

TYPE C K -STANLEY SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS AND KRAŚKIEWICZ-HECKE INSERTION

JOSHUA ARROYO, ZACHARY HAMAKER, GRAHAM HAWKES, AND JIANPING PAN

ABSTRACT. We study Type C K -Stanley symmetric functions, which are K -theoretic extensions of the Type C Stanley symmetric functions. They are indexed by signed permutations and can be used to enumerate reduced words via their expansion into Schur Q -functions, which are indexed by strict partitions. A combinatorial description of the Schur Q -coefficients is given by Kraśkiewicz insertion. Similarly, their K -Stanley analogues are conjectured to expand positively into GQ 's, which are K -theory representatives for the Lagrangian Grassmannian introduced by Ikeda and Naruse also indexed by strict partitions. We introduce a K -theoretic analogue of Kraśkiewicz insertion, which can be used to enumerate 0-Hecke expressions for signed permutations and gives a conjectural combinatorial rule for computing this GQ expansion.

We show the Type C K -Stanleys for certain fully commutative signed permutations are skew GQ 's. Combined with a Pfaffian formula of Anderson's, this allows us to prove Lewis and Marberg's conjecture that GQ 's of (skew) rectangle shape are GQ 's of trapezoid shape. Combined with our previous conjecture, this also gives an explicit combinatorial description of the skew GQ expansion into GQ 's. As a consequence, we obtain a conjecture for the product of two GQ functions where one has trapezoid shape.

1. INTRODUCTION

Although this paper is combinatorial in methods and results, our underlying objective is to understand geometric properties of the isotropic or Lagrangian Grassmannian. Beginning in the 19th century with work of Schubert, mathematicians have investigated enumerative properties of the intersections of curves and hypersurfaces. The modern approach to calculating these quantities is to interpret them by computing the cup product for the cohomology ring of an appropriate projective variety. In this guise, such computations are fundamentally combinatorial in nature. For example, Schubert's computations are encoded in the cohomology of the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(k, n)$, the space of k -planes in \mathbb{C}^n , whose cup product is computed by the Littlewood-Richardson rule for multiplying Schur functions (see e.g. [26] for a textbook treatment). Similarly, the cup product in cohomology for the orthogonal and Lagrangian Grassmannians is computed by multiplying Schur P - and Schur Q -functions [18, 29].

A major line of active research is to understand combinatorially more exotic cohomology theories such as K -theory, which encodes finer data about the boundaries of intersections. For K -theory, products in the Grassmannian were first computed combinatorially by Buch [5], and later extended to the orthogonal Grassmannian [10, 8]. For the Lagrangian Grassmannian, K -theory has proved far more difficult to understand combinatorially, with the only progress being Buch and Ravikumar's Pieri rule [7]. We offer a new pathway towards understanding such products based on Type C K -Stanley symmetric functions.

1.1. Stanley symmetric functions and Kraśkiewicz-Hecke insertion. The Stanley symmetric functions F_w are symmetric functions indexed by permutations. Introduced by Stanley to enumerate reduced words [31], Stanley symmetric functions are also stable limits of the Schubert polynomials \mathfrak{S}_w , which represent cohomology classes in the flag variety $\text{Fl}(n)$, and are themselves cohomology representatives for graph Schubert varieties [21]. Edelman-Greene insertion shows they expand into the Schur basis with non-negative coefficients enumerated by Edelman-Greene insertion tableaux [11], showing reduced words for permutations are enumerated by standard tableaux counts. By choosing the permutation w appropriately, this expansion recovers the Littlewood-Richardson rule for products of Schur functions. Our work continues this line of investigation, introducing a novel insertion algorithm to better understand symmetric functions arising in Schubert calculus.

The symmetric functions we study are *Type C K -Stanley symmetric functions* G_w^C , introduced in [20] and indexed by signed permutations. Our main tool is a novel insertion algorithm we call *Kraśkiewicz-Hecke insertion*, which generalizes Kraśkiewicz insertion, the Type C analogue of Edelman-Greene insertion [22].

As shown in [23], Kraśkiewicz insertion interprets the Schur Q -coefficients of a Type C Stanley symmetric function from [3] as certain decomposition tableaux. Consequently, reduced words for signed permutations are enumerated by standard shifted tableaux counts. Hecke insertion is the K -theoretic extension of Edelman–Greene insertion from reduced words to all words in the alphabet $\{1, 2, \dots\}$ [6]. At the level of symmetric functions, Hecke insertion shows a K -Stanley symmetric function¹ from [13] expands into stable Grothendieck polynomials² with coefficients enumerating increasing tableaux. This expansion gives a new proof for the K -theory product structure of the Grassmannian and shows 0-Hecke expressions for permutations are enumerated by standard set-valued tableaux counts. The 0-Hecke product and 0-Hecke expressions are defined in Section 2.1.

Insertion algorithms map a word (a_1, \dots, a_p) to an insertion tableau P and a recording tableau Q . The recording tableaux for Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion are standard shifted set-valued tableaux from [19]. We introduce *strict decomposition tableaux* (see Definition 4.3) to play the role of insertion tableaux. For λ a strict integer partition, let $\text{ShSet}_n(\lambda)$ be the set of standard shifted set-valued tableaux containing n values and $\text{SDT}(\lambda)$ be the set of strict decomposition tableaux of shape λ . Let KH denote Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion. For P a strict decomposition tableau, $\rho(P)$ is the usual reading word of P (see Section 2.2).

Theorem 1.1. *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion is a bijection:*

$$KH : \mathbb{N}^n \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigsqcup_{\lambda \vdash n \text{ strict}} \text{SDT}(\lambda) \times \text{ShSet}_n(\lambda).$$

Moreover, for $KH(a_1, \dots, a_p) = (P, Q)$, the words (a_1, \dots, a_p) and $\rho(P)$ are 0-Hecke expressions for the same signed permutation.

The definition of Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion and proof of Theorem 1.1 appear in Section 5 and is extraordinarily technical. As opposed to most families of tableau, checking the strict decomposition tableau column condition for two entries requires examining the intermediate segment of the tableau’s reading word. As a consequence, the insertion rules can modify entries in two rows, with concomitant difficulties propagating throughout the arguments in our proofs.

For w a signed permutation, let $\mathcal{H}_n(w)$ be the set of 0-Hecke expressions for w of length n . Note $\mathcal{H}_{\ell(w)}$ is the set of reduced words w . Also, let $a_w^C(\lambda)$ be the number of strict decomposition tableaux of shape λ whose reading word is a 0-Hecke expression for w . As an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1, we have:

Corollary 1.2. *For w a signed permutation and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$(1.1) \quad |\mathcal{H}_n(w)| = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n \text{ strict}} a_w^C(\lambda) \cdot |\text{ShSet}_n(\lambda)|.$$

Corollary 1.2 is precisely analogous to the use of Edelman–Greene and Kraśkiewicz insertions for reduced word enumeration and Hecke insertion for 0-Hecke expression enumeration in Type A. All three of these insertions are enumerative shadows of (K -)Stanley symmetric function expansions. Unfortunately, as shown in Section 7.2 an insertion algorithm extending Kraśkiewicz insertion **cannot** be used to directly compute the analogous expansion for G_w^C . That said, we believe Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion is correctly identifying coefficients. For λ a strict partition, GQ_λ is a symmetric function defined in terms of shifted set-valued tableaux and represents K -theory classes for the Lagrangian Grassmannian [19].

Conjecture 1.3. *For w a signed permutation,*

$$(1.2) \quad G_w^C = \sum_{\lambda \text{ strict}} \beta^{|\lambda| - \ell(w)} a_w^C(\lambda) \cdot GQ_\lambda.$$

By combining [20, Lemma 7 (1)] with the main result from [9], it is known that $G_w^C \in \mathbb{Z}[\beta][GQ_\lambda : \lambda \text{ strict}]$. However, establishing the positivity implied by Conjecture 1.3 is an open problem, even using geometric methods. By taking the coefficient of $x_1 \dots x_n$ on both sides of (1.2), we obtain Corollary 1.2 as a consequence of Conjecture 1.3. Assuming the conjecture is false, replacing each $a_w^C(\lambda)$ with the correct coefficient of GQ_λ for G_w^C in (1.1) gives a true equation. Therefore, should our conjecture fail we will have instead identified a striking collection of relations for standard shifted set-valued tableaux counts.

While we cannot establish Conjecture 1.3, we prove two important expansions of GC ’s into GQ ’s. First, as a straightforward application of the Pfaffian formula for Type C degeneracy loci from [1]³, we show:

¹Originally known as a Stable Grothendieck polynomial for a permutation.

²Hence our preference for the newer name.

³See the current arXiv version for the corrected formula

Theorem 1.4. *For w a vexillary signed permutation, there is a shifted shape $\lambda(w)$ so that $G_w^C = GQ_{\lambda(w)}$.*

Using the identification between reduced words and heaps for certain fully commutative elements [32, 33] (a similar and more general construction appears in [34]), we also show:

Theorem 1.5. *For ν/μ a skew shifted shape, there is a signed permutation w with $G_w^C = GQ_{\nu/\mu}$.*

Many properties of GQ 's that are known for other families of K -theoretic symmetric functions remain open. For example, there is no combinatorial rule for the product $GQ_\lambda \cdot GQ_\mu$. By picking appropriate skew shapes, Theorem 1.5 and Conjecture 1.3 combine to give conjectural descriptions for several GQ expansions of interest. This includes Conjecture 5.14 from [25] and Conjecture 4.36 from [27], which state that a skew GQ lies in $\mathbb{Z}[\beta][GQ_\lambda : \lambda \text{ strict}]$. See Conjecture 74 from [17] for a distinct conjectural expansion.

Second, we give a conjectural rule for certain GQ products, the first progress on this problem since Buch and Ravikumar's Pieri rule for computing $GQ_\lambda \cdot GQ_{(\tau)}$ [7]. For $a < b$, let

$$\tau(a, b) = (b+a-1, b+a-3, \dots, b-a+1).$$

Using Theorem 1.5, we prove Conjecture 4.23 from [27], which allows us to show the product $GQ_\lambda \cdot GQ_{\tau(a,b)}$ is GC_w for an appropriate signed permutation w . Then Conjecture 1.3 specializes to a combinatorial rule for such products. Note $\tau(1, b) = (b)$ is a single row, so this would generalize the Buch–Ravikumar Pieri rule. In forthcoming work, the first author reproves the Pieri case using strict decomposition tableaux.

Paper structure. Section 2 introduces necessary background material on signed permutations, set-valued tableaux and GQ functions. In Section 3, we give a precise definition for Type C K -Stanley symmetric functions and demonstrate their features required for our conjectures, including Theorems 1.4 and 1.5. We introduce strict decomposition tableaux and prove several of their basic properties in Section 4. The most technical material in our work is Section 5, where we introduce Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion and prove its properties leading to Theorem 1.1. We discuss Conjecture 1.3 and its applications including Conjecture 6.3 in greater detail in Section 6 before concluding with final remarks and further directions in Section 7.

2. BACKGROUND

For n a positive integer, let $\bar{n} = -n$, $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $[\bar{n}] = \{\bar{1}, \bar{2}, \dots, \bar{n}\}$. Let \mathbb{Z}_- be the set of negative integers and \mathbb{Z}_+ be the set of positive integers. Define \prec as the total order on $\mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ where $\bar{1} \prec 1 \prec \bar{2} \prec 2 \prec \dots$

A *strict partition* is a descending sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \dots > \lambda_k)$ of positive integers. Here, the *size* of λ is $|\lambda| = \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i$, and the *length* of λ is $\ell(\lambda) = k$. The *shifted Young Diagram* of λ is the set

$$D_\lambda = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^2 : i \leq j \leq \lambda_i + i\}.$$

See Figure 1 for an example. We say the strict partition μ is *contained* in λ , denoted $\mu \subseteq \lambda$, if $\mu_i \leq \lambda_i$ for all $i \in [\ell(\mu)]$, or equivalently if $D_\mu \subseteq D_\lambda$. Here, we refer to λ/μ as a *skew shape*, whose associated diagram is $D_{\lambda/\mu} = D_\lambda \setminus D_\mu$.

2.1. Signed Permutations. A *signed permutation* w is a permutation of the elements $[\bar{n}] \cup [n]$ such that $w(i) = -w(\bar{i})$. For example, $v = \bar{1}\bar{3}\bar{2}\bar{2}31$ is a signed permutation. By antisymmetry, w is determined by $w([n])$. When writing a signed permutation, we frequently omit $w([\bar{n}])$; for instance $v = \bar{2}31$. Signed permutations with composition form a group W_n , which is the Coxeter group of Type B/C. Viewed as a Coxeter group, the generators of W_n are s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{n-1} where $s_0 = (\bar{1}, 1)$ swaps positions $\bar{1}$ and 1 and $s_i = (\overline{i+1}, \bar{i})(i, i+1)$ simultaneously swaps positions i and $i+1$ and positions \bar{i} and $\overline{i+1}$ for $i > 0$. These generators satisfy the relations

- (1) Self-inverse: $s_i^2 = 1$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$;
- (2) Commutation: $s_i s_j = s_j s_i$ if $|i - j| \geq 2$;
- (3) Braid Relation: $s_i s_{i+1} s_i = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1}$ if $i > 0$;
- (4) Long Braid Relation: $s_1 s_0 s_1 s_0 = s_0 s_1 s_0 s_1$.

The *length* of $w \in W_n$ is the minimum number of generators needed to express w , denoted $\ell(w)$. A *reduced expression* for w is an expression of the form

$$w = s_{a_1} \cdot s_{a_2} \cdot \dots \cdot s_{a_p}$$

where $p = \ell(w)$. The associated word (a_1, \dots, a_p) is a *reduced word* for w . The Matsumoto–Tits theorem says that the set of reduced words for a given w is connected by the commutation, braid and long braid relations. For example, the reduced words of $w = \overline{2}31$ are $(1, 0, 2)$ and $(1, 2, 0)$.

The *0–Hecke monoid* (W_n, \circ) is the monoid on signed permutations obtained by replacing the Self-inverse relation with the Idempotent Relation $s_i \circ s_i = s_i$. A *0–Hecke expression* for $w \in W_n$ is an expression of the form

$$w = s_{a_1} \circ s_{a_2} \circ \dots \circ s_{a_p}$$

with associated *Hecke word* (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p) . Let $\mathcal{H}_p(w)$ be the set of Hecke words for w with p letters and $\mathcal{H}(w) = \cup_{p \geq 0} \mathcal{H}_p(w)$. For example, with $w = \overline{2}31$ we have $\mathcal{H}_3(w) = \{(1, 0, 2), (1, 2, 0)\}$ and

$$\mathcal{H}_4(w) = \{(1, 0, 0, 2), (1, 0, 2, 0), (1, 0, 2, 2), (1, 1, 0, 2), (1, 2, 0, 0), (1, 2, 0, 2), (1, 2, 2, 0)\}.$$

Note $\mathcal{H}_{\ell(w)}(w)$ is the set of reduced words for w and $\mathcal{H}_m(w)$ is empty when $m < \ell(w)$. The *peak set* of a word (a_1, \dots, a_p) is $\text{Peak}((a_1, \dots, a_p)) = \{i \in [p] : a_{i-1} < a_i > a_{i+1}\}$. By construction $1, p \notin \text{Peak}((a_1, \dots, a_p))$.

We now introduce several important families of signed permutations. A signed permutation w is *Grassmannian* if $w(i) < w(i+1)$ for all $i \in [n-1]$, that is w_1, \dots, w_n is an increasing sequence. Each Grassmannian signed permutation is associated with a strict partition, λ , defined by $\lambda_i = \overline{w(i)}$ for each i such that $w(i) < 0$. For example, $w = \overline{4}1\overline{2}3$ is a Grassmannian signed permutation associated with $\lambda = (4, 1)$. Note the identity corresponds to the empty partition.

Let $w \in W_n$ and $v \in V_m$, w contains v as a *pattern* if there exists a subsequence of w of length m , w' , such that for all $i, j \in [m]$, $w'(i)$ and $v(i)$ have the same sign and $|w'(i)| < |w'(j)|$ if and only if $|v(i)| < |v(j)|$. If w does not contain v as a pattern, then w *avoids* v . A signed permutation, w , is *vexillary* if w avoids the following 18 patterns [4]:

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \overline{1}32 & \overline{2}31 & 3\overline{1}2 & 321 & \overline{3}21 & 32\overline{1} & \overline{3}2\overline{1} \\ 2143 & 2\overline{3}4\overline{1} & \overline{2}34\overline{1} & 2413 & 3142 & 3\overline{4}1\overline{2} & \overline{3}41\overline{2} \\ 341\overline{2} & \overline{3}412 & \overline{4}1\overline{2}3 & \overline{4}123 & & & \end{array}$$

Each vexillary permutation has an associated shifted shape $\lambda(w)$, which we define implicitly in Section 3.1, see [4] for an algorithmic construction of $\lambda(w)$.

2.2. Shifted Tableaux. For λ, μ strict partitions with $\mu \subseteq \lambda$, a *shifted tableau* of shape λ/μ is a function T whose domain is $D_{\lambda/\mu}$. Here, $T_{ij} = T((i, j))$ is called the *entry* in the cell (i, j) . For a shifted tableau T , let T_i be the entries in the i^{th} row of T , read from left to right. The *reading word* of T with ℓ rows is $\rho(T) = T_\ell T_{\ell-1} \dots T_1$. A *shifted standard Young tableau* is a shifted tableau filled bijectively by $[n]$ so that each row is strictly increasing rightwards and each column is strictly increasing downwards. Viewing $D_{\lambda/\mu}$ as a poset with $(i, j) \leq (k, \ell)$ if $i \leq k$ and $j \leq \ell$, note shifted standard Young tableaux of shape λ/μ are in bijection with linear extensions of $D_{\lambda/\mu}$.

A *set-valued tableau* T has entries that are finite sets of integers, that is $T_{ij} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$. Similarly, a *shifted set valued standard Young tableau* T of *size* $|T| = n$ is a shifted diagram filled with sets that partition $[n]$ such that for all cells

$$\max T_{ij} \leq \min T_{i+1, j}, \min T_{i, j+1}$$

(assuming such cells exist). Let $\text{ShSet}(\lambda)$ be the set of shifted set valued standard Young tableaux of shape λ and $\text{ShSet}_n(\lambda)$ be the subset whose entries partition $[n]$. Note for $\lambda \vdash n$ that $\text{ShSet}_n(\lambda)$ is the set of shifted standard Young tableaux of shape λ . The *peak set* of a shifted set-valued standard Young tableau T is $\text{Peak}(T)$, the set of values i such that $i - 1$ is in a column to the left of i and $i + 1$ is in a row below i . Note for any tableau T that $i \in \text{Peak}(T)$ implies $i - 1, i + 1 \notin \text{Peak}(T)$. See Figure 1 for examples.

A *shifted set valued semistandard Young tableau* is a set valued tableau with entries in $\mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ so that $\max(T_{ij}) \leq \min(T_{i+1, j})$ with equality only for negative values and $\max(T_{ij}) \leq \min(T_{i, j+1})$ with equality only for positive values. For T a set valued tableau, define

$$x^T = \prod_{(i, j) \in \lambda(T)} x^{T_{ij}} \quad \text{where} \quad x^S = x_{|s_1|} \dots x_{|s_k|} \quad \text{for} \quad S = \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}.$$

Let $\text{ShSet}^*(\lambda/\mu)$ be the set of shifted set valued semistandard Young tableaux of shape λ/μ . Then

$$(2.1) \quad GQ_{\lambda/\mu}^{(\beta)} = \sum_{T \in \text{ShSet}^*(\lambda/\mu)} \beta^{|T| - |\lambda/\mu|} x^T.$$

We write $GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)} := GQ_{\lambda/\emptyset}^{(\beta)}$. For $\mu = \emptyset$, the GQ 's were first introduced in [19] (see also [14]) as K -theory representatives for Schubert classes in the Lagrangian Grassmannian. The lowest degree homogeneous component of GQ_λ is the *Schur Q -function* $Q_\lambda = GQ_\lambda^{(0)}$. While it is not obvious from the above definition, the $GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)}$'s are symmetric functions in the x -variables.

Let λ be a strict partition with $\ell(\lambda) = k$ and $\mu = (k-1, \dots, 1)$. Then the shifted diagram of λ/μ is the ordinary diagram of the (non-strict) partition $\nu = (\lambda_1 - (k-1), \dots, \lambda_k)$. An important special case of skew GQ functions are the GS functions defined by $GS_\nu = GQ_{\lambda/\mu}$. These are generating functions for unshifted marked set-valued tableaux.




FIGURE 1. To the left is a shifted Young diagram of shape $\lambda = (4, 3, 1)$. Next is a standard shifted Young tableau T_1 of the same shape with peak set $\text{Peak}(T_1) = \{2, 5\}$, followed by a standard shifted set valued Young tableau T_2 of the same shape with $\text{Peak}(T_2) = \{4, 6, 8, 10\}$. Last is a semistandard shifted set valued Young tableau T_3 so that $\text{st}(T_3) = T_2$.

Given a set-valued semistandard tableau T , we construct the *standardization* of $\text{st}(T)$ iteratively as follows. First assume T has only entries \bar{a} and a , with $|T| = k$ and $a \notin [k]$. Beginning as high as possible, replace each $\bar{1}$ with the smallest value of $[k]$ not in T . After all such values have been replaced, beginning as low as possible replace each 1 with the smallest value of $[k]$ not in T . The resulting tableau is standard. For a set-valued semistandard tableau whose largest entry is m or \bar{m} , we can repeat this procedure for each value in $[m]$ to construct a standard tableau of the same size.

3. TYPE C K -STANLEY SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

In [20], the authors introduce Type C K -Stanley symmetric functions G_w^C as part of their construction of Type C double Grothendieck polynomials. However, as ancillary objects in their work the G_w^C 's were not investigated for their own sake. Since then these symmetric functions have not received further study, so we must establish several of their basic properties.

3.1. Definition and basic properties. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$ be commuting variables and u_1, \dots, u_{n-1} be non-commuting variables subject to the following β -Idempotent Relation and the Coxeter relations:

$$\begin{aligned} u_i^2 &= \beta u_i, & u_1 u_0 u_1 u_0 &= u_0 u_1 u_0 u_1, \\ u_i u_{i+1} u_i &= u_{i+1} u_i u_{i+1} \quad (i > 0), & u_i u_j &= u_j u_i \quad (|i - j| > 1). \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$(3.1) \quad G_n^C(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i \geq 1} (1 + x_i u_{n-1})(1 + x_i u_{n-2}) \dots (1 + x_i u_1)(1 + x_i u_0)(1 + x_i u_0)(1 + x_i u_1) \dots (1 + x_i u_{n-1}),$$

where the product is computed beginning with the terms containing x_1 . For $w \in W_n$, the *type C K -Stanley symmetric function* of w is the coefficient of u_w in $G_n^C(\mathbf{x})$, which we denote G_w^C . These symmetric functions (with $\beta = -1$) are introduced in [20] in order to define Type C double Grothendieck polynomials and are stable under the natural inclusion $W_n \hookrightarrow W_{n+1}$. Note that G_w^C is not homogeneous; its lowest degree homogeneous component is the *Type C Stanley symmetric function* $F_w^C = G_w^C|_{\beta=0}$. It is not obvious, but G_w^C is symmetric for each w . In fact, it can be expressed in terms of GQ -functions.

Proposition 3.1. For $w \in W_n$, $G_w^C \in \mathbb{Z}[\beta][GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)} : \lambda \text{ strict}]$.

Proof. This is essentially [20, Lemma 7 (1)], which says $G_w^C \in \mathbb{Z}[\beta][GP_\lambda^{(\beta)} : \lambda \text{ strict}]$, where $GP_\lambda^{(\beta)}$ is a symmetric function closely related to the $GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)}$ that we do not define. In [9] the authors show each $GP_\lambda^{(\beta)}$ is an element of $\mathbb{Z}[GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)} : \lambda \text{ strict}]$, so the result follows. \square

A *unimodal factorization* of the word $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_p)$ in the alphabet \mathbb{N} is the biword (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i}) where

$$\mathbf{i} = i_1 \preceq i_2 \preceq \dots \preceq i_p$$

with $i_j \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ for all j so that $i_k = i_{k+1}$ implies $a_k > a_{k+1}$ when $i_k < 0$ and $a_k < a_{k+1}$ when $i_k > 0$. Such biwords are also known as compatible sequences. Our nomenclature comes from the following depiction of the unimodal factorization (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i}) : group consecutive subwords of \mathbf{a} whose corresponding entry in \mathbf{i} have the same absolute value using parentheses, indicating the transition from negative to positive values in each parenthesized subword with $|$. For example, the unimodal factorization

$$(\mathbf{a} = (0, 1, 2, 3, 0, 1, 4, 2, 3, 3, 0, 1, 2, 5, 0, 1), \quad \mathbf{i} = (1, 1, 1, \overline{2}, 2, 2, \overline{4}, \overline{4}, 4, \overline{5}, 5, 5, \overline{6}, 6, 6))$$

is depicted as

$$(| 012)(3 | 01)() (42 | 3)(3 | 012)(5 | 01).$$

Let $\mathcal{U}(w)$ be the set of unimodal factorizations whose word is in $\mathcal{H}(w)$ and $\mathcal{U}_p(w)$ be the subset whose word is in $\mathcal{H}_p(w)$. By interpreting the definition of $G_w^C(\mathbf{x})$ in terms of (3.1) appropriately, we have:

Proposition 3.2 ([20, Prop. 17]). *For w a signed permutation,*

$$G_w^C(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{p \geq 0} \sum_{(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i}) \in \mathcal{U}_p(w)} \beta^{p-\ell(w)} x^{\mathbf{i}} \quad \text{where} \quad x^{\mathbf{i}} = x_{|i_1|} \dots x_{|i_p|}.$$

Proof. A non-zero monomial in $G_n^C(\mathbf{x})$ is of the form

$$x_{j_1} u_{a_1} \dots x_{j_p} u_{a_p}.$$

Construct the biword (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i}) from this monomial with $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_p)$ and $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_p)$ where

$$i_k = \begin{cases} \overline{j_k} & x_{i_k} u_{a_k} \text{ is in the descending part of the } j_k \text{th term in } G_n^C(\mathbf{x}), \\ j_k & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

The reader can confirm that $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i}) \in \mathcal{U}_p(w)$ where $w = u_{a_1} \circ \dots \circ u_{a_p}$, and that all such terms arise in this way. \square

As a corollary, we see Type C K -Stanley symmetric functions can be used to enumerate 0 -Hecke expressions.

Corollary 3.3. *For $w \in W_n$, the coefficient of $\beta^{n-\ell(w)} x_1 \dots x_n$ in G_w^C is $2^n \cdot |\mathcal{H}_n(w)|$.*

Proof. This follows Proposition 3.2: each monomial $x_1 \dots x_n$ corresponds to a unimodal factorization $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i}) \in \mathcal{U}(w)$ where $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{H}_n(w)$ and each i_j can be \overline{j} or j independent of other choices. \square

Using the unimodal factorization characterization of Type C K -Stanley symmetric functions, we can characterize certain products, generalizing and extending [4, Cor. 3.3] to the K -theoretic setting.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $u \in W_k$ and $v \in S_n$ so that $v(i) = i$ for all $i \in [k]$. Then*

$$G_{uv}^C = G_u^C \cdot G_v^C.$$

Proof. Consider the n th parenthesization of $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i}) \in \mathcal{U}_{uv}$, which is of the form

$$(b_1 > \dots > b_i > c_1 > \dots > c_j | c_{j+1} < \dots < c_\ell < b_{i+1} < \dots < b_m).$$

where the b' are greater than k and c 's are less than k . This term can be split into two parenthesizations

$$(b_1 > \dots > b_i | b_{i+1} < \dots < b_m) \quad \text{and} \quad (c_1 > \dots > c_j | c_{j+1} < \dots < c_\ell).$$

Applying this procedure to all parenthesizations of (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i}) , we obtain unimodal factorizations $(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{j}) \in \mathcal{U}(u)$ and $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{l}) \in \mathcal{U}(v)$, respectively. This process is invertible, so we have a weight preserving bijection from $\mathcal{U}(uv)$ to $\mathcal{U}(u) \times \mathcal{U}(v)$, hence the result follows from Proposition 3.2. \square

In [20], the authors show for Grassmannian $w(\lambda)$ that $G_{w(\lambda)}^C = GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)}$ via a geometric argument. This is also a special case of our Theorem 1.5, which we prove combinatorially. We extend the Grassmannian result to all vexillary permutations via a geometric argument:

Proposition 3.5. *For $w \in W_n$ vexillary, $G_w^C = GQ_{\lambda(w)}^{(\beta)}$.*

Proof sketch. For the degeneracy locus associated to a vexillary signed permutation w , there is a Pfaffian formula for its equivariant K -theory class in terms of Chern classes $c_w(j)$ [1, Thm. 2]. With appropriate conventions and specializing to the single case, we can view such Chern classes as

$$c_w(j) = \frac{(1 - y_a)}{(1 - z_b)} \cdot (1 + c_1 + c_2 + \dots)$$

where y_a and z_b are variables whose indices are determined by w . The terms of the matrix whose Pfaffian is being taken are certain $c_w(j)$'s, where each j term is determined by the shape $\lambda(w)$. By [20, Prop. 2], setting the y_i and z_j variables to zero recovers G_w^C from this formula. Therefore G_w^C is determined by $\lambda(w)$, so the result follows from the Grassmannian case. \square

Note by taking $\beta = 0$ in (2) we have for w vexillary that $F_w^C = Q_{\lambda(w)}$, as shown in [4]. We take this as the definition of $\lambda(w)$.

For λ a strict partition and a, b positive integers, recall from the introduction that

$$w(a, b, k) = 12 \dots k \ell+1 \ell+2 \dots n k+1 k+2 \dots \ell$$

where $\ell = a + k$ and $n = a + b + k$. When $a \leq b$, recall also the shifted trapezoid

$$\tau(a, b) = (a + b - 1, a + b - 3, \dots, b - a + 1).$$

As a consequence of Proposition 3.5 we prove Conjecture 4.23 from [25]:

Corollary 3.6. *For a, b, k positive integers with $a \leq b$,*

$$G_{w(a,b,k)}^C = GQ_{\tau(a,b)}.$$

Proof. By discussion after [4, Cor. 3.3], we see $G_{w(a,b,k)}^C$ is vexillary of shape $\tau(a, b)$. Therefore, the result follows by Proposition 3.5. \square

From this, we have:

Corollary 3.7. *For λ a strict partition with $\lambda_1 < k$ and $a \leq b$ positive integers,*

$$G_{w(\lambda,k) \cdot w(a,b,k)}^C = GQ_{\lambda} \cdot GQ_{\tau(a,b)}.$$

Proof. We compute

$$G_{w(\lambda,k) \cdot w(a,b,k)}^C = G_{w(\lambda,k)}^C \cdot G_{w(a,b,k)}^C = GQ_{\lambda} \cdot GQ_{\tau(a,b)}$$

with the first equality by Proposition 3.4 and the second by Proposition 3.5 and Corollary 3.7. \square

One might hope further GQ -products can be modeled as GC -expansions. Unfortunately, as discussed in [4], trapezoids are the **only** shifted shapes λ for which $w \in S_n$ exists with $GQ_w|_{\beta=0} = Q_{\lambda}$. This property was needed to ensure $w(\lambda, k)$ would not be changed in above product.

3.2. Top fully commutative elements. In this section, we study top fully commutative elements of W_n , which we abbreviate to ‘top’ and are indexed by skew shifted shapes. There is a transparent bijection between shifted standard tableaux of strict shape λ/μ and reduced words for the top element $w_{(\lambda/\mu)}$ due to Stembridge [32, 33]. We extend this bijection to the map $\text{res} : \text{ShSSYT}_p(\lambda/\mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_p(w_{(\lambda/\mu)})$, proving Theorem 1.5, which says

$$GQ_{\lambda/\mu}^{(\beta)} = G_{w_{(\lambda/\mu)}}^C$$

We say $w \in W_n$ is **fully commutative** if its reduced words contain no braid relations, that is none of them contain the consecutive subwords $(0, 1, 0, 1)$ and $(i, i + 1, i)$ for $i \geq 1$. Fully commutative elements for Coxeter groups have been studied extensively, with Stembridge [32] giving the first systematic treatment. A key feature of fully commutative w is that its reduced words are in bijection with linear extensions of an associated poset called the **heap** of w .

We are especially interested in signed permutations w that are **top fully commutative**, abbreviated to **top**, which are fully commutative and whose reduced words do not contain the consecutive subword $(1, 0, 1)$. As shown in [33, Cor. 5.6], top signed permutations are those avoiding the patterns

$$\overline{12}, \overline{12}, \overline{321}, \overline{321}, 32\overline{1}, 321.$$

The heaps of top elements are skew strict partitions.

Proposition 3.8 ([12, Thm. 8.2], [33, Prop. 6.1]). *For $w \in W_n$ top, there is a shifted shape λ/μ so that the heap of w is isomorphic to $D_{\lambda/\mu}$. Moreover, for every skew shape λ/μ such a top element exists.*

Proposition 3.8 is stated without proof in [12]. A proof appears in [33], where a complete characterization is presented for the fully commutative elements that are not top but whose heap is isomorphic to $D_{\lambda/\mu}$ for some λ/μ .

The Grassmannian permutation of shape λ is the top element whose heap is the reverse (as a poset) of D_λ . More generally, for shifted shape λ/μ with $|\lambda/\mu| = p$ and $\ell(\lambda) = k$, we can construct the associated top element $w_{(\lambda/\mu)}$ as follows. Let C be the tableau of shape λ/μ whose (i, j) th entry $C_{ij} = j - i$ is the *content* of cell (i, j) . Note contents are non-negative since λ/μ is shifted. Then the top-to-bottom reading word $C_1 C_2 \dots C_k$ of C is the *canonical reduced word* for the top element $w_{(\lambda/\mu)}$ whose heap is $D_{\lambda/\mu}$. This construction is equivalent to the alternate characterization of top elements [33, Cor. 5.6 (b)].

The construction of $w_{(\lambda/\mu)}$ is a special case of the bijection between linear extensions of $D_{\lambda/\mu}$, i.e., shifted standard Young tableaux of shape λ/μ , and reduced words for $w_{(\lambda/\mu)}$. Following [28], we call this map (and its subsequent generalization) the *residue map*, denoted res . Given a shifted standard Young tableau T of shape λ/μ , construct the associated reduced word $\text{res}(T) = (a_1, \dots, a_p)$ for $w_{(\lambda/\mu)}$ by setting $a_k = j - i$ where $(i, j) = T^{-1}(k)$ is the cell labeled k in T . For example, with $\lambda/\mu = (65421/41)$ the top element $w_{(\lambda/\mu)}$ has canonical reduced word $(4, 5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 0, 1, 2, 3, 0, 1, 0)$, and

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline & 2 & 3 & 6 \\ \hline 1 & 4 & 7 & \\ \hline & 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{has} \quad \text{res}(T) = (0, 2, 3, 1, 0, 4, 2) \in \mathcal{H}_7(w_{(531/2)}).$$

The above description of the residue map is the restriction of a more general map res from shifted set-valued semistandard tableaux to unimodal factorizations of 0-Hecke expressions.

Definition 3.9. For $T \in \text{ShSSYT}(\lambda/\mu)$, construct $\text{res}(T)$ iteratively as follows. For each positive integer k in ascending order, we construct the k th parenthesization $(\mathbf{a}^k \mid \mathbf{b}^k)$ as follows:

- Let $(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_\ell, j_\ell)$ be the cells containing \bar{k} with $i_1 < \dots < i_\ell$. Then $\mathbf{a}^k = (j_1 - i_1, \dots, j_\ell - i_\ell)$.
- Let $(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_m, q_m)$ be the cells containing k with $q_1 < \dots < q_m$. Then $\mathbf{b}^k = (q_1 - p_1, \dots, q_m - p_m)$.

Note the semistandard conditions guarantee that each row contains at most one \bar{k} and each column contains at most one k so the above construction is well-defined. To see the resulting parenthesization is unimodal, note the cells containing \bar{k} are being read weakly from right to left, strictly from top to bottom so their contents are descending. Likewise, the cells containing k are being read strictly from left to right, weakly from bottom to top so their contents are increasing.

When T is standard with $|T| = p$, we see each letter is in the positive part of its own parenthesization so $\text{res}(T) = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i})$ with $\mathbf{i} = (1, \dots, p)$. Then $T \mapsto \mathbf{a}$ is restriction of res to a map from $\text{ShSet}_p(\lambda/\mu)$ to \mathbb{N}^p . In this guise, res generalizes the aforementioned bijection from linear extensions of the heap to reduced words of $w_{\lambda/\mu}$.

We will show for $T \in \text{ShSSYT}(\lambda/\mu)$ that $\text{res}(T)$ lies in $\mathcal{U}(w_{(\lambda/\mu)})$. For example, with

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1_0 & 1_1 & 1_2 & 2'_3 & 3'_4 & 5'_5 \\ \hline & 2_0 & 2_1 & 3'_2 & 3'_4 & \\ \hline & & 4_0 & 4_1 & 4_2 & \\ \hline & & & 5_0 & 5_1 & \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad \text{res}(T) = (| 012)(3 | 01)(42 | 3)(3 | 012)(5 | 01).$$

Here, the contents are depicted using red subscripts inside of T for reference.

We require a simple lemma about 0-Hecke expressions of fully commutative elements, which we phrase for top elements.

Lemma 3.10. For λ/μ a skew shifted shape, let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_p) \in \mathcal{H}(w_{(\lambda/\mu)})$, and let $a_i = a_\ell = m$ so that $m \notin \{a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{\ell-1}\}$. Then

$$s_{a_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{a_{\ell-1}} = s_{a_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{a_{\ell-1}} \circ s_{a_\ell}$$

if and only if for $j \in (i, \ell)$, we have $a_j \neq m + 1, m - 1$.

Proof. For the forward direction, since all 0-Hecke expressions are connected by the Commutation and Idempotent relations, we see we must be able to commute a_ℓ up to a_i and cancel, hence no intermediate values can be present to prevent this commutation. For the converse, if no such a_j exists then we can commute s_{a_ℓ} up to s_{a_i} and apply the Idempotent relation. \square

Theorem 3.11. *The map $\text{res} : \text{ShSSYT}(\lambda/\mu) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(w_{(\lambda/\mu)})$ is a weight preserving bijection, that is for $\text{res}(T) = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i})$ we have $x^T = x^{\mathbf{i}}$.*

Proof. Note the power of x_k in x^T is the number of \bar{k} and k 's in T , while the power of x_k in $x^{\mathbf{i}}$ is the size of the k th parenthesization in (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i}) . By construction, these quantities are the same so res is weight preserving.

To see res is a bijection, we first treat the case where $T \in \text{ShSet}_p(\lambda/\mu)$. In this case

$$\text{res}(T) = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i} = (1, 2, \dots, p))$$

by construction, so we must show the restriction $T \mapsto \mathbf{a}$ is a bijection from $\text{ShSet}_p(\lambda/\mu)$ to $\mathcal{H}_p(w_{\lambda/\mu})$. We first show this restriction is well-defined. Let $m_1 < \dots < m_k$ be the minimum values of the cells of T , occurring in cells $(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_k, j_k)$. Then the subword

$$(a_{m_1}, \dots, a_{m_k}) = (j_1 - i_1, \dots, j_k - i_k)$$

is a reduced word for $w_{\lambda/\mu}$ since res restricts to a bijection from standard tableaux to reduced words. For $r \in [p] \setminus \{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$ in cell (i, j) also containing m_ℓ , we see the restriction $T|_{[r]}$ cannot contain cells $(i, j+1)$ or $(i+1, j)$. Therefore, in $\text{res}(T) = (a_1, \dots, a_p)$ we have $a_r = j - i = a_{m_\ell}$ and all intermediate values $a_{m_\ell+1}, \dots, a_{r-1}$ cannot be $j - i - 1, j - i + 1$ as these would be drawn from cells $(i, j-1)$ and $(i-1, j)$, respectively, violating the semistandard condition. By Lemma 3.10, we see

$$s_{a_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{a_{r-1}} = s_{a_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{a_{r-1}} \circ s_{a_r},$$

so $\text{res}(T) \in \mathcal{H}_p(w_{\lambda/\mu})$.

We now demonstrate an inverse map for the restriction $T \mapsto \mathbf{a}$. For $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{H}_p(w_{\lambda/\mu})$, let $m_1 < \dots < m_k$ be all values so that

$$s_{a_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{m_1-1} < s_{a_1} \circ \dots \circ s_{m_1-1} \circ s_{m_1}.$$

Then $\mathbf{a}' = (a_{m_1}, \dots, a_{m_k})$ is a reduced word for $w_{\lambda/\mu}$. Since res restricted to standard tableaux and reduced words is a bijection, we see \mathbf{a}' is the image of some $T \in \text{SYT}(\lambda/\mu)$ under res with i th entry replaced with m_i . We fill in the rest of T iteratively so that it is set-valued standard. For ℓ minimal amongst all values not yet in T , let m_i be maximal so that $m_i < \ell$ and $a_{m_i} = a_\ell$. By Lemma 3.10, we see for $m_i < j < \ell$ that $a_j \neq a_\ell \pm 1$ so m_i is in an outer corner of $T|_{[\ell-1]}$. This means we can add ℓ to the cell containing m_i while preserving the standard condition, hence this process terminates with $T \in \text{ShSet}_p(\lambda/\mu)$.

To upgrade to unimodal factorizations, first observe for $\text{res}(T) = (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{i})$ that $\text{st}(T) \mapsto \mathbf{a}$ by the definition of res . Therefore $\text{res} : \text{ShSSYT}(\lambda/\mu) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{U}} (w_{\lambda/\mu})$ as desired. For the inverse, let $T' = \text{res}^{-1}(\mathbf{a})$. Replacing the elements corresponding to \mathbf{a}^k with \bar{k} , the descending condition guarantees they will be row strict and column weak. Likewise, when replacing the elements corresponding to \mathbf{b}^k with k , the ascending condition guarantees they will be column strict and row weak. Therefore, res is invertible, hence the result follows. \square

Our motivation for proving this is the following:

Corollary 3.12. *For $\mu \subseteq \lambda$ strict shapes, $G_{w_{\lambda/\mu}}^C = GQ_{\lambda/\mu}^{(\beta)}$.*

Proof. Combine Proposition 3.2 with Theorem 3.11 and the definition (2.1) of $GQ_{\lambda/\mu}^{(\beta)}$. \square

This result generalizes to products for the form GQ times GS , and more generally G^C times GS as follows. Let ρ be a strict partition with $\ell(\rho) = k$ and $\rho_k > n$. For $\mu = (n + k - 1, n + k - 2, \dots, n)$, the C tableau construction shows the minimum entry in a reduced word for $w_{(\lambda/\mu)}$ is n so it fixes $i < n$. By Corollary 3.12, we see $G_{w_{(\rho/\mu)}}^C = GS_\nu$ where ν is the (not strict) partition with i th entry $\rho_i + i - n - k$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.4 for $w \in W_n$ we have

$$(3.2) \quad G_{w \cdot w_{(\lambda/\mu)}}^C = G_w^C \cdot GS_\nu$$

We highlight an important special case:

Corollary 3.13. *Let λ be a strict partition with $\lambda_1 < a$ and ν be a (not necessarily) strict partition with $\ell(\nu) = k$. Define ρ so that $\nu_i = \rho_i + i - a - k$, and let $\mu = (a + k - 1, a + k - 2, \dots, a)$. Then*

$$G_{w^{(\lambda)} \cdot w_{(\rho/\mu)}}^C = GQ_\lambda \cdot GS_\nu.$$

4. STRICT DECOMPOSITION TABLEAUX

In this section, we introduce a notion of strict decomposition tableaux, simultaneously generalizing the reduced decomposition tableaux appearing in [22, 23] and the standard decomposition tableaux appearing in [30]⁴. In order to define strict decomposition tableau, we require some preliminaries.

Definition 4.1. A sequence $R = r_1 r_2 \dots r_k$ of natural numbers is a *(strictly) unimodal* if there exists $j \in [k]$ so that

$$r_1 > r_2 > \dots > r_j < \dots < r_k.$$

Depending on context, we refer to both j and r_j as the *dip* of R . The *decreasing* and *increasing parts* of R are $R^\downarrow = r_1 \dots r_{j-1}$ and $R^\uparrow = r_j \dots r_k$, respectively. Note the increasing part is always non-empty, which is at odds with the conventions in [23].

For shifted tableau with a unimodal row R in row i with dip j , it is frequently convenient to view it as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{T}(R) &:= -r_i < \dots < -r_{j-1} < r_j < r_{j+1} < \dots < r_k, \text{ or} \\ \mathsf{B}(R) &:= -r_i < \dots < -r_{j-1} < -r_j < r_{j+1} \dots < r_k, \end{aligned}$$

which are increasing sequences of integers.

Remark 4.2. Often, unimodal sequences are first increasing, then decreasing. However, the previous observation demonstrates that working with sequences that first decrease, then increase is more natural in our context. For simplicity, we use the term unimodal throughout, as opposed to ‘counimodal’.

We are now prepared to define the main object of this section.

Definition 4.3. Let λ be a strict partition with $\ell(\lambda) = k$. A *strict decomposition tableau* is a tableau $T : D_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with rows $R_1 \dots R_k$ so that:

- (a) For all $i \in [k]$, the row R_i is unimodal.
- (b) For $i \in [k-1]$, the first and last entries of R_{i+1} are less than the first entry of R_i .
- (c) For $i \in [k-1]$, consider the increasing sequences $\mathsf{T}(R_i) = a_i \dots a_{i+\lambda_i}$ and $\mathsf{B}(R_{i+1}) = b_{i+1} \dots b_{i+1+\lambda_{i+1}}$. For all $j \in [\lambda_{i+1}]$,

$$(4.1) \quad \{\pm a_i, \dots, \pm a_{j-1}, \pm b_{j+1}, \dots, \pm b_{i+1+\lambda_{i+1}}\} \cap (b_j, a_j] = \emptyset.$$

In Condition (c), note that a_j appears immediately above b_j in T . If $a_j \leq b_j$, then we will have that $(b_j, a_j] = \emptyset$, so Equation (4.1) is satisfied vacuously. If x is an element of the set defined in the LHS of Equation (4.1), we say x *witnesses* $b_j < a_{j+1}$, hence the failure of Condition (c).

Lemma 4.4. *A shifted tableau with unimodal rows is a strict decomposition tableau if and only if the tableau avoids the following five configurations:*

$$(i) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline a & \cdots & \\ \hline \cdots & & b \\ \hline \end{array}, (ii) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & a & \cdots & \\ \hline \cdots & c & \cdots & b \\ \hline \end{array}, (iii) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & v & z & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & \cdots & x & \cdots \\ \hline \end{array}, (iv) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline y & \cdots & z \\ \hline \cdots & & x \\ \hline \end{array}, (v) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & y & \cdots & z \\ \hline \cdots & & \cdots & x \\ \hline \end{array}$$

with $a \leq b < c$, $x < y \leq z$, and $v < z$.

Proof. Suppose a tableau contains configuration (i), then the tableau breaks rule (b) as $b > a$ where a is the first entry in the row above b .

Suppose a tableau contains configuration (ii), then $-c < \pm a$ is witnessed by $b \in (-c, \pm a]$ meaning rule (c) is broken.

Suppose a tableau contains configuration (iii), then as $v < z$ we have that z is in the increasing part of it’s row. Thus, as $x < z$ we always have y witnesses z over x resulting in the tableau breaking rule (iii).

Suppose a tableau contains configuration (iv) or (v), then as $y \leq z$ we have that z is in the increasing part of it’s row. Thus, as $x < z$ we always have y witnesses z over x resulting in the tableau breaking rule (iii).

Therefore, we have that if a tableau contains any of the five configurations, then it is not a strict decomposition tableau.

Suppose a tableau fails rule (b) at row i . Let a be the first entry of row R_i and b be the entry of row R_{i+1} that is greater or equal to a . Then $a \leq b$ forms configuration (i).

⁴Confusingly, reduced decomposition tableaux are referred to as ‘standard’ in [23]. We introduce the term ‘reduced’ as the Serrano tableaux more closely resemble the conventional meaning of ‘standard’.

Suppose a tableau fails rule (c). Let $p \in R_{i+1}$, $q \in R_i$ such that q above p is witnessed by an element w .

Case 1: Both p and q are in the decreasing part of their rows. Note that $q \leq w < p$. If $w \in R_{i+1}$, then we have that w is right of p and $q < w < p$. Therefore, the tableau contains configuration (ii) with $a = q$, $b = w$, and $c = p$. If $w \in R_i$, then let t be the element directly below w . If t does not exist then the tableau forms configuration (i) with $a = w$ and $b = p$. Otherwise, we have that $t > p$ as p is in the decreasing part of its row. However, then the tableau forms configuration (ii) with $a = w$, $b = p$, and $c = t$.

Case 2: p is in the decreasing part of its row and q is in the increasing part of its row. Note that $w < q$. If $w \in R_{i+1}$, take t to be the element directly above w . As q is in the increasing part of its row we have that $q < t$ and as w witnesses q above p we also have $w < q$. Therefore, the tableau forms configuration (v) with $x = w$, $y = q$, and $z = t$. If $w \in R_i$, take t to be the element directly below w . If t does not exist, then the tableau either forms configuration (i) or (iv) with $a = w$ and $b = p$ if $w \leq p$ and $x = p$, $y = w$, $z = q$ otherwise. If t does exist, then we have that $t > p$ as p is in the decreasing part of its row and t is left of p . Then w above t is witnessed by p bringing us to either case 1 or the earlier part of this case. In either situation we have shown that the tableau contains one of the configurations.

Case 3: Both p and q are in the increasing part of their row. Note that $p < w \leq q$. If $w \in R_{i+1}$, then let t be the element directly left of q . As q is in the increasing part of its row we have that $t < q$. Therefore, the tableau contains configuration (iii) with $v = t$, $x = p$, $y = w$, and $z = q$. If $w \in R_i$, then the tableau forms configuration (iv) or (v) with $x = p$, $y = w$, $z = q$. \square

If a tableau follows all the conditions of a strict decomposition except with weakly unimodal rows instead or equivalently avoids each configuration in Lemma 4.4 with weakly unimodal rows instead we call the tableau a *pseudo strict decomposition tableau*.

Lemma 4.5. *For T a strict decomposition tableau with rows R_1, \dots, R_k , for each $i \in [k]$, R_i is a unimodal subsequence of maximal length in $R_k R_{k-1} \dots R_i$.*

Proof. Let $t_1 t_2 \dots t_{|T|}$ be the reading word of T . Let $r_1 \dots r_p$ be a unimodal subsequence of the reading word with r_1, \dots, r_ℓ being in row j . We aim to show that there exists another unimodal subsequence of equal or greater length that starts in row $j - 1$.

Suppose $r_{\ell+1}$ is in any row above row $j - 1$. Let s be the element directly above r_ℓ and let s' be the element directly left of s . If $r_\ell < r_{\ell+1}$ and if $s < r_{\ell+1}$, then r_1, \dots, r_ℓ can be replaced with the elements in row $j - 1$ up to s . If $r_\ell < r_{\ell+1}$ and $s \geq r_{\ell+1}$, then in order to avoid configuration (v) we either have $s' > s$ or $s' < r_\ell$. In both cases we can replace r_1, \dots, r_ℓ with row $j - 1$ up to s' as in the first case row $j - 1$ is decreasing up to s' . Therefore, we will assume $r_{\ell+1}$ is in row $j - 1$ as in the case where it is not we can raise elements until we have this property.

Case 1: Let $r_{\ell+1}$ be in row $j - 1$ weakly left of r_ℓ . Note that this implies that $r_\ell < r_{\ell+1}$. This is due to the fact that if the unimodal sequence is decreasing up to r_ℓ then row j must be decreasing up to r_ℓ as well. Therefore the element below $r_{\ell+1}$ is greater than r_ℓ if it exists. However, then the tableau would form configuration (i) or (ii) with $a = r_{\ell+1}$, $b = r_\ell$, and c being the element below $r_{\ell+1}$ if it exists. Thus, we have that $r_\ell < r_{\ell+1}$. Then the element above r_ℓ must be less than $r_{\ell+1}$, as otherwise that element would be the z in a (iv) or (v) configuration with $x = r_\ell$ and $y = r_{\ell+1}$. This allows us to then replace r_1, \dots, r_ℓ with row $j - 1$ up to the element above r_ℓ and keep the sequence unimodal.

Case 2: Let $r_{\ell+1}$ be in row $j - 1$ right of r_ℓ . If $r_\ell < r_{\ell+1}$, then we can simply replace r_1, \dots, r_ℓ with row $j - 1$ up to $r_{\ell+1}$. If $r_\ell > r_{\ell+1} < r_{\ell+2}$ (or $r_{\ell+2}$ does not exist), then we can replace r_1, \dots, r_ℓ with row $j - 1$ up to $r_{\ell+1}$. If $r_\ell > r_{\ell+1} > r_{\ell+2}$, let s be the element directly above r_ℓ . If $r_\ell > s > r_{\ell+2}$, then we can replace $r_{\ell+1}$ with s and then reduce to sequence in row $j - 1$ and above by Case 1. If $r_\ell \leq s$, then we can replace r_1, \dots, r_ℓ with row $j - 1$ up to s .

Thus we have shown given any unimodal subsequence of T that doesn't start in row 1, there exists a unimodal subsequence of equal or greater length that starts a row higher. Therefore, as the first row is unimodal it must be a unimodal subsequence of maximal length. \square

The following tableaux were introduced as key objects for Kraśiewicz insertion.

Definition 4.6. Let λ be a strict partition with $\ell(\lambda) = k$. A *reduced decomposition tableau* of shape λ is a tableau $T : D_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with rows $R_1 \dots R_k$ such that the reading word is a reduced word and R_i is a unimodal subsequence of maximal length in $R_k R_{k-1} \dots R_i$ for all $i \in [k]$.

Proposition 4.7. *Every reduced decomposition tableau is also a strict decomposition tableau.*

Proof. Let T be a reduced decomposition tableau with rows R_1, \dots, R_k . By definition we have each row is unimodal, thus T satisfies (a). Suppose the first or last entry of R_{i+1} , a , is greater than the first entry of R_i . Then aR_i would be a unimodal subsequence of $R_k R_{k-1} \dots R_i$, contradicting T being a reduced decomposition tableau. Thus, T satisfies (b).

By way of contradiction, assume T breaks condition (c) in rows R_i and R_{i+1} with $\pm a_j$ in R_i greater than $\pm b_j$ in R_{i+1} and witness c .

Case 1: $c \neq a_j$. Let R'_{i+1} be R_{i+1} up to position j and R'_i be R_i without the first $j-1$ entries. Then $R'_{i+1}cR'_i$ is a unimodal subsequence of $R_k R_{k-1} \dots R_i$ of length greater than R_i , a contradiction.

Case 2: Suppose that there is no witness that satisfies the conditions of case 1, that is every witness that exists is equal to the top element. Take c to be the greatest such witness.

Case 2.1: Suppose $c = 0$. Then we must have that $a_j = 0$, c must be in the bottom row at position j , and there must be a 1 between a_j and c . However, that 1 will always be witnessed by $0 = b_{j+1} < a_{j+1}$ contradicting our assumption that c was maximal.

Case 2.2: Suppose a_j is in the increasing part of R_i .

Case 2.2.1: Suppose $c = 1$, which requires then that $b_j = 0$. In order for the reading word to be reduced there must be a 2 or 0 between a_j and c . If c is in R_i , then there cannot be $c+1$ between a_j and c . If c is in R_{i+1} , then as $a_{j+1} > 1$ any 2 between a_j and c would witness $1 = b_{j+1} < a_{j+1}$ contradicting c maximal. Thus, there must be a 0 between a_j and c , specifically a_{j-1} must be 0. Further, there cannot be any 2 between b_{j-1} and c as if c is in R_i then the element below c is at least 2 which then contradicts that c is maximal and if c is in R_{i+1} such a 2 would mean R_{i+1} is not unimodal. However, then the tableau has a 10101 pattern which is not reduced.

Case 2.2.2: Suppose $c > 1$. In order for the reading word to be reduced there must be a $c+1$ or $c-1$ between a_j and c . If c is in R_i then there cannot be $c+1$ between a_j and c without making R_i not unimodal. If c is in R_{i+1} then the element above c is greater than a_j meaning that a $c+1$ between c and a_j would be witnessed contradicting c being maximal. Therefore, there is a $c-1$ between a_j and c . Further, in order to not be in case 1 we require that $b_j = c-1$ otherwise $b_j < a_j$ witnesses $c-1$. However, the reading word then has a $c-1cc-1c$ pattern with $c > 1$, meaning the word is not reduced.

Case 2.3: Suppose a_j is in the decreasing part of R_i , note that this means c is in R_{i+1} . In order for the reading word to not be reduced there must be a $c+1$ or $c-1$ between a_j and c .

Case 2.3.1: Suppose $c-1$ is between a_j and c . If c is in the increasing part of R_{i+1} then since R_i and R_{i+1} are unimodal there cannot be and $c-1$ between a_j and c . Further, if c is in the decreasing part of R_{i+1} then the element above c witnesses $c-1$. In order to not be case 1 we then require that the element above c is also $c-1$. However, then the reading word will not be reduced unless $c = 1$ in which case the element above $c-1$ has witnesses such that we are either in case 1 or case 2.2.1.

Case 2.3.2: Suppose $c+1$ is between a_j and c , which requires that $b_j = c+1$ to not be in case 1. Further, suppose $c-1$ is not between a_j and c . Then the reading word has a $cc+1cc+1$ pattern meaning that the reading word is not reduced unless $c = 0$. However, then the element above c witnesses the $c+1$ between a_j and c meaning this case is either covered in case 1 or case 2.2.1.

□

5. KRAŚKIEWICZ–HECKE INSERTION

The goal of this section is to construct a bijection from words in the alphabet $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ to pairs of tableaux P, Q of the same shape where P is a *strict decomposition tableau* and Q is a *standard set-valued shifted tableau*. This algorithm generalizes Kraśkiewicz insertion, introduced in [22] and further studied in [23], which maps reduced words for signed permutations to pairs P, Q where P belongs to a subclass of strict decomposition tableau and Q is standard shifted but not set-valued.

5.1. Insertion. We are now prepared to introduce our insertion algorithm, beginning with the row insertion rule. This algorithm is very similar to Kraśkiewicz row insertion, but requires a plethora of additional cases to correct situations where the resulting tableau would fail to be a strict decomposition tableau.

Definition 5.1. (*Kraśkiewicz–Hecke*) *row insertion* is an algorithm with inputs $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and a two-row strict decomposition tableau RS and outputs $b \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and two-row strict decomposition tableau $R'S$. Note S is unchanged and that S may be empty. Row insertion is a two step procedure, first applying *right insertion* and then *left insertion*, which in some cases is trivial. Let $R = r_1 \dots r_\ell$ with dip r_q and $S = s_2 \dots s_k$ with

dip s_p and $k \leq \ell$. Set $r_0, s_1 = -\infty$, $r_{\ell+1} = \infty$ and $s_m = \infty$ for $m > k$. Note r_i appears immediately above s_i in RS . For any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, define $A_d = \{s_{d+1}, \dots, s_k, r_1, \dots, r_{d-1}\}$.

We first define right insertion, which outputs $a' \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and row R'' , which is an input for left insertion. If a equals the dip r_q , set $i = q$. Otherwise, let $q < i \leq \ell + 1$ be minimal such that $r_i \geq a$.

(R1) If $a \neq r_i$, then set $a' = r_i$ and create R'' by changing r_i to a .

(R2) If $a = r_i$ and $r_{i-1} > r_{i+1}$, then set $a' = r_{i+1}$ and create R'' by setting $r_{i+1} = r_i$, note the resulting tableau will be a pseudo SDT.

(R3) If $a = r_i$ and $r_{i-1} \leq r_{i+1}$, then let $R'' = R$ and set $a' = \min(\{r_{i+1}\} \cup [(s_i, r_{i+1}) \cap A_i])$.

We now define left insertion. If $a' = \infty$, then set $b = \infty$ and $R' = R''$. Otherwise, let $1 \leq j \leq q$ be minimal such that $r_j \leq a'$ where here r_j indicates the j^{th} entry of R'' .

(L1) If $a' \neq r_j$, set $b = r_j$ and create R' by changing r_j to a' .

(L2) If $a' = r_j$, then set $R' = R''$.

(I) If $j < p$, we define

$$b = \begin{cases} \max(A_j \cap (r_{j+1}, s_j)), & \text{if } j+1 < q \text{ and } A_j \cap (r_{j+1}, s_j) \neq \emptyset \\ \max(A_j \cap (-\infty, s_j)), & \text{if } j+1 \geq q \text{ and } A_j \cap (-\infty, s_j) \neq \emptyset \\ r_{j+1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(II) If $j \geq p$, then define

$$b = \begin{cases} s_{j+1}, & \text{if (a) } j+1 \geq q \text{ and (b) } r_{j+1} > s_{j+1} \text{ or } r_{j+2}, s_{j+2} > r_j > s_{j+1} \\ r_{j+1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Example 5.2. We present examples of the various steps of the insertion.

(1) Here $r_i = \infty$ triggering (R1), followed by left inserting ∞ triggering (L1) which ends the process:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array} \leftarrow 2 \quad \infty \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

(2) Here $r_i = 2$ triggering (R1), then $r_j = 0 \neq 2$ triggering (L1):

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array} \leftarrow 1 \quad 2 \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 2 & 1 \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} \leftarrow 0$$

(3) Here $r_i = 0$ triggering (R2) as $2 > 1$, then left insertion of 0 triggers (L1). When the bottom row is empty we take $p = 0$, thus we get that 0 is inserted into the next row:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \leftarrow 0 \quad 1 \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} \leftarrow 0 \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

(4) Here $r_i = 1$ triggering (R3) as $0 \leq \infty$. As r_{i+1} and s_i are ∞ we get $a' = r_{i+1} = \infty$, terminating as in (1):

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \leftarrow 1 \quad \infty \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

(5) Here $r_i = 1$ triggering (R3) as $0 \leq 3$. As $2 \in (1, 3)$ and there is a 2 between s_i and r_i , we get $a' = 2$:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \leftarrow 1 \quad 2 \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 0 & 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

(6) Here $r_j = 1$ triggering (L2). As $j = 2 < p = 3$ and $j+1 = 3 \not\leq q = 3$, we set b to $\max(-\infty, 2) \cap \{0, 1, 4\}$ which is 1:

$$2 \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 0 & 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \leftarrow 1$$

- (7) Here $r_j = 3$, triggering (L2). As $j = 2 < p = 3$ and $j + 1 = 3 < q = 4$, we set b to $(1, 3) \cap \{2, 4\}$ which is 2:

$$3 \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 3 & 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 3 & 2 & \leftarrow 2 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

- (8) Here $r_j = 4$, triggering (L2). As $j = 2 \not< p = 2$, we are in case (II). (a) and (b) hold as $j + 1 = 3 \geq q = 3$, $j = 2 \geq p = 2$, and $r_{j+1} = 2 > s_{j+1} = 1$. Thus, we set $b = s_{j+1} = 1$:

$$4 \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 5 & 4 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 5 & 4 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \leftarrow 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

- (9) Here $r_j = 2$ triggering (L2). As $j = 2 \not< p = 2$, we are in case (II). (a) and (b) hold as $j + 1 = 3 \geq q = 3$, $j = 2 \geq p = 2$, and $r_{j+2}, s_{j+2} = 3, 3 > r_j = 2 > s_{j+1} = 1$. Thus, we set $b = s_{j+1} = 1$:

$$2 \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} \leftarrow 1$$

- (10) Here $r_j = 2$ triggering (L2). As $j = 2 \not< p = 2$, we are in case (II). (b) does not hold as $r_{j+1} = 1 \not> s_{j+1} = 2$ and $r_{j+2} = 0 \not> r_j = 2$. Thus, $b = r_{j+1} = 1$:

$$2 \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline & 2 & 3 & \\ \hline \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline & 2 & 3 & \leftarrow 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

We extend row insertion to an insertion algorithm by repeated application.

Definition 5.3. For $P = R_1 \dots R_\ell$ a strict decomposition tableau and $a \in \mathbb{N}$, we *Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insert* a into P by row inserting a into $R_1 R_2$, updating R_1 and inserting the output b into $R_2 R_3$ and so on until the output is ∞ . The insertion *terminates in row i* where i is the row whose output from row insertion is ∞ .

For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_p) \in \mathbb{N}^p$ and $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \dots, a_{p-1})$, we define the *Hecke–Kraśkiewicz insertion tableau* $P_{HK}(\mathbf{a})$ recursively by row inserting a_p into $P_{HK}(\mathbf{a}')$. The *Hecke–Kraśkiewicz recording tableau* $Q = Q_{HK}(\mathbf{a})$ is also constructed recursively from $Q' = Q_{HK}(\mathbf{a}')$. Let λ and λ' be the shapes of $P_{HK}(\mathbf{a})$ and $P_{HK}(\mathbf{a}')$, respectively.

- (1) If $\lambda \neq \lambda'$, they differ by a single cell (i, j) . We obtain Q from Q' by setting $Q_{ij} = \{p\}$.
- (2) If $\lambda = \lambda'$, let k be the row where row insertion of a_p into $P_{HK}(\mathbf{a}')$ terminates. Let $\ell = \max\{\ell : \lambda_\ell + \ell - k = \lambda_k\}$, and construct Q from Q' by adding p to $Q'_{\ell\lambda_\ell}$.

We show this algorithm is well-defined in Proposition 5.9. Many of our arguments depend on understanding the sequences of left and right positions output by the insertion.

Definition 5.4. Consider the KH–row insertion of $a \in \mathbb{N}$ into the i^{th} row of the strict decomposition tableau P with a bumping a' , which is then left inserted to obtain P' . The *right position* is the largest c so that $P'_{ic} = a$. Likewise, the *left position* is the smallest d so that $P'_{id} = a'$. When inserting $a \in \mathbb{N}$ into a strict decomposition tableau P , we obtain a sequence of k row insertions. The *right bumping path* is the sequence (c_1, \dots, c_k) whose i^{th} entry is the right position of the i^{th} row insertion. Similarly, the *left bumping path* is the sequence (d_1, \dots, d_{k-1}) whose i^{th} entry is the left position of the i^{th} row insertion.

We present an example of a complete Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion with bumping path.

Example 5.5. We present an example of KH insertion into a relatively large tableau. The right bumping path of the insertion is colored in red while the left bumping path is colored in green. Note both bumping

paths move weakly left as required by Lemma 5.6. The insertion rule applied is to the right of the tableau.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{cccccccc} 8 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 7 & & \\ 6 & 4 & 1 & 3 & & & & & & & \\ 5 & & & & & & & & & & \end{array} \leftarrow 0 & (R3) & 1 \rightarrow \begin{array}{cccccccc} 8 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 7 & & \\ 6 & 4 & 1 & 3 & & & & & & & \\ 5 & & & & & & & & & & \end{array} & (L2)(I) \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{cccccccc} 8 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 7 & & \\ 6 & 4 & 1 & 3 & & & & & & & \\ 5 & & & & & & & & & & \end{array} \leftarrow 0 & (R3) & 3 \rightarrow \begin{array}{cccccccc} 8 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 7 & & \\ 6 & 4 & 1 & 3 & & & & & & & \\ 5 & & & & & & & & & & \end{array} & (L1) \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{cccccccc} 8 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 7 & & \\ 6 & 4 & 1 & 3 & & & & & & & \\ 5 & & & & & & & & & & \end{array} & (R1) & \begin{array}{cccccccc} 8 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 7 & & \\ 6 & 4 & 1 & 3 & & & & & & & \\ 5 & & & & & & & & & & \end{array} & (L1) \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{cccccccc} 8 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 7 & & \\ 6 & 4 & 1 & 3 & & & & & & & \\ 5 & & & & & & & & & & \end{array} \leftarrow 2 & & 3 \rightarrow \begin{array}{cccccccc} 8 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 7 & & \\ 6 & 4 & 1 & 3 & & & & & & & \\ 5 & & & & & & & & & & \end{array} & & \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{cccccccc} 8 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 7 & & \\ 6 & 4 & 3 & 2 & & & & & & & \\ 5 & & & & & & & & & & \end{array} \leftarrow 1 & (R1) & \begin{array}{cccccccc} 8 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 7 \\ 7 & 6 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 & 7 & & \\ 6 & 4 & 3 & 2 & & & & & & & \\ 5 & & & & & & & & & & \end{array} & & \\
 \end{array}$$

Lemma 5.6. *The right bumping path and left bumping path are weakly decreasing sequences.*

Proof. Consider right inserting a into row R of a SDT P and assume the insertion does not terminate at this row. Let the row below R be S , a' the element left inserted into R , b the element right inserted to S , and b' the element left inserted to S .

Right bumping path: Let y be the element in S below a after a is right inserted into R . If $|b| \leq |y|$, then we can see the right bumping path will be weakly decreasing. Now we assume $|b| > |y|$ for the sake of contradiction. By the definition of left insertion we have that $|a'| > |b|$. Since $|y| < |b| < |a'|$ and $a' \in R^\uparrow$, we see $y < a'$. Since b is the output of the left insertion of a' into R^\downarrow , either a' or b is in R^\downarrow . Next we discuss the two cases and find contradiction in each of them.

Case 1: Suppose the right insertion of a into R triggers (R1) or (R2), so a' is above y in P . Then the presence of a' or b in R^\downarrow witnesses $y < a'$, so P is not a SDT and we get a contradiction.

Case 2: Suppose the right insertion of a into R triggers (R3). Let z be the (possibly infinite) value after a in R^\uparrow . By the definition of (R3) we have $|a'| \leq |z|$. Also $|a'| > |y|$, so $|a'| \in (|y|, |z|]$.

Case 2.1: Suppose $b \in R^\downarrow$. Since $|y| < |b| < |a'|$, we have $|b| \in (|y|, |q|)$, by the definition of (R3) would give $b = a'$, a contradiction.

Case 2.2: Suppose $a' \in R^\downarrow$ and $b \notin R^\downarrow$, then we know the left insertion of a' into R^\downarrow will trigger (L3). By the definition of (R3) every element between $a' \in R^\downarrow$ and $a \in R^\uparrow$ must be less than or equal to $|y|$, as otherwise a different element would be left inserted. Combining this observation with the fact that $|y| < |b| < |a'|$, and the definition of (L3) shows that b is strictly to the right of a' in S . Suppose $b \in S^\uparrow$, then the element above b must be greater than or equal to z (defined at the start of this case). However, as $|b| < |a'| \leq |z|$ we would have had a' witnessing b less than the element above it before insertion, so the tableau wouldn't be a SDT. Therefore, $b \in S^\downarrow$. Let x be the entry above b in R . Since b is to the right of a' and to the left of y , we see x is between $a' \in R^\downarrow$ and $a \in R^\uparrow$. Therefore $|x| \leq |y| < |b|$ so y witnesses $b < x$ in P , a contradiction.

We conclude that the right bumping path of our insertion is weakly decreasing.

Left bumping path: The argument is similar, but not identical to the previous case. If $b' = \infty$, which is the (L1) case, then the result is vacuously true. Otherwise the left bumping path will be weakly decreasing if $|b'| \geq |x|$ or if $x \in S^\uparrow$, where x is the element below a' after a' was left inserted into R . For the sake of contradiction, we suppose that $|b'| < |x|$ with $x \in S^\downarrow$. By the definition of right insertion we have $|b| < |b'|$, so $|b| < |x|$ as well. Next we discuss the two cases and find contradiction in each of them.

Case 1: Suppose b was bumped by a' using (L1). Since b' is left inserted into S we must have either b or b' in S^\uparrow . If b or b' is to the left of x , then $x \in S^\downarrow$ as $|b| < |b'| < |x|$ which contradicts our assumption that $x \in S^\uparrow$. If b or b' is to the right of x , then we have $x < b$ in P witnessed by b or b' , which is a contradiction.

Case 2: Suppose a' is left inserted using (L2), hence $a' \in R^\downarrow$. If $b' \in S$, since $|b'| \in (|b|, |x|)$ the insertion of a' by (L2) would bump b' instead of b , a contradiction. Necessarily, when b is right inserted to S it triggers (R3), outputting b' . Therefore we $b \in S^\uparrow$ and b' is in the row below S in P .

Let z be the element in S above b' , and note z is to the right of b by the definition of (R3), hence also to the right of x . Since $x \in S^\downarrow$, we must be in case (I) of (L2). Suppose $|z| < |x|$, then we have

$|r_{j+1}| < |b| < |z| < |x|$ and $A \neq \emptyset$, which will cause (L3) to output a $|z|$ instead of $|b|$. Therefore we must have $|z| \geq |x|$.

However now we have $b' < z$ witnessed by x , hence P is not a SDT. This is a contradiction, which completes our proof. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Right insertion outputs a greater number than the input and left insertion outputs a smaller number than the input.*

Proof. The result is clearly true for (R1), (R2), and (L1). Let $R = r_1, \dots, r_\ell$ be the row we are inserting into and $S = s_2 \dots s_k$ the row below R . We first consider (R3). Let a be the element right inserted and b be the output from this right insertion. By the definition of (R3) a must already be in the increasing part of the row, say $r_i = a$ in R^\uparrow . Further, we have $b \in (s_i, r_{i+1})$ or $b = r_{i+1}$, which is greater than $r_i = a$ as r_i is in R^\uparrow . Therefore if $a \geq b$ then $b \in (s_i, r_{i+1})$ so $r_i = a \geq b > s_i$, hence b witnesses r_i over s_i . Therefore, we have $a < b$.

Next we consider the case (L2). Let c be the element left inserted and d be the output from this left insertion. By definition of (L2) c must already be in the decreasing part of the row, say $r_j = c$ in R^\downarrow . Further, by our last case we know that c cannot be the dip of R . In case (II) we either have $d = r_{j+1} < r_j = c$ or we have $d = s_{j+1}$. In (b) of the latter case, either $d = s_{j+1} < r_{j+1} < r_j = c$ or $d = s_{j+1} < r_j = c$. Now for case (I) suppose that $c \leq d$. If $s_j \in S^\downarrow$, case (I), then we have $d < s_j$ or $d = r_{j+1}$. The latter contradicts $c \leq d$ as c is not the dip, so $d < s_j$. However, if $d < s_j$ then $r_j = a \leq b < s_j$ meaning b witnesses r_j over s_j . Therefore, we have that $c > d$. \square

Corollary 5.8. *Right insertion can never output the dip.*

Proof. Right insertion always ends with the input being in the increasing part of the row, thus as the output is greater than the input we cannot output the dip. \square

We are now prepared to show that row insertion is well-defined.

Proposition 5.9. *Given an $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and T a strict decomposition tableau, the tableau $T' = T \leftarrow a$ is also a strict decomposition tableau.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.6, we have that row insertion always outputs a tableau of a shifted shape as the only way for the tableau to not have a shifted shape is to have right insertion terminate to make the number of boxes in row R_k equal to the number of boxes in row R_{k-1} . However, in that case the right bumping path would go from a value less than or equal to $k - 1 + \lambda_{k-1}$ to $k + \lambda_{k-1}$ contradicting that the right bumping path is a weakly decreasing sequence.

By Lemma 4.4, a strict decomposition tableau has unimodal rows and avoids the five following configurations:

$$(i) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline a & \cdots & \\ \hline \cdots & & b \\ \hline \end{array}, (ii) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & a & \cdots & \\ \hline \cdots & c & \cdots & b \\ \hline \end{array}, (iii) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & v & z & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & \cdots & x & \cdots & y \\ \hline \end{array}, (iv) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline y & \cdots & z \\ \hline \cdots & & x \\ \hline \end{array}, (v) \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & y & \cdots & z \\ \hline \cdots & & \cdots & x \\ \hline \end{array}$$

with $a \leq b < c$, $x < y \leq z$, and $v < z$. In this argument, we can treat (iv) and (v) together.

Each insertion step preserves unimodality of rows with the exception of (R2). However, (R2) is always followed by (L1) meaning that unimodality of the rows will be regained after the next insertion step. Therefore, the result will follow if we show an insertion step resulting in the tableau T' containing a bad configuration can only occur when T is not a (pseudo) strict decomposition tableau. We will denote each case as a triple: the configuration found in T' , the element in the configuration that was inserted, and \mathbf{R} or \mathbf{L} depending on whether the insertion was right insertion or left insertion. For each case let t be the element that was bumped out by the whatever created the bad configuration. Further, let $R = r_1 \dots r_\ell$ be the top of row of the configuration and $S = s_2 \dots s_k$ the bottom row. Note if t was bumped by u via right insertion then $t > u$ and if via left insertion $t < u$.

Case (i, a, R): This is only possible if R is increasing. Then r_1 witnesses r_2 over s_2 , so this is impossible.

Case (i, a, L): As $t < a \leq b$ we have that t and b form configuration (i).

Case (i, b, R): As $a \leq b < t$ we have that a and t form configuration (i).

Case (i, b, L): For b to be left inserted into S , either b was already in S or it was in the row below. In the first case we already have configuration (i) with a and b . In the second case, in order to avoid configuration (i) the first element s_2 of S must be greater than b . However, that would mean $a \leq b < s_2$ forms configuration (i).

Case (ii, a, R): As t is bumped via right insertion we have $t \in R^\uparrow$, and as $c > b$ we have that $c \in S^\downarrow$. Therefore as $b < c$, b witnesses t over c .

Case (ii, a, L): As $t < a \leq b < c$ we have that t , b , and c form configuration (ii).

Case (ii, b, R): If $t < c$, then a , t , and c form configuration (ii), as $a \leq b < t$. Therefore, assume $t \geq c$. Then $c \in S^\downarrow$ as otherwise b would have bumped c . In order for b to be right inserted into S we must have had b in R or S before the last insertion step. If b was in R , we have $b \in R^\downarrow$ as it is the output of left insertion. Then b was to the left of a , so it would witness a over c since $c \in S^\downarrow$ and $a < b < c$. Therefore, we have $b \in S$. As $c \in S^\downarrow$ we must have that b is right of c , so a , b , and c already formed configuration (ii).

Case (ii, b, L): If $t \geq a$, we see a , t , and c form configuration (ii) as $a \leq t < b < c$. Therefore, assume $t < a$. For b to be left inserted into S , the element g that was right inserted into S must be less than b by Lemma 5.7. Furthermore, before right insertion of g we must have $b \notin S^\uparrow$, else a , b , and c would already form configuration (ii). This implies the insertion rule for g is (R3) and b is in the row below S . Then (R3) guarantees b is below the entry h to the right of g and $h > b$. If $h < c$, then a , h and c form configuration (ii). Therefore $h \geq c$, in which case b , c and h from configuration (iv/v).

Case (ii, c, R): Impossible as $c > b$ meaning $c \in S^\downarrow$.

Case (ii, c, L): If $t > b$, then $a \leq b < t$ forms configuration (ii). Therefore, assume that $t \leq b$. For c to be left inserted into S , it must be the output of the right insertion of some h into S with $h < c$ by Lemma 5.7. Further, we must have $b < h$ as otherwise h would bump an less than c as $t \leq b$ implies $b \in S^\uparrow$. Let g be the element that was left inserted into R to output h . By Lemma 5.6 we have that whatever g bumps is weakly right of the position where a will be (if not there already). Therefore, we have that $g \leq a$ as it either bumps a , an element right of a in R^\downarrow , or is a . By Lemma 5.7 we have that $g > h$, however we also have that $g \leq a \leq b \leq h$. Thus, we could not have c bump $t \leq b$.

Case (iii, v, R): As t bumps v not z we must have that $t < z$. Therefore, $x < y \leq z$ and $t < z$ forms configuration (iii).

Case (iii, v, L): As $t < v$, we have that $x < y \leq z$ and $t < z$ forms configuration (iii).

Case (iii, x, R): As $z \in R^\uparrow$ and either $t < y$ or $t \in S^\downarrow$ we have that y witnesses z over t .

Case (iii, x, L): As $z \in R^\uparrow$ and $t \in S^\downarrow$ we have that y witnesses z over t .

Case (iii, y, R): If $t \leq z$, then x , t , z , and v form configuration (iii). Therefore, assume $t > z$. In order for t to be bumped by y we require that the element s directly left of t is less than y . Further, $s \leq x$, as otherwise s forms configuration (iii) with x , z , and v . If s is not x (in position), then $x \in S^\downarrow$ so s witnesses z over x . Therefore, x is s , i.e., x must be directly left of t . In order for y to be right inserted into S we require $y \in R$ or $y \in S$ before the prior insertion step. If $y \in R$ then $v < z$ implies $z \in R^\uparrow$ so y would be left of z . Therefore x , y , and z would form configuration (iv/v), so we can assume $y \in S$. However, by definition of (L3) this would require that $y \in S^\uparrow$ which cannot happen as $x < y < t$ with x and t next to each other.

Case (iii, y, L): This requires that $t \in S^\downarrow$, but that would mean $x \in S^\downarrow$. This is a contradiction as y could not bump t with $x > t$ left of t .

Case (iii, z, R): As $t > z$ we have that x , y , t , and v form configuration (iii).

Case (iii, z, L): As $v < z$ this would require left inserting z into R^\uparrow which is impossible.

Case (iv/v, x, R): If $t < y$, then $t < y \leq z$ forms configuration (iv/v) . Therefore, assume that $t \geq y$. Let g be the element left inserted in the step before and let h be the element right inserted in the step before that. By Lemma 5.6 h inserts into a location weakly right of the column in R containing z . Thus, $h \geq z$ as either $h = z$ or h bumps an element right of z . Then by Lemma 5.7 we have that $h < g$, thus $g > z$.

If $y \in R^\downarrow$, since $g > z \geq y$ we see g must bump an element $\geq y$ unless we are in case (L3), hence g is already in R^\downarrow in column j . If we are in case (I), necessarily $x = \max(B)$ as elements of A are $\geq y$, so y is the dip of R and the element left of y is already g . Since $x = \max(B)$, either x is immediately below y or in S^\uparrow . In the former case, y is positive since it is the dip so t witnesses y over x . In the latter case, x would not bump t . If we are in case (II), note that $r_{j+1} \geq y > x$ so we must output $x = s_{j+1}$. However, then $x \in S^\uparrow$, which would again prevent x from bumping t when we right insert x .

Therefore, we must have $y \in R^\uparrow$ with some $v < y$ directly left of y . Let u be the element directly below y . We have that either $u \in S^\downarrow$ or $u \in S^\uparrow$ with $u < x$ so that x does not bump u . If $u \in S^\downarrow$, then x could not be in R or in S right of u before left insertion of g as otherwise x would witness y over u . Therefore, in this case we also have $u < x$. Thus, after right insertion of x we have that $u < x < y$ and $v < y$ forms configuration (iii). As shown in **Case (iii, y, R)** this cannot happen.

Case (iv/v, x, L): As $t < x$ we have that t, y , and z form configuration (iv/v) .

Case (iv/v, y, R): As $t \in R^\uparrow$ and left of z we have that $t < z$. Then as $t > y > x$ we have that x, t , and z form configuration (iv/v) .

Case (iv/v, y, L): If $t > x$, then as $t < y \leq z$ we have that x, t , and z form configuration (iv/v) . Therefore, assume that $t \leq x$. Before left insertion of y we have $y \notin R$ as otherwise x, y , and z would already form configuration (iv/v) . Thus, $y \in S$. Let g be the element that was right inserted in order for us to end up left inserting y . Let h be the element directly below where g ends up after being inserted. By definition of (R3) we have $y > h$ and $x \leq h$ in order for y to be the element left inserted instead of x . If $h \in S^\uparrow$ we must have h weakly right of x and thus g weakly right of z , so y is strictly right of x and witnesses z over x . If $h \in S^\downarrow$, then g over h would be witnessed by x unless $h = x$. In that case, we also have $z = g \in R^\uparrow$ and $t < x$ as if t is left of $h \in S^\downarrow$. Therefore t, h, z , and the element directly left of z form configuration (iv/v) .

Case (iv/v, z, R): As $t > z$, we have that x, y , and t form configuration (iv/v) .

Case (iv/v, z, L): As $t \in R^\downarrow$ and is right of y we have that $y > t$. However, then we could never bump t by left inserting z . □

Two words with the same Kraškievich tableaux P are necessarily reduced words for the same signed permutation. Similarly, the Kraškievich–Hecke insertion tableau for a word determines its 0-Hecke product.

Proposition 5.10. *Let T be a SDT and $\rho(T)$ be its reading word. For $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and $T' = T \leftarrow a$ we have that $\rho(T)a \equiv_H \rho(T')$.*

Proof. The result follows if when a is row inserted into the two-row SDT RS bumping b , we have $SRa \equiv_H SbR'$. Throughout this proof, we fix notation: p is the dip of S ; q is the dip of R ; i and j are the indices defined in right and left row insertion, respectively.

First, we treat the case where $a = 0$ and $r_i = 0, r_{i+1} = 1$ in R . In this case, we will show $b = 0$.

- (R2)/(L1) Assume $r_{i-1} > 1$ so that r_{i+1} is the only 1 in R . When 0 is inserted 0 will bump $r_{i+1} = 1$ which in turn will bump $r_i = 0$. The overall result is R' will be R with r_i and r_{i+1} swapped and the output to the next row is 0. To see that $SR0 \equiv_H S0R'$ commute 0 up to $r_{i+1} = 1$, then commute $r_i = 0$ up to S as $r_k > 1$ for $k < i$. This effectively swaps the values of r_i and r_{i+1} , thus showing that $SR0 \equiv_H S0R'$.
- (R3)/(L2) Assume $r_{i-1} = 1$. Note that in this case (R3) will always output $r_{i+1} = 1$ and (L2) will always output 0, both leaving R unchanged. To see $SR0 \equiv_H S0R$, first commute $a = 0$ up to $r_{i+1} = 1$, then perform a long braid with $r_{i-1} = 1, r_i = 0, r_{i+1} = 1$, and $a = 0$ to get 0 on the other side of 101. Next, commute the left 0 past the rest of R^\downarrow .

Now assume either that $a \neq 0$ or R does not contain 0 followed by 1. Let a' be the entry bumped when right inserting a , and recall that $a' > a$. First we will show $SRa \equiv_H SR^\downarrow a' R''^\uparrow$.

- (R1) Let right insertion of a into R trigger (R1). Then $r_i \geq a + 1$ is not the dip. Therefore, we can commute a up to r_i since all entries to its right are greater than r_i . Since $r_{i-1} < a$ as i is not the dip, we can commute r_i past r_q , giving us that $SRa \equiv_H SR^\downarrow a' R''^\uparrow$.
- (R2) Let right insertion of a into R trigger (R2), so $r_i = a$. Recall $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\{x, y\} \neq \{0, 1\}$ we have the short braid relation $xyx \equiv_H yxy$. Therefore we can commute a up to r_{i+1} , to get the desired result, taking $r_i \in R^\downarrow$.
- (R3) Let right insertion of a into R trigger (R3). We split into cases, depending on where a' is located. When $a' = r_{i+1}$, the argument is the same as (R2) except after braiding we commute the left instance of $a' = r_{i+1}$ past the dip.

Otherwise, $a' \in (s_i, r_{i+1})$, which implies $s_i < r_{i+1} - 1$ so we cannot have $r_{i+1} = a + 1$ without a' witnessing $s_i < r_i = a$. Therefore, we can commute a up to $r_i = a$ and annihilate a . It remains to get a copy of a' directly after r_q .

Suppose that $a' \in S$, then a' is to the right of s_i , which implies that the element above it is greater than or equal to r_{i+1} . Therefore there are no elements in $(a', r_{i+1}]$ between a' and r_i . If there is no $a' - 1$ between a' and r_q , then a copy of a' could commute all the way up to r_q and we are done. Suppose there is an $a' - 1$ between a' and r_q (note this means that $a' - 1 \neq 0$), this requires that $a' - 1 \notin (s_i, r_{i+1})$ by definition of a' meaning that $a' = s_i + 1$. Then as there are no elements in $(a', r_{i+1}]$ between a' and r_i we can commute the pair of s_i and a' up to the $a' - 1$, possibly annihilating an a' immediately preceding the $a' - 1$ in R . Then duplicate s_i and perform a short braid relation with the s_i , a' , and $a' - 1$. Finally, commute back $a' - 1$ and a' , possibly leaving behind a duplicate of the left a' , and commute forward up to the dip the extra copy of a' .

Suppose that $a' \in R^\downarrow$, then a' is to the left of r_i in R . If $a' - 1 \notin R^\downarrow$, we can copy a' and commute the copy up to r_q . If $a' - 1 \in R^\downarrow$, then by definition of a' we must have that $a' - 1 = s_i$, as otherwise we would have a different value for a' . Further, there can be no $s_i - 1$ in S after s_i , as the element above such a $s_i - 1$ would be witnessed by a' . The case where $s_i + 1$ is to the right of s_i in S is treated above. Therefore, we can duplicate s_i in S , then commute the duplicate up to a' , short braid the duplicate, a' , and $a' - 1$, and then commute the copy of a' made up to r_q .

Now we left insert whatever a' was the output from right insertion. In right insertion we addressed the case where $a = 0$ and R contains 0 followed by 1, so for left insertion we already have the case where $a' = 1$ and R'' contains 1 followed by 0. We now show $SR^\downarrow a' R''^\uparrow \equiv_H SbR'$.

- (L1) Let left insertion of a' into R'' trigger (L1). This then means that r_j is the greatest element in R''^\downarrow less than a' and $a' \notin R''^\downarrow$. Therefore, we can commute a' up to r_j and then commute r_j past the rest of R''^\downarrow for the desired outcome.
- (L2) Let left insertion of a' into R'' trigger (L2), so $a' = r_j$. We have already treated the case $a' = 1$. First assume $r_{j+1} = a' - 1$ and $j + 1$ is not the dip of R'' . In this case condition (a) in (L2) is always false, so either $b = \max A$ or $b = r_{j+1}$. When $b = \max A$, for A to be nonempty we have $r_j < s_j$ as $r_{j+1} = r_j - 1$. However as $r_j \in R''^\downarrow$ and $s_j \in S^\downarrow$, so b would witness r_j over s_j . Therefore, we must have $b = r_{j+1} = a' - 1$. Note $b > 0$ since $b = r_{j+1}$ is not the dip. Therefore we can braid r_j, r_{j+1} , and a' to get a copy of $b = a' - 1$ on the other side, which can then commute past the rest of R'' . Now we consider the cases where $r_{j+1} \neq a' - 1$ or is the dip. In both cases a' can freely commute to $r_j = a'$ to be annihilated as the insertion element is considered to be past the dip. Thus, we aim to show that $SR'' \equiv_H Sa'R'$.

First, suppose that $b = \max A$ or $b = \max B$. If there is no $b + 1$ between b and the end of S we can freely commute b to the end of S and be done. Otherwise, since $b + 1 \notin A$ or B (depending on the case), we see $b + 1 \geq s_j$, but $b < s_j$ so we have $b + 1 = s_j$. If $b \in R$, necessarily $b > a'$ meaning that $s_j > a' = r_j$, which a' would witness. Therefore, $b \in S$. We create a copy of s_j then commute the copy to $b = s_j - 1$. Then perform a braid relation and commute out of S the extra copy of a' .

Now suppose that $b = s_{j+1}$, $b \neq \max A$, and $a \neq \max B$. This means $s_{j+1} \in S^\uparrow$ by condition (b) from (L2). Note condition (c) from (L2) prevents us from having $s_{j+1} + 1 \in S^\uparrow$ as either $s_{j+1} + 1$ witnesses $s_{j+1} < r_{j+1}$ or $s_{j+1} < r_j < s_{j+2}$, meaning $s_{j+2} > s_{j+1} + 1$. Therefore, a copy of b made by s_{j+1} can freely commute out of S .

Finally, when $b = r_{j+1}$ since we have assumed either r_{j+1} is the dip or $r_j \neq b + 1$ there is no obstruction to commuting a copy of b past the rest of R'' .

This completes our proof. \square

For $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$ a strict shape, we will see for words in $\mathcal{H}(w_\lambda)$ that $Q_K H$ and res are the same map. Towards that end, let $(c_1 < \dots < c_{\lambda_1 - k})$ so that $[0, \lambda_1 - 1] = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k, c_1, \dots, c_{\lambda_1 - k}\}$ and define P^λ as the tableau with i th row

$$\lambda_{i+1}, \dots, \lambda_k, 0 (= \lambda_{k+1}), c_1, \dots, c_{\lambda_1 - k + i},$$

so that P_λ has shape λ . By construction, note that every column of P^λ has the same entry. Moreover, we obtain $P^{(\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k)}$ from P^λ by removing the first row. For example, with $\lambda = (5, 3, 2)$, we have

$$P^{(5,3,2)} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 4 \\ \hline & 2 & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline & & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array},$$

while the second and third rows give $P^{(3,2)}$ and the last is $P^{(2)}$.

Note that $\lambda_i - 1$ is the largest entry in the i th row of P^λ . When (i, j) is an outer corner of D_λ , we then have $P_{ij}^\lambda = \lambda_i - 1$ since $\lambda_{i+1} < \lambda_i - 1$.

Theorem 5.11. *Let $T \in \text{ShSVT}(\lambda)$, and let $\mathbf{a} = \text{res}(T)$. Then KH maps \mathbf{a} to (P^λ, T) .*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{a} = \text{res}(T)$, we see $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{H}(w_\lambda)$. For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_p)$ and $j \in [p]$, note that $\mathbf{a}[j] := (a_1, \dots, a_j) \in \mathcal{H}(w_{\mu^{(j)}})$ for some strict shape $\mu^{(j)}$. Since w_μ is vexillary for any μ , Theorem 1.4 shows $P_{KH}(\mathbf{a}[j])$ is unique. We can now prove our result by downward induction on k . The base case is immediate since any word \mathbf{a} for w_λ has $a_1 = 0$, so the $j = 1$ case follows.

Assume the result holds for up to k , so $(P^{\mu^{(k)}}, T|_{[k]})$ is the image of $\mathbf{a}[k]$ under KH . The next step is to insert a_{k+1} into $P^{\mu^{(k)}}$ to obtain P' , with resulting recording tableau Q' . There are two cases.

Case 1: $P' = P^{\mu^{(k)}}$. In this case, we see $w_{\mu^{(k)}} \circ a_{k+1} = w_{\mu^{(k)}}$, so $k+1 \in T_{ij}$ and is not minimal in this cell since $(i, j) \in D_{\mu^{(k)}}$. Then (i, j) is an outer corner of $\mu^{(k)}$ so $j = \mu_i^{(k)} + i - 1$. Then $a_{k+1} = (j - i) = \mu_i^{(k)} - 1$.

We a_{k+1} inserts into $P_{\mu^{(k)}}$ without changing it, terminating in row j . To see this, for R_ℓ the ℓ th row of P^λ note $a_{k+1} \in R_\ell^\uparrow$ for $\ell \leq i$. For the first step of insertion, we are in (R3). If $i = 1$, we see a_{k+1} is the largest entry in the first row, so we terminate in row 1 as desired. Otherwise, a' is the smallest entry in R_1^\downarrow greater than a_{k+1} , which is $\mu_i^{(k)}$. Left inserting $\mu_i^{(k)}$ uses (L2), which bumps $a'' = \mu_i^{(k)} - 1 = a_{k+1}$ as this value is maximal in the appropriate interval. We are now inserting a_{k+1} into the second row of $P^{\mu^{(k)}}$, which is P^ν for ν obtained from $\mu^{(k)}$ by deleting the first row. The result then follows by the inductive hypothesis.

Case 2: $P' \neq P^{\mu^{(k)}}$. By the previous case, we see $\mu^{(k+1)} \neq \mu^{(k)}$. Let (i, j) be the unique cell in $D_{\mu^{(k+1)}} \setminus D_{\mu^{(k)}}$, so $j = \mu_i^{(k+1)} + i - 1 = \mu_i^{(k)} + i$. Then $a_{k+1} = j - i = \mu_i^{(k)}$.

If $i = 1$, when inserting a_{k+1} we apply (R1) to append it to the end of the first row, giving $P' = P^{\mu^{(k+1)}}$ as desired. Otherwise, let R be the first row of $P^{\mu^{(k)}}$ and R' the result after KH -inserting a_{k+1} into R . Since $\mu_i^{(k)}$ is in R^\downarrow and $\mu_i^{(k)} + 1$ is in R^\uparrow , by applying rules (R1) and (L1) we swap these to obtain R' , inserting $\mu_i^{(k)}$ into the next row. Applying induction on i as in the previous case, this process will terminate by inserting a_{k+1} at the end of the i th row while swapping $\mu_i^{(k)}$ with $\mu_i^{(k)} + 1 = \mu_i^{(k+1)}$ as desired. This completes our proof. \square

Case 2 in the above argument appears in the second author's thesis [16, Thm. 4.4 (a)]. It implies the equivalent result for tableaux that are not set-valued, where Kraśkiewicz insertion is applicable. It has not been previously published.

5.2. Inverse insertion. In order to show that Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion is a bijection we will first show that the map is injective and then create an explicit inverse map.

Proposition 5.12. *Let M, N, T be SDTs and $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$. If right inserting x into M at row k and right inserting y into N at row k both output left inserting z into T at row k , then $M = N$ and $x = y$. Similarly, if left inserting x into M at row k and left inserting y into N at row k both output right inserting z into T at row $k + 1$, then $M = N$ and $x = y$.*

Proof. Let M, N, T be SDTs and $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose right inserting x into M at row k and right inserting y into N at row k both output left inserting z into T at row k .

Case 1: Suppose inserting x into M triggers rule (R1). Let $m_i = z$ be the element x bumped.

Case 1.1: Suppose inserting y into N would trigger rule (R1). Then in order for the resulting tableau to be T and output to be z we require that position i is where bumping occurs, $n_i = z$, and $y = x$. Thus, $M = N$ and $y = x$.

Case 1.2: Suppose inserting y into N would trigger rule (R2). Then T would have two y s in row k , however as inserting x into N triggered (R1) we know row k in T is strictly unimodal. Therefore, inserting y into N cannot trigger (R2).

Case 1.3: Suppose inserting y into N would trigger rule (R3), note this means that $N = T$. By definition of (R1) we have that $m_{i+1} > z$. Therefore, we require that $y = x$ as if $y < x$ then we could not output $z > x$ and if $y > x$ we would also require $y > z$. Further as $m_{i+1} > z$ we cannot output m_{i+1} , meaning that the output z is somewhere right of s_i (the element below m_i) in row $k+1$ or left of m_i in row k of N . However, we must have that this z is also in M , but then z would witness $s_i < z = m_i$ in M meaning M was not a SDT. Therefore, inserting y into N cannot trigger (R3).

Case 2: Suppose inserting x into M triggers rule (R2). Let $m_i = x$ and $m_{i+1} = z$ where i is the location bumping occurred at.

Case 2.2: Suppose inserting y into N would trigger rule (R2). In order to end up with output tableau T we require that $x = y$ and in order to output z we require that the element bumped by x is z . Therefore, $N = M$ and $y = x$.

Case 2.3: Suppose inserting y into N would trigger rule (R3), note this means that $N = T$. However, T is a pseudo-SDT and N is not. Therefore, this cannot happen.

Case 3: Suppose inserting x into M triggers rule (R3).

Case 3.3: Suppose inserting y into N would trigger rule (R3), note this means that $N = T = M$. Suppose $x < y$. By Lemma 5.7 we have that $z > y$ from inserting into N , however by definition of (R3) for inserting into M we have that $z \leq y$ as the output is at most the value directly right of the copy of the input. Therefore, we cannot have $x \neq y$.

Let M, N, T be SDTs and $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose left inserting x into M at row k and left inserting y into N at row k both output left inserting z into T at row k .

Case 1: Suppose inserting x into M triggers rule (L1). Let $m_j = z$ be the element x bumped.

Case 1.1: Suppose inserting y into N would trigger rule (L1). In order for the resulting tableau to be T and output z we require that position j is where bumping occurs, $n_j = z$, and $y = x$. Thus, $M = N$ and $y = x$.

Case 1.2: Suppose inserting y into N would trigger rule (L2), note this means that $N = T$. By definition of (L1) we have that $x > z$. Suppose that $y < x$, then in order for $N = T$ we require that in M y is right on $m_j = z$ meaning $z > y$. However this contradicts Lemma 5.7. Suppose $y > x$. Note that as $N = T$ we have that x is in N and by Corollary 5.8 x cannot be the dip. Thus, by definition of (L2) the output must be greater or equal to x meaning we cannot be in this case. Suppose $y = x$. If $j < p$, the dip of the row $k+1$ of N , then we must have $z < s_j$. However, then the z we output from inserting x into N serve as a witness in M meaning M is not a SDT. Therefore, we have that $j \geq p$. This then requires that $s_{j+1} = z$ and $r_{j+2}, s_{j+2} > x$ (as we know $r_{j+1} > z$ due to z being the element bumped when x is inserted into M). However, this then prevents another x from existing in any location that would allow it to end being left inserted into N meaning this cannot happen. Therefore, inserting y into N cannot trigger rule (L2).

Case 2: Suppose inserting x into M triggers rule (L2).

Case 2.2: Suppose inserting y into N would trigger rule (L2), note this means that $M = N = T$ so suppose $x \neq y$. Without loss of generality suppose $x < y$. By Corollary 5.8 x cannot be the dip, therefore when inserting y we cannot output an element less than x . However, $z < x$ meaning this case cannot happen. \square

To prove that Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion is a bijection, we demonstrate an explicit inverse map.

Definition 5.13. We define *inverse Kraśkiewicz–Hecke row insertion* in two steps, each using an input $a \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and a strict decomposition tableau with distinguished row R above row S . Write $R = r_1 \dots r_\ell$ and $S = s_2 \dots s_k$ with $k \leq \ell$, r_q the dip of R and s_p the dip of S . Note k could be 1, in which case S is empty. Set $r_0, s_1 = -\infty$, $r_{\ell+1} = \infty$ and $s_m = \infty$ for $m > k$. Note r_i appears immediately above s_i in RS . For any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, define $A_d = \{s_{d+1}, \dots, s_k, r_1, \dots, r_{d-1}\}$. There are two forms of inverse insertion, *left*

inverse insertion and *right inverse insertion*. First we define left inverse insertion, for which we require the terminating tableau from right inserting a into row S to be a SDT.

Let $1 \leq j < q$ be maximal such that $r_j > a$.

- (I) If $j < p$:
- (a) If $j + 1 < q$ and $a = \max\{r_{j+1}\} \cup (A_j \cap (r_{j+1}, s_j))$, then go to (L2)
 - (b) If $j + 1 \geq q$ and $a = \max\{r_{j+1}\} \cup (A_j \cap (-\infty, s_j))$, then go to (L2)
- Otherwise, go to (L1)
- (II) If $j \geq p$:
- (a) If the following are both true, go to (L2)
 - (i) $j + 1 \geq q$,
 - (ii) $a = s_{j+1} < r_{j+1}$ or $r_{j+2}, s_{j+2} > r_j > s_{j+1} = a$.
 - (b) Otherwise, if $a = r_{j+1}$, and either of the following are true, go to (L2)
 - (i) $r_{j+2} \leq r_j$, or
 - (ii) $s_{j+1} < r_j$ and there exists $k \geq j + 2$ such that $s_k \in (s_{j+1}, r_j]$,
- Otherwise go to (L1).
- (L2) Set $a' = r_j$ and $R'' = R$.
- (L1) Set $a' = r_j$ and replace r_j with a to get R'' .

We now define inverse right insertion, for which we require the terminating tableau from left inserting a' into R'' to be a SDT. Let $q \leq i \leq \ell$ be maximal such that $r_i \leq a'$:

- (R3) (I) If $s_i < a'$ and

$$a' = \min((s_i, r_{i+1}) \cap A_i),$$

then set $R' = R''$ and $b = r_i$.

- (II) If $a' = r_i$, $r_i \geq r_{i-2}$, and

$$a' = \min(\{r_i\} \cup [(s_{i-1}, r_i) \cap A_{i-1}],)$$

then set $R' = R''$ and $b = r_{i-1}$.

- (R1/R2) Else, set $b = r_i$ and create R' by setting $r_i = a'$.

Example 5.14. We present examples of the various steps of the inverse insertion.

- (1) Left inverse inserting 1 into the top row of the tableau below is undefined as if you right insert 1 into the row below the tableau is no longer an SDT.

$$1 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 3 & 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 3 & 2 & \leftarrow 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 3 & 2 & 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

- (2) Here $r_j = 2$. None of the conditions for (L2) are met, so we set $a' = r_j = 2$ and swap a and r_j to get R' .

$$0 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 2 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 2$$

- (3) Here $r_j = 3$. As $j = 2 < p = 3$, $j + 1 = 3 < q = 4$, and $\max\{1\} \cup [(1, 3) \cap \{2, 4\}] = 2 = a$, we set $a' = r_j$.

$$2 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 3 & 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 3 & 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 3$$

- (4) Here $r_j = 1$. As $j = 2 < p = 3$ and $j + 1 = 3 \geq q = 3$, and $\max\{0\} \cup [(-\infty, 3) \cap \{0, 4\}] = 0 = a$, we set $a' = r_j$.

$$0 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline & 3 & 0 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline & 3 & 0 & \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 1$$

- (5) Here $r_j = 4$. We are in case (II) (a) as $j+1 = 3 \geq q = 3$, $j = 2 \geq p = 2$, and $r_{j+1} = 2 > s_{j+1} = 1 = a$. Thus, we set $a' = r_j = 4$.

$$1 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 5 & 4 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 5 & 4 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 4$$

- (6) Here $r_j = 2$. We are in case (II) (a) as $j+1 = 3 \geq q = 3$, $j = 2 \geq p = 2$, and $r_{j+2}, s_{j+2} = 3, 3 > r_j = 2 > s_{j+1} = 1 = a$. Thus, we set $a' = r_j = 2$.

$$1 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 2$$

- (7) Here $r_j = 2$. As $j = 2 \geq p = 2$ we are in case (II). As $a \neq s_{j+1}$ and $a = r_{j+1} = 1$, we consider case (b). As $0 = r_{j+2} \leq r_j = 2$ we set $a' = r_j$.

$$1 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline & 2 & 3 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline & 2 & 3 & \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 2$$

- (8) Here $r_j = 3$. As $j = 1 \geq p = 2$ we are in case (II). As $a = 0 \not\prec r_{j+1} = 0$ and $r_{j+2} = 2 \not\prec 3 = r_j$ (ii) is false meaning we aren't in case (a). As $a = r_{j+1} = 0$, $s_{j+1} = 1 < 3 = r_j$, and $s_3 \in (0, 3]$ we are in case (b) meaning we set $a' = 3 = r_j$.

$$0 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 0$$

- (9) Here $r_j = 2$. As $j = 2 \geq p = 2$ we are in case (II). As $a = 0 \neq 1 = s_{j+1}$ (ii) is false meaning we aren't in case (a). As $r_{j+2} = 3 \not\prec 2 = r_j$ and there is not $k \geq j+2$ such that $s_k \in (1, 3]$, we are also not in case (b). Therefore (L1) applies setting $a' = 2$ and replacing r_j with 0 to get R' .

$$0 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 2 & 0 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 2$$

- (10) Here $r_i = 0$. As $\{3, 0\} \cap (0, 1) = \emptyset$ and $a' \neq 3$ we are not in case (I). As $a' \neq r_i = 0$, we are also not in case (II). Therefore, we apply (R1/R2) by setting $b = 0$ and replacing r_i with 2.

$$0 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 2 \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 0 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline & 0 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

- (11) Here $r_i = 1$. As $s_i = 1 < a = 2 < r_{i+1} = 3$ and $a = \min(\{3\} \cup [(1, 3) \cap \{4, 2, 0\}]) = 2$, due to (I) we set $b = r_i = 1$ and leave R' unchanged.

$$1 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 0 & 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 2 \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 0 & 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

- (12) Here $r_i = 3$. As $s_i = \infty$ we are not in case (I). As $a' = 3 = r_i \geq 0 = r_{i-2}$ and $a' = \min(\{3\} \cup [(1, 3) \cap \{0, 1, 4\}])$, due to (II) we set $b = r_{i-1} = 3$ and leave R' unchanged.

$$1 \leftarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \rightarrow 3 \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

We now show these inverse maps are well-defined.

Theorem 5.15. *Left and right inverse Kraškievicz–Hecke row insertions are well-defined and are inverse to left and right Kraškievicz–Hecke row insertions, respectively.*

Proof. Note that each inverse insertion step preserves unimodality of rows with the exception of (L1) when $a = r_{j+1}$. However, in that case the next inverse insertion step will restore unimodality of the row as it will always trigger (R1/R2).

To see this we first aim to show that $i = j + 1 = q$. Assume for the sake of obtaining a contradiction, that $r_{j+2} \leq r_j$. We discuss the following two cases.

(I): Suppose $j < p$, where p is the dip of S . Then as left inverse inserting a triggers (L1) we must have that $a \neq \max\{r_{j+1}\} \cup A_j \cap (r_{j+1}, s_j)$ if $j + 1 < q$ or $a \neq \max\{r_{j+1}\} \cup A_j \cap (-\infty, s_j)$ if $j + 1 \geq q$. Therefore, there must exist some $x \in A_j$ such that $a < x < s_j$, take your x to be the topmost, leftmost such element.

Suppose $x \in R$, then as x is left of r_j , x would witness r_j over s_j .

Suppose $x \in S^\downarrow$, then if you would right insert a into S , there would be an a right of x . However, then that a would witness a over x .

Suppose $x \in S^\uparrow$. Let y be the element bumped by right inserting a into S . Note that y must be weakly left of x as $a < x$, meaning $y \leq x < s_j$. Then as $s_{j+1} < a < y < s_j$ we have that left inserting y into S will bump s_{j+1} . However, then $a \in S$ will witness a over y . Thus, we cannot have $j < p$.

(II): Suppose $j \geq p$, then we left inverse inserting a we find (II)(b)(i) is always true meaning we can never trigger (L1).

Therefore, we must have that $i = j + 1$ and is the dip q .

Now suppose that the next inverse insertion step triggers (R3) instead of (R1/R2). Note that $a' = r_j > r_i = a$, so we must satisfy (I). Therefore, $s_i < a'$ and $a' = \min[(s_i, r_{i+1}) \cap A_i]$.

If $j < p$, then in order for inverse left insertion of a to trigger (L1) we must have had that $a \neq \max\{r_{j+1}\} \cup (A_j \cap (r_{j+1}, s_j))$. Note that $a \geq s_i$ as otherwise $\min[(s_i, r_{i+1}) \cap A_i] \leq a$, a contradiction as $a' > a$. However, then x witnesses a over s_i . Thus, we must have that $j \geq p$.

However, as left inverse inserting a trigger (L1) we must have that (II)(b)(ii) is false meaning either $s_{j+1} \geq r_j$ or $s_{j+1} < r_j$ and there does not exist $k \geq j + 2$ such that $s_k \in (s_{j+1}, r_j]$.

If $s_{j+1} \geq r_j = a'$, then $\min[(s_i, r_{i+1}) \cap A_i] = \emptyset$ as $s_i = s_{j+1} \geq r_j = r_{i+1}$.

Otherwise, assume for each $k \geq j + 2$ either $s_k < s_{j+1} = s_i$ or $s_k > r_j = a'$. Note that as every element in R left of r_j is greater than a' , we have that $A_j \cap (s_i, r_{i+1})$ can only contain elements greater than a' . Thus, $a' \neq \min[(s_i, r_{i+1}) \cap A_i]$. This concludes the proof that inverse insertion preserves unimodality.

It remains to show that after each inverse insertion step the tableau remains a (pseduo) strict decomposition tableau. By Lemma 4.5, this is equivalent to saying if inverse insertion results in a tableau with one of the configurations either our original tableau had one of the configurations or we could forward insert our element to get a tableau with one of the configurations. We will denote each case as a triple: the configuration found in T' , the element in the configuration that was inserted, and **R** or **L** depending on whether the insertion was right insertion or left insertion. For each case let t be the element that was bumped out by the whatever created the bad configuration. Further, let $R = r_1 \dots r_\ell$ be the top of row of the configuration and $S = s_2 \dots s_k$ the bottom row. Note if t was bumped by u via right inverse insertion then $t < u$ and if via left insertion inverse $t > u$.

Case (i, a, L): Note that by definition of (L1) we either have that $a \geq r_{j+1}$ or r_{j+1} is the dip where $t = r_j$. If we then right insert a into S by Lemma 5.7 we have that $u > a$ where u is the element a bumps from right insertion. Therefore, after left inserting v into S we have $w > a$ where w is the element below r_{j+1} , note $w \in S^\downarrow$. As either $a \geq r_{j+1}$ or r_{j+1} is the dip we always have that r_{j+1} over w witnesses a .

Case (i, a, R): This requires $a \in R^\downarrow$ after inverse right insertion which cannot happen.

Case (i, b, L): As $t > b \geq a$ we have that a and t form configuration (i).

Case (i, b, R): Left insert b into S will result in $b \in S$ meaning a and b form configuration (i).

Case (ii, a, L): Note that by definition of (L1) we either have that $a \geq r_{j+1}$ or r_{j+1} is the dip where $t = r_j$. If we then right insert a into S by Lemma 5.7 we have that $u > a$ where u is the element a bumps from right insertion. Therefore, after left inserting v into S we have $w > a$ where w is the element below r_{j+1} , note as $c \in S^\downarrow$ and is not the dip, we have that $w \in S^\downarrow$. As either $a \geq r_{j+1}$ or r_{j+1} is the dip we always have that r_{j+1} over w witnesses a .

Case (ii, a, R): As $t < a$ we have that t, b and c form configuration (ii).

Case (ii, b, L): Note that we must have $t \in S^\downarrow$ in order for b to bump it when left inverse inserting. Therefore, we must have that $t < c$. However, as $t > b \leq a$ we then have that a, t , and c form configuration (ii).

Case (ii, b, R): Left inserting b into S will result in b ending up right of c as $c > b$ and $c \in S^\downarrow$. Therefore, after left insertion of b into S the tableau has configuration (ii) made from a, b , and c .

Case (ii, c, L): As $t > c > b \geq a$ we have that a, b , and t form configuration (ii).

Case (ii, c, R): As $t \in S^\uparrow$ and is left of b we have that $t < b$. However, as $c > b$ with b right of t , c cannot bump t from inverse right insertion. Therefore, this case cannot happen.

Case (iii, v, L): Note that as $v < z$ we either have $v \in R^\uparrow$ or v is the dip of R . However, by definition of (L1) we have that $v \in R^\downarrow$ and is not the dip of R .

Case (iii, v, R): As $t < v$ we have that t, x, y , and z form configuration (iii).

Case (iii, x, L): As $t \in S^\downarrow$ and $z \in R^\uparrow$ with $z \geq y$ we have that y witnesses z over t .

Case (iii, v, R): As $t < x$ we have that v, t, y , and z form configuration (iii).

Case (iii, y, L): Note that as $x < y$ we have $y \in R^\uparrow$ meaning this case cannot happen.

Case (iii, y, R): If $x < t$, then as $t < y$ we have that v, x, t , and z form configuration (iii). Thus, suppose $x \geq t$ which requires that $x \in S^\downarrow$. However, as $z \in R^\uparrow$ we will have that t witnesses z over x .

Case (iii, z, L): Note that as $v < z$ we have $z \in R^\uparrow$ meaning this case cannot happen.

Case (iii, z, R): If $t \geq y$, then v, x, y , and t form configuration (iii), so suppose otherwise. Let u be the element above y , as inverse right inserting z bumps t we have that $u > z$. However, after left inserting z into R we will then have that the tableau contains configuration (iv/v) with y, z , and u .

Case (iv/v, x, L): If $t < y$, then t, y , and z form configuration (iv/v) . Therefore, suppose $t \geq y$. However, then as $z \in R^\uparrow$ we have that y witnesses z over t .

Case (iv/v, x, R): As $t < x$ we have that t, y , and z form configuration (iv/v) .

Case (iv/v, y, L): If $t \leq z$, then x, t , and z form configuration (iv/v) . Therefore, suppose $t > z$. If we then right insert y into S we would have that y ends up somewhere right of x as $x < y$. Let w be the element above where y ends up. Note that as z is above x we have that w is right of z and therefore $z < w$. However, we then have that z witnesses w over y .

Case (iv/v, y, R): After left inserting y into R we have that x, y , and z form configuration (iv/v) .

Case (iv/v, z, L): Note that as $y < z$ we have $z \in R^\uparrow$ meaning this case cannot happen.

Case $(iv/v, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{R})$: If $y \in R^\uparrow$, then we require $t > y$ meaning x, y , and t form configuration (iv/v) . Therefore, suppose $y \in R^\downarrow$. Let u be the element z bumps after being left inserted into R , note that $z > u \geq y > x$. As $u > x$ we have that after u is right inserted into S , there is a u right of x . Let w be the element above that u , note that as w is right of t and when inverse right inserted z bumps t we have that $w > z$. Thus, u, z and w form configuration (iv/v) . \square

Definition 5.16. For a pair of a strict decomposition tableau and a standard shifted set valued Young tableau, (T, S) , perform *Kraśkiewicz–Hecke inverse insertion* by first finding the largest number, n , in S . If n is alone in a box remove that box from S and T and left inverse insert the element that was in that box in T to the row above. If n is not alone in a box remove, n from that box in S and left inverse insert the element in that box in T to the row above. If you would try to left inverse insert above the first row instead record the element you wished to left inverse insert as a_n . Repeat this process until your tableau are both empty, then $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is the *Kraśkiewicz–Hecke inverse* of (T, S) .

Combining Theorem 5.15 with Proposition 5.9, we have proved:

Corollary 5.17. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the map $\mathbb{N}^n \xrightarrow{\text{KH}} \bigsqcup_{\lambda \vdash k \leq n} \text{SDT}(\lambda) \times \text{ShSet}_n(\lambda)$ is a bijection.

6. CONJECTURES

Our original aim in this project was to compute the GQ_λ -expansion of G_w^C . As we explain in Section 7.2, insertion methods exhibit a fundamental inadequacy for the task. Despite this shortcoming, empirically Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion correctly computes this expansion as asserted in Conjecture 1.3, which we restate. Recall $a_w^C(\lambda)$ is the number of strict decomposition tableaux of shape λ whose reading word is a 0–Hecke expression for w .

Conjecture (Conjecture 1.3). For w a signed permutation,

$$G_w^C = \sum_{\lambda \text{ strict}} \beta^{|\lambda| - \ell(w)} a_w^C(\lambda) \cdot GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)}.$$

This conjecture has been tested to correctly compute G_w^C up to degree 9 with $w \in W_4$ (words of five letters) and up to degree 11 with $w \in W_3$.

By taking the $x_1 \dots x_n$ coefficient on each side, we see Conjecture 1.3 and Corollary 3.3 would imply Corollary 1.2:

$$|\mathcal{H}_p(w)| = \sum_{\lambda \text{ strict}} a_w^C(\lambda) \cdot |\text{ShSet}_p(\lambda)|.$$

Note we have removed the factor 2^p from each side; on the left side by replacing $\mathcal{U}_p(w)$ with $\mathcal{H}_p(w)$ and on the right by not allowing barred entries in our tableaux. We view this as very strong evidence for Conjecture 1.3. To see why, assume the conjecture were to fail for $w \in W_n$. By Proposition 3.1, we have

$$G_w^C = \sum_{\lambda \text{ strict}} b_w^C(\lambda) \cdot GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)}$$

for some coefficients $b_w^C(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}$, and conjecturally in \mathbb{N} . Then for fixed p , we have

$$(6.1) \quad \sum_{\lambda \text{ strict}} a_w^C(\lambda) \cdot |\text{ShSet}_p(\lambda)| = \sum_{\lambda \text{ strict}} b_w^C(\lambda) \cdot |\text{ShSet}_p(\lambda)|.$$

Additionally, when $|\lambda| = \ell(w)$, we know from [23] that $a_w^C(\lambda) = b_w^C(\lambda)$ for all λ . Therefore, and especially assuming the positivity of $b_w^C(\lambda)$, the failure of Conjecture 1.3 gives a highly non-trivial relation on the number of shifted set-valued standard tableaux of given sizes.

We now explain how Conjecture 1.3 implies several other significant results. The first is a combinatorial proof of [25, Conj. 5.14] and [27, Conj. 4.36], which says that a skew GQ function is a positive integer combination of GQ functions:

Conjecture 6.1. For any shifted shape λ/μ , we have

$$GQ_{\lambda/\mu}^{(\beta)} = \sum_{\nu} a_{w(\lambda/\mu)}^C(\nu) \cdot GQ_\nu.$$

Assuming Conjecture 1.3, this follows from Theorem 1.5. This basic fact about skew GQ 's has resisted explanation for several years.

When $\ell(\lambda) = k$ and $\mu = (k - 1, \dots, 1)$, note that $D_{\lambda/\mu}$ is the Young diagram for an ordinary partition ν . Recall $GS_\nu^{(\beta)} = GQ_{\lambda/\mu}^{(\beta)}$. Since each GS function is a skew GQ function, they should be non-negative integer combinations of GQ functions [25, Conj. 5.14]. As a special case of Conjecture 6.1, we would have the following combinatorial expansion for GS functions:

Conjecture 6.2. *Let ν be a (not necessarily strict) partition with $\ell(\nu) = k$. Define ρ so that $\nu_i = \rho_i + i - k$, and let $\mu = (k - 1, k - 2, \dots, 1)$. Then*

$$GS_\nu = \sum_{\lambda} a_{w(\rho/\mu)}^C(\lambda) \cdot GQ_\lambda.$$

As mentioned in the introduction, it is an open problem to find the GQ expansion for products of GQ functions. Conjecture 1.3 implies a special case of this problem. Recall for $a \leq b$ positive integers that $\tau(a, b) = (b + a - 1, b + a - 3, \dots, b - a + 1)$. Combining Conjecture 1.3 with Corollary 3.7, we have:

Conjecture 6.3. *Let $a \leq b$ positive integers and λ a strict shape with $\lambda_1 < k$. Then*

$$GQ_\lambda \cdot GQ_{\tau(a,b)} = \sum_{\nu} a_{w(\lambda,k) \cdot w(a,b,k)}^C(\nu) \cdot GQ_\nu.$$

Example 6.4. For $w = \overline{52134891067}$, we have $a_w^C((10, 3, 2)) = 2$ with tableaux

9	6	4	3	2	1	0	6	7	8	9	6	4	3	2	1	0	6	7	8	
	8	1	0								8	1	0							
		0	7									7	0							

This correctly computes the coefficient of GQ_{1032} in $GQ_{521} \cdot GQ_{42}$.

The case where $a = 1$ is equivalent to computing the product $GQ_\lambda \cdot GQ_b$. Such products are instances of the Pieri rule of Buch and Ravikumar [7]. However, the version of this rule following from Conjecture 6.3 is substantially different, as the Buch-Ravikumar rule is in terms of what they refer to as KLG tableaux, which are skew set-valued semistandard tableaux with primed entries. Using recurrences from [7], the first author has verified Conjecture 6.3 for the Pieri case [2].

Trapezoids $\tau(a, b)$ are the unique strict partitions μ for which GQ_μ is a GS function. As such, the product $GQ_\lambda \cdot GQ_{\tau(a,b)}$ takes the form GQ times GS . Combining Conjecture 1.3 with Corollary 3.13 would solve this more general problem:

Conjecture 6.5. *Let λ be a strict partition with $\lambda_1 < a$ and ν be a (not necessarily) strict partition with $\ell(\nu) = k$. Define ρ so that $\nu_i = \rho_i + i - a - k$, and let $\mu = (a + k - 1, a + k - 2, \dots, a)$. Then*

$$GQ_\lambda \cdot GS_\nu = \sum_{\sigma} a_{w(\lambda) \cdot w(\rho/\mu)}^C(\sigma) GQ_\sigma.$$

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

7.1. Fix a positive integer and let $I \subset [n - 1] - \{1\}$ so that $i \in I$ implies $i - 1, i + 1 \notin I$. Following [25, (4.9)], the *multipeak quasisymmetric function* of I is

$$K_I^{(\beta)} := \sum_S \beta^{|S| - n} x^S$$

where the sum is over n -tuples $S = (S_1, \dots, S_n)$ of sets in $\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ so that

- $\max(S_i) \preceq \min(S_{i+1})$ for $i \in [n - 1]$;
- $S_i \cap S_{i+1} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_-$ if $i \in I$;
- $S_i \cap S_{i+1} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_+$ if $i \notin I$.

Here $|S| = \sum_{i=1}^n |S_i|$ and $x^S = x^{S_1} \dots x^{S_n}$ where $x^A = x_{|a_1|} \dots x_{|a_k|}$ for $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$.

Let $\text{ShSet}^*(\lambda)$ be the set of shifted set valued standard Young tableaux of shape λ so that no consecutive numbers share the same box.

Proposition 7.1 ([25, (4.14)]). *For $\lambda/$ a shifted shape of size n , define*

$$GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)} := \sum_{T \in \text{ShSet}^*(\lambda)} \beta^{|T|-n} \cdot K_{\text{Peak}(T)}^{(\beta)}.$$

By analogy, one might hope to identify a set of words $\mathcal{H}^*(w) \subseteq \mathcal{H}(w)$ so that

$$G_w^C = \sum_{(a_1, \dots, a_p) \in \mathcal{H}^*(w)} \beta^{p-\ell(w)} \cdot K_{\text{Peak}((a_1, \dots, a_p))}^{(\beta)}.$$

To identify such a set bijectively would require an insertion-like algorithm that preserves peak sets and records consecutive letters in the same box if and only if the word is in $\mathcal{H}^*(w)$. An obvious candidate for $\mathcal{H}^*(w)$ is words without repeated consecutive entries. Our insertion fails to prove this identity. Even in Type A, none of the analogues of Hecke insertion in the literature have this property. It would be interesting to find one.

7.2. To prove Conjecture 1.3 using an insertion algorithm, one would want a map

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{i} \\ \mathbf{a} \end{pmatrix} \mapsto (P, Q)$$

where P and Q are shifted tableau of the same shape with P strict and Q set-valued semistandard. Naively, one would hope Kraśkiewicz–Hecke insertion accomplishes this goal by replacing the value j in $Q_{KH}(\mathbf{a})$ with i_j . In order for this operation to produce a set-valued semistandard tableau, we would need to show entries cells containing \bar{i} are in distinct rows and those containing i are distinct columns. Equivalently, if $(a_k > \dots > a_\ell < \dots < a_m)$ is unimodal we require that k, \dots, ℓ are in distinct rows of $Q_{KH}(\mathbf{a})$ and ℓ, \dots, m are in distinct columns. Likewise, if $a_j < a_{j+1} > a_{j+2}$, we see $j+1$ cannot be in the same column as j or the same row as $j+2$.

We present an example that demonstrates a fundamental obstruction to producing an insertion algorithm that proves Conjecture 1.3. For $u = s_1 s_0 s_2$, $v = s_1 s_0 s_2 s_1$, $w = s_1 s_0 s_2 s_1 s_0$,

$$G_u^C = GQ_{(3)} + GQ_{(21)} + \beta GQ_{(31)}, \quad G_v^C = GQ_{(31)}, \quad G_w^C = GQ_{(32)}$$

The strict decomposition tableaux witnessing these expansions are:

$$u : U^1 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad U^2 = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & 0 \\ \hline 1 \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad U^3 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 0 & 2 \\ \hline 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad v : V = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad w : W = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

For a word $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ and $j \leq k$, recall $\mathbf{x}[j] = (x_1, \dots, x_j)$. Consider the words

$$\mathbf{a} = (1, 0, 2, 0, 1, 0), \quad \mathbf{b} = (1, 2, 0, 2, 1, 0) \in \mathcal{H}(w), \quad \text{so} \quad P(\mathbf{a}) = P(\mathbf{b}) = W$$

in order for Proposition 5.10 to hold. Similarly, $P(\mathbf{a}[5]) = P(\mathbf{b}[5]) = V$ since v is vexillary. From Kraśkiewicz insertion, we know $P(\mathbf{b}[3]) = U^2$. We claim any reasonable generalization of Kraśkiewicz insertion will have $P(\mathbf{b}[4]) = U^3$. Since we are inserting 2 into U^2 , which must result in one of U^2 or U^3 . If we return U^2 , we would have recording tableaux

$$Q(\mathbf{b}[4]) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3,4 \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad Q(\mathbf{b}[5]) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3,4 \\ \hline \end{array},$$

violating the peak condition at values 3, 4, 5. Therefore, we must obtain U^3 , but this would give us recording tableaux

$$Q(\mathbf{a}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3,5 \\ \hline 4 & 6 \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad Q(\mathbf{b}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4,5 \\ \hline 3 & 6 \\ \hline \end{array},$$

However, then \mathbf{b} violates the peak condition at position 3, 4, 5. Alternatively, we could have $P(\mathbf{b}[3]) = U^1$, but then $P(\mathbf{a}[3]) = U^2$, which violates the unimodality condition.

This example shows any insertion algorithm mapping words to strict decomposition tableaux that generalizes Kraśkiewicz insertion and satisfies the reading word property in Proposition 5.10 cannot prove Conjecture 1.3 in the obvious fashion. Moreover, even if we alter the definition of strict decomposition tableaux, the only reasonable alternative to U^3 is

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & 2 \\ \hline 1 \\ \hline \end{array},$$

where a similar analysis shows no such insertion can exist.

7.3. In [34], the author gives a tableau formula for G_w^C for a family of signed permutations he calls skew. To define these, a signed permutation w is *k-Grassmannian* if $ws_k < w$ and $ws_j > w$ for $j \neq k$. A signed permutation v is *skew* if there exist u, w both *k-Grassmannian* so that $w = v \cdot u$. Note that the Grassmannian signed permutations we consider are precisely the 0-Grassmannian signed permutations. While Tamvakis gives a tableau formula for G_w^C , his formula is in terms of unshifted tableaux. We suspect his tableaux for the 0-Grassmannian case are equivalent to standard set-valued tableaux, but this is not obvious. Finding the GQ -expansion of G_v^C for v skew is an interesting open problem for $k \geq 1$ even in the cohomology ($\beta = 0$) case.

7.4. One consequence of Conjecture 1.3 is the weaker statement:

Conjecture 7.2. *For $w \in W_n$, we have $G_w^C \in \mathbb{N}[\beta][GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)} : \lambda \text{ strict}]$.*

This statement likely has a geometric proof. Assuming this weaker conjecture, we suspect that (6.1) can be used to prove special cases of Conjecture 1.3.

As a heuristic for why this should be possible, we compare our situation to the expansion of Type A K -Stanley symmetric functions into the stable Grothendieck polynomials. For $w \in S_\infty$, if the (Type A) Stanley symmetric function is $F_w = s_\lambda + s_\mu$, then the K -Stanley symmetric function has expansion

$$G_w^A = G_\lambda^{(\beta)} + G_\mu^{(\beta)} + \beta G_\nu^{(\beta)}$$

for some third shape ν (this is a consequence of transition for Grothendieck polynomials [24]). If the analogous statement were true for Type C K -Stanley symmetric functions, we would have for $w \in W_\infty$ that

$$F_w^C = Q_\lambda + Q_\mu \quad \text{implies} \quad G_w^C = GQ_\lambda^{(\beta)} + GQ_\mu^{(\beta)} + \beta GQ_\nu^{(\beta)}$$

for some shape ν . We claim without proof for $\lambda \neq \mu$ strict shapes that $|\text{ShSet}_p(\lambda)| \neq |\text{ShSet}_p(\mu)|$ for all p . Therefore, assuming Conjecture 7.2 we would necessarily have $a_w^C(\nu) = 1$ as desired.

7.5. There is a parallel story of Type B K -Stanley symmetric functions G_w^B , also defined in [20]. These belong to the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\beta][GP_\lambda : \lambda \text{ strict}]$, where the GP 's are symmetric functions that represent K -theory of the orthogonal Grassmannian. We limit our focus in this paper to the GQ case as GP 's are better understood. In particular, there already exist multiple combinatorial rules for multiplying GP symmetric functions [10, 15]. However, we remark that it is an open problem to express a skew GP function in terms of GP 's [27, Conj. 4.35]. It is easy to adapt the map res to compute G_w^B for w top. Therefore, if one could prove a version of Conjecture 1.3 for the G^B setting, this would solve this open problem.

REFERENCES

- [1] David Anderson. K-theoretic Chern class formulas for vexillary degeneracy loci. *Advances in Mathematics*, 350:440–485, 2019.
- [2] Joshua Arroyo. An alternate Pieri rule for GQ 's. *In Progress*, 2025+.
- [3] Sara Billey and Mark Haiman. Schubert polynomials for the classical groups. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, pages 443–482, 1995.
- [4] Sara Billey and Tao Kai Lam. Vexillary elements in the hyperoctahedral group. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 8(2):139–152, 1998.
- [5] Anders Skovsted Buch. A Littlewood-Richardson rule for the K-theory of Grassmannians. *Acta Mathematica*, 189(1):37–78, 2002.
- [6] Anders Skovsted Buch, Andrew Kresch, Mark Shimozono, Harry Tamvakis, and Alexander Yong. Stable Grothendieck polynomials and K-theoretic factor sequences. *Mathematische annalen*, 340:359–382, 2008.
- [7] Anders Skovsted Buch and Vijay Ravikumar. Pieri rules for the K-theory of cominuscule Grassmannians. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)*, 2012(668):109–132, 2012.
- [8] Anders Skovsted Buch and Matthew J Samuel. K-theory of minuscule varieties. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)*, 2016(719):133–171, 2016.
- [9] Yu-Cheng Chiu and Eric Marberg. Expanding K -theoretic Schur Q -functions. *Algebraic Combinatorics*, 6(6):1419–1445, 2023.
- [10] Edward Clifford, Hugh Thomas, and Alexander Yong. K-theoretic Schubert calculus for $OG(n, 2n+1)$ and jeu de taquin for shifted increasing tableaux. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)*, 2014(690):51–63, 2014.
- [11] Paul Edelman and Curtis Greene. Balanced tableaux. *Advances in Mathematics*, 63(1):42–99, 1987.
- [12] Sergey Fomin and Anatol Kirillov. Combinatorial B_n -analogues of Schubert polynomials. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 348(9):3591–3620, 1996.
- [13] Sergey Fomin and Anatol N Kirillov. Grothendieck polynomials and the Yang-Baxter equation. In *Proc. 6th Conf. Formal Power Series and Alg. Comb.*, pages 183–190, 1994.

- [14] William Graham and Victor Kreiman. Excited Young diagrams, equivariant K-theory, and Schubert varieties. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 367(9):6597–6645, 2015.
- [15] Zachary Hamaker, Adam Keilthy, Rebecca Patrias, Lillian Webster, Yinuo Zhang, and Shuqi Zhou. Shifted Hecke insertion and the K-theory of $OG(n, 2n + 1)$. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 151:207–240, 2017.
- [16] Zachary R Hamaker. *Bijective combinatorics of reduced decompositions*. PhD thesis, Dartmouth College, 2014.
- [17] Graham Hawkes. Combinatorics of double grothendieck polynomials. *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, P4.13, 2024.
- [18] Howard Hiller and Brian Boe. Pieri formula for SO_{2n+1}/U_n and Sp_n/U_n . *Advances in Mathematics*, 62(1):49–67, 1986.
- [19] Takeshi Ikeda and Hiroshi Naruse. K-theoretic analogues of factorial Schur P- and Q-functions. *Advances in Mathematics*, 243:22–66, 2013.
- [20] Anatol N Kirillov and Hiroshi Naruse. Construction of double Grothendieck polynomials of classical types using idCoxeter algebras. *Tokyo Journal of Mathematics*, 39(3):695–728, 2017.
- [21] Allen Knutson, Thomas Lam, and David E Speyer. Positroid varieties: juggling and geometry. *Compositio Mathematica*, 149(10):1710–1752, 2013.
- [22] W Kraskiewicz. Reduced decompositions in hyperoctahedral groups. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences. Série 1, Mathématique*, 309(16):903–907, 1989.
- [23] Tao Kai Lam. *B and D analogues of stable Schubert polynomials and related insertion algorithms*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1995.
- [24] Alain Lascoux. Transition on Grothendieck polynomials. In *Physics and combinatorics*, pages 164–179. World Scientific, 2001.
- [25] Joel Brewster Lewis and Eric Marberg. Enriched set-valued P-partitions and shifted stable Grothendieck polynomials. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 299(3-4):1929–1972, 2021.
- [26] Laurent Manivel. *Symmetric functions, Schubert polynomials and degeneracy loci*, volume 3. American Mathematical Soc., 2001.
- [27] Eric Marberg. Shifted combinatorial Hopf algebras from K-theory. *Algebraic Combinatorics*, 7(4):1123–1156, 2024.
- [28] Jennifer Morse, Jianping Pan, Wencin Poh, and Anne Schilling. A crystal on decreasing factorizations in the 0-Hecke monoid. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 27(2):1–48, 2020.
- [29] Piotr Pragacz. Algebro—Geometric applications of Schur S- and Q-polynomials. In *Topics in Invariant Theory: Séminaire d'Algèbre P. Dubreil et M.-P. Malliavin 1989–1990 (40ème Année)*, pages 130–191. Springer, 1991.
- [30] Luis Serrano. The shifted plactic monoid. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 266(2):363–392, 2010.
- [31] Richard P Stanley. On the number of reduced decompositions of elements of Coxeter groups. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 5(4):359–372, 1984.
- [32] John R Stembridge. On the fully commutative elements of Coxeter groups. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 5:353–385, 1996.
- [33] John R. Stembridge. Some combinatorial aspects of reduced words in finite Coxeter groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 349(4):1285–1332, 1997.
- [34] Harry Tamvakis. Tableau formulas for skew Grothendieck polynomials. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan*, 1(1):1–26, 2023.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE, FL 32611
 Email address: joshuarroyo@uf1.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA, GAINESVILLE, FL 32611
 Email address: zhamaker@uf1.edu

INDUSTRY
 Email address: ghawkes1217@gmail.com

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL AND STATISTICAL SCIENCES, ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, AZ 85287
 Email address: jianping.pan@asu.edu