

CHROMATIC QUASISYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS AND NONCOMMUTATIVE P -SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

BYUNG-HAK HWANG

ABSTRACT. For a natural unit interval order P , we describe proper colorings of the incomparability graph of P in the language of heaps. After then, we introduce a combinatorial operation, called a *local flip*, on the heaps. This operation defines an equivalence relation on the proper colorings, and the equivalent relation refines the ascent statistic introduced by Shareshian and Wachs.

We also define an analogue of noncommutative symmetric functions introduced by Fomin and Greene, with respect to P . We establish a duality between the chromatic quasisymmetric function of P and these noncommutative symmetric functions. This duality leads us to positive expansions of the chromatic quasisymmetric functions into several symmetric function bases. Also, we present some partial results for the e -positivity conjecture.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Chromatic quasisymmetric functions	2
1.2. Positivity of symmetric functions	3
1.3. Outline	4
2. Background	4
2.1. Natural unit interval orders and their incomparability graphs	4
2.2. Words on the alphabet $[n]$	6
2.3. Compositions and partitions	6
2.4. Symmetric and quasisymmetric functions	7
2.5. Chromatic quasisymmetric functions	10
3. Heaps and local flips	11
4. Noncommutative P -symmetric functions	18
4.1. An analogue of noncommutative symmetric functions and Cauchy product	19
4.2. Noncommutative P -power sum symmetric functions	24
4.3. Noncommutative P -Schur functions	26
5. Noncommutative P -monomial symmetric functions	30
5.1. Indexed by two-column shapes	33
5.2. Indexed by hook shapes	35
5.3. A recurrence relation	41

Key words and phrases. Chromatic quasisymmetric functions, noncommutative symmetric functions, the e -positivity conjecture, Stanley–Stembridge conjecture.

Acknowledgments	42
References	42

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Chromatic quasisymmetric functions. Chromatic quasisymmetric functions are one of the most notable objects in algebraic combinatorics, because of their connections with other fields. In [Sta95], Stanley introduced the *chromatic symmetric function* which generalizes the chromatic polynomial. For a graph G , the chromatic symmetric function $X_G(\mathbf{x})$ of G is defined by

$$X_G(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\kappa} x^{\kappa},$$

where $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ is a set of formal commuting variables, κ ranges over all proper colorings of G and $x^{\kappa} = \prod_{v \in V(G)} x_{\kappa(v)}$. By definition, $X_G(1^n)$ counts proper colorings of G with n colors. He presented many interesting properties of $X_G(\mathbf{x})$ and a famous conjecture; the so-called *e-positivity conjecture* (Conjecture 2.3). In fact, the *e-positivity conjecture* is equivalent to a conjecture on immanants suggested by Stanley and Stembridge [SS93]. This conjecture is one of the most famous long-standing open problems in algebraic combinatorics.

Although chromatic symmetric functions are of some interest in their own right, the quasisymmetric refinement of $X_G(\mathbf{x})$, due to Shareshian and Wachs [SW16], provides connections with other mathematical objects. The *chromatic quasisymmetric function* $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q)$ of a graph G whose vertex set is $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ is defined as follows:

$$X_G(\mathbf{x}, q) = \sum_{\kappa} q^{\text{asc}(\kappa)} x^{\kappa},$$

where $\kappa : [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ ranges over all proper colorings of G , and $\text{asc}(\kappa)$ is the number of edges $\{i, j\}$ such that $i < j$ and $\kappa(i) < \kappa(j)$. By definition, $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q)$ is in general a quasisymmetric function, not a symmetric function. But for some classes of graphs, the chromatic quasisymmetric functions are symmetric. Shareshian and Wachs concentrated one of such classes of graphs, called *incomparability graphs of natural unit interval orders*. They also refined the *e-positivity conjecture* (some notions will be defined in Section 2): for a natural unit interval order P , $X_{\text{inc}(P)}(\mathbf{x}, q)$ is *e-positive*. (Originally, Stanley conjectured for more general classes than natural unit interval orders, but due to Guay-Paquet [GP13], it suffices to show for natural unit interval orders.)

Since this quasisymmetric generalization was introduced, the chromatic quasisymmetric functions have been more actively studied than ever before. For example, Carlsson and Mellit [CM18] gave a plethystic formula between chromatic quasisymmetric functions and unicellular LLT polynomials. Clearman, Hyatt, Shelton and Skandera [CHSS16] observed a relationship between chromatic quasisymmetric functions and characters of Hecke algebras of type A. Their result refines the previous work of Haiman [Hai93].

Also, there is an algebraic geometry perspective for understanding the chromatic quasisymmetric functions. Let P be a natural unit interval order on $[n]$. Tymoczko [Tym08] defined an \mathfrak{S}_n -action on the (equivariant) cohomology of the regular semisimple Hessenberg variety corresponding to P via GKM theory. Based on her work, Shareshian and Wachs [SW16] conjectured that the Frobenius character of the cohomology of such variety is equal to $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$. This conjecture was proved independently by Brosnan–Chow [BC18] and Guay-Paquet [GP16], and hence it allows us to use geometric approaches for studying chromatic quasisymmetric functions. For example, Harada and Precup [HP19] showed the e -positivity of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$ with certain conditions for P via geometric techniques. They proved a recurrence relation on the coefficients of elementary symmetric functions, which holds for very special cases. Using only combinatorial and algebraic methods, we improve their result so that the recurrence holds for general cases.

The Shareshian–Wachs quasisymmetric refinement has an advantage for resolving the e -positivity conjecture. The chromatic quasisymmetric function $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q)$ has more information about colorings than $X_G(\mathbf{x})$, and it is obvious that the conjecture of Shareshian–Wachs implies the original e -positivity conjecture of Stanley–Stembridge. Thus the refined e -positivity conjecture seems to be more difficult than the original conjecture at first glance. But thanks to the quasisymmetric generalization, we can group colorings of G along the ascent statistic, and this grouping makes us focus on certain colorings instead of whole ones. In this sense, the refined conjecture may be easier than the original one. One can then ask for a natural way which refines the Shareshian–Wachs refinement.

One of the goals of the paper is to answer this question. We will introduce a combinatorial operation, called a *local flip*. This operation defines an equivalence relation on proper colorings, and all colorings belonging to each equivalence class have the same ascent. Therefore we can say that this operation refines the chromatic quasisymmetric function. Many results for the Shareshian–Wachs refinement still hold for our refinement. We hope that our refinement helps to resolve the e -positivity conjecture in the same sense.

1.2. Positivity of symmetric functions. Whenever a new class of symmetric functions is introduced, a question that naturally arises is positivity of them with respect to various symmetric function bases. To show positivity of a given symmetric function, numerous combinatorial and algebraic tools are developed. For example, approaches via RSK-like algorithms or crystals are efficient for showing Schur positivity of a given symmetric function. (Recently, Kim and Pylyavskyy [KP21] gave an RSK-like algorithm for natural unit interval orders with some addition conditions.) In [Hai92], Haiman introduced the notion of dual equivalences, which relates to Knuth relations, with many interesting applications. Inspired by his work, Assaf [Ass15] introduced a dual equivalence graph. Using this, she gave a systematic method for establishing Schur positivity.

Another well developed tool is a noncommutative algebraic method. A prototypical example is the plactic monoid, introduced by Lascoux and Schützenberger [LS81], which is the quotient of a free monoid by the Knuth relations. The plactic monoid allows us to embed the ring of symmetric functions into a noncommutative ring. Hence it lifts many questions in the ring of symmetric functions to ones in the noncommutative ring. Under the

noncommutative circumstance, some questions may be tackled more easily rather than the ones of commutative version. Especially, using this noncommutative approach, Fomin and Greene [FG98] developed noncommutative Schur functions to prove Schur positivity for various symmetric functions. In [BF17], Blasiak and Fomin gave a more general algebraic framework of this approach. Their framework also involves Lam’s [Lam08] and a part of Assaf’s [Ass15] works.

We devote the second half of this paper to introducing analogues of noncommutative symmetric functions which reflect properties of a given natural unit interval order P . In the same spirit of [BF17], these noncommutative symmetric functions provide expansions of the chromatic quasisymmetric function of P in terms of several bases. This approach unifies many results about positivity of chromatic quasisymmetric functions, including results in [Ath15, CH19, HP19, SW16]. In addition, we provide new partial results for the e -positivity conjecture.

1.3. Outline. In Section 2, we briefly review some necessary background for natural unit interval orders, symmetric functions, and chromatic quasisymmetric functions. In Section 3, we review the definition of heaps, and describe a relation between proper colorings and heaps. After that, we define a local flip, which is an operation on heaps. This operation is crucial in this paper. Via local flips, we suggest a more refined e -positivity conjecture (Conjecture 3.10). We also construct graphs on words according to a natural unit interval order, similarly to [Ass15, BF17]. In Sections 4 and 5, we define noncommutative P -symmetric functions which are analogues of noncommutative symmetric functions. After we establish a duality between chromatic quasisymmetric functions and noncommutative P -symmetric functions, we give combinatorial descriptions of the coefficients in the expansions of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$ into forgotten symmetric functions (Theorem 4.6), power sum symmetric functions (Theorem 4.10), and Schur functions (Theorem 4.19). Especially, in Section 5, we provide a combinatorial description of coefficients of $e_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ in the expansions of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$ where λ is of two-column shape or hook shape. In addition, we prove the conjecture of Harada–Precup [HP19, Conjecture 8.1].

2. BACKGROUND

In this section, we review background materials about natural unit interval orders, symmetric functions, and chromatic quasisymmetric functions.

Notations. We write \mathbb{Z} (respectively, \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{P}) for the set of (respectively, nonnegative and positive) integers. For $n \in \mathbb{P}$, we write $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

2.1. Natural unit interval orders and their incomparability graphs. Fix a positive integer n , and let $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$ be a weakly increasing integer sequence satisfying $i \leq m_i \leq n$ for each i . The *natural unit interval order* $P = P(\mathbf{m})$ corresponding to \mathbf{m} is a poset on $[n]$ whose ordering $<_P$ is given by $i <_P j$ if $m_i < j$. The term “natural unit interval order” arises from the following unit interval model: given a natural unit interval order P , one can assign a unit interval on the real line to each $i \in [n]$ such that $i <_P j$ if and only if the unit interval assigned to i completely lies on the left of the unit interval




FIGURE 1. The natural unit interval order $P(2, 4, 5, 5, 5)$ and its unit interval model.

assigned to j . For example, the natural unit interval order $P = P(2, 4, 5, 5, 5)$ and its unit interval model are presented in Figure 1.

For a poset P , the *incomparability graph* $\text{inc}(P)$ of P is the graph whose vertices are elements of P , and for $a, b \in P$, a and b are adjacent if and only if a and b are incomparable in P . When $P = P(\mathbf{m})$ is a natural unit interval order on $[n]$, for $i < j$, i and j are adjacent if and only if $j \leq m_i$. In this paper, we will deal with incomparability graphs of natural unit interval orders. By abuse of notation, if there is no danger of confusion, we also write P instead of $\text{inc}(P)$ for the incomparability graph of P .

An easy way to see the incomparability graph of $P(\mathbf{m})$ is to use Dyck diagrams. A *Dyck path* of length $2n$ is a lattice path consisting of $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$ steps from $(0, 0)$ to (n, n) which is above the diagonal line $y = x$. There is a simple bijection between natural unit interval orders P on $[n]$ and Dyck paths D of length $2n$. In fact the sequence \mathbf{m} corresponding to P records the heights of horizontal steps in D except the last step. To see the incomparability graph of a natural unit interval order P , draw the corresponding Dyck path. Then unit square boxes which are placed between the diagonal line and the Dyck path represent edges of $\text{inc}(P)$.

Given a Dyck path D of length $2n$, define the *bounce path* of D as follows. Beginning at the origin $(0, 0)$, the bounce path goes north until it reaches an east step of D . Then it goes east until it reaches the diagonal line $x = y$. This process continues recursively, and terminates when it reaches (n, n) . The *height* $h(D)$ of D is one less than the number of intersecting points of the bounce path and the diagonal line. Let $h(\mathbf{m}) = h(D)$ where D is the Dyck path corresponding to $P(\mathbf{m})$. In fact, the height $h(\mathbf{m})$ is the maximum cardinality of independent sets of $\text{inc}(P(\mathbf{m}))$, equivalently, the maximum length of chains in $P(\mathbf{m})$. See Figure 2 for an example.

For $a, b > 0$, let $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}$ denote the poset which is a disjoint union of two chains of length a and b . For a poset P , we say that P is $(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b})$ -free if P has no induced subposet isomorphic to $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}$. Introducing the chromatic symmetric functions, Stanley [Sta95] conjectured that if P is a $(\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{1})$ -free poset, then $X_{\text{inc}(P)}(\mathbf{x})$ is e -positive (see Section 2.4). On the other hand, there is a well-known characterization [SS58] such that a poset P is isomorphic to some natural unit interval order if and only if P is $(\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{1})$ - and $(\mathbf{2} + \mathbf{2})$ -free. Thus the class of natural unit interval orders is a subclass of the class of $(\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{1})$ -free posets. Guay-Paquet [GP13], however, showed that for a $(\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{1})$ -free poset P , the chromatic symmetric function $X_{\text{inc}(P)}(\mathbf{x})$ can be written as a positive linear combination of those of some natural




FIGURE 2. The Dyck path corresponding to $\mathbf{m} = (2, 4, 5, 5, 5)$ and the incomparability graph $\text{inc}(P(\mathbf{m}))$. The dashed line illustrates the bounce path, and the height $h(\mathbf{m}) = 2$.

unit interval orders. For this reason, we concentrate natural unit interval orders throughout this paper. See also Remark 3.9.

2.2. Words on the alphabet $[n]$. Fix a natural unit interval order P on $[n]$. We define some notions for words on the alphabet $[n]$, with respect to P . For a word $\mathbf{w} = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_d$ and $1 \leq i < d$, i is a P -descent of \mathbf{w} if $w_i >_P w_{i+1}$. Define the P -descent set $\text{Des}_P(\mathbf{w})$ of \mathbf{w} by

$$\text{Des}_P(\mathbf{w}) = \{i \in [d-1] \mid w_i >_P w_{i+1}\}.$$

For $1 \leq i < j \leq d$, (i, j) is an P -inversion pair of \mathbf{w} if w_i and w_j are incomparable in P , and $w_i > w_j$ in the natural order on \mathbb{P} . We denote by $\text{inv}_P(\mathbf{w})$ the number of P -inversion pairs of \mathbf{w} . For example, if $P = P(2, 4, 4, 4)$ and $\mathbf{w} = 413231$, then $\text{Des}_P(\mathbf{w}) = \{1, 5\}$ and $\text{inv}_P(\mathbf{w}) = 5$.

2.3. Compositions and partitions. A *composition* α of n , denoted by $\alpha \models n$, is a finite sequence $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ of positive integers whose sum equals n . We call each integer α_i a *part* of α , and the *length* $\ell(\alpha)$ of α is the number of parts of α . A *partition* λ of n , denoted by $\lambda \vdash n$, is a composition of n satisfying $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_\ell$. Let $\text{Comp}(n)$ (respectively, $\text{Par}(n)$) be the set of compositions (respectively, partitions) of n , and $\text{Comp} = \sqcup_n \text{Comp}(n)$ and $\text{Par} = \sqcup_n \text{Par}(n)$.

There is a simple bijection between $\text{Comp}(n)$ and the collection of subsets of $[n-1]$: given a composition $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell) \models n$, define $S(\alpha) := \{\alpha_1, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_{\ell-1}\} \subset [n-1]$. Conversely, for $S = \{s_1 < s_2 < \cdots < s_k\} \subset [n-1]$, define $\alpha(S) := (s_1, s_2 - s_1, \dots, n - s_k) \in \text{Comp}(n)$. Then they are inverses of each other.

We define a partial order \leq on $\text{Comp}(n)$ by refinement: for compositions $\alpha, \beta \in \text{Comp}(n)$, we say that $\alpha \leq \beta$ if $S(\beta) \subset S(\alpha)$. For example, $(3, 1, 1, 2, 4) \leq (4, 1, 6)$. On the other hand, we will use two orderings on $\text{Par}(n)$. For partitions $\lambda, \mu \in \text{Par}(n)$, we say $\lambda \supseteq \mu$ in the *dominance order* if $\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_i \geq \mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_i$ for all $i \geq 1$. Another order we will use is the *reverse lexicographic order*: define $\lambda \overset{R}{>} \mu$ if either $\lambda = \mu$, or for some i ,

$$\lambda_1 = \mu_1, \quad \dots, \quad \lambda_i = \mu_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{i+1} > \mu_{i+1}.$$

The dominance order is a partial order while the reverse lexicographic order is a total order which is compatible with the dominance order.

2.4. Symmetric and quasisymmetric functions. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots)$ be a set of formal variables which commute with each other. A *symmetric function* $f(\mathbf{x})$ is a bounded degree formal power series in $\mathbb{Q}[[\mathbf{x}]]$ which is invariant under permuting variables. For $n \geq 0$, let \mathbf{Sym}_n be the vector space of symmetric functions of homogeneous degree n , and let $\mathbf{Sym} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{Sym}_n$ be the \mathbb{Q} -algebra of symmetric functions. It is well known that the dimension of \mathbf{Sym}_n is the number of partitions of n .

There are various bases for the symmetric function space \mathbf{Sym} :

(a) The *monomial symmetric function*: for a partition $\lambda \in \text{Par}$,

$$m_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\alpha} x^\alpha,$$

where α ranges over all distinct permutations $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots)$ of the entries of λ and $x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \dots$.

(b) The *elementary symmetric function*:

$$\begin{aligned} e_n(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{i_1 > \dots > i_n} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_n} \quad \text{for } n \geq 1 \text{ with } e_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1, \text{ and} \\ e_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) &= e_{\lambda_1}(\mathbf{x}) e_{\lambda_2}(\mathbf{x}) \cdots \quad \text{for a partition } \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

(c) The *complete homogeneous symmetric function*:

$$\begin{aligned} h_n(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_n} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_n} \quad \text{for } n \geq 1 \text{ with } h_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1, \text{ and} \\ h_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) &= h_{\lambda_1}(\mathbf{x}) h_{\lambda_2}(\mathbf{x}) \cdots \quad \text{for a partition } \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

(d) The *power sum symmetric function*:

$$\begin{aligned} p_n(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_i x_i^n \quad \text{for } n \geq 1 \text{ with } p_0(\mathbf{x}) = 1, \text{ and} \\ p_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) &= p_{\lambda_1}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\lambda_2}(\mathbf{x}) \cdots \quad \text{for a partition } \lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

From the fact that $\{e_\lambda(\mathbf{x})\}_{\lambda \in \text{Par}}$ forms a basis for \mathbf{Sym} , $\{e_1(\mathbf{x}), e_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots\}$ are algebraically independent and generate $\mathbf{Sym} = \mathbb{Q}[e_1(\mathbf{x}), e_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots]$, which will be used frequently throughout this paper.

Let

$$H(t) = \prod_{i \geq 1} \frac{1}{1 - x_i t} = \sum_{n \geq 0} h_n(\mathbf{x}) t^n \quad \text{and} \quad E(t) = \prod_{i \geq 1} (1 + x_i t) = \sum_{n \geq 0} e_n(\mathbf{x}) t^n.$$

By definition, we obtain $H(t)E(-t) = 1$, which yields a relation

$$h_k(\mathbf{x}) - e_1(\mathbf{x})h_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \cdots + (-1)^k e_k(\mathbf{x}) = \delta_{k,0} \quad (1)$$

between complete homogeneous symmetric functions and elementary symmetric functions. Similarly let

$$P(t) = \sum_{i \geq 1} \frac{x_i}{1 - x_i t} = \sum_{n \geq 0} p_{n+1}(\mathbf{x}) t^n.$$

It is easy to check that $P(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \log H(t) = H'(t)E(-t)$, so we get

$$p_k(\mathbf{x}) = e_1(\mathbf{x})h_{k-1}(\mathbf{x}) - 2e_2(\mathbf{x})h_{k-2}(\mathbf{x}) + \cdots + (-1)^{k-1}ke_k(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2)$$

for $k > 0$.

Schur functions are the most important basis for \mathbf{Sym} , which can be defined by various ways. One of them is the way using semistandard Young tableaux. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ be a partition. The *Young diagram of shape λ* is a collection of cells arranged in left-justified such that the i -th row length consists of λ_i cells, denoted by $[\lambda]$. A *Young tableau of shape λ* is a filling of cells in $[\lambda]$ with positive integers. We may also think of a Young tableau T of shape λ as the array (T_{ij}) of positive integers of shape λ such that T_{ij} is the integer placed in the cell (i, j) in $[\lambda]$. A Young tableau T is called *semistandard* if each row is weakly increasing from left to right, and each column is strictly increasing from top to bottom. Schur functions $s_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ can be defined purely combinatorially via semistandard Young tableaux:

$$s_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_T x^T, \quad (3)$$

where the sum ranges over all semistandard Young tableaux of shape λ and $x^T = \prod_i x_i^{m_i(T)}$ where $m_i(T)$ is the number of appearances of i in T . Another way to define $s_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ is to use the (dual) Jacobi–Trudi identity. This identity gives the expansion of the Schur function into the elementary symmetric functions. For a partition λ , let λ' is the conjugate of λ . Then

$$s_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \det(e_{\lambda'_i+j-i}(\mathbf{x}))_{i,j=1}^{\lambda_1} = \det \begin{pmatrix} e_{\lambda'_1}(\mathbf{x}) & e_{\lambda'_1+1}(\mathbf{x}) & e_{\lambda'_1+2}(\mathbf{x}) & \cdots \\ e_{\lambda'_2-1}(\mathbf{x}) & e_{\lambda'_2}(\mathbf{x}) & e_{\lambda'_2+1}(\mathbf{x}) & \cdots \\ \vdots & & & \ddots \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

There is a beautiful combinatorial proof of that two definitions (3) and (4) are equivalent, via non-intersecting lattice paths. We do not write down the proof here, but we will revisit this method in Section 4.3.

For a basis $\{b_\lambda\}$ for \mathbf{Sym} , a symmetric function $g \in \mathbf{Sym}$ is said to be *b-positive* if the expansion of g with respect to the basis $\{b_\lambda\}$ has nonnegative coefficients. Moreover, letting $\mathbf{Sym}_q = \mathbb{Q}[q] \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbf{Sym}$, $g \in \mathbf{Sym}_q$ is said to be *b-positive* if for any partition λ , the coefficient of b_λ in the expansion of g with respect to the basis $\{b_\lambda\}$ is a polynomial in q with nonnegative coefficients. We denote the coefficient of b_λ of g by $[b_\lambda]g$. Hence g is *b-positive* if and only if $[b_\lambda]g \in \mathcal{N}[q]$ for any λ .

Next we introduce an involution ω on \mathbf{Sym} . Define an endomorphism $\omega : \mathbf{Sym} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sym}$ by $\omega(e_k(\mathbf{x})) = h_k(\mathbf{x})$ for each $k \geq 1$, and extend to $\mathbf{Sym} = \mathbb{Q}[e_1(\mathbf{x}), e_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots]$. One can

quickly check that ω is an involution, i.e., $\omega^2 = id_{\text{Sym}}$. Also it is well known that

$$\omega(e_\lambda(\mathbf{x})) = h_\lambda(\mathbf{x}), \quad \omega(p_\lambda(\mathbf{x})) = (-1)^{|\lambda| - \ell(\lambda)} p_\lambda(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{and} \quad \omega(s_\lambda(\mathbf{x})) = s_{\lambda'}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $\ell(\lambda)$ is the number of parts of λ . The images $\omega(m_\lambda(\mathbf{x}))$ of monomial symmetric functions are called the *forgotten symmetric functions* denoted by $f_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$. In contrast to other symmetric function bases, the forgotten symmetric functions $f_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ have no simple monomial expressions (even they are not positive sums of monomials), therefore they have been less studied than others. But we will discuss f -positivity later.

Let $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots)$ be another set of commuting variables. Define

$$C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \prod_{i,j} \frac{1}{1 - x_i y_j} \in \mathbb{Q}[[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]],$$

called the *Cauchy product*. Observing the definition of $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ carefully, one can see that

$$C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \prod_{j \geq 1} \sum_{l \geq 0} x_j^l h_l(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{Par}} m_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) h_\lambda(\mathbf{y}). \quad (5)$$

The Cauchy product plays an important role in the theory of symmetric functions because $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ has many applications and connections with other areas, especially representation theory. Among many results related to $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, what we need is a list of various expressions. We state them in here without proofs (see [Sta99]):

$$C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\lambda} f_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) e_\lambda(\mathbf{y}) \quad (6)$$

$$= \sum_{\lambda} \frac{1}{z_\lambda} p_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) p_\lambda(\mathbf{y}) \quad (7)$$

$$= \sum_{\lambda} s_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) s_\lambda(\mathbf{y}) \quad (8)$$

$$= \sum_{\lambda} h_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) m_\lambda(\mathbf{y}), \quad (9)$$

where each summation runs over all partitions, and $z_\lambda = \prod_{i \geq 1} i^{m_i} m_i!$ where m_i is the number of parts of λ which are equal to i .

We turn our attention to quasisymmetric functions. A *quasisymmetric function* is a bounded degree formal power series in $\mathbb{Q}[[\mathbf{x}]]$ such that for all compositions $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, the coefficient of $\prod x_i^{\alpha_i}$ equals the coefficient of $\prod x_{i_j}^{\alpha_i}$ for all $i_1 < \dots < i_\ell$. Let QSym_n denote the space of quasisymmetric functions of degree n , and $\text{QSym} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \text{QSym}_n$. By definition, $\text{Sym}_n \subset \text{QSym}_n$ and $\text{Sym} \subset \text{QSym}$. For a composition $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, define the *monomial quasisymmetric function* $M_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ by

$$M_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_\ell} x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_{i_\ell}^{\alpha_\ell}.$$

Then $\{M_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbf{QSym}_n \mid \alpha \in \text{Comp}(n)\}$ forms a basis for \mathbf{QSym}_n . Also we will concern another important basis for \mathbf{QSym} . Given $\alpha \in \text{Comp}(n)$, define the *fundamental quasisymmetric function* $F_\alpha(\mathbf{x})$ by

$$F_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\beta \leq \alpha} M_\beta(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\substack{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_n \\ j \in S(\alpha) \Rightarrow i_j < i_{j+1}}} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_n},$$

often written $F_{n,S(\alpha)}(\mathbf{x})$. We can extend the involution ω to \mathbf{QSym} as follows: for a subset $S \subset [n-1]$, $\omega F_{n,S}(\mathbf{x}) = F_{n,[n-1] \setminus S}(\mathbf{x})$.

2.5. Chromatic quasisymmetric functions. Let G be a simple graph on the vertex set $[n]$. A *proper coloring* κ of G is a function $\kappa : [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ such that $\kappa(i) \neq \kappa(j)$ whenever i and j are adjacent. The *chromatic quasisymmetric function* X_G of G is

$$X_G(\mathbf{x}, q) = \sum_{\kappa} q^{\text{asc}_G(\kappa)} x_{\kappa(1)} x_{\kappa(2)} \cdots x_{\kappa(n)},$$

where the sum is over all proper colorings $\kappa : [n] \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ and $\text{asc}_G(\kappa) = |\{\{i, j\} \in E(G) \mid i < j \text{ and } \kappa(i) < \kappa(j)\}|$. We generalize this to the generating function of proper multi-colorings. The multi-coloring generalization of chromatic symmetric functions was introduced in [Gas96, Sta98]. For a given sequence $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, a *proper multi-coloring* κ of G of type μ is a function from $[n]$ to the collection of all finite subsets of \mathbb{P} such that for each $i \in [n]$, $|\kappa(i)| = \mu_i$ and $\kappa(j) \cap \kappa(k) = \emptyset$ whenever $\{j, k\} \in E(G)$. Then the *(multi-)chromatic quasisymmetric function* $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ of G is given by

$$X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_{\kappa} q^{\text{asc}_G(\kappa)} x^\kappa,$$

where the sum is over all proper multi-colorings κ of type μ , $x^\kappa = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{k \in \kappa(i)} x_k$ and $\text{asc}_G(\kappa) = |\{((i, r), (j, s)) \mid \{i, j\} \in E(G), i < j, r \in \kappa(i), s \in \kappa(j), r < s\}|$. See Figure 3. Obviously, $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q) = X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; (1^n))$.




FIGURE 3. For a graph $G = 1 - 2 - 3$, let κ be the proper multi-coloring of G given by $\kappa(1) = \{1, 3, 6\}$, $\kappa(2) = \{4\}$ and $\kappa(3) = \{2, 6\}$. Then $x^\kappa = x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4 x_6^2$ and $\text{asc}_G(\kappa) = 3$.

In general, $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ is a quasisymmetric function, but when G is the incomparability graph of a natural unit interval order, $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ is a symmetric function (Theorem 4.4).

When $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ is symmetric, $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ has an interesting property. This property was proved for $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q)$ by Shareshian–Wachs [SW16], and their proof works on $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ with slight modifications. Hence we omit the proof.

Proposition 2.1. *If $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ is symmetric, then*

$$X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_{\kappa} q^{\text{des}_G(\kappa)} x^{\kappa},$$

where κ ranges over all proper multi-colorings of type μ and $\text{des}_G(\kappa) = |\{(i, r), (j, s) \mid \{i, j\} \in E(G), i < j, r \in \kappa(i), s \in \kappa(j), r > s\}|$.

Then for a natural unit interval order P , we have

$$X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_{\kappa} q^{\text{des}_P(\kappa)} x^{\kappa}.$$

Remark 2.2. Our multi-chromatic generalization $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ is equal, up to a scalar multiple, to $X_{G^\mu}(\mathbf{x}, q)$ of G^μ where G^μ is the graph obtained from G by replacing each vertex $a \in [n]$ by a complete graph of size μ_a . More precisely, let $d = \mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_n$. For a vertex i , let a_i be an integer such that $\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_{a_i-1} + 1 \leq i \leq \mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_{a_i}$. Then G^μ denotes the graph whose vertex set is $[d]$ and two vertices i and j are adjacent if either $a_i = a_j$ or a_i and a_j are adjacent in G . Therefore one can easily see that

$$X_{G^\mu}(\mathbf{x}, q) = \prod_{i=1}^n [\mu_i]_q X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu),$$

where $[k]_q = 1 + q + \cdots + q^{k-1}$.

For a natural unit interval order P , expansions of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$ into certain bases have been studied in a number of papers using various methods; F -expansion [SW16], p -expansion [Ath15], s -expansion [Gas96, SW16]. Also the e -expansion of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$ of certain natural unit interval orders P has been studied in [CH19, Ell17, HNY20, HP19, SW16]. We close this section with an explicit statement of the e -positivity conjecture.

Conjecture 2.3 ([SS93, Sta95, SW16]). *For a natural unit interval order P on $[n]$, let*

$$X_P(\mathbf{x}, q) = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} c_\lambda(q) e_\lambda(\mathbf{x}).$$

Then $c_\lambda(q)$ is a polynomial with nonnegative integer coefficients.

3. HEAPS AND LOCAL FLIPS

In this section, we review the definition of heaps and define an operation, called a local flip, on heaps. This operation plays a central role in this paper. The theory of heaps, invented by Viennot [Vie86], has been developed for sets equipped with a symmetric and reflexive relation, but in this paper we restrict this theory to natural unit interval orders, focusing only on its definition and diagrammatic realization. For another approach via heap theory, we refer to [BN20].

Fix a natural unit interval order P on $[n]$, and a nonnegative integer sequence $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Similarly to G^μ in Remark 2.2, let P^μ be the graph whose vertex set is $\{v_{a,i} \mid a \in [n], 1 \leq i \leq \mu_a\}$, and $v_{a,i}$ and $v_{b,j}$ are adjacent if either $a = b$ or a and b are incomparable in P . A *heap* H of P of type μ is an acyclic orientation of P^μ satisfying that




FIGURE 4. A heap of $P(2, 4, 5, 5, 5)$ of type $(3, 1, 0, 2, 2)$ and its diagrammatic realization.

for each $a \in [n]$ and $1 \leq i < j \leq \mu_a$, the direction on the edge between $v_{a,i}$ and $v_{a,j}$ is toward $v_{a,i}$. Clearly a heap of type (1^n) is just an acyclic orientation of the incomparability graph of P . We call a vertex of a heap a *piece*, and denote the set of heaps of P of type μ by $\mathcal{H}(P, \mu)$. The terminology “heap” originates from the following diagrammatic realization: take n unit intervals described in Section 2.1 and assign a natural number for each interval in an incrementing order from left to right. Then we stack blocks on top of each interval, following the condition which prohibits the blocks from overlapping horizontally (i.e., the blocks can overlap only vertically). For each $a \in [n]$, the number of blocks stacked on the a -th interval equals μ_a . For example, a heap of $P = P(2, 4, 5, 5, 5)$ of type $(3, 1, 0, 2, 2)$ and its diagrammatic realization are depicted in Figure 4. We will often identify heaps with their diagrammatic realizations.

Each proper multi-coloring κ of P of type μ gives us a heap of P of type μ . For each vertex $a \in V(P)$, list its colors $\kappa(a) = \{c_{a,1} < \cdots < c_{a,\mu_a}\}$, and for each edge $\{v_{a,i}, v_{b,j}\}$ assign the direction $v_{a,i} \leftarrow v_{b,j}$ if $c_{a,i} < c_{b,j}$. Then this orientation is acyclic, and thus we have the heap of type μ corresponding to κ . To see this diagrammatically, consider again n unit intervals on the real line. For each $a \in [n]$ and $c \in \kappa(a)$, place a block at the position of height c above the a -th interval. By the properness of κ , no pair of blocks overlap horizontally. After placing all blocks, drop them down as far as gravity takes them. Of course, they still are not permitted to overlap horizontally. Then the resulting configuration is actually a diagrammatic realization of a heap of type μ . See Figure 5. Let $P = P(2, 3, 3)$ and κ be a proper multi-coloring of P of type $(3, 1, 2)$: $\kappa(1) = \{1, 3, 6\}$, $\kappa(2) = \{4\}$, $\kappa(3) = \{2, 6\}$, shown in Figure 5(a), while its corresponding heap is shown in Figure 5(b).

In addition, we can regard heaps as posets: denoting a partial order on H by \prec , define $v_{a,i} \prec v_{b,j}$ whenever $v_{a,i} \leftarrow v_{b,j}$, and take their transitive closure. From this point of view, a proper multi-coloring κ of P corresponding to H can be thought of as a strict order-preserving map from H to \mathbb{P} , that is, $\kappa : H \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$ satisfying $\kappa(v_{a,i}) < \kappa(v_{b,j})$ whenever $v_{a,i} \prec v_{b,j}$ in H . Hence the theory of (P, ω) -partitions helps us study the chromatic quasisymmetric functions. First, we review this theory briefly. (We have already used the letters P and ω for natural unit interval orders and the involution on \mathbf{Sym} , respectively.




FIGURE 5

Thus, to avoid confusion we use (Q, σ) instead of (P, ω) , unlikely the usual convention.) Let Q be an arbitrary poset consisting of n elements and σ a bijection $\sigma : Q \rightarrow [n]$, called a *labeling*. For a function $f : Q \rightarrow \mathbb{P}$, let $x^f = \prod_{t \in Q} x_{f(t)}$. Then define the (Q, σ) -partition generating function by

$$K_{Q, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_f x^f,$$

where f ranges over all functions $f : Q \rightarrow [n]$ satisfying

- (i) if $s \leq t$ in Q , then $f(s) \leq f(t)$,
- (ii) if $s < t$ in Q and $\sigma(s) > \sigma(t)$, then $f(s) < f(t)$.

By definition, when σ is order-preserving (respectively, order-reversing), $K_{Q, \sigma}(\mathbf{x})$ is the generating function for order-preserving (respectively, strictly order-preserving) maps of P . For simplicity, we write $K_Q(\mathbf{x}) = K_{Q, \sigma}(\mathbf{x})$ for some order-preserving labeling σ , and $\overline{K}_Q(\mathbf{x}) = K_{Q, \tau}(\mathbf{x})$ for some order-reversing labeling τ . By definition, $K_{Q, \sigma}(\mathbf{x})$ is a quasisymmetric function, and due to Stanley [Sta99, Sta11], $K_Q(\mathbf{x}) = \omega \overline{K}_Q(\mathbf{x})$. Let $\mathcal{L}(Q, \sigma)$ be the set of permutations $\pi = \pi_1 \dots \pi_n$ of $[n]$ such that the map $w : Q \rightarrow [n]$ defined by $w(\sigma^{-1}(\pi_i)) = i$ is a linear extension of Q .

Theorem 3.1 ([Sta99]). *We have*

$$K_{Q, \sigma}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{L}(Q, \sigma)} F_{n, \text{Des}(\pi)}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $\text{Des}(\pi) = \{i \in [n-1] \mid \pi_i > \pi_{i+1}\}$.

Now we apply Theorem 3.1 to the chromatic quasisymmetric functions. Let $W(\mu)$ be the set of all words of type μ . For a heap H of P of type μ , let $f : H \rightarrow [d]$ be a linear extension of H where $d = \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_n = |H|$. Then define the word $\mathbf{w}_f = \mathbf{w}_{f,1} \dots \mathbf{w}_{f,d}$ by $\mathbf{w}_{f,k} = a$ if $f^{-1}(k) = v_{a,i} \in H$ for some i . Then \mathbf{w}_f is of type μ . Let

$$W(H) = \{\mathbf{w}_f \in W(\mu) \mid f \text{ is a linear extension of } H\}.$$

Then $\mathbf{w} \in W(H)$ if and only if when blocks are piled on \mathbf{w}_i -th interval in order, the resulting diagram is the diagrammatic realization of H . Of course, $W(\mu)$ is the disjoint union of $W(H)$'s, i.e., $W(\mu) = \bigsqcup_H W(H)$ where H ranges over all heaps of type μ .

Example 3.2. Let $P = P(2, 3, 3)$ and H be the heap depicted in Figure 5(b). Let f be a linear extension of H given by $(f^{-1}(1), \dots, f^{-1}(6)) = (v_{1,1}, v_{3,1}, v_{1,2}, v_{2,1}, v_{1,3}, v_{3,2})$. Then $w_f = 131213$. Also one can easily see

$$W(H) = \{113213, 131213, 311213, 113231, 131231, 311231\}.$$

For a heap H , an edge between $v_{a,i}$ and $v_{b,j}$ is *ascent* if the edge is toward $v_{a,i}$ and $a > b$ in the natural order. Let $\text{asc}_P(H)$ denote the number of ascent edges in H . We note that for a multi-coloring κ , $\text{des}_P(\kappa) = \text{asc}_P(H)$ where H is the heap corresponding to κ .

Theorem 3.3. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) &= \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}(P, \mu)} q^{\text{asc}_P(H)} K_H(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in W(\mu)} q^{\text{inv}_P(\mathbf{w})} F_{d, \text{Des}_P(\mathbf{w})}(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The relation between proper multi-colorings and strict order-preserving maps on H implies that

$$X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}(P, \mu)} q^{\text{asc}_P(H)} \overline{K}_H(\mathbf{x}).$$

Applying ω on both sides gives the first equation. It is easy to check that $\text{asc}_P(H) = \text{inv}_P(\mathbf{w})$ for all $\mathbf{w} \in W(H)$. To prove the second equation, it is therefore enough to show that for any heap H ,

$$K_H(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in W(H)} F_{d, \text{Des}_P(\mathbf{w})}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Regarding H as a poset, we construct a labeling σ of H as follows. First, list all minimal elements $\{v_{a_1,1}, v_{a_2,1}, \dots\}$ satisfying $a_1 <_P a_2 <_P \dots$. Then label $v_{a_1,1}$ with 1, and let H' be the heap obtained from H by removing the vertex $v_{a_1,1}$ and edges attached to $v_{a_1,1}$. Again list all minimal elements of H' , and label the smallest element (with respect to the ordering $<_P$ on P) with 2. Repeat this process until all pieces of H are labeled. Figure 6 might help understand this labeling. An integer in each block represents its label.




FIGURE 6

Then our labeling σ is order-preserving by construction, so Theorem 3.1 yields that

$$K_H(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{L}(H, \sigma)} F_{d, \text{Des}(\pi)}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Define a map ϕ on $[d]$ by $\phi(k) = a$ if $\sigma^{-1}(k) = v_{a,i}$ for some i . By abuse of notation we define a map ϕ from $\mathcal{L}(H, \sigma)$ to $W(H)$: for each $\pi = \pi_1 \dots \pi_d \in \mathcal{L}(H, \sigma)$, define $\phi(\pi) = \phi(\pi_1)\phi(\pi_2) \dots \phi(\pi_d) \in W(H)$. It is not hard to see that this map $\phi : \mathcal{L}(H, \sigma) \rightarrow W(H)$ is bijective, and $\text{Des}(\pi) = \text{Des}_P(\phi(\pi))$, which completes the proof. For instance, let H be the heap shown in Figure 6. Then

$$\mathcal{L}(H, \sigma) = \{123456, 132456, 312456, 123465, 132465, 312465\}.$$

Compare $\mathcal{L}(H, \sigma)$ with $W(H)$ in Example 3.2. Also we see that $\phi(132456) = 131213$ and $\text{Des}(132456) = \{2\} = \text{Des}_P(131213)$. \square

Note that Theorem 3.3 holds not only for natural unit interval orders, but for arbitrary posets on $[n]$ under a suitable setting.

We are now in a position to define an important operation on heaps. For any distinct pieces p, q and r in H , we call (p, q, r) a *flippable triple* in H if regrading H as a poset, one of the following conditions hold:

- (i) q covers p and r ;
- (ii) q is covered by p and r .


By definition, p and r are not adjacent. Note that each piece covers at most two pieces, and is covered by at most two pieces because of the $(\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{1})$ -freeness of P .

Definition 3.4. Let H be a heap of P and (p, q, r) a flippable triple in H . A *local flip* at (p, q, r) is reversing the directions on the edges $\{p, q\}$ and $\{q, r\}$.

The following lemma follows easily from the definition of flippable triples.

Lemma 3.5. Let H be a heap and (p, q, r) a flippable triple in H . Then the orientation H' obtained from H by local flipping at (p, q, r) is acyclic, so H' is also a heap of the same type.

As we can see from the example below, we can think of a local flip as an operation on diagrammatic realizations of heaps acting by transposing relative positions of blocks as follows:



Example 3.6. Let H be the heap shown in Figure 4. There are 4 flippable triples: $(v_{1,2}, v_{2,1}, v_{4,1})$, $(v_{1,3}, v_{2,1}, v_{4,2})$, $(v_{2,1}, v_{4,1}, v_{5,1})$ and $(v_{2,1}, v_{4,2}, v_{5,2})$. The two diagrams shown in Figure 7 are the heaps obtained from H by local flipping at $(v_{2,1}, v_{4,1}, v_{5,1})$ and $(v_{2,1}, v_{4,2}, v_{5,2})$, respectively.

Using local flips, we can define an equivalence relation on the set of heaps of P of type μ : for two heaps $H, H' \in \mathcal{H}(P, \mu)$, $H \sim H'$ if and only if H' can be obtained from H by applying a finite sequence of local flips. For instance, we illustrate all heaps of $P(2, 3, 4, 5, 5)$ of type (1^5) and their equivalence relations in Figure 8.

The following proposition and theorem tell us why local flips are crucial.




FIGURE 7




FIGURE 8. All heaps of $P(2, 3, 4, 5, 5)$ of type (1^5) . A gray line between heaps means that they can be transformed to each other via a local flip. Hence each connected component represents an equivalence class.

Proposition 3.7. *Local flips preserve the number of ascents, i.e., $\text{asc}_P(H) = \text{asc}_P(H')$ if $H \sim H'$.*

Proof. Let (p, q, r) be a flippable triple in H . Also let a, b, c be integers such that $p = v_{a,i}$, $q = v_{b,j}$, $r = v_{c,k}$ for some i, j, k . We may assume that $q \rightarrow p$, $q \rightarrow r$ and $a <_P c$. Then one can easily see that $a < b < c$ in the natural order on \mathbb{P} , and $a \not\prec_P b \not\prec_P c$. Hence $q \rightarrow r$ contributes to $\text{asc}_P(H)$, while $q \rightarrow p$ is not. In H' , this two edges are reversed, so $p \rightarrow q$ contributes to $\text{asc}_P(H')$, while $r \rightarrow q$ is not. Other edges are unchanged, so the number of ascents is preserved. \square




FIGURE 9. Two non-equivalent heaps with the same ascent number; here $P = (2, 4, 4, 5, 5)$ and heaps of type (1^5) .

Theorem 3.8. *Let $[H]$ be an equivalence class in $\mathcal{H}(P, \mu)/\sim$. Then*

$$K_{[H]}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{H' \in [H]} K_{H'}(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{Sym}.$$

In particular, $X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ is a symmetric function.

This theorem follows from some results in Section 4, and thus we postpone the proof until all necessary materials are prepared.

Remark 3.9. Recall that a poset P is a natural unit interval order if and only if P is $(\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{1})$ - and $(\mathbf{2} + \mathbf{2})$ -free. Since there is no “natural” labeling on elements of a $(\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{1})$ -free poset, the ascent statistic can not be extended to the class of $(\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{1})$ -free posets in a natural way. But we do not need the $(\mathbf{2} + \mathbf{2})$ -freeness of P for defining local flips, and hence local flips can be defined on heaps of the incomparability graphs of $(\mathbf{3} + \mathbf{1})$ -free posets.

The equivalence relation is a more refined notion than the ascent statistic introduced by Shareshian and Wachs. Indeed, two heaps with the same ascent number could belong to different equivalence classes, while Proposition 3.7 says that any two heaps H, H' belonging to the same equivalent class have the same ascent number; see Figure 9. In addition, Theorem 3.8 admits a refinement of the refined e -positivity conjecture.

Conjecture 3.10. *Let P be a natural unit interval order on $[n]$, and $\mu \in \mathbb{N}^n$. For any equivalence class $[H] \in \mathcal{H}(P, \mu)/\sim$, $K_{[H]}(\mathbf{x})$ is h -positive. In particular, $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ is e -positive.*

We end this section with constructing an edge-labeled graph Γ_μ for $\mu \in \mathbb{N}^n$ which will appear again in the next section. The vertex set of Γ_μ is the set $W(\mu)$ of all words of type μ . Two words $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 \cdots \mathbf{w}_d$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_1 \cdots \mathbf{v}_d$ are adjacent in Γ_μ if there exists an integer i satisfying the one of the following conditions:

- (i) $\mathbf{w}_j = \mathbf{v}_j$ for $j \notin \{i, i+1\}$, and $\{\mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_{i+1}\} = \{\mathbf{ab}, \mathbf{ba}\}$ for some $a <_P b$. (label this edge with i)
- (ii) $\mathbf{w}_j = \mathbf{v}_j$ for $j \notin \{i-1, i, i+1\}$, and either $\{\mathbf{w}_{i-1} \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_{i+1}, \mathbf{v}_{i-1} \mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_{i+1}\} = \{\mathbf{bac}, \mathbf{acb}\}$ or $\{\mathbf{bca}, \mathbf{cab}\}$ for some $a < b < c$ satisfying $a \not<_P b$, $b \not<_P c$ and $a <_P c$. (label this edge with \bar{i})

The second condition represents how a local flip operates on words. Let Γ be a disjoint union of Γ_μ for all μ .

The graph Γ is reminiscent of dual equivalence graphs [Ass15] or switchboards [BF17]. Each connected component of dual equivalence graphs or switchboards defines a positive

sum of specific Schur functions (sometimes, a single Schur function) where they relies on the structure of the connected component [Ass15, BF17]. In our case, Γ has a similar property (see Theorem 4.19).

The following proposition tells us a connection between connected components of Γ_μ and equivalence classes in $H(P, \mu)/\sim$.

Proposition 3.11. *Let H, H' be heaps of type μ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *For some $\mathbf{w} \in W(H)$ and $\mathbf{w}' \in W(H')$, \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{w}' are contained in the same connected component of Γ_μ .*
- (b) *For all $\mathbf{w} \in W(H)$ and $\mathbf{w}' \in W(H')$, \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{w}' are contained in the same connected component of Γ_μ .*
- (c) *$H \sim H'$.*

Proof. It is in fact a basic fact that $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in W(H)$ if and only if there is an path from \mathbf{w} to \mathbf{w}' along only unbarred edges; see [Vie86, Lemma 4]. Then let us consider barred edges. Suppose that H and H' can be transformed to each other via a local flip at a flippable triple (p, q, r) . Without loss of generality, let $p = v_{a,i}$, $q = v_{b,j}$ and $r = v_{c,k}$ for some $1 \leq a < b < c \leq n$. Also suppose that $q \rightarrow p$ and $q \rightarrow r$ in H . By the definition of a flippable triple, there is a word $\mathbf{w} \in W(H)$ such that $\mathbf{w} = \cdots \mathbf{acb} \cdots$. Let $\mathbf{w}' = \cdots \mathbf{bac} \cdots$, so one can quickly check that $\mathbf{w}' \in W(H')$. But in this case, \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{w}' is connected by a barred edge. Summing these facts up, this proposition is easily verified. We leave the details to the reader. \square

In other words, there is a one-to-one correspondence between equivalence classes in $\mathcal{H}(P, \mu)/\sim$ and connected components of Γ_μ . We note that letting Γ'_μ be the subgraph of Γ_μ on the same vertex set containing unbarred edges only, there is a one-to-one correspondence between heaps of type μ and connected components of Γ'_μ .

Example 3.12. Let $P = P(2, 3, 3)$ and $\mu = (1, 1, 2)$. Then $W(\mu)$ consists of 12 words. Also there are 6 heaps of P of type μ and 4 equivalence classes in $\mathcal{H}(P, \mu)/\sim$; see Figure 10(a). The graph Γ_μ shown in Figure 10(b) reflects this information. We will return to this example later.

4. NONCOMMUTATIVE P -SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

In this section, we define noncommutative P -symmetric functions associated with a natural unit interval order P , and present their connection with the chromatic quasisymmetric function of P . Using these, we prove positivity phenomena of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ in several symmetric function bases.

Noncommutative symmetric function theory was introduced by Fomin and Greene [FG98], which is a framework for proving positivity of symmetric functions. Using this, Schur expansions of various symmetric functions have been discovered [FG98, Lam08, Bla16]. Unfortunately, this theory cannot be applied to chromatic quasisymmetric functions directly. Hence we modify a general setting of the theory slightly, and show several positivities of chromatic quasisymmetric functions. Our modification is inspired by [Sta98].




FIGURE 10. Let $P = P(2, 3, 3)$ and $\mu = (1, 1, 2)$. (a) All heaps of P of type μ and their equivalence relations. (b) The graph Γ_μ .

4.1. An analogue of noncommutative symmetric functions and Cauchy product.

Let P be a natural unit interval graph on $[n]$ and $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{Z}\langle u_1, \dots, u_n \rangle$ the free associative \mathbb{Z} -algebra generated by $\{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$. For simplicity we write $u_{\mathbf{w}} = u_{w_1}u_{w_2} \cdots u_{w_d}$ for a word $\mathbf{w} = w_1w_2 \cdots w_d$ on the alphabet $[n]$. Let \mathcal{I}_P be the 2-sided ideal of \mathcal{U} generated by the following elements:

$$u_a u_b - u_b u_a \quad (a <_P b), \quad (10)$$

$$u_a u_c u_b - u_b u_a u_c \quad (a < b < c, a \not<_P b, b \not<_P c \text{ and } a <_P c). \quad (11)$$

The ideal is just the algebraic counterpart of the graph Γ , and hence the following proposition follows directly from Proposition 3.11.

Proposition 4.1. *Let H, H' be heaps. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) $u_{\mathbf{w}} \equiv u_{\mathbf{w}'} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}$ for some $\mathbf{w} \in W(H)$ and $\mathbf{w}' \in W(H')$.
- (b) $u_{\mathbf{w}} \equiv u_{\mathbf{w}'} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}$ for all $\mathbf{w} \in W(H)$ and $\mathbf{w}' \in W(H')$.
- (c) $H \sim H'$.

For $k \geq 1$, we define the *noncommutative P -elementary symmetric function* $\mathfrak{e}_k^P(\mathbf{u})$, which is not in general symmetric on variables u_1, \dots, u_n , by

$$\mathfrak{e}_k^P(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i_1 >_P i_2 >_P \cdots >_P i_k} u_{i_1} u_{i_2} \cdots u_{i_k} \in \mathcal{U}. \quad (12)$$

By convention, let $\mathfrak{e}_0^P(\mathbf{u}) = 1$ and $\mathfrak{e}_k^P(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ for any $k < 0$. For a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$, define $\mathfrak{e}_\lambda^P(\mathbf{u}) = \mathfrak{e}_{\lambda_1}^P(\mathbf{u}) \cdots \mathfrak{e}_{\lambda_\ell}^P(\mathbf{u})$. Throughout this paper, the given poset P is always clear, so we write $\mathfrak{e}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$ instead of $\mathfrak{e}_\lambda^P(\mathbf{u})$. Furthermore, although other noncommutative P -symmetric functions which will be defined subsequently also rely on P , we will omit the superscript P . Before defining others, we check the following important property. Blasiak and Fomin [BF17] called this property the commutation relation.

Theorem 4.2. *For any integers $k, l \geq 0$, $\mathbf{e}_k(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathbf{e}_l(\mathbf{u})$ commute with each other modulo \mathcal{I}_P , that is,*

$$\mathbf{e}_k(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{e}_l(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \mathbf{e}_l(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{e}_k(\mathbf{u}) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}.$$

Proof. For $m \geq 1$, let \mathcal{E}_m be the set of all words $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 \cdots \mathbf{w}_m$ such that $\mathbf{w}_1 >_P \cdots >_P \mathbf{w}_m$. By convention, let \mathcal{E}_0 be the set consisting of the empty word. Since

$$\mathbf{e}_k(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{e}_l(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{E}_k \times \mathcal{E}_l} u_{\mathbf{w}} u_{\mathbf{v}},$$

we prove this theorem by constructing a bijection $\psi_{k,l} : \mathcal{E}_k \times \mathcal{E}_l \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_l \times \mathcal{E}_k$ satisfying for $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{E}_k \times \mathcal{E}_l$, $u_{\mathbf{w}} u_{\mathbf{v}} \equiv u_{\mathbf{v}'} u_{\mathbf{w}'}$ modulo \mathcal{I}_P where $(\mathbf{v}', \mathbf{w}') = \psi(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v})$. We describe $\psi_{k,l}$ using diagrams which are similar to diagrams of heaps. Let $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 \cdots \mathbf{w}_k$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_1 \cdots \mathbf{v}_l$. We take again n unit intervals on the real line, which correspond to P . Then for $1 \leq i \leq k$ put a block on the \mathbf{w}_i -th interval. Also for $1 \leq j \leq l$ place a block at the position of height 2 above on the \mathbf{v}_j -th interval. Then blocks may or may not adjoin others placed at different height. If a block placed at height 1 is isolated, then lift it to height 2, and vice versa if a block at height 2 is isolated, then drop it down to at height 1. For nonisolated blocks, we consider their connected components. Each connected component consists of r blocks at height 1 and s blocks at height 2 with $|r - s| \leq 1$. If $r = s$, we leave them unchanged. If $r \neq s$, we switch their heights; lift all blocks at height 1 to at height 2, and drop all blocks at height 2 to at height 1. In fact, this process is a consequence of a series of local flips. Hence, we finally obtain a diagram consisting of l blocks at height 1 and k blocks at height 2. Figure 11 shows how this procedure works. A diagram shown in Figure 11(a) corresponds to a pair $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathcal{E}_5 \times \mathcal{E}_6$. The diagram obtained by applying the procedure described above to (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}) is depicted in Figure 11(b).




FIGURE 11

Then we let \mathbf{v}' and \mathbf{w}' be the words corresponding to blocks at height 1 and 2, respectively. One can deduce from Proposition 4.1 that $u_{\mathbf{w}} u_{\mathbf{v}} \equiv u_{\mathbf{v}'} u_{\mathbf{w}'}$ modulo \mathcal{I}_P , which finishes the proof. \square

Mimicking the relation (1), we define the *noncommutative P -complete homogeneous symmetric functions* $\mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u})$ inductively as follows:

$$\mathbf{h}_k(\mathbf{u}) - \mathbf{e}_1(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{h}_{k-1}(\mathbf{u}) + \cdots + (-1)^k \mathbf{e}_k(\mathbf{u}) = \delta_{k,0},$$

with $\mathfrak{h}_0(\mathbf{u}) = 1$, and define $\mathfrak{h}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) = \mathfrak{h}_{\lambda_1}(\mathbf{u}) \cdots \mathfrak{h}_{\lambda_\ell}(\mathbf{u})$ for a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$. Then it is easy to check that

$$\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{i_1 \not\prec_P i_2 \not\prec_P \cdots \not\prec_P i_k} u_{i_1} u_{i_2} \cdots u_{i_k}. \quad (13)$$

Proposition 4.3. *Let P be a natural unit interval order, and H a heap of P . Then there is a unique word $\mathbf{w} \in W(H)$ such that \mathbf{w} has no P -descents. Denoting this word by \mathbf{w}_H , we have*

$$\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_H u_{\mathbf{w}_H},$$

where the sum is over all heaps H consisting of k pieces.

Proof. In the proof of Theorem 3.3, we constructed an order-preserving labeling σ together with a bijective map $\phi : \mathcal{L}(H, \sigma) \rightarrow W(H)$ such that $\text{Des}(\pi) = \text{Des}_P(\phi(\pi))$ for all $\pi \in \mathcal{L}(H, \sigma)$. Since σ is order-preserving, there exists a unique $\pi_0 \in \mathcal{L}(H, \sigma)$ with no descents. Then $\phi(\pi_0)$ is the unique word in $W(H)$ with no P -descents. The second part of this lemma follows immediately from (13). \square

By Theorem 4.2, $\mathfrak{h}_k(\mathbf{u})$'s also commute with each other in $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{I}_P$ since they can be written as polynomials in $\mathfrak{e}_1(\mathbf{u}), \mathfrak{e}_2(\mathbf{u}), \dots$.

Define

$$H(x, \mathbf{u}) = \sum_{l \geq 0} x^l \mathfrak{h}_l(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{U}[[x]]$$

and

$$\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = H(x_1, \mathbf{u}) H(x_2, \mathbf{u}) \cdots = \sum_{\alpha} M_{\alpha}(\mathbf{x}) \mathfrak{h}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{U}[[\mathbf{x}]],$$

where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ ranges over all compositions and $\mathfrak{h}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathfrak{h}_{\alpha_1}(\mathbf{u}) \cdots \mathfrak{h}_{\alpha_\ell}(\mathbf{u})$. Here, x and \mathbf{x} commute with \mathbf{u} . We call $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ the *noncommutative P -Cauchy product*. Observing the definition of $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ and (13), we have

$$\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) = \sum_{\mathbf{w}} F_{d, \text{Des}_P(\mathbf{w})}(\mathbf{x}) u_{\mathbf{w}}, \quad (14)$$

where \mathbf{w} ranges over all words on the alphabet $[n]$ and d is the length of \mathbf{w} . Since $H(x_i, \mathbf{u}) H(x_j, \mathbf{u}) \equiv H(x_j, \mathbf{u}) H(x_i, \mathbf{u})$ modulo $\mathcal{I}_P[[\mathbf{x}]]$, we can write $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ as the usual Cauchy product (5):

$$\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{\lambda} m_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \mathfrak{h}_{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P[[\mathbf{x}]]}. \quad (15)$$

The noncommutative P -Cauchy product $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ gives us a duality between the chromatic quasisymmetric function $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ and noncommutative P -symmetric functions. To explain what the term ‘duality’ means, let \mathcal{U}^* be the free \mathbb{Z} -module generated by words on the alphabet $[n]$, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ a canonical pairing between \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{U}^* such that $\langle u_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \delta_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}}$ for words \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{v} . Then \mathcal{U}^* is the dual space of \mathcal{U} as \mathbb{Z} -modules. Letting

$$\mathcal{I}_P^{\perp} = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{U}^* \mid \langle z, \gamma \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } z \in \mathcal{I}_P\}$$

be the orthogonal complement of \mathcal{I}_P , we have the naturally induced pairing between $\mathcal{U}/\mathcal{I}_P$ and \mathcal{I}_P^\perp : for $z + \mathcal{I}_P \in \mathcal{U}/\mathcal{I}_P$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{I}_P^\perp$, the pairing $\langle z + \mathcal{I}_P, \gamma \rangle := \langle z, \gamma \rangle$ is well-defined. Also let $\mathcal{U}_q^* = \mathbb{Z}[q] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{U}^*$ and $\mathcal{I}_{P,q}^\perp = \mathbb{Z}[q] \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{I}_P^\perp$. Then we extend the pairing to \mathcal{U}_q^* , and $\mathcal{I}_{P,q}^\perp$ plays the role of \mathcal{I}_P^\perp .

Let

$$\gamma_H = \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in W(H)} \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{U}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{[H]} = \sum_{H' \in [H]} \gamma_{H'} \in \mathcal{U}^*$$

for a heap H . Then one can show that $\gamma_{[H]}$ belongs to not only \mathcal{U}^* , but also \mathcal{I}_P^\perp . Also let

$$\gamma_\mu = \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in W(\mu)} q^{\text{inv}_P(\mathbf{w})} \mathbf{w} = \sum_{[H] \in \mathcal{H}(P, \mu)/\sim} q^{\text{asc}_P(H)} \gamma_{[H]} \in \mathcal{U}_q^*,$$

so γ_μ is automatically in $\mathcal{I}_{P,q}^\perp$. The following theorem enables us to use the noncommutative P -Cauchy product $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ for studying the chromatic quasisymmetric function $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$.

Theorem 4.4. *For a nonnegative integer sequence $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$, we have*

$$K_{[H]}(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}), \gamma_{[H]} \rangle$$

and

$$\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \langle \Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}), \gamma_\mu \rangle. \quad (16)$$

In particular, $K_{[H]}(\mathbf{x})$ is a symmetric function, and so is $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$.

Proof. We already have all ingredients necessary to prove this theorem. The proofs of two equations are similar, so we only prove the second equation (16).

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}), \gamma_\mu \rangle &= \left\langle \sum_{\mathbf{w}} F_{d, \text{Des}_P(\mathbf{w})}(\mathbf{x}) u_{\mathbf{w}}, \gamma_\mu \right\rangle && \text{by (14),} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}} q^{\text{inv}_P(\mathbf{v})} F_{d, \text{Des}_P(\mathbf{w})}(\mathbf{x}) \langle u_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{v} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{v}} q^{\text{inv}_P(\mathbf{v})} F_{d, \text{Des}_P(\mathbf{v})}(\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) && \text{by Theorem 3.3,} \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{w} ranges over all words on the alphabet $[n]$ and d is the length of \mathbf{w} , while \mathbf{v} is a word of type μ . We also know that the order of the product in the definition of $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ has no effect when $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ is considered as an element in $\mathcal{U}[[\mathbf{x}]]/\mathcal{I}_P[[\mathbf{x}]]$. So $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ is a symmetric function because $\gamma_\mu \in \mathcal{I}_{P,q}^\perp$. \square

Based on this theorem, we will use the following strategy to obtain a combinatorial description of coefficients of certain bases in the expansion of $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$.

Corollary 4.5. *Suppose that we can write*

$$\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{\lambda} g_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) f_{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P[[\mathbf{x}]]} \quad (17)$$

for some symmetric function basis $g_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ and noncommutative P -symmetric functions $\mathbf{f}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$. Let $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_\lambda r_\lambda(q) g_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$. Then for any partition λ , we have

$$r_\lambda(q) = \langle \mathbf{f}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}), \gamma_\mu \rangle.$$

Proof. The fact that γ_μ belongs to $\mathcal{I}_{P,q}^\perp$ allows us to combine Theorem 4.4 with (17). Then

$$\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \left\langle \sum_\lambda g_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{f}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}), \gamma_\mu \right\rangle = \sum_\lambda \langle \mathbf{f}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}), \gamma_\mu \rangle g_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$$

and hence we obtain the desired identity. \square

In what follows, we will define several noncommutative P -symmetric functions in order to obtain expansions of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ into certain bases using Corollary 4.5. More specifically, we will define noncommutative P -symmetric functions parallel to symmetric functions, and write $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ in several ways similar to (5)–(9). Then Corollary 4.5 offers expansions of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ in terms of various bases. As an example, let us consider the noncommutative P -complete homogeneous symmetric functions $\mathbf{h}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$, which we already defined. They provide the expansion of $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ in terms of the monomial symmetric functions, or equivalently the expansion of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ in terms of the forgotten symmetric functions.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_\lambda a_\lambda(q) f_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$. Then we have*

$$a_\lambda(q) = \sum_{\mathbf{w}} q^{\text{inv}_P(\mathbf{w})},$$

where \mathbf{w} ranges over all words of type μ such that when we split \mathbf{w} from left to right into consecutive segments of lengths $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell$, each segment has no P -descents.

Proof. By Corollary 4.5 and (15), it suffice to show that

$$\langle \mathbf{h}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}), \gamma_\mu \rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{w}} q^{\text{inv}_P(\mathbf{w})}$$

where \mathbf{w} is described above. This immediately follows from (13). \square

Example 4.7. Consider the running example, Example 3.12. To compute the coefficient $a_{3,1}(q)$, it suffices to find words $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 \mathbf{w}_2 \mathbf{w}_3 \mathbf{w}_4$ such that the subword $\mathbf{w}_1 \mathbf{w}_2 \mathbf{w}_3$ has no P -descents. We can find such words as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \boxed{1233} & \boxed{1323} \overset{1}{-} 3123 & \boxed{1332} \overset{1}{-} 3132 \overset{2}{-} 3312 & & & & \\ & \overset{2}{\mid} & \overset{2}{\mid} & \overset{3}{\mid} & \overset{3}{\mid} & & \\ & \boxed{2133} \overset{2}{-} 2313 \overset{3}{-} \boxed{2331} & \boxed{3213} \overset{3}{-} \boxed{3231} & \boxed{3321} & & & \end{array}$$

Then we obtain $a_{3,1}(q) = q^3 + 3q^2 + 3q + 1$.

4.2. Noncommutative P -power sum symmetric functions. When Stanley [Sta95] introduced chromatic symmetric functions $X_G(\mathbf{x})$, he also gave the p -expansion of $X_G(\mathbf{x})$. For the quasisymmetric case, Shareshian and Wachs [SW16] interpreted the coefficient of $p_n(\mathbf{x})$ of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$, and conjectured similar interpretations for the coefficients of $p_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ for arbitrary partitions λ . Athanasiadis [Ath15] proved soon thereafter their conjecture, thus the p -positivity of $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$ (equivalently, the ωp -positivity of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$) was established. In his paper, he used some results for α -unimodal sequences together with the result of Shareshian–Wachs. In this subsection, we define noncommutative P -power sum symmetric functions, which give the positive p -expansion of $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$.

As the noncommutative P -complete homogeneous symmetric functions $\mathfrak{h}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$, we define noncommutative P -power sum symmetric functions using the relation (2).

Definition 4.8. For $k \geq 1$, the *noncommutative P -power sum symmetric function* $\mathfrak{p}_k(\mathbf{u})$ is defined by

$$\mathfrak{p}_k(\mathbf{u}) = \mathfrak{e}_1(\mathbf{u})\mathfrak{h}_{k-1}(\mathbf{u}) - 2\mathfrak{e}_2(\mathbf{u})\mathfrak{h}_{k-2}(\mathbf{u}) + \cdots + (-1)^{k-1}k\mathfrak{e}_k(\mathbf{u}). \quad (18)$$

For a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$, define $\mathfrak{p}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) = \mathfrak{p}_{\lambda_1}(\mathbf{u}) \cdots \mathfrak{p}_{\lambda_\ell}(\mathbf{u})$.

Proposition 4.9. *We have*

$$\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{\lambda} \frac{1}{z_{\lambda}} p_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \mathfrak{p}_{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P[[\mathbf{x}]]}. \quad (19)$$

Proof. Although the proof is essentially the same as the proof of [BF17, Eq. (2.15)], we include it for the sake of completeness.

Let $\mathbf{Sym}(\mathbf{y})$ be the ring of symmetric polynomials in commuting variables y_1, y_2, \dots . Then $\{e_k(\mathbf{y})\}_{k \geq 1}$ generates $\mathbf{Sym}(\mathbf{y})$ and they are algebraically independent. Define $\phi : \mathbf{Sym}(\mathbf{y}) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ by $\phi(e_k(\mathbf{y})) = \mathfrak{e}_k(\mathbf{u})$ so that $\phi(C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) \equiv \Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ modulo $\mathcal{I}_P[[\mathbf{x}]]$ where $C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is the ordinary Cauchy product. Also we have $\phi(p_k(\mathbf{y})) \equiv \mathfrak{p}_k(\mathbf{u})$ modulo \mathcal{I}_P because $p_k(\mathbf{y})$ and $\mathfrak{p}_k(\mathbf{u})$ obey the same kind of relations (2) and (18), respectively. Hence we deduce (19) from (7) and (15). \square

Thanks to Corollary 4.5 and (19), the coefficients of $p_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ of $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ can be obtained from monomial expressions of $\mathfrak{p}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$. In other words, expanding $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ with respect to power sum symmetric functions $p_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ is equivalent to finding monomial expressions of $\mathfrak{p}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$. To do this we need the following notion. For a word $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 \cdots \mathbf{w}_d$, \mathbf{w}_i is a *left-to-right P -maximum* if $\mathbf{w}_i >_P \mathbf{w}_j$ for all $1 \leq j < i$. Of course, \mathbf{w} always has at least one left-to-right P -maximum, namely \mathbf{w}_1 . Then we say that \mathbf{w} has no nontrivial left-to-right P -maxima if for each $2 \leq i \leq d$, there is an integer $j < i$ such that $\mathbf{w}_i \not>_P \mathbf{w}_j$.

Theorem 4.10. *We have*

$$\mathfrak{p}_k(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{\mathbf{w}} u_{\mathbf{w}} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}, \quad (20)$$

where the sum ranges over all words \mathbf{w} of length k with no P -descents and no nontrivial left-to-right P -maxima. Consequently, let $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_{\lambda} \frac{1}{z_{\lambda}} b_{\lambda}(q) p_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$, then

$$b_{\lambda}(q) = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{N}_{\lambda}(\mu)} q^{\text{inv}_P(w)}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{\lambda}(\mu)$ is the set of words \mathbf{w} of type μ such that when we split \mathbf{w} into consecutive subwords of length $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\ell}$, each consecutive subword has no P -descents and no nontrivial left-to-right P -maxima.

Proof. Once (20) is verified, the second assertion immediately follows from Corollary 4.5, (19) and the definition of $\mathbf{p}_{\lambda}(\mathbf{u})$. Thus we only prove (20).

Fix an integer $k > 0$. Let \mathcal{S}_r be the set of words of length k whose P -descent set is $\{1, 2, \dots, r-1\}$, i.e., $\mathcal{S}_r = \{\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 \cdots \mathbf{w}_k \mid \mathbf{w}_1 >_P \cdots >_P \mathbf{w}_r \not>_P \mathbf{w}_{r+1} \not>_P \cdots \not>_P \mathbf{w}_k\}$ for $1 \leq r \leq k$. By (12) and (13), we have

$$\mathbf{e}_r(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{h}_{k-r}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{S}_r} u_{\mathbf{w}} + \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{S}_{r+1}} u_{\mathbf{w}}$$

for $1 \leq r < k$. The definition (18) of $\mathbf{p}_k(\mathbf{u})$ and the above equation yield that

$$\mathbf{p}_k(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{r=1}^k \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{S}_r} (-1)^{r-1} u_{\mathbf{w}}.$$

Now we construct a sign-reversing involution ψ on $\bigsqcup_r \mathcal{S}_r$, which is essentially the same as the one introduced in [SW16]. Let \mathcal{N}_k be the set of words of length k with no P -descents and no nontrivial left-to-right P -maxima. Then $\mathcal{N}_k \subset \mathcal{S}_1 \subset \bigsqcup_r \mathcal{S}_r$. For $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{S}_r$, define $\psi(\mathbf{w})$ as follows: First, if $r = 1$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{N}_k$, then let $\psi(\mathbf{w}) := \mathbf{w}$ so that \mathbf{w} is fixed by ψ . Otherwise, let i be the largest integer such that $\mathbf{w}_i >_P \mathbf{w}_j$ for all $r \leq j < i$. The fact that \mathbf{w} is not in \mathcal{N}_k guarantees the existence of such i and $i > 1$. If $\mathbf{w}_i >_P \mathbf{w}_1$, then let $\psi(\mathbf{w}) := \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{w}_1 \cdots \mathbf{w}_{i-1} \mathbf{w}_{i+1} \cdots \mathbf{w}_k$. In this case, $\psi(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathcal{S}_{r+1}$. If $\mathbf{w}_i \not>_P \mathbf{w}_1$, then $\psi(\mathbf{w}) := \mathbf{w}_2 \cdots \mathbf{w}_l \mathbf{w}_1 \mathbf{w}_{l+1} \cdots \mathbf{w}_k$ where l is the largest integer such that $\mathbf{w}_1 >_P \mathbf{w}_j$ for all $r \leq j \leq l$, then $\psi(\mathbf{w}) \in \mathcal{S}_{r-1}$. Also one can check that ψ is an involution. Therefore ψ is a sign-reversing involution on $\bigsqcup_r \mathcal{S}_r$, and \mathcal{N}_k is the set of fixed points of ψ . To finish the proof, we need that $\psi(\mathbf{w}) \equiv \mathbf{w}$ modulo \mathcal{I}_P , but it follows from the generators (10) of \mathcal{I}_P . \square

Example 4.11. Let us compute the coefficient $b_{3,1}(q)$ in our running example. Similarly to Example 4.7, it is enough to find words $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 \mathbf{w}_2 \mathbf{w}_3 \mathbf{w}_4$ such that the subword $\mathbf{w}_1 \mathbf{w}_2 \mathbf{w}_3$ has no P -descents and no nontrivial left-to-right P -maxima:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \boxed{1233} & 1323 \overset{1}{-} 3123 & 1332 \overset{1}{-} 3132 \overset{2}{-} 3312 & & & & \\ & \begin{array}{c} \bar{2} \mid \\ \bar{2} \mid \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \bar{2} \mid \\ \bar{2} \mid \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \bar{3} \mid \\ \bar{3} \mid \end{array} & \begin{array}{c} \bar{3} \mid \\ \bar{3} \mid \end{array} & & \\ & \boxed{2133} \overset{2}{-} 2313 \overset{3}{-} \boxed{2331} & \boxed{3213} \overset{3}{-} \boxed{3231} & \boxed{3321} & & & \end{array}$$

Thus we conclude $b_{3,1}(q) = q^3 + 2q^2 + 2q + 1$.

Using the correspondence between words and heaps, we interpret a word with no P -descents and no nontrivial left-to-right P -maxima to be a heap with a unique sink. Using Proposition 4.3, we can restate (20) as follows.

Corollary 4.12. *We have*

$$\mathfrak{p}_k(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_H u_{\mathbf{w}_H} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}, \quad (21)$$

where H ranges over all heaps consisting of k pieces with a unique sink.

Remark 4.13. In [GKL⁺95], the authors defined two kinds of noncommutative power sum symmetric functions. The noncommutative P -power sum symmetric functions are an analogue of the noncommutative power sum symmetric functions of *first kind*, and we do not consider an analogue of that of *second kind* in this paper. For p -positivity of $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$, Alexandersson and Sulzgruber [AS19] gave a more general result. They proved that for an arbitrary graph G on $[n]$, $\omega X_G(\mathbf{x}, q)$ is Ψ -positive where Ψ is the quasisymmetric power sum basis of first kind, which is the dual basis of the noncommutative power sum basis of first kind. Moreover, they described the coefficients in Ψ expansion via acyclic orientations. Our approach extends their result to the (multi-)chromatic quasisymmetric functions $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ of the incomparability graph of an arbitrary poset P . The reason why our noncommutative approach is still valid for this case is that properties of natural unit interval orders are not used in Definition 4.8 and Theorem 4.10. The only place which relies on properties of P (more precisely, properties of local flips) is in (19). But, from the duality between noncommutative power sum symmetric functions and power sum quasisymmetric functions of first kind, $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ can be written via them. Therefore one can deduce that $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ is Ψ -positive, and the coefficients in the Ψ -expansion can be described as generating functions of certain words similar to $b_\lambda(q)$ in Theorem 4.10, or equivalently as generating functions of certain heaps. In fact, when we modify some of our settings, this noncommutative approach gives Ψ -positivity of $\omega X_G(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ for an arbitrary graph G . But that modification is out of the main plot of this paper, so we omit that.

4.3. Noncommutative P -Schur functions. Schur functions play a central role in algebraic combinatorics. Since expanding a given symmetric function into Schur functions provides a bridge between combinatorics and other mathematics areas, finding a nice combinatorial model describing the Schur coefficients of the symmetric function is one of the main questions in the theory of symmetric functions. In this subsection, we define noncommutative P -Schur functions via the dual Jacobi–Trudi identity, and describe them in terms of semistandard P -tableaux as the Schur functions. Using this and the duality from (23), we provide the Schur expansions of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$. The notion of P -tableaux was introduced by Gasharov [Gas96] to prove s -positivity of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, 1; \mu)$. Subsequently, Shareshian and Wachs [SW16] showed s -positivity of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q)$.

First, we recall the dual Jacobi–Trudi identity which presents a relation between Schur functions $s_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ and elementary symmetric functions $e_\mu(\mathbf{x})$: for a partition λ ,

$$s_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m} \text{sgn}(\sigma) e_{\lambda'_1 + \sigma(1) - 1}(\mathbf{x}) e_{\lambda'_2 + \sigma(2) - 2}(\mathbf{x}) \cdots e_{\lambda'_m + \sigma(m) - m}(\mathbf{x})$$

1	2	5	4
3	5		
5			

1	2	5	4
4	5		
5			

1	2	5	3
3	5		
5			

FIGURE 12

where λ' is the conjugation of λ and $m = \lambda_1$.

Definition 4.14. For a partition λ , we define the *noncommutative P -Schur function* \mathfrak{J}_λ by

$$\mathfrak{J}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \mathbf{e}_{\lambda'_1 + \sigma(1) - 1}(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{e}_{\lambda'_2 + \sigma(2) - 2}(\mathbf{u}) \cdots \mathbf{e}_{\lambda'_m + \sigma(m) - m}(\mathbf{u}), \quad (22)$$

where λ' is the conjugation of λ and $m = \lambda_1$.

Similarly to the Schur functions, we will provide a combinatorial description of noncommutative P -Schur functions. Before describing $\mathfrak{J}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$ combinatorially, we point out the following congruence about the noncommutative P -Cauchy product, and this gives us a duality between the Schur expansion of $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ and $\mathfrak{J}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$. The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 4.9, so we omit it.

Proposition 4.15. *We have*

$$\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{\lambda} s_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \mathfrak{J}_{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P[[\mathbf{x}]]}. \quad (23)$$

Definition 4.16. For a partition λ , a *semistandard P -tableau of shape λ* is a filling of the Young diagram of shape λ with $[n]$ satisfying that

- (i) each row is non- P -decreasing from left to right, and
- (ii) each column is P -increasing from top to bottom.

A semistandard P -tableau T is of *type* $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$ if each $i \in [n]$ appears μ_i times in T . We denote the set of all semistandard P -tableaux of shape λ by $\mathcal{T}_P(\lambda)$. The *reading word* $\mathbf{w}(T)$ of T is the word obtained by reading T from bottom to top, beginning with the leftmost column of T and working from left to right.

Example 4.17. Let $P = P(2, 4, 4, 5)$ and $\lambda = (4, 2, 1)$. In Figure 12, the first one is a semistandard P -tableau of type $(1, 1, 1, 1, 3)$ and the reading word is **5315254**. The others are not semistandard P -tableaux because the first column of the second tableau is not P -increasing and the first row of the last tableau is not non- P -decreasing.

Remark 4.18. Gasharov [Gas96] and Shareshian–Wachs [SW16] defined P -tableaux slightly differently. Their definition is the conjugate version of ours. We use the above definition which is parallel to the definition of semistandard Young tableaux.

Theorem 4.19. *We have*

$$\mathfrak{J}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}_P(\lambda)} u_{\mathbf{w}(T)} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}. \quad (24)$$

Consequently, $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ is s -positive and its coefficient of s_λ counts semistandard P -tableaux of shape λ and of type μ . In other words,

$$\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_T q^{\text{inv}_P(T)} s_{\text{sh}(T)}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where T ranges over all semistandard P -tableaux of type μ and $\text{sh}(T)$ denotes the shape of T .

Proof. As Theorem 4.10, the second part of this theorem follows immediately from (23) and (24). To show (24), we use an idea of the Lindström-Gessel-Viennot lemma, which is a useful tool for enumerating non-intersecting paths (see [Sta99, Theorem 7.16.1] for more details).

Let $P = P(\mathbf{m})$ where $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$. Then we construct a edge-weighted graph with vertex set $\mathbb{Z} \times [n+1]$. Two distinct vertices (i, a) and (j, b) with $a < b$ are adjacent by an edge e if either

- (i) $i = j$ and $b = a + 1$ (in this case, we assign $\text{wt}(e) = 1$), or
- (ii) $i = j - 1$ and $b = m_a + 1$ (in this case, we assign $\text{wt}(e) = u_a$).

For any $i, k \geq 0$, let $A = (i + k, n + 1)$ and $B = (i, 1)$, and let \mathbf{p} be a path from A to B . We define $\text{wt}(\mathbf{p}) = \text{wt}(e_1) \cdots \text{wt}(e_r)$ where $\mathbf{p} = (A = p_0 \xrightarrow{e_1} p_1 \xrightarrow{e_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{e_r} p_r = B)$. Then by construction we have

$$\mathbf{e}_k(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \text{wt}(\mathbf{p})$$

where the sum is over all paths \mathbf{p} from A to B . See Figure 13. For an m -tuple $(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m)$ of paths, define $\text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m) = \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_1) \cdots \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_m)$.

For a partition λ , let $m = \lambda_1$. Also let $A_i = (m - i + \lambda'_i, n + 1)$ and $B_i = (m - i, 1)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. Then $\mathfrak{J}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$ is equal to the signed sum of weights of m -tuples $(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m)$ of paths from (A_1, \dots, A_m) to $(B_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, B_{\sigma(m)})$ over all $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m$. Since our weights on edges (and paths) do not commute, we cannot apply the Lindström-Gessel-Viennot lemma directly. Hence we modify the Lindström-Gessel-Viennot lemma, and then it will work on our case modulo \mathcal{I}_P .

We construct a sign-reversing involution on the m -tuples of paths, whose fixed points are m -tuples of non-intersecting paths from (A_1, \dots, A_m) to (B_1, \dots, B_m) . Suppose that $(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m)$ be an m -tuple of paths such that there are some intersecting points. Choose the highest intersecting point p (if there are more than one such points, we choose the leftmost one among them). Then only two paths intersect at p , and their starting positions are next to each other, so we denote them by A_k and A_{k+1} . We can split \mathbf{p}_k into two paths $\mathbf{p}_k^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{p}_k^{(2)}$ such that $\mathbf{p}_k^{(1)}$ (respectively, $\mathbf{p}_k^{(2)}$) is the path from A_k to p (respectively, from p to $B_{\sigma(k)}$ for some $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_m$). We write $\mathbf{p}_k = (A_k \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}_k^{(1)}} p \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}_k^{(2)}} B_{\sigma(k)})$. Similarly, we split \mathbf{p}_{k+1} as $\mathbf{p}_{k+1} = (A_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}_{k+1}^{(1)}} p \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}_{k+1}^{(2)}} B_{\sigma(k+1)})$. Also let $\text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_k^{(2)}) = u_{\mathbf{w}}$ and $\text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_{k+1}^{(2)}) = u_{\mathbf{v}}$ for some words $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{E}_r$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{E}_s$ where \mathcal{E}_l is given in the proof of Theorem 4.2. Let $(\mathbf{v}', \mathbf{w}') = \psi_{r,s}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v})$,




FIGURE 13. For $P = P(2, 4, 5, 5, 5)$ and $k = 2$, we illustrate all paths from A to B . From left to right, the weights of paths are u_3u_1 , u_4u_1 , u_5u_1 , and u_5u_2 , respectively. Their summation coincides with $\mathfrak{e}_2(\mathbf{u}) = u_3u_1 + u_4u_1 + u_5u_1 + u_5u_2$.

and then there is the path \mathbf{p}'_k (respectively, \mathbf{p}'_{k+1}) from p to $B_{\sigma(k)}$ (respectively, $B_{\sigma(k+1)}$) whose weight is $u_{w'}$ (respectively, $u_{v'}$). We now define a map as follows:

$$(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m) \mapsto \begin{cases} (\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m) & \text{if } (\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m) \text{ have} \\ & \text{no intersecting point,} \\ (\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_k, \tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{k+1}, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_k = (A_k \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}_k^{(1)}} p \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}'_{k+1}} B_{\sigma(k+1)})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{k+1} = (A_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}_{k+1}^{(1)}} p \xrightarrow{\mathbf{p}'_k} B_{\sigma(k)})$. Obviously, this map is a sign-reversing involution. Furthermore it preserves weights modulo \mathcal{I}_P because

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_k) \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_{k+1}) &= \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_k^{(1)}) \cdot u_w \cdot \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_{k+1}^{(1)}) \cdot u_v \\ &\equiv \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_k^{(1)}) \cdot \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_{k+1}^{(1)}) \cdot u_w \cdot u_v \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P} \\ &\equiv \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_k^{(1)}) \cdot \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_{k+1}^{(1)}) \cdot u_{v'} \cdot u_{w'} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P} \quad \text{by the property of } \psi_{r,s}, \\ &\equiv \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_k^{(1)}) \cdot u_{v'} \cdot \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_{k+1}^{(1)}) \cdot u_{w'} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P} \\ &= \text{wt}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_k) \text{wt}(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with the above involution, the Lindström-Gessel-Viennot lemma yields

$$\mathfrak{J}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m)} \text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P},$$

where $(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m)$ ranges over all non-intersecting paths from (A_1, \dots, A_m) to (B_1, \dots, B_m) . One can easily construct a bijection ϕ between such paths and semistandard P -tableaux

of shape λ satisfying $\text{wt}(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m) = u_{\mathbf{w}(T)}$ where $T = \phi(\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m)$. This completes the proof. \square

Example 4.20. Returning to the running example, to obtain the coefficient $a_{3,1}(q)$ of $s_{3,1}(\mathbf{x})$ of $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$, it suffices to find words $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_1 \mathbf{w}_2 \mathbf{w}_3 \mathbf{w}_4$ such that \mathbf{w} is a reading word for some semistandard P -tableaux of shape $(3, 1)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1233 & 1323 & \xrightarrow{1} & \boxed{3123} & 1332 & \xrightarrow{1} & \boxed{3132} \xrightarrow{2} 3312 \\ & \bar{2} \downarrow & & \bar{2} \downarrow & & \bar{3} \downarrow & \bar{3} \downarrow \\ & 2133 & \xrightarrow{2} & 2313 & \xrightarrow{3} & 2331 & 3213 \xrightarrow{3} 3231 \quad 3321 \end{array}$$

Therefore we have $a_{3,1}(q) = q^2 + q$.

Remark 4.21. In [KP21], the authors defined an equivalence relation on words, which differs from ours. In addition, they conjectured that the Schur expansions of equivalence classes are given by reading words of P -tableaux that occur in the equivalence class; see [KP21, Conjecture 4.16]. Their equivalence classes are finer than ours, so Theorem 4.19 gives a weak answer for the conjecture.

5. NONCOMMUTATIVE P -MONOMIAL SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

We devote the remainder of this paper to establish noncommutative P -monomial symmetric functions.

Describing the e -coefficients of chromatic quasisymmetric functions is a famous long-standing open problem in algebraic combinatorics. Thanks to the duality from (26) which will be described below, monomials appearing in the noncommutative P -monomial symmetric function $\mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$ modulo \mathcal{I}_P gives us the coefficient of $e_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ (equivalently, the coefficient of $h_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ of $\omega X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$).

Before defining the noncommutative P -monomial symmetric functions, consider the monomial symmetric functions $m_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$. The transition matrix between $\{m_\lambda(\mathbf{x})\}_{\lambda \in \text{Par}}$ and $\{e_\lambda(\mathbf{x})\}_{\lambda \in \text{Par}}$ has a simple combinatorial interpretation; see [Sta99].

Theorem 5.1. *Let $e_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_\mu M_{\lambda,\mu} m_\mu(\mathbf{x})$. Then $M_{\lambda,\mu}$ is the number of $(0, 1)$ -matrices whose i -th row sum equals λ_i , and j -th column sum equals μ_j for all i, j . In particular,*

$$M_{\lambda,\mu} = 0 \text{ unless } \mu \trianglelefteq \lambda', \quad \text{and} \quad M_{\lambda,\lambda'} = 1.$$

From this theorem, the matrix $(M_{\lambda,\mu'})_{\lambda,\mu}$ with reverse lexicographic order is a lower triangular matrix with 1's on its diagonal. Then we obtain immediately the following proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $m_\lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_\mu N_{\lambda,\mu} e_\mu(\mathbf{x})$. Then $N_{\lambda,\mu} = 0$ unless $\mu' \trianglelefteq \lambda$, and $N_{\lambda,\lambda'} = 1$.*

Definition 5.3. For a partition λ , the *noncommutative P -monomial symmetric function* $\mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_\mu N_{\lambda,\mu} \mathbf{e}_\mu(\mathbf{u}), \tag{25}$$

where $N_{\lambda,\mu}$ is given in Proposition 5.2.

As (9), we can write $\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u})$ via complete homogeneous symmetric functions $h_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$ and noncommutative P -monomial symmetric functions $\mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$.

Proposition 5.4. *We have*

$$\Omega(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{\lambda} h_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{m}_{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P[[\mathbf{x}]]}. \quad (26)$$

Let us first consider a general case. In his seminal paper [Sta95], Stanley showed that e -coefficients of chromatic symmetric functions are related to acyclic orientations of the graph, and Shareshian and Wachs [SW16] proved a refined result for chromatic quasisymmetric functions.

Theorem 5.5 ([SW16, Sta95]). *For a natural unit interval order P , let $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q) = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\lambda}(q) e_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$. Then for $k \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{\ell(\lambda)=k} c_{\lambda}(q) = \sum_{\mathfrak{o} \in AO(P, k)} q^{\text{asc}_P(\mathfrak{o})},$$

where $AO(P, k)$ is the set of all acyclic orientations of P with k sinks, and $\text{asc}_P(\mathfrak{o})$ is the number of ascent edges in \mathfrak{o} .

Although Stanley proved this theorem for arbitrary graphs, the chromatic quasisymmetric functions are in general not symmetric functions, so Shareshian and Wachs showed this for natural unit interval orders.

Theorem 5.5 is an evidence for the conjectures of Stanley–Stembridge and Shareshian–Wachs which say that $c_{\lambda}(q)$ is a polynomial with nonnegative coefficients, i.e., $c_{\lambda}(q) \in \mathbb{N}[q]$. Furthermore, this theorem suggests that $c_{\lambda}(q)$ can be stated as a sum of certain acyclic orientations of P with some conditions. For $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$, we have a similar description of $\sum_{\ell(\lambda)=k} c_{\lambda}(q)$ in terms of certain heaps instead of acyclic orientations. To show this, we need the following lemma which is an easy exercise.

Lemma 5.6. *We have*

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash d \\ \ell(\lambda)=k}} m_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=k}^d (-1)^{j-k} \binom{j}{k} e_j(\mathbf{x}) h_{d-j}(\mathbf{x}).$$

Theorem 5.7. *Let P be a natural unit interval order. Then for $d, k \geq 1$, we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash d \\ \ell(\lambda)=k}} \mathbf{m}_{\lambda}(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_H u_{\mathbf{w}_H} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P},$$

where H ranges over all heaps of P consisting of d pieces with k sinks. Consequently, let $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\lambda}(q) e_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$. Then we have

$$\sum_{\ell(\lambda)=k} c_{\lambda}(q) = \sum_H q^{\text{asc}_P(H)},$$

where H ranges over all heaps of type μ with k sinks.

Proof. From Lemma 5.6, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash d \\ \ell(\lambda)=k}} \mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{j=k}^d (-1)^{j-k} \binom{j}{k} \mathbf{e}_j(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{h}_{d-j}(\mathbf{u}) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}. \quad (27)$$

Let us write $\mathbf{e}_j(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{h}_{d-j}(\mathbf{u})$ as a sum of monomials:

$$\mathbf{e}_j(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{h}_{d-j}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{w}_1 >_P \cdots >_P \mathbf{w}_j \\ \mathbf{w}_{j+1} \not>_P \cdots \not>_P \mathbf{w}_d}} u_{\mathbf{w}}.$$

Proposition 4.1 says that if \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{w}' correspond to the same heap H , i.e., $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in W(H)$, then $u_{\mathbf{w}} \equiv u_{\mathbf{w}'} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}$. Let \mathbf{w} be a word satisfying the condition in the sum on the right hand side. Then the heap corresponding to \mathbf{w} has at least j sinks. Conversely, let H be a heap with l sinks. Then there are $\binom{l}{j}$ words in $W(H)$ satisfying the condition. Indeed, first choose j sinks, and write them in P -decreasing order. Delete the chosen sinks from H , denoting the resulting heap by H' , and then by Proposition 4.3 there is only one word $\mathbf{w}_{H'}$ corresponding to H' with no P -descents, so let $\mathbf{w}_{j+1} \cdots \mathbf{w}_d = \mathbf{w}_{H'}$. Then by Proposition 4.1, we can rewrite $\mathbf{e}_j(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{h}_{d-j}(\mathbf{u})$ as

$$\mathbf{e}_j(\mathbf{u}) \mathbf{h}_{d-j}(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{s(H) \geq j} \binom{s(H)}{j} u_{\mathbf{w}_H} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P},$$

where $s(H)$ is the number of sinks of H . Combining with (27) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash d \\ \ell(\lambda)=k}} \mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) &\equiv \sum_{j=k}^d (-1)^{j-k} \binom{j}{k} \sum_{s(H) \geq j} \binom{s(H)}{j} u_{\mathbf{w}_H} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P} \\ &\equiv \sum_{s(H) \geq k} \sum_{j=k}^{s(H)} (-1)^{j-k} \binom{s(H)}{j} \binom{j}{k} u_{\mathbf{w}_H} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P} \\ &\equiv \sum_{s(H)=k} u_{\mathbf{w}_H} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}, \end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_{j=k}^l (-1)^{j-k} \binom{l}{j} \binom{j}{k} = \delta_{l,k}$. □

We remark that the case $k = 1$ in the theorem is compatible with Corollary 4.12 since $p_k(\mathbf{x}) = m_k(\mathbf{x})$ and thus $\mathbf{p}_k(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \mathbf{m}_k(\mathbf{u})$ modulo \mathcal{I}_P .

According to Theorem 5.7, one can try to describe the coefficient $c_\lambda(q)$ as a sum of certain heaps with $\ell(\lambda)$ sinks and some extra conditions. In this sense, we provide a combinatorial description of $c_\lambda(q)$ where λ is of two-column shape or of hook shape.




FIGURE 14. From left to right, each connected component is of type S, N, M, and W, respectively.

5.1. Indexed by two-column shapes. First we check the following equation for the monomial symmetric functions indexed by partitions of two-column shape: for $k \geq l \geq 0$,

$$e_{(k,l)}(\mathbf{x}) = m_{(2^l, 1^{k-l})}(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \binom{k+l-2i}{l-i} m_{(2^i, 1^{k+l-2i})}(\mathbf{x}).$$

This equation follows immediately from Theorem 5.1. We thus obtain a noncommutative P -analogue of this equation module \mathcal{I}_P :

$$\mathfrak{e}_{(k,l)}(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \mathfrak{m}_{(2^l, 1^{k-l})}(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} \binom{k+l-2i}{l-i} \mathfrak{m}_{(2^i, 1^{k+l-2i})}(\mathbf{u}) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}. \quad (28)$$

We will find conditions for heaps which contribute to $\mathfrak{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$ where λ is of two-column shape using this congruence.

Given a heap H , the *rank* of a piece p is the height of p in the diagrammatic realization of H , denoted by $\text{rank}(p)$. In other words, $\text{rank}(p)$ is one more than the length of a longest path from p to some sink in H . In particular, $\text{rank}(p) = 1$ if and only if p is a sink. Also we define the *rank* of H by the maximum rank of pieces.

The following argument is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.2. Consider $\mathfrak{e}_{(k,l)}(\mathbf{u})$ for $k \geq l \geq 0$. Let

$$\mathcal{E}_{k,l} = \{\mathbf{w}_1 \cdots \mathbf{w}_{k+l} \mid \mathbf{w}_1 >_P \cdots >_P \mathbf{w}_k \text{ and } \mathbf{w}_{k+1} >_P \cdots >_P \mathbf{w}_{k+l}\}.$$

Then, by definition,

$$\mathfrak{e}_{(k,l)}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{E}_{k,l}} u_{\mathbf{w}}.$$

For a word \mathbf{w} , we denote by $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ the heap corresponding to \mathbf{w} . Note that for each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{E}_{k,l}$, $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ is of rank at most 2. We can classify connected heaps of rank at most 2 as follows. For a connected heap H at most rank 2, let n_1 and n_2 be the numbers of pieces of rank 1 and 2, respectively. Note that $|n_1 - n_2| \leq 1$. We say that the heap H is

- (i) *of type S* if $n_1 = 1$ and $n_2 = 0$ (that is, the rank of H is 1);
- (ii) *of type N* if $n_1 = n_2$;
- (iii) *of type M* if $n_1 = n_2 + 1 \geq 2$;
- (iv) *of type W* if $n_1 = n_2 - 1$.

An example of each type is depicted in Figure 14.

One can easily check that a connected component of type M can be flipped to that of type W via a series of local flips, and vice versa.

Theorem 5.8. *For $k \geq l \geq 0$, we have*

$$\mathfrak{m}_{(2^l, 1^{k-l})}(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_H u_{\mathbf{w}_H} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}, \quad (29)$$

where H ranges over all heaps of P such that H consists of k pieces of rank 1 and l pieces of rank 2, and has no connected component of type W . Consequently, let $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\lambda}(q) e_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$, then

$$c_{(2^l, 1^{k-l})}(q) = \sum_H q^{\text{asc}_P(H)},$$

where H ranges over such heaps of type μ .

Proof. We use induction on l , the base case $l = 0$ being trivial.

Since two distinct words $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{E}_{k,l}$ may correspond to the same heap, we first enumerate the number of words in $\mathcal{E}_{k,l}$ corresponding to $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ for a given word $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{E}_{k,l}$. Let n_1 and n_2 be the number of pieces of $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ of rank 1 and rank 2, respectively. For $1 \leq i \leq k$, each piece corresponding to \mathbf{w}_i is of rank 1, and every piece of rank 2 corresponds to \mathbf{w}_j for some $k+1 \leq j \leq k+l$. Then $n_1 \geq k$ and $n_2 \leq l$. Furthermore, for $k+1 \leq j \leq k+l$, if a piece corresponding to \mathbf{w}_j is of rank 1, then it forms a connected component of type S . Let n_S be the number of connected components of $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ of type S . Therefore we have

$$\#\{\mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{E}_{k,l} \mid H_{\mathbf{w}'} = H_{\mathbf{w}}\} = \binom{n_S}{l - n_2}. \quad (30)$$

For a word $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{E}_{k,l}$, let $\text{WM}(H_{\mathbf{w}})$ be the heap obtained from $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ by flipping all connected components of type W to ones of type M via a series of local flips. By Proposition 4.1, $u_{\mathbf{w}} \equiv u_{\mathbf{w}\text{WM}(H_{\mathbf{w}})} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}$. Define the multiset $\text{WM}(\mathcal{E}_{k,l})$ by

$$\text{WM}(\mathcal{E}_{k,l}) = \{\text{WM}(H_{\mathbf{w}}) \mid \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{E}_{k,l}\}.$$

Then we can write

$$\mathfrak{e}_{(k,l)}(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{H \in \text{WM}(\mathcal{E}_{k,l})} u_{\mathbf{w}_H} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}. \quad (31)$$

For $H \in \text{WM}(\mathcal{E}_{k,l})$, let us now find the multiplicity of H . Again let n_2 be the number of pieces of H of rank 2, and n_S, n_M be the number of connected components of H of type S and type M , respectively. Since H has no connected component of type W , one can quickly check that $n_M + n_S = k + l - 2n_2$. In addition, we need the following observation. Choose j connected components of type M , and flip them to ones of type W . Then the resulting heap H' has $n_2 + j$ pieces of rank 2, and n_S connected components of type S . Of course,

$\text{WM}(H') = H$. Hence by this observation and (30), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{the multiplicity of } H \text{ in } \text{WM}(\mathcal{E}_{k,l}) &= \sum_{j=0}^{n_M} \binom{n_M}{j} \binom{n_S}{l - n_2 - j} \\ &= \binom{n_M + n_S}{l - n_2} \\ &= \binom{k + l - 2n_2}{l - n_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Apply this to (31), and hence by induction on l , comparing with (28) completes the proof. \square

Example 5.9. Let $P = P(2, 3, 4, 5, 5)$ and $\mu = (1^5)$. See Figure 8. There are two heaps of type μ of rank 2; they are connected, and one is of type M while the other is of type W. Then by Theorem 5.8, we have $c_{(2,2,1)}(q) = q^2$ since the ascent number of the heap of type M is 2.

From the interpretation of the coefficients $c_\lambda(q)$ in Theorem 5.8, we obtain somewhat more information for the coefficients. To simplify, we consider the chromatic symmetric function $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q) = X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; 1^n)$. If there is a triangle in the graph P , every heap of P has rank at least 3. Therefore, in this case, the theorem implies that $c_\lambda(q) = 0$ for all partitions λ of 2-column shape. Suppose that P has no triangles. Since P is the incomparability graph of a natural unit interval order, P has to be a disjoint union of paths. Let H be a heap satisfying the conditions in Theorem 5.8. Then the rank condition and the type condition force that each connected component of H consisting of odd pieces forms of type M. On the other hand, each connected component consisting of even pieces can be form of the following two cases:



We summarize the above discussion.

Corollary 5.10. *Let P be the incomparability graph of a natural unit interval order with n vertices, and $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q) = \sum_\lambda c_\lambda(q) e_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$. Let n_e and n_o be the numbers of connected components of P consisting of even and odd vertices, respectively. Then for a partition λ of 2-column shape, we have*


$$c_\lambda(q) = \begin{cases} q^{(n-2n_e-n_o)/2} (1+q)^{n_e} & \text{if } P \text{ is triangle-free and } \lambda' = ((n+n_o)/2, (n-n_o)/2), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, the coefficients $c_\lambda(q)$ where λ are of 2-column shape are unimodal.

5.2. Indexed by hook shapes. In this subsection, we deal with the coefficient $c_\lambda(q)$ where λ is a partition of hook shape. We first define some notions. For $\{a_1 < \dots < a_k\} \subset [n]$, we say that $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ forms a P -path if the subgraph of $\text{inc}(P)$ induced by $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$

is a path. In terms of the poset structure of P , $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ forms a P -path if and only if $a_1 \not\prec_P a_2 \not\prec_P \dots \not\prec_P a_k$ and $a_i <_P a_j$ if $j - i > 1$.


Now consider the following situation. Let H_1 be a heap with the unique sink p_1 , and (p_2, p_1, p_0) be a flippable triple in H_1 as



Let H_2 be the heap obtained from H_1 by a local flip at (p_2, p_1, p_0) . Then p_1 is of rank 2 and p_0, p_2 are of rank 1 in H_2 . Suppose that there is a piece p_3 in H_2 such that p_3 differs from p_0 and (p_3, p_2, p_1) is flippable in H_2 . In this case, p_3 is necessarily of rank 2. Then let H_3 be the heap obtained from H_2 by a local flip at (p_3, p_2, p_1) . H_2 and H_3 are depicted as follows:



Similarly, if there is a piece p_{i+1} in H_i such that p_{i+1} is different from p_i and (p_{i+1}, p_i, p_{i-1}) is flippable, then H_{i+1} is the heap obtained from H_i by a local flip at (p_{i+1}, p_i, p_{i-1}) . This process continues until there is no such p_{i+1} . Then we finally obtain the heap forming as follows:



By construction, $\{p_k, p_{k-1}, \dots, p_0\}$ forms a P -path. Also, deleting p_k from this heap, the resulting heap has the unique sink p_0 . This process motivates the following definition. For a heap H , a set $\{v_{a_1, i_1}, \dots, v_{a_k, i_k}\}$ of pieces forms a *forbidden P -path* if

- (i) $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ forms a P -path,
- (ii) $\text{rank}(v_{a_1, i_1}) = 1$ and $\text{rank}(v_{a_j, i_j}) = k - j + 1$ for $2 \leq j \leq k$, and
- (iii) $(v_{a_1, i_1}, v_{a_2, i_2}, v_{a_3, i_3})$ is flippable.

Figure 15 illustrates an example and non-examples of a forbidden P -path. The following lemma will be used in the proof of Theorem 5.13.

- Lemma 5.11.**
- (a) *Every forbidden P -path can be transformed to a heap with a unique sink and two pieces of rank 2, via local flips.*
 - (b) *Let H be a heap of P and p a piece in H . If H contain a forbidden P -path, and every forbidden P -path in H contains p as the rightmost element in the diagram, then we can transform H to a heap with no forbidden P -path via local flips.*

Proof. We replace a specific proof by diagrammatic examples.






FIGURE 15. The north-west heap forms a forbidden P -path. The others are non-examples of a forbidden P -path. The north-east one does not form a P -path. If we choose all pieces except the one of rank 3, we obtain a P -path, but they does not form a forbidden P -path because they violate the rank condition (ii). Similarly, the south-west diagram does not form a P -path, and if we choose all pieces except the one of rank 2 on left side, we have a P -path. But they violate the condition (iii), so is not a forbidden P -path. The last one is a P -path, but the pieces does not satisfy the rank condition (ii). Hence it does not form a forbidden P -path.

(a) It follows from the definition of a P -path and the rank condition for a forbidden P -path.



(b) Choose the shortest forbidden P -path, and apply the procedure in (a) to it.




□


For $a, l \geq 1$, let $M_{(l|a)}$ be the set of heaps H of P consisting of $a + l + 1$ such that H has $l + 1$ sinks and satisfies one of the following conditions:

- (i) the number of pieces of rank 2 is equal to 1;
- (ii) the number of pieces of rank 2 is equal to 2. Also denoting the two pieces of rank 2 by p and r ,
 - (A) there is a piece q of rank 1 such that (p, q, r) is a flippable triple,
 - (B) there is no piece q' other than q such that $p \rightarrow q'$ or $r \rightarrow q'$, and
 - (C) H has no forbidden P -path.

Example 5.12. Let $a = 4$ and $l = 2$. The following two heaps are examples of elements in $M_{(l|a)}$.



In contrary, the following heaps are not included in $M_{(l|a)}$.



Indeed, the north-west heap has only 2 sinks. The north-east, south-west, south-east heaps violate the conditions (A), (B), (C), respectively.

As before, we first check the following identity related to the monomial symmetric functions indexed by partitions of hook shapes: for $a \geq 2$ and $l \geq 0$,

$$e_{l+1}(\mathbf{x})p_a(\mathbf{x}) = m_{(a+1,1^l)}(\mathbf{x}) + m_{(a,1^{l+1})}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (32)$$

Theorem 5.13. For $a, l \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbf{m}_{(a+1,1^l)}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{H \in M_{(l|a)}} u_{\mathbf{w}_H} \mod \mathcal{I}_P. \quad (33)$$

Consequently, let $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_{\lambda} c_{\lambda}(q) e_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$, then

$$c_{(a+1,1^l)}(q) = \sum_H q^{\text{asc}_P(H)},$$

where the sum runs over all heaps H of type μ contained in $M_{(l|a)}$.

Proof. We induct on a . For the base case $a = 1$, the partition $(a+1, 1^l)$ is not only of hook shape, but also of two-column shape. In this case, (29) and (33) coincide.

For $a \geq 2$, from (32), we have

$$\mathbf{e}_{l+1}(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{p}_a(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \mathbf{m}_{(a+1,1^l)}(\mathbf{u}) + \mathbf{m}_{(a,1^{l+1})}(\mathbf{u}) \mod \mathcal{I}_P. \quad (34)$$

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 5.8, let $\mathcal{EP}_{l+1,a}$ be a multiset given by

$$\mathcal{EP}_{l+1,a} = \left\{ \mathbf{w}_1 \cdots \mathbf{w}_{l+a+1} \mid \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{w}_1 >_P \cdots >_P \mathbf{w}_{l+1} \text{ and } \mathbf{w}_{l+2} \cdots \mathbf{w}_{l+a+1} \text{ has} \\ \text{no } P\text{-descents and no left-to-right } P\text{-maxima} \end{array} \right\},$$

then

$$\mathbf{e}_{l+1}(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{p}_a(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \sum_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{EP}_{l+1,a}} u_{\mathbf{w}} \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}.$$

Hence by induction, it suffices to find a bijective map

$$\Phi : \mathcal{EP}_{l+1,a} \longrightarrow M_{(l|a)} \cup M_{(l+1|a-1)}$$

such that $H_{\mathbf{w}} \sim \Phi(\mathbf{w})$ for all $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{EP}_{l+1,a}$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} M_{(l|a),1} &= \{H \in M_{(l|a)} \mid H \text{ has a unique piece of rank 2}\} \text{ and} \\ M_{(l|a),2} &= \{H \in M_{(l|a)} \mid H \text{ has two pieces of rank 2}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and let $M_{(l+1|a-1),1}, M_{(l+1|a-1),2}$ be defined similarly. Recall that $\mathbf{p}_k(\mathbf{u})$ is the generating function for heaps consisting of k pieces with a unique sink; see Corollary 4.12. For a word $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{EP}_{l+1,a}$, pieces corresponding to $\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{l+1}$ form sinks in $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ by definition, and the piece corresponding to \mathbf{w}_{l+2} may or may not be a sink. Then $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ has $l+1$ or $l+2$ sinks. With this fact and the diagrammatic realization of $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ in mind, we give an explicit case-by-case description of $\Phi(\mathbf{w})$ as follows:


Case 1: $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ has $l+1$ sinks. In this case, there is a unique piece of rank 2, namely the piece corresponding to \mathbf{w}_{l+2} . Then define $\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = H_{\mathbf{w}} \in M_{(l|a),1}$.

Case 2: $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ has $l+2$ sinks. Then $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ has at most 2 pieces of rank 2. We break this case into subcases depending on the number of pieces of rank 2.

Case 2a: $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ has a unique piece of rank 2. We denote this piece by q . There are 1 or 2 pieces under q in the diagrammatic realization of $H_{\mathbf{w}}$.


Case 2aa: There is a unique piece under q . Then this piece has to correspond to \mathbf{w}_{l+2} . In this case, we define $\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = H_{\mathbf{w}} \in M_{(l+1|a-1),1}$.

Case 2ab: There are two pieces under q . The diagrammatic realization then forms as follows:



Then \mathbf{w}_{l+2} corresponds to either p or r . If it corresponds to p , then define $\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = H_{\mathbf{w}} \in M_{(l+1|a-1),1}$. Otherwise, let H' be the heap obtained from $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ by a local flip at (p, q, r) . It is routine to check that H' satisfies conditions (A), (B), (C), and hence define $\Phi(\mathbf{w}) = H' \in M_{(l|a),2}$.

Case 2b: $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ has two pieces of rank 2. Then $H_{\mathbf{w}}$ forms as




where q corresponds to \mathbf{w}_{l+2} , and then satisfies condition (A). But it is possible that there is another piece under p or r . Again we split this case into subcases.

Case 2ba: H_w satisfies conditions (B) and (C). Then define $\Phi(w) = H_w \in M_{(l+1|a-1),2}$.


Case 2bb: There is a forbidden P -path containing q as the rightmost piece. So H_w violates condition (C), then we need to transform H_w . Choose the shortest forbidden P -paths containing q as the rightmost piece, and apply local flips as Lemma 5.11(a). Then Lemma 5.11(b) guarantees that the resulting heap H' satisfies conditions (A), (B), (C), so define $\Phi(w) = H' \in M_{(l|a),2}$.

Case 2bc: There is no forbidden P -path having q as the rightmost piece, and there is another piece under r . Then H_w forms as



Let H' be the heap obtained from H_w by a local flip at (q, r, s) . Since H_w has no forbidden P -path containing q as the rightmost piece, H' do not allow any forbidden P -path. Moreover, conditions (A) and (C) hold for H' . We define $\Phi(w) = H' \in M_{(l|a),2}$.

By the construction of Φ , we have that $H_w \sim \Phi(w)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{EP}_{l+1,a}$. Also it is straightforward that Φ is bijective, except the case where $\Phi(w) \in M_{(l|a),2}$. This happens in Cases 2ab, 2bb and 2bc. Let w be a word such that $\Phi(w) \in M_{(l|a),2}$, and (p, q, r) be a unique flippable triple in $\Phi(w)$ such that q is of rank 1 and p, r are of rank 2. Also let H' be the heap obtained from $\Phi(w)$ by a local flip at (p, q, r) . Observing H' provides what case w is in. First one can directly check that w is in Case 2ab if and only if H' has a unique piece of rank 2. Suppose that H' has at least two pieces of rank 2. If w is in Case 2bb, then H_w, H' and $\Phi(w)$ are depicted as follows:



Hence, in H' , there is a piece s of rank 2 different from q such that s is placed above r . On the other hand, if w is in Case 2bc, then there is no such piece s . Therefore we partition

$M_{(l|a),2}$ as follows.


$$\begin{aligned} M'_{(l|a),2} &= \{H \in M_{(l|a),2} \mid H' \text{ has a unique piece of rank 2}\}, \\ M''_{(l|a),2} &= \left\{ H \in M_{(l|a),2} \left| \begin{array}{l} H' \text{ has a piece } s \text{ of rank 2} \\ \text{different from } q \text{ such that } s \rightarrow r \end{array} \right. \right\}, \text{ and} \\ M'''_{(l|a),2} &= M_{(l|a),2} \setminus (M'_{(l|a),2} \cup M''_{(l|a),2}). \end{aligned}$$

By the above observation, for a word \mathbf{w} such that $\Phi(\mathbf{w}) \in M_{(l|a),2}$, $\Phi(\mathbf{w}) \in M'_{(l|a),2}$ if \mathbf{w} is in Case 2ab, $\Phi(\mathbf{w}) \in M''_{(l|a),2}$ if \mathbf{w} is in Case 2bb, and $\Phi(\mathbf{w}) \in M'''_{(l|a),2}$ if \mathbf{w} is in Case 2bc. Using this partition, it is routine to show that the map

$$\Phi : \mathcal{EP}_{l+1,a} \longrightarrow M_{(l|a),1} \cup M'_{(l|a),2} \cup M''_{(l|a),2} \cup M'''_{(l|a),2} \cup M_{(l+1|a-1),1} \cup M_{(l+1|a-1),2}$$

is bijective. \square

Example 5.14. Let $P = P(2, 3, 4, 5, 5)$ and $\mu = (1^5)$ again. For $a = 3$ and $l = 1$, there are three heaps of type μ contained in $M_{(l|a)}$:



From left to right, the ascent number of each heap is 3, 2, and 1, respectively. Then by Theorem 5.13, we have $c_{4,1}(q) = q^3 + q^2 + q$. Also there is no heap of type μ contained in $M_{(2|2)}$, and hence $c_{3,1,1}(q) = 0$.

5.3. A recurrence relation. In this subsection, we give a recurrence relation for $\mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u})$, which is equivalent to Harada–Precup’s conjecture [HP19, Conjecture 8.1]. Recall that for a natural unit interval order P , the height h of P is the maximum number of independent vertices in $\text{inc}(P)$, or equivalently, the maximum length of chains in P . Then, by definition, $\mathbf{e}_k(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ for all $k > h$.

To show Harada–Precup’s conjecture, we need the following simple lemma which is straightforward from the definition of monomial symmetric functions.

Lemma 5.15. *For a partition ν and $k \geq \ell(\nu)$, let $e_k(\mathbf{x})m_\nu(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_\rho d_\rho m_\rho(\mathbf{x})$. Then $d_{\nu+(1^k)} = 1$ where $\nu + (1^k) = (\nu_1 + 1, \nu_2 + 1, \dots, \nu_k + 1)$, and if $\rho \neq \nu + (1^k)$ and $d_\rho \neq 0$, then $\ell(\rho) > k$.*

Theorem 5.16 ([HP19, Conjecture 8.1]). *Let P be a natural unit interval order, and h the height of P . Then, for a partition λ of length ℓ , we have*

$$\mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \ell > h, \\ \mathbf{e}_h(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{m}_\mu(\mathbf{u}) & \text{if } \ell = h, \end{cases}$$

modulo \mathcal{I}_P , where $\mu = (\lambda_1 - 1, \dots, \lambda_\ell - 1)$.

Proof. Since $\mathbf{e}_k(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ for all $k > h$, we have that $\mathbf{e}_\nu(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ for any partition $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots)$ with $\nu_1 > h$. On the other hand, by Proposition 5.2, if $\nu_1 < \ell$, then $N_{\lambda,\nu} = 0$. Therefore we deduce that $\mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ if $\ell > h$. Suppose now $\ell = h$. As before,

the noncommutative P -analogue of Lemma 5.15 also holds modulo \mathcal{I}_P . Thus applying Lemma 5.15 to the case $\nu = \mu$ and $k = h$, we have

$$\mathbf{e}_h(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{m}_\mu(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) + \sum_{\ell(\rho) > h} d_\rho \mathbf{m}_\rho(\mathbf{u}) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_P}.$$

However we already know that $\mathbf{m}_\rho(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ for any partition ρ with $\ell(\rho) > h$, and thus this completes the proof. \square

By the same argument as in [HP19], Theorem 5.16 implies e -positivity of $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu)$ for natural unit interval orders P of height 2. We remark that Cho and Huh [CH19] also deduced this result via a different approach.

Corollary 5.17. *Let P be a natural unit interval order of height 2 and $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ a partition. Then we have*

$$\mathbf{m}_\lambda(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \begin{cases} \mathbf{p}_{\lambda_1}(\mathbf{u}) & \text{if } \ell = 1, \\ \mathbf{e}_{2\lambda_2}(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{p}_{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}(\mathbf{u}) & \text{if } \ell = 2, \\ 0 & \text{if } \ell > 2, \end{cases}$$

modulo \mathcal{I}_P . Consequently, let $X_P(\mathbf{x}, q; \mu) = \sum_\lambda c_\lambda(q) e_\lambda(\mathbf{x})$, then $c_\lambda(q) = 0$ for any λ with $\ell(\lambda) > 2$, and

$$c_\lambda(q) = \sum_{\mathbf{w}} q^{\text{inv}_P(\mathbf{w})},$$

where $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ (λ_2 may equal 0) and \mathbf{w} ranges over all words such that for $1 \leq i \leq \lambda_2$, $\mathbf{w}_{2i} >_P \mathbf{w}_{2i-1}$, and the consecutive subword $\mathbf{w}_{2\lambda_2+1} \cdots \mathbf{w}_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}$ has no P -descents and no nontrivial left-to-right P -maxima.

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Theorem 5.16 and the fact that $\mathbf{m}_k(\mathbf{u}) \equiv \mathbf{p}_k(\mathbf{u})$ modulo \mathcal{I}_P . \square

As Harada and Precup mentioned, this recurrence relation does not in general give positive monomial expressions of all noncommutative P -monomial symmetric functions; see [HP19, Example 8.2].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Jang Soo Kim for suggestions to help improve some expositions.

REFERENCES

- [AS19] Per Alexandersson and Robin Sulzgruber. P -Partitions and p -Positivity. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 07 2019. rnz130.
- [Ass15] Sami H Assaf. Dual equivalence graphs I: A new paradigm for Schur positivity. In *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, volume 3. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [Ath15] Christos A Athanasiadis. Power Sum Expansion of Chromatic Quasisymmetric Functions. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, 22(2):P2–7, 2015.

- [BC18] Patrick Brosnan and Timothy Y Chow. Unit interval orders and the dot action on the cohomology of regular semisimple Hessenberg varieties. *Advances in Mathematics*, 329:955–1001, 2018.
- [BF17] Jonah Blasiak and Sergey Fomin. Noncommutative Schur functions, switchboards, and Schur positivity. *Selecta Mathematica*, 23(1):727–766, 2017.
- [Bla16] Jonah Blasiak. Haglund’s conjecture on 3-column Macdonald polynomials. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 283(1):601–628, 2016.
- [BN20] Olivier Bernardi and Philippe Nadeau. Combinatorial reciprocity for the chromatic polynomial and the chromatic symmetric function. *Discrete Mathematics*, 343(10):111989, 2020.
- [CH19] Soojin Cho and JiSun Huh. On e -Positivity and e -Unimodality of Chromatic Quasi-symmetric Functions. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 33(4):2286–2315, 2019.
- [CHSS16] Samuel Clearman, Matthew Hyatt, Brittany Shelton, and Mark Skandera. Evaluations of Hecke algebra traces at Kazhdan-Lusztig basis elements. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, pages P2–7, 2016.
- [CM18] Erik Carlsson and Anton Mellit. A proof of the shuffle conjecture. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 31(3):661–697, 2018.
- [Ell17] Brittney Ellzey. A directed graph generalization of chromatic quasisymmetric functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.00454*, 2017.
- [FG98] Sergey Fomin and Curtis Greene. Noncommutative Schur functions and their applications. *Discrete Mathematics*, 193(1-3):179–200, 1998.
- [Gas96] Vesselin Gasharov. Incomparability graphs of $(3+1)$ -free posets are s -positive. *Discrete Mathematics*, 157(1-3):193–197, 1996.
- [GKL⁺95] IM Gelfand, D Krob, A Lascoux, B Leclerc, VS Retakh, and JY Thibon. Noncommutative Symmetrical Functions. *Advances in Mathematics*, 112(2):218–348, 1995.
- [GP13] Mathieu Guay-Paquet. A modular relation for the chromatic symmetric functions of $(3+1)$ -free posets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.2400*, 2013.
- [GP16] Mathieu Guay-Paquet. A second proof of the Shareshian–Wachs conjecture, by way of a new Hopf algebra. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.05498*, 2016.
- [Hai92] Mark D Haiman. Dual equivalence with applications, including a conjecture of Proctor. *Discrete Mathematics*, 99(1-3):79–113, 1992.
- [Hai93] Mark Haiman. Hecke algebra characters and immanant conjectures. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 6(3):569–595, 1993.
- [HNY20] JiSun Huh, Sun-Young Nam, and Meesue Yoo. Melting lollipop chromatic quasisymmetric functions and Schur expansion of unicellular LLT polynomials. *Discrete Mathematics*, 343(3):111728, 2020.
- [HP19] Megumi Harada and Martha E Precup. The cohomology of abelian Hessenberg varieties and the Stanley–Stembridge conjecture. *Algebraic Combinatorics*, 2(6):1059–1108, 2019.
- [KP21] Dongkwan Kim and Pavlo Pylyavskyy. Robinson–Schensted correspondence for unit interval orders. *Selecta Mathematica*, 27(5):1–66, 2021.
- [Lam08] Thomas Lam. Ribbon Schur operators. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 29(1):343–359, 2008.
- [LS81] Alain Lascoux and Marcel-P Schützenberger. Le monoïde plaxique. *Noncommutative structures in algebra and geometric combinatorics (Naples, 1978)*, 109:129–156, 1981.
- [SS58] Dana Scott and Patrick Suppes. Foundational aspects of theories of measurement 1. *The journal of symbolic logic*, 23(2):113–128, 1958.
- [SS93] Richard P Stanley and John R Stembridge. On immanants of Jacobi-Trudi matrices and permutations with restricted position. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 62(2):261–279, 1993.
- [Sta95] Richard P Stanley. A symmetric function generalization of the chromatic polynomial of a graph. *Advances in Mathematics*, 111(1):166–194, 1995.

- [Sta98] Richard P Stanley. Graph colorings and related symmetric functions: ideas and applications A description of results, interesting applications, & notable open problems. *Discrete Mathematics*, 193(1-3):267–286, 1998.
- [Sta99] Richard P Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics. Volume 2*. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [Sta11] Richard P Stanley. *Enumerative Combinatorics Volume 1 second edition*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [SW16] John Shareshian and Michelle L Wachs. Chromatic quasisymmetric functions. *Advances in Mathematics*, 295:497–551, 2016.
- [Tym08] Julianna S Tymoczko. Permutation representations on Schubert varieties. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 130(5):1171–1194, 2008.
- [Vie86] Gérard Xavier Viennot. Heaps of pieces, I: Basic definitions and combinatorial lemmas. In *Combinatoire énumérative*, pages 321–350. Springer, 1986.

Email address: byunghakhwang@gmail.com