

On Permutations with Bounded Drop Size

Joanna N. Chen¹, William Y.C. Chen²

¹Center for Combinatorics, LPMC-TJKLC
Nankai University
Tianjin 300071, P.R. China

²Center for Applied Mathematics
Tianjin University
Tianjin 300072, P.R. China

¹joanna@cfc.nankai.edu.cn, ²chenyc@tju.edu.cn

Abstract

The maximum drop size of a permutation π of $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is defined to be the maximum value of $i - \pi(i)$. Chung, Claesson, Dukes and Graham obtained polynomials $P_k(x)$ that can be used to determine the number of permutations of $[n]$ with d descents and maximum drop size not larger than k . Furthermore, Chung and Graham gave combinatorial interpretations of the coefficients of $Q_k(x) = x^k P_k(x)$ and $R_{n,k}(x) = Q_k(x)(1 + x + \dots + x^k)^{n-k}$, and raised the question of finding a bijective proof of the symmetry property of $R_{n,k}(x)$. In this paper, we establish a bijection φ on $A_{n,k}$, where $A_{n,k}$ is the set of permutations of $[n]$ and maximum drop size not larger than k . The map φ remains to be a bijection between certain subsets of $A_{n,k}$. This provides an answer to the question of Chung and Graham. The second result of this paper is a proof of a conjecture of Hyatt concerning the unimodality of polynomials in connection with the number of signed permutations of $[n]$ with d type B descents and the type B maximum drop size not greater than k .

Keywords: descent polynomial, unimodal polynomial, maximum drop

AMS Subject Classifications: 05A05, 05A15

1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with the study of permutations of $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with d descents and maximum drop size not greater than k . Let this number be denoted by $E^k(n, d)$. Chung, Claesson, Dukes and Graham [3] found polynomials $P_k(x)$ that can be used to determine the number $E^k(n, d)$. They proved that the polynomials $P_k(x)$ are unimodal. Furthermore, Chung and Graham found combinatorial interpretations of the polynomials $Q_k(x) = x^k P_k(x)$ and $R_{n,k}(x) = Q_k(x)(1 + x + \dots + x^k)^{n-k}$, and asked for a combinatorial interpretation of the symmetry property of $R_{n,k}(x)$. The first result of

this paper is to present a bijection in answer to the question of Chung and Graham. The second result of this paper is a proof of a conjecture of Hyatt [6] on the unimodality of the type B analogue of the polynomials $P_k(x)$.

Let us give an overview of notation and terminology. Let S_n denote the set of permutations of $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For a permutation $\pi = \pi_1\pi_2 \cdots \pi_n$ in S_n , we say that a number $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ is a descent of π if $\pi_i > \pi_{i+1}$. The descent set of $\pi \in S_n$, denoted by $\text{Des}(\pi)$, is defined by

$$\text{Des}(\pi) = \{i \in [n-1] : \pi_i > \pi_{i+1}\}.$$

Let $\text{des}(\pi)$ denote the number of descents of $\pi \in S_n$. We say that $\pi \in S_n$ has a drop at i if $\pi_i < i$ and the drop size is meant to be $i - \pi_i$. Define the maximum drop size of π by

$$\text{maxdrop}(\pi) = \max\{i - \pi_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\}.$$

Chung, Claesson, Dukes and Graham [3] obtained a polynomial $P_k(x)$ that can be used to determine the number $E^k(n, d)$ of permutations of $[n]$ with d descents and maximum drop size not larger than k . Let $A_{n,k}$ denote the set of permutations of $[n]$ with maximum drop size not larger than k . The k -maxdrop-restricted descent polynomial is defined by

$$A_{n,k}(y) = \sum_{\pi \in A_{n,k}} y^{\text{des}(\pi)} = \sum_{d \geq 0} E^k(n, d) y^d.$$

Clearly, for $k \geq n-1$, we have $A_{n,k} = S_n$ and $A_{n,k}(y)$ becomes the Eulerian polynomial

$$A_n(y) = \sum_{\pi \in S_n} y^{\text{des}(\pi)}.$$

Notice that the above definition of the Eulerian polynomial differs from the definition given in Stanley [7] by a factor of y . Chung, Claesson, Dukes and Graham [3] obtained the following recurrence relation of $A_{n,k}(y)$.

Theorem 1.1 *For $n \geq 0$, we have*

$$A_{n+k+1,k}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \binom{k+1}{i} (y-1)^{i-1} A_{n+k+1-i,k}(y),$$

where $A_{i,k}(y) = A_i(y)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k$.

Using the recurrence of $A_{n,k}(y)$ in Theorem 1.1, they introduced the polynomials

$$P_k(x) = \sum_{l=0}^k A_{k-l}(x^{k+1}) (x^{k+1} - 1)^l \sum_{i=l}^k \binom{i}{l} x^{-i} \quad (1.1)$$

to determine the numbers $E^k(n, d)$.

Theorem 1.2 For $n, k \geq 0$, we have

$$A_{n,k}(y) = \sum_d \beta_k((k+1)d)y^d, \quad (1.2)$$

where

$$\sum_j \beta_k(j)x^j = P_k(x) \left(\frac{1-x^{k+1}}{1-x} \right)^{n-k}. \quad (1.3)$$

In other words, $E^k(n, d)$ equals the coefficient of $x^{(k+1)d}$ in

$$P_k(x)(1+x+x^2+\dots+x^k)^{n-k}.$$

Chung, Claesson, Dukes and Graham [3] also proved that $P_k(x)$ is a unimodal polynomial. We say a sequence $s_1 s_2 \dots s_n$ is unimodal if there exists a $1 \leq t \leq n$ such that $s_1 \leq s_2 \leq \dots \leq s_t$ and $s_t \geq s_{t+1} \geq \dots \geq s_n$. A polynomial is said to be unimodal if the sequence of its coefficients is unimodal.

Furthermore, Chung and Graham [4] found combinatorial interpretations of the coefficients of $Q_k(x) = x^k P_k(x)$ and $R_{n,k}(x) = Q_k(x)(1+x+\dots+x^k)^{n-k}$.

Theorem 1.3 For $n \geq 0$,

$$Q_n(x) = \sum_{0 \leq i, j \leq n} E(n+1, i; j+1)x^{(n+1)i+j},$$

where $E(n, i; j)$ is the number of $\pi = \pi_1 \pi_2 \dots \pi_n \in S_n$ such that $\text{des}(\pi) = i$ and $\pi_n = j$.

Theorem 1.4 For $k \geq 0$,

$$R_{n,k}(x) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq k} E^k(n+1, i; n+1-k+j)x^{(k+1)i+j}.$$

where $E^k(n, i; j)$ is the number of $\pi = \pi_1 \pi_2 \dots \pi_n \in A_{n,k}$ such that $\text{des}(\pi) = i$ and $\pi_n = j$.

Notice that Chung and Graham [4] used the notation $\left\langle \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ i \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle^j$ for the number $E(n, i; j)$ and the notation $\left\langle \begin{smallmatrix} n \\ i \end{smallmatrix} \right\rangle_{[k]}^j$ for the number $E^k(n, i; j)$. They raised the question of finding a bijective proof of the following symmetry property of $R_{n,k}(x)$.

Theorem 1.5 For $n, k \geq 0$, the polynomials $R_{n,k}(x)$ are symmetric. In other words, for $r = (k+1)i + j$ and $r' = (k+1)i' + j'$, where $0 \leq i, i' \leq n-1, 0 \leq j, j' \leq k$ and $r + r' = (n+1)k$, we have

$$E^k(n, i; n-k+j) = E^k(n, i'; n-k+j').$$

In Section 2, we construct a bijection φ on $A_{n,k}$ by a recursive procedure. Then we prove that φ remains to be a bijection between certain subsets of $A_{n,k}$. This leads to a bijective proof of Theorem 1.5.

Hyatt [6] extended the notion of the maximum drop to the type B case or signed permutations. Recall that a signed permutation $\pi = \pi_1\pi_2\cdots\pi_n$ can be viewed as a permutation of $[n]$ for which each element may be associated with a minus sign. The descent set of a signed permutation π is defined by

$$\text{Des}_B(\pi) = \{i \in [0, n-1] : \pi_i > \pi_{i+1}\},$$

where we assume that $\pi_0 = 0$, see Brenti [1]. We denote by $\text{des}_B(\pi)$ the number of type B descents of $\pi \in B_n$.

Let $\text{maxdrop}_B(\pi)$ denote the maximum drop size of $\pi \in B_n$ as defined by

$$\text{maxdrop}_B(\pi) = \max \left\{ \max\{i - \pi_i : \pi_i > 0\}, \max\{i : \pi_i < 0\} \right\}.$$

Let $B_{n,k}$ denote the set of signed permutations of $[n]$ with maximum drop size not larger than k , and let $E_B^k(n, d)$ denote the number of signed permutations in $B_{n,k}$ with d descents.

The type B k -maxdrop-restricted descent polynomial is defined by

$$B_{n,k}(y) = \sum_{\pi \in B_{n,k}} y^{\text{des}_B(\pi)} = \sum_{d \geq 0} E_B^k(n, d) y^d.$$

When $k \geq n$, $B_{n,k} = B_n$ and $B_{n,k}(y)$ becomes the type B Eulerian polynomial $B_n(y)$, which is defined by

$$B_n(y) = \sum_{\pi \in B_n} y^{\text{des}_B(\pi)}.$$

Hyatt [6] showed that $B_{n,k}(y)$ satisfied the following recurrence relation.

Theorem 1.6 *For $n \geq 0$, we have*

$$B_{n+k+1,k}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \binom{k+1}{i} (y-1)^{i-1} B_{n+k+1-i,k}(y),$$

where $B_{i,k}(y) = B_i(y)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k$.

Similarly, using the above recurrence relation of $B_{n,k}(y)$, Hyatt gave the following type B analogue of the polynomials $P_k(x)$

$$T_k(x) = \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{k+1})(x^{k+1} - 1)^l \sum_{i=l}^k \binom{i}{l} x^{-i}, \quad (1.4)$$

which can be used to compute the numbers $E_B^k(n, d)$.

Theorem 1.7 *We have*

$$B_{n,k}(y) = \sum_d \gamma_k((k+1)d)y^d, \quad (1.5)$$

where

$$\sum_j \gamma_k(j)x^j = T_k(x) \left(\frac{1-x^{k+1}}{1-x} \right)^{n-k}. \quad (1.6)$$

The following conjecture was posed by Hyatt [6].

Conjecture 1.8 *The polynomial $T_k(x)$ is unimodal for any $k \geq 0$.*

The second result of this paper is a proof of the above conjecture, which will be given in Section 3.

2 A bijective proof of Theorem 1.5

In this section, we give a bijection φ on $A_{n,k}$, and we prove that the map φ remains to be a bijection between certain subsets of $A_{n,k}$. This yields a bijective proof of Theorem 1.5.

We begin with some notation. Given $\pi \in S_n$ and $1 \leq i \leq n+1$, let $\pi \leftarrow i$ denote the permutation $\mu = \mu_1\mu_2 \cdots \mu_{n+1}$ in S_{n+1} that is obtained from π by adding i at the end of π and increasing the elements $i, i+1, \dots, n$ by 1. For example, $3421 \leftarrow 3 = 45213$.

For $n, k \geq 0$, $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$, let $\Gamma^k(n, i; j)$ denote the set of permutations $\pi = \pi_1\pi_2 \cdots \pi_n$ in $A_{n,k}$ with $\text{des}(\pi) = i$ and $\pi_n = n - k + j$, which is counted by $E^k(n, i; n - k + j)$.

Given n and k , we proceed to construct a map φ from $A_{n,k}$ to $A_{n,k}$, which can be described as a recursive procedure. Let $\pi = \pi_1\pi_2 \cdots \pi_n \in A_{n,k}$. For $n = 1$, we define $\varphi(1) = 1$. For $n \geq 2$, let $i = \text{des}(\pi)$ and $j = \pi_n - n + k$. Let

$$i' = \left\lfloor \frac{(n+1)k - (k+1)i - j}{k+1} \right\rfloor, \quad (2.1)$$

$$j' = (n+1)k - (k+1)i - j - (k+1)i'. \quad (2.2)$$

Assume that π' is the permutation of $[n-1]$ that is order isomorphic to $\pi_1\pi_2 \cdots \pi_{n-1}$. In other words, $\pi = \pi' \leftarrow \pi_n$. Now we define $\varphi(\pi) = \varphi(\pi') \leftarrow (n - k + j')$.

For example, let $\pi = 12354$, which belongs to $A_{5,2}$, or more precisely, $\Gamma^2(5, 1; 1)$. It is easy to check that $i' = 2$ and $j' = 2$. Then we have $\pi' = 1234$. Iterating the above procedure, we get $\pi'' = 123$, $\pi''' = 12$ and $\pi'''' = 1$. Then we have $\varphi(\pi''''') = 1$, $\varphi(\pi''''') = 21$, $\varphi(\pi''''') = 321$, $\varphi(\pi''') = 3214$ and $\varphi(\pi) = 32145$.

The following theorem shows that the map φ becomes a bijection between certain subsets of $A_{n,k}$.

Theorem 2.1 *For $n, k \geq 0$, $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$, the map φ gives a bijection from $\Gamma^k(n, i; j)$ to $\Gamma^k(n, i'; j')$, where i' and j' are given by (2.1) and (2.2).*

The following lemmas are needed to prove Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 2.2 *For $n, k \geq 0$, $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$, let $\pi = \pi_1\pi_2 \cdots \pi_n$ be a permutation in $\Gamma^k(n, i; j)$. Then we have $\varphi(\pi)$ is a permutation in $\Gamma^k(n, i'; j')$, where i' and j' are given by (2.1) and (2.2).*

Proof. We proceed by induction on n . Clearly, when $n = 1$, we have $1 \in \Gamma^k(1, 0; k)$. By (2.1) and (2.2), we have $i' = 0$ and $j' = k$. Hence $\varphi(1) = 1 \in \Gamma^k(1, 0; k)$. Assume that the lemma holds for $n - 1$, where $n \geq 2$. We aim to show that it holds for n .

Assume that $\pi = \pi_1\pi_2 \cdots \pi_n$ is a permutation in $\Gamma^k(n, i; j)$, that is, $i = \text{des}(\pi)$ and $j = \pi_n - n + k$. Let $\sigma = \sigma_1\sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{n-1}$ be the permutation of $[n - 1]$ which is order isomorphic to $\pi_1\pi_2 \cdots \pi_{n-1}$, that is, $\pi = \sigma \leftarrow \pi_n$. Then we have $p = p_1p_2 \cdots p_n = \varphi(\pi) = \varphi(\sigma) \leftarrow (n - k + j')$, where j' is defined by (2.1) and (2.2).

By the definition of φ , we have $p_n = n - k + j'$. Let $\alpha = \alpha_1\alpha_2 \cdots \alpha_{n-1} = \varphi(\sigma)$. By the induction hypothesis, we find $\text{maxdrop}(\alpha) \leq k$. It can be seen that $\text{maxdrop}(p) \leq k$ since $p_i \geq \alpha_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ and $n - p_n = k - j'$.

It remains to show that $\text{des}(p) = i'$. Let

$$a = \text{des}(\sigma) \tag{2.3}$$

$$b = \sigma_{n-1} - n + 1 + k \tag{2.4}$$

$$a' = \left\lfloor \frac{nk - a(k+1) - b}{k+1} \right\rfloor \tag{2.5}$$

$$b' = nk - a(k+1) - b - a'(k+1) \tag{2.6}$$

Again, by the induction hypothesis, we have $a' = \text{des}(\alpha)$ and $b' = \alpha_{n-1} - n + 1 + k$. Recall that $p = \alpha \leftarrow (n - k + j')$. It suffices to prove that $i' = a' + 1$ when $\alpha_{n-1} \geq p_n$ and $i' = a'$ when $\alpha_{n-1} < p_n$. Since $p_n = n - k + j'$ and $\alpha_{n-1} = n - 1 - k + b'$, we need to show that $i' = a' + 1$ when $j' - b' \leq -1$ and $i' = a'$ when $j' - b' > -1$.

By the definition of j and b , we have $0 \leq j \leq k$ and $0 \leq b \leq k$. It follows that

$$-k \leq j - b \leq k. \tag{2.7}$$

Similarly, we have

$$-k \leq j' - b' \leq k. \tag{2.8}$$

By (2.2) and (2.6), we get

$$i(k+1) + j + i'(k+1) + j' = (n+1)k, \quad (2.9)$$

$$a(k+1) + b + a'(k+1) + b' = nk. \quad (2.10)$$

Here are two cases.

Case 1: $i = a$, namely, $j - b > -1$.

By (2.9) and (2.10), we find that

$$(i' - a')(k+1) = k - (j - b) - (j' - b').$$

If $j' - b' \leq -1$, by (2.8), we see that $k \geq 1$. Moreover, by (2.7) and (2.8) and the assumptions $j - b > -1$ and $j' - b' \leq -1$, we deduce that $-1 < j - b \leq k$ and $-k \leq j' - b' \leq -1$. It follows that $(i' - a')(k+1) \in [1, 2k]$, where $k \geq 1$. Hence we arrive at the assertion that $i' = a' + 1$.

If $j' - b' > -1$, by (2.7) and (2.8) and the assumptions $j - b > -1$, we find that $-1 < j' - b' \leq k$ and $-1 < j - b \leq k$. It follows that $(i' - a')(k+1) \in [-k, k]$. Hence we deduce that $i' = a'$.

Case 2: $i = a + 1$, namely, $j - b \leq -1$

By (2.7) and the assumption $j - b \leq -1$, we deduce that $k \geq 1$. It follows from (2.9) and (2.10) that

$$(i' - a')(k+1) = -1 - (j - b) - (j' - b').$$

If $j' - b' \leq -1$, we claim that $k \geq 2$. Assume to the contrary that $k = 1$. By (2.7) and (2.8), we have $j' - b' = -1$ and $j - b = -1$. Hence we get $2(i' - a') = 1$, a contradiction to the fact that $i' - a'$ is an integer. This proves that $k \geq 2$. In view of (2.7) and (2.8) and the assumptions $j - b \leq -1$ and $j' - b' \leq -1$, we find that $(i' - a')(k+1) \in [1, 2k - 1]$, where $k \geq 2$. So we reach the conclusion that $i' = a' + 1$.

If $j' - b' > -1$, by (2.7) and (2.8) and the assumptions $j - b \leq -1$, we find that $-1 < j' - b' \leq k$ and $-k \leq j - b \leq -1$. It follows that $(i' - a')(k+1) \in [-k, k - 1]$, where $k \geq 1$. Hence we have $i' = a'$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

It should be noted that the above lemma can be restated in the form of its converse. Assume that π is a permutation in $\Gamma^k(n, i'; j')$. Then $\varphi(\pi)$ is in $\Gamma^k(n, i; j)$. The verification of this fact is straightforward, and hence it is omitted.

Lemma 2.3 *The map φ is an involution on $A_{n,k}$, that is, $\varphi^2 = I$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on n . When $n = 1$, the lemma is obvious. Suppose that the lemma holds for $n - 1$, where $n \geq 2$. We aim to show that it is valid for n .

Assume that π is a permutation in $A_{n,k}$, that is, there exist $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$ such that $\pi \in \Gamma^k(n, i; j)$. Let $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{n-1}$ be a permutation of $[n-1]$ such that $\pi = \sigma \leftarrow \pi_n$ with $\pi_n = n - k + j$. Assume j' be the number defined by (2.1) and (2.2). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^2(\pi) &= \varphi^2(\sigma \leftarrow (n - k + j)) \\ &= \varphi(\varphi(\sigma) \leftarrow (n - k + j')) \\ &= \varphi^2(\sigma) \leftarrow (n - k + j) \\ &= \sigma \leftarrow (n - k + j) \\ &= \pi. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

Combining Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, we are led to a bijective proof of Theorem 2.1, which is a combinatorial statement of the symmetry property of $R_{n,k}(x)$ as given by Chung and Graham [4].

3 Proof of Conjecture 1.8

In this section, we give a proof of the conjecture of Hyatt [6] on the unimodality of the polynomials $T_k(x)$ associated with the number of signed permutations with d type B descents and the type B maximum drop size not larger than k . Based on the polynomials $T_k(x)$, we define the polynomials $H_k(x)$ as given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_k(x) &= \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{2k+2})(x^{2k+2} - 1)^l \sum_{s=l}^k \binom{s}{l} x^{2k+1-s} \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{-2k-2})(x^{-2k-2} - 1)^l \sum_{s=l}^k \binom{s}{l} x^{2(k+1)^2+s}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

Notice that the sequence of coefficients of $T_k(x)$ is a subsequence of the sequence of coefficients of $H_k(x)$. Therefore, the unimodality of $T_k(x)$ follows from the unimodality of $H_k(x)$.

Let $\tilde{T}_k(x) = x^k T_k(x)$, that is,

$$\tilde{T}_k(x) = \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{k+1})(x^{k+1} - 1)^l \sum_{i=l}^k \binom{i}{l} x^{k-i}. \quad (3.2)$$

The polynomials $\tilde{T}_k(x)$ for $0 \leq k \leq 3$ are given in Table 3.1. Like the array representation of $Q_k(x)$ given by Chung and Graham [4], we shall use an array representation

k	$\widetilde{T}_k(x)$
0	1
1	$x + 2x^2 + x^3$
2	$x^2 + 4x^3 + 6x^4 + 6x^5 + 4x^6 + 2x^7 + x^8$
3	$x^3 + 8x^4 + 12x^5 + 18x^6 + 23x^7 + 32x^8 + 32x^9 + 28x^{10} + 23x^{11}$ $+ 8x^{12} + 4x^{13} + 2x^{14} + x^{15}$

Table 3.1: The polynomials $\widetilde{T}_k(x)$ for $0 \leq k \leq 3$.

of $\widetilde{T}_k(x)$. The array representation t_k of the coefficients of $\widetilde{T}_k(x)$ is defined as follows. For $0 \leq i \leq k+1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$, the (i, j) -entry $t_k(i, j)$ is set to be the coefficient of $x^{(k+1)i+j}$ of $\widetilde{T}_k(x)$, that is,

$$\widetilde{T}_k(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^k t_k(i, j) x^{(k+1)i+j}. \quad (3.3)$$

Similarly, we can arrange the coefficients of $H_k(x)$ in a $(k+2) \times 2(k+1)$ array h_k so that

$$H_k(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{2k+1} h_k(i, j) x^{2(k+1)i+j}.$$

It can be seen that the array h_2 can be obtained from the array t_2 by the following operations. First, rotate the array t_2 180 degrees counter clockwise. Then put this rotated array in front of t_2 . For example, Table 3.2 gives an array t_2 and Table 3.3 gives the corresponding array h_2 .

0	0	1
4	6	6
4	2	1
0	0	0

Table 3.2: The array t_2

0	0	0	0	0	1
1	2	4	4	6	6
6	6	4	4	2	1
1	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3.3: The array h_2

In fact, for any $k \geq 0$, h_k can be constructed from t_k in this fashion, which is stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1 *For $k \geq 0$, h_k can be obtained by rotating t_k 180 degrees counter clockwise, and putting the rotated array in front of t_k .*

To prove Lemma 3.1, we need the following property.

Lemma 3.2 For $k \geq 0$, define

$$F_k(x) = \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{k+2})(x^{k+2} - 1)^l \sum_{i=l}^k \binom{i}{l} x^{k+1-i}. \quad (3.4)$$

Arrange the coefficients of $F_k(x)$ in a $(k+2) \times (k+2)$ array f_k so that

$$F_k(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{k+1} f_k(i, j) x^{(k+2)i+j}.$$

Then the array f_k can be obtained from t_k given in (3.3) by adding a column of zeros in front of t_k .

Proof. To prove that f_k can be obtained from t_k by inserting a column of zeros in front of t_k , we proceed to verify that $f_k(i, 0) = 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$ and $f_k(i, j+1) = t_k(i, j)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$.

For convenience, for $0 \leq l \leq k$, let

$$\begin{aligned} U_l(t) &= B_{k-l}(t)(t-1)^l, \\ V_l(t) &= \sum_{i=l}^k \binom{i}{l} t^{k-i}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $U_l(t)$ is a polynomial of t of degree k and $V_l(t)$ is a polynomial of t of degree not larger than k .

From the expression (3.4) of $F_k(x)$, we see that

$$F_k(x) = \sum_{l=0}^k x U_l(x^{k+2}) V_l(x).$$

Since $U_l(x^{k+2})$ can be seen as a polynomial of x^{k+2} and the degree of $V_l(x)$ is not larger than k , we deduce that the coefficient of $x^{(k+2)i}$ in $F_k(x)$ equals zero for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$. Hence $f_k(i, 0) = 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$.

Next we prove that $t_k(i, j) = f_k(i, j+1)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$. We shall adopt the common notation $[x^l]p(x)$ for the coefficient of x^l in a polynomial $p(x)$. It suffices to show that

$$[x^{(k+1)i+j}] \widetilde{T}_k(x) = [x^{(k+2)i+j+1}] F_k(x). \quad (3.5)$$

From the expression (3.2) of $\widetilde{T}_k(x)$, it follows that

$$\widetilde{T}_k(x) = \sum_{l=0}^k U_l(x^{k+1}) V_l(x).$$

Recalling that $V_l(x)$ is a polynomial of x of degree not larger than k , for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$, it is easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned} [x^{(k+1)i+j}] \widetilde{T}_k(x) &= \sum_{l=0}^k \left([x^{(k+1)i}] U_l(x^{k+1}) \right) \left([x^j] V_l(x) \right) \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^k \left([t^i] U_l(t) \right) \left([x^j] V_l(x) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [x^{(k+2)i+j+1}] F_k(x) &= \sum_{l=0}^k \left([x^{(k+2)i}] U_l(x^{k+2}) \right) \left([x^{j+1}] x V_l(x) \right) \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^k \left([x^{(k+2)i}] U_l(x^{k+2}) \right) \left([x^j] V_l(x) \right) \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^k \left([t^i] U_l(t) \right) \left([x^j] V_l(x) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Hence (3.5) follows from (3.6) and (3.7). So arrive at the conclusion that $f_k(i, j+1) = t_k(i, j)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$. This completes the proof. \blacksquare

We are now ready to give a proof of Lemma 3.1.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Write $H_k(x)$ as

$$H_k(x) = H'_k(x) + H''_k(x),$$

where

$$H'_k(x) = \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{2k+2})(x^{2k+2} - 1)^l \sum_{s=l}^k \binom{s}{l} x^{2k+1-s}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$H''_k(x) = \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{-2k-2})(x^{-2k-2} - 1)^l \sum_{s=l}^k \binom{s}{l} x^{2(k+1)^2+s}. \quad (3.9)$$

Assume $H'_k(x)$ has the array representation h'_k such that

$$H'_k(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{2k+1} h'_k(i, j) x^{2(k+1)i+j},$$

and $H''_k(x)$ has the array representation h''_k such that

$$H''_k(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{2k+1} h''_k(i, j) x^{2(k+1)i+j}.$$

Clearly, we have $h_k = h'_k + h''_k$. Using Lemma 3.2 repeatedly, we deduce that h'_k can be obtained from t_k by adding $k + 1$ columns of zeros in front of t_k . Table 3.4 gives an example of h'_k for $k = 2$.

From the expression (3.8) of $H'_k(x)$ and the expression (3.9) of $H''_k(x)$, we see that

$$H''_k(x) = H'_k(x^{-1})x^{2(k+1)(k+2)-1}.$$

Hence, in the form of array representation, we deduce that h''_k can be obtained from h'_k by rotating h'_k 180 degrees. For example, the array h''_2 in Table 3.5 is constructed from the array h'_2 in Table 3.4.

0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	4	6	6
0	0	0	4	2	1
0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3.4: The array h'_2

0	0	0	0	0	0
1	2	4	0	0	0
6	6	4	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3.5: The array h''_2

In view of the fact that $h_k = h'_k + h''_k$ and the constructions of h'_k and h''_k from t_k , we see that the first $k + 1$ columns of h_k can be obtained from t_k by a rotation of 180 degrees and t_k remains to be the last $k + 1$ columns of h_k . This completes the proof. ■

As a consequence of Lemma 3.1, we have the following property.

Corollary 3.3 *For $k \geq 0$, the polynomial $H_k(x)$ is symmetric.*

In the array representation, the symmetry of $H_k(x)$ means that for $0 \leq i \leq k + 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2k + 1$, we have

$$h_k(i, j) = h_k(k + 1 - i, 2k + 1 - j). \quad (3.10)$$

According to Lemma 3.1, it is clear that the sequence of coefficients of $T_k(x)$ is a subsequence of the coefficients of $H_k(x)$. We shall prove that for $k \geq 0$, $H_k(x)$ is a unimodal polynomial. This implies the unimodality of $T_k(x)$.

Theorem 3.4 *The polynomial $H_k(x)$ is unimodal for any $k \geq 0$.*

To prove Theorem 3.4, we introduce the polynomials $G_k(x)$ which will be used to derive a recurrence relation of $H_k(x)$.

Based on the definition (3.1) of $H_k(x)$, we define

$$G_k(x) = \frac{1}{x} \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{2k+4})(x^{2k+4} - 1)^l \sum_{s=l}^k \binom{s}{l} x^{2k+3-s}$$

$$+ \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{-2k-4})(x^{-2k-4} - 1)^l \sum_{s=l}^k \binom{s}{l} x^{2(k+1)(k+2)+s}. \quad (3.11)$$

Let g_k be the array representation of $G_k(x)$ such that

$$G_k(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{2k+3} g_k(i, j) x^{2(k+2)i+j}.$$

We claim that the array g_k can be obtained from h_k by adding a column of zeros after the $(k+1)$ -st column and adding a column of zeros after the $2(k+1)$ -st column of h_k . The detailed verification of this fact is omitted. Table 3.6 gives an example.

0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
1	2	4	0	4	6	6	0
6	6	4	0	4	2	1	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3.6: The array g_2

Lemma 3.5 For $k \geq 0$, we have

$$H_{k+1}(x) = G_k(x) \cdot (x + x^2 + \cdots + x^{2k+4}) \quad (3.12)$$

Proof. We aim to show that

$$(1-x) \cdot H_{k+1}(x) = xG_k(x) \cdot (1-x^{2k+4}), \quad (3.13)$$

which is equivalent to (3.12). By the definition of $H_k(x)$ in (3.1), we see that $(1-x) \cdot H_{k+1}(x)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned} & (1-x) \sum_{l=0}^{k+1} B_{k+1-l}(x^{2k+4})(x^{2k+4} - 1)^l \sum_{s=l}^{k+1} \binom{s}{l} x^{2k+3-s} \\ & + (1-x) \sum_{l=0}^{k+1} B_{k+1-l}(x^{-2k-4})(x^{-2k-4} - 1)^l \sum_{s=l}^{k+1} \binom{s}{l} x^{2(k+2)^2+s} \\ & = (1-x) \sum_{l=1}^{k+1} B_{k+1-l}(x^{2k+4})(x^{2k+4} - 1)^l \sum_{s=l}^{k+1} \binom{s}{l} x^{2k+3-s} \\ & + (1-x) \sum_{l=1}^{k+1} B_{k+1-l}(x^{-2k-4})(x^{-2k-4} - 1)^l \sum_{s=l}^{k+1} \binom{s}{l} x^{2(k+2)^2+s} \\ & + (1-x) B_{k+1}(x^{2k+4}) \sum_{s=0}^{k+1} x^{2k+3-s} + (1-x) B_{k+1}(x^{-2k-4}) \sum_{s=0}^{k+1} x^{2(k+2)^2+s} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= - \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{2k+4})(x^{2k+4} - 1)^{l+1} \sum_{s=l}^k \binom{s}{l} x^{2k+3-s} \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{2k+4})(x^{2k+4} - 1)^{l+1} \binom{k+1}{l+1} x^{k+2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{-2k-4})(x^{-2k-4} - 1)^{l+1} \sum_{s=l}^k \binom{s}{l} x^{2(k+2)^2+s+1} \\
&\quad - \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{-2k-4})(x^{-2k-4} - 1)^{l+1} \binom{k+1}{l+1} x^{(k+2)(2k+5)} \\
&\quad + B_{k+1}(x^{2k+4})x^{k+2}(1 - x^{k+2}) + B_{k+1}(x^{-2k-4})x^{2(k+2)^2}(1 - x^{k+2}). \tag{3.14}
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the definition of $G_k(x)$ in (3.11), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
xG_k(x) \cdot (1 - x^{2k+4}) &= - \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{2k+4})(x^{2k+4} - 1)^{l+1} \sum_{s=l}^k \binom{s}{l} x^{2k+3-s} \\
&\quad + \sum_{l=0}^k B_{k-l}(x^{-2k-4})(x^{-2k-4} - 1)^{l+1} \sum_{s=l}^k \binom{s}{l} x^{2(k+2)^2+s+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing the above expression for $xG_k(x) \cdot (1 - x^{2k+4})$ and the the first two summations in (3.14), to prove (3.13), it suffices to show that the remaining sum in (3.14) equals zero, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}
&B_{k+1}(x^{2k+4})x^{2k+4} - B_{k+1}(x^{-2k-4})x^{2(k+2)^2} \\
&= \sum_{l=0}^{k+1} B_{k+1-l}(x^{2k+4})(x^{2k+4} - 1)^l \binom{k+1}{l} x^{k+2} \\
&\quad - \sum_{l=0}^{k+1} B_{k+1-l}(x^{-2k-4})(x^{-2k-4} - 1)^l \binom{k+1}{l} x^{(k+2)(2k+5)}. \tag{3.15}
\end{aligned}$$

It is known that the type B Eulerian polynomial $B_n(t)$ is a symmetric polynomial of degree n , that is,

$$B_n(t) = B_n(t^{-1})t^n,$$

see Brenti [1]. Hence we have

$$B_{k+1}(x^{2k+4})x^{2k+4} - B_{k+1}(x^{-2k-4})x^{2(k+2)^2} = 0.$$

Thus (3.15) is equivalent to the following relation

$$\sum_{l=0}^{k+1} B_{k+1-l}(x^{2k+4})(x^{2k+4} - 1)^l \binom{k+1}{l}$$

$$= \sum_{l=0}^{k+1} B_{k+1-l}(x^{-2k-4})(x^{-2k-4} - 1)^l \binom{k+1}{l} x^{2(k+2)^2}. \quad (3.16)$$

Setting $t = x^{2k+4}$ and $n = k + 1$, (3.16) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{l=0}^n B_{n-l}(t)(t-1)^l \binom{n}{l} = \sum_{l=0}^n B_{n-l}(t^{-1})(t^{-1}-1)^l \binom{n}{l} t^{n+1}. \quad (3.17)$$

To prove (3.17), we need the following formula

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} B_n(t) \frac{x^n}{n!} = \frac{(1-t)e^{x(1-t)}}{1-te^{2x(1-t)}}, \quad (3.18)$$

which was obtained by Chow and Gessel [2]. Using (3.18), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n>1} \sum_{j=0}^n B_{n-j}(t)(t-1)^j \binom{n}{j} \frac{x^n}{n!} \\ &= \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} B_n(t) \frac{x^n}{n!} \right) \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} (t-1)^n \frac{x^n}{n!} \right) - 1 \\ &= \frac{te^{2x(1-t)} - t}{1 - te^{2x(1-t)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

On the other hand, using (3.18) again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n>1} \sum_{j=0}^n B_{n-j}(t^{-1})(t^{-1}-1)^j \binom{n}{j} t^{n+1} \frac{x^n}{n!} \\ &= t \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} B_n(t^{-1}) \frac{x^n}{n!} \right) \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} (t-1)^n \frac{(tx)^n}{n!} \right) - t \\ &= \frac{te^{2x(1-t)} - t}{1 - te^{2x(1-t)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

Combining (3.19) and (3.20), we arrive at (3.17). This completes the proof. \blacksquare

Based on Lemma 3.5 and the relationship between the array representation of $H_k(x)$ and the array representation of $G_k(x)$, we can obtain the following recurrence relations for the array representation of $H_k(x)$, which can be verified by induction on k . The detailed proof is omitted.

Corollary 3.6 *For $0 \leq i \leq k + 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k$, we have*

$$h_k(i, j) = h_{k-1}(i, 0) + h_{k-1}(i, 1) + \cdots + h_{k-1}(i, j-1)$$

$$+h_{k-1}(i-1, j) + h_{k-1}(i-1, j+1) + \cdots + h_{k-1}(i-1, 2k-1), \quad (3.21)$$

and for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$ and $k+1 \leq j \leq 2k+1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_k(i, j) &= h_{k-1}(i, 0) + h_{k-1}(i, 1) + \cdots + h_{k-1}(i, j-2) \\ &\quad + h_{k-1}(i-1, j-1) + h_{k-1}(i-1, j) + \cdots + h_{k-1}(i-1, 2k-1), \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

where we assume that $h_k(i, j) = 0$ when $i < 0$.

Now we are ready to give a proof of Theorem 3.4.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. We proceed by induction on k . By expression (3.1) of $H_k(x)$, we get $H_0(x) = x + x^2$, which is unimodal. Assume that $H_{k-1}(x)$ is unimodal, where $k \geq 1$. We aim to prove that $H_k(x)$ is unimodal.

Assume that $k \geq 1$. Let $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{2k^2+2k-1})$ denote the sequence of coefficients of $H_{k-1}(x)$. By the symmetry of $H_{k-1}(x)$ as given in Corollary 3.3, we have $a_i = a_{2k^2+2k-1-i}$. It follows that the unimodality of $H_{k-1}(x)$ is equivalent to the fact that

$$a_0 \leq a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_{k^2+k-1}. \quad (3.23)$$

Assume that $(b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{2k^2+6k+3})$ is the sequence of coefficients of $H_k(x)$. By the symmetry of $H_k(x)$, to prove that $H_k(x)$ is unimodal, it suffices for us to prove that

$$b_0 \leq b_1 \leq \cdots \leq b_{k^2+3k+1}. \quad (3.24)$$

To conduct the induction, we employ the array representation of $H_k(x)$. Recall that h_k is the array representation of $H_k(x)$ such that

$$H_k(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=0}^{2k+1} h_k(i, j) x^{2(k+1)i+j}.$$

Clearly, we have $h_k(i, j) = b_{2(k+1)i+j}$ for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2k+1$. Hence we may restate (3.24) in the array representation. More precisely, when k is odd, (3.24) can be transformed into the following assertions:

- (i) $h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) \geq 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \rfloor - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2k$.
- (ii) $h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) \geq 0$ for $i = \lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \rfloor$ and $0 \leq j \leq k-1$.
- (iii) $h_k(i, 0) - h_k(i-1, 2k+1) \geq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \rfloor$.

Similarly, when k is even, (3.24) can be recast into the following assertions:

- (iv) $h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) \geq 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq \frac{k}{2}$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2k$.

(v) $h_k(i, 0) - h_k(i - 1, 2k + 1) \geq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq \frac{k}{2}$.

Now we proceed to prove the above assertions. It follows from (3.21) that for $0 \leq i \leq k + 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$,

$$h_k(i, j + 1) - h_k(i, j) = h_{k-1}(i, j) - h_{k-1}(i - 1, j). \quad (3.25)$$

Using (3.22), we find that for $0 \leq i \leq k + 1$ and $k + 1 \leq j \leq 2k$,

$$h_k(i, j + 1) - h_k(i, j) = h_{k-1}(i, j - 1) - h_{k-1}(i - 1, j - 1). \quad (3.26)$$

Moreover, by (3.21) and (3.22), it is easy to check that for $0 \leq i \leq k + 1$,

$$h_k(i, k) = h_k(i, k + 1), \quad (3.27)$$

$$h_k(i, 0) = h_k(i - 1, 2k + 1). \quad (3.28)$$

We first consider that case when k is odd. To prove (i), we assume that $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \rfloor - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2k$. Here are three subcases. When $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$, we claim that $h_k(i, j + 1) - h_k(i, j) \geq 0$. From (3.25) we see that

$$h_k(i, j + 1) - h_k(i, j) = a_{2ki+j} - a_{2ki-2k+j}.$$

Since $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \rfloor - 1$ and $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$, noting $2\lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \rfloor = k + 1$, we find that

$$2ki + j \leq 2k \left(\left\lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) + k - 1 = k^2 - 1.$$

Clearly, we have $2ki + j \geq 2ki - 2k + j$. Thus we may use the induction hypothesis to deduce that $a_{2ki+j} - a_{2ki-2k+j} \geq 0$, which is equivalent to the claim.

When $k + 1 \leq j \leq 2k$, we claim that $h_k(i, j + 1) - h_k(i, j) \geq 0$. By (3.26), we get

$$h_k(i, j + 1) - h_k(i, j) = a_{2ki+j-1} - a_{2ki-2k+j-1}.$$

Using the same argument as in the case when $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$, we deduce that

$$2ki + j - 1 \leq 2k \left(\left\lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) + 2k - 1 = k^2 + k - 1.$$

Similarly, we have $2ki + j - 1 \geq 2ki - 2k + j - 1$. Hence we may use the induction hypothesis to deduce that $a_{2ki+j-1} - a_{2ki-2k+j-1} \geq 0$, which is equivalent to the claim.

Recall that $h_k(i, k + 1) = h_k(i, k)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k + 1$ as given in (3.27). On the other hand, when $j = k$, assertion (i) becomes the relation $h_k(i, k + 1) - h_k(i, k) \geq 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \rfloor - 1$, which is valid since the equality holds. Combining the above three cases, assertion (i) is proved.

To prove (ii), we assume that $i = \lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \rfloor$ and $0 \leq j \leq k-1$. We claim that $h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) \geq 0$. By (3.25) and the symmetry relation (3.10), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) &= h_{k-1}(i, j) - h_{k-1}(i-1, j) \\ &= h_{k-1}(k-i, 2k-1-j) - h_{k-1}(i-1, j) \\ &= a_{2k(k-i)+2k-1-j} - a_{2k(i-1)+j}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $i = \lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \rfloor$ and $0 \leq j \leq k-1$, we see that

$$2k(k-i) + 2k-1-j \leq 2k\left(k - \left\lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \right\rfloor\right) + 2k-1 = k^2 + k - 1,$$

and

$$2k(k-i) + 2k-1-j \geq 2k(i-1) + j.$$

Hence we may use the induction hypothesis to deduce that $a_{2k(k-i)+2k-1-j} - a_{2k(i-1)+j} \geq 0$. This proves the claim, and hence assertion (ii) holds.

Note that by (3.28), we have $h_k(i, 0) = h_k(i-1, 2k+1)$ for $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor \frac{k+2}{2} \rfloor$. This proves assertion (iii).

Next we turn to the case when k is even.

To prove (iv), we assume that $0 \leq i \leq \frac{k}{2}$ and $0 \leq j \leq 2k$. When $0 \leq i \leq \frac{k}{2}$ and $0 \leq j \leq k-1$, we claim that $h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) \geq 0$. By (3.25), we see that

$$h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) = a_{2ki+j} - a_{2ki-2k+j}.$$

By the assumptions $0 \leq i \leq \frac{k}{2}$ and $0 \leq j \leq k-1$, we see that

$$2ki + j \leq k^2 + k - 1.$$

Hence we may use the induction hypothesis to deduce that $a_{2ki+j} - a_{2ki-2k+j} \geq 0$, which is equivalent to the claim.

When $0 \leq i \leq \frac{k}{2} - 1$ and $k+1 \leq j \leq 2k$, we claim that $h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) \geq 0$. By (3.26), we find that

$$h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) = a_{2ki+j-1} - a_{2ki-2k+j-1}.$$

By the assumptions $0 \leq i \leq \frac{k}{2} - 1$ and $k+1 \leq j \leq 2k$, we see that

$$2ki + j - 1 \leq k^2 - 1.$$

Hence the induction hypothesis can be used to get $a_{2ki+j-1} - a_{2ki-2k+j-1} \geq 0$, which is equivalent to the claim.

When $i = \frac{k}{2}$ and $k+1 \leq j \leq 2k$, we claim that $h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) \geq 0$. By (3.26) and the symmetry relation (3.10), we find that

$$h_k(i, j+1) - h_k(i, j) = h_{k-1}(i, j-1) - h_{k-1}(i-1, j-1)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= h_{k-1}(k-i, 2k-j) - h_{k-1}(i-1, j-1) \\
&= a_{2k(k-i)+2k-j} - a_{2k(i-1)+j-1}
\end{aligned}$$

Using the assumptions $i = \frac{k}{2}$ and $k+1 \leq j \leq 2k$, we get

$$2k(k-i) + 2k-j \leq k^2 + k - 1,$$

and

$$2k(k-i) + 2k-j \geq 2k(i-1) + j - 1.$$

Hence the induction hypothesis can be used to deduce that $a_{2k(k-i)+2k-j} - a_{2k(i-1)+j-1} \geq 0$, which is equivalent to the claim.

When $j = k$, assertion (iv) takes the form $h_k(i, k+1) - h_k(i, k) \geq 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq \frac{k}{2}$, which is true since the equality holds according to (3.27). Combining the above cases, assertion (iv) is proved. Note that by (3.28), we have $h_k(i, 0) = h_k(i-1, 2k+1)$ for $1 \leq i \leq \frac{k}{2}$. This proves assertion (v). So the proof of the theorem is complete. ■

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the 973 Project, the PCSIRT Project of the Ministry of Education, and the National Science Foundation of China.

References

- [1] F. Brenti, q -Eulerian polynomials arising from Coxeter groups, *European J. Combin.* 15 (1994), 417–441.
- [2] C. Chow and I. Gessel, On the descent numbers and major indices for the hyperoctahedral group, *Adv. App. Math.* 38 (2007) 275–301.
- [3] F. Chung, A. Claesson, M. Dukes and R. Graham, Descent polynomials for permutation with bounded drop size, *European J. Combin.* 31 (2010) 1853–1867.
- [4] F. Chung and R. Graham, Inversion-descent polynomials for restricted permutations, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 120 (2013) 366–378.
- [5] D. Foata, G.N. Han, q -Series in Combinatorics; Permutation Statistics (Lecture Notes), preliminary edition, 2004.
- [6] M. Hyatt, Descent polynomials for k bubble-sortable permutations of type B , *European J. Combin.* 34 (2013) 1171–1191.
- [7] R.P. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics, Vol. 1*, Cambridge University Press, 1997.