

A CONJECTURED FORMULA FOR THE RATIONAL q, t -CATALAN POLYNOMIAL

GRAHAM HAWKES

ABSTRACT. We conjecture a formula for the rational q, t -Catalan polynomial $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}$ that is symmetric in q and t by definition. Denoting by $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}^d$ the homogeneous part of degree d less than the maximum degree appearing in $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}$, we prove that our conjecture is correct on the set $\{\mathcal{C}_{r/s}^d : r \cong 1 \pmod{s}, d \leq 20\}$. In the process we show that for any finite d^* providing a combinatorial proof of the symmetry of the infinite set of functions $\{\mathcal{C}_{r/s}^d : r \cong 1 \pmod{s}, d \leq d^*\}$ is equivalent to carrying out a finite number of base case computations depending only on d^* . We provide python code needed to carry out these computations for $d^* = 20$ (or any finite d^*) as well as python code that can be used to check the conjecture for any relatively prime (s, r) for all d .

1. INTRODUCTION

The rational q, t -Catalan polynomial is defined combinatorially in [6] (definition 21 of section 7). This is a generalization of the classical q, t -Catalan polynomial, the combinatorics of which had been studied earlier in places such as [1], [2], [3], and [4] (see also [5]). In this paper we conjecture a formula (see section 9, Conjecture 1 and example 14) for the rational q, t -Catalan polynomial. The formula is composed of monomial strings of the form $(\pm 1)(q^a t^b + q^{a+1} t^{b-1} + \dots + q^{b-1} t^{a+1} + q^b t^a)$. Each string is associated to a maximal rational Dyck path, that is, a rational Dyck path (see the definition of r/s -Dyck path in section 4.2 of [6]) that passes as close as possible to the bounding diagonal. Since each string is symmetric in q and t the formula is symmetric by definition. Consequently a combinatorial proof of the conjectured formula counts as a combinatorial proof of the symmetry of the rational q, t -Catalan polynomial. We give such a proof in a relatively “large” subcase. It is important to specify precisely how “large” this subcase is:

Let (s, r) be a pair of relatively prime numbers and denote the rational q, t -Catalan polynomial associated to this pair by $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}$. Let us denote by $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}^d$ the homogeneous part of $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}$ of total degree in q and t equal to $M - d$ where M is the maximum degree appearing in $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}$ (equal to the number of unit squares fully contained in the triangle with vertices $(0, 0), (s, 0), (s, r)$). For complete generality, we would need to prove the conjecture for all relatively prime pairs (s, r) and all d . Our first specialization is that we will only consider those pairs (s, r) with $r \cong 1 \pmod{s}$. In terms of generality, this is roughly half way between the classical case

Key words and phrases. Catalan Numbers, Dyck Paths, Symmetric Polynomials.

Declarations of interest: none.

G. Hawkes supported by ISF 711/18.

Email address: ghawkes1217@gmail.com.

Address: Department of Mathematics, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, 1 David Ben Gurion Blvd., Be'er Sheva, Israel.

(which only considers pairs $(s, s + 1)$) and rational case (which considers any relatively prime pair (s, r)). In other words, we are interested in proving the symmetry of $\mathcal{C}_{((\ell+1)m+1)/(\ell+1)}^d$ for all $\ell \geq 1$, $m \geq 1$, and $d \geq 0$. Our second specialization is to set some finite bound, d^* , for d . Such a constraint is needed because there are certain base case conditions that must be checked for each $d \leq d^*$. In principle, d^* can be arbitrarily large but in this paper we take it to be 20. We choose $d^* = 20$ simply because it is small enough to keep the computation time needed for the base case checks down to a few minutes on a personal computer.

To summarize, we give a complete combinatorial proof of the correctness of our conjecture for relatively prime pairs of the form $((\ell + 1), (\ell + 1)m + 1)$ for all $\ell \geq 1$, $m \geq 1$, and $d \in [0, 20]$. Because the formula in the conjecture is symmetric by construction, the paper in effect gives a combinatorial proof of the symmetry of the rational q, t -Catalan polynomial in the cases specified in the beginning of this paragraph. In particular it gives a combinatorial proof of the symmetry of the classical q, t -Catalan polynomial for all $d \leq 20$. We note that this had been done up to $d \leq 9$ in [7] and up to $d \leq 11$ in [8]. In fact, when we reduce our constructions to the $m = 1$ case there are certain overlaps with the methodologies of these papers. However, the $m = 1$ case is not the primary focus of this paper. In fact many of the constructions in this paper become either trivial or vastly simplified when we reduce to the $m = 1$ case.

We include additional code that the reader may use to check our conjecture for any pair (s, r) of relatively prime integers for all d simultaneously. This provides additional evidence that our conjecture is correct in the fully general case. Relatively large values of s and r can be quickly checked. For instance, checking the $s = 12$ and $r = 17$ case takes only a couple minutes.

We remark that the fact that our conjecture would imply that we may express $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}$ as the difference between two symmetric polynomials, $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}^+$ and $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}^-$, may have important implications. In the current combinatorial formulation, $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}$ is expressed as a sum of monomials indexed by the set of Dyck paths. However, it is notoriously difficult to arrange these paths into symmetric strings of paths to give a combinatorial proof of the symmetry of $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}$. The reason for this may be that the set of Dyck paths is “too small” in a sense. That is, there ought to be some set of “positive” Dyck paths that is strictly larger than the set of classically defined Dyck paths, along with a set of “negative” Dyck paths. The positive paths would correspond to monomials appearing in $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}^+$ and the negative paths would correspond to monomials appearing in $\mathcal{C}_{r/s}^-$. The difficulty in constructing symmetric strings of Dyck paths may be resolved when we are allowed to choose paths from this larger set of positive Dyck paths. (Of course, one would also have to construct symmetric strings for the negative Dyck paths.) This approach is not attempted in this paper, but it is a promising line of future investigation.

The following is a *very* rough overview of how our proof works: We at first focus on some maximal base case, $\ell = \ell^*$, which is defined relative to the choice of m . In this case, we construct strings of Dyck paths that do not (in general) have the desired symmetry property. We then use a map to permute the “tops” of these strings (while fixing the bottoms) to create symmetric strings. Then, using a combination of computation and argumentation we show that we have the desired symmetry for all $\ell < \ell^*$. Finally we use the fundamental result of the paper

(Theorem 1) about how Dyck paths of length ℓ and length $\ell + 1$ are related to prove the desired symmetry property for all $\ell > \ell^*$.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2 we introduce the definitions and establish a few basic facts. In section 3 we include some technical results about the form of degree bounded Dyck paths. In section 4 we define the cyclic maps on Dyck paths and describe their basic properties. In section 5 we introduce bounded partitions and $0 - 1$ matrices and establish their relationship to Dyck paths. In section 6 we state and prove the backbone of the paper, which is Theorem 1. In section 7 we describe how to construct strings of Dyck paths and show how to extend them. In section 8 we consider the base case of $\ell = 2$. In section 9 we state the conjecture and prove it (using the material so far described) for the cases mentioned earlier. Appendix A gives the code needed to complete some additional base case computations. Appendix B gives the code needed to test the conjecture for any pair (s, r) of relatively prime integers.

Sections 2 to 8 contain material only pertaining to the case $s = (\ell + 1)$ and $r = (\ell + 1)m + 1$. In this case it is irrelevant whether we consider paths from $(0, 0)$ to (s, r) that stay weakly below the line between these two points or the paths from $(0, 0)$ to $(s, r - 1)$ that stay weakly the line between those two points because there is a bijection from the former set of paths to the latter given by deleting the last vertical step in the path. It is somewhat notationally simpler to consider the latter so from now on we do so.


2. DYCK PATHS, DEGREE, AND AREA

An (ℓ, m) -Dyck path is a integral lattice path from $(0, 0)$ to $(\ell + 1, m(\ell + 1))$ that stays (weakly) below the diagonal line between these two points. We can specify such a path x using *step coordinates* via the expression $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ where $x_0 + \dots + x_i \leq m(i + 1)$ for $0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ and $x_0 + \dots + x_\ell = m(\ell + 1)$.

Since the last step coordinate of an (ℓ, m) -Dyck path is determined by the previous step coordinates we will sometimes write $x = (x_0, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -)$. In terms of lattice paths, the x_i appearing in an (ℓ, m) -Dyck path represent the number of vertical steps taken between each horizontal step in the physical path.

Example 1. A $(5, 2)$ -Dyck path x is shown on the right.

- In step coordinates we have $x = (1, 3, 0, 2, 2, 4)$.
- In position coordinates (defined in section 3) we have $x = [0, 1, 0, 2, 2, 2]$.
- We have $area(x) = 7$ (see below).
- We have $degr(x) = 9$ (see below).



The area of an (ℓ, m) -Dyck path is defined to be $area(x) = M - (\ell x_0 + \dots + 1x_{\ell-1})$ where $M = m \binom{\ell+1}{2}$, and the degree is defined to be $degr^+(x) + degr^-(x)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{degr}^+(x) &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j < \ell} \delta_{ij}^-(x) \\ \text{degr}^-(x) &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j < \ell} \delta_{ij}^+(x) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{ij}^+(x) &= \min(x_i, \max(0, (x_i - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) - 1)) \\ \delta_{ij}^-(x) &= \min(x_{i-1}, \max(0, (m - x_i) + \dots + (m - x_j))) \end{aligned}$$

Claim 1. *Suppose that $x = (x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ is an $(\ell - 1, m)$ -Dyck path and that $x_0 \leq m$, then then $x' = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -)$ is an (ℓ, m) -Dyck path and $\text{degr}(x') \leq x_0(\ell - 1) + \text{degr}(x)$.*

Proof. We have $(x_1 - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) \leq 0$ and $x_0 \leq m$ whence $(x_0 - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) \leq 0$ so that x' is an (ℓ, m) -Dyck path. We also have

$$\text{degr}(x') - \text{degr}(x) = \sum_{1 \leq j < \ell} \delta_{1j}^+(x') + \delta_{1j}^-(x')$$

Now $(x_1 - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) \leq 0$ implies that $\delta_{1j}^+(x') = 0$ and this along with $\delta_{1j}^-(x') \leq x_0$ implies each term in the sum is at most x_0 proving the claim. \square

Claim 2. *Suppose that $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ is an (ℓ, m) -Dyck path and that for all $1 \leq j < \ell$ we have $(x_0 - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) \leq -m$ then $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -)$ is an $(\ell - 1, m)$ -Dyck path and $\text{degr}(x) = x_0(\ell - 1) + \text{degr}(x')$.*

Proof. We have $(x_0 - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) \leq -m$ whence $(x_1 - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) \leq 0$ so that x' is an $(\ell - 1, m)$ -Dyck path. We also have

$$\text{degr}(x) - \text{degr}(x') = \sum_{1 \leq j < \ell} \delta_{1j}^+(x) + \delta_{1j}^-(x)$$

Now $(x_1 - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) \leq 0$ implies that $\delta_{1j}^+(x) = 0$ and $(x_0 - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) \leq -m$ implies $\delta_{1j}^-(x) = x_0$ so each term in the sum is equal to x_0 proving the claim. \square

Sometimes it will be convenient to compute $\text{degr}(x)$ in a different way. To do this we define

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{ij}^+(x) &= \min(m, \max(0, (x_i - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) - 1)) \\ \epsilon_{ij}^-(x) &= \min(m, \max(0, (m - x_i) + \dots + (m - x_j))) \\ \epsilon_{ij}^0(x) &= \max(0, (m - x_i) + \dots + (m - x_j) - m) \end{aligned}$$

Claim 3. *Let $1 \leq j < \ell$*

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & \epsilon_{1j}^+(x) + \dots + \epsilon_{jj}^+(x) = \delta_{1j}^+(x) + \dots + \delta_{jj}^+(x) \\ (2) \quad & \epsilon_{1j}^-(x) + \dots + \epsilon_{jj}^-(x) - \epsilon_{0j}^0(x) = \delta_{1j}^-(x) + \dots + \delta_{jj}^-(x) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By considering the four possible cases:

- $x_i, m \leq (x_i - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) - 1$
- $x_i, m \geq (x_i - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) - 1$

- $x_i < (x_i - m) + \cdots + (x_j - m) - 1 < m$
- $m < (x_i - m) + \cdots + (x_j - m) - 1 < x_i$

it is easy to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{ij}^+(x) - \delta_{ij}^+(x) &= \max(0, (x_i - m) + \cdots + (x_j - m) - 1 - x_i) \\ &\quad - \max(0, (x_i - m) + \cdots + (x_j - m) - 1 - m) \end{aligned}$$

Thus if the difference between the lefthand side and the righthand side of 1 is rewritten using this equation, all middle terms cancel and we are left with

$$\max(0, -1 - m) - \max(0, (x_1 - m) + \cdots + (x_j - m) - 1 - m) = 0$$

since $(x_1 - m) + \cdots + (x_j - m) \leq m + 1$ follows from the fact x is an (ℓ, m) -Dyck path. Similarly by considering the four possible cases:

- $x_{i-1}, m \leq (m - x_i) + \cdots + (m - x_j)$
- $x_{i-1}, m \geq (m - x_i) + \cdots + (m - x_j)$
- $x_{i-1} < (m - x_i) + \cdots + (m - x_j) < m$
- $m < (m - x_i) + \cdots + (m - x_j) < x_{i-1}$

one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{ij}^-(x) - \delta_{ij}^-(x) &= \max(0, (m - x_i) + \cdots + (m - x_j) - x_{i-1}) \\ &\quad - \max(0, (m - x_i) + \cdots + (m - x_j) - m) \end{aligned}$$

Thus if the difference between the lefthand side and the righthand side of 2 is rewritten using this equation, all middle terms cancel and we are left with

$$\begin{aligned} -\epsilon_{(0)j}^0(x) + \max(0, (m - x_1) + \cdots + (m - x_j) - x_0) \\ - \max(0, (m - x_j) - m) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

since the first two terms above are opposites and the third term is 0. \square

It follows from the previous claim that

Claim 4. *We have:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{degr}^+(x) &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j < \ell} \epsilon_{ij}^+(x) \\ \text{degr}^-(x) &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j < \ell} \epsilon_{ij}^-(x) - \sum_{1 \leq j < \ell} \epsilon_{0j}^0(x) \end{aligned}$$

Example 2. Suppose that $\ell = 5$ and that $m = 5$ and that $x = (3, 0, 12, 1, 2, 12)$ then we have

$$\delta_{11}^+ = 0, \delta_{12}^+ = 0, \delta_{13}^+ = 0, \delta_{14}^+ = 0, \delta_{22}^+ = 6, \delta_{23}^+ = 2, \delta_{24}^+ = 0, \delta_{33}^+ = 0, \delta_{34}^+ = 0, \delta_{44}^+ = 0$$

$$\epsilon_{11}^+ = 0, \epsilon_{12}^+ = 1, \epsilon_{13}^+ = 0, \epsilon_{14}^+ = 0, \epsilon_{22}^+ = 5, \epsilon_{23}^+ = 2, \epsilon_{24}^+ = 0, \epsilon_{33}^+ = 0, \epsilon_{34}^+ = 0, \epsilon_{44}^+ = 0$$

so that by either method $\text{degr}^+(x) = 8$ whereas

$$\delta_{11}^- = 3, \delta_{12}^- = 0, \delta_{13}^- = 2, \delta_{14}^- = 3, \delta_{22}^- = 0, \delta_{23}^- = 0, \delta_{24}^- = 0, \delta_{33}^- = 4, \delta_{34}^- = 7, \delta_{44}^- = 1$$

$$\epsilon_{11}^- = 5, \epsilon_{12}^- = 0, \epsilon_{13}^- = 2, \epsilon_{14}^- = 5, \epsilon_{22}^- = 0, \epsilon_{23}^- = 0, \epsilon_{24}^- = 0, \epsilon_{33}^- = 4, \epsilon_{34}^- = 5, \epsilon_{44}^- = 3$$

and

$$\epsilon_{01}^0 = 2, \epsilon_{02}^0 = 0, \epsilon_{03}^0 = 0, \epsilon_{04}^0 = 2$$

so that by either method $\text{degr}^-(x) = 20$.

Definition 1. We define the set $\mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}$ to be the set of all (ℓ, m) -Dyck paths. We define $\mathbf{T}_{\ell,m}$ to be the subset of $\mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}$ such that if $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ then $x_0 = m$. We define $\mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}^{<d} = \{x \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m} : \text{degr}(x) < d\}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{\ell,m}^{<d} = \{x \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell,m} : \text{degr}(x) < d\}$.

3. PROPERTIES OF DEGREE BOUNDED DYCK PATHS

In this section we establish some properties of (ℓ, m) -Dyck paths with degree less than $(\ell - 2)m$.

Claim 5. *Let $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$. Suppose $x_1 + \dots + x_{\ell-1} \leq (\ell - 2)m$ and $x_0 + x_1 \geq m$ then $\text{degr}^-(x) \geq (\ell - 2)m$.*

Proof. First suppose that $x_0 + x_1 = m$. Define

$$\text{neg}(x) = \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq \ell-1} \delta_{ij}^-(x) \right) - \delta_{11}^-(x)$$

For $1 < k \leq \ell$ let

$$x^k = (x_0, x_1, 0, \dots, 0, x_2 + \dots + x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_\ell)$$

It is easy to see that $\delta_{1j}^-(x^\ell) + \delta_{2j}^-(x^\ell) = m$ for $2 \leq j \leq \ell - 1$ so that $\text{neg}(x^\ell) \geq (\ell - 2)m$. Now suppose $\text{neg}(x^k) \geq (\ell - 2)m$ for some $k \in (2, \ell]$ and let $\mathbf{shift}_k(z_0, \dots, z_{k-1}, z_k, \dots, z_\ell) = (z_0, \dots, z_{k-1} + 1, z_k - 1, \dots, z_\ell)$ for any z . Then x^{k-1} is obtained from x^k by applying $\mathbf{shift}_k(x_2 + \dots + x_{k-1})$ times.

The only terms that appear in $\text{neg}()$ that can decrease in value when one of these instances of \mathbf{shift}_k is applied are $\delta_{1(k-1)}$, $\delta_{2(k-1)}$ and $\delta_{(k+1)j}$ for $j \in [k+1, \ell - 1]$ and each of these values may decrease by at most 1. The only terms that appear in $\text{neg}()$ that can increase in value when one of these instances of \mathbf{shift}_k is applied are δ_{kj} for $j \in [k, \ell - 1]$ and each of these values may increase by at most 1.

Moreover, if the t^{th} application of \mathbf{shift}_k results in a decrease in $\delta_{1(k-1)}$ then $x_0 + x_1 + t > (k - 1)m$ so that $t > (k - 2)m$ which implies that $\delta_{2(k-1)}$ is 0 before and after the t^{th} application of \mathbf{shift}_k . Thus, at most one of $\delta_{1(k-1)}$ and $\delta_{2(k-1)}$ can decrease with each application of \mathbf{shift}_k . Further, if t^{th} application of \mathbf{shift}_k results in a decrease in either $\delta_{1(k-1)}$ or $\delta_{2(k-1)}$ we have $x_1 + t > (k - 2)m$. This in combination with the assumption that $x_1 + \dots + x_{\ell-1} \leq (\ell - 2)m$ implies that $(x_2 + \dots + x_k - t) + x_{k+1} + \dots + x_{\ell-1} < (\ell - k)m$ which implies that $\delta_{k(\ell-1)}$ increases with the t^{th} application of \mathbf{shift}_k .

Finally, if for some $j \in [k+1, \ell - 1]$ the t^{th} application of \mathbf{shift}_k results in a decrease in $\delta_{(k+1)j}$ then $(x_2 + \dots + x_k - t) + x_{k+1} + \dots + x_j < (j - k)m$ which implies that $(x_2 + \dots + x_k - t) + x_{k+1} + \dots + x_{j-1} < (j - k)m$ so that $\delta_{k(j-1)}$ must increase with the t^{th} application of \mathbf{shift}_k . It follows that $\text{neg}(x^{k-1}) \geq \text{neg}(x^k)$ so by induction we see that $\text{neg}(x) \geq (\ell - 2)m$ since $x^2 = x$.

Now suppose that $x_0 + x_1 \geq m$. If $x_1 > m$ then the argument above implies that $\text{neg}(0, m, x_2, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -) \geq m(\ell - 2)$ which then implies that $\text{neg}(0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -) \geq$

$(\ell - 2)m$ which implies $\text{neg}(x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -) \geq (\ell - 2)m$. On the other hand, if $x_1 \leq m$ then the argument above implies that $\text{neg}(m - x_1, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -) \geq (\ell - 2)m$ so that $\text{neg}(x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -) \geq (\ell - 2)m$. But $\text{degr}^-(x) \geq \text{neg}(x) \geq (\ell - 2)m$. \square

Claim 6. *Let $x = (x_0, \dots, x_\ell)$ and suppose that i is minimal such that $i > 0$ and $x_i + x_{i+1} \geq m$. Suppose that $x_{i+1} + \dots + x_{\ell-1} > (\ell - i)m + 1$ and that either there exists some $2 \leq j \leq \ell - 1$ such that $x_0 + \dots + x_j > jm$ or else $x_0 + x_1 \geq m$. Then $\text{degr}(x) \geq (\ell - 2)m$.*

Proof. From the fact that $x_{i+1} + \dots + x_{\ell-1} > (\ell - i)m + 1$ we can deduce that for $k \in [i+1, \ell-1]$ we have $\epsilon_{(i+1)k}^+(x) + \epsilon_{(k+1)(\ell-1)}^+(x) \geq m$ and also that $\epsilon_{(i+1)(\ell-1)}^+(x) = m$ so certainly $\text{degr}^+(x) \geq (\ell - i - 1)m$ so we may from now on assume $i > 1$.

Next, suppose that $x_0 + x_1 < m$. Since we also have $x_1 + x_2 < m, \dots, x_{i-1} + x_i < m$ if we were to have $j \leq i$ then $x_0 + \dots + x_j < jm$ which contradicts an assumption so $j > i$. Now for $k \in [2, i]$, since $(x_0 - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) > -m$ while $x_2, \dots, x_{k-1} < m$ we have $(x_k - m) + \dots + (x_j - m) > m - x_0 - x_1$ implying that $\epsilon_{kj}^+(x) \geq m - x_0 - x_1$. So far we have that $\text{degr}^+(x) \geq (\ell - i - 1)m + (i - 1)(m - x_0 - x_1)$. Furthermore, for $k \in [2, i]$, we have $\delta_{1k}^-(x) = x_0$ and $\delta_{2k}^-(x) = x_1$ so $\text{degr}^-(x) \geq (x_0 + x_1)(i - 1)$. Thus $\text{degr}(x) \geq (\ell - 2)m$.

On the other hand, if $x_0 + x_1 \geq m$ we still have $\text{degr}^+(x) \geq (\ell - i - 1)m$ and since $x_1 + x_2 < m, \dots, x_{i-1} + x_i < m$ we have $x_1 + \dots + x_i < (i - 1)m$ so the previous claim can be applied to $x' = (x_0, \dots, x_i, -)$ and we see that $\text{degr}^-(x) \geq \text{degr}^-(x') \geq (i - 1)m$ so again $\text{degr}(x) \geq (\ell - 2)m$. \square

4. POINT, PAIR, AND THE CYCLE MAPS

If $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_\ell) \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell, m}$ in step coordinates then x may be represented in *position coordinates* as $x = [a_0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ where $a_i = (x_i - m) + \dots + (x_\ell - m)$ or equivalently $a_0 = 0$ and $a_i = (m - x_0) + \dots + (m - x_{i-1})$ for $i > 0$. On the other hand, if $x = [a_0, \dots, a_\ell]$ is written in position coordinates then $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -)$ where $x_i = m + a_i - a_{i+1}$. In terms of the physical path, a_i represents how far the path is below the diagonal before the step represented by x_i is taken. The following is immediate from this definition.

Lemma 1. *If $x = [a_0, \dots, a_\ell]$ in position coordinates then*

$$\text{area}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$$

Definition 2. Let $\alpha(a, b) = \min(a - b - 1, m)$ if $a > b$ and $\alpha(a, b) = \min(b - a, m)$ if $a \leq b$. Define $\alpha^0(a) = \max(0, a - m)$.

Note that if $x = [a_0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ we have $\epsilon_{ij}^+(x) + \epsilon_{ij}^-(x) = \alpha(a_i, a_{j+1})$ and $\epsilon_{0j}(x) = \alpha^0(a_{j+1})$ so that

$$\text{degr}(x) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \ell} \alpha(a_i, a_j) + \sum_{2 \leq j \leq \ell} \alpha^0(a_j)$$

Example 3. Recall that in example 3 we had that $\ell = 5$ and that $m = 5$ and that $x = (3, 0, 12, 1, 2, 12)$. We can write x in position coordinates as $x = [0, 2, 7, 0, 4, 7]$ Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{degr}(x) &= \alpha(2, 7) + \alpha(2, 0) + \alpha(2, 4) + \alpha(2, 7) + \\ &\quad \alpha(7, 0) + \alpha(7, 4) + \alpha(7, 7) + \\ &\quad \alpha(0, 4) + \alpha(0, 7) + \\ &\quad \alpha(4, 7) - \\ &\quad \alpha_0(7) - \alpha_0(0) - \alpha_0(4) - \alpha_0(7) = \\ &= 5 + 1 + 2 + 5 + 5 + 2 + 0 + 4 + 5 + 3 - 2 - 0 - 0 - 2 = 28 \end{aligned}$$

as before.

We translate some earlier results into position coordinates:

Corollary 1. *Suppose that $x = [0, a_2, \dots, a_\ell]$ is an $(\ell - 1, m)$ -Dyck path and choose some $a_1 \in [0, m]$, then then $x' = [0, a_1, a_2 + a_1, \dots, a_\ell + a_1]$ is an (ℓ, m) -Dyck path and $\text{degr}(x') \leq (m - a_1)(\ell - 1) + \text{degr}(x)$.*

Proof. Translate claim 1 from step coordinates to position coordinates. \square

Corollary 2. *Suppose that $x = [0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ is an (ℓ, m) -Dyck path and that for all $2 \leq j \leq \ell$ we have $a_j \geq m$ then $x' = [0, a_2 - a_1, \dots, a_\ell - a_1]$ is an $(\ell - 1, m)$ -Dyck path and $\text{degr}(x) = (m - a_1)(\ell - 1) + \text{degr}(x')$.*

Proof. Translate claim 2 from step coordinates to position coordinates. \square

Corollary 3. *Let $x = [a_0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$. Suppose that $a_2 \leq m$ or for some $j \in (2, \ell]$ we have $a_j < m$. Let $i > 0$ be minimal such that $a_i - a_{i+2} \geq -m$ and suppose $a_{i+1} - a_\ell > m + 1$. Then $\text{degr}(x) \geq (\ell - 2)m$.*

Proof. Translate claim 6 from step coordinates to position coordinates. \square

Now we can define the cycle maps:

Definition 3. If $x = [a_0, \dots, a_\ell]$ in position coordinates then we define

$$\text{cyclerright}(i, x) = [a_0, \dots, a_i, a_\ell + 1, a_{i+1}, a_{i+2}, \dots, a_{\ell-2}, a_{\ell-1}]$$

Definition 4. If $x = [a_0, \dots, a_\ell]$ in position coordinates then we define

$$\text{cycleleft}(i, x) = [a_0, \dots, a_i, a_{i+2}, a_{i+3}, \dots, a_{\ell-1}, a_\ell, a_{i+1} - 1]$$

The following are easy to check:

- $\text{cyclerright}(i, \text{cycleleft}(i, x)) = x$
- $\text{cycleleft}(i, \text{cyclerright}(i, x)) = x$
- $\text{area}(\text{cyclerright}(i, x)) = \text{area}(x) + 1$

Definition 5. Let $x = [a_0, \dots, a_\ell]$ we define $\text{point}(x)$ to be the minimal $r \leq \ell$ such that $a_r - a_\ell > -m$.

Definition 6. Let $x = (x_0, \dots, x_\ell)$ we define $\text{pair}(x)$ to be the minimal $r < \ell$ such that $a_r - a_{r+2} \geq -m$ (where the convention is $a_s = 0$ for $s > \ell$).

Definition 7. Let $x = [a_0, \dots, a_\ell]$ and $\text{point}(x) = r$. If $r < \ell$ and for all $0 \leq i \leq r - 2$ we have $a_i - a_{i+2} < -m$ we say x is **rightable** (at r) and define $\text{right}(x) = \text{cyclerright}(r, x)$.

Definition 8. Let $x = [a_0, \dots, a_\ell]$ and $\text{pair}(x) = r$. If $a_{r+1} - a_\ell \leq m + 1$ we say x is **leftable** (at r) and define $\text{left}(x) = \text{cycleleft}(r, x)$.

Remark 1. When $m = 1$, the maps **right** and **left** essentially reduce to the maps ν^{-1} and ν of [7] and [8].

Example 4. Let $m = 5$ and let $x^0 = [0, 4, 9, 12, 6, 6, 6, 7, 12, 8]$. For $i < 0$ define $x^i = \text{left}(x^{i+1})$ if x^{i+1} is leftable and for $i > 0$ define $x^i = \text{right}(x^{i-1})$ if x^{i-1} is rightable. All such x^i are shown below and to its right the value of the tuple $(\text{pair}(x^i), \text{point}(x^i))$. Note that x^{-5} is unleftable and x^6 is unrightable.

x^{-5}	0	4	7	12	8	11	8	5	5	5	(2, 1)
x^{-4}	0	4	6	7	12	8	11	8	5	5	(1, 1)
x^{-3}	0	4	6	6	7	12	8	11	8	5	(1, 1)
x^{-2}	0	4	6	6	6	7	12	8	11	8	(1, 1)
x^{-1}	0	4	9	6	6	6	7	12	8	11	(1, 2)
x^0	0	4	9	12	6	6	6	7	12	8	(2, 1)
x^1	0	4	9	9	12	6	6	6	7	12	(1, 2)
x^2	0	4	9	13	9	12	6	6	6	7	(2, 1)
x^3	0	4	8	9	13	9	12	6	6	6	(1, 1)
x^4	0	4	7	8	9	13	9	12	6	6	(1, 1)
x^5	0	4	7	7	8	9	13	9	12	6	(1, 1)
x^6	0	4	7	7	7	8	9	13	9	12	(1, 6)

Claim 7. Suppose $y \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell, m}$ is rightable at r and $x = \text{right}(y)$. Then we have:

- (1) $x \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell, m} \setminus \mathbf{T}_{\ell, m}$
- (2) x is leftable at r and $\text{left}(x) = y$.
- (3) $\text{degr}(x) = \text{degr}(y)$
- (4) $\text{area}(x) = \text{area}(y) + 1$

Proof. We write $y = [c_0, c_1, \dots, c_\ell]$ and $x = [a_0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$

- (1) We must first check that all $a_i - a_{i+1} \geq -m$ for $i \in [0, \ell]$ (otherwise x would contain negative step coordinates). If $i \notin \{r, r+1\}$ this follows from the fact that $c_j - c_{j+1} \geq m$ for all $j \in [0, \ell]$. Next if $i = r$ then $a_i - a_{i+1} = c_r - c_\ell - 1 \geq -m$ by the assumption that $\text{point}(y) = r$. Finally we must check $a_i - a_{i+1} \geq -m$ for $i = r+1$. Since we are assuming $i < \ell$ we have $r < \ell - 1$. If $r > 0$, then by minimality of r we have $c_\ell - c_{r-1} \geq m$ which in conjunction with $c_{r-1} - c_r \geq -m$ and $c_r - c_{r+1} \geq -m$ gives $c_\ell - c_{r+1} \geq -m$ so $a_{r+1} - a_{r+2} = c_\ell + 1 - c_{r+1} > -m$. If $r = 0$ then since $c_0 - c_1 = 0 - c_1 \geq -m$ we have $a_{r+1} - a_{r+2} = a_1 - a_2 = c_\ell + 1 - c_1 > -m$.
Next we must check that $x \notin \mathbf{T}_{\ell, m}$ or equivalently that $a_1 \neq 0$. If $\text{point}(y) = 0$ then $a_1 = c_\ell + 1 > 0$. If $\text{point}(y) \geq 2$ and $a_1 = 0$ then $c_1 = 0 = c_0$ so, since $c_1 - c_2 \geq -m$ also $c_0 - c_2 \geq -m$ which would imply y is not rightable. If $\text{point}(y) = 1$ and $a_1 = 0$ then $c_1 = 0 = c_0$ and so since $c_1 - c_\ell > -m$ we also have $c_0 - c_\ell > -m$ which contradicts $\text{point}(y) = 1$.
- (2) We have $a_i - a_{i+2} = c_i + c_{i+2} < -m$ for $0 \leq i \leq r-2$ by the fact that y is rightable at r . Further $a_{r-1} - a_{r+1} = c_{r-1} - c_\ell - 1 < c_{r-1} - c_\ell \leq -m$ by minimality of r . If $r = \ell - 1$ we have by convention that $a_r - a_{r+2} = a_r \geq 0 \geq -m$. If $r < \ell - 1$ then $a_r - a_{r+2} = c_r - c_{r+1} \geq -m$. Thus $\text{pair}(x) = r$. Further $a_{r+1} = c_\ell + 1 > 0$. Finally if $r = \ell - 1$ then $a_{r+1} - a_\ell = 0 \leq m + 1$.

Otherwise $a_{r+1} - a_\ell = c_\ell + 1 - c_{\ell-1} \leq m + 1$. Therefore we see x is leftable at r and so $\mathbf{left}(x) = y$.

(3) Using definition 2 and applying claim 4 we see that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{degr}(y) - \text{degr}(x) = \\ & \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \ell} \alpha(c_i, c_j) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq \ell} \alpha^0(c_j) - \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \ell} \alpha(a_i, a_j) + \sum_{2 \leq j \leq \ell} \alpha^0(a_j) = \\ & \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r} \alpha(c_j, c_\ell) - \alpha(c_j, c_\ell + 1) + \sum_{r < j < \ell} \alpha(c_j, c_\ell) - \alpha(c_\ell + 1, c_j) \\ & \quad - \alpha^0(c_\ell) + \alpha^0(c_\ell + 1) \end{aligned}$$

First suppose $r > 0$. For $j < r$ the fact that y is rightable at r implies that $c_j - c_\ell \leq -m$ so $\alpha(c_j, c_\ell) = m = \alpha(c_j, c_\ell + 1)$. Now $c_r - c_\ell > -m$ and $c_r - c_\ell \leq 0$ since $c_r - c_{r-1} \leq m$ and $c_{r-1} - c_\ell \leq -m$ so $\alpha(c_r, c_\ell) - \alpha(c_r, c_\ell + 1) = -1$. For $j > r$ we have $\alpha(c_j, c_\ell) = \alpha(c_\ell + 1, c_j)$ by definition of α . Finally, we have $\alpha^0(c_\ell + 1) - \alpha^0(c_\ell) = 1$ since $r > 0$ implies $c_0 - c_\ell \leq -m$. i.e., $c_\ell \geq m$.

If $r = 0$ then first sum is empty and the second sum completely cancels and we are left with $\alpha^0(c_\ell + 1) - \alpha^0(c_\ell)$, but both terms in this difference are 0 since $r = 0$ implies that $c_0 - c_\ell > -m$ so $c_\ell < m$. Therefore, in any case we have $\text{degr}(y) = \text{degr}(x)$.

(4) Finally, it is trivial to check $\text{area}(x) = \text{area}(y) + 1$. □

Claim 8. Suppose $x \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell, m} \setminus \mathbf{T}_{\ell, m}$ is leftable at r and $y = \mathbf{left}(x)$. Then we have:

- (1) $y \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell, m}$
- (2) y is rightable at r and $\mathbf{right}(y) = x$.
- (3) $\text{degr}(y) = \text{degr}(x)$
- (4) $\text{area}(y) = \text{area}(x) - 1$

Proof. We write $x = [a_0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ and $y = [c_0, c_1, \dots, c_\ell]$.

- (1) We must first check that $c_i - c_{i+1} \geq -m$ for $i \in [0, \ell)$. If $i \notin \{r, \ell - 1\}$ this follows from the fact that $a_j - a_{j+1} \geq m$ for all $j \in [0, \ell)$. Further if $r = \ell - 1$ we need only still check that $c_{\ell-1} - c_\ell \geq -m$ but we have $c_{\ell-1} - c_\ell = a_{\ell-1} - a_\ell + 1 > -m$ so we may suppose $r < \ell - 1$. Now $c_r - c_{r+1} = a_r - a_{r+2} \geq -m$ by the assumption that $\text{pair}(x) = r$. Next, $c_{\ell-1} - c_\ell = a_\ell - a_{r+1} + 1 \geq -m$ since $a_{r+1} - a_\ell \leq m + 1$ by the fact x is leftable at r .

We must also check that $c_\ell = a_{r+1} - 1 \geq 0$. Suppose that $a_{r+1} = 0$. If $r = 0$ this implies $x \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell, m}$ which is contrary to assumption and if $r > 0$ it implies $a_{r-1} - a_{r+1} \geq -m$ contradicting $\text{pair}(x) = r$.

- (2) We have $c_r - c_\ell = a_r - a_{r+1} + 1 > -m$. If for some $i < r$ we have $c_i - c_\ell > -m$ that means that $a_i - a_{r+1} \geq -m$ or that $(a_i - a_{i+1} + m) + \dots + (a_r - a_{r+1} + m) \geq m(r - i)$ which implies there must be some $i' \in [i, r - 1]$ with $(a_{i'} - a_{i'+1} + m) + (a'_{i'+1} - a_{i'+2} + m) \geq m$, which is to say $a_{i'} - a_{i'+2} \geq -m$, contradicting the fact that $\text{pair}(x) = r$. It follows that

$point(y) = r$. Further for all $i \leq r - 2$ we have $c_i - c_{i+2} = a_i - a_{i+2} < -m$ by minimality of r . Therefore y is rightable at r and $\mathbf{right}(y) = x$.

- (3) This follows from the above and claim 7
- (4) Finally, it is trivial to check $area(y) = area(x) - 1$.

□

5. BOUNDED PARTITIONS AND 0 – 1 MATRICES

In this section we define two sets that are in bijective correspondence with maximal (ℓ, m) -Dyck paths of degree less than $(\ell - 1)m$. These constructions will be essential to the next section and be used throughout the rest of the paper.

Definition 9. Let $\mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}$ be the set of all partitions $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$ with longest part at most $\ell - 1$ that is $\lambda_1 \leq \ell - 1$.

Definition 10. For $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}$ define the height of λ , or $h(\lambda)$, to be the number of rows of the partition. Define the $(\ell - 1)$ -width of λ or $w^{\ell-1}(\lambda)$ to be the sum of the length of all of the $(\ell - 1)$ -hook rows of λ . The $(\ell - 1)$ -hook rows (or just hook rows, when ℓ is clear from context) of $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$ are determined as follows: The first row of the partition is a hook row, and, if row i is a hook row so is row $i + \ell - \lambda_i$. Finally the size of λ or $|\lambda|$ is the sum of the lengths of all rows.

Definition 11. Define $\mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^{<d}$ to be the subset of $\mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}$ of size less than d .

Definition 12. Given a matrix, M , we define $\mathbf{rowRead}(M)$ to be the list attained by concatenating the rows of M (read left to right) beginning with the top row and moving down. Similarly, we define $\mathbf{colRead}(M)$ to be the list attained by concatenating the columns of M (read top to bottom) beginning with the leftmost column and moving right.

Definition 13. We define $\mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}$ to be the set of $m \times \ell$ matrices M , with the following properties:

- (1) The entries of M belong to the set $\{0, 1, *\}$.
- (2) Any $*$ appearing in $\mathbf{rowRead}(M)$ lies to the right of any 0 or 1 appearing in $\mathbf{rowRead}(M)$.
- (3) The first entry of $\mathbf{rowRead}(M)$ is 0.
- (4) The rightmost entry of $\mathbf{rowRead}(M)$ which is not a $*$ is a 1.
- (5) There is no appearance of a 0 that lies directly above a 1 in M .

Definition 14. We say that a 0 and a 1 are in contact in M if either they appear in the same row with the 0 to the left of the 1 or else if the 1 appears in the row below the 0 and weakly to its left (equivalently, strictly to its left since no 0 may lie above a 1). We define $|M|$ to be the total number of $(0, 1)$ pairs that are in contact.

Definition 15. We define $h(M)$ to be the total number of 0s in M and $w(M)$ to be the total number of 1s in M .

Example 5. We have $M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbf{M}_{5 \times 9}$ and we have $h(M) = 14$ and $w(M) = 19$ and $|M| = 51$.


Definition 16. We say $M \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}^{<d}$ if $M \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}$ and $|M| < d$.

Claim 9. There is a bijection $g : \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^{<(\ell-1)m} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}^{<(\ell-1)m}$ such that if $g(\lambda) = M$ then:

- $h(\lambda) = h(M)$.
- $w^{\ell-1}(\lambda) = w(M)$.
- $|\lambda| = |M|$

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^{<(\ell-1)m}$. Consider the Young diagram associated to the partition λ . Beginning in the top right corner and moving to the bottom left corner trace the (lower right) boundary of λ . As you do this, create a sequence composed of the symbols $\{0, 1, |\}$ by starting with a $|$ and then recording a 0 for each downward step and a 1 for each leftward step until you arrive at the (top right corner of the) next $(\ell - 1)$ -hook row. At this point record a $|$ and continue the process. The process terminates when you reach the bottom left corner of λ . You now have a sequence of 0s and 1s divided up into n parts, s_1, \dots, s_n by the $|$ symbols where n is the number of hook rows of λ . We will denote the number of 0s in s_k by z_k and the number of 1s in s_k by u_k . We denote the indices of the hook rows of λ by h_1, \dots, h_n .

Example 6. If $\ell = 9$ and $\lambda = (8, 7, 5, 5, 4, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1)$ then $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}$. The hook rows are rows $h_1 = 1$, $h_2 = 2$, $h_3 = 4$, and $h_4 = 8$ and are each marked by a • below. We have $h(\lambda) = 10$ and $w^{\ell-1}(\lambda) = 22$ and $|\lambda| = 39$.



Tracing the boundary of λ gives the sequence $|01|0110|0101001|01001$. We have $z_1 = 1$, $z_2 = 2$, $z_3 = 4$, and $z_4 = 3$ while $u_1 = 1$, $u_2 = 2$, $u_3 = 3$, and $u_4 = 2$.

Now, start with an empty $m \times \ell$ matrix. We now perform n steps. In step 1 place the sequence s_n in row n of M flushed to the left. (This is possible since s_n has at most ℓ terms by construction and since $n \leq m$. Indeed, if $n > m$ then the first m hook rows of λ contribute at least $\ell - 1$ to $|\lambda|$ contradicting $|\lambda| < (\ell - 1)m$.) Then, for each j such that $M_{n,j}$ contains a 1, place a 1 in $M_{i,j}$ for each $i < n$. Now suppose that you have completed steps $1, 2, \dots, n - k$. To perform step $n - k + 1$ consider the empty positions in row k and fill these (left to right) with the terms found in the sequence s_k until there are no more empty positions or until you run out of terms. Then, for each j such that $M_{k,j}$ contains a 1, place a 1 in $M_{i,j}$ (if there is not already one) for each $i < n$. When all n steps are complete, fill the remaining positions with *s.

Example 7. Again let us take $\lambda = (8, 7, 5, 5, 4, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1)$ which gave us the sequence $|01|0110|0101001|01001$. Following the steps outlined above creates the following matrix.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \left[\begin{array}{cccccc} & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \\ & & & & & \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{cccccc} & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \\ & & & & & \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \\
 \\
 \left[\begin{array}{cccccccc} & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & & & & \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{cccccccc} & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & & & & \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \\
 \\
 \left[\begin{array}{cccccccc} & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & & & & \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{cccccccc} & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & & & & \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \\
 \\
 \left[\begin{array}{cccccccc} & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & & & & \end{array} \right] \longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{cccccccc} & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ & & & & & & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & * & * & * & * \\ & & & & & * & * & * & * \end{array} \right]
 \end{array}$$

It is clear that in this process a 0 is never placed above a 1. Suppose now steps $1, \dots, n - k + 1$ have been performed and the following additional properties are true for each $k' \geq k$.

- (1) There are no empty positions in row k' and ignoring each 1 in row k' which lies above another 1, the entries row k' read left to right gives the sequence $s_{k'}$.
- (2) For each $i \in [1, z_{k'}]$ the i^{th} 0 of row k' of M is in contact with $\lambda_{h_{k'}+i-1}$ entries equal to 1.
- (3) The leftmost entry in row k' is 0.

We now show that if these properties hold for all $k' \geq k$ after step $n - k + 1$ then they hold for all $k' \geq k - 1$ after step $n - k + 2$.

- (1) If $k = n$ then the number of empty positions in row $k - 1$ of M after step 1 is equal to $\ell - u_k$. Moreover, we have $\lambda_{h_k} + z_{k-1} + u_{k-1} = \ell$ and that $u_k = \lambda_{h_k}$ so the number of terms in s_{k-1} is equal to $z_{k-1} + u_{k-1} = \ell - u_k$ as well.

If $k < n$ then the number of empty positions in row $k - 1$ of M after step $n - k + 1$ is equal to z_k by the fact that (1) holds for $k' = k$ after step $n - k + 1$. Moreover, by the fact row h_k of λ is a hook row we have $z_k + h_k = \ell$ and by the fact row h_{k-1} of λ is a hook row we have $z_{k-1} + u_{k-1} + h_k = \ell$ and so the number of terms in s_{k-1} is also equal to z_k .

- Therefore, after step $n - k + 1$ the number of empty positions in row $k - 1$ of M is equal to the length of s_{k-1} which implies that after step $n - k + 2$ is completed, (1) holds for all $k' \geq k - 1$.
- (2) Now suppose we have completed step $n - k + 2$. Consider the i^{th} 0 in row $k - 1$. This 0 is in contact with three types of 1s. First, it is in contact with 1s that appear in row $k - 1$ and do not have another 1 below them. This number is equal to the number of 1s following the i^{th} 0 in s_{k-1} which by considering the Young diagram of λ can be seen to be $\lambda_{h_{k-1}+(i-1)} - \lambda_{h_k}$. The second type of 1s are those that appear in row $k - 1$ and have a 1 beneath them. The third type of 1s are those that appear in row k . The number of 1s of the second and third type that our 0 is in contact with is equal to the total number of 1s in row k . Since (3) holds for $k' = k$ after step $n - k + 1$ there is a 0 in the first position of row k which is in contact with all 1s in that row and since (2) holds for $k' = k$ after step $n - k + 1$ there are λ_{h_k} such 1s. Thus it follows that the i^{th} 0 of row $k - 1$ is in contact with $\lambda_{h_{k-1}+(i-1)}$ 1s. This proves that after step $n - k + 2$ is completed, (2) is true for all $k' \geq k - 1$.
- (3) Finally, since s_{k-1} must begin with a 0 and row $k - 1$ and column 1 must be empty before step $n - k + 2$ by the fact (3) holds for $k' = k$ after step $n - k + 1$, we see that this position contains a 0 after step $n - k + 2$. Thus after step $n - k + 2$ is completed, (3) is true for all $k' \geq k - 1$.

We define the result of this process to be $g(\lambda)$. The discussion above makes it clear that $g(\lambda) \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}$. Moreover, number of 0s appearing in $g(\lambda)$ is clearly equal to the number of rows of λ so we have $h(g(\lambda)) = h(\lambda)$. Further, $w^{\ell-1}(\lambda) = \lambda_{h_1} + \cdots + \lambda_{h_n}$. But the discussion above implies that for each $i \in [1, n]$ the 0 in the leftmost column of row i and is in contact with λ_{h_i} many 1s, so this is exactly the number of 1s in row i . It follows that $w(g(\lambda)) = w^{\ell-1}(\lambda)$. Finally, since for each $i \in [1, h(\lambda)]$, the i^{th} 0 in $g(\lambda)$ is in contact with λ_i many 1s, the total number of (0, 1) pairs that are in contact, or $|g(\lambda)|$ is equal to the sum of the lengths of the rows of λ or $|\lambda|$. This last statement implies that in fact $g(\lambda) \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}^{<(\ell-1)m}$.

Now suppose that $M \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}^{<(\ell-1)m}$. Let \prec denote row reading order (i.e., the order used to compute $\text{rowread}(M)$) on the positions of M . Define $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{h(M)})$ where the i^{th} (under the order of \prec) 0 of M is in contact with precisely λ_i 1s. Suppose that there is some i such that $\lambda_i < \lambda_{i+1}$. Then there is some j such that the $i+1^{\text{st}}$ 0 of M is in contact with a 1 in column j but i^{th} 0 of M is not in contact with a 1 in column j . But this is only possible if a 0 appears above a 1 in column j which is a contradiction. Therefore λ is a partition. Since any 0 can be in contact with at most $\ell - 1$ 1s we have $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}$ and so by construction in $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^{<(\ell-1)m}$.

Property (2) shown earlier implies that if $g(\mu) = M$ then $\mu = \lambda$ so g is injective. To show that g is surjective it suffices to show that $g(\lambda) = M$. Suppose, rather, that $g(\lambda) = N \neq M$. Let (i, j) be maximal position in M under \prec such that $M_{i,j} \neq N_{i,j}$. Suppose that $M_{i,j} = 0$ and $N_{i,j} = 1$. Let (i', j') be maximal such that $(i', j') \prec (i, j)$ and $N_{i',j'} = 0$. For any k such that the 0 in $M_{i,j}$ is in contact with some 1 in column k of M , the 0 in $N_{i',j'}$ must be in contact with a 1 from column k of N . In addition, the 0 in $N_{i',j'}$ is also in contact with the 1 in $N_{i,j}$. Therefore (interchanging M and N in the previous argument if necessary), there is

some r such that the r^{th} to last 0 in M is in contact with a different number of 1s than the r^{th} to last 0 in N is in contact with. By definition the former number is $\lambda_{h(\lambda)-r+1}$ and by property (2) the latter number is also $\lambda_{h(\lambda)-r+1}$. Thus $M \neq N$ is impossible. □

The following result will be used later:

Claim 10. *If $x \in \mathbf{T}_\ell^{<(\ell-1)m}$ and $x = [a_0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ then $a_j \leq m$ for all $j \in [0, \ell]$.*

Proof. Suppose there is some k such that $a_k > m$. Let x be represented by an array A composed of columns of varying height, all flushed to the top of the array. A has ℓ columns and column j read from top to bottom is equal to a_j 1s followed by m 0s.

Example 8. If $a = [0, 0, 2, 7, 3, 5, 4, 6, 6, 3] \in \mathbf{T}_{9,5}$ then

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

and we could take k to be 3, 7, or 8.

Recall that using definition 2 we have

$$\text{degr}(x) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq \ell} \alpha(a_i, a_j) - \sum_{2 \leq j \leq \ell} \alpha_0(a_j)$$

Note that if $a_i > a_j$ then $\alpha(a_i, a_j)$ returns the number of 0s in column j of A in contact with a 1 in column i of A (and there are no 0s in column i in contact with a 1 in column j .) On the other hand, if $a_i \leq a_j$ then $\alpha(a_i, a_j)$ returns the number of 0s in column i of A in contact with a 1 in column j of A (and there are no 0s in column j in contact with a 1 in column i .) Therefore, in either case $\alpha(a_i, a_j)$ counts the number of $(0, 1)$ pairs in contact with one term appearing in column i and the other in column j . Meanwhile the value of $\alpha^0(a_j)$ is the number of 1s that appear in column j below row m . Therefore $\text{degr}(x)$ is equal to the total number of $(0, 1)$ pairs in contact in A minus the number 1s that appear below row m of A .

Since $a_1 = 0$ the first column of A contains m 0s and so for each 1 in the first m rows of A there is a 0 in the first column of A that is in contact with it. Moreover, every 0 in the first m rows of A and not in column 1 is in contact with a 1 in column k . So far we have counted $m(\ell - 1)$ $(0, 1)$ pairs in contact. Now for any 1 that lies in some row $i > m$ and column j (for instance row 6 and column 7 in the example), let $j' < j$ be maximal such that $A_{i,j'}$ does not contain a 1 (continuing the example we would have $j' = 5$). Column 1 contains no 1 so such maximal j' exists. Since $a_{j'} - a_{j'+1} \geq -m$ and $A_{i,j'+1}$ contains a 1, it follows that $A_{i,j'}$ contains a 0 (that

is in contact with the 1 in $A_{i,j}$). Since no $(0, 1)$ pair with the 0 below row m has been counted yet, we have now counted $m(\ell - 1) + u$ pairs in contact where u is the number of 1s below row m . It follows that $\text{degr}(a) \geq (m(\ell - 1) + u) - u$ which contradicts the assumption thereby proving the claim. \square

Claim 11. *There is a bijection $f : \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}^{<(\ell-1)m} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_{\ell, m}^{<(\ell-1)m}$ such that if $f(M) = x$ then:*

- $w(M) = \text{area}(x)$.
- $|M| = \text{degr}(x)$

Proof. Given $M \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}^{<(\ell-1)m}$ define $f(M) = [a_0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ where $a_0 = 0$ and for $j > 0$, a_j is equal to the number of 1s in column j of M . Since the M has only m rows the maximum value of a_j is m so $a_j - a_{j+1} \geq -m$ for $0 \leq j < \ell$ and we see that $f(M) \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell, m}$. Since column 1 of M has no 1s we also have that $a_1 = 0$ so that in fact $f(M) \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell, m}$. Clearly $w(M) = \text{area}(f(M))$. Moreover since all $a_j \leq m$ we have $\alpha_0(a_j) = 0$ for all $j \in [2, \ell]$ and it follows (see the proof of claim 10) that $\text{degr}(f(M))$ is the number of pairs of 0s and 1 in contact in the array A associated to x (as in the proof of 10). Since A is identical to M except that the former may contain some 0s (but no 1s) below row m , this number is the same as the number of $(0, 1)$ pairs in contact in M or $|M|$. This implies that $\text{degr}(f(M)) = |M|$ and therefore also that $f(M) \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell, m}^{<(\ell-1)m}$

Given $x = [a_0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell] \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell, m}^{<(\ell-1)m}$ start with an empty $m \times \ell$ matrix and for each $j \in [1, \ell]$ place a 1 in the top a_j positions in column j . Note that this is possible since by claim 10 $a_j \leq m$ for all j . Now suppose that (i, j) is maximal (in the row reading order, \prec) such that position (i, j) of the result contains a 1. For all pairs $(i', j') \prec (i, j)$ that do not contain a 1, place a 0 in position (i', j') . Finally, place a $*$ in all remaining empty positions. If M is the resulting matrix we define $f^{-1}(x) = M$. Since $a_1 = 0$ the top left entry of M is 0. The rest of the properties of $\mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}$ specified in definition 13 follow easily from the construction. Clearly we have $f(f^{-1}(x)) = x$ so we see from the above that $|f^{-1}(x)| = \text{degr}(x)$ so that $f^{-1}(x) \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}^{<(\ell-1)m}$

Finally since also $f^{-1}(f(M)) = M$ the claim is proved. \square

Claim 12. *There is an involution ι on $\mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}$ such that if $\iota(M) = N$ then*

- $w(M) = h(N)$
- $h(M) = w(N)$
- $|M| = |N|$

Proof. Given $M \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}$ start by changing all entries of M that were 1 to 0 and all entries that were 0 to 1. Now, let (\hat{i}, \hat{j}) be maximal in the row reading order \prec such that $M_{\hat{i}, \hat{j}} \neq *$. Consider the submatrix with top left corner in position $(1, 1)$ and bottom right corner (\hat{i}, \hat{j}) . Take this submatrix and rotate it through 180 degrees. Then consider the submatrix with top left corner in position $(1, \hat{j} + 1)$ and bottom right corner in position $(\hat{i} - 1, \ell)$. Rotate this submatrix through 180 degrees as well.

Example 9. In the top left we start with the matrix M . Then we interchange all 0s and 1s to get the matrix on the top right. Then we rotate the first submatrix

mentioned in the proof to get the matrix on the bottom left. Finally, we rotate the second submatrix mentioned in the proof to get the matrix on the bottom right.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix} & \rightarrow & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \\
\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix} & \rightarrow & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}
\end{array}$$

First we show that $\iota(M) \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}$ by checking the conditions of definition 13:

- (1) Clearly the entries of $\iota(M)$ belong to the set $\{0, 1, *\}$.
- (2) Any $*$ appearing in $\text{rowRead}(\iota(M))$ lies to the right of any 0 or 1 appearing in $\text{rowRead}(\iota(M))$ since ι does not affect which entries are equal to $*$.
- (3) The first entry of $\text{rowRead}(\iota(M))$ is 0. This follows from the fact that the rightmost entry of $\text{rowRead}(M)$ which is not a $*$ is a 1.
- (4) The rightmost entry of $\text{rowRead}(\iota(M))$ which is not a $*$ is a 1. This follows from the fact that the first entry of $\text{rowRead}(M)$ is 0.
- (5) There is no appearance of a 0 which lies directly above a 1 in $\iota(M)$. This follows from the fact that it is true for M .

Next it is obvious from construction that we have $w(M) = h(\iota(M))$ and that $h(M) = w(\iota(M))$.

Next, the map ι induces an involution on the set of positions $\{(i, j) : M_{i,j} \neq *\}$ in the obvious way (rotating the positions in each of the submatrices mentioned in the construction through 180 degrees) which we denote by $\hat{\iota}$. We claim that for any position p and q such that M has a 0 in position p and a 1 in position q that are in contact we have that $N = \iota(M)$ has a 0 in position $\hat{\iota}(q)$ and a 1 in position $\hat{\iota}(p)$ that are in contact. If p and q are in the same submatrix this is easy to see. If p is in the left submatrix and q in the right then we must have that p and q lie in the same row. It follows that $\hat{\iota}(q)$ lies in the row above $\hat{\iota}(p)$ (and to its right). Thus, in N , the 0 in the former is in contact with the 1 in the latter. If p lies in the right submatrix and q lies in the left submatrix then it must be that p lies one row above q . It follows that $\hat{\iota}(q)$ lies in the same row as $\hat{\iota}(p)$ (and to its left) so, in N , the 0 in the former is in contact with the 1 in the latter. Therefore we have $|M| \leq |\iota(M)|$ and since it is clear that $\iota^2(M) = M$ we have that $|M| = |\iota(M)|$. \square

6. THE PROJECTION THEOREM AND ITS PROOF

Definition 17. Given $x \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell, m}$, define $\text{lowest}(x) = \text{right}^i(x)$ where i is maximal such that $\text{right}^i(x)$ is defined (and where $\text{right}^i(x) = \text{right} \circ \dots \circ \text{right}(x)$ with i factors).

Theorem 1. Let $\lambda = [p_0, \dots, p_{\ell-2}] \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}$ be the partition with p_i parts of size $\ell-1-i$ and let $\mu = [p_1, \dots, p_{\ell-2}] \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-2}$ be the partition with p_i parts of size $\ell-1-i$.

Further suppose that $|\lambda| < (\ell - 2)m$. Then if $\mathbf{lowest}(f(g(\lambda))) = [0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ we have $\mathbf{lowest}(f(g(\mu))) = [a_1 - (m - p_0), \dots, a_\ell - (m - p_0)]$. In particular, $a_1 = m - p_0$.

Proof. Let $N_0 = g(\lambda) \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times \ell}^{<(\ell-2)m}$. Let N'_0 denote the $m \times (\ell - 1)$ matrix with every entry equal to $*$. Form the array $N_0 N'_0$ by appending the matrix N'_0 to the bottom of N_0 and flushed to the right (so that the shape of $N_0 N'_0$ is that of a $2m \times \ell$ matrix except with positions $(m + 1, 1), \dots, (2m, 1)$ missing). If $N_k N'_k$ is defined and columns 2 through ℓ of N_k contain at least one entry that is equal to 0 or $*$, define $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1} = \mathbf{Right}(N_k N'_k)$ where $\mathbf{Right}(NN')$ is defined as follows:

- If the rightmost column of NN' has less than m 1s define $\mathbf{Point}(NN') = 0$. Otherwise let j be minimal such that the difference between the number of 1s in the rightmost column of NN' and the number of 1s in the j^{th} column of NN' is less than m and define $\mathbf{Point}(NN') = j$.
- Remove the rightmost column of NN' , denote C_ℓ , and slide all entries in a column $j \in [\mathbf{Point}(NN') + 1, \ell - 1]$ one position to the right. Then append a 1 to the top of C_ℓ and remove its bottom entry and use the result to fill the evacuated positions (top to bottom).

Example 10. In the examples below we have $m = 3$ and $\ell = 5$. The first arrow represents removing column C_ℓ and shifting the columns to the right of $\mathbf{Point}(NN')$ to the right. The second arrow represents shifting the entries of C_ℓ down and the third represents placing the resulting entries back into the matrix. In this example we have $\mathbf{Point}(NN') = 1$.

$$NN' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & 1 & * & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 1 & * & * \\ & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ * \\ * \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ * \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 0 & 1 & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}$$

In this example we have $\mathbf{Point}(NN') = 0$.

$$NN' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ & 1 & * & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 1 & * & * \\ & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ * \\ * \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ * \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ & 0 & 1 & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}$$

Example 11. Let $m = 3$ and $\ell = 5$ and suppose that $\lambda = (4, 2, 1) = [1, 0, 1, 1]$. Applying **Right** starting from $N_0N'_0$ gives the sequence:

$$\begin{aligned}
 N_0N'_0 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}, & N_1N'_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}, \dots \\
 \dots, N_9N'_9 &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ & 1 & 0 & 1 & * \\ & * & * & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}, & N_{10}N'_{10} &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ & * & * & * & * \\ & * & * & * & * \end{bmatrix}
 \end{aligned}$$

Define $\mathcal{F}(NN') = [0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ where a_j is the number of 1s in the j^{th} column of NN' . Define $\mathcal{G}(NN')$ to be (ρ_1, \dots, ρ_z) where ρ_i is the number of 1s that the i^{th} 0 of NN' (under the row reading order, \prec) is in contact with. Note that $\mathcal{F}(N_0N'_0) = f(N_0)$ whereas $\mathcal{G}(N_0N'_0) = g^{-1}(N_0)$.

Let r be maximal such that $N_rN'_r$ is defined ($r = 10$ in example 11 since the first m rows of columns 2 to ℓ of $N_{10}N'_{10}$ only contain 1s). We make the following claims:

- (1) There is no 0 over a 1 in $N_kN'_k$
- (2) $\mathcal{F}(N_kN'_k) = \mathbf{right}^k(f(g(\lambda)))$ for $0 \leq k \leq r$.
- (3) $\mathcal{G}(N_kN'_k) = \lambda$ for $0 \leq k \leq r$.
- (4) $\mathbf{rowRead}(N_kN'_k)$ is composed of $h(\lambda) + w^{\ell-1}(\lambda) + k$ entries that are 0 or 1 ending on 1 and then followed by all *s.

It is evident that these claims are true for $k = 0$. Suppose they are true for some $k \leq r$. We will show that this implies they are also true for $k + 1$ if $k + 1 \leq r$.

First suppose that $\mathit{Point}(N_kN'_k) > 1$. Let A be the array of ℓ columns of varying height all flushed to the top whose j^{th} column is composed of as many 1s as are in the j^{th} column of $N_kN'_k$ followed by m 0s. As in the proof of claim 10 we have that $\mathit{degr}(\mathcal{F}(N_kN'_k))$ is given by the number of $(0, 1)$ pairs in A in contact minus the number of 1s below row m in A . Let (i_1, j_1) be minimal in the ordering \prec such that $A_{i_1, j_1} = 0$. Let (i_2, j_2) be minimal in the ordering \prec such that $j_2 \neq j_1$ and $A_{i_2, j_2} = 0$.

If $k < r$ then by definition of r there is a 0 somewhere in the first m rows of columns 2 to ℓ of $N_kN'_k$. If $k = r$ then the previous is true of $N_{k-1}N'_{k-1}$ but not of $N_kN'_k$. In light of the definition of **Right** this is only possible if N_{k-1} has a 0 in its bottom right corner which then implies that N'_k has a 0 in its top left corner. It follows that A has a 0 in columns 2 to ℓ in a position weakly before (in the \prec order) $(m + 1, 2)$. Moreover, the shape of $N_kN'_k$ implies that the top 0 in column 1 of A is in row $m + 1$ or higher. It follows that $(i_1, j_1) \prec (i_2, j_2) \preceq (m + 1, 2)$.

Consider the set of positions $S = \{(i, j) : j \notin \{j_1, j_2\}, (i_1, j_1) \preceq (i, j) \prec (i_1 + m, j_1)\}$. By the assumption that $\mathit{Point}(N_kN'_k) > 1$ there are at least m more 1s in column ℓ of A than in column 1. Since (i_1, j_1) weakly precedes (in \prec) the top 0 in column 1 of A it follows that every position in S lies in a row ending in 1. Therefore,

every 0 in S is in contact with a 1 in column ℓ . Moreover, by the construction of S , for every 1 in S there is a 0 in column j_1 in contact with it. Since the minimality of (i_1, j_1) implies there are no empty positions in S , so far we have counted $(\ell - 2)m$ $(0, 1)$ pairs in contact and none of these pairs feature a 0 from column j_2 .

Now consider a fixed column $j \notin \{j_1, j_2\}$. Suppose the lowest 1 in column j lies in (i, j) . Since the lowest 0 in column j_2 lies in $(i_2 + m - 1, j_2)$ if we have $(i_2 + m - 1, j_2) \prec (i, j)$ then every 0 in column j_2 (there are m) lies in contact with a 1 in column j (there are at most m 1s in column j below row m due to the shape of $N_k N'_k$). If $(i, j) \prec (i_2 + m - 1, j_2)$ then for every 1 in column j below row m there is a 0 in column j_2 in contact with it (since $(i_2, j_2) \preceq (m + 1, 2)$ and every 1 in A below row m is weakly after $(m + 1, 2)$). Thus the number of $(0, 1)$ pairs with a 0 in column j_2 and a 1 in column j is at least the number of 1s in column j below row m . It follows that the number of $(0, 1)$ pairs in contact in A that feature a 0 in column j_2 is at least the number of 1s below row m in A . All this implies that $\text{degr}(\mathcal{F}(N_k N'_k)) \geq (\ell - 2)m$ which is a contradiction so we may assume that $\text{Point}(N_k N'_k) \in \{0, 1\}$.

Now suppose that $k < r$ and $\text{Point}(N_k N'_k) = 0$. We prove each of the four claims listed earlier for $k + 1$:

- (1) Columns 3 through ℓ of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ were columns in $N_k N'_k$ so there is no 0 over a 1 these columns. Column 1 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ is formed by appending a 1 to the top $m - 1$ entries of column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$ so there is no 0 over a 1 in column 1 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$. Column 2 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ is formed from column 1 of $N_k N'_k$ followed by the entries in rows m through $2m - 1$ of column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$. However since $\text{Point}(N_k N'_k) = 0$ no entry on or below row m of column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$ is equal to 1 so column 2 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ also has no 0 over a 1.
- (2) As mentioned above, no entry on or below row m in column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$ is equal to 1 so all 1s in column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$ are added to the leftmost column of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ (along with one additional 1) and none to column 2. This along with the fact that $\text{point}(\mathcal{F}(N_k N'_k)) = \text{Point}(N_k N'_k) = 0$ implies that $\mathcal{F}(N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}) = \text{right}(\mathcal{F}(N_k N'_k))$.
- (3) It follows from positional considerations that the i^{th} 0 of $N_k N'_k$ is in contact with the same number of 1s as is the i^{th} 0 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ as long as the i^{th} 0 of $N_k N'_k$ does not occur in row $m - 1$ and column ℓ . If this were the case it could potentially be in contact with one less 1 in $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ than in $N_k N'_k$. However, this would require the entry in row m and column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$ to be 1 which is impossible (since the i^{th} 0 is above this position). It follows that $\mathcal{G}(N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}) = \mathcal{G}(N_k N'_k)$.
- (4) The final property is obvious as $\text{rowRead}(N_{k+1} N'_{k+1})$ is attained from $\text{rowRead}(N_k N'_k)$ by appending a 1 to the beginning and deleting the last entry (which must be a $*$ as it cannot be a 1 because $\text{Point}(N_k N'_k) = 0$ implies there is a 0 in column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$ and it cannot be a 0 because this would contradict the fact that property (4) holds for k).

Now suppose that $k < r$ and $\text{Point}(N_k N'_k) = 1$. We prove each of the four claims for $k + 1$:

- (1) All columns of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ appeared as columns in $N_k N'_k$ except column 2 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ which is column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$ with a 1 appended to the top and the bottom entry removed. It follows there is no 0 over a 1 in $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$.

- (2) $Point(N_k N'_k) = 1$ which means that $point(\mathcal{F}(N_k N'_k)) = 1$ and also ensures that there is no 1 in row $2m$ and column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$. This means that all of the 1s in column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$ are placed into column 2 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ along with one additional 1. From this and the definitions, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{F}(N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}) = right(\mathcal{F}(N_k N'_k))$.
- (3) We claim that the i^{th} 0 of $N_k N'_k$ is in contact with the same number of 1s as the i^{th} 0 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$. Since $Point(N_k N'_k) = 1$, column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$ begins with at least m 1s so that only 1s are placed into the first m rows of column 2 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$. This implies the following:
- If the i^{th} 0 of $N_k N'_k$ appears in position $(p, 1)$ then the i^{th} 0 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ also appears in $(p, 1)$. Since exactly one 1 is removed from row p and one 1 is added to row p the number of 1s in row p of $N_k N'_k$ and $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ is the same. But these numbers are the number of 1s that the i^{th} 0 of $N_k N'_k$ is in contact and the number of 1s that the i^{th} 0 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ is in contact with, respectively.
 - If $j \in [2, \ell - 1]$ and the i^{th} 0 of $N_k N'_k$ appears in position (p, j) then the i^{th} 0 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ appears in position $(p, j + 1)$. Further, the number of 1s in $N_k N'_k$ in the interval $[(p, j), (p + 1, j)]$ under \prec is the same as the number of 1s in $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ in the interval $[(p, j + 1), (p + 1, j + 1)]$ under \prec .
 - If the i^{th} 0 of $N_k N'_k$ appears in position (p, ℓ) then $p > m$ and the i^{th} 0 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ appears in position $(p + 1, 2)$. In this case the i^{th} 0 of $N_k N'_k$ is in contact with exactly the number of 1s that appear in row $p + 1$ of $N_k N'_k$. Since $p > m$ there is no entry in position $(p + 1, 1)$ so the i^{th} 0 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ is in contact with exactly the number of 1s that appear in row $p + 1$ of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$. Since neither position (p, ℓ) nor $(p + 1, \ell)$ of $N_k N'_k$ contain a 1 these numbers are the same.
- Thus the number of 1s that the i^{th} 0 of $N_k N'_k$ is in contact with is the same as the number of 1s that the i^{th} 0 of $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ is in contact with. It follows that $\mathcal{G}(N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}) = \mathcal{G}(N_k N'_k)$.
- (4) This is true for $N_{k+1} N'_{k+1}$ because it is true for $N_k N'_k$ and because row $2m$ and column ℓ of $N_k N'_k$ contains a $*$ (otherwise it would have to be a 1 and would force $Point(N_k N'_k) \geq 2$).

By definition of r we have that N_r contains only 1s in columns 2 to ℓ . Since r is minimal, this is not true of N_{r-1} . The only way both of these statements are possible is if $N_{r-1} N'_{r-1}$ has a 0 in row m and column ℓ . It follows that row $m + 1$ of column 2 of $N_r N'_r$ contains a 0, that is, the leftmost column of N'_r is all 0s and $*$ s which implies that $N'_r \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times (\ell-1)}$. Now since $\mathcal{G}(N_r N'_r) = \lambda = [p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{\ell-2}]$, column 1 of $N_r N'_r$ must contain p_0 0s (since no 0 in N'_r can be in contact with more than $\ell - 2$ 1s).

If we let $\mathbf{1}_{m \times \ell}$ denote the $m \times \ell$ matrix of all 1s and $\mathbf{1}_{m \times \ell} N'_r$ the result of appending N'_r below it (flushed to the right) then this implies that $\mathcal{G}(\mathbf{1}_{m \times \ell} N'_r) = [0, p_1, \dots, p_{\ell-2}]$. The latter is equivalent to the statement that $g^{-1}(N'_r) = [p_1, \dots, p_{\ell-2}]$ or that $g(\mu) = N'_r$ (where g is being applied to μ considered as an $\ell - 2$ bounded partition).

Now $|\mu| < (\ell - 2)m - p_0(\ell - 1) \leq (\ell - 2)(m - p_0)$, so that $|N'_r| < (\ell - 2)(m - p_0)$. Suppose that N'_r has more than $m - p_0$ 1s in some column $j \in [1, \ell - 2]$ or that

column $\ell - 1$ has $m - p_0$ 1s. Since $N'_r \in \mathbf{M}_{m \times (\ell-1)}$ it follows that column 1 of N'_r contains at least $m - p_0$ non-* entries which must all be 0s. Each of these 0s is in contact with all the 1s in its row. Moreover, all 0s in the first $m - p_0$ rows of columns 2 to $\ell - 1$ of N'_r are in contact with a 1 in column j . Thus the number of $(0, 1)$ pairs in contact in N'_r is at least $(\ell - 2)(m - p_0)$ so we would have $|N'_r| \geq (\ell - 2)(m - p_0)$ since N'_r can have no 1s below row m as it has only m rows. Thus the assumption of the second sentence of this paragraph is impossible and it follows that the bottom p_0 rows of N'_r are all composed of all *s.

Now let us apply $\mathbf{Right}^{p_0(\ell-1)}$ to $N'_r \mathbf{X}_{m \times (\ell-2)}$, the array formed by appending the $m \times (\ell - 2)$ matrix of all *s to the bottom of N'_r and flushed to the right. Before each of these $p_0(\ell - 1)$ applications of \mathbf{Right} the rightmost entry in row m is still *, from which it follows that the action of \mathbf{Right} is just to move each entry one position forward in the order \prec (and add a 1 in the top left position). Therefore $\mathbf{Right}^{p_0(\ell-1)}(N'_r \mathbf{X}_{m \times (\ell-2)})$ is just the matrix whose first p_0 rows are all 1s and whose next $m - p_0$ rows are the top $m - p_0$ rows of N'_r and whose last m rows are all *s.

Now suppose that $\mathbf{right}^r(f(g(\lambda))) = [0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ which in turn means that $\mathcal{F}(N_r N'_r) = [0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$. Since column 1 of N_r contains $m - p_0$ 1s this says that $a_1 = m - p_0$. Now for $j \in [2, \ell]$ column j of $N_r N'_r$ contains m more 1s than column $j - 1$ of N'_r and column $j - 1$ of $\mathbf{Right}^{p_0(\ell-1)}(N'_r \mathbf{X}_{m \times (\ell-2)})$ contains p_0 more 1s than column $j - 1$ of N'_r . Since column j of $N_r N'_r$ contains a_j 1s, column $j - 1$ of $\mathbf{Right}^{p_0(\ell-1)}(N'_r \mathbf{X}_{m \times (\ell-2)})$ contains $a_j - m + p_0$ 1s. In other words we have $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{Right}^{p_0(\ell-1)}(N'_r \mathbf{X}_{m \times (\ell-2)})) = [0, a_2 - (m - p_0), \dots, a_\ell - (m - p_0)]$. However, it is not hard to see that $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{Right}^{p_0(\ell-1)}(N'_r \mathbf{X}_{m \times (\ell-2)})) = \mathbf{right}^{p_0(\ell-1)} \mathcal{F}(N'_r \mathbf{X}_{m \times (\ell-2)})$ and since we have $g(\mu) = N'_r$ this in turn equals $\mathbf{right}^{p_0(\ell-1)} f(g(\mu))$.

Let $x^q = \mathbf{right}^{r+q}(f(g(\lambda)))$ and let $y^q = \mathbf{right}^{p_0(\ell-1)+q} f(g(\mu))$. We claim that for any $q \geq 0$ such that x^q and y^q are defined if $x^q = [0, a_1^q, \dots, a_\ell^q]$ then $a_1^q = m - p_0$, and $a_j^q \geq m$ for $j \in [2, \ell]$, and $y^q = [0, a_2^q - (m - p_0), \dots, a_\ell^q - (m - p_0)]$. Moreover, if $q > 0$ then $a_2^q > m$.

We have already established this for $q = 0$. Suppose it is true for some $q \geq 0$ and x^q and y^q are rightable. Then $a_\ell^q \geq m$ so $\mathit{point}(x^q) > 0$. It follows from this that $\mathit{point}(y^q) = \mathit{point}(x^q) - 1$ and that if $x_{q+1}^q = [0, a_1^{q+1}, \dots, a_\ell^{q+1}]$ then $a_1^{q+1} = m - p_0$ and $y^q = [0, a_2^{q+1} - (m - p_0), \dots, a_\ell^{q+1} - (m - p_0)]$, and since $a_j^q \geq m$ for $j \in [2, \ell]$ that $a_j^{q+1} \geq m$ for $j \in [2, \ell]$. If $\mathit{point}(x^q) = 1$ it also follows that $a_2^{q+1} > m$ since $a_\ell^q \geq m$. Additionally if $\mathit{point}(x^q) > 1$ and $q > 0$ then $a_2^{q+1} = a_2^q$ so it follows that $a_2^{q+1} > m$ since $a_2^q > m$. It is only left to show that $a_2^{q+1} > m$ if $\mathit{point}(x^q) > 1$ and $q = 0$. But the fact that $\mathit{Point}(N_r N'_r) \in \{0, 1\}$ shows that $\mathit{point}(x^0) > 1$ is impossible.

Now let q be minimal such that one or both of x^q and y^q is not rightable. Suppose that $\mathit{point}(x^q) = s$. Then $s > 0$ and x^q is rightable if and only if $s < \ell$ and $a_i^q - a_{i+2}^q < -m$ for $i \in [0, s - 2]$. Meanwhile y^q is rightable if and only if $s < \ell$ and $(a_i^q - (m - p_0)) - (a_{i+2}^q - (m - p_0)) < -m$ for $i \in [1, s - 2]$. But $a_0^q - a_2^q = -a_2^q \leq -m$ with strict inequality if $q > 0$. Thus unless $q = 0$ the statements are equivalent. But if $q = 0$ then $s = 1$ and the sets $[0, s - 2]$ and $[1, s - 2]$ are empty so both x^q and y^q are rightable. It follows that there is some q such that $x^q = \mathbf{lowest}(f(g(\lambda))) = [0, a_1^q, \dots, a_\ell^q]$ where $a_1^q = m - p_0$ and $y^q =$

$\text{lowest}(f(g(\mu))) = [0, a_2^q - (m - p_0), \dots, a_\ell^q - (m - p_0)]$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Example 12. Let $m = 3$ and $\ell = 5$ and $\lambda = (4, 2, 1) = [1, 0, 1, 1]$ (as in example 10) and $\mu = (2, 1) = [0, 1, 1]$. For $q \geq -r$ set $x^q = \text{right}^{r+q}(f(g(\lambda)))$ and similarly for each $q \geq -p_0(\ell - 1)$ set $y^q = \text{right}^{p_0(\ell-1)+q}(f(g(\mu)))$. We have $r = 10$ and $p_0(\ell - 1) = 4$ so that $f(g(\lambda)) = x^{-10}$ and $f(g(\mu)) = y^{-4}$ (shown in green). $x^0 = \text{right}^r(f(g(\lambda)))$ and $y^0 = \text{right}^{p_0(\ell-1)}(f(g(\mu)))$ are shown in red. Since x^{19} and y^{19} are not rightable, $\text{lowest}(f(g(\lambda))) = x^{19}$ and $\text{lowest}(f(g(\mu))) = y^{19}$ (shown in blue).

$$\begin{array}{l}
 x^{-10} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{-9} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{-8} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{-7} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{-6} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{-5} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{-4} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{-3} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 3 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{-2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 4 & 3 & 4 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 5 & 3 & 4 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 5 & 3 & 4 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 4 & 5 & 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 5 & 4 & 5 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \\
 \\
 \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
 \\
 x^{15} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 5 & 7 & 8 & 9 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{16} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 5 & 7 & 10 & 8 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{17} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 5 & 7 & 9 & 10 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{18} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 5 & 7 & 9 & 11 \end{bmatrix} \\
 x^{19} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 5 & 7 & 9 & 12 \end{bmatrix}
 \end{array}
 \qquad
 \begin{array}{l}
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = y^{-4} \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = y^{-3} \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = y^{-2} \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = y^{-1} \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} = y^0 \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = y^1 \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} = y^2 \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = y^3 \\
 \\
 \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
 \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 5 & 6 & 7 \end{bmatrix} = y^{15} \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 5 & 8 & 6 \end{bmatrix} = y^{16} \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 5 & 7 & 8 \end{bmatrix} = y^{17} \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 5 & 7 & 9 \end{bmatrix} = y^{18} \\
 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 3 & 5 & 7 & 10 \end{bmatrix} = y^{19}
 \end{array}$$

7. STRINGS AND THEIR EXTENSIONS

Definition 18. We say that $x \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}$ is disconnected if there exists $i \geq 0$ such that $\text{left}^i(x) \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}$ and is unleftable. We say $x \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}$ is connected if it is not disconnected.

Definition 19. Let $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^{<(\ell-1)m}$. Define $\text{string}(\lambda) = \{v_0, \dots, v_b\}$ where we define $v_0 = f(g(\lambda))$ and where $v_b = \text{lowest}(v_0)$ and for $0 < i < b$ $v_i = \text{right}^i(v_0)$. (Note that the definition depends on m since the definition of lowest depends on m .)

Claim 13. Let $d < (\ell - 1)m$ and let $\mathbf{C}_{\ell,m}^d \subseteq \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}$ denote the subset of elements which are connected and have degree d .

$$\mathbf{C}_{\ell,m}^d = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^d} \text{string}(\lambda)$$

where the union is disjoint and $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{(\ell-1)}^d$ if and only if $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{(\ell-1)}$ and $|\lambda| = d$.

Proof. Assume $x \in \mathbf{string}(\lambda) \cap \mathbf{string}(\lambda^*)$ where $\lambda \neq \lambda^*$. Thus we have $\mathbf{left}^i(x) = t$ and $\mathbf{left}^{i^*}(x) = t^*$ for some $i \neq i^*$ and $t \neq t^* \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell,m}^d$ by injectivity of $f \circ g$ and the fact that \mathbf{left} and \mathbf{right} are inverses. WLOG $i < i^*$ so $t^* = \mathbf{left}^{i^*-i}(t)$. Writing $t = [0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ we have $a_1 = 0$ since $t \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell,m}^d$ which implies $a_2 \leq m$ so that $0 - a_2 \geq -m$ and $\mathbf{pair}(t) = 0$. Since $a_1 = 0$ this implies $\mathbf{left}(t)$ contains a negative position coordinate and therefore so does $t^* = \mathbf{left}^{i^*-i}(t)$, which contradicts $t^* \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}^d$.

Now let $x \in \mathbf{C}_{\ell,m}^d$. Suppose there is no $i \geq 0$ such that $\mathbf{left}^i(x) \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell,m}^d$. Since it is clear we cannot have $\mathbf{left}^i(x) \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}^d$ for all i (eventually some position coordinate must become negative) there must exist $x' \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}^d \setminus \mathbf{T}_{\ell,m}^d$ with $\mathbf{left}(x') \notin \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}^d$. But this contradicts claim 8. Therefore such i exists and $x \in \mathbf{string}(g^{-1}(f^{-1}(\mathbf{left}^i(x))))$. \square

Claim 14. Suppose $x = [0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell] \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell,m}^d$ where $d < m(\ell - 2)$. Then $x' = [0, a_2 - a_1, \dots, a_\ell - a_1] \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell-1,m}^{d-(m-a_1)(\ell-1)}$

Proof. Since $x \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell,m}^d$ there is $q \geq 0$ such that $z = \mathbf{left}^q(x) = [0, e_1, \dots, e_\ell] \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}^d$ is unleftable. Suppose there is some $r \in [0, q]$ such that writing $y = \mathbf{left}^r(x) = [0, c_1, \dots, c_\ell]$ then either $c_2 \leq m$ or $c_j < m$ for some $j \in (2, \ell]$ and let us assume we have chosen the maximal such r . Suppose that $r < q$ and let $\mathbf{left}(y) = [0, \overline{c}_1, \overline{c}_2, \dots, \overline{c}_\ell]$. If $c_2 \leq m$ then $\mathbf{pair}(y) = 0$ and so $\overline{c}_\ell = c_1 - 1 < m$ since $0 - c_1 \geq -m$. If $c_j < m$ for some $j \in (2, \ell]$ then either $\overline{c}_j = c_j$ or $\overline{c}_{j-1} = c_j$ or $\overline{c}_\ell = c_j - 1$ so one of these is less than m . Therefore either $\overline{c}_2 \leq m$ or else $\overline{c}_j < m$ for some $j \in (2, \ell]$ which contradicts the maximality of r .

Therefore we must have that $r = q$ so either $e_2 \leq m$ or $e_j < m$ for some $j \in (2, \ell]$. Now $\mathbf{pair}(z) > 0$ since otherwise the fact that z is unleftable would imply that $e_1 - e_\ell > m + 1$ which is impossible since $0 - e_1 \geq -m$. Therefore $i = \mathbf{pair}(z)$ is the minimal $i > 0$ such that $e_i - e_{i+2} \geq -m$ and we have $e_{i+1} - e_\ell > m + 1$ since z is unleftable. Therefore the hypotheses of corollary 3 apply to z so we have $\mathbf{degr}(z) \geq (\ell - 2)m$ which is a contradiction since $\mathbf{degr}(x) = \mathbf{degr}(z)$.

It follows that for all $r \in [0, q]$ such that $y = \mathbf{left}^r(x) = [0, c_1, \dots, c_\ell]$ we have $c_2 > m$ and $c_j \geq m$ for all $j \in (2, \ell]$. Therefore corollary 2 implies that for all such y we have that the element $y' = [0, c_2 - c_1, \dots, c_\ell - c_1] \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell-1,m}^{d-(m-c_1)(\ell-1)}$. Moreover, since $c_2 > m$ it follows that $\mathbf{pair}(y) > 0$ for all such y . Since $x = [0, a_1, \dots, a_\ell]$ and $x' = [0, a_2 - a_1, \dots, a_\ell - a_1]$ this implies (by induction) that if $\mathbf{left}^r(x) = [0, c_1, \dots, c_\ell]$ then $\mathbf{left}^r(x') = [0, c_2 - a_1, \dots, c_\ell - a_1]$. When $r = q$ this implies that $\mathbf{left}^q(x') = z'$ where $z' = [0, e_2 - a_1, \dots, e_\ell - a_1]$. It follows from the facts that $\mathbf{pair}(z) > 0$ and that $z = [0, e_1, \dots, e_\ell]$ is unleftable that z' is also unleftable which implies that $x' \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell-1,m}^{d-(m-a_1)(\ell-1)}$. \square

Claim 15. Suppose that $x = [0, a_2, \dots, a_\ell] \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell-1,m}^d$ and suppose $a_1 \leq m$ is such that $(m - a_1)(\ell - 1) + d < m(\ell - 2)$. Then $x' = [0, a_1, a_2 + a_1, \dots, a_\ell + a_1] \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell,m}^{d+(m-a_1)(\ell-1)}$

Proof. Since $x \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell, m}^d$ there is $q \geq 0$ such that $z = \mathbf{left}^q(x) = [0, e_2, \dots, e_\ell] \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell, m}^d$ is unleftable. Suppose there is some $r \in [0, q]$ such that writing $y = \mathbf{left}^r(x) = [0, c_2, \dots, c_\ell]$ then either $c_2 \leq m - a_1$ or $c_j < m - a_1$ for some $j \in (2, \ell]$ and let us assume we have chosen the maximal such r . Suppose that $r < q$ and let $\mathbf{left}(y) = [0, \overline{c}_2, \dots, \overline{c}_\ell]$. If $c_2 \leq m - a_1$ then either $\overline{c}_2 = c_2 \leq m - a_1$ or else $\overline{c}_\ell = c_2 - 1 < m - a_1$. If $c_j < m$ for some $j \in (2, \ell]$ then either $\overline{c}_j = c_j$ or $\overline{c}_{j-1} = c_j$ or $\overline{c}_\ell = c_j - 1$ so one of these is less than $m - a_1$. Therefore either $\overline{c}_2 \leq m - a_1$ or else $\overline{c}_j < m - a_1$ for some $j \in (2, \ell]$ which contradicts the maximality of r .

It follows that we must have that $r = q$ which means that either $e_2 \leq m - a_1$ or $e_j < m - a_1$ for some $j \in (2, \ell]$. Since z is unleftable, if i is minimal such that $e_i - e_{i+2} \geq -m$, then $e_{i+1} - e_\ell > m + 1$ (note that $i > 0$ by definition). Further corollary 1 implies that the element $z' = [0, a_1, e_2 + a_1, \dots, e_\ell + a_1] \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell, m}^{\leq d+(m-a_1)(\ell-1)}$ and the previous sentence implies that if $i > 0$ is minimal such that $(e_i + a_1) - (e_{i+2} + a_1) \geq -m$ then $(e_{i+1} + a_1) - (e_\ell + a_1) > m + 1$. Since the first sentence of the paragraph implies that either $e_2 + a_1 \leq m$ or $e_j + a_1 < m$ for some $j \in (2, \ell]$ the hypotheses of corollary 3 apply to z' . It follows that we have $\text{degr}(z') \geq (\ell - 2)m$ which means that $d + (m - a_1)(\ell - 1) \geq (\ell - 2)m$ which contradicts an assumption of the original claim.

It follows that for any $r \in [0, q]$, if we write $y = \mathbf{left}^r(x) = [0, c_2, \dots, c_\ell]$ then $c_j \geq m - a_1$ for all $j \in (2, \ell]$ and $c_2 > m - a_1$, the latter of which implies $\text{pair}([0, a_1, c_2 + a_1, \dots, c_\ell + a_1]) > 0$. Now since $x = [0, a_2, \dots, a_\ell]$ and $x' = [0, a_1, a_2 + a_1, \dots, a_\ell + a_1]$ this implies (by induction) that if $\mathbf{left}^r(x) = [0, c_2, \dots, c_\ell]$ we must have $\mathbf{left}^r(x') = [0, a_1, c_2 + a_1, \dots, c_\ell + a_1]$. When $r = q$ this means that we have $\mathbf{left}^q(x') = z'$ where $z' = [0, a_1, e_2 + a_1, \dots, e_\ell + a_1]$ and that $\text{pair}(z') > 0$, which in light of the fact that z is unleftable implies z' is unleftable. When $r = 0$ the first sentence implies that for all $j \in [2, \ell]$, $a_j \geq m - a_1$, i.e., $a_j + a_1 \geq m$ so that we may apply corollary 2 to $x' = [0, a_1, a_2 + a_1, \dots, a_\ell + a_1]$ to see that $\text{degr}(x') = \text{degr}(x) + (m - a_1)(\ell - 1)$. Since corollary 1 implies $x' \in \mathbf{D}_{\ell, m}$, it follows that $x' \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell, m}^{d+(m-a_1)(\ell-1)}$ \square

Definition 20. Fix ℓ, m , and d and set $M = m(\ell + 1)(\ell)/2$. Suppose that for each $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^d$ such that $\mathbf{string}(\lambda) = (v_0, \dots, v_s)$ we have either that $\text{area}(v_s) = M - |\lambda| - h(\lambda)$ or else $\text{area}(v_s) < M - |\lambda| - h(\lambda)$ and there is a way to chose an extension $\mathbf{ext}(\lambda) = (w_1, \dots, w_e)$ with $w_i \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell, m}^d$ such $\text{area}(w_1) = \text{area}(v_s) + 1$, $\text{area}(w_{i+1}) = \text{area}(w_i) + 1$, and $\text{area}(w_e) = M - |\lambda| - h(\lambda)$. Further, suppose this can be done in such a way that:

$$\mathbf{N}_{\ell, m}^d = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^d} \mathbf{ext}(\lambda)$$

where the union is disjoint. In this case we define $\mathbf{extendable}(\ell, m, d) = \mathbf{true}$ and equal to \mathbf{false} otherwise.

Example 13. Let $\ell = 4, m = 3$, and $d = 5$ so that $M = 30$. The five elements of \mathbf{P}_4^5 are shown below along with their diagrammatic representations above them. Below each is an interval of the form $[P, Q/R]$ where $P = w^{\ell-1}(\lambda) = \text{area}(f(g(\lambda)))$ and $Q = \text{area}(\mathbf{lowest}(f(g(\lambda))))$ and $R = M - d - h(\lambda)$. Further below that are all elements (appearing in black) of $\mathbf{string}(\lambda)$ arranged by value of area (the numerical value is shown on the left). The red entries appearing at the bottom of

a string comprise the elements of $\text{ext}(\lambda)$. Since the union of the six red elements turns out to be precisely $\mathbf{N}_{4,3}^5$ we see that $\text{extendable}(4, 3, 5) = \text{true}$.

	$\lambda = [1, 1, 0]$	$\lambda = [1, 0, 2]$	$\lambda = [0, 2, 1]$	$\lambda = [0, 1, 3]$	$\lambda = [0, 0, 5]$
	[5, 23]	[4, 22]	[3, 20/22]	[3, 19/21]	[2, 18/20]
2					[0, 0, 0, 2, 0]
3			[0, 0, 2, 0, 1]	[0, 0, 1, 2, 0]	[0, 3, 1, 0, 0]
4		[0, 0, 1, 2, 1]	[0, 2, 0, 2, 0]	[0, 1, 0, 1, 2]	[0, 1, 3, 1, 0]
5	[0, 0, 2, 2, 1]	[0, 2, 0, 1, 2]	[0, 1, 2, 0, 2]	[0, 3, 1, 0, 1]	[0, 1, 1, 3, 1]
6	[0, 2, 0, 2, 2]	[0, 3, 2, 0, 1]	[0, 3, 1, 2, 0]	[0, 2, 1, 1, 3]	[0, 2, 1, 1, 3]
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
17	[0, 2, 4, 6, 5]	[0, 2, 5, 4, 6]	[0, 3, 3, 6, 5]	[0, 3, 5, 3, 6]	[0, 3, 4, 7, 3]
18	[0, 2, 4, 6, 6]	[0, 2, 5, 7, 4]	[0, 3, 6, 3, 6]	[0, 3, 5, 7, 3]	[0, 3, 4, 4, 7]
19	[0, 2, 4, 7, 6]	[0, 2, 5, 5, 7]	[0, 3, 6, 7, 3]	[0, 3, 4, 5, 7]	[0, 3, 5, 8, 3]
20	[0, 2, 4, 7, 7]	[0, 2, 5, 8, 5]	[0, 3, 4, 6, 7]	[0, 3, 6, 8, 3]	[0, 3, 4, 5, 8]
21	[0, 2, 4, 7, 8]	[0, 2, 5, 6, 8]	[0, 3, 6, 9, 3]	[0, 3, 4, 6, 8]	
22	[0, 2, 4, 7, 9]	[0, 2, 5, 6, 9]	[0, 3, 4, 6, 9]		
23	[0, 2, 4, 7, 10]				

Before stating the next claim it will be convenient to translate Theorem 1 and the last two claims into step coordinates:

Corollary 4. *Let $\lambda = [p_0, \dots, p_{\ell-2}] \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}$ be the partition with p_i parts of size $\ell-1-i$ and let $\mu = [p_1, \dots, p_{\ell-2}] \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-2}$ be the partition with p_i parts of size $\ell-1-i$. Further suppose that $|\lambda| < (\ell-2)m$. Suppose that $x = \text{lowest}(f(g(\mu)))$ and $x' = \text{lowest}(f(g(\lambda)))$. Then if $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, x_\ell)$ we have $x' = (p_0, x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -)$.*

Proof. Translate Theorem 1 into step coordinates. \square

Corollary 5. *Suppose $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, x_\ell) \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell,m}^d$ where $d < (\ell-2)m$. Then $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -) \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell-1,m}^{d-x_0(\ell-1)}$*

Proof. Translate claim 14 into step coordinates. \square

Corollary 6. *Suppose that $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, x_\ell) \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell-1,m}^d$ and suppose x_0 is such that $x_0(\ell-1) + d < (\ell-2)m$. Then $x' = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -) \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell,m}^{d+x_0(\ell-1)}$*

Proof. Translate claim 15 into step coordinates. \square

Claim 16. Fix m and ℓ^* and some $d^* < (\ell^* - 1)m$. If for all $d \leq d^*$ we have $\text{extendable}(\ell^*, m, d) = \text{true}$ then for any $\ell > \ell^*$ we have $\text{extendable}(\ell, m, d) = \text{true}$ for all $d \leq d^*$.

Proof. It suffices to assume that $\ell = \ell^* + 1$. Suppose we have already constructed $\text{ext}(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell^*-1}^{\leq d^*}$. Now fix $d \leq d^*$ and suppose that $\lambda = [p_0, \dots, p_{\ell-2}] \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^d$ and let $\mu = [p_1, \dots, p_{\ell-2}] \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell^*-1}^{d-p_0(\ell-1)}$.

Write $x = \text{lowest}(f(g(\mu)))$ and $x' = \text{lowest}(f(g(\lambda)))$. It follows from corollary 4 that if $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, x_\ell)$ we have $x' = (p_0, x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}, -)$.

If $\text{ext}(\mu) = \{w_1, \dots, w_e\}$ then define $\text{ext}(\lambda) = \{w'_1, \dots, w'_e\}$ where for $1 \leq i \leq e$ we have that if $w_i = (y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}, y_\ell)$ then $w'_i = (p_0, y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}, -)$. Note the following:

- (1) We have $\text{area}(w'_1) - \text{area}(x') = \text{area}(w_1) - \text{area}(x) = 1$
- (2) We have $\text{area}(w'_{i+1}) - \text{area}(w'_i) = \text{area}(w_{i+1}) - \text{area}(w_i) = 1$
- (3) We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{area}(w'_e) &= \text{area}(w_e) + (m - p_0)\ell = \\ &= m(\ell^* + 1)\ell^*/2 - |\mu| - h(\mu) + (m - p_0)\ell = \\ &= m\ell(\ell - 1)/2 - (|\lambda| - p_0(\ell - 1)) - (h(\lambda) - p_0) + (m - p_0)\ell = \\ &= m\ell(\ell - 1)/2 - |\lambda| - h(\lambda) + p_0\ell + (m - p_0)\ell = \\ &= m(\ell + 1)(\ell)/2 - |\lambda| - h(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

- (4) $w'_i \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell, m}^d$.

The last of these follows from corollary 6 since $p_0(\ell - 1) + \text{degr}(w_i) = p_0(\ell - 1) + |\mu| = |\lambda| < m(\ell - 2)$. Therefore taking $\text{ext}(\lambda) = (w'_1, \dots, w'_e)$ gives a valid extension. It remains to show:

$$\mathbf{N}_{\ell, m}^d = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^d} \text{ext}(\lambda)$$

where the union is disjoint.

Now let $y' = (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}, y_\ell) \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell, m}^d$ be arbitrary. We must show y' appears in the union above. Claim 14 implies that the element $y = (y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}, -) \in \mathbf{N}_{(\ell-1), m}^{d-y_0(\ell-1)}$. Therefore $y \in \text{ext}(\mu)$ for some $\mu \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-2}^{d-y_0(\ell-1)}$ since we are assuming the extensions for all such μ have already been (validly) constructed. It follows by the construction in the proof that if $\mu = [p_1, \dots, p_{\ell-1}]$ then $y' \in \text{ext}(\lambda)$ where $\lambda = [y_0, p_1, \dots, p_{\ell-1}]$. Clearly $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^d$ so y' appears in the union above.

Finally we must show the union is disjoint. Suppose that $\lambda \neq \rho \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^d$ and $y' \in \text{ext}(\lambda)$, and $y' \in \text{ext}(\rho)$. If $y' = (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}, y_\ell)$ and $\lambda = [p_0, \dots, p_{\ell-1}]$ and $\rho = [q_0, \dots, q_{\ell-1}]$ we must have $p_0 = y_0 = q_0$ by construction. Moreover we have $y = (y_1, \dots, y_{\ell-1}, -) \in \text{ext}([p_1, \dots, p_{\ell-1}])$ and also $y \in \text{ext}([q_1, \dots, q_{\ell-1}])$ which implies $p_i = q_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ since otherwise we would have two distinct partitions in $\mathbf{P}_{\ell-2}^{d-y_0(\ell-1)}$ whose extensions intersect. \square

8. THE CASE OF $\ell = 2$

We now specialize to the case that $\ell = 2$. We begin with the following claim:

Claim 17. *Suppose that $x \in \mathbf{D}_{2,m}$. Then $\text{area}(x) + 2\text{degr}(x) \leq 3m$. Moreover, for any $d \in [0, m]$ there is some $x \in \mathbf{D}_{2,m}$ with $\text{degr}(x) = d$ and $\text{area}(x) + 2\text{degr}(x) = 3m$.*

Proof. To show the first half, suppose that $x = [0, a_1, a_2]$. We have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{degr}(x) &= \alpha(a_1, a_2) - \alpha_0(a_2) \\ &= \max(a_2 - a_1, a_1 - a_2 - 1) - \max(0, a_2 - m) \end{aligned}$$

Thus if :

- $a_2 \geq m$ then $\text{degr}(x) = m - a_1$ so $\text{area}(x) + 2\text{degr}(x) = a_2 - a_1 + 2m \leq 3m$ since $a_1 - a_2 \geq -m$.
- $a_2 < m$ and $a_2 \geq a_1$ then $\text{degr}(x) = a_2 - a_1 - (0)$ so that $\text{area}(x) + 2\text{degr}(x) = 3a_2 - a_1 < 3m$ since $a_2 < m$.
- $a_2 < a_1$ then $\text{degr}(x) = a_1 - a_2 - 1 - (0)$ since $a_2 < a_1 \leq m$ so that $\text{area}(x) + 2\text{degr}(x) = 3a_1 - a_2 - 2 < 3m$ since $a_1 \leq m$.

To see the second part, simply take $x = [0, m - d, 2m - d]$. \square

Claim 18. *If $d < m$ then $\mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d = \text{string}([d])$ where $[d]$ is the partition composed of d parts of size 1 (i.e., the unique element of \mathbf{P}_1^d).*

Proof. First we show that $\mathbf{C}_{2,m}^d = \mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d$. If this were not true there would have to be some disconnected element $x \in \mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d$ and therefore some unleftable element $y = [0, a_1, a_2] \in \mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d$. If $\text{pair}(y) = 0$ this would imply that $a_1 - a_2 > m + 1$ which is impossible as $a_1 \leq m$. If $\text{pair}(y) = 1$ this would imply that $a_2 - a_2 > m + 1$ which is also impossible.

Now, since $d < m = (\ell - 1)m$ we may apply claim 13 to see

$$\mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d = \mathbf{C}_{2,m}^d = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_1^d} \text{string}(\lambda)$$

but $[d]$ is the only element in \mathbf{P}_1^d so the claim follows. \square

Claim 19. *Writing $M = 3m$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in \mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d} q^{\text{area}(x)} t^{M-d-\text{area}(x)} = \\ q^d t^{M-2d} + q^{d+1} t^{M-2d-1} + \dots + q^{M-2d-1} t^{d+1} + q^{M-2d} t^d \end{aligned}$$

Proof. If $d < m$ let $b = \text{lowest}(f(g([d])))$. By claim 18 we know that b is the unique element of maximal area in $\mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d$ and by claim 17 that we know that such an element has area of $M - 2d$. Since $\text{area}(f(g([d]))) = d$ the claim follows for $d < m$. On the other hand, suppose $x = [0, a_1, a_2] \in \mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d$ for some $d \geq m$. If:

- $a_2 \geq m$ then $\text{degr}(x) = m - a_1$ which forces $a_1 = 0$ which in turn forces $a_2 \leq m$. Thus we must have $x = [0, 0, m]$.
- $a_2 < m$ and $a_2 \geq a_1$ then $\text{degr}(x) = a_2 - a_1 - (0) < m$ which is a contradiction.
- $a_2 < a_1$ then $\text{degr}(x) = a_1 - a_2 - 1 - (0) < m$ which is a contradiction.

Therefore $\mathbf{D}_{2,m}^m = \{[0, 0, m]\}$ and $\mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d = \emptyset$ for $d > m$ which shows the claim is true for all $d \geq m$ since $area([0, 0, m]) = m$. \square

9. THE CONJECTURE AND EVIDENCE OF ITS TRUTH

We now consider rational Dyck paths x with the parameters $(\ell + 1, n)$ where $\ell + 1$ and n are relatively prime. They are equivalent to sequences $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ such that $x_0 + \dots + x_i < n(i + 1)/(\ell + 1)$ for $0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ and $x_0 + \dots + x_\ell = n$. We define $\mathbf{D}_{n/(\ell+1)}$ to be the set of such sequences. Note that if $n = (\ell + 1)m + 1$ for some m then $\mathbf{D}_{n/(\ell+1)} = \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}$ (more precisely, there is a bijection $\mathbf{D}_{\ell,m} \rightarrow \mathbf{D}_{n/(\ell+1)}$ given by adding 1 to the last step coordinate). We make the following definitions:

$$M = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \lfloor \frac{n}{\ell+1}(i+1) \rfloor$$

$$area(x) = M - (x_0(\ell) + x_1(\ell-1) + \dots + x_{\ell-1}(1) + x_\ell(0))$$

Note that if $n = (\ell + 1)m + 1$ for some m then $M = (\ell)(\ell + 1)/2$ and the definition of $area(x)$ coincides with that given earlier. Next, we define the following:

$$\beta_{ij}(x) = (x_i + \dots + x_j) - \frac{n}{\ell+1}(j-i+1)$$

$$\gamma_{ij}(x) = \min(x_{i-1}, \lfloor |\beta_{ij}(x)| \rfloor) \text{ if } \beta_{ij}(x) < 0$$

$$\gamma_{ij}(x) = \min(x_i, \lfloor |\beta_{ij}(x)| \rfloor) \text{ if } \beta_{ij}(x) > 0$$

$$degr(x) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j < \ell} \gamma_{ij}(x)$$

Note that if $n = (\ell + 1)m + 1$ then $\gamma_{ij}(x) = \delta_{ij}^+(x) + \delta_{ij}^-(x)$ and so the definition of $degr(x)$ agrees with that given earlier. Next, we define:

$$under(x) = \min_{i \in [0, \ell]} \left(\frac{n}{\ell+1}(i+1) - (x_0 + \dots + x_i) \right)$$

$$\mathbf{T}_{n/(\ell+1)} = \{x : x \in \mathbf{D}_{n/(\ell+1)}, under(x) = 1/(\ell+1)\}$$

$$\mathbf{D}_{n/(\ell+1)}^d = \{x : x \in \mathbf{D}_{n/(\ell+1)}, degr(x) = d\}$$

$$\mathbf{T}_{n/(\ell+1)}^d = \{x : x \in \mathbf{T}_{n/(\ell+1)}, degr(x) = d\}$$

Note that if $n = (\ell + 1)m + 1$ and $x = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_\ell) \in \mathbf{D}_{n/(\ell+1)} = \mathbf{D}_{\ell,m}$ then $under(x) = 1/(\ell + 1)$ is equivalent to the statement that $x_0 = m$ which is equivalent to the statement that $x \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell,m}$. Thus $\mathbf{T}_{n/(\ell+1)} = \mathbf{T}_{\ell,m}$. Similarly, $\mathbf{T}_{n/(\ell+1)}^d = \mathbf{T}_{\ell,m}^d$.

Definition 21. The degree $M - d$ part of the rational q, t -Catalan polynomial is

$$\mathcal{C}_{n/(\ell+1)}^d = \sum_{x \in \mathbf{D}_{n/(\ell+1)}^d} q^{area(x)} t^{M-d-area(x)}$$

In the case that $n = (\ell + 1)m + 1$ we also write $\mathcal{C}_{n/(\ell+1)}^d = \mathcal{C}_{\ell,m}^d$.

Remark 2. This function first appears as definition 21 in section 7 of [6]. More precisely, we have:

$$\sum_{d \geq 0} \mathcal{C}_{n/(\ell+1)}^d = C_{n,\ell+1,1}(q, t)$$

where the left hand side is our notation and the right hand side is the notation of [6]. More precisely our statistic *area* corresponds to their statistic area^c and their $h_{r/s}^+$ is equal to the value of our $M - \text{degr} - \text{area}$.

Definition 22. We define

$$\text{sym}(a, b) = \frac{q^{b+1}t^a - q^a t^{b+1}}{q - t}$$

Conjecture 1. We have:

$$\mathcal{C}_{n/(\ell+1)}^d = \sum_{x \in \mathbf{T}_{n/(\ell+1)}^d} \text{sym}(\text{area}(x), M - d - \text{area}(x))$$

Lemma 2. Set $d^* = 20$ and fix $m \geq 1$. Let ℓ^* be minimal such that $m(\ell^* - 1) > d^*$. Then for all $d \leq d^*$ and all $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell^*-1}^d$ we have:

$$\text{area}(\text{lowest}(f \circ g(\lambda))) \geq \frac{(\ell^* + 1)(\ell^*)}{2} m - |\lambda| - h(\lambda)$$

where **lowest** is defined with respect to the choice of m .

Proof. First suppose that $m > 20$. In this case we have $\ell^* = 2$. According to claim 19 the maximal area of an element of $\mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d$ is $3m - 2d$. According to claim 18 the element of maximum area in $\mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d$ is $\text{lowest}(f \circ g([d]))$ so we conclude this element has area of $3m - 2d$. On the other hand, $3m - |[d]| - h([d]) = 3m - 2d$ as well, so the claim holds. Therefore it remains only to check the lemma in the case that $m \in [1, 20]$. But in this case the parameters m and d are both bounded and ℓ^* is a function of m . Thus there are only a finite number of values of (ℓ^*, m, d) to check. This is done in appendix A. \square

Lemma 3. Set $d^* = 20$ and fix $m \geq 1$. Let ℓ^* be minimal such that $(\ell^* - 1)m > d^*$. Then for all $d \leq d^*$ and $\ell \leq \ell^*$ we have:

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{C}_{\ell,m}^d = \sum_{x \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell,m}^d} \text{sym}\left(\text{area}(x), \frac{(\ell + 1)\ell}{2} m - d - \text{area}(x)\right)$$

Proof. First suppose that $m > 20$. In this case we have $\ell^* = 2$. We need to consider the cases of $\ell = 1$ and $\ell = 2$. If $\ell = 2$ then $M = m(\ell + 1)(\ell)/2 = 3m$. For $d \leq d^*$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{2,m}^d &= \sum_{x \in \mathbf{D}_{2,m}^d} q^{\text{area}(x)} t^{M-d-\text{area}(x)} = \\ &= q^d t^{M-2d} + q^{d+1} t^{M-2d-1} + \dots + q^{M-2d-1} t^{d+1} + q^{M-2d} t^d = \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathbf{T}_{2,m}^d} \text{sym}(\text{area}(x), M - d - \text{area}(x)) \end{aligned}$$

The first equality is the definition. The second equality is claim 19. The third equality follows from the fact that $\mathbf{T}_{2,m}^d = \{[0, 0, d]\}$ for $d < m$ and the fact that $area([0, 0, d]) = d$. Therefore equation 3 holds for $\ell = 2$ for all $d \leq d^*$ for $m > 20$.

On the other hand, if $\ell = 1$ then $M = m$ and we have $\mathbf{D}_{1,m} = \{[0, 0], [0, 1], \dots, [0, m]\}$. Since $degr([0, i]) = 0$ and $area([0, i]) = i$ it follows that $\mathcal{C}_{1,m}^d = 0$ if $d > 0$ and

$$\mathcal{C}_{1,m}^0 = q^0 t^m + q^1 t^{m-1} + \dots + q^{m-1} t^1 + q^m t^0 = sym(0, m)$$

Since $\mathbf{T}_{1,m} = \{[0, 0]\}$ and $area([0, 0]) = 0 = degr([0, 0])$ it follows that equation 3 holds for $\ell = 2$ for all $d \leq d^*$ for $m > 20$.

This proves the lemma in the case that $m > 20$. Therefore it remains only to check the lemma in the case that $m \in [1, 20]$. But in this case the parameters m and d are both bounded and ℓ^* is also finite by construction. Thus there are only a finite number of values of (ℓ, m, d) to check. This is done in appendix A. \square

Theorem 2. *Suppose that $n = (\ell + 1)m + 1$ for some $m \geq 1$. Then Conjecture 1 holds for all $d \leq 20$.*

Proof. Let $d^* = 20$ and choose ℓ^* minimal such that $(\ell^* - 1)m > d^*$. First let us define:

$$str(a, b, c) = q^a t^{c-a} + q^{a+1} t^{c-a-1} + \dots + q^{b-1} t^{c-b+1} + q^b t^{c-b}$$

Remark 3. Note that if $a < b$ then $str(a, b, a+b) = sym(a, b)$. Moreover, note that if for some index set I we have $a_i < c/2 < b_i$ for $i \in I$ then for any permutation, σ , of the index set we have:

$$\sum_{i \in I} str(a_i, b_i, c) = \sum_{i \in I} str(a_i, b_{\sigma_i}, c)$$

Remark 4. If $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell-1}^d$ for some $d < (\ell - 1)m$ then we have $2h(\lambda) < \frac{(\ell+1)\ell}{2}m - |\lambda|$ and $2w^{\ell-1}(\lambda) < \frac{(\ell+1)\ell}{2}m - |\lambda|$. This follows from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} 3|\lambda| &= 3d < 3(\ell - 1)m = \\ &((\ell - 2) + (\ell - 1) + (\ell))m \leq \\ &(1 + 2 + \dots + \ell^*)m = \\ &\frac{(\ell + 1)\ell}{2}m \end{aligned}$$

along with the fact that $h(\lambda) \leq |\lambda|$ and $w^{\ell-1}(\lambda) \leq |\lambda|$.

Now fix some $d \leq d^*$. We wish to evaluate $\mathbf{extendable}(\ell^*, m, d)$.

Note that since $d \leq d^* < (\ell^* - 1)m$ it follows by claims 9 and 11 that the function $f \circ g$ is a bijection $\mathbf{P}_{\ell^*-1}^d \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_{\ell^*,m}^d$ such that if $f \circ g(\lambda) = x$ then $area(x) = w^{\ell^*-1}(\lambda)$. Hence by Lemma 3 we have:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\ell^*,m}^d = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell^*-1}^d} sym\left(w^{\ell^*-1}(\lambda), \frac{(\ell^* + 1)\ell^*}{2} - |\lambda| - w^{\ell^*-1}(\lambda)\right)$$

By remark 4 we have $w^{\ell^*-1}(\lambda) < \frac{(\ell^*+1)\ell^*}{2}m - |\lambda| - w^{\ell^*-1}(\lambda)$ so the first part of remark 3 implies that we may instead write:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\ell^*, m}^d = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell^* - 1}^d} \text{str} \left(w^{\ell^* - 1}(\lambda), \frac{(\ell^* + 1)\ell^*}{2} - |\lambda| - w^{\ell^* - 1}(\lambda), \frac{(\ell^* + 1)\ell^*}{2} - |\lambda| \right)$$

Since $d < (\ell^* - 1)m$ we may combine claims 9 and 12 and consider the involution $g^{-1} \circ \iota \circ g$ on $\mathbf{P}_{\ell^* - 1}^d$ which has the property that if $g^{-1}(\iota(g(\lambda))) = \mu$ then $w^{\ell^* - 1}(\lambda) = h(\mu)$. From this and the inequalities of remark 4 and the second part of remark 3 it follows that:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\ell^*, m}^d = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell^* - 1}^d} \text{str} \left(w^{\ell^* - 1}(\lambda), \frac{(\ell^* + 1)\ell^*}{2} - |\lambda| - h(\lambda), \frac{(\ell^* + 1)\ell^*}{2} - |\lambda| \right)$$

This implies that there is a way to write

$$\mathbf{D}_{\ell^*, m}^d = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell^* - 1}^d} \text{string}(\lambda)$$

where for each λ we have that if $\text{string}(\lambda) = (u_0, \dots, u_e)$ then $\text{area}(u_0) = w^{\ell^* - 1}(\lambda)$, while $\text{area}(u_{i+1}) = \text{area}(u_i) + 1$ and $\text{area}(u_e) = \frac{(\ell^* + 1)\ell^*}{2} - |\lambda| - h(\lambda)$. Now by claim 13 we have

$$\mathbf{C}_{\ell^*, m}^d = \bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell^* - 1}^d} \mathbf{string}(\lambda)$$

and since Lemma 2 states that $\text{area}(\text{lowest}(f \circ g(\lambda))) \geq \frac{(\ell^* + 1)\ell^*}{2} - |\lambda| - h(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell^* - 1}^d$ we may assume that $\text{string}(\lambda) = (v_0, \dots, v_s, w_{s+1}, \dots, w_e)$ where $\mathbf{string}(\lambda) = (v_0, \dots, v_s)$ and all $w_i \in \mathbf{N}_{\ell^*, m}^d$. Thus $\text{extendable}(\ell^*, m, d) = \text{true}$.

Since we have shown that $\text{extendable}(\ell^*, m, d) = \text{true}$ for any $d \leq d^*$ we see from claim 16 that for all $\ell \geq \ell^*$ and $d \leq d^*$ we have $\text{extendable}(\ell, m, d) = \text{true}$. From this it follows that for any $\ell \geq \ell^*$ and $d \leq d^*$ we have:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\ell, m}^d = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell - 1}^d} \text{str} \left(w^{\ell - 1}(\lambda), \frac{(\ell + 1)\ell}{2} - |\lambda| - h(\lambda), \frac{(\ell + 1)\ell}{2} - |\lambda| \right)$$

Now $d < (\ell^* - 1)m \leq (\ell - 1)m$ so $g^{-1} \circ \iota \circ g$ is an involution on $\mathbf{P}_{\ell - 1}^d$ such that if $g^{-1}(\iota(g(\lambda))) = \mu$ then $w^{\ell - 1}(\lambda) = h(\mu)$ so again applying the second part of remark 3 in light of the inequalities of remark 4 we have:


$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\ell, m}^d &= \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell - 1}^d} \text{str} \left(w^{\ell - 1}(\lambda), \frac{(\ell + 1)\ell}{2} - |\lambda| - w^{\ell - 1}(\lambda), \frac{(\ell + 1)\ell}{2} - |\lambda| \right) \\ &= \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_{\ell - 1}^d} \text{sym} \left(w^{\ell - 1}(\lambda), \frac{(\ell + 1)\ell}{2} - |\lambda| - w^{\ell - 1}(\lambda) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Finally using the bijection $f \circ g : \mathbf{P}_{\ell - 1}^d \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_{\ell, m}^d$ we have:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\ell, m}^d = \sum_{x \in \mathbf{T}_{\ell, m}^d} \text{sym} \left(\text{area}(x), \frac{(\ell + 1)\ell}{2} - d - \text{area}(x) \right)$$

We have shown this equation holds for all $\ell \geq \ell^*$ and $d \leq d^*$. Since this equation also holds for all $\ell \leq \ell^*$ and $d \leq d^*$ by Lemma 3 this completes the proof. \square

Example 14. The elements of $\mathbf{D}_{13/8}^{19}$ are shown below diagrammatically.



For each $x \in \mathbf{D}_{13/8}^{19}$ the value of $area(x)$ is written inside the diagram of x . This is equal to the number of unshaded boxes. The maximum possible area for any path is given by $M = 1 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 8 + 9 + 11 = 42$. By the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{13/8}^{19}$ we may compute that:

$$\mathcal{C}_{13/8}^{19} = q^8 t^{15} + 3q^9 t^{14} + 6q^{10} t^{13} + 8q^{11} t^{12} + 8q^{12} t^{11} + 6q^{13} t^{10} + 3q^{14} t^9 + q^{15} t^8$$

The elements of $\mathbf{T}_{13/8}^{19}$ are those whose paths come within $1/8$ of the bounding diagonal. These are specified above by a red circle where this occurs. Therefore the conjecture states that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{13/8}^{19} = & q^8 t^{15} + q^9 t^{14} + q^{10} t^{13} + q^{11} t^{12} + q^{12} t^{11} + q^{13} t^{10} + q^{14} t^9 + q^{15} t^8 \\ & + 2q^9 t^{14} + 2q^{10} t^{13} + 2q^{11} t^{12} + 2q^{12} t^{11} + 2q^{13} t^{10} + 2q^{14} t^9 \\ & + 4q^{10} t^{13} + 4q^{11} t^{12} + 4q^{12} t^{11} + 4q^{13} t^{10} \\ & + 4q^{11} t^{12} + 4q^{12} t^{11} \\ & + 4(0) \\ & - 2q^{11} t^{12} - 2q^{12} t^{11} \\ & - q^{10} t^{13} - q^{11} t^{12} - q^{12} t^{11} - q^{13} t^{10} \end{aligned}$$

Comparing the two expressions shows that the conjecture is correct in this case.

APPENDIX A. COMPLETING THE PROOF OF LEMMAS 2 AND 3

In this appendix we give the python code needed to carry out the computations needed to complete the proofs of Lemmas 2 and 3. We refer to “computation 1” as the computation needed to complete Lemma 2 and “computation 2” as the computation needed to complete Lemma 3. The code should not take more than a few minutes to run on a personal computer.

#We use position coordinates to define Dyck paths in this code

```
import math

#Define the basic statistics
def alpha(a,b,m):
    if a<=b:
        return(min(b-a,m))
    if a>b:
        return(min(a-b-1,m))

def alpha0(a,m):
    return(max(0,a-m))

def point(x,m):
    for i in range(len(x)-1,-1,-1):
        if x[i]-x[len(x)-1]>-m:
            pt=i
    return(pt)

def pair(x,m):
    pr=len(x)-2
```

```

for i in range(len(x)-3,-1,-1):
    if x[i]-x[i+2]>=-m:
        pr=i
    return(pr)

#Define right and left
def right(x,m):
    pt=point(x,m)
    pr=pair(x,m)
    if pt<=pr+1 and pt<len(x)-1:
        y=x[0:pt+1]
        y+=x[len(x)-1+1]
        y+=x[pt+1:len(x)-1]
        return(y)
    if pt>pr+1 or pt==len(x)-1:
        return(x)

def left(x,m):
    pr=pair(x,m)
    if x[len(x)-1]-x[pr+1]>=-m-1:
        y=x[0:pr+1]
        y+=x[pr+2:len(x)]
        y+=x[pr+1]-1]
        return(y)
    if x[len(x)-1]-x[pr+1]<-m-1:
        return(x)

#Define lowest
def lowest(x,m):
    Record=[]
    y=None
    while x!=y:
        y=x
        x=right(x,m)
        Record.append(x)
    return(x)

#Define height of A to be height of P such that f(g(P))=A
def height(x):
    greatest=0
    j=0
    for i in range(0,len(x)):
        if x[i]>=greatest:
            greatest=x[i]
            j=i
    return((greatest-1)*(len(x)-1)+j-sum(x))

#Generate all relevant Dyck paths: Format [m,d,[a0,a1,...,a_l]]
def generate():
    Dyck_Paths=[]
    #We need to check m=1,2,3,...,20
    for m in range(20,0,-1):
        print('generating Dyck Paths with  $\underline{m}=\underline{\quad}$ ' + str(m) )
        #Compute lstar and dstar for given m
        lstar=int(math.ceil(20/m+1.001))
        dstar=20

```

```

#Initialize A as all paths for a given m
A=[[m,0,[0]]]
#Initialize X as paths with current number of coordinates
X=[[m,0,[0]]]
while len(X[0][2])<lstar+1:
    #Initialize Y as paths of with one more coordinate than X
    Y=[]
    for i in range(0,len(X)):
        x=X[i][2]
        last=x[len(x)-1]
        #Create paths with l+1 coordinates from a path with l
        for j in range(0,last+m+1):
            d=X[i][1]
            #Compute increase in degr statistic
            for k in range(1,len(x)):
                d+=alpha(x[k],j,m)
            d-=alpha0(j,m)
            #If degr<=dstar record the path
            if d<=dstar:
                Y.append([m,d,x+[j]])
                A.append([m,d,x+[j]])
        #Reset X to Y
        X=Y
    #Collect all A together in variable Dyck_Paths
    Dyck_Paths+=A
return(Dyck_Paths)

#Perform computation 1 for single Dyck path of form A=[m,d,[a0,a1,...,a_l]]
def string_okay(A):
    m=A[0]
    d=A[1]
    x=A[2]
    #Compute lstar and dstar for given m
    lstar=int(math.ceil(20/m+1.001))
    dstar=20
    #If l<lstar there is nothing to check
    if len(x)<lstar+1:
        return(True)
    if len(x)==lstar+1:
        #If x is not in T there is nothing to check
        if x[1]>0:
            return(True)
        if x[1]==0:
            #Compute M, h, and b=lowest(x)
            M=m*len(x)*(len(x)-1)/2
            h=height(x)
            b=lowest(x,m)
            #Compare area(b) to its supposed bound
            if sum(b)<=M-h-d:
                return(True)
            if sum(b)>M-h-d:
                print(A)
                return(False)

#Check computation 1 for all Dyck Paths in 'dp'
def all_strings_okay(dp):
    okay=True
    for v in range(0,len(dp)):

```

```

    if string_okay(dp[v])==False:
        okay=False
    return(okay)

#Sorting parameter to use later
def sort_rule(X):
    return(X[1]+X[0]/1000)

#Check computation 2 for all Dyck Paths in 'dp'
def conjecture(dp):
    okay=True
    start=0
    end=0
    while end<len(dp):
        #Group together paths
        #if they have the same value of m
        #and they have the same value of l
        while end<len(dp)-1 and dp[end][0]==dp[end+1][0] and\
            len(dp[end][2])==len(dp[end+1][2]):
            end+=1
        end+=1
        #into a variable called 'Dlm'
        Dlm=dp[start:end]
        l=len(Dlm[0][2])-1
        #The case l=0 is trivial
        if l>0:
            m=Dlm[0][0]
            M=m*(1+1)*(1)/2
            #Plus represents all positive monomials appearing in RHS of computation 2
            Plus=[]
            #Minus represents all negative monomials appearing in RHS of computation 2
            Minus=[]
            #All represents all monomials appearing in LHS of computation 2
            All=[]
            #Monomial format is [q degree, sum of q and t degree]
            for i in range(0, len(Dlm)):
                x=Dlm[i][2]
                d=Dlm[i][1]
                a=sum(x)
                #Add a monomial to All for every element of Dlm
                All.append([a,M-d])
                #Check if x is also an element of Tlm
                if x[1]==0:
                    a=sum(x)
                    if a<=M-a-d:
                        #Add monomial string to Plus if coefficients are positive
                        for j in range(a, int(M-a-d+1)):
                            Plus.append([j,M-d])
                    if M-a-d<a:
                        #Add monomial string to Minus if coefficients are negative
                        for j in range(int(M-a-d+1),a):
                            Minus.append([j,M-d])
            #Check that the union of All and Minus gives Plus
            All_Minus=All+Minus
            Plus.sort(key=sort_rule)
            All_Minus.sort(key=sort_rule)
            if Plus==All_Minus:

```

```

        print('m=' + str(m) + ', l=' + str(l) + ' is ok')
    if Plus!=All_Minus:
        okay=False
    start=end
    return(okay)

#Generate all relevant Dyck paths
DP=generate()
print(len(DP))

#Perform computation 1
str_check=all_strings_okay(DP)
print(str_check)

#Perform computation 2
con_check=conjecture(DP)
print(con_check)

```

APPENDIX B. CHECKING CONJECTURE 1

Using this python code the individual may check whether Conjecture 1 holds for any pair of relatively prime numbers.

We use step coordinates to define Dyck paths in this code

```

import math

#Define the basic statistics
def beta(n,l,i,j,x):
    return(sum(x[i:j+1]) -n*(j-i+1)/(l+1))

#Define the basic statistics
def gamma(n,l,i,j,x):
    b=beta(n,l,i,j,x)
    if b<0:
        g=min(x[i-1],math.floor(-b))
    if b>0:
        g=min(x[i],math.floor(b))
    return(g)

#Generate all relevant Dyck paths: Format [d,(x0,x1,...,x{l-1})]
def generate(l,n):
    #Initialize X as paths with current number of coordinates
    X=[[0,[]]]
    while len(X[0][1])<l:
        #Initialize Y as paths of with one more coordinate than X
        Y=[]
        for i in range(0,len(X)):
            x=X[i][1]
            room=math.floor(((len(x)+1)*n/(l+1))-sum(x))
            #Create paths with l+1 coordinates from a path with l
            for j in range(0,int(room)+1):
                d=X[i][0]
                xj=x+[j]

```

```

        #Compute increase in degr statistic
        for k in range(1, len(xj)):
            d+=gamma(n, l, k, len(xj)-1, xj)
        #Append path to Y
        Y.append([d, xj])
    #Reset X to Y
    X=Y
return(X)

#Sorting parameter to use later
def sort_rule(X):
    return(X[1]+X[0]/1000)

#Test the conjecture for a pair of relatively prime integers p and n.
def conjecture(p, n):
    #Use l=p-1 to agree with notation in paper
    l=p-1
    #Find the point where the path can come within 1/(l+1) of bounding diagonal
    for q in range(0, l):
        if round((l+1)*((q+1)*n/(l+1)-math.floor((q+1)*n/(l+1))))==1:
            #Record as [horizontal coordinate, vertical coordinate]
            closest=[q, math.floor((q+1)*n/(l+1))]
    dp=generate(l, n)
    #Compute max possible area, 'M'
    M=0
    for i in range(0, l):
        M=int(math.floor((i+1)*n/(l+1)))
    #Plus represents all positive monomials appearing in RHS of conjecture
    Plus=[]
    #Plus represents all negative monomials appearing in RHS of conjecture
    Minus=[]
    #All represents all monomials appearing in LHS of conjecture
    All=[]
    #Monomial format is [q degree, sum of q and t degree]
    for i in range(0, len(dp)):
        x=dp[i][1]
        d=dp[i][0]
        #Compute area, 'a'
        a=M
        for p in range(0, len(x)):
            a=sum(x[0:p+1])
            #Add a monomial to All for every element
            All.append([a, M-d])
            #Check if x is in T
            if sum(x[0:closest[0]+1])==closest[1]:
                if a<=M-a-d:
                    #Add monomial string to Plus if coefficients are positive
                    for j in range(a, int(M-a-d+1)):
                        Plus.append([j, M-d])
                if M-a-d<a:
                    #Add monomial string to Minus if coefficients are negative
                    for j in range(int(M-a-d+1), a):
                        Minus.append([j, M-d])
    print(len(All))
    print(len(Plus))
    print(len(Minus))
    All_Minus=All+Minus
    Plus.sort(key=sort_rule)

```

```

All_Minus.sort(key=sort_rule)
#Check that the union of All and Minus gives Plus
if Plus==All_Minus:
    okay=True
if Plus!=All_Minus:
    okay=False
return(okay)

#Test the conjecture on your favorite pair of relatively prime integers
print(conjecture(12,17))

```

REFERENCES

- [1] A.M. Garsia and James Haglund *A proof of the q, t -Catalan positivity conjecture* Discrete Math. 256 (2002), no. 3, 677-717
- [2] James Haglund *Conjectured statistics for the q, t -Catalan numbers* Adv. Math. 175 (2003), no. 2, 319-334
- [3] James Haglund, Mark Haiman, Nicholas A. Loehr, J. B. Remmel, and A. Ulyanov *A combinatorial formula for the character of the diagonal coinvariants* Duke Math. J., 126(2):195-232, 2005.
- [4] James Haglund and Nicholas A. Loehr *A conjectured combinatorial formula for the Hilbert series for diagonal harmonics* Discrete Math. 298 (2005), no. 1-3, 189-204
- [5] James Haglund *The q, t -Catalan numbers and the space of diagonal harmonics*, volume 41 of *University Lecture Series* American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.
- [6] Nicholas A. Loehr and Gregory S. Warrington *A continuous family of partition statistics equidistributed with length* J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 116 (2009), no. 2, 379–403.
- [7] Kyungyong Lee, Li Li, and Nicholas A. Loehr *A Combinatorial Approach to the Symmetry of q, t -Catalan Numbers*, SIAM J. Discrete Math (SIDMA). 32 (2018) no.1, 191–232.
- [8] Seongjune Han, Kyungyong Lee, Li Li, and Nicholas A. Loehr *Chain Decompositions of q, t -Catalan Numbers via Local Chains*, Ann. Comb. 24, 739–765 (2020).
- [9] Seongjune Han, Kyungyong Lee, Li Li, and Nicholas A. Loehr *Chain Decompositions of q, t -Catalan Numbers: Tail Extensions and Flagpole Partitions*, Ann. Comb. (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00026-022-00590-7>.

(G. Hawkes) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BEN GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV, 1
 DAVID BEN GURION BLVD., BE'ER SHEVA, ISRAEL
 Email address: ghawkes1217@gmail.com