

# Equivalences of LLT polynomials via lattice paths

David Keating

Department of Mathematics, UC Berkeley

dkeating@berkeley.edu

## Abstract

The LLT polynomials  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X; t)$  are a family of symmetric polynomials indexed by a tuple of (possibly skew-)partitions  $\beta/\gamma = (\beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(k)}/\gamma^{(k)})$ . It has recently been shown that these polynomials can be seen as the partition function of a certain vertex model whose boundary conditions are determined by  $\beta/\gamma$ . In this paper we describe an algorithm which gives a bijection between the configurations of the vertex model with boundary condition  $\beta/\gamma = (\beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}/\gamma^{(2)})$  and those with boundary condition  $(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}} = (\beta^{(2)}/\gamma^{(2)}, \beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)})$ . We prove a sufficient condition for when this bijection is weight-preserving up to an overall factor of  $t$ , which in turn implies that the corresponding LLT polynomials are equal up to the same overall factor. Using these techniques, we are also able to systematically determine linear relations within families of LLT polynomials.

## 1 Introduction

Originally defined by Lascoux, Leclerc, and Thibon [10] as the generating function of a spin statistic on ribbon tableaux, the eponymously named LLT polynomials are a family of symmetric polynomials which can be seen as a  $t$ -deformation of products of Schur polynomials. In [9] the LLT polynomials were reformulated as the generating function for an inversion statistic on tuples of semistandard Young tableaux, with the relationship between ribbon tableaux and tuples of SSYT given by the Stanton-White correspondence [14]. Most recently, in [3], the authors use a new formulation of the LLT polynomials in their work on the generalization of the shuffle theorem. We will use this formulation in what follows, and we will refer to them as the *coinversion LLT polynomials*.

We study the LLT polynomials from the perspective of vertex models. Vertex models have long been studied in relation to integrable systems and statistical mechanics (see [13] and references therein). Recently, they have been used to gain new insights on symmetric polynomials and their non-symmetric variants (for example, but by no means an exhaustive list, [6, 8, 5, 4]). It was shown in [1, 7] that the LLT polynomials could be expressed as the partition function of a certain vertex model. In [1] it was shown that, in fact, the LLT polynomial vertex model was a degeneration of a more general vertex model related to the quantized affine Lie superalgebra  $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}(1|n))$ . We will not need that level of generality here.

We say that two LLT polynomials are *equivalent* if they are equal up to an overall factor of  $t$ . In this paper, we use the vertex model structure to prove a sufficient condition for when swapping a pair of partitions in the indexing tuple of an LLT polynomial results in an equivalent LLT polynomial. Our main result is

**Theorem.** *If there is a unique non-crossing matching  $M$  of the sequence of beads associated to  $\beta/\gamma$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}}}(X_n; t)$  are equivalent. In particular,*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t) = \left( \prod_{a \in M} w(a) \right) \mathcal{L}_{(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}}}(X_n; t)$$

where the product is over all arcs  $a$  in the matching and the weight of an arc is given by (7).

We then extend our techniques to construct linear relations between certain LLT polynomials. As one possible application we show

**Theorem.** *For every  $\beta$  in the family of  $\binom{2n}{n}$  partitions given in (8), the LLT polynomial  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta}(X_n; t)$  can be written*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta}(X_n; t) = \sum_{j=1}^{C_n} t^{n_j(\beta)} g_j(X_n; t)$$

where  $C_n = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n}$  is the  $n^{\text{th}}$  Catalan number,  $n_j(\beta) \in \mathbb{Z}$  for each  $j$  and  $\beta$ , and the  $g_i$  are polynomials symmetric in the  $X_n$ .

The layout of this paper is as follows: In Section 2, we define the coinversion LLT polynomials. We briefly explain how the LLT polynomials can be seen as the partition function of a certain vertex model. In Section 3, we describe an algorithm which selectively swaps the color of certain paths in a configuration of the vertex model. We use this algorithm to give a bijection between the configurations of the vertex model with boundary condition  $\beta/\gamma = (\beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}/\gamma^{(2)})$  and those with boundary condition  $(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}} = (\beta^{(2)}/\gamma^{(2)}, \beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)})$ . In Section 4, we prove a sufficient condition for when this bijection is weight preserving up to an explicit overall power of  $t$ , which implies that the corresponding LLT polynomials are equal up to the same overall factor. In Section 5, we show how we can use the tools developed in the previous sections to determine linear relations within families of LLT polynomials.

**Acknowledgements:** The author would like to thank Sylvie Corteel, Andrew Gitlin, Jeremy Meza, Ananth Sridhar, and Matthew Nicoletti for many useful discussions. The author was partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1902226 and the FRG grant DMS-1664521.

## 2 LLT polynomials

In this section we give a brief description of the coinversion LLT polynomials. We then review their characterization as lattice paths introduced in [1, 7].

Let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_m \geq 0)$  be a partition with  $l(\lambda) = m$  parts. Note that we consider our partitions to have a fixed number of parts, but allow for the possibility of parts of zero. We associate to  $\lambda$  its Young (or Ferrers) diagram  $D(\lambda) \subseteq \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ , given as

$$D(\lambda) = \{(i, j) \mid 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\lambda), 1 \leq j \leq \lambda_i\}$$

We draw our diagrams in French notation, in the first quadrant, such as below

$$\lambda = (4, 2, 1), \quad D(\lambda) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & \bullet & \\ \hline \end{array}$$


We refer to the elements in  $D(\lambda)$  as *cells*. The cell labelled above has coordinates (1,3).

The *content* of a cell  $u = (i, j)$  in row  $i$  and column  $j$  of any Young diagram is  $c(u) = j - i$ . Given a tuple  $\beta/\gamma = (\beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(k)}/\gamma^{(k)})$  of skew partitions, define a semistandard Young tableau  $T$  of shape  $\beta/\gamma$  to be a semistandard Young tableau on each  $\beta^{(j)}/\gamma^{(j)}$ , that is,

$$\text{SSYT}(\beta/\gamma) = \text{SSYT}(\beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)}) \times \dots \times \text{SSYT}(\beta^{(k)}/\gamma^{(k)})$$

We can picture this as placing the Young diagrams diagonally “on content lines” with the first shape in the South-West direction and the last shape in the North-East direction. See Example 2.1 below.

**Example 2.1.** Let  $\beta/\gamma = ((3, 1), (2, 2, 2))/(1, 1, 1), (1), (2, 1)/(2)$ . The top row labels the contents of each line.




Given a tuple  $\beta/\gamma$  of skew partitions, we say that three cells  $u, v, w \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$  form a *triple* of  $\beta/\gamma$  if (i)  $v \in \beta/\gamma$ , (ii) they are situated as below



namely with  $v$  and  $w$  on the same content line and  $w$  in a later shape, and  $u$  on a content line one smaller, in the same row as  $w$ , and (iii) if  $u, w$  are in row  $r$  of  $\beta^{(j)}/\gamma^{(j)}$ , then  $u$  and  $w$  must be between the cells  $(r, \gamma_r^{(j)} - 1), (r, \beta_r^{(j)} + 1)$ , inclusive. It is important to note that while  $v$  must be a cell in  $\beta/\gamma$ , we allow the cells  $u$  and  $w$  to not be in any of the skew shapes, in which case  $u$  must be at the end of some row in  $\gamma$  and  $w$  must be the cell directly to the right of the end of some row in  $\beta$ .

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\beta/\gamma$  be a tuple of skew partitions and let  $T \in \text{SSYT}(\beta/\gamma)$ . Let  $a, b, c$  be the entries in the cells of a triple  $(u, v, w)$ , where we set  $a = 0$  and  $c = \infty$  if the respective cell

is not in  $\beta/\gamma$ . Given the triple of entries



we say this is a coinversion triple of  $T$  if  $a \leq b \leq c$ .

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $\beta/\gamma$  be a tuple of skew partitions. The coinversion LLT polynomial is the generating function

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X; t) = \sum_{T \in \text{SSYT}(\beta/\gamma)} t^{\text{coinv}(T)} x^T$$

where  $\text{coinv}(T)$  is the number of coinversion triples of  $T$ .

We will only consider the case when  $X$  is a finite alphabet  $X_n = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ . The coinversion LLT polynomials are related to the inversion LLT polynomials in a simple way

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X; t) = t^m \mathcal{G}_{\beta/\gamma}(X; t^{-1}) \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{G}$  is the inversion LLT polynomial and  $m$  is the total number of triples in  $\beta/\gamma$ .

In [1, 7] it was shown that there is a bijection between tuple of SSYT and a certain vertex model consisting of several colors of lattice paths. We review the construction from [7] here, and refer the readers to the original papers for details.

Consider a lattice model consisting of a up-right lattice paths of  $k$  different colors where paths of the same color are not allowed to intersect. At each face of our lattice we assign a label in  $\{0, 1\}^k$  to the sides of the face as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{K} \\ \mathbf{J} \left[ \begin{array}{c} x \\ \mathbf{I} \end{array} \right] \mathbf{L} \end{array}, \quad \mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J}, \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{L} \in \{0, 1\}^k.$$

where the  $x$  indicates a parameter that will be used in defining the weight of the face. One should interpret, for example, a 1 in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  component of  $\mathbf{I}$  as indicating that a path of color  $i$  crosses the bottom boundary of the face. The weights of the face are given by

$$L_x(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{L}) = x^{\# \text{ colors exiting the vertex to the right}} \prod_{\substack{\text{colors } i \text{ exiting the} \\ \text{vertex to the right}}} t^{\# \text{ colors larger than } i \text{ that appear in the vertex}}. \quad (3)$$

whenever  $\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{J} = \mathbf{K} + \mathbf{L}$  and there is no  $i \in [k]$  such that  $I_i = J_i = 1$ , and  $L_x(\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{J}; \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{L}) = 0$  otherwise. The condition  $\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{J} = \mathbf{K} + \mathbf{L}$  ensures that any path that enters a face from the bottom or left must exit the face from the top or right, while the condition that there is no  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that  $I_i = J_i = 1$  ensures that paths of a given color are non-intersecting.

Let us define the boundary condition of our vertex model. Given a tuple of partitions  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu^{(1)}, \dots, \mu^{(k)})$  and an integer  $i$ , let  $\mu(i) \in \{0, 1\}^k$  be the vector whose  $j$ -th component is 1 if and only if

$$i = \mu_m^{(j)} - m + 1$$

for some  $m \in \{1, \dots, \ell(\mu^{(j)})\}$ , for each index  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Let  $\beta/\gamma = (\beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(k)}/\gamma^{(k)})$  be a tuple of skew partitions. Let

$$\begin{aligned} r &= r(\beta/\gamma) = \min\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : \gamma(i) \neq \mathbf{0}\}, \\ s &= s(\beta/\gamma) = \max\{i \in \mathbb{Z} : \beta(i) \neq \mathbf{0}\} \end{aligned}$$

where  $s - r + 1$  gives the number of columns necessary in the vertex model for  $\beta/\gamma$ ,  $\beta(r + i)$  will give the top boundary condition for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  column from the left, and  $\gamma(r + i)$  will give the bottom boundary condition for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  column from the left. With this notation, we introduce the lattice that will be of particular interest to us:

$$L_{\beta/\gamma} := \begin{array}{ccccc} & \beta(r) & \dots & \beta(s) & \\ \mathbf{0} & x_n & \dots & x_n & \mathbf{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & x_1 & \dots & x_1 & \mathbf{0} \\ & \gamma(r) & \dots & \gamma(s) & \end{array} \quad (4)$$

We let  $\mathcal{Z}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t)$  denote the partition function of  $L_{\beta/\gamma}$ , that is

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t) = \sum_{L \in LC_{\beta/\gamma}} \text{weight}(L).$$


where  $LC_{\beta/\gamma}$  denotes the set of path configurations on  $L_{\beta/\gamma}$  satisfying the boundary conditions and  $\text{weight}(L)$  is the product of the weight of each face in  $L$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $\beta/\gamma$  be a tuple of skew partitions. Then,*

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t) = \mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t).$$

We refer the reader to [7] for a proof.

As an example of the above constructions, consider  $\beta/\gamma = ((2, 2)/(1, 0), (1))$  with  $n = 2$ . We have




where the left is a possible semistandard filling of the tuple of partitions and the right is the corresponding lattice paths. Note that there is a simple bijection between fillings on the sequence of tableaux and lattice paths in which each row of tableaux  $i$  is a path of color  $i$  and the entries in the row correspond to the height of the horizontal steps of the path. The columns of the vertex model correspond to the content lines in the tableaux formulation (see the labelling in the above example). The green cells in the tableaux correspond to a coninverson triple that corresponds to the face highlighted in green in the vertex model.





our example, this would give



where we swap the color of all highlighted paths in the right configuration to get the left configuration.

**Proposition 3.4.**  $\Phi$  is a bijection between configurations with boundary condition given by  $\beta/\gamma$  and configurations with boundary condition given by  $(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}}$ .

*Proof.* First, it is easy to see that after swapping the color of all the highlighted edges we still have a valid configuration of our vertex model, by simply checking what changes can possibly happen at a single face.

Next, we show that the boundary conditions change appropriately, that is, we need all singleton blue boundary paths to become red and vice-versa (we are not concerned with points on the boundary with both colors, as they appear for both the  $\beta/\gamma$  and  $(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}}$  boundary conditions). It suffices to show that all singleton boundary paths are traversed in our procedure. Suppose that this was not the case and there was, say, a singleton red boundary path on the bottom boundary was not included in a walk. Then starting at that path and running the procedure in reverse (that is, reversing all the arrows in the set of rules (5)) we must end at either a singleton red boundary path at the top or a singleton blue boundary path at the bottom. But this path will have already been included in a walk as we use it as a starting point. So we must have traversed all singleton boundary paths.

Finally, it is easy to see that running this procedure again returns us to our original configuration, so  $\Phi$  is invertible.  $\square$

This algorithm can be seen as a generalization of the procedure used in proving the fact that if each of the partitions in the indexing tuple of  $\mathcal{L}_{(\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(k)})}(X_n; t)$  are single rows, then any rearrangement of the order of the partitions will result in an equivalent LLT polynomial given in [7].

## 4 Calculating the weight

While  $\Phi$  is always a bijection, we are interested in the case when the LLT polynomials  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n, t)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}}}(X_n, t)$  are equivalent. That is, we wish to know for what  $\beta/\gamma$   $\Phi$  is weight-preserving up to an overall power of  $t$ .

Towards this end, we associate a sequence of colored beads to the boundary conditions of the path given by  $\beta/\gamma$  as follows: We consider two rows of beads. Scanning the columns of our lattice model from left-to-right, for every singleton path along the top boundary we add a bead of the same color on the top row, and for every singleton path along the bottom boundary we add a bead of the same color to the bottom row, ensuring that the beads keep the same ordering (from left-to-right) as the paths. We label the beads by number of paths to the right of their corresponding path.







**Lemma 4.2.** For a walk starting at a path with  $j$  paths to its right and ending at a path with  $i$  paths to its right, we have

$$\# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \text{---} \text{---} \rightarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = j - i.$$





*Proof.* Steps of the form






always put us on a new section of path that has one fewer paths to its right. Steps of the form




always put us on a new section of path with one more path to its right. As the walk starts  $j$  paths to its right and ends with  $i$  paths to its right, we have the identity.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.3.** A  cannot be immediately followed and preceded by a  and vice versa. Similarly, a  cannot be immediately followed and preceded by a  and vice versa.

*Proof.* Consider a face in which the walk takes a step of the form . Suppose it was immediately followed and preceded by . Then we must have a configuration of the form



No matter how the two lower faces are arranged, either the dashed blue path or the dashed red path must intersect one of the solid paths. This would mean that there is a step of our walk in between those drawn, contradicting that these steps immediately follow and precede

the .

The other cases can be done similarly.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** For a walk starting and ending at the top we have

$$\# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \rightarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \pm 1$$

where the RHS is +1 when the walk ends to the right of where it started and -1 if it ends to the left. For a walk starting and ending at the bottom we have

$$\# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \rightarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \pm 1$$

where the RHS is +1 when the walk ends to the left of where it started and -1 if it ends to the right. For a walk starting at one boundary and ending at the other we have


$$\# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \rightarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = 0.$$

*Proof.* Let us consider the case where the walk starts and ends on the top. Note that the walk is made up of straight sections of path and right angled corners. These corners can either occur on a segment of path, or at a face where the walk switches from one segment to the other.

Suppose that the walk ends to right of where it started. Then we must have that  $\#(\text{left turns}) = \#(\text{right turns}) + 2$ , where left and right are defined relative to the direction of travel of the walk. We can restate the lemma as saying


$$\#(\text{left turns where the walk switches color}) - \#(\text{right turns where the walk switches colors}) = 1.$$

For turns that occur on a path segment the difference between the number of left turns and the number of right turns can only be  $\pm 1$  or 0. In fact, we can say precisely how this difference depends on the corners the path segment starts and ends at:



where the box  $\boxed{L/R}$  indicates a left/right turn at a corner where the walk switches color, and

the line segment  $\overset{L/R/0}{\text{---}}$  indicates the the segment of path connecting the corners has a net left/right/equal number of turns. We also need to consider what can happen for first and last path segments, there are two possibilities for each



Here we redraw the walk in example (6) and give the sequence of turns:



Counting the number of the lefts and rights, we must also have

$$L_1 + L_2 - R_1 - R_2 = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if (first,last) = } \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline R & R \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline R & 0 \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \\ 0, & \text{if (first,last) = } \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline R & R \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline L & L \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \\ 0, & \text{if (first,last) = } \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 0 & L \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline R & 0 \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \\ 1, & \text{if (first,last) = } \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 0 & L \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline L & L \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \end{cases}$$

Using the above equations, a little algebra shows

$$\#(\text{left turns where walk switches color}) - \#(\text{right turns where walk switches color}) = L_1 + 2L_2 - R_1 - 2R_2 = 1$$

as desired. If the walk instead ended to the left of where it started we would have

$$\#(\text{left turns}) - \#(\text{right turns}) = -2$$

but otherwise the same equations. Computing gives

$$\#(\text{left turns where walk switches color}) - \#(\text{right turns where walk switches color}) = -1.$$

Here we worked out the case where the walk starts and ends on the top row. A similar analysis works for the other walks.  $\square$

For each type of arc between the labelled beads define the weight of the arc by

$$a: \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} i \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \\ j \\ \bullet \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} j \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \\ i \\ \bullet \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} j \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowright \\ i \\ \bullet \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} i \\ \bullet \\ \curvearrowleft \\ j \\ \bullet \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ i \\ \bullet \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowleft \\ j \\ \bullet \end{array} \end{array} \quad (7)$$

$$w(a): \quad t^{(j-i)/2} \quad t^{(j-i)/2} \quad t^{(j-i+1)/2} \quad t^{(j-i-1)/2} \quad t^{(j-i+1)/2} \quad t^{(j-i-1)/2}$$

**Proposition 4.5.** *For a single walk, the change in the power of  $t$  after swapping the color of all the segments of paths traversed in the walk depends only on its corresponding arc in the matching. In particular, the change in the power of  $t$  is equal to the weight of the arc.*

*Proof.* The change in the power of  $t$  after swapping the colors of all the path segments of a walk is given by

$$\# \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \downarrow & | \\ \hline \hline \hline \rightarrow & \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \uparrow & | \\ \hline \hline \hline \leftarrow & \\ \hline \end{array} \right).$$

This can easily be computed from the previous lemmas. For example, suppose we are the case where our walk starts at the top boundary and end at the top boundary to the right of where it started. From Lemmas 4.2 and 4.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = j - i \\ \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Adding them together gives

$$\# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = (j - i + 1)/2$$

which agrees with

$$w \left( \begin{array}{c} j \\ \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \\ i \end{array} \right) = t^{(j-i+1)/2}.$$

Note that this implies that  $j - i + 1$  is even. Alternatively, we can see this since on the boundary between the starting and ending path there must be an even number of paths, either pairs of singleton boundary paths that are connected by a walk or non-singleton boundary paths.

For a walk starting at a red path at the top boundary and ending at a red path on the bottom boundary, Lemmas 4.2 and 4.4 give

$$\begin{aligned} \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = j - i \\ \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) + \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

from which we have

$$\# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \downarrow \\ \hline \rightarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) - \# \left( \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \left[ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \uparrow \\ \hline \leftarrow \\ \hline \end{array} \right] \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = (j - i)/2$$

which agrees with

$$w \left( \begin{array}{c} j \\ \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \\ i \end{array} \right) = t^{(j-i)/2}.$$

Note that in this case we see that  $j - i$  is even.

The same analysis can be done for walks starting on blue paths.  $\square$

Proposition 4.5 give a sufficient condition for when the the LLT polynomials  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}}}(X_n; t)$  are equivalent.


**Theorem 4.6.** *If there is a unique non-crossing matching  $M$  of the sequence of beads associated to  $\beta/\gamma$ , then  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}}}(X_n; t)$  are equivalent. In particular,*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t) = \left( \prod_{a \in M} w(a) \right) \mathcal{L}_{(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}}}(X_n; t)$$

where the product is over all arcs  $a$  in the matching and the weight of an arc is given by (7).

*Proof.* We know that the algorithm from Section 3 associates to every configuration of the vertex model a non-crossing matching which determines the change in weight of the configuration under the bijection  $\Phi$ . If there is a unique non-crossing matching then each configuration is associated to the same matching and the change in weight is the same for all configurations. Thus the bijection is weight preserving up to an overall power of  $t$ .  $\square$

In our running example, we have the tuple of partitions  $\beta/\gamma = ((8, 7, 6), (4, 3, 2)/(2, 0, 0))$  for which there is a unique non-crossing matching for the sequence of beads associated to  $\beta/\gamma$ . It is given by



Using Theorem 4.6 we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t) = t^5 \mathcal{L}_{(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}}}(X_n; t)$$

where  $(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}} = ((4, 3, 2)/(2, 0, 0), (8, 7, 6))$ .


**Remark 4.7.** *Suppose  $\beta/\gamma = (\dots, \beta^{(i)}/\gamma^{(i)}, \beta^{(i+1)}/\gamma^{(i+1)}, \dots)$  and  $(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}} = (\dots, \beta^{(i+1)}/\gamma^{(i+1)}, \beta^{(i)}/\gamma^{(i)}, \dots)$  are two tuples of partitions which are the same except for having their  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $(i+1)^{\text{st}}$  partitions swapped. Then if there is a unique non-crossing matching  $M$  of the sequence of beads associated to the tuple of partitions  $(\beta/\gamma)_{i, i+1} = (\beta^{(i)}/\gamma^{(i)}, \beta^{(i+1)}/\gamma^{(i+1)})$ , it still holds that*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta/\gamma}(X_n; t) = \left( \prod_{a \in M} w(a) \right) \mathcal{L}_{(\beta/\gamma)_{\text{swap}}}(X_n; t)$$

where the the product is over all arcs  $a$  in the matching and the weight of an arc is given by (7).


In Appendix A, we classify which sequences of beads have unique non-crossing matchings. We find that

**Proposition 4.8.** *For a single row, sequences of beads that have a unique non-crossing matching are of the form*



with  $p + r = q$ , or the same configurations as above with red and blue swapped.


**Proposition 4.9.** *With two rows, sequence of beads that have a unique non-crossing matching are given by*




*or the same sequences as above with the rows or colors swapped, where the difference between the number of red and blue beads in the top row is equal to the difference in the number of red and blue beads in the bottom row.*

We then pull back these conditions to conditions on the tuple  $\beta/\gamma$  for which Theorem 4.6 holds.

While the procedure in Section 3 associates to every vertex model configuration a non-crossing matching of a sequence of labelled beads, it is not true in general that there is vertex model configuration associated to every non-crossing matching. For example, let  $\beta/\gamma = ((5, 4, 4)/(2, 2, 0), (3, 1, 1))$ . There are two non-crossing matchings for the sequence of beads associated to the tuple



An example configuration which realizes the second matching is given by



but it is impossible to realize the first matching with paths. That is, the map from configuration of the vertex model to non-crossing matchings is not generally onto.


However, if  $\beta/\gamma = \beta$  is a tuple of straight shapes, each with the same number of parts, then we can indeed construct a path configuration for the vertex model corresponding to every non-crossing matching (provided that the vertex model has sufficiently many rows). We leave the construction of such a configurations to the interested reader. In what follows, we will consider either this case or specific examples in which it is clear that all matchings can be obtained.

## 5 Linear Relations between LLT polynomials


In this section we show how we can use the techniques we have developed to exhibit linear relations between different LLT polynomials.



Let's start with a small example. Consider the tuples of partitions  $\lambda_1 = ((3,3),(1))$ ,  $\lambda_2 = ((2,2),(3))$ , and  $\lambda_3 = ((3,2),(2))$ . The vertex model boundary conditions and the non-crossing matchings associated to the tuples are given by



As there is a unique non-crossing matching associated to  $\lambda_1$ , the previous section allow us to conclude that  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_1}(X_n; t) = t^2 \mathcal{L}_{((1),(3,3))}(X_n; t)$ . However, we can do more. Given a path configuration with boundary condition given by  $\lambda_1$ , we can switch the color of all path segments in the walk starting from red path on the top boundary. For example,



This results in a configuration with boundary condition given by  $\lambda_3$ , in particular, a configuration which corresponds to matching  $M_1$ . Doing this for every configuration gives a bijection  $\{\text{config. with boundary condition } \lambda_1\} \rightarrow \{\text{config. with boundary condition } \lambda_3 \text{ corresponding to } M_1\}$  where under this mapping the change in the power of  $t$  is given by

$$w \left( \begin{array}{c} 2 \\ \text{red node} \end{array} \text{ --- } \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \text{blue node} \end{array} \right) = t.$$

Similarly, for any configuration in the vertex model for  $\lambda_2$ , we can swap the color of all path segments along the walk starting at the red path on the top row. This gives a bijection  $\{\text{config. with boundary condition } \lambda_2\} \rightarrow \{\text{config. with boundary condition } \lambda_3 \text{ corresponding to } M_2\}$

where under this mapping the change in the power of  $t$  is given by

$$w \left( \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \\ 0 \end{array} \right) = t^{-1}.$$

All together this shows that


$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_3}(X; t) = t^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_1}(X; t) + t \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_2}(X; t).$$

As one possible application of this type of calculation, we can reprove a relation between LLT polynomials indexed by single rows given in [15]. Note that the precise powers of  $t$  differ than that of [15] as we are working with coinversion LLT polynomials.

**Lemma** (Lemma 3.17, [15]). *Let  $\beta_1, \gamma_1, \beta_2, \gamma_2$  be positive integers such that  $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 \leq \beta_1 < \beta_2$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{L}_{(\beta/\gamma)_1, (\beta_2/\gamma_2)}(X_n; t) = \mathcal{L}_{(\beta_2/\gamma_2, \beta_1/\gamma_1)}(X_n; t) + (t^{-1} - 1) \mathcal{L}_{(\beta_2/\gamma_1, \beta_1/\gamma_2)}(X_n; t).$$

*Proof.* We began by drawing the boundary conditions and matchings corresponding to the tuple of partitions of each of these LLT polynomials:



Note that the terms corresponding to  $M_2$  in  $(\beta/\gamma)_1$  and  $(\beta/\gamma)_2$  are equal as we can swap the colors along the arcs connecting the two rows with no cost. Similarly, terms corresponding to  $M_1$  in  $(\beta/\gamma)_1$  and  $(\beta/\gamma)_2$  are equal to those in  $(\beta/\gamma)_3$  up a power of  $t$  coming from swapping the color along one of the arcs. Putting this together, we have


$$\mathcal{L}_{(\beta_1/\gamma_1, \beta_2/\gamma_2)}(X_n; t) - t^{-1} \mathcal{L}_{(\beta_2/\gamma_1, \beta_1/\gamma_2)}(X_n; t) = \mathcal{L}_{(\beta_2/\gamma_2, \beta_1/\gamma_1)}(X_n; t) - \mathcal{L}_{(\beta_2/\gamma_1, \beta_1/\gamma_2)}(X_n; t)$$

from which the result follows. □


For a more complicated example, consider the family of tuples of partitions

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1 &= ((4, 4, 4), (1, 1, 1)), \lambda_2 = ((4, 4, 3), (2, 1, 1)) \\ \lambda_3 &= ((4, 4, 2), (2, 2, 1)), \lambda_4 = ((4, 3, 3), (3, 1, 1)) \\ \lambda_5 &= ((4, 3, 2), (3, 2, 1)), \lambda_6 = ((4, 4, 1), (2, 2, 2)) \\ \lambda_7 &= ((4, 1, 1), (3, 3, 3)), \lambda_8 = ((4, 2, 2), (3, 3, 1)) \\ \lambda_9 &= ((4, 2, 1), (3, 3, 2)), \lambda_{10} = ((4, 3, 1), (3, 2, 2)) \end{aligned}$$


and the tuples  $\lambda_{10+i}$  which we obtain by swapping the order of the partitions in  $\lambda_i$ . These are all the tuples that can be obtained by starting with the boundary conditions for  $\lambda_1$



and rearranging the order of the paths on the top boundary (without changing which columns have paths). These tuples of partitions are all associated to matchings on six beads. If we ignore the color of the beads, there are five possible non-crossing matchings:




We choose a specific way to color the beads of each of these matchings, so that an arc in the matching connects a red bead to a blue bead:



Each of these sequences of colored beads corresponds to an LLT polynomial in our family. In particular, our coloring of  $M_1$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_1}$ ,  $M_2$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_2}$ ,  $M_3$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_3}$ ,  $M_4$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_4}$ , and  $M_5$  corresponds to  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_5}$ . Note that, by construction,  $M_i$  is a non-crossing matching associated to  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_i}$ , but  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_i}$  might have other non-crossing matchings associated to it as well. Define the polynomial  $g_i(X_n; t)$  as the terms in  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_i}(X_n; t)$  which correspond to the matching  $M_i$  under the algorithm in Section 3.

If  $M_j$  is a non-crossing matching associated to  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_i}$ , let  $w_{ij}(t)$  be the difference in the power of  $t$  between the weight of our choice of coloring of  $M_j$  and the coloring of  $M_j$  given by  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_i}$ . For example, there are two non-crossing matchings associated to  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_2}$ :



The first is precisely our choice of coloring of  $M_2$ , so  $w_{22}(t) = 1$ . However, to make our choice coloring of  $M_1$  match with the coloring given here we would need to swap the 3-2 arc which gives a weight of  $t$ . So  $w_{21}(t) = t$ . This allows us to write

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_i}(X_n; t) = \sum_j w_{ij}(t)g_j(X_n; t)$$

for each of  $\lambda_i$ .

Consider the matrix  $M(t)$  that in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row and  $j^{\text{th}}$  column has  $w_{ij}(t)$  if  $M_j$  is a matching associated to  $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_i}$ , and zero otherwise. Then  $M(t)$  is the matrix that transforms  $(g_1, \dots, g_5)^T$  into  $(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_1}, \dots, \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_5})^T$ . For the above, this matrix is

$$M(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ t & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-1} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ t^2 & t^{-1} & t & t^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M^{-1}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -t & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ t^2 & -t & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -t^{-1} & -t^2 & -t^3 & -t^{-1} + t^2 \\ 1 - t^{-1} - t^2 - t^3 & t^{-2} - t^{-1} + t^2 & -t & -t^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where we also write its inverse. The inverse tells us how to write the  $g_i$  as a linear combination of the LLT polynomials. For example,


$$g_3(X_n; t) = \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_3}(X_n; t) - t\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_2}(X_n; t) + t^2\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_1}(X_n; t).$$

Though we chose a particular coloring of the beads in each of the  $M_i$ , any other choice of color would have resulted in the same polynomial  $g_i(X_n; t)$  up to an overall factor of  $t$ , as we can always switch the color along an arc. Furthermore, we see that the  $g_i(X_n; t)$  are all symmetric in the  $X_n$  as they are linear combinations of LLT polynomials. Since every tuple of partitions in this family must be made up of configurations corresponding to these five matchings, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_i}(X_n; t) = \sum_{j=1}^5 t^{n_{ij}} g_j(X_n; t)$$

for some integers  $n_{ij}$ .

For instance, there are two non-crossing matchings associated to  $\lambda_8$ :



For the first matching, we can get from our choice of coloring for  $M_1$  to the coloring given here by changing the color along the arc connecting the beads labelled 4 and 1 at the cost of a  $t^{-2}$ , and along the arc connecting the beads labelled 3 and 2 at the cost of a  $t^{-1}$ . For the second matching we can get from our coloring of  $M_5$  to this coloring by swapping the color along the arc connecting beads labelled 3 and 2 at the cost of a  $t^{-1}$ . All together we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_8}(X_n; t) = t^{-3} g_1(X_n; t) + t^{-1} g_5(X_n; t).$$

While we chose a specific family of LLT polynomials in this example, the same result holds for any family of tuples of partitions which are associated to the same sequence of beads (allowing for changes in the labelling of the beads). The only difference will be the specific powers of  $t$  that will appear. But these can easily be computed as they only depend on the matchings.

This computation can be generalized. Consider  $2n$  real numbers  $\beta_1 > \beta_2 > \dots > \beta_{2n} \geq 0$ . Consider the family of tuples of partitions of the form

$$\beta = ((\beta_{i_1} - n + 1, \dots, \beta_{i_n} - n + n), (\beta_{j_1} - n + 1, \dots, \beta_{j_n} - n + n)) \quad (8)$$


where  $\beta_{i_1} > \dots > \beta_{i_n}$ ,  $\beta_{j_1} > \dots > \beta_{j_n}$ , and the  $\beta_i$ 's and  $\beta_j$ 's make up all of the  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{2n}$ . There are  $\binom{2n}{n}$  tuples of partitions in this family. As in the previous example, we will show that these LLT polynomials can all be written as sums of a smaller collection of symmetric polynomials associated to the possible non-crossing matchings.

**Theorem 5.1.** *Consider the family of partitions given in (8). Then for every  $\beta$  in this family, the LLT polynomial  $\mathcal{L}_\beta(X_n; t)$  can be written*

$$\mathcal{L}_\beta(X_n; t) = \sum_{j=1}^{C_n} t^{n_j(\beta)} g_j(X_n; t)$$

where  $C_n = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n}$  is the  $n^{\text{th}}$  Catalan number,  $n_j(\beta) \in \mathbb{Z}$  for each  $j$  and  $\beta$ , and the  $g_i$  are polynomials symmetric in the  $X_n$ .

*Proof.* The given family of partitions corresponds to sequence of beads on only one row with  $n$  red and  $n$  blue beads. For example, the tuple of partitions  $\beta = ((\beta_1 - n + 1, \dots, \beta_n - n + n), (\beta_{n+1} - n + 1, \dots, \beta_{2n} - n + n))$  corresponds to the LLT polynomial with the sequence of beads



Ignoring the color of beads, there are  $C_n = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n}$  non-crossing matchings of  $2n$  beads. The proof of this theorem will follow the same lines as in the example. We will choose an ordering of the non-crossing matchings. Then choosing a coloring of the beads in the matching picks out a partition in our family, we call  $\beta_i$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(X_n; t)$  has  $M_i$  as one of its associated matchings. We define  $g_i(X_n; t)$  as the terms in  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(X_n; t)$  which give the matching  $M_i$  under the algorithm in Section 3. We have


$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(X_n; t) = \sum_{j=1}^{C_n} w_{ij}(t) g_j(X_n; t)$$

where  $w_{ij}(t)$  is defined as in the previous example. While it is clear we can write the LLT polynomials as the sum of the  $g_i$ , it is not obvious that the  $g_i$  are symmetric.

To show this, let  $\mathbf{M}(t)$  be the matrix which takes  $(g_1, \dots, g_{C_n})^T$  to  $(\mathcal{L}_{\beta_1}, \dots, \mathcal{L}_{\beta_{C_n}})^T$  as before. We'll show that by appropriately choosing the ordering of the matchings and their coloring, the matrix  $\mathbf{M}(t)$  will be lower triangular with ones on the diagonal. In particular,  $\mathbf{M}(t)$  is invertible with  $\mathbf{M}^{-1}(t)$  describing how to write  $g_i(X_n; t)$  as a linear combination of the  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta_j}(X_n; t)$ . It then follows that the  $g_i$  are symmetric in the  $X_n$ . Since every partition in our family has to be made up of terms corresponding to one of  $C_n$  matchings, the result follows.


We order these matchings inductively. When there are zero beads there is a unique non-crossing matching (the empty matching). Suppose now how to correctly order the matchings of  $2k$ ,  $k < n$ , beads. When there are  $2n$  beads, we can uniquely describe any matching by the triple  $(a, b, c)$ ,  $0 \leq a \leq n$ ,  $0 < b \leq C_a$ ,  $0 < c \leq C_{n-a-1}$ , by decomposing it into the  $b^{\text{th}}$  matching

of  $2a$  beads  $M_b^{(a)}$  and the  $c^{\text{th}}$  matching of  $2(n-a-1)$  beads  $M_c^{(n-a-1)}$  through



We then order the matchings on  $2n$  beads by the rule  $(a_1, b_1, c_1) < (a_2, b_2, c_2)$  iff  $a_1 < a_2$ , or  $a_1 = a_2$  and  $b_1 < b_2$ , or  $a_1 = a_2$  and  $b_1 = b_2$  and  $c_1 < c_2$ .

Similarly, we choose to color each of the matchings inductively. When there are no beads, there is only the empty matching. Now suppose we know the coloring how to correctly color the matchings for sequences of  $2k$  beads,  $k < n$ . Then we color a matching of  $2n$  beads by



where, by induction, we already know how to color  $M_b^{(a)}$  and  $M_c^{(n-a-1)}$ . If  $M_i$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  matching of  $2n$  beads, coloring the beads as above picks out the partition in our family which has that sequence of colored beads. Call this partition  $\beta_i$ .

We will now show that under these choices we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(X_n; t) = g_i(X_n; t) + \sum_{j < i} w_{ij}(t) g_j(X_n; t),$$

that is,  $\mathbf{M}(t)$  is lower triangular with ones on the diagonal. The fact that the coefficient in front of the  $g_i$  for  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta_i}(X_n; t)$  is one follows from the definition of the  $g$ 's. Suppose  $M_i$  can be decomposed as  $(a, b, c)$ . Then we need to show that the sequence of colored beads associated to  $\beta_i$  does not have a matching that can be decomposed as  $(a', b', c')$  with  $(a', b', c') > (a, b, c)$ . The case when  $a' = a$  is handled by induction, so we are left to with showing we cannot have  $a' > a$ . If  $a = n$  there is nothing to check, so we assume  $a < n$ .

Order the beads from  $0$  to  $2n-$  going from right to left. Define a function  $h_n : \{0, \dots, 2n-1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  where  $h_n(k)$  returns the number of blue beads minus the number of red beads up to and including the  $k^{\text{th}}$  bead. Note that our choice of coloring guarantees  $h_n(0) = 1$ . It is easy to see that for the rightmost blue bead to match with the  $k^{\text{th}}$  bead it is necessary that  $h_n(k) = 0$ . So we are done if we can show that  $h_n(k) \neq 0$  for  $k < 2(n-a)$ .

Let  $h_{n-a} : \{0, \dots, n-a\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , be the same as the function above but applied to the subsequence of bead between the rightmost blue bead and the  $2(n-a)^{\text{th}}$  bead. By construction the rightmost bead in this subsequence is also blue. A simple induction argument shows that  $h_{n-a}(k) \geq 0$  for all  $k$ . Noting that  $h_{n-a}(k) + 1 = h_n(k+1)$  for all  $k \in \{0, \dots, 2(n-a)\}$  finishes the proof. □

We emphasize again that this holds for any family of partitions corresponding to the same sequence of beads (allowing for differences in labelling which only affect the specific powers of  $t$ ).

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper we prove a sufficient condition for when  $\mathcal{L}_{(\beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}/\gamma^{(2)})}(X_n; t)$  is equivalent to  $\mathcal{L}_{(\beta^{(2)}/\gamma^{(2)}, \beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)})}(X_n; t)$ . We do so by giving a bijection between configurations of the vertex model for each of the LLT polynomials. We show that the change in weight under this map is determined by a matching of a sequence of colored beads that can be associated to the boundary conditions of the vertex model. When the sequence of beads has a unique non-crossing matching, the bijection is weight preserving up to an overall power of  $t$  and it follows that the LLT polynomials are equivalent. From this general theorem, we can make statement about specific families of partitions. For example, as a corollary to the main result, we can show

**Corollary 6.1.** *Let  $\lambda^{(1)}$  and  $\lambda^{(2)}$  be rectangular partitions such that the Young diagram of one is contained inside the Young diagram of the other. Then  $\mathcal{L}_{(\lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)})}(X_n; t)$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{(\lambda^{(2)}, \lambda^{(1)})}(X_n; t)$  are equivalent.*

Using these techniques we are also able to construct linear relations between different LLT polynomials. Knowing these relations has been instrumental in proving results about the expansion of LLT polynomials into Schur and  $k$ -Schur polynomials [2, 11, 12, 15]. Our new techniques give a systematic way to determine these relations. While we focussed on a few specific families of partitions, we wish to emphasize that these techniques could be applied to many different families without much additional effort. We hope that these techniques will be helpful in further understanding the Schur expansion of LLT polynomials.

## 7 A: Classification

In this section we classify the sequences of beads for which there is a unique non-crossing matching. Since we can associate a sequence of beads to every  $\beta/\gamma$ , this gives a sufficient condition on tuples of partitions for which the bijection  $\Phi$  is weight-preserving up to an overall power of  $t$ .

**Lemma 7.1.** *A sequence of beads has at least one non-crossing matching if and only if the difference between the number of red beads and blue beads on the top row equals the difference in the number of red beads and blue beads on the bottom row. In particular, if there is only one row then it must have an equal number of red and blue beads.*

*Proof.* From our definition of a matching of the sequence of beads, its obvious that if we have a matching then the difference between the number of red beads and blue beads on the top row must equal the difference in the number of red beads and blue beads on the bottom row.


Now assume that the constraint on the beads is holds. As a base case, when there are two beads we can either have a red and blue bead in the same row, or beads of the same color in different row. In either case we have a matching.

Suppose there are  $n$  beads. For concreteness let the left most bead on the top row be red. Order the beads from left to right on the top row, then from right to left on the bottom row. Let  $f : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  be the function such that  $f(i)$  returns the difference between the number of red beads and blue beads on the top row minus the difference in the number of red beads and blue beads on the bottom row in the first  $i$  beads in our sequence. Note that  $f(n) = 0$  due to the constrain on the beads, and  $f(1) = 1$  as we assume the first bead is red.

Let the  $k^{th}$  bead under this ordering be the first such that  $f(k) = 0$ . Then  $f(k-1)$  must be positive, otherwise, by the intermediate value theorem,  $f$  must have been zero on an earlier bead. This implies that if the  $k^{th}$  bead is in the top row, it must be blue since for beads in the top row  $f(i) < f(i-1)$  iff the  $i^{th}$  bead is blue. Similarly, if the  $k^{th}$  bead is in the bottom row, then it must be red.


Adding an arc that connects the first bead to the  $k^{th}$  bead splits the sequence of beads into two pieces: those beads between the  $1^{st}$  and the  $k^{th}$ , and those after the  $k^{th}$ . For each piece the difference between the number of red beads and blue beads on the top row equals the difference in the number of red beads and blue beads on the bottom row. By induction each of the pieces has a non-crossing matching. Thus the whole sequence of beads has a non-crossing matching.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.2.** *For a single row, sequences of beads that have a unique non-crossing matching are of the form*




with  $p + r = q$ , or the same configurations as above with red and blue swapped.


*Proof.* It is easy to see that such a sequence admits only one non-crossing matching. It is left to show that if we have any other type of configuration there are multiple non-crossing matchings. In particular, if we have a sequence of beads not of the above form it must contain a subsequence of the form



or




We will show that in this case there are at least two non-crossing matchings. We will do this by constructing two matchings. As a base case, when there are two blue and two red beads, we have the two matchings




Now suppose we have  $n$  red and  $n$  blue beads. Suppose our sequence of beads contains a subsequence of the form red-blue-red-blue (the case of blue-red-blue-red is handled the same way with all the colors swapped). We can always choose the subsequence so the first red and blue beads in the sequence are adjacent.

From Lemma 7.1 we know there is at least one matching. Let us consider where this first red bead matches. We mark it the red bead with a star. There are three cases:

Case 1: The red matches to the right of the blue. Then we must have a matching of the form




Note that any arcs in  $interior_1$  must stay in  $interior_1$ , and similarly for arcs in  $interior_2$ . Here we can simply exhibit a second matching






where the matching of all the other beads remains the same.

Case 2: The red matches to the left. Here we have two subcases, the blue matching to the left or the blue matching to the right. The matchings take the form




where again any arcs in  $\text{interior}_1$  must stay in  $\text{interior}_1$ , and similarly for arcs in  $\text{interior}_2$ . Again we can simply exhibit a second matching



where the matching of all the other beads remains the same.

Case 3: The red matches with the blue. Since we know this pair of beads is the first red-blue in a red-blue-red-blue subsequence we can instead look at the second red-blue pair. Again we can always choose them to be adjacent. Repeating the analysis from case 1 and 2 above, we are left only with the case when the the red and blue beads in this pair also match. The matching then looks like




where we label the other beads as being in the interior or exterior.

Note if the interior is empty we can exhibit a second matching as in the base case. Similarly if beads in the interior only match with other beads in the interior, we can exhibit a second matching. So suppose there are beads in the interior which match with beads in the exterior.


If a red bead in the interior matches with a blue bead in the left exterior, then this these beads and all those in between them form a sequence that contains a blue-red-blue-red subsequence which by induction has more than one matching. Similarly, if a blue bead in the interior matches with a red bead in the right exterior, by induction we have more than one matching. So we are left to consider the case in which either some blue beads in the interior match with red beads in the left exterior, some red beads in the interior match with blue beads in the right exterior, or both.

Let us look only at the rightmost blue bead in the interior that matches with the left exterior (or the original left red-blue pair if no such blue bead exists) and the left most red bead in the interior that matches with the right exterior (or the original right red-blue pair if no such red bead exists). The matching takes the form




where now beads in the interior must match only with other beads in the interior. Now we can

exhibit a second matching



We see that if the sequence of beads has a red-blue-red-blue subsequence, there are at least two non-crossing matchings. Repeating the analysis but swapping all the colors gives the same result for blue-red-blue-red subsequences. Thus the only sequences of beads that have a unique non-crossing matching are those in the statement of the proposition.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.3.** *With two rows, sequence of beads that have a unique non-crossing matching are given by*




or the same sequences as above with the rows or colors swapped, where the difference between the number of red and blue beads in the top row is equal to the difference in the number of red and blue beads in the bottom row.

*Proof.* It easy to check that the above sequences of bead do in fact have a unique non-crossing matching. It is left to show that these are the only sequences for which this holds. We will do this by induction the difference between the number of red and blue beads in a row.

As base case, suppose there are an equal number of red and blue beads in each row. Then viewing each row individually, from Lemma 7.1 we know there exist a matching of each row on its own. So there is a matching of the two rows with no arcs connecting them. For there to be a unique non-crossing matching then each row individually must have a unique non-crossing matching. Let's assume the left most bead on the top row is red. If there are no beads in the bottom row, we know the possible configurations of the top row from Prop. 7.2 which agrees with the case in this Proposition.


Now suppose the bottom row is non-empty and the left most bead of the bottom row is red. We know there is a matching in which these beads match with blue beads to their right in their own row. Given this matching is easy to construct a second matching



by making the reds match with red, and blues match with blues, across the rows.


We see for there to be a unique non-crossing matching, the bottom row must start with a

blue bead. If the bottom row ends with a blue bead, we similarly have two matchings




where in the first matching no arcs connect the two rows. So the bottom row must end in a red bead. Applying this argument a third time we can show that for there to be a unique non-crossing matching, the top row must end in a blue bead.

The only sequences of beads satisfying these constraints, as well as those of Prop. 7.2, are of the form




with  $q - p = r - s = 0$ , as desired.


Now suppose we are in the case where there are  $k$  more blue beads than red beads in each row. Any matching must have at least  $k$  arcs connecting the two rows. Given any matching, consider the left most such arc. Suppose it connects between two blue beads, the case where it connects between two red beads can be done by swapping all the colors. This divides the sequence of beads into two pieces




For the whole sequence to have a unique non-crossing matching each piece must also have a unique non-crossing matching. Let's consider piece A. Since the difference between the number of blue and red beads in each row is zero in this piece, by induction we can see that this portion must take the form



or the same sequences as above with the rows or colors swapped. Including the arc between the two blue beads, the only case in which we are unable to construct a second non-crossing matching is




or the same sequences with the rows swapped. For example, if both rows are non-empty we have the two matchings




where the first is the unique non-crossing matching of the beads in piece A (we draw the arc of particular interest to us) as well as the arc connecting the two rightmost blue beads, and in the second the matching changes as shown.

Now consider piece B (including the arc between the two blue beads). The difference between the number of blue and red beads in each row is  $k - 1$  in this piece, so again by induction we can see that this portion must take the form



or the same sequences as above with the rows or colors swapped. Including the arc between the two blue beads, the only sequence of beads that still has a unique non-crossing matching is




or the same configuration with the rows swapped.

Finally, combining the two pieces we see that the configuration of beads must be in the form given in the statement of the proposition.  $\square$


We can pull this constraint on matching back to a constraint on the partition  $\beta/\gamma = (\beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}/\gamma^{(2)})$ . Recall that the top row of beads corresponds to the singleton paths in the top boundary condition of the vertex model, which depends only on  $\beta^{(1)}$  and  $\beta^{(2)}$ . Similarly, the bottom row of beads depends only on  $\gamma^{(1)}$  and  $\gamma^{(2)}$ . For simplicity, we'll assume  $l(\beta^{(1)}) = l(\beta^{(2)}) = n$ . Let  $\delta_n = (n - 1, n - 2, \dots, 0)$  be the staircase partition of length  $n$ . Consider the strict partitions  $\tilde{\beta}^{(1)} = \beta^{(1)} + \delta_n$  and  $\tilde{\beta}^{(2)} = \beta^{(2)} + \delta_n$ . Recall that each row of the partitions  $\beta^{(1)}/\gamma^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}/\gamma^{(2)}$  correspond to a path in the vertex model. The length of the rows of  $\tilde{\beta}^{(1)}, \tilde{\beta}^{(2)}$  encode the number of horizontal steps the paths takes.

We can construct a third strict partition  $\sigma_\beta$  whose parts are the parts of  $\tilde{\beta}^{(1)}$  and  $\tilde{\beta}^{(2)}$  sorted into the decreasing order, along with the condition that anytime a part of  $\tilde{\beta}^{(1)}$  is equal to a part of  $\tilde{\beta}^{(2)}$  both are removed. The order of the parts in this partition gives the order of the singleton boundary paths from rightmost to leftmost. If we color the parts coming from  $\tilde{\beta}^{(1)}$  blue and those coming from  $\tilde{\beta}^{(2)}$  then this is precisely the ordering of the sequence of colored beads associated to the top boundary. We see that the top row of the sequence of colored beads is equivalent to the order of the parts of  $\sigma_\beta$  if we keep track of each parts color. The bottom row of the sequence of colored beads comes from same sorted partition using the  $\gamma$ 's rather than the  $\beta$ 's.

For example, when  $\beta/\gamma = ((5, 5, 1)/(2, 1, 0), (4, 3, 2)/(1, 0, 0))$ . Then  $\tilde{\beta}^{(1)} = (7, 6, 1)$ ,  $\tilde{\beta}^{(2)} = (6, 5, 2)$ ,  $\tilde{\gamma}^{(1)} = (4, 2, 0)$ , and  $\tilde{\gamma}^{(2)} = (3, 1, 0)$ . The Young diagrams for  $\sigma_\beta$  and  $\sigma_\gamma$  are then



corresponding to the vertex model boundary condition and sequence of colored beads



With this the constraints on the sequence of beads can then be translated to a constraint on  $\sigma_\beta$  and  $\sigma_\gamma$ .

## References

- [1] A. Aggarwal, A. Borodin, and M. Wheeler. Colored Fermionic Vertex Models and Symmetric Functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.01605*, 2021.
- [2] P. Alexandersson. LLT polynomials, elementary symmetric functions and melting lollipops. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 2020.
- [3] J. Blasiak, M. Haiman, J. Morse, A. Pun, and G. Seelinger. A shuffle theorem for paths under any line. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.07931*, 2020.
- [4] A. Borodin and M. Wheeler. Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials via integrable vertex models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.06804*, 2019.
- [5] B. Brubaker, V. Buciumas, D. Bump, and H. Gustafsson. Colored five-vertex models and Demazure atoms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01795*, 2019.
- [6] B. Brubaker, D. Bump, and S. Friedberg. Schur polynomials and the Yang-Baxter equation. *Communications in mathematical physics*, 308(2):281, 2011.
- [7] S. Corteel, A. Gitlin, D. Keating, and J. Meza. A vertex model for LLT polynomials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.02376*, 2020.
- [8] A. Garbali and M. Wheeler. Modified Macdonald polynomials and integrability. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, pages 1–68, 2020.
- [9] J. Haglund, M. Haiman, N. Loehr, J. B. Remmel, A. Ulyanov, et al. A combinatorial formula for the character of the diagonal coinvariants. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 126(2):195–232, 2005.
- [10] A. Lascoux, B. Leclerc, and J.-Y. Thibon. Ribbon tableaux, Hall–Littlewood functions, quantum affine algebras, and unipotent varieties. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 38(2):1041–1068, 1997.
- [11] S. Lee. Linear relations on LLT polynomials and their  $k$ -Schur positivity for  $k = 2$ . *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03951*, 2018.

- [12] C. R. Miller. *On the  $k$ -Schur Positivity of  $k$ -Bandwidth LLT Polynomials*. PhD thesis, UC Berkeley, 2019.
- [13] N. Reshetikhin. Lectures on the integrability of the six-vertex model. *Exact methods in low-dimensional statistical physics and quantum computing*, pages 197–266, 2010.
- [14] D. W. Stanton and D. E. White. A Schensted algorithm for rim hook tableaux. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 40(2):211–247, 1985.
- [15] F. Tom. A combinatorial Schur expansion of triangle-free horizontal-strip LLT polynomials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.13671*, 2020.