

# A proof of the $\frac{n!}{k}$ conjecture for hook shapes

Sam Armon

## Abstract

A well-known representation-theoretic model for the transformed Macdonald polynomial  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$ , where  $\mu$  is an integer partition, is given by the Garsia-Haiman module  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ . We study the  $\frac{n!}{k}$  conjecture of Bergeron and Garsia, which concerns the behavior of certain  $k$ -tuples of Garsia-Haiman modules under intersection. In the special case that  $\mu$  has hook shape, we use a basis for  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  due to Adin, Remmel, and Roichman to resolve the  $\frac{n!}{k}$  conjecture by constructing an explicit basis for the intersection of two Garsia-Haiman modules.

## 1 Introduction

The Macdonald polynomials  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$  have become a central object of study in algebra, combinatorics, and geometry since their introduction by Macdonald in [15]. Of particular import is the expansion of  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$  in the Schur basis:

$$\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q) = \sum_{\lambda} \tilde{K}_{\lambda\mu}(t, q) s_{\lambda}(Z).$$

The (since resolved) *Macdonald positivity conjecture* asserts that  $\tilde{K}_{\lambda\mu}(t, q)$  is a polynomial in  $t$  and  $q$  with nonnegative integer coefficients. This conjecture suggests that  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$  should have a representation-theoretic interpretation as the character of a doubly graded symmetric group module, and indeed such an interpretation is given by the *Garsia-Haiman module*  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ :

**Theorem 1.1** ([14]). The transformed Macdonald polynomial  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$  equals the bigraded Frobenius series of the Garsia-Haiman module  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ .

In fact, Garsia and Haiman were able to show that in order to establish this connection, it would be enough to prove that  $\dim(\mathcal{H}_\mu) = n!$ . Thus the problem was reduced to this  $n!$  *conjecture*, which was later resolved by Haiman ([14]).

This paper studies the related  $\frac{n!}{k}$  *conjecture* of Bergeron and Garsia, which makes a similar assertion about the dimension of the intersection of certain  $k$ -tuples of Garsia-Haiman modules:

**Conjecture 1.1** ([5]). Let  $\lambda$  be an integer partition of  $n + 1$ , and let  $\mu^{(1)}, \dots, \mu^{(k)}$  be partitions of  $n$  each obtained from  $\lambda$  by removing a removable cell from the Young diagram of  $\lambda$ . Then,

$$\dim \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}_{\mu^{(i)}} \right) = \frac{n!}{k}.$$


We resolve the  $\frac{n!}{k}$  conjecture in the special case that  $\lambda$  has hook shape — the only nontrivial case is  $k = 2$  since a hook has at most two removable cells, hence the title. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: after outlining some necessary prerequisites in Section 2, we introduce the Garsia-Haiman module  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  in Section 3. In particular, we define a basis for  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  when  $\mu$  has hook

shape; each basis element is indexed by a *standard filling* of  $\mu$ , and is given by a monomial which encodes particular inversions in the standard filling. This basis is simply a restatement of the  $k$ -th Artin basis of [1], using the language of standard fillings rather than permutations.

Equipped with this basis, we proceed in Section 4 to construct an explicit basis for the intersection of two Garsia-Haiman modules with hook shape by defining a bijective map between particular subsets of standard fillings which leaves the corresponding basis element unchanged. Our bijection makes use of two “Foata-like” maps which preserve particular inversions in the first row and column of a standard filling of hook shape.

## 2 Macdonald polynomials


We begin by cataloguing some necessary terminology. An *integer partition* of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is a nonincreasing sequence of positive integers  $\mu = (\mu_1 \geq \mu_2 \geq \dots \geq \mu_k)$  such that  $\sum_i \mu_i = n$ , abbreviated  $\mu \vdash n$ . We say that an integer partition  $\mu$  has *hook shape* if  $\mu = (a, 1, \dots, 1)$  for some  $a \geq 1$ . The *Young diagram* of  $\mu$  a subset of  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  with  $\mu_i$  left-justified cells in row  $i$ . We opt for French (coordinate) notation, so that the partition  $\mu = (4, 3, 3)$  has Young diagram



By a slight abuse of notation we identify  $\mu$  with its Young diagram; e.g. when we refer to “the cells of  $\mu$ ” we really mean “the cells of the Young diagram of  $\mu$ ”.

The *length* of a partition  $\mu$ , denoted  $\ell(\mu)$ , is the number of nonzero rows of  $\mu$ , and the *conjugate* of  $\mu$ , denoted  $\mu'$ , is the partition obtained from  $\mu$  by transposing rows and columns. We say a cell  $c$  in  $\mu$  is *removable* if there are no cells immediately above or directly right of  $c$ ; in other words,  $c$  is removable if the diagram  $\mu - \{c\}$  still has partition shape. For instance, the cells at the ends of rows 1 and 3 in the above diagram are removable, but the cell at the end of row 2 is not.

A *filling* of  $\mu \vdash n$  is a map  $S : \mu \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  — i.e. an assignment of positive integers to the cells of  $\mu$  — and a *standard filling* of  $\mu$  is a bijective map  $S : \mu \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . For instance, the six standard fillings of  $\mu = (2, 1)$  are:



For a filling  $S$ , we let  $S_{i,j}$  denote the entry in row  $i$ , column  $j$  of  $S$ .

Let  $Z = z_1, z_2, \dots$  denote a countably infinite set of variables. The *symmetric group*  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  is the group of permutations of  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , and we say that a function  $f \in \mathbb{Q}[Z]$  is *symmetric* if it is unchanged under the  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -action given by permuting indices, for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Q}[Z]$  denote the subring of symmetric functions. Many bases for  $\Lambda$  are known, but perhaps the most famous (and most useful from a representation-theoretic point of view) is the basis of *Schur functions*  $\{s_\mu\}$ , where  $\mu$  ranges over the collection of all integer partitions.

Macdonald ([15]) defined an exceptional new basis for the ring  $\Lambda_{(t,q)}$  of symmetric functions with coefficients in the field  $\mathbb{Q}(t,q)$  which simultaneously generalizes the Schur functions, Hall-Littlewood polynomials, and Jack symmetric functions, among others. Macdonald’s polynomials were not given by an explicit formula — rather, they were characterized by particular triangularity and orthogonality relations with respect to a  $(t, q)$ -deformation of the Hall inner product — but a certain transformed version  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$  of the Macdonald polynomial has an elegant combinatorial description, proved in [12]. For any integer partition  $\mu$ ,  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$  may be described as a  $(t, q)$ -weighted sum over fillings of  $\mu$ , where the  $t$ - and  $q$ -weights are given by combinatorial statistics on

fillings which were originally defined by Haglund ([11]). See [11] or [12] for the precise definition of these statistics.

Moreover,  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$  has an elegant expansion in the Schur basis:

$$\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q) = \sum_{\lambda} \tilde{K}_{\lambda\mu}(t, q) s_{\lambda}(Z). \quad (1)$$

The coefficients  $\tilde{K}_{\lambda\mu}(t, q)$  are *a priori* rational functions in  $t$  and  $q$ , but Macdonald conjectured that  $\tilde{K}_{\lambda\mu}(t, q) \in \mathbb{N}[t, q]$ ; this *Macdonald positivity conjecture* was resolved in [14], by realizing  $\tilde{K}_{\lambda\mu}(t, q)$  as the doubly graded character multiplicities of a certain doubly graded  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -module, which we describe in the following section.

### 3 Garsia-Haiman modules

Garsia and Haiman ([9]) proposed the following representation-theoretic interpretation for  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$ . Consider the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Q}[X, Y] = \mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_n]$  along with the diagonal  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -action given by permuting the  $X$ - and  $Y$ -variables simultaneously and identically; that is,

$$\sigma \cdot f(x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_n) = f(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)}; y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, y_{\sigma(n)})$$

for any  $f(X, Y) \in \mathbb{Q}[X, Y]$  and  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ . For  $\mu \vdash n$ , define the polynomial

$$\Delta_\mu = \det(x_i^{p_i-1} y_i^{q_i-1})_{i,j=1}^n \in \mathbb{Q}[X, Y],$$

where  $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_n, q_n)\}$  encode the coordinates of the cells of  $\mu$ , taken in any order. For instance, we label the cells of  $\mu = (3, 2)$  as follows:

(2,1)	(2,2)	
(1,1)	(1,2)	(1,3)

Then  $\Delta_\mu \neq 0$  since the above biexponents are distinct, and  $\Delta_\mu$  is an  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -alternating polynomial which is doubly homogeneous of  $X$ -degree  $b(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell(\mu)} (i-1)\mu_i$  and of  $Y$ -degree  $b(\mu') = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell(\mu')} (j-1)\mu'_j$ . Let

$$\mathfrak{I}_\mu = \{f \in \mathbb{Q}[X, Y] : f(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}; \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}) \Delta_\mu = 0\}$$

denote the ideal of polynomials whose corresponding differential operator annihilates  $\Delta_\mu$ . Note that, since  $\Delta_\mu$  is doubly homogeneous and  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -alternating,  $\mathfrak{I}_\mu$  is an  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -invariant, doubly homogeneous ideal.

**Definition 3.1** ([9]). The *Garsia-Haiman module* is the quotient ring

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu = \mathbb{Q}[X, Y] / \mathfrak{I}_\mu$$

viewed as a doubly graded  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -module, with the  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -action induced by the diagonal action on  $\mathbb{Q}[X, Y]$ .

Since  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  is doubly graded, we have a direct sum decomposition

$$\mathcal{H}_\mu = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{b(\mu)} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{b(\mu')} (\mathcal{H}_\mu)_{i,j},$$

where  $(\mathcal{H}_\mu)_{i,j}$  denotes the submodule spanned by elements of total  $X$ -degree  $i$  and total  $Y$ -degree  $j$ .

Garsia and Haiman conjectured that the *Frobenius series* of  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  (defined below) is precisely  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$ . Due to known identities involving the usual Kostka numbers  $K_{\lambda\mu}$ , it is necessary that  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  afford a doubly graded version of the regular representation of  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ , and in particular that the dimension of  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  is  $n!$ , for this identity to hold. Strikingly, this apparently weaker condition is sufficient to establish the desired result:

**Theorem 3.1** ([13]). If the dimension of  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  is  $n!$ , then the bigraded Frobenius series of  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  given by

$$\text{Frob}_{\mathcal{H}_\mu}(Z; t, q) = \sum_{i,j} t^i q^j \text{ch}((\mathcal{H}_\mu)_{i,j}),$$

where  $\text{ch}$  is the map which sends the irreducible  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -representation  $S^\lambda$  to the Schur function  $s_\lambda$ , equals the transformed Macdonald polynomial  $\tilde{H}_\mu(Z; t, q)$ .

Thus the problem was reduced to this comparatively simpler  $n!$  *conjecture*, which was later resolved by Haiman:

**Theorem 3.2** ([14]). The dimension of  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  is  $n!$ .

This in turn proves the Macdonald positivity conjecture, since it realizes  $\tilde{K}_{\lambda\mu}(t, q)$  as the doubly graded multiplicity of  $S^\lambda$  in  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ . The proof of the  $n!$  conjecture in [14], however, relies on deep algebro-geometric results, and it remains an open problem to construct an explicit basis for  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  in general.

Many bases for  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$  are known when  $\mu$  has hook shape, however (see [1],[2],[3],[4],[10],[16]). We opt to work with the  $k$ -th Artin basis of [1], which was also known to Garsia and Haiman in [?]. Using the following terminology, we reframe this basis in a form which is more amenable to our later constructions.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\text{SF}(\mu)$  denote the set of standard fillings of  $\mu$ . Given  $S \in \text{SF}(a, 1^\ell)$ , define a *row inversion* to be a pair  $S_{1,i} > S_{1,j}$  where  $i < j$ . Similarly, define a *column inversion* to be a pair  $S_{j,1} > S_{i,1}$  for  $i < j$  (note the swapped indices). Denote the collection of row (resp. column) inversions in  $S$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{rowInv}(S) &= \{(t, r) : t > r, t \text{ left of } r \text{ in row 1 of } S\}, \\ \text{collnv}(S) &= \{(d, c) : d > c, d \text{ above } c \text{ in column 1 of } S\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 3.3.** Given  $S \in \text{SF}(a, 1^\ell)$ , define the polynomial  $\varphi_S(X, Y) \in \mathbb{Q}[X, Y]$  by

$$\varphi_S(X, Y) = \prod_{(d,c) \in \text{collnv}(S)} x_d \prod_{(t,r) \in \text{rowInv}(S)} y_r$$

(cf. [1], Definition 1.6).

**Example 3.1.** The following standard filling of  $\mu = (5, 1^4)$ :

$$S = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 4 \\ \hline 1 \\ \hline 9 \\ \hline 7 \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 3 & 2 & 8 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

has

$$\begin{aligned}\text{rowInv}(S) &= \{(5, 3), (5, 2), (6, 3), (6, 2), (3, 2)\}, \\ \text{colInv}(S) &= \{(4, 1), (9, 7), (9, 5), (7, 5)\},\end{aligned}$$

so  $\varphi_S(X, Y) = x_4 x_7 x_9^2 y_2^3 y_3^2$ .

**Theorem 3.3** ([1], Corollary 1.7). The set

$$\{\varphi_S(X, Y) : S \in \text{SF}(a, 1^\ell)\}$$

forms a basis for the Garsia-Haiman module  $\mathcal{H}_{(a, 1^\ell)}$ .

**Remark 3.1.** The theory of orbit harmonics developed by Garsia and Haiman ([8]) lays the groundwork for a new, direct proof that  $\{\varphi_S\}$  forms a basis for  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ , which we sketch here. Let  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$  be distinct rational numbers. To any standard filling  $S$  we associate an *orbit point*  $p_S = (\alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_n}; \beta_{j_1}, \dots, \beta_{j_n})$ , and a polynomial

$$\psi_S = \prod_{(d, c) \in \text{colInv}(S)} (x_d - \alpha_{\text{row}(c)}) \prod_{(t, r) \in \text{rowInv}(S)} (y_r - \beta_{\text{col}(t)}),$$

so that  $\varphi_S$  is the leading term of  $\psi_S$ . Garsia and Haiman proved that if

1. the matrix  $(\psi_S(p_T))$  is nonsingular, and
2. the Hilbert series of  $\{\psi_S\}$  is symmetric,

then the leading terms  $\{\varphi_S\}$  form a basis for  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ . There exists a total ordering on standard fillings under which  $(\psi_S(p_T))$  is upper-triangular with nonzero diagonal entries (hence nonsingular), and the symmetry of the Hilbert series is evidenced by the fact that  $\varphi_S(t, q) = t^{n(\mu)} q^{n(\mu')} \varphi_{\tilde{S}}(t^{-1}, q^{-1})$ , where  $\tilde{S}$  is obtained from  $S$  by replacing the entry  $i$  with  $n - i + 1$ .

## 4 A proof of the $\frac{n!}{k}$ conjecture for hook shapes

Now equipped with an explicit basis for  $\mathcal{H}_{(a, 1^\ell)}$ , we can study the remarkable intersection properties of these modules which were conjectured in [5]. In full generality, the  $\frac{n!}{k}$  conjecture is:

**Conjecture 4.1** ([5]). Let  $\lambda \vdash n + 1$ , and let  $\mu^{(1)}, \dots, \mu^{(k)}$  be partitions of  $n$  each be obtained from  $\lambda$  by removing a removable cell from the Young diagram of  $\lambda$ . Then,

$$\dim \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}_{\mu^{(i)}} \right) = \frac{n!}{k}.$$

We prove the  $\frac{n!}{k}$  conjecture when  $\lambda$  has hook shape; in particular, the only nontrivial case is  $k = 2$ , since a hook shape only has two removable cells. These ideas are also pursued in [6], where the authors obtain a plethystic formula for the Frobenius series of the intersection of two Garsia-Haiman modules with hook shape. For the rest of the paper, assume  $\lambda = (a, 1^\ell)$  is a partition of  $n + 1 := a + \ell$  with  $a \geq 2$  and  $\ell \geq 1$  — the conjecture is trivial otherwise — and let  $\mu = (a, 1^{\ell-1})$ ,  $\rho = (a - 1, 1^\ell)$  be partitions of  $n$  obtained from  $\lambda$  by removing a cell from the end of the first column, and from the end of the first row, respectively.

**Theorem 4.1** ( $\frac{n!}{2}$  for hook shapes). For partitions  $\mu, \rho$  as defined above,

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho) = \frac{n!}{2}.$$

The rest of Section 4 is devoted to a proof of Theorem 4.1.

**Definition 4.1.** As above, let  $SF(\mu)$  (resp.  $SF(\rho)$ ) denote the set of standard fillings of  $\mu$  (resp.  $\rho$ ). Define a map  $\text{bump} : SF(\mu) \rightarrow SF(\rho)$ , where  $\text{bump}(S)$  is the filling of  $\rho$  obtained from  $S$  by moving each entry in the first column up one row, and then pushing each remaining entry in the first row to the left one column; that is,

$$\text{bump} \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline v_\ell & & & & \\ \hline \vdots & & & & \\ \hline v_2 & & & & \\ \hline v_1 & u_1 & u_2 & \cdots & u_{a-1} \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline v_\ell & & & \\ \hline \vdots & & & \\ \hline v_2 & & & \\ \hline v_1 & & & \\ \hline u_1 & u_2 & \cdots & u_{a-1} \\ \hline \end{array} .$$

Now consider the subsets

$$\begin{aligned} SF_{<}(\mu) &= \{S \in SF(\mu) : S_{1,1} < S_{1,a}\}, \\ SF_{<}(\rho) &= \{T \in SF(\rho) : T_{\ell+1,1} < T_{1,1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $S_{i,j}$  denotes the entry in row  $i$ , column  $j$  of  $S$ .

We have  $\#SF_{<}(\mu) = \#SF_{<}(\rho) = \frac{n!}{2}$ , and we claim furthermore that

$$\{\varphi_S : S \in SF_{<}(\mu)\} = \{\varphi_T : T \in SF_{<}(\rho)\}.$$

To prove this assertion, we will define a bijective map  $\theta : SF_{<}(\mu) \rightarrow SF_{<}(\rho)$  such that  $\varphi_S = \varphi_{\theta(S)}$  for any  $S \in SF_{<}(\mu)$ .

There are two main steps in defining the map  $\theta$ :

1. Given a filling  $S \in SF_{<}(\mu)$ , consider  $\text{bump}(S) \in SF(\rho)$ . This new filling is potentially missing some row inversions in  $S$  which were created by  $u = S_{1,1}$ , which now resides in the second row, so we must rearrange what remains of the first row to reintroduce the necessary inversions.
2. After rearranging the first row there is a new entry  $v$  in row 1, column 1, so we may have introduced some column inversions which were not there before, and we must rearrange the first column to remove these new inversions.

To this end, we define a map  $\text{arm}_u$  which reintroduces the row inversions removed in the first step, and a map  $\text{leg}_v$  which removes the column inversions introduced in the second. In what follows, let

$$\mathcal{W} = \{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m : m, w_i \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

denote the set of words of finite length in the alphabet  $\mathbb{N}$ .

**Definition 4.2.** For a fixed  $u \in \mathbb{N}$ , consider the set of words

$$\mathcal{A}_u = \{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m : m \in \mathbb{N}, w_i \in \mathbb{N} - \{u\}, w_m > u\}.$$

Define a map  $\text{arm}_u : \mathcal{A}_u \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$  as follows: given  $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m \in \mathcal{A}_u$ , let  $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_j$  denote the indices for which  $w_{b_i} < u$ . If there are no such indices, then define  $\text{arm}_u(w) = w$ . Otherwise,

1. Draw a vertical bar immediately to the left of  $w_{b_i}$  if either  $w_{b_i-1} > u$ , or if  $i = 1$  and  $b_1 = 1$ .

2. Within each newly created block which contains at least one of the  $w_{b_i}$ 's, move the leftmost entry which is  $> u$  to the front of the block, immediately right of the (leftmost) vertical bar.

Define the resulting word to be  $\text{arm}_u(w)$ . This map is well-defined on  $\mathcal{A}_u$ , since the last letter in  $w \in \mathcal{A}_u$  is required to be  $> u$ ; that is, we will always have an entry  $> u$  to shuffle within each block.

**Example 4.1.** For  $w = 49263187 \in \mathcal{A}_5$ , draw vertical bars to the left of 4, 2, and 3, and within each block shuffle the leftmost number  $> 5$  to the front:

$$\left| 4 \ 9 \right| \left| 2 \ 6 \right| \left| 3 \ 1 \ 8 \ 7 \right| \mapsto \left| 9 \ 4 \right| \left| 6 \ 2 \right| \left| 8 \ 3 \ 1 \ 7 \right|$$

So,  $\text{arm}_5(49263187) = 94628317$ .

**Definition 4.3.** For a fixed  $v \in \mathbb{N}$ , consider the set of words

$$\mathcal{L}_v = \{w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m : m \in \mathbb{N}, w_i \in \mathbb{N} - \{v\}, w_1 < v\}.$$

Define  $\text{leg}_v : \mathcal{L}_v \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$  as follows: given  $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_m \in \mathcal{L}_v$ , let  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k$  denote the indices for which  $w_{c_i} > v$ . If there are no such indices, then define  $\text{leg}_v(w) = w$ . Otherwise,

1. Draw a vertical bar immediately to the right of  $w_{c_i}$  if either  $w_{c_i+1} < v$ , or if  $i = k$  and  $c_k = m$ .
2. Within each newly created block which contains at least one of the  $w_{c_i}$ 's, move the rightmost entry which is  $< v$  to the end of the block, immediately left of the (rightmost) vertical bar.

Define the resulting word to be  $\text{leg}_v(w)$ . This map is well-defined on  $\mathcal{L}_v$ , since the first letter in  $w \in \mathcal{L}_v$  is required to be  $< v$ ; that is, we will always have an entry  $< v$  to shuffle within each block.

**Example 4.2.** For  $w = 48731926 \in \mathcal{L}_5$ , draw vertical bars to the right of 7, 9, and 6, and within each block shuffle the rightmost number  $< 5$  to the end:

$$4 \ 8 \ 7 \left| 3 \ 1 \ 9 \right| \left| 2 \ 6 \right| \mapsto 8 \ 7 \ 4 \left| 3 \ 9 \ 1 \right| \left| 6 \ 2 \right|$$

So,  $\text{leg}_5(48731926) = 87439162$ .

Note the similarity of  $\text{arm}_u$  and  $\text{leg}_v$  to the maps  $\gamma_x$  introduced by Foata ([7]), which he used to bijectively prove that the major index and inversion number have the same distribution over  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ .

**Definition 4.4.** Using the maps  $\text{arm}_u$  and  $\text{leg}_v$  defined above, we define  $\theta : \text{SF}_{<}(\mu) \rightarrow \text{SF}_{<}(\nu)$  as follows. Given  $S \in \text{SF}_{<}(\mu)$ , let  $u = S_{1,1}$ , and let  $v$  be the leftmost entry in the first row of  $S$  which is  $> u$ . Then define

$$\theta(S) = \text{leg}_v \circ \text{arm}_u \circ \text{bump}(S),$$

where  $\text{arm}_u$  acts only on the first row of  $\text{bump}(S)$  — that is, we replace the first row of  $\text{bump}(S)$  with  $\text{arm}_u(S_{1,2}S_{1,3} \cdots S_{1,\alpha})$  — and  $\text{leg}_v$  acts on the first column of  $\text{arm}_u(\text{bump}(S))$ , strictly above the first row, so that these entries are replaced by  $\text{leg}_v(S_{1,1}S_{2,1} \cdots S_{\ell,1})$ , entered from bottom to top.

Since  $S_{1,\alpha} > u$  and  $u < v$  for any  $S \in \text{SF}_{<}(\mu)$ , each step in the composition is defined; thus  $\theta$  is well-defined. Furthermore we have  $\theta(S)_{\ell+1,1} < v = \theta(S)_{1,1}$  by construction, so that  $\theta(S) \in \text{SF}_{<}(\rho)$ .

**Example 4.3.** Let  $\mu = (5, 1^4)$  and  $\rho = (4, 1^5)$ , and let

$$S = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 9 \\ \hline 1 \\ \hline 7 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 3 & 2 & 8 \\ \hline \end{array} \in \text{SF}_{<}(\mu).$$

Then in the language of the above definition, we have  $u = 5, v = 6$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(S) &= \text{leg}_6 \circ \text{arm}_5 \circ \text{bump}(S) = \text{leg}_6 \circ \text{arm}_5 \left( \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ \hline 6 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 8 \end{array} \right) \\ &= \text{leg}_6 \left( \begin{array}{c} 9 \\ 1 \\ 7 \\ 4 \\ 5 \\ \hline 6 \quad 8 \quad 3 \quad 2 \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 9 \\ 4 \\ 7 \\ 5 \\ \hline 6 \quad 8 \quad 3 \quad 2 \end{array} \in \text{SF}_{<}(\rho). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\varphi_S = \varphi_{\theta(S)} = x_7^2 x_9^4 y_2^3 y_3^2$ .

**Theorem 4.2.** For partitions  $\mu = (a, 1^{\ell-1})$  and  $\rho = (a-1, 1^\ell)$ , the map  $\theta : \text{SF}_{<}(\mu) \rightarrow \text{SF}_{<}(\rho)$  defined above satisfies  $\varphi_S = \varphi_{\theta(S)}$  for every  $S \in \text{SF}_{<}(\mu)$ .

*Proof.* We begin by comparing the first rows of  $S$  and  $\theta(S)$  to demonstrate that

$$\{r : (t, r) \in \text{rowInv}(S) \text{ for some } t\} = \{r' : (t', r') \in \text{rowInv}(\theta(S)) \text{ for some } t'\}. \quad (2)$$

Since the smaller entries of the row inversions in  $S$  determine the  $y$ -terms in  $\varphi_S$  (resp.  $\theta(S)$ ), it will follow that  $\varphi_S$  and  $\varphi_{\theta(S)}$  have identical  $y$ -terms.

First, each row inversion in  $\text{bump}(S)$  is also a row inversion in  $S$ , but  $S$  may have additional row inversions created by  $u = S_{1,1}$  which are absent in  $\text{bump}(S)$ . Let  $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_p$  denote the elements in the first row of  $S$  which are  $< u$ , so that

$$\text{rowInv}(S) = \text{rowInv}(\text{bump}(S)) \cup \{(u, r_1), (u, r_2), \dots, (u, r_p)\}.$$

We claim that performing  $\text{arm}_u$  on  $\text{bump}(S)$  introduces exactly one new row inversion involving each of  $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_p$ , and does not create any other new row inversions, nor alter any existing ones.

Indeed, in performing the “blocking” procedure of  $\text{arm}_u$ , each of the  $r_i$ ’s will be contained in a unique block; in each of these blocks we move some number  $z > u > r_i$  to the left of each  $r_i$  contained in the block, so that exactly one new row inversion is created with each of  $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_p$  in  $\text{arm}_u(\text{bump}(S))$ . Furthermore, since  $z$  is chosen to be the leftmost entry in each block which is  $> u$ ,

- (i) the only new row inversions created within a block are those created with some  $r_i$ , and
- (ii) no existing row inversions are removed, since  $z$  does not move to the left of a number larger than itself.

We only shuffle numbers within blocks which contain at least one of the  $r_i$ ’s, and performing  $\text{leg}_v$  on the resulting filling does not affect the first row, so it follows that (2) holds.

Now we compare the first columns of  $S$  and  $\theta(S)$  to demonstrate that

$$\{d : (d, c) \in \text{colInv}(S) \text{ for some } c\} = \{d' : (d', c') \in \text{colInv}(\theta(S)) \text{ for some } c'\}. \quad (3)$$

Since the larger entries of the column inversions in  $S$  determine the  $x$ -terms in  $\varphi_S$  (resp.  $\theta(S)$ ), it will follow that  $\varphi_S$  and  $\varphi_{\theta(S)}$  have identical  $x$ -terms.



First, note that  $v = \text{arm}_u(\text{bump}(S))_{1,1}$  by construction. Then every column inversion in  $S$  is also a column inversion in  $\text{arm}_u(\text{bump}(S))$ , except that  $\text{arm}_u(\text{bump}(S))$  may have additional column inversions created by  $v$  which are not present in  $S$ . Let  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q$  denote the elements in the first column of  $\text{arm}_u(\text{bump}(S))$  which are  $> v$ , so that

$$\text{collnv}(S) = \text{collnv}(\text{arm}_u(\text{bump}(S))) - \{(d_1, v), (d_2, v), \dots, (d_q, v)\}.$$

We claim that performing  $\text{leg}_v$  on  $\text{arm}_u(\text{bump}(S))$  removes exactly one column inversion involving each of  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q$ . When we perform the ‘‘blocking’’ procedure required by  $\text{leg}_v$  in the first column of  $\text{arm}_u(\text{bump}(S))$ , each of the  $d_j$ 's is contained in a unique block, and within each block some number  $t < v < d_j$  is shuffled above each  $d_j$  in the block, so that exactly one column inversion involving each of  $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_q$  is removed. Furthermore, since  $t$  is chosen to be the topmost number  $< v$  in its block,

- (i) the only column inversions removed within a block are those involving some  $d_j$ , and
- (ii) no new column inversions are created, since  $t$  does not move above any number smaller than itself.

Thus (3) holds, and we conclude that  $\varphi_S = \varphi_{\theta(S)}$ . □

**Corollary 4.1.** The map  $\theta : \text{SF}_{<}(\mu) \rightarrow \text{SF}_{<}(\rho)$  is a bijection.

*Proof.* First, we claim that  $\theta$  is injective. Indeed, if  $\theta(S) = \theta(T)$  for  $S, T \in \text{SF}_{<}(\mu)$ , then  $\varphi_{\theta(S)} = \varphi_{\theta(T)}$ . But then by Theorem 4.2, we obtain  $\varphi_S = \varphi_T$ , i.e.  $S = T$ . Thus  $\theta$  is injective, and since  $\#\text{SF}_{<}(\mu) = \#\text{SF}_{<}(\rho) = \frac{n!}{2}$ , the result follows. □

**Corollary 4.2.** We have  $\dim(\mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho) \geq \frac{n!}{2}$ .

*Proof.* We have exhibited that  $\varphi_S \in \mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho$  for any  $S \in \text{SF}_{<}(\mu)$  (equivalently  $\text{SF}_{<}(\rho)$ ), and  $\{\varphi_S : S \in \text{SF}_{<}(\mu)\}$  is linearly independent, so it follows that

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho) \geq \#\{\varphi_S : S \in \text{SF}_{<}(\mu)\} = \frac{n!}{2}.$$

□

In fact, we claim that  $\{\varphi_S : S \in \text{SF}_{<}(\mu)\}$  (or equivalently  $\{\varphi_T : T \in \text{SF}_{<}(\rho)\}$ ) forms a basis for  $\mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho$ , aided by the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** For partitions  $\mu = (a, 1^{\ell-1})$ ,  $\rho = (a-1, 1^\ell)$ , let  $\text{SF}_{>}(\mu) = \text{SF}(\mu) - \text{SF}_{<}(\mu)$  and  $\text{SF}_{>}(\rho) = \text{SF}(\rho) - \text{SF}_{<}(\rho)$ . Then

1. for any  $S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)$ , we have  $\varphi_S \neq \varphi_T$  for all  $T \in \text{SF}(\rho)$ , and
2. for any  $T \in \text{SF}_{>}(\rho)$ , we have  $\varphi_T \neq \varphi_S$  for all  $S \in \text{SF}(\mu)$ .

*Proof.* For the first assertion, let  $S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)$ . We then have that  $S_{1,1} > S_{1,a}$ . Let  $r = S_{1,a}$ , and let  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k$  denote the entries in row 1 of  $S$  which are  $< S_{1,1}$ , ordered in such a way that  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_j$  are the entries which are also  $> r$ . Then  $S_{1,1}$  forms a row inversion with each of  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k$ , and  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_j$  each form a row inversion with  $r$ . Since there are then  $a - k - 1$  remaining terms in row 1 which are  $\geq S_{1,1}$  (and thus form row inversions with  $r$ ), the following term divides  $\varphi_S$ :

$$m_S(Y) = y_r^{a-k-1+j} y_{t_1} y_{t_2} \cdots y_{t_k}. \tag{4}$$

We now claim that  $m_S(Y)$  does not divide  $\varphi_T$  for any filling  $T \in \text{SF}(\rho)$ . If it did, then each of  $r, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k$  must appear in the first row of  $T$ . Furthermore, since  $t_1, t_2, \dots, t_j$  are the only of

these elements which could be the larger entry in a row inversion involving  $r$ , there must be at least  $a - k - 1$  other entries in row 1 which are  $> r$  in order for  $\varphi_T$  to have a  $y_r$ -degree of  $a - k - 1 + j$ . There are thus at least  $a$  distinct entries in the first row of  $T$ , a contradiction since  $\rho = (a - 1, 1^\ell)$ . Thus  $\varphi_S \neq \varphi_T$  for all  $T \in \text{SF}(\rho)$ .

The second assertion follows from a completely analogous argument, where we instead show that for any  $T \in \text{SF}_{>}(\rho)$ , one can infer from  $\varphi_T$  that there must be  $\ell + 1$  distinct entries in the first column of  $T$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** For  $\mu = (a, 1^{\ell-1})$ ,  $\rho = (a - 1, 1^\ell)$ , we have  $\dim(\mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho) \leq \frac{n!}{2}$ .

*Proof.* We demonstrate that no nontrivial linear combination of  $\{\varphi_S : S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)\}$ , or of  $\{\varphi_T : T \in \text{SF}_{>}(\rho)\}$ , lies in  $\mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho$ . First, assume that

$$\sum_{S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)} c_S \varphi_S \in \mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho$$

for some  $c_S \in \mathbb{Q}$ . Then, there exist constants  $d_T \in \mathbb{Q}$  so that

$$\sum_{S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)} c_S \varphi_S = \sum_{T \in \text{SF}(\rho)} d_T \varphi_T.$$

Pick any  $\tilde{S} \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)$  and write

$$c_{\tilde{S}} \varphi_{\tilde{S}} = \sum_{T \in \text{SF}(\rho)} d_T \varphi_T - \sum_{S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu) - \{\tilde{S}\}} c_S \varphi_S.$$

By Lemma 4.1, and using the fact that  $\{\varphi_S : S \in \text{SF}(\mu)\}$  and  $\{\varphi_T : T \in \text{SF}(\rho)\}$  are linearly independent sets of monomials, the monomial  $m_{\tilde{S}}(Y)$  defined in (4) must divide each term on the right-hand side which has a nonzero coefficient. (More precisely, none of the terms *within* a given sum can cancel because they are linearly independent, and none of the terms *between* the sums can cancel because  $\varphi_T$  cannot contain the same monomial  $m_S(Y)$  as  $\varphi_S$  for any  $S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)$ .)

But, again applying Lemma 4.1,  $m_{\tilde{S}}(Y)$  cannot divide  $\varphi_T$  for any  $T \in \text{SF}(\rho)$ , forcing  $d_T = 0$  for all  $T$ . Thus the above equation reduces to

$$c_{\tilde{S}} \varphi_{\tilde{S}} = - \sum_{S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu) - \{\tilde{S}\}} c_S \varphi_S,$$

forcing  $c_S = 0$  for all  $S$ , since  $\{\varphi_S : S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)\}$  is linearly independent. Thus

$$\sum_{S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)} c_S \varphi_S \in \mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho \Rightarrow c_S = 0 \text{ for all } S.$$

An identical argument shows that

$$\sum_{T \in \text{SF}_{>}(\rho)} d_T \varphi_T \in \mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho \Rightarrow d_T = 0 \text{ for all } T$$

by appealing to the second assertion in Lemma 4.1. Thus no nonzero element of  $\mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho$  can be written as a linear combination of  $\{\varphi_S : S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)\}$  or of  $\{\varphi_T : T \in \text{SF}_{>}(\rho)\}$ , proving that  $\dim(\mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho) \leq \frac{n!}{2}$ .  $\square$

Combining Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 proves Theorem 4.1.

**Remark 4.1.** Dually, one may define the Garsia-Haiman module as

$$D_\mu = \text{span}\{f(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}; \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n})\Delta_\mu : f \in \mathbb{Q}[X, Y]\},$$

the span of all partial derivatives of all orders of  $\Delta_\mu$ ; the map  $\mathcal{H}_\mu \rightarrow D_\mu$  given by  $f(X, Y) \mapsto f(\frac{\partial}{\partial X}, \frac{\partial}{\partial Y})\Delta_\mu$  is an isomorphism of doubly graded  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ -modules (see [13], Proposition 3.4).

It is worth pointing out that the original  $\frac{n!}{k}$  conjecture in [5] is stated in terms of  $D_\mu$ , rather than  $\mathcal{H}_\mu$ . Our basis for  $\mathcal{H}_\mu \cap \mathcal{H}_\rho$  does not immediately yield a basis for  $D_\mu \cap D_\rho$  in the sense that

$$\{\varphi_S(\frac{\partial}{\partial X}, \frac{\partial}{\partial Y})\Delta_\mu : S \in \text{SF}_{<}(\mu)\} \neq \{\varphi_T(\frac{\partial}{\partial X}, \frac{\partial}{\partial Y})\Delta_\rho : T \in \text{SF}_{<}(\rho)\}.$$

In fact, experimental evidence suggests that these sets are disjoint.

As the above isomorphism is bidegree-complementing, the naive/optimistic conjecture would be that the complements  $\text{SF}_{>}(\mu)$  and  $\text{SF}_{>}(\rho)$  index a basis for  $D_\mu \cap D_\rho$ . However, it is not true in general that  $\varphi_S(\frac{\partial}{\partial X}, \frac{\partial}{\partial Y})\Delta_\mu \in D_\rho$  for arbitrary  $S \in \text{SF}_{>}(\mu)$  (and vice-versa), either. Thus it appears to be nontrivial to construct an explicit basis for  $D_\mu \cap D_\rho$  in the present paradigm.

## References

- [1] Ron M. Adin, Jeffrey B. Remmel, and Yuval Roichman. The combinatorics of the Garsia-Haiman modules for hook shapes. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 15(1):Research Paper 38, 42, 2008.
- [2] E. E. Allen. Bitableaux bases for some Garsia-Haiman modules and other related modules. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 9(1):Research Paper 36, 59, 2002.
- [3] Sami Assaf and Adriano Garsia. A kicking basis for the two column Garsia-Haiman modules. In *21st International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (FPSAC 2009)*, pages 103–114. Assoc. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., Nancy, 2009.
- [4] Jean-Christophe Aval. Monomial bases related to the  $n!$  conjecture. *Discrete Math.*, 224(1-3):15–35, 2000.
- [5] F. Bergeron and A. M. Garsia. Science fiction and Macdonald’s polynomials. In *Algebraic methods and  $q$ -special functions (Montréal, QC, 1996)*, volume 22, pages 1–52, 1999.
- [6] F. Bergeron and S. Hamel. Intersection of modules related to Macdonald’s polynomials. *Discrete Math.*, 217(1-3):51–64, 2000.
- [7] Foata, Dominique. On the Netto inversion number of a sequence. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 19:236–240, 1968.
- [8] A.M. Garsia and M. Haiman. Orbit harmonics and graded representations.
- [9] A.M. Garsia and M. Haiman. A graded representation model for Macdonald’s polynomials. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 90(8):3607–3610, 1993.
- [10] A.M. Garsia and M. Haiman. Some natural bigraded  $S_n$ -modules and  $q, t$ -Kostka coefficients. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 3(2):Research Paper 24, approx. 60, 1996.
- [11] J. Haglund. A combinatorial model for the Macdonald polynomials. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 101(46):16127–16131, 2004.
- [12] J. Haglund, M. Haiman, and N. Loehr. A combinatorial formula for Macdonald polynomials. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 18(3):735–761, 2005.

- [13] M. Haiman. Macdonald polynomials and geometry. *New perspectives in algebraic combinatorics (Berkeley, CA, 1996–97)*, 38(207–254), 1999.
- [14] M. Haiman. Hilbert schemes, polygraphs, and the Macdonald positivity conjecture. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 14(4):941–1006, 2001.
- [15] I.G. Macdonald. A new class of symmetric functions. *Actes du 20<sup>o</sup> Séminaire Lotharingien*, pages 131–171, 1988.
- [16] J. R. Stembridge. Some particular entries of the two-parameter Kostka matrix. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 121(2):367–373, 1994.