ON PERMUTATIONS SORTED BY $k$ PASSES THROUGH A DETERMINISTIC POP STACK
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Abstract. We consider permutations sortable by $k$ passes through a deterministic pop stack. We show that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the set is characterised by finitely many forbidden patterns, answering a question of Claesson and Gudmundsson.

Our characterisation demands a more precise definition than in previous literature of what it means for a permutation to avoid a set of barred and unbarred patterns. We propose a new notion called $PB$-containment and prove some useful results about it.

1. Introduction

A pop stack is a sorting device which operates as follows: at each step it can either push one token from the input stream onto the top of the stack, or else pop the entire stack contents to the output stream. We consider the tokens to be distinct real numbers with the usual ordering. A deterministic pop stack always performs the push move unless the token on the top of the stack is larger in value that the token to be pushed from the input, or if there is no further input. See for example Figure 1. For convenience from now on we assume tokens are integers and write a sequence $2, 1, 3$ as 213.

![Figure 1. Sorting 213 using a deterministic pop stack](image)

Observe that by definition the stack remains ordered from smallest on top to largest on the bottom during the operation of a deterministic pop stack.

A permutation (ordered sequence of distinct real numbers) can be sorted by $k$ passes through a deterministic pop stack if after repeating the procedure $k$ times, the sequence is ordered from smallest to largest. For example, 41352 can be sorted by two passes (Figure 2).

Let $p_1(\alpha)$ denote the sequence obtained by passing a sequence $\alpha$ through a deterministic pop stack once, and define $p_k(\alpha) = p_{k-1}(p_1(\alpha))$. For example $p_1(41352) = 14325$ and $p_2(41352) = 12345$. We say $\alpha$ is $k$-pass deterministic pop stack sortable if $p_k(\alpha)$ is an increasing sequence.

In 1981 Avis and Newborn characterised permutations sorted by a single pass through a pop stack [1], initiating the study of pop stack sorting. Specifically they
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showed a permutation can be sorted in one pass if and only if it avoids 231 and 312 in the usual sense of pattern avoidance (see Section 2 for precise definitions). Pudwell and Smith characterised permutations sorted by 2 passes, in terms of avoiding a set of six usual patterns and two special (barred) patterns, and computed a rational generating function for the number of such permutations \[8\]. Claesson and Guðmundsson then computed a rational generating function for permutations sorted by any number of passes \[2\], and asked whether a “useful permutation pattern characterization of the \(k\)-pop stack-sortable permutations” exists for \(k \geq 3\).

In this paper we show that \(k\)-pass deterministic pop stack sortable permutations are characterised by a finite list of forbidden (usual and barred) patterns for all \(k \in \mathbb{N}\). In order to prove this, we realised the current notions of what it means to avoid a set of barred and unbarred patterns would not suffice. Because of this we have introduced a new notion called \(PB\)-containment which we define in Section 2. We show that this is exactly the right notion for multiple-pass pop stack sorting.

The proof of our characterisation is in the form of a constructive algorithm, which we implement to obtain an explicit list for \(k = 2, 3\). For \(k = 2\) our list includes the patterns obtained by Pudwell and Smith, but also contains (redundant) patterns. We give several lemmas which show how to remove redundant patterns in general, but further lemmas are needed to obtain a “minimal” list.

We make the following observations. First, our present result is in contrast to the usual (nondeterministic) stacks-in-series model where in many cases no finite pattern-avoidance characterisation is possible due to the existence of infinite antichains \([3, 7]\). Second, the operation of a pop stack is related to classical sorting: “bubble-sort” is exactly sorting by arbitrarily many passes through a pop stack of depth 2. Third, pop stacks are a natural model for genome rearrangement \([8]\).

This work is part of the PhD thesis of the second author \([4]\).

2. Preliminaries

Define a permutation to be a sequence of distinct real numbers, written as \(\alpha = a_1a_2\ldots a_r\) (we continue the convention to write sequences without commas). The reduced form of a permutation \(\alpha\), denoted \(\text{red}(\alpha)\), is the permutation obtained by replacing the \(i\)th smallest entry of \(\alpha\) by the integer \(i\). Two permutations \(\alpha = a_1\ldots a_r\) and \(\beta = b_1\ldots b_s\) are order-isomorphic if they have the same reduced form.
For example 253 and 132 are order-isomorphic. We use the notation $\alpha \sim \beta$. In general, we will write permutations in their reduced form.

A subpermutation of $\alpha = a_1 \ldots a_r$ is a sequence $a_{i_1} \ldots a_{i_s}$ where $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_s \leq r$, while a factor is a sequence $a_{i_1} \ldots a_{i_{j+1}}$ where $i_j + 1 = i_{j+1}$. If $\alpha, \beta$ are two permutations, we say $\beta$ contains $\alpha$ if some subpermutation of $\beta$ is order-isomorphic to $\alpha$. We use the notation $\alpha \leq \beta$ if $\beta$ contains $\alpha$, and the notation $\alpha \prec_{\text{subperm}} \beta$ if $\alpha$ is a subpermutation of $\beta$. We say $\beta$ avoids $\alpha$ if no subpermutation of $\beta$ is order-isomorphic to $\alpha$. For example 54123 contains 312 and avoids 231. For any set of permutations $F$, let $\text{Av}(F)$ denote the set of all permutations that simultaneously avoid every $\alpha \in F$.

Knuth famously observed that a permutation can be sorted by passing it through a single infinite stack if and only if it avoids 231 [6]. Avis and Newborn proved a permutation can be sorted by passing it through an infinite pop stack once if and only if it avoids both 231 and 312. However, for multiple passes through a pop stack, the situation arises that some permutation cannot be sorted, while a longer permutation containing it can, so the usual notion of pattern avoidance is not useful for characterising permutations in this context (in other words, for $k \geq 2$, $k$-pass pop stack sortable permutations are not a closed class with respect to usual pattern avoidance). As a concrete example, Figure 3 shows that 3241 is not 2-pass pop stack sortable, whereas 41352 is (as demonstrated by Figure 2), and contains 3241.

This leads to the following notion.

**Definition 2.1 (B-sequence).** Let $X^*$ denote the set of all finite sequences of letters from some alphabet $X$, and $|u|$ the length of a sequence $u \in X^*$.

Consider $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ as an infinite alphabet of letters and define a disjoint copy $\mathbb{N} = \{\overline{i} \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of barred letters. Define a map $\text{unbar}: \mathbb{N} \cup \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ by $\text{unbar}(\overline{i}) = i = \text{unbar}(i)$, which extends to $(\mathbb{N} \cup \mathbb{N})^*$ entry-by-entry.

A finite sequence $\beta \in (\mathbb{N} \cup \mathbb{N})^*$ is called a $B$-sequence if $\text{unbar}(\beta)$ is a permutation. For example 41352 is a $B$-sequence, since $\text{unbar}(41352) = 41352$, whereas 3112 is not a $B$-sequence. 

\[1 \text{In [5] and elsewhere the term "barred pattern" is used, although the string 14352 is also referred to as a barred pattern [5, p. 310]. So to avoid confusion we use the new term "B-sequence".}\]
Define a second map $\nu : \mathbb{N} \cup \overline{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{N}$ by $\nu(\overline{i}) = \varepsilon$ (the empty letter) and $\nu(i) = i$, which also extends to sequences entry-by-entry. Then define $\text{removebar} : (\mathbb{N} \cup \overline{\mathbb{N}})^* \to \mathbb{N}^*$ by $\text{removebar}(\alpha) = \text{red}(\nu(\alpha))$. For example $\text{removebar}(4\overline{7}3\overline{5}2) = 3241$.

Informally we will say that $\text{unbar}(\beta)$ is the permutation obtained by erasing the bar above any barred token in $\beta$, and $\text{removebar}(\beta)$ a permutation obtained by deleting barred tokens then reducing. Note that a $B$-sequence which satisfies $\beta = \text{unbar}(\beta)$ can either be considered as a $B$-sequence or a permutation, and depending on the context this will be an important distinction. If $F$ is any set of $B$-sequences, let $F_p = \{ \beta \in F \mid \beta = \text{unbar}(\beta) \}$ and $F_b = F \setminus F_p$ be the sets of \textit{unbarred} and \textit{barred} elements of $F$ respectively.

Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq (\mathbb{N} \cup \overline{\mathbb{N}})^*$ denote the set of all $B$-sequences. A \textit{subsequence} of a $B$-sequence $\beta = b_1 \ldots b_r$, $b_i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \overline{\mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence $b_{i_1} \ldots b_{i_s}$ where $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_s \leq r$.

**Definition 2.2 ($PB$-containment).** Let $\sigma$ be a permutation and $F \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ a set of $B$-sequences. We say that $\sigma$ $PB$-\textit{contains} $F$ if there exists $\beta \in F$ and a subpermutation $\gamma$ of $\sigma$ such that
\begin{itemize}
  \item $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(\beta)$ and
  \item for all $\alpha \in F_b$, if $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(\alpha)$ then $\gamma$ is not subpermutation of $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ of $\sigma$.
\end{itemize}

Informally, the second condition says that the forbidden subpermutation $\gamma \sim \text{unbar}(\beta)$ of $\sigma$ can potentially be “saved” by some $\alpha \in F_b$ (possibly different to $\beta$) if $\gamma$ is a subpermutation of some $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ where $\delta$ is itself a subpermutation of $\sigma$. The requirement that $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(\alpha)$ is somehow optional, but we found it convenient to include. In this way, $PB$-containment differs considerably from existing notions of containing barred patterns. See Remark 2.7.

We admit that “$PB$-contains” sounds technical, but we persist with it because the nature of avoiding a set of barred patterns turns out to be very subtle, as we describe in Remark 2.7. The present definition captures precisely the properties we need to characterise $k$-pass pop stack sortable permutations. $P, B$ stands for “permutation” versus “set of $B$-sequences”.

**Example 2.3.** Let $F = \{3241, 4\overline{1}352\}$ and consider the permutations $\sigma_1 = 143562$ and $\sigma_2 = 152463$. Then
\begin{itemize}
  \item $\sigma_1$ has the subpermutation $4352 \sim 3241$ which is not part of a longer subpermutation of $\sigma_1$ order-isomorphic to $\text{unbar}(4\overline{1}352) = 41352$, so $\sigma_1$ $PB$-contains $F$.
  \item $\sigma_2$ has subpermutation $5463 \sim 3241$, however $5463$ is a subpermutation of $52463 \sim \text{unbar}(4\overline{1}352) = 41352$ (so $\sigma_2$ or strictly speaking its subpermutation $5462$) is “saved” by the existence of this other pattern). Since there are no other subpermutations of $\sigma_2$ that are order-isomorphic to either $3241$ or $\text{removebar}(4\overline{1}352) = 3241$, then $\sigma_2$ does not $PB$-contain $F$.
\end{itemize}

**Example 2.4.** Let $\beta_1 = 463\overline{1}572, \beta_2 = 473\overline{1}562, F = \{\beta_1, \beta_2\}$ and consider the permutation $\sigma = 473\overline{1}562$.
\begin{itemize}
  \item $\sigma$ has subpermutation $43562 \sim \text{removebar}(\beta_1)$, however there exists $\alpha = \beta_2 \in F_b$ such that $43562 \sim \text{removebar}(\beta_2)$ is a subpermutation of $473\overline{1}562 = \text{unbar}(\beta_2)$. Since there are no other subpermutations of $\sigma$ that are order-isomorphic to $\text{removebar}(\beta_1) = \text{removebar}(\beta_2)$, then $\sigma$ does not $PB$-contain $F$. Note that it is $\beta_2$ (and not $\beta_1$) that “saves” $\sigma$ because $43562 \sim \text{removebar}(\beta_1)$ is not a subpermutation of $463\overline{1}572 = \text{unbar}(\beta_1)$ in $\sigma$. In short, $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $\{\beta_1\}$ but does not $PB$-contain $F$ because of the existence of $\beta_2$ in $F$. 
\end{itemize}
We remark that 32451 is not 3-pass pop stack sortable, however both 4631572 and 4731562 are, so Example 2.4 is relevant when we try to characterise 3-pass pop stack sortable permutations. See Remark 2.7.

Further examples showing the subtlety of PB-containment are given below as Examples 2.6–3.9.

We say σ PB-avoids F if it does not PB-contain F. Using propositional logic, we can express this as follows:

**Definition 2.5 (PB-avoidance).** Let σ be a permutation and F ⊆ B a set of B-sequences. We say that σ PB-avoids F if for every β ∈ F and every subpermutation γ of σ either

- γ ≠ removebar(β), or
- there exists α ∈ F such that γ ∼ removebar(α) and γ is a subpermutation of δ ∼ unbar(α) of σ.

For any set of B-sequences F, let Av_B(F) denote the set of permutations that PB-avoid F. We call Av_B(F) the PB-avoidance set of F. If F has no barred elements (so F = F_p) then the second condition in Definitions 2.2–2.5 is vacuous and Av_B(F) = Av(F).

**Example 2.6.** Let F = {12, 21}. Suppose σ PB-contains F. If σ contains some γ ∼ removebar(12) = 1 (so γ can be any entry of σ), then the second condition in Definition 2.2 say we must check every α ∈ F_p to see that γ is not contained in a subpermutation δ ∼ 12 or δ ∼ 21 of σ. This means σ cannot have more than one token. The same argument also holds for σ containing some γ ∼ removebar(21) = 1. Thus, σ of length at least two cannot PB-contains F. So, Av_B(F) = S^∞ \ {1}.

**Remark 2.7.** Our definition of PB-avoidance is (necessarily) more complicated than the notions of avoiding barred patterns found in previous literature. In [5, Definition 1.2.3] a permutation σ is said to avoid a barred pattern β if each occurrence of removebar(β) in σ (if any) is a part of an occurrence of unbar(β) in σ. There are two issues with this definition.

- As written, this does not agree with the usual pattern avoidance when β has no bar tokens. For example, σ = 21 obviously does not avoid β = 21 in the usual sense of pattern avoidance, but if β is considered as a barred pattern then σ avoids β since there exist a subsequence, κ = 21 = removebar(β) in σ and κ is part of the occurrence of unbar(β) = 21 in σ.
- More seriously, in applications such as [8, 10] some set of permutations S is characterised by being those permutations avoiding some list of barred and unbarred patterns, where, as we understand it, this means that each permutation in S must avoid every pattern individually. Explicitly, Tenner [9] defines that if P is a collection of pattern, then Av(P) means is the set of permutations simultaneously avoiding all patterns in P:

\[ Av(P) = \bigcap_{p \in P} Av(p) \]

If this interpretation were used for Example 2.4 we would say that 4731562 does not avoid any list containing 4631572, 4731562 since it fails to avoid the barred pattern 4631572. Our definition of PB-avoid says that even though some permutation may not avoid some pattern in a list of barred and unbarred patterns, it might be saved by another barred pattern in the list. This interpretation is what is needed to characterise 3-pass pop stack sortable permutations, since both 4631572, 4731562 are 3-pass pop
stack sortable and 32451 is not. For the applications in \cite{S} \cite{T}, either interpretation is correct since the sets of barred and unbarred patterns to be avoided have no “overlap”: in the case of \cite{S}, the two barred patterns have removebar equal to 2341 and 4312 which are both different to the unbarred patterns in their list; and in the case of \cite{T} there is only one barred pattern whose removebar is different to the unbarred pattern.

We make the following definition to compare different sets of $B$-sequences, in analogy with usual pattern avoidance.

**Definition 2.8 (B-isomorphic).** Let $F, G \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. We say that $F$ and $G$ are $B$-isomorphic, written $F \sim_B G$, if $\text{Av}_B(F) = \text{Av}_B(G)$.

For example, $\{35412\} \not\sim_B \{35412\}$ (since for example $3412 \in \text{Av}_B(35412) \setminus \text{Av}_B(35412)$), but it can be shown (by Lemma 2.9 next) that $\{35412\} \sim_B \{35412\}$. Our definition characterises “sameness” of sets of $B$-sequences according to the permutations which $PB$-avoid them. Following Example 2.5 we have $\{12, 21\} \sim_B \{12, 21\} \sim_B \{12, 21\}$ since in each case the $PB$-avoidance set is $S^\infty \setminus \{1\}$. The following lemma gives a method to check $B$-isomorphism for singleton sets without having to construct entire $PB$-avoidance sets.

**Lemma 2.9.** Let $\alpha, \beta$ be $B$-sequences. Then $\{\alpha\} \sim_B \{\beta\}$ if and only if $\text{unbar}(\alpha) \sim \text{unbar}(\beta)$ and $\text{removebar}(\alpha) = \text{removebar}(\beta)$.

*Proof.* Suppose that $\text{unbar}(\alpha) \sim \text{unbar}(\beta)$ and $\text{removebar}(\alpha) = \text{removebar}(\beta)$. Let $\sigma \notin \text{Av}_B(\beta)$, then $\sigma$ contains a subpermutation $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(\beta)(= \text{removebar}(\alpha))$ that is not part of a longer subpermutation $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\beta)(\sim \text{unbar}(\alpha))$ in $\sigma$, which means $\sigma \notin \text{Av}_B(\alpha)$. Conversely, the same argument gives $\sigma \notin \text{Av}_B(\alpha)$ implies $\sigma \notin \text{Av}_B(\beta)$, so $\alpha \sim_B \beta$.

For the other direction, if $\text{removebar}(\alpha) \neq \text{removebar}(\beta)$, then either one is shorter, or if they have the same length, they are not order-isomorphic. Without loss of generality say $\sigma = \text{removebar}(\beta)$ is not longer than $\text{removebar}(\alpha)$. Then $\sigma \notin \text{Av}_B(\beta)$. However $\sigma \in \text{Av}_B(\alpha)$ because no subpermutation $\gamma$ of $\sigma$ is order-isomorphic to $\text{removebar}(\alpha)$, so $\{\alpha\} \not\sim_B \{\beta\}$.

Otherwise we have $\text{removebar}(\alpha) = \text{removebar}(\beta)$ and $\text{unbar}(\alpha) \not\sim \text{unbar}(\beta)$. Let us consider the cases separately.

1. If one has no barred tokens, say $\beta$, then $\alpha$ must contain barred tokens and be longer. We have $\sigma = \text{unbar}(\alpha) \in \text{Av}_B(\beta)$, but $\sigma$ contains $\gamma = \text{removebar}(\beta)$ which is not saved by $\beta$, so $\sigma \notin \text{Av}_B(\beta)$.

2. Else both have barred tokens.

   (a) If one is shorter than the other, say $\sigma = \text{unbar}(\beta)$ is shorter than $\text{unbar}(\alpha)$, then $\sigma \in \text{Av}_B(\beta)$, but $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $\{\alpha\}$ because it contains $\text{removebar}(\alpha)$ which cannot be part of a subsequence $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ because $\delta$ would be longer than $\sigma$ itself.

   (b) Else $\text{unbar}(\alpha)$, $\text{unbar}(\beta)$ have the same length, and $\text{unbar}(\alpha) \not\sim \text{unbar}(\beta)$. Let $\sigma = \text{unbar}(\beta)$ so $\sigma \in \text{Av}_B(\beta)$. Now $\sigma$ contains $\text{removebar}(\alpha)$ which is not part of a subsequence $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ because the only permutation having the same length as $\text{unbar}(\alpha)$ is $\sigma$ itself, and $\sigma = \text{unbar}(\beta) \not\sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$. Thus $\sigma \notin \text{Av}_B(\alpha)$.

Thus in all cases we have $\{\alpha\} \not\sim_B \{\beta\}$. \qed

It follows from the lemma that for example $\{35412\} \sim_B \{35412\}$. 

3. Removing redundant $B$-sequences

In this section we give several lemmas which tell us when we may remove elements from a set $F$ without changing its $PB$-avoidance set. We make no claim that the lemmas in this section are exhaustive, for example there are sets $F, G \subseteq B$ for which none of the three lemmas applies but they have the same $PB$-avoidance sets for other reasons. See Example 3.9 below for an example of this. However, the rules we give in this section are useful in Theorem 5.1 to reduce the size of the finite sets we obtain there.

We start with a useful (reflexive and transitive) relation on $B$.

**Definition 3.1.** Let $\kappa, \lambda \in B$. We say $\kappa \preceq_B \lambda$ if

- $\text{unbar}(\kappa) = \text{removebar}(\lambda)$, and
- $\kappa \preceq_B \lambda$ (where $\lambda$ is order-isomorphic to a subpermutation of $\lambda$).

For example:

- $12 \preceq_B 132$
- $12 \preceq_B 132$
- $35412 \preceq_B 35412$

It follows from Lemma 2.9 that $\kappa \preceq_B \lambda$ and $\lambda \preceq_B \kappa$ implies $\{\kappa\} \sim_B \{\lambda\}$. For convenience in our proofs we formalise “because” and “saves”.

**Definition 3.2.** Let $\beta \in F \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. A permutation $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F$ because of $\beta \in F$ and $\gamma <_{\text{subperm}} \sigma$ if:

- $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(\beta)$, and
- for all $\alpha \in F_b$, if $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(\alpha)$ then $\gamma$ is not subpermutation of $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ of $\sigma$.

An element $\alpha \in F_b$ saves $\gamma <_{\text{subperm}} \sigma$ if $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(\alpha)$ and $\gamma$ is not subpermutation of any $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ of $\sigma$.

Of course in general $\sigma$ could $PB$-contain $F$ because of several different $\beta$ and $\gamma$.

Here are the first three lemmas.

**Lemma 3.3.** Let $F \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ with $\kappa, \lambda \in F_b$. If $\kappa \preceq_B \lambda$ then $F \sim_B F \setminus \{\lambda\}$.

**Proof.** First, suppose $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F$. Then this is either because of $\beta \in F \setminus \{\kappa, \lambda\}$, or $\kappa$, or $\lambda$.

- In the first case, there is some $\beta \in F \setminus \{\kappa, \lambda\}$ and $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(\beta)$ a subpermutation of $\sigma$ with $\gamma$ not contained in any $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in F_b$ where $\delta$ is a subpermutation of $\sigma$. If so, then $\gamma$ is not contained in any $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ for any $\alpha \in (F_b \setminus \{\lambda\})$, so $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F \setminus \{\lambda\}$.
- Else, $\sigma$ contains a subpermutation $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(\lambda) = \text{removebar}(\kappa)$, and $\gamma$ is not a subpermutation of any subpermutation $\delta$ of $\sigma$ with $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ for any $\alpha \in F_b$, so in particular $\gamma$ is not contained in any $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ for any $\alpha \in (F_b \setminus \{\lambda\})$, so $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F \setminus \{\lambda\}$. Thus $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F \setminus \{\lambda\}$.

This shows $\text{Av}_B(F \setminus \{\lambda\}) \subseteq \text{Av}_B(F)$.

Now suppose $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F \setminus \{\lambda\}$ but does not $PB$-contain $F$. This means that there must be some subpermutation $\gamma$ of $\sigma$ with $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(\beta)$ for some $\beta \in F \setminus \{\lambda\}$ which is not saved by any $\alpha \in (F \setminus \{\lambda\})_b$, but is saved by $\lambda \in F_b$. This means $\gamma$ is a subpermutation of $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\lambda)$ of $\sigma$. But this means $\gamma$ is also a subpermutation of $\delta' \sim \text{unbar}(\kappa)$ since $\text{unbar}(\kappa) \leq \text{unbar}(\lambda)$, which contradicts that $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F \setminus \{\lambda\}$. This shows

$$\text{Av}_B(F) \cap \overline{\text{Av}_B(F \setminus \{\lambda\})}$$

is empty, hence the result. \qed
Lemma 3.4. Let $F \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ with $\kappa \in F_p, \lambda \in F_b$. If $\kappa \preceq_B \lambda$ then $F \sim_B F \setminus \{ \kappa \}$.

Proof. Suppose $\sigma PB$-contains $F$, then this is either because of $\beta \in F \setminus \{ \kappa \}$, or because of $\kappa$. In the first case we have $\sigma PB$-contains $F \setminus \{ \kappa \}$. In the second case $\sigma$ contains a subpermutation $\gamma \sim \kappa = \text{removebar}(\lambda)$ and for all $\alpha \in F_b$, $\gamma$ is not a subpermutation of a subpermutation $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$ of $\sigma$. This means $\sigma PB$-contains $F$ because of $\lambda$ as well, so $\sigma PB$-contains $F \setminus \{ \kappa \}$. Thus by contrapositive we have shown $\text{Av}_B(F \setminus \{ \kappa \}) \subseteq \text{Av}_B(F)$.

Now suppose $\sigma PB$-contains $F \setminus \{ \kappa \}$ because of $\beta$. Since $\kappa \in F_p$ it can play no role in saving $\sigma$, this means $\sigma PB$-contains $F$ also because of $\beta$, so $\text{Av}_B(F) \subseteq \text{Av}_B(F \setminus \{ \kappa \})$. \qed

Lemma 3.5. Let $F \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ with $\kappa, \lambda \in F_p$. If $\kappa \leq \lambda$ and for all $\alpha \in F_b, \kappa \not\sim_B \text{removebar}(\alpha)$, then $F \sim_B F \setminus \{ \lambda \}$.

Proof. Suppose $\sigma PB$-contains $F$. Then this is either because of $\lambda$, or not. If it is because of $\beta \neq \lambda$ then since $\lambda \in F_p$ plays no role in saving $\beta, \sigma$ also $PB$-contains $F \setminus \{ \lambda \}$. If it is because of $\lambda$, then $\sigma$ contains a subpermutation $\gamma \sim \lambda$. Since $\kappa \leq \lambda$ this means $\sigma$ has a subpermutation $\gamma' \sim \kappa$ and by hypothesis no $\alpha \in F_b$ can save $\sigma$ since $\kappa \not\sim_B \text{removebar}(\alpha)$ for any $\alpha \in F_b$. Thus $\sigma PB$-contains $F$ because of $\kappa$, so $\sigma PB$-contains $F \setminus \{ \lambda \}$, and $\text{Av}_B(F \setminus \{ \kappa \}) \subseteq \text{Av}_B(F)$.

Now suppose $\sigma PB$-contains $F \setminus \{ \lambda \}$ because of $\beta$. Since $\lambda \in F_p$ plays no role in saving $\sigma, \sigma PB$-contains $F$ also because of $\beta$. Thus $\text{Av}_B(F) \subseteq \text{Av}_B(F \setminus \{ \lambda \})$. \qed

Here are some examples which demonstrate the lemmas.

Example 3.6. Let $F = \{ 51\bar{4}23, 4\bar{1}32 \}$. We claim that the first pattern is redundant. Suppose you want to decide whether $\sigma PB$-contains $F$ because of $\beta = 51\bar{2}43$, then first find a subpermutation $\gamma \sim 543 \sim 321$, then check whether this is part of a longer subpermutation $\delta \sim 41\bar{3}2$ or $\delta \sim 51\bar{2}43$. But if it is part of 4132 then it is automatically also part of 51243, so the decision is already made and there is no need to check for 51243 as well. This example generalises to Lemma 3.3.

The next example shows the situation in Lemma 3.5.

Example 3.7. Let $F = \{ 54\bar{3}21, 43\bar{2}1, 32\bar{1}1, 3\bar{4}21 \}$. We claim the pattern 54321 is redundant. Suppose you want to decide whether $\sigma PB$-contains $F$ because of $\beta = 54\bar{3}21$. If so $\sigma$ contains the subpermutation $\gamma \sim 43\bar{2}1$ as well, and since there is only one $\alpha \in F_b$, with removebar($\alpha$) = 321, and neither 54321 nor 4321 is order-isomorphic to 321, so the second condition of the Definition does not apply. Thus 4321 suffices to deal with it.

Note that for $F' = \{ 43\bar{2}1, 32\bar{1}1, 3\bar{4}21 \}$, Lemma 3.5 cannot be applied to remove 4321, and one can show that $F' \not\sim_B \{ 32\bar{1}1, 3\bar{4}21 \}$. However, Lemma 3.4 does apply, and shows $F' \sim_B \{ 43\bar{2}1, 3\bar{4}21 \}$.

The next examples show situations where none of Lemmas 3.3–3.5 apply.

Example 3.8. Let $F = \{ 51\bar{2}463, 4\bar{1}32 \}$, $G = \{ 4\bar{1}32 \}$ and consider the permutation $\sigma = 41\bar{3}52$. We claim that $\sigma PB$-contains $F$ but $PB$-avoids $G$.

To see the first claim, there exists $\beta = 51\bar{2}463 \in F$ and $\gamma = 3241$ a subpermutation of $\sigma$ so that $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(51\bar{2}463)$, and for each $\alpha \in F_b$:

- $\alpha = 51\bar{2}463$ satisfies $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(51\bar{2}463)$ but is not a subpermutation of any $\delta \sim 51\bar{2}463$ of $\sigma$, so this $\alpha$ does not save it.
- $\alpha = 4\bar{1}32$ does not satisfy $\gamma \sim \text{removebar}(4\bar{1}32) = 432$ so this $\alpha$ does not save it either.

To see the second claim, the only possible $\beta$ is $4\bar{1}32$, and the only subpermutation of $\sigma$ that is $\sim \text{removebar}(\beta)$ is $\gamma = 432$, but $\gamma$ is a subpermutation of $\delta = 4\bar{1}32$ of $\sigma$ and $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\beta)$. So by Definition 2 $\sigma PB$-avoids $\{ 4\bar{1}32 \}$. 


Example 3.9. $F = \{3124, 312\}$, $G = \{213, 312\}$ have same $PB$-avoidance sets, and again none of the three lemmas applies. We claim that both $F$ and $G$ are “minimal” in that there is no set $H \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ with $|H| = 1$ and $\text{Av}_B(H) = \text{Av}_B(F)$.

3.1. Further lemma. We have one further way to remove redundant $B$-sequences which is slightly more involved, and will be useful below.

Lemma 3.10. Let $F \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ with $\kappa, \lambda \in F_b$, removebar($\kappa$) $\subseteq$ removebar($\lambda$) and unbar($\kappa$) $\sim$ unbar($\lambda$). If

- $\alpha \in F$ with removebar($\alpha$) $= \text{removebar}(\kappa)$ implies $\alpha = \kappa$, and
- $\alpha \in F$ with removebar($\alpha$) $= \text{removebar}(\lambda)$ implies $\alpha = \lambda$,

then $F \sim_B F \setminus \{\lambda\}$.

Proof. If $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F$ because of $\lambda$ and $\gamma$, then by hypothesis there exists $\gamma' <_{\text{subperm}} \gamma$ with $\gamma' \sim \text{removebar}(\kappa)$. If there exists $\alpha \in F_b$ and $\delta$ with $\gamma' <_{\text{subperm}} \sigma$ and removebar($\alpha$) $\sim \delta$ then by hypothesis the only possible $\alpha$ is $\kappa$, so $\sigma$ contains $\delta \sim \text{unbar}(\kappa) \sim \text{unbar}(\lambda)$ which is a contradiction that $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F$ because of $\lambda$, so $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F$ because of $\kappa$, hence $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F \setminus \{\lambda\}$, so $\text{Av}_B(F \setminus \{\lambda\}) \subseteq \text{Av}_B(F)$.

Conversely if $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F \setminus \{\lambda\}$, but $PB$-avoids $F$, then it must be that some $\gamma <_{\text{subperm}} \sigma$ is saved by $\lambda$. But this cannot be since there is no $\alpha \in (F \setminus \{\lambda\})_b$ with removebar($\alpha$) $\sim \text{removebar}(\lambda)$. $\square$

Example 3.11. Let

$F = \{61352784, 61352784, 61352784, 61352784, 61352784\}$.

The lemma shows $F \sim_B 61352784$.

Certainly there are many more ways to remove redundant $B$-sequences, and reduce the size of forbidden pattern sets. However the hypotheses become more and more complicated.

4. Blocks

Here we follow Pudwell and Smith [8]. Let $\sigma$ be a permutation. Call a factor $B_i = a_{i,1}a_{i,2} \ldots a_{i,n_i}$ of $\sigma$ a block if $n_i > 0$ and $a_{i,j} > a_{i,j+1}$ for all $1 \leq j < n_i$. (Recall that factor means the entries are contiguous in $\sigma$.) A (maximal) block decomposition of $\sigma$ is an expression of the form $\sigma = B_1B_2B_3 \ldots B_m$ where each $B_i$ is a block and for any two adjacent blocks $B_i = a_{i,1}a_{i,2} \ldots a_{i,n_i}$ and $B_{i+1} = a_{i+1,1}a_{i+1,2} \ldots a_{i+1,n_{i+1}}$ we have $a_{i,n_i} < a_{i+1,1}$. For example $\sigma = 87634521$ has block decomposition $\bar{B}_1 = 8763$, $B_2 = 4$, $B_3 = 521$. For convenience we indicate the block decomposition of $\sigma$ by inserting ‘|’ symbols to separate blocks, so for our example we write $8763|4|521$.

If $B_i = a_{i,1}a_{i,2} \ldots a_{i,n_i}$ is a block, let $\bar{B}_i = a_{i,n_i} \ldots a_{i,2}a_{i,1}$. We have the following.

Lemma 4.1 [8]. If $\sigma$ has block decomposition $B_1B_2B_3 \ldots B_m$ then

$p_{\lambda}(\sigma) = B_1\bar{B}_2\bar{B}_3 \ldots \bar{B}_m$.

For example, if $F = \{4123, 4231, 43251, 41352\}$, the the pattern 43251 is redundant. Suppose $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F$. Either this is because of some $\beta \in F \setminus \{43251\}$, in which case *done*, else it is only because of $\kappa = 43251$. So, each of the subpermutation $\gamma \sim 4351 \sim 4251 \sim 41351 \sim \text{removebar}(41352) <_{\text{subperm}} \delta$ must be saved by 43251 with $\gamma <_{\text{subperm}} \sim \text{unbar}(41352)$. Thus, $\kappa$ will contains subpermutation 4a3b25 such that 4b351 $\sim 4a251 \sim 3b251 \sim \text{unbar}(41352)$. So, 4a3b25 is either order isomorphic to 6152473 or 6251473. Both of these subpermutations contains removebar(4123) and removebar(4231) respectively. So, $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F$ because of removebar(4123) or removebar(4231) contradicts that it is because of $\kappa$ only. Thus, $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $F$ and also $PB$-contains $F \setminus \{43251\}$. 
Lemma 4.2. Let $\gamma = B_1B_2B_3\ldots B_m$ be a factor of $\sigma$, $\alpha \in B_1$, $\beta \in B_m$ such that $\alpha > \beta$. After $k$-passes through a deterministic pop stack, $\gamma$ is not sorted if $m > 4k$.

Proof. Due to the deterministic sorting process, after 1 pass, the size of each block is sorted after 1 pass. Thus, the elements in a block is sorted after 1 pass. We will prove that this state never happen at the end of $k$-passes.

Note that if $\gamma$ is sorted after $k-1$ passes, then the state where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ in a block such that $\ldots|\ldots\alpha\ldots\beta|\ldots$ must have happen so that after $k$ passes, $\alpha$ will be on the right of $\beta$ such as $\gamma = \ldots\beta\ldots\alpha\ldots$.

We will prove that this state never happen at the end of $k-1$-pass, thus $\gamma$ is not sorted after $k$ passes.

Let assume each blocks in $\gamma$ including $B_1$ and $B_m$ has at most 1 element. So, there are total $4k$ elements between $\alpha$ and $\beta$. After 1 pass, there will still be $4k$ elements between $\alpha$ and $\beta$ because initially there is no other element in $B_1$ and $B_m$ for $\alpha$ to move to right and $\beta$ to move to the left. In the best case, let assume starting from $p_1(\gamma)$, each subsequence pass will move $\alpha$ to the right across two tokens and $\beta$ to move to the left across two tokens. Thus, the the number of tokens between $\alpha$ and $\beta$ will be reduced by 4 tokens in each pass. Thus, after $(k-1)$ passes which means after $(k-2)$ passes from $p_1(\gamma)$, the number of tokens between $\alpha$ and $\beta$ will be $\geq 4k - 4(k-2)$. So, it is obvious that the state $\ldots|\ldots\alpha\ldots\beta|\ldots$ has not yet happened and $\gamma$ cannot be sorted at the end of $k$ passes. In other cases, the number of tokens that $\alpha$ or $\beta$ move pass might be less than 2 tokens as the size of blocks is at most 3. Therefore, at the end of $(k-1)$ passes, number of tokens separating $\alpha$ or $\beta$ will still be $> -4k + 8$. Thus, $\gamma$ is still not able to be sorted at the end of $k$ passes.

5. General characterisation of $k$-pass pop stack sortable permutations

Theorem 5.1. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$. There exists a finite set $F_k \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ such that the set of all $k$-pass pop stack sortable permutations is equal to $\text{Av}_{\mathcal{B}}(F_k)$. Moreover, the set $F_k$ can be algorithmically constructed.

Proof. Let $S_k$ denote the set of all $k$-pass pop stack sortable permutations. We proceed by induction, with the base case $k = 1$ established by Avis and Newborn (specifically, $F_1 = \{231, 312\}$). Assume $F_{k-1}$ has been constructed, is finite, and $S_{k-1} = \text{Av}_{\mathcal{B}}(F_{k-1})$.

Let $r_{\text{max}} = \max\{|\text{removebar}(\beta)| \mid \beta \in F_{k-1}\}$ and $C = (3 + 8k)3r_{\text{max}}$. Then define

$$\Omega_k = \{\tau \in \mathcal{B} \mid |\tau| \leq 3r_{\text{max}}, \tau \not\in S_k\} \cup \{\tau \in \mathcal{B} \mid |\tau| \leq C, |\text{removebar}(\tau)| \leq 3r_{\text{max}}, \text{removebar}(\tau) \not\in S_k, \text{unbar}(\tau) \in S_k\}.$$

Claim 1: $\Omega_k$ is finite: we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{C} i!2^i$$

$B$-sequences ($i!$ permutations and $2^i$ ways to assign bars) to consider to add to $\Omega_k$. This count includes those in $\mathcal{B}$ since $3r_{\text{max}} \leq C$.

Claim 2: $\Omega_k$ is algorithmically constructible: since we only have finitely many $\tau$ of length at most $C$, for each $\tau$ we can check $\tau \not\in S_k, \text{removebar}(\tau) \not\in S_k$ and
unbar(τ) ∈ S_k in linear time by passing them according to the deterministic procedure.

Claim 3: σ /∈ S_k if and only if σ PB-contains Ω_k.

Proof of Claim 3. Recall that σ /∈ S_k if and only if p_1(σ) /∈ S_{k-1} if and only if
p_1(σ) PB-contains F_{k-1}.

To prove the forward direction, suppose p_1(σ) PB-contains F_{k-1}, and further assume this is because of some ζ < subperm p_1(σ) and δ ∈ F_{k-1} with removebar(δ) ∼ ζ, and there is no α ∈ (F_{k-1})_b and δ < subperm σ with ζ < subperm δ, ζ ∼ removebar(α) and δ ∼ unbar(α). Note, there may be many choices of β and ζ to take, but fix one choice.

1. Mark tokens corresponding to ζ in p_1(σ) bold. Let ζ' < subperm σ be such that after one pass, the tokens belonging to ζ' are the bold tokens corresponding to ζ < subperm p_1(σ). Mark the ζ' tokens bold as well. Note that |ζ'| ≤ r_{max}.

For example, if σ = 987354621 then p_1(σ) = 378945126 which PB-contains F_1 = {231, 312} because of (for instance) β = 312 and the subpermutation ζ = 946 of p_1(σ). We write p_1(σ) as 378945126, and thus σ as 987354621.

2. Next, write σ in block decomposition σ = B_1B_2B_3...B_m. Say that B_i is bold if it contains at least one bold entry (from ζ'). We wish to delete non-bold entries of σ but we do not want to merge bold blocks, so we apply the following subroutine.

- set κ = σ
- while a_{i,j} is a non-bold letter,
  - if removing a_{i,j} from κ does not cause two or more bold blocks to merge, delete a_{i,j} from κ.

We claim that at the end of this process |κ| ≤ 3|ζ'| ≤ 3r_{max}. Let a_{i,j} ∈ B_i with 1 < i < m be a non-bold token in κ. If at most one of B_{i-1}, B_i, B_{i+1} is bold, then removing a_{i,j} cannot merge bold blocks. Else assume at least two of B_{i-1}, B_i, B_{i+1} are bold. If a_{i,j} is not the first or last entry in B_i, it can be deleted without merging blocks. This leaves at most two unbold entries in each block. For B_1 (resp. B_m) we can delete all except the last (resp. first) entry without merging bold blocks. This leaves at most two unbold entries in each block. Then in the worst case each block contains just one bold entry, with an unbold entry on either side. For example, if we get to κ = ⋯ |12, 10, 8 | 975 | 642 | 31 then we cannot delete 8, 9, 5, 6, 2, 3 without merging blocks.

3. After this, we obtain a permutation κ < subperm σ such that the bold letters ζ' < subperm κ and |κ| ≤ 3r_{max}.

We now claim that p_1(κ) PB-contains F_{k-1} because of the same ζ and β as σ. Since bold blocks are preserved in κ, we know that p_1(κ) will also contain ζ.

Now suppose there is some α ∈ (F_{k-1})_b and δ < subperm p_1(κ) < subperm p_1(σ) with ζ' < subperm δ, removebar(α) ∼ ζ and δ ∼ unbar(α). This means that the same α saves σ, which contradicts our original assumption. Thus p_1(κ) PB-contains F_{k-1} which implies p_1(κ) /∈ S_{k-1} which implies κ /∈ S_k.

Thus since |κ| ≤ 3r_{max} and κ /∈ S_k, we have κ ∈ (Ω_k)_p by definition. To finish this direction, we will show that κ is not saved by any τ ∈ (Ω_k)_b.

Suppose (for contradiction) that κ < subperm σ is saved by some τ ∈ (Ω_k)_b. Thus we have removebar(τ) ∼ κ, and some subpermutation δ < subperm σ with κ < subperm δ and δ ∼ unbar(τ) ∈ S_k. This means p_1(δ) PB-avoids F_{k-1}.
Now $p_1(\delta)$ will contain $\zeta$ since blocks containing $\zeta' \prec_{\text{subperm}} \kappa \prec_{\text{subperm}} \delta$ will not merge after one pass. Since $p_1(\delta)$ $PB$-avoids $F_{k-1}$ and contains $\zeta$, there must be some $\alpha \in (F_{k-1})_b$ which saves $\zeta \prec_{\text{subperm}} p_1(\delta)$. This means there is some $\delta' \prec_{\text{subperm}} p_1(\delta)$ with $\zeta \prec_{\text{subperm}} \delta'$, $\zeta \sim \text{removebar}(\alpha)$ and $\delta' \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$.

We claim $\alpha$ saves $\zeta \prec_{\text{subperm}} p_1(\sigma)$, since there exists $\delta' \prec_{\text{subperm}} p_1(\delta) \prec_{\text{subperm}} p_1(\sigma)$ with $\zeta \sim \text{removebar}(\alpha)$ and $\delta' \sim \text{unbar}(\alpha)$. This contradicts that $p_1(\sigma)$ $PB$-contains $F_{k-1}$ because of $\zeta$ and $\beta$. Thus we have shown $\sigma \not\in S_k$ implies $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $\Omega_k$.

Now for the converse direction, suppose that $\sigma$ $PB$-contains $\Omega_k$, and so we can assume that this is because of $\gamma \prec_{\text{subperm}} \kappa$ and $\tau \in (\Omega_k)_b$ with $\gamma \sim \tau$ (which is not saved by any $\alpha \in (\Omega_k)_b$), and so by definition $\gamma \not\in S_k$ so $p_1(\gamma)$ $PB$-contains $F_{k-1}$.

Assume (for contradiction) that $\sigma \in S_k$. We will show that this implies we can construct some $\kappa \prec_{\text{subperm}} \sigma$ such that $\kappa \in S_k, \gamma \prec_{\text{subperm}} \kappa$ and $|\kappa| \leq C = (3 + 8k)3r_{\text{max}}$. If so, then we can construct $\alpha \in (\Omega_k)_b$ with $\text{unbar}(\alpha) = \kappa$ and $\text{removebar}(\alpha) = \gamma$, which means $\alpha$ saves $\gamma \prec_{\text{subperm}} \sigma$, and this gives a contradiction.

Here is how we construct $\kappa$. In $\sigma$, mark the tokens corresponding to $\gamma$ bold.

Call a block of $\sigma$ bold if it contains at least one bold token, and otherwise a block is called non-bold. Starting with $\kappa = \sigma$, we delete non-bold tokens using the following procedure, which is more careful than the similar subroutine used in the proof of the forward direction above. The goal is to delete non-bold tokens to obtain a permutation $\kappa$ with subpermutation $\gamma$ such that for every block $B$ in $\kappa$ there is a block $B'$ in $\sigma$ so that the tokens in $B$ are tokens in $B'$. That is, we do not allow any blocks to merge, only to be deleted entirely.

- set $\kappa = \sigma$
- while $a_{i,j} \in B_i$ is a non-bold letter,
  - if removing $a_{i,j}$ from $\kappa$ does not cause two or more blocks of any kind (bold or non-bold) in $\kappa$ to merge, delete $a_{i,j}$ from $\kappa$,
  - if $B_i$ is non-bold and removing the entire block $B_i$ at once does not cause any of the remaining blocks to merge, then delete $B_i$.

We claim that at the end of this process each block contains at most two non-bold entries, which will be the first and last entries of the block. However, since we have not deleted non-bold blocks if their removal would cause other blocks to merge, we could have arbitrarily long factors of non-bold blocks, as in Figure 4.

However, we claim that this is the only situation that can occur with arbitrarily long blocks of size 2, and in this case if the factor is longer than $4k$ blocks by Lemma 4.2 the factor cannot be sorted by $k$ passes and so neither can $\sigma$, contradiction. Thus we have $|\kappa|$ is at most $3|\gamma|$ (the bold blocks with a non-bold entry first and last) plus $8k|\gamma| \cdot (4k$ factors each containing 2 tokens, as in Figure 3 in the worst case occurring between every pair of bold tokens from $\gamma$). Thus

$$|k| \leq (3 + 8k)|\gamma| \leq (3 + 8k)3r_{\text{max}} = C$$

If $\kappa$ cannot be sorted, then $p_1(\kappa) \not\in S_{k-1}$ because of some subpermutation $\tau \sim \text{removebar}(\beta)$ with $\beta \in F_{k-1}$, but since no block has merged in obtaining $p_1(\kappa)$, $p_1(\sigma)$ also contains $\tau$ which cannot be saved since blocks containing the tokens forming $\tau$ are fixed. Thus $p_1(\sigma) \not\in S_{k-1}$, so $\sigma \not\in S_k$, contradiction. \qed

Claim 3 implies that we could take $F_k = \Omega_k$ and the theorem is done. However, we can first apply Lemmas 3.3 5.10 to $\Omega_k$ to obtain a smaller set with the same $PB$-avoidance set, so we will call this $F_k$. As remarked in the previous section, the result of applying the lemmas is not guaranteed to give a set that is minimal.
or unique. Note that each of these lemmas needs to check a finite set so each is algorithmic.

\[ \square \]
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