

SPECTRUM OF RANDOM-TO-RANDOM SHUFFLING IN THE HECKE ALGEBRA

ILANI AXELROD-FREED, SARAH BRAUNER, JUDY CHIANG, PATRICIA COMMINS, AND VERONICA LANG

ABSTRACT. We generalize random-to-random shuffling from a Markov chain on the symmetric group to one on the Type A Iwahori Hecke algebra, and show that its eigenvalues are polynomials in q with non-negative integer coefficients. Setting $q = 1$ recovers results of Dieker and Saliola, whose computation of the spectrum of random-to-random in the symmetric group resolved a nearly 20 year old conjecture by Uyemura-Reyes. Our methods simplify their proofs by drawing novel connections to the Jucys-Murphy elements of the Hecke algebra, Young seminormal forms, and the Okounkov-Vershik approach to representation theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we generalize the well-known but mysterious shuffling process *random-to-random* \mathcal{R}_n from a Markov chain on the symmetric group \mathfrak{S}_n to a Markov chain on the Type A Iwahori Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. Building on seminal work by Dieker and Saliola [25], we compute the complete spectrum of \mathcal{R}_n in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. Our methods simplify the proof for $q = 1$ by adopting the Okounkov-Vershik approach to the representation theory of the symmetric group and Hecke algebra, and drawing connections to the Jucys-Murphy elements and Young seminormal basis of \mathfrak{S}_n and $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

This project is motivated by a growing interest in studying random walks on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ from a combinatorial perspective. There is a rich connection between $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ and interacting particle systems, beginning with the work of Alcaraz–Droz–Henkel–Rittenberg [1] who realized that the generators of *asymmetric simple exclusion processes (ASEPs)* satisfy the algebra relations of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. Bufetov then showed in [15] that this connection could be generalized to numerous important interacting particle systems with multiple species arising from statistical mechanics, including ASEP, M -exclusion, TASEP, and stochastic vertex models [15]. Many of these systems have been studied using algebraic combinatorics with great success; see for example [6, 7, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24].

On the other hand, there is a beautiful theory of random walks on hyperplane arrangements (and more generally, left regular bands) pioneered by Bidigare–Hanlon–Rockmore [11] and Brown [14], which was originally built as a way of understanding and computing the mixing times of card shuffling processes, i.e. Markov chains on the symmetric group. This approach forges important links between combinatorial representation theory, probability, statistical physics and dynamic data storage; see [3, 4, 5, 9, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 36]. It has since been generalized to a broad class of random walks on semigroups in work of Ayyer–Schilling–Steinberg–Thiéry [8] and Rhodes–Schilling [47].

Our work serves to unite these two perspectives, by defining and studying one of the most important shuffling processes arising in the latter setting—random-to-random—as a Markov chain on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

Random-to-random shuffling in the symmetric group. The random-to-random shuffling process \mathcal{R}_n acts on a permutation $(w_1, \dots, w_n) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ by removing a “card” w_i with uniform probability then re-inserting it with uniform probability to a new position in the deck. One can think of this as a two-step process:

- (1) Apply *random-to-bottom* \mathcal{B}_n^* , which moves w_i to the end of the word;
- (2) Apply *bottom-to-random* \mathcal{B}_n , which moves the last letter of the word to a new position j .

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05E10, 60J10 20C08 .

Key words and phrases. Hecke algebra, Markov chain, card shuffling, random-to-random, Jucys-Murphy elements, Young seminormal forms, Okounkov-Vershik approach to representation theory, integral probability.

Formally, \mathcal{R}_n is the linear map $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n]$ acting on $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ by *right* multiplication (i.e. by position):

$$\mathcal{R}_n(w) := w \cdot \underbrace{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n s_i \cdots s_{n-1} \right)}_{:=\mathcal{B}_n^*} \underbrace{\left(\sum_{j=1}^n s_{n-1} \cdots s_j \right)}_{:=\mathcal{B}_n},$$

where s_k denotes the transposition $(k, k+1)$ in \mathfrak{S}_n swapping k and $k+1$. To obtain a random walk on $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n]$, normalize both \mathcal{B}_n^* and \mathcal{B}_n by $\frac{1}{n}$; after normalization, the coefficient $[u]\mathcal{R}_n(w)$ of $u \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ is the probability of obtaining u from w after one iteration of \mathcal{R}_n .

Random-to-bottom shuffling \mathcal{B}_n^* is very well-studied and has numerous interesting connections to combinatorics. Bidigare–Halon–Rockmore showed in [11] that the eigenvalues of \mathcal{B}_n^* acting on $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n]$ are $0, 1, \dots, n-2, n$, recovering a result of Phatarfod [43]. The multiplicity of the eigenvalue j is $\binom{n}{j} d_{n-j}$, where d_{n-j} is the $(n-j)$ -*derangement number* counting the number of permutations in \mathfrak{S}_{n-j} with zero fixed points. The kernel of \mathcal{B}_n^* carries the so-called *derangement representation* introduced by Désarménien and Wachs [20], which is related to well-loved objects such as Gessel’s fundamental quasisymmetric function [29], the free left regular band [13], the complex of injective words [46], and the configuration space of n points in \mathbb{R}^3 [33].

Random-to-*random* shuffling is significantly harder to understand. It was first defined by Diaconis (see [49, p100]), and studied by Uyemura-Reyes in his thesis [49]. Uyemura-Reyes conjectured that the eigenvalues of \mathcal{R}_n were non-negative integers, and proved this to be true in several cases. The full conjecture was open for almost two decades, until it was resolved by Dieker and Saliola in 2018 [25]. Random-to-random is a special case of a broader family of “symmetrized shuffling operators” whose spectral properties are still quite mysterious; see [36, 45].

To state Dieker and Saliola’s solution, recall that a skew shape $\lambda \setminus \mu$ is a *horizontal strip* if it has at most one box in each column. The *content* $\mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}$ of a skew shape $\lambda \setminus \mu$ is defined by summing the difference of the row and column number for each box in $\lambda \setminus \mu$. Formally, letting (i, j) indicate the coordinates of the box in the i -th row (ordered top-to-bottom, in English notation) and j -th column (ordered left-to-right),

$$\mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu} := \sum_{(i,j) \in \lambda \setminus \mu} (j - i).$$

Dieker and Saliola showed that the eigenvalues of \mathcal{R}_n acting on $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n]$ are indexed by horizontal strips $\lambda \setminus \mu$, where $|\lambda| = n$ and $\mu \subseteq \lambda$. The horizontal strip $\lambda \setminus \mu$ corresponds to the eigenvalue

$$(1.1) \quad \mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu} := \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu} + \sum_{k=|\mu|+1}^n k.$$

Equation 1.1 implies that, remarkably, $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, thereby proving Uyemura-Reyes’s conjecture. Using (1.1), Bernstein–Nestoridi [10] proved that \mathcal{R}_n exhibits cutoff behavior at

$$\frac{3}{4}n \log(n) - \frac{1}{4} \log(\log(n)).$$

At the heart of the Dieker–Saliola’s proofs in [25] is the representation theory of the symmetric group, which they use to inductively construct eigenvectors of \mathcal{R}_n from the kernels of \mathcal{R}_j for $j < n$. Our work will follow a similar strategy, but utilize different tools that both simplify their arguments and deepen the connections between \mathcal{R}_n and fundamental concepts in representation theory.

Generalization to the Hecke algebra. Given $q \in \mathbb{C}$, the Type A Iwahori Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is the associative \mathbb{C} -algebra on the generators $T_{s_1}, \dots, T_{s_{n-1}}$, subject to the relations

- (1) $T_{s_i}^2 = (q-1)T_{s_i} + q$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$,
- (2) $T_{s_i}T_{s_j} = T_{s_j}T_{s_i}$ when $|i-j| \geq 2$, and
- (3) $T_{s_i}T_{s_{i+1}}T_{s_i} = T_{s_{i+1}}T_{s_i}T_{s_{i+1}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-2$.

Note that $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is a q -deformation of the symmetric group algebra $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n]$, where $\mathcal{H}_n(1) = \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n]$. As in the case of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n]$, the Hecke algebra has a \mathbb{C} -basis given by $\{T_w\}$ for w in \mathfrak{S}_n .

We define the following q -deformation of \mathcal{R}_n .

Definition 1.1. For any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, define q -random-to-random shuffling $\mathcal{R}_n(q) : \mathcal{H}_n(q) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_n(q)$ by linearly extending

$$\mathcal{R}_n(q)(T_w) := T_w \cdot \underbrace{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} \right)}_{=: \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)} \underbrace{\left(\sum_{j=1}^n T_{s_{n-1}} \cdots T_{s_j} \right)}_{=: \mathcal{B}_n(q)}.$$

Putting additional assumptions on q allows us to define a random walk $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_n(q)$ on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ using a construction by Diaconis–Ram [23, Theorem 4.3]. Assume $q \geq 1 \in \mathbb{R}$, so that $q^{-1} \in (0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$ can be understood as a probability. Define $\tilde{T}_{s_i} := q^{-1}T_{s_i}$, and more generally let $\tilde{T}_w := q^{-\ell(w)}T_w$, where $\ell(w)$ is the Coxeter length of the reduced word $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. Then \tilde{T}_{s_i} acts by right multiplication on \tilde{T}_w :

$$(1.2) \quad \tilde{T}_w \cdot \tilde{T}_{s_i} := \begin{cases} \tilde{T}_{ws_i} & \ell(ws_i) > \ell(w) \\ q^{-1}\tilde{T}_{ws_i} + (1 - q^{-1})\tilde{T}_w & \ell(ws_i) < \ell(w), \end{cases}$$

thereby defining a Markov chain on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

Recall that the q -integer $[n]_q$ is defined for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$[n]_q := \frac{1 - q^n}{1 - q} = \begin{cases} 1 + q + \cdots + q^{n-1} & n > 0 \\ 0 & n = 0 \\ -q^{-1} - q^{-2} - \cdots - q^n & n < 0. \end{cases}$$

We can thus define a random walk $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_n(q)$ by rewriting $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ in terms of the \tilde{T}_{s_i} and normalizing:

$$(1.3) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_n(q)(\tilde{T}_w) := \tilde{T}_w \cdot \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{[n]_q} \sum_{i=1}^n q^{n-i} \tilde{T}_{s_i} \cdots \tilde{T}_{s_{n-1}} \right)}_{=: \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_n^*(q)} \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{[n]_q} \sum_{j=1}^n q^{n-j} \tilde{T}_{s_{n-1}} \cdots \tilde{T}_{s_j} \right)}_{=: \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_n(q)}.$$

The goal of our work is to characterize the spectrum of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ acting by right multiplication on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. Observe that the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_n(q)$ can be obtained immediately from those of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ by restricting to the case where $q^{-1} \in (0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$ and dividing by $([n]_q)^2$.

Our spectral formula for $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ uses two combinatorial statistics. First, given a skew shape $\lambda \setminus \mu$, we define the q -content

$$\mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) := \sum_{(i,j) \in \lambda \setminus \mu} [i - j]_q.$$

Note that $\mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) \in \mathbb{Z}(q)$ may be a Laurent polynomial; however, $q^{|\lambda|} \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ is a genuine polynomial in q .

Second, a standard Young tableau \mathfrak{t} has a *descent* at position $i \in [n-1]$ if $i+1$ appears south and weakly west of i in \mathfrak{t} . Let $\text{Des}(\mathfrak{t})$ be the set of descents of \mathfrak{t} . A tableau of size n is a *desarrangement tableau* if the minimum element of $[n] \setminus \text{Des}(\mathfrak{t})$ is even. Let d^μ be the number of desarrangement tableaux of shape μ and f^μ be the number of standard Young tableaux of shape μ .

Our main result is Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 1.2. For any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, the right action of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ has the following properties:

- (1) All eigenvalues of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ are of the form

$$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) = q^n \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) + \sum_{k=|\mu|+1}^n q^{n-k} [k]_q$$

where $\lambda \setminus \mu$ is a horizontal strip with $|\lambda| = n$ and $0 \leq |\mu| \leq n$.

- (2) The (algebraic) multiplicity of a fixed eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}(q)$ is given by

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \setminus \mu \text{ a horizontal strip} \\ \mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) = \mathcal{E}(q)}} f^\lambda d^\mu.$$

- (3) Every eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ is a polynomial in q with non-negative integer coefficients.

Theorem 1.2 has the following special cases.

Corollary 1.3. *Letting $\lambda = (n)$ and $\mu = \emptyset$ gives the eigenvalue*

$$\mathcal{E}_{(n)\setminus\emptyset}(q) = ([n]_q)^2.$$

The corresponding stationary distribution for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_n(q)$ is the Mallows measure of \mathfrak{S}_n :

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}_n, q^{-1}) = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_n} q^{\ell(w)} \tilde{T}_w.$$

Corollary 1.4. *The case $\lambda = (n-1, 1)$ and $\mu = (1, 1)$ gives the eigenvalue*

$$\mathcal{E}_{(n-1,1)\setminus(1,1)}(q) = [n-2]_q [n+1]_q,$$

which recovers the second largest eigenvalue of \mathcal{R}_n when $q = 1$.

Note that Theorem 1.2 does not imply that $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ is diagonalizable for arbitrary q . We show that $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ is diagonalizable when $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ by constructing an eigenbasis from bases of the kernels of $\mathcal{R}_j(q)$ for $j < n$ (Theorem 6.9 and Remark 6.5). Our analysis also has implications for $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$.

Theorem 1.5. *For any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, the right actions of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ have characteristic polynomial $\chi(y, q)$ given by*

$$\chi(y, q) = \prod_{j=0}^n (y - [j]_q)^{\binom{n}{j} d_{n-j}},$$

where d_{n-j} is the $(n-j)$ -derangement number counting permutations of \mathfrak{S}_{n-j} with zero fixed points.

Moreover, when $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, both $\mathcal{B}_n^(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ are diagonalizable.*

Methods. Our overall strategy is similar in spirit to [25], in that we inductively construct eigenvectors for the action of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ on the irreducible representations of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ when $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, using the kernels of $\mathcal{R}_j(q)$ for $j < n$ as the base case. However, our approach differs from [25] in technique.

The novelty of our method is to recursively relate $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ to the *Jucys-Murphy elements* of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$

$$J_k(q) := \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q^{i-k} T_{(i,k)}$$

and their many wonderful properties¹ In particular, we prove the following recursion for $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$.

Theorem 1.6. *For any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, the following recursion holds in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$:*

$$\mathcal{B}_n(q)\mathcal{R}_n(q) = \left(q\mathcal{R}_{n-1}(q) + [n]_q + q^n J_n(q) \right) \mathcal{B}_n(q).$$

This connection with $J_k(q)$ unlocks a wealth of tools put forth by Dipper–James [26], Mathas [39] and others, which develops the Okounkov-Vershik approach to the Hecke algebra as a parallel to that of the symmetric group. Chief among these are *Young’s seminormal units* which give an elegant basis for the irreducible representation S^λ of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ in terms of standard Young tableaux of shape λ . The seminormal units are a simultaneous eigenbasis for the Jucys-Murphy elements $J_1(q), \dots, J_n(q)$, with eigenvalues determined by the q -contents of the standard Young tableau indexing each element.

We briefly summarize how our argument for Theorem 1.2 builds from Theorem 1.6:

- (1) When $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, for each $\lambda \vdash n$ we construct a set \mathfrak{B}_λ of eigenvectors of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ that span the irreducible Specht module S^λ of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, as follows. First, we explain in Theorem 4.4 how, given an eigenvector of $\mathcal{R}_{n-1}(q)$ with eigenvalue \mathcal{E} , one can use Theorem 1.6 to obtain an eigenvector for $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ with eigenvalue

$$q \mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) + [n]_q + q^n \mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'}(q).$$

We show in Theorem 4.13 that all eigenvectors of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ can be obtained by iterating this process, starting with kernel eigenvectors of $\mathcal{R}_j(q)$ for $j < n$. In particular, the eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ in Theorem 1.2 corresponds to an eigenvector in S^λ constructed from a $\mathcal{R}_{|\mu|}(q)$ -kernel eigenvector in S^μ . Our proof relies on a *Straightening Lemma* (Lemma 4.12) that draws upon the remarkable properties of

¹Sometimes these elements are referred to as the *additive Jucys-Murphy elements*, see [27].

Young's seminormal units. We prove and later apply a *Horizontal Strip Lemma* (Lemma 3.12) to show in Lemma 4.14 that the only non-zero elements of \mathfrak{B}_λ are indexed by horizontal strips.

- (2) We prove a connection between $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and a Markov chain on the space of flags of the finite field \mathbb{F}_q^n studied in [13, 14] (Proposition 5.10). We use this connection to show that when q is a power of a prime p^m , the kernels of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ have dimension given by the derangement number d_n (Proposition 5.13), and prove in Section 5.4 that having this nullity is sufficient to conclude that \mathfrak{B}_λ is a basis for S^λ (Theorem 6.4). This allows us to compute the characteristic polynomial of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ whenever $q = p^m$.
- (3) In Theorem 6.6 we compute the characteristic polynomial of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ for any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, using the fact that we know the characteristic polynomial for infinitely many values of q .

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2 we explain the necessary semisimple representation theory of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, including the construction of the Young idempotents and seminormal forms. In Section 3 we describe branching rules for $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, and prove the Horizontal Strip Lemma (Lemma 3.12). We prove Theorem 1.6 and construct the spanning set of eigenvectors in Section 4, as outlined in (1) above. In Section 5, we specialize to the case that $q = p^m$, as detailed in (2) above, and prove the first part of Theorem 1.5. Finally, in Section 6, we obtain an $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ -eigenbasis for S^λ when $q = p^m$ (Theorem 6.4). We use this to prove Theorem 1.2, the second part of Theorem 1.5, and Corollaries 1.3 and 1.4. Data for $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ up to $n = 5$ can be found in Appendix A.

Acknowledgements. The authors are extremely grateful to Alexey Bufetov for illuminating discussions about random walks on Hecke algebras and for pointing us to [23]; to Ben Elias for first introducing us to the Jucys-Murphy elements of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ and the perspective in [27]; to Darij Grinberg for very helpful discussions about Proposition 4.11 and Proposition 2.5, careful edits, and—crucially—for pointing out an error in an earlier draft of this paper; to Vic Reiner for suggesting the problem and insightful guidance throughout the project; to Franco Saliola for invaluable discussions about Theorem 4.13; and to Peter Webb for help with Lemma 3.12. The authors also benefited from conversations with Anne Schilling, Arvind Ayyer, Jan de Gier, Zachary Hamaker, Andy Hardt, Jeanne Scott, and Nadia Lafrenière.

All computations were done using SageMath. This project began as part of the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities REU in Algebra and Combinatorics, and all authors received partial support from NSF DMS-1745638. The second author was supported an NSF Mathematical Sciences Research Postdoctoral Fellowship under DMS 2303060, and the fourth author was supported by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship.

2. (SEMISIMPLE) REPRESENTATION THEORY OF $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$

In this section we review the representation of the Type A Iwahori Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, with a view towards the Okounkov-Vershik perspective. For an excellent contextual overview of this approach, see Elias–Hogancamp [27, §1]. We assume for the remainder of this section that $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, which occurs if and only if $q \neq 0$ or a nontrivial root of unity. For a treatment of the non-semisimple case, see [39].

In what follows, we will write $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$ to be the set of standard Young tableaux of shape λ , and

$$\text{SYT}(n) := \bigcup_{\lambda \vdash n} \text{SYT}(\lambda), \quad \text{SYT} := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \text{SYT}(n).$$

Given a tableau $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$, the shape of \mathfrak{t} will be written $\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}) = \lambda$. We will also work with skew diagrams $\lambda \setminus \mu$, and many of our definitions above can be adapted in this case. Write

$$\text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$$

to be the set of skew tableaux of shape $\lambda \setminus \mu$ filled with the letters $|\mu| + 1, \dots, |\lambda|$ with entries increasing across rows and down columns.

2.1. Basics of the Hecke algebra and conventions. As discussed in the introduction, for any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, the Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is defined as the associative \mathbb{C} -algebra on $T_{s_1}, \dots, T_{s_{n-1}}$, subject to the relations

- (1) $T_{s_i}^2 = (q - 1)T_{s_i} + q$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$,
- (2) $T_{s_i}T_{s_j} = T_{s_j}T_{s_i}$ when $|i - j| \geq 2$, and
- (3) $T_{s_i}T_{s_{i+1}}T_{s_i} = T_{s_{i+1}}T_{s_i}T_{s_{i+1}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$.

The elements T_{s_i} should be thought of as q -deformations of the simple transpositions $s_i := (i, i + 1)$, which generate \mathfrak{S}_n . Recall that a reduced word $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ is a minimal expression of w in the generators s_1, \dots, s_{n-1} . The number of generators s_i used to write a reduced word (counting multiplicity) is independent of the choice of reduced word, and is called the length $\ell(w)$ of w .

It is well known that $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ has a linear basis indexed by $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ which we shall write as

$$T_w := T_{s_{i_1}} \cdots T_{s_{i_\ell}},$$

where $s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_\ell}$ is any reduced expression for w .

Using the generating relations for $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, one can deduce the right action of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ on itself:

$$(2.1) \quad T_w T_{s_i} = \begin{cases} T_{ws_i} & \ell(ws_i) > \ell(w) \\ qT_{ws_i} + (q-1)T_w & \ell(ws_i) < \ell(w). \end{cases}$$

Recall from the introduction that our operator of interest is the element $\mathcal{R}_n(q) = \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, where $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ are defined to be:

$$(2.2) \quad q\text{-bottom-to-random} := \mathcal{B}_n(q) := \sum_{i=1}^n T_{s_{n-1}} T_{s_{n-2}} \cdots T_{s_i},$$

$$(2.3) \quad q\text{-random-to-bottom} := \mathcal{B}_n^*(q) := \sum_{j=1}^n T_{s_j} T_{s_{j+1}} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}}.$$

Before proceeding, we make a few remarks on conventions for the remainder of the paper.

Remark 2.1. In the introduction, we also introduced $\tilde{T}_w := q^{-\ell(w)}T_w$. Diaconis and Ram show [23, Theorem 4.3] that one can deduce the right action of \tilde{T}_{s_i} on \tilde{T}_w given in equation (1.2) using (2.1). Everything that follows can be rephrased in terms of the \tilde{T}_w by assuming $q \neq 0$ and substituting T_w with $q^{\ell(w)}\tilde{T}_w$.

Remark 2.2 (Anti-isomorphism $*$). There is an anti-isomorphism on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} * : \mathcal{H}_n(q) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_n(q) \\ T_w &\longmapsto (T_w)^* := T_{w^{-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

The map $*$ is useful in studying properties of random walks on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ (see [15]). The right action of any $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_n(q)$ on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ can be realized as an $n! \times n!$ matrix, and the corresponding matrix realization of φ^* is the transpose of φ . As the notation suggests, $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ is the image of $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ under $*$.

Remark 2.3 (Bottom versus Top). We have made the choice to let the end of a word or permutation be its bottom (read left to right), and the beginning be its top. In some of the literature [11, 13, 43] the authors prefer to use *random-to-top* and *top-to-random*, defined in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} q\text{-top-to-random} &:= \mathcal{T}_n(q) := \sum_{i=1}^n T_{s_1} T_{s_2} \cdots T_{s_i}, \\ q\text{-random-to-top} &:= \mathcal{T}_n^*(q) := \sum_{j=1}^n T_{s_j} T_{s_{j-1}} \cdots T_{s_1}. \end{aligned}$$

We can move between these perspectives by applying the \mathbb{C} -algebra isomorphism $\tau : \mathcal{H}_n(q) \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_n(q)$, which sends

$$\tau(T_{s_i}) = T_{s_{n-i}}, \quad \tau(\mathcal{T}_n(q)) = \mathcal{B}_n(q), \quad \tau(\mathcal{T}_n^*(q)) = \mathcal{B}_n^*(q).$$

It is straightforward to check that τ preserves the eigenvalues and multiplicities an element in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ acting via multiplication on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. Hence studying the spectrum of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ is equivalent to studying that of $\mathcal{T}_n^*(q)$. Note that we make the choice to study $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ rather than $\mathcal{T}_n^*(q)$ because its indexing is more compatible with our recursion (Theorem 1.6). We will need to use the equivalence of $\mathcal{T}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ to understand the kernel of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ in Section 5.1.

Recall that in the representation theory of the symmetric group, the irreducible representations—called *Specht modules*—are indexed by partitions λ of n . The Specht module indexed by λ has dimension given by f^λ , the number of standard Young tableaux of shape λ . The number f^λ also appears when decomposing $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n]$ into irreducible representations: there are f^λ copies of the Specht module indexed by λ inside $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n]$.

In the case that $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, these facts remain true:

- the irreducible representations of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ are indexed by $\lambda \vdash n$, and will be denoted by S^λ ;
- the dimension of each S^λ is f^λ ; and
- for every $\lambda \vdash n$, the multiplicity of S^λ in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is f^λ .

As in the case of the symmetric group, one way of understanding the second and third points is by decomposing $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ as a $(\mathcal{H}_n(q), \mathcal{H}_n(q))$ -bimodule, where $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ acts on itself by multiplication on both the right and left. In this case, we obtain that

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{H}_n(q) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash n} (S^\lambda)^* \otimes S^\lambda,$$

where S^λ is an irreducible *right* module of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ and $(S^\lambda)^*$ is an irreducible *left* module of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$; see [32] for more details on this perspective.

The bimodule decomposition of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ in (2.4) will be essential for our analysis. Given an element $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_n(q)$, suppose the right action of φ on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is diagonalizable (i.e. φ acts semisimply) with eigenspaces $V(\mathcal{E}_1), \dots, V(\mathcal{E}_k)$ corresponding to eigenvalues $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_k$. Each $V(\mathcal{E}_j)$ is a left $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module, since

$$y \cdot (x \cdot \varphi) = (y \cdot x) \cdot \varphi$$

for any $x, y, \varphi \in \mathcal{H}_n(q)$. The decomposition in (2.4) can be used to deduce the left module structure of each $V(\mathcal{E}_j)$ from the spectrum of φ acting on S^λ .

Corollary 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ be semisimple and suppose $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_n(q)$ acts semisimply $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ by right multiplication with eigenvalues $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_k$.*

- (1) *Then the \mathcal{E}_j -eigenspace is a left $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module $V(\mathcal{E}_j)$; and*
- (2) *The (representation) multiplicity of $(S^\lambda)^*$ in $V(\mathcal{E}_j)$ is $m_{\mathcal{E}_j}(\lambda)$ if and only if the (eigenvalue) multiplicity of \mathcal{E}_j in S^λ is $m_{\mathcal{E}_j}(\lambda)$.*

Corollary 2.4 assumes that φ is diagonalizable. However, under certain assumptions, if φ is diagonalizable for infinitely many values of q , we may deduce the characteristic polynomial of φ for *any* $q \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose $\varphi : \mathcal{H}_n(q) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is a linear transformation that can be represented by an $n! \times n!$ matrix with entries in $\mathbb{Z}[q]$. Let $\chi(y, q)$ be a polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}[y, q]$. If the characteristic polynomial*

$$(2.5) \quad \det(y \cdot 1 - \varphi) = \chi(y, q)$$

for infinitely many $q \in \mathbb{C}$, then $\det(y \cdot 1 - \varphi) = \chi(y, q)$ for all $q \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. Both sides of (2.5) belong to $\mathbb{Z}[y, q]$. By comparing coefficients the coefficients of y^i on both sides, it suffices to prove the following polynomial identities in $\mathbb{Z}[q]$ hold for all i :

$$[y^i] \det(y \cdot 1 - \varphi) = [y^i] \chi(y, q)$$

By assumption, these identities are true for infinitely many q . Hence, the “polynomial identity trick” (see, for instance, [31, Corollary 7.5.7]) implies it holds for all q . \square

In what follows, we will let $\varphi = \mathcal{R}_n(q)$ and study its right action on S^λ . We will show that $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ is diagonalizable when $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ by constructing an eigenbasis for each S^λ , and then appeal to Proposition 2.5 to deduce the characteristic polynomial of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ for any $q \in \mathbb{C}$.

2.2. Explicit constructions of Specht modules using the Jucys Murphy elements. As in the case of the symmetric group, there are several ways to explicitly construct Specht modules of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. Here, we will adopt what is sometimes referred to as the “Okounkov-Vershik approach” described in the influential paper [42], which reframes tools developed earlier by Murphy [40] and Jucys [34] for \mathfrak{S}_n , and Dipper–James [26] for $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$; see [27, §1] for a nice overview of this story. While we only discuss $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, setting $q = 1$ recovers the classical \mathfrak{S}_n -theory.

We will be interested in explicit presentations of right Specht modules S^λ , but the corresponding left module $(S^\lambda)^*$ can be constructed analogously. Note that there is also a way to realize $(S^\lambda)^* \otimes S^\lambda$ inside $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$; this is the perspective taken in Mathas [39] (see Remark 2.25).

The key ingredient will be the Jucys–Murphy elements of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, defined below.

Definition 2.6 (Jucys-Murphy elements). *For $1 \leq k \leq n$, the k -th Jucys-Murphy element of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is defined as*

$$J_k(q) := \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} q^{i-k} T_{(i,k)}.$$

Example 2.7. In $\mathcal{H}_6(q)$,

$$J_4(q) = q^{-3}T_{(1,4)} + q^{-2}T_{(2,4)} + q^{-1}T_{(3,4)} = q^{-3}T_{s_1s_2s_3s_2s_1} + q^{-2}T_{s_2s_3s_2} + q^{-1}T_{s_3}.$$

The Jucys-Murphy elements satisfy several miraculous properties. First, they pairwise commute (see [39, Proposition 3.26(iii)]). Second, an element x is in the center of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ if and only if it is a symmetric polynomial in the $J_k(q)$. The forwards direction of this fact is a result of Francis–Graham [28], solving a conjecture of Dipper–James [26]; the converse appeared much earlier (see, for example, [39, Corollary 3.27]). Finally—and most importantly for us—the Jucys-Murphy elements have a simultaneous eigenbasis known as *Young’s seminormal basis*, which is a particularly nice basis for the Specht modules S^λ . The first step in constructing the seminormal basis is to define *Young’s idempotents*.

2.2.1. *Young’s idempotents.* For any semisimple algebra A one can define canonical projectors onto the isotypic components of A ; these projectors form a family of mutually orthogonal, central idempotents in A . In the case of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, these projectors will be written as

$$\{p_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_n(q) : \lambda \vdash n\}.$$

However, in general there is no canonical way to project from A onto a single, irreducible representation of A . As discussed in Section 2.1, the λ -isotypic component of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ contains f^λ -many copies of S^λ .

Remarkably, when $A = \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{S}_n]$ or $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, there exists a family of idempotents that project onto the individual Specht modules in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$: these are Young’s idempotents, which we shall write as

$$\{p_{\mathfrak{t}} \in \mathcal{H}_n(q) : \mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(n)\}.$$

Right multiplication by $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$ projects onto a copy of the left module $(S^\lambda)^*$ in (2.4). Since there are f^λ distinct $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$, this gives a method of projecting onto each copy of $(S^\lambda)^*$ in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

The Young idempotent $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$ will also be—by design—a projector onto a simultaneous eigenspace of the Jucys-Murphy elements. The q -content of k in \mathfrak{t} determines the eigenvalue with which each $J_k(q)$ acts. Write $x_k(\mathfrak{t})$ to be the index of the row of \mathfrak{t} containing the box k (counting from top to bottom), and $y_k(\mathfrak{t})$ to be the column containing k (counting from left to right).

Definition 2.8. *Given a tableau $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$, the q -content of \mathfrak{t} at k is*

$$\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},k}(q) := [y_k(\mathfrak{t}) - x_k(\mathfrak{t})]_q.$$

Setting $q = 1$, recovers the classical content $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},k} := \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},k}(1)$. We will see soon that the Young idempotent $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$ is an eigenvector of $J_k(q)$ with eigenvalue $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},k}(q)$ for every $1 \leq k \leq n$.

Example 2.9. Consider the standard Young tableau $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(3, 3, 1, 1)$:

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

Then,

$$\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},7}(q) = [-3]_q, \quad \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},6}(q) = [-2]_q, \quad \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},2}(q) = [-1]_q, \quad \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},1}(q) = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},5}(q) = [0]_q, \quad \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},3}(q) = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},8}(q) = [1]_q, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},4}(q) = [2]_q.$$

Denote by $\mathfrak{C}(m)$ the set of all possible values $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},m}$ for any $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}$:

$$\mathfrak{C}(m) := \begin{cases} \{k : -m < k < m\} & m \neq 2, 3 \\ \{k : -m < k < m\} \setminus \{0\} & m = 2, 3. \end{cases}$$

We will use $\mathfrak{C}(m)$ to define the Young idempotents² via a process called *Lagrange interpolation*.

²The $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$ are written as $E_{\mathfrak{t}}$ in [41], but there is a minor typo in the definition in [41, p504]: in the product index, the set $\mathfrak{C}(n)$ should be replaced by $\mathfrak{C}(m)$.

Definition 2.10. Given a standard Young tableau $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(n)$ define the Young idempotent $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$ to be

$$p_{\mathfrak{t}} := \prod_{m=1}^n \prod_{\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{C}(m) \setminus \{\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},m}\}} \frac{J_m(q) - [\mathfrak{d}]_q}{\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},m}(q) - [\mathfrak{d}]_q}.$$

Lagrange interpolation guarantees the following properties, which can be found in [41, p. 506].

Proposition 2.11. The Young idempotents $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$ for $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}$ satisfy the following properties:

- (1) The collection of $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$ for $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(n)$ form a family of mutually orthogonal, complete idempotents, meaning that

$$p_{\mathfrak{t}} p_{\mathfrak{q}} = \delta_{\mathfrak{t},\mathfrak{q}} p_{\mathfrak{t}} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(n)} p_{\mathfrak{t}} = 1.$$

- (2) Each $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$ for $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(n)$ is a simultaneous (right) eigenvector for $J_m(q)$ for $1 \leq m \leq n$:

$$p_{\mathfrak{t}} J_m(q) = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},m}(q) p_{\mathfrak{t}}.$$

- (3) The collection of $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$ for all $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(m)$ diagonalize $J_m(q)$, so that $J_m(q)$ can be written as

$$J_m(q) = \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(m)} \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},m}(q) p_{\mathfrak{t}}.$$

The Young idempotents beautifully encode the connection between representations of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ and $\text{SYT}(n)$ as follows. For $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(n)$, let $\mathfrak{t}|_k$ be the subtableau of \mathfrak{t} obtained from restricting \mathfrak{t} to the boxes labeled $1, \dots, k$ of \mathfrak{t} , and let $\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_k)$ be the shape of $\mathfrak{t}|_k$. Then

$$\mathfrak{t}|_k \in \text{SYT}(\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_k)) \subset \text{SYT}(k),$$

and we will think of each $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(n)$ as being built by a nested sequence of tableaux:

$$\mathfrak{t}|_1 \subset \mathfrak{t}|_2 \subset \dots \subset \mathfrak{t}|_n = \mathfrak{t}.$$

Crucially, each $p_{\mathfrak{t}} \in \mathcal{H}_n(q)$ can be built from a tower of inclusions in the same way. Algebraically, the nested tableaux correspond to the containment $\mathcal{H}_k(q) \subset \mathcal{H}_{k+1}(q)$. This idea is encapsulated in the *Tower Rule* (Proposition 2.12) below, which will allow us to move between Hecke algebras of different sizes in a precise way. This is essential to our inductive arguments.

Recall that $\{p_{\lambda} : \lambda \vdash n\}$ is the collection of canonical central orthogonal idempotents that project onto the S^{λ} -isotypic component of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. We sketch the proof of the Tower rule for completeness, though the result is not new; see for instance [27, §1].

Proposition 2.12 (Tower rule). For any $\lambda \vdash n$, we have that

$$p_{\lambda} = \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} p_{\mathfrak{t}},$$

and for $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$,

$$p_{\mathfrak{t}} = p_{\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_1)} p_{\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_2)} \cdots p_{\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_{n-1})} p_{\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_n)}.$$

Proof. Since the isotypic decomposition of semisimple algebras is unique, the corresponding complete, orthogonal idempotent projectors p_{λ} are unique. It is straightforward to check that

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} p_{\mathfrak{t}}$$

form a family of complete, orthogonal idempotents, which implies that $\mathcal{H}_n(q) \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \in \lambda} p_{\mathfrak{t}}$ is a left submodule of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ isomorphic to

$$\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} \mathcal{H}_n(q) p_{\mathfrak{t}} \cong \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} (S^{\lambda})^*,$$

which must be the λ -isotypic subspace. For the second claim, by induction on n it suffices to show

$$p_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot p_{\lambda} = p_{\mathfrak{t}}$$

where $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ and $\mathfrak{t}' = \mathfrak{t}|_{n-1}$. By definition of $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$, we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\mathfrak{t}} &= \left(\prod_{m=1}^{n-1} \prod_{\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{C}(m) \setminus \{\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}', m}\}} \frac{J_m(q) - [\mathfrak{d}]_q}{\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}', m}(q) - [\mathfrak{d}]_q} \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{C}(n) \setminus \{\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}, n}\}} \frac{J_n(q) - [\mathfrak{d}]_q}{\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}, n}(q) - [\mathfrak{d}]_q} \right) \\ &= p_{\mathfrak{t}'} \left(\prod_{\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{C}(n) \setminus \{\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}, n}\}} \frac{J_n(q) - [\mathfrak{d}]_q}{\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}, n}(q) - [\mathfrak{d}]_q} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this observation with the fact that $p_{\mathfrak{t}'}$ is idempotent, we rewrite

$$(2.6) \quad p_{\mathfrak{t}} = p_{\mathfrak{t}'} \cdot p_{\mathfrak{t}'} \left(\prod_{\mathfrak{d} \in \mathfrak{C}(n) \setminus \{\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}, n}\}} \frac{J_n(q) - [\mathfrak{d}]_q}{\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}, n}(q) - [\mathfrak{d}]_q} \right) = p_{\mathfrak{t}'} \cdot p_{\mathfrak{t}}.$$

Equation (2.6) and orthogonality imply that

$$p_{\mathfrak{t}'} \cdot p_{\mathfrak{q}} = p_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot p_{\mathfrak{q}|_{n-1}} \cdot p_{\mathfrak{q}} = 0$$

for any $\mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ with $\mathfrak{q}|_{n-1} \neq \mathfrak{t}'$. Since the only $\mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ with $\mathfrak{q}|_{n-1} = \mathfrak{t}'$ is $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{t}$, we can again apply equation (2.6) to show

$$p_{\mathfrak{t}'} \cdot p_{\lambda} = p_{\mathfrak{t}'} \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} p_{\mathfrak{q}} = p_{\mathfrak{t}'} p_{\mathfrak{t}} = p_{\mathfrak{t}}.$$

□

Example 2.13. Let

$$\mathfrak{t} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Then, the shapes of the restricted tableaux $\mathfrak{t}|_k$ are as follows.

k	1	2	3	4	5
$\mathfrak{t} _k$	$\boxed{1}$	$\boxed{1 \ 2}$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \end{array}$
$\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t} _k)$	(1)	(2)	(2, 1)	(2, 2)	(3, 2)

Hence, by the tower rule:

$$p_{\mathfrak{t}} = p_{(1)} p_{(2)} p_{(2,1)} p_{(2,2)} p_{(3,2)}.$$

We use the tower rule to extend our definition of Young idempotents to skew diagrams $\lambda \setminus \mu$. For $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$, let

$$p_{\mathfrak{t}} := p_{\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_{|\mu|})} p_{\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_{|\mu|+1})} \cdots p_{\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_{|\lambda|})}.$$

It will also be useful to build a standard tableau in $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$ from elements of $\text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$ and $\text{SYT}(\mu)$.

Definition 2.14. Given a tableau $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)$ and a skew tableau $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$, define $\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s}) \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ to be the unique tableau for which

$$\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})|_{|\mu|} = \mathfrak{s} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s}) \setminus \mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}.$$

Example 2.15. If

$$\mathfrak{s} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{t} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 7 & 9 \\ \hline 8 & 10 \\ \hline 6 & 11 \\ \hline \end{array},$$

then

$$\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 & 7 & 9 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 8 & 10 & \\ \hline 6 & 11 & & & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

2.2.2. *Specht modules and the seminormal basis.* We will now use the Young idempotents to construct the seminormal basis for Specht modules of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

In order to describe this basis and its properties, we will define a partial order on $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$ as follows. Recall the *dominance* partial order on partitions of a fixed size, given by $\mu \leq \nu$ if for all j ,


$$\sum_{i=1}^j \mu_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^j \nu_i$$

Definition 2.16 (Dominance order on $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$). *For any $\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ we say $\mathfrak{q} \trianglelefteq \mathfrak{t}$ if*

$$\text{sh}(\mathfrak{q}|_k) \trianglelefteq \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_k) \quad \text{for all} \quad 1 \leq k \leq |\lambda|.$$

There is always a unique maximal element in $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$ with respect to \trianglelefteq , which we denote by \mathfrak{t}^λ .

Example 2.17. We draw Hasse diagram for dominance order on $\text{SYT}(3, 2)$. The top tableau is $\mathfrak{t}^{(3,2)}$.



Definition 2.16 can easily be extended to an ordering on $\text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$ by \trianglelefteq . We will use $\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}$ to denote the largest element of $\text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$ with respect to \trianglelefteq .

Given any $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$, one can define a word, $\text{word}(\mathfrak{t})$, in the alphabet $\{1, 2, \dots, \ell(\lambda)\}$ as follows.

Definition 2.18. *Given $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ with $|\lambda| = n$, define $\text{word}(\mathfrak{t})$ to be the word*

$$w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n,$$

where $w_i \in [n]$ has value given by the row in which i appears in \mathfrak{t} .

Example 2.19. For $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$, we have that

$$\text{word}(\mathfrak{t}^\lambda) = \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{\lambda_1}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{\lambda_2}, \dots, \underbrace{k, \dots, k}_{\lambda_k}.$$

By construction $\text{word}(\mathfrak{t})$ has content λ . There is a natural right symmetric group action on any word $\mathbf{w} = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n$ by position, where s_i swaps the positions of w_i and w_{i+1} . Importantly, [39, Chapter 4, Exercise 19, pg 67] shows this action generalizes to a right action by $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ as well, defined as follows:

$$(2.7) \quad \mathbf{w} \cdot T_{s_i} := \begin{cases} q\mathbf{w}, & w_i = w_{i+1}, \\ \mathbf{w}s_i, & w_i < w_{i+1}, \\ q\mathbf{w}s_i + (q-1)\mathbf{w}, & w_i > w_{i+1}. \end{cases}$$

Let W^λ denote the \mathbb{C} -span of all words of length n with content λ . Note that by (2.7), the $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ action on words preserves content, and so W^λ is a $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module.

We are at last ready to define Young's seminormal units

Definition 2.20 (Young seminormal units). *Given $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$, define the Young seminormal unit:*

$$w_{\mathfrak{t}} := \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}) p_{\mathfrak{t}}.$$

The importance of the seminormal units is that they provide a particularly nice basis for the irreducible representations S^λ of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

Theorem 2.21 (Dipper-James). *Suppose $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple. Then the following holds:*

(1) *The collection*

$$\{w_{\mathfrak{t}} : \mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)\}$$

give an orthogonal basis for an irreducible representation S^λ of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

(2) *For every $1 \leq m \leq n$,*

$$w_{\mathfrak{t}} J_m(q) = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},m}(q) w_{\mathfrak{t}}.$$

(3) *For $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{t} \cdot s_i$ and $\rho_i := \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},i} - \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{q},i}$,*

$$w_{\mathfrak{t}} T_{s_i} = \begin{cases} q w_{\mathfrak{t}} & i \text{ and } i+1 \text{ are in the same row in } \mathfrak{t} \\ -w_{\mathfrak{t}} & i \text{ and } i+1 \text{ are in the same column in } \mathfrak{t} \\ -\frac{1}{[\rho_i]_q} w_{\mathfrak{t}} + w_{\mathfrak{q}} & \mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda) \text{ and } \mathfrak{q} \triangleleft \mathfrak{t} \\ \frac{q^{\rho_i}}{[\rho_i]_q} w_{\mathfrak{t}} + \frac{q^{[\rho_i+1]_q} [\rho_i-1]_q}{([\rho_i]_q)^2} w_{\mathfrak{q}} & \mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda) \text{ and } \mathfrak{t} \triangleleft \mathfrak{q}. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.22. Theorem 2.21(3) as stated in Mathas [39, Thm 3.36 (ii), pg 44] has a minor typo in the final case, which we correct above.

Example 2.23. The one-dimensional representation $S^{(n)}$ of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ has basis element $w_{\mathfrak{t}^{(n)}}$ and

$$w_{\mathfrak{t}^{(n)}} \cdot T_w = q^{\ell(w)} w_{\mathfrak{t}^{(n)}}.$$

We can see this as an example of Theorem 2.21 (3), since i and $i+1$ are always in the same row in

$$\mathfrak{t}^{(n)} = \boxed{1 \ 2 \ \cdot \ \cdot \ \cdot \ n}$$

Thus the *character* of T_w acting on $S^{(n)}$ is $q^{\ell(w)}$; see [44] for more on characters of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

Similarly, the one-dimensional representation $S^{(1^n)}$ has basis element $w_{\mathfrak{t}^{(1^n)}}$, and the character of $T_w \in \mathcal{H}_n(q)$ on $S^{(1^n)}$ is given by $w_{\mathfrak{t}^{(1^n)}}$:

$$w_{\mathfrak{t}^{(1^n)}} \cdot T_w = (-1)^{\ell(w)} w_{\mathfrak{t}^{(1^n)}}.$$

This can also be deduced from Theorem 2.21(3), since for any i , one always has i and $i+1$ in the same column in $\mathfrak{t}^{(1^n)}$.

Example 2.24. Consider $i = 2$, with

$$\mathfrak{t} = \boxed{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & 5 & \\ \hline \end{array}} \text{ so that } \mathfrak{t} \cdot s_2 = \mathfrak{q} = \boxed{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 5 & \\ \hline \end{array}}.$$

We see that $\mathfrak{t} \triangleleft \mathfrak{q}$, and $\rho_2 = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},2} - \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{q},2} = -1 - 1 = -2$. Thus the final case of Theorem 2.21 gives

$$w_{\mathfrak{t}} \cdot T_{s_2} = \frac{q^{-2}}{[-2]_q} w_{\mathfrak{t}} + \frac{q^{[-1]_q} [-3]_q}{([-2]_q)^2} w_{\mathfrak{q}}.$$

Remark 2.25. Our presentation of S^λ is slightly different (though equivalent) to the one presented by Mathas in [39, Chapter 3]. While we use $w_{\mathfrak{t}} = \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}) p_{\mathfrak{t}}$, Mathas defines the corresponding basis elements of S^λ as $m_{\mathfrak{t}} p_{\mathfrak{t}}$, where

$$m_{\mathfrak{t}} = m_{\lambda} T_w,$$

with $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ being the minimal length permutation such that $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}^\lambda \cdot w$ and

$$m_{\lambda} := \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda}} T_w$$

for the Young subgroup $\mathfrak{S}_{\lambda} \cong \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda_1} \times \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda_2} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda_k}$.

It is not hard to check that W^λ is isomorphic to the right $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module generated by the $m_{\mathfrak{t}}$ for all *row strict tableaux* \mathfrak{t} , i.e. \mathfrak{t} whose entries increase across rows.

The advantage of Mathas's approach is that the Specht modules he defines are actually in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, and because of this he can construct a basis for the bimodule $(S^\lambda)^* \otimes S^\lambda$. The advantage of our approach is that the elements $\text{word}(\mathfrak{t})$ are quite concrete, and work well with our inductive arguments.

Example 2.26. The element

$$m_{(1^j, n-j)} = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}} T_w$$

will appear many times in subsequent sections. Note that $\mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)} \cong \mathfrak{S}_{n-j}$ in the generators $s_{n-j+1}, \dots, s_{n-1}$. Thus, as in Example 2.23, for any $w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}$,

$$m_{(1^j, n-j)} T_w = q^{\ell(w)} m_{(1^j, n-j)}.$$

3. BRANCHING RULES FOR $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ AND THE HORIZONTAL STRIP LEMMA

We review the branching rules of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. When $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, one can define a Frobenius characteristic map (Section 3.1). We prove the *horizontal strip lemma* (Lemma 3.12) in Section 3.2.

3.1. Branching rules and the Frobenius characteristic map. In the semisimple case, the branching rules (i.e. behavior of restriction and induction) for $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ mirror the symmetric group, as we now explain.

Suppose V is an $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module. Then one can define $\text{Res}(V)$, the restriction of V to $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}(q)$, as the module V viewed as an $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}(q)$ module inside $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

The induction of V to $\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(q)$ is the $\mathcal{H}_{n+1}(q)$ module

$$\text{Ind}(V) := V \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_n(q)} \mathcal{H}_{n+1}(q).$$

Given a partition λ , we say $\mu < \lambda$ if μ is a partition obtained from removing a single box from λ .

Theorem 3.1 (Dipper-James). *When $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, for any irreducible S^λ in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$,*

$$\text{Res}(S^\lambda) \cong \bigoplus_{\mu < \lambda} S^\mu \quad \text{Ind}(S^\lambda) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda < \nu} S^\nu.$$

More generally, for a subalgebra B of an algebra A , one can define the induction of a B -module V to an A -module as

$$\text{Ind}_B^A(V) := V \otimes_B A.$$

We will be most interested in the case $B = \mathcal{H}_j(q) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n-j}(q)$ and $A = \mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

Note that $\mathcal{H}_j(q) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{n-j}(q)$ can be realized explicitly in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ as the algebra generated by T_{s_i} for $i \neq j$; write this realization as $\mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q)$. Write $S^\mu \otimes S^\nu$ to be an irreducible representation of $\mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q)$, where S^μ is a Specht module of $\mathcal{H}_j(q)$ and S^ν is a Specht module of $\mathcal{H}_{n-j}(q)$.

3.1.1. Frobenius characteristic map. One of the most powerful tools to study the representation theory of the symmetric group is the *Frobenius characteristic map* from the ring of virtual symmetric group representations to the ring of symmetric functions. When $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, there is an analogous map ([35, §3.2]). Let

$$\text{Rep}[\mathcal{H}(q)] = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \text{Rep}[\mathcal{H}_n(q)]$$

be the graded ring of isomorphism classes of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -modules, where addition corresponds to direct sum of representations, and the product of $M \in \text{Rep}[\mathcal{H}_m(q)]$ and $N \in \text{Rep}[\mathcal{H}_n(q)]$ corresponds to induction

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{m,n}(q)}^{\mathcal{H}_{m+n}(q)}(M \otimes N).$$

Write Λ for the ring of symmetric functions, s_λ for the Schur function indexed by a partition λ , and h_n for the homogeneous symmetric function.

Proposition 3.2 (Frobenius characteristic map). *When $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, the map*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ch} : \text{Rep}[\mathcal{H}(q)] &\rightarrow \Lambda \\ S^\lambda &\mapsto s_\lambda \\ S^{(n)} &\mapsto h_n \end{aligned}$$

is a ring isomorphism.

We thus immediately obtain *Pieri rules* for $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$; see also [37, §1] or [30, Prop 1.2].

Corollary 3.3 (Pieri rules for $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$). *When $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple,*

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)}^{\mathcal{H}_n(q)} \left(S^\mu \otimes S^{(n-j)} \right) \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{\nu \vdash n \\ \nu \setminus \mu \text{ a horizontal strip}}} S^\nu.$$

3.1.2. *The operator Φ .* Our proofs in Section 4 build concrete realizations of $\text{Res}(S^\lambda)$ and $\text{Ind}(S^\lambda)$. We define an operator Φ_a that will facilitate these constructions.

Definition 3.4. Given a word $\mathbf{w} = w_1, \dots, w_n$ and letter $a \in [n+1]$, we append a to \mathbf{w} by

$$\mathbf{w} \cdot \Phi_a = w_1 \cdots w_n a.$$

Suppose $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$ and $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)$. Then define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{word}(\mathfrak{s}) \cdot \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} &:= \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})) \\ \text{word}(\mathfrak{s}) \cdot \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \mu} &:= \text{word}(\mathfrak{s}) \cdot \Phi_{\mathfrak{t} \setminus \mu} \\ \left(\sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} \text{word}(\mathfrak{s}) \right) \cdot \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \mu} &:= \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} (\text{word}(\mathfrak{s}) \cdot \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \mu}). \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.5. Consider

$$\mathfrak{s} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{t} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 7 & 9 \\ \hline 8 & 10 \\ \hline 6 & 11 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Then,

$$\text{word}(\mathfrak{s})\Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} = \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})) = 11221312123,$$

whereas

$$\text{word}(\mathfrak{s})\Phi_{(5,4,2) \setminus (3,2)} = \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}^{(5,4,2) \setminus (3,2)}(\mathfrak{s})) = 11221112233.$$

The following lemma is straightforward to check and will be used throughout our paper.

Lemma 3.6. *Given a word $\mathbf{w} = w_1, \dots, w_n$, letter $a \in [n+1]$, and element $x \in \mathcal{H}_n(q)$,*

$$\mathbf{w} \Phi_a \cdot x = (\mathbf{w} \cdot x) \Phi_a.$$

Importantly, the operator Φ behaves well with restriction.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ and $\mathfrak{t}' = \mathfrak{t}|_{n-1}$. Then, $w_{\mathfrak{t}}$ can be rewritten as*

$$w_{\mathfrak{t}} = w_{\nu} \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \text{sh}(\nu)} p_{\lambda}.$$

Thus, any $u \in S^\lambda$ can be expressed as

$$u = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{t}' \in \text{SYT}(\lambda') \\ \lambda' \triangleleft \lambda}} c_{\mathfrak{t}'} w_{\mathfrak{t}'} \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}')} p_{\lambda}$$

for scalars $c_{\mathfrak{t}'} \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proof. The first claim follows from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\mathfrak{t}} &= \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}) p_{\mathfrak{t}} = \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}') \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}')} p_{\mathfrak{t}} \\ (\text{Proposition 2.12}) &= \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}') \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}')} p_{\nu} p_{\lambda} \\ (\text{Lemma 3.6}) &= \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}') p_{\nu} \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}')} p_{\lambda} \\ &= w_{\nu} \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}')} p_{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

For the second claim, note that any $u \in S^\lambda$ can be written as

$$u = \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} c_{\mathfrak{t}} w_{\mathfrak{t}}.$$

Since each \mathfrak{t} restricts uniquely to a \mathfrak{t}' , letting $c_{\mathfrak{t}'} = c_{\mathfrak{t}}$ we can use the first claim to write

$$u = \sum_{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} c_{\mathfrak{t}} w_{\mathfrak{t}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{t}' \in \text{SYT}(\lambda'): \\ \lambda' \triangleleft \lambda}} c_{\mathfrak{t}'} w_{\mathfrak{t}'} \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}')} p_{\lambda}.$$

□

The map Φ also provides a method of constructing induced representations, as we will see in Section 3.2.

3.2. The horizontal strip lemma. Our $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ -eigenvectors will be constructed from products of $\mathcal{B}_i(q)$ for $i \in (j, n]$ as j varies. Write such a product as

$$\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} := \mathcal{B}_{j+1}(q) \cdots \mathcal{B}_n(q).$$

We will first show that $\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)}$ can be factored in a useful way (Proposition 3.8). We will apply this factorization to prove the *Horizontal Strip Lemma* (Lemma 3.12, which will be used later to characterize when certain eigenvectors in our recursive construction in Section 4 are zero).

For a permutation $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, recall that $\ell(w)$ is the *Coxeter length* of w . It is well-known (see, for instance, [12, Section 2.4]) that each right coset $\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha} w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha} \setminus \mathfrak{S}_n$ has a unique representative $w' \in \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha} w$ such that $\ell(w') < \ell(u)$ for all other $u \in \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha} w$. We denote the set of these minimal-length coset representatives as X_{α} and define the corresponding sum

$$x_{\alpha} := \sum_{w \in X_{\alpha}} T_w.$$

Our first goal is to prove the following:

Proposition 3.8. *The element $\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} := \mathcal{B}_{j+1}(q) \mathcal{B}_{j+2}(q) \cdots \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q)$ factors as*

$$\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = m_{(1^j, n-j)} x_{(j, n-j)}.$$

We record here a few Coxeter-theoretic facts from [12] which will be useful for this goal, translated to be statements about right cosets, since this is the setting relevant to us.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$.*

- (1) [12, Proposition 2.4.4]: *For any composition α of n , we can uniquely factor w as*

$$w = u \cdot v,$$

where $u \in \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}$, $v \in X_{\alpha}$. For this factorization, $\ell(u) + \ell(v) = \ell(w)$.

- (2) [12, Corollary 2.4.6]: *Furthermore, w can be written uniquely in the form*

$$w = y_1 \cdot y_2 \cdots y_{n-1},$$

where $y_i \in X_{(i,1)}$ and $\ell(w) = \ell(y_1) + \ell(y_2) + \cdots + \ell(y_{n-1})$.

The elements of X_{α} have a nice characterization in terms of descents. Recall that $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ is a *right* descent of a permutation $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ if $w(i) > w(i+1)$. In contrast, i is a *left* descent of w if $\ell(s_i w) < \ell(w)$; note that i is a left descent of w precisely if i is a right descent of w^{-1} . Define a subset $J(\alpha) \subseteq [n-1]$ associated to the composition $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k)$ as

$$J(\alpha) := \{\alpha_1, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_{k-1}\}.$$

As explained in [12, p41], the elements in X_{α} are precisely the permutations in \mathfrak{S}_n whose left descents are contained in the set $J(\alpha)$. We will use this characterization to first realize $\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)}$ as the element $x_{(j, 1^{n-j})}$.

Lemma 3.10. *For any $q \in \mathbb{C}$ the element $\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_{j+1}(q) \mathcal{B}_{j+2}(q) \cdots \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q)$ can be rewritten as*

$$\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = x_{(j, 1^{n-j})}.$$

Proof. Observe that $X_{(k,1)} = \{s_k s_{k-1} \cdots s_i : 1 \leq i \leq k+1\}$. Hence, $\mathcal{B}_{k+1}(q) = x_{(k,1)}$ and the terms in the expansion of $\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_{j+1}(q) \cdots \mathcal{B}_n(q)$ biject with tuples (y_j, \dots, y_{n-1}) where $y_k \in X_{(k,1)}$. Notice that $1 \in X_{(k,1)}$ for any k , so by Proposition 3.9(2), the expressions of the form $y_j y_{j+1} \cdots y_{n-1}$ are all distinct and length-additive, implying that

$$T_{y_j \cdots y_{n-1}} = T_{y_j} T_{y_{j+2}} \cdots T_{y_{n-1}}.$$

To complete the proof, it suffices to explain that there is an equality of sets

$$\{y_j \cdots y_{n-1} : (y_j, \dots, y_{n-1}) \in X_{(j,1)} \times \cdots \times X_{(n-1,1)}\} = X_{(j,1^{n-j})}.$$

Since

$$\frac{|\mathfrak{S}_n|}{|\mathfrak{S}_{(j,1^{n-j})}|} = n \cdot (n-1) \cdots (j+1),$$

the two sets have the same size, so it is enough to show that the left descent set of each $y_j \cdots y_{n-1}$ is contained in $J(j, 1^{n-j}) = \{j, j+1, \dots, n-1\}$. This is equivalent to proving that for $i < j$, the element s_i is not a left descent of $y_j \cdots y_{n-1}$.

To this end, fix $i < j$. Since s_i is a minimal length (right) coset representative of $\mathfrak{S}_{(i-1,1)}$, it follows from Proposition 3.9(2) that

$$\ell(s_i y_j \cdots y_{n-1}) = 1 + \ell(y_j \cdots y_{n-1}).$$

Thus, s_i is not a left descent of $y_{j+1} \cdots y_n$, as desired. \square

We are now able to prove Proposition 3.8.

Proof of Proposition 3.8. By Lemma 3.10, it suffices to prove that

$$x_{(j,1^{n-j})} = m_{(1^j, n-j)} \cdot x_{(j, n-j)}.$$

Using the descent interpretation of $X_{(j,1^{n-j})}$, note that

$$X_{(j,1^{n-j})} = \{w \in \mathfrak{S}_n : w^{-1}(1) < w^{-1}(2) < \cdots < w^{-1}(j)\}.$$

Suppose $w \in X_{(j,1^{n-j})}$. By Proposition 3.9(1), there is a unique way to factor $w = u \cdot v$ where $u \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}$, and $v \in X_{(1^j, n-j)}$ with $\ell(w) = \ell(u) + \ell(v)$. Since $v \in X_{(1^j, n-j)}$, the left descents of v are contained in $J(1^j, n-j) = \{1, 2, \dots, j\}$, meaning v has the property that

$$v^{-1}(j+1) < v^{-1}(j+2) < \cdots < v^{-1}(n).$$

However, since $w^{-1}(1) < \cdots < w^{-1}(j)$ and u fixes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, j\}$ it follows that v also satisfies

$$v^{-1}(1) < v^{-1}(2) < \cdots < v^{-1}(j).$$

Therefore, $v \in X_{(j, n-j)}$. Thus each element $w \in X_{(j,1^{n-j})}$ can be factored uniquely as $u \cdot v$ where $u \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}$ and $v \in X_{(j, n-j)}$.

Since $|X_{(j,1^{n-j})}| = |\mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}| \cdot |X_{(j, n-j)}|$, we can conclude that

$$x_{(j,1^{n-j})} = \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)} \\ v \in X_{(j, n-j)}}} T_{uv} = \left(\sum_{u \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}} T_u \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{v \in X_{(j, n-j)}} T_v \right) = m_{(1^j, n-j)} \cdot x_{(j, n-j)}.$$

\square

We will use Proposition 3.8 to prove that when $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, the element $\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)}$ behaves like the induction operators discussed in Section 3.1. This will eventually explain why our eigenvectors in Theorem 1.2 are indexed by horizontal strips.

We will use the following lemma, whose proof is straightforward.

Lemma 3.11. *Let A be a semisimple algebra and let M and N be A -modules. If there is a surjective A -module morphism*

$$f : N \twoheadrightarrow M,$$

then M is isomorphic to a submodule of N .

We can now prove the Horizontal Strip Lemma.

Lemma 3.12 (Horizontal strip lemma). *Assume $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple. Let λ be a partition of n and μ a partition of $0 \leq j \leq n$ such that $\mu \subset \lambda$. Then for any $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$,*

$$(S^\mu) \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)}$$

is contained in a $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module isomorphic to a submodule of

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{\nu \vdash n \\ \nu \setminus \mu \text{ is a horizontal strip}}} S^\nu.$$

Thus, if $\lambda \setminus \mu$ is not a horizontal strip, then for any $u \in S^\mu$

$$u \Phi_t \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} p_\lambda = 0.$$

Proof. We shall prove the first statement by

- (1) Showing $S^\mu \Phi_t \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)}$ is contained in a certain $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module we call M ,
- (2) Defining an $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module N which is isomorphic to

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{\nu \vdash n \\ \nu \setminus \mu \text{ is a horizontal strip}}} S^\nu,$$

- (3) explaining that M is isomorphic to a submodule of N .

We begin with item (1). Observe that $S^\mu \Phi_t m_{(1^j, n-j)}$ is closed under the right action of $\mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q)$. In fact, it is straightforward to check that as right $\mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q)$ -modules,

$$(3.1) \quad S^\mu \Phi_t m_{(1^j, n-j)} \cong S^\mu \otimes S^{(n-j)}.$$

This follows by noting that any element of $\mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q)$ can be written as $T_u T_v$ where $u \in \mathfrak{S}_{(j, 1^{n-j})}$ and $v \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}$. Since T_u commutes with $\Phi_t m_{(1^j, n-j)}$, by Example 2.23,

$$S^\mu \Phi_t m_{(1^j, n-j)} \cdot T_u T_v = (S^\mu \cdot T_u) (\Phi_t m_{(1^j, n-j)} \cdot T_v) = (S^\mu \cdot T_u) (\Phi_t m_{(1^j, n-j)} q^{\ell(v)}).$$

Define a right $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module M by the \mathbb{C} -vector space sum

$$M := \sum_{v \in X_{j, n-j}} S^\mu \Phi_t m_{(1^j, n-j)} T_v.$$

Let $u \in S^\mu$. Using Proposition 3.8 to write $\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = m_{(1^j, n-j)} x_{(j, n-j)}$ gives

$$u \Phi_t \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = \sum_{v \in X_{j, n-j}} u \Phi_t m_{(1^j, n-j)} T_v \in M,$$

completing item (1).

We now explain item (2). Set N to be the following right-module:

$$N := \bigoplus_{v \in X_{(j, n-j)}} S^\mu \Phi_t m_{(1^j, n-j)} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q)} \mathbb{C} T_v.$$

One can use Proposition 3.9(1) to see that $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is free as a left $\mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q)$ -module, with basis

$$\{T_v : v \in X_{j, n-j}\},$$

from which it follows that

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{H}_n(q) = \bigoplus_{v \in X_{j, n-j}} \mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q) T_v.$$

Then combining the Pieri rules (Corollary 3.3) with equations (3.1) and (3.2) above, we obtain:

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{\nu \vdash n \\ \nu \setminus \mu \text{ is a horizontal strip}}} S^\nu \cong \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q)}^{\mathcal{H}_n(q)} S^\mu \otimes S^{(n-j)} \cong (S^\mu \Phi_t m_{(1^j, n-j)}) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q)} \mathcal{H}_n(q) = N.$$

It now suffices to prove item (3): that M is isomorphic to a submodule of N . Observe that the map linearly extending

$$\begin{aligned} N &\longrightarrow M \\ x \otimes T_v &\longmapsto x \cdot T_v \end{aligned}$$

is surjective and commutes with the left action of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. Hence, by Lemma 3.11, N is isomorphic to a submodule of M , completing item (3) and thus the first claim.

For the second claim, if $\lambda \setminus \mu$ is not a horizontal strip, then S^λ does not appear in the irreducible decomposition of N . Since p_λ is the projector onto the λ -isotypic component, this forces $u \Phi_t \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} p_\lambda = 0$. \square

4. A SPANNING SET OF EIGENVECTORS FOR $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$

In this section we will construct a spanning set of eigenvectors for the action of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ on S^λ in the case that $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple. In Section 4.1 we prove Theorem 1.6, which gives a recursive formulation of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. We use this recursion in Section 4.2 to construct eigenvectors of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ from eigenvectors of $\mathcal{R}_{n-1}(q)$, and in turn, apply this to obtain eigenvectors of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ from $\ker \mathcal{R}_j(q)$ for $j < n$. We then prove that this construction yields a spanning set \mathfrak{B}_λ of S^λ in Section 4.3, and give a simplified description of \mathfrak{B}_λ in Section 4.4. In what follows, we denote by

$$\ker(\mathcal{R}_n(q)|_{S^\lambda}) \subset S^\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \text{im}(\mathcal{R}_n(q)|_{S^\lambda}) \subset S^\lambda$$

the kernel and image from the action of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ on S^λ , respectively. We will fix a basis of the former space, and construct explicit vectors of the latter.

Definition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ be semisimple. For any S^μ , define κ_μ to be a basis for $\ker(\mathcal{R}_{|\mu|}(q)|_{S^\mu})$.*

In general, it is an open problem to determine explicit expressions for the elements of κ_μ , even when $q = 1$. However for our arguments, the existence of a basis inside of S^μ is sufficient. Later, we will be able to determine the size of each κ_μ when q is a power of a prime number (Section 5) and a positive real number (Section 6), which will allow us to construct an eigenbasis of S^λ in those cases.

4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.6: the recursion. Recall that $\mathcal{R}_n(q) = \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)\mathcal{B}_n(q)$, with the definitions of $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ given in equations (2.2) and (2.3).

Our goal is to prove a recursion for $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ using the Jucys-Murphy elements³

Theorem 4.2 (Theorem 1.6). *For any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, the following holds in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$:*

$$\mathcal{B}_n(q) \mathcal{R}_n(q) = \left(q \mathcal{R}_{n-1}(q) + [n]_q + q^n J_n(q) \right) \mathcal{B}_n(q).$$

To do so, we first need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *For any $q \in \mathbb{C}$,*

$$\mathcal{B}_{n-1}^*(q) T_{s_{n-1}} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q) = q \mathcal{R}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q).$$

Proof. We claim that

$$(4.1) \quad T_{s_{n-1}} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q) = q \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q).$$

To see why, note that by Proposition 3.8,

$$\mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q) = m_{(1^{n-2}, 2)} x_{(n-2, 2)} = (1 + T_{s_{n-1}}) x_{(n-2, 2)}.$$

Combining this equality with the fact that $T_{s_{n-1}}(1 + T_{s_{n-1}}) = q(1 + T_{s_{n-1}})$, we obtain

$$T_{s_{n-1}} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q) = T_{s_{n-1}}(1 + T_{s_{n-1}}) x_{(n-2, 2)} = q(1 + T_{s_{n-1}}) x_{(n-2, 2)} = q \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q).$$

Using Equation (4.1) then gives

$$\mathcal{B}_{n-1}^*(q) T_{s_{n-1}} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q) = q \mathcal{B}_{n-1}^*(q) \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q) = q \mathcal{R}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q).$$

\square

We are now ready for the Proof of Theorem 4.2

³Note that while $J_m(q)$ is not defined for $q = 0$, $q^n J_m(q)$ is defined for any $q \in \mathbb{C}$ (and is simply 0 when $q = 0$).

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Scaling $J_n(q)$ by q^n removes all negative exponents of q , making both sides of the equation defined for all q . Note that if

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{B}_n(q) \mathcal{B}_n^*(q) = \mathcal{B}_{n-1}^*(q) T_{s_{n-1}} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) + [n]_q + q^n J_n(q),$$

then the claim follows by multiplying both sides by \mathcal{B}_n on the right and applying Lemma 4.3. Hence, it suffices to prove Equation (4.2), which we do by induction on n .

First, we rewrite $\mathcal{B}_n(q) \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_n(q) \mathcal{B}_n^*(q) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n T_{s_{n-1}} T_{s_{n-2}} \cdots T_{s_i} T_{s_j} \cdots T_{s_{n-2}} T_{s_{n-1}} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n T_{s_j} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_{s_{n-1}} T_{s_{n-2}} \cdots T_{s_i} + T_{s_{n-1}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (T_{s_{n-2}} \cdots T_{s_i})(T_{s_j} \cdots T_{s_{n-2}}) \right) T_{s_{n-1}} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n T_{s_j} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_{s_{n-1}} \cdots T_{s_i} + T_{s_{n-1}} (\mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_{n-1}^*(q)) T_{s_{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We rewrite $\mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_{n-1}^*(q)$ with the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^n T_{s_j} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_{s_{n-1}} \cdots T_{s_i} + T_{s_{n-1}} \left(\mathcal{B}_{n-2}^*(q) T_{s_{n-2}} \mathcal{B}_{n-2}(q) + [n-1]_q + q^{n-1} J_{n-1}(q) \right) T_{s_{n-1}} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n T_j \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_{s_{n-1}} \cdots T_{s_i} + \underbrace{[n-1]_q T_{s_{n-1}}^2}_{v_1} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} q^i T_{s_{n-1}} T_{(i,n-1)} T_{s_{n-1}}}_{v_2} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} T_{s_{n-1}} T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-3}} T_{s_{n-2}} T_{s_{n-3}} \cdots T_{s_j} T_{s_{n-1}}}_{v_3}. \end{aligned}$$

We expand v_1 , v_2 , and v_3 separately. First,

$$v_1 = [n-1]_q (q + (q-1)T_{s_{n-1}}) = [n]_q - 1 + [n-1]_q (q-1)T_{s_{n-1}} = [n]_q - 1 + (q^{n-1} - 1)T_{s_{n-1}}.$$

Next, since $(i, n-1)$ has reduced expression

$$(i, n-1) = s_i s_{i+1} \cdots s_{n-3} s_{n-2} s_{n-3} \cdots s_{i+1} s_i,$$

we have $(i, n) = s_{n-1} \cdot (i, n-1) \cdot s_{n-1}$ is a reduced expression and so

$$v_2 := \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} q^i T_{s_{n-1}} T_{(i,n-1)} T_{s_{n-1}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} q^i T_{(i,n)}.$$

Finally, we use the generating relations for $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ to rewrite v_3 :

$$\begin{aligned} v_3 &:= \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} T_{s_{n-1}} T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-3}} T_{s_{n-2}} T_{s_{n-3}} \cdots T_{s_j} T_{s_{n-1}} \\ (T_{s_i} T_{s_j} &= T_{s_j} T_{s_i} \text{ when } |i-j| \geq 2) &&= \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-3}} T_{s_{n-1}} T_{s_{n-2}} T_{s_{n-1}} T_{s_{n-3}} \cdots T_{s_j} \\ (T_{s_i} T_{s_{i+1}} T_{s_i} &= T_{s_{i+1}} T_{s_i} T_{s_{i+1}}) &&= \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \sum_{j=2}^{n-2} T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-3}} T_{s_{n-2}} T_{s_{n-1}} T_{s_{n-2}} T_{s_{n-3}} \cdots T_{s_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting these simplifications into our full expression and rearranging, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}_n(q) \mathcal{B}_n^*(q) &= \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} T_{s_j} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} T_{s_{n-1}} \cdots T_{s_i} + ([n]_q - 1 + q^{n-1} T_{s_{n-1}} - T_{s_{n-1}}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} q^i T_{(i,n)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-2}} T_{s_{n-1}} T_{s_{n-2}} \cdots T_{s_j} \\
&= [n]_q + \left(q^{n-1} T_{s_{n-1}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} q^i T_{(i,n)} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-2}} T_{s_{n-1}} T_{s_{n-2}} \cdots T_{s_j} \\
&= [n]_q + q^n J_n(q) + \mathcal{B}_{n-1}^*(q) T_{s_{n-1}} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(q).
\end{aligned}$$

□

4.2. Eigenvector construction. Our next task is to turn the recursion in Theorem 1.6 into a method for constructing eigenvectors of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$. The idea behind Theorem 4.4 below is to use the Tower Rule (Proposition 2.12) and the properties of the seminormal units to build an eigenvector for $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ from one of $\mathcal{R}_{n-1}(q)$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ be semisimple and $\lambda' \triangleleft \lambda$ with $|\lambda| = n$. If $u' \in S^{\lambda'}$ is an eigenvector for $\mathcal{R}_{n-1}(q)$ with eigenvalue \mathcal{E} , then*

$$u := u' \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} \mathcal{B}_n(q) p_\lambda$$

is either zero or an eigenvector for $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ with eigenvalue

$$q\mathcal{E} + [n]_q + q^n \mathbf{c}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'}(q).$$

Proof. Consider $u \mathcal{R}_n(q)$, with u defined above. Since p_λ is central in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, by Theorem 4.2

$$\begin{aligned}
u \mathcal{R}_n(q) &= u' \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} \mathcal{B}_n(q) p_\lambda \mathcal{R}_n(q) \\
&= \left(u' \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} \right) \left(q \mathcal{R}_{n-1}(q) + [n]_q + q^n J_n(q) \right) \mathcal{B}_n(q) p_\lambda \\
&= \underbrace{q \left(u' \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} \mathcal{R}_{n-1}(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q) p_\lambda \right)}_{=: v_1} + \underbrace{[n]_q \left(u' \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} \mathcal{B}_n(q) p_\lambda \right)}_{=: v_2} + \underbrace{q^n \left(u' \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} J_n(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q) p_\lambda \right)}_{=: v_3}.
\end{aligned}$$

We will go through each summand in turn. For v_1 , note that \mathcal{R}_{n-1} commutes with $\Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'}$ since $\mathcal{R}_{n-1} \in \mathcal{H}_{n-1}(q)$. Since u' is an eigenvector for \mathcal{R}_{n-1} by assumption, we thus have

$$v_1 = q \left(u' \mathcal{R}_{n-1} \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_\lambda \right) = (q\mathcal{E}) u' \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} \mathcal{B}_n p_\lambda = (q\mathcal{E})u.$$

The second term is $v_2 = [n]_q u$.

The third term is the most interesting. Write u' as

$$u' = \sum_{\nu \in \text{SYT}(\lambda')} c_\nu w_\nu$$

for scalars c_ν . Since p_λ is central in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, we can write

$$v_3 = q^n \left(\sum_{\nu \in \text{SYT}(\lambda')} c_\nu w_\nu \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_\lambda \right) J_n(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q) = q^n \left(\sum_{\substack{\nu \in \text{SYT}(\lambda'), \\ \mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)}} c_\nu w_\nu \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_\nu \right) J_n(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q).$$

Using the tower rule (Proposition 2.12),

$$w_\nu \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_\mathfrak{t} = \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}') \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_{\nu'} p_{\mathfrak{t}|_{n-1}} p_\lambda = \begin{cases} 0 & \mathfrak{t}|_{n-1} \neq \mathfrak{t}', \\ w_\mathfrak{t} & \mathfrak{t}|_{n-1} = \mathfrak{t}'. \end{cases}$$

Hence, we continue to simplify v_3 as

$$\begin{aligned}
v_3 &= q^n \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda): \\ \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_{n-1}) = \lambda'}} c_{\mathfrak{t}|_{n-1}} w_{\mathfrak{t}} \right) J_n(q) \mathcal{B}_n(q) \\
&= q^n \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'}(q) \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda): \\ \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_{n-1}) = \lambda'}} c_{\mathfrak{t}|_{n-1}} w_{\mathfrak{t}} \right) \mathcal{B}_n(q) \\
&= q^n \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'}(q) \left(\sum_{\mathfrak{v} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda')} c_{\mathfrak{v}} w_{\mathfrak{v}} \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_{\lambda} \right) \mathcal{B}_n(q) \\
&= q^n \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'}(q) u.
\end{aligned}$$

(Theorem 2.21 (2))

Thus in total we can conclude that

$$u \mathcal{R}_n = v_1 + v_2 + v_3 = (q\mathcal{E}) u + [n]_q u + q^n \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'}(q) u = (q\mathcal{E} + [n]_q + q^n \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'}(q)) u.$$

□

Theorem 4.4 gives an inductive method of constructing eigenvectors of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$. The base case of this inductive process are the 0-eigenvectors of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$, i.e. the elements of κ_{μ} . Theorem 4.5 below iterates the construction in Theorem 4.4, starting with this base case.

Theorem 4.5. *Suppose $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple and for a fixed λ , let $\mu \subset \lambda$ be a partition of j . Then for $u \in \kappa_{\mu}$ and $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$, the element*

$$u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} p_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)}$$

is either zero or is an eigenvector for \mathcal{R}_n with eigenvalue

$$q^n \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) + \sum_{k=j+1}^n q^{n-k} [k]_q.$$

Proof. Let $u = \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} w_{\mathfrak{s}} \in \kappa_{\mu}$ for some scalars $c_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and let r_i be the row in which i appears in \mathfrak{t} . For any $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)$ and $j \leq k \leq n$ define $\lambda^{(k)} := (\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})|_k)$, so that

$$\mu = \lambda^{(j)} \subset \lambda^{(j+1)} \subset \dots \subset \lambda^{(n)} = \lambda.$$

We may rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}
u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} p_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} &= u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} p_{\lambda^{(j+1)}} p_{\lambda^{(j+2)}} \dots p_{\lambda} \mathcal{B}_{j+1}(q) \mathcal{B}_{j+2}(q) \dots \mathcal{B}_n(q) \\
&= u \left(\Phi_{r_{j+1}} \mathcal{B}_{j+1}(q) p_{\lambda^{(j+1)}} \right) \left(\Phi_{r_{j+2}} \mathcal{B}_{j+2}(q) p_{\lambda^{(j+2)}} \right) \dots \left(\Phi_{r_n} \mathcal{B}_n(q) p_{\lambda} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For $j \leq m < n$, define v_m as

$$v_m := u \left(\Phi_{r_{j+1}} \mathcal{B}_{j+1}(q) p_{\lambda^{(j+1)}} \right) \dots \left(\Phi_{r_m} \mathcal{B}_m(q) p_{\lambda^{(m)}} \right),$$

so that $u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = v_n$. Assume by induction that v_m is an eigenvector for $\mathcal{R}_m(q)$ with eigenvalue

$$q^m \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda^{(m)} \setminus \mu}(q) + \sum_{k=j+1}^m q^{m-k} [k]_q.$$

(Note this holds trivially in the base case $m = j$.) By Theorem 4.4, if

$$v_{m+1} = v_m \left(\Phi_{r_{m+1}} \mathcal{B}_{m+1}(q) p_{\lambda^{(m+1)}} \right)$$

is non-zero, it is an eigenvector for $\mathcal{R}_{m+1}(q)$ with eigenvalue

$$\begin{aligned}
q \left(q^m \mathbf{c}_{\lambda^{(m)} \setminus \mu}(q) + \sum_{k=j+1}^m q^{m-k} [k]_q \right) + [m+1]_q + q^{m+1} \mathbf{c}_{\mathfrak{t}, m+1}(q) \\
= q^{m+1} (\mathbf{c}_{\lambda^{(m)} \setminus \mu}(q) + \mathbf{c}_{\mathfrak{t}, m+1}(q)) + \sum_{k=j+1}^{m+1} q^{m+1-k} [k]_q \\
= q^{m+1} \mathbf{c}_{\lambda^{(m+1)} \setminus \mu}(q) + \sum_{k=j+1}^{m+1} q^{m+1-k} [k]_q.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Example 4.6. Suppose we begin with $\mu = (1, 1)$. Then $d^{(1,1)} = 1$, so $\kappa_{(1,1)}$ contains one element. One choice of such an element is $u = 12 - 21 \in S^{(1,1)}$. To build an eigenvector in $S^{(2,1,1)}$, take

$$\mathfrak{t}^{(2,1,1) \setminus (1,1)} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \boxed{3} \\ \hline \square & \\ \hline \square & \boxed{4} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

One can check that the element

$$(4.3) \quad (12 - 21) \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{(2,1,1) \setminus (1,1)}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{(2,1,1) \setminus (1,1)}} \mathcal{C}_2^{(n)} = (1213 - 2113) p_{(2,1)} p_{(2,1,1)} \mathcal{B}_3(q) \mathcal{B}_4(q) \neq 0.$$

Hence, by Theorem 4.5, it is an eigenvector for $\mathcal{R}_4(q)$ with eigenvalue

$$q^4 \mathbf{c}_{(2,1,1) \setminus (1,1)}(q) + \sum_{k=3}^4 q^{4-k} [k]_q = q^4 ([1]_q + [-2]_q) + q[3]_q + [4]_q = [5]_q + q.$$

We will see in Section 4.3 why the vector in (4.3) is a “good” choice of eigenvector.

4.3. A spanning set of eigenvectors when $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple. Finally, we will use the recursive construction of eigenvectors of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ acting on S^λ in Theorem 4.5 to define a spanning set of S^λ .

Recall that $\kappa_\mu \subset S^\mu$ is a basis of $\ker(\mathcal{R}_n(q)|_{S^\mu})$. We also have from Section 3.2 that

$$\mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)} := \mathcal{B}_{|\mu|+1}(q) \cdots \mathcal{B}_n(q),$$

while the definitions of $p_{\mathfrak{t}^\lambda \setminus \mu}$ and $\Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^\lambda \setminus \mu}$ can be found in Definitions 2.10 and 3.4.

We define the set \mathfrak{B}_λ as follows.

Definition 4.7. For a fixed $\lambda \vdash n$, $\mu \subseteq \lambda$, and $u \in \kappa_\mu$ define the element

$$x_{\mu(u)}^\lambda := u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^\lambda \setminus \mu} p_{\mathfrak{t}^\lambda \setminus \mu} \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)} \in S^\lambda,$$

and the set of all such $x_{\mu(u)}^\lambda$ as

$$\mathfrak{B}_\lambda := \{x_{\mu(u)}^\lambda : u \in \kappa_\mu, \mu \subseteq \lambda\}.$$

Our goal in this section is to prove that \mathfrak{B}_λ spans S^λ (Theorem 4.13). Recall that the general construction in Theorem 4.5 showed that for any $u \in \kappa_\mu$ with $|\mu| = j$ and $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$,

$$(4.4) \quad u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} p_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)} \in S^\lambda$$

was either 0 or an eigenvector for $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$. The idea behind this construction was to build the element in (4.4) iteratively via the Tower Rule (Proposition 2.12) using the chain of inclusions

$$(4.5) \quad \mu \setminus \mu \subset \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_{j+1}) \subset \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_{j+2}) \cdots \subset \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}) = \lambda \setminus \mu.$$

An element $x_{\mu(u)}^\lambda$ of \mathfrak{B}_λ is a special cases of an element of the form (4.4). The key difference is that for $x_{\mu(u)}^\lambda$ we have fixed a specific tableau $\mathfrak{t}^\lambda \setminus \mu$, and thus chosen a specific inclusion chain of the form in (4.5).

At the heart of proving that \mathfrak{B}_λ spans S^λ is showing that this is possible; namely, that at every step in the inductive process given in Theorem 4.5, we can *straighten* our tableau to ensure that we are using the tableau of largest dominance order $\mathfrak{t}^{\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}|_k) \setminus \mu}$. We demonstrate this idea in Example 4.8 below.

Example 4.8. We illustrate the ideas of the proof of Theorem 4.13, showing that \mathfrak{B}_λ spans S^λ for $\lambda = (5, 3, 1)$. We first decompose S^λ into the image and kernel of $\mathcal{R}_9(q)$:

$$S^\lambda = \ker(\mathcal{R}_9(q)|_{S^\lambda}) \oplus \text{im}(\mathcal{R}_9(q)|_{S^\lambda}).$$

By construction $\ker(\mathcal{R}_9(q)|_{S^\lambda})$ is spanned by the elements $x_{\lambda(u)}^\lambda \in \kappa_\lambda$ of \mathfrak{B}_λ . So, it suffices prove that \mathfrak{B}_λ spans $\text{im}(\mathcal{R}_9(q)|_{S^\lambda})$, or sufficiently $\text{im}(\mathcal{B}_9(q)|_{S^\lambda})$, since

$$\text{im}(\mathcal{R}_9(q)|_{S^\lambda}) \subset \text{im}(\mathcal{B}_9(q)|_{S^\lambda}).$$

By Proposition 3.7, any $v \in \text{im}(\mathcal{B}_9(q)|_{S^{(5,3,1)}})$ can be written as a sum

$$v = \underbrace{\sum_{t' \in \text{SYT}(4,3,1)} c_{t'} w_{t'} \cdot \Phi_1 p_{(5,3,1)} \mathcal{B}_9(q)}_{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square & \square & \blacksquare \\ \hline \square & \square & \square & & \\ \hline \square & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}} + \underbrace{\sum_{t' \in \text{SYT}(5,2,1)} c_{t'} w_{t'} \cdot \Phi_2 p_{(5,3,1)} \mathcal{B}_9(q)}_{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \blacksquare & \square & \\ \hline \square & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}} + \underbrace{\sum_{t' \in \text{SYT}(5,3)} c_{t'} w_{t'} \cdot \Phi_3 p_{(5,3,1)} \mathcal{B}_9(q)}_{\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \square & & \\ \hline \blacksquare & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}}.$$

Our task is to show that each of these summands can be written as a linear combination of elements of \mathfrak{B}_λ , which we will do by example on the first summand, where $\lambda' = (4, 3, 1)$.

By induction, for $t' \in \text{SYT}(\lambda')$, the element $w_{t'}$ can be rewritten as a linear combination of $x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'}$:

$$(4.6) \quad w_{t'} = \sum_{x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'} \in \mathfrak{B}_{\lambda'}} \alpha_{\mu(u)} x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'}.$$

Suppose $\mu = (3, 1)$. Then for $u \in \kappa_{(3,1)}$ one such $x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'}$ appearing in (4.6) above is

$$x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'} = u \Phi_{t^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}} p_{t^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}} C_4^{(8)} \quad \text{where} \quad t^{\lambda' \setminus \mu} = t^{(4,3,1) \setminus (3,1)} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square & 5 \\ \hline \square & 6 & 7 & \\ \hline 8 & & & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Thus the corresponding term in v above is

$$x_{(3,1)(u)}^{\lambda'} \cdot \Phi_1 p_{(5,3,1)} \mathcal{B}_9(q) = \left(u \Phi_{t^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}} p_{t^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}} C_4^{(8)} \right) \Phi_1 p_{(5,3,1)} \mathcal{B}_9(q) = u \Phi_t p_t C_4^{(9)}$$

where

$$t = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square & 5 & 9 \\ \hline \square & 6 & 7 & & \\ \hline 8 & & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \neq t^{(5,3,1) \setminus (3,1)} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square & 5 & 6 \\ \hline \square & 7 & 8 & & \\ \hline 9 & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Since $t \neq t^{(5,3,1) \setminus (3,1)}$, it is not obvious that $x_{(3,1)(u)}^{\lambda'} \cdot \Phi_1 p_{(5,3,1)} \mathcal{B}_9(q)$ is in the span of $\mathfrak{B}_{(5,3,1)}$. The goal of our Straightening Lemma (Lemma 4.12) is to show that it actually is.

To this end, note that t is related to $t^{(5,3,1) \setminus (3,1)}$ by a cycle, namely

$$t^{(5,3,1) \setminus (3,1)} = t \cdot s_8 s_7 s_6.$$

Our straightening lemma (Lemma 4.12) will be used to explain that this implies $u \Phi_t p_t C_4^{(9)}$ is a constant multiple of $u \Phi_{t^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{t^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} C_4^{(9)}$, and thus in the span of \mathfrak{B}_λ .

Remark 4.9. The straightening process is missing from [25]. In particular, the proof of [25, Proposition 58] assumes they can inductively construct an eigenvector that is already “straightened,” but without an argument as in Lemma 4.12, this assumption is not valid, as illustrated in Example 4.8. By setting $q = 1$, our Lemma 4.12 thus corrects this mistake.

We will now formalize the straightening performed in Example 4.8 in Lemmas 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12. Though these arguments are somewhat technical, the key idea behind them is that the miraculous properties of the seminormal units given in Theorem 2.21(3) provide a way to straighten our tableau.

Lemma 4.10. *Assume $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple. Suppose $t, q \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ are such that*

- $t \cdot s_i = q$ so that $t|_{i-1} = q|_{i-1}$, and
- $q \triangleright t$.

Then $w_{\mathfrak{q}}(1 + T_{s_i})$ is a scalar multiple of $w_{\mathfrak{t}}(1 + T_{s_i})$. Specifically:

$$w_{\mathfrak{q}}(1 + T_{s_i}) \cdot \frac{[\rho + 1]_{\mathfrak{q}}}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}} = w_{\mathfrak{t}}(1 + T_{s_i}),$$

where $\rho := \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},i} - \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},i+1} = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{q},i+1} - \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t},i+1}$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.21(3),

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\mathfrak{t}}(1 + T_{s_i}) &= w_{\mathfrak{t}} + \frac{q^{\rho}}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}} w_{\mathfrak{t}} + \frac{q[\rho - 1]_{\mathfrak{q}}[\rho + 1]_{\mathfrak{q}}}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}^2} w_{\mathfrak{q}} \\ &= \frac{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}} + q^{\rho}}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}} w_{\mathfrak{t}} + \frac{q[\rho - 1]_{\mathfrak{q}}[\rho + 1]_{\mathfrak{q}}}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}^2} w_{\mathfrak{q}} \\ &= \frac{[\rho + 1]_{\mathfrak{q}}}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}} w_{\mathfrak{t}} + \frac{q[\rho - 1]_{\mathfrak{q}}[\rho + 1]_{\mathfrak{q}}}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}^2} w_{\mathfrak{q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using Theorem 2.21(3) again on \mathfrak{q} gives

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\mathfrak{q}}(1 + T_{s_i}) &= w_{\mathfrak{q}} - \frac{1}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}} w_{\mathfrak{q}} + w_{\mathfrak{t}} \\ &= \frac{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}} - 1}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}} w_{\mathfrak{q}} + w_{\mathfrak{t}} \\ &= \frac{q[\rho - 1]_{\mathfrak{q}}}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}} w_{\mathfrak{q}} + w_{\mathfrak{t}}. \end{aligned}$$

We thus deduce that

$$w_{\mathfrak{q}}(1 + T_{s_i}) \cdot \frac{[\rho + 1]_{\mathfrak{q}}}{[\rho]_{\mathfrak{q}}} = w_{\mathfrak{t}}(1 + T_{s_i}).$$

□

In order to use Lemma 4.10, we will need to factor the term $(1 + T_{s_i})$ out of $\mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = m_{(1^j, n-j)} x_{(j, n-j)}$; this is the goal of Lemma 4.11.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $n - j \geq 2$. Then for any $j < i < n$, the element $m_{(1^j, n-j)}$ factors as*

$$m_{(1^j, n-j)} = (1 + T_{s_i}) \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}: \\ w^{-1}(i) < w^{-1}(i+1)}} T_w.$$

Proof. We have

$$m_{(1^j, n-j)} = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}} T_w = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}: \\ w^{-1}(i) < w^{-1}(i+1)}} T_w + \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}: \\ w^{-1}(i+1) > w^{-1}(i)}} T_w.$$

Observe that for any $w, u \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, as sets

$$\{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)} : w^{-1}(i+1) > w^{-1}(i)\} = \{s_i u : u \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}, u^{-1}(i) < u^{-1}(i+1)\}.$$

Further, if $u^{-1}(i) < u^{-1}(i+1)$, then $T_{s_i} T_u = T_{s_i u}$. Hence, we can continue rewriting of $m_{(1^j, n-j)}$ as

$$m_{(1^j, n-j)} = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}: \\ w^{-1}(i) < w^{-1}(i+1)}} T_w + \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}: \\ u^{-1}(i) < u^{-1}(i+1)}} T_{s_i} T_u = (1 + T_{s_i}) \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)}: \\ w^{-1}(i) < w^{-1}(i+1)}} T_w.$$

□

Finally, we will combine Lemma 4.10 and Lemma 4.11 to give our straightening procedure.

Lemma 4.12 (Straightening Lemma). *Assume $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple. Fix $\lambda \vdash n$ and $\mu \subset \lambda$ with $|\mu| = j$ such that $n - j \geq 2$. Suppose for $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda \setminus \mu)$ there exists an $i > j$, and k such that $i - 1 < k < n$ and*

$$\mathfrak{t} \cdot s_k s_{k-1} \cdots s_{i+1} s_i = \mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}.$$

Then there exists a constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ such that for any $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)$,

$$w_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = \alpha w_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}(\mathfrak{s})} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)}.$$

Proof. We induct on k . The base case ($k = i - 1$) is vacuously true since in this case $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}$.

Now, assume that $k \geq i$ so that $\mathfrak{t} \cdot s_k s_{k-1} \cdots s_{i+1} s_i = \mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}$. By Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 4.11

$$w_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = w_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})} m_{(1^j, n-j)} x_{(j, n-j)} = w_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})} (1 + T_{s_k}) \left(\sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)} \\ w^{-1}(k) < w^{-1}(k+1)}} T_w \right) x_{(j, n-j)}.$$

The fact that $\mathfrak{t} \cdot s_k s_{k-1} \cdots s_{i+1} s_i = \mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}$ implies that in \mathfrak{t} , the box $k + 1$ appears in a row north of box k . Letting $\mathfrak{q} := \mathfrak{t} \cdot s_k$, we see that this implies that $\mathfrak{q} \triangleright \mathfrak{t}$.

Since $k > j$, the contents $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s}), k}$ and $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s}), k+1}$ do not depend on \mathfrak{s} . Hence, Lemma 4.10 implies there exists a constant $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ for which

$$w_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})} (1 + T_{s_k}) = \beta \cdot w_{\mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{s})} (1 + T_{s_k})$$

for all $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} &= w_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})} (1 + T_{s_k}) \left(\sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)} \\ w^{-1}(k) < w^{-1}(k+1)}} T_w \right) x_{(j, n-j)} \\ &= \beta w_{\mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{s})} (1 + T_{s_k}) \left(\sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{(1^j, n-j)} \\ w^{-1}(k) < w^{-1}(k+1)}} T_w \right) x_{(j, n-j)} \\ &= \beta w_{\mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{s})} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu} = \mathfrak{q} \cdot s_{k-1} \cdots s_i$, by induction there exists a constant $\alpha' \in \mathbb{C}$ for which

$$w_{\mathfrak{q}(\mathfrak{s})} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} = \alpha' w_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}(\mathfrak{s})} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)}.$$

Setting $\alpha = \beta \alpha'$ completes the proof. \square

We are finally ready to prove that \mathfrak{B}_λ spans S^λ .

Theorem 4.13. *When $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, the set \mathfrak{B}_λ spans S^λ .*

Proof. We proceed by induction on $|\lambda| = n$, where the base case $|\lambda| = 1$ is trivial. For $|\lambda| > 1$, note that S^λ can be decomposed as a direct sum into the image and kernel from the action of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ on S^λ . By construction, $\kappa_\lambda \subset S^\lambda$ is a basis for $\ker(\mathcal{R}_n(q)|_{S^\lambda})$. Consider the subset of \mathfrak{B}_λ where $|\mu| < |\lambda|$:

$$\mathfrak{B}_\lambda^\circ := \{x_{\mu(u)}^\lambda : \mu \subsetneq \lambda, u \in \kappa_\mu\} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}_\lambda,$$

Then

$$\mathfrak{B}_\lambda = \kappa_\lambda \sqcup \mathfrak{B}_\lambda^\circ.$$

We will show that $\mathfrak{B}_\lambda^\circ$ spans $\text{im}(\mathcal{R}_n(q)|_{S^\lambda})$. Note that since $\text{im}(\mathcal{R}_n(q)|_{S^\lambda}) \subseteq \text{im}(\mathcal{B}_n(q)|_{S^\lambda})$, it suffices to show that $\mathfrak{B}_\lambda^\circ$ spans $\text{im}(\mathcal{B}_n(q)|_{S^\lambda})$.

Take $v \in \text{im}(\mathcal{B}_n(q)|_{S^\lambda})$. Proposition 3.7 implies that v can be written as

$$v = \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \text{SYT}(\lambda') \\ \lambda' \subsetneq \lambda}} c_\nu w_\nu \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \text{sh}(\nu)} p_\lambda \mathcal{B}_n(q) = \left(\sum_{\lambda' \subsetneq \lambda} \left(\sum_{\nu \in \text{SYT}(\lambda')} c_\nu w_\nu \right) \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} \right) p_\lambda \mathcal{B}_n(q).$$

For a fixed λ' in the above sum, write $v' := \sum_{v' \in \text{SYT}(\lambda')} c_{v'} w_{v'} \in S^{\lambda'}$. By induction, v' can be written as a linear combination of elements in $\mathfrak{B}_{\lambda'}$:

$$v' = \sum_{x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'} \in \mathfrak{B}_{\lambda'}} c_{\mu(u)} x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'}.$$

Consider $x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'} = u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n-1)}$. If $|\mu| = |\lambda'|$ then $x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'} = u$, and $u \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_{\lambda} \mathcal{B}_n(q) \in \mathfrak{B}_{\lambda}$. Suppose $|\lambda| - |\mu| \geq 2$ and fix $j = |\mu|$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'} \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_{\lambda} \mathcal{B}_n(q) &= \left(u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n-1)} \right) \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_{\lambda} \mathcal{B}_n(q) \\ &= u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}} \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}} p_{\lambda} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n-1)} \mathcal{B}_n(q) \\ &= u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} p_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} \end{aligned}$$

where \mathfrak{t} is the skew tableau obtained from $\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}$ by adding the box n at $\lambda \setminus \lambda'$.

If $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}$, then $x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda'} \Phi_{\lambda \setminus \lambda'} p_{\lambda} \mathcal{B}_n(q) = x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda}$ and we are done. Otherwise, since $\mathfrak{t}|_{n-1} = \mathfrak{t}^{\lambda' \setminus \mu}$, we necessarily have that

$$\mathfrak{t} \cdot s_{n-1} s_{n-2} \cdots s_i = \mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}$$

for some $i > |\mu|$. Hence, Lemma 4.12 applies. Rewriting $u \in S^{\mu}$ using the basis $w_{\mathfrak{s}}$ for $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)$:

$$\begin{aligned} u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} p_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} &= \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} w_{\mathfrak{s}} \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}} p_{\mathfrak{t}} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} \\ &= \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} w_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{s})} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} \\ \text{(Lemma 4.12)} \quad &= \alpha \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} w_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}(\mathfrak{s})} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} \\ &= \alpha \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} w_{\mathfrak{s}} \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} \\ &= \alpha u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_j^{(n)} \\ &= \alpha x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda} \in \mathfrak{B}_{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

□

4.4. A simplified description of \mathfrak{B}_{λ} . Recall that we defined \mathfrak{B}_{λ} as

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\lambda} := \{x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda} := u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)} : u \in \kappa_{\mu}, \mu \subseteq \lambda\}.$$

We now show that the elements of \mathfrak{B}_{λ} are either zero, or can be rewritten as follows.

Lemma 4.14. *Assume $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple. Fix $\lambda \vdash n$ and let $\mu \subseteq \lambda$. For any $u \in \kappa_{\mu}$,*

$$x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda} := u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)} = \begin{cases} 0 & \lambda \setminus \mu \text{ is not a horizontal strip} \\ y_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda} := u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)} p_{\lambda} & \lambda \setminus \mu \text{ is a horizontal strip.} \end{cases}$$

Recall that by Lemma 3.12, when $\lambda \setminus \mu$ is not a horizontal strip and $u \in S^{\mu}$, we have

$$u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)} p_{\lambda} = 0.$$

To prove Lemma 4.14, we would like to apply Lemma 3.12. However, in order to do so, we must first transform the $x_{\mu(u)}^{\lambda}$ to be of the form $u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)} p_{\lambda}$ rather than $u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)}$. This is the purpose of the Lemma 4.16, whose proof also uses the following fact, given in [39, Exercise 19, p50].

Lemma 4.15 (Mathas). *If $\mathfrak{q} \triangleright \mathfrak{t}$, then $\text{word}(\mathfrak{q}) p_{\mathfrak{t}} = 0$.*

Lemma 4.16. *For $u \in S^{\mu}$ and $\mu \subseteq \lambda$,*

$$u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} = u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\lambda}.$$

Proof. Let $|\mu| = j$ and $|\lambda| = n$. Write $u = \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} w_{\mathfrak{s}}$ with scalars $c_{\mathfrak{s}}$. By the tower rule (Proposition 2.12) and orthogonality of the $p_{\mathfrak{t}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\lambda} &= \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{q}} \\
&= \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} w_{\mathfrak{s}} \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{q}} \\
&= \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} \sum_{\mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} \text{word}(\mathfrak{s}) \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{s}} p_{\mathfrak{q}}. \\
&= \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda) \\ \mathfrak{q}|_j = \mathfrak{s}}} c_{\mathfrak{s}} \text{word}(\mathfrak{s}) \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{q}} \\
&= \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda) \\ \mathfrak{q}|_j = \mathfrak{s}}} c_{\mathfrak{s}} \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda/\mu}(\mathfrak{s})) p_{\mathfrak{q}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for all $\mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{t}^{\lambda/\mu}(\mathfrak{s})$ with $\mathfrak{q}|_j = \mathfrak{s}$, we have $\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda/\mu}(\mathfrak{s}) \triangleright \mathfrak{q}$. By Lemma 4.15, the sum thus becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\lambda} &= \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} \text{word}(\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda/\mu}(\mathfrak{s})) p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}(\mathfrak{s})} \\
&= \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} \text{word}(\mathfrak{s}) \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{s}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \\
&= \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{SYT}(\mu)} c_{\mathfrak{s}} w_{\mathfrak{s}} \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \\
&= u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.14 easily follows from Lemma 4.16.

Proof of Lemma 4.14. By Lemma 4.16,

$$u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} = u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\lambda}.$$

Using the fact that p_{λ} is central, we have

$$x_{\mu}^{\lambda}(u) = u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} C_{|\mu|}^{(n)} = u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} p_{\lambda} C_{|\mu|}^{(n)} = u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} C_{|\mu|}^{(n)} p_{\lambda}.$$

Thus by Lemma 3.12, if $\lambda \setminus \mu$ is not a horizontal strip,

$$u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} C_{|\mu|}^{(n)} p_{\lambda} = 0.$$

□

Having shown that $x_{\mu}^{\lambda}(u) = 0$ if $\lambda \setminus \mu$ is not a horizontal strip, we will now slightly abuse notation and remove the copies of 0 from \mathfrak{B}_{λ} , so that

$$\mathfrak{B}_{\lambda} := \{y_{\mu}^{\lambda}(u) := u \Phi_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} C_{|\mu|}^{(n)} p_{\lambda} : u \in \kappa_{\mu} \text{ for } \lambda \setminus \mu \text{ a horizontal strip}\}.$$

5. THE DERANGEMENT REPRESENTATION AND FLAGS OF \mathbb{F}_q^n

The goal of this section is to relate the $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ to Markov chains on flags over a finite field \mathbb{F}_q^n , and to use this connection to describe the kernels of both operators when q is the power of a prime number. This will serve as the essential base case of our analysis of the full spectrum of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ in Section 6.

We first define in Section 5.1 the *derangement representation* of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. We then explain the general connection between $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ and flags over a finite field in Section 5.2, and use this in Section 5.3 to link q -random-to-top $\mathcal{T}_n^*(q)$ (and thus also $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$, see Remark 2.3) to a Markov chain on flags introduced by Brown [14] and studied in [13]. Finally, we apply this analysis in Section 5.4 to show that the kernel of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ carries the derangement representation, and compute the characteristic polynomials of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$.

5.1. The Derangement representation. Recall that an integer $i \in [n - 1]$ is a *descent* of $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}$ if $i + 1$ appears south and weakly west of i , with $\text{Des}(\mathfrak{t})$ the set of descents of \mathfrak{t} . Then $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(n)$ is a *desarrangement tableau* if the smallest element of $[n] \setminus \text{Des}(\mathfrak{t})$ is even. Write

$$\mathcal{D}_n := \{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(n) : \mathfrak{t} \text{ is a desarrangement tableau}\}.$$

We will keep track of the number of desarrangement tableaux of shape μ by

$$d^\mu := \#\{\mathfrak{t} \in \mathcal{D}_n : \text{sh}(\mathfrak{t}) = \mu\}.$$

Let d_n be the number of *derangements* permutations, or permutations with no fixed points, of \mathfrak{S}_n . Then work of Désarménien and Wachs [20] shows that

$$d_n = \sum_{\mu \vdash n} d^\mu f^\mu.$$

Example 5.1. The desarrangement tableaux in \mathcal{D}_5 are shown below.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & 5 & \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 5 \\ \hline 2 & 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & & 5 \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 5 \\ \hline 2 & & 4 \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 4 \\ \hline 5 & \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 5 \\ \hline 2 & \\ \hline 3 & \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} \\
 d^{(4,1)} = 1 & d^{(3,2)} = 2 & d^{(3,1,1)} = 2 & d^{(2,2,1)} = 2 & d^{(2,1,1,1)} = 2
 \end{array}$$

Hence, in total,

$$d_5 = \sum_{\mu \vdash 5} d^\mu f^\mu = 1 \cdot 4 + 2 \cdot 5 + 2 \cdot 6 + 2 \cdot 5 + 2 \cdot 4 = 44.$$

We define a representation from the set \mathcal{D}_n as follows.

Definition 5.2 (Derangement representation). *Let $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ be semisimple. The derangement representation of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is the left-module*

$$\mathfrak{D}_n(q) := \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{t} \in \mathcal{D}_n} \left(S^{\text{sh}(\mathfrak{t})} \right)^*.$$

Equivalently, $\mathfrak{D}_n(q)$ is the representation satisfying

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{j=0}^n \text{ch}(\mathfrak{D}_j(q)) h_{n-j} = h_1^n, \quad \text{ch}(\mathfrak{D}_0(q)) = 1.$$

In addition to the characterizations in Definition 5.2, there are several other equivalent ways to describe $\mathfrak{D}_n(q)$ in terms of symmetric functions; see [13, Prop. 3.1].

By construction, the multiplicity of $(S^\mu)^*$ in $\mathfrak{D}_n(q)$ is d^μ and the total dimension of $\mathfrak{D}_n(q)$ is d_n . We will soon show that when q is the power of a prime number, the kernel of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ carries the derangement representation. Hence, in this case $|\kappa_\mu| = d^\mu$ for every μ .

5.2. Connection between $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ and flags over a finite field. We will now discuss an alternative perspective of the Hecke algebra—in fact its original motivation—which realizes $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ as the centralizer of the action of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ on the space of complete flags over \mathbb{F}_q^n , where \mathbb{F}_q is the field with q elements. We will summarize the relevant aspects of this story; for a comprehensive study, see Halverson–Ram [32].

When working in this setting, we set q to be the power of a prime number, which we shall denote by $q = p^m$. Let

$$F_\bullet = (F_1 \subset \cdots \subset F_{n-1} \subset F_n = \mathbb{F}_q^n)$$

be a complete flag of \mathbb{F}_q^n with $\dim(F_i) = i$, and write the collection of all such flags as \mathcal{F}_n . We will be interested in their \mathbb{C} -span $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$, upon which $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ acts diagonally:

$$g \cdot F_\bullet = (g \cdot F_1 \subset \cdots \subset g \cdot F_{n-1} \subset g \cdot F_n = \mathbb{F}_q^n).$$

There is a $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ -equivariant bijection between \mathcal{F}_n and the coset space $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)/B$, where B is the Borel subgroup of upper triangular matrices of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$; see [32, §1] for details. This induces an isomorphism $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n] \cong \mathbb{C}[\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)/B]$ of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ -representations.

The subset of irreducible representations of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ which appear as the irreducible constituents from the action of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ were studied by Steinberg [48] and are called the *unipotent representations*; more explanation can be found in [13, §3.2]. Each irreducible unipotent representation is indexed by a partition, denoted as G^λ , with dimension $f^\lambda(q) := \dim(G^\lambda)$ given by the *q-hook formula*, see [38, Equation (4.2)]. In fact, the space $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ decomposes as $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ -representation in an analogous way to $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$:

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n] \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash n} (G^\lambda)^{f^\lambda}.$$

In this setting, one can define $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ in terms of B -double cosets of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$. We omit this description, but note that it implies there is an $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ action on $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)/B] \cong \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ as follows.

Definition 5.3. *When $q = p^m$, there is a right action of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ by*

$$F_\bullet \cdot T_{s_i} = \sum_{\substack{G \neq F_i \\ \dim(G)=i}} (F_1 \subset F_2 \subset \cdots \subset F_{i-1} \subset G \subset F_{i+1} \subset \cdots \subset F_n = \mathbb{F}_q^n).$$

Importantly, the right action by $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ commutes with the left action by $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, and so we obtain a bimodule decomposition of $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$, see [32, p.253-254]. Write

$$\mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)}(\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n])$$

to be the centralizer algebra of the action of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$.

Corollary 5.4 (Double centralizer Theorem). *When $q = p^m$,*

$$\mathcal{H}_n(q) \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)}(\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]).$$

Moreover, there is a $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q) \times \mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -bimodule decomposition of $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n] \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash n} G^\lambda \otimes S^\lambda,$$

where G^λ is an irreducible unipotent representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and S^λ is a Specht module of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

Example 5.5 (Derangement representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$). Just as one can define $\mathfrak{D}_n(q)$ as a representation of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, there is a natural *derangement representation* of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, defined as the analogous sum over unipotent representations:

$$\bigoplus_{t \in \mathfrak{D}_n} G^{\mathrm{sh}(t)}.$$

This will become relevant in Section 5.4, when we study a Markov chain on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ whose kernel carries the derangement representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

As in the case of the bimodule decomposition of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ in (2.4), Theorem 5.4 allows us to deduce information about the actions of elements of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$.

Corollary 5.6. *Consider $\tilde{\varphi} \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)}(\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n])$, and suppose that for $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_n(q)$,*

$$\tilde{\varphi} \cdot F_\bullet = F_\bullet \cdot \varphi$$

for every $F_\bullet \in \mathcal{F}_n$. Then, if $\tilde{\varphi}$ acts semisimply on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$, Corollary 5.4 implies the following:

- (1) *The element φ acts semisimply on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.*
- (2) *If the \mathcal{E} -eigenspace of $\tilde{\varphi}$ acting on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ has irreducible decomposition as a $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ -module*

$$\bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash n} \underbrace{G^\lambda \oplus G^\lambda \oplus \cdots \oplus G^\lambda}_{m_{\mathcal{E}}(\lambda)}$$

then the right \mathcal{E} -eigenspace of φ acting on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ decomposes as a left $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module

$$\bigoplus_{\lambda \vdash n} \underbrace{(S^\lambda)^* \oplus (S^\lambda)^* \oplus \cdots \oplus (S^\lambda)^*}_{m_{\mathcal{E}}(\lambda)}.$$

- (3) The set of eigenvalues of $\tilde{\varphi}$ acting on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ will equal those of φ acting by right multiplication on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$. The multiplicity of the eigenvalue \mathcal{E} in φ acting on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ will be

$$\sum_{\lambda \vdash n} f^\lambda m_{\mathcal{E}}(\lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} \dim(S^\lambda) m_{\mathcal{E}}(\lambda),$$

while the multiplicity of \mathcal{E} from $\tilde{\varphi}$ acting on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ is

$$\sum_{\lambda \vdash n} f^\lambda(q) m_{\mathcal{E}}(\lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} \dim(G^\lambda) m_{\mathcal{E}}(\lambda).$$

We will use Corollary 5.6 in Section 5.3 to translate properties between our operators in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ and a flag analog of random-to-top introduced by Brown [14] and studied in [13].

5.3. Random-to-top on flags. In [14], Brown introduced a q -analogue of \mathcal{B}_n^* which acts on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$.

Definition 5.7. For $F_\bullet \in \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$, define $x^{(q)} \in \text{End}_{\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)}(\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n])$ to be the \mathbb{C} -linear map

$$x^{(q)}(F_\bullet) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{L_i} (L_i \subset L_i + F_1 \subset \cdots \subset L_i + F_{i-2} \subset F_i \subset F_{i+1} \subset \cdots \subset F_n),$$

where the second sum is over one-dimensional subspaces (or lines L_i) for which $L_i \subseteq F_i$ but $L_i \not\subseteq F_{i-1}$.

Example 5.8. Let $q = n = 2$. Use $\langle v \rangle$ to express the \mathbb{F}_q -span of the vector $v \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ and let e_1, e_2 be the standard basis vectors of \mathbb{F}_q^n . Suppose $F_\bullet = (\langle e_1 + e_2 \rangle \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n)$. Then

$$x^{(q)}(F_\bullet) = \underbrace{\langle \langle e_1 + e_2 \rangle \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n \rangle}_{i=1} + \underbrace{\langle \langle e_1 \rangle \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n \rangle + \langle \langle e_2 \rangle \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n \rangle}_{i=2}.$$

Work of Reiner, the second and fourth author in [13] compute the characteristic polynomial of $x^{(q)}$.

Theorem 5.9 ([13]). The action of $x^{(q)}$ on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ is semisimple, with characteristic polynomial $\chi(y, q)$ given by

$$\chi(y, q) = \prod_{j=0}^n (y - [j]_q)^{m_j},$$

where $m_j = \binom{n}{j} d_{n-j}$. The kernel of $x^{(q)}$ carries the derangement representation of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

We will use the bimodule decomposition in Section 5.2 to relate $x^{(q)}$ to our operator $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$. By Corollary 5.6, studying the spectrum of $x^{(q)}$ is equivalent to studying that of an element $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}_n(q)$ for which

$$x^{(q)} \cdot F_\bullet = F_\bullet \cdot \varphi$$

for all flags $F_\bullet \in \mathcal{F}_n$. We will show that this element is q -random-to-top $\mathcal{T}_n^*(q)$, and use this to deduce information about q -random-to-bottom $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ using Remark 2.3.

Proposition 5.10. For any flag $F_\bullet \in \mathcal{F}_n$,

$$x^{(q)}(F_\bullet) = F_\bullet \cdot \mathcal{T}_n^*(q).$$

Proof. Let $E_\bullet = (E_1 \subset \cdots \subset E_n)$, where each E_i is the span of the first i standard basis vectors of \mathbb{F}_q^n . Since $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ acts transitively on $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{F}_n]$ and $x^{(q)}$ commutes with the action of $\text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, it suffices to prove that

$$x^{(q)}(E_\bullet) = \sum_{i=1}^n E_\bullet \cdot T_{s_{i-1}} T_{s_{i-2}} \cdots T_{s_1}.$$

We will show that for a fixed i ,

$$E_\bullet \cdot T_{s_{i-1}} T_{s_{i-2}} \cdots T_{s_1} = \sum_{L_i} (L_i \subset L_i + E_1 \subset \cdots \subset E_{i-2} \subset E_{i-2} + L_i \subset E_i \subset \cdots \subset E_n),$$

where the sum is over lines L_i contained in E_i but not contained in E_{i-1} . Using Definition 5.3, we have that

$$(5.2) \quad E_\bullet \cdot T_{s_{i-1}} T_{s_{i-2}} \cdots T_{s_1} = \sum F_\bullet,$$

where the sum is over all flags $F_\bullet \in \mathcal{F}_n$ for which both:

- (i) $F_j \neq E_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq i-1$, and
- (ii) $E_{j-1} \subset F_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq i-1$.

We claim these conditions force $F_j = F_1 + E_{j-1}$ for all $2 \leq j \leq i-1$. Indeed, since E_1 and F_1 are two distinct one-dimensional subspaces of the two-dimensional subspace F_2 , we must have $F_1 + E_1 = F_2$. Inductively, for $j > 2$, assume $F_{j-1} = F_1 + E_{j-2}$. Since $E_{j-2} \subset F_{j-1} \neq E_{j-1}$, the vector e_{j-1} is not contained in F_{j-1} , so

$$F_{j-1} \subsetneq F_{j-1} + \langle e_{j-1} \rangle = E_{j-2} + F_1 + \langle e_{j-1} \rangle = E_{j-1} + F_1 \subseteq F_j.$$

Hence, $F_j = E_{j-1} + F_1$, as desired. This also forces that $F_1 \not\subseteq E_{i-1}$ (since otherwise $F_{i-1} = F_1 + E_{i-2}$ would equal E_{i-1}). Thus, each flag F_\bullet appearing in the sum (5.2) is determined by the line F_1 which is contained in E_i but not E_{i-1} . Conversely, any choice of such a line gives rise to a flag in (5.2). \square

5.4. Analysis of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$. Finally, we will use the connection between $x^{(q)}$ and $\mathcal{T}_n^*(q)$ to compute the spectrum of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$. The techniques used to study $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ are similar (but far simpler) to what is needed to study $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$:

- (1) We inductively construct eigenvectors of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ from $\ker(\mathcal{B}_j^*(q))$ for $j \leq n$;
- (2) We compute the dimension of $\ker(\mathcal{B}_j^*(q))$ for certain values of q , and use a dimension counting argument to show we that all eigenvectors are obtained from the construction above.

We first construct eigenvectors of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ using elements of $\ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q)$ for $j \leq n$.

Proposition 5.11. *Let $q \in \mathbb{C}$. Suppose $u \in \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q)$ for $0 \leq j \leq n$. Then $(m_{(1^j, n-j)} u)$ is eigenvector for $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ with eigenvalue $[n-j]_q$:*

$$(m_{(1^j, n-j)} u) \mathcal{B}_n^*(q) = [n-j]_q (m_{(1^j, n-j)} u).$$

Proof. Using the fact that $u \in \mathcal{H}_j(q)$ commutes with T_{s_i} for $i > j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (m_{(1^j, n-j)} u) \mathcal{B}_n^*(q) &= (m_{1^j, n-j} u) \sum_{i=1}^n T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^j (m_{(1^j, n-j)} u) T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} + \sum_{i=j+1}^n (m_{(1^j, n-j)} u) T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^j (m_{(1^j, n-j)} u) T_{s_i} T_{s_{i+1}} \cdots T_{s_{j-1}} T_{s_j} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} + \sum_{i=j+1}^n (m_{(1^j, n-j)} u) T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} \\ &= m_{(1^j, n-j)} (u \mathcal{B}_j^*(q)) T_{s_j} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} + \sum_{i=j+1}^n m_{(1^j, n-j)} T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} u. \end{aligned}$$

The discussion in Example 2.26 then implies that

$$\begin{aligned} m_{(1^j, n-j)} (u \mathcal{B}_j^*(q)) T_{s_j} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} + \sum_{i=j+1}^n m_{(1^j, n-j)} T_{s_i} \cdots T_{s_{n-1}} u &= \sum_{i=j+1}^n q^{n-i} (m_{(1^j, n-j)} u) \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-j-1} q^i \right) (m_{(1^j, n-j)} u) \\ &= [n-j]_q (m_{(1^j, n-j)} u). \end{aligned}$$

\square

Proposition 5.11 provides a set of eigenvectors of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$. We next show that if the kernel of every $\mathcal{B}_j^*(q)$ has the appropriate dimension, the method in Proposition 5.11 produces a full eigenbasis of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$.

Lemma 5.12. *Let $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ be semisimple and suppose that for all $0 \leq j \leq n$, one has*

$$\dim \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q) = d_j.$$

Then

- (1) Both $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ act semisimply on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ with eigenvalues $[0]_q, [1]_q, \dots, [n]_q$,

(2) The $[n-j]_q$ -eigenspace of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ carries the left $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -representation

$$\ker(\mathcal{B}_n^*(q) - [n-j]_q) \cong \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)}^{\mathcal{H}_n(q)} \left(\mathfrak{D}_j(q) \otimes \left(S^{(n-j)} \right)^* \right).$$

Proof. For each $0 \leq j \leq n$, define

$$(5.3) \quad N_j := \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}} \{ m_{(1^j, n-j)} u : u \in \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q) \}.$$

Observe that each N_j is closed under the left action of the subalgebra $\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)$ and carries the representation

$$\ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q) \otimes \left(S^{(n-j)} \right)^*.$$

Define V_j to be the left $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -module

$$V_j := \mathcal{H}_n(q) N_j.$$

Since each eigenspace $\ker(\mathcal{B}_n^*(q) - [n-j]_q)$ is closed under the left action of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, Proposition 5.11 implies there is a containment

$$(5.4) \quad V_j \subseteq \ker(\mathcal{B}_n^*(q) - [n-j]_q).$$

Recall from the proof of Lemma 3.12 that $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is free as a left $\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)$ -module with basis

$$\{ T_v : v \in X_{j,n-j} \}.$$

Similarly, $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is free as a right $\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)$ -module with basis $\{ T_{v^{-1}} : v \in X_{j,n-j} \}$.

Since $N_j \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)$ and

$$(5.5) \quad \mathcal{H}_n(q) = \bigoplus_{v \in X_{j,n-j}} T_{v^{-1}} \mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q),$$

it follows that V_j can be written as

$$(5.6) \quad V_j = \bigoplus_{v \in X_{j,n-j}} T_{v^{-1}} N_j.$$

We will construct an isomorphism

$$\gamma : \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)}^{\mathcal{H}_n(q)} (N_j) \longrightarrow V_j$$

as follows. By the definition of induction and (5.5), the domain can be written as

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)}^{\mathcal{H}_n(q)} (N_j) := \mathcal{H}_n(q) \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)} N_j = \bigoplus_{v \in X_{j,n-j}} \mathbb{C} T_{v^{-1}} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)} N_j.$$

Using the description of V_j as in (5.6), we define γ as

$$\gamma : T_{v^{-1}} \otimes n \longmapsto T_{v^{-1}} n,$$

which is an isomorphism by the above discussion of $\{ T_{v^{-1}} : v \in X_{j,n-j} \}$ as an $\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)$ -basis for $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

Hence, as left $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -modules

$$(5.7) \quad V_j \cong \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)}^{\mathcal{H}_n(q)} (N_j) \cong \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{j,n-j}(q)}^{\mathcal{H}_n(q)} \left(\ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q) \otimes \left(S^{(n-j)} \right)^* \right)$$

and

$$\dim V_j = \binom{n}{j} \cdot \dim \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q) = \binom{n}{j} d_j.$$

Thus

$$(5.8) \quad n! = \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} d_j = \sum_{j=0}^n \dim V_j \leq \sum_{j=0}^n \dim(\mathcal{B}_n^*(q) - [n-j]_q) \leq n!,$$

forcing the containments in (5.4) to be equalities. This proves that $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ acts on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ semisimply with eigenvalues $[j]_q$ for $0 \leq j \leq n$. Noting that $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ is the transpose of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ by Remark 2.2 then gives the analogous claim for $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$.

To prove (2), it suffices to show that $\mathfrak{D}_j(q) \cong \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q)$ as left $\mathcal{H}_j(q)$ -modules. To do so, we make use of the Frobenius characteristic map introduced in Section 3.1. Let

$$\mathcal{K}_j = \text{ch}(\ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q)).$$

Observe that $\bigoplus_{j=0}^n V_j \cong \mathcal{H}_n(q)$, which has Frobenius characteristic h_{1^n} . Taking the Frobenius characteristic of (5.7) and summing over all j implies that

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \mathcal{K}_j h_{n-j} = h_{1^n}.$$

By the characterization of $\mathfrak{D}_n(q)$ in (5.1), we conclude that $\mathfrak{D}_j(q) \cong \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q)$. \square

Finally, we are able to combine Proposition 5.10 and Lemma 5.12 in the case that $p = q^m$. We will be able to improve upon this result by taking $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ in Section 6 (Theorem 6.9) after proving Theorem 6.6.

Proposition 5.13. *Let $q = p^m$. Then the conditions of Lemma 5.12 are satisfied.*

Proof. Since the \mathbb{C} -algebra isomorphism τ is dimension preserving, we have for any $0 \leq j \leq n$

$$\dim \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q) = \dim \ker \mathcal{T}_j^*(q).$$

Combining Theorem 5.9 and Corollary 5.6 with Proposition 5.10, shows that $\ker \mathcal{T}_j^*(q) \cong \mathcal{D}_j(q)$, and therefore $\dim \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q) = d_j$. \square

One immediate consequence of Proposition 5.13 is the following:

Corollary 5.14. *For any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, the characteristic polynomials of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ are*

$$\chi(y, q) = \prod_{j=0}^n (y - [n-j]_q)^{\binom{n}{j} d_j}.$$

Proof. Observe that the matrix representing the action of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ with respect to the T_w basis has entries in $\mathbb{Z}[q]$. Hence, by Lemma 2.5, it suffices to prove the characteristic polynomial

$$\det(y \cdot 1 - \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)) = \prod_{j=0}^n (y - [n-j]_q)^{\binom{n}{j} d_j}$$

holds for infinitely many q , e.g. for all $q = p^m$. This follows immediately by Proposition 5.13. \square

6. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM: SPECTRUM FOR RANDOM-TO-RANDOM

Our final task is to apply our work in Sections 4 and 5 to compute the full spectrum of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ for any $q \in \mathbb{C}$. We show in Section 6.1 that when $q = p^m$, the set \mathfrak{B}_λ defines an eigenbasis of S^λ for every $\lambda \vdash n$. We use the $q = p^m$ case to compute the spectrum of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ for any q in Section 6.2, thereby proving our main result, Theorem 6.6. Finally, in Section 6.3.1, we use Theorem 6.6 and properties of real matrices to make stronger claims about $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ when $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. We also discuss special cases of Theorem 6.6, including Corollaries 1.3 describing $\mathcal{E}_{(n)\setminus\emptyset}(q)$ and 1.4 describing $\mathcal{E}_{(n-1,1)\setminus(1,1)}(q)$ from the introduction.

6.1. Sufficient conditions for an $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ -eigenbasis. The goal of this section is give sufficient conditions to describe when \mathfrak{B}_λ is a basis for S^λ , and show that these conditions are satisfied when $q = p^m$. We have already shown in Theorem 4.13 that when $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple, \mathfrak{B}_λ spans S^λ . In Lemmas 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 below, we show that the only additional ingredients needed to produce a genuine basis are that $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$\dim \ker \mathcal{R}_j(q) = d_j \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq j \leq n.$$

Lemma 6.1. *When $q \in \mathbb{R}$, one has $\ker \mathcal{R}_n(q) = \ker \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$.*

Proof. Note that since $\mathcal{R}_n(q) = \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)\mathcal{B}_n(q)$, there is a containment of left kernels: $\ker \mathcal{B}_n^*(q) \subset \ker \mathcal{R}_n(q)$. For a fixed $q \in \mathbb{R}$, the right actions of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$, $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ and $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ can be realized as real $n! \times n!$ matrices, and by Remark 2.2, the matrix $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ is the transpose of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$. The result then follows from the general fact that for any real, square matrix M with transpose M^\top , the following left kernels are equal:

$$\ker M \cdot M^\top = \ker M.$$

\square

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose $q \neq 0, -1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and for all $0 \leq j \leq n$ one has*

$$\dim \ker \mathcal{R}_j(q) = d_j.$$

Then $\ker \mathcal{R}_j(q) \cong \mathcal{D}_j(q)$, and thus for any partition $\mu \vdash j$

$$\dim \ker (\mathcal{R}_j(q)|_{S^\mu}) = d^\mu.$$

Proof. Since $q \in \mathbb{R}$, by Lemma 6.1, $\ker \mathcal{R}_j(q) = \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q)$. By assumption, $\dim \ker \mathcal{R}_j(q) = d_j$ for $0 \leq j \leq n$. Thus the same must be true for $\mathcal{B}_j^*(q)$, so the hypotheses of Lemma 5.12 are satisfied. Thus

$$\ker \mathcal{R}_j(q) = \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q) \cong \mathcal{D}_j(q) \cong \bigoplus_{t \in \mathcal{D}_j} S^{\text{sh}(t)}.$$

□

Recall that for a fixed λ of size n , by Lemma 4.14 the nonzero elements of \mathfrak{B}_λ are of the form

$$\{y_{\mu(u)}^\lambda = u \Phi_{t^{\lambda \setminus \mu}} \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)} p_\lambda : u \in \kappa_\mu \text{ and } \lambda \setminus \mu \text{ is a horizontal strip}\},$$

where κ_μ is a basis for $\ker (\mathcal{R}_{|\mu|}(q)|_{S^\mu})$. We will now show that whenever $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple and $|\kappa_\mu| = d^\mu$, the elements $y_{\mu(u)}^\lambda$ define a basis for S^λ .

Lemma 6.3. *If $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple and for any partition μ*

$$\dim \ker (\mathcal{R}_{|\mu|}(q)|_{S^\mu}) = d^\mu,$$

then the set \mathfrak{B}_λ defines an eigenbasis for the right action of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ on S^λ .

Proof. By Theorem 4.13 the set \mathfrak{B}_λ spans S^λ and by Lemma 4.14 consists of elements

$$\mathfrak{B}_\lambda = \{y_{\mu(u)}^\lambda : u \in \kappa_\mu \text{ for } \lambda \setminus \mu \text{ a horizontal strip}\}.$$

Thus it remains to prove that the $y_{\mu(u)}^\lambda$ are linearly independent. We will show that $|\mathfrak{B}_\lambda| = f^\lambda$, from which the result will follow. Since \mathfrak{B}_λ spans S^λ ,

$$\dim(S^\lambda) = f^\lambda \leq |\mathfrak{B}_\lambda|.$$

By assumption, $\dim \ker (\mathcal{R}_{|\mu|}(q)|_{S^\mu}) = d^\mu$, and thus \mathfrak{B}_λ has at most d^μ nonzero $y_{\mu(u)}^\lambda$ for each horizontal strip $\lambda \setminus \mu$ of λ , so

$$|\mathfrak{B}_\lambda| \leq \sum_{\lambda \setminus \mu \text{ a horizontal strip}} d^\mu.$$

Summing over all j in [45, Proposition 6.25] gives

$$\sum_{\lambda \setminus \mu \text{ a horizontal strip}} d^\mu = f^\lambda,$$

and so $|\mathfrak{B}_\lambda| = f^\lambda$. □

Using Lemmas 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3, we obtain an eigenbasis for S^λ in the case where $q = p^m$, where the kernel of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ is well-understood by Proposition 5.13.

Theorem 6.4. *When $q = p^m$, the set \mathfrak{B}_λ gives an eigenbasis for the right action of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ on S^λ .*

Proof. By Lemmas 6.2 and Lemma 6.3, it suffices to show that $\dim \ker \mathcal{R}_j(q) = d_j$ for $0 \leq j \leq n$. When $q = p^m$, by Proposition 5.13 we have $\dim \ker \mathcal{B}_j^*(q) = d_j$ for all $0 \leq j \leq n$, and so the same must be true for $\mathcal{R}_j(q)$ by Lemma 6.1. □

Remark 6.5 (Eigenbasis for $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$). Note that it is not difficult to construct an $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ -eigenbasis of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ using the eigenbasis for each S^λ by embedding each $y_{\mu(u)}^\lambda$ in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

For any composition ν , define the injective linear map

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : W^\nu &\hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_n(q) \\ w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n &\longmapsto m_\nu T_{\sigma_w}, \end{aligned}$$

where σ_w is the unique element in X_ν for which $w = \text{word}(\mathbf{t}^\nu)\sigma_w$. We abuse notation and write

$$\iota(y_{\mu(u)}^\lambda) := \iota(u \cdot \Phi_{\mathbf{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}}) \cdot \mathcal{C}_{|\mu|}^{(n)} \cdot p_\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_n(q).$$

Then using the construction in [39] (see Remark 2.25) a basis for the S^λ -isotypic component of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is

$$\left\{ p_{\mathbf{t}} \cdot m_\lambda \cdot \iota(y_{\mu(u)}^\lambda) : \mathbf{t} \in \text{SYT}(\lambda) \text{ and } y_{\mu(u)}^\lambda \in \mathfrak{B}_\lambda \right\}.$$

Varying over all λ gives a $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ -eigenbasis of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$.

6.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2: Spectrum of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$. Theorem 6.4 gives a complete understanding of how $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ acts on S^λ when $q = p^m$. We will at last apply this knowledge to compute the full spectrum fo $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ for any $q \in \mathbb{C}$.

Theorem 6.6 (Theorem 1.2). *For $q \in \mathbb{C}$, the action of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ has the following properties:*

- (1) *All eigenvalues of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ are of the form*

$$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) = q^n \mathbf{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) + \sum_{k=|\mu|+1}^n q^{n-k} [k]_q,$$

where $\lambda \setminus \mu$ is a horizontal strip with $|\lambda| = n$ and $0 \leq |\mu| \leq n$.

- (2) *The (algebraic) multiplicity of a fixed eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}(q)$ is given by*

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \setminus \mu \text{ a horizontal strip} \\ \mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) = \mathcal{E}(q)}} f^\lambda d^\mu,$$

where $d^\mu = |\kappa_\mu|$ is the number of desarrangement tableaux of shape μ .

- (3) *Every $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ is a polynomial in q with non-negative integer coefficients.*

Note that when $\lambda = \mu$, the formula $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda}(q)$ is vacuous, and so $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda}(q) = \mathcal{E}_\emptyset(q) = 0$.

Proof. We will prove each claim in turn. Observe that the matrix representing the action of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ on the T_w basis of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ has entries in $\mathbb{Z}[q]$. Hence, by Lemma 2.5, it suffices to prove (1) and (2) for infinitely many q . We will do so in the case that $q = p^m$.

- (1) Let $q = p^m$. By Theorem 6.4, for any $\lambda \vdash n$ the set \mathfrak{B}_λ is a basis of S^λ . By Proposition 4.5, each $y_{\mu(u)}^\lambda$ is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ with eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$. The bimodule decomposition of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ and Corollary 2.4 then gives the claim.
- (2) Again let $q = p^m$. For a fixed S^λ , the construction of the eigenbasis \mathfrak{B}_λ from Theorem 6.3, combined with Proposition 5.13 says that the eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ has multiplicity d^μ in S^λ . Thus by Corollary 2.4, the multiplicity of $(S^\lambda)^*$ in the $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ eigenspace of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ is d^μ . Since each $(S^\lambda)^*$ has dimension f^λ , this gives a single summand in the expression for (2). Summing over all $\lambda \setminus \mu$ where $\mathcal{E}(q) = \mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ then gives the claim.
- (3) Finally, we will prove that for all $q \in \mathbb{C}$

$$(6.1) \quad q^n \mathbf{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) + \sum_{k=|\mu|+1}^n q^{n-k} [k]_q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[q].$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} q^n \mathbf{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) + \sum_{k=|\mu|+1}^n q^{n-k} [k]_q &= \sum_{k=|\mu|+1}^n q^{n-k} (q^k \mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}, k}(q) + [k]_q) \\ &= \sum_{k=|\mu|+1}^n q^{n-k} [\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}, k} + k]_q, \end{aligned}$$

the claim follows by observing that $\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu}, k} \geq -k$ for all k .

□

Remark 6.7. Note that Theorem 6.6 neither claims that $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ acts semisimply on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ nor explains the left $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -representation structure on eigenspaces for general $q \in \mathbb{C}$. In fact, one can check that even when $n = 4$, $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ is not always diagonalizable, even when $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ is semisimple. However, as we will see in Theorem 6.9, when $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, we can make stronger claims, including constructing eigenbases for the Specht modules S^λ and the describing the representation structure of each eigenspace.

Remark 6.8 (Degree of $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ as a polynomial in q). For $\mu \subset \lambda$, define

$$C_{\lambda \setminus \mu} = \max_{|\mu|+1 \leq k \leq n} \{c_{\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda \setminus \mu, k}}\},$$

and set $C_{\lambda \setminus \lambda} = -n + 1$. Write $\deg(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q))$ to be the q -degree of $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$. Then Theorem 6.6 implies that

$$\deg(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)) = n + C_{\lambda \setminus \mu} - 1.$$

6.3. Special cases of Theorem 1.2 and analysis when q is a positive real number. We will use Theorem 6.6 and properties of real matrices to say more about $\mathcal{R}_n(q), \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ in the case that $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Note that this includes the setting that $q^{-1} \in (0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$ of probabilistic interest.

Theorem 6.9. *Suppose $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Then the following holds:*

- (1) *The right actions of $\mathcal{R}_n(q), \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$ on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ are diagonalizable.*
- (2) *The set \mathfrak{B}_λ is an $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ -eigenbasis of S^λ .*
- (3) *The $\mathcal{E}(q)$ -eigenspace of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ carries the left $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -representation*

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{\lambda \setminus \mu \text{ a horizontal strip:} \\ \mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) = \mathcal{E}(q)}} \underbrace{\left((S^\lambda)^* \oplus \cdots \oplus (S^\lambda)^* \right)}_{d_\mu \text{ copies}}.$$

- (4) *The $[j]_q$ -eigenspace of $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ carries the left $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ -representation*

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{H}_{j, n-j}(q)}^{\mathcal{H}_n(q)} \left(\mathfrak{D}_j(q) \otimes \left(S^{(n-j)} \right)^* \right).$$

Proof. We will first show that $\dim \ker \mathcal{R}_n(q) = d_n$ when $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, from which all of the claims will follow. To this end, note that since $q \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}_n(q) = \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)\mathcal{B}_n(q)$, the right action of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ can be represented as a real symmetric matrix, so it is diagonalizable. It follows that the dimension of the kernel of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ is equal to the algebraic multiplicity of $\mathcal{E}(q) = 0$ in Theorem 6.6.

Since $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ is a polynomial in q with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, by *Descartes' rule of signs* (see for instance [2]), if $\mu \neq \lambda$, then $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ has no positive real solutions. Thus the only zero eigenvalues of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ are of the form $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda}(q) = \mathcal{E}_\emptyset(q)$, and so by Theorem 6.6(2),

$$(6.2) \quad \dim \ker \mathcal{R}_n(q) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} f^\lambda d^\lambda = d_n.$$

Note that this argument holds for any $0 \leq j \leq n$. We are thus in the setting of Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3, which gives (2). Corollary 2.4 then gives (3).

Moreover, since $q \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $\ker \mathcal{B}_n^*(q) = \ker \mathcal{R}_n(q)$ by Lemma 6.1, so by equation (6.2) $\dim \ker \mathcal{B}_n^*(q) = d_n$. Hence, we are also in the setting of Lemma 5.12, which implies the remaining parts of (1) and (4). \square

Theorem 6.9 implies that the construction in Remark 6.5 gives an $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ -eigenbasis of $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ whenever $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Note that when $q \in \mathbb{R}$ is negative, we still have that $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ is diagonalizable, since it can be represented as a real, symmetric matrix. However, we can no longer ensure that $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) \neq 0$ for $\lambda \neq \mu$, and thus cannot conclude that the kernel of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ has dimension d_n in this setting. For example, this is certainly *not* the case when $q = -1$.

6.3.1. Special cases of Theorem 6.6. We conclude by applying Theorem 6.6 to compute the eigenvalues $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ in some special cases of interest.

The eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{(n)\setminus\emptyset}(q)$. Though it is not obvious from Theorem 6.6(1), the eigenvalue $\lambda = (n)$ and $\mu = \emptyset$ has the following simple expression.

Corollary 6.10. *For any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, when $\lambda = (n)$ and $\mu = \emptyset$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_{(n)\setminus\emptyset}(q) = ([n]_q)^2,$$

which has left and right eigenvector

$$m_{(n)} = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_n} T_w.$$

Proof. Applying Theorem 6.6(1), $\mathcal{E}_{(n)\setminus\emptyset}$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} q^n \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} [i]_q + \sum_{k=1}^n q^{n-k} [k]_q &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q^i (q^{n-i} [i]_q) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q^i [n-i]_q \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q^i (q^{n-i} [i]_q + [n-i]_q) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q^i [n]_q = [n]_q [n]_q = ([n]_q)^2. \end{aligned}$$

It is not hard to check that for any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, the element $m_{(n)}$ is always an eigenvector of $\mathcal{B}_n(q)$, $\mathcal{B}_n^*(q)$ and $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ with eigenvalues $[n]_q$ and $\mathcal{E}_{(n)\setminus\emptyset}(q) = ([n]_q)^2$, respectively. This follows from the fact that $\mathcal{R}_n(q) = \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)\mathcal{B}_n(q)$, the element $m_{(n)}$ is central in $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ and by Example 2.23

$$m_{(n)}\mathcal{B}_n^*(q) = [n]_q m_{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_n^*(q)m_{(n)} \quad m_{(n)}\mathcal{B}_n(q) = [n]_q m_{(n)} = \mathcal{B}_n(q)m_{(n)}.$$

□

Recall from the introduction that we defined in (1.3) the random walk $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_n(q)$ when $q^{-1} \in (0, 1]$. In the theory of Markov chains, the *stationary distribution* is the unique eigenvector for eigenvalue 1 (after normalization). In the case of $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_n(q)$, this corresponds to the eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{(n)\setminus\emptyset}(q)$.

Bufetov showed that any random walk on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ has stationary distribution given by the *Mallows measure* [15, Prop 2.3], defined below.

Definition 6.11 (Mallows Measure). *The Mallows measure of the symmetric group is*

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}_n, q^{-1}) := \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_n} q^{\ell(w)} \tilde{T}_w.$$

That $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_n(q)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_n^*(q)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_n(q)$ define random walks on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ thus immediately implies the following.

Corollary 6.12. *The stationary distributions of $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_n^*(q)$, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_n(q)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_n(q)$ are $\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}_n, q^{-1})$.*

Note that in our earlier notation,

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{S}_n, q^{-1}) = m_{(n)} = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_n} T_w.$$

Thus Corollary 6.12 is consistent with Corollary 6.10.

While it no longer makes sense to describe the “largest” eigenvalue for $q \in \mathbb{C}$, note that

$$\deg(\mathcal{E}_{(n)\setminus\emptyset}(q)) = 2n - 2 > \deg(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda\setminus\mu}(q))$$

for any other horizontal strip $\lambda \setminus \mu$.

The case $\lambda \setminus \mu = (n - 1, 1) \setminus (1, 1)$. The second largest eigenvalue of a Markov chain is of interest when computing the mixing time of the process. In [25], Dieker–Saliola show that the second largest eigenvalue is $\mathcal{E}_{(n-1,1)\setminus(1,1)} = (n - 2)(n + 1)$. We show that this formula generalizes to $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$ as follows.

Corollary 6.13. *For any $q \in \mathbb{C}$, when $\lambda = (n - 1, 1)$ and $\mu = (1, 1)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{E}_{(n-1,1)\setminus(1,1)}(q) = [n - 2]_q [n + 1]_q.$$

Proof. Applying Theorem 6.6(1),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{(n-1,1)\setminus(1,1)}(q) &= q^n ([1]_q + [2]_q + \cdots [n - 2]_q) + \sum_{k=3}^n q^{n-k} [k]_q \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} q^n [j]_q + q^{j-1} [n + 1 - j]_q \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} q^{j-1} [n + 1]_q \\ &= [n - 2]_q [n + 1]_q. \end{aligned}$$

□

The multiplicity of $\mathcal{E}_{(n-1,1)\setminus(1,1)}(q)$ is $n - 1$ if we treat q as an indeterminate. To see why, note first that by Theorem 6.6(2), we have $d^{(1,1)} = 1$ and $f^{(n-1,1)} = n - 1$. Second, we claim there are no other $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ with eigenvalue $[n - 2]_q [n + 1]_q$ as a polynomial in q . This follows from observing that

(1) By Remark 6.8,

$$\deg(\mathcal{E}_{(n-1,1)\setminus(1,1)}(q)) = 2n - 3 > \deg(\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q))$$

when $\lambda \neq (n)$ and $\lambda \setminus \mu \notin \{(n - 1, 1) \setminus (n - j, 1) : 1 \leq j \leq n - 1\}$

(2) By the eigenvalue formulas in Theorem 6.6,

$$\mathcal{E}_{(n-1,1)\setminus(1,1)}(q) - \mathcal{E}_{(n-1,1)\setminus(n-j,1)}(q) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[q] \setminus \{0\}$$

for $1 \leq j \leq n - 2$.

Observations (1) and (2) also suggest $\mathcal{E}_{(n-1,1)\setminus(1,1)}(q)$ is still the second largest eigenvalue of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ as $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ becomes large.

The kernel of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$. When $\lambda = \mu$, both sums in the formula for $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ in Theorem 6.6(1) are empty, hence $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \lambda}(q) = \mathcal{E}_{\emptyset}(q) = 0$ for all $q \in \mathbb{C}$. However, any solution to $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q) = 0$ will also contribute to the kernel of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$. As discussed in Theorem 6.9, $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ cannot have positive real solutions when $\mu \neq \lambda$, and so when $q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we can conclude that the multiplicity of 0 is d_n .

The eigenvalue on S^{1^n} . When n is even, the unique $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(1^n)$ is a desarrangement tableau, since $\text{Des}(\mathfrak{t}) = \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$, so $[n] \setminus \text{Des}(\mathfrak{t}) = \{n\}$. Thus in this case $\mathcal{E}_{(1^n)\setminus(1^n)}(q) = 0$.

When n is odd, $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{SYT}(1^n)$ is not a desarrangement tableau. The only horizontal strip of (1^n) is $(1^n) \setminus (1^{n-1})$. By Theorem 6.6(1),

$$\mathcal{E}_{(1^n)\setminus(1^{n-1})}(q) = q^n [-(n - 1)]_q + [n]_q = [n - (n - 1)]_q = [1]_q = 1.$$

Since $n - 1$ is even in this case, $d^{(1^{n-1})} = 1$, so $\mathcal{E}_{(1^n)\setminus(1^{n-1})}(q)$ occurs with multiplicity 1.

Eigenvalues with multiplicity zero: $d^\mu = 0$. The eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ is constructed from $u \in \kappa_\mu$. Hence if $\kappa_\mu = \emptyset$, the eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ will appear with multiplicity 0. This is reflected in Theorem 6.6(2), since if $\kappa_\mu = \emptyset$, then $d^\mu = 0$.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. C. Alcaraz, M. Droz, M. Henkel, and V. Rittenberg. Reaction-diffusion processes, critical dynamics, and quantum chains. *Annals of Physics*, 230(2):250–302, 1994.
- [2] B. Anderson, J. Jackson, and M. Sitharam. Descartes’ rule of signs revisited. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 105(5):447–451, 1998.

- [3] S. Assaf, P. Diaconis, and K. Soundararajan. Riffle shuffles of a deck with repeated cards. *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science*, (Proceedings), 2009.
- [4] C. A. Athanasiadis and P. Diaconis. Functions of random walks on hyperplane arrangements. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 45(3):410–437, 2010.
- [5] A. Ayer, S. Klee, and A. Schilling. Combinatorial Markov chains on linear extensions. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 39(4):853–881, 2014.
- [6] A. Ayer, O. Mandelshtam, and J. B. Martin. Modified macdonald polynomials and the multispecies zero range process: I. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06117*, 2020.
- [7] A. Ayer, O. Mandelshtam, and J. B. Martin. Modified macdonald polynomials and the multispecies zero range process: II. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.09859*, 2022.
- [8] A. Ayer, A. Schilling, B. Steinberg, and N. M. Thiéry. Markov chains, \mathcal{R} -trivial monoids and representation theory. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 25(1-2):169–231, 2015.
- [9] A. Ayer, A. Schilling, and N. M. Thiéry. Spectral gap for random-to-random shuffling on linear extensions. *Experimental Mathematics*, 26(1):22–30, 2017.
- [10] M. Bernstein and E. Nestoridi. Cutoff for random to random card shuffle. *The Annals of Probability*, 47(5):3303–3320, 2019.
- [11] P. Bidigare, P. Hanlon, and D. Rockmore. A combinatorial description of the spectrum for the Tsetlin library and its generalization to hyperplane arrangements. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 99(1):135–174, 1999.
- [12] A. Björner and F. Brenti. *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, volume 231. Springer, 2005.
- [13] S. Brauner, P. Commins, and V. Reiner. Invariant theory for the free left-regular band and a q -analogue. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 322(2):251–280, 2023.
- [14] K. S. Brown. Semigroups, rings, and Markov chains. *J. Theoret. Probab.*, 13(3):871–938, 2000.
- [15] A. Bufetov. Interacting particle systems and random walks on Hecke algebras. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02730*, 2020.
- [16] S. Corteel, J. Haglund, O. Mandelshtam, S. Mason, and L. Williams. Compact formulas for macdonald polynomials and quasisymmetric macdonald polynomials. *Selecta Mathematica*, 28(2):32, 2022.
- [17] S. Corteel, O. Mandelshtam, and L. Williams. Combinatorics of the two-species asep and koorwinder moments. *Advances in Mathematics*, 321:160–204, 2017.
- [18] S. Corteel, O. Mandelshtam, and L. Williams. Cylindric rhombic tableaux and the two-species asep on a ring. In *Representation Theory, Mathematical Physics, and Integrable Systems: In Honor of Nicolai Reshetikhin*, pages 135–162. Springer, 2021.
- [19] S. Corteel, O. Mandelshtam, and L. Williams. From multiline queues to macdonald polynomials via the exclusion process. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 144(2):395–436, 2022.
- [20] J. Désarménien and M. L. Wachs. Descentes des dérangements et mots circulaires. *Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire*, 19:13–21, 1988.
- [21] P. Diaconis. Mathematical developments from the analysis of riffle shuffling. *Groups, combinatorics & geometry (Durham, 2001)*, pages 73–97, 2003.
- [22] P. Diaconis, M. M. Grath, and J. Pitman. Riffle shuffles, cycles, and descents. *Combinatorica*, 15:11–29, 1995.
- [23] P. Diaconis and A. Ram. Analysis of systematic scan Metropolis algorithms using Iwahori–Hecke algebra techniques. *Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 48(1):157–190, 2000.
- [24] P. Diaconis, A. Ram, and M. Simper. Double coset Markov chains. In *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, volume 11, page e2. Cambridge University Press, 2023.
- [25] A. B. Dieker and F. V. Saliola. Spectral analysis of random-to-random Markov chains. *Adv. Math.*, 323:427–485, 2018.
- [26] R. Dipper and G. James. Blocks and idempotents of Hecke algebras of general linear groups. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 54(1):57–82, 1987.
- [27] B. Elias and M. Hogancamp. Categorical diagonalization of full twists. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00191*, 2017.
- [28] A. R. Francis and J. J. Graham. Centres of Hecke algebras: the Dipper–James conjecture. *Journal of algebra*, 306(1):244–267, 2006.
- [29] I. M. Gessel. Multipartite P -partitions and inner products of skew Schur functions. In *Combinatorics and algebra (Boulder, Colo., 1983)*, volume 34 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 289–317. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1984.
- [30] F. M. Goodman and H. Wenzl. Littlewood–Richardson coefficients for Hecke algebras at roots of unity. *Advances in Mathematics*, 82(2):244–265, 1990.
- [31] D. Grinberg. Math 235: Mathematical problem solving.
- [32] T. Halverson and A. Ram. Bitraces for $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and the Iwahori–Hecke algebra of type A_{n-1} . *Indag. Mathem.*, 10(2):247–268, 1999.
- [33] P. Hersh and V. Reiner. Representation stability for cohomology of configuration spaces in. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2017(5):1433–1486, 2017.
- [34] A. Jucys. Factorization of young’s projection operators for symmetric groups. *Litovsk. Fiz. Sb.*, 11:1–10, 1971.
- [35] D. Krob and J.-Y. Thibon. Noncommutative symmetric functions iv: Quantum linear groups and hecke algebras at $q=0$. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 6:339–376, 1997.
- [36] N. Lafrenière. Valeurs propres des opérateurs de mélanges symétrisés, [arxiv:1912.07718](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.07718). 2019.
- [37] B. Leclerc. A Littlewood–Richardson rule for evaluation representations of quantum affine $sl(n)$. *Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire*, 50:12, 2003.
- [38] J. B. Lewis, V. Reiner, and D. Stanton. Reflection factorizations of Singer cycles. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 40(3):663–691, 2014.
- [39] A. Mathas. Iwahori–Hecke algebras and Schur algebras of the symmetric group. *AMS University Lecture Series*, 15, 1999.

[40] G. Murphy. A new construction of Young’s seminormal representation of the symmetric groups. *Journal of Algebra*, 69(2):287–297, 1981.

[41] G. Murphy. On the representation theory of the symmetric groups and associated Hecke algebras. *Journal of Algebra*, 152(2):492–513, 1992.

[42] A. Okounkov and A. Vershik. A new approach to representation theory of symmetric groups. *Selecta Mathematica*, 2(4):581, 1996.

[43] R. M. Phatarfod. On the matrix occurring in a linear search problem. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 28:336–346, 1991.

[44] A. Ram. A Frobenius formula for the characters of the Hecke algebras. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 106(1):461–488, 1991.

[45] V. Reiner, F. Saliola, and V. Welker. Spectra of symmetrized shuffling operators. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, 2011.

[46] V. Reiner and P. Webb. The combinatorics of the bar resolution in group cohomology. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 190, 2004.

[47] J. Rhodes and A. Schilling. Unified theory for finite Markov chains. *Advances in Mathematics*, 347:739–779, 2019.

[48] R. Steinberg. A geometric approach to the representations of the full linear group over a galois field. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 71(2):274–282, 1951.

[49] J.-C. Uyemura-Reyes. *Random Walk, Semi-Direct Products, and Card Shuffling*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2002.

APPENDIX A. DATA

Below we include the spectrum of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ for $n = 2, 3, 4, 5$, where:


- Each row in the table corresponds to an eigenvalue $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ of $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ in S^λ . For the important cases of $\lambda \setminus \mu$ explained in Section 6.3.1, we write $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$ as computed in that section.
- The first column shows the corresponding λ with $\mu \subset \lambda$ shaded in gray. The boxes in $\lambda \setminus \mu$ are filled with the content they contribute to $\mathfrak{c}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}$.
- The third column indicates the (algebraic) multiplicity of the eigenvalue from $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ acting on S^λ as indicated by Theorem 6.3.
- The last column indicates the (algebraic) multiplicity of the eigenvalue from $\mathcal{R}_n(q)$ acting on $\mathcal{H}_n(q)$, as explained by Theorem 6.6.

$n = 2$.






Horizontal strip $\lambda \setminus \mu$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$	Multiplicity in $S^\lambda: d^\mu$	Multiplicity in $\mathcal{H}_n(q): d^\mu f^\lambda$
	$([2]_q)^2$	1	1
	0	1	1


$n = 3$.

Horizontal strip $\lambda \setminus \mu$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$	Multiplicity in $S^\lambda: d^\mu$	Multiplicity in $\mathcal{H}_n(q): d^\mu f^\lambda$
	$([3]_q)^2$	1	1
	0	1	2





	$q^3[1]_q + [3]_q = [1]_q \cdot [4]_q$	1	2
<hr/>			
	1	1	1










$n = 4.$






Horizontal strip $\lambda \setminus \mu$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$	Multiplicity in $S^\lambda: d^\mu$	Multiplicity in $\mathcal{H}_n(q): d^\mu f^\lambda$
	$([4]_q)^2$	1	1
<hr/>			
	0	1	3
	$q^4[2]_q + [4]_q$	1	3
	$q^4([1]_q + [2]_q) + (q[3]_q + [4]_q) = [2]_q \cdot [5]_q$	1	3
<hr/>			
	0	1	2
	$q^4[0]_q + [4]_q$	1	2
<hr/>			
	0	1	3
	$q^4[-2]_q + [4]_q$	1	3

	$q^4 ([-2]_q + [1]_q) + (q[3]_q + [4]_q)$	1	3
	0	1	1

$n = 5$.

Horizontal strip $\lambda \setminus \mu$	$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda \setminus \mu}(q)$	Multiplicity in $S^\lambda: d^\mu$	Multiplicity in $\mathcal{H}_n(q): d^\mu f^\lambda$
	$([5]_q)^2$	1	1
	0	1	4
	$q^5 [3]_q + [5]_q$	1	4
	$q^5 ([2]_q + [3]_q) + (q[4]_q + [5]_q)$	1	4
	$q^5 ([1]_q + [2]_q + [3]_q) + (q^2 [3]_q + q[4]_q + [5]_q) = [3]_q \cdot [6]_q$	1	4
	0	2	10
	$q^5 ([0]_q) + [5]_q$	1	5

	$q^5 ([2]_q) + [5]_q$	1	5
	$q^5 ([0]_q + [2]_q) + (q[4]_q + [5]_q)$	1	5
<hr/>			
	0	2	12
	$q^5 [-2]_q + [5]_q$	1	6
	$q^5 [2]_q + [5]_q$	1	6
	$q^5 ([-2]_q + [2]_q) + q[4]_q + [5]_q$	1	6
	$q^5 ([-2]_q + [1]_q + [2]_q) + (q^2[3]_q + q[4]_q + [5]_q)$	1	6
<hr/>			
	0	2	10
	$q^5 [-2]_q + [5]_q$	1	5
	$q^5 [0]_q + [5]_q$	1	5

	$q^5 ([0]_q + [-2]_q) + q[4]_q + [5]_q$	1	5
	0	2	8
	$q^5 [-3]_q + [5]_q$	1	4
	$q^5 [1]_q + [5]_q$	1	4
	1	1	1

Email address: ilani_af@mit.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE MA, 02139

Email address: sarahbrauner@gmail.com

LACIM, UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL, MONTRÉAL, QC H2X 3Y7

Email address: hchiang@umn.edu, commi010@umn.edu

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, MINNEAPOLIS MN 55455

Email address: langv@umich.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR MI 48109