RIGID SURFACE OPERATOR AND SYMBOL INARIANT OF PARTITIONS

BAO SHOU

Abstract. The symbol is used to describe the Springer correspondence for the classical groups by Lusztig. We refine the explanation that the S-duality maps of the rigid surface operators are symbol preserving maps. We find that the maps X_1 and Y_2 are essentially the same. We clear up cause of the mismatch problem of the total number of the rigid surface operators between the B_n and C_n theories. We construct all the B_n/C_n rigid surface operators which can not have a dual. A classification of the problematic surface operators is made.
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1. Introduction

Surface operators are two-dimensional defects supported on a two-dimensional submanifold of spacetime, which are natural generalisations of the 't Hooft operators. In [2], Gukov and Witten initiated a study of surface operators in \( \mathcal{N} = 4 \) super Yang-Mills theories in the ramified case of the Geometric Langlands Program.

S-duality for certain subclass of surface operators is discussed in [4,5]. The S-duality [10] assert that \( S : (G, \tau) \rightarrow (G^L, -1/n_g \tau) \) (where \( n_g \) is 2 for F_4, 3 for G_2, and 1 for other semisimple classical groups [2]; \( \tau = \theta/2\pi + 4\pi i/g^2 \) is usual gauge coupling constant ). This transformation exchanges gauge group \( G \) with the Langlands dual group. For example, the Langlands dual groups of Spin(2n+1) are Sp(2n)/\( \mathbb{Z}_2 \). And the langlands dual groups of SO(2n) are themselves.
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In [4], Gukov and Witten extended their earlier analysis [2] of surface operators which are based on the invariants. They identified a subclass of surface operators called 'rigid' surface operators expected to be closed under S-duality. There are two types rigid surface operators: unipotent and semisimple. The rigid semisimple surface operators are labelled by pairs of partitions. Unipotent rigid surface operators arise when one of the partitions is empty. In [4], some proposals for the S-duality maps related to rigid surface operators were made in the $B_n(SO(2n+1))$ and $C_n(Sp(2n))$ theories. These proposals involved all unipotent rigid surface operators as well as certain subclasses of rigid semisimple operators.

In [6], we analyse and extend the S-duality maps proposed by Wyllard using consistency checks. We propose the S-duality for a subclasses of rigid surface operators. The symbol invariant is convenient to study the S duality of surface operators. In [15], we propose equivalent definitions of symbols for different theories uniformly. Based on the new definition, we simplify the computation of symbol extremely. We give another construction of symbol in [18]. The fingerprint is another symbols for different theories uniformly. We simplify the computation of symbol preserving maps, which is the basics of study in this paper.

In [6], we analyse and extend the S-duality maps proposed by Wyllard using consistency checks. We propose the S-duality for a subclasses of rigid surface operators. The symbol invariant is convenient to study the S duality of surface operators. In [15], we propose equivalent definitions of symbols for different theories uniformly. Based on the new definition, we simplify the computation of symbol extremely. We give another construction of symbol in [18]. The fingerprint is another symbols for different theories uniformly. We simplify the computation of symbol preserving maps, which is the basics of study in this paper.

The S duality maps preserve symbol but not all symbol preserving maps are S duality maps. However more thorough understanding the construction of the S duality of surface operators might lead to progress. A problematic mismatch in the total number of rigid surface operators between the $B_n$ and the $C_n$ theories was pointed out in [3] [6]. The discrepancy is clearly a major problem. Fortunately, the construction of symbol [6] and the classification of symbol preserving maps are helpful to address this problem.

In this paper, we attempt to extend the analysis in [3] [6] and [6]. Since no noncentral rigid conjugacy classes in the $A_n$ theory, we do not discuss surface operators in this case. We also omit the discussion of the exceptional groups, which are more complicated. We will focus on theories with gauge groups $SO(2n)$ and the gauge groups $Sp(2n)$ whose Langlands dual group are $SO(2n+1)$.

In Section 2 we review the construction of rigid surface operators given in [4]. We discuss some mathematical results and definitions as preparation. We focus on the symbol invariant of surface operators which are unchanged under the S-duality map. In Section 3 we review the symbol invariant proposed in [17]. We refine the computational rules of symbol found in [17]. We find the contributions to symbol of a row in the same position of pairwise rows are the same in the $B_n$, $C_n$, and $D_n$ theories. As applications, the $S$-duality maps proposed in the [3] [6] can be illustrated more clearly [2]. We find that the maps $X_S$ and $Y_S$ are identical essential.

The second part of the paper involve the mismatch problem of the total number of the rigid surface operators between the $B_n$ and $C_n$ theories. We clear up cause of this problem. Finally, we give the construction and classification of all the $B_n/C_n$ rigid surface operators which can not have a dual, revealing some subtle things.

In the appendix, we summarize relevent facts about all rigid surface operators and their associated invariants in the $SO(13)$ and $Sp(12)$ theories.

2. Surface operators in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Super-Yang-Mills

In this section, we introduce the relevent backgrounds for our discussion. We closely follow paper [2] to which we refer the reader for more details.

We consider $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super-Yang-Mills theory on $\mathbb{R}^4$ with coordinates $x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3$. The most important bosonic fields: a gauge field as 1-form, $A_\mu$ ($\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$), six real scalars, $\phi_I$ ($I = 1, \ldots, 6$). All fields take values in the adjoint representation of the gauge group $G$. Surface operators are introduced by prescribing a certain singularity structure of fields near the surface on which the operator is supported. Without loss of generality we can assume the support of the surface operator $D$ to be oriented along the $(x^0, x^1)$ directions. Since the fields satisfy the BPS condition, the combinations $A = A_2 dx^2 + A_3 dx^3$ and $\phi = \phi_2 dx^2 + \phi_3 dx^3$ must obey Hitchin’s equations [2]

\begin{equation}
F_A - \phi \wedge \phi = 0, \quad d_A \phi = 0, \quad d_A \ast A = 0
\end{equation}

A surface operator is defined as a solution to these equations with a prescribed singularity along the surface $\mathbb{R}^2(x^0, x^1)$.
For the superconformal surface operator, setting \( x_2 + ix_3 = re^{i\theta} \), the most general possible rotation-invariant Ansatz for \( A \) and \( \phi \) is
\[
A = a(r) \, d\theta, \\
\phi = -c(r) \, d\theta + b(r) \frac{dr}{r}.
\]
On substituting this Ansatz into Hitchin’s equations (2.1) and defining \( s = -\ln r \), equations (2.1) reduces to Nahm’s equations
\[
\frac{da}{ds} = [b, c], \\
\frac{db}{ds} = [c, a], \\
\frac{dc}{ds} = [a, b]
\]
which imply the communication for the constants \( a, b \) and \( c \). Surface operators of this type were discussed in [2].

There is another way to obtain conformally invariant surface operator. Nahm’s equations (2.3) are solved with
\[
a = \frac{t_x}{s + 1/f}, \quad b = \frac{t_y}{s + 1/f}, \quad c = \frac{t_z}{s + 1/f},
\]
where \( t_x, t_y \) and \( t_z \) are elements of the lie algebra \( g \), spanning a representation of \( \mathfrak{su}(2) \). These \( t_i \)’s are in the adjoint representation of the gauge group. The surface operator is actually conformal invariant if the function \( f \) allowed to fluctuate.

Alternatively, the surface operators can be characterised as the conjugacy class of the monodromy
\[
U = P \exp(\oint A),
\]
where \( A = A + i\phi \). The integration is around a circle near \( r = 0 \). Following from (2.1), one finds that \( F = dA + A \wedge A = 0 \), which means that \( U \) is independent of deformations of the integration contour. For the surface operators (2.4), \( U \) becomes
\[
U = P \exp(\frac{2\pi}{s + 1/f} t_+),
\]
where \( t_+ \equiv t_x + it_y \) is nilpotent, corresponding to unipotent surface operator.

There are two types of conjugacy classes in a Lie group: unipotent and semisimple. Semisimple classes can also lead to surface operators. With a semisimple element \( S \), one can obtain a surface operator with monodromy \( V = SU \). For a general surface operator, it is constructed by requiring all the fields which are solutions to Nahm’s equations satisfy the following constrain near the surface \( D(\[4\]) \)
\[
S\Psi(r, \theta)S^{-1} = \Psi(r, \theta + 2\pi).
\]
From all the surface operators constructed from conjugacy classes, a subclass of surface operators called rigid surface operator is closed on the \( S \)-duality. The rigid surface operators are expected to be superconformal and not to depend on any parameters. A unipotent conjugacy classes is called rigid if its dimension is strictly smaller than that of any nearby orbit. All rigid orbits have been classified [3][4]. A semisimple conjugacy classes \( S \) is called rigid if the centraliser of such class is larger than that of any nearby class. Summary, surface operators are called rigid if they based on monodromies of the form \( V = SU \), where \( U \) is unipotent and rigid and \( S \) is semisimple and rigid.

2.1. Preliminary

From the above discussions, a classification of unipotent and semisimple conjugacy classes is needed to study surface operators. We describe the classification of rigid surface operators in the \( B_n(\text{SO}(2n+1)), C_n(\text{Sp}(2n)) \) and \( D_n(\text{SO}(2n)) \) theories in detail.

---

1The rigid surface operators here correspond to strongly rigid operators in [2].
The \( t_+ \) in Eq. (2.8) can be described in block-diagonal basis as follows

\[
(2.8) \quad t_+ = \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t_+^{n_1} & \cdots & t_+^{n_k} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & t_+^{n_k} \end{array} \right),
\]

where \( t_+^{n_k} \) is the ‘raising’ generator of the \( n_k \)-dimensional irreducible representation of \( su(2) \). For the \( B_n \), \( C_n \) and \( D_n \) theories, there are restrictions on the allowed dimensions of the \( su(2) \) irreps since \( t_+ \) should belong to the relevant gauge group. From the block-decomposition \( \text{(2.8)} \) we see that unipotent (nilpotent) surface operators are classified by the restricted partitions.

A partition \( \lambda \) of the positive integer \( n \) is defined by a decomposition \( \sum_{i=1}^{t} \lambda_i = n \) (\( \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_t \)), where the \( \lambda_i \) are called parts and \( t \) is the length. There is a one-to-one correspondence between partition and Young tableaux. For instance the partition \( 3 \) \( \text{(2.9)} \) corresponds to

\[
\text{(2.9)} \quad \lambda^+ = \begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{array}
\]

The another representation of partition is \( \lambda^T = \lambda^+ \) and the length \( l = \sum_i \lambda_i \). The addition of two partitions \( \lambda \) and \( \kappa \) is defined by the additions of each part \( \lambda_i + \kappa_i \). Young diagrams occur in a number of branches of mathematics and physics. They are also useful to construct the eigenstates of Hamiltonian System \( \text{(2.6)} \). We have the following classification of nilpotent orbits in terms of partitions \( \text{(1)} \):

- \((B_n)\): partitions of \( 2n+1 \), \( \sum \lambda_i = 2n+1 \), with a constraint that all even integers appear an even number of times;
- \((D_n)\): partitions of \( 2n \), \( \sum \lambda_i = 2n \), with a constraint that all even integers appear an even number of times;
- \((C_n)\): partitions of \( 2n \), \( \sum \lambda_i = 2n + 1 \), with a constraint that all odd integers appear an even number of times;

A partition in the \( B_n \) or \( D_n(C_n) \) theories is called rigid if it satisfies the following conditions,

1. no gaps (i.e. \( \lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} \leq 1 \) for all \( i \)),
2. no odd (even) integer appears exactly twice.

Rigid partitions correspond to rigid surface operators. The following facts are important for studying rigid partitions, which are easy to be proved and omitted here \( \text{[4]} \).

**Proposition 2.1.** The longest row in a rigid \( B_n \) partition always contains an odd number of boxes. And the following two rows of the first row are either both of odd length or both of even length. This pairwise rows then continues. If the Young tableau has an even number of rows the row of shortest length has to be even.

**Proposition 2.2.** The longest two rows in a rigid \( C_n \) partition both contain either an even or an odd number of boxes. This pairwise rows then continues. If the Young tableau has an even number of rows the row of shortest length has to be even.

**Proposition 2.3.** The longest row in a rigid \( D_n \) partition always contains an even number of boxes. And the following two rows are either both of even length or both of odd length. This pairwise rows then continue. If the Young tableau has an even number of rows the row of the shortest length has to be even.

The rigid semisimple conjugacy classes \( S \) in formula \( \text{(2.7)} \) correspond to diagonal matrices with elements \( +1 \) and \( -1 \) along the diagonal in the \( B_n \), \( C_n \) and \( D_n \) theories \( \text{[3]} \). The matrices \( S \) break the gauge group to its centraliser at the Lie algebra level as follows

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{so}(2n+1) & \rightarrow \text{so}(2k+1) \oplus \text{so}(2n-2k), \\
\text{so}(2n) & \rightarrow \text{so}(2k) \oplus \text{so}(2n-2k), \\
\text{sp}(2n) & \rightarrow \text{sp}(2k) \oplus \text{sp}(2n-2k),
\end{align*}
\]

which imply that the rigid semisimple surface operators correspond to pairs of partitions \( (\lambda'; \lambda'') \) in the \( B_n \), \( C_n \), and \( D_n \) \( \text{[3]} \). \( \lambda' \) is a rigid \( B_k \) partition and \( \lambda'' \) is a rigid \( D_{n-k} \) partition in the \( B_n \) case. \( \lambda' \) is a rigid \( D_k \) partition and \( \lambda'' \) is a rigid \( D_{n-k} \) partition in the \( D_n \) case. \( \lambda' \) is a rigid \( C_k \) partition and \( \lambda'' \) is a rigid \( C_{n-k} \) partition in the \( C_n \) case. The rigid unipotent surface operator is a limiting case of rigid semisimple surface operator with \( \lambda'' = 0 \).
There is a close relationship between the pair of partition \((\lambda'; \lambda'')\) and Weyl group. For Weyl groups in the \(B_n\), \(C_n\), and \(D_n\) theories both conjugacy classes and irreducible unitary representations are in one-to-one correspondence with ordered pairs of partitions \([\alpha; \beta]\). \(\alpha\) is a partition of \(n_\alpha\) and \(\beta\) is a partition of \(n_\beta\), with \(n_\alpha + n_\beta = n\). Though the conjugacy classes and unitary representations are parameterised by ordered pair of partitions there is no canonical isomorphism between the two sets.

The Kazhdan-Lusztig map is a map from the unipotent conjugacy classes of a simple group to the set of conjugacy classes of the Weyl group. This map can be extended to the case of rigid semisimple conjugacy classes \([4]\). The Springer correspondence is an injective map from the unipotent conjugacy classes of a simple group to the set of unitary representations of the Weyl group. For the classical groups the above two maps can be described explicitly by the invariants fingerprint and symbol of partitions in \([1]\), respectively.

### 2.2. Invariants of surface operators

Invariants of the surface operators \((\lambda'; \lambda'')\) do not change under the \(S\)-duality map \([4][5]\).

The dimension \(d\) is the most basic invariant of a rigid surface operator. It is calculated as follows \([4][6]\):

\[
\begin{align*}
B_n: & \quad d = 2n^2 + n - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k (s_k')^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k (s_k'')^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \text{ odd}} r_k' + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \text{ odd}} r_k'',
C_n: & \quad d = 2n^2 + n - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k (s_k')^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k (s_k'')^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \text{ odd}} r_k' + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \text{ odd}} r_k''.
\end{align*}
\]

where \(s_k'\) denotes the number of parts of \(\lambda'\)'s that are larger than or equal to \(k\) and \(r_k'\) denotes the number of parts of \(\lambda'\) that are equal to \(k\). Similarly, \(s_k''\) and \(r_k''\) correspond to \(\lambda''\).

The invariant fingerprint constructed from \((\lambda'; \lambda'')\) via the Kazhdan-Lusztig map. This invariant is a pair of partitions \([\alpha; \beta]\) associated with the Weyl group conjugacy class.

There is another invariant symbol based on the Springer correspondence, which can be extended to rigid semisimple conjugacy classes. One can construct the symbol of this rigid semisimple surface operator \((\lambda'; \lambda'')\) by calculating the symbols for both \(\lambda'\) and \(\lambda''\), then add the entries that are ‘in the same place’ of these two partitions. The result symbol is denoted as follows

\[
\sigma((\lambda' + \lambda'')) = \sigma(\lambda') + \sigma(\lambda'').
\]

An example illustrates the addition rule in detail:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\
1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 3
\end{pmatrix}
\]

It is checked that the symbol of a rigid surface operator contains the same amount of information as the fingerprint \([6]\). Compared with the fingerprint invariant, the symbol is much easier to be calculated and more convenient to find the \(S\)-duality maps of surface operators.

In \([3]\), it was pointed that two discrete quantum numbers ‘center’ and ‘topology’ are interchanged under \(S\)-duality. A surface operator can detect topology then its dual should detect the centre and vice versa. However, there are some puzzles using these discrete quantum numbers to find duality pair \([3]\). There is another problem that the number of rigid surface operators in the \(B_n\) theory is larger than that in the \(C_n\) theory \([3]\), which was first observed in the \(B_2/C_1\) theories \([4]\). In this paper, we ignore the first problem for the moment. We focus on the symbol invariant to study the second problem of rigid surface operators between the dual theories. Hopefully, our works will be helpful in making new insight to the surface operator.

### 3. Contributions to symbol of rows of partition

In this section, we discuss the contribution to symbol of a row in a partition. What we emphasize is that the contributions of the same row in different theories are the same. This result imply that the two important maps \(X_S\) and \(Y_S\) are in same in nature.

#### 3.1. Symbol invariant of partitions

In \([3]\), we proposed equivalent definitions of symbol for the partitions in the \(C_n\) and \(D_n\) theories which are consistent with that for the \(B_n\) theory as much as possible.
Table 1. Contribution to symbol of the $i$th row of a partition. $B_n(t = -1)$, $C_n(t = 0)$, and $D_n(t = 1)$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parity of the length of $i$th row</th>
<th>Parity of $i + t + 1$</th>
<th>$L$</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| odd                             | even                  | $\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{k=1}^{n} n_k + 1)$ | \[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\] |
| even                             | odd                   | $\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{k=1}^{n} n_k)$ | \[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\] |
| even                             | even                  | $\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{k=1}^{n} n_k)$ | \[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & L
\end{pmatrix}
\] |
| odd                             | odd                   | $\frac{1}{2}(\sum_{k=1}^{n} n_k - 1)$ | \[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & L
\end{pmatrix}
\] |

Definition 1. The symbol of a partition in the $B_n$, $C_n$, and $D_n$ theories.

- For the $B_n$ theory: firstly, we add $l - k$ to the $k$th part of the partition. Next we arrange the odd parts of the sequence $l - k + \lambda_k$ and the even parts in an increasing sequence $2f_i + 1$ and in an increasing sequence $2g_i$, respectively. Then we calculate the terms
  \[
  \alpha_i = f_i - i + 1 \quad \beta_i = g_i - i + 1
  \]
  Finally we write the symbol as
  \[
  (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 \cdots \beta_1 \beta_2 \cdots).
  \]

- For the $C_n$ theory:
  1: If the length of partition is even, we compute the symbol as in the $B_n$ case and then append an extra 0 on the left of the top row of the symbol.
  2: If the length of the partition is odd, we append an extra 0 as the last part of the partition and then compute the symbol as in the $B_n$ case. Finally, we delete a 0 which is in the first entry of the bottom row of the symbol.

- For the $D_n$ theory: we append an extra 0 as the last part of the partition and then compute the symbol as in the $B_n$ case. We delete two 0’s which occupy the first two entries of the bottom row of the symbol.

Remark 3.1. The terms $\alpha_i$ are all related to $f_*$ and $\beta_i$ are all related to $g_*$ in the new definitions of symbol for different theories.

3.2. Contributions to symbol of rows

In Table 1, we determine the contribution to symbol for each row of a partition in the $B_n(t = -1)$, $C_n(t = 0)$, and $D_n(t = 1)$ theories, which is given by Table 1.

Example: Partition $\lambda = 3^22^21^2$ in the $D_n$ theory,

\[
\sigma_{(3^22^21^2)}^{D} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},
\]

where the superscript $D$ indicates that it is a partition in the $D_n$ theory.

First we study the rows of partitions which have the same contribution to symbol with same lengths.

The row $a$ is the second row of pairwise rows as shown in Fig. 1 in the $B_n$, $C_n$, and $D_n$ theories. If the length of the row $a$ is $2n + 1$, according to Table 1 its contributions to symbol is...
Figure 1. Row \( a \) is the second row of pairwise rows of partition in the \( B_n \), 
\( D_n \) theories, with the same contribution to symbol.

the same for different theories with

\[
(3.16) \quad \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

If the length of the row \( a \) is \( 2n \), its contribution to symbol is the same for different theories with

\[
(3.17) \quad \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

If the row \( a \) is the first row of pairwise rows, its contribution to symbol are also the same in different theories. Summary, with the same position in pairwise rows, one row has the same contribution to symbol in different theories.

Figure 2. The first row \( a \) in the \( B_n \) theory can be regarded the second row 
of odd pairwise rows. Rows \( a' \)'s have the same contribution to symbol in the 
\( B_n, D_n, \) and \( C_n \) theories.

Even more, we find that the first row of the \( B_n \) theory has the same contribution to symbol as the second row of odd pairwise rows in the \( D_n \) and \( C_n \) theories as shown in Fig. 2. According to 
Table 1 the row \( a \), with length \( 2n + 1 \), has a contribution to symbol in the \( B_n \) theory as follows

\[
(3.18) \quad \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

which is the same as the contributions in the \( D_n \) and \( C_n \) theories according to Table 1. We claim that the first row of the \( B_n \) theory partition can be seen as the top row of odd pairwise rows.

Figure 3. Row \( a \) in the \( D_n \) theory can be regarded as the top row of pairwise 
rows. Row \( a' \)'s have the same contributions to symbol in the \( B_n, D_n, \) and \( C_n \) 
theories.

Similarly, we find that the first row \( a \) of the \( D_n \) theory has the same contribution to symbol 
as the top row of even pairwise rows in the \( B_n \) and \( C_n \) theories as shown in Fig. 3. With length 
\( 2n \), the row \( a \), has a contribution to symbol in the \( D_n \) theory as follows

\[
(3.19) \quad \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]
Table 2. Contribution to symbol of a row of a partition in the $B_n$, $D_n$, and $C_n$ theories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parity of the length row</th>
<th>Position of row</th>
<th>Length of row</th>
<th>Contribution to symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>odd</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>$2n + 1$</td>
<td>$\begin{bmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; \cdots &amp; 0 &amp; 1 &amp; \cdots &amp; 1 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; \cdots &amp; 1 &amp; 0 &amp; \cdots &amp; 0 \end{bmatrix}_{n}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>odd</td>
<td>bottom</td>
<td>$2n + 1$</td>
<td>$\begin{bmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; \cdots &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; \cdots &amp; 1 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; \cdots &amp; 1 &amp; 0 &amp; \cdots &amp; 0 \end{bmatrix}_{n}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>bottom</td>
<td>$2m$</td>
<td>$\begin{bmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; \cdots &amp; 0 &amp; 1 &amp; \cdots &amp; 1 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; \cdots &amp; 1 &amp; 0 &amp; \cdots &amp; 0 \end{bmatrix}_{m}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>$2m$</td>
<td>$\begin{bmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; \cdots &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; \cdots &amp; 1 \ 0 &amp; 1 &amp; \cdots &amp; 1 &amp; 0 &amp; \cdots &amp; 0 \end{bmatrix}_{m}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which is the same as the contributions in the $D_n$ and $C_n$ theories according to Table 1. We claim that the first row of the $D_n$ theory partition can be seen as the top row of even pairwise rows.

From the above discussions, we have the following concise proposition.

**Proposition 3.1.** *With the same position in pairwise rows, one row has the same contribution to symbol in the $B_n$, $D_n$, and $C_n$ theories.*

And the contribution to symbol of a row has the form as shown in Table 2.

![Figure 4](image.png)

**Figure 4.** $a$ and $b$ are pairwise rows in the $B_n$, $D_n$, and $C_n$ theories. These pairwise rows have the same contributions to symbol.

Next, we study the contributions to symbol of pairwise pattern. The two rows $a$ and $b$ of pairwise rows as shown in Fig. 4 have the lengths of $2n + 1$ and $2m + 1$, respectively. According to Table 2, the contributions to symbol of these two rows in the $B_n$, $D_n$, and $C_n$ theories are the same as follows,

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{bmatrix}_{n}.
$$

If the length of $a$ is $2n$ and the length of $b$ is $2m$, according to Table 2 the contributions are

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{bmatrix}_{m}.
$$

Summary, we get the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.1.** *The contributions to symbol are the same for the same pairwise rows in the $B_n$, $D_n$, and $C_n$ theories.*

Next we study the rows of partitions which have the same contribution to symbol with different lengths. According to Table 2 the bottom row of odd pairwise rows has the same contribution to symbol as the top row of even pairwise rows which has one more box as shown in Fig. 4. Without
Figure 5. The first two partitions are in the $B_n$ theory. Length of $b$ is $l$ and the lengths of $b_1$, $b_2$, and $b_3$ are $l + 1$. The gray box is appended. These four rows have the same contribution to symbol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parity of row</th>
<th>Position of row in pairwise rows</th>
<th>Length of row</th>
<th>Contribution to symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>odd</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>$2n + 1$</td>
<td>$(0 \ 0 \cdots\ 0 \ n+1 \cdots\ 0 \ \cdots\ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \cdots\ 1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>bottom</td>
<td>$2n$</td>
<td>$(0 \ 0 \cdots\ 0 \ \cdots\ 0 \ 0 \cdots\ 0 \ n \cdots\ 1 \ 1 \cdots\ 1)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Contribution to symbol of the second row of odd pairwise rows with length $2n + 1$. And the contribution to symbol of the first row of even pairwise rows with length $2n$.

an explanation in the following sections, the gray box is the box appended and the black box is the box omitted. The contribution to symbol of the row $b$ with length $2n + 1$ is

\[(3.20) \begin{align*} &0 \ 0 \cdots\ 0 \ n+1 &0 \ 0 \cdots\ 1 \ 1 \cdots\ 1 \\ &0 \cdots\ 0 \ 0 \cdots\ 0 \end{align*} \]

which is the same as the contribution of the row $b$ in the $D_n$ theory as shown in Fig. (5).

Figure 6. The first two partitions are in $B_n$ theory. Length of $b$ is $l$. And the lengths of $b_1$, $b_2$, and $b_3$ are $l - 1$. The black box is omitted. These four rows have the same contribution to symbol.

According to Table 2, the top row of even pairwise rows have the same contribution to symbol as the bottom row of odd pairwise rows which has one less box as shown in Fig. (6). The contribution to symbol of the row $b$ with length $2n$ is

\[(3.21) \begin{align*} &0 \ 0 \cdots\ 0 \ 1 \cdots\ 1 \cdots\ 0 \ 0 \cdots\ 0 \\ &0 \cdots\ 0 \ 0 \cdots\ 0 \end{align*} \]

which is the same as that of the row $b$ with length $2n - 1$ in the $D_n$ theory as shown in Fig. (6).

Summary, the contribution to symbol of a row has the form as shown in Tables 3 and 4.

According to Propositions 3.1 and 3.2, the contribution to symbol of a row can be seen an invariant. In other words, we can list all the lengths and the positions of rows with the same contribution to symbol.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parity of row</th>
<th>Position of row in pairwise rows</th>
<th>Length of row</th>
<th>Contribution to symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>odd</td>
<td>bottom</td>
<td>$2n+1$</td>
<td>$(0 \cdots 1 1 \cdots 1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; \cdots &amp; 0 \cdots 0 \cdots 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even</td>
<td>top</td>
<td>$2n$</td>
<td>$(0 \cdots 1 1 \cdots 1) \begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; \cdots &amp; 0 \cdots 0 \cdots 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Contribution to symbol of the first row of odd pairwise rows with length $2n+1$. And the contribution to symbol of the second row of even pairwise rows with length $2n$.

3.3. Maps preserving symbol

![Figure 7](image)

**Figure 7.** $\lambda'$ is a partition in the $B_n$ theory and $\lambda''$ is a partition in the $D_n$ theory. Symbol preserving maps $S_{e1221}$ and $D_{e1221}$.

There are two classes of symbol preserving maps. The second class of map take surface operators to surface operators in the same theory. We have made a classification of the second class of maps in [12]. As shown in Fig. 7, the map $D_{e1221}$ is one of them which preserves symbol according to Proposition 3.1. ($\lambda', \lambda''$) is a rigid semisimple operator in the $B_n$ theory. The another map $S_{e1221}$ swap one row of $\lambda'$ with one row of $\lambda''$ which preserve symbol according to Proposition 3.2.

The first class of symbol preserving maps take surface operators into different theories, for examples, the $S$ duality maps. Without confusion, the second class of maps will be called the $S$ duality maps in the following sections. For the construction of the $S$ duality maps [5], the maps $X_S$ and $Y_S$ play a significant role. $X_S$ map a partition with only odd rows in the $B_n$ theory to a partition with only even rows in the $C_n$ theory as shown in Fig. 8.

$$X_S : m^{2n_m+1} (m-1)^{2n_m-1} (m-2)^{2n_m-2} \cdots 2^{2n_1} 1^{2n_1}$$

$$\mapsto m^{2n_m} (m-1)^{2n_m-1}+2 (m-2)^{2n_m-2} \cdots 2^{2n_1+2} 1^{2n_1-2}.$$ (3.22)

where $m$ has to be odd in order for the first object to be a partition in the $B_n$ theory. The black boxes which are the last boxes of the second row of pairwise rows are deleted and the gray boxes are appended as the last boxes of the first row of pairwise rows.

**Lemma 3.2.** The map $X_S$ preserve symbol invariant.

**Proof.** On the left hand side of the map $X_S$, the 2kth and $(2k+1)$th rows of a partition in the $B_n$ theory are pairwise rows excepting the first row. On the right hand side of the map $X_S$, the $(2k-1)$th and 2kth rows of a partition in the $C_n$ theory are pairwise rows. According to Table 5, the contribution to symbol of the 2kth row in the $B_n$ partition is equal to that of the $(2k-1)$th row in the $C_n$ partition. According to Table 6, the contribution to symbol of the $(2k+1)$th row
in the $B_n$ partition is equal to that of the $2k$th row in the $C_n$ partition. So the symbols on the
two sides of the map $X_S$ are the same. □

Next, we introduce the map $Y_S$ which take a rigid partition with only odd rows in the
$C_n$ theory to a rigid partition with only even rows in the $D_n$ theory as shown in Fig. (9).

\[
Y_S : m^{2n} \rightarrow (m - 1)^{2n} \rightarrow (m - 2)^{2n} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow 1^{2n}
\]

where $m$ has to be even in order for the first element to be a $C_k$ partition.

Similarly, we can prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3.** The map $Y_S$ preserve symbol invariant.

**Summary**, for a partition $\rho_{\text{odd}}$ with only odd rows in the $B_n$ theory, we get a partition $\lambda_{\text{even}}$ with only even rows in the $C_n$ theory

\[
X_S : \rho_{\text{odd}} \rightarrow \rho_{\text{even}}.
\]

For a partition $\rho_{\text{odd}}$ with only odd rows in the $C_n$ theory, we get a partition $\lambda_{\text{even}}$ with only even rows in the $D_n$ theory

\[
Y_S : \rho_{\text{odd}} \rightarrow \rho_{\text{even}}.
\]

The common characteristics of the maps $X_S$ and $Y_S$ are appending a box at the end of the first row of pairwise rows and deleting a box at the end of the second one for a partition with only odd rows. Compared Fig. (8) with Fig. (9), the relationship between the map $X_S$ and the map $Y_S$ is

\[
X_S(m \rightarrow m - 1) = Y_S.
\]

The map $Y_S$ can be regarded as a special case of the map $X_S$.

3.4. **S-duality maps for rigid surface operators**

We can generalize the maps $X_S$ and $Y_S$ of the unipotent surface operators to rigid semisimple
operators using addition rules 2.12. For example, the $S$ duality maps of the rigid semisimple
surface operators from the $B_n$ theory to the $C_n$ theory have the following form.

\[
S : (\lambda, \rho)_B \rightarrow (\lambda', \rho'')_C
\]

$\lambda, \rho$ are partitions in the $B_n$ and $D_n$ theories, respectively. $\lambda', \rho''$ are in the $C_n$ theory. This
map preserve symbol, but not all the symbol preserving maps are $S$ duality maps which should
preserve all invariants as those proposed in [5]. In [5], Wyllard made explicit proposals for how
the $S$-duality map should act on unipotent surface operators and certain subclasses of semisimple
surface operators, which are passed all consistency checks. In [6], we made new proposals for

---

\[2\] The unipotent conjugacy classes(nilpotent orbits) are related to the partitions by Kazhdan-Lusztig map.
It would be interesting to study the inspiration on the nilpotent orbits from the operation.
certain subclasses of semisimple surface operators. In this section, we illustrate that these $S$-duality maps can be explained naturally as the symbol preserving maps using Propositions 3.1 and 3.2.

**For rigid unipotent operators $(\lambda, \emptyset)$ of the $B_n$ theory**

The $S$-duality map is

$$WB : (\lambda, \emptyset)_B \rightarrow (\lambda_{\text{odd}} + \lambda_{\text{even}}, \emptyset) \rightarrow (X_S \lambda_{\text{odd}}, \lambda_{\text{even}})_C.$$  

Start by splitting the Young tableau $\lambda$ into tableau $\lambda_{\text{even}}$ constructed from even rows only and tableau $\lambda_{\text{odd}}$ constructed from the odd rows only. Next the map $X_S$ turns $\lambda_{\text{odd}}$ to a partition with only even rows while $\lambda_{\text{even}}$ is left unchanged. Finally, the duality operator corresponding to $(\lambda, \emptyset)$ in the $C_n$ theory is $(X_S \lambda_{\text{odd}}, \lambda_{\text{even}})$. According to Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 3.2, the map $WB$ preserve the symbol invariant. An example illustrates this procedure.

**Example:** For the $B_{16}$ partition, $\lambda = 5^4 2^3 1^4$, applying the map $WB$, we find

$$WB : \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{array}$$

which leads to the semisimple $C_{16}$ surface operator $(2^4 1^8, 2^6 1^4)$.

**For rigid unipotent operators $(\lambda, \emptyset)$ of the $C_n$ theory**

Similarly, we can prove the following $S$-duality map preserve symbol.

$$WC : (\lambda, \emptyset)_C \rightarrow (\lambda_{\text{odd}} + \lambda_{\text{even}}, \emptyset) \rightarrow (X_S^{-1} \lambda_{\text{even}}, Y_S \lambda_{\text{odd}})_B.$$  

**For semisimple surface operators $(\rho; \rho)$ of the $C_n$ theory**

The $S$-duality map is

$$WCC : (\rho; \rho)_C \rightarrow (\rho_{\text{even}} + \rho_{\text{odd}}; \rho_{\text{odd}} + \rho_{\text{even}}) \rightarrow (\rho_{\text{even}} + X_S^{-1} \rho_{\text{even}}; \rho_{\text{odd}} + Y_S \rho_{\text{odd}})_B.$$  

Firstly, split two equal tableaux into even-row tableaux $\rho_{\text{even}}$ and odd-row tableaux $\rho_{\text{odd}}$. Then apply the map $X_S$ to one of the odd-row tableaux and apply the map $Y^{-1}_S$ to the even-row tableau in the other semisimple factor. Next add the altered and unaltered even-row tableaux to form one of the two partitions in a semisimple $B_n$ operator. Finally, do the same to the odd-row tableaux and lead to a semisimple operator in the $B_n$ theory.

According to Proposition 3.1, the partitions $\rho_{\text{even}}$ and $\rho_{\text{odd}}$ have the same contributions to symbol on the two sides of the map $WCC$. According to Proposition 3.2, the partitions $X_S^{-1} \rho_{\text{even}}$ and $Y_S \rho_{\text{odd}}$ have the same contributions to symbol on the two sides of the map $WCC$. However, we need to prove that $(\rho_{\text{even}} + X_S^{-1} \rho_{\text{even}}; \rho_{\text{odd}} + Y_S \rho_{\text{odd}})_B$ is a rigid semisimple surface operator. An illustration is made through an example as shown in Fig. 10. Pairwise rows of $\rho_{\text{even}}$ are placed between the first and the second row of a pairwise rows of $X_S^{-1} \rho_{\text{even}}$, not violating the rigid conditions. Pairwise rows of $\rho_{\text{odd}}$ are placed between the first and the second row of a pairwise rows of $Y_S \rho_{\text{odd}}$, not violating the rigid conditions.

**For semisimple surface operators $(\lambda_{\text{even}}; \rho_{\text{odd}})$ of the $C_n$ theory**

In [6], we propose a $S$-duality map as follows.

$$C_{\text{geo}} : (\lambda_{\text{even}}; \rho_{\text{odd}})_C \rightarrow (X_S^{-1} \lambda_{\text{even}}; Y_S \rho_{\text{odd}})_B.$$  

We can prove it preserves symbol invariant using Proposition 3.2.

### 3.5. Discussions

The $S$-duality maps must preserve symbol invariant and other invariants. Compared to other invariants, the symbol is more easier to be calculated and more convenient to find the $S$ duality maps. We can study the symbol invariant preserving maps by using Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 firstly. Our motivation is that a more thorough understanding the symbol preserving maps might lead to progress. Proposition 3.1 implies the symbol preserving operations that moving a row of a partition to another partition with the same position of pairwise rows. One example is that leaving $\lambda_{\text{even}}$ unchanged in the $S$ duality map $WB$. Proposition 3.2 implies the symbol preserving operations such as the maps $X_S$, $Y_S$ and their inverse maps.

With these principles in mind, we discuss the constructions of the rigid semisimple operators in the $B_n$ theory from the $C_n$ theory and vice versa in next section.
4. Mismatch in the total number of the rigid semisimple surface operator

There is a discrepancy of the number of rigid surface operators between the $B_n$ and $C_n$ theories, which was first observed in the $B_4/C_4$ theories in [4]. Using the generating function, Wyllard found that the difference of the total number of rigid surface operators (both unipotent and semisimple) between the $B_n$ and $C_n$ theory is

$$q^9 + 2q^{11} + 4q^{13} + 5q^{15} + 9q^{17} + 12q^{19} + 17q^{21} + 23q^{23} + \cdots$$

where the degree corresponds to the rank $n$ of Lie algebra.

The discrepancy issue is clearly a major problem. Wyllard made a preliminary analysis of the problematic surface operators and gave examples of mismatches [5]. As shown in the appendix, there are two types of mismatches of rigid surface operators between the $B_n$ theory and $C_n$ theory. The first type is that certain surface operators in $B_n/C_n$ theory do not have duals. The second type is that the number of surface operators with certain invariants in $B_n$ theory is more than that in the $C_n$ theory.

In this section, we analyse mismatch problem based on the results in previous sections. We find that the discrepancy issues originate from the rigid conditions of partitions. We recover all the results in [5] and find new type of problem operators. Even more, the algorithms proposed give all the problematic rigid surface operators, with a classification is made.

4.1. Changes of the first row of a partition

According to Tables 3 and 4, the contribution to symbol of a row is an invariant. The contribution to symbol of each row of partition will not change under the symbol preserving map. So the longest row of two factors of a rigid surface operator would always the longest row on the two sides of the $S$ duality maps. On the other hand, the first two rows of the $C_n$ partitions are pairwise rows, while the first row of the $B_n$ and $D_n$ theories are not pairwise rows. With these facts in mind, there are two choices to move the longest row from one factor of the rigid semisimple surface operator to another factor for constructing a symbol preserving map. For the first one, the longest row moves from one factor of the rigid semisimple surface operator to another factor under the symbol preserving map, which will be studied in Sections 4.2, 4.3. For the second one, the longest row stays in the same partition under the symbol preserving map, which will be studied in Sections 4.5. In the following sections we would illustrate these procedures in detail.

It should be pointed out that the maps between the rigid semisimple surface operator with the same symbol have been classified in [13]. We would find that there are one to one correspondence of these maps on the two side of the $S$ duality map.
4.2. Generating $B_n$ rigid semisimple surface operators from the $C_n$ theory

We propose algorithms to generate $B_n$ rigid semisimple surface operators from the $C_n$ theory as follows. First consider the first two rows of both factors of the rigid partitions have the same parities.

- The first two rows of both factors of a rigid surface operator are even. Take the longest row of two factors from one factor to another one, and then append a gray box as the last part of the partition as shown in Fig. (11).

Figure 11. Partitions $C_1$ and $C_2$ are in the $C_n$ theory. And the partitions $B_1$ and $D_2$ are in the $B_n$ and $D_n$ theories, respectively. Algorithm $EE$ turn a $C_n$ rigid surface operator into a $B_n$ one.

- The first two rows of both factors of a rigid surface operator are odd. Take the longest row from one factor to another one, and then append an gray box as the last part of the partition as shown in Fig. (12).

Figure 12. Partitions $C_1$ and $C_2$ are in the $C_n$ theory. And the partitions $B_1$ and $D_2$ are in the $B_n$ and $D_n$ theories, respectively. Algorithm $OO$ turn a $C_n$ rigid surface operator into a $B_n$ one.

According to Tables 3 and 4, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.1.** The algorithms $EE$ and $OO$ preserve symbol.

They also preserve the rigid conditions.

**Proposition 4.2.** The algorithms $EE$ and $OO$ preserve rigid conditions of partitions.

_Proof._ It is obviously that no gaps appear in the new rigid surface operator as shown in Fig. (11) and Fig. (12). And the even integers in the partitions $C_1, C_2$ become the odd integers in the partitions $B_1, D_2$. Since no even integer appears exactly twice in the symplectic($C_n$) partitions $C_1, C_2$, no odd integer ($\geq 3$) appears exactly twice in the orthogonal($B_n, D_n$) partitions $B_1, D_2$. Since the numbers of the difference between the longest row after appending a gray box and the second row of the partition $B_1$ and $D_2$ are odd, the part '1' would not appear twice. \qed

Next consider the first two rows of both factors of the rigid partitions are of different parities.

- The longest row of two partitions is even. If the first row of $C_2$ is the longest and even, we propose an algorithm $CE$ to get a $B_n$ rigid semisimple surface operator from the $C_n$ one as shown in Fig. (13). We add the longest row to $C_1$ and append a gray box, leading to a $B_n$ partition $B_1$ and the $D_n$ partition $D_2$. The $D_n$ partition $D_2$ satisfy the rigid conditions as Proposition 4.2.
Figure 13. The first row of $C_2$ is the longest of the two partitions on the left hand side of $EO$. Add it to $C_1$ and append a gray box as the last part of the longest row.

Figure 14. The first row of $C_2$ is the longest of the two partitions on the left hand side of $OE$. Add it to $C_1$ and append a gray box as the last part of the longest row.

- The longest row of two partitions is odd. If the first row of $C_2$ is the longest and odd, we propose an algorithm $CO$ as shown in Fig. (14). We add the longest row to $C_1$ and append a gray box, leading to a $D_n$ partition $D_2$ and the $B_n$ partition $B_1$. The $B_n$ partition $B_1$ satisfy the rigid conditions as Proposition 4.2.

Proposition 4.3. The algorithms $EE$ and $OO$ preserve symbol.

However, under the algorithms $CE$ and $CO$, the partitions $B_1$ and $D_2$ do not always preserve the rigid condition.

**IC type problematic surface operators:**

$L(C_1)$ and $L(C_2)$ denote the lengths of the partitions of $C_1$ and $C_2$, respectively.

- If $L(C_1) = L(C_2) - 1$, the part ’1’ appear twice in the $B_n$ partition $B_1$ under the algorithm $CE$, violating rigid condition 2.
- If $L(C_1) = L(C_2) - 1$, the part ’1’ appear twice in the $D_n$ partition $D_2$ under the algorithm $CO$, violating rigid condition 2.

For these problem operators, we may try to add the shorter row of the two first rows from one factor to another one. However, these procedure do not lead to rigid surface operators, violating the rigid condition $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} \leq 1$ as shown in Figs. (13) and (14).

- If $L(C_1) = L(C_2) - 1$, and then $\lambda_{i-1} - \lambda_i = 2$ in the $D_n$ partition $D_2$ under the algorithm $COS$, violating rigid condition 1.
- If $L(C_2) = L(C_1) - 1$, and then $\lambda_{i-1} - \lambda_i = 2$ in the $B_n$ partition $B_1$ under the algorithm $CES$, violating rigid condition 1.

We may try to map the $C_n$ operator to another $C_n$ operator with the same symbol as shown in Fig. (17) before taking the algorithm $OE$. We swap the row $a$ of the partition $C_1$ with row $b$ of the partition $C_2$, deleting the last box of the row $b$ and append a box at the end of the row $a$. However the first two rows of the new factor $C_2$ would have the same lengths, violating the rigid condition 1. We can get the same conclusion for the operator $(C_1, C_2)$ on the left hand of the algorithm $CO$.

Summary, the $C_n$ rigid semisimple surface operators $(C_1, C_2)$ with $|L(C_1) - L(C_2)| = 1$ can not have rigid $B_n$ duals. We denoted them as the IC type problematic surface operators.
Algorithm \( \text{COS} \) take the first row of \( C_2 \) to \( C_1 \) and append a gray box under the condition \( L(C_1) = L(C_2) - 1 \).

Algorithm \( \text{CES} \) take the first row of \( C_1 \) to \( C_2 \) and append a gray box under the condition \( L(C_2) = L(C_1) - 1 \).

![Figure 16. \( C_n \) partitions \( C_1, C_2 \). \( D_n \) partition \( D_2 \) and \( B_n \) partition \( B_1 \). Algorithm \( \text{CES} \) take the first row of \( C_1 \) to \( C_2 \) and append a gray box under the condition \( L(C_2) = L(C_1) - 1 \).](image)

![Figure 17. \( C_n \) partitions \( C_1, C_2 \). Lengths of partitions satisfy \( L(C_1) = L(C_2) - 1 \) on the left hand side of the map.](image)

For the special rigid semisimple surface operator \( (\lambda_{\text{even}}, \lambda_{\text{odd}})_C \), we will come back this problem in Section 4.7.

4.3. Generating \( C_n \) rigid semisimple surface operators from the \( B_n \) theory

The construction rigid semisimple surface operators in the \( C_n \) theory from that in the \( B_n \) theory is roughly parallel to the discussions in previous section.

- The longest row the rigid semisimple surface operator is the first row of the \( B_n \) partition \( B_1 \). We suggest the algorithm \( \text{BO} \): delete the last box and then add it to the \( D_n \) partition \( D_2 \) as shown in Fig. 18. Then the first two rows of the \( C_n \) partitions \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are even. And the partition \( C_1 \) satisfies the rigid condition naturally.

- The longest row the rigid semisimple surface operator is the first row of the \( D_n \) partition \( D_2 \). We suggest the algorithm \( \text{BE} \): delete the last box and then add it to the \( B_n \) partition \( B_1 \) as shown in Fig. 19. Then the first two rows of the \( C_n \) partitions \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are even. And the partition \( C_2 \) satisfies the rigid condition naturally.

However, the partitions \( C_2 \) and \( C_1 \) do not always preserve the rigid condition under the algorithms \( \text{BO} \) and \( \text{BE} \), respectively.

**IB type problematic surface operators:**

\( L(B_1) \) and \( L(D_2) \) denote the lengths of the partitions of \( B_1 \) and \( D_2 \), respectively.
Figure 18. Partitions $B_1$ and $D_2$ are in the $B_n$ and $D_n$ theories, respectively. Partitions $C_1$ and $C_2$ are in the $C_n$ theory. BO map $B_n$ rigid surface operators to $C_n$ rigid surface operators.

Figure 19. Partitions $B_1$ and $D_2$ are in the $B_n$ and $D_n$ theories, respectively. Partitions $C_1$ and $C_2$ are in the $C_n$ theory. BE map $B_n$ rigid surface operators to $C_n$ rigid surface operators.

- If $L(B_1) = L(D_2) + 1$, then $\lambda_{l-1} - \lambda_l = 2$ in the partition $C_2$ under the algorithm BO, violating the rigid condition.
- If $L(B_1) = L(D_2) - 1$, then $\lambda_{l-1} - \lambda_l = 2$ in the partition $C_1$ under the algorithm BE, violating the rigid condition.

If $L(B_1) = L(D_2) + 1$, we may try to take the $B_n$ operator to another $B_n$ operator by symbol preserving map before taking the algorithm BO as shown in Fig. 20(a). We swap the row $a$ with row $b$, deleting the last box of the row $b$ and append a box at the end of the row $a$. However this operation will not lead to a rigid surface operator since the integer ’1’ would appear twice in the $B_n$ partition $B_1$, violating the rigid condition. We may swap the even row $b$ with even row $c$ as shown in Fig. 20(b). From the condition $L(B_1) = L(D_2) + 1$, we have $L(b) \geq L(a)$. So this operation will not lead to a rigid surface operator.

Similarly the above operations will not improve the algorithm BE to get a rigid semisimple surface operator under the condition $L(B_1) = L(D_2) - 1$.

For the special rigid surface operators $(\lambda_{odd}, \lambda_{even})$, we will come back to this problem in Section 4.7.

4.4. One to one correspondence of maps preserving symbol

We can get another $C_n$ rigid semisimple surface operator by taking symbol preserving map on a rigid semisimple surface operator $(C_1, C_2)$. We find the following relationship between the symbol preserving maps on the two side of the algorithms in previous section.

Proposition 4.4. For the algorithms EE, OO, CO, CE, BO, and BE preserving symbol and the rigid conditions, there are one to one correspondence of maps preserving symbol on the left hand side of algorithms and on the right hand side of algorithms.

Proof. We prove the proposition for the algorithm EE as shown in Fig. 21. According to the discussions in Section 4.4 the change of the longest row is fixed for generating rigid semisimple surface operator in the $B_n$ theory from that in the $C_n$ theory. There is an one to one correspondence between the change of the blue parts on the left hand side of EE and that of the blue parts on the right side of EE. Similarly, we can prove the proposition for the algorithms OO, CO, CE, BO, and BE.
Remark 4.1. The algorithms $EE$, $OO$, $CO$, $CE$, $BO$, and $BE$ can be regarded functors since they not only map the operators in one theory to that of the dual theory but also map the changes on one side of the algorithms to that of the another side.

We illustrate this proposition by two examples. For the first example as shown in Fig. (22), the algorithm $EE$ map the $C_n$ surface operators to the $B_n$ surface operators. the four rows $c_{11}$, $c_{12}$, $c_{21}$, and $c_{22}$ have the same parities. The operation that the rows $c_{11}$ and $c_{21}$ swap places is denoted by down arrow on the left hand side of the algorithms $EE$, which leads to a new rigid semisimple surface operator in the $C_n$ theory. According to Proposition 3.1 this operation preserve symbol and corresponds to the operation swapping $c_{11}$ with $c_{21}$ denoted by down arrow on the right hand side of the algorithms $EE$.

For the second example as shown in Fig. (23) the row $c_{21}$ of $C_2$ is inserted into $C_1$. The row $c_{21}$ and rows above it would change parities as well as the rows above the $c_{11}$. This operation is denoted by down arrow on the left hand side of the algorithms $EE$, leading to a new semisimple rigid semisimple surface operator in the same theory. According to Proposition 3.2 this operation preserve symbol and corresponds to operation denoted by down arrow on the right hand side of the algorithms $EE$. 

**Figure 20.** Maps (a) and (b) preserve symbol.

**Figure 21.** The partitions $C_1$ and $C_2$ are in the $C_n$ theory and the partitions $B_1$ and $D_1$ are in the $B_n$ and $D_n$ theories, respectively. The algorithms $EE$ map $C_n$ rigid operators to $B_n$ rigid operators. The changes on the blue parts of the rigid surface operators on the left hand side are one to one correspondence to that on the right hand side.
4.5. II type problematic surface operators

As an application of Proposition 4.4, we find there is another kind of problematic surface operators: the number of surface operators of one theory is more than that of another theory with the same symbol invariant. As the 18th and 19th examples shown in the appendix, the number of surface operators in the $B_n$ theory is one more than that in the $C_n$ theory.

$(\lambda_{\text{even}}, \rho_{\text{odd}})$ is a surface operator in the $C_n$ theory and $\lambda_{\text{even}}$ and $\rho_{\text{odd}}$ are partitions with even rows and odd rows only, respectively. We take the following algorithm $OE$ to get $B_n$ rigid semisimple surface operators from that of the $C_n$ theory as shown in Fig. 24.

$$OE : (\lambda_{\text{even}}, \rho_{\text{odd}})_C \rightarrow (X_S^{-1} \lambda_{\text{even}}, Y_S \rho_{\text{odd}})_B \rightarrow (\lambda'_{\text{odd}}, \rho'_{\text{even}})_B.$$ 

As shown in Fig. 25, with the same symbol, the algorithm $OE$ map change of $C_n$ surface operator to that of $B_n$ that.
Figure 24. Partition $C_1$ with only even rows and the partition $C_2$ with odd rows are in the $C_n$ theory. The partitions $B_1$ with only odd rows and $D_2$ with only even rows are in the $B_n$ and $D_n$ theories, respectively.

Figure 25. Pairwise rows $r_2$ and $r_3$ of the partition $C_1$ are inserted into the partition $C_2$. And pairwise rows $r_2$ and $r_3$ of the partition $B_1$ are inserted into the partition $D_2$. These two operations are one to one corresponding under the algorithm $OE$.

However not all the changes on the right hand side of $OE$ could be realized on the left hand side. As shown in Fig. 26, the row $r_1$ is the second row of pairwise rows of the partition $C_1$, and the row $r_2$ is the first row of pairwise rows of the partition $C_2$. The length of $r_1$ is shorter than that of the row $r_2$. Under the algorithm $OE$, the row $r_1$ becomes the first row of pairwise rows of $B_1$, and the row $r_2$ becomes the second row of pairwise rows of $D_2$. Now we take the $B_n$ rigid semisimple surface operator $(\lambda_{\text{even}}, \rho_{\text{odd}})$ to another $B_n$ rigid semisimple surface operator under the down arrow on the right hand side of $OE$. We put the row $r_1$ and the parts above $r_1$ of $B_1$ on $r_2$ of $D_2$. This change of the $B_n$ rigid semisimple surface operator $(X_S^{-1} \lambda_{\text{even}}, Y_S \rho_{\text{odd}})$ can not be realized in the $C_n$ rigid semisimple surface operator $(\lambda_{\text{even}}, \rho_{\text{odd}})$ as shown in Fig. 26.

The algorithms Figs. 25 and 26 are particularly revealing. For the the $C_n$ operators $(\lambda_{\text{even}}, \rho_{\text{odd}})$, the algorithm $OE$ will work when the algorithm in Sections 4.2 which fail to preserving rigid conditions. Since not all the symbol preserving maps of surface operators on the right side of $EO$ can be realized on the left side, the number of rigid $B_n$ surface operators is more than that of the $C_n$ surface operators with the symbol of the rigid semisimple surface operator in Fig. 26. We denote them as the $IIC$ type problematic surface operators.

Similarly, we can propose an algorithm $OE$ to get $C_n$ rigid semisimple surface operators from that of the $B_n$ theory as follows

$$EO : (\lambda'_{\text{odd}}, \rho'_{\text{even}})_B \rightarrow (X_S \lambda'_{\text{odd}}, Y_S^{-1} \rho'_{\text{even}})_C \rightarrow (\lambda_{\text{even}}, \rho_{\text{odd}})_C.$$ 

And we have the similar conclusion to the $B_n$ case that the number of rigid $C_n$ surface operators is more than that of the $B_n$ surface operators for certain symbol. We denote them as the $IIB$ type problematic surface operators.
Figure 26. Algorithm OE take the $C_n$ rigid semisimple surface operator $(\lambda_{\text{even}}, \rho_{\text{odd}})$ to the $B_n$ rigid semisimple surface operator $(X_{\text{even}}^{-1} \lambda_{\text{even}}, Y_{\text{odd}})$. The row $r1$ and the rows above $r1$ of $B1$ are putted upon the row $r2$ of $D2$ under the algorithm $OE$.

4.6. Generating $D_n$ rigid semisimple surface operator from the $D_n$ theory

Since the langlands dual groups of SO$(2n)$ are themselves, the $D_n$ theory is self duality. The $S$ duality pairs can be realized by the first class of symbol preserving maps, which will not lead to semisimple surface operators violating rigid conditions. For certain symbol with only one rigid semisimple surface operator, we suggest the following $S$ duality map

$$f : (\lambda, \rho)_{D} \rightarrow (\lambda, \rho)_{D},$$

which map it to itself.

4.7. Discussions

Figure 27. $g$ and $g'$ belong to the second class of symbol preserving maps which map surface operator from one theory to itself. $f$ is $S$-duality map which take surface operator from one theory to the dual theory as the algorithms $EE, OO$. $f$ map $g$ to $g'$.

We find two types of problematic surface operators in this study which are denoted as $I$ and $II$. For the non-problematic surface operators, we have the commutation relation as shown in Fig. 27. The $I$ type surface operators appear only in one theory which mean the map $f$ can not work in Fig. 27. For example, the algorithm $BO$ can not map the operators in $B_n$ theory to that in $C_n$ theory with certain condition. And the $II$ type one are surface operators which do not have the same number of operators in dual theories with certain symbol. It means that the map
Table 5. Classification of problematic surface operators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Surface operator</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Algorithm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>$C_n$</td>
<td>$(\lambda, \rho)_C$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>L(\lambda) - L(\rho)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>$B_n$</td>
<td>$(\lambda, \rho)_B$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>L(\lambda) - L(\rho)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC</td>
<td>$C_n$</td>
<td>$(\lambda, \rho)_C$</td>
<td>$(\lambda, \rho)<em>C = (\lambda</em>{odd}, \rho_{even})_C$</td>
<td>$OE$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>$B_n$</td>
<td>$(\lambda, \rho)_B$</td>
<td>$(\lambda, \rho)<em>B = (\lambda</em>{odd}, \rho_{even})_B$</td>
<td>$EO$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$g$ can be only realized in one theory as shown in Fig. (24). The origin of both types of problematic surface operators are the rigid conditions. The classification of the problematic surface operators in the previous sections is given by Table 5.

We can learn much from Table 5. When the algorithms $CE$ and $CO$ work, they would realize all the $S$ duality pairs with certain symbol. When the algorithms $CE$ and $CO$ fail to realize the $S$ duality pairs, the algorithm $OE$ is the only choice to work, which is an evidence of the $S$ duality map $CB_{eo}$ (3.30).

From formula (4.31), one gets further insight into the mismatch problem. The coefficient is positive, which imply that the number of rigid surface operators in the $B_n$ theory is larger than that in the $C_n$ theory. A naive guess would be that there are more $B_n$ surface operators than $C_n$ surface operators with certain symbol. In fact, it only point out that the number of the $B_n$ surface operators is more than the number of the $C_n$ surface operators. They do not find that there are rigid surface operators in the $C_n$ theory which do not have candidate duals in the $B_n$ theory. However, according to Table 5, the $IC$ type $C_n$ problematic surface operators can not have duals in the $B_n$ theory under the algorithms $BE$ and $BO$. They also did not find the $IIC$ type problematic surface operators in the $C_n$ theory.

The number of the rigid surface operators which do not have candidate duals in the $C_n$ theory do increase with the rank $n$ from the discussion in Section 4.2. Fortunately, the excess number of states divided by the total number appears to approach zero as $n \to \infty$. So one hope that only a minor modification is needed to make the numbers match, which is consistent with the fact that most rigid surface operators do seem to have candidate duals.

The physical reason for the discrepancy is still unknown. Throughout this paper we will only consider strongly rigid operators which we refer to as rigid surface operator. From the discussions, we should also take account of the larger class including the weakly rigid surface operators discussed in [6] or the quantum effect to resolve the mismatch in the total number of rigid surface operators. Clearly more work is required.
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Appendix A. Rigid semisimple surface operators in $SO(13)$ and $Sp(12)$

The first column is the type of the duality maps listed in [6]. The second and third columns list pairs of partitions corresponding to the surface operators in the $B_n$ and $C_n$ theories. The other columns are the dimension, symbol invariant, and fingerprint invariant of the surface operator, respectively. Even the mismatch in the total number of rigid surface operators in the $B_n$ and $C_n$ theories can be explained. The 18th and 19th pairs of rigid semisimple surface operators belong to the $II$ type mismatch. The 20th, 23th, and 24th pairs of rigid semisimple surface operators belong to the $I$ type mismatch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>$\text{Sp}(12)$</th>
<th>$\text{SO}(13)$</th>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Fingerprint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(1^{12}; 0)$</td>
<td>$(1^{12}; 0)$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[1^6; 0]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(2^{110}; 0)$</td>
<td>$(1; 1^{12})$</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[1^5; 1]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(1^{10}; 12)$</td>
<td>$(2^{19}; 0)$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 2 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[2^{14}; 0]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(2^{3}; 16; 0)$</td>
<td>$(1; 2^{2} 18)$</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[1^3; 13]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$CB_{eo}$</td>
<td>$(2^{18}; 12)$</td>
<td>$(1^{3}; 1^{10})$</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \ 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[1^3; 13]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(1^{8}; 1^{4})$</td>
<td>$(2^{4} 1^{5}; 0)$</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 2 &amp; 2 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[2^{2}; 1^{2}; 0]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(2^{4} 1^{4}; 0)$</td>
<td>$(3^{2}; 1^{6}; 0)$</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[1^2; 1^4]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$CB_{eo}$</td>
<td>$(1^{8}; 2; 1)$</td>
<td>$(1^{9}, 1^{4})$</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[1^2; 1^4]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(1^{6}; 1^{6})$</td>
<td>$(2^{6}; 1^{4}; 0)$</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 2 &amp; 2 &amp; 2 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[2^{2}; 0]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(2^{5}; 1^{2}; 0)$</td>
<td>$(1; 2^{4}; 1^{4})$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[1; 1^5]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$CB_{eo}$</td>
<td>$(2^{16}; 1^{4})$</td>
<td>$(1^{5}; 1^{8})$</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[1; 1^5]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$CB_{eo}$</td>
<td>$(1^{6}; 2; 1^{4})$</td>
<td>$(1^{7}; 1^{6})$</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[0; 1^6]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(3^{2}; 2^{4}; 0)$</td>
<td>$(1^{3}; 2; 1^{6})$</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[3^{1}; 1^{2}]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$N1$</td>
<td>$(2^{3}; 1^{4}; 1^{2})$</td>
<td>$(2^{2}; 1; 18)$</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[3^{1}; 2; 1]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(2^{16}; 2; 1^{2})$</td>
<td>$(1; 3^{2}; 2^{1}; 1^{5})$</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 2 &amp; 2 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[2^{1} 1^{2}; 2]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$N2$</td>
<td>$(2^{4}; 1^{2}; 1^{2})$</td>
<td>$(2^{2}; 1^{5}; 1^{4})$</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 2 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[3^{1}; 1^{2}]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$CB$</td>
<td>$(2^{14}; 2; 1^{4})$</td>
<td>$(1; 3^{2}; 1^{1})$</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 2 &amp; 2 &amp; 2 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[2^{2}; 2]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$CB_{eo}$</td>
<td>$(2^{3}; 1^{2}; 1^{4})$</td>
<td>$(1^{5}; 2^{2}; 1^{4})$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[3^{1}; 1^3]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$(2^{2}; 1^{3}; 1^{6})$</td>
<td>$(1^{5}; 1^{2}; 1^{6})$</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[3^{1}; 1^3]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$(2^{4}; 1; 1^{4})$</td>
<td>$(3^{2}; 1^{2}; 1^{4})$</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[3^{1}; 2; 0]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>$N3$</td>
<td>$(2^{3}; 1^{2}; 2; 1^{2})$</td>
<td>$(1^{3}; 3^{2}; 2^{1}; 1^{3})$</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[3^{1}; 2; 1]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>$C^2 B$</td>
<td>$(3^{2}; 2^{1}; 1^{2})$</td>
<td>$(2^{2}; 1; 2; 2^{1})$</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[3^{2}; 1]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$(1^{5}; 3^{2}; 2; 1)$</td>
<td>$(2^{2}; 1; 3^{2}; 2; 1)$</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[3^{2}; 1]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>$-$</td>
<td>$(2^{2}; 1; 3^{2}; 2; 1)$</td>
<td>$(2^{2}; 1; 3^{2}; 2; 1)$</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$\begin{pmatrix} 0 &amp; 0 &amp; 0 \ 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$[3^{2}; 1]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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