Big),$$

where $\Psi_1 \cup \Psi_2 = \Psi = \Phi \setminus \{\epsilon_{i-1} - \epsilon_i, \quad \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1})\}$, $\Psi_1 \cap \Psi_2 = \varnothing$. By commuting with w_β, where $\beta \in \Psi_1$, we may have a non-strict descent $\mu_1 \to \mu_2$, where

$$\mu_2 = (i-1 \quad i+1)\Big(\prod_{\zeta \in \Psi} w_\zeta\Big), \quad l(\mu_2) = m.$$

Put $\delta = \epsilon_{i-1} - \epsilon_i$. Suppose $i - 1 \neq 1$. Then $\mu_2(\delta) = \epsilon_k - \epsilon_i > 0$, $k \leq i - 2$ (because among the roots in Ψ there is the root $\epsilon_{i-2} - \epsilon_{i-1}$), and $\mu_2^{-1}(\delta) = \epsilon_l - \epsilon_i < 0$, $l \geq i + 1$. Hence $l(w_\delta \mu_2 w_\delta) = l(\mu_2) = m$. Put $\mu_3 = w_\delta \mu_2 w_\delta$. We have $\mu_2 \to \mu_3$, where

$$\mu_3 = (i \quad i+1)\Big(\prod_{\zeta' \in \Psi'} w_{\zeta'}\Big)(i-2 \quad i)\Big(\prod_{\zeta'' \in \Psi''} w_{\zeta''}\Big),$$

where $\Psi' \cup \Psi'' = \Psi \setminus \{\epsilon_{i-2} - \epsilon_{i-1}\}$, $\Psi' \cap \Psi'' = \varnothing$. Similar as in the case of the descent $\mu_1 \to \mu_2$ we can get a descent $\mu_3 \to \mu_4$, where

$$\mu_4 = (i-2 \quad i)\Big(\prod_{\chi \in \Delta} w_\chi\Big), \quad l(\mu_4) = m,$$

where $\Delta = \Phi \setminus \{\epsilon_{i-2} - \epsilon_{i-1}, \epsilon_{i-1} - \epsilon_i\}$. Thus, acting similarly, we can get a descent $\mu_4 \to \mu'$, where μ' is an $(m-1)$-cycle of the form

$$\mu' = (13) \prod_{\psi \in \Sigma} w_\psi,$$

where $\Sigma = \Phi \setminus \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2, \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_3\}$. Let $w_{\alpha_1} = w_{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2}$. Then

$$\widetilde{\mu} \overset{\text{def}}{=} w_{\alpha_1} \mu' w_{\alpha_1} = (23) \prod_{\psi \in \Sigma} w_\psi = \prod_{\phi \in \Phi \setminus \{(12)\}} w_\phi.$$

Obviously, $\widetilde{\mu}$ is an $(m-1)$-cycle in $S[2, m]$ and $l(\widetilde{\mu}) = m - 2$. □

Lemma 3.7. *If $\omega = (1m) \in W_m$, then for every k with $1 \leq k \leq m - 1$ there is a way $\omega \mapsto \mu$, where $\mu = (k\ k+1 \ldots m)$.*

Proof. Conjugating ω successively by $(12), (23), \ldots, (k-1 \quad k)$ we get a descent $\omega \to (km)$. Now our statement follows from ([6, Proposition 4.1]). □

Let $w \in W_n$ with $i(w) \geq [\frac{n}{2}]$, and let k be the number of stable points of w. Further, assume

$$w = u_1 \cdots u_s$$

is the decomposition of w into a product of disjoint cycles. Also, let $l_1, \dots, l_s$ be the degrees of the cycles $u_1, \dots, u_s$, respectively. We assume $l_1 = \min\{l_i\}_{i=1}^{s}$.

Case 1. $k \geq 1$, $l_1 > 2$.

Let u_1' be a cycle of length $l_1 - 1$. Put $w_1 = u_1' u_2 \cdots u_s$. Then the number of stable points of w_1 is equal to $k+1$ and $i(w_1) = i(w) - 1 \geq [\frac{n-2}{2}]$. Since the condition of the proposition for the element w and the statement concern all elements of the conjugacy class of w in W_n, we may assume $w_1 \in S[2, n-1]$ (because $k > 1$).

By assumption $\flat$, there is a way $w_0' \mapsto w_2$, where w_0' is the element of maximal length in the group $S[2, n-1]$ and w_2 is an element in the group $S[2, n-1]$ that is conjugate to w_1 in W_n and that satisfies conditions (2) and (3) of $\flat$. By Lemma 3.3, there is a way

$$w_0 = (1n) w_0' \mapsto w_3 = (1n) w_2,$$

where $w_2 = \omega_1 \omega_2 \cdots \omega_s \in S[k+1, n-1]$ is a product of disjoint cycles of degree $l_1 - 1, l_2, \dots, l_s$. Moreover, $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_s$ are products of simple reflections w_{α_i}, where each such reflection can occur not more than once. Also, ω_1 is an $(l_1 - 1)$-cycle in the set $[k+1, k+l_1-1]$. The element w_2 satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.4 (with $w_2 = \omega$, $l_1 - 1 = r_1$, $l_i = r_i$, $i > 2$. $s = d$, $n = m+1$, $e = k$). Hence there is a descent

$$w_3 = (1n) w_2 \to w_4 = (k \quad k + l_1) \omega_1 \widetilde{\omega},$$

where $\widetilde{\omega} \in S[k+l_1+1, n]$ is conjugate to $\omega_2 \omega_3 \cdots \omega_s$ and $\widetilde{\omega} \in S[k+l_1+1, n]$ is a product of basic reflections, where each such reflection can occur not more than once. By Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, there is a way

$$(k \quad k + l_1) \omega_1 \mapsto \omega_1' \in S[k+1, k+l_1],$$

where ω_1' is an l_1-cycle and where $l(\omega_1') = l_1 - 1$. By Lemma 3.3, there is a way

$$w_4 = (k \quad k + l_1) \omega_1 \widetilde{\omega} \mapsto w_5 = \omega_1' \widetilde{\omega} \in S[k+1, n].$$

The process of the construction shows that the element w_5 satisfies the conditions for w' of the proposition.

Case 2. $k = 0$, $s > 1$.

Claim. $i(u_2 \cdots u_s) \geq [\frac{n-2}{2}]$.

Proof. We have

$$i(u_2 \cdots u_s) = (l_2 - 1) + \cdots + (l_s - 1)$$

$$= n - l_1 - s + 1 \geq \frac{n-2}{2} \Leftrightarrow n \geq 2(l_1 + s - 2).$$

Since $l_1 \geq 2$, $s \geq 2$, and $l_1 = \min\{l_i\}$, we obtain

$$n \geq l_1 s = l_1[(s-2)+2] = l_1(s-2)+2l_1 \geq 2(s-2)+2l_1 = 2(l_1+s-2). \quad \square$$

The same arguments as above yield the way

$$w_0 \mapsto (1l_1)\widetilde{\omega} \in S[1, n],$$

where $\widetilde{\omega} \in S[l_1 + 1, n]$ is an element that is conjugate to $u_2 \cdots u_s$ and, using Lemma 3.7, we get the way

$$(1l_1)\widetilde{\omega} \in S[k+1, n] \mapsto w',$$

where w' satisfies the conditions of the proposition.

Case 3. $k = 0$, $l_1 > 2$, $s = 1$.

Again the same arguments as above yield the way

$$w_0 \mapsto (1n)\zeta',$$

where $\zeta' \in S[2, n-1]$ is an $(n-2)$-cycle of length $n - 3$. Thus there is a jump

$$(1n)\zeta' \rightsquigarrow \zeta = (12)(1n)\zeta',$$

where ζ is an n-cycle. Therefore there is a descent

$$\zeta \to w',$$

where w' is an n-cycle of length $n - 1$. $\square$

Proposition 3.8. *Let $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(K)$ or $G = \mathrm{SL}_n(K)$. If $g \in G$ and*

$$\operatorname{rank}(g - \alpha E_n) \geq \left[\frac{n}{2}\right] \quad \textit{for every} \quad \alpha \in K^*,$$

then g is conjugate in G to a block-diagonal matrix

$$R = \mathrm{di}(R_1, R_2, \dots, R_s), \tag{3.3}$$

where each R_i is a cyclic matrix of size n_i (possibly, $n_i = 1$)

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\cdots & 0 \\ \cdots & & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\cdots & 1 \\ a_1 & a_2 & a_3 & \cdots & a_{n_i} \end{pmatrix} \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s}(n_i - 1) \geq \left[\frac{n}{2}\right]. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. Note, that every matrix in G is conjugate to a matrix of the form (3.3) (we may take the rational form). We may assume that we cannot join any two blocks R_i, R_j into one block of the form (3.4). Suppose

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s}(n_i - 1) < \left[\frac{n}{2}\right]. \tag{3.6}$$

Inequality (3.6) implies that there is a block R_i of size one, $n_i = 1$, i.e., $R_i = \alpha \in K^*$. Consider any block R_j, $j \neq i$. If α is not an eigenvalue of R_j, then we can join the blocks R_i, R_j into one block of the form (3.4), which is a contradiction to our assumption. Thus α is an eigenvalue of every block R_j, and therefore

$$\operatorname{rank}(R - \alpha E_n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{s}(n_i - 1). \tag{3.7}$$

Now we have a contradiction of (3.6), (3.7) with the assumption of the proposition. □

Now we can finish the proof of the theorem.

Let $g \in G$ be an element satisfying condition (3.2), and let C_g be its conjugacy class. By Proposition 3.8, $C_g \cap B\dot{w}'B \neq \varnothing$ for some $w' \in W_n$ with $i(w') \geq \left[\frac{n}{2}\right]$. By Proposition 3.7, there is a way $w_0 \mapsto w$, where $w \in W_n$ is an element in the same conjugacy class as w'. Note, that in Proposition 3.8 we can take the block diagonal matrix R corresponding to w. Thus, we may assume $C_g \cap B\dot{w}B \neq \varnothing$. This implies $C_g \cap B\dot{w}_0 B \neq \varnothing$ (see [6] and the Introduction). $\square$

Remark. If $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n(K) \leq \mathrm{GL}_n(\overline{K})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{rank}(g - \alpha E_n) \geq \left[\frac{n}{2}\right] \quad \text{for every} \quad \alpha \in K^* \Leftrightarrow \\ \Leftrightarrow \operatorname{rank}(g - \alpha E_n) \geq \left[\frac{n}{2}\right] \quad \text{for every} \quad \alpha \in \overline{K}^*. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, if $\alpha \in \overline{K} \setminus K$, then α can be an eigenvalue only for blocks of the form (3.4) of size ≥ 2. Hence the inequality $\operatorname{rank}(g - \alpha E_n) \geq \left[\frac{n}{2}\right]$ holds for every such α.

In the following proposition we describe the structure of the affine variety $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$. We assume here $K = \mathfrak{K}$ is an algebraically closed field. Let $g \in \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ be a semisimple element. Then Theorem 3.1 implies $\operatorname{rank}(g - \alpha_0 E_n) < [\frac{n}{2}]$ for some $\alpha_0 \in K^*$. This means that g has an eigenvalue α_0 with multiplicity $m = \left[\frac{n+3}{2}\right]$. Let T be the group of diagonal matrices in G and let

$$T_m = \{\mathrm{di}(\underbrace{\alpha, \alpha, \ldots, \alpha}_{m-\text{times}}, \beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_{n-m}) \mid \alpha, \beta_i \in K\}.$$

Since the semisimple element g has eigenvalue α_0 with multiplicity m, it is conjugate to an element in T_m.

Note, that T_m is a subtorus of T if $m < n$ or $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(K)$, that is T_m is a connected algebraic group. The cases $m = n$ are possible only for $n = 2, 3$, and in these cases the set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ coincides with the center of the group G.

Proposition 3.9. *Let K be an algebraically closed field and let $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(K), \mathrm{SL}_n(K)$. If T is the group of diagonal matrices in G, then*

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{B}} = \overline{\bigcup_{g \in G} gT_m g^{-1}}. \tag{3.8}$$

In particular, if $n > 3$ or $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(K)$, the set $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ is irreducible and

$$\dim \widehat{\mathfrak{B}} = \begin{cases} n^2 - m^2 + 1 & \text{if} \quad G = \mathrm{GL}_n(K), \\ n^2 - m^2 & \text{if} \quad G = \mathrm{SL}_n(K). \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. Let H_1, $H_2 \leq G$ be the subgroups consisting of matrices of the form

$$H_1 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} X & \mid & \mathbf{0}_{(n-m)\times m} \\ -- & \mid & -- \\ \mathbf{0}_{m\times(n-m)} & \mid & \alpha E_m \end{pmatrix} \ \mid \ X \in \mathrm{GL}_{n-m}(K), \alpha \in K^* \right\};$$

(note that $\alpha^m \det X = 1$, $m < n$ if $G = \mathrm{SL}_n(K)$),

$$H_2 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} E_{n-m} & \mid & Y \\ -- & \mid & -- \\ \mathbf{0}_{m\times(n-m)} & \mid & E_m \end{pmatrix} \ \mid \ Y \in M_{(n-m)\times m}(K) \right\}.$$

Obviously, H_1 and H_2 are connected groups and the set $H = H_1H_2 = \{h_1h_2 \mid h_1 \in H_1,\ h_2 \in H_2\}$ is also a group. Thus H is a connected subgroup of G. Further, if S is a maximal torus of H_1, then S is also a maximal torus of H, and the centralizer of S in H coincides with S. Hence the elements that are conjugate to S are dense in H (see [7, 2.2]). On the other hand, the torus S is conjugate to T_m in G (this follows from the definitions of T_m and H). Thus

$$H \subset \overline{\bigcup_{g \in G} gT_m g^{-1}}. \tag{3.10}$$

Further, if $x \in \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$, then the linear operator x satisfies the inequality $\operatorname{rank}(x - \alpha E_n) < [\frac{n}{2}]$ for some $\alpha \in K^*$, and therefore x has at least $m = [\frac{n+3}{2}]$ eigenvectors corresponding to the eigenvalue α. Hence the operator x is conjugate to an element in H. Thus

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{B}} = \bigcup_{g \in G} gHg^{-1}. \tag{3.11}$$

Now (3.10) and (3.11) imply

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{B}} = \overline{\bigcup_{g\in G} gT_m g^{-1}}.$$

The variety $G \times T_m$ is irreducible. Hence the closure of the image of the morphism $\phi : G \times T_m \to G$, given by the formula $\phi(g,t) = gtg^{-1}$, is irreducible. Thus $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ is an irreducible affine variety.

Let $\phi(g_1 \times t_1) = \phi(g_2 \times t_2)$. Then $g_2^{-1}g_1(t_1)g_1^{-1}g_2 = t_2$. Further, since $t_1, t_2 \in T$ are conjugate, $\dot{w}t_2\dot{w}^{-1} = t_1$ for some $w \in W$. Hence $g_2 = g_1c\dot{w}^{-1}$ for some $c \in C_G(t_1)$, and therefore

$$\dim \phi^{-1}(\phi(g_1 \times t_1)) = \dim C_G(t_1). \tag{3.12}$$

Let $t = \mathrm{di}(\underbrace{\alpha, \alpha, \dots, \alpha}_{m-\text{times}}, \beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{n-m})$, where $\alpha \neq \beta_i$ for every i and $\beta_i \neq \beta_j$. The set of such elements t is dense in T_m. Therefore (3.12) implies

$$\dim \widehat{\mathfrak{B}} = \dim T_m + \dim G - \dim C_G(t). \tag{3.13}$$

Further,

$$\dim T_m = \begin{cases} n-m+1 & \text{if } G = \mathrm{GL}_n, \\ n-m & \text{if } G = \mathrm{SL}_n, \end{cases} \tag{3.14}$$

$$\dim C_G(y) = \begin{cases} n-m+m^2 & \text{if } G = \mathrm{GL}_n, \\ n-m-1+m^2 & \text{if } G = \mathrm{SL}_n. \end{cases} \tag{3.15}$$

The formula for $\dim \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ follows from (2.13)–(2.15). □

4. Example II: $Sp_4(K)$

In this section, we consider the case $\mathfrak{K} = K$ and $\widetilde{G} = G = Sp_4(K) \leq GL(V)$, $\dim V = 4$.

Here $\Phi = \Phi(C_2) = \{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2,\ 2\epsilon_2\}$ is the standard simple root system of the root system C_2 (see [2, Table III]). The weights of the representation $G \hookrightarrow GL(V)$ are $\pm\epsilon_1$, $\pm\epsilon_2$. The highest weight is ϵ_1. We fix the basis e_1, e_2, e_{-2}, e_{-1} for V, where $e_{\pm i}$ is the weight vector of the weight $\pm\epsilon_i$. Here the corresponding bilinear form is given by

$$\langle e_i, e_{-i}\rangle = 1, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \langle e_i, e_j\rangle = 0, \quad j \neq -i.$$

The following is a presentation of root subgroups of G:

$$x_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -x \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x_{\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2}(y) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & y & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$x_{2\epsilon_1}(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & s \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad x_{2\epsilon_2}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Further, if char $K \neq 2$, there exist the following nontrivial unipotent conjugacy classes in G:

$C_{\text{reg}} = \{$the conjugacy class of regular unipotent elements$\}$
 = the conjugacy class of $x_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2}(1)x_{2\epsilon_2}(1)$;

$C_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2} = \{$the conjugacy class of short root element $x_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2}(1)\}$
 $= \{$conjugacy class of $\mathfrak{u} = x_{2\epsilon_1}(1)x_{2\epsilon_2}(1)\}$;

$C_{2\epsilon_2} = \{$the conjugacy class of the long root element $x_{2\epsilon_2}(1)\}$;

$C_1 = \{$the conjugacy class of E_4 $\}$.

Moreover we have the following inclusion:

$$C_1 \subset \overline{C}_{2\epsilon_2} \subset \overline{C}_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2} \subset \overline{C}_{\text{reg}}.$$

(see [3, p. 435] and [11, Tables]). Let C be a unipotent class and $u \in C$; the class of $-u$ will be denoted by $-C$.

The group $H = \langle h_{2\epsilon_1}(\alpha), h_{2\epsilon_2}(\beta)\rangle$ is a maximal torus of G and the presentation of elements of H by matrices is the following:

$$h_{2\epsilon_1}(\alpha)h_{2\epsilon_2}(\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \beta^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha^{-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We emphasize the element

$$h_0 = h_{2\epsilon_1}(-1)h_{2\epsilon_2}(1),$$

which is conjugate to $-h_0 = h_{2\epsilon_1}(1)h_{2\epsilon_2}(-1)$. We denote the conjugacy class of h_0 by C_{h_0}.

The general matrix corresponding to the Borel subgroup has the form

$$B(\alpha,\beta,x,y,t,s) = h_{2\epsilon_1}(\alpha)h_{2\epsilon_2}(\beta)x_{2\epsilon_1}(s)x_{2\epsilon_2}(t)x_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2}(x)x_{\epsilon_1+\epsilon_2}(y)$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \alpha x & \alpha y & \alpha c \\ 0 & \beta & \beta t & \beta y - \beta t x \\ 0 & 0 & \beta^{-1} & -\beta^{-1}x \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha^{-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

where c is a polynomial in α,β,x,y,t,s such that for every fixed α,β,x,y,t we can get every value of c in K changing the parameter s. Further, we choose

$$\dot{w}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence

$$\dot{w}_0 B(\alpha,\beta,x,y,t,s) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 & \beta^{-1} & -\beta^{-1}x \\ 0 & -\beta & -\beta t & -\beta y + \beta t x \\ -\alpha & -\alpha x & -\alpha y & -\alpha c \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.1}$$

Note,

$$g \in \mathfrak{B} \Leftrightarrow g \ \text{ is conjugate to a matrix of the form (4.1).}$$

Thus

$$g \in \mathfrak{B} \Rightarrow \operatorname{rank}(g - \alpha E_4) \geq 2 \quad \text{for every} \quad \alpha \in K^*. \tag{4.2}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $G = Sp_4(K)$. If* char $K \neq 2$, *then*

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{B}} = \pm C_1 \cup C_{h_0} \cup \pm C_{2\epsilon_2}.$$

Proof.

Lemma 4.2. *If $g \in G$ is an element that has no eigenvalues ± 1, then $g \in \mathfrak{B}$.*

Proof. Let $g = g_s g_u$ be the Jordan decomposition. We may assume $g_s = h_{2\epsilon_1}(\alpha)h_{2\epsilon_2}(\beta)$. Then $\alpha, \beta \neq \pm 1$. Also $x g_s x^{-1} = \dot{w}_{2\epsilon_1}\dot{w}_{2\epsilon_2}u$ for some $x \in \langle X_{\pm 2\epsilon_1}\rangle \times \langle X_{\pm 2\epsilon_2}\rangle$, $u \in X_{2\epsilon_1} \times X_{2\epsilon_2}$. Thus $g_s \in \mathfrak{B}$. If $g \notin \mathfrak{B}$, then $g \in \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$. Since $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ is closed and G-invariant, the closure of the conjugacy class of g is also in $\widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$. But g_s is in this closure (see[13, II]). This is a contradiction. Hence $g \in \mathfrak{B}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *If* $\mathfrak{u} = x_{2\epsilon_1}(1)x_{2\epsilon_2}(1)$ *and if* $g \in G$ *is an element that is conjugate to* $\pm\mathfrak{u}$, $\pm h_0\mathfrak{u}$, *then* $g \in \mathfrak{B}$.

Proof. The same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

Lemma 4.4. *If* $\alpha \neq \pm 1$, *then* $h_{2\epsilon_1}(\alpha)h_{2\epsilon_2}(\pm 1)x_{2\epsilon_2}(1) \in \mathfrak{B}$.

Proof. The same arguments as in the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

Lemma 4.5. *If* u *is a regular unipotent element, then* $u \in \mathfrak{B}$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 4.3 and the inclusion $C_{\mathfrak{u}} \subset C_{\mathrm{reg}}$ (see also [8]). □

Lemma 4.6. $h_0 \in \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$.

Proof. Consider the natural surjection $\phi : \mathrm{Sp}_4(K) \to \mathrm{SO}_5(K)$. Consider the natural representation of $\mathrm{SO}_5(K)$. One can easily check that $\phi(h_0) = \mathrm{di}(-1,-1,-1,-1,1)$. Also, $\phi(\mathfrak{B}_{\mathrm{Sp}_4}) = \mathfrak{B}_{\mathrm{SO}_5}$ (here $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathrm{Sp}_4}$ and $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathrm{SO}_5}$ are the variety $\mathfrak{B}$ for $\mathrm{Sp}_4(K)$ and $\mathrm{SO}_5(K)$, respectively) and if $g \in \mathfrak{B}_{\mathrm{SO}_5}$, then $\mathrm{rank}\,(g + E_5) \geq 2$. □

Lemma 4.7. *If* δ, $t \in K$, $\delta \neq \pm 1$, $t \neq 0$, *then*

$$h_{2\epsilon_1}(\delta)h_{2\epsilon_2}(\pm 1), \quad \pm h_0 x_{2\epsilon_2}(t) \in \mathfrak{B}.$$

Proof. Let g_x and g_{-x} be two matrices of the form (4.1) (i.e., $g_{\pm x} \in \dot{w}_0 B$) with the following values of parameters $\alpha = \beta = 1, t = 2, y = x, c = 2 - x^2$:

$$g_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -x \\ 0 & -1 & -2 & x \\ -1 & -x & -x & x^2 - 2 \end{pmatrix},$$

and $\alpha = \beta = 1,\ t = -2,\ y = -x,\ c = x^2 - 2$:

$$g_{-x} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -x \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & -x \\ -1 & -x & x & 2 - x^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consider the matrices

$$g_x + E_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & -x \\ 0 & -1 & -1 & x \\ -1 & -x & -x & x^2-1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$g_x - E_4 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & -x \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & -x \\ -1 & -x & x & 1-x^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that $\operatorname{rank}(g_x + E_4) = 2$ and $\operatorname{rank}(g_{-x} - E_4) = 2$. Hence the set of eigenvalues of g_x is $\{-1, -1, \delta, \delta^{-1}\}$ and the set of eigenvalues of g_{-x} is $\{1, 1, \delta, \delta^{-1}\}$. Varying the parameter x we can get any value for $\operatorname{tr} g_{\pm x}$ and, therefore, we can get any value for δ.

If $\delta \neq \pm 1$, then $g_{\pm x}$ are semisimple elements (otherwise the elements $g_{\pm x}$ are conjugate to $h_{2\epsilon_1}(\delta) h_{2\epsilon_2}(\pm 1) x_{2\epsilon_2}(d)$ for some $d \neq 0$, and then $\operatorname{rank}(g_{\pm x} \pm 1) > 2$). Thus, if $\delta \neq \pm 1$, there are semisimple elements $g_{\pm x}$ of the form (4.1) (i.e., $g_{\pm x} \in \mathfrak{B}$) that are conjugate to $h_{2\epsilon_1}(\delta) h_{2\epsilon}(\pm 1)$.

Now we put $x = 2$ and get $\operatorname{tr} g_x = 0$. Then the element g_2 has eigenvalues $\{-1, -1, 1, 1\}$ and therefore the semisimple part of the Jordan decomposition of g_x is conjugate to h_0. Since $h_0 \notin \mathfrak{B}$ (Lemma 4.6) the unipotent part of g_x is not trivial. There are two possibilities: g_x is conjugate to $\pm h_0 x_{2\epsilon_2}(t)$ or to $\pm h_0 \mathfrak{u}$. But in the latter case $\operatorname{rank}(g_x + E_4) = 3$. Hence there is only the possibility that g_x is conjugate to $\pm h_0 x_{2\epsilon_2}(t)$. □

Now we can prove our statement. Obviously, $\pm C_1 = \{\pm E_4\} \subset \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$. Further, if $g \in \pm C_{2\epsilon_2}$, then $\operatorname{rank}(g \pm E_4) = 1$. Hence $\pm C_{2\epsilon_2} \subset \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$, and, by Lemma 4.6, $C_{h_0} \subset \mathfrak{B}$.

Now let $g \in \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ and let $g = g_s g_u$ be its Jordan decomposition. By Lemmas 4.2 and 4.7, the eigenvalues of the element g_s can only be 1 or -1. Thus, $g_s = \pm E_4$ or g_s is conjugate to h_0. In the latter case, $g_u = 1$, by Lemma 4.7. If $g_s = \pm E_4$ then Lemmas 4.3 and 4.5 imply that the unipotent part g_u is either trivial or it is conjugate to $x_{2\epsilon_2}(1)$.

Now the proposition has been proved. □

Now we consider the case char $K = 2$. Here we have the following diagram of unipotent conjugacy classes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & C_{\mathrm{reg}} & \\ & \downarrow & \\ & C_{2\epsilon_1 2\epsilon_2} & \\ \swarrow & & \searrow \\ C_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2} & & C_{2\epsilon_2} \\ \searrow & & \swarrow \\ & C_1 & \end{array}$$

where $C_{2\epsilon_1 2\epsilon_2}$ is the conjugacy class of $x_{2\epsilon_1}(1)x_{2\epsilon_2}(1)$ and where $C_a \to C_b$ means $C_b \subset \overline{C}_a$ (see [11, Tables]).

Proposition 4.8. *Suppose* char $K = 2$. *If* $G = \mathrm{Sp}_4(K)$, *then*

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{B}} = C_1 \cup C_{2\epsilon_2} \cup C_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2}.$$

Proof. Let $g \in G$ and let $g = g_s g_u$ be the Jordan decomposition. If $g_s \neq 1$, then $g_s \notin \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$ (the proof is the same as in the case char $K \neq 2$). Thus we need to check only the unipotent classes. The same arguments as in the case char $K \neq 2$ show that $C_{2\epsilon_1 2\epsilon_2} \subset \mathfrak{B}$, $C_{reg} \subset \mathfrak{B}$, $C_{2\epsilon_2} \subset \widehat{\mathfrak{B}}$. If $C_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2} \subset \mathfrak{B}$, then $c = \dot{w}_0 u$ for some $c \in C_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2}$, $\quad u \in U$. Since $c^2 = 1$ we have

$$1 = \underbrace{(\dot{w}_0 u \dot{w}_0)}_{\in U^-} u \Rightarrow u = 1 \Rightarrow c = \dot{w}_0 = \dot{w}_{2\epsilon_1}\dot{w}_{2\epsilon_2}, \quad \dot{w}_{2\epsilon_1}^2 = \dot{w}_{2\epsilon_2}^2 = 1.$$

The involution $x_{2\epsilon_1}(1)$ is conjugate in $\langle X_{\pm 2\epsilon_1}\rangle$ to $\dot{w}_{\epsilon_1}$ and the involution $x_{2\epsilon_2}(1)$ is conjugate in $\langle X_{\pm 2\epsilon_2}\rangle$ to $\dot{w}_{\epsilon_2}$. Hence the involution $x_{2\epsilon_1}(1)x_{2\epsilon_2}(1)$ is conjugate to c. Therefore, $c \in C_{2\epsilon_1 2\epsilon_2}$ and $c \in C_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2}$. This is a contradiction and therefore $C_{\epsilon_1-\epsilon_2} \nsubseteq \mathfrak{B}$. □

References

1. A. Borel, *Linear Algebraic groups.* 2nd enl.ed. Graduate texts in mathematics **126**. Springer-Verlag New York Inc., 1991.
2. N. Bourbaki, *Éléments de Mathématique. Groupes et Algèbres de Lie.* Chap. IV, V, VI, 2ème édition. Masson, Paris, 1981.
3. R. W. Carter, *Finite Groups of Lie Type.* Conjugacy Classes and Complex Characters. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester et al., 1985.

4. Key Yuen Chan, Jiang-Hua Lu, Simon Kai Ming To, *On intersections of conjugacy classes and Bruhat cells.* — Transformation groups **15**(2) (2010), 243–260.
5. E. W. Ellers, N. Gordeev, *Intersection of conjugacy classes with Bruhat cells in Chevalley groups.* — Pacific J. Math. **214**(2) (2004), 245–261.
6. E. W. Ellers, N. Gordeev, *Intersection of conjugacy classes with Bruhat cells in Chevalley groups: The cases* $\mathrm{SL}_n(K), \mathrm{GL}_n(K)$. — J. Pure and Appl. Algebra **209** (2007), 703–723.
7. J. E. Humphreys, *Linear Algebraic Groups.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics 21. Springer-Verlag New York–Heidelberg–Berlin, 1975.
8. N. Kawanaka, *Unipotent elements and characters of finite Chevalley groups.* — Osaka J. Math. **12**(2) (1975), 523–554.
9. G. Lusztig, *From conjugacy classes in the Weyl Group to unipotent classes.* arXiv:1003.0412v4 (2010).
10. G. Lusztig, *On C-small conjugacy classes in a reductive group.* arXiv:1005.4313v1 (2010).
11. J. N. Spaltenstein, *Classes unipotentes et sous-groupes de Borel.* — Lect. Notes Math **946**. Springer-Verlag. Berlin–Heidelberg –New York, 1980.
12. T. A. Springer, *Linear Algebraic Groups.* 2nd edition. Progress in Mathematics 9. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston MA, 1998.
13. T. A. Springer, R. Steinberg, *Conjugacy classes.* — In: A. Borel et al. Seminar on Algebraic Groups and Related Finite Groups. Part E. Lect. Notes Math. **131** Springer-Verlag. Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, 1970.
14. R. Steinberg, *Regular elements of semisimple algebraic groups.* — Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. **25** (1965) 49–80.
15. N. A. Vavilov, *Bruhat decomposition of two-dimensional transformations.* — Vestnik Leningrad. Univ. Mat. Mekh. Astronom. **3** (1989), 3–7; transl. in Vestnik Leningrad Univ. Math. **22**, No. 3 (1989), 1–6.
16. N. A. Vavilov, A. A. Semenov, *Bruhat decomposition for long root tori in Chevalley groups.*— Zap. Nauchn. Semin. LOMI **175** (1989), 12–23.

Russian State Pedagogical
University, Moijka 48, 191186 St.Petersburg, Russia
E-mail: nickgordeev@mail.ru

Поступило 9 ноября 2010 г.

Department of Mathematics,
University of Toronto, 40 St. George Street,
Toronto, Ontario M5S 2E4, Canada
E-mail: ellers@math.toronto.edu