

**MONOMIAL EXPANSIONS FOR q -WHITTAKER AND
MODIFIED HALL-LITTLEWOOD POLYNOMIALS
(EXTENDED ABSTRACT)**

ARITRA BHATTACHARYA, T V RATHEESH, AND SANKARAN VISWANATH

ABSTRACT. We consider the monomial expansion of the q -Whittaker polynomials given by the fermionic formula and via the *inv* and *quinv* statistics. We construct bijections between the parametrizing sets of these three models which preserve the x - and q -weights, and which are compatible with natural projection and branching maps. We apply this to the limit construction of local Weyl modules and obtain a new character formula for the basic representation of $\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_n$. Finally, we indicate how our main results generalize to the modified Hall-Littlewood case.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let λ be a partition. For $n \geq 1$, let X_n denote the tuple of indeterminates x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n . The q -Whittaker polynomial $W_\lambda(X_n; q)$ and the modified Hall-Littlewood polynomial $Q'_\lambda(X_n; q)$ are well-studied specializations of the modified Macdonald polynomial. Several different monomial expansions for these polynomials are known. In this article, our focus will be on three of these: the so-called *fermionic formulas* [13, (0.2), (0.3)] and the *inv*- and *quinv*-expansions arising from specializations of the formulas of Haglund-Haiman-Loehr [9] and Ayyer-Mandelshtam-Martin [1].

We recall that the Schur expansion of the $W_\lambda(X_n; q)$ (resp. $Q'_\lambda(X_n; q)$) has certain q -Kostka polynomials as coefficients [13]. In turn, this implies yet another monomial expansion, with the underlying indexing set involving pairs of semistandard Young tableaux of conjugate (resp. equal) shapes. This relates to the *inv*-expansion via the RSK correspondence [9].

The fermionic formula, expressed as a sum of products of q -binomials, is seemingly of a very different nature from all the other monomial expansions, and should probably be viewed as a kind of compression of these formulas. Recently, Garbali-Wheeler [8] obtained a general formula of the fermionic kind for the full modified Macdonald polynomial $\tilde{H}_\lambda(X_n; q, t)$.

The purpose of this article is to bijectively reconcile the fermionic formula with both the *inv*- and *quinv*-expansions. We construct bijections between the underlying sets of these three models which (i) preserve the x - and q -weights, and (ii) are compatible with natural projection and branching maps.

The authors acknowledge partial support under a DAE Apex Grant to the Institute of Mathematical Sciences.

As a corollary, we obtain bijections between the *inv*- and *quinv*-models in the q -Whittaker and modified Hall-Littlewood specializations, partially answering a question of [1]. We find that the *inv*- and *quinv*-models are related by the simple *box-complementation* map of the fermionic model and that $inv + quinv$ is a constant on fibers of the natural projection. We also apply this to the limit construction for Weyl modules [7, 15] and obtain an apparently new character formula for the basic representation of the affine Lie algebra $\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_n$.

In this extended abstract, we describe the q -Whittaker polynomials in greater detail, contenting ourselves with brief remarks about the modified Hall-Littlewood case in §8 due to space limitations. Complete proofs will appear in [3].

2. SPECIALIZATIONS OF $\widetilde{H}_\lambda(X_n; q, t)$

Given a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots)$, we will draw its Young diagram $\text{dg}(\lambda)$ following the English convention, as a left-up justified array of boxes, with λ_i boxes in the i th row from the top. The boxes are called the cells of $\text{dg}(\lambda)$. We let $|\lambda| := \sum_i \lambda_i$. Fix $n \geq 1$ and let $\mathcal{F}(\lambda)$ denote the set of all maps (“fillings”) $F : \text{dg}(\lambda) \rightarrow [n]$ where $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. If the values of F strictly increase (resp. weakly decrease) as we move down a column, we say F is a *column strict filling* (CSF) (resp. *weakly decreasing filling* (WDF)¹), and denote the set of such fillings by $\text{CSF}(\lambda)$ (resp. $\text{WDF}(\lambda)$). The x -weight of a filling F is the monomial $x^F := \prod_{c \in \text{dg}(\lambda)} x_{F(c)}$.

We recall that the modified Macdonald polynomial $\widetilde{H}_\lambda(X_n; q, t)$ is a symmetric polynomial in the x_i with $\mathbb{N}[q, t]$ coefficients. We expand this in powers of t ; our interest lies in the coefficients of the lowest and highest powers [2, (3.1)]:

$$\widetilde{H}_\lambda(X_n; q, t) = \mathcal{H}_\lambda(X_n; q)t^0 + \dots + W_\lambda(X_n; q)t^{\eta(\lambda)} \quad (1)$$

where $\eta(\lambda) = \sum_{j \geq 1} \binom{\lambda'_j}{2}$ where λ'_j denote the parts of the partition conjugate to λ . The $\widetilde{W}_\lambda(X_n; q)$ is the q -Whittaker polynomial. The q -reversal (or reciprocal) polynomial of $\mathcal{H}_\lambda(X_n; q)$ coincides with the modified Hall-Littlewood polynomial $Q'_{\lambda'}(X_n; q)$ where λ' is the partition conjugate to λ , i.e., $q^{\eta(\lambda')} \mathcal{H}_\lambda(X_n; q^{-1}) = Q'_{\lambda'}(X_n; q)$. These are further related to each other by $\omega W_\lambda(X_n; q) = Q'_{\lambda'}(X_n; q)$ where ω is the classical involution on the ring of symmetric polynomials.

Following Haglund-Haiman-Loehr [9] and Ayyer-Mandelshtam-Martin [1], there are statistics *inv*, *quinv* and *maj* on $\mathcal{F}(\lambda)$ such that

$$\widetilde{H}_\lambda(X_n; q, t) = \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda)} x^F q^{v(F)} t^{\text{maj}(F)} \quad (2)$$

¹These latter ones may be easily transformed into the familiar *tabloids* by transposing rows and columns and replacing $i \mapsto n - i + 1$

where $v \in \{\text{inv}, \text{quinv}\}$. The next lemma follows directly from the definition of maj [9]:

Lemma 1. *Let $F \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda)$. Then (i) $\text{maj}(F) = \eta(\lambda)$ iff $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$, and (ii) $\text{maj}(F) = 0$ iff $F \in \text{WDF}(\lambda)$.*

Putting together (1), (2) and Lemma 1, we obtain for $v \in \{\text{inv}, \text{quinv}\}$:

$$W_\lambda(X_n; q) = \sum_{F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)} x^F q^{v(F)} \quad (3)$$

$$Q'_{\lambda'}(X_n; q) = \sum_{F \in \text{WDF}(\lambda)} x^F q^{\eta(\lambda') - v(F)} \quad (4)$$

These are in fact symmetric in the x -variables and can be viewed as expansions in terms of the monomial symmetric functions in x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n .

3. FERMIONIC FORMULA FOR $W_\lambda(X_n; q)$

Let $n \geq 1$ and $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq 0)$ be a partition with at most n nonzero parts. Let $\text{GT}(\lambda)$ denote the set of integral Gelfand-Tsetlin (GT) patterns with bounding row λ . Given $T \in \text{GT}(\lambda)$, we denote its entries by T_i^j for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ as in Figure 1. It will also be convenient to define $T_{j+1}^j = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. We define the North-East and South-East differences of T by: $\text{NE}_{ij}(T) = T_i^{j+1} - T_i^j$ and $\text{SE}_{ij}(T) = T_i^j - T_{i+1}^j$ for $1 \leq i \leq (j+1) \leq n$. The GT inequalities ensure that these differences are non-negative.

We will interchangeably think of a GT pattern as a semistandard Young tableau (SSYT). In this perspective, $(T_1^j, T_2^j, \dots, T_j^j)$ is the partition formed by the cells of the tableau which contain entries $\leq j$. It follows that $\text{NE}_{ij}(T)$ is the number of cells in the i^{th} row of the tableau which contain the entry $j+1$. We let x^T denote the x -weight of the corresponding tableau. The following fermionic formula for the q -Whittaker polynomial appears in [10, 13] and follows readily from Macdonald's more general formula [14, Chap VI, (7.13)']:

$$W_\lambda(X_n; q) = \sum_{T \in \text{GT}(\lambda)} x^T \prod_{1 \leq i \leq j < n} \left[\begin{matrix} \text{NE}_{ij}(T) + \text{SE}_{ij}(T) \\ \text{NE}_{ij}(T) \end{matrix} \right]_q \quad (5)$$

Following [12], we define $\text{wt}_q(T) = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq j < n} \left[\begin{matrix} \text{NE}_{ij}(T) + \text{SE}_{ij}(T) \\ \text{NE}_{ij}(T) \end{matrix} \right]_q$.

3.1. Partition overlaid patterns. We recall that the q -binomial $\left[\begin{matrix} k+\ell \\ k \end{matrix} \right]_q$ is the generating function of partitions that fit into a $k \times \ell$ rectangle, i.e., $\left[\begin{matrix} k+\ell \\ k \end{matrix} \right]_q = \sum q^{|\gamma|}$ where $\gamma = (\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2 \geq \dots \geq \gamma_k \geq 0)$ with $\ell \geq \gamma_1$. We also identify partitions of the above form with strictly decreasing k -tuples of integers between 0 and $k + \ell - 1$ via the bijection $\gamma \mapsto \bar{\gamma} = \gamma + \delta$ where $\delta = (k-1, k-2, \dots, 0)$.




FIGURE 1. A GT pattern for $n = 4$. The NE and SE differences are those along the red and blue lines. On the right is a partition overlay compatible with this GT pattern.

As shown in [15], the right-hand side of (5) can be interpreted in terms of the so-called *partition overlaid patterns* (POPs). A POP of shape λ is a pair (T, Λ) where $T \in \text{GT}(\lambda)$ and $\Lambda = (\Lambda_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq j < n)$ is a tuple of partitions such that each Λ_{ij} fits into a rectangle of size $NE_{ij}(T) \times SE_{ij}(T)$. For example, if T is the GT pattern of Figure 1, we could take $\Lambda_{11} = (2, 1, 0)$, $\Lambda_{12} = (2)$, $\Lambda_{13} = (1, 1)$, $\Lambda_{22} = (0, 0, 0)$, $\Lambda_{23} = (1)$, $\Lambda_{33} = (2, 2)$. We imagine the Λ_{ij} as being placed in a triangular array as in Figure 1. We let $\text{POP}(\lambda)$ denote the set of POPs of shape λ . It is now clear from (5) that

$$W_\lambda(X_n; q) = \sum_{(T, \Lambda) \in \text{POP}(\lambda)} x^T q^{|\Lambda|} \quad (6)$$

where $|\Lambda| = \sum_{i,j} |\Lambda_{ij}|$. We remark that $W_\lambda(X_n; q)$ is the character of the *local Weyl module* $W_{\text{loc}}(\lambda)$ - a module for the current algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_n[t]$ [6, 5]. Further, POPs of shape λ index a special basis of this module with Gelfand-Tsetlin like properties [6, 15].

3.2. Projection and Branching for Partition overlaid patterns. Given $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq 0)$, we say that $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_{n-1})$ *interlaces* λ (and write $\mu \prec \lambda$) if $\lambda_i \geq \mu_i \geq \lambda_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i < n$. The q -Whittaker polynomials have the following important properties which readily follow from (6):

(*projection*) $W_\lambda(X_n; q = 0) = s_\lambda(X_n)$, the Schur polynomial, and

$$(\text{branching}) \quad W_\lambda(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n = 1; q) = \sum_{\mu \prec \lambda} \prod_{1 \leq i < n} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} \\ \lambda_i - \mu_i \end{bmatrix}_q \cdot W_\mu(X_{n-1}; q) \quad (7)$$

In fact, Chari-Loktev [6] lift (7) to the level of modules, showing that the local Weyl module $W_{\text{loc}}(\lambda)$ when restricted to $\mathfrak{sl}_{n-1}[t]$ admits a filtration whose successive quotients are of the form $W_{\text{loc}}(\mu)$ for $\mu \prec \lambda$; further their graded multiplicities are precisely given by the product of q -binomial coefficients that appear in (7).

The combinatorial shadow of projection is the map $\text{pr} : \text{POP}(\lambda) \rightarrow \text{GT}(\lambda)$ given by $\text{pr}(T, \Lambda) = T$. Likewise, we define *combinatorial branching* to be

the map $\text{br} : \text{POP}(\lambda) \rightarrow \bigsqcup_{\mu \prec \lambda} \text{POP}(\mu)$ defined by $\text{br}(T, \Lambda) = (T^\dagger, \Lambda^\dagger)$ where T^\dagger is obtained from T by deleting its bottom row, and Λ^\dagger is obtained from Λ by deleting the overlays Λ_{ij} with $j = n - 1$.

3.3. Box complementation. In addition to pr and br , $\text{POP}(\lambda)$ is endowed with another important map, which we term *box complementation*. Observe that given a partition $\pi = (\pi_1 \geq \pi_2 \geq \cdots \geq \pi_k \geq 0)$ fitting into a $k \times \ell$ rectangle, i.e., with $\pi_1 \leq \ell$, we may consider its complement in this rectangle, defined by $\pi^c = (\ell - \pi_k \geq \ell - \pi_{k-1} \geq \cdots \geq \ell - \pi_1)$. Now, for $(T, \Lambda) \in \text{POP}(\lambda)$, define $\text{boxcomp}(T, \Lambda) = (T, \Lambda^c)$ where for each i, j , $(\Lambda^c)_{ij}$ is defined to be the complement of Λ_{ij} in its bounding rectangle of size $\text{NE}_{ij}(T) \times \text{SE}_{ij}(T)$.

We note that since $|\Lambda| \neq |\Lambda^c|$ in general, boxcomp preserves x -weights, but not q -weights. However $|\Lambda| + |\Lambda^c| = \sum_{i,j} \text{NE}_{ij}(T) \text{SE}_{ij}(T) =: \text{area}(T)$ (in the terminology of [15]), which depends only on T .

4. PROJECTION AND BRANCHING FOR COLUMN STRICT FILLINGS

Our goal is to construct natural bijections between $\text{CSF}(\lambda)$ and $\text{POP}(\lambda)$ which explain the equality of (3) and (6) for $v = \text{inv}, \text{quinv}$. In addition to preserving x - and q -weights, we would like our bijections to be compatible with projection and branching. Towards this end, we first define these latter maps in the setting of $\text{CSF}(\lambda)$.

4.1. Projection: rowsort. Given $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$, let $\text{rsort}(F)$ denote the filling obtained from F by sorting entries of each row in ascending order. In light of the following easy lemma, we think of rsort as the projection map in the CSF setting.

Lemma 2. *If $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$, then $\text{rsort}(F) \in \text{SSYT}(\lambda) \cong \text{GT}(\lambda)$.*

4.2. Branching: delete-and-splice. A strictly increasing sequence $a = (a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_m)$ of positive integers will also be termed a *column tuple* with $\text{len}(a) = m \geq 0$. Let $\ell \geq 1$ and suppose $\sigma = (\sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \cdots < \sigma_{\ell-1})$ and $\tau = (\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \cdots < \tau_\ell)$ are column tuples of length $\ell - 1$ and ℓ respectively. We set $\sigma_0 = 0$ and let k denote the maximum element of the (non-empty) set $\{1 \leq i \leq \ell : \sigma_{i-1} < \tau_i\}$. Define $\text{splice}(\sigma, \tau) = (\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau})$ where

$$\bar{\sigma}_i = \begin{cases} \sigma_i & 1 \leq i < k \\ \tau_i & k \leq i \leq \ell \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\tau}_i = \begin{cases} \tau_i & 1 \leq i < k \\ \sigma_i & k \leq i < \ell \end{cases}$$

i.e., $\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau}$ are obtained by swapping certain suffix portions of σ, τ . The choice of k ensures that $\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau}$ are also column tuples; we also have $\text{len}(\bar{\sigma}) = \text{len}(\tau)$ and $\text{len}(\bar{\tau}) = \text{len}(\sigma)$. For instance, when $(\sigma, \tau) = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \\ 5 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix} \right)$, we get

$$(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau}) = \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 5 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

We now define the delete-and-splice rectification (“ dsplice ”) map on $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$ as follows: **(1)** delete all cells in F containing the entry n and let

F^\dagger denote the resulting filling. While its column entries remain strictly increasing, F^\dagger may no longer be of partition shape. **(2)** Let $\sigma^{(j)}$ ($j \geq 1$) denote the column tuple obtained by reading the j^{th} column of F^\dagger from top to bottom. If F^\dagger is not of partition shape, there exists $j \geq 1$ such that $\text{len}(\sigma^{(j+1)}) = \text{len}(\sigma^{(j)}) + 1$. Choose any such j and modify F^\dagger by replacing the pair of columns $(\sigma^{(j)}, \sigma^{(j+1)})$ in F^\dagger by $\text{splice}(\sigma^{(j)}, \sigma^{(j+1)})$. This swaps the column lengths and brings the shape of F^\dagger one step closer to being a partition. **(3)** If the shape of F^\dagger is a partition, STOP. Else go back to step 2.

It is clear that this process terminates and finally produces a CSF of partition shape (filled by numbers between 1 and $n - 1$), which we denote $\text{dsplice}(F)$. The following properties hold:

Proposition 1. *With notation as above: (i) $D := \text{dsplice}(F)$ is independent of the intermediate choices of j made in step 2 of the procedure. (ii) $\text{rsort}(D)$ is obtained from $\text{rsort}(F)$ by deleting the cells containing the entry n . (iii) If μ and λ are the shapes of D and F respectively, then $\mu \prec \lambda$.*

We consider dsplice to be the combinatorial branching map in the CSF context. Its key property is its compatibility with the natural branching map br of the POP setting (Theorem 1 below). While each splice operation is “local”, the end result $\text{dsplice}(F)$ can have a fair bit of “intermixing” amongst columns of F (see also §8 for a pictorial description).

5. THE MAIN THEOREM

Theorem 1. *For any $n \geq 1$ and any partition $\lambda : \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n \geq 0$ with at most n nonzero parts, there exist two bijections ψ_{inv} and ψ_{quinv} from $\text{CSF}(\lambda)$ to $\text{POP}(\lambda)$ with the following properties:*

1. If $\psi_v(F) = (T, \Lambda)$, then $x^F = x^T$ and $v(F) = |\Lambda|$, for $v = \text{inv}$ or quinv .
2. The following diagrams commute ($v = \text{inv}$ or quinv):

(A)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{CSF}(\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\psi_v} & \text{POP}(\lambda) \\
 \searrow \text{rsort} & & \swarrow \text{pr} \\
 & \text{GT}(\lambda) &
 \end{array}$$

(B)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{CSF}(\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\psi_v} & \text{POP}(\lambda) \\
 \text{dsplice} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{br} \\
 \bigsqcup_{\mu \prec \lambda} \text{CSF}(\mu) & \xrightarrow{\psi_v} & \bigsqcup_{\mu \prec \lambda} \text{POP}(\mu)
 \end{array}$$

3. The two bijections are related via the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \text{CSF}(\lambda) & \\
 \psi_{\text{inv}} \swarrow & & \searrow \psi_{\text{quinv}} \\
 \text{POP}(\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\text{boxcomp}} & \text{POP}(\lambda)
 \end{array}$$

□

To summarize, ψ_{inv} and ψ_{quinv} acting on a CSF produce POPs with the same underlying GT pattern, but with complementary overlays. These bijections are compatible with the natural projection and branching maps, and preserve x - and appropriate q -weights (inv or quinv). Note the slight abuse of notation in part 2(B) above: for $\mu \prec \lambda$, $\text{CSF}(\mu)$ denotes the set of column strict fillings $F : \text{dg}(\mu) \rightarrow [n-1]$ (rather than $[n]$). Theorem 1, with the exception of part 2(B), can also be formulated in the setting of q -Whittaker functions in infinitely many variables. Next, we obtain the following corollaries:

Corollary 1. *Let $T \in \text{GT}(\lambda)$ and let $\text{rsort}^{-1}(T) = \{F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda) : \text{rsort}(F) = T\}$ be the fiber of rsort over T .*

$$(1) \quad \sum_{F \in \text{rsort}^{-1}(T)} q^{\text{inv}(F)} = \sum_{F \in \text{rsort}^{-1}(T)} q^{\text{quinv}(F)} = \text{wt}_q(T).$$

$$(2) \quad \text{inv}(F) + \text{quinv}(F) = \text{area}(T) \text{ is constant for } F \in \text{rsort}^{-1}(T).$$

An interpretation of $\text{wt}_q(T)$ in terms of flags of subspaces compatible with nilpotent operators appears in [12, Theorem 5.8(i)]. In [1], the authors asked for an explicit bijection on $\mathcal{F}(\lambda)$ which interchanges the inv and quinv statistics. We describe this bijection on $\text{CSF}(\lambda)$, thereby partially answering their question.

Corollary 2. *The map $\Omega : \psi_{\text{inv}}^{-1} \circ \psi_{\text{quinv}} = \psi_{\text{inv}}^{-1} \circ \text{boxcomp} \circ \psi_{\text{inv}} : \text{CSF}(\lambda) \rightarrow \text{CSF}(\lambda)$ is an involution satisfying $\text{inv}(\Omega(F)) = \text{quinv}(F)$ for all $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$.*

The explicit construction of the ψ_v and their inverses in the next section makes Ω effectively computable.

6. PROOF SKETCH

6.1. Cellwise zcounts and quinv triples. We first describe the construction of ψ_{quinv} . For a partition λ , the augmented diagram $\widehat{\text{dg}}(\lambda)$ is $\text{dg}(\lambda)$ together with one additional cell below the last cell in each column (see Figure 2). Given $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$, a *quinv-triple* in F is a triple of cells (x, y, z) in $\widehat{\text{dg}}(\lambda)$ such that (i) $x, z \in \text{dg}(\lambda)$ and z is to the right of x in the same row, (ii) y is the cell immediately below x in its column, (iii) $F(x) < F(z) < F(y)$, where we set $F(y) = \infty$ if y lies outside $\text{dg}(\lambda)$. It is easy to see that the quinv-triples considered in [1] for $F \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda)$ reduce to this description when F is a CSF rather than a general filling. Thus, $\text{quinv}(F)$ as defined in [1] equals the number of quinv-triples in F (as defined above) for a CSF F .




FIGURE 2. Here $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda = (10, 6, 4, 0)$ and $n = 4$. Cells of F are coloured according to their entries. The gray cells are the extra cells in the augmented diagram $\widehat{\text{dg}}(\lambda)$. On the right are cellwise $zcount$ values. Here $\text{quinv}(F) = 12$.

Given $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$, we define a function $zcount$ which tracks the contributions of individual cells of $\text{dg}(\lambda)$ to $\text{quinv}(F)$ as follows: for each cell $c \in \text{dg}(\lambda)$, let $zcount(c, F) =$ the number of quinv -triples (x, y, z) in F with $z = c$. Clearly

$$\sum_{c \in \text{dg}(\lambda)} zcount(c, F) = \text{quinv}(F) \quad (8)$$

We next group cells of the filling F row-wise according to the entries they contain. More precisely, let $\text{cells}(i, j, F) = \{c \in \text{dg}(\lambda) : c \text{ is in the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ row and } F(c) = j + 1\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq j + 1 \leq n$. Figure 2 shows an example, with these groups colour-coded in each row. It readily follows from §3 that

$$|\text{cells}(i, j, F)| = NE_{ij}(T), \text{ where } T = \text{rsort}(F). \quad (9)$$

The next proposition brings the SE differences also into play [3]:

Proposition 2. *Let $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$ and $T = \text{rsort}(F)$. Fix $1 \leq i \leq j + 1 \leq n$.*

- (1) *If $c \in \text{cells}(i, j, F)$, then $zcount(c, F) \leq SE_{ij}(T)$.*
- (2) *If $c, d \in \text{cells}(i, j, F)$ with c lying to the right of d , then $zcount(c, F) \geq zcount(d, F)$.*
- (3) *Further, equality holds in (1) for all i, j and all cells $c \in \text{cells}(i, j, F)$ iff $F = T$.*

6.2. Definition of ψ_{quinv} . We now have all the ingredients in place to define ψ_{quinv} . Let $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$ and $T = \text{rsort}(F)$. For each $1 \leq i \leq j + 1 \leq n$, consider the sequence

$$\Lambda_{ij} = (zcount(c, F) : c \in \text{cells}(i, j, F) \text{ traversed right to left in row } i). \quad (10)$$

In Figure 2, this amounts to reading the entries of a fixed colour from right to left in a given row of $zcount(\cdot, F)$. By Proposition 2, this is a weakly decreasing sequence bounded above by $SE_{ij}(T)$. Together with (9), this implies that Λ_{ij} may be viewed as a partition fitting into the $NE_{ij}(T) \times SE_{ij}(T)$ rectangle. Since $SE_{ij} = 0$ for $i = j + 1$, Λ_{ij} is the zero sequence in this case. We drop the pairs $(j + 1, j)$ to conclude that if $\Lambda = (\Lambda_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq j < n)$, then $(T, \Lambda) \in \text{POP}(\lambda)$. We define $\psi_{\text{quinv}}(F) = (T, \Lambda)$. Clearly, $x^F = x^T$ and (8) implies $\text{quinv}(F) = |\Lambda|$, establishing (1) of Theorem 1 for $v = \text{quinv}$.



FIGURE 3. (left to right) Configuration of quinv, inv and refin triples.

6.3. refin triples. We now turn to the definition of ψ_{inv} . While we may anticipate doing this via a modification of the foregoing arguments, replacing quinv-triples with Haglund-Haiman-Loehr’s inv-triples, that turns out not to work out-of-the-box. In place of the latter (see Figure 3), we consider triples (x, y, z) in $\widehat{\text{dg}}(\lambda)$ where (i) $x, z \in \text{dg}(\lambda)$ with z to the left of x in the same row, (ii) y is the cell immediately below x in its column. Given $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$, we call (x, y, z) a *refinv-triple* (or “reflected inv-triple”) for F if in addition to (i) and (ii), we also have (iii) $F(x) < F(z) < F(y)$, where $F(y) := \infty$ if $y \notin \text{dg}(\lambda)$. We have [3]:

Proposition 3. *For $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$, $\text{inv}(F)$ equals the number of refin-triples of F .*

Remarks. 1. We may in fact define a new statistic² *refinv* on all fillings $F \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda)$ as follows: $\text{refinv}(F) = \text{Inv}(F) - \sum_{u \in \text{Des } F} \text{coarm}(u)$, borrowing notation of [9, §2]. This replaces *arm* in HHL’s definition by *coarm*. The content of Proposition 3 is that $\text{refinv}(F) = \text{inv}(F)$ for $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$. In fact, this equality holds more generally for all fillings F whose descent set is a union of rows of $\text{dg}(\lambda)$. More generally, The proof follows from the observation that the sum of $\text{arm}(c)$ equals the sum of $\text{coarm}(c)$ when the cell c runs over the union of a subset of rows of $\text{dg}(\lambda)$.

2. The refin triples for $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$ actually make an appearance in [13, §2.2], where they are attributed to Zelevinsky (and their total number denoted \widetilde{ZEL}). From this perspective, the content of Proposition 3 is that $\widetilde{ZEL}(F) = \text{inv}(F)$.

6.4. $\overline{\text{zcount}}$, zcount and the proof of the main theorem. Given $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$ and $c \in \text{dg}(\lambda)$, define $\overline{\text{zcount}}(c, F) =$ the number of refin-triples (x, y, z) in F with $z = c$. In light of Proposition 3, it is clear that

$$\sum_{c \in \text{dg}(\lambda)} \overline{\text{zcount}}(c, F) = \text{inv}(F) \quad (11)$$

We have the following relation between $\overline{\text{zcount}}$ and zcount [3]:

Proposition 4. *Let $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$ and $T = \text{rsort}(F)$. Let $1 \leq i \leq j + 1 \leq n$ and $c \in \text{cells}(i, j, F)$. Then $\text{zcount}(c, F) + \overline{\text{zcount}}(c, F) = \text{SE}_{ij}(T)$.*

²In fact, *refquinv* can also be likewise defined on all fillings, and agrees with *quinv* on CSFs. But rephrased in terms of refin-triples, this involves counting such triples with signs [3].

We may now define ψ_{inv} following the template of ψ_{quinv} . Given $F \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$, let $T = \text{rsort}(F)$. For each $1 \leq i \leq j < n$, consider the sequence:

$$\overline{\Lambda}_{ij} = (\overline{\text{zcount}}(c, F) : c \in \text{cells}(i, j, F) \text{ traversed left to right in row } i)$$

Recall also the definition of the partition Λ_{ij} from (10). It follows from Propositions 2 and 4 that $\overline{\Lambda}_{ij}$ is the box-complement of Λ_{ij} in the $\text{NE}_{ij}(T) \times \text{SE}_{ij}(T)$ rectangle. Letting $\overline{\Lambda} = (\overline{\Lambda}_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq j < n)$, we define $\psi_{\text{inv}}(F) = (T, \overline{\Lambda})$. As in the case of quinv, we have $x^F = x^T$, and $\text{inv}(F) = |\overline{\Lambda}|$ by (11). This proves part (1) of Theorem 1 for $v = \text{inv}$.

Since by definition $\text{pr}(\psi_v(F)) = T$ for $v = \text{inv}, \text{quinv}$, Part (2A) of Theorem 1 follows. Part (3) of Theorem 1 follows from the fact that Λ and $\overline{\Lambda}$ are box complements of each other in the appropriate rectangles. That the diagrams in part (2B) of Theorem 1 are commutative follows from an analysis of each elementary splice step of the dsplice map; we defer the details to [3].

Finally, this leaves us with proving that the ψ_v are bijections. We sketch the construction of ψ_{inv}^{-1} . Given $(T, \Lambda) \in \text{POP}(\lambda)$, construct the filling $F := \psi_{\text{inv}}^{-1}(T, \Lambda) \in \text{CSF}(\lambda)$ inductively row-by-row, from the bottom (n^{th}) row to the top as follows: (a) fill all cells of the n^{th} row (if nonempty) with n , (b) let $1 \leq i \leq j < n$; assuming that all rows of F strictly below row i have been completely determined and that the locations of entries $> (j + 1)$ in row i have been determined, we now need to fill $\text{NE}_{ij}(T)$ many cells of row i with the entry $j + 1$. It turns out that the number of cells in row i in which we can potentially put a $j + 1$ without violating the CSF condition thus far is exactly $k + \ell$ where $k = \text{NE}_{ij}(T)$ and $\ell = \text{SE}_{ij}(T)$. We label these cells $0, 1, \dots, k + \ell - 1$ from right to left (left-to-right when defining ψ_{quinv}^{-1}). We now use the identification from §3.1 of partitions fitting inside a $(k \times \ell)$ -box with k -tuples of distinct integers in $0, 1, \dots, k + \ell - 1$. Via this, the partition Λ_{ij} can be viewed as a k -tuple of candidate cells in row i ; we put the entry $j + 1$ into these, (c) fill the remaining cells of row i with the entry i . The rest of the argument is straightforward [3]. \square

For example, let $n = 4$, $\lambda = (10, 6, 4, 0)$ and let T, Λ be the GT pattern and overlay depicted in Figure 1. Then $\psi_{\text{quinv}}^{-1}(T, \Lambda)$ is precisely the CSF F of Figure 2, while

$$\psi_{\text{inv}}^{-1}(T, \Lambda) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 3 & & & & \\ \hline 4 & 4 & 3 & 3 & & & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

7. LOCAL WEYL MODULES AND LIMIT CONSTRUCTIONS

Finally, we can apply these ideas to the study of local Weyl modules, in particular to the *limit constructions* of [7, 15, 16]. Let $L(\Lambda_0)$ denote the basic representation of the affine Lie algebra $\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_n$ [11, Prop. 12.13]. Using Theorem 1 to replace POPs with CSFs as our model in [15, Corollary 5.13], we deduce [3]:




FIGURE 4. A CSF F with columns colour-coded to match its lattice path representation. The three marked intersections show that $\text{inv}(F) = 3$.

Proposition 5. Fix $n \geq 2$ and consider the partition $\theta = (2, 1, 1, \dots, 1, 0)$ with $n - 1$ nonzero parts and $|\theta| = n$. For $k \geq 0$, let \mathcal{C}_k denote the set of CSFs F of shape $k\theta$ and entries in $[n]$, with the property that either 1 occurs in the first column of F or 1 does not occur in its last column. Then $\sum_{k \geq 0} \sum_{F \in \mathcal{C}_k} x^F q^{k^2 - \text{inv}(F)}$ equals the character of $L(\Lambda_0)$.

There is also a more general version with $\lambda + k\theta$ in place of $k\theta$ (for appropriate λ), mirroring [15, Corollary 5.13].

8. CONCLUDING REMARKS

For the modified Hall-Littlewood polynomials $Q'_{\lambda'}(X_n; q)$ of (4), the fermionic formula appears in [13, (0.2)]. Analogous to (6), this can now be recast as a weighted sum over partition overlaid plane-partitions (POPP) of shape λ . Theorem 1 takes the form of bijections from $\text{WDF}(\lambda)$ to $\text{POPP}(\lambda)$ (or equivalently, from tabloids to partition overlaid reverse-plane-partitions). The subtlety here is that POPPs need to be weighted with an additional power of q (which depends only on the underlying plane-partition, cf [13, (0.2)]). The refin- or quinv-triples in this case also involve \leq relations (rather than just $<$) and this extra q -power keeps track of certain equalities among the triples [3].

Secondly, the bijections of Theorem 1 (and those indicated above for the modified Hall-Littlewood case) have an attractive interpretation in terms of lattice-path diagrams [8, 4]. Figure 4 shows the lattice path representation of a CSF F ; $\text{inv}(F)$ is just the total number of intersections of the form



in the grid, and refining this further to each box of the grid produces the partition overlay as well [3]. Likewise $\text{quinv}(F)$ counts non-intersections of the above form. The dsplice map of §4.2 translates into deletion of the



REFERENCES

- [1] Arvind Ayyer, Olya Mandelshtam, and James B. Martin. “Modified Macdonald polynomials and the multispecies zero-range process. I”. English. In: *Algebr. Comb.* 6.1 (2023), pp. 243–284. ISSN: 2589-5486.
- [2] F. Bergeron. *A Survey of q -Whittaker polynomials*. 2020. arXiv: 2006.12591 [math.CO].
- [3] Aritra Bhattacharya, T. V. Ratheesh, and Sankaran Viswanath. “On q -Whittaker and modified Hall-Littlewood polynomials”. In preparation.
- [4] Alexei Borodin and Michael Wheeler. “Nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials via integrable vertex models”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 375.12 (2022), pp. 8353–8397.
- [5] Vyjayanthi Chari and Bogdan Ion. “BGG reciprocity for current algebras”. English. In: *Compos. Math.* 151.7 (2015), pp. 1265–1287. ISSN: 0010-437X.
- [6] Vyjayanthi Chari and Sergei Loktev. “Weyl, Demazure and fusion modules for the current algebra of \mathfrak{sl}_{r+1} ”. English. In: *Adv. Math.* 207.2 (2006), pp. 928–960. ISSN: 0001-8708.
- [7] G. Fourier and P. Littelmann. “Weyl modules, Demazure modules, KR-modules, crystals, fusion products, limit constructions”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 211.2 (2007), pp. 566–593. ISSN: 0001-8708.
- [8] Alexandr Garbali and Michael Wheeler. “Modified Macdonald polynomials and integrability”. English. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 374.3 (2020), pp. 1809–1876. ISSN: 0010-3616.
- [9] J. Haglund, M. Haiman, and N. Loehr. “A combinatorial formula for Macdonald polynomials”. In: *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 18.3 (2005), pp. 735–761. ISSN: 0894-0347,1088-6834.
- [10] Goro Hatayama et al. “Character formulae of $\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_n$ -modules and inhomogeneous paths”. English. In: *Nucl. Phys., B* 536.3 (1999), pp. 575–616. ISSN: 0550-3213.
- [11] V. G. Kac. *Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*. 3rd edition. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [12] Steven N. Karp and Hugh Thomas. “ q -Whittaker functions, finite fields, and Jordan forms”. English. In: *Sémin. Lothar. Comb.* 85B (2021). Id/No 57, p. 12. ISSN: 1286-4889.
- [13] Anatol N. Kirillov. “New combinatorial formula for modified Hall-Littlewood polynomials”. English. In: *q -series from a contemporary perspective*. American Mathematical Society, 2000, pp. 283–333. ISBN: 0-8218-1150-9.
- [14] I. G. Macdonald. *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*. Second edition. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford University Press, New York, 1995, pp. x+475. ISBN: 0-19-853489-2.
- [15] K. N. Raghavan, B. Ravinder, and Sankaran Viswanath. “On Chari-Loktev bases for local Weyl modules in type A ”. English. In: *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A* 154 (2018), pp. 77–113. ISSN: 0097-3165.

- [16] B. Ravinder. *Stability of the Chari-Loktev bases for local Weyl modules of $\mathfrak{sl}_{r+1}[t]$* . 2018. arXiv: 1612.01484 [math.RT].

THE INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, A CI OF HOMI BHABHA NATIONAL
INSTITUTE, CHENNAI 600113, INDIA
Email address: `baritra@imsc.res.in`

THE INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, A CI OF HOMI BHABHA NATIONAL
INSTITUTE, CHENNAI 600113, INDIA
Email address: `ratheeshtv@imsc.res.in`

THE INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, A CI OF HOMI BHABHA NATIONAL
INSTITUTE, CHENNAI 600113, INDIA
Email address: `svis@imsc.res.in`