

A Bijection Between Weighted Dyck Paths and 1234-avoiding Up-Down Permutations

Justine Falque

Univ. Gustave Eiffel, Laboratoire d'Informatique Gaspard Monge, Marne-la-Vallée, France

Abstract. Three-dimensional Catalan numbers are a variant of the classical (bidimensional) Catalan numbers, that count, among other interesting objects, the standard Young tableaux of shape (n, n, n) . In this paper, we present a structural bijection between two three-dimensional Catalan objects: 1234-avoiding up-down permutations, and a class of weighted Dyck paths.

Keywords: Bijective combinatorics, three-dimensional Catalan numbers, up-down permutations, pattern avoidance, weighted Dyck paths, Young tableaux, prographs

1 Introduction

Among a vast amount of combinatorial classes of objects, the famous Catalan numbers enumerate the standard Young tableaux of shape (n, n) . Counting the standard tableaux of shape (n, n, n) is a sequence known as the three-dimensional Catalan numbers [A005789](#), whose first entries are 1, 1, 5, 42, 462, 6006, 87516, 1385670, Many other combinatorial objects are enumerated by this sequence, from certain walks in the quarter plane [2], to product-coproduct prographs [1], to 1234-avoiding up-down permutations.

This last case, which this paper dwells on, was proven by Lewis, who provides in [6, 5] two bijections between this class and standard Young tableaux of shape (n, n, n) . As observed by Borie in [1] however, these bijections do not highlight any obvious similarities of combinatorial nature.

In this same article, Borie proves that product-coproduct prographs are three-dimensional Catalan objects, by giving a bijection with standard Young tableaux of shape (n, n, n) ; on the other hand, and with another bijection involving his prographs, he highlights a certain class of weighted Dyck paths as a new three-dimensional Catalan family. About this new family, he makes the freely rephrased following conjecture, which is the starting point of this paper.

Conjecture 1.1 (Conjecture of Borie [1]). *There exists a combinatorial bijection between up-down permutations of size $2n$ avoiding 1234 and a certain class of weighted Dyck paths.*

Borie additionally assumes that the positions of the steps $(1, 1)$ in the paths should correspond to the bottom elements in the permutation, and came up with a partial

bijection, in the particular case where these are exactly the elements $1, 2, \dots, n$. He relied on the observation that the product-coproduct prographs, in this case, were essentially pairs of binary trees, and he used a bijection to 123-avoiding permutations on each one in such a way that the two permutations could respectively become the bottom elements and top elements of a 1234-avoiding up-down permutation.

In this extended abstract, we present a general bijection from these weighted Dyck paths to 1234-avoiding up-down permutations. This bijection extends Borie's partial bijection to the whole combinatorial classes and preserves some structural properties and statistics.

2 The combinatorial objects

This section presents, in two separate subsections, both classes of combinatorial objects dealt with in this paper. In each case, we recall the definition, provide examples, and then describe the Schützenberger involution and a natural product on the objects.

2.1 Up-down permutations of $2n$ avoiding 1234

An up-down permutation of $2n$ avoiding 1234 is a permutation of size $2n$ whose descents set is $\{2, 4, 6, \dots\}$, with no increasing subsequence of length 4. We denote by $A_{2n}(1234)$ the set of all these permutations.

For instance, here are the 42 up-down permutations of size 6 avoiding 1234:

$$A_6(1234) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 143625, 153624, 154623, 163524, 164523, 241635, 243615, \\ 251436, 251634, 253614, 254613, 261435, 261534, 263514, \\ 264513, 341625, 342615, 351426, 351624, 352416, 352614, \\ 354612, 361425, 361524, 362415, 362514, 364512, 451326, \\ 451623, 452316, 452613, 453612, 461325, 461523, 462315, \\ 462513, 463512, 561324, 561423, 562314, 562413, 563412 \end{array} \right\}. \quad (2.1)$$

We shall use the following convenient notations: for any permutation σ of $A_{2n}(1234)$ seen as a word, we denote by $Bot(\sigma) = \sigma_2\sigma_4 \cdots \sigma_{2n}$ the subword that consists of the letters in even positions — that we may call bottom elements rather than valleys, in order to avoid confusion with the valleys of Dyck paths; and by $Top(\sigma) = \sigma_1\sigma_3 \cdots \sigma_{2n-1}$ the subword of the odd-position letters — that we may call top elements. Of course, σ is determined by $Bot(\sigma)$ and $Top(\sigma)$, for instance:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \sigma = 364512 & & 6 & 5 & 2 & & \longleftarrow Top(\sigma) \\ & & 3 & 4 & 1 & & \longleftarrow Bot(\sigma) . \end{array}$$

The set of 1234-avoiding up-down permutations is endowed with a product:

Lemma 2.1 ([1]). *The set $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_{2n}(1234)$ is closed under the shifted concatenation product \bullet on permutations defined by $\sigma \bullet \tau = (\text{shift}_{\text{length}(\tau)}(\sigma)) \cdot \tau$.*

For instance, we have $12 \bullet 1423 = 561423$.

Another structure indicator, the classical Schützenberger involution on permutations consists in reversing the alphabet, then reversing the reading direction.

For example, we have $S(48271635) = 46382715$. As it preserves appearance and avoidance of patterns, S stabilizes the set of up-down permutations of $2n$ avoiding 1234.

We shall use a variant on words: for any word ω on the alphabet $\{1, 2, \dots, 2n\}$, $S_{2n}(\omega)$ is obtained by the same process of reversing the alphabet and the reading direction. The main difference is that not all letters need to appear. For instance, we have $S_8(164) = 538$.

2.2 Weighted Dyck paths

Definition 2.2. We denote by WD_{2n} weighted Dyck paths of length $2n$ whose weights satisfy the following assertions:

1. all weights are non-negative integers smaller than or equal to the lower height;
2. weights are non-decreasing on successive rises;
3. weights are non-increasing on successive descents;
4. On a peak of height h , with d and e the weights of its steps, we have: $e + d \leq h$;
5. On a valley of height h , with d and e the weights of its steps, we have: $d + e \geq h$.




Figure 1: Example of a weighted Dyck path in DW_{14} .

There is a natural concatenation product on these objects, as well as a natural notion of “Schützenberger involution”: the reflection according to a vertical axis (see Figure 2).

3 A statistics-preserving bijection

This section presents the results of our work, specifically a solution to the following conjecture.




Figure 2: Concatenation product and Schützenberger involution in WD_{2n} .

Conjecture 3.1 (Conjecture of Borie [1]). *There exists a bijection between up-down permutations of size $2n$ avoiding 1234 and weighted Dyck paths of WD_{2n} that has the following properties: compatibility with the concatenation product and the Schützenberger involution; correspondence between the positions of steps $(1, 1)$ in the Dyck path and the bottom elements of the permutation.*

Let wd be an irreducible weighted Dyck path (that is, a weighted Dyck path with no intermediate return to 0) of length $2n$ and let $wd(u)$ denote the weight associated with the step in position $u \in \{1, \dots, 2n\}$. Let us define a map β' on irreducible weighted Dyck paths. The image permutation is computed using an algorithm that inserts the *positions* of the steps one at a time; moreover, the elements of the bottom word are the positions of the steps $(1, 1)$ in the Dyck path.

Definition 3.2. Let $\beta'(wd)$ be the permutation σ whose bottom word is obtained by an insertion algorithm *ins* defined below; and the top word is obtained by applying the Schützenberger involution to wd , then the algorithm *ins*, and then the (shifted) Schützenberger involution again (so that in the end the elements in the top word are the positions of steps $(1, -1)$ in wd). Formally, σ is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bot}(\sigma) &= \text{ins}(wd) \\ \text{Top}(\sigma) &= S_{2n}(\text{ins}(S(wd))) \end{aligned}$$

where S and S_{2n} are the Schützenberger involution and its variant on words, respectively, and *ins* is the function defined by the following algorithm.

1. Split wd into the first, left-hand half of slopes L and the second, right-hand half of slopes R (see Figures 4 & 5 for examples).
2. Start with $\tau = \varepsilon$ the empty permutation. The weighted Dyck path wd is scanned from the left, and elements are inserted in τ as we go.
3. For every upward slope U in wd , starting from the left
 - (a) Let *shift* be the total number of steps $(1, -1)$ that are to the left of the slope in wd .




Figure 3: Insertion positions in the building bottom word (dots are word’s elements).

- (b) For every step $(1, 1)$ of the current upward slope, starting from the left, denote by u its position and proceed to insert u in τ as follows:
- In case the slope U is in L : if $wd(u)$ is *minimal*, insert u to the left of τ (we say that u *jumps*, or that $wd(u)$ is a jumping weight); otherwise, insert u in τ at a distance $wd(u) + shift - 1$ from the right-hand end of τ .
 - In case the slope U is in R : consider instead the *maximality* of $wd(u)$ to decide if u jumps, and insert at a distance $wd(u) + shift$ from the right-hand end otherwise.

The minimality (resp. maximality) of the value is decided by considering either the increment condition on the slope or the valley (resp. peak) condition of Definition 2.2: if the corresponding bound is achieved, then the tested value is indeed extremal.

Remark 3.3. Since a bottom (resp. top) element in an up-down permutation is automatically followed (resp. preceded) by a larger top (resp. smaller bottom) element, a top element and a bottom element, in that order, can never form a 12 pattern in $A_{2n}(1234)$. This is the reason for the *shift* value: as *shift* elements, among the top elements of the permutation, need to be to the right of the element u that is being inserted as a bottom element, the insertion position of u from the right needs to be at least *shift* if we aim at obtaining (as we actually do) a 1234-avoiding permutation.

Remark 3.4. Keeping all the way through the path the comparison to the minimum (resp. maximum) as the unique criterion for jumps may seem tempting, but it would make the map β non-injective, as a single valley (resp. peak) condition would decide if both of its adjacent steps yield jumping weights — this being generally the case with several different pairs of weights. On the other hand, a choice like comparing to the minimum all weights of the steps $(1, 1)$ and to the maximum all those of the steps down would make this map incompatible with the Schützenberger involution (refer to Figure 4 for visual support).

Remark 3.5. Why jump at all? Without diving into the detail, it allows to avoid completing a 1234 pattern (recall that is an increasing subsequence of size 4). The *ins* construction has two assets. First, as we explain later, elements that do not jump are those




Figure 4: Locations where the jump is decided using the peak or valley condition.

forming a 12 pattern with their fellow bottom elements; actually, at the time of insertion, all elements to the left are the 1 (the smallest element in the increasing subsequence of length 2) of a 12 pattern, the element not jumping being the 2. Second (as a consequence), the insertion position of a no-jump element is the number of elements strictly following the (current) first ascent in the word; transposed to $Top(\sigma)$, this means the weights of steps down enable to locate the rightmost ascent. For bottom elements, jumping allows to escape the threat of this ascent as a potential 34 in the 1234. Since the leftmost insertion position that could be computed, if it was not for jumps, is the problematic one, one could have thought of just making weights achieving this bound jumping weights... but then, not all elements would be able to jump — which brings back to Remark 3.4.

Remark 3.6. The minus 1 in the computation of the insertion position as of the left-hand half L compensates the fact that elements jump if their weight is minimal, so the non-jumping weights have values between 1 and ℓ (the current lower height), whereas the valid insertion positions are 0 to $\ell - 1$.

In the sequel, whilst we will be applying the algorithm to weighted Dyck paths wd in order to realize $\sigma = \beta'(wd)$, we will be referring to the transitional word that will become $Bot(\sigma)$ as the *bottom word*, and to the word that will become $Top(\sigma)$ as the *top word*.

Example 3.7. Take again the example in Figure 1, of an element of WD_{14} . Here, the set L consists of the upward slopes to the left of the valley in position 5 (in dotted blue on Figure 5), and R consists of the upward slopes to the right (in dashed orange). The big dots on the figure mark the places where the weight must be compared to its minimal/maximal possible value in order to decide if the element jumps.

1. First to be handled is the leftmost upward slope. Both elements jump to the left: 2 1.
2. We overrun the first slope down, which is one step long, so we have $shift = 1$ as we handle the 4. Since this upward slope still belongs to the first half L , we compare the weight 1 to its minimum value. In the absence of a previous weight on the slope to compare it to, it is determined by the valley condition: here, $1 + 1$ is strictly greater than the valley height 1, so the weight is not minimal and 4 does not jump. Its insertion position from the right is $1 + shift - 1 = 1$, so we obtain 2 4 1.




Figure 5: Left-hand and right-hand halves of the upward slopes (L and R , respectively).

3. We overrun the second slope down and add its length to $shift$, which is now 2. We leave the left-hand half L and enter the right-hand half R , so we need to check if the next weight is maximal to decide if the elements jump. The value 1 is indeed maximal, both because of its height and because the next element is 1 too, so 6 jumps. However, 7 does not, since 1 is less than both its lower height and the following weight 3. In R , we do not subtract 1 to the insertion position anymore; we get $1 + shift = 3$ for 7, and: **6 7 2 4 1**. Finally, 8 does jump because 3 is maximal with respect to the peak condition: $2 + 2 = 4 = h_{peak}$. We have now: **8 6 7 2 4 1**.
4. We add the length of the next slope down to $shift$, which brings it to 4, and test if 0 is maximal. It is obviously smaller than its height, and since it is the last element of the slope we need to test the peak condition: $0 + 2$ is less than 3, so 11 does not jump and is inserted at the position $0 + shift = 4$ from the right, which hands:

$$Bot(\sigma) = 8 6 \mathbf{11} 7 2 4 1.$$

5. The subsequence $Top(\sigma)$ is obtained by applying the Schützenberger involution to the path, basically reversing left and right, then executing the algorithm, and finally applying the (shifted) Schützenberger involution so as to be back with the right element values. Note that it boils down to using the same algorithm on the slopes down as on the upward slopes, except they are scanned from right to left (with the rules related to L and R swapped), the insertion position computed is from the left, and elements that jump go all the way to the right. In the end we get $Top(\sigma) = 13 12 14 10 9 5 3$ and $\sigma = 8 13 6 12 11 14 7 10 2 9 4 5 1 3$.

Definition 3.8. Let wd be a weighted Dyck path in WD_{2n} . We define $\beta(wd)$ as the map obtained by applying β' to the irreducible factors of wd and then taking the shifted concatenation product of the image permutations.

Remark 3.9. By construction, the map β is compatible with the concatenation product as well as the Schützenberger involution of both WD_{2n} and $A_{2n}(1234)$.

Theorem 3.10. *The map β is a bijection between DW_{2n} and $A_{2n}(1234)$.*

4 Proof of the bijection

4.1 Proof of injectivity

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let wd be an irreducible element of WD_{2n} . Suppose we are applying β' to wd using the algorithm of Definition 3.2, and call u the next element to be inserted in the bottom word. Assume further that u does not jump. Then the possible values of the weight $wd(u)$ all have a different, valid insertion position.*

Sketch of proof. By considering the range of possible insertion positions in this case. \square

Proposition 4.2. *The map β is injective.*

Sketch of proof. By definition, two weighted Dyck paths with different underlying Dyck paths have different images, since the steps $(1, 1)$ correspond exactly to the elements in even positions in the image permutation.

Let us consider wd and wd' two weighted Dyck paths from WD_{2n} with the same underlying Dyck path and the same image, and assume that they are different. Consider the position of the first difference a in the weight values, starting from the left: we have $wd(a) \neq wd'(a)$ and $wd(e) = wd'(e)$ for all $e < a$.

Using Lemma 4.1, for the element a to be inserted in the same position in the image permutations, regardless of the difference of values, it needs to jump in both cases.

Since $wd(a-1)$ is equal to $wd'(a-1)$, the slope a needs to be one whose jumps are decided by considering the next value to the right (so we are in R , and we will stay so all the way until the right-hand end).

By checking every configuration, one can show that every weight from there on to the right has only one possible value, determined by the weight of a and that differs in both paths. This is necessary all the way to the last element, which can only assume the weight 0 by definition; so this is actually impossible. \square

4.2 The image is a 1234-avoiding up-down permutation

In this subsection, we rely on the following criteria.

Proposition 4.3 ([1]). *For n a non-negative integer and σ a permutation of size $2n$, σ is an up-down permutation avoiding 1234 if and only if the following four conditions are satisfied:*

1. *the sequence $Top(\sigma)$ avoids 123;*
2. *the sequence $Bot(\sigma)$ avoids 123;*

3. each value of $\text{Top}(\sigma)$ smaller than a bottom element k appears to the right of k in σ ;
4. if a bottom element k has a smaller bottom element to its left, all peak values greater than k to its right must be ordered in σ decreasingly.

Proposition 4.4. *Let wd be a weighted Dyck path and σ be its image by the map β . Then, σ is an up-down permutation avoiding 1234.*

Sketch of proof. We shall use the above criteria to prove the proposition.

First and foremost, let us prove that $\text{Bot}(\sigma)$ avoids 123 (the first item is proven essentially the same way).

Note that the insertion process on the first upward slope (which hands a permutation of size the length of the slope) is actually a bijection between non-decreasing parking functions (here starting from 0) and 123-avoiding permutations which is described in [1].

To obtain the subsequence $\text{Bot}(\sigma)$, one just needs to consider the upward slopes, as well as whether their valley/peak steps need to jump (which is usually determined by looking at the value of the adjacent step $(1, -1)$). Following this viewpoint, we define a transformation of the upward slopes, whose image is a single upward slope; this slope will be such that applying the function ins to it hands a permutation that is the standardized version of $\text{Bot}(\sigma)$. To obtain the weights of the new upward slope from the initial (upward slopes of the) weighted Dyck path, consider each step $(1, 1)$, from left to right and determine if it jumps in the initial Dyck path. If so, give it the same image weight as the previously obtained weight; if not, the image weight will be the pre-image weight to which one adds a *correction*, which is the number *shift* of steps $(1, -1)$ that are on its left, plus 1 if the pre-image weight belongs to the right-hand half of the upward slopes (this in order to compensate the minus one that is applied to left-hand slopes when determining the position of insertion according to ins).





Figure 6: Transformation to a single slope. Weights are red when there is a jump.

First, use consecutive peak and valley conditions to show that the weights of the transformation are non-decreasing.



In addition, the new weights are still bounded by the height. It is straightforward for the left-hand half of upward slopes (in blue on the figures), since the weight and height of the step are increased by the same value. As for the right-hand half (in orange), to which an additional 1 is added, the only values that could bring trouble are maximal values with respect to the height and, as part of the right-hand half, that means they jump: they will thus take the value of the previous weight in the image, so they necessarily stay below the bound.

The new weights are therefore a non-decreasing parking function (starting from 0), on which the function *ins* hands a 123-avoiding permutation, which ends the proof.

We now move on to the third criterion. Referring to the notations of Figure 7, we need to show that the distance between d and u in the image permutation (in grey) is non-negative. We compute it as the difference between the distances from the right of u and d (in green and violet, respectively). We assume that neither d nor u jumps, which is the worst-case scenario for the distance. More specifically, we may assume without loss of generality that at least one element from each one of the two slopes does not jump; the lowest height element of the slope that does not jump is then the one we should examine since it is the closest, in the permutation, to its counterparts from the other slope: replace d (resp. u) by this element.

In the algorithm of insertion defined by β , u is inserted at a distance from the right $pos(u) = wd(u) + shift(u) (-1)$, where $wd(u)$ is the weight of u in the Dyck path, $shift(u)$ is defined in the algorithm (see also the legend of Figure 7), and 1 may or may not be subtracted depending on the position of the slope in the path. What the transformation described in the previous item of the proof shows is that the steps $(1, 1)$ that are to the right of u correspond to elements that will be inserted to its left in the permutation (this is only true if u does not jump). Therefore, this position of insertion is also the final distance from the right of u . For the same reason (except that the insertion position is computed as a distance from the left), the final distance from the right of d is $n - pos(d) = n - wd(d) + shift(d) (+1)$. Note also, by exhaustion of cases, that at most one of the two insertion positions requires a minus 1.

Now the difference of positions between d and the element following u in the permutation is:





Figure 7: No smaller top element on the left of a given bottom element.

$$\begin{aligned}
 dist(u, d) &= pos(u) + pos(d) - n \quad (-1) \\
 &= wd(u) + wd(d) + shift(u) + shift(d) - n \quad (-1) \\
 &= wd(u) + wd(d) + shift(u) - lenBot(u) \quad (-1) \\
 &= wd(u) + wd(d) - h_{val} \quad (-1)
 \end{aligned}$$

where $lenBot(u)$ is the length of the bottom word right before the insertion of the slope of u . The condition on the valley is that we have $wd(u) + wd(d) \geq h_{val}$, but since neither u nor d jumps, this inequality is strict, so that the distance is non-negative, and d is before u in the permutation, as needed.

Finally, let us prove the last criterion is satisfied, that is to say that the configuration of 1234 pattern on the following figure cannot occur.



Observe, by considering once again the transformation at the beginning of this proof, that the elements in $Bot(\sigma)$ (resp. $Top(\sigma)$) that have a smaller bottom (resp. larger top) element to their left (resp. right) in the permutation are exactly those who do not jump. Consider thus a bottom element u and a larger top element d , both of which do not jump. Use similar arguments and distance computation as before to show that d is inserted to

the left of u . □

Corollary 4.5. *Let n be a positive integer. The map β_n is a bijection from WD_{2n} to $A_{2n}(1234)$ and is compatible with the concatenation product and the Schützenberger involution. Furthermore, the set of positions of the steps $(1, 1)$ of the Dyck path is the set of bottom elements (valleys) in its image up-down permutation.*

Now that this bijection has been uncovered, it would be interesting to study how it relates to product-coproduct prographs. Indeed, these objects are more visual, and their geometric nature may allow to derive new properties. To name one, it seems possible to endow them with a poset structure that embeds Tamari lattices, and we conjecture it is a lattice itself: this is a work in progress with Nicolas Borie.

Acknowledgements

This research relied to the open-source software SageMath [4] and the combinatorics features developed by the Sage-Combinat community [3]. I would like to thank Nicolas Borie for his conjecture and for interesting exchanges; as well as Jean-Christophe Novelli for suggesting I take a look and for useful discussions during the redaction phase.

References

- [1] Nicolas Borie. “Three-dimensional Catalan numbers and product-coproduct prographs.” English. In: *Sémin. Lothar. Comb.* 78B (2017), 78b.39, 12. ISSN: 1286-4889/e.
- [2] Mireille Bousquet-Mélou and Marni Mishna. *Walks with small steps in the quarter plane*. 2009. arXiv: [0810.4387](https://arxiv.org/abs/0810.4387) [math.CO].
- [3] The Sage-Combinat community. *Sage-Combinat: enhancing Sage as a toolbox for computer exploration in algebraic combinatorics*. <http://combinat.sagemath.org>. 2008.
- [4] The Sage Developers. *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 6.4)*. <http://www.sagemath.org>. 2014.
- [5] Joel Brewster Lewis. “Generating trees and pattern avoidance in alternating permutations”. In: *Electron. J. Combin.* 19.1 (2012), Paper 21, 21. ISSN: 1077-8926.
- [6] Joel Brewster Lewis. “Pattern avoidance in alternating permutations and tableaux (extended abstract)”. In: *22nd International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (FPSAC 2010)*. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. Proc., AN. Assoc. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., Nancy, 2010, pp. 391–402.