

## EQUI-ISOCLINIC SUBSPACES FROM SYMMETRY

MATTHEW FICKUS\* JOSEPH W. IVERSON† JOHN JASPER\*  
DUSTIN G. MIXON‡§

ABSTRACT. We describe a flexible technique that constructs tight fusion frames with prescribed transitive symmetry. Applying this technique with representations of the symmetric and alternating groups, we obtain several new infinite families of equi-isoclinic tight fusion frames, each with the remarkable property that its automorphism group is either  $S_n$  or  $A_n$ . These ensembles are optimal packings for Grassmannian space equipped with spectral distance, and as such, they find applications in block compressed sensing.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In a  $d$ -dimensional Hilbert space  $V$  over  $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$ , two  $r$ -dimensional subspaces  $W_1, W_2 \leq V$  are called  $\alpha$ -**isoclinic** if the unit sphere in one space projects orthogonally into the other space to form a sphere of radius  $\sqrt{\alpha} \in [0, 1]$  centered at the origin, where  $\alpha$  is known as the **parameter** of isoclinism. This turns out to be a symmetric relation. For example, when  $r = 1$  any two lines are  $\alpha$ -isoclinic, where  $\sqrt{\alpha}$  is the cosine of the acute angle between the lines. It is harder to visualize isoclinic subspaces of dimension  $r > 1$  since distinct planes in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  can never be  $\alpha$ -isoclinic for  $\alpha < 1$ : orthogonal projection fixes a unit vector in the planes' intersection, but it shrinks a unit vector outside their intersection. Nevertheless, two  $\alpha$ -isoclinic subspaces exist whenever  $r \leq d/2$ , as demonstrated by the images of

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\alpha} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\alpha} \\ \sqrt{1-\alpha} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1-\alpha} \end{bmatrix}$$

in the case  $(d, r) = (4, 2)$ . More elusive, an ensemble  $\{W_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  of  $r$ -dimensional subspaces  $W_j \leq V$  is called **equi-isoclinic** with parameter  $\alpha$  if  $W_i$  and  $W_j$  are  $\alpha$ -isoclinic whenever  $i \neq j$ . (Here and throughout, we abbreviate  $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .) In this paper, we construct such ensembles with the aid of representation theory.

Traditionally in the domain of algebraic combinatorics, the main problem for equi-isoclinic subspaces is to find the maximum value of  $n$  given the other parameters above. For example, Lemmens and Seidel [35] proved the bound

$$(1.1) \quad n \leq \frac{d(1-\alpha)}{r-d\alpha}$$

\*DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB, OH

†DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY, AMES, IA

‡DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OH

§TRANSLATIONAL DATA ANALYTICS INSTITUTE, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OH  
*E-mail address:* [jwi@iastate.edu](mailto:jwi@iastate.edu).

and showed it can be achieved in many cases.

More recently, other communities took interest in equi-isoclinic subspaces thanks to connections with Grassmannian packing [12, 24]. Here one similarly considers a  $d$ -dimensional Hilbert space  $V$  over  $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$ , and the goal is to produce an ensemble  $\{W_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  of exactly  $n$  subspaces  $W_j \leq V$ , each with given dimension  $r$ , such that the minimum distance between any two subspaces is as large as possible. In this paper we construct optimal packings with respect to the **spectral distance**

$$\text{dist}_s(W_i, W_j) := \min \{ |\langle w_i, w_j \rangle| : w_k \in W_k, \|w_k\| = 1, k \in \{i, j\} \},$$

which can be understood geometrically as the sine of the sharpest angle between any two lines in  $W_i$  and  $W_j$ . (Note this does not give a metric for Grassmannian space since spectral distance vanishes whenever the subspaces have nontrivial intersection.) The (spectral) **Welch bound** [45, 12] states that

$$(1.2) \quad \min_{i \neq j} \text{dist}_s(W_i, W_j) \leq \sqrt{\frac{n(d-r)}{d(n-1)}}.$$

If equality holds, then  $\{W_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  is a **tight fusion frame**, meaning the orthogonal projections for our subspaces add up to a scalar multiple of the identity. Specifically, equality holds in (1.2) if and only if  $\{W_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  is an **equi-isoclinic tight fusion frame** for  $V$ , abbreviated  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(d, r, n)$ , meaning  $\{W_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  is a tight fusion frame that is also equi-isoclinic. In this case, the parameter of isoclinism is

$$(1.3) \quad \alpha = \frac{rn - d}{d(n-1)},$$

and equality holds in (1.1). Conversely, any ensemble of equi-isoclinic subspaces that achieves equality in (1.1) forms an  $\text{EITFF}$ .

The main problem for  $\text{EITFF}$ s is existence: for which  $\mathbb{F}$ ,  $d$ ,  $r$ , and  $n$  is there an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(d, r, n)$ ? The case  $r = 1$  has received considerable attention; such  $\text{EITFF}$ s are also known as **equiangular tight frames** (ETFs), and they produce optimal packings in projective space. A variety of constructions are known, as summarized in [25]. Next,  $\text{EITFF}$  existence for the case  $r = \frac{d}{2}$  is completely settled by solutions to the Radon–Hurwitz equations [35, 20]. For  $r > 1$  and  $r \neq \frac{d}{2}$ , there are  $\text{EITFF}$  constructions involving covers of the complete graph [27, 21], complex conference matrices [17, 3], quaternions [29, 43, 8], representations of abelian groups [23], and others [16, 18, 31]. Finally, the *Naimark complement* of any  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(d, r, n)$  with  $d < rn$  is an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(rn - d, r, n)$ , any  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{C}}(d, r, n)$  produces an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{R}}(2d, 2r, n)$  [29], and for any integer  $m \geq 1$  a simple tensoring construction converts an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(d, r, n)$  into an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(dm, rm, n)$  [35, 4, 5].

The main contribution of this paper is the construction of infinitely many  $\text{EITFF}$ s with new parameters. In addition, these  $\text{EITFF}$ s feature remarkable symmetry, where the **automorphism group** of a subspace ensemble  $\{W_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  consists of all permutations  $\sigma: [n] \rightarrow [n]$  for which there exists a unitary  $U$  with  $UW_j = W_{\sigma(j)}$  for every  $j \in [n]$ . In this paper, we produce infinitely many  $\text{EITFF}$ s with **total symmetry** or **alternating symmetry**, meaning the automorphism group is the entire symmetric group or contains the alternating group, respectively.<sup>1</sup>

Given the definition of equi-isoclinism, it is perhaps unsurprising that symmetry plays a role in the construction of some  $\text{EITFF}$ s. In fact, the present work

<sup>1</sup>A preliminary version of some of these results appeared in the conference proceeding [22].

may be viewed in the context of a broader story about symmetry interacting with optimality. Such interactions were noted in the work of Fejes Tóth on regular figures [19], and again by Conway, Hardin, and Sloane for Grassmannian packings specifically [9]. For projective packings ( $r = 1$ ), it is known that symmetry may imply optimality, where any ensemble of  $n > d$  lines in  $\mathbb{F}^d$  with a doubly transitive automorphism group forms an ETF [10, 32, 33, 11]. In the other direction, it was recently shown that optimality implies symmetry for EITFFs with  $r = \frac{d}{2}$ , which always have alternating or total symmetry [20]. (None of the constructions in this paper have  $r = \frac{d}{2}$ .) By comparison, one might say that symmetry *facilitates* optimality in this paper. In fact, our main construction in Section 3 creates tight fusion frames by first prescribing a transitive group of automorphisms and then applying techniques from representation theory to obtain a corresponding ensemble of subspaces. Similar techniques appear for subspaces with abelian symmetry in [23] and for lines with prescribed symmetry in [30]. Furthermore, symmetry is famously conjectured to facilitate optimality in *Zauner's conjecture* on the existence of an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{C}}(d, 1, d^2)$  for every  $d$  [46, 36]. Interestingly, symmetry may also *obstruct* the existence of EITFFs when  $r = 1$ , where any  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(d, 1, n)$  with a triply transitive automorphism group and  $n > d$  is necessarily a trivial construction with  $d \in \{1, n - 1\}$  [34, 33]. (This is similar to how any graph with a doubly vertex transitive automorphism group must either be complete or trivial.) Apparently, this obstruction can be removed by taking  $r > 1$ , and in general there is no limit to the amount of symmetry in an EITFF.

Totally symmetric EITFFs are worthy of study in their own right, and they also find applications in *block compressed sensing* [15]. The goal there is to create deterministic subspace ensembles  $\{W_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  with the *block restricted isometry property* (*block RIP*): any appropriately sized sub-ensemble  $\{W_j\}_{j \in E}$  has projections that sum to an operator whose positive eigenvalues reside in a narrow window. All EITFFs are known to satisfy block RIP to at least a certain degree [41, 14, 4]. Interestingly, random ensembles are known to satisfy block RIP to an even greater degree (i.e., larger sub-ensembles with eigenvalues in that narrow window) with high probability. However, certifying this for any particular draw is computationally difficult since  $[n]$  has many subsets [1, 2]. As mentioned in [20], this obstruction vanishes for totally symmetric EITFFs, which have only one subset of any given size, up to a unitary. The totally symmetric EITFFs in this paper may be particularly suitable for analysis in this context since they arise from representations of the symmetric group and thus have considerable algebraic structure. We leave this line of inquiry for future research.

The paper is organized as follows. Following preliminaries in Section 2, we provide a general construction of tight fusion frames with prescribed transitive symmetry in Section 3. Our construction comes in two flavors: the “single layer” version of Theorem 3.1 is simpler and uses irreducible representations, while the “multiple layer” version of Theorem 3.9 is more flexible and allows for reducible (but still multiplicity-free) representations. Subsection 3.2 illustrates our technique with examples, including three new EITFFs. The remainder of the paper interprets the constructions of Section 3 for EITFFs prescribed to have total or alternating symmetry. Section 4 reviews the necessary representation theory of symmetric groups, which is put to good use in Section 5 to create infinitely many totally symmetric EITFFs from a single-layer construction in Theorem 5.3. Next, Section 6 develops

the theory of totally symmetric EITFFs from multiple-layer constructions, where Theorems 6.10 and 6.13 each provide infinitely many examples. Our main results on alternating symmetry are stated in Section 7, where Corollary 7.4 produces infinitely many additional EITFFs. The proof of these results appears in Section 9, following background on representation theory of alternating groups in Section 8.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We begin by establishing notation and terminology.

**2.1. Group actions.** The reader may consult [13] for background on group actions. We use the following conventions. Given a set  $X$ , we write  $S_X$  for the group of all bijections  $g: X \rightarrow X$ , where the group operation is given by composition, with functions on the *right* acting first:  $fg = f \circ g$ . The **symmetric group** on  $n$  points is  $S_n := S_{[n]}$ . We adopt the usual cycle notation for its elements, where as above permutations on the right act first. Thus,  $(12)(23) = (123)$ . (Warning: GAP [39] implements the opposite group operation!) Whenever it is convenient we abuse notation and consider  $S_{n-1}$  to be a subgroup of  $S_n$ , where elements of  $S_{n-1}$  fix the point  $n$  and permute the elements of  $[n-1] \subset [n]$  as expected.

For a group  $G$  and a set  $X$ , a (left) **group action** of  $G$  on  $X$  amounts to a group homomorphism  $\sigma: G \rightarrow S_X$ . Given such an action, we typically suppress  $\sigma$  in our notation and abbreviate  $gx = \sigma(g)x$  for  $g \in G$  and  $x \in X$ . The action is called **faithful** if  $\sigma$  is injective, i.e., no nontrivial element of  $G$  fixes every element of  $X$ . For non-faithful actions the image  $\sigma(G) \leq S_X$  is isomorphic to  $G/\ker \sigma$ . The **orbit** of a point  $x \in X$  is the subset  $Gx := \{gx : g \in G\} \subseteq X$ ; the orbits partition  $X$ . The action is **transitive** if  $X = Gx$  for some (hence any)  $x \in X$ , or equivalently, for every  $x, y \in X$  there exists  $g \in G$  with  $gx = y$ . In particular, if  $G$  acts transitively on  $X$  then for any choice of  $x_0 \in X$  there exists a **transversal**  $\{t_x\}_{x \in X}$  of elements in  $G$  such that  $t_x x_0 = x$  for every  $x \in X$ . The **stabilizer** of a point  $x \in X$  is the subgroup  $G_x := \{g \in G : gx = x\} \leq G$ . Given any subgroup  $H \leq G$ ,  $G$  acts transitively on the left cosets  $G/H$  via  $g(hG) = ghG$ , where the stabilizer of the coset  $H \in G/H$  is the subgroup  $H \leq G$ . Up to equivalence, this accounts for all transitive group actions: if  $G$  acts transitively on  $X$  then for any choice of  $x_0 \in X$  the mapping  $f: G/G_{x_0} \rightarrow X$  given by  $f(gH) = gx_0$  is a well-defined bijection that satisfies  $f(hgG_{x_0}) = hf(gG_{x_0})$  for every  $h \in G$  and  $gG_{x_0} \in G/G_{x_0}$ . The action of  $G$  on  $X$  is **regular** if it is transitive and some (hence every) stabilizer  $G_{x_0}$  is trivial; equivalently, the mapping  $g \mapsto gx_0$  gives a bijection  $G \rightarrow X$ . We say  $G$  acts **doubly homogeneously** on  $X$  if for every two unordered pairs  $\{x, y\}, \{x', y'\} \subseteq X$  with  $x \neq y$  and  $x' \neq y'$  there exists  $g \in G$  such that  $\{gx, gy\} = \{x', y'\}$ . The action is **doubly transitive** if for every two ordered pairs  $(x, y)$  and  $(x', y')$  of elements in  $X$  with  $x \neq y$  and  $x' \neq y'$  there exists  $g \in G$  such that  $(gx, gy) = (x', y')$ .

**2.2. Subspace ensembles.** Let  $V$  be a  $d$ -dimensional Hilbert space over  $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$ , where the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is linear in the first variable and either linear or conjugate-linear in the second variable, according as  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ . We use the following terminology for an ensemble  $\mathcal{W} = \{W_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  of  $r$ -dimensional subspaces  $W_j \leq V$ . For each  $j \in [n]$ , let  $P_j: V \rightarrow V$  give orthogonal projection onto  $W_j$ . Then  $S = \sum_{j=1}^n P_j$  is the **fusion frame operator** of  $\mathcal{W}$ , which equals a scalar multiple of the identity if and only if  $\mathcal{W}$  forms a tight fusion frame for  $V$ , abbreviated TFF $_{\mathbb{F}}(d, r, n)$ . (No confusion should arise between the fusion frame operator

$S$  and the symmetric group  $S_n$ .) Next, fix an  $r$ -dimensional Hilbert space  $W$  over  $\mathbb{F}$ , and choose linear isometries  $\Phi_j: W \rightarrow V$  with  $\text{im } \Phi_j = W_j$  for each  $j \in [n]$ , so that each  $P_j = \Phi_j \Phi_j^*$ . Given  $i, j \in [n]$ ,  $\Phi_i^* \Phi_j: W \rightarrow W$  is called a **cross-Gram operator** for  $W_i$  and  $W_j$ . By fixing an orthonormal basis for  $W$ , we may identify  $\Phi_i^* \Phi_j$  with an  $r \times r$  matrix, called a **cross-Gram matrix** for  $W_i$  and  $W_j$ . Now fix an orthonormal basis for  $V$ . Then each  $\Phi_j$  may be identified with a  $d \times r$  matrix whose columns form an orthonormal basis for  $W_j$ , and  $\mathcal{W}$  can be described by a **fusion synthesis matrix**  $\Phi := [\Phi_1 \ \cdots \ \Phi_n] \in \mathbb{F}^{d \times rn}$ . Here,  $\Phi \Phi^* \in \mathbb{F}^{d \times d}$  is the matrix of the fusion frame operator  $S$ , while  $\Phi^* \Phi \in \mathbb{F}^{rn \times rn}$  is known as a **fusion Gram matrix** for  $\mathcal{W}$  (note it is not unique). Specifically,  $\Phi^* \Phi$  is the  $n \times n$  block array whose  $(i, j)$  block is the cross-Gram matrix  $\Phi_i^* \Phi_j \in \mathbb{F}^{r \times r}$ . Since  $\Phi \Phi^*$  and  $\Phi^* \Phi$  have the same nonzero eigenvalues with multiplicities,  $\mathcal{W}$  is a tight fusion frame for  $V$  if and only if  $\Phi^* \Phi$  has exactly one nonzero eigenvalue  $\lambda$  occurring with multiplicity  $d$ . Taking a trace shows the only option is  $\lambda = \frac{rn}{d}$ . Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{W}$  is a tight fusion frame and  $d < rn$  then  $\frac{rn}{rn-d}(I - \frac{d}{rn}\Phi^* \Phi)$  is the fusion Gram matrix of some  $\text{TFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(rn-d, r, n)$ , called a **Naimark complement** for  $\mathcal{W}$ . In case  $\mathcal{W}$  is an  $\text{ECTFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(d, r, n)$ , then any Naimark complement of  $\mathcal{W}$  is an  $\text{ECTFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(dr-n, r, n)$ . Similarly, if  $\mathcal{W}$  is an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(d, r, n)$  then any Naimark complement of  $\mathcal{W}$  is an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(dr-n, r, n)$ .

Given another  $d$ -dimensional Hilbert space  $V'$  over  $\mathbb{F}$  and another ensemble  $\mathcal{W}' = \{W'_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  of  $r$ -dimensional subspaces  $W'_j \leq V'$ , we say  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{W}'$  are **unitarily equivalent** if there exists a unitary  $U: V \rightarrow V'$  with  $UW_j = W'_j$  for every  $j \in [n]$ . Equivalently,  $\mathcal{W}$  and  $\mathcal{W}'$  are unitarily equivalent if and only if some fusion Gram matrix for  $\mathcal{W}$  is also a fusion Gram matrix for  $\mathcal{W}'$ . In particular, if  $\mathcal{W}$  is a tight fusion frame and  $d < rn$  then any two Naimark complements for  $\mathcal{W}$  are unitarily equivalent. For this reason, we often refer to “the” Naimark complement of a tight fusion frame.

Many notions of distance in Grassmannian space can be expressed in terms of the **principal angles** between subspaces  $W_i$  and  $W_j$ , defined as follows. The first principal angle is the sharpest angle achieved between some unit vectors  $w_i^{(1)} \in W_i$  and  $w_j^{(1)} \in W_j$ ; explicitly,

$$\theta_{i,j,1} := \min \{ \arccos |\langle w_i^{(1)}, w_j^{(1)} \rangle| : w_\ell^{(1)} \in W_\ell, \|w_\ell^{(1)}\| = 1, \ell \in \{i, j\} \}.$$

The second principal angle  $\theta_{i,j,2}$  is then the sharpest angle achieved between unit vectors  $w_i^{(2)} \in W_i \ominus \text{span}\{w_i^{(1)}\}$  and  $w_j^{(2)} \in W_j \ominus \text{span}\{w_j^{(1)}\}$  in the orthogonal complements, and so on, for a total of  $r$  principal angles  $\theta_{i,j,1}, \dots, \theta_{i,j,r}$  between  $W_i$  and  $W_j$ . These can be expressed in terms of singular values of any cross-Gram operator  $\Phi_i^* \Phi_j$ , where each  $\theta_{i,j,k} = \arccos \sigma_k(\Phi_i^* \Phi_j)$ . Furthermore,  $W_i$  and  $W_j$  are  $\alpha$ -isoclinic if and only if  $\theta_{i,j,k} = \arccos \sqrt{\alpha}$  for all  $k \in [r]$ , if and only if  $(\Phi_i^* \Phi_j)^* (\Phi_i^* \Phi_j) = \alpha I$ . In addition to spectral distance, we will also consider the **chordal distance** between subspaces, defined as

$$\text{dist}_c(W_i, W_j) := \sqrt{\sum_{k \in [r]} \sin^2 \theta_{i,j,k}} = \sqrt{r - \|\Phi_i^* \Phi_j\|_F^2},$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  indicates Frobenius norm. The spectral distance can be expressed similarly as

$$\text{dist}_s(W_i, W_j) = \min_{k \in [r]} \sin \theta_{i,j,k} = \sqrt{1 - \|\Phi_i^* \Phi_j\|_{\text{op}}^2},$$

where  $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$  indicates operator norm. The minimum chordal distance obeys the (chordal) **Welch bound** [45, 9, 12], which states that

$$(2.1) \quad \min_{i \neq j} \text{dist}_c(W_i, W_j) \leq \sqrt{\frac{rn(d-r)}{d(n-1)}}.$$

Equality holds in (2.1) if and only if  $\{W_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  is an **equi-chordal tight fusion frame** for  $V$ , abbreviated  $\text{ECTFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(d, r, n)$ , meaning  $\{W_j\}_{j \in [n]}$  is a tight fusion frame and  $\text{dist}_c(W_i, W_j)$  is equal across all pairs  $i \neq j$ . When  $r = 1$ , the notions of  $\text{ECTFF}$  and  $\text{EITFF}$  coincide, and each is equivalent to the notion of an equiangular tight frame. When  $r > 1$ , every  $\text{EITFF}$  is an  $\text{ECTFF}$ , but not vice versa.

In addition to the notation above, we will find it convenient to work with subspace ensembles indexed by an arbitrary finite set  $X$ , not necessarily  $[n]$ . Then similar notation and terminology apply. In particular, the automorphism group of an ensemble  $\{W_x\}_{x \in X}$  of subspaces  $W_x \leq V$  is the subgroup  $\text{Aut}(\{W_x\}_{x \in X}) \leq S_X$  consisting of all permutations  $\sigma$  for which there exists a unitary  $U \in \text{U}(V)$  satisfying  $UW_x = W_{\sigma(x)}$  for every  $x \in X$ .

**2.3. Representation theory.** The reader may consult [7, 6, 38] for background on representation theory. Fix a finite group  $G$  and a field  $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$ . A (unitary) **representation** of  $G$  is a group homomorphism  $\rho: G \rightarrow \text{U}(V)$ , where  $V$  is a finite-dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{F}$ . Its **degree** is the dimension of  $V$ . A subspace  $W \leq V$  is **invariant** for  $\rho(G)$  if  $\rho(g)W = W$  for every  $g \in G$ ; equivalently, orthogonal projection onto  $W$  commutes with  $\rho(g)$  for every  $g \in G$ . Any invariant subspace  $W \leq V$  gives rise to another representation  $G \rightarrow \text{U}(W)$  by restricting the domain and codomain of each  $\rho(g)$  to  $W$ . We say  $\rho$  is **reducible** if a proper and nontrivial invariant subspace  $W \leq V$  exists; otherwise it is **irreducible**.

Next, let  $W$  be another Hilbert space over  $\mathbb{F}$ , and let  $\pi: G \rightarrow \text{U}(W)$  be another representation of  $G$ . A linear map  $L: W \rightarrow V$  **intertwines**  $\pi$  and  $\rho$  if  $L\pi(g) = \rho(g)L$  for every  $g \in G$ . If there exists an intertwining isometry  $W \rightarrow V$ , then we call  $\pi$  a **constituent** of  $\rho$ . We say  $\pi$  and  $\rho$  are **equivalent**, written  $\pi \cong \rho$ , if there exists an intertwining unitary  $W \rightarrow V$ ; otherwise they are **inequivalent**. In case  $\pi$  is irreducible, its **isotypic component** in  $\rho$  is the sum of all images of intertwining isometries  $W \rightarrow V$ . (If no such isometries exist, i.e.  $\pi$  is not a constituent of  $\rho$ , then the isotypic component is defined to be  $\{0\}$ .) This is an invariant subspace for  $\rho(G)$ . Part of **Schur's Lemma** says that if  $\pi$  and  $\rho$  are inequivalent and irreducible, then any linear map intertwining them is constantly 0.

Let  $X$  be a finite set, let  $\{V_x\}_{x \in X}$  be a collection of finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces over  $\mathbb{F}$ , and let  $\{\pi_x\}_{x \in X}$  be a collection of representations  $\pi_x: G \rightarrow \text{U}(V_x)$ . Their **direct sum**  $\bigoplus_{x \in X} \pi_x$  is the representation of  $G$  on the orthogonal direct sum  $\bigoplus_{x \in X} V_x$  given by  $g \mapsto \bigoplus_{x \in X} \pi_x(g)$  for  $g \in G$ . It is always possible to decompose  $\rho$  as a direct sum of irreducible representations. (Here and throughout, we freely conflate internal and external direct sums of Hilbert spaces.) If the irreducible representations in some (hence any) such decomposition are pairwise inequivalent, then  $\rho$  is called **multiplicity free**.

Finally, in the case where  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\rho$  extends to a representation  $\rho'$  on the complexification  $V' \supset V$  of  $V$ , where any orthonormal basis for  $V$  (over  $\mathbb{R}$ ) is also an orthonormal basis for  $V'$  (over  $\mathbb{C}$ ), and the action of each  $\rho'(g)$  on this orthonormal basis is identical. Put differently, the matrix of each  $\rho'(g)$  is exactly the matrix of  $\rho(g)$ , now understood to have complex entries. We say  $\rho$  is **absolutely irreducible**

if  $\rho'$  is irreducible. Any irreducible representation over  $\mathbb{C}$  is also called absolutely irreducible.

### 3. TIGHT FUSION FRAMES FROM SYMMETRY

In this section, we develop our main technical tools for constructing tight fusion frames with prescribed transitive symmetry. We have two such tools: Theorem 3.1 implements a simpler “single layer” construction based on irreducible representations, while Theorem 3.9 implements a more flexible “multiple layer” construction based on multiplicity-free representations. We begin with the simpler of the two.

**3.1. One layer.** As inspiration for the following, let  $G \leq S_X$  be contained in the automorphism group of an ensemble  $\{W_x\}_{x \in X}$  of subspaces of  $V$ . Then for each  $\sigma \in G$ , there exists a unitary  $U \in U(V)$  such that  $UW_x = W_{\sigma(x)}$  for every  $x \in X$ . In particular, if  $\sigma$  belongs to the stabilizer of a point  $x_0 \in X$  then  $U$  must hold  $W_{x_0}$  invariant. This suggests a connection with representation theory, which we leverage as a source of unitaries below.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $G$  be a finite group acting transitively on a set  $X$  via  $\sigma: G \rightarrow S_X$ . Fix a base point  $x_0 \in X$  with stabilizer  $H \leq G$ , and select a transversal  $\{t_x\}_{x \in X}$  of elements in  $G$  such that  $\sigma(t_x)x_0 = x$  for each  $x \in X$ . Next, let  $\rho: G \rightarrow U(\mathbb{F}^d)$  be an irreducible representation, where  $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$ , and suppose  $W \leq \mathbb{F}^d$  is a subspace held invariant by  $\rho(H)$ . Then the orbit  $\mathcal{W} := \{\rho(t_x)W\}_{x \in X}$  is a tight fusion frame whose automorphism group contains  $\sigma(G) \leq S_X$ .*

*Furthermore, if  $G$  acts doubly homogeneously on  $X$  then the following hold:*

- (a)  $\mathcal{W}$  is an ECTFF, and
- (b) when  $|X| \geq 2$ ,  $\mathcal{W}$  is an EITFF if and only if there exists  $g \in G \setminus H$  for which  $W$  and  $\rho(g)W$  are isoclinic.

In Theorem 3.1, the subspace ensemble  $\mathcal{W}$  does not depend on the choice of transversal  $\{t_x\}_{x \in X}$  since  $W$  is held invariant by the stabilizer  $H$  of  $x_0$ . Indeed, if  $t'_x \in G$  also satisfies  $\sigma(t'_x)x_0 = x$ , then  $t_x^{-1}t'_x \in H$  and  $\rho(t'_x)W = \rho(t_x)\rho(t_x^{-1}t'_x)W = \rho(t_x)W$ . In the case where  $G$  has an abelian subgroup  $A \leq G$  that acts regularly on  $X$ , then selecting  $A$  as a transversal shows that  $\mathcal{W}$  is *harmonic*, in the sense of [23].

Our construction of tight fusion frames in Theorem 3.1 generalizes the well-known construction of unit-norm tight frames by irreducible representations, as explained in Theorem 10.5 of [44] (for instance). An even more general version appears in Theorem 3.9 below. The precise construction in Theorem 3.1 was suggested as a promising method for arranging subspaces by Conway, Hardin, and Sloane in [9], but the terminology of tight fusion frames had not yet been invented, and the authors of [9] did not provide certificates for optimality of this construction. Whereas [10] essentially contains part (a) of Theorem 3.1, it does not contain the observation in part (b) or any of its consequences. As far as the authors know, the content of Theorem 3.1 is entirely new in the case where  $\dim W > 1$  and  $G$  does not act doubly transitively on  $X$ . In the sequel, we will mainly be interested in collecting EITFFs which arise from Theorem 3.1(b).

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Let  $P \leq \mathbb{F}^{d \times d}$  be the matrix of orthogonal projection onto  $W$ , so that for each  $x \in X$   $P_x := \rho(t_x)P\rho(t_x)^*$  is the orthogonal projection onto

$\rho(t_x)W$ . Then  $S := \sum_{x \in X} P_x$  is the fusion frame operator of  $\mathcal{W}$ . We claim it commutes with  $\rho(g)$  for every  $g \in G$ . To prove this, we first demonstrate that

$$(3.1) \quad \rho(t_{\sigma(g)x})W = \rho(gt_x)W$$

for every  $x \in X$ . Indeed, the identity  $\sigma(gt_x)x_0 = \sigma(g)x = \sigma(t_{\sigma(g)x})x_0$  implies  $t_{\sigma(g)x}^{-1}gt_x \in H$ , and since  $H$  holds  $W$  invariant it follows that  $\rho(t_{\sigma(g)x}^{-1}gt_x)W = W$ , as in (3.1). In particular, (3.1) implies that

$$P_{\sigma(g)x} = \rho(t_{\sigma(g)x})P\rho(t_{\sigma(g)x})^* = \rho(gt_x)P\rho(gt_x)^* = \rho(g)P_x\rho(g)^*,$$

so that

$$\rho(g)S\rho(g)^* = \sum_{x \in X} \rho(g)P_x\rho(g)^* = \sum_{x \in X} P_{\sigma(g)x} = S.$$

This proves the claim.

Now choose an eigenvalue  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$  of  $S$ . (It exists even when  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  since  $S = S^*$ .) Applying the claim, we find that the  $\lambda$ -eigenspace  $V \leq \mathbb{F}^d$  is invariant under  $\rho(g)$  for every  $g \in G$ : any  $v \in V$  satisfies  $S\rho(g)v = \rho(g)Sv = \lambda\rho(g)v$ . Since  $\rho$  is irreducible, it follows that  $V = \mathbb{F}^d$  and  $S = \lambda I$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{W}$  is a tight fusion frame. Its automorphism group contains  $\sigma(G)$  since the identity  $\rho(g)P_x\rho(g)^* = P_{\sigma(g)x}$  implies  $\sigma(g) \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{W})$  for each  $g \in G$ .

Finally, to prove the ‘‘furthermore’’ part, assume  $G$  acts doubly homogeneously on  $X$ . Given any two unordered pairs  $\{x, y\}, \{x', y'\} \subseteq X$  with  $x \neq y$  and  $x' \neq y'$ , there exists  $g \in G$  with  $\{\sigma(g)x, \sigma(g)y\} = \{x', y'\}$ . Applying (3.1), we find that

$$\{\rho(t_{x'})W, \rho(t_{y'})W\} = \{\rho(t_{\sigma(g)x})W, \rho(t_{\sigma(g)y})W\} = \{\rho(g)\rho(t_x)W, \rho(g)\rho(t_y)W\}.$$

In particular,  $\text{dist}_c(\rho(t_{x'})W, \rho(t_{y'})W) = \text{dist}_c(\rho(t_x)W, \rho(t_y)W)$ . This proves (a). The ‘‘if’’ part of (b) follows similarly, while the ‘‘only if’’ part holds trivially.  $\square$

*Remark 3.2.* When applying Theorem 3.1, there could be infinitely many candidate subspaces  $W$  that are invariant under  $\rho(H)$ , and different choices of  $W$  may lead to fusion frames with very different properties. (This occurs, for instance, in the context of *Zauner’s conjecture* [46, 36], where the main problem is to choose a line from a particular eigenspace so that its orbit under the Schrödinger representation is equiangular. This construction may be seen as an instance of Theorem 3.1, where  $G$  is a certain group containing the Heisenberg group as a normal subgroup of index 3.) Among this possible multitude of choices for  $W$ , we focus in this paper on a special class of candidates identified by Creignou [10]. Let  $G$ ,  $H$ , and  $\rho$  be as in Theorem 3.1. For each irreducible representation of  $H$ , the corresponding isotypic component of  $\rho|_H$  is invariant under  $\rho(H)$ , and so any sum of isotypic components satisfies the condition for  $W$  in Theorem 3.1. In particular, when  $G$  is doubly transitive on  $G/H$ , taking  $W$  to be any sum of isotypic components of  $\rho|_H$  produces an ECTFF via Theorem 3.1(a). This method creates many examples of ECTFFs [10], and they have not been carefully catalogued for  $\dim W > 1$ . (The case  $\dim W = 1$  amounts to doubly transitive lines, and the interesting examples have been classified [11, 33, 32].) As we will see, this method also produces many EITFFs via Theorem 3.1(b).

**3.2. Examples.** Details of the following examples can be verified with software such as GAP [39]. Table 1 collects EITFF parameters obtained in this subsection. We begin with a simple example that illustrates the notation of Theorem 3.1.

$\mathbb{F}$	$\mathbb{R}$	$\mathbb{R}$	$\mathbb{C}$	$\mathbb{C}$	$\mathbb{R}$	$\mathbb{C}$
$d$	2	5	10	10	11	16
$r$	1	2	3	4	3	5
$n$	3	5	15	10	11	12
$\alpha$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{1}{5}$	$\frac{1}{4}$
$G$	$S_3$	$S_5$	$A_7$	$\text{PSL}(2, 9)$	$\text{PSL}(2, 11)$	$M_{11}$

TABLE 1. For each column above, Theorem 3.1 constructs an ensemble of  $n$  equi-isoclinic subspaces with dimension  $r$  that form a tight fusion frame for  $\mathbb{F}^d$ , where  $\alpha$  is the common parameter of isoclinism. Furthermore, the automorphism group of this ensemble is doubly transitive and contains a copy of  $G$ . These examples appear in Subsection 3.2.

*Example 3.3.* Theorem 3.1 constructs the three equiangular lines in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  spanned by vectors of the *Mercedes-Benz frame* as follows. Let  $G := S_3$  act on  $X := [3]$ , and take  $x_0 := 3$  for a base point. Its stabilizer is  $H = \langle (12) \rangle$ , and a transversal consists of  $t_1 := (123)$ ,  $t_2 := (132)$ , and  $t_3 := ()$ . For an irreducible representation, take the homomorphism  $\rho: S_3 \rightarrow \text{U}(\mathbb{R}^2)$  uniquely determined by the generator images

$$\rho(123) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -\sqrt{3} \\ \sqrt{3} & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(12) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the line  $W := \text{span}\{(0, 1)\} \leq \mathbb{R}^2$  is held invariant by  $\rho(H)$ , and its orbit  $\mathcal{W} = \{\rho(t_k)W\}_{k \in [3]}$  consists of the three lines spanned by the Mercedes-Benz frame vectors  $\frac{1}{2}(-\sqrt{3}, -1)$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{3}, -1)$ , and  $(0, 1)$ . Theorem 3.1 implies  $\mathcal{W}$  is a tight fusion frame with automorphism group  $S_3$ . Furthermore, since  $S_3$  is doubly homogeneous, and since any two lines are isoclinic, Theorem 3.1(b) implies  $\mathcal{W}$  is an EITFF (as is well known).

*Example 3.4.* Next, we construct a totally symmetric EITFF $_{\mathbb{R}}(5, 2, 5)$ . This example is the smallest instance of our main results in Section 5. Consider  $G := S_5$  acting on  $X := [5]$ , and take  $x_0 := 5$  for a base point. Its stabilizer is  $H := \langle (12), (23), (34) \rangle \cong S_4$ , and a transversal  $\{t_k\}_{k \in [5]}$  is given by  $t_k := (12345)^k$ . There is an irreducible representation  $\rho: S_5 \rightarrow \text{U}(\mathbb{R}^5)$  uniquely determined by the generator images

$$\rho(12) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \rho(23) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & \sqrt{3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{3} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & \sqrt{3} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3} & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\rho(34) = \frac{1}{3} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 2\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2\sqrt{2} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \rho(45) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & \sqrt{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & \sqrt{3} \\ 0 & \sqrt{3} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3} & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the image  $W \leq \mathbb{R}^5$  of the isometry  $\Psi := [e_4 \ e_5] \in \mathbb{R}^{5 \times 2}$  is invariant under  $\rho(H)$ , where  $e_k$  is the  $k$ th column of the identity matrix. By Theorem 3.1,  $\mathcal{W} = \{\rho(t_k)W\}_{k \in [5]}$  is a tight fusion frame with automorphism group  $S_5$ . An explicit fusion synthesis matrix for  $\mathcal{W}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} & [ \rho(t_1)\Psi \ \rho(t_2)\Psi \ \rho(t_3)\Psi \ \rho(t_4)\Psi \ \rho(t_5)\Psi ] \\ &= \frac{1}{12} \left[ \begin{array}{cc|cc|cc|cc|cc} 4\sqrt{6} & 0 & -2\sqrt{6} & -6\sqrt{2} & 4\sqrt{6} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sqrt{3} & 9 & -4\sqrt{3} & 6 & 2\sqrt{3} & 0 & -3\sqrt{3} & -9 & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & -3\sqrt{3} & -6 & 0 & 0 & 6\sqrt{3} & -9 & 3\sqrt{3} & 0 & 0 \\ -3 & -3\sqrt{3} & 6 & 0 & 6 & 0 & -3 & -3\sqrt{3} & 12 & 0 \\ -3\sqrt{3} & 3 & 0 & -6 & 0 & -6 & -3\sqrt{3} & 3 & 0 & 12 \end{array} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,  $W$  and  $\rho(45)W$  are isoclinic since  $\Psi^\top \rho(45)\Psi = \frac{1}{2}I_2$ , and so Theorem 3.1(b) implies  $\mathcal{W}$  is a totally symmetric EITFF(5, 2, 5). Such an ensemble was previously constructed by Et-Taoui using a different technique [16]. In Section 5, we extend the present construction to an infinite family of totally symmetric EITFFs. See Example 5.1 for more detail.

*Example 3.5.* The group  $\text{PSL}(2, 9)$  acts doubly transitively on 10 points [13]. Here we construct an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{C}}(10, 4, 10)$  whose automorphism group contains an isomorphic copy of this action. Consider  $G := \text{SL}(2, 9) = \langle g_1, g_2, g_3 \rangle$ , where

$$g_1 := \begin{bmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & a^{-1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad g_2 := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad g_3 := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and where  $a$  is a generator of the multiplicative group of the finite field  $\mathbb{F}_9$ . Then  $G$  acts doubly transitively on the set  $X$  of one-dimensional lines through the origin of  $\mathbb{F}_9^2$ , and the stabilizer of the line spanned by  $[1 \ 0]^\top$  is the upper-triangular subgroup  $H := \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle$ . This action of  $G$  is not faithful, and the corresponding image in  $S_X$  is isomorphic to  $\text{PSL}(2, 9)$ .

For a unitary representation of  $G$ , first let  $\xi: G \rightarrow \mathbb{T} = \text{U}(\mathbb{C})$  be either one of the two degree-1 representations of  $H$  given by  $(\xi(g_1), \xi(g_2)) = (e^{\frac{2\pi i}{8}}, 1)$  or  $(\xi(g_1), \xi(g_2)) = (e^{\frac{7 \cdot 2\pi i}{8}}, 1)$ , and then let  $\rho: G \rightarrow \text{U}(\mathbb{C}^{10})$  be the unitary representation of  $G$  induced from  $\xi$ ; see [7]. It turns out that  $\rho$  is irreducible, and its restriction to  $H$  decomposes as a sum of pairwise inequivalent irreducible constituents with degrees 1, 1, 4, 4. Let  $W \leq \mathbb{C}^{10}$  be either of the 4-dimensional isotypic components. By Theorem 3.1, the orbit  $\{\rho(g)W\}_{gH \in G/H}$  of  $W$  is a tight fusion frame whose automorphism group contains  $\text{PSL}(2, 9) \leq S_X$ . This fusion frame turns out to be an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{C}}(10, 4, 10)$ . As far as the authors know, these parameters are new. We include a fusion synthesis matrix as an ancillary file with the arXiv version of this paper.

*Example 3.6.* There is a sporadic doubly transitive action of  $\text{PSL}(2, 11)$  on 11 points; see [13]. Here we construct an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{R}}(11, 3, 11)$  from this action. Consider  $G := \text{SL}(2, 11) = \langle g_1, g_2, g_3 \rangle$ , where

$$g_1 := \begin{bmatrix} 6 & 10 \\ 2 & 9 \end{bmatrix}, \quad g_2 := \begin{bmatrix} 4 & 4 \\ 4 & 7 \end{bmatrix}, \quad g_3 := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 10 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then (one can verify)  $G$  has a 2-transitive action on  $X := [11]$ , where a base point  $x_0 := 11$  is stabilized by  $H := \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle$ , and where a transversal  $\{t_k\}_{k \in [11]}$  is given

by  $t_k := \begin{bmatrix} 9 & 4 \\ 6 & 4 \end{bmatrix}^k$ . This is not a faithful action of  $G$ , and the corresponding image in  $S_{11}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathrm{PSL}(2, 11)$ . Let  $\rho: G \rightarrow \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{R}^{11})$  be an irreducible representation of degree 11. (There is only one up to equivalence, and it can be taken to be real.) Then the restriction of  $\rho$  to  $H$  decomposes as a direct sum of three inequivalent irreducible subspaces with dimensions 3, 3, 7. Let  $W \leq \mathbb{R}^{11}$  be either one of the two 3-dimensional isotypic components. Then its orbit  $\mathcal{W} := \{\rho(t_k)W\}_{k \in [11]}$  is a tight fusion frame whose automorphism group contains a copy of  $\mathrm{PSL}(2, 11)$ , by Theorem 3.1. This fusion frame turns out to be an  $\mathrm{EITFF}_{\mathbb{R}}(11, 3, 11)$ . Furthermore, we constructed  $\mathcal{W}$  as an orbit of the regular abelian subgroup  $\langle t_1 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}_{11}$ , and so it is a *harmonic*  $\mathrm{EITFF}_{\mathbb{R}}(11, 3, 11)$  in the sense of [23]. Such an EITFF appeared in Theorem 4.3 of [23].

*Example 3.7.* Next, we construct an  $\mathrm{EITFF}_{\mathbb{C}}(16, 5, 12)$  whose automorphism group is triply transitive and contains a copy of the Mathieu group  $M_{11}$ . Let  $G = M_{11}$ , and let  $H \leq G$  be a subgroup of index  $[G : H] = 12$ . (There is only one conjugacy class of such subgroups.) Take  $\rho: G \rightarrow \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{C}^{16})$  to be either one of the two (complex conjugate) irreducible representations of  $G$  having degree 16. Then the restriction of  $\rho$  to  $H$  decomposes as a direct sum of two irreducible subspaces with dimensions 5 and 11. If  $W \leq \mathbb{C}^{16}$  is the 5-dimensional isotypic component, then its orbit  $\{\rho(g)W\}_{gH \in G/H}$  is a tight fusion frame whose automorphism group contains a copy of  $M_{11}$ , by Theorem 3.1. This fusion frame turns out to be an  $\mathrm{EITFF}_{\mathbb{C}}(16, 5, 12)$ . As far as the authors know, these parameters are new. We include a fusion synthesis matrix as an ancillary file with the arXiv version of this paper.

*Example 3.8.* Finally, we construct an  $\mathrm{EITFF}_{\mathbb{C}}(10, 3, 15)$  whose automorphism group is doubly transitive and contains a copy of  $A_7$ . Let  $G = A_7$ , and let  $H \leq G$  be a subgroup of index  $[G : H] = 15$ . (There are two conjugacy classes, and either one works.) Take  $\rho: G \rightarrow \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{C}^{10})$  to be either one of the two (complex conjugate) irreducible representations of  $G$  having degree 10. Then the restriction of  $\rho$  to  $H$  decomposes as a direct sum of two irreducible subspaces with dimensions 3 and 7. If  $W \leq \mathbb{C}^{10}$  is the 3-dimensional isotypic component, then its orbit  $\{\rho(g)W\}_{gH \in G/H}$  is a tight fusion frame whose automorphism group contains an action of  $A_7$  on 15 points, by Theorem 3.1. This fusion frame turns out to be an  $\mathrm{EITFF}_{\mathbb{C}}(10, 3, 15)$ . As far as the authors know, these parameters are also new. We include a fusion synthesis matrix as an ancillary file with the arXiv version of this paper.

**3.3. Multiple layers.** The remainder of the paper is devoted to generalizing the totally symmetric  $\mathrm{EITFF}_{\mathbb{R}}(5, 2, 5)$  from Example 3.4. We will utilize the construction of Theorem 3.1, as well as the following generalization, which produces tight fusion frames from multiplicity-free representations.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Let  $G$  be a finite group acting transitively on a set  $X$  via  $\sigma: G \rightarrow S_X$ . Fix a base point  $x_0 \in X$  with stabilizer  $H \leq G$ , and select a transversal  $\{t_x\}_{x \in X}$  of elements in  $G$  such that  $\sigma(t_x)x_0 = x$  for each  $x \in X$ . Next, choose pairwise inequivalent, irreducible representations  $\rho_i: G \rightarrow \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{F}^{d_i})$ ,  $i \in [\ell]$ , over a common base field  $\mathbb{F} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$ . Assume their restrictions to  $H$  have a common constituent  $\pi: H \rightarrow \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{F}^r)$  (not necessarily irreducible), and select isometries  $\Psi_i \in \mathbb{F}^{d_i \times r}$  with the property that  $\rho_i(h)\Psi_i = \Psi_i\pi(h)$  for every  $i \in [\ell]$  and  $h \in H$ . Finally, denote  $d := \sum_{i \in [\ell]} d_i$  and  $\rho := \bigoplus_{i \in [\ell]} \rho_i: G \rightarrow \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{F}^d)$ . Then the vertical*

concatenation

$$\left[ \sqrt{d_1/d}\Psi_1; \sqrt{d_2/d}\Psi_2; \cdots; \sqrt{d_\ell/d}\Psi_\ell \right] \in \mathbb{F}^{d \times r}$$

is an isometry onto a subspace  $W \leq \mathbb{F}^d$ , and its orbit  $\mathcal{W} := \{\rho(t_x)W\}_{x \in X}$  is a tight fusion frame whose automorphism group contains  $\sigma(G) \leq S_X$ .

Furthermore, if  $G$  acts doubly homogeneously on  $X$  then the following hold:

- (a)  $\mathcal{W}$  is an ECTFF, and
- (b) when  $|X| \geq 2$ ,  $\mathcal{W}$  is an EITFF if and only if there exists  $g \in G \setminus H$  for which  $W$  and  $\rho(g)W$  are isoclinic.

As with Theorem 3.1, the subspace ensemble  $\mathcal{W}$  in Theorem 3.9 does not depend on the choice of transversal  $\{t_x\}_{x \in X}$ . We refer to  $\ell$  as the number of **layers** in Theorem 3.9, since the resulting fusion synthesis matrix decomposes as an  $[\ell] \times X$  array of blocks, where the  $(i, x)$  block is  $\sqrt{d_i/d}\rho_i(t_x)\Psi_i \in \mathbb{F}^{d_i \times r}$ . This decomposition appears prominently in the following proof.

*Proof of Theorem 3.9.* It is easy to verify that the matrix in the theorem statement is an isometry. Let  $W$  be its image, and let  $P \in \mathbb{F}^{d \times d}$  be the matrix of orthogonal projection onto  $W$ , so that for each  $x \in X$  the orthogonal projection onto  $\rho(t_x)W$  is given by  $P_x := \rho(t_x)P\rho(t_x)^*$ . We may view each  $P_x$  as an  $\ell \times \ell$  array of blocks, where the  $(i, j)$  block is

$$(P_x)_{ij} = \frac{\sqrt{d_i d_j}}{d} \rho_i(t_x)\Psi_i\Psi_j^*\rho_j(t_x)^* \in \mathbb{F}^{d_i \times d_j}.$$

Then the fusion frame operator  $S = \sum_{x \in X} P_x$  has a corresponding block structure, where

$$S_{ij} = \frac{\sqrt{d_i d_j}}{d} \sum_{x \in X} \rho_i(t_x)\Psi_i\Psi_j^*\rho_j(t_x)^* \in \mathbb{F}^{d_i \times d_j}.$$

We claim that  $\rho_i(g)S_{ij} = S_{ij}\rho_j(g)$  for every  $i, j \in [\ell]$  and  $g \in G$ . To see this, choose any  $g \in G$  and  $x \in X$ . As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, it holds that  $h := t_{\sigma(g)x}^{-1}gt_x \in H$ , and so

$$\rho_k(g)\rho_k(t_x)\Psi_k = \rho_k(t_{\sigma(g)x})\rho_k(t_{\sigma(g)x}^{-1}gt_x)\Psi_k = \rho_k(t_{\sigma(g)x})\Psi_k\pi(h)$$

for every  $k \in [\ell]$ . Given any  $i, j \in [\ell]$ , we deduce the crucial identity

$$(3.2) \quad \rho_i(g)\rho_i(t_x)\Psi_i\Psi_j^*\rho_j(t_x)^*\rho_j(g)^* = \rho_i(t_{\sigma(g)x})\Psi_i\Psi_j^*\rho_j(t_{\sigma(g)x})^*.$$

Summing over  $x \in X$  and then re-indexing, we quickly deduce that  $\rho_i(g)S_{ij}\rho_j(g)^* = S_{ij}$ , as claimed.

For  $i \neq j$ , the irreducible representations  $\rho_i$  and  $\rho_j$  are inequivalent, and our claim together with Schur's Lemma implies  $S_{ij} = 0$ . Similarly, for  $i = j$ , we have  $S_{ii}^* = S_{ii}$ , and it follows as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 that  $S_{ii} = c_i I_{d_i}$  for some constant  $c_i$ . The constant  $c_i$  does not depend on  $i$ , as seen by taking a trace:

$$c_i d_i = \text{tr}(c_i I_{d_i}) = \text{tr}(S_{ii}) = \frac{d_i}{d} \sum_{x \in X} \text{tr} \left[ \rho_i(t_x)\Psi_i^*\Psi_i\rho_i(t_x)^* \right] = \frac{d_i}{d} \sum_{x \in X} \text{tr}(I_r) = \frac{d_i}{d} r |X|.$$

Hence,  $S = \frac{r|X|}{d} I_d$ , and  $\mathcal{W}$  is a tight fusion frame. To see that its automorphism group contains  $\sigma(G)$ , we may interpret (3.2) to say  $\rho_i(g)(P_x)_{ij}\rho_j(g)^* = (P_{\sigma(g)x})_{ij}$ , so that  $\rho(g)P_x\rho(g)^* = P_{\sigma(g)x}$  for every  $g \in G$  and  $x \in X$ .

Finally, the proof of the ‘‘furthermore’’ part is similar to that in Theorem 3.1.  $\square$




FIGURE 1. (a) The Young diagram with shape  $\mu := (4, 2^2)$ , where removable boxes are colored blue. (b) A standard tableau  $T \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$ . (c) The action of a transposition on  $T$ . (d) The embedding of  $T$  into  $\text{Tab}(\lambda)$  for  $\lambda := (4, 3, 2) \in \mu^\uparrow$ , where the  $\lambda - \mu$  box is colored red. (e) Hook lengths for  $\mu$ , where one hook is colored green.

#### 4. REVIEW OF REPRESENTATION THEORY OF $S_n$

In order to produce more EITFFs with the techniques from Section 3, we now recall some representation theory of the symmetric group  $S_n$  [6]. Some of the notation that follows is nonstandard, but it will prove helpful in the sequel.

As detailed below, each irreducible representation of  $S_n$  is associated with a unique **partition**  $\lambda \vdash n$ , that is, a nonincreasing sequence of positive integers that sum to  $n$ . We use superscripts to indicate repeated entries in this sequence:

$$\lambda = (\underbrace{l_1, \dots, l_1}_{a_1 \text{ copies}}, \dots, \underbrace{l_m, \dots, l_m}_{a_m \text{ copies}}) =: (l_1^{a_1}, \dots, l_m^{a_m}).$$

Here, if  $l_1 > \dots > l_m$ , then we say  $\lambda$  has  $m$  **distinct parts**.

A **Young diagram** depicts a partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  as an array of  $n$  boxes arranged on a grid, where the  $i$ th row from the top contains  $\lambda_i$  boxes. For example, Figure 1(a) shows the Young diagram with shape  $(4, 2^2) \vdash 8$ . Boxes of a Young diagram are indexed just like matrix entries: rows from top to bottom and columns from left to right. For  $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the  $c$ th **superdiagonal** of a Young diagram consists of all boxes in position  $(i, j)$  with  $j - i = c$ . Thus, the main diagonal is the 0th superdiagonal, with positive superdiagonals above it and negative ones below it. In Figure 1(a), the upper blue box is on the 3rd superdiagonal, and the lower one is on the  $-1$ st. The **axial distance** from the  $(i, j)$  box to the  $(k, l)$  box is defined as the difference of their superdiagonals:

$$D((i, j), (k, l)) := (j - i) - (l - k).$$

This is the total signed distance of any path from  $(i, j)$  to  $(k, l)$ , where paths that go down or to the left count as having positive length, and those that go up or to the right count negative. In Figure 1(a), the axial distance from the lower blue square to the upper one is  $-4$ .

A **Young tableau**  $T$  with shape  $\lambda$  assigns the numbers  $1, \dots, n$  bijectively to the boxes in the Young diagram of  $\lambda$ . We write  $T_{ij}$  for the number in the  $(i, j)$  box of  $T$ . Then  $S_n$  acts on the set of all tableaux with shape  $\lambda$  by the formula  $(gT)_{ij} = g(T_{ij})$  for  $g \in S_n$ . Figure 1(b) shows an example of a tableau  $T$  with shape  $(4, 2, 2)$ , and then Figure 1(c) shows  $(6\ 7)T$ . A tableau is called **standard** if its entries increase moving down and to the right: if  $i < i'$  and  $j < j'$  then  $T_{ij} < T_{i'j}$  and  $T_{ij} < T_{ij'}$ . In Figure 1,  $T$  is standard and  $(6\ 7)T$  is not. The set of all standard tableaux with shape  $\lambda \vdash n$  is denoted  $\text{Tab}(\lambda)$ . The **content** of a (possibly nonstandard) tableau  $T$  with shape  $\lambda$  is the sequence  $C(T) = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  of superdiagonal positions of

$1, \dots, n$ ; that is,  $a_k = j - i$  when  $k = T_{ij}$ . The **axial distance** from  $i \in [n]$  to  $j \in [n]$  in  $T$  is the same as for their box positions,  $D_T(i, j) := a_i - a_j$ . For example, the tableau  $T$  in Figure 1(b) has content  $C(T) = (0, -1, 1, -2, 2, 0, -1, 3)$ , and some of its axial distances are  $D_T(5, 4) = 4$ ,  $D_T(1, 6) = 0$ , and  $D_T(7, 6) = -1$ .

As we now explain, each partition  $\lambda \vdash n$  determines a representation  $\pi_\lambda$  of  $S_n$  on the real Hilbert space  $V_\lambda$  with formal orthonormal basis  $\{v_T\}_{T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)}$ . It suffices to describe  $\pi_\lambda$  on the generating set of adjacent transpositions  $s_k := (k \ k+1)$ ,  $k \in [n-1]$ , and it suffices to give the action of  $\pi_\lambda(s_k)$  on the basis vectors  $v_T$ ,  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ . In this paper, we take  $\pi_\lambda$  in **Young's orthogonal form**, where

$$(4.1) \quad \pi_\lambda(s_k)v_T = \frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)}v_T + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)^2}}v_{s_k T}.$$

(Above, the coefficient  $\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)^2}}$  is zero precisely when  $s_k T \notin \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ , and in this case it does not matter that  $v_{s_k T}$  is undefined.) Expressed as a matrix with entries indexed by  $\text{Tab}(\lambda) \times \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ ,

$$[\pi_\lambda(s_k)]_{S, T} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)} & \text{if } S = T, \\ \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)^2}} & \text{if } S = s_k T, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then  $\pi_\lambda(s_k)$  is a unitary operator on  $V_\lambda$ , and the images  $\{\pi_\lambda(s_k) : k \in [n-1]\}$  determine an absolutely irreducible unitary representation  $\pi_\lambda : S_n \rightarrow \text{U}(V_\lambda)$ . Furthermore, this accounts for all irreducible representations of  $S_n$ , and when  $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$  the representations  $\pi_{\lambda_1}$  and  $\pi_{\lambda_2}$  are inequivalent.

The degree of  $\pi_\lambda$  can be computed with the aid of the Young diagram for  $\lambda$  as follows. In a Young diagram, the **hook** with corner at position  $(k, l)$  consists of all boxes in position  $(i, j)$  where either  $i = k$  and  $j \geq l$ , or  $i \geq k$  and  $j = l$ . In other words, a hook consists of a box, all boxes underneath it, and all boxes to its right. The Young diagram in Figure 1(e) shows a hook highlighted in green. The number of boxes in a hook is its **length**, denoted  $h_\lambda(k, l)$  for the hook with corner at position  $(k, l)$ . In Figure 1(e), the length of each hook in the Young diagram is listed at its corner. The **hook length formula** states that

$$d_\lambda := \dim(V_\lambda) = |\text{Tab}(\lambda)| = \frac{n!}{\prod_{(k, l)} h_\lambda(k, l)},$$

where the product is over all box positions in the Young diagram for  $\lambda$ . For example, one can compute  $d_{(4, 2, 2)}$  with the aid of Figure 1(e):

$$d_{(4, 2, 2)} = \frac{8!}{7 \cdot 5 \cdot 2 \cdot 1 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 1} = 48.$$

The **transpose** of a partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h) \vdash n$  is defined as the partition  $\lambda' = (\lambda'_1, \dots, \lambda'_{h'}) \vdash n$  given by  $\lambda'_i := \max\{j : \lambda_j \geq i\}$ , where  $h' := \lambda_1$ . This terminology is appropriate since the Young diagram of  $\lambda'$  is obtained by reflecting the Young diagram of  $\lambda$  across its main diagonal. Then  $d_{\lambda'} = d_\lambda$  (as shown for instance by the Hook length formula). If  $\lambda = \lambda'$  then  $\lambda$  is called **symmetric**. Similarly, the **transpose** of a tableau  $T$  with shape  $\lambda$  is defined to be the tableau  $T'$  with shape  $\lambda'$  and entries  $T'_{ij} = T_{ji}$ .

The irreducible constituents of the restriction  $\pi_\lambda|_{S_{n-1}}$  are necessarily indexed by certain partitions of  $n-1$ , and they can be identified with the aid of a Young diagram as follows. In the Young diagram for  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_h)$ , the  $(k, l)$  box is called **removable** if  $l = \lambda_k$  and either  $k = h$  or  $\lambda_k > \lambda_{k+1}$ . In Figure 1(a), the removable boxes are colored blue. Equivalently, the  $(k, l)$  box is removable if its deletion produces a valid Young diagram for another partition  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$ . We express the relationship between such  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  by writing  $\mu \in \lambda^\downarrow$  and  $\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow$ , and we write  $\lambda - \mu := (k, l)$  for the index of the removed box. We use  $[\lambda] := \{\lambda - \mu : \mu \in \lambda^\downarrow\}$  for the set of box indices that can be removed from  $\lambda$ . Notice that the number  $||[\lambda]||$  of removable boxes is precisely the number of distinct entries in the sequence  $\lambda$ , i.e., the number of distinct parts. An inductive argument shows that a box is removable if and only if it contains  $n$  in some standard tableau:

$$(4.2) \quad [\lambda] = \{(i, j) : T_{ij} = n \text{ for some } T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)\}.$$

The **branching rule** says that each constituent of  $\pi_\lambda|_{S_{n-1}}$  occurs with multiplicity one, and it is obtained by removing a box:

$$\pi_\lambda|_{S_{n-1}} \cong \bigoplus_{\mu \in \lambda^\downarrow} \pi_\mu.$$

For an explicit embedding, choose  $\mu \in \lambda^\downarrow$ , and let  $(k, l) = \lambda - \mu$  index the removed box. Given a tableau  $R$  with shape  $\mu$ , we define  $R^\lambda$  to be the tableau that restores the  $(k, l)$  box to  $R$  and fills it with the number  $n$ . Figure 1(d) shows an example. Explicitly,  $R_{ij}^\lambda = R_{ij}$  for  $(i, j) \neq (k, l)$ , and  $R_{kl}^\lambda = n$ . Then  $D_R(i, j) = D_{R^\lambda}(i, j)$  for every  $i, j \in [n-1]$ . Furthermore,  $(gR)^\lambda = g(R^\lambda)$  for every  $g \in S_{n-1}$ , and  $R^\lambda \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$  if and only if  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$ . Now consider the linear isometry  $\Psi_{\lambda, \mu} : V_\mu \rightarrow V_\lambda$  given by  $\Psi_{\lambda, \mu} v_R = v_{R^\lambda}$  for  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$ . As a matrix, the entries of  $\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}$  are indexed by  $\text{Tab}(\lambda) \times \text{Tab}(\mu)$  and can be expressed in terms of the Kronecker delta:

$$[\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}]_{T, R} = \delta_{T, R^\lambda}.$$

Then it is easy to check that  $\Psi_{\lambda, \mu} \pi_\mu(s_k) v_R = \pi_\lambda(s_k) \Psi_{\lambda, \mu} v_R$  for every  $k \in [n-2]$  and  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$ , so that

$$(4.3) \quad \Psi_{\lambda, \mu} \pi_\mu(g) = \pi_\lambda(g) \Psi_{\lambda, \mu}, \quad g \in S_{n-1}.$$

In particular, the  $\pi_\mu$ -isotypic component of  $\pi_\lambda|_{S_{n-1}}$  is

$$(4.4) \quad \text{im } \Psi_{\lambda, \mu} = \text{span}\{v_{R^\lambda} : R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)\} = \text{span}\{v_T : T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda), T_{kl} = n\}.$$

## 5. TOTAL SYMMETRY: ONE LAYER


Having reviewed the necessary background, we now apply the single-layer construction of Theorem 3.1 to the representations from Section 4, obtaining new and totally symmetric EITFFs in Theorem 5.3. Specifically, select a partition  $\lambda \vdash n$  and an isotypic component  $W \leq V_\lambda$  of  $\pi_\lambda|_{S_{n-1}}$ . Then the action of  $S_{n-1}$  on  $W$  is equivalent to  $\pi_\mu$  for some  $\mu \in \lambda^\downarrow$ . Choose a transversal  $\{t_k\}_{k \in [n]}$  in  $S_n$  with  $t_k n = k$  for each  $k$ , and consider the orbit  $\mathcal{W} := \{\pi_\lambda(t_k)W\}_{k \in [n]}$ . Then Theorem 3.1(a) asserts that  $\mathcal{W}$  is a totally symmetric ECTFF. As detailed below, there are many choices of  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  for which  $\mathcal{W}$  is an EITFF. We begin with some illustrative examples, which we encourage the reader to study carefully.

*Example 5.1.* In the context described above, take  $\lambda = (3, 2)$  and  $\mu = (2, 2)$ . Their Young diagrams are shown below, where the red box belongs to  $\lambda$  but not  $\mu$ , and where the only removable box of  $\mu$  is colored blue.



We will show that the  $\pi_\mu$ -isotypic component  $W = \text{im } \Psi_{\lambda, \mu} \leq V_\lambda$  and its image  $\pi_\lambda(s_4)W = \text{im } \pi_\lambda(s_4)\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}$  are isoclinic subspaces. It will follow from Theorem 3.1 that the orbit  $\mathcal{W}$  is a totally symmetric EITFF $_{\mathbb{R}}(d_\lambda, d_\mu, 5)$ .

By the hook length formula, there are  $d_\mu = \frac{4!}{3 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 1} = 2$  standard tableaux with shape  $\mu$ , and  $d_\lambda = \frac{5!}{4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1 \cdot 1} = 5$  standard tableaux with shape  $\lambda$ , all shown below.



To express  $\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}: V_\mu \rightarrow V_\lambda$  as a matrix, observe that  $R_1^\lambda = T_4$  and  $R_2^\lambda = T_5$ . (These are exactly the  $\lambda$ -tableaux with  $n = 5$  in the red box, and they necessarily have  $n - 1 = 4$  in the blue box.) With the bases ordered as above, we have

$$\Psi_{\lambda, \mu} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the cross-Gram  $\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}^\top \pi_\lambda(s_4) \Psi_{\lambda, \mu}$  is the bottom-right  $2 \times 2$  submatrix of

$$\pi_\lambda(s_4) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix},$$

where we have applied (4.1). Explicitly, the corner highlighted in green is determined by  $\pi_\lambda(s_4)v_{T_4}$  and  $\pi_\lambda(s_4)v_{T_5}$ . In (4.1), we have  $s_4T_4 = T_2$  and  $D_{T_4}(5, 4) = 2$ , so that

$$\pi_\lambda(s_4)v_{T_4} = \frac{1}{D_{T_4}(5, 4)}v_{T_4} + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_{T_4}(5, 4)^2}}v_{s_4T_4} = \frac{1}{2}v_{T_4} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}v_{T_2}.$$

Likewise,  $s_4T_5 = T_3$  and  $D_{T_5}(5, 4) = 2$ , so that

$$\pi_\lambda(s_4)v_{T_5} = \frac{1}{D_{T_5}(5, 4)}v_{T_5} + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_{T_5}(5, 4)^2}}v_{s_4T_5} = \frac{1}{2}v_{T_5} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}v_{T_2}.$$

Thus, the cross-Gram matrix is


$$\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}^\top \pi_\lambda(s_4) \Psi_{\lambda, \mu} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix},$$

where the diagonal entries are determined by the axial distance from the red box to the blue box. Since the cross-Gram is a multiple of a unitary, the corresponding spaces are isoclinic, and the orbit is a totally symmetric EITFF(5, 2, 5). In fact, it is the one from Example 3.4.

*Example 5.2.* Next, consider  $\lambda = (3, 2, 1)$  and  $\mu = (3, 1, 1)$ . Their Young diagrams are shown below, where the red box belongs to  $\lambda$  but not  $\mu$ , and where the removable boxes of  $\mu$  are colored blue.




Considering the following hook lengths, we have  $d_\lambda = \frac{6!}{5 \cdot 3 \cdot 3} = 16$  and  $d_\mu = \frac{5!}{5 \cdot 2 \cdot 2} = 6$ .



As in the last example, we will show that  $W := \text{im } \Psi_{\lambda, \mu} \leq V_\lambda$  is isoclinic with  $\pi_\lambda(s_5)W = \text{im } \pi_\lambda(s_5)\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}$ , and it will follow that the orbit of  $W$  under  $\pi_\lambda(S_6)$  is a totally symmetric EITFF $_{\mathbb{R}}$ (16, 6, 6).

The standard tableaux with shape  $\mu$  are shown below, along with their embeddings in  $\text{Tab}(\lambda)$ . There are 10 additional standard tableaux with shape  $\lambda$  that are not displayed, but they will not matter in this example.



For each  $i \in [6]$ ,  $R_i^\lambda = T_i$  and  $\Psi_{\lambda, \mu} v_{R_i} = v_{T_i}$ , so the cross-Gram matrix has entries

$$[\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}^\top \pi_\lambda(s_5) \Psi_{\lambda, \mu}]_{ij} = \langle \Psi_{\lambda, \mu}^\top \pi_\lambda(s_5) \Psi_{\lambda, \mu} v_{R_j}, v_{R_i} \rangle = \langle \pi_\lambda(s_5) v_{T_j}, v_{T_i} \rangle, \quad i, j \in [6].$$

When computing  $\pi_\lambda(s_5) v_{T_j}$  with (4.1), notice that  $s_5 T_j \notin \{T_i : i \in [6]\}$  since  $[s_5 T_j]_{22} = 5$  and  $[T_i]_{22} = 6$  for  $i, j \in [6]$ . Applying (4.1), we find

$$\begin{aligned} [\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}^\top \pi_\lambda(s_5) \Psi_{\lambda, \mu}]_{ij} &= \langle \pi_\lambda(s_5) v_{T_j}, v_{T_i} \rangle = \left\langle \frac{1}{D_{T_j}(6, 5)} v_{T_j} + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_{T_j}(6, 5)^2}} v_{s_5 T_j}, v_{T_i} \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{\delta_{ij}}{D_{T_j}(6, 5)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the cross-Gram is diagonal, and each diagonal entry is determined by an axial distance from the red box to one of the two blue boxes. Since these two axial distances are opposites, the diagonal has constant absolute value:

$$\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}^\top \pi_\lambda(s_5) \Psi_{\lambda, \mu} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In particular,  $W$  and  $\pi_\lambda(s_5)W$  are isoclinic. By Theorem 3.1, the orbit of  $W$  under  $\pi_\lambda(S_6)$  is a totally symmetric EITFF(16, 6, 6). See Example 7.1 for a related construction of an EITFF(8, 3, 6).

The following theorem extends Example 5.1 and Example 5.2 to an infinite family of totally symmetric EITFFs.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Select partitions  $\lambda \vdash n$  and  $\mu \in \lambda^\perp$ , and let  $W \leq V_\lambda$  be the  $\pi_\mu$ -isotypic component of  $\pi_\lambda|_{S_{n-1}}$ . Assume  $W \neq V_\lambda$ . Choose any transversal  $\{t_k\}_{k \in [n]}$  for  $[n]$  in  $S_n$  with  $t_k n = k$  for each  $k$ . Then the orbit  $\mathcal{W} := \{\pi_\lambda(t_k)W\}$  is a totally symmetric and real ECTFF. Furthermore, it is equi-isoclinic if and only if one of the following holds (cf. Figure 2):*

- (i) for some integers  $a \geq 2$  and  $b \geq 1$ ,  $\mu = (b^a)$  is depicted by an  $a \times b$  rectangle, and  $\lambda = (b+1, b^{a-1})$  adds a box to the first row,
- (ii) for some integers  $a \geq 2$  and  $b \geq 1$ ,  $\mu = (a^b)$  is depicted by a  $b \times a$  rectangle, and  $\lambda = (a^b, 1)$  adds a box to the bottom,
- (iii) for some integers  $a, b \geq 1$  and  $c \geq 2$ ,  $\mu = ((b+c)^a, b^c)$  is depicted by an  $(a+c) \times (b+c)$  rectangle with the bottom right  $c \times c$  corner removed, and  $\lambda = ((b+c)^a, b+1, b^{c-1})$  adds a box in the corner.

In that case,  $\mathcal{W}$  is a totally symmetric EITFF $_{\mathbb{R}}(d, r, n)$  with parameters given as follows in cases:

$$(i)-(ii) \quad d = \frac{a}{a+b}rn, \quad r = (ab)! \prod_{k=0}^{a-1} \frac{k!}{(k+b)!} = (ab)! \prod_{k=0}^{b-1} \frac{k!}{(k+a)!}, \quad n = ab + 1,$$

(iii)

$$d = \frac{c^2}{(a+c)(b+c)}rn,$$

$$r = (ab + ac + bc)! \prod_{k=0}^{c-1} \frac{(k!)^2}{(a+k)!(b+k)!} \prod_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \frac{(2c+\ell)!}{(2c+b+\ell)!}$$

$$= (ab + ac + bc)! \prod_{k=0}^{c-1} \frac{(k!)^2}{(a+k)!(b+k)!} \prod_{\ell=0}^{b-1} \frac{(2c+\ell)!}{(2c+a+\ell)!},$$

$$n = ab + ac + bc + 1.$$




FIGURE 2. Illustration of the Young diagrams for cases (i)–(iii) of Theorem 5.3, where the red box belongs to  $\lambda$  but not  $\mu$ , and where the removable boxes of  $\mu$  are colored blue.

$d$	5	14	16	42	90	132	168	210	429	448	1430	2100	2112
$r$	2	5	6	14	20	42	56	42	132	70	429	252	660
$n$	5	7	6	9	8	11	9	10	13	10	15	12	12
$\alpha$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{9}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{9}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{16}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{1}{25}$	$\frac{1}{4}$
$a$	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	3	2	1	2	1	1
$b$	2	3	1	4	1	5	2	3	6	1	7	1	3

TABLE 2. For each column above, Theorem 5.3 constructs a totally symmetric ensemble of  $n$  equi-isoclinic subspaces with dimension  $r$  that form a tight fusion frame for  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $\alpha$  is the common parameter of isoclinism. If  $n = ab + 1$ , apply (i); otherwise, put  $c = \frac{n-ab-1}{a+b}$  and apply (iii).

As we will see, the requirement  $W \neq V_\lambda$  precludes taking  $a = 1$  in (i) and (ii), as well as  $c = 1$  in (iii). Table 2 lists some small parameters of totally symmetric EITFFs whose existence follows from Theorem 5.3. Fusion synthesis matrices for the first ten columns are included as ancillary files with the arXiv version of this paper. As in Theorem 3.1, the subspace ensemble  $\mathcal{W}$  in Theorem 5.3 does not depend on the choice of transversal  $\{t_k\}_{k \in [n]}$ . Choosing  $t_k = (1 \ 2 \ \cdots \ n)^k$  shows  $\mathcal{W}$  is *harmonic* in the sense of [23].

*Remark 5.4.* Under certain restrictions, the parameter formulas in Theorem 5.3 simplify considerably. If  $a = 1$  in (i) or (ii), then  $(d, r, n) = (b, 1, b + 1)$ , and the EITFF consists of the lines spanned by elements of a regular simplex in  $\mathbb{R}^b$ . If  $a = 2$  in (i) or (ii), then  $(d, r, n) = (C_{b+1}, C_b, 2b + 1)$ , where  $C_b := \frac{1}{b+1} \binom{2b}{b}$  is a *Catalan number*. Likewise, if  $b = 2$  in (i) or (ii), then  $(d, r, n) = (C_{a+1}, C_a, 2a + 1)$ . If  $a = b = 1$  in (iii), then  $(d, r, n) = \left( \frac{2c^2}{c+1} \binom{2c}{c}, \binom{2c}{c}, 2c + 2 \right)$ . The Young diagrams are symmetric in the last case, and  $\mathcal{W}$  can be decomposed to form two smaller EITFFs, as detailed in Theorem 9.1.

Example 5.1 illustrates Theorem 5.3(i) in the case where  $a = b = 2$ . Likewise, Example 5.2 is an instance of Theorem 5.3(iii), where  $a = b = 1$  and  $c = 2$ . These examples serve as inspiration for the following proof. (Later, we will generalize other ideas in the proof below as Theorem 6.8.)

*Proof of Theorem 5.3.* This construction is an instance of Theorem 3.1, which implies  $\mathcal{W}$  is a totally symmetric ECTFF, and it is equi-isoclinic if and only if the subspaces  $W$  and  $\pi_\lambda(s_{n-1})W$  are isoclinic. We test isoclinism with a cross-Gram matrix. The columns of the  $\text{Tab}(\mu) \times \text{Tab}(\lambda)$  matrix  $\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}$  form an orthonormal basis for  $W$ , and the columns of  $\pi_\lambda(s_{n-1})\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}$  form an orthonormal basis for  $\pi_\lambda(s_{n-1})W$ . Then  $\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}^\top \pi_\lambda(s_{n-1})\Psi_{\lambda, \mu}$  is a cross-Gram matrix, and for  $R, S \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$  the  $(S, R)$  entry is

$$\langle \Psi_{\lambda, \mu}^\top \pi_\lambda(s_{n-1})\Psi_{\lambda, \mu} v_R, v_S \rangle = \langle \pi_\lambda(s_{n-1})v_{R^\lambda}, v_{S^\lambda} \rangle.$$

Here, (4.1) gives

$$\pi_\lambda(s_{n-1})v_{R^\lambda} = \frac{1}{D_{R^\lambda}(n, n-1)}v_{R^\lambda} + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_{R^\lambda}(n, n-1)^2}}v_{s_{n-1}R^\lambda}.$$


To compute its inner product with  $v_{S^\lambda}$ , observe that  $\delta_{R^\lambda, S^\lambda} = \delta_{R, S}$ , and  $s_{n-1}R^\lambda \neq S^\lambda$  since these tableaux differ in the  $\lambda - \mu$  entry. Therefore,

$$(5.1) \quad \langle \Psi_{\lambda, \mu}^\top \pi_\lambda(s_{n-1}) \Psi_{\lambda, \mu} v_R, v_S \rangle = \frac{1}{D_{R^\lambda}(n, n-1)} \delta_{R, S}, \quad R, S \in \text{Tab}(\mu).$$

In particular, the cross-Gram matrix is diagonal. Its product with its adjoint is a multiple of the identity if and only if the diagonal has constant absolute value, if and only if  $|D_{R^\lambda}(n, n-1)|$  takes the same value for all  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$ . To interpret this condition in terms of the underlying Young diagrams, observe that  $n$  appears in box  $(k, l) := \lambda - \mu$  of  $R^\lambda$ , while  $n-1$  necessarily appears in a removable box of  $\mu$ . Furthermore, every removable box of  $\mu$  occurs in this way for some  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$  by (4.2). Overall,  $\mathcal{W}$  is equi-isoclinic if and only if there is an integer  $m \geq 1$  such that every removable box of  $\mu$  has axial distance  $m$  or  $-m$  to  $(k, l)$ .

As we now explain, this condition is satisfied for each of (i)–(iii). In (i) and (ii),  $\mu$  is a rectangle with only one removable box, and the condition is trivially satisfied. In (iii),  $\mu$  has exactly two removable boxes. The first is at position  $(a, b+c)$ , with axial distance  $-c$  from  $(k, l) = (a+1, b+1)$ . The second is at position  $(a+c, b)$ , with axial distance  $c$  from  $(k, l)$ . Hence, each of (i)–(iii) yields a totally symmetric EITFF( $d, n, r$ ), where the given values of  $d = d_\lambda$  and  $r = d_\mu$  can be verified by straightforward (if tedious) application of the Hook length formula.

Conversely, suppose  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are chosen so that  $\mathcal{W}$  is equi-isoclinic, and let  $m$  be the common absolute value of the axial distance to any removable box of  $\mu$  from  $(k, l) = \lambda - \mu$ . Then every removable box of  $\mu$  appears on one of two superdiagonals:  $l - k - m$  or  $l - k + m$ . Any superdiagonal contains at most one removable box of  $\mu$ , so  $\mu$  has at most two removable boxes. We now argue in cases. First suppose  $\mu$  has only one removable box. Then  $\mu$  is a constant sequence, and its Young diagram is a rectangle. There are only two places to add a box and produce the Young diagram of  $\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow$ . Depending on the choice,  $(\lambda, \mu)$  is as in (i) or (ii), where the condition  $a \geq 2$  follows from the constraint  $W \neq V_\lambda$ . Now suppose  $\mu$  has exactly two removable boxes. Then  $\mu$  is a sequence with exactly two values, and we can write  $\mu = (a^{b+d}, b^c)$  for some  $a, b, c, d \geq 1$ . Its Young diagram has removable boxes at  $(a, b+d)$  and  $(a+c, b)$ , as shown in blue below (with some extra red boxes).



There are three possibilities for  $(k, l) = \lambda - \mu$ , shown in red above. If  $(k, l) = (1, b+d+1)$  were at the top, then the unequal axial distances would both be positive. If  $(k, l) = (a+c+1, 1)$  were at the bottom, then the unequal axial distances would both be negative. Neither cannot happen, so  $(k, l) = (a+1, b+1)$  is in the corner. Then the axial distances to the removable boxes are  $-d$  and  $c$ . These must be opposites, so  $d = c$ . Finally, the constraint  $W \neq V_\lambda$  ensures  $c \geq 2$ : when  $c = 1$ ,  $\lambda$  has a rectangular Young diagram with just one removable box,

and the branching rule implies  $\pi_\lambda|_{S_{n-1}} \cong \pi_\mu$ , so that  $\dim V_\lambda = \dim V_\mu = \dim W$ . Overall,  $(\lambda, \mu)$  is as in (iii). This completes the proof.  $\square$

## 6. TOTAL SYMMETRY: MULTIPLE LAYERS

Next we consider totally symmetric subspace ensembles that arise from the multiple-layer construction of Theorem 3.9, obtaining additional infinite families of totally symmetric EITFFs in Theorems 6.10 and 6.13.

To begin, we interpret Theorem 3.9 for representations of the symmetric group, and find conditions under which the resulting subspace ensemble is equi-isoclinic.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Select a partition  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$  and a subset  $L \subseteq \mu^\uparrow$ , and consider the representation  $\pi_L := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in L} \pi_\lambda$  of  $S_n$  on  $V_L := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in L} V_\lambda$  with degree  $d_L := \sum_{\lambda \in L} d_\lambda$ . Next, let  $W_L \leq V_L$  be the image of the isometry  $\Psi_L: V_\mu \rightarrow V_L$  given by*

$$\Psi_L(v) = \left\{ \sqrt{d_\lambda/d_L} \Psi_{\lambda,\mu}(v) \right\}_{\lambda \in L}, \quad v \in V_\mu.$$

*Finally, choose any transversal  $\{t_k\}_{k \in [n]}$  for  $[n]$  in  $S_n$  with  $t_k n = k$  for each  $k$ . Then the orbit  $\mathcal{W}_L := \{\pi_L(t_k)W_L\}_{k \in [n]}$  is a totally symmetric ECTFF $_{\mathbb{R}}(d_L, d_\mu, n)$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{W}_L$  is equi-isoclinic if and only if  $L$  satisfies*

$$(6.1) \quad \exists \beta \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{nd_\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k, l))} = \pm \beta \quad \forall (k, l) \in [\mu],$$

*in which case  $\frac{n^2 d_\mu^2}{d_L^2} \beta^2$  is the common isoclinism parameter of  $\mathcal{W}_L$  and*

$$\beta = \sqrt{\frac{d_L(nd_\mu - d_L)}{d_\mu^2 n^2 (n-1)}}.$$

We discuss how Theorem 6.1 relates to Theorem 5.3 in Example 6.2 below. For simplicity, we do not impose  $W_L \neq V_L$  in Theorem 6.1. While the statement of Theorem 6.1 could be modified to remove the global factor of  $\frac{1}{nd_\mu}$  from the left-hand side of (6.1), this factor makes it easier to verify (6.1) in practice. Indeed, the hook length formula implies  $\frac{d_\lambda}{nd_\mu}$  is the product of all hook lengths for  $\mu$  divided by the product of all hook lengths for  $\lambda$ . Many of these hook lengths are the same for  $\mu$  and  $\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow$  (and so they cancel out), and many others telescope away in the quotient. A version of Theorem 6.1 was announced by the authors as Theorem 2 of [22], together with a promise to prove it in a later manuscript. The formulation given above is more detailed, and its proof below settles our debt from [22].

*Proof of Theorem 6.1.* This construction is an instance of Theorem 3.9, which implies  $\mathcal{W}_L$  is a totally symmetric ECTFF $(d, d_\mu, n)$ , and it is an EITFF if and only if the subspaces  $W_L$  and  $\pi_L(s_{n-1})W_L$  are isoclinic. To determine isoclinism, we consider a cross-Gram matrix. The operator  $\Psi_L$  is an isometry onto  $W_L$ , and  $\pi_L(s_{n-1})\Psi_L$  is an isometry onto  $\pi_L(s_{n-1})W_L$ . Then  $\Psi_L^\top \pi_L(s_{n-1})\Psi_L: V_\mu \rightarrow V_\mu$  is a cross-Gram operator, where

$$\Psi_L^\top \pi_L(s_{n-1})\Psi_L = \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{d_L} \Psi_{\lambda,\mu}^\top \pi_\lambda(s_{n-1}) \Psi_{\lambda,\mu}.$$

By (5.1), the corresponding cross-Gram matrix has entries

$$\langle \Psi_L^\top \pi_L(s_{n-1}) \Psi_L v_R, v_S \rangle = \frac{1}{d_L} \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D_{R^\lambda}(n, n-1)} \delta_{R,S}, \quad R, S \in \text{Tab}(\mu).$$

In particular, the cross-Gram matrix is diagonal. Its product with its adjoint is a multiple of the identity if and only if its diagonal has constant absolute value, if and only if there exists  $\beta \geq 0$  such that  $\left| \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{nd_\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{D_{R^\lambda}(n, n-1)} \right| = \beta$  for every  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$ . To see this is equivalent to (6.1), fix  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$  and notice that  $n$  always appears in the  $\lambda - \mu$  box of  $R^\lambda$ , while  $n-1$  appears in a removable box  $(k, l) \in \lfloor \mu \rfloor$  whose location depends only on  $R$  and not on  $\lambda$ . Then  $D_{R^\lambda}(n, n-1) = D(\lambda - \mu, (k, l))$  for every  $\lambda \in L$ . Furthermore, every removable box  $(k, l) \in \lfloor \mu \rfloor$  occurs in this way for some  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$  by (4.2). Overall,  $\mathcal{W}_L$  is equi-isoclinic if and only if (6.1) holds, where  $\frac{n^2 d_\mu^2}{d_L^2} \beta^2$  is the parameter of isoclinism for  $W_L$  and  $\pi_L(s_{n-1})W_L = \pi_L(t_{n-1})W_L$ . Then the formula for  $\beta$  follows from (1.3).  $\square$

*Example 6.2.* Suppose  $L = \{\lambda\}$  is a singleton in Theorem 6.1. Then  $\mathcal{W}_L$  is precisely the ECTFF of Theorem 5.3. Furthermore, (6.1) is easily seen to be satisfied in each of Theorem 5.3(i)–(iii). In (i) and (ii),  $\mu$  has only one removable box, and so the quantity on the left-hand side of (6.1) is trivially constant on  $\lfloor \mu \rfloor$ . In (iii), the two removable boxes of  $\mu$  are at opposite axial distances from  $\lambda - \mu$ , and so the respective quantities from the left-hand side of (6.1) are opposites.

*Example 6.3.* Let  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$  be arbitrary, and take  $L$  to be all of  $\mu^\uparrow$  in Theorem 6.1. Then  $d_{\mu^\uparrow} = \sum_{\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow} d_\lambda = nd_\mu$ , by the remark following Theorem 4 in [42]. Consequently, the subspace ensemble  $\mathcal{W}_{\mu^\uparrow}$  is an ECTFF( $nd_\mu, d_\mu, n$ ). It follows that  $\mathcal{W}_{\mu^\uparrow}$  consists of  $n$  mutually orthogonal subspaces: since equality holds in (2.1), the chordal distance between any two subspaces of  $\mathcal{W}_{\mu^\uparrow}$  is exactly  $r = \sqrt{d_\mu}$ , and all the principal angles are right angles. In particular,  $\mathcal{W}_{\mu^\uparrow}$  is an EITFF.

As we will see in Theorem 6.8 below, for any  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$  there are either zero or exactly two choices of nonempty proper subsets  $L \subset \mu^\uparrow$  that produce EITFFs in Theorem 6.1, and in the latter case the two choices are set complements. The following explains the relation of the corresponding EITFFs.

**Lemma 6.4.** *Given  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$  and  $L \subseteq \mu^\uparrow$ , denote  $L^c := \mu^\uparrow \setminus L$ . Then the ECTFFs  $\mathcal{W}_L$  and  $\mathcal{W}_{L^c}$  produced by Theorem 6.1 are Naimark complements. In particular,  $\mathcal{W}_L$  is equi-isoclinic if and only if  $\mathcal{W}_{L^c}$  is equi-isoclinic.*

*Proof.* Fix a transversal  $\{t_k\}_{k \in [n]}$  for  $[n]$  in  $S_n$ , where  $t_k n = k$  for each  $k \in [n]$ . We continue in the notation of Theorem 6.1. For each partition  $\lambda$ , we identify  $V_\lambda \cong \mathbb{R}^{\text{Tab}(\lambda)}$  and consider  $\pi_\lambda$  to take values in the space of real  $\text{Tab}(\lambda) \times \text{Tab}(\lambda)$  matrices. Then  $V_L \cong \mathbb{R}^{\cup_{\lambda \in L} \text{Tab}(\lambda)}$ , and  $\Psi_L$  may be viewed as a  $(\cup_{\lambda \in L} \text{Tab}(\lambda)) \times \text{Tab}(\mu)$  matrix. Analogously, by considering the disjoint union  $\mu^\uparrow = L \cup L^c$ , we may express

$$\Psi_{\mu^\uparrow} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{d_L}{d_{\mu^\uparrow}}} \Psi_L \\ \sqrt{\frac{d_{L^c}}{d_{\mu^\uparrow}}} \Psi_{L^c} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then since  $\pi_{\mu^\uparrow} = \pi_L \oplus \pi_{L^c}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{\mu^\uparrow} &:= \begin{bmatrix} \pi_{\mu^\uparrow}(t_1)\Psi_{\mu^\uparrow} & \cdots & \pi_{\mu^\uparrow}(t_n)\Psi_{\mu^\uparrow} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{d_L}{d_{\mu^\uparrow}}}\pi_L(t_1)\Psi_L & \cdots & \sqrt{\frac{d_L}{d_{\mu^\uparrow}}}\pi_L(t_n)\Psi_L \\ \sqrt{\frac{d_{L^c}}{d_{\mu^\uparrow}}}\pi_{L^c}(t_1)\Psi_{L^c} & \cdots & \sqrt{\frac{d_{L^c}}{d_{\mu^\uparrow}}}\pi_{L^c}(t_n)\Psi_{L^c} \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{d_L}{d_{\mu^\uparrow}}}\Phi_L \\ \sqrt{\frac{d_{L^c}}{d_{\mu^\uparrow}}}\Phi_{L^c} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Phi_{\mu^\uparrow}$ ,  $\Phi_L$ , and  $\Phi_{L^c}$  are fusion synthesis matrices for  $\mathcal{W}_{\mu^\uparrow}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}_L$ , and  $\mathcal{W}_{L^c}$ , respectively. By Example 6.3,  $\Phi_{\mu^\uparrow}$  is an orthogonal matrix and  $d_{\mu^\uparrow} = nd_\mu$ . Thus,

$$I = \Phi_{\mu^\uparrow}^\top \Phi_{\mu^\uparrow} = \frac{d_L}{nd_\mu} \Phi_L^\top \Phi_L + \frac{d_{L^c}}{nd_\mu} \Phi_{L^c}^\top \Phi_{L^c},$$

so  $\mathcal{W}_L$  and  $\mathcal{W}_{L^c}$  are Naimark complements.  $\square$

*Example 6.5.* In Theorem 5.3, the EITFFs of types (i) and (ii) are Naimark complements after reversing the parameters  $a$  and  $b$ . For type (iii), we have  $|\mu^\uparrow| = 3$  and so a Naimark complement  $\mathcal{W}_L$  is constructed using two layers in Theorem 6.1, namely,  $L = \{\mu + (1, b + c + 1), \mu + (a + c + 1, 1)\}$ .

### 6.1. Isoclinic partitions.

*Definition 6.6.* We say a partition  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$  is **isoclinic** if there exists a proper and nonempty subset  $L \subset \mu^\uparrow$  for which the subspace ensemble  $\mathcal{W}_L$  of Theorem 6.1 is equi-isoclinic, hence an EITFF.

**Lemma 6.7.** *If  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$  is an isoclinic partition, then so is its transpose  $\mu'$ .*

*Proof.* We apply Theorem 6.1. Since  $\mu$  is isoclinic, there is a proper and nonempty subset  $L \subset \mu^\uparrow$  for which (6.1) holds. Consider the proper and nonempty subset  $L' := \{\lambda' : \lambda \in L\} \subset (\mu')^\uparrow$ . For each  $\lambda \in L$ , if  $\lambda - \mu =: (i, j)$  then  $\lambda' - \mu' = (j, i)$  and  $D(\lambda - \mu, (k, l)) = -D(\lambda' - \mu', (l, k))$  for each  $(k, l) \in [\mu]$ . Since  $d_{\lambda'} = d_\lambda$  and  $d_{\mu'} = d_\mu$ , it follows that

$$\sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{nd_\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k, l))} = - \sum_{\lambda' \in L'} \frac{d_{\lambda'}}{nd_{\mu'}} \cdot \frac{1}{D(\lambda' - \mu', (l, k))}, \quad (k, l) \in [\mu].$$

Then since  $L$  satisfies (6.1) and  $[\mu'] = \{(l, k) : (k, l) \in [\mu]\}$ , the subspace ensemble  $\mathcal{W}_{L'}$  corresponding to  $L'$  in Theorem 6.1 is equi-isoclinic.  $\square$

For any  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$ , every subset of  $\mu^\uparrow$  delivers an ECTFF via Theorem 6.1. However, the following theorem shows that at most two proper nonempty subsets of  $\mu^\uparrow$  can deliver EITFFs. Furthermore, there is no mystery about the identities of these sets, or even about the signs of the sums in (6.1).

**Theorem 6.8.** *Suppose  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$  is an isoclinic partition, and enumerate  $[\mu] = \{(k_1, l_1), \dots, (k_m, l_m)\}$  and  $\mu^\uparrow = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m+1}\}$  as in Figure 3. Then the following hold:*

- (a) *there are exactly two choices of nonempty proper subset  $L \subset \mu^\uparrow$  for which the subspace ensemble  $\mathcal{W}_L$  of Theorem 6.1 is equi-isoclinic, namely,*

$$L_0 := \{\lambda_p : p \in [m+1] \text{ is even}\} \quad \text{and} \quad L_1 := \{\lambda_p : p \in [m+1] \text{ is odd}\},$$




FIGURE 3. Given a partition  $\mu$  with  $m$  distinct parts, we label  $[\mu] = \{(k_1, l_1), \dots, (k_m, l_m)\}$  by descending superdiagonal order, and  $\mu^\uparrow = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m+1}\}$  by descending superdiagonal order of differences with  $\mu$ .

- (b) for  $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ , let  $\frac{n^2 d_\mu^2}{d_{L_\delta}^2} \beta^2$  be the common isoclinism parameter of  $\mathcal{W}_{L_\delta}$ , where  $\beta \geq 0$ ; then

$$\sum_{\lambda \in L_\delta} \frac{d_\lambda}{n d_\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_q, l_q))} = (-1)^{q+\delta} \beta, \quad q \in [m].$$

*Proof.* For (a), let  $L \subset \mu^\uparrow$  be a nonempty and proper subset of  $\mu^\uparrow$  such that  $\mathcal{W}_L$  is equi-isoclinic, i.e., (6.1) holds. We will prove that the complement  $L^c := \mu^\uparrow \setminus L$  contains no adjacent terms from the sequence  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m+1}$ . Since the Naimark complement  $\mathcal{W}_{L^c}$  is also equi-isoclinic, it will follow that  $L$  contains no adjacent terms from this sequence either; thus, the sequence  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m+1}$  alternates between elements of  $L$  and  $L^c$ , and  $\{L, L^c\} = \{L_0, L_1\}$ .

To begin, we fix  $p \in [m+1]$  and prove the crucial inequality

$$(6.2) \quad \frac{d_{\lambda_p}}{D(\lambda_p - \mu, (k_{q-1}, l_{q-1}))} > \frac{d_{\lambda_p}}{D(\lambda_p - \mu, (k_q, l_q))}, \quad 1 < q \neq p.$$

To see this, fix  $1 < q \neq p$  and observe that

$$D(\lambda_p - \mu, (k_{q-1}, l_{q-1})) < D(\lambda_p - \mu, (k_q, l_q)), \quad q > 1.$$

If  $p > q$ , then  $D(\lambda_p - \mu, (k_{q-1}, l_{q-1})) < D(\lambda_p - \mu, (k_q, l_q)) < 0$ , and (6.2) follows. Likewise, if  $p \leq q-1$ , then  $0 < D(\lambda_p - \mu, (k_{q-1}, l_{q-1})) < D(\lambda_p - \mu, (k_q, l_q))$ , and (6.2) follows again. This proves the claim.

Now suppose  $L^c$  contains one of the middle terms  $\lambda_q$  with  $1 < q < m+1$ . Then any  $\lambda_p \in L$  has  $p \neq q$ , and summing over all such  $p$  in (6.2) shows that

$$(6.3) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_{q-1}, l_{q-1}))} > \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_q, l_q))}, \quad 1 < q < m+1, \lambda_q \in L^c.$$

If  $L^c$  were to contain two adjacent middle terms  $\lambda_q, \lambda_{q+1}$  with  $1 < q < m$ , it would follow that

$$\sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_{q-1}, l_{q-1}))} > \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_q, l_q))} > \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_{q+1}, l_{q+1}))}.$$

This cannot occur since three distinct real numbers cannot share one absolute value in (6.1). It remains to show that  $L^c$  contains neither  $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$  nor  $\{\lambda_m, \lambda_{m+1}\}$ .

For the first case, suppose  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q \in L^c$ . Then any  $\lambda_p \in L$  has  $p > q$ , so that  $D(\lambda_p - \mu, (k_q, l_q)) < 0$ . Summing over all  $\lambda_p \in L$ , we obtain

$$(6.4) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_q, l_q))} < 0, \quad \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q \in L^c.$$

If  $L^c$  were to contain both  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$ , then we could take  $q = 2$  in (6.2) and sum over all  $\lambda_p \in L$  to conclude

$$0 > \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_1, l_1))} > \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_2, l_2))}.$$

This is impossible since distinct negative numbers cannot share an absolute value in (6.1).

The story for the second case is similar. If  $\lambda_q, \dots, \lambda_{m+1} \in L^c$ , then any  $\lambda_p \in L$  has  $p < q$ , so that  $D(\lambda - \mu, (k_{q-1}, l_{q-1})) > 0$ . Hence,

$$(6.5) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_{q-1}, l_{q-1}))} > 0, \quad \lambda_q, \dots, \lambda_{m+1} \in L^c.$$

If  $L^c$  contained both  $\lambda_m$  and  $\lambda_{m+1}$ , and if  $m$  was greater than 1 (so that we were not in the first case), then we could take  $q = m$  in (6.2) and sum over all  $\lambda_p \in L$  to conclude

$$\sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_{m-1}, l_{m-1}))} > \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_m, l_m))} > 0,$$

which contradicts (6.1). This completes the proof of (a).

For (b), we prove the case where  $\delta = 0$ ; a similar argument applies when  $\delta = 1$ . Take  $L = L_0$  above, so that  $L^c = L_1$ . It suffices to establish the sign of each sum

$$c_q := \sum_{\lambda \in L} \frac{d_\lambda}{nd_\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_q, l_q))}, \quad q \in [m],$$

since each  $c_q = \pm\beta$  by (6.1) and (a). We have  $c_1 < 0$  by (6.4) since  $\lambda_1 \in L^c$ . Next, if  $3 \leq q \leq m$  is odd, then (6.3) implies  $c_{q-1} > 0$  and  $c_q < 0$ . So far we have established the sign of  $c_q$  for every  $q \in [m]$  except for  $c_m$  when  $m$  is even. In that remaining case, we have  $\lambda_{m+1} \in L^c$ , and (6.5) yields  $c_m > 0$ .  $\square$

The remainder of this section is devoted to identifying isoclinic partitions with the following characterization, which follows immediately from Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.8.

**Corollary 6.9.** *Given  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$ , enumerate  $[\mu] = \{(k_1, l_1), \dots, (k_m, l_m)\}$  and  $\mu^\uparrow = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{m+1}\}$  as in Figure 3. Define  $L_0 := \{\lambda_p : p \in [m+1] \text{ is even}\}$  and  $L_1 := \{\lambda_p : p \in [m+1] \text{ is odd}\}$ . Then for either choice of  $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\mu$  is an isoclinic partition if and only if*

$$(6.6) \quad \exists \beta \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } \sum_{\lambda \in L_\delta} \frac{d_\lambda}{nd_\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{D(\lambda - \mu, (k_q, l_q))} = (-1)^{q+\delta} \beta \quad \forall q \in [m].$$


In that case, the subspace ensemble  $\mathcal{W}_{L_\delta}$  from Theorem 6.1 is a totally symmetric and real EITFF( $d_{L_\delta}, d_\mu, n$ ), and  $\frac{n^2 d_\mu^2}{d_{L_\delta}^2} \beta^2$  is its common parameter of isoclinism, where

$$\beta = \sqrt{\frac{d_{L_\delta}(nd_\mu - d_{L_\delta})}{d_\mu^2 n^2 (n-1)}}.$$

**6.2. Examples.** We organize our search for isoclinic partitions in terms of the number  $m$  of distinct parts. When an isoclinic partition  $\mu$  has  $m = 1$  or  $m = 2$  distinct parts, Theorem 6.8 implies one of the two resulting nontrivial EITFFs must be constructed using a single layer, and so  $\mu$  is described in Theorem 5.3. For partitions with  $m = 3$  distinct parts, we have the following characterization.

**Theorem 6.10.** *For  $a, b, c, e, f, g \in \mathbb{N}$ , the partition  $\mu := ((e + f + g)^a, (e + f)^b, e^c$ ) shown below (with some extra red boxes) is isoclinic if and only if*

$$(6.7) \quad c = \frac{2af}{b+g} + f \quad \text{and} \quad e = \frac{(a+g)f}{b} - c.$$



*Remark 6.11.* Theorem 6.10 produces at least one isoclinic partition (hence at least one totally symmetric real EITFF) for every choice of  $a, f \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $af > 1$ . Indeed, the following procedure yields positive integers  $a, b, c, e, f, g \in \mathbb{N}$  that satisfy (6.7):

- STEP 1: Choose any  $a, f \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $af > 1$ .  
STEP 2: Choose any divisor  $h \mid 2af$  with  $h > 2$ .  
STEP 3: Choose any divisor  $b \mid (a+h)f$  with  $0 < b < \frac{h}{2}$ .  
STEP 4: Put  $c := f + \frac{2af}{h}$ ,  $e := \frac{(a-b+h)f}{b} - c$ , and  $g := h - b$ .

In Step 2, such  $h$  exists since  $2af > 2$ . In Step 3, such  $b$  exists since we could take  $b = 1$ . To see that  $e$  is a positive integer in Step 4, observe that  $b < \frac{h}{2}$  implies  $\frac{(a+h)f}{b} > \frac{2(a+h)f}{h} = f + c$ , and so  $c$  is less than the integer  $\frac{(a+h)f}{b} - f = \frac{(a-b+h)f}{b}$ . Finally,  $g > 0$  since  $b < \frac{h}{2} < h$ . It is easy to check that the resulting parameters satisfy (6.7). Conversely, one can show that every choice of  $a, b, c, e, f, g \in \mathbb{N}$  satisfying (6.7) occurs in this way.

*Example 6.12.* In Theorem 6.10, taking  $a = c = 2$ ,  $b = f = 1$ , and  $e = g = 3$  shows that  $\mu = (7, 7, 4, 3, 3)$  is isoclinic. Choosing  $\delta = 1$  in Corollary 6.9 produces a totally symmetric EITFF $_{\mathbb{R}}(d, r, n)$  with  $d = 10r$ ,  $r = 11\,660\,320\,672$ , and  $n = 25$ .

*Proof of Theorem 6.10.* We apply Corollary 6.9 with  $\delta = 1$ . Enumerate  $\lfloor \mu \rfloor = \{(k_1, l_1), (k_2, l_2), (k_3, l_3)\}$  and  $\mu^\uparrow = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4\}$  as in Figure 3. Taking  $\delta = 1$

in (6.6), the axial distances in the denominators are

$$\begin{aligned} D(\lambda_1 - \mu, (k_1, l_1)) &= a, & D(\lambda_3 - \mu, (k_1, l_1)) &= -(b + f + g), \\ D(\lambda_1 - \mu, (k_2, l_2)) &= a + b + g, & D(\lambda_3 - \mu, (k_2, l_2)) &= -f, \\ D(\lambda_1 - \mu, (k_3, l_3)) &= a + b + c + f + g, & D(\lambda_3 - \mu, (k_3, l_3)) &= c. \end{aligned}$$

By the hook length formula, each factor  $\frac{d_\lambda}{nd_\mu}$  is the product of all hook lengths for  $\mu$  divided by the product of all hook lengths for  $\lambda$ . After applying the hook length formula and canceling common terms in the numerator and denominator, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d_{\lambda_1}}{nd_\mu} &= \frac{a(a+b+g)(a+b+c+f+g)}{(a+g)(a+b+f+g)(a+b+c+e+f+g)}, \\ \frac{d_{\lambda_3}}{nd_\mu} &= \frac{cf(b+f+g)}{(c+e)(b+f)(a+b+f+g)}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice the common factor of  $a+b+f+g$  in the denominators. With the elimination of this factor and (6.6) in mind, define

$$y_p := (a+b+f+g) \left( \frac{d_{\lambda_1}}{nd_\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{D(\lambda_1 - \mu, (k_p, l_p))} + \frac{d_{\lambda_3}}{nd_\mu} \cdot \frac{1}{D(\lambda_3 - \mu, (k_p, l_p))} \right), \quad p \in [3].$$

Explicitly, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 &= \frac{(a+b+g)(a+b+c+f+g)}{(a+g)(a+b+c+e+f+g)} - \frac{cf}{(c+e)(b+f)} \\ y_2 &= \frac{a(a+b+c+f+g)}{(a+g)(a+b+c+e+f+g)} - \frac{c(b+f+g)}{(c+e)(b+f)} \\ y_3 &= \frac{a(a+b+g)}{(a+g)(a+b+c+e+f+g)} + \frac{f(b+f+g)}{(c+e)(b+f)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 6.9,  $\mu$  is isoclinic if and only if  $y_1 = y_3 = -y_2$ . After rearranging, we find  $y_1 = y_3$  if and only if

$$(6.8) \quad \frac{1}{(a+b+c+e+f+g)(a+g)} = \frac{f}{(a+b+g)(c+e)(b+f)},$$

while  $y_3 = -y_2$  if and only if

$$\frac{(c-f)(b+f+g)}{(c+e)(b+f)} = \frac{a(2a+2b+c+f+2g)}{(a+b+c+e+f+g)(a+g)}.$$

In particular, if  $\mu$  is isoclinic then  $c-f > 0$ . Combining the above, we find  $\mu$  is isoclinic if and only if  $c-f > 0$ , (6.8) holds, and

$$\frac{(c-f)(b+f+g)}{(c+e)(b+f)} = \frac{af(2a+2b+c+f+2g)}{(a+b+g)(c+e)(b+f)}.$$

The latter equation may be rewritten as

$$(c-f) \left( a+b+g - \frac{a(c+f)}{c-f} \right) (a+b+f+g) = 0,$$

and then (after canceling the positive factors and rearranging) as

$$(6.9) \quad c = \frac{2af}{b+g} + f.$$

Therefore,  $\mu$  is isoclinic if and only if (6.8) and (6.9) hold. After substituting (6.9) and applying tedious simplification (perhaps with the aid of a computer algebra system), (6.8) becomes

$$e = \frac{(a+g)f}{b} - \frac{2af}{b+g} - f.$$

Consequently,  $\mu$  is isoclinic if and only if (6.7) holds.  $\square$


For isoclinic partitions with  $m = 4$  distinct parts, the algebra gets more difficult. Things are simpler when the partition is symmetric, as below.

**Theorem 6.13.** *For  $a, b, c, e \in \mathbb{N}$ , the partition*

$$\mu := ((a+b+c+e)^a, (a+b+c)^b, (a+b)^c, a^e)$$

*shown below (with some extra red boxes) is isoclinic if and only if*

$$(6.10) \quad e = \frac{b^2}{c} + b.$$



*Remark 6.14.* Infinitely many positive integers  $a, b, c, e$  satisfying (6.10) may be obtained as follows:

- STEP 1: Choose any  $b \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- STEP 2: Choose any positive divisor  $c \mid b^2$ .
- STEP 3: Put  $e := \frac{b^2}{c} + b$ .
- STEP 4: Choose  $a \in \mathbb{N}$  arbitrarily.

Each choice yields an isoclinic partition, hence a totally symmetric and real EITFF.

*Example 6.15.* In Theorem 6.13, taking  $a = b = c = 1$  and  $e = 2$  shows that  $\mu = (5, 3, 2, 1, 1)$  is isoclinic. Choosing  $\delta = 0$  in Corollary 6.9 produces a totally symmetric EITFF $_{\mathbb{R}}(42\,900, 7700, 13)$ .

*Proof of Theorem 6.13.* We apply Corollary 6.9 with  $\delta = 0$ . Enumerate  $[\mu] = \{(k_1, l_1), (k_2, l_2), (k_3, l_3), (k_4, l_4)\}$  and  $\mu^\uparrow = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5\}$  as in Figure 3. Consider  $L_0 = \{\lambda_2, \lambda_4\}$ . Since  $\lambda_4 = \lambda_2'$ , we have  $d_{\lambda_4} = d_{\lambda_2}$ , and the factor  $\frac{d_\lambda}{nd_\mu}$  in (6.6) does not depend on  $\lambda$ . Thus,  $\mu$  is isoclinic if and only if

$$\exists \gamma \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } \frac{1}{D(\lambda_2 - \mu, (k_q, l_q))} + \frac{1}{D(\lambda_4 - \mu, (k_q, l_q))} = (-1)^q \gamma \quad \forall q \in [m].$$

The axial distances in the denominators are

$$\begin{aligned} D(\lambda_2 - \mu, (k_1, l_1)) &= -e, & D(\lambda_4 - \mu, (k_1, l_1)) &= -(2b + 2c + e), \\ D(\lambda_2 - \mu, (k_2, l_2)) &= b, & D(\lambda_4 - \mu, (k_2, l_2)) &= -(b + 2c), \\ D(\lambda_2 - \mu, (k_3, l_3)) &= b + 2c, & D(\lambda_4 - \mu, (k_3, l_3)) &= -b, \\ D(\lambda_2 - \mu, (k_4, l_4)) &= 2b + 2c + e, & D(\lambda_4 - \mu, (k_4, l_4)) &= e. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting above, we find  $\mu$  is isoclinic if and only if

$$\frac{1}{e} + \frac{1}{2b + 2c + e} = \frac{1}{b} - \frac{1}{b + 2c}.$$

After rearranging and solving for  $e$ , we conclude  $\mu$  is isoclinic if and only if  $e = \frac{b^2}{c} + b$  or  $e = -\frac{b^2 + 2c^2 + 2bc}{c}$ . The latter is not possible since  $b, c, e > 0$ .  $\square$

*Example 6.16.* Not every isoclinic partition with  $m = 4$  distinct parts takes the symmetric form in Theorem 6.13. For example,  $\mu = (12^2, 7^3, 5, 4^3)$  is not symmetric, but one can check that it satisfies (6.6) and is therefore isoclinic. More generally, for every integer  $a \geq 1$ , one can show the partition  $((12a)^2, (7a)^3, 5a, (4a)^3)$  is isoclinic.

A symmetric isoclinic partition with  $m = 6$  distinct parts appears in [22]. The proof of its existence is complicated and involves elliptic curves. We leave the following more general problem for future research.

*Problem 6.17.* Are there isoclinic partitions with  $m$  distinct parts for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ?

## 7. ALTERNATING SYMMETRY

When  $\lambda \vdash n$  is a symmetric partition, the restriction of  $\pi_\lambda$  to the alternating group  $A_n$  is known to decompose as a direct sum of two (possibly complex) irreducible subrepresentations, as detailed in Section 8 below. For EITFFs constructed by symmetric isoclinic partitions, there is a related decomposition into two smaller EITFFs, each with alternating symmetry. This produces additional new examples of EITFFs, as in the following example.

*Example 7.1.* Returning to Example 5.2, choose a transversal for [6] in  $S_6$  consisting of even permutations, like so:

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 &:= (5\ 6)(1\ 6), & t_2 &:= (5\ 6)(2\ 6), & t_3 &:= (5\ 6)(3\ 6), \\ t_4 &:= (5\ 6)(4\ 6), & t_5 &:= (4\ 6)(5\ 6), & t_6 &:= (). \end{aligned}$$

Next, label the 10 remaining elements of  $\text{Tab}(\lambda)$  as follows:

$T_7$	$T_8$	$T_9$	$T_{10}$	$T_{11}$
$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & 5 & \\ \hline 6 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 5 & \\ \hline 6 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & 5 & \\ \hline 6 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline 6 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 3 & 5 \\ \hline 2 & 4 & \\ \hline 6 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 2 & 6 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 3 & 6 \\ \hline 2 & 4 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 2 & 6 \\ \hline 3 & 5 & \\ \hline 4 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 3 & 6 \\ \hline 2 & 5 & \\ \hline 4 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 4 & 6 \\ \hline 2 & 5 & \\ \hline 3 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$
$T_{12}$	$T_{13}$	$T_{14}$	$T_{15}$	$T_{16}$

Then Theorem 5.3 produces an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{R}}(16, 6, 6)$  with fusion synthesis matrix  $\Phi := [\Phi_1 \ \Phi_2 \ \Phi_3 \ \Phi_4 \ \Phi_5 \ \Phi_6]$ , where each  $\Phi_k := \pi_\lambda(t_k)\Psi_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^{16 \times 6}$  and  $\Psi_{\lambda,\mu} = [I \ 0]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{16 \times 6}$  in our basis ordering. (Specifically, take  $a = b = 1$  and  $c = 2$  in Theorem 5.3(iii).)

Now consider a change of basis. Globally, we apply the unitary

$$U_\lambda := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & - & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot & - & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot \\ + & \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & + & \cdot \\ \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & - \\ \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & - & \cdot & + & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot \\ \cdot & - & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot & + \\ \cdot & - & \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ + & \cdot & - & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\cdot$  indicates 0 and  $\pm$  indicates  $\pm 1$ . In each subspace, we apply the unitary

$$U_\mu := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} + & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & - & \cdot & \cdot & + \\ \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & + \\ \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot & - & \cdot \\ - & \cdot & \cdot & + & \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we have a unitarily equivalent  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{R}}(16, 6, 6)$  with fusion synthesis matrix  $\tilde{\Phi} := [\tilde{\Phi}_1 \ \tilde{\Phi}_2 \ \tilde{\Phi}_3 \ \tilde{\Phi}_4 \ \tilde{\Phi}_5 \ \tilde{\Phi}_6]$ , where each  $\tilde{\Phi}_k := U_\lambda^* \Phi_k U_\mu$ . After this change of basis, it happens that each isometry is block diagonal with the form

$$\tilde{\Phi}_k = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Phi}_k^+ & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\Phi}_k^- \end{bmatrix},$$

where each  $\tilde{\Phi}_k^\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{8 \times 3}$  is an isometry. In this sense, our  $\text{EITFF}$  decomposes as a “direct sum” of two smaller subspace ensembles, with fusion synthesis matrices  $\tilde{\Phi}^+ := [\tilde{\Phi}_1^+ \ \tilde{\Phi}_2^+ \ \tilde{\Phi}_3^+ \ \tilde{\Phi}_4^+ \ \tilde{\Phi}_5^+ \ \tilde{\Phi}_6^+]$  and  $\tilde{\Phi}^- := [\tilde{\Phi}_1^- \ \tilde{\Phi}_2^- \ \tilde{\Phi}_3^- \ \tilde{\Phi}_4^- \ \tilde{\Phi}_5^- \ \tilde{\Phi}_6^-]$ , respectively. Furthermore, each of the smaller ensembles is an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{R}}(8, 3, 6)$ . This follows from the fact that for any  $i \neq j \in [6]$  we have

$$\tilde{\Phi}_i^* \tilde{\Phi}_j = \begin{bmatrix} (\tilde{\Phi}_i^+)^* \tilde{\Phi}_j^+ & 0 \\ 0 & (\tilde{\Phi}_i^-)^* \tilde{\Phi}_j^- \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Phi}_i \tilde{\Phi}_i^* = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Phi}_i^+ (\tilde{\Phi}_i^+)^* & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{\Phi}_i^- (\tilde{\Phi}_i^-)^* \end{bmatrix}.$$

Indeed, multiplying the cross-Grams by their adjoints demonstrates equi-isoclinism, and adding up the orthogonal projections demonstrates we have a tight fusion frame. See [18, 31] for other constructions of an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{R}}(8, 3, 6)$ .

In fact, each  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{R}}(8, 3, 6)$  above has alternating symmetry. Indeed, for every  $g \in A_6$  it happens that

$$U_{\lambda}^* \pi_{\lambda}(g) U_{\lambda} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\pi}_{\lambda}^+(g) & 0 \\ 0 & \hat{\pi}_{\lambda}^-(g) \end{bmatrix},$$

where each  $\hat{\pi}_{\lambda}^{\epsilon}(g) \in \text{U}(\mathbb{R}^8)$ . Each  $\hat{\pi}_{\lambda}^{\epsilon}: A_6 \rightarrow \text{U}(\mathbb{R}^8)$  turns out to be an irreducible representation, and the image  $W^{\epsilon} \leq \mathbb{R}^8$  of  $\tilde{\Psi}_6^{\epsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^{8 \times 3}$  is invariant under  $\hat{\pi}_{\lambda}^{\epsilon}(A_5)$ , where  $A_5 \leq A_6$  is the stabilizer of the point 6. Then each  $\tilde{\Phi}_k^{\epsilon} = \hat{\pi}_{\lambda}^{\epsilon}(t_k) \tilde{\Phi}_6^{\epsilon}$ , and  $\tilde{\Phi}^{\epsilon}$  is a fusion synthesis matrix for the orbit of  $W^{\epsilon}$ . By Theorem 3.1, the automorphism group of this subspace ensemble contains  $A_6$ .

Our main result on EITFFs with alternating symmetry generalizes the example above, replacing  $\mu$  with any symmetric isoclinic partition.

**Theorem 7.2.** *Suppose  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_h) \vdash (n-1)$  is an isoclinic partition, and further assume that  $\mu$  is symmetric ( $\mu = \mu'$ ) and has an even number of distinct parts. Write  $p_{\mu} := \max\{i : \mu_i \geq i\}$ , and put*

$$\mathbb{F} := \begin{cases} \mathbb{R} & \text{if } (n-1-p_{\mu})/2 \text{ is an even integer,} \\ \mathbb{C} & \text{if } (n-1-p_{\mu})/2 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Finally, given  $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ , let  $L_{\delta} \subset \mu^{\uparrow}$  be as in Corollary 6.9, and let  $d_{\delta} := \sum_{\lambda \in L_{\delta}} d_{\lambda}$ . Then there exists an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(d_{\delta}/2, d_{\mu}/2, n)$  whose automorphism group contains  $A_n$ .

We postpone the proof of Theorem 7.2 until Section 9, where a more detailed version appears as Theorem 9.1.

*Example 7.3.* Applying Theorem 7.2 to the isoclinic partition  $\mu$  in Example 6.15 produces an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{C}}(21\,450, 3850, 13)$  with alternating symmetry.

To obtain EITFFs with smaller parameters, we interpret Theorem 7.2 for the symmetric isoclinic partitions with  $m = 2$  distinct parts given by Theorem 5.3(iii). This gives the following.

**Corollary 7.4.** *Choose integers  $a \geq 1$  and  $c \geq 2$ , and put*

$$\mathbb{F} := \begin{cases} \mathbb{R} & \text{if } a(a+2c-1)/2 \text{ is even,} \\ \mathbb{C} & \text{if } a(a+2c-1)/2 \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Then for each  $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$ , there exists an  $\text{EITFF}_{\mathbb{F}}(d_{\delta}/2, r, n)$  with alternating symmetry, where  $d_0/2 = \frac{c^2}{(a+c)^2} rn$ ,  $d_1/2 = \frac{a(a+2c)}{(a+c)^2} rn$ ,

$$r = \frac{1}{2}(a^2 + 2ac)! \prod_{k=0}^{c-1} \left[ \frac{k!}{(a+k)!} \right]^2 \prod_{\ell=0}^{a-1} \frac{(2c+\ell)!}{(2c+a+\ell)!},$$

and  $n = a^2 + 2ac + 1$ .

Table 3 lists some EITFF parameters given by Corollary 7.4. Each of the first four columns in Table 3 is related to a column in Table 2 with  $b = a$  and the same value of  $n$ . Fusion synthesis matrices for the first columns of Table 3 are included as ancillary files with the arXiv version of this paper. The authors do not know if the EITFFs of Corollary 7.4 are in fact totally symmetric, and we leave this for future research.

$\mathbb{F}$	$\mathbb{R}$	$\mathbb{C}$	$\mathbb{R}$	$\mathbb{C}$	$\mathbb{R}$	$\mathbb{C}$	$\mathbb{C}$	$\mathbb{R}$	$\mathbb{C}$
$d$	8	35	126	462	1716	4290	6435	24310	92378
$r$	3	10	35	126	462	1320	1716	6435	24310
$n$	6	8	10	12	14	13	16	18	20
$\alpha$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{9}{49}$	$\frac{16}{81}$	$\frac{25}{121}$	$\frac{36}{169}$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{49}{225}$	$\frac{64}{289}$	$\frac{81}{361}$
$a$	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1

TABLE 3. For each column above, Corollary 7.4 produces an ensemble of  $n$  equi-isoclinic subspaces with dimension  $r$  that form a tight fusion frame for  $\mathbb{F}^d$ , where  $\alpha$  is the common parameter of isoclinism. Furthermore, the automorphism group of this subspace ensemble contains  $A_n$ . In each case  $c = \frac{n-a^2-1}{2a}$  and  $\delta$  is chosen so that  $d = d_\delta/2$ .

*Remark 7.5.* When  $a = 1$  in Corollary 7.4, the parameters reduce to  $d_0/2 = \frac{c^2}{c+1} \binom{2c}{c}$ ,  $d_1/2 = \frac{2c+1}{c+1} \binom{2c}{c}$ ,  $r = \frac{1}{2} \binom{2c}{c}$ , and  $n = 2c + 2$ . For example, taking  $a = 1$ ,  $c = 2$ , and  $\delta = 0$  in Corollary 7.4 yields an EITFF $_{\mathbb{R}}(8, 3, 6)$  with alternating symmetry, as in Example 7.1.

## 8. REVIEW OF REPRESENTATION THEORY OF $A_n$

In order to prove Theorem 7.2, we first review some representation theory of the alternating groups. Our exposition in this section is greatly influenced by [26]. While some of our treatment is original, the essential ideas are well known [26, 40, 28, 37].


**8.1. Symmetric partitions.** Throughout this subsection, we fix a symmetric partition  $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_h) = \nu' \vdash n$ . Denote  $p_\nu := \max\{i : \nu_i \geq i\}$  for the number of boxes on the main diagonal of its Young diagram. Then  $n - p_\nu$  is an even number, where  $(n - p_\nu)/2$  counts the number of boxes above the main diagonal. Put

$$(8.1) \quad \mathbb{F} := \begin{cases} \mathbb{R} & \text{if } (n - p_\nu)/2 \text{ is even,} \\ \mathbb{C} & \text{if } (n - p_\nu)/2 \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Define a Hilbert space  $\hat{V}_\nu$  over  $\mathbb{F}$  in cases as follows: if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ , put  $\hat{V}_\nu := V_\nu$ ; if  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ , let  $\hat{V}_\nu \supset V_\nu$  be the complexification of  $V_\nu$ . In both cases,  $\hat{V}_\nu \supseteq V_\nu$  has orthonormal basis  $\{v_T\}_{T \in \text{Tab}(\nu)}$ . Similarly, let  $\hat{\pi}_\nu : S_n \rightarrow U(\hat{V}_\nu)$  be given by  $\hat{\pi}_\nu(g)v_T = \pi_\nu(g)v_T$  for  $g \in S_n$  and  $T \in \text{Tab}(\nu)$ , extended linearly over  $\mathbb{F}$ ; thus,  $\hat{\pi}_\nu = \pi_\nu$  when  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ . Since  $\pi_\nu$  is absolutely irreducible,  $\hat{\pi}_\nu$  is irreducible even when  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ .

Next, we identify a distinguished element  $\mathcal{T}_\nu \in \text{Tab}(\nu)$  by considering cases. Since  $\nu$  is symmetric, it belongs to a unique pair  $(\nu_b, \nu_s)$  of symmetric partitions with  $\nu_b \in \nu_s^\uparrow$ , where  $\nu_s$  is obtained by removing the  $(p_{\nu_b}, p_{\nu_b})$  box from  $\nu_b$ . Our definition of  $\mathcal{T}_\nu$  depends on whether  $\nu$  is the ‘‘big’’ or ‘‘small’’ partition in this pair. Specifically  $\nu = \nu_b$  is ‘‘big’’ if the  $(p_\nu, p_\nu)$  box of the Young diagram for  $\nu$  is removable, and otherwise  $\nu = \nu_s$  is ‘‘small’’. Alternatively,  $\nu = \nu_b$  if it has an odd number of distinct parts, while  $\nu = \nu_s$  if it has an even number of distinct parts. Define  $\mathcal{T}_{\nu_s} \in \text{Tab}(\nu_s)$  to be the ‘‘row superstandard tableau’’ with shape  $\nu_s$ , whose rows list  $1, 2, 3, \dots$  in order, reading from left to right and top to bottom. Then

define  $\mathcal{T}_{\nu_b} := \mathcal{T}_{\nu_s}^{\nu_b}$ , as shown in the example below. Finally, interpret the notation in cases to determine  $\mathcal{T}_{\nu}$ .



Next, recall the (regular) action of  $S_n$  on tableaux with shape  $\nu$ . Given such a tableau  $T$ , we define  $g_T \in S_n$  to be the unique permutation such that  $g_T \mathcal{T}_{\nu} = T$ . Then  $g_{T'} g_T^{-1} T = T'$ , and in particular,  $g_{T'} g_T^{-1}$  can be expressed as the product of  $(n - p_{\nu})/2$  transpositions that exchange off-diagonal entries of  $T$  with their mirror images across the main diagonal. Denoting  $\text{sgn}: S_n \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$  for the unique homomorphism with kernel  $A_n$ , it follows that

$$(8.2) \quad \text{sgn}(g_{T'}) = \begin{cases} \text{sgn}(g_T) & \text{if } (n - p_{\nu})/2 \text{ is even,} \\ -\text{sgn}(g_T) & \text{if } (n - p_{\nu})/2 \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

The following proposition implicitly gives some irreducible representations of  $A_n$ .

**Proposition 8.1** ([28, 40]). *Define  $U_{\nu}$  to be the operator on  $\hat{V}_{\nu}$  given by*

$$U_{\nu} v_T = i^{(n-p_{\nu})/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) v_{T'}, \quad T \in \text{Tab}(\nu).$$

Then  $U_{\nu}^2 = I$ , and for each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ , the  $\epsilon$ -eigenspace  $\hat{V}_{\nu}^{\epsilon} := \ker(\epsilon I - U_{\nu})$  is an irreducibly  $\hat{\pi}_{\nu}(A_n)$ -invariant subspace of  $\hat{V}_{\nu}$ .

Given  $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ , we write  $\rho_{\nu}^{\epsilon}: A_n \rightarrow \text{U}(\hat{V}_{\nu}^{\epsilon})$  for the irreducible representation given by the action of  $\hat{\pi}_{\nu}|_{A_n}$  on  $\hat{V}_{\nu}^{\epsilon}$ . Our next goal is to produce an orthonormal basis of  $\hat{V}_{\nu}^{\epsilon}$  and derive the corresponding matrix representation of  $\rho_{\nu}^{\epsilon}$ .

Observe that  $U_{\nu}$  is self-adjoint since it is unitary with only real eigenvalues. Consequently,  $\hat{V}_{\nu} = \hat{V}_{\nu}^{+} \oplus \hat{V}_{\nu}^{-}$  as an orthogonal direct sum of eigenspaces. Given  $v \in \hat{V}_{\nu}$  and  $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ , define

$$P_{\epsilon} v := \frac{1}{2}(v + \epsilon U_{\nu} v) \in \hat{V}_{\nu}^{\epsilon}.$$

Then  $v = P_{+} v + P_{-} v$ , and  $P_{\epsilon}$  is the orthogonal projection onto  $\hat{V}_{\nu}^{\epsilon}$ . For each  $T \in \text{Tab}(\nu)$ , we define a normalized projection

$$(8.3) \quad w_T^{\epsilon} := \sqrt{2} P_{\epsilon} v_T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_T + \epsilon i^{(n-p_{\nu})/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) v_{T'}).$$

A computation involving (8.2) produces

$$(8.4) \quad w_T^{\epsilon} = \epsilon i^{(n-p_{\nu})/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) \cdot w_{T'}^{\epsilon}, \quad T \in \text{Tab}(\nu).$$

Then  $\hat{V}_{\nu}^{\epsilon} = \text{span}\{w_T^{\epsilon} : T \in \text{Tab}(\nu)\}$ , and any basis contained in this spanning set has at most one element from each pair  $\{w_T^{\epsilon}, w_{T'}^{\epsilon}\}$ ,  $T \in \text{Tab}(\nu)$ . With this in mind, we define

$$\text{Tab}_{*}(\nu) := \{T \in \text{Tab}(\nu) : T_{1,2} = 2\}.$$

Exactly one element from each transpose pair  $\{T, T'\} \subset \text{Tab}(\nu)$  belongs to  $\text{Tab}_{*}(\nu)$ . In particular,  $|\text{Tab}_{*}(\nu)| = d_{\nu}/2$ . Furthermore, if  $T \in \text{Tab}_{*}(\nu)$ , then for  $2 < k < n$  we either have  $s_k T \in \text{Tab}_{*}(\nu)$  or  $s_k T \notin \text{Tab}(\nu)$ , while  $s_2 T' \in \text{Tab}_{*}(\nu)$  or  $s_2 T' \notin \text{Tab}(\nu)$ .

**Proposition 8.2** (Thrall [40]). *Fix  $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ .*

- (a) *An orthonormal basis for  $\hat{V}_{\nu}^{\epsilon}$  is given by  $\{w_T^{\epsilon}\}_{T \in \text{Tab}_{*}(\nu)}$ ,*

(b) Suppose  $n \geq 5$ . Then for  $T \in \text{Tab}_*(\nu)$  and  $3 \leq k \leq n-1$ ,

$$(8.5) \quad \rho_\nu^\epsilon(s_1 s_k) w_T^\epsilon = \frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)} w_T^\epsilon + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)^2}} w_{s_k T}^\epsilon,$$

where the coefficient of  $w_{s_k T}^\epsilon$  is zero precisely when  $s_k T \notin \text{Tab}_*(\nu)$ . In particular, the matrix of  $\rho_\nu^\epsilon(s_1 s_k)$  in the basis of (a) satisfies

$$(8.6) \quad \langle \rho_\nu^\epsilon(s_1 s_k) w_T^\epsilon, w_S^\epsilon \rangle = \langle \pi_\nu(s_k) v_T, v_S \rangle, \quad S, T \in \text{Tab}_*(\nu).$$

Meanwhile, the matrix of  $\rho_\nu^\epsilon(s_1 s_2)$  has entries

$$(8.7) \quad \langle \rho_\nu^\epsilon(s_1 s_2) w_T^\epsilon, w_S^\epsilon \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{D_T(3,2)} & \text{if } S = T, \\ \epsilon i^{(n-p_\nu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_T(3,2)^2}} & \text{if } S = s_2 T', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for  $S, T \in \text{Tab}_*(\nu)$ .

These formulas completely determine a unitary matrix representation of  $\rho_\nu^\epsilon$ , since  $A_n$  is generated by  $s_1 s_k$  for  $2 \leq k \leq n-1$ . The idea behind Proposition 8.2 is contained in [40], but the specific formulas are not. For the sake of completeness, we include a proof in Appendix A.

It is well known that  $\rho_\nu^\epsilon|_{A_{n-1}}$  is multiplicity free, and if  $\mu \in \nu^\downarrow$  is symmetric, then  $\rho_\mu^\epsilon$  occurs as a constituent of  $\rho_\nu^\epsilon|_{A_{n-1}}$  [26, 37]. A direct computation yields the following explicit embedding, in parallel with (4.4).

**Proposition 8.3.** *Assume  $\nu$  has an odd number of parts, and suppose  $\mu \in \nu^\downarrow$  is symmetric. Given  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ , consider the linear transformation  $\Psi_{\nu, \mu, \epsilon}: \hat{V}_\mu^\epsilon \rightarrow \hat{V}_\nu^\epsilon$  with  $\Psi_{\nu, \mu, \epsilon} w_R^\epsilon = w_{R\nu}^\epsilon$  for  $R \in \text{Tab}_*(\mu)$ . Then  $\Psi_{\nu, \mu, \epsilon}$  is an isometry that intertwines  $\rho_\mu^\epsilon$  with  $\rho_\nu^\epsilon|_{A_{n-1}}$ .*

**8.2. Non-symmetric partitions.** Throughout this subsection, we fix a symmetric partition  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$  that is ‘‘small’’ in the sense of having an even number of distinct parts. As we detail below, the representations  $\rho_\mu^\epsilon$  also occur as constituents when representations corresponding to non-symmetric partitions of  $A_n$  are restricted to  $A_{n-1}$ . This sometimes requires a field extension, which we express with the following notation. As above, we define

$$(8.8) \quad \mathbb{F} := \begin{cases} \mathbb{R} & \text{if } (n-1-p_\mu)/2 \text{ is even,} \\ \mathbb{C} & \text{if } (n-1-p_\mu)/2 \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Note that  $\mu^\uparrow$  contains a unique symmetric partition  $\nu \vdash n$ , and the current definition of  $\mathbb{F}$  agrees with (8.1) since Young diagrams for  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  have the same number of boxes above the main diagonal. More generally, for any  $\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow$  we define  $\hat{V}_\lambda \supseteq V_\lambda$  to be the inner product space over  $\mathbb{F}$  with orthonormal basis  $\{v_T\}_{T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)}$ , and we define  $\hat{\pi}_\lambda: S_n \rightarrow \text{U}(\hat{V}_\lambda)$  to be given by  $\hat{\pi}_\lambda(g)v_T = \pi_\lambda(g)v_T$  for  $g \in S_n$  and  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ , extended linearly. (If  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$  then  $\hat{V}_\lambda = V_\lambda$  and  $\hat{\pi}_\lambda = \pi_\lambda$ .) Collecting all such spaces, define  $\hat{V}_{\mu^\uparrow} := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow} \hat{V}_\lambda$ . We treat this as an internal orthogonal direct sum, so that each  $\hat{V}_\lambda \leq \hat{V}_{\mu^\uparrow}$ , and the latter has orthonormal basis  $\{v_T\}_{T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda), \lambda \in \mu^\uparrow}$ . Next, with  $\mathcal{T}_\mu$  defined as above (the row superstandard tableau with shape  $\mu$ ), we define  $\mathcal{T}_\lambda := \mathcal{T}_\mu^\lambda$  for each  $\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow$ . Finally, for each  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$  and  $\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow$  we define

$g_T \in S_n$  to be the unique permutation with  $g_T \mathcal{T}_\lambda = T$ . (These definitions agree with the above for the unique symmetric partition  $\nu \in \mu^\uparrow$ .) Then it is easy to show

$$(8.9) \quad g_{R\lambda} = g_R, \quad R \in \text{Tab}(\mu), \quad \lambda \in \mu^\uparrow,$$

as well as

$$(8.10) \quad (R')^\lambda = [R^{(\lambda')}]', \quad R \in \text{Tab}(\mu), \quad \lambda \in \mu^\uparrow$$

We are going to extract representations of  $A_n$  from the following generalization of Proposition 8.1.

**Proposition 8.4.** *Define  $U_{\mu^\uparrow}$  to be the operator on  $\hat{V}_{\mu^\uparrow}$  given by*

$$U_{\mu^\uparrow} v_T = i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) v_{T'}, \quad T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mu^\uparrow.$$

Then  $U_{\mu^\uparrow}$  is a unitary that satisfies  $U_{\mu^\uparrow}^2 = I$  and

$$U_{\mu^\uparrow} \hat{\pi}_{\mu^\uparrow}(g) = \hat{\pi}_{\mu^\uparrow}(g) U_{\mu^\uparrow}, \quad g \in A_n.$$

While the essential idea behind Proposition 8.4 is known, we give a proof in Appendix B for the sake of completeness.

For each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ , let  $Q_\epsilon := \frac{1}{2}(I + \epsilon U_{\mu^\uparrow})$  give orthogonal projection onto the  $\epsilon$ -eigenspace  $\hat{V}_{\mu^\uparrow}^\epsilon := \ker(\epsilon I - U_{\mu^\uparrow}) \leq \hat{V}_{\mu^\uparrow}$ . Since  $Q_\epsilon$  commutes with each  $\hat{\pi}_{\mu^\uparrow}(g)$ ,  $g \in A_n$ , its image  $\hat{V}_{\mu^\uparrow}^\epsilon$  is invariant under  $\hat{\pi}_{\mu^\uparrow}(A_n)$ . More generally, for any subset  $L \subseteq \mu^\uparrow$  that is symmetric in the sense that  $\lambda \in L$  only if  $\lambda' \in L$ , define  $\hat{V}_L := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in L} \hat{V}_\lambda \leq \hat{V}_{\mu^\uparrow}$  and equip it with the subrepresentation  $\hat{\pi}_L := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in L} \hat{\pi}_\lambda$  of  $\hat{\pi}_{\mu^\uparrow}$ . Since  $L$  is symmetric,  $U_{\mu^\uparrow}$  holds  $\hat{V}_L$  is invariant. Furthermore, each eigenspace  $\hat{V}_L^\epsilon := \hat{V}_L \cap \hat{V}_{\mu^\uparrow}^\epsilon$  of the restricted unitary is invariant under  $\hat{\pi}_L(A_n)$ . For each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ , define  $\rho_L^\epsilon: A_n \rightarrow \text{U}(\hat{V}_L^\epsilon)$  to be the representation given by the action of  $\hat{\pi}_L|_{A_n}$  on  $\hat{V}_L^\epsilon$ .

**Proposition 8.5.** *Fix  $\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow$  with  $\lambda' \neq \lambda$ , and select  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ . For each  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ , define a normalized vector*

$$w_T^\epsilon := \sqrt{2} Q_\epsilon v_T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} v_T + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) v_{T'} \in \hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon.$$

Then

$$(8.11) \quad w_T^\epsilon = \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) w_{T'}^\epsilon, \quad T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda),$$

and furthermore, the following hold:

- (a) an orthonormal basis for  $\hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon$  is given by  $\{w_T^\epsilon\}_{T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)}$ ,
- (b) the unitary  $\hat{V}_\lambda \rightarrow \hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon$  given by  $v_T \mapsto w_T^\epsilon$  for  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$  intertwines  $\hat{\pi}_\lambda|_{A_n}$  with  $\rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon$ ; that is,

$$(8.12) \quad \langle \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon(g) w_T^\epsilon, w_S^\epsilon \rangle = \langle \hat{\pi}_\lambda(g) v_T, v_S \rangle, \quad g \in A_n, \quad S, T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda),$$

- (c) the linear map  $\hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon}: \hat{V}_\mu^\epsilon \rightarrow \hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon$  given by

$$\hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon} w_R^\epsilon = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_{R\lambda}^\epsilon + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_{R(\lambda')}^\epsilon, \quad R \in \text{Tab}_*(\mu),$$

is an isometry that intertwines  $\rho_\mu^\epsilon$  with  $\rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon|_{A_{n-1}}$ .

For completeness, we provide a proof of Proposition 8.5 in Appendix C. When  $\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow$  satisfies  $\lambda \neq \lambda'$ , it is known that  $\hat{\pi}_\lambda|_{A_n}$  is irreducible. By Proposition 8.5(b), so is the equivalent representation  $\rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon$ . Furthermore, when  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mu^\uparrow$  satisfy  $\lambda_i \neq \lambda'_i$  for each  $i$  and  $\{\lambda_1, \lambda'_1\} \neq \{\lambda_2, \lambda'_2\}$ , and when  $\nu \in \mu^\uparrow$  is symmetric, the representations  $\hat{\pi}_{\lambda_1}|_{A_n}$ ,  $\hat{\pi}_{\lambda_2}|_{A_n}$ ,  $\rho_\nu^+$ , and  $\rho_\nu^-$  are known to be pairwise inequivalent. In particular, for each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ , the representation  $\rho_{\mu^\uparrow}^\epsilon = \rho_\nu^\epsilon \oplus \bigoplus_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subset \mu^\uparrow \setminus \{\nu\}} \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon$  is multiplicity free, and so is any of its subrepresentations  $\rho_L^\epsilon$  where  $L \subseteq \mu^\uparrow$  satisfies  $\lambda \in L$  only if  $\lambda' \in L$ .

## 9. PROOF OF THEOREM 7.2

Armed with the necessary background, we now turn to the proof of Theorem 7.2. In fact, we prove a much more general result that explains how to decompose any multiple-layer totally symmetric ECTFF based on a symmetric partition.

**Theorem 9.1.** *Let  $\mu \vdash (n-1)$  be a symmetric partition with an even number of distinct parts. Fix a nonempty and proper subset  $L \subset \mu^\uparrow$  with the property that  $\lambda \in L$  only if  $\lambda' \in L$ , and put  $d_L := \dim \hat{V}_L = \sum_{\lambda \in L} d_\lambda$ . Next, let  $\hat{W}_L \leq \hat{V}_L$  be the image of the isometry  $\hat{\Psi}_L: \hat{V}_\mu \rightarrow \hat{V}_L$  given by*

$$(9.1) \quad \hat{\Psi}_L v_R = \sum_{\lambda \in L} \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L}} v_{R^\lambda}, \quad R \in \text{Tab}(\mu),$$

and for each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ , let  $\hat{W}_L^\epsilon := \hat{W}_L \cap \hat{V}_L^\epsilon \leq \hat{V}_L^\epsilon$ . Finally, choose a transversal  $\{t_k\}_{k \in [n]}$  for  $[n]$  in  $A_n$  with the property that  $t_k n = k$  for every  $k \in [n]$ . Then  $\hat{W}_L := \{\hat{\pi}_L(t_k) \hat{W}_L\}_{k \in [n]}$  is a totally symmetric ECTFF $_{\mathbb{F}}(d_L, d_\mu, n)$  for  $\hat{V}_L$ , and for each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ ,  $\hat{W}_L^\epsilon := \{\rho_L^\epsilon(t_k) \hat{W}_L^\epsilon\}_{k \in [n]}$  is an ECTFF $_{\mathbb{F}}(d_L/2, d_\mu/2, n)$  for  $\hat{V}_L^\epsilon$  with alternating symmetry, where  $\mathbb{F}$  is given by (8.8). Furthermore, the following hold:

- (a) for each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ ,  $\hat{W}_L^\epsilon$  and  $\hat{W}_{L^c}^\epsilon$  are Naimark complements,
- (b)  $\hat{W}_L^+$  and  $\hat{W}_L^-$  are unitarily equivalent subspace ensembles,
- (c) for each  $k \in [n]$ ,

$$\hat{\pi}_L(t_k) \hat{W}_L = \rho_L^+(t_k) \hat{W}_L^+ \oplus \rho_L^-(t_k) \hat{W}_L^- = (\hat{\pi}_L(t_k) \hat{W}_L \cap \hat{V}_L^+) \oplus (\hat{\pi}_L(t_k) \hat{W}_L \cap \hat{V}_L^-),$$

- (d) for each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ ,  $\hat{W}_L^\epsilon$  is equi-isoclinic if and only if  $\hat{W}_L$  is equi-isoclinic, if and only if the ensemble  $\mathcal{W}_L$  of Theorem 6.1 is equi-isoclinic.

Theorem 7.2 follows immediately from Theorem 9.1 by taking  $L = L_\delta$  and applying Corollary 6.9.

*Proof of Theorem 9.1.* To begin, we show that each of the subspace ensembles  $\hat{W}_L$  and  $\hat{W}_L^\epsilon$  is an instance of the multiple-layer construction in Theorem 3.9. As in the case where  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ , for each  $\lambda \in L$  the mapping  $\hat{\Psi}_{\lambda, \mu}: \hat{V}_\mu \rightarrow \hat{V}_\lambda$  given by  $\hat{\Psi}_{\lambda, \mu} v_R = v_{R^\lambda}$ ,  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$ , is an isometry that intertwines  $\hat{\pi}_\mu$  with  $\hat{\pi}_\lambda|_{S_{n-1}}$ . Applying Theorem 3.9 with these isometries in mind, we find that  $\hat{\Psi}_L$  is an isometry whose image  $\hat{W}_L$  generates a totally symmetric ECTFF under the action of  $\hat{\pi}_L = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in L} \hat{\pi}_\lambda$ , namely  $\hat{W}_L$ .

Something similar happens for each  $\hat{\mathcal{W}}_L^\epsilon$ . To understand this, we first consider cases to decompose  $\rho_L^\epsilon$  as a direct sum of pairwise inequivalent irreducible subrepresentations, and obtain a corresponding isometry  $\hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon: \hat{V}_\mu^\epsilon \rightarrow \hat{V}_L^\epsilon$  as in Theorem 3.9. Since  $\mu$  has an even number of distinct parts,  $\mu^\uparrow$  contains a unique symmetric partition  $\nu \vdash n$ . If  $\nu \notin L$ , then  $\rho_L^\epsilon = \bigoplus_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L} \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon$ . In this case, for  $R \in \text{Tab}_*(\mu)$  we follow the hypotheses of Theorem 3.9 to define

$$\hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon w_R^\epsilon = \sum_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L} \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L/2}} \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon} w_R^\epsilon = \sum_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L} \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L}} (w_{R^\lambda}^\epsilon + w_{R^{(\lambda')}}^\epsilon).$$

If  $\nu \in L$ , then  $\rho_L^\epsilon = \rho_\nu^\epsilon \oplus \bigoplus_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L \setminus \{\nu\}} \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon$ . In this case, for  $R \in \text{Tab}_*(\mu)$  we follow the hypotheses of Theorem 3.9 to define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon w_R^\epsilon &= \sqrt{\frac{d_\nu/2}{d_L/2}} \hat{\Psi}_{\nu, \mu, \epsilon} w_R^\epsilon + \sum_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L \setminus \{\nu\}} \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L/2}} \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon} w_R^\epsilon \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{d_\nu}{d_L}} w_{R^\nu}^\epsilon + \sum_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L \setminus \{\nu\}} \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L}} (w_{R^\lambda}^\epsilon + w_{R^{(\lambda')}}^\epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, we claim that

$$(9.2) \quad \hat{\Psi}_L = \hat{\Psi}_L^+ \oplus \hat{\Psi}_L^-: \hat{V}_\mu^+ \oplus \hat{V}_\mu^- \rightarrow \hat{V}_L^+ \oplus \hat{V}_L^-,$$

and in particular,  $\hat{W}_L^\epsilon = (\text{im } \hat{\Psi}_L) \cap \hat{V}_L^\epsilon = \text{im } \hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon$  for each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ . Then each  $\hat{\mathcal{W}}_L^\epsilon$  is an instance of the construction in Theorem 3.9, so it is an ECTFF $_{\mathbb{F}}(d_L/2, d_\mu/2, n)$  for  $\hat{V}_L^\epsilon$  with alternating symmetry.

Choose any  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$ . Writing  $P_\epsilon$  for orthogonal projection of  $\hat{V}_\mu$  onto  $\hat{V}_\mu^\epsilon$ ,

$$(9.3) \quad (\hat{\Psi}_L^+ \oplus \hat{\Psi}_L^-)v_R = (\hat{\Psi}_L^+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} P_+ v_R) + (\hat{\Psi}_L^- P_- v_R) = (\hat{\Psi}_L^+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_R^+) + (\hat{\Psi}_L^- \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_R^-),$$

and to prove the claim it suffices to show this quantity equals  $\hat{\Psi}_L v_R$  as given in (9.1).

To accomplish this, we first simplify our formula for  $\hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon$ . Whether  $\nu \notin L$  or  $\nu \in L$ , the definition given above reduces to

$$\hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon w_R^\epsilon = \sum_{\lambda \in L} \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L}} w_{R^\lambda}^\epsilon, \quad R \in \text{Tab}_*(\mu), \quad \epsilon \in \{\pm\}.$$

As we now show, this formula holds even when  $R \notin \text{Tab}_*(\mu)$ . For such  $R$ , we have  $R' \in \text{Tab}_*(\mu)$ , and for each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ ,

$$w_R^\epsilon = \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_R) w_{R'}^\epsilon$$

by (8.4). Consequently,

$$\hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon w_R^\epsilon = \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_R) \hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon w_{R'}^\epsilon = \sum_{\lambda \in L} \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L}} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_R) w_{(R')^\lambda}^\epsilon.$$

For every  $\lambda \in L$ , we have  $d_\lambda = d_{\lambda'}$ , while  $(R')^\lambda = [R^{(\lambda')}]'$  by (8.10) and  $g_R = g_{R^{(\lambda')}}$  by (8.9). Making these substitutions, we find

$$\hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon w_R^\epsilon = \sum_{\lambda \in L} \sqrt{\frac{d_{\lambda'}}{d_L}} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_{R^{(\lambda')}}) w_{[R^{(\lambda')}]'}^\epsilon = \sum_{\lambda \in L} \sqrt{\frac{d_{\lambda'}}{d_L}} w_{R^{(\lambda')}}^\epsilon,$$

where the last step applies (8.11) for  $\lambda \neq \nu$  and (8.4) in the case where  $\lambda = \nu$ . Since  $L$  is invariant under the mapping  $\lambda \mapsto \lambda'$ , we may reindex this sum to conclude

$$\hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon w_R^\epsilon = \sum_{\lambda \in L} \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L}} w_{R^\lambda}^\epsilon, \quad R \in \text{Tab}(\mu), \quad \epsilon \in \{\pm\}.$$

Armed with this formula, we continue (9.3) for arbitrary  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$  to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\Psi}_L^+ \oplus \hat{\Psi}_L^-)v_R &= (\hat{\Psi}_L^+ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}w_R^+) + (\hat{\Psi}_L^- \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}w_R^-) = \sum_{\lambda \in L} \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}w_{R^\lambda}^+ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}w_{R^\lambda}^- \right) \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \in L} \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L}} v_{R^\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. This completes the proof of (9.2).

It remains to prove (a), (b), (c), and (d). The proof of (a) can be obtained by trivially modifying the proof of Lemma 6.4, including the content of Example 6.3, where  $\pi_L$  should be replaced with  $\rho_L^\epsilon$  and  $\Psi_L$  should be replaced with  $\hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon$ .

For (b), suppose first that  $\nu \notin L$ . Fix a representative  $\lambda$  for each transpose pair  $\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L$ , and let  $U_{\lambda, \lambda'}: \hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^+ \rightarrow \hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^-$  be the unitary given by  $U_{\lambda, \lambda'} w_T^+ = w_T^-$  for  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ . We will show that the unitary  $U := \bigoplus_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L} U_{\lambda, \lambda'}: \hat{V}_L^+ \rightarrow \hat{V}_L^-$  satisfies  $U \rho_L^+(t_k) \hat{W}_L^+ = \rho_L^-(t_k) \hat{W}_L^-$  for each  $k \in [n]$ .

Fix such  $k \in [n]$ . For any pair  $\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L$  and any  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ , two applications of (8.12) show that

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\lambda, \lambda'} \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^+(g) w_T^+ &= \sum_{S \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)} \langle \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^+(g) w_T^+, w_S^+ \rangle U_{\lambda, \lambda'} w_S^+ \\ &= \sum_{S \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)} \langle \hat{\pi}_\lambda(g) v_T, v_S \rangle w_S^- \\ &= \sum_{S \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)} \langle \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^-(g) w_T^-, w_S^- \rangle U_{\lambda, \lambda'} w_S^- \\ &= \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^-(g) w_T^-. \end{aligned}$$

Given  $R \in \text{Tab}_*(\mu)$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} U \rho_L^+(t_k) \hat{\Psi}_L^+ w_R^+ &= \sum_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L} U_{\lambda, \lambda'} \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^+(t_k) \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L}} (w_{R^\lambda}^+ + w_{R^{(\lambda')}}^+) \\ &= \sum_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\} \subseteq L} \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^-(t_k) \sqrt{\frac{d_\lambda}{d_L}} (w_{R^\lambda}^- + w_{R^{(\lambda')}}^-) \\ &= \rho_L^-(t_k) \hat{\Psi}_L^- w_R^-. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the span over all  $R \in \text{Tab}_*(\mu)$ , we find that  $U \rho_L^+(t_k) \hat{W}_L^+ = \rho_L^-(t_k) \hat{W}_L^-$ , as desired.

Now suppose  $\nu \in L$ . Then  $\nu \notin L^c$ , and the above shows that  $\hat{W}_{L^c}^+$  and  $\hat{W}_{L^c}^-$  are unitarily equivalent. By (a), so are their Naimark complements  $\hat{W}_L^+$  and  $\hat{W}_L^-$ .

For (c), recall that  $\hat{\pi}_L|_{A_n} = \rho_L^+ \oplus \rho_L^-$ , and in particular, for each  $k \in [n]$ ,

$$\hat{\pi}_L(t_k) = \rho_L^+(t_k) \oplus \rho_L^-(t_k): \hat{V}_L^+ \oplus \hat{V}_L^- \rightarrow \hat{V}_L^+ \oplus \hat{V}_L^-.$$

Applying this representation to both sides of (9.2), we obtain the generalization

$$(9.4) \quad \hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{\Psi}_L = \rho_L^+(t_k)\hat{\Psi}_L^+ \oplus \rho_L^-(t_k)\hat{\Psi}_L^- : \hat{V}_\mu^+ \oplus \hat{V}_\mu^- \rightarrow \hat{V}_L^+ \oplus \hat{V}_L^-,$$

where  $\hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{\Psi}_L$  is an isometry onto  $\hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{W}_L$  and each  $\rho_L^\epsilon(t_k)\hat{\Psi}_L^\epsilon$  is an isometry onto  $\rho_L^\epsilon(t_k)\hat{W}_L^\epsilon$ . It follows easily that

$$\hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{W}_L = \rho_L^+(t_k)\hat{W}_L^+ \oplus \rho_L^-(t_k)\hat{W}_L^- = (\hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{W}_L \cap \hat{V}_L^+) \oplus (\hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{W}_L \cap \hat{V}_L^-).$$

For (d), we first show that the subspace ensemble  $\mathcal{W}_L$  of Theorem 6.1 is equi-isoclinic if and only if  $\hat{\mathcal{W}}_L$  is equi-isoclinic. Let  $\pi_L: S_n \rightarrow \mathbf{U}(V_L)$  be as in Theorem 6.1. Then for each  $k \in [n]$ ,  $\pi_L(t_k)W_L \subseteq \hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{W}_L$  with set equality when  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ . Furthermore, any orthonormal basis for  $\pi_L(t_k)W_L$  (as a space over  $\mathbb{R}$ ) is also an orthonormal basis for  $\hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{W}_L$  (as a space over  $\mathbb{F}$ ). In particular, for any  $k \neq \ell \in [n]$  a cross-Gram matrix between  $\pi_L(t_k)W_L$  and  $\pi_L(t_\ell)W_L$  is also a cross-Gram matrix between  $\hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{W}_L$  and  $\hat{\pi}_L(t_\ell)\hat{W}_L$ . Multiplying this common cross-Gram matrix by its adjoint, we find the first two subspaces are  $\alpha$ -isoclinic if and only if the second two subspaces are  $\alpha$ -isoclinic. This proves the claim.

Now we show that for each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ ,  $\hat{\mathcal{W}}_L$  is equi-isoclinic if and only if  $\hat{W}_L^\epsilon$  is equi-isoclinic. For any  $k \neq \ell \in [n]$ , an application of (9.4) shows a cross-Gram operator between  $\hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{W}_L$  and  $\hat{\pi}_L(t_\ell)\hat{W}_L$  is given by

$$\hat{W}_L^* \hat{\pi}_L(t_\ell^{-1}t_k)\hat{W}_L = (\hat{W}_L^+)^* \rho_L^+(t_\ell^{-1}t_k)\hat{W}_L^+ \oplus (\hat{W}_L^-)^* \rho_L^-(t_\ell^{-1}t_k)\hat{W}_L^-,$$

which is the direct sum of the two cross-Gram operators between  $\rho_L^\epsilon(t_k)\hat{W}_L^\epsilon$  and  $\rho_L^\epsilon(t_\ell)\hat{W}_L^\epsilon$  for  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ . Multiplying cross-Grams by their adjoints, we find that  $\hat{\pi}_L(t_k)\hat{W}_L$  and  $\hat{\pi}_L(t_\ell)\hat{W}_L$  are  $\alpha$ -isoclinic if and only if *both* pairs of subspaces  $\rho_L^\epsilon(t_k)\hat{W}_L^\epsilon$  and  $\rho_L^\epsilon(t_\ell)\hat{W}_L^\epsilon$  are  $\alpha$ -isoclinic. Consequently,  $\hat{\mathcal{W}}_L$  is equi-isoclinic with parameter  $\alpha$  if and only if *both*  $\hat{W}_L^+$  and  $\hat{W}_L^-$  are equi-isoclinic with parameter  $\alpha$ . Meanwhile, (b) implies that  $\hat{W}_L^+$  is equi-isoclinic with parameter  $\alpha$  if and only if  $\hat{W}_L^-$  is equi-isoclinic with parameter  $\alpha$ . Thus, for either choice of  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ ,  $\hat{W}_L$  is equi-isoclinic with parameter  $\alpha$  if and only if  $\hat{W}_L^\epsilon$  is equi-isoclinic with parameter  $\alpha$ .  $\square$

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

JWI was supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation, by NSF DMS 2220301, and by the Air Force Institute of Technology through the Air Force Office of Scientific Research Summer Faculty Fellowship Program, Contract Numbers FA8750-15-3-6003, FA9550-15-0001 and FA9550-20-F-0005. JJ was supported by NSF DMS 2220320. DGM was supported by NSF DMS 2220304. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not reflect the official guidance or position of the United States Government, the Department of Defense, the United States Air Force, or the United States Space Force.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] A. S. Bandeira, E. Dobriban, D. G. Mixon, and W. F. Sawin. Certifying the restricted isometry property is hard. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 59(6):3448–3450, 2013.
- [2] A. S. Bandeira, M. Fickus, D. G. Mixon, and P. Wong. The road to deterministic matrices with the restricted isometry property. *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 19(6):1123–1149, 2013.

- [3] A. Blokhuis, U. Brehm, and B. Et-Taoui. Complex conference matrices and equi-isoclinic planes in Euclidean spaces. *Beitr. Algebra Geom.*, 59(3):491–500, 2018.
- [4] R. Calderbank, A. Thompson, and Y. Xie. On block coherence of frames. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 38(1):50–71, 2015.
- [5] P. G. Casazza, M. Fickus, D. G. Mixon, Y. Wang, and Z. Zhou. Constructing tight fusion frames. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 30(2):175–187, 2011.
- [6] T. Ceccherini-Silberstein, F. Scarabotti, and F. Tolli. *Representation theory of the symmetric groups*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010.
- [7] T. Ceccherini-Silberstein, F. Scarabotti, and F. Tolli. *Discrete harmonic analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2018.
- [8] H. Cohn, A. Kumar, and G. Minton. Optimal simplices and codes in projective spaces. *Geom. Topol.*, 20(3):1289–1357, 2016.
- [9] J. H. Conway, R. H. Hardin, and N. J. A. Sloane. Packing lines, planes, etc.: packings in Grassmannian spaces. *Experiment. Math.*, 5(2):139–159, 1996.
- [10] J. Creignou. Constructions of Grassmannian simplices. arXiv:cs/0703036.
- [11] U. Dempwolff and W. M. Kantor. On 2-transitive sets of equiangular lines. *Bull. Aust. Math. Soc.*, 107(1):134–145, 2023.
- [12] I. S. Dhillon, R. W. Heath, Jr., T. Strohmer, and J. A. Tropp. Constructing packings in Grassmannian manifolds via alternating projection. *Experiment. Math.*, 17(1):9–35, 2008.
- [13] J. D. Dixon and B. Mortimer. *Permutation groups*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
- [14] Y. C. Eldar, P. Kuppinger, and H. Bölcskei. Block-sparse signals: uncertainty relations and efficient recovery. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 58(6):3042–3054, 2010.
- [15] Y. C. Eldar and M. Mishali. Robust recovery of signals from a structured union of subspaces. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 55(11):5302–5316, 2009.
- [16] B. Et-Taoui. Equi-isoclinic planes of Euclidean spaces. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 17(2):205–219, 2006.
- [17] B. Et-Taoui. Infinite family of equi-isoclinic planes in Euclidean odd dimensional spaces and of complex symmetric conference matrices of odd orders. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 556:373–380, 2018.
- [18] B. Et-Taoui and J. Rouyer. On  $p$ -tuples of equi-isoclinic 3-spaces in the Euclidean space. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 20(4):491–525, 2009.
- [19] L. Fejes Tóth. *Regular figures*. Macmillan, New York, 1964.
- [20] M. Fickus, E. Gomez-Leos, and J. W. Iverson. Radon-Hurwitz Grassmannian codes. arXiv:2404.06417, 2024.
- [21] M. Fickus, J. W. Iverson, J. Jasper, and D. G. Mixon. Equi-isoclinic subspaces, covers of the complete graph, and complex conference matrices. arXiv:2212.12617, 2022.
- [22] M. Fickus, J. W. Iverson, J. Jasper, and D. G. Mixon. A note on totally symmetric equi-isoclinic tight fusion frames. In *ICASSP 2022 - 2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 8987–8991, 2022.
- [23] M. Fickus, J. W. Iverson, J. Jasper, and D. G. Mixon. Harmonic Grassmannian codes. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.*, 65:1–39, 2023.
- [24] M. Fickus, J. Jasper, D. G. Mixon, and C. E. Watson. A brief introduction to equi-chordal and equi-isoclinic tight fusion frames. In Y. M. Lu, D. V. D. Ville, and M. Papadakis, editors, *Wavelets and Sparsity XVII*, volume 10394, page 103940T. International Society for Optics and Photonics, SPIE, 2017.
- [25] M. Fickus and D. G. Mixon. Tables of the existence of equiangular tight frames. arXiv:1504.00253, 2015.
- [26] T. Geetha and A. Prasad. Comparison of Gelfand-Tsetlin bases for alternating and symmetric groups. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, 21(1):131–143, 2018.
- [27] C. D. Godsil and A. D. Hensel. Distance regular covers of the complete graph. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 56(2):205–238, 1992.
- [28] P. Headley. On Young’s orthogonal form and the characters of the alternating group. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 5(2):127–134, 1996.
- [29] S. G. Hoggar. New sets of equi-isoclinic  $n$ -planes from old. *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. (2)*, 20(4):287–291, 1977.
- [30] J. W. Iverson, J. Jasper, and D. G. Mixon. Optimal line packings from finite group actions. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 8:e6, 2020.

- [31] J. W. Iverson, E. J. King, and D. G. Mixon. A note on tight projective 2-designs. *J. Combin. Des.*, 29(12):809–832, 2021.
- [32] J. W. Iverson and D. G. Mixon. Doubly transitive lines I: Higman pairs and roux. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 185:105540, 2022.
- [33] J. W. Iverson and D. G. Mixon. Doubly transitive lines II: Almost simple symmetries. *Algebr. Comb.*, 7:37–76, 2024.
- [34] E. J. King. 2- and 3-covariant equiangular tight frames. In *2019 13th International conference on Sampling Theory and Applications (SampTA)*, 2019.
- [35] P. W. H. Lemmens and J. J. Seidel. Equi-isoclinic subspaces of Euclidean spaces. *Indag. Math.*, 35:98–107, 1973. *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A* **76**.
- [36] J. M. Renes, R. Blume-Kohout, A. J. Scott, and C. M. Caves. Symmetric informationally complete quantum measurements. *J. Math. Phys.*, 45(6):2171–2180, 2004.
- [37] O. Ruff. Weight theory for alternating groups. *Algebra Colloq.*, 15(3):391–404, 2008.
- [38] J.-P. Serre. *Linear representations of finite groups*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.
- [39] The GAP Group. *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.11.1*, 2021. <https://www.gap-system.org>.
- [40] R. M. Thrall. Young’s semi-normal representation of the symmetric group. *Duke Math. J.*, 8:611–624, 1941.
- [41] J. A. Tropp. Greed is good: algorithmic results for sparse approximation. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 50(10):2231–2242, 2004.
- [42] A. M. Vershik. A new approach to the representation theory of the symmetric groups. III. Induced representations and the Frobenius-Young correspondence. *Mosc. Math. J.*, 6(3):567–585, 588, 2006.
- [43] S. Waldron. Tight frames over the quaternions and equiangular lines. arXiv:2006.06126, 2020.
- [44] S. F. D. Waldron. *An introduction to finite tight frames*. Applied and Numerical Harmonic Analysis. Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2018.
- [45] L. Welch. Lower bounds on the maximum cross correlation of signals. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 20(3):397–399, 1974.
- [46] G. Zauner. *Quantendesigns—Grundzüge einer nichtkommutativen Designtheorie*. PhD thesis, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria, 1999.

## APPENDIX A. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 8.2

For (a), orthonormality follows from (8.3), and we have

$$\hat{V}_\nu^\epsilon = \text{im } P_\epsilon = \text{span}\{w_T^\epsilon : T \in \text{Tab}(\nu)\} = \text{span}\{w_T^\epsilon : T \in \text{Tab}_*(\nu)\}$$

by (8.4).

For (b), choose any  $T \in \text{Tab}(\nu)$  and any  $k \in [n-1]$ . Then  $D_{T'}(k+1, k) = -D_T(k+1, k)$ , and so (4.1) yields

$$\hat{\pi}_\nu(s_k)v_{T'} = -\frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)}v_{T'} + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)^2}}v_{s_k T'},$$

where we have used the fact that  $(s_k T)^\epsilon = s_k T^\epsilon$ . Since  $\text{sgn}(g_{s_k T}) = \text{sgn}(s_k g_T) = -\text{sgn}(g_T)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_\nu(s_k)w_T^\epsilon &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{\pi}_\nu(s_k)v_T + \epsilon i^{(n-p_\nu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_T)\hat{\pi}_\nu(s_k)v_{T'}) \\ (A.1) \quad &= \frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)}w_T^{-\epsilon} + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_T(k+1, k)^2}}w_{s_k T}^{-\epsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $s_k T$  fails to be standard precisely when the coefficient on  $w_{s_k T}^\epsilon$  is zero. Observe that  $D_T(2, 1) = 1$  if  $T \in \text{Tab}_*(\nu)$  and  $D_T(2, 1) = -1$  if  $T \notin \text{Tab}_*(\nu)$ . Then (A.1) yields

$$(A.2) \quad \hat{\pi}_\nu(s_1)w_T^\epsilon = \begin{cases} w_T^{-\epsilon} & \text{if } T \in \text{Tab}_*(\nu), \\ -w_T^{-\epsilon} & \text{if } T \in \text{Tab}(\nu) \setminus \text{Tab}_*(\nu). \end{cases}$$

If  $2 < k < n$ , then either  $s_k T \in \text{Tab}_*(\nu)$  or  $D_T(k+1, k) \in \{\pm 1\}$ , so (A.1) and (A.2) combine to imply (8.5). Comparing with (4.1), we immediately deduce (8.6).

Now consider  $k = 2$ . For  $T \in \text{Tab}_*(\nu)$ , we have  $(s_2 T)_{12} = 3$ , so  $s_2 T \notin \text{Tab}_*(\nu)$ . By (A.1) and (A.2),

$$(A.3) \quad \hat{\pi}_\nu(s_1 s_2) w_T^\epsilon = \frac{1}{D_T(3,2)} w_T^\epsilon - \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_T(3,2)^2}} w_{s_2 T}^\epsilon,$$

with the usual interpretation when  $s_2 T$  is not standard. In the case where  $s_2 T$  is standard, (8.4) implies

$$-w_{s_2 T}^\epsilon = -\epsilon i^{(n-p_\nu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_{s_2 T}) w_{s_2 T'}^\epsilon = \epsilon i^{(n-p_\nu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) w_{s_2 T'}^\epsilon.$$

Then (A.3) says

$$\hat{\pi}_\nu(s_1 s_2) w_T^\epsilon = \frac{1}{D_T(3,2)} w_T^\epsilon + \epsilon i^{(n-p_\nu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{D_T(3,2)^2}} w_{s_2 T'}^\epsilon.$$

This is the expansion of  $\hat{\pi}^\epsilon(s_1 s_2) w_T^\epsilon$  in the basis of (a). Then (8.7) follows since  $s_2 T' \neq T$  as a consequence of our assumption  $n \geq 5$ .

#### APPENDIX B. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 8.4

It is clear that  $U_{\mu^\uparrow}$  is unitary. For the intertwining relation, let  $\lambda \in \mu^\uparrow$  be arbitrary and define a related linear map  $\phi_\lambda: \hat{V}_\lambda \rightarrow \hat{V}_{\lambda'}$  by  $\phi_\lambda v_T = \text{sgn}(g_T) v_{T'}$  for  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ . For any  $g \in A_n$ , the discussion below Corollary 1 in [26] shows that  $\phi_\lambda \hat{\pi}_\lambda(g) = \hat{\pi}_{\lambda'}(g) \phi_\lambda$ . Since the restriction of  $U_{\mu^\uparrow}$  to  $\hat{V}_\lambda$  coincides with  $i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \phi_\lambda$ , we conclude that for any  $v \in V_\lambda$ ,

$$U_{\mu^\uparrow} \hat{\pi}_{\mu^\uparrow}(g) v = i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \phi_\lambda \hat{\pi}_\lambda(g) v = i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \hat{\pi}_{\lambda'}(g) \phi_\lambda v = \hat{\pi}_{\mu^\uparrow}(g) U_{\mu^\uparrow} v.$$

This holds for any  $\lambda \in L$ , so  $U_{\mu^\uparrow} \hat{\pi}_{\mu^\uparrow}(g) = \hat{\pi}_{\mu^\uparrow}(g) U_{\mu^\uparrow}$ .

It remains to show  $U_{\mu^\uparrow}^2 = I$ , or equivalently, that

$$(B.1) \quad (-1)^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_{T'}) \text{sgn}(g_T) = 1, \quad T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \mu^\uparrow.$$

To accomplish this, we show that  $g_{T'} g_T^{-1}$  is a product of  $(n-1-p_\mu)/2$  transpositions. More specifically, we show that  $g_{T'} g_T^{-1}$  fixes the  $\lambda - \mu$  entry of  $T$ , and in the portion of  $T$  that lies in the Young diagram for  $\mu$ , it exchanges the off-diagonal entries with their mirror images across the main diagonal. Thus,  $g_{T'} g_T^{-1}$  is the product of the  $(n-1-p_\mu)/2$  transpositions that swap such mirror entries. Indeed, denoting  $(k, \ell) = \lambda - \mu$ , so that  $(\ell, k) = \lambda' - \mu$ , we compute

$$g_T^{-1} T_{k\ell} = (\mathcal{T}_\lambda)_{k\ell} = n = (\mathcal{T}_{\lambda'})_{\ell k} = g_{T'}^{-1} (T')_{\ell k} = g_{T'}^{-1} T_{k\ell},$$

so that  $g_{T'} g_T^{-1} T_{k\ell} = T_{k\ell}$ . For any other position  $(i, j) \neq \lambda - \mu$  in the Young diagram for  $\lambda$ , we have

$$(\mathcal{T}_\lambda)_{ij} = (\mathcal{T}_\mu^\lambda)_{ij} = (\mathcal{T}_\mu)_{ij} = (\mathcal{T}_\mu^{\lambda'})_{ij} = (\mathcal{T}_{\lambda'})_{ij}.$$

Consequently,

$$g_T^{-1} T_{ij} = (\mathcal{T}_\lambda)_{ij} = (\mathcal{T}_{\lambda'})_{ij} = g_{T'}^{-1} (T')_{ij}.$$

Therefore,  $g_{T'} g_T^{-1} T_{ij} = (T')_{ij} = T_{ji}$ , as desired.

## APPENDIX C. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 8.5

For (8.11), choose any  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$  and  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ , and apply (B.1) to obtain

$$\epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) w_{T'}^\epsilon = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_T) v_{T'} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} v_T = w_T^\epsilon.$$

For (a), it is clear from the definition that each  $\{w_T^\epsilon\}_{T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)}$  is orthonormal. To show each  $\{w_T^\epsilon\}_{T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)}$  spans  $\hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon$ , it suffices to show  $\{w_T^+\}_{T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)}$  and  $\{w_T^-\}_{T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)}$  together span  $\hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^+ = \hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^+ \oplus \hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^-$ . Denote  $W \leq \hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^+$  for this mutual span. Then  $W$  includes  $\hat{V}_\lambda$  since  $v_T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_T^+ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_T^-$  for every  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ . Furthermore, for every  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda')$  and  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ ,  $W$  contains  $w_T^\epsilon$  by (8.11), and so it also includes  $v_T$ . Thus,  $W$  contains  $\hat{V}_{\lambda'}$ , so that  $W \geq \hat{V}_\lambda \oplus \hat{V}_{\lambda'} = \hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^+$ , as desired.

To prove (b), choose any  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ . It suffices to prove (8.12). First observe that for any  $g \in A_n$ ,  $Q_\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}(I + \epsilon U_{\mu^\dagger})$  commutes with  $\hat{\pi}_{\mu^\dagger}(g)$  by Proposition 8.4. With this in mind, we compute for any  $g \in A_n$  and  $T \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon(g) w_T^\epsilon &= \hat{\pi}_{\mu^\dagger}(g) \sqrt{2} Q_\epsilon v_T = \sqrt{2} Q_\epsilon \hat{\pi}_{\mu^\dagger}(g) v_T = \sqrt{2} Q_\epsilon \hat{\pi}_\lambda(g) v_T \\ &= \sqrt{2} Q_\epsilon \sum_{S \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)} \langle \hat{\pi}_\lambda(g) v_T, v_S \rangle v_S \\ &= \sum_{S \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)} \langle \hat{\pi}_\lambda(g) v_T, v_S \rangle w_S^\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Now take inner products to obtain (8.12).

Finally, we prove (c). For each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ , it is easy to see that  $\hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon}$  maps the orthonormal basis  $\{w_R^\epsilon\}_{R \in \text{Tab}_*(\mu)}$  for  $\hat{V}_\mu^\epsilon$  to an orthonormal system in  $\hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon$ , so it is an isometry. It remains to show the intertwining relation

$$(C.1) \quad \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon} \rho_\mu^\epsilon(g) = \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon(g) \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon}, \quad g \in A_{n-1}.$$

Consider the related isometries  $\hat{\Psi}_{\lambda, \mu}: \hat{V}_\mu \rightarrow \hat{V}_\lambda$  and  $\hat{\Psi}_{\lambda', \mu}: \hat{V}_\mu \rightarrow \hat{V}_{\lambda'}$  given by  $\hat{\Psi}_{\lambda, \mu} v_R = v_{R^\lambda}$  and  $\hat{\Psi}_{\lambda', \mu} v_R = v_{R^{\lambda'}}$  for  $R \in \text{Tab}(\mu)$ , as well as  $\hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu}: \hat{V}_\mu \rightarrow \hat{V}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}$  given by

$$\hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu} v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\Psi}_{\lambda, \mu} v + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\Psi}_{\lambda', \mu} v, \quad v \in \hat{V}_\mu.$$

For any  $g \in S_{n-1}$  and  $v \in \hat{V}_\mu$ , (4.3) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu} \hat{\pi}_\mu(g) v &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\Psi}_{\lambda, \mu} \hat{\pi}_\mu(g) v + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\Psi}_{\lambda', \mu} \hat{\pi}_\mu(g) v \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\Psi}_{\lambda, \mu} \hat{\pi}_\mu(g) v + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\Psi}_{\lambda', \mu} \hat{\pi}_\mu(g) v \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\pi}_\lambda(g) \hat{\Psi}_{\lambda, \mu} v + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\pi}_{\lambda'}(g) \hat{\Psi}_{\lambda', \mu} v \\ &= \hat{\pi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}(g) \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu} v. \end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu} \hat{\pi}_\mu(g) = \hat{\pi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}(g) \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu}, \quad g \in S_{n-1}.$$

For each  $\epsilon \in \{\pm\}$ , we claim that  $\hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon}$  is the restriction of  $\hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu}$  to  $\hat{V}_\mu^\epsilon$ . Then for any  $g \in A_{n-1}$  and  $w \in \hat{V}_\mu^\epsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon} \rho_\mu^\epsilon(g)w &= \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu} \hat{\pi}_\mu(g)w = \hat{\pi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}(g) \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu} w \\ &= \rho_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}}^\epsilon(g) \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon} w, \end{aligned}$$

as in (C.1). Given  $R \in \text{Tab}_*(\mu)$ , we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu} w_R^\epsilon &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu} v_R + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_R) \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu} v_{R'} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} v_{R^\lambda} + \frac{1}{2} v_{R^{(\lambda')}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_R) v_{(R')^\lambda} + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_R) v_{(R')^{(\lambda')}}. \end{aligned}$$

We have  $g_R = g_{R^\lambda} = g_{R^{(\lambda'')}}$  by (8.9), while (8.10) gives  $(R')^\lambda = [R^{(\lambda')}]'$  and  $(R')^{(\lambda')} = (R^\lambda)'$ . Making these substitutions above, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu} w_R^\epsilon &= \frac{1}{2} v_{R^\lambda} + \frac{1}{2} v_{R^{(\lambda')}} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_{R^{(\lambda')}}) v_{[R^{(\lambda')}]'} + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_{R^\lambda}) v_{(R^\lambda)'} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} v_{R^\lambda} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_{R^\lambda}) v_{(R^\lambda)'} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} v_{R^{(\lambda')}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \epsilon i^{(n-1-p_\mu)/2} \text{sgn}(g_{R^{(\lambda')}}) v_{[R^{(\lambda')}]'} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_{R^\lambda}^\epsilon + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} w_{R^{(\lambda')}}^\epsilon \\ &= \hat{\Psi}_{\{\lambda, \lambda'\}, \mu, \epsilon} w_R^\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.