JANTZEN FILTRATION OF WEYL MODULES, PRODUCT OF YOUNG SYMMETRIZERS AND DENOMINATOR OF YOUNG’S SEMINORMAL BASIS
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Abstract. Let $G$ be a connected reductive algebraic group over an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$, $\Delta(\lambda)$ denote the Weyl module of $G$ of highest weight $\lambda$ and $\iota_{\lambda,\mu} : \Delta(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu)$ be the canonical $G$-morphism. We study the split condition for $\iota_{\lambda,\mu}$ over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$, and apply this as an approach to compare the Jantzen filtrations of the Weyl modules $\Delta(\lambda)$ and $\Delta(\lambda + \mu)$. In the case when $G$ is of type $A$, we show that the split condition is closely related to the product of certain Young symmetrizers and is further characterized by the denominator of a certain Young’s seminormal basis vector in certain cases. We obtain explicit formulas for the split condition in some cases.

1. Introduction

Let $G$ be a connected reductive algebraic group over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{F}$ of prime characteristic $p$. The Jantzen filtration of a Weyl module of $G$, introduced in [9], enjoys a rich structure, which led to many remarkable results (see, for example, [1, 2, 10, 12, 16]), giving us a more complete understanding of the representation theory of $G$.

Despite these advances, how these filtrations for different Weyl modules are related remains to this day a very difficult open problem. Conjectures concerning this open problem include the Jantzen’s conjecture, stated in [1], that relates the Jantzen filtrations of two Weyl modules with adjacent highest weights, and Xi’s conjecture [13] Conjecture H which implies a relation between the Jantzen filtrations of $\Delta(\lambda)$ and that of $\Delta(\lambda + p(p - 1)\rho)$, where $\lambda$ is a $p$-restricted dominant weight and $\rho$ is the half sum of all positive roots.

In this paper, we concern ourselves with the relationship between the Jantzen filtrations of the Weyl modules $\Delta(\lambda)$ and $\Delta(\lambda + \mu)$ for two dominant weights $\lambda$ and $\mu$. Let $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ be the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ localized at the prime ideal $(p)$, and write $\Delta\mathbb{Z}(p)(\lambda)$ for the $i$-th term in the Jantzen filtration of the Weyl module $\Delta\mathbb{Z}(p)(\lambda)$ over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$, and similarly for the weights $\mu$ and $\lambda + \mu$. Our first main result (Theorem 3.1) states that if the canonical $G$-morphism $\iota_{\lambda,\mu} : \Delta(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu)$ admits a splitting map defined over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$, then $\Delta\mathbb{Z}(p)(\lambda)$ may be embedded into $\Delta\mathbb{Z}(p)(\lambda + \mu)^i$ for all $i$.

The split condition for $\iota_{\lambda,\mu}$ over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ appears to be of independent interest. Indeed, Andersen communicated to us some necessary conditions for this splitting by considering the restriction to $SL_2$; see Proposition 3.3. In the case when $G$ is the general linear group, the split condition for $\lambda = (m)$ and $\mu = (n)$ is obtained by Donkin [3, §4.8(12) Proposition] (see also Proposition 3.4) and has played a crucial role in the determination of the global dimensions of Schur algebras [17] (see also [4, §4.8]). We note also that the split condition for $\lambda$ an arbitrary partition and $\mu = (1)$ can be deduced from the theory of translation functors developed in [3].

Having shown that the splitting of $\iota_{\lambda,\mu}$ over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ plays a significant role in the comparison of the Jantzen filtrations of $\Delta(\lambda)$ and $\Delta(\lambda + \mu)$, we seek to determine some necessary and sufficient conditions for this splitting for the case of the general linear groups. Our second main result (Theorem 3.7) gives such a condition in terms of $\theta_{\lambda,\mu}$, which is the greatest common divisor of the coefficients of the product of certain Young symmetrizers in the integral group ring of symmetric groups. In the case when the Young diagram of $\lambda + \mu$ can
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be obtained by putting the Young diagrams of \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) side by side, we show further that
\( \theta_{\lambda,\mu} \) can be expressed in terms of \( d_{\lambda,\mu} \), the denominator of a certain Young’s seminormal basis vector.

We conclude the paper by an explicit computation of \( \theta_{\lambda,\mu} \) for two cases: \( \lambda = (1^n) \) and \( \mu = (m) \), and \( \lambda = (k, \ell) \) and \( \mu = (m) \). In particular, the determination of \( \theta_{(k,\ell), (m)} \) gives us a split condition for \( \iota_{(k,\ell), (m)} \) over \( \mathbb{Z}(p) \) which generalizes the aforementioned result of Donkin.

The paper is organized as follows: in the following section, we recall the necessary background, fix some notations which shall be used throughout and prove some preliminary results. In Section 3, we state and prove our main results, namely Theorems 3.1, 3.7 and 3.12. We then conclude in Section 4 with the explicit computations of the products of Young symmetrizers that lead to the closed formulas for \( \theta_{(1^n), (m)} \) and \( \theta_{(k,\ell), (m)} \).

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we recall the background theory that we require, fix all relevant notations and prove some preliminary results. Throughout this article, \( \mathbb{F} \) denotes an algebraically closed field of prime characteristic \( p \), and \( \mathbb{Z}(p) \) denotes the ring of integers localized at the prime ideal \( (p) \). We identify \( \mathbb{Z}(p) \) with the subring of \( \mathbb{Q} \) consisting of all rational numbers with denominators not divisible by \( p \), and note that \( \mathbb{F} \) is a natural \( \mathbb{Z}(p) \)-module.

We remark that our results in fact hold even when \( \mathbb{F} \) is not algebraically closed, but we assume \( \mathbb{F} \) to be algebraically closed here for the ease of presentation, which avoids the discussion of group schemes when defining the Weyl modules.

2.1. Weyl modules and Jantzen filtration. Following [10, p.267], without loss of generality, we consider only Weyl modules and Jantzen filtration for connected simply-connected semisimple algebraic groups, where it is also convenient to take the hyperalgebra approach. Let \( g \) be a finite-dimensional complex semisimple Lie algebra. Let \( \Phi \supset \Phi^+ \supset \Pi \) be the sets of roots, positive roots and simple roots for \( g \) respectively. Fix a set of Chevalley generators \( \{ e_\alpha, f_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi^+ \} \cup \{ h_i \mid \alpha_i \in \Pi \} \). Let \( U_\mathbb{Z}(g) \) be the Kostant \( \mathbb{Z} \)-form of the universal enveloping algebra \( U(g) \) of \( g \); thus \( U_\mathbb{Z}(g) \) is the \( \mathbb{Z} \)-subalgebra of \( U(g) \) generated by the divided powers \( e_\alpha^{(n)} := e_\alpha^n / n! \), \( f_\alpha^{(n)} := f_\alpha^n / n! \) and \( h_i \) for all \( n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \). Then \( U_\mathbb{Z}(g) := U_\mathbb{Z}(g) \otimes_\mathbb{Z} \mathbb{F} \) is the hyperalgebra of the connected simply-connected semisimple algebraic group \( G \) over \( \mathbb{F} \) of type \( \Phi \).

Let \( \tau \) denote the Cartan involution on \( U_\mathbb{Z}(g) \); thus \( \tau \) satisfies \( \tau(h_i) = h_i \), \( \tau(e_\alpha) = f_\alpha \). Let \( M \) be a left \( U_\mathbb{Z}(g) \)-module. Then its dual \( \text{Hom}_\mathbb{Z}(M, \mathbb{Z}) \) is a left \( U_\mathbb{Z}(g) \)-module via \( \tau \). A symmetric bilinear form \( (\cdot, \cdot) \) on \( M \) is contravariant if \( (um_1, m_2) = (m_1, \tau(u)m_2) \) for all \( u \in U_\mathbb{Z}(g) \) and \( m_1, m_2 \in M \).

Let \( \lambda \) be a dominant integral weight for \( g \) and let \( L(\lambda) \) be the finite-dimensional irreducible \( g \)-module of highest weight \( \lambda \). Let \( \eta_\lambda \) be a nonzero highest weight vector in \( L(\lambda) \). The integral Weyl module \( \Delta_\mathbb{Z}(\lambda) \) for \( U_\mathbb{Z}(g) \) is defined to be \( \Delta_\mathbb{Z}(\lambda) := U_\mathbb{Z}(g) \eta_\lambda \subseteq L(\lambda) \). The canonical \( U_\mathbb{Z}(g) \)-morphism \( \Delta_\mathbb{Z}(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta_\mathbb{Z}(\lambda) \otimes \Delta_\mathbb{Z}(\mu) \) such that \( \eta_{\lambda + \mu} \mapsto \eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu \), is denoted by \( \iota_{\lambda,\mu} \), for dominant integral weights \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \). The canonical bilinear form \( c_\lambda \) on \( \Delta_\mathbb{Z}(\lambda) \) is the unique symmetric and contravariant bilinear form such that \( c_\lambda(\eta_\lambda, \eta_\lambda) = 1 \). Let \( R \) be any commutative ring with 1, and write \( \Delta_R(\lambda) \) for \( \Delta_\mathbb{Z}(\lambda) \otimes_\mathbb{Z} R \), and \( \nabla_R(\lambda) \) for the dual of \( \Delta_R(\lambda) \). We abuse notation and continue to denote the \( R \)-bilinear form on \( \Delta_R(\lambda) \) induced by \( c_\lambda \) as \( c_\lambda \). It is well known that \( \Delta_R(\lambda) \) is irreducible, on which \( c_\lambda \) is non-degenerate.

Define
\[
\Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\lambda)^i = \{ x \in \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\lambda) \mid c_\lambda(x, y) \in p^i \mathbb{Z}(p), \forall y \in \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\lambda) \}.
\]

Then
\[
\Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\lambda) \supset \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\lambda)^1 \supset \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\lambda)^2 \supset \cdots
\]
is the Jantzen filtration of \( \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\lambda) \). Writing \( \Delta(\lambda)^i \) for the image of \( \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\lambda)^i \) in the Weyl module \( \Delta(\lambda) := \Delta_\mathbb{F}(\lambda) \), we have the corresponding Jantzen filtration
\[
\Delta(\lambda) \supset \Delta(\lambda)^1 \supset \Delta(\lambda)^2 \supset \cdots
\]
2.2. Symmetric groups. Denote the group of bijections on a nonempty set \( X \) by \( \mathfrak{S}_X \), and further write \( \mathfrak{S}_n \) for \( \mathfrak{S}_{\{1, \ldots, n\}} \). We view elements of such a group as functions, so that we compose these elements from right to left. When \( Y \) is a nonempty subset of \( X \), we view \( \mathfrak{S}_Y \) as a subgroup of \( \mathfrak{S}_X \) by identifying an element of \( \mathfrak{S}_Y \) with its extension that sends \( x \) to \( x \) for all \( x \in X \setminus Y \).

Let \( X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^+ \) and \( k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \). Define \( X^k \) := \( \{x + k \mid x \in X\} \), and for any function \( \sigma : X \to X \), write \( \sigma^k : X^k \to X^k \) for the function such that \( \sigma(x + k) = \sigma(x) + k \) for all \( x \in X \). Then \( \sigma \mapsto \sigma^k \) is a group isomorphism from \( \mathfrak{S}_X \) to \( \mathfrak{S}_{X^k} \), and this extends further to give an isomorphism \( \mathbb{Z}\mathfrak{S}_X \to \mathbb{Z}\mathfrak{S}_{X^k} \). If \( R \subseteq \mathbb{Z}\mathfrak{S}_X \), we write \( R^k \) for \( \{r^k \mid r \in R\} \). In particular, \( \mathfrak{S}_{X^k} = \mathfrak{S}_{X+k} \).

For a subset \( S \) of \( \mathfrak{S}_n \), define \( \{S\}, |S| \in \mathbb{Z}\mathfrak{S}_n \) by
\[
\{S\} := \sum_{\sigma \in S} \sigma, \quad |S| := \sum_{\sigma \in S} \text{sgn}(\sigma)\sigma,
\]
where \( \text{sgn}(\sigma) \in \{\pm 1\} \) is the usual signature of \( \sigma \).

2.3. Partitions and Young tableaux. Let \( n \) be a natural number. A partition \( \lambda \) of \( n \), denoted \( \lambda \vdash n \), is a non-decreasing sequence \( \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots) \) of non-negative integers such that \( \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \cdots = n \). The dominance order \( \leq \) on all partitions of \( n \) is given by: \( \lambda \leq \mu \) if and only if \( \lambda_1 + \ldots + \lambda_k \leq \mu_1 + \ldots + \mu_k \) for all \( k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \).

The Young diagram of \( \lambda \) is defined to be the set \( [\lambda] = \{(a, b) \in (\mathbb{Z}^+)^2 \mid b \leq \lambda_a\} \); and we call its elements the nodes of \( \lambda \). The conjugate of \( \lambda \) is the partition \( \lambda' \) with \( \lambda'_j = |\{i \mid (j, i) \in [\lambda]\}| \) for all \( i \). We depict \( [\lambda] \) as an array of left-justified boxes in which the \( i \)-th row comprises exactly \( \lambda_i \) boxes, with each box representing a node of \( \lambda \).

A \( \lambda \)-tableau is a bijective map \( s : [\lambda] \to \{1, \ldots, n\} \), and \( \lambda \) is said to be the shape of \( s \), denoted by \( \text{Shape}(s) \). We identify \( s \) with the filling of the boxes in \([\lambda]\) by \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) so that each integer appears exactly once. For \( 1 \leq r \leq n \), the residue \( \text{res}_s(r) \) is equal to \( j - i \) if \( s(i, j) = r \). Denote the set of all \( \lambda \)-tableaux by \( \mathcal{F}(\lambda) \).

A \( \lambda \)-tableau \( s \) is said to be \textit{standard} if the entries in \( s \) are increasing along each row and down each column in the Young diagram. Let \( \text{Std}(\lambda) \) be the set of all standard \( \lambda \)-tableaux. Let \( s \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \) and \( 1 \leq r \leq n \). Since \( s \) is standard, \( s^{-1}(\{1, \ldots, r\}) \) is the Young diagram of a partition, and we define the subtableau \( s_{i,r} \) of \( s \) to be the restriction of \( s \) to this subdomain. Pictorially, \( s_{i,r} \) consists precisely of those boxes in \([\lambda]\) which are filled with \( 1, \ldots, r \) by \( s \).

The dominance order \( \leq \) on \( \text{Std}(\lambda) \) is given by \( s \leq t \) if and only if, for each \( 1 \leq r \leq n \), we have
\[
\text{Shape}(s_{i,r}) \leq \text{Shape}(t_{i,r}).
\]

Let \( t^{\lambda} \) be the \( \lambda \)-tableau such that \( t^{\lambda}(a, b) = \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{a-1} + b \). Similarly, let \( t_{\lambda} \) be the \( \lambda \)-tableau such that \( t_{\lambda}(a, b) = a + \lambda'_1 + \cdots + \lambda'_{b-1} \). It is well known that, with respect to \( \leq \), \( t^{\lambda} \) and \( t_{\lambda} \) are the largest and smallest respectively in \( \text{Std}(\lambda) \).

Post-composition of \( \lambda \)-tableaux by elements of \( \mathfrak{S}_n \) gives a well-defined, faithful and transitive left action of \( \mathfrak{S}_n \) on \( \mathcal{F}(\lambda) \), i.e. \( \sigma \cdot s = s \circ \sigma \) for \( \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n \) and \( s \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda) \). For a \( \lambda \)-tableau \( s \), let \( d(s) \) be the element in \( \mathfrak{S}_n \) such that \( s = d(s) \cdot t^{\lambda} \), or equivalently \( d(s) = s \circ (t^{\lambda})^{-1} \).

Furthermore, we write
\[
\sigma_\lambda := d(t^{\lambda}).
\]

We denote by \( R_s \) and \( C_s \) the row and column stabilizers of \( s \), respectively. The associated Young symmetrizer \( Y_s \in \mathbb{Z}\mathfrak{S}_n \) is defined as
\[
Y_s := \{R_s\}[C_s].
\]

It is well known that \( Y_s^2 = \theta^\lambda Y_s \), where \( \theta^\lambda := [\text{Std}(\lambda)]^{n!} \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), and that if \( t = \sigma \cdot s \), where \( \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n \), then \( R_t = \sigma R_s \sigma^{-1} \) and \( C_t = \sigma C_s \sigma^{-1} \), and so \( Y_t = \sigma Y_s \sigma^{-1} \).

For a \( \lambda \)-tableau \( s \) and \( k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \), define \( s^{\lambda+k} : [\lambda] \to \mathbb{Z}^+ \) by \( s^{\lambda+k}(i,j) = s(i,j) + k \) for \( (i,j) \in [\lambda] \). We view \( s^{\lambda+k} \) as a filling of the boxes in \([\lambda]\) by the numbers \( k+1, \ldots, k+n \).
We may thus speak of row and column stabilizers of $s^{+k}$ too, which are subgroups of $S_n^{+k}$. Note that $R_s^{+k} = R_{s^{+k}}^{+k}$ and $C_s^{+k} = C_{s^{+k}}^{+k}$.

Let $\lambda \vdash n$ and $\mu \vdash m$, and let $s \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda)$ and $t \in \mathcal{F}(\mu)$. We have $\lambda + \mu = (\lambda_1 + \mu_1, \lambda_2 + \mu_2, \ldots) \vdash m + n$, and we now define a $(\lambda + \mu)$-tableau $s + t$, which has the properties that $C_{s+t} = C_{s}C_{t^{+n}}$ and $R_{s+t} \supseteq R_s R_{t^{+n}}$. To obtain $s + t$, we insert the columns of $t^{+n}$ into $s$ successively, starting from the leftmost column and working towards the rightmost, such that a column of $t^{+n}$ is inserted between two adjacent columns, the left of which is at least as long as the column to be inserted, while the right of which is strictly shorter. We illustrate this with the following example:

Example 2.1. Let

$$s = \begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 3 & 6 \\
2 & 4 & \\
5 & 
\end{array}, \quad t = \begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 2 & 4 & 6 \\
3 & 7 & 8 & \\
9 & 
\end{array}.$$  

Then

$$t^{+6} = \begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 8 & 10 & 12 \\
9 & 13 & 14 & 15 \\
1 & 
\end{array}, \quad \text{and} \quad s + t = \begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 7 & 3 & 8 & 10 & 6 & 2 \\
2 & 9 & 4 & 13 & 14 & \\
5 & 1 
\end{array}.$$  

Thus

$$R_{s+t} = \mathfrak{S}_{\{1,3,6,7,8,10,12\}} \mathfrak{S}_{\{2,4,9,13,14\}} \mathfrak{S}_{\{5,11\}}; \quad C_{s+t} = \mathfrak{S}_{\{1,2,5\}} \mathfrak{S}_{\{3,4\}} \mathfrak{S}_{\{7,9,11\}} \mathfrak{S}_{\{8,13\}} \mathfrak{S}_{\{10,14\}}.$$  

2.4. Dual Specht modules. Let $\lambda$ be a partition of $n$. We briefly review the construction of the permutation module $M^{\lambda}_Z$ using $\lambda$-tabloids [5, Chapter 7]. Two $\lambda$-tabloids $s$ and $t$ are row equivalent if $t = \sigma \cdot s$ for some $\sigma \in R_s$, and a $\lambda$-tabloid is a row equivalence class of $\lambda$-tabloids, which we usually write as $\{t\}$ and depict, for example, as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 6 & 5 & 4 \\
7 & 2 & \\
3 & 
\end{array} = \begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
2 & 7 & \\
3 & 
\end{array}.$$  

The left action of $S_n$ on $\mathcal{F}(\lambda)$ induces an action on the set of $\lambda$-tabloids, i.e. $\sigma \cdot \{t\} = \{\sigma \cdot t\}$ for $\sigma \in S_n$ and $t \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda)$, and $M^{\lambda}_Z$ is the associated permutation representation of this action over $Z$. The integral dual Specht module $S^{\lambda}_Z$ is then defined to be the quotient of $M^{\lambda}_Z$ by the Garnir relations [5, §7.4 Exercise 14]: let $\{t\}$ be a $\lambda$-tabloid, and $X$ be any $k$ elements in its $(i + 1)$-th row of $t$, then

$$\{t\} \equiv (-1)^k \sum \{s\}$$  

where the sum runs over all $\lambda$-tabloids $s$ obtained from $t$ by interchanging $X$ with $k$ elements in the $i$-th row, maintaining the orders of the two sets. (Readers are cautioned to the misprint of sign in [5, §7.4 Exercise 14].)

For each $s \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda)$, let $e_s$ denote the image of $\{s\}$ in $S^{\lambda}_Z$ under the quotient map. Since the action of $S_n$ is transitive on $\mathcal{F}(\lambda)$, it is also transitive on $\{e_s \mid s \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda)\}$, so that $S^{\lambda}_Z$ is a cyclic $ZS_n$-module, generated by any $e_s$. It is well known that $\{e_s \mid s \in \text{Std}(\lambda)\}$ is a $Z$-basis for $S^{\lambda}_Z$, called the standard basis. Furthermore, the $ZS_n$-isomorphism defined by $e_s \mapsto Y_s$ gives an isomorphism $S^{\lambda}_Z \cong ZS_n Y_\lambda$, and embeds $S^{\lambda}_Z$ into $ZS_n$ as a $Z$-summand.

Given a commutative ring $R$ with 1, define $S^{\lambda}_Z := R \otimes \mathbb{Z} S^{\lambda}_Z$. The above statements about $S^{\lambda}_Z$ behave well under base change, so that analogous statements hold when $Z$ is replaced by $R$. The set $\{S^{\lambda}_Z \mid \lambda \vdash n\}$ is a complete set of pairwise non-isomorphic irreducible $QS_n$-modules. In particular, the dimension of $S^{\lambda}_Z$, $|\text{Std}(\lambda)|$, divides $n!$, the order of $S_n$, so that indeed we have $R^{\lambda} = \frac{n!}{|\text{Std}(\lambda)|} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, as claimed in the Subsection 2.3.

2.5. Young’s seminormal basis. Following [13] Section 4, but considering the left $S_n$-action (where composition of elements of $S_n$ are from right to left) instead and taking the classical limit $q \to 1$, we have the following constructions and facts.

For $2 \leq k \leq n$, define the $k$-th Jucys-Murphy element $L_k := (1, k) + \cdots + (k-1, k) \in ZS_n$, and let $R(k)$ be the set $\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid -k < i < k\}$ if $k \geq 4$, and $\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid -k < i < k, i \neq 0\}$
otherwise. For each $\lambda \vdash n$ and $s \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$, define, as the Jucys-Murphy elements pairwise commute,

$$E_s := \prod_{k=2}^{n} \prod_{m \in R(k) \backslash \{\text{res}_u(k)\}} \frac{(L_k - m)}{\text{res}_u(k) - m} \in \mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{S}_n.$$

Then $\{E_s \mid s \in \text{Std}(\lambda), \lambda \vdash n\}$ is a complete set of pairwise orthogonal idempotents of $\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{S}_n$ [14, p.505, last paragraph].

**Definition 2.2.** Let $\lambda \vdash n$.

1. For each $t \in \mathcal{T}(\lambda)$, define
   $$\gamma_t := \prod_{(i,j) \in [\lambda]} \prod_{(k,\ell) \in E_t(i,j)} \frac{(j-i) - (\ell-k) + 1}{(j-i) - (\ell-k)},$$
   where, for each $(i,j) \in [\lambda],
   $$\Gamma_t(i,j) = \{(k,\ell) \in [\lambda] \mid k < j, t(k,\ell) < t(i,j), t(k',\ell) > t(i,j) \forall k' > k\}.$$
2. For any $s,t \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$, define
   $$f_{s,t} := E_s d(s) \{R_{t^0}\} d(t)^{-1} E_t \in \mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{S}_n,$$
   and $f_s := \gamma_{u_0}f_{s,u_0}$.

From now on, for each $1 \leq i < n$, denote the basic transposition $(i,i+1) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ by $s_i$.

**Theorem 2.3.**

1. For $\lambda \vdash n$, we have $\gamma_{u_0^\lambda} \gamma_{t^0} = R^\lambda$.
2. The group algebra $\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{S}_n$ has a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis $\{f_{s,t} \mid \lambda \vdash n, s, t \in \text{Std}(\lambda)\}$, called the Young’s seminormal basis.
3. For $\lambda, \mu \vdash n$, $s,t \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ and $u,v \in \text{Std}(\mu)$, we have $f_{s,t}f_{u,v} = \delta_{u} \gamma_{s}f_{s,t,v}$, where $\delta_{u}$ is the Kronecker delta.
4. Denote by $s_i$ the basic transposition $(i,i+1) \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. For $\lambda \vdash n$ and $s,t \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$, we have
   $$s_i f_{s,t} = \begin{cases} 
   f_{s,t}, & \text{if } s_i \in R_s; \\
   -f_{s,t}, & \text{if } s_i \in C_s; \\
   a_i f_{s,t} + f_{s_i \cdot s,t}, & \text{if } s_i \cdot s \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \text{ and } s \triangleright s_i \cdot s; \\
   a_i f_{s,t} + (1-a_i^2) f_{s_i \cdot s,t}, & \text{if } s_i \cdot s \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \text{ and } s \triangleright s_i \cdot s,
   \end{cases}$$
   where $a_i = (\text{res}_u(i+1) - \text{res}_u(i))^{-1}$.
5. For $\lambda \vdash n$, recall that $\sigma_{\lambda} = d(t_{\lambda})$. We have
   $$Y_{t_{\lambda}} = f_{\lambda} \sigma_{\lambda}, \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{t_{\lambda}} = \sigma_{\lambda} f_{\lambda}.$$
6. We have that $\{f_s \mid s \in \text{Std}(\lambda)\}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $\mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{S}_n f_{\lambda} = \mathbb{Q}\mathfrak{S}_n Y_{t_{\lambda}} \sigma_{\lambda}^{-1}$, which is another realisation of the dual Specht module $S^Q_{\lambda}$. This basis is known as the Young’s seminormal basis of $S^Q_{\lambda}$.

**Proof.** Part (1) follows from the penultimate displayed equation on [14, p.507].

For parts (2)–(4), we first prove that $E_s x_{st} E_t$ and $\zeta_{st} = (E_s \zeta_{st} E_t)$ in [14] are equal (we refer the reader to [14] for the definitions of $x_{st}$ and $\zeta_{st}$). By [14, Theorem 4.5], we see that $\zeta_{st} = x_{st} + h_{st}$ where

$$h_{st} \in \mathcal{H}^\lambda := \text{span}\{x_{uv} \mid u, v \in \text{Std}(\mu), \mu \vdash n, \mu \triangleright \lambda\}.$$

By [13, 3.20] (note that $m_{st}$ in [13] is $x_{st}$ in [14]), $\{x_{st} \mid s, t \in \text{Std}(\lambda), \lambda \vdash n\}$ is another basis for $\mathcal{H}^\lambda$ and, that is, in fact,

$$\text{span}\{x_{uv} \mid u, v \in \text{Std}(\mu), \mu \vdash n, \mu \triangleright \lambda\} = \mathcal{H}^\lambda \supseteq h_{st}.$$

Now, $\zeta_{uv} E_t = 0$ for all $u, v \in \text{Std}(\mu)$ for some $\mu \vdash n$ with $\mu \triangleright \lambda$ by [14, (5.5)]. Thus, $\zeta_{st} E_t = (x_{st} + h_{st}) E_t = x_{st} E_t$, and so $\zeta_{st} = E_s x_{st} E_t$.

Our $f_{t_{\lambda}}$ is precisely $E_s x_{st} E_t = \zeta_{s,t}$ at the limit $q = 1$, and thus parts (2) and (3) follow from p.505 to p.506, last displayed equation on p.510 of [13] respectively. Part (4) also
follows from [14, Theorem 6.4] in the same way, once the incorrect formula given there is corrected. The correct formula should be:

$$\zeta_{us}T_v = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{|h|} \zeta_{us}, & \text{if } |h| = 1; \\
\frac{1}{|q|} \zeta_{us} + \zeta_{ut}, & \text{if } h > 1; \\
\frac{1}{|q|} \zeta_{us} + \frac{q|h+1|a|h-1|u}{|h|^2} \zeta_{ut}, & \text{if } h < -1.
\end{cases}$$

This mistake is rendered by another error in Lemma 6.2 of [14], which the formula depends on (the author erroneously attributed to Lemma 6.1 instead), where for the first displayed equation to hold, one needs to define \( h \) to be \( a - b \) instead of \( b - a \). (There is another minor error, inconsequential to the proof of Theorem 6.4, in the second displayed equation in Lemma 6.2 too). The readers are welcome to verify that the correct results are as claimed above.

For part (5), using the penultimate display equation on page 511 of [14] to our context,

\[ [C_{t+1}] \sigma_\lambda \{ R_{t+1} \} = \gamma_{t',t} f_{t',t}, \]

Applying the anti-automorphism of \( Q \mathcal{S}_n \) defined by \( \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n} a_\sigma \sigma \mapsto \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n} a_\sigma \sigma^{-1} \) to the above equation, since \( E_a \) is invariant under the anti-automorphism, we get

\[ f_{t+1} = \gamma_{t',t} f_{t',t+1} = \{ R_{t+1} \} \sigma_\lambda^{-1} [C_{t+1}] = \{ R_{t+1} \} [C_{t+1}] \sigma_\lambda^{-1} = Y_{t+1} \sigma_\lambda^{-1}, \]

and, similarly, \( f_{t+1} = \sigma_\lambda^{-1} \{ R_{t+1} \} [C_{t+1}] = \sigma_\lambda^{-1} Y_{t+1} \).

Part (6) follows immediately from parts (2), (3) and (5). \( \square \)

**Remark 2.4** Any scalar multiple of the \( f_s \)'s would of course also give a \( Q \)-basis of \( Q \mathcal{S}_n Y_{t+1} \sigma_\lambda^{-1} \).

We choose the scaling for the \( f_s \)'s so that \( f_{t+1} = Y_{t+1} \sigma_\lambda^{-1} \).

The following are the results about Young’s seminormal basis that we require in this paper:

**Proposition 2.5.** Let \( \lambda \vdash n \) and \( \mu \vdash m \), and let \( s, t \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \) and \( u, v \in \text{Std}(\mu) \).

(1) If \( m \leq n \), then \( f_{u,v} f_{s,t} = 0 \) unless \( s | m = v \), in which case,

\[ f_{u,v} f_{s,t} = \gamma_{v} f_{s',t}, \]

where \( s' \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \) is obtained from \( s \) by replacing its subtableau \( s | m \) by \( u \).

(2) Suppose that the last column of \([\lambda]\) is no shorter than the first column of \([\mu]\), and let \( \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_m \). If \( \sigma f_{u,v} = \sum_{w \in \text{Std}(\mu)} a_{w} f_{u,v} \) \((a_{w} \in \mathbb{Q})\), then

\[ \sigma^{+n} f_{s+u,q} = \sum_{w} a_{w} f_{s+w,q} \]

for any \( q \in \text{Std}(\lambda + \mu) \).

(3) We have

\[ d(s) f_{t,1} = f_{s,t} + \sum_{t \in \text{Std}(\lambda), t \prec s} a_{t} f_{t,1} \quad (a_{t} \in \mathbb{Q}). \]

(4) Let \( \phi : S_{\lambda}^{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow Q \mathcal{S}_n f_{t,1} \) be the \( Q \mathcal{S}_n \)-isomorphism defined by \( \phi(e_{1}) = f_{t,1} \). Then

\[ f_{s} = \phi(e_{s}) + \sum_{t \in \text{Std}(\lambda), t \prec s} b_{t} \phi(e_{t}) \quad (b_{t} \in \mathbb{Q}). \]

**Proof.**

(1) If \( v \neq s | m \), then \( E_a E_{s|m} = 0 \) since these are distinct orthogonal idempotents. Consequently \( E_a E_s = 0 \), and thus \( f_{u,v} f_{s,t} = 0 \).

If \( v = s | m \), then \([\mu]\) is a subdiagram of \([\lambda]\). Let \( p \) be the skew \( \lambda/\mu \)-tableau obtained by removing \( v \) from \( s \). For a \( \mu \)-tableau \( w \), let \( w \sqcup p \) be the \( \lambda \)-tableau obtained by patching \( p \) and \( w \) together (thus \( s = v \sqcup p \) and \( s' = u \sqcup p \)). Since \( p \) takes values in \( \{ m+1, \ldots, n \} \), it follows that \( w \sqcup p \) is standard whenever \( w \) is standard. By Theorem 2.3 (4), if \( \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_m \), and \( w \in \text{Std}(\mu) \) such that if \( \sigma f_{u,v} = \sum_{v \in \text{Std}(\mu)} a_{v} f_{u,v} \) for \( a_{v} \in \mathbb{Q} \), then the coefficients \( a_{v} \) are independent of the choice of \( w \), and moreover \( \sigma f_{u,v} = \sum_{v \in \text{Std}(\mu)} a_{v} f_{u,v} \) for any \( q \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \). Since this is true for all \( \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_m \),
it remains true when we replace \( \sigma \) by any element of \( Q \mathcal{S}_m \). Since \( f_{u,v} \in Q \mathcal{S}_m \), and \( f_{u,v} f_{u,w} = \gamma_0 f_{u,w} \) by Theorem 2.3.3, it follows that

\[
\sigma \mathcal{Z} \quad \gamma_0 f_{u,w} = \gamma_0 f_{u,w} \quad \gamma_0 f_{u,w} = \gamma_0 f_{u,w, t} = \gamma_0 f_{u,w, t}
\]

as desired.

(2) The conditions on \([\lambda]\) and \([\mu]\) imply that \( s + w \in \text{Std}(\lambda + \mu) \) for all \( w \in \text{Std}(\mu) \), and that \( \text{res}_{s + w}(n + j) = \text{res}_u(j) + \lambda_1 \) for all \( 1 \leq j \leq m \), and thus

\[
\text{res}_{s + w}(n + i + 1) - \text{res}_{s + w}(n + i) = \text{res}_u(i + 1) - \text{res}_u(i)
\]

for any \( 1 \leq i \leq m - 1 \). It is enough to prove part (2) for the case when \( \sigma = s_i \) for some \( 1 \leq i \leq m - 1 \), and since \( s_i^{n+1} = s_i + n \), this follows directly from Theorem 2.3.4.

(3) The statement is trivial for \( s = t^\lambda \), and so let \( s \neq t^\lambda \). Then, since \( s \) is standard, there exists some \( i \) such that \( i + 1 \) lies on a higher row of \( s \) than \( i \). Let \( s' = s_i \cdot s \). Then \( s' \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \), and \( s' \triangleright s \) [13, Lemma 3.7], so that premultiplying any reduced expression of \( d(s') \) by \( s_i \) will yield a reduced expression for \( d(s) \). By induction, we have

\[
d(s) f_{t^\lambda} = s_i d(s') f_{t^\lambda} = s_i(f_{t^\lambda} + \sum_{r \in \text{Std}(\lambda)} a_r f_{t^\lambda}) \quad (a_t \in Q)
\]

If \( s_i \cdot t \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \) for some \( r \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \) with \( t \triangleright s' \), then, since \( d(t) \triangleright d(s') \) [13, Theorem 3.8], we have that \( d(t) \) has a reduced expression which is a proper subexpression of a reduced expression of \( d(s') \), so that \( s_i d(t) \) has a reduced expression which is a proper subexpression of a reduced expression of \( s_i d'(s') = d(s) \), or equivalently, \( s_i \cdot t \triangleright s \). The proof is now complete by applying Theorem 2.3.4.

(4) We have, from part (3),

\[
\phi(e_s) = \phi(d(s) f_{t^\lambda}) = d(s) f_{t^\lambda} = f_s + \sum_{r \triangleright s} a_r f_{t^\lambda}.
\]

Thus, \( f_s = \phi(e_s) - \sum_{r \triangleright s} a_r f_{t^\lambda} \), and the desired result follows by induction.

\( \square \)

2.6. Gcds.

**Definition 2.6.** Let \( \mathcal{L} \) be a free \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module of finite rank. We define, for each non-zero \( z \in \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathbb{Z} \mathbb{Q} \), a positive rational number \( \text{gcd}_{\mathcal{L}}(z) \) as follows:

\[
\text{gcd}_{\mathcal{L}}(z) := \max\{\kappa \in \mathbb{Q} \mid z/\kappa \in \mathcal{L} \}.
\]

We gather together some elementary properties resulting from this definition.

**Lemma 2.7.** Let \( \mathcal{L} \) be a free \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module of finite rank, and let \( z \in \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathbb{Z} \mathbb{Q} \).

\( 1 \) If \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\} \) is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-basis for \( \mathcal{L} \), so that it is a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-basis for \( \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathbb{Z} \mathbb{Q} \), and \( z = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i v_i \neq 0 \) where \( \text{gcd}(a_i, b_i) = 1 \) for each \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), then \( \text{gcd}_{\mathcal{L}}(z) \) is the (positive) greatest common divisor of the integers \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \) divided by the (positive) least common multiple of the integers \( b_1, \ldots, b_n \).

\( 2 \) If \( a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0} \), then \( \text{gcd}_{\mathcal{L}}(az) = a \text{gcd}_{\mathcal{L}}(z) \).

\( 3 \) We have \( z \in \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathbb{Z} \mathbb{Z}(p) \) if and only if \( \text{gcd}_{\mathcal{L}}(z) \in \mathbb{Z}(p) \).

\( 4 \) Let \( \mathcal{K} \) be a direct \( \mathbb{Z} \)-summand of \( \mathcal{L} \), and suppose that \( z \in \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathbb{Z} \mathbb{Q} \). Then \( \text{gcd}_{\mathcal{K}}(z) = \text{gcd}_{\mathcal{L}}(z) \).

**Proof.** Part (1) follows directly from the definition of \( \text{gcd}_{\mathcal{L}} \), while parts (2) and (3) follow immediately from part (1).

For part (4), since \( \mathcal{K} \) is a direct summand of \( \mathcal{L} \), it follows that \( \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{K}' \) for some submodule \( \mathcal{K}' \) of \( \mathcal{L} \). With respect to this decomposition, \( z \) regarded as an element of \( \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathbb{Z} \mathbb{Q} \) is realized as \( (z, 0) \). Thus for any \( \kappa \in \mathbb{Q} \), \( (z, 0)/\kappa = (z/\kappa, 0) \), and in particular \( \text{gcd}_{\mathcal{K}}(z) = \text{gcd}_{\mathcal{L}}(z) \). \( \square \)

**Remark 2.8.**
(1) One can give an alternative definition of gcd_{\mathcal{S}} using Lemma 2.7(1), but our definition makes it clear that gcd_{\mathcal{S}} is independent of the basis chosen for \mathcal{S}.

(2) The condition that \mathcal{K} is a direct summand, instead of merely a submodule, in Lemma 2.7(4) is necessary. For example, \mathbb{Z} is a submodule, but not a direct summand of \mathbb{Z}, and for 1 \in 2\mathbb{Z} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{Q} \cong \mathbb{Q}, we have gcd_{2\mathbb{Z}}(1) = 1/2, while gcd_{\mathbb{Z}}(1) = 1.

(3) It is clear from Lemma 2.7(1) that gcd_{\mathcal{S}}(z) generalizes the greatest common divisor of the coefficients of z (which makes sense when the latter are integers).

Recall the Young’s seminormal basis \{f_s \mid s \in \text{Std}(\lambda)\} for the dual Specht module \mathcal{S}_{\lambda}^Q defined in Theorem 2.3(6).

**Lemma 2.9.** Let \lambda \vdash n and s \in \text{Std}(\lambda). Then gcd_{\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{S}_n}(f_s) = \frac{1}{d_s} for some \ d_s \in \mathbb{Z}^+. We call \ d_s \ the denominator of \ f_s.

**Proof.** By Theorem 2.3(5), \ f_\lambda = Y_\lambda \sigma^{-1}_\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{S}_n. Note that \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{S}_nf_\lambda is a Z-summand of \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{S}_n (since \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{S}_n, Y_\lambda is), so that gcd_{\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{S}_n}(f_s) = gcd_{\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{S}_n,f_\lambda}(f_s) by Lemma 2.7(4). Using the \mathbb{Q}\mathcal{S}_n-isomorphism \phi in Proposition 2.5(4), we have \phi(S^Q_{\lambda}) = \mathbb{Z}\mathcal{S}_n, f_\lambda and \phi^{-1}(f_s) = c_s + \sum_{t \geq s} b_t e_t where \ b_t \in \mathbb{Q}. Thus, gcd_{\mathbb{Z}\mathcal{S}_n,f_\lambda}(f_s) = gcd_{S^Q_{\lambda}}(\phi^{-1}(f_s)) = \frac{1}{d_s}, for some \ d_s \in \mathbb{Z}^+, by Lemma 2.7(1). \hfill \Box

### 3. Main results

#### 3.1. Comparison of Jantzen filtrations

Let \ G be a connected, simply-connected and semisimple algebraic group over \mathbb{F}, with the hyperalgebra \mathbb{U}_F(\mathfrak{g}). Let \lambda and \mu be dominant integral weights. The canonical G-morphism \iota_{\lambda,\mu}: \Delta(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu) is characterized by \iota_{\lambda,\mu}(\eta_{\lambda+\mu}) = \eta_{\lambda} \otimes \eta_{\mu}, where \eta_r is the highest weight vector generating the Weyl module \Delta(\nu) (see Subsection 2.1). This G-morphism is injective, and sometimes admits a splitting map \psi_{\lambda,\mu}. We say that \psi_{\lambda,\mu} is defined over \mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g}) if \psi_{\lambda,\mu} is induced from a \mathbb{U}_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mathfrak{g})-morphism \psi_{\lambda,\mu}: \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda) \otimes \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mu) \to \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda + \mu), where \mathbb{U}_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathbb{U}(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes \mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g}). By abusing notation, we shall also write \psi_{\lambda,\mu} for \psi_{\lambda,\mu} in what follows.

As our first main result which also serves as a motivation to the study of the split condition for \iota_{\lambda,\mu}, we have the following result that compares the Jantzen filtrations of \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda) and \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda + \mu).

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \ G be a connected reductive algebraic group over \mathbb{F}. Let \lambda and \mu be dominant integral weights. If the canonical G-morphism \iota_{\lambda,\mu}: \Delta(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu) admits a splitting \psi_{\lambda,\mu} defined over \mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g}), then there are injective maps for all \ i \geq 0

\[ \psi_{\lambda,\mu} \circ \iota_\lambda : \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda)^i \to \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda + \mu)^i \]

where \iota_\lambda is the map \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda) \to \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda) \otimes \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mu) given by \iota_\lambda(x) = x \otimes \eta_\mu, and \eta_\mu is the highest weight vector in \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mu).

**Proof.** Without loss of generality, we may assume that \ G is a connected, simply-connected and semisimple algebraic group over \mathbb{F} (see Section 2.1). Let \mathbb{U}_F(\mathfrak{g}) be the hyperalgebra of \ G. By assumption, \psi_{\lambda,\mu} \circ \iota_{\lambda,\mu} = id, and so we have the decomposition \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda) \otimes \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mu) \cong \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda + \mu) \oplus ker(\psi_{\lambda,\mu}) as \mathbb{U}_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mathfrak{g})-modules. Let \mathfrak{c}_\lambda, \mathfrak{c}_\mu and \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda+\mu} be the canonical bilinear form on \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda), \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mu) and on \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda + \mu), respectively. The tensor product \mathfrak{c}_\lambda \otimes \mathfrak{c}_\mu defines a symmetric bilinear form on \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda) \otimes \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mu). Since the Cartan involution \tau commutes with the comultiplication \Delta on \mathbb{U}_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mathfrak{g}), i.e., (\tau \otimes \tau)\Delta = \Delta \tau, it follows that \mathfrak{c}_\lambda \otimes \mathfrak{c}_\mu and its restriction to \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda + \mu) are symmetric and contravariant. As a result, \mathfrak{c}_\lambda \otimes \mathfrak{c}_\mu coincides with \mathfrak{c}_{\lambda+\mu} on \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda + \mu) as \langle \mathfrak{c}_\lambda \otimes \mathfrak{c}_\mu(\iota_{\lambda,\mu}(\eta_{\lambda+\mu}), \iota_{\lambda,\mu}(\eta_{\lambda+\mu})) \rangle = \langle \mathfrak{c}_\lambda \otimes \mathfrak{c}_\mu(\eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu, \eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu) \rangle = 1 and the symmetric and contravariant bilinear form on \mathfrak{Q}(\lambda + \mu) is unique up to scalar.

We claim that \langle \mathfrak{c}_\lambda \otimes \mathfrak{c}_\mu(\iota_{\lambda,\mu}(u_{\lambda+\mu}), w) \rangle = 0 for any \ u \in \mathbb{U}_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mathfrak{g}) and \ w \in ker(\psi_{\lambda,\mu}). Indeed, \lambda + \mu is the highest weight in both \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda + \mu) and \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\lambda) \otimes \Delta_{\mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{g})}(\mu), and the
corresponding weight spaces are one-dimensional. It follows that all weights in $\ker(\psi_{\lambda,\mu})$ are strictly smaller than $\lambda + \mu$, and thus $(c_\lambda \otimes c_\mu)(\eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu, \ker(\psi_{\lambda,\mu})) = 0$. So, for any $u \in U_{Z_{(\ell)}(g)}$ and $w \in \ker(\psi_{\lambda,\mu})$, we have

$$(c_\lambda \otimes c_\mu)(\lambda_{\mu}(u\eta_{\lambda+\mu}), w) = (c_\lambda \otimes c_\mu)(u \cdot (\eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu), w) = (c_\lambda \otimes c_\mu)(\eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu, \tau(u)w) = 0.$$  

Now for $u \eta_\lambda \in \Delta_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}\lambda^i$, we have $\iota_\lambda(u\eta_\lambda) = u\eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu = \lambda_{\mu}(u\eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu) + w$ for some $w \in \ker(\psi_{\lambda,\mu})$, and for any $u' \eta_{\lambda+\mu} \in \Delta_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}(\lambda + \mu)$, using the claim above,

$$c_{\lambda+\mu}(\lambda_{\mu}(u\eta_\lambda), u'\eta_{\lambda+\mu}) = (c_\lambda \otimes c_\mu)(\lambda_{\mu}(u\eta_\lambda), \iota_\lambda(u'\eta_{\lambda+\mu})) = (c_\lambda \otimes c_\mu)(u\eta_\lambda, \iota_\lambda(u'\eta_{\lambda+\mu})) = (c_\lambda \otimes c_\mu)(u\eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu, u'\eta_{\lambda+\mu}) = c_\lambda(u\eta_\lambda, u'\eta_\lambda).$$

Consequently, $\psi_{\lambda,\mu}\iota_\lambda(u\eta_\lambda) \in \Delta_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}(\lambda + \mu)^i$. To see that $\psi_{\lambda,\mu} \circ \iota_\lambda : \Delta_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}(\lambda)^i \to \Delta_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}(\lambda + \mu)^i$ is injective, i.e., $\psi_{\lambda,\mu}(u\eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu) \neq 0$ for $u\eta_\lambda \neq 0$, we may take $u'\eta_\lambda \in \Delta_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}(\lambda)$ for some $u' \in U_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}$, such that $c_\lambda(u\eta_\lambda, u'\eta_\lambda) \neq 0$. Here we use the fact that $c_\lambda$ is non-degenerate over $Q$. Then the identity above reads $c_{\lambda+\mu}(\lambda_{\mu}(u\eta_\lambda), u'\eta_{\lambda+\mu}) = c_\lambda(u\eta_\lambda, u'\eta_\lambda) \neq 0$. So $\psi_{\lambda,\mu}\iota_\lambda(u\eta_\lambda) = \psi_{\lambda,\mu}(u\eta_\lambda \otimes \eta_\mu) \neq 0$ as desired.

$$\square$$

**Remark 3.2.**

(1) The injective morphism $\psi_{\lambda,\mu} \circ \iota_\lambda : \Delta_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}(\lambda)^i \to \Delta_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}(\lambda + \mu)^i$ induces naturally the morphism $\Delta(\lambda)^i \to \Delta(\lambda + \mu)^i$. However the latter is not necessarily injective any more. For example, when $p = 3$, the canonical $SL_2(\mathbb{F})$-morphism $\Delta(5) \to \Delta(2) \otimes \Delta(3)$ admits a splitting $\psi_{2,3}$ defined over $Z_{(3)}$. In $\Delta_{Z_{(3)}(2)}(\ell) \otimes \Delta_{Z_{(3)}(3)}(\ell)$, we have $\eta_2 \otimes f_3 \eta_3 = \frac{2}{3} f_3 \eta_2 \otimes \eta_3 + (-\frac{2}{3} f_3 \eta_2 \otimes \eta_3 + \frac{2}{3} \eta_2 \otimes f_3 \eta_3)$. Therefore, $\psi_{2,3}(\eta_2 \otimes f_3 \eta_3) = \frac{2}{3} f_3 \eta_5$. In particular, the image of $\eta_2 \otimes f_3 \eta_3$ in $\Delta(5)$ under $\psi_{2,3} \circ \iota_2$ is zero.

(2) Changing the role of $\lambda$ and $\mu$ in this theorem, we obtain a comparison of the Jantzen filtrations of $\Delta_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}(\mu)$ and $\Delta_{Z_{(\ell)}(\ell)}(\lambda + \mu)$.

(3) Let $p = 2$ and $\lambda = (0, 1)$. It is straightforward to check that the canonical $SL_2(\mathbb{P})$-morphism $\iota_{1,2} : \Delta(\lambda + 2\rho) \to \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(2\rho)$ does not admit a splitting map defined over $Z_{(2)}$, where $\rho = (1, 1)$. On the other hand, $\Delta(\lambda)$ is irreducible, and by straightforward computations there exist surjective maps $\Delta(\lambda + 2\rho)^i \to \Delta(\lambda)^i$ for all $i$ as predicted by [LS, Conjecture H].

We thank H. Andersen for communicating to us the following result, which gives a necessary split condition for $\iota_{\lambda,\mu}$.

**Proposition 3.3** (Anderson). Let $G$ be a connected, simply-connected and semisimple algebraic group of rank $n$ over $\mathbb{F}$. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)$ and $\mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n)$ be two dominant integral weights for $G$. Then the canonical $G$-morphism $\iota_{\lambda,\mu} : \Delta(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu)$ splits only if $p^i(\lambda_i^\alpha + \mu_i^\alpha)$ for all $i$.

**Proof.** Let $U_\mathbb{F}$ be the hyperalgebra of $G$, and for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $U_{\mathbb{F}}^i$ be the $\mathbb{F}$-subalgebra of $U_\mathbb{F}$ generated by the divided powers $e_{\alpha_i}^{(m)}$, $f_{\alpha_i}^{(m)}$ and $h_i^{(m)}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Let $\Delta_{\alpha_i}(\lambda)$ be the $U_{\mathbb{F}}^i$-submodule of $\Delta(\lambda)$ generated by the highest weight vector $\eta_\lambda$ and let $\Delta_{\alpha_i}(\lambda + \mu)$ and $\Delta_{\alpha_i}^\mu(\lambda + \mu)$ be defined similarly. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, there is a commutative diagram of $U_{\mathbb{F}}^i$-modules as follows, where $\varphi_i$ is the canonical morphism:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Delta_{\alpha_i}(\lambda + \mu) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_i} & \Delta_{\alpha_i}(\lambda) \otimes \Delta_{\alpha_i}(\mu) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\Delta(\lambda + \mu) & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\lambda,\mu}} & \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu)
\end{array}$$

Note that $U_{\mathbb{F}}^i$ is canonically isomorphic to the hyperalgebra of $SL_2(\mathbb{F})$. Moreover, under this identification, $\Delta_{\alpha_i}(\lambda)$ is the same as the Weyl module $\Delta(\lambda_i)$ for $SL_2(\mathbb{F})$, and $\varphi_i$ is
the same as the canonical $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{F})$-morphism $\Delta(\lambda_i + \mu_i) \rightarrow \Delta(\lambda_i) \otimes \Delta(\mu_i)$. Also note that if $\iota_{\lambda,\mu}$ admits a splitting $\psi_{\lambda,\mu}$, then the image of $\Delta^e(\lambda) \otimes \Delta^e(\mu)$ under $\psi_{\lambda,\mu}$ lies in the $U^\mathbb{Q}_0$-submodule $\Delta^e(\lambda + \mu)$ of $\Delta(\lambda + \mu)$, i.e., $\psi_{\lambda,\mu}$ restricts down to give a splitting of $\varphi_i$. Now by straightforward computations, $\varphi_i$ admits a splitting if and only if $p \nmid (\lambda_i + \mu_i)$, and so $\iota_{\lambda,\mu}$ splits only if $p \nmid (\lambda_i + \mu_i)$ for all $i$. \hfill $\Box$

In view of Proposition 3.3, we shall refer to the condition $p \nmid (\lambda_i + \mu_i)$ for all $i$ as Anderson’s condition (on $p$, for the fixed pair $(\lambda, \mu)$.)

3.2. Split condition for $\iota_{\lambda,\mu}$ for type $A$. The rest of the section is devoted to the split condition for $\iota_{\lambda,\mu}$ when $G$ is the general linear group $\text{GL}_N(\mathbb{F})$, for which we are able to relate the split condition to the product of certain Young symmetrizers and to the denominator of a certain Young’s seminormal basis vector. We recall first the following result due to Donkin, see [1] §4.8(12) for its quantized analogue.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let $G$ be the general linear group $\text{GL}_N(\mathbb{F})$. Then, for $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, the canonical $G$-morphism $\Delta(m+n) \rightarrow \Delta(n) \otimes \Delta(m)$ admits a splitting if and only if $p \nmid \binom{m+n}{n}$, in which case the splitting map is defined over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$.

To state the condition for which $\iota_{\lambda,\mu}$ splits, we make the following definition:

**Definition 3.5.** Let $\lambda \vdash n$ and $\mu \vdash m$. Define $\theta_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ by

$$\theta_{\lambda,\mu} := \gcd_{\mathbb{Z}[m+n]}(Y_{\lambda}, Y_{\mu}^n Y_{\lambda+m}).$$

We first collect together some properties of $\theta_{\lambda,\mu}$.

**Lemma 3.6.** Let $\lambda \vdash n$, $\mu \vdash m$, and let $s \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda)$ and $t \in \mathcal{F}(\mu)$. Then

1. $\theta_{\lambda,\mu} = \gcd_{\mathcal{S}_{m+n}}(Y_s Y_{n+s}) = \gcd_{\mathcal{S}_{m+n}}([C_{s+t}] Y_{s+t}, \{R_s, R_{t+n}\})$,
2. $\theta_{\lambda,\mu} = \theta_{\mu,\lambda}$, and
3. $\theta_{\lambda,\mu} \mid \Delta^\lambda \Delta^\mu$.

**Proof.** Under the anti-automorphism of $\mathcal{S}_{m+n}$ induced by the inverse operator on $\mathcal{S}_{m+n}$, the image of $Y_s Y_{n+s} = \{R_s\} [C_s, \{R_{t+n}\}, \{C_{t+n}\}, \{R_s\}, \{R_{t+n}\}]$ is

$$[C_{s+t}] [R_s] \{C_{t+n}\} \{R_{t+n}\} = [C_{s+t}] [R_s] \{C_{t+n}\} [C_s] \{R_{t+n}\} [R_s] = [C_{s+t}] Y_{s+t} \{R_s, R_{t+n}\},$$

since $C_s$ commutes with $\{R_{t+n}\}$, and $C_{s+t} = C_s C_{t+n}$. In particular, they have the same gcd in $\mathcal{S}_{m+n}$. This proves the second equality in part (1).

For the first equality in part (1), let $h = d(s)d(t)^{n} \in \mathcal{S}_{m+n}$, so that $s = h \cdot t^\lambda$ and $t^n = h \cdot (t^\mu)^n$, and hence $s + t = h \cdot (t^\lambda + t^\mu)$. Thus $Y_s Y_{n+s} Y_{n+t} = h(Y_{\lambda} Y_{n+t}) \otimes Y_{\lambda + \mu}) h$, and so $Y_s Y_{n+s} Y_{n+t}$ has the same gcd as $Y_s Y_{n+t} Y_{\lambda + \mu}$ over $\mathcal{S}_{m+n}$.

For part (2), let $\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{m+n}$ such that $\tau(i) = i + m$ if $i \leq n$, and $\tau(i) = i - n$ otherwise. Then $\tau \cdot s = s^{t+n}$ and $\tau \cdot t^n = t$. Furthermore, $\tau \cdot (s+t)$ is a column-wise rearrangement of $s+t$: consequently, $Y_{\tau(s+t)} = Y_{t+s}$. Thus $\tau(Y_s Y_{n+s} Y_{t+n}) Y_{\tau(s+t)} = Y_s Y_{n+s} Y_{t+n}$, and so $Y_{\tau(s+t)}$ has the same gcd as $Y_s Y_{n+t} Y_{t+n}$, giving $\theta_{\lambda,\mu} = \theta_{\mu,\lambda}$.

For part (3), note that $C_{s+t} = C_s C_{t+n}$, while $R_{s+t}$ contains $R_s R_{t+n}$. Let $\Gamma$ be a left transversal of $R_s R_{t+n}$ in $R_{s+t}$. Then

$$Y_{s+t} = \{R_{s+t}\} [C_{s+t}] = \{\Gamma R_s R_{t+n}\} [C_s C_{t+n}] = \{\Gamma\} [R_s] \{R_{t+n}\} [C_s] [C_{t+n}] = \{\Gamma\} Y_s Y_{t+n}.$$
Theorem 3.7. Let \( \lambda \vdash n, \mu \vdash m \) and \( N \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) with \( N \geq m + n \). The canonical \( \text{GL}_N(\mathbb{F}) \)-morphism \( \iota_{\lambda,\mu} : \Delta(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu) \) admits a splitting defined over \( \mathbb{Z}(p) \) if and only if \( p \nmid \lambda^{\lambda+\mu} \).

To prove this theorem, we need some preparations. Let \( G_Z = \text{GL}_N(\mathbb{Z}) \) and \( E_Z^r \) be a free \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module of rank \( N \) with a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-basis \( \{v_1, \ldots, v_N\} \). The \( r \)-th tensor power \( E_Z^{o r} \) is a \((ZG_Z, Z\mathfrak{S}_r)\)-bimodule, where \( \mathfrak{S}_r \) acts on the right by place permutation, with a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-basis

\[ \mathcal{B} := \{v_f := v_{f(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{f(r)} \mid f : \{1, \ldots, r\} \to \{1, \ldots, N\} \}. \]

The right action of \( \mathfrak{S}_r \) on \( E_Z^{o r} \) restricts to give an action on \( \mathcal{B} \) via \( v_f \cdot \sigma = v_{f \sigma} \), so that \( \mathcal{B} \) is a disjoint union of \( \mathfrak{S}_r \)-orbits. This induces a decomposition of \( E_Z^{o r} \) into a direct sum of right \( \mathbb{Z} \mathfrak{S}_r \)-submodules, where each summand is indexed by an \( \mathfrak{S}_r \)-orbit. In particular, when \( N \geq r \), so that each \( \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_r \) may be viewed as a function from \( \{1, \ldots, r\} \) to \( \{1, \ldots, N\} \), \( \mathcal{B}_\sigma := \{v_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_r\} \) is such an \( \mathfrak{S}_r \)-orbit, and its \( \mathbb{Z} \)-span, denoted \( Z\mathcal{B}_\sigma \), is a \( \mathfrak{S}_r \)-summand of \( E_Z^{o r} \) isomorphic to \( Z\mathfrak{S}_r \), where \( v_\sigma \) is identified with \( \sigma \).

Let \( H \) be a subgroup of \( \mathfrak{S}_r \), and define

\[ (E_Z^{o r})_H := E_Z^{o r} \otimes_{Z\mathfrak{S}_r} Z\mathfrak{S}_r \{H\}. \]

Since \( E_Z^{o r} \) decomposes, as a right \( \mathfrak{S}_r \)-module, into a direct sum where each summand is indexed by an \( \mathfrak{S}_r \)-orbit of \( \mathcal{B} \), \( (E_Z^{o r})_H \) decomposes as a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-module into an analogous direct sum. We have a \( G_Z \)-morphism \( \Phi_H : (E_Z^{o r})_H \to E_Z^{o r} \), defined by \( a \otimes \{H\} \mapsto a\{H\} \) for \( a \in E_Z^{o r} \), which respects the abovementioned decomposition. When \( N \geq r \) so that \( Z\mathcal{B}_\sigma \) is a right \( \mathfrak{S}_r \)-summand of \( E_Z^{o r} \), the map \( \Phi_H \) is injective when restricted to the corresponding summand \( (Z\mathcal{B}_\sigma)_H \), and when post-composed with the isomorphism \( Z\mathcal{B}_\sigma \cong Z\mathfrak{S}_r \), sends \((Z\mathcal{B}_\sigma)_H \) bijectively onto \( Z\mathfrak{S}_r \{H\} \), which is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-summand of \( Z\mathfrak{S}_r \), since \( Z\mathfrak{S}_r = Z\mathfrak{S}_r \{H\} \oplus \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_r \setminus \{1\}} Z\mathfrak{S}_r \), where \( \Gamma \) is a left transversal of \( H \) in \( \mathfrak{S}_r \).

Let \( \lambda \) be a partition of \( r \) of at most \( N \) parts and let \( \mathfrak{s} \) be a \( \lambda \)-tableau. Consider the \( G_Z \)-morphism:

\[ \delta^Z_{\mathfrak{s}} : E_Z^{o r} [C_{\mathfrak{s}}] \hookrightarrow (E_Z^{o r})_{R_\mathfrak{s}}, \]

where the second map sends \( a \in E_Z^{o r} \) to \( a \otimes \{R_\mathfrak{s}\} \in (E_Z^{o r})_{R_\mathfrak{s}} \). It is well known from the polynomial representation theory of general linear groups that \( \text{Im} (\delta^Z_{\mathfrak{s}}) \), the image of \( \delta^Z_{\mathfrak{s}} \), is isomorphic to the integral dual Weyl module \( \nabla_Z(\lambda) \) [2, §8.3, Proposition 1], and is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-summand of \( (E_Z^{o r})_{R_\mathfrak{s}} \). To describe the highest weight vector in \( \text{Im} (\delta^Z_{\mathfrak{s}}) \), let \( \lambda^Z(i) : \{1, \ldots, r\} \to \{1, \ldots, N\} \) be the function such that \( \lambda^Z(i) = j \) if the node labelled \( i \) in \( \mathfrak{s} \) lies on its \( j \)-th row. Then \( \delta^Z_{\mathfrak{s}}(\lambda^Z(\mathfrak{s})[C_{\mathfrak{s}}]) \) is a highest weight vector in \( \text{Im} (\delta^Z_{\mathfrak{s}}) \).

All the statements in the previous three paragraphs behave well under base change, so that we have entirely analogous statements as above, with \( \mathbb{Z} \) being replaced by any commutative ring \( R \) with 1.

Proof of Theorem 3.7. Note that \( \iota_{\lambda,\mu} \) admits a splitting defined over \( \mathbb{Z}(p) \) if and only if the canonical \( \text{GL}_N(\mathbb{F}) \)-morphism \( \phi : \nabla(\lambda) \otimes \nabla(\mu) \to \nabla(\lambda + \mu) \) admits a splitting defined over \( \mathbb{Z}(p) \).

Let \( \mathfrak{s} = t^1 \) and \( t = t^\mu \). Recall that \([C_{s+t}] = [C_s][C_{t+n}]\), so that \( E_R^{o(m+n)} [C_{s+t}] = E_R^{o(m)} [C_s] \otimes E_R^{o(n)} [C_{t+n}]\), for any commutative ring \( R \) with 1. Thus we have the following \( G_Z \)-morphisms, which are well-behaved under base change:

\[ \psi_Z : E_Z^{o(m+n)} [C_{s+t}] \overset{Y_{s+t}^{-1}}\to E_Z^{o(m+n)} [C_{s+t}] \overset{Y_{s+t}}\to E_Z^{o(n)} [C_s] \otimes E_Z^{o(m)} [C_{t+n}] \overset{\delta^Z_{s+t} \otimes \delta^Z_{t+n}}\to (E_Z^{o(m)})_{R_\mathfrak{s}} \otimes (E_Z^{o(n)})_{R_\mathfrak{t}}, \]

where \( Y_{s+t} \) is right ‘multiplication’ by \( Y_{s+t} = \{R_{s+t}\}[C_{s+t}] \), and

\[ \zeta_Z : E_Z^{o(m+n)} [C_{s+t}] \overset{\delta^Z_{s+t}}\to (E_Z^{o(m+n)})_{R_{s+t}} \overset{\beta}\to E_Z^{o(m+n)} [C_{s+t}] \]

where \( \beta(u \otimes \{R_{s+t}\}) = u\{R_{s+t}\}[C_{s+t}] \) for \( u \in E_Z^{o(m+n)} \). By the representation theory of \( \text{GL}_N(\mathbb{Q}) \) ([2, 1]), the induced \( \text{GL}_N(\mathbb{Q}) \)-morphism \( \psi_Q \) factors through \( \delta^Q_{s+t} \), and hence induces the \( \text{GL}_N(\mathbb{Q}) \)-morphism

\[ \psi' : \text{Im} (\delta^Q_{s+t}) \to \text{Im} (\delta^Q_{s}) \otimes \text{Im} (\delta^Q_{t}). \]
satisfying, over \( \mathbb{Q} \),
\[
\psi'(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}])) = \psi_{Q}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]) = (\delta^Q_s \otimes \delta^Q_t)(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]Y_{s+1}) = \frac{1}{[R_{s+1}]}(\delta^Q_s \otimes \delta^Q_t)(v_{s+1+1}(R_{s+1})[C_{s+1}]Y_{s+1}) = h_{\lambda+\mu}(\delta^Q_s \otimes \delta^Q_t)(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]) = h_{\lambda+\mu}(\delta^Q_s(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]) \otimes \delta^Q_t(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}])) = h_{\lambda+\mu}(\delta^Q_s(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]) \otimes \delta^Q_t(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]))
\]
where the third equality holds since \( R_{s+1} \) is the stabilizer of \( v_{s+1+1} \), and the fourth follows since \( Y^Q_{s+1} = h_{\lambda+\mu}Y_{s+1} \), see Section 2.3.

Assume that \( \phi \) admits a splitting \( \xi \) defined over \( \mathbb{Z}(p) \). Identify \( \nabla_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\lambda + \mu) \cong \text{Im}(\delta^Q_{s+1}) \), \( \nabla_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\lambda) \cong \text{Im}(\delta^Q_{s+1}) \), and \( \nabla_{\mathbb{Z}(p)}(\mu) \cong \text{Im}(\delta^Q_{s+1}) \). Under this identification, the splitting map \( \xi \) of \( \phi \) satisfies
\[
\xi(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}])) = \delta^Q_{s+1}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]) \otimes \delta^Q_{s+1}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]) = \delta^Q_s(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]) \otimes \delta^Q_t(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]).
\]
Since \( \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{GL}(\mathbb{Q})}(\nabla_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda + \mu), \nabla_{\mathbb{Q}}(\lambda) \otimes \nabla_{\mathbb{Q}}(\mu)) = 1 \), we must have \( \psi' = h_{\lambda+\mu}\xi \). To proceed, note that \( N \geq n + m \) implies that elements of \( \mathfrak{S}_{m+n} \) may be viewed as functions from \( \{1, \ldots, m + n\} \) to \( \{1, \ldots, N\} \). Let \( \tilde{\omega} \) be the identity element in \( \mathfrak{S}_{m+n} \), viewed in this way. Then, since
\[
\psi'(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}])) = (\delta^Q_s \otimes \delta^Q_t)(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]Y_{s+1}) = (v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]Y_{s+1}) \otimes (R_sR_t),
\]
we have, by Lemmas 2.7(4) and 3.6(1),
\[
\gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_1}(\psi'(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}])) = \gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_2}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]Y_{s+1} \otimes (R_sR_t)) = \gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_3}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]Y_{s+1} \otimes (R_sR_t)) = \gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_4}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]Y_{s+1} \otimes (R_sR_t)) = \theta_{\lambda, \mu},
\]
where \( \mathcal{Z}_1 := \text{Im}(\delta^Q_s \otimes \delta^Q_t) \) is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-summand of \( \mathcal{Z}_2 := (\mathbb{Z}(n+m)) \), which also has another \( \mathbb{Z} \)-summand \( \mathcal{Z}_3 := (\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{S}_{m+n})) \) that is \( \mathbb{Z} \)-isomorphic to \( \mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{S}_{m+n}) \), a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-summand of \( \mathbb{Z}(\mathfrak{S}_{m+n}) \). Since \( \psi' = h_{\lambda+\mu}\xi \) and \( \xi \) is defined over \( \mathbb{Z}(p) \), we thus have
\[
\frac{\theta_{\lambda, \mu}}{h_{\lambda+\mu}} = \frac{1}{h_{\lambda+\mu}} \gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_1}(\psi'(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}]))) = \gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_1}(\xi(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_{s+1}[C_{s+1}])) \in \mathbb{Z}(p).
\]
In particular, since \( \theta_{\lambda, \mu} \equiv h_{\lambda+\mu} \) by Lemma 3.6(3), we must have \( p \nmid \frac{\theta_{\lambda, \mu}}{h_{\lambda+\mu}} \).

Conversely, suppose that \( p \nmid \frac{\theta_{\lambda, \mu}}{h_{\lambda+\mu}} \), or equivalently, \( \frac{\theta_{\lambda, \mu}}{h_{\lambda+\mu}} \in \mathbb{Z}(p) \). For each \( v_f \in \mathcal{Z}_p \), there exists \( g_f \in \mathbb{Z}(p) \) such that \( g_f(v_f) = v_f \), where \( v_f \) continues to denote the identity of \( \mathbb{S}_{m+n} \), viewed as a function from \( \{1, \ldots, m + n\} \) to \( \{1, \ldots, N\} \). Thus,
\[
\gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_1}(\psi'(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_f[C_{s+1}]))) = \gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_2}(\psi'(\delta^Q_{s+1}(g_f(v_f)[C_{s+1}]))) = \gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_3}(\psi'(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_f[C_{s+1}]))),
\]
which is an integer multiple of \( \gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_1}(\psi'(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_f[C_{s+1}])) = \theta_{\lambda, \mu} \), since \( g_f \in \mathbb{Z}(p) \) stabilizes \( \mathcal{Z}_1 \). Consequently,
\[
\gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_1}(\frac{\psi'}{h_{\lambda+\mu}}(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_f[C_{s+1}]))) = \frac{\gcd_{\mathcal{Z}_1}(\psi'(\delta^Q_{s+1}(v_f[C_{s+1}])))}{\theta_{\lambda, \mu}} \frac{\theta_{\lambda, \mu}}{h_{\lambda+\mu}} \in \mathbb{Z}(p).
\]
Therefore, \( \frac{\psi'}{h_{\lambda+\mu}} \) is defined over \( \mathbb{Z}(p) \), and, as we’ve seen above, is a splitting map for \( \phi \). \( \square \)

Without the assumption \( N \geq n + m \) in the above theorem, we get the following partial result.
Corollary 3.8. Let $N$ be a natural number, and let $\lambda \vdash n$ and $\mu \vdash m$ be partitions of at most $N$ parts. If $p \nmid \frac{\Delta(\lambda + \mu)}{\Delta(\mu)}$, then the canonical $GL_N(\mathbb{F})$-morphism $\iota_{\lambda, \mu} : \Delta(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu)$ admits a splitting defined over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$.

Proof. Suppose that $p \nmid \frac{\Delta(\lambda + \mu)}{\Delta(\mu)}$. If $N \geq n + m$, then the statement follows from Theorem 3.7. If $N < n + m$, then let $N' = n + m$ and, by Theorem 3.7, the canonical $GL_N'(\mathbb{F})$-morphism $\Delta_N'(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta_N'(\lambda) \otimes \Delta_N'(\mu)$ admits a splitting defined over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ (here we put the subscript $N'$ to emphasize that $\Delta_N'(\lambda)$, $\Delta_N'(\mu)$ and $\Delta_N'(\lambda + \mu)$ are Weyl modules for $GL_N'(\mathbb{F})$). Now applying the Schur functor $d_{N,N}$ from polynomial representations of $GL_N'(\mathbb{F})$ to polynomial representations of $GL_N(\mathbb{F})$ (see [7, §6.5]), we deduce that the canonical $GL_N(\mathbb{F})$-morphism $\Delta(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu)$ also admits a splitting defined over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$. □

Example 3.9. The following examples in type $A$ show that Andersen’s condition is generally not sufficient for $\iota_{\lambda, \mu}$ to split (over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$), and in the case $N < n + m$, the condition $p \nmid \frac{\Delta(\lambda + \mu)}{\Delta(\mu)}$ is not always necessary. Note that Andersen’s condition (Proposition 3.3) is given in terms of dominant weights, and that for a partition $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$ with $r \leq N$, its associated dominant weight for $SL_N(\mathbb{F})$ is $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_{N-1} - \lambda_N)$, where $\lambda_i$ is set to be zero if $i > r$.

1. $\lambda = (1, 1)$, $\mu = (1, 0)$: In this case, Andersen’s condition is empty (regardless of $N$), while $p \nmid \frac{\Delta(\lambda + \mu)}{\Delta(\mu)}$ yields $p \neq 3$. When $N = 2$, $\Delta(\lambda)$ is the one-dimensional determinant representation for $GL_2(\mathbb{F})$ and so, $\iota_{\lambda, \mu} : \Delta(\lambda + \mu) \to \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu)$ is the canonical isomorphism, and thus splits over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ for all $p$, showing that the condition $p \neq 3$ is not necessary. If $N \geq 3$, $\iota_{\lambda, \mu}$ splits over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ if and only if $p \neq 3$, as predicted by Theorem 3.7, showing that Andersen’s condition is sufficient.

2. $\lambda = (1, 1)$, $\mu = (4, 2)$: In this case, Andersen’s condition is empty for $N = 2$, and is $p \neq 3$ for $N \geq 3$, while $p \nmid \frac{\Delta(\lambda + \mu)}{\Delta(\mu)}$ yields $p \notin \{2, 3\}$. Once again, when $N = 2$, $\Delta(\lambda)$ is the one-dimensional determinant representation for $GL_2(\mathbb{F})$, and so $\iota_{\lambda, \mu}$ splits over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ for all $p$, show that the condition $p \notin \{2, 3\}$ is unnecessary. For $N \geq 3$, we found by brute force that $\iota_{\lambda, \mu}$ splits over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ if and only if $p \notin \{2, 3\}$, showing once again that Andersen’s condition is insufficient. This example implies in particular, that for a 2-restricted dominant weight $\alpha = (0, 1)$ for $SL_3(\mathbb{F})$, the canonical morphism $\Delta(a + p(p - 1)\rho) \to \Delta(a) \otimes \Delta(p(p - 1)\rho)$ does not admit a splitting map defined over $\mathbb{Z}(2)$, where $p = 2$ and $\rho = (1, 1)$ is the half sum of all positive roots of $SL_3(\mathbb{F})$; see also Remark 3.2(3).

We also have a result analogous to Theorem 3.7 for the symmetric groups.

Proposition 3.10. Let $\lambda, \mu$ be partitions of $n$ and $m$ respectively. Then the canonical $\mathbb{F}S_n \otimes \mathbb{F}S_m$-morphism $j_{\lambda, \mu} : S^2_{\lambda, \mu} \to \text{Ind}_{\mathbb{F}S_n \otimes \mathbb{F}S_m}^{\mathbb{F}S_{n+m}}(S^2_{\lambda} \otimes S^2_{\mu})$ admits a splitting defined over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ if and only if $p \nmid \frac{\Delta(\lambda + \mu)}{\Delta(\mu)}$. Here, we identify $\mathbb{F}S_n \otimes \mathbb{F}S_m$ with the subgroup $\mathbb{F}S_n \otimes \mathbb{F}S_m$ of $\mathbb{F}S_{n+m}$.

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}(\lambda)$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{F}(\mu)$. Recall that the dual Specht modules $S_{\lambda}$ and $S_{\mu}$ (over any commutative ground ring with 1) may be realized as left ideals of the symmetric group rings generated by the Young symmetrizers $Y_{\sigma}$ and $Y_{\tau}$ respectively. The induced module $\text{Ind}_{\mathbb{F}S_n \otimes \mathbb{F}S_m}^{\mathbb{F}S_{n+m}}(S_{\lambda} \otimes S_{\mu})$ may then be realized as the left ideal generated by $Y_{\sigma}Y_{\tau}$, and as in the proof of Lemma 3.6,

$$Y_{\sigma+\tau} = \{\Gamma\}Y_{\sigma}Y_{\tau} \in \mathbb{Z}S_{n+m}Y_{\sigma+m},$$

where $\Gamma$ is a left transversal of $R_{\sigma}R_{\tau}$ in $R_{\sigma+\tau}$. As such, the left ideal generated by $Y_{\sigma}Y_{\tau}$, $\text{Ind}_{\mathbb{F}S_n \otimes \mathbb{F}S_m}^{\mathbb{F}S_{n+m}}(S_{\lambda} \otimes S_{\mu})$, contains $S_{\lambda+m}$, which is generated by $Y_{\lambda+m}$. Under this realisation, the canonical $\mathbb{F}S_{n+m}$-morphism $j_{\lambda, \mu} : S_{\lambda+m} \to \text{Ind}_{\mathbb{F}S_n \otimes \mathbb{F}S_m}^{\mathbb{F}S_{n+m}}(S_{\lambda} \otimes S_{\mu})$ is the inclusion map.

Let $\chi : \text{Ind}_{\mathbb{F}S_n \otimes \mathbb{F}S_m}^{\mathbb{F}S_{n+m}}(S_{\chi} \otimes S_{\mu}) \to S^2_{\lambda+m}$ be a nonzero $\mathbb{Q}S_{n+m}$-morphism, which exists since $\mathbb{Q}S_{n+m}$ is semisimple. Then $\chi(Y_{\sigma}Y_{\tau}) = \alpha Y_{\sigma+\tau}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}S_{n+m}$. We evaluate $\chi(Y_{\sigma}Y_{\tau})(Y_{\sigma}Y_{\tau})$ in two ways. Firstly,

$$\chi(Y_{\sigma}Y_{\tau})(Y_{\sigma}Y_{\tau}) = \chi((Y_{\sigma})^2Y_{\tau}) = \hat{\lambda}^{\lambda} \hat{\mu}^{\mu} \chi(Y_{\sigma}Y_{\tau}) = \hat{\lambda}^{\lambda} \hat{\mu}^{\mu} (\alpha Y_{\sigma+\tau}).$$
On the other hand, we also have

$$\chi(Y_s Y_{t+n}(Y_y Y_{t+n})) = Y_s Y_{t+n} \chi(Y_s Y_{t+n})$$

$$= Y_s Y_{t+n} \alpha Y_{s+t}$$

$$= \{R_s\} \{R_{t+n}\} [C_\sigma][C_{t+n}] \alpha \{R_{s+t}\} [C_{s+t}].$$

Since $[C_s][C_{t+n}] \sigma \{R_{s+t}\} = [C_{s+t}] \sigma \{R_{t+n}\} \in \{0, \pm [C_{s+t}]\} \{R_{s+t}\}$ for all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{m+n}$ by Lemma 4.6, we have $[C_s][C_{t+n}] \alpha \{R_{s+t}\} = z[C_s][C_{t+n}] \{R_{s+t}\}$ for some $z \in \mathbb{Q}$, and hence, continuing with the second evaluation, we get

$$\chi(Y_s Y_{t+n}(Y_y Y_{t+n})) = z Y_s Y_{t+n} Y_{s+t}.$$ 

Equating the two evaluations, we have, for $y := z/(\tilde{h}^\lambda \tilde{h}^\mu) \in \mathbb{Q}$,

$$y Y_s Y_{t+n} Y_{s+t} = \alpha Y_{s+t} = \chi(Y_s Y_{t+n}).$$

Thus,

$$\chi(Y_{s+t}) = \chi(\{y\} Y_s Y_{t+n}) = \{y\} \chi(Y_s Y_{t+n}) = \{y\} y Y_s Y_{t+n} Y_{s+t} = y(y Y_{s+t})^2 = y \tilde{h}^\lambda \mu Y_{s+t}.$$ 

Now, $\chi$ is a splitting map for the inclusion map $j_{\lambda,\mu}$ if, and only if, $\chi(Y_{s+t}) = Y_{s+t}$, i.e. $y = \frac{1}{\tilde{h}^\lambda \mu}$. Now this splitting map is defined over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ if and only if

$$S^{Z(p)}_{\lambda,\mu} = Z(p) \mathfrak{S}_{m+n} Y_{s+t} \ni \chi(Y_s Y_{t+n}) = \frac{1}{\tilde{h}^\lambda \mu} Y_s Y_{t+n} Y_{s+t},$$

i.e. $Z(p) \ni \gcd_{Z(\mathfrak{S}_{m+n})} (\frac{1}{\tilde{h}^\lambda \mu} Y_s Y_{t+n} Y_{s+t}) = \frac{1}{\tilde{h}^\lambda \mu} \gcd_{Z(\mathfrak{S}_{m+n})} (Y_s Y_{t+n} Y_{s+t}) = \frac{\theta_{\lambda,\mu}}{\tilde{h}^\lambda \mu}$, or equivalently, $p \nmid \frac{\theta_{\lambda,\mu}}{\tilde{h}^\lambda \mu}$; here, we have used the fact that $Z\mathfrak{S}_{m+n} Y_{s+t}$ is a $Z$-summand of $Z\mathfrak{S}_{m+n}$ and Lemmas 2.7, 2.4 and 3.6(1).

**Remark 3.11.** One can of course apply the Schur functor to Theorem 3.7 to deduce immediately the reverse direction of Proposition 3.10. However, the forward direction does not seem to be obtainable in this way due to the lack of inverse Schur functor in general.

Our next result relates $\theta_{\lambda,\mu}$ to the denominator of $f_{\lambda,\mu}$ when the last column of $[\lambda]$ is no shorter than the first column of $[\mu]$, which is equivalent to either $t^{\lambda} + t^{\mu} \in \text{Std}(\lambda + \mu)$ or $t_\lambda + t_\mu = t_{\lambda+\mu}$.

**Theorem 3.12.** Let $\lambda \vdash n$ and $\mu \vdash m$, and suppose that the last column of $[\lambda]$ is no shorter than the first column of $[\mu]$. Then

$$\theta_{\lambda,\mu} = \frac{\tilde{h}^\lambda \tilde{h}^\mu}{d_{\lambda,\mu}};$$

where $d_{\lambda,\mu} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is the denominator of $f_{\lambda,\mu}$ (see Lemma 2.1).

In particular, $t_{\lambda,\mu}$ (when $N \geq m + n$) and $j_{\lambda,\mu}$ admit a splitting defined over $\mathbb{Z}(p)$ if and only if $p \nmid \frac{\tilde{h}^\lambda \tilde{h}^\mu}{d_{\lambda,\mu}}$.

**Proof.** Let $s = t_\lambda$ and $t = t_\mu$. Then $s + t = t_{\lambda+\mu}$. By Theorem 2.3(5), we have

$$Y_s = \gamma_{t_\lambda} \sigma_{t_\lambda} f_{t_\lambda, t_\lambda};$$

$$Y_t = \gamma_{t_\mu} \sigma_{t_\mu} f_{t_\mu, t_\mu};$$

$$Y_{s+t} = Y_{t_{\lambda+\mu}} = \gamma_{t_{\lambda+\mu}} \sigma_{t_{\lambda+\mu}} f_{t_{\lambda+\mu}, t_{\lambda+\mu}}.$$
Thus, we have, by the various parts of Proposition 2.5 as indicated below,

\[ Y^t_5 Y_{t+1} = Y_{t+n} Y_{t+1} \]

\[ = \gamma_{\nu} \gamma_{\nu}(\lambda_{\nu} \mu)^{+n} \sigma_{\lambda} f_{\lambda_{\nu}, \lambda_{\mu}} + \sum_{t \neq 1} a_t f_{t, 1, \lambda_{\nu}} \] (by (3))

\[ = \gamma_{\nu} \gamma_{\nu}(\lambda_{\nu} \mu)^{+n} \sigma_{\lambda} f_{\lambda_{\nu}, \lambda_{\mu}} + \sum_{t \neq 1} a_t f_{t, 1, \lambda_{\nu}} \] (by (1))

\[ = \gamma_{\nu} \gamma_{\nu}(\lambda_{\nu} \mu)^{+n} \sigma_{\lambda} f_{\lambda_{\nu}, \lambda_{\mu}} \] (by (2) and Theorem 2.3)

Thus, we have, by Lemmas 2.7(2) and 2.9

\[ \theta_{\lambda, \mu} = \gcd_{\mathcal{S}_{m+n}}(Y_5 Y_{t+n} Y_{t+1}) = \gcd_{\mathcal{S}_{m+n}}(\lambda_{\lambda} \mu \sigma_{\lambda} f_{\lambda_{\nu}, \lambda_{\mu}}) \]

\[ = \frac{\lambda_{\lambda} \mu \sigma_{\lambda} f_{\lambda_{\nu}, \lambda_{\mu}}}{d_{\lambda_{\nu}, \lambda_{\mu}}} \]

The last assertion now follows from Theorem 3.7 and Proposition 3.10.

Since \( d_{\lambda_{\nu}, \lambda_{\mu}} \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) by Lemma 2.9, we have the following immediately corollary, when combined with Lemma 3.6(3).

**Corollary 3.13.** Suppose that the last column of \([\lambda]\) is no shorter than the first column of \([\mu]\). Then \( \theta_{\lambda, \mu} \mid \gcd(\lambda_{\lambda}, \mu, \lambda_{\lambda} + \mu) \).

### 4. Some examples

Perhaps it is to be expected, the computation of \( \theta_{\lambda, \mu} \) is difficult in general. The only work (of which we are aware) that relates to the computation of \( Y_5 Y_{t+n} Y_{t+1} \) is by Raicu [15] Theorem 1.2, in which he provides a simplified way of evaluating \( Y_5 Y_{t+n} Y_{t+1} \) when \( t \) is the unique (1)-tableau. However, it is not clear how one can deduce \( \theta_{\lambda, \mu}(1) \) immediately from his result.

In this concluding section, we provide closed formulas for \( \theta_{\lambda, \mu} \) for two ‘easy’ cases, in which we compute explicitly the product \( Y_5 Y_{t+n} Y_{t+1} \) obtain and the greatest common divisor of its coefficients.

We shall use the following notation in this section: for \( a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \) with \( a \leq b \), we write \([a, b]\) for integer interval between \( a \) and \( b \) (both inclusive), i.e.

\[ [a, b] := \{ c \in \mathbb{Z} \mid a \leq c \leq b \} \]

#### 4.1. The case \( \lambda = (1^a) \) and \( \mu = (m) \)

We have \( Y_{t_{\lambda_{\nu}}} = \{ \mathcal{S}_{n} \}, Y_{t_{\mu}} = \{ \mathcal{S}_{m} \} \) and \( Y_{t_{\lambda_{\mu}}} = \{ \mathcal{S}_{1}\cup[n+1, n+m] \} \{ \mathcal{S}_{n} \} \). Let \( \gamma_0 = 1_{\mathcal{S}_{m+n}} \) the identity of \( \mathcal{S}_{m+n} \), and let \( \gamma_i = (1, n+i) \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq m \). Then \( \Gamma := \{ \gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_m \} \) is a transversal of \( \mathcal{S}_{m+n} \) in \( \mathcal{S}_{1}\cup[n+1, n+m] \). Thus,

\[ Y_{t_{\lambda_{\nu}}} Y_{t_{\lambda_{\mu}}} = \{ \mathcal{S}_{n} \} \{ \mathcal{S}_{m} \} \{ \mathcal{S}_{1}\cup[n+1, n+m] \} \{ \mathcal{S}_{n} \} \]

\[ = \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{m+n} \gamma_i = \Gamma} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \sigma_1 \tau_i^{+n} \gamma_i \tau_i^{+n} \sigma_2. \]

Write \( Y_{t_{\lambda_{\nu}}} Y_{t_{\lambda_{\mu}}} = \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{S}_{m+n}} \sum_{\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{m+n} \gamma_i = \Gamma} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \sigma_1 \tau_i^{+n} \gamma_i \tau_i^{+n} \sigma_2. \) then the \( \rho \) where the sum runs over all \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{m+n} \gamma_i \), \( \tau_i \in \mathcal{S}_{m} \) and \( \gamma_i \in \Gamma \) such that \( \sigma_1 \tau_i^{+n} \gamma_i \tau_i^{+n} \sigma_2 = \rho \).

Fix \( i \in [1, m] \), and let \( H = \mathcal{S}_{[1, n]} \) and \( K_i = \mathcal{S}_{[1, n+m]} \{ n+i \} \). For \( a \in [1, n] \) and \( b \in [1, m] \), define \( \alpha_a = (1, a) \) and \( \beta_b = (n+i, n+b) \) (where \( (1, 1) \) and \( (n+i, n+i) \) are to be read as \( 1_{\mathcal{S}_{m+n}} \)). Then \( \{ \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \} \) is a transversal of \( H \) in \( \mathcal{S}_{n} \) while \( \{ \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m \} \) is a transversal of \( K_i \) in \( \mathcal{S}_{m+n} \), so that

\[ \mathcal{S}_{n} \mathcal{S}_{m+n} \gamma_i \mathcal{S}_{m+n} \mathcal{S}_{n} = \bigcup_{a=1}^{n} \bigcup_{b=1}^{m} \mathcal{S}_{n} \beta_b K_i \gamma_i \mathcal{S}_{m+n} H \alpha_a. \]
Furthermore, we clearly have
\[ C_{a,b} := \mathfrak{S}_n \beta_h K_\gamma \mathfrak{S}_m^{+n} H a_\alpha \subseteq \{ \rho \in \mathfrak{S}_{m+n} \mid \rho([1, n] \setminus \{ a \}) \subseteq [1, n], \rho(a) = n + b \}; \]
in particular, the \( C_{a,b} \)'s are pairwise disjoint. We claim that the above inequality is in fact an equality. If \( \rho \in \mathfrak{S}_{m+n} \) such that \( \rho(j) \in [1, n] \) for all \( j \in [1, n] \setminus \{ a \} \), and \( \rho(a) = n + b \), let \( a' \in [1, n] \) be the unique element such that \( a' \notin \rho([1, n]) \). Then \( \gamma_i \beta_h \alpha_{a' \rho(a)} \in \mathfrak{S}_{m+n} \) sends \( [1, n] \) to \( [1, n] \), and fixes \( 1 \), so that \( \gamma_i \beta_h \alpha_{a'} \rho(a) = \tau_{\rho}^{+n} h_{\rho,i} \) for some unique \( h_{\rho,i} \in H \) and \( \tau_{\rho,i} \in \mathfrak{S}_m \). Thus, \( \rho = \alpha_a \beta_h \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h_{\rho,i} \alpha_a \in \mathfrak{S}_n \beta_h K_\gamma \mathfrak{S}_m^{+n} H a_\alpha \). This proves the claim.

In particular, this justifies our notation \( C_{a,b} \) which is independent of \( i \in [1, m] \). Now, let \( \rho \in C_{a,b} \). Then we have seen above that there exist unique \( a' \in [1, n] \), \( h_{\rho,i} \in H \) and \( \tau_{\rho,i} \in \mathfrak{S}_m \) such that \( \rho = \alpha_{\rho} \beta_h \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h_{\rho,i} \alpha_a \). For any \( \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n, \kappa \in K_i, \tau \in \mathfrak{S}_m \) and \( h, \tau \), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha_{\rho} \beta_h \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h_{\rho,i} \alpha_a = \rho &= \sigma_{\rho} \beta_h \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h_{\rho,i} \alpha_a \\
\iff \alpha_{\rho} h_{\rho,i} \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h &= \sigma \gamma_i \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h \\
\iff \alpha_{\rho} h_{\rho,i} \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h &= \sigma \gamma_i \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h \\
\iff \alpha_{\rho} h_{\rho,i} \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h &= \sigma \gamma_i \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h \\
\iff \alpha_{\rho} h_{\rho,i} \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h &= \sigma \gamma_i \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h \\
\iff \sigma &= \alpha_{\rho} h_{\rho,i} \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h = \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h.
\end{align*}
\]

where the penultimate line holds because the lefthand side of the previous line has support a subset of \([1, n] \) while the righthand side has support a subset of \([1, n] \cup [n+1, 1+n] \).

Thus, exactly \( |K_i||H| = (m-1)(n-1) \) such quadruples will contribute to \( c_{\rho} \), with each contributing \( \text{sgn}(\sigma a_\alpha) = \text{sgn}(\alpha_{\rho} h_{\rho,i} a_\alpha) = \text{sgn}(h_{\rho,i}) \).

For \( i \in [1, m] \) and \( \rho \in C_{a,b} \), we have \( \alpha_{\rho} \beta_h \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h_{\rho,i} \alpha_a = \rho = \alpha_{\rho} \beta_h \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,i}^{+n} h_{\rho,i} \alpha_a \), giving \( h_{\rho,i} h_{\rho,j}^{-1} = (\tau_{\rho,i}^{-1})^{+n} \gamma_i \tau_{\rho,j}^{+n} \), which has to be the identity since the two expressions have disjoint support. Thus, \( h_{\rho,i} = h_{\rho,j} \), which we shall now denote as \( h \). Since, for each \( i \in [1, m] \), we have exactly \( (m-1)(n-1) \) contributions to \( c_{\rho} \), with each contributing \( \text{sgn}(h_{\rho,i}) = \text{sgn}(h_{\rho}) \), and since \( \mathfrak{S}_n \mathfrak{S}_m^{+n} \gamma_0 \mathfrak{S}_m^{+n} \mathfrak{S}_n = \mathfrak{S}_n \mathfrak{S}_m^{+n} \) is disjoint from the \( C_{a,b} \)'s, we conclude that \( c_{\rho} = m!/(n-1)! \text{sgn}(h_{\rho}) \).

Finally, for \( \rho \in \mathfrak{S}_n \mathfrak{S}_m^{+n} \), and \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathfrak{S}_n \) and \( \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathfrak{S}_m \), we have
\[
\rho = \sigma_1 \tau_1^{+n} \tau_2^{+n} \sigma_2 \iff \sigma_1 \sigma_2 = \sigma_\rho \text{ and } \tau_1 \tau_2 = \tau_\rho,
\]
where \( \sigma_\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_n \) and \( \tau_\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_m \) are the unique elements such that \( \rho = \sigma_\rho \tau_\rho^{+n} \). Thus, there are exactly \( |\mathfrak{S}_n| |\mathfrak{S}_m| = m!n! \) contributions to \( c_{\rho} \), with each contributing \( \text{sgn}(\sigma_1 \sigma_2) = \text{sgn}(\sigma_\rho) \).

We have therefore shown that:

**Proposition 4.1.** Let \( \lambda = (1^n) \) and \( \mu = (m) \). Then
\[
Y_{\lambda} Y_{(\mu)^n} = \sum_{\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_n \mathfrak{S}_m^{+n}} m!n! \text{sgn}(\sigma_\rho) \rho + \sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{b=1}^{m} \sum_{\rho \in C_{a,b}} m!(n-1)! \text{sgn}(h_{\rho}) \rho.
\]

In particular, \( \theta_{(1^n), (m)} = m!(n-1)! \).

We thus conclude from Proposition 4.1 Theorem 5.7 and Proposition 3.10 that \( \iota_{(1^n), (m)} \) (when \( N \geq m + n \)) and \( \iota_{(1^n), (m)} \) admit a splitting defined over \( \mathbb{Z}(1) \) if and only if \( p \not| \frac{m(n+1)!, n!}{m!(n-1)!} \) = \( m + n \).

**Remark 4.2.** It is perhaps not surprising that \( p \not| (m + n) \) is sufficient for the splitting of \( \iota_{(1^n), (m)} \), as one may draw the same conclusion by considering the Weyl filtration of \( \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu) \) obtained from the Littlewood-Richardson’s rule and the block(s) in which the Weyl factors, in particular \( \Delta(\lambda + \mu) \), lie. Our results show that the condition is also necessary, which agrees with [6, Theorem 1.4(i)(c)].

4.2. The case \( \lambda = (k, \ell) \) and \( \mu = (m) \). Let \( s = t^k \) and \( t = t^\ell \), and let
\[
A_1 := [1, k]; \quad A_2 := [k + 1, k + \ell]; \quad A_3 := [k + \ell + 1, k + \ell + m].
\]

Then \( C_{3+k} = C_9 = \{(j - k, j) \mid j \in A_2\} \), an elementary Abelian 2-group of rank \( \ell \), which implies in particular that \( \kappa = \kappa^{-1} \) for all \( \kappa \in C_9 \), a fact that we shall use repeatedly in
Corollary 4.4. We record some easy consequences and leave their proofs to the reader as an easy exercise.

Let $m : R_{s \times 1} \times C_s \times R_{s+t} \times C_s \to \mathfrak{g}_{k+\ell+m}$ be defined by $m(\rho, \kappa, \kappa') = \rho \kappa \rho' \kappa'$. Then the image of $m$ is precisely $R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} C_s$, and so $Y_s Y_{s+t} Y_{s+t} = \sum_{\sigma \in R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} C_s} a_\sigma \sigma$, where

$$a_\sigma = \sum_{(\rho, \kappa, \kappa', \kappa'')} \text{sgn}(\kappa \kappa').$$

To continue, we will describe $R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} C_s$ first, then $m^{-1}(\{\sigma\})$ for $\sigma \in R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} C_s$, and finally compute $a_\sigma$.

Denote the conjugacy class of $\mathfrak{g}_{k+\ell+m}$ consisting of all permutations having cycle type $(2^k, 1^{\ell+m})$ by $\mathcal{C}$. There is a unique element of $C_s$ in $\mathcal{C}$, namely $\pi_s := \prod_{j \in A_2} (j - k, j)$. The symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_{k+\ell+m}$ acts naturally and transitively (from the left) on $\mathcal{C}$ by conjugation, i.e. $g \cdot \pi = g \pi g^{-1}$ for $g \in \mathfrak{S}_{k+\ell+m}$ and $\pi \in \mathcal{C}$. Under this action, the stabilizer of $\pi_s$ is its centralizer in $\mathfrak{S}_{k+\ell+m}$, namely $\Delta_2(\mathfrak{g}_\ell) \mathfrak{S}_{[\ell+1, k]} \mathfrak{S}_A C_s$, where

$$\Delta_2(\mathfrak{g}_\ell) = \{ \sigma \in \mathfrak{g}_\ell \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{g}_2 \}.$$

Observe also that $R_{s+t} \cdot \pi_s = \{ \prod_{j \in A_2} (a_j, j) \mid a_j \text{ distinct elements of } A_1 \cup A_2 \}$.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{k+\ell+m}$ and $\kappa \in C_s$. Then $\sigma \in R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} \kappa$ if and only if $\sigma \kappa(A_2) \subseteq A_1 \cup A_2$.

**Proof.** The forward direction of the statement is clear.

Conversely, if $\sigma \kappa(A_2) \subseteq A_1 \cup A_2$, then we can find $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_{A_1}$ such that $\rho(\sigma \kappa(A_2)) \subseteq [1, \ell] \cup A_2$. Let $\tau = (\rho \sigma \kappa)^{-1}$. Then $\tau([1, \ell] \cup A_2)$ contains precisely $A_2$ and $\ell$ other integers in $A_1 \cup A_3$. Consider $\tau \cdot \pi_s = \prod_{j \in A_2} (\tau(j - k), \tau(j))$. Let

$$J := \{ j \in A_2 \mid \tau(j - k), \tau(j) \in A_2 \},$$

$$J' := \{ j \in A_2 \mid \tau(j - k), \tau(j) \notin A_2 \}.$$

Then $|J| = |J'| = r$. Let $J = \{ j_1, \ldots, j_r \}$ and $J' = \{ j'_1, \ldots, j'_r \}$, and let $\rho_1 = \prod_{j \in J} (j, j) \in \mathfrak{S}_{A_2}$. Then for each $j \in A_2$, exactly one of $(\tau \rho_1)(j - k)$ and $(\tau \rho_1)(j)$ lie in $A_2$, so that

$$(\tau \rho_1) \cdot \pi_s = \prod_{j \in A_2} ((\tau \rho_1)(j - k), (\tau \rho_1)(j)) \in R_{s+t} \cdot \pi_s,$$

and hence $(\kappa \kappa)^{-1} \rho^{-1} \rho_1 = \tau \rho_1 \in R_{s+t} \text{Stab}_{\mathfrak{g}_{s+n}}(\pi_s) = R_{s+t} C_s$. Consequently, $(\kappa \kappa)^{-1} \in R_{s+t} C_s R_{s+t} C_s$ as $\rho, \rho_1 \in R_{s \times 1}$, or equivalently, $\sigma \kappa \in R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} C_s$ as desired. 

The following corollary provides a description for the set $R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} C_s$ as promised.

**Corollary 4.4.** $R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} C_s = \{ \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{k+\ell+m} \mid \{ \sigma(j - k), \sigma(j) \} \nsubseteq A_3 \forall j \in A_2 \}$. 

**Proof.** That the lefthand side is a subset of the righthand side follows immediately from Proposition 4.3. For the converse, let $\sigma$ be an element of the righthand side, and let $\kappa := \prod_{j \in A_2 \cap \sigma^{-1}(A_3)} (j - k, j) \in C_s$. Then $\kappa \kappa(j) \notin A_3$ for all $j \in A_2$, and thus $\sigma \in R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} \kappa \subseteq R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} C_s$ by Proposition 4.3. 

Let $\sigma \in R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} C_s$. Define

$$J_\sigma = \{ j \in A_2 \mid \sigma(j), \sigma(j - k) \notin A_3 \};$$

$$J'_\sigma = \{ j \in A_2 \mid \sigma(j) \in A_3 \}.$$

Then $\sigma \in R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t} \kappa$ for some $\kappa \in C_s$ if and only if $\kappa = \kappa_{\sigma, I} := \prod_{j \in I} (j - k, j)$ for some $I \subseteq J_\sigma$ by Corollary 4.4 and Proposition 4.3. Thus, to describe $m^{-1}(\sigma)$, it suffices to consider $\sigma \kappa_{\sigma, I} \in R_{s \times 1} C_s R_{s+t}$ for various subsets $I$ of $J_\sigma$.

For the remainder of this paper, we need the following notation. For $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{k+\ell+m}$ and $i, j \in [1, 3]$, let

$$X_{ij}^\sigma = \sigma(A_i) \cap A_j.$$ 

We record some easy consequences and leave their proofs to the reader as an easy exercise.
Lemma 4.5.

(1) (a) If \( \rho \in R_{s \times t} \), then \( X_{ij}^{\sigma \rho} = X_{ij}^\sigma \) and \( X_{ij}^{\rho \sigma} = \rho(X_{ij}^\sigma) \) for all \( i, j \in [1, 3] \).

(b) If \( \rho' \in R_{t \times s} \), then \( X_{2j}^{\rho' \sigma} = X_{2j}^{\sigma} \) and \( X_{2i}^{\sigma \rho'} = \sigma(X_{2i}^{\rho'}) \) for all \( i, j \in [1, 3] \).

(2) Let \( \kappa \in C_8 \) and \( J \subseteq A_1 \). The following statements are equivalent:

(a) \( X_{21}^\kappa = J \).

(b) \( \kappa = \prod_{j \in J} (j, j + k) \).

(c) \( X_{12}^\kappa = \sigma_\pi(J) = J + k \).

In particular, \( \kappa(X_{21}^\kappa) = X_{21}^\kappa \), and \( \text{sgn}(\kappa) = (-1)^{|X_{21}^\kappa|} = (-1)^{|X_{21}^\kappa|} \).

Proposition 4.6. Let \( \tau = \rho \kappa \rho' \), where \( \kappa \in C_8 \), \( \rho \in R_{s \times t} \) and \( \rho' \in R_{t \times s} \), and let \( \rho_1 \in R_{s \times t} \).

Then \( \tau \in \rho_1 C_8 R_{s+t} \) if and only if \( \rho_1^{-1} \rho(X_{21}^\kappa) = (\rho_1^{-1} \rho(X_{21}^\kappa))^+ \), in which case there exist unique \( \kappa_1 \in C_8 \) and \( \rho_1' \in R_{s+t} \) such that \( \tau = \rho_1 \kappa_1 \rho_1' \).

In particular, \( |\{ (\rho_1, \kappa_1, \rho_1') \in R_{s \times t} \times C_8 \times R_{s+t} \mid \rho_1 \kappa_1 \rho_1' = \tau \}| = |X_{21}^\kappa|!(k - |X_{21}^\kappa|)!l!m! \).

Proof. If \( \tau = \rho_1 \kappa_1 \rho_1' \) with \( \kappa_1 \in C_8 \) and \( \rho_1' \in R_{s+t} \), then

\[ \mathcal{G}_{A_1 \cup A_2} \mathcal{G}_{A_3} \ni \kappa_1^{-1} \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa = \rho_1' \rho^{-1} \in R_{s+t} = \mathcal{G}_{A_1 \cup A_2} \mathcal{G}_{A_3} \]

so that \( \kappa_1^{-1} \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa \in \mathcal{G}_{A_1 \cup A_2} \mathcal{G}_{A_3} \cap \mathcal{G}_{A_1 \cup A_2} \mathcal{G}_{A_3} = \mathcal{G}_{A_1} \mathcal{G}_{A_2} \mathcal{G}_{A_3} \). In particular, for all \( i \in X_{21}^\kappa \), we have \( \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa(i) \in A_2 \) (since \( \kappa(i) \in A_2 \) and \( \rho_1^{-1} \rho \in R_{s \times t} \)) while \( \kappa_1^{-1} \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa(i) \in A_1 \) (since \( i \in A_1 \)), so that \( \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa(i) \in X_{21}^\kappa \). By Lemma 4.3, we have \( |X_{21}^\kappa| = |X_{21}^\kappa| = |X_{21}^\kappa| \) and hence \( X_{12}^\kappa = \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa(X_{21}^\kappa) = \rho_1^{-1} \rho(X_{21}^\kappa) \); consequently \( \kappa_1 = \prod_{i \in X_{21}^\kappa} (\rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa(j) - k, \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa(j)) \). In particular, \( \kappa_1 \) is unique, and hence so is \( \rho_1' \). Repeating the same argument with \( X_{21}^\kappa \) replacing \( X_{21}^\kappa \), we also get \( X_{21}^\kappa = \rho_1^{-1} \rho(X_{21}^\kappa) \) in the same way.

Conversely, if \( \rho_1^{-1} \rho(X_{21}^\kappa) = (\rho_1^{-1} \rho(X_{21}^\kappa))^+ \), let

\[ \kappa_1 = \prod_{i \in X_{21}^\kappa} (\rho_1^{-1} \rho(i), \rho_1^{-1} \rho(i) + k) = \prod_{j \in X_{21}^\kappa} (\rho_1^{-1} \rho(j) - k, \rho_1^{-1} \rho(j)) \]

Then for \( j \in X_{21}^\kappa \), we have \( \kappa(j) \in X_{21}^\kappa \) by Lemma 4.3(2), so that \( \kappa_1 \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa(j) = \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa(j) + k \in A_2 \). On the other hand, if \( j \in A_2 \setminus X_{21}^\kappa \), then \( \kappa_1 \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa(j) = \kappa_1 \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa) ) = \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa) ) \in A_2 \). Thus, \( \kappa_1 \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa \in \mathcal{G}_{A_1} \mathcal{G}_{A_2} \mathcal{G}_{A_3} \), and hence \( \kappa \rho_1^{-1} \tau = \kappa_1 \rho_1^{-1} \rho \kappa r \in R_{s+t} \) as desired.

Let \( B_1 = \rho(X_{21}^\kappa) \subseteq A_1 \) and \( B_2 = \rho(X_{21}^\kappa) \subseteq A_2 \). Then \( |B_1| = |B_2| = |X_{21}^\kappa| = |X_{21}^\kappa| \) by Lemma 4.3. Suppose that \( \rho_1^{-1} \sigma_1 = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_3 \) where \( \sigma_i \in \mathcal{G}_{A_i} \) for all \( i \). The condition \( \rho_1^{-1} \rho(X_{21}^\kappa) = (\rho_1^{-1} \rho(X_{21}^\kappa))^+ k \) is equivalent to \( \sigma_2(B_2) = (\sigma_1(B_1)) \). For each pair \( (\sigma_2, \sigma_3) \in \mathcal{G}_{A_2} \mathcal{G}_{A_3} \), \( |\{ \sigma_1 \in A_1 \mid (\sigma_1(B_1)) \} = |X_{21}^\kappa| \!(k - |X_{21}^\kappa|)! \). The last assertion thus follows.

Lemma 4.7. Let \( \sigma \in R_{s \times t} C_8 R_{s \times t} C_8 \). If \( (\sigma(j - k), \sigma(j)) \in R_{s \times t} \) for some \( j \in A_2 \), then \( a_\sigma = 0 \).

Proof. The map \( f : \mathbb{m}^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) \to \mathbb{m}^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) \) defined by

\[ (\rho, \kappa, \rho', \kappa') \mapsto ((\sigma(j - k), \sigma(j)) \rho, \kappa, \rho', \kappa'(j - k, j)) \]

is a well-defined fixed-point-free involution on \( \mathbb{m}^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) \). Furthermore, \( \text{sgn}(\kappa) \text{sgn}(\kappa') = -\text{sgn}(\kappa) \text{sgn}(\kappa'(j - k, j)) \), so that the contributions by \( (\kappa, \rho, \rho', \kappa') \) and \( f(\kappa, \rho, \rho', \kappa') \) to \( a_\sigma \) cancel out. Thus \( a_\sigma = 0 \).

Proposition 4.8. Let \( \sigma \in R_{s \times t} C_8 R_{s \times t} C_8 \) such that \( (\sigma(j - k), \sigma(j)) \notin R_{s \times t} \) for all \( j \in A_2 \). Then there exists \( \varepsilon_\sigma \in \{\pm 1\} \) such that \( \text{sgn}(\kappa') = \varepsilon_\sigma \) for all \( (\rho, \kappa, \rho', \kappa') \in \mathbb{m}^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) \).

Proof. We assume first that \( X_{21}^\kappa = \sigma(A_2) \cap A_1 = \emptyset \). Let \( (\rho, \kappa, \rho', \kappa') \in \mathbb{m}^{-1}(\{\sigma\}) \).

Then \( \sigma \rho' = \rho \kappa \rho' \), and so \( X_{21}^{\rho' \sigma} = X_{21}^{\kappa^{-1} \rho' \sigma} = \rho(X_{21}^{\kappa^{-1} \sigma}) \) by Lemma 4.5(1). On the other hand, by
Lemma 4.9.

We prove by induction on \( h \) hence \( \text{sgn}(\epsilon) \) is easily verified. Assume therefore that \( \sigma \) is complete. Since \( \sigma(A_2) \cap A_1 = \emptyset \) (our assumption) and \( (\sigma(i'), \sigma(i' + k)) \notin R_{\kappa \ell} \) (the condition in the proposition), we must have \( \sigma(i' + k) \in A_3 \). But by Proposition 1.3 we have \( \kappa(i' + k) \notin A_3 \), and so \( \kappa(i' + k) \neq i' + k \). Thus, by Lemma 1.3, \( i' + k \in X_{21}^{\sigma} \) and \( \sigma(i') = \kappa(i' + k) \in \sigma(X_{21}^{\sigma}) \). Furthermore, since \( \sigma(i') \in A_2 \), we have \( \sigma(i') \notin X_{21}^{\sigma} \subseteq A_1 \), and the proof of the claim is complete.

Since \( \rho(X_{21}^{\sigma}) = X_{21}^{\sigma} \subseteq \sigma(X_{21}^{\sigma}) \), we conclude from the above that \( |X_{21}^{\sigma}| - |X_{21}^{\sigma}| = |\sigma(1, \ell) \cap A_2| \). Let \( \varepsilon_{\sigma} = (-1)^{|\sigma(1, \ell) \cap A_2|} \). Then, by Lemma 1.3,

\[
\text{sgn}(\kappa \kappa') = (-1)^{|X_{21}^{\sigma}| - |X_{21}^{\sigma}|} = (-1)^{|\sigma(1, \ell) \cap A_2|} = \varepsilon_{\sigma}.
\]

For general \( \sigma \), let \( \kappa'' = \prod_{j \in A_2 \cap \sigma^{-1}(A_1)} (j - k, j) \in C_\delta \), and let \( \sigma_0 = \kappa'' \). Then for all \( j \in A_2 \), if \( \sigma(j) \notin A_1 \), then \( \sigma_0(j) = \sigma(j) \notin A_1 \), while if \( \sigma(j) \in A_1 \), then \( \sigma_0(j) = \kappa''(j) = \sigma(j - k) \notin A_1 \) since \( (\sigma(j - k), \sigma(j)) \notin R_{\kappa \ell} \). Thus \( \sigma_0(A_2) \cap A_1 = \emptyset \). Furthermore, \( \sigma_0 \in R_{\kappa \ell} \) such that \( \sigma_0(j - k, j) \notin R_{\kappa \ell} \) for all \( j \in A_2 \). If \( (\rho, \kappa'', \kappa''') \in m^{-1}(\{1, \ell\}) \), then \( (\rho, \kappa, \kappa', \kappa'') \in m^{-1}(\{\sigma_0\}) \), and so \( \text{sgn}(\kappa \kappa' \kappa''') = \varepsilon_{\sigma_0} \), and hence \( \text{sgn}(\kappa \kappa') = \text{sgn}(\kappa'') \varepsilon_{\sigma_0} =: \varepsilon_{\sigma} \), and the proof is complete. \( \square \)

We will need the next result in the proof of Proposition 4.10 later.

Lemma 4.9. Let \( r, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) with \( r + s \leq k \). Then

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{k-r-s} \binom{k-r-s}{i}(i+s)!(k-i-s)! = \frac{(k+1)!r!s!}{(r+s+1)!}.
\]

Proof. We prove by induction on \( k - r - s \), where the base case of \( k - r - s = 0 \) can be easily verified. Assume therefore that \( k - r - s > 0 \). Using the identity \( \binom{n}{a} = \binom{n-1}{a} + \binom{n-1}{a-1} \), together with the convention that \( \binom{n}{0} = 0 \) if \( a > n \) or \( a < 0 \), we have

\[
\text{LHS} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-r-s} \left( \binom{k-r-s-1}{i} + \binom{k-r-s-1}{i-1} \right) (i+s)!(k-i-s)!
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=0}^{k-r-s-1} \binom{k-r-s-1}{i} (i+s)!(k-i-s)!
+ \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-s} \binom{k-r-s-1}{i-1} (i+s)!(k-i-s)!
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=0}^{k-r-s-1} \binom{k-r-s-1}{i} (i+s)!(k-i-s)!
+ \sum_{i=0}^{k-r-s-1} \binom{k-r-s-1}{i} (i+s+1)!(k-i-s-1)!
\]

\[
= \frac{(k+1)!(r+1)!s!}{(r+s+2)!} + \frac{(k+1)!r!(s+1)!}{(r+s+2)!}
\]

\[
= \frac{(k+1)!r!s!}{(r+s+2)!} (r+1+s+1) = \frac{(k+1)!r!s!}{(r+s+1)!},
\]

where the fourth equality follows from induction hypothesis. \( \square \)
Lemma 4.12. Let \( \sigma \in R_{g+1}(C_3) \) such that \( (\sigma(j-k),\sigma(j)) \notin R_{s+1} \) for all \( j \in A_2 \). Let
\[
\begin{align*}
  r &= |\{i \in [\ell + 1, k] \cup A_3 \mid \sigma(i) \in A_1\}|; \\
  s &= |\{j \in A_2 \mid \sigma(j), \sigma(j-k) \notin A_2\}|.
\end{align*}
\]
Then
\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad r \geq k - \ell \text{ and } r + s \leq \min(k, k - \ell + m); \\
(2) & \quad a_\sigma = \frac{\ell ! m ! (k + 1)! r ! s !}{(r + s + 1)!}.
\end{align*}
\]

Proof. For each \( i \in [1, 3] \), let \( B_i = \{ a \in [1, \ell] \cup A_2 \mid \sigma(a) \in A_i \} \). Then our imposed condition on \( \sigma \) implies that for each \( j \in A_2 \), at most one of \( \sigma(j) \) and \( \sigma(j-k) \) may lie in \( A_i \), so that \( |B_i| \leq \ell \). Furthermore, for each of the \( s j \)'s in \( A_2 \) for which \( \sigma(j), \sigma(j-k) \notin A_2 \), exactly one of \( \sigma(j) \) and \( \sigma(j-k) \) lies in \( A_1 \), while the other lies in \( A_3 \). Thus, there are exactly \(|B_1| - s\) \( j \)'s in \( A_2 \) such that exactly one of \( \sigma(j) \) and \( \sigma(j-k) \) lies in \( A_1 \) while the other lies in \( A_2 \).

(1) There are exactly \( k \) \( i \)'s from \([1, k + \ell + m]\) such that \( \sigma(i) \in A_1 \), and thus \( r + s \leq k \). Exactly \( |B_1| \) of these \( i \)'s lie in \([1, \ell] \cup A_2 \), while exactly \( r \) of these \( i \)'s lie outside \([1, \ell] \cup A_2 \). Thus \( r + |B_1| = k \), giving \( r = k - |B_1| \geq k - \ell \). There are exactly \( |B_1| \) \( j \)'s in \( A_2 \) for which \( \{\sigma(j), \sigma(j-k)\} \cap A_1 \neq \emptyset \), and hence exactly \( \ell - |B_1| \) \( j \)'s in \( A_2 \) for which \( \sigma(j), \sigma(j-k) \notin A_1 \), which is equivalent to having exactly one of \( \sigma(j) \) and \( \sigma(j-k) \) lying in \( A_2 \) while the other lying in \( A_3 \). Consequently, \( m \geq |B_3| \geq s + (\ell - |B_1|) = s + \ell - (k - r) \), as desired.

(2) By Proposition 4.10, we have \( a_\sigma = \varepsilon_\sigma |m^{-1}(|\sigma|)|. \) Recall the paragraph right after Corollary 4.3 that \((\rho, \kappa, \rho', \kappa') \in m^{-1}(|\sigma|)\) if and only if \( \kappa' = \kappa_\sigma, I = \bigcup_{j \in I} (j - k, j) \) for some \( I \subseteq J_\sigma \), where \( J_\sigma = \{ j \in A_2 \mid \sigma(j), \sigma(j-k) \notin A_3 \} \) and \( J'_\sigma = \{ j \in A_2 \mid \sigma(j) \in A_3 \} \), and that
\[
|\{(\rho, \kappa, \rho') \in R_{s+1}(C_3) \mid \rho \kappa \rho' \kappa_\sigma, I = \sigma\}| = |X_{21 \sigma, \kappa_\sigma, I}^{\sigma_\kappa_\sigma, I}!| (k - |X_{21 \sigma, \kappa_\sigma, I}^{\sigma_\kappa_\sigma, I}|)! |m|!
\]
by Proposition 4.10. We conclude from the above discussion that \( |J_\sigma| = |B_1| - s = k - r - s \), and that \( |X_{21 \sigma, \kappa_\sigma, I}^{\sigma_\kappa_\sigma, I}| = s + |\{ j \in J_\sigma \mid \sigma_\kappa_\sigma, I (j) \in A_1 \}|. \) Thus, for each \( i \in [0, k - r - s] \), there are exactly \((k - r - s)\) subsets \( I \) of \( J_\sigma \) such that \( |X_{21 \sigma, \kappa_\sigma, I}^{\sigma_\kappa_\sigma, I}| = s + i \). Hence,
\[
|m^{-1}(|\sigma|)| = \sum_{i=0}^{k-r-s} \binom{k-r-s}{i} (i + s)! (k - i - s)! |m|!
\]
by Lemma 4.10.

Lemma 4.11. Let \( r, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) such that \( r \geq k - \ell \) and \( r + s \leq \min(k, k - \ell + m) \). Then there exists \( \sigma \in R_{s+1}(C_3) \) such that \( (\sigma(j-k), \sigma(j)) \notin R_{s+1} \) for all \( j \in A_2 \), and
\[
\begin{align*}
  r &= |\{i \in [\ell + 1, k] \cup A_3 \mid \sigma(i) \in A_1\}| \quad \text{and} \quad s = |\{j \in A_2 \mid \sigma(j), \sigma(j-k) \notin A_2\}|.
\end{align*}
\]

Proof. Let \( \rho' = \prod_{j=1}^{s+k+2} (j, k + \ell + j) \in R_{s+1} \) and \( \kappa = \prod_{j=1}^{s} (j, j+k) \in C_3 \). Then for \( \sigma = \kappa \rho' \), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
  \{i \in [\ell + 1, k] \cup A_3 \mid \sigma(i) \in A_1\} &= [\ell + 1, k] \cup [k + \ell + s + 1, 2\ell + s + r]; \\
  \{j \in A_2 \mid \sigma(j), \sigma(j-k) \notin A_2\} &= [k + 1, k + s].
\end{align*}
\]

We need the following number theoretic result to express \( \theta_{(k, \ell), (m)} \) in a nice closed form.

Lemma 4.12. Let \( a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \).

(1) We have
\[
\frac{(a+b+1)!}{a!b!} \mid \text{lcm}_2([a + 1, a + b + 1]).
\]
(2) The following two subsets of positive integers have the same least common multiple:
\[
\left\{ \frac{(r+s+1)!}{r!s!} \mid r, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \ r \geq a, \ r+s \leq a+b \right\} \\
\{a+1, a+b+1\}.
\]

Proof.

(1) It suffices to show that \(v_p\left(\frac{(a+b+1)!}{a!b!}\right) \leq v_p(\text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([a+1, a+b+1]))\) for any prime integer \(p\). We have \(v_p\left(\frac{(a+b+1)!}{a!b!}\right) = v_p((a+1)(a+b+1)) = v_p(a+1) + v_p\left(\frac{(a+b+1)}{a+1}\right)\). Let 
\[a+1 = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \alpha_ip^i \quad \text{and} \quad b = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \beta_ip^i\]
be the \(p\)-adic decompositions of \(a+1\) and \(b\). Let 
\[I = \{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \mid \sum_{j=0}^{i} (\alpha_j + \beta_j)p^j \geq p^{i+1}\}.
\]

By a result of Kummer [11, p.116], we have \(v_p\left(\frac{(a+b+1)!}{a!b!}\right) = |I|\).

If \(I = \emptyset\), then 
\[v_p\left(\frac{(a+b+1)!}{a!b!}\right) = v_p(a+1) \leq v_p(\text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([a+1, a+b+1])).\]

Assume thus \(I \neq \emptyset\), and let \(i_0 = \min(I)\) and \(i_1 = \max(I)\). Since \(\alpha_i = 0\) for all \(j < v_p(a+1)\), we have \(\sum_{j=0}^{i_0}(\alpha_j + \beta_j)p^j = \sum_{j=0}^{i_0}\beta_jp^j < p^{i+1}\) for all \(i < v_p(a+1)\), so that 
\[i_0 \geq v_p(a+1)\].

Let \(c = p^{i+1} + \sum_{i=i_1+1}^{\infty} \alpha_ip^i\). Then \(c - (a+1) = p - \sum_{i=0}^{i_1} \alpha_ip^i > 0\), while 
\[(a+b+1) - c = \sum_{i=i_1+1}^{\infty} \beta_i + \sum_{j=0}^{i_1}(\alpha_j + \beta_j)p^j - p^{i+1} \geq 0\]
since \(i_1 \in I\), so that \(c \in [a+1, a+b+1]\). Thus, 
\[v_p\left(\frac{(a+b+1)!}{a!b!}\right) = v_p(a+1) + v_p\left(\frac{(a+b+1)!}{a!b!}\right) \leq i_0 + |I|\]
\[\leq i_1 + 1 \leq v_p(c) \leq v_p(\text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([a+1, a+b+1]),
\]
and we are done.

(2) Fix \(a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\). Let \(S_b = \left\{ \frac{(r+s+1)!}{r!s!} \mid r, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \ r \geq a, \ r+s \leq a+b \right\}\), and \(\ell_b = \text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}(S_b)\). We prove by induction on \(b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\), with the base case of \(b = 0\) being trivial. Assume thus that \(b > 0\) and \(\ell_{b-1} = \text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([a+1, a+b])\). When \(s = 0\) we have \(\frac{(r+s+1)!}{r!s!} = r+1\). Thus \([a+1, a+b+1] \subseteq S_b\), so that 
\[\text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([a+1, a+b+1]) | \ell_b.
\]

Conversely, as \(S_b = S_{b-1} \cup \left\{ \frac{(a+b+1)!}{(a+b-s)!s!} \mid s \in [0, b] \right\}\), we have, for any \(x \in S_{b-1}, x | \ell_{b-1} = \text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([a+1, a+b]) | \text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([a+1, a+b+1])\) by induction, while 
\[\frac{(a+b+1)!}{(a+b-s)!s!} | \text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([a+b-s+1, a+b+1]) | \text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([a+1, a+b+1])\]
for all \(s \in [0, b]\) by part (1), and the proof is complete.

\[\square\]

Theorem 4.13. We have 
\[\theta_{(k,\ell),(m)} = \frac{(k+1)! \ell! m!}{\text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([k-\ell+1, k-\ell+1 + \min(\ell, m)])}.
\]

Proof. By Lemmas 4.7 and 4.11 and Proposition 4.10 we have 
\[\theta_{(k,\ell),(m)} = \gcd_{\mathbb{Z}}\left\{ \frac{\ell m!(k+1)!(k+s+1)!}{(r+s+1)!} \mid r, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \ r \geq k-\ell, \ r+s \leq \min(k, k-\ell + m) \right\}
\]
\[= \frac{\ell m!(k+1)!}{\text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([k-\ell+1, k-\ell+1 + \min(\ell, m)])},
\]
\[\theta_{(k,\ell),(m)} = \frac{\ell m!(k+1)!}{\text{lcm}_\mathbb{Z}([k-\ell+1, k-\ell+1 + \min(\ell, m)])},
\]
where the last equality follows from Lemma 4.12(3).

\[\square\]

Remark 4.14. Putting $\ell = 0$ in Theorem 4.13 we obtain $\theta(k, m) = k! m!$, and so the canonical $\GL_N(F)$-morphism $\iota(k, m)$ when $N \geq m + n$ splits over $\mathbb{Z}_p$ if and only if $p \nmid k! m! = (k + m)! (k + m)! = \binom{k + m}{m}$, agreeing with Proposition 3.4 as expected.
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