

Cell classification of Gelfand S_n -Graphs

Yifeng Zhang

School of Mathematical Sciences

South China Normal University

calvinz314159@gmail.com

Abstract

Kazhdan and Lusztig introduced the W -graphs, which represent the multiplication action of the standard basis on the canonical basis in the Iwahori-Hecke algebra. In the Hecke algebra module, Marberg defined two generalised W -graphs, called the Gelfand W -graphs. The classification of the molecules of the type A Gelfand S_n -graphs are determined by two RSK-like insertion algorithms. We finish the classification of cells by proving that every molecule in the S_n -graphs is indeed a cell.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Preliminaries	3
2.1	Quasiparabolic sets	3
2.2	Hecke algebra modules	4
2.3	Canonical bases	6
3	Cells	8
3.1	Cells	8
3.2	W -graphs	9
4	Proof of cell conjecture in m case	11
4.1	Row Beissinger insertion	11
4.2	One-direction edges and dominance order for m	12
4.3	Proof of cell conjecture	18
5	Proof of cell conjecture in n case	18
5.1	Column Beissinger insertion	18
5.2	One-direction edges and dominance order for n	19
5.3	Proof of cell conjecture	27

1 Introduction

For a Coxeter system (W, S) , the corresponding *Iwahori-Hecke algebra* \mathcal{H} possesses both a *standard basis* $\{H_w : w \in W\}$ and a *Kazhdan-Lusztig basis* $\{\underline{H}_w : w \in W\}$. The left and right multiplication

actions of the standard basis on the Kazhdan-Lusztig basis are represented by two directed graphs, known respectively as the *left and right Kazhdan-Lusztig graphs* of W . These graphs constitute fundamental examples of *W -graphs*, which are weighted directed graphs encoding \mathcal{H} -module structures with canonical bases analogous to $\{\underline{H}_w : w \in W\}$. For the exact definition of a W -graph, refer to Section 3.

The main combinatorial issue concerning a W -graph is to classify its *cells* — defined as the graph’s strongly connected components. This classification is fundamental because the original W -graph structure naturally restricts to a W -graph on each individual cell. Furthermore, the ensemble of cells inherently forms a directed acyclic graph that induces a canonical filtration on the associated \mathcal{H} -module of the W -graph. A parallel research objective involves characterizing *molecules* within W -graphs, defined as connected components in the undirected graph formed by vertex pairs $\{x, y\}$ possessing bidirectional edges $x \rightarrow y$ and $y \rightarrow x$.

Determining molecules within a W -graph proves more tractable compared to cell identification, with each cell constituting a union of one or more molecules. However, under specific cases of interest — particularly for the left and right Kazhdan-Lusztig graphs of the symmetric group [2, §6.5] — cells and molecules in W -graphs exhibit full coincidence. Crucially, these molecules (equivalently, the cells) correspond precisely to subsets where the operators Q_{RSK} and P_{RSK} keep constant respectively, as established in [6, Thm. 1.4].

In [10], we defined the *perfect models* for finite Coxeter groups. Such a model comprises a collection of linear characters defined on specific subgroups, constrained by precise technical conditions — the name originates from the requirement that each subgroup must constitute the centralizer of a *perfect involution* (as defined in [13]) within standard parabolic subgroups. Crucially, every perfect model generates a pair of W -graphs whose associated \mathcal{H} -representations are *Gelfand models*, meaning they decompose into multiplicity-free direct sums of all irreducible \mathcal{H} -modules.

In [11], we established a complete classification of perfect models across all finite Coxeter groups under natural equivalence relations. Notably, the symmetric group S_n (when $n \notin \{2, 4\}$) admits a unique equivalence class of perfect models [11, Thm. 3.3], thereby generating a distinguished pair of *Gelfand S_n -graphs* Γ^{row} and Γ^{col} . The detailed combinatorial architecture of these graphs will be methodically reconstructed in Section 3.

Refer to [12], the molecules of Gelfand S_n graphs are classified by two insertion algorithm, analogous to Robinson-Schensted insertion. These insertions, called the row Beissinger insertion and the column Beissinger insertion, are inspired by [1]. To classify the cells, we give a conjecture, which is proved in this paper.

Theorem 1.1. If y and z are in the same cell of Γ^{row} or Γ^{col} , then they are in the same molecule. In other words, all molecules of Γ^{row} and Γ^{col} are cells, respectively.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains some preliminaries on the Quasiparabolic sets and Iwahori-Hecke algebra modules. Section 3 reviews the construction of the Gelfand S_n -graphs Γ^{row} and Γ^{col} as well as the cells. In Section 4 and 5, we give the proofs of the main theorem for Γ^{row} and Γ^{col} respectively.

2 Preliminaries

In this section (W, S) denotes an arbitrary Coxeter system with length function ℓ . We write \leq for the Bruhat order on W . Recall that if $s \in S$ and $w \in W$ then $sw < w$ if and only if $\ell(sw) = \ell(w) - 1$.

2.1 Quasiparabolic sets

Rains and Vazirani introduce the following definitions in [13, §2].

Definition 2.1. A *scaled W -set* is a W -set X with a height function $\text{ht} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying

$$|\text{ht}(x) - \text{ht}(sx)| \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for all } s \in S \text{ and } x \in X.$$

Denote the set of reflections in W by $R = \{wsw^{-1} : w \in W \text{ and } s \in S\}$.

Definition 2.2. A scaled W -set (X, ht) is *quasiparabolic* if both of the following properties hold:

(QP1) If $\text{ht}(rx) = \text{ht}(x)$ for some $(r, x) \in R \times X$ then $rx = x$.

(QP2) If $\text{ht}(rx) > \text{ht}(x)$ and $\text{ht}(srx) < \text{ht}(sx)$ for some $(r, x, s) \in R \times X \times S$ then $rx = sx$.

Example 2.3. The set W with height function $\text{ht} = \ell$ is quasiparabolic relative to its action on itself by left (also, by right) multiplication and also when viewed as a scaled $W \times W$ -set relative to the action $(x, y) : w \mapsto xwy^{-1}$; see [13, Theorem 3.1].

Example 2.4. A conjugacy class in W is a scaled W -set relative to conjugation and the height function $\text{ht} = \ell/2$. This scaled W -set is sometimes but not always quasiparabolic.

We restate [13, Corollary 2.13] as the lemma which follow this definition:

Definition 2.5. An element x in a scaled W -set X is *W -minimal* (respectively, *W -maximal*) if $\text{ht}(sx) \geq \text{ht}(x)$ (respectively, $\text{ht}(sx) \leq \text{ht}(x)$) for all $s \in S$.

Lemma 2.6 (Rains and Vazirani [13]). If a scaled W -set is quasiparabolic, then each of its orbits contains at most one W -minimal element and at most one W -maximal element. These elements, if they exist, have minimal (respectively, maximal) height in their W -orbits.

Remark 2.7. This property is enough to nearly classify the quasiparabolic conjugacy classes in the symmetric group. Assume that $W = S_n$, $S = \{s_i = (i, i + 1) : i = 1, \dots, n - 1\}$ with the height function $\text{ht} = \ell/2$. Suppose $\mathcal{K} \subset S_n$ is a quasiparabolic conjugacy class. Since \mathcal{K} is finite, it contains a unique W -minimal element by Lemma 2.6. \mathcal{K} consists of involutions since every permutation is conjugate in S_n to its inverse. There are $1 + \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ such conjugacy classes: $\{1\}$ and the conjugacy classes of $s_1 s_3 s_5 \cdots s_{2k-1}$ for positive integers k with $2k \leq n$. $\{1\}$ is trivially quasiparabolic, while the conjugacy class of $s_1 s_3 s_5 \cdots s_{2k-1}$ is quasiparabolic only if $2k = n$, since otherwise $s_2 s_4 s_6 \cdots s_{2k}$ belongs to the same conjugacy class but has the same (minimal) length. The only remaining conjugacy class, consisting of the fixed-point-free involutions in S_n for n even, is quasiparabolic by [13, Theorem 4.6].

For the rest of this section, (X, ht) denotes a fixed quasiparabolic W -set. The following lemma is a consequence of [13, Theorem 2.8].

Lemma 2.8 (Rains and Vazirani [13]). Suppose $x_0 \in X$ is a W -minimal element. The set

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{ht}}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{w \in W : x = wx_0 \text{ such that } \text{ht}(x) = \ell(w) + \text{ht}(x_0)\} \quad (2.1)$$

is then nonempty for any element x in the W -orbit of x_0 .

Additionally, we have this definition from [13, §5], which attaches to X a certain partial order:

Definition 2.9. The *Bruhat order* on a quasiparabolic W -set X is the weakest partial order \leq with $x \leq rx$ for all $x \in X$ and $r \in R$ with $\text{ht}(x) \leq \text{ht}(rx)$.

It follows immediately from the definition that if $x, y \in X$ then $x < y$ implies $\text{ht}(x) < \text{ht}(y)$. Rains and Vazirani develop several other general properties of the Bruhat order in [13, Section 5]. Among these properties, we only quote the following lemma (which appears as [13, Lemma 5.7]) for use later:

Lemma 2.10 (Rains and Vazirani [13]). Let $x, y \in X$ such that $x \leq y$ and $s \in S$. Then

$$sy \leq y \Rightarrow sx \leq y \quad \text{and} \quad x \leq sx \Rightarrow x \leq sy.$$

2.2 Hecke algebra modules

Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$ and recall that the *Iwahori-Hecke algebra* of (W, S) is the \mathcal{A} -algebra

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(W, S) = \mathcal{A}\text{-span}\{H_w : w \in W\}$$

defined in the introduction. For more infomations on this algebra, see, for example, [2, 5, 6, 7]. Observe that $H_s^{-1} = H_s + (v^{-1} - v)$ and that $H_w = H_{s_1} \cdots H_{s_k}$ whenever $w = s_1 \cdots s_k$ is a reduced expression. Therefore every basis element H_w for $w \in W$ is invertible.

Rains and Vazirani define a representation of \mathcal{H} by deforming the permutation representation of W on a quasiparabolic set. We use this slightly changed version of Hecke algebra modules for type A case as below. Define I_n to be the set of involutions in S_n while I_n^{FPF} to be the fixed-point-free involutions in S_n when n is even.

For $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(S_n)$, the bases of these modules are indexed by the images of two natural embeddings $I_n \hookrightarrow I_{2n}^{\text{FPF}}$ to be denoted ι_{asc} and ι_{des} . Let 1_{FPF} be the permutation of \mathbb{Z} sending $i \mapsto i - (-1)^i$. Choose $w \in I_n$ and let $c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_q$ be the numbers $c \in [n]$ with $w(c) = c$. Both $\iota_{\text{asc}}(w)$ and $\iota_{\text{des}}(w)$ will be elements of I_{2n}^{FPF} sending

$$i \mapsto w(i) \text{ for } i \in [n] \setminus \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_q\} \quad \text{and} \quad i \mapsto 1_{\text{FPF}}(i) \text{ for } i \in [2n] \setminus [n + q].$$

The only difference between these two permutations is that we define

$$\iota_{\text{asc}}(w) : c_i \leftrightarrow n + i \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_{\text{des}}(w) : c_i \leftrightarrow n + q + 1 - i \quad \text{for all } i \in [q].$$

We refer to ι_{asc} as the *ascending embedding*, since it turns each of $n + 1, n + 2, \dots, n + q - 1$ into ascents, and to ι_{des} as the *descending embedding*. Both maps are injective. Finally let

$$\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}} := \{\iota_{\text{asc}}(w) : w \in I_n\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}} := \{\iota_{\text{des}}(w) : w \in I_n\}. \quad (2.2)$$

The set $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ consists of the elements $z \in I_{2n}^{\text{FPF}}$ with no *visible descents* greater than n , where an integer i is a visible descent of z if $z(i + 1) < \min\{i, z(i)\}$ [9, Prop. 2.9].

Example 2.11. If $n = 4$ and $w = (1, 3)$ then $\iota_{\text{asc}}(w) = (1, 3)(2, 5)(4, 6)(7, 8)$ and $\iota_{\text{des}}(w) = (1, 3)(2, 6)(4, 5)(7, 8)$. Is it useful to draw involutions in S_n as matchings on $[n]$ with edges corresponding to 2-cycles. Our examples are given in terms of such pictures as

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_{\text{asc}} &: 1 \overset{\frown}{2} 3 \ 4 \mapsto 1 \overset{\frown}{2} 3 \ 4 \overset{\frown}{5} 6 \ 7 \overset{\frown}{8} , \\ \iota_{\text{des}} &: 1 \overset{\frown}{2} 3 \ 4 \mapsto 1 \overset{\frown}{2} 3 \ 4 \overset{\frown}{5} 6 \ 7 \overset{\frown}{8} . \end{aligned}$$

For each fixed-point-free involution $z \in I_{2n}^{\text{FPF}}$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Des}^{\bar{}}(z) &:= \{i \in [n-1] : i+1 = z(i) > z(i+1) = i\}, \\ \text{Asc}^{\bar{}}(z) &:= \{i \in [n-1] : z(i) > n \text{ and } z(i+1) > n\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

We refer to elements of these sets as *weak descents* and *weak ascents*.

Remark. An index $i \in [n-1]$ belongs to $\text{Des}^{\bar{}}(z)$ if and only if z commutes with $s_i = (i, i+1)$. Note that if the involution z belongs to either $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ or $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$, then $i \in [n-1]$ is contained in $\text{Asc}^{\bar{}}(z)$ if and only if $zs_i z \in \{s_{n+1}, s_{n+2}, \dots, s_{2n-1}\}$. Finally, observe that if $i \in \text{Asc}^{\bar{}}(z)$ then we have $z(i) < z(i+1)$ when $z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ but $z(i) > z(i+1)$ when $z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$.

For $z \in I_{2n}^{\text{FPF}}$ we also define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Des}^<(z) &:= \{i \in [n-1] : z(i) > z(i+1)\} \setminus (\text{Asc}^{\bar{}}(z) \sqcup \text{Des}^{\bar{}}(z)), \\ \text{Asc}^<(z) &:= \{i \in [n-1] : z(i) < z(i+1)\} \setminus \text{Asc}^{\bar{}}(z). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

The elements of these sets are *strict descents* and *strict ascents*. Write $\ell : S_n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for the length function with $\ell(w) = |\text{Inv}(w)|$ where $\text{Inv}(w) := \{(i, j) \in [n] \times [n] : i < j \text{ and } w(i) > w(j)\}$. Write $\text{ht}(z) = \frac{\ell(z)}{2}$

The next theorem summarize the type A case of a few of the main results from [10].

Theorem 2.12 ([10, Thms. 1.7 and 1.8]). Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(S_n)$ and define \mathcal{M} to be the free \mathcal{A} -module with basis $\{M_z : z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}\}$. There is a unique \mathcal{H} -module structure on \mathcal{M} in which

$$H_s M_z = \begin{cases} M_{s_z s} & \text{if } i \in \text{Asc}^<(z) \\ M_{s_z s} + (v - v^{-1})M_z & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}^<(z) \\ -v^{-1}M_z & \text{if } i \in \text{Asc}^{\bar{}}(z) \\ vM_z & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}^{\bar{}}(z) \end{cases} \quad \text{for } s = s_i \in \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}\}.$$

This \mathcal{H} -module has the following additional properties:

- (a) \mathcal{M} is a Gelfand model for \mathcal{H} .
- (b) \mathcal{M} has a unique \mathcal{H} -compatible bar operator with $\overline{M_z} = M_z$ whenever $\text{Des}^<(z) = \emptyset$.
- (c) \mathcal{M} has a unique basis $\{\underline{M}_z : z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}\}$ with $\underline{M}_z = \overline{M_z} \in M_z + \sum_{\ell(y) < \ell(z)} v^{-1} \mathbb{Z}[v^{-1}] M_y$.

Replacing $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ by $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$ and x by $-x^{-1}$ changes Theorem 2.12 to the following:

Theorem 2.13 ([10, Thms. 1.7 and 1.8]). Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(S_n)$ and define \mathcal{N} to be the free \mathcal{A} -module with basis $\{N_z : z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}\}$. There is a unique \mathcal{H} -module structure on \mathcal{N} in which

$$H_s N_z = \begin{cases} N_{s z s} & \text{if } i \in \text{Asc}^<(z) \\ N_{s z s} + (v - v^{-1})N_z & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}^<(z) \\ v N_z & \text{if } i \in \text{Asc}^=(z) \\ -v^{-1} N_z & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}^=(z) \end{cases} \quad \text{for } s = s_i \in \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}\}.$$

This \mathcal{H} -module has the following additional properties:

- (a) \mathcal{N} is a Gelfand model for \mathcal{H} .
- (b) \mathcal{N} has a unique \mathcal{H} -compatible bar operator with $\overline{N_z} = N_z$ whenever $\text{Des}^<(z) = \emptyset$.
- (c) \mathcal{N} has a unique basis $\{\underline{N}_z : z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}\}$ with $\underline{N}_z = \overline{N_z} \in N_z + \sum_{\ell(y) < \ell(z)} v^{-1} \mathbb{Z}[v^{-1}] N_y$.

Remark 2.14. The cited results in [10] describe an \mathcal{H} -module \mathcal{N} with the same multiplication rule but with $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ rather than $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$ as a basis. Theorem 2.13 still follows directly from [10, Thms. 1.7 and 1.8]. Specifically, the module \mathcal{N} in [10] is isomorphic to our version of \mathcal{N} via the \mathcal{A} -linear map sending $N_{\iota_{\text{asc}}(z)} \mapsto N_{\iota_{\text{des}}(z)}$ for $z \in I_n$.

2.3 Canonical bases

Let $m_{y,z}, n_{y,z} \in \mathbb{Z}[x^{-1}]$ be the polynomials indexed by $y, z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ and $y, z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$, respectively, such that $\underline{M}_z = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}} m_{y,z} M_y$ and $\underline{N}_z = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}} n_{y,z} N_y$. Write $\mu_m(y, z)$ and $\mu_n(y, z)$ for the coefficients of x^{-1} in $m_{y,z}$ and $n_{y,z}$.

For $z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(z) &:= \{s_i : i \in \text{Asc}^<(z) \sqcup \text{Asc}^=(z)\} = \{s_i : i \in [n-1] \text{ and } z(i) < z(i+1)\} \\ &= \{s_i : i \in [n-1] \text{ and } \ell(z) < \ell(s_i z s_i)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

For $z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(z) &:= \{s_i : i \in \text{Asc}^<(z) \sqcup \text{Des}^=(z)\} \\ &= \{s_i : i \in [n-1] \text{ and } z(i) < z(i+1) \text{ or } z(i) = i+1\} \\ &= \{s_i : i \in [n-1] \text{ and } \ell(z) \leq \ell(s_i z s_i)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

The following theorem describes the action of \mathcal{H} on the basis elements \underline{M}_x and \underline{N}_x .

Theorem 2.15 ([10]). Let $s = s_i \in S$ and $x \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ or $x \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$, respectively. Recall that $\underline{H}_s = H_s + v^{-1}$.

- (a) In \mathcal{M} , the following multiplication formula holds:

$$\underline{H}_s \underline{M}_x = \begin{cases} (v + v^{-1}) \underline{M}_x & \text{if } s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x) \\ (1 - \delta_{x, s x s}) \underline{M}_{s x s} + \sum_{w < x, s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(w)} \mu_m(w, x) \underline{M}_w & \text{if } s \in \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x). \end{cases}$$

(b) In \mathcal{N} , the following multiplication formula holds:

$$\underline{H}_s \underline{N}_x = \begin{cases} (v + v^{-1}) \underline{N}_x & \text{if } s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x) \\ (1 - \delta_{x,sys}) \underline{N}_{sys} + \sum_{w < x, s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(w)} \mu_n(w, x) \underline{N}_w & \text{if } s \in \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x). \end{cases}$$

Define $\tilde{m}_{x,y} = v^{\text{ht}(y) - \text{ht}(x)} m_{x,y}$ and $\tilde{n}_{x,y} = v^{\text{ht}(y) - \text{ht}(x)} n_{x,y}$ for $x, y \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ or $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$. The preceding theorem translates to the following recurrences, which one can use to compute these polynomials.

Corollary 2.16 ([10]). Let $x, y \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ and $s = s_i \in S$.

1. If $i \in \text{Des}^=(y) \sqcup \text{Des}^<(y)$ then $\tilde{m}_{x,y} = \tilde{m}_{sxs,y}$. In particular, if $i \in \text{Asc}^=(x)$ then $\tilde{m}_{x,y} = 0$.
2. If $i \in \text{Des}^<(y)$ and $i \in \text{Des}^=(x) \sqcup \text{Des}^<(x)$ then

$$\tilde{m}_{x,y} = v^2 \cdot \tilde{m}_{x,sys} + \tilde{m}_{sxs,sys} - \sum_{\substack{x \leq z < sys \\ s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(z)}} \mu_m(z, sys) \cdot v^{\text{ht}(y) - \text{ht}(z)} \cdot \tilde{m}_{x,z}$$

3. If $i \in \text{Des}^<(y)$ and $i \in \text{Asc}^<(x)$ then

$$\tilde{m}_{x,y} = \tilde{m}_{x,sys} + v^2 \cdot \tilde{m}_{sxs,sys} - \sum_{\substack{x \leq z < sys \\ s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(z)}} \mu_m(z, sys) \cdot v^{\text{ht}(y) - \text{ht}(z)} \cdot \tilde{m}_{x,z}$$

Corollary 2.17 ([10]). Let $x, y \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$ and $s = s_i \in S$.

1. If $i \in \text{Asc}^=(y) \sqcup \text{Des}^<(y)$ then $\tilde{n}_{x,y} = \tilde{n}_{sxs,y}$. In particular, if $i \in \text{Des}^=(x)$ then $\tilde{n}_{x,y} = 0$.
2. If $i \in \text{Des}^<(y)$ and $i \in \text{Des}^<(x)$ then

$$\tilde{n}_{x,y} = v^2 \cdot \tilde{n}_{x,sys} + \tilde{n}_{sxs,sys} - \sum_{\substack{x < z < sys \\ s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(z)}} \mu_n(z, sys) \cdot v^{\text{ht}(y) - \text{ht}(z)} \cdot \tilde{n}_{x,z}$$

3. If $i \in \text{Des}^<(y)$ and $i \in \text{Des}^=(x)$ then

$$\tilde{n}_{x,y} = - \sum_{\substack{x < z < sys \\ s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(z)}} \mu_n(z, sys) \cdot v^{\text{ht}(y) - \text{ht}(z)} \cdot \tilde{n}_{x,z}$$

4. If $i \in \text{Des}^<(y)$ and $i \in \text{Asc}^<(x)$ then

$$\tilde{n}_{x,y} = \tilde{n}_{x,sys} + v^2 \cdot \tilde{n}_{sxs,sys} - \sum_{\substack{x < z < sys \\ s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(z)}} \mu_n(z, sys) \cdot v^{\text{ht}(y) - \text{ht}(z)} \cdot \tilde{n}_{x,z}$$

By definition $m_{x,y} = 0$ when $x \not\leq y$. When $x \leq y$, the following parity property holds:

Proposition 2.18 ([10]). If $x, y \in X$ with $x \leq y$ then

$$v^{\ell(y) - \ell(x)} m_{x,y} = \tilde{m}_{x,y} \in 1 + v^2 \mathbb{Z}[v^2] \quad \text{and} \quad v^{\ell(y) - \ell(x)} n_{x,y} = \tilde{n}_{x,y} \in \mathbb{Z}[v^2].$$

Consequently, $\mu_m(x, y) = \mu_n(x, y) = 0$ whenever $\ell(y) - \ell(x)$ is even.

Lemma 2.19 ([10]). Let $x, y \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ or $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$ with $x < y$.

- (a) If there exists $s \in S$ with $s \in \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x)$ and $s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(y)$, then $\mu_m(x, y) = \delta_{sx,y}$.
- (b) If there exists $s \in S$ with $s \in \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x)$ and $s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(y)$, then $\mu_n(x, y) = \delta_{sx,y}$.

3 Cells

3.1 Cells

For $x \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ define $D_x^{\mathbf{m}} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A})$ by $D_x^{\mathbf{m}}(\underline{M}_z) = \delta_{x,z}$ for all $z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$. For $x, x' \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ we write $x' \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} x$ if $D_x^{\mathbf{m}}(\underline{H}_s \underline{M}_{x'}) \neq 0$ for some $s \in S$. If $x, x' \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$, we say that $x' \leq_{\mathbf{m}} x$ if there exist $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = x'$ in W such that for any $i \in [0, n-1]$ we have $x_i \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} x_{i+1}$.

Similarly, for $x \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$ define $D_x^{\mathbf{n}} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{A})$ by $D_x^{\mathbf{n}}(\underline{N}_z) = \delta_{x,z}$ for all $z \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$. For $x, x' \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$ we write $x' \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} x$ if $D_x^{\mathbf{n}}(\underline{H}_s \underline{N}_{x'}) \neq 0$ for some $s \in S$. If $x, x' \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$, we say that $x' \leq_{\mathbf{n}} x$ if there exist $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = x'$ in W such that for any $i \in [0, n-1]$ we have $x_i \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} x_{i+1}$.

Clearly $\leq_{\mathbf{m}}$ and $\leq_{\mathbf{n}}$ are preorders. Let $\sim_{\mathbf{m}}$ and $\sim_{\mathbf{n}}$ be the associated equivalence relations. The equivalence classes are called \mathbf{m} -cells or \mathbf{n} -cells. We say that $x <_{\mathbf{m}} x'$ if $x \leq_{\mathbf{m}} x'$ and $x \not\sim_{\mathbf{m}} x'$, while $x <_{\mathbf{n}} x'$ if $x \leq_{\mathbf{n}} x'$ and $x \not\sim_{\mathbf{n}} x'$. Then

$$\mathcal{M}_{\leq_{\mathbf{m}} x'} = \bigoplus_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}} \\ x \leq_{\mathbf{m}} x'}} \mathcal{A} \underline{M}_x$$

is a submodule of \mathcal{M} while

$$\mathcal{N}_{\leq_{\mathbf{n}} x'} = \bigoplus_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}} \\ x \leq_{\mathbf{n}} x'}} \mathcal{A} \underline{N}_x$$

is a submodule of \mathcal{N} .

Let X be $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$ or $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}$ and let Y be a cell of X , then we see that for $y \in Y$,

$$\mathcal{M}_{\leq_{\mathbf{m}} y} / \mathcal{M}_{<_{\mathbf{m}} y} = \bigoplus_{\substack{x \in X \\ x \leq_{\mathbf{m}} y}} \mathcal{A} \underline{M}_x / \bigoplus_{\substack{x \in X \\ x <_{\mathbf{m}} y}} \mathcal{A} \underline{M}_x$$

is a quotient of two left submodules of \mathcal{M} (independent of the choice of y) hence it is naturally a left \mathcal{H} -module; it has an \mathcal{A} -basis consisting of the images of \underline{M}_x .

Similarly, for $y \in Y$,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\leq_{\mathbf{n}} y} / \mathcal{N}_{<_{\mathbf{n}} y} = \bigoplus_{\substack{x \in X \\ x \leq_{\mathbf{n}} y}} \mathcal{A} \underline{N}_x / \bigoplus_{\substack{x \in X \\ x <_{\mathbf{n}} y}} \mathcal{A} \underline{N}_x$$

is a quotient of two left submodules of \mathcal{N} (independent of the choice of y) hence it is naturally a left \mathcal{H} -module; it has an \mathcal{A} -basis consisting of the images of \underline{N}_x .

The definitions and discussions in this section is an analogue of Lusztig[7].

Proposition 3.1. Let $x \neq x' \in \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}$. If $x \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} x'$, then $\text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x) \not\subset \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x')$.

Proof. If $x \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} x'$, then we have $D_{x'}^{\mathbf{m}}(\underline{H}_s \underline{M}_x) \neq 0$ for some $s \in S$. By Theorem 2.15,

$$\underline{H}_s \underline{M}_x = \begin{cases} (v + v^{-1}) \underline{M}_x & \text{if } s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x) \\ (1 - \delta_{x, sxs}) \underline{M}_{sxs} + \sum_{w < x, s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(w)} \mu_m(w, x) \underline{M}_w & \text{if } s \in \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x). \end{cases}$$

If $s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x)$, then $D_{x'}^{\mathbf{m}}(\underline{H}_s \underline{M}_x) = 0$. So we have $s \in \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x)$ and there are two cases: $x' = sxs$ or $x' < x, s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x')$ and $\mu_m(x, x') \neq 0$. In both case, we have $s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x')$. Hence we have $\text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x) \not\subset \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x')$. \square

Proposition 3.2. Let $x \neq x' \in X$. If $x \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} x'$, then $\text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x) \not\subset \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x')$.

Proof. If $x \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} x'$, then we have $D_{x'}^{\mathbf{n}}(\underline{H}_s \underline{N}_x) \neq 0$ for some $s \in S$. By Theorem 2.15,

$$\underline{H}_s \underline{N}_x = \begin{cases} (v + v^{-1}) \underline{N}_x & \text{if } s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x) \\ (1 - \delta_{x, sxs}) \underline{N}_{sxs} + \sum_{w < x, s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(w)} \mu_n(w, x) \underline{N}_w & \text{if } s \in \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x). \end{cases}$$

If $s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x')$, then $D_{x'}^{\mathbf{n}}(\underline{H}_s \underline{N}_x) = 0$. So we have $s \in \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x)$ and there are two cases: $x = sx's$ or $s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x')$ and $\mu_n(x, x') \neq 0$. In both case, we have $s \notin \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x')$. Hence we have $\text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x) \not\subset \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x')$. \square

3.2 W -graphs

Recall that $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$. Let \mathcal{X} be an \mathcal{H} -module which is free as an \mathcal{A} -module. Given an \mathcal{A} -basis $V \subset \mathcal{X}$, consider the directed graph with vertex set V and with an edge from $x \in V$ to $y \in V$ whenever there exists $H \in \mathcal{H}$ such that the coefficient of y in Hx is nonzero. Each strongly connected component in this graph spans a quotient \mathcal{H} -module since its complement spans a submodule of \mathcal{X} . There is a natural partial order on the set of strongly connected components in any directed graph, and this order in our present context gives rise to a filtration of \mathcal{X} . For some choices of bases of V , this filtration can be interesting and nontrivial.

When this procedure is applied to the Kazhdan-Lusztig basis of \mathcal{H} (viewed as a left module over itself), the graph one obtains has a particular form, which serves as the prototypical example of a *W-graph*. The notion of a W -graph dates to Kazhdan and Lusztig's paper [6], but our conventions in the following definitions have been adopted from Stembridge's more recent work [14, 15].

Definition 3.3. Let I be a finite set. An *I -labeled graph* is a triple $\Gamma = (V, \omega, \tau)$ where

- (i) V is a finite vertex set;
- (ii) $\omega : V \times V \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a map;
- (iii) $\tau : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(I)$ is a map assigning a subset of I to each vertex.

We write $\omega(x \rightarrow y)$ for $\omega(x, y)$ when $x, y \in V$. One views Γ as a weighted directed graph on the vertex set V with an edge from x to y when the weight $\omega(x \rightarrow y)$ is nonzero.

Definition 3.4. Fix a Coxeter system (W, S) . An S -labeled graph $\Gamma = (V, \omega, \tau)$ is a *W-graph* if the free \mathcal{A} -module generated by V may be given an \mathcal{H} -module structure with

$$H_s x = \begin{cases} vx & \text{if } s \notin \tau(x) \\ -v^{-1}x + \sum_{y \in V; s \notin \tau(y)} \omega(x \rightarrow y)y & \text{if } s \in \tau(x) \end{cases} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ and } x \in V.$$

The prototypical W -graph defined by the Kazhdan-Lusztig basis of \mathcal{H} has several notable features; Stembridge [14, 15] calls W -graphs with these features *admissible*. We introduce the following slight variant of Stembridge's definition.

Definition 3.5. An I -labeled graph $\Gamma = (V, \omega, \tau)$ is *quasi-admissible* if

- (a) it is *reduced* in the sense that $\omega(x \rightarrow y) = 0$ whenever $\tau(x) \subset \tau(y)$.
- (b) its edge weights $\omega(x \rightarrow y)$ are all integers;
- (c) it is bipartite;
- (d) the edge weights satisfy $\omega(x \rightarrow y) = \omega(y \rightarrow x)$ whenever $\tau(x) \not\subset \tau(y)$ and $\tau(y) \not\subset \tau(x)$.

The I -labeled graph Γ is *admissible* if its integer edge weights are all nonnegative.

Let (X, ht) denote a fixed quasiparabolic W -set which is bounded below and admits a bar operator, so that canonical bases $\{\underline{M}_x\} \subset \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(X, \text{ht})$ and $\{\underline{N}_x\} \subset \mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}(X, \text{ht})$ given in Theorem 2.12 and Theorem 2.13 are well-defined. We show below that these bases induce two quasi-admissible W -graph structures on the set X .

$\omega^{\text{row}} : \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}} \times \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and $\omega^{\text{col}} : \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}} \times \mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be the maps with

$$\omega^{\text{row}}(y \rightarrow z) := \mu_m(y, z) + \mu_m(z, y) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega^{\text{col}}(y \rightarrow z) := \mu_n(y, z) + \mu_n(z, y). \quad (3.1)$$

Unlike the Kazhdan–Lusztig case, these integer coefficients can be negative.

Theorem 3.6 ([10]). The triples $\Gamma^{\text{row}} := (\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{asc}}, \omega^{\text{row}}, \text{Asc}^{\text{row}})$ and $\Gamma^{\text{col}} := (\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{des}}, \omega^{\text{col}}, \text{Asc}^{\text{col}})$ are quasi-admissible S_n -graphs.

Now we show that the two definitions are equivalent.

Theorem 3.7. $x \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} y$ if and only if $\omega_m(x \rightarrow y) \neq 0$.

Proof. If $x \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} y$, then we have $\text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x) \not\subset \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(y)$ by Proposition 3.1. Also, consider the two cases in the proof of Proposition 3.1, since $\mu_m(x, sxs) = 1$ by Lemma 2.19, we see that $\mu_m(x, y) + \mu_m(y, x) \neq 0$, so $\omega_m(x \rightarrow y) \neq 0$.

Conversely, if $\omega_m(x \rightarrow y) \neq 0$, then we have $\text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(x) \not\subset \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(y)$ and without loss of generality, we assume $\mu_m(x, y) \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.19, if $\mu_m(x, y) \neq 0$, we must have $y = sxs$. So by Theorem 2.15, we see that $D_y^{\mathbf{m}}(\underline{H}_s \underline{M}_x) \neq 0$ in both case. Hence, $x \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} y$. \square

Theorem 3.8. $x \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} y$ if and only if $\omega_n(x \rightarrow y) \neq 0$.

Proof. If $x \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} y$, then we have $\text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x) \not\subset \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(y)$ by Proposition 3.2. Also, consider the two cases in the proof of Proposition 3.2, since $\mu_n(x, sxs) = 1$ by Lemma 2.19, we see that $\mu_n(x, y) + \mu_n(y, x) \neq 0$, so $\omega_n(x \rightarrow y) \neq 0$.

Conversely, if $\omega_n(x \rightarrow y) \neq 0$, then we have $\text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(x) \not\subset \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(y)$ and without loss of generality, we assume $\mu_n(x, y) \neq 0$. By Lemma 2.19, if $\mu_n(x, y) \neq 0$, we must have $y = sxs$. So by Theorem 2.15, we see that $D_y^{\mathbf{n}}(\underline{H}_s \underline{N}_x) \neq 0$ in both case. Hence, $x \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} y$. \square

In the literature on W -graphs, strongly connected components (in a W -graph Γ) are referred to as *cells*, while the connected components when we only consider the bidirected edges are referred to as *molecules*. As explained at the beginning of this section, the cells of Γ define a filtration of its corresponding \mathcal{H} -module, and so classifying the cells is a natural problem of interest. When $(X, \text{ht}) = (W, \ell)$ the cells of $\Gamma_m = \Gamma_n$ are the *left cells* of (W, S) , about which there exists a substantial literature; see [2, Chapter 6] for an overview. It is a natural problem to study to molecules and cells of the W -graphs Γ_m and Γ_n defined in this section for more general quasiparabolic sets. Marberg and I have already classified the molecules of Γ_m and Γ_n [12]. So it remains to show that the molecules are exactly the cells.

4 Proof of cell conjecture in m case

In this section, we write I_n for the involutions in S_n .

4.1 Row Beissinger insertion

Definition 4.1 (Row Beissinger insertion). Suppose T is a partially standard tableau and (a, b) is a pair of integers with $a \leq b$. Let (i, j) be the box of $T \xleftarrow{\text{RSK}} a$ that is not in T . If $a < b$ then form $T \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (a, b)$ by adding b to the end of **row** $i + 1$ of $T \xleftarrow{\text{RSK}} a$. If $a = b$ then form $T \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (a, b)$ by inserting $T \xleftarrow{\text{RSK}} a$.

Example. We have $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (5, 5) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$ and $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 & 6 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (2, 5) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 6 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$.

Definition 4.2 (Row Beissinger correspondence). Given $z \in I_n$ let $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_q, b_q)$ be the list of pairs $(a, b) \in [n] \times [n]$ with $a < b = z(a)$, ordered with $b_1 < \dots < b_q$. Let $c_1 < \dots < c'_q$ be the fixed points. Moreover, define

$$P_{\text{rB}}(z) := \emptyset \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (a_1, b_1) \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (a_2, b_2) \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} \dots \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (a_q, b_q) \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (c_1, c_1) \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} \dots \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (c'_q, c'_q).$$

Example. We have $P_{\text{rB}}(4321) = \emptyset \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (2, 3) \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (1, 4) = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 2 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$.

Theorem 4.3 ([1, Thm. 3.1]). If $z \in I_n^{\text{FPF}}$, then $P_{\text{rB}}(z) = P_{\text{RSK}}(z) = Q_{\text{RSK}}(z)$.

Remark 4.4. The definition of Row Beissinger correspondence is slightly different from the definition in [12]. Actually, $P_{\text{rB}}(z)$ we defined is just $\hat{P}_{\text{rB}}(z)$ in [12].

Theorem 4.5 ([12, Thm 2.9]). For $y, z = s_i y s_i \in I_n$, $A := \{i - 1, i, i + 1\}$, $B = \{i, i + 1, i + 2\}$, if we have one of the following cases:

- $y(A) \neq A$ and $y(i - 1)$ is between $y(i)$ and $y(i + 1)$.
- $y(B) \neq B$ and $y(i + 2)$ is between $y(i)$ and $y(i + 1)$.

Then we have $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$, $\iota_{\text{asc}}(z) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(y)$.

Theorem 4.6 ([12, Thm 3.15]). If $y, z \in I_n$, then the following statements are equivalent:

- $P_{\text{rB}}(y)$ and $P_{\text{rB}}(z)$ are in same shape.
- $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y)$ and $\iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$ are in the same molecule in Γ^{row} .

4.2 One-direction edges and dominance order for \mathbf{m}

Proposition 4.7. For $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$ but $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y) \not\rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$. Then we have the following cases, where $y(i-1)$ and $y(i+2)$ is not between $y(i)$ and $y(i+1)$:

1. $y = \cdots (a, i)(b, i+1) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i)(a, i+1) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$.
2. $y = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i+1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$, where $a < i < i+1 < b$.
3. $y = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i+1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$, where $i+1 < a < b$.
4. $y = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$, where $i+1 < a$.

Proof. Since $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$, we must have $\iota_{\text{asc}}(z) = s_i \iota_{\text{asc}}(y) s_i$ hence $z = s_i y s_i$ for some i . Since $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$ but $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y) \not\rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$, we have $\text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(\iota_{\text{asc}}(z)) \subsetneq \text{Asc}^{\text{row}}(\iota_{\text{asc}}(y))$, so $\{j \in [n-1] : j \neq z(j) < z(j+1)\} \cup \{j \in [n-1] : z(j+1) = j+1\} \subsetneq \{j \in [n-1] : j \neq y(j) < y(j+1)\} \cup \{j \in [n-1] : y(j+1) = j+1\}$. Then there exist $j \in [n-1]$ such that either $j \neq y(j) < y(j+1)$ or $y(j+1) = j+1$ and either $z(j) > z(j+1) \neq j+1$ or $z(j) = j, z(j+1) \neq j+1$.

When $y(i) = i$ and $y(i+1) = i+1$ or $y(i) = i+1$, we then have $z = y$ which is a contradiction. When $y(i) = i$ but $y(i+1) \neq i+1$, we have the following cases:

- $y = \cdots (a, i+1)(b, i+2) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i)(b, i+2) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$.
- $y = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < i < i+2 < b$.
- $y = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $i+2 < a < b$.
- $y = \cdots (b, i-1)(a, i+1) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i-1)(a, i) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$.
- $y = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < i < i+2 < b$.
- $y = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $i+2 < a < b$.

We claim that for all these cases, $P_{\text{rB}}(y)$ and $P_{\text{rB}}(z)$ are in same shape. This is our Proposition 4.12.

When $y(i+1) = i+1$ but $y(i) \neq i$, we have the following case:

- $y = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$, where $i+1 < a$.

When $\{y(i), y(i+1)\} \cap \{i, i+1\} = \emptyset$, by some case analysis, we get these cases:

- 1 $j = i$: $y(i) < y(i+1)$.

$$2 \quad j = i + 1: y(i + 1) < y(i + 2) < y(i).$$

$$3 \quad j = i - 1: y(i + 1) < y(i - 1) < y(i).$$

In case 2 and 3, by Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 4.6, we see that $P_{\text{rB}}(y)$ and $P_{\text{rB}}(z)$ have same shape, which contradicts the fact that $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y) \not\rightarrow_{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$. And then, we have the following cases:

1. $y = \cdots (a, i)(b, i + 1) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i)(a, i + 1) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$;
2. $y = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i + 1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i + 1) \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$, where $a < i < i + 1 < b$;
3. $y = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i + 1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i + 1, a) \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$, where $i + 1 < a < b$.

□

Before the case analysis, we need some preliminary notation and a few lemmas.

The *bumping path* resulting from Schensted inserting a number a into a tableau T is the sequence of positions $(1, b_1), (2, b_2), \dots, (k, b_k)$ of the entries in T that are changed to form $T \xleftarrow{\text{RSK}} a$, together with the new box that is added to the tableau. Let $B_{T \leftarrow a}$ denote this sequence. Let $b_{T \leftarrow a}(j) := b_j$ be the column of the j th position in the bumping path, let $\text{frow}_{T \leftarrow a} := k$ denote the length of the path (which is also the index of the path's "final row"), and let $\text{ivalue}_{T \leftarrow a}(j)$ be the value inserted into row j , so that $\text{ivalue}_{T \leftarrow a}(1) = a$. Observe that

$$b_{T \leftarrow a}(1) \geq \cdots \geq b_{T \leftarrow a}(k) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ivalue}_{T \leftarrow a}(1) < \cdots < \text{ivalue}_{T \leftarrow a}(k).$$

For example, if $a = 2$ and $T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 9 \\ \hline 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 7 & 8 & \\ \hline \end{array}$ so that $T \xleftarrow{\text{RSK}} a = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 9 \\ \hline 3 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 4 & 8 & \\ \hline 7 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$ then we have $b_{T \leftarrow a}(1) = 2$ and

$b_{T \leftarrow a}(j) = 1$ for $2 \leq j \leq \text{frow}_{T \leftarrow a} = 4$, while

$$\text{ivalue}_{T \leftarrow a}(1) = 2 < \text{ivalue}_{T \leftarrow a}(2) = 3 < \text{ivalue}_{T \leftarrow a}(3) = 4 < \text{ivalue}_{T \leftarrow a}(4) = 7.$$

Define a *partially standard tableau* to be a semistandard tableau with distinct positive entries. For the rest of this section, fix $y \in I_n$ and suppose $b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_k$ are the distinct numbers in $[n]$ with $a_i := y(b_i) < b_i$ and suppose $c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_q$ are the distinct numbers in $[n]$ with $c_i = y(c_i)$ so that $y = (a_1, b_1)(a_2, b_2) \cdots (a_k, b_k)(c_1, c_1) \cdots (c_q, c_q)$. For $i \in [k]$ let

$$T_i := \emptyset \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (a_1, b_1) \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (a_2, b_2) \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} \cdots \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (a_i, b_i) \quad \text{and} \quad T_0 := \emptyset.$$

$$T'_i := \emptyset \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (a_1, b_1) \cdots \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (a_k, b_k) \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (c_1, c_1) \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} \cdots \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (c_i, c_i)$$

We refer to $T_0, T_1, T_2, \dots, T_k, T'_1, \dots, T'_q$ as the *partial tableaux* for y . For $y, z \in I_n$, let the shape of $P_{\text{rB}}(y)$ and $P_{\text{rB}}(z)$ be $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$ and $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ respectively.

Proposition 4.8. For $y = \cdots (a, i)(b, i + 1) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i)(a, i + 1) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$, if $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} \neq \lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ then $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$, i.e. for $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} = (y_1, y_2, \dots)$ and $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}} = (z_1, z_2, \dots)$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^k z_i > \sum_{i=1}^k y_i$ for all suitable k .

Proof. Let the tableau of y before and after inserting (a, i) be T_y, T'_y , the tableau after inserting $(b, i + 1)$ be T''_y , and define similarly for z, T_z, T'_z, T''_z .

Consider the two adjacent insertions $T_y \leftarrow a$ and $T'_y \leftarrow b$. Since $a < b$, we have $\text{ivalue}_{T_y \leftarrow a}(i) < \text{ivalue}_{T'_y \leftarrow b}(i)$ for $i \leq \min \text{frow}_{T_y \leftarrow a}, \text{frow}_{T'_y \leftarrow b}$. For the two insertions $T_z \leftarrow b$ and $T'_z \leftarrow a$, since $a < b$, the bumping paths $B_{T_z \leftarrow b}$ and $B_{T'_z \leftarrow a}$ may intersect. Thus, we have two cases.

In the first case, assume the bumping path $B_{T_z \leftarrow b}$ and $B_{T'_z \leftarrow a}$ do not intersect, then we must have T'_z is just T'_y after interchanging i and $i + 1$ with the same shape. Moreover, i is below $i + 1$ in T'_y . The further insertions will not change the equalness of the shapes of the corresponding partial tableaux of y and z , unless there exist some insertion bumping i into the row of $i + 1$ in the partial tableau of z . Denote this bumping by $T_y^\circ \leftarrow (p, q)$ and $T_z^\circ \leftarrow (p, q)$. Then we must have the following two rows containing i and $i + 1$:

$$T_y^\circ : \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & i + 1 & \dots \\ \hline \dots & i & c & \dots \\ \hline \dots & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad T_z^\circ : \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & i & \dots \\ \hline \dots & i + 1 & c & \dots \\ \hline \dots & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Then the insertion $\leftarrow p$ bump $i + 1$ in T_y° and i in T_z° into the next row to get

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & p' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & i & i + 1 & \dots \\ \hline \dots & c & (\dots) & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & p' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & i & c & \dots \\ \hline \dots & i + 1 & (\dots) & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

To make the shape of results different, if in the insertion $\leftarrow (p, q)$, $p = q$, then we have the following rows containing i and $i + 1$ of T_y° and T_z° :

$$T_y^\circ : \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & \dots & i + 1 & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & i & & \\ \hline \dots & & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad T_z^\circ : \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & \dots & i & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & i + 1 & & \\ \hline \dots & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Then after insertion, we get:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & \dots & p' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & i & i + 1 & \\ \hline \dots & & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & \dots & p' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & i & & \\ \hline \dots & i + 1 & (\dots) & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Therefore the shape of the $T_z^\circ \leftarrow p$ dominates the shape of $T_y^\circ \leftarrow p$. Further insertions will insert $\alpha > i + 1$ into the row with i , so it will stop here and will not change the position of $i, i + 1$

and other boxes below them. Therefore it will keep the dominance order. Thus, we see that $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$.

If in the insertion $\leftarrow (p, q)$, $p \neq q$, then we have the following rows containing i and $i + 1$ of T_y° and T_z° :

$T_y^\circ :$	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>$i + 1$</td><td>...</td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>i</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>c</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	$i + 1$	i			...	c					
...	...	$i + 1$...																		
...	i																				
...	c																				
...																					
...																					

and	$T_z^\circ :$	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>i</td><td>...</td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>$i + 1$</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>c</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	i	$i + 1$...	c					
...	...	i	...																			
...	$i + 1$																					
...	c																					
...																						
...																						

Then after insertion, we get:

	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>p'</td><td>...</td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>i</td><td>$i + 1$</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>c</td><td>q</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	p'	i	$i + 1$...	c	q				
...	...	p'	...																		
...	i	$i + 1$																			
...	c	q																			
...																					
...																					

and	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>p'</td><td>...</td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>i</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>$i + 1$</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>c</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>q</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	p'	i			...	$i + 1$...	c			...	q		
...	...	p'	...																		
...	i																				
...	$i + 1$																				
...	c																				
...	q																				

Here we have c, q just below $i, i + 1$ respectively, because inserting (p, q) with $p < q$ will lead to a tableau with no odd columns. Therefore the shape of the $T_z^\circ \leftarrow (p, q)$ dominates the shape of $T_y^\circ \leftarrow (p, q)$.

Further insertions $\leftarrow (p_i, q_i)$ with $p_i \neq q_i$ will insert $\alpha < i$ or $\beta > i + 1$ into the row with i . For $\beta > i + 1$, the insertion will stop here and will not change the position of $i, i + 1$ and other boxes below them. Therefore it will keep the dominance order. For $\alpha < i$, we have the following results:

	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>p'</td><td>...</td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>α</td><td>$i + 1$</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>i</td><td>q</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>c</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>q_i</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	p'	α	$i + 1$...	i	q		...	c			...	q_i		
...	...	p'	...																		
...	α	$i + 1$																			
...	i	q																			
...	c																				
...	q_i																				

and	<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>p'</td><td>...</td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>α</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>i</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>$i + 1$</td><td>...</td><td>c</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>...</td><td>q</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	p'	α			i			...	$i + 1$...	c			q		
...	p'	...																										
...	α																												
...	i																												
...	$i + 1$...	c																												
...	q																												

In the second graph, the 1×2 grids is added in an column left to c . Therefore it will keep the dominance order.

Now it suffices to consider the insertions $\leftarrow (c_i, c_i)$. For $c_i > b$, the insertion will keep the dominance order. So assume $c_i < b$. This insertion is similar to the case when insert $\leftarrow (p_i, q_i)$ with $p_i \neq q_i$. So it will not change the dominance order. Thus, we see that $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$.

In the second case, assume the bumping path $B_{T_z \leftarrow b}$ and $B_{T'_z \leftarrow a}$ intersect. Then $k = \mathbf{frow}_{T_z \leftarrow b} < \mathbf{frow}_{T'_z \leftarrow a}$ and $\mathbf{ivalue}_{T'_z \leftarrow a}(k+1) < i$ so $\mathbf{ivalue}_{T'_z \leftarrow a}(k+2) = i$ and $\mathbf{frow}_{T'_z \leftarrow a} = k+2$. Then we must have the following rows containing i and $i+1$ of T'_y and T''_z :

...	...	p'	...	and	p'	...
...	i	$i+1$...	i		
...					...	$i+1$		

Thus, the shape of T''_z dominates the shape of T'_y . According to similar analysis as the first case, we see that $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$. \square

Proposition 4.9. For $y = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i+1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$, where $a < i < i+1 < b$, if $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} \neq \lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ then $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$.

Proof. Let the tableau of y after inserting (a, i) be T_y , the tableau before and after inserting $(i+1, b)$ be T'_y, T''_y , and define similarly for z , T_z, T'_z, T''_z .

By insertion algorithm, it is easy to see that T_z and T'_z are just T_y and T'_y replacing i by $i+1$ respectively. Then inserting $(i+1, b)$ into T'_y and (i, b) into T'_z makes T''_z equals to T''_y after interchanging i and $i+1$. Moreover, i is below $i+1$ in T''_y . Then the further result is similar to Proposition 4.8 when the bump paths do not intersect. Thus, $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$. \square

Proposition 4.10. For $y = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i+1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots$, where $i+1 < a < b$, if $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} \neq \lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ then $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$.

Proof. Let the tableau of y after inserting (i, a) be T_y , the tableau before and after inserting $(i+1, b)$ be T'_y, T''_y , and define similarly for z , T_z, T'_z, T''_z .

It is easy to see that T'_y and T'_z are the same except replacing i by $i+1$. Assume $B_{T_z \leftarrow i+1}$ and $B_{T'_z \leftarrow i}$ do not intersect. Then this case is similar to Proposition 4.8 when the bump paths do not intersect. Thus, $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$.

Assume $B_{T_z \leftarrow i+1}$ and $B_{T'_z \leftarrow i}$ intersect. Then this case is similar to Proposition 4.8 when the bump paths intersect. Thus, $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$. \square

Proposition 4.11. For $y = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$, where $i+1 < a$, if $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} \neq \lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ then $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$.

Proof. Let the tableau of y before and after inserting $(i+1, i+1)$ be T_y, T'_y and define similarly for z , T_z, T'_z .

It is easy to see that T_y and T_z are the same except replacing $i+1$ by i . Assume in T_y , i is not in the first row, then T'_y and T'_z are the same except interchanging i and $i+1$. Further insertions $c_i > i+1$ will not change the position of i and $i+1$, thus in this case, $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} = \lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$.

So it suffices to consider when in T_y , i is in the first row. Then we have the first two row of T_y and T_z as below:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & i & p' & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & q' & \cdots & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & i+1 & p' & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & q' & \cdots & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

After the insertion, we have the first two row of T'_y and T'_z as below:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & i & i+1 & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & p' & \cdots & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & i & p' & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & i+1 & \cdots & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Their shape are the same except when p' does not exist, in that case, we have:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & \cdots & i & i+1 \\ \hline \cdots & & & \\ \hline \cdots & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & \cdots & i \\ \hline \cdots & i+1 & \\ \hline \cdots & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Therefore, the shape of T'_z dominates the shape of T'_y . Since insertions $c_i > i+1$ will not affect the dominance, $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$. \square

Proposition 4.12. For the following cases, we have $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} = \lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$.

- 1 $y = \cdots (a, i+1)(b, i+2) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i)(b, i+2) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$.
- 2 $y = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < i < i+2 < b$.
- 3 $y = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $i+2 < a < b$.
- 4 $y = \cdots (b, i-1)(a, i+1) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i-1)(a, i) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$.
- 5 $y = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < i < i+2 < b$.
- 6 $y = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_1, c_1) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $i+2 < a < b$.

Proof. For all cases, let the tableau of y before and after inserting (i, i) be T_y, T'_y and define similarly for z, T_z, T'_z .

It is easy to see that T_z is just T_y after replacing $i+1$ by i . Also, for case 1-2 and 4-6, in T_y , $i+1$ is not in the first row. So the insertion $T_y \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (i, i)$ and $T_z \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} (i+1, i+1)$ will not change

the equalness of the shapes. Thus, T'_z is just T'_y after interchanging $i + 1$ and i . Further insertion $\xleftarrow{\text{rB}}(c, c)$ with $c > i + 1$ will also keep the equalness. Thus, we have $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} = \lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$.

For case 3, when $i + 1$ is in the first row of T_y , we have the first two rows in T_y and T_z as following:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & i+1 & i+2 & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & i & i+2 & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

After the insertions, we have the first two rows in T'_y and T'_z as following:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & i & i+2 & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & i+1 & \cdots & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & i & i+1 & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & i+2 & \cdots & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

They still have the same shape. Further insertion $\xleftarrow{\text{rB}}(c, c)$ with $c > i + 1$ will also keep the equalness. Thus, we have $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} = \lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$. \square

4.3 Proof of cell conjecture

Theorem 4.13. For $y, z \in I_n$, if $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y)$ and $\iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$ are in the same cell of Γ^{row} , then they are in the same molecule. In other words, all molecules of Γ^{row} are cells, respectively.

Proof. Suppose $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y)$ and $\iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$ are in the same cell, then we have a sequence $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(y_1) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{m}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(y_p) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(z) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(z_1) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{m}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(z_q) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{m}} \iota_{\text{asc}}(y)$ for some integers p and q . Then denote $\lambda > \lambda'$ by λ dominates λ' and we have $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} \leq \lambda_{y_1}^{\mathbf{m}} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{y_p}^{\mathbf{m}} \leq \lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}} \leq \lambda_{z_1}^{\mathbf{m}} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{z_q}^{\mathbf{m}} \leq \lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$, which means $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}} = \lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$. Then by Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 4.6, $\iota_{\text{asc}}(y)$ and $\iota_{\text{asc}}(z)$ are in the same molecule. \square

5 Proof of cell conjecture in n case

5.1 Column Beissinger insertion

Refer to [12], we define the Column Beissinger insertion:

Definition 5.1 (Column Beissinger insertion). Let (i, j) be the box of $T \xleftarrow{\text{RSK}} a$ that is not in T . If $a < b$ then form $T \xleftarrow{\text{cB}}(a, b)$ by adding b to the end of **column** $j + 1$ of $T \xleftarrow{\text{RSK}} a$. If $a = b$ then form $T \xleftarrow{\text{cB}}(a, b)$ by inserting $T \xleftarrow{\text{RSK}} a$.

Example. We have $\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} \xleftarrow{\text{cB}}(5, 5) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 4 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$ and $\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & \\ \hline \end{array} \xleftarrow{\text{cB}}(2, 5) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline \end{array}$.

By symmetry we refer to $\xleftarrow{\text{cB}}$ as *column Beissinger insertion*.

Definition 5.2 (Column Beissinger correspondence). Given $z \in I_n$ let $(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_q, b_q)$ be the list of pairs $(a, b) \in [n] \times [n]$ with $a < b = z(a)$, ordered with $b_1 < \cdots < b_q$. Let $c_1 < \cdots < c'_q$ be the fixed points. Moreover, define

$$P_{\text{cB}}(z) := \emptyset \xleftarrow{\text{cB}}(a_1, b_1) \xleftarrow{\text{cB}}(a_2, b_2) \xleftarrow{\text{cB}} \cdots \xleftarrow{\text{cB}}(a_q, b_q) \xleftarrow{\text{cB}}(c_{q'}, c_{q'}) \xleftarrow{\text{rB}} \cdots \xleftarrow{\text{cB}}(c_1, c_1).$$

Example. We have $P_{\text{cB}}(4231) = \emptyset \xleftarrow{\text{cB}} (1, 4) \xleftarrow{\text{cB}} (3, 3) \xleftarrow{\text{cB}} (2, 2) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array}$.

Remark 5.3. The definition of Column Beissenger correspondence is slightly different from the definition in [12]. Actually, $P_{\text{cB}}(z)$ we defined is just $\hat{P}_{\text{cB}}(z)$ in [12].

Theorem 5.4 ([12, Thm 2.13]). For $y, z = s_i y s_i \in I_n$, $A := \{i - 1, i, i + 1\}$, $B = \{i, i + 1, i + 2\}$, $C \in \{A, B\}$, let

$$\epsilon_C(j) := \begin{cases} y(j) & \text{if } y(j) \notin C \\ -j & \text{if } y(j) = j \\ j & \text{if } j \neq y(j) \in C. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

If we have one of the following cases:

- $\epsilon_A(i - 1)$ is between $\epsilon_A(i)$ and $\epsilon_A(i + 1)$.
- $\epsilon_B(i + 2)$ is between $\epsilon_B(i)$ and $\epsilon_B(i + 1)$.

Then $\iota_{\text{des}}(y) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(z)$, $\iota_{\text{des}}(z) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(y)$.

Theorem 5.5 ([12, Thm 3.18]). If $y, z \in I_n$, then the following statements are equivalent:

- $P_{\text{cB}}(y)$ and $P_{\text{cB}}(z)$ are in same shape.
- $\iota_{\text{des}}(y)$ and $\iota_{\text{des}}(z)$ are in the same molecule in Γ^{col} .

5.2 One-direction edges and dominance order for \mathbf{n}

Proposition 5.6. For $\iota_{\text{des}}(y) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(z)$ but $\iota_{\text{des}}(y) \not\rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(z)$. Then we have the following cases, where $y(i - 1)$ and $y(i + 2)$ is not between $y(i)$ and $y(i + 1)$:

- 1.1 $y = \cdots (a, i)(b, i + 1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i)(a, i + 1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$.
- 1.2 $y = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i + 1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i + 1) \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$, where $a < i < i + 1 < b$.
- 1.3 $y = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i + 1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i + 1, a) \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$, where $i + 1 < a < b$.
- 2.1 $y = \cdots (b, i) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i + 1, i + 1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i + 1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$, where $b < i$.
- 2.2 $y = \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i + 1, i + 1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i + 1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$, where $i + 1 < b$.

Proof. Since $\iota_{\text{des}}(y) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(z)$, we must have $\iota_{\text{des}}(z) = s_i \iota_{\text{des}}(y) s_i$ hence $z = s_i y s_i$ for some i . Since $\iota_{\text{des}}(y) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(z)$ but $\iota_{\text{des}}(y) \not\rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(z)$, we have $\text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(\iota_{\text{des}}(z)) \subsetneq \text{Asc}^{\text{col}}(\iota_{\text{des}}(y))$, so $\{j \in [n - 1] : j \neq z(j) < z(j + 1)\} \cup \{j \in [n - 1] : z(j) \neq j, z(j + 1) = j + 1\} \cup \{j \in [n - 1] : z(j) = j + 1\} \subsetneq \{j \in [n - 1] : j \neq y(j) < y(j + 1)\} \cup \{j \in [n - 1] : y(j) \neq j, y(j + 1) = j + 1\} \cup \{j \in [n - 1] : y(j) = j + 1\}$. Then there exist $j \in [n - 1]$ such that either $j \neq y(j) < y(j + 1)$, $y(j) \neq j < y(j + 1) = j + 1$ or $y(j) = j + 1$ and either $j \neq z(j) > z(j + 1) \neq j, j + 1$ or $z(j) = j$.

When $y(i) = i$ and $y(i + 1) = i + 1$ or $y(i) = i + 1$, we then have $z = y$ which is a contradiction. When $y(i) = i$ but $y(i + 1) \neq i + 1$, then we get the following cases:

- I.1 $y = \cdots (b, i-1)(a, i+1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i-1)(a, i) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i-1$.
- I.2 $y = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < i-1 < i+1 < b$.
- I.3 $y = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $i+1 < a < b$.
- II.1 $y = \cdots (a, i+1)(b, i+2) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i)(b, i+2) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$.
- II.2 $y = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < i < i+2 < b$.
- II.3 $y = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $i+2 < a < b$.
- III.1 $y = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+2, i+2)(i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+2, i+2)(i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < i$.
- III.2 $y = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+2, i+2)(i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+2, i+2)(i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $i+2 < a$.
- IV $y = \cdots (i+1, i+2) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, i+2) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$.

By Theorem 5.10, we see that these lead to contradictions.

When $y(i+1) = i+1$ but $y(i) \neq i$, then we get the following cases:

- 2.1 $y = \cdots (b, i) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i+1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$, where $b < i$.
- 2.2 $y = \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i+1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$, where $i+1 < b$.

When $\{y(i), y(i+1)\} \cap \{i, i+1\} = \emptyset$, by some case analysis, we get the following cases:

- 1 $j = i$: $i \neq y(i) < y(i+1) \neq i+1$.
- 2 $j = i+1$: $i+1 \neq y(i+1) < y(i+2) < y(i) \neq i, i+1$.
- 3 $j = i-1$: $i+1 \neq y(i+1) < y(i-1) < y(i) \neq i, i+1$.
- 4 $j = i+1$: $i < y(i)$ and $y(i+1) = i+2$.
- 5 $j = i-1$: $i+1 > y(i+1)$ and $y(i) = i-1$.

Thus, by Theorem 5.4 and Theorem 5.5, we get the following cases:

- 1.1 $y = \cdots (a, i)(b, i+1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i)(a, i+1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$.
- 1.2 $y = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i+1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$, where $a < i < i+1 < b$.

1.3 $y = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i+1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$, where $i+1 < a < b$.

□

For $y, z \in I_n$, let the shape of $P_{\text{CB}}(y)$ and $P_{\text{CB}}(z)$ be $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}}$ respectively.

Proposition 5.7. For $y = \cdots (a, i)(b, i+1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i)(a, i+1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$, if $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}} \neq \lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}}$ then $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}}$.

Proof. Let the tableau of y before and after inserting (a, i) be T_y, T'_y , the tableau after inserting $(b, i+1)$ be T''_y , and define similarly for z, T_z, T'_z, T''_z .

Consider the two adjacent insertions $T_y \leftarrow a$ and $T'_y \leftarrow b$. Since $a < b$, we have $\text{ivalue}_{T_y \leftarrow a}(i) < \text{ivalue}_{T'_y \leftarrow b}(i)$ for $i \leq \min \text{frow}_{T_y \leftarrow a}, \text{frow}_{T'_y \leftarrow b}$. For the two insertions $T_z \leftarrow b$ and $T'_z \leftarrow a$, since $a < b$, the bumping paths $B_{T_z \leftarrow b}$ and $B_{T'_z \leftarrow a}$ may intersect. Thus, we have two cases.

In the first case, assume the bumping path $B_{T_z \leftarrow b}$ and $B_{T'_z \leftarrow a}$ do not intersect, then we must have T'_z is just T'_y after interchanging i and $i+1$ with the same shape. Moreover, i is below $i+1$ in T'_y . The further insertions will not change the equalness of the shapes of the corresponding partial tableaux of y and z , unless there exist some insertion bumping i into the row of $i+1$ in the partial tableau of z . Denote this bumping by $T_y^\circ \leftarrow (p, q)$ and $T_z^\circ \leftarrow (p, q)$. Then we must have the following two rows containing i and $i+1$:

$$T_y^\circ : \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & \cdots & i+1 & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & i & c & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & & & \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad T_z^\circ : \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & \cdots & i & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & i+1 & c & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & & & \end{array}$$

Then the insertion $\leftarrow p$ bump $i+1$ in T_y° and i in T_z° into the next row to get

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & \cdots & p' & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & i & i+1 & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & c & (\cdots) & \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & \cdots & p' & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & i & c & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & i+1 & (\cdots) & \end{array}$$

To make the shape of results different, if in the insertion $\leftarrow (p, q)$, $p = q$, then we have the following rows containing i and $i+1$ of T_y° and T_z° :

$$T_y^\circ : \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & i+1 & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & \cdots & i & & \\ \hline \cdots & & & & \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad T_z^\circ : \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & i & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & \cdots & i+1 & & \\ \hline \cdots & & & & \end{array}$$

Then after insertion, we get:

...	p'	...
...	...	i	$i+1$	
...				

and

...	p'	...
...	...	i		
...	$i+1$	(...)		

Therefore the shape of the $T_z^\circ \leftarrow p$ dominates the shape of $T_y^\circ \leftarrow p$. Further insertions will insert $\alpha < i$ into the row with i , so it will not change the position of $i, i+1$ unless it bumps i into the next row, like the following:

...	p'	...
...	...	α	$i+1$	
...	i	(...)		
...	(...)			

and

...	p'	...
...	...	α		
...	i	(...)		
...	$i+1$	(...)		

Therefore it will keep the dominance order. By some recursive analysis, we see that λ_z^n dominates λ_y^n .

If in the insertion $\leftarrow (p, q)$, $p \neq q$, then we have the following rows containing i and $i+1$ of T_y° and T_z° :

...	...	$i+1$...
T_y° :	...	i	c (...)
	...		

and

...	...	i	...
T_z° :	...	$i+1$	c (...)
	...		

Then after insertion, we get:

...	...	p'	...
...	i	$i+1$	(...)
...	c	(...)	
(...)	(...)		
(...)	q		

and

...	...	p'	...
...	i	c	(...)
...	$i+1$	(...)	
(...)	(...)		
(...)	q		

Here since $c > i+1$, we have $\text{frow}_{T_z^\circ \leftarrow p} \leq \text{frow}_{T_y^\circ \leftarrow p}$. Therefore the shape of the $T_z^\circ \leftarrow (p, q)$ dominates the shape of $T_y^\circ \leftarrow (p, q)$.

Further insertions $\leftarrow (p_i, q_i)$ with $p_i \neq q_i$ will insert $\alpha < i$ or $\beta > i + 1$ into the row with i . For $\beta > i + 1$, the insertion will stop here and will not change the position of i , $i + 1$ and other boxes below them. Therefore it will keep the dominance order. For $\alpha < i$, we have the following results:

...	p'	...	and	p'	...	
...	...	α	$i + 1$	(\dots)		α	c	(\dots)	
...	i	(\dots)	c	(\dots)		...	i	(\dots)			
(\dots)	(\dots)					(\dots)	(\dots)				
(\dots)	q					(\dots)	q				

In both graphs, we bump i into the third row and replace $c' > i$ for the left graph and $i + 1$ for the right graph. Since $i + 1 < c'$, the dominance order is kept.

Now it suffices to consider the insertions $\leftarrow (c_i, c_i)$. For $c_i > b$, the insertion will keep the dominance order. So assume $c_i < b$. This insertion is similar to the case when insert $\leftarrow (p_i, q_i)$ with $p_i \neq q_i$. So it will not change the dominance order. Thus, we see that $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$.

In the second case, assume the bumping path $B_{T_z \leftarrow b}$ and $B_{T'_z \leftarrow a}$ intersect. Then $k = \text{frow}_{T_z \leftarrow b} < \text{frow}_{T'_z \leftarrow a}$ and $i \text{value}_{T'_z \leftarrow a}(k + 1) < i$ so $i \text{value}_{T'_z \leftarrow a}(k + 2) = i$ and $\text{frow}_{T'_z \leftarrow a} = k + 2$. Then we must have the following rows containing i and $i + 1$ of T''_y and T''_z :

...	...	p'	...	and	p'	...	
...	i	$i + 1$...	i			
...					...	$i + 1$			

Thus, the shape of T''_z dominates the shape of T''_y . According to similar analysis as the first case, we see that $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}}$. □

Proposition 5.8. For $y = \dots (a, i) \dots (i + 1, b) \dots (c_1, c_1) \dots$ and $z = \dots (a, i + 1) \dots (i, b) \dots (c_1, c_1) \dots$, where $a < i < i + 1 < b$, if $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}} \neq \lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}}$ then $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}}$.

Proof. Let the tableau of y after inserting (a, i) be T_y , the tableau before and after inserting $(i + 1, b)$ be T'_y, T''_y and define similarly for z , T_z, T'_z, T''_z .

By insertion algorithm, it is easy to see that T_z and T'_z are just T_y and T'_y replacing i by $i + 1$ respectively. Then inserting $(i + 1, b)$ into T'_y and (i, b) into T'_z makes T''_z equals to T''_y after interchanging i and $i + 1$. Moreover, i is below $i + 1$ in T''_y . Then the further result is similar to Proposition 5.7 when the bump paths do not intersect. Thus, $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}}$. □

Proposition 5.9. For $y = \dots (i, a) \dots (i + 1, b) \dots (c_1, c_1) \dots$ and $z = \dots (i + 1, a) \dots (i, b) \dots (c_1, c_1) \dots$, where $i + 1 < a < b$, if $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}} \neq \lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}}$ then $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}}$.

Proof. Let the tableau of y after inserting (i, a) be T_y , the tableau before and after inserting $(i+1, b)$ be T'_y, T''_y , and define similarly for z, T_z, T'_z, T''_z .

It is easy to see that T'_y and T'_z are the same except replacing i by $i+1$. Assume $B_{T_z \leftarrow i+1}$ and $B_{T'_z \leftarrow i}$ do not intersect. Then this case is similar to Proposition 5.7 when the bump paths do not intersect. Thus, λ_z^n dominates λ_y^n .

Assume $B_{T_z \leftarrow i+1}$ and $B_{T'_z \leftarrow i}$ intersect. Then this case is similar to Proposition 5.7 when the bump paths intersect. Thus, λ_z^n dominates λ_y^n . \square

Proposition 5.10. For one of the following cases, we have $\lambda_y^n = \lambda_z^n$.

- I.1 $y = \cdots (b, i-1)(a, i+1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (b, i-1)(a, i) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i-1$.
- I.2 $y = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < i-1 < i+1 < b$.
- I.3 $y = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i-1, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $i+1 < a < b$.
- II.1 $y = \cdots (a, i+1)(b, i+2) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i)(b, i+2) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < b < i$.
- II.2 $y = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < i < i+2 < b$.
- II.3 $y = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (i+2, b) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $i+2 < a < b$.
- III.1 $y = \cdots (a, i+1) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+2, i+2)(i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (a, i) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+2, i+2)(i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $a < i$.
- III.2 $y = \cdots (i+1, a) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+2, i+2)(i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, a) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+2, i+2)(i+1, i+1) \cdots$, where $i+2 < a$.
- IV $y = \cdots (i+1, i+2) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i, i) \cdots$ and $z = \cdots (i, i+2) \cdots (c_q, c_q) \cdots (i+1, i+1) \cdots$.

Proof. Let the tableau of y before and after inserting (i, i) be T_y, T'_y and define similarly for z, T_z, T'_z .

It is easy to see that T_z is T_y after replacing $i+1$ by i . In case I.1-3, we see that in T_y , $i-1$ is in a row higher than $i+1$. Then in T'_y we have i is in a row equal to or higher than $i-1$. Thus it cannot be bumped into the row of $i+1$, since $i-1$ will be bumped before i does. For example, if we have two rows as follows:

...	...	$i-1$	i	...	and	$i-1$	$i+1$...	
...	$i+1$...	i				

then we cannot bump i into next row while keep $i-1$ staying in its row. Therefore, in case I.1-3, we have $\lambda_y^n = \lambda_z^n$.

In case II.1-3, III.1-2 and IV, we see that in T_y , $i + 2$ is in a row equal to or higher than $i + 1$. Then in T'_y we have i is in a row equal to or higher than $i + 2$. The further insertions will not change the equalness of the shapes of the corresponding partial tableaux of y and z , unless there exist some insertion bumping i into the row of $i + 1$ in the partial tableau of y . Denote this bumping by $T_y^\circ \leftarrow (c', c')$ and $T_z^\circ \leftarrow (c', c')$. Then we must have the following two rows containing $i, i + 1, i + 2$:

...	...	i	...	and	$i + 1$...
...	$i + 1$	$i + 2$	i	$i + 2$...
...					...			

and after the insertions:

...	...	p	...	and	p	...
...	i	$i + 2$	i	$i + 1$...
...	$i + 1$	(\dots)			...	$i + 2$	(\dots)	

Since further insertions will bump $\alpha < i$ into the row of i in $T_y^\circ \leftarrow (c', c')$, the position of $i + 2$ in $T_y^\circ \leftarrow (c', c')$ will not change. Therefore in case II.1-3, III.1-2 and IV, we have $\lambda_y^n = \lambda_z^n$. \square

Proposition 5.11. For $y = \dots (b, i) \dots (c_q, c_q) \dots (i + 1, i + 1) \dots$ and $z = \dots (b, i + 1) \dots (c_q, c_q) \dots (i, i) \dots$, where $b < i$, or $y = \dots (i, b) \dots (c_q, c_q) \dots (i + 1, i + 1) \dots$ and $z = \dots (i + 1, b) \dots (c_q, c_q) \dots (i, i) \dots$, where $i + 1 < b$. If $\lambda_y^n \neq \lambda_z^n$ then λ_z^n dominates λ_y^n .

Proof. In both cases, let the tableau of y before and after inserting $(i + 1, i + 1)$ be T_y, T'_y and define similarly for z, T_z, T'_z .

It is easy to see that T_z is T_y after replacing i by $i + 1$. Then we have two cases. Assume in T_z , $i + 1$ is not in the first row, then we have T'_y and T'_z are the same except interchanging i and $i + 1$.

The further insertions will not change the equalness of the shapes of the corresponding partial tableaux of y and z , unless there exist some insertion bumping i into the row of $i + 1$ in the partial tableau of z . Denote this bumping by $T_y^\circ \leftarrow (c', c')$ and $T_z^\circ \leftarrow (c', c')$. Then we must have the following two rows containing i and $i + 1$:

$T_y^\circ :$	$i + 1$...	and	$T_z^\circ :$	i	...
...	i	(c)		$i + 1$	(c)	...		
...				...						

Then the insertion $\leftarrow c'$ bump $i + 1$ in T_y° and i in T_z° into the next row to get

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & p' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & i & i + 1 & \dots \\ \hline \dots & c & (\dots) & \\ \hline \end{array}
 \quad \text{and} \quad
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & p' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & i & c & \dots \\ \hline \dots & i + 1 & (\dots) & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

To make the shape of results different, c does not exist, and we have the following rows containing i and $i + 1$ of T_y° and T_z° :

$$T_y^\circ : \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & \dots & i + 1 & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & i & & \\ \hline \dots & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}
 \quad \text{and} \quad
 T_z^\circ : \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & \dots & i & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & i + 1 & & \\ \hline \dots & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Then after insertion, we get:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & \dots & p' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & i & i + 1 & \\ \hline \dots & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}
 \quad \text{and} \quad
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & \dots & p' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & i & & \\ \hline \dots & i + 1 & (\dots) & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Therefore the shape of the $T_z^\circ \leftarrow c'$ dominates the shape of $T_y^\circ \leftarrow c'$. Further insertions will insert $\alpha < i$ into the row with i , so we have the following rows:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & \dots & p' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & \alpha & i + 1 & \\ \hline \dots & i & (\dots) & & \\ \hline \end{array}
 \quad \text{and} \quad
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & \dots & \dots & p' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & \alpha & & \\ \hline \dots & i & (\dots) & & \\ \hline \dots & i + 1 & (\dots) & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

We see that the dominance order is kept, further insertions will also keep this order by recursive analysis. Thus, we see that $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$.

Assume in T_z , $i + 1$ is in the first row, then we have the first two row of T_y and T_z as below:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & i & a' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & & \\ \hline \end{array}
 \quad \text{and} \quad
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \dots & i + 1 & a' & \dots \\ \hline \dots & \dots & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

After the insertion, we have the first two row of T'_y and T'_z as below:

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & i & i+1 & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & a' & \cdots & \\ \hline \end{array}
 \quad \text{and} \quad
 \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \cdots & i & a' & \cdots \\ \hline \cdots & i+1 & \cdots & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Further insertions will not change the equalness of the shapes, unless it bumps i into the row of $i+1$ in the partial tableau of z . In that case, the discussion is similar as the case above. Thus, we see that $\lambda_z^{\mathbf{m}}$ dominates $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{m}}$. \square

5.3 Proof of cell conjecture

Theorem 5.12. For $y, z \in I_n$, if $\iota_{\text{des}}(y)$ and $\iota_{\text{des}}(z)$ are in the same cell of Γ^{col} , then they are in the same molecule. In other words, all molecules of Γ^{col} are cells, respectively.

Proof. Suppose $\iota_{\text{des}}(y)$ and $\iota_{\text{des}}(z)$ are in the same cell, then we have a sequence $\iota_{\text{des}}(y) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(y_1) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \cdots \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(y_p) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(z) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(z_1) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \cdots \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(z_q) \rightarrow_{\mathbf{n}} \iota_{\text{des}}(y)$ for some integers p and q . Then denote $\lambda > \lambda'$ by λ dominates λ' and we have $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}} \leq \lambda_{y_1}^{\mathbf{n}} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{y_p}^{\mathbf{n}} \leq \lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}} \leq \lambda_{z_1}^{\mathbf{n}} \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_{z_q}^{\mathbf{n}} \leq \lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}}$, which means $\lambda_y^{\mathbf{n}} = \lambda_z^{\mathbf{n}}$. Then by Theorem 5.4 and Theorem 5.5, $\iota_{\text{des}}(y)$ and $\iota_{\text{des}}(z)$ are in the same molecule. \square

Acknowledgements

We thank Hongsheng Hu for the useful discussion. On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] J. S. Beissinger, Similar constructions for Young tableaux and involutions, and their application to shiftable tableaux, *Discrete Math.* **67** (1987), 149–163.
- [2] A. Björner and F. Brenti, *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, Graduate Texts in Maths. 231. Springer, New York, 2005.
- [3] J. Du, IC Bases and Quantum Linear Groups, *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.* **56** (1994), 135–148.
- [4] B. Elias and G. Williamson, The Hodge theory of Soergel bimodules, *Ann. Math.* **180** (2014), no. 3, 1089–1136.
- [5] J. E. Humphreys, *Reflection groups and Coxeter groups*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.
- [6] D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig, Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras, *Invent. Math.* **53** (1979), 165–184.
- [7] G. Lusztig, *Hecke algebras with unequal parameters*, CRM Monograph Ser. 18, Amer. Math. Soc., 2003.

- [8] E. Marberg, Bar operators for quasiparabolic conjugacy classes in a Coxeter group, *J. Algebra* **453** (2016), 325–363.
- [9] E. Marberg and B. Pawlowski, Gröbner geometry for skew-symmetric matrix Schubert varieties, *Adv. Math.* **405** (2022), 108–488.
- [10] E. Marberg and Y. Zhang, Gelfand W -graphs for classical Weyl groups, *J. Algebra* **609** (2022), 292–336.
- [11] E. Marberg and Y. Zhang, Perfect models for finite Coxeter groups, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **227** (2023), 107303.
- [12] E. Marberg and Y. Zhang, Insertion algorithms for Gelfand S_n -graphs, *Ann. Comb.* **28**(2024), 1199–1242.
- [13] E. M. Rains and M. J. Vazirani, Deformations of permutation representations of Coxeter groups, *J. Algebr. Comb.* **37** (2013), 455–502.
- [14] J. R. Stembridge, Admissible W -graphs, *Represent. Theory*, **12** (2008) 346–368.
- [15] J. R. Stembridge, Admissible W -graphs and commuting Cartan matrices, *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, **44** (2010) 203–224.