

# On the Order of P-Strict Promotion on $V \times [\ell]$

Ben Adenbaum\*

## Abstract

Denote by  $V$  the poset consisting of the elements  $\{A, B, C\}$  with cover relations  $\{A \lessdot B, A \lessdot C\}$ . We show that  $P$ -strict promotion, as defined by Bernstein, Striker, and Vorland, on  $P$ -strict labelings of  $V \times [\ell]$  with labels in the set  $[q]$  has order  $2q$  for every  $\ell \geq 1$  and  $q \geq 3$ . The idea of the proof is to suitably generalize the methods of Hopkins and Rubey which they used to prove that Promotion on the linear extensions of  $V \times [n]$  has order  $6n$ . As a consequence of results of Bernstein, Striker, and Vorland this result proves that Piecewise-Linear Promotion, and thus Piecewise-Linear Rowmotion, on  $V \times [k]$  has order  $2(k+2)$  for all  $k \geq 1$ , as conjectured by Hopkins.

## 1 Introduction

Promotion is an action on the linear extensions of a finite poset, see section 2.1 for definitions. First described and then developed by Schützenberger in [12, 13, 14], Promotion and its generalizations have become a large focus of study within the field of Dynamical Algebraic Combinatorics. Throughout we will be concerned with a generalization of Promotion due to Bernstein, Striker, and Vorland named *P-strict Promotion*; see Section 2.1 for the definition.

Similarly, Rowmotion is an operation defined on the order ideals of a finite poset; see Section 2.3 for definitions. Historically, Rowmotion was first described by Brouwer and Schrijver [1], and then again by Cameron and Fon-der-Flaas [2] as a composition of certain involutions called toggles. The name of Rowmotion comes from the work of Striker and Williams [16] where, for certain posets, Rowmotion is described as a composition of toggles along the rows, and it is shown to be related to Promotion. In particular, the toggle definition was extended to an action referred to as Piecewise-Linear Rowmotion on the Order Polytope of  $P$  in [4].

Analogously, the family of posets of the form  $V \times [k]$  have similarly been the focus of study, as they have been conjectured to satisfy “good” dynamical behavior [17] especially with respect to both with Promotion and Rowmotion. In particular, it has been shown that the orders of these actions for a fixed  $k$  are  $6k$  [9] and  $2(k+2)$  [10] respectively. Furthermore it has been conjectured [17] that the order of Piecewise-Linear Rowmotion on the Order Polytope of  $V \times [k]$  has the same order as Rowmotion on the order ideals of  $V \times [k]$ . The goal

---

\*Department of Mathematics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, USA.

of this work is to resolve this conjecture by proving an equivalent conjecture of Bernstein, Striker, and Vorland concerning the order of  $P$ -strict Promotion on  $P$ -strict labelings of  $\mathbf{V} \times [\ell]$  with entries in  $[q]$  for all  $\ell \geq 1, q \geq 3$ . The method of proof was suggested as a possible attack for this problem by Bernstein, Striker, and Vorland in [6]. Specifically we will prove the following result.

**Theorem 1.** *The order of Pro on  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{V} \times [\ell]}(R^q)$  divides  $2q$ .*

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In section 2 we review the necessary background for our proof. Section 3 is devoted to the proof.

## Acknowledgements

The author thanks Sergi Elizalde, Sam Hopkins, Tom Roby, and Alexander Wilson for helpful discussions.

## 2 Background

In this section, we review the necessary background for the argument of Theorem 1. Throughout  $P$  will denote a poset. Recall that  $P$  is said to be *graded of rank  $n$*  if every maximal chain of  $P$  has  $n + 1$  elements. Denote by  $rk$  the rank function of such a poset.

### 2.1 Promotion

For  $P$  a finite poset with  $|P| = m$ , a *linear extension* of  $P$  is an order preserving bijection  $f : P \rightarrow [m]$ . Typically this is represented as a labeling of the Hasse diagram of  $P$  with the elements of  $[m]$  where if  $p <_P p'$  then the label of  $p'$  is greater than the label of  $p$ . This can be equivalently thought of as an ordered tuple listing the elements of  $P$  where if  $p <_P p'$  then  $p$  precedes  $p'$  in the tuple. Denote by  $e(P)$  the set of all linear extensions of  $P$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$ , define the  $i$ th Bender-Knuth involution  $t_i : e(P) \rightarrow e(P)$  by setting  $t_i(f)$  to be the linear extension of  $P$  obtained from  $f \in e(P)$  by switching the labels  $i$  and  $i + 1$  if the elements labeled by  $i$  and  $i + 1$  are incomparable and doing nothing otherwise. Note that  $t_i$  is an involution as two consecutive applications just swaps the labels of  $i$  and  $i + 1$  twice or does nothing twice. Define promotion on  $e(P)$  to be the map  $\text{Pro} = t_{m-1}t_{m-2} \cdots t_2t_1$ . See Figure 1 for an example of Promotion on  $\mathbf{V} \times [6]$ .

### 2.2 P-Strict Promotion

We now state some preliminary definitions, following the treatment given in [6]. The initial definitions and a more general treatment of these ideas can be found in [8]. Notationally, using the convention of [6],  $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z})$  is the set of finite subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}$ .




Figure 1: An application of Promotion applied to a linear extension of  $V \times [6]$ .

**Definition 2** ([6, Definition 2.2 and 2.3]). *A function  $f : P \times [\ell] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  is a  $P$ -strict labeling of  $P \times [\ell]$  with restriction function  $R : P \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z})$  if  $f$  satisfies the following:*

- (1)  $f(p_1, i) < f(p_2, i)$  if  $p_1 <_P p_2$
- (2)  $f(p, i_1) \leq f(p, i_2)$  if  $i_2 \leq i_1$
- (3)  $f(p, i) \in R(p)$ .

A restriction function  $R$  is consistent with respect to  $P \times [\ell]$  if for all  $p \in P$  and  $k \in R(p)$  there exists some  $P$ -strict labeling  $f$  of  $P \times [\ell]$  with  $f(p, i) = k$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ .

Continuing to follow the notation of [6], for a fixed  $i \in [\ell]$  we refer to  $L_i = \{(p, i) : p \in P\}$  as the  $i$ th layer of  $f$  and for  $p \in P$  we call  $F_p = \{(p, i) | i \in [\ell]\}$  the  $p$ th fiber of  $P \times [\ell]$ . Additionally, we denote the set of  $P$ -strict labelings on  $P \times [\ell]$  with restriction function  $R$  by  $\mathcal{L}_{P \times [\ell]}(R)$ . If  $R$  is the consistent restriction function induced by the respective lower and upper bounds  $a, b : P \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ , i.e.  $R(p)$  is the largest sub interval of  $[a(p), b(p)]$  that allows  $R$  to be consistent then we denote this restriction function by  $R_a^b$ . For our purposes we will only work in the case where  $a = 1, b = q$  and we denote this restriction function by  $R^q$ .

In the case where  $R = R^q$  and  $P$  is graded of rank  $n$ , then  $R(p) = \{rk(p) + i | i \in [q - (n + 1)]\}$  for all  $p \in P$ .

**Definition 3** ([6, Definition 2.5]). *Let  $R(p)_{>k}$  denote the smallest label of  $R(p)$  that is larger than  $k$ , and let  $R(p)_{<k}$  denote the largest label of  $R(p)$  less than  $k$ . If  $R = R^q$ , then  $R(p)_{>k}$  and  $R(p)_{<k}$  are  $k + 1$  and  $k - 1$  respectively if they exist.*

Say that a label  $f(p, i)$  in a  $P$ -strict labeling  $f \in \mathcal{L}_{P \times [\ell]}(R)$  is **raisable (lowerable)** if there exists another  $P$ -strict labeling  $g \in \mathcal{L}_{P \times [\ell]}(R)$  where  $f(p, i) < g(p, i)$  ( $f(p, i) > g(p, i)$ ), and  $f(p', i') = g(p', i')$  for all  $(p', i') \in P \times [\ell]$ ,  $p' \neq p$ .

**Definition 4** ([6, Definition 2.6]). Let the action of the  $k$ th **Bender-Knuth involution**  $\tau_k$  on a  $P$ -strict labeling  $f \in \mathcal{L}_{P \times [q]}(R)$  be as follows: identify all raisable labels  $f(p, i) = k$  and all lowerable labels  $f(p, i) = R(p)_{>k}$ . Call these labels ‘free’. Suppose the labels  $f(F_p)$  include a free  $k$  labels followed by  $b$  free  $R(p)_{>k}$  labels;  $\tau_k$  changes these labels to  $b$  copies of  $k$  followed by a copies of  $R(p)_{>k}$ . **Promotion** on  $P$ -strict labelings is defined as the composition of these involutions:  $\text{Pro}(f) = \cdots \circ \tau_3 \circ \tau_2 \circ \tau_1 \circ \cdots (f)$ . Note that since  $R$  induces upper and lower bounds on the labels, only a finite number of Bender-Knuth involutions act nontrivially.




Figure 2: An example  $f$  in  $\mathcal{L}_{\vee \times [6]}(R^9)$

Importantly, when restricting to where  $q = \ell|P|$ , and all the labels are distinct,  $P$ -strict Promotion is the same as Promotion on the linear extensions of  $P \times [\ell]$ .

### 2.3 Rowmotion

We now review Rowmotion on the Order Polytope of  $P$  and consequently on bounded  $P$ -Partitions. To begin we first define the Order Polytope of  $P$  following the description given in [15]. Let  $\hat{P}$  denote the poset obtained from  $P$  by adjoining a new minimal element  $\hat{0}$  and a new maximal element  $\hat{1}$ .

**Definition 5** ([15]). For a poset  $P$  the order polytope of  $P$  is

$$\mathcal{O}(P) = \{f : \hat{P} \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid \text{if } p \leq_{\hat{P}} p' \text{ then } f(p) \leq f(p') \text{ and } f(\hat{0}) = 0, f(\hat{1}) = 1\}.$$

Equivalently  $\mathcal{O}(P)$  is the set of order preserving functions from  $P$  to  $[0, 1]$ .

We now define Rowmotion on  $\mathcal{O}(P)$  and on  $P$ -Partitions, where we follow an amalgamation of the treatments given in [4] and [6]. For each  $p \in P$ , we define the toggle at  $p$ , denoted by  $\tau_p$ , to be  $\tau_p : \mathcal{O}(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(P)$  where for any  $f \in \mathcal{O}(P)$  and  $p' \in P$

$$\tau_p(f)(p') = \begin{cases} f(p') & p' \neq p \\ \min\{f(r) \mid p' \triangleleft r\} + \max\{f(r) \mid r \triangleleft p'\} - f(p) & p' = p \end{cases}$$




Figure 3: The steps of Pro when the Bender-Knuth involutions are applied to  $f$  of Figure 2

The following facts about the toggles follow immediately. Firstly the toggles are in fact involutions, as the toggle  $\tau_p$  just reflects the value of the coordinate indexed by  $p$  in the interval of possible values. Secondly, just as was shown for the combinatorial case in [2]  $p$  and  $p'$  do not share a cover relation if and only if the toggles  $\tau_p$  and  $\tau_{p'}$  commute. Additionally if for any  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $f \in \mathcal{O}(P)$  such that  $\ell f$  is integer valued then for any  $p \in P$ ,  $\ell \tau_p(f)$  integer valued is as well. As such for every integer  $\ell$ , we may talk about the action of the toggles restricted to the elements  $f \in \mathcal{O}(P)$  such that  $\ell f$  is integer valued. Note that these functions are just the maps from  $P \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$  that are order preserving, otherwise known as a  $P$ -Partition of  $\ell$ , and following the notation of [6] we denote these by  $\mathcal{A}^\ell(P)$ .

**Definition 6.** Let  $(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m)$  be a linear extension of  $P$ . Then Rowmotion on  $\mathcal{O}(P)$ , and consequently on  $\mathcal{A}^\ell(P)$ , otherwise known as piecewise-linear Rowmotion is defined as  $Row = \tau_{p_1} \circ \tau_{p_2} \circ \dots \circ \tau_{p_m}$ .

For our purposes the primary relation between  $P$ -Strict Promotion and Rowmotion that we will use is the following result.

**Proposition 7** ([6, Corollary 2.26]). Let  $P$  be a graded poset of rank  $n$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_{P \times [q]}(R^q)$  under Pro is in equivariant bijection with  $\mathcal{A}^\ell(P \times [q - (n + 1)])$  under Row.

As a consequence of the above proposition, by proving Theorem 1 for all  $\ell$  and  $q$  we will have shown that the order of Row on the rational points of  $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{V} \times [q - 2])$  has order dividing

$2q$ , so the order of Row on  $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{V} \times [q - 2])$  has order dividing  $2q$  by an immediate density argument.

## 2.4 Kreweras Words and Promotion

We now discuss Kreweras Words, originally considered by Kreweras in [11] as a three candidate generalization of the ballot problem, with the goal of generalizing them and the associated Promotion action as considered in [9] towards understanding Promotion on  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{V} \times [q]}(R^q)$ .

**Definition 8** ([9]). *A Kreweras Word of length  $3n$  is a word in letters  $A, B, C$  with equally many  $A$ 's,  $B$ 's, and  $C$ 's for which every prefix has at least as many  $A$ 's as  $B$ 's and also at least as many  $A$ 's as  $C$ 's.*

Additionally, these words have an action upon them called Promotion which is defined as follows.

**Definition 9** ([9]). *Let  $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{3n})$  be a Kreweras Word of length  $3n$ . The promotion of  $w$ , denoted  $\text{Pro}(w)$ , is obtained from  $w$  as follows. Let  $\iota(w)$  be the smallest index  $\iota \geq 1$  for which the prefix  $(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_\iota)$  has either the same number of  $A$ 's as  $B$ 's or the same number of  $A$ 's as  $C$ 's. Then*

$$\text{Pro}(w) = (w_2, w_3, \dots, w_{\iota(w)-1}, A, w_{\iota(w)+1}, w_{\iota(w)+2}, \dots, w_{3n}, w_{\iota(w)}).$$

*It is easy to verify that  $\text{Pro}(w)$  is also a Kreweras Word, and that promotion is an invertible action on the set of Kreweras Words.*

Linear extensions of  $\mathbf{V} \times [n]$  correspond to Kreweras Words of length  $3n$  as follows. If  $l$  is a linear extension of  $\mathbf{V} \times [n]$  and  $l^{-1}(i) = (p, k)$  then  $w_i = p$ . As noted in [9] this is the same as just forgetting the second coordinate. Importantly, as Hopkins and Rubey showed in the following proposition, the promotion actions on Kreweras Words of length  $3n$  and linear extensions of  $\mathbf{V} \times [n]$  are the same.

**Proposition 10** ([9, Proposition 2.2]). *The above map of forgetting the second coordinate is a bijection from linear extensions of  $\mathbf{V} \times [n]$  to Kreweras Words of length  $3n$ , and under this bijection, Promotion of linear extensions corresponds to Promotion of Kreweras Words.*

An additional perspective on these words and how promotion acts is via what is called the *Kreweras bump* diagram described in [9]. To properly state the definition, we include the relevant definitions that are originally from [9] below.

**Definition 11** ([9, Definition 3.2]). *An arc is a pair  $(i, j)$  of positive integers with  $i < j$ . A crossing is a set  $\{(i, j), (k, \ell)\}$  of two arcs such that  $i \leq k < j < \ell$ .*

**Definition 12** ([9, Definition 3.3]). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a collection of arcs. For a set of positive integers  $S$ , we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a noncrossing matching of  $S$  if for every  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}$  we have  $i, j \in S$ , every  $i \in S$  belongs to a unique arc in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and no two arcs in  $\mathcal{A}$  form a crossing. The set of openers of  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\{i: (i, j) \in \mathcal{A}\}$  and the set the set of closers of  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\{j: (i, j) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ .*

**Definition 13** ([9, Definition 3.4]). Let  $w$  be a Kreweras Word of length  $3n$ . Let  $\varepsilon \in \{B, C\}$ , where  $-\varepsilon$  denotes the other element of  $\{B, C\}$ . We use  $\mathcal{M}_w^\varepsilon$  to denote the noncrossing matching of  $\{i \in [3n]: w_i \neq -\varepsilon\}$  whose set of openers is  $\{i \in [3n]: w_i = A\}$  and whose set of closers is  $\{i \in [3n]: w_i = \varepsilon\}$ .

The Kreweras bump diagram  $\mathcal{D}_w$  of  $w$  is obtained by placing the numbers  $1, \dots, 3n$  in this order on a line, and drawing a semicircle above the line connecting  $i$  and  $j$  for each arc  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_w^B \cup \mathcal{M}_w^C$ . The arc is solid blue if  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_w^B$  and dashed crimson (i.e., red) if  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{M}_w^C$ . The arcs are drawn in such a fashion that only pairs of arcs which form a crossing intersect, and any two arcs intersect at most once.

In the proof of the order of Promotion on linear extensions of  $\mathbf{V} \times [n]$  [9, Theorem 1.2], the Kreweras bump diagram plays a central role. By considering a local rule at the crossings of arcs in the diagram, called the *rules of the road* [9, Definition 3.6], Hopkins and Rubey construct a permutation of  $3n$ , denoted by  $\sigma_w$ , called the *trip permutation* [9, Definition 3.6] of  $w$ . By showing that  $\sigma_w$  together with a sequence of  $B$ 's and  $C$ 's coming from  $w$  and  $\sigma_w$ , called  $\varepsilon_w$ , which together can uniquely recover  $w$  and that Pro corresponds to a rotation of order  $3n$  on  $\sigma_w$  and a rotation of order  $6n$  on  $\varepsilon_w$ , they show that the order of Pro on  $e(\mathbf{V} \times [n])$  is  $6n$ .

For our purposes, we introduce the Kreweras bump diagram as it will suffice to decompose our generalizations by the corresponding arc structure. From there we will be able to relate and describe  $P$ -strict promotion on  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{V} \times [\ell]}(R^q)$  in terms of Promotion of Kreweras Words, without needing any analogues of the rules of the road or trip permutations.




Figure 4: The Kreweras Bump Diagram of the word  $w = ACABBAABCCACBABCCB$

### 3 Proof of Main Theorem

This section is the proof of Theorem 1. To begin, we define a generalization of the Kreweras Word which will be our combinatorial model for  $P$ -strict promotion on  $\mathbf{V}$ .

**Definition 14.** An  $(\ell, q)$ -Partial Multi Kreweras Word is a sequence  $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_q$  of  $q$  potentially empty multisets of  $\{A, B, C\}$  subject to the conditions that for each  $i$  neither the number of  $B$ 's nor the number of  $C$ 's in  $w_1 w_2 \dots w_i$  exceeds the number of  $A$ 's in  $w_1 w_2 \dots w_{i-1}$  and that there are  $\ell$  of total of  $A, B$ , and  $C$ . Additionally we call  $w_i$  the  $i$ th block of  $w$ .

Particularly, the collection of  $(\ell, q)$ -Partial Multi Kreweras Words is in bijection with  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{V} \times [\ell]}(R^q)$  via the map  $W$  which takes a word  $w$  to the  $\mathbf{V}$ -strict labeling where for each  $p \in \mathbf{V}$  the labels of  $F_p$  that are equal to  $i$  is equal to the number of instances of  $p$  in  $w_i$ . When writing one of these words, we will always place the  $A$ 's in  $w_i$  after the  $B$ 's or  $C$ 's, and unless otherwise specified ignore the order of the  $B$ 's and  $C$ 's. Additionally, if  $w_i = \emptyset$  we will denote this by writing  $\emptyset$  in the  $i$ th position.

A	CA	BBAA	BCCA	C	BA	B	CC	B
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Figure 5: The associated  $(6,9)$ -Partial Multi Kreweras Word associated to  $f$  of Figure 2 with the index of  $w_i$  written below.

We can then define the actions of the Bender-Knuth involutions, and thus promotion, on these words by for  $1 \leq k \leq q-1$ ,  $\tau_k(w) = W^{-1} \circ \tau_k \circ W(w)$  and  $\text{Pro}(w) = \tau_{q-1} \tau_{q-2} \dots \tau_1(w)$ .

At the level of the word  $w$ ,  $\tau_k$  swaps some  $A$ 's,  $B$ 's, and  $C$ 's between  $w_k$  and  $w_{k+1}$ . It is always possible to swap an  $A$  in  $w_{k+1}$  to  $w_k$  and it is always possible to swap a  $B$  or  $C$  in  $w_k$  to  $w_{k+1}$ . Without loss of generality, the only way an  $A$  in  $w_k$  cannot be swapped to  $w_{k+1}$  or a  $B$  (or  $C$ ) in  $w_{k+1}$  cannot be swapped to  $w_k$  is if  $w_k$  contains the  $i, i+1, \dots, j$ th  $A$ 's of  $w$  and  $w_{k+1}$  contains the  $s, s+1, \dots, t$ th  $B$ 's (or  $C$ 's) with  $[i, j] \cap [s, t] \neq \emptyset$ . This is because for each  $r \in [i, j] \cap [s, t]$  in  $W(w)$  it must be that  $f(A, r) = k, f(B, r) = k+1$ , so neither of these labels are free as in Definition 4.

To describe how  $\text{Pro}$  will impact  $w$ , we introduce a generalization of the Kreweras bump diagram.

**Definition 15.** *Given an  $(\ell, q)$ -Partial Multi Kreweras Word  $w$ , linearly order the  $A$ 's within each block, where the  $A$ 's follow the  $B$ 's and  $C$ 's. Draw the non-crossing arc diagrams as in Definition 13 between the  $A$ 's and  $B$ 's and the  $A$ 's and  $C$ 's using this linear ordering within each block, where the number of arcs in the diagram between the  $A$ 's and  $B$ 's of the form  $(i, j)$ , with  $i < j$  are the number of  $B$ 's in  $w_j$ . This is just to say that we have degenerate crossings where there can be multiple arcs whose right endpoints share the same location. We call the resulting diagram  $\mathcal{D}_w$  following the notation of [9].*

*Additionally we call the instances where an  $A$  has arcs to a  $B$  and  $C$  in the same block a double arc.*

In particular, this linear ordering is just increasingly labeling the  $A$ 's in each block so there can be no ambiguity about possible orderings.

**Definition 16.** *Suppose  $f \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{V} \times [\ell]}(R^q)$  with  $w$  the associated  $(\ell, q)$ -Partial Multi Kreweras Word with diagram  $\mathcal{D}_w$ . For each  $i \in [\ell]$ , if  $A_i$  in the linear ordering of the  $A$ 's is in block  $w_{a_i}$  and has arcs to  $B, C$  in blocks  $w_{b_i}, w_{c_i}$  respectively, define  $L'_i$  to be the  $P$ -strict labeling of  $\mathbf{V}$  with  $L'_i(A) = a_i, L'_i(B) = b_i, L'_i(C) = c_i$ . We call the multiset of  $\mathbf{V}$ -strict labelings obtained from  $w$  in this way the non-crossing layer decomposition of  $f$ .*






Figure 6: The associated Kreweas Bump Diagram to  $w$  and non-crossing layer decomposition of  $W(w)$ , where  $w$  is from Figure 3

We can now state and prove our first result on the impact of Pro on  $w$ .

**Proposition 17.** *If  $f$  has non-crossing layer decomposition  $\{L'_i\}$ , then  $\text{Pro}(f)$  is the  $P$ -strict labeling obtained by applying Pro to each  $L'_i$  and then reordering the labels within each fiber.*

*Proof.* Let  $w = W^{-1}(f)$ . We first note that if there are no A's labeled 1, then Pro will reduce each label by 1, which is the same as applying Pro to each  $L'_i$ . So we will assume that there is some A with label 1. One thing we note is that in  $\tau_r \dots \tau_1 f$ , when considering the application of  $\tau_{r+1}$  the only A labels that can be raised corresponded to A's that before applying any toggles had the label of 1. This is as all other A's corresponded to lowerable labels.

Let  $L'_i(A) = 1$ ,  $L'_i(B) = b_i$ ,  $L'_i(C) = c_i$ , where without loss of generality  $b_i \leq c_i$ , and suppose that  $L'_{i+1}(A) > 1$ , i.e. this A is largest A in the linear order of  $w_1$ . Denote this A of  $L'_i$  by  $A_i$  and suppose that the B of  $L'_i$  is the B of the  $k$ th layer of  $f$ , where  $k$  is minimal among the B's of  $w_{b_i}$  that are matched to an A in  $w_1$ . Under  $\tau_{b_i-2} \dots \tau_2 \tau_1$  the  $b_i - 1$ st block is exactly  $i$  A's. This is as every other A label encountered during the applications of  $\tau_{b_i-2} \dots \tau_2 \tau_1$  was lowerable. Additionally every label corresponding to a B or C that was encountered was lowerable. This claim about the labels of the B's and C's encountered up to this point always being lowerable holds by the following argument. The labels that correspond to B's or C's were matched, via the non-crossing matchings, to an A that at the time of checking if the label of the  $j$ th B or C is lowerable has label at least 2 less than the label of the  $j$ th B or C. This is as the A initially had label at least 1 less than the label of the  $j$ th B or C but was then lowered. As such there are at least  $j$  A's with labels at least 2 less than the label of the  $j$ th B or C. Consequently the label of the  $j$ th B or C is lowerable.

Through the application of  $\tau_{b_i-2} \dots \tau_2 \tau_1$  to  $f$  no labels have been fixed, so there are  $i$  A's in  $w_{b_i-1}$ . Importantly there are exactly  $k - 1$  A's through the first  $b_i - 2$  blocks of  $\tau_{b_i-2} \dots \tau_2 \tau_1(w)$ . If there were any fewer  $k$  would not be minimal and if there were any more the  $k$ th B would not be matched to  $A_i$  in the non-crossing matching.

Now consider what the application of  $\tau_{b_i-1}$  will do to  $\tau_{b_i-2} \dots \tau_2 \tau_1 f$ . For convenience let  $w' = W^{-1}(\tau_{b_i-2} \dots \tau_2 \tau_1 f)$ . All the labels of all the  $B$ 's and  $C$ 's that were the  $j$ th  $B$  or  $C$ , for  $j < k$ , in  $f$  correspond to lowerable labels for the same reasons that all previously encountered  $B$  and  $C$  labels were lowerable. Importantly, the  $k$ th  $B$  is in block  $w'_{b_i}$  and the  $k$ th  $A$  is in block  $w'_{b_i-1}$ . So this  $A$  will not be a raisable label and this  $B$  will not be a lowerable label. Importantly if  $L'_i(C) = L'_i(B)$  then the label of the associated  $C$  will also not be lowerable.

Note that this argument holds for any  $A$  in  $w'_{b_i-1}$  with associated non-crossing layer  $L'_{i'}$  in  $f$  that satisfies  $\min(L'_{i'}(B), L'_{i'}(C)) = b_i$ . Following the same logic, the only  $B$ 's or  $C$ 's in  $w'_{b_i}$  that were lowerable under the application of  $\tau_{b_i-1}$  are those that were not matched via the non-crossing matchings to  $A$ 's that were initially in the first block of  $w$ .

While then continuing to apply the  $\tau$ 's, we see that the only time a label corresponding to an  $A$  is not raisable when applying  $\tau_t$  to  $\tau_{t-1} \dots \tau_2 \tau_1 f$  is when in the corresponding non-crossing layer  $L'_r$  decomposition of  $f$  that the  $A$  corresponding to the label which is not raisable was matched to a  $B$  or  $C$  that was in block  $w_{t+1}$  and  $\min(L'_r(B), L'_r(C)) = t + 1$ . As such all labels that were not associated to a non-crossing layer  $L'_s$ , with  $s \leq i$ , have just been reduced by 1, as were all labels that were associated to such a non-crossing layer and were strictly larger than  $\min(L'_s(B), L'_s(C))$ , by the same logic as used to show that all the  $B$ 's and  $C$ 's that were before the  $k$ th  $B$  corresponded to lowerable labels. This is as the  $A$  to which the  $B$  or  $C$  was originally matched to in  $\mathcal{D}_w$  has corresponding label at least 2 less when applying the first toggle which can change the label.

One further thing that follows immediately is that if a label corresponding to a  $B$  or  $C$  was not lowerable, then in all subsequent toggles the associated label will be raisable, implying that there will be a  $B$  or  $C$  in the last block of  $W^{-1} \text{Pro}(f)$  for each label of a  $B$  or  $C$  that was not lowerable.

Additionally, note that for any  $g \in \mathcal{L}_V(R^q)$ , so an increasing labeling of  $V$  with entries in  $[q]$ ,  $\text{Pro}(g)$  just reduces each label by 1 if  $g(A) > 1$ . If  $g(A) = 1$ , there are two cases. The first is where  $g(B) = g(C)$ ,  $\text{Pro}(g)$  is obtained by first increasing the label of  $A$  to be 1 less than  $g(B)$ , and then increasing the labels of  $B$  and  $C$  to  $q$ .

If instead, without loss of generality  $g(B) < g(C)$ , then  $\text{Pro}(g)$  is obtained by first increasing the label of  $A$  to be 1 less than  $g(B)$ , then decreasing  $g(C)$  by 1, and setting  $g(B) = q$ .

Putting this all together, one can observe that the labels of  $\text{Pro}(f)$  were changed exactly as if  $\text{Pro}$  had been applied to each labeling in the non-crossing layer decomposition. □

Next, we try to understand the behavior of arcs under  $\text{Pro}$ . To begin, we will try to fully describe the behavior of double arcs, towards the goal of being able to reduce to the case where there are no double arcs.

**Lemma 18.** *For each  $L'_i$  in the non-crossing layer decomposition of  $W(w)$  that corresponds to a double arc between  $(k, j)$  in  $\mathcal{D}_w$  there is a non-crossing layer in the non-crossing layer decomposition of  $\text{Pro}(W(w))$  which is  $\text{Pro}(L'_i)$ , i.e. a double arc between  $(k - 1, j - 1)$  if  $k > 1$  and otherwise a double arc between  $(j - 1, q)$  in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Pro}(w)}$ .*




Figure 7: The associated Kreweras Bump Diagram to  $w$  and non-crossing layer decomposition of  $W(w)$ , where  $w$  is from Figure 3

*Proof.* First observe that no  $A_s$  for  $s \leq i$  can have an arc to a  $B$  or  $C$  in any of the blocks  $w_t$  for  $t \in [k + 1, j - 1]$  as this arc would be part of a crossing in one of the two matchings. There are two cases to consider, either  $k > 1$  or  $k = 1$ .

If  $k > 1$  and in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Pro}(w)}$  there is not a corresponding double arc from  $(k - 1, j - 1)$ , then one of the  $B$  or  $C$  from  $L'_i$  is matched to an  $A$  in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Pro}(w)}$  that was in block 1 of  $w$ . This is as for there not to be a double arc, there would need to be an  $A$  in block  $s \in [k, j - 2]$  in  $\text{Pro}(w)$  that was not in block  $s + 1$  in  $w$ . But this cannot occur, as it would imply this  $A$  in  $\mathcal{D}_w$  was matched to a  $B$  or  $C$  that in was in block  $s$ , which would imply a crossing in the corresponding matching.

If  $k = 1$ , then for every  $i' < i$ ,  $A_{i'}$  is matched to a  $B$  and  $C$  in respective blocks indexed by  $b_{i'}, c_{i'} \geq j$  with  $\min b_{i'}, c_{i'} = j'$  due to the non-crossing property of the matchings. When considering  $\text{Pro}(w)$  by Proposition 17, for each  $i' < i$ , there will be an  $A$  in block  $j' - 1 \geq j - 1$ , and a  $B$  and a  $C$  in blocks with indices at least  $j'$  which are matched to the  $A$  corresponding to  $A_{i'}$  in  $w$ . This means that the  $A$  that was  $A_i$  in  $w$  now corresponds to an  $A$  in block  $j - 1$  who must match to a  $B$  and  $C$  in block  $q$ . This is as every  $B$  and  $C$  in  $w$  that was matched

to an  $A_{i'}$ ,  $i' < i$  or an  $A$  in a block  $t$ ,  $t \geq j$  every must correspond to a  $B$  or  $C$  in a block  $s \geq j$  by Proposition 17 and the associated  $A$  must be in a block indexed by  $s' \geq j - 1$ . After rearranging  $A$ 's within a block we can assume that all of the associated  $A$ 's in  $\text{Pro}(w)$  follow the  $A$  that was  $A_i$ , so they match to all the  $B$ 's and the  $C$ 's they collectively were associated to in  $w$ . As such the  $A$  that was  $A_i$  in  $w$  must match to a  $B$  and  $C$  in  $\text{Pro}(w)_q$ , as there are no other  $B$ 's and  $C$ 's to match to. So there is a double arc of the form  $(j - 1, q)$  in  $\text{Pro}(w)$  that corresponded to the double arc of the form  $(1, j)$  in  $w$ .

Note that if there are multiple double arcs of the form  $(k, j)$  in  $\mathcal{D}_w$ ,  $\text{Pro}$  acts identically on all of them. This is as they are interchangeable at the level of the word. As such, they each correspond to a double arc of the form  $(k - 1, j - 1)$  if  $k > 1$  or  $(j - 1, q)$  if  $k = 1$ .  $\square$

We now show that the number of double arcs is preserved under  $\text{Pro}$ . The proof provided is more involved than necessary, but provides more understanding of the structure of  $P$ -strict Promotion. Additionally some of the machinery will be essential later. The shorter proof is that as an immediate consequence of Lemma 18 the number of double arcs of  $\text{Pro}(w)$  is at least the number of double arcs of  $w$ . Since  $\text{Pro}$  has finite order the number of double arcs can never strictly increase, so the number of double arcs must be constant over an orbit of  $\text{Pro}$ .

In  $\mathcal{D}_w$  with associated  $P$ -strict labeling  $f$ , for  $A_i$  associated to  $L'_i$ , if  $L'_i(B) \leq L'_i(C)$  (or  $L'_i(C) \leq L'_i(B)$ ), we say that the arc  $(a_i, b_i)$  (or  $(a_i, c_i)$ ) is the *shortest arc associated to  $A_i$* .

**Lemma 19.** *For each  $A$  such that  $f(A_i) = a_i > 1$  and the shortest arc in  $\mathcal{D}_w$  of  $A_i$  is  $(a_i, b_i)$  (or  $(a_i, c_i)$ ), then in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Pro}(w)}$  there is an  $A$  in block  $a_i - 1$  with shortest arc to a  $B$  (or  $C$ ) in block  $b_i - 1$  ( $c_i - 1$ ).*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume  $b_i \leq c_i$ . If the shortest arc associated to  $A_i$  does not just shift down by 1 block in each coordinate under  $\text{Pro}$ , then it must be of the form  $(a_i - 1, j)$  with  $j \geq b_i$  as otherwise  $(a_i, b_i)$  wouldn't have been the shortest arc associated to  $A_i$ . If this is the case, since the  $B$  that was originally matched to  $A_i$  shifted down 1 block by Proposition 17, then in  $\text{Pro}(w)$  there must be an  $A$  that follows the  $A$  that was  $A_i$  in  $w$  that did not do so in  $w$ . As such, this must have been an  $A$  in block 1 whose shortest arc was to a  $B$  or  $C$  which followed  $A_i$  but preceded the  $B$  of the shortest arc of  $A_i$ . But this can't happen, as it would imply that one of the matchings has a crossing.  $\square$

**Lemma 20.** *For a word  $w$  associated to a  $P$ -strict labeling  $f$ , the number of double arcs of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Pro}(w)}$  equals the number of double arcs of  $\mathcal{D}_w$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 18, we need only show that no new double arcs are created. If a double arc could be created it must be associated to an  $A$  that is in the first block of  $w$ . To see why, if an  $A$  in block  $i > 1$  in  $w$  has a double arc in  $\text{Pro}(w)$ , by Lemma 19 the shortest arc in  $\mathcal{D}_w$  from this  $A$  must be going to a block  $w_d$  with both a  $B$  and  $C$ . Specify this  $A$  as  $A'$  and suppose it's shortest arc is to a  $B$ . Since there was not a double arc in  $\mathcal{D}_w$  associated to  $A'$ , then there must be an  $A$  that follows  $A'$  in the linear order of the  $A$ 's with shortest arc to a  $B$  that is in a block which precedes  $w_d$  that was matched to the  $C$  in the double arc in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Pro}(w)}$ . This is as we can assume this second  $A$  is not part of a double arc as if so we have

just relabeled and not created a new double arc. As such, this second  $A$  must be matched to a  $B$  in a block which strictly precedes  $w_d$ . Thus the swapping of the arcs to the  $C$ 's of these two  $A$ 's would induce a crossing in the matching between  $A$ 's and  $C$ 's, as the  $C$  to which  $A$  is matched is in a block strictly following  $w_d$ .

The  $A$  in  $w$  which in  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Pro}(w)}$  is part of a new double arc, call it  $A_D$ , must be in the first block of  $w$  as otherwise by Lemma 19  $A_D$  would already form a double arc. Additionally,  $A_D$  cannot be matched to either of the  $B$  or the  $C$  with which it will form a double arc. This is because if  $A_D$  did, then there would be an  $A$  which follows  $A_D$  that is matched to the other  $B$  or  $C$  and does not form a double arc. This  $A$  must follow the  $B$  or  $C$  that is matched in the shortest arc of  $A_D$ , in which case no double arc would be formed. Then the  $B$  and  $C$  which will form a double arc must be matched to different  $A$ 's which follow  $A_D$ . But this would then force the shortest arc of  $A_D$  to cross one of the arcs connecting to these  $B$  and  $C$ , as it must be connected to a  $B$  or  $C$  which strictly precedes the two. Therefore there can be no new double arcs.  $\square$

For a double arc  $D$  in  $\mathcal{D}_w$ , we say the *interior* of  $D$  are the arcs of  $\mathcal{D}_w$  connected to an  $A$  with both arcs nested beneath the double arc. Similarly the *exterior* consists of all other arcs. Importantly, no  $A$  can have arcs in both the interior and exterior of a double arc, as it would induce a crossing in one of the matchings. We now have everything needed to show that the removal of double arcs does not impact Pro, formalized in the following proposition.

**Proposition 21.** *Suppose that  $w$  is an  $(\ell, q)$ -Partial Multi Kreweras Word where the associated arc diagram  $\mathcal{D}_w$  has a double arc  $D$  of the form  $(k, j)$ . Let  $w_D$  be the  $(\ell - 1, q)$ -Partial Multi Kreweras Word obtained from  $w$  by deleting  $D$ . Then the resulting word obtained by deleting the double arc corresponding to  $\text{Pro}(D)$  in  $\text{Pro}(w)$  is  $\text{Pro}(w_D)$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $W(w)$  and  $W(w_D)$  have the same non-crossing layer decomposition aside from the layer corresponding to  $D$ . Let  $\text{Int}_D(w)$  and  $\text{Ext}_D(w)$  denote the  $P$ -strict labelings corresponding to the labels of the interior and exterior of  $D$  respectively. Since there is no overlap between these two collection of arcs, the non-crossing layer decomposition of  $W(w)$  is their union together with the layer corresponding to  $D$ . So by Proposition 17,  $\text{Pro}(w)$  is obtained by applying Pro to layers corresponding to  $D$ ,  $\text{Int}_D(w)$ , and  $\text{Ext}_D(w)$  and then combining. Following the same reasoning,  $\text{Pro}(w_D)$  is obtained by applying Pro to the layers corresponding to  $\text{Int}_D(w)$  and  $\text{Ext}_D(w)$  and then combining. The only difference in these layer decompositions is the layer corresponding to  $\text{Pro}(L'_D)$  where  $L'_D$  is the layer corresponding to  $D$ . By Lemma 18 the layer corresponding to  $L'_D$  is just  $\text{Pro}(L'_D)$ , so deleting the this layer before or after applying Pro will make no difference in the corresponding word.  $\square$

As a consequence of Proposition 21, as with Lemma 18 and Lemma 20 we not only fully understand how double arcs are impacted under Pro but also that we can ignore them, we conclude that it suffices to consider the case where there are no double arcs in  $\mathcal{D}_w$ . Suppose then that  $w$  is an  $(\ell, q)$ -Partial Multi Kreweras Word with no double arcs in  $\mathcal{D}_w$ . The *standardization* of  $w$ ,  $\text{std}(w)$  is the Kreweras Word length  $3\ell$  obtained by first linearly

ordering the  $B$ 's and  $C$ 's of each block of  $w$  such that there are no crossings between arcs that terminate in the same block, and then extending the linear orders on the blocks to a linear order of all the letters. The standardization is well defined, as the only such ordering without crossings of arcs that terminate in the same block is where within each block the  $B$ 's and  $C$ 's are ordered such that the arcs terminating in this block are nesting. Note that the standardization is not an invertible function, see Figure 8, but with the information of what the size of each block was, the original word can be recovered uniquely by replacing the labels of the standardization with the multiset of labels of the original word in increasing order. The final result needed to prove the main theorem is how  $\text{Pro}(w)$  impacts  $\text{std}(w)$ .

$\emptyset$	AA	CC	BB	A	A	C	C	B	B	A	A	CC	BB
1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4

Figure 8: A pair of  $(2, 4)$  Multi-Partial Kreweras Words together with their equal standardization.

**Lemma 22.** *Suppose that  $w$  is an  $(\ell, q)$ -Partial Multi Kreweras Word with  $|w_1| = k$  and where  $\mathcal{D}_w$  has no double arcs. Then  $\text{std}(\text{Pro}(w)) = \text{Pro}^k(\text{std}(w))$ .*

*Proof.* Given a  $(\ell, q)$ -Partial Multi Kreweras Word  $w$  with  $|w_1| = k$ , consider  $\text{std}(w)$ . In  $\text{std}(w)$ , let  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k$  denote the first  $k$   $A$ 's of  $\text{std}(w)$  and  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_k$  where  $\epsilon_i$  is the  $B$  or  $C$  that is matched to  $A_i$  via the shortest arc. The shortest arc is always well defined as  $\mathcal{D}_w$  has no double arcs. Then consider  $\text{Pro}(\text{std}(w))$ . Observe that that  $\text{Pro}(\text{std}(w))$  is obtained by shifting all letters that aren't  $A_1$  and  $\epsilon_1$  forward one space, placing  $A_1$  in the space before  $\epsilon_1$ , and placing  $\epsilon_1$  at the end. For  $i > 1$ ,  $A_1$  precedes  $A_i$  and  $\epsilon_1$  follows  $\epsilon_i$ , so in  $\text{Pro}(\text{std}(w))$  the  $A$  that corresponded to  $A_1$  has no arcs which cross any of the arcs between  $A_i$  and  $\epsilon_i$  for  $i > 1$ . Then by the argument of the proof of [9, Proposition 3.10] where they show that arcs which do not cross the shortest arc of the first  $A$  are just shifted down by 1 in each coordinate under  $\text{Pro}$ , for the next  $k - 1$  iterations of  $\text{Pro}$  on  $\text{Pro}(\text{std}(w))$  the arcs connecting to the  $A$  which corresponded to  $A_1$  will just shift down by 1 in each coordinate. Importantly, by Lemma 19 the  $A$  corresponding to  $A_i$  still has shortest arc to  $\epsilon_i$  through the first  $i - 1$  applications of  $\text{Pro}$  on  $\text{std}(w)$ . Consequently  $\text{Pro}^k(\text{std}(w))$  is obtained by shifting each letter which was not an  $A_i$  or  $\epsilon_i$  forward by  $k$  positions, placing an  $A$  exactly  $k$  positions before the position of each  $\epsilon_i$ , and the last  $k$  letters are  $\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \dots \epsilon_k$ . Additionally, there is no crossing among arcs connecting to the final  $k$  letters. This is as for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$  if  $i < j$ , the  $A$  to which  $\epsilon_i$  is matched to is preceded by the  $A$  to which  $\epsilon_j$  is matched to.

Denote by  $A'_1, A'_2, \dots, A'_k$  the  $A$ 's in  $w_1$  and by  $\epsilon'_i$  the  $B$  or  $C$  in  $w$  to which  $A'_i$  has its shortest arc. Note that if the letter which follows  $\epsilon'_i$  in  $\text{std}(w)$ , and is not  $\epsilon'_{i-1}$ , is in the same block as  $\epsilon'_i$ , then it must be an  $A$ . This is as if it is a  $B$  or  $C$  it must be different than  $\epsilon'_i$ , as otherwise due to the fact that it is not  $\epsilon'_{i-1}$  there would be more  $B$ 's or  $C$ 's at that point than  $A$ 's. Similarly it cannot be different due to the lack of double arcs. Consequently we have that in a block the  $\epsilon'_i$ 's are the terminal sequence of non  $A$  letters. By Proposition 17

we know that  $\text{Pro}(w)$  is the  $P$ -strict labeling obtained by shifting each label not associated to  $A'_i$  or  $\epsilon'_i$  down by 1, having the label associated to  $A'_i$  be 1 less than that of  $\epsilon'_i$ , and having the label of  $\epsilon_i$  become  $q$ . Importantly this implies that the multiset of the values of the labels has corresponded to cyclically shifting each element down by 1. Additionally, for each  $A$ ,  $B$ , or  $C$  that was not an  $A'_i$  or  $\epsilon'_i$  there are  $k$  fewer preceding letters. Then consider  $\text{std}(\text{Pro}(w))$ . One can observe that the computation for  $\text{Pro}(w)$  is the same as deleting  $w_1$ , replacing each  $\epsilon'_i$  with  $A'_i$ , adding a new artificial block labeled by  $q + 1$  equal to the multiset of the  $\epsilon'_i$ 's, and then reducing the label of each block by 1. What this corresponds to for  $\text{std}(\text{Pro}(w))$  is then the same as deleting the first  $k$  letters, replacing the  $\epsilon'_i$ 's with  $A$ 's, then adding  $k$  letters corresponding to the  $\epsilon_i$ 's in order at the end, then shifting the indices down by  $k$ . Note then that this is the same as  $\text{Pro}^k(\text{std}(w))$ .  $\square$

This is the final tool needed to prove our main result.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{D}_w$  contains some number of double arcs and consider  $\text{Pro}^q(w)$ . By Lemmas 18 and 20 it follows that the double arcs of  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{Pro}^q(w)}$  are the same as in  $\mathcal{D}_w$  as the endpoints of each double arc were just shifted by  $q \pmod q$ . So by Proposition 21 we can reduce to the case where  $w$  has no double arcs.

We now assume that  $\mathcal{D}_w$  has no double arcs. Then consider  $\text{Pro}^q(w)$ . Note that by Proposition 17 the multiset of values for the labels will be the same. Additionally, one can notice that through the  $q$  applications, there will be exactly  $3\ell$  1's in the multisets of labels as the number of instances of each label cyclically rotates. As such by Lemma 22  $\text{std}(\text{Pro}^q(w)) = \text{Pro}^{3\ell}(\text{std}(w))$ , which by [9, Theorem 1.2] is the reflection of the labels. Then by the fact that the standardization is invertible once the multiset of values is known,  $\text{Pro}^q(w)$  is just swapping all instances of  $B$ 's and  $C$ 's. Thus  $\text{Pro}^{2q}(w) = w$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] A. Brouwer and A. Schrijver, On the period of an operator, defined on antichains, Math Centrum report ZW 24/74 (1974).
- [2] P. J. Cameron and D. G. Fon-Der-Flaass, Orbits of antichains revisited, European J. Combin. 16 (1995), no. 6, 545–554.
- [3] D. Einstein and J. Propp. Combinatorial, piecewise-linear, and birational homomesy for products of two chains. Algebraic Combinatorics, Volume 4(2), pp. 201-224, 2021
- [4] D. Einstein and J. Propp. Piecewise-linear and birational toggling, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.3455> 2014
- [5] J. Propp and T. Roby, *Homomesy in products of two chains*, Electronic Journal of Combinatorics, Volume 22, Issue 3 (2015)
- [6] J. Bernstein, J. Striker, and C. Vorland, *P-strict promotion and Q-partition rowmotion: the graded case* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.04938> 2022

- [7] K. Dilks, J. Striker, and C. Vorland. Rowmotion and increasing labeling promotion. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 164:72–108, 2019.
- [8] J. Bernstein, J. Striker, and C. Vorland. P-strict promotion and B-bounded rowmotion, with applications to tableaux of many flavors. *Combinatorial Theory*, 1:no. 8, 2021.
- [9] S. Hopkins and M. Rubey. Promotion of kreweeras words. *Selecta Mathematica*, 28:Paper No. 10, 2021
- [10] M. Plante. Periodicity and homomesy for the  $V \times [n]$  poset and center-seeking snakes, 2020. Poster presented at BIRS - DAC (Online Workshop) (20w5164).
- [11] Germain Kreweeras. Sur une classe de problemes de dénombrement liés au treillis des partitions des entiers. *Cahiers du B.U.R.O.*, 6:5–105, 1965.
- [12] M.P. Schützenberger, Quelques remarques sur une construction de Schensted, *Canad. J. Math.* 13 (1961), 117–128
- [13] M.P. Schützenberger, Promotion des morphismes d'ensembles ordonnés, *Discrete Math.* 2 (1972), 73–94.
- [14] M.P. Schützenberger, Evacuations, in *Colloquio Internazionale sulle Teorie Combinatorie* (Rome, 1973), Tomo I, *Atti dei Convegni Lincei*, No. 17, *Accad. Naz. Lincei*, Rome, 1976, pp. 257–264.
- [15] R.P. Stanley, Two poset polytopes. *Discrete Comput Geom* 1, 9–23 (1986).
- [16] J. Striker and N. Williams, Promotion and rowmotion, *European J. Combin.* 33 (2012), no. 8, 1919–1942.
- [17] S. Hopkins, Order polynomial product formulas and poset dynamics, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.01568> 2020