

Interpolation Polynomials, Binomial Coefficients, and Symmetric Function Inequalities

Hong Chen*, Siddhartha Sahi†

June 7, 2024

Abstract

Inhomogeneous versions of Jack and Macdonald polynomials, called interpolation polynomials, have been introduced by Knop–Sahi (type A) and Okounkov (type BC). In this paper, we study binomial coefficients and Littlewood–Richardson (LR) coefficients for these interpolation polynomials. We extend to type BC the weighted sum formula for binomial coefficients due to the second author in type A , and obtain a new weighted sum formula for LR coefficients for both types A and BC . We prove that binomial coefficients are positive and monotone using the weighted sum formula and the combinatorial formulas due to Okounkov.

As an application, we prove various inequalities on power-sums and Jack polynomials, including their specializations, monomial, Schur, Zonal and elementary symmetric polynomials, generalizing similar inequalities due to Cuttler–Greene–Skandera, Sra and Khare–Tao.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Main Results	2
1.1.1	Binomial Coefficients	3
1.1.2	Littlewood–Richardson Coefficients	4
1.1.3	Applications	5
1.2	Ideas in the Proofs	6
1.3	Organizations	6
1.4	Related Results	7

*Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, hc813@math.rutgers.edu

†Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, sahi@math.rutgers.edu

2	Preliminaries	7
2.1	Partitions and Ferrers Diagrams	7
2.2	Notations	9
2.2.1	The Base Field and the Cone of Positivity	10
2.2.2	Weyl Group	11
2.2.3	Degree	11
2.3	Interpolation Polynomials	11
3	Recursion and Weighted Sum Formulas	15
3.1	Binomial Coefficients	15
3.2	Recursion for Littlewood–Richardson Coefficients	18
3.3	Weighted Sum Formula for LR coefficients	20
4	Proof of Theorem B via the Weighted Sum Formula	24
5	Proof of Theorem C via the Combinatorial Formulas	28
5.1	Interpolation Jack Polynomials	28
5.2	Interpolation Macdonald Polynomials	31
6	Applications and Future Extensions	33
6.1	Inequalities of Symmetric Polynomials	33
6.2	Integrality	40
6.2.1	Jack Polynomials	41
6.2.2	Macdonald Polynomials	42
6.3	Double Schur Polynomials and Molev’s Work	44
6.4	The Non-Symmetric Case	46
	References	46

1 Introduction

1.1 Main Results

Many interesting bases of the ring of symmetric polynomials in n variables, such as the monomial symmetric polynomials and Schur polynomials, are indexed by \mathcal{P}_n , the set of partitions of length at most n . Such a partition is an n -tuple $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq 0$, and the corresponding polynomial is homogeneous of degree $|\lambda| = \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_n$. Jack and Macdonald polynomials are certain one-parameter and two-parameter deformations of Schur polynomials and many others.

In the past 30 years, several families of *inhomogeneous* symmetric polynomials have been defined and studied, including interpolation versions of Jack and Macdonald polynomials due to Knop–Sahi in type A [[KS96](#), [OO97a](#), [Kno97](#), [Oko97](#), [Oko98b](#)], and Okounkov in type

BC [Oko98a, Rai05, Koo15]. Denote by AJ, AM the type A interpolation polynomials and similarly BJ, BM for type BC .

Each family depends on certain parameters, and can be uniformly defined over the field \mathbb{F} of rational functions in these parameters by some degree condition and the following vanishing and normalization condition:

$$h_\mu(\bar{\lambda}) = \delta_{\lambda\mu}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n, \quad |\lambda| \leq |\mu|,$$

where $\bar{\cdot} : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^n$ is a certain “shifting” function (see Section 2.2 below).

It is a surprising fact, called the *extra vanishing property*, that the polynomial h_μ vanishes at more points than required in the definition. To be precise, we have, $h_\mu(\bar{\lambda}) = 0$, unless $\lambda \supseteq \mu$, where $\lambda \supseteq \mu$ means $\lambda_i \geq \mu_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.

In this paper, we study the evaluations $h_\mu(\bar{\lambda})$, which are called (generalized) **binomial coefficients** and were first studied in [Las90, Kan93, Oko97, OO97a]. They play a key role in the Okounkov–Olshanski binomial theorem for Jack and Macdonald polynomials [OO97a, Oko97]. We also consider the **Littlewood–Richardson coefficients**, which are defined by the product expansion $h_\mu(x)h_\nu(x) = \sum_\lambda c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda h_\lambda(x)$ [Sah11b, Sah11a], and which generalize the LR coefficients for Jack and Macdonald polynomials [Sta89, Mac15, Yip12].

We prove a number of results for these coefficients, which are formulated in Theorems A–E below, and which hold for all four families of interpolation polynomials. These include explicit formulas and certain positivity and monotonicity properties. We also discuss two applications of these results, which are described in Theorems F and G, and which are relevant to open problems in the theory of Jack polynomials.

The relevant notion of positivity is different for different families. To make this precise, we define, for each family, convex cones $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbb{F}_{> 0}$ in the coefficient field \mathbb{F} , which we call the **cone of (strict) positivity** (see Section 2.2). For example, in the case of type AM , we have $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Q}(q, t)$ and $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ (resp., $\mathbb{F}_{> 0}$) contains those rational polynomials that are non-negative (resp., strictly positive) when $0 < q, t < 1$.

1.1.1 Binomial Coefficients

As mentioned above, the binomial coefficients are evaluations of the interpolation polynomials. We shall write

$$b_{\lambda\mu} := \binom{\lambda}{\mu} := h_\mu(\bar{\lambda}) \quad \text{and} \quad a_{\lambda\mu} := \begin{cases} b_{\lambda\mu}, & \lambda \supset \mu; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\lambda \supset \mu$ denotes the covering relation of $\lambda \supseteq \mu$, i.e., $\lambda \supset \mu$ if $\lambda \supseteq \mu$ and $|\lambda| = |\mu| + 1$. The coefficients $a_{\lambda\mu}$ are called **adjacent binomial coefficients** and they admit explicit product formulas (see Proposition 4.3).

Our Theorems A and B generalize results of [Sah11a, Sah11b] from type A to type BC .

Theorem A (Weighted Sum Formula). *The binomial coefficient admits the following weighted sum formula*

$$b_{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\zeta \in \mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\mu}} \text{wt}(\zeta) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}},$$

where $\mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\mu}$ consists of chains from λ to μ (see Section 2.1) and the weight $\text{wt}(\zeta)$ is given in Eq. (3.8).

See Theorem 3.3 for the precise statement, as well as a similar formula for inverse binomial coefficients.

Theorem B (Positivity). *In general, the binomial coefficient $b_{\lambda\mu}$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$. Moreover, $b_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$ if and only if $\lambda \supseteq \mu$.*

The following result is new for all families AJ, BJ, AM, and BM.

Theorem C (Monotonicity). *If $\lambda \supseteq \mu$, then the difference of binomial coefficients $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$. If, in addition, $\lambda \neq \mu$ and $\lambda \supseteq \nu \neq \mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0)$ then $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$.*

1.1.2 Littlewood–Richardson Coefficients

The (unital) Littlewood–Richardson coefficients are defined by the product expansion

$$h_\mu(x)h_\nu(x) = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda h_\lambda(x).$$

They generalize the corresponding coefficients for Jack and Macdonald polynomials.

We prove a weighted sum formula for LR coefficients, which is new in all cases. This formula is a natural generalization of the formula for binomial coefficients in Theorem A.

Theorem D (Weighted Sum Formula). *The LR coefficient admits the following weighted sum formula*

$$c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \sum_{\zeta \in \mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\mu}} \text{wt}_\nu^{\text{LR}}(\zeta) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}},$$

where the weight $\text{wt}_\nu^{\text{LR}}(\zeta)$ is given by Eq. (3.20).

See Theorem 3.7 for the precise statement. Equivalently, we also prove a similar formula for the expansion coefficients for multiplying any $p \in \Lambda$ in Theorem 3.9.

We show that adjacent LR coefficients are always positive.

Theorem E (Adjacent Positivity for LR Coefficients). *If $\lambda \supset \mu$, then the adjacent LR coefficient $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$. If, in addition, $\lambda \supseteq \nu \neq \mathbf{0}$ then $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$.*

1.1.3 Applications

As an application of the previous theorems, we have the following characterization of the containment order $\lambda \supseteq \mu$ in terms of positivity of symmetric functions.

Let $P_\lambda(x; \tau)$ be the ordinary Jack polynomials in n variables (where our parameter τ corresponds to the usual parameter α by $\tau = \frac{1}{\alpha}$, see Remark 3). Let $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$ and $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0} := \{f/g \mid f, g \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\tau], g \neq 0\}$. Note that when we evaluate a function $f/g \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ at $\tau \in [0, \infty]$, the result is also in $[0, \infty]$ (usually it will be finite).

Theorem F. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) λ contains μ ;
- (2) The difference of normalized Jack polynomials, $\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau)} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau)}$, is **Jack positive**, namely, can be written as an $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ -combination of Jack polynomials;
- (3) For some fixed $\tau_0 \in [0, \infty]$, the difference of normalized Jack polynomials, $\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau_0)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau_0)} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau_0)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau_0)}$, is τ_0 -**Jack positive**, namely, can be written as an $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ -combination of Jack polynomials with parameter τ_0 .

In particular, the last part includes monomial, Schur, Zonal and (transposed) elementary symmetric functions. Somewhat surprisingly, this type of inequalities also hold for power-sums.

These inequalities are in parallel with [CGS11, Sra16, KT18], in which characterizations of two other partial orders, **majorization** and **weak majorization**, are given in terms of certain evaluation positivity of Schur polynomials and other symmetric functions. See Section 6.1 for more details.

As another application, we address the matter of integrality, which, for Jack polynomials, means that the coefficients of the parameter τ lie in \mathbb{Z} (see Eq. (6.24) for the precise definition). In [KS97, NSS23], it is shown that the expansion coefficients of Jack polynomials and the interpolation Jack polynomials, of *integral* normalization, in terms of the monomial symmetric polynomials are integral and positive. Our result concerns adjacent binomial coefficients, of integral normalization. We show that they are integral and positive.

Theorem G (Integrality and Positivity). *For the families $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}$ and BJ , if $\lambda \supset \mu$, then the integral adjacent binomial coefficient $A_{\lambda\mu}$ is a polynomial with non-negative integer coefficients in the parameter(s). For the families $\mathcal{F} = \text{AM}$ and BM , if $\lambda \supset \mu$, then the integral adjacent binomial coefficient $A_{\lambda\mu}$, after a re-parametrization and up to some sign and powers, is a polynomial with non-negative integer coefficients in the new parameters.*

See Section 6.2 for the precise statements.

1.2 Ideas in the Proofs

Theorem [A](#) is first proved in the case of *AJ* and *AM* in [[Sah11b](#), [Sah11a](#)] respectively and Lemma [3.1](#) plays a key role in the proof of Theorem [A](#), which is first observed in [[OO97b](#), Section 9] in the (even more) special case of shifted Schur polynomials. The crucial ingredient in the proof of Lemma [3.1](#) is this quantity: $|x| = x_1 + \cdots + x_n$, which we realize is equivalent to $h_{\varepsilon_1}(x)$ for *AJ* and *AM*. Writing it abstractly as $h_{\varepsilon_1}(x)$ makes the proof for Lemma [3.1](#) type-independent. Hence many results in [[Sah11b](#), [Sah11a](#)] work as well in the case of *BJ* and *BM*. In particular, Theorems [3.2](#), [3.5](#) and [3.6](#) give recursion formulas for binomial coefficients and LR coefficients respectively. Using the recursions formulas, we prove the weighted sum formulas for binomial coefficients and LR coefficients in Theorems [A](#) and [D](#), respectively.

Theorem [B](#) is proved in Section [4](#) via the weighted sum formula in Theorem [A](#). We show that the weights and the adjacent binomial coefficients are positive, hence by the weighted sum formula, so are the binomial coefficients.

Theorem [C](#) is proved in Section [5](#) by comparing and examining the combinatorial formulas Eqs. [\(2.11\)](#), [\(2.12\)](#), [\(2.14\)](#) and [\(2.15\)](#), due to Okounkov [[Oko98a](#), [Oko98b](#)]. In the meanwhile, we obtain another proof of Theorem [B](#), independent of the previous proof.

As for Theorem [E](#), we use Corollary [3.8](#), which is a corollary of Theorem [D](#) and is a simple identity that relates adjacent LR coefficients with binomial coefficients. We deduce Theorem [E](#) from Theorems [B](#) and [C](#) using this relation.

Theorem [F](#) follows from the monotonicity of binomial coefficients (Theorem [C](#)) and the binomial formula due to Okounkov–Olshanski [[OO97a](#)] that expands Jack polynomials shifted by [1](#).

Theorem [G](#) follows easily from the definition and Propositions [4.2](#) and [4.3](#) which are combinatorial formulas for certain normalization factors and adjacent binomial coefficients.

1.3 Organizations

The organization of this paper is as follows:

In Section [2](#), we recall some preliminaries, including basic notions of partitions and tableaux, some notations used in the paper, and basic definitions and properties of interpolation polynomials. In particular, Table [1](#) contains some useful information about the four families of interpolation polynomials.

In Section [3](#), we give the precise statements and the proofs for Theorems [A](#), [D](#) and [E](#). In addition, we prove Theorems [3.2](#) and [3.5](#) which give some recursion formulas, Corollary [3.8](#) which relates adjacent LR coefficients with binomial coefficients, and Theorem [3.9](#) which gives a formula for computing the expansion coefficients for multiplying any $p \in \Lambda$.

In Section [4](#), we first recall some formulas for the normalizing factor $H(\lambda)$ and adjacent binomial coefficients $a_{\lambda\mu}$ in Propositions [4.2](#) and [4.3](#), in particular, we show that adjacent binomial coefficients are positive.

In Section 5, we prove Theorem C.

In Section 6, we discuss some applications and future extensions of our work: we prove Theorem F about the containment order and Theorem G about integrality, as well as make several conjectures (Conjectures 1 to 6). In Section 6.1, we recall the binomial theorems due to Okounkov–Olshanski and prove Theorem F. In Section 6.2, we recall some work of [KS97, NSS23] on integrality for certain expansion coefficients, discuss the integrality of binomial coefficients and prove Theorem G. In Section 6.3, we discuss the work of [Mol09] on double Schur functions. And finally, in Section 6.4, we briefly discuss the non-symmetric case.

1.4 Related Results

Jack polynomials are introduced by Jack [Jac71] as a one-parameter generalization of Schur functions and of the zonal polynomials that play an important role in multivariate statistics [Mui82]. Along with Hall–Littlewood polynomials, they are one of the two key sources of inspiration for Macdonald’s introduction of his two-parameter family of symmetric functions [Mac15]; see [KS06] for a historical background. These polynomials, in turn, are the impetus behind Cherednik’s discovery of the double affine Hecke algebra [Che95a].

Interpolation polynomials arise naturally as solutions to the Capelli eigenvalue problem for invariant differential operators on a symmetric cone [Sah94]. The Capelli problem has analogues for other symmetric spaces studied in [SZ17, SS19] and also for symmetric superspaces [SS16, SSS20]. The solutions of these other problems are related to interpolation polynomials defined by Okounkov, Ivanov, and Sergeev and Veselov [Iva97, Oko98a, SV05].

There are various combinatorial formulas for Jack and Macdonald polynomials, for example, [Sta89, KS97, Mac15, HHL05, CHM⁺22]. For interpolation analogues, see [Oko98a, Oko98b, Koo15]. Non-symmetric analogues of these are studied in [Opd95, Che95b, Sah96, Kno97, Sah98, Mar03, HHL08, DKS21].

In the classical setting, the expansion of Schur functions into the power-sum basis gives rise to irreducible characters of the symmetric group. This idea is generalized to Jack and Macdonald polynomials, giving the so-called Jack and Macdonald characters in [Las08, BDD23, DD24], where these characters are characterized as the image of the power-sum basis under the dehomogenization operator, which is also studied in [KS96, NSS23].

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Partitions and Ferrers Diagrams

For this section, we refer to [Mac15, Chapter I].

Throughout the paper, we will fix $n \geq 1$ the number of variables. All four families of interpolation polynomials are indexed by partitions of length at most n . Such a **partition**

is an n -tuple of weakly-decreasing non-negative integers:

$$\mathcal{P}_n := \{ \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq 0 \}.$$

For $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the **size** of λ is $|\lambda| := \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_n$, and let $\mathcal{P}_n^d := \{ \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n \mid |\lambda| \leq d \}$.

We write $\lambda \supseteq \mu$ if $\lambda_i \geq \mu_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. This partial order is called the **inclusion order** or the **containment order**. Write $\lambda \supset \mu$ if $\lambda \supseteq \mu$ and $|\lambda| = |\mu| + 1$, called the **covering relation**. Let $\mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\mu}$ be the set of all covering chains from λ to μ , where a covering chain $\zeta = (\zeta_0, \dots, \zeta_k)$ is defined by

$$\lambda = \zeta_0 \supset \zeta_1 \supset \dots \supset \zeta_{k-1} \supset \zeta_k = \mu,$$

where $k = |\lambda| - |\mu|$. Covering chains from λ to μ correspond bijectively to standard tableaux of skew shape λ/μ ; we shall only use the former notion.

We shall identify a partition λ with its **Ferrers diagram**, a left-justified rectangular array of boxes, with λ_i boxes in row i , i.e.,

$$\{ (i, j) : 1 \leq j \leq \lambda_i, 1 \leq i \leq n \}.$$

The **conjugate** of a partition (not necessarily of length at most n), denoted by λ' , is the partition associated to the transpose of the Ferrers diagram of λ .

Let $s = (i, j) \in \lambda$ denote the j th boxes in the i th row of the Ferrers diagram of λ , and define the **arm** and **coarm** of s to be the number of boxes directly to the right and left of s , and the **leg** and **coleg** to be the number of boxes direct below and above s , i.e.,

$$a_\lambda(s) := \lambda_i - j, \quad a'_\lambda(s) = j - 1, \quad l_\lambda(s) := \lambda'_j - i, \quad l'_\lambda(s) = i - 1. \quad (2.1)$$

The containment order $\lambda \supseteq \mu$ holds if and only if the Ferrers diagram of λ contains that of μ . In this case, we write λ/μ for the set of boxes that are in λ but not in μ , and call it a **skew diagram**. A **horizontal strip** is a skew diagram with at most one box in each column. For a horizontal strip λ/μ , denote by $R_{\lambda/\mu}$ (resp., $C_{\lambda/\mu}$) the set of boxes in a row (resp., column) of λ that is intersecting λ/μ and by $(R \setminus C)_{\lambda/\mu}$ the set difference $R_{\lambda/\mu} \setminus C_{\lambda/\mu}$. It is clear that $(R \setminus C)_{\lambda/\mu}$ is a subset of μ . See [Koo15, Page 6] for a nice example.

A **tableau** of shape λ is a function $T : \lambda \rightarrow [n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$, which is thought of as filling the boxes in λ with numbers in $[n]$. We say T is a (column-strict) **reverse tableau** (**RT** for short) if $T(i, j)$ is weakly decreasing in j and strictly decreasing in i .

Given an RT T of shape λ , let

$$\lambda^{(k)} := \{ s \in \lambda \mid T(s) > k \}, \quad k = 0, \dots, n.$$

Then we have a descending chain of partitions:

$$\lambda = \lambda^{(0)} \supseteq \lambda^{(1)} \supseteq \dots \supseteq \lambda^{(n-1)} \supseteq \lambda^{(n)} = (0^n),$$

where each skew diagram $\lambda^{(i-1)}/\lambda^{(i)}$ is a horizontal strip.

Given any partition λ , an RT of shape λ is called the **distinguished RT**, if its first row is equal to λ' . Distinguished RT is unique for each shape and can be given by

$$T(i, j) = l_\lambda(i, j) + 1 = \lambda'_j - i + 1. \quad (2.2)$$

For example,

5	3	3	2	2
4	2	2	1	1
3	1	1		
2				
1				

is the distinguished RT for $\lambda = (55311)$ since its first row is $(53322) = \lambda'$.

Throughout the paper, we will assume d is a non-negative integer, and $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_n$ unless otherwise stated; also, let $\delta = (n-1, n-2, \dots, 1, 0) \in \mathcal{P}_n$ be the “staircase” partition.

2.2 Notations

For the purpose of being concise and uniform, we will introduce some common notations for the four families of interpolation polynomials. We shall use

$$\mathcal{F} \in \{AJ, BJ, AM, BM\}$$

to indicate the family in discussion. Denote by AJ, AM the type A interpolation polynomials and similarly BJ, BM for type BC .

To each family \mathcal{F} , we associate the following ingredients, some given in Table 1.

- \mathcal{W} , the Weyl group;
- $\mathbb{F} \supset \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0} = \mathbb{F}_{>0} \cup 0$, the base field and the cone of positivity;
- Λ and Λ^d , the corresponding polynomial ring and a certain subspace of Λ ;
- $\overline{(\cdot)} : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}^n$, a shifting function;
- $h_\mu(x)$ and $h_\mu^{\text{monic}}(x)$, the interpolation polynomial of **unital** and **monic** normalization for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_n$;
- $H(\lambda) := h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(\overline{\lambda})$ the normalization factor;
- $\|\cdot\|$, the top degree terms of $h_{\varepsilon_1}^{\text{monic}}$;
- $b_{\lambda\mu}$ and $a_{\lambda\mu}$, binomial coefficients and adjacent binomial coefficients.

	AJ	BJ	AM	BM
parameters	τ	τ, α	q, t	q, t, a
\mathbb{F}	$\mathbb{Q}(\tau)$	$\mathbb{Q}(\tau, \alpha)$	$\mathbb{Q}(q, t)$	$\mathbb{Q}(q, t, a)$
\mathcal{W}	S_n	$S_n \times \mathbb{Z}_2^n$	S_n	$S_n \times \mathbb{Z}_2^n$
Λ	$\mathbb{F}[X]^{S_n}$	$\mathbb{F}[X]^{S_n \times \mathbb{Z}_2^n}$	$\mathbb{F}[X]^{S_n}$	$\mathbb{F}[X, X^{-1}]^{S_n \times \mathbb{Z}_2^n}$
$\bar{\lambda}$	$\lambda + \tau\delta$	$\lambda + \tau\delta + \alpha$	$q^\lambda t^\delta$	$aq^\lambda t^\delta$
$\bar{\lambda}_i$	$\lambda_i + (n-i)\tau$	$\lambda_i + (n-i)\tau + \alpha$	$q^{\lambda_i} t^{n-i}$	$aq^{\lambda_i} t^{n-i}$
$\ x\ $	$\sum x_i$	$\sum x_i^2$	$\sum x_i$	$\sum (x_i + x_i^{-1})$

Table 1: Notations

2.2.1 The Base Field and the Cone of Positivity

In all cases, $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$ is defined by excluding the zero function from $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$.

For AJ, the base field \mathbb{F} is $\mathbb{Q}(\tau)$, the field of rational functions in τ . Let

$$\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0} := \left\{ \frac{f}{g} \mid f, g \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\tau], g \neq 0 \right\}, \quad (2.3)$$

then $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ is a convex multiplicative cone, i.e., it is closed under addition, multiplication, and scalar multiplication by $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$. When we view τ as a real number instead of an indeterminate, we have $f(\tau) \geq 0$ if $\tau > 0$ for $f \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$; and $f(\tau_0) = 0$ for some $\tau_0 > 0$ if and only if f is identically 0.

Remark 1. *Our definition of $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ is the same as the \mathbb{F}^+ in [Sch11b, Section 1.4]. In that paper, a subcone \mathbb{F}^{++} , consisting of functions with nonzero limit as $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ is also considered. Also, we do not require f and g to be coprime in the definition (otherwise $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ would not be multiplicatively closed). It could happen that a polynomial with some negative coefficients lies in $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$, for example, $\tau^2 - \tau + 1 = \frac{\tau^3 + 1}{\tau + 1} \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$.*

For BJ, the base field is $\mathbb{Q}(\tau, \alpha)$ and

$$\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0} := \left\{ \frac{f}{g} \mid f, g \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\tau, \alpha], g \neq 0 \right\}. \quad (2.4)$$

Then for $f \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$, we also have the properties that $f(\tau, \alpha) \geq 0$ if $\tau, \alpha > 0$; and $f(\tau_0, \alpha_0) = 0$ for some $\tau_0, \alpha_0 > 0$ if and only if f is identically 0.

For AM and BM , the base field is $\mathbb{Q}(q, t)$ and $\mathbb{Q}(q, t, a)$, respectively. The cone of positivity consists of functions that map $(q, t) \in (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ and $(q, t, a) \in (0, 1) \times (0, 1) \times (0, 1)$ to $[0, \infty)$, namely,

$$\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0} := \{ f \in \mathbb{Q}(q, t) \mid f(q, t) \geq 0 \text{ when } q, t \in (0, 1) \}, \quad \mathcal{F} = AM; \quad (2.5)$$

$$\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0} := \{ f \in \mathbb{Q}(q, t, a) \mid f(q, t, a) \geq 0 \text{ when } q, t, a \in (0, 1) \}, \quad \mathcal{F} = BM. \quad (2.6)$$

(In Section 6.2, a new parametrization for Macdonald polynomials, along with a new notion of positivity and integrality, is given.)

In all cases, for $f, g \in \mathbb{F}$, we write $f \geq g$ if $f - g \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$.

2.2.2 Weyl Group

The Weyl group S_n acts by permuting the variables; \mathbb{Z}_2^n acts by signs ($x_i \mapsto -x_i$) for $\mathcal{F} = BJ$ and by reciprocals ($x_i \mapsto x_i^{-1}$) for $\mathcal{F} = BM$.

In Table 1, X is short for (x_1, \dots, x_n) , and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda &= \mathbb{F}[x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2]^{S_n}, \quad \mathcal{F} = BJ; \\ \Lambda &= \mathbb{F}[x_1 + x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_n + x_n^{-1}]^{S_n}, \quad \mathcal{F} = BM, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., symmetric polynomials in the variables $(x_i^2)_i$ and $(x_i + x_i^{-1})_i$ respectively.

2.2.3 Degree

A Laurent polynomial $f \in \mathbb{F}[x_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, x_n^{\pm 1}]$ can be written as $f(x) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^n} c_\alpha x^\alpha$ with $c_\alpha \in \mathbb{F}$ and nonzero for finitely many $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $x^\alpha := x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n}$. The **degree** of f is defined by

$$\deg f := \begin{cases} -\infty, & \text{if } f \text{ is identically } 0; \\ \max\{|\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_n| \mid c_\alpha \neq 0\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We shall write Λ^d for the subspace of Λ consisting of polynomials of degree at most d when $\mathcal{F} = AJ, AM, BM$; and at most $2d$ when $\mathcal{F} = BJ$.

2.3 Interpolation Polynomials

In this subsection, we recall some definitions and propositions of interpolation polynomials.

We begin with a proposition about symmetric interpolation.

Proposition 2.1. *Fix $d \geq 0$ and any function $\bar{f} : \mathcal{P}_n^d \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, then there is a unique polynomial f in Λ^d such that*

$$f(\bar{\lambda}) = \bar{f}(\lambda), \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n^d.$$

Proof. When $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}$, see [KS96, Theorem 2.1]. When $\mathcal{F} = \text{AM}$, see [Sah96, Theorem 3.1]. When $\mathcal{F} = \text{BM}$, see [DKS21, Proposition 3.3]. When $\mathcal{F} = \text{BJ}$, the proof for the case $\mathcal{F} = \text{BM}$ could be easily modified for this case. \square

Now, we can define the interpolation polynomials.

Definition 1. *The unital **interpolation polynomial** indexed by $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_n$ is the unique function in $\Lambda^{|\mu|}$ that interpolates the characteristic function at μ (restricted to $\mathcal{P}_n^{|\mu|}$). That is, it is the unique \mathcal{W} -symmetric function that satisfies the following interpolation condition and degree condition:*

$$h_\mu(\bar{\lambda}) = \delta_{\lambda\mu}, \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n, \quad |\lambda| \leq |\mu|, \quad (2.7)$$

$$\deg h_\mu \leq \begin{cases} |\mu|, & \mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}, \text{AM}, \text{BM}; \\ 2|\mu|, & \mathcal{F} = \text{BJ}. \end{cases} \quad (2.8)$$

Remark 2. *The degree condition above can be improved to equality. Argue by induction on $|\mu|$. The base case is clear since $\mathcal{P}_n^0 = \{\mathbf{0} = (0^n)\}$ and Λ^0 consists of constant functions. For the inductive step, if h_μ had a strictly smaller degree, it would lie in $\Lambda^{|\mu|-1}$ and interpolate the zero function on $\mathcal{P}_n^{|\mu|-1}$ by definition, hence is equal to the zero function by Proposition 2.1, a contradiction.*

The normalization here is called **unital** in the sense that $h_\mu(\bar{\mu}) = 1$. One also has **monic** normalization, denoted by h_μ^{monic} , in the sense that the coefficient of x^μ in h_μ^{monic} is 1 when $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}, \text{AM}, \text{BM}$; and the coefficient of $x^{2\mu}$ is 1 when $\mathcal{F} = \text{BJ}$. The two normalizations are related by a normalizing factor $H(\mu) := h_\mu^{\text{monic}}(\bar{\mu})$ and

$$h_\mu(x) = \frac{h_\mu^{\text{monic}}(x)}{H(\mu)} = \frac{h_\mu^{\text{monic}}(x)}{h_\mu^{\text{monic}}(\bar{\mu})}. \quad (2.9)$$

In Proposition 4.2, combinatorial formulas for $H(\mu)$ for each family are given. In Section 6.2, we also discuss the **integral** normalization.

It follows from Proposition 2.1 that $\{h_\mu \mid \mu \in \mathcal{P}_n^d\}$ (reps., $\{h_\mu \mid \mu \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$) forms an \mathbb{F} -basis for the ring of symmetric polynomials Λ^d (reps., Λ).

We recall the following combinatorial formulas due to Okounkov [Oko98a, Oko98b], which generalize the formulas for ordinary Jack and Macdonald polynomials given in [Mac15]. (Okounkov uses shifted symmetry instead of the usual symmetry; the parameters we use are also different from his.)

$$J : P_\lambda(x; \tau) = \sum_T \psi_T(\tau) \prod_{s \in \lambda} x_{T(s)}, \quad (2.10)$$

$$AJ : h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(x; \tau) = \sum_T \psi_T(\tau) \prod_{s \in \lambda} \left(x_{T(s)} - (a'_\lambda(s) + (n - T(s) - l'_\lambda(s))\tau) \right), \quad (2.11)$$

$$BJ : h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(x; \tau, \alpha) = \sum_T \psi_T(\tau) \prod_{s \in \lambda} \left(x_{T(s)}^2 - (a'_\lambda(s) + (n - T(s) - l'_\lambda(s))\tau + \alpha)^2 \right), \quad (2.12)$$

$$M : P_\lambda(x; q, t) = \sum_T \psi_T(q, t) \prod_{s \in \lambda} x_{T(s)}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$AM : h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(x; q, t) = \sum_T \psi_T(q, t) \prod_{s \in \lambda} \left(x_{T(s)} - q^{a'_\lambda(s)} t^{n - T(s) - l'_\lambda(s)} \right), \quad (2.14)$$

$$BM : h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(x; q, t, a) = \sum_T \psi_T(q, t) \prod_{s \in \lambda} \left(x_{T(s)} + x_{T(s)}^{-1} - q^{a'_\lambda(s)} t^{n - T(s) - l'_\lambda(s)} a - \left(q^{a'_\lambda(s)} t^{n - T(s) - l'_\lambda(s)} a \right)^{-1} \right), \quad (2.15)$$

where the sums run over RTs of shape λ , and $\psi_T(\tau)$ and $\psi_T(q, t)$ are rational functions, given by

$$\psi_T = \prod_{i=1}^n \psi_{\lambda^{(i-1)}/\lambda^{(i)}}, \quad \psi_{\mu/\nu} = \prod_{s \in (R \setminus C)_{\mu/\nu}} \frac{b_\nu(s)}{b_\mu(s)}, \quad (2.16)$$

where b_λ is the ratio of hooklengths, given by

$$b_\lambda(s; \tau) := \frac{c_\lambda(s; \tau)}{c'_\lambda(s; \tau)}, \quad b_\lambda(s; q, t) := \frac{c_\lambda(s; q, t)}{c'_\lambda(s; q, t)}, \quad (2.17)$$

$$c_\lambda(s; \tau) := a_\lambda(s) + \tau(l_\lambda(s) + 1), \quad c'_\lambda(s; \tau) := a_\lambda(s) + \tau l_\lambda(s) + 1, \quad (2.18)$$

$$c_\lambda(s; q, t) := 1 - q^{a_\lambda(s)} t^{l_\lambda(s) + 1}, \quad c'_\lambda(s; q, t) := 1 - q^{a_\lambda(s) + 1} t^{l_\lambda(s)}. \quad (2.19)$$

Remark 3. It should be noted that our Jack parameter τ corresponds to the parameter α in [Mac15, Section VI.10] by $\tau = \frac{1}{\alpha}$, so Macdonald's $P_\lambda^{(\alpha)}(x)$ is equal to our $P_\lambda(x; \frac{1}{\alpha})$. Also, our hooklength $c_\mu(s; \tau)$ is different from Macdonald's; Macdonald's would-be $c_\mu(s; \alpha) := \alpha a_\mu(s) + l_\mu(s) + 1$ in [Mac15, VI. (10.21)] is equal to our $\frac{1}{\tau} \cdot c_\mu(s; \tau)$.

Remark 4. There are various notations for interpolation polynomials and shifted polynomials. Our notations mostly follow Koornwinder's notations in [Koo15], apart from changing his P_μ^{ip} to our h_μ^{monic} . For example, our interpolation Jack polynomial $h_\mu^{\text{AJ,monic}}(x; \tau)$ is the same as his $P_\mu^{\text{ip}}(x; \tau)$. See [Koo15, Section 5] for relations of $P_\mu^{\text{ip}} = h_\mu^{\text{monic}}$ with the notations in [Sah94, Sah96, KS96, Kno97, OO97a, Oko98b, Oko98a, Rai05].

The following limit formulas follow easily from definitions and some are known in [Mac15, Oko98a, Oko98b, Koo15] in various notations. Most of these are *not* needed in this paper; we collect them here for the sake of completeness.

Proposition 2.2. *In our notations, we have the following limits.*

(1) *The τ -hooklengths are limits of (q, t) -hooklengths:*

$$c_\lambda(s; \tau) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} \frac{c_\lambda(s; q, q^\tau)}{1 - q}, \quad c'_\lambda(s; \tau) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} \frac{c'_\lambda(s; q, q^\tau)}{1 - q}. \quad (2.20)$$

(2) *Jack polynomials are limits of Macdonald polynomials:*

$$P_\lambda(x; \tau) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} P_\lambda(x; q, q^\tau), \quad (2.21)$$

$$h_\lambda^{\text{monic, AJ}}(x; \tau) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} \frac{h_\lambda^{\text{monic, AM}}(q^x; q, q^\tau)}{(q - 1)^{|\lambda|}}, \quad (2.22)$$

$$h_\lambda^{\text{monic, BJ}}(x; \tau, \alpha) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} \frac{h_\lambda^{\text{monic, BM}}(q^x; q, q^\tau, q^\alpha)}{(q - 1)^{2|\lambda|}}, \quad (2.23)$$

$$h_\lambda^{\text{AJ}}(x; \tau) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} h_\lambda^{\text{AM}}(q^x; q, q^\tau), \quad (2.24)$$

$$h_\lambda^{\text{BJ}}(x; \tau, \alpha) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} h_\lambda^{\text{BM}}(q^x; q, q^\tau, q^\alpha), \quad (2.25)$$

where $q^x = (q^{x_1}, \dots, q^{x_n})$, and

$$b_{\lambda\mu}^{\text{AJ}}(\tau) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} b_{\lambda\mu}^{\text{AM}}(q, q^\tau), \quad (2.26)$$

$$b_{\lambda\mu}^{\text{BJ}}(\tau, \alpha) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} b_{\lambda\mu}^{\text{BM}}(q, q^\tau, q^\alpha). \quad (2.27)$$

(3) *Type A interpolation polynomials are limits of type BC:*

$$h_\lambda^{\text{monic, AJ}}(x; \tau) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_\lambda^{\text{monic, BJ}}(x + \alpha; \tau, \alpha)}{(2\alpha)^{|\lambda|}}, \quad (2.28)$$

$$h_\lambda^{\text{monic, AM}}(x; q, t) = \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_\lambda^{\text{monic, BM}}(ax; q, t, a)}{a^{|\lambda|}}, \quad (2.29)$$

$$h_\lambda^{\text{AJ}}(x; \tau) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} h_\lambda^{\text{BJ}}(x + \alpha; \tau, \alpha), \quad (2.30)$$

$$h_\lambda^{\text{AM}}(x; q, t) = \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} h_\lambda^{\text{BM}}(ax; q, t, a), \quad (2.31)$$

and

$$b_{\lambda\mu}^{\text{AJ}}(\tau) = \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} b_{\lambda\mu}^{\text{BJ}}(\tau, \alpha), \quad (2.32)$$

$$b_{\lambda\mu}^{\text{AM}}(q, t) = \lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} b_{\lambda\mu}^{\text{BM}}(q, t, a). \quad (2.33)$$

(4) Limits of interpolation Macdonald polynomials as $q \rightarrow 1$:

$$P_\lambda(x - \mathbf{1}; \tau) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} h_\lambda^{\text{monic,AM}}(x; q, q^\tau), \quad (2.34)$$

$$P_\lambda(x + x^{-1} - \mathbf{2}; \tau) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} h_\lambda^{\text{monic,BM}}(x; q, q^\tau, q^\alpha), \quad (2.35)$$

where $x - \mathbf{1} = (x_1 - 1, \dots, x_n - 1)$, and $x + x^{-1} - \mathbf{2} = (x_1 + x_1^{-1} - 2, \dots, x_n + x_n^{-1} - 2)$.

(5) The top degree terms of $h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(x)$ is equal to $P_\lambda(x)$ for $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ, AM}$, $P_\lambda(x^2)$ for $\mathcal{F} = \text{BJ}$, and $P_\lambda(x) + P_\lambda(x^{-1})$ for $\mathcal{F} = \text{BM}$:

$$P_\lambda(x; \tau) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_\lambda^{\text{monic,AJ}}(rx; \tau)}{r^{|\lambda|}}, \quad (2.36)$$

$$P_\lambda(x; q, t) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_\lambda^{\text{monic,AM}}(rx; q, t)}{r^{|\lambda|}}, \quad (2.37)$$

$$P_\lambda(x^2; \tau) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_\lambda^{\text{monic,BJ}}(rx; \tau)}{r^{2|\lambda|}}, \quad (2.38)$$

$$P_\lambda(x; q, t) = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h_\lambda^{\text{monic,BM}}(rx; q, t)}{r^{|\lambda|}}. \quad (2.39)$$

Proof. Most are clear by definition. For the formulas concerning the unital normalization, see Proposition 4.2 for the normalizing factor $H(\lambda) = h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(x)/h_\lambda(x)$. \square

As mentioned in the introduction, the interpolation polynomials satisfy the following property.

Proposition 2.3 (Extra Vanishing Property). *The interpolation polynomial h_μ vanishes at $\bar{\lambda}$ unless λ contains μ .*

The property is first proved in [KS96, Theorem 5.2] for $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}$, in [Kno97, Theorem 4.5] for $\mathcal{F} = \text{AM}$ (in the non-symmetric case, while the symmetric case can be derived via symmetrization). The property also follows from the weighted sum formula Eq. (3.7) below.

3 Recursion and Weighted Sum Formulas

3.1 Binomial Coefficients

In 2011, one of the authors derived some recursion formulas and weighted sum formulas for the binomial coefficients for type A interpolation Jack and Macdonald polynomials respectively in [Sah11b, Sah11a]. (The treatment there works for non-symmetric cases as well.) We now generalize the arguments and the results to type BC .

A key relation, the **Pieri rule**, is first observed in [OO97b, Section 9] for shifted Schur polynomials (corresponding to our AJ with $\tau = 1$) and in [OO97a, Section 5] for $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}$. Let $\varepsilon_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathcal{P}_n$.

Lemma 3.1 (Pieri Rule). *Fix $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_n$, then*

$$(h_{\varepsilon_1}(x) - h_{\varepsilon_1}(\bar{\mu})) \cdot h_{\mu}(x) = \sum_{\nu \supset \mu} (h_{\varepsilon_1}(\bar{\nu}) - h_{\varepsilon_1}(\bar{\mu})) a_{\nu\mu} h_{\nu}(x). \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. It is clear from the definition that both sides of Eq. (3.1) have degree (at most) $\deg h_{\varepsilon_1} + \deg h_{\mu}$, hence, lies in $\Lambda^{|\mu|+1}$. By the uniqueness of interpolation (Proposition 2.1), it suffices to check that the two sides have the same evaluations at $\bar{\lambda}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n^{|\mu|+1}$, which is easily seen. \square

Remark 5. *Eq. (3.1) can be written as*

$$\left(\|x\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|\right) \cdot h_{\mu}(x) = \sum_{\lambda \supset \mu} \left(\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|\right) a_{\lambda\mu} h_{\lambda}(x), \quad (3.2)$$

where the “norm” $\|x\|$ is the top degree terms of $h_{\varepsilon_1}^{\text{monic}}(x)$, because the equation is invariant under translation and scalar multiplication of the norm $\|\cdot\|$.

Fix a total order on \mathcal{P}_n that is compatible with the size function, i.e., $|\lambda| \leq |\mu|$ whenever λ precedes μ .

Write

$$A = (a_{\lambda\mu}), \quad B = (b_{\lambda\mu}), \quad Z = (\|\bar{\mu}\| \delta_{\lambda\mu}) \quad (3.3)$$

for the infinite matrices where $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_n$. Then B is unitriangular by Eq. (2.7), and hence invertible. Denote the entry of its inverse matrix by $b'_{\lambda\mu}$, i.e., $B^{-1} = (b'_{\lambda\mu})$. We call $b'_{\lambda\mu}$ the **inverse binomial coefficients**.

Theorem 3.2 (Recursion for Binomial Coefficients).

(1) *The following recursion characterizes $b_{\lambda\mu}$:*

$$(i) \ b_{\lambda\lambda} = 1; \quad (ii) \ \left(\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|\right) b_{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\nu \supset \mu} b_{\lambda\nu} \left(\|\bar{\nu}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|\right) a_{\nu\mu}, \quad |\lambda| > |\mu|. \quad (3.4)$$

(2) *The following recursion characterizes $b'_{\lambda\mu}$:*

$$(i) \ b'_{\lambda\lambda} = 1; \quad (ii) \ \left(\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|\right) b'_{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\nu \subset \lambda} a_{\lambda\nu} \left(\|\bar{\nu}\| - \|\bar{\lambda}\|\right) b'_{\nu\mu}, \quad |\lambda| > |\mu|. \quad (3.5)$$

(3) *The matrices A, B, Z satisfy the commutation relations:*

$$(i) \ [Z, B] = B[Z, A]; \quad (ii) \ [Z, B^{-1}] = -[Z, A]B^{-1}. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. We borrow the proof in [Sah11a].

It is clear that (1) \iff (3.i) \iff (3.ii) \iff (2): the first and last equivalences follow by looking at the (λ, μ) -entry of Eq. (3.6), while the second equivalence is a simple calculation. (There is a typo in [Sah11a] for this part, which we fix now.)

$$[Z, B^{-1}] = ZB^{-1} - B^{-1}Z = -B^{-1}(ZB - BZ)B^{-1} = -B^{-1}[Z, B]B^{-1} \stackrel{(3.i)}{=} -[Z, A]B^{-1}.$$

Now, it suffices to prove (1): (1.i) follows from the interpolation condition Eq. (2.7); for (1.ii), evaluate the Pieri rule Eq. (3.1) at $\bar{\lambda}$; Eq. (3.4) characterizes $b_{\lambda\mu}$ by induction on $|\lambda| - |\mu|$. \square

Theorem 3.3 (Theorem A, Weighted Sum Formula for Binomial Coefficients). *Assume $\lambda \supseteq \mu$, and $k = |\lambda| - |\mu|$.*

(1) *The binomial coefficient admits the following weighted sum formula*

$$b_{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_{\lambda\mu}} \text{wt}(\zeta) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}}, \quad (3.7)$$

where the weight $\text{wt}(\zeta)$ is defined as

$$\text{wt}(\zeta) := \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\|\bar{\zeta}_i\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_{i+1}\|}{\|\bar{\zeta}_0\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_{i+1}\|}. \quad (3.8)$$

(2) *The inverse binomial coefficient admits the following weighted sum formula*

$$b'_{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_{\lambda\mu}} \text{wt}'(\zeta) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}} \quad (3.9)$$

where the weight $\text{wt}'(\zeta)$ is defined as

$$\text{wt}'(\zeta) := (-1)^k \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\|\bar{\zeta}_{i+1}\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_i\|}{\|\bar{\zeta}_k\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_i\|}. \quad (3.10)$$

Proof. We will only prove for binomial coefficients as the other case is similar. Let $\bar{b}_{\lambda\mu}$ temporarily denote the sum in Eq. (3.7). By Theorem 3.2, it suffices to verify that $\bar{b}_{\lambda\mu}$ satisfies the recursion Eq. (3.4). Clearly $\bar{b}_{\lambda\lambda} = 1$ since the sum involves only the single chain $\zeta = (\lambda)$ and the weight reduces to 1. For the second part, we observe that

$$\text{wt}(\zeta) = \text{wt}(\zeta') \cdot \frac{\|\bar{\zeta}_{k-1}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|}{\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|}, \quad \text{where } \zeta' = (\zeta_0, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{k-1}).$$

Therefore, collecting the terms in Eq. (3.7) with $\zeta_{k-1} = \nu$, we have

$$\bar{b}_{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\nu \supset \mu} \left(\sum_{\zeta' \in \mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\nu}} \text{wt}(\zeta') \prod_{i=0}^{k-2} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}} \right) \frac{\|\bar{\nu}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|}{\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|} a_{\nu\mu} = \sum_{\nu \supset \mu} \bar{b}_{\lambda\nu} \frac{\|\bar{\nu}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|}{\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|} a_{\nu\mu}.$$

□

Corollary 3.4 (Extra Vanishing Property). *The binomial coefficient $b_{\lambda\mu}$ and the inverse binomial coefficient $b'_{\lambda\mu}$ are 0 unless $\lambda \supseteq \mu$.*

Proof. If λ does not contain μ , then $\mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\mu}$ is empty, hence $b_{\lambda\mu} = 0$ and $b'_{\lambda\mu} = 0$. □

We would like to point out that in the case of AJ, the norm $\|\bar{\lambda}\|$ is simply $|\lambda|$, hence the weight $\text{wt}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{k!}$ is independent of ζ . Sahi [Sah11b] shows that $B = \exp(A)$ and $b'_{\lambda\mu} = (-1)^{|\lambda|-|\mu|} b_{\lambda\mu}$. Such simple relations fail in other cases.

3.2 Recursion for Littlewood–Richardson Coefficients

The results in this subsection are again known in type A in [Sah11b, Sah11a]. We generalize them to type BC .

For any $p \in \Lambda$, one can define the (generalized) Littlewood–Richardson (LR for short) coefficient $c_\mu^\lambda(p)$ by the product expansion

$$p(x)h_\mu(x) = \sum_{\lambda} c_\mu^\lambda(p)h_\lambda(x). \quad (3.11)$$

Define matrices $C = C(p) := \left(c_\mu^\lambda(p) \right)_{\lambda, \mu}$ and $D = D(p) := (p(\bar{\mu})\delta_{\lambda\mu})$.

Theorem 3.5.

(1) *The following recursion characterizes $c_\mu^\lambda(p)$:*

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & c_\lambda^\lambda(p) = p(\bar{\lambda}); \\ (ii) \quad & \left(\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\| \right) c_\mu^\lambda(p) = \sum_{\zeta \supset \mu} c_\zeta^\lambda(p) \left(\|\bar{\zeta}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\| \right) a_{\zeta\mu} - \sum_{\zeta \subset \lambda} \left(\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\zeta}\| \right) a_{\lambda\zeta} c_\mu^\zeta(p), \quad |\lambda| > |\mu|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

(2) *The matrices C and D satisfy:*

$$(i) \quad C = B^{-1}DB; \quad (ii) \quad [Z, C] = [C, [Z, A]]. \quad (3.13)$$

(3) The LR coefficient admits the following formula

$$c_\mu^\lambda(p) = \sum_{\lambda \supseteq \zeta \supseteq \mu} b'_{\lambda\zeta} b_{\zeta\mu} p(\bar{\zeta}). \quad (3.14)$$

Proof. We again borrow the proof in [Sah11a].

Evaluating Eq. (3.11) at $\bar{\nu}$, we get

$$p(\bar{\nu}) b_{\nu\mu} = \sum_{\lambda} b_{\nu\lambda} c_\mu^\lambda(p), \quad (3.15)$$

in other words, $DB = BC$, hence (2.i) holds. For (2.ii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} [Z, C] &= [Z, B^{-1}DB] = [Z, B^{-1}]DB + B^{-1}[Z, D]B + B^{-1}D[Z, B] \\ &= -[Z, A]B^{-1}DB + B^{-1}DB[Z, A] \\ &= -[Z, A]C + C[Z, A] = [C, [Z, A]]. \end{aligned}$$

In the second line, we use Eq. (3.6) and the fact that D and Z are diagonal matrices.

Since B is unitriangular, (2.i) implies that C and D share diagonal entries, hence (1.i) holds. Also, (1.ii) is exactly the (λ, μ) -entry of (2.ii). Eq. (3.12) characterizes $c_\mu^\lambda(p)$ by induction on $|\lambda| - |\mu|$.

(3) is the (λ, μ) -entry of (2.i). \square

Of special interest are the LR coefficients with $p = h_\nu$, defined by $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda := c_\mu^\lambda(h_\nu)$, in other words,

$$h_\mu(x) h_\nu(x) = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda h_\lambda(x). \quad (3.16)$$

Unless otherwise stated, when we say LR coefficients, we will refer to $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ instead of $c_\mu^\lambda(p)$. We rewrite the previous theorem in this case.

Theorem 3.6.

(1) The following recursions characterize $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$:

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & c_{\lambda\mu}^\lambda = b_{\lambda\mu} \\ (ii) \quad & \left(\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\| \right) c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \sum_{\zeta \supset \mu} c_{\zeta\nu}^\lambda a_{\zeta\mu} \left(\|\bar{\zeta}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\| \right) - \sum_{\zeta \subset \lambda} a_{\lambda\zeta} c_{\mu\nu}^\zeta \left(\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\zeta}\| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

(2) The LR coefficient admits the following formula

$$c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \sum_{\lambda \supseteq \zeta \supseteq \mu, \nu} b'_{\lambda\zeta} b_{\zeta\mu} b_{\zeta\nu}. \quad (3.18)$$

In particular, if λ does not contain μ and ν , then $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = 0$. \square

Note that by checking the degrees, we see that $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = 0$ if $|\lambda| > |\mu| + |\nu|$.

3.3 Weighted Sum Formula for LR coefficients

As in the case of binomial coefficients, the recursion formula for LR coefficients give rise to a weighted sum formula. This formula is new in all cases.

Theorem 3.7 (Theorem D, Weighted Sum Formula for LR Coefficients). *The LR coefficient admits the following weighted sum formula*

$$c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda\mu}} \text{wt}_\nu^{\text{LR}}(\zeta) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}}, \quad (3.19)$$

where $\zeta = (\zeta_0, \dots, \zeta_k)$ and the weight $\text{wt}_\nu^{\text{LR}}$ is defined as

$$\text{wt}_\nu^{\text{LR}}(\zeta) := \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{\prod_{0 \leq i \leq k-1} (\|\bar{\zeta}_i\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_{i+1}\|)}{\prod_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k \\ i \neq j}} (\|\bar{\zeta}_j\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_i\|)} b_{\zeta_j \nu}. \quad (3.20)$$

Proof. Temporarily denote by $\bar{c}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ the sum in Eq. (3.19), we will verify that $\bar{c}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ satisfy the recursion Eq. (3.17).

When $\lambda = \mu$, the sum is over the single chain $\zeta = (\lambda)$, then we have $c_{\lambda\nu}^\lambda = b_{\lambda\nu}$.

The RHS of Eq. (3.17)(ii), divided by $\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|$ and with $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ replaced by $\bar{c}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$, is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\xi \supset \mu} \bar{c}_{\xi\nu}^\lambda a_{\xi\mu} \frac{\|\bar{\xi}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|}{\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|} - \sum_{\xi \subset \lambda} a_{\lambda\xi} \bar{c}_{\mu\nu}^\xi \frac{\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\xi}\|}{\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|} \\ &= \sum_{\xi \supset \mu} \sum_{\zeta' \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda\xi}} \text{wt}_\nu^{\text{LR}}(\zeta') \prod_{i=0}^{k-2} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}} a_{\xi\mu} \frac{\|\bar{\xi}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|}{\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|} \\ & \quad - \sum_{\xi \subset \lambda} \sum_{\zeta'' \in \mathcal{C}_{\xi\mu}} \text{wt}_\nu^{\text{LR}}(\zeta'') \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}} a_{\lambda\xi} \frac{\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\xi}\|}{\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\zeta' = (\zeta_0 = \lambda : \supset \dots : \supset \zeta_{k-1} = \xi) \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda\xi}, \quad \zeta'' = (\zeta_1 = \xi : \supset \dots : \supset \zeta_k = \mu) \in \mathcal{C}_{\xi\mu}.$$

Extend ζ' and ζ'' to

$$\zeta_0 = \lambda : \supset \dots : \supset \zeta_{k-1} = \xi : \supset \zeta_k = \mu \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_0 = \lambda : \supset \zeta_1 = \xi : \supset \dots : \supset \zeta_k = \mu$$

respectively, then the two double sums can be viewed as summing over $\mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\mu}$. Note that both

$$\prod_{i=0}^{k-2} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}} \cdot a_{\xi\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}} \cdot a_{\lambda\xi}$$

are now written as $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}}$, hence we get

$$\sum_{\zeta \in \mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\mu}} \left(\text{wt}_{\nu}^{\text{LR}}(\zeta_0, \dots, \zeta_{k-1}) \frac{\|\overline{\zeta_{k-1}}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|}{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|} - \text{wt}_{\nu}^{\text{LR}}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k) \frac{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_1}\|}{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|} \right) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}}.$$

Hence it suffices to show

$$\text{wt}_{\nu}^{\text{LR}}(\zeta_0, \dots, \zeta_k) = \text{wt}_{\nu}^{\text{LR}}(\zeta_0, \dots, \zeta_{k-1}) \frac{\|\overline{\zeta_{k-1}}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|}{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|} - \text{wt}_{\nu}^{\text{LR}}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k) \frac{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_1}\|}{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|},$$

for any chain $\zeta = (\zeta_0, \dots, \zeta_k) \in \mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\mu}$. The RHS is

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{i=0}^{k-2} \left(\|\overline{\zeta_i}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_{i+1}}\| \right) \cdot \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{b_{\zeta_j \nu}}{\prod_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k-1 \\ i \neq j}} \left(\|\overline{\zeta_j}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_i}\| \right)} \cdot \frac{\|\overline{\zeta_{k-1}}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|}{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|} \\ & - \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} \left(\|\overline{\zeta_i}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_{i+1}}\| \right) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{b_{\zeta_j \nu}}{\prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ i \neq j}} \left(\|\overline{\zeta_j}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_i}\| \right)} \cdot \frac{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_1}\|}{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|}, \end{aligned}$$

which has a common factor $\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \left(\|\overline{\zeta_i}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_{i+1}}\| \right)$; dividing by this factor, we get

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \frac{b_{\zeta_j \nu}}{\prod_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k-1 \\ i \neq j}} \left(\|\overline{\zeta_j}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_i}\| \right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|} - \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{b_{\zeta_j \nu}}{\prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ i \neq j}} \left(\|\overline{\zeta_j}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_i}\| \right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|}.$$

Now the coefficient of $b_{\zeta_j \nu}$, with $j = 0$ and k respectively, is

$$\frac{1}{\prod_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k-1 \\ i \neq j}} \left(\|\overline{\zeta_j}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_i}\| \right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|} \quad \text{and} \quad - \frac{1}{\prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ i \neq j}} \left(\|\overline{\zeta_j}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_i}\| \right)} \cdot \frac{1}{\|\overline{\zeta_0}\| - \|\overline{\zeta_k}\|}$$

respectively, both of which are equal to $\frac{1}{\prod_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k \\ i \neq j}} (\|\bar{\zeta}_j\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_i\|)}$.

The coefficient of $b_{\zeta_j \nu}$, with $1 \leq j \leq k-1$, is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\prod_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k-1 \\ i \neq j}} (\|\bar{\zeta}_j\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_i\|)} \frac{1}{\|\bar{\zeta}_0\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_k\|} - \frac{1}{\prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ i \neq j}} (\|\bar{\zeta}_j\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_i\|)} \cdot \frac{1}{\|\bar{\zeta}_0\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_k\|} \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k-1 \\ i \neq j}} (\|\bar{\zeta}_j\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_i\|)} \frac{1}{\|\bar{\zeta}_0\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_k\|} \left(\frac{1}{\|\bar{\zeta}_j\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_0\|} - \frac{1}{\|\bar{\zeta}_j\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_k\|} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k \\ i \neq j}} (\|\bar{\zeta}_j\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_i\|)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we show that $\bar{c}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ satisfies the recursions in Eq. (3.17), and we are done. \square

Observe that setting $\nu = \lambda$, Eqs. (3.17), (3.19) and (3.20) for LR coefficients *degenerate* to Eqs. (3.4), (3.7) and (3.8) for binomial coefficients, respectively.

The following is an easy corollary.

Corollary 3.8. *When $\lambda \supset \mu$, the LR coefficients and binomial coefficients are related by*

$$c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = a_{\lambda\mu} (b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}). \quad (3.21)$$

More generally, for $\lambda \supseteq \mu$ and any $\zeta = (\zeta_0, \dots, \zeta_k) \in \mathfrak{E}_{\lambda\mu}$,

$$b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{c_{\zeta_{i+1}\nu}^{\zeta_i}}{a_{\zeta_i\zeta_{i+1}}}. \quad (3.22)$$

Proof. The first claim follows from Eq. (3.19) directly: $\zeta = (\lambda, \mu)$ is the only chain, and the weight $\text{wt}_\nu^{\text{LR}}(\zeta)$ becomes $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}$. The second claim follows from the telescoping series technique

$$b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu} = b_{\zeta_0\nu} - b_{\zeta_k\nu} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} (b_{\zeta_i\nu} - b_{\zeta_{i+1}\nu}) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{c_{\zeta_{i+1}\nu}^{\zeta_i}}{a_{\zeta_i\zeta_{i+1}}}.$$

\square

Lemma 3.1 is then a special case when $\nu = \varepsilon_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, i.e.,

$$c_{\mu\varepsilon_1}^\lambda = \begin{cases} b_{\mu\varepsilon_1}, & \lambda = \mu; \\ a_{\lambda\mu}(b_{\lambda\varepsilon_1} - b_{\mu\varepsilon_1}), & \lambda \supset \mu; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.23)$$

As mentioned in Section 1, Corollary 3.8 is a key relation between adjacent LR coefficients and binomial coefficients in proving Theorem E.

Proof of Theorem E. Suppose $\lambda \supset \mu$. We will assume Proposition 4.3 (proved in Section 4) and Theorem C (proved in Section 5), which state that $a_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$ and $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu} \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$. Now, by Corollary 3.8, we have $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$. The part of strict positivity follows from that of Theorem C. \square

As another corollary, we generalize Theorem D to a similar formula for generalized LR coefficient $c_\mu^\lambda(p)$ defined by Eq. (3.11).

Theorem 3.9. *For $p \in \Lambda$, the generalized Littlewood–Richardson coefficient $c_\mu^\lambda(p)$ admits the following weighted sum formula*

$$c_\mu^\lambda(p) = \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda\mu}} \text{wt}_p^{\text{LR}}(\zeta) \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}}, \quad (3.24)$$

where $\zeta = (\zeta_0, \dots, \zeta_k)$ and the weight wt_p^{LR} is defined as

$$\text{wt}_p^{\text{LR}}(\zeta) := \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{\prod_{0 \leq i \leq k-1} (\|\bar{\zeta}_i\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_{i+1}\|)}{\prod_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq k \\ i \neq j}} (\|\bar{\zeta}_j\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_i\|)} p(\bar{\zeta}_j). \quad (3.25)$$

In particular, we have the following:

- (1) The weight $\text{wt}_\nu^{\text{LR}}$ is a special case of wt_p^{LR} where $p = h_\nu$.
- (2) For the family AJ, the weight $\text{wt}_p^{\text{LR}}(\zeta)$ takes the following simple form:

$$\text{wt}_p^{\text{LR}, \text{AJ}}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k-j} \binom{k}{j} p(\bar{\zeta}_j). \quad (3.26)$$

- (3) When $\mu = \mathbf{0}$, $h_\mu = 1$, then we have the expansion of p in the interpolation basis h_λ ,

$$p = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\mathbf{0}}^\lambda(p) h_\lambda, \quad (3.27)$$

where the sum runs over all chains from λ to $\mathbf{0}$, i.e., standard tableaux of shape λ .

Proof. This follows from the fact that the interpolation polynomials form an \mathbb{F} -basis for Λ and the linearity of Eqs. (3.16), (3.19) and (3.20) in terms of h_ν . \square

4 Proof of Theorem B via the Weighted Sum Formula

We begin with a simple lemma. Recall that the distinguished RT of shape λ is the one whose first row (viewed as a λ_1 -tuple) is precisely the conjugate partition λ' , see Section 2.

Lemma 4.1. *Fix a partition $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, and let T be an RT of shape λ . Let τ, q, t be indeterminates over \mathbb{Q} . Then the two products*

$$\prod_{s \in \lambda} \left((\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\lambda(s) + l'_\lambda(s)\tau) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{s \in \lambda} \left(q^{\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\lambda(s)} t^{l'_\lambda(s)} - 1 \right) \quad (4.1)$$

vanish identically for all but the distinguished RT.

Proof. If the box $s = (i, j)$ is not in the first row, then $l'(s) > 0$, giving a nonzero factor. Suppose T corresponds to a non-vanishing product. Let the first row of T be $(n^{m_n}, \dots, k^{m_k}, \dots, 1^{m_1})$, i.e.,

$$\underbrace{(n, \dots, n)}_{m_n \text{ times}}, \dots, \underbrace{(k, \dots, k)}_{m_k \text{ times}}, \dots, \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{m_1 \text{ times}}.$$

In particular, $\lambda_1 = m_1 + \dots + m_n$. Then the products are multiples of

$$\prod_{k=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^{m_k} (\lambda_k - (m_n + \dots + m_{k+1}) - i + 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{k=1}^n \prod_{i=1}^{m_k} \left(q^{\lambda_k - (m_n + \dots + m_{k+1}) - i + 1} - 1 \right)$$

respectively, hence we have

$$\lambda_k \geq m_n + \dots + m_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n.$$

We claim that the inequalities above must all be equal. Assume the contrary, and let $k > 1$ be the smallest such that $\lambda_k > m_n + \dots + m_k$, then $\lambda_{k-1} - \lambda_k < m_{k-1}$. Consider the first column whose first row is labeled by $k-1$, which is column number $m_n + \dots + m_k + 1 = \lambda_{k-1} - m_{k-1} + 1$. However, there are at least k boxes in this column (since $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k \geq \lambda_{k-1} - m_{k-1} + 1$), a contradiction.

In other words, the two products are non-vanishing if and only if the first row of T is equal to $(n^{\lambda_n}, \dots, k^{\lambda_k - \lambda_{k+1}}, \dots, 1^{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}) = \lambda'$, i.e., T is the distinguished RT. \square

The following two propositions are known in certain cases [Sah11a, Sah11b, Rai05, Koo15]. Here, we give a uniform proof for all families.

Proposition 4.2. *The normalizing factor $H(\lambda) := h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(\bar{\lambda})$ for each family is given by:*

(1) AJ:

$$H(\lambda; \tau) = \prod_{s \in \lambda} \left(\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\lambda(s) + \tau l'_\lambda(s) \right) = c'_\lambda(\tau); \quad (4.2)$$

(2) BJ:

$$\begin{aligned} H(\lambda; \tau, \alpha) &= \prod_{s \in \lambda} \left(\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\lambda(s) + \tau l'_\lambda(s) \right) \cdot \prod_{s \in \lambda} \left(\lambda_{T(s)} + a'_\lambda(s) + (2n - 2T(s) - l'_\lambda(s))\tau + 2\alpha \right) \\ &= c'_\lambda(\tau) d_\lambda(\tau, \alpha); \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

(3) AM:

$$\begin{aligned} H(\lambda; q, t) &= \prod_{s \in \lambda} \left(-q^{a'_\lambda(s)} t^{n-T(s)-l'_\lambda(s)} \right) \left(1 - q^{\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\lambda(s)} t^{l'_\lambda(s)} \right) \\ &= (-1)^{|\lambda|} q^{n\langle \lambda' \rangle} t^{(n-1)|\lambda| - 2n\langle \lambda \rangle} \cdot c'_\lambda(q, t) \\ &= (-1)^{|\lambda|} q^{(n-1)|\lambda| - \langle \lambda', \delta \rangle} t^{n|\lambda| - \langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle} \cdot c'_\lambda(q, t), \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

(4) BM:

$$\begin{aligned} H(\lambda; q, t, a) &= \prod_{s \in \lambda} \frac{\left(1 - q^{\lambda_{T(s)} + a'_\lambda(s)} t^{2n - 2T(s) - l'_\lambda(s)} a^2 \right) \left(1 - q^{\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\lambda(s)} t^{l'_\lambda(s)} \right)}{q^{\lambda_{T(s)}} t^{n-T(s)} a} \\ &= q^{-|\lambda| - 2n\langle \lambda' \rangle} t^{-(n-1)|\lambda| + n\langle \lambda \rangle} a^{-|\lambda|} \cdot c'_\lambda(q, t) d_\lambda(q, t, a) \\ &= q^{-\langle \lambda, \lambda \rangle} t^{-\langle \lambda, \tau \rangle} a^{-|\lambda|} \cdot c'_\lambda(q, t) d_\lambda(q, t, a); \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where $T(s)$ is the distinguished RT; $c'_\lambda := \prod_{s \in \lambda} c'_\lambda(s)$, $d_\lambda := \prod_{s \in \lambda} d_\lambda(s)$, $c'_\lambda(s)$ is given by Eqs. (2.18) and (2.19) and $d_\lambda(s)$ is given by

$$d_\lambda(s; \tau, \alpha) := a_\lambda(s) + 2a'_\lambda(s) + 1 + (2n - (l_\lambda(s) + 2l'_\lambda(s) + 2))\tau + 2\alpha, \quad (4.6)$$

$$d_\lambda(s; q, t, a) := 1 - q^{a_\lambda(s) + 2a'_\lambda(s) + 1} t^{2n - (l_\lambda(s) + 2l'_\lambda(s) + 2)} a^2. \quad (4.7)$$

The function $n(\lambda)$ is given by [Mac15, I. (1.5)], namely,

$$n(\lambda) := \sum_{(i,j) \in \lambda} (i-1) = \sum_i (i-1)\lambda_i = \sum_j \binom{\lambda'_j}{2} = (n-1)|\lambda| - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle, \quad (4.8)$$

and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the Euclidean inner product on \mathbb{R}^n .

Proof. It follows from the previous lemma, the combinatorial formulas Eqs. (2.11), (2.12), (2.14) and (2.15) and some easy calculations. \square

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose $\lambda \supset \mu$ and that λ and μ differ by the box $s_0 = (i_0, j_0)$. Let $C := C_{\lambda/\mu} \setminus R_{\lambda/\mu}$ and $R := R_{\lambda/\mu} \setminus C_{\lambda/\mu}$ be the set of other boxes in the column and row of s_0 respectively. Then the adjacent binomial coefficient $a_{\lambda\mu}$ can be given by the following formulas. In particular, $a_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$.*

(1) AJ:

$$a_{\lambda\mu} = \prod_{s \in C} \frac{c_\lambda(s; \tau)}{c_\mu(s; \tau)} \prod_{s \in R} \frac{c'_\lambda(s; \tau)}{c'_\mu(s; \tau)}; \quad (4.9)$$

(2) BJ:

$$a_{\lambda\mu} = \prod_{s \in C} \frac{c_\lambda(s; \tau) d_\lambda(s; \tau, \alpha)}{c_\mu(s; \tau) d_\mu(s; \tau, \alpha)} \prod_{s \in R} \frac{c'_\lambda(s; \tau) d_\lambda(s; \tau, \alpha)}{c'_\mu(s; \tau) d_\mu(s; \tau, \alpha)}; \quad (4.10)$$

(3) AM:

$$a_{\lambda\mu} = \frac{1}{t^{i_0-1}} \cdot \prod_{s \in C} \frac{c_\lambda(s; q, t)}{c_\mu(s; q, t)} \prod_{s \in R} \frac{c'_\lambda(s; q, t)}{c'_\mu(s; q, t)}; \quad (4.11)$$

(4) BM:

$$a_{\lambda\mu} = \frac{1}{q^{j_0-1}} \cdot \prod_{s \in C} \frac{c_\lambda(s; q, t) d_\lambda(s; q, t, a)}{c_\mu(s; q, t) d_\mu(s; q, t, a)} \prod_{s \in R} \frac{c'_\lambda(s; q, t) d_\lambda(s; q, t, a)}{c'_\mu(s; q, t) d_\mu(s; q, t, a)}; \quad (4.12)$$

where $c_\lambda(s)$ and $c'_\lambda(s)$ are given by Eqs. (2.18) and (2.19) and $d_\lambda(s)$ by Eqs. (4.6) and (4.7).

Proof. Comparing the combinatorial formulas Eqs. (2.11), (2.12), (2.14) and (2.15) with Eqs. (2.10) and (2.13), we see that the top degree terms of the interpolation polynomials correspond to the ordinary Jack or Macdonald polynomials, hence they have the same *monic* LR coefficients. To be more precise, let P_λ be the monic Jack or Macdonald polynomial. Define $\tilde{c}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ by

$$P_\mu P_\nu = \sum_{\lambda} \tilde{c}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda P_\lambda. \quad (4.13)$$

When $\nu = \varepsilon_1$, by the Pieri rule [Sta89, Mac15], the LR coefficient can be explicitly given by

$$\tilde{c}_{\mu\varepsilon_1}^{\lambda, J} = \prod_{s \in C} \frac{b_\lambda(s; \tau)}{b_\mu(s; \tau)} = \prod_{s \in C} \frac{c_\lambda(s; \tau)}{c_\mu(s; \tau)} \prod_{s \in C} \frac{c'_\mu(s; \tau)}{c'_\lambda(s; \tau)}, \quad \lambda \supset \mu; \quad (4.14)$$

$$\tilde{c}_{\mu\varepsilon_1}^{\lambda, M} = \prod_{s \in C} \frac{b_\lambda(s; q, t)}{b_\mu(s; q, t)} = \prod_{s \in C} \frac{c_\lambda(s; q, t)}{c_\mu(s; q, t)} \prod_{s \in C} \frac{c'_\mu(s; q, t)}{c'_\lambda(s; q, t)}, \quad \lambda \supset \mu. \quad (4.15)$$

Since our LR coefficient $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ is defined w.r.t. the *unital* normalization, $\tilde{c}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ and $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ are related by

$$c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = \frac{H(\lambda)}{H(\mu)H(\nu)} \tilde{c}_{\mu\nu}^\lambda. \quad (4.16)$$

Then by Eq. (3.23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\lambda\mu} &= \frac{c_{\mu\varepsilon_1}^\lambda}{b_{\lambda\varepsilon_1} - b_{\mu\varepsilon_1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{b_{\lambda\varepsilon_1} - b_{\mu\varepsilon_1}} \frac{H(\lambda)}{H(\mu)H(\varepsilon_1)} \tilde{c}_{\mu\varepsilon_1}^\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{h_{\varepsilon_1}^{\text{monic}}(\bar{\lambda}) - h_{\varepsilon_1}^{\text{monic}}(\bar{\mu})} \frac{H(\lambda)}{H(\mu)} \tilde{c}_{\mu\varepsilon_1}^\lambda \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\bar{\lambda}\| - \|\bar{\mu}\|} \frac{H(\lambda)}{H(\mu)} \tilde{c}_{\mu\varepsilon_1}^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

The desired formulas, Eqs. (4.9) to (4.12), follow from Proposition 4.2 and Table 1.

To show that $a_{\lambda\mu}$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$, simply note that $c_\lambda(s)$, $c'_\lambda(s)$ lie in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$ by definition. As for $d_\lambda(s)$, note that $2n - (l_\lambda(s) + 2l'_\lambda(s) + 2) \geq 0$ as $l_\lambda(s) + l'_\lambda(s) + 1 \leq n$. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem B via the weighted sum formula Eq. (3.7).

Proof for Theorem B. By the extra vanishing property Proposition 2.3, if $\lambda \not\supseteq \mu$, then $b_{\lambda\mu} = 0$. Hence it suffices to show that $b_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$ if $\lambda \supseteq \mu$. Assuming this, by Eq. (3.7) and the positivity of adjacent binomial coefficients, it suffices to show that for each chain $\zeta \in \mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\mu}$, the weight

$$\text{wt}(\zeta) = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{\|\bar{\zeta}_i\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_{i+1}\|}{\|\bar{\zeta}_0\| - \|\bar{\zeta}_{i+1}\|}$$

lies in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$.

For $\mathcal{F} = AJ$, we have $\text{wt}(\zeta) = \frac{1}{k!}$ for each ζ , where $k = |\lambda| - |\mu|$. This result was first obtained in [Sah11b].

For $\mathcal{F} = BJ$, assume $\nu \supseteq \xi$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\nu}\| - \|\bar{\xi}\| &= \sum (\nu_i + (n-i)\tau + \alpha)^2 - \sum (\xi_i + (n-i)\tau + \alpha)^2 \\ &= \sum (\nu_i + \xi_i + 2(n-i)\tau + 2\alpha)(\nu_i - \xi_i) \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}, \end{aligned}$$

hence the weight $\text{wt}(\zeta)$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$.

For $\mathcal{F} = AM$, assume $\nu \supseteq \xi$, then we have

$$\|\bar{\nu}\| - \|\bar{\xi}\| = \sum \left(q^{\nu_i} t^{n-i} - q^{\xi_i} t^{n-i} \right) = \sum \left(q^{\nu_i} - q^{\xi_i} \right) t^{n-i} < 0,$$

when $q, t \in (0, 1)$, hence the weight $\text{wt}(\zeta)$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$.

For $\mathcal{F} = BM$, assume $\nu \supseteq \xi$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{\nu}\| - \|\bar{\xi}\| &= \sum \left(q^{\nu_i} t^{n-i} a - q^{\xi_i} t^{n-i} a + (q^{\nu_i} t^{n-i} a)^{-1} - (q^{\xi_i} t^{n-i} a)^{-1} \right) \\ &= \sum \left((q^{\nu_i - \xi_i} - 1) q^{\xi_i} t^{n-i} a + (1 - q^{\nu_i - \xi_i}) (q^{\nu_i} t^{n-i} a)^{-1} \right) \\ &= \sum \frac{1 - q^{\nu_i - \xi_i}}{q^{\nu_i} t^{n-i} a} \left(1 - q^{\nu_i + \xi_i} t^{2n-2i} a^2 \right) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

when $q, t, a \in (0, 1)$, hence the weight $\text{wt}(\zeta)$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$. \square

Note that for the interpolation Macdonald polynomials of type A and BC , a similar argument shows that if $q, t, a \in (1, \infty)$, then the weight $\text{wt}(\zeta)$ and the adjacent binomial coefficient $a_{\zeta_i \zeta_{i+1}}$ are also positive, hence so is the binomial coefficient $b_{\lambda \mu}$. However, if t or q is negative, then the adjacent binomial coefficient could be negative, due to the factors t and q in Eqs. (4.11) and (4.12).

5 Proof of Theorem C via the Combinatorial Formulas

In this section, we will prove the monotonicity theorem. In fact, we will prove the positivity of binomial coefficients along the way.

Note that if $\lambda \not\supseteq \nu$, then both $b_{\lambda \nu}$ and $b_{\mu \nu}$ are 0 by the extra vanishing property; and if $\lambda \supseteq \nu$ but $\mu \not\supseteq \nu$, then $b_{\lambda \nu} - b_{\mu \nu} = b_{\lambda \nu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$ by Theorem B. Hence it suffices to prove $b_{\lambda \nu} - b_{\mu \nu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$ when $\lambda \supseteq \mu \supseteq \nu \neq \mathbf{0}$. By the telescoping series technique, we may assume that $\lambda \supset \mu \supseteq \nu \neq \mathbf{0}$.

5.1 Interpolation Jack Polynomials

The proof is inspired by [AF19, Section 7].

Lemma 5.1. *Assume $\lambda \supseteq \mu$. Then for any RT T of shape μ , either the product*

$$\prod_{s \in \mu} \left(\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s) + l'_\mu(s) \tau \right) \tag{5.1}$$

is identically zero, or we have $\lambda_{T(s)} > a'_\mu(s)$ for any $s \in \mu$. In particular, the product lies in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$. Moreover, when T is the distinguished RT, the product is indeed nonzero.

Proof. Note that $\lambda_{T(i,j)} \geq \lambda_{T(1,j)}$, $a'_\mu(i,j) = a'_\mu(1,j)$, and $l'_\mu(i,j) \geq l'_\mu(1,j) = 0$ for $(i,j) \in \mu$, then it suffices to consider the sequence $(\lambda_{T(1,j)} - a'_\mu(1,j))_{1 \leq j \leq \mu_1}$.

Assume that $\lambda_{T(1,j_0)} - a'_\mu(1,j_0) < 0$ for some j_0 . The sequence is decreasing by at most 1 (or weakly-increasing) as

$$(\lambda_{T(1,j)} - a'_\mu(1,j)) - (\lambda_{T(1,j-1)} - a'_\mu(1,j-1)) = \lambda_{T(1,j)} - \lambda_{T(1,j-1)} - 1 \geq -1.$$

Since the sequence starts at $\lambda_{T(1,1)} \geq 0$ and contains $\lambda_{T(1,j_0)} - a'_\mu(1,j_0) < 0$, it must contain 0 as well. In other words, either the sequence contains 0 or it consists of numbers in $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, and we are done.

When T is the distinguished RT, for any $s = (i,j) \in \mu$, we have

$$\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s) \geq \mu_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s) = \mu_{\mu'_j - i + 1} - j + 1 \geq \mu_{\mu'_j} - j + 1 \geq 1.$$

□

Proof of Theorem C for $\mathcal{F} = AJ$. First, we prove positivity. Assume $\lambda \supseteq \mu$. Evaluating Eq. (2.11) (with λ replaced by μ) at $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda + \tau\delta$, we get

$$H(\mu)b_{\lambda\mu} = h_\mu^{\text{monic}}(\bar{\lambda}; \tau) = \sum_T \psi_T(\tau) \prod_{s \in \mu} (\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s) + l'_\mu(s)\tau). \quad (5.2)$$

Note that $H(\mu) \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$ by Proposition 4.2. For any RT T , it follows from the definition that $\psi_T(\tau) \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$ and hence by Lemma 5.1, $b_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$.

Now we prove monotonicity. Assume that $\lambda \supset \mu \supseteq \nu \neq \mathbf{0}$ and that λ and μ differ in the i_0 th row. By Eq. (5.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & H(\nu) (b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}) \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(\tau) \left(\prod_{s \in \nu} (\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s) + l'_\nu(s)\tau) - \prod_{s \in \nu} (\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s) + l'_\nu(s)\tau) \right) \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(\tau) \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) \neq i_0}} (\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s) + l'_\nu(s)\tau) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) = i_0}} (\mu_{T(s)} + 1 - a'_\nu(s) + l'_\nu(s)\tau) - \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) = i_0}} (\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s) + l'_\nu(s)\tau) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.1, for any RT T that gives a nonzero product, the numbers $\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s) > 0$ for $s \in \nu$, hence $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$ by Lemma 5.2 below (where $x_i = \mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s)$ and $a_i = l'_\nu(s)\tau$). □

Lemma 5.2. *Given a finite sequence (a_1, \dots, a_m) of indeterminates, define*

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_m) := \prod_i (x_i + a_i).$$

Then $f(x_1 + 1, \dots, x_m + 1) - f(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ lies in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[a_1, \dots, a_m][x_1, \dots, x_m] \setminus 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem C for $\mathcal{F} = BJ$. First, we prove positivity. Assume $\lambda \supseteq \mu$. Evaluating Eq. (2.12) (with λ replaced by μ) at $\bar{\lambda}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} H(\mu)b_{\lambda\mu} &= h_{\mu}^{\text{monic}}(\bar{\lambda}; \tau, \alpha) \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(\tau) \prod_{s \in \mu} \left(\left(\lambda_{T(s)} + (n - T(s))\tau + \alpha \right)^2 - \left(a'_{\mu}(s) + (n - T(s) - l'_{\mu}(s))\tau + \alpha \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(\tau) \prod_{s \in \mu} \left(\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_{\mu}(s) + l'_{\mu}(s)\tau \right) \left(\lambda_{T(s)} + a'_{\mu}(s) + (2n - 2T(s) - l'_{\mu}(s))\tau + 2\alpha \right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

We again have that $H(\mu)$ and ψ_T lie in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$. By Lemma 5.1, the product $\prod_{s \in \mu} \left(\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_{\mu}(s) + l'_{\mu}(s)\tau \right)$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ and the one indexed by the distinguished RT is nonzero. Also it is evident that $\prod_{s \in \mu} \left(\lambda_{T(s)} + a'_{\mu}(s) + (2n - 2T(s) - l'_{\mu}(s))\tau + 2\alpha \right)$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$ since $T(s) + l'_{\mu}(s) \leq n$. We conclude that $b_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$.

We now prove monotonicity. We may assume that $\lambda \supset \mu \supseteq \nu \neq \mathbf{0}$ and that λ and μ differ in the i_0 th row. By Eq. (5.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &H(\nu) (b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}) \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(\tau) \\ &\quad \cdot \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) \neq i_0}} \left(\mu_{T(s)} - a'_{\nu}(s) + l'_{\nu}(s)\tau \right) \left(\mu_{T(s)} + a'_{\nu}(s) + (2n - 2T(s) - l'_{\nu}(s))\tau + 2\alpha \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) = i_0}} \left(\mu_{T(s)} + 1 - a'_{\nu}(s) + l'_{\nu}(s)\tau \right) \left(\mu_{T(s)} + 1 + a'_{\nu}(s) + (2n - 2T(s) - l'_{\nu}(s))\tau + 2\alpha \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) = i_0}} \left(\mu_{T(s)} - a'_{\nu}(s) + l'_{\nu}(s)\tau \right) \left(\mu_{T(s)} + a'_{\nu}(s) + (2n - 2T(s) - l'_{\nu}(s))\tau + 2\alpha \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

As argued in the case of AJ, for any RT T that gives a nonzero summand, the numbers $\mu_{T(s)} - a'_{\nu}(s) > 0$ for $s \in \nu$, hence $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$ by Lemma 5.2. \square

5.2 Interpolation Macdonald Polynomials

Lemma 5.3. *Assume $\lambda \supseteq \mu$. Let $q, t \in (0, 1)$. Then for any RT T of shape μ , either the product*

$$\prod_{s \in \mu} \left(1 - q^{\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s)} t^{l'_\mu(s)}\right) \quad (5.4)$$

is identically zero, or we have $\lambda_{T(s)} > a'_\mu(s)$ for any $s \in \mu$. In particular, the product lies in $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$. Moreover, when T is the distinguished RT, the product is indeed nonzero.

Proof. This lemma is parallel to Lemma 5.1, and the proof is omitted. Simply note that in the case of Lemma 5.1, $\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s) + l'_\mu(s)\tau = 0$ if and only if $\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s) = 0 = l'_\mu(s)$; and in this case, $1 - q^{\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s)} t^{l'_\mu(s)} = 0$ if and only if $\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s) = 0 = l'_\mu(s)$. \square

Proof of Theorem C for $\mathcal{F} = \text{AM}$. We first prove positivity. Assume $\lambda \supseteq \mu$. Evaluating Eq. (2.14) (with λ replaced by μ) at $\bar{\lambda}$, since $H(\mu)$ is given by the distinguished RT T_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\lambda\mu} &= \frac{h_\mu^{\text{monic}}(\bar{\lambda}; q, t)}{H(\mu)} \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(q, t) \prod_{s \in \mu} \frac{\left(-q^{a'_\mu(s)} t^{n - T(s) - l'_\mu(s)}\right) \left(1 - q^{\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s)} t^{l'_\mu(s)}\right)}{H(\mu)} \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(q, t) \prod_{s \in \mu} t^{T_0(s) - T(s)} \frac{1 - q^{\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s)} t^{l'_\mu(s)}}{1 - q^{\mu_{T_0(s)} - a'_\mu(s)} t^{l'_\mu(s)}}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, $\psi_T(q, t) \in \mathbb{F}_{> 0}$. Then by Lemma 5.3, $b_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$.

Now we prove the monotonicity. Assume that $\lambda \supset \mu \supseteq \nu \neq \mathbf{0}$ and that λ and μ differ in the i_0 th row. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu} \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(q, t) \left(\prod_{s \in \nu} t^{T_0(s) - T(s)} \frac{1 - q^{\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}}{1 - q^{\mu_{T_0(s)} - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}} - \prod_{s \in \nu} t^{T_0(s) - T(s)} \frac{1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}}{1 - q^{\nu_{T_0(s)} - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}} \right) \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(q, t) \prod_{s \in \nu} \frac{t^{T_0(s) - T(s)}}{1 - q^{\nu_{T_0(s)} - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}} \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) \neq i_0}} \left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}\right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) = i_0}} \left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} + 1 - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}\right) - \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) = i_0}} \left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 5.3, for T giving a nonzero product, we have $\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s) > 0$, hence $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$ by the assumption that $q, t \in (0, 1)$. In fact, by a similar argument, if we assume $q, t \in (1, \infty)$, we still have $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu} > 0$ since we have an equal number of factors of the form $1 - q^a t^b$ in the numerator and the denominator. \square

Proof of Theorem C for $\mathcal{F} = BM$. We first prove the positivity. Assume $\lambda \supseteq \mu$. Evaluating Eq. (2.15) (with λ replaced by μ) at $\bar{\lambda}$, since $H(\mu)$ is given by the distinguished RT T_0 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\lambda\mu} &= \frac{h_\mu^{\text{monic}}(\bar{\lambda}; q, t, a)}{H(\mu)} \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(q, t) \prod_{s \in \mu} \frac{t^{T(s)-T_0(s)} \frac{1 - q^{\lambda_{T(s)} + a'_\mu(s)} t^{2n-2T(s)-l'_\mu(s)} a^2}{1 - q^{\mu_{T_0(s)} + a'_\mu(s)} t^{2n-2T_0(s)-l'_\mu(s)} a^2} \frac{1 - q^{\lambda_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s)} t^{l'_\mu(s)}}{1 - q^{\mu_{T_0(s)} - a'_\mu(s)} t^{l'_\mu(s)}}}{1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\mu(s)} t^{l'_\mu(s)}}. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\psi_T(q, t) \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$. The product Eq. (5.4) is in $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ by Lemma 5.3, and the remaining factors are in $\mathbb{F}_{>0}$ since the exponents are positive. It follows immediately that $b_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$. Now we prove the monotonicity. Assume $\lambda \supset \mu \supseteq \nu \neq 0$ and that λ and μ differ in the i_0 th row. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu} \\ &= \sum_T \psi_T(q, t) \prod_{s \in \nu} \frac{t^{T(s)-T_0(s)} q^{\nu_{T_0(s)}}}{1 - q^{\nu_{T_0(s)} + a'_\nu(s)} t^{2n-2T_0(s)-l'_\nu(s)} a^2} \frac{1}{1 - q^{\nu_{T_0(s)} - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}} \\ &\quad \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) \neq i_0}} \frac{\left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} + a'_\nu(s)} t^{2n-2T(s)-l'_\nu(s)} a^2\right) \left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}\right)}{q^{\mu_{T(s)}}}. \\ &\quad \left(\prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) = i_0}} \frac{\left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} + 1 + a'_\nu(s)} t^{2n-2T(s)-l'_\nu(s)} a^2\right) \left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} + 1 - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}\right)}{q^{\mu_{T(s)} + 1}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s) = i_0}} \frac{\left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} + a'_\nu(s)} t^{2n-2T(s)-l'_\nu(s)} a^2\right) \left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}\right)}{q^{\mu_{T(s)}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For any T giving a nonzero product, we have $\mu_{T(s)} - a'_\nu(s) > 0$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s)=i_0}} \frac{\left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)}+1+a'_\nu(s)} t^{2n-2T(s)-l'_\nu(s)} a^2\right) \left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)}+1-a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}\right)}{q^{\mu_{T(s)}+1}} \\
> \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s)=i_0}} \frac{\left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)}+1+a'_\nu(s)} t^{2n-2T(s)-l'_\nu(s)} a^2\right) \left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)}+1-a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}\right)}{q^{\mu_{T(s)}}} \\
> \prod_{\substack{s \in \nu \\ T(s)=i_0}} \frac{\left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)}+a'_\nu(s)} t^{2n-2T(s)-l'_\nu(s)} a^2\right) \left(1 - q^{\mu_{T(s)}-a'_\nu(s)} t^{l'_\nu(s)}\right)}{q^{\mu_{T(s)}}},
\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$. As in the case of AM, if we assume instead $q, t, a \in (1, \infty)$, we still have $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu} > 0$. \square

6 Applications and Future Extensions

6.1 Inequalities of Symmetric Polynomials

In this subsection, let $P_\lambda(x) = P_\lambda(x; \tau)$ be the monic Jack polynomials and $b_{\lambda\mu} = b_{\lambda\mu}(\tau)$ the binomial coefficients of family AJ. Recall that the cone of positivity $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ is defined by Eq. (2.3).

Also recall that for partitions λ and μ (as before, written as n -tuples), we say λ **weakly majorizes** (or, **weakly dominates**) μ , if $\sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^r \mu_i$, for $1 \leq r \leq n$; if, in addition, $|\lambda| = |\mu|$, we say λ **majorizes** (or, **dominates**) μ .

Let $\mathbf{1} = (1^n) = (1, \dots, 1)$. Bingham [Bin74] (for $\tau = \frac{1}{2}$) and Lassalle [Las90] (for general τ) first studies the expansion of $P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau)$ in terms of $P_\mu(x; \tau)$. The following is proved in [Kan93, OO97a].

Theorem (Binomial Theorem for Jack Polynomials).

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau)} = \sum_{\mu \subseteq \lambda} b_{\lambda\mu} \frac{P_\mu(x; \tau)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau)}. \tag{6.1}$$

The normalization $P_\lambda(x)/P_\lambda(\mathbf{1})$ is sometimes called the **unital** normalization, as it maps $\mathbf{1}$ to 1.

As a direct application of the monotonicity of binomial coefficients (Theorem C), we have the following characterization of the containment order.

Theorem 6.1 (Theorem F). *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) λ contains μ ;
- (2) The difference of normalized Jack polynomials, $\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau)} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau)}$, is **Jack positive**, namely, can be written as an $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ -combination of Jack polynomials;
- (3) For some fixed $\tau_0 \in [0, \infty]$, the difference of normalized Jack polynomials, $\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau_0)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau_0)} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau_0)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau_0)}$, is τ_0 -**Jack positive**, namely, can be written as an $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ -combination of Jack polynomials with parameter τ_0 .

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Note that $P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau) \in \mathbb{F}_{> 0}$ by [Mac15, VI. (10.20)] or Eq. (2.10), and $P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau_0) > 0$ (it suffices to check for $\tau_0 = 0$ and ∞).

We first show that (1) \implies (2). If $\lambda \supseteq \mu$, then by the binomial formula Eq. (6.1),

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau)} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau)} = \sum_{\nu \subseteq \lambda} (b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}) \frac{P_\nu(x; \tau)}{P_\nu(\mathbf{1}; \tau)},$$

the coefficient $b_{\lambda\nu} - b_{\mu\nu}$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ by the monotonicity of binomial coefficients.

(2) \implies (3) is clear since functions in $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ have non-negative evaluation at $\tau_0 \in [0, \infty]$.

(3) \implies (1): If λ does not contain μ , since $\{P_\lambda(x; \tau_0) \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$ forms an \mathbb{R} -basis for $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]^{S_n}$, the difference would contain $-P_\mu(x; \tau_0)/P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau_0)$, hence is not τ_0 -Jack positive. \square

It is well-known, see [Mac15, Chapters I, VI and VII], that Jack polynomials $P_\lambda(x; \tau)$ specialize to many symmetric polynomials: monomial symmetric polynomials m_λ when $\tau = 0$, Zonal polynomials Z_λ when $\tau = 1/2$ (for complex) and 2 (for quaternion), Schur polynomials s_λ when $\tau = 1$, and elementary symmetric polynomials $e_{\lambda'}$ when $\tau = \infty$ (where λ' is the transpose of λ). Hence we have the following inequalities.

Theorem 6.2. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) λ contains μ ;
- (2) The difference of normalized monomial symmetric polynomials, $\frac{m_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1})}{m_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{m_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})}{m_\mu(\mathbf{1})}$, is **monomial positive**;
- (3) The difference of normalized Zonal polynomials, $\frac{Z_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1})}{Z_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{Z_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})}{Z_\mu(\mathbf{1})}$, is **Zonal positive**;
- (4) The difference of normalized Schur polynomials, $\frac{s_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1})}{s_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{s_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})}{s_\mu(\mathbf{1})}$, is **Schur positive**;

- (5) The difference of normalized elementary symmetric polynomials, $\frac{e_{\lambda'}(x + \mathbf{1})}{e_{\lambda'}(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{e_{\mu'}(x + \mathbf{1})}{e_{\mu'}(\mathbf{1})}$, is **elementary positive**.

These inequalities are in parallel with some classical results due to Maclaurin, Newton, Schlömilch, Muirhead and Gantmacher, see the introduction of [CGS11]. Recall the following:

Theorem 6.3. *Let $|\lambda| = |\mu|$. The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) λ majorizes μ ;
(2) ([Mwi04]) The difference of normalized monomial symmetric polynomials is positive on the positive orthant:

$$\frac{m_{\lambda}(x)}{m_{\lambda}(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{m_{\mu}(x)}{m_{\mu}(\mathbf{1})} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.2)$$

- (3) ([CGS11, Theorem 3.2]) The difference of normalized elementary symmetric polynomials is positive on the positive orthant:

$$\frac{e_{\lambda'}(x)}{e_{\lambda'}(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{e_{\mu'}(x)}{e_{\mu'}(\mathbf{1})} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.3)$$

- (4) ([CGS11, Theorem 4.2]) The difference of normalized power-sum is positive on the positive orthant:

$$\frac{p_{\lambda}(x)}{p_{\lambda}(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{p_{\mu}(x)}{p_{\mu}(\mathbf{1})} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.4)$$

- (5) ([CGS11, Conjecture 7.4, Theorem 7.5] and [Sra16]) The difference of normalized Schur polynomials is positive on the positive orthant:

$$\frac{s_{\lambda}(x)}{s_{\lambda}(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{s_{\mu}(x)}{s_{\mu}(\mathbf{1})} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.5)$$

We now extend Theorem 6.2 to power-sums. As usual, let n be the number of variables. It is well-known that power-sums p_1, \dots, p_n are algebraically independent (but not $p_1, \dots, p_n, p_{n+1}, \dots$), and $\{p_{\nu} \mid \nu \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$ forms a \mathbb{Q} -basis for $\mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]^{S_n}$.

Theorem 6.4. λ contains μ if and only if $\frac{p_{\lambda}(x + \mathbf{1})}{p_{\lambda}(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{p_{\mu}(x + \mathbf{1})}{p_{\mu}(\mathbf{1})}$ is power-sum positive, when expressed in the basis $\{p_{\nu} \mid \nu \in \mathcal{P}_n\}$.

Proof. We will abuse notation in this proof only and let $P_\lambda(x) := p_\lambda(x)/p_\lambda(\mathbf{1})$, let $p_{\mathbf{0}} = n$ and $P_{\mathbf{0}} = 1$. Note that $p_\lambda(\mathbf{1}) = n^{\ell(\lambda)}$.

For the “only if” direction, we use induction on $\ell(\lambda)$. First assume $\ell(\lambda) = 1$, then by the classical binomial formulas,

$$P_r(x + \mathbf{1}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i (x_i + 1)^r = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i,t} \binom{r}{t} x_i^t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_t \binom{r}{t} p_s(x) = \sum_t \binom{r}{t} P_t(x).$$

It is well-known that the usual binomial coefficient is positive and monotone, hence if $r \geq s$, then $P_r(x + \mathbf{1}) - P_s(x + \mathbf{1})$ is a positive sum in $P_t(x)$, i.e., power-sum positive.

For the inductive step, consider the pair $(L, \lambda) \supseteq (M, \mu)$, where L and M are integers that make the expressions partitions, then $L \geq M$ and $\lambda \supseteq \mu$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{(L,\lambda)}(x + \mathbf{1}) - P_{(M,\mu)}(x + \mathbf{1}) \\ &= P_L(x + \mathbf{1})P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}) - P_M(x + \mathbf{1})P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1}) \\ &= (P_L(x + \mathbf{1}) - P_M(x + \mathbf{1})) P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}) + P_M(x + \mathbf{1}) (P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}) - P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})), \end{aligned}$$

which is power-sum positive by the induction base, the induction hypothesis and the fact that power-sum positive polynomials are closed under products.

For the “if” direction, we have

$$P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}) = \prod_i P_{\lambda_i}(x + \mathbf{1}) = \prod_i \sum_{\eta_i} \binom{\lambda_i}{\eta_i} P_{\eta_i}(x) = \sum_{\substack{\eta_1 \leq \lambda_1 \\ \dots \\ \eta_\ell \leq \lambda_\ell}} \prod_i \binom{\lambda_i}{\eta_i} P_{\eta_i}(x)$$

Sort $\eta := (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell)$ into a partition ν , then we have

$$P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}) = \sum_\nu \left(\sum_{\eta \sim \nu} \prod_i \binom{\lambda_i}{\eta_i} \right) P_\nu(x).$$

If $\lambda \not\supseteq \nu$, then for any permutation η of ν , the product $\prod_i \binom{\lambda_i}{\eta_i}$ is vanishing as there exists some i_0 such that $\lambda_{i_0} < \eta_{i_0}$. Hence the sum above is over $\nu \subseteq \lambda$. Also, the coefficient of $P_\lambda(x)$ is 1. Now, if $\lambda \not\supseteq \mu$, the difference will contain $-P_\mu(x)$, hence is not power-sum positive. \square

Khare and Tao, [KT18, Theorem 4.1], prove the following for Schur polynomials (more generally for *real* powers):

Theorem. λ weakly majorizes μ if and only if

$$\frac{s_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1})}{s_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{s_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})}{s_\mu(\mathbf{1})} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.6)$$

In fact, we could prove similar inequalities for other polynomials. Our characterization of containment, Theorem 6.2, together with the characterization of majorization, Theorem 6.3, gives the following characterization of weak majorization.

Theorem 6.5. *The followings are equivalent:*

(1) λ weakly majorizes μ ;

(2) *The difference of normalized monomial symmetric polynomials is positive:*

$$\frac{m_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1})}{m_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{m_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})}{m_\mu(\mathbf{1})} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.7)$$

(3) *The difference of normalized elementary symmetric polynomials is positive:*

$$\frac{e_{\lambda'}(x + \mathbf{1})}{e_{\lambda'}(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{e_{\mu'}(x + \mathbf{1})}{e_{\mu'}(\mathbf{1})} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.8)$$

(4) *The difference of normalized power-sum is positive:*

$$\frac{p_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1})}{p_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{p_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})}{p_\mu(\mathbf{1})} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.9)$$

(5) ([KT18]) *The difference of normalized Schur is positive:*

$$\frac{s_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1})}{s_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{s_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})}{s_\mu(\mathbf{1})} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.10)$$

Proof. Abusing notation, let P_λ be any one of m_λ , $e_{\lambda'}$, p_λ and s_λ .

We first prove that (1) \implies (2)–(5). Assume λ weakly majorizes μ . We may assume $|\lambda| > |\mu|$ since otherwise this follows from Theorem 6.3, then by Lemma 6.6 below, there exists some ν such that λ contains ν and ν majorizes μ . Then

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1})}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1})} = \left(\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1})}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{P_\nu(x + \mathbf{1})}{P_\nu(\mathbf{1})} \right) + \left(\frac{P_\nu(x + \mathbf{1})}{P_\nu(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1})} \right).$$

The first difference is P -positive by Theorems 6.2 and 6.4, and in particular, non-negative when evaluating at $x \in [0, \infty)^n$. The second difference is non-negative by Theorem 6.3.

Conversely, each of (2)–(5) \implies (1) follows by some degree consideration, as in the proof of [CGS11, Theorem 7.5]. Assume λ does not weakly majorize μ , then there exists some index i , such that $\sum_{k=1}^i \lambda_k < \sum_{k=1}^i \mu_k$. Now, evaluate $\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1})}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1})}$ and $\frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1})}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1})}$ at

$((t-1)^i, 0^{n-i}) = (\underbrace{t-1, \dots, t-1}_i, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{n-i})$, then the evaluations are polynomials in $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}[t]$ of degrees $\sum_{k=1}^i \lambda_k$ and $\sum_{k=1}^i \mu_k$ respectively. Hence, by degree consideration, the limit

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_\lambda((t^i, 1^{n-i}))}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{P_\mu((t^i, 1^{n-i}))}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1})} = -\infty. \quad (6.11)$$

Hence the difference $\frac{P_\lambda(x+1)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1})} - \frac{P_\mu(x+1)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1})}$ could not be positive for all $x \in [0, \infty)^n$. \square

Lemma 6.6. *If λ weakly majorizes μ and $|\lambda| > |\mu|$, then there exists some ν , such that λ contains ν and ν majorizes μ .*

Proof. Totally order the boxes in λ as follows:

$$(1, 1) < (1, 2) < \dots < (1, \lambda_1) < (2, 1) < \dots < (2, \lambda_2) < \dots < (l, \lambda_l),$$

where $l = \ell(\lambda)$. In other words, this corresponds to reading the boxes in the *English* manner. Let $\nu \subseteq \lambda$ be the partition consisting of the first $|\mu|$ boxes in λ . Then $|\nu| = |\mu|$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k \nu_i &= \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i, & k < \ell(\nu); \\ \sum_{i=1}^k \nu_i &= |\nu| = |\mu| \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i, & k \geq \ell(\nu). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

In the view of Ferrers diagram, the containment order corresponds to removing boxes and the majorization lowering boxes. The lemma means that the weak majorization can be viewed as first removing then lowering boxes.

One natural question is whether the CGS-type and the KT-type inequalities hold for Jack polynomials with parameter τ in general.

Conjecture 1. *Let $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{R}} := \{ \frac{f}{g} \mid f, g \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}[\tau], g \neq 0 \}$. In particular, if $\tau \in [0, \infty]$, then $f(\tau) \geq 0$ for $f \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{R}}$.*

(1) (CGS Conjecture for Jack polynomials) *Let $|\lambda| = |\mu|$. λ majorizes μ if and only if*

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x; \tau)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau)} - \frac{P_\mu(x; \tau)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau)} \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{R}}, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n, \quad (6.12)$$

if and only if for some fixed $\tau_0 \in [0, \infty]$,

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x; \tau_0)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau_0)} - \frac{P_\mu(x; \tau_0)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau_0)} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n, \quad (6.13)$$

(2) (KT Conjecture for Jack polynomials) λ weakly majorizes μ if and only if

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau)} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau)} \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{R}}, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n, \quad (6.14)$$

if and only if for some fixed $\tau_0 \in [0, \infty]$,

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau_0)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; \tau_0)} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1}; \tau_0)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; \tau_0)} \geq 0, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n, \quad (6.15)$$

We would like to point out that the “if” direction follows easily by the argument above, and that the KT Conjecture can be derived from the CGS Conjecture and our Theorem F, again by the argument above. We will discuss this further elsewhere.

In [MN22, Conjecture 4.7, Proposition 4.8], a generalized notion of majorization associated to an arbitrary crystallographic root system is considered.

Now, let us briefly discuss Macdonald polynomials. Let $P_\lambda(x; q, t)$ be the monic Macdonald polynomials, $h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(x) = h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(x; q, t)$ be the monic interpolation Macdonald polynomials of type A, and $b_{\lambda\mu} = b_{\lambda\mu}(q, t)$ the binomial coefficients of family AM. Recall $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ is defined by Eq. (2.5).

The following binomial formula is proved in [Oko97, Eq. (1.10)]

$$\frac{h_\lambda(at^{n-1}x; q, t)}{h_\lambda(at^\delta; q, t)} = \sum_{\mu \subseteq \lambda} (-1)^{|\mu|} \frac{t^{n(\mu)}}{q^{n(\mu')}} \left(b_{\lambda\mu}(q, t) \frac{h_\mu(x; q, t)}{h_\mu(\frac{1}{a}t^\delta; q, t)} \right) \Bigg|_{q=\frac{1}{q}, t=\frac{1}{t}}, \quad (6.16)$$

where $n(\mu)$ is the function defined in Eq. (4.8).

As a special case ([Oko97, Eq. (1.11)]), we have

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x; q, t)}{P_\lambda(t^\delta; q, t)} = \sum_{\mu \subseteq \lambda} b_{\lambda\mu} \frac{h_\mu^{\text{monic}}(x; q, t)}{P_\mu(t^\delta; q, t)}. \quad (6.17)$$

Note that the denominator $P_\mu(t^\delta; q, t)$ is in $\mathbb{F}_{> 0}$ by [Mac15, VI. (6.11')] or Eq. (2.13). Then similar to Theorem 6.1, we have the following result.

Theorem 6.7. *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) λ contains μ ;
- (2) The difference of normalized Macdonald polynomials, $\frac{P_\lambda(x; q, t)}{P_\lambda(t^\delta; q, t)} - \frac{P_\mu(x; q, t)}{P_\mu(t^\delta; q, t)}$ is **monic interpolation Macdonald positive**, namely, can be written as an $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ -combination of h_ν^{monic} . \square

One could define another kind of binomial coefficients, $\tilde{b}_{\lambda\mu}(q, t)$, by the following expansion:

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; q, t)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; q, t)} = \sum_{\mu} \tilde{b}_{\lambda\mu}(q, t) \frac{P_\mu(x; q, t)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; q, t)}. \quad (6.18)$$

Proposition 6.8. *Both kinds of binomial coefficient $b_{\lambda\mu}(q, t)$ and $\tilde{b}_{\lambda\mu}(q, t)$ degenerate to binomial coefficient $b_{\lambda\mu}(\tau)$ of family AJ under the classical limit:*

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} \tilde{b}_{\lambda\mu}(q, q^\tau) = b_{\lambda\mu}^{\text{AJ}}(\tau) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 1} b_{\lambda\mu}^{\text{AM}}(q, q^\tau). \quad (6.19)$$

Proof. Compare Eqs. (6.1) and (6.18) and make use of Eq. (2.21). The second equality is Eq. (2.26). \square

Conjecture 2. Let $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{R}} := \{ f \in \mathbb{R}(q, t) \mid f(q, t) > 0 \text{ when } q, t \in (0, 1) \}$.

(1) *(Positivity and Monotonicity) The binomial coefficient $\tilde{b}_{\lambda\mu}$ is positive and monotone, in the sense of Theorems B and C.*

(2) *(CS Conjecture for Macdonald polynomials) λ contains μ if and only if the difference*

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; q, t)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; q, t)} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1}; q, t)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; q, t)}$$

is Macdonald positive, i.e., can be written as an $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{R}}$ -combination of $P_\nu(x; q, t)$.

(3) *(CGS Conjecture for Macdonald polynomials) Suppose $|\lambda| = |\mu|$. λ majorizes μ if and only if*

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x; q, t)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; q, t)} - \frac{P_\mu(x; q, t)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; q, t)} \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{R}}, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.20)$$

(4) *(KT Conjecture for Macdonald polynomials) λ weakly majorizes μ if and only if*

$$\frac{P_\lambda(x + \mathbf{1}; q, t)}{P_\lambda(\mathbf{1}; q, t)} - \frac{P_\mu(x + \mathbf{1}; q, t)}{P_\mu(\mathbf{1}; q, t)} \in \mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}^{\mathbb{R}}, \quad \forall x \in [0, \infty)^n. \quad (6.21)$$

6.2 Integrality

The integral forms (i.e., normalizations) of Jack and Macdonald polynomials are defined by

$$J_\lambda(x; \tau) = c_\lambda(\tau) P_\lambda(x; \tau), \quad (6.22)$$

$$J_\lambda(x; q, t) = c_\lambda(q, t) P_\lambda(x; q, t), \quad (6.23)$$

where c_λ is given by Eqs. (2.18) and (2.19) and P_λ is the monic Jack and Macdonald polynomial given by Eqs. (2.10) and (2.13).

Remark 6. Here $J_\lambda(x; q, t)$ is as in [Mac15, VI. (8.3)], while $J_\lambda(x; \tau)$ is related to Macdonald's $J^{(\alpha)}(x)$ in [Mac15, VI. (10.22)] by $J_\lambda(x; \tau) = \tau^{|\lambda|} J_\lambda^{(1/\tau)}(x)$. See also Remark 3.

6.2.1 Jack Polynomials

Let us first consider the Jack polynomials.

Define the notions of integrality and positivity-integrality as follows:

$$\mathbb{I} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}[\tau], & \mathcal{F} = \text{J, AJ}; \\ \mathbb{Z}[\tau, \alpha], & \mathcal{F} = \text{BJ}, \end{cases} \quad \mathbb{I}^+ = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\tau], & \mathcal{F} = \text{J, AJ}; \\ \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\tau, \alpha], & \mathcal{F} = \text{BJ}. \end{cases} \quad (6.24)$$

Recall that the **augmented monomial** symmetric function is $\tilde{m}_\lambda := u_\lambda m_\lambda$, where m_λ is the monomial symmetric function and $u_\lambda = \prod_k m_k(\lambda)!$, $m_k(\lambda) := \{1 \leq i \leq n \mid \lambda_i = k\}$ is the number of parts that are equal to k in λ .

The following is first conjectured in [Mac15, VI. (10.26?)] and proved in [KS97].

Theorem. *The expansion coefficient $\tilde{v}_{\lambda\mu}(\tau)$ defined by*

$$J_\lambda(x; \tau) = \sum_{\mu} \tilde{v}_{\lambda\mu}(\tau) \tilde{m}_\mu(x) \quad (6.25)$$

is a polynomial in τ with non-negative integral coefficients, i.e., lies in \mathbb{I}^+ .

Define, similarly, interpolation polynomials of **integral** normalization as follows:

$$h_\lambda^{\text{int}}(x) = c_\lambda \cdot h_\lambda^{\text{monic}}(x) = c_\lambda H(\lambda) \cdot h_\lambda(x). \quad (6.26)$$

For interpolation Jack polynomials of type A , a similar conjecture is made in [KS96] and proved in [NSS23].

Theorem. *The expansion coefficient $\mathbf{a}_{\lambda\mu}(\tau)$ defined by*

$$h_\lambda^{\text{int}}(x; \tau) = \sum_{\mu} (-1)^{|\lambda| - |\mu|} \mathbf{a}_{\lambda\mu}(\tau) m_\mu(x) \quad (6.27)$$

is a polynomial in τ with non-negative integral coefficients, i.e., lies in \mathbb{I}^+ .

Now, consider the binomial coefficients. Define **integral binomial coefficients** $B_{\lambda\mu}$ and **integral adjacent binomial coefficients** $A_{\lambda\mu}$ as follows:

$$B_{\lambda\mu} := h_\mu^{\text{int}}(\bar{\lambda}) = c_\mu H(\mu) b_{\lambda\mu}, \quad A_{\lambda\mu} := \begin{cases} B_{\lambda\mu}, & \lambda \supset \mu; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6.28)$$

We naturally hope that the integral binomial coefficients $B_{\lambda\mu}$ have certain integrality and positivity. The adjacent ones can be easily seen to be integral and positive.

Theorem 6.9 (Part of Theorem G, Integrality and Positivity). *For the families $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}$ and BJ , if $\lambda \supset \mu$, then the integral adjacent binomial coefficient $A_{\lambda\mu}$ is a polynomial with non-negative integer coefficients in the parameter(s), i.e., lies in \mathbb{I}^+ .*

Proof. By Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 and the definition $A_{\lambda\mu} = c_\mu H(\mu) a_{\lambda\mu}$, we see that for $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\lambda\mu} &= \prod_{s \in \mu} c_\mu(s) c'_\mu(s) \prod_{s \in C} \frac{c_\lambda(s)}{c_\mu(s)} \prod_{s \in R} \frac{c'_\lambda(s)}{c'_\mu(s)} \\ &= \prod_{s \in \mu \setminus (C \cup R)} c_\mu(s) c'_\mu(s) \prod_{s \in C} c'_\mu(s) c_\lambda(s) \prod_{s \in R} c_\mu(s) c'_\lambda(s) \in \mathbb{I}^+, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for $\mathcal{F} = \text{BJ}$. \square

For binomial coefficients in general, however, this is still an open problem. It does not follow from the weighted sum formula, as the weights are not integral.

Conjecture 3 (Integrality and Positivity). *For the families $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}$ and BJ , if $\lambda \supseteq \mu$, then the integral binomial coefficient $B_{\lambda\mu}$ is a polynomial with non-negative integral coefficients in the parameter(s), i.e., lies in \mathbb{I}^+ .*

As explained in [NSS23, Section 5], the integrality of the expansion coefficients and that of the binomial coefficients seem to be independent: one does *not* imply the other.

6.2.2 Macdonald Polynomials

In the case of Macdonald polynomials, many expressions contain factors of the form $1 - q^a t^b$, with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, making the sense of positivity-integrality not so clear. Inspired by a recent paper [DD24, Section 5.1], we consider the following re-parametrization¹ of Macdonald and interpolation Macdonald polynomials:

$$\begin{cases} q = 1 + \gamma \\ t = 1 + \gamma\tau \\ a = 1 + \gamma\alpha \end{cases} \longleftrightarrow \begin{cases} \gamma = q - 1 \\ \tau = \frac{t-1}{q-1} \\ \alpha = \frac{a-1}{q-1} \end{cases}. \quad (6.29)$$

Then the base field $\mathbb{Q}(q, t)$ (resp., $\mathbb{Q}(q, t, a)$) is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Q}(\gamma, \tau)$ (resp., $\mathbb{Q}(\gamma, \tau, \alpha)$). Under this parametrization, we then define the following:

$$\mathbb{I} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}[\gamma, \tau], & \mathcal{F} = \text{M}, \text{AM}; \\ \mathbb{Z}[\gamma, \tau, \alpha], & \mathcal{F} = \text{BM}, \end{cases} \quad \mathbb{I}^+ = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\gamma, \tau], & \mathcal{F} = \text{M}, \text{AM}; \\ \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[\gamma, \tau, \alpha], & \mathcal{F} = \text{BM}. \end{cases} \quad (6.30)$$

Note that factors of the form $-(1 - q^m t^n a^l)$ are now in \mathbb{I}^+ where $m, n, l \geq 0$. Abuse notation and let

$$J_\lambda(x; \gamma, \tau) := J_\lambda(x; q = 1 + \gamma, t = 1 + \gamma\tau) \quad (6.31)$$

¹A different parametrization is used in [DD24]; we define it this way to match our Jack parameter τ .

be the integral Macdonald polynomial after the re-parametrization and similarly for the integral interpolation Macdonald polynomials.

As noted in [DD24, Proposition 5.1], [HHL05, Proposition 8.1] implies the following:

Theorem. *The expansion coefficient $u_{\lambda\mu}(\gamma, \tau)$ defined by*

$$J_\lambda(x; \gamma, \tau) = \sum_{\mu} u_{\lambda\mu}(\gamma, \tau) m_\mu(x) \quad (6.32)$$

is a polynomial in γ and τ with non-negative integral coefficients, i.e., lies in \mathbb{I}^+ .

For integral binomial coefficients of families AM and BM, we have the following:

Theorem 6.10 (Part of Theorem G, Integrality and Positivity). *For the families $\mathcal{F} = \text{AM}$ and BM , if $\lambda \supset \mu$, then the integral adjacent binomial coefficient $A_{\lambda\mu}$, in the parametrization (γ, τ, α) , up to some sign and powers of $q = 1 + \gamma$, $t = 1 + \gamma\tau$ and $a = 1 + \gamma\alpha$, is a polynomial with non-negative integer coefficients in the parameters, i.e., lies in \mathbb{I}^+ .*

Proof. Again, by Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 and the definition $A_{\lambda\mu} = c_\mu H(\mu) a_{\lambda\mu}$, we see that for $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}$,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\lambda\mu} &= (-1)^{|\mu|} q^{n(\mu')} t^{(n-1)|\mu| - 2n(\mu) - i_0 + 1} \cdot \prod_{s \in \mu} c_\mu(s) c'_\mu(s) \prod_{s \in C} \frac{c_\lambda(s)}{c_\mu(s)} \prod_{s \in R} \frac{c'_\lambda(s)}{c'_\mu(s)} \\ &= (-1)^{|\mu|} q^{n(\mu')} t^{(n-1)|\mu| - 2n(\mu) - i_0 + 1} \\ &\quad \cdot \prod_{s \in \mu \setminus (C \cup R)} c_\mu(s) c'_\mu(s) \prod_{s \in C} c'_\mu(s) c_\lambda(s) \prod_{s \in R} c_\mu(s) c'_\lambda(s) \in \mathbb{I}^+. \end{aligned}$$

For BM , it is similar. □

For example, let $n = 2$ and $\lambda = (2, 2)$, $\mu = (2, 1)$. By Propositions 4.2 and 4.3, we have for AM ,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\lambda\mu} &= \frac{1}{t} \frac{1 - t^2}{1 - t} \frac{1 - q^2}{1 - q} \\ A_{\lambda\mu} &= -qt(1 - q)^2(1 - q^2t) \cdot (1 - t)^2(1 - qt^2) \cdot a_{\lambda\mu} \\ &= -q(1 - q)(1 - t)(1 - q^2)(1 - t^2)(1 - q^2t)(1 - qt^2) \end{aligned}$$

then up to a minus sign, $A_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbb{I}^+$. For BM , we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\lambda\mu} &= \frac{1}{q} \frac{(1 - t^2)(1 - q^3ta^2)}{(1 - t)(1 - q^3t^2a^2)} \frac{(1 - q^2)(1 - q^2a^2)}{(1 - q)(1 - qa^2)} \\ A_{\lambda\mu} &= \frac{1}{q^5t^2a^3} (1 - q^2ta^2)(1 - q^2t)(1 - q^3t^2a^2)(1 - q)^2(1 - qa^2) \cdot (1 - t)^2(1 - qt^2) \cdot a_{\lambda\mu} \\ &= \frac{1}{q^6t^2a^3} (1 - q)(1 - t)(1 - q^2)(1 - t^2)(1 - q^2t)(1 - qt^2)(1 - q^2a^2)(1 - q^2ta^2)(1 - q^3ta^2), \end{aligned}$$

so up to a minus sign (as there are 9 factors in the form $1 - q^m t^n a^l$) and some powers of q , t and a , we have $A_{\lambda\mu} \in \mathbb{I}^+$.

Conjecture 4 (Integrality and Positivity). *For the families $\mathcal{F} = AM$ and BM , if $\lambda \supseteq \mu$, then the integral binomial coefficient $B_{\lambda\mu}$ lies in \mathbb{I}^+ in the sense of Theorem 6.10.*

6.3 Double Schur Polynomials and Molev's Work

Double Schur polynomials are certain generalizations of factorial Schur polynomials or shifted Schur polynomials [OO97b], with the parameter being an infinite sequence $a = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$. See, for example, [Mol09, Section 1] for an introduction.

Let λ be a partition of length at most n . Double Schur polynomials of n variables can be defined using the following combinatorial formula:

$$s_\lambda(x||a) = \sum_T \prod_{s \in \lambda} (x_{T(s)} - a_{T(s) - c_\lambda(s)}), \quad (6.33)$$

where T runs over reverse tableaux of shape λ and with entries in $[n]$ and $c_\lambda(s) = a'_\lambda(s) - l'_\lambda(s) = j - i$ is the content of $s = (i, j)$.

Double Schur polynomials and interpolation Jack polynomials *intersect* at one case, namely, the factorial Schur polynomials: for double Schur polynomials, let $a_i = -i$ for all i , and for interpolation Jack polynomials, let $\tau = 1$.

Molev [Mol09] studied the Littlewood–Richardson coefficients for double Schur polynomials. Let us recall the following notions (in our notations).

Assume $\lambda \supseteq \mu$ and $\xi = (\xi_0, \dots, \xi_k) \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda\mu}$ is a covering chain. Let r_i denote the row number of ξ_{k-i}/ξ_{k-i+1} , for $i = 1, \dots, k = |\lambda| - |\mu|$. The **Yamanouchi symbol** of ξ is the sequence $r_1 \cdots r_k$. For example, $(3, 2) : \supset (2, 2) : \supset (2, 1)$ is a chain from $(3, 2)$ to $(2, 1)$, and its Yamanouchi symbol is $r_1 r_2 = 21$.

Given any chain $\xi \in \mathcal{C}_{\lambda\mu}$, a **barred tableau** of type (ξ, ν) is defined as follows: consider a reverse tableau T of shape ν with entries in $[n]$ and barred boxes $s_1 <_C \cdots <_C s_k$, such that $T(s_i) = r_i$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, where the total order $s <_C s'$ is defined by

$$(i, j) <_C (i', j') \iff j < j' \text{ or } j = j', i > i'. \quad (6.34)$$

For example, for $\lambda = (4, 3, 1)$, $\mu = (3, 1)$ and $\xi = (4, 3, 1) : \supset (3, 3, 1) : \supset (3, 2, 1) : \supset (3, 2) : \supset (3, 1)$, the Yamanouchi symbol is 2321. For $\nu = (5, 5, 3)$, the following is a barred tableau:

5	5	4	$\bar{2}$	2
4	$\bar{3}$	2	1	$\bar{1}$
$\bar{2}$	1	1		

We say a tableau is **λ -bounded** if the first row of the tableau (viewed as a partition) is contained in the conjugate of λ . The example above is not λ -bounded, since its first row

$(5, 5, 4, 2, 2)$ is not contained in $\lambda' = (3, 2, 2, 1)$. A **Molev tableau** of type (λ, μ, ν) is a λ -bounded barred tableau of type (ξ, ν) , for some $\xi \in \mathfrak{C}_{\lambda\mu}$. [Mol09, Example 2.3] gives all Molev tableau of type (λ, μ, ν) , where $\lambda = (5, 2, 2)$, $\mu = (2, 2)$ and $\nu = (4, 2, 1)$.

The Littlewood–Richardson coefficients for the double Schur polynomials are defined by the usual expansion:

$$s_\mu(x||a)s_\nu(x||a) = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda, \text{DS}}(a)s_\lambda(x||a). \quad (6.35)$$

[Mol09, Theorem 2.1] gives a combinatorial formula for the Littlewood–Richardson coefficient $c_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda, \text{DS}}$, summing over all Molev tableaux, and each summand is positive in the sense of [Gra01]. In particular, his result implies the following:

Theorem. *Let μ, ν be partitions of length at most n . The set*

$$S_{\mu\nu}^{\text{DS}} := \{ \lambda \mid c_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda, \text{DS}} \neq 0 \} \quad (6.36)$$

is equal to the following set

$$M_{\mu\nu} := \{ \lambda \supseteq \mu, \nu \mid \text{there exists a Molev tableau of type } (\lambda, \mu, \nu) \}. \quad (6.37)$$

Our Theorem E shows that adjacent LR coefficients are positive. We conjecture the following:

Conjecture 5 (Positivity Conjecture for LR Coefficients). *For each family of interpolation polynomials, AJ, BJ, AM and BM, the Littlewood–Richardson coefficient $c_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda}$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{\geq 0}$ in general.*

Conjecture 6. *Fix μ and ν . The sets*

$$S_{\mu\nu}^{\mathcal{F}} := \{ \lambda \mid c_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda, \mathcal{F}} \neq 0 \} \quad (6.38)$$

for $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}, \text{BJ}, \text{AM}, \text{BM}$ are the same set, and are equal to the set $M_{\mu\nu}$.

As an application of Theorems B, D and E, we show that Conjecture 6 holds at the bottom.

Theorem 6.11. *For $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and any family $\mathcal{F} = \text{AJ}, \text{AM}, \text{BJ}, \text{BM}$.*

$$S_{\mu\nu}^{\mathcal{F}} \cap \mathcal{P}_n^{|\mu|+1} = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n^{|\mu|+1} \mid \lambda \supseteq \mu, \nu \right\} = M_{\mu\nu} \cap \mathcal{P}_n^{|\mu|+1}. \quad (6.39)$$

Proof. By the weighted sum formula Eq. (3.19) and the symmetry $c_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda} = c_{\nu\mu}^{\lambda}$, we have $c_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda} = 0$ unless $\lambda \supseteq \mu, \nu$. Now assume $\lambda \supseteq \mu, \nu$. If $\lambda = \mu$, then $c_{\lambda\nu}^{\lambda} = b_{\lambda\nu} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$ by Theorem B. If $\lambda \supset \mu$, then $c_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda} \in \mathbb{F}_{>0}$ by Theorem E. This proves that first equality.

As for the second equality, by definition, if $\lambda \not\supseteq \mu$ or if $\lambda \not\supseteq \nu$, then there is no Molev tableau (as mentioned in [Mol09, Page. 3455]). Assume $\lambda \supseteq \mu, \nu$. If $\lambda = \mu$, a barred tableau of shape ν is simply a usual RT and the first row of the distinguished RT (see Section 2.1) is equal to $\nu' \subseteq \lambda'$, hence the distinguished RT is λ -bounded, and so $\lambda \in M_{\mu\nu}$. If $\lambda \supset \mu$, let r be the Yamanouchi symbol. If $r \leq \nu'_1$, then r appears in the first column of the distinguished RT of shape ν , and putting a bar this box gives a Molev tableau. If instead $r > \nu'_1$, we can modify the distinguished RT by replacing $T(1, 1)$ with \bar{r} . Then this modified tableau is a Molev tableau since $r \leq \lambda'_1$. \square

6.4 The Non-Symmetric Case

Let us conclude the paper with the non-symmetric counterparts of interpolation polynomials. Non-symmetric interpolation polynomials of family *AM* and *BM* are first studied in [Kno97, Sah96] and [DKS21] respectively. Such polynomials can also be defined by some interpolation condition and degree condition, similar to our Eqs. (2.7) and (2.8), as such interpolation problems also satisfy certain existence and uniqueness theorem (see [DKS21, Proposition 3.3]).

Now, let L be the index set of non-symmetric interpolation polynomials ($L = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ for *AM* and $L = \mathbb{Z}^n$ for *BM*), and still denote by $h_u(x)$ the non-symmetric interpolation polynomials. Assume $u, v \in L$ such that $|u| = |v| + 1$, formally define a covering relation $u \supset v$ if $h_v(\bar{u}) \neq 0$, and let \supseteq be the partial order generated by it, i.e., $u \supseteq v$ if there exist $w^{(1)}, \dots, w^{(k-1)}$ such that $u \supset w^{(1)} \supset \dots \supset w^{(k-1)} \supset v$. Then the weighted sum formulas Eqs. (3.7) and (3.8), Eqs. (3.19) and (3.20), Eqs. (3.24) and (3.25), and the recursion formulas Eqs. (3.4), (3.12) and (3.17) still hold if we replace the covering relation, the containment order, and the interpolation polynomials with their non-symmetric counterparts.

The crucial question is then to give a *combinatorial* interpretation of the covering relation. For the family *AM*, this is done in [Kno97, Section 4]; whereas for *BM*, some computations and conjecture are made in [DKS21, Appendix]. We shall address this matter further elsewhere.

References

- [AF19] Per Alexandersson and Valentin Féray. A positivity conjecture on the structure constants of shifted Jack functions. 2019. [arXiv:1912.05203](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.05203).
- [BDD23] Houcine Ben Dali and Maciej Dołęga. Jack characters as generating series of bipartite maps and proof of Lassalle’s conjecture. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 89B:Art. 34, 12, 2023.
- [Bin74] Christopher Bingham. An identity involving partitionial generalized binomial coefficients. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 4:210–223, 1974.

- [CGS11] Allison Cuttler, Curtis Greene, and Mark Skandera. Inequalities for symmetric means. *European J. Combin.*, 32(6):745–761, 2011.
- [Che95a] Ivan Cherednik. Double affine Hecke algebras and Macdonald’s conjectures. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 141(1):191–216, 1995.
- [Che95b] Ivan Cherednik. Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (10):483–515, 1995.
- [CHM⁺22] Sylvie Corteel, Jim Haglund, Olya Mandelshtam, Sarah Mason, and Lauren Williams. Compact formulas for Macdonald polynomials and quasisymmetric Macdonald polynomials. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 28(2):Paper No. 32, 33, 2022.
- [DD24] Houcine Ben Dali and Michele D’Adderio. Macdonald characters from a new formula for Macdonald polynomials. 2024. [arXiv:2404.03904](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.03904).
- [DKS21] Niels Disveld, Tom H. Koornwinder, and Jasper V. Stokman. A nonsymmetric version of Okounkov’s BC-type interpolation Macdonald polynomials. *Transform. Groups*, 26(4):1261–1292, 2021.
- [Gra01] William Graham. Positivity in equivariant Schubert calculus. *Duke Math. J.*, 109(3):599–614, 2001.
- [HHL05] J. Haglund, M. Haiman, and N. Loehr. A combinatorial formula for Macdonald polynomials. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 18(3):735–761, 2005.
- [HHL08] J. Haglund, M. Haiman, and N. Loehr. A combinatorial formula for nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. *Amer. J. Math.*, 130(2):359–383, 2008.
- [Iva97] V. N. Ivanov. The dimension of skew shifted Young diagrams, and projective characters of the infinite symmetric group. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)*, 240:115–135, 292–293, 1997.
- [Jac71] Henry Jack. A class of symmetric polynomials with a parameter. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 69:1–18, 1970/71.
- [Kan93] Jyoichi Kaneko. Selberg integrals and hypergeometric functions associated with Jack polynomials. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 24(4):1086–1110, 1993.
- [Kno97] Friedrich Knop. Symmetric and non-symmetric quantum Capelli polynomials. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 72(1):84–100, 1997.
- [Koo15] Tom H. Koornwinder. Okounkov’s BC-type interpolation Macdonald polynomials and their $q = 1$ limit. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 72:Art. B72a, 27, 2014/15.

- [KS96] Friedrich Knop and Siddhartha Sahi. Difference equations and symmetric polynomials defined by their zeros. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (10):473–486, 1996.
- [KS97] Friedrich Knop and Siddhartha Sahi. A recursion and a combinatorial formula for Jack polynomials. *Invent. Math.*, 128(1):9–22, 1997.
- [KS06] Vadim B. Kuznetsov and Siddhartha Sahi, editors. *Jack, Hall-Littlewood and Macdonald polynomials*, volume 417 of *Contemporary Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006.
- [KT18] Apoorva Khare and Terence Tao. Schur polynomials, entrywise positivity preservers, and weak majorization. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 80B:Art. 14, 12, 2018.
- [Las90] Michel Lassalle. Une formule du binôme généralisée pour les polynômes de Jack. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 310(5):253–256, 1990.
- [Las08] Michel Lassalle. A positivity conjecture for Jack polynomials. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 15(4):661–681, 2008.
- [Mac15] I. G. Macdonald. *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*. Oxford Classic Texts in the Physical Sciences. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, second edition, 2015. With contribution by A. V. Zelevinsky and a foreword by Richard Stanley.
- [Mar03] Dan Marshall. The product of a nonsymmetric Jack polynomial with a linear function. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 131(6):1817–1827, 2003.
- [MN22] Colin McSwiggen and Jonathan Novak. Majorization and spherical functions. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (5):3977–4000, 2022.
- [Mol09] A. I. Molev. Littlewood-Richardson polynomials. *J. Algebra*, 321(11):3450–3468, 2009.
- [Mui04] R. F. Muirhead. *Some Methods Applicable to Identities and Inequalities of Symmetric Algebraic Functions of n Letters*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 1904. Thesis (D.Sc.)—University of Glasgow (United Kingdom).
- [Mui82] Robb J. Muirhead. *Aspects of multivariate statistical theory*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1982.
- [NSS23] Yusra Naqvi, Siddhartha Sahi, and Emily Sergel. Interpolation polynomials, bar monomials, and their positivity. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (8):6809–6844, 2023.

- [Oko97] Andrei Okounkov. Binomial formula for Macdonald polynomials and applications. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 4(4):533–553, 1997.
- [Oko98a] A. Okounkov. BC-type interpolation Macdonald polynomials and binomial formula for Koornwinder polynomials. *Transform. Groups*, 3(2):181–207, 1998.
- [Oko98b] Andrei Okounkov. (Shifted) Macdonald polynomials: q -integral representation and combinatorial formula. *Compositio Math.*, 112(2):147–182, 1998.
- [OO97a] A. Okounkov and G. Olshanski. Shifted Jack polynomials, binomial formula, and applications. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 4(1):69–78, 1997.
- [OO97b] A. Okun’kov and G. Ol’shanskiĭ. Shifted Schur functions. *Algebra i Analiz*, 9(2):73–146, 1997.
- [Opd95] Eric M. Opdam. Harmonic analysis for certain representations of graded Hecke algebras. *Acta Math.*, 175(1):75–121, 1995.
- [Rai05] Eric M. Rains. BC_n -symmetric polynomials. *Transform. Groups*, 10(1):63–132, 2005.
- [Sah94] Siddhartha Sahi. The spectrum of certain invariant differential operators associated to a Hermitian symmetric space. In *Lie theory and geometry*, volume 123 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 569–576. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1994.
- [Sah96] Siddhartha Sahi. Interpolation, integrality, and a generalization of Macdonald’s polynomials. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (10):457–471, 1996.
- [Sah98] Siddhartha Sahi. The binomial formula for nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials. *Duke Math. J.*, 94(3):465–477, 1998.
- [Sah11a] Siddhartha Sahi. Binomial coefficients and Littlewood-Richardson coefficients for interpolation polynomials and Macdonald polynomials. In *Representation theory and mathematical physics*, volume 557 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 359–369. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.
- [Sah11b] Siddhartha Sahi. Binomial coefficients and Littlewood-Richardson coefficients for Jack polynomials. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (7):1597–1612, 2011.
- [Sra16] Suvrit Sra. On inequalities for normalized Schur functions. *European J. Combin.*, 51:492–494, 2016.
- [SS16] Siddhartha Sahi and Hadi Salmasian. The Capelli problem for $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ and the spectrum of invariant differential operators. *Adv. Math.*, 303:1–38, 2016.

- [SS19] Siddhartha Sahi and Hadi Salmasian. Quadratic Capelli operators and Okounkov polynomials. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 52(4):867–890, 2019.
- [SSS20] Siddhartha Sahi, Hadi Salmasian, and Vera Serganova. The Capelli eigenvalue problem for Lie superalgebras. *Math. Z.*, 294(1-2):359–395, 2020.
- [Sta89] Richard P. Stanley. Some combinatorial properties of Jack symmetric functions. *Adv. Math.*, 77(1):76–115, 1989.
- [SV05] A. N. Sergeev and A. P. Veselov. Generalised discriminants, deformed Calogero-Moser-Sutherland operators and super-Jack polynomials. *Adv. Math.*, 192(2):341–375, 2005.
- [SZ17] Siddhartha Sahi and Genkai Zhang. The Capelli identity and Radon transform for Grassmannians. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (12):3774–3800, 2017.
- [Yip12] Martha Yip. A Littlewood-Richardson rule for Macdonald polynomials. *Math. Z.*, 272(3-4):1259–1290, 2012.