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Abstract

The Kronecker coefficients are the structure constants for the restriction of irreducible representations of the general linear group $GL(nm)$ into irreducibles for the subgroup $GL(n) \times GL(m)$. In this work we study the piecewise quasipolynomial nature of the Kronecker function using tools from polyhedral geometry. By bounding the lengths of the partitions, we write the Kronecker function in terms of coefficients of vector partition functions. We illustrate the power of this approach in the first nontrivial case: we give exact formulas and an upper bound for the Kronecker coefficients, and derive other properties. An additional advantage of this approach is that asymptotic estimates for dilations are computable using techniques of analytic combinatorics in several variables. We also show how our approach can be applied to other families of structure constants.
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1 Introduction

Let $G$ be a group, and let $H$ a subgroup. The subgroup restriction or branching problem investigates how an irreducible representation of $G$ decomposes into irreducible representations when restricted to $H$. In this article, we study this branching for $GL(n) \times GL(m)$ viewed as a subgroup of $GL(nm)$ via the tensor product of matrices.

The Kronecker coefficients are the structure constants for the restriction of irreducible representations of $GL(nm)$ into irreducibles for $GL(n) \times GL(m)$. Since irreducible representations of $GL(n)$ are indexed by partitions of length at most $n$, the Kronecker coefficients are indexed by triples of partitions of the same weight, with bounded lengths. Let $g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}$ be the Kronecker coefficient corresponding to the triple $\mu, \nu, \lambda$.

Symmetric functions appear naturally in the study of the representations of the general linear group: the Schur function $s_\lambda(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is the character of the irreducible representation of $GL(n)$ indexed by $\lambda$. In this setting, the Kronecker coefficients $g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}$ can be defined by the expression (whose notation is defined in Eq.(3)):

$$s_\lambda[XY] = s_\lambda(x_1y_1, x_1y_2, \ldots, x_ny_m) = \sum_{\mu,\nu} g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda} s_\mu[X]s_\nu[Y]$$

where all partitions appearing in the equation have the same weight, and bounded lengths.

Even the most basic questions about the Kronecker coefficients remain unsolved eight decades after the pioneering investigations of Murnaghan and Littlewood [Mur37, Mur38, Mur55, Lit56, Lit58]. They are nonnegative integers – what do they count? How do we compute them? What can we say about them?

Littlewood–Richardson coefficients provide a benchmark for the sort of answers we would like to obtain. They are also the solution of a closely related group restriction problem: They govern the restriction from a symmetric group to its Young subgroups.
Figure 1: Holes in the Kronecker cone when all three partitions are of length 2. The point at \((i, j, k)\) is black if \(g_{(24-i,i)(24-j,j)(24-k,k)}\) is nonzero (assuming, \(j \leq i \leq k \leq 24/2\)). The points with red crosses, or no dots are 0. Remark that the top face has both zeroes and nonzero values. These are the holes in the polytope.

The Littlewood–Richardson coefficients are known to count several classes of combinatorial structures, including points in polytopes, Littlewood-Richardson tableaux, and hives. No such combinatorial interpretations are known for the Kronecker coefficients. It is a fact that the dilated Kronecker coefficients do not count integer points in dilations of polytopes. See Example (33) for a simple example.

Identify a triple of partitions of lengths \(\leq a, b, c\) (respectively) with a point in \(Q^{a+b+c}\). The set of triples of partitions whose corresponding Kronecker coefficient is nonzero is known to have the structure of a finitely generated semigroup ([Chr06, Kly04, Man15]). This semigroup generates a rational polyhedral cone, called the Kronecker cone and denoted by \(PKron_{a,b,c}\). Its walls (i.e. facets) are described by a finite set of inequalities. Can we find these inequalities? Is this cone saturated, or do there exist holes, that is, points where the Kronecker coefficient is zero, inside it? If so, where are the holes located?

The equivalent problem for the similarly defined Littlewood-Richardson cone is a major chapter in algebraic combinatorics. The faces of the cone are given by the famous Horn inequalities. The saturation theorem of Knutson and Tao says that there are no holes in the Littlewood-Richardson cone. A survey of these results can be found in [Ful00]. Standard techniques in integer programming allow us to decide if a point belongs to a rational cone in polynomial time. Therefore, deciding if a Littlewood-Richardson coefficient is zero or not can also be decided in polynomial time [BI13, MNS12]. On the other hand, computing a Littlewood–Richardson coefficient is a \#P problem [BI08].

In striking contrast with the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients, the Kronecker coefficients do not satisfy the saturation property: There are holes in the Kronecker cone. Counterexamples and related conjectures can be found in [Kin09, BOR09b, Chr06]. Figure 1 illustrates their location in a small, visualizable case. The inequalities describing the faces of the Kronecker cone, the analogues of the Horn inequalities, are known only for some very particular cases [Kly04, Bra04, Kir04, Res10, CHM07].

Our main goal in this work is to understand the Kronecker function \(\kappa_{m,n,l}\), a function of the
parts of a triple of partitions \((\mu, \nu, \lambda)\) of lengths bounded by \(n, m\) and \(l\) respectively,

\[
\kappa_{n,m,l}(\mu, \nu, \lambda) = \kappa_{n,m,l}(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n, \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_m, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_l) := g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}
\]  

(1)

and where \(g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}\) is the Kronecker coefficient indexed by the partitions \((\mu, \nu, \lambda)\).

We give an elementary proof of the known fact that \(\kappa_{n,m,l}\) is a piecewise quasipolynomial (see Theorem 29). Then we apply the understanding gained by our approach to the various questions raised in this introduction.

The piecewise quasipolynomiality of the Kronecker function has been the center of much interest. It has recently been studied by Mulmuley [Mul07], Christandl, Doran, and Walter [CDW12], Baldoni, Vergne, and Walter [BVW16], Kahle and Michalek [KM16], and Pak and Panova [PP17b], and Manivel [Man15], among others. Indeed, this phenomenon is a consequence of the powerful \([Q, R] = 0\) theorem of Meinrenken-Sjamaar [MS99] on the piecewise quasipolynomial behavior of multiplicity functions. In the case where \(\mu, \nu\) and \(\lambda\) are partitions of lengths at most 2, 2, and 4, respectively, the piecewise quasipolynomial is explicitly computable from formulas given in [BOR09a].

1.1 Article organization and main contributions

In this work we propose an elementary approach towards the study of the Kronecker function: We deduce the piecewise quasipolynomiality by passing through polytopes in a new way. To set it up, we begin in Section 2 with a basic survey on polytopes and quasipolynomials. This is sufficient to understand the mechanics of our strategy. The examples appearing in this section will play a major role in Section 3.

The key idea is to start from Cauchy’s definition of the Schur function as a quotient of alternants, and then deduce a relation between Kronecker coefficients and points in a polytope. To illustrate the process, we start in Section 3 with the smallest nontrivial example, that in which two of the partitions have length \(\leq 2\). We provide concrete visualizations of the Kronecker functions \(\kappa_{2,2}\) and \(\kappa_{2,2,4}\) since the polyhedra involved are of small dimension. We give an explicit closed form (Theorem 12) for the Kronecker coefficients in terms of coefficients of the vector partition function \(F_{2,2}\). We also identify a single coefficient of \(F_{2,2}\) as an upper bound for the Kronecker coefficient (Theorem 18). Our polyhedral approach plays a crucial role here.

In Section 4 we consider the general situation. We prove in Theorem 29 that there exists a nontrivial change of variables which converts the \(F_{n,m}\) into a form recognizable as a vector partition function. This facilitates our analysis since it returns us to the realm of Taylor series from Laurent series.

We call the coefficients of the vector partition function \(F_{n,m}\) atomic Kronecker coefficients. They share some properties with the reduced Kronecker coefficients, a family of coefficients lying between the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients and the Kronecker coefficients that we will introduce later in the article (See Section 3.7). They contain enough information to recover the value of any Kronecker coefficient. They may also sometimes coincide with the Kronecker coefficients. In fact, a Kronecker coefficient that is atomic is always reduced. However, they are simpler objects. It is immediate from their definition that the atomic Kronecker coefficients count integer points in polytopes. The polytopes obtained in this way are particularly elegant because their dimension coincides with the degree of the Kronecker piecewise quasipolynomial (Theorem 31).

The next two cases after \(\kappa_{2,2,4}\), namely \(\kappa_{2,3,6}\) and \(\kappa_{3,3,9}\), involve polyhedra of dimensions 8 and 26, bigger than what we can actually visualize. In Sections 4.2 and 4.3, we analyse the corresponding
vector partition functions $F_{2,3}, F_{3,3}$ from a different perspective. We investigate what happens on the faces of the associated polyhedral cones $K_{2,3}$ and $K_{3,3}$. We show that the coefficients of the vector partition function behave differently on the different faces. In particular, we show that, whereas for the vector partition function $F_{2,2}$, the coefficients are identically one on both facets, for $F_{2,3}$ and $F_{3,3}$ there is only one facet on which the atomic Kronecker coefficients are identically one.

In Section 5 we study the dilated Kronecker coefficients, $g_{k\lambda,k\mu,k\nu}$, defined for fixed $\lambda, \mu, \nu$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. We express these as a subseries of vector partition generating functions which implies that these are given by quasipolynomials in $k$. Using the vector partition generating function, we describe in 5.3 how to use methods from analytic combinatorics in several variables to determine asymptotic estimates for the values of the coefficients.

Finally, in Section 6.1, using the observation that many families of coefficients related to the representation theory of the general linear group can be defined by the evaluation of a Schur function on a finite alphabet, we describe how our approach for analysing the Kronecker coefficients can be applied to other families, including the Littlewood–Richardson, Heisenberg, and plethystic coefficients.

2 A Quick Introduction to Polytopes and Quasipolynomials

This section is a primer on polytope point enumeration and quasipolynomiality. It can be skipped by those familiar with the topic. For more details we recommend one of the following comprehensive introductions: [DLHK13, BR15, BSar]. The examples we have chosen for this section are directly relevant in our study of the Kronecker coefficients.

2.1 Polyhedra and polytopes

A polyhedron $\mathcal{P}$ is the set of solutions of a (finite) system and inequalities:

$$\mathcal{P} = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : Ax \leq b \},$$

for a fixed matrix $A$ and vector $b$, where the “$\leq$” sign is to be understood componentwise. That is, a polyhedron is the intersection of finitely many half spaces. A polyhedron is said to be rational if both $A$ and $b$ have integer entries. (If instead, all coefficients are rational, we could always clear the denominators to make an integral system). A polytope is a bounded polyhedron. Equivalently, a polytope is the convex hull of a finite number of points. A polytope is said to be rational when it has rational vertices. Note that any dilation of a polytope contains only a finite number of integer points. The dimension of a polytope is defined as the dimension of the smallest affine space that contains it, i.e. the affine space spanned by its vertices. A $k$-simplex is a $k$-dimensional polytope which is the convex hull of $k + 1$ vertices.

2.2 Quasipolynomials

A function $\phi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{Q}$ is a (one-variable) quasipolynomial if there exist polynomials $p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_{k-1}$ in $\mathbb{Q}[t]$ and a natural number $m > 0$, a period of $\phi$, such that

$$\phi(t) = p_i(t), \text{ for } t \equiv i \mod m.$$
Figure 2: The one dimensional polytope $\mathcal{P} = [0, 1/2]$ and its first four integer dilations. The volume of the $k$-th dilation is $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor + 1$, a quasipolynomial in $k$.

The polynomials $p_i$ are the constituents of $\phi$. The degree of a quasipolynomial is the maximum of the degrees of its components. If $m_0$ is the minimum period for $\phi$, then we refer to it as the minimal period of $\phi$. It is easy to see that $m_0$ divides any possible period $m$.

**Example 1.** Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the one-dimensional polytope $[0, 1/2]$, and consider its integer dilations $k\mathcal{P} = [0, k/2]$. This is illustrated in Figure 2. We are interested in counting the number of integer points in the dilation of $\mathcal{P}$:

$$\phi_{\mathcal{P}}(k) := |\mathbb{Z} \cap k\mathcal{P}|$$

For example, $\phi(3) = 2$. Alternatively, we want to count the number of nonnegative integer solutions to the inequality $0 \leq s_1 \leq k/2$. Then

$$\phi_{\mathcal{P}}(k) = \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 = \begin{cases} \frac{k+2}{2} & \text{if } k \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ \frac{k+1}{2} & \text{if } k \equiv 1 \mod 2 \end{cases}.$$

is a linear quasipolynomial of period 2.

Example 1 illustrates that one-variable quasipolynomials appear when counting integral points in polytopes. The following insight of Ehrhart tells us that this is always the case.

**Theorem 2** (Ehrhart [Ehr62]). Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a rational polytope in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\phi_{\mathcal{P}}(k) = |\mathbb{Z}^d \cap k\mathcal{P}|$, the number of integer points in $k\mathcal{P}$. Then $\phi_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a quasipolynomial in $k$. Moreover, the degree of $\phi_{\mathcal{P}}$ equals the dimension of $\mathcal{P}$. All constituents of the quasipolynomial have the volume of $\mathcal{P}$ as their leading coefficient.

The smallest positive integer $k$ such that $k\mathcal{P}$ has integer coordinates yields a period. In particular, if the polytope has integral vertices, then $\phi_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a polynomial.

Not all one-variable quasipolynomials count integer points in the dilations of a polytope. Those that do will be called Ehrhart functions. The presence of the floor function in Example 1 necessitates working with congruence classes.

### 2.3 Partition functions

A partition of a positive integer $n$ is a way of writing $n$ as a sum of nonnegative integers, where we do not take into consideration the order of the summands. Two partitions that differ only in the number of zero summands are considered the same. We consider partitions whose parts (nonzero summands) belong to a fixed finite multi-subset of nonnegative integers $S$, that is, where there could be different copies of the same part.

The partition function $p_S : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ evaluated at $n$ gives the number of partitions of $n$ with parts in $S$. The partition function $p_S$ can also be defined by the formal power series:

$$\prod_{a_i \in S} \frac{1}{1-t^{a_i}} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} p_S(n)t^n.$$
Figure 3: A visualization of the two dimensional 2-simplex with vertices \((0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1)\) and some integral dilations bounded by vertices \((0, 0), (k, 0)\) and \((0, k)\) for \(k = 2, 3, 4, \ldots\).

**Example 3.** Let \(S = \{1, 1, 1\}\). Then \(p_S(n)\) is the number of partitions of \(n\) with three distinct copies of 1. This is also the number of nonnegative integer solutions to the equation \(s_0 + s_1 \leq n\), and the number of integer points in the dilations \(nP\) of the 2-simplex with vertices \((0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1)\).

In fact, \(p_S\) is given by

\[
p_S(n) = \frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}.
\]

This is a polynomial since all vertices have integer coordinates, as predicted by Ehrhart’s Theorem.

**Example 4.** Let \(S = \{1, 1, 2\}\). By definition, the partition function \(p_S(n)\) counts the number of nonnegative integer solutions of the linear equation

\[x_1 + x_2 + 2x_3 = n.\]

We consider \(x_1\) to be a slack variable and rewrite this as an inequality:

\[x_2 + 2x_3 \leq n.\]

Thus, \(x_3\) should satisfy \(0 \leq x_3 \leq \frac{n}{2}\). After \(x_3\) is chosen, the value of \(x_2\) can be any value from zero to \(n - 2x_3\). We conclude that the partition function is a quadratic quasipolynomial of period 2. Indeed,

\[
p_{\{1,1,2\}}(n) = \sum_{x_3=0}^{\frac{n}{2}} (n - 2x_3 + 1) = \begin{cases} \frac{n^2}{4} + n + 1, & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ \frac{n^2}{4} + n + \frac{3}{4}, & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \mod 2 \end{cases}.
\]

### 2.4 Cones and Chambers

A rational polyhedral cone is the set of all linear combinations with nonnegative real coefficients of a finite set of generators \(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\) in \(\mathbb{N}^d\). If the generators are linearly independent, then we say that the cone \(P\) is simplicial. Let \(A\) be a \(d \times n\) matrix with column vectors \(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\). Let \(\text{pos}(A)\) be the polyhedral cone generated by the columns of \(A\). In general, \(\text{pos}(A)\) is not a simplicial cone.

Given \(\sigma \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}\), let \(A_\sigma\) be the submatrix of \(A\) consisting of those columns \(a_i\) with \(i \in \sigma\). Let \(\mathbb{Z}A_\sigma\) be the integral lattice spanned by the columns of \(A_\sigma\). A subset \(\sigma\) is a basis if \(\text{rank}(A) = \text{rank}(A_\sigma)\).

The chamber complex is the polyhedral subdivision of the cone \(\text{pos}(A)\) which is defined as the common refinement of the simplicial cones \(\text{pos}(A_\sigma)\), where \(\sigma\) runs over all bases. The relation between rational polyhedral cones and polytopes is made explicit in the following theorem.
A function $g : \mathbb{N}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ is a multivariate quasipolynomial if there exists an $n$-dimensional lattice $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$, a set $\{\lambda_i\}$ of coset representatives of $\mathbb{Z}^n/\Lambda$, and polynomials $p_i \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ such that $g(t) = p_i(t)$, for $t \in \lambda_i + \Lambda$.

**Theorem 5** (Blakley [Bla64], Sturmfels [Stu95]). Let $A$ be a $d \times n$ matrix with column vectors $S = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{N}^d$. There exists a finite decomposition of $\mathbb{Z}^d \cap \text{pos}(A)$ such that $p_A(b)$ is a multivariable quasipolynomial of degree $n - d$ in each part. The number $n - d$ is the dimension of the polytope $\{x | Ax = b, \text{ and } x_i \geq 0\}$.

We call the function $p_A(b)$ that satisfies the description in Theorem 5, a piecewise quasipolynomial function.

### 2.5 Vector partitions with restricted parts

A vector partition of $b \in \mathbb{N}^d$ is a way of decomposing $b$ as a sum of nonzero vectors in $\mathbb{N}^d$. Two vector partitions that differ only in the order of their nonzero summands are considered the same, and the number of zero vectors in the decomposition is not relevant.

We are interested in partitions whose parts (nonzero summands) belong to a fixed finite submultiset of $\mathbb{N}^d$. The vector partition function $p_S : \mathbb{N}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is the function that evaluated at $b$ gives the number of vector partitions of $b$ with parts in $S$.

Given a vector $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we define $t^x = t_1^{x_1}t_2^{x_2}\cdots t_n^{x_n}$. Then, much like the univariate case, the vector partition function $p_S$ is defined by the formal power series

$$\prod_{a \in S} \frac{1}{1 - t^a} = \sum_{b \in \mathbb{N}^n} p_S(b)t^b.$$

A nonnegative integer solution $x$ for the system of linear equation $Ax = b$, where $A$ is the $d \times |S|$ matrix whose columns are the vectors in $S$, encodes a vector partition of $b$. In our work, it turns out that our matrices always contains a copy of the $n \times n$ identity matrix $I_n$.

### 2.6 A vector partition function

**Example 6.** Let $p_S(n, m)$ count the number of vector partitions of $b = (n, m)$ with parts in $S = \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1), (1, 2)\}$. Equivalently, this is the number of nonnegative integer solutions $x$ to the system $Ax = b$, where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} n \\ m \end{bmatrix}$$

To determine one such partition, it suffices to determine the number of parts equal to $(1, 1)$ and $(1, 2)$ in it. The standard basis vectors serve as slack variables here, consequently, the multiplicities of $(1, 1)$ and $(1, 2)$ should fulfill the inequalities:

$$\begin{align*}
x_3 + x_4 &\leq n \\
x_3 + 2x_4 &\leq m
\end{align*}$$

Therefore, the vector partition function $p_S$ counts nonnegative integer points in the polytope defined by the inequalities (2). The three different possibilities are illustrated in Figure 4.
Figure 4: Three possibilities for the polytope defined by the inequalities in Eqn. (2)

Figure 5: The chambers giving the value of $p_S(n, m)$, the number of vector partitions of $(n, m)$ with parts in $S = \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1), (1, 2)\}$.

(I) If $m \leq n$ the first equation is redundant. We are counting integer points in the 2-simplex defined by $x_3 \geq 0$, $x_4 \geq 0$, and $x_3 + 2x_4 \leq m$. The number of solutions is given by the quadratic quasipolynomial $p_{1,1,2}(m)$ of Example 4.

(II) If $n \leq \frac{m}{2}$, it is the second equation that is redundant. We are counting integer points in the standard 2-simplex defined by $x_3 \geq 0$, $x_4 \geq 0$, and $x_3 + x_4 \leq n$.

This was solved in Example 3. The number of solutions is given by the quadratic polynomial $p_S(n) = \left(\frac{n+2}{2}\right)$.

(III) Finally, if $\frac{m}{2} < n < m$, both inequalities are relevant. We are counting the number of points in the polytope with vertices $(0,0), (n,0), (0, \frac{m}{2}), (2n-m, m-n)$. We need to multiply by 2 to get integer vertices, so the Ehrhart theorem says that the resulting quasipolynomial has period 2 on $m$. Indeed, by fixing $s_1$ and counting the possibilities for $s_0$, we have $p_S(n, m) = \sum_{s_1=0}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} (1 + \min(m - 2s_1, n - s_1))$ and $m - n < \lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor$, and hence

\[
p_S(n, m) = \begin{cases} 
  nm - \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{m^2}{4} + \frac{n+m}{2} + 1, & \text{if } m \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\
  nm - \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{m^2}{4} + \frac{n+m}{2} + \frac{3}{4}, & \text{if } m \equiv 1 \mod 2 
\end{cases}
\]

\[= nm - \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{m^2}{4} + \frac{n+m}{2} + \frac{7}{8} + \frac{(-1)^m}{8}.
\]
3 A vector partition function related to the Kronecker coefficients.

In this section we show how to use Cauchy’s definition of the Schur function as a quotient of alternants to deduce the quasipolynomiality of the Kronecker function. Schur polynomials play a central role in the representation theory of the general linear group. Schur polynomials of \( n \) variables are the characters of the irreducible polynomial representations of \( GL(n) \).

For our purposes Cauchy’s definition, as a quotient of alternants, works best. Suppose \( \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_n) \) is a partition (or more generally, a vector in \( \mathbb{N}^n \)). The alternant \( a_\lambda(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \) is defined as the polynomial obtained by antisymmetrizing the monomial \( x^\lambda \). When \( \delta_n = (n - 1, n - 2, \ldots, 1, 0) \), \( a_\delta \) is the Vandermonde determinant, and

\[
a_\delta_n(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} (x_j - x_k).
\]

Since \( a_\lambda(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \) is a skew-symmetric polynomial, it vanishes unless \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_n \) are all different. As a result, there is no loss in assuming that \( \lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \ldots > \lambda_n \geq 0 \). We write \( \lambda = \alpha + \delta_n \), where \( \alpha \) is always a partition, possibly with repeated parts. Then,

\[
a_\lambda[X] = a_\lambda(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = \det(x_i^j)_{i,j}.
\]

Let \( \alpha \) be a partition of length \( \leq n \). The Schur polynomial indexed by \( \alpha \) in the variables \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \) is defined as the quotient of alternants:

\[
s_\alpha[X] = s_\alpha(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = \frac{a_{\alpha + \delta_n}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)}{a_{\delta_n}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)}.
\]

As a quotient of anti-symmetric polynomials, \( s_\alpha(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \) is symmetric. On the other hand, since \( a_{\alpha + \delta_n} \) is divisible by \( a_{\delta_n} \), \( s_\alpha(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \) is a polynomial.

Remark 7. Cauchy’s definition of the Schur function is a particular case of both the Weyl character formula and the Kostant partition formulas. This fact provides the link between our approach and those of Christandl, Doran, and Walter [CDW12] and Baldoni, Vergne, and Walter [BVW16].

Schur polynomials will allow to define the Kronecker coproduct of Schur functions without any reference to representation theory. Let \( \mu, \nu, \) and \( \lambda \) be three partitions of the same weight satisfying that \( \ell(\mu) \leq n, \ell(\nu) \leq m, \) and \( \ell(\lambda) \leq nm \). Let \( X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}, Y = \{y_1, \ldots, y_m\} \), and set \( XY = \{x_1y_1, \ldots, x_ny_m\} \). Define\n
\[
s_\lambda[XY] := s_\lambda(x_1y_1, x_1y_2, \ldots, x_ny_m).
\]

This is a symmetric function in the \( x \)'s and the \( y \)'s separately. Since Schur functions form an integral basis for the algebra of symmetric functions, we can write

\[
s_\lambda[XY] = \sum_{\mu,\nu} g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda} s_\mu[X]s_\nu[Y].
\]

The structure coefficients \( g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda} \) for this operation (comultiplication) are the Kronecker coefficients.

Combining Cauchy’s definition of a Schur polynomial in Eq. (3) as a quotient of alternants with the comultiplication formula (4), we obtain the identity

\[
\frac{a_{\delta_n}[X]a_{\delta_m}[Y]}{a_{\delta_{nm}}[XY]} a_{\lambda + \delta_m}[XY] = \sum_{\mu,\nu} g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda} a_{\mu + \delta_n}[X]a_{\nu + \delta_m}[Y].
\]

(5)
In the preceding formula, the factor \( \frac{a_{\delta_{n}}[X]a_{\delta_{m}}[Y]}{a_{\delta_{nm}}[XY]} \) on the left is a rational function. The alternant \( a_{\delta_{nm}}[XY] \) is a polynomial consisting of \((nm)!\) nonzero monomials. On the right side of the equality, we obtain a polynomial, as opposed to a rational function, because the denominator of the rational function on the left divides the alternant \( a_{\delta_{nm}}[XY] \). (There are a lot of cancellations.)

To avoid having to consider the \((nm)!\) monomials in \( a_{\delta_{nm}}[XY] \), we select the smallest of these monomials, and construct a vector partition function which carries a lot of information about the Kronecker coefficients.

The remainder of this section will be devoted to the analysis of the particular case \( n = m = 2 \) for the Kronecker coefficients. The general situation will be studied in Section 4.

3.1 The Kronecker coefficients indexed by triples of partitions of lengths \( \leq 2, 2, 4 \), respectively.

Our approach is best illustrated in the simplest nontrivial case of three partitions with length at most 2, 2, and 4, respectively. We dedicate the rest of this section to this particular case. We show how to describe the corresponding vector partition function as a signed sum of vector partition functions, in such a way that the corresponding polytope is of minimal dimension. It may be interesting to compare our approach to [Ros01] where the Kronecker coefficients for certain shapes are computed from Cauchy’s definition of the Schur function.

Let \( \lambda \) be a fixed partition of length \( \leq 4 \). Schur functions are homogeneous polynomials. Without loss of information, we set \( X = \{1, x\}, Y = \{1, y\}, XY = \{1, x, y, xy\} \) in Eq. (5):

\[
\frac{a_{\delta_{2}}[X]a_{\delta_{2}}[Y]}{a_{\delta_{4}}[XY]} a_{\lambda+\delta_{4}}[XY] = \sum_{\mu, \nu} g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} x^{\mu 2} y^{\nu 2} + \text{lex. gr.}
\]

where “lex. gr.” stands for “lexicographically greater terms.”

Recall that we are multiplying a rational function by a polynomial. However, the result is polynomial. (This is because \( a_{\delta_{4}}[XY] \) divides \( a_{\lambda+\delta_{4}}[XY] \).) What would happen if, in the previous equation, we replaced the alternant by its leading monomial \( S(a_{\lambda+\delta_{4}}[XY]) \)? We would have a Laurent series (and not a polynomial).

\[
\frac{a_{\delta_{2}}[X]a_{\delta_{2}}[Y]}{a_{\delta_{4}}[XY]} S(a_{\lambda+\delta_{4}}[XY]) = \sum_{\mu, \nu} \tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} x^{\mu 2} y^{\nu 2} + \text{lex. gr.}
\]

This is a well–defined Laurent series, convergent under the assumption that \( 0 < |xy| < |y| < |x| < 1 \).

Let us compute all terms appearing in the previous equation. First, we extract the lexicographically least monomial simply by taking the product of the terms along the main diagonal. This gives:

\[
S(a_{\lambda+\delta_{4}}[XY]) = (xy)^{\lambda_{4}} \cdot y^{\lambda_{3} + 1} \cdot x^{\lambda_{2} + 2} = x^{2} y \cdot x^{\lambda_{4} + \lambda_{2}} y^{\lambda_{4} + \lambda_{3}}
\]

while the product-cum-quotient of alternants reduces to

\[
\frac{1}{x^{2} y \cdot (1 - y/x)(1 - xy)(1 - x)(1 - y)}.
\]

Note that we obtain the factor \((1 - y/x)\) from \((x - y)\) after factoring out \( x \). Also note that our ordering\(^1\) has been chosen with care to cancel the monomial \( x^{2} y \). Simplifying the resulting

\(^1\)When we extract coefficients, we must also respect this ordering for the extractions to be meaningful.
expression we obtain a rational function that we will denote by $\tilde{F}_{2,2}(x, y)$:

$$\tilde{F}_{2,2}(x, y) = \frac{1}{(1 - y/x)(1 - xy)(1 - x)(1 - y)} = \sum_{\mu, \nu} \tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} x^{\mu_2 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_4} y^{\nu_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

Restating Eqn. (6), we can also use the series $\tilde{F}_{2,2}(x, y)$ to compute the actual Kronecker coefficients:

$$\sum_{\mu, \nu} g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} x^{\mu_2} y^{\nu_2} + \text{lex. gr.} = \frac{a_{\lambda + \delta_4}[XY]}{(1 - y/x)(1 - xy)(1 - x)(1 - y)x^2y} = a_{\lambda + \delta_4}[XY] \frac{\tilde{F}_{2,2}(x, y)}{x^2y}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (8)

**Lemma 8** (A vector partition function). After the change of basis $x = s_1$ and $y = s_0 s_1$, the Laurent series $\tilde{F}_{2,2}(x, y)$ becomes a vector partition function:

$$F_{2,2}(s_0, s_1) = \sum_{\mu, \nu} \tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} s_0^{\nu_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4} s_1^{\mu_2 + \nu_2 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - 2\lambda_4}$$

$$= \frac{1}{(1 - s_0)(1 - s_1)(1 - s_0 s_1)(1 - s_0 s_1^2)}.$$ \hspace{1cm} (9)

This change of variables is desirable as it returns us to the realm of Taylor series. Note that the assumptions $0 < |xy| < |y| < |x| < 1$, that define the domain of convergence of this series translate to $0 < |s_0|, |s_1| < 1$. This is precisely the vector partition function of Example 2.6.

The following observation is useful in the present discussion. We respect our coefficient ordering by noting that when we say the coefficient of $x^i y^j$ in $\tilde{F}_{2,2}(x, y)$, denoted $[x^i y^j] \tilde{F}_{2,2}(x, y)$ we mean $[y^j][x^i] \tilde{F}_{2,2}(x, y)$ since our series expansion prioritizes $x$. The order is interchangeable in extractions of $F_{2,2}(s_0, s_1)$, since it is a finite product of Taylor (geometric) series. In our analysis of the coefficients, we choose between the original series $\tilde{F}_{2,2}(x, y)$ in the variables $x, y$, and the vector partition function $F_{2,2}(s_0, s_1)$ depending upon which is more convenient. More precisely, we use Eqn. (9) to apply techniques from the theory of vector partition functions and polyhedral geometry. However Eqn. (8) is the more natural choice to analyse the alternant $a_{\lambda + \delta_4}[XY]$.

**Proposition 9.** The coefficient of $x^i y^j$ in $\tilde{F}_{2,2}(x, y)$, which is also the coefficient of $s_0^{j} s_1^{i+j}$ in the Taylor expansion of $F_{2,2}(s_0, s_1)$, is nonzero if and only if $j \geq 0$ and $i + j \geq 0$.

It follows immediately from this or from Eqn. (7) and Section 2.6, that

**Proposition 10.** The atomic Kronecker coefficient $\tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$ is nonzero if and only if

$$\begin{cases} 
\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 2\lambda_4 \leq \mu_2 + \nu_2 & \text{(First Bravyi Inequality)} \\
\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 \leq \nu_2. & \text{(Second Bravyi Inequality)}
\end{cases}$$ \hspace{1cm} (10)

In this case,

$$\tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} = p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4), \mu_2 + \nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4) - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4)), $$

a quasipolynomial of degree 2.

**Corollary 11.** The value of the atomic Kronecker coefficient depends only on the values of the two linear forms $\nu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4)$ and $\mu_2 + \nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4) - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4)$. In particular, when either one is equal to zero, the corresponding atomic Kronecker coefficient is equal to 1.
The rest of Section 3 will study the Kronecker coefficients indexed by partitions of lengths bounded by 2, 2, and 4 in a unified way. We analyse the relationship between the atomic Kronecker coefficients, $\tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$ and the actual Kronecker coefficients. The strategy is elementary: we compute using both Eqns. (8) and (9).

It is important to keep in mind that for the rest of Section 3, we always refer to the situation where $\mu$ and $\nu$ have length bounded by 2, and the length of $\lambda$ is less or equal to 4.

We postpone the introduction of the analogue of vector partition functions $F_{2, 2}$ and $\bar{F}_{2, 2}$ for the general situation until Section 4.

### 3.2 From $\bar{F}_{2, 2}$ to an exact expression for Kronecker coefficients.

The rational series $F_{2, 2}$ is not directly the generating series for the Kronecker coefficients because we truncated some polynomials in its construction. The main result of this section, Theorem 12, is an exact formula for the Kronecker coefficients in the $n = m = 2$ case.

We ask ourselves: What do the terms in the expansion of $a_{\lambda + \delta_m} [XY] - S(a_{\lambda + \delta_m} [XY])$ look like? The difference is described in the precise affine combinations of the parts of $\lambda$ appearing in the left-hand side of Eq. (5). In the case $n = m = 2$, we identify these affine combinations. Since $\ell(\lambda) \leq 4$, the number of terms (here, $4! = 24$) in the expansion of the alternant $a_{\lambda + \delta_4} [XY]$ is fixed. However, it turns out that only seven terms contribute to the Kronecker coefficient.

The following theorem explicitly identifies which terms of the alternant contribute to the Kronecker coefficient. The polynomial in Theorem 12 is minimal in the following sense: Example 13 below exhibits a combination in which all seven terms contribute nontrivially to the Kronecker coefficient, with NO cancellation between any pairs of terms.

**Theorem 12.** Assume $\ell(\lambda) \leq 4$, and $\ell(\mu), \ell(\nu) \leq 2$. Also assume $\mu_2 \geq \nu_2$. Then the Kronecker coefficient $g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$ is equal to each of the following:

1. the coefficient of $x^{\mu_2} y^{\nu_2}$ in
   \[ P_\lambda(x, y) \bar{F}_{2, 2}(x, y) \]
   where $P_\lambda(x, y)$ is the polynomial consisting of the following seven terms:
   \[
y^{\lambda_3 + \lambda_4} (x^{\lambda_2 + \lambda_4} - x^{\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 - 1} - x^{\lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1} + x^{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + 2}) + y^{\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 + 1} (-x^{\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - 1} + x^{\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1} + x^{\lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1}) \tag{11}
   \]
   A monomial $y^b x^a$ in $P_\lambda$ makes a nonzero contribution to $g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$ if and only if $b \leq \nu_2$ and $b + a \leq \mu_2 + \nu_2$.

2. the following 7-term linear combination of Ehrhart functions $p_S(n, m)$:
   \[ g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} = p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4), \nu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + \mu_2 - (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4)) - p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4), \nu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + \mu_2 - (\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1)) - p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4), \nu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + \mu_2 - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1)) + p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4), \nu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + \mu_2 - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + 2)) - p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 + 1), \nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 + 1) + \mu_2 - (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - 1)) + p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 + 1), \nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 + 1) + \mu_2 - (\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1)) \tag{12}
   \]
Example 13. (Minimality of the polynomial in Theorem 12.) Let $\lambda = (12, 7, 4, 1), \mu = \nu = (12, 12)$. From Theorem 12, the Kronecker coefficient $g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$ is the coefficient of $x^{12}y^{12}$ in the product $P_\lambda \bar{F}_{2,2}(x, y)$, where

$$P_\lambda = y^5(x^8 - x^{12} - x^{14} + x^{18}) + y^9(-x^4 + x^{12} + x^{14}).$$

Using Eq. (12), we have

$$g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} = p_S(7, 11) - p_S(7, 7) - p_S(7, 5) + p_S(7, 1) - p_S(3, 11) + p_S(3, 3) + p_S(3, 1)$$

$$= 32 - 20 - 12 + 2 - 10 + 6 + 2 = 0.$$

This example is noteworthy because the Kronecker coefficient vanishes, but there is no cancellation between pairs of the seven coefficients above. By definition, the atomic coefficient is the contribution from the first monomial $y^5x^8$ in the expansion of $P_\lambda$ above, (it is also the lexicographically least monomial), hence $\tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} = p_S(7, 11) = 32$.

Proof of Theorem 12. Eqn. (12) follows from the polynomial $P_\lambda$ because of the following observation: If $x^ay^b$ is a monomial in $P_\lambda$ making a nonzero contribution to $g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$, that value is

$$\pm s_{\nu_2-a-b}[F_{2,2}] = \pm p_S(\nu_2 - b, \mu_2 + \nu_2 - a - b).$$

This follows from the substitution $x \mapsto s_1$ and $y \mapsto s_0s_1$, Proposition 9 and Section 2.6.

Now we establish Eqn. (11), the first equality of the theorem. Proposition 9 says that the Kronecker coefficient $g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$ is obtained by extracting the coefficient of $x^{\mu_2}y^{\nu_2}$ in the product of $\bar{F}_{2,2}$ with the expansion of $(x^{-2}y^{-1})$ times the alternant $a_{\lambda + \delta_4}$.

Let $\lambda$ be a fixed partition of $n$. We represent the 24 monomial terms of $x^{-2}y^{-1}a_{\lambda + \delta_4}$ using Cartesian coordinates, as in Figure 6. The lattice point $(a, b)$ (corresponding to the monomial $x^ay^b$) has been marked with a plus sign or a minus sign to indicate the coefficient of $x^ay^b$; the
nonzero coefficients in the alternant are always ±1. The horizontal (resp. vertical) axis shows the possible exponents of \(x\) (resp. \(y\)).

The first observation is the ordering
\[
\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - 1 < \lambda_2 + \lambda_4 < \min(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1) \leq \max(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1) < \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + 2.
\]

The second observation is that
\[
\min(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4) \leq \frac{n}{2} \leq \max(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4),
\]

since \((\lambda_2 + \lambda_3) + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_4) = n\). (In particular the inequalities are strict unless \(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_4\).)

Thus there are two possible total orders. Figure 6 shows the case \(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 < \lambda_1 + \lambda_4\); but the argument is identical for the other case, since it corresponds to switching the appropriate pair of rows and columns. In particular, note the important fact that the lattice point weights corresponding to the lines \(y = \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 2\), \(y = \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 2\) are identical, and likewise for the lines \(x = \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1\), \(x = \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1\).

Proposition 9 says that the only monomials of \(x^{-2}y^{-1}a_{\lambda+\delta_4}\) making a nonzero contribution to the computation of \(g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}\) are those \(x^ay^b\) satisfying \((n/2) \geq \nu_2 \geq b\) and \(n \geq \mu_2 + \nu_2 \geq a + b\). The second inequality immediately implies that only lattice points below the line \(x + y = n\) can contribute (and hence these are the only ones shown in Figure 6). In the case depicted in Figure 6, the first inequality implies in addition that only points below the line \(y = \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 2\) can contribute.

This argument eliminates all monomials in \(x^{-2}y^{-1}a_{\lambda+\delta_4}\) except for the nine points appearing in the region bounded by the dimension of the coordinate axes and the lines \(y = \frac{n}{2} + 2\), \(x + y = n\) in Figure 6. An additional argument will now show that indeed the contributions of monomials \(x^{\lambda_3+\lambda_4-1}y^{\lambda_2+\lambda_1+2}\) and \(x^{\lambda_2+\lambda_4}y^{\lambda_2+\lambda_1+2}\) (along the line \(y = \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 2\)) are equal but of opposite signs.

The coefficient of \(x^{\mu_2}y^{\nu_2}\) in the product of each monomial \(x^ay^b\) in the above polynomial with \(\bar{F}_{2,2}(x, y)\) is equal to the coefficient of \(x^{\mu_2-a}y^{\nu_2-b}\) in \(\bar{F}_{2,2}(x, y)\). From Section 2.6 and Proposition 9, this coefficient equals \(p_S(n_b, m_{b,a})\) where \(n_b = \nu_2 - b\), \(m_{b,a} = (\nu_2 - b) + (\mu_2 - a)\). Note that \(a < b\) implies \(\mu_2 - a > \mu_2 - b \geq (\nu_2 - b)\), and hence \(m_{b,a} > 2n_b\). It follows from (II) in Figure 5 that \(p_S(n_b, m_{b,a}) = \binom{n_b+2}{m_{b,a}}\) is independent of \(a\), the exponent of \(x\).

Now apply these observations to the two monomials corresponding to \(b = \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 2\) and \(a_i \in \{\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - 1, \lambda_2 + \lambda_4\}, i = 1, 2\). Since \(a_i < b\) and \(\mu_2 \geq \nu_2\), we have \(\mu_2 - a_i \geq \nu_2 - a_i > \nu_2 - b\). A necessary condition for either monomial to make a nonzero contribution is for the exponent \(\nu_2 - b\) of \(y\) to be nonnegative. In the present situation, this forces the exponent \(\mu_2 - a_i\) of \(x\) to be nonnegative as well. Hence either both monomials \(x^{\mu_2-a_i}y^{\nu_2-b}\), \(i = 1, 2\), contribute to the Kronecker coefficient, or neither does. Since \(a_i < b\), from the preceding paragraph, the contributions are independent of the \(a_i\) and equal (to \(\binom{\nu_2-b+2}{2}\)), and since the monomials come with opposite sign, their combined contribution is zero.

The remaining seven nonzero lattice points (boxed in Figure 6) are precisely those corresponding to the monomials in the polynomial \(P_\lambda\).

Remark 14. Calculations of \(\kappa_{2,2,4}\) were previously explicitly worked out in [BOR09a] using an identity describing the Kronecker coefficient as a linear combination of reduced Kronecker coefficients (See section 3.7)[BOR09a, Theorem 4]. Their approach differs from ours, but does permit determination that the number of chambers in the corresponding chamber complex is 74. This approach
can also be compared with [Ros01] where a combinatorial interpretation for \( \kappa_{2,2,4} \) was found as the difference of the number of integer points in two rectangles (mod 2).

### 3.3 Examples

We illustrate these results with some examples. Since we invoke the computation of the coefficients \( p_S(n, m) \) of \( s_0^n s_1^m \) in \( E_{2,2}(s_0, s_1) \) from Section 2.6 extensively, we record the values of the following special coefficients:

\[
p_S(n, 0) = 1 = p_S(0, m); \quad p_S(n, 1) = 2 \text{ for } n > 0; \quad p_S(1, m) = 3 \text{ for } m \geq 2.
\]

**Example 15.** Let \( \lambda = (6, 5, 4, 1) \), \( \mu = \nu = (9, 7) \). Note that \( \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 = 5, \mu_2 + \nu_2 = 14 \), and thus, by checking the inequalities (15) and (16), we see that only three of the seven terms from the polynomial \( P_\lambda \) contribute to \( g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} \), specifically those in the expansion of

\[
y^5(x^6 - x^8) + y^7(-x^4).
\]

We obtain the value

\[
g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} = p_S(2, 3) - p_S(2, 1) - p_S(0, 3) = 2.
\]

**Example 16.** Our format is well suited to compute dilated Kronecker coefficients\(^2\), as we shall see in greater detail in Section 5. Assume \( k \) is a positive integer, and let \( k\lambda = (6k, 3k, 2k), k\mu = (7k, 4k) \) and \( k\nu = (8k, 3k) \). These are the dilations of the triple \((6, 3, 2), (7, 4), (8, 3)\). The Kronecker coefficients are all atomic and given by the quasipolynomial \( p_S(k, 2k) = (k + 1)(k + 2)/2 \), which counts integer points in dilations of a standard 2-simplex. This is precisely the polytope dilation in Figure 3.

### 3.4 Inequalities that determine when a Kronecker coefficient is atomic

A careful analysis of the order relations between the exponents appearing in Eqn. (11) yields the following result.

**Corollary 17.** The atomic coefficient equals the Kronecker coefficient if

1. \( \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \leq \nu_2 \leq \lambda_2 + \lambda_4 \) and
2. \( (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4) \leq \mu_2 + \nu_2 \leq (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + \min(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4) \).

When \( \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 \), these inequalities can be combined into a more pleasing form to give a sufficient condition for equality of atomic and Kronecker coefficients:

\[
\lambda_4 \leq \mu_2 + \nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4) \leq \lambda_3 \leq \nu_2 - \lambda_4 \leq \lambda_2.
\]

**Proof.** We now examine the exponents in Eqn. (11) more carefully. The two exponents of \( y \) in Eqn. (11) are ordered as follows:

\[
\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 < \lambda_2 + \lambda_4 + 1.
\]
The five exponents of $x$ are ordered thus:

$$\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - 1 < \lambda_2 + \lambda_4 < \min(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1) \leq \max(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1) < \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + 2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

Compare with [Ros01]. In turn, by considering the total degree sequences of the monomials, which constitute a set of size six, we have the following two chains of inequalities:

$$(\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4) < (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + \min(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1) \leq (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + \max(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1) < (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + (\lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + 2)$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

and

$$(\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 + 1) + (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - 1) < (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 + 1) + \min(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1) \leq (\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 + 1) + \max(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1).$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

A monomial $y^b x^a$ will make a nonzero contribution to $g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$ if and only if

$$b \leq \nu_2 \text{ and } b + a \leq \mu_2 + \nu_2.$$

Hence the subset of 7 monomials in Eqn. (11) contributing to the Kronecker coefficient $g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$ is determined by where the number $\mu_2 + \nu_2$ falls in the consecutive intervals determined by each of the inequalities Eqn. (15) and (16), and also where $\nu_2$ falls in Eqn. (13).

The atomic coefficient comes from the least monomial, which is the first one in the first line of (11). The first condition in the above statement, in view of the inequality (16), eliminates the possibility of any contribution to the Kronecker coefficient from the monomials in the second line of (11).

The second condition then eliminates all but the first monomial, because only monomials with total degree not exceeding

$$(\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + \min(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4)$$

can contribute. Hence we are left with only the atomic coefficient. \qed

From this we can easily deduce some conditions on the parts which ensure that the atomic Kronecker coefficients are an upper bound for the Kronecker coefficients. In fact Theorem 18 below states that NO restrictions on the parts of $\lambda$ are needed. The proof is quite technical, and appears in the Appendix.

**Theorem 18.** The atomic coefficient is an upper bound for the Kronecker coefficient.

### 3.5 Bravyi’s vanishing conditions for the Kronecker coefficients.

A theorem of Murnaghan implies that if $\mu_2 + \nu_2 < \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4$, then the Kronecker coefficient vanishes (see Eqn. (17)). The following stronger result (due to Bravyi) follows from our methods.

**Proposition 19 (Bravyi [Kir04, Bra04]).** Assume $\ell(\lambda) \leq 4, \ell(\mu), \ell(\nu) \leq 2$. The Kronecker coefficient is zero if $\nu_2 < \lambda_3 + \lambda_4$ or $\mu_2 + \nu_2 < \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 2\lambda_4$. Equivalently, if the Kronecker coefficient $g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$ is nonzero then Bravyi’s inequalities (10) are satisfied.
Publishing a stable value. The reduced Kronecker coefficient is thus given by

\[\text{Proof.}\] We assume without loss of generality that \(\mu_2 \geq \nu_2\). We will use the polynomial \(P_\lambda\) of Theorem 12.

First suppose \(\nu_2 < \lambda_3 + \lambda_4\). Then we have \(\nu_2 < \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 \leq \lambda_2 + \lambda_4\). Examining the polynomial \(P_\lambda\) in (11), we see that none of the monomials \(y^a x^b\) makes a contribution since the condition \(b \leq \nu_2\) is violated for both exponents \(b\) of \(y\) in \(P_\lambda\).

Now suppose \(\mu_2 + \nu_2 < \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 2\lambda_4\). Observe that \(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 2\lambda_4\) is precisely the sum of the exponents for the first monomials \(y^b x^a\) in each of the first two lines of the polynomial in (11). Hence the condition \(b + a \leq \mu_2 + \nu_2\) is violated for these two monomials. But the sum of exponents \(b + a\) for each of the other monomials in (11) is strictly greater than the sum for the first monomial in each line, so the condition is violated for all the monomials in \(P_\lambda\).

\[\square\]

3.6 A closed formula for the reduced Kronecker coefficients.

Long ago, Murnaghan observed that the sequences of Kronecker coefficients obtained by increasing the value of \(k\) in \(g(\lambda + (k), \mu + (k), \nu + (k))\) always stabilize. Their stable value is called the reduced Kronecker coefficient and denoted by \(\bar{g}_\lambda, \mu, \nu\), where, given a partition \(\lambda\), we denote by \(\bar{\lambda}\) the partition obtained from \(\lambda\) deleting its first part.

The reduced Kronecker coefficients are conjectured to verify the saturation hypothesis [Kly04, Kir04]. They share with the atomic Kronecker coefficients the property that [BOR11] that the value of Kronecker coefficients can be computed as an alternated sum of reduced Kronecker coefficients. We will have more to say about the reduced Kronecker coefficients in Section 3.7.

Murnagahan also discovered a necessary condition for the Kronecker coefficient \(g_{\lambda, \mu, \nu}\) to be nonzero. The following inequality has to hold:

\[|\bar{\lambda}| \leq |\bar{\mu}| + |\bar{\nu}|.\] (17)

**Proposition 20.** Let \(\lambda_2 \geq \mu_2 \geq \nu_2\). Assume \(\lambda\) has at most two parts. Then \(g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}\) is independent of \(\lambda_1\) as soon as \(\lambda_1 \geq \mu_2 + \nu_2\). Moreover, the stable value is \(p_S(\nu_2, \nu_2 + \mu_2 - \lambda_2) - p_S(\nu_2, \nu_2 + \mu_2 - \lambda_2 - 1)\). Explicitly, let \(\ell = \nu_2 + \mu_2 - \lambda_2\), then,

\[\bar{g}(\lambda_2), (\mu_2), (\nu_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{\ell}{2} + \frac{3 + (-1)^\ell}{4} = \left\lfloor \frac{\ell}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 & \text{if } \mu_2 + \nu_2 \geq \lambda_2 \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu_2 + \nu_2 < \lambda_2 \end{cases}\] (18)

**Proof.** We have \(\lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0\). For any statement \(S\), we write \(\delta(S)\) to mean 1 if \(S\) is true and 0 otherwise. From Eqn. (12) of Theorem 12, the Kronecker coefficient is

\[p_S(\nu_2, \nu_2 + \mu_2 - \lambda_2) - p_S(\nu_2, \nu_2 + \mu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1)) \]

\[- p_S(\nu_2, \nu_2 + \mu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1)) \cdot \delta(\mu_2 + \nu_2 \geq \lambda_1 + 1) + p_S(\nu_2, \nu_2 + \mu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 2)) \cdot \delta(\mu_2 + \nu_2 \geq \lambda_1 + 2) \]

\[- p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1), \nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1) + \mu_2 + 1) + p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1), \nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1) + \mu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1)) \]

\[+ \delta(\mu_2 + \nu_2 \geq \lambda_1 + 2) \cdot \delta(\mu_2 + \nu_2 \geq \lambda_1 + 3) \cdot p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1), \nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1) + \mu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1)) \]

The zero coefficient in the last line is explained by the fact that \((\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)/2 \geq \mu_2 \geq \nu_2\), and thus we always have \(\mu_2 + \nu_2 \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2\).

The hypothesis that \(\lambda_1 \geq \mu_2 + \nu_2\) eliminates the two terms with \(\lambda_1\) in their arguments, establishing a stable value. The reduced Kronecker coefficient is thus given by

\[p_S(\nu_2, \nu_2 + \mu_2 - \lambda_2) - p_S(\nu_2, \nu_2 + \mu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1)) \]

\[- p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1), \nu_2 + \mu_2 - \lambda_2) + p_S(\nu_2 - (\lambda_2 + 1), \nu_2 + \mu_2 - 2(\lambda_2 + 1)) \] (19)
Figure 7: The chamber complex for the reduced Kronecker coefficients indexed by three one-row shapes. The reduced coefficients are zero outside the tetrahedra, one on all the boundaries, and grow linearly as we move towards the center of one of the chambers. The interior of the cone is divided into three chambers.

Of these four terms, since $\lambda_2 \geq \mu_2 \geq \nu_2$, the third and fourth terms are immediately eliminated because the first argument is negative: $\nu_2 - \lambda_2 - 1 \leq -1$.

If $\mu_2 + \nu_2 < \lambda_2$, both first and second terms are identically zero.

If $\mu_2 + \nu_2 = \lambda_2$, only the first term appears, but it must be 1 from the boundary values $p_S(0,0) = 1 = p_S(0,m)$ recorded in Section 3.3.

If $\mu_2 + \nu_2 > \lambda_2$, the first two Ehrhart functions both appear. Since $\lambda_2 - \mu_2 \geq 0$ implies $\nu_2 \geq \ell = \nu_2 + \mu_2 - \lambda_2$, both are computed using the quasipolynomial corresponding to Region I in Figure 5, and consequently the reduced Kronecker coefficient is

$$p_S(\nu_2, \ell) - p_S(\nu_2, \ell - 1) = \frac{\ell}{2} + \frac{3 + (-1)^\ell}{4}.$$

The proof is now complete.

Using the symmetry of the Kronecker coefficients with respect to the three partitions, we immediately have:

**Corollary 21.** Fix $\lambda_2, \mu_2,$ and $\nu_2$. Let $a = \max(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \nu_2) \geq b \geq c = \min(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \nu_2)$ be a total ordering of $\lambda_2, \mu_2, \nu_2$. Set $\ell = b + c - a$. Then

$$\bar{g}(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \nu_2) = \bar{g}(a, b, c) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{\ell}{2} + \frac{3 + (-1)^\ell}{4} = \left\lfloor \frac{\ell}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 & \text{if } \ell \geq 0 \\
0 & \text{if } \ell < 0.
\end{cases}$$

(20)
The chamber complex for this quasipolynomial is illustrated in Figure 5. The walls are the hyperplanes

I : \mu_2 + \nu_2 = \lambda_2, 
II : \mu_2 + \lambda_2 = \nu_2, 
III : \lambda_2 + \nu_2 = \mu_2.

The reduced Kronecker coefficient indexed by points on any of these walls always has value equal to one.

We have obtained the counting function for the number of integer points in the one-dimensional polytope of Figure 2, which was studied in Example 1.

Remark 22. Both Kirillov and Klyachko have conjectured that the reduced Kronecker coefficients satisfy the saturation hypothesis (See [Kly04], Conjecture 6.2.4, and [Kir04], Conjecture 2.33). (Note that Kirillov calls the reduced Kronecker coefficients the extended Littlewood–Richardson coefficients.) We have a showed a stronger result. The quasipolynomial

\[ G_{(\lambda_2, \mu_2, \nu_2)}(k) = \bar{g}_{\lambda_2, k\mu_2, k\nu_2} \]

is an Ehrhart function as it counts integer points in polytopes.

3.7 The relative positions of the cones associated to the Kronecker, the reduced Kronecker and the Littlewood–Richardson coefficients

Murnaghan discovered an unexpected relationship between the Kronecker and the Littlewood–Richardson coefficients: In the particular case where Eq (17) is an equality, and the first parts of the partitions are “big enough”, the Kronecker coefficient \( g_{\lambda, \mu, \nu} \) coincides with the Littlewood–Richardson coefficient \( c_{\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}} \). Equivalently, Murnaghan’s result can be expressed in terms of the reduced Kronecker coefficients,

\[ \bar{g}_{\lambda, \mu, \nu} = c_{\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}} \]

For this reason the reduced Kronecker coefficients are sometimes called extended Littlewood–Richardson coefficients.

The Littlewood–Richardson coefficients are both particular instances of Kronecker and reduced Kronecker coefficients. We call the cone defined by the non-zero atomic Kronecker coefficients the atomic cone; see Proposition 10. We ask, what is the relation between the positions of these different families of coefficients (the Kronecker, the reduced Kronecker, and the Littlewood–Richardson coefficients) with respect to the atomic cone?

The atomic Kronecker coefficients attain their minimum values (one) at its boundary: \( \nu_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4 = 0 \) or \( \mu_2 + \nu_2 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - 2\lambda_4 = 0 \) (compare with inequality (10)). When we dilate the three indexing partitions, the values of the atomic Kronecker coefficients inside the cone are always strictly increasing. Moreover, on the face defined by \( \mu_2 + \nu_2 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - 2\lambda_4 = 0 \), the atomic Kronecker coefficients coincide with the Kronecker coefficient.

**Theorem 23.** The Littlewood–Richardson cone coincides with the intersection of the face of the Kronecker cone defined by the first Bravyi inequality:

\[ \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 2\lambda_4 = \mu_2 + \nu_2 \]

with the hyperplane \( \lambda_4 = 0 \).

**Proof.** Let \( c^\gamma_{\alpha, \beta} = \bar{g}^\gamma_{\alpha, \beta} = g_{\lambda, \mu, \nu} \) with \( \alpha = \bar{\mu} \), \( \beta = \bar{\nu} \) and \( \gamma = \bar{\lambda} \). We want to see where \( (\lambda, \mu, \nu) \) sits in relation with the Kronecker cone.

Suppose that \( c^\gamma_{\alpha, \beta} > 0 \). Since \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) have just one part, Pieri’s rule tells us that the length of \( \gamma \) can be at most two, and hence \( \lambda_4 = 0 \), and \( \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = \mu_2 + \nu_2 \). On the other hand, using the inequalities described in Corollary 17 we easily see that all atomic Kronecker coefficients in this wall are indeed Kronecker coefficients.
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Let $N$ be any number such that the sequences $(N - \lambda_2, \lambda_2, \lambda_3), (N - \mu_2, \mu_2), (N - \nu_2, \nu_2)$ are partitions. It remains to see whether the Kronecker coefficient $g_{(N - \lambda_2, \lambda_2, \lambda_3), (N - \mu_2, \mu_2), (N - \nu_2, \nu_2)}$ is reduced. For this, we will use the bound described in Theorem 1.5 of [BOR11]. It says that such a Kronecker coefficient is stable as soon as $N \geq \lambda_2 + \mu_2 + \nu_2 + \left[\frac{\lambda_2}{2}\right] = 2\lambda_2 + \left[\frac{\lambda_2}{2}\right]$. But since $(N - \lambda_2, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$ has to be a partition, the smallest possible value for $N$ will be that one that corresponds to partition $(\lambda_2, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)$. That is, $2\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 \geq 2\lambda_2 + \left[\frac{\lambda_2}{2}\right]$.

Bravyi derived a third inequality that the Kronecker coefficients must satisfy in order to be positive [Kir04, Bra04, p.6], namely

$$|\mu_2 - \nu_2| \leq \min(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3, \lambda_2 - \lambda_4). \quad \text{(Third Bravyi Inequality)} \tag{21}$$

Define the Bravyi cone to be the polyhedral cone obtained by taking the intersection of the atomic cone with the region defined by the third Bravyi inequality. All nonzero Kronecker coefficients lie within the Bravyi cone. We can ask where the Littlewood–Richardson (LR) coefficients lie inside the cone. More precisely, we are asking for those nonzero Littlewood–Richardson coefficients (inside the Kronecker cone) coming from the identities:

$$g_{\lambda, \mu, \nu} = \bar{g}_{\lambda, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}} = \bar{c}_{\bar{\mu}, \bar{\nu}}.$$

Now the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient $c_{(\lambda_2, \lambda_3)/(\mu_2), (\nu_2)}$ is nonzero iff the skew-shapes $(\lambda_2, \lambda_3)/(\mu_2)$ and $(\lambda_2, \lambda_3)/(\nu_2)$ are horizontal strips, or equivalently iff

$$\lambda_2 \geq \mu_2 \geq \lambda_3 \text{ and } \lambda_2 \geq \nu_2 \geq \lambda_3,$$

which in turn is equivalent to saying $\mu_2$ and $\nu_2$ lie in the interval $[\lambda_3, \lambda_2]$. Hence, when the LR coefficient is nonzero, we must have (since $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq \lambda_4$),

$$|\mu_2 - \nu_2| \leq \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 \leq \min(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3, \lambda_2 - \lambda_4),$$

and this is the third Bravyi inequality.

Remark 24. Note that we have the following implications. If a Kronecker coefficient is atomic then it is reduced, the reason being that the value of $\bar{g}$ does not depend on the first part of $\lambda$. On the other hand, if a Kronecker coefficient satisfies the equality of Murnaghan’s condition then it is reduced. This is Theorem 23.

Finally, consider next what happens at the intersection of the hyperplanes defined by the various Bravyi inequalities.

$$\begin{cases} 
\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 2\lambda_4 = \mu_2 + \nu_2, & \text{(first Bravyi)} \\
\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 = \nu_2, & \text{(second Bravyi)} \\
\mu_2 - \nu_2 = \lambda_2 - \lambda_4, & \text{(third Bravyi)}
\end{cases}$$

The first and third Bravyi inequalities give $\mu_2 = \lambda_2 + \lambda_4$ while the second and third give $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = \mu_2$. Therefore, they intersect at the plane with parametric equations $\lambda_2 = t, \lambda_3 = s, \lambda_4 = s, \mu_2 = s + t, \nu_2 = 2s$.

A triple in this family of partitions satisfies Murnaghan’s condition iff $s = 0$. That is, we are looking at the coefficients $g_{(s, t), (s, t), (s)} = 1$. This corresponds to tensoring with the trivial representation.
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Proposition 25. Let \( \lambda = (u, t, s, s) \), \( \mu = (u + s, t + s) \), \( \nu = (u + t, 2s) \) where \( u \geq t \geq s \). Then for all \( k \geq 1 \),
\[
g_{k\mu,k\nu,k\lambda} = 1 = \tilde{g}_{k\mu,k\nu,k\lambda}.
\]
That is, the dilated Kronecker coefficient equals 1, as does the atomic dilated Kronecker coefficient.

Proof. Note that we are computing the Kronecker coefficient for the dilated triple \((k\lambda, k\mu, k\nu)\). We will use the 7-term polynomial in Theorem 12 to determine which coefficients of \( F_{2,2} \) contribute to \( g_{k\mu,k\nu,k\lambda} \). We check that the inequalities of Corollary 17 are satisfied:
\[
k(\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) = 2ks = k\nu_2 < k(\lambda_2 + \lambda_4) + 1 = k(t + s) + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad k(\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + k(\lambda_2 + \lambda_4) = k(3s + t) \leq k(\mu_2 + \nu_2) = k(3s + t) \leq k(\mu + \nu) = k(\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) + k \min(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4) = k(3s + t).
\]

Hence the Kronecker and atomic coefficients coincide, and they both equal the coefficient of \( x^{k(t+s)}y^{2ks} \) in \( x^{k(t+s)}y^{2ks} \tilde{F}_{2,2} \), which is just \( p_{S}(0,0) = 1 \), as claimed.

A triple of partitions \((\lambda, \mu, \nu)\) of the same weight is stable if \( g_{k\lambda,k\mu,k\nu} \) equals 1 for all \( k \). We have shown that all triples of partitions lying at the intersection of the three walls (i.e. facets) defined by the inequalities of Bravyi are stable. Stable triples are relevant because the sequences \( g_{a+n\lambda, \beta+n\mu, \gamma+n\nu} \) stabilize for \( n \) sufficiently large. Stembridge asks for the location of all stable triples [Ste14]. It remains to decide whether there are more of them.

Corollary 26. All triples of partitions at the intersection of the three facets of the Bravyi cone are stable. That is, if we fix \( u \geq t \geq s \), the sequence of Kronecker coefficients
\[
g(\lambda + k(u, t, s, s), \mu + k(u + s, t + s), \nu + k(u + t, 2s))
\]
is eventually constant.

4 The vector partition function \( F_{n,m} \)

Having completed our analysis of the \( n = m = 2 \) case, we examine the extent to which these results generalize. First we show that we can make a variable substitution to convert \( \frac{a_{\delta_n}[X]a_{\delta_m}[Y]}{a_{\delta_{nm}}[XY]} \) into a vector partition function. This is the result of Theorem 29.

Let us go back to beginning, that is, back to Eq.(3). Let \( S(p) \) denote the smallest monomial in \( p \) with respect to the lexicographic order. By truncating the alternants in Eq.(3), we obtain a new family of coefficients \( \tilde{g}_{\mu,\nu,\lambda} \) closely related to the Kronecker coefficients:
\[
\frac{a_{\delta_n}[X]a_{\delta_m}[Y]}{a_{\delta_{nm}}[XY]} S(a_{\lambda+\delta_n}[X]S(a_{\mu+\delta_n}[X])S(a_{\nu+\delta_m}[Y])) + \text{ lex. g. t.} \quad (22)
\]

We proceed by first expanding all the Vandermonde determinants involved as a product of linear binomial factors. We want to factor the binomial terms so that we obtain a product of terms of the form 1 minus a Laurent monomial. We can do this in such a way that the resulting Laurent series converges in a nonzero domain if we follow the lexicographic ordering, and always factor the smallest monomial in each binomial.

We consider the special alphabets \( X = \{1, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{n-1}\} \), \( Y = \{1, y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{m-1}\} \), \( n, m \geq 2 \). Then \( XY = \{1, x_i, y_j, x_iy_j : 1 \leq i \leq n - 1, 1 \leq j \leq m - 1\} \). The set \( XY \) is ordered as follows:
\[
1 > x_i > x_{i+1}, y_j > y_{j+1}, x_i > y_j, x_iy_j > x_ky_l \quad \text{if} \quad i < k, \quad \text{or} \quad i = k \quad \text{and} \quad j < l.
\]
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Observe that we have the Vandermonde expansion, which we describe in detail below, to ensure that we get a convergent Taylor series expansion.

Similarly, to compute the smallest term, with respect to the lex ordering, in each of the two remaining alternants \( S(a_{\mu+\delta_n}[X]) \) and \( S(a_{\nu+\delta_m}[Y]) \), we take the product of the monomials in the main diagonal of the corresponding matrices. We obtain a Laurent series

\[
\sum_{\mu,\nu} g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda} x^{l_1(\mu,\nu,\lambda)} y^{l_2(\mu,\nu,\lambda)}
\]

where \( l_1(\mu,\nu,\lambda) \) and \( l_2(\mu,\nu,\lambda) \) are linear combinations of the parts of \( \mu, \nu \) and \( \lambda \). It is a product of binomial terms of the form 1 minus a Laurent monomial. Finally, we perform a change of basis by

\[
G_{n,m} = \frac{a_{\delta_n}[X]a_{\delta_m}[Y]}{a_{\delta_n}[XY]}
\]

Observe that we have the Vandermonde expansion

\[
a_{\delta_n}[X] = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (1 - x_i) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n-1} (x_i - x_j),
\]

and similarly for the second alternant \( a_{\delta_m}[Y] \). For the alternant in the denominator we have

\[
a_{\delta_{nm}}[XY] = a_{\delta_n}[X] \cdot a_{\delta_m}[Y] \cdot A \cdot B \cdot C \cdot D \cdot E \cdot F,
\]

where

\[
A = \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (x_i - y_j), \quad B = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (1 - x_i y_j)
\]

and

\[
C = \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (x_i - x_i y_j) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (y_j - x_i y_j)
\]

\[
= \left( \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (1 - y_j) \right) \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i^{m-1} \right) \left( \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} (1 - x_i) \right) \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j^{n-1} \right),
\]

\[
D = \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} (x_k - x_i y_j) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (y_k - x_i y_j),
\]

\[
E = \prod_{j \neq \ell = 1}^{n-1} \prod_{1 \leq i < k \leq n-1} (x_i y_j - x_k y_k),
\]

The following claim is clear.

**Lemma 27.** The smallest term in \( S(a_{\lambda+\delta_{nm}}[XY]) \), with respect to the lexicographic ordering, is the product of the monomials in the main diagonal of the matrix of the alternant \( a_{\lambda+\delta_{nm}}[XY] \).

For example, for \( n = m = 3 \), the substitution is \( x_1 = s_1 t_1, x_2 = s_1 s_2 t_2^2, y_1 = s_0 s_1 s_2 t_1^2, \) and \( y_2 = s_0 s_1 s_2 t_2^3 \). More precisely, in order to guarantee convergence of our series, we assume in Eqn. (23) that

\[
1 > |x_1| > |x_2| > \ldots > |x_{n-1}| > |y_1| > |y_2| > \ldots > |y_{m-1}| > |x_1 y_1| > |x_1 y_2| > \ldots > |x_1 y_{m-1}| > \ldots > |x_{n-1} y_1| > |x_{n-1} y_2| > \ldots > |x_{n-1} y_{m-1}|.
\]

We define the rational function \( G_{n,m} \) by

\[
G_{n,m} = \frac{a_{\delta_n}[X]a_{\delta_m}[Y]}{a_{\delta_{nm}}[XY]}.
\]
This establishes our claim. Hence we have proved:

\[ F = \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} \prod_{1 \leq i < k \leq n-1} (x_i y_j - x_k y_j) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \prod_{1 \leq j < \ell \leq m-1} (x_i y_j - x_\ell y_\ell) \]

\[ = \prod_{j=1}^{m-1} y_j^{(n-1)} \prod_{1 \leq i < k \leq n-1} (x_i - x_k)^{m-1} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i^{(m-1)} \prod_{1 \leq j < \ell \leq m-1} (y_j - y_\ell)^{n-1}. \]

It follows that the quotient of alternants \( G_{n,m} \) simplifies to \( \frac{1}{ABCDEF} \).

Note that each factor in \( A, C, D, E, F \) can be rewritten in the form \((1 - M)\) where \( M \) is a Laurent monomial in the \( x_i \) and the \( y_j \). The factors of \( B \) are already in this form. For instance, in \( E \) we can rewrite each factor as

\[ x_i y_j - x_k y_\ell = x_i y_j (1 - x_k y_\ell x_i^{-1} y_j^{-1}). \]

Thus, the following definition for \( \bar{F}_{n,m}(X,Y) \) makes sense.

**Definition 28** \( (\bar{F}_{n,m}(X,Y) ) \). There are positive integers \( a_i, b_j \) such that in the product

\[ G_{n,m} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i^{a_i} \prod_{i=j}^{m-1} y_j^{b_j}, \]

all factors are of the form \((1 - M)^{-1}\) where \( M \) is a Laurent monomial in the \( x_i \) and the \( y_j \). We define \( \bar{F}_{n,m}(X,Y) \) to be this product, i.e. we have

\[ G_{n,m} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} x_i^{a_i} \prod_{i=j}^{m-1} y_j^{b_j} = \bar{F}_{n,m}. \quad (24) \]

We now show that there is a different set of \((n + m - 2)\) variables \( s_i, i = 0, \ldots n-1, t_j, j = 1, \ldots, m - 2 \), such that by effecting a judicious (and non-obvious) change of variables, \( \bar{F}_{n,m}(X,Y) \) becomes a product of factors of the form \((1 - M)^{-1}\) where each Laurent monomial \( M \) in \( X,Y \) is a monomial with nonnegative exponents in the new variables \( S,T \). In other words, \( \bar{F}_{n,m}(S,T) \) is a vector partition function in the new variables.

We claim that the quotients of consecutive terms in the sequence (23) become monomials (and not Laurent monomials), after setting, for each \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \) and \( 1 \leq j \leq m - 1 \),

\[ \begin{align*}
  x_i &= s_1 s_2 \ldots s_i (t_1 t_2 \ldots t_{m-2})^j, \\
  y_j &= (s_0 s_1 \ldots s_{n-1}) (t_1 t_2 \ldots t_{m-2})^{n-1} t_1 t_2 \ldots t_{j-1}.
\end{align*} \quad (25) \]

Note when \( n = m = 2 \), there are no \( t_i \) variables, and we recover the substitution for \( F_{2,2} \) in Section 2.6. We have

\[ \begin{align*}
  \frac{x_{i+1}}{x_i} &= s_{i+1} t_1 t_2 \ldots t_{m-2}, & \frac{y_{j+1}}{y_j} &= t_j, & 1 \leq j \leq m - 2, \\
  \frac{y_1}{x_{n-1}} &= s_0, & x_i y_1 &= s_1, & \frac{x_i y_1}{x_{i-1} y_{m-1}} &= s_i, & 2 \leq i \leq n - 1. \quad (26)
\end{align*} \]

This establishes our claim. Hence we have proved:
Theorem 29. Let $F_{n,m}(S,T)$ be the series obtained after performing the previous substitutions in the series (24); its domain of convergence is $\{|s_i| < 1, |t_j| < 1 : 0 \leq i \leq n-1, 1 \leq j \leq m-2\}$. Then $F_{n,m}$ is a vector partition function.

From the preceding discussion we can also conclude:

Corollary 30. Let $A_{n,m}$ be the matrix associated to the vector partition function $F_{n,m}$, as in Section 2.5. Then

1. the largest entry is $2n-1$;
2. the number of columns is $\binom{nm}{2} - \binom{n}{2} - \binom{m}{2}$;
3. the number of rows is $m + n - 2$;
4. all the basis vectors appear in the columns of $A_{n,m}$;
5. the rank of the matrix is $m + n - 2$.

Proof. The largest entry is obtained by examining the largest possible exponent of the variables $s_i$ or $t_j$ in the monomials $M$ occurring in the factors $(1 - M)$ of $F_{n,m}$. We have, from the product $B$ of the preceding proof, for $i \leq n - 2, j \leq m - 1$, the monomial

$$x_iy_j = (s_1 \cdots s_i)(t_1t_2 \cdots t_{m-2})^i \cdot (s_0s_1 \cdots s_{n-1})(t_1t_2 \cdots t_{m-2})^{n-1}(t_1t_2 \cdots t_{j-1})$$

and clearly the largest exponent here occurs for each of $t_1, \ldots, t_{j-1}$, and it equals $i + (n - 1) + 1 = n + i \leq 2n - 1$. The maximum exponent $2n - 1$ occurs in the monomial $x_{n-1}y_j$. Examining the products other than $B$, we see that all other monomials involve dividing by $x_i$ or $y_j$ or both, so it is clear that they cannot yield a larger exponent.

The number of columns in the matrix $A_{n,m}$ equals the number of linear factors in $a_{\delta_{nm}}[XY]$ minus the number of linear factors in $a_{\delta_n}[X]$ minus the number of linear factors in $a_{\delta_m}[Y]$; since these are all Vandermonde determinants, the second result follows. For the third result, observe that the number of rows is simply the number of variables in the set $\{s_i, 0 \leq i \leq n-1, t_j, 1 \leq j \leq m-2\}$. For the last two statements, observe that Eqn.(26) in the preceding proof establishes that all the basis vectors appear as columns of the matrix $A_{n,m}$, since all the variables $s_i$ and $t_j$ occur as quotients when converting the factors of the Vandermonde in the products $A-F$ into the form $(1 - M)$ in Eq. (26). Hence the rank is the number of rows of the matrix.

4.1 The degree of the Kronecker piecewise quasipolynomial

We can now immediately obtain information about the degree of the Kronecker quasipolynomial $\kappa_{n,m,nm}$. Let $X$ be an alphabet of size $n$, and $Y$ an alphabet of size $m$, and let

$$d = \frac{n^2m^2}{2} - \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{m^2}{2} - \frac{nm}{2} - \frac{n}{2} - \frac{m}{2} + 2$$

Theorem 31. The Kronecker function $\kappa_{n,m,nm}$ is always described by a piecewise quasipolynomial of degree $\leq d$. 
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Proof. The degree of the Kronecker quasipolynomial $\kappa_{n,m,nm}$ is bounded by the dimension of the null space of $A_{n,m}$. It is thus equal to the number of columns minus the rank. By Corollary 30, this is just $d$.

Since Kronecker coefficients are linear combinations of different shifts of this vector partition function, these bounds apply in general.

The degree of $\kappa_{n,m,nm}$ has been obtained by Baldoni, Vergne, and Walter [BVW16, VW17] using the language of moment maps.

In addition to being completely elementary, another advantage of our approach is that the dimension of the polyhedral cones involved in the calculation are the minimal possible ones, as they coincide with the degree of the quasipolynomial.

Still, the dimensions of the polyhedral cones involved grow fast. For instance, from Theorem 31, for $n = 2, m = 3$ we have dimension 8, and for $n = m = 3$ the dimension is 26. In the next examples, we will briefly explore $F_{2,3}$, and $F_{3,3}$. In particular, we will look at the faces of the polyhedral cones of the atomic Kronecker coefficients.

4.2 The vector partition function $F_{2,3}$

The domain of convergence of the vector partition function $F_{2,3}$ is $|x_1y_2| < |x_1y_1| < |y_2| < |y_1| < |x_1| < 1$. $F_{2,3}$ counts nonnegative integer solutions to $A_{2,3}x = n$, with $A_{2,3}$ equal to

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

We need the following computations for partitions $\lambda, \mu, \nu$ of lengths bounded by 6,2 and 3 respectively.

\[
S(a_{\lambda+\delta_0}[XY]) = (x_1y_2)^{\lambda_0}(x_1y_1)^{\lambda_5+1}y_2^{\lambda_4+2}y_1^{\lambda_3+3}x_1^{\lambda_2+4} \cdot 1^{\lambda_1+5}
= (x_1^{5}y_1^{4}y_2^{2}) \cdot x_1^{\lambda_0+\lambda_5+\lambda_4+\lambda_3+\lambda_2+\lambda_1+\lambda_0},
\]

\[
S(a_{\mu+\delta_3}[Y]) = y_2^{\mu_3}y_1^{\mu_2}y_1,
\]

\[
S(a_{\mu+\delta_2}[X]) = x_1^{\mu_2}.
\]

As in Section 3 (see the definition following Eqn. (7)), we denote by $\tilde{F}_{2,3}(x, y)$ the series obtained from $F_{2,3}(x, y)$ by factoring out monomials from each binomial factor so that every factor is of the form $(1 - M)$. One then checks that the relation $F_{2,3} = \frac{F_{2,3}}{x_1y_1y_2^2}$ holds. Hence Eqn. (5) becomes

\[
\tilde{F}_{2,3}(x_1y_1y_2^2) a_{\lambda+\delta_0}[XY] = \sum_{\mu, \nu} g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} x_1^{\mu_2}y_2^{\nu_3}y_1^{\nu_2} + \text{lex. gr.}
\]

or

\[
\tilde{F}_{2,3} a_{\lambda+\delta_0}[XY] = x_1^{5}y_1^{4}y_2^{2} \sum_{\mu, \nu} g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} x_1^{\mu_2}y_2^{\nu_3}y_1^{\nu_2} + \text{lex. gr.}
\]

Truncate the alternant $a_{\lambda+\delta_0}$ to the lexicographically least monomial, using the expression above. The defining equation for the atomic coefficients, Eqn. (22), now gives

\[
\tilde{F}_{2,3} x_1^{\lambda_0+\lambda_5+\lambda_4+\lambda_3+\lambda_2+\lambda_1+\lambda_0} = \sum_{\mu, \nu} \tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} x_1^{\mu_2}y_2^{\nu_3}y_1^{\nu_2},
\]
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where $\tilde{g}$ is the atomic Kronecker coefficient as before. Note that the initial affine combinations of the parts of $\lambda, \mu, \nu$ fortuitously reduce to linear combinations.

To make $\tilde{F}_{2,3}$ into the vector partition function whose matrix $A_{2,3}$ is given above, we need the substitution of Theorem 29, namely $x_1 = s_1 t_1, y_1 = s_0 s_1 t_1, y_2 = s_0 s_1 t_1^2$. This gives

$$F_{2,3}(s_0, s_1, t_1) = \sum_{\mu, \nu} \tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} M(\mu, \nu, \lambda)$$

where the monomial $M(\mu, \nu, \lambda)$ is given by

$$t_1^{\mu_2 + \nu_2 + 2\nu_3 - (3\lambda_6 + \lambda_5 + 2\lambda_4 + 2\lambda_3 + \lambda_2)} s_1^{\mu_2 + \nu_2 + 2\nu_3 - (2\lambda_6 + \lambda_5 + \lambda_4 + 2\lambda_3 + \lambda_2)} s_0^{\nu_2 + \nu_3 - (\lambda_6 + \lambda_5 + \lambda_4 + \lambda_3)}.$$

We conclude that the atomic coefficient is nonzero if and only if the exponents appearing in $M(\mu, \nu, \lambda)$ are all nonnegative.

The dimension of the solution space is rather large. The polytopes involved have dimension 8, making them very hard to visualize. However, some interesting phenomena can be observed by looking at the restriction of this system of equations to the positive orthant. Recall that we are looking for nonnegative solutions to $A_{2,3} x = n$. Let $n = (n_1, n_2, n_3)$.

If $n_3 = 0$, since we are only considering nonnegative linear combinations of the columns of the matrix, none of the columns other than the first two can appear. We obtain the restricted matrix $A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $p_{A_3}(n_1, n_2) = 1$ is a constant polynomial. Here we use the notation of Theorem 5 for the quasipolynomial $p_A(b)$ associated to the polytope defined by the solution space of the matrix equation $A x = b$.

On the other hand, if $n_2 = 0$, we can discard any column where the second entry is not zero. In this case the restricted matrix is $A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $p_{A_2}(n_1, n_3)$ is a linear piecewise polynomial: We need to solve the system of inequalities $x_3 \leq n_1, x_3 \leq n_3$. Hence $p_{A_2}(n_1, n_3) = 1 + \min(n_1, n_3)$.

Finally, if we set $n_1 = 0$, the restricted matrix is then $A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$, and $p_{A_1}(n_2, n_3)$ is a piecewise cubic quasipolynomial.

Note that the atomic Kronecker coefficients are identically one only on the facet defined by $n_3 = 0$. Contrast this with the situation for $F_{2,2}$, where the coefficients are identically one on both facets: from Figure 5, we see that $p_{A_{2,2}}(n, m) = 1$ if $n = 0$ or $m = 0$.

### 4.3 The vector partition function $F_{3,3}$

The domain of convergence of the vector partition function $F_{3,3}$ is $|x_2 y_2| < |x_2 y_1| < |x_1 y_2| < |x_1 y_1| < |y_2| < |y_1| < |x_2| < |x_1| < 1$. $F_{3,3}$ counts nonnegative integer solutions to $A_{3,3} x = n$, with

$$A_{3,3} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The dimension of the solution space is now much larger than the previous case of $F_{2,3}$. The polytopes involved have dimension 26, again rendering visualisation impossible. However, a similar phenomenon can be observed by looking at the restriction of this system of equations to the positive orthant.
Let \( n = (n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4) \). Set \( n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 0 \). That is, we are counting solutions of the system on those integer points belonging to the \( n_4 \) axis. Since we are only considering nonnegative linear combinations of the columns (vector partitions), all variables corresponding to a column where one of the first three rows has a nonzero entry should be equal to zero. We end up counting partitions of \( n_4 \) with two copies of 1, Example 3.

Similar arguments allows us to deduce that:

1. On the axes \( n_1, n_2 \) and \( n_3 \) we are counting partitions with just one part equal to 1. Therefore, \( p_A = 1 \) a constant polynomial.

2. On the 2-faces, generated by either axes \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \), or by \( n_1 \) and \( n_3 \), or by \( n_2 \) and \( n_3 \), the restricted matrix is \( \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \). Therefore, \( p_A = 1 \) is a constant polynomial.

3. In any subspace of \( n_4 = 0 \), there is a unique solution: \( p_A = 1 \) is a constant polynomial.

4. If \( n_3 = 0 \) (which coincides with the case \( n_2 = 0 \)), the resulting quasipolynomial has degree is 7. The restricted matrix is

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

5. If \( n_1 = 0 \), the resulting quasipolynomial has degree 11. The restricted matrix is

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

This situation is reminiscent of the results obtained for \( F_{2,3} \). There is only one facet where the atomic Kronecker coefficients are identically one, namely the facet defined by setting the last coordinate \( n_4 \) to be equal to zero.

It only remains to figure out the equations of the facets in terms of the parts of the three indexing partitions.

As in the preceding section, we need the following computations for partitions \( \lambda, \mu, \nu \) of lengths bounded by 9, 3 and 3 respectively.

\[
S(a_{\lambda + \delta_9}[XY]) = (x_2 y_2)^{\lambda_9} (x_2 y_1)^{\lambda_9 + 1} (x_1 y_1)^{\lambda_9 + 2} (x_1 y_1)^{\lambda_9 + 3} y_2^{\lambda_9 + 4} y_1^{\lambda_9 + 5} x_2^{\lambda_9 + 6} x_1^{\lambda_9 + 7}
\]

\[
S(a_{\nu + \delta_3}[Y]) = y_2^3 y_1^{\mu_2} y_1,
\]

\[
S(a_{\mu + \delta_3}[X]) = x_2^{\mu_3} x_1^{\mu_2} x_1.
\]
We denote by $\tilde{F}_{3,3}(x,y)$ the series obtained from $F_{3,3}(x,y)$ by factoring out monomials from each binomial factor so that every factor is of the form $(1 - M)$. One then checks that the relation $F_{3,3} = \frac{\tilde{F}_{3,3}}{x^{k_1} y^{k_2} z^{k_3}}$ holds. Compare with (Eqn. (7).) Hence Eqn. (5) becomes

$$F_{3,3} a_{\lambda+\delta_0} [XY] = \sum_{\mu, \nu} g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} x_1 y_1 x_2^2 y_1^2 + \text{lex. gr.}$$

Then,

$$\tilde{F}_{3,3} a_{\lambda+\delta_0} [XY] = x_1^2 x_2^2 y_1^2 y_2^2 \sum_{\mu, \nu} g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} x_2^{\delta_2} x_1^{\delta_1} y_2^{\delta_2} y_1^{\delta_1} + \text{lex. gr.} \quad (32)$$

Truncating the alternant on the left using the preceding computation, Eqn. (22) now gives the series for the atomic Kronecker coefficients (by definition). Note (again) that the initial affine substitution of Theorem 29, namely $x \mapsto x_1^2 x_2^2 y_1^2 y_2^2$, reduces the initial affine combinations of the parts of $\lambda, \mu, \nu$ fortuitously reduce to linear combinations.

$$F_{3,3} x_1^{\lambda_3} x_2^{\lambda_2} y_1^{\lambda_1} y_2^{\lambda_0} = \sum_{\mu, \nu} \tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} x_1^{\mu_3} x_2^{\mu_2} y_1^{\mu_1} y_2^{\mu_0}$$

To make $\tilde{F}_{3,3}$ into the vector partition function $F_{3,3}$ whose matrix $A_{3,3}$ is given above, we need the substitution of Theorem 29, namely $x_1 = s_1 t_1, x_2 = s_1 s_2 t_1^2, y_1 = s_0 s_1 s_2 t_1^2, y_2 = s_0 s_1 s_2 t_1^3$.

This makes

$$x_2^{\mu_3} x_1^{\mu_2} y_1^{\mu_1} y_2^{\mu_0} = s_0^{\nu_2} s_1^{\nu_3} s_2^{\nu_2 + \nu_3} s_3^{\nu_2 + \nu_3} s_4^{\nu_2 + \nu_3} s_5^{\nu_2 + \nu_3} s_6^{\nu_2 + \nu_3} s_7^{\nu_2 + \nu_3} s_8^{\nu_2 + \nu_3} s_9^{\nu_2 + \nu_3} s_{10}^{\nu_2 + \nu_3} s_{11}^{\nu_2 + \nu_3}$$

and

$$x_1^{\lambda_3} x_2^{\lambda_2} y_1^{\lambda_1} y_2^{\lambda_0} = s_0^{a} s_1^{b} s_2^{c} s_3^{d}$$

where

$$a = \lambda_{\geq 4}, \quad b = \lambda_{\geq 2}, \quad c = \lambda_{\geq 3} + \lambda_{\geq 8},$$

$$d = \lambda_2 + 2 \lambda_3 + 2 \lambda_4 + 3 \lambda_5 + 3 \lambda_6 + 4 \lambda_7 + 4 \lambda_8 + 5 \lambda_9;$$

and here we have written $\lambda_{\geq i}$ to mean the sum of all parts $\lambda_i + \lambda_{i+1} + \ldots$

**Proposition 32.** We conclude that the atomic coefficient $\tilde{g}_{\mu, \nu, \lambda}$ is nonzero if and only if all of the following hold:

\[
\begin{align*}
\nu_2 + \nu_3 - a & \geq 0, \\
\mu_2 + \mu_3 + \nu_2 + \nu_3 - b & \geq 0, \\
\mu_3 + \nu_2 + \nu_3 - c & \geq 0, \\
\mu_2 + 2 \mu_3 + 2 \nu_2 + 3 \nu_3 - d & \geq 0.
\end{align*}
\]

## 5 Computing Dilated Kronecker coefficients

### 5.1 Dilated Kronecker Coefficients

Fix $\mu, \nu$ and $\lambda$. The family of Kronecker coefficients given by the image of the function $k \mapsto g_{k, \mu, \nu, \lambda}$, for $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ is a set of dilated Kronecker coefficients, has been the center of a lot of attention. When the lengths of the partitions $\mu, \nu, \lambda$ are bounded by 2, 2, and 4, we can compute them using Theorem 12, and we can also write them as subseries of $F_{n,m}$ in a way that directly connects to Ehrhart functions.
5.2 Examples using Theorem 12

Theorem 12 gives exact formulas for \( g_{k\mu,k\nu,k\lambda} \) when \( \ell(\mu), \ell(\nu) \leq 2, \ell(\lambda) \leq 4 \) and \( \mu_2 \geq \nu_2 \).

Example 33 (The Kronecker function is not an Ehrhart function). Consider the dilated Kronecker coefficient \( g_{(k)(k)(k)} \), for any positive integer \( k \).

By direct computation we see that only the first four monomials of \( P_\lambda \) in Theorem 12 contribute to the Kronecker coefficient:

\[
g_{(k)(k)(k)} = \left[ x^k y^k \right] (x^k - 2x^{k+1} + x^{k+2})F_{2,2}(x,y) \tag{33}
\]

\[
= \left[ s_0^k s_1^k \right] (1 - 2s_1 + s_1^2)F_{2,2}(s_0, s_1) \tag{34}
\]

\[
= ps(k,k) - 2ps(k,k-1) + ps(k,k-2). \tag{35}
\]

Using the formula of Section 2.6 for \( ps(n,m) \), we obtain

\[
g_{(k)(k)(k)} = \begin{cases} 1, & k \text{ even} \\ 0, & k \text{ odd}. \end{cases} \tag{36}
\]

The sequence \( g_{(k)(k)(k)} \) for \( k \geq 0 \) illustrates that the Kronecker coefficients cannot possibly count points in the dilations of a polytope because such sequences are necessarily weakly increasing. That is, the Kronecker function is not an Ehrhart function. See [Kin09, BOR09b] for related results and conjectures.

Remark 34 (The holes of the Kronecker cone). Example 33 also illustrates the origin of the holes in the Kronecker cone that we saw in Figure 1. Note that the holes are all in the face of the Kronecker cone defined by equations \( \mu_1 = \mu_2, \nu_1 = \nu_2, \lambda_1 = \lambda_2, \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0 \). It is always the case that the zeroes of the Kronecker cone are on its walls (facets) [Man15].

This can also be seen for the example in Figure 1 where the holes are all inside the face defined by \( \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 \).

Example 35. Consider an example of Baldoni and Vergne [BVW16, Section 5.1.1], whose methods are quite different from ours. Let \( \lambda = (132, 38, 19, 11), \mu = (110, 90), \nu = (120, 80) \). We will compute an expression for the dilated Kronecker coefficient \( g_{k\mu,k\nu,k\lambda} \).

We have \( k(\mu_2 + \nu_2) = 170k, k(\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) = 30k, k(\lambda_2 + \lambda_1) = 49k, k\min(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3, \lambda_1 + \lambda_4) = k\min(57, 143) = 57k \). Eqn. (11) of Theorem 12 becomes

\[
y^{30k} (x^{49k} - x^{57k+1} - 0 \cdot x^{143k+1} + 0 \cdot x^{151k+2}) + y^{49k+1} (-x^{30k-1} + x^{57k+1} + 0 \cdot x^{143k+1}).
\]

From Proposition 9 and Section 2.6,

\[
g_{k\mu,k\nu,k\lambda} = ps(50k, 91k) - ps(50k, 83k-1) - ps(31k - 1, 91k - 2) + ps(31k - 1, 64k - 2).
\]

From Section 2.6, the last two terms cancel each other because both correspond to Region II in Figure 4, and hence depend only on the first argument \( n \) of \( ps(n,m) \). The two remaining terms correspond to Region III. The reader can check that using the formula for Region III gives

\[
g_{k\mu,k\nu,k\lambda} = 52k^2 + \frac{25}{2}k + \frac{3}{4} + \frac{(-1)^k}{4},
\]

in agreement with the result in [BVW16, Section 5.1.1].
5.3 A generating function for Kronecker coefficient dilations, an approach from analytical combinatorics.

The coefficient extraction that we use to write Kronecker coefficients can be done in bulk at the generating function level to encode dilated Kronecker products. Consider the formal series

$$\Phi_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}(z) := \sum g_{k\mu,k\nu,k\lambda} z^k.$$ 

We can express $\Phi_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}(z)$ as a diagonal of a rational function. A diagonal is a subseries defined as follows. Let $x = x_1, \ldots, x_d$. Given a multivariate Taylor series,

$$A(x) = \sum_{(i_1, \ldots, i_d) \in \mathbb{N}^d} a(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_d) x_1^{i_1} x_2^{i_2} \cdots x_d^{i_d},$$

the central diagonal of this series, denoted $\text{Diag}_{x_1,\ldots,x_d} A(x)$ is the univariate series $\sum a(k, k, \ldots, k) z^k$.

More generally, we define the diagonal along the ray $r = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_d)$ to be the univariate series:

$$\text{Diag}_{r_1,\ldots,r_d} A(x) := \sum a(kr_1, kr_2, \ldots, kr_d) z^k.$$ 

If we apply Diag to a rational function, or more generally any function, it is a shorthand for the application of the operator to the series development around the origin with variables considered in order $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_d$.

For example, from Eqn. (34) we have

$$\sum_k g(k,k,k,k) z^k = \Delta \frac{1-2s_1 + s_1^2}{(1-s_0)(1-s_1)(1-s_0s_1)(1-s_0s_1^2)}. \quad (37)$$

Dilations of the atomic coefficients can be expressed as diagonals of rational functions, given Eqn. (9) and Proposition 10:

$$\sum \tilde{g}_{k\mu,k\nu,k\lambda} z^k = \sum \left[ \frac{k(\nu_2-\lambda_3-\lambda_4)}{s_0} \frac{k(\mu_2+\nu_2-\lambda_2-2\lambda_3)}{s_1} \right] \frac{1}{(1-s_0)(1-s_0s_1)(1-s_0s_1^2)(1-s_1)} z^k.$$

Furthermore, by factoring out the lexicographically least monomial in the expression in Theorem 12 we can write the generating function for dilations of arbitrary Kronecker coefficients as diagonals of rational functions.

Generating functions which can be expressed as diagonals of rational functions are well studied in their own right, particularly from a point of view of asymptotics and computation. Recently, Bostan et al. [BLS17] showed an equivalence between generating functions of binomial sums, and diagonals of rational functions. Thus, Kronecker coefficients are multiple binomial sums.$^3$

There are explicit expressions for the coefficient asymptotics of rational function diagonals. We point the reader to two books which cover the topic [PW13][Example 10.2.5] and [Mish19][Chapter 9]. The methods can be used to determine dominant asymptotics of the dilated Kronecker function as $n$ tends to infinity. The first step is to rewrite the quotient $F_{n,m}$ as a sum of rational functions.

$^3$This is the class of multivariate sequences that contains the binomial coefficient sequence and that is closed under pointwise addition, pointwise multiplication, linear change of variables and partial summation.
\( F_{n,m} = \sum G_i/H_i \) such that the point \((1,1,\ldots,1)\) is a transversal intersection for each \(H_i\). Finding such a form is done via a systematic computation. We have done this in the case of \(F_{2,2}\) and \(F_{2,3}\). The computations for \(F_{3,3}\) have recently been completed by Stefan Trandafir. This is the subject of ongoing work. The asymptotics make clear the chambers of quasipolynomiality, and the technique gives computational tests for when the degree of the quasipolynomial will drop. It is directly related to the degree to which the numerator vanishes at the critical point, which in this case is the all ones vector. Manivel [Man15, Remark 1] remarked:

One interesting implication of the quasipolynomiality property is that, knowing the Kronecker coefficients asymptotically, in fact we know them completely.

It is an active area of research to develop computer algebra methods to make such diagonal computations effective. There are numerous strategies possible. For example, there is a method using systems of linear differential equations, made effective in several implementations [Chy00, Kou13]. In each case, the algorithm execution is limited by heavy intermediary Gröbner basis computations. The two-variable case, \(F_{2,2}\), is easily manageable, but the computations are not currently possible for larger \(n,m\).

6 Final comments

6.1 Vector partition functions and other families of coefficients

Most interesting families of coefficients related to the representation theory of the general linear group can be defined by the evaluation of a Schur function on a finite alphabet:

\[
\begin{align*}
    s_\lambda [X + Y] &= \sum_{\mu, \nu} c_{\mu, \nu}^\lambda s_\mu [X] s_\nu [Y], & \text{Littlewood Richardson coefficients} \\
    s_\lambda [XY] &= \sum_{\mu, \nu} g_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} s_\mu [X] s_\nu [Y], & \text{Kronecker coefficients} \\
    s_\lambda [XY + X + Y] &= \sum_{\mu, \nu} h_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} s_\mu [X] s_\nu [Y], & \text{Heisenberg coefficients} \\
    s_\lambda [s_\theta] [X + Y] &= \sum_{\mu, \nu} a_{\mu, \nu, \lambda} s_\mu [X] s_\nu [Y], & \text{plethysm coefficients}
\end{align*}
\]

and so on. They all share the common property of being defined by the evaluation of a Schur function on an alphabet \(P(X, Y)\), where \(P(X, Y)\) is a polynomial function of two alphabets \(X\) and \(Y\) with integer coefficients.

The approach presented in this work for the Kronecker coefficients will apply to the study of all such families of coefficients. Therefore, the Littlewood-Richardson, Heisenberg, and plethysm functions are all given by quasipolynomials. Let us briefly discuss the well-known simple case of the Littlewood–Richardson coefficients.
6.2 The Littlewood–Richardson coefficients and the resultant

In this section we explore a beautiful and unexpected relation between the resultant, the alternant \( a_{\delta_n+m}[X+Y] \), and the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients.

Let \( P \) be a monic polynomial. Vieta’s formula expresses the coefficients of polynomial \( P \) as ± the elementary symmetric functions evaluated at its roots. Therefore, we can think of the alphabet \( X \) (of size \( n = \deg(P) \)) as listing the roots of \( P = \prod_{i=1}^n (x - x_i) \).

In this setting, the alternant \( a_{\delta_n}[X] \) is just the square of the discriminant of \( P \). Similarly, if \( Q \) is a monic polynomial of degree \( m \), then \( a_{\delta_m}[Y] \) is the square of the discriminant of \( Q \).

Note that for the Littlewood-Richardson coefficients, we have

\[
\frac{a_{\delta_n}[X] a_{\delta_m}[Y]}{a_{\delta_{n+m}}[X+Y]} = \frac{1}{\prod_{j,i} (x_j - y_i)} = \frac{1}{\text{Res}(P,Q)}
\]

the product running over all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( i = 1, \ldots, m \). Elegantly, the function appearing in the denominator of this expression is the resultant of the monic polynomials \( P \) and \( Q \).

For fixed \( n \) and \( m \), the matrix \( A_{n,m} \) associated to the vector partition function is an \((n+m) \times (nm)\) matrix with entries equal to \( \pm 1 \) or zero. For each pair \( j, i \) there is a column in this matrix, corresponding to the factor \((1 - x_j^{-1} y_i)\), with the entry in the top \( n \) rows (indexing the \( x_j \)) equal \(-1\), and the entry in the bottom \( m \) rows (indexing the \( y_i \)), equal to 1; the remaining entries are zero. A couple of examples will illustrate this construction.

\[
A_{2,2} = \begin{pmatrix}
-1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & -1 \\
1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

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

Define the stretched Littlewood-Richardson function \( P^\lambda_{\mu,\nu}(k) := c^k_{\mu,\nu}. \) The same argument used to show that the Kronecker function is a quasipolynomial implies that the Littlewood-Richardson function is also a quasipolynomial. However, a stronger statement holds.

A matrix is \textit{totally unimodular} if its square submatrices all have determinant \( \pm 1 \) or 0. Equivalently, all nonzero minors are \( \pm 1 \). It is straightforward to see that \( A_{n,m} \) is totally unimodular. For this we could either use the characterization totally unimodular matrices of Ghouila-Houri [GH62], or give an inductive argument.

The total unimodularity of \( A_{n,m} \) immediately implies the well-known fact that the Littlewood–Richardson function is a polynomial (and not just a quasipolynomial). See [Stu95, DLS2003].

**Corollary 36.** Let \( n \) and \( m \) be two fixed integers. Let \( \nu \vdash n \), \( \mu \vdash m \), and \( \lambda \vdash n+m \) be partitions.

Then the degree of \( P^\lambda_{\nu,\mu} \) is always less than or equal to the co-rank of \( A_{\ell(\nu),\ell(\mu)} \):

\[
\deg(P^\lambda_{\nu,\mu}) \leq (\ell(\nu) - 1)(\ell(\mu) - 1).
\]

Moreover, this bound is sharp.
Proof. It is easy to see that these matrices always have rank $n + m - 1$. The matrix structure is as follows. The $nm$ columns are partitioned left to right into $n$ blocks each of size $m$. The bottom $m$ rows of each block constitute a copy of the $m$ by $m$ identity matrix, contributing $m$ pivots. Since every column has exactly two nonzero entries, a $+1$ and a $-1$, the sum of the rows is the zero vector. In the top $n$ rows, each column has exactly one nonzero entry, equal to $(-1)$. Each of rows $2, \ldots, n$ contributes one pivot, since it consists of all zeros except for one block of $m$ columns filled with consecutive $(-1)$s. Hence the co-rank of the matrix is $nm - (m + n - 1) = (n-1)(m-1)$. □

6.3 Other families of coefficients: The plethystic and Heisenberg coefficients.

A similar argument will show that the plethystic and Heisenberg coefficients can be computed as an alternating sum of vector partition functions. The implications of this fact will be the theme of another work. The quasipolynomial corresponding to some families of plethysms has been studied by Kahle and Michalek in \cite{KM16}, and from a different point of view by Colmenarejo \cite{Col17}.

6.4 Are the atomic Kronecker coefficients an upper bound for the Kronecker coefficients?

Theorem \ref{atomic} suggests the following, using an analogous definition of atomic for other dimensions:

Conjecture 37. For any dimension, the atomic Kronecker coefficient is an upper bound for the Kronecker coefficient: $\tilde{g}_{\mu,\nu,\lambda} \geq g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}$.

If the asymptotics of coefficients of \(F_{n,m}\) are known, such a bound would be useful for determining when a coefficient is nonzero. This result could be very useful to find triples in the Kronecker polyhedron, such that $g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda} = 0$. This would have importance in Geometric Complexity Theory. Manivel \cite[Remark 2]{Man15} noticed that although the dilated Kronecker coefficient $g(k\mu, k\nu, k\lambda)$ is a quasipolynomial function of $k \geq 0$, its highest order term is really polynomial. More precisely, the period at the level of the coefficients increases for the terms of lower degrees. Can we use results on diagonals to prove explicit results of this nature?

6.5 Towards a combinatorial interpretation

Let us return to one of our motivating questions: Can we develop a combinatorial interpretation of Kronecker coefficients from this work? A first step could be to determine the conditions on $\lambda, \mu$ and $\nu$ under which the Kronecker coefficient is an Ehrhart polynomial. A second approach could be to apply the work of Garrabrant and Pak \cite{GP14} wherein they interpret of diagonals of (combinatorial) rational functions using tiling systems. Their constraints are met here, and would connect a new object to Kronecker coefficients.

Some other families of Kronecker coefficients are known to count integer partitions satisfying some restrictions. Manivel \cite{Man11} encountered them looking at rectangular Kronecker coefficients, A. Garsia, N. Wallach, G. Xin and M. Zabrocki \cite{GWXZ09} found that only some elegant families of partitions appeared in some particular Kronecker products, (like in $s_{d,d} * s_{d,d}$), I. Pak, G. Panova, and E. Vallejo \cite{PPV16} used partition functions in their attack on the Saxl conjecture, and Pak and Panova \cite{PP17a} have expressed some families (again of rectangular Kronecker coefficients) as the difference of two partition functions. Colmenarejo and Rosas \cite{CR15, Col16} determined some other families of Kronecker coefficients given by vector partition functions and plane partitions.
6.6 Comparison with other approaches

Both Christandl, Doran, and Walter [CDW12] and Baldoni, Vergne, and Walter [BVW16] describe and implement algorithms to compute the Kronecker coefficients. They work in dimensions that are the sum of the lengths of the partitions – and hence are much greater than what we see here.

More recently, Igor Pak and Greta Panova used an elegant approach to obtain a bound for the calculation of the Kronecker coefficients, see the proof of Lemma 5.4 in [PP17b]. They extracted the Kronecker coefficients from the generalized Cauchy identity (see Ex I.7.10 in [Mac95] or Ex 7.78 in [Sta99]):

\[
\sum_{\lambda,\mu,\nu} g_{\lambda,\mu,\nu} s_{\lambda}[X] s_{\mu}[Y] s_{\nu}[Z] = \prod_{i,j,k} \frac{1}{1 - x_i y_j z_k}
\]

They then showed that this could be expressed as a signed sum of three dimensional contingency arrays with certain margins.

7 Appendix: The atomic Kronecker coefficient is an upper bound for the Kronecker coefficient for the case 2 – 2 – 4

Recall that in Theorem 18 we claimed that for a triple of partitions \(\lambda, \mu, \nu\) of the same integer, such that \(\ell(\lambda) \leq 4, \ell(\mu), \ell(\nu) \leq 2, \) and \(\mu_2 \geq \nu_2\), the atomic Kronecker coefficient \(\tilde{g}_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}\) is always greater than or equal to the actual Kronecker coefficient \(g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}\). In this appendix we use our polyhedral geometry approach to prove this result. Theorem 12 and its applications showed how the Kronecker coefficient is completely determined by the functions \(p_{S}(n,m)\). Our proof, depending heavily on the fact that the \(p_{S}(n,m)\) are Ehrhart functions, consists of a careful analysis of the contributions of each term in the polynomial \(P_{\lambda}\) in the proof of Theorem 12.

Our arguments will reveal a remarkable relationship between the seven monomials in \(P_{\lambda}\). For brevity we will label the exponents of \(y\) and \(x\) appearing in Eqn. 11 as follows:

\[
b = \lambda_3 + \lambda_4, a_0 = \lambda_2 + \lambda_4, a_1 = \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + 1, a_2 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_4 + 1, a_3 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_3 + 2.
\]

Combining Eqns. (13), (14), we have the inequalities

\[
b \leq a_0 < \{a_1, a_2\} < a_3.
\]

The polynomial \(P_{\lambda}\) is then

\[
P_{\lambda} = y^b(x^{a_0} - x^{a_1} - x^{a_2} + x^{a_3}) + y^{a_0+1}(-x^{b-1} + x^{a_1} + x^{a_2}).
\]

Recall that the first monomial, \(y^b x^{a_0}\), is the one that determines the atomic Kronecker coefficient. We will call this the atomic monomial. The dependency digraph of Figure 8 for the signed monomials in \(P_{\lambda}\) is a consequence of Theorem 12 and the inequalities (38), (15), (16). If \(M_1, M_2\) are signed monomials, a directed edge from node \(M_1\) to node \(M_2\) in the digraph signifies that if \(M_1\) makes a nonzero contribution to the Kronecker coefficient (as described by Theorem 12), then so must the monomial \(M_2\).

We will examine the contribution to \(g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}\) of each of the three non-atomic monomials in \(P_{\lambda}\) with positive coefficient. Recalling Eqn. (12) from Theorem 12, this in turn will necessarily entail a detailed analysis of the vector partition function \(p_{S}(n,m)\) of Section 2.6. The final result exhibits
the following surprising phenomenon in the monomials of $P_\lambda$. We will show that in fact, every non-atomic monomial with positive coefficient can be matched with a monomial with negative coefficient to yield a net nonpositive value (see the coloured arrows in Figure 8). For clarity of exposition, the technical lemmas have been relegated to the end of the section.

**Proof of Theorem 18.** The atomic Kronecker coefficient is determined by only the first monomial $y^b x^{a_0}$. In order to prove that the result of the corresponding coefficient extraction from $F_{2,2}$ is never less than the actual Kronecker coefficient, it suffices to show that the contribution of the three remaining (non-atomic) positively signed monomials, viz.

$$+y^{a_0+1} x^{a_1}, +y^{a_0+1} x^{a_2}, +y^b x^{a_3}$$

is offset by that of the three negative ones,

$$-y^b x^{a_1}, -y^b x^{a_2}, -y^{a_0+1} x^{b-1}.$$

More precisely, we say that a positive monomial $+M_1$ is **offset** by a negative monomial $-M_2$ if the contribution of $M_1 - M_2$ to the Kronecker coefficient is **nonpositive**.

Lemmas 38 to 44 which follow will establish that one of the following two scenarios, corresponding respectively to the blue arrows and the red arrows in Figure 8, **must** occur.

The contribution of

1. $+y^{a_0+1} x^{a_1}$ is offset by $-y^b x^{a_1}$ AND

2. $+y^{a_0+1} x^{a_2}$ is offset by $-y^{a_0+1} x^{b-1}$ AND

3. $+y^b x^{a_3}$ is offset by $-y^b x^{a_2}$;

OR the contribution of
1. \( +y^{a_0+1}x^{a_1} \) is offset by \( -y^{a_0+1}x^{b-1} \) AND
2. \( +y^{a_0+1}x^{a_2} \) is offset by \( -y^{b}x^{a_2} \) AND
3. \( +y^{b}x^{a_3} \) is offset by \( -y^{b}x^{a_1} \).

The above two scenarios show that, apart from the monomial \( y^{b}x^{a_0} \), whenever there is a contribution from a positively signed monomial in \( P_{\lambda} \) to the Kronecker coefficient, there is an offsetting negatively signed monomial which also contributes, resulting in a net nonpositive contribution.

This completes the proof that the monomial \( y^{b}x^{a_0} \) gives the maximal contribution to the Kronecker coefficient, i.e. that \( \tilde{g}_{\mu,\nu,\lambda} \) is an upper bound.

We now prove the technical lemmas we need on the monotonic behaviour of the function \( p_{S}(n, m) \). For brevity, throughout these arguments, we will write \( c(m) \) for the expression \( \frac{7}{8} + \frac{(-1)^m}{8} \). Note that \( c(m) \leq 1 \) for all \( m \).

**Lemma 38.** The partition function \( p_{S}(n, m) \) satisfies

\[
p_{S}(n, m) \leq p_{S}(n, m') = \binom{n+2}{2} \quad \text{whenever } m' \geq 2n.
\]

**Proof.** We have three cases.

**Case 1:** Suppose \( n \in [0, \frac{m}{2}] \). Then we claim that \( p_{S}(n, m) = \binom{n+2}{2} = p_{S}(n, m') \) for all \( m' \geq 2n \). This is just a consequence of the definition.

**Case 2:** Suppose \( n \in (\frac{m}{2}, m) \). We must show that \( p_{S}(n, m) \leq p_{S}(n, m') \) for all \( m' \geq 2n \).

From Figure 5, when \( \frac{m}{2} \leq n < m \), \( p_{S}(n, m) \) is given by the formula for Region III, while \( p_{S}(n, m') \) is given by the binomial coefficient \( \binom{n+2}{2} \). Inspecting the third figure in Figure 4, and using the fact that the \( p_{S}(n, m) \) count lattice points in the appropriate regions, it is immediate that the difference \( p_{S}(n, m') - p_{S}(n, m) \) is nonnegative for \( n \) in this interval and \( m' \geq 2n \).

**Case 3:** Suppose \( n \geq m \geq 0 \). We must show that \( p_{S}(n, m) \leq \binom{n+2}{2} = p_{S}(n, m') \) for all \( m' \geq 2n \). Again this is immediate by the same geometric argument, inspecting the first and third figures in Figure 4.

**Lemma 39.** Suppose \( \frac{m}{2} < \frac{M}{2} < n < M \). Then \( p_{S}(n, M) - p_{S}(n, m) \geq 0 \).

**Proof.** Both partition functions are computed according to the formula for Region III in Figure 5, and hence count lattice points in a convex polytope (see Figure 4). They are therefore increasing functions in each argument.

**Lemma 40.** Fix \( k \geq 0 \). Then \( p_{S}(n, n + k) \), for \( 0 \leq k \leq n \), is an increasing function of \( n \).

**Proof.** From Section 2.6, we see that the conditions on \( k, n \), imply that \( p_{S}(n, n + k) \) corresponds to Region III in Figure 5. As before, since the function \( p_{S}(n, n + k) \) counts lattice points in a convex polytope (see the third figure in Figure 4), it is an increasing function of \( n \).

Consider first the monomial \( +y^{a_0+1}x^{a_i}, i = 1, 2 \). Note the crucial fact that from the dependency relations, if either of these monomials contributes a nonzero coefficient, so does the preceding negative monomial \( -y^{a_0+1}x^{b-1} \).
Lemma 41. Let $i = 1, 2$. Then the net contribution of the monomials $y^{a_0+1}(-x^{b-1}+x^{a_1})$ to $g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}$ is negative or zero.

Proof. The value contributed to $g_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}$ by the monomial $+y^{a_0+1}x^{a_i}, i = 1, 2$, is the coefficient $[x^{\mu_2}y^{\nu_2}]$ in the product $+y^{a_0+1}x^{a_i}F_{2,2}$, which in turn is given by the vector partition function

$$p_S(\nu_2 - (a_0 + 1), \nu_2 - (a_0 + 1) + (\mu_2 - a_i)). \quad (39)$$

On the other hand, the contribution from the negative monomial $-y^{a_0+1}x^{b-1}$ was shown in the proof of Theorem 12 to be coming from Region II in Figure 5. It therefore contributes the value

$$-p_S(\nu_2 - (a_0 + 1), \nu_2 - (a_0 + 1) + (\mu_2 - b + 1)) = -\left(\frac{\nu_2 - (a_0 + 1)}{2}\right). \quad (40)$$

But now Lemma 38 says the net contribution of these two monomials is negative or zero, as claimed.

However, this is of course not sufficient to establish our theorem, because both positive monomials $+y^{a_0+1}x^{a_i}, i = 1, 2$ can make a nonzero contribution. Appealing to the dependency relations, we see that a positive contribution from $+y^{a_0+1}x^{a_i}$ forces a negative contribution from the monomial $-y^{b}x^{a_i}$, for each $i = 1, 2$.

Lemma 42. If $\mu_2 - a_i \leq 0$, then the net contribution of $+y^{a_0+1}x^{a_i}$ and $-y^{b}x^{a_i}$ is negative or zero.

Proof. The contribution of $+y^{a_0+1}x^{a_i}$ is given by the vector partition function Eqn. (39), while that of $-y^{b}x^{a_i}$ is given by

$$-p_S(\nu_2 - b, \nu_2 - b + (\mu_2 - a_i)). \quad (41)$$

Because $\mu_2 - a_i \leq 0$, in each case we have a vector partition function of the form $p_S(n, m)$ where $m < n$. Hence each vector partition function corresponds to Region I in Figure 5. But that function is clearly an increasing function of its second argument, $m$. Also, we know from the inequalities (38) above that $\nu_2 - (a_0 + 1) + (\mu_2 - a_i) < \nu_2 - b + (\mu_2 - a_i)$. Hence the claim follows.

Lemma 43. If $\mu_2 - a_i > 0$, then the net contribution of $+y^{a_0+1}x^{a_i}$ and $-y^{b}x^{a_i}$ is negative or zero.

Proof. We must again carefully examine the respective contributions of these two monomials, which are

$$p_S(\nu_2 - (a_0 + 1), \nu_2 - (a_0 + 1) + (\mu_2 - a_i)). \quad (42)$$

and

$$-p_S(\nu_2 - b, \nu_2 - b + (\mu_2 - a_i)). \quad (43)$$

Each function above is of the form $p_S(n, m)$ where $n < m$, so it is evaluated according to the formula for Region II or Region III in Figure 5. We know $\nu_2 - (a_0 + 1) < \nu_2 - b$. We have three cases to consider:

**Case 1:** Assume $\nu_2 - (a_0 + 1) < \nu_2 - b < \mu_2 - a_i$. Then each vector partition function above corresponds to Region II in Figure 5, given by a binomial coefficient so the net contribution is a difference of two binomial coefficients $(\nu_2-(a_0+1)+2) - (\nu_2-b+2)$, and this is clearly negative in view of the inequality (38).

**Case 2:** Assume $0 \leq \nu_2 - (a_0 + 1) < \mu_2 - a_i < \nu_2 - b$. Set $\mu_2 - a_i = k$, $n_1 = \nu_2 - (a_0 + 1)$, $n_2 = \nu_2 - b$. Thus we have $0 \leq n_1 < k < n_2$. In particular, $n_1 - n_2 \leq -2$. 38
Since $2n_1 < n_1 + k$, we know that $p_S(n_1, n_1 + k)$, which is the value of the contribution from the monomial $y^{a_0+1}x^{a_i}$, is specified by Region II in Figure 5, and is therefore given by the binomial coefficient $\binom{n_1+2}{2}$.

Since $n_2 \in (\frac{m_3 + k}{2}, n_2 + k)$, we conclude similarly that the contribution from the monomial $y^b x^{a_i}$ is given by computing $p_S(n_2, n_2 + k)$ using the formula for Region III.

Hence, using the expression for $p_S(n, n + k)$ for Region III in Figure 5, the net contribution of $-y^b x^{a_i} + y^{a_0+1} x^{a_i}$ is given by

$$p_S(n_1, n_1 + k) - p_S(n_2, n_2 + k)$$

$$= n_1^2 + 3n_1 + 2 - \left( \frac{n_2^2}{4} + n_2 \left( \frac{k}{2} + 1 \right) - \frac{k^2}{4} + \frac{k}{2} + c(n_2 + k) \right)$$

Consider the function $f(k) = \frac{n_1^2 + 3n_1 + 2}{2} - \left( \frac{n_2^2}{4} + n_2 \left( \frac{k}{2} + 1 \right) - \frac{k^2}{4} + \frac{k}{2} \right)$, a polynomial in $k$. It is easy to check that $f'(k) = \frac{1}{2} (k - 1 - n_2) \leq -1$ when $k < n_2$, and hence this is a decreasing function of $k$ with maximum value $f(n_1)$ in the interval $[n_1, n_2 - 1]$. But

$$f(n_1) = \frac{n_1^2}{2} - \frac{n_2^2}{4} + \frac{3n_1}{2} - \frac{n_1 n_2}{2} - n_2 + 1 + \frac{n_1^2}{4} - \frac{n_1}{2}$$

$$= \frac{n_1^2 - n_2^2}{4} + (n_1 - n_2) + \frac{n_1^2}{2} - \frac{n_1 n_2}{2} + 1$$

$$= (n_1 - n_2) \left( \frac{n_1 + n_2}{4} + 1 + \frac{n_1}{2} \right)$$

Since $n_1 - n_2 \leq -2$, and the expression in square brackets is at least $\frac{5}{4}$, we see that $f(k) \leq f(n_1 + 1) < f(n_1) < -\frac{3}{2}$. To find the net contribution of the two monomials, we need to add the value of $c(n_2 + k)$. But this is at most 1. It follows that the net contribution is negative.

**Case 3:** Assume $0 < \mu_2 - a_i \leq \nu_2 - (a_0 + 1) < \nu_2 - b$. Again set $\mu_2 - a_i = k$, $n_1 = \nu_2 - (a_0 + 1)$, $n_2 = \nu_2 - b$. The contribution of the monomial $y^{a_0+1} x^{a_i}$ is $p_S(n_1, n_1 + k)$ while that of the monomial $-y^b x^{a_i}$ is $-p_S(n_2, n_2 + k)$. The inequalities imply that the function $p_S$ corresponds to Region III in Figure 5 in both cases. Hence Lemma 40 applies (because $0 < k \leq n_1 < n_2$), showing that the net contribution, $p_S(n_1, n_1 + k) - p_S(n_2, n_2 + k)$, is indeed negative or zero.

It remains to consider what happens when the last monomial with positive coefficient in the first line of $P_i$, $y^b x^{a_3}$, contributes to the Kronecker coefficient. From the dependency relations, we know that then all the monomials $y^b x^{a_i}$ must contribute nonzero terms as well, and possibly also one or both monomials $y^{a_0+1} x^{a_i}$. In the latter case there is also necessarily a negative contribution from $-y^{a_0+1} x^b$.

**Lemma 44.** For each $i = 1, 2$, the net contribution of the two monomials $-y^b x^{a_i} + y^b x^{a_3}$ is always negative or zero.

**Proof.** Set $n = \nu_2 - b$, $m_i = n + (\mu_2 - a_i), i = 1, 2, 3$. The contribution of $y^b x^{a_3}$ is $p_S(n, m_3)$, and that of $-y^b x^{a_i}, i = 1, 2$, is $-p_S(n, m_3)$. Note that $m_3 < m_i, i = 1, 2$, in view of (38).

We will examine the behaviour of the function $p_S(n, m)$ according to where $n$ falls in each of the intervals below. Although there are two categories:

$$0 < \frac{m_3}{2} < m_3 \leq \frac{m_4}{2} < m_i, \text{ or } 0 < \frac{m_3}{2} < \frac{m_4}{2} < m_3 < m_i,$$
both can be treated by the same arguments, because the same difference of vector partition functions \( p_S(n,m) \) comes into play in each case.

**Case 1:** If \( n \leq \frac{m_3}{2} \), then in either category, both \( p_S(n,m_3) \) and \( p_S(n,m_i) \) are computed by the formula for Region II in Figure 5, and hence both equal the binomial coefficient \( \binom{n^2}{2} \). The net contribution of \(-y^b x^a + y^b x^{a_3}\) here is zero.

**Case 2:** If \( n > m_i \), then in either category, both \( p_S(n,m_3) \) and \( p_S(n,m_i) \) are computed by the formula for Region I in Figure 5. But the quasipolynomial for Region I is clearly an increasing function of the second argument of \( p_S \), and hence, (since \( m_3 < m_i \)), \(-p_S(n,m_i) + p_S(n,m_3)\) is negative or zero.

**Case 3:** Suppose \( \frac{m_3}{2} \leq n \leq m_3 \). Then both functions \( p_S \) correspond to Region III, and Lemma 39 applies directly to show that \(-p_S(n,m_i) + p_S(n,m_3)\) is negative or zero.

**Case 4:** Suppose \( m_3 \leq n \leq \frac{m_3}{2} \). Then the monomial \(-y^b x^{a_i}\) contributes \( p_S(n,m_i) \) which is now a binomial coefficient since \( n \leq \frac{m_3}{2} \). By Lemma 38, the net contribution here is negative or zero.

**Case 5:** Suppose \( 0 < \frac{m_3}{2} < m_3 \leq \frac{m_3}{2} < n < m_i \).

We need to examine the difference

\[
p_S(n,m_3) - p_S(n,m_i),
\]

where the first function corresponds to Region I and the second to region III. We will consider the function \( f(n) = p_S(n,m_3) - p_S(n,m_i) \) on the interval \([m_i/2, m_i]\). We have

\[
f(n) = \frac{m_3^2}{4} + m_3 + c(m_3) - (nm_i - \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{m_i^2}{4} + \frac{n + m_i}{2} + c(m_i)).
\]

One checks that \( f'(n) = -(m_i - n + 1/2) \leq -\frac{3}{2} \), and hence the function is decreasing with maximum at \( \frac{m_i}{2} \). This value is checked to be

\[
f(\frac{m_i}{2}) = \frac{1}{4} (m_3^2 - \frac{m_i^2}{2}) + (m_3 - \frac{3m_i}{4}) + c(m_3) - c(m_i).
\]

But \( c(m_3) - c(m_i) \leq \frac{1}{4} \) as before, and we have \( m_3 < m_i \). Hence \( f(\frac{m_i}{2}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \) is negative, and so is \( f(n) \).

**Case 6:** Suppose \( 0 < \frac{m_3}{2} < \frac{m_3}{2} < m_3 < n < m_i \). Exactly the same argument applies to this case, since we still have \( m_3 < n < m_i \), which was the only inequality we used in the preceding argument. This completes the proof of the lemma.
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