

A UNIFORM APPROACH TO SOLITON CELLULAR AUTOMATA USING RIGGED CONFIGURATIONS

XUAN LIU AND TRAVIS SCRIMSHAW

ABSTRACT. For soliton cellular automata, we give a uniform description and proofs of the solitons, the scattering rule of two solitons, and the phase shift using rigged configurations in a number of special cases. In particular, we prove these properties for the soliton cellular automata using $B^{r,1}$ when r is adjacent to 0 in the Dynkin diagram or there is a Dynkin diagram automorphism sending r to 0.

1. INTRODUCTION

A soliton cellular automaton (SCA) is a discrete dynamical system on a one-dimensional lattice that evolves according to a particular deterministic rule. Some of the key properties of SCA are that they possess stable configurations called solitons, isolated solitons move proportional to their length, and the number of solitons and their lengths do not change after collisions. A classic and, despite its simplicity, surprisingly rich example is the box-ball system of Takahashi and Satsuma [TS90].

The box-ball system is an integrable nonlinear dynamical system and is related to the difference analog of the Lotka–Volterra equation under tropicalization [TNS99, TTMS96]. It is also an ultradiscrete version of the Korteweg–de Vries (KdV) equation [Bou77, KdV95]: a nonlinear partial differential equation that models shallow water waves in 1D (such as a thin channel). Solutions of the KdV equation were shown to separate in solitary waves, where they retained their shape after interaction, by Kruskal and Zabusky [KZ64]. These solitary waves are called solitons, and solitons in the box-ball system are the ultradiscrete analog. The inverse scattering transform was constructed in [GGKM74] and applied to the KdV equation, showing m -soliton solutions exist and that the KdV equation is an exactly solvable model.

The next breakthrough in studying SCA came from using the theory of Kashiwara’s crystal bases [Kas90, Kas91] and certain finite crystals for affine Kac–Moody algebras called Kirillov–Reshetikhin (KR) crystals [FOS09, HKO⁺99, HKO⁺02b, JS10, KKM⁺92b, KMOY07, OS08, Yam98]. SCA were reformulated using tensor products of KR crystals $(B^{r,1})^{\otimes \infty}$,¹ where the time evolution was given using the combinatorial R -matrix with a carrier $B^{r,s}$ (typically for $s \gg 1$) and the invariants were described using the local energy function [bM12, FOY00, HHI⁺01, HKO⁺02a, HKT00, MOW12, MW13, TNS99, Yam04, Yam07]. Based on these results, it is

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 17B37, 05E10, 82B23, 37B15.

Key words and phrases. soliton, crystal, rigged configuration, cellular automaton.

TS was partially supported by the National Science Foundation RTG grant NSF/DMS-1148634.

¹This could be given more generally as $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{\infty} B^{r_i, s_i}$ for any sequence $\{(r_i, s_i) \in I_0 \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$. However, we will not consider this level of generality.

conjectured that solitons are parameterized by “decoupled” KR crystals (removing nodes 0 and r from the Dynkin diagram and taking the appropriate affinization), the scattering rule is determined by the “decoupled” combinatorial R -matrix, and the phase shift is given by the local energy function for all SCA. We note that the phase shift corresponds to the change in the coefficient of the null root δ if we consider the affinization crystal (we refer the reader to [HK02, Ch. 10] for details) of “decoupled” KR crystals. Additionally, the time evolution can also be described using the row-to-row transfer matrix of integrable 2D lattice models at $q = 0$. In particular, the box-ball system is given using the KR crystal $B^{1,1}$ in type $A_1^{(1)}$.

SCA are also intimately connected to the Bethe ansatz [Bet31] of Heisenberg spin chains. The connection comes from the fact that the Hamiltonian of the Heisenberg spin chain commutes with the row-to-row transfer matrix of the 2D lattice model and can be simultaneously diagonalized [KKM⁺92a]. The analysis of the 2D lattice model and the Bethe ansatz led to the $X = M$ conjecture [HKO⁺99, HKO⁺02b], but there is a more direct combinatorial interpretation. Baxter’s corner transfer matrix [Bax89] can be to solve the 2D lattice model, which naturally corresponds to classically highest weight elements in a tensor product of KR crystals. In [KKR86, KR86], Kerov, Kirillov, and Reshetikhin introduced combinatorial objects called rigged configurations to parameterize solutions to the Bethe ansatz and developed a bijection Φ between rigged configurations and classically highest weight elements in $\bigotimes_{i=1}^N B^{1,s_i}$ in type $A_n^{(1)}$. The bijection Φ was later extended to an affine crystal isomorphism with the full tensor product in general (*i.e.*, for $\bigotimes_{i=1}^N B^{r_i,s_i}$) in type $A_n^{(1)}$ [DS06, KSS02, SW10].

The SCA for type $A_n^{(1)}$ has similar dynamics to the box-ball system, but now there are n colored balls (for $r = 1$). In the bijection Φ , the addition of vacuum states to the end of the tensor product does not change the rigged configuration, and thus we can extend Φ to be a bijection between rigged configurations and states of the SCA. Moreover, the combinatorial R -matrix intertwines with the identity map on rigged configurations under Φ , and thus time evolution acts by increasing the riggings $J_i^{(r)}$ by i . Hence, the corresponding rigged configuration under Φ^{-1} encodes the action-angle variables of the SCA, and in particular, the partition $\nu^{(r)}$ of the rigged configuration encodes the sizes of the solitons (with no interactions) [KNTW18, KS09, KOS⁺06, Tak05]. The scattering of two solitons has been identified with the affine combinatorial R -matrices [KSY07, Sak08], which ensures the Yang–Baxter property and is also valid for all intermediate states during multiple scatterings. In [KSY07], it was shown that Φ can be described by a tropicalization of the τ function from the Kadomtsev–Petviashvili (KP) hierarchy (we refer the reader to [JM83] for details). Additionally, time evolution is a tropicalization of the nonautonomous discrete KP equation [HHI⁺01].

In type $A_n^{(1)}$, there is an intermediate geometric (or rational) model between the KdV equation and the box-ball system introduced by Hirota [Hir81] called the discrete KdV equation. For the discrete KdV equation, Kashiwara’s crystals are replaced by geometric crystals [BK00, BK07]; more specifically, with the affine geometric crystals of [KNO08, LP12]. The geometric R -matrix was described by Yamada [Yam01], where the ring of geometric R -matrix invariants was studied in [LP13]. This led to a conjectural description of a geometric version of Φ

in [LPS16, Scr17a] using these invariants, where it is known that it tropicalizes to describe $\nu^{(1)}$ [LPS16].

Transitioning back to the more general setting, SCA have been well studied through explicit description of the action of the combinatorial R -matrix; *e.g.*, [bM12, FOY00, HHI⁺01, HKO⁺02a, HKT00, MOW12, MW13, TNS99, Yam04, Yam07]. Moreover, rigged configurations have been used to describe properties of SCA in types $A_n^{(1)}$ [KOS⁺06, KSY07, Sak08] and $D_n^{(1)}$ [KSY11, Sak17]. There exists an analogous (conjectural) bijection Φ for all types [DS06, JS10, KSS02, OSSS17, OS12, OSS18, OSS03a, OSS03b, OSS03c, SS15, SS06, SW10, Scr16, Scr17c]. Thus, it is expected that similar results hold for all types; in particular, that rigged configurations and the (conjectural) bijection Φ can be applied to show properties about SCA. The main goal of this paper is to do this in as general as possible with uniform methods. In particular, our results give an interpretation of [HKO⁺02b, App. B] as “decoupling” rules on the level of rigged configurations by forgetting $\nu^{(r)}$ and instead using $\nu^{(r)}$ to describe the “decoupled” KR crystals. Moreover, our results subsume the results on the scattering and phase shift of SCA (see Conjecture 2.10) from [bM12, FOY00, HHI⁺01, HKO⁺02a, HKT00, MOW12, MW13, TNS99, Yam04, Yam07] as the requisite properties of Φ are known [KSS02, OSSS17, OSS18, Scr17c]. Our results also include other types that have not previously been considered; *e.g.*, $E_{6,7}^{(1)}$ and $F_4^{(1)}$.

One key aspect of our results is that they are largely type-independent, typically relying on the properties of the KR crystals. Moreover, the proofs are typically short and straightforward, relying on (expected) properties of Φ and utilizing the natural information of rigged configurations. An important advantage to this approach is that we do not require an understanding of the often intricate combinatorial R -matrix as it (conjecturally) becomes the identity map on rigged configurations under Φ . In contrast, directly studying the SCA using KR crystals requires detailed descriptions of the combinatorial R -matrix or the evolution rules of [HKT01], as well as doing multiple applications, in order to prove properties about the SCA, leading to complicated (and type-dependent) proofs. See, *e.g.*, [bM12, FOY00, HHI⁺01, HKO⁺02a, HKT00, MOW12, MW13, TNS99, Yam04, Yam07].

We note that in order to give a uniform description and proofs of SCA, we require a formal, uniform definition of solitons and their length. As far as the authors are aware, no such definition has been given in the literature. Provided the conjectured properties of Φ are true, we mostly achieve this, but our description of length is somewhat *ad-hoc*. Our description of length requires a special considerations for elements not in the maximal component $B(\overline{\Lambda}_r) \subseteq B^{r,1}$ despite being entirely determined by the crystal. It is based upon the (conjectural) algorithm for Φ and that $\nu^{(r)}$ should describe the lengths of the solitons (which naturally shows their speed corresponds to their length). The latter property is expected as all rows of $\nu^{(r)}$ are connected with solitons of the KP hierarchy [KSY07]. Hence, we are not certain our definition of length will fully generalize. Specifically in type $C_n^{(1)}$, we can contrast this with the description of the solitons given in [HKO⁺02a, Sec. 2.3] and [HKT00, Sec. 3.2], where a vacuum element gets bounded as part of the soliton.

Our approach also allows us to give a simple description of the phase shift, the shift to the left of the larger soliton after scattering compared to its movement without scattering, in terms of the vacancy numbers of the rigged configuration. In particular, the phase shift is measuring the change in the vacancy numbers,

where we discard any contribution from the tensor factors $(B^{r,1})^{\otimes \infty}$, of $\nu^{(r)}$ after adding a smaller soliton. Furthermore, the larger class of SCA that we can examine from our results allows us to construct a number of examples where the phase shift is negative, a phenomenon only previously observed in types $D_4^{(3)}$ [Yam07] and $G_2^{(1)}$ [MOW12]. We construct such examples not just in nonexceptional types, but the simply-laced type $D_4^{(1)}$. Moreover, our results suggest that a large class of SCA can exhibit negative phase shifts. In addition, our results also connect the phase shift to the local energy function of the decoupled in certain special cases, recovering previous known results.

Rigged configurations and the bijection Φ are known to be well behaved under the virtualization map [OSS18, OSS03b, OSS03c, SS15, Scr16, Scr17c], an embedding of a crystal of non-simply-laced type into one of simply-laced type. Furthermore, it is known that an SCA constructed using $B^{1,1}$ in every nonexceptional type can be embedded in a type $D_n^{(1)}$ SCA [KTT04]. Therefore, we expect that our results could be applied to obtain analogous embedding results for other SCA and SCA in exceptional types.

We note that some of the KR crystals we consider in this paper have not been shown to exist (more specifically, in the exceptional types). Yet, this is implicit in our assumption that the combinatorial R -matrix corresponds to the identity map on rigged configurations under Φ . Thus, our results give further evidence that these KR crystals should exist. Furthermore, they are additional evidence for some of the conjectural properties of KR crystals.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give the necessary background on crystals, KR crystals, SCA, and rigged configurations. In Section 3, we describe solitons in a number of cases using the properties of the KR crystals. In Section 4, we give our main results under some natural conjectures, where we show rigged configurations encode the sizes of the solitons and give simple uniform proofs of scattering and the phase shift. In Section 5, we summarize the cases when our results are not based on any conjectures.

2. BACKGROUND

Let \mathfrak{g} be an affine Kac–Moody Lie algebra with index set I , Cartan matrix $(A_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$, simple roots $(\alpha_i)_{i \in I}$, fundamental weights $(\Lambda_i)_{i \in I}$, weight lattice P , simple coroots $(\alpha_i^\vee)_{i \in I}$, and canonical pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle: P^\vee \times P \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ given by $\langle \alpha_i^\vee, \alpha_j \rangle = A_{ij}$. Let $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ denote the corresponding (Drinfel’d–Jimbo) quantum group. Define $t_i^\vee := \max(c_i^\vee/c_i, c_0)$, where c_i and c_i^\vee are the Kac and dual Kac labels respectively [Kac90, Table Aff1-3]. We write $i \sim j$ if $A_{ij} \neq 0$ and $i \neq j$.

Let \mathfrak{g}_0 (resp. $\mathfrak{g}_{0,r}$) denote the canonical semisimple Lie algebra given by the index set $I_0 = I \setminus \{0\}$ (resp. $I_{0,r} = I \setminus \{0, r\}$) and quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ (resp. $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$). Let $\bar{\Lambda}_i$ and $\bar{\alpha}_i$ denote the natural projection of Λ_i and α_i , respectively, onto the weight lattice \bar{P} of \mathfrak{g}_0 . Note that $(\bar{\alpha}_i)_{i \in I_0}$ are the simple roots in \mathfrak{g}_0 . Denote the fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{g}_{0,r}$ by $\{\varpi_i\}_{i \in I_{0,r}}$.

We say an $r \in I_0$ is *special* if it is in the orbit of 0 in I under Dynkin diagram automorphisms. We say r is *minuscule* if it is special and \mathfrak{g} is of dual untwisted type (i.e., it is the dual type to an untwisted type). In particular, if a r node is minuscule, then $B(\bar{\Lambda}_r)$ is a minuscule $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ -representation.




FIGURE 1. Dynkin diagrams for the exceptional affine types with labels from [Kac90].

An *abstract $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -crystal* is a set B with *crystal operators* $e_i, f_i: B \rightarrow B \sqcup \{0\}$, for $i \in I$, and *weight function* $\text{wt}: B \rightarrow P$ that satisfy the following conditions:

- (1) $\varphi_i(b) = \varepsilon_i(b) + \langle h_i, \text{wt}(b) \rangle$ for all $b \in B$ and $a \in I$,
- (2) $f_i b = b'$ if and only if $b = e_i b'$ for $b, b' \in B$ and $a \in I$,

where $\varepsilon_i, \varphi_i: B \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ are the statistics

$$\varepsilon_i(b) := \max\{k \mid e_i^k b \neq 0\}, \quad \varphi_i(b) := \max\{k \mid f_i^k b \neq 0\}.$$

Hence, we can express an entire i -string through an element $b \in B$ diagrammatically by

$$e_i^{\varepsilon_i(b)} b \xrightarrow{i} \cdots \xrightarrow{i} e_i^2 b \xrightarrow{i} e_i b \xrightarrow{i} b \xrightarrow{i} f_i b \xrightarrow{i} f_i^2 b \xrightarrow{i} \cdots \xrightarrow{i} f_i^{\varphi_i(b)} b.$$

More generally, we identify the abstract crystal B with its crystal graph, an I -edge-colored weighted directed graph, where there is an edge $b \rightarrow b'$ if $f_i b = b'$. We say an element $b \in B$ is *highest weight* if $e_i b = 0$ for all $a \in I$.

Remark 2.1. The definition of an abstract crystal given in this paper is sometimes called a *regular* or *seminormal* abstract crystal in the literature.

We call an abstract $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -crystal B a *$U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -crystal* if B is the crystal basis of some $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module. Kashiwara has shown that the irreducible highest weight module $V(\lambda)$ admits a crystal basis [Kas91]. We denote this crystal basis by $B(\lambda)$, and let $u_\lambda \in B(\lambda)$ denote the unique highest weight element, which is the unique element of weight λ . Since the crystal graph of $B(\lambda)$ is acyclic, we regard $B(\overline{\Lambda}_r)$ as a poset with $b \leq b'$ if there exists a path $f_{i_L} \cdots f_{i_1} b = b'$. In particular, the crystal graph is the Hasse diagram of this poset.

We define the *tensor product* of abstract $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -crystals B_1 and B_2 as the crystal $B_2 \otimes B_1$ that is the Cartesian product $B_2 \times B_1$ with the crystal structure

$$\begin{aligned} e_i(b_2 \otimes b_1) &= \begin{cases} e_i b_2 \otimes b_1 & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_2) > \varphi_i(b_1), \\ b_2 \otimes e_i b_1 & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_2) \leq \varphi_i(b_1), \end{cases} \\ f_i(b_2 \otimes b_1) &= \begin{cases} f_i b_2 \otimes b_1 & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_2) \geq \varphi_i(b_1), \\ b_2 \otimes f_i b_1 & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_2) < \varphi_i(b_1), \end{cases} \\ \varepsilon_i(b_2 \otimes b_1) &= \max(\varepsilon_i(b_1), \varepsilon_i(b_2) - \langle h_i, \text{wt}(b_1) \rangle), \\ \varphi_i(b_2 \otimes b_1) &= \max(\varphi_i(b_2), \varphi_i(b_1) + \langle h_i, \text{wt}(b_2) \rangle), \\ \text{wt}(b_2 \otimes b_1) &= \text{wt}(b_2) + \text{wt}(b_1). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.2. Our tensor product convention is opposite of Kashiwara [Kas91].

Consider $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -crystals B_1, \dots, B_L . The action of the crystal operators on the tensor product $B = B_L \otimes \dots \otimes B_2 \otimes B_1$ can be computed by the *signature rule*. Let $b = b_L \otimes \dots \otimes b_2 \otimes b_1 \in B$, and for $i \in I$, we write

$$\underbrace{- \cdots -}_{\varphi_i(b_L)} \underbrace{+ \cdots +}_{\varepsilon_i(b_L)} \cdots \underbrace{- \cdots -}_{\varphi_i(b_1)} \underbrace{+ \cdots +}_{\varepsilon_i(b_1)}.$$

Then by successively deleting any $+-$ -pairs (in that order) in the above sequence, we obtain a sequence

$$\text{sgn}_i(b) := \underbrace{- \cdots -}_{\varphi_i(b)} \underbrace{+ \cdots +}_{\varepsilon_i(b)}$$

called the *reduced signature*. Suppose $1 \leq j_-, j_+ \leq L$ are such that b_{j_-} contributes the rightmost $-$ in $\text{sgn}_i(b)$ and b_{j_+} contributes the leftmost $+$ in $\text{sgn}_i(b)$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e_i b &= b_L \otimes \dots \otimes b_{j_++1} \otimes e_i b_{j_+} \otimes b_{j_+-1} \otimes \dots \otimes b_1, \\ f_i b &= b_L \otimes \dots \otimes b_{j_-+1} \otimes f_i b_{j_-} \otimes b_{j_--1} \otimes \dots \otimes b_1. \end{aligned}$$

Let B_1 and B_2 be two abstract $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -crystals. A *crystal morphism* $\psi: B_1 \rightarrow B_2$ is a map $B_1 \sqcup \{0\} \rightarrow B_2 \sqcup \{0\}$ with $\psi(0) = 0$ such that the following properties hold for all $b \in B_1$ and $i \in I$:

- (1) If $\psi(b) \in B_2$, then $\text{wt}(\psi(b)) = \text{wt}(b)$, $\varepsilon_i(\psi(b)) = \varepsilon_i(b)$, and $\varphi_i(\psi(b)) = \varphi_i(b)$.
- (2) We have $\psi(e_i b) = e_i \psi(b)$ if $\psi(e_i b) \neq 0$ and $e_i \psi(b) \neq 0$.
- (3) We have $\psi(f_i b) = f_i \psi(b)$ if $\psi(f_i b) \neq 0$ and $f_i \psi(b) \neq 0$.

An *embedding* (resp. *isomorphism*) is a crystal morphism such that the induced map $B_1 \sqcup \{0\} \rightarrow B_2 \sqcup \{0\}$ is an embedding (resp. bijection).

Let r be a minuscule node. Following [JS10, Scr17c], we first note that $b \in B(\overline{\Lambda}_r)$ is determined by the subset

$$X_b := \{i \mid \varphi_i(b) = 1\} \sqcup \{\bar{i} \mid \varepsilon_i(b) = 1\}$$

where $i \in I$. To ease notation, we will write this simply as a word, which we call the *minuscule word* of b . See Figure 3 for two examples. For $r \sim 0$, we decompose the crystal $B(\overline{\Lambda}_r) = \{x_\alpha\} \sqcup \{y_i\}$, where

- x_α is the unique element weight α , which is a root of the root system of \mathfrak{g} ;
- y_i satisfies $\varepsilon_j(y_i) = \varphi_j(y_i) = \delta_{ij}$ (note that $\text{wt}(y_i) = 0$).




FIGURE 2. The crystal $B(\overline{\Lambda}_2) \subseteq B^{2,1}$ in type $G_2^{(1)}$ (left) and $B(\overline{\Lambda}_1) \subseteq B^{1,1}$ in type $D_4^{(3)}$ (right) (this is the “little” adjoint representation of G_2).

See Figure 2 for an example. We will also represent elements of $B(\overline{\Lambda}_1)$ in nonexceptional types by the common $1, \dots, \overline{1}$ from [KM94, KN94].

Next, we want to characterize the elements in the unique connected component $B(s\overline{\Lambda}_r) \subseteq B(\overline{\Lambda}_r)^{\otimes s}$.

Proposition 2.3 ([Scr17c, Prop. 7.29]). *Let r be such that $\overline{\Lambda}_r$ is a minuscule weight. Then $B(s\overline{\Lambda}_r) \subseteq B(\overline{\Lambda}_r)^{\otimes s}$ is characterized by*

$$\{b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_s \mid b_1 \leq \cdots \leq b_s\}.$$

We will write the elements of $B(s\overline{\Lambda}_r)$ as the single row tableaux

$$\boxed{b_1 \mid b_2 \mid \cdots \mid b_s}.$$

This was also used to describe the elements of $B(s\overline{\Lambda}_1)$ for types A_n , B_n , C_n , and D_n in [KN94] and for type G_2 in [KM94]. However, when there is an element $y_1 \in B(\overline{\Lambda}_1)$ of weight 0 (and is the unique such element and denoted 0 in [KM94, KN94]), it can only appear once in a tableau. For example, a typical element in $B(s\overline{\Lambda}_1)$ in type B_n is of the form:

$$\boxed{1 \mid \cdots \mid 1 \mid 2 \mid \cdots \mid n \mid 0 \mid \overline{n} \mid \cdots \mid \overline{2} \mid \overline{1} \mid \cdots \mid \overline{1}}$$

2.1. Kirillov–Reshetikhin crystals. Let c_a denote the Kac labels [Kac90, Table Aff1-3]. Let $U'_q(\mathfrak{g}) := U_q([\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}])$, and we note that the weight lattice is given by $P' = P/\mathbb{Z}\delta$, where $\delta = \sum_{a \in I} c_a \alpha_a$ is the null root. In particular, the simple roots in P' have a linear dependence. We will not be considering $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -crystals in this paper, and so we abuse notation and denote the $U'_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -weight lattice by P . For a $U'_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -crystal B , we say $b \in B$ is *classically highest weight* if $e_i b = 0$ for all $i \in I_0$.

An important class of finite-dimensional irreducible $U'_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules are *Kirillov–Reshetikhin (KR) modules*, which are characterized by their Drinfel’d polynomials [CP95, CP98]. A (conjectural [HKO⁺99, HKO⁺02b]) remarkable property of KR modules is that they admit crystal bases, which are known as *Kirillov–Reshetikhin (KR) crystals*. A KR crystal is denoted by $B^{r,s}$, where $r \in I_0$ and $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. KR




FIGURE 3. The crystal $B(\overline{\Lambda}_1)$ of type E_6 (left) and $B(\overline{\Lambda}_5)$ of type D_5 (right).

crystals were shown to exist in all nonexceptional types in [OS08] and a combinatorial model given in [FOS09]. Jones and Schilling showed KR crystals exist and gave a combinatorial model for $B^{r,s}$, where $r = 1, 2, 6$, in type $E_6^{(1)}$ [JS10]. The cases $B^{1,s}$ in type $D_4^{(3)}$ [KMOY07] and $B^{2,s}$ in type $G_2^{(1)}$ [Yam98] are also known to exist and have a combinatorial model. The KR crystal $B^{r,1}$ in all types was constructed uniformly using projected level-zero LS paths by the work of Naito and Sagaki [NS08a, NS08b].

We will also describe the elements of $B^{r,1}$ when $r \sim 0$ following [BFKL06]. Specifically for \mathfrak{g} not of type $A_n^{(1)}$ or $A_{2n}^{(2)\dagger}$, we have $B^{r,1} \cong B(\bar{\Lambda}_r) \oplus B(0)$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ -crystals. We denote the unique element $\emptyset \in B(0)$, which plays the role of y_0 . For type $A_{2n}^{(2)\dagger}$, we have $B^{r,1} \cong B(\bar{\Lambda}_r)$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ -crystals.

There exists a unique classical component $B(s\bar{\Lambda}_r) \subseteq B^{r,s}$. Moreover, we have $B(s\bar{\Lambda}_r) \cong B^{r,s}$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ -crystals when r is a minuscule node. Let $u(B^{r,s}) = u_{r\bar{\Lambda}_s} \in B(s\bar{\Lambda}_r) \subseteq B^{r,s}$ denote the *maximal element*, which is the unique element in $B^{r,s}$ of classical weight $s\bar{\Lambda}_r$. For $B = \bigotimes_{i=1}^N B^{r_i, s_i}$, the maximal element is $u(B) = u(B^{r_1, s_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes u(B^{r_N, s_N})$, which is the unique element of classical weight $\sum_{i=1}^N s_i \bar{\Lambda}_{r_i}$. Let $v(B)$ denote the *minimal element* of B , which is the unique element of classical weight $-\sum_{i=1}^N s_i \bar{\Lambda}_{r_i}$.

It is conjectured that tensor products of KR crystals are connected, which is known in nonexceptional types [Oka13] and when the KR crystals are perfect of the same level [FSS07, ST12]. Since tensor products of KR crystals are (conjecturally) connected, there exists a unique $U'_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -crystal morphism $R: B \otimes B' \rightarrow B' \otimes B$, called the *combinatorial R-matrix*, defined by

$$R(u(B) \otimes u(B')) = u(B') \otimes u(B).$$

We denote the combinatorial R -matrix $R(b \otimes b') = \tilde{b}' \otimes \tilde{b}$ pictorially by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & b & \\ & | & \\ \tilde{b}' & \leftarrow & b' \\ & | & \\ & \tilde{b} & \end{array}.$$

We now describe an important statistic that arises from mathematical physics called the *local energy function*. Let $\tilde{b}' \otimes \tilde{b} = R(b \otimes b')$, and define the following conditions:

$$(LL) \quad e_0(b \otimes b') = e_0 b \otimes b' \text{ and } e_0(\tilde{b}' \otimes \tilde{b}) = e_0 \tilde{b}' \otimes \tilde{b};$$

$$(RR) \quad e_0(b \otimes b') = b \otimes e_0 b' \text{ and } e_0(\tilde{b}' \otimes \tilde{b}) = \tilde{b}' \otimes e_0 \tilde{b}.$$

The local energy function $H: B^{r,s} \otimes B^{r',s'} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is defined by

$$H(e_i(b \otimes b')) = H(b \otimes b') + \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } i = 0 \text{ and } (LL), \\ 1 & \text{if } i = 0 \text{ and } (RR), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

and it is known H is defined up to an additive constant [KKM⁺92a]. We normalize H by setting $H(u(B^{r,s}) \otimes u(B^{r',s'})) = 0$. Note that H is constant on classical components.

For special nodes, the local energy has the following form.

$b' \otimes b$	$u \otimes u_{\overline{\Lambda}_r}$	$(f_r u) \otimes u$	$\emptyset \otimes u$	$u \otimes \emptyset$	$x \otimes u_{\overline{\Lambda}_r}$	$y_r \otimes u$	$v \otimes u$	$\emptyset \otimes \emptyset$
$H(b' \otimes b)$	0	$-A_{0,r}$	1	1	2	2	2	2

TABLE 1. Local energy on $B^{r,1} \otimes B^{r,1}$ for $r \sim 0$, where $u = u(B^{r,1})$, $v = v(B^{r,1})$, $x \in B(\overline{\Lambda}_r) \setminus \{u, f_r u\}$.

Theorem 2.4 ([Scr17c, Thm. 7.5]). *Let r be a special node. Then the classically highest weight elements of $B^{r,s} \otimes B^{r,s'}$ are of the form $b \otimes u(B^{r,s'})$ and $H(b \otimes u(B^{r,s'}))$ equals the number of r -arrows in the path from b to $u_{s\overline{\Lambda}_r}$ in $B(s\overline{\Lambda}_r)$.*

For $r \sim 0$, the local energy has the following form.

Theorem 2.5 ([BFKL06, Thm. 6.2]). *Let $r \sim 0$. Then the local energy of $B^{r,1} \otimes B^{r,1}$ is given in Table 1 (it is specified on the I_0 -highest weight elements).*

Remark 2.6. The local energy function on $B^{r,1} \otimes B^{r,1}$ from [BFKL06] in Table 1 is renormalized to our convention. Let $u = u(B^{r,1})$. We note that there are two minor errors in [BFKL06], where it is stated $H(x \otimes u) = 1$ and $H(f_r u \otimes u) = 1$ (the only difference is for types $D_{n+1}^{(2)}$ and $A_{2n}^{(2)}$).

Define $\varphi(b) = \sum_{i \in I} \varphi_i(b) \Lambda_i$. Let $b^\sharp \in B^{r,s}$ be the unique element such that $\varphi(b^\sharp) = \ell \Lambda_0$, where $\ell = \min\{\langle c, \varphi(b) \rangle \mid b \in B^{r,s}\}$ and c is the canonical central element. For example, when r is a special node, we have $b^\sharp = v(B^{r,s})$. Following [HKO⁺02b], we then define $D_{B^{r,s}}: B^{r,s} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$D_{B^{r,s}}(b) = H(b \otimes b^\sharp) - H(u(B^{r,s}) \otimes b^\sharp).$$

Let $B = \bigotimes_{k=1}^N B^{r_k, s_k}$. We define *energy* [HKO⁺99] $D: B \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$D = \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq N} H_j R_{j+1} R_{j+2} \cdots R_{k-1} + \sum_{j=1}^N D_{B^{r_j, s_j}} R_1 R_2 \cdots R_{j-1}, \quad (2.2)$$

where R_j and H_j are the combinatorial R -matrix and local energy function, respectively, acting on the j -th and $(j+1)$ -th factors and $D_{B^{r_j, s_j}}$ acts on the rightmost factor. Note that D is constant on classical components since H is and R is a $U'_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -crystal isomorphism.

If we restrict ourselves to the case when $B = (B^{r,s})^{\otimes N}$ for r a minuscule node, then we can simplify the energy function to

$$D(b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_N) = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} j H(b_j \otimes b_{j+1}). \quad (2.3)$$


2.2. Soliton cellular automata. A *soliton cellular automaton (SCA)* using $B^{r,1}$ of type \mathfrak{g} is a discrete dynamical system, where a *state* is an element in $\bigotimes_{k=-\infty}^0 B^{r,1}$ of the form

$$\cdots \otimes u_1 \otimes u_1 \otimes b_L \otimes \cdots \otimes b_1 \otimes b_0,$$

where u_s is the maximal element of $B^{r,s}$, for some $L \gg 1$. The element u_1 in a state is called a *vacuum element*. Given a state b , define the *time evolution operator* $T_\ell(b)$ by

$$u_\ell \otimes T_\ell(b) = \cdots R_{-3} R_{-2} R_{-1} R_0(b \otimes u_\ell).$$

Note that this is well defined because eventually we have $R(u_1 \otimes u_\ell) = u_\ell \otimes u_1$. We depict this by



The *state energy* is defined as

$$E_\ell(b) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} H(b_{-k} \otimes u^{(k)}).$$

When $\ell = 1$, the state energy may be simplified as

$$E_1(b) = \sum_{k=0}^{L+1} H(b_k \otimes b_{k+1}),$$


where $b_1 = b_{-L-1} = u_1$, since the combinatorial R -matrix $R: B^{r,s} \otimes B^{r,s} \rightarrow B^{r,s} \otimes B^{r,s}$ is the identity map.

Definition 2.7. Consider an SCA using $B^{r,1}$ of type \mathfrak{g} . A *soliton* is a tensor product $b = b_{-L} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_0$ such that $b_k \neq u_1$, for all k , and $E_1(b) = H(f_r u_1 \otimes u_1)$ (with b considered as a state by $\cdots \otimes u_1 \otimes u_1 \otimes b$). The *length* of a soliton is $\sum_{k=0}^L N_r(b_{-k})$, where

$$N_r(b_{-k}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } b_{-k} = \emptyset, \\ |\{a \mid i_a = r\}| & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for $e_{i_1} \cdots e_{i_m} b_{-k} = u_{\Lambda_r}$.

Example 2.8. Consider $r = 1$ in type $C_3^{(1)}$. Then $2 \otimes \bar{1}$ is a soliton of length 3 as $e_1 e_2 e_3 e_2 e_1 \bar{1} = 1 = u_1$ and $E_1(2 \otimes \bar{1}) = H(2 \otimes 1) = 1$. Therefore, ℓ is not necessarily equal L . In particular, we apply $T_5(\cdots \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes 2 \otimes \bar{1})$:



Note that the soliton moved 3 steps to the left, which agrees with its length.

Let $\mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_m)$ denote the set of states consisting of a solitons of length ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_m , in that order from right to left, in the SCA using $B^{r,1}$ of type \mathfrak{g} that are “far apart;” *i.e.*, the solitons (pairwise) will not be interacting after applying T_∞ . Note that the set of solitons of length ℓ is equivalent to $\mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell)$ up to removing vacuum states.

Example 2.9. Let \mathfrak{g} be of type $D_5^{(2)}$. In this example and all subsequent examples, unless otherwise stated, we will evolve the SCA by T_∞ (or T_ℓ for $\ell \gg 1$) and we

²We consider $D_3^{(1)} = A_3^{(1)}$ and $D_2^{(1)} = A_1^{(1)} \times A_1^{(1)}$. Furthermore, we consider $X_{\mathfrak{R}(1)}^{(t)} = A_1^{(1)}$ whenever $X_{\mathfrak{R}(1)}^{(t)} \neq A_2^{(2)}$.

\mathfrak{g}	$F_4^{(1)}$	$F_4^{(1)}$	$F_4^{(1)}$	$E_6^{(2)}$	$E_6^{(2)}$	$E_6^{(2)}$	$G_2^{(1)}$	$D_4^{(3)}$
r	1	2, 3	4	1	2, 3	4	1, 2	1, 2
$\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_{0,r}$	$C_3^{(1)}$	$A_2^{(1)} \times A_1^{(1)}$	$B_3^{(1)}$	$D_4^{(2)}$	$A_2^{(1)} \times A_1^{(1)}$	$A_5^{(2)}$	$A_1^{(1)}$	$A_1^{(1)}$

TABLE 3. The restrictions given by removing node r in type \mathfrak{g} considered.

Three of the fundamental questions about SCA are given as the following conjecture.³ This has not been explicitly stated in the literature as far as the authors are aware, but it is known to experts.

Conjecture 2.10. *Consider an SCA using $B^{r,1}$ of type \mathfrak{g} , and fix some integers $\ell_1 < \ell_2$.*

- (1) *There exists a bijection Ψ between solitons of length ℓ and elements in*

$$\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell) := \bigotimes_{r' \sim r} \begin{cases} B^{r', \ell \tilde{\gamma}_r / \gamma_{r'}} & \text{if } \tilde{\gamma}_r / \gamma_{r'} \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ B^{r', \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} \otimes B^{r', \lceil \ell/2 \rceil} & \text{if } \tilde{\gamma}_r / \gamma_{r'} = 1/2, \\ B^{r', \lfloor \ell/3 \rfloor} \otimes B^{r', \lfloor \ell/3 \rfloor + \sigma} \otimes B^{r', \lfloor \ell/3 \rfloor + \tau} & \text{if } \tilde{\gamma}_r / \gamma_{r'} = 1/3, \end{cases}$$

of type $\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_{r,0}$, where $\sigma = 1$ (resp. $\tau = 1$) if the remainder of $\ell/3$ is at least 1 (resp. equals 2) and 0 otherwise.

- (2) *The **scattering rule** of two solitons, a state in $\mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \ell_2)$ evolving to $\mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_2, \ell_1)$ under sufficiently many time evolutions, is given by the combinatorial R -matrix*

$$R: \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1) \otimes \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_2) \otimes \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1)$$

of type $\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_{0,r}$.

- (3) *The **phase shift**, the shift of the soliton positions after scattering compared to if there was no interaction, is given by*

$$\delta = 2\ell_1 - C_r H(x \otimes y),$$

where $x \in \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1)$ and $y \in \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_2)$ correspond to the solitons given by Part (1) and $C_r \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Remark 2.11. Conjecture 2.10(1) can be considered an interpretation of the formulas given in [HKO⁺02b, App. B].

We make some remarks about Conjecture 2.10. First, the ordering of the tensor factors in Part (1) does not matter by the combinatorial R -matrix. Additionally, we can extend Part (1) to a more general case.

Definition 2.12 (Decoupling rule). Define

$$\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k) := \bigotimes_{i=1}^k \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_i).$$

We construct a bijection between $\mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k)$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k)$ by applying the bijection Ψ from Part (1) on each soliton of a fixed state $p \in \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k)$. We call the resulting bijection the **decoupling rule**.

³Two other fundamental questions include determining the soliton equations and an ultradiscrete description.

TABLE 4. The factors $(\gamma_i)_{i \in I}$.

where $L_s^{(r)}$ equals the number of factors $B^{r,s}$ that occur in B . When there is no danger of confusion, we will simply write $p_\ell^{(i)}$.

A *B-rigged configuration* is the pair (ν, J) , where ν is a configuration and $J = (J_\ell^{(i)})_{(i,\ell) \in \mathcal{H}_0}$ be such that $J_\ell^{(i)}$ is a multiset $\{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x \leq p_\ell^{(i)}(\nu; B)\}$ ⁴ with $|J_\ell^{(i)}| = m_\ell^{(i)}$ for all $(i, \ell) \in \mathcal{H}_0$. The integers in $J_\ell^{(i)}$ are called *riggings* or *labels*, and we can associate each rigging in $J_\ell^{(i)}$ to a row of length ℓ in $\nu^{(i)}$. The *corriging* or *colabel* of a rigging $x \in J_\ell^{(i)}$ is defined as $p_\ell^{(i)} - x$. For any $K \subseteq I$, a *K-highest weight B-rigged configuration* is a rigged configuration (ν, J) such that $\min J_\ell^{(i)} \geq 0$ (we define the minimum to be 0 when $|J_\ell^{(i)}| = 0$) for all $(i, \ell) \in K \times \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. When $K = I$, we say the *B-rigged configuration* is *highest weight*. Let $\text{RC}^\nabla(B)$ denote the set of all highest weight *B-rigged configurations*. When *B* is clear, we call a *B-rigged configuration* simply a *rigged configuration*.

Next, let $\text{RC}(B)$ denote the closure of $\text{RC}^\nabla(B)$ under the following crystal operators. For simplicity of the exposition, we consider \mathfrak{g} to not be of type $A_{2n}^{(2)}$ nor $A_{2n}^{(2)\dagger}$ and refer the reader to [SS15, Def. 3.1]. Fix a *B-rigged configuration* (ν, J) and $i \in I_0$. For simplicity, we assume there exists a row of length 0 in $\nu^{(a)}$ with a rigging of 0. Let $x = \min\{\min J_\ell^{(i)} \mid \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$; i.e., the smallest rigging in $\nu^{(i)}$.

e_i: If $x = 0$, then define $e_i(\nu, J) = 0$. Otherwise, remove a box from the smallest row with rigging x , replace that label with $x + 1$, and change all other riggings so that the corrigings remain fixed. The result is $e_i(\nu, J)$.

f_i: If the smallest corriging of $\nu^{(i)}$ is 0, then define $f_i(\nu, J) = 0$. Otherwise, add a box from the largest row with rigging x , replace that label with $x - 1$, and change all other riggings so that the corrigings remain fixed. The result is $f_i(\nu, J)$.

We finish the $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ -crystal structure on $\text{RC}(B)$ by defining

$$\overline{\text{wt}}(\nu, J) = \sum_{(i,\ell) \in \mathcal{H}_0} \ell \left(L_\ell^{(i)} \overline{\Lambda}_i - m_\ell^{(i)} \overline{\alpha}_i \right).$$

Theorem 2.14 ([Sch06, SS15]). *Let B be a tensor product of KR crystals. Fix some $(\nu, J) \in \text{RC}^\nabla(B)$. Let $X_{(\nu, J)}$ denote the closure of (ν, J) under e_i and f_i for all $a \in I_0$. Then, we have $X_{(\nu, J)} \cong B(\lambda)$, where $\lambda = \overline{\text{wt}}(\nu, J)$.*

Rigged configurations also come with a natural statistics from mathematical physics called *cocharge* given by

$$\text{cc}(\nu, J) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{(i,\ell) \in \mathcal{H}_0 \\ (j,k) \in \mathcal{H}_0}} \frac{t_i^\vee A_{ij}}{\gamma_k} \min(\tilde{\gamma}_i \ell, \tilde{\gamma}_j k) m_\ell^{(i)} m_k^{(j)} + \sum_{(i,\ell) \in \mathcal{H}_0} t_i^\vee \sum_{x \in J_\ell^{(i)}} x.$$

Cocharge is invariant under the classical crystal operators.

Proposition 2.15 ([Sch06, SS15]). *Fix a classical component $X_{(\nu, J)}$ as given in Theorem 2.14. Cocharge is constant on $X_{(\nu, J)}$.*

Next, fix $B = (B^{r,1})^{\otimes N}$, where r is a minuscule node. We define a bijection $\Phi: \text{RC}(B) \rightarrow B$ by repeating the process below for each factor from left to right. Start at $b = u_{\overline{\Lambda}_r}$, and set $\ell_0 = 1$. Consider step j . Let ℓ_j denote the minimal $k_i \geq \ell_{j-1}$ over all $i \in I_0$ such that $f_i b \neq 0$ and $\nu^{(i)}$ has a singular row of length k_i that has not been previously selected. If no such row exists, terminate, set all

⁴If $\mathfrak{g} = A_{2n}^{(2)\dagger}$ and $i = n$ and i odd, then we take $x \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$.

$\ell_{j'} = \infty$ for $j' \geq j$, and return b . Otherwise, select such a row and repeat the above with $f_{i'}(b)$, where $\nu^{(i')}$ is the partition that the row was selected from. We then construct $\delta(\nu, J)$ by removing a box from all selected rows and keeping those rows singular.

We sketch the inverse bijection Φ^{-1} when r is a minuscule node. This is given by adding factors right to left by starting at b and finding a path to $u_{\overline{\Lambda}_r}$ by selecting the largest singular rows that were at most as large as the previously selected row. We terminate when we reach $u_{\overline{\Lambda}_r}$.

When $r \sim 0$, the bijection Φ is similar to when r is minuscule except we are allowed to select a row twice when at a negative root and we can select a quasisingular row, a row such that the rigging equals $p_\ell^{(i)} - 1$ and $\max J_\ell^{(i)} = p_\ell^{(i)} - 1$, when going into y_i for some $i \in I_0$. For the remaining nodes, we need the box-splitting map, which we do not describe here. Instead, for a precise description of Φ , we refer the reader to [KSS02, OSSS17, OSS18, Scr17c].

We recall some conjectural properties of the bijection Φ (see, *e.g.*, [SS15]). We will need the map $\theta: \text{RC}(B) \rightarrow \text{RC}(B)$ on highest weight rigged configurations that sends every rigging to its corresponding corigging and extended as a classical crystal isomorphism.

Conjecture 2.16. *Let $B = \bigotimes_{k=1}^N B^{r_k, s_k}$. The map $\Phi: \text{RC}(B) \rightarrow B$ is a classical crystal isomorphism such that $\text{cc} = D \circ \Phi \circ \theta$.*

Conjecture 2.17. *Let $B = \bigotimes_{k=1}^N B^{r_k, s_k}$. The diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{RC}(B) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{RC}(B') \\ \Phi \downarrow & & \downarrow \Phi \\ B & \xrightarrow{R} & B' \end{array}$$

commutes for any reordering $B' = \bigotimes_{k=1}^N B^{r'_k, s'_k}$.

It is known that Conjecture 2.16 and Conjecture 2.17 hold in general for nonexceptional types $A_n^{(1)}$ [KSS02, OSSS17, OSS18]. These conjectures have been proven in a number of special cases for exceptional types [OS12, SS15, SS06, Scr16, Scr17c].

3. SOLITONS

In this section, we describe the solitons of length ℓ by using tensor products of KR crystals in a number of special cases. Two particular cases we cover in general are when r is minuscule and $r \sim 0$.

We adopt the following notation. Let $(\varpi_r)_{r \in I_{0,r}}$ denote the fundamental weights of type $\mathfrak{g}_{0,r}$. Let $\varpi = \sum_{r' \sim r} \varpi_{r'}$ and $u_\varpi = f_r u_{\overline{\Lambda}_r}$. Note that this is a slight abuse of notation, but u_ϖ is the unique $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight element of the unique $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystal $B(\varpi) \subseteq B(\overline{\Lambda}_r)$. Let v_ϖ denote the $I_{0,r}$ -lowest weight element of $B(\varpi) \subseteq B(\overline{\Lambda}_r)$. Let $u = u(B^{r,1})$ and $v = v(B^{r,1})$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let r be a special node or $r = 1$ for \mathfrak{g} of type $B_n^{(1)}$, $C_n^{(1)}$, $A_{2n}^{(2)\dagger}$, or $D_4^{(3)}$. For a soliton $p = b_{-L} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_0 \in \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell)$, we have*

$$u < b_{-L} \leq \cdots \leq b_0 \leq w = \begin{cases} v & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} = C_n^{(1)}, A_{2n}^{(2)\dagger} \text{ and } r = 1, \\ v_\varpi & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

Proof. In both of these cases, we have $1 \sim 0$, and so the local energy is given by Theorem 2.5. In particular, we have $H(u_{\varpi} \otimes u) = 2$. Note that $H(\emptyset \otimes \emptyset) = 2$ and $H(b \otimes \emptyset) = H(\emptyset \otimes b) = 1$ for all $b \in B(\overline{\Lambda}_r)$. The remainder of the proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.1. \square

Example 3.4. Consider an SCA starting with a state in $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}(1, 2, 4)$ of type $D_4^{(2)}$:

[illegible]

$$u < b_{-L} \leq \cdots \leq b_0 \leq v_{\varpi}.$$

- in type $B_n^{(1)}$, there is at most one $x_{\overline{\Lambda}_1}$ or $x_{\overline{\Lambda}_1 - \alpha_1}$,
- in type $G_2^{(1)}$, there is at most one $x_{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}$ or $x_{2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}$.

We note that any $r' \sim r$ is a special node in $\widehat{\mathbf{g}}_{0,r}$. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(s) \cong B(s\varpi)$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystals. Next, we note that if $H(b_0 \otimes u) = 1$ then either $b_0 \in B(\varpi)$ or $b_0 = \emptyset$. The proof of this is similar to the proof given in Proposition 3.1, and the lowest weight element is $v_{\varpi} \otimes u$. We note that we cannot have $\emptyset \otimes u$ as $H(x \otimes \emptyset) = 1$ for all $x \in B(\overline{\Lambda}_r)$, which would give a state energy of at least 2.

We give an example of the computation of Proposition 3.5. We note that $B(\overline{\Lambda}_3)$ in type C_3 , which comes from $F_4^{(1)}$, is also characterized by Proposition 2.3, but not $B(\overline{\Lambda}_4)$ in type C_4 .

Example 3.6. Consider an SCA starting with a state in $\mathcal{S}^{(2)}(2, 4)$ in type $B_4^{(1)}$:

Note that in this example, the phase shift is 0.

Our next result shows that Conjecture 2.10(1) holds for some special cases, which we show by direct computation.

$$\Psi: \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell).$$
$$u_{\mathcal{B}}^{\otimes m} \otimes v^{\otimes \overline{m}} \mapsto (f_1^{\overline{m}} u_{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor}) \otimes u_{\lceil \ell/2 \rceil},$$

We note that v and \emptyset both have weight 0 as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystals and contribute 2 and 1, respectively, to the length of the soliton. These are also the only elements that appear in the solitons that are not in $B(\varpi)$. Therefore, we define Ψ by

$$u_{\overline{m}}^{\otimes m} \otimes v^{\otimes \overline{m}} \otimes \emptyset^{\otimes m_*} \mapsto u_{m\varpi},$$

where $m + 2\overline{m} + m_* = \ell$ (and $m_* \in \{0, 1\}$), and extend as a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystal morphism.

Note that the defining condition of the solitons from Proposition 3.1, Proposition 3.3, or Proposition 3.5 and elements in $B(k\varpi)$ from Proposition 2.3 agree with the description of single row tableaux, which are given pairwise by $x \leq y$ for $x \otimes y$ with y_r appearing at most once. Therefore Ψ is a bijection by considering the classical decompositions of $\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell)$. It is clear that the $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -weights agree and $\Psi(f_i p) = f_i \Psi(p)$ for all $i \in I_{0,r}$. Hence, the map Ψ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystal isomorphism as desired. \square

We can describe the map Ψ given by Proposition 3.7 explicitly using Kashiwara–Nakashima (KN) tableaux [FOS09, KN94] for $r = 2$, which is adjacent to 0, in types $A_{2n-1}^{(2)}$, $B_n^{(1)}$, and $D_n^{(1)}$.⁵ We consider type $D_n^{(1)}$ [MW13], but the other types are similar. We have

$$\begin{array}{|c|} \hline x_{-L} \\ \hline y_{-L} \\ \hline \end{array} \otimes \cdots \otimes \begin{array}{|c|} \hline x_0 \\ \hline y_0 \\ \hline \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline x_{-L} & \cdots & x_0 \\ \hline \end{array} \otimes \mathbf{y}_{\downarrow} \in B_A^{1,\ell} \otimes B_D^{1,\ell},$$

where $B_A^{1,\ell}$ is a KR crystal of type $A_1^{(1)}$ and $B_D^{1,\ell}$ is a KR crystal of type $D_{n-2}^{(1)}$ and \mathbf{y}_{\downarrow} decreases all (barred) entries by 2 of

$$\mathbf{y} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline y_{-L} & \cdots & y_0 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Example 3.8. Let \mathfrak{g} be of type $B_4^{(1)}$, then we have

$$\Psi \left(\begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline \end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 1 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline \end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 2 \\ \hline 4 \\ \hline \end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 2 \\ \hline 3 \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 0 & \overline{2} & \overline{2} & \overline{1} \\ \hline \end{array},$$

where the image is in $B_A^{1,5} \otimes B_B^{1,5}$ of type $A_1^{(1)} \times B_2^{(1)}$.

A similar description of Ψ exists for $r = 1$ in types $C_n^{(1)}$, $D_{n+1}^{(2)}$, $A_{2n}^{(2)}$, and $A_{2n}^{(2)\dagger}$ using KN tableaux. In this case, it is a single row tableaux mapping to a single row tableaux, removing all $\overline{1}$ and \emptyset entries, and decreasing all (barred) entries by 1. In [MOW12, Prop. 8], the map Ψ was described explicitly for $r = 2$ in type $G_2^{(1)}$.

Proposition 3.9. Fix r such that $\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell) \cong B(\ell\varpi)$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystals. Let $p \in \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell)$. Then we have $E_k(p) = t_r^{\vee} \min(k, \ell)$ and $T_k(p)$ moves the soliton $\min(k, \ell)$ steps to the left.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell) \cong B(\ell\varpi)$, there exist a unique $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight element. Therefore, we can apply e_i , where $i \in I_{0,r}$, as many times as possible to obtain the $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight element

$$p' = u_{\varpi} \otimes \cdots \otimes u_{\varpi}.$$

Note that H does not change and e_i commutes with the combinatorial R -matrix. Therefore, we have $E_k(p') = E_k(p)$.

Next, we note that our time evolution and local energy correspond to those for the box-ball system under identifying $u_{\overline{\Lambda}_r}$ and u_{ϖ} with an empty box and a ball, respectively. Hence, the claim follows from [FOY00, Lemma 4.1]. \square

⁵For type $B_3^{(1)}$, the map is slightly more complicated because the right factor should instead be $B_A^{1, \lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor} \otimes B_A^{1, \lceil \ell/2 \rceil}$. This map is similar to the $C_2^{(1)}$ for $r = 1$ case, and we leave the details to the reader.

Now we consider the case when \mathfrak{g} is of type $B_n^{(1)}$ and $r = n$. We recall that $B^{n,1} \cong B(\overline{\Lambda}_n)$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ -crystals and $B(\overline{\Lambda}_n)$ is a minuscule representation.

Proposition 3.10. *Let $r = n$ and \mathfrak{g} of type $B_n^{(1)}$. Let v_* denote the lowest weight vector in the $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -subcrystal B_* generated by $u_* := f_n f_{n-1} f_n u$. For a soliton $p = b_{-L} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_0 \in \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell)$, we have*

$$u < b_{-L} \leq \cdots \leq b_0 \leq v_*.$$

Moreover, we have $\ell = L + m_* + 1$, where m_* are the number of elements in B_* in the soliton.

Proof. All classically highest weight elements in $B^{n,1} \otimes B^{n,1}$ are of the form

$$u^{(k)} := k \overline{k+1} \otimes u,$$

where the element on the left is written as a minuscule word. A straightforward computation shows that $H(u^{(k)}) = \lceil k/2 \rceil$. Note that $u^{(1)} = u_{\varpi} \otimes u$ and $u^{(2)} = u_* \otimes u$. Since $B(\overline{\Lambda}_n)$ is a minuscule representation, the subset $B(2\overline{\Lambda}_n) \subseteq B(\overline{\Lambda}_n) \otimes B(\overline{\Lambda}_n)$ is given by the elements $x \otimes y$ such that $x \leq y$. Thus, the remainder of the proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.1. \square

Proposition 3.11. *Let \mathfrak{g} be of type $B_n^{(1)}$ and $r = n$. Define $u_* := f_n f_{n-1} f_n u$. There exists a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystal isomorphism*

$$\Psi: \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell),$$

where we remove the left factor if $\ell = 1$, defined by

$$u^{\otimes m} \otimes u_*^{\otimes m_*} \mapsto (f_{n-1}^{m_*} u_{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor \varpi_{n-1}}) \otimes u_{\lceil \ell/2 \rceil \varpi_{n-1}}.$$

Proof. Since each u_* contributes 2 to the length of the soliton, we have $m_* \leq \ell/2$. It is straightforward to see that Ψ is an $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystal morphism. From [Ste01], the highest weight elements of $B(\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor \varpi_{n-1}) \otimes B(\lceil \ell/2 \rceil \varpi_{n-1})$ are given by

$$(f_{n-1}^{m_*} u_{\lfloor \ell/2 \rfloor \varpi_{n-1}}) \otimes u_{\lceil \ell/2 \rceil \varpi_{n-1}}.$$

Hence, the map Ψ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystal isomorphism. \square

Example 3.12. We begin with the spin representation of [KN94] (see also [BS17, HK02]) to represent elements of $B(\overline{\Lambda}_n)$, where the elements are given by a sequence (s_1, \dots, s_n) with $s_i = \pm$. Next, we consider this to be the binary representation of an integer written in reverse order with $+$ \mapsto 0 and $-$ \mapsto 1. For example, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= 000 \cdots 0 = u_{\overline{\Lambda}_n} = (+, \dots, +, +, +), \\ 2^{n-1} &= 100 \cdots 0 = f_n u_{\overline{\Lambda}_n} = u_{\varpi} = (+, \dots, +, +, -), \\ 2^{n-1} + 2^{n-2} &= 110 \cdots 0 = u_* = (+, \dots, +, -, -). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, consider an SCA starting with an initial state in $\mathcal{S}^{(3)}(1, 3)$ in type $B_3^{(1)}$:

$$\begin{array}{l|l} t = 0 & \cdots 000000000000100460 \\ t = 1 & \cdots 0000000000001460000 \\ t = 2 & \cdots 0000000000047000000 \\ t = 3 & \cdots 0000000430400000000 \\ t = 4 & \cdots 0000430004000000000 \\ t = 5 & \cdots 0430000040000000000 \end{array}$$

Note that the right soliton after scattering $u_{\varpi} \otimes u_*$ is not connected to $u_{\varpi} \otimes u_{\varpi}$ by e_1 and e_2 operators. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(1) &= \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}, & \Psi(4) &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \Psi(46) &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, & \Psi(43) &= \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 \end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that 46 and $\Phi(46)$ are $I_{0,3}$ -highest weight elements, but 66 another $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight element. This demonstrates the necessity of the two tensor factors as there is only a unique $I_{0,3}$ highest weight element for any KR crystal $B^{r,s}$ of type $A_2^{(1)}$.

Example 3.13. Keeping the same conventions as Example 3.12, we give an SCA with an initial state in $\mathcal{S}^{(3)}(1, 3)$ in type $B_3^{(1)}$:

$$\begin{array}{l|l} t = 0 & \cdots 00000000000001004210 \\ t = 1 & \cdots 000000000000014210000 \\ t = 2 & \cdots 0000000000004310000000 \\ t = 3 & \cdots 00000004300100000000 \\ t = 4 & \cdots 00004300001000000000 \\ t = 5 & \cdots 04300000010000000000 \end{array}$$

Also, we have $\Psi(421) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 3 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$.

Next, we consider $r = 1$ for type $G_2^{(1)}$. The local energy on highest weight elements is given by

$$H(1 \otimes 1) = 0, \quad H(2 \otimes 1) = 1, \quad H(0 \otimes 1) = 1, \quad H(\bar{1} \otimes 1) = 2.$$

We have $H(b \otimes b') = 0$ if and only $b \leq b'$ and we do not have $b = b' = 0$.

Proposition 3.14. *Let $r = 1$ and \mathfrak{g} of type $G_2^{(1)}$. For a soliton $p = b_{-L} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_0 \in \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell)$, we have*

$$1 < b_{-L} \leq \cdots \leq b_0 \leq \bar{2},$$

where 0 appears at most once. Moreover, we have $\ell = L + m_0 + 2(m_{\bar{3}} + m_{\bar{2}})$, where m_b denotes the number of occurrences of b in the soliton.

Proof. This reduces to a computation of local energy on $B^{1,1} \otimes B^{1,1}$, which is a finite computation. \square

Proposition 3.15. *Let \mathfrak{g} be of type $G_2^{(1)}$ and $r = 1$. Define*

$$\Psi: \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell) := B^{r', \lfloor \ell/3 \rfloor} \otimes B^{r', \lfloor \ell/3 \rfloor + \sigma} \otimes B^{r', \lfloor \ell/3 \rfloor + \tau},$$

where $\sigma = 1$ (resp. $\tau = 1$) if the remainder of $\ell/3$ is at least 1 (resp. equals 2) and 0 otherwise (we remove factors of $B^{r', 0}$), by

$$\Psi(p) = f_1^d((f_1^{m_{\bar{3}}-M} u_{\lfloor \ell/3 \rfloor \varpi_1}) \otimes (f_1^{m_0+2M} u_{(\lfloor \ell/3 \rfloor + \sigma) \varpi_1}) \otimes u_{(\lfloor \ell/3 \rfloor) \varpi_1 + \tau}),$$

for

$$p = 2^{\otimes m_2} \otimes 3^{\otimes m_3} \otimes 0^{\otimes m_0} \otimes \bar{3}^{\otimes m_{\bar{3}}} \otimes \bar{2}^{\otimes m_{\bar{2}}},$$

where $M = \min\{m_3, m_{\bar{3}}\}$ and $d = m_3 - M + m_{\bar{2}}$. Then Ψ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystal isomorphism.

Proof. We first consider $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight elements, where $m_{\overline{3}} - m_3 \geq 0$ and $m_{\overline{2}} = 0$. So we have $M = m_3$ and $d = 0$. It is clear that Ψ is a weight preserving bijection and $\Psi(p)$ is $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight. For the general case, it is straightforward to see that Ψ commutes with the crystal operators. \square

Example 3.16. Consider $p = 2330\overline{32}$, and so $\ell = 11$. Thus, we have $\sigma = \tau = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(p) &= f_1^2((f_1^1 u_{3\varpi_1}) \otimes (f_1^3 u_{4\varpi_1}) \otimes u_{4\varpi_1}) \\ &= f_1^2(\boxed{1\ 1\ 2} \otimes \boxed{1\ 2\ 2\ 2} \otimes \boxed{1\ 1\ 1\ 1}) \\ &= \boxed{1\ 2\ 2} \otimes \boxed{1\ 2\ 2\ 2} \otimes \boxed{1\ 1\ 1\ 2}.\end{aligned}$$

4. SCA USING RIGGED CONFIGURATIONS

In this section, we give a proof of Conjecture 2.10 using rigged configurations under various assumptions. Throughout this section, we assume Conjecture 2.16 and Conjecture 2.17 hold. We note that our results are known in general for type $A_n^{(1)}$ [FOY00, HHI⁺01, KOS⁺06, Sak08, Sak09, Yam04], some of which also use rigged configurations in their proofs, and generalize the other cases done in [bM12, HKO⁺02a, HKT00, MOW12, MW13, TNS99, Yam07]. We start with our first main result, where the partition $\nu^{(r)}$ encodes the sizes of the solitons under Φ .

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose r is a special node or $r \sim 0$. Consider a state b with solitons of type \mathfrak{g} of sizes $\ell_1 > \ell_2 > \dots > \ell_m$ that are sufficiently far apart (not necessarily in that order). Then we have $\nu^{(r)} = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_m)$, where $(\nu, J) = \Phi(b)$.*

Proof. We first consider the case r is a minuscule node. We note that when we add every box of a soliton, we add exactly one box to $\nu^{(r)}$ as there is only one r arrow in the path from any entry of the soliton to $u_{\overline{\Lambda}_r}$ or for \emptyset . Because the solitons are sufficiently far apart, we can make the difference between the riggings $J_i^{(r)}$ and the vacancy numbers $p_i^{(r)}$ as large as we want. Therefore, we have precisely one singular row in $\nu^{(r)}$ for each soliton and the length corresponds to the number of elements of the currently soliton we have added.

Next, when $r \sim 0$, we have $x \otimes y$ in a soliton if and only if $x \leq y$ by Proposition 3.1, Proposition 3.3, and Proposition 3.5. Thus, when we add b_0 , we add a row of length equal to the number of r -arrows in the path from $b_0 \rightarrow u$ to $\nu^{(r)}$ as there are no singular rows in $\nu^{(r)}$, where we add the first box under Φ^{-1} . Thus, the newly added row is the only singular row in $\nu^{(r)}$ as the solitons are far apart. Therefore, for each subsequent b_i , we can select at most the same rows that were previously selected by b_{i+1} . Hence, all boxes added to $\nu^{(r)}$ are in the same row and the claim follows.

For $r = 1$ in type $B_n^{(1)}$, the proof is similar to the minuscule case. For $r = n$ in type $C_n^{(1)}$, we note that the only box in the column (x_1, \dots, x_n) that would change $\nu^{(n)}$ is $n < x_n < \overline{1}$ as $x_k < n$ for all $k < n$. Moreover, the addition of x_n only adds a single box to $\nu^{(n)}$, and hence the proof is similar to the minuscule case. \square

Theorem 4.1 suggests the following as an equivalent definition of solitons. This suggested equivalence also comes from the description of solitons from inverse scattering transform and the R -matrix invariance of rigged configurations (see Proposition 4.3 below).

Conjecture 4.2. *Let p be a state and $(\nu, J) = \Phi^{-1}(p)$. Then p corresponds to a soliton of length ℓ if and only if $\nu^{(r)} = (\ell)$. Moreover, Theorem 4.1 holds for all $r \in I_0$.*

We can now give a description of time evolution on rigged configurations. Let A_s denote the map on rigged configurations given by adding $\min(i, s)$ to all riggings $J_i^{(r)}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The following was shown in [KOS⁺06, Prop. 2.6] (see also [KSY11, Thm. 5.2]), and we include a proof for completeness.

Proposition 4.3. *We have*

$$A_s \circ \Phi^{-1} = \Phi^{-1} \circ T_s.$$

Proof. Let $u_s = u(B^{r,s})$. Consider a state b and $(\nu, J) = \Phi^{-1}(b)$. We claim $\Phi^{-1}(b \otimes u_s) = (\nu, J') = A_s(\nu, J)$, where J' is formed by adding $\min(i, s)$ to all riggings in $J_i^{(r)}$ for all i . This follows from the fact that Φ is only based upon the corrigings, and that after adding u_s , we still have the empty rigged configuration. Thus, every subsequent step is the same as for Φ^{-1} applied to b except $p_i^{(r)}$ has increased by i for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and the claim follows from the fact that we make every changed row singular. Next, we have $\Phi^{-1}(b \otimes u_s) = \Phi^{-1}(u_s \otimes T_\infty(b))$ from Conjecture 2.17. Furthermore, from the definition of Φ^{-1} , we have $\Phi^{-1}(u_s \otimes T_\infty(b)) = \Phi^{-1}(T_\infty(b))$, and the claim follows from Theorem 4.1. \square

We use rigged configurations to give an alternative (and uniform) proof of Proposition 3.9 and the conservation laws. These were shown in [FOY00, Thm. 3.2], where the proof given is also uniform using the Yang–Baxter equation.

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose Conjecture 4.2 holds. For $p \in \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell)$, we have $E_s(p) = t_r^\vee \min(s, \ell)$ and $T_s(p)$ moves the soliton $\min(s, \ell)$ steps to the left.*

Proof. Let $(\nu, J) = \Phi(p)$, and note that $\nu^{(r)} = (\ell)$ from Conjecture 4.2. From Proposition 4.3, $\Phi^{-1}(T_s(p))$ differs from $\Phi^{-1}(p)$ by adding $\min(s, \ell)$ to the rigging $J_\ell^{(r)}$. Thus, we have nonvacuum factors $\min(s, \ell)$ steps earlier under Φ^{-1} . Moreover, the image of the soliton under Φ^{-1} must be the same as Φ^{-1} only depends on the corrigings. Hence $T_s(p)$ moves the soliton $\min(s, \ell)$ steps to the left.

Next, we note that $\text{cc}(A_s(\nu, J)) - \text{cc}(\nu, J) = t_r^\vee \min(k, \ell)$. We consider the state p truncated to $K \gg 1$ factors, which we denote by p_K . From the definition of energy, we have

$$D(u_s \otimes T_s(p_K)) - D(T_s(p_K)) = E_s(p_K)$$

since $R(u_s \otimes T_s(p_K)) = p_K \otimes u_s$ and $D(u_s) = 0$. Note that $(\theta \circ \Phi^{-1})(u_s \otimes T_s(p_K)) = (\nu, J)$ since A_s preserves corrigings and the extra u_s factor increases the vacancy numbers $p_i^{(r)}$ by $\min(i, s)$. Hence, we have $E_s(p_K) = t_r^\vee \min(s, \ell)$ since $\text{cc} = D \circ \Phi \circ \theta$. \square

Proposition 4.5 (Conservation laws). *Suppose Conjecture 4.2 holds. We have*

$$T_s \circ T_{s'} = T_{s'} \circ T_s, \quad E_s \circ T_{s'} = E_s.$$

Proof. It is clear that $T_s \circ T_{s'} = T_{s'} \circ T_s$ from Proposition 4.3 and the description of A_s . Next, we have

$$\text{cc}((A_{s'} \circ A_s)(\nu, J)) - \text{cc}(A_s(\nu, J)) = \text{cc}(A_s(\nu, J)) - \text{cc}(\nu, J) = E_s(p)$$

by Proposition 4.4. Therefore, we have $E_s \circ T_{s'} = E_s$. \square

We now prove the desired decoupling rules using rigged configurations.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $B = \bigotimes_{i=1}^N B^{r, s_i}$ of type \mathfrak{g} . Let $\mu = \{\tilde{s}_1, \dots, \tilde{s}_{\tilde{N}}\}$ be a partition and*

$$\mathcal{B}_\mu = \bigotimes_{r' \sim r} \bigotimes_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} \begin{cases} B^{r', \gamma_r \tilde{s}_i} & \text{if } \check{\gamma}_r / \gamma_{r'} \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ B^{r', \lfloor \tilde{s}_i/2 \rfloor} \otimes B^{r', \lceil \tilde{s}_i/2 \rceil} & \text{if } \check{\gamma}_r / \gamma_{r'} = 1/2, \\ B^{r', \lfloor \tilde{s}_i/3 \rfloor} \otimes B^{r', \lceil \tilde{s}_i/3 \rceil + \sigma_i} \otimes B^{r', \lceil \tilde{s}_i/3 \rceil + \tau_i} & \text{if } \check{\gamma}_r / \gamma_{r'} = 1/3, \end{cases}$$

of type $\widehat{\mathfrak{g}}_{r,0}$, where $\sigma_i = 1$ (resp. $\tau_i = 1$) if the remainder of $\tilde{s}_i/3$ at least 1 (resp. equals 2) and 0 otherwise. Then, the map

$$B^{(r)}: \text{RC}(B) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\mu} \text{RC}(\mathcal{B}_\mu)^{\oplus m_\mu}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $m_\mu = |\{(\nu, J) \in \text{RC}^\nabla(B) \mid \nu^{(r)} = \mu\}|$, given by deleting $\nu^{(r)}$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystal isomorphism.

Proof. For $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight rigged configurations, this follows from the definition of the vacancy numbers. The remaining cases follow from the definition of the crystal operators on rigged configurations. \square

We note that Proposition 3.7 follows immediately from Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 4.6. Moreover, Equation (4.1) is the decoupling rule on rigged configurations. Thus, we have a proof of Proposition 3.7 using rigged configurations.

Example 4.7. Consider soliton p from Example 3.8. The corresponding rigged configuration (ν, J) under Φ is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} -2 & \boxed{} \boxed{} & -2 & 2 & \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} & 2 & \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ -1 \end{array} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ -1 \end{array} & -5 & \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} & -5 \end{array}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$B^{(2)}(\nu, J) = \begin{array}{ccccccc} -2 & \boxed{} \boxed{} & -2 & \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ -1 \end{array} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ -1 \end{array} & -5 & \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} & -5 \end{array}$$

in $\text{RC}(B^{1,5})$ in type $A_1^{(1)} \times B_2^{(1)}$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} -2 & \boxed{} \boxed{} & -2 & \xrightarrow{\Phi_A^{-1}} & \boxed{1} \boxed{1} \boxed{1} \boxed{2} \boxed{2}, \\ \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ -1 \end{array} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ -1 \end{array} & -5 & \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} \boxed{} & -5 & \xrightarrow{\Phi_B^{-1}} & \boxed{1} \boxed{0} \boxed{2} \boxed{2} \boxed{1}, \end{array}$$

which agrees with $\Psi(p)$.

Lemma 4.8. *We have $\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell) \cong B(\ell\varpi)$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystals if and only if for all $r' \sim r$, we must have r' a special node and $\check{\gamma}_r / \gamma_{r'} \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. This is a straightforward check. \square

Proposition 4.9. *Fix an r such that $\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell) \cong B(\ell\varpi)$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystals. Let $\mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k; K)$ denote the truncation of states in $\mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k)$ to $(B^{r,1})^{\otimes K}$*

from $(B^{r,1})^{\otimes \infty}$. For $K \gg 1$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k; K) & \xrightarrow{\Phi^{-1}} & \text{RC}((B^{1,1})^{\otimes K}) \\ \Psi \downarrow & & \downarrow B^{(r)} \\ \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k) & \xrightarrow{\Phi^{-1}} & \text{RC}(\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k)) \end{array}$$

commutes.

Proof. For $k = 1$, this follows from Proposition 4.6.

Next, assume it holds for $k - 1$. We note that Φ^{-1} , $B^{(r)}$, and Ψ are $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystal isomorphisms, so it is sufficient to consider the case when we have a $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight element. Additionally, note that there is a unique $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight element $\tilde{u}_{\ell_1} \in \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1)$. Consider a state $p \in \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k; K)$. Therefore, the rightmost soliton of p is $u_{\varpi}^{\otimes \ell_k}$, which maps to \tilde{u}_{ℓ_1} under Ψ .

Let $p = \bar{p} \otimes u_{\varpi}^{\otimes \ell_k}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} (\nu, J) &= \Phi^{-1}(p), & (\bar{\nu}, \bar{J}) &= \Phi^{-1}(\bar{p}), \\ (\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{J}) &= \Phi^{-1}(\Psi(p)), & (\tilde{\bar{\nu}}, \tilde{\bar{J}}) &= \Phi^{-1}(\Psi(\bar{p})). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain $(\tilde{\nu}, \tilde{J})$ from $(\tilde{\bar{\nu}}, \tilde{\bar{J}})$ by adding $\min(i, \ell_k)$ to each rigging of $J_i^{(r')}$ for all $r' \sim r$ as adding $u(\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_k))$ does not change the rigged configuration. Next we consider how (ν, J) differs from $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{J})$. We note that adding $u_{\varpi}^{\otimes \ell_k}$ only adds a single row of length ℓ_k to $\nu^{(r)}$ similar to the proof of Proposition 3.7. Since the solitons are far apart, we never change this row, so it does not affect the remaining steps of Φ^{-1} other than the final riggings. Hence, the riggings $J_i^{(r')}$ are $\min(i, \ell_k)$ larger than the riggings $\bar{J}_i^{(r')}$ for all $r' \sim r$. Hence, we have $B^{(r)} \circ \Phi^{-1} = \Phi^{-1} \circ \Psi$ by induction. \square

Conjecture 4.10. *Proposition 4.9 holds for all r .*

We expect a similar proof to work in general, but describing the difference between (ν, J) and $(\bar{\nu}, \bar{J})$ is more complicated.

Next, we give our second main result, a proof of scattering using rigged configurations.

Theorem 4.11. *Suppose Conjecture 4.10 holds. Let $\Psi: \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \ell_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \ell_2)$, where $\ell_1 > \ell_2$. Then we have*

$$\Psi \circ T_{\infty}^k = R \circ \Psi$$

for $k \gg 1$.

Proof. Fix some $k \gg 1$. Let $\mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \ell_2)_k$ denote the set of states p such that $T_{\infty}^k(p) \in \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_2, \ell_1)$. Let $\text{RC}(\mathcal{S})$ denote the image of the states \mathcal{S} under Φ^{-1} , which is well defined since adding the left factors of u_1 does not change the rigged

configuration under Φ^{-1} . Consider the cube

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \ell_2)_k & \xrightarrow{T_\infty^k} & \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_2, \ell_1) & & \\
 \downarrow \Psi & \searrow \Phi^{-1} & \swarrow \Phi^{-1} & & \downarrow \Psi \\
 & \text{RC}(\mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \ell_2)_k) & \xrightarrow{A_\infty^k} & \text{RC}(\mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_2, \ell_1)) & \\
 & \downarrow B^{(r)} & & \downarrow B^{(r)} & \\
 & \text{RC}(\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \ell_2)) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \text{RC}(\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_2, \ell_1)) & \\
 \uparrow \Phi^{-1} & & & & \uparrow \Phi^{-1} \\
 \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \ell_2) & \xrightarrow{R} & \mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_2, \ell_1) & &
 \end{array}$$

We first show the back face commutes. Considering the path of $B^{(r)} \circ A_\infty^k$, we first change the riggings associated with the partition $\nu^{(r)}$, and then B deletes the partition $\nu^{(r)}$. Therefore, we have the new rigged configurations $\text{RC}(\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_2, \ell_1))$ without the partition $\nu^{(r)}$. Next, if we begin with the path of $B^{(r)}$ and id , we will delete the partition $\nu^{(r)}$ first by $B^{(r)}$ and then change nothing by id , so we will also get the rigged configurations $\text{RC}(\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_2, \ell_1))$. Hence, we have $B^{(r)} \circ A_\infty^k = \text{id} \circ B^{(r)}$ as desired.

The top face commutes by Proposition 4.3. The bottom face commutes by our assumption that Conjecture 2.17 holds. The left and right faces commute by Conjecture 4.10. Hence, by [KSS02, Lemma 5.3] and that Φ is a bijection, the front face commutes as desired. \square

Finally, we give our last main result: a description of the phase shift and a proof using rigged configurations.

Theorem 4.12. *Fix an r such that $\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell) \cong B(\ell\varpi)$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystals. Consider a two soliton state with solitons s_1 and s_2 of lengths $\ell_1 < \ell_2$. The phase shift is*

$$\delta = 2\ell_1 + A_{rr'} H(\Psi(s_1) \otimes \Psi(s_2)),$$

where $r' \sim r$.

Proof. Note that for $\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell) \cong B(\ell\varpi)$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{0,r})$ -crystals, for all $r', r'' \sim r$, we have $A_{rr'} = A_{rr''}$, so the statement is well defined. Moreover, our assumptions satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 4.9 (and hence, Conjecture 4.10 holds).

Consider a state $b \in \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_1, \ell_2)$ with $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ and is $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight, and let $(\nu, J) = \Phi^{-1}(b)$. Let s_1 and s_2 denote the solitons of length ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 respectively. Without loss of generality, assume there are no vacuums to the right of s_2 . By Proposition 3.7/Proposition 4.6, it is sufficient to consider p to be a $I_{0,r}$ -highest weight states.

We modify the vacancy numbers by

$$P_i^{(a)}(\nu) = P_i^{(a)} = - \sum_{(b,j) \in \mathcal{H}_0} \frac{A_{ab}}{\gamma_b} \min(\tilde{\gamma}_a i, \tilde{\gamma}_b j) m_j^{(b)},$$

and note that for $B = (B^{r,1})^{\otimes \kappa}$, we have $p_i^{(a)} = P_i^{(a)} + \delta_{ar}\kappa$. Let ζ denote the starting position of the right soliton s_2 and j denote the rigging of $J_{\ell_2}^{(r)}$. By our assumptions, we have $\Psi(s_2) = u(\mathcal{B}^{(r)}(\ell_2))$; in particular, the only nonempty partition of $\Phi(s_2)$ is $\nu^{(r)} = (\ell_2)$ with rigging $j = -\zeta = -\ell_2$. Let

$$\tilde{j} = j + k\ell_2,$$

which is the rigging of $\tilde{J}_{\ell_2}^{(r)}$ after k time evolutions. We choose $k \gg 1$ such that $\Phi(\nu, \tilde{j}) \in \mathcal{S}^{(r)}(\ell_2, \ell_1)$: we have two solitons of length $\ell_2 > \ell_1$ that are not interacting. Let ξ be such that $\tilde{j} = \xi + P_{\ell_2}^{(r)}$, and so

$$\xi = \tilde{j} - P_{\ell_2}^{(r)} = j + k\ell_2 - P_{\ell_2}^{(r)}$$

is the position of the left soliton \tilde{s}_2 . Note that

$$P_{\ell_2}^{(r)} = -2(\ell_1 + \ell_2) + \sum_{r' \sim r} A_{rr'} |\nu^{(r')}|$$

since $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ and by Lemma 4.8. Note that each box added to $\nu^{(r')}$ when performing Φ on $b \otimes u_{\ell_2 \varpi}$ in type $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{0,r}$ corresponds to an r' arrow from b to $u_{\ell_1 \varpi}$. Moreover, we add one to the local energy for each of these r' arrows by Theorem 2.4. Hence, we have $H(\Psi(s_1) \otimes \Psi(s_2)) = \sum_{r' \sim r} |\nu^{(r')}|$. Thus, the phase shift is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \xi - (\ell_2 + k\ell_2) = j - P_{\ell_2}^{(r)} - \ell_2 \\ &= 2\ell_1 + \sum_{r' \sim r} A_{rr'} |\nu^{(r')}| = 2\ell_1 + A_{rr'} H(\Psi(s_1) \otimes \Psi(s_2)), \end{aligned}$$

for some $r' \sim r$ as desired. \square

From the proof above, observe that the phase shift is determined by the change in the vacancy number $P_{\ell_2}^{(r)}$ by adding the soliton s_1 under Φ .

Example 4.13. Consider an SCA in type $E_6^{(1)}$ with an initial state in $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}(1, 2)$, where we separate tensor factors with '|':

$$\begin{array}{l|l} t=0 & \cdots 1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|\bar{2}5|1|1|1|1|\bar{2}56|\bar{2}4\bar{6} \\ t=1 & \cdots 1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|\bar{2}5|1|1|1|\bar{2}56|\bar{2}4\bar{6}|1|1 \\ t=2 & \cdots 1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|\bar{2}5|1|\bar{2}56|\bar{2}4\bar{6}|1|1|1|1|1|1 \\ t=3 & \cdots 1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|\bar{2}5|\bar{2}56|\bar{2}4\bar{6}|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1 \\ t=4 & \cdots 1|1|1|1|1|1|1|\bar{2}5|\bar{2}4\bar{5}6|\bar{2}6|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1 \\ t=5 & \cdots 1|1|1|1|\bar{2}5|\bar{2}4\bar{5}6|1|1|\bar{2}6|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1 \\ t=6 & \cdots 1|1|1|\bar{2}5|\bar{2}4\bar{5}6|1|1|\bar{2}6|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1 \\ t=7 & \cdots 1|\bar{2}5|\bar{2}4\bar{5}6|1|1|1|\bar{2}6|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1|1 \end{array}$$

Here we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\bar{2}5) &= \boxed{\bar{2}4}, & \Psi(\bar{2}56 \otimes \bar{2}4\bar{6}) &= \boxed{\bar{1}2\bar{4}} \boxed{\bar{1}3\bar{4}}, \\ \Psi(\bar{2}6) &= \boxed{\bar{1}4}, & \Psi(\bar{2}5 \otimes \bar{2}4\bar{5}6) &= \boxed{\bar{2}4} \boxed{\bar{1}2\bar{3}\bar{4}}, \end{aligned}$$

see Figure 3 for the crystal graphs. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} R(\boxed{\bar{2}4} \otimes \boxed{\bar{1}2\bar{4}} \boxed{\bar{1}3\bar{4}}) &= \boxed{\bar{2}4} \boxed{\bar{1}2\bar{3}\bar{4}} \otimes \boxed{\bar{1}4}, \\ H(\boxed{\bar{2}4} \otimes \boxed{\bar{1}2\bar{4}} \boxed{\bar{1}3\bar{4}}) &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} 2t \\ t+4 \end{array} \quad -1 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} -1 \quad 0 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} 0 \quad 1 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} 1 \quad 0 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} -1 \quad -1 \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \\ \hline \end{array} -1,$$
$$0 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} 0 \quad -1 \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} -1 \quad 0 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} 0 \quad 1 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} 1 \quad -1 \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline \end{array} -1 \quad -1 \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array} -1,$$
$$\Psi(p) = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline 4 \\ \hline 5 \\ \hline 6 \\ \hline \end{array} \otimes \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 2 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 3 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

$t = 0$	$\cdots yxxxxxxxxxxxxx$
$t = 1$	$\cdots yxxxuuuuuuuuuu$
$t = 2$	$\cdots zxxxxxxxxxxuuuuuu$
$t = 3$	$\cdots xxx\emptyset uuuuuuuuuuu$
$t = 4$	$\cdots xyxyxxxxxxxxxxxxx$
$t = 5$	$\cdots xxyyxuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuuu$

$$\begin{aligned}x &= f_2 u = u_{\varpi}, \\y &= f_4 f_3 f_1 f_5 f_4 f_3 f_6 f_5 f_4 f_2 u, \\z &= f_2 f_2 f_4 f_3 f_1 f_5 f_4 f_3 f_6 f_5 f_4 f_2 u.\end{aligned}$$
[illegible][illegible]
$$H(\Psi(3) \otimes \Psi(\overline{1})) = H(2 \otimes \emptyset) = 1,$$

In this example, note that if the soliton $\bar{1}$ was concentrated at one point, we should get to $t = 3$ before the solitons start to interact. Instead, they begin to interact at $t = 3$, as if there is an additional 1 linked together with the $\bar{1}$; in other words, we should consider the soliton $\bar{1}$ instead as $1\bar{1}$. With this modification, we see the phase shift would indeed be 1 for the left soliton.

[illegible]

We give one more example with an initial state in $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}(2, 4)$ in type $C_3^{(1)}$:

$$\begin{array}{l|ll}
t = 0 & \cdots & 11111111111111111111111111\underline{\underline{23}}111\underline{\underline{11}} \\
t = 1 & \cdots & 11111111111111111111111111\underline{\underline{23}}\underline{\underline{11}} \\
t = 2 & \cdots & 11111111111111111111111111\underline{\underline{23}}\underline{\underline{2222}}11111111 \\
t = 3 & \cdots & 111111111111111111111111\underline{\underline{2322}}\underline{\underline{22}}1111111111 \\
t = 4 & \cdots & 11111111111111\underline{\underline{2322}}\underline{\underline{11}}\underline{\underline{22}}111111111111 \\
t = 5 & \cdots & 1111111111\underline{\underline{2322}}\underline{\underline{11}}\underline{\underline{11}}\underline{\underline{22}}111111111111 \\
t = 6 & \cdots & 11111\underline{\underline{2322}}\underline{\underline{11}}11111\underline{\underline{11}}\underline{\underline{22}}11111111111111 \\
t = 7 & \cdots & 1\underline{\underline{2322}}\underline{\underline{11}}11111111\underline{\underline{11}}\underline{\underline{22}}1111111111111111
\end{array}$$

Acknowledgments. The authors thank Atsuo Kuniba and Masato Okado for valuable discussions and comments on an earlier version of this paper. The authors thank Ben Salisbury for comments on an earlier version of this paper. This

work benefited from computations using SAGEMATH [Dev17, SCc08]. The authors would like to thank the referee for comments on our paper.

APPENDIX A. EXAMPLES WITH SAGEMATH

We give some examples using SAGEMATH [Dev17], which has been implemented by the second author (the examples given here are using [Scr17b]). We begin with the code used to construct Example 3.4.

```
sage: initial = [[1],[1],[ 'E' ],[1],[1],[1],
....:           [3],[0],[1],[1],[1],[1],[2],[-3],[-1]]
sage: SCA = SolitonCellularAutomata(initial, [ 'D' ,4,2])
sage: view(SCA.latex_states(10))
```

Next, we construct Example 5.2 by using the following code.

```
sage: I = [[2,1],[-3,2],[2,1],[2,1],[2,1],[2,1],
....:      [3,1],[4,2],[-4,2],[-3,2]]
sage: SCA = SolitonCellularAutomata(I, [ 'B' ,4,1], vacuum=2)
sage: view(SCA.latex_states(7))
```

The following code is used to construct Example 3.12.

```
sage: K = crystals.KirillovReshetikhin([ 'B' ,3,1], 3,1)
sage: u = K.module_generators[0]
sage: v = u.f(3)
sage: w = u.f_string([3,2,3])
sage: I = [u,v.f(2).f(1),u,u,v,w]
sage: SCA = SolitonCellularAutomata(I, [ 'B' ,3,1], vacuum=3)
sage: view(SCA.latex_states(6))
```

Continuing with the same variables, we construct Example 3.13.

```
sage: I = [u,v.f(2).f(1),u,u,v,v.f(2),v.f(2).f(1)]
sage: SCA = SolitonCellularAutomata(I, [ 'B' ,3,1], vacuum=3)
sage: view(SCA.latex_states(6))
```

APPENDIX B. CLASSICAL SINGLE ROW CRYSTALS FOR TYPES $E_{6,7}$

Proposition B.1. *The classically highest weight elements in $B^{1,s} \otimes B^{1,s'}$, where $B^{1,s}$ and $B^{1,s'}$ are of type $E_6^{(1)}$, are given by*

$$\underbrace{[\bar{0}1, \dots, \bar{0}1]}_{k_1} \underbrace{[\bar{0}\bar{1}3, \dots, \bar{0}\bar{1}3]}_{k_2} \underbrace{[\bar{1}6, \dots, \bar{1}6]}_{k_3} \otimes \underbrace{[\bar{0}1, \dots, \bar{0}1]}_{s'}$$

where $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 = s$ and $k_2 + k_3 \leq s'$.

Proof. As noted in the proof [JS10, Lemma 3.1], the $\{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ -highest weight elements in $B(s\Lambda_1)$ are of the form

$$b = \underbrace{[\bar{0}1, \dots, \bar{0}1]}_{k_1} \underbrace{[\bar{0}\bar{1}3, \dots, \bar{0}\bar{1}3]}_{k_2} \underbrace{[\bar{1}6, \dots, \bar{1}6]}_{k_3},$$

with $\varepsilon_1(b) = k_2 + k_3$. Note that $u_{s'\Lambda_1} = [\bar{0}1, \dots, \bar{0}1]$ is the unique classically highest weight element in $B^{1,s'}$ and that $\varphi_1(u_{s'\Lambda_1}) = s$. By the tensor product

rule, $e_1(b \otimes u_{s'\Lambda_1}) = 0$ if and only if $k_2 + k_3 \leq s'$. Similarly, we have $e_i(b \otimes u_{s\Lambda_1}) = 0$ for all $i \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$.

Next, by the tensor product rule, any highest element in $B^{1,s} \otimes B^{1,s'}$ must be of the form $b \otimes u_{s'\Lambda_1}$. Note that $\varepsilon_i(u_{s\Lambda_1}) = 0$ for all $i \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$, so b must be a $\{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ -highest weight element. Therefore, we have described all classically highest weight elements above. \square

Proposition B.2. *The classically highest weight elements in $B^{7,s} \otimes B^{7,s'}$, where $B^{7,s} \otimes B^{7,s'}$ are of type $E_7^{(1)}$, are given by*

$$\underbrace{[7, \dots, 7]}_{k_1} \underbrace{[\bar{7}6, \dots, \bar{7}6]}_{k_2} \underbrace{[\bar{7}1, \dots, \bar{7}1]}_{k_3} \underbrace{[\bar{7}, \dots, \bar{7}]}_{k_4} \otimes \underbrace{[7, \dots, 7]}_{s'}$$

where $k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4 = s$ and $k_2 + k_3 + k_4 \leq s'$.

Proof. As noted in the proof [JS10, Lemma 3.1], the $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ -highest weight elements in $B(s\Lambda_7)$ are of the form

$$b = \underbrace{[7, \dots, 7]}_{k_1} \underbrace{[\bar{7}6, \dots, \bar{7}6]}_{k_2} \underbrace{[\bar{7}1, \dots, \bar{7}1]}_{k_3} \underbrace{[\bar{7}, \dots, \bar{7}]}_{k_4},$$

with $\varepsilon_1(b) = k_2 + k_3 + k_4$. Note that $u_{s'\Lambda_7} = [7, \dots, 7]$ is the unique classically highest weight element in $B^{7,s'}$ and that $\varphi_1(u_{s'\Lambda_7}) = s$. By the tensor product rule, $e_7(b \otimes u_{s'\Lambda_7}) = 0$ if and only if $k_2 + k_3 + k_4 \leq s'$. Similarly, we have $e_i(b \otimes u_{s\Lambda_7}) = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$.

Next, by the tensor product rule, any highest element in $B^{7,s} \otimes B^{7,s'}$ must be of the form $b \otimes u_{s'\Lambda_7}$. Note that $\varepsilon_i(u_{s\Lambda_7}) = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$, so b must be a $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ -highest weight element. Therefore, we have described all classically highest weight elements above. \square

REFERENCES

- [Bax89] Rodney J. Baxter. *Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics*. Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], London, 1989. Reprint of the 1982 original.
- [Bet31] H. Bethe. Zur Theorie der Metalle. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 71(3-4):205–226, 1931.
- [BFKL06] Georgia Benkart, Igor Frenkel, Seok-Jin Kang, and Hyeonmi Lee. Level 1 perfect crystals and path realizations of basic representations at $q = 0$. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, pages Art. ID 10312, 28, 2006.
- [BK00] Arkady Berenstein and David Kazhdan. Geometric and unipotent crystals. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, Special Volume, Part I:188–236, 2000. GAFA 2000 (Tel Aviv, 1999).
- [BK07] Arkady Berenstein and David Kazhdan. Geometric and unipotent crystals. II. From unipotent bicrystals to crystal bases. In *Quantum groups*, volume 433 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 13–88. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.
- [bM12] Mahathir bin Mohammad. Scattering rules in soliton cellular automata associated with $U_q(D_n^{(1)})$ -crystal $B^{n,1}$. *J. Phys. A*, 45(7):075208, 22, 2012.
- [Bou77] J. Boussinesq. Essai sur la théorie des eaux courantes. *Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Acad. des Sci. Inst. Nat. France*, XXIII(1):1–680, 1877.
- [BS17] Daniel Bump and Anne Schilling. *Crystal bases*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2017. Representations and combinatorics.
- [CP95] Vyjayanthi Chari and Andrew Pressley. Quantum affine algebras and their representations. In *Representations of groups (Banff, AB, 1994)*, volume 16 of *CMS Conf. Proc.*, pages 59–78. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995.
- [CP98] Vyjayanthi Chari and Andrew Pressley. Twisted quantum affine algebras. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 196(2):461–476, 1998.

- [Dev17] The Sage Developers. *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 8.0)*. The Sage Development Team, 2017. <http://www.sagemath.org>.
- [DS06] Lipika Deka and Anne Schilling. New fermionic formula for unrestricted Kostka polynomials. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 113(7):1435–1461, 2006.
- [FOS09] Ghislain Fourier, Masato Okado, and Anne Schilling. Kirillov-Reshetikhin crystals for nonexceptional types. *Adv. Math.*, 222(3):1080–1116, 2009.
- [FOY00] Kaori Fukuda, Masato Okado, and Yasuhiko Yamada. Energy functions in box ball systems. *Internat. J. Modern Phys. A*, 15(9):1379–1392, 2000.
- [FSS07] Ghislain Fourier, Anne Schilling, and Mark Shimozono. Demazure structure inside Kirillov-Reshetikhin crystals. *J. Algebra*, 309(1):386–404, 2007.
- [GGKM74] Clifford S. Gardner, John M. Greene, Martin D. Kruskal, and Robert M. Miura. Korteweg-deVries equation and generalization. VI. Methods for exact solution. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 27:97–133, 1974.
- [HHI⁺01] G. Hatayama, K. Hikami, R. Inoue, A. Kuniba, T. Takagi, and T. Tokihiro. The $A_M^{(1)}$ automata related to crystals of symmetric tensors. *J. Math. Phys.*, 42(1):274–308, 2001.
- [Hir81] Ryogo Hirota. Discrete analogue of a generalized Toda equation. *J. Phys. Soc. Japan*, 50(11):3785–3791, 1981.
- [HK02] Jin Hong and Seok-Jin Kang. *Introduction to quantum groups and crystal bases*, volume 42 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.
- [HKO⁺99] G. Hatayama, A. Kuniba, M. Okado, T. Takagi, and Y. Yamada. Remarks on fermionic formula. In *Recent developments in quantum affine algebras and related topics (Raleigh, NC, 1998)*, volume 248 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 243–291. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.
- [HKO⁺02a] G. Hatayama, A. Kuniba, M. Okado, T. Takagi, and Y. Yamada. Scattering rules in soliton cellular automata associated with crystal bases. In *Recent developments in infinite-dimensional Lie algebras and conformal field theory (Charlottesville, VA, 2000)*, volume 297 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 151–182. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2002.
- [HKO⁺02b] Goro Hatayama, Atsuo Kuniba, Masato Okado, Taichiro Takagi, and Zengo Tsuboi. Paths, crystals and fermionic formulae. In *MathPhys odyssey, 2001*, volume 23 of *Prog. Math. Phys.*, pages 205–272. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2002.
- [HKT00] Goro Hatayama, Atsuo Kuniba, and Taichiro Takagi. Soliton cellular automata associated with crystal bases. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 577(3):619–645, 2000.
- [HKT01] Goro Hatayama, Atsuo Kuniba, and Taichiro Takagi. Simple algorithm for factorized dynamics of the \mathfrak{g}_n -automaton. *J. Phys. A*, 34(48):10697–10705, 2001. Symmetries and integrability of difference equations (Tokyo, 2000).
- [JM83] Michio Jimbo and Tetsuji Miwa. Solitons and infinite-dimensional Lie algebras. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 19(3):943–1001, 1983.
- [JS10] Brant Jones and Anne Schilling. Affine structures and a tableau model for E_6 crystals. *J. Algebra*, 324(9):2512–2542, 2010.
- [Kac90] Victor G. Kac. *Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, third edition, 1990.
- [Kas90] Masaki Kashiwara. Crystalizing the q -analogue of universal enveloping algebras. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 133(2):249–260, 1990.
- [Kas91] Masaki Kashiwara. On crystal bases of the q -analogue of universal enveloping algebras. *Duke Math. J.*, 63(2):465–516, 1991.
- [KdV95] D.J. Korteweg and G. de Vries. On the Change of Form of Long Waves Advancing in a Rectangular Canal, and on a New Type of Long Stationary Waves. *Phil. Mag.*, 39(240):422–443, 1895.
- [KKM⁺92a] Seok-Jin Kang, Masaki Kashiwara, Kailash C. Misra, Tetsuji Miwa, Toshiaki Nakashima, and Atsushi Nakayashiki. Affine crystals and vertex models. In *Infinite analysis, Part A, B (Kyoto, 1991)*, volume 16 of *Adv. Ser. Math. Phys.*, pages 449–484. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1992.
- [KKM⁺92b] Seok-Jin Kang, Masaki Kashiwara, Kailash C. Misra, Tetsuji Miwa, Toshiaki Nakashima, and Atsushi Nakayashiki. Perfect crystals of quantum affine Lie algebras. *Duke Math. J.*, 68(3):499–607, 1992.

- [KKR86] S. V. Kerov, A. N. Kirillov, and N. Yu. Reshetikhin. Combinatorics, the Bethe ansatz and representations of the symmetric group. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 155(Differentsialnaya Geometriya, Gruppy Li i Mekh. VIII):50–64, 193, 1986.
- [KM94] Seok-Jin Kang and Kailash C. Misra. Crystal bases and tensor product decompositions of $U_q(G_2)$ -modules. *J. Algebra*, 163(3):675–691, 1994.
- [KMOY07] M. Kashiwara, K. C. Misra, M. Okado, and D. Yamada. Perfect crystals for $U_q(D_4^{(3)})$. *J. Algebra*, 317(1):392–423, 2007.
- [KN94] Masaki Kashiwara and Toshiki Nakashima. Crystal graphs for representations of the q -analogue of classical Lie algebras. *J. Algebra*, 165(2):295–345, 1994.
- [KNO08] Masaki Kashiwara, Toshiki Nakashima, and Masato Okado. Affine geometric crystals and limit of perfect crystals. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 360(7):3645–3686, 2008.
- [KNTW18] S. Kakei, J. J. C. Nimmo, S. Tsujimoto, and R. Willox. Linearization of the box-ball system: an elementary approach. *J. Integrable Syst.*, 3(1):xyy002, 2018.
- [KOS⁺06] Atsuo Kuniba, Masato Okado, Reiho Sakamoto, Taichiro Takagi, and Yasuhiko Yamada. Crystal interpretation of Kerov-Kirillov-Reshetikhin bijection. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 740(3):299–327, 2006.
- [KR86] A. N. Kirillov and N. Yu. Reshetikhin. The Bethe ansatz and the combinatorics of Young tableaux. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 155(Differentsialnaya Geometriya, Gruppy Li i Mekh. VIII):65–115, 194, 1986.
- [KS09] Anatol N. Kirillov and Reiho Sakamoto. Relationships between two approaches: rigged configurations and 10-eliminations. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 89(1):51–65, 2009.
- [KSS02] Anatol N. Kirillov, Anne Schilling, and Mark Shimozono. A bijection between Littlewood-Richardson tableaux and rigged configurations. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 8(1):67–135, 2002.
- [KSY07] Atsuo Kuniba, Reiho Sakamoto, and Yasuhiko Yamada. Tau functions in combinatorial Bethe ansatz. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 786(3):207–266, 2007.
- [KSY11] Atsuo Kuniba, Reiho Sakamoto, and Yasuhiko Yamada. Generalized energies and integrable $D_n^{(1)}$ cellular automaton. In *New trends in quantum integrable systems*, pages 221–242. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2011.
- [KTT04] Atsuo Kuniba, Taichiro Takagi, and Akira Takenouchi. Factorization, reduction and embedding in integrable cellular automata. *J. Phys. A*, 37(5):1691, 2004.
- [KZ64] Martin D. Kruskal and Norman J. Zabusky. Stroboscopic-perturbation procedure for treating a class of nonlinear wave equations. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 5:231–244, 1964.
- [LP12] Thomas Lam and Pavlo Pylyavskyy. Total positivity in loop groups, I: Whirls and curls. *Adv. Math.*, 230(3):1222–1271, 2012.
- [LP13] Thomas Lam and Pavlo Pylyavskyy. Intrinsic energy is a loop Schur function. *J. Comb.*, 4(4):387–401, 2013.
- [LPS16] Thomas Lam, Pavlo Pylyavskyy, and Reiho Sakamoto. Rigged configurations and cylindric loop Schur functions. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré D*, 2016. To appear.
- [MOW12] Kailash C. Misra, Masato Okado, and Evan A. Wilson. Soliton cellular automaton associated with $G_2^{(1)}$ crystal base. *J. Math. Phys.*, 53(1):013510, 21, 2012.
- [MW13] Kailash C. Misra and Evan A. Wilson. Soliton cellular automaton associated with $D_n^{(1)}$ -crystal $B^{2,s}$. *J. Math. Phys.*, 54(4):043301, 2013.
- [NS08a] Satoshi Naito and Daisuke Sagaki. Crystal structure on the set of Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths of an arbitrary level-zero shape. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 96(3):582–622, 2008.
- [NS08b] Satoshi Naito and Daisuke Sagaki. Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths of level-zero shape and one-dimensional sums associated to level-zero fundamental representations. *Compos. Math.*, 144(6):1525–1556, 2008.
- [Oka13] Masato Okado. Simplicity and similarity of Kirillov-Reshetikhin crystals. In *Recent developments in algebraic and combinatorial aspects of representation theory*, volume 602 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 183–194. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013.
- [OS08] Masato Okado and Anne Schilling. Existence of Kirillov-Reshetikhin crystals for nonexceptional types. *Represent. Theory*, 12:186–207, 2008.

- [OS12] Masato Okado and Nobumasa Sano. KKR type bijection for the exceptional affine algebra $E_6^{(1)}$. In *Algebraic groups and quantum groups*, volume 565 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 227–242. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012.
- [OSS03a] Masato Okado, Anne Schilling, and Mark Shimozono. A crystal to rigged configuration bijection for nonexceptional affine algebras. In *Algebraic combinatorics and quantum groups*, pages 85–124. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2003.
- [OSS03b] Masato Okado, Anne Schilling, and Mark Shimozono. Virtual crystals and fermionic formulas of type $D_{n+1}^{(2)}$, $A_{2n}^{(2)}$, and $C_n^{(1)}$. *Represent. Theory*, 7:101–163 (electronic), 2003.
- [OSS03c] Masato Okado, Anne Schilling, and Mark Shimozono. Virtual crystals and Kleber’s algorithm. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 238(1-2):187–209, 2003.
- [OSS18] Masato Okado, Anne Schilling, and Travis Scrimshaw. Rigged configuration bijection and proof of the $X = M$ conjecture for nonexceptional affine types. *J. Algebra*, 516:1–37, 2018.
- [OSSS17] Masato Okado, Reiho Sakamoto, Anne Schilling, and Travis Scrimshaw. Type $D_n^{(1)}$ rigged configuration bijection. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 46(2):341–401, 2017.
- [Sak08] Reiho Sakamoto. Crystal interpretation of Kerov-Kirillov-Reshetikhin bijection. II. Proof for \mathfrak{sl}_n case. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 27(1):55–98, 2008.
- [Sak09] Reiho Sakamoto. Kirillov-Schilling-Shimozono bijection as energy functions of crystals. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (4):579–614, 2009.
- [Sak17] Reiho Sakamoto. Invitation to the Bethe ansatz. In *Proceedings for the 61st Symposium on Algebra*, pages 43–118. Mathematical Society of Japan, 2017.
- [SCc08] The Sage-Combinat community. Sage-Combinat: enhancing Sage as a toolbox for computer exploration in algebraic combinatorics, 2008. <http://combinat.sagemath.org>.
- [Sch06] Anne Schilling. Crystal structure on rigged configurations. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, pages Art. ID 97376, 27, 2006.
- [Scr16] Travis Scrimshaw. A crystal to rigged configuration bijection and the filling map for type $D_4^{(3)}$. *J. Algebra*, 448C:294–349, 2016.
- [Scr17a] Travis Scrimshaw. Rigged configurations as tropicalizations of loop Schur functions. *J. Integrable Syst.*, 2(1), 2017.
- [Scr17b] Travis Scrimshaw. SAGEMATH code for soliton cellular automata. https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B_R5aihegKRMbGNWa0Q4VWpoQUU, 2017. Accessed: 2017-07-18.
- [Scr17c] Travis Scrimshaw. Uniform description of the rigged configuration bijection. Preprint, [arXiv:1703.08945](https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.08945), 2017.
- [SS06] Anne Schilling and Mark Shimozono. $X = M$ for symmetric powers. *J. Algebra*, 295(2):562–610, 2006.
- [SS15] Anne Schilling and Travis Scrimshaw. Crystal structure on rigged configurations and the filling map for non-exceptional affine types. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 22(1):Research Paper 73, 56, 2015.
- [ST12] Anne Schilling and Peter Tingely. Demazure crystals, Kirillov-Reshetikhin crystals, and the energy function. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 19(2):Paper 4, 42, 2012. [Second author’s name now “Tingley” on article].
- [Ste01] John R. Stembridge. Multiplicity-free products of Schur functions. *Ann. Comb.*, 5(2):113–121, 2001.
- [SW10] Anne Schilling and Qiang Wang. Promotion operator on rigged configurations of type A . *Electron. J. Combin.*, 17(1):Research Paper 24, 43, 2010.
- [Tak05] Taichiro Takagi. Inverse scattering method for a soliton cellular automaton. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 707(3):577–601, 2005.
- [TNS99] T. Tokihiro, A. Nagai, and J. Satsuma. Proof of soliton nature of box and ball systems by means of inverse ultra-discretization. *Inverse Probl.*, 15(6):1639–1662, 1999.
- [TS90] Daisuke Takahashi and Junkichi Satsuma. A soliton cellular automaton. *J. Phys. Soc. Japan*, 59(10):3514–3519, 1990.

- [TTMS96] T. Tokihiro, D. Takahashi, J. Matsukidaira, and J. Satsuma. From soliton equations to integrable cellular automata through a limiting procedure. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 76(18):3247–3250, 1996.
- [Yam98] Shigenori Yamane. Perfect crystals of $U_q(G_2^{(1)})$. *J. Algebra*, 210(2):440–486, 1998.
- [Yam01] Yasuhiko Yamada. A birational representation of Weyl group, combinatorial R -matrix and discrete Toda equation. In *Physics and combinatorics, 2000 (Nagoya)*, pages 305–319. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2001.
- [Yam04] Daisuke Yamada. Box ball system associated with antisymmetric tensor crystals. *J. Phys. A*, 37(42):9975–9987, 2004.
- [Yam07] Daisuke Yamada. Scattering rule in soliton cellular automaton associated with crystal base of $U_q(D_4^{(3)})$. *J. Math. Phys.*, 48(4):043509, 28, 2007.

(X. Liu) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, 206 CHURCH ST. SE, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455

Current address, X. Liu: Department of Statistics, North Carolina State University, 2311 Stinson Dr., Raleigh, NC 27695

E-mail address: xliu65@ncsu.edu

URL: <https://sites.google.com/ncsu.edu/xliu65/home>

(T. Scrimshaw) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND, ST. LUCIA, QLD 4072, AUSTRALIA

E-mail address: tcscrims@gmail.com

URL: <https://people.smp.uq.edu.au/TravisScrimshaw/>