


Graphical Abstract

Arrow Relations in Lattices of Integer Partitions

Asma Almazaydeh, Mike Behrisch, Edith Vargas-García, Andreas Wachtel



Highlights

Arrow Relations in Lattices of Integer Partitions

Asma'a Almazaydeh, Mike Behrisch, Edith Vargas-García, Andreas Wachtel

- Type **D** partitions allow up-arrows, which fail to be down-arrows, to all types **I–IV**.
- Type **IV** partitions allow down-arrows, which fail to be up-arrows, to all types **A–D**.
- Type **D** partitions have double arrows only to those of type **IV** and vice versa.
- Partitions of types **A–C** are double arrow related only to types **I–III** and vice versa.
- For $n \geq 3$ there are exactly $2n - 4$ one-generated arrow-closed (1×1) -subcontexts of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$.

Arrow Relations in Lattices of Integer Partitions

Asma'a Almazaydeh^a, Mike Behrisch^b, Edith Vargas-García^{c,1}, Andreas Wachtel^{c,1,*}

^aDepartment of Mathematics, Tafila Technical University, PO Box 179, 66110, Tafila, Jordan

^bInstitute of Discrete Mathematics and Geometry, TU Wien, Wiedner Hauptstr. 8–10, 1040, Vienna, Austria

^cDepartment of Mathematics, ITAM, Río Hondo 1, Ciudad de México, CP 01080, Mexico

Abstract

We give a complete characterisation of the single and double arrow relations of the standard context $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of the lattice \mathcal{L}_n of partitions of any positive integer n under the dominance order, thereby addressing an open question of Ganter, 2022.

Keywords: Integer partition, Lattice, Dominance order, Arrow relation, Subdirect representation

2020 MSC: 05A17, 11P81, 06B23, 06A07, 06B05, 06B15

1. Introduction

Integer partitions have captivated mathematicians for centuries, starting as early as 1674 with Leibniz investigating the number $p(n)$ of ways in which a natural number n can be partitioned, that is, expressed as a sum of a non-increasing sequence of positive integer summands, see [14, p. 37]. Recursive presentations of $p(n)$, for example, following from Euler's pentagonal number theorem, are well known, and the search for more explicit formulæ or approximations for $p(n)$ culminated with the celebrated asymptotic expressions given by Hardy and Ramanujan [11] and with Rademacher's representations by convergent series [16, 17].

The partitions of a given integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ can be ordered by dominance, that is, by pointwise comparing their sequences of partial sums; the resulting ordered set carries the structure of a finite (hence complete) lattice \mathcal{L}_n , see [5]. The cardinalities of these lattices \mathcal{L}_n , that is, the numbers $p(n) = |\mathcal{L}_n|$ of (unrestricted) partitions of n , grow fast as n is increasing, the asymptotics shown in [11] to be $p(n) \sim \frac{\exp(\pi\sqrt{2n/3})}{4n\sqrt{3}}$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$. Their size alone suggests an increasing complexity of the lattices \mathcal{L}_n for larger values of n , wherefore splitting them up into smaller parts would be an important step towards enhancing our understanding of their structure. Fortunately, formal concept analysis and lattice theory offer techniques for this task in the form of subdirect representations of complete lattices, see, e.g., [10, Chapter 4]. These are embeddings of the given lattice \mathcal{L}_n into a direct product of smaller lattices, the subdirect factors, such that for each coordinate the corresponding projection is surjective. Of course, the subdirect factors may themselves be again subdirectly representable by even smaller factors, leading eventually to the concept of subdirect irreducibility: a lattice is subdirectly irreducible if in each subdirect representation at least one of the coordinate projections is not only surjective, but bijective, that is, an isomorphism onto the corresponding subdirect factor. The most efficient decompositions are hence given by representations using subdirectly irreducible factors. Such decompositions exist for any doubly founded (in particular any finite) complete lattice, such as \mathcal{L}_n , see [10, Theorem 18].

Formal concept analysis [10] offers a powerful framework to study complete lattices \mathbb{L} (up to isomorphism) as lattices of Galois closed sets of a suitable Galois connection between completely join-dense and completely meet-dense subsets of the lattice. This is part of the basic (or fundamental) theorem of formal concept analysis, see [10,

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: aalmazaydeh@ttu.edu.jo (Asma'a Almazaydeh), behrisch@logic.at (Mike Behrisch), edith.vargas@itam.mx (Edith Vargas-García), andreas.wachtel@itam.mx (Andreas Wachtel)

¹This author gratefully acknowledges support by the Asociación Mexicana de Cultura A.C.

Theorem 3]. The Galois connection is, up to isomorphism, induced by the order relation of the lattice between the elements of the two dense subsets, and this inducing binary relation is usually represented in a tabular form, called formal context. A canonically derived complete lattice, the concept lattice, is isomorphic (anti-isomorphic) to the lattice of Galois closed sets and serves to represent the given complete lattice \mathbb{L} . For finite lattices \mathbb{L} there is, up to isomorphism, a unique way of representation, namely through the so-called standard context, which is given by the order relation between all completely join-irreducible and complete meet-irreducible elements of \mathbb{L} , see [10, Proposition 12]. Formal concept analysis further defines binary relations \swarrow , \nearrow and $\nearrow = \swarrow \cap \nearrow$ as certain subsets of the complement of the relation represented by a formal context, cf. [10, Definition 25]. These arrow relations appear in the ‘empty cells’ of the context table, and from them one may determine so-called one-generated arrow-closed subcontexts. This is done by adding attributes (resp. objects) pointed to by arrows ensuing from objects (resp. attributes) already appearing in the subcontext until the configuration stabilises. According to [10, Proposition 62] the one-generated arrow-closed subcontexts of the standard context of a finite lattice \mathbb{L} give subdirectly irreducible concept lattices, and taking sufficiently many of them, one may construct a subdirect decomposition of \mathbb{L} , see [10, Proposition 61]. A thorough understanding of the arrow relations in the standard context is hence a crucial step towards systematically obtaining subdirect decompositions of \mathcal{L}_n .

For the lattice \mathcal{L}_n of partitions of an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the sets of completely join-irreducible and completely meet-irreducible elements were described by Brylawski [5]; moreover, a very intuitive understanding of the covering relation in \mathcal{L}_n (and thus of the irreducibles) was later given in [13]. Recursive and non-recursive constructions of the standard contexts $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ for increasing values of n were studied in [3] and [9]. In [3], supported by [4], also the non-embeddability of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_9)$ into $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_{10})$ was argued, the proof of which was later refined in [8] for the symmetric case, extending previous work in [2, 9].

We have computationally determined the standard contexts of \mathcal{L}_n for parameters $n \leq 60$ and our results show some curious patterns regarding the appearing one-generated arrow-closed subcontexts and the corresponding subdirectly irreducible factors, cf. [15] for a limited prospect. In order to be able, at a later stage, to substantiate these experimental results with rigid proofs, we aim in this paper at a complete characterisation of the arrow relations in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, a question that was raised in [9, p. 40]. Our work has partially evolved in parallel with [7], which also mentions some of the more basic results of this article and has, for example, inspired the graphical presentation of \mathcal{L}_{11} including all arrows in Fig. 6. We first describe all double arrows of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ in Theorems 4.10, 4.17 and 4.23. After that we provide characterisations of all down-arrows that fail to be up-arrows in Theorems 5.2, 5.4 and 5.6, with a summary in Corollary 5.7; then we use partition conjugation to obtain the dual results, i.e., up-arrows without down-arrows, in Corollaries 5.5 and 5.8. Our knowledge regarding arrows is schematically summarised in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated within the lattice \mathcal{L}_{11} in Fig. 6. As a proof of concept we finally show in Section 6 how our characterisations can be used to determine and count, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, all one-generated arrow-closed one-by-one subcontexts of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, which correspond to two-element subdirectly irreducible lattice factors of \mathcal{L}_n .

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Lattices and ordered sets

Throughout the text we write $\mathbb{N} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ for the set of *natural numbers*, and we set $\mathbb{N}_+ := \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. An *ordered set* is a pair $\mathbb{P} = (P, \leq)$ where P is a set and $\leq \subseteq P \times P$ is a reflexive, antisymmetric and transitive binary relation on it. For $a, b \in P$ we have $a \geq b$ if and only if $b \leq a$, and we write $a < b$ for $a \leq b$ and $a \neq b$ as usual. Moreover, we say that a is *covered by* b in \mathbb{P} (or b *covers* a in \mathbb{P}), symbolically $a < b$, if $a < b$ and $a \leq x < b$ implies $x = a$ for each $x \in P$. The *dual* of \mathbb{P} is the ordered set (P, \geq) . An *order-isomorphism* $\varphi: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ is given by a map $\varphi: P \rightarrow Q$ such that for all $a, b \in P$ the inequality $a \leq b$ in \mathbb{P} is equivalent to $\varphi(a) \leq \varphi(b)$ in \mathbb{Q} . The ordered sets \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{Q} are then said to be (*order-*)*isomorphic*. An *order-antiisomorphism* or *dual isomorphism* $\varphi: \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ is an order isomorphism between \mathbb{P} and the dual of \mathbb{Q} , and \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{Q} are then called *antiisomorphic* or *dually isomorphic*; \mathbb{P} is *self-dual* (or *autodual*) if it is dually isomorphic to itself. Furthermore, we define $\downarrow x := \{y \in \mathbb{P} \mid y \leq x\}$ as the *principal down-set* of $x \in P$, and $\uparrow x := \{y \in \mathbb{P} \mid x \leq y\}$ as the *principal up-set* of x .

A *complete lattice* is an ordered set $\mathbb{L} = (L, \leq)$ where any subset $S \subseteq L$ has a greatest common lower bound $\bigwedge S \in L$ (called *infimum* of S) and a least common upper bound $\bigvee S \in L$ (called *supremum* of S). It is customary to write $a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_k$ for $\bigwedge \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ and $a_1 \vee \dots \vee a_k$ for $\bigvee \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ for finitely many elements $a_1, \dots, a_k \in L$.

A subset $D \subseteq L$ is called (*completely*) *join-dense* in \mathbb{L} if for every $x \in L$ there is a subset $S \subseteq D$ with $x = \bigvee S$; D is (*completely*) *meet-dense* in \mathbb{L} if for each $x \in L$ there is some $S \subseteq D$ with $x = \bigwedge S$. We say that $a \in L$ is *completely join-irreducible*, denoted by \vee -irreducible, if for all $S \subseteq L$ such that $a = \bigvee S$ we necessarily have that $a \in S$. Dually, $a \in L$ is *completely meet-irreducible*, or \wedge -irreducible, if for all $S \subseteq L$ such that $a = \bigwedge S$ we must have $a \in S$. For a finite non-empty lattice, it is sufficient to check this condition for the empty and all two-element subsets S of L . That is, for finite $L \neq \emptyset$, an element $a \in L$ is completely join-irreducible, if a is not the minimum element of L and for all $b, c \in L$ the condition $a = b \vee c$ implies that $a = b$ or $a = c$. This happens exactly if a covers exactly one element below it, cf. [10, Proposition 2]. Dually, for a finite lattice, $a \in L$ is completely meet-irreducible if it is not the top element of L and for all $b, c \in L$ with $a = b \wedge c$ it follows that $b = a$ or $c = a$. This condition is met precisely if a has exactly one upper cover. For a complete lattice \mathbb{L} , we denote by $\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$ and by $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$ the sets of all *completely join-irreducible elements*, and of all *completely meet-irreducible elements* of \mathbb{L} , respectively. Elements of $\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L}) \cap \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$ are called *doubly completely irreducible*. In the lattice diagrams shown in Fig. 3 and 6, the completely irreducible elements have been highlighted using half or completely filled nodes.

A (complete) lattice $\mathbb{L} = (L, \leq)$ is *supremum-founded* if, for any two $x < y$ from L , the set $\{p \in L \mid p \leq y \text{ \& } p \not\leq x\}$ contains a \leq -minimal element; the dual property that for any $x < y$ in L the set $\{p \in L \mid x \leq p \text{ \& } y \not\leq p\}$ includes a \leq -maximal element is called *infimum-founded*. The lattice \mathbb{L} is *doubly founded* if it is both supremum-founded and infimum-founded, see [10, p. 33]. Every chain-finite and hence every finite lattice is doubly founded, cf. [10, p. 33 et seq., Fig. 1.11, p. 35].

2.2. Notions of formal concept analysis

Formal concept analysis (FCA) is a theoretical framework that harnesses the powers of general abstract Galois theory and the structure theory of complete lattices for data analysis and many other applications. At its core lies the notion of a Galois connection between (the power sets of) sets G and M , induced by a binary relation $I \subseteq G \times M$. This data is collected in a *formal context* $\mathbb{K} = (G, M, I)$, and the elements of G and M are given the interpretative names *objects* and *attributes*, respectively. The set I is called the *incidence relation*, and $(g, m) \in I$ is usually written as $g I m$ and read as ‘object g has attribute m ’. When G and M are finite, the context \mathbb{K} is often given as a *cross table*, where the objects form the rows, the attributes label the columns, and the crosses represent the characteristic function of I on $G \times M$. Formal concept analysis extends the ‘prime notation’ for the Galois derivatives, which is common in classical Galois theory [12, Chapter V, Theorem 2.3 et seq.], to general formal contexts $K = (G, M, I)$. For every set $A \subseteq G$ of objects, $A' := \{m \in M \mid \forall g \in A: g I m\}$ assigns to it the set of attributes commonly shared by all objects of A . Dually, for $B \subseteq M$, the set $B' := \{g \in G \mid \forall m \in B: g I m\}$ contains exactly those objects possessing all the attributes in B . A *formal concept* is a pair (A, B) where the *extent* $A \subseteq G$ and the *intent* $B \subseteq M$ are sets that are mutually Galois closed: $A = B'$ and $B = A'$. Intents of the form $B = \{g'\}$ with $g \in G$ are called *object intents* and are written as g' , for short; dually extents $A = \{m'\} =: m'$ with $m \in M$ are referred to as *attribute extents*. The equivalent conditions $A_1 \subseteq A_2$ and $B_1 \supseteq B_2$ define an order $(A_1, B_1) \leq (A_2, B_2)$ on the set $\mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{K})$ of all formal concepts. $\underline{\mathfrak{B}}(\mathbb{K}) = (\mathfrak{B}(\mathbb{K}), \leq)$ becomes a complete lattice under this order, the *concept lattice* of \mathbb{K} . The fundamental theorem of formal concept analysis [10, Theorem 3] states that, in fact, every complete lattice is a concept lattice, up to isomorphism. Namely, if \mathbb{L} is a complete lattice, then $\mathbb{L} \cong \underline{\mathfrak{B}}(\mathbb{L}, \mathbb{L}, \leq)$. For finite lattices, which are always complete, this construction can be improved: $\mathbb{L} \cong \underline{\mathfrak{B}}(\mathbb{K})$, where $\mathbb{K} = (\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L}), \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}), \leq)$ is the *standard context* of \mathbb{L} [10, Proposition 12]. This applies to partition lattices \mathcal{L}_n in particular.

A central notion for this paper will be the *arrow relations* of a formal context, which fill up some of the empty cells in the cross table.

Definition 2.1 ([10, Definition 25]). If (G, M, I) is a context, $g \in G$ an object, and $m \in M$ an attribute, we write

$$\begin{aligned} g \swarrow m &:\iff g I m, \text{ and for all } h \in G \text{ with } g' \subsetneq h' \text{ we have } h I m; \\ g \nearrow m &:\iff g I m, \text{ and for all } n \in H \text{ with } m' \subsetneq n' \text{ we have } g I n; \\ g \nearrow m &:\iff g \nearrow m \text{ and } g \swarrow m. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $g \swarrow m$ if and only if g' is maximal among all object intents which do not contain m ; dually we have $g \nearrow m$ if and only if m' is maximal among all attribute extents which do not contain g .

We will now derive a useful characterisation of the arrow relations in standard contexts of doubly founded lattices.

Remark 2.2. Consider the (standard) context $\mathbb{K}(\mathbb{L}) = (\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L}), \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}), \leq)$ of any complete lattice $\mathbb{L} = (L, \leq)$. Note that for $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} g' &= \{m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}) \mid g \leq m\} = \uparrow g \cap \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}) =: g\uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})}, \\ m' &= \{g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L}) \mid g \leq m\} = \downarrow m \cap \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L}) =: m\downarrow_{\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})}. \end{aligned}$$

This allows us to reformulate the definition of the arrow relations of $\mathbb{K}(\mathbb{L})$ in terms of the up-sets and down-sets of \mathbb{L} . Consider again $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} g \not\prec m &\stackrel{I:=\leq}{\iff} g \not\leq m \ \& \ \forall h \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L}) \setminus \{g\}: \quad g' \not\subseteq h' \quad \implies h \leq m, \\ &\iff g \not\leq m \ \& \ \forall h \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L}) \setminus \{g\}: \quad g\uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})} \not\subseteq h\uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})} \implies m \in \uparrow h, \\ g \not\succ m &\stackrel{I:=\leq}{\iff} g \not\leq m \ \& \ \forall a \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}) \setminus \{m\}: \quad m' \not\subseteq a' \quad \implies g \leq a, \\ &\iff g \not\leq m \ \& \ \forall a \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}) \setminus \{m\}: \quad m\downarrow_{\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})} \not\subseteq a\downarrow_{\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})} \implies g \in \downarrow a. \end{aligned}$$

The following sufficient condition will lead to our main tool to establish arrow relations in standard contexts, in particular in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$.

Lemma 2.3. Let $\mathbb{L} = (L, \leq)$ be any complete lattice. Consider any $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$ with unique lower cover $\tilde{g} \in L$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$ with unique upper cover $\tilde{m} \in L$ such that $g \not\leq m$. Then in the context $\mathbb{K}(\mathbb{L}) = (\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L}), \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}), \leq)$ the following implications regarding arrow relations hold.

- (a) If $\tilde{g} \leq m$ and there is a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$ such that $g = \bigwedge S$, then $g \not\prec m$.
- (b) If $\tilde{m} \geq g$ and there is a set $S \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$ such that $m = \bigvee S$, then $g \not\succ m$.
- (c) If $\tilde{g} \leq m$ and $g \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$ (thus doubly completely irreducible), then $g \not\prec m$.
- (d) If $\tilde{m} \geq g$ and $m \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$ (thus doubly completely irreducible), then $g \not\succ m$.

Proof. We only prove statement (a), for (b) is completely dual; (c) follows by setting $S := \{g\}$ in (a), and (d) by setting $S := \{m\}$ in (b). By assumption we have $g \not\leq m$. To show $g \not\prec m$, according to Remark 2.2, we take any $h \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L}) \setminus \{g\}$ and assume $g\uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})} \not\subseteq h\uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})}$. From the hypothesis of (a) we have $g = \bigwedge S$ with $S \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$, thus we infer $S \subseteq g\uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})} \subseteq h\uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})}$. Therefore, h is a common lower bound of the elements of S , hence $h \leq \bigwedge S = g$. Since $h \neq g$, we have $h < g$, and, as $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$, we infer $h \leq \tilde{g} \leq m$, as it is required for $g \not\prec m$. \square

We shall need the following statement for infimum/supremum founded complete lattices, which can be read from [10, Fig. 1.11, p. 35]. For completeness, we provide a proof of this fundamental fact.

Lemma 2.4. Let $\mathbb{L} = (L, \leq)$ be a complete lattice with completely join-irreducibles $\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$ and meet-irreducibles $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$.

- (a) If \mathbb{L} is infimum-founded, then $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$ is completely meet-dense.
- (b) If \mathbb{L} is supremum-founded, then $\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$ is completely join-dense.

Proof. Part (b) follows from (a) by duality, thus we only show the latter. Consider any $g \in \mathbb{L}$ and define the subset $S := \{y \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}) \mid g \leq y\} \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$. By its construction, S satisfies $g \leq \bigwedge S$. Let us assume for a contradiction that $g < \bigwedge S =: h$. By infimum-foundedness, there is hence a maximal element $x \in L$ with the properties $g \leq x$ but $h \not\leq x$. If $x \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$, then $x \in S$ and thus $h = \bigwedge S \leq x$, being a contradiction. Therefore, we consider now $x \notin \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$. This means there must exist a subset $W \subseteq L \setminus \{x\}$ with $x = \bigwedge W$. It follows for each $w \in W$ that $x \leq w$, and, in fact, $g \leq x < w$ since $w \neq x$. From the maximality of x we infer now that $h \not\leq w$ fails, i.e., $h \leq w$. Since this holds for all $w \in W$, we conclude $h \leq \bigwedge W = x$, which is again a contradiction. Both contradictions show $g = h = \bigwedge S$. \square

For our purposes the following characterisation of the arrow relations is the most appropriate one since the lattice \mathcal{L}_n is finite, thus all its chains have only a finite number of elements, and it hence is doubly founded.

Proposition 2.5. Let $\mathbb{L} = (L, \leq)$ be a doubly founded complete lattice, e.g., a finite lattice. In the formal context $\mathbb{K}(\mathbb{L}) = (\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L}), \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}), \leq)$ the arrow relations can be characterised as follows (cf. Fig. 1). Consider any $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$ with unique lower cover $\tilde{g} \in L$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$ with unique upper cover $\tilde{m} \in L$. Then we have

- (a) $g \swarrow m \iff g \not\leq m \ \& \ \tilde{g} \leq m$;
(b) $g \nearrow m \iff g \not\leq m \ \& \ \tilde{m} \geq g$.

Proof. We shall only prove (a) since (b) is completely dual. To show ‘ \iff ’ we use infimum-foundedness, which implies that the set $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$ is infimum-dense, see Lemma 2.4(a). This means that every $g \in L$ can be written as $\bigwedge S$ for some set $S \subseteq \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$, namely, we may take $S = \{y \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L}) \mid g \leq y\}$. This is true, in particular, for all $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$, hence $g \not\leq m$, $\tilde{g} \leq m$ and Lemma 2.3(a) imply $g \swarrow m$.

For the converse implication, let us assume that $g \swarrow m$ holds. This implies $g \not\leq m$ by Remark 2.2. By infimum-foundedness, there is $p \in L$ that is maximal with respect to the property $\tilde{g} \leq p$ but $g \not\leq p$. Let $U := \{z \in L \mid z > p\}$. For every $z \in U$ we have $z > p \geq \tilde{g}$, thus, in order to not violate the maximality of p , the element z must fail the property $g \not\leq z$, that is, $g \leq z$ must hold. Therefore, g is a common lower bound for the elements of U , and hence we have $g \leq \bigwedge U$. As $g \not\leq p$, we know that $\bigwedge U \neq p$, thus in fact, $\bigwedge U > p$ since all $z \in U$ are above p . Consequently, if $p = \bigwedge T$ for some subset $T \subseteq L$, then $p \in T$, for otherwise $T \subseteq U$ and thus $p < \bigwedge U \leq \bigwedge T$. This shows that $p \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$. Since \mathbb{L} is supremum-founded, the set $\mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$ is supremum-dense, see Lemma 2.4(b). Thus we can write $\tilde{g} = \bigvee S$ for some set $S \subseteq \mathcal{J}(\mathbb{L})$. For every $h \in S$ we have $h \leq \bigvee S = \tilde{g} < g$, wherefore $g \uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})} \subseteq h \uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})}$. As $p \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})$ and $p \geq \tilde{g}$, we have $p \in h \uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})}$, but certainly $p \notin g \uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})}$ since $p \not\leq g$. Thus, $p \in h \uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})} \setminus g \uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})}$, i.e., $g \uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})} \subsetneq h \uparrow_{\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{L})}$. Now $g \swarrow m$ and Remark 2.2 imply $h \leq m$. As $h \in S$ was arbitrary, we conclude that $\tilde{g} = \bigvee S \leq m$. \square

$$g \not\leq m \ \& \ \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \tilde{g} \quad \circ \end{array} m \iff g \swarrow m \qquad g \not\leq m \ \& \ \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \tilde{m} \quad \circ \end{array} m \iff g \nearrow m$$

Fig. 1: Graphical representation of Proposition 2.5; solid edges represent the covering relation.

In Section 1 we explained that so-called arrow-closed subcontexts (of the standard context) are a key ingredient in order to obtain subdirect decompositions of finite lattices. We now provide concrete definitions as far as they are needed in this paper. A *subcontext* of a context $\mathbb{K} = (G, M, I)$ is a context $\tilde{\mathbb{K}} = (H, N, J)$ where $H \subseteq G$, $N \subseteq M$ and $J = I \cap (H \times N)$. For a clarified context \mathbb{K} , that is, $g' = h'$ implies $g = h$, and $m' = n'$ implies $m = n$ for all $g, h \in G$ and $m, n \in M$, such a subcontext $\tilde{\mathbb{K}}$ is *arrow-closed* if for all $h \in H$, $m \in M$, $n \in N$ and $g \in G$ the condition $g \nearrow m$ implies $m \in N$, and $g \swarrow n$ implies $g \in H$, see [10, Definition 46]. Note that the standard context of a finite lattice \mathbb{L} is always clarified and reduced [10, Proposition 12]. For a finite clarified context $\mathbb{K} = (G, M, I)$ and $G_1 \subseteq G$ and $M_1 \subseteq M$ there is always a smallest arrow-closed subcontext $\tilde{\mathbb{K}} = (H, N, I \cap (H \times N))$ of \mathbb{K} with $G_1 \subseteq H$ and $M_1 \subseteq N$. It can be obtained by constructing the directed graph $(G \dot{\cup} M, \nearrow \cup (\swarrow)^{-1})$ and considering the (not necessarily strongly) connected directed components $[x]$ of each $x \in G_1 \dot{\cup} M_1$. One then forms $\bigcup_{x \in G_1 \dot{\cup} M_1} [x]$, which can be written in a unique way as $H \dot{\cup} N$ with $H \subseteq G$ and $N \subseteq M$. In particular, starting from $G_1 = \{g\}$ and $M_1 = \emptyset$ with $g \in G$ (or dually from $G_1 = \emptyset$ and $M_1 = \{m\}$ with $m \in M$), we get the *one-generated arrow-closed subcontexts* of \mathbb{K} , cf. [10, Section 4.1]. Note that if the context \mathbb{K} is reduced, we may always concentrate on using either only objects or attributes for constructing all its one-generated arrow-closed subcontexts.

2.3. Integer partitions

Our aim is to study the arrow relations of the standard context of the lattice \mathcal{L}_n of positive integer partitions, which is formed by the sets $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. First, we define formally, what a partition and the dominance order is.

Definition 2.6. An (ordered) *partition* of a number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is an n -tuple $a := (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ of natural numbers such that

$$a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_n \geq 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad n = a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n.$$

If there is $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $a_k \geq 1$ and $a_i = 0$ for all $i > k$, we also allow for the partition a to be written in the form (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) , where we have deleted the zeros at the end.

For example, $(5, 4, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ is a partition of 11 because $5 \geq 4 \geq 1 \geq 0$ and $5 + 4 + 1 + 1 = 11$. By removing the trailing zeros we can represent it more compactly as $(5, 4, 1, 1)$. Graphically, we can illustrate a partition using a diagram drawn with small squares or ‘bricks’ arranged in a downward ladder shape (cf. Fig. 2), which is known as *Ferrers diagram* (usually Ferrers diagrams are drawn rotated clockwise by a 90 degrees angle, but the chosen presentation is more useful to us, cf. Definition 2.9). Given a partition a of n , one obtains the *conjugated* or *dual partition* a^* in the sense of [5] and [9] as $a^* = (a_1^*, \dots, a_n^*)$ where $a_i^* := |\{1 \leq j \leq n \mid a_j \geq i\}|$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The Ferrers diagram of a^* can be seen from the diagram of a by reading it by rows, from bottom to top. For instance, the partition $(5, 4, 1, 1)$ of $11 = 5 + 4 + 1 + 1$ has the Ferrers diagram shown in Fig. 2, and its conjugate consists of 4 bricks from the first row, 2 bricks from the second to fourth, and 1 brick from the fifth row. We thereby obtain the partition $(4, 2, 2, 2, 1)$; its Ferrers diagram is also depicted in Fig. 2.



Fig. 2: Ferrers diagrams. Left: of $g = (5, 4, 1, 1)$; right: of the conjugated (dual) partition $g^* = (4, 2, 2, 2, 1)$.

We denote the *set of all partitions* of an integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ by $\text{Part}(n)$. From the construction of the conjugate via the Ferrers diagram, it is easy to see that $(a^*)^* = a$ holds for every $a \in \text{Part}(n)$. Therefore, partition conjugation is an involutive permutation of $\text{Part}(n)$. One may order the set $\text{Part}(n)$ in different ways, for example, lexicographically, or pointwise. In this paper we are interested in the dominance order established by Brylawski [5].

Definition 2.7 ([5]). Let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ be two partitions of $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We define the *dominance order* between a and b by setting $a \geq b$ if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^j a_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^j b_i$ holds for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Brylawski showed in [5, Proposition 2.2] that the set $\text{Part}(n)$ forms a lattice under the dominance order; further arguments for this were given in [6, Chapter 3] and [9, Section 2]. We denote by \mathcal{L}_n the *lattice of all partitions* of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with the dominance order. It follows from [5, Proposition 2.8] that for partitions $a, b \in \mathcal{L}_n$ we have $a \leq b$ if and only if $a^* \geq b^*$, that is, partition conjugation is an order-antiautomorphism of \mathcal{L}_n , making \mathcal{L}_n is self-dual.

Brylawski in [5, Proposition 2.3] characterised precisely two possibilities for downward movement along the covering relation of \mathcal{L}_n . These were later given a more intuitive geometric interpretation as *transition rules* by Latapy and Phan [13, Fig. 2, p. 1358], which we are going to follow in this article. The subsequent definitions are required for this.


Definition 2.8 (cf. [13, p. 1358]). Let $n, j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq j < n$. The partition $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathcal{L}_n$ has

- (1) a *cliff* at j if $a_j - a_{j+1} \geq 2$;
- (2) a *slippery step* at j if there is $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2 \leq \ell \leq n - j$ and $a_j - 1 = a_{j+1} = \dots = a_{j+\ell-1} = a_{j+\ell} + 1$.


For example, the left Ferrers diagram in Fig. 2 has a cliff in the second position ($j = 2$) and its dual has a cliff at $j = 1$ and a slippery step (with $\ell = 2$) at $j = 4$.

Definition 2.9 (Transition rules, cf. [5, 13]). Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \in \mathcal{L}_n$.

- (1) If $a = (\dots, k + 1, k, \dots, k, k - 1, \dots)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq k < n$ has a slippery step, then the brick at the slippery step may slip across the step to give $\tilde{a} = (\dots, k, k, \dots, k, k, \dots)$. The subsequent illustration shows the application of such a transition to a slippery step at position j (with $i \geq j + 2$).



- (2) If $a = (\dots, k, k - h, \dots)$ for some $k, h \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2 \leq h \leq k \leq n$ has a cliff, then the brick may fall from the cliff to give $\tilde{a} = (\dots, k - 1, k - h + 1, \dots)$. Again, this is illustrated with a cliff of height 3 at position j .



Lemma 2.10 ([5, Proposition 2.3] and [13]). *The set of lower covers of a partition $g \in \mathcal{L}_n$ consists exactly of all partitions \tilde{g} that can be obtained from g by applying one of the two transition rules (1) or (2) described in Definition 2.9.*

Since the completely join-irreducible elements of \mathcal{L}_n have exactly one lower cover, according to Lemma 2.10, the partitions in $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ are precisely those to which exactly one of the transition rules (1) or (2) applies. Therefore, the \vee -irreducible partitions of n can be characterised as those that have exactly one cliff (and no slippery step) or exactly one slippery step (and no cliff). Based on this Brylawski [5] split the set $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ into four categories, extending this by conjugation to $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. To be able to express our results more compactly, in the following statement we have slightly modified the borders between the different types of irreducibles compared to [5], making them in particular disjoint.

Lemma 2.11 (cf. [5, Corollary 2.5]). *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the completely join-irreducible partitions of $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ can be categorised into four types where $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $d, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$:*

Type A: (k, k, \dots, k) for $k \geq 2$.

Type B: $(k, k, \dots, k, k-1, k-1, \dots, k-1)$ for $k \geq 2$, $b \geq 1$.

Type C: $(k, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$ for $k \geq 3$.

Type D: $(k+1, k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$ for $k \geq 3$, $b + \ell \geq 2$.

Also the \wedge -irreducible elements can be split into four groups where $c \in \mathbb{N}_+$:

Type I: (t, t, \dots, t) for $t \geq 1$, $c \geq 2$, i.e., t appears at least twice.

Type II: (t, t, \dots, t, r) for $t > r \geq 1$.

Type III: $(a, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$ for $a \geq 2$, $c \geq 2$, i.e., there are at least two 1s.

Type IV: (a, t, t, \dots, t, r) for $a > t > r \geq 0$, $t, c \geq 2$, i.e., $t \geq 2$ appears at least twice.

Observe that for each $(L, J) \in \{(A, J), (B, II), (C, III), (D, IV)\}$ we have that if $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ has type L , then g^* has type J , and if $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ has type J , then m^* has type L . Therefore, the pairs (L, J) of categories of completely irreducible elements of \mathcal{L}_n are completely dual to each other.

We mentioned that \mathcal{L}_n is a self-dual lattice under partition conjugation as involutive antiautomorphism, see [5, Proposition 2.8]. Using this fact we obtain the following simple but useful results to switch down and up-arrows.

Lemma 2.12. *Let $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ with duals g^* and m^* , respectively. Then it holds that*

$$g \swarrow m \iff m^* \nearrow g^*.$$

Proof. The proof is a routine calculation exploiting the involutive antiautomorphism $*$: $\mathcal{L}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_n$ and the duality of the involved concepts. \square

Similarly, one can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 2.13. *Let $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ with duals g^* and m^* , respectively. Then it holds that*

$$g \nearrow m \iff m^* \swarrow g^*.$$

Combining Lemma 2.12 and Lemma 2.13, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.14. *Let $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ with duals $g^* \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $m^* \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. Then it holds that*

$$g \nearrow^* m \iff m^* \swarrow^* g^*.$$




Fig. 3: Lattice \mathcal{L}_7 with all arrows. Up-arrows are shown with open arrow tips ending in \wedge -irreducibles, and down-arrows with filled arrow tips ending in \vee -irreducibles; single up-arrows are coloured green, single down-arrows red.

To obtain some familiarity with the completely irreducible elements of \mathcal{L}_n and the characterisations concerning the arrow relations given in Subsection 2.2, we consider the lattice \mathcal{L}_7 shown in Fig. 3.

Example 2.15. For $n = 7$ we have from Lemma 2.11, cf. also [9, Proposition 2], that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_7) &= \{(2, 1, \dots, 1), (2, 2, 1, 1, 1), (2, 2, 2, 1), (3, 1, \dots, 1), (3, 2, 2), (3, 3, 1), (4, 1, 1, 1), (4, 3), (5, 1, 1), (6, 1), (7)\}, \\ \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_7) &= \{(1, \dots, 1), (2, 1, \dots, 1), (2, 2, 2, 1), (3, 1, \dots, 1), (3, 2, 2), (3, 3, 1), (4, 1, 1, 1), (4, 3), (5, 1, 1), (5, 2), (6, 1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The standard context $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_7) = (\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_7), \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_7), \leq)$ is presented in Fig. 4. In both Fig. 4 and Fig. 3 we have indicated the arrow relations. Note that $n = 7$ is the first case where single arrows appear. In fact there is exactly one single up-arrow and one single down-arrow in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_7)$ (where the respective opposite arrow is not present). We shall investigate this in the case of the down-arrow $(4, 1, 1, 1) \checkmark (3, 2, 2)$, shown in red in Fig. 3. The green up-arrow can then be explained by self-duality of \mathcal{L}_7 using Lemma 2.13.

The partition $g := (4, 1, 1, 1)$ is completely join-irreducible of type **C**, while $m = (3, 2, 2)$ is completely meet-irreducible of type **IV**. To explain the down-arrow we shall use Proposition 2.5(a). Clearly, $g \not\leq m$ since the condition on the partial sums already fails with $4 \not\leq 3$ in the first position. The partition g has a single cliff in the first position, from which a brick may fall to obtain the unique lower cover $\tilde{g} = (3, 2, 1, 1)$, cf. transition rule (2) and Fig. 3. Indeed, the lattice diagram confirms that $\tilde{g} \leq m$, which can also be checked with Definition 2.7. Thus, by Proposition 2.5(a) we conclude $g \checkmark m$. Moreover, that this arrow is not a double arrow, can also be explained with the help of Proposition 2.5. Namely, the unique upper cover of m is $\tilde{m} = (3, 3, 1)$ since we may let the brick fall from the cliff in the second position of \tilde{m} to get m , cf. transition rule (2). Since $g \not\leq \tilde{m}$, we have $g \not\checkmark \tilde{m}$ by Proposition 2.5(b).

The fact that there is a *unique* up-arrow (and a unique down-arrow) in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_7)$ that fails to be a double arrow, and why non-double arrows appear for $n = 7$ for the first time, cannot be explained yet. This requires the characterisations in Sections 4 and 5.

$\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_7)$	1111111	211111	31111	2221	4111	322	331	511	43	52	61
7											↗
61										↗	×
511								×	↗	×	×
43								↗	×	×	×
4111					×	↘	↗	×	×	×	×
331					↗	↗	×	×	×	×	×
322					↗	×	×	×	×	×	×
31111			×	↗	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
2221			↗	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
22111		↗	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
211111	↗	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×

Fig. 4: Standard context $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_7) = (\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_7), \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_7), \leq)$ with arrow relations shown.

3. General facts concerning the dominance order of integer partitions

We start with a lemma giving a simple sufficient condition for the dominance order among partitions.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $n, j, k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $j, k, m \leq n$ and let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_k, 0, \dots), b = (b_1, \dots, b_m, 0, \dots) \in \mathcal{L}_n$. If $s := \sum_{i=1}^j a_i = \sum_{i=1}^j b_i$ and $a_i \geq b_i$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $2 \leq i \leq j$, while $a_i \leq b_i$ for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ with $j < i < m$, then $a \leq b$.*

Proof. Let $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. If $l \leq j$, then we have $\sum_{i=1}^l a_i = s - \sum_{i=l+1}^j a_i \leq s - \sum_{i=l+1}^j b_i = \sum_{i=1}^l b_i$ since $b_i \leq a_i$ for $2 \leq l+1 \leq i \leq j$. Let now $l > j$. If $l < m$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^l a_i = s + \sum_{i=j+1}^l a_i \leq s + \sum_{i=j+1}^l b_i = \sum_{i=1}^l b_i$ since $a_i \leq b_i$ for $j < i \leq l < m$. Otherwise, $m \leq l \leq n$, and then we have $\sum_{i=1}^l a_i \leq n = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i = \sum_{i=1}^l b_i$ as $a, b \in \mathcal{L}_n$. \square

As an easy corollary we have the situation where b is not longer than a and lies pointwise above a .

Corollary 3.2. *Let $n, k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_k), b = (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \mathcal{L}_n$. If $a_i \leq b_i$ for all $1 \leq i < m$, then $a \leq b$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 3.1 for $j = 0$ and $s = \sum_{i \in \emptyset} a_i = 0 = \sum_{i \in \emptyset} b_i$. \square

We may also have the somewhat opposite situation.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $n, k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $a = (a_1, \dots, a_k), b = (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \mathcal{L}_n$. If $a_i \geq b_i$ for all $2 \leq i \leq m$, then $a \leq b$.*

Proof. For $2 \leq i \leq m$ we have $a_i \geq b_i$; for $m < i \leq n$ we have $a_i \geq 0 = b_i$. Hence $a_i \geq b_i$ holds for all $2 \leq i \leq n$. Thus we can apply Lemma 3.1 with $j = n$ and $s = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i = n = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$ to get $a \leq b$. \square

We now introduce two natural geometric parameters of partitions.

Definition 3.4. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p = (p_1, p_2, \dots) \in \mathcal{L}_n$.

- (a) The *height* of p is the value of its first entry, that is, $\text{ht}(p) := p_1$.
- (b) For $h \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $\mathcal{H}_n(h) := \{p \in \mathcal{L}_n \mid \text{ht}(p) \leq h\}$ to be the set of partitions of height at most h .
- (c) The *length*, synonymously *width*, of p is the value of the first index $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p_{j+1} = 0$, that is to say, $\text{len}(p) := \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid p_{j+1} = 0\}$.
- (d) For $w \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $\mathcal{W}_n(w) := \{p \in \mathcal{L}_n \mid \text{len}(p) \leq w\}$ to be the set of partitions of length (width) at most w .

Lemma 3.5. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ the length of $p \in \mathcal{L}_n$ is the value of the largest index $j \geq 1$ where $p_j \geq 1$, that is, $\text{len}(p) = \max\{j \in \mathbb{N}_+ \mid p_j > 0\}$.*

Proof. For $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ we have $p_1 = \text{ht}(p) \geq 1$, thus the maximum $w := \max\{j \in \mathbb{N}_+ \mid p_j > 0\}$ exists. We have $p_w > 0$, but, by maximality, $p_{w+1} = 0$. By antitonicity of p we have $p_j \geq p_w > 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq w$, thus w is the first index where $p_{w+1} = 0$. Hence $\text{len}(p) = w$. \square

Lemma 3.6. For $n, w \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\mathcal{W}_n(w) = \{p \in \mathcal{L}_n \mid p_{w+1} = 0\}$.

Proof. Let $p \in \mathcal{L}_n$ and $w \in \mathbb{N}$. If $p_{w+1} = 0$, then the minimality in the definition of length implies $\text{len}(p) \leq w$, thus $p \in \mathcal{W}_n(w)$. Conversely, if $j := \text{len}(p) \leq w$, then $0 = p_{j+1} \geq p_{w+1} \geq 0$ by the antitonicity of p . \square

For parameter values at least n the concept of bounded height or width trivialises.

Lemma 3.7. For $n, h \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $h \geq n$, we have $\mathcal{H}_n(h) = \mathcal{W}_n(h) = \mathcal{L}_n$.

Proof. For every $p \in \mathcal{L}_n$ we have $\text{ht}(p) = p_1 \leq n \leq h$, thus $p \in \mathcal{H}_n(h)$. If $p_{h+1} > 0$, then for every $1 \leq j \leq h+1$ we would have $p_j \geq p_{h+1} \geq 1$, thus $n \geq \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} p_j \geq \sum_{j=1}^{h+1} 1 = h+1 \geq n+1$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $p_{h+1} = 0$ and $p \in \mathcal{W}_n(h)$ by Lemma 3.6. \square

In a similar fashion, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we have $\mathcal{H}_n(0) = \mathcal{W}_n(0) = \emptyset$ since $p_1 = 0$ implies $p = (0, 0, \dots)$ and thus $n = 0$. Therefore, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ we may safely restrict our attention to parameter values $1 \leq h \leq n$ to bound the height or width of a partition, which is, of course, clear from the geometric intuition via the Ferrers diagrams.

It is useful to observe that height and width are dual concepts with respect to partition conjugation.

Lemma 3.8. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in \mathcal{L}_n$ we have $\text{ht}(p^*) = \text{len}(p)$ and $\text{len}(p^*) = \text{ht}(p)$. Moreover, for $w \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $p \in \mathcal{W}_n(w)$ exactly if $p^* \in \mathcal{H}_n(w)$.

Proof. Let $w := \text{len}(p)$ such that $p = (p_1, \dots, p_w)$ with $p_j \geq 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq w$. From the definition of the conjugate we infer that the first entry of p^* is w , hence $\text{ht}(p^*) = w = \text{len}(p)$. The second equality follows from $\text{ht}(p^*) = \text{len}(p)$ since $p^{**} = p$. Finally, for $w \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $p \in \mathcal{W}_n(w)$ if and only if $\text{ht}(p^*) = \text{len}(p) \leq w$, i.e., if and only if $p^* \in \mathcal{H}_n(w)$. \square

We may also observe a basic necessary condition following from the dominance order: the dominated partition is always at least as long as the dominating one.

Lemma 3.9. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a, b \in \mathcal{L}_n$. If $\text{len}(a) < \text{len}(b)$, then $a \not\leq b$.

Proof. Assume $l := \text{len}(a) < w := \text{len}(b)$. Then $a_{l+1} = 0$ and $n = \sum_{i=1}^l a_i$. Since $l < w$ we have $l+1 \leq w$, whence $b_{l+1} \geq b_w \geq 1$. Thus $\sum_{i=1}^l b_i < \sum_{i=1}^{l+1} b_i \leq n = \sum_{i=1}^l a_i$, demonstrating $a \not\leq b$. \square

The following lemma describes the largest partition of a given least length ℓ .

Lemma 3.10. Let $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq \ell \geq 1$, let $p \in \mathcal{L}_n$ and set $m := (n - (\ell - 1), 1, \dots, 1)$. If $\text{len}(p) \geq \ell$, then $p \leq m$; if $\text{len}(p) < \ell$, then $p \not\leq m$.

Proof. Take $p \in \mathcal{L}_n$ with $\text{len}(p) \geq \ell$, that is, $p = (p_1, \dots, p_\ell, \dots)$ with $p_i \geq p_\ell \geq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. Thus, for $2 \leq i \leq \ell$ we have $m_i = 1 \leq p_i$, hence $p \leq m$ by Corollary 3.3. Furthermore, if p is shorter than m , then $p \not\leq m$ by Lemma 3.9. \square

There is also a second largest partition of a given least length ℓ .

Corollary 3.11. Let $n, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $2 \leq \ell, n - \ell$. Then $m = (n - (\ell - 1), 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **C** and has $\tilde{m} = (n - \ell, 2, 1, \dots, 1)$ as its unique lower cover (the part $1, \dots, 1$ appearing as of $\ell \geq 3$); moreover any $p \in \mathcal{L}_n \setminus \{m\}$ with $\text{len}(p) \geq \ell$ satisfies $p \leq \tilde{m}$.

Proof. Since $n - (\ell - 1) \geq 3$ and $\ell \geq 2$, we see that m is of type **C**, and we can obtain the unique lower cover \tilde{m} by applying transition rule (2) to the cliff in the first position of m . If $p \in \mathcal{L}_n$ has length $\text{len}(p) \geq \ell$, then $p \leq m$ by Lemma 3.10. If we additionally assume $p \neq m$, then $p < m$ and thus $p \leq \tilde{m}$, for \tilde{m} is the unique lower cover of m . \square

We can also identify a largest partition with a given height bound.

Lemma 3.12. Let $n, h \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $h \leq n$ and factorise $n = wh + r$ where $r, w \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq r < h$. Then $w \geq 1$ and every $p \in \mathcal{H}_n(h)$ satisfies $p \leq m := (h, \dots, h, r) \in \mathcal{H}_n(h)$.

Proof. Since $n = wh + r$, we have $m \in \mathcal{L}_n$. If $w = 0$, then $n = r < h \leq n$; thus $w \geq 1$ and therefore $\text{ht}(m) = h$, i.e., $m \in \mathcal{H}_n(h)$. By antitonicity, for each $1 \leq i \leq w$ we have $p_i \leq p_1 = \text{ht}(p) \leq h = m_i$, hence $p \leq m$ by Corollary 3.2. \square

By duality we have a least partition of a given bounded width.

Lemma 3.13. *Let $n, w \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $w \leq n$ and factorise $n = \kappa w + b$ where $\kappa, b \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq b < w$. Then $\kappa \geq 1$ and every $p \in \mathcal{W}_n(w)$ satisfies $p \geq g = (\kappa + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{\kappa + 1}, \kappa, \dots, \overset{w}{\kappa})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.8, for $p \in \mathcal{L}_n$ we have $p \in \mathcal{W}_n(w)$ if and only if $p^* \in \mathcal{H}_n(w)$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.12, we obtain $p^* \leq m = (w, \dots, \overset{\kappa}{w}, b)$, and since conjugation is an involutive antiautomorphism of \mathcal{L}_n , this inequality implies $p = p^{**} \geq m^* = (\kappa + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{\kappa + 1}, \kappa, \dots, \overset{w}{\kappa}) = g$. \square

Corollary 3.14. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and set $n := b(k + 1) + \ell k$. The least partition in $\mathcal{W}_n(b + \ell)$ has the form $g = (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b + \ell}{k})$. If $b + \ell < n$, then $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type A and $k \geq 2$, or g is of type B.*

Proof. We set $w := b + \ell \geq 1$. Since $k \geq 1$ we have $n = b(k + 1) + \ell k \geq b + \ell = w$, moreover $n = b + (b + \ell)k = b + wk$. Since $0 \leq b < b + \ell = w$, this provides the factorisation of n modulo w , whence Lemma 3.13 shows that the least element of $\mathcal{W}_n(w)$ is $g = (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b + \ell}{k})$. Furthermore, if $b \geq 1$, then $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type B. If otherwise $b = 0$, then $\ell = b + \ell < n = \ell k$ implies $k > 1$, i.e., $k \geq 2$. Therefore, $g = (k, \dots, \overset{\ell}{k})$ is of type A. \square

4. Description of the double arrow relation in the standard context $(\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n), \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n), \leq)$.

It is our aim to describe the arrow relations of the standard context $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. To do this, we start by giving a complete characterisation of all arrow relations of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_7)$. To this end we present the following lemmata, which are true for \mathcal{L}_n in general. The first lemma is quite elementary, but useful, as it describes the top part of \mathcal{L}_n .

Lemma 4.1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n \geq 2$.*

- (a) *Then $(n) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $(n - 1, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is its unique lower cover.*
- (b) *If $n \geq 3$, then $(n - 1, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n) \cap \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$.*
- (c) *If $n \geq 4$, then $(n - 2, 2) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is the unique lower cover of $(n - 1, 1)$. Hence the top part of \mathcal{L}_n has the shape depicted in Fig. 5.*




Fig. 5: Chain at the top of \mathcal{L}_n for $n \geq 4$; edges denote the covering relation.

Proof. The top partition (n) is completely join-irreducible, since $n \geq 2$ ensures that it is of type A. Letting a brick fall from the cliff, we obtain via transition rule (2) its unique lower cover $(n - 1, 1)$. The latter partition is completely meet-irreducible, for it is of type I when $n = 2$ and of type II if $n \geq 3$. This shows part (a).

Let us now assume that $n \geq 3$. If $n = 3$, then $(n - 1, 1)$ is completely join-irreducible of type B; moreover, it is of type C when $n \geq 4$. Part (b) has been demonstrated.

Finally let us impose $n \geq 4$. By applying transition rule (2), that is, by letting a brick fall from the cliff in the first position of $(n - 1, 1)$, we obtain $(n - 2, 2)$ as its lower cover, which is unique by (b). Moreover, $(n - 2, 2)$ is completely meet-irreducible of type I if $n = 4$ and of type II if $n \geq 5$. \square

Lemma 4.2. *For $n \geq 2$, we have $g = (n) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, $m = (n - 1, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, and $g \not\prec m$ in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$.*

Proof. From Lemma 4.1(a), we have $g = (n) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, $m = (n-1, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, and clearly $\tilde{g} = m$ is the unique lower cover of g and $\tilde{m} = g$ is the unique upper cover of m . Since $g \not\leq m$, Proposition 2.5 directly implies $g \nearrow m$. \square

Lemma 4.3. *For $n \geq 4$ we have $g = (n-1, 1) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, $m = (n-2, 2) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, and $g \nearrow m$ in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$.*

Proof. As $n \geq 4$, we know from Lemma 4.1 that $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n) \cap \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, having $\tilde{g} := m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ as its unique lower cover. At the same time $\tilde{m} = g$ is thus the (unique) upper cover of m . Since $g \not\leq m$, Proposition 2.5 directly yields $g \nearrow m$. \square

Applying Corollary 2.14 to Lemmata 4.2 and 4.3, respectively, we obtain two additional double arrows in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$.

Lemma 4.4. *In the standard context $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of \mathcal{L}_n the following facts hold:*

- (a) *For $n \geq 2$ we have $g = (2, 1, \dots, \overset{n-1}{1}) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, $m = (1, 1, \dots, \overset{n}{1}) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, and $g \nearrow m$.*
- (b) *For $n \geq 4$ we have $g = (2, 2, 1, \dots, \overset{n-2}{1}) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, $m = (2, 1, \dots, \overset{n-1}{1}) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, and $g \nearrow m$.*

Proof. To prove the first statement, let $g = (2, 1, \dots, \overset{n-1}{1})$ and $m = (1, 1, \dots, \overset{n}{1})$. Then $m^* = (n)$ and $g^* = (n-1, 1)$. From Lemma 4.2, we infer that $m^* \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, $g^* \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $m^* \nearrow g^*$. Applying Corollary 2.14 to the latter expression, we obtain $g \nearrow m$, as required; moreover, using partition conjugation, it follows that $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. Similarly, combining Corollary 2.14 with Lemma 4.3, one can prove the second statement. \square

Lemma 4.5. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$; set $n = 2b + d$. Then we have $g = (2, \dots, \overset{b}{2}, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1}) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type A if $d = 0$ and of type B if $d \geq 1$. Its unique lower cover is $\tilde{g} = (2, \dots, \overset{b-1}{2}, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1}, 1)$.*

Proof. If $d = 0$, then g is of type A and has got a unique cliff at position b , from which a brick may fall and produce $\tilde{g} = (2, \dots, \overset{b-1}{2}, 1, 1)$, see transition rule (2). If $d \geq 1$, then g has got no cliffs but a unique slippery step at position b . Therefore its unique lower cover is obtained by applying transition rule (1) to g , that is, by letting a brick slip across the step at position b to obtain $\tilde{g} = (2, \dots, \overset{b}{2}, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1}, 1)$. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let $b, d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $b \geq 2$; set $n := 2b + d$. Then we have $m = (b, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1}, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type III, having $\tilde{m} = (b, 2, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1})$ as its unique upper cover, where the part $1, \dots, 1$ only appears for $b + d \geq 3$, that is, $d \geq 1$, or $d = 0$ and $b \geq 3$.*

Proof. As $b \geq 2$, we have $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type III. Since partition conjugation is an order-antiautomorphism of \mathcal{L}_n , the unique upper cover of m can be obtained by conjugating the unique lower cover of $m^* = (b+d+1, 1, 1, \dots, \overset{b}{1}) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. Since $b \geq 2$, the join-irreducible m^* has got a unique cliff in its first position and no slippery step. Applying transition rule (2), we obtain its lower cover $(b+d, 2, 1, \dots, \overset{b}{1})$, which we can conjugate to obtain $\tilde{m} = (b, 2, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1})$, the unique upper cover of m . Knowing that there is a unique upper cover \tilde{m} of m from $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, the fact that \tilde{m} looks as given before can also be verified by checking that m is a lower cover of \tilde{m} . Indeed, by simply applying transition rule (1) to the slippery step in the second position of \tilde{m} when $b + d \geq 3$, or by applying transition rule (2) to the cliff in the second position of $\tilde{m} = (b, 2) = (2, 2)$ when $d = 0$ and $b = 2$, we see that we get m . \square

Lemma 4.7. *Let $b, d \in \mathbb{N}$, $b \geq 2$, and set $n := 2b + d$. Then, for $g := (2, \dots, \overset{b}{2}, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1})$ and $m := (b, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1}, 1)$ we have $g \nearrow m$; moreover, $m^* = (d+b+1, 1, \dots, \overset{b}{1}) \nearrow g^* = (d+b, b)$.*

Proof. Clearly, the statement about m^* and g^* will follow from the one about g and m by Corollary 2.14. We therefore let $n = 2b + d$ with $b \geq 2$, $d \geq 0$ and consider g and m . We have that $g \not\leq m$ because the partial sums up to index b exhibit the relation $2b > 2b - 1 = b + b - 1$. From Lemma 4.5 we know that $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ has the unique lower cover $\tilde{g} = (2, \dots, \overset{b-1}{2}, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1}, 1)$; from Lemma 4.6 we infer that $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ has the unique upper cover $\tilde{m} = (b, 2, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1})$.

First we prove that $g \nearrow m$. We shall verify that $g \leq \tilde{m}$ by comparing the sequences of partial sums. For the sum up to the index $j = 1$ we have $2 \leq b$ by hypothesis. The sequence of partial sums of \tilde{m} continues after b with the terms $(\min(b+j, n))_{j \geq 2}$. If $2 \leq j \leq b$, then the partial sum of g up to index j yields $2j = j + j \leq j + b$ since $j \leq b$. For indices $j \geq b$ both partial sums coincide with the value $j + b$, until they reach the common maximum n . Hence $\tilde{m} \geq g$, and thus we may rely on Proposition 2.5(b) to show that $g \nearrow m$.

Our next goal is to demonstrate that $g \not\leftarrow m$. For this we first show that $\tilde{g} \leq m$ by comparing the sequences of partial sums. For m we obtain the sequence $(\min(n, b-1+j))_{j \geq 1}$, while for \tilde{g} it begins with $(2j)_{1 \leq j < b}$ and then continues with $(\min(n, b-1+j))_{j \geq b}$. For $1 \leq j \leq b-1$ we have $2j = j + j \leq b-1+j$, and for indices $j \geq b$ both sequences coincide. Thus we have established $\tilde{g} \leq m$, and hence Proposition 2.5(a) yields $g \not\leftarrow m$. \square

Corollary 4.8. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $b \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and set $n := 2b + d$. Under these assumptions we have the two double arrow relations $g = (2, \dots, \overset{b}{2}, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d}{1}) \not\leftarrow m = (b, 1, \dots, \overset{b+d+1}{1})$ and $m^* = (b+d+1, 1, \dots, \overset{b}{1}) \not\leftarrow g^* = (b+d, b)$.*

Proof. If $b = 1$, the first statement follows from Lemma 4.4(a), while for $b \geq 2$ it follows from Lemma 4.7. The second statement follows by dualisation via Corollary 2.14. \square

Fig. 4 shows the arrow relations of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_7)$. Using Lemmata 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4, one can verify some of those:

$$\begin{array}{llll} (7) \not\leftarrow (6, 1) & \text{by Lemma 4.2} & (6, 1) \not\leftarrow (5, 2) & \text{by Lemma 4.3} \\ (2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) \not\leftarrow (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) & \text{by Lemma 4.4} & (2, 2, 1, 1, 1) \not\leftarrow (2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) & \text{by Lemma 4.4} \end{array}$$

All remaining double arrows of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_7)$ will be collected in the following remark, whose proof will illustrate several similar cases. In subsequent sections we introduce parameters to prove general statements and avoid such repetitions.

Remark 4.9. We consider Fig. 3 and the context given in Fig. 4. The first double arrow $(2, 2, 2, 1) \not\leftarrow (3, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ and its dual $(5, 1, 1) \not\leftarrow (4, 3)$ are confirmed by Lemma 4.7 for $b = 3$ and $d = 1$. It remains to verify

$$\begin{array}{lll} \text{a) } (3, 1, 1, 1, 1) \not\leftarrow (2, 2, 2, 1) & \text{b) } (4, 1, 1, 1) \not\leftarrow (3, 3, 1) & \text{c) } (3, 3, 1) \not\leftarrow (3, 2, 2) \\ (4, 3) \not\leftarrow (5, 1, 1) & (3, 2, 2) \not\leftarrow (4, 1, 1, 1) & \end{array}$$

Proof. First, we verify a). Using the definition or inspecting Fig. 4, we get $g := (3, 1, 1, 1, 1) \not\leftarrow m := (2, 2, 2, 1)$. Clearly, we have $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_7)$ of type C and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_7)$ of type II. Applying transition rule (2), the unique lower cover of g is $\tilde{g} = (2, 2, 1, 1, 1)$, which lies below m . Hence Proposition 2.5(a) entails $g \not\leftarrow m$. To prove the relation $g \nearrow m$, we note that the unique upper cover of m is $\tilde{m} = (3, 2, 1, 1)$, which is the conjugate of the unique lower cover of $m^* = (4, 3)$, as explained in the proof of Lemma 4.6. Using the definition or inspecting Fig. 3, we observe $g \leq \tilde{m}$. Then, as $g \not\leftarrow m$, Proposition 2.5(b) entails $g \nearrow m$. We conclude that $g \nearrow m$. Furthermore, since $m^* = (4, 3)$ and $g^* = (5, 1, 1)$, Corollary 2.14 gives the second double arrow in a), namely $(4, 3) \not\leftarrow (5, 1, 1)$.

Next, we verify b). We repeat the arguments of a) and get $g := (4, 1, 1, 1) \not\leftarrow m := (3, 3, 1)$ with $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_7)$ of type C and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_7)$ of type II. Applying the same transition rules yields the unique lower cover $\tilde{g} = (3, 2, 1, 1)$ and the unique upper cover $\tilde{m} = (4, 2, 1)$. Also, the definition or inspecting Fig. 3 gives $g \leq \tilde{m}$ and $\tilde{g} \leq m$. Therefore, since $g \not\leftarrow m$, Proposition 2.5 confirms $g \nearrow m$. Furthermore, since $m^* = (3, 2, 2)$ and $g^* = (4, 1, 1, 1)$, Corollary 2.14 gives the second double arrow in b), namely $(3, 2, 2) \not\leftarrow (4, 1, 1, 1)$.

Finally, to prove $g := (3, 3, 1) \not\leftarrow m := (3, 2, 2)$, observe that $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_7)$ of type D and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_7)$ of type IV. Since $g_1 + g_2 = 6 > m_1 + m_2$, we get $g \not\leftarrow m$. Furthermore, the unique lower cover $\tilde{g} = (3, 2, 2)$ of g is obtained by applying transition rule (2). This gives both $\tilde{g} = m$ and $g = \tilde{m}$ where \tilde{m} is the unique upper cover of m . We conclude that $g \not\leftarrow m$, $\tilde{g} \leq m$ and $g \leq \tilde{m}$, wherefore Proposition 2.5 entails $g \nearrow m$. \square

4.1. Double arrows involving completely join-irreducibles of type A or B

The subsequent theorem exhibits the following one-to-one relation: For every $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type A or B there is exactly one $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ such that $g \nearrow m$. This unique m has the form $m = (a, 1, \dots, 1)$ and for each m of this shape there is exactly one $p \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type A or B such that $p \not\leftarrow m$, namely $p = g$.

Theorem 4.10. Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell, n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that $b + \ell < n = b(k + 1) + \ell k$ and set $a = n - b - \ell$. Then $g = (k + 1, \dots, k + 1, k, \dots, k) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **A** for $b = 0$ and of type **B** for $b \geq 1$, $m = (a, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, and $g \not\prec m$.

Moreover, the previously described m are the only $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ satisfying $g \not\prec m$ for given $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **A** or **B**.

Proof. First, we consider the cases $b + \ell = 1$ and $k = 1$ individually. If $b + \ell = 1$, then we get $\ell = 1$, $b = 0$, hence $1 = b + \ell < n = k$ (since $b = 0$), and thus $g = (k) = (n)$ is of type **A** and $m = (n - 1, 1)$. Hence the case $b + \ell = 1$ was proved in Lemma 4.2. Moreover, if $k = 1$, then $0 < n - b - \ell = b$, i.e., $b \geq 1$, and g is of type **B**, wherefore this case was proved in Corollary 4.8.

Accordingly, it remains to show the statement for $k \geq 2$ and $b + \ell \geq 2$. Then, as $k \geq 2$, we have $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ because it is completely join-irreducible of type **A** (for $b = 0$) and of type **B** (for $b \geq 1$). Moreover, $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **III** as $a = n - b - \ell = b(k + 1) + \ell k - b - \ell \geq 3b + 2\ell - b - \ell = b + b + \ell \geq 2$ due to $k \geq 2$ and $b + \ell \geq 2$. Since g is ‘shorter’ than m , Lemma 3.9 asserts $g \not\prec m$.

The unique lower cover of g is $\tilde{g} = (k + 1, \dots, k + 1, k, \dots, k, k - 1, 1)$, where the middle part k, \dots, k only appears for $\ell \geq 2$. The partition \tilde{g} is obtained by letting a brick fall from the cliff in the last position of g (transition rule (2)).

The unique upper cover of m is $\tilde{m} = (a, 2, 1, \dots, 1)$, where, to obtain m , we can let a brick fall from the cliff in the second position if $b + \ell = 2$, or let a brick slip across the slippery step if $b + \ell \geq 3$ and the part $1, \dots, 1$ is present. We shall prove that $\tilde{g} \leq m$ and $g \leq \tilde{m}$; then Proposition 2.5 will entail $g \not\prec m$. By Lemma 3.10, m is the largest partition of length $b + \ell + 1 = \text{len}(\tilde{g})$; hence $\tilde{g} \leq m$. By Corollary 3.11, \tilde{m} is the second largest partition of length $b + \ell = \text{len}(g)$, while, according to Lemma 3.10, $p := (n - (b + \ell - 1), 1, \dots, 1)$ is the largest. Since $k \geq 2 > 1$ we have $g \neq p$; hence $g \leq \tilde{m}$.

That there are no other $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ in relation $g \not\prec m$ with g of type **A** or **B** will be proved in the subsequent lemmata, the proof being concluded with Corollary 4.16. \square

Lemma 4.11. Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell, n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that $b + \ell < n = b(k + 1) + \ell k$ and set $g := (k + 1, \dots, k + 1, k, \dots, k)$. If $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ satisfies $g \not\prec m$, then $\text{len}(m) = b + \ell + 1$ and the final entry of m is $m_{b+\ell+1} = 1$.

Proof. Under the given conditions, g is completely join-irreducible of type **A** or **B**, see Corollary 3.14. Let us assume that $g \not\prec m$ with $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. If $\text{len}(m) \leq b + \ell$, then $m \in \mathcal{W}_n(b + \ell)$, and thus Corollary 3.14 shows that $g \leq m$, in contradiction to $g \not\prec m$. Therefore, $\text{len}(m) \geq b + \ell + 1$. The unique lower cover \tilde{g} of g satisfies $\text{len}(\tilde{g}) = b + \ell + 1$. By Proposition 2.5(a), our assumption $g \not\prec m$ entails $\tilde{g} \leq m$, wherefore $\text{len}(\tilde{g}) < \text{len}(m)$ is impossible by Lemma 3.9. Consequently, we conclude $\text{len}(m) \leq \text{len}(\tilde{g}) = b + \ell + 1$ and hence $\text{len}(m) = \text{len}(\tilde{g}) = b + \ell + 1$, which also yields $m_{b+\ell+1} \geq 1$. Moreover, we have $n - 1 = \sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell} \tilde{g}_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell} m_i = n - m_{b+\ell+1}$ due to $\tilde{g} \leq m$ and $\tilde{g}_{b+\ell+1} = 1$; thus $m_{b+\ell+1} \leq 1$, and therefore $m_{b+\ell+1} = 1$. \square

Lemma 4.12. Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell, n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that $b + \ell < n = b(k + 1) + \ell k$ and set $g := (k + 1, \dots, k + 1, k, \dots, k)$. If $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **I**, **II** or **III** and satisfies $g \not\prec m$, then m is of the form as described in Theorem 4.10.

Proof. We assume that the given g and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ satisfy $g \not\prec m$. From Lemma 4.11 we know that $\text{len}(m) = b + \ell + 1$ and that $m_{b+\ell+1} = 1$. If m is of type **I**, **III**, or **II** with $\text{len}(m) = 2$, then m is of the form $m = (a, 1, \dots, 1)$ with $a \geq 1$. Since its total sum amounts to $n = a + (b + \ell)$, we have $a = n - b - \ell$ and m is exactly of the form described in Theorem 4.10.

Finally, let us consider the case that m is of type **II** with $\text{len}(m) \geq 3$ and m has the form $m = (\kappa, \dots, \kappa, 1)$ where $b + \ell \geq 2$ and $\kappa \geq 2$. Thus, if $k = 1$, then $g \leq m$ by Corollary 3.2, which contradicts $g \not\prec m$. Therefore, we know that $k \geq 2$. Hence the unique lower cover \tilde{g} of g is obtained by letting a brick fall from the cliff in position $b + \ell \geq 2$, and thus $\tilde{g} = (k + 1, \dots, k + 1, k, \dots, k, k - 1, 1)$ with its first entry satisfying $\tilde{g}_1 \geq k$. Now $g \not\prec m$ and Proposition 2.5(a) entail $\tilde{g} \leq m$, hence $k \leq \tilde{g}_1 \leq m_1 = \kappa$. Using this, we can finally estimate $\sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell-1} m_i = n - \kappa - 1 \leq n - k - 1 < n - k = \sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell-1} \tilde{g}_i$, which implies the contradiction $\tilde{g} \not\leq m$. Therefore, the third case, where m is of type **II** with $\text{len}(m) \geq 3$, is impossible and the lemma has been shown. \square

Corollary 4.13. *Partitions $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **B** are not arrow-related to any $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **II**.*

Proof. First, we prove that g of type **B**, m of type **II** and $g \not\prec m$ is impossible. Note that any arrow relation for $g = (k+1, \dots, \overset{b}{k+1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k})$ of type **B** requires $\text{len}(m) > \text{len}(g) = b + \ell$, because otherwise Corollary 3.14 yields $m \in \mathcal{W}_n(b + \ell)$ and $g \leq m$, which by Proposition 2.5 prevents any arrow. Therefore, we have $\text{len}(g) \geq 2$ and thus $\text{len}(m) \geq 3$. The proof of Lemma 4.12 confirms that a relation $g \not\prec m$ with m of type **II** with $\text{len}(m) \geq 3$ is impossible.

Finally, if g of type **B** and m of type **II** were such that $g \succ m$, then the conjugates m^* of type **B** and g^* of type **II** would satisfy $m^* \not\prec g^*$ by Lemma 2.13, but this is impossible as shown before. \square

The following simple observation will be used more than once.

Lemma 4.14. *Let $a, t, r, c \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $a > t > r \geq 0$ and $c \geq 2$ and set $n := a + ct + r$. In \mathcal{L}_n we have the covering relation $m := (a, t, \dots, \overset{c+1}{t}, r) < \tilde{m} := (a, t+1, t, \dots, \overset{c+1}{t}, t-1, r)$. Furthermore, \tilde{m} is the unique upper cover of m .*

Proof. If $c = 2$, we apply transition rule (2) to the cliff in the second position of $\tilde{m} = (a, t+1, t-1, r)$, yielding $m = (a, t, t, r)$. If $c \geq 3$, we apply rule (1) to the slippery step in the second position of $\tilde{m} = (a, t+1, t, \dots, t, t-1, r)$. In both cases the result is m , and thus Lemma 2.10 yields $m < \tilde{m}$. Moreover, m is completely meet-irreducible of type **III** (if $t = 1$) and **IV** (if $t \geq 2$), wherefore \tilde{m} is the unique upper cover. \square

Lemma 4.15. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell, n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that $b + \ell < n = b(k+1) + \ell k$ and set $g := (k+1, \dots, \overset{b}{k+1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k})$. If $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **IV** and satisfies $g \not\prec m$, then $g \not\succeq m$ fails.*

Proof. We assume that $m = (a, t, \dots, t, r)$ of type **IV** satisfies $g \not\prec m$. Then Lemma 4.11 implies that $\text{len}(m) = b + \ell + 1$ and that the last non-zero entry of m equals 1. Hence if $r = 0$, then $t = 1$, which is forbidden for m of type **IV**; we therefore know $r \geq 1$ and actually $r = 1$ by Lemma 4.11. We thus have $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{t}, 1)$ with $b + \ell \geq 3$ and $a > t \geq 2$. By Lemma 4.14, the unique upper cover of m is $\tilde{m} = (a, t+1, t, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{t}, t-1, 1)$, where the part t, \dots, t appears as of $b + \ell \geq 4$. Since $\text{len}(g) = b + \ell < b + \ell + 1 = \text{len}(\tilde{m})$, we have $g \not\prec \tilde{m}$ by Lemma 3.9. According to Proposition 2.5(b), this renders $g \not\succeq m$ impossible. \square

The following result shows that Theorem 4.10 indeed describes all double arrows $g \not\succeq m$ involving partitions g of type **A** or **B**.

Corollary 4.16. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell, n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that $b + \ell < n = b(k+1) + \ell k$ and set $g := (k+1, \dots, \overset{b}{k+1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k})$. Every $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ in relation $g \not\succeq m$ is of the form described in Theorem 4.10.*

Proof. Under the assumption $g \not\succeq m$, Lemma 4.15 implies that m is not of type **IV**. Therefore, it is of type **I–III**, and Lemma 4.12 establishes the desired claim. \square

4.2. Double arrows involving completely join-irreducibles of type **C**

The following result exhibits further one-to-one double arrows $g \not\succeq m$, originating from any $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **C**, and covering two exceptional cases. These are (n) and $(2, 1, \dots, 1)$, which are also discussed in Theorem 4.10.

Theorem 4.17. *Let $n, k, t, r \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $2 \leq k \leq n$ and $n = t(k-1) + r$ where $0 \leq r \leq k-2$. We have $t \geq 1$, $g = (k, 1, \dots, \overset{n-k+1}{1}) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, $m = (k-1, \dots, \overset{t}{k-1}, r) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $g \not\succeq m$.*

*Moreover, if $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **C**, $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $g \not\succeq m$ holds, then m must be of the shape as described before.*

Proof. The proof of $g \not\succeq m$ relies on showing $m^* \not\succeq g^*$ and then applying Corollary 2.14. The conjugate of m is $m^* = (t+1, \dots, \overset{r}{t+1}, t, \dots, \overset{k-1}{t})$, the one of g is $g^* = (n - (k-1), 1, \dots, \overset{k}{1})$. We infer that $t \geq 1$, for otherwise $n = t(k-1) + r = r \leq k-2 \leq n-2$. As $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell = k-1-r \geq 1$ and $k-1 \leq n-1 < n$, we can apply Theorem 4.10 to infer $m^* \not\succeq g^*$.

To show, for $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **C** that there are no other double arrows will require a series of little results, being complete with Corollary 4.22. \square

Lemma 4.18. Let $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $2 \leq k \leq n$ and set $g := (k, 1, \dots, \overset{n-k+1}{1})$. If $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ satisfies $g \not\prec m$ or $g \nearrow m$, then $m_1 = k - 1$.

Proof. Let us assume that $m_1 \geq k$. In this case Corollary 3.2 directly implies $g \leq m$, which, by Proposition 2.5, makes $g \not\prec m$ and $g \nearrow m$ impossible.

Let us now assume that $m_1 \leq k - 2$. We work with the first entries of the unique lower cover \tilde{g} of g and the unique upper cover \tilde{m} of m . We have $\text{ht}(m) = m_1 \leq k - 2 < k - 1 = \tilde{g}_1$, hence $\tilde{g} \not\prec m$. Thus, by Proposition 2.5(a), $g \not\prec m$ is excluded. Likewise, we have $\text{ht}(\tilde{m}) \leq m_1 + 1 \leq k - 1 < k = g_1$, hence $g \not\prec \tilde{m}$. Now Proposition 2.5(b) excludes $g \nearrow m$. \square

Corollary 4.19. Let $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $2 \leq k \leq n$ and set $g := (k, 1, \dots, \overset{n-k+1}{1})$. If $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type I or II and satisfies $g \not\prec m$ or $g \nearrow m$, then m is of the form as described in Theorem 4.17.

Lemma 4.20. Partitions $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type C are not arrow-related to any $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type III.

Proof. Let $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ be of type C, that is $g = (k, 1, \dots, \overset{d+1}{1})$ with $k \geq 3$. Suppose that m is of type III, with $g \not\prec m$ or $g \nearrow m$. Then $m = (a, 1, \dots, \overset{c+1}{1})$ with $a, c \geq 2$, and Lemma 4.18 implies $a = k - 1$ and $c + 1 = d + 2$. Then the unique upper cover of m is $\tilde{m} = (k - 1, 2, 1, \dots, \overset{c}{1})$ by Lemma 4.14. Hence $\tilde{m} \not\prec g$, and Proposition 2.5(b) proves $g \nearrow m$. Therefore $g \not\prec m$. Now, the unique lower cover of g is $\tilde{g} = (k - 1, 2, 1, \dots, \overset{d+1}{1})$ since $k \geq 3$. Then, we get $\text{len}(\tilde{g}) = d + 1 < c + 1 = \text{len}(m)$, and thus Lemma 3.9 yields $\tilde{g} \not\prec m$, contradicting $g \not\prec m$ by Proposition 2.5(a). \square

Lemma 4.21. Let $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $2 \leq k \leq n$ and set $g := (k, 1, \dots, \overset{n-k+1}{1})$. If $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type III or IV, then $g \nearrow m$ is impossible.

Proof. By Lemma 4.20, $g \nearrow m$ with m of type III is impossible. Therefore, aiming for a contradiction, we assume that $g \nearrow m$ with m of type IV. Then $\text{len}(m) \geq 3$, and, by Lemma 4.18, we must have $m_1 = k - 1$, i.e., $m = (k - 1, t, \dots, \overset{\ell}{t}, r)$ where $0 \leq r < t < k - 1$, $t \geq 2$ and $\ell \geq 3$. Now, by Lemma 4.14, the upper cover of m is $\tilde{m} = (k - 1, t + 1, t, \dots, t, t - 1, r)$, implying that $g_1 = k > k - 1 = \tilde{m}_1$. Therefore, $g \not\prec \tilde{m}$, and consequently Proposition 2.5(b) excludes $g \nearrow m$, in contradiction to $g \nearrow m$. \square

We can now finally observe that for g of type C all double arrows $g \nearrow m$ were characterised in the first part of Theorem 4.17.

Corollary 4.22. Let $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $2 \leq k \leq n$ and set $g := (k, 1, \dots, \overset{n-k+1}{1})$. If $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ satisfies $g \nearrow m$, then m is of the form as described in Theorem 4.17.

Proof. Assuming $g \nearrow m$, Lemma 4.21 yields that m cannot be of type IV nor of type III. Therefore, m is of type I or II, whence Corollary 4.19 implies that m is of the form as given in Theorem 4.17. \square

4.3. Double arrows involving completely join-irreducibles of type D

Theorem 4.23. Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, d, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $k \geq 3, b + \ell \geq 2$ and set $n := b(k + 1) + \ell k + d$. Now, choose $2 \leq t \leq \min(k - 1, d + 1)$, set $a := b + (b + \ell)(k - t) + t - 1$ and decompose $n - a = ct + r$ with $0 \leq r < t$ and $c \in \mathbb{N}$. Then we have $g := (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k}, 1, \dots, \overset{b+\ell+d}{1}) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $m := (a, t, \dots, \overset{c+1}{t}, r) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type IV and $g \nearrow m$.

Moreover, if $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type D, $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $g \nearrow m$ holds, then m must be of the shape as described before.

Note that if $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type IV, then its dual partition $m^* \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type D. Since Theorem 4.23 exhibits double arrow relationships between \vee -irreducibles of type D and \wedge -irreducibles of type IV, the dual result of Theorem 4.23 under partition conjugation is contained within the original statement.

Moreover, Theorem 4.23 represents a one-to-many double arrow relationship, as can be observed from the example $g \nearrow (4, 3, 3)$ and $g \nearrow (5, 2, 2, 1)$ where $g = (4, 4, 1, 1)$ in both cases.

Proof. First, we check that $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **IV** by verifying the inequalities $c \geq b+\ell \geq 2$ and $a \geq k+b \geq t+1 \geq 3$. We have $a-k = b+(b+\ell-1)(k-t)-1 = (b-1+\ell)(k-t)+b-1 \geq b+(b+\ell-2) \geq b$ since $k-t \geq 1$ and $b+\ell \geq 2$, hence $a \geq k+b \geq k \geq t+1 \geq 3$. For the other inequality we see that

$$a + (b + \ell - 1)t = b + (b + \ell)k - 1 = b(k + 1) + \ell k - 1 = n - d - 1 \leq n - t = a + ct + r - t < a + ct,$$

where we have used that $d+1 \geq t$ and $r-t < 0$. Thus, due to $t > 0$, we have $b+\ell-1 < c$, i.e., $b+\ell < c+1$ or $2 \leq b+\ell \leq c$. Hence m is completely meet-irreducible of type **IV**. We also observe that g is completely join-irreducible of type **D** since $b+\ell \geq 2, k \geq 3$ and $d, \ell \geq 1$.

We have that $g \not\leq m$ because summing up the first $b+\ell \leq c$ entries of g gives $b(k+1) + \ell k = n-d$, which is larger than the corresponding value of m , namely $a + (b+\ell-1)t = n-d-1$.

The unique lower cover of g is $\tilde{g} = (k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k, k-1, 2, 1, \dots, 1)$, in which the part k, \dots, k only appears for $\ell \geq 2$ and $1, \dots, 1$ only appears for $d \geq 2$. We obtain \tilde{g} from g by letting the brick in position $b+\ell$ fall from the cliff (transition rule (2)). Since $k-1 \geq t \geq 2$, Lemma 3.1 with position $j := b+\ell$ and common sum $s = b(k+1) + \ell k - 1 = n-d-1 = a + (b+\ell-1)t$ directly implies $\tilde{g} \leq m$. Therefore, Proposition 2.5(a) yields $g \not\leq m$.

By Lemma 4.14, the unique upper cover of m is $\tilde{m} = (a, t+1, t, \dots, t, t-1, r)$. Since $b+\ell \leq c, k \geq t+1$ and $1 \leq t-1$, applying Lemma 3.1 with position $j := b+\ell$ and the common sum $s = b(k+1) + \ell k = a + (b+\ell-1)t + 1$ shows $g \leq \tilde{m}$. Thus Proposition 2.5(b) yields $g \nearrow m$.

That, for given $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **D**, there are no other $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ than the previous with $g \nearrow m$ will follow from the following results, the proof being complete with Corollary 4.27. \square

The following lemma in particular applies to completely join-irreducible elements g of any type.

Lemma 4.24. *Let $b, d \in \mathbb{N}, k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and set $n := b(k+1) + \ell k + d$. For $g := (k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k, 1, \dots, 1)$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ we have that $\hat{m}_{b+\ell} := \sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell} m_i \geq n-d$ implies $g \leq m$.*

Proof. As $k \geq 1$, we have $1 \leq j := b+\ell \leq b(k+1) + \ell k = n-d \leq \hat{m}_j$. There are $\kappa, r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r < j$ such that \hat{m}_j decomposes modulo j as $\hat{m}_j = j\kappa + r$. As $r < j$, we have $j\kappa = bk + \ell k \leq b(k+1) + \ell k = n-d \leq \hat{m}_j = j\kappa + r < j(\kappa+1)$, hence $k < \kappa+1$, i.e., $k \leq \kappa$. If $k = \kappa$, then $b+jk = b(k+1) + \ell k = n-d \leq \hat{m}_j = r + j\kappa = r + jk$ and so $b \leq r$; otherwise $\kappa \geq k+1$. In both cases $\check{g} := (k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k)$ lies pointwise below $p := (\kappa+1, \dots, \kappa+1, \kappa, \dots, \kappa)$. Now we have $p, \check{m} := (m_1, \dots, m_j) \in \mathcal{W}_{\hat{m}_j}(j)$, and since $\hat{m}_j = \kappa j + r$ with $0 \leq r < j$ and $1 \leq j \leq \hat{m}_j$, Lemma 3.13 implies $p \leq \check{m}$. Hence we obtain $\sum_{i=1}^s g_i = \sum_{i=1}^s \check{g}_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^s p_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^s \check{m}_i = \sum_{i=1}^s m_i$ for each s with $1 \leq s \leq j$. If $\text{len}(m) > j$, then for each $j < i \leq \text{len}(m)$ we have $g_i \leq 1 \leq m_i$, and thus $\sum_{i=1}^s g_i = \sum_{i=1}^j g_i + \sum_{i=j+1}^s g_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^j m_i + \sum_{i=j+1}^s m_i = \sum_{i=1}^s m_i$ for any $s > j$. Therefore, we conclude $g \leq m$. \square

Also the following lemma applies to any possible completely join-irreducible partition g .

Lemma 4.25. *Let $b, d \in \mathbb{N}, k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $k \geq 2$ and set $n := b(k+1) + \ell k + d$. If $k = 2$ and $d \geq 1$, we additionally assume $b = 0$. Define $g := (k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k, 1, \dots, 1)$ and let $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ be such that $g \not\leq m$. Then $\hat{m}_{b+\ell} := \sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell} m_i = n - (d+1) < n$.*

Proof. Let $j := b+\ell$ and assume $g \not\leq m$. By Lemma 4.24, we must have $\hat{m}_j \leq n-d-1$ because $\hat{m}_j \geq n-d$ would entail $g \leq m$, in contradiction to $g \not\leq m$, see Proposition 2.5(a). On the other hand, we know from Proposition 2.5(a), that $\tilde{g} \leq m$ holds for the unique lower cover \tilde{g} of g , wherefore, we have $\hat{m}_j \geq \sum_{i=1}^j \tilde{g}_i =: N$. It only remains to observe that the latter sum indeed amounts to $n - (d+1)$. We do this by considering three different cases: if $d = 0$, then $g = (k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k)$, $\tilde{g} = (k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k, k-1, 1)$ and $N = b(k+1) + \ell k - 1 = n-1 = n-d-1$. Next, if $d \geq 1$ and $k = 2$, then $b = 0, j = \ell, n = \ell k + d = 2\ell + d$ and $g = (2, \dots, 2, 1, \dots, 1)$, $\tilde{g} = (2, \dots, 2, 1, \dots, 1, 1)$ and $N = 2\ell - 1 = b(k+1) + \ell k - 1 = n-d-1$. The last case is $d \geq 1$ and $k \geq 3$. Now g is of the general form given in the statement and its unique lower cover is $\tilde{g} = (k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k, k-1, 2, 1, \dots, 1)$ where the part k, \dots, k only appears for $\ell \geq 2$ and $1, \dots, 1$ only for $d \geq 2$. Again, we get $N = b(k+1) + \ell k - 1 = n-d-1$ as $n = b(k+1) + \ell k + d$. Therefore, we conclude that in all cases mentioned in the lemma the inequalities $n > n-d-1 \geq \hat{m}_j \geq N = n-d-1$, i.e., $n > n-d-1 = \hat{m}_j$, hold. \square

The subsequent lemma shows in particular that if $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **D**, $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **I**, **II** or **III**, then $g \not\prec m$ fails.

Lemma 4.26. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell, d \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that $k \geq 3$, $b + \ell \geq 2$ and set $n := b(k + 1) + \ell k + d$. Consider $g := (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, \overset{b+\ell}{k}, \dots, \overset{b+\ell+d}{k}, 1, \dots, 1)$ and any $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. If $g \not\prec m$, then there are $a, t, c, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n = a + ct + r$, $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{c+1}{t}, r)$, $a > t > r \geq 0$, $c \geq 2$, $2 \leq t \leq k - 1$ and $a = b + (b + \ell)(k - t) + t - 1$. In particular, m is of type **IV**. Moreover, if m is such that $t > d + 1$, then $r = d + 1 \geq 2$, $b + \ell = c + 1$ and $g \not\prec m$ fails.*

Proof. Suppose that $g \not\prec m$; then Proposition 2.5(a) entails $\tilde{g} \leq m$ for the unique lower cover \tilde{g} of g . Since $b + \ell \geq 2$, we thus have $g_1 = \tilde{g}_1 \leq m_1 =: h$. If m were of type **I** or **II**, then $m = (h, \dots, h, r)$ for some $0 \leq r < h$, and thus m would be the largest member of $\mathcal{H}_n(h)$ (see Lemma 3.12). Since $\text{ht}(g) = g_1 \leq h$, we would have $g \in \mathcal{H}_n(h)$, hence $g \leq m$, contradicting $g \not\prec m$ by Proposition 2.5(a).

Therefore, m is neither of type **I** nor **II**, thus it must be of type **III** or **IV**. Hence it has the form $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{c+1}{t}, r)$ where $a > t > r \geq 0$ and $c \geq 2$. The total sum of m being n , we note that $n = a + ct + r$. If $t \geq k + 1$, then $a > t \geq k + 1 > k \geq 3 > 1$ and hence $g \leq m$ by Corollary 3.2. By Proposition 2.5(a), this is in contradiction to $g \not\prec m$, wherefore $t \leq k$. As $k \geq 3$, Lemma 4.25 shows that the partial sum of m up to position $b + \ell$ is $\hat{m}_{b+\ell} = n - (d + 1) < n$. Since $\hat{m}_{b+\ell} < n$, we must have $b + \ell \leq c + 1$, hence $\hat{m}_{b+\ell} = a + (b + \ell - 1)t = n - (d + 1) = a + ct + r - (d + 1)$ and $\hat{m}_{b+\ell-1} = n - (d + 1) - t$. Since $g \not\prec m$, Proposition 2.5(a) yields $\tilde{g} \leq m$ for the unique lower cover \tilde{g} of g . Thus, $n - (d + k) = n - \sum_{i=b+\ell}^{b+\ell+d} g_i = n - \sum_{i=b+\ell}^{b+\ell+d} \tilde{g}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell-1} \tilde{g}_i \leq \hat{m}_{b+\ell-1} = n - (d + 1) - t$, i.e., $t \leq k - 1$. Since $t > r \geq 0$, we have $t \geq 1$. With the intent to derive a contradiction, we assume that $t = 1$, hence $m = (a, 1, \dots, 1)$. We know that $\tilde{g} = (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, \overset{b+\ell}{k}, \dots, \overset{b+\ell+d}{k}, k - 1, 2, 1, \dots, 1) \leq m$, thus $d \geq 1$ and Lemma 3.9 imply $\text{len}(g) = \text{len}(\tilde{g}) \geq \text{len}(m)$; hence our assumption $t = 1$ and Lemma 3.10 yield $g \leq m$, contradicting $g \not\prec m$ by Proposition 2.5(a). Therefore, $2 \leq t \leq k - 1$, and m has type **IV**. Moreover, from $\hat{m}_{b+\ell} = a + (b + \ell - 1)t = n - (d + 1)$ we infer

$$\begin{aligned} a &= n - (d + 1) - (b + \ell - 1)t = (b(k + 1) + \ell k + d) - d - 1 - (b + \ell)t + t \\ &= b + b(k - t) + \ell(k - t) + t - 1 = b + (b + \ell)(k - t) + t - 1. \end{aligned}$$

From $\hat{m}_{b+\ell} = a + (b + \ell - 1)t = a + ct + r - (d + 1)$ we infer that $d + 1 + (b + \ell - 1)t = ct + r$ and hence $d + 1 \equiv r \pmod{t}$. If we now additionally assume that $d + 1 < t$, then $d + 1 = r$, and we may cancel this common summand from both sides of the equation, leading to $(b + \ell - 1)t = ct$, or $b + \ell - 1 = c$, i.e., $b + \ell = c + 1$. Consequently, we have $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{t}, d + 1)$, being of type **IV** with $d + 1 \geq 2$, and thus the unique upper cover of m is $\tilde{m} = (a, t + 1, t, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{t}, t - 1, d + 1)$, see Lemma 4.14. Therefore, we obtain $\sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell} \tilde{m}_i = n - (d + 1) < n - d = b(k + 1) + \ell k = \sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell} g_i$ and hence $g \not\leq \tilde{m}$. By Proposition 2.5(b) $g \not\prec m$ fails. \square

The following corollary shows that all double arrows $g \not\prec m$ involving $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **D** were described in Theorem 4.23. In particular, dualising the statements of Theorem 4.23 yields double arrow relations that are already described as a part of that theorem.

Corollary 4.27. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, d, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that $k \geq 3$, $b + \ell \geq 2$ and define $n := b(k + 1) + \ell k + d$, as well as $g := (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, \overset{b+\ell}{k}, \dots, \overset{b+\ell+d}{k}, 1, \dots, 1)$. If $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ satisfies $g \not\prec m$, then m is of type **IV** of the shape as shown in Theorem 4.23.*

Proof. Let us assume that $g \not\prec m$. According to Lemma 4.26, the partition $m \in \mathcal{L}_n$ is of the form $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{c+1}{t}, r)$ with $a > t > r \geq 0$, $c \geq 2$, $n - a = ct + r$, $2 \leq t \leq k - 1$, and $a = b + (b + \ell)(k - t) + t - 1$. Moreover, if $t > d + 1$, then $g \not\prec m$ would fail by Lemma 4.26, contradicting $g \not\prec m$. Therefore, we have $2 \leq t \leq \min(k - 1, d + 1)$, whence m is of type **IV** with exactly the shape as given in Theorem 4.23. \square

We summarise our understanding of the double arrow relation in Table 1.

Result	$g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$	Arrow	$m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$
Theorem 4.10:	$(k, \dots, \overset{\ell}{k}), k \geq 2$	\nearrow	$(n - \ell, 1, \dots, \overset{\ell}{1}, 1)$
Theorem 4.10:	$(k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k}), k \geq 1$	\nearrow	$(n - b - \ell, 1, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{1}, 1)$
Theorem 4.17:	$(k, 1, \dots, \overset{n-k+1}{1}), k \geq 2$	\nearrow	$(k - 1, \dots, \overset{c}{k - 1}, r)$
Theorem 4.23:	$(k, \dots, \overset{\ell}{k}, 1, \dots, \overset{\ell+d}{1}), k \geq 3, \ell \geq 2$	\nearrow	$(a, t, \dots, \overset{c+1}{t}, r), c \geq 2$
Theorem 4.23:	$(k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k}, 1, \dots, \overset{b+\ell+d}{1}), k \geq 3$	\nearrow	$(a, t, \dots, \overset{c+1}{t}, r), c \geq 2$

Table 1: A summary of the \nearrow characterisation results where $b, \ell, d, c, a, t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $a \geq k > t > r \geq 0$ and $t \geq 2$. The precise value of a is stated in Theorem 4.23.

5. Results regarding single arrows

Since results for up-arrows can be deduced from down-arrows by partition conjugation and Lemma 2.13, we focus here on the complete description of the relation $g \swarrow m$ where $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. As, by definition, $g \nearrow m$ implies $g \swarrow m$, the results from Section 4 yield part of the description of the down-arrows. Subsequently, we need to concentrate on finding the remaining ‘single’ down-arrows, where $g \swarrow m$ but not $g \nearrow m$. Our strategy will be to derive necessary conditions that follow from $g \swarrow m$, to isolate the cases that were already covered in Section 4, and then to prove in the remaining cases from a subset of the necessary conditions that $g \swarrow m$ actually holds. We organise our investigations according to the different types $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ may have.

For $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **A** or **B**, Lemma 4.12 confirms that all down-arrows involving m of types **I**, **II** and **III** are contained in Theorem 4.10 and hence are double arrows. Therefore, we here only discuss down-arrows between g of type **A** or **B** and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **IV**. In this respect, Lemma 5.1 gives necessary conditions for the down-arrows; these necessary conditions will be shown to be sufficient in Theorem 5.2.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}, n, k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that $b + \ell < n = b(k + 1) + \ell k$. The partition $g = (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k})$ is of type **A** or **B**. If $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **IV** and satisfies $g \swarrow m$, then $k, b + \ell \geq 3$ and $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{t}, 1)$ with $a > t$ and $2 \leq t \leq k - 1$.*

Proof. Lemma 4.11 yields $\text{len}(m) = b + \ell + 1$ and that $m = (a, t, \dots, t, r)$ with $a > t > r \geq 0$ and $t \geq 2$ must end with 1. If $r = 0$, then this implies the contradiction $t = 1$, hence $r \geq 1$ and thus $r = 1$ by Lemma 4.11. Therefore, $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{t}, 1)$ with $a > t \geq 2$, and since two values t must appear, we obtain $b + \ell \geq 3$. Finally, we prove $t \leq k - 1$ in two steps. First, we cannot have $t \geq k + 1$ because under this assumption the partial sum of m exceeds $(k + 1)(b + \ell) + 1 > n$ as $a > t \geq k + 1$. Thus, we have $2 \leq t \leq k$, i.e., $k \geq 2$, wherefore g has a cliff in position $b + \ell$, and by transition rule (2) the unique lower cover of g is $\tilde{g} = (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k}, k - 1, 1)$. Our assumption $g \swarrow m$ and Proposition 2.5(a) imply $\tilde{g} \leq m$, hence we get $n - k = \sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell-1} \tilde{g}_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{b+\ell-1} m_i = n - t - 1$, i.e., $t \leq k - 1$. Therefore, $k \geq t + 1 \geq 3$, finishing the proof. \square

We now show that the conditions in Lemma 5.1 are sufficient for a down-arrow between g of type **A** or **B** and m of type **IV**, and that this arrow is not a double arrow.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}, k, t, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $k, b + \ell \geq 3$ and $2 \leq t \leq k - 1$; set $n = b(k + 1) + \ell k$ and $a = n - 1 - (b + \ell - 1)t$. Then the partitions $g = (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k})$ and $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{t}, 1)$ satisfy $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ being of type **A** or **B**, $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ being of type **IV** with $a \geq t + 2$, and $g \swarrow m$ but not $g \nearrow m$.*

Proof. As $k \geq 3$ we have that $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **A** (if $b = 0$) or **B** (if $b \geq 1$). In Lemma 5.1 we saw that the unique lower cover of g is $\tilde{g} = (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k}, k - 1, 1)$. Since \tilde{g} is shorter than m , Lemma 3.9 yields $\tilde{g} \not\leq m$. Next,

we verify that $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **IV**. First, given $b + \ell \geq 3$, we get that t appears $(b + \ell - 1) \geq 2$ times. Next, we have $m \in \mathcal{L}_n$ since $a = n - 1 - (b + \ell - 1)t$. Furthermore, from $n = (b + \ell)(k - 1) + 2b + \ell$, $t \leq k - 1$ and $b + \ell \geq 3$, we get $a - t = n - (b + \ell)t - 1 \geq n - (b + \ell)(k - 1) - 1 = 2b + \ell - 1 = (b + \ell) + b - 1 \geq 2$, hence $a \geq t + 2 > t$ and m is of type **IV**.

We now prove $\tilde{g} \leq m$. Note that the partial sums of both \tilde{g} and m reach $n - 1$ at position $b + \ell$. Therefore, since $\tilde{g}_i \geq k - 1 \geq t = m_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq b + \ell$, Lemma 3.1 with $j = b + \ell$ gives $\tilde{g} \leq m$. Hence Proposition 2.5(a) yields $g \not\prec m$. Finally, as $n \geq k(b + \ell) \geq 3(b + \ell) > b + \ell$, Lemma 4.15 shows that $g \nearrow m$ in Theorem 5.2 is impossible. \square

Lemmata 4.12, 5.1 and Theorem 5.2 characterise all $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ in relation $g \not\prec m$ with g of type **A** or **B**.

We are now starting to deal with $g \not\prec m$ for partitions $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **C**. Theorem 4.17 and Corollary 4.19 cover the case when $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **I** or **II**. Here the down-arrow automatically is a double arrow. We therefore focus in the subsequent two results on m of types **III** or **IV**. As done earlier we first derive necessary conditions from $g \not\prec m$, which we then prove to be sufficient for a down-arrow that is not a double arrow.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $k, d \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $k \geq 3$, set $n = k + d$ and let $g = (k, 1, \dots, 1^{1+d}) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. Suppose $g \not\prec m$ with $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **III** or **IV**, then $k \geq 4$, $m = (k - 1, t, \dots, t^{c+1}, r)$ for $r, t, c \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 \leq r < t \leq k - 2$, $t \geq 2$, $c \geq 2$, i.e., m is of type **IV**, and $d + 1 \geq 2t$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.18, m starts with $m_1 = k - 1 = n - (d + 1)$. Since m is of type **III** or **IV**, we have $m = (m_1, t, \dots, t^{c+1}, r)$ where $k - 1 = m_1 > t > r \geq 0$ and $c \geq 2$. From $g \not\prec m$ we infer by Proposition 2.5(a) that $\tilde{g} \leq m$, where \tilde{g} denotes the unique lower cover of g . Hence we obtain $k + 1 = (k - 1) + 2 = \tilde{g}_1 + \tilde{g}_2 \leq m_1 + m_2 = k - 1 + t$, i.e., $t \geq 2$ and m is of type **IV**. As $m_1 = n - (d + 1)$, the total sum of m equals $n = n - (d + 1) + ct + r$, thus $d + 1 = ct + r \geq ct \geq 2t$ since $r \geq 0$ and $c \geq 2$. Finally, we get $k \geq 4$ from $2 \leq t \leq k - 2$. \square

Theorem 5.4. *Let $k, d, t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $k \geq 4$, $2 \leq t \leq k - 2$, $2t \leq d + 1$ and set $n = k + d$. Let us decompose $n - (k - 1) = ct + r$ with $c, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 \leq r < t$. Then $c \geq 2$, and for $g = (k, 1, \dots, 1^{d+1})$ and $m = (k - 1, t, \dots, t^{c+1}, r)$ we have $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ being of type **C**, $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ being of type **IV**, and $g \not\prec m$, but not $g \nearrow m$.*

Observe that $g = (5, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ satisfies $g \not\prec (4, 3, 3)$ and $g \not\prec (4, 2, 2, 2)$. Hence Theorem 5.4 represents a one-to-many relationship. The number of distinct $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ such that $g \not\prec m$ with a fixed g grows with n , e.g., if $n = 16$ and $g = (7, 1, \dots, 1)$, then $g \not\prec m$ for $m \in \{(6, 5, 5), (6, 4, 4, 2), (6, 3, 3, 3, 1), (6, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)\}$.

Proof. First, we check that $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. By the definition of c and r , we have $m \in \mathcal{L}_n$. Moreover, since $t > r$, $n = k + d$ and $d + 1 \geq 2t$, we obtain $(c - 1)t > ct + r - 2t = n - (k - 1) - 2t = d + 1 - 2t \geq 0$, which yields $c - 1 > 0$, i.e., $c \geq 2$. Thus, m is completely meet-irreducible of type **IV**. We have $g \not\prec m$ as the first entries are $g_1 = k > k - 1 = m_1$. Since $k \geq 4$ and $d \geq 1$, we observe that g is completely join-irreducible of type **C** and that its unique lower cover is $\tilde{g} = (k - 1, 2, 1, \dots, 1^{d+1})$, which is obtained from g by letting the brick in position 1 fall from the cliff (transition rule (2)). Since $m_1 = k - 1 = \tilde{g}_1$ and $m_i = t \geq 2 > 1 > 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq c + 1$, we obtain $\tilde{g} \leq m$ from Corollary 3.2. Thus, Proposition 2.5(a) confirms $g \not\prec m$.

Finally, by Lemma 4.14, we get $\tilde{m} = (k - 1, t + 1, t, \dots, t^{c+1}, r)$ for the upper cover of m , which means that $\tilde{m}_1 = k - 1 < k = g_1$ and thus $\tilde{m} \not\prec g$. Hence $g \nearrow m$ becomes impossible by Proposition 2.5(b). \square

Corollary 4.19, Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 5.4 characterise all $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ in relation $g \not\prec m$ with g of type **C**. Dualising Theorem 5.4 with the help of Lemmata 2.12 and 2.13 yields the following result.

Corollary 5.5. *Let $k, d, t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $k \geq 4$, $2 \leq t \leq k - 2$ and $2t \leq d + 1$ and set $n = k + d$. Moreover, decompose $n - (k - 1) = ct + r$ with $c, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 \leq r < t$. Then $c \geq 2$, and abbreviating $\kappa := c + 1$ we have $m^* = (\kappa + 1, \dots, \kappa + 1, \kappa, \dots, \kappa, 1, \dots, 1^{k-1}) \nearrow g^* = (d + 1, 1, \dots, 1^k)$, but not $m^* \not\prec g^*$, where m^* is of type **D** and g^* is of type **III**.*

It remains to discuss $g = (k+1, \dots, \overset{b}{k+1}, k, \dots, \overset{b+\ell}{k}, 1, \dots, \overset{b+\ell+d}{1}) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **D** where $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell, d \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $k \geq 3$, $b + \ell \geq 2$ and $n = b(k+1) + \ell k + d$. Then we may deduce via Lemma 4.26 from $g \not\prec m$ for some $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ that $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{c+1}{t}, r) \in \mathcal{L}_n$ is of type **IV** with $n = a + ct + r$, $a > t > r \geq 0$, $c \geq 2$, $a = b + (b + \ell)(k - t) + t - 1$ and $2 \leq t \leq k - 1$. In this situation there are two cases: the first is that $t \leq d + 1$, in which Theorem 4.23 entails that $g \not\prec m$ is not only present, but that it is actually a double arrow. The second case is that $d + 1 < t$, in which Lemma 4.26 implies $t > r = d + 1 \geq 2$, $b + \ell = c + 1 \geq 3$ and that $g \nearrow m$ is impossible. Under these necessary conditions, the following result shows that $g \not\prec m$ is actually present (and clearly is not a double arrow).

Theorem 5.6. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell, d, t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $b + \ell \geq 3$ and $d + 1 < t \leq k - 1$; set $n = b(k + 1) + \ell k + d$ and $a = b + (b + \ell)(k - t) + t - 1$, and consider $g = (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b + \ell}{k}, 1, \dots, \overset{b + \ell + d}{1})$ and $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{b + \ell}{t}, d + 1)$. Then we have $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **D** with $k \geq 4$, $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **IV** with $a \geq t + 2$, and $g \not\prec m$ but not $g \nearrow m$.*

Proof. Since $d + 2 \leq t \leq k - 1$ and $d \geq 1$, we have $t \geq 3$ and $k \geq d + 3 \geq 4$. Moreover, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} a + (b + \ell - 1)t + d + 1 &= b + (b + \ell)(k - t) + t - 1 + (b + \ell)t - t + d + 1 = b + (b + \ell)k + d \\ &= b + bk + \ell k + d = b(k + 1) + \ell k + d = n, \end{aligned}$$

whence $m \in \mathcal{L}_n$. We check that $a = b + (b + \ell)(k - t) + t - 1 \geq b + b + \ell + t - 1 \geq 0 + 3 + t - 1 = t + 2 > t$ as $k - t \geq 1$ and $b + \ell \geq 3$. Hence, as $a > t > d + 1 \geq 2$ and $b + \ell \geq 3$, we conclude that $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **IV**. Since $k \geq 3$, $\ell, d \geq 1$ and $b + \ell \geq 2$, it is also clear that $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **D**. Furthermore, we have $g \not\prec m$ because the partial sums up to position $b + \ell$ satisfy $\hat{g}_{b+\ell} = n - d > n - (d + 1) = \hat{m}_{b+\ell}$. Applying transition rule (2) to the cliff in position $b + \ell$ of g , we obtain its unique lower cover $\tilde{g} = (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b + \ell}{k}, k - 1, 2, 1, \dots, \overset{b + \ell + d}{1})$ as $d \geq 1$, with $1, \dots, 1$ appearing for $d \geq 2$. Note that the partial sums of both \tilde{g} and m reach $n - (d + 1)$ at position $b + \ell$. Therefore, as $\tilde{g}_i \geq k - 1 \geq t = m_i$ for $2 \leq i \leq b + \ell$, Lemma 3.1 with $j = b + \ell$ yields $\tilde{g} \leq m$, and hence Proposition 2.5(a) implies $g \not\prec m$.

Finally, since $k \geq 3$, $b + \ell \geq 2$, $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, $g \not\prec m$ and $t > d + 1$, Lemma 4.26 implies that $g \nearrow m$ is impossible. \square

Lemma 4.26, Corollary 4.27 and Theorem 5.6 characterise all $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ in relation $g \not\prec m$ with g of type **D**.

The following summary combines Theorems 5.2 and 5.6, covering g of types **A**, **B** or **D**.

Corollary 5.7. *Let $b, d \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $b + \ell \geq 3$ and $k \geq d + 3$; set $n = b(k + 1) + \ell k + d$. Furthermore, choose $t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d + 1 < t \leq k - 1$ and set $a := b + (b + \ell)(k - t) + t - 1$. Then we have $g = (k + 1, \dots, \overset{b}{k + 1}, k, \dots, \overset{b + \ell}{k}, 1, \dots, \overset{b + \ell + d}{1}) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, $m = (a, t, \dots, \overset{b + \ell}{t}, d + 1) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **IV** with $a \geq t + 2$, and g and m satisfy $g \not\prec m$ but not $g \nearrow m$.*

Observe that $g = (4, 4, 4)$ satisfies $g \not\prec (5, 3, 3, 1)$ and $g \not\prec (7, 2, 2, 1)$. Hence Corollary 5.7 represents a one-to-many relationship. Similarly to Theorem 5.4 the number of distinct $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ such that $g \not\prec m$ with a fixed g grows with n , e.g., if $n = 15$ and $g = (5, 5, 5)$, then $g \not\prec m$ for $m \in \{(10, 2, 2, 1), (8, 3, 3, 1), (6, 4, 4, 1)\}$.

Proof. Note that $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is always of type **IV** while $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **A** (if $b = d = 0$), of type **B** (if $b \geq 1$, $d = 0$), of type **D** (if $d \geq 1$).

For $d = 0$ the hypotheses and partitions g and m simplify to those of Theorem 5.2, since $d + 1 < t$ is equivalent to $2 \leq t$. Therefore, Theorem 5.2 proves $g \not\prec m$ but not $g \nearrow m$.

For $d \geq 1$ the hypotheses restate those of Theorem 5.6. Hence $g \not\prec m$ but not $g \nearrow m$. \square

Dualising Corollary 5.7 via Lemmata 2.12 and 2.13 produces the following result.

Corollary 5.8. *Let $b, d \in \mathbb{N}$, $k, \ell, t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $b + \ell \geq 3$, $k \geq d + 3$ and $d + 1 < t \leq k - 1$; further set $n = b(k + 1) + \ell k + d$ and $a = b + (b + \ell)(k - t) + t - 1$. Then $a \geq t + 2$, and abbreviating $\kappa := b + \ell$ we have*

$$m^* = (\kappa + 1, \dots, \overset{d+1}{\kappa + 1}, \kappa, \dots, \overset{t}{\kappa}, 1, \dots, \overset{a}{1}) \nearrow g^* = (\kappa + d, \kappa, \dots, \overset{k}{\kappa}, b), \quad \text{but not } m^* \not\prec g^*,$$

where $m^* \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **D** and $g^* \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type **I** (if $b = d = 0$), **II** (if $d = 0, b \geq 1$) or **IV** (if $d \geq 1$).




Fig. 6: Lattice \mathcal{L}_n for $n = 11$ with all arrows.

Result	$g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$	Arrow	$m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$
Theorem 5.4:	$(k, 1, \dots, 1)^{d+1}$, $k \geq 4$, $d \geq 2t - 1$	\nearrow, \nearrow	$(k-1, t, \dots, t, r)^{c+1}$
Corollary 5.5:	$(\kappa+1, \dots, \kappa+1, \kappa, \dots, \kappa, 1, \dots, 1)^{k-1}$, $\kappa := c+1$	\nearrow, \swarrow	$(d+1, 1, \dots, 1)^k$
Corollary 5.7:	$(k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k, 1, \dots, 1)^{b+\ell+d}$, $k \geq d+3$, $d \leq t-2$	\swarrow, \swarrow	$(a, t, \dots, t, d+1)^{b+\ell}$
Corollary 5.8:	$(\kappa+1, \dots, \kappa+1, \kappa, \dots, \kappa, 1, \dots, 1)^a$, $\kappa := b+\ell$	\nearrow, \swarrow	$(\kappa+d, \kappa, \dots, \kappa, b)^k$

Table 2: A summary of the arrow characterisation results for \nearrow and \swarrow where $b, d \in \mathbb{N}$, $c, \ell, t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $b + \ell \geq 3$ and $c, t \geq 2$. There are different additional restrictions on t that have to be taken from the respective results. Rows 1 and 2, and 3 and 4 are duals of each other and are subject to the same conditions.

We finally collect our knowledge about single arrows in Table 2. Moreover, with Fig. 6 depicting \mathcal{L}_{11} we aim to illustrate for the concrete case $n = 11$ the various up, down and double arrow relations appearing in Tables 1 and 2.

We are now ready to discuss once more the single arrows in Example 2.15. The first $n \in \mathbb{N}$ where a single arrow appears in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is $n = 7$. This is justified by our Theorem 5.4 since its assumptions require $k \geq 4$ and $4 \leq 2t \leq d+1$, which gives $n = k + d \geq 4 + 3 = 7$. Moreover, Corollary 5.7 can only be applied for $n \geq 9$ as it requires $b + \ell \geq 3$ and $k \geq d + 3$, wherefore $n = b + (b + \ell)k + d \geq 3k \geq 3(d + 3) \geq 9$ as $b, d \geq 0$. The dual results Corollary 5.5 and Corollary 5.8 are also valid for $n \geq 7$ and $n \geq 9$, respectively.

Finally, for $n = 7$, if $d = 3$, then the restriction $4 \leq 2t \leq d + 1 = 4$ of Theorem 5.4 shows that $t = 2$, wherefore the partition $g = (4, 1, 1, 1)$ satisfies $g \swarrow m$ with a unique $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_7)$. Hence, considering the dual arrow (justified by Corollary 5.5) there exist exactly two single-directional arrows in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_7)$. These two arrows are the ones exhibited in Example 2.15 and illustrated in Fig. 3.

6. One-generated arrow-closed one-by-one subcontexts

We have implemented a brute-force algorithm (based on Definition 2.1) and an algorithm that uses the information given in Tables 1 and 2 to discover one-generated arrow-closed subcontexts of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$. Both implementations suggest that as of $n \geq 3$ there exist exactly $2n - 4$ arrow-closed (1×1) -subcontexts. To demonstrate the applicability of our general characterisations of the arrow relations in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ to the original problem of describing one-generated arrow-closed subcontexts (with the ultimate intent to obtain subdirect decompositions), we prove in this section that $2n - 4$ is the correct number of one-generated arrow-closed subcontexts of format (1×1) .

Our first lemma deals precisely with all arrow-closed subcontexts of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ generated by $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of types A or B.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $b \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell, k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ be such that $b + \ell < n = b(k+1) + \ell k$. Then $g = (k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k)^{b+\ell} \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ generates the following arrow-closed (1×1) -subcontext of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ with $m = (n - b - \ell, 1, \dots, 1, 1)^{b+\ell} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$.*

	$m = (n - b - \ell, 1, \dots, 1, 1)^{b+\ell}$
$g = (k+1, \dots, k+1, k, \dots, k)^{b+\ell}$	\nearrow

Proof. Under the given conditions, g is of type A or B, see Corollary 3.14. We apply the procedure to arrow-close the context. The summarising Tables 1 and 2 show that $g \nearrow m = (n - b - \ell, 1, \dots, 1, 1)^{b+\ell}$ by Theorem 4.10 (in fact $g \swarrow m$) and that this m is the only one in relation $g \nearrow m$. It remains to justify that no other partition $p \neq g$ satisfies $p \swarrow m$ for the given m . Considering the summarising Tables 1 and 2 and the shape of $m = (a, 1, \dots, 1)$, we realise that Theorem 4.10 describes all $p \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ such that $p \swarrow m$ (the cases $m = (1, \dots, 1)$ and $m = (n - 1, 1)$ can be handled by Theorem 4.17, as well, and yield the same $p = g$ as Theorem 4.10). Therefore, the partitions satisfying $p \swarrow m$ are exclusively of type A or B and have length $b + \ell = \text{len}(m) - 1$. Then the uniqueness of the decomposition $n = (b + \ell)k + b$ modulo $b + \ell$ where $0 \leq b < b + \ell$ entails that p coincides with the given g . \square

We now dualise Lemma 6.1 and thereby cover in particular all arrow-closed subcontexts of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ generated by any $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type C.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $k \geq 2$, set $n = k + d$ and decompose $n = c(k - 1) + r$ with $c, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 \leq r \leq k - 2$. Then the partition $g = (k, 1, \dots, \overset{d+1}{1}) \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ generates the following arrow-closed (1×1) -subcontext of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ with $m = (k - 1, \dots, k - 1, r) \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$.*

	$m = (k - 1, \dots, k - 1, r)$
$g = (k, 1, \dots, \overset{d+1}{1})$	\nearrow

Proof. This result is the exact dual of Lemma 6.1. An explicit proof can be obtained by dualising the argument of Lemma 6.1 where applications of Theorem 4.10 need to be replaced by Theorem 4.17 and types A and B become types I and II. The lemma can also be proved directly using the arrow-closing procedure and the tables. In fact, if $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type I or II, then Tables 1 and 2 confirm that Theorem 4.17 describes all $p \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ such that $p \not\prec m$ (there are (only) two cases, $p = (n)$ and $p = (2, 1, \dots, 1)$, which are handled by Theorem 4.10 and 4.17 simultaneously). \square

Proposition 6.3. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 3$ there are exactly $2n - 4$ one-generated arrow-closed (1×1) -subcontexts in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$.*

Proof. Considering Lemmata 6.1 and 6.2 we may count the arrow-closed (1×1) -subcontexts. First, Lemma 6.2 allows to choose the parameter $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$. Hence, $n - 1$ choices are available, and each leads to a distinct g and thus a distinct (1×1) -subcontext. Moreover, Lemma 6.1 is exactly the dual of Lemma 6.2, wherefore we have once more $n - 1$ choices, and thus $n - 1$ distinct subcontexts, available. The only $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ that are captured by Lemma 6.1 and 6.2 at the same time are either $g = (n)$, or have length at least two and thus, according to Lemma 6.2, end with 1, have height at least 2 and satisfy $g_1 > g_2$. Now, according to the shapes of g considered in Lemma 6.1, the height must be equal to 2 since g ends in 1, and so $g = (2, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$. We therefore have to reduce the sum $2(n - 1)$ by 2 and thus have at least $2n - 4$ distinct arrow-closed (1×1) -subcontexts generated by $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of types A, B or C.

Finally, if g is of type D with $k \geq 3$ and $b + \ell \geq 2$, then Theorem 4.23 exhibits some $m_{\text{IV}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type IV with $g \nearrow m_{\text{IV}}$, and Corollary 5.5 yields some $m_{\text{III}} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type III with $g \nearrow m_{\text{III}}$. Since the type classes are disjoint, we therefore have two distinct $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ such that $g \nearrow m$, and hence arrow-closed subcontexts generated by g of type D cannot be of format 1×1 . Consequently, the subcontexts shown in Lemmata 6.1 and 6.2 are the only ones of this shape. \square

7. Conclusion

In this paper, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we characterised all arrow relations appearing in the standard context of the lattice \mathcal{L}_n of partitions of n under the dominance order. When looking at Tables 1 and 2, collecting our results, some curious patterns with respect to the three arrow shapes and the partition types connected by arrows of a specific form arise. These will be summarised subsequently; more detailed information for which values of n these patterns appear and which result justifies them, can be seen from Table 3. Inspecting Table 3, we note that all of these connections can be observed in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ as soon as $n \geq 13$. The following patterns caught our eye:

- (a) If $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type A, B or C and $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ satisfies $g \nearrow m$, then m is not of type IV and m is unique. Conversely, if $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of types I, II or III and $g \nearrow m$ with $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, then g is not of type D and it is also unique. Therefore, the double arrows establish a one-to-one relationship between elements of the union of the type classes A–C and the union of the classes I–III.

More specifically, if $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ is of type A or B such that $g \neq (n)$, $g \neq (2, 1, \dots, \overset{n-1}{1})$ and $g \nearrow m$, then Theorem 4.10 implies that m is of type III, and the whole class of type III partitions is exhausted by those g . The two exceptional double arrow relations are $(n) \nearrow (n - 1, 1)$ with g of type A and m of type II (or I for $n = 2$), and $(2, 1, \dots, 1) \nearrow (1, \dots, 1)$ with g of type B and m of type I. In particular, $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type A is never \nearrow -connected to $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type I (or IV) when $n \geq 3$, and g of type B is never \nearrow -connected to m of type II

(or **IV**). In fact, g of type **B** is never connected via any kind of arrow to m of type **II**, as shown in Corollary 4.13. Having observed the bijective correspondence given by the double arrow relation, this leaves that the $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **C** correspond in a one-to-one way to the $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n) \setminus \{(n-1, 1), (1, \dots, 1)\}$ of types **I** or **II**. This can also be verified directly using Theorem 4.17 for parameters $2 \leq a \leq n-2$. Note also that g of type **C** is not even \nearrow or \swarrow -related to m of type **III**, as shown in Lemma 4.20.

- (b) If $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$, $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ and $g \swarrow m$, then g is of type **D** if and only if m is of type **IV**, see Table 1. However, this correspondence is not unique because for sufficiently large values of n , k and d , Theorem 4.23 allows for several choices of the parameter t determining distinct shapes of $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **IV**. Dually, a given m of type **IV** may only be double arrow related to $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **D**, and these g may not be unique.
- (c) Every up-arrow originating in $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **A**, **B** or **C** is actually a double arrow described in Table 1. This is so because Table 2 does not contain any up-arrows of such type. Conversely, every down-arrow connecting $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ with some $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **I**, **II** or **III** is necessarily a double arrow. This implies that $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of types **A**, **B** or **C** receive down-arrows from $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ that are not double-arrows only if m is of type **IV**. Dually, $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ are in relation $g \nearrow m$ and $g \swarrow m$ with $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of types **I**, **II** or **III** only if g is of type **D**. On the other hand, $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **D** exhibit up-arrows to $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of all four types that fail to be double arrows; likewise $m \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of type **IV** satisfy $g \swarrow m$ but $g \nearrow$ with $g \in \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of all four types. All of these single directional arrow relationships are in general not one-to-one as Theorem 5.4 and Corollary 5.7 exhibit a flexible parameter range for t with fixed and sufficiently large k , d and n . This happens as of $n \geq 10$ for Theorem 5.4 and as of $n \geq 12$ for Corollary 5.7.

As a side-product of Proposition 6.3, we discovered that the number of ways a natural number n can be decomposed yielding partitions of type **A** or **B** is exactly $n-1$, for this is the same as the number of partitions of n of the shape $(a, 1, \dots, 1)$ with $2 \leq a \leq n$. This is an example of a bijective proof as they are typical for counting the number of restricted partitions in the combinatorial theory of integer partitions, see, e.g., [1, Section 2.2].

Finally, in order to demonstrate the applicability of our general descriptions, we started by characterising all one-generated arrow-closed subcontexts of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ of format 1×1 . We determined that their number is exactly $2n-4$, see Proposition 6.3. Working on this we observed that also the characterisation of other arrow-closed subcontexts of small shape seems to be within reach of our results. We leave the complete description of the one-generated arrow-closed subcontexts of $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$ as a task for future investigation.

Arrow vs. type	For	First example	Result
$A \swarrow I$	$n = 2$	$(2) \swarrow (1, 1)$	Theorem 4.10
$B \swarrow I$	$n \geq 3$	$(2, 1) \swarrow (1, 1, 1)$	Theorem 4.10
$A \swarrow II$	$n \geq 3$	$(3) \swarrow (2, 1)$	Theorem 4.10
$A \swarrow III$	$n \geq 4$	$(2, 2) \swarrow (2, 1, 1)$	Theorem 4.10
$B \swarrow III$	$n \geq 5$	$(2, 2, 1) \swarrow (2, 1, 1, 1)$	Theorem 4.10
$C \swarrow I$	$n \geq 4$	$(3, 1) \swarrow (2, 2)$	Theorem 4.17
$C \swarrow II$	$n \geq 5$	$(3, 1, 1) \swarrow (2, 2, 1)$	Theorem 4.17
$D \swarrow IV$	$n \geq 7$	$(3, 3, 1) \swarrow (3, 2, 2)$	Theorem 4.23
$C \swarrow IV$	$n \geq 7$	$(4, 1, 1, 1) \swarrow (3, 2, 2)$	Theorem 5.4
$A \swarrow IV$	$n \geq 9$	$(3, 3, 3) \swarrow (4, 2, 2, 1)$	Corollary 5.7
$B \swarrow IV$	$n \geq 10$	$(4, 3, 3) \swarrow (5, 2, 2, 1)$	Corollary 5.7
$D \swarrow IV$	$n \geq 13$	$(4, 4, 4, 1) \swarrow (5, 3, 3, 2)$	Corollary 5.7
$D \nearrow III$	$n \geq 7$	$(3, 3, 1) \nearrow (4, 1, 1, 1)$	Corollary 5.5
$D \nearrow I$	$n \geq 9$	$(4, 3, 1, 1) \nearrow (3, 3, 3)$	Corollary 5.8
$D \nearrow II$	$n \geq 10$	$(4, 3, 1, 1, 1) \nearrow (3, 3, 3, 1)$	Corollary 5.8
$D \nearrow IV$	$n \geq 13$	$(4, 4, 3, 1, 1) \nearrow (4, 3, 3, 3)$	Corollary 5.8

Table 3: Arrow relation patterns between different types of partitions with least $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that these occur in $\mathbb{K}(\mathcal{L}_n)$.

References

- [1] G. E. Andrews, K. Eriksson, *Integer partitions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004. doi:10.1017/CB09781139167239.
- [2] M. Behrisch, Symmetric embeddings between standard contexts of lattices of integer partitions [dataset], Zenodo (Dec. 2021). doi:10.5281/zenodo.5810903.
- [3] M. Behrisch, A. Chavarri Villarello, E. Vargas-García, Representing partition lattices through FCA, in: A. Braud, A. Buzmakov, T. Hanika, F. Le Ber (Eds.), *Formal Concept Analysis – 16th International Conference, ICFCA 2021, Strasbourg, France, June 29 – July 2, 2021, Proceedings*, Vol. 12733 of *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*, Springer, Cham, 2021, pp. 3–19. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-77867-5_1.
- [4] M. Behrisch, E. Vargas-García, Non-embeddability of standard contexts of lattices of integer partitions [dataset], Zenodo (Dec. 2021). doi:10.5281/zenodo.5805981.
- [5] T. Brylawski, The lattice of integer partitions, *Discrete Math.* 6 (3) (1973) 201–219. doi:10.1016/0012-365X(73)90094-0.
- [6] A. Chavarri Villarello, El retículo de particiones de enteros positivos y su contexto estándar, Undergraduate honors thesis, ITAM, Río Hondo 1, Ciudad de México (Jul. 2020).
- [7] S. A. Díaz Miranda, Retículos de números naturales y sus relaciones de flechas, Undergraduate honors thesis, ITAM, Río Hondo 1, Ciudad de México (Mar. 2024).
- [8] L. A. Franco Solorio, Encajes entre contextos estándar de los retículos de particiones de números enteros, Undergraduate honors thesis, ITAM, Río Hondo 1, Ciudad de México (Mar. 2022).
- [9] B. Ganter, Notes on integer partitions, *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning* 142 (2022) 31–40. doi:10.1016/j.ijar.2021.11.004.
- [10] B. Ganter, R. Wille, *Formal concept analysis. Mathematical foundations*, Springer, Berlin, 1999, translated from the 1996 German original by Cornelia Franzke. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-59830-2.
- [11] G. H. Hardy, S. Ramanujan, Asymptotic formulæ in combinatory analysis, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (2) 17 (1) (1918) 75–115. doi:10.1112/plms/s2-17.1.75.
- [12] T. W. Hungerford, *Algebra*, Vol. 73 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, Springer, New York, NY, 2011, reprint of the 1974 original. doi:10.1007/978-1-4612-6101-8.
- [13] M. Latapy, T. H. D. Phan, The lattice of integer partitions and its infinite extension, *Discrete Math.* 309 (6) (2009) 1357–1367. doi:10.1016/j.disc.2008.02.002.
- [14] D. Mahnke, *Leibniz auf der Suche nach einer allgemeinen Primzahlgleichung*, *Bibl. Math.* (3) XIII (1912–1913) 29–61. URL <https://www.ophen.org/pub-102519>
- [15] A. Páramo Pítol, Factores subdirectamente irreducibles de pequeños retículos de particiones, Undergraduate honors thesis, ITAM, Río Hondo 1, Ciudad de México (Jul. 2022).
- [16] H. Rademacher, On the partition function $p(n)$, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (2) 43 (4) (1937) 241–254. doi:10.1112/plms/s2-43.4.241.
- [17] H. Rademacher, On the expansion of the partition function in a series, *Ann. of Math.* (2) 44 (3) (1943) 416–422. doi:10.2307/1968973.