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Abstract. In this paper we consider arbitrary hexagons on the triangular lattice with three arbitrary bowtie-shaped holes, whose centers form an equilateral triangle. The number of lozenge tilings of such general regions is not expected — and indeed is not — given by a simple product formula. However, when considering a certain natural normalized counterpart $R$ of any such region $R$, we prove that the ratio between the number of tilings of $R$ and the number of tilings of $\overline{R}$ is given by a simple, conceptual product formula. Several seemingly unrelated previous results from the literature — including Lai’s formula for hexagons with three dents and Ciucu and Krattenthaler’s formula for hexagons with a removed shamrock — follow as immediate consequences of our result.

1. Introduction

MacMahon’s classical formula [14] stating that the number of plane partitions that fit in an $x \times y \times z$ box is equal to

$$P(x, y, z) = \prod_{i=1}^{x} \prod_{j=1}^{y} \prod_{k=1}^{z} \frac{i + j + k - 1}{i + j + k - 2}$$

has served as motivation and source of inspiration for a considerable amount of work in enumerative combinatorics for the past three decades. Following David and Tomei’s [8] elegant observation that such boxed plane partitions are in one-to-one correspondence with lozenge tilings of a hexagon of sides $x, y, z, x, y, z$ (in cyclic order) on the triangular lattice, a lot of this research has been phrased in terms of lozenge tilings.

Generalizations of MacMahon’s formula include [2][3][15][6][10][13][7][11][12][1].

In this paper we consider a family of regions which generalizes several of the regions involved in the above mentioned previous work in the literature. We call our regions triad hexagons — arbitrary hexagons on the triangular lattice with three bowtie-shaped holes arranged in a triad, so that the nodes of the bowties form a lattice triangle.
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The main result of this paper is not a product formula for the number of lozenge tilings of a single such triad hexagon. Instead, we define a natural equivalence relation on the set of triad hexagons based on an operation we call bowtie squeezing, and we prove that the ratio of the number of tilings of any two regions in the same equivalence class is given by a simple, conceptual product formula.

Several of the mentioned results from the literature, including Lai’s formula [10] for the number of lozenge tilings of hexagons with three dents, and Ciucu and Krattenthaler’s formula [5] concerning hexagons with a removed shamrock, follow as immediate consequences of our result. Given the simple form of our current formula, this point of view helps to understand conceptually the original formulas, which were less structured and more complicated.

2. Statement of main results

A bowtie is a union of two oppositely oriented, not necessarily congruent lattice triangles sharing a vertex, called the node; a bowtie with down-pointing lobe of side-length $a$ and up-pointing lobe of side-length $a'$ is said to have type $(a, a')$, and is referred to as an $(a, a')$-bowtie.
Three bowties form a triad if their nodes form a lattice triangle housing at each of its three agles one bowtie lobe (see the top left picture in Figure 1 for in example).

Suppose we remove a triad of bowties, say of types \((a, a'), (b, b')\) and \((a, a')\) (counterclockwise from top), from a hexagonal region. It is not hard to see that, provided the resulting region can be tiled by lozenges\(^1\), the side-lengths of the hexagon must be of the form \(x + a + b + c, y + a' + b' + c', z + a + b + c, x + a' + b' + c', y + a + b + c, z + a' + b' + c'\), with \(x, y, z\) non-negative integers.

Indeed, take a lozenge tiling of our region, and consider in it the \(a + b + c\) paths of lozenges that start upward along the horizontal edges of the down-pointing lobes. These must end somewhere along the top side of the hexagon; if the number of unit segments on this side where no such path ends is \(x\), then the top side has length \(x + a + b + c\). An analogous argument, involving the paths of lozenges starting downward from the horizontal edges of the up-pointing lobes, shows that the bottom side of the hexagon has length \(x' + a' + b' + c'\), where \(x'\) is some non-negative integer. Because the paths of lozenges that start at the bottom side and do not end at the lobes can only end at places on the top side not connected by paths of lozenges to the lobes, we must have \(x' = x\). Repeating this argument for the other two pairs of opposite sides of the hexagon we obtain the claim in the previous paragraph.

If the nodes of the bowties in the triad are at points \(A, B\) and \(C\) (counterclockwise from top), we denote this bowtie by \(R_{x,y,z}^{A,B,C}\)\((a, b, c, a', b', c')\). We emphasize that the upper indices denote the geometrical position of the nodes, and not numbers. This hybrid notation between integer parameters and geometric positions is best suited for bringing out the conceptual form of our formulas. We call the points \(A, B\) and \(C\) focal points, and the segments \(AB, AC\) and \(BC\) focal edges.

We call the distance \(|AB| = |AC| = |BC|\) (measured in unit triangle side lengths) the focal distance of the triad hexagon, and we denote it by \(f\). Note that if \(R_{x,y,z}^{A,B,C}\)\((a, b, c, a', b', c')\) can be tiled by lozenges, we must necessarily have \(f \geq a' + b' + c'\). One can see this for instance by considering a tiling and following the paths of lozenges that start along the horizontal side of the lobe of size \(a'\) of the top bowtie: These \(a'\) paths must fit through the gap determined by the bottom two bowties, which has size \(f - b' - c'\), so \(a' \leq f - b' - c'\), proving our claim.

Therefore, throughout this paper we will assume that the focal distance \(f\) of our triad hexagons satisfies \(f \geq a' + b' + c'\).

We now define the operation of bowtie squeezing, which turns a given triad hexagon into another triad hexagon, as follows. Given a triad hexagon \(R\), the triad hexagon obtained from \(R\) by squeezing out the \((a, a')\)-bowtie \(d\) units, where \(d \leq a'\), is the region obtained from \(R\) by

(i) keeping the node \(A\) fixed and replacing the \((a, a')\)-bowtie with a \((a + d, a' - d)\)-bowtie

(ii) translating the \((b, b')-\) and \((c, c')\)-bowties \(d\) units (measured in unit triangle sides) in the \(BA\) and \(CA\) directions, respectively

(iii) pushing out \(d\) units (measured in lattice spacings) the top three sides of the hexagon, and pulling in \(d\) units the bottom three sides of the hexagon.

The top right picture in Figure 1 illustrates the operation of squeezing out the top bowtie two units. The resulting triad hexagon has the outer boundary indicated by the thick dotted line, and its removed bowties are shaded (the inner lobe of the resulting top bowtie is empty, as that lobe was completely squeezed out).

The operation of squeezing out the other two bowties is defined by symmetry. The inverse of the described operation is called squeezing in the \((a, a')\)-bowtie \(d\) units; it is defined for \(d \leq a\).

Note that the difference between the focal length and the sum of the sizes of the inner lobes is invariant under bowtie squeezing: both decrease (resp. increase) by \(d\) units when a bowtie is

\(^1\) A lozenge is the union of two unit triangles sharing an edge.
squeezed out (resp., squeezed in) \( d \) units. This implies in particular that, since the bowties in \( R \) have disjoint interiors, so do the bowties in any triad hexagon obtained from \( R \) by a sequence of bowtie squeezings.

One special triad hexagon we get from \( R \) is the one obtained by squeezing out completely all three bowties. Figure 1 shows an example (the top right, bottom left and bottom right pictures illustrate the operation of squeezing out successively the top, left and right bowtie, respectively). We denote the resulting region, in which all three inner lobes have shrunk to zero, by \( \overrightarrow{R} \).

Two triad hexagons are said to be equivalent if one can be obtained from the other by a sequence of bowtie squeezing operations. This is obviously an equivalence relation on the set of triad hexagons.

Our main result is a simple product formula for the ratio of any two triad hexagons in the same equivalence class. To state it, we need to define the weight of a triad and the couple of a focal point and of a focal edge.

Recall that the hyperfactorial \( H(n) \) is defined by \( H(0) := 1 \) and
\[
H(n) := 0! 1! \cdots (n - 1)!, \quad n \geq 1. \tag{2.1}
\]

For a triad of bowties of types \( (a, a'), (b, b'), (c, c') \) and focal distance \( f \), we define its weight \( w \) by
\[
w := \frac{H(f)^4 H(a) H(b) H(c) H(a') H(b') H(c')}{H(f + a) H(f + b) H(f + c) H(f - a') H(f - b') H(f - c')} . \tag{2.2}
\]

For a triad hexagon \( R = R^A,B,C_{x,y,z}(a, b, c, a', b', c') \), we define the weight \( w^{(R)} \) to be equal to the quantity \( w \) given by (2.2). Note that \( w^{(R)} \) depends only on the triad of bowties, and not on the position of the triad inside the hexagon.

We also define the couple of the focal points \( A, B \) and \( C \), by
\[
k^{(R)}_A := H(d(A, N)) H(d(A, S)) \tag{2.3}
\]
\[
k^{(R)}_B := H(d(B, NE)) H(d(B, SW)) \tag{2.4}
\]
\[
k^{(R)}_C := H(d(C, NW)) H(d(C, SE)) , \tag{2.5}
\]
where \( d(A, N) \) denotes the distance between \( A \) and the northern side of the outer boundary of \( R \) (expressed in lattice spacings), \( d(B, NE) \) is the distance between \( B \) and the northeastern boundary, and so on.

Similarly, the couple of the focal segments \( BC, AC \) and \( AB \) are defined by
\[
k^{(R)}_{BC} := H(d(BC, N)) H(d(BC, S)) \tag{2.6}
\]
\[
k^{(R)}_{AC} := H(d(AC, NE)) H(d(AC, SW)) \tag{2.7}
\]
\[
k^{(R)}_{AB} := H(d(AB, NW)) H(d(AB, SE)) . \tag{2.8}
\]

The main result of this paper is the following.

**Theorem 1.** Let \( R = R^A,B,C_{x,y,z}(a, b, c, a', b', c') \) be an arbitrary triad hexagon, and let \( Q = R^A_{1,2,3,C_{1,2,3}}(a_1, b_1, c_1, a'_1, b'_1, c'_1) \) be a triad hexagon obtained from \( R \) by a sequence of bowtie squeezings. The we have
\[
\frac{M(R)}{M(Q)} = \frac{w^{(R)} k^{(R)}_A k^{(R)}_B k^{(R)}_C}{w^{(Q)} k^{(Q)}_{A_1} k^{(Q)}_{B_1} k^{(Q)}_{C_1}} , \tag{2.9}
\]
where the weights \( w \) and the couples \( k \) are defined by equations (2.2), (2.8).
Remark 1. Consider the special case when $R$ is a triad hexagon in which the bowties touch the northern, southwestern and southeastern sides of the boundary (see the left picture in Figure 2 for an illustration). Let $\bar{R}$ be the region obtained from $R$ by completely squeezing in all three bowties. Our definition of the bowtie squeezing operation implies that $\bar{R}$ is a hexagon with three triangular holes touching with one of their vertices alternate sides of the boundary (if $R$ is the region on the left in Figure 2, $\bar{R}$ is pictured on the right in the same figure). The details of the construction are shown in Figure 3. After removing from $\bar{R}$ all the lozenges that are forced to be part of each of its tilings, the leftover region is a centrally symmetric hexagon, whose number of tilings is given by MacMahon’s formula (1.1). Therefore equation (2.9) yields a product formula for $M(\bar{R})$. This gives Lai’s earlier result [10].

Remark 2. Another interesting special case is when the bottom two bowties consist just of their outer lobes (i.e. their inner lobes are empty), and they touch the corners of the inner lobe of the top bowtie (see Figure 4 for an example). Let $R$ be such a region, and let $Q$ be the region obtained from $R$ by completely squeezing out the top bowtie (if $R$ is as pictured on the left in Figure 4 the resulting region $Q$ is illustrated in the same figure on the right). Then the bowties in $Q$ consist of single down-pointing lobes, sharing a common vertex. The shaded lozenges indicated in Figure 4 are forced. Upon their removal, the leftover region is a hexagon with an equilateral triangle removed from its center (see [2] for the precise definition of what this central position means). Since equation (2.9) holds, and the lozenge tilings of $Q$ (being a hexagon with an equilateral triangle removed from its center) are enumerated by Theorems 1
and 2 in \cite{2}, we obtain a simple product formula for $M(R)$. This yields Ciucu and Krattenthaler’s earlier result \cite{5}.

3. Two special cases

In this section we present formulas that give the number of lozenge tilings of two families of regions, both special cases of triad hexagons. We will use these formulas in our proof of Theorem 1. Both results are known from the literature. However, the form of the formulas is new — it is tailored to make our calculations in the proof of Theorem 1 easier.

The first family of regions, called magnet bar regions, was introduced in \cite{5}. The picture on the left in Figure 6 describes the magnet bar region $I_{x,y}(a,b,c,m)$.

Note that $I_{x,y}(a,b,c,m)$ is a special case of a triad hexagon, with the focal points $A$, $B$ and $C$ being the top, left and right vertices of the triangular dent of side $m$ along the base, and bowties of types $(c,m)$, $(0,0)$ and $(0,0)$, respectively.
The following result was proved in [5].

**Theorem 2.** [5, Theorem 3.1] For non-negative integers \(x, y, a, b, c, m\), the number of lozenge tilings of the region \(I = I_{x,y}(a, b, c, m)\) is given by

\[
M(I_{x,y}(a, b, c, m)) = w(I) \frac{k_A^{(l)} k_B^{(l)} k_C^{(l)}}{k_{BC}^{(l)} k_{AC}^{(l)} k_{AB}^{(l)}} P(x, y, a + b + c + m),
\]

where the weight \(w\) and the couples \(k\) are given by \((2.2)\) – \((2.8)\) (with \(I\) viewed as a triad hexagon with the focal points \(A, B\) and \(C\) being the top, left and right vertices of the triangular dent of side \(m\) along the base, and bowties of types \((c, m)\), \((0, 0)\) and \((0, 0)\), respectively), and \(P\) is given by \((1.1)\).

The second family consists of the snowman regions \(S_{x,y}(a, b, c, k)\) described on the right in Figure 6. The region itself is determined by the thick solid line contour. The thick dotted lines on top indicate how \(S_{x,y}(a, b, c, k)\) can be viewed as a triad hexagon: The focal points \(A, B, C\) are the top of the triangle of side \(a\), the left vertex of the triangular dent of side \(b\), and the right vertex of the triangular dent of side \(c\), and the corresponding bowties are of type \((0, a)\), \((0, b)\) and \((0, c)\), respectively.

The following is a special case of Theorem 2.1 of [7]. The case \(x = y, b = c\) is an earlier result of Rohatgi (see [13]). Again, the form of the formula is new, adapted for our use of it in the proof of Theorem 1.

---

2In [5] we denoted these regions by the letter \(B\); to avoid confusion with the focal point \(B\), we use here the letter \(I\) instead.

3 The top side of this triad hexagon has length zero.
Figure 7. An example of a triad hexagon $R$ with $x = 0$ (left) and the corresponding region $\overline{R}$ (right).

**Theorem 3.** For non-negative integers $x, y, a, b, c, k$, the number of lozenge tilings of the region $S = S_{x,y}(a, b, c, k)$ is given by

$$M(S_{x,y}(a, b, c, k)) = w^{(S)} \frac{k_A^{(S)} k_B^{(S)} k_C^{(S)}}{k_{BC}^{(S)} k_{AC}^{(S)} k_{AB}^{(S)}} P'(x + b + k, y + c + k, k),$$

where the weight $w$ and the couples $k$ are given by (2.2)–(2.8) (with $S$ viewed as a triad hexagon with the focal points $A$, $B$ and $C$ being the top of the triangle of side $a$, the left vertex of the triangular dent of side $b$, and the right vertex of the triangular dent of side $c$, and bowties of type $(0, a)$, $(0, b)$ and $(0, c)$, respectively), and $P'$ is given by

$$P'(x, y, z) = \frac{H(x) H(y) H(z) H(x + y - z)}{H(x + y) H(y - x) H(z - x)}.$$  

4. The case $x = 0$

In this section we prove the special case of Theorem 1 when $x = 0$ and $Q = \overline{R}$. We need to prove that

$$\frac{M(R)}{M(\overline{R})} = \frac{w^{(R)} k_A^{(R)} k_B^{(R)} k_C^{(R)}}{k_{BC}^{(R)} k_{AC}^{(R)} k_{AB}^{(R)}} \frac{k_{A0}^{(R)} k_{B0}^{(R)} k_{C0}^{(R)}}{k_{B0C0}^{(R)} k_{A0C0}^{(R)} k_{A0B0}^{(R)}},$$

where $\overline{R}$ is obtained from $R$ by squeezing out completely all three bowties (see Section 2 for the definition), and $A_0$, $B_0$ and $C_0$ are its focal points.

Suppose $x = 0$, and consider the triad hexagon $R = R_{0,y,z}^{A,B,C} (a, b, c, a', b', c')$ (an example is shown on the left in Figure 7). Consider also the region $\overline{R}$ obtained from $R$ by completely squeezing out its three bowties (see the picture on the right in Figure 7).
Due to the fact that in this case the length of the top side of $R$ is $a + b + c$, in any tiling of $R$, the paths of lozenges that start upward from the lobes of sizes $a$, $b$ and $c$ are all the paths that end on the top side. This implies that the top shaded hexagon $I$ in Figure 7 is always internally tiled.

Since the length of the bottom side of $R$ is $a' + b' + c'$, the same argument shows that the bottom shaded hexagon $S$ on the left in Figure 7 must also be internally tiled. Since the lozenge tiling is forced on the leftover portion of $R$ (see Figure 7), it follows that

$$M(R) = M(I) M(S). \quad (4.2)$$

The same argument shows that

$$M(\overline{R}) = M(I') M(S'), \quad (4.3)$$

where $S'$ and $I'$ are the top and bottom shaded regions on the right in Figure 7 respectively.

Combining the above two equations gives

$$\frac{M(R)}{M(\overline{R})} = \frac{M(I) M(S)}{M(I') M(S')} \quad (4.4)$$

Express both $M(I)$ and $M(I')$ using the formula of Theorem 2. We claim that the resulting $P$-parts from the right hand side of $(3.1)$ are equal, and thus cancel out in the fraction $M(I)/M(I')$ in $(4.4)$.

To see this, note that, when $I$ is obtained from $R$ as the top shaded region on the left in Figure 7 we have the following interpretation for the quantities in the arguments of $P$ in $(3.1)$:

$$x = (\ell(NW) - f) - d(b\text{-lobe, SW}) \quad (4.5)$$
$$y = (\ell(NE) - f) - d(c\text{-lobe, SE}) \quad (4.6)$$
$$a + b + c + m = \ell(N) + f \quad (4.7)$$

where $\ell(s)$ denotes the length of the side $s$ of the outer hexagon, and all things on the right hand sides refer to the region $R$.

The same realization shows that, when the region $I$ in $(3.1)$ is obtained from $\overline{R}$ as the top shaded region on the right in Figure 7, the quantities $x$, $y$ and $a + b + c + m$ in the resulting arguments of $P$ have the same interpretation $(4.5)-(4.7)$, with the only difference that now the things on the right hand sides of $(4.5)-(4.7)$ refer to the region $\overline{R}$.

However, it is a consequence of our definition of the bowtie squeezing operation that the quantities $\ell(NW) - f$, $\ell(N) + f$, $\ell(NE) - f$, as well as the distance of an outer lobe to the side facing it away from the other two bowties are invariant under bowtie squeezing. This proves our claim.

A similar argument proves the analogous claim that, when we express both $M(S)$ and $M(S')$ using the formula of Theorem 3, the resulting $P'$-parts from the right hand side of $(3.2)$ are equal, and thus cancel out in the fraction $M(S)/M(S')$ in $(4.4)$. To see this, the needed analogs of $(4.5)-(4.7)$ are

$$k = f - a' - b' - c' \quad (4.8)$$
$$x + b = d(b'\text{-lobe, SW}) \quad (4.9)$$
$$y + c = d(c'\text{-lobe, SE}). \quad (4.10)$$

Since both the difference between the focal length and the sum of the inner lobes and the distance between an inner lobe and the side facing it through the other two bowties are invariant under bowtie squeezing, this proves our second claim.
Using the above two claims, we obtain from \((4.4)\) and Theorems 2 and 3 that

\[
\frac{w^{(I)}}{M(R)} = \frac{k^{(I)}_A k^{(I)}_B k^{(I)}_C}{k^{(I)}_{BC} k^{(I)}_{AC} k^{(I)}_{AB}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{w^{(S)}}{M(R)} = \frac{k^{(S)}_A k^{(S)}_B k^{(S)}_C}{k^{(S)}_{BC} k^{(S)}_{AC} k^{(S)}_{AB}}.
\]

By the definition \((2.2)\) of the weight \(w\), we have from the picture on the left in Figure 7

\[
w^{(I)} w^{(S)} = \frac{H(f)^4 H(a) H(0) H(f) H(0)}{H(f + a) H(f + 0) H(f + 0) H(f + f - f) H(f - f)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{H(f)^4 H(0) H(0) H(a') H(b') H(c')}{H(f + 0) H(f + 0) H(f + 0) H(f - a') H(f - b') H(f - c')}
\]

Similarly, we obtain

\[
\frac{k^{(I)}_A}{k^{(I)}_{BC}} = \frac{H(d(A, N)) H(f)}{H(d(BC, N)) H(0)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{k^{(S)}_A}{k^{(S)}_{BC}} = \frac{H(f) H(d(A, S))}{H(0) H(d(BC, S))}
\]

\[
\frac{k^{(I)}_B}{k^{(I)}_{AC}} = \frac{H(d(B, NE)) H(b)}{H(d(AC, NE)) H(0)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{k^{(S)}_B}{k^{(S)}_{AC}} = \frac{H(f) H(d(B, SW))}{H(0) H(d(AC, SW))}
\]

\[
\frac{k^{(I)}_C}{k^{(I)}_{AB}} = \frac{H(d(C, NW)) H(c)}{H(f + a) H(f + 0) H(f + c)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{k^{(S)}_C}{k^{(S)}_{AB}} = \frac{H(f) H(d(C, SE))}{H(0) H(d(AB, SE))}
\]

Thus we obtain

\[
w^{(I)} w^{(S)} = \frac{H(f)^4 H(a) H(b) H(c) H(a') H(b') H(c')}{H(f + a) H(f + b) H(f + c) H(f + f - f) H(f - f)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{H(d(A, N)) H(d(A, S))}{H(d(BC, N)) H(d(BC, S))}
\]

\[
\times \frac{H(d(B, NE)) H(d(B, SW))}{H(d(AC, NE)) H(d(AC, SW))} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{H(d(C, NW)) H(d(C, SE))}{H(d(AB, NW)) H(d(AB, SE))}
\]

\[
= w^{(R)} \frac{k^{(R)}_A k^{(R)}_B k^{(R)}_C}{k^{(R)}_{BC} k^{(R)}_{AC} k^{(R)}_{AB}}.
\]

This shows that the product of the numerators on the right hand side of \((4.11)\) is equal to the numerator on the right hand side of \((4.1)\). The very same argument implies that also the product of the denominators on the right hand side of \((4.11)\) is equal to the denominator on the right hand side of \((4.1)\). Therefore \((4.11)\) follows from \((4.11)\).

5. Proof of Theorem \ref{thm:main}

Our proof is based on Kuo’s graphical condensation method (see \cite{9}). For ease of reference, we state below the particular instance of Kuo’s general results that we need for our proofs (which is Theorem 2.1 in \cite{9}).
Theorem 4. [9, Theorem 2] Let \( G = (V_1, V_2, E) \) be a plane bipartite graph in which \( |V_1| = |V_2| \). Let vertices \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \) and \( \delta \) appear cyclically on a face of \( G \). If \( \alpha, \gamma \in V_1 \) and \( \beta, \delta \in V_2 \), then
\[
M(G)M(G - \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\}) = M(G - \{\alpha, \beta\})M(G - \{\gamma, \delta\}) + M(G - \{\alpha, \delta\})M(G - \{\beta, \gamma\}).
\] (5.1)

Proof of Theorem 7. We claim that in order to prove the theorem, it suffices to show that for any triad hexagon \( R \) we have
\[
M(R) = \frac{w(R)}{w(\overline{R})} \frac{k_A^{(R)} k_B^{(R)} k_C^{(R)}}{k_{BC}^{(R)} k_{AC}^{(R)} k_{AB}^{(R)}},
\] (5.2)
where \( \overline{R} \) is obtained from \( R \) by squeezing out completely all three bowties (see Section 2 for the definition), and \( A_0, B_0 \) and \( C_0 \) are its focal points.

Indeed, assume (5.2) holds for any triad hexagon. Then it holds in particular for \( R \) replaced by \( Q \). Crucially, since \( Q \) is obtained from \( R \) by a sequence of bowtie squeezing operations (see Section 2 for their definition), the region obtained from \( Q \) by completely squeezing out its bowties is also \( \overline{R} \) (i.e. \( \overline{\overline{Q}} = \overline{R} \)). Therefore, we obtain
\[
M(Q) = \frac{w(Q)}{w(\overline{R})} \frac{k_A^{(Q)} k_B^{(Q)} k_C^{(Q)}}{k_{BC}^{(Q)} k_{AC}^{(Q)} k_{AB}^{(Q)}},
\] (5.3)
Combining equations (5.2) and (5.3) yields (2.9), proving our claim.

We prove the equivalent form
\[
M(R) = M(\overline{R}) \frac{w(R)}{w(\overline{R})} \frac{k_A^{(R)} k_B^{(R)} k_C^{(R)}}{k_{BC}^{(R)} k_{AC}^{(R)} k_{AB}^{(R)}},
\] (5.4)
of (5.2) by arguments that parallel those in Sections 3 and 4 of [8]. Namely, we prove (5.4) by showing that both sides satisfy the same recurrence. The formal proof is set up as a proof by induction.

The recurrence satisfied by the left hand side of (5.4) is obtained by applying Kuo condensation as follows.

Let \( G \) be the planar dual graph of the region \( R_{x,y,z}^{A,B,C}(a, b, c, a', b', c') \), choose the vertices \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \) and \( \delta \) of \( G \) to be the duals of the unit triangles indicated on the top right in Figure 8 and apply Theorem 4. Then all six graphs in the equation resulting from (5.4) are planar duals of regions that become triad hexagons once all forced lozenges are removed from them (this is illustrated in Figure 8).

The change in the \( x- \), \( y- \) and \( z- \)parameters of the resulting triad hexagons is easily read off from Figure 8. As the lobe sizes \( a, b, c, a', b', c' \) and the geometrical position of the focal points \( A, B \) and \( C \) remain unchanged for all resulting regions, one sees that (5.1) becomes
\[
M(R_{x,y,z}^{A,B,C}(a, b, c, a', b', c')) M(R_{x,y-1,z-1}^{A,B,C}(a, b, c, a', b', c')) =
M(R_{x,y-1,z}^{A,B,C}(a, b, c, a', b', c')) M(R_{x,y,z-1}^{A,B,C}(a, b, c, a', b', c'))
+ M(R_{x-1,y,z}^{A,B,C}(a, b, c, a', b', c')) M(R_{x+1,y-1,z-1}^{A,B,C}(a, b, c, a', b', c')).
\] (5.5)
We use this recurrence to prove (5.4) by induction on $x + y + z$. As $x, y, z \geq 1$ is a necessary condition in order for all the regions in (5.5) to be defined, the base cases of our induction will be the cases when $x = 0$, $y = 0$ or $z = 0$. 

**Figure 8.** Obtaining the recurrence for the left hand side of (5.4).
By symmetry, it is enough to treat the base case \( x = 0 \). The details of this case were presented in the previous section.

For the induction step, let \( x, y, z \geq 1 \) and assume that (5.4) holds for all triad hexagons with the sum of their \( x \)-, \( y \)- and \( z \)-parameters strictly less than \( x + y + z \). We need to deduce that (5.4) holds also for \( R_{x,y,z}^{A,B,C}(a, b, c, a', b', c') \).

Since \( x, y, z \geq 1 \), we can apply (5.4). Since for the last five triad hexagons in (5.4) the sum of the \( x \)-, \( y \)- and \( z \)-parameters is strictly less than \( x + y + z \), by the induction hypothesis, their number of lozenge tilings can be expressed as indicated by formula (5.4). Do this for each of these five regions in (5.4). This yields a certain expression for \( M(R_{x,y,z}^{A,B,C}(a, b, c, a', b', c')) \).

To complete the proof, we need to verify that this expression agrees with the right hand side of (5.4). This amounts to checking that the right hand side of (5.4) satisfies recurrence (5.5). We carry out this verification in Section 6. This completes the proof.

6. Verifying that the right hand side of (5.4) satisfies recurrence (5.5)

Figure 8 illustrates the six regions in equation (5.5). On the top left is the triad hexagon \( R = R_{x,y,z}^{A,B,C}(a, b, c, a', b', c') \). For ease of reference, denote the top right, center left, center right, bottom left and bottom right regions in Figure 8 by \( R_2 \), \( R_3 \), \( R_4 \), \( R_5 \) and \( R_6 \), respectively.

Then in order to verify that the right hand side of (5.4) satisfies recurrence (5.5), we need to prove that

\[
M(\overline{R}) = \frac{w(R_2)}{w(R)} \frac{k_A^{(R_2)} k_B^{(R_2)} k_C^{(R_2)}}{k_B^{(R)} k_C^{(R)} k_A^{(R)}} M(\overline{R}_2) + \frac{w(R_3)}{w(R)} \frac{k_A^{(R_3)} k_B^{(R_3)} k_C^{(R_3)}}{k_B^{(R)} k_C^{(R)} k_A^{(R)}} M(\overline{R}_3) + \frac{w(R_4)}{w(R)} \frac{k_A^{(R_4)} k_B^{(R_4)} k_C^{(R_4)}}{k_B^{(R)} k_C^{(R)} k_A^{(R)}} M(\overline{R}_4) + \frac{w(R_5)}{w(R)} \frac{k_A^{(R_5)} k_B^{(R_5)} k_C^{(R_5)}}{k_B^{(R)} k_C^{(R)} k_A^{(R)}} M(\overline{R}_5) + \frac{w(R_6)}{w(R)} \frac{k_A^{(R_6)} k_B^{(R_6)} k_C^{(R_6)}}{k_B^{(R)} k_C^{(R)} k_A^{(R)}} M(\overline{R}_6),
\]

where for \( i = 2, \ldots, 6 \), \( \overline{R}_i \) is the region obtained from \( R_i \) by completely squeezing out each of its three bowties. Note that the triad of bowties (and in particular the focal points) in the regions \( R_i \) are the same as in \( R \), and a similar statement relates the regions \( \overline{R}_i \) and \( \overline{R} \), for \( i = 2, \ldots, 6 \).

It turns out that the products of the two fractions in each of the three terms in (6.1) have the same value. Indeed, all twelve weights \( w \) are clearly equal, as the twelve involved regions share the same triad of bowties, and \( w \) only depends on the geometry of this triad (see (2.2)). Furthermore, one readily sees from equation (2.3) and Figure 8 that

\[
k_A^{(R_2)} = k_A^{(R_3)} = k_A^{(R_4)} = k_A^{(R_5)} = k_A^{(R_6)}.
\]

This is because in each of the six regions, the distance from the focal point \( A \) to the northern boundary is equal to either \( d \) or \( d + 1 \), and its distance to the southern boundary is either \( e \).
or $e+1$, for some non-negative integers $d$ and $e$. Then by (2.3), each of the three quantities in (6.2) is equal to $de(d+1)(e+1)$.

In a similar way, one sees that

$$k_B^{(R_d)} k_B^{(R_4)} = k_B^{(R_3)} k_B^{(R_6)},$$

(6.3)

and also that

$$k_C^{(R_2)} k_C^{(R_4)} = k_C^{(R_3)} k_C^{(R_6)},$$

(6.4)

$$k_{BC}^{(R_2)} k_{BC}^{(R_4)} = k_{BC}^{(R_3)} k_{BC}^{(R_6)},$$

(6.5)

and

$$k_{AC}^{(R_2)} k_{AC}^{(R_4)} = k_{AC}^{(R_3)} k_{AC}^{(R_6)},$$

(6.6)

and

$$k_{AB}^{(R_2)} k_{AB}^{(R_4)} = k_{AB}^{(R_3)} k_{AB}^{(R_6)}.$$  

(6.7)

Therefore, the products of the couples $k$ at the numerators in (6.1) are equal across the three terms. Since the barred regions at the denominators are special cases of regions at the numerators, the same conclusion holds also for the numerators in (6.1).

Thus, (6.1) simplifies to

$$M(R) M(R_2) = M(R_3) M(R_4) + M(R_5) M(R_6).$$

(6.8)

However, this holds by Kuo’s condensation identity (5.1).

7. Concluding remarks

In this paper we presented a simple product formula that relates the number of lozenge tilings of two triad hexagons (hexagonal regions with a triad of bowties removed from them) that can be obtained from one another by a sequence of bowtie squeezing operations. One new aspect of this formula is that the number of tilings of the two involved regions is not given in general by a simple product formula, but their ratio always is (see [12], [11] and [1] for another similar phenomenon). Several previous results from the literature readily follow from our result, including Lai’s formula [10] for the number of lozenge tilings of hexagons with three dents, and Ciucu and Krattenthaler’s formula [5] concerning hexagons with a removed shamrock (see Section 2).

Another new aspect is that our formula is conceptual — it is determined by the geometry of the triad of bowties and the distances from the focal points to the sides of the hexagon. This provided us with three advantages: (i) we were able to avoid the somewhat tedious splitting into the cases when $x$, $y$ and $z$ do or do not have the same parity, (ii) the base cases and the verification that the claimed formula satisfies the recurrence could be handled essentially with no calculations, just looking at the relevant figures, and (iii) we were able to present the full details of the calculations in this relatively short paper.
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