

Cellularity of endomorphism algebras of Young permutation modules.

Stephen Donkin

Department of Mathematics, University of York, York YO10 5DD

`stephen.donkin@york.ac.uk`

3 June 2020

Abstract

Let E be an n -dimensional vector space. Then the symmetric group $\text{Sym}(n)$ acts on E by permuting the elements of a basis and hence on the r -fold tensor product $E^{\otimes r}$. Bowman, Doty and Martin ask, in [1], whether the endomorphism algebra $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(E^{\otimes r})$ is cellular. The module $E^{\otimes r}$ is the permutation module for a certain Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set. We shall show that the endomorphism algebra of the permutation module on an arbitrary Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set is a cellular algebra. We determine, in terms of the point stabilisers which appear, when the endomorphism algebra is quasi-hereditary.

1 Introduction

We fix a positive integer n . The symmetric group of degree n is denoted $\text{Sym}(n)$. For a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ of n we have the Young subgroup, i.e. the group $\text{Sym}(\lambda) = \text{Sym}(\lambda_1) \times \text{Sym}(\lambda_2) \times \dots$, regarded as a subgroup of $\text{Sym}(n)$ in the usual way. By a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set we mean a finite $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set such that each point stabiliser is conjugate to a Young subgroup. Let R be a commutative ring. Our interest is in the endomorphism algebra $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(R\Omega)$ of the permutation module $R\Omega$ on a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set Ω . We shall show that $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(\mathbb{Z}\Omega)$ has a cellular structure, Theorem 6.4, hence by base change so has $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(R\Omega)$, for an arbitrary commutative ring R .

Taking the base ring now to be a field k of positive characteristic, we give a criterion for $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(k\Omega)$ to be a quasi-hereditary algebra, in terms of the set of partitions λ of n for which $\text{Sym}(\lambda)$ occurs as a point stabiliser, and the characteristic p of k , see Theorem 6.4. This is applied to the case $\Omega = I(n, r)$, the set of maps from $\{1, \dots, r\}$ to $\{1, \dots, n\}$, for a positive integer r , with $\text{Sym}(n)$ acting by composition of maps. The permutation module $kI(n, r)$ may be regarded as the r th tensor power $E^{\otimes r}$ of an n -dimensional vector space E , and we thus determine when $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(E^{\otimes r})$ is quasi-hereditary, see Proposition 7.3.

Our procedure is to analyse the endomorphism algebra of a Young permutation module in the spirit of the Schur algebra $S(n, r)$ (which is a special case). Of particular importance to us will be the fact that the Schur algebras is quasi-hereditary. There are several approaches to this (see e.g. [5, Section A5] and [18]) but for us the most convenient is that of Green, [9]. This has the advantage of being a purely combinatorial account carried out over an arbitrary commutative base ring. So we regard what follows as a modest generalisation of some aspects of [9]: we follow Green's approach and notation to a large extent.

2 Preliminaries

We write $\text{mod}(S)$ for the category of finitely generated modules over a ring S .

Let G be a finite group and K a field of characteristic 0. Let X be a finitely generated KG -module. Suppose that all composition factors of X are absolutely irreducible. Let U_1, \dots, U_d be a complete set of pairwise non-isomorphic composition factors of X . We write X as a direct sum of simple modules $X = X_1 \oplus \dots \oplus X_h$. For $1 \leq i \leq d$ let m_i be the number of elements $r \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ such that X_r is isomorphic to U_i . Let $S = \text{End}_G(X)$. Then S is isomorphic to the product of the matrix algebras $M_{m_1}(K), \dots, M_{m_d}(K)$. Let the corresponding irreducible modules for S be L_1, \dots, L_d . We have an exact functor from $f : \text{mod}(KG) \rightarrow \text{mod}(S)$, given on objects by $f(Z) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(X, Z)$. Moreover we have $S = f(X) = \bigoplus_{r=1}^h \text{Hom}_G(X, X_r)$. It follows that the modules $L_i = fU_i = \text{Hom}_G(X, U_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq d$, form a complete set of pairwise non-isomorphic irreducible S -modules.

The situation in positive characteristic is similar, cf. [8, (3.4) Proposition]. Suppose now that F is any field which is a splitting field for G . Let Y be a finitely generated KG -module such that every indecomposable component is absolutely indecomposable. Let V_1, \dots, V_e be a complete set of pairwise non-isomorphic indecomposable summands of Y . We write Y as a direct sum of indecomposable modules $Y = Y_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Y_k$. For $1 \leq j \leq e$ let n_j be the number of elements $r \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that X_r is isomorphic to V_j . Let $T = \text{End}_G(Y)$. Then each $P_j = \text{Hom}_G(Y, V_j)$ is naturally a T -module and the modules P_1, \dots, P_e form a complete set of pairwise non-isomorphic projective T -modules. Let N_j be the head of P_j , $1 \leq j \leq e$. Then the modules N_1, \dots, N_e form a complete set of pairwise non-isomorphic irreducible T -modules. The dimension of N_j over F is n_j .

We now fix a positive integer n . We write $\text{Par}(n)$ for the set of partitions of n . By the support $\zeta(\Omega)$ of a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set Ω we mean the set of $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$ such that the Young subgroup $\text{Sym}(\lambda)$ is a point stabiliser. Let

R be a commutative ring. For a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set Ω we write $S_{\Omega,R}$ for the endomorphism algebra $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(R\Omega)$ of the permutation module $R\Omega$. For $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$ we write $M(\lambda)_R$ for the permutation module $R\text{Sym}(n)/\text{Sym}(\lambda)$.

We have the usual dominance partial order \leq on $\text{Par}(n)$. Thus, for $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots), \mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots) \in \text{Par}(n)$, we write $\lambda \leq \mu$ if $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_a \leq \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_a$ for all $1 \leq a \leq n$.

Recall that the Specht modules $\text{Sp}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}, \lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$, form a complete set of pairwise irreducible $\mathbb{Q}\text{Sym}(n)$ -modules. For $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$ we have $M(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}} = \text{Sp}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}} \oplus C$, where C is a direct sum of modules of the form $\text{Sp}(\mu)$ with $\lambda \triangleleft \mu$, and moreover every Specht module $\text{Sp}(\mu)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $\lambda \triangleleft \mu$ occurs in C (see for example [12, 14.1]).

For a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set Ω we define

$$\zeta^{\geq}(\Omega) = \{\mu \in \text{Par}(n) \mid \mu \geq \lambda \text{ for some } \lambda \in \zeta(\Omega)\}.$$

Thus the composition factors of $\mathbb{Q}\Omega$ are $\{\text{Sp}(\mu)_{\mathbb{Q}} \mid \mu \in \zeta^{\geq}(\Omega)\}$ and, setting $\nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}} = \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(\mathbb{Q}\Omega, \text{Sp}(\mu)_{\mathbb{Q}})$, we have the following.

Lemma 2.1. *The modules $\nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}, \lambda \in \zeta^{\geq}(\Omega)$, form a complete set of pairwise non-isomorphic irreducible $S_{\Omega,\mathbb{Q}}$ -modules.*

Remark 2.2. *Since $S_{\Omega,\mathbb{Q}}$ is a direct sum of matrix algebras over \mathbb{Q} it is semisimple, all irreducible modules are absolutely irreducible and $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} S_{\Omega,\mathbb{Q}} = \sum_{\lambda \in \zeta^{\geq}(\Omega)} (\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}})^2$.*

We now let k be a field of characteristic $p > 0$. For $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$ we have the Young module $Y(\lambda)$ for $k\text{Sym}(n)$, labelled by λ , as described in [5, Section 4.4] for example. Then we have $M(\lambda)_k = Y(\lambda) \oplus C$, where C is a direct sum of Young modules $Y(\mu)$, with $\lambda \triangleleft \mu$, see for example [5, Section 4.4 (1) (v)]. A partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ will be called p -restricted (also called column p -regular) if $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} < p$ for all $i \geq 1$. A partition λ has a unique expression

$$\lambda = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \lambda(i)$$

where each $\lambda(i)$ is a p -restricted partition. This is called the base p (or p -adic) expansion of λ .

We write $\Lambda(n)$ for the set of all n -tuples of non-negative integers. An expression $\lambda = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \gamma(i)$, with all $\gamma(i) \in \Lambda(n)$ (but not necessarily restricted) will be called a weak p expansion.

For an n -tuple of non-negative integers γ we write $\overline{\gamma}$ for the partition obtained by arranging the entries in descending order.

Definition 2.3. *For $\lambda, \mu \in \text{Par}(n)$ we shall say that μ p -dominates λ , and write $\mu \geq_p \lambda$ (or $\lambda \leq_p \mu$) if there exists a weak p expansion $\lambda = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \gamma(i)$, such that $\mu(i) \geq \overline{\gamma(i)}$ for all $i \geq 0$, where $\mu = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \mu(i)$ is the base p expansion of μ .*

Note that $\lambda \leq_p \mu$ implies $\lambda \leq \mu$.

By [4, Section 3, Remark], for $\lambda, \mu \in \text{Par}(n)$, then module $Y(\mu)$ appears as a component of $M(\lambda)_k$ if and only if $\lambda \leq_p \mu$. For a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set Ω we define

$$\zeta^{\geq p}(\Omega) = \{\mu \in \text{Par}(n) \mid \mu \succeq_p \lambda \text{ for some } \lambda \in \zeta(\Omega)\}.$$

Writing $P(\mu) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(k\Omega, Y(\mu))$ and writing $L(\mu)$ for the head of $P(\lambda)$, for $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq p}(\Omega)$ we have the following.

Lemma 2.4. *The modules $L(\mu)$, $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq p}(\Omega)$, form a complete set of pairwise non-isomorphic irreducible $S_{\Omega, k}$ -modules.*

3 Basic Constructions

We fix a positive integer n and a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set Ω . Here we assume the base ring R is either the ring integers \mathbb{Z} or the field of rational numbers \mathbb{Q} . We write $M_{\Omega, R}$, or just M_R for the permutation module $R\Omega$ over $R\text{Sym}(n)$. We also just write M for $M_{\Omega, \mathbb{Z}}$. We shall sometimes write simply S_R for $S_{\Omega, R}$ and just S for $S_{\mathbb{Z}}$. We identify S with a subring or $S_{\mathbb{Q}}$ in the natural way.

Let $\{\emptyset_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Lambda_\Omega\}$ be a complete set of orbits in Ω . For $\lambda \in \zeta(\Omega)$ we pick $\alpha(\lambda) \in \Lambda_\Omega$ such that $\text{Sym}(\lambda)$ is a point stabiliser of some element of \emptyset_α .

We put $M_{\alpha, R} = R\emptyset_\alpha$, and sometimes write just M_α for $M_{\alpha, \mathbb{Z}}$, for $\alpha \in \Lambda_\Omega$. For $\beta \in \Lambda_\Omega$ we define the element ξ_β of S_R to be the projection onto $M_{\beta, R}$ coming from the decomposition $M_R = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda_\Omega} M_{\alpha, R}$. Then each ξ_α is idempotent and we have the orthogonal decomposition:

$$1_S = \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda_\Omega} \xi_\alpha.$$

For a left S_R -module V and $\beta \in \Lambda_\Omega$ we have the β weight space ${}^\beta V = \xi_\beta V$ and the weight space decomposition

$$V = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda_\Omega} {}^\alpha V.$$

For $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$ we define

$$\lambda_V = \begin{cases} \xi_{\alpha(\lambda)} V, & \text{if } \lambda \in \zeta(\Omega); \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Similar remarks apply to weight spaces of right S_R -modules.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\lambda \in \zeta^{\geq}(\Omega)$. Then*

- (i) $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} {}^\lambda \nabla_\Omega(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}} = 1$; and
- (ii) if $\mu \in \text{Par}(n)$ and ${}^\mu \nabla_\Omega(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}} \neq 0$ then $\mu \leq \lambda$.

Proof. Let $\mu \in \text{Par}(n)$ and suppose ${}^\mu\nabla_\Omega(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q} \neq 0$. Thus $\xi_\mu \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M_\mathbb{Q}, \text{Sp}(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q}) \neq 0$ i.e. $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M(\mu)_\mathbb{Q}, \text{Sp}(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q}) \neq 0$ and so $\mu \succeq \lambda$, giving (ii). Moreover

$$\xi_\lambda \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M_\mathbb{Q}, \text{Sp}(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q}) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q}, \text{Sp}(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q}$$

giving (i). □

For $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$ we set

$$\xi_\lambda = \begin{cases} \xi_{\alpha(\lambda)}, & \text{if } \lambda \in \zeta(\Omega) : \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$ we set $S_R(\lambda) = S_R \xi_\lambda S_R$ and for $\sigma \subseteq \text{Par}(n)$ set

$$S_R(\sigma) = \sum_{\lambda \in \sigma} S_R(\lambda).$$

We also write simply $S(\lambda)$ for $S_\mathbb{Z}(\lambda)$ and $S(\sigma)$ for $S_\mathbb{Z}(\sigma)$.

Let \leq be a partial order on $\text{Par}(n)$ which is a refinement of the dominance partial order. For $\lambda \in \zeta(\Omega)$ we set $S_R(\geq \lambda) = S_R(\sigma)$, where $\sigma = \{\mu \in \text{Par}(n) \mid \mu \geq \lambda\}$, and $S_R(> \lambda) = S_R(\tau)$, where $\tau = \{\mu \in \text{Par}(n) \mid \mu > \lambda\}$. Thus

$$S_R(\geq \lambda) = S_R \xi_\lambda S_R + S_R(> \lambda).$$

We set $V_R(\lambda) = S_R(\geq \lambda) / S_R(> \lambda)$. So we have

$$V_R(\lambda)^\lambda = (S_R \xi_\lambda + S_R(> \lambda)) / S_R(> \lambda),$$

$${}^\lambda V_R(\lambda) = (\xi_\lambda S_R + S_R(> \lambda)) / S_R(> \lambda)$$

and the multiplication map $S_R \xi_\lambda \times \xi_\lambda S_R \rightarrow S_R$ induces a surjective map

$$\phi_R(\lambda) : V_R(\lambda)^\lambda \otimes_R {}^\lambda V_R(\lambda) \rightarrow V_R(\lambda).$$

For left S_R -modules P, Q and $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$ we define $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^\lambda(P, Q)$ to be the R -submodule of $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(P, Q)$ spanned by all composite maps $f \circ g$, with $f \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M(\lambda)_R, Q)$ and $g \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(P, M(\lambda)_R)$. For a subset σ of $\text{Par}(n)$ we set

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^\sigma(P, Q) = \sum_{\lambda \in \sigma} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^\lambda(P, Q).$$

We note some similarity of our approach here via these groups of homomorphisms with the approach to Schur algebras due to Erdmann, [6] via stratification.

For $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$ we define $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\geq \lambda}(P, Q) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\sigma}(P, Q)$, where $\sigma = \{\mu \in \text{Par}(n) \mid \mu \geq \lambda\}$, and $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{> \lambda}(P, Q) = \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\tau}(P, Q)$, where $\tau = \{\mu \in \text{Par}(n) \mid \mu > \lambda\}$.

Note that if $\lambda \notin \zeta(\Omega)$ then $V_R(\lambda) = 0$. Suppose $\lambda \in \zeta(\Omega)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_R \xi_{\lambda} S_R &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \Lambda_{\Omega}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M_{\alpha, R}, M_{\beta, R}) \xi_{\lambda} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M_{\gamma, R}, M_{\delta, R}) \\ &= \sum_{\alpha, \delta \in \Lambda_{\Omega}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M_{\alpha, R}, M_{\alpha(\lambda)}) \xi_{\lambda} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M_{\alpha(\lambda)}, M_{\delta, R}) \\ &= \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda_{\Omega}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\lambda}(M_{\alpha, R}, M_{\beta, R}) \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$S_R(\sigma) = \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda_{\Omega}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\sigma}(M_{\alpha, R}, M_{\beta, R}) \quad (1)$$

for $\sigma \subseteq \text{Par}(n)$. In particular we have

$$S_R(\geq \lambda) = \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda_{\Omega}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\geq \lambda}(M_{\alpha, R}, M_{\beta, R})$$

and

$$S_R(> \lambda) = \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda_{\Omega}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{> \lambda}(M_{\alpha, R}, M_{\beta, R})$$

and hence

$$V_R(\lambda) = \bigoplus_{\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda_{\Omega}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\geq \lambda}(M_{\alpha, R}, M_{\beta, R}) / \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{> \lambda}(M_{\alpha, R}, M_{\beta, R}). \quad (2)$$

Example 3.2. *Of crucial importance is the motivating example of the usual Schur algebra $S(n, r)$. Let R be a commutative ring and let E_R be a free R -module of rank n . Then $\text{Sym}(r)$ acts on the r -fold tensor product $E_R^{\otimes r} = E_R \otimes \cdots \otimes_R E_R$ by place permutation, and the Schur algebra $S_R(n, r)$ may be realised as $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(r)}(E_R^{\otimes r})$.*

We choose an R -basis e_1, \dots, e_n of E_R . We write $I(n, r)$ for the set of maps from $\{1, \dots, r\}$ to $\{1, \dots, n\}$. We regard $i \in I(n, r)$ as an r -tuple of elements (i_1, \dots, i_r) with entries in $\{1, \dots, n\}$ (where $i_a = i(a)$, $1 \leq a \leq r$). The group $\text{Sym}(r)$ acts on $I(n, r)$ composition of maps, i.e. by $w \cdot i = i \circ w^{-1}$, for $w \in \text{Sym}(r)$, $i \in I(n, r)$. Moreover, for $i \in I(n, r)$, $w \in \text{Sym}(r)$, we have $w \cdot e_i = e_{i \circ w^{-1}}$.

We may thus regard $E_R^{\otimes r}$ as the $R\text{Sym}(r)$ permutation module $R\Omega$ on $\Omega = I(n, r)$. Note that $\zeta(\Omega) = \Lambda^+(n, r)$, the set of partitions of r with at most n parts. We write $\Lambda(n, r)$ for the set of weights, i.e. the set of n -tuples of non-negative integers $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ such that $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n = r$. An element i of $I(n, r)$ has weight $\text{wt}(i) = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \Lambda(n, r)$, where $\alpha_a = |i^{-1}(a)|$, for $1 \leq a \leq n$. For $\alpha \in \Lambda(n, r)$ we have the orbit \mathcal{O}_{α} consisting of all $i \in I(n, r)$ such that $\text{wt}(i) = \alpha$. Then $R\Omega = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Lambda(n, r)} R\mathcal{O}_{\alpha}$.

4 Groups of homomorphisms between Young permutation modules

In the situation of the Example 3.2 it follows from the quasi-hereditary structure of $S_{\mathbb{Z}}(n, r)$ that $V_{\mathbb{Z}}(\lambda)$ is a free abelian group - indeed an explicit basis is given by Green in [9, (7.3) Theorem, (ii),(iii)]. Thus, taking $r = n$, from Section 3, (2), we have the following.

Lemma 4.1. *For all $\lambda, \mu, \tau \in \text{Par}(n)$ the quotient*

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\geq \lambda}(M(\mu), M(\tau)) / \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\geq \lambda}(M(\mu), M(\tau))$$

is torsion free.

We can improve on this somewhat. A subset σ of $\text{Par}(n)$ will be called co-saturated (also said to be a co-ideal) if whenever $\lambda, \mu \in \sigma$, $\lambda \in \sigma$ and $\lambda \leq \mu$ then $\mu \in \sigma$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let σ, τ be cosaturated subsets of $\text{Par}(n)$ with the $\tau \subseteq \sigma$. Then, for all $\mu, \nu \in \text{Par}(n)$, the quotient*

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\sigma}(M(\mu), M(\nu)) / \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\tau}(M(\mu), M(\nu))$$

is torsion free.

Proof. If there is a co-saturated subset θ with $\tau \subset \theta \subset \sigma$ (and $\theta \neq \sigma, \tau$) and if

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\sigma}(M(\mu), M(\nu)) / \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\theta}(M(\mu), M(\nu))$$

and

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\theta}(M(\mu), M(\nu)) / \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\tau}(M(\mu), M(\nu))$$

are torsion free then so is

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\sigma}(M(\mu), M(\nu)) / \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\tau}(M(\mu), M(\nu)).$$

Thus we are reduced to the case $\tau = \sigma \setminus \{\lambda\}$, where λ is a maximal element of σ . We choose a total order \preceq on $\text{Par}(n)$ refining \leq such that, writing out the elements of $\text{Par}(n)$ in descending order $\lambda^1 \succ \lambda^2 \cdots \succ \lambda^h$ we have $\tau = \{\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^k\}$, $\sigma = \{\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^{k+1}\}$ (so $\lambda = \lambda^{k+1}$) for some k . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\sigma}(M(\mu), M(\nu)) / \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\tau}(M(\mu), M(\nu)) \\ &= \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\geq \lambda}(M(\mu), M(\nu)) / \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}^{\succ \lambda}(M(\mu), M(\nu)) \end{aligned}$$

which is torsion free by the Lemma. □

Returning to the general situation we have, by the Proposition and Section 3, (2), the following results.

Corollary 4.3. *The S -module $V(\lambda)$ is torsion free.*

Corollary 4.4. *Let σ be cosaturated set (with respect to \leq). Then $S(\sigma)$ is a pure submodule of S .*

5 Cosaturated $\text{Sym}(n)$ -sets

From Corollary 4.4, if σ is any co-saturated subset of $\text{Par}(n)$ then we may identify $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} S(\sigma)$ with an $S_{\Omega, \mathbb{Q}}$ -submodule of $S_{\Omega, \mathbb{Q}}$ via the natural map $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} S(\sigma) \rightarrow S_{\mathbb{Q}}$.

We now suppose that Ω is cosaturated, by which we mean that $\zeta(\Omega)$ is a cosaturated subset of $\text{Par}(n)$. We check that much of the structure, described by Green for the Schur algebras in [9], still stands in this more general case.

Let σ be a co-saturated subset of the support $\zeta(\Omega)$ of Ω . Let $\mu \in \zeta(\Omega)$. If $\nabla_{\Omega}(\mu)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a composition factor of $S(\sigma)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ then it is a composition factor of $S(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and hence of $S_{\mathbb{Q}}\xi_{\lambda}$, for some $\lambda \in \sigma$. Hence we have $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(S_{\mathbb{Q}}\xi_{\lambda}, \nabla_{\Omega}(\mu)_{\mathbb{Q}}) \neq 0$ and so $\mu \geq \lambda$, Lemma 3.1(ii), and therefore $\mu \in \sigma$.

We fix $\lambda \in \zeta(\Omega)$. Then $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(S_{\mathbb{Q}}\xi_{\lambda}, \nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}) = {}^{\lambda}\nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q}$, by Lemma 3.1(i), so that $\nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a composition factor of $S(\geq \lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}$, but not of $S(> \lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Now we can write $S(\geq \lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}} = S(> \lambda) \oplus I$ for some ideal I which, as a left $S_{\mathbb{Q}}$ -module, has only the composition factor $\nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Hence I is isomorphic to the matrix algebra $M_d(\mathbb{Q})$, where $d = \dim \nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}$, and, as a left $S_{\mathbb{Q}}$ -module $S(\geq \lambda)/S(> \lambda)$ is a direct sum of d copies of $\nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} {}^{\lambda}V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) &= \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(S_{\mathbb{Q}}\xi_{\lambda}, V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)) \\ &= d \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(S_{\mathbb{Q}}\xi_{\lambda}, \nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}) \\ &= d \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} {}^{\lambda}\nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}} = d. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\dim V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)^{\lambda} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} {}^{\lambda}V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) = \dim V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)$ and we have:

$$\text{the natural map } V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)^{\lambda} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} {}^{\lambda}V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) \rightarrow V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) \text{ is an isomorphism.} \quad (1)$$

We now consider the integral version. We have the natural surjective map $V(\lambda)^{\lambda} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} {}^{\lambda}V(\lambda) \rightarrow V(\lambda)$. But the rank of $V(\lambda)^{\lambda}$ is the dimension of $V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)^{\lambda}$, the rank of ${}^{\lambda}V(\lambda)$ is the dimension of ${}^{\lambda}V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)$, and the rank of $V(\lambda)$ is the dimension of $V_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda)$ so that, by (1), $V(\lambda)^{\lambda} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} {}^{\lambda}V(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$ have the same rank. Thus the surjective map $V(\lambda)^{\lambda} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} {}^{\lambda}V(\lambda) \rightarrow V(\lambda)$ is an isomorphism.

We have shown the following.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume Ω is cosaturated. Then, for each $\lambda \in \text{Par}(n)$, the map*

$$V(\lambda)^{\lambda} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} {}^{\lambda}V(\lambda) \rightarrow V(\lambda)$$

induced by multiplication in S , is an isomorphism.

Remark 5.2. *If k is a field then the corresponding algebras $S_{\Omega, k}$ over k are Morita equivalent to those considered by Mathas and Soriano in [15]. There they determined blocks of such algebras (for the Schur algebras themselves this was done in [3], and for the quantised case by Cox in [2]).*

6 Cellularity of endomorphism algebras of Young permutation modules

We now establish our main result, namely that the endomorphism algebra of a Young permutation module has the structure of a cellular algebra. We first recall the notion of a cellular algebra due to Graham and Lehrer, [7]. (We have made some minor notational changes to be consistent with the notation above. The most serious of these is the reversal of the partial order from the definition given in [7].)

Definition 6.1. *Let A be an algebra over a commutative ring R . A cell datum for $(\Lambda^+, N, C, *)$ for A consists of the following.*

- (C1) *A partially ordered set Λ^+ and for each $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ a finite set $N(\lambda)$ and an injective map $C : \coprod_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+} N(\lambda) \times N(\lambda) \rightarrow A$ with image an R -basis of A .*
- (C2) *For $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ and $t, u \in N(\lambda)$ we write $C(t, u) = C_{t,u}^\lambda \in R$. Then $*$ is an R -linear anti-involution of A such that $(C_{t,u}^\lambda)^* = C_{u,t}^\lambda$.*
- (C3) *If $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ and $t, u \in N(\lambda)$ then for any element $a \in A$ we have*

$$aC_{t,u}^\lambda \equiv \sum_{t' \in N(\lambda)} r_a(t', t)C_{t',u}^\lambda \pmod{A(> \lambda)}$$

where $r_a(t', t) \in R$ is independent of u and where $A(> \lambda)$ is the R -submodule of A generated by $\{C_{t'',u''}^\mu \mid \mu \in \Lambda^+, \mu > \lambda \text{ and } t'', u'' \in N(\mu)\}$.

We say that A is a cellular R -algebra if it admits a cell datum.

Let G be a finite group. Let Ω be a finite G -set and let R be a commutative ring. Now G acts on $\Omega \times \Omega$. If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \Omega \times \Omega$ is G -stable then we have an element $a_{\mathcal{A}} \in \text{End}_G(R\Omega)$ satisfying

$$a_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \sum_y y$$

where the sum is over all $y \in \Omega$ such that $(y, x) \in \mathcal{A}$. We write $\text{Orb}_G(\Omega \times \Omega)$ for the set of G -orbits in $\Omega \times \Omega$. Then $\text{End}_{RG}(R\Omega)$ free over R on basis $a_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\mathcal{A} \in \text{Orb}_G(\Omega \times \Omega)$. We have an involution on $\Omega \times \Omega$ defined by $(x, y)^* = (y, x)$, $x, y \in \Omega$. For a G -stable subset \mathcal{A} of $\Omega \times \Omega$ we write \mathcal{A}^* for the G -stable set $\{(x, y)^* \mid (x, y) \in \mathcal{A}\}$.

For $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \text{Orb}_G(\Omega \times \Omega)$ we have

$$a_{\mathcal{A}}a_{\mathcal{B}} = \sum_{\mathcal{C} \in \text{Orb}_G(\Omega \times \Omega)} n_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{C}} a_{\mathcal{C}}$$

where, for fixed $x \in \mathcal{A}$, $y \in \mathcal{B}$, the coefficient $n_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the cardinality of the set $\{z \in \mathcal{C} \mid (x, z) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } (z, y) \in \mathcal{B}\}$. It follows that $\text{End}_{RG}(R\Omega)$ has an involutory anti-automorphism satisfying $a_{\mathcal{D}}^* = a_{\mathcal{D}^*}$, for a G -stable subset

\mathcal{D} of $\Omega \times \Omega$. The notion of cellularity has built into it an involutory anti-automorphism $*$ and in the case of endomorphism algebras of permutation modules, we shall always use the one just defined.

We now restrict to the case $G = \text{Sym}(n)$ with Ω a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set as usual and label by \mathcal{O}_α , $\alpha \in \Lambda_\Omega$, the G -orbits in Ω . Now, for $\alpha \in \Lambda_\Omega$ and $x \in \Omega$ we have

$$\xi_\alpha(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence $\xi_\alpha = a_{\mathcal{A}}$, where $\mathcal{A} = \{(x, x) \mid x \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha\}$ and therefore $\xi_\alpha^* = \xi_\alpha$. In particular we have $\xi_\lambda^* = \xi_\lambda$ for $\lambda \in \zeta(\Omega)$. Thus we also have $S_{\Omega, R}(\sigma)^* = S_{\Omega, R}(\sigma)$, for $\sigma \subseteq \text{Par}(n)$.

Note that if Γ is a G -stable subset of Ω then we have the idempotent $e_\Gamma \in S_{\Omega, R}$ given on elements of Ω by

$$e_\Gamma(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \in \Gamma; \\ 0, & \text{if } x \notin \Gamma. \end{cases}$$

Thus $e_\Gamma = a_{\mathcal{C}}$ where $\mathcal{C} = \{(y, y) \mid y \in \Gamma\}$ and $e_\Gamma^* = e_\Gamma$.

So now let Γ be a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set and let Ω be a co-saturated Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set containing Γ . We have the idempotent $e = e_\Gamma \in S_{\Omega, R}$ as above and $S_{\Gamma, R} = \text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(R\Gamma)$ is naturally identified with $eS_{\Omega, R}e$.

Lemma 6.2. *For $\lambda \in \zeta(\Omega)$ we have $e\nabla_\Omega(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q} \neq 0$ if and only if $\lambda \in \zeta^\triangleleft(\Gamma)$.*

Proof. We have $e = \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda_\Gamma} \xi_\alpha$. Hence $e\nabla_\Omega(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q} \neq 0$ if and only if $\xi_\alpha \nabla_\Omega(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q} \neq 0$ i.e. $\sum_{\beta \in \Lambda_\Omega} \xi_\alpha \text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M_{\beta, \mathbb{Q}}, \text{Sp}(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q}) \neq 0$, for some $\alpha \in \Lambda_\Gamma$. Hence $e\nabla_\Omega(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q} \neq 0$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M_{\beta, \mathbb{Q}}, \text{Sp}(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q}) \neq 0$ for some $\beta \in \Lambda_\Gamma$, i.e. if and only if $\text{Hom}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(M(\mu)_\mathbb{Q}, \text{Sp}(\lambda)) \neq 0$ for some $\mu \in \zeta(\Gamma)$, i.e. if and only if there exists $\mu \in \zeta(\Gamma)$ such that $\mu \triangleleft \lambda$. \square

We fix a partial order \leq on $\zeta(\Omega)$ refining the partial order \triangleleft .

Let $\lambda \in \zeta(\Omega)$. We have the section $V(\lambda) = S(\geq \lambda)/S(> \lambda)$ of $S = S_\Omega$.

We write J^{op} for the opposite ring of a ring J . We write S^{env} for the enveloping algebra $S \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} S^{\text{op}}$. We identify an (S, S) -bimodule with a left S^{env} -module in the usual way.

We have the idempotent $\tilde{e} = e \otimes e \in S^{\text{env}}$ and hence the Schur functor $\tilde{f} : \text{mod}(S^{\text{env}}) \rightarrow \text{mod}(\tilde{e}S^{\text{env}}\tilde{e})$ as in [10, Chapter 6]. Moreover, $\tilde{e}S^{\text{env}}\tilde{e} = eSe \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (eSe)^{\text{op}}$. Now \tilde{f} is exact so applying it to the isomorphism $V(\lambda)^\lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} {}^\lambda V(\lambda) \rightarrow V(\lambda)$ of Proposition 5.1 we obtain an isomorphism

$$eV(\lambda)^\lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} {}^\lambda V(\lambda)e \rightarrow eV(\lambda)e \quad (1).$$

Now $\xi_\lambda S + S(> \lambda) = (S\xi_\lambda + S(> \lambda))^*$ so that $eV(\lambda)e \neq 0$ if and only if $eV(\lambda)^\lambda \neq 0$. Moreover, $V(\lambda)^\lambda$ is a \mathbb{Z} -form of $\nabla(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q}$ so that $eV(\lambda)e \neq 0$ if and only if $e\nabla_\Omega(\lambda)_\mathbb{Q} \neq 0$. Hence by, Lemma 6.2,:

$$eV(\lambda)e \neq 0 \text{ if and only if } \lambda \in \zeta^{\square}(\Gamma). \quad (2).$$

We now assemble our cell data. We have the set $\Lambda^+ = \zeta^{\square}(\Gamma)$ with partial order induced from the partial order \leq on $\zeta(\Omega)$ (and also denoted \leq). Let $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$. We let $n_\lambda = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} e\nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and set $N(\lambda) = \{1, \dots, n_\lambda\}$. The rank of $eV(\lambda)^\lambda$ is n_λ . We choose elements $d_{\lambda,1}, \dots, d_{\lambda,n_\lambda}$ of $eS\xi_\lambda$ such that the elements $d_{\lambda,1} + S(> \lambda), \dots, d_{\lambda,n_\lambda} + S(> \lambda)$ form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of $eV(\lambda)^\lambda = (eS\xi_\lambda + S(> \lambda))/S(> \lambda)$. Then $d_{\lambda,1}^*, \dots, d_{\lambda,n_\lambda}^*$ are elements of $(eS\xi_\lambda)^* = \xi_\lambda Se$ and the elements $d_{\lambda,1}^* + S(> \lambda), \dots, d_{\lambda,n_\lambda}^* + S(> \lambda)$ form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of ${}^\lambda V(\lambda)e = (\xi_\lambda Se + S(> \lambda))/S(> \lambda)$. Thus $d_{\lambda,t}d_{\lambda,u}^*$ belongs to $eS\xi_\lambda Se$. We define $C : \coprod_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+} N(\lambda) \times N(\lambda) \rightarrow eSe$ by $C(t, u) = C_{t,u}^\lambda = d_{\lambda,t}d_{\lambda,u}^*$, for $t, u \in N(\lambda)$.

Let M be the \mathbb{Z} -span of all $C_{t,u}^\lambda$, $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, $t, u \in N(\lambda)$. We claim that $M = eSe$. We have $S = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_\Omega} S\xi_\lambda S$ so that if the claim is false then there exists $\lambda \in \Lambda_\Omega$ such that $eS\xi_\lambda Se \not\subseteq M$. In that case we choose λ minimal with this property. First suppose that $\lambda \notin \zeta^{\square}(\Gamma)$. Then we have $eV(\lambda)e = 0$, by (2), i.e., $eS\xi_\lambda Se \subseteq S(> \lambda)$ and so $eS\xi_\lambda Se \subseteq eS(> \lambda)e$. However, $eS(> \lambda)e = \sum_{\mu > \lambda} eS\xi_\mu Se \subseteq M$, by minimality of λ and so $eS\xi_\lambda Se \subseteq M$. Thus we have $\lambda \in \Lambda^+ = \zeta^{\square}(\Gamma)$.

Now by (1) the map

$$(eS\xi_\lambda + S(> \lambda)) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\xi_\lambda Se + S(> \lambda)) \rightarrow eS\xi_\lambda Se + S(> \lambda)$$

induced by multiplication is surjective. Moreover we have $eS\xi_\lambda + S(> \lambda) = \sum_{t=1}^{n_\lambda} \mathbb{Z}d_{\lambda,t} + S(> \lambda)$ and $\xi_\lambda Se + S(> \lambda) = \sum_{u=1}^{n_\lambda} \mathbb{Z}d_{\lambda,u}^* + S(> \lambda)$ so that

$$eS\xi_\lambda Se \subseteq \sum_{t,u=1}^{n_\lambda} \mathbb{Z}d_{\lambda,t}d_{\lambda,u}^* + S(> \lambda) = \sum_{t,u=1}^{n_\lambda} \mathbb{Z}C_{t,u}^\lambda + S(> \lambda)$$

and hence

$$eS\xi_\lambda Se \subseteq \sum_{t,u=1}^{n_\lambda} \mathbb{Z}C_{t,u}^\lambda + eS(> \lambda)e.$$

But now $\sum_{t,u=1}^{n_\lambda} \mathbb{Z}C_{t,u}^\lambda \subseteq M$ by definition and again $eS(> \lambda)e \subseteq M$ by the minimality of λ so that $eS\xi_\lambda Se \subseteq M$ and the claim is established.

The elements $C_{t,u}^\lambda$, $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, $1 \leq t, u \leq n_\lambda$ form a spanning set of $eS_\Omega e = S_\Gamma$. But the rank of eSe is the \mathbb{Q} -dimension of $eS_\Omega e$, i.e., the \mathbb{Q} -dimension of $S_{\Gamma, \mathbb{Q}}$ and this is $\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^+} (\dim e\nabla_{\Omega}(\lambda))^2$ by Remark 2.2. Hence the elements $C_{t,u}^\lambda$, with $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$, $t, u \in N(\lambda)$, form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of eSe .

We have now checked the defining properties (C1) and (C2) of cell structure and it remains to check (C3). We fix $\lambda \in \Lambda^+$ and let $1 \leq t, u \leq n_\lambda$. Let $a \in eSe$. Then we have

$$aC_{t,u}^\lambda = ad_{\lambda,t}d_{\lambda,u}^*.$$

Now we have $\sum_{i=1}^{n_\lambda} \mathbb{Z}d_{\lambda,i} + S(> \lambda) = eS\xi_\lambda + S(> \lambda)$ so we may write $ad_{\lambda,t} = \sum_{t'=1}^{n_\lambda} r_a(t', t)d_{\lambda,t'} + y$ for some integers $r_a(t', t)$ and an element y of $S(> \lambda)$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} aC_{t,u}^\lambda &= ad_{\lambda,t}d_{\lambda,u}^* = \sum_{t'=1}^{n_\lambda} r_a(t', t)d_{\lambda,t'}d_{\lambda,u}^* + yd_{\lambda,u}^* \\ &= \sum_{t'=1}^{n_\lambda} r_a(t', t)C_{t',u}^\lambda + yd_{\lambda,u}^* \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$aC_{t,u}^\lambda = \sum_{t'=1}^{n_\lambda} r_a(t', t)C_{t',u}^\lambda \pmod{S(> \lambda)}.$$

We have thus checked defining property (C3) and hence proved the following.

Theorem 6.3. *Let Γ be a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set. Then $(\Lambda^+, N, C, *)$ is a cell structure on $S_{\Gamma, \mathbb{Z}} = eS_{\Omega, \mathbb{Z}}e = \text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(\mathbb{Z}\Gamma)$.*

One now obtains a cell structure on $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(R\Gamma)$, for any commutative ring R by base change.

There is also the question of when an endomorphism algebra over a field k is quasi-hereditary. If k has characteristic 0 then $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(k\Gamma)$ is semisimple and there is nothing to consider. We assume now that the characteristic of k is $p > 0$. By [7, Remark 3.10] (see also [13], [14]) $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(k\Gamma)$ is quasi-hereditary if and only if the number of irreducible $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(k\Gamma)$ -modules (up to isomorphism) is equal to the length of the cell chain, i.e., $|\zeta^\square(\Gamma)|$. By Lemma 2.4, the number of irreducible $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(k\Gamma)$ -modules is $|\zeta^{\square p}(\Gamma)|$. Moreover, we have $\zeta^{\square p}(\Gamma) \subseteq \zeta^\square(\Gamma)$ and so $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(k\Gamma)$ is quasi-hereditary if and only if $\zeta^\square(\Gamma) \subseteq \zeta^{\square p}(\Gamma)$. We spell this out in the following result.

Theorem 6.4. *Let k be a field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let Γ be a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set. Then the endomorphism algebra $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(k\Gamma)$ of the permutation module $k\Gamma$ is quasi-hereditary if and only if for every partition λ of n such that the Young subgroup $\text{Sym}(\lambda)$ appears as the stabiliser of a point of Γ and every partition $\mu \triangleright \lambda$ there exists a partition τ such that $\text{Sym}(\tau)$ appears as a point stabiliser and such that μ p -dominates τ , i.e., there exists a weak p expansion $\tau = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \gamma(i)$, with $\gamma(i) \in \Lambda(n)$, and $\overline{\gamma(i)} \trianglelefteq \overline{\mu(i)}$ for all i (where $\mu = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \mu(i)$ is the base p -expansion of μ and where $\overline{\gamma(i)}$ is the partition obtained by writing the parts of $\gamma(i)$ in descending order, for $i \geq 0$).*

Remark 6.5. *We emphasise that the above gives a criterion for the endomorphism algebra $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(k\Gamma)$ of the Young permutation module $k\Gamma$ to be quasi-hereditary with respect to any labelling of the simple modules by a partially ordered set (which may have nothing to do with those considered*

above) thanks to the result of König and Xi, [14, Theorem 3.]. Thus if Γ does not satisfy the condition above then $S_{\Gamma,k}$ can not have finite global dimension by [14, Theorem 3] and hence is not quasi-hereditary.

7 Example: Tensor Powers

Let R be a commutative ring and let E_R be a free R -module on basis $e_{1,R}, \dots, e_{n,R}$. Let r be a positive integer and let $I(n, r)$ be the set described in Example 3.2. Then the r -fold tensor product $E_R^{\otimes r} = E_R \otimes_R \otimes \cdots \otimes_R E_R$ has R -basis $e_{i,R} = e_{i_1,R} \otimes \cdots \otimes e_{i_r,R}$, $i \in I(n, r)$, and we thus identify $E_R^{\otimes r}$ with $RI(n, r)$, the free R -module on $I(n, r)$.

Remark 7.1. *The symmetric group $\text{Sym}(r)$ acts on $E_R^{\otimes r}$ by place permutations, i.e. $w \cdot e_{i,R} = e_{i \circ w^{-1}, R}$, for $w \in \text{Sym}(r)$, $i \in I(n, r)$. Thus we may regard $E_R^{\otimes r}$ as the permutation module $RI(n, r)$, with $\text{Sym}(r)$, acting on $I(n, r)$ by $w \cdot i = i \circ w^{-1}$. The endomorphism algebra $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(r)}(E_R^{\otimes r})$ is the Schur algebra $S_R(n, r)$.*

The stabiliser of $i \in I(n, r)$ is the direct product of the symmetric groups on the fibres of i (regarded as a subgroup of $\text{Sym}(r)$ in the usual way). Hence $I(n, r)$ is a Young $\text{Sym}(r)$ -set. Hence $E_R^{\otimes r}$ is a Young permutation module and hence $S_R(n, r)$ is cellular. Moreover, $\zeta(I(n, r))$ is the set $\Lambda^+(n, r)$ of all partitions of r with at most n parts. This is a co-saturated set and hence for a prime p we have $\zeta(I(n, r)) = \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r)) = \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$. Hence, for a field k of characteristic p the Schur algebra $S_k(n, r)$ is quasi-hereditary.

However, this is not a new proof since our treatment relies crucially on a detail from Green's analysis of $S_{\mathbb{Z}}(n, r)$ as in [9], at least in the case $n = r$. (See Example 3.2 above and the proofs of the results of Section 4.)

We now regard E_R as an $R\text{Sym}(n)$ -module with $\text{Sym}(n)$ permuting the basis $e_{1,R}, \dots, e_{n,R}$ in the natural way. This action induces an action on the tensor product $E_R^{\otimes r}$. Specifically, we have $w \cdot e_{i,R} = e_{w \circ i, R}$, for $w \in \text{Sym}(n)$, $i \in I(n, r)$, and we thus regard $E_R^{\otimes r}$ as the permutation module $RI(n, r)$. For $w \in \text{Sym}(n)$, $i \in I(n, r)$ we have $w \circ i = i$ if and only if w acts as the identity on the image of i , so that the stabiliser of i is the group of symmetries of the complement of the image of i in $\{1, \dots, n\}$, identified with a subgroup of $\text{Sym}(n)$ in the usual way. Thus $I(n, r)$ is a Young $\text{Sym}(n)$ -set so we have the following consequence of Theorem 6.3, answering a question raised in [1].

Proposition 7.2. *The endomorphism algebra $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(E_R^{\otimes r}) = \text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(RI(n, r))$ is a cellular algebra.*

The support of $I(n, r)$ consists of hook partitions, more precisely we have

$$\zeta(I(n, r)) = \{(a, 1^b) \mid a + b = n, 1 \leq b \leq r\}.$$

Hence we have

$$\zeta^{\geq}(I(n, r)) = \{\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots) \in \text{Par}(n) \mid \lambda_1 \geq n - r\}.$$

Let k be a field of characteristic $p > 0$. Then $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(E_k^{\otimes r})$ is quasi-hereditary if and only if $\zeta^{\geq}(I(n, r)) \subseteq \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$, i.e., if and only for every $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots) \in \text{Par}(n)$ with $\mu_1 \geq n - r$ there exists some $\lambda = (a, 1^b)$, $1 \leq b \leq r$, such that $\lambda \trianglelefteq_p \mu$.

We are able to give an explicit list of quasi-hereditary algebras arising in the above manner.

Proposition 7.3. *Let k be a field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let n be a positive integer and E an n -dimensional k -vector space with basis e_1, \dots, e_n . We regard E as a $k\text{Sym}(n)$ -module with $\text{Sym}(n)$ permuting the basis in the obvious way. For $r \geq 1$ we regard the r th tensor power $E^{\otimes r}$ as a $k\text{Sym}(n)$ -module via the usual tensor product action. Then $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(E^{\otimes r})$ is quasi-hereditary if and only if:*

- (i) p does not divide n ; and
- (ii) either $n < 2p$ (and r is arbitrary) or $n > 2p$ and $r < p$.

Proof. We see this in a number of steps. We regard $E^{\otimes r}$ as the permutation module $kI(n, r)$, as above, with $\text{Sym}(n)$ action by $w \cdot i = w \circ i$, for $w \in \text{Sym}(n)$, $i \in I(n, r)$. We shall say that $I(n, r)$ is quasi-hereditary if $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(E^{\otimes r})$ is.

Step 1. If p divides n then $I(n, r)$ is not quasi-hereditary.

We have $(n - 1, 1) \in \zeta(I(n, r))$ and $(n, 0) \triangleright (n - 1, 1)$ so that $(n, 0) \in \zeta^{\geq}(I(n, r))$. Now $n = pm$, for some positive integer m , so that $\mu = (n, 0) = p(m, 0)$ has base p expansion $(n, 0) = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \mu(i)$, with restricted part $\mu(0) = 0$. Thus if $\tau = (a, 1^b)$ has weak p -expansion $\tau = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \gamma(i)$ and $\overline{\gamma(i)} \trianglelefteq \mu(i)$, for all i , then $\gamma(0) = 0$ and τ is divisible by p . However, this is not the case so no such weak p -expansion exists and $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq}(I(n, r)) \setminus \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$. Thus $\zeta^{\geq}(I(n, r)) \not\subseteq \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$ and $I(n, r)$ is not quasi-hereditary.

Step 2. If p does not divide n then $I(n, 1)$ is quasi-hereditary.

We have $\zeta(I(n, 1)) = \{(n - 1, 1)\}$. If $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq}(I(n, 1)) \setminus \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$ then $\mu = (n, 0)$. Now n has base p expansion $n = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i n_i$, with $0 \leq n_i < p$ for all $i \geq 0$ and $n_0 \neq 0$ and μ has base p expansion $\mu = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \mu(i)$, with $\mu(i) = (n_i, 0)$, for all $i \geq 0$.

But now we write

$$\tau = (n - 1, 1) = (n_0 - 1, 1) + \sum_{i \geq 1} p^i (n_i, 0)$$

and τ has weak p -expansion $\tau = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \gamma(i)$, with $\gamma(0) = (n_0 - 1, 1)$, $\gamma(i) = (n_i, 0)$ for $i \geq 1$. Moreover $\overline{\gamma(i)} \leq \mu(i)$, for all i so that $(n, 0) \in \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, 1))$. Thus $\zeta^{\geq}(I(n, 1)) = \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, 1))$ and $I(n, 1)$ is quasi-hereditary.

Step 3. If $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq}(I(n, r))$ is p -restricted then $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$

We have $\mu \supseteq (a, 1^b)$ for some $n = a + b$, $1 \leq b \leq r$. The partition μ has base p expansion $\mu = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \mu(i)$, with $\mu(i) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$.

But now $\tau = (a, 1^b)$ has weak p -expansion $\tau = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \gamma(i)$, with $\gamma(0) = (a, 1^b)$ and $\gamma(i) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$. Furthermore we have $\overline{\gamma(i)} \leq \mu(i)$ for all $i \geq 0$ so $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$.

Step 4. If $n < p$ then $I(n, r)$ is quasi-hereditary.

This follows from Step 3 all since elements of $\text{Par}(n)$ are restricted.

Step 5. If $p < n < 2p$ then $I(n, r)$ is quasi-hereditary.

For a contradiction suppose not and let

$\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots) \in \zeta^{\geq}(I(n, r)) \setminus \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$. We have $\mu \supseteq (a, 1^b)$ for some a, b with $n = a + b$, $1 \leq b \leq r$. Choose a, b with this property with $b \geq 1$ minimal. If $b = 1$ then $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq}(I(n, 1))$, which by Step 2 is $\zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, 1))$. Thus we have $b \geq 2$.

We claim that $\mu_1 = a$. Since $\mu \supseteq (a, 1^b)$ the length l , say, of μ is at most the length of $(a, 1^b)$, i.e. $b + 1$. Put $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots) = (a + 1, 1^{b-1})$. If $\mu_1 > a$ then $\mu_1 \geq \xi_1$ and, for $1 < i \leq l$, we have

$$\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i \geq a + 1 + (i - 1) = a + i = \xi_1 + \dots + \xi_i.$$

So $\mu \supseteq \xi = (a + 1, 1^{b-1})$, which is a contradiction, and the claim is established.

Note that μ is non-restricted, by Step 3, and, since μ is a partition of $n < 2p$ in the base p expansion $\mu = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \mu(i)$ of μ , we must have $\mu(1) = (1, 0)$ and $\mu(i) = 0$ for $i \geq 2$. Let $\tau = (a, 1^b)$. Then $\tau \leq \mu$ implies that $\tau - (p, 0) \leq \mu - (p, 0) = \mu(0)$. But now

$$\tau = (a, 1^b) = (a - p, 1^b) + p(1, 0)$$

so we have the weak p expansion $\tau = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \gamma(i)$ with $\gamma(0) = (a - p, 1^b)$, $\gamma(1) = (1, 0)$ and $\gamma(i) = 0$ for $i > 1$. Since $\overline{\gamma(i)} \leq \mu(i)$ for all $i \geq 0$ we have $(a, 1^b) \leq_p \mu$ and so $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$, a contradiction.

Step 6. If $n > 2p$ and $r \geq p$ then $I(n, r)$ is not quasi-hereditary.

Note that $\zeta(I(n, r))$ contains $(n - p, 1^p)$ and hence $\zeta^{\geq}(I(n, r))$ contains $\mu = (n - p, p)$. Now we have $\mu = (n - 2p, 0) + p(1, 1)$ and so $\mu = \mu(0) + p\xi$, where $\mu(0)$ has at most one part and ξ has two parts. Hence in the base p expansion $\mu = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \mu(i)$, there is for some $j \geq 1$, such that $\mu(j)$ has two parts.

Now if $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$ there exists some $\tau = (a, 1^b)$ with weak p expansion $\tau = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \gamma(i)$ such that $\overline{\gamma(i)} \leq \mu(i)$ for all $i \geq 0$. But then $\gamma(j)$ must have at least two parts. Since $j \geq 1$, the partition $\tau = (a, 1^b)$ has two parts of size at least p . This is not the case so there is no such weak p expansion and $\mu \notin \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$. Thus $\zeta^{\leq}(I(n, r)) \neq \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$ and $I(n, r)$ is not quasi-hereditary.

Step 7. If $n > 2p$, if p does not divide n and if $r < p$, then $I(n, r)$ is quasi-hereditary.

If not there exists $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots) \in \zeta^{\leq}(I(n, r)) \setminus \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$. Thus $\mu \supseteq (a, 1^b)$, for some $n = a + b$, $b \geq 1$ and, as in Step 5, we choose such $(a, 1^b)$ with b minimal. Again, by Step 2, we have $b \geq 2$.

We claim that $\mu_1 = a$. If not, we get $\mu \supseteq (a + 1, 1^{b-1})$ as in Step 5, contradicting the minimality of b .

Thus we have $\mu_2 + \dots + \mu_n = n - \mu_1 = b < p$, in particular we have $\mu_i < p$ for all $i \geq 1$. Hence in the base p expansion $\mu = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \mu(i)$, for all $i \geq 1$ we have $\mu(i) = (c_i, 0, \dots, 0)$, for some $0 \leq c_i < p$. Also, $\mu(0) = (k, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n)$, for some $k > 0$.

Now we have

$$\tau = (a, 1^b) = (k + \sum_{i \geq 1} p^i c_i, 1^b) = (k, 1^b) + \sum_{i \geq 1} p^i (c_i, 0, \dots, 0).$$

Thus we have the weak p -expansion $\tau = \sum_{i \geq 0} p^i \gamma(i)$, with $\gamma(0) = (k, 1^b)$ and $\gamma(i) = (c_i, 0, \dots, 0)$, for $i \geq 1$. Furthermore, $\overline{\gamma(i)} \leq \mu(i)$, for all $i \geq 0$ so that $\mu \in \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$ and therefore $\zeta^{\leq}(I(n, r)) = \zeta^{\geq p}(I(n, r))$ and $I(n, r)$ is quasi-hereditary. \square

Let k be a field. Recall that, for $\delta \in k$, and r a positive integer we have the partition algebra $P_r(\delta)$ over k . One may find a detailed account of the construction and properties of $P_r(\delta)$ in for example the papers by Paul P. Martin, [16], [17], and [11], [1]. Suppose now that k has characteristic $p > 0$ and $\delta = n1_k$, for some positive integer n . Let E_n be an n -dimensional vector space with basis e_1, \dots, e_n . Then $P_r(n) = P_r(n1_k)$ acts on $E_n^{\otimes r}$. By a result of Halverson-Ram, [11, Theorem 3.6] the image of the representation $P_r(n) \rightarrow \text{End}_k(E_n^{\otimes r})$ is $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(n)}(E^{\otimes r})$. Moreover, for $n \gg 0$ the action of $P_r(n)$ is faithful. Let $N = n + ps$, for s suitably large, so that $P_r(n) = P_r(N)$ acts faithfully on $E_N^{\otimes r}$. Thus $P_r(n)$ is quasi-hereditary if and only if $\text{End}_{\text{Sym}(N)}(E_N^{\otimes r})$ is faithful. Hence from Proposition 7.3 we have the following, which is a special case of a result of König and Xi, [14, Theorem 1.4].

Corollary 7.4. *The partition algebra $P_r(n)$ is quasi-hereditary if and only if n is prime to p and $r < p$.*

References

- [1] C. Bowman, S. R. Doty and S. Martin, *Integral Schur-Weyl duality for partition algebras*, arXiv:1906.00457v1, 2019.
- [2] A. G. Cox, *The blocks of the q -Schur algebra*, J. of Algebra **207**, 306-325, 1998.
- [3] S. Donkin, *On Schur Algebras and Related Algebras IV: the blocks of the Schur algebras*, J. of Algebra, **168**, 400-429, 1994.
- [4] S. Donkin, *On tilting modules for algebraic groups*, Math. Z. **212**, 39-60, 1993.
- [5] S. Donkin, *The q -Schur algebra*, LMS Lecture Notes 253, Cambridge University Press 1998.
- [6] Karin Erdmann, *Stratifying systems, filtration multiplicities and symmetric groups*, Journal of Algebra and Its Applications, **5**, (2005), 551-555.
- [7] J. J. Graham and G. I. Lehrer, *Cellular algebras*, Invent. Math. **123**, (1996), 1-34.
- [8] J. A. Green, *A theorem on modular endomorphism rings*, Illinois Journal of Mathematics **32**, (1988), 510-519.
- [9] J. A. Green, *Combinatorics and the Schur algebra*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **88** (1993), 89-106
- [10] J. A. Green, *Polynomial Representations of GL_n , Second Edition with an Appendix on Schensted Correspondence and Littelmann Paths by K. Erdmann, J. A. Green and M. Schocker*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **830**, Springer 2007.
- [11] T. Halverson and A. Ram, *Partition Algebras*, European J. Combin. **28**, (2005), 869-921.
- [12] G. D. James, *The Representation Theory of the Symmetric Groups*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 682, Springer 1970.
- [13] Steffen König and Changchang Xi, *On the structure of cellular algebras*, In: I. Reiten, S. Smalø, Ø. Solberg (Eds.): Algebras and Modules II. Canadian Math. Society Conference Proceedings, vol. **24**, (1998), 365-386.
- [14] Steffen König and Changchang Xi, *When is a cellular algebra quasi-hereditary*, Mathematische Annalen, **315**, (1999), 281-293 .

- [15] Andrew Mathas and Marcos Soriano *Blocks of truncated q -Schur algebras of type A* . Contemporary Mathematics, Recent Developments in Algebraic and Combinatorial Aspects of Representations Theory; Eds Vyjayanthi Chari, Jacob Greenstein, Kallash C. Misra, K.N. Raghavan and Sankaran Viswananth **602**, (2013), 123-142.
- [16] P. Martin, *Potts models and related problems in statistical mechanics*, Series on Advances in Statistical Mechanics, vol 5. World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., Teaneck, NJ, 1991.
- [17] P. Martin, *Temperley-Lieb algebras for nonplanar statistical mechanics - the partition algebra construction*, J. Knot Theory Ramifications **3**, (1994), no. 1, 51-82.
- [18] B. Parshall, *Finite dimensional algebras and algebraic groups*, Contemporary Math. **82**, (1989), 97-114.