

COMPLEXITY AND COMPLETENESS OF IMMANANTS

JEAN-LUC BRYLINSKI AND RANEE BRYLINSKI

ABSTRACT. Immanants are polynomial functions of n by n matrices attached to irreducible characters of the symmetric group \mathcal{S}_n , or equivalently to Young diagrams of size n . Immanants include determinants and permanents as extreme cases. Valiant proved that computation of permanents is a complete problem in his algebraic model of NP theory, i.e., it is VNP-complete. We prove that computation of immanants is VNP-complete if the immanants are attached to a family of diagrams whose separation is $\Omega(n^\delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$. We define the separation of a diagram to be the largest number of overhanging boxes contained in a single row. Our theorem proves a conjecture of Bürgisser for a large variety of families, and in particular we recover with new proofs his VNP-completeness results for hooks and rectangles.

1. INTRODUCTION

In algebraic complexity theory, one considers families (f_n) of multivariate polynomials, where both the number of variables and the degree are polynomially bounded functions of n (i.e., are of the form $O(p(n))$ for some polynomials $p(n)$). The complexity of (f_n) is the minimum possible size (or cost) of a computation of (f_n) . This is a function of n , and the growth of this function is what matters. Of course, we must first choose a suitable computational model for the f_n . In this context, a computational model is some type of arithmetic circuit. We assume the circuit inputs the variables and some scalars, and then computes f_n by performing the arithmetic operations $+$, $-$, $*$ on the inputs and previously computed quantities. The *size* of this circuit is then the number of operations used to compute f_n . The size of the smallest possible circuit is called the (*total*) *algebraic complexity* $L(f_n)$.

In this theory, the determinant and the permanent play a special role. The determinant and permanent families (DET_n) and (PER_n) are defined by

$$\text{DET}_n = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n} \epsilon(\pi) \prod_{i=1}^n X_{i,\pi(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{PER}_n = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n} \prod_{i=1}^n X_{i,\pi(i)} \quad (1.1)$$

where $X = (X_{ij})$ is an n by n matrix, \mathcal{S}_n is the symmetric group in n letters, and $\epsilon(\pi)$ is the sign of a permutation π . Although (DET_n) and (PER_n) look very similar, their complexities are (apparently) very different. The determinant family is *easy* to compute, in the sense that its algebraic complexity is polynomially bounded. In fact, $O(n^4)$ operations are enough to compute DET_n ; see e.g. [4]. In Valiant's algebraic model of P – NP theory, (DET_n) is the analog of a P decision problem.

However, the permanent family is apparently *hard* to compute, in that no known polynomial size circuit computes (PER_n) . The smallest known circuits for (PER_n) require $O(n \cdot 2^n)$ arithmetic operations [10, 9]. In Valiant's theory, (PER_n) is the algebraic analog

¹AMS Subject Classification: 68Q17, (05E10, 15A15, 68W30)

Date: January 23, 2003.

Key words and phrases. permanents, immanants, computational complexity, algebraic completeness .

of an NP-complete decision problem (assuming the characteristic of the ground field is different from 2). Precisely, Valiant discovered [12, 13, 5] that the permanent family is VNP-complete. This was a hard and surprising result. Valiant's hypothesis is true if and only if the algebraic complexity of (PER_n) truly grows faster than any polynomial function of n .

The representation theory of the symmetric group provides a natural way to construct families which are intermediate between the determinants and the permanents. The new families consist of immanants. For each irreducible character χ_λ of the symmetric group \mathcal{S}_n , Littlewood [7] defined the immanant of X to be the polynomial

$$\text{IM}_\lambda = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n} \chi_\lambda(\pi) \prod_{i=1}^n X_{i, \pi(i)} \quad (1.2)$$

Here $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ is a partition of size n . So $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_\ell > 0$ are integers, $\ell = \ell(\lambda)$ is the *length* of λ and $|\lambda| = \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_\ell$ is the *size* of λ . We set $\lambda_{\ell+1} = 0$. If $\lambda = (1^n)$, then χ_λ is the sign character, and so $\text{IM}_\lambda = \text{DET}_n$. If $\lambda = (n)$, then χ_λ is the trivial character and so $\text{IM}_\lambda = \text{PER}_n$. We can identify λ with its Young diagram. This is a left-justified array of ℓ rows of boxes, with exactly λ_i boxes in the i -th row. So DET_n and PER_n correspond to the two extreme partitions where λ is simply a column or a row. The *width* of λ is then the size λ_1 of its largest row.

Lower bound results for the complexity of immanants have been found by Hartmann [6], and most recently, by Bürgisser [1, 2]. One main question here is to figure out when an immanant family is VNP-complete, i.e., has the same hardness as the permanent family. Bürgisser showed (see Proposition 2.1) that for this it is natural to consider a family $(\lambda^{(n)})$ of partitions where the size $|\lambda^{(n)}|$ is polynomially bounded in n . Bürgisser conjectured that if also the width of $\lambda^{(n)}$ is $\Omega(n^\delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$, then the family $(\text{IM}_{\lambda^{(n)}})$ is VNP-complete. Bürgisser's main result in [1] is the proof of his conjecture for two types of families of partitions, one where the shapes were all hooks $(n-i, 1^i)$, and the other where the shapes were all rectangles (m^s) .

In this paper, we prove Bürgisser's conjecture for a large variety of families, where we replace the width of each partition λ by the parameter

$$k = \max_{i=1}^{\ell} \{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}\}$$

We call k the *separation* of λ . For instance, the separation of the hook $(h, 1^i)$, $h \geq 2$, is $h-1$ and that of the rectangle (m^s) is m . Our main result is

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(\lambda^{(n)})$ be a family of partitions such that*

- (i) *the size $|\lambda^{(n)}|$ is polynomially bounded in n ;*
- (ii) *the separation $k(n)$ of $\lambda^{(n)}$ satisfies $k(n) = \Omega(n^\delta)$ for some $\delta > 0$.*

Then the corresponding immanant family $(\text{IM}_{\lambda^{(n)}})$ is VNP-complete.

This result recovers, with new proofs, the two cases of hooks and rectangles treated by Bürgisser. (However in the case of hook shapes, we do not recover his result on #P-completeness).

We prove Theorem 1.1 in a rather simple way, by constructing an explicit projection, in the sense of Valiant, from IM_λ to PER_k , where k is the separation of λ (in fact, for any $k \in \{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$). Constructing such a projection means the following. For any k by k matrix A , we construct an n by n matrix A^\sharp such that (i) The value of IM_λ at A^\sharp is equal to the value of PER_k at A and (ii) each entry of A^\sharp is either a scalar or an entry of A . What makes our proof simple is the nature of A^\sharp . Our matrix A^\sharp is block diagonal. The first block

is A and the subsequent blocks are scalar matrices, drawn from a list $\{H_1, E_1, H_2, E_2, \dots\}$ where H_q and E_q are some explicit q by q matrices; see Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 5.1.

Here is the organization of the paper. In Section 2, we recall some key notions of the Valiant's theory for families of polynomials. We also state Bürgisser's result on immanant families lying in VNP.

In Section 3, we explain our projection results. The main result, Proposition 3.1, is somewhat abstract, but it easily leads to Corollary 3.2, in which we project an immanant to a permanent. Sections 4-6 are devoted to proving Proposition 3.1. Finally, in Section 7 we complete the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Returning to Bürgisser's conjecture, we note that our results in this paper give no useful information in the case where the separation of $\lambda^{(n)}$ grows too slowly for Theorem 1.1 to apply. We expect the key question here is

Question 1.2. *Suppose $\lambda^{(n)}$ is the staircase partition $(n, n-1, \dots, 2, 1)$. Is the corresponding immanant family VNP-complete?*

An affirmative answer to this question, together with a reasonable explanation, should lead to a proof of Bürgisser's conjecture. A negative answer would of course disprove Bürgisser's conjecture.

2. IMMANANT FAMILIES AND VALIANT'S ALGEBRAIC MODEL OF P – NP THEORY

In this section, we recall some definitions and results concerning Valiant's complexity classes. See [12, 13, 5, 11, 3, 2] for more information.

We fix a field k of characteristic 0; in particular k can be the field \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers. For a multivariate polynomial $f \in k[X_1, \dots, X_v]$, the *total algebraic complexity* $L(f)$ of f is the minimum number of arithmetic operations $+, -, *$ needed to compute f in an arithmetic circuit (or straight line program), using only inputs in $k \cup \{X_1, \dots, X_v\}$. For instance, if $f(X) = X^{2^n}$, then $L(f) = n$.

A p -family (f_n) is a sequence of multivariate polynomials $f_n \in k[X_1, \dots, X_{v(n)}]$ such that both the number $v(n)$ and the degree $\deg(f_n)$ are polynomially bounded. The determinant and permanent families (DET_n) and (PER_n) discussed in Section 1 are p -families. Clearly, $(\text{IM}_{\lambda^{(n)}})$ is a p -family if and only if the size $|\lambda^{(n)}|$ is polynomially bounded.

A p -family (f_n) is called p -computable if the complexity $L(f_n)$ is polynomially bounded. The set of all p -computable families (f_n) is Valiant's complexity class VP. For instance, (DET_n) lies in VP since $L(\text{DET}_n) = O(n^4)$.

A family (f_n) , $f_n \in k[X_1, \dots, X_{v(n)}]$, is called p -definable if there exists a p -computable family (g_n) , $g_n \in k[X_1, \dots, X_{u(n)}]$, with $u(n) \geq v(n)$ such that

$$f_n(X_1, \dots, X_{v(n)}) = \sum_{e \in \{0,1\}^{u(n)-v(n)}} g_n(X_1, \dots, X_{v(n)}, e_{v(n)+1}, \dots, e_{u(n)}) \quad (2.1)$$

The set of p -definable families is Valiant's complexity class VNP. It is not hard to show that (PER_n) is p -definable. Bürgisser proved that every p -family of immanants is p -definable.

Proposition 2.1 ([1, Prop. 4.1], [2, Prop. 7.9, p. 126]). *If $(\lambda^{(n)})$ is a sequence of partitions such that the size $|\lambda^{(n)}|$ is polynomially bounded, then the corresponding immanant family $(\text{IM}_{\lambda^{(n)}})$ belongs to VNP.*

Valiant's notion of VNP-completeness is based on the following simple notion of reduction. A polynomial $f \in k[X_1, \dots, X_v]$ is called a *projection* of a polynomial $g \in$

$k[X_1, \dots, X_u]$ if for some a_1, \dots, a_u lying in $k \cup \{X_1, \dots, X_v\}$ we have the identity

$$f(X_1, \dots, X_v) = g(a_1, \dots, a_u) \quad (2.2)$$

In this case, we write $f \leq g$. For instance, if $f_k(X_1, \dots, X_k) = X_1 \dots X_k$ and $n \geq k$, then $f_k \leq \text{DET}_n$ and $f_k \leq \text{PER}_n$. This follows by specializing $X = (X_{ij})$ to an appropriate diagonal matrix. Note that $f \leq g$ implies $L(f) \leq L(g)$.

A p -family (f_n) is a *projection* of the p -family (g_n) if there exists a function $t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that t is polynomially bounded and $f_n \leq g_{t(n)}$ for all n . A p -definable family (f_n) is called *VNP-complete* if every family $(g_n) \in \text{VNP}$ is a projection of (f_n) . We have

Theorem 2.2 (Valiant [12, 5]). *The permanent family (PER_n) is VNP-complete.*

This result is surprising since (PER_n) is the enumerator for the problem of deciding if a bipartite graph has a perfect matching, and this decision problem belongs to P. An immediate consequence is

Corollary 2.3. *Suppose (f_n) , $f_n \in k[X_1, \dots, X_{v(n)}]$, is a p -definable family. Then (f_n) is VNP-complete if and only if (f_n) projects to (PER_n) .*

Valiant's hypothesis asserts $\text{VP} \neq \text{VNP}$. This is a (nonuniform) algebraic analog of the famous Cook hypothesis $\text{P} \neq \text{NP}$.

3. PROJECTION FORMULAS FOR IMMANANTS

In this section, we describe our projection results. For this purpose, we use (as in [3, 2, 1]) the following notation. If A is a d by d matrix and $|\lambda| = d$, then $\text{im}_\lambda(A)$ and $\text{per}(A)$ denote the values of IM_λ and PER_d at A .

Our key result is Proposition 3.1 below. To state this, we introduce the diagonal q by q matrix D_q

$$D_q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \frac{1}{q} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

with entries $1, \frac{1}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{q}$.

We also need two notions concerning partitions. A *horizontal strip* inside λ is a set S of boxes of λ such that if s lies in S , then (a) all boxes to the right of s in the same row also belong to S , and (b) s is the lowest box in its column. Similarly, one also defines a *vertical strip* inside λ . In both cases, the size of the strip S is the total number of boxes in S . Notice that if we remove from λ either a horizontal strip or a vertical strip, then what remains is again a partition.

Proposition 3.1. *Let λ be a partition of n , and choose $q \leq n$. We have:*

- (i) IM_λ projects to $\sum_\mu \text{IM}_\mu$, where the sum is over all partitions μ obtained by removing from λ a horizontal strip of size q .
- (ii) IM_λ projects to $\sum_\nu \text{IM}_\nu$, where the sum is over all partitions obtained by removing from λ a vertical strip of size q .

We can realize the projections explicitly in the following way, where A is a square matrix of size $n - q$. In (i) we have

$$\sum_\mu \text{im}_\mu(A) = \text{im}_\lambda \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & H_q \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.2)$$

where H_q is the q by q matrix

$$H_q = D_q \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{2} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{q} & \cdots & \frac{1}{q} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.3)$$

In (ii) we have

$$\sum_{\nu} \text{im}_{\nu}(A) = \text{im}_{\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & E_q \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.4)$$

where E_q is the q by q matrix

$$E_q = D_q \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (-1)^{q-2} & (-1)^{q-3} & \cdot & \cdots & q-1 \\ (-1)^{q-1} & (-1)^{q-2} & \cdot & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.5)$$

We prove Proposition 3.1 in Sections 4-6. In this paper, we will only use the following corollary:

Corollary 3.2. *Let λ be a partition of n . Then*

- (i) IM_{λ} projects to IM_{μ} , where μ is obtained from λ by removing its first row.
- (ii) IM_{λ} projects to IM_{ν} , where ν is obtained from λ by removing its first column.

The explicit formulas are as in Proposition 3.1, where in (i) we choose q to be the size of the first row of λ , and in (ii) we choose q to be the size of the first column of λ .

Proof. We will prove (i); the proof of (ii) is entirely similar. Let q be the size of the first row of λ ; so $q = \lambda_1$. Then there is a unique horizontal strip of size q inside λ : this contains the lowest box in each column. Removing this strip from λ has the effect of shortening the i th row from λ_i to λ_{i+1} . The remaining partition is then $\mu = (\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{\ell})$. Thus IM_{λ} projects to IM_{μ} by Proposition 3.1(i). \square

By making successive applications of Corollary 3.2, we can project IM_{λ} to PER_k for any $k \in \{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$. This is because, by successively removing rows and columns from λ , we can obtain the row partition (k) . For example, if λ is the hook partition $(n - i, 1^i)$, then removing the first column of λ leaves the row $(n - i - 1)$. So here IM_{λ} projects to PER_{n-i-1} . If λ is the rectangle (m^s) , then removing the first $s - 1$ rows of λ leaves the row (m) . So then IM_{λ} projects to PER_m .

More generally, given an arbitrary partition λ , we can remove the first $i - 1$ rows of λ . This leaves the partition $\lambda^{\sharp} = (\lambda_i, \dots, \lambda_{\ell})$. Then we can remove the first λ_{i+1} columns of λ^{\sharp} ; these have lengths $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{\lambda_{i+1}}$, where π is the conjugate partition to λ^{\sharp} . This leaves exactly the row $(\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1})$. Then for any square matrix A of size $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}$ we have

$$\text{per}_{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}}(A) = \text{im}_{\lambda}(G) \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$G = \text{diag}(A, H_{\lambda_1}, \dots, H_{\lambda_{i-1}}, E_{\pi_1}, \dots, E_{\pi_{\lambda_{i+1}}}) \quad (3.7)$$

is the block diagonal matrix made up of the indicated blocks. Finally, we can chose i so that we maximize $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}$. Thus we get

Corollary 3.3. IM_λ projects to PER_k where $k = \max_{i=1}^{\ell} \{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}\}$ is the separation of λ . We can realize the projection explicitly as in (3.6) and (3.7).

4. COMPUTING IMMANANTS OF BLOCK DIAGONAL MATRICES

To prove Proposition 3.1, we start with the following simple observation about the immanants of the block diagonal matrix $\begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$. Let V_λ be the irreducible representation of \mathcal{S}_n with character χ_λ .

Lemma 4.1. *Let λ be a partition of n and write $n = p + q$. Suppose A is a p by p matrix and B is a q by q matrix. Then*

$$\text{im}_\lambda \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{|\alpha|=p, |\beta|=q} c_{\alpha, \beta}^\lambda \text{im}_\alpha(A) \text{im}_\beta(B) \quad (4.1)$$

where $c_{\alpha, \beta}^\lambda$ is the multiplicity of V_λ in the induced representation $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{S}_p \times \mathcal{S}_q}^{\mathcal{S}_{p+q}} V_\alpha \otimes V_\beta$.

Here $\mathcal{S}_p \times \mathcal{S}_q$ is the subgroup of \mathcal{S}_{p+q} formed in the usual way. I.e., we can represent \mathcal{S}_{p+q} as the permutations of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and then $\mathcal{S}_p \times \mathcal{S}_q$ is the set of elements $\sigma\tau$ where σ is a permutation of $\{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ and τ is a permutation of $\{p+1, p+2, \dots, n\}$.

Proof. Let $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & B \end{pmatrix}$. We have $\text{im}_\lambda(M) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_n} \chi_\lambda(\pi) f_\pi(M)$ where $f_\pi(M) = \prod_{i=1}^n M_{i, \pi(i)}$. Clearly, $f_\pi(M)$ vanishes unless π belongs to the subgroup $\mathcal{S}_p \times \mathcal{S}_q$. So we assume $\pi = \sigma\tau$ where $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_p$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_q$. Then $f_\pi(M) = f_\sigma(A) f_\tau(B)$, where we define f_σ and f_τ in the same way as f_π . Our aim now is to compute the character values $\chi_\lambda(\sigma\tau)$. But $\chi_\lambda(\sigma\tau)$ is the trace of $\sigma\tau$ on V_λ , and so we need to decompose V_λ as a representation of $\mathcal{S}_p \times \mathcal{S}_q$. By Frobenius reciprocity, this decomposition is

$$V_\lambda \downarrow \mathcal{S}_p \times \mathcal{S}_q = \bigoplus_{|\alpha|=p, |\beta|=q} c_{\alpha, \beta}^\lambda V_\alpha \otimes V_\beta \quad (4.2)$$

where the coefficients $c_{\alpha, \beta}^\lambda$ were defined in the statement of the lemma. Thus $\chi_\lambda(\sigma\tau) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} c_{\alpha, \beta}^\lambda \chi_\alpha(\sigma) \chi_\beta(\tau)$. Then

$$\text{im}_\lambda(M) = \sum_{\sigma, \tau, \alpha, \beta} c_{\alpha, \beta}^\lambda \chi_\alpha(\sigma) \chi_\beta(\tau) f_\sigma(A) f_\tau(B) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} c_{\alpha, \beta}^\lambda \text{im}_\alpha(A) \text{im}_\beta(B) \quad (4.3)$$

□

5. THE MATRICES H_q AND E_q

To use Lemma 4.1 to prove Proposition 3.1 we need the following properties of H_q and E_q .

Lemma 5.1. (i) $\text{per}(H_q) = 1$ while $\text{im}_\beta(H_q) = 0$ for all β different from (q) .
(ii) $\det(E_q) = 1$ while $\text{im}_\beta(E_q) = 0$ for all β different from (1^q) .

Proof. (i) Let R_q be the q by q matrix with all entries equal to 1, so that $H_q = D_q R_q$. Then $\text{im}_\beta(H_q) = \frac{1}{q!} \text{im}_\beta(R_q)$ for each partition β of q , and we get

$$\text{im}_\beta(H_q) = \frac{1}{q!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_q} \chi_\beta(\pi) = \frac{1}{q!} \langle \chi_\beta, \chi_{(q)} \rangle \quad (5.1)$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the usual inner product of characters. We know the irreducible characters of \mathcal{S}_q are orthogonal and $\langle \chi_{(q)}, \chi_{(q)} \rangle = q!$. So $\text{per}(H_q) = \text{im}_{(q)}(H_q) = 1$ and $\text{im}_\beta(H_q) = 0$ for $\beta \neq (q)$.

(ii) We have $E_q = D_q T_q$ where T_q is the last matrix in (3.5). Then $\text{im}_\beta(E_q) = \frac{1}{q!} \text{im}_\beta(T_q)$ for each partition β of q . Littlewood [7, pp. 83-86] introduced the matrix

$$Z = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \zeta_2 & \zeta_1 & 2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \zeta_{q-1} & \zeta_{q-2} & \cdot & \cdots & q-1 \\ \zeta_q & \zeta_{q-1} & \cdot & \cdots & \zeta_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.2)$$

where ζ_1, \dots, ζ_q are indeterminates, and he proved the formula

$$\text{im}_\beta(Z) = \sum_{|\gamma|=q} d_\gamma \chi_\beta^\gamma \zeta^\gamma \quad (5.3)$$

where $\zeta^\gamma = \zeta_{\gamma_1} \cdots \zeta_{\gamma_r}$ if $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r)$ with $\ell(\gamma) = r$, and d_γ is the number of permutations of cycle type γ . Here χ_β^γ is the value $\chi_\beta(\pi)$ for any $\pi \in \mathcal{S}_q$ of cycle type γ . Now we obtain the immanants of T_q by specializing the ζ_i so that $\zeta_i = (-1)^{i+1}$. Notice that ζ^γ specializes to $\epsilon(\gamma)$ where ϵ is the sign character and $\epsilon(\gamma)$ is the sign of any permutation of cycle type γ . So we find

$$\text{im}_\beta(E_q) = \frac{1}{q!} \text{im}_\beta(T_q) = \frac{1}{q!} \sum_{|\gamma|=q} d_\gamma \chi_\beta^\gamma \epsilon(\gamma) = \frac{1}{q!} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{S}_q} \chi_\beta(\pi) \epsilon(\pi) = \frac{1}{q!} \langle \chi_\beta, \epsilon \rangle \quad (5.4)$$

By orthogonality of characters again, we know $\langle \chi_\beta, \epsilon \rangle$ is zero unless $\chi_\beta = \epsilon$. This happens when $\beta = (1^q)$ and then $\langle \epsilon, \epsilon \rangle = q!$. So $\det(E_q) = \text{im}_{(1^q)}(E_q) = 1$ and $\text{im}_\beta(E_q) = 0$ if $\beta \neq (1^q)$.

Finally, for completeness, we recall Littlewood's proof of (5.3). Let \mathcal{O}_γ be the set of permutations of cycle type γ , so that $d_\gamma = |\mathcal{O}_\gamma|$. Then it suffices to compute the cycle format polynomials $\text{CF}_\gamma(Z) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{O}_\gamma} f_\pi(Z)$ (where f_π was defined in the proof of Lemma 4.1), since $\text{im}_\beta(Z) = \sum_{|\gamma|=q} \chi_\beta^\gamma \text{CF}_\gamma(Z)$. We will show that

$$\text{CF}_\gamma = d_\gamma \zeta^\gamma \quad (5.5)$$

Certainly (5.5) implies (5.3). (In fact, they are equivalent).

To compute $\text{CF}_\gamma(Z)$, we first observe that $f_\pi(Z)$ is non-zero only if each cycle of π is of the form $\theta_{i+s,s} = (i+1, i+2, \dots, i+s)$ for some i and s . Then $\theta_{i+s,s}$ contributes the factor $(i+1) \cdots (i+s-1) \zeta_s$ to $f_\pi(Z)$.

Thus the π in \mathcal{O}_γ with $f_\pi(Z) \neq 0$ are all obtained in the following way: we take a permutation $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_r)$ of $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r)$ and then π is the product of the cycles $\theta_{j_1, j_1} \theta_{j_1+j_2, j_2} \cdots \theta_{j_1+\dots+j_r, j_r}$. Then

$$f_\pi(Z) = 1 \cdot 2 \cdots (j_1 - 1) \zeta_{j_1} (j_1 + 1) \cdots (j_1 + j_2 - 1) \zeta_{j_2} (j_1 + j_2 + 1) \cdots = \frac{q!}{\phi(\mathbf{j})} \zeta^\gamma \quad (5.6)$$

where $\phi(\mathbf{j}) = j_1(j_1 + j_2) \cdots (j_1 + \dots + j_r)$. So $\text{CF}_\gamma(Z) = (\sum_{\mathbf{j}} q! / \phi(\mathbf{j})) \zeta^\gamma$ where we sum over all distinct choices for \mathbf{j} . Fortunately, we can recognize $\sum_{\mathbf{j}} q! / \phi(\mathbf{j})$ as the size d_γ of \mathcal{O}_γ . Littlewood proved this numerically by induction on r (using the formula $d_\gamma = q! / 1^{m_1} m_1! 2^{m_2} m_2! \cdots$ where $\gamma = (1^{m_1} 2^{m_2} \cdots)$) but instead we will prove it by a counting argument where we partition \mathcal{O}_γ into subsets.

We attach to each $\pi \in \mathcal{O}_\gamma$ a sequence $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, \dots, j_r)$ in the following way. Given a cycle $\sigma = (t_1, \dots, t_s)$ in \mathcal{S}_q , we put $\max(\sigma) = \max\{t_1, \dots, t_s\}$. Clearly there is a unique way to write $\pi = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_r$ as a product of r disjoint cycles so that $\max(\sigma_1) < \dots < \max(\sigma_r)$. Now let j_i be the length of σ_i . Then \mathbf{j} is a permutation of $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r)$. Let $\mathcal{O}_\gamma(\mathbf{j})$ be the set of

π attached to \mathbf{j} in this way. The cardinality of $\mathcal{O}_\gamma(\mathbf{j})$ is exactly $q!/\phi(\mathbf{j})$. To see this, we can associate to $\pi = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_r$ the word $w(\pi) = w_1 \cdots w_q$ where $(w_{j_1+\cdots+j_{i-1}+1}, \dots, w_{j_1+\cdots+j_i}) = \sigma_i$ and $w_{j_1+\cdots+j_i} = \max(\sigma_i)$. Notice that $w(\pi)$ lies in \mathcal{S}_q , i.e., is just a permutation of the word $12 \cdots q$. This sets up a bijection between $\mathcal{O}_\gamma(\mathbf{j})$ and the set of words w such that $w \in \mathcal{S}_q$ and $w_k = \max\{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$ if $k \in \{j_1, j_1+j_2, \dots, j_1+\cdots+j_r\}$. Clearly $1/(j_1+\cdots+j_r)$ of all words $u \in \mathcal{S}_q$ satisfy $\max\{u_1, \dots, u_{j_1+\cdots+j_r}\} = u_{j_1+\cdots+j_r}$, and $1/(j_1+\cdots+j_{r-1})$ of these words satisfy $\max\{u_1, \dots, u_{j_1+\cdots+j_{r-1}}\} = u_{j_1+\cdots+j_{r-1}}$, and so on. Thus $q!/\phi(\mathbf{j}) = |\mathcal{O}_\gamma(\mathbf{j})|$. We have the disjoint union $\mathcal{O}_\gamma = \cup_{\mathbf{j}} \mathcal{O}_\gamma(\mathbf{j})$ and so we conclude $d_\gamma = \sum_{\mathbf{j}} q!/\phi(\mathbf{j})$. This proves (5.5) and hence also (5.3). \square

Remark 5.2. Littlewood actually discussed the identity (5.3) in the setting where ζ_i is the i -th power sum symmetric function $p_i = p_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = x_1^i + \cdots + x_n^i$ in indeterminates x_1, \dots, x_n . (The power sums p_1, \dots, p_q are algebraically independent as long as $q \leq n$, and so there was no harm in thinking of them as indeterminates). Littlewood's result (5.3) was then that $\text{im}_\beta(Z)$ is $q!$ times the Schur function $s_\beta(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

Remark 5.3. In (i) and (ii) of Lemma 5.1, and of Proposition 3.1, there are other choices for H_q and E_q which work equally well.

Indeed, H_q can be any q by q matrix of rank 1 such that the product of its diagonal entries is $1/q!$. Or, H_q can be the following variant of E_q :

$$H'_q = D_q \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & -2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ (-1)^{q-2} & (-1)^{q-3} & \cdot & \cdots & 1-q \\ (-1)^{q-1} & (-1)^{q-2} & \cdot & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.7)$$

We could change E_q by rescaling all its rows (or all its columns) by scalars (r_1, \dots, r_q) where $r_1 \cdots r_q = 1$. But we do not know of any significantly different way to choose E_q .

6. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1

The aim of this section is to prove Proposition 3.1 using the results of the last two sections. Putting together Lemmas 4.1 and 5.1 we obtain the two formulas

$$\text{im}_\lambda \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & H_q \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{|\alpha|=n-q} c_{\alpha,(q)}^\lambda \text{im}_\alpha(A) \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$\text{im}_\lambda \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & E_q \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{|\alpha|=n-q} c_{\alpha,(1^q)}^\lambda \text{im}_\alpha(A) \quad (6.2)$$

So proving Proposition 3.1 reduces to proving (I) $c_{\alpha,(q)}^\lambda$ vanishes unless α is obtained by removing a horizontal strip of size q from λ , in which case $c_{\alpha,(q)}^\lambda = 1$, and (II) $c_{\alpha,(1^q)}^\lambda$ vanishes unless α is obtained by removing a horizontal strip of size q from λ , in which case $c_{\alpha,(1^q)}^\lambda = 1$.

These statements (I) and (II) are actually familiar facts from the theory of symmetric group representations and symmetric functions. The best reference is probably Macdonald's book [8], and so we will explain how to locate these results in his book.

We defined the $c_{\alpha,\beta}^\lambda$ by the decomposition

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{S}_p \times \mathcal{S}_q}^{\mathcal{S}_{p+q}} V_\alpha \otimes V_\beta = \sum_{|\lambda|=p+q} c_{\alpha,\beta}^\lambda V_\lambda \quad (6.3)$$

But there is a natural vector space isomorphism $\Psi : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \Lambda$ from the direct sum $\mathcal{R} = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \mathcal{R}^m$ of the character groups of the symmetric groups \mathcal{S}_m onto the algebra Λ of symmetric functions in (infinitely many) indeterminates x_1, x_2, \dots with integral coefficients. This isomorphism Ψ sends the character χ_γ of V_γ to the Schur function $s_\gamma = s_\gamma(x_1, x_2, \dots)$. In particular $\Psi(\chi_{(m)}) = s_{(m)}$ is the complete homogeneous symmetric function h_m and $\Psi(\chi_{(1^m)}) = s_{(1^m)}$ is the elementary symmetric function e_m . The isomorphism Ψ sends the character of the induced representation $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{S}_p \times \mathcal{S}_q}^{\mathcal{S}_{p+q}} V_\alpha \otimes V_\beta$ to the product $s_\alpha s_\beta$ of the corresponding Schur functions [8, Chap. I, Sec. 7]. Thus Ψ transforms (6.3) into the symmetric function formula

$$s_\alpha s_\beta = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\alpha,\beta}^\lambda s_\lambda \quad (6.4)$$

In this context, the $c_{\alpha,\beta}^\lambda$ are known as the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients.

Now computing $c_{\alpha,(q)}^\lambda$ and $c_{\alpha,(1^q)}^\lambda$ amounts to computing the Schur function expansions of $s_\alpha h_q$ and $s_\alpha e_q$. Macdonald computes these expansions in [8, Chap. I, Sec. 5, (5.16) and (5.17)], and he obtains precisely (I) and (II).

Remark 6.1. There is a third projection result similar to (i) and (ii) in Proposition 3.1. This result was found by Bürgisser [1, Lemma 5.1], [2, Lemma 7.12, p. 129] and is one of two main tools he uses to prove VNP-completeness. (A special case was already used by Hartmann [6, proof of Lemma 2]).

The result is that IM_λ projects to $\sum_{\eta} (-1)^{r(\lambda,\eta)} \text{IM}_\eta$ where the sum is over all partitions η obtained by removing from λ a “skew-hook” θ of size q and $r(\lambda,\eta)$ is one less than the number of rows of θ . This projection is realized by the formula

$$\sum_{\eta} (-1)^{r(\lambda,\eta)} \text{im}_\eta(A) = \text{im}_\lambda \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & P_q \end{pmatrix} \quad (6.5)$$

where P_q is the q by q permutation matrix corresponding to the cycle $(12 \cdots q)$.

We note that (6.5) can be proven by the same method we used to prove (3.2) and (3.4). Indeed, we find that $\text{im}_\lambda \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & P_q \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{|\alpha|=n-q} f_\alpha^\lambda \text{im}_\alpha(A)$ where the coefficients f_α^λ give the Schur function expansion $s_\alpha p_q = \sum_{\lambda} f_\alpha^\lambda s_\lambda$. Here p_q is as in Remark 5.2. Macdonald computes $s_\alpha p_q$ in [8, Sec. 3, Example 11].

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 1.1. First Proposition 2.1 says that the family $(\text{IM}_{\lambda^{(n)}})$ belongs to VNP. So by Corollary 2.3 it is enough to show that if $\lambda^{(n)}$ satisfies (i) and (ii) then the family $(\text{IM}_{\lambda^{(n)}})$ projects to the permanent family (PER_n) . We know by Corollary 3.2 that the polynomial $\text{IM}_{\lambda^{(n)}}$ projects to the polynomial $\text{PER}_{k(n)}$ where $k(n)$ is the separation of $\lambda^{(n)}$. To get the projection result for families, we need to find a function $t(n)$ such that (a) $t(n)$ is polynomially bounded and (b) the polynomial $\text{IM}_{\lambda^{(t(n))}}$ projects to the polynomial PER_n . Clearly (b) happens if $k(t(n)) \geq n$. But we have in (ii) the growth condition $k(n) = \Omega(n^\delta)$ for some δ , and so clearly we can find $t(n)$ such that $k(t(n)) \geq n$ and $t(n) = O(n^{1/\delta})$. Thus $t(n)$ satisfies both (a) and (b). This proves that $(\text{IM}_{\lambda^{(n)}})$ projects to (PER_n) .

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Bürgisser, *The computational complexity of immanants*, Siam J. Comput. **30**, no.3 (2000), 1023-1040
- [2] P. Bürgisser, *Completeness and Reduction in Algebraic Complexity Theory*, Algorithms Comp. Mat. 7, Springer Verlag, Berlin (2000)
- [3] P. Bürgisser, M. Clausen and M. Shokrollahi, *Algebraic Complexity Theory*, Grundle. der Math. Wiss. 315, Springer Verlag, New York (2000)
- [4] L. Blum, F. Cucker, M. Shub and S. Smale, *Complexity and Real Computation*, Springer New York (1998)
- [5] J. von zur Gathen, *Feasible arithmetic computations: Valiant's hypothesis*, J. Symb. Comp. **4** (1987), 137-172
- [6] W. Hartmann, *On the complexity of immanants*, Linear and Multilinear Alg. **18** (1995), 127-140
- [7] D. Littlewood, *The Theory of Group Characters and Matrix Representations of Groups*, Oxford Univ. Press (1940)
- [8] I. Macdonald, *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*, Clarendon Press, Oxford (1979)
- [9] A. Nijenhuis and H. S. Wilf, *Combinatorial Algorithms* 2nd ed., Academic Press (1978)
- [10] H. J. Ryser, *Combinatorial Mathematics*, Carus Math. Monographs vol. 14, Math. Assoc. America (1963)
- [11] V. Strassen, *Algebraic Complexity Theory*, Chapter 11, Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science, ed. J. van Leuwen, Elsevier (1990), 634-672
- [12] L. Valiant, *Completeness classes in algebra*, Proc. 11th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Atlanta, GA (1979), 249-261
- [13] L. Valiant, *Reducibility by algebraic projections*, Logic and Algorithmic: An International Symposium in Honor of Ernst Specker, Monographies de l'Enseignement Mathématique 30, Geneva (1982), 365-380

JLB: P.O. Box 1089, TRURO, MA 02666
E-mail address: jl496@yahoo.com

RKB: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PENN STATE UNIVERSITY, UNIVERSITY PARK 16802
CURRENT ADDRESS: P.O. Box 1089, TRURO, MA 02666
E-mail address: rkb@math.psu.edu, rkb248@yahoo.com
URL: www.math.psu.edu/rkb