

# QUASISYMMETRIC SCHUR $Q$ -FUNCTIONS AND PEAK YOUNG QUASISYMMETRIC SCHUR FUNCTIONS

SEUNG-IL CHOI, SUN-YOUNG NAM, AND YOUNG-TAK OH

**ABSTRACT.** In this paper, we explore the relationship between quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -functions and peak Young quasisymmetric Schur functions. We introduce a bijection on  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  such that  $\{w_c(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\}$  and  $\{w_r(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\}$  share identical descent distributions. Here,  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  is the set of standard peak immaculate tableaux of shape  $\alpha$ , and  $w_c$  and  $w_r$  denote column reading and row reading, respectively. By combining this equidistribution with the algorithm developed by Allen, Hallam, and Mason, we demonstrate that the transition matrix from the basis of quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -functions to the basis of peak Young quasisymmetric Schur functions is upper triangular, with entries being non-negative integers. Furthermore, we provide explicit descriptions of the expansion of peak Young quasisymmetric Schur functions in specific cases, in terms of quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -functions. We also investigate the combinatorial properties of standard peak immaculate tableaux, standard Young composition tableaux, and standard peak Young composition tableaux. We provide a hook length formula for  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  and show that standard Young composition tableaux and standard peak Young composition tableaux can be bijectively mapped to specific words in a familiar form. Especially, cases of compositions with rectangular shape are examined in detail.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Preliminaries	5
2.1. Compositions and peak compositions	5
2.2. The ring of quasisymmetric functions and its bases	6
2.3. Stembridge's peak ring and its bases	8
3. An equidistribution arising from $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$	11
3.1. A combinatorial bijection on $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ preserving its descent	11
3.2. A representation-theoretical interpretation of Theorem 3.14	23
4. Transition matrices for $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha\}$ and $\{\tilde{S}_\alpha\}$	31
4.1. The transition matrix from $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha\}$ to $\{\tilde{S}_\alpha\}$	31
4.2. The expansion of $\tilde{S}_\alpha$ in the basis $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha\}$ in special cases	35

*Date:* May 10, 2024.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20C08, 05E05, 05E10.

*Key words and phrases.* Quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -function, Peak Young quasisymmetric function, 0-Hecke algebra, Weak Bruhat order, Fuss–Catalan number.

5. Combinatorial properties of $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ and $\text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$	41
5.1. A hook length formula for $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$	41
5.2. Word models for $\text{SYCTs}$ and $\text{SPYCTs}$	42
5.3. Other bijections	45
References	49

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Quasisymmetric Schur functions and dual immaculate quasisymmetric functions emerged in the early 2010s as significant quasi-analogues of Schur functions. Specifically, quasisymmetric Schur functions were introduced by Haglund, Luoto, Mason, and van Willigenburg [17] as specializations of integral form nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials obtained by setting  $q = t = 0$  in the combinatorial formula described in [26] and summing the resulting Demazure atoms over all weak compositions that collapse to the same strong composition. On the other hand, dual immaculate quasisymmetric functions were introduced by Berg, Bergeron, Saliola, Serrano, and Zabrocki [2] as the quasisymmetric duals of the corresponding immaculate noncommutative symmetric functions. These functions respectively form a basis for the ring  $\mathbf{QSym}$  of quasisymmetric functions and possess many properties similar to those of Schur functions (for instance, see [18, 7, 24] and [8, 6, 4]). They have also been extensively investigated within the framework of 0-Hecke algebras (see [35, 3, 36, 12, 14, 15]).

At the end of the 2010s, it was demonstrated that dual immaculate quasisymmetric functions have a closer relationship with Young quasisymmetric Schur functions than with quasisymmetric Schur functions. Young quasisymmetric Schur functions were introduced by Luoto, Mykytiuk, and van Willigenburg in [24] as a variant of quasisymmetric Schur functions (for the precise definition, see Section 2.2). For a composition  $\alpha$ , let  $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^*$  and  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha$  denote the dual immaculate quasisymmetric function and the Young quasisymmetric Schur function associated with  $\alpha$ . Allen, Hallam, and Mason [1] showed that

$$(1.1) \quad \mathfrak{S}_\alpha^* = \sum_{\beta} c_{\alpha,\beta} \hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\beta,$$

where  $c_{\alpha,\beta}$  counts the number of dual immaculate recording tableaux of shape  $\beta$  with row strip shape  $\alpha^r$ , and the transition matrix from the basis  $\{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^*\}$  to  $\{\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha\}$  is unitriangular. For more details, refer to Section 4.1.

Let us recall the  $F$ -expansions of  $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^*$  and  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha$ , which play a fundamental role throughout this paper. It was shown in [2, Proposition 3.48] that  $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^* = \sum_T F_{\text{comp}(\text{Des}(w_r(T)))}$ , where the summation is over the set of standard immaculate tableaux of shape  $\alpha$ ,  $w_r(T)$  is the word obtained by reading the entries from left to right, starting from the uppermost row of  $T$ , and  $F_\gamma$  is the *fundamental quasisymmetric function* associated with  $\gamma$ . Similarly, by combining [24, Proposition 5.2.2] with [30, Lemma 5.3], one derives that

$\hat{S}_\alpha = \sum_T F_{\text{comp}(\text{Des}(w_Y(T)))}$ , where the summation is over the set of standard Young composition tableaux of shape  $\alpha$  and  $w_Y(T)$  is the word obtained from  $T$  by reading its entries from top to bottom in the first column, and then bottom to top in subsequent columns, reading the columns in order from left to right.

Now, we introduce the main subjects of this paper. Jing and Li [19] introduced *quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -functions* by dualizing noncommutative lifts of Schur  $Q$ -functions. Meanwhile, Searles [30] introduced *peak Young quasisymmetric Schur functions* as the images of certain 0-Hecke–Clifford modules under the peak quasisymmetric characteristic. For a peak composition  $\alpha$ , let  $\tilde{Q}_\alpha$  denote the quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -function and  $\tilde{S}_\alpha$  denote the peak Young quasisymmetric Schur function  $\tilde{S}_\alpha$  associated with  $\alpha$ . The  $K$ -expansions of  $\tilde{Q}_\alpha$  and  $\tilde{S}_\alpha$  are given in [21, Theorem 3.9] and [30, Theorem 5.9], respectively. To be more precise,

$$(1.2) \quad \tilde{Q}_\alpha = \sum_{T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_c(T))))} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{S}_\alpha = \sum_{T \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_Y(T))))},$$

where  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  is the set of standard peak immaculate tableaux of shape  $\alpha$ ,  $\text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$  is the set of standard peak Young composition tableaux of shape  $\alpha$ ,  $w_c(T)$  is the word obtained by reading the entries from bottom to top, starting from the leftmost column of  $T$ , and  $K_\gamma$  is the *peak quasisymmetric function* associated with the peak composition  $\gamma$ . By comparing these expansions with the  $F$ -expansions of  $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^*$  and  $\hat{S}_\alpha$ , we can regard  $\tilde{Q}_\alpha$  and  $\tilde{S}_\alpha$  as natural peak analogues of  $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^*$  and  $\hat{S}_\alpha$ . However, it should be noted that in the right-hand side of the first equality in (1.2), the column reading word  $w_c(T)$  is used instead of the row reading word  $w_r(T)$ .

In this paper, we examine the relationship between quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -functions and peak Young quasisymmetric Schur functions by studying their combinatorial models.

Given a positive integer  $n$ , the classification of subsets of  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  up to descent-preserving isomorphism is known to be a highly challenging problem (for instance, see [31, 27, 22]). In Section 3.1, we introduce a function  $\Xi_\alpha : \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ , which is constructed using an algorithm operating on  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . We confirm the well-definedness of this function and demonstrate that it satisfies the equality:

$$\text{Des}(w_c(T)) = \text{Des}(w_r(\Xi_\alpha(T))) \quad \text{for all } T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$$

(Theorem 3.7). Furthermore, we establish the bijectivity of this function (Theorem 3.14). Consequently, we conclude that  $\{w_c(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\}$  and  $\{w_r(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\}$  share the same descent distribution (Corollary 3.16). From this equidistribution, we obtain the equality:

$$(1.3) \quad \tilde{Q}_\alpha = \sum_{T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_r(T))))}.$$

It is worth noting that the algorithm by Allen, Hallam, and Mason [1] is designed for row-reading words. Thanks to this equality, in Section 4.1, we can utilize their algorithm. In Section 3.2, we investigate two 0-Hecke modules  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$  satisfying that

$$\text{ch}(\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c) = \sum_{\sigma \in \{w_c(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\}} F_{\text{comp}(\text{Des}(\sigma))} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ch}(\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r) = \sum_{\sigma \in \{w_r(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\}} F_{\text{comp}(\text{Des}(\sigma))},$$

where  $\text{ch}$  is the quasisymmetric characteristic (see (3.6)). The equidistribution mentioned above indicates that these two modules share the same image under the quasisymmetric characteristic. We demonstrate that if  $\alpha$  has at most one part greater than 2, then  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c = \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$  as 0-Hecke modules, and if  $\alpha$  has more than one part greater than 2, then  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c \not\cong \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$  as 0-Hecke modules. Furthermore, we show that when  $\alpha$  has at most one part greater than 2, both  $\{w_c(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\}$  and  $\{w_r(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\}$  are left weak Bruhat intervals, and there exists a descent-preserving colored digraph between them (Theorem 3.20).

In Section 4.1, we resolve the problem proposed by Searles [30, Section 8] by combining (1.3) with the algorithm developed by Allen, Hallam, and Mason. To be more precise, we prove that for a peak composition  $\alpha$  of  $n$ ,

$$\tilde{Q}_\alpha = \sum_{\beta} c_{\alpha, \beta} \tilde{S}_\beta$$

where the coefficients  $c_{\alpha, \beta}$  are given in (1.1) (Theorem 4.5). From this expansion, we can derive that the transition matrix from  $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha\}$  to  $\{\tilde{S}_\alpha\}$  is upper triangular, composed of nonnegative integer entries. This result can be viewed as a peak version of [1, Theorem 1.1]. On the other hand, the expansion of a peak Young quasisymmetric Schur function in terms of quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -functions has not been well understood until now. In Section 4.2, we successfully describe the expansions of peak Young quasisymmetric Schur functions associated with strict partitions, peak compositions with entries  $\leq 3$ , and peak compositions containing at most one part greater than 2 (Proposition 4.6, Proposition 4.8, and Proposition 4.10). Additionally, we discover a characterization of peak compositions  $\alpha$  for which  $\tilde{S}_\alpha = \tilde{Q}_\alpha$  (Proposition 4.11). These results are of significant importance in partially resolving the peak version conjectures of [1, Conjecture 6.1 and Conjecture 6.2].

The final section is devoted to exploring the combinatorial properties of  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  and  $\text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ . In Section 5.1, we present a hook length formula for  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  that applies to every peak composition (Proposition 5.1). However, closed-form enumeration formulas for standard Young composition tableaux and standard peak Young composition tableaux have yet to be discovered. In Section 5.2, we demonstrate that standard Young composition tableaux and standard peak Young composition tableaux can be bijectively mapped to specific words in a familiar form (Proposition 5.4 and Proposition 5.6). The case where  $\alpha$  is of rectangular shape is investigated in more detail. Particularly intriguing is the fact that  $|\text{SPYCT}(3^k)|$  emerges as the well-known Fuss–Catalan number  $\frac{1}{2k+1} \binom{3k}{k}$  (Example 5.7). Therefore,  $|\text{SPYCT}((m^k))|$  can be regarded as a new generalization of

### Convention.

Let  $\alpha$  be a composition and  $T$  be a filling of the composition diagram of  $\alpha$ .

- We also employ the notation  $x \in T$  to denote that  $x$  appears as an entry of  $T$ .

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

For nonnegative integers  $a, b$  with  $a \leq b$ , we define  $[a, b]$  as the set  $\{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$  and define  $[a]$  as  $[1, a]$  if  $a \geq 1$ , and as the empty set otherwise. Throughout this paper,  $n$  denotes a nonnegative integer unless explicitly stated otherwise.

**2.1. Compositions and peak compositions.** A *composition*  $\alpha$  of  $n$  is a finite ordered list of positive integers  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k)$  such that  $|\alpha| := \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i = n$ . We call  $k$  the *length* of  $\alpha$  and denote it by  $\ell(\alpha)$ . For convenience, we regard the empty composition  $\emptyset$  as a unique composition of size and length 0. We represent each composition visually using its composition diagram. The *composition diagram*  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  of  $\alpha$  is the left-justified array of boxes with  $\alpha_i$  boxes in row  $i$ , where the rows are numbered from bottom to top. In this paper, when there is no danger of confusion, we frequently identify each box in  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  by its  $xy$ -plane coordinate. For example, when  $\alpha = (3, 2, 5)$ , the coordinate  $(5, 3)$  denotes the shaded box in the diagram

$$\text{cd}(\alpha) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & & \text{shaded} \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

For later use, we denote the largest part of  $\alpha$  as  $\alpha_{\max}$ , and represent the number of boxes in the  $i$ th column of  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  as  $c_i(\alpha)$ . Let  $\text{Comp}_n$  be the set of compositions of  $n$ , and let  $\text{Comp} := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \text{Comp}_n$ .

For  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}_n$  and  $I = \{i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p\} \subset [n-1]$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{set}(\alpha) &:= \{\alpha_1, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)-1}\} \\ \text{comp}(I) &:= (i_1, i_2 - i_1, \dots, n - i_p). \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\mathbf{Comp}_n$  is in bijection with the set of subsets of  $[n-1]$  under the correspondence  $\alpha \mapsto \text{set}(\alpha)$  (or  $I \mapsto \text{comp}(I)$ ). For  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{Comp}_n$ , we say that  $\alpha$  refines  $\beta$  if one can obtain  $\beta$  from  $\alpha$  by combining some of its adjacent parts. Alternatively, this means that  $\text{set}(\beta) \subseteq \text{set}(\alpha)$ . Denote this by  $\alpha \preceq \beta$ . For a composition  $\alpha$ , let  $\alpha^r$  denote the composition  $(\alpha_{\ell(\alpha)}, \dots, \alpha_1)$ . The partition obtained by sorting the parts of  $\alpha$  in a weakly decreasing order is denoted by  $\lambda(\alpha)$ .

Now, let us introduce peak compositions, which are central objects in this paper. A *peak composition* of  $n$  is a composition of  $n$  whose parts (except possibly the last part) are all greater than 1. On the other hand, a subset  $P$  of  $[n]$  is called a *peak set* in  $[n]$  if  $P \subseteq [2, n-1]$  and for every  $i$  in  $P$ ,  $i-1$  is not in  $P$ . One can see that under the correspondence  $\alpha \mapsto \text{set}(\alpha)$ , the peak compositions of  $n$  precisely correspond to the peak sets of  $[n-1]$ . Let  $\mathbf{Pcomp}_n$  denote the set of peak compositions of  $n$  and let  $\mathbf{Pcomp} := \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{Pcomp}_n$ . For

a finite set  $X$  with positive integer entries, define

$$\text{Peak}(X) := \{i \in X \mid i > 1 \text{ and } i-1 \notin X\},$$

which is referred to as the *peak set* of  $X$ .

**2.2. The ring of quasisymmetric functions and its bases.** Quasisymmetric functions are formal power series of bounded degree in variables  $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots$  with coefficients in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , which are shift invariant in the sense that the coefficient of  $x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_k^{\alpha_k}$  is equal to the coefficient of  $x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} x_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_{i_k}^{\alpha_k}$  for any strictly increasing sequence of positive integers  $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k$  indexing the variables and any positive integer sequence  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k)$  of exponents. Let  $\mathbf{QSym}$  be the ring of quasisymmetric functions. It is a graded ring, decomposing as

$$\mathbf{QSym} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathbf{QSym}_n,$$

where  $\mathbf{QSym}_n$  is the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module consisting of all quasisymmetric functions that are homogeneous of degree  $n$ . For  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}_n$ , we define the *monomial quasisymmetric function*  $M_\alpha$  by

$$M_\alpha = \sum_{i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k} x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} x_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \cdots x_{i_k}^{\alpha_k}$$

Clearly  $\{M_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}_n\}$  is a basis for  $\mathbf{QSym}_n$ . Similarly, we define the *fundamental quasisymmetric function*  $F_\alpha$  by

$$F_\alpha = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 \leq \cdots \leq i_n \\ i_j < i_{j+1} \text{ if } j \in \text{set}(\alpha)}} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_n}.$$

Since  $F_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \preceq \alpha} M_\beta$ , it follows that  $\{F_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}_n\}$  is also a basis for  $\mathbf{QSym}_n$ .

Besides these bases, we introduce the basis of dual immaculate quasisymmetric functions and the basis of Young quasisymmetric Schur functions. To do this, we recall that for a permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ , the (*left*) *descent set* of  $\sigma$  is defined by

$$\text{Des}(\sigma) := \{1 \leq i \leq n-1 \mid i \text{ is to the right of } i+1 \text{ in } \sigma = \sigma(1)\sigma(2) \cdots \sigma(n)\}.$$

It is important to note that this constitutes the descent set of  $\sigma$  in the context of the left weak Bruhat order on  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ , in other words,  $\text{Des}(\sigma) = \{i \in [n-1] \mid \ell(s_i\sigma) < \ell(\sigma)\}$ . Here,  $s_i$  is the simple transposition  $(i \ i+1)$ .

For  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}$ , the *dual immaculate quasisymmetric function*  $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^*$  was initially introduced as the quasisymmetric dual of the corresponding immaculate noncommutative symmetric function in [2, Section 3.7]. A *standard immaculate tableau* (SIT) of *shape*  $\alpha$  is a filling of  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  with distinct entries in  $[|\alpha|]$  such that the entries in each row are increasing from left to right and that in the first column are increasing from bottom to top. Let  $\text{SIT}(\alpha)$  denote the set of all standard immaculate tableaux of shape  $\alpha$ . Rather than utilizing the original definition, we adopt the following identity presented in [2, Proposition 3.48]

$$(2.1) \quad \mathfrak{S}_\alpha^* := \sum_{T \in \text{SIT}(\alpha)} F_{\text{comp}(\text{Des}(\text{w}_r(T)))}$$

as the formal definition for  $\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^*$ . Here,  $\text{w}_r(T)$  represents the word obtained by reading the entries from left to right, starting from the uppermost row of  $T$ . It follows from [2, Proposition 3.37] that  $\{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^* \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}\}$  is a basis for  $\mathbf{QSym}$ .

For  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}$ , the *Young quasisymmetric Schur function*  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha$  is defined by  $\rho(\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha^r})$ , where  $\mathfrak{S}_{\alpha^r}$  is the quasisymmetric Schur function associated with  $\alpha^r$  and  $\rho : \mathbf{QSym} \rightarrow \mathbf{QSym}$  is the automorphism given by  $F_\alpha \mapsto F_{\alpha^r}$ . It follows from [17, Proposition 5.5] that  $\{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}\}$  is a basis for  $\mathbf{QSym}$ . Therefore, these functions form a basis for  $\mathbf{QSym}$  and exhibit many analogous properties to quasisymmetric Schur functions. For detailed information, refer to [24, Section 4 and Section 5]. A *Young composition tableau*  $T$  (YCT) of shape  $\alpha$  is a filling of  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  such that

- (1) the entries in each row are weakly increasing from left to right,
- (2) the entries in the first column are strictly increasing from bottom to top, and
- (3) if  $i < j$  and  $T_{k,j} \leq T_{k+1,i}$ , then  $(k+1, j) \in \text{cd}(\alpha)$  and  $T_{k+1,j} < T_{k+1,i}$ .

The third condition is called the *Young triple condition*. Pictorially, this condition states that if

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{(k, j)} \quad \boxed{(k+1, j)} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{(k+1, i)} \end{array} \quad \text{with } T_{k,j} \leq T_{k+1,i},$$

then  $T_{k+1,j} < T_{k+1,i}$ . A *standard Young composition tableau* (SYCT) of shape  $\alpha$  is a Young composition tableau in which each of entries in  $[|\alpha|]$  appears exactly once. Let  $\text{SYCT}(\alpha)$  denote the set of all standard Young composition tableaux of shape  $\alpha$ . Then it holds that

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha = \sum_{T \in \text{SYCT}(\alpha)} F_{\text{comp}(\mathbf{Des}(T))},$$

where  $\mathbf{Des}(T)$  is the set of  $i$ 's such that  $i$  is weakly right of  $i+1$  in  $T$  (see [24, Proposition 5.2.2]). In [30, Lemma 5.3], Searles showed that  $\mathbf{Des}(T) = \text{Des}(\text{w}_Y(T))$  for every SYCT  $T$ , where  $\text{w}_Y(T)$  denotes the word obtained from  $T$  by reading its entries from top to bottom in the first column, and then bottom to top in subsequent columns, reading the columns in order from left to right. It follows that

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha = \sum_{T \in \text{SYCT}(\alpha)} F_{\text{comp}(\text{Des}(\text{w}_Y(T)))}.$$

**2.3. Stembridge's peak ring and its bases.** For each peak set  $I$  in  $[n]$ , the peak quasisymmetric function  $K_I$  was introduced by Stembridge [34, Proposition 2.2] as the weight enumerator for enriched  $(P, \gamma)$ -partitions, where  $(P, \gamma)$  is a specific labeled poset. Furthermore, he showed in [34, Proposition 3.5] that

$$K_I = 2^{|I|+1} \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}_n \\ I \subseteq \text{set}(\alpha) \Delta (\text{set}(\alpha)+1)}} F_\alpha,$$

where  $\Delta$  represents the symmetric difference of sets, defined as  $A \Delta B := (A - B) \cup (B - A)$ , and  $\text{set}(\alpha) + 1$  denotes the set  $\{i + 1 \mid i \in \text{set}(\alpha)\}$ . In this paper, we adopt this identity as the definition of  $K_I$ . Additionally, to maintain consistency with other bases, we parameterize peak quasisymmetric functions using peak compositions rather than peak sets. To be precise, for each  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Pcomp}$ , we use  $K_\alpha$  to denote  $K_{\text{set}(\alpha)}$ . One can see that  $\{K_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Pcomp}\}$  is linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . For each nonnegative integer  $n$ , let  $\mathcal{B}_n := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathbf{Pcomp}_n} \mathbb{Z}K_\alpha$ . It is shown in [34, Proposition 3.5] that  $\mathcal{B} := \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{B}_n$  is a graded subring of  $\mathbf{QSym}$ , called *Stembridge's peak ring*.

In the following, we introduce the basis of quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -functions and the basis of peak Young quasisymmetric Schur functions. These serve as peak analogues to  $\{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^* \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}\}$  and  $\{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}\}$ , respectively.

In [19], Jing and Li introduced quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -functions by dualizing non-commutative lifts of Schur  $Q$ -functions. They conjectured that these functions expand positively in the basis  $\{K_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Pcomp}\}$ . Subsequently, Oğuz confirmed this conjecture in [21] by providing a detailed description of the expansion.



**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$ . A *standard peak immaculate tableau* (SPIT)<sup>1</sup> of *shape*  $\alpha$  is a standard immaculate tableau of shape  $\alpha$  such that for every  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , the subdiagram of  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  formed by the boxes filled with entries  $\leq k$  represents the diagram of a certain peak composition.

In this paper, we refer to the last condition in Definition 2.1 as the “*peak-tableau condition*”. Given a filling  $S$  of a composition diagram, we say that  $S$  is *canonical* if its entries are strictly increasing in order from left to right and from bottom to top. With this terminology, standard peak immaculate tableaux can be characterized in the following simple form.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition and  $T \in \text{SIT}(\alpha)$ . Then  $T$  satisfies the peak-tableau condition if and only if  $T^{(\leq 2)}$  is canonical.*

*Proof.* For the ‘if’ part we prove its contraposition. Suppose that  $T$  does not satisfy the peak-tableau condition. Then there exist entries  $c < d$  of  $T$  such that

- $c$  appears in column 1,
- $d$  is immediately above  $c$ , and
- the entries  $c+1, c+2, \dots, d-1$  are located in rows distinct from the one containing  $c$ .

This says that the entry immediately to the right of  $c$  is greater than  $d$ . Therefore  $T^{(\leq 2)}$  is not canonical.

For the ‘only if’ part, we observe that the peak-tableau condition implies the inequalities  $T_{1,i+1} > T_{2,i}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha) - 1$ ). Since  $T_{1,i} < T_{2,i}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha)$ ),  $T^{(\leq 2)}$  is canonical.  $\square$

Let  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  denote the set of all standard peak immaculate tableaux of shape  $\alpha$ . Rather than relying on the original definition due to Jing and Li, we adopt the expansion obtained by Oğuz as the definition for quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -functions.

**Definition 2.3.** ([21, Theorem 3.9]) Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$ . The *quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -function*  $\tilde{Q}_\alpha$  is defined by

$$\tilde{Q}_\alpha = \sum_{T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_c(T))))},$$

where  $w_c(T)$  is the word obtained by reading the entries from bottom to top, starting from the leftmost column of  $T$ .

It was also stated in [21, Theorem 3.9] that  $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \text{Pcomp}\}$  is a basis for  $\mathcal{B}$ .

---

<sup>1</sup>In [19, Definition 4.1], this tableau is referred to as a *standard peak composition tableau*. However, we use this terminology to emphasize that it is a peak analogue of a standard immaculate tableau.

**Example 2.4.** The tableaux in  $\text{SPIT}((3, 3, 1))$  are

$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 7 & & \\ \hline 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 6 & & \\ \hline 4 & 5 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 7 & & \\ \hline 3 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 6 & & \\ \hline 3 & 5 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 7 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 6 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 6 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 7 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 5 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 6 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 5 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 6 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$

Here, the entries in red indicate the descents of  $w_c(T)$  for  $T \in \text{SPIT}((3, 3, 1))$ . Therefore we have

$$\tilde{Q}_{(3,3,1)} = K_{(3,3,1)} + K_{(3,2,2)} + 2K_{(2,2,2,1)} + 2K_{(2,2,3)} + K_{(2,4,1)} + 3K_{(2,3,2)}.$$

To introduce peak Young quasisymmetric Schur functions, we need a peak analogue of standard Young composition tableaux.

**Definition 2.5.** ([30, Definition 5.6]) Given a peak composition  $\alpha$  of  $n$ , a *standard peak Young composition tableau*  $T$  (SPYCT) of shape  $\alpha$  is a standard Young composition tableau of shape  $\alpha$  satisfying the peak-tableau condition.

Similar to Lemma 2.2, standard peak Young tableaux can be characterized in the following simple form.

**Lemma 2.6.** ([30, Lemma 5.7]) *Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$  and  $T \in \text{SYCT}(\alpha)$ . Then  $T \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$  if and only if the entries in the second column of  $T$  increase from bottom to top.*

Let  $\text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$  denote the set of all standard peak Young composition tableaux of shape  $\alpha$ . While peak Young quasisymmetric Schur functions are initially defined as the images of certain 0-Hecke–Clifford modules under the *peak quasisymmetric characteristic*, we choose to adopt the following expansion as the definition. For the definition of the peak quasisymmetric characteristic, see [5, Theorem 5.7].

**Definition 2.7.** ([30, Theorem 5.9]) Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$ . Then the *peak Young quasisymmetric Schur function*  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha$  is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha = \sum_{T \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_Y(T))))}.$$

It follows from [30, Theorem 5.11] that  $\{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \text{Pcomp}\}$  forms a basis for  $\mathcal{B}$ .

**Example 2.8.** Continuing Example 2.4, the elements of  $\text{SPYCT}((3, 3, 1))$  are

$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 7 & & \\ \hline 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 7 & & \\ \hline 3 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 7 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 6 & & \\ \hline 4 & 5 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 6 & & \\ \hline 3 & 5 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 6 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 5 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 6 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Here the entries in red indicate the descents of  $w_Y(T)$  for  $T \in \text{SPYCT}((3, 3, 1))$ . Therefore we have

$$\widetilde{\mathfrak{S}}_{(3,3,1)} = K_{(3,3,1)} + 2K_{(2,2,2,1)} + 2K_{(2,3,2)} + K_{(3,2,2)} + K_{(2,2,3)}.$$

### 3. AN EQUIDISTRIBUTION ARISING FROM $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$

In this section, we demonstrate that the subsets of  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  obtained by applying the column reading  $w_c$  and the row reading  $w_r$  to  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  exhibit the same descent distribution for every  $\alpha \in \text{Pcomp}_n$ . Using this equidistribution, we develop a combinatorial formula for the quasisymmetric Schur  $Q$ -functions. Moreover, we examine this equidistribution from the viewpoint of the representation theory of 0-Hecke algebras.

**3.1. A combinatorial bijection on  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  preserving its descent.** Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ . For  $\alpha \in \text{Pcomp}_n$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RW}_c(\alpha) &:= \{w_c(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}_n \quad \text{and} \\ \text{RW}_r(\alpha) &:= \{w_r(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\} \subseteq \mathfrak{S}_n. \end{aligned}$$

We will provide a bijection

$$\Xi_\alpha : \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$$

satisfying that  $\text{Des}(w_c(T)) = \text{Des}(w_r(\Xi_\alpha(T)))$  for all  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . Consequently we deduce that  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  and  $\text{RW}_r(\alpha)$  have the same descent distribution, that is,

$$\{\text{Des}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \text{RW}_c(\alpha)\} = \{\text{Des}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \text{RW}_r(\alpha)\} \quad (\text{as multisets}).$$

Indeed, our bijection is defined through an appropriate algorithm. Initially, we will introduce the essential definitions and notation needed for the construction of this algorithm.

For  $\alpha \in \text{Pcomp}$ , a *generalized standard peak immaculate tableau* (generalized SPIT)  $T$  of shape  $\alpha$  is a filling of  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  with distinct entries  $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_{|\alpha|}$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  such that the tableau obtained from  $T$  by the replacement  $a_i \mapsto i$  is an SPIT of shape  $\alpha$ . For a generalized SPIT  $T$  and a positive integer  $i$ , we define  $s_i \cdot T$  as the tableau obtained from  $T$  by swapping  $i$  and  $i + 1$  if  $i, i + 1 \in T$ , and the empty tableau otherwise.

For a word  $w$  with distinct entries in  $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Des}(w) &:= \{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid i, i + 1 \in w \text{ and } i \text{ is to the right of } i + 1 \text{ in } w\} \quad \text{and} \\ \text{Asc}(w) &:= \{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid i, i + 1 \in w \text{ and } i \text{ is to the left of } i + 1 \text{ in } w\}. \end{aligned}$$

In our algorithm, we will consider pairs  $(T, U)$  of generalized SPITs satisfying the following conditions:

- (size relation)  $|U| = |T| - 1$ .
- (shape condition) The shape of  $T$  has at least one part greater than or equal to 3, and the shape of  $U$  equals that of  $T_{[1:|U|]}$ .
- (entry correspondence) The set of entries of  $U$  equals that of  $T_{[1:|U|]}$ .
- (descent correspondence)  $\text{Des}(w_r(U)) = \text{Des}(w_c(T_{[1:|U|]}))$ .

In this case, we say that  $(T, U)$  satisfies the *shape-descent alignment condition*.

**Algorithm 3.1.** Let  $(T, U)$  be a pair of generalized SPITs satisfying the shape-descent alignment condition. Let  $h$  be the entry in  $T$ , but not in  $U$ . And, let  $(x, y)$  be the position of  $h$  in  $T$ .

*Step 1.* Set  $j := 1$ . Let  $U_j^h$  be the tableau obtained from  $U$  by adding a box at position  $(x, y)$  and filling that box with  $h$ .

*Step 2.* Let

$$\begin{aligned} A(j) &:= \text{Des}(w_r(U_j^h)) \cap \text{Asc}(w_c(T)) \quad \text{and} \\ B(j) &:= \text{Asc}(w_r(U_j^h)) \cap \text{Des}(w_c(T)). \end{aligned}$$

If  $(A(j), B(j)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ , then return  $U_j^h$ . Otherwise, go to *Step 3*.

*Step 3.* If  $A(j) \neq \emptyset$ , then let  $a$  denote the unique element in  $A(j)$ . Similarly, if  $B(j) \neq \emptyset$ , then let  $b$  denote the unique element in  $B(j)$ . (It will be shown in [Lemma 3.3](#) and [Lemma 3.4](#) that if  $A(j), B(j)$  are nonempty, then they are singletons, respectively). Then, we define  $z_j$  by

$$\begin{cases} a & \text{if } A(j), B(j) \neq \emptyset, b = a + 1, \text{ and } a \text{ is strictly below } a + 2 \text{ in } U_j^h, \\ a + 1 & \text{if } A(j), B(j) \neq \emptyset, b = a + 1, \text{ and } a \text{ is weakly above } a + 2 \text{ in } U_j^h, \\ a & \text{if } A(j) \neq \emptyset, B(j) = \emptyset, \\ b & \text{if } A(j) = \emptyset, B(j) \neq \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

For the  $z_j$  defined in this way, set  $U_{j+1}^h := s_{z_j} \cdot U_j^h$ , increase  $j$  by 1, and then proceed to *Step 2*.

**Example 3.2.** Let

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 8 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 9 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad U = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 9 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

The pair  $(T, U)$  satisfies the shape-descent alignment condition and  $h = 8$ . Thus the

filling  $U_1^h$  in *Step 1* is given by  $U_1^h = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 8 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 9 \\ \hline \end{array}$ . Note that  $A(1) = \{7\}$  and  $B(1) = \{8\}$ ,

hence we go to *Step 3*. Since 7 is weakly above 9 in  $U_1^h$ ,  $z_1 = 8$ , thus  $U_2^h := s_8 \cdot U_1^h$ , that

is,  $U_2^h = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 9 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ . Increase  $j$  by 1 and proceed to *Step 2*. Since  $A(2) = B(2) = \emptyset$ , our

algorithm returns  $U_2^h$  as the final value.

By the construction of  $U_1^h$  in [Algorithm 3.1](#), it is evident that the pair  $(A(1), B(1))$  takes one of the following forms:

$$(\emptyset, \emptyset), \quad (\{h-1\}, \emptyset), \quad (\emptyset, \{h\}), \quad (\{h-1\}, \{h\}).$$

The next two lemmas show how  $(A(j), B(j))$  appears when  $j \geq 2$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $(T, U)$  be a pair of generalized SPITs satisfying the shape-descent alignment condition. If  $(A(1), B(1)) = (\{h-1\}, \{h\})$ , then either  $(A(2), B(2)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$  or*

$$(A(2), B(2)) = \begin{cases} (\{h-2\}, \emptyset) & \text{if } h-1 \text{ is strictly below } h+1 \text{ in } U_1^h, \\ (\emptyset, \{h+1\}) & \text{if } h-1 \text{ is weakly above } h+1 \text{ in } U_1^h. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* First, we deal with the case where  $h-1$  is strictly below  $h+1$  in  $U_1^h$ . Following [Algorithm 3.1](#), we see that  $z_1 = h-1$  and  $U_2^h = s_{h-1} \cdot U_1^h$ . To prove that  $(A(2), B(2))$  is either  $(\emptyset, \emptyset)$  or  $(h-2, \emptyset)$ , it is necessary to examine how the positions of  $h$ ,  $h-1$ , and  $h-2$  change when transitioning from  $U_1^h$  to  $U_2^h$ .

(i) *(the change in the position of  $h$ )* From  $B(1) = \{h\}$  it follows that  $h \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h \in \text{Des}(w_c(T))$ . Also, from  $U_2^h = s_{h-1} \cdot U_1^h$ , it follows that  $h$  is strictly below  $h+1$  in  $U_2^h$ . Therefore,  $h \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_2^h)) \cap \text{Des}(w_c(T))$ . This implies that  $h$  belongs to neither  $A(2)$  nor  $B(2)$ .

(ii) *(the change in the position of  $h-1$ )* From  $A(1) = \{h-1\}$  it follows that  $h-1 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h-1 \in \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$ . Therefore  $h-1 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_2^h))$ . This implies that  $h-1$  belongs to neither  $A(2)$  nor  $B(2)$ .

(iii) *(the change in the position of  $h-2$ )* If  $h-2 \notin T$ , then  $h-2 \notin U_1^h$ . Therefore,  $(A(2), B(2)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ . If  $h-2 \in T$ , then  $h-2$  is neither in  $A(1)$  nor  $B(1)$ . This implies that the entry  $h-2$  appears in either  $\text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h)) \cap \text{Des}(w_c(T))$  or  $\text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h)) \cap \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$ .

- If  $h-2 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h))$ , then  $h-2 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_2^h))$ .
- If  $h-2 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h-2$  is weakly above  $h$  in  $U_1^h$ , then  $h-2 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_2^h))$ .
- If  $h-2 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h-2$  is strictly below  $h$  in  $U_1^h$ , then  $h-2 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_2^h))$ .

In the first two cases,  $h-2$  does not belong to either  $A(2)$  or  $B(2)$ , hence  $(A(2), B(2)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ . In the third case,  $h-2 \in A(2)$ , hence  $(A(2), B(2)) = (\{h-2\}, \emptyset)$ .

Next, we deal with the case where  $h-1$  is weakly above  $h+1$  in  $U_1^h$ . Following [Algorithm 3.1](#), we see that  $z_1 = h$  and  $U_2^h = s_h \cdot U_1^h$ . Similarly to the previous paragraph, we analyze how the positions of entries  $h$ ,  $h-1$ , and  $h-2$  change during the transition from  $U_1^h$  to  $U_2^h$ .

(i) *(the change in the position of  $h-1$ )* From  $A(1) = \{h-1\}$ , it follows that  $h-1 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h-1 \in \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$ . Also, from  $U_2^h = s_h \cdot U_1^h$ , it follows that  $h-1$  is weakly above  $h$  in  $U_2^h$ . Therefore,  $h-1 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_2^h)) \cap \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$ . This implies that  $h-1$  belongs to neither  $A(2)$  nor  $B(2)$ .

(ii) *(the change in the position of  $h$ )* From  $B(1) = \{h\}$ , it follows that  $h \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h \in \text{Des}(w_c(T))$ . Therefore  $h \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_2^h))$ . This implies that  $h$  belongs to neither  $A(2)$  nor  $B(2)$ .

(iii) (*the change in the position of  $h + 1$* ) If  $h + 2 \notin T$ , then  $h + 2 \notin U_1^h$ . Therefore,  $(A(2), B(2)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ . If  $h + 2 \in T$ , then  $h + 1$  is neither in  $A(1)$  nor  $B(1)$ . This implies that the entry  $h + 1$  appears in either  $\text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h)) \cap \text{Des}(w_c(T))$  or  $\text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h)) \cap \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$ .

- If  $h + 1 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h + 2$  is strictly above  $h$  in  $U_1^h$ , then  $h + 1 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_2^h))$ .
- If  $h + 1 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h + 2$  is weakly below  $h$  in  $U_1^h$ , then  $h + 1 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_2^h))$ .
- If  $h + 1 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h))$ , then  $h + 1 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_2^h))$ .

In the first and third case,  $h + 1$  does not belong to either  $A(2)$  or  $B(2)$ , hence  $(A(2), B(2)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ . In the second case,  $h + 1 \in B(2)$ , hence  $(A(2), B(2)) = (\emptyset, \{h + 1\})$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $(T, U)$  be a pair of generalized SPITs satisfying the shape-descent alignment condition, and  $j \geq 1$ .*

- (a) *If  $(A(j), B(j)) = (\{h - j\}, \emptyset)$ , then either  $(A(j + 1), B(j + 1)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$  or  $(A(j + 1), B(j + 1)) = (\{h - j - 1\}, \emptyset)$ .*
- (b) *If  $(A(j), B(j)) = (\emptyset, \{h + j - 1\})$ , then either  $(A(j + 1), B(j + 1)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$  or  $(A(j + 1), B(j + 1)) = (\emptyset, \{h + j\})$ .*

*Proof.* (a) We use induction on  $j$ . For the base case where  $j = 1$ , following Algorithm 3.1, we see that  $z_1 = h - 1$  and  $U_2^h = s_{h-1} \cdot U_1^h$ . To prove that  $(A(2), B(2))$  is either  $(\emptyset, \emptyset)$  or  $(\{h - 2\}, \emptyset)$ , we analyze how the positions of  $h$ ,  $h - 1$ , and  $h - 2$  change during the transition from  $U_1^h$  to  $U_2^h$ .

(i) (*the change in the position of  $h$* ) If  $h + 1 \notin T$ , then  $h + 1 \notin U_1^h$ , so  $h$  does not belong to either  $A(2)$  or  $B(2)$ . If  $h + 1 \in T$ , then  $h$  is neither in  $A(1)$  nor  $B(1)$ . This implies that the entry  $h$  appears in either  $\text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h)) \cap \text{Des}(w_c(T))$  or  $\text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h)) \cap \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$ .

- If  $h \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h))$ , then  $h \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_2^h))$  since  $h$  is strictly below  $h - 1$  in  $U_1^h$ .
- If  $h \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h - 1$  is weakly above  $h + 1$  in  $U_1^h$ , then  $h \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_2^h))$ .
- If  $h \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h - 1$  is strictly below  $h + 1$  in  $U_1^h$ , then  $h + 1$  must be strictly to the right of  $h$  in  $T$  since  $h \in \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$ .

However, the third case contradicts the fact that  $h$  is the final letter to appear in  $w_c(T)$ . Thus, we deduce that if  $h + 1$  is in  $U_1^h$ , then  $h$  does not belong to either  $A(2)$  or  $B(2)$ .

(ii) (*the change in the position of  $h - 1$* ) From  $A(1) = \{h - 1\}$ , it follows that  $h - 1 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h - 1 \in \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$ . So  $h - 1 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_2^h))$ , and thus we see that  $h - 1$  does not belong to either  $A(2)$  or  $B(2)$ .

(iii) (*the change in the position of  $h - 2$* ) If  $h - 2 \notin T$ , then  $h - 2 \notin U_1^h$ . Therefore,  $(A(2), B(2)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ . If  $h - 2 \in T$ , then  $h - 2$  is neither in  $A(1)$  nor  $B(1)$ . This implies that the entry  $h - 2$  appears in either  $\text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h)) \cap \text{Des}(w_c(T))$  or  $\text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h)) \cap \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$ .

- If  $h - 2 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_1^h))$ , then  $h - 2 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_2^h))$ .
- If  $h - 2 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h - 2$  is weakly above  $h$  in  $U_1^h$ , then  $h - 2 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_2^h))$ .
- If  $h - 2 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_1^h))$  and  $h - 2$  is strictly below  $h$  in  $U_1^h$ , then  $h - 2 \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_2^h))$ .

In the first two cases,  $h - 2$  does not belong to either  $A(2)$  or  $B(2)$ , hence  $(A(2), B(2)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ . In the third case,  $h - 2 \in A(2)$ , hence  $(A(2), B(2)) = (\{h - 2\}, \emptyset)$ .

Now, assume that the assertion holds for all  $j \leq m$ . Suppose that  $(A(m+1), B(m+1)) = (\{h-m-1\}, \emptyset)$ . Following [Algorithm 3.1](#), we see that  $z_{m+1} = h-m-1$  and  $U_{m+2}^h = s_{h-m-1} \cdot U_{m+1}^h$ . To prove that  $(A(m+2), B(m+2))$  is either  $(\emptyset, \emptyset)$  or  $(\{h-m-2\}, \emptyset)$ , we analyze how the positions of  $h-m$ ,  $h-m-1$  and  $h-m-2$  change during the transition from  $U_{m+1}^h$  to  $U_{m+2}^h$ .

(i) (*the change in the position of  $h-m$* ) If  $h-m+1 \notin T$ , then  $h-m+1 \notin U_{m+1}^h$ , so  $h-m$  does not belong to either  $A(m+2)$  or  $B(m+2)$ . If  $h-m+1 \in T$ , then  $h-m$  is neither in  $A(m+1)$  or  $B(m+1)$ . This implies that the entry  $h-m$  appears in either  $\text{Des}(w_r(U_{m+1}^h)) \cap \text{Des}(w_c(T))$  or  $\text{Asc}(w_r(U_{m+1}^h)) \cap \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$ .

- If  $h-m \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_{m+1}^h))$ , then  $h-m \in \text{Des}(w_r(U_{m+1}^h))$ .
- If  $h-m \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_{m+1}^h))$  and  $h-m-1$  is weakly above  $h-m+1$  in  $U_{m+1}^h$ , then  $h-m \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_{m+2}^h))$ .
- If  $h-m \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_{m+1}^h))$  and  $h-m-1$  is strictly below  $h-m+1$  in  $U_{m+1}^h$ , then  $h-m-1 \in A(m)$ . This is because that  $(A(m), B(m)) = (\{h-m\}, \emptyset)$  and  $U_{m+1}^h = s_{h-m} \cdot U_m^h$ , so the placement of  $h-m-1$  in both  $U_m^h$  and  $U_{m+1}^h$  remains unchanged.

However, the third case contradicts to the induction hypothesis. Therefore, we deduce that if  $h-m+1$  is in  $U_{m+1}^h$ , then  $h-m$  does not belong to either  $A(m+2)$  or  $B(m+2)$ .

(ii) (*the change in the position of  $h-m-1$  and  $h-m-2$* ) Using the same approach as for the letters  $h-1$  and  $h-2$  in case of  $j=1$ , it becomes clear that  $h-m-1$  does not belong to either  $A(m+2)$  or  $B(m+2)$ . Furthermore,  $h-m-2 \in A(m+2)$  if and only if  $h-m-2 \in \text{Asc}(w_r(U_{m+1}^h)) \cap \text{Asc}(w_c(T))$  and  $h-m-2$  is strictly below  $h-m$  in  $U_{m+1}^h$ . Combining all the observations mentioned, we conclude that  $(A(m+2), B(m+2))$  is either  $(\emptyset, \emptyset)$  or  $(\{h-m-2\}, \emptyset)$ , as desired.

(b) We prove the assertion by using induction on  $j$  with a similar approach in (a). In the case where  $j=1$ , it can be done by analyzing how the positions of  $h+1$ ,  $h$ , and  $h-1$  change during the transition from  $U_1^h$  to  $U_2^h$ . Under the assumption that the assertion holds for all  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , and by analyzing the positions of  $h+j$ ,  $h+j-1$ , and  $h+j-1$ .  $\square$

Let  $j \geq 2$ . Due to [Lemma 3.3](#) and [Lemma 3.4](#), if  $(A(j'), B(j')) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)$  for all  $1 \leq j' < j$ , then  $U_j^h$  is given by

$$(3.1) \quad s_{h-j}s_{h-j+1} \cdots s_{h-1} \cdot U_1^h \quad \text{or} \quad s_{h+j-1} \cdots s_{h+1}s_h \cdot U_1^h.$$

This implies that there exists a positive integer  $l$  such that  $A(l) = B(l) = \emptyset$ . Therefore, [Algorithm 3.1](#) always terminates after a finite number of steps.

We will provide a clear summary of the changes in entry positions from  $U_j^h$  to  $U_{j+1}^h$  in the proofs of [Lemma 3.3](#) and [Lemma 3.4](#). This summary will help demonstrate the reversibility of this transition (see [Theorem 3.14](#)).

**Summary 3.5.** Let  $(T, U)$  be a pair satisfying the shape-descent alignment condition. Let  $l$  be the positive integer such that  $(A(j), B(j)) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)$  for  $1 \leq j < l$ , but  $(A(l), B(l)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ . Suppose that  $l \geq 2$ , equivalently,  $(A(1), B(1)) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ . For the sequence  $\{z_j\}_{j=1,2,\dots,l-1}$  in [Algorithm 3.1](#), we have the two cases.

*Case 1.*  $z_j = h - j$ : For  $1 \leq j < l - 1$ , the entry  $h - j + 1$  is strictly below  $h - j$  and  $h - j - 1$  is strictly below  $h - j + 1$  in  $U_{j+1}^h$ . And,  $h - l + 2$  is strictly below  $h - l + 1$  in  $U_l^h$ , and one of the following conditions holds:

- $h - l \notin U_l^h$ .
- $h - l \in U_l^h$  and  $h - l$  is strictly below  $h - l + 2$ .
- $h - l \in U_l^h$  and  $h - l$  is weakly above  $h - l + 1$ .

*Case 2.*  $z_j = h + j - 1$ : For  $1 \leq j < l - 1$ , the entry  $h + j - 1$  is strictly below  $h + j$  and  $h + j + 1$  is weakly below  $h + j - 1$  in  $U_{j+1}^h$ . And,  $h + l - 1$  is strictly below  $h + l$  in  $U_l^h$ , and one of the following conditions holds:

- $h + l + 1 \notin U_l^h$ .
- $h + l + 1 \in U_l^h$  and  $h + l + 1$  is weakly below  $h + l - 1$ .
- $h + l + 1 \in U_l^h$  and  $h + l + 1$  is strictly above  $h + l$ .

The next lemma tells us that the final tableau returned by [Algorithm 3.1](#) is a generalized SPIT.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $(T, U)$  be a pair of generalized SPITs satisfying the shape-descent alignment condition. Then [Algorithm 3.1](#) returns a generalized SPIT.*

*Proof.* The construction of  $U_1^h$  in [Algorithm 3.1](#) ensures that  $U_1^h$  is a generalized SPIT. Due to the previous discussion, the assertion can be verified by showing that if  $U_j^h$  is a generalized SPIT and  $(A(j), B(j)) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ , then  $U_{j+1}^w$  is a generalized SPIT.

Suppose that  $U_j^h$  is a generalized SPIT with  $(A(j), B(j)) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ . Let  $(x, y)$  be the position of  $h$  in  $T$ . Since  $(T, U)$  is a pair of generalized SPITs satisfying the shape-descent alignment condition,  $(x, y)$  cannot be in the first two columns of  $T$ . Moreover, referring to [Lemma 3.3](#) and [Lemma 3.4](#), if  $z_j$  is in  $A(j)$ , then  $z_j + 1$  is placed at the position  $(x, y)$  in  $U_j^h$ , with  $z_j$  positioned strictly below  $z_j + 1$ . On the other hand, if  $z_j \in B(j)$ , then  $z_j$  is placed at the position  $(x, y)$  in  $U_j^h$ , with  $z_j + 1$  with  $z_j$  positioned weakly above  $z_j + 1$ . According to [Lemma 2.2](#), neither  $z_j$  nor  $z_j + 1$  can be in the first two columns of  $U_j^h$ . Therefore,  $U_{j+1}^h := s_{z_j} \cdot U_j^h$  is a generalized SPIT.  $\square$

Let  $\alpha \in \mathbf{Pcomp}_n$  and  $\mathbf{c}_\alpha := c_1(\alpha) + c_2(\alpha)$ . For each  $T \in \mathbf{SPIT}(\alpha)$ , we recursively define a sequence  $\{U_i(T)\}_{i=0,1,\dots,n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha}$ . Let

$$U_0(T) := T_{[1:\mathbf{c}_\alpha]}.$$

For  $1 \leq i \leq n - \mathbf{c}_\alpha$ , assume that  $U_j(T)$ 's have been determined for all  $0 \leq j \leq i - 1$ . Then, define  $U_i(T)$  to be the filling obtained by applying [Algorithm 3.1](#) to  $(T_{[1:\mathbf{c}_\alpha+i]}, U_{i-1}(T))$ .



We consider the function

$$\Xi_\alpha : \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{SPIT}(\alpha), \quad T \mapsto U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha}(T).$$

**Theorem 3.7.** *For every peak composition  $\alpha$ , the map  $\Xi_\alpha$  is well-defined, and for all  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ , it holds that  $\text{Des}(w_c(T)) = \text{Des}(w_r(\Xi_\alpha(T)))$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the first pair  $(T_{[1:\mathbf{c}_\alpha+1]}, U_0(T))$ . Since  $U_0(T) = T_{[1:\mathbf{c}_\alpha]}$ , it satisfies the shape-descent alignment condition. By Lemma 3.6, the resulting filling  $U_1(T)$  is a generalized SPIT. And, by the construction of Algorithm 3.1,  $\text{Des}(w_r(U_1(T))) = \text{Des}(T_{[1:\mathbf{c}_\alpha+1]})$ . In the same manner as above, the resulting tableaux  $U_i(T)$ 's ( $2 \leq i \leq n - \mathbf{c}_\alpha$ ) are generalized SPITs and  $\text{Des}(w_r(U_i(T))) = \text{Des}(T_{[1:\mathbf{c}_\alpha+i]})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n - \mathbf{c}_\alpha$ . Hence, we conclude that  $\Xi_\alpha(T) \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  and  $\text{Des}(w_c(T)) = \text{Des}(w_r(\Xi_\alpha(T)))$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.8.** Let  $\alpha = (4, 3, 4, 1)$  and

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 8 & 10 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 & 11 \\ \hline \end{array} \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha).$$

For  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ , applying Algorithm 3.1 to each pair  $(T_{[1:\mathbf{c}_\alpha+i]}, U_{i-1}(T))$ , we can observe the following sequence of steps:

$$\begin{aligned} U_0(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 9 & \\ \hline 5 & 6 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array} &\longrightarrow U_1(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 \\ \hline \end{array} &\longrightarrow U_2(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 & \\ \hline \end{array} \\ &\longrightarrow U_3(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 \\ \hline \end{array} &\left( (U_3(T))_1^8 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 8 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{s_7} (U_3(T))_2^8 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \\ &\longrightarrow U_4(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 11 \\ \hline \end{array} &\longrightarrow U_5(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 12 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 11 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 10 & \\ \hline \end{array} \\ &\left( (U_5(T))_1^{10} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 10 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 11 & \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{s_{10}} (U_5(T))_2^{10} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 11 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 10 & \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{s_{11}} (U_5(T))_3^{10} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 12 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 11 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 10 & \\ \hline \end{array} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\Xi_\alpha(T) := U_5(T)$ . Note that  $\text{Des}(w_c(T)) = \{2, 4, 8, 10, 11\} = \text{Des}(w_r(\Xi_\alpha(T)))$ .

Consider the situation where each element in  $\{\text{Des}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \text{RW}_c(\alpha)\}$  occurs with multiplicity 1. In this instance, Theorem 3.7 implies that  $\Xi_\alpha$  is a bijection. In what follows, we will show that this function is a bijection in general. This can be accomplished by showing the reversibility of each step in Algorithm 3.1.

**Algorithm 3.9.** Let  $V$  be a generalized SPIT and  $g \in V$ .

*Step 1.* Set  $j := 1$ . Let  $a_j := g - 1$  and  $V_j := V$  and  $\mathbf{d}_{(j)}$  be the sequence  $\{a_j\}$ .

*Step 2.* Increase  $j$  by 1 and then let  $V_j := s_{a_{j-1}} \cdot V_{j-1}$ . Examine the conditions listed below:

- $g - j \in V_j$ ,
- $g - j$  is weakly above  $g - j + 2$  in  $V_j$ , and
- $g - j$  is strictly below  $g - j + 1$  in  $V_j$ .

If any of the conditions fail, then return  $\mathbf{d}_{(j-1)}$ . Otherwise, go to *Step 3*.

*Step 3.* Let  $a_j := g - j$  and define  $\mathbf{d}_{(j)}$  to be the sequence obtained from  $\mathbf{d}_{(j-1)}$  by appending  $a_j$  at the end. Then, proceed to *Step 2*.

**Algorithm 3.10.** Let  $V$  be a generalized SPIT and  $g \in V$ .

*Step 1.* Set  $j := 1$ . Let  $b_j = g$  and  $V_{(j)} = V$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{(j)}$  be the sequence  $\{b_j\}$ .

*Step 2.* Increase  $j$  by 1 and then let  $V_j = s_{b_{j-1}} \cdot V_{j-1}$ . Examine the conditions listed below:

- $g + j \in V_j$ ,
- $g + j$  is strictly below  $g + j - 1$  in  $V_j$ , and
- $g + j$  is weakly below  $g + j - 2$  in  $V_j$ .

If any of the conditions fail, then return  $\mathbf{u}_{(j-1)}$ . Otherwise, go to *Step 3*.

*Step 3.* Let  $b_j = g + j - 1$  and define  $\mathbf{u}_{(j)}$  to be the sequence obtained from  $\mathbf{u}_{(j-1)}$  by appending  $b_j$  at the end. Then, proceed to *Step 2*.

Let  $(V, g)$  be a pair of a generalized SPIT and a positive integer. Since  $|V|$  is finite, these processes terminate after a finite number of steps. We denote by  $\mathbf{d}_{V;g}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{V;g}$  the final sequences obtained from [Algorithm 3.9](#) and [Algorithm 3.10](#), respectively, that is,

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{d}_{V;g} &= \{a_j\}_{j=1,2,\dots,l}, \quad \text{where } a_j = g - j, \\ \mathbf{u}_{V;g} &= \{b_j\}_{j=1,2,\dots,l'}, \quad \text{where } b_j = g + j - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $l$  and  $l'$  are the lengths of  $\mathbf{d}_{V;g}$  and  $\mathbf{u}_{V;g}$ , respectively. Let

$$\mathbf{d}_{V;g} \cdot V := s_{a_l} s_{a_{l-1}} \cdots s_{a_1} \cdot V \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{u}_{V;g} \cdot V := s_{b_{l'}} s_{b_{l'-1}} \cdots s_{b_1} \cdot V.$$

We say that  $(V, g)$  *satisfies the condition (C1)* if

- (1) both  $g - 1$  and  $g$  are entries of  $V$ , with  $g - 1$  strictly below  $g$ , and
- (2) whenever  $g + 1 \in V$ ,  $g + 1$  is either weakly below  $g - 1$  or  $g + 1$  is strictly above  $g$ .

Similarly, we say that  $(V, g)$  *satisfies the condition (C2)* if

- (1) both  $g$  and  $g + 1$  are entries of  $V$ , with  $g + 1$  strictly below  $g$ , and
- (2) whenever  $g - 1 \in V$ ,  $g - 1$  is either strictly below  $g + 1$  or  $g + 1$  is weakly above  $g$ .

It is evident that conditions (C1) and (C2) are mutually exclusive.

Given  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ , we introduce a sequence  $\{V^i(T)\}_{i=0,1,\dots,n-\mathfrak{c}_\alpha}$  consisting of certain fillings. Let

$$V^0(T) := T.$$

Given  $1 \leq i \leq n - \mathbf{c}_\alpha$ , assume that  $V^j(T)$ 's have been defined for all  $0 \leq j \leq i - 1$ . Let  $g$  be the entry of the uppermost box in the rightmost column of  $V^{i-1}(T)$ . We now define

$$(3.3) \quad V^i(T) := \begin{cases} (\mathbf{d}_{V^{i-1}(T);g} \cdot V^{i-1}(T))_{[1:n-i]} & \text{if } (V^{i-1}(T), g) \text{ satisfies (C1),} \\ (\mathbf{u}_{V^{i-1}(T);g} \cdot V^{i-1}(T))_{[1:n-i]} & \text{if } (V^{i-1}(T), g) \text{ satisfies (C2),} \\ V^{i-1}(T)_{[1:n-i]} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 3.11.** *Let  $\alpha \in \text{Pcomp}_n$  and  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . For every  $0 \leq i \leq n - \mathbf{c}_\alpha$ ,  $V^i(T)$  is a generalized SPIT.*

*Proof.* We prove this assertion by induction on  $i$ . The case where  $i = 0$ , it is obvious since  $V^0(T) = T$ . Given  $1 \leq i \leq n - \mathbf{c}_\alpha$ , assume that  $V^{i-1}(T)$  is a generalized SPIT. Let  $(x, y)$  be the position of the uppermost box in the rightmost column of  $V^{i-1}(T)$ , and let  $g := V^{i-1}(T)_{x,y}$ . If  $(V^{i-1}(T), g)$  satisfies (C1), then  $\mathbf{d}_{V^{i-1}(T);g} = \{g - j\}_{j=1,2,\dots,l}$  for some  $l \geq 1$ . For  $1 \leq j < l$ , one observes that  $g - j - 1$  is strictly below  $g - j$  in  $s_{g-j} \cdots s_{g-1} \cdot V^{i-1}(T)$ . Combining this with the induction hypothesis, we derive that  $V^i(T) = \mathbf{d}_{V^{i-1}(T);g} \cdot V^{i-1}(T)$  is a generalized SPIT. If  $(V^{i-1}(T), g)$  satisfies (C2), then  $\mathbf{u}_{V^{i-1}(T);g} = \{g + j - 1\}_{j=1,2,\dots,l'}$  for some  $l' \geq 1$ . For  $1 \leq j < l'$ , one observes that  $g + j$  is strictly below  $g + j - 1$  in  $s_{g+j-1} \cdots s_g \cdot V^{i-1}(T)$ . Combining this with the induction hypothesis, we derive that  $V^i(T) = \mathbf{u}_{V^{i-1}(T);g} \cdot V^{i-1}(T)$  is a generalized SPIT. If neither (C1) nor (C2) holds, then  $V^i(T) = (V^{i-1}(T))_{[1:|V^{i-1}(T)|-1]}$ . Thus, by induction hypothesis,  $V^i(T)$  is a generalized SPIT.  $\square$

Let  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . Note that the shape of  $V^i(T)$  is obtained from the shape of  $V^{i-1}(T)$  by removing the uppermost box in the rightmost column. For each  $1 \leq i \leq n - \mathbf{c}_\alpha$ , let  $y_i(T)$  be the unique entry in  $V^{i-1}(T)$ , but not in  $V^i(T)$ . We now assume that the sequence  $\{(V^i(T), y_i(T))\}_{i=1,\dots,n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha}$  has been obtained by the previously described process. Then we define the map

$$\Theta_\alpha : \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{SPIT}(\alpha), \quad T \mapsto V^\bullet(T),$$

where  $V^\bullet(T)$  is defined to be the filling of  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  such that

$$w_c(V^\bullet(T))_i = \begin{cases} w_c(V^{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha}(T))_i & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq \mathbf{c}_\alpha, \\ y_{n+1-i}(T) & \text{if } \mathbf{c}_\alpha + 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

For the reader's understanding, we give an example before proving that  $\Theta_\alpha$  is well-defined.

**Example 3.12.** Let us consider the SPIT

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 12 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 11 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 10 \\ \hline \end{array} \in \text{SPIT}((4, 3, 4, 1)).$$

We explain how to obtain  $V^1(T)$  from  $V^0(T) := T$ . Start with  $g := 12$ . Since  $g - 1 \in V^0(T)$  and  $g - 1$  is strictly below  $g$ , but  $g + 1 \notin V^0(T)$ ,  $(V^0(T), g)$  satisfies **(C1)**. Since  $\mathbf{d}_{V^0(T);g} = \{a_j\}_{j=1,2}$ , where  $a_j = g - j$ , from (3.3) we have

$$V^1(T) := \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 11 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 12 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 11 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 10 & \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{s_{11}} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 11 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 10 & \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{s_{10}} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 10 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 11 & \\ \hline \end{array} \right)$$

For  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ , applying this process iteratively to the filling  $V^i(T)$  yields the filling  $V^{i+1}(T)$  as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} V^2(T) := \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad V^3(T) := \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \left( \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{s_7} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 8 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 & \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \\ \\ V^4(T) := \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad V^5(T) := \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 9 & \\ \hline 5 & 6 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

From  $V^i(T)$ 's ( $1 \leq i \leq 5$ ), we get

$$y_1 = 10, \quad y_2 = 11, \quad y_3 = 8, \quad y_4 = 12, \quad y_5 = 7.$$

Finally, we have that

$$\Theta_\alpha(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 8 & 10 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 & 11 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Note that  $\text{Des}(w_r(T)) = \{2, 4, 8, 10, 11\} = \text{Des}(w_c(\Theta_\alpha(T)))$ .

**Lemma 3.13.** *For every peak composition  $\alpha$ , the map  $\Theta_\alpha$  is well-defined.*

*Proof.* Let  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . To verify that  $V^\bullet(T) \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ , it suffices to show that

- (i) if  $y_p(T)$  is placed to the right of  $y_q(T)$  in  $V^\bullet(T)$ , then  $y_p(T) > y_q(T)$ , and
- (ii)  $V^\bullet(T)^{(\leq 2)}$  is canonical.

For (i), let  $(c_p, d_p)$  ( $1 \leq p \leq n$ ) denote the position of the  $p$ th box in  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  from top to bottom and right to left. According to the assumption,  $p < q$ ,  $d_p = d_q$  and  $c_p = c_q + 1$ . Now, suppose for contradiction that  $y_p < y_q$ . By Lemma 3.11,  $V^p(T)$  forms a generalized SPIT, implying that the entries in row  $d_p$  increase from left to right. Since  $V^p(T)_{c_q, d_q} < y_p$ , there should exist  $p < k \leq q$  such that

$$V^{k-1}(T)_{c_q, d_q} < y_p, \quad \text{but} \quad V^k(T)_{c_q, d_q} > y_p.$$

However, such a situation does not arise because either the sequence  $\mathbf{d}_{V^{k-1}(T);g}$  is a consecutively decreasing one or  $\mathbf{u}_{V^{k-1}(T);g}$  is a consecutively increasing one, as shown in (3.2). Therefore, we deduce that  $y_q < y_p$ .

For (ii), due to the construction of  $V^\bullet(T)$ , it is clear that  $(V^\bullet(T))^{(\leq 2)} = V^{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha}(T) = T^{(\leq 2)}$ . Since  $T^{(\leq 2)}$  is canonical, so is  $V^\bullet(T)^{(\leq 2)}$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.14.** *For every peak composition  $\alpha$ , the map  $\Xi_\alpha$  is a bijection.*

*Proof.* For  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ , we recall that  $U_0(T) = T^{(\leq 2)}$  and  $U_i(T)$  denotes the generalized SPIT obtained by applying [Algorithm 3.1](#) to  $(T_{[1:\mathbf{c}_\alpha+i]}, U_{i-1}(T))$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n - \mathbf{c}_\alpha$ . Moreover,  $\Xi_\alpha(T) = U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha}(T)$ . To confirm the assertion, it suffices to show that  $\Theta_\alpha \circ \Xi_\alpha = \text{id}$ . This equality can be established by proving the identities

$$(3.4) \quad U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T) = V^i(\Xi_\alpha(T)) \text{ for } i = 0, 1, \dots, n - \mathbf{c}_\alpha.$$

We prove (3.4) by induction on  $i$ . First, consider  $i = 0$ . By definition, we have that

$$U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha}(T) = \Xi_\alpha(T) = V^0(\Xi_\alpha(T)).$$

Next, let  $1 \leq i \leq n - \mathbf{c}_\alpha$ . Assuming that  $U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-p}(T) = V^p(\Xi_\alpha(T))$  for all  $p \leq i - 1$ , we aim to show  $U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T) = V^i(\Xi_\alpha(T))$ . To do this, let us consider the sequence  $\{(U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T))_j^h\}_{j=1,2,\dots,l}$  obtained from the pair  $(T_{[1:n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i+1]}, U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T))$  by applying [Algorithm 3.1](#). Here,  $h$  is the positive integer associated with this pair, equals  $w_c(T)_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i+1}$ , and  $l$  is the positive integer such that  $(A(j), B(j)) \neq (\emptyset, \emptyset)$  for  $1 \leq j < l$ , but  $(A(l), B(l)) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ . We now consider two cases:  $l = 1$  or  $l > 1$ .

First, we deal with the case where  $l = 1$ . By the construction of [Algorithm 3.1](#), it holds that

$$(3.5) \quad U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i+1}(T) = (U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T))_1^h,$$

that is,  $U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i+1}(T)$  is obtained from  $U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T)$  by adding a box at position  $(x, y)$  and filling that box with  $h$ . Here,  $(x, y)$  is the position of  $h$  in  $T_{[1:n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i+1]}$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T)) = U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i+1}(T)$ , so it follows from (3.5) that

$$V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T)) = (U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T))_1^h.$$

Since the entry  $g$  associated with  $V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T))$  equals  $h$  and  $A(1) = B(1) = \emptyset$ , we can observe that

- if  $h - 1 \in (U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T))_1^h$ , then  $h - 1$  is weakly above  $h$ , and
- if  $h + 1 \in (U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T))_1^h$ , then  $h + 1$  is also weakly above  $h$ .

For the definition of  $g$ , see (3.3). This observation says that  $(V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T)), h)$  satisfies neither the condition (C1) nor the condition (C2). By (3.3), we have

$$V^i(\Xi_\alpha(T)) = V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T))_{[1:n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i]} = U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T).$$

Second, we deal with the case where  $l > 1$ . Consider the sequence  $\{z_j\}_{j=1,\dots,l-1}$  for the pair  $(T_{[1:n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i+1]}, U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T))$ . By [Lemma 3.3](#) and [Lemma 3.4](#), we see that either

$z_j = h - j$  for all  $j$ 's or  $z_j = h + j - 1$  for all  $j$ 's. In the former case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T)) &= U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i+1}(T) && \text{(by induction hypothesis)} \\ &= s_{h-l+1}s_{h-l+2}\cdots s_{h-1} \cdot (U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T))_1^h && \text{(by the construction of } U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i+1}(T)\text{)}. \end{aligned}$$

Following [Algorithm 3.1](#), we will write  $s_{h-l+1}s_{h-l+2}\cdots s_{h-1} \cdot (U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T))_1^h$  as  $U_l^h$ . Then, we consider the pair  $(V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T)), h - l + 1)$ . From [Summary 3.5\(a\)](#) we observe that  $h - l + 2 \in U_l^h$  and  $h - l + 2$  is strictly below  $h - l + 1$  in  $U_l^h$ , one of the following conditions holds:

- $h - l \notin U_l^h$ .
- $h - l \in U_l^h$  and  $h - l$  is strictly below  $h - l + 2$ .
- $h - l \in U_l^h$  and  $h - l$  is weakly above  $h - l + 1$ .

By these observation, the pair  $(V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T)), h - l + 1)$  satisfies the condition **(C2)**, and therefore

$$V^i(\Xi_\alpha(T)) = (\mathbf{u}_{V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T)); h-l+1} \cdot V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T)))_{[1:n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i]}$$

(see [\(3.3\)](#)). On the other hand, the sequence  $\mathbf{u}_{V^{i-1}(\Xi_\alpha(T)); h-l+1}$  is given by  $\{b_j\}_{j=1,2,\dots,l-1}$  with  $b_j = h - l + j$ . This tells us that  $z_j = b_{l-j}$  for all  $j = 1, 2, \dots, l - 1$ , and therefore

$$V^i(\Xi_\alpha(T)) = ((U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T))_1^h)_{[1:n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i]} = U_{n-\mathbf{c}_\alpha-i}(T).$$

The latter case can be dealt with in the same manner as above.  $\square$

**Example 3.15.** Let  $\alpha = (4, 3, 4, 1)$ , and consider the five tableaux in  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ :

$$T_1 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 9 & 10 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 11 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 & 8 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad T_2 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 8 & 10 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 9 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 & 11 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad T_3 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 8 & 10 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 7 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 9 & 11 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad T_4 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 11 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 9 & 10 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad T_5 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 8 & 10 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 12 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 & 11 \\ \hline \end{array}$$

We already showed from [Example 3.8](#) and [Example 3.12](#) that

$$\Xi_\alpha(T_5) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 12 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 11 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 10 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_\alpha(\Xi_\alpha(T_5)) = T_5.$$

For the remaining cases, one can check that

$$\Xi_\alpha(T_1) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 11 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 10 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 & 8 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \Xi_\alpha(T_2) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 11 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 9 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 10 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \Xi_\alpha(T_3) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 9 & 11 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 7 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 10 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \Xi_\alpha(T_4) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & 9 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 11 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & 10 \\ \hline \end{array},$$

and  $\Theta_\alpha(\Xi_\alpha(T_i)) = T_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ .

**Corollary 3.16.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition.*

(a) *As multisets, we have*

$$\{\text{Des}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \text{RW}_c(\alpha)\} = \{\text{Des}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \text{RW}_r(\alpha)\}.$$

(b) *The quasisymmetric Schur Q-function is equal to the K-generating function of standard peak immaculate tableaux for the reading  $w_r$ , where K is used to denote peak quasisymmetric functions. More precisely,*

$$\tilde{Q}_\alpha = \sum_{T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_r(T)))}.$$

*Proof.* (a) The assertion can be obtained by combining [Theorem 3.7](#) with [Theorem 3.14](#).

(b) The assertion can be obtained by combining [Definition 2.3](#) with (a).  $\square$

**Remark 3.17.** When  $\alpha$  is a peak composition with at most one part greater than 2,  $\Xi_\alpha$  is the identity map. In the case where  $\alpha$  has no parts greater than 2, this follows from  $|\text{SPIT}(\alpha)| = 1$ . On the other hand, if  $\alpha$  has only one part greater than 2, [Lemma 2.2](#) implies that for  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ ,  $i \in \text{Des}(w_r(T))$  if and only if  $i+1$  appears strictly upper-left of  $i$  in  $T$ . Consequently,  $U_i(T) = T_{[1:\mathfrak{c}_\alpha+i]}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n - \mathfrak{c}_\alpha$ , implying  $\Xi_\alpha(T) = T$ .

**3.2. A representation-theoretical interpretation of [Theorem 3.14](#).** For each  $\alpha \in \text{Pcomp}_n$ , we present two 0-Hecke modules  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$  such that

$$\text{ch}(\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c) = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{RW}_c(\alpha)} F_{\text{comp}(\text{Des}(\sigma))} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ch}(\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r) = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{RW}_r(\alpha)} F_{\text{comp}(\text{Des}(\sigma))},$$

where  $\text{ch}$  is the quasisymmetric characteristic (see [\(3.6\)](#)). The equidistribution demonstrated in [Section 3.1](#) implies that these two modules share the same image under the quasisymmetric characteristic. However, it turns out that they are not isomorphic as  $H_n(0)$ -modules in general.

To begin with, we briefly review the representation theory of the 0-Hecke algebra  $H_n(0)$ . For more details, see [\[12, 13\]](#). The 0-Hecke algebra  $H_n(0)$  is an associative  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra with 1 generated by the elements  $\bar{\pi}_1, \bar{\pi}_2, \dots, \bar{\pi}_{n-1}$  subject to the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\pi}_i^2 &= -\bar{\pi}_i \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ \bar{\pi}_i \bar{\pi}_{i+1} \bar{\pi}_i &= \bar{\pi}_{i+1} \bar{\pi}_i \bar{\pi}_{i+1} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n-2, \\ \bar{\pi}_i \bar{\pi}_j &= \bar{\pi}_j \bar{\pi}_i \quad \text{if } |i-j| \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\pi_i := \bar{\pi}_i + 1$ . Then, the set  $\{\pi_i \mid i \in [n-1]\}$  is also a generating set of  $H_n(0)$ . For any reduced expression  $s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_p}$  for  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ , let  $\bar{\pi}_\sigma := \bar{\pi}_{i_1} \bar{\pi}_{i_2} \cdots \bar{\pi}_{i_p}$  and  $\pi_\sigma := \pi_{i_1} \pi_{i_2} \cdots \pi_{i_p}$ . It is well known that these elements are independent of the choice of reduced expressions, and both  $\{\bar{\pi}_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}$  and  $\{\pi_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}$  are  $\mathbb{C}$ -bases for  $H_n(0)$ .

According to [\[28\]](#), there are  $2^{n-1}$  pairwise inequivalent irreducible (left)  $H_n(0)$ -modules, which are naturally indexed by compositions of  $n$ . For each  $\alpha \in \text{Comp}_n$ , the corresponding

irreducible  $H_n(0)$ -module  $\mathbf{F}_\alpha$  is defined to be the 1-dimensional  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space spanned by a nonzero vector  $v_\alpha$  with the  $H_n(0)$ -action

$$\bar{\pi}_i \cdot v_\alpha = \begin{cases} 0 & i \notin \text{set}(\alpha), \\ -v_\alpha & i \in \text{set}(\alpha) \end{cases}$$

for each  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ . Let  $H_n(0)\text{-}\mathbf{mod}$  be the category of  $H_n(0)$ -modules and  $\mathcal{R}(H_n(0)\text{-}\mathbf{mod})$  be the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -span of the isomorphism classes of finite dimensional  $H_n(0)$ -modules. We denote by  $[M]$  the isomorphism class corresponding to an  $H_n(0)$ -module  $M$ . The *Grothendieck group*  $G_0(H_n(0)\text{-}\mathbf{mod})$  is the quotient of  $\mathcal{R}(H_n(0)\text{-}\mathbf{mod})$  modulo the relations  $[M] = [M'] + [M'']$  whenever there exists a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow M'' \rightarrow 0$ . By abusing notation, we denote by  $[M]$  the element of  $G_0(H_n(0)\text{-}\mathbf{mod})$  corresponding to an  $H_n(0)$ -module  $M$ . Then  $G_0(H_n(0)\text{-}\mathbf{mod})$  is a free abelian group with a basis  $\{[\mathbf{F}_\alpha] \mid \alpha \in \text{Comp}_n\}$ . Let

$$\mathcal{G}(H_\bullet(0)\text{-}\mathbf{mod}) := \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} G_0(H_n(0)\text{-}\mathbf{mod}).$$

It was shown in [16, 23] that the linear map

$$(3.6) \quad \text{ch} : \mathcal{G}(H_\bullet(0)\text{-}\mathbf{mod}) \rightarrow \text{QSym}, \quad [\mathbf{F}_\alpha] \mapsto F_\alpha,$$

called the *quasisymmetric characteristic*, is a ring isomorphism.

In the remainder of this subsection, let us fix  $\alpha \in \text{Pcomp}_n$ . Before introducing the  $H_n(0)$ -modules  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$ , we need to study the interval structure of  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  and  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$ . The *(left) weak Bruhat order*  $\preceq_L$  on  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  is defined to be the partial order on  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  whose covering relation  $\preceq_L^c$  is given as follows:

$$\sigma \preceq_L^c s_i \sigma \text{ if and only if } i \notin \text{Des}(\sigma).$$

Given  $\sigma, \rho \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ , if  $\sigma \preceq_L \rho$ , then the *(left) weak Bruhat interval* from  $\sigma$  to  $\rho$  is defined by

$$[\sigma, \rho]_L := \{\gamma \in \mathfrak{S}_n \mid \sigma \preceq_L \gamma \preceq_L \rho\}.$$

The *right Bruhat order*, denoted as  $\preceq_R$ , on  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ , and the *right weak Bruhat interval*  $[\sigma, \rho]_R$  can likewise be defined analogously.

For  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_n \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Inv}(\sigma) &:= \{(i, j) \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \text{ but } \sigma_i > \sigma_j\} \quad \text{and} \\ \text{Coinv}(\sigma) &:= \{(i, j) \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \text{ and } \sigma_i < \sigma_j\}. \end{aligned}$$

From [9, Proposition 3.1.3] or [10, Proposition 3.1] it follows that

$$(3.7) \quad \sigma \preceq_L \rho \text{ if and only if } \text{Inv}(\sigma) \subseteq \text{Inv}(\rho) \text{ if and only if } \text{Coinv}(\sigma) \supseteq \text{Coinv}(\rho).$$

With this notation, we first observe that  $\text{RW}_r(\alpha)$  is always an interval under the weak Bruhat order. To be more precise, let  $T_\alpha^{\text{source}}$  be the SPIT of shape  $\alpha$  filled with entries  $1, 2, \dots, n$  from bottom to top and from left to right and  $T_\alpha^{\text{sink}}$  the SPIT of shape  $\alpha$  whose entries in column 1 are the first  $\ell(\alpha)$  odd numbers, whose entries in column 2 are the first



$\ell(\alpha) - 1$  or  $\ell(\alpha)$  even numbers (depending on whether or not the last part of  $\alpha$  is equal to 1), and whose entries in subsequent rows from top to bottom are the remaining numbers, increasing consecutively up each row. For example,

$$T_{(3,2,4,1)}^{\text{source}} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 10 & & & \\ \hline 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\ \hline 4 & 5 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad T_{(3,2,4,1)}^{\text{sink}} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 7 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 8 & 9 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 10 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Then the following lemma shows that  $\text{RW}_r(\alpha)$  is an interval under the weak Bruhat order.

**Lemma 3.18.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$ . Then we have*

$$\text{RW}_r(\alpha) = [\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sink}}), \text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})]_L.$$

*Proof.* First, let us show  $\text{RW}_r(\alpha) \subseteq [\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sink}}), \text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})]_L$ . Let  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . If  $(i, j) \in \text{Inv}(\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sink}}))$ , then  $\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sink}})_i$  is strictly above  $\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sink}})_j$  and  $\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sink}})_j$  appears in the first or second column of  $T_\alpha^{\text{sink}}$ . For such a pair, since  $T$  is an SPIT, it follows from Lemma 2.2 that  $\text{w}_r(T)_i > \text{w}_r(T)_j$ , which implies that  $(i, j) \in \text{Inv}(\text{w}_r(T))$ . Thus, we have that  $\text{Inv}(\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sink}})) \subseteq \text{Inv}(\text{w}_r(T))$ . Similarly, if  $(i, j) \in \text{Coinv}(\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}}))$ , then  $\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})_i$  and  $\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})_j$  appear in the same row of  $T_\alpha^{\text{source}}$ . For such a pair, it follows from the definition of SPITs that  $\text{w}_r(T)_i < \text{w}_r(T)_j$ , which implies that  $(i, j) \in \text{Coinv}(\text{w}_r(T))$ . Thus, we have that  $\text{Coinv}(\text{w}_r(T)) \supseteq \text{Coinv}(\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}}))$ . Consequently, we deduce that  $\text{RW}_r(\alpha) \subseteq [\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sink}}), \text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})]_L$ .

Next, let us show  $\text{RW}_r(\alpha) \supseteq [\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sink}}), \text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})]_L$ . Let  $\sigma \in [\text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sink}}), \text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})]_L$  and  $T_\sigma$  be the filling of shape  $\alpha$  such that  $\text{w}_r(T_\sigma) = \sigma$ . To prove the assertion, it suffices to show that  $T_\sigma \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . Suppose that  $x$  is immediately left of  $y$  in  $T_\sigma$ . Let  $i_x$  and  $i_y$  denote the indices such that  $\text{w}_r(T_\sigma)_{i_x} = x$  and  $\text{w}_r(T_\sigma)_{i_y} = y$ , respectively. Since  $(i_x, i_y) \in \text{Coinv}(\text{w}_c(T_\alpha^{\text{source}}))$ , it follows from (3.7) that  $(i_x, i_y) \in \text{Coinv}(\text{w}_c(T_\sigma))$ , that is,

$$x = \text{w}_c(T_\sigma)_{i_x} < \text{w}_c(T_\sigma)_{i_y} = y.$$

So, the entries in each row are increasing from left to right. Moreover, it follows from  $\text{Coinv}(T_\sigma) \supseteq \text{Coinv}(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})$  that  $(T_\sigma)_{2,i} > (T_\sigma)_{1,i+1}$  for all  $1 \leq i < \ell(\alpha)$ . This shows that  $T_\sigma^{(\leq 2)}$  is canonical, and therefore  $T_\sigma \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ .  $\square$

On the other hand,  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  generally does not form an interval under the left weak Bruhat order. Let  $T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}$  the SPIT of shape  $\alpha$  whose entries in column 1 are the first  $\ell(\alpha)$  odd numbers, whose entries in column 2 are the first  $\ell(\alpha) - 1$  or  $\ell(\alpha)$  even numbers (depending on whether or not the last part of  $\alpha$  is equal to 1), and whose entries in subsequent columns from left to right are the remaining numbers, increasing consecutively up each column.

For example,

$$(3.8) \quad T_{(3,2,4,1)}^{\text{sup}} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 7 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 9 & 10 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 8 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

In [30, Lemma 4.10], it was established that  $w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}})$  is the unique minimal element in  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  under the left weak Bruhat order. However, it may not have a unique maximal element. The subsequent lemma provides a characterization of  $\alpha$  for which  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  forms an interval.

**Lemma 3.19.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$ . The set  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  is an interval under the weak Bruhat order if and only if the number of parts of  $\alpha$  greater than 2 is at most 1.*

*Proof.* Let us prove the ‘if’ part. When  $\alpha$  has no parts greater than 2, the assertion is trivial since  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha) = \{T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}\}$ . When  $\alpha$  has only one part greater than 2, one can prove that

$$\text{RW}_c(\alpha) = [w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}), w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})]_L$$

by following the same approach used to prove Lemma 3.18.

The converse is established through a proof by contradiction. To do this, we assume that  $\alpha$  has at least 2 parts greater than 2. Let  $T_\alpha^s$  be the SPIT of shape  $\alpha$  defined in the following way:

- If  $\alpha_{\ell(\alpha)} = 2$ , then the entries in column 1 are the first  $\ell(\alpha)$  odd numbers, the entries in column 2 are the first  $\ell(\alpha)$  even numbers, and the entries in subsequent rows are the remaining numbers, increasing consecutively from left to right in each row starting from the top.
- If  $\alpha_{\ell(\alpha)} = 1$ , then for the peak composition  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)-1})$ , the entries from 1 to  $n - 1$  are filled in the same manner as described above. Then, the entry  $n$  is placed in the box  $(1, \ell(\alpha))$ .

It can be observed that for every  $i \notin \text{Des}(w_c(T_\alpha^s))$ ,  $s_i \cdot T_\alpha^s \notin \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . That is,  $w_c(T_\alpha^s)$  is a maximal element in  $\{w_c(T) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\} \cap \mathfrak{S}_n$  under the weak Bruhat order. Put  $c := c_1(\alpha) + c_2(\alpha)$  and  $d := c + c_3(\alpha)$ . By the assumption,  $d - c \geq 2$ . Then it follows from the definition of  $T_\alpha^s$  and  $T_\alpha^{\text{source}}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} (c + 1, d) &\in \text{Inv}(w_c(T_\alpha^s)), \text{ but } (c + 1, d) \notin \text{Inv}(w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})), \\ (c, c + 1) &\notin \text{Inv}(w_c(T_\alpha^s)), \text{ but } (c, c + 1) \in \text{Inv}(w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})). \end{aligned}$$

Given (3.7), this observation implies that  $w_c(T_\alpha^s)$  and  $w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})$  are incomparable under the weak Bruhat order. Consequently,  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  cannot be an interval under the weak Bruhat order, contradicting the assumption.  $\square$

Now, we are ready to introduce the desired  $H_n(0)$ -modules. Let  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c$  denote the  $H_n(0)$ -module with  $\mathbb{C}\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  as its underlying space, equipped with the following  $H_n(0)$ -action. For  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$  and  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ ,

$$(3.9) \quad \pi_i \star T := \begin{cases} -T & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}(w_c(T)), \\ 0 & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}(w_c(T)) \text{ and } s_i \cdot T \notin \text{SPIT}(\alpha), \\ s_i \cdot T & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}(w_c(T)) \text{ and } s_i \cdot T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha). \end{cases}$$

This module was originally introduced by Searles and is cyclically generated by  $T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}$  (see [30, Theorem 4.11]). It should be noted that if  $\alpha$  is a peak composition of  $n$  with at most one part greater than 2, then  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  is a weak Bruhat interval by Lemma 3.19 and therefore  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c$  is isomorphic to the negative weak Bruhat interval module  $\overline{\mathbf{B}}(\text{RW}_c(\alpha))$  introduced in [20, Definition 1 (2)]. In this case, the desired isomorphism is induced from the bijection

$$w_c : \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{RW}_c(\alpha), \quad T \mapsto w_c(T).$$

Next, we introduce the  $H_n(0)$ -module  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$ . To do this, we first consider the negative weak Bruhat interval module  $\overline{\mathbf{B}}(\text{RW}_r(\alpha))$  associated with the weak Bruhat interval  $\text{RW}_r(\alpha)$ . Then, we equip  $\mathbb{C}\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  with an  $H_n(0)$ -module structure by transporting the  $H_n(0)$ -module from  $\overline{\mathbf{B}}(\text{RW}_r(\alpha))$  via the bijection

$$w_r : \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{RW}_r(\alpha), \quad T \mapsto w_r(T).$$

We denote the resulting  $H_n(0)$ -module as  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$ . Therefore its  $H_n(0)$ -action is given by

$$(3.10) \quad \pi_i \bullet T := \begin{cases} -T & \text{if } i \in \text{Des}(w_r(T)), \\ 0 & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}(w_r(T)) \text{ and } s_i \cdot T \notin \text{SPIT}(\alpha), \\ s_i \cdot T & \text{if } i \notin \text{Des}(w_r(T)) \text{ and } s_i \cdot T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \end{cases}$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$  and  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ .

Before presenting the main result of this subsection, it is necessary to introduce the concept of colored digraph isomorphisms. For weak Bruhat intervals  $I_1, I_2$  of  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ , a map  $f : I_1 \rightarrow I_2$  is called a *colored digraph isomorphism* if  $f$  is bijective and satisfies that for all  $\gamma, \gamma' \in I_1$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ ,

$$\gamma \xrightarrow{i} \gamma' \quad \text{if and only if} \quad f(\gamma) \xrightarrow{i} f(\gamma'),$$

where  $\gamma \xrightarrow{i} \gamma'$  denotes that  $\gamma \preceq_L \gamma'$  and  $s_i \gamma = \gamma'$ . If there exists a descent-preserving colored digraph isomorphism between two intervals  $I_1$  and  $I_2$ , then  $\overline{\mathbf{B}}(I_1)$  is isomorphic to  $\overline{\mathbf{B}}(I_2)$ . For details, see [20, Section 4].

**Theorem 3.20.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$ .*

- (a)  $\text{ch}(\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c) = \text{ch}(\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r)$ .
- (b) *If  $\alpha$  has at most one part greater than 2, then  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c = \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$  as  $H_n(0)$ -modules. Otherwise,  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c \not\cong \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$  as  $H_n(0)$ -modules.*

- (c) If  $\alpha$  has at most one part greater than 2, then there exists a descent-preserving colored digraph between  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  and  $\text{RW}_r(\alpha)$ . Moreover, the intervals  $[\gamma, \xi\gamma]_L$ 's are equivalent up to descent-preserving colored digraph isomorphism for all  $\gamma \in [\text{w}_c(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}), \text{w}_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}})]_R$ , where  $\xi = \text{w}_c(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})\text{w}_c(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}})^{-1}$ .

*Proof.* (a) Following the same way as in [35, Section 5], we can see that

$$\text{ch}(\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c) = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{RW}_c(\alpha)} F_{\text{comp}(\text{Des}(\sigma))} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ch}(\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r) = \sum_{\sigma \in \text{RW}_r(\alpha)} F_{\text{comp}(\text{Des}(\sigma))}.$$

Therefore, the assertion follows from Corollary 3.16.

(b) To begin with, we note that  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$  share the same underlying space  $\mathbb{C}\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . Now, we assume that  $\alpha$  has at most one part greater than 2. By Remark 3.17, we see that  $\text{Des}(\text{w}_c(T)) = \text{Des}(\text{w}_r(T))$  for every  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . Considering  $H_n(0)$ -actions given in (3.9) and (3.10), we observe that  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$  have exactly the same  $H_n(0)$ -action. As a consequence,  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c$  and  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$  are identical as  $H_n(0)$ -modules.

Next, let us consider the case where  $\alpha$  has more than one part greater than 2. Recall that for an  $H_n(0)$ -module  $M$ , the notation  $\chi[M]$  denotes the  $\chi$ -twist of  $M$ , where  $\chi$  is the anti-involution of  $H_n(0)$  defined by

$$\chi : H_n(0) \rightarrow H_n(0), \quad \bar{\pi}_i \mapsto \bar{\pi}_i \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n-1.$$

The underlying space of  $\chi[M]$  is the dual space  $M^*$  of  $M$ , and its  $H_n(0)$ -action is given by

$$(b \cdot^{\chi} \delta)(m) := \delta(\chi(b) \cdot m) \quad \text{for } b \in H_n(0), \delta \in M^*, \text{ and } m \in M$$

(refer to [20, Section 3.4] for more details). In the following, we will show that  $\chi[\mathbf{Q}^c(\alpha)]$  is not isomorphic to  $\chi[\mathbf{Q}^r(\alpha)]$  as  $H_n(0)$ -modules.

Combining [20, Theorem 4 (3)] with Lemma 3.18, we derive that the  $H_n(0)$ -module  $\chi[\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r]$  is generated by  $(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})^*$ . Here,  $\{T^* \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)\}$  denotes the dual basis of the basis  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  for  $\mathbb{C}\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . On the other hand, according to Lemma 3.19, the module  $\chi[\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c]$  is generated by  $T^*$ 's, where  $T$ 's are the SPITs satisfying the condition

$$\bar{\pi}_i \star T = 0 \text{ or } T \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n-1.$$

It can be easily seen that  $T_\alpha^{\text{source}}$  and  $T_\alpha^{\text{s}}$  satisfy this condition. For the definition of  $T_\alpha^{\text{s}}$ , see the proof of Lemma 3.19. Moreover, from [3, Lemma 3.11] it follows that  $T_\alpha^{\text{source}}$  is the unique tableau in  $\text{SIT}(\alpha)$  satisfying the condition  $\text{Des}(\text{w}_r(T)) \subseteq \text{set}(\alpha)$ . Since  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{SIT}(\alpha)$  and  $\{\text{Des}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \text{RW}_c(\alpha)\} = \{\text{Des}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in \text{RW}_r(\alpha)\}$  by Corollary 3.16 (a), any  $H_n(0)$ -module homomorphism  $\Gamma_\alpha : \chi[\mathbf{Q}^r] \rightarrow \chi[\mathbf{Q}^c]$  should map  $(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})^*$  to itself.

Suppose that  $j_1 < j_2$  are the smallest two subindices in  $\{1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha) \mid \alpha_i > 2\}$ . Then, let  $T_\alpha^{\text{sp}}$  be the SPIT of shape  $\alpha$  such that

- the subdiagram  $\text{cd}((2^{j_2}))$  of  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  is filled with  $1, 2, \dots, 2j_2$  from left to right and from bottom to top, and

- the entries at  $(3, j_1)$  and  $(3, j_2)$  are  $2j_2 + 1$  and  $2j_2 + 2$  respectively, with the remaining boxes filled with increasing consecutive numbers, arranged from left to right and from bottom to top.

Consider the permutation  $\rho_\alpha := w_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sp}}) \cdot (w_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}}))^{-1}$ . We observe that

$$(3.11) \quad \pi_{\rho_\alpha} \bullet^\chi (T_\alpha^{\text{source}})^* = (T_\alpha^{\text{sp}})^* \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{2j_2+1} \pi_{\rho_\alpha} \bullet^\chi (T_\alpha^{\text{source}})^* = s_{2j_2+1} (T_\alpha^{\text{sp}})^*.$$

Note that from the definitions of  $T_\alpha^{\text{source}}$  and  $T_\alpha^{\text{sp}}$ , we deduce that

$$\rho_\alpha = s_{[k_{j_1}-\alpha_{j_1}+1+q, k_{j_1}-\alpha_{j_1}+2]} s_{[k_{j_1}-\alpha_{j_1}+3+q, k_{j_1}-\alpha_{j_1}+3]} \cdots s_{[k_{j_1}+q, k_{j_1}]},$$

where  $k_{j_1} := \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_{j_1}$ ,  $q := 2(j_2 - j_1)$ , and  $s_{[a,b]} := s_a s_{a-1} \cdots s_b$  ( $a > b$ ). This expression tells us that

$$(3.12) \quad \pi_{\rho_\alpha} \star^\chi \Gamma_\alpha((T_\alpha^{\text{source}})^*) = (T_\alpha^{\text{sp}})^*, \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_{2j_2+1} \pi_{\rho_\alpha} \star^\chi \Gamma_\alpha((T_\alpha^{\text{source}})^*) = (T_\alpha^{\text{sp}})^*.$$

Here, the second equality follows from the fact that the entry  $2j_2 + 1$  is strictly below  $2j_2 + 2$  in column 3 of  $T_\alpha^{\text{sp}}$ . Comparing (3.11) with (3.12) yields that

$$\chi[\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r] \not\cong \chi[\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c] \quad \text{as } H_n(0)\text{-modules.}$$

(c) We observe the equality  $T_\alpha^{\text{sup}} = T_\alpha^{\text{sink}}$ , which follows from the fact that  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  has only one box in each column  $3, 4, \dots, \alpha_{\max}$ . Therefore we have

$$\text{RW}_c(\alpha) = [w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}), w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})]_L \quad \text{and} \quad \text{RW}_r(\alpha) = [w_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}), w_r(T_\alpha^{\text{source}})]_L.$$

Next, we observe that the readings  $w_c : \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  and  $w_r : \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{RW}_r(\alpha)$  induce the following  $H_n(0)$ -isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} w_c : \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c &\rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{B}}(\text{RW}_c(\alpha)), & T &\mapsto w_c(T) \\ w_r : \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r &\rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{B}}(\text{RW}_r(\alpha)), & T &\mapsto w_r(T). \end{aligned}$$

From the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r \\ w_c(\cong) \downarrow & & \downarrow w_r(\cong) \\ \overline{\mathbf{B}}(\text{RW}_c(\alpha)) & \xrightarrow{w_r \circ w_c^{-1}} & \overline{\mathbf{B}}(\text{RW}_r(\alpha)) \end{array}$$

it follows that

$$w_r \circ w_c^{-1}(\overline{\pi}_i \cdot w_c(T)) = w_r(\overline{\pi}_i \star T) = w_r(\overline{\pi}_i \bullet T) = \overline{\pi}_i \cdot w_r(T).$$

Note that  $w_c(T) \xrightarrow{i} s_i w_c(T)$  if and only if  $i \notin \text{Des}(w_c(T))$  and  $s_i w_c(T) \in \text{RW}_c(\alpha)$ . In the proof of (b), we showed that  $\text{Des}(w_c(T)) = \text{Des}(w_r(T))$ . Thus, if  $i \notin \text{Des}(w_c(T))$  and  $s_i w_c(T) \in \text{RW}_c(\alpha)$ , then

$$w_r \circ w_c^{-1}(s_i w_c(T)) = w_r(s_i \cdot T) = w_r(\overline{\pi}_i \bullet T) = \overline{\pi}_i \cdot w_r(T) = s_i w_r(T),$$

as required. As a consequence, we conclude that

$$w_r \circ w_c^{-1} : \text{RW}_c(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{RW}_r(\alpha)$$

is a descent-preserving poset isomorphism.

On the other hand, [22, Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 4.5] says that the equivalence class  $C$  up to descent-preserving colored digraph isomorphism containing  $\text{RW}_c(\alpha)$  and  $\text{RW}_r(\alpha)$  is of the form

$$C = \{[\gamma, \xi\gamma]_L \mid \gamma \in [\sigma_0, \sigma_1]_R\}$$

for some right weak Bruhat interval  $[\sigma_0, \sigma_1]_R$ . One can easily check that  $w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}) \preceq_R w_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}})$  by using induction on  $|\alpha|$ . Since

$$[w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}), w_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}})]_R \subseteq [\sigma_0, \sigma_1]_R,$$

it follows that  $[\gamma, \xi\gamma]_L$ 's for all  $\gamma \in [w_c(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}), w_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}})]_R$  are contained in  $C$ , and which proves the second assertion.  $\square$

**Example 3.21.** (a) Let us consider  $\alpha = (2, 3, 2)$ . Let

$$T_1 := \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 5 & 6 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad T_2 := \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 5 & 7 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad \text{and} \quad T_3 := \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 6 & 7 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Then  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha) = \{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$ . By a direct calculation, one observes that  $\Xi_\alpha(T) = T$  for  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  (see also Remark 3.17). Figure 3.1 illustrates their  $H_7(0)$ -actions on the bases for  $\overline{\text{B}}(\text{RW}_c(\alpha))$  and  $\overline{\text{B}}(\text{RW}_r(\alpha))$ . From this one knows that  $\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c = \mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r$  as  $H_n(0)$ -modules.

In Figure 3.1, the symbol  $\curvearrowright \pi_i$  represents that  $\pi_i$  acts as  $-\text{id}$ .




FIGURE 3.1.  $\overline{\text{B}}(\text{RW}_c(\alpha))$  and  $\overline{\text{B}}(\text{RW}_r(\alpha))$

(b) Let  $\alpha = (3, 3)$ . Then

$$T_\alpha^{\text{source}} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad T_\alpha^{\text{sp}} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 4 & 6 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad T_\alpha^{\text{sup}} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 6 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Put  $T_1 := \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 2 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$ , and then we see that  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha) = \{T_\alpha^{\text{source}}, T_\alpha^{\text{sp}}, T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}, T_1\}$ . Consider  $\chi[\mathbf{Q}^r]$  and  $\chi[\mathbf{Q}^c]$ . Figure 3.2 illustrates their  $H_6(0)$ -actions on the bases. In Figure 3.2, the symbol  $\curvearrowright \pi_i$  represents that  $\pi_i$  act as id.




FIGURE 3.2. The  $\bullet^x$ -action and the  $\star^x$ -action on the dual basis of  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$

By definition,  $\rho_\alpha = s_{[4,3]}$ . From this one observes that

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\rho_\alpha} \bullet^x T_\alpha^{\text{source}*} &= T_\alpha^{\text{sp}*} & \text{and} & & \pi_5 \pi_{\rho_\alpha} \bullet^x T_\alpha^{\text{source}*} &= T_\alpha^{\text{sup}*}, \\ \pi_{\rho_\alpha} \star^x T_\alpha^{\text{source}*} &= T_\alpha^{\text{sp}*} & \text{and} & & \pi_5 \pi_{\rho_\alpha} \star^x T_\alpha^{\text{source}*} &= T_\alpha^{\text{sp}*}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $\chi[\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^r] \not\cong \chi[\mathbf{Q}_\alpha^c]$  as  $H_6(0)$ -modules.

**Remark 3.22.** The classification of left weak Bruhat intervals in  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  up to descent-preserving isomorphism was explored in [22, Section 4]. Let  $\alpha$  denote a peak composition with at most one part greater than 2. In the proof of Theorem 3.20, we see that the intervals  $[\gamma, \xi\gamma]_L$  in Theorem 3.20 (c) belong to the same equivalence class, say  $C$ , within this classification. However, it is still unclear whether these intervals represent the complete set of intervals within  $C$ , or if there is an additional interval yet to be identified. It would be very nice to obtain a thorough description of this class, which can be achieved by the identification of the minimal and maximal elements in  $\{\sigma \mid [\sigma, \rho]_L \in C\}$  under the right weak Bruhat order.

#### 4. TRANSITION MATRICES FOR $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha\}$ AND $\{\tilde{S}_\alpha\}$

**4.1. The transition matrix from  $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha\}$  to  $\{\tilde{S}_\alpha\}$ .** In this subsection, we present a detailed description of the transition matrix from  $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Pcomp}\}$  to  $\{\tilde{S}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Pcomp}\}$ . A crucial tool in accomplishing this is the insertion algorithm developed by Allen, Hallam, and Mason [1], which was obtained through a slight modification of the Schensted insertion

method outlined in [17, Section 6]. This algorithm inserts a positive integer  $k$  into a YCT  $T$ , resulting in another YCT denoted as  $k \rightarrow T$ . Using this algorithm, they proved that the transition matrix from  $\{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^* \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}\}$  to  $\{\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}\}$  consists of nonnegative integers (see [1]). We show that this algorithm can also be applicable in describing the expansion of  $\tilde{Q}_\alpha$  in the basis  $\{\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Pcomp}\}$ .

For  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)})$ , let  $\bar{\alpha} := (\alpha_1 + 1, \alpha_2 + 1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)} + 1)$ . Given a YCT  $T$  of shape  $\alpha$ , let  $\bar{T}$  be the filling of  $\mathbf{cd}(\bar{\alpha})$  in which the rightmost entry in each row is  $\infty$  and the remaining boxes have the same entry as  $T$ . For example,

$$(4.1) \quad T = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 6 & 8 \\ \hline 2 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{T} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 6 & 8 & \infty \\ \hline 2 & 4 & 7 \\ \hline 1 & \infty & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Then the procedure  $k \rightarrow T$  is defined in the following manner.

**Algorithm 4.1.** ([1, Procedure 3.1]) Let  $(c_1, d_1), (c_2, d_2), \dots$  be the boxes of  $\bar{T}$  listed in the order from top to bottom and from right to left.

*Step 1.* Set  $k_0 := k$  and let  $i$  be the smallest positive integer such that  $\bar{T}_{c_{i-1}, d_i} \leq k_0 < \bar{T}_{c_i, d_i}$ .

If such an  $i$  exists, then go to *Step 2*. Otherwise, go to *Step 3*.

*Step 2.* Consider the following two cases:

**Case 1:** If  $\bar{T}_{c_i, d_i} = \infty$ , then place  $k_0$  in box  $(c_i, d_i)$  and terminate the procedure.

**Case 2:** If  $\bar{T}_{c_i, d_i} \neq \infty$ , then set  $k := \bar{T}_{c_i, d_i}$ , place  $k_0$  in box  $(c_i, d_i)$ , and repeat the procedure by inserting  $k$  into the sequence of boxes  $(c_{i+1}, d_{i+1}), (c_{i+2}, d_{i+2}), \dots$

In such a situation, we say that  $\bar{T}_{c_i, d_i}$  is *bumped*.

*Step 3.* Begin a new row (containing only  $k_0$ ) in the highest position in the leftmost column such that all entries below  $k_0$  in the leftmost column are smaller than  $k_0$  and terminate the procedure. If the new row is not the top row of the diagram, shift all higher rows up by one.

**Example 4.2.** Let us consider the insertion of 5 into  $T$  in (4.1):

$$5 \rightarrow \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 6 & 8 \\ \hline 2 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & \\ \hline \end{array} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 6 & 7 \\ \hline 2 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 8 \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

The first element bumped is the 7 in column 3. This 7 is replaced by 5 and 7 is then inserted into the remaining sequence of boxes. The 7 then bumps the 8 in column 2 and 8 is inserted into the remaining boxes. The 8 is placed to the right of the 1 and the procedure terminates.

Now we introduce the procedure in [1] that maps a word to a pair of fillings of the same shape. Begin with  $(P_0, Q_0) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$ , where  $\emptyset$  is the empty filling. Let  $w_1$  be the first letter in the word  $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k$ . Insert  $w_1$  into  $P_0$  using Algorithm 4.1 and let  $P_1$  be the resulting YCT. Record the location in  $P_1$  where the new box was created by placing a



“1” in  $Q_0$  in the corresponding location and let  $Q_1$  be the resulting filling. Next, assume the first  $j - 1$  letters of  $w$  have been inserted. Let  $w_j$  be the  $j$ th letter in  $w$ . Insert  $w_j$  into  $P_{j-1}$  and let  $P_j$  be the resulting filling. Place the letter  $j$  in the box of  $Q_{j-1}$  corresponding to the new box in  $P_j$  created from [Algorithm 4.1](#) and let  $Q_j$  be the resulting filling. We denote the final pair  $(P_k, Q_k)$  as  $(P(w), Q(w))$ . We refer to  $P(w)$  as the *insertion tableau* of  $w$  and  $Q(w)$  as the *recording tableau* of  $w$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** ([1, Lemma 3.5]) *Assume that  $x \leq y$  are inserted into a YCT  $T$  to form  $(y \rightarrow (x \rightarrow T))$ . The new box created by the insertion of  $y$  is strictly to the right of the new box created by the insertion of  $x$ . In particular, if a sequence  $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_m$  is inserted into a YCT in order from smallest to largest, then the column indices of the resulting new boxes strictly increase.*

Here are the three key properties of this insertion algorithm.

- $P(w)$  is an SYCT for every  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ .
- $Q(w)$  is a dual immaculate recording tableau (DIRT) with a row strip shape  $\alpha^r$  if and only if  $w$  appears as  $w_r(T)$  for some  $T \in \text{SIT}(\alpha)$ .
- $\text{Des}(w_r(T)) = \mathbf{Des}(P(w_r(T)))$  holds for all  $T \in \text{SIT}(\alpha)$ .

All details can be found in [1]. In particular, refer to [1, Definition 3.9 and Definition 3.4] for the definitions of *dual immaculate recording tableaux* and *row strip shape*. Based on these properties, Allen, Hallam, and Mason established the bijection

$$\underline{\text{AHM}} : \text{SIT}(\alpha) \longrightarrow \bigcup_{\beta \in \text{Comp}_n} \text{SYCT}(\beta) \times \text{DIRT}(\beta, \alpha^r), \quad T \mapsto (P(w_r(T)), Q(w_r(T))),$$

which yields the expansion:

$$(4.2) \quad \mathfrak{S}_\alpha^* = \sum_{\beta \in \text{Comp}_n} c_{\alpha, \beta} \hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\beta,$$

where  $c_{\alpha, \beta} = |\text{DIRT}(\beta, \alpha^r)|$ . Furthermore, they showed that  $c_{\alpha, \alpha} = 1$  and  $c_{\alpha, \beta}$  vanishes unless  $\beta$  is strictly less than  $\alpha$  in the dominance order. Consequently, the transition matrix from  $\{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^*\}$  to  $\{\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha\}$  is unitriangular and comprises nonnegative integer entries (see [1, Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 4.2]).

Combining the equality  $\text{Des}(w_r(T)) = \mathbf{Des}(P(w_r(T)))$  with [30, Lemma 5.3] yields that

$$(4.3) \quad \text{Des}(w_r(T)) = \text{Des}(w_Y(P(w_r(T)))) \quad \text{for } T \in \text{SIT}(\alpha).$$

In the following, we investigate what can be obtained if the domain of  $\underline{\text{AHM}}$  is restricted to  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ .

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$ . Then the image of  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  under  $\underline{\text{AHM}}$  is given by  $\bigcup_{\beta} \text{SPYCT}(\beta) \times \text{DIRT}(\beta, \alpha^r)$ , and therefore the map*

$$\underline{\text{AHM}}|_{\text{SPIT}(\alpha)} : \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \longrightarrow \bigcup_{\beta \in \text{Pcomp}_n} \text{SPYCT}(\beta) \times \text{DIRT}(\beta, \alpha^r)$$

is a one-to-one correspondence satisfying that  $\text{Des}(w_r(T)) = \text{Des}(w_Y(P(w_r(T))))$  for all  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $T \in \text{SIT}(\alpha)$ . For the assertion we need to verify that

- (i) if  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ , then  $P(w_r(T))$  is an SPYCT, and
- (ii) if  $P(w_r(T))$  is an SPYCT, then  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ .

For (i), let  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . Since  $P(w_r(T))$  is an SYCT, we have only to show that  $P(w_r(T))^{(\leq 2)}$  is canonical. By Lemma 2.2, for  $1 \leq i < \ell(\alpha)$ , it holds that  $T_{1,i} < T_{2,i} < u$  for all  $u \in T_{(\geq i+1)}$ . Here,  $T_{(\geq i+1)}$  is the subtableau consisting of the rows  $T_{(i+1)}, T_{(i+2)}, \dots, T_{(\ell(\alpha))}$ . Due to this inequality, the entry  $T_{1,i}$  appears at the box  $(1, 1)$  in  $T_{1,i} \rightarrow P(w_r(T_{(\geq i+1)}))$ , and  $T_{2,i}$  appears at the box  $(2, 1)$  in  $T_{2,i} \rightarrow (T_{1,i} \rightarrow P(w_r(T_{(\geq i+1)})))$ . Therefore,

$$(T_{2,i} \rightarrow (T_{1,i} \rightarrow P(w_r(T_{(\geq i+1)}))))_{2,j} < (T_{2,i} \rightarrow (T_{1,i} \rightarrow P(w_r(T_{(\geq i+1)}))))_{1,j+1}$$

for all  $1 \leq j < \ell(\alpha) - i + 1$ . Repeating this process, we can derive from Lemma 4.3 that

$$P(w_r(T))_{2,j} < P(w_r(T))_{1,j+1} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j < \ell(\alpha),$$

thus  $P(w_r(T))^{(\leq 2)}$  is canonical.

To prove (ii) by contradiction, we assume that  $T$  does not satisfy the peak-tableau condition. As  $T^{(\leq 2)}$  is not canonical, we can choose the smallest  $1 \leq i < \ell(\alpha)$  such that

$$(4.4) \quad T_{1,i} < T_{1,i+1} < T_{2,i}, \quad \text{but} \quad T_{1,k} < T_{2,k} < T_{1,k+1} \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq k \leq i-1.$$

When  $i = 1$ ,  $P(w_r(T))_{1,1} = 1$  and  $P(w_r(T))_{1,2} = 2$  since  $T_{1,1} = 1$  and  $T_{1,2} = 2$ . This violates the peak-tableau condition, which contradicts the assumption. Consider the case where  $i \geq 2$ . The latter inequality implies that  $P(w_r(T))_{1,k} = T_{1,k}$  and  $P(w_r(T))_{2,k} = T_{2,k}$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq i-1$ . Consider the process

$$P(w_r(T_{(\ell(\alpha))})) \rightsquigarrow P(w_r(T_{(\geq \ell(\alpha)-1)})) \rightsquigarrow \cdots \rightsquigarrow P(w_r(T_{(\geq 1)})) = P(w_r(T)).$$

Note that the entry  $P(w_r(T))_{2,i}$  remains stabilized after the  $(\ell(\alpha) - i + 1)$ st step, with the exception of being shifted one box upwards at each step, as illustrated below:

$$P(w_r(T_{(\geq i)}))_{2,1} = P(w_r(T_{(\geq i-1)}))_{2,2} = \cdots = P(w_r(T))_{2,i}.$$

If the box  $(2, i)$  is not contained in the composition diagram of  $P(w_r(T))$ , then  $P(w_r(T))$  is not an SPYCT. Otherwise,  $P(w_r(T))_{2,i}$  belongs to the set of entries of  $T_{(\geq i)}$ . On the other hand, the entries  $T_{1,i} + 1, T_{1,i} + 2, \dots, T_{1,i+1} - 1$  belong to the set of entries of  $T_{(\leq i-1)}$  due to (4.4). This indicates that  $P(w_r(T))_{2,i} > T_{1,i+1} = P(w_r(T))_{1,i+1}$ , and thus  $P(w_r(T))^{(\leq 2)}$  is not canonical. Therefore, by Lemma 2.6,  $P(w_r(T))$  is not an SPYCT.  $\square$

Now, we are ready to state the main result of this subsection, which asserts that the transition matrix from  $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha\}$  to  $\{\tilde{S}_\beta\}$  is derived from the transition matrix from  $\{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^*\}$  to  $\{\hat{S}_\alpha\}$  by restricting the index set from **Comp** to **Pcomp**.

**Theorem 4.5.** *For a peak composition  $\alpha$  of  $n$ , we have*

$$\tilde{Q}_\alpha = \sum_{\beta \in \text{Pcomp}_n} c_{\alpha,\beta} \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\beta,$$

where  $c_{\alpha,\beta} = |\text{DIRT}(\beta, \alpha^r)|$ .

*Proof.* Combining [Corollary 3.16](#) with [Proposition 4.4](#), we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_\alpha &= \sum_{T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(\text{w}_r(T))))} \\ &= \sum_{\beta \in \text{Pcomp}_n} c_{\alpha,\beta} \left( \sum_{P \in \text{SPYCT}(\beta)} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(\text{w}_Y(P))))} \right) = \sum_{\beta \in \text{Pcomp}_n} c_{\alpha,\beta} \tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\beta, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

Recall that the transition matrix from  $\{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^*\}$  to  $\{\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha\}$  is unitriangular in the dominance order and consists of nonnegative integer entries. [Theorem 4.5](#) verifies that this property holds for the transition matrix from  $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha\}$  to  $\{\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha\}$ .

**4.2. The expansion of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha$  in the basis  $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha\}$  in special cases.** Unlike the transition matrix from  $\{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^* \mid \alpha \in \text{Comp}\}$  to  $\{\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \text{Comp}\}$ , very little is known about its inverse until now. Nevertheless, some important observation and conjectures were presented in [\[1, Section 6\]](#). Specifically, the authors noted that this transition matrix has integer entries. Furthermore, they proposed the following conjectures:

- ([\[1, Conjecture 6.1\]](#)) For  $\alpha \in \text{Comp}_n$ ,  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha = \sum_{\beta} b_{\alpha,\beta} \mathfrak{S}_\beta^*$  with  $b_{\alpha,\beta} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ . Moreover,  $\sum_{\beta} b_{\alpha,\beta} = 1$  if  $\alpha = (1^k, n-k)$  and 0 otherwise.
- ([\[1, Conjecture 6.2\]](#)) If  $\lambda$  is a strict partition, then  $\hat{\mathfrak{S}}_\lambda = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{\ell(\lambda)}} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma)} \mathfrak{S}_{\sigma(\lambda)}^*$ , where  $\sigma(\lambda) = (\lambda_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \lambda_{\sigma(\ell(\lambda))})$ .

Motivated by these conjectures, we study the expansion of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\alpha$  in the basis  $\{\tilde{Q}_\alpha\}$  in special cases.

Firstly, we study the case where  $\alpha$  is a strict partition. The following proposition is a peak analogue of [\[1, Conjecture 6.2\]](#).

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $\lambda$  be a strict partition. Then we have*

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{S}}_\lambda = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \text{Pcomp} \\ \lambda(\alpha) = \lambda}} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma_\alpha)} \tilde{Q}_\alpha,$$

where  $\sigma_\alpha$  is a unique minimal permutation in  $\mathfrak{S}_{\ell(\lambda)}$  such that  $\sigma_\alpha \cdot \alpha = \lambda(\alpha)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\text{SShT}(\lambda)$  be the set of all standard shifted tableaux of shape  $\lambda$ . For any  $S \in \text{SShT}(\lambda)$ , we have  $i \in \text{Des}(w_r(S))$  if and only if  $i$  is positioned strictly below  $i+1$  in  $S$ . It was shown in [30, Lemma 6.8] that there is a bijection  $\text{rect} : \text{SShT}(\lambda) \rightarrow \text{SPYCT}(\lambda)$  such that

$$\text{Des}(w_r(S)) = \text{Des}(w_Y(\text{rect}(S))).$$

On the other hand, it was shown in [34, Eq.(2.5)] that

$$Q_\lambda = \sum_{S \in \text{SShT}(\lambda)} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_r(S))))},$$

where  $Q_\lambda$  is the *Schur Q-function* associated with  $\lambda$ . From this it follows that  $Q_\lambda = \tilde{S}_\lambda$ . Now, the assertion can be derived from the equality

$$Q_\lambda = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \text{Pcomp} \\ \lambda(\alpha) = \lambda}} (-1)^{\ell(\sigma_\alpha)} \tilde{Q}_\alpha$$

(see [19, Theorem 4.12]). □

Secondly, we study the case where  $\alpha$  is a peak composition with  $\alpha_i \leq 3$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha)$ . We show that a peak analogue of [1, Conjecture 6.1] holds in this case. For such a peak composition  $\alpha$ , define

$$I_\alpha := \{i \mid 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha) - 1 \text{ and } \alpha_i = 3 \text{ and } \alpha_{i+1} \neq 1\}.$$

For any interval  $[i, j]$  contained in  $I_\alpha$ , we define  $\Delta_{[i, j]}(\alpha)$  by the composition such that

$$\Delta_{[i, j]}(\alpha)_k = \begin{cases} \alpha_k - 1 & \text{if } i \leq k \leq j \\ \alpha_k + (j - i + 1) & \text{if } k = j + 1 \\ \alpha_k & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Given a subset  $S$  of  $I_\alpha$ , write it as the disjoint union of intervals

$$S = [i_1, j_1] \cup [i_2, j_2] \cup \cdots \cup [i_s, j_s].$$

For  $1 \leq k < l \leq s$ , one observes that

$$\Delta_{[i_k, j_k]}(\Delta_{[i_l, j_l]}(\alpha)) = \Delta_{[i_l, j_l]}(\Delta_{[i_k, j_k]}(\alpha)),$$

thus this operation does not depend on the order of applying  $\Delta_{[i_k, j_k]}$ 's. Therefore, we can define  $\Delta_S(\alpha)$  recursively as follows:

$$(4.5) \quad \Delta_S(\alpha) := \Delta_{[i_s, j_s]}(\cdots \Delta_{[i_2, j_2]}((\Delta_{[i_1, j_1]}(\alpha))) \cdots).$$

For each  $s \in I_\alpha$ , define

$$\mathcal{A}_\alpha(s) := \{T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \mid T_{\alpha_s, s} > T_{\alpha_{s+1}, s+1}\}.$$

And, let

$$\mathcal{A}_\alpha := \{T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \mid T_{\alpha_s, s} > T_{\alpha_{s+1}, s+1} \text{ for some } s \in I_\alpha\}.$$

**Lemma 4.7.** *Assume that  $\alpha$  is a peak composition with  $\alpha_i \leq 3$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha)$ .*

(a) *Let  $S \subseteq I_\alpha$ . Then, as multisets,*

$$\{\text{Des}(\text{w}_r(T)) \mid T \in \bigcap_{s \in S} \mathcal{A}_\alpha(s)\} = \{\text{Des}(\text{w}_r(T)) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\Delta_S(\alpha))\}.$$

(b) *As multisets,*

$$\{\text{Des}(\text{w}_r(T)) \mid T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{A}_\alpha\} = \{\text{Des}(\text{w}_Y(T)) \mid T \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)\}.$$

*Proof.* (a) Due to (4.5), we only need to prove the assertion for  $S = [i, j] \subset I_\alpha$  with  $i \leq j$ . Note that

$$\bigcap_{s \in S} \mathcal{A}_\alpha(s) = \{T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \mid T_{3,i} > \cdots > T_{3,j} > T_{\alpha_{j+1}, j+1}\}.$$

Consider the map

$$\Phi_S : \bigcap_{s \in S} \mathcal{A}_\alpha(s) \rightarrow \text{SPIT}(\Delta_S(\alpha)), \quad T \mapsto \mathbf{s}_{i,j+1}(\cdots(\mathbf{s}_{j,j+1}(T))),$$

where  $\mathbf{s}_{p,q}(T)$  ( $1 \leq p < q \leq \ell(\alpha)$ ) is the filling obtained from  $T$  by shifting the box located at  $(\beta_i, i)$  along with its entry to the immediately right of the rightmost box of row  $j$  in  $T$ . From the definition of  $\mathbf{s}_{p,q}$ , it follows that  $\Phi_S$  is well-defined and bijective.

Next, let us show that

$$(4.6) \quad \text{Des}(\text{w}_r(T)) = \text{Des}(\text{w}_r(\Phi_S(T)))$$

for all  $T \in \bigcap_{s \in [i,j]} \mathcal{A}_\alpha(s)$ . For each  $i \leq s \leq j$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} T[s] &:= \mathbf{s}_{s,j+1}(\cdots(\mathbf{s}_{j,j+1}(T))), \text{ and} \\ x_s &:= T[s]_{3,s}. \end{aligned}$$

For convenience, we set  $T[j+1] := T$ . Using this notation, the equality (4.6) is equivalent to

$$(4.7) \quad \text{Des}(\text{w}_r(T[s])) = \text{Des}(\text{w}_r(T[s+1])) \quad \text{for all } s = 1, 2, \dots, j.$$

For  $i \leq s \leq j+1$ ,  $T[s]$  is an SPIT, and thus, by definition,

$$(4.8) \quad T[s]_{\alpha_{j+1}, j+1} < x_s.$$

Except for the entry  $x_s$ ,  $T[s]$  and  $T[s+1]$  are the same. So, to establish the equality (4.7), it suffices to show that

- (i)  $x_s - 1$  does not appear between row  $s$  and row  $j$ , and
- (ii)  $x_s + 1$  does not appear between row  $s$  and row  $j+1$ .

If  $x_s - 1$  appears between row  $s$  and row  $j$ , then  $x_s - 1$  should be in column 1 or column 2, so it follows from Lemma 2.2 that  $T[s]_{\alpha_{j+1}, j+1} > x_s$ . It contradicts (4.8), thus (i) holds. If  $x_s + 1$  appears between row  $s$  and row  $j+1$ , one can obtain a contradiction in a similar way of (i), thus (ii) holds.

(b) Consider a map

$$\Psi_\alpha : \text{SPYCT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{A}_\alpha, \quad T \mapsto \Psi_\alpha(T),$$

where  $\Psi_\alpha(T)$  is the filling of shape  $\alpha$  obtained from  $T$  by sorting the entries of  $T^{(3)}$  in increasing order from bottom to top, while keeping  $T^{(1)}$  and  $T^{(2)}$  unchanged. We claim that  $\Psi_\alpha$  is a well-defined bijection, and  $\text{Des}(w_Y(T)) = \text{Des}(w_r(\Psi_\alpha(T)))$  for  $T \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ .

Firstly, to show that  $\Psi_\alpha(T) \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ , consider  $T \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ . By definition,  $\Psi_\alpha(T)^{(1)} = T^{(1)}$  and  $\text{sort}(T)^{(2)} = T^{(2)}$ . According to the Young triple condition,  $\Psi_\alpha(T)_{2,i} < \Psi_\alpha(T)_{1,i+1}$  for all  $1 \leq i < \ell(\alpha)$ , ensuring  $\Psi_\alpha(T) \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . If  $j$  is an index such that  $\alpha_{j+1} = 2$  and  $\alpha_j = 3$ , then  $T_{2,j} > T_{3,r}$  for any  $r < j$  where  $\alpha_r = 3$ , due to the Young triple condition. It follows that  $T_{3,r_2} < T_{3,r_1}$  for any  $r_1 < j < r_2$  where  $\alpha_{r_1} = \alpha_{r_2} = 3$ . Consequently,  $\text{sort}(T)_{2,j+1} > \text{sort}(T)_{3,j}$ , which confirms that  $\Psi_\alpha(T) \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ .

Secondly, we show that  $\Psi_\alpha$  is a bijection. For  $T, S \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ , it holds that if  $T^{(3)}$  and  $S^{(3)}$  have the same set of entries, then  $T = S$ . Therefore the injectiveness of  $\Psi_\alpha$  can be derived by showing that the same phenomenon happens for  $T, S \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ . Assume for contradiction that  $T^{(3)}$  and  $S^{(3)}$  have the same set of entries, but  $T \neq S$ . Choose the largest index  $i$  such that  $T_{3,i} \neq S_{3,i}$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $T_{3,i} < S_{3,i}$ . Then there exists an index  $q < i$  such that  $S_{3,q} = T_{3,i}$ . Given that  $T_{2,i} < T_{3,i}$ , it follows that  $S_{2,i} = T_{2,i} < S_{3,q} < S_{3,i}$ , yielding a violation of the Young triple condition. This contradicts the assumption that  $S \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ . We next derive the surjectiveness of  $\Psi_\alpha$ . For  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{A}_\alpha$ , let  $S_T$  be the filling of shape  $\alpha$  subject to the following conditions:

- The first column and second column of  $S_T$  are those of  $T$ , respectively.
- The third column of  $S_T$  is constructed as follows: Let  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l)$  be the sequence of the entries in the third column of  $T$  from bottom to top. For  $1 \leq p \leq l$ , let  $y_p$  be the uppermost entry in the second column of  $S_T$  such that  $y_p < x_p$  and the box to the immediate right of  $y_p$  is empty. Then, place  $x_p$  in the box to the immediate right of  $y_p$ .

The latter condition shows that  $S_T$  satisfies the Young triple condition, therefore  $S_T \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ .

Finally, we show that  $\text{Des}(w_Y(T)) = \text{Des}(w_r(\Psi_\alpha(T)))$  for  $T \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ . Observe that  $i \in \text{Des}(w_Y(T))$  if and only if  $i+1, i \in T^{(3)}$  and  $i+1$  is strictly below  $i$ . Now, the desired equality follows from the definition of the map  $\text{sort}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.8.** *Assume that  $\alpha$  is a peak composition with  $\alpha_i \leq 3$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha)$ . Then we have*

$$(4.9) \quad \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}_\alpha = \sum_{S \subseteq I_\alpha} (-1)^{|S|} \tilde{Q}_{\Delta_S(\alpha)}.$$

*In particular, the sum of all coefficients is 1 if  $I_\alpha = \emptyset$  and 0 otherwise.*

*Proof.* Note that

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{S \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_r(S))))} \\ &= \sum_{T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{A}_\alpha} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_r(T))))} + \sum_{U \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_r(U))))}. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 4.7(b) it follows that

$$\sum_{T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha) \setminus \mathcal{A}_\alpha} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_r(T))))} = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha.$$

On the other hand, using the inclusion-exclusion principle, we can derive that

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\alpha}(T) = \sum_{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq I_\alpha} (-1)^{|S|+1} \mathbb{1}_{\bigcap_{s \in S} \mathcal{A}_\alpha(s)}(T) \quad \text{for } T \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha.$$

Here,  $\mathbb{1}_X$  is the indicator function, that is,  $\mathbb{1}_X(T) = 1$  if  $T \in X$  and 0 otherwise. Combining this equality with Lemma 4.7(a) yields that

$$\sum_{U \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha} K_{\text{comp}(\text{Peak}(\text{Des}(w_r(U))))} = \sum_{\emptyset \neq S \subseteq I_\alpha} (-1)^{|S|+1} \tilde{Q}_{\Delta_S(\alpha)}.$$

Therefore, the assertion follows from that the left-hand side of (4.10) is  $\tilde{Q}_\alpha$  (see Corollary 3.16(b)).  $\square$

We remark that the summation of the right-hand side of (4.9) is cancellation-free.

**Example 4.9.** Let  $\alpha = (3, 2, 3, 3, 1)$ . Then  $I_\alpha = \{1, 3\}$  and its subsets are  $\emptyset$ ,  $\{1\}$ ,  $\{3\}$ , and  $\{1, 3\}$ . One can see that  $\Delta_\emptyset(\alpha) = (3, 2, 3, 3, 1)$ ,  $\Delta_{\{1\}}(\alpha) = (2, 3, 3, 3, 1)$ ,  $\Delta_{\{3\}}(\alpha) = (3, 2, 2, 4, 1)$ , and  $\Delta_{\{1, 3\}}(\alpha) = \Delta_{\{3\}}\Delta_{\{1\}}(\alpha) = \Delta_{\{1\}}\Delta_{\{3\}}(\alpha) = (2, 3, 2, 4, 1)$ . Combining these calculations with Proposition 4.8 shows that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{(3,2,3,3,1)} = \tilde{Q}_{(3,2,3,3,1)} - \tilde{Q}_{(2,3,3,3,1)} - \tilde{Q}_{(3,2,2,4,1)} + \tilde{Q}_{(2,3,2,4,1)}.$$

Thirdly, we study the case where  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  is of hook-like shape within the context of peak compositions.

**Proposition 4.10.** *Assume that  $\alpha$  is a peak composition with at most one part greater than 2. Then we have*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha = \begin{cases} \tilde{Q}_\alpha & \text{if } \alpha = (2, 2, \dots, 2, k) \text{ or } \alpha = (2, 2, \dots, 2, k, 1) \text{ for } k \geq 2, \\ \tilde{Q}_\alpha - \tilde{Q}_{s_i \cdot \alpha} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here,  $i$  denotes the index such that  $\alpha_i = k$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of shape  $(2^a, k, 2^b)$  or  $(2^a, k, 2^b, 1)$  for some  $a, b \geq 0$  and  $k \geq 2$ . First, assume that  $b > 0$  and  $\alpha_i = k > 2$ . Then there are two cases  $T_{i+2,2} > T_{i,3}$  and  $T_{i+2,2} < T_{i,3}$  where  $T \in \mathbf{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . In the former case, since  $P(w_r(T)) = T$ ,  $T \in \mathbf{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ . By (4.3) it follows that  $\text{Des}(w_r(T)) = \text{Des}(w_Y(T))$ . In the latter case, let  $\hat{T}$  be the tableau obtained from  $T$  by shifting the subfiling  $\boxed{T_{3,i}} \boxed{T_{4,i}} \cdots \boxed{T_{\alpha_i,i}}$  upwards by one cell. Then the map

$$\{T \in \mathbf{SPIT}(\alpha) \mid T_{2,i+1} < T_{3,i}\} \rightarrow \mathbf{SPIT}(s_i \cdot \alpha), \quad T \mapsto \hat{T}$$

is a bijection satisfying that  $\text{Des}(w_r(T)) = \text{Des}(w_r(\hat{T}))$ . Combining both cases, we see that

$$\mathbf{SPIT}(\alpha) = \mathbf{SPYCT}(\alpha) \cup \mathbf{SPIT}(s_i \cdot \alpha)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \{\text{Des}(w_r(T)) \mid T \in \mathbf{SPIT}(\alpha)\} \\ &= \{\text{Des}(w_Y(T)) \mid T \in \mathbf{SPYCT}(\alpha)\} \cup \{\text{Des}(w_r(T)) \mid T \in \mathbf{SPIT}(s_i \cdot \alpha)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have  $\tilde{Q}_\alpha = \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha + \tilde{Q}_{s_i \cdot \alpha}$ .

Next, assume that  $b = 0$  and  $k \leq 2$ . Let  $T \in \mathbf{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . Since  $P(w_r(T)) = T$ , it follows that  $T \in \mathbf{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ , and therefore  $\mathbf{SPIT}(\alpha) = \mathbf{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ . Now, the assertion follows from (4.3).  $\square$

Finally, we characterize peak compositions  $\alpha$  such that  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha = \tilde{Q}_\alpha$ .

**Proposition 4.11.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$ . Then  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha = \tilde{Q}_\alpha$  if and only if  $\alpha = (2, 2, \dots, 2, k)$  or  $(2, 2, \dots, 2, k, 1)$  for some  $k \geq 2$ .*

*Proof.* The ‘if’ part is already shown in Proposition 4.10. We here show the ‘only if’ part. For the sake of contradiction, let us suppose that  $\alpha$  is neither of the forms  $(2^{\ell(\alpha)-1}, k)$  nor  $(2^{\ell(\alpha)-2}, k, 1)$  for some  $k \geq 2$ . For a such composition  $\alpha$ , we consider the SPIT  $T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}$  (see (3.8)). By the map  $\underline{\text{AHM}}$  one can see that the shape of  $P(w_r(T_\alpha^{\text{sup}}))$  is

$$\beta := \begin{cases} (2^{\ell(\alpha)-1}, n - 2\ell(\alpha) + 2) & \text{if } \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)} = 2, \\ (2^{\ell(\alpha)-2}, n - 2\ell(\alpha) + 3, 1) & \text{if } \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)} = 1. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, considering Theorem 4.5,  $c_{\alpha,\beta} \geq 1$  for  $\beta \neq \alpha$  except when  $\alpha$  equals either  $(2, 2, \dots, 2, k)$  or  $(2, 2, \dots, 2, k, 1)$  for some  $k \geq 2$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha = \tilde{Q}_\alpha$ , confirming the assertion.  $\square$

**Remark 4.12.** It was pointed out in [21, Section 4] that  $\tilde{Q}_\alpha$  may not necessarily exhibit positive expansion in the bases  $\{\mathcal{S}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}\}$ ,  $\{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}\}$ , and  $\{\mathfrak{S}_\alpha^* \mid \alpha \in \mathbf{Comp}\}$ . One can observe a similar phenomenon for peak Young quasisymmetric Schur functions. For example,  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{(2,2,1)} = -\mathcal{S}_{(1^2,2,1)} + \mathcal{S}_{(1,2^2)} + \mathcal{S}_{(1,3,1)} + \mathcal{S}_{(2,1,2)}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{(2,2,1)} = -\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{(1,2,1^2)} + \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{(1,3,1)} + \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{(2,1,2)} + \hat{\mathcal{S}}_{(2^2,1)}$ , and  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{(3,1)} = -\mathfrak{S}_{(1,3)}^* + \mathfrak{S}_{(2,1^2)}^* + \mathfrak{S}_{(2^2)}^* + \mathfrak{S}_{(3,1)}^*$ .



5. COMBINATORIAL PROPERTIES OF  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$  AND  $\text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ 

**5.1. A hook length formula for  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ .** Recall that we have a surprising enumeration formula for standard immaculate tableaux that is analogous to the hook length formula for standard Young tableaux (see [2, Proposition 3.13]). The aim of this subsection is to provide a peak analogue of this formula.

Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition and  $k$  be a positive integer. In this subsection, we present a closed formula for the cardinality of  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ . Given a box  $(i, j) \in \text{cd}(\alpha)$ , we define

$$\tilde{h}_\alpha((i, j)) := \begin{cases} \alpha_j + \alpha_{j+1} + \cdots + \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)} & \text{if } i = 1, \\ \alpha_j + \alpha_{j+1} + \cdots + \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)} - 1 & \text{if } i = 2, \\ \alpha_j - i + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

When  $i \leq 2$ ,  $\tilde{h}_\alpha((i, j))$  counts the number of boxes above or weakly to the right of  $(i, j)$  in  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$ . For  $i \geq 3$ , it counts the number of boxes weakly to the right of  $(i, j)$ . With this notation, we can derive the following hook length formula for  $\text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$ . Then we have*

$$|\text{SPIT}(\alpha)| = \frac{n!}{\prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\alpha)} \tilde{h}_\alpha(c)}.$$

*Proof.* We will prove the assertion by applying mathematical induction on  $\ell(\alpha)$ . If  $\ell(\alpha) = 1$ , the assertion holds, as both sides equal 1. Now, assume that the assertion holds for all peak compositions of  $n$  of length  $l$ . Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$  with  $\ell(\alpha) = l + 1$ . For each  $T \in \text{SPIT}(\alpha)$ , recall that  $T_{(1)}$  denotes the first row of  $T$ , and let  $T \setminus T_{(1)}$  denote the tableau obtained from  $T$  by removing  $T_{(1)}$ . Note that the first two entries of  $T_{(1)}$  are 1 and 2. Consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : \text{SPIT}(\alpha) &\rightarrow \{U \subseteq [3, n] \mid |U| = \alpha_1 - 2\} \times \text{SPIT}((\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)})) \\ T &\mapsto (\{T_{1,j} \mid 3 \leq j \leq \alpha_1\}, \text{stan}(T \setminus T_{(1)})), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\text{stan}(T \setminus T_{(1)})$  is the standardization of  $T \setminus T_{(1)}$ . It can be easily seen that this map is a bijection, and therefore

$$|\text{SPIT}(\alpha)| = \binom{n-2}{\alpha_1-2} \cdot |\text{SPIT}((\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)}))|.$$

Now, the assertion follows from the induction hypothesis.  $\square$

**Example 5.2.** (a) Let  $\alpha = (3, 2, 4, 2)$ . Then the filling  $T$  of  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  with  $T_{i,j} = \tilde{h}_\alpha((i, j))$  is given by

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 6 & 5 \\ \hline 8 & 7 \\ \hline 11 & 10 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \\ \hline & 2 & 1 & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

By [Proposition 5.1](#), we see that  $|\text{SPIT}(\alpha)| = 54$ .

(b) Let  $\alpha = (3^k)$  for some positive integer  $k$ . By [Proposition 5.1](#), we see that

$$|\text{SPIT}(3^k)| = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq k} (3i - 2).$$

The sequence  $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  given by  $a_n = |\text{SPIT}(3^{n+1})|$  coincides with the sequence [A007559](#) in [\[29\]](#).

**5.2. Word models for SYCTs and SPYCTs.** Unlike standard peak immaculate tableaux, a closed-form enumeration formula for standard peak Young composition tableaux is currently unknown. In this subsection, we demonstrate that SYCTs and SPYCTs can be bijectively mapped to specific words in a familiar form.

Let  $\alpha$  be a composition of  $n$ . Recall that each box in  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$  is identified with its  $xy$ -plane coordinate. With this convention, every  $T \in \text{SYCT}(\alpha)$  can be represented by a sequence of composition diagrams:

$$(5.1) \quad D_0 := \emptyset \subset D_1 \subset D_2 \subset \cdots \subset D_n = \text{cd}(\alpha),$$

where new boxes should be placed according to the following rules.

- (1) Boxes within each row are placed from left to right.
- (2) Boxes in the leftmost column are stacked from bottom to top.
- (3) For  $i < j$ , if  $(k, j)$  precedes  $(k + 1, i)$ , meaning the former is placed before the latter, then  $(k + 1, j) \in \text{cd}(\alpha)$  and  $(k + 1, j)$  precedes  $(k + 1, i)$ .

In this case,  $T$  is obtained by recording the order in which the boxes are placed, and therefore  $D_i$  is the shape of  $T[\leq i]$  for  $0 \leq i \leq n$ .

**Example 5.3.** Consider the following sequence of composition diagrams:

$$D_0 = \emptyset \quad D_1 = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array} \quad D_2 = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array} \quad D_3 = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad D_4 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad D_5 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Then the corresponding recording tableau  $T$  is given by  $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 5 & \\ \hline \end{array}$ .

Clearly, the diagram  $D_1$  consists of only the box  $(1, 1)$ . For  $k > 1$ , let us assume that  $D_k$  is obtained from  $D_{k-1}$  by adding a new box in column  $i$  of  $\text{cd}(\alpha)$ . According to the Young triple condition, this box should be placed into  $D_{k-1}$  in such a way that it occupies the topmost position among the boxes  $(i, j)$ , where the position  $(i - 1, j)$  is already occupied by a box, but the position  $(i, j)$  is still vacant. This rule enables us to correspond each tableau  $T \in \text{SYCT}(\alpha)$  to a word of length  $n$  in alphabets  $1, 2, 3, \dots$  in a bijective manner. Let us explain this correspondence in detail. A *lattice word* is a word composed of positive integers, in which every prefix contains at least as many positive integers  $i$  as integers  $i + 1$ . With this terminology, we define  $\text{W}_{\text{SYCT}(\alpha)}$  to be the set of lattice words  $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_n$

with  $c_i(\alpha)$  occurrences of  $i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \alpha_{\max}$ , where  $c_i(\alpha)$  is the number of boxes in column  $i$  of  $\mathbf{cd}(\alpha)$  and  $\alpha_{\max}$  is the largest part of  $\alpha$ . Define

$$f_\alpha : \mathbf{SYCT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{SYCT}(\alpha)}, \quad T \mapsto f_\alpha(T),$$

where the  $j$ th letter of  $f_\alpha(T)$  is given by the index of the column of  $T$  to which  $j$  belongs.

**Proposition 5.4.** *For every composition  $\alpha$  of  $n$ , the map  $f_\alpha$  is bijective.*

*Proof.* The injectivity of  $f_\alpha$  is evident. For the surjectivity, choose any word  $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_n$  in  $\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{SYCT}(\alpha)}$ . By the definition of  $\mathbf{SYCT}(\alpha)$ , it is evident that  $w_1 = 1$ . Let  $D_1$  be the diagram consisting of only the box  $(1, 1)$ . For  $1 < k \leq n$ , suppose we have a sequence of composition diagrams

$$D_0 = \emptyset \subset D_1 \subset \dots \subset D_{k-1}$$

associated with  $w_1 w_2 \dots w_{k-1}$ . Then, obtain  $D_k$  from  $D_{k-1}$  by adding a new box directly to the right of the highest box among the boxes  $(i, j)$ , where the position  $(i-1, j)$  is already occupied by a box, but the position  $(i, j)$  is still vacant. Such a box  $(i, j)$  exists by the definition of  $\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{SYCT}(\alpha)}$ . Thus, the new box is placed in column  $w_k$  of  $D_k$ . Now, let  $T$  be the tableau obtained from the sequence

$$D_0 = \emptyset \subset D_1 \subset \dots \subset D_n$$

by recording the order in which the boxes are placed. Since this sequence satisfies three conditions in (5.1), it follows that  $T \in \mathbf{SYCT}(\alpha)$ . Finally,  $f_\alpha(T) = w_1 w_2 \dots w_n$  is straightforward from the construction of  $T$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.5.** Let  $\alpha = (m^k)$  for  $m \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 1$ . In this case,  $\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{SYCT}(\alpha)}$  is the set of lattice words  $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_{mk}$  with  $k$  occurrences of  $i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . In the case where  $m = 2$ , it is well known that  $\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{SPYCT}(\alpha)}$  is a combinatorial model for the  $k$ th Catalan number  $C_k := \frac{1}{k+1} \binom{2k}{k}$  (for instance, see [33]). Therefore, from Proposition 5.4, we deduce that  $|\mathbf{SYCT}((2^k))| = \frac{1}{k+1} \binom{2k}{k}$ .

Now, we consider a peak analogue of Proposition 5.4. Let  $\alpha$  be a peak composition of  $n$ . Then, each  $T \in \mathbf{SPYCT}(\alpha)$  can be represented by a sequence as described in (5.1) with the additional requirement that each  $D_i$  must be the diagram of a peak composition. The additional condition specifies that the boxes in the first two columns should be stacked from left to right and from bottom to top.

We define  $\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{SPYCT}(\alpha)}$  by the set of words  $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_n$  with  $(c_1(\alpha) + c_2(\alpha))$  occurrences of 1 and  $c_{i+1}(\alpha)$  occurrences of  $i$  for  $2 \leq i \leq \alpha_{\max} - 1$  such that for every subword  $w_1 w_2 \dots w_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ),

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \#(1 \text{ occurrences}) &\geq 2 \cdot \#(2 \text{ occurrences}), \\ \#(i \text{ occurrences}) &\geq \#(i+1 \text{ occurrences}) \text{ for all } 2 \leq i \leq \alpha_{\max} - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$\tilde{f}_\alpha : \mathbf{SPYCT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{SPYCT}(\alpha)}, \quad T \mapsto \tilde{f}_\alpha(T),$$

where the  $j$ th letter of  $\tilde{f}_\alpha(T)$  is 1 if  $j$  is in the first or second column; otherwise, it is the index of the column of  $T$  to which  $j$  belongs, subtracted by 1. Define

$$\bar{\iota} : \mathbf{W}_{\text{SPYCT}(\alpha)} \rightarrow \mathbf{W}_{\text{SYCT}(\alpha)}, \quad w_1 w_2 \dots w_n \mapsto v_1 v_2 \dots v_n,$$

where

$$v_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } w_i = 1 \text{ and the count of 1's preceding } w_i \text{ is even,} \\ 2 & \text{if } w_i = 1 \text{ and the count of 1's preceding } w_i \text{ is odd,} \\ w_i + 1 & \text{if } w_i \neq 1 \end{cases}$$

For instance, 1112312344 is mapped to 1213423455. Clearly  $\bar{\iota}$  is injective. Using a similar approach as the proof of [Proposition 5.4](#), we can establish the following proposition.


**Proposition 5.6.** *For every peak composition  $\alpha$ , the map  $\tilde{f}_\alpha$  is bijective. Furthermore, the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{SPYCT}(\alpha) & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \text{SYCT}(\alpha) \\ \tilde{f}_\alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow f_\alpha \\ \mathbf{W}_{\text{SPYCT}(\alpha)} & \xrightarrow{\bar{\iota}} & \mathbf{W}_{\text{SYCT}(\alpha)} \end{array}$$

is commutative, where  $\iota : \text{SPYCT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{SYCT}(\alpha)$  is the natural injection.

**Example 5.7.** Let  $\alpha = (m^k)$  for  $m \geq 3$  and  $k \geq 1$ . In this case,  $\mathbf{W}_{\text{SPYCT}(\alpha)}$  is the set of words  $w = w_1 w_2 \dots w_{mk}$  with  $2k$  occurrences of 1 and  $k$  occurrences of  $i$  for  $2 \leq i \leq m-1$  such that for every subword  $w_1 w_2 \dots w_k$  ( $k = 1, 2, \dots, mk$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} \sharp(1 \text{ occurrences}) &\geq 2 \cdot \sharp(2 \text{ occurrences}), \text{ and} \\ \sharp(i \text{ occurrences}) &\geq \sharp(i+1 \text{ occurrences}) \text{ for all } 2 \leq i \leq m-2. \end{aligned}$$

- In the case where  $m = 3$ , one can easily see that  $\mathbf{W}_{\text{SPYCT}((3^k))}$  is in bijection with the set of the lattice paths originating from  $(0, 0)$  and terminating at  $(2k, k)$  using steps from the set  $\{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$  that do not cross above the diagonal. For instance, when  $k = 2$ , the word 111212 is mapped to . It is well known


that the latter set is a combinatorial model for the number  $C_k^{(3)} := \frac{1}{2k+1} \binom{3k}{k}$  (for instance, see [\[32, Exercise 6.33\(c\)\]](#) or [\[11\]](#)). The numbers  $C_k^{(3)}$  ( $k \geq 1$ ) are called the *Fuss–Catalan numbers* or *Raney numbers* (see [\[29, A001764\]](#)). Therefore  $|\text{SPYCT}((3^k))| = \frac{1}{2k+1} \binom{3k}{k}$ .

- In the case where  $m = 4$ , under the assignment  $1 \mapsto (1, 0)$ ,  $2 \mapsto (1, 1)$ , and  $3 \mapsto (1, -1)$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_{\text{SPYCT}((4^k))}$  is in bijection with the set  $\text{Sch}((4^k))$  of the Schröder paths originating from  $(0, 0)$  and terminating at  $(4k, 0)$  using  $(1, 0)$  steps  $2k$  times,  $(1, 1)$  steps  $k$  times, and  $(1, -1)$  steps  $k$  times such that at each lattice point  $P$  along the path,  $a_P \geq 2b_P$  and  $b_P \geq c_P$ . Here,  $a_P, b_P, c_P$  denote the numbers of

$(1, 0)$ -steps,  $(1, 1)$ -steps, and  $(0, 1)$ -steps, respectively, taken to reach  $P$  from  $(0, 0)$ . The first six  $|\text{Sch}((4^k))|$ 's are given by

$$1, 9, 153, 3579, 101630, 3288871.$$

It should be mentioned that this sequence is already listed in [29, A361190], which enumerates the number of  $4k$ -step closed paths commencing and concluding at  $(0, 0)$  without crossing above the diagonal  $y = x$  or below the  $x$ -axis, utilizing steps from the set  $\{(1, 1), (1, -1), (-1, 0)\}$ . Establishing a bijection between  $\text{Sch}((4^k))$  and the set of paths mentioned above is quite straightforward. To elaborate, our Schröder paths can be mapped onto the aforementioned closed paths by associating the  $i$ th step of the Schröder path with the  $(4k - i + 1)$ st step of the closed path, following the rule:  $(1, 0) \longleftrightarrow (-1, 0)$ ,  $(1, 1) \longleftrightarrow (1, -1)$ , and  $(1, -1) \longleftrightarrow (1, 1)$ . For instance, the following figure illustrates the connections among the SPYCT  $T$ , its corresponding lattice word, the associated Schröder path, and the corresponding closed path.



**5.3. Other bijections.** Let  $\lambda$  be a partition, and let  $\text{SYT}(\lambda)$  denote the set of standard Young tableaux of shape  $\lambda$ . Consider the map,

$$f_\lambda : \bigcup_{\substack{\alpha \in \text{Comp} \\ \lambda(\alpha) = \lambda}} \text{SYCT}(\alpha) \rightarrow \text{SYT}(\lambda), \quad T \mapsto \text{sort}(T),$$

where  $\text{sort}(T)$  is the standard Young tableau of shape  $\lambda(\alpha)$  by placing the entries in the  $i$ th column of  $T$  into the  $i$ th column of  $\text{sort}(T)$  in the increasing order from bottom to top.

For example, if  $T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 5 & 6 & 7 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 8 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & \\ \hline \end{array}$ , then  $\text{sort}(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 5 & 6 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 8 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ . By making slight modifications

to the arguments presented in [25, Section 3 and Section 4] or [24, Section 4], one can easily see that  $f_\lambda$  is a bijection.<sup>2</sup> Now, assume that  $\lambda$  is a partition with at most one part equal to 1, equivalently, a partition that is also a peak composition. We refer to such a partition as a *peak partition*. For simplicity, let

$$\widehat{\text{SYCT}(\lambda)} := \bigcup_{\substack{\alpha \in \text{Comp} \\ \lambda(\alpha) = \lambda}} \text{SYCT}(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\text{SPYCT}(\lambda)} := \bigcup_{\substack{\alpha \in \text{Pcomp} \\ \lambda(\alpha) = \lambda}} \text{SPYCT}(\alpha),$$

<sup>2</sup>In [25, Section 3 and Section 4], the authors consider standard reverse composition tableaux and standard reverse Young tableaux instead of standard Young composition tableaux and standard Young tableaux.

and consider the restriction of  $f_\lambda$

$$f_\lambda| : \widehat{\text{SPYCT}}(\lambda) \rightarrow \text{SYT}(\lambda), \quad T \mapsto \text{sort}(T).$$

A standard Young tableau  $T$  of shape  $\lambda$  is referred to as a *standard peak Young tableau* (SPYT) if for every  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , the subdiagram of  $\text{cd}(\lambda)$  consisting of boxes with entries at most  $k$  in  $T$  forms the diagram of a peak composition. We denote by  $\text{SPYT}(\lambda)$  the set of standard peak Young tableaux of shape  $\lambda$ .

**Proposition 5.8.** *Let  $\lambda$  be a peak partition.*

- (a) *The image of  $f_\lambda|$  equals  $\text{SPYT}(\lambda)$ .*
- (b) *Assume that each part of  $\lambda$  is less than or equal to 3. Then we have*

$$|\text{SPYT}(\lambda)| = \frac{|\lambda|!}{\prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\lambda)} \hat{h}_\lambda(c)},$$

where

$$\hat{h}_\lambda((i, j)) := \begin{cases} \lambda'_1 - j + \lambda'_2 - j + \lambda_j & \text{if } i = 1, \\ \lambda'_1 - j + \lambda'_2 - j + \lambda_j - 1 & \text{if } i = 2, \\ \lambda'_3 - j + 1 & \text{if } i = 3. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* (a) Let  $T \in \text{SYCT}(\alpha)$  for some  $\alpha$  with  $\lambda(\alpha) = \lambda$ . Note that for a column where the entries increase from bottom to top,  $f_\lambda$  does not alter the relative positions of the entries. Therefore, according to Lemma 2.6, if  $T \in \text{SPYCT}(\alpha)$ , then  $T$  and  $\text{sort}(T)$  share the first and second columns. Once more, according to Lemma 2.6, we observe that  $\text{sort}(T) \in \text{SPYT}(\lambda)$ .

Next, choose any tableau  $U \in \text{SPYT}(\lambda)$ . Since  $\text{SPYT}(\lambda) \subseteq \text{SYT}(\lambda)$ ,  $U$  is an SYT. Therefore there is a unique  $T_U \in \text{SYCT}(\beta)$  for some  $\beta \in \text{Comp}$  with  $\lambda(\beta) = \lambda$  such that  $f_\lambda(T_U) = U$ . Specifically, the tableau  $T_U$  is constructed as follows:

- $(T_U)_{1,j} := U_{1,j}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)$ .
- For  $i = 2, 3, \dots, \alpha_{\max}$ , let  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_q)$  be the sequence of the entries in column  $i$  of  $U$  from bottom to top. For  $p = 1, 2, \dots, q$ , find the uppermost entry  $y$  in column  $j - 1$  in  $T_U$  such that  $y < x_p$  and the box to the right of  $y$  is empty. Then, place  $x_p$  in the box to the right of  $T_U^{-1}(y)$ .

(See [25, Section 3 and Section 4] or [24, Section 4]). Since  $U \in \text{SPYT}(\lambda)$ ,  $U^{(\leq 2)}$  is canonical, meaning

$$U_{1,1} < U_{2,1} < U_{1,2} < U_{2,2} < U_{1,3} < \dots.$$

Therefore, according to the construction of  $T_U$ ,  $U_{2,j}$  should be placed in the box  $(2, j)$  in  $T_U$ . Consequently,  $(T_U)_{2,j} = U_{2,j}$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)$ , indicating that  $T_U$  is an SPYCT.

(b) We prove the first assertion by using induction on  $|\lambda|$ . In the cases where  $|\lambda| = 1, 2$ , or 3, the assertion is straightforward.

Let  $\text{PP}_{\leq n}$  denote the set of peak partitions of size  $\leq n$  such that each part is at most 3. We now assume that the assertion is true for all  $\lambda \in \text{PP}_{n-1}$ . Suppose that

$\lambda \in \text{PP}_{\leq n} \setminus \text{PP}_{\leq n-1}$ . If every part of  $\lambda$  is at most two parts, that is,  $\lambda = (2^a, 1)$  or  $(2^a)$ , then one observes that  $|\text{SPYT}(\lambda)| = 1$ . The only tableau is obtained by filling integers  $1, 2, \dots, n$  in this order from left to right and from bottom to top. By a direct calculation, one can see that the hook length type formula gives the value 1, as required.

Next, consider the cases where  $\lambda$  has at least one part equal to 3, that is,

$$\lambda = (3^a, 2^b) \text{ or } (3^a, 2^b, 1) \text{ for some } a \geq 1, \text{ and } b \geq 0.$$

Let  $T \in \text{SPYT}(\lambda)$ . To begin with, we observe that the subtableau  $T[\leq n-1]$  of  $T$ , obtained by excluding the box filled with  $n$ , can be viewed as an SPYT within  $\text{SPYT}(\mu)$  for some  $\mu \in \text{PP}_{n-1}$ . From this observation, it follows that

$$|\text{SPYT}(\lambda)| = \sum_{\text{some } \mu \text{'s in } \text{PP}_{n-1}} |\text{SPYT}(\mu)|.$$

Here, we will deal with the most intricate case:  $\lambda = (3^a, 2^b, 1)$  for  $b \geq 1$ . The remaining cases can be verified in the same manner. Since the entries in each column of  $T$  are increasing from bottom to top, the shape of  $T[\leq n-1]$  aligns with one of the peak compositions

$$\mu(1) := (3^{a-1}, 2^{b+1}, 1), \quad \mu(2) := (3^a, 2^{b-1}, 1, 1), \quad \mu(3) := (3^a, 2^b).$$

However,  $\mu(2)$  is not a peak composition, leading to the equality

$$|\text{SPYT}(\lambda)| = |\text{SPYT}(\mu(1))| + |\text{SPYT}(\mu(3))|.$$

In the case where  $T[\leq n-1] \in \text{SYCT}(\mu(1))$ , discrepancies in hook lengths between  $\text{cd}(\lambda)$  and  $\text{cd}(\mu(1))$  are confined to the  $a$ th row and third column, thus we see that

$$\prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\lambda)} \hat{h}_\lambda(c) = \frac{(n-3(a-1))a}{n-3a+1} \prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\mu(1))} \hat{h}_{\mu(1)}(c).$$

On the other hand, in the case where  $T[n-1] \in \text{SYCT}(\mu(3))$ , discrepancies in hook lengths between  $\text{cd}(\lambda)$  and  $\text{cd}(\mu(3))$  are confined to the first and second column, thus we see that

$$\prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\lambda)} \hat{h}_\lambda(c) = \frac{(n-a+1)(n-3a)}{n-3a+1} \prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\mu(3))} \hat{h}_{\mu(3)}(c).$$

Merging these equations under the induction hypothesis shows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{SPYT}(\lambda)| &= \frac{(n-1)!}{\prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\mu(1))} \hat{h}_{\mu(1)}(c)} + \frac{(n-1)!}{\prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\mu(3))} \hat{h}_{\mu(3)}(c)} \\ &= \frac{(n-1)!}{\prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\lambda)} \hat{h}_\lambda(c)} \left( \frac{(n-3(a-1))a}{n-3a+1} + \frac{(n-a+1)(n-3a)}{n-3a+1} \right) \\ &= \frac{(n-1)!}{\prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\lambda)} \hat{h}_\lambda(c)} \cdot \frac{n(n-3a+1)}{n-3a+1}, \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

**Remark 5.9.** It is worth noting that Proposition 5.8(b) may not apply to all peak partitions. For example, when  $\lambda = (5, 3)$ , we have  $\frac{|\lambda|!}{\prod_{c \in \text{cd}(\lambda)} \hat{h}_\lambda(c)} = 20$ , while  $|\text{SPYT}(\lambda)| = 19$ .

From now on, we assume that  $\lambda$  is a peak partition with  $\ell(\lambda) \geq 2$  and no parts equal to 1. The rest of this subsection is devoted to showing that  $\text{SPYCT}(\lambda)$  is in bijection with the set of standard set-valued Young tableaux satisfying suitable conditions. For any partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k)$  and a composition  $\rho = (\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_k)$ , a *standard set-valued Young tableau* of shape  $\lambda$  and density  $\rho$  is a filling  $\text{cd}(\lambda)$  with distinct entries in  $[\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \rho_i]$  such that

- (1) every box in the  $j$ th row contains precisely  $\rho_j$  distinct integers,
- (2) for each  $(i, j), (i, j+1) \in \text{cd}(\lambda)$ , every integer in  $(i, j)$  is smaller than every integer in  $(i, j+1)$ , and
- (3) for  $(i, j), (i+1, j) \in \text{cd}(\lambda)$ , every integer in  $(i, j)$  is smaller than every integer in  $(i+1, j)$ .

We denote by  $\text{SVT}(\lambda, \rho)$  the set of all standard set-valued Young tableaux of shape  $\lambda$  and density  $\rho$ .

We present the operations required to establish our bijection. Given a standard Young tableau  $T$  of any shape, we define  $\mathbf{m}_c(T)$  (resp.,  $\mathbf{m}_r(T)$ ) as the tableau obtained from  $T$  by merging the first and second columns (resp., rows) in such a way that the box  $(1, i)$  (resp., the box  $(i, 1)$ ) of the new filling is filled with the entries  $T_{1,i}$  and  $T_{2,i}$  (resp., the entries  $T_{i,1}$  and  $T_{i,2}$ ) if they exist. Note that if  $T$  is of shape  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)})$ , then  $\mathbf{m}_c(T)$  is of shape  $\beta$  with  $\beta_i = \alpha_i + \delta_{\alpha_i, 1} - 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \ell(\alpha)$  and  $\mathbf{m}_r(T)$  is of shape  $(\max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{\ell(\alpha)})$ , where  $\delta_{i,j}$  is the *Kronecker delta function*. Next, given a standard Young tableau or standard set-valued Young tableau  $T$  of any shape, we define  $\mathbf{r}(T)$  as the tableau obtained from  $T$  by reflecting it along the line  $y = x$ . When the tableau shape is fixed, the first two operations yield functions  $\mathbf{m}_c, \mathbf{m}_r$  from the set of standard Young tableaux of the given shape to the set of standard set-valued Young tableaux of a certain shape and density. Similarly, the third operation yields a function  $\mathbf{r}$  from the set of standard Young tableaux of the given shape (resp., the set of standard set-valued Young tableaux of the given shape and density) to the set of standard Young tableaux of a certain shape (resp., the set of standard set-valued Young tableaux of a certain shape and density). For simplicity, we omit specifying the domains and ranges of these functions.

Let  $\lambda$  be a peak partition whose last part is greater than 1, and let  $\lambda'_-$  be the partition  $(\lambda'_1, \lambda'_3, \lambda'_4, \dots, \lambda'_{\lambda_1})$ , where  $\lambda' = (\lambda'_1, \lambda'_2, \dots, \lambda'_{\lambda_1})$  is the conjugate of  $\lambda$ . For each positive integer  $s$ , we define  $\rho_s$  as the composition  $(2, 1, 1, \dots, 1)$  of length  $s$ . Now, we consider the map

$$g_\lambda : \text{SPYT}(\lambda) \longrightarrow \text{SVT}(\lambda'_-, \rho_{\lambda_1-1}), \quad T \mapsto \mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{m}_c(T).$$



For instance, we have

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 8 & 9 & 10 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 7 & 12 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline & & & 11 \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{m}_c} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 8 & 9 & 10 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 7 & 12 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline & & & 11 \\ \hline \end{array} \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{r}} g_{(5,4,3)}(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 11 & & & \\ \hline 6 & 12 & & \\ \hline 5 & 7 & 10 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline & 8 & 9 & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

**Proposition 5.10.** *Let  $\lambda$  be a peak partition with its last part greater than 1. The map  $g_\lambda$  is a bijection. Furthermore, the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \widehat{\text{SYCT}}(\lambda) & \xrightarrow{f_\lambda} & \text{SYT}(\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{r}} & \text{SYT}(\lambda') \\ \uparrow \iota & & \uparrow \iota & & \downarrow \mathfrak{m}_r \\ \widehat{\text{SPYCT}}(\lambda) & \xrightarrow{f_{\lambda|}} & \text{SPYT}(\lambda) & \xrightarrow{g_\lambda} & \text{SVT}(\lambda'_-, \rho_{\lambda_1-1}) \end{array}$$

is commutative, where  $\iota$ 's are the natural injections.

*Proof.* We prove the first assertion by directly constructing the inverse of  $g_\lambda$ . Let  $U \in \text{SVT}(\lambda'_-, \rho_{\lambda_1-1})$ . Define  $\mathfrak{s}_r(U)$  as the tableau obtained by splitting the first column into two columns. During this process, the smaller entry from the  $(1, i)$  box of  $U$  is placed in the  $(1, i)$  box of  $\mathfrak{s}_r(U)$ , while the larger entry is positioned in the  $(2, i)$  box of  $\mathfrak{s}_r(U)$ . Now, consider the map

$$h_\lambda : \text{SVT}(\lambda'_-, \rho_{\lambda_1-1}) \rightarrow \text{SPYT}(\lambda), \quad V \mapsto \mathfrak{s}_c \circ \mathfrak{r}(V).$$

Given that  $\mathfrak{r}$  is an involution and  $\mathfrak{s}_c \circ \mathfrak{m}_c(T) = T$  for  $T \in \text{SPYT}(\lambda)$ , it follows that  $h_\lambda$  is the inverse of  $g_\lambda$ . And, the commutativity of the diagram follows from the equality  $\mathfrak{r} \circ \mathfrak{m}_c = \mathfrak{m}_r \circ \mathfrak{r}$ .  $\square$

Combining [Section 5.2](#) with [Section 5.3](#), we observe that the sets

$$\text{SPYCT}((m^k)), \quad \text{W}_{\text{SPYCT}((m^k))}, \quad \text{SPYT}((m^k)), \quad \text{SVT}((k^{m-1}), \rho_{m-1}), \quad (m, k \geq 2),$$

are mutually bijective. The cardinality of these sets can be regarded as a novel generalization of the Fuss–Catalan number  $C_k^{(3)}$  because it equals  $C_k^{(3)}$  when  $m = 3$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. E. Allen, J. Hallam, and S. K. Mason. Dual immaculate quasisymmetric functions expand positively into Young quasisymmetric Schur functions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 157:70–108, 2018.
- [2] C. Berg, N. Bergeron, F. Saliola, L. Serrano, and M. Zabrocki. A lift of the Schur and Hall–Littlewood bases to non-commutative symmetric functions. *Canad. J. Math.*, 66(3):525–565, 2014.
- [3] C. Berg, N. Bergeron, F. Saliola, L. Serrano, and M. Zabrocki. Indecomposable modules for the dual immaculate basis of quasi-symmetric functions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 143(3):991–1000, 2015.

- [4] C. Berg, N. Bergeron, F. Saliola, L. Serrano, and M. Zabrocki. Multiplicative structures of the immaculate basis of non-commutative symmetric functions. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 152:10–44, 2017.
- [5] N. Bergeron, F. Hivert, and J.-Y. Thibon. The peak algebra and the Hecke–Clifford algebras at  $q=0$ . *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 107(1):1–19, 2004.
- [6] N. Bergeron, J. Sánchez-Ortega, and M. Zabrocki. The pieri rule for dual immaculate quasisymmetric functions. *Annals of Combinatorics*, 20:283–300, 2016.
- [7] C. Bessenrodt, K. Luoto, and S. van Willigenburg. Skew quasisymmetric Schur functions and non-commutative Schur functions. *Adv. Math.*, 226(5):4492–4532, 2011.
- [8] C. Bessenrodt, V. Tewari, and S. van Willigenburg. Littlewood–Richardson rules for symmetric skew quasisymmetric Schur functions. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 137:179–206, 2016.
- [9] A. Björner and F. Brenti. *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, volume 231. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [10] A. Björner and M. L. Wachs. Permutation statistics and linear extensions of posets. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 58(1):85–114, 1991.
- [11] C. Ceballos and R. S. González D’León. Signature Catalan combinatorics. *J. Comb.*, 10(4):725–773, 2019.
- [12] S.-I. Choi, Y.-H. Kim, S.-Y. Nam, and Y.-T. Oh. Modules of the 0-Hecke algebra arising from standard permuted composition tableaux. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 179:105389, 2021.
- [13] S.-I. Choi, Y.-H. Kim, S.-Y. Nam, and Y.-T. Oh. Homological properties of 0-Hecke modules for dual immaculate quasisymmetric functions. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 10:e91, 2022.
- [14] S.-I. Choi, Y.-H. Kim, S.-Y. Nam, and Y.-T. Oh. The projective cover of tableau-cyclic indecomposable  $H_n(0)$ -modules. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 375(11):7747–7782, 2022.
- [15] S.-I. Choi, Y.-H. Kim, and Y.-T. Oh. Poset modules of the 0-Hecke algebras and related quasisymmetric power sum expansions. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 120:103965, 2024.
- [16] G. Duchamp, D. Krob, B. Leclerc, and J.-Y. Thibon. Fonctions quasi-symétriques, fonctions symétriques non commutatives et algèbres de Hecke à  $q = 0$ . *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 322(2):107–112, 1996.
- [17] J. Haglund, K. Luoto, S. Mason, and S. van Willigenburg. Quasisymmetric Schur functions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 118(2):463–490, 2011.
- [18] J. Haglund, K. Luoto, S. Mason, and S. van Willigenburg. Refinements of the Littlewood–Richardson rule. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 363(3):1665–1686, 2011.
- [19] N. Jing and Y. Li. A lift of Schur’s  $Q$ -functions to the peak algebra. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 135:268–290, 2015.
- [20] W.-S. Jung, Y.-H. Kim, S.-Y. Lee, and Y.-T. Oh. Weak Bruhat interval modules of the 0-Hecke algebra. *Math. Z.*, 301(4):3755–3786, 2022.
- [21] E. Kantarcı Oğuz. A note on Jing and Li’s type B quasisymmetric Schur functions. *Ann. Comb.*, 23(1):159–170, 2019.
- [22] Y.-H. Kim, S.-Y. Lee, and Y.-T. Oh. Regular schur labeled skew shape posets and their 0-Hecke modules. *arXiv preprint*, [arXiv:2310.20571](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.20571) [math.RT], 2023.
- [23] D. Krob and J.-Y. Thibon. Noncommutative symmetric functions. IV. Quantum linear groups and Hecke algebras at  $q = 0$ . *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 6(4):339–376, 1997.
- [24] K. Luoto, S. Mykytiuk, and S. van Willigenburg. *An introduction to quasisymmetric Schur functions*. SpringerBriefs in Mathematics. Springer, New York, 2013.
- [25] S. Mason. A decomposition of Schur functions and an analogue of the Robinson–Schensted–Knuth algorithm. *Sémin. Lothar. Comb.*, 75(B57e), 2006.

- [26] S. Mason. An explicit construction of type A Demazure atoms. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 29(3):295–313, 2009.
- [27] P. R. McNamara and R. E. Ward. Equality of  $P$ -partition generating functions. *Ann. Comb.*, 18(3):489–514, 2014.
- [28] P. N. Norton. 0-Hecke algebras. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A*, 27(3):337–357, 1979.
- [29] OEIS Foundation Inc. The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, 2024. Published electronically at <http://oeis.org>.
- [30] D. Searles. Diagram supermodules for 0-Hecke–Clifford algebras. *arXiv preprint*, [arXiv:2202.12022](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.12022) [math.RT], 2022.
- [31] R. Stanley. *Ordered structures and partitions*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1972. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 119.
- [32] R. Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics. Vol. 2*, volume 62 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [33] R. P. Stanley. *Catalan numbers*. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2015.
- [34] J. Stembridge. Enriched  $p$ -partitions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 349(2):763–788, 1997.
- [35] V. Tewari and S. van Willigenburg. Modules of the 0-Hecke algebra and quasisymmetric Schur functions. *Adv. Math.*, 285:1025–1065, 2015.
- [36] V. Tewari and S. van Willigenburg. Permuted composition tableaux, 0-Hecke algebra and labeled binary trees. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 161:420–452, 2019.

CENTER FOR QUANTUM STRUCTURES IN MODULES AND SPACES, SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY,  
SEOUL 08826, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

*Email address:* [ignatioschoi@snu.ac.kr](mailto:ignatioschoi@snu.ac.kr)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOGANG UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 04107, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

*Email address:* [synam.math@gmail.com](mailto:synam.math@gmail.com)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SOGANG UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 04107, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

*Email address:* [ytoh@sogang.ac.kr](mailto:ytoh@sogang.ac.kr)