

A generalization of the Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for K - k -Schur and k -Schur functions

Duc-Khanh Nguyen

Abstract

The K - k -Schur functions and k -Schur functions appeared in the study of K -theoretic and affine Schubert Calculus as polynomial representatives of Schubert classes. In this paper, we introduce a new family of symmetric functions $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^{(k)}$, that generalizes the constructions via the Pieri rule of K - k -Schur functions and k -Schur functions. Then we obtain the Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for the generalized functions. The rule is described explicitly in the cases of K - k -Schur functions and k -Schur functions, with concrete descriptions and algorithms for coefficients. Our work recovers the result of Bandlow, Schilling, and Zabrocki for k -Schur functions, and explains it as a degeneration of the rule for K - k -Schur functions. In particular, many other special cases and connections promise to be detailed in the future.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05E05, 14N15.

Keywords and phrases. Murnaghan-Nakayama rule, affine symmetric groups, $(k+1)$ -cores, k -bounded partitions, K - k -Schur functions, k -Schur functions.

1 Introduction

The classical Murnaghan-Nakayama rule is a combinatorial rule for computing the irreducible character values $\chi_\lambda(\mu)$ of the symmetric group using ribbon tableaux [Nak40b, Nak40a, Mur37, LR34]. In terms of symmetric functions, it can be understood as the decomposition of $p_r \cdot s_\lambda$ to the sum of s_μ , where p_r is the power sum symmetric function, s_λ is the Schur function associated to partition λ . In general, studying the decomposition rules (Monk rule, Pieri rule, Murnaghan-Nakayama rule, Littlewood-Richardson rule) of symmetric functions is very important because it lies at the crossroads of many different domains such as Representation Theory, Schubert Calculus, Algebraic Combinatorics. The Schur functions s_λ are characters of polynomial irreducible representations of the general linear group $GL(n)$, and it is the polynomial representative of Schubert classes of the cohomology $H^*(G_{m,n})$ of Grassmannian $G_{m,n}$ [Man01]. The product of two symmetric functions may tell us the direct sum decomposition into irreducible modules of a tensor product of two irreducible modules, or the number of certain geometric objects. For this reason, many generalizations of classical Murnaghan-Nakayama rule were studied, for instance [KHST23, MS18, Tew16, LM16, Ros14, Kon12, BSZ11, HR98, FG98, Hal95].

The k -Schur functions $s_\lambda^{(k)}$ are a variation of Schur functions s_λ . They were first introduced in [LLM03] to study Macdonald polynomials [Mac98], and then appeared in the study of affine Schubert Calculus. Namely, they are the polynomial representatives of Schubert classes of the homology $H_*(Gr)$ of the affine Grassmannian $Gr = SL_{k+1}(\mathbb{C}((t)))/SL_{k+1}(\mathbb{C}[[t]])$ [Lam08]. The Pieri rule [LM07] provides a way to define k -Schur functions, and it is an important key to obtaining the Murnaghan-Nakayama

rule [BSZ11].

The K - k -Schur functions $g_\lambda^{(k)}$ are a variation of k -Schur functions $s_\lambda^{(k)}$ in K -theoretic Schubert Calculus. Namely, when replacing homology $H_*(Gr)$ by K -homology $K_*(Gr)$, the Schubert classes are represented by K - k -Schur functions. The polynomials $g_\lambda^{(k)}$ are simultaneously introduced and characterized via the Pieri rule in [LSS10, Mor12], with an explicit combinatorial formula given recently by [BMS22]. The K - k -Schur functions carry continued interest in the mathematical community. For instance, in [BMS22], the authors introduced symmetric functions called Katalan functions and proved that the K - k -Schur functions form a subfamily of the Katalan functions. They also conjectured that another subfamily of Katalan functions called the closed k -Schur Katalan functions are identified with the Schubert structure sheaves in the K -homology of the affine Grassmannian. The conjecture is verified in [IIN22].

In this paper, we introduce a new family of symmetric functions $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^{(k)}$, that generalizes the constructions via the Pieri rule of K - k -Schur functions and k -Schur functions (Section 7). Then we obtain the Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for the generalized functions (Theorem 8.1). In the case of K - k -Schur functions and k -Schur functions, we describe explicitly the rule with concrete description and algorithms for the coefficients (Corollaries 9.2, 9.6, Proposition 9.10 for $g_\lambda^{(k)}$ and Corollaries 10.2, 10.4, Proposition 10.6 for $s_\lambda^{(k)}$). Our result for $s_\lambda^{(k)}$ recovers [BSZ11] and explains it as a degeneration of the rule for K - k -Schur functions.

The proof of the main results is carried out as follows: For Theorem 8.1, the key point is the cancellation-free expression of the noncommutative power sum symmetric polynomials p_r (Lemma 7.6). This formula is directly obtained from the definition of p_r with the help of the previous reduction steps (Lemmas 7.4, 7.5). The arguments in the proofs of the lemmas are based on the properties of weak hook words (Lemma 5.3). For the consequences on K - k -Schur functions, Corollary 9.2 is deduced directly from Theorem 8.1. Corollary 9.6 is a translation of Corollary 9.2 in terms of partitions. The observations between them describe the formation of a partition that would appear in the Murnaghan-Nakayama rule. By this, we know which partitions will appear with nonzero coefficients in Corollary 9.6, and an algorithmic description to compute exactly the coefficients in Proposition 9.10. For the consequences on k -Schur functions, the story is similar but simpler, the process of forming a partition during the transfer from Corollary 10.2 to Corollary 10.4 is considered as the process from Corollary 9.2 to Corollary 9.6, but has been degenerated. So the results for the k -Schur functions are degenerations of the results for the K - k -Schur functions.

There are some directions to study from our work in the future. Namely, many other special or related cases of $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^{(k)}$ promise to be detailed, for instance, dual k -Schur functions [Lam06], affine stable Grothendieck polynomials [LSS10, Lam06], closed K - k -Schur functions [IIN22, Tak19], etc. Furthermore, one can look for the translations of those results via Peterson isomorphism that sends homology $H_*(Gr)$ to quantum cohomology $QH(Fl_n)$ [LS10, Pet97], or via K -theoretic Peterson isomorphism that sends K -homology $K_*(Gr)$ to quantum K -cohomology $QK(Fl_n)$ [IIM20].

The paper is organized as follows: Sections 2–4 present fundamental objects (Grassmannian elements, $(k+1)$ -cores, and k -bounded partitions) which parametrize K - k Schur functions, k -Schur function and the generalized symmetric functions $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^{(k)}$, and bijections between them. Section 5 introduces a generalized algebra \mathcal{A}_k that captures 0-Hecke alge-

bras and nilCoxeter algebras as quotient algebras. The weak hook words in this algebra are introduced. Lemma 5.3 collects important properties of those words to help us obtain cancellation-free expression of noncommutative power sum symmetric polynomials in Section 7. Section 6 studies anti-weak hook words. We recall Edelman-Greene insertion to transform an anti-weak hook word to a weak hook word. The relation is packaged into Lemma 6.6, and will be used later to translate the Murnaghan-Nakayama rule in terms of partitions in Sections 9, 10. Section 7 introduces noncommutative symmetric functions, including the generalized functions $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^{(k)}$, in algebra \mathcal{A}_k . The cancellation-free expression of power sum symmetric polynomials is in Lemma 7.6. Section 8 states Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for $\mathcal{F}_\lambda^{(k)}$. Sections 9, 10 describe explicitly the rule for K - k -Schur functions and k -Schur functions.

Acknowledgments: The author would like to express his gratitude to Prof. Cristian Lenart and Prof. Satoshi Naito to introduce related topics that led to this work. He is grateful to Prof. Anne Schilling and Prof. Mike Zabrocki for explanations in [BSZ11]. The work is sponsored by DAAD postdoctoral fellowship at Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Germany. The author would like to thank Prof. Petra Schwer for her support during his visit, and Prof. Rebecca Waldecker for her influenced questions in presentation and writing. We are grateful to the referees for their extensive knowledge, valuable comments, and encouragement, which helps to improve the text a lot.

2 Affine symmetric group

Definitions 2.1. Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Let \tilde{S}_{k+1} be the *affine symmetric group* with generators $\{s_0, \dots, s_k\}$ satisfying relations

$$s_i^2 = 1 \text{ for all } i, \quad (1)$$

$$s_i s_{i+1} s_i = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1} \text{ for all } i, \quad (2)$$

$$s_i s_j = s_j s_i \text{ for all } i - j \neq \pm 1, \quad (3)$$

where the indices are taken from $\mathbb{Z}/(k+1)\mathbb{Z}$. For $w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}$, a shortest expression of w in generators is called a *reduced word*. The *length* $l(w)$ of w is defined to be the length of its reduced word. We write $s_{i_1 \dots i_m}$ for $s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_m}$. The *finite symmetric group* S_{k+1} is the subgroup of \tilde{S}_{k+1} generated by $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. Set \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0 to be the set of minimal length coset representatives of \tilde{S}_{k+1}/S_{k+1} . The elements of \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0 are said *Grassmannian elements*.

Example 2.2. Let $k = 4$, then $s_{23043210}$ is an element in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0 .

3 $(k+1)$ -cores and k -bounded partitions

Definitions 3.1. A *partition* λ is a weakly decreasing sequence of non-negative integers $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l)$. Its *length* $l(\lambda)$ is defined by the last index l' such that $\lambda_{l'} > 0$. Its *size* is defined by $|\lambda| = \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_l$. We identify λ with its *Young diagram*, which is a collection of boxes arranged in left-justified rows, with λ_i boxes in the i th row from the top. The *conjugate partition* λ^t of λ is obtained by reflecting λ about its main diagonal. A box in the i th row and j th column is called a *cell* (i, j) . We say that it is a λ -removable corner if

$$(i, j) \in \lambda, \text{ and } (i+1, j), (i, j+1) \notin \lambda,$$

and a λ -addable corner if

$$\begin{aligned} (i, j) &= (1, \lambda_1 + 1), \text{ or} \\ (i, j) &= (l(\lambda) + 1, 1), \text{ or} \\ (i, j) &\notin \lambda, (i - 1, j), (i, j - 1) \in \lambda. \end{aligned}$$

The *hook-length* of a cell (i, j) in λ is the number of cells in λ , below or to the right of (i, j) , including (i, j) itself.

Let $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l)$ be another partition. We say that $\mu \geq \lambda$ if $\mu_i \geq \lambda_i$ for all i . If $\mu \geq \lambda$, we define the *skew Young diagram* μ/λ to be the shape consisting of all boxes in μ but not in λ . The *size* of μ/λ is defined by $|\mu/\lambda| = |\mu| - |\lambda|$. A skew Young diagram is called a *ribbon* if it does not contain any 2×2 square, a *vertical strip* if it does not contain two boxes in the same row, and a *horizontal strip* if it does not contain two boxes in the same column. We say that a skew shape is *connected* if, for any consecutive rows, there exist two cells in the same column. The *height* $ht(\mu/\lambda)$ of a ribbon μ/λ is defined by the number of occupied rows minus the number of connected components. A *tableau* of skew shape μ/λ is a filling of skew diagram μ/λ by integers.

Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The $(k + 1)$ -*residue* of a cell (i, j) is $j - i \bmod (k + 1)$. We define $supp(\mu/\lambda)$ to be the set of $(k + 1)$ -residues of cells in μ/λ . A partition is called a $(k + 1)$ -*core* if it has no cell of hook-length $k + 1$. The set of all $(k + 1)$ -cores is denoted by \mathcal{C}_{k+1} . A partition λ is called k -*bounded* if $\lambda_1 \leq k$. The set of all k -bounded partitions is denoted by \mathcal{P}_k .

Example 3.2. Let $k = 4$, then $\lambda = (4, 2, 1, 1) \in \mathcal{P}_k$, $\kappa = (6, 2, 1, 1) \in \mathcal{C}_{k+1}$. The tableau of $(k + 1)$ -residues of π is marked red in this picture

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
2	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2
3	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1
4	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0
5	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
6	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
7	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2

Here, the numbers on the top and the rightmost are indices of columns and rows, respectively. The set of κ -removable corners is $\{(4, 1), (2, 2), (1, 6)\}$. The set of κ -addable corners is $\{(5, 1), (3, 2), (2, 3), (1, 7)\}$. Let $\pi = (7, 3, 3, 1, 1, 1)$, then π/κ is the ribbon shaped by blue entries, with support $\{0, 1, 4\}$.

4 Bijections

Definitions 4.1. Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. By [LM05], we have bijections

$$\mathcal{P}_k \xrightarrow{\phi} \widetilde{S}_{k+1}^0 \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{C}_{k+1} \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{P}_k, \quad (4)$$

with $p \circ s \circ \phi = \text{id}$. They are described as follows.

1. $\phi : \mathcal{P}_k \rightarrow \widetilde{S}_{k+1}^0$, $\lambda \mapsto w_\lambda$, where $w_\lambda = s_{i_1 \dots i_m}$ with (i_1, \dots, i_m) is obtained by reading the $(k + 1)$ -residue of cells in λ from the bottom row to the top row, and in each row from right to left.

2. $\mathfrak{s} : \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{k+1}, w \mapsto w.\emptyset$, where the action \cdot of \tilde{S}_{k+1} on \mathcal{C}_{k+1} is defined by:
- $s_i.\kappa$ is κ with all κ -addable corners of $(k+1)$ -residue i added if there is at least one κ -addable corner of $(k+1)$ -residue i ,
 - $s_i.\kappa$ is κ with all κ -addable corners of $(k+1)$ -residue i removed if there is at least one κ -removable corner of $(k+1)$ -residue i ,
 - $s_i.\kappa$ is κ if there are no κ -addable or κ -removable corner of $(k+1)$ -residue i ,
3. $\mathfrak{p} : \mathcal{C}_{k+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_k, \kappa \mapsto \lambda$, where λ_i is the number of cells in the i th row of κ which have hook-length not exceed k .

We have $\mathfrak{p}^{-1} = \mathfrak{s} \circ \phi$. We define the k -conjugate of $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_k$ by $\lambda^{(k)} = \mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\lambda)^t)$.

Example 4.2. Let w be $s_{23043210}$ in Example 2.2, and λ, κ be partitions in Example 3.2. The diagram (4) applying to λ is $\lambda \mapsto w \mapsto \kappa \mapsto \lambda$. Indeed, $\lambda \mapsto w$ and $w \mapsto \kappa$ are obtained by reading the green, and red tableaux below, respectively. We have $\lambda^{(k)} = (3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
2	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2
3	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1
4	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0
5	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
6	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
7	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
2	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2
3	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1
4	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0
5	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
6	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
7	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2

5 0-Hecke algebras and nilCoxeter algebras

Definitions 5.1. Let \mathcal{A}_k be the associative algebra over \mathbb{Z} with generators $\{A_0, \dots, A_k\}$ satisfying relations (2), (3) (replace s_i by A_i). It is the group algebra of the affine braid group. The 0-Hecke algebra \mathcal{H}_k is the associative algebra over \mathbb{Z} with generators $\{H_0, \dots, H_k\}$ satisfying relations $H_i^2 = -H_i$ for all i , and (2), (3) (replace s_i by H_i) [Nor79]. The nilCoxeter algebra \mathcal{N}_k is the associative algebra over \mathbb{Z} with generators $\{N_0, \dots, N_k\}$ satisfying relations $N_i^2 = 0$ for all i , and (2), (3) (replace s_i by N_i) [FS94]. Then \mathcal{H}_k and \mathcal{N}_k are quotient algebras of \mathcal{A}_k . Namely,

$$\mathcal{H}_k = \mathcal{A}_k / J_k \text{ and } \mathcal{N}_k = \mathcal{A}_k / I_k,$$

where J_k (resp. I_k) is the two-sided ideal of \mathcal{A}_k generated by all elements $A_i^2 + A_i$ (resp. A_i^2).

An expression of $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_k$ in generators is called a *word* of α . The *weak length* $\tilde{l}(\alpha)$ of α is defined to be the length of its word. Write $A_{i_1 \dots i_m}$ for $A_{i_1} \dots A_{i_m}$. If $u = A_{i_1 \dots i_m}$ is a word of α , we call $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ the *support* of α , and denote $\text{supp}(\alpha)$. For a proper subset S of $[0, k]$, we define the *canonical cyclic interval*

$$I_S : a + 1 < \dots < k < 0 < \dots < a - 1,$$

where a is the smallest integer in $[0, k]$ which is not in S . A word u is called *k-connected* if $\text{supp}(u)$ is a proper subset of $[0, k]$, and also is an interval in $I_{\text{supp}(u)}$. We call $u = A_{i_1 \dots i_m}$ a *weak hook word* if with respect to the order $I_{\text{supp}(u)}$

- (a) $i_1 > \dots > i_j < i_{j+1} < \dots < i_m$, or

(b) $i_1 > \cdots > i_j = i_{j+1} < \cdots < i_m$,

and say *hook type* of u is V for (a), and U for (b). The part with only inequalities $>$ (resp. $<$) is called *left side* (resp. *right side*) of hook form. Replace both $>$, $<$ by $<$, $>$ in (a), (b) give us *anti-weak hook words*. When u is a weak hook word:

- (i) The number of ascents $i_t < i_{t+1}$ of u is denoted by $asc(u)$.
- (ii) With respect to order $I_{supp(u)}$, we consider all letters $a < c$ such that $a \not\equiv c - 1 \pmod{k+1}$ and there is no letter b in u such that $a < b < c$. Let u_{min} be the smallest possible value of c . Then by definition, the number of occurrences of u_{min} in u will be 0, or 1, or 2.
 - (ii.1) If it is 0, then u is k -connected.
 - (ii.2) If it is 1, then u is not k -connected and u_{min} is on only one side of hook form.
 - (ii.3) If it is 2, then u is not k -connected and u_{min} is on both sides of hook form.

We say that u is *k-weak connected* for the cases (ii.1), (ii.3).

Let $X_{i,con,side}^r$ be the set of all weak hook words u in \mathcal{A}_k such that hook type of u is $X \in$

$$\{V, U\}, \tilde{l}(u) = r, asc(u) = i, \text{ connected type of } u \text{ is } con = \begin{cases} c = k\text{-connected,} \\ \bar{c} = \text{not } k\text{-connected,} \\ wc = k\text{-weak connected,} \\ \overline{wc} = \text{not } k\text{-weak connected,} \end{cases}$$

and side of u_{min} in hook form is $side \in \{\text{left, right}\}$. Let $X_{i,con}^r$ be the set of all weak hook words u of hook type X , $\tilde{l}(u) = r$, $asc(u) = i$, connected type con . Let X_i^r be the set of all weak hook words u of hook type X , $\tilde{l}(u) = r$, $asc(u) = i$.

Example 5.2. Let $k = 4$. We have $supp(A_{0424}) = \{0, 2, 4\}$, $I_{\{0,2,4\}} = 2 < 3 < 4 < 0$. So A_{0424} is a weak hook word of type V , with only one ascent $2 < 4$, not k -connected, $(A_{0424})_{min} = 4$ is on both sides of hook form (the left side is $0 > 4 > 2$, the right side is $2 < 4$). Hence $A_{0424} \in V_{1,wc}^4$. Other examples are $A_{2240} \in U_{2,\overline{wc},\text{right}}^4$, $A_{4224} \in U_{1,wc}^4$.

Lemma 5.3. Let $X \in \{U, V\}$. We have

1. X_i^r is the disjoint union of the sets $X_{i,wc}^r$, $X_{i,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^r$, $X_{i,\overline{wc},\text{right}}^r$,
2. there is a bijection between $X_{i,\overline{wc},\text{right}}$ and $X_{i-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}$ that preserves value in \mathcal{A}_k ,
3. $X_{0,\overline{wc},\text{right}}$, $V_{r-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^r$, $U_{r-2,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^r$, X_i^r ($i < 0$) are empty sets.

Proof. 1. Trivial by definition.

2. For each $u \in X_{i,\overline{wc},\text{right}}$, we see that u_{min} commutes with the substring consisting of indices less than $u_{min} - 1$ concerning the order $I_{supp(u)}$. Let $\tau(u)$ be the result after interchanging u_{min} with this substring. Then $\tau(u) \in X_{i-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}$ and $\tau(u) = u$ in \mathcal{A}_k . The invert map of τ is still τ , but from $X_{i-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}$ to $X_{i,\overline{wc},\text{right}}$.

3. Trivial by definition.

□

6 Anti-weak hook words to reduced hook words

Definitions 6.1. Let \mathcal{M} be the monoid consisting of all words in the alphabet $\{a < a+1 < \dots\}$. The *Coxeter-Knuth equivalence* on \mathcal{M} is defined by relations

$$i(i+1)i = (i+1)i(i+1) \text{ for all } i, \quad (5)$$

$$kij = kji \text{ for all } i < k \leq j, |i-j| \geq 2, \quad (6)$$

$$ijk = jik \text{ for all } i \leq k < j, |i-j| \geq 2. \quad (7)$$

Given a tableau P with weakly increasing rows P_1, \dots, P_l and $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$, the *Edelman-Greene insertion* of x_0 into P is defined as follows [EG87, Definition 6.20].

1. For each $i \geq 0$, if there is no entry in P_{i+1} greater than x_i , then insert x_i to the end of P_{i+1} and stop. Otherwise, let x_{i+1} be the first entry in P_{i+1} greater than x_i .
2. We replace x_{i+1} in P_{i+1} by x_i if x_i and $(x_i + 1)$ do not appear together in P_{i+1} .
3. Repeat above steps with x_{i+1} and P_{i+2} . The algorithm terminates when some x_i is added to the end of a row. The result is a new tableau, which we denote $P \xleftarrow{EG} x_0$.

For a word $x = i_1 \dots i_m$ in \mathcal{M} , let $EG(x)$ be the tableau

$$(\emptyset \xleftarrow{EG} i_1) \xleftarrow{EG} \dots \xleftarrow{EG} i_m.$$

For a given tableau P , let $\rho(P)$ be the word obtained by reading the rows of P from bottom to top, and reading from left to right in each row.

Example 6.2. Let \mathcal{M} be the monoid with alphabet $\{1 < 2 < 3 < 4 < 5 < 6\}$. Let $x = 24541$. The process to create $EG(x)$ is

$$\emptyset \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 24 \rightarrow 245 \rightarrow \begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 4 & 5 \\ 5 & & \end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{ccc} 1 & 4 & 5 \\ 2 & & \\ 5 & & \end{array}$$

We have $\rho(EG(x)) = 52145$.

Definitions 6.3. Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Let x be a word with $\text{supp}(x) \subsetneq \mathbb{Z}/(k+1)\mathbb{Z}$, and \mathcal{M}_x be the monoid with alphabet $I_{\text{supp}(x)}$.

Lemma 6.4 (Lemma 6.23, [EG87]). *Consider x as a word in \mathcal{M}_x . If s_x is a reduced, then*

1. x and $\rho(EG(x))$ are Coxeter-Knuth equivalent, $s_x = s_{\rho(EG(x))}$.
2. $EG(x)$ is a row and column strict tableau.

Lemma 6.5. *Let x be a word in \mathcal{M} .*

1. *If one of s_x, H_x, N_x is reduced, then the others are reduced.*
2. *If $s_x = s_y$ and they both are reduced, then $A_x = A_y$, and so $H_x = H_y, N_x = N_y$.*

Proof. 1. If one of s_x, H_x, N_x is not reduced, then some x' of form $\dots jj \dots$ obtained from x by (5), (6), (7). It contradicts the fact that one of s_x, H_x, N_x is reduced.

2. $s_x = s_y$ means x, y are transformed to each other by (5), (6), (7), or (1). When they both are reduced, we do not apply (1).

□

Lemma 6.6. *Let x be an anti-weak hook word in \mathcal{M}_x . There is a reduced hook word $H_{\bar{x}}$ (resp. $N_{\bar{x}}$) such that $H_x = H_{\bar{x}}$ (resp. $N_x = N_{\bar{x}}$), $|\text{left side of } x| = |\text{right side of } \bar{x}|$.*

Proof. We construct $H_{\bar{x}}$ as follows.

1. For each i appearing twice in x , we pick the last letter, interchange with the substring of letters greater than $i + 1$ standing right before i , then replace all ii by i . Let \tilde{x} be the final result. Then \tilde{x} is an anti-weak hook word in \mathcal{M}_x .
2. $H_{\tilde{x}}$ is a reduced word. Then by Lemma 6.5.1, $s_{\tilde{x}}$ is reduced, and then by Lemma 6.4.1, $s_{\tilde{x}} = s_{\rho(EG(\tilde{x}))}$, and so by Lemma 6.5.2, $H_{\tilde{x}} = H_{\rho(EG(\tilde{x}))}$. Lemma 6.4.2 says that $EG(\tilde{x})$ is a row and column strict tableau. Now, more than that, it has form

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} * & * & \dots & * & * \\ \vdots & & & & \\ * & & & & \end{array}$$

because \tilde{x} is an anti-weak hook word. Then $\rho(EG(\tilde{x}))$ is a hook word in \mathcal{M}_x .

3. Set $\bar{x} = \rho(EG(\tilde{x}))$, we can see

$$|\text{left side of } x| = |\text{left side of } \tilde{x}| = |\text{columns of } EG(\tilde{x})| = |\text{right side of } \bar{x}|.$$

$H_{\bar{x}}$ is a word we are looking for. For N_x , we assume it is reduced and skip step 1. \square

Example 6.7. Let $k = 6$, and $x = 2455421$. Then \mathcal{M}_x is the monoid with alphabet $\{1 < 2 < 3 < 4 < 5 < 6\}$. We can see x is an anti-weak hook word in \mathcal{M}_x . The words in the proof of Lemma 6.6 are $\tilde{x} = 24541$, $\bar{x} = 52145$ by Example 6.2. The left side of x is $2 < 4 < 5$ and the right side of \bar{x} is $1 < 4 < 5$.

7 Noncommutative symmetric functions

Definitions 7.1. Fix $0 \leq r \leq k$. Let A be a proper subset of r elements in $\mathbb{Z}/(k+1)\mathbb{Z}$. Set $d_A = A_{i_1 \dots i_r}$ and $i_A = A_{i_r \dots i_1}$, where (i_1, \dots, i_r) is an arrangement of A such that if $i, i+1 \in A$, then $i+1$ occurs before i . We call d_A (resp. i_A) the *cyclically decreasing* (resp. *increasing*) *element* associated to A . The elements do not depend on the choice of (i_1, \dots, i_r) .

Example 7.2. Let $k = 4$, $A = \{0, 2, 4\}$. Then $d_A = A_{042} = A_{024}$, $i_A = A_{240} = A_{420}$.

Definitions 7.3. Denote $\binom{\mathfrak{S}}{r}$ the set of all r -combinations of a set \mathfrak{S} . Following [Lam06], we define the *noncommutative homogenous symmetric functions*

$$h_r = \sum_{A \in \binom{[0, k]}{r}} d_A, \quad (8)$$

the *noncommutative elementary symmetric functions*

$$e_r = \sum_{A \in \binom{[0, k]}{r}} i_A, \quad (9)$$

the *noncommutative hook Schur functions*

$$s_{(r-i, 1^i)} = \sum_{j=0}^i (-1)^j h_{r-i+j} e_{i-j}, \quad (10)$$

and the *noncommutative power sum symmetric functions*

$$p_r = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i s_{(r-i, 1^i)}. \quad (11)$$

We need the following lemmas to get a cancellation-free expression of p_r . First, to simplify formulas, we write \underline{S} for $\sum_{u \in S} u$. Obviously,

$$\underline{S \cup B} = \underline{S} + \underline{B} \text{ if } S \cap B = \emptyset. \quad (12)$$

Lemma 7.4. *For $0 \leq i \leq r \leq k$, we have $h_{r-i}e_i = \underline{V_i^r} + \underline{V_{i-1}^r} + \underline{U_{i-1}^r}$.*

Proof. By (8), (9), we have

$$h_{r-i}e_i = \sum_{A \in \binom{[0, k]}{r-i}, B \in \binom{[0, k]}{i}} d_A i_B.$$

Suppose that $d_A = A_{i_1 \dots i_{r-i}}$, $i_B = A_{i_{r-i+1} \dots i_r}$. Rearranging (i_1, \dots, i_{r-i}) in decreasing order, and (i_{r-i+1}, \dots, i_r) in increasing order with respect to $I_{A \cup B}$ do not change d_A , i_B . So we can assume that $i_1 > \dots > i_{r-i}$ and $i_{r-i+1} < \dots < i_r$ with respect to $I_{A \cup B}$. Set $u = A_{i_1 \dots i_r}$. Then $u \in V_i^r, V_{i-1}^r, U_{i-1}^r$ if i_{r-i} is less, more, equal i_{r-i+1} , respectively. \square

Lemma 7.5. *For $0 \leq i \leq r \leq k$, we have*

$$s_{(r-i, 1^i)} = \underline{V_i^r} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (-1)^j \underline{U_{i-j-1, wc}^r} + \underline{U_{i-1, \overline{wc}, \text{left}}^r} \quad (13)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{(r-i, 1^i)} &= \sum_{j=0}^i (-1)^j h_{r-i+j} e_{i-j} && \text{by (10)} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^i (-1)^j (\underline{V_{i-j}^r} + \underline{V_{i-j-1}^r} + \underline{U_{i-j-1}^r}) && \text{by Lemma 7.4} \\ &= \underline{V_i^r} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (-1)^j \underline{U_{i-j-1}^r} \\ &= \underline{V_i^r} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (-1)^j (\underline{U_{i-j-1, wc}^r} + \underline{U_{i-j-1, \overline{wc}, \text{left}}^r} + \underline{U_{i-j-1, \overline{wc}, \text{right}}^r}) && \text{by (12), Lemma 5.3.1} \\ &= \underline{V_i^r} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (-1)^j \underline{U_{i-j-1, wc}^r} + \underline{U_{i-1, \overline{wc}, \text{left}}^r} + (-1)^{i-1} \underline{U_{0, \overline{wc}, \text{right}}^r} && \text{by Lemma 5.3.2} \\ &= \underline{V_i^r} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (-1)^j \underline{U_{i-j-1, wc}^r} + \underline{U_{i-1, \overline{wc}, \text{left}}^r} && \text{by Lemma 5.3.3.} \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 7.6. *For $1 \leq r \leq k$, we have*

$$p_r = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i \underline{V_{i, wc}^r} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^i (r-i) \underline{U_{i-1, wc}^r} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-2} (-1)^i \underline{U_{i-1, \overline{wc}, \text{left}}^r}. \quad (14)$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
p_r &= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i s_{(r-i, 1^i)} && \text{by (11)} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i (\underline{V_i^r} + \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (-1)^j \underline{U_{i-j-1,wc}^r} + \underline{U_{i-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^r}) && \text{by (13)} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i \underline{V_i^r} + \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (-1)^{i+j} \underline{U_{i-j-1,wc}^r} + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^i \underline{U_{i-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^r}.
\end{aligned}$$

First

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i \underline{V_i^r} &= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i (\underline{V_{i,wc}^r} + \underline{V_{i,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^r} + \underline{V_{i,\overline{wc},\text{right}}^r}) && \text{by (12), Lemma 5.3.1} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i \underline{V_{i,wc}^r} + \underline{V_{0,\overline{wc},\text{right}}^r} + (-1)^{(r-1)} \underline{V_{r-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^r} && \text{by Lemma 5.3.2} \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i \underline{V_{i,wc}^r} && \text{by Lemma 5.3.3.}
\end{aligned}$$

Second

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} (-1)^{i+j} \underline{U_{i-j-1,wc}^r} &= \sum_{t=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^{r-t-1} (-1)^{t+2j} \underline{U_{t-1,wc}^r} && \text{with } t = i - j \\
&= \sum_{t=1}^{r-1} (-1)^t (r-t) \underline{U_{t-1,wc}^r}.
\end{aligned}$$

Third

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^i \underline{U_{i-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^r} = \sum_{i=1}^{r-2} (-1)^i \underline{U_{i-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^r} \quad \text{by Lemma 5.3.3.}$$

So, the lemma is proved. \square

Definitions 7.7. Let φ be a representation of \mathcal{A}_k on $\mathbb{C}[\tilde{S}_{k+1}]$ and set $\alpha *_{\varphi} w = \varphi(\alpha)(w)$. A function $\psi : \mathcal{A}_k \times \tilde{S}_{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be φ -compatible if $\psi(\alpha\beta, w) = \psi(\alpha, \beta *_{\varphi} w) \psi(\beta, w)$. Fix a representation φ and a φ -compatible function ψ , we define $\{\mathcal{F}_w^{(k)}\}_{w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}$ to be a family of symmetric functions such that $\mathcal{F}_{id}^{(k)} = 1$ and

$$h_r \cdot \mathcal{F}_w^{(k)} = \sum_{\substack{A \in \binom{[0,k]}{r} \\ d_A *_{\varphi} w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}} \psi(d_A, w) \mathcal{F}_{d_A *_{\varphi} w}^{(k)}, \quad (15)$$

$$e_r \cdot \mathcal{F}_w^{(k)} = \sum_{\substack{B \in \binom{[0,k]}{r} \\ i_B *_{\varphi} w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}} \psi(i_B, w) \mathcal{F}_{i_B *_{\varphi} w}^{(k)}, \quad (16)$$

for $w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0$, $0 \leq r \leq k$. Via (4), we define $\mathcal{F}_{\lambda}^{(k)} = \mathcal{F}_{w_{\lambda}}^{(k)}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_k$.

8 A generalized Murnaghan-Nakayama rule

Theorem 8.1. *Let φ be a representation of \mathcal{A}_k on $\mathbb{C}[\tilde{S}_{k+1}]$ and let $\{\mathcal{F}_w^{(k)}\}_{w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}$ be the family of symmetric functions whose Pieri rules are defined by φ -compatible function ψ . Furthermore, suppose that $\psi(\alpha, w)$ depends only on $\tilde{l}(\alpha)$, $\alpha *_{\varphi} w$, w , and we can write it as a function $\tilde{\psi}$ on the three variables. Then for $1 \leq r \leq k$ and $w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0$, the product $p_r \cdot \mathcal{F}_w^{(k)}$ is equal to*

$$\sum_{w' \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0} \tilde{\psi}(r, w', w) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i |V_{i,wc}^{r,w'}| + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^i (r-i) |U_{i-1,wc}^{r,w'}| + \sum_{i=1}^{r-2} (-1)^i |U_{i-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^{r,w'}| \right) \mathcal{F}_{w'}^{(k)}, \quad (17)$$

where $X_{i,\text{con},\text{side}}^{r,w'}$ is the subset of all weak hook words u in $X_{i,\text{con},\text{side}}^r$ such that $u *_{\varphi} w = w'$.

Proof. From (10), (11) we have

$$p_r = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^i (-1)^{i+j} h_{r-i+j} e_{i-j} \quad (18)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^i \sum_{\substack{A \in \binom{[0,k]}{r-i+j} \\ B \in \binom{[0,k]}{i-j}}} (-1)^{i+j} d_A i_B. \quad (19)$$

By (15), (16) we have

$$p_r \cdot \mathcal{F}_w^{(k)} = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^i \sum_{\substack{A \in \binom{[0,k]}{r-i+j} \\ d_A *_{\varphi} (i_B *_{\varphi} w) \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}} \sum_{\substack{B \in \binom{[0,k]}{i-j} \\ i_B *_{\varphi} w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}} (-1)^{i+j} \psi(d_A, i_B *_{\varphi} w) \psi(i_B, w) \mathcal{F}_{d_A *_{\varphi} (i_B *_{\varphi} w)}^{(k)} \quad (20)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^i \sum_{\substack{A \in \binom{[0,k]}{r-i+j} \\ B \in \binom{[0,k]}{i-j} \\ (d_A i_B) *_{\varphi} w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}} (-1)^{i+j} \psi(d_A i_B, w) \mathcal{F}_{(d_A i_B) *_{\varphi} w}^{(k)} \quad (21)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^i \sum_{\substack{A \in \binom{[0,k]}{r-i+j} \\ B \in \binom{[0,k]}{i-j} \\ (d_A i_B) *_{\varphi} w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}} (-1)^{i+j} \tilde{\psi}(r, (d_A i_B) *_{\varphi} w, w) \mathcal{F}_{(d_A i_B) *_{\varphi} w}^{(k)}. \quad (22)$$

The identities (19), (22) tell us that if $p_r = \sum_u a_u u$ with $a_u \in \mathbb{C}$, u has form $d_A i_B$, then

$$p_r \cdot \mathcal{F}_w^{(k)} = \sum_{u *_{\varphi} w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0} \tilde{\psi}(r, u *_{\varphi} w, w) a_u \mathcal{F}_{u *_{\varphi} w}^{(k)}. \quad (23)$$

So the conclusion (17) follows directly from (23), Lemma 7.6. \square

9 Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for K - k -Schur functions

Definitions 9.1. We consider *star representation* of \mathcal{A}_k on $\mathbb{C}[\tilde{S}_{k+1}]$ [Tak19, Mor12]

$$\eta(A_i)(w) = A_i * w = \begin{cases} s_i w & \text{if } l(s_i w) > l(w), \\ w & \text{if } l(s_i w) < l(w). \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Define $\psi : \mathcal{A}_k \times \tilde{S}_{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\psi(\alpha, w) = (-1)^{\tilde{l}(\alpha) - l(\alpha * w) + l(w)}$. Then ψ is η -compatible. The family $\{\mathcal{F}_w^{(k)}\}_{w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}$ in this case coincides with the family of K - k -Schur functions $\{g_w^{(k)}\}_{w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}$ [Tak19, Mor12]. Since $\{\eta(A_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/(k+1)\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfy relations $\eta(A_i)^2 = \eta(A_i)$, and (2), (3) (replace s_i by $\eta(A_i)$), η well defines a representation of \mathcal{H}_k on $\mathbb{C}[\tilde{S}_{k+1}]$

$$H_i = A_i J_k \mapsto -\eta(A_i).$$

Theorem 8.1 taken from \mathcal{H}_k gives us the Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for K - k -Schur functions.

Corollary 9.2. For $1 \leq r \leq k$ and $w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0$, the product $p_r \cdot g_w^{(k)}$ is equal to

$$\sum_{w' \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0} (-1)^{r-l(w')+l(w)} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i |V_{i,wc}^{r,w'}| + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^i (r-i) |U_{i-1,wc}^{r,w'}| + \sum_{i=1}^{r-2} (-1)^i |U_{i-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^{r,w'}| \right) g_{w'}^{(k)}. \quad (25)$$

Definitions 9.3. Suppose that the diagram (4) applying to $w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0$ is $w \mapsto \kappa \mapsto \lambda$. To translate Corollary 9.2 to $\{g_\lambda^{(k)}\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_k}$, we need a translation of (24) to $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{C}_{k+1}]$

$$A_i * \kappa = \begin{cases} \kappa \text{ with all } \kappa\text{-addable corners of } (k+1)\text{-residue } i \text{ added if they exist,} \\ \kappa \text{ if there exists } \kappa\text{-removable corners of } (k+1)\text{-residue } i, \\ 0 \text{ otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

and then to $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{P}_k]$

$$A_i * \lambda = \begin{cases} \lambda + e_t \text{ where } t \text{ is the lowest row of } A_i \cdot \kappa / \kappa \text{ if } A_i \cdot \kappa \supsetneq \kappa, \\ \lambda \text{ if } A_i * \kappa = \kappa, \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

The actions seem not to be mentioned precisely in [Tak19, Mor12], but they are simple adaptations of [LM05, Definition 18, Proposition 22] from s_i to A_i , or of [Mor12, Section 4.1] from s_i to A_i . In (26), the second line, we can view the image κ as κ with all κ -removable corners of residue i absorbed. And in (27), the second line, we can view the image λ as λ with the last cell in the row t of λ absorbed.

Remark 9.4. We observe the process u acting on κ , when $u = A_{i_1 \dots i_r}$ is a weak hook word with

$$i_1 > \dots > i_j \leq i_{j+1} < \dots < i_r.$$

Suppose that $u * \kappa \neq 0$, we can see:

Ob1. By (26), if $A_i * \kappa \neq 0$, there must be some κ -addable or κ -removable corners of residue i .

Ob2. When we apply $A_i A_{i+1}$ on κ , if one cell of residue i is added, then it must appear directly below one κ -addable or κ -removable corner of residue $i + 1$.

Ob3. Set $V = A_{i_{j+1} \dots i_r}$, then by Ob2, $V * \kappa / \kappa$ must be a vertical strip.

Ob4. Set $\kappa^V = V * \kappa$. Similar to Ob2, when we apply $A_{j+1} A_j$ on κ^V , if one cell of residue $j + 1$ is added, then it must appear directly to the right of one κ^V -addable or κ^V -removable corner of residue j .

Ob5. Set $H = A_{i_1 \dots i_j}$, then by Ob4, $H * \kappa^V / \kappa^V$ must be a horizontal strip.

Ob6. By Ob3 and Ob5, $u * \kappa / \kappa$ must be a ribbon.

Ob7. By (26), $\text{supp}(u) = \text{supp}(u * \kappa / \kappa) \cup \{\text{residues of some } \kappa\text{-removable corners}\}$.

Remark 9.5. Observe the process u acting on λ , suppose that $u * \lambda \neq 0$, we can see:

ob1. Let $V = V^{(p)} \dots V^{(1)}$ be the factorization of V into maximal segments of consecutive indices. Then for $1 \leq p' \leq p$, the word $V^{(p')}$ adds a connected vertical strip, say $\mathcal{S}^{(p')}$, to $V^{(p'-1)} \dots V^{(1)} * \lambda$. The strips are disjoint from each other. The reason is the same as [BSZ11, Corollary 4.3], with a remark that the last letter of $V^{(p')}$ may add or absorb one cell to $V^{(p'-1)} \dots V^{(1)} * \lambda$. Let $\mathcal{E}^{(p')}$ be the set of cells absorbed to $V^{(p'-1)} \dots V^{(1)} * \lambda$ (at most one cell). Then $|\mathcal{S}^{(p')}| + |\mathcal{E}^{(p')}| = \tilde{l}(V^{(p')})$.

ob2. By ob1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
ht(V * \lambda / \lambda) &= \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset} |\mathcal{S}^{(p')}| - 1, \\
&= \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset} \tilde{l}(V^{(p')}) - |\mathcal{E}^{(p')}| - 1 \\
&= \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset} \tilde{l}(V^{(p')}) - |\mathcal{E}^{(p')}| - 1 + \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} = \emptyset} \tilde{l}(V^{(p')}) - |\mathcal{E}^{(p')}| \\
&= \tilde{l}(V) - \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset} |\mathcal{E}^{(p')}| - \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} = \emptyset} |\mathcal{E}^{(p')}| - \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset} 1 \\
&= \tilde{l}(V) - \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset} |\mathcal{E}^{(p')}| - \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} = \emptyset} 1 - \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset} 1
\end{aligned}$$

because if $\mathcal{S}^{(p')} = \emptyset$, then $|\mathcal{E}^{(p')}| = 1$,

$$= \tilde{l}(V) - p - \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset} |\mathcal{E}^{(p')}|.$$

So

$$ht(V * \lambda / \lambda) \leq \tilde{l}(V) - p. \quad (28)$$

The equality in (28) happens if and only if $\mathcal{E}^{(p')} = \emptyset$ for all p' such that $\mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset$.

ob3. When applying H on $V * \lambda$, the cells absorbed or added to λ form a horizontal strip by Ob5, (27). So, a letter A_i of H increases $ht(V * \lambda / \lambda)$ if and only if A_{i+1} is a first letter of some word $V^{(p')}$. Denote $i^{(p')}$ the first index of $V^{(p')}$, then

$$ht(\mu / \lambda) = ht(V * \lambda / \lambda) + \sum_{p' \text{ s.t. } i^{(p')} - 1 \text{ is an index of } H} 1.$$

So, we have

$$ht(\mu/\lambda) \leq ht(V * \lambda/\lambda) + p \leq \tilde{l}(V). \quad (29)$$

Both inequalities in (29) become equalities if and only if

1. $i^{(p')} - 1$ is an index of H for all p' , and
2. $\mathcal{E}^{(p')} = \emptyset$ for all p' such that $\mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset$.

The first condition implies that the hook type of u must be V . Hence, there are some particular cases we do not have equality in (29)

1. the hook type of u is U , or
2. there is p' such that $i^{(p')} - 1$ is not an index of H , or
3. there is p' such that $\mathcal{S}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset$, $\mathcal{E}^{(p')} \neq \emptyset$.

In particular, we have equality in (29) for a word satisfying conditions

1. it has hook type V , is a k -connected word, and
2. $\mathcal{E}^{(p')} = \emptyset$ for all p' .

ob4. Similar to ob3, we want to think $\tilde{l}(H)$ as height of a skew shape. Let $\overline{H}, \overline{V}$ be H, V after replacing index i by $\bar{i} = k+1-i$, respectively. From a trivial fact that $A_i * \lambda = \mu$ if and only if $A_{\bar{i}} * \lambda^{(k)} = \mu^{(k)}$, we have

$$\overline{H} \overline{V} * \lambda^{(k)} = \mu^{(k)}.$$

We can see that $\overline{H} \overline{V}$ is an anti-weak hook word. Let \bar{u} be the reduced weak hook word constructed from $\overline{H} \overline{V}$ by Lemma 6.6, then \bar{u} equals $\overline{H} \overline{V}$ in \mathcal{H}_k , and

$$\tilde{l}(H) = \tilde{l}(\overline{H}) = \tilde{l}(V') + 1,$$

where V' is the subword of \bar{u} defined as in Ob3. By (29), we have

$$ht(\mu^{(k)}/\lambda^{(k)}) \leq \tilde{l}(V') = \tilde{l}(H) - 1. \quad (30)$$

ob5. By (29), (30), we have $ht(\mu/\lambda) + ht(\mu^{(k)}/\lambda^{(k)}) \leq r - 1$. In particular, we have the equality for a word satisfying conditions

1. it has hook type V , is a k -connected word, and
2. all $\mathcal{E}^{(p')} = \emptyset$, for both parts V of u and V' of \bar{u} .

Corollary 9.6. *For $1 \leq r \leq k$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_k$, the product $p_r \cdot g_\lambda^{(k)}$ is equal to*

$$\sum_{\mu} (-1)^{r-|\mu|+|\lambda|} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i |V_{i,wc}^{r,\mu}| + \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (-1)^i (r-i) |U_{i-1,wc}^{r,\mu}| + \sum_{i=1}^{r-2} (-1)^i |U_{i-1,\overline{wc},\text{left}}^{r,\mu}| \right) g_\mu^{(k)}, \quad (31)$$

where the sum runs over $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_k$ such that

$$(K0) \quad \lambda \subset \mu, \lambda^{(k)} \subset \mu^{(k)},$$

$$(K1) \quad |\mu/\lambda| \leq r,$$

$$(K2) \quad \mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\mu)/\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\lambda) \text{ is a ribbon,}$$

(K3) $\text{supp}(\mathbf{p}^{-1}(\mu)/\mathbf{p}^{-1}(\lambda))$ is k -connected, or $|\text{supp}(\mathbf{p}^{-1}(\mu)/\mathbf{p}^{-1}(\lambda))| < r$,

(K4) $ht(\mu/\lambda) + ht(\mu^{(k)}/\lambda^{(k)}) < r$.

Proof. (K0), (K1) follow directly from (27). (K2) is Ob6. (K3) follows directly from Ob7 and the fact that $\mathbf{p}^{-1}(\mu) = u * \kappa$ where $\kappa = \mathbf{p}^{-1}(\lambda)$, with u taken from the sets in (31). Indeed, by Ob7,


1. If $\text{supp}(\mathbf{p}^{-1}(\mu)/\mathbf{p}^{-1}(\lambda)) \subsetneq \text{supp}(u)$, then its cardinality is less than r .
2. If $\text{supp}(\mathbf{p}^{-1}(\mu)/\mathbf{p}^{-1}(\lambda)) = \text{supp}(u)$, by (31), there are some possibilities:
 - u is k -connected.
 - u is not k -connected, u_{min} is on both side of hook form. Then $|\text{supp}(u)| < r$.
 - u is not k -connected, u_{min} is on only one side of hook form. Then u must have hook type U , and so $|\text{supp}(u)| < r$.

(K4) is ob5. □

Remark 9.7. Suppose that we know $\pi = u * \kappa \neq 0$, we can see:

- Ob1'. By Ob4, let c be a cell in π/κ so that the cell directly on its left-hand still belongs to π/κ and c has residue j , then j must be an index of H .
- Ob2'. Among κ^V -removable corners of residue j , if there exists a cell so that the cell directly below does not belong to π/κ^V , then j can be an index of H . Contrary, if there is no such cell, j can not be an index of H . Indeed, if j is an index of H and there is no such cell, then $j - 1$ must be an index of H and appear before j in H . It contradicts the fact that indices of H are decreasing.
- Ob3'. By Ob3, let c' be a cell in π/κ so that the cell directly below still belong to π/κ and c' has residue $i + 1$, then $i + 1$ must be an index of V .
- Ob4'. Among κ -removable corners of residue i , if there exists a cell so that the cell directly on its right-hand does not belong to κ^V/κ , then i can be an index of V . Contrary, if there is no such cell, i can not be an index of V . Indeed, if i is an index of V and there is no such cell, then $i + 1$ must be an index of V and appear before i in V . It contradicts the fact that indices of V are increasing.

In the picture below, let κ be the white partition bounded by black and green bold lines. Let κ^V be the partition bounded by green bold lines. Let π be the biggest partition. The cells in Ob1', Ob2', Ob3', Ob4' are marked 1' (yellow), 2' (green), 3' (green), 4', respectively.



Definitions 9.8. For λ, μ satisfying the conditions in Corollary 9.6, we give a way to find the sets which contribute to (31). It is based on Remark 9.7. Namely, set $\kappa = \mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\lambda)$ and $\pi = \mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\mu)$, we construct a set $K_{\lambda, \mu}^r$ as follows.

Kk1. Let `pre.must.down.cell` be the set of all cells $(i, j) \in \pi/\kappa$ such that $(i, j-1) \in \pi/\kappa$. The set of all $(k+1)$ -residues of the cells in `pre.must.down.cell` is denoted by `must.down.residue`. Let `must.down.cell` be the set of cells in

$$\pi/(d_{\text{must.down.residue}})^{-1} * \pi.$$

Kk2. Let `pre.must.up.cell` be the set of all cells $(i, j) \in \pi/\kappa$ such that $(i+1, j) \in \pi/\kappa$. The set of all $(k+1)$ -residues of the cells in `pre.must.up.cell` is denoted by `must.up.residue`. Let `must.up.cell` be the set of cells in

$$i_{\text{must.up.residue}} * \kappa/\kappa.$$

Kk3. Let `up.or.down.residue` be the set of all $(k+1)$ -residues of the cells in

$$(d_{\text{must.down.residue}})^{-1} * \pi/i_{\text{must.up.residue}} * \kappa.$$

Let `up.choice` be a subset of `up.or.down.residue`. For each `up.choice`, set

$$\mathcal{V} = \text{must.up.residue} \cup \text{up.choice}.$$

Kk3'. For each \mathcal{V} in step Kk3, let `absorb.cell.up` be the set of all κ -removable corners (i, j) such that $(i, j+1) \notin i_{\mathcal{V}} * \kappa/\kappa$. Set `absorb.residue.up` to be the set of all residues of the cells in `absorb.cell.up`. For each subset `absorb.up.choice` of `absorb.residue.up` such that

$$|\text{absorb.up.choice}| + |\text{supp}(\pi/\kappa)| \leq r, \quad (32)$$

set $V = i_{(\mathcal{V} \cup \text{absorb.up.choice})}$.

Kk4. We have $V * \kappa = i_{\mathcal{V}} * \kappa$. It does not depend on the choice of `absorb.up.choice` in step Kk3'.

Kk5. For each V in step Kk3', let \mathcal{H} be $\text{supp}(\pi/V * \kappa)$. It is exactly the union of `must.down.residue` with the complement of `up.choice` in `up.or.down.residue`.

Kk5'. For each V in step Kk3', let `absorb.cell.down` be the set of all $V * \kappa$ -removable corners (i, j) such that $(i+1, j) \notin \pi/V * \kappa$. Set `absorb.residue.down` to be the set of all residues of the cells in `absorb.cell.down`. For each subset `absorb.down.choice` of `absorb.residue.down` such that

$$|\text{absorb.down.choice}| + |\mathcal{H}| + |\mathcal{V}| + |\text{absorb.up.choice}| = r, \quad (33)$$

set $H = d_{(\mathcal{H} \cup \text{absorb.down.choice})}$.

Kk6. For each H in step Kk5', set $u = HV$, rearrange indices of H in decreasing order, of V in increasing order with respect to $I_{\text{supp}(u)}$ and then add it to $K_{\lambda, \mu}^r$. This process does not change the value of u in \mathcal{A}_k , but rewrites it as a weak hook word. Indeed,

– HV is not a weak hook word in general because $I_{\text{supp}(H)} \neq I_{\text{supp}(V)}$.

- The value of V is not changed in \mathcal{A}_k . The reason is as follows. We have

$$\text{supp}(V) \subset \text{supp}(u) \subset \text{supp}(I_{\text{supp}(u)}).$$

Let $a, b \in \text{supp}(V)$, then $a, b \in \text{supp}(I_{\text{supp}(u)})$. We have

1. if $b = a + 1 \pmod{k+1}$, then $a < b$ in $I_{\text{supp}(V)}$ implies $a < b$ in $I_{\text{supp}(u)}$,
2. if $b \neq a + 1 \pmod{k+1}$, then $a < b$ in $I_{\text{supp}(V)}$ does not imply $a < b$ in $I_{\text{supp}(u)}$. However, we still have $A_{ab} = A_{ba}$ by (3).

In Kk3', we see that the indices of V are increasing with respect to $I_{\text{supp}(V)}$. Let $V^{(p)} \dots V^{(1)}$ be the factorization of V into maximal segments of consecutive indices in $I_{\text{supp}(V)}$. By points 1. and 2., the rearrangement on V with respect to $I_{\text{supp}(u)}$ preserves segments $V^{(i)}$ ($1 \leq i \leq p$), but permutes $(V^{(p)}, \dots, V^{(1)})$. If $a, b \in \text{supp}(V)$ are in two different segments, by definition of $V^{(i)}$, we know that $b \neq a \pm 1 \pmod{k+1}$. By point 2., the value of $V = V^{(p)} \dots V^{(1)}$ is unchanged by any permutation on $(V^{(p)}, \dots, V^{(1)})$. So it is preserved after the rearrangement of V in increasing order with respect to $I_{\text{supp}(u)}$.

- The value of H is not changed in \mathcal{A}_k by similar arguments above.

Example 9.9. Let $k = 4, r = 4, \lambda = (4, 2, 1, 1), \mu = (4, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1)$. Then $\kappa = (6, 2, 1, 1), \pi = (7, 3, 3, 1, 1, 1)$. We can identify $\kappa, \pi/\kappa$ with the red, and blue tableaux below.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
2	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2
3	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1
4	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0
5	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
6	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3
7	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2

Kk1. pre.must.down.cell = $\{(3, 3)\}$, must.down.residue = $\{0\}$, must.down.cell = $\{(6, 1), (3, 3)\}$.

Kk2. pre.must.up.cell = $\{(5, 1), (2, 3)\}$, must.up.residue = $\{1\}$, must.up.cell = $\{(5, 1), (2, 3), (1, 7)\}$.

Kk3. up.or.down.residue = $\{4\}$, up.choice $\in \{\emptyset, \{4\}\}$. We have

1. if up.choice = \emptyset then $\mathcal{V} = \{1\}$,
2. if up.choice = $\{4\}$ then $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 4\}$.

Kk3'. Suppose that in step Kk3 we have up.choice = $\{4\}$, $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 4\}$, then absorb.cell.up = $\{(4, 1)\}$, absorb.residue.up = $\{2\}$. So absorb.up.choice $\in \{\emptyset, \{2\}\}$. Both of them satisfy the inequality (32). Now

1. if absorb.up.choice = \emptyset then $V = A_{14}$,
2. if absorb.up.choice = $\{2\}$ then $V = A_{124}$.

Kk4. For each V in step Kk3', we have $V * \kappa = (7, 3, 2, 1, 1)$.

Kk5. For each V in step Kk3', we have $\mathcal{H} = \{0\}$.

Kk5'. For each V in step Kk3', we have absorb.cell.down = $\{(3, 2), (1, 7)\}$, absorb.residue.down = $\{4, 1\}$. So absorb.down.choice $\in \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{4\}, \{1, 4\}\}$. To satisfy the equality (33),

1. if $\text{absorb.up.choice} = \emptyset$ then $\text{absord.down.choice} = \{1\}$ or $\{4\}$,
2. if $\text{absorb.up.choice} = \{2\}$ then $\text{absord.down.choice} = \emptyset$.

In the first case, $H = A_{10}$ or A_{04} , respectively. In the second case, $H = A_0$.

Kk6. The words HV created in steps Kk3'–Kk5' are $A_{1014}, A_{0414}, A_{0124}$. Similarly, if in step Kk3, $\text{up.choice} = \emptyset$, we create words A_{1041}, A_{0412} . Rewrite those words to weak hook form, we get $K_{\lambda, \mu}^r = \{A_{1041}, A_{0441}, A_{0412}\}$.

Proposition 9.10. $K_{\lambda, \mu}^r = \{u \in \mathcal{A}_k \text{ such that } u \text{ is a weak hook word, } \tilde{l}(u) = r, u * \lambda = \mu\}$.

Proof. Let $u = A_{i_1 \dots i_r}$ be a weak hook word in \mathcal{A}_k of weak length $\tilde{l}(u) = r$, with

$$i_1 > \dots > i_j \leq i_{j+1} < \dots < i_r.$$

Let $H = A_{i_1 \dots i_j}$ and $V = A_{i_{j+1} \dots i_r}$. Set $\kappa = \mathbf{p}^{-1}(\lambda)$, $\pi = \mathbf{p}^{-1}(\mu)$. By Definitions 4.1, $u * \lambda = \mu$ if and only if $u * \kappa = \pi$. After Remark 9.7, the indices of H, V will be classified into five cases below, and they are collected in the steps Kk1–Kk6 in the Definition 9.8 of $K_{\lambda, \mu}^r$:

- (H1) The residues mentioned in Ob1' must be indices of H . They must be added to $V * \kappa$.
- (H2) The residues mentioned in Ob2' can be indices of H . If they are indices of H , then they must be absorbed to $V * \kappa$.
- (V1) The residues mentioned in Ob3' must be indices of V . They must be added to κ .
- (V2) The residues mentioned in Ob4' can be indices of V . If they are indices of V , then they must be absorbed to κ .
- (HV) The residues that were not mentioned in Ob1'–Ob4' can be indices of H or V . One element must be added to κ as an index of V , or added to $V * \kappa$ as an index of H . In the picture of Remark 9.7, the cells that were not mentioned in Ob1'–Ob4' are unmarked cells of π/κ .

Now we see (the numbering below corresponds to the numbering in Definition 9.8):

1. The indices in case (H1) are collected in step Kk1 as **must.down.residue**. The name of the set **must.down.residue** says the meaning “must be an index of H ”.
2. The indices in case (V1) are collected in step Kk2 as **must.up.residue**. The name of the set **must.up.residue** says the meaning “must be an index of V ”.
3. The indices in case (HV) are collected in step Kk3. Indeed, the $(k+1)$ -residues of cells in

$$(d_{\text{must.down.residue}})^{-1} * \pi / i_{\text{must.up.residue}} * \kappa$$

can be indices of H or V . We collect them in a set called **up.or.down.residue**. Here, **down** means “an index of H ”, **up** means “an index of V ”. When we choose a subset **up.choice** of **up.or.down.residue** and combine it with the set **must.up.residue**, we get a set \mathcal{V} of all indices of V that will be added to κ .

- 3'. So after step Kk3, the indices in case (V2) are collected in step Kk3'.
4. We have $i_{\mathcal{V}} * \kappa = V * \kappa$.

5. After step Kk3, the set of indices of H added to $V * \kappa$ in cases (H1), (HV) is $\mathcal{H} = \text{supp}(\pi/V * \kappa)$.
- 5'. So after step Kk3', the indices in case (H2) are collected in step Kk5'. The condition $\tilde{l}(u) = r$ is guaranteed by (32), (33).
6. The condition u is a weak hook word is handled in step Kk6 because the indices of H , V are arranged in decreasing, increasing order with respect to $I_{\text{supp}(u)}$, respectively.

□

Example 9.11. In Example 9.9, we have $A_{1041} \in V_{1,wc}^{r,\mu}$, $A_{0441} \in U_{1,wc}^{r,\mu}$, $A_{0412} \in V_{2,wc}^{r,\mu}$. By Proposition 9.10, (31), the coefficient of $g_{(4,2,2,1,1,1)}^{(4)}$ in $p_4 \cdot g_{(4,2,1,1)}^{(4)}$ is -2 .

10 Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for k -Schur functions

Definitions 10.1. We consider *dot representation* of \mathcal{A}_k on $\mathbb{C}[\tilde{S}_{k+1}]$ [Lam06]

$$\zeta(A_i)(w) = A_i \cdot w = \begin{cases} s_i w & \text{if } l(s_i w) > l(w), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

Define $\psi : \mathcal{A}_k \times \tilde{S}_{k+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\psi(\alpha, w) = 1$. Then ψ is ζ -compatible. The family $\{\mathcal{F}_w^{(k)}\}_{w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}$ in this case coincides with the family of k -Schur functions $\{s_w^{(k)}\}_{w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0}$ [LM07, Lam06]. Since $\{\zeta(A_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{Z}/(k+1)\mathbb{Z}}$ satisfy relations $\zeta(A_i)^2 = 0$, and (2), (3) (replace s_i by $\zeta(A_i)$), ζ well defines a representation of \mathcal{N}_k on $\mathbb{C}[\tilde{S}_{k+1}]$

$$N_i = A_i I_k \mapsto \zeta(A_i).$$

Theorem 8.1 taken from \mathcal{N}_k gives us the Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for k -Schur functions. Furthermore, by identity $N_i^2 = 0$, the sets in (17) will be simplified. Namely,

1. the sets of type U become empty sets,
2. the sets $V_{i,wc}^{r,w'}$ become $V_{i,c}^{r,w'}$. Indeed, let τ be the map in the proof of Lemma 5.3.2. For each u satisfying condition (ii.3), we have $u = \tau(u) = 0$ in \mathcal{N}_k .

We have proved the following result.

Corollary 10.2 (Theorem 3.1, [BSZ11]). *For $1 \leq r \leq k$ and $w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0$, we have*

$$p_r \cdot s_w^{(k)} = \sum_{w' \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i |V_{i,c}^{r,w'}| \right) s_{w'}^{(k)}. \quad (35)$$

Definitions 10.3. Suppose that the diagram (4) applying to $w \in \tilde{S}_{k+1}^0$ is $w \mapsto \kappa \mapsto \lambda$. To translate Corollary 10.2 to $\{s_\lambda^{(k)}\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_k}$, we need a translation of (34) to $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{C}_{k+1}]$

$$A_i \cdot \kappa = \begin{cases} \kappa \text{ with all } \kappa\text{-addable corners of } (k+1)\text{-residue } i \text{ added if they exist,} \\ 0 \text{ otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

and then to $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{P}_k]$

$$A_i \cdot \lambda = \begin{cases} \lambda + e_t \text{ where } t \text{ is the lowest row of } N_i \cdot \kappa / \kappa \text{ if } N_i \cdot \kappa \supsetneq \kappa, \\ 0 \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

The actions were mentioned in [BSZ11, Lam06], and they are simple adaptations of [LM05, Definition 18, Proposition 22] from s_i to A_i . We see that (36), (37) are (26), (27) without considering κ -removable corners, respectively. Hence, observations in Remarks 9.4, 9.7 for $u * \kappa$ are automatically transferred to $u.\kappa$ without considering κ -removable corners. And observations in Remark 9.5 for $u * \lambda$ are automatically transferred to $u.\lambda$ with all $\mathcal{E}^{(p')} = \emptyset$. Remember that the words u we are considering are k -connected, and have hook type V . It immediately leads to the following results. The equivalence to [BSZ11, Theorem 1.2] will be explained in Remark 10.7.

Corollary 10.4 (Theorem 1.2, [BSZ11]). *For $1 \leq r \leq k$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_k$, we have*

$$p_{r \cdot s_\lambda^{(k)}} = \sum_{\mu} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i |V_{i,c}^{r,\mu}| \right) s_\mu^{(k)}, \quad (38)$$

where the sum runs over $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_k$ such that

- (k0) $\lambda \subset \mu$, $\lambda^{(k)} \subset \mu^{(k)}$,
- (k1) $|\mu/\lambda| = r$,
- (k2) $\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\mu)/\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\lambda)$ is a ribbon,
- (k3) $\text{supp}(\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\mu)/\mathfrak{p}^{-1}(\lambda))$ is k -connected,
- (k4) $ht(\mu/\lambda) + ht(\mu^{(k)}/\lambda^{(k)}) = r - 1$.

Definitions 10.5. For λ, μ satisfying the conditions in Corollary 10.4, we give a way to find the sets which contribute to (38). Namely, let $k_{\lambda,\mu}^r$ be a set constructed by the same steps in Definition 9.8 for $K_{\lambda,\mu}^r$ with `absorb.up.choice` in step Kk3' and `absorb.down.choice` in step Kk5' are empty sets. In particular, $k_{\lambda,\mu}^r \subset K_{\lambda,\mu}^r$. Because of (33), $k_{\lambda,\mu}^r \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $k_{\lambda,\mu}^r = K_{\lambda,\mu}^r$.

Proposition 10.6. $k_{\lambda,\mu}^r = \{u \in \mathcal{A}_k \text{ such that } u \text{ is a weak hook word, } \tilde{l}(u) = r, u.\lambda = \mu\}$.

Remark 10.7. When $k_{\lambda,\mu}^r$ is nonempty, we have $|k_{\lambda,\mu}^r| = 1$ (see [BSZ11, Lemma 4.1(2)]). Suppose that it contains u , then $ht(\mu/\lambda) = \tilde{l}(V) = \text{asc}(u)$ by (29). The coefficient of $s_\mu^{(k)}$ in (38) is

$$\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (-1)^i |V_{i,c}^{r,\mu}| = (-1)^{ht(\mu/\lambda)} + \sum_{i \neq ht(\mu/\lambda)} (-1)^i |V_{i,c}^{r,\mu}| = (-1)^{ht(\mu/\lambda)}.$$

This explains why Corollary 10.4 is equivalent to [BSZ11, Theorem 1.2].

Example 10.8. With set up in Example 9.9, we have $k_{\lambda,\mu}^r = \emptyset$. This fits the fact that μ does not satisfy condition (k4). If we choose $\mu = (4, 2, 2, 2, 2)$, then $k_{\lambda,\mu}^r = \{A_{2134}\}$. Since $A_{2134} \in V_{2,c}^{r,\mu}$, then by (38), the coefficient of $s_{(4,2,2,2,2)}^{(4)}$ in $p_4 \cdot s_{(4,2,1,1)}^{(4)}$ is 1.

References

- [BMS22] Jonah Blasiak, Jennifer Morse, and George H Seelinger. K-theoretic Catalan functions. *Advances in Mathematics*, 404:108421, 2022.

- [BSZ11] Jason Bandlow, Anne Schilling, and Mike Zabrocki. The Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for k -Schur functions. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 118(5):1588–1607, 2011.
- [EG87] Paul Edelman and Curtis Greene. Balanced tableaux. *Advances in Mathematics*, 63(1):42–99, 1987.
- [FG98] Sergey Fomin and Curtis Greene. Noncommutative Schur functions and their applications. *Discrete Mathematics*, 193(1-3):179–200, 1998.
- [FS94] Sergey Fomin and Richard Stanley. Schubert polynomials and the nilCoxeter algebra. *Advances in Mathematics*, 103(2):196–207, 1994.
- [Hal95] Tom Halverson. A q -rational Murnaghan-Nakayama rule. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 71(1):1–18, 1995.
- [HR98] Tom Halverson and Arun Ram. Murnaghan-Nakayama rules for characters of Iwahori-Hecke algebras of the complex reflection groups $G(r, p, n)$. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 50(1):167–192, 1998.
- [IIM20] Takeshi Ikeda, Shinsuke Iwao, and Toshiaki Maeno. Peterson isomorphism in K-theory and relativistic Toda lattice. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2020(19):6421–6462, 2020.
- [IIN22] Takeshi Ikeda, Shinsuke Iwao, and Satoshi Naito. Closed k -Schur Catalan functions as K-homology Schubert representatives of the affine Grassmannian. *preprint arXiv:2203.14483*, 2022.
- [KHST23] Nguyen Duc Khanh, Dang Tuan Hiep, Tran Ha Son, and Do Le Hai Thuy. A Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for Grothendieck polynomials of Grassmannian type. *Annals of Combinatorics*, to appear, 2023.
- [Kon12] Matjaž Konvalinka. Skew quantum Murnaghan-Nakayama rule. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 35(4):519–545, 2012.
- [Lam06] Thomas Lam. Affine Stanley symmetric functions. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 128(6):1553–1586, 2006.
- [Lam08] Thomas Lam. Schubert polynomials for the affine Grassmannian. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 21(1):259–281, 2008.
- [LLM03] Luc Lapointe, Alain Lascoux, and Jennifer Morse. Tableau atoms and a new Macdonald positivity conjecture. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 116(1):103–146, 2003.
- [LM05] Luc Lapointe and Jennifer Morse. Tableaux on $k + 1$ -cores, reduced words for affine permutations, and k -Schur expansions. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 112(1):44–81, 2005.
- [LM07] Luc Lapointe and Jennifer Morse. A k -tableau characterization of k -Schur functions. *Advances in mathematics*, 213(1):183–204, 2007.
- [LM16] Frank Lübeck and Gunter Malle. A Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for values of unipotent characters in classical groups. *Representation Theory of the American Mathematical Society*, 20(6):139–161, 2016.

- [LR34] Dudley Ernest Littlewood and Archibald Read Richardson. Group characters and algebra. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character*, 233(721-730):99–141, 1934.
- [LS10] Thomas Lam and Mark Shimozono. Quantum cohomology of G/P and homology of affine Grassmannian. *Acta mathematica*, 204(1):49–90, 2010.
- [LSS10] Thomas Lam, Anne Schilling, and Mark Shimozono. K-theory Schubert Calculus of the affine Grassmannian. *Compositio Mathematica*, 146(4):811–852, 2010.
- [Mac98] Ian Grant Macdonald. *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*. Oxford university press, 1998.
- [Man01] Laurent Manivel. *Symmetric functions, Schubert polynomials and degeneracy loci*, volume 6 of *SMF/AMS Texts and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2001. Translated from the 1998 French original by John R. Swallow, Cours Spécialisés [Specialized Courses], 3.
- [Mor12] Jennifer Morse. Combinatorics of the K-theory of affine Grassmannians. *Advances in Mathematics*, 229(5):2950–2984, 2012.
- [MS18] Andrew Morrison and Frank Sottile. Two Murnaghan-Nakayama rules in Schubert Calculus. *Annals of Combinatorics*, 22(2):363–375, 2018.
- [Mur37] Francis Murnaghan. The characters of the symmetric group. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 59(4):739–753, 1937.
- [Nak40a] Tadasi Nakayama. On some modular properties of irreducible representations of a symmetric group, I. In *Japanese journal of mathematics: transactions and abstracts*, volume 17, pages 165–184. The Mathematical Society of Japan, 1940.
- [Nak40b] Tadasi Nakayama. On some modular properties of irreducible representations of symmetric groups, II. In *Japanese journal of mathematics: transactions and abstracts*, volume 17, pages 411–423. The Mathematical Society of Japan, 1940.
- [Nor79] PN Norton. 0-Hecke algebras. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 27(3):337–357, 1979.
- [Pet97] Dale Peterson. Quantum cohomology of G/P . Lecture notes at MIT, 1997.
- [Ros14] Dustin Ross. The loop Murnaghan-Nakayama rule. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 39(1):3–15, 2014.
- [Tak19] Motoki Takigiku. A Pieri formula and a factorization formula for sums of K-theoretic k -Schur functions. *Algebraic Combinatorics*, 2(4):447–480, 2019.
- [Tew16] Vasu Tewari. A Murnaghan-Nakayama rule for noncommutative Schur functions. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 58:118–143, 2016.

Institut für Algebra und Geometrie, Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Germany.
 E-mail: khanh.mathematic@gmail.com