

SCHUR POSITIVITY OF DIFFERENCE OF PRODUCTS OF DERIVED SCHUR POLYNOMIALS

JULIUS ROSS AND KUANG-YU WU

ABSTRACT. To any Schur polynomial s_λ one can associated its derived polynomials $s_\lambda^{(i)}$ $i = 0, \dots, |\lambda|$ by the rule

$$s_\lambda(x_1 + t, \dots, x_n + t) = \sum_i s_\lambda^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) t^i.$$

We conjecture that

$$(s_\lambda^{(i)})^2 - s_\lambda^{(i-1)} s_\lambda^{(i+1)}$$

is always Schur positive and prove this when $i = 1$ for rectangles $\lambda = (k^\ell)$, for hooks $\lambda = (k, 1^{\ell-1})$, and when $\lambda = (k, k, 1)$ or $\lambda = (3, 2^{k-1})$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Among the many notions of positivity for symmetric polynomials, one that has attracted particular interest is Schur positivity [1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15] that demands that a polynomial be written as a non-negative sum of Schur polynomials. In this paper we explore a notion of Schur-positive log-concavity, which results in new classes of polynomials that we conjecture to be Schur positive.

To describe this, for any partition λ , we let $s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ denote the associated Schur polynomial. Following [16], we define the *derived Schur polynomials* $s_\lambda^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for $i = 0, \dots, |\lambda|$ to be the symmetric polynomials required to satisfy

$$s_\lambda(x_1 + t, \dots, x_n + t) = \sum_{i=0}^{|\lambda|} t^i s_\lambda^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad \text{for all } t.$$

All derived Schur polynomials are Schur positive by [5, Theorem 1.5] or [17, Remark 5.3], and hence products of derived Schur polynomials are also Schur positive. In this paper, we consider the following:

Conjecture 1.1. Let λ be a partition. Then


$$(s_\lambda^{(i)})^2 - s_\lambda^{(i-1)} s_\lambda^{(i+1)}$$

is Schur positive for all $i \geq 1$.

This conjecture can be thought of as a strong form of “log-concavity” of the function $i \mapsto s_\lambda^{(i)}$. It is motivated by the following weaker statement [17, Corollary 10.12], which states that if x_1, \dots, x_n are non-negative, then $i \mapsto s_\lambda^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a log concave sequence of real numbers. Clearly this would be implied by Conjecture 1.1 since Schur polynomials are monomial positive.

An easy case in which Conjecture 1.1 is clear is where $\lambda = (1^n) = \overbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}^{n \text{ copies}}$ and there are exactly n variables. Since $s_{(1^n)}$ is the n -th elementary symmetric

FIGURE 1. Examples of three different types of partitions of $|\lambda| - 2$, where $\lambda = (5, 3, 3, 2)$



polynomial e_n , the derived Schur polynomials $s_{(1^n)}^{(i)}$ are equal to e_{n-i} . Therefore,

$$(s_{\lambda}^{(i)})^2 - s_{\lambda}^{(i-1)} s_{\lambda}^{(i+1)} = \begin{vmatrix} e_{n-i} & e_{n-i+1} \\ e_{n-i-1} & e_{n-i} \end{vmatrix} = s_{(n-i, n-i)'} = s_{(2^{n-i})}$$

by the Jacobi-Trudi identity.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.2 (= Corollary 3.7, Theorem 4.1, Theorem 5.1, Theorem 6.3). *The polynomial*

$$(s_{\lambda}^{(1)})^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}^{(2)}$$

is Schur positive if λ is a partition of one of the following forms.

- (a) *Rectangles, i.e. $\lambda = (k^{\ell})$, where k, ℓ are positive integers.*
- (b) *Hooks, i.e. $\lambda = (k, 1^{\ell-1})$, where $k, \ell \geq 2$*
- (c) *$\lambda = (k, k, 1)$, where $k \geq 3$.*
- (d) *$\lambda = (3, 2^{k-1})$, where $k \geq 3$.*

1.1. Outline of the proof. Fix a partition λ . Using work of Corteel-Kim [5], the i -th derived Schur polynomials $s_{\lambda}^{(i)}$ can be expressed explicitly as a linear combinations of Schur polynomials corresponding to partitions of $|\lambda| - i$ contained in λ . For partitions of $|\lambda| - 1$ contained in λ , we use $\lambda_{(j)}$ to denote the partition obtained by removing the last cell from the j -th row of the Young diagram of λ . For partitions of $|\lambda| - 2$ contained in λ , we split them into three different types depending on the configuration of the two cells removed from the Young diagram of λ . (See Figure 1.)

- (i) A type I partition $\lambda_{(j,k)}$ (of $|\lambda| - 2$ contained in λ) for $j < k$ is obtained by removing two nonadjacent cells from the j -th and the k -th rows.
- (ii) A type II partition $\lambda_{(j,\uparrow)}$ is obtained by removing the last cell from the j -th row and the cell above it.
- (iii) A type III partition $\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow)}$ is obtained by removing the last two cells from the j -th row.

Then, we rewrite $(s_{\lambda}^{(1)})^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}^{(2)}$ as a non-negative linear combination of three classes of polynomials

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(Type I)} & \quad 2s_{\lambda_{(j)}} s_{\lambda_{(k)}} - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda_{(j,k)}} \\ \text{(Type II)} & \quad s_{\lambda_{(j)}}^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda_{(j,\uparrow)}} \\ \text{(Type III)} & \quad s_{\lambda_{(j)}}^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow)}} \end{aligned}$$

Now Type II and Type III polynomials are Schur positive by [11], from which part (a) of Theorem 1.2 immediately follows as Type I partitions do not exist for rectangles. However as Type I partitions are not Schur positive in general, more work must be done for parts (b)-(d).

For partitions in (b) and (c) of Theorem 1.2, we proceed by showing that the coefficient of s_α in $2s_{\lambda_{(j)}}s_{\lambda_{(k)}} - s_\lambda s_{\lambda_{(j,k)}}$ is non-negative for most partitions α of $2|\lambda| - 2$ and identify the partitions for which the coefficients are negative. This is done by exhibiting maps between sets of Littlewood-Richardson tableaux that are at most 2-to-1. For the partitions with negative coefficients, we compute their coefficients in $(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)}$ directly by enumerating Littlewood-Richardson tableaux and show that they are non-negative.

Finally, part (d) of Theorem 1.2 is obtained by taking conjugates of partitions in (c).

1.2. Discussion. More generally, for any homogeneous symmetric polynomial p in n variables, we may define $p^{(i)}$ for $i = 0, \dots, \deg p$ to be the symmetric polynomials required to satisfy

$$p(x_1 + t, \dots, x_n + t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\deg p} t^i p^{(i)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \text{ for all } t.$$

Example 1.3. The following example shows that p being Schur positive is not enough to ensure that $(p^{(1)})^2 - pp^{(2)}$ is Schur positive. Consider $p = s_{(3)} + s_{(1,1,1)}$ with $n = 3$ variables. We have $p^{(1)} = 5s_{(2)} + s_{(1,1,1)}$ and $p^{(2)} = 11s_{(1)}$. Thus, $(p^{(1)})^2 - pp^{(2)}$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & (25s_{(4)} + 35s_{(3,1)} + 26s_{(2,2)} + 11s_{(2,1,1)} + s_{(1,1,1,1)}) - 11(s_{(4)} + s_{(3,1)} + s_{(2,1,1)} + s_{(1,1,1,1)}) \\ & = 14s_{(4)} + 24s_{(3,1)} + 26s_{(2,2)} - 10s_{(1,1,1,1)}, \end{aligned}$$

which is not Schur positive. We remark that this example also shows that the set of p for which $(p^{(1)})^2 - pp^{(2)}$ is Schur positive is not convex.

Nevertheless we expect that Conjecture 1.1 holds even more generally.

Conjecture 1.4. Let λ, μ be partitions and define $p = s_\lambda s_\mu$. Then

$$(p^{(i)})^2 - p^{(i-1)}p^{(i+1)}$$

is Schur positive for all $i \geq 1$.


Using SageMath, we have verified that Conjecture 1.1 is true for all partitions λ with $|\lambda| \leq 15$ in the cases of at most 100 variables, and that Conjecture 1.4 is true for all pairs of partitions (λ, μ) with $|\lambda| + |\mu| \leq 10$ in the cases of at most 100 variables.

Remark 1.5. If p and q are symmetric polynomials such that

$$(p^{(1)})^2 - pp^{(2)}, \quad (q^{(1)})^2 - qq^{(2)}$$

are both Schur positive, then pq satisfies that

$$((pq)^{(1)})^2 - (pq)(pq)^{(2)}$$

FIGURE 2. Young diagram of $(5, 3^2, 2)$ 

is Schur positive. To this observe that since we have

$$\begin{aligned} (pq)^{(1)} &= p^{(1)}q + pq^{(1)}, \\ (pq)^{(2)} &= p^{(2)}q + p^{(1)}q^{(1)} + pq^{(2)}, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &((pq)^{(1)})^2 - (pq)(pq)^{(2)} \\ &= ((p^{(1)})^2 - pp^{(2)})q^2 + pp^{(1)}qq^{(1)} + p^2((q^{(1)})^2 - qq^{(2)}). \end{aligned}$$

This is Schur positive as derived Schur polynomials are Schur positive and Schur positivity is preserved under taking products.

Acknowledgments. JR thanks Matt Larson for bringing up this Schur positive question and for other stimulating discussions, as well as Allen Knutson for discussion on this topic. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1749447.

2. PRELIMINARIES


We list some standard definitions and facts regarding Schur polynomials and Littlewood-Richardson coefficients that will be needed in this article. We refer readers to [7, 18] for more details on this subject.

2.1. Partitions and Schur polynomials. A partition of a positive integer d is a non-increasing sequence of non-negative integers $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots)$ with $|\lambda| := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \lambda_i = d$. Each entry λ_i of the partition λ is called a part of λ . The length of a partition λ , denoted by $\ell(\lambda)$, is the number of non-zero parts of λ . The zeros are often omitted when writing down a partition, i.e. if $\ell = \ell(\lambda)$, we write $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$. We use the shorthand a^f for a, \dots, a (f times) in a partition. For example, $(5, 3^2, 2) = (5, 3, 3, 2)$ is a partition of 13 with length 4.

Each partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ corresponds to a Young diagram, which is a left-justified array of square cells with exactly λ_i cells in the i -th row for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. For example, Figure 2 is the Young diagram of $(5, 3^2, 2)$. We use λ' to denote the conjugate partition of λ , which is defined to be the partition corresponding to the reflection of the Young diagram of λ in the diagonal line.

We write $\mu \subseteq \lambda$ for two partitions μ, λ if $\mu_i \leq \lambda_i$ for all $i \geq 1$, or equivalently, if the Young diagram of μ is contained in that of λ . In this case, we define the skew shape λ/μ to be the diagram obtained by removing the Young diagram of μ from that of λ . For example, Figure 3 is the skew shape $(5, 3^2, 2)/(3^2, 1)$, and going forward we will illustrate skew shapes in this way with white cells and gray shaded region.

Given a partition λ and a positive integer $n \geq \ell(\lambda)$, we let $s_\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the Schur polynomial of the partition λ in n variables. By the Jacobi-Trudi

FIGURE 3. The skew shape $(5, 3^2, 2)/(3^2, 1)$ 

identities, we have

$$s_\lambda = \det(h_{\lambda_i+j-i})_{i,j=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} = \det(e_{\lambda'_i+j-i})_{i,j=1}^{\ell(\lambda')},$$

where h_k is the k -th complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial and e_k is the k -th elementary homogeneous symmetric polynomial.

Each Schur polynomial s_λ is a homogeneous symmetric polynomial of degree $|\lambda|$. The vector space Λ_d of (rational coefficient) homogeneous symmetric polynomial of a fixed degree d has a basis given by $\{s_\lambda\}_{\lambda:|\lambda|=d}$. We say that a symmetric polynomial $f \in \Lambda_d$ is Schur positive, and write $f \geq_s 0$, if the coefficients in the expression of f as a linear combination of s_λ are all non-negative.

2.2. Littlewood-Richardson rule. Given two partitions μ, ν , the product $s_\mu s_\nu$ of Schur polynomials is a homogeneous symmetric polynomial and can be written as

$$s_\mu s_\nu = \sum_{\lambda:|\lambda|=|\mu|+|\nu|} c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda s_\lambda.$$

The integers $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ are called the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients.

Definition 2.1. A Littlewood-Richardson tableau T of shape λ/μ is a filling of boxes of the skew shape λ/μ with positive integers that satisfies the following.

- (a) The filling is weakly increasing across each row, and strictly increasing down each column.
- (b) The reverse reading word $w = (w_1, \dots, w_{|\lambda|-|\mu|})$ of T , i.e. the sequence of positive integers obtained by reading the entries of T from right to left and top row to bottom row, is a lattice permutation, i.e. in every initial part (w_1, \dots, w_j) of w the number of any positive integer i is not less than the number of $i+1$.

The content of a Littlewood-Richardson tableau T is defined as a sequence of integer $\nu = (\nu_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ such that there are exactly ν_i of i 's in T . It follows from condition (b) of Definition 2.1 that the content of a Littlewood-Richardson tableau is always a partition.

The Littlewood-Richardson rule states that the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ is equal to the number of Littlewood-Richardson tableaux of shape λ/μ with content ν . It follows that all Littlewood-Richardson coefficients $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda$ are non-negative, and hence products of Schur polynomials are Schur positive. By the fact that $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = c_{\nu\mu}^\lambda$ and the Littlewood-Richardson rule, it is also clear that $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = 0$ if $\mu \not\subseteq \lambda$ or $\nu \not\subseteq \lambda$.

For a skew shape λ/μ , if $\lambda_i > \mu_i$ then we call the i -th row of λ/μ a non-empty row. The following simple criteria for non-existence of Littlewood-Richardson tableaux will be useful.

Lemma 2.2. *Littlewood-Richardson tableaux of shape λ/μ with content ν do not exist, and hence $c_{\mu\nu}^\lambda = 0$ if any of the following statements is true.*

- (a) *There exists a column of λ/μ with more than $\ell(\nu)$ cells.*
- (b) *There are more than ν_1 cells in the first non-empty row of λ/μ .*
- (c) *The skew shape λ/μ has fewer than $\ell(\nu)$ non-empty rows.*

Proof. Part (a) follows from the requirement for strictly increasing columns. Suppose the shape λ/μ has a column with m cells, where $m > \ell(\nu)$. Then the integer placed in the last cell of this column must be at least m . However, we have $\mu_i = 0$ for $i \geq m$ as $m > \ell(\nu)$. Thus, Littlewood-Richardson tableaux of shape λ/μ with content ν do not exist.

Parts (b) and (c) are corollaries of the following more general lemma (by taking $k = 1$ and k equals the number of non-empty rows in λ/μ , respectively). \square

Lemma 2.3. *In a Littlewood-Richardson tableau T of shape λ/μ with content ν , for every positive integer $k \leq \ell(\nu)$, the k -th non-empty row can only contain integers $1, \dots, k$. In particular, in order for a Littlewood-Richardson tableau of shape λ/μ with content ν to exist, the total number of cells in the first k non-empty rows of λ/μ cannot exceed $\sum_{i=1}^k \nu_i$ for every positive integer $k \leq \ell(\nu)$.*

Proof. Suppose the first statement is false. Let k_0 be the smallest integer such that the statement fails, and let A be the integer in the last cell of the k_0 -th non-empty row of T . The integer A is the largest in this row, so we have $A > k_0$. However, the first $(k_0 - 1)$ non-empty rows of T only contain integers $1, \dots, k_0 - 1$. This implies that A precedes all k_0 's in the reverse reading word of T , which contradicts condition (b) in Definition 2.1.

Now, since the first k non-empty rows of a Littlewood-Richardson tableau T of shape λ/μ with content ν can only contain integers $1, \dots, k$, the total number of cells in the first k non-empty rows cannot exceed the total number of integers $1, \dots, k$ in T , which is exactly $\sum_{i=1}^k \nu_i$. \square

3. SETUP

Fix a partition λ . We first define notations for partitions of $|\lambda| - 1$ and $|\lambda| - 2$ that are contained in λ .

Definition 3.1. Let $J(\lambda) := \{j : \lambda_j > \lambda_{j+1}\}$.

- (a) For each $j \in J(\lambda)$, define $\lambda_{(j)}$ to be the partition corresponding to the Young diagram obtained by removing the last cell of the j -th row from the Young diagram of λ ; i.e. $\lambda_{(j)} = (\lambda_{(j),i})$ is defined by $\lambda_{(j),j} = \lambda_j - 1$ and $\lambda_{(j),i} = \lambda_i$ for $i \neq j$.
- (b) For each pair of $j, k \in J(\lambda)$ with $j < k$, define $\lambda_{(j,k)}$ to be the partition corresponding to the Young diagram obtained by removing the last cell of the j -th row and the last cell of the k -th row from the Young diagram of λ ; i.e. $\lambda_{(j,k)} = (\lambda_{(j,k),i})$ is defined by $\lambda_{(j,k),j} = \lambda_j - 1$, $\lambda_{(j,k),k} = \lambda_k - 1$ and $\lambda_{(j,k),i} = \lambda_i$ for i not equal to j or k .
- (c) Given $j \in J(\lambda)$ with $\lambda_{j-1} = \lambda_j$, define $\lambda_{(j,\uparrow)}$ to be the partition corresponding to the Young diagram obtained by removing the last cell of the j -th row and the cell directly above it from the Young diagram of λ ; i.e. $\lambda_{(j,\uparrow)} = (\lambda_{(j,\uparrow),i})$ is defined by $\lambda_{(j,\uparrow),j} = \lambda_{(j,\uparrow),j-1} = \lambda_j - 1$ and $\lambda_{(j,\uparrow),i} = \lambda_i$ for i not equal to j or $j - 1$.

- (d) Given $j \in J(\lambda)$ with $\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1} > 1$, define $\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow)}$ to be the partition corresponding to the Young diagram obtained by removing the last two cells of the j -th row from the Young diagram of λ ; i.e. $\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow)} = (\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow),i})$ is defined by $\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow),j} = \lambda_j - 2$ and $\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow),i} = \lambda_i$ for $i \neq j$.
- (e) For convenience, we also define $s_{\lambda_{(j,\uparrow)}} := 0$ if $\lambda_{j-1} > \lambda_j$ (i.e. if $\lambda_{(j,\uparrow)}$ does not exist), and define $s_{\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow)}} := 0$ if $\lambda_j - \lambda_{j+1} = 1$ (i.e. if $\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow)}$ does not exist).

Example 3.2. Consider the partition $\lambda = (3, 3, 2)$. We have $J(\lambda) = \{2, 3\}$. There are two partitions of $|\lambda| - 1$ contained in λ , given by $\lambda_{(2)} = (3, 2, 2)$ and $\lambda_{(3)} = (3, 3, 1)$, and three partitions of $|\lambda| - 2$ that are contained in λ , given by $\lambda_{(2,3)} = (3, 2, 1)$, $\lambda_{(2,\uparrow)} = (2, 2, 2)$, and $\lambda_{(3,\leftarrow)} = (3, 3)$. We also have $s_{\tau_{(3,\uparrow)}} = s_{\tau_{(2,\leftarrow)}} = 0$.

Let n be the numbers of variables. Note that $s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ whenever $n < \ell(\lambda)$ by Jacobi-Trudi identity and the fact that $e_m(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ whenever $m > n$. Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume that $n \geq \ell(\lambda)$.

By [5, Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.5], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
s_\lambda^{(1)} &= \sum_{j \in J} (n + \lambda_j - j) s_{\lambda_{(j)}} , \\
s_\lambda^{(2)} &= \sum_{\substack{j, k \in J \\ j < k}} (n + \lambda_j - j)(n + \lambda_k - k) s_{\lambda_{(j,k)}} \\
(\dagger) \quad &+ \sum_{j \in J} \frac{1}{2} (n + \lambda_j - j)(n + \lambda_j - j + 1) s_{\lambda_{(j,\uparrow)}} \\
&+ \sum_{j \in J} \frac{1}{2} (n + \lambda_j - j)(n + \lambda_j - j - 1) s_{\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow)}} .
\end{aligned}$$

Example 3.3. Following Example 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{(3,3,2)}^{(1)} &= (n+1)s_{(3,2,2)} + (n-1)s_{(3,3,1)} , \\
s_{(3,3,2)}^{(2)} &= (n+1)(n-1)s_{(3,2,1)} + \frac{1}{2}(n+1)(n+2)s_{(2,2,2)} + \frac{1}{2}(n-1)(n-2)s_{(3,3)} .
\end{aligned}$$

Plug (\dagger) into $(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)}$, and we obtain the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)} &= \sum_{\substack{j, k \in J \\ j < k}} (n + \lambda_j - j)(n + \lambda_k - k) (2 s_{\lambda_{(j)}} s_{\lambda_{(k)}} - s_\lambda s_{\lambda_{(j,k)}}) \\
(*) \quad &+ \sum_{j \in J} \frac{1}{2} (n + \lambda_j - j)(n + \lambda_j - j + 1) (s_{\lambda_{(j)}}^2 - s_\lambda s_{\lambda_{(j,\uparrow)}}) \\
&+ \sum_{j \in J} \frac{1}{2} (n + \lambda_j - j)(n + \lambda_j - j - 1) (s_{\lambda_{(j)}}^2 - s_\lambda s_{\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow)}})
\end{aligned}$$

The second and the third term in $(*)$ are always Schur positive by the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *The polynomials $s_{\lambda_{(j)}}^2 - s_\lambda s_{\lambda_{(j,\uparrow)}}$ and $s_{\lambda_{(j)}}^2 - s_\lambda s_{\lambda_{(j,\leftarrow)}}$ are Schur positive.*

Our proof of this lemma relies on results in [11] that we record here.

Definition 3.5. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and $\mu = (\mu_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be two partitions.

- (a) If $\lambda_i + \mu_i$ is even for all i , define $\frac{\lambda+\mu}{2} := \left(\frac{\lambda_i+\mu_i}{2}\right)_{i=1}^{\infty}$.
- (b) Let $\nu_1 \geq \nu_2 \geq \nu_3 \geq \dots$ be the sequence obtained by collecting all parts of λ and μ and reordering them in non-increasing order. Define two partitions $\text{sort}_1(\lambda, \mu) := (\nu_1, \nu_3, \nu_5, \dots)$ and $\text{sort}_2(\lambda, \mu) := (\nu_2, \nu_4, \nu_6, \dots)$.

Theorem 3.6. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and $\mu = (\mu_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be two partitions. Then we have

- (a) $(s_{\frac{\lambda+\mu}{2}})^2 \geq_s s_{\lambda} s_{\mu}$ if $\lambda_i + \mu_i$ is even for all i .
- (b) $s_{\text{sort}_1(\lambda, \mu)} s_{\text{sort}_2(\lambda, \mu)} \geq_s s_{\lambda} s_{\mu}$.

Proof. Part (a) is a special case of [11, Conjectures 1] with $\mu = \rho = 0$, and part (b) is [11, Conjectures 2], both of which are true by [11, Theorem 4]. \square

Proof of Lemma 3.4. If $\lambda_{(j, \uparrow)}$ or $\lambda_{(j, \leftarrow)}$ do not exist, then we have $s_{\lambda_{(j, \uparrow)}} = 0$ or $s_{\lambda_{(j, \leftarrow)}} = 0$ and the lemma follows from the fact that products of Schur polynomials are Schur positive.

Suppose that $\lambda_{(j, \uparrow)}$ exists. We have $\text{sort}_1(\lambda, \lambda_{(j, \uparrow)}) = \text{sort}_2(\lambda, \lambda_{(j, \uparrow)}) = \lambda_{(j)}$, and hence $s_{\lambda_{(j)}}^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda_{(j, \uparrow)}}$ is Schur positive by part (b) of Theorem 3.6.

Suppose that $\lambda_{(j, \leftarrow)}$ exists. We have $\frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \lambda_{(j, \leftarrow)}) = \lambda_{(j)}$, and hence $s_{\lambda_{(j)}}^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda_{(j, \leftarrow)}}$ is Schur positive by part (a) of Theorem 3.6. \square

Since the first term in (*) does not exist for rectangles $\lambda = (k^{\ell})$, Lemma 3.4 immediately implies the following.

Corollary 3.7. Let λ be a rectangle, i.e. a partition of the form (k^{ℓ}) , where k, ℓ are positive integers. Then $(s_{\lambda}^{(1)})^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}^{(2)}$ is Schur positive.

The first term in (*), however, is not necessarily Schur positive. In fact, since $\text{sort}_1(\lambda_{(j)}, \lambda_{(k)}) = \lambda$ and $\text{sort}_2(\lambda_{(j)}, \lambda_{(k)}) = \lambda_{(j, k)}$ in the sense of [11], we have that $s_{\lambda_{(j)}} s_{\lambda_{(k)}} - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda_{(j, k)}}$ is Schur negative by [11, Conjecture 2] (which is true by [11, Theorem 4]). In each of the remaining sections, we pin down the negative contributions in the first term in (*) and show that they are compensated by the other two terms in (*).


4. HOOKS

Fix positive integers $k, \ell \geq 3$ and consider the partition $\lambda = (k, 1^{\ell-1})$. Such a partition is called a hook because of the shape of its Young diagram. Let $n \geq \ell$ be the number of variables. The goal of this section is to prove the following.

Theorem 4.1. Let λ be a hook, i.e. a partition of the form $(k, 1^{\ell-1})$, where $k, \ell \geq 3$. Then $(s_{\lambda}^{(1)})^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}^{(2)}$ is Schur positive.

There are two partitions of $|\lambda| - 1$ contained in λ , given by $\lambda_{(1)} = (k-1, 1^{\ell-1})$ and $\lambda_{(\ell)} = (k, 1^{\ell-2})$, as well as three partitions of $|\lambda| - 2$ contained in λ , given by $\lambda_{(1, \ell)} = (k-1, 1^{\ell-2})$ and $\lambda_{(\ell, \uparrow)} = (k, 1^{\ell-3})$ and $\lambda_{(1, \leftarrow)} = (k-2, 1^{\ell-1})$. The theorem will follow from the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4.2. Let α be a partition of $2|\lambda| - 2 = 2(k + \ell - 2)$, containing λ and not equal to $(k^2, 2^{\ell-2})$. Then we have $c_{\lambda_{(1)}, \lambda_{(\ell)}}^{\alpha} \geq c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(1, \ell)}}^{\alpha}$.

FIGURE 4. A tableau of shape α/λ , where $\alpha_3 > 2$ 

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\beta = (k^2, 2^{\ell-2})$. Then we have*

$$\left(c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(\ell)}}}^{\beta}, c_{\lambda_{(\ell),\lambda_{(\ell)}}}^{\beta}, c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(1)}}}^{\beta}, c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(1,\ell)}}}^{\beta}, c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(\ell,\uparrow)}}}^{\beta}, c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(1,\leftarrow)}}}^{\beta} \right) = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0).$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. By Lemma 4.2 and equation (*), the only possibly negative coefficient in the Schur expansion of $(s_{\lambda}^{(1)})^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}^{(2)}$ is that of $s_{(k^2, 2^{\ell-2})}$. However, by Lemma 4.3 and equation (*), this coefficient is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & -(n+k-1)(n+1-\ell) + \frac{1}{2}(n+k-1)(n+k) + \frac{1}{2}(n+1-\ell)(n+2-\ell) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(n+k-1)(n+k-2) + \frac{1}{2}(n+1-\ell)(n-\ell) \\ & = -(n+k-1)(n+1-\ell) + (n+k-1)^2 + (n+1-\ell)^2 \\ & = (n+k-1)(k+\ell-2) + (n+1-\ell)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which is positive. \square

Before proving Lemma 4.2, we observe that it is obviously true when $c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(\ell)}}}^{\alpha} = 0$, which occurs in the following case:

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a partition of $2|\lambda| - 2$ with $\alpha_3 > 2$ or $\alpha_{\ell+1} > 1$. Then we have $c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(\ell)}}}^{\alpha} = 0$.*

Proof. If $\alpha_{\ell+1} > 1$, then the second column of α/λ contains at least ℓ cells. However, we have $\ell(\lambda_{(1,\ell)}) = \ell - 1 < \ell$. Thus, we get $c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(\ell)}}}^{\alpha} = 0$ by Lemma 2.2(a).

Next, suppose $\alpha_3 > 2$ but $c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(\ell)}}}^{\alpha} > 0$. Let T be a Littlewood-Richardson tableau of shape α/λ with content $\lambda_{(1,\ell)}$. See Figure 4. As $\alpha_3 > 2$, there are at least two cells in the third row of T . Let A, B be the integers in the first two cells of the third row of T , so certainly $A \leq B$. Since there is a cell above each of these two cells, both A and B are greater than 1. Note that $\lambda_{(1,\ell),i} \leq 1$ for all $i > 1$ as λ is a hook, so we must have A and B are distinct, thus $A < B$. Then in the reverse reading word of T , the integer B comes before the only A in the word. This contradicts condition (b) of Definition 2.1. Therefore, there do not exist Littlewood-Richardson tableaux of shape α/λ with content $\lambda_{(1,\ell)}$ in this case, and we must have $c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(\ell)}}}^{\alpha} = 0$. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.2. For each partition α of $2|\lambda| - 2$, containing λ and not equal to $(k^2, 2^{\ell-2})$, in order to prove the inequality $c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(\ell)}}}^{\alpha} \geq c_{\lambda_{(1),\lambda_{(\ell)}}}^{\alpha}$, we construct an injection from $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(1,\ell)})$, the set of Littlewood-Richardson tableaux of shape α/λ and content $\lambda_{(1,\ell)}$, to $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(\ell)}, \lambda_{(1)})$, the set of Littlewood-Richardson tableaux of shape $\alpha/\lambda_{(\ell)}$ and content $\lambda_{(1)}$.

By Lemma 4.4, it suffices to consider $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ with $\alpha_{\ell+1} \leq 1$ and $\alpha_3 \leq 2$ (which implies $\alpha_{\ell} \leq 2$). We divide into 3 cases, namely (1) $\alpha_{\ell} = 1$ (2) $\alpha_{\ell} = 2$

FIGURE 5. The map $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(1,\ell)}) \rightarrow \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(\ell)}, \lambda_{(1)})$ in Case 1. In this and the following figures that illustrate maps, the cells that will be changed are indicated by either a blue border, and the integer that is added is indicated by a red border





FIGURE 6. The map $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(1,\ell)}) \rightarrow \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(\ell)}, \lambda_{(1)})$ in Case 2




and $\alpha_{\ell+1} = 1$ and (3) $\alpha_{\ell} = 2$ and $\alpha_{\ell+1} = 0$. In each case, we give an algorithm that turns a Littlewood-Richardson tableau $T \in \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(1,\ell)})$ into a Littlewood-Richardson tableau $T' \in \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(\ell)}, \lambda_{(1)})$ by adding an extra cell to the beginning of the ℓ -th row and an extra integer ℓ to the content, and we check that T' satisfies both conditions (a) and (b) in Definition 2.1.

As such we obtain a map


$$\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(1,\ell)}) \rightarrow \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(\ell)}, \lambda_{(1)})$$

which by the construction is clearly injective, proving the result.

- **Case 1:** $\alpha_{\ell} = 1$.
 - T' is obtained by moving the first column of T one cell upward, and then placing the integer ℓ in the last cell.
 - Then (a) is clear as ℓ is larger than all other integers in T . For (b), the integer ℓ is added to the end of the reverse reading word of T , so the result remains a lattice permutation.
- **Case 2:** $\alpha_{\ell} = 2$ and $\alpha_{\ell+1} = 1$.
 - T' is obtained by moving the first column of T one cell upward, and then placing the integer ℓ in the last cell.
 - Then (a) is clear and (b) is proved similar to Case 1.
- **Case 3:** $\alpha_{\ell} = 2$ and $\alpha_{\ell+1} = 0$, but $\alpha \neq (k^2, 2^{\ell-2})$.

FIGURE 7. The map $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(1,\ell)}) \rightarrow \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(\ell)}, \lambda_{(1)})$ in Case 3FIGURE 8. Skew shapes β/λ and $\beta/\lambda_{(\ell)}$

$$(A) \beta/\lambda = (k^2, 2^{\ell-2})/(k, 1^{\ell-1}) \quad (B) \beta/\lambda_{(\ell)} = (k^2, 2^{\ell-2})/(k, 1^{\ell-2})$$



- Note first the first column of T must contain $1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$ since it is strictly increasing. We define T' by moving the last 1 in the second row to the first cell of the ℓ -th row, and move the 2 to the end of the second row, move the $3, \dots, \ell - 1$ one cell upward, and place the integer ℓ in the last cell of the second column.
- Then (a) is clear. For (b), note that there must be 1's in the first row as $\alpha \neq (k^2, 2^{\ell-2})$. Thus, there is at least one 1 in front of the 2 in the reverse word of T' .

□

Proof of Lemma 4.3. We claim $c_{\lambda_{(1)}, \lambda_{(\ell)}}^\beta = c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(1, \leftarrow)}}^\beta = 0$ by Lemma 2.2(c). In fact, both skew shapes $\beta/\lambda_{(\ell)}$ and β/λ have only $\ell - 1$ non-empty rows (see Figure 8) but $\ell(\lambda_{(1)}) = \ell(\lambda_{(1, \leftarrow)}) = \ell$, so there do not exist Littlewood-Richardson tableaux of shape $\beta/\lambda_{(\ell)}$ and content $\lambda_{(1)}$ or those of shape β/λ and content $\lambda_{(1, \leftarrow)}$.

Next we claim $c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(\ell, \uparrow)}}^\beta = 0$, since by Lemma 2.2(a): the second column of $\beta/\lambda_{(\ell)}$ has $\ell - 1$ cells (see Figure 8) but $\ell(\lambda_{(\ell, \uparrow)}) = \ell - 2$, so there do not exist Littlewood-Richardson tableaux of shape $\beta/\lambda_{(\ell)}$ and content $\lambda_{(\ell, \uparrow)}$.

Finally, one may check that each of $\text{LR}(\beta/\lambda_{(\ell)}, \lambda_{(\ell)})$, $\text{LR}(\beta/\lambda_{(1)}, \lambda_{(1)})$ and $\text{LR}(\beta/\lambda, \lambda_{(1, \ell)})$ is a singleton, the only element of which is depicted in Figure 9. Therefore, we have $c_{\lambda_{(\ell)}, \lambda_{(\ell)}}^\beta = c_{\lambda_{(1)}, \lambda_{(1)}}^\beta = c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(1, \ell)}}^\beta = 1$ which completes the proof.

□

Finally, we deal with hooks $\lambda = (k, 1^{\ell-1})$ with $k = 2$ or $\ell = 2$ separately.

Theorem 4.5. *Let λ be a hook, i.e. a partition of the form $(k, 1^{\ell-1})$, where $k = 2$ or $\ell = 2$. Then $(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)}$ is Schur positive.*

FIGURE 9. Littlewood-Richardson tableaux in $\text{LR}(\beta/\lambda_{(\ell)}, \lambda_{(\ell)})$,
 $\text{LR}(\beta/\lambda_{(1)}, \lambda_{(1)})$, $\text{LR}(\beta/\lambda, \lambda_{(1,\ell)})$

(A) $T \in \text{LR}(\beta/\lambda_{(\ell)}, \lambda_{(\ell)})$ (B) $T \in \text{LR}(\beta/\lambda_{(1)}, \lambda_{(1)})$ (C) $T \in \text{LR}(\beta/\lambda, \lambda_{(1,\ell)})$

	1	2	3	...	$k-1$	k
1						
2		1	1	...	1	1
3		2				
...		...				
$\ell-1$		$\ell-2$				
ℓ	1	$\ell-1$				

	1	2	3	...	$k-1$	k
1						
2		1	1	...	1	2
3		3				
...		...				
$\ell-1$		$\ell-1$				
ℓ		ℓ				

	1	2	3	...	$k-1$	k
1						
2		1	1	...	1	1
3		2				
...		...				
$\ell-1$		$\ell-2$				
ℓ		$\ell-1$				

Proof. We will prove this theorem by direct computation. The main fact that we will use in the computation is that the product of s_λ and $s_{(1^\ell)}$ equals the sum of Schur polynomials s_μ corresponding to all partitions μ that can be obtained by adding one block each to ℓ rows of λ .

- **Case 1:** $\lambda = (2, 1)$.

By (\dagger) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_\lambda^{(1)} &= (n+1)s_{(1,1)} + (n-1)s_2 \\ s_\lambda^{(2)} &= (n+1)(n-1)s_1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)} \\ &= (n+1)^2(s_{(2,2)} + s_{(2,1,1)} + s_{(1,1,1,1)}) \\ &\quad + 2(n+1)(n-1)(s_{(3,1)} + s_{(2,1,1)}) \\ &\quad + (n-1)^2(s_{(2,2)} + s_{(3,1)} + s_{(4)}) \\ &\quad - (n+1)(n-1)(s_{(3,1)} + s_{(2,2)} + s_{(2,1,1)}). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that this polynomial is Schur positive.

- **Case 2:** $\lambda = (2, 1^{\ell-1})$ with $\ell \geq 3$.

By (\dagger) , we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_\lambda^{(1)} &= (n+1)s_{(1^\ell)} + (n+1-\ell)s_{(2,1^{\ell-2})} \\ s_\lambda^{(2)} &= (n+1)(n+1-\ell)s_{(1^{\ell-1})} + \frac{1}{2}(n+1-\ell)(n+2-\ell)s_{(2,1^{\ell-3})}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)} = \\ &(n+1)^2 s_{(1^\ell)}^2 + 2(n+1)(n+1-\ell)s_{(1^\ell)}s_{(2,1^{\ell-2})} + (n+1-\ell)^2 s_{(2,1^{\ell-2})}^2 \\ &- (n+1)(n+1-\ell)s_\lambda s_{(1^{\ell-1})} - \frac{1}{2}(n+1-\ell)(n+2-\ell)s_\lambda s_{(2,1^{\ell-3})}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.4, we have that $s_{(2,1^{\ell-2})}^2 - s_\lambda s_{(2,1^{\ell-3})}$ is Schur positive, which implies that

$$(n+1-\ell)^2 s_{(2,1^{\ell-2})}^2 - \frac{1}{2}(n+1-\ell)(n+2-\ell)s_\lambda s_{(2,1^{\ell-3})}$$

is Schur positive. The sum of the other three terms in $(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)}$ is also Schur-positive by the following.

$$\begin{aligned} s_{(1^\ell)}^2 &= s_{(2^\ell)} + s_{(2^{\ell-1}, 1^2)} + \cdots + s_{(2, 1^{2\ell-2})} + s_{(1^{2\ell})} \\ s_{(1^\ell)} s_{(2, 1^{\ell-2})} &= s_{(3, 2^{\ell-2}, 1)} + s_{(3, 2^{\ell-3}, 1^3)} + \cdots + s_{(3, 1^{2\ell-3})} \\ &\quad + s_{(2^{\ell-1}, 1^2)} + \cdots + s_{(2, 1^{2\ell-2})} \\ s_\lambda s_{(1^{\ell-1})} &= s_{(3, 2^{\ell-2}, 1)} + s_{(3, 2^{\ell-3}, 1^3)} + \cdots + s_{(3, 1^{2\ell-3})} \\ &\quad + s_{(2^\ell)} + s_{(2^{\ell-1}, 1, 1)} + \cdots + s_{(2, 1^{2\ell-2})} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)}$ is Schur positive.

- **Case 3:** $\lambda = (k, 1)$ with $k \geq 3$.

By (†), we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_\lambda^{(1)} &= (n-1)s_{(k)} + (n+k-1)s_{(k-1, 1)} \\ s_\lambda^{(2)} &= (n-1)(n+k-1)s_{(k-1)} + \frac{1}{2}(n+k-1)(n+k-2)s_{(k-2, 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} (s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)} &= \\ &= (n-1)^2 s_{(k)}^2 + 2(n-1)(n+k-1)s_{(k)}s_{(k-1, 1)} + (n+k-1)^2 s_{(k-1, 1)}^2 \\ &\quad - (n-1)(n+k-1)s_\lambda s_{(k-1)} - \frac{1}{2}(n+k-1)(n+k-2)s_\lambda s_{(k-2, 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.4, we have that $s_{(k-1, 1)}^2 - s_\lambda s_{(k-2, 1)}$ is Schur-positive, which implies that

$$(n+k-1)^2 s_{(k-1, 1)}^2 - \frac{1}{2}(n+k-1)(n+k-2)s_\lambda s_{(k-2, 1)}$$


is Schur positive. The sum of the other three terms in $(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)}$ is almost Schur positive by the following, which is obtained by taking conjugate partitions in the previous case.

$$\begin{aligned} s_{(k)}^2 &= s_{(k, k)} + s_{(k+1, k-1)} + \cdots + s_{(2k-1, 1)} + s_{(2k)} \\ s_{(k)} s_{(k-1, 1)} &= s_{(k, k-1, 1)} + s_{(k+1, k-2, 1)} + \cdots + s_{(2k-2, 1, 1)} \\ &\quad + s_{(k+1, k-1)} + \cdots + s_{(2k-1, 1)} \\ s_\lambda s_{(k-1)} &= s_{(k, k-1, 1)} + s_{(k+1, k-2, 1)} + \cdots + s_{(2k-2, 1, 1)} \\ &\quad + s_{(k, k)} + s_{(k+1, k-1)} + \cdots + s_{(2k-1, 1)} \end{aligned}$$

The only problematic coefficient is that of $s_{(k, k)}$, but note that $c_{(k-1, 1), (k-1, 1)}^{(k, k)} = 1$ and $c_{\lambda, (k-2, 1)}^{(k, k)} = 0$. Thus, the coefficient of $s_{(k, k)}$ in $(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)}$ is given by

$$(n-1)^2 - (n-1)(n+k-1) + (n+k-1)^2,$$

which is positive. Therefore, $(s_\lambda^{(1)})^2 - s_\lambda s_\lambda^{(2)}$ is Schur positive. \square

FIGURE 10. Positions where α cannot have cells in order for $c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}}^{\alpha} > 0$ 5. PARTITIONS OF THE FORM $(k, k, 1)$

Fix a positive integers $k \geq 3$ and consider the partition $\lambda = (k, k, 1)$. Let $n \geq \ell(\lambda) = 3$ be the number of variables. The goal of this section is to prove the following.

Theorem 5.1. *Fix a positive integers $k \geq 3$, and let $\lambda = (k, k, 1)$. Then $(s_{\lambda}^{(1)})^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}^{(2)}$ is Schur positive.*

There are two partitions of $|\lambda| - 1$ contained in λ , given by $\lambda_{(2)} = (k, k - 1, 1)$ and $\lambda_{(3)} = (k, k)$, and three partitions of $|\lambda| - 2$ contained in λ , given by $\lambda_{(2,3)} = (k, k - 1)$ and $\lambda_{(2,\uparrow)} = (k - 1, k - 1, 1)$ and $\lambda_{(2,\leftarrow)} = (k, k - 2, 1)$. The theorem follows from the following two lemmas.

Lemma 5.2. *Let α be a partition of $2|\lambda| - 2 = 4k$, containing λ and not equal to $(2k, k, k)$ or (k^4) . Then we have $2c_{\lambda_{(2)}, \lambda_{(3)}}^{\alpha} \geq c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}}^{\alpha}$.*

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\beta_1 = (2k, k, k)$ and $\beta_2 = (k^4)$. Then we have, for $i = 1, 2$,*

$$\left(c_{\lambda_{(2)}, \lambda_{(3)}}^{\beta_i}, c_{\lambda_{(2)}, \lambda_{(2)}}^{\beta_i}, c_{\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(3)}}^{\beta_i}, c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}}^{\beta_i}, c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,\uparrow)}}^{\beta_i}, c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,\leftarrow)}}^{\beta_i} \right) = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0).$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By Lemma 5.2 and equation (*), the only possibly negative coefficients in the Schur expansion of $(s_{\lambda}^{(1)})^2 - s_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}^{(2)}$ are those of $s_{(2k, k, k)}$ and $s_{(k^4)}$. However, by Lemma 5.3 and equation (*), both these coefficients are equal to



$$\begin{aligned} & -(n + k - 2)(n - 2) + \frac{1}{2}(n + k - 2)(n + k - 1) + \frac{1}{2}(n - 2)(n - 1) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(n + k - 2)(n + k - 3) + \frac{1}{2}(n - 2)(n - 3) \\ & = -(n + k - 2)(n - 2) + (n + k - 2)^2 + (n - 2)^2 \\ & = (n + k - 2)k + (n - 2)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which is positive. \square

Before proving Lemma 5.2, we observe that it is obviously true when $c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}}^{\alpha} = 0$, which occurs in the following case:

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a partition of $2|\lambda| - 2$ with $\alpha_1 > 2k$, $\alpha_3 > k$, $\alpha_5 > 1$, or $\alpha_6 > 0$. Then we have $c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}}^{\alpha} = 0$.*

Proof. If $\alpha_1 > 2k$, then there are more than k cells in the first (non-empty) row of α/λ (see Figure 10). However, we have $\lambda_{(2,3),1} = k$. Then, it follows from Lemma 2.2(b) that $c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}}^{\alpha} = 0$.




FIGURE 11. The map $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}) \rightarrow \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(2)})$ in Case 1FIGURE 12. The map $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}) \rightarrow \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(2)})$ in Case 2

The other three conditions would imply that there is a column in α/λ with at least 3 cells (see Figure 10). However, we have $\ell(\lambda_{(2,3)}) = 2$. Thus, Lemma 2.2(a) implies that $c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}}^\alpha = 0$. \square

Proof of Lemma 5.2. For each partition α of $2|\lambda| - 2$, containing λ and not equal to $(2k, k, k)$ or (k^4) , in order to prove the inequality $2c_{\lambda_{(2)}, \lambda_{(3)}}^\alpha \geq c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}}^\alpha$, we construct an at most 2-to-1 map from $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)})$, the set of Littlewood-Richardson tableaux of shape α/λ and content $\lambda_{(2,3)}$, to $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(2)})$, the set of Littlewood-Richardson tableaux of shape $\alpha/\lambda_{(3)}$ and content $\lambda_{(2)}$.

By Lemma 5.4, it suffices to consider $\alpha = (\alpha_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ with $\alpha_1 \leq 2k$, $\alpha_3 \leq k$, $\alpha_5 \leq 1$ and $\alpha_6 = 0$. We divide into 3 different cases: (1) $\alpha_4 = 0$ (2) $\alpha_5 = 1$ and (3) $\alpha_4 > 0$ and $\alpha_5 = 0$. In each case, we give an algorithm that turns a Littlewood-Richardson tableau $T \in \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)})$ into a Littlewood-Richardson tableau $T' \in \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(2)})$ by adding an extra cell to the beginning of the third row and an extra integer 3 to the content, and we check that T' satisfies both conditions (a) and (b) in Definition 2.1.

- **Case 1:** $\alpha_4 = 0$, but $\alpha \neq (2k, k, k)$.
 - T' is obtained by moving the third row of T left by one cell, and placing the integer 3 in the last cell of the third row.
 - Then (a) is clear as 3 is larger than all other integers in T . For (b), note that there must be a 2 in the second row as $\alpha \neq (2k, k, k)$. Thus, in the reverse word of T' , there is at least a 2 in front of the added 3.
- **Case 2:** $\alpha_5 = 1$.
 - Note that the first column of T must contain 1 and 2. Then T' is obtained by moving each of them one cell upward, and then placing the integer 3 in the last cell of the first column.
 - For (a) note first that the third row remains increasing as 1 is the smallest integer in T . Moreover, the fourth row remains increasing, as all cells behind the first cell must contain 2. For (b), the integer 3 is added to the end of the reverse reading word of T , so the result remains a lattice permutation.

FIGURE 13. The map $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}) \rightarrow \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(2)})$ in Case 3.1FIGURE 14. The map $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}) \rightarrow \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(2)})$ in Case 3.2FIGURE 15. The map $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}) \rightarrow \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(2)})$ in Case 3.3

- **Case 3:** $\alpha_4 > 0$ and $\alpha_5 = 0$, but $\alpha \neq (k^4)$. We further break this case down into three sub-cases.
 - **Case 3.1:** The first cell of the fourth row contains 1.
 - T' is obtained by moving the 1 in the first cell of the fourth row one cell upward, and moving the rest of the fourth row left by one cell, and placing the integer 3 in the last cell of the fourth row.
 - Condition (a) is then clear. For (b), note that there is at least one 2 in the third row, since α would have to be (k^4) for all $k-1$ of 2's to be in the fourth row. Thus, in the reverse word of T' , there is at least one 2 in front of the added 3.
 - **Case 3.2:** The first cell in the fourth row contains 2, and there are fewer 2's in the second and third rows than the 1's in the first row.
 - Then T' is obtained by moving over the third row left by one cell, moving the 2 in the first cell of the fourth row to the last cell of the third row, moving the rest of the fourth row left by one cell, and placing the integer 3 in the last cell of the fourth row.
 - Condition (a) is clear. For (b), note that the number of 2's in the second and third rows is no more than the number of 1's in the first row by assumption. Also, in the reverse reading work of T' , the 2 moved to the third row is in front of the added 3.
 - **Case 3.3:** The first cell in the fourth row contains 2, and there are as many 2's in the second and third rows as the 1's in the first row.

FIGURE 16. Two distinct $T_1, T_2 \in \text{LR}((4, 3, 3, 2)/(3, 3, 1), (3, 2))$ mapped to the same $T' \in \text{LR}((4, 3, 3, 2)/(3, 3), (3, 2, 1))$





FIGURE 17. Skew shapes β_i/λ and $\beta_i/\lambda_{(3)}$




- Then T' is obtained by moving the third row left by one cell, and placing the integer 3 in the last cell of the third row.
- For condition (a) note the fourth row of T contains only 2's, so there are $k - 1 - \alpha_4$ of 2's in the second and the third rows of T and the same amount of 1's in the first row of T . Thus, there are $k - (k - 1 - \alpha_4) = \alpha_4 + 1$ of 1's in the third row of T , which ensures that the α_4 -th column of T' is strictly increasing.

The check for condition (b) is similar to before. As argued above, there are $\alpha_4 + 1$ of 1's in the third row of T , which implies that there are at most $(k - 1) - (\alpha_4 + 1) = k - 2 - \alpha_4$ of 2's in the third row of T . Therefore, there is at least one 2 in the second row of 2, and hence in the reverse reading word of T' , there is at least one 2 in front of the added 3.

Now the maps $\text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}) \rightarrow \text{LR}(\alpha/\lambda_{(2)}, \lambda_{(3)})$ in the first two cases are clearly injective. In Case 3, note that the T' obtained in Case 3.3 is different from the other two subcases since the integer 3 is placed in a different row. Thus, the maps in case 3 are at most 2-to-1. (In fact it is in general 2-to-1 as Figure 16 shows an example of two distinct T mapped to the same T' .) \square

Proof of Lemma 5.3. We have $c_{\lambda_{(2)}, \lambda_{(3)}}^{\beta_i} = c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2, \uparrow)}}^{\beta_i} = c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2, \leftarrow)}}^{\beta_i} = 0$, for $i = 1, 2$, by Lemma 2.2(c): all four skew shapes $\beta_i/\lambda_{(3)}, \beta_i/\lambda$ ($i = 1, 2$) have only two

FIGURE 18. Littlewood-Richardson tableaux in $\text{LR}(\beta_i/\lambda_{(2)}, \lambda_{(2)})$,
 $\text{LR}(\beta_i/\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(3)})$, $\text{LR}(\beta_i/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)})$, $i = 1, 2$



non-empty rows (see Figure 17), but $\ell(\lambda_{(2)}) = \ell(\lambda_{(2,\uparrow)}) = \ell(\lambda_{(2,\leftarrow)}) = 3$, so $\text{LR}(\beta_i/\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(2)})$, $\text{LR}(\beta_i/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,\uparrow)})$, $\text{LR}(\beta_i/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,\leftarrow)})$, for $i = 1, 2$, are all empty.

One may check that each of $\text{LR}(\beta_i/\lambda_{(2)}, \lambda_{(2)})$, $\text{LR}(\beta_i/\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(3)})$, $\text{LR}(\beta_i/\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)})$ ($i = 1, 2$) is a singleton, the only element of which is depicted in Figure 18. Therefore, we have $c_{\lambda_{(2)}, \lambda_{(2)}}^{\beta_i} = c_{\lambda_{(3)}, \lambda_{(3)}}^{\beta_i} = c_{\lambda, \lambda_{(2,3)}}^{\beta_i} = 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. \square

6. CONJUGATE PARTITIONS AND PARTITIONS OF THE FORM $(3, 2^{k-1})$

The conjugate partition of a partition λ , denoted by λ' , is defined to be the partition corresponding to the transpose of the Young diagram of λ . The Littlewood-Richardson coefficients are preserved under conjugation in the sense that $c_{\mu'\nu'}^{\lambda'} = c_{\mu\nu}^{\lambda}$ for all partitions λ, μ, ν . (See, for example, [7, Corollary 2, p. 62] for a combinatorial proof.) The corners are also preserved under conjugation, and we have $J(\lambda') = \{\lambda_j : j \in J(\lambda)\}$. It is also easy to see that $(\lambda_{(j)})' = \lambda'_{(\lambda_j)}$, $(\lambda_{(j,k)})' = \lambda'_{(\lambda_j, \lambda_k)}$, and that either $(\lambda_{(j,\uparrow)})' = \lambda'_{(\lambda_j, \leftarrow)}$ or neither partition exists.

Fix $k \geq 3$. Now we consider the partition $\lambda' = (3, 2^{k-1})$, which is the conjugates of the partition $\lambda = (k, k, 1)$ considered in the previous section. The following lemmas follow immediately from Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3.

Lemma 6.1. *Let α' be a partition of $2|\lambda'| - 2 = 4k$, containing λ' and not equal to $(2k, k, k)' = (3^k, 1^k)$ or $(k^4)' = (4^k)$. Then we have $2c_{\lambda'_{(1)}, \lambda'_{(k)}}^{\alpha'} \geq c_{\lambda', \lambda'_{(1,k)}}^{\alpha'}$.*

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\beta'_1 = (2k, k, k)' = (3^k, 1^k)$ and $\beta'_2 = (k^4)' = (4^k)$. Then we have, for $i = 1, 2$,*

$$\left(c_{\lambda'_{(1)}, \lambda'_{(k)}}^{\beta'_i}, c_{\lambda'_{(k)}, \lambda'_{(k)}}^{\beta'_i}, c_{\lambda'_{(1)}, \lambda'_{(1)}}^{\beta'_i}, c_{\lambda', \lambda'_{(1,k)}}^{\beta'_i}, c_{\lambda', \lambda'_{(k,\uparrow)}}^{\beta'_i}, c_{\lambda', \lambda'_{(k,\leftarrow)}}^{\beta'_i} \right) = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0).$$

As a result, we obtain the following.

Theorem 6.3. *Fix a positive integers $k \geq 3$, and let $\lambda' = (3, 2^{k-1})$. Then $(s_{\lambda'}^{(1)})^2 - s_{\lambda'} s_{\lambda'}^{(2)}$ is Schur positive.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.1 and equation (*), the only possibly negative coefficients of $(s_{\lambda'}^{(1)})^2 - s_{\lambda'} s_{\lambda'}^{(2)}$ are those of $s_{(3^k, 1^k)}$ and $s_{(4^k)}$. However, by Lemma 6.2 and equation (*), both these coefficients are equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & - (n+2)(n+2-k) + \frac{1}{2}(n+2)(n+3) + \frac{1}{2}(n+2-k)(n+3-k) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(n+2)(n+1) + \frac{1}{2}(n+2-k)(n+1-k) \\ & = - (n+2)(n+2-k) + (n+2)^2 + (n+2-k)^2 \\ & = (n+2)k + (n+2-k)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which is positive. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Cristina Ballantine and Rosa Orellana. Schur-positivity in a square. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 21(3):Paper 3.46, 36, 2014.
- [2] François Bergeron, Riccardo Biagioli, and Mercedes H. Rosas. Inequalities between Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 113(4):567–590, 2006.
- [3] François Bergeron and Peter McNamara. Some positive differences of products of schur functions, 2004.
- [4] William Y. C. Chen, Larry X. W. Wang, and Arthur L. B. Yang. Schur positivity and the q -log-convexity of the Narayana polynomials. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 32(3):303–338, 2010.
- [5] Sylvie Corteel and Jang Soo Kim. Enumeration of bounded lecture hall tableaux. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 81:Art. B81f, 28, 2020.
- [6] Sergey Fomin, William Fulton, Chi-Kwong Li, and Yiu-Tung Poon. Eigenvalues, singular values, and Littlewood-Richardson coefficients. *Amer. J. Math.*, 127(1):101–127, 2005.
- [7] William Fulton. *Young tableaux*, volume 35 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997. With applications to representation theory and geometry.
- [8] Alice L. L. Gao, Matthew H. Y. Xie, and Arthur L. B. Yang. Schur positivity and log-concavity related to longest increasing subsequences. *Discrete Math.*, 342(9):2570–2578, 2019.
- [9] Ronald C. King, Trevor A. Welsh, and Stephanie J. van Willigenburg. Schur positivity of skew Schur function differences and applications to ribbons and Schubert classes. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 28(1):139–167, 2008.
- [10] Anatol N. Kirillov. An invitation to the generalized saturation conjecture. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 40(4):1147–1239, 2004.
- [11] Thomas Lam, Alexander Postnikov, and Pavlo Pylyavskyy. Schur positivity and Schur log-concavity. *Amer. J. Math.*, 129(6):1611–1622, 2007.
- [12] Alain Lascoux, Bernard Leclerc, and Jean-Yves Thibon. Ribbon tableaux, Hall-Littlewood functions, quantum affine algebras, and unipotent varieties. *J. Math. Phys.*, 38(2):1041–1068, 1997.
- [13] Peter R. W. McNamara. Necessary conditions for Schur-positivity. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 28(4):495–507, 2008.
- [14] Peter R. W. McNamara and Stephanie van Willigenburg. Positivity results on ribbon Schur function differences. *European J. Combin.*, 30(5):1352–1369, 2009.
- [15] Peter R. W. McNamara and Stephanie van Willigenburg. Maximal supports and Schur-positivity among connected skew shapes. *European J. Combin.*, 33(6):1190–1206, 2012.
- [16] Julius Ross and Matei Toma. Hodge-Riemann bilinear relations for Schur classes of ample vector bundles. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 56(1):197–241, 2023.
- [17] Julius Ross and Matei Toma. On Hodge-Riemann cohomology classes. In *Birational geometry, Kähler-Einstein metrics and degenerations*, volume 409 of *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, pages 763–793. Springer, Cham, [2023] ©2023.
- [18] Richard P. Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics. Vol. 2*, volume 208 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, [2024] ©2024. With an appendix by Sergey Fomin.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS, AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT CHICAGO, CHICAGO, IL 60607
Email address: `juliusro@uic.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS, AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT CHICAGO, CHICAGO, IL 60607
Email address: `kwu33@uic.edu`