On a generalization of corner trees

Joscha Diehl, Emanuele Verri

August 16, 2024

Corner trees, introduced in "Even-Zohar and Leng, 2021, Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms", allow for the efficient counting of certain permutation patterns.

Here we identify corner trees as a subset of finite (strict) double posets, which we term *twin-tree double posets*. They are contained in both *twin double posets* and *tree double posets*, giving candidate sets for generalizations of corner tree countings. We provide the generalization of an algorithm proposed by Even-Zohar/Leng to a class of tree double posets, thereby enlarging the space of permutations that can be counted in $\tilde{O}(n^{\frac{5}{3}})$.

Contents

1.	Counting permutations in linear time using corner trees	4
	1.1. Corner trees: counting linear combinations of permutation patterns	4
	1.2. Illustration of the algorithm that counts corner tree occurrences	6
2.	SN polytrees, relation to corner trees and double posets	9
	2.1. SN polytrees	9
	2.2. Double posets	11
3.	Counting permutations using double posets	15
	3.1. Linear functionals encoding number of morphisms	16
	3.2. Counting double poset morphisms when $D = \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{DP} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi) \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	17
	3.3. Which permutations are counted by double posets?	19
4.	Generalization of the algorithm which counts occurrences of [3214]	21
	4.1. Algorithm to count Type_A and Type_B_not_A $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	27
	4.2. Algorithm to count Type_not_A_not_B	29
	4.3. New directions at level 5	32
5.	Conclusion and outlook	33
6.	Open questions	34

A. Morphisms in the category of finite strict partial orders						
	A.1.	Characterization of regular monomorphisms	38			
	A.2.	Characterization of regular epimorphisms	41			
	A.3.	Factorization	46			
в.	Morn	hisms in the category of double posets	48			
		mome in the category of adapte percete				
	B.1.	Characterization of regular monomorphisms	49			
	B.1. B.2.	Characterization of regular epimorphisms	49 51			
	B.1. B.2. B.3.	Characterization of regular monomorphisms	49 51 52			

Overview

This work is organized as follows

- In Section 1, we recall the definition of corner trees and the algorithm used to count their occurrences in permutations.
- In Section 2, we show how moving the root within a corner tree does not affect the counted patterns, leading to the concept of SN polytrees, i.e. polytrees with edges labeled by S or N. We then introduce two families of double posets: tree double posets and twin double posets. We show that SN polytrees are equivalent to double posets that belong to both classes, termed twin tree double posets. Additionally, we encode permutations as double posets, where both posets are linear orders, and show that occurrences of corner trees on permutations can be viewed as maps preserving both orders.
- In Section 3, we show that counting morphisms from double posets to a permutation can be reformulated as a linear combination of pattern occurrences. This reformulation allows us to explore different classes of double posets, beyond twin tree double posets, for pattern counting.
- In Section 4, we generalize an algorithm originally developed in EL21 to count the pattern [3214]. We introduce a new family of tree double posets for which this algorithm is applicable, leading to six new directions at level five that can be computed in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{\frac{5}{3}})$ time.
- In Section 6 we present conjectures and open questions.
- In Appendix A , we show how morphisms can be factorized within the category of (strict) posets. These results are then used in Appendix B, where we extend the factorization approach to the category of (strict) double posets.

Contributions

• We recognize the counting of corner tree occurrences in permutations as the counting of homomorphisms between specific families of double posets. Namely, corner trees correspond to those double posets whose Hasse diagrams are both trees in the graph theoretical sense and are equal as labeled undirected graphs. On the other hand, permutations can just be

seen as pairs of linear orders. We show that counting homomorphisms from any double poset to a permutation always corresponds to a certain linear combination of pattern occurrences. Therefore, in principle, we can consider any family of double posets to count patterns and generalize the framework introduced in EL21.

- In an extensive appendix, we elucidate regular monomorphisms and regular epimorphisms in the category of posets and the category of double posets. We show that any double poset morphism can either be factored as a regular epimorphism composed with a monomorphism or as an epimorphism composed with a regular monomorphism. This allows us to recover analogs of mappings that are used to switch between homomorphism and embedding numbers in the category of simple graphs. In our setting, we show how they can be used to understand the patterns counted by double posets.
- Using a family of tree double posets, we extend the algorithm to count [3214] from EL21 to a wider range of patterns, thereby adding six dimensions to the space of level-five patterns countable in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{5/3})$.

Notation

- $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, ...\}$ denotes the non-negative integers.
- The set of permutations $\mathfrak{S} := \bigcup_{n \ge 0} \mathfrak{S}(n)$, where $[n] := \{1, ..., n\}$ and $\mathfrak{S}(n) := \{f | f : [n] \to [n] \text{ is a bijection}\}$. We use lowercase greek letters to denote "small" permutations $\sigma, \tau, \dots \in \mathfrak{S}$. To indicate a specific permutation, we use the one-line notation and write $[2 \, 1 \, 3]$, for example.
- To denote "large" permutations, we use capital greek letters like $\Pi, \Lambda \in \mathfrak{S}$.
- The set of (isomorphism classes of) corner trees CornerTrees := U_{n≥0} CornerTrees(n) and ct ∈ CornerTrees, see Definition 1.1.
- The set of (isomorphism classes of) SN polytrees $SNpolyT := \bigcup_{n\geq 0} SNpolyT(n)$ and $T_{SN} \in SNpolyT$, see Definition 2.1.
- The set of (isomorphism classes of) double posets $\mathsf{DP} := \bigcup_{n \ge 0} \mathsf{DP}(n)$ and $\mathsf{d} \in \mathsf{DP}$.
- A double poset (A, P_A, Q_A) , written explicitly as a triple, where A is a finite set and P_A, Q_A are strict partial order relation, see Definition A.1.
- A "large" double poset $D \in \mathsf{DP}$.
- Twin double posets as $twin \in TwinDP$, see Definition 2.8.
- Tree double posets as $t \in \mathsf{TreeDP}$ see Definition 2.9.
- Twin tree double poset as $tt \in TwinTreeDP$ Definition 2.10.
- Tree double posets for which our generalization of the algorithm to count [3214] works, $t_{Algo} \in Tree_{Algo}$, see the beginning of Section 4.
- For double posets $t \in \mathsf{TreeDP}(n)$ or $\mathsf{twin} \in \mathsf{TwinDP}(n)$ we will also denote the first poset as $<_{\mathsf{West}}$ and the second as $<_{\mathsf{South}}$. This terminology stems from permutations, encoded

as double posets, where both $<_{West}$, $<_{South}$ are linear and each point is comparable. We are allowed to say that a point is "to the North" or "to the South" of another, for example. We also speak of points to the "to the most east", i.e. maximal points, for example.

- $\Psi_{SN\leftarrow CT}$ the map taking a corner tree ct to its underlying SN polytree, see Definition 2.2.
- Say T_{SN} is a SN polytree then $\Psi_{CT \leftarrow SN}(T_{SN}, v)$ is the map sending this SN polytree to the associated corner tree rooted at $v \in V(T_{SN})$, see Definition 2.3.
- $\Psi_{\mathsf{TTDP}\leftarrow\mathsf{SN}}$ the map taking a SN polytree to its respective twin tree double poset, see Lemma 2.11.
- $\Psi_{SN\leftarrow TTDP}$ the map taking a twin tree double poset to its respective SN polytree, see Lemma 2.11.
- $\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}$ is the map taking a permutation to its double poset representation, see Definition 2.12.
- $\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}$ is the map taking a permutation represented as a double poset to its underlying permutation, see Definition 2.12.
- $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} := \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\mathfrak{S})$ is the set of permutations, embedded into double posets.

1. Counting permutations in linear time using corner trees

1.1. Corner trees: counting linear combinations of permutation patterns

Corner trees were introduced by EL21 to count permutation patterns in almost¹ linear time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$. In the original work by EL21, these are finite rooted trees whose vertices, except for the root, are labeled with the four directions NE, NW, SE and SW. Here we use an equivalent formulation and instead label the edges with the four directions.²

Definition 1.1. A corner tree, for us, is a rooted tree ct := (V(ct), E(ct)) equipped with a mapping

 $\mathrm{E}(\mathsf{ct}) \to \{\mathsf{NE},\mathsf{NW},\mathsf{SE},\mathsf{SW}\}.$

¹It is linear up to a polylogarithmic factor.

 $^{^{2}}$ This, for example, makes the formulation of the algorithms more transparent to us (see Section 1.2).



Figure 1: Example of a corner tree.

Here we recall the definition presented in EL21 which motivate the labels assigned to the edges.

Definition 1.2. An occurrence of a corner tree ct in a permutation $\Pi \in \mathfrak{S}$ is a mapping $f : V(\mathsf{ct}) \to [n]$ such that $\forall e \in E(\mathsf{ct})$, where e = (v, v') (v' is the child of v) the label of e determines the allowed order in the image as follows

label(e)	NE	NW	SE	SW
f(v') < f(v)	×	\checkmark	×	\checkmark
f(v') > f(v)	\checkmark	×	\checkmark	×
$\Pi(f(v')) < \Pi(f(v))$	×	×	\checkmark	\checkmark
$\Pi(f(v')) > \Pi(f(v))$	\checkmark	\checkmark	×	×

Corner trees are a tool to efficiently count permutation patterns.

Definition 1.3. Consider the free \mathbb{Q} -vector space on permutations, $\mathbb{Q}[\mathfrak{S}] := \bigoplus_n \mathbb{Q}[\mathfrak{S}(n)]$, and fix a "large" permutation $\Pi \in \mathfrak{S}(n)$. Define on basis elements $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$ the linear functional

$$\langle \mathsf{PC}(\Pi), \sigma \rangle := |\{A \subset [n]| \operatorname{std}(\Pi|_A) = \sigma\}|$$

where, for example std($[15324]|_{\{2,3,5\}}$) = [312]. Then $\langle PC(\Pi), \sigma \rangle$ corresponds to the number of times that σ arises as a **permutation pattern** in Π .

Occurrences of corner trees count linear combinations of permutation patterns, as the following example hints at, and as will be shown in Proposition 3.8. See also Remark 3.9.

Example 1.4. If we consider occurrences of the corner tree \bigcirc^{\frown}_{Ξ} in a permutation Λ , these are exactly the occurences of the permutation [12] in Λ , i.e. their number is equal to $\langle \mathsf{PC}(\Lambda), [12] \rangle$.

While for the corner tree $\overset{*}{\circ}$ the number of occurences in Λ is equal to

$$(\mathsf{PC}(\Lambda), [1\,2] + 2 \cdot [1\,2\,3] + 2 \cdot [1\,3\,2]).$$

We will see that for a fixed corner tree, counting these corner-tree occurences in a permutation, always corresponds to a certain linear combination of permutation patterns. We will also see that these maps are order-preserving when we frame corner trees and permutations in the context of double posets.

1.2. Illustration of the algorithm that counts corner tree occurrences

Corner trees are introduced in EL21 because counting their occurrences in a permutation can be done in almost linear time, thanks to the following algorithm they introduce. (Adapted to our indexing of corner trees.)

```
def vertex(Pi, ct, v):
    , , ,
     Pi : (large) permutation
      ct : corner tree
      v : vertex of ct
     returns X, where X[i] tells us:
     How many ways can we place the children of v
      when we place v at (i,Pi(i)).'''
   X = [1, ..., 1]
    for e in child-edges(v):
        X = X * edge(Pi, ct, e)
    return X
def edge(Pi, ct, e):
    , , ,
     Pi : (large) permutation
      ct : corner tree
      e : edge of ct
      returns Z, where Z[i] tells us:
     How many ways can we place child(e)
      when we place parent(e) at (i,Pi(i)).'''
    X = vertex(Pi, ct, child(v))
    Z = [0, ..., 0]
    Y = [0, \ldots, 0] \# This will be implemented as a sum-tree.
    order = [1, ..., N] if label(e) in ['NW', 'SW'] else [N, ..., 1]
    for i in order:
            Y[Pi[i]] = X[i]
                     = Y.prefix_sum( Pi[i] ) if label(e) in ['SE', 'SW']
            Z[i]
                  else Y.suffix_sum( Pi[i] )
```

return Z

Observe that sum(vertex(Pi,ct,root)) will yield the number of occurrences of ct in Pi.

Remark 1.5. The array Y in the algorithm is implemented as a sum-tree, SV82. This is a data structure that has logarithmic cost for inserting a number into the array, as well as for prefix and postfix sums. This leads to the logarithmic factor in the complexity (Theorem 1.8).

In Figure 2, an array stored as a sum-tree, i.e. a complete binary tree with depth $\lceil \log n \rceil$, see EL19. The array is stored at the leaves and each ancestor contains the sum of its two children. Updating the array at i costs $\log n$ since we only need to update the ancestors of the i-th leaf. Computing prefix sums at i also costs $\log n$ because we need to sum over the left siblings of the ancestors of the i-th leaf.



Figure 2: Update of an array stored as a sum-tree

Example 1.6. Let

$$\mathsf{ct} = \bigcup_{(b)}^{(a)} \Pi = [34251].$$

Below, we illustrate the loop that is run when evaluating $edge(\Pi, ct, (a, b))$. Since the label is NW, we only perform suffix sums. The columns of the tables on the right are the arrays Y and Z at each iteration, from left to right. The respective column header indicates which entry of the array is updated. Zeros are omitted for readability.



	$Y[\Pi(1)]$	$Y[\Pi(2)]$	$Y[\Pi(3)]$	$Y[\Pi(4)]$	$Y[\Pi(5)]$
5				1	1
4		1	1	1	1
3	1	1	1	1	1
2			1	1	1
1					1
	Z[1]	Z[2]	Z[3]	Z[4]	Z[5]
5					4
4					
3			2	2	2
2					
1					

Example 1.7. Let



We start counting at the leaves

$$\operatorname{vertex}(\Pi, \mathsf{ct}, b) = \frac{1}{1} \operatorname{vertex}(\Pi, \mathsf{ct}, c) = \frac{1}{1$$

and then going up the edges

edge(II, ct, (a, b)) =
$$4^{3}$$
, edge(II, ct, (a, c)) = 0^{4} , edge(II, ct, (a, c)) = 0^{4}

We then take the entry-wise product

$$edge(\Pi, \mathsf{ct}, (a, b)) \cdot edge(\Pi, \mathsf{ct}, (a, c)) = vertex(\Pi, \mathsf{ct}, a) = 0^{4} \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}$$

and finally

$$edge(\Pi, \mathsf{ct}, (r, a)) = \operatorname{vertex}(\Pi, \mathsf{ct}, r) = 6^{6} \sqrt{\binom{1}{0}}$$

Summing vertex(Π , ct, r) yields the number of occurrences.

We now recall Theorem 1.1 from in EL21.

Theorem 1.8 (EL21). Let $\Pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and let $\mathsf{ct} \in \mathsf{CornerTrees}$. Then counting

$$|\{f|f: \mathbf{V}(\mathsf{ct}) \to [n]: f \text{ is a occurrence of } \mathsf{ct} \text{ on } \Pi\}|$$

costs $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$.

2. SN polytrees, relation to corner trees and double posets

It is immediate to check that re-rooting a corner tree (and changing the edge labels accordingly) leads to the same occurrence count in a permutation. Hence, to get rid of (some) redundancies we consider unrooted, directed trees with north/south labels, "SN polytrees".

Moreover, we show that both SN polytrees and permutations can be seen as (certain kinds of) double posets. We then show that occurrences of corner trees in permutations are morphisms within the category of double posets.

2.1. SN polytrees

In RP87 the authors study directed graphs whose underlying undirected graphs are trees and introduce the terminology *polytree*. Here we show that corner trees can be seen as polytrees endowed with a binary labeling on the edges.

Definition 2.1. An SN polytree is a polytree whose edges are labeled either with S or N.



Figure 3: Example of an SN polytree

Definition 2.2. Given a corner tree ct = (V(ct), E(ct)) we define the SN polytree $\Psi_{SN\leftarrow CT}(ct)$ as follows. Take the original vertex set

$$V(\Psi_{\mathsf{SN}\leftarrow\mathsf{CT}}(\mathsf{ct})) := V(\mathsf{ct}).$$

Every edge of ct leads to exactly one directed edge of $\Psi_{SN\leftarrow CT}(ct)$ as follows: The directed edges of $\Psi_{SN\leftarrow CT}(ct)$ point west and the label denotes the SN position of the target with respect to the source.

For example



Figure 4: From a corner tree to its associated SN polytree

The other way around, to a SN polytree and a choice of its vertices as a root, we can associate a corner tree.

Definition 2.3 (SN polytree and related corner trees). Let T_{SN} be a SN polytree and $V(T_{SN})$ be its set of vertices. Forget the directions and labels of the edges of T_{SN} to obtain a tree T. Fix a vertex $v \in V(T_{SN}) = V(T)$, and consider the resulting rooted tree with root v. Label the edges as follows:

- SE, if the corresponding edge (in the polytree) points towards the parent (in the rooted tree) and is labeled N
- NE, if the corresponding edge (in the polytree) points towards the parent (in the rooted tree) and is labeled S
- NW, if the corresponding edge (in the polytree) points towards the child (in the rooted tree) and is labeled N
- SW, if the corresponding edge (in the polytree) points towards the child (in the rooted tree) and is labeled S

This yields a corner tree $\Psi_{\mathsf{CT}\leftarrow\mathsf{SN}}(\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}}, v)$.

We define the set-valued map

$$\Psi_{\mathsf{CT}\leftarrow\mathsf{SN}}(\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}}) := \{\Psi_{\mathsf{CT}\leftarrow\mathsf{SN}}(\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}}, v) \mid v \in \mathrm{V}(\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}})\}.$$

Remark 2.4. Notice that different rootings for an SN polytree could yield instances of the same (isomorphism classes 3 of) corner trees. For instance, the three different rootings of



are shown in Figure 5. The image of $\Psi_{\mathsf{CT}\leftarrow\mathsf{SN}}$ where unlabeled corner trees appear is shown in Figure 6.



Figure 5: The three possible rootings.

³The isomorphism between corner trees is the usual notion of isomorphism between rooted trees which respect the edge labels.





SN polytrees are in bijection with the equivalence class of corner trees modulo re-rooting, as the following lemma, whose proof is immediate, encodes.

Lemma 2.5. Given $ct \in CornerTrees$ and considering the root $r \in V(ct)$ we have

$$\mathsf{ct} = \Psi_{\mathsf{CT} \leftarrow \mathsf{SN}}(\Psi_{\mathsf{SN} \leftarrow \mathsf{CT}}(\mathsf{ct}), r).$$

For any SN polytree T_{SN} and $v \in V(T_{SN})$,

$$\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}} = \Psi_{\mathsf{SN}\leftarrow\mathsf{CT}}(\Psi_{\mathsf{CT}\leftarrow\mathsf{SN}}(\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}},v)).$$

2.2. Double posets

A (strict) **double poset** is a triple (A, P_A, Q_A) where A is a (finite) set, and P_A and Q_A are strict posets on A. We also write d to denote the double poset itself. We refer to Appendix A for a review of strict partial orders.

Since we work with *finite* double posets we can always draw the **Hasse diagram**, i.e. the underlying cover relation, which is in *one-to-one correspondence* with the poset. We denote the Hasse diagram of a poset P with H_P .

Remark 2.6. We work with strict posets, where the morphisms correspond to strict orderpreserving maps, since this will lead to the connection with corner tree occurences, Proposition 2.15.

Definition 2.7. A morphism of double posets $d = (A, P_A, Q_A)$ and $d' = (B, P_B, Q_B)$ is a map $f : A \to B$ such that

$$\forall a_1, a_2 \in A : a_1 <_{P_A} a_2 \implies f(a_1) <_{P_B} f(a_2)$$

$$\forall a_1, a_2 \in A : a_1 <_{Q_A} a_2 \implies f(a_1) <_{Q_B} f(a_2)$$

We now define certain classes of double posets. Corner trees and permutations will arise as elements of these classes.

Definition 2.8 (Twin double poset). A double poset d is a twin double poset if the underlying two Hasse diagrams are equal as (vertex-)labeled, undirected graphs. We denote a general twin double poset with twin.

Definition 2.9 (Tree double poset). A double poset d is a tree double poset if the underlying Hasse diagrams are both trees (in the graph-theoretic, undirected sense). See the terminology used in TM77 at the beginning of Section 7. We denote a general tree double poset with t.

Definition 2.10 (Twin tree double posets). A double poset d is a twin tree double poset if it is both a twin double poset and a tree double poset. We denote a general twin tree double poset with tt.

Spelled out, if H_P and H_Q are the Hasse diagrams, then as undirected graphs

- they are (labeled) trees;
- they are equal as unrooted, labeled trees.



Figure 7: Examples: pairs of Hasse diagrams.

Corner trees are twin tree double posets in disguise, as the following lemma shows. Indeed, SN polytrees are equivalent to twin tree double posets.

Lemma 2.11. Let T_{SN} be a SN polytree. Define the following relations $<'_{West}$ and $<'_{South}$ on $V(T_{SN})$

$$\begin{split} & u <'_{\mathsf{West}} v \iff (u, v) \in \mathrm{E}(\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}}) \\ & u <'_{\mathsf{South}} v \iff (u, v) \in \mathrm{E}(\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}}) \text{ and its label is } \mathsf{S} \\ & v <'_{\mathsf{South}} u \iff (u, v) \in \mathrm{E}(\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}}) \text{ and its label is } \mathsf{N} \end{split}$$

(Here we use the convention that $(u, v) \in E(T_{SN})$ means that the arrow is pointing towards u.)

Let $<_{West}$ and $<_{South}$ be the respective transitive closures of $<'_{West}$ and $<'_{South}$. Then the double poset $(V(T_{SN}), <_{West}, <_{South})$ is a twin tree double poset. The map

$$\begin{split} \Psi_{\mathsf{TTDP}\leftarrow\mathsf{SN}}:\mathsf{SNpolyT}\to\mathsf{TwinTreeDP}\\ \mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}}\mapsto(\mathrm{V}(\mathsf{T}_{\mathsf{SN}}),<_{\mathsf{West}},<_{\mathsf{South}}) \end{split}$$

is a bijection whose inverse we denote with $\Psi_{SN\leftarrow TTDP}$.

Proof. Since the graphs underlying the relations $<'_{West}$ and $<'_{South}$ are polytrees, it means that there is no <u>undirected</u> cycles on these graphs. Therefore the transitive closure is again an asymmetric relation, i.e.

$$u <_{\mathsf{West}} v \implies \neg(v <_{\mathsf{West}} u)$$

We proceed analogously for $<_{\text{South}}$. It is immediate to verify that as a double poset, this is both a twin and a tree. To show that $\Psi_{\text{TTDP}\leftarrow\text{SN}}$ is a bijection we can rely on the well-known fact that Hasse diagrams are in one-to-one correspondence with their respective posets. Similarly, one can argue that pairs of Hasse diagrams are in one-to-one correspondence with their respective double posets.



Figure 8: SN polytree and its corresponding twin tree double poset

The following map allows us to consider permutations as strict double posets as well.

Definition 2.12. Let

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} := \{ (\{1, ..., n\}, 1 < \dots < n, \sigma^{-1}(1) < \dots < \sigma^{-1}(n)) : \sigma \in \mathfrak{S} \} \subset \mathsf{DP}.$$

Define

$$\begin{split} \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}} &: \mathfrak{S} \to \mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \\ & \sigma \mapsto (\{1, ..., n\}, 1 < \dots < n, \sigma^{-1}(1) < \dots < \sigma^{-1}(n)). \end{split}$$

This map is obviously bijective and we denote its "inverse" by $\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}$.

Example 2.13. Consider the permutation $\sigma = [312]$. Then

$$\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma) = (\{1,2,3\}, 1 < 2 < 3, 2 < 3 < 1)$$

and

$$\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}((\{1,2,3\}, 1<2<3, 2<3<1)) = [\texttt{312}]$$

Remark 2.14. For any permutation σ , $\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma) \in \mathsf{TreeDP}$. We have $\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma) \in \mathsf{TwinTreeDP}$ only for the cases $\sigma = \mathrm{id}$ and $\sigma = [\mathsf{n} \dots \mathsf{321}]$ (the full reversal).

With these maps in hand, we can now characterize corner tree occurences as morphisms in the category of double posets.

Proposition 2.15. Let $\Pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and $\mathsf{ct} \in \mathsf{CornerTrees}$. Then

 $\{f: \mathsf{V}(\mathsf{ct}) \to [n] : f \text{ is an occurrence of } \mathsf{ct} \text{ in } \Pi\} = \mathsf{Mor}(\Psi_{\mathsf{SN}\leftarrow\mathsf{TTDP}}(\Psi_{\mathsf{SN}\leftarrow\mathsf{CT}}(\mathsf{ct})), \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi), \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi), \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi), \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi), \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi), \Psi_\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi), \Psi_\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi), \Psi_\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi), \Psi_\mathfrak{S}(\Pi), \Psi_\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi), \Psi_\mathfrak{S}(\Pi), \Psi_\mathfrak{S}(\Pi), \Psi_\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)$

where Mor(d, d') denotes the set of morphisms between the double posets d, d'.

Proof. Let f be an occurrence and without loss of generality assume the label of e := (v, v') to be SW. Then

$$f(v) < f(v'), \Pi(f(v)) < \Pi(f(v')).$$

By construction we have $v <_{West} v'$ and $v <_{South} v'$, More explicitly we can write

 $f(v) <_{1 < \dots < n} f(v'), \Pi(f(v)) <_{1 < \dots < n} \Pi(f(v'))$

which implies

$$f(v) <_{1 < \dots < n} f(v'), f(v) <_{\Pi^{-1}(1) < \dots < \Pi^{-1}(n)} f(v')$$

For the other direction, let $f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\Psi_{\mathsf{SN}\leftarrow\mathsf{TTDP}}(\Psi_{\mathsf{SN}\leftarrow\mathsf{CT}}(\mathsf{ct})),\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi))$. This means

$$\begin{split} v <_{\mathsf{West}} v' \implies f(v) <_{1 < \dots < n} f(v'), \\ v <_{\mathsf{South}} v' \implies f(v) <_{\Pi^{-1}(1) < \dots < \Pi^{-1}(n)} f(v') \end{split}$$

This implies

$$f(v) <_{1 < \dots < n} f(v'), \Pi(f(v)) <_{1 < \dots < n} \Pi(f(v'))$$

Write $tt := \Psi_{SN \leftarrow TTDP}(\Psi_{SN \leftarrow CT}(ct))$ and consider

$$\Psi_{\mathsf{CT}\leftarrow\mathsf{SN}}(\Psi_{\mathsf{SN}\leftarrow\mathsf{TTDP}}(\mathtt{tt}), root)$$

where *root* is the root node of ct. Without loss of generality assume that v' is the child node of v, then the label of e = (v, v') is SW, and we are done.

Consider Figure 9 and Figure 10. The mappings $f, f' : \{a, b, c\} \rightarrow [3], f(a) = 2, f(b) = 3, f(c) = 1$

and f'(a) = 3, f'(b) = 2, f'(c) = 1 are occurrences of the corner tree on the permutation. They can also be seen as morphisms between the two underlying double posets.



Figure 9: A corner tree, its corresponding SN polytree and its corresponding twin tree double poset.



Figure 10: A permutation (left) and its correspondent double poset (right).

3. Counting permutations using double posets

In Section 3.1 we introduce two linear mappings that allow us to switch between counting different types of morphisms between double posets. These maps are analogs of the ones used in the setting of graphs to switch between homomorphisms and embeddings, see Lov12. Here we show that they are linear isomorphisms, see Theorem 3.2. In our setting, we use them to understand the permutations counted by double posets, see Proposition 3.8 and Theorem 3.12.

From Proposition 2.15 we know that occurrences of corner trees in permutations are maps between double posets. And from EL21 we know that they that count linear combinations of permutation patterns. In Section 3.2 we will see that this is an instance of a more general phenomenon: maps from a double poset to a permutation (intended as a double poset) always count linear combinations of patterns' occurrences (see Proposition 3.8).

In general, double posets count permutations also at "lower levels". In other words, the map taking us from double posets to permutations is a filtered map. In Section 3.3 we show that the permutations counted by TwinDP can be studied "layer by layer" using the maps from Section 3.1, see Theorem 3.12.

3.1. Linear functionals encoding number of morphisms

Consider the set of isomorphism classes of finite double posets, DP. We work with the free \mathbb{Q} -vector space on DP

$$\bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)],$$

where DP(n) denotes the set of equivalence classes of double posets with n elements. We now introduce three linear functionals. For details on the morphisms in the category of strict double posets, we refer to Appendix B.

Definition 3.1. Fix a (large) double poset $D \in \bigcup_n DP(n)$. On basis elements $d \in \bigcup_n DP(n)$ define linear functionals $\bigoplus_n \mathbb{Q}[DP(n)] \to \mathbb{Q}$.

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathsf{D}), \mathsf{d} \rangle := \#\mathsf{Mor}(\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{D})$$

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{mono}}(\mathsf{D}), \mathsf{d} \rangle := \#\mathsf{Mono}(\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{D})$$

 $\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{regmono}}(D), d\rangle := \#\mathsf{RegMono}(d, D).$

We now introduce linear maps which allow to translate between these three different type of morphisms. These maps are linear isomorphisms. Analogous linear maps on simple graphs are defined in Cau+22. They were originally introduced by Lovasz (Lov12) to count subgraphs and induced subgraphs in terms of graph homomorphisms. In our context, these maps can be used to obtain the permutation patterns counted by double posets.

Theorem 3.2. The maps

$$\begin{split} \Phi_{\mathsf{mono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}} &: \bigoplus_n \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)] \to \bigoplus_n \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)] \\ \mathsf{d} &\mapsto \sum_{\mathsf{d}'} \frac{|\mathsf{RegEpi}(\mathsf{d},\mathsf{d}')|}{|\mathsf{Aut}(\mathsf{d}')|} \mathsf{d}' \end{split}$$

and

$$\begin{split} \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}} &: \bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)] \to \bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)] \\ & \mathsf{d} \mapsto \sum_{\mathsf{d}'} \frac{|\mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{d},\mathsf{d}')|}{|\mathsf{Aut}(\mathsf{d}')|} \mathsf{d}' \end{split}$$

are linear isomorphisms. These maps are filtered. They are (obviously) graded if we change the grading on the domain as follows

$$\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}:\bigoplus_{n}\mathbb{Q}[\Phi_{\mathsf{Mor}\leftarrow\mathsf{regmono}}(\mathsf{DP}(n))]\to\bigoplus_{n}\mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)]$$

An analogous statement holds for for $\Phi_{\mathsf{mono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}' \in \mathsf{DP}(n)$ and $\mathsf{RegEpi}(\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}') \neq \emptyset$. Then, this implies $\mathsf{Iso}(\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}') \neq \emptyset$, using the well-known fact that an arrow that is both a regular epimorphism and a monomorphism is an isomorphism. Therefore $\Phi_{\mathsf{mono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}$ sends basis elements to basis elements bijectively and we are done.

Regarding $\Phi_{\text{regmono}\leftarrow\text{Mor}}$, order the isomorphism classes of double posets in DP(n) as follows. On $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ we consider the lexicographic order, i.e. (i, j) < (i', j') if i < i' or i = i' and j < j'. We then order double posets $\mathbf{d} = (A, P_A, Q_A)$ by first ordering, using $<_{\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}}$, the sizes of the two relations, $(|P_A|, |Q_A|)$ and resolving ties arbitrarily.

We now use Lemma B.13 and Lemma B.14 to see that with this order on basis elements, the matrix corresponding to $\Phi_{\text{regmono}\leftarrow\text{Mor}}$ is triangular and we are done.

Corollary 3.3. The following holds

 $\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathtt{D}), \mathtt{d} \rangle = \langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{regmono}}(\mathtt{D}), \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono} \leftarrow \mathsf{Mor}}(\mathtt{d}) \rangle$

 $\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathtt{D}), \mathtt{d} \rangle = \langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{mono}}(\mathtt{D}), \Phi_{\mathsf{mono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathtt{d}) \rangle$

Proof. It follows from Theorem B.12.

3.2. Counting double poset morphisms when $D = \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{DP} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)$

As shown in Proposition 3.8, when the "large" double poset corresponds to a permutation, counting double posets morphisms can always be rewritten as counting permutation patterns. We first define the projection on the space of permutations embedded as double posets.

Definition 3.4. Define

$$\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}} : \bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)] \to \bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)],$$

with

$$\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}(\mathsf{d}) = \begin{cases} \mathsf{d}, & \text{if } \mathsf{d} = \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\sigma) \text{ for some } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The following three lemmas will be used in the proof of Proposition 3.8. Notice that $\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}} \circ \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}$ is the map already hinted at in EL21, Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 3.5.

$$\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathsf{d})) = \sum_{\sigma} |\mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{d},\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma))| \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma).$$

Proof. Clearly $\forall \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$: $\operatorname{Aut}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\sigma)) = {\operatorname{id}}$ and therefore $|\operatorname{Aut}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\sigma))| = 1$. \Box

Lemma 3.6.

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{regmono}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)), \mathsf{d} \rangle = \langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{regmono}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)), \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}(\mathsf{d}) \rangle$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{d} = (A, P_A, Q_A)$ and let $f : (A, P_A, Q_A) \to \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)$ be a regular monomorphism. Then P_A and Q_A are total orders. Therefore, we have $\mathbf{d} \cong \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\sigma)$ for some permutation σ . \Box

Lemma 3.7.

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{regmono}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)), \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma) \rangle = \langle \mathsf{PC}(\Pi), \sigma \rangle.$$

Proof. Let $n, N \ge 0, \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(n)$ and $\Pi \in \mathfrak{S}(N)$. Let $f \in \mathsf{RegMono}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\sigma), \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi))$, i.e.

$$\begin{split} f:([n], 1 < \cdots < n, \sigma^{-1}(1) < \cdots < \sigma^{-1}(n)) \\ \to (f([n]), (1 < \cdots < N) \cap (f([n]) \times f([n])), (\Pi^{-1}(1) < \cdots < \Pi^{-1}(N)) \cap (f[n] \times f[n])) \end{split}$$

is an isomorphism. This clearly holds if and only if $f[n] \subset N$ is an occurrence of σ in Π and we are done.

The following proposition shows that counting double poset morphisms into a permutation can always be rewritten as a linear combination of permutation pattern counts.

Proposition 3.8. For any $d \in DP, \Pi \in \mathfrak{S}$,

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)), \mathsf{d} \rangle = \langle \mathsf{PC}(\Pi), \sum_{\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}} |\mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{d}, \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma))| \ \sigma \rangle.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{split} &\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)), \mathsf{d} \rangle \\ &\overset{\mathrm{Theorem \ }3.2}{=} \langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{regmono}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)), \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathsf{d}) \rangle \\ &\overset{\mathrm{Lemma \ }3.6}{=} \langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{regmono}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)), \mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}} \circ \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathsf{d}) \rangle \\ &\overset{\mathrm{Lemma \ }3.5}{=} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}} |\mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{d},\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma))| \langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{regmono}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)), \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma) \rangle \\ &\overset{\mathrm{Lemma \ }3.7}{=} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}} |\mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{d},\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma))| \langle \mathsf{PC}(\Pi),\sigma \rangle \end{split}$$

Remark 3.9. To compare with EL21, denote a corner tree with T. There is a one-to-one correspondence between the occurrences of a corner tree T on a permutation σ and the morphisms

between the corresponding twin tree double poset $tt := \Psi_{\mathsf{TTDP}\leftarrow\mathsf{SN}}(\Psi_{\mathsf{SN}\leftarrow\mathsf{CT}}(T))$ and $\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma)$. If we consider the <u>underlying set maps</u>, see Proposition 2.15, they coincide and therefore $\#T(\sigma)$, as written in EL21, is equal to

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma)), \mathsf{tt} \rangle$$

in our setting. Using Proposition 3.8, we have

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma)), \mathtt{tt}\rangle = \sum_{\tau\in\mathfrak{S}} |\mathsf{Epi}(\mathtt{tt},\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\tau))| \langle \mathsf{PC}(\sigma),\tau\rangle$$

which is equivalent to the equation of EL21, Lemma 2.1.

3.3. Which permutations are counted by double posets?

To understand the permutations counted by double posets (and in particular twin tree double posets 4) we need to study the image of the map

$$\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}} \circ \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono} \leftarrow \mathsf{Mor}} : \bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)] \to \bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)],$$

which is just a <u>filtered map</u>. One way to simplify the study of its image is to introduce a graded basis which turns it into a graded map, as highlighted in the following remark.

Remark 3.10. The map

$$\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}:\bigoplus_{n}\mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)]\to\bigoplus_{n}\mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)]$$

is not graded. With either the following changes of grading on the domain

$$\begin{split} \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}} &: \bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\Phi_{\mathsf{Mor}\leftarrow\mathsf{regmono}}(\mathsf{DP}(n))] \to \bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)] \\ \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}} &: \bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\Phi_{\mathsf{Mor}\leftarrow\mathsf{mono}}(\mathsf{DP}(n))] \to \bigoplus_{n} \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{DP}(n)] \end{split}$$

it becomes a graded map. Regarding the first line this is shown in Theorem 3.2 and for the second line it follows from the following identity

$$\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono} \leftarrow \mathsf{Mor}}(\Phi_{\mathsf{Mor} \leftarrow \mathsf{mono}}(\mathsf{d})) = \sum_{\mathsf{d}'} \frac{|\mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{d},\mathsf{d}') \cap \mathsf{Mono}(\mathsf{d},\mathsf{d}')|}{|\mathsf{Aut}(\mathsf{d}')|} \mathsf{d}'.$$

Observe that $\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}}(\Phi_{\mathsf{Mor}\leftarrow\mathsf{regmono}}(\mathsf{d}))) = \operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}(\mathsf{d})$ and

$$\begin{split} &\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(\Phi_{\mathsf{Mor}\leftarrow\mathsf{mono}}(\mathtt{d}))) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}} |\mathsf{Epi}(\mathtt{d},\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma))\cap\mathsf{Mono}(\mathtt{d},\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma))|\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma) \end{split}$$

⁴From EL21 we know that already at level 4 corner trees fail to count some directions on the space of permutations.

Hence, with these changes of grading $\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}} \circ \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono} \leftarrow \mathsf{Mor}}$ is also turned into a graded map.

Remark 3.10 refers to all double posets, but we are interested in the permutations counted by twin tree double posets.

Consider now $\Phi_{\mathsf{mono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}$, restricted to twin tree double posets, i.e. $\Phi_{\mathsf{mono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}|_{\bigoplus_n \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{TwinTreeDP}(n)]}$. If

$$\Phi_{\mathsf{mono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}|_{\bigoplus_{n}\mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{TwinTreeDP}(n)]}\left(\bigoplus_{n}\mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{TwinTreeDP}(n)]\right)$$

were equal to

$$\bigoplus_n \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{TwinTreeDP}(n)]$$

we could study the permutation patterns expressed by corner trees "layer by layer". But this is not the case, as the following remark shows.

Remark 3.11. The space of twin tree double posets is not closed under $\Phi_{\mathsf{mono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}$, indeed



Obviously then the space of twin tree double posets is not closed under $\Phi_{\text{regmono}\leftarrow\text{Mor}}$. This example shows that the space of tree double posets is also not closed under $\Phi_{\text{mono}\leftarrow\text{Mor}}$ and $\Phi_{\text{regmono}\leftarrow\text{Mor}}$ as well.

If we consider the set of twin double posets, instead, things work out nicely.

Theorem 3.12. The space of twin double posets is closed under $\Phi_{\mathsf{Mor}\leftarrow\mathsf{mono}}$ and restricts to a linear automorphism on this subspace.

Proof. If G is a finite oriented graph, then let Un(G) denote its underlying undirected graph. Let (A, P_A, Q_A) be a twin double poset, i.e.

$$\mathrm{Un}(\mathsf{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(P_A)) = \mathrm{Un}(\mathsf{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(Q_A))$$

Let (B, P_B, Q_B) be any double poset and $f : (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$ be a regular epimorphism. Since

$$TrRd(P_B) = f(TrRd(P_A))$$
$$TrRd(Q_B) = f(TrRd(Q_A))$$

we have

$$\mathrm{Un}(\mathsf{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(P_B)) = \mathrm{Un}(\mathsf{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(Q_B)).$$

Indeed, let

$$\{x, y\} \in \operatorname{Un}(\operatorname{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(P_B))$$

Without loss of generality $(x, y) \in \operatorname{Tr} \operatorname{Rd}(P_B) = f(\operatorname{Tr} \operatorname{Rd}(P_A))$. This means that $\exists (w, z) \in \operatorname{Tr} \operatorname{Rd}(P_A) : (f(w), f(z))) = (x, y)$. Now either $(w, z) \in \operatorname{Tr} \operatorname{Rd}(Q_A)$ or $(z, w) \in \operatorname{Tr} \operatorname{Rd}(Q_A)$ which means that either $(x, y) \in \operatorname{Tr} \operatorname{Rd}(Q_B)$ or $(y, x) \in \operatorname{Tr} \operatorname{Rd}(Q_B)$. For the other direction we can proceed analogously. To show that $\Phi_{\operatorname{mono} \leftarrow \operatorname{Mor}}(\operatorname{Twin} \operatorname{DP}) = \operatorname{Twin} \operatorname{DP}$ we can proceed as in the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Remark 3.13. Notice that it is immediate to verify that the space of twin double posets is not closed under $\Phi_{\mathsf{Mor}\leftarrow\mathsf{regmono}}$.

As a consequence of Theorem 3.12, we have that

$$\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}|_{\bigoplus_{n}\mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{TwinDP}(n)]}:\bigoplus_{n}\mathbb{Q}[\Phi_{\mathsf{Mor}\leftarrow\mathsf{mono}}(\mathsf{TwinDP}(n))]\to\bigoplus_{n}\mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{TwinDP}(n)]$$

is a graded map. It follows that

$$\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}} \circ \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}} \leftarrow \operatorname{Mor} |_{\bigoplus_n \mathbb{Q}}[\mathsf{TwinDP}(n)]$$

is also graded. Therefore, we can study the image of twin double posets "layer by layer". Notice that the set TwinDP is "much larger" than TwinTreeDP. It would be interesting to find a smaller superset of TwinTreeDP under which $\Phi_{mono \leftarrow Mor}$ is still a change of basis and to develop counting algorithms for these cases.

Although the current section shows that the TwinDP is easier to handle from a bookkeeping perspective, we have not been able to identify new elements in it that we can count efficiently. In the next section we instead will present an algorithm that works for a certain family of TreeDP.

4. Generalization of the algorithm which counts occurrences of [3214]

We refer to EL21[Sec. 4] where an algorithm designed to count occurrences of the pattern [3214] is introduced. Here, we rewrite the algorithm using the language of double posets and show that it extends to a certain family of tree (but not twin) double posets. We first introduce this family. To construct an element of this set we start with the double poset $\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{DP}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}([3214])$



Figure 11: 3214 as a double poset

and we are free to add any number of SN polytrees dangling from 1, 2 or 3 as long as the arrows are always pointing outside and the edges are labeled with S.



Figure 12: Examples for which the generalization works

We are also allowed to remove the 2 together with the SN polytrees dangling from it.

Notice that the examples in Figure 11 and Figure 12 are not SN polytrees. Only if we remove the 4 they are, and this is a key aspect for the algorithm. We indicate this family with $Tree_{Algo}$ and denote one of its elements as t_{Algo} . The main result of this section is the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. Let $\Pi \in \mathfrak{S}(n)$ and $t_{Algo} \in \mathsf{Tree}_{Algo}$. Then counting

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)), \mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}} \rangle$$

is feasible in time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{\frac{5}{3}})$ and space $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$.

Definition 4.2. Let $d := (A, P_A, Q_A)$ be a double poset. Define

$$\mathbf{Swap}(\mathtt{d}) := (A, Q_A, P_A).$$

Remark 4.3. Let $d = \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\sigma)$ for some permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}$. Then

$$\mathbf{Swap}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma))\cong\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\sigma^{-1}).$$

Remark 4.4. Let $t_{Algo} \in Tree_{Algo}$. Then





Figure 13: t_{Algo} and $\mathbf{Swap}(t_{\mathsf{Algo}})$

When we swap t_{Algo} we also exchange the 1 and the 3 so that they play the same "role", the 1 being the point to the most north and the 3 the point to the most east. We refer to this copy as t_{Algo}' .



Figure 14: t_{Algo}'

 $\mathit{Notice that} \ t_{\mathsf{Algo}} \in \mathsf{TreeDP} \ \mathit{but} \ t_{\mathsf{Algo}} \not\in \mathsf{TwinTreeDP}. \ \mathit{Given an element of} \ t_{\mathsf{Algo}} \in \mathsf{Tree}_{\mathsf{Algo}} \ \mathit{and}$

writing explicitly $t_{Algo} = (V(t_{Algo}), <_{West}, <_{South})$ notice that 4 is the maximal element for both posets $<_{West}$ and $<_{South}$. Moreover, taking away 4 from the double poset, yields a SN polytree where 3 is the maximal element for $<_{West}$ and 1 is the maximal element for $<_{South}$. Therefore, rooting the SN polytree in 3 will yield a corner tree where only the West label appears. Similarly rooting it in 1 will yield a corner tree where only the South label appears. This means that rooting in 3 the SN polytree obtained by removing 4 from $t_{Algo}' \in Tree_{Algo}$ will again yield a corner tree where only the West label appears. The relevance of this structure will become clear in the illustration of the algorithm.

Remark 4.5. Let $t_{Algo} \in Tree_{Algo}$ and let $tt \in TwinTreeDP$ be the twin tree double poset obtained by removing the 4. Consider

$$\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathtt{tt})\right)\right)=\sum_{n\geq 0}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}_n}c_{\sigma}\sigma(1)\cdots\sigma(n).$$

Then

$$\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}})\right)\right) = \sum_{n\geq 0}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathfrak{S}_n}c_{\sigma}\sigma(1)\cdots\sigma(n)\,n+1.$$

Given
$$tt = \int_{0}^{N \times S} 0$$
, we have

$$\begin{split} \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathtt{tt})\right)\right) &= [1\,3\,2] + 2[1\,2\,4\,3] + [1\,3\,4\,2] + [1\,4\,2\,3] \\ &+ 2[2\,1\,4\,3] + [2\,4\,1\,3] + [3\,1\,4\,2] + [3\,4\,1\,2], \end{split}$$

and

$$\begin{split} \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}})\right)\right) &= [1\,3\,2\,4] + 2[1\,2\,4\,3\,5] + [1\,3\,4\,2\,5] + [1\,4\,2\,3\,5] \\ &+ 2[2\,1\,4\,3\,5] + [2\,4\,1\,3\,5] + [3\,1\,4\,2\,5] + [3\,4\,1\,2\,5]. \end{split}$$

To count occurrences of [3214] in the algorithm presented in EL21[Sec. 4], the authors distinguish between three types of occurrences. Here these correspond to three types of morphisms:

Proposition 4.6 (Morphism types). Let $t_{Algo} \in \text{Tree}_{Algo}$ and $\Pi \in \mathfrak{S}(n)$. Let $\{\mathcal{I}_i | i \in I\}$ be an interval partition of [n] where the blocks are intervals according to the order $1 < \cdots < n$ and $\{\mathcal{J}_j | j \in J\}$ an interval partition of [n] where the blocks are intervals according to the order $\Pi^{-1}(1) < \cdots < \Pi^{-1}(n)$. Consider the following subsets of $\text{Mor}(t_{Algo}, \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{DP} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi))$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Type}_{\mathsf{A}} &:= \{ f \mid f(1) \in \mathcal{J}_j \land f(4) \in \mathcal{J}_{j'} \text{ where } j \neq j' \} \\ \mathsf{Type}_{\mathsf{B}} &:= \{ f \mid f(3) \in \mathcal{I}_i \land f(4) \in \mathcal{I}_{i'} \text{ where } i \neq i' \} \\ \mathsf{Type}_{\mathsf{B}}_{\mathsf{n}} \mathsf{not}_{\mathsf{A}} &:= \{ f \mid f(3) \in \mathcal{I}_i \land f(4) \in \mathcal{I}_{i'} \text{ where } i \neq i', f(1) \in \mathcal{J}_j \land f(4) \in \mathcal{J}_{j'} \text{ where } j = j' \} \\ \mathsf{Type}_{\mathsf{A}}_{\mathsf{n}} \mathsf{not}_{\mathsf{B}} &:= \{ f \mid f(1) \in \mathcal{J}_j \land f(4) \in \mathcal{J}_{j'} \text{ where } j \neq j', \ f(3) \in \mathcal{I}_i \land f(4) \in \mathcal{I}_{i'} \text{ where } i = i' \} \end{aligned}$$

 $\mathsf{Type_not_A_not_B} := \{ f \mid f(3) \in \mathcal{I}_i \land f(4) \in \mathcal{I}_{i'} \text{ where } i = i', f(1) \in \mathcal{J}_j \land f(4) \in \mathcal{J}_{j'} \text{ where } j = j' \}.$

Then

$$\begin{split} &\mathsf{Mor}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}},\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi))\\ &=\mathsf{Type}_\mathsf{A}\sqcup\mathsf{Type}_\mathsf{B_not}_\mathsf{A}\sqcup\mathsf{Type_not}_\mathsf{A_not}_\mathsf{B} \end{split}$$

Proof. Immediate.

We now show that counting Type_A and Type_B is essentially analogous.

Lemma 4.7 (Symmetry of Type_A and Type_B). Let $t_{Algo} \in \text{Tree}_{Algo}$ and $\Pi \in \mathfrak{S}(n)$. Recall that $\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{DP}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi) = ([n], 1 < \cdots < n, \Pi^{-1}(1) < \cdots < \Pi^{-1}(n)$. Let $\{\mathcal{I}_i | i \in I\}$ be an interval partition of [n] where the blocks are interval according to the order $1 < \cdots < n$ and $\{\mathcal{J}_j | j \in J\}$ an interval partition of [n] where the blocks are interval according to the order $\Pi^{-1}(1) < \cdots < \Pi^{-1}(n)$. Consider also the interval partitions \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{M} of [n] according to the total orders $\Pi(1) < \cdots < \Pi(n)$ and $1 < \cdots < n$ respectively, defined as

$$\mathcal{L} := \{\mathcal{L}_i | i \in I\} \text{ where } \mathcal{L}_i := \Pi(\mathcal{I}_i)$$
$$\mathcal{M} := \{\mathcal{M}_j | j \in J\} \text{ where } \mathcal{M}_j := \Pi(\mathcal{J}_j).$$

Then

$$\begin{split} &|\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}}, \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi))|f(3) \in \mathcal{I}_i \wedge f(4) \in \mathcal{I}_{i'} \text{ where } i \neq i'\}| \\ &= |\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathbf{Swap}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}}), \ \mathbf{Swap}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)))|f(3) \in \mathcal{I}_i \wedge f(4) \in \mathcal{I}_{i'} \text{ where } i \neq i'\}| \\ &= |\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathbf{Swap}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}}), \ \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi^{-1}))|f(3) \in \mathcal{L}_i \wedge f(4) \in \mathcal{L}_{i'} \text{ where } i \neq i'\}| \\ &= |\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}}', \ \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi^{-1}))|f(1) \in \mathcal{L}_i \wedge f(4) \in \mathcal{L}_{i'} \text{ where } i \neq i'\}|. \end{split}$$

where t_{Algo}' is a copy of $\mathbf{Swap}(t_{Algo})$ where the labels 1 and 3 are exchanged, see Remark 4.4. And similarly also

$$\begin{aligned} |\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}}, \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi))|f(1) \in \mathcal{J}_j \wedge f(4) \in \mathcal{J}_{j'} \text{ where } j \neq j'\}| \\ &= |\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}}', \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi^{-1}))|f(3) \in \mathcal{M}_j \wedge f(4) \in \mathcal{M}_{j'} \text{ where } j \neq j'\}|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The first equality holds since

$$f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathsf{d},\mathsf{d}') \iff f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathbf{Swap}(\mathsf{d}),\mathbf{Swap}(\mathsf{d}')).$$

For the second equality, consider the isomorphism

$$\begin{split} g: \mathbf{Swap}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)) \to \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi^{-1}) \\ i \mapsto \Pi(i). \end{split}$$

The map

$$\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathbf{Swap}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}}), \ \mathbf{Swap}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi))) | f(3) \in \mathcal{I}_i \land f(4) \in \mathcal{I}_{i'} \text{ where } i \neq i' \}$$

 $\rightarrow \{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathbf{Swap}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}}), \ \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi^{-1})) | f(3) \in \mathcal{L}_i \land f(4) \in \mathcal{L}_{i'} \text{ where } i \neq i' \}$
 $f \mapsto g \circ f$

is a bijection. The third equality is trivial.



Figure 15: Type_B can be counted as Type_A

Example 4.8. Considering

$$f(1) = 1, f(2) = 3, f(3) = 4, f(4) = 6,$$
$$\mathcal{I} = \{\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}, \{5, 6\}, \{7, 8\}, \{9, 10\}\},$$
$$g \circ f(1) = 7, g \circ f(2) = 3, g \circ f(3) = 1, g \circ f(4) = 8,$$
$$\mathcal{L} = \{\{7, 10\}, \{3, 1\}, \{9, 8\}, \{5, 4\}, \{2, 6\}\},$$

and Figure 15, we see how a morphism of Type_B can be counted as a morphism of Type_A on the inverse permutation.

Remark 4.9. To count Type_B_not_A we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\{f| \ f(3) \in \mathcal{I}_i \wedge f(4) \in \mathcal{I}_{i'} \text{ where } i \neq i', f(1) \in \mathcal{J}_j \wedge f(4) \in \mathcal{J}_{j'} \text{ where } j = j'\}| \\ &= |\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(\mathsf{t}_{\mathsf{Algo}}', \ \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\Pi^{-1}))| f(1) \in \mathcal{L}_i \wedge f(4) \in \mathcal{L}_{i'} \text{ where } i \neq i', \\ f(3) \in \mathcal{M}_j \wedge f(4) \in \mathcal{M}_{j'} \text{ where } j = j'\}|. \end{aligned}$$

See Remark 4.4 for the definition of t_{Algo}' . This is just Type_A_not_B for $Mor(t_{Algo}', \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{DP}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi^{-1}))$.

4.1. Algorithm to count Type_A and Type_B_not_A

From the symmetry we observed above, see Remark 4.9, we can write down an algorithm which counts morphisms of Type_A, which immediately counts morphisms of Type_B. With a similar procedure counting morphisms of Type_A_not_B, will allow us to count morphisms of type Type_B_not_A. The building block for counting these two types is based on the algorithm from Section 1.2 to count corner tree occurrences, whenever the edge labels of the corner trees are all West, i.e. SW or NW. Under this assumption, the algorithm can be rewritten as follows.

```
def vertex_W(Pi, ct_west, v, i, vertex_dict, edge_dict):
, , ,
      Ρi
                  : (large) permutation
      ct_west
                  : corner tree where all edges have the West label
      77
                  : vertex of ct
                  : i-th permutation node
      i
      vertex_dict : store outputs of vertex_W for all vertices until i-1
      edge_dict : store outputs of edge_W for all edges until i-1
      returns vertex_dict[v][i], where vertex_dict[v][i] tells us:
      How many ways can we place the children of v
      when we place v at (i,Pi(i)).'''
    if not v in vertex_dict:
        vertex_dict[v] = n * [1]
    for e in child_edges(v):
        vertex_dict[v][i] *= edge_W(Pi, ct_west, e, i, vertex_dict, edge_dict)
    return vertex_dict[v][i]
def edge_W(Pi, ct_west, e, i, vertex_dict, edge_dict):
, , ,
      Ρi
                  : (large) permutation
                  : corner tree where all edges have the West label
      ct_west
                  : vertex of ct
      V
                  : i-th permutation node
      i
      vertex_dict : store outputs of vertex_W for all vertices until i-1
      edge_dict : store outputs of edge_W for all edges until i-1
      returns edge_dict[e].prefix_sum(Pi[i]) or edge_dict[e].prefix_sum(Pi[i])
      which, in both cases, tells us
      How many ways can we place child(e)
      when we place parent(e) at (i,Pi(i)).'''
    if not e in edge_dict:
        edge_dict[e] = n * [0]
```

```
edge_dict[e][Pi[i]] = vertex_W(Pi, ct_west, child_vertex(e), i,
    vertex_dict, edge_dict)
    if label(e) == "SW":
        return edge_dict[e].prefix_sum(Pi[i])
    else:
        return edge_dict[e].suffix_sum(Pi[i])
def countW(Pi,ct_west,v):
, , ,
      Ρi
             : (large) permutation
      ct_west : corner tree where all edges have the West label
             : vertex of ct'''
      V
    n = len(Pi)
    count = 0
    vertex_dict = {}
    edge_dict = {}
    for i in [1,...,n]:
        count += vertex_W(Pi, ct_west, v, i, vertex_dict, edge_dict)
```

return count

Now the number of occurrences is given by countW(Pi,ct_west,root). Notice that we can count the occurrences of such corner trees by scanning the permutation only <u>one time</u> from left to right. The functions countW_A and countW_B_not_A are slight modifications of the function we introduce before: countW(Pi,ct_west,v).

```
def countW_A(Pi,ct_west,row,block_size):
    n = len(Pi)
    countCT=0
    count = 0
    vertex_dict = {}
    edge_dict = {}
    for i in range(n):
        if Pi[i] < row:</pre>
            countCT += vertex_W(Pi, ct_west, v, i, vertex_dict, edge_dict)
        if row <= Pi[i] < block_size + row:</pre>
            count += countCT
    return count
def countW_B_not_A(Pi,ct_west,col,block_size):
    n = len(Pi)
    vertex_dict = {}
    edge_dict = {}
```

```
countCT = 0
count = 0
for i in range(n):
    if i % block_size == 0:
        countCTback = countCT
    if Pi[i] < col:
        countCT += vertex_W(Pi, ct_west, v, i, vertex_dict, edge_dict)
    if col <= Pi[i] < block_size +col:
        count += countCT-countCTback</pre>
```

return count

Remark 4.10. See Proposition 4.6 for Type_A. Type_B_not_A is counted as Type_A_not_B on the inverse permutation, see Remark 4.4, and Remark 4.9. For both algorithms, it's crucial that we only scan the permutation once, moving from left to right. We consider interval partitions where all blocks have equal sizes.

Proposition 4.11. Let $\Pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and let *m* be the size of the blocks. Both countW_A and countW_B_not_A cost time $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^2/m)$ and space $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$ to calculate.

Proof. We scan the permutation Π from left to right, n/m times in total, i.e. the number of blocks. Each time we count the occurrences of the corner tree obtained by removing the 4 from t_{Algo} which costs $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$, see Theorem 1.8.

The maintenance of the corner trees costs space $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

4.2. Algorithm to count Type_not_A_not_B

Here we present the algorithm where 2 is present, and therefore we need to consider the SN polytrees dangling from 1,2 and 3.

```
def count_Box(Pi,dangle3_trees,dangle2_tree,dangle1_trees,block_size):
    n = len(Pi)
    inv_Pi = invperm(Pi)
    count = 0
    dangle2_box = ProductTree(n)
    dangle1_boxes = [ProductTree(n) for _ in dangle1_trees]
    dangle3_boxes = [ProductTree(n) for _ in dangle3_trees]
    for i in range(len(dangle3_boxes)):
        vertex_dict = {}
        edge_dict = {}
        for x,y in enumerate(Pi):
            dangle3_boxes[i].add(x,y,vertex_W(Pi, dangle3_trees[i],
            x,vertex_dict,edge_dict))
```

```
for i in range(len(dangle1_boxes)):
    vertex_dict = {}
    edge_dict = {}
    for x,y in enumerate(Pi):
        dangle1_boxes[i].add(x,y,vertex_W(Pi, dangle1_trees[i],
        x,vertex_dict,edge_dict))
vertex_dict = {}
edge_dict = {}
for x,y in enumerate(Pi):
        dangle2_box.add(x,y,vertex_W(Pi, dangle2_tree,
        x,vertex_dict,edge_dict))
for x4,y4 in enumerate(Pi):
    col,row = x4-x4%block_size,y4-y4%block_size
    for x3,y3 in enumerate(Pi[col:x4], col):
        for y1,x1 in enumerate(inv_Pi[row:y4], row):
            if x1 < x3 and y1 > y3:
                dangle3_product = dangle1_product = 1
                for i in range(len(dangle3_boxes)):
                    dangle3_product *= dangle3_boxes[i].sum_box(0,x3,0,y3)
                for i in range(len(dangle1_boxes)):
                    dangle1_product *= dangle1_boxes[i].sum_box(0,x1,0,y1)
                count += dangle3_product*dangle1_product
                            *dangle2_box.sum_box(x1+1,x3,y3+1,y1)
```

return count

Remark 4.12. A ProductTree is a 2-dimensional generalization of a sum-tree, see Remark 1.5 and EL19. Updating these 2-dimensional arrays costs $\mathcal{O}(\log(n)^2)$ and summing over the box queries costs $\mathcal{O}(\log(n)^2)$ as well. Again, this is a key aspect to guarantee that the complexity is almost linear in n.

Since the 2-dimensional arrays we store are sparse (they have at most n nonzero entries), the space demand of a ProductTree is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$.

Remark 4.13. In dangle3_boxes we store the occurrences of the corner trees that are dangling to the south-west of 3, while dangle1_boxes we store the occurrences of the corner trees that are dangling to the south-west of 1. In dangle2_box we store the occurrences of the single corner tree where the root 2 is to the south-east of 1 and to the north-west of 3. Notice that, again, we only need a single left-to-right scan of the permutation to fill these boxes. As for the previous two algorithms, we consider interval partitions where all blocks have equal sizes.



Proposition 4.15. Let $\Pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and let *m* be the size of the blocks. Then the time complexity of count_Box is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(nm^2)$ and space complexity is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n)$.

Proof. Say we have k dangling corner trees in total. Filling the boxes costs $\mathcal{O}(k \log^2(n) \log(n)n)$ time and $\mathcal{O}(kn \log^2(n))$ space, see Remark 4.12 and Theorem 1.8. Then we scan the permutation from left to right once and at each 4 we perform at most m^2k queries which cost $\mathcal{O}(\log^2(n))$, therefore the counting costs time $\mathcal{O}(nm^2k \log^2(n))$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. The proof follows from considering the algorithm

```
def count_gen_3214(Pi,tree, inv_tree,dangle3_trees,dangle2_tree,dangle1_trees):
    n = len(Pi)
    block_size = int(n**(1/3))
    inv_Pi = invperm(Pi)
    count = 0

    # Type A
    for row in range(0, n, block_size):
        count += countW_A(Pi,tree,row,block_size)

    # Type B not A
    for col in range(0, n, block_size):
        count += countW_B_not_A(inv_Pi,inv_tree,col,block_size)

    # Type not A not B
    count += count_Box(Pi,dangle3_trees,dangle2_tree,dangle1_trees,block_size)
    return count
```

Considering Proposition 4.11, Proposition 4.15 and picking the size of the blocks to be $m := n^{1/3}$ yields the desired result. This is the same argument used in EL21 to prove the complexity of the algorithm to count [3214].

4.3. New directions at level 5

Using Theorem 4.1 we can count 3 directions that are not spanned by corner trees up to level 5. Leveraging on some simple symmetries yields in total six new directions.

Definition 4.16. If P is a strict poset, we denote its opposite poset as P^{op} where

$$(b,a) \in P^{\mathrm{op}} \iff (a,b) \in P^{\mathrm{op}}$$

Let $d := (A, P_A, Q_A)$ be a double poset. Define

$$\mathbf{Anti}(\mathtt{d}) := (A, P_A^{\mathrm{op}}, Q_A^{\mathrm{op}}).$$

Remark 4.17. We can write an algorithm for a family of double posets which generalize the counting of the pattern $\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{DP}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(1432)\cong \operatorname{Anti}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{DP}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(3214))$ but we don't need this since for any double posets d, D we have

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathsf{D}), \mathsf{d} \rangle = \langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathbf{Anti}((\mathsf{D})), \mathbf{Anti}(\mathsf{d}) \rangle$$

and using the idempotency of Anti, we have

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathbf{Anti}(\mathtt{D})),\mathtt{d}\rangle = \langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\mathtt{D}),\mathbf{Anti}(\mathtt{d})\rangle$$

It is known to EL21 that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}} \left(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono} \leftarrow \mathsf{Mor}} \left(\bigoplus_{n \leq 5} \mathbb{Q} \left[\mathsf{TwinTreeDP}(n) \right] \right) \right) \cap \mathbb{Q}[\mathfrak{S}_{5}] = 100,$$

Using our generalization we can count

$$\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}} \leftarrow \mathsf{Mor}(\mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{Tree}_{\mathsf{Algo}}(5)]))$$
 .

This yields three new directions, given by three elements of $Tree_{Algo}$. If we apply **Anti** to them, see Remark 4.17, we get other three.



We improve to

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}} \left(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono} \leftarrow \mathsf{Mor}} \left(\bigoplus_{n \leq 5} \mathbb{Q}[\mathsf{TwinTreeDP}(n)] \oplus \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{New}] \right) \right) \cap \mathbb{Q}[\mathfrak{S}_5] = 106,$$

where $\mathbf{New} := \{ t_{\mathsf{Algo}_1}, t_{\mathsf{Algo}_2}, t_{\mathsf{Algo}_3}, \mathbf{Anti}(t_{\mathsf{Algo}_1}), \mathbf{Anti}(t_{\mathsf{Algo}_2}), \mathbf{Anti}(t_{\mathsf{Algo}_3}) \}.$

Remark 4.18. We have

$$\begin{split} \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(t_{\mathsf{Algo}_{1}})\right)\right) &= [1\,4\,3\,2\,5] + [2\,4\,3\,1\,5] + [3\,4\,2\,1\,5],\\ \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(t_{\mathsf{Algo}_{2}})\right)\right) &= [1\,4\,3\,2\,5] + [2\,4\,3\,1\,5] + [4\,1\,3\,2\,5] + [4\,2\,3\,1\,5],\\ \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\mathrm{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}}\left(\Phi_{\mathsf{regmono}\leftarrow\mathsf{Mor}}(t_{\mathsf{Algo}_{3}})\right)\right) &= [1\,4\,3\,2\,5] + [4\,1\,3\,2\,5] + [4\,3\,1\,2\,5], \end{split}$$

See Remark 4.5 for the linear combination of patterns counted by an element of Tree_{Algo}.

5. Conclusion and outlook

In this work, we have shown that corner trees and permutations belong to certain classes of double posets. This encoding leads to a broader theoretical framework that generalizes the one developed in EL21. A generalization is necessary, even at the cost of a slower algorithm. Indeed, corner trees fail to count all permutation patterns already at level 4. Here we introduce a family of tree double posets that generalize the permutation pattern [3214]. The algorithm is based on ideas that are similar to the ones given in EL21 to count [3214] and the complexity is again $\tilde{O}(n^{\frac{5}{3}})$. Using this generalization, we were able to fill six of the missing 20 directions at level 5

countable in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(n^{\frac{5}{3}})$ time. It remains open whether one can use similar ideas to develop other algorithms and increase the span of permutations countable with this time complexity. We also point out that our framework allows us to consider arbitrary families of double posets and correspondent algorithms to count permutation patterns faster than the naive approach.

6. Open questions

• Let $tt, tt' \in \mathsf{TwinTreeDP}$ such that

$$\sum_{\sigma} |\mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{tt}, \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\sigma))| \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma} |\mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{tt}', \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\sigma))| \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}(\sigma).$$

Is it then true that $tt \cong tt'$? Notice that this is not true for double posets in general. For example

$$\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}} \circ \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono} \leftarrow \mathsf{Mor}} \begin{pmatrix} \circ & \circ \\ \circ & \circ \end{pmatrix} = \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}([1\,2]) + \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}([2\,1])$$

and

$$\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}} \circ \Phi_{\mathsf{regmono} \leftarrow \mathsf{Mor}} \left(\begin{array}{c} \circ & \circ \\ \circ & \circ \end{array} \right) = \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}([1\,2]) + \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}([2\,1]).$$

• How efficiently are we able to count

$$\langle \mathsf{DPC}^{\mathsf{Mor}}(\Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}}\leftarrow\mathfrak{S}}(\Pi)), \ \Diamond \ \diamond \rangle?$$

In Section 3.3 we put forward the idea that the space of twin double poset is closed under regular epimorphisms, thereby simplifying the analysis of the subspace of permutations counted by twin double posets. Is the double poset

$$\oint \oint$$

an element of a strict subset of TwinDP which is again closed under epimorphisms?

• Observe that

$$= \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}([\texttt{12}]) + \Psi_{\mathfrak{S}_{\mathsf{DP}} \leftarrow \mathfrak{S}}([\texttt{21}]).$$

Given a fixed level, can we use corner trees at higher levels to increase the dimension of

the subspace of permutations efficiently countable at that fixed level?

Acknowledgments

We thank Diego Caudillo for providing the example given in Remark 3.11. We would also like to thank Moritz Sokoll and Leonard Schmitz for fruitful discussions.

References

- [AHS90] J. Adamek, H. Herrlich, and G. Strecker. Abstract and Concrete Categories: The Joy of Cats. 1990.
- [Cau+22] D. Caudillo et al. "Graph counting signatures and bicommutative Hopf algebras". In: arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08323 (2022).
- [EL19] C. Even-Zohar and C. Leng. corner. https://github.com/chaim-e/corners. 2019.
- [EL21] C. Even-Zohar and C. Leng. "Counting small permutation patterns". In: Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA). SIAM. 2021, pp. 2288–2302.
- [Lov12] L. Lovász. Large networks and graph limits. Vol. 60. American Mathematical Soc., 2012.
- [RP87] G. Rebane and J. Pearl. "The recovery of causal poly-trees from statistical data". In: Proceedings of the Third Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence. 1987, pp. 222–228.
- [SV82] Y. Shiloach and U. Vishkin. "An O (n2log n) parallel max-flow algorithm". In: Journal of Algorithms 3.2 (1982), pp. 128–146.
- [TM77] W. T. Trotter Jr and J. I. Moore Jr. "The dimension of planar posets". In: Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B 22.1 (1977), pp. 54–67.

A. Morphisms in the category of finite strict partial orders

We utilize category theory because regular monomorphisms and regular epimorphisms can help to identify the "good" morphisms within a given category. We will show that, in the category of posets, regular monomorphisms correspond to order embeddings, while regular epimorphisms are maps that surjectively send the transitive reduction of one poset to the transitive reduction of another. Any order-preserving map can then be factorized either as a regular epimorphism composed with a monomorphism or as an epimorphism composed with a regular monomorphism. In the category of double posets, which is the focus of this work, the characterizations of morphisms naturally extend those found in the category of posets, see Appendix B. Notably, we use morphism factorizations to understand the permutations represented by double posets, see Section 3. Let A, B be objects in some category C. A morphism $f \in Mor_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$ is

• a monomorphism if for all objects C and all $g, h \in Mor_{\mathcal{C}}(C, A)$

$$f \circ g = f \circ h \Rightarrow g = h.$$

• a **regular monomorphism** if it is the equalizer of some parallel pair of morphisms, i.e. if there is a limit diagram of the form

$$A \xrightarrow{J} B \rightrightarrows D.$$

It is well-known that a regular monomorphism is a monomorphism.

• an epimorphism, if for all objects C and for all $g, h \in Mor_{\mathcal{C}}(B, C)$

$$g \circ f = h \circ f \Rightarrow g = h.$$

• a **regular epimorphism** if it is the coequalizer of some parallel pair of morphisms, i.e. if there is a colimit diagram of the form

$$D \rightrightarrows A \xrightarrow{f} B.$$

It is well-known that a regular epimorphism is an epimorphism.

• an **isomorphism** if it has a two sided inverse: there is $f^{-1} \in Mor_{\mathcal{C}}(B, A)$ with $f^{-1} \circ f = id_A, f \circ f^{-1} = id_B$. It is well-known that f is an isomorphism if and only if it is both a monomorphism and a regular epimorphism if and only if it is both a regular monomorphism and an epimorphism.

We consider the category **PoSet** of finite strict partial orders. Its objects are finite sets, endowed with a strict partial order.

Definition A.1. Let S be a set. A binary relation $R \subset S \times S$ is a strict partial order if it is an asymmetric and transitive relation, i.e.

$$\forall s, s' \in S : (s, s') \in R \implies (s', s) \notin R$$

$$\forall s, s', s'' \in S : (s, s') \land (s', s'') \in R \implies (s, s'') \in R.$$

Morphisms between objects are strictly order-preserving maps.

Definition A.2. $f: (A, P_A) \rightarrow (B, P_B)$ is strictly order-preserving if

$$\forall a, a' \in A : (a, a') \in P_A \implies (f(a), f(a')) \in P_B.$$

We refer to strictly order-preserving maps simply as **order-preserving maps**.



Figure 16: A (strictly) order-preserving map

Definition A.3. Let $f : (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$. Then

$$f(P_A) := \{ (b, b') \in P_B | \exists (a, a') \in P_A : (f(a), f(a')) = (b, b') \}.$$

Definition A.4 (Transitive closure). For $R \subset A \times A$

$$\mathsf{Tr}(R) := \bigcap_{\substack{S \subseteq A \times A \\ R \subseteq S \\ S \text{ is transitive}}} S$$

Definition A.5 (Transitive reduction). Let $T \subset A \times A$ be transitive. Then

$$\mathrm{Tr}\mathrm{Rd}(T):=\bigcap_{\substack{S\subseteq T\\\mathrm{Tr}(S)=T}}S$$

The following result follows from the fact that $R \subset Tr(R)$.

Lemma A.6. Let A be a finite set and $R \subset A \times A$. Then $\text{TrRd}(\text{Tr}(R)) \subset R$.

We characterize monomorphisms, epimorphisms, isomorphisms, regular monomorphisms, and regular epimorphisms in PoSet.

Lemma A.7. Monomorphisms in PoSet are injective order-preserving maps.

Proof. Assume that $f: (B, P_B) \to (C, P_C)$ is an injective order-preserving map. Then for each pair of maps $\ell, m: (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ such that

$$f \circ \ell = f \circ m.$$

it follows from injectivity of f that $\ell = m$ and therefore f is a monomorphism. For the other direction, assume that $f : (B, P_B) \to (C, P_C)$ is a monomorphism. Assume f(b) = f(b') and define the morphisms

$$\iota : (*, \emptyset) \to (B, P_B) \qquad \qquad \iota' : (*, \emptyset) \to (B, P_B)$$
$$* \mapsto b \qquad \qquad * \mapsto b'$$

so that

$$f \circ \iota = f \circ \iota'$$

holds. Therefore, using that f is a monomorphism $\iota = \iota'$ and hence b = b' which means that f is injective.

Similarly, we have the following result.

Lemma A.8. Epimorphisms in PoSet are surjective order-preserving maps.

By definition, isomorphisms in PoSet are bijective order-preserving maps, whose inverses are order-preserving maps as well.

A.1. Characterization of regular monomorphisms

Definition A.9. Let $f : (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ be a morphism. f is an order embedding if its corestriction to f(A) defined as

$$\hat{f}: (A, P_A) \to (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)))$$
$$\forall a \in A : \hat{f}(a) := f(a)$$

is an isomorphism.

We will show that regular monomorphisms in PoSet are exactly the order embeddings.

Lemma A.10. Let $f, g: (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ be a parallel pair of order-preserving maps. Let

$$E := \{ a \in A | f(a) = g(a) \}.$$

Then the poset $(E, P_A \cap (E \times E))$, together with the inclusion map $\iota : (E, P_A \cap (E \times E)) \to (A, P_A)$ is an equalizer.

Proof. The inclusion map

$$\iota: (E, P_A \cap (E \times E)) \to (A, P_A)$$

is order preserving and by construction satisfies $f \circ \iota = g \circ \iota$, hence is a cone. Consider any other cone, i.e. any poset (T, P_T) and any order-preserving map $t : (T, P_T) \to (A, P_A)$ such that

$$f \circ t = g \circ t.$$

We necessarily have

 $t(T) \subset E$

and

$$t(P_T) \subset P_A \cap (E \times E).$$

Therefore, we can corestrict t

$$\hat{t}: (T, P_T) \to (E, P_A \cap (E \times E))$$

so that $\iota \circ \hat{t} := t$. Uniqueness follows from the fact that ι in an injective map.

Lemma A.11. Let f be a regular monomorphism. Then f is an order embedding.

Proof. Let $f: (D, P_D) \to (A, P_A)$ be a regular monomorphism, i.e. a limit for some parallel pair $g, h: (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$. Consider the equalizer constructed in Lemma A.10, i.e. the inclusion map

$$\iota: (E, P_A \cap (E \times E)) \to (A, P_A)$$

where

$$E := \{ a \in A | g(a) = h(a) \}.$$

The inclusion map ι is clearly an order embedding. From the proof of Lemma A.10, we have $f = \iota \circ \hat{f}$. Observe that the map \hat{f} is the unique isomorphism between the two equalizers. Therefore \hat{f} is in particular an order embedding. Since ι and \hat{f} are both order embeddings and the composition of order embeddings is an order embedding, we are done.

$$(E, P_A \cap (E \times E)) \stackrel{\iota}{\longleftrightarrow} (A, P_A) \xrightarrow{h} (B, P_B)$$

$$\stackrel{f^{\uparrow}}{\underset{(D, P_D)}{\longrightarrow}} (D, P_D) \stackrel{\iota}{\longrightarrow} (A, P_A) \xrightarrow{h} (B, P_B)$$

To show that order embeddings are regular monomorphisms we rely on the following result, where we "clone" a part of a poset.

Lemma A.12. Let (A, P_A) be a poset and $S \subset A$. Consider a copy of S

$$S_{\mathsf{Copy}} = \{(x, *) | x \in S\}.$$

Now define a relation $R_{\mathsf{Copy}} \subset (A \cup S_{\mathsf{Copy}}) \times (A \cup S_{\mathsf{Copy}})$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x, y \in A : x R_{\mathsf{Copy}} y \iff x <_{P_A} y \\ \forall x, y \in S : (x, *) R_{\mathsf{Copy}}(y, *) \iff x <_{P_A} y \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \forall (x,y) \in S \times (A \setminus S) : (x,*) R_{\mathsf{Copy}} y \iff x <_{P_A} y \\ \forall (x,y) \in (A \setminus S) \times S : x R_{\mathsf{Copy}}(y,*) \iff x <_{P_A} y \end{aligned}$$

(See Figure 17 for an example.)

Then $Tr(R_{Copy})$ is a partial order relation.

Proof. Let $x_1 R_{\mathsf{Copy}} x_2 R_{\mathsf{Copy}} \dots R_{\mathsf{Copy}} x_k$ be a chain in R_{Copy} . Then $\hat{x}_1 P_A \hat{x}_2 P_A \dots P_A \hat{x}_k$ is a chain in P_A , if we replace any element of $x_i \in S_{\mathsf{Copy}}$ with the respective element in $\hat{x}_i \in S$. Hence $\hat{x}_1 \neq \hat{x}_k$. From the definition of S_{Copy} it follows that $x_1 \neq x_k$. Hence, $\mathsf{Tr}(R_{\mathsf{Copy}})$ has no directed cycles and in particular is an asymmetric relation.



Figure 17: Example of a Hasse diagram for $Tr(R_{Copy})$. The blue vertices denote S and the red ones S_{Copy} .

Lemma A.13. Let $f : A \to B$ be an equalizer. Consider a cone $g : D \to B$ such that there is an isomorphism $\phi : D \to A$ such that $f \circ \phi = g$. Then $g : D \to B$ is also an equalizer.

Proof. Consider a cone $h: (F, P_F) \to (B, P_B)$. Then we know that there exists a unique map $u: (F, P_F) \to (A, P_A)$ such that $f \circ u = h$. Since $g \circ (\phi^{-1} \circ u) = h$ holds, we are done.

Lemma A.14. Let f be an order embedding. Then f is a regular monomorphism.

Proof. Let $f: (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ be an order embedding. Consider a copy of the set $B \setminus f(A)$

$$(B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}} := \{(x, *) | x \in B \setminus f(A)\}.$$

and a relation $R_{\mathsf{Copy}} \subset (B \cup (B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}}) \times (B \cup (B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}})$. Its transitive closure, $\mathsf{Tr}(R_{\mathsf{Copy}})$, is a partial order according to Lemma A.12. Now define two maps $\ell, m : (B, P_B) \to (B \cup (B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}}, \mathsf{Tr}(R_{\mathsf{Copy}}))$,

$$\forall b \in B : \ell(b) := b$$

and

$$\forall b \in f(A) : m(b) := b$$

$$\forall b \in (B \setminus f(A)) : m(b) := (b, *).$$

They are both order-preserving. Observe that f is a cone by construction. From Lemma A.10, we know that

$$f(A) = \{ b \in B | \ell(b) = m(b) \}$$

together with the inclusion $\iota : (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A))) \to (B, P_B)$ is an equalizer.

We have $f = \iota \circ \hat{f}$, and, by definition of order embedding, \hat{f} is an isomorphism. Then f is an equalizer by using Lemma A.13.

$$(A, P_A) \xrightarrow{f} (B, P_B) \xrightarrow{\ell} (B \cup (B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}}, \mathsf{Tr}(R_{\mathsf{Copy}}))$$

$$\stackrel{f_{\downarrow}}{\underset{i}{f_{\downarrow}}} \underbrace{f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)))} (B, P_B) \xrightarrow{\ell} (B \cup (B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}}, \mathsf{Tr}(R_{\mathsf{Copy}}))$$

A.2. Characterization of regular epimorphisms

We will show that regular epimorphisms in PoSet are exactly the maps that are surjective on the cover relation.

For technical reasons, we temporarily deal with finite oriented graphs, "simple graphs with arrows", OrGraphs, and also with finite Digraphs which allow for double edges in opposite directions and single loops. We can think of Digraphs as binary relations and OrGraphs as *asymmetric* binary relations. We think of OrGraphs as a subcategory of Digraphs.

Lemma A.15. In Digraphs coequalizers always exist.

Proof. A digraph $\sigma = (V(\sigma), E(\sigma))$ can be encoded as a pair where $V(\sigma)$ is a finite set and $E(\sigma) \subset V(\sigma) \times V(\sigma)$. Consider now a parallel pair $f, g : \sigma \to \tau$ and the relation

$$R := \{ (f(a), g(a)) | a \in V(\sigma) \} \subset V(\tau) \times V(\tau).$$

Furthermore consider the smallest relation which contains it, denoted as $\langle R \rangle_{\sim}$. Now consider the digraph γ with vertex set defined as

$$V(\gamma) := \{ [b]_{\langle R \rangle_{\sim}} | b \in V(\tau) \}.$$

and edge set defined as

$$E(\gamma) := \{ (d, d') \in V(\gamma) \times V(\gamma) | \exists b \in d \land \exists b' \in d' : (b, b') \in E(\tau) \}.$$

Then γ , together with

$$\begin{aligned} \pi: \tau \to \gamma \\ b \to [b]_{\langle R \rangle} \end{aligned}$$

is a coequalizer. Indeed $\gamma \in \mathsf{Digraphs}$ and $\pi \in \mathsf{Mor}(\tau, \gamma)$. Furthermore, π is a cocone, i.e.

$$\forall a \in V(\sigma) : \ \pi(f(a)) = \pi(g(a))$$

since $(f(a), g(a)) \in \langle R \rangle_{\sim}$. Finally given another cocone, i.e. a digraph γ' and a map $\pi' \in Mor(\tau, \gamma')$ such that $\pi' \circ f = \pi' \circ g$, we define $u : \gamma \to \gamma'$ as

$$u(d) := \pi'(d)$$

which is well-defined since

$$\{(\pi')^{-1}(\{d\})| d \in \pi'(V(\tau))\}$$

as a partition is coarser than $V(\gamma)$. Then u gives the unique morphisms such that $u \circ \pi = \pi'$. \Box

The following lemma is immediate.

Lemma A.16. Let σ, τ be oriented graphs as objects in Digraphs. Let $f, g: \sigma \to \tau$. Then the coequalizer exists in OrGraphs if and only if the coequalizer in Digraphs is an oriented graph.

We now give necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of coequalizers in PoSet.

Lemma A.17. Let $f, g: (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ be order-preserving maps. Assume that

• considering f, g as arrows in OrGraphs, their coequalizer exists. Notice that in particular

$$\pi: (B, P_B) \to (C, E_C).$$

is then also a coequalizer, where (C, E_C) is constructed as in Lemma A.16.

• the transitive closure of E_C , $P_C := \text{Tr}(E_C)$ is a poset.

Then

$$\pi: (B, P_B) \to (C, P_C).$$

is a coequalizer in PoSet.

Remark A.18. Note that if $h: X \to Y$ is an arrow in Digraphs, and if both X and Y are in fact posets, then h is an order-preserving map, i.e. an arrow in PoSet.

Proof. The map $\pi : (B, P_B) \to (C, P_C)$ is order-preserving by considering it as a directed graph morphism. Universality follows simply by arguing that if $\pi' : (B, P_B) \to (D, P_D)$ is a cocone, then considering u from the simple directed graph construction, yields $u \circ \pi = \pi'$. Finally u is order-preserving since is a directed graph morphism

$$u: (C, E_C) \to (D, P_D).$$

and therefore order-preserving

$$u: (C, P_C) \to (D, P_D).$$

Lemma A.19. Let $f: (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ be a morphism such that $\text{TrRd}(P_B) \subset f(P_A)$. Then

$$\operatorname{Tr}\operatorname{Rd}(P_B) = f(\operatorname{Tr}\operatorname{Rd}(P_A)).$$

Proof. Let $(a, a') \in \text{TrRd}(P_A)$.

 $(f(a), f(a')) \in P_B$ means that there exist $x_1, ..., x_n \in B$ with $n \ge 0$ such that

$$(f(a), x_1) \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_B) \land (x_1, x_2) \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_B) \land \cdots$$
$$\land (x_{n-1}, x_n) \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_B) \land (x_n, f(a')) \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_B).$$

By assumption there exist $y_i \in A$ with $f(y_i) = x_i, i = 1, ..., n$ such that

$$(a, y_1) \in P_A \land (y_1, y_2) \in P_A \land \cdots$$

 $\land (y_{n-1}, y_n) \in P_A \land (y_n, a') \in P_A.$

Since $(a, a') \in \text{Tr}\text{Rd}(P_A)$, we have n = 0 and therefore $(f(a), f(a')) \in \text{Tr}\text{Rd}(P_B)$. For the other direction, let $(b, b') \in \text{Tr}\text{Rd}(P_B)$.

Since $\operatorname{Tr}(P_B) \subset f(P_A)$, we know that there exist $x_1, ..., x_n \in A$ with $n \geq 0$ such that

$$(a, x_1) \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_A) \land (x_1, x_2) \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_A) \land \cdots \land (x_{n-1}, x_n) \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_A) \land (x_n, a') \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_A)$$

where f(a) = b and f(a') = b'. Since we have already shown that $f(\operatorname{TrRd}(P_A)) \subset \operatorname{TrRd}(P_B)$ we have

$$(b, f(x_1)) \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_B) \land (f(x_1), f(x_2)) \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_B) \land \cdots \land (f(x_{n-1}), f(x_n)) \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_B) \land (f(x_n), b') \in \mathsf{TrRd}(P_B)$$

which implies that n = 0 and therefore $(a, a') \in \text{TrRd}(P_A)$.

Lemma A.20. Let $f : (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ be a regular epimorphism in PoSet. Then f is surjective on the cover relation of P_B .

Proof. The map $\pi : (A, P_A) \to (C, E_C)$ as constructed in Lemma A.17 is a regular epimorphism in OrGraphs. It is also a regular epimorphism in PoSet, $\pi : (A, P_A) \to (C, P_C)$, where $P_C = \operatorname{Tr}(E_C)$. By construction $\pi(P_A) = E_C$. Using Lemma A.6, we get $\operatorname{TrRd}(P_C) = \operatorname{TrRd}(\operatorname{Tr}(E_C)) \subset E_C$, i.e. π is surjective on the cover relation. Since f and π are both coequalizers we know that there exists $v \in \operatorname{Iso}((C, P_C), (B, E_B))$ such that $f = v \circ \pi$. Since v is an isomorphism, it is, in particular, surjective on the cover relation and we can apply Lemma A.19. Therefore $v \circ \pi(\operatorname{TrRd}(P_A)) = \operatorname{TrRd}(P_B)$ and we are done. \Box

The following straightforward lemma is independent of the category we are working on.

Lemma A.21. Let $f : B \to C$ be a coequalizer. Consider now a cocone $g : B \to D$ such that there exists an isomorphism $\phi : D \to C$ such that $\phi \circ g = f$. Then $g : B \to D$ is a coequalizer, as well.

Proof. Let $\ell : B \to L$ be a cocone. Since f is a coequalizer we know that $\exists ! u : C \to L$ such that $u \circ f = \ell$. It follows that g is a coequalizer since we can write $\ell = (u \circ \phi) \circ g$.

Lemma A.22. Let $f: (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ be an order-preserving map. Then the set

$${f^{-1}(y)|y \in f(A)}$$

together with the transitive closure of the relation R defined as

$$\forall x, y \in f(A) : (f^{-1}(x), f^{-1}(y)) \in R \iff \exists a \in f^{-1}(x) \land \exists a' \in f^{-1}(y) : (a, a') \in P_A$$
(1)

forms a poset and

$$(f(A), \mathsf{Tr}(f(P_A))) \cong (\{f^{-1}(y) | y \in f(A)\}, \mathsf{Tr}(R)).$$

Proof. The relation (1) has no directed cycle. Indeed, let $x_1, ..., x_n \in f(A)$ and such that we have a chain

$$f^{-1}(x_1)Rf^{-1}(x_2)R\cdots Rf^{-1}(x_n).$$

This means that there exists $a_1 \in f^{-1}(x_1), ..., a_n \in f^{-1}(x_n)$ such that

$$a_1 <_{P_A} a_2 <_{P_A} \cdots <_{P_A} a_n.$$

In particular

 $a_1 <_{P_A} a_n$

implies $x_1 = f(a_1) <_{P_B} f(a_n) = x_n$ which implies $x_1 \neq x_n$ and therefore

$$f^{-1}(x_1) \neq f^{-1}(x_n),$$

and hence the relation indeed has no directed cycles.

The isomorphism is given by

$$\phi: (f(A), \operatorname{Tr}(f(P_A))) \to (\{f^{-1}(y) | y \in f(A)\}, \operatorname{Tr}(R)),$$
$$y \mapsto \{a \in A | f(a) = y\}.$$

Lemma A.23. Let $f : (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ be a surjective order-preserving map that is also surjective on the cover relation of P_B . Then f is a regular epimorphism.

Proof. Using Lemma A.22, we have

$$(B, P_B) \cong (\{f^{-1}(b) | b \in B\}, \operatorname{Tr}(R)).$$

We now build a parallel pair from (A, \emptyset) (the discrete poset) which commutes with $\pi : (A, P_A) \rightarrow (\{f^{-1}(b)|b \in B\}, \mathbf{Tr}(R))$. Define $h := \mathrm{id}_A$ and h' as follows, for each block $A_i = \{a_{1,i}, ..., a_{n_i,i}\} \in \{f^{-1}(b)|b \in B\}$ and $j = 1, ..., n_i - 1$

$$h'(a_{j,i}) = a_{j+1,i}.$$

and

$$h'(a_{n_i,i}) = a_{1,i}.$$

Now $\pi : (A, P_A) \to (\{f^{-1}(b) | b \in B\}, \operatorname{Tr}(R))$ is a coequalizer as already shown in Lemma A.17. Clearly we have $\phi \circ f = \pi$, where $\phi(b) = \{a \in A | f(a) = b\}$ is an isomorphism (see the proof of Lemma A.22), and using Lemma A.21, we have that $f : (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ is a coequalizer. \Box

We can also characterize regular epimorphism as follows.

Lemma A.24. A morphism $f: (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ is a regular epimorphism if and only if

$$f(\operatorname{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(P_A)) = \operatorname{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(P_B).$$



Figure 18: non-regular epimorphism (left), regular epimorphism (right)

A.3. Factorization

Let E, M be classes of morphisms in C. We say that C has (E, M)-factorization if every morphism f in C can be written as $f = e \circ m$ for some $e \in E, m \in M$.

From AHS90 , we recall the following definition.

Definition A.25. A category C is (E, M)-structured if

- 1. E and M are both closed under composition with isomorphisms,
- 2. C has (E, M)-factorization,
- 3. C has the unique (E, M)-diagonalization property, i. e., for each commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \stackrel{e}{\longrightarrow} & B \\ f & & \downarrow^{g} \\ C & \stackrel{m}{\longrightarrow} & D \end{array}$$

with $e \in E$ and $m \in M$ there exists a unique morphism d such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{c} A \xrightarrow{e} B \\ f \downarrow & \downarrow^{d} & \downarrow^{g} \\ C \xrightarrow{m} D \end{array}$$

The proof of the following proposition can be found in AHS90, Proposition 14.4.

Proposition A.26. If C is (E, M)-structured, then (E, M)-factorizations are essentially unique, *i.e.*,

1. if $A \xrightarrow{e_i} C_i \xrightarrow{m_i} B$ are (E, M)-factorizations of $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ for i = 1, 2, then there exists a (unique) isomorphism h, such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \stackrel{e_1}{\longrightarrow} & C_1 \\ e_2 \downarrow & \swarrow & \downarrow m_1 \\ C_2 & \stackrel{m_2}{\longrightarrow} & B \end{array}$$

2. if $A \xrightarrow{f} B = A \xrightarrow{e} C \xrightarrow{m} B$ is a factorization and $C \xrightarrow{h} D$ is an isomorphism, then $A \xrightarrow{f} B = A \xrightarrow{h \circ e} D \xrightarrow{m \circ h^{-1}} B$ is also an (E, M)-factorization of f.

We also recall part of AHS90, Proposition 14.14.

Proposition A.27. If a category C admits (RegEpi, Mono) ((Epi, RegMono)) factorization, then the category is (RegEpi, Mono)((Epi, RegMono))-structured. This factorization is unique in the sense of Proposition A.26.

Proof. As an example, RegMono is closed under precomposition with isomorphisms. Indeed, if $f \in Mor(A, B)$ is a regular monomorphism, it is the equalizer of some parallel pair $\ell, m \in Mor(B, C)$. If $\phi : Mor(X, A)$ is an isomorphism, then $f \circ \phi$ is the equalizer of the same parallel pair ℓ, m .

Lemma A.28. Let $f : (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ be an order preserving map. Then f can factorized as $f = g \circ h$ where h is an epimorphism and g is a regular monomorphism.

Proof. We just need to corestrict $f, \hat{f}: (A, P_A) \to (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)))$ and consider the inclusion $\iota: (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A))) \to (B, P_B)$. We can then write $f = \iota \circ \hat{f}$.

Lemma A.29. Let $f : (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ be an order preserving map. Then f can factorized as $f = g \circ h$ where h is a regular epimorphism and g is a monomorphism.

Proof. We can corestrict f as follows

$$h: (A, P_A) \to (f(A), \mathsf{Tr}(f(P_A)))$$

 $a \mapsto f(a)$

which is a regular epimorphism since h is by definition surjective on $\text{TrRd}(\text{Tr}(f(P_A)))$, see Lemma A.6 which shows that $\text{TrRd}(\text{Tr}(f(P_A))) \subset f(P_A)$. The monomorphism g is simply the inclusion

$$g: (f(A), \mathsf{Tr}(f(P_A)))) \to (B, P_B)$$
$$b \mapsto b.$$

The following theorem is a simpler version of Theorem B.12.

Theorem A.30. We have

$$\begin{split} &|\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(P_A, P_B)|(f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)) \cong (C, P_C)\}| \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathsf{Aut}(P_C)|} |\mathsf{Epi}(P_A, P_C)||\mathsf{RegMono}(P_C, P_B)| \end{split}$$

Similarly

$$|\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(P_A, P_B)|(f(A), \mathsf{Tr}(f(P_A))) \cong (C, P_C)\}|$$

$$= \frac{1}{|\mathsf{Aut}(P_C)|} |\mathsf{RegEpi}(P_A, P_C)| |\mathsf{Mono}(P_C, P_B)|$$

Proof. We only show the first equality. Let $f \in \{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(P_A, P_B) | (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A))) \cong (C, P_C)\}$. Each f can be factorized as $f = \iota \circ \hat{f}$, where $\hat{f} : (A, P_A) \to (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)))$, is defined as $\hat{f}(a) := f(a)$ and $\iota : (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A))) \to (B, P_B)$ as $\iota(a) := a$. Let $f = m \circ e$ with $e \in \mathsf{Epi}(P_A, P_C)$ and $m \in \mathsf{RegMono}(P_C, P_B)$ be another factorization of f. Then, from Proposition A.26 we know that there exists a unique $h \in \mathsf{Iso}((f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)), P_B))$ such that:

the diagram commutes, which means that $e = h \circ \hat{f}$ and $m = \iota \circ h^{-1}$. For any $e \in \mathsf{Epi}(P_A, P_C)$ and $m \in \mathsf{RegMono}(P_C, P_B)$ we have that $m \circ e = f \in \{g \in \mathsf{Mor}(P_A, P_B) | (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)) \cong (C, P_C)\}$. Define the map, ψ :

$$\psi : \mathsf{Epi}(P_A, P_C) \times \mathsf{RegMono}(P_C, P_B) \to \{ f \in \mathsf{Mor}(P_A, P_B) | (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)) \cong (C, P_C) \}$$

$$\psi((e, m)) := m \circ e.$$

Let $f \in \{f \in \mathsf{Mor}(P_A, P_B) | (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A))) \cong (C, P_C)\}$. The map ψ is surjective, since we can pick $e = h \circ \hat{f}$ and $m = \iota \circ h^{-1}$. Furthermore, $|\psi^{-1}(f)| = |\mathsf{Iso}((f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)), (C, P_C))| = |\mathsf{Aut}(P_C)|$.

B. Morphisms in the category of double posets

The objects of our category, DPoSet, are now finite double (strict) posets, i.e. triples

$$(A, P_A, Q_A)$$

where P_A and Q_A are strict partial order relations. Morphisms are maps that are order preserving entrywise simultaneously for both posets, i.e.

$$f: (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$$

such that

$$\forall x, y \in A : (x, y) \in P_A \implies (f(x), f(y)) \in P_B$$

and $\forall x, y \in A : (x, y) \in Q_A \implies (f(x), f(y)) \in Q_B$

hold.

Lemma B.1. Monomorphisms are injective double poset morphisms.

By definition, $f: A \to B$ is an isomorphism if and only if is an invertible double poset morphism and $f^{-1}: B \to A$ is also a double poset morphism.

B.1. Characterization of regular monomorphisms

Definition B.3. Let $f : (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$ be a morphism. f is a **double order** embedding if its corestriction to f(A) defined as

$$\hat{f}: (A, P_A, P_B) \to (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)), Q_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)))$$
$$\forall a \in A : \hat{f}(a) := f(a)$$

is an isomorphism.

We will show that regular monomorphisms in DPoSet are exactly the double order embeddings.

Lemma B.4. Let $f, g: (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$ be a parallel pair. Let

$$E := \{ a \in A | f(a) = g(a) \}.$$

Then the double poset $(E, P_A \cap (E \times E), Q_A \cap (E \times E))$, together with the inclusion map ι : $(E, P_A \cap (E \times E), Q_A \cap (E \times E)) \rightarrow (A, P_A, Q_A)$ is an equalizer.

Proof. The inclusion map

$$\iota: (E, P_A \cap (E \times E), Q_A \cap (E \times E)) \to (A, P_A, Q_A)$$

by construction satisfies $f \circ \iota = g \circ \iota$, hence is a cone. Consider any other cone, i.e. any double poset (T, P_T, Q_T) and any order-preserving map $t : (T, P_T, Q_T) \to (A, P_A, Q_A)$ such that

$$f \circ t = g \circ t.$$

We necessarily have

$$t(T) \subset E$$

and

$$t(P_T) \subset P_A \cap (E \times E), \quad t(Q_T) \subset Q_A \cap (E \times E).$$

Therefore, we can corestrict t

$$\hat{t}: (T, P_T, Q_T) \to (E, P_A \cap (E \times E), Q_A \cap (E \times E))$$

Lemma B.5. Let f be a regular monomorphism. Then f is a double order embedding.

Proof. Let $f: (D, P_D, Q_D) \to (A, P_A, Q_A)$ be a regular monomorphism, i.e. a limit for some parallel pair $g, h: (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$. Consider the equalizer constructed in Lemma A.10, i.e. the inclusion map

$$\iota: (E, P_A \cap (E \times E), Q_A \cap (E \times E)) \to (A, P_A)$$

where

$$E := \{ a \in A | g(a) = h(a) \}.$$

The inclusion map ι is clearly an order embedding. From the proof of Lemma A.10, we have $f = \iota \circ \hat{f}$. Observe that the map \hat{f} is the unique isomorphism between the two equalizers. Therefore \hat{f} is in particular a double order embedding. Since ι and \hat{f} are both double order embeddings and the composition of double order embeddings is a double order embedding, we are done.

To show that order embeddings are regular monomorphisms we rely on the following result, where we "clone" a part of a poset.

Lemma B.6. Let f be a double order embedding. Then f is a regular monomorphism.

Proof. Let $f: (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$ be an order embedding. Consider a copy of the set $B \setminus f(A)$

$$(B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}} := \{(x, *) | x \in B \setminus f(A)\}.$$

and a relation $R_{\mathsf{Copy}} \subset (B \cup (B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}}) \times (B \cup (B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}}).$

Its transitive closure, $\operatorname{Tr}(R_{\mathsf{Copy}})$, is a partial order according to Lemma A.12. Analogously consider, $\operatorname{Tr}(S_{\mathsf{Copy}})$, where S_{Copy} is built upon Q_A instead of P_A , used to build R_{Copy} . Now define two maps $\ell, m : (B, P_B, Q_B) \to (B \cup (B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}}, \operatorname{Tr}(R_{\mathsf{Copy}}), \operatorname{Tr}(S_{\mathsf{Copy}}))$,

$$\forall b \in B : \ell(b) := b$$

and

$$\forall b \in f(A) : m(b) := b$$

$$\forall b \in (B \setminus f(A)) : m(b) := (b, *).$$

They are both morphisms. Observe that f is a cone by construction. From Lemma A.10, we know that

$$f(A) = \{ b \in B | \ell(b) = m(b) \}$$

together with the inclusion $\iota : (f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)), Q_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A))) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$ is an equalizer.

We have $f = \iota \circ \hat{f}$, and, by definition of double order embedding, \hat{f} is an isomorphism. Then f is an equalizer by using Lemma A.13.

$$(A, P_A, Q_A) \xrightarrow{f} (B, P_B, Q_B) \xrightarrow{\ell} (B \cup (B \setminus f(A))_{\mathsf{Copy}}, \mathsf{Tr}(R_{\mathsf{Copy}}), \mathsf{Tr}(S_{\mathsf{Copy}}))$$

$$\stackrel{f^{\downarrow}}{\underset{\iota}{f_{\downarrow}}} \underbrace{(f(A), P_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)), Q_B \cap (f(A) \times f(A)))}$$

We can now also use the characterization of regular monomorphisms for strict posets, see Appendix A.1.

Lemma B.7. $f : (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$ is a regular monomorphism if and only if $f : (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ and $f : (A, Q_A) \to (B, Q_B)$ are regular monomorphisms in the category of posets.

B.2. Characterization of regular epimorphisms

Using ideas similar to the ones used in Appendix A.2 we have the following result.

Lemma B.8. Let $f : (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$ be a morphism in DPoSet. Then f is a regular epimorphism if and only if it surjective on the cover relation of P_B and on the cover relation of Q_B .

We can also characterize regular epimorphism in DPoSet as follows.

Lemma B.9. A morphism $f : (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$ is a regular epimorphism if and only if

$$f(\operatorname{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(P_A)) = \operatorname{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(P_B), \quad f(\operatorname{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(Q_A)) = \operatorname{Tr}\mathsf{Rd}(Q_B).$$

We can also use the characterization of regular epimorphisms for strict posets, see Appendix A.

Lemma B.10. $f: (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$ is a regular epimorphism in DPoSet if and only if $f: (A, P_A) \to (B, P_B)$ and $f: (A, Q_A) \to (B, Q_B)$ are regular epimorphisms in the category of posets.

B.3. Factorization

Theorem B.11. The category of double posets is (RegEpi,Mono)-structured and (Epi,RegMono)structured.

Proof. We show how any morphism can be factorized into a regular epimorphism and a monomorphism. Similar to the proof of Lemma A.29,

$$f: (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (B, P_B, Q_B)$$

can be corestricted to

$$\hat{f}: (A, P_A, Q_A) \to (f(A), \mathsf{Tr}(f(P_A)), \mathsf{Tr}(f(Q_A)))$$

and then we compose it with the inclusion

$$\iota: (f(A), \mathsf{Tr}(f(P_A)), \mathsf{Tr}(f(Q_A))) \to (B, P_B, Q_B).$$

The following theorem is used in Corollary 3.3.

Theorem B.12. We have

$$\begin{split} &|\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}((A, P_A, Q_A), (B, P_B, Q_B))| \\ &(f(A), P_B \cap f(A) \times f(A), Q_B \cap f(A) \times f(A)) \cong (C, P_C, Q_C)\}| \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathsf{Aut}((C, P_C, Q_C))|} |\mathsf{Epi}((A, P_A, Q_A), (C, P_C, Q_C))||\mathsf{RegMono}((C, P_C, Q_C), (B, P_B, Q_B))| \end{split}$$

Similarly

$$\begin{split} &|\{f \in \mathsf{Mor}((A, P_A, Q_A), (B, P_B, Q_B))|\\ &(f(A), \mathsf{Tr}(f(P_A)), \mathsf{Tr}(f(Q_A))) \cong (C, P_C, Q_C)\}|\\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathsf{Aut}((C, P_C, Q_C))|} |\mathsf{RegEpi}((A, P_A, Q_A), (C, P_C, Q_C))||\mathsf{Mono}((C, P_C, Q_C), (B, P_B, Q_B))| \end{split}$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem A.30.

B.4. Auxiliary results

These two results are used in the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Lemma B.13. Let $d = (A, P_A, Q_A)$ and $d' = (B, P_B, Q_B)$ be double posets such that |A| = |B|. If $|P_A| > |P_B|$ or $|Q_A| > |Q_B|$ then $\mathsf{Epi}(d, d') = \emptyset$.

Proof. Assume that we have a morphism $f \in \mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{d}')$ and that $|P_A| > |P_B|$. Since |A| = |B| we know that $f \in \mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{d}') \cap \mathsf{Mono}(\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{d}')$. We therefore have $|P_A| = |f(P_A)| \le |P_B|$ which yields a contradiction.

Lemma B.14. Let $d = (A, P_A, Q_A)$ and $d' = (B, P_B, Q_B)$ be double posets such that |A| = |B|, $|P_A| = |P_B|$ and $|Q_A| = |Q_B|$. Then

$$\mathsf{Epi}(\mathtt{d},\mathtt{d}') \neq \emptyset \iff \mathtt{d} \cong \mathtt{d}'$$

Proof. Let $f \in \mathsf{Epi}(\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{d}')$. f is a bijection and since $|f(P_A)| = Q_A$ implies that $f(P_A) = Q_A$ and similarly $f(P_B) = Q_B$. It follows that f^{-1} is also a morphism and therefore $f \in \mathsf{lso}(\mathsf{d}, \mathsf{d}')$ and we are done.