

# ENUMERATION OF PARTITIONS VIA SOCLE REDUCTION

MICHELE GRAFFEO, SERGEJ MONAVARI, RICCARDO MOSCHETTI, ANDREA T. RICOLFI

*In memory of Percy A. MacMahon (1854–1929), on the occasion of his  $\binom{19}{2}$ -th birthday.*

ABSTRACT. We study the enumeration problem of higher dimensional partitions, a natural generalisation of classical integer partitions. We show that their counting problem is equivalent to the enumeration of simpler classes of higher dimensional partitions, satisfying suitable constraints on their embedding dimension and socle type. We provide exact formulas for the generating functions of several infinite families of such partitions, and design a procedure enumerating them in the general case. As a proof of concept, we determine the number of partitions of size up to 30 in any dimension.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Background and notation	7
3. Generating functions of partitions	11
4. M-partitions: reduction to socle in degree $\geq 3$	20
5. Exact count of M-partitions	23
6. Conjectures	42
References	46

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Overview.** *Higher dimensional partitions* are classical combinatorial objects introduced by MacMahon over a century ago [32, 33]. For  $n, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional partition of size  $d$  can be graphically visualised as an arrangement of  $d$  boxes in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $p_d^n$  be the number of such partitions. Based on small experimental data, MacMahon conjectured the elegant formula

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{d \geq 0} p_d^n t^d = \prod_{m > 0} (1 - t^m)^{-\binom{m+n-3}{n-2}},$$

which does hold for  $n = 2, 3$ . The case  $n = 2$  was known to Euler, whereas for the case  $n = 3$  we refer to MacMahon's original work [32, 33]. The identity (1.1) is, however, only true modulo  $t^6$  as long as  $n \geq 4$  [2]. Computing the numbers  $p_d^n$  for  $n \geq 4$  is a major unsolved problem in Combinatorics; quoting the words of Stanley, "almost nothing significant is

known” [47, Sec. 7.20, p. 365]. While it was recently proved that the right-hand side of (1.1) enumerates higher dimensional partitions of fixed *corner-hook volume* [1], a closed formula for its left-hand side is currently out of reach. See Section 6.1 for more on this matter.

It is worth stressing that, despite the validity of Euler’s formula, no closed (nonrecursive) formula is known for  $p_d^2$ , let alone for  $p_d^n$ . This problem originally motivated Hardy and Ramanujan, over a century ago, to look for asymptotic formulas for  $p_d^2$ . In [27] they proved that  $\log p_d^2 \approx \pi\sqrt{2d/3}$ . A short while later, they improved this estimate with analytic methods, see [29, 28]. In more recent years it was confirmed that the asymptotic growth of  $p_d^n$  is exponentially fast for higher  $n$  as well [5, 40, 43]; more precisely, one has

$$\log p_d^n \approx d \frac{n-1}{n}.$$

This makes the direct computation of  $p_d^n$  cumbersome and, in practice, unfeasible; for instance, the exact values of  $p_d^4$  are only known for  $d \leq 72$ , and for a general  $n \geq 1$  the numbers  $p_d^n$  were computed for  $d \leq 26$  [16, 17].

In this paper we are interested in the *exact values* of the numbers  $p_d^\bullet$ , rather than their asymptotics. Motivated by Govindarajan’s work [17] and by our previous paper [20], we study the distribution of the numbers  $p_d^\bullet$  where we fix the size  $d$  and allow the dimension to grow indefinitely. This means that, instead of working with the series (1.1), we switch perspective and deal with the (rational) generating function

$$(1.2) \quad H_d(t) = \sum_{n \geq 0} p_d^{n+1} t^n.$$

Our main results exploit a *socle reduction* technique (cf. Section 1.2), through which we explicitly compute the generating functions counting higher dimensional partitions satisfying suitable constraints, *refining* the original counting  $p_d^n$ . We carefully analyse the rationality properties of these infinite series. The key insight of our analysis is that these refinements and their ‘internal’ relationships, that we pinpoint throughout the paper, are enough to reconstruct all integers  $p_d^\bullet$  for fixed  $d$ . As a byproduct, we obtain a closed expression for  $H_d(t)$  for  $d \leq 30$ . With such expression at hand, it is immediate to compute, for instance,

$$p_{30}^{666} = 5390806817913544023450455014935417834529246670018145780.$$

**1.2. Refined partition counting: socle reduction technique.** As already mentioned, no closed formula is currently known for the generating function of the numbers  $p_d^n$  for  $n \geq 4$ . On the other hand, if we fix the size  $d \geq 1$ , an immediate corollary of the main result in our previous work [20] states that the generating function  $H_d(t)$  defined in (1.2) is a rational function, satisfying the relation

$$(1.3) \quad H_d(t) = \frac{h_d(t)}{(1-t)^d} \in \mathbb{Z}(t),$$

where  $h_d(t) = 1$  for  $d = 1, 2, 3$ , and is a polynomial of degree at most  $d - 2$  if  $d > 3$ . The rationality is related to the crucial observation<sup>1</sup> that the counting problem for *all* higher dimensional partitions is actually redundant, as suggested by the relation

$$(1.4) \quad p_d^n = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \binom{n}{k} y_d^k,$$

where  $y_d^k$  is the number of  $(k - 1)$ -dimensional partitions of precisely *embedding dimension*  $k$  and size  $d$  (cf. Section 2.2). In particular, for a fixed  $d \geq 1$ , the *infinitely many* numbers  $p_d^\bullet$  can be computed knowing only  $d - 1$  initial values.

1.2.1. *Exact embedding dimension.* Our first main result is on the generating function

$$Y_e(t) = \sum_{k \geq 0} y_{k+2+e}^{k+1} t^k,$$

which should be regarded as encoding easier *fundamental blocks* determining the numbers  $p_d^n$ .

**Theorem A** (Theorem 3.4). *Fix  $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ . Then*

$$Y_e(t) = \frac{y_e(t)}{(1-t)^{2e+1}}$$

in  $\mathbb{Z}(t)$ , where

$$y_e(t) = \sum_{h=0}^{2e-1} \gamma_h^{(e)} t^h \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$$

is a polynomial of degree at most  $2e - 1$ , whose coefficients are given by

$$\gamma_h^{(e)} = \sum_{j=0}^h (-1)^{h+j} \binom{2e+1}{h-j} y_{j+e+2}^{j+1}$$

for  $0 \leq h \leq 2e - 1$ . In particular,  $Y_e(t)$  is a rational function.

We have computed the polynomials  $y_e(t)$  for  $e \leq 18$  and we have listed them in [generatingfunctions.txt](#). We shall pinpoint in Corollary 3.3 how exactly the infinite sequence  $(y_{k+e+1}^k)_{k \geq 0}$  is determined by its first  $2e + 1$  values.

It is worth mentioning that [2] introduced some refined numbers  $\overline{y}_d^\bullet$ , formally extracted by MacMahon's conjectural formula (1.1) analogously to (1.4) (cf. Section 6) and conjectured the positivity of the *discrepancy*  $e_d^k = \overline{y}_d^k - y_d^k$ . We propose a conjectural rational formula for the generating series of the numbers  $\overline{y}_d^\bullet$  (cf. Conjecture 6.2) and prove that implies the positivity of the discrepancy  $e_d^k$  for  $d \gg 0$  (cf. Proposition 6.5).

---

<sup>1</sup>While this observation was already classically known [2], Equation (1.3) follows directly from our more general result on *motivic invariants* [20].

1.2.2. *No socle in degree 1.* Similarly to (1.4), it was already noticed in [17, 20] that the numbers  $y_{\bullet}^{\circ}$  admit further refinements via

$$y_{k+e+1}^k = \sum_{j=0}^{2e} \binom{k}{j} c_e^j,$$

where  $c_e^j$  is the number of partitions of size  $1 + j + e$ , embedding dimension  $j$  and no *socle* in degree 1, where the *socle* of a partition is the collection of its maximal elements according to the standard poset structure (see Equation (2.1) for the precise definition).

Define, for  $x \geq 0$ , the generating function

$$C_x(t) = \begin{cases} \sum_{e \geq \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil} c_{e+1}^{2(e+1)-x} t^{e - \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil} & \text{if } x \text{ is even} \\ \sum_{e \geq \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil} c_e^{2e-x} t^{e - \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil} & \text{if } x \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

in  $\mathbb{Z}[[t]]$ . Our second result is that  $C_x(t)$  becomes a nice analytic function after applying the *Borel resummation* operator  $\mathbf{B}: \mathbb{Q}[[t]] \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}[[t]]$  sending  $\sum_{k \geq 0} f_k t^k \mapsto \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{1}{k!} f_k t^k$  (cf. Section 2.5).

**Theorem B** (Theorem 3.7). *Fix  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Then*

$$\mathbf{B}(C_x(t)) = \frac{c_x(t)}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3}{2}+2x-\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}}$$

in  $\mathbb{Q}[[t]]$ , where  $c_x(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$  is a polynomial of degree at most  $2x - \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil$ . In particular,  $\mathbf{B}(C_x(t))$  is an analytic function in  $t = 0$ .

See Theorem 3.7 for an explicit formula for  $c_x(t)$ . We have computed these polynomials for  $x \leq 26$  and we have listed them in [generatingfunctions.txt](#). We remark that, for  $x \leq 5$ , our result recovers the polynomials displayed in [17, Sec. 4.3]. The first polynomial that could not be extracted from the data provided in [16] is

$$c_6(t) = -\frac{4081}{6}t^9 + \frac{8491}{2}t^8 - \frac{25511}{2}t^7 + \frac{116795}{6}t^6 + \frac{1929}{4}t^5 + \frac{292709}{4}t^4 \\ + 59667t^3 + 6773t^2 + 475t + 11.$$

We shall pinpoint in Corollary 3.3 how exactly the infinite sequence  $(c_e^{2e-x})_{e \geq \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}$  is determined by its first  $2x - \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil$  values.

1.2.3. *No socle in degree 2.* Motivated by the yoga of *socle reduction* outlined in 1.2.2, we show that the numbers  $c_{\bullet}^{\circ}$  can be further refined by new numbers  $\alpha_{\bullet, \bullet}^{\circ}$  and  $c_{\bullet, \bullet}^{\circ}$ , see Definitions 4.1 and 4.5.

**Proposition 1.1** (Proposition 4.6). *The numbers  $c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a$  satisfy the relations*

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} c_{e,(k,q,m)}^0 &= 0, \\ c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a &= \alpha_{q,m}^k \binom{a}{k} \binom{\binom{a+1}{2} - q}{e - q - m} - \sum_{i=1}^{a-1} \binom{a}{i} c_{e,(k,q,m)}^i. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, there is an identity

$$c_e^a = \sum_{\substack{k \leq a \\ q+m \leq e}} c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a.$$

Thanks to the recursive structure of Proposition 1.1, the enumeration of higher dimensional partitions is reduced to the computation of the numbers  $\alpha_{\bullet,\bullet}^a$ , which count *M-partitions* (cf. Definition 4.1). These are higher dimensional partitions with fixed embedding dimension and number of degree 2 boxes, and admitting *no socle* in degree 1 and 2.

Excluding from the counting all the higher dimensional partitions with socle in degree 2 dramatically reduces the computational complexity of  $p_{\bullet}^a$ . In fact, M-partitions enjoy particularly nice features; for instance, their embedding dimension is always bounded by their number of quadrics, cf. Proposition 4.2. This allowed us to find exact formulas for their generating function in many cases, as we outline in Section 1.3.

In Section 5.5, we devise an algorithmic strategy for computing the numbers  $\alpha_{\bullet,\bullet}^a$  in the general case, which we have implemented in Sage [48], Mathematica [30] and Macaulay2 [21] to collect a large amount of data.

Combining the recursion of Proposition 1.1 with the main Theorems A and B, the exact generating functions in Section 5 and the algorithmic strategy presented in Section 5.5, we were able to compute the number  $p_d^n$  of higher dimensional partitions for all  $n \geq 1$  and  $d \leq 30$ . We remark that already the number  $p_{27}^n$  would be computationally out of reach for  $n \geq 7$  using only the algorithms currently present in the literature, see e.g. [17, Sec. 4.3].

It is worth mentioning that our socle reduction principle could ideally be extended to reduce the general partition enumeration problem to the enumeration problem of partitions with arbitrary lower bound for the socle degree. However, already in the case of constraining the socle to be in degree at least 4, finding a recursive structure analogous to the one of Proposition 1.1 is a highly nontrivial problem, which we leave to future exploration.

**1.3. Counting M-partitions.** We introduce in Definition 5.8 a special kind of M-partitions, that we call *hydral partitions*. These are  $(n-1)$ -dimensional partitions  $\lambda$  with socle in degree at least 3, and such that  $h_\lambda(1) = h_\lambda(2) = n$ , i.e. with minimal number of quadrics. They are counted by the integers  $\alpha_{n,\bullet}^n$ . The following theorem describes their count in arbitrary dimension, see also Propositions 5.6 and 5.9 for a direct calculation of their

generating function in the case  $n = 2$  and  $n = 3$  respectively, and Example 5.11 for the case  $n = 4$ .

**Theorem C** (Theorem 5.18 and Corollary 5.21). *Fix some integer  $d = 1 + 2n + m$ . Let  $\alpha_{n,m}^n$  be the number of hydral partitions of size  $d$  and embedding dimension  $n$ . Then*

$$(1.6) \quad \sum_{m \geq 0} \alpha_{n,m}^n t^m = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} \sum_{i=0}^{t(\lambda)} \binom{n}{3i} \frac{(3i)!}{6^i i!} f(s^i(\lambda)) \Psi_{s^i(\lambda)}(t) t^i,$$

where  $t, f, s$  are auxiliary functions that we define in Notation 5.19 and  $\Psi_{s^i(\lambda)}(t)$  is defined and proved to be rational in Lemma 5.20. In particular, the left-hand side of (1.6) is a rational function.

Theorem C implies that it is enough to perform the algorithmic procedure explained in Section 5.5 only for M-partitions with nonminimal number of quadrics. Moreover, the rationality statement in Theorem C should be considered ‘optimal’, in the sense that counting M-partitions with nonminimal number of quadrics, i.e. with  $h_\lambda(2) = h_\lambda(1) + 1$ , yields manifestly nonrational generating functions in any dimension, cf. Remark 5.22.

In a similar fashion, we prove a closed exact formula for the generating series of a special class of hydral partitions, summing over all dimensions.

**Theorem D** (Theorem 5.4). *Fix an integer  $s \geq 3$  and define the Hilbert–Samuel function*

$$h_{n,s} = (1, \underbrace{n, n, \dots, n}_s).$$

Then  $\alpha_{h_{n,s}}$  is independent of  $s$  and there is an identity

$$\mathbf{B} \left( \sum_{n \geq 0} \alpha_{h_{n,s}} t^n \right) = e^{te^t}.$$

Analogously to Theorem D, we prove a series of closed exact formulas counting families of (anti-)compressed M-partitions, cf. Proposition 5.1, 5.2, 5.3. Once more, each of these exact counting eventually simplifies the complexity of the original counting problem  $p_\bullet^\bullet$ .

**1.4. Geometry and Physics.** Fix integers  $n > 0$  and  $d \geq 0$ . Let  $Z$  be a smooth  $n$ -dimensional complex variety,  $E$  a locally free sheaf of rank  $r \geq 1$  over  $Z$ . Form the Quot scheme of points  $\text{Quot}_Z(E, d)$ , namely the fine moduli space of coherent sheaf quotients  $E \rightarrow Q$ , where  $\chi(Q) = d$  [24]. When  $r = 1$ , this space reduces to the Hilbert scheme of points  $\text{Hilb}^d(Z)$ , which is almost always singular (precisely when  $n \geq 3$  and  $d \geq 4$ ) and pathological in a precise sense [31]. The integers  $p_\bullet^n$  determine the topological Euler characteristic of  $\text{Quot}_Z(E, \bullet)$  via

$$(1.7) \quad \sum_{d \geq 0} \chi(\text{Quot}_Z(E, d)) t^d = \left( \sum_{d \geq 0} p_d^n t^d \right)^{r\chi(Z)},$$

independently on  $E$ , which should be seen as a numerical shadow of the *motivic* identities proved in [44, 26]. We remark that, through the viewpoint of algebraic geometry, the failure of the motivic analogue of MacMahon’s conjecture is deeply related with the singularities of the Hilbert scheme  $\text{Hilb}^d(\mathbb{A}^n)$ , cf. [20].

The connection between the enumeration of higher dimensional partitions and Quot schemes is ubiquitous in enumerative geometry (Donaldson–Thomas theory), geometric representation theory and string theory, where the main focus is on the cases  $n = 3, 4$ , see [34, 4, 11, 3, 8, 9, 18, 45, 14, 36, 19, 7, 35, 13, 37, 38, 41] for a nonexhaustive list of references.

**Acknowledgements.** We would like to thank Geoffrey Critzer, Alessio D’Ali, Paolo Lella and Alessio Sammartano for useful discussions. Special thanks to Giorgio Gubbiotti for generously sharing his expertise and technical support on some rationality questions. Finally, we thank Andrea Sangiovanni for suggesting the link with hypergeometric functions (Remark 3.9).

S.M. is supported by the FNS Project 200021-196960 “Arithmetic aspects of moduli spaces on curves”. R.M. is partially supported by the PRIN project 2022L34E7W “Moduli Spaces and Birational Geometry”. A.R. is partially supported by the PRIN project 2022BTA242 “Geometry of algebraic structures: moduli, invariants, deformations”. All authors are members of the GNSAGA - INdAM.

## 2. BACKGROUND AND NOTATION

2.1. **Conventions.** We set  $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we set

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (n-i)}{k!},$$

which coincides with the classical binomial coefficient if  $n \geq 0$ . Moreover, for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , the lattice  $\mathbb{N}^n$  is endowed with its stanfard component-wise poset structure throughout.

The cardinality of a finite set  $S$  will be denoted  $|S|$ .

2.2. **Higher dimensional partitions.** We introduce the main object of study of this paper.

**Definition 2.1.** Fix  $n, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . An  $(n-1)$ -dimensional partition is a collection of  $d$  points  $\lambda = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d\} \subset \mathbb{N}^n$  such that if  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{N}^n$  satisfies  $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{a}_i$  for some  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , then  $\mathbf{y} \in \lambda$ . We call  $|\lambda| = d$  the size of  $\lambda$  and we denote by  $\mathbb{P}_d^n$  the set of  $(n-1)$ -dimensional partitions of size  $d$ , and by  $p_d^n$  the cardinality  $|\mathbb{P}_d^n|$ .

A partition  $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_d^n$  can alternatively be visualised as a stack of boxes in  $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ , labelled by nonincreasing positive integers, whence the name  $(n-1)$ -dimensional partitions.

For instance,

$$p_d^n = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d \in \{0, 1\}, n = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } d > 1, n = 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } n = 1 \\ 1 & \text{if } d = 0. \end{cases}$$

Elements of  $P_d^2$  (resp.  $P_d^3$ ) are known in the literature as *linear* (resp. *plane*) partitions. Linear partitions of size  $d > 0$  are in natural bijections with Young diagrams of size  $d$ .

Next, we recall a few constructions and invariants attached to higher dimensional partitions.

Given a lattice point  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ , we define its *degree* by

$$\deg(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i.$$

Let  $\lambda \in P_d^n$  be a partition. For  $k \geq 1$ , we set

$$\lambda_{\geq k} = \{ \mathbf{y} \in \lambda \mid \deg(\mathbf{y}) \geq k \} \subset \lambda,$$

and similarly we denote by  $\lambda_{=k}$  (resp.  $\lambda_{\leq k}$ ) the set of lattice points of degree exactly  $k$  (resp. at most  $k$ ). The *Hilbert–Samuel function* of  $\lambda$  is the function

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N} &\xrightarrow{h_\lambda} \mathbb{N} \\ i &\longmapsto |\lambda_{=i}|, \end{aligned}$$

which we sometimes represent as a tuple of positive integers  $h_\lambda = (h_0, h_1, \dots, h_{\ell(\lambda)})$ , calling  $\ell(\lambda)$  the *length* of  $\lambda$ . We also set  $|h_\lambda| = |\lambda|$ . Note that the length of  $\lambda$  satisfies

$$\ell(\lambda) = \max \{ \deg(\mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{y} \in \lambda \}.$$

We call  $h_\lambda(1)$  the *embedding dimension* of  $\lambda$ . The *socle*  $\text{Soc}(\lambda)$  is defined to be the set of maximal elements in  $\lambda$ , namely

$$(2.1) \quad \text{Soc}(\lambda) = \{ \mathbf{y} \in \lambda \mid \mathbf{y} \not\prec \mathbf{a} \text{ for all } \mathbf{a} \in \lambda \} \subset \lambda.$$

A basic, but key observation is that by the very definition of partition, the socle  $\text{Soc}(\lambda)$  determines  $\lambda$  uniquely.

Finally, the *socle type* of  $\lambda$  is the function

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{N} &\xrightarrow{e_\lambda} \mathbb{N} \\ i &\longmapsto |\text{Soc}(\lambda) \cap \lambda_{=i}|, \end{aligned}$$

which we sometimes represent as a tuple of integers  $e_\lambda = (e_0, e_1, \dots, e_{\ell(\lambda)})$ .


**Notation 2.2.** Given a linear partition  $\lambda \in P_d^2$ , there are two different (equivalent) ways to represent  $\lambda$ , namely

$$(1) \quad \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell) \text{ where } \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_\ell > 0 \text{ and } d = \sum_j \lambda_j, \text{ and}$$



- (2)  $\lambda = (1^{\alpha_1} 2^{\alpha_2} \dots d^{\alpha_d})$  where  $d = \sum_i i \alpha_i$  (and some  $\alpha_i$  might be 0, in which case they are omitted).

In both cases, we write ' $\lambda \vdash d$ ' to say that  $\lambda \in P_d^2$ . The notation in (2) means that  $\lambda$  consists of  $\alpha_i$  parts of size  $i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$ , so that  $\ell = \sum_i \alpha_i$  counts the number of columns in the Young diagram attached to  $\lambda$ . To pass from (1) to (2), consider the string  $\lambda' = (\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \dots, \lambda'_s)$  of decreasing *distinct* parts of  $\lambda$  (so that  $\lambda_1 = \lambda'_1 > \lambda'_2 > \dots > \lambda'_s$  and  $s \leq \ell$ ). Each  $\lambda'_j$  satisfies  $1 \leq \lambda'_j \leq d$  and carries a positive multiplicity  $\alpha_{\lambda'_j} \leq d$ , counting the number of times it occurred in  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ . For example, the Young diagram



corresponds to  $\lambda = (4, 3, 3, 1, 1) = (1^2 3^2 4^1)$ , has size 12, satisfies  $\lambda' = (4, 3, 1)$  and has  $2 + 2 + 1 = 5$  parts.

The *automorphism group* of  $\lambda \in P_d^2$  is, by definition, the group  $\text{aut}(\lambda) = \prod_i \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha_i}$ , where  $\mathfrak{S}_a$  is the symmetric group on  $a$  letters. In the above example, the automorphism group is  $\mathfrak{S}_2 \times \mathfrak{S}_2$ .

**2.3. Apolarity.** Let  $S \subset \mathbb{N}^n$  be any finite subset. The *apolar partition*  $S^\perp$  associated to  $S$  is the partition

$$S^\perp = \{ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{N}^n \mid \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{a} \text{ for some } \mathbf{a} \in S \} \subset \mathbb{N}^n.$$

We say that a finite subset  $S \subset \mathbb{N}^n$  is *admissible* if any two elements in  $S$  are not comparable. By construction, for all partitions  $\lambda \in P_d^n$  and finite admissible subsets  $S \subset \mathbb{N}^n$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Soc}(\lambda)^\perp &= \lambda, \\ \text{Soc}(S^\perp) &= S. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, there is a bijection between partitions and admissible subsets  $S \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ .

**2.4. Monomial ideals.** Fix  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . There is a bijective correspondence between  $(n-1)$ -dimensional partitions and monomial ideals of finite colength in  $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . To a partition  $\lambda \in P_d^n$ , one associates the monomial ideal

$$I_\lambda = \left\langle x_1^{i_1} \dots x_n^{i_n} \mid (i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n \setminus \lambda \right\rangle \subset \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n],$$

with quotient

$$\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n] / I_\lambda = \bigoplus_{(i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \lambda} \mathbb{C} \cdot x_1^{i_1} \dots x_n^{i_n}.$$

We now reformulate the apolar construction for ideals and their quotients (see e.g. [20, Sec. 2.5]). For a finite subset  $T \subset \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , define its *apolar ideal*

$$T^\perp = \left\langle x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} \mid \frac{\partial^{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i}}{\partial^{\alpha_1} x_1 \dots \partial^{\alpha_n} x_n} p = 0, \text{ for all } p \in T, \alpha_i \in \mathbb{N} \right\rangle \subset \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n].$$

To an admissible subset  $S \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ , we associate the collection of monomials

$$\tilde{S} = \left\{ x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_n^{i_n} \mid (i_1, \dots, i_n) \in S \right\} \subset \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n],$$

whose apolar ideal  $\tilde{S}^\perp$  corresponds to the apolar partition  $S^\perp$ . This formulation will be a useful language to describe partitions in terms of the monomial ideals generated via apolarity by their socles.

Whenever it will be clear from the context, we will identify partitions with their associated monomial ideals.

**2.5. Borel transform.** Several formulas that we shall prove in this paper are most conveniently formulated in terms of the *Borel transform*, namely the operator

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}[[t]] &\xrightarrow{\mathbf{B}} \mathbb{Q}[[t]] \\ \sum_{k \geq 0} f_k t^k &\longmapsto \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{f_k}{k!} t^k. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by  $\mathbf{IB}$  its inverse. We now prove two identities that will be used throughout the paper.

**Lemma 2.3.** *For every  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  there is an identity*

$$\mathbf{IB} \left( \frac{1}{(1-2t)^{\frac{1+2x}{2}}} \right) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(2n+2x-1)!!}{(2x-1)!!} t^n$$

*Proof.* By the binomial theorem with rational exponents, we have, for every rational number  $m \in \mathbb{Q}$ , the identity

$$(2.2) \quad (1+u)^m = \sum_{i \geq 0} \left( \frac{1}{i!} \prod_{k=0}^{i-1} (m-k) \right) u^i.$$

Specialising to  $u = -2t$  and  $m = -x - 1/2$ , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{(1-2t)^{\frac{1+2x}{2}}} = \sum_{i \geq 0} \left( \frac{(-2)^i}{i!} \prod_{k=0}^{i-1} (-x-1/2-k) \right) t^i.$$

The claim then reduces to proving the identity

$$(-2)^i \prod_{k=0}^{i-1} (-x-1/2-k) = \frac{(2i+2x-1)!!}{(2x-1)!!}$$

for every  $i \geq 0$ . But this is clear, since

$$(2x-1)!! (-2)^i \prod_{k=0}^{i-1} (-x-1/2-k) = (2x-1)!! \prod_{k=0}^{i-1} (2x+1+2k) = (2i+2x-1)!!$$

as required.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** *For every  $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  there is an identity*

$$\mathbf{IB} \left( \frac{(2s-1)!!(s+t)}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3+2s}{2}}} \right) = \sum_{i \geq 0} (s+i)(2s+2i-1)!! t^i.$$

*Proof.* We split the argument of **IB** into two functions, corresponding to the sum  $s + t$ . By Equation (2.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{s(2s-1)!!}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3+2s}{2}}} &= s(2s-1)!! \sum_{i \geq 0} \left( \frac{1}{i!} \prod_{k=0}^{i-1} (3+2s+2k) \right) t^i \\ \frac{t(2s-1)!!}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3+2s}{2}}} &= (2s-1)!! \sum_{i \geq 1} \left( \frac{1}{(i-1)!} \prod_{k=0}^{i-2} (3+2s+2k) \right) t^i. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the operator **IB**, we thus obtain

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{IB} \left( \frac{s(2s-1)!!}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3+2s}{2}}} \right) &= s(2s-1)!! \sum_{i \geq 0} \left( \prod_{k=0}^{i-1} (3+2s+2k) \right) t^i \\ \mathbf{IB} \left( \frac{t(2s-1)!!}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3+2s}{2}}} \right) &= (2s-1)!! \sum_{i \geq 1} \left( i \prod_{k=0}^{i-2} (3+2s+2k) \right) t^i. \end{aligned}$$

Let us check the coefficients of  $t^0$  and  $t^1$  separately before dealing with the general case. As for  $t^0$ , only the first function contributes, and gives  $s(2s-1)!!$ , as it should. As for  $t^1$ , we obtain

$$s(2s-1)!!(3+2s) + (2s-1)!! = (2s-1)!!(1+3s+2s^2) = (2s-1)!!(2s+1)(s+1),$$

which coincides with the required value  $(s+1)(2s+1)!!$ . For the cases  $i \geq 2$ , summing the contributions from Equations (2.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} &s(2s-1)!! \prod_{k=0}^{i-1} (3+2s+2k) + i(2s-1)!! \prod_{k=0}^{i-2} (3+2s+2k) \\ &= \left( (2s-1)!! \prod_{k=0}^{i-2} (3+2s+2k) \right) (s(2s+2i+1) + i) \\ &= (2s-1)!!(2s+3)(2s+5) \cdots (2s+2i-1)(s+i)(2s+1) \\ &= (2s+2i-1)!!(s+i), \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

### 3. GENERATING FUNCTIONS OF PARTITIONS

In the next subsection, we introduce two distinguished collections  $Y_{\bullet}^{\bullet}$  and  $C_{\bullet}^{\bullet}$  of higher dimensional partitions, whose associated counting theories reconstruct the original counting problem for  $p_{\bullet}^{\bullet}$ , as we establish by means of the ‘inversion formulas’ in Proposition 3.2 below. In subsections 3.2 and 3.3 we prove Theorems A and B respectively.

**3.1. Refined partition counting and inversion formulas.** Fix  $k, d, e \in \mathbb{N}$ . Define the sets

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} Y_d^k &= \{ \lambda \in P_d^k \mid h_{\lambda}(1) = k \} \subset P_d^k, \\ C_e^k &= \{ \lambda \in Y_{1+k+e}^k \mid \text{Soc}(\lambda) \subset \lambda_{\geq 2} \} \subset Y_{1+k+e}^k, \\ D_e^k &= \{ \lambda \in C_e^k \mid \lambda_{=2} \text{ is M-stable, cf. Section 5.5} \} \subset C_e^k. \end{aligned}$$

The sets  $C_e^\bullet$  are key to our *socle reduction* technique. The sets  $D_e^k$  are only defined for  $e \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq k \leq 2e - [e/2]$ . We will not expand on their definition as they will play only an auxiliary role in the proof of Theorem B, but we refer to [17] for more details on  $D_e^\bullet$ . We denote the cardinalities of the sets defined in (3.1) by

$$y_d^k = |Y_d^k|, \quad c_e^k = |C_e^k|, \quad d_e^k = |D_e^k|.$$

We present now a list of exact values of the numbers  $y_d^k, c_e^k$  in some elementary limit cases (see also Example 3.6).

**Proposition 3.1.** *We have*

- (1)  $y_d^k = 0$  for  $k \geq d$ , or  $d > 1$  and  $k = 0$ ,
- (2)  $c_e^k = 0$  for  $k > 2e$ , or  $k = 0$  and  $e > 0$ ,
- (3)  $c_e^k = 1$  for  $k = e = 0$  or  $k = 1$  and  $e > 0$  or  $k = 2$  and  $e = 1$ ,
- (4)  $c_e^{2e} = (2e - 1)!!$  for  $e > 0$ ,
- (5)  $c_e^{2e-1} = e(2e - 1)!!$  for  $e > 0$ .
- (6)  $y_{n+1}^2 = \text{Coef}_{q^{n+1}} \left[ \begin{matrix} 2n \\ n \end{matrix} \right]_q$ , where

$$\left[ \begin{matrix} a \\ b \end{matrix} \right]_q = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^a (q^j - 1)}{\prod_{j=1}^b (q^j - 1) \prod_{j=1}^{a-b} (q^j - 1)} \in \mathbb{Z}[q].$$

- (7)  $y_n^2 = p_n^2 - 2$ .
- (8)  $c_{n-2}^2 = p_{n+1}^2 - 4 = y_{n+1}^2 - 2$ .

*Proof.* Points (1), (2) and (3) follow from the definition of  $y_d^k, c_e^k$ . Points (4) and (5) follow from [17, Section 2.5]. Point (6) follows from (7) after noting that

$$\text{Coef}_{q^{n+1}} \left[ \begin{matrix} 2n \\ n \end{matrix} \right]_q = p_{n+1}^2 - 2.$$

Indeed, it is well-known that the coefficient of  $q^{n+1}$  in this  $q$ -binomial coefficient counts the number of partitions of  $n + 1$  fitting in an  $n \times n$  square. Of all the partitions of  $n + 1$ , only the curvilinear ones do not have this property.

Relation (7) follows from the observation that the only two linear partitions having nonmaximal embedding dimension are the curvilinear ones. Similarly, for (8), the numbers  $c_{n-2}^2$  excludes the curvilinear partitions and the partitions  $(2, 1, \dots, 1)$  and  $(n, 1)$ , as these are the only ones having socle in degree 1.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.2** (Inversion formulas). *The following statements hold.*

- (1) *The collections of integers  $p_d^\bullet$  and  $y_d^\bullet$  determine each other via the relations*

$$p_d^n = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \binom{n}{k} y_d^k, \quad y_d^n = \sum_{j=0}^n (-1)^{n+j} \binom{n}{j} p_d^j,$$

for each  $n \geq 0$  and  $d \geq 1$ .

(2) The collections of integers  $y_\bullet$  and  $c_\bullet$  determine each other via the relations

$$y_{k+e+1}^k = \sum_{x=0}^{2e} \binom{k}{x} c_e^x, \quad c_e^k = \sum_{j=0}^k (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j} y_{e+j+1}^j,$$

for each  $k, e \geq 0$ .

(3) The collections of integers  $c_\bullet$  and  $d_\bullet$  determine each other via the relations

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} c_e^{2e-x} &= \sum_{y=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^{\min(e, 2x)} \frac{(2e-x)!}{(2e-2y)!!(2y-x)!} d_y^{2y-x}, \\ d_e^x &= \sum_{y=0}^{\lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor} (-1)^y \frac{x!}{(2y)!!(x-2y)!} c_{e-y}^{x-2y}, \end{aligned}$$

for each  $e \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq x \leq 2e - \lfloor e/2 \rfloor$ .

*Proof.* The first identity in (1) follows from the definitions,<sup>2</sup> and so does the first identity in (2). The second identity in (1) is a direct check using the first identity.<sup>3</sup> The same happens for the second identity in (2).

As for (3), we know from [17, Sec. 2.6] that the first relation in (3.2) is satisfied. It then remains to confirm that the two equations in (3.2) compose to the identity. This is indeed the case, as for  $\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil \leq e < 2x$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_e^{2e-x} &= \sum_{y=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^e \frac{(2e-x)!}{(2e-2y)!!(2y-x)!} d_y^{2y-x} \\ &= \sum_{y=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^e \sum_{z=0}^{y-\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil} \frac{(-1)^z (2e-x)!}{(2e-2y)!!(2z)!!(2y-x-2z)!} c_{y-z}^{2y-x-2z} \\ &= \sum_{y=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^e \sum_{z=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^y \frac{(-1)^{z+y} (2e-x)!}{(2e-2y)!!(2y-2z)!!(2z-x)!} c_z^{2z-x} \\ &= \sum_{y=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^e \sum_{z=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^y (-1)^{z+y} \binom{2e-x}{2z-x} \frac{(2e-2z)!}{(2e-2y)!!(2y-2z)!!} c_z^{2z-x} \\ &= \sum_{y=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^e \sum_{z=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^y (-1)^{z+y} \binom{2e-x}{2z-x} \binom{e-z}{e-y} \frac{(2e-2z)!}{(2e-2z)!!} c_z^{2z-x} \\ &= \sum_{z=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^e (-1)^z \binom{2e-x}{2z-x} \frac{(2e-2z)!}{(2e-2z)!!} c_z^{2z-x} \sum_{y=z}^e (-1)^y \binom{e-z}{e-y} \\ &= \sum_{z=\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}^e (-1)^z \binom{2e-x}{2z-x} \binom{e-z-1}{2x-z} \frac{(2e-2z)!}{(2e-2z)!!} c_z^{2z-x}. \end{aligned}$$

<sup>2</sup>Alternatively, use [20, Thm. 3.4, Eqn. (3.1)], and set  $\mathbb{L} = 1$ .

<sup>3</sup>Alternatively, use [20, Lemma 5.1], and set  $\mathbb{L} = 1$ .

To conclude, notice that

$$(-1)^z \binom{2e-x}{2z-x} \binom{e-z-1}{2x-z} \frac{(2e-2z)!}{(2e-2z)!!} = \delta_{e,z},$$

where  $\delta_{e,z}$  is the Kronecker symbol.  $\square$

As a corollary, we obtain a recursive expression for the sequences  $(y_{k+e+1}^k)_{k \geq 0}$  and  $(c_e^{2e-x})_{e \geq 0}$  in terms of finitely many initial values.

**Corollary 3.3.** *The sequence  $(y_{k+e+1}^k)_{k \geq 0}$  is determined by its first  $2e+1$  values. More precisely, for  $k > 2e$  we have*

$$y_{k+e+1}^k = \sum_{j=0}^{2e} (-1)^j \binom{k}{j} \binom{k-j-1}{2e-j} y_{j+e+1}^j.$$

Similarly, the sequence  $(c_e^{2e-x})_{e \geq 0}$  is determined by its first  $2x - \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor$  values. More precisely, for  $e > 2x$  we have

$$c_e^{2e-x} = \sum_{z=\lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor}^{2x} (-1)^z \binom{2e-x}{2z-x} \binom{e-z-1}{2x-z} (2e-2z-1)!! c_z^{2z-x}$$

*Proof.* The first equation follows from Proposition 3.2 and a direct calculation. The proof of the second one is identical to that of Proposition 3.2.  $\square$

Corollary 3.3 recovers (and extends) the formulas in [17, Sec. 4.3].

**3.2. Proof of Theorem A.** In this section we prove Theorem A from the Introduction. Define the generating function

$$Y_e(t) = \sum_{k \geq 0} y_{k+2+e}^{k+1} t^k \in \mathbb{Z}[[t]].$$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Fix  $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ . Then*

$$Y_e(t) = \frac{y_e(t)}{(1-t)^{2e+1}}$$

in  $\mathbb{Z}(t)$ , where

$$y_e(t) = \sum_{h=0}^{2e-1} \gamma_h^{(e)} t^h \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$$

is a polynomial of degree at most  $2e-1$ , whose coefficients are given by

$$\gamma_h^{(e)} = \sum_{j=0}^h (-1)^{h+j} \binom{2e+1}{h-j} y_{j+e+2}^{j+1}$$

for  $0 \leq h \leq 2e-1$ . In particular,  $Y_e(t)$  is a rational function.

*Proof.* By definition we have

$$Y_e(t) = \sum_{k \geq 0} y_{k+2+e}^{k+1} t^k$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{k \geq 0} \left( \sum_{x=0}^{2e} \binom{k+1}{x} c_e^x \right) t^k && \text{by Proposition 3.2} \\
 &= \sum_{x=0}^{2e} c_e^x \frac{t^{x-1}}{(1-t)^{x+1}} \\
 &= \frac{1}{(1-t)^{2e+1}} \sum_{x=0}^{2e} c_e^x (1-t)^{2e-x} t^{x-1} \\
 &= \frac{1}{(1-t)^{2e+1}} \sum_{x=0}^{2e} \sum_{h=x}^{2e} \binom{2e-x}{h-x} (-1)^{h+x} c_e^x t^{h-1} \\
 &= \frac{1}{(1-t)^{2e+1}} \sum_{h=1}^{2e} \sum_{x=1}^h \binom{2e-x}{h-x} (-1)^{h+x} c_e^x t^{h-1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This proves the rationality claim. We now check that

$$\sum_{h=1}^{2e} \sum_{x=1}^h \binom{2e-x}{h-x} (-1)^{h+x} c_e^x t^{h-1} = y_e(t),$$

with  $y_e(t)$  as in the statement. The coefficient of  $t^h$  in the left-hand side is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{x=0}^h (-1)^{h+x} \binom{2e-x-1}{h-x} c_e^{x+1} &= \sum_{x=0}^h (-1)^{h+x} \binom{2e-x-1}{h-x} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{x+1} (-1)^{x+1+j} \binom{x+1}{j} y_{e+j+1}^j \right) \\
 &= \sum_{x=0}^h \sum_{j=0}^x (-1)^{h+j} \binom{2e-x-1}{h-x} \binom{x+1}{j+1} y_{e+j+2}^{j+1} \\
 &= \sum_{j=0}^h (-1)^{h+j} \binom{2e+1}{h-j} y_{e+j+2}^{j+1},
 \end{aligned}$$

where the first identity follows from Proposition 3.2(2) and Proposition 3.1(1), and the last identity follows from [20, Cor. 4.5] after a suitable change of variables.  $\square$

We prove two relations among the coefficients of the polynomial  $y_e(t)$ , which reduce the computational data needed to determine the series  $Y_e(t)$ .

**Corollary 3.5.** *Fix  $e > 0$ . There are identities*

- (1)  $\sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2e-1} \gamma_i^{(e)} = (2e-1)!!$ ,
- (2)  $\sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2e-1} (i+1) \gamma_i^{(e)} = e(2e-1)!!$ .

*Proof.* The proof of (1) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2e-1)!! &= c_e^{2e} && \text{Proposition 3.1(4)} \\
 &= \sum_{j=0}^{2e} (-1)^j \binom{2e}{j} y_{e+j+1}^j && \text{Proposition 3.2(2)}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{j=1}^{2e} \sum_{\alpha=0}^j (-1)^\alpha \binom{2e+1}{\alpha} y_{e+j+1}^j \\
&= \sum_{\beta=0}^{2e-1} y_{e+\beta+2}^{\beta+1} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\beta+1} (-1)^\alpha \binom{2e+1}{\alpha} \\
&= \sum_{\beta=0}^{2e-1} y_{e+\beta+2}^{\beta+1} \sum_{\alpha=\beta+2}^{2e+1} (-1)^{\alpha+1} \binom{2e+1}{\alpha} \\
&= \sum_{\beta=0}^{2e-1} y_{e+\beta+2}^{\beta+1} \sum_{\bar{\alpha}=\beta+2}^{2e+1} (-1)^{\bar{\alpha}+\beta} \binom{2e+1}{\bar{\alpha}-\beta-2} \\
&= \sum_{\beta=0}^{2e-1} \sum_{\bar{\alpha}=\beta}^{2e-1} (-1)^{\bar{\alpha}+\beta} \binom{2e+1}{\bar{\alpha}-\beta} y_{e+\beta+2}^{\beta+1} \\
&= \sum_{\bar{\alpha}=0}^{2e-1} \sum_{\beta=0}^{\bar{\alpha}} (-1)^{\bar{\alpha}+\beta} \binom{2e+1}{\bar{\alpha}-\beta} y_{e+\beta+2}^{\beta+1} \\
&= y_e(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the third equality we used [20, Lemma 4.11] with  $\mathbb{L} = 1$  and where the final identity follows from Theorem 3.4.

The proof of (2) follows from an analogous formal manipulation involving binomial coefficients and Proposition 3.1.  $\square$

We shall now list, for all  $d \geq 1$ , some values of  $y_d^k$ , which along with the relations of Corollary 3.5 decrease the computational complexity of the polynomial  $y_e(t)$  of Theorem 3.4.

**Example 3.6.** Let  $s_k = \binom{k+1}{2}$  be the number of linearly independent quadrics in  $k$  variables. Then, for all  $d \geq 1$ , there are identities

- (1)  $y_d^1 = 1$ ,
- (2)  $y_d^2 = p_d^2 - 2$ ,
- (3)  $y_d^3 = p_d^3 - 3(y_d^2 + 1)$ ,
- (4)  $y_d^{d-5} = \binom{s_{d-5}}{4} + (d-5)\binom{s_{d-5}+1}{2} + \binom{d-5}{2}(2s_{d-5}-1) + \binom{d-5}{3}$ ,
- (5)  $y_d^{d-4} = \binom{s_{d-4}}{3} + (d-4)s_{d-4} + 2\binom{d-4}{2}$ ,
- (6)  $y_d^{d-3} = \binom{s_{d-3}}{2} + (d-3)$ ,
- (7)  $y_d^{d-2} = s_{d-2}$ ,
- (8)  $y_d^{d-1} = 1$ ,
- (9)  $y_d^{d-6} = \frac{1}{46080}(d^{11} - 49d^{10} + 1060d^9 - 13210d^8 + 104645d^7 - 554849d^6 + 2057246d^5 - 5611700d^4 + 11491704d^3 - 15859872d^2 + 10654464d - 967680)(d-5)$ .

The relations (1)–(3) are obtained by the closed formula counting partitions in dimension up to 3. Relations (4)–(8) are obtained by specialising  $\mathbb{L} = 1$  in the formulas in



[20, Prop. 7.2]. The proof of (9) comes from combining Corollary 3.3 with our explicit computations, see the ancillary file [generatingfunctions.txt](#).

**3.3. Proof of Theorem B.** In this section we prove Theorem B from the Introduction. Recall that we defined the generating function

$$C_x(t) = \begin{cases} \sum_{e \geq \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil} c_{e+1}^{2(e+1)-x} t^{e - \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil} & \text{if } x \text{ is even} \\ \sum_{e \geq \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil} c_e^{2e-x} t^{e - \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil} & \text{if } x \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

in the ring of formal power series  $\mathbb{Z}[[t]]$ .

**Theorem 3.7.** Fix  $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Then

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbf{B}(C_x(t)) = \frac{c_x(t)}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3}{2}+2x-\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}}$$

in  $\mathbb{Q}[[t]]$ , where  $c_x(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$  is a polynomial of degree at most  $2x - \lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil$ . In particular,  $\mathbf{B}(C_x(t))$  is an analytic function in  $t = 0$ .

More precisely, writing

$$c_x(t) = \sum_{h=0}^{2x-\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil} \mu_h^{(x)} t^h,$$

we have that

(1) if  $x = 2\alpha$  is even, then

$$\mu_h^{(2\alpha)} = \sum_{z=0}^h \frac{(-1)^{z+h} 2^h c_{z+1+\alpha}^{2z+2}}{(2z+1)!!} \sum_{y=z}^{3\alpha-1} \binom{3\alpha-y}{h-y} \binom{y+1}{z+1} \frac{(2y+1)!!}{(2y+2)!!} \left( \frac{(2y+3)(3\alpha-h)}{3\alpha-y} - 1 \right)$$

for  $0 \leq h \leq 3\alpha$ , and

(2) if  $x = 2\alpha - 1$  is odd, then

$$\mu_h^{(2\alpha-1)} = \sum_{z=0}^h \frac{(-1)^z c_{z+\alpha}^{2z+1}}{(2z+1)!! z!} \sum_{y=z}^h \binom{3\alpha-2-y}{h-y} \frac{(-1)^y (2y+1)!! 2^{h-y}}{(y-z)!}$$

for  $0 \leq h \leq 3\alpha - 2$ .

**Remark 3.8.** Before proving Theorem 3.7, we comment on the statement. In (3.3) we interpret the function

$$\frac{c_x(t)}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3}{2}+2x-\lceil \frac{x}{2} \rceil}}$$

analytic at  $t = 0$  as its Taylor expansion at the origin.

Notice also that the statement implies a precise formula for the degree zero coefficient of  $c_x$ , namely

$$\mu_0^{(x)} = \begin{cases} c_{1+\alpha}^2 & \text{if } x = 2\alpha, \\ c_\alpha^1 = 1 & \text{if } x = 2\alpha - 1. \end{cases}$$

*Proof of Theorem 3.7.* We start proving Equation (3.3) in the even case (1). If  $x = 2\alpha$ , our claim is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{B}(C_{2\alpha}(t)) = \frac{c_{2\alpha}(t)}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3}{2}+3\alpha}}.$$

The case  $\alpha = 0$  easily follows from Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 3.1, therefore we may assume  $\alpha > 0$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}(C_{2\alpha}(t)) &= \sum_{e \geq \alpha} \frac{c_{e+1}^{2(e+1-\alpha)}}{(e-\alpha)!} t^{e-\alpha} \\ &= \sum_{e \geq \alpha} \frac{t^{e-\alpha}}{(e-\alpha)!} \sum_{y=\alpha}^{\min(e+1, 4\alpha)} \frac{(2(e+1-\alpha))!}{(2(e+1-y))!!(2(y-\alpha))!} d_y^{2(y-\alpha)} \\ &= \sum_{y=\alpha+1}^{4\alpha} \sum_{e \geq y-1} \frac{t^{e-\alpha}}{(e-\alpha)!} \frac{(2(e+1-\alpha))!}{(2(e+1-y))!!(2(y-\alpha))!} d_y^{2(y-\alpha)} \\ &= \sum_{y=1}^{3\alpha} \sum_{e \geq y} \frac{t^{e-1}}{(e-1)!} \frac{(2e)!}{(2(e-y))!!(2y)!} d_{y+\alpha}^{2y} \\ &= \sum_{y=1}^{3\alpha} \sum_{e \geq y} \sum_{z=0}^y \frac{t^{e-1}}{(e-1)!} \frac{(-1)^z (2e)!}{(2e-2y)!!(2z)!!(2y-2z)!} c_{y-z+\alpha}^{2y-2z} \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Proposition 3.2(3) in the last step. Noting that the term  $z = 0$  does not contribute and performing a shift of the variables, we continue the above chain of identities to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}(C_{2\alpha}(t)) &= \sum_{y=1}^{3\alpha} \sum_{e \geq y} \sum_{z=1}^y \frac{(-1)^{z+y} e(2e-1)!!}{(e-y)!(y-z)!(2z-1)!!z!} c_{z+\alpha}^{2z} t^{e-1} \\ &= \sum_{y=1}^{3\alpha} \sum_{z=1}^y \frac{(-1)^{z+y} c_{z+\alpha}^{2z} t^{y-1}}{(y-z)!(2z-1)!!z!} \sum_{e \geq 0} \frac{(e+y)(2e+2y-1)!!}{e!} t^e \\ &= \sum_{y=1}^{3\alpha} \sum_{z=1}^y \frac{(-1)^{z+y} c_{z+\alpha}^{2z} t^{y-1}}{(y-z)!(2z-1)!!z!} \frac{(2y-1)!!(y+t)}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3}{2}+y}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 2.4 for the last identity. Let us ignore the factor  $(1-2t)^{-\frac{3}{2}-y}$  from now on. What remains can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{z=1}^{3\alpha} \frac{(-1)^z c_{z+\alpha}^{2z}}{(2z-1)!!z!} \sum_{y=z}^{3\alpha} \frac{(-1)^y (2y-1)!! t^{y-1} (y+t) (1-2t)^{3\alpha-y}}{(y-z)!} \\ &= \sum_{z=1}^{3\alpha} \frac{(-1)^z c_{z+\alpha}^{2z}}{(2z-1)!!z!} \sum_{y=z}^{3\alpha} \sum_{h=0}^{3\alpha-y} \binom{3\alpha-y}{h} \frac{(-1)^{3\alpha+h} (2y-1)!! t^{3\alpha-h-1} (y+t) 2^{3\alpha-y-h}}{(y-z)!} \\ &= \sum_{z=0}^{3\alpha-1} \frac{(-1)^z c_{z+1+\alpha}^{2z+2}}{(2z+1)!!(z+1)!} \sum_{y=z}^{3\alpha-1} \sum_{h=y}^{3\alpha-1} \binom{3\alpha-y-1}{h-y} \frac{(-1)^h (2y+1)!! (y+1+t) 2^{h-y}}{(y-z)!} t^h. \end{aligned}$$

Now, for the purpose of extracting the coefficient of  $t^h$ , we split the  $(y+1+t)$  term appearing in the last fraction. This gives

$$\sum_{z=0}^{3\alpha-1} \frac{(-1)^z c_{z+1+\alpha}^{2z+2}}{(2z+1)!!(z+1)!} \sum_{y=z}^{3\alpha-1} \left( \sum_{h=y}^{3\alpha-1} \binom{3\alpha-y-1}{h-y} \frac{(-1)^h (2y+1)!!(y+1)2^{h-y}}{(y-z)!} t^h \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{h=y}^{3\alpha-1} \binom{3\alpha-y-1}{h-y} \frac{(-1)^h (2y+1)!!2^{h-y}}{(y-z)!} t^{h+1} \right).$$

Rearranging, the last expression equals

$$\sum_{z=0}^{3\alpha-1} \sum_{y=z}^{3\alpha-1} \sum_{h=y}^{3\alpha} \frac{(-1)^z c_{z+1+\alpha}^{2z+2}}{(2z+1)!!(z+1)!} \binom{3\alpha-y}{h-y} \frac{(-1)^h (2(y+1)(3\alpha-h)-h+y)(2y+1)!!2^{h-y-1}}{(3\alpha-y)(y-z)!} t^h \\ = \sum_{h=0}^{3\alpha} \sum_{z=0}^h \sum_{y=z}^{3\alpha-1} \frac{(-1)^z c_{z+1+\alpha}^{2z+2}}{(2z+1)!!(z+1)!} \binom{3\alpha-y}{h-y} \frac{(-1)^h (2(y+1)(3\alpha-h)-h+y)(2y+1)!!2^{h-y-1}}{(3\alpha-y)(y-z)!} t^h.$$

The coefficient  $\mu_h^{(2\alpha)}$  of  $t^h$  in the above sum can now be rewritten as

$$\mu_h^{(2\alpha)} = \sum_{z=0}^h \frac{(-1)^{z+h} 2^h c_{z+1+\alpha}^{2z+2}}{(2z+1)!!} \sum_{y=z}^{3\alpha-1} \binom{3\alpha-y}{h-y} \binom{y+1}{z+1} \frac{(2y+1)!!}{(2y+2)!!} \left( \frac{(2y+3)(3\alpha-h)}{3\alpha-y} - 1 \right).$$

This finishes the proof of the even case (1).

It remains to prove Equation (3.3) in the odd case (2). If  $x = 2\alpha - 1$ , our claim is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{B}(C_{2\alpha-1}(t)) = \frac{c_{2\alpha-1}(t)}{(1-2t)^{3\alpha-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

We compute

$$\mathbf{B}(C_{2\alpha-1}(t)) = \sum_{e \geq \alpha} \frac{c_e^{2e-2\alpha+1}}{(e-\alpha)!} t^{e-\alpha} \\ = \sum_{e \geq \alpha} \frac{t^{e-\alpha}}{(e-\alpha)!} \sum_{y=\alpha}^{\min(e, 4\alpha-2)} \frac{(2e-2\alpha+1)!}{(2e-2y)!!(2y-2\alpha+1)!} d^{2y-2\alpha+1} \\ = \sum_{y=\alpha}^{4\alpha-2} \sum_{e \geq y} \frac{t^{e-\alpha}}{(e-\alpha)!} \frac{(2e-2\alpha+1)!}{(2e-2y)!!(2y-2\alpha+1)!} d^{2y-2\alpha+1} \\ = \sum_{y=0}^{3\alpha-2} \sum_{e \geq y} \sum_{z=0}^y (-1)^{z+y} \frac{t^e}{e!} \frac{(2e+1)!}{(2e-2y)!!(2y-2z)!!(2z+1)!} c_{z+\alpha}^{2z+1} \\ = \sum_{y=0}^{3\alpha-2} \sum_{z=0}^y \frac{(-1)^{z+y} (2y+1)!! t^y c_{z+\alpha}^{2z+1}}{(y-z)!(2z+1)!!z!} \sum_{e \geq 0} \frac{(2e+2(y+1)-1)!!}{(2(y+1)-1)!!e!} t^e \\ = \sum_{y=0}^{3\alpha-2} \sum_{z=0}^y \frac{(-1)^{z+y} (2y+1)!! t^y c_{z+\alpha}^{2z+1}}{(y-z)!(2z+1)!!z!} \frac{1}{(1-2t)^{\frac{3}{2}+y}} \\ = \frac{1}{(1-2t)^{3\alpha-\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{y=0}^{3\alpha-2} \sum_{z=0}^y \sum_{h=0}^{3\alpha-2-y} \binom{3\alpha-2-y}{h} \frac{(-1)^{z+y} (2y+1)!! t^y (-2t)^{3\alpha-2-y-h} c_{z+\alpha}^{2z+1}}{(y-z)!(2z+1)!!z!} \\ = \frac{1}{(1-2t)^{3\alpha-\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{h=0}^{3\alpha-2} \sum_{y=0}^h \sum_{z=0}^y \binom{3\alpha-2-y}{h-y} \frac{(-1)^{h+z} (2y+1)!! (-2)^{h-y} c_{z+\alpha}^{2z+1}}{(y-z)!(2z+1)!!z!} t^h$$

The coefficient  $\mu_h^{(2\alpha-1)}$  of  $t^h$  in the above sum can now be rewritten as

$$(3.4) \quad \mu_h^{(2\alpha-1)} = \sum_{z=0}^h \frac{(-1)^z c_{z+\alpha}^{2z+1}}{(2z+1)!!z!} \sum_{y=z}^h \binom{3\alpha-2-y}{h-y} \frac{(-1)^y (2y+1)!! 2^{h-y}}{(y-z)!}.$$

This completes the proof of the odd case (2), and hence of the theorem.  $\square$

**Remark 3.9.** For each  $h = 0, \dots, 3\alpha - 2$  there is an identity<sup>4</sup>

$$\mu_h^{(2\alpha-1)} = \sum_{z=0}^h \binom{3\alpha-z-2}{h-z} \frac{2^{h-z}}{z!} {}_2F_1\left(\frac{3}{2} + z, z - h; 2 + z - 3\alpha; -1\right) c_{z+\alpha}^{2z+1},$$

where  ${}_2F_1(a, b; c; t)$  is the ordinary hypergeometric function, see e.g. [42].

#### 4. M-PARTITIONS: REDUCTION TO SOCLE IN DEGREE $\geq 3$

In this section we go one step further in our socle reduction technique: we provide a recursion (cf. Proposition 4.6) that recovers the numbers  $c_{\bullet}$  from the number of partitions with socle in degree at least 3. The key character in this recursion is the number of *M-partitions*, that we introduce in Definition 4.1 below. In Section 5.5 we discuss explicit methods to effectively compute these numbers.

**Definition 4.1.** For a triple of positive integers  $k, q, m > 0$ , we call *M-partition* of type  $(k, q, m)$  a  $(k-1)$ -dimensional partition  $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{1+k+q+m}^k$  such that

- (i)  $\text{Soc}(\lambda) \subset \lambda_{\geq 3}$ ,
- (ii)  $h_{\lambda}(1) = k$ ,
- (iii)  $h_{\lambda}(2) = q$ ,
- (iv)  $\sum_{i \geq 3} h_{\lambda}(i) = m$ .

We denote by  $\alpha_{q,m}^k$  the number of M-partitions of type  $(k, q, m)$ . We formally set  $\alpha_{0,0}^0 = 1$ , and  $\alpha_{q,0}^k = 0$  for  $k, q > 0$ .

The next result shows that the number of quadrics in an M-partition is always at least the number of variables.

**Proposition 4.2.** *We have  $\alpha_{q,m}^k = 0$ , for  $q < k$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda$  be an M-partition of type  $(k, q, m)$  and let  $I$  be the monomial ideal associated to  $\lambda$ . Identifying lattice points in  $\lambda$  with monomials, we set

$$\lambda_{=1} = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\},$$

and

$$\lambda_{=2} = \prod_{i=1}^4 Q_i$$

<sup>4</sup>Obtained with the help of Mathematica [30].

to be the decomposition of degree 2 elements given by (up to reordering of the variables)

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &= \{x_1^2, \dots, x_l^2\}, \quad \text{for some } 1 \leq l \leq k, \\ Q_2 &= \{x_a x_b \in \lambda \mid a, b = 1, \dots, l \text{ and } a \neq b\}, \\ Q_3 &= \{x_a x_b \in \lambda \mid a = 1, \dots, l \text{ and } b = l+1, \dots, k\}, \\ Q_4 &= \{x_a x_b \in \lambda \mid a, b = l+1, \dots, k \text{ and } a \neq b\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\lambda$  admits no socle in degree 1, all the variables in  $\lambda_{=1}$  are obtained as derivatives of some monomials in  $\lambda_{=2}$ . In particular,  $Q_1$  contributes precisely with  $l$  variables,  $Q_2$  does not contribute with new variables (with respect to the ones already introduced by  $Q_1$ ), and  $Q_3$  contributes with at most  $|Q_3|$  new variables.

On the other hand,  $\lambda$  admits no socle in degree 2, which implies that for all monomials  $x_a x_b \in Q_4$ , there must exist a third different variable  $x_c$  such that  $x_a x_c, x_b x_c \in Q_4$ . This readily implies that  $Q_4$  contributes with at most  $|Q_4|$  new variables.

Summing up all the contributions yields  $q \geq k$ , which implies the result.  $\square$

**Remark 4.3.** The numbers  $\alpha_{q,m}^k$  may be refined in several ways. For instance, set

$$\alpha_{q,m,\ell}^k = \left| \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{1+k+q+m}^k \mid \lambda \text{ is an M-partition of type } (k, q, m) \text{ and } \ell(\lambda) = \ell \right\} \right|.$$

The numbers  $\alpha_{q,m,\ell}^k$  play a central role in the counting procedure that we develop in Section 5.5. For a more refined example, let  $h$  be a Hilbert–Samuel function. Define

$$\alpha_h = \left| \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{|h|}^{h(1)} \mid \lambda \text{ is an M-partition of type } \left( h(1), h(2), \sum_{i \geq 3} h(i) \right) \text{ and } h_\lambda = h \right\} \right|.$$

We compute explicitly the numbers  $\alpha_{q,m,\ell}^k$  and  $\alpha_h$  in Propositions 5.1 to 5.3 and Theorem 5.4, where we study some families of compressed and anti-compressed partitions, see Section 5.1.

**Example 4.4.** The number of M-partitions of type  $(3, 5, 13)$  and length 4 is  $\alpha_{5,13,4}^3 = 531$ . Precisely, this number decomposes as

$$\alpha_{5,13,4}^3 = \alpha_{h_1} + \alpha_{h_2} = 504 + 27,$$

where  $h_1 = (1, 3, 5, 7, 6)$  and  $h_2 = (1, 3, 5, 6, 7)$ . On the other hand, we have in total  $\alpha_{5,13}^3 = 43260$ .

**Definition 4.5.** Given a triple of positive integers  $k, q, m$ , and a pair of nonnegative integers  $e, a \geq 0$ , we denote by  $c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a$  the number of partitions  $\lambda \in C_e^a$  such that the partition

$$(\text{Soc}(\lambda) \cap \lambda_{\geq 3})^\perp$$

is an M-partition of type  $(k, q, m)$ . For  $a > 0$ , we set  $c_{e,(0,0,0)}^a$  to be the number of partitions  $\lambda \in C_e^a$  such that  $\text{Soc}(\lambda) = \lambda_{=2}$ .

In the next result, we show that knowing the numbers  $\alpha_{\bullet, \bullet}^{\bullet}$  implies the knowledge of the numbers  $c_{\bullet}^{\bullet}$ .

**Proposition 4.6.** *The numbers  $c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a$  satisfy the relations*

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} c_{e,(k,q,m)}^0 &= 0, \\ c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a &= \alpha_{q,m}^k \binom{a}{k} \binom{\binom{a+1}{2} - q}{e - q - m} - \sum_{i=1}^{a-1} \binom{a}{i} c_{e,(k,q,m)}^i. \end{aligned}$$

*In particular, there is an identity*

$$c_e^a = \sum_{\substack{k \leq a \\ q+m \leq e}} c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a.$$

*Proof.* The vanishing  $c_{e,(k,q,m)}^0 = 0$  is a direct consequence of the definition of the numbers  $c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a$ . To construct a partition  $\lambda$  among the ones counted by  $c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a$ , we first choose  $k$  variables among the  $a$  variables given, and then choose an M-partition  $\pi$  of type  $(k, q, m)$  in the  $k$  variables we selected. This amounts to a contribution of

$$\alpha_{q,m}^k \binom{a}{k}.$$

Next, we have to add  $e - q - m$  boxes in degree 2 to  $\pi$ , which contributes

$$\binom{\binom{a+1}{2} - q}{e - q - m}.$$



Notice that not all partitions constructed in this way have embedding dimension  $a$ . In fact, they could be represented by some partitions counted by  $c_{e,(k,q,m)}^i$ , for some  $i < a$ . Summing it up yields

$$c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a = \alpha_{q,m}^k \binom{a}{k} \binom{\binom{a+1}{2} - q}{e - q - m} - \sum_{i=1}^{a-1} \binom{a}{i} c_{e,(k,q,m)}^i.$$

The second claim follows by subdividing the set  $C_e^k$  according to the type  $(k, q, m)$  of the M-partition  $(\text{Soc}(\lambda) \cap \lambda_{\geq 3})^\perp$ .  $\square$

The recursion in Proposition 4.6 shows that only finitely many  $c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a$  contribute to the computation of  $c_e^a$ . It is also worth mentioning that some of the contributing  $c_{e,(k,q,m)}^a$  might be zero: for instance, we have  $c_{3,(2,2,1)}^3 = 0$ .

**Example 4.7.** Figures 1 and 2 depict two examples of partitions  $\lambda \in P_{16}^3$  and  $\lambda' \in P_{13}^3$  counted by  $c_{12,(3,4,8)}^3$  and  $c_{9,(2,3,5)}^3$  respectively.


 FIGURE 1. A partition  $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{16}^3$  counted by  $c_{12,(3,4,8)}^3$ .

 FIGURE 2. A partition  $\lambda' \in \mathbb{P}_{13}^3$  counted by  $c_{9,(2,3,5)}^3$ .

## 5. EXACT COUNT OF M-PARTITIONS

In this section, we provide exact formulas for the generating functions counting partitions with prescribed Hilbert–Samuel functions and constraints on their socles. More precisely, we find generating functions for some collections of numbers  $\alpha_{\bullet, \bullet, \bullet}^{\bullet}$  (cf. Remark 4.3). Finding such generating functions reduces the complexity of the computations of the numbers  $c_{\bullet}^{\bullet}$  (and, in turn, of the number of partitions  $p_{\bullet}^{\bullet}$ , via Proposition 3.2) and offers interesting perspectives on the asymptotic distribution of partitions.

**5.1. Compressed and anti-compressed partitions.** Fix  $n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$  and a vector  $e \in \mathbb{N}^r$ . We say that an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional partition  $\lambda$  is *compressed* (resp. *anti-compressed*) with respect to  $e$  if it has maximal (resp. minimal) size among the partitions with socle type  $e_{\lambda} = e$  and embedding dimension  $h_{\lambda}(1) = n$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** Fix  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . A partition  $\lambda$  with embedding dimension  $h_{\lambda}(1) = 3n$  and socle type  $(0, 0, 0, n)$  has Hilbert–Samuel function  $(1, 3n, 3n, n)$ . In particular, it is a compressed M-partition of type  $(3n, 3n, n)$  and length 3. Moreover, the number  $\alpha_{3n, n, 3}^{3n}$  of such partitions is

$$(5.1) \quad \alpha_{3n, n, 3}^{3n} = \frac{(3n)!}{6^n n!}.$$

*Proof.* If  $n$  cubics generate  $3n$  linear terms, it means that the set of cubics in  $\lambda$  consists of  $x_1 y_1 z_1, \dots, x_n y_n z_n$ , which in particular means that there are  $3n$  quadrics, all of the form  $x_i y_i, x_i z_i, y_i z_i$ , and that the associated partition is compressed. Therefore, the possible partitions of this form correspond to the numbers of partitions of a set of  $3n$

elements in  $n$  subsets of 3 elements, that is

$$\frac{1}{n!} \binom{3n}{3} \binom{3n-3}{3} \cdots \binom{6}{3} \binom{3}{3} = \frac{(3n)!}{6^n n!}. \quad \square$$

**Proposition 5.2.** Fix  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . A partition  $\lambda$  with embedding dimension  $h_\lambda(1) = 3n - 1$  and socle type  $(0, 0, 0, n)$  has possible Hilbert–Samuel functions

- $(1, 3n - 1, 3n, n)$ ,
- $(1, 3n - 1, 3n - 1, n)$ .

In particular, in the first case it is a compressed  $M$ -partition of type  $(3n - 1, 3n, n)$  and length 3, and the number of such partitions is

$$\alpha_{3n, n, 3}^{3n-1} = \frac{3(n-1)}{2} \alpha_{3n, n, 3}^{3n}.$$

In the second case  $\lambda$  is anti-compressed, and the number of such partitions is

$$\alpha_{3n-1, n, 3}^{3n-1} = 2 \alpha_{3n, n, 3}^{3n}.$$

*Proof.* If  $n$  cubics generate  $3n - 1$  linear terms, the cubics are (up to symmetry or relabelling of the variables) of one of the two forms

- $x_1 y_1 z_1, \dots, x_{n-1} y_{n-1} z_{n-1}, x_n y_n x_i$ , for some  $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$ ,
- $x_1 y_1 z_1, \dots, x_{n-1} y_{n-1} z_{n-1}, x_n y_n^2$ .

In the first case, the  $n$  cubics generate  $3n$  quadrics and the partition is compressed, while in the second case they generate  $3n - 1$  quadrics and the partition is anti-compressed. A simple combinatorial computation yields that in the compressed case the number of such partitions is

$$\frac{1}{2} \binom{3n-1}{2} \cdot (3n-3) \cdot \frac{(3n-3)!}{6^{n-1}(n-1)!} = \frac{3(n-1)(3n-1)!}{4 \cdot 6^{n-1}(n-1)!},$$

while in the anti-compressed case is

$$(3n-1)(3n-2) \cdot \frac{(3n-3)!}{6^{n-1}(n-1)!} = \frac{(3n-1)!}{6^{n-1}(n-1)!}.$$

The result now follows from Equation (5.1).  $\square$

**Proposition 5.3.** Fix  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . An anti-compressed partition  $\lambda$  with embedding dimension  $h_\lambda(1) = 3n - 2$  and socle type  $(0, 0, 0, n)$  has Hilbert–Samuel function  $(1, 3n - 2, 3n - 2, n)$ . The number of such partitions is

$$\alpha_{3n-2, n, 3}^{3n-2} = (3n-2)^2 \alpha_{3(n-1), n-1, 3}^{3(n-1)}.$$

*Proof.* A case by case analysis shows that the possible collections of cubics in  $\lambda$  (up to symmetry or relabelling of the variables) are of one of the two forms

- $x_1 y_1 z_1, \dots, x_{n-1} y_{n-1} z_{n-1}, x_n^3$ ,
- $x_1 y_1 z_1, \dots, x_{n-2} y_{n-2} z_{n-2}, x_{n-1} y_{n-1}^2, x_n y_n^2$ .



The first configuration contributes

$$(3n-2)\alpha_{3(n-1),n-1,3}^{3(n-1)}.$$

The second configuration contributes

$$12\binom{3n-2}{4}\alpha_{3(n-2),n-2,3}^{3(n-2)} = 12\binom{3n-2}{4}\frac{(3n-6)!}{6^{n-2}(n-2)!} = 3\frac{(3n-2)!}{6^{n-1}\cdot(n-2)!}.$$

Summing the contributions yields the result.  $\square$

We provide a closed formula for the generating functions counting infinite families of anti-compressed partitions of arbitrary length. These partitions are a special instance of the *hydral* partitions, cf. Definition 5.8.

**Theorem 5.4.** *Fix a positive integer  $s \geq 3$  and define the Hilbert–Samuel function*

$$h_{n,s} = (1, \underbrace{n, n, \dots, n}_s).$$

*Then we have the identity*

$$\alpha_{h_{n,s}} = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} k^{n-k}.$$

*In particular,  $\alpha_{h_{n,s}}$  is independent of  $s$  and there is an identity*

$$\mathbf{B}\left(\sum_{n \geq 0} \alpha_{h_{n,s}} t^n\right) = e^{te^t}.$$

*Proof.* The second claim easily follows from the first one, by noticing that

$$\text{Coef}_{t^n}(\mathbf{IB}(e^{te^t})) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} k^{n-k},$$

which is proved by a direct computation. We divide the proof of the first claim in several steps.

Step I. For  $s \geq 3$ , set

$$P_{n,s} = \{ \lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{n+1}^n \mid \text{Soc}(\lambda) \subset \lambda_{\geq 3} \text{ and } h_\lambda = h_{n,s} \}$$

to be the collections of partitions of interest counted by  $\alpha_{h_{n,s}}$  and

$$P_n^+ = \left\{ (\Lambda, \bar{a}) \mid \Lambda \subset 2^{[n]}, \coprod_{A \in \Lambda} A = [n], \bar{a} = (a_A)_{A \in \Lambda} \in \prod_{A \in \Lambda} A \right\}$$

to be the collection of partitions of the set  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$  with a *coloured* element in each subset of the partition. Consider the map

$$(5.2) \quad P_n^+ \xrightarrow{\Psi_s} P_{n,s}$$

$$(\Lambda, \bar{a}) \longmapsto \left( \bigcup_{A \in \Lambda} \{x_{a_A}^{s-1} x_b \mid b \in A\} \right)^\perp$$

where we denote partitions in  $P_{n,s}$  using monomial ideals through the correspondence of Section 2.4. The map  $\Psi_s$  is well-defined, as  $h_{\Psi_s(\Lambda, \bar{a})} = h_{n,s}$ . Notice that the number of

partitions of  $[n]$  with a chosen coloured element in each subset of the partition is given by

$$|\mathbb{P}_n^+| = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} k^{n-k}.$$

Therefore, the conclusion of the theorem follows by proving that  $\Psi_s$  is a bijection.

Step II. We prove that  $\Psi_{s-1}$  is a bijection by induction on  $s \geq 3$ . In this step, we prove the inductive step. Assume therefore that  $\Psi_s$  is a bijection. Consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_{n,s} &\xrightarrow{\tau_s} \mathbb{P}_{n,s-1} \\ I &\longmapsto I + \mathfrak{m}^s, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  is the monomial maximal ideal. We claim that  $\tau_s$  is a bijection.

For surjectivity, by the inductive assumption, we have that all ideals  $J \in \mathbb{P}_{n,s-1}$  are of the form

$$(5.3) \quad J = \left( \bigcup_{A \in \Lambda} \{ x_{a_A}^{s-2} x_b \mid b \in A \} \right)^\perp$$

for some  $(\Lambda, \bar{a}) \in \mathbb{P}_n^+$ . However, the ideal  $J$  satisfies

$$J = \Psi_s \left( \left( \bigcup_{A \in \Lambda} \{ x_{a_A}^{s-1} x_a \mid a \in A \} \right)^\perp \right),$$

which yields surjectivity.

For injectivity, assume there are two ideals  $I, I' \in \mathbb{P}_{n,s}$  such that

$$I + \mathfrak{m}^s = I' + \mathfrak{m}^s.$$

Since by induction we know that all ideals in  $\mathbb{P}_{n,s-1}$  are of the form (5.3), without loss of generality we can suppose

$$I = \left( \bigcup_{A \in \Lambda} \{ x_{a_A}^{s-1} x_a \mid a \in A \} \right)^\perp,$$

for some  $(\Lambda, \bar{a}) \in \mathbb{P}_n^+$ . Assume by contradiction that  $I \neq I'$ . Then it means that  $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I'$  contains a monomial of degree  $s$  which is not of the form  $x_{a_A}^{s-1} x_b$  for some  $A \in \Lambda$  and  $b \in A$ . The only possible choice would be a monomial of the form  $x_{a_A}^{s-2} x_b^2$ , which is a contradiction since it would imply that  $I' + \mathfrak{m}^s$  contains  $x_{a_A}^{s-3} x_b^2$  as well.

Step III. Now we prove the base of the induction. Let  $I \in \mathbb{P}_{n,3}$  be an ideal corresponding to a partition with Hilbert–Samuel function  $(1, n, n, n)$  and with socle in degree 3. Set  $R = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . Surjectivity of  $\Psi_3$  is equivalent to the claim that

$$(5.4) \quad R/I \cong \bigoplus_{A \in \Lambda} \bigoplus_{b \in A} \mathbb{C} \cdot x_{a_A}^2 x_b,$$

for some  $(\Lambda, \bar{a}) \in \mathbb{P}_n^+$ , which we now prove. Up to relabelling the variables, let

$$C_0 = \{ x_1^3, \dots, x_k^3 \} \subset R/I$$

be the third-power cubic monomials in  $R/I$ , for some  $k \leq n$ . This implies that  $R/I$  contains the quadratic terms

$$Q_0 = \{x_1^2, \dots, x_k^2\} \subset R/I$$

and the linear terms

$$L_0 = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subset R/I.$$

The collection of these monomials (and the constant term 1) contributes  $(1, k, k, k)$  to the Hilbert–Samuel function. To realise a possible partition of the required form, we still have to add  $n - k$  different cubic monomials  $m_1, \dots, m_{n-k}$  to  $R/I$ . Set

$$C_i = C_{i-1} \cup \{m_i\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n - k.$$

Adding a cubic monomial  $m_i$  to  $R/I$  implies that at most other 3 quadratic monomials  $q_{i,1}, q_{i,2}, q_{i,3}$  and linear terms  $y_{i,1}, y_{i,2}, y_{i,3}$  have to be in  $R/I$  as well. Set

$$Q_i = Q_{i-1} \cup \{q_{i,1}, q_{i,2}, q_{i,3}\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n - k,$$

$$L_i = L_{i-1} \cup \{y_{i,1}, y_{i,2}, y_{i,3}\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n - k,$$

Notice that at the ‘step’ 0, the number of monomials in degree 0, 1, 2, 3 (i.e. the cardinalities of  $\{1\}, L_0, Q_0, C_0$ ) is

$$(1, k, k, k),$$

and we ask that at the ‘step’  $n - k$  the number of monomials in degree 0, 1, 2, 3 (i.e. the cardinalities of  $\{1\}, L_{n-k}, Q_{n-k}, C_{n-k}$ ) to be

$$(1, n, n, n).$$

Now, at each ‘step’  $i$ , adding a cubic  $m_i$  implies adding some quadratic and linear monomial, therefore contributes with one of the possible following vectors

$$e_1 = (0, 0, 0, 1)$$

$$e_2 = (0, 0, 1, 1)$$

$$e_3 = (0, 1, 1, 1)$$

$$e_4 = (0, 0, 2, 1)$$

$$e_5 = (0, 1, 2, 1)$$

$$e_6 = (0, 2, 2, 1)$$

$$e_7 = (0, 0, 3, 1)$$

$$e_8 = (0, 2, 3, 1)$$

$$e_9 = (0, 3, 3, 1)$$

to the cardinalities of  $\{1\}, L_i, Q_i, C_i$ . This means that performing all the ‘steps’ for  $i = 1, \dots, n - k$  yields a relation

$$(1, k, k, k) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} e_{j_i} = (1, n, n, n).$$

Since each contribution vector  $e_i$  could appear with multiplicity, the relation can be rewritten as

$$(1, k, k, k) + \sum_{i=1}^9 a_i e_i = (1, n, n, n),$$

for some nonnegative integers  $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Solving the linear system, we find that

$$a_2 = a_4 = a_5 = a_7 = a_8 = 0,$$

$$a_1 = a_6 + 2a_9$$

$$a_3 = n - k - 2a_6 - 3a_9.$$

This in particular means that no ‘step’ could contribute with vectors  $e_2, e_4, e_5, e_7, e_8$ . We claim now that  $a_1 = 0$ . This would conclude the proof, since it would imply that each step contributes with  $e_3 = (0, 1, 1, 1)$ , which is easily seen to be equivalent to adding at step  $i$  a cubic monomial of the form  $x_a^2 y$ , where  $a = 1, \dots, k$  and  $y$  is a new variable. This in fact contributes the new monomials  $x_a y$ ,  $y$  and would imply that our partition is of the form (5.4).

To prove that  $a_1 = 0$ , we have to prove that no step could contribute with  $e_1$ . Therefore, suppose the step  $i$  is the first one to contribute with  $e_1$ . There are two cases:  $m_i$  could either be of the form  $x y z$  for three different variables  $x, y, z$  or of the form  $x^2 y$ , for two different variables  $x, y$ . We spell out the proof only that the first case; the second case follows by an analogous reasoning.

So say that  $m_i = x y z$  contributes with  $(0, 0, 0, 1)$  at step  $i$ . This means that  $x y, y z, x z \in Q_{i-1}$  and  $x, y, z \in L_{i-1}$  were already contained in the step  $i-1$ . Since clearly  $x y, y z, x z \notin Q_0$ , there should have been three intermediate steps  $1 \leq i' < i'' < i''' < i$  adding cubic monomials of the form

$$m_{i'} = x y t,$$

$$m_{i''} = x z u,$$

$$m_{i'''} = y z w,$$

for some  $t, u, w$ . We require these steps to be respectively the first time that the quadric monomials  $x y, x z, y z$  appear at the corresponding step. In particular, the step  $i'''$  contributes with quadrics  $y z, y w, z w$  and variables  $y, z, w$ . Since  $y, z \in L_{i'''-1}$ , at step  $i'''$  we could add either 0 or 1 new linear term, so the only possibility is that this step contributes with  $e_4$  and therefore  $w \notin L_{i'''-1}$ . However, this implies that at this step we are

adding only one new quadric to  $Q_{i''}$ , which is a contradiction since it implies that either  $yw$  or  $zw$  is in  $Q_{i''-1}$ , which would imply that  $w \in L_{i''-1}$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.5.** We exhibit some examples of the partitions counted in Theorem 5.4 for  $s = 3$  and  $n = 2, 3$ . In the caption, we describe the associated partition of  $[n]$  (labelled with variables  $x, y, z$ ) with the chosen coloured element.




FIGURE 3. Examples of partitions from Theorem 5.4 in the case  $s = 3$  and  $n = 2, 3$ .

Notice moreover that the monomial ideals

$$I_1 = \{x^3, y^3, x^2y, xy^2, zx, t\}^\perp \subset \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, t]$$

$$I_2 = \{x^3, y^3, x^2y, xy^2, zt\}^\perp \subset \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, t]$$

corresponding to partitions with Hilbert–Samuel function  $(1, 4, 4, 4)$  are not of the form (5.2), as they have socle in degree 1, 2 and 3 (resp. in degree 2 and 3).

**5.2. Hydral partitions and their counts.** In this subsection, we study the number of M-partitions with minimal number of boxes in degree 2 (cf. Proposition 4.2), which comes in useful in view of the strategy we present in Section 5.5. We first explicitly derive closed formulas for the corresponding generating function when  $n \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ . In Section 5.3, we will present a general formula working in any dimension.

**Proposition 5.6.** Fix integers  $s \geq 2$  and  $m \geq 1$ . Set  $d = 1 + 2(s - 1) + m$  and let  $\bar{\alpha}_{s,m}$  be the number of partitions  $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_d^2$  with  $h_\lambda(2) = 2$  and  $\text{Soc}(\lambda) \subset \lambda_{\geq s}$ . Then, we have

$$\bar{\alpha}_{s,m} = \bar{\alpha}_{3,m} = \alpha_{2,m}^2.$$

Moreover, the generating function of these numbers is given by

$$\sum_{m \geq 0} \bar{\alpha}_{s,m} t^m = \sum_{m \geq 1} \alpha_{2,m}^2 t^m = \frac{t^2 + t + 2}{(1-t)(1-t^2)} t,$$

showing that the left-hand side is a rational function.

*Proof.* The possible diagrams associated to linear partitions of the required form are classified according to  $(1, 1) \in \lambda$  or  $(1, 1) \notin \lambda$ , see Figure 4 for the two possible shapes (up to symmetry).




FIGURE 4. On the left  $(1, 1) \in \lambda$ , on the right  $(1, 1) \notin \lambda$ .

Set

$$A_{1,s}^{(m)} = \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{P}_d^2 \mid h_\lambda(2) = 2, \text{Soc}(\lambda) \in \lambda_{\geq s}, (0, 2) \notin \lambda \},$$

$$A_{2,s}^{(m)} = \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{P}_d^2 \mid h_\lambda(2) = 2, \text{Soc}(\lambda) \in \lambda_{\geq s}, (1, 1) \notin \lambda \}.$$

Then, we have

$$\Lambda_{d,s}^{(2)} = 2|A_{1,s}^{(m)}| + |A_{2,s}^{(m)}|.$$

A simple computation yields

$$|A_{1,s}^{(m)}| = \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor - s + 1, \quad |A_{2,s}^{(m)}| = d - 2s.$$

The final claim follows by expanding the rational function and comparing the coefficients.  $\square$

**Remark 5.7.** Notice that the number  $|A_{1,3}^{(m)}|$  coincides with the number of partitions of  $m - 1$  into two parts (possibly empty), the first being greater or equal than the second. Indeed, if a linear partition  $\lambda$  does not contain the point  $(0, 2)$ , its socle is of the form

$$\text{Soc}(\lambda) = \{ (h, 1), (h + j, 0) \},$$

with  $m - 1 = (h + j - 2) + (h - 2)$ .

These combinatorial objects are known as *headstrong combinations* of  $m - 1$  into 2 parts, see Definition 5.12.

On the other hand, the computation of  $|A_{2,3}^{(m)}|$  is easier and can be reduced to a counting problem of 0-dimensional partitions.

**Definition 5.8.** We say that a partition  $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_d^k$  is *hydral* if  $h_\lambda(1) = h_\lambda(2) = k$  and  $\text{Soc}(\lambda) \subset \lambda_{\geq 3}$ . Equivalently, a hydral partition is an M-partition of type  $(k, k, m)$  for some  $k, m \geq 1$ .

**Proposition 5.9.** Fix an integer  $m \geq 1$  and set  $d = 1 + 6 + m$ . The number  $\alpha_{3,m}^3$  of hydral partitions  $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_d^3$  is given by

$$\alpha_{3,m}^3 = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } m = 1 \\ 6 \left( m - 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{m-2} \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right) + 3 \left( 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{m^2 - 4}{6} \right\rfloor \right) + \binom{m-1}{2} & \text{if } m \geq 2. \end{cases}$$


Moreover, the generating function of these numbers is given by

$$\sum_{m \geq 0} \alpha_{3,m}^3 t^m = \frac{1 + 8t + 6t^2 + 11t^3 + 3t^4 + 2t^5 - t^6}{(1-t)(1-t^2)(1-t^3)} t,$$

showing that the left-hand side is a rational function.

*Proof.* We consider the contribution to  $\alpha_{3,m}^3$  from the 5 possible configurations of partitions according to their degree 2 boxes (up to symmetry). For each case, we display the corresponding  $\lambda_{\leq 2}$ .


1.  $\lambda_{=2} = \{(2, 0, 0), (0, 2, 0), (0, 0, 2)\}$ .



If  $m = 1, 2$  this configuration does not contribute, while if  $m \geq 3$  it contributes as

$$\binom{m-1}{2}.$$


2.  $\lambda_{=2} = \{(2, 0, 0), (0, 2, 0), (1, 0, 1)\}$ .



If  $m = 1$  this configuration does not contribute, while if  $m \geq 2$  it contributes as

$$6 \left( m - 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{m-2} \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \right).$$


3.  $\lambda_{=2} = \{(2, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1)\}$ .



If  $m = 1$  this configuration does not contribute, while if  $m \geq 2$  it contributes as


$$3 \left( 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{m^2 - 4}{6} \right\rfloor \right).$$

4.  $\lambda_{=2} = \{(2, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1)\}$ .



This configuration never contributes, as it fails the minimality of degree 2 boxes.

5.  $\lambda_{=2} = \{(1, 0, 1), (1, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1)\}$ .



If  $m = 1$  it contributes with 1, otherwise it does not contribute.

The final claim follows by expanding the rational function and checking its coefficients.  $\square$

**Remark 5.10.** As already observed in Remark 5.7, some configurations (the cases 1. and 2.) that contribute to  $\alpha_{3,m}^3$  can be derived from  $\alpha_{n,m}^n$  for  $n = 1, 2$ . On the other hand, the cases 3. and 5. are purely three-dimensional. In particular, notice that 3. contributes as the number of partitions of  $m - 2$  in three ordered (possibly empty) parts, with the first one being greater or equal than the others.

We will see in Section 5.3 that these cases cover essentially all the possibilities in any dimension.

**Example 5.11.** Fix an integer  $m \geq 1$  and set  $d = 1 + 8 + m$ . The number  $\alpha_{4,m}^4$  of hydral partitions  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_d^4$  has the following generating series

$$\sum_{m \geq 0} \alpha_{4,m}^4 t^m = \frac{16 + 40t + 57t^2 + 79t^3 + 81t^4 + 46t^5 + 37t^6 + 7t^7 + t^8 - 4t^9}{(1-t^2)(1-t^3)(1-t^4)} t^2.$$

This formula is a direct application of Corollary 5.21.

**5.3. Headstrong M-partitions and their count.** We prove a closed formula for the number  $\alpha_{n,m}^n$  of hydral partitions for all  $n, m \geq 1$  in terms of the combinatorics of *headstrong compositions*.

**Definition 5.12.** Fix  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . A *headstrong composition* of  $m$  into  $n$  parts is a combination (ordered partition) of  $m$  into  $n$  parts,<sup>5</sup> with the first part greater or equal than all the other parts. In other words, it is an  $n$ -tuple  $(\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n$  of nonnegative integers such that

- $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = m$ ,
- $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

**Definition 5.13.** Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $m \geq n - 1$  be two positive integers. An M-partitions  $\lambda$  of type  $(n, n, m)$  is called *headstrong* if there exists a headstrong combination  $(\alpha_i)_{i=1}^n$  of  $m - n + 1$  into  $n$  parts and a permutation  $\sigma: [n] \rightarrow [n]$  such that

$$\lambda = \left\{ \left\{ (\alpha_1 + 2) \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\sigma(1)} \right\} \amalg \left\{ \mathbf{e}_{\sigma(i)} + (\alpha_i + 2) \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\sigma(1)} \mid i = 2, \dots, n \right\} \right\}^\perp \subset \mathbb{N}^n,$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_i$  denotes the  $i$ -th canonical generator of  $\mathbb{N}^n$ .

<sup>5</sup>For our convenience, we choose our definition consistently with [39, A156041]. Beware that in the literature, e.g. [23], some authors define headstrong compositions allowing only strictly positive  $\alpha_i$ . Nevertheless, the two associated generating functions are related to each other in an elementary way, cf. Lemma 5.16.



**Example 5.14.** An example of headstrong combinations of 10 into 4 parts are

$$\alpha = (4, 1, 2, 3) \text{ or } \beta = (5, 1, 3, 1).$$

The permutation  $\sigma = (12)(34) \in \mathfrak{S}_4$  induces two headstrong partitions  $\pi_1, \pi_2$ , which we display in monomial notation

$$\pi_1 = \{x_2^6, x_1 x_2^3, x_4 x_2^4, x_3 x_2^5\}^\perp, \quad \pi_2 = \{x_2^7, x_1 x_2^3, x_4 x_2^5, x_3 x_2^3\}^\perp.$$

Figure 5 depicts two example of headstrong M-partitions partitions of type  $(3, 3, 4)$  and  $(4, 4, 16)$  and compatible with the headstrong combinations  $(3, 0, 1)$  and  $(6, 2, 1, 4)$ . Two possible realisations are

$$\{x_1^5, x_2 x_1^2, x_3 x_1^3\}^\perp \text{ and } \{x_1^8, x_2 x_1^3, x_3 x_1^4, x_4 x_1^6\}^\perp.$$

Other examples of headstrong partitions can be found in the first and last pictures of Figure 3 and in the left picture of Figure 4.




FIGURE 5. Examples of planar and (a projection of) a solid headstrong partitions.

**Remark 5.15.** If  $\lambda$  is a headstrong M-partition of type  $(n, n, m)$ , then there exists a permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  such that

$$\lambda_{=2} = \{ \mathbf{e}_{\sigma(1)} + \mathbf{e}_{\sigma(i)} \mid i = 1, \dots, n \} \subset \mathbb{N}^n.$$

In Lemma 5.16 we will compute the number of headstrong M-partitions whose ‘head’ corresponds to the first variable.

**Lemma 5.16.** Fix two integers  $n \geq 1$  and  $m \geq 0$ . Denote by  $\delta_{n,m}$  the number of M-partitions  $\lambda$  of type  $(n, n, m)$  such that

$$(5.5) \quad \lambda_{=2} = \{ \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n \} \subset \mathbb{N}^n.$$

Then, the generating function

$$\Phi_n(t) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \delta_{n,m} t^m$$

satisfies the identity

$$\Phi_n(t) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i \geq 1} t^i & \text{for } n = 1, \\ \sum_{i \geq 1} t^{i+n-2} \left( \frac{1-t^i}{1-t} \right)^{n-1} & \text{for } n \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

In particular, the number of headstrong  $M$ -partitions of type  $(n, n, m)$  is  $n \cdot \delta_{n,m}$ .

*Proof.* The case  $n = 1$  is a direct check. Let  $n \geq 2$ . Denote by  $\Delta_{n,m}$  the collection of headstrong  $M$ -partitions of type  $(n, n, m)$  satisfying (5.5). By condition (5.5), if  $\lambda \in \Delta_{n,m}$  then

$$\{\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_i \mid i = 2, \dots, n\} \subset \lambda_{=3}.$$

As a consequence, we have  $\Delta_{n,m} = \emptyset$ , for  $m < n - 1$ . Let us now assume  $m \geq n - 1$  and let us denote by  $\text{HS}_{n,m-n+1}$  the set of headstrong compositions of  $m - n + 1$  into  $n$  parts. There is a bijective correspondence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{HS}_{n,m-n+1} &\longrightarrow \Delta_{n,m} \\ (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) &\longmapsto \{(\alpha_1 + 2) \cdot \mathbf{e}_1\} \amalg \{\mathbf{e}_i + (\alpha_i + 2) \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 \mid i = 2, \dots, n\}^\perp. \end{aligned}$$

By the proof of [23, Thm. 20], the generating function of the number of headstrong combinations of  $m$  into  $n$  parts is given by

$$\sum_{m \geq 1} |\text{HS}_{n,m}| t^m = \sum_{i \geq 1} t^{i-1} \left( \frac{1-t^i}{1-t} \right)^{n-1}.$$

Combining this identity with the bijective correspondence above yields the result.

The final claim follows from the fact that there are  $n$  choices for the head of the partition.  $\square$

**Remark 5.17.** The generating function in Lemma 5.16 is rational: a straightforward manipulation yields the equality

$$\Phi_n(t) = \frac{t^{n-2}}{(1-t)^{n-1}} \sum_{k=1}^n \binom{n-1}{k-1} (-1)^{k+1} \frac{t^k}{1-t^k},$$

see also [15, Sec. I.3] for some related rational generating functions.

In the next result, we give a complete characterisation of hydral partitions, in terms of headstrong  $M$ -partitions.

**Theorem 5.18.** *Let  $\lambda$  be a hydral partition of type  $(k, k, m)$ , for  $k, m \geq 1$ . Then there exist*

- a partition of the set  $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$

$$(5.6) \quad [k] = \prod_{i=1}^r A_i \amalg \prod_{i=1}^s B_i \amalg \prod_{i=1}^t C_i,$$

such that

- $A_i = \{ a_i \}$  is a singleton for all  $i = 1, \dots, r$ ,
- $|B_i| \geq 2$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, s$ ,
- $|C_i| = 3$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, t$ ,
- $\widetilde{m} := m - (r + t - s + \sum_{i=1}^s |B_i|) \geq 0$ ,
- two tuples  $(m_i)_{i=1}^r, (n_i)_{i=1}^s$  of nonnegative integers such that

$$\widetilde{m} = \sum_{i=1}^r m_i + \sum_{i=1}^s n_i,$$

- for each  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , a headstrong  $M$ -partition  $\pi_i$  of type  $(|B_i|, |B_i|, n_i + |B_i| - 1)$ , such that, in monomial notation, we have

$$\lambda = \bigcup_{i=1}^r \{ x_{a_i}^{m_i+3} \}^\perp \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^s \pi_i \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^t \{ x_a x_b x_c \mid C_i = \{ a, b, c \} \}^\perp.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda$  be a hydral partition of type  $(k, k, m)$ , and denote by  $\overline{\lambda} = \lambda_{\leq 3}$ . We divide the proof into several steps. To ease the notation, we denote the elements of  $\lambda, \overline{\lambda}$  in terms of monomials, cf. Section 2.4.

Step I. Let  $x y z \in \lambda_{=3}$  be a square-free cubic monomial and  $n \in \lambda_{=3}$  any other cubic monomial. We claim that none of the three different variables  $x, y, z$  appear in  $n$ . Assume by contradiction that there exists at least one variable in common. We prove the case when  $n = x y z'$  is square-free with  $z \neq z'$ ; the other cases will follow by an analogous analysis.

We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 5.4, ‘building’ the partition  $\overline{\lambda}$  by adding one by one the socle elements, and looking at their contributions to the Hilbert–Samuel function of  $\overline{\lambda}$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned} W_0 &= \emptyset, \\ W_1 &= W_0 \cup \{ x y z \}. \end{aligned}$$

The cubic  $x y z$  contributes to the Hilbert–Samuel function with a vector  $(1, 3, 3, 1)$ , i.e. with one degree zero element, three linear terms, three quadratics and one cubic. Set now

$$W_2 = W_1 \cup \{ x y z' \}.$$

The cubic  $x y z'$  contributes to the Hilbert–Samuel function with a vector  $(0, 1, 2, 1)$ , for a total contribution of  $(1, 4, 5, 2)$ . Since the Hilbert–Samuel function of  $\overline{\lambda}$  is  $(1, k, k, k')$  for some  $k' \leq m$ , there must exist a ‘step’  $W_i$  where we add a cubic monomial  $m$  which contributes with more variables than quadratic monomials. The only possibilities are that  $m$  contributes with  $(0, 2, 1, 1)$  or  $(0, 3, 2, 1)$ . If the contributing vector is  $(0, 2, 1, 1)$ , it means that  $m$  contributes with exactly two new variables  $a, b$ . Therefore, up to relabelling the variables, its possibilities are

$$m \in \{ a^2 b, a b c \},$$

where  $c$  is a variable already added at a previous step. In both cases,  $m$  contributes with 2 new quadrics, which is a contradiction. The case of contributing vector  $(0, 3, 2, 1)$  follows from an analogous reasoning.

If we denote by

$$\{x_i y_i z_i \mid i = 1, \dots, t\}$$

the set of square-free cubics in  $\lambda$ , we set  $C_i = \{x_i, y_i, z_i\}$ .

Step II. By Step I, if  $\lambda$  contains a square-free monomial  $x y z$ , then the only monomials it contains with variables  $x, y, z$  are precisely all the partial derivatives of  $x y z$ . Therefore, without loss of generality we can suppose that  $\lambda$  contains no square-free cubic monomials. Denote the Hilbert–Samuel function of  $\bar{\lambda}$  by  $(1, k, k, k')$ .

We claim that  $k' \leq k$ . Assume by contradiction that  $k' > k$ . Then it means that there exists in  $\lambda$  at least one cubic of the form  $x^2 y$  with  $x \neq y$ . Let  $x_1^3, \dots, x_\ell^3$  be all the pure cubic monomial in  $\lambda$ . As in Step I, set

$$\begin{aligned} W_0 &= \emptyset, \\ W_i &= W_{i-1} \cup \{x_i^3\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, \ell. \end{aligned}$$

The first step contributes to the total Hilbert–Samuel function of  $\bar{\lambda}$  with  $(1, 1, 1, 1)$  while all the others with  $(0, 1, 1, 1)$ , for a total of  $(1, \ell, \ell, \ell)$ . Set

$$W_{\ell+1} = W_\ell \cup \{x^2 y\}.$$

The possible vector contribution of this step are

$$\begin{aligned} (0, 2, 2, 1) \\ (0, 1, 2, 1) \\ (0, 1, 1, 1) \\ (0, 0, 1, 1). \end{aligned}$$

A case by case analysis as in Step I shows that none of these situations occurs.

Step III. Consider cubic monomials  $m_1, \dots, m_{k'-k}$  such that

$$\tilde{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda} \cup \{m_1, \dots, m_{k'-k}\},$$

is a partition with Hilbert–Samuel function  $(1, k, k, k)$ . In particular,  $m_i$  belongs to the socle of  $\tilde{\lambda}$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, k' - k$ . By the proof of Theorem 5.4, there exists a partition of the set of variables

$$[k] = \prod_{i=1}^r A_i \amalg \prod_{i=1}^s B_i,$$

where  $A_i = \{a_i\}$  and  $|B_i| \geq 2$ , with distinguished elements  $b_i \in B_i$ , such that

$$\tilde{\lambda} = \bigcup_{i=1}^r \{x_{a_i}^3\}^\perp \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^s \{x_{b_i}^2 x_b \mid b \in B_i\}^\perp.$$

In particular, this implies that the monomials we possibly added can only be of the form  $x_{b_i}^3$ .

**Step IV.** For a general hydral partition  $\lambda$  of type  $(k, k, m)$ , we define the sets  $C_\bullet$  as in Step I, and the sets  $A_\bullet, B_\bullet$  as in Step III among the remaining variables. The sets  $A_\bullet, B_\bullet, C_\bullet$  completely describe the partition  $\lambda_{\leq 2}$ . Denote by  $\lambda_{A_\bullet}$  (resp.  $\lambda_{B_\bullet}, \lambda_{C_\bullet}$ ) the projection of the partition  $\lambda$  to the variables in  $A_i$  (resp. in  $B_i, C_i$ ). Clearly,  $\lambda$  is reconstructed by its projections  $\lambda_{A_\bullet}, \lambda_{B_\bullet}, \lambda_{C_\bullet}$ .

By the description of the elements in  $\lambda$  of degree 3 in Step III, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_{A_i} &= \{x_{a_i}^{m_i+3}\}^\perp, \quad \text{for some } m_i \geq 0, \\ \lambda_{C_i} &= \{x_i y_i z_i\}^\perp,\end{aligned}$$

and that  $\lambda_{B_i}$  is a headstrong M-partition of type  $(|B_i|, |B_i|, n_i + |B_i| - 1)$  for some  $n_i$ . The fact that  $\widetilde{m} \geq 0$  follows by a simple counting of the number of boxes in  $\lambda$ .  $\square$

**5.4. Proof of Theorem C.** In this subsection we prove Theorem C from the introduction, see Corollary 5.21. To this end, we need to introduce some auxiliary functions that will appear in the closed formula counting the number of hydral partitions.

**Notation 5.19.** Recall from Notation 2.2 that a linear partition  $\lambda \in P_d^2$  of a positive integer  $d$  can be represented as

$$\lambda = (1^{\alpha_1} 2^{\alpha_2} 3^{\alpha_3} \dots d^{\alpha_d}),$$

where  $\sum_{i=1}^d i\alpha_i = d$ , and recall that  $|\text{aut}(\lambda)| = \prod_{i=1}^d \alpha_i!$ . The integers  $i \leq d$  such that  $\alpha_i \neq 0$  form a decreasing tuple  $\lambda'_1 > \dots > \lambda'_{s'}$  of positive integers, each coming with its own multiplicity  $\alpha_{\lambda'_k}$  for  $k = 1, \dots, s'$ . We set  $s_k = \alpha_{\lambda'_k}$  for simplicity, so that, for instance,  $|\text{aut}(\lambda)| = \prod_{k=1}^{s'} s_k!$ . After setting  $s = \sum_{k=1}^{s'} s_k$ , we can also represent  $\lambda \vdash d$  as

$$\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s), \quad \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_s > 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1 &= \dots = \lambda_{s_1} = \lambda'_1 \\ \lambda_{s_1+1} &= \dots = \lambda_{s_1+s_2} = \lambda'_2 \\ \lambda_{s-s_{s'}+1} &= \dots = \lambda_s = \lambda'_{s'}.\end{aligned}$$

Define the following auxiliary functions:

- (i) For arbitrary  $\lambda \vdash d$ , define

$$t(\lambda) = |\{i = 1, \dots, s \mid \lambda_i = 3\}|.$$

This is the multiplicity  $\alpha_3$ .

- (ii) if  $\lambda$  satisfies  $t(\lambda) > 0$  (i.e.  $\alpha_3 > 0$ ), define

$$s(\lambda) = (1^{\alpha_1} 2^{\alpha_2} 3^{\alpha_3-1} \dots d^{\alpha_d}) \vdash d - 3.$$

(iii) For arbitrary  $\lambda \vdash d$ , define

$$f(\lambda) = \frac{1}{|\text{aut}(\lambda)|} \prod_{j=1}^s \binom{d - \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} \lambda_i}{\lambda_j} \lambda_j.$$

(iv) For arbitrary  $\lambda \vdash d$ , define

$$u(\lambda) = (1^{\alpha_1} 2^{\alpha_2} \dots \lambda_1^{\alpha_{\lambda_1-1}}) \vdash d - \lambda_1.$$

(v) For arbitrary  $\lambda \vdash d$ , define

$$r(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^s \max(\lambda_i - 1, 1).$$

(vi) for  $m \geq r(\lambda)$ , define

$$\mu(\lambda, m) = \sum_{i_1=0}^{m-r(u(\lambda))} \sum_{i_2=0}^{m-i_1-r(u^2(\lambda))} \sum_{i_3=0}^{m-i_1-i_2-r(u^3(\lambda))} \dots \sum_{i_{s-1}=0}^{m-\sum_{j=1}^{s-2} i_j-r(u^{s-1}(\lambda))} \prod_{j=1}^s \delta_{\lambda_j, i_j},$$

where  $i_s = m - \sum_{j=1}^{s-1} i_j$ ,  $u^\ell = u \circ \dots \circ u$  ( $\ell$  times iteration) and  $\delta_{n,m}$  are defined in Lemma 5.16. For our convenience, we set  $\mu(\lambda, m) = 0$  for  $m < r(\lambda)$ .

**Lemma 5.20.** *Let  $\lambda$  be a linear partition and define the series*

$$\Psi_\lambda(t) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \mu(\lambda, m) t^m.$$

*Then there is an identity*

$$\Psi_\lambda(t) = \prod_{i=1}^s \Phi_{\lambda_i}(t),$$

*where we adopt the conventions of Notation 5.19 for  $\lambda$ , and  $\Phi_\bullet(t)$  was defined in Lemma 5.16.*

*In particular, by Remark 5.17, the series  $\Psi_\lambda(t)$  is rational.*

*Proof.* We prove the statement by induction on the length  $\ell(\lambda) \geq 1$ . The base case is trivial. Fix now some linear partition  $\lambda \vdash n$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_\lambda(t) &= \sum_{m \geq 0} \mu(\lambda, m) t^m \\ &= \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{i_1=0}^{m-r(u(\lambda))} \sum_{i_2=0}^{m-i_1-r(u^2(\lambda))} \dots \sum_{i_{s-1}=0}^{m-\sum_{j=1}^{s-2} i_j-r(u^{s-1}(\lambda))} \prod_{j=1}^s \delta_{\lambda_j, i_j} t^m \\ &= \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{i_1=r(u(\lambda))}^m \delta_{\lambda_1, i_1-r(u(\lambda))} \sum_{i_2=0}^{m+r(u(\lambda))-i_1-r(u^2(\lambda))} \dots \sum_{i_{s-1}=0}^{m+r(u(\lambda))-\sum_{j=1}^{s-2} i_j-r(u^{s-1}(\lambda))} \prod_{j=2}^s \delta_{\lambda_j, i_j} t^m \\ &= \sum_{m \geq r(u(\lambda))} \sum_{i_1=r(u(\lambda))}^m \delta_{\lambda_1, i_1-r(u(\lambda))} \sum_{i_2=0}^{m+r(u(\lambda))-i_1-r(u^2(\lambda))} \dots \sum_{i_{s-1}=0}^{m+r(u(\lambda))-\sum_{j=1}^{s-2} i_j-r(u^{s-1}(\lambda))} \prod_{j=2}^s \delta_{\lambda_j, i_j} t^m \\ &= \sum_{i_1 \geq r(u(\lambda))} \sum_{m \geq i_1} \delta_{\lambda_1, i_1-r(u(\lambda))} \sum_{i_2=0}^{m+r(u(\lambda))-i_1-r(u^2(\lambda))} \dots \sum_{i_{s-1}=0}^{m+r(u(\lambda))-\sum_{j=1}^{s-2} i_j-r(u^{s-1}(\lambda))} \prod_{j=2}^s \delta_{\lambda_j, i_j} t^m \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{i_1 \geq r(u(\lambda))} \sum_{m \geq 0} \delta_{\lambda_1, i_1 - r(u(\lambda))} \sum_{i_2=0}^{m+r(u(\lambda))-r(u^2(\lambda))} \cdots \sum_{i_{s-1}=0}^{m+r(u(\lambda))-\sum_{j=2}^{s-2} i_j - r(u^{s-1}(\lambda))} \prod_{j=2}^s \delta_{\lambda_j, i_j} t^{m+i_1} \\
 &= \sum_{i_1 \geq 0} \delta_{\lambda_1, i_1} t^{i_1} \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{i_2=0}^{m+r(u(\lambda))-r(u^2(\lambda))} \cdots \sum_{i_{s-1}=0}^{m+r(u(\lambda))-\sum_{j=2}^{s-2} i_j - r(u^{s-1}(\lambda))} \prod_{j=2}^s \delta_{\lambda_j, i_j} t^{m+r(u(\lambda))} \\
 &= \sum_{i_1 \geq 0} \delta_{\lambda_1, i_1} t^{i_1} \sum_{m \geq r(u(\lambda))} \mu(u(\lambda), m) t^m \\
 &= \Phi_{\lambda_1}(t) \Psi_{u(\lambda)}(t) \\
 &= \prod_{i=1}^s \Phi_{\lambda_i}(t),
 \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

The factorisation of  $\Psi_{\lambda}(t)$  into the rational functions  $\Phi_{\lambda_i}(t)$  reflects the fact that, by Theorem 5.18, headstrong combinations are the building blocks for hydral partitions.

We can now complete the proof of Theorem C.

**Corollary 5.21.** *Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . Then*

$$\alpha_{n,m}^n = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} \sum_{i=0}^{t(\lambda)} \binom{n}{3i} \frac{(3i)!}{6^i i!} f(s^i(\lambda)) \mu(s^i(\lambda), m-i).$$

Moreover, there is an identity

$$(5.7) \quad \sum_{m \geq 0} \alpha_{n,m}^n t^m = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} \sum_{i=0}^{t(\lambda)} \binom{n}{3i} \frac{(3i)!}{6^i i!} f(s^i(\lambda)) \Psi_{s^i(\lambda)}(t) t^i.$$

In particular, the left-hand side of (5.7) is a rational function.

*Proof.* By Theorem 5.18 the number  $\alpha_{n,m}^n$  is given by the number of possibilities for the combinatorial data needed to describe a hydral partition.

First we claim that, given a linear partition  $\lambda$  of size  $n$ , the number of ways to partition the set  $[n]$  as in (5.6) with  $t = 0$  is

$$f(\lambda) \mu(\lambda, m).$$

In fact, we have that

$$f(\lambda) = \left\{ (D_i, d_i) \mid [n] = \bigsqcup_{i=1}^s D_i, |D_i| = \lambda_i \text{ and } d_i \in D_i \right\}.$$

On the other hand,  $\mu(\lambda, m)$  counts the number of partitions  $\pi$  that can be written as a union

$$\pi = \bigcup_{i=1}^s \pi_i$$

of headstrong partitions  $\pi_i$  such that

$$(\pi_i)_{=2} = \{ \mathbf{e}_{\sigma_i(1)} + \mathbf{e}_{\sigma_i(j)} \mid j = 1, \dots, \lambda_i \} \subset \mathbb{N}^n,$$

for some bijection  $\sigma_i: [\lambda_i] \rightarrow D_i$  sending 1 to  $d_i$ .

Secondly, we take into account the presence of the sets of variables  $C_i$  as in (5.6). For  $j = 0, \dots, t(\lambda)$ , we have  $\binom{n}{3i}$  ways to choose  $3i$  variables among the  $n$  given to define the sets  $C_1, \dots, C_j$  of cardinality 3. Once chosen the  $3i$  preferred variables, there are  $\frac{(3i)!}{6^i i!}$  ways to form the sets  $C_i$ . Therefore, there are in total,  $\binom{n}{3i} \frac{(3i)!}{6^i i!}$  ways to choose the sets  $C_1, \dots, C_j$  as in (5.6). Once fixed the sets  $C_i$ , there remain  $m - j$  boxes of  $\lambda$  to be distributed in the variables corresponding to indices in  $A_\bullet, B_\bullet$ . By the first part of this proof, this can be done in

$$f(s^i(\lambda))\mu(s^i(\lambda), m - i)$$

ways. This proves the first claimed equality.

A simple manipulation shows that (5.7) holds. Its rationality is deduced by combining Lemma 5.20 and Remark 5.17.  $\square$

**Remark 5.22.** The rationality statement in Corollary 5.21 should be considered ‘optimal’, in the sense that counting M-partitions with nonminimal number of quadrics, i.e. with  $h_\lambda(2) = h_\lambda(1) + 1$ , yields manifestly nonrational generating functions in any dimension.

As an example, we computed explicitly a closed formula in the case  $h_\lambda(1) = 3, h_\lambda(2) = 4$ . Due to the complexity of the formula we do not display it, but rather discuss how to obtain it. Let  $\lambda$  be an M-partition of type  $(3, 4, m)$ . Then, up to symmetry, the partition  $\lambda_{\leq 2}$  is of one of the forms presented in Figure 6 below. One can easily show that the configu-




FIGURE 6. Possible shapes of  $\lambda \in P_8^3$  with  $h_\lambda(1) = 3$  and  $\ell(\lambda) = 2$ .

rations 1. and 2. contribute with rational generating functions that can be found in [39, A008763, A006918]. On the other hand, configurations 3. and 4. do not. In fact, as suggested by Figure 6, the counting of M-partitions with shape as in 3. and 4. is equivalent (up to a shift) to the counting of linear partitions  $\pi$  with  $h_\pi(2) = 3$ , i.e. with the maximal number of quadrics. This counting clearly yields a nonrational generating series, as it differs from the counting of all linear partitions (up to a finite shift) by the rational series in Proposition 5.6.

$m$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
$\alpha_{4,m}^3$	0	18	51	126	252	474	801	1302	2001	3000	4344	6183	8595

TABLE 1. Values of  $\alpha_{4,m}^3$  for  $m = 1, \dots, 13$ .



5.5. **The computation of the numbers  $\alpha_{q,m}^k$ .** The naive approach to compute the numbers  $\alpha_{q,m}^k$  is to fix a degree  $d$ , classify the possible admissible subsets  $S \subset \mathbb{N}^k$  and their associated partitions  $S^\perp$ , and count only the correct ones. This naive approach turns out to be computationally too hard already for small values of  $k$ .

We propose a new algorithmic procedure to compute higher dimensional partitions exploiting apolarity of monomial ideals. This approach allows us to control the socle type and hence to effectively construct M-partitions of given type  $(k, q, m)$  and length  $\ell$ .

Let us denote by  $Q^k$  the set of quadrics

$$Q^k = \{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{N}^k \mid \deg(\mathbf{x}) = 2 \}.$$

We say that a subset  $U \subset Q^k$  is M-stable if there exists an M-partition  $\lambda$  such that  $h_\lambda(1) = k$  and  $\lambda_{=2} = U$ .

Let  $q \geq 1$  be a positive integer and let  $S_q^k$  be the set

$$S_q^k = \{ U \subset Q^k \mid U \text{ is M-stable, and } |U| = q \} / \mathfrak{S}_k,$$

where  $\mathfrak{S}_k$  is the symmetric group on  $k$  letters.

**Example 5.23.** For  $k = 2$  the set  $\{(2, 0)\}$  is M-stable, while  $\{(1, 1)\}$  is not. In fact, any M-partition containing  $(1, 1)$  also contains at least one among  $(2, 0)$  and  $(0, 2)$ .

Fix an integer  $\ell \geq 3$  and  $[U] \in S_q^k$ . Define the partition

$$\lambda_{U,\ell} = \bigcup_{\substack{\ell(\lambda) = \ell, \\ \lambda_{=2} = U}} \lambda.$$

Then, we have

$$(5.8) \quad \alpha_{q,m,\ell}^k = \sum_{[U] \in S_q^k} |[U]| \cdot \left| \left\{ \lambda \subset \lambda_{U,\ell} \mid \begin{array}{l} \lambda \text{ is an M-partition of} \\ \text{type } (k, q, m) \text{ and } \ell(\lambda) = \ell \end{array} \right\} \right|.$$

Notice that, by definition of  $\lambda_{U,\ell}$ , an apolar partition  $\lambda = S^\perp$  verifies  $\lambda \subset \lambda_{U,\ell}$  if and only if  $S \subset \lambda_{U,\ell}$ . Moreover, in this case, we get  $(S^\perp)_{=2} \subseteq U$ . This observation, together with the (5.8), provides an accessible set of possible socles for partitions contributing to the computation of  $\alpha_{q,m,\ell}^k$ .

It is worth mentioning that another strong restriction is provided by Macaulay's bound for monomial ideals, see e.g. [22, Thm. 3.3]. Indeed, prescribing the number  $q = h_\lambda(2)$  imposes constraints on the other values of the Hilbert–Samuel function  $h_\lambda$ , therefore constraining the number of possible admissible subsets of  $\lambda_{U,\ell}$ .

5.5.1. *Algorithm.* The above strategy can be put into an algorithmic form to compute the numbers  $\alpha_{q,m}^k$ . To do so, one has to list explicitly all the possible socles of an M-partition of length  $\ell$ , i.e. all admissible subsets of  $\lambda_{U,\ell}$ , for all  $[U] \in S_q^k$ , and for each of them to compute the Hilbert–Samuel function of the corresponding apolar partition.

Via this procedure, one can compute the numbers  $\alpha_{q,m,\ell}^k$ , which can be summed together to get the numbers  $\alpha_{q,m}^k$  for every value of  $k \leq q \leq \binom{k+1}{2}$ , see Proposition 4.2.

We have implemented this algorithm in Sage, Mathematica and Macaulay2 and computed enough values  $c_e^k$  to recover the polynomials  $c_x(t)$ , for  $x \leq 26$ . Moreover, using the same strategy, we computed enough values  $p_d^n$  to recover the polynomials  $h_d(t)$  for  $d \leq 30$ , thus extending the data provided in [16]. We have collected these polynomials in the ancillary file [generatingfunctions.txt](#).

## 6. CONJECTURES

**6.1. MacMahon's discrepancy.** We conjectured in [20, Sec. 9.4] a structural result on the discrepancy between the generating function of higher dimensional partitions and MacMahon's original guess. We present here a stronger version of [20, Conj. 9.8].

Define numbers  $\pi_d^n$ , by

$$\sum_{d \geq 0} \pi_d^n t^d = \prod_{m > 0} (1 - t^m)^{-\binom{m+n-3}{n-2}},$$

In [1] it has been proven that  $\pi_d^n$  counts the number of  $(n-1)$ -dimensional partitions (of varying size) having corner-hook volume equal to  $d$ . According to [2, p. 1098], there are integers  $\bar{y}_d^\bullet$  such that

$$(6.1) \quad \pi_d^n = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \binom{n}{k} \bar{y}_d^k.$$

Analogously to Proposition 3.2(1), the numbers  $\bar{y}_d^\bullet$  can be interpreted as a refinement of the numbers  $\pi_d^\bullet$ .

**Remark 6.1.** We do not report here the definition of *corner-hook volume* as it is beyond the scope of this paper, see [1]. Nevertheless, we give some example. In dimension  $n \leq 2$  corner-hook volume and size agree. Even though for  $n = 3$  we have  $p_d^3 = \pi_d^3$ , the two numbers count different objects, see Figure 7.

We call 'MacMahon's discrepancy' the quantity

$$e_d^k = \bar{y}_d^k - y_d^k,$$

also considered in [2]. In [20, Conj. 9.8] we conjectured the existence of rational generating functions for the sequences  $(e_{i+k+2}^{i+1})_{i \geq 1}$ , for  $k \geq 1$ . We now propose a stronger version which relates to a question raised in [2], see Proposition 6.5.

**Conjecture 6.2.** For every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  there exists a polynomial  $\bar{y}_k(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$  of degree at most  $\binom{k+4}{2} - 7 - k$ , such that

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} \bar{y}_{i+k+2}^{i+1} t^i = \frac{\bar{y}_k(t)}{\prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^i (1 - jt)}.$$

Moreover, for every  $0 \leq k \leq d-1$  we have  $\bar{y}_d^k \geq 0$ .




FIGURE 7. Plane partitions of corner-hook volume and size 3,4,5.

**Remark 6.3.** The nonnegativity of  $\overline{y}_\bullet^3$  would follow from a combinatorial interpretation of (6.1). Indeed, one could subdivide the partitions counted by  $\pi_\bullet^3$  according to their embedding dimension, as suggested by Figure 7. However, it is not clear whether in general this subdivision is consistent with (6.1). In particular, if such a combinatorial interpretation exists, we expect it to be possible to define integers  $\overline{c}_\bullet^3$  refining  $\overline{y}_\bullet^3$ , yielding a proof of Conjecture 6.2, analogously to Theorem A.

The latter expectation comes from the fact that the rational function  $\prod_{j=1}^i (1 - jt)^{-1}$  is the generating series of the Stirling numbers of the second kind  $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ i \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ , i.e. the number of partitions of a set of  $n$  elements into  $i$  nonempty parts [15, App. A.8].

**Remark 6.4.** Conjecture 6.2 is strictly stronger than [20, Conj. 9.8], and is more suited for computational checks for  $k, i$  arbitrarily large. Using Mathematica [30] we have checked Conjecture 6.2, for  $k = 1, \dots, 18$  and  $i < 10^3$ , thus confirming, thanks to [generatingfunctions.txt](#), [20, Conj. 9.8] as well, in the same range.

Another motivation for Conjecture 6.2 is a question raised in [2], regarding the positivity of the numbers  $e_d^k$ .

**Proposition 6.5.** *If Conjecture 6.2 holds, then  $e_d^k > 0$  for  $d \gg 0$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from [25, Thm. 3.4] (see also the references therein) on the asymptotic growth of the coefficients of the Maclaurin expansion of a rational generating function in terms of its radius of convergence.  $\square$

Via a direct check,<sup>6</sup> we were able to confirm the positivity of  $(e_{j+k+2}^{j+1})_{j \geq 0}$ , for  $k \leq 18$  and  $j \leq 10^3$ . We remark that these checks are highly nontrivial, as the coefficients of  $M_k(t)$  (i.e. the numerator of the generating function for  $(e_{j+k+2}^{j+1})_{j \geq 0}$ ) from [20, Conj. 9.8] are in general both positive and negative.

Another possible measure of the MacMahon's discrepancy is given in terms of the difference between the correct and predicted exponents in equation (1.1). Define numbers  $\omega_m^n, \overline{\omega}_m^n$  by

$$\sum_{d \geq 0} p_d^n t^d = \prod_{m > 0} (1 - t^m)^{-\omega_m^n},$$

$$\overline{\omega}_m^n = \binom{m+n-3}{n-2},$$

and set

$$\varepsilon_m^n = \overline{\omega}_m^n - \omega_m^n.$$

Notice that  $p_d^n$  is a polynomial of degree  $d-1$  in  $n$  by Proposition 3.2. As a consequence, via a direct check we see that  $\omega_m^n$  is a polynomial in  $n$  as well, of degree at most  $m-1$ . Similarly, by definition,  $\overline{\omega}_m^n$  is a polynomial in  $n$  of degree  $m-1$ . Therefore, the ‘error’  $\varepsilon_m^n$  is a polynomial in  $n$  of degree at most  $m-1$ .

**Conjecture 6.6** ([20, Conj. 9.6]). *For every  $m \geq 6$  there exists an irreducible polynomial  $r_m(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$  of degree at most  $m-6$  such that*

$$\varepsilon_m^n = \binom{n}{4} r_m(n)$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ . In particular, the error  $\varepsilon_m^n$  has degree at most  $m-2$ .

We have used [generatingfunctions.txt](#) and Macaulay2 [21] to provide checks of Conjecture 6.6.

**Proposition 6.7.** *Conjecture 6.6 holds for  $m \leq 30$ .*

Notice that the degree of  $\varepsilon_m^n$  is predicted to be strictly smaller than  $m-1$ . This in particular would imply that for all  $m \geq 1$  one has

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\overline{\omega}_m^n}{\omega_m^n} = 1.$$

---

<sup>6</sup>We stress that, thanks to Equation (6.1) and Theorem A, this check can easily be performed for  $j$  arbitrarily large.

6.2. **Sparsity.** We conclude by formulating a conjecture on the sparsity of the numbers  $p_d^n$ .

One may ask whether there are repetitions among the numbers  $p_d^n$ , i.e. if there are pairs  $(n, d) \neq (m, e)$  such that  $p_d^n = p_e^m$ . Since we have  $1 = p_1^n$  and  $n = p_2^n$ , the question becomes nontrivial for  $d \geq 3$ . Inspecting [generatingfunctions.txt](#), we found the following repetitions which remarkably only involve, on one side of each identity, the

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 p_3^5 = p_7^2 = 15 & p_3^9 = p_4^5 = 45 \\
 p_3^{14} = p_4^7 = 105 & p_3^{15} = p_5^5 = 120 \\
 p_3^{21} = p_{16}^2 = 231 & p_3^{65} = p_8^5 = 2145 \\
 p_3^{70} = p_{13}^3 = 2485 & p_3^{89} = p_4^{27} = 4005 \\
 p_3^{185} = p_4^{45} = 17205 & p_3^{1418} = p_5^{66} = 1006071 \\
 p_3^{3382} = p_4^{323} = 5720653 & p_3^{4898} = p_4^{414} = 11997651 \\
 p_3^{2160324} = p_4^{24100} = 2333500972650 &
 \end{array}$$

TABLE 2. Solutions to  $p_d^n = p_e^m$ , for  $3 \leq d < e \leq 30$  and  $p_e^m \leq 10^{18}$ .

integer  $d = 3$ . Recall that the numbers  $p_3^n$  have a peculiar combinatorial interpretation, being the number of subsets of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  of cardinality 1 or 2. This interpretation is not available for  $d \geq 4$ .

It is worth mentioning that, when  $d = 3$ , for any  $e > 3$ , the equation

$$(6.2) \quad \binom{n+1}{2} = p_e^m,$$

defines a hyperelliptic curve with a given integral point  $(1, 1)$ . By [12] the number of rational solutions of (6.2) is finite, and there are algorithms to find other integral solutions, see [10, Sec. 10.4.1] and also [6]. In the special case  $e = 4$  equation (6.2) defines a smooth elliptic curve in this case there are finitely many integral points which we list in Table 2, see [46, Ch. 5] for more details. It is worth mentioning that in case  $e = 5$  we get a singular elliptic curve. Up to our knowledge, in the case  $e > d > 3$  there is no general algorithm to compute all integral points.

Motivated by these observations, we propose the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 6.8.** Fix  $2 < d < e$ . If  $p_d^n = p_e^m$  for some  $n, m$ , then  $d = 3$ .

A direct computer check using the data in [generatingfunctions.txt](#) allowed us to confirm the conjecture in a wide range.

**Proposition 6.9.** Conjecture 6.8 holds in the following cases:

- $e \leq 30$  and  $m$  such that  $p_e^m \leq 10^{23}$ ,

- $m \leq 3$  and  $e$  such that  $p_e^m \leq 10^{23}$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Alimzhan Amanov and Damir Yeliussizov, *MacMahon's statistics on higher-dimensional partitions*, Forum Math. Sigma **11** (2023), 1–23. [2](#), [42](#)
- [2] Arthur O. L. Atkin, Paul Bratley, Ian G. Macdonald, and John K. S. McKay, *Some computations for  $m$ -dimensional partitions*, Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. **63** (1967), 1097–1100. [1](#), [3](#), [42](#), [43](#)
- [3] Sjoerd Beentjes and Andrea T. Ricolfi, *Virtual counts on Quot schemes and the higher rank local DT/PT correspondence*, Math. Res. Lett. **28** (2021), no. 4, 967–1032. [7](#)
- [4] Kai Behrend, Jim Bryan, and Balázs Szendrői, *Motivic degree zero Donaldson–Thomas invariants*, Invent. Math. **192** (2013), no. 1, 111–160. [7](#)
- [5] Dharam P. Bhatia, M. A. Prasad, and D. Arora, *Asymptotic results for the number of multidimensional partitions of an integer and directed compact lattice animals*, J. Phys. A, Math. Gen. **30** (1997), no. 7, 2281–2285. [2](#)
- [6] Yann Bugeaud, Maurice Mignotte, Samir Siksek, Michael Stoll, and Szabolcs Tengely, *Integral points on hyperelliptic curves*, Algebra Number Theory **2** (2008), no. 8, 859–885. [45](#)
- [7] Yalong Cao, Martijn Kool, and Sergej Monavari,  *$K$ -theoretic DT/PT correspondence for toric Calabi–Yau 4-folds*, Comm. Math. Phys. **396** (2022), no. 1, 225–264. [7](#)
- [8] Alberto Cazzaniga, Dimbinaina Ralaivaosaona, and Andrea T. Ricolfi, *Higher rank motivic Donaldson–Thomas invariants of  $\mathbb{A}^3$  via wall-crossing, and asymptotics*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. (2022), 97–122. [7](#)
- [9] Alberto Cazzaniga and Andrea T. Ricolfi, *Framed motivic Donaldson–Thomas invariants of small crepant resolutions*, Math. Nachr. **295** (2022), no. 6, 1096–1112. [7](#)
- [10] Henri Cohen, *A course in computational algebraic number theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 138, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993. [45](#)
- [11] Ben Davison and Andrea T. Ricolfi, *The local motivic DT/PT correspondence*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. **104** (2021), no. 3, 1384–1432. [7](#)
- [12] G. Faltings, *Endlichkeitssätze für abelsche Varietäten über Zahlkörpern*, Invent. Math. **73** (1983), no. 3, 349–366. [45](#)
- [13] Nadir Fasola and Sergej Monavari, *Tetrahedron instantons in Donaldson–Thomas theory*, Adv. Math. **462** (2025), 110099. [7](#)
- [14] Nadir Fasola, Sergej Monavari, and Andrea T. Ricolfi, *Higher rank  $K$ -theoretic Donaldson–Thomas theory of points*, Forum Math. Sigma **9** (2021), no. E15, 1–51. [7](#)
- [15] Philippe Flajolet and Robert Sedgewick, *Analytic combinatorics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. [34](#), [43](#)
- [16] Suresh Govindarajan, *The Partitions project*, 2011. [2](#), [4](#), [42](#)
- [17] Suresh Govindarajan, *Notes on higher-dimensional partitions*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **120** (2013), no. 3, 600–622. [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#)
- [18] Michele Graffeo, *Moduli spaces of  $\mathbb{Z}/k\mathbb{Z}$ -constellations over  $\mathbb{A}^2$* , Communications in Contemporary Mathematics **27** (2025), no. 03, 2450019. [7](#)
- [19] Michele Graffeo, Paolo Lella, Sergej Monavari, Andrea T. Ricolfi, and Alessio Sammartano, *The geometry of double nested Hilbert schemes of points on curves*, [ArXiv:2310.09230](#), to appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (DOI: 10.1090/tran/9247), 2023. [7](#)
- [20] Michele Graffeo, Sergej Monavari, Riccardo Moschetti, and Andrea T. Ricolfi, *The motive of the Hilbert scheme of points in all dimensions*, [ArXiv:2406.14321](#), 2024. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [7](#), [9](#), [13](#), [15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [42](#), [43](#), [44](#)

- [21] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman, *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*, Available at <http://www2.macaulay2.com>. 5, 44
- [22] Mark L. Green, *Generic initial ideals*, In: *Six lectures on commutative algebra*, Mod. Birkhäuser Class, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2010, pp. 119–186. 41
- [23] Gal Gross, *Maximally additively reducible subsets of the integers*, J. Integer Seq. **23** (2020), no. 10, Art. 20.10.5, 40. 32, 34
- [24] Alexander Grothendieck, *Techniques de construction et théorèmes d'existence en géométrie algébrique. IV. Les schémas de Hilbert*, Séminaire Bourbaki, Exp. No. 221, no. 6, Soc. Math. France, 1961, pp. 249–276. 6
- [25] Giorgio Gubbiotti, Andrew P. Kels, and Claude-M. Viallet, *Algebraic entropy for hex systems*, Nonlinearity **37** (2024), no. 12, Paper No. 125007, 24. 44
- [26] Sabir M. Gusein-Zade, Ignacio Luengo, and Alejandro Melle-Hernández, *Power structure over the Grothendieck ring of varieties and generating series of Hilbert schemes of points*, Mich. Math. J. **54** (2006), no. 2, 353–359. 7
- [27] Godfrey H. Hardy and Srinivasa Ramanujan, *Asymptotic formulae for the distribution of integers of various types*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **16** (1917), 112–132. 2
- [28] Godfrey H. Hardy and Srinivasa Ramanujan, *Une formule asymptotique pour le nombre des partitions de  $n$ .*, C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris **164** (1917), 35–38. 2
- [29] Godfrey H. Hardy and Srinivasa Ramanujan, *Asymptotic formulae in combinatory analysis.*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **17** (1918), 75–115. 2
- [30] Wolfram Research, Inc., *Mathematica, Version 14.1*, Champaign, IL, 2024. 5, 20, 43
- [31] Joachim Jelisiejew, *Pathologies on the Hilbert scheme of points*, Invent. Math. **220** (2020), no. 2, 581–610. 6
- [32] Percy A. MacMahon, *Combinatory analysis. Vol. 1*, Cambridge Univ. Press., v-xx, 300 p., 1915. 1
- [33] Percy A. MacMahon, *Combinatory analysis. Vol. 2.*, Cambridge Univ. Press. xix, 340 p., 1916. 1
- [34] Davesh Maulik, Nikita Nekrasov, Andrei Okounkov, and Rahul Pandharipande, *Gromov–Witten theory and Donaldson–Thomas theory, I*, Compos. Math. **142** (2006), no. 5, 1263–1285. 7
- [35] Sergej Monavari, *Canonical vertex formalism in DT theory of toric Calabi–Yau 4-folds*, J. Geom. Phys. **174** (2022), 104466. 7
- [36] Sergej Monavari and Andrea T. Ricolfi, *On the motive of the nested Quot scheme of points on a curve*, J. Algebra **610** (2022), 99–118. 7
- [37] Nikita Nekrasov, *Magnificent four*, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré D **7** (2020), no. 4, 505–534. 7
- [38] Nikita A. Nekrasov, *Instanton partition functions and M-theory*, Jpn. J. Math. **4** (2009), no. 1, 63–93. 7
- [39] OEIS Foundation Inc., *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences*, 2024, Published electronically at <http://oeis.org>. 32, 40
- [40] Kristina Oganessian, *Bounds for the number of multidimensional partitions*, Eur. J. Comb. **120** (2024), 27, Id/No 103982. 2
- [41] Andrei Okounkov, Nikolai Reshetikhin, and Cumrun Vafa, *Quantum Calabi–Yau and classical crystals*, The unity of mathematics, Progr. Math., vol. 244, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2006, pp. 597–618. 7
- [42] Adri B. Olde Daalhuis, *Hypergeometric function*, NIST handbook of mathematical functions, U.S. Dept. Commerce, Washington, DC, 2010, pp. 383–401. 20
- [43] Cosmin Pohoata and Dmitrii Zakharov, *On the number of high-dimensional partitions*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **128** (2024), no. 2, 12. 2
- [44] Andrea T. Ricolfi, *On the motive of the Quot scheme of finite quotients of a locally free sheaf*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **144** (2020), 50–68. 7

- [45] Andrea T. Ricolfi, *Virtual classes and virtual motives of Quot schemes on threefolds*, Adv. Math. **369** (2020), 107182. [7](#)
- [46] Joseph H. Silverman and John T. Tate, *Rational points on elliptic curves*, Springer Cham, Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, 2nd ed., 2015, pp. xxii+332. [45](#)
- [47] Richard P. Stanley, *Enumerative combinatorics*, vol. 2, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999. [2](#)
- [48] The Sage Developers, *Sagemath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 9.3)*, 2021, <https://www.sagemath.org>. [5](#)

Michele Graffeo

SISSA, Via Bonomea 265, 34136, Trieste (Italy)

[mgraffeo@sissa.it](mailto:mgraffeo@sissa.it)

Sergej Monavari

École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), CH-1015 Lausanne (Switzerland)

[sergej.monavari@epfl.ch](mailto:sergej.monavari@epfl.ch)

Riccardo Moschetti

Università di Torino, Via Carlo Alberto 10, 10123, Torino (Italy)

[riccardo.moschetti@unito.it](mailto:riccardo.moschetti@unito.it)

Andrea T. Ricolfi

SISSA, Via Bonomea 265, 34136, Trieste (Italy)

[aricolfi@sissa.it](mailto:aricolfi@sissa.it)