

THE RELATION BETWEEN ALTERNATING SIGN MATRICES AND DESCENDING PLANE PARTITIONS: $n + 3$ PAIRS OF EQUIVALENT STATISTICS

FLORIAN AIGNER AND ILSE FISCHER

ABSTRACT. There is the same number of $n \times n$ alternating sign matrices (ASMs) as there is of descending plane partitions (DPPs) with parts no greater than n , but finding an explicit bijection is an open problem for about 40 years now. So far, quadruples of statistics on ASMs and on DPPs that have the same joint distribution have been identified. We introduce extensions of ASMs and of DPPs along with $n + 3$ statistics on each extension, and show that the two families of statistics have the same joint distribution. The ASM-DPP equinumerosity is obtained as an easy consequence by considering the (-1) -enumerations of these extended objects with respect to one pair of the $n + 3$ pairs of statistics. One may speculate that the fact that these extensions might be necessary to have this significance increase in the number of statistics, as well as the involvement of signs when specializing to ASMs and DPPs may hint at the obstacles in finding an explicit bijection between ASMs and DPPs. One important tool for our proof is a multivariate generalization of the operator formula for the number of monotone triangles with prescribed bottom row that generalizes Schur functions.

1. INTRODUCTION

An *alternating sign matrix* (ASM) is a square matrix with entries in $\{0, \pm 1\}$ such that, in each row and each column, 1's and -1 's alternate and sum to 1. All 3×3 ASMs are given next.

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

ASMs had been introduced by Robbins and Rumsey in the 1980s [RR86] in the course of generalizing the determinant to the so-called λ -*determinant*, which turned out to be expressible as a sum over all ASMs of fixed size. They conjectured that the number of $n \times n$ ASMs is

$$(1.1) \quad \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{(3i+1)!}{(n+i)!},$$


which was proved after considerable effort by Zeilberger [Zei96] (in fact, he showed a more general result that includes an additional parameter). Soon after that Kuperberg used methods from statistical physics to give another, shorter proof [Kup96] (of the special case).

Two further observations caused considerable excitement in the combinatorics community: it turned out that (1.1) appears also as the enumeration formula for two classes of plane partitions, namely for *descending plane partitions* (DPPs) [MRR83] and for *totally symmetric self-complementary plane partitions* (TSSCPPs) [MRR86]. Since then, there has been much effort to construct explicit bijections that prove these facts, but until recently without much


Florian Aigner acknowledges the financial support from the Austrian Science Foundation FWF, grant J 4387.

progress. A beautiful account on the early story of this line of research is described in [Bre99]. Very recently, a bijective proof of the fact that $n \times n$ ASMs are counted by (1.1) has been constructed as well as a bijective proof of an identity that implies the equinumerosity of ASMs and DPPs, see [FK20a, FK20b, FK]. More precisely, if ASM_n denotes the set of $n \times n$ ASMs and DPP_n denotes the set of DPPs with parts no greater than n , a bijection between $\text{ASM}_n \times \text{DPP}_{n-1}$ and $\text{ASM}_{n-1} \times \text{DPP}_n$ has been constructed (among other things). These constructions are quite involved, and use signed sets and a generalization of the involution principle by Garsia and Milne. It seems fair to say that a perfect understanding of these relations despite the many efforts is still missing. To complete the picture, it should also be mentioned that recently a new class of objects that are counted by (1.1) has been discovered [ABF20], namely *alternating sign triangle* (ASTs), which are as indicated by the name definitely more on the ASM side.


We now define DPPs and a variant needed here. A *strict partition* is a sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ of positive integers with $\lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_n$, and the *shifted Young diagram* of shape λ has λ_i cells in row i and each row is indented by one cell to the right with respect to the previous row. The shifted Young diagram of the strict partition $(5, 4, 2, 1)$ is displayed next.



A *column strict shifted plane partition* (CSSPP) is a filling of a shifted Young diagram with positive integers such that rows decrease weakly and columns decrease strictly. An example is given next.




A CSSPP is said to be a *descending plane partition* (DPP) if the first part of each row is greater than the length of its row and less than or equal to the length of the previous row. The example is obviously a DPP. The DPPs with all entries less than or equal to 3 are given next.



It is no coincidence that the number of these objects is the same as the number of 3×3 ASMs as it is known that the number of DPPs with parts no greater than n is also given by (1.1) for general n . This was shown by Andrews [And79] prior to the introduction of ASMs.

We introduce other subclasses of CSSPPs. Let k be an integer, then a CSSPP is said to be of class k if the first part of each row exceeds the length of its row by precisely k . It can be seen that DPPs are equivalent to CSSPPs of class 2. In order to transform a DPP into a CSSPP of class 2 add 1 to each part and add possibly parts equal to 1 at the end of each row to guarantee that all conditions are satisfied in the end. We leave it to the reader to check that this is always possible. In our example, this transformation results in the following CSSPP of class 2.



It should also be mentioned that CSSPPs of class k are known to be in “easy” bijective correspondence with cyclically symmetric lozenge tilings of a hexagon with a central triangular hole of size k [Kra06].

The lack of an explicit bijection between $n \times n$ ASMs and DPPs with parts no greater than n is also astonishing in the view of the fact that Mills, Robbins and Rumsey had discovered triples of statistics for both objects for which they conjecture that they have the same joint distribution [MRR83]. This conjecture was proved in [BDFZJ12], and in [BDFZJ13] another statistic could be added, which is the best possible result in this direction so far.

A main purpose of this paper is to shed light on the relation between ASMs and DPPs, in particular it offers an understanding why it might be hard to find the longed for explicit bijection in the current setting, and it provides a new, extended setting in which it could be (arguable) easier to find an explicit bijection. More concretely, we define extended (multivariate) weighted objects, both on the ASM side and on the DPP side, and show that the generating functions of these extended objects coincide. The equinumerosity of ASMs and DPPs is then a simple consequence of this result that is obtained by specializing the weights in a way such that objects are assigned ± 1 . Simple sign reversing involutions on both sides “cancel” certain subsets of the extended objects, and the remaining two sets are in easy bijective correspondence with the classical ASMs and DPPs, respectively. This may hint at the circumstance that it is possibly unavoidable to work with signed sets, which is also the case in the recent (complicated) bijective proofs mentioned above. However, at least in principal, the situation is of a somewhat different nature here. Namely, an explicit, weight-preserving bijection in this extended setting that is also compatible with the sign-reversing involutions just mentioned would have as an immediate corollary an explicit bijection between the original ASMs and DPPs, and such a bijection would not make use of the involution principle of Garsia and Milne as long as the bijection for the extended objects did not. However, already the case $n = 3$ shows that such a compatible bijection might not exist at all (or at least that yet another twist is necessary), which might be an explanation for the obstacles we have encountered in the last 40 years.


The major advantage of the extended objects is that we were able to make significant progress concerning the number of pairs of equivalent statistics we have identified on the two families of objects. More precisely, in this paper we are able to perform the step from a fixed number of statistics (the four from [BDFZJ13]) to a linear number of statistics in the order n , namely $n + 3$. In a sense, a further step to the (right) quadratic number of statistics would resolve the problem of establishing a bijection as the two families of objects are (in a sense) assembled of a quadratic number of integers at most.

We also want to stress how we were naturally led to the extensions and the many statistics because we believe that many more results can be established that way. In bijective combinatorics, new interesting objects and statistics are often discovered through experiments. This “approach” is certainly responsible for many unforeseeable and thus very exciting developments in this field, which is particularly true for results involving alternating sign matrices, plane partitions and their relatives, and must not be underestimated. However, the approach that led to the results in this paper is different and in a sense more systematic (which should not be misinterpreted as if we thought that it is therefore also “better”). Two ideas were the guiding principles. In the past, to prove enumeration results on ASMs, it was often possible to deduce complicated, multivariate expressions that somewhat “included” the enumerative quantities we are interested in, such as for instance in Zeilberger’s first proof of the ASM

- If e has a \nwarrow -neighbor and is equal to it, then e must not carry \nwarrow, \nearrow (and therefore carries \nearrow).
- If e has a \nearrow -neighbor and is equal to it, then e must not carry \nearrow, \nwarrow (and therefore carries \nwarrow).

In summary, an arrow simply indicates that the entry is different from the next entry in the specified direction.

When assigning \nwarrow to an entry a in our examples, we write $\nwarrow a \nearrow$. Such an example is given next.



We associate the following weight to an arrowed monotone triangle with n rows,

$$u^{\#\nearrow} v^{\#\nwarrow} w^{\#\times} \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{(\text{sum of entries in row } i) - (\text{sum of entries in row } i-1) + (\#\nearrow \text{ in row } i) - (\#\nwarrow \text{ in row } i)}$$

where the sum of entries in row 0 is defined to be 0. The exponents of the $n + 3$ variables are the statistics from the title for the ASM-side. The weight of the arrowed monotone triangle given above is

$$u^{10} v^8 w^3 X_1^5 X_2^2 X_3^4 X_4^5 X_5^4 X_6^3.$$

Our first main result concerns the generating function of arrowed monotone triangles with prescribed bottom row. It is a multivariate generalization of the operator formula from [Fis06] (with extensions given in [Fis10]). It requires a (straightforward) extension of the Schur polynomial $s_{(k_n, k_{n-1}, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ to integer sequences k_1, \dots, k_n that are not necessarily weakly increasing. This extension is provided in Section 3.

Theorem 2.2. *The generating function of arrowed monotone triangles with bottom row $k_1 < \dots < k_n$ is*

$$\prod_{i=1}^n (uX_i + vX_i^{-1} + w) \prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n} (uE_{k_p} + vE_{k_q}^{-1} + wE_{k_p}E_{k_q}^{-1}) s_{(k_n, k_{n-1}, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n),$$

where E_x denotes the shift operator, defined as $E_x p(x) = p(x + 1)$.

The formula has to be interpreted as follows: First treat the k_i 's in $s_{(k_n, k_{n-1}, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ as indeterminates, and apply $\prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n} (uE_{k_p} + vE_{k_q}^{-1} + wE_{k_p}E_{k_q}^{-1})$. Only then the k_i 's can be specialized to the actual values.

We provide a variation of this result in Theorem 3.1, but also significant extensions in two different directions: in Theorem 3.2, we deal with arbitrary integer sequences k_1, \dots, k_n , while, in Theorem 6.1, we consider (in addition) much more general decorations.

From a simple inclusion-exclusion argument, it follows that the generating function of arrowed monotone triangles with bottom row k_1, \dots, k_n is just the number of monotone triangles with bottom row k_1, \dots, k_n when setting

$$(2.1) \quad u = v = 1, w = -1, (X_1, \dots, X_n) = (1, \dots, 1)^1.$$

¹Consider an entry a in a monotone triangle and its \nwarrow -neighbour b and its \nearrow -neighbour c . Then, we may first consider all cases with $b < a \leq c$ (this corresponds to $\text{decor}(a) = \nwarrow$), second consider all cases with $b \leq a < c$

This is also obvious from Theorem 3.1 and its connection to Theorem 2.2, as discussed in Section 3.3.


Our second main result concerns the special case $(k_1, \dots, k_n) = (1, 2, \dots, n)$ (which corresponds to ASMs). More precisely, we define certain weighted plane partitions, whose generating function coincides with the one for arrowed monotone triangles in this special case. Excitingly, it can be seen combinatorially that the generating function of these plane partitions with parts no greater than n is equal to the number of DPPs with parts no greater than n when specializing as in (2.1).

For the definition of these plane partitions, almost self-conjugate shapes in the following sense are crucial.

Definition 2.3. Let $\lambda = (a_1, \dots, a_l | b_1, \dots, b_l)$ be a partition in Frobenius notation, i.e., a_i is the number of cells right of the diagonal cell (i, i) in the same row, while b_i is the number of cells below (i, i) in the same column. We say that λ is balanced if, for all i , either $a_i = b_i$ or $a_i = b_i + 1$. The weight is

$$W(\lambda) = w^{l + \sum_{i=1}^l (b_i - a_i)}.$$

We list all balanced shapes with at most 3 rows.



Their weights are

$$1, w, 1, w, 1, w, 1, w^2, w, w^2, w, 1, w, 1, w^2, w, 1, w^3, w^2, w, 1.$$

Now we are in the position to define the new class of plane partitions.

Definition 2.4. A set-valued balanced column strict plane partition (SBCSPP) D of shape λ and order n is a filling of a balanced shape with non-empty subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that strictly above the diagonal the subsets are singletons, and

- (1) rows decrease weakly in the sense that the maxima of the sets form a weakly decreasing sequence if read from left to right, and
- (2) columns decrease strictly in the sense that for two adjacent cells in a column, all elements in the top cell are strictly greater than all elements in the bottom cell.

The weight of D is as follows

$$W(D) = W(\lambda) \cdot u^{\#\text{of cells strictly above the main diagonal}} \cdot v^{\binom{n+1}{2} - \#\text{of entries on and below the main diagonal}} \\ \cdot w^{\#\text{of entries} - \#\text{of cells}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{\#\text{of } i \text{ in } D}$$

Again, the exponents of the $n + 3$ variables in the weight are the statistics from the title for the DPP-side.

(decor(a) = \nearrow), and, third, to get rid of the double counting, subtract the cases when $b < a < c$ (decor(a) = \bowtie), which is why we set $w = -1$.

An example of an SBCSPP is displayed next.

8	8	8	7	7	6	4	1
7	7	7	6	5	5		
6	6	5	4	4	4		
5	4	3	3, 2	3	2		
3	2	2, 1	1				
2	1						
1							

Letting $n = 9$, its weight is

$$u^{16}v^{26}w^3X_1^5X_2^5X_3^4X_4^5X_5^4X_6^4X_7^5X_8^3.$$

Before stating our second main result, which connects arrowed monotone triangles with bottom row $1, 2, \dots, n$ and SBCSPPs of order n , we elaborate on the specialization (2.1) for the generating function of SBCSPPs to see that it gives the number of DPPs. For this purpose, we define a sign-reversing involution on a subset of the SBCSPPs of order n and see that the remaining SBCSPPs are in easy bijection with DPPs with parts no greater than n . A few observations are in order.

- We say that an SBCSPP is *principal* if the sets in all cells are singletons. We associate with each SBCSPP a principal SBCSPP by just keeping the maximum of each set in the cells. Clearly, this always produces a principal SBCSPP and also each principal SBCSPP is assigned to itself.
- If a principal SBCSPP has more than one SBCSPP assigned to it then the sum of weights of all these SBCSPPs is 0 when specializing as in (2.1).
- Thus it suffices to consider principal SBCSPPs that have only one SBCSPP assigned to them. They are characterized as follows: for each diagonal entry d , the entries below in the same column are $d - 1, d - 2, \dots, 1$ (in particular, there are $d - 1$ cells below that cell).
- Next, we define a sign-reversing involution on the subset of the remaining SBCSPPs for which at least one of the following is satisfied: the SBCSPP contains a 1 strictly above the diagonal or $a_i \neq b_i + 1$ for an i where $(a_1, \dots, a_l | b_1, \dots, b_l)$ is the shape of the SBCSPP in Frobenius notation. If $a_i = b_i + 1$ for all i , choose the topmost row that contains a 1, and remove the rightmost cell (which then has to contain a 1). Otherwise choose the minimal i with $a_i \neq b_i + 1$. If the SBCSPP has a 1 above row i , do as we did in the previous case. Otherwise add a 1 at the end of row i .

What remains are SBCSPPs such that (1) all cells contain a single element, (2) their shapes $(a_1, \dots, a_l | b_1, \dots, b_l)$ satisfy $a_i = b_i + 1$ for all i , (3) in the parts of the columns that are weakly below a diagonal entry, we have consecutive integers ending with 1, and (4) there are no 1's above the diagonal. All such SBCSPPs have weight 1. Such SBCSPPs are referred to as the DPP-SBCPPs in the following. Next we remove all cells strictly below the main diagonal (no information is lost), and we obtain a column strict *shifted* plane partition, i.e., the shape is not left-justified, but each row is intended by one cell to the right with respect to the previous row. From $a_i = b_i + 1$, it follows that the first part of each row is one less than the length. Since there is no 1 in the plane partition, we may subtract 1 from each entry and obtain a column strict shifted plane partition such that the first part of each row is two less

than the length of its row. Such CSSPPs with parts no greater than $n-1$ are in easy bijective correspondence with CSSPPs of class 2 with parts no greater than $n+1$, by conjugating the partition in each row. The latter are in easy bijective correspondence with DPPs with parts no greater than n . We elaborate much more on this in Section 4.

Our second main result is the following.

Theorem 2.5. *The generating function of arrowed monotone triangles with bottom row $1, 2, \dots, n$ is equal to the generating function of set-valued balanced column strict plane partitions with parts in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.*

We illustrate the theorem with the help of the case $n = 2$ here. This case is in fact small enough such that many weights appear precisely once, except for $uvwX_1X_2^2$ and $uvwX_1^2X_2$ which appear twice, and, therefore, there are only four weight-preserving bijections.

AMT	W	SBCSPP	AMT	W	SBCSPP
$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	v^3	\emptyset	$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$uvwX_1X_2^2$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	v^2wX_1	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$uvwX_1X_2^2$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$uv^2X_1^2$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$u^2vX_1^3X_2$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 2 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	v^2wX_2	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$uw^2X_1^2X_2^2$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$uw^2X_1X_2$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$u^2vX_1^2X_2^2$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 2 & 2 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$vw^2X_1X_2$	$\begin{array}{ c } \hline 2, 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$u^2wX_1^3X_2^2$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 2 & 2 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$uw^2X_2^2$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$u^2vX_1X_2^3$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 2 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$uvwX_1^2X_2$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$u^2wX_1^2X_2^3$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 2 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$uvwX_1^2X_2$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \nearrow_1 \quad \searrow_2 \\ \searrow_1 \quad \nearrow_2 \end{array}$	$u^3X_1^3X_2^3$	$\begin{array}{ c c c } \hline 2 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$

The two DPP-SBCSPPs are

$$\emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array},$$

and the above bijection induces a bijection between these DPP-SBCSPPs and monotone triangles with bottom row $(1, 2)$, simply by ignoring the arrows in the corresponding arrowed monotone triangles.

In the case $n = 3$, there are the following 7 DPP-SBCSPPs of order 3 (their weights are listed next to them).

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\emptyset, v^6), \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array}, u^2 v^4 X_1 X_2^3 \right), \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline 1 & & & \\ \hline \end{array}, u^3 v^3 X_1 X_2^4 X_3 \right), \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline 1 & & & \\ \hline \end{array}, u^3 v^3 X_1 X_2^3 X_3^2 \right), \\
& \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 3 & 3 & 2 \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline 1 & & & \\ \hline \end{array}, u^3 v^3 X_1 X_2^2 X_3^3 \right), \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline 1 & & & \\ \hline \end{array}, u^3 v^3 X_1 X_2 X_3^4 \right), \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array}, u^5 v X_1^2 X_2^4 X_3^4 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The question is whether a weight-preserving bijection between SBCSPPs of order 3 and arrowed monotone triangles with bottom row $(1, 2, 3)$ induces naturally a bijection between DPP-SBCSPPs and monotone triangles with bottom row $(1, 2, 3)$. This could mean that in the weight-preserving bijection DPP-SBCSPPs are mapped to arrowed monotone triangles with distinct underlying monotone triangles. We will argue that this is not possible.

There are 7 monotone triangles with bottom row $(1, 2, 3)$. In an arrowed monotone triangle, the decoration of an entry has to be \nearrow (resp. \nwarrow) in case its \nwarrow -neighbour (resp. \nearrow -neighbour) is equal to the entry. Otherwise, all three possible decorations \nwarrow , \nearrow , \nearrow are eligible, which is indicated below as $*e*$ for an entry e below. Each of the 7 decorated arrays below corresponds to a set of arrowed monotone triangles, and the sum of weights of the elements in this set is given next to them.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& & *1* \\
& \nwarrow 1 & *2* \quad v^3 X_1 X_2 X_3 (uX_1 + vX_1^{-1} + w)(uX_2 + vX_2^{-1} + w)(uX_3 + vX_3^{-1} + w) \\
\nwarrow 1 & & \nwarrow 2 \quad *3* \\
& & *1* \\
& \nwarrow 1 & *3* \quad uv^2 X_1 X_2^2 X_3^2 (uX_1 + vX_1^{-1} + w)(uX_2 + vX_2^{-1} + w)(uX_3 + vX_3^{-1} + w) \\
\nwarrow 1 & & *2* \quad 3 \nearrow \\
& & *2* \\
& *1* & 2 \nearrow \quad uv^2 X_1^2 X_2^2 X_3 (uX_1 + vX_1^{-1} + w)(uX_2 + vX_2^{-1} + w)(uX_3 + vX_3^{-1} + w) \\
\nwarrow 1 & & \nwarrow 2 \quad *3* \\
& & *2* \\
& *1* & *3* \quad uv X_1^2 X_2^2 X_3^2 (uX_1 + vX_1^{-1} + w)(uX_2 + vX_2^{-1} + w)^2 (uX_3 + vX_3^{-1} + w) \\
\nwarrow 1 & & *2* \quad 3 \nearrow \\
& & *2* \\
& \nwarrow 2 & *3* \quad u^2 v X_1^2 X_2^2 X_3^3 (uX_1 + vX_1^{-1} + w)(uX_2 + vX_2^{-1} + w)(uX_3 + vX_3^{-1} + w) \\
1 & & 2 \nearrow \quad 3 \nearrow
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
^*3^* \\
^*1^* \quad 3^{\nearrow} \\
\swarrow 1 \quad ^*2^* \quad 3^{\nearrow}
\end{array}
\quad
u^2 v X_1^3 X_2^2 X_3^2 (uX_1 + vX_1^{-1} + w)(uX_2 + vX_2^{-1} + w)(uX_3 + vX_3^{-1} + w) \\
\\
\begin{array}{c}
^*3^* \\
^*2^* \quad 3^{\nearrow} \\
^*1^* \quad 2^{\nearrow} \quad 3^{\nearrow}
\end{array}
\quad
u^3 X_1^3 X_2^3 X_3^3 (uX_1 + vX_1^{-1} + w)(uX_2 + vX_2^{-1} + w)(uX_3 + vX_3^{-1} + w)
\end{array}$$

However, looking at the exponents of X_1 , we find that a weight-preserving bijection can never be restricted to a bijection between DPP-SBCSPPs and monotone triangles with bottom row $(1, 2, 3)$ as described above: For two (out of the 7) monotone triangles, the exponents of X_1 in the weight of the associated arrowed monotone triangles is at least 2 (namely for those that have a 3 at the top), while only for one DPP-SBCSPPs, the exponent of X_1 in the weight is greater than 1.

Another remark about the case $n = 3$ is that there are actually 71 weights that appear precisely once (therefore it is clear what the weight-preserving bijection has to be for the corresponding arrowed monotone triangles and SBCSPPs), 31 weights appear twice, 6 appear three times, 14 appear four times, 6 five times and 1 six times.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 3, we elaborate more on the extension on the ASM-side: we will see how one is naturally led to arrowed monotone triangles and how to extend them naturally to arbitrary integers sequence (k_1, \dots, k_n) at the cost of having to work with signed sets. In Section 4, we provide several objects that are equivalent to SBCSPPs, in particular certain families of non-intersecting lattice paths that will be crucial for our proof of Theorem 2.5. We will also see how these paths natural extend the classical families of non-intersecting lattice that are known to be in (easy) bijective correspondence with DPPs (which is where the above sketched sign-reversing involution for SBCSPP comes from when specializing as in (2.1)). In Section 5, we provide a proof of a generalization of Theorem 2.2, while in Section 6 we explain how to obtain a much more general version that deals with more general decorations. In Section 7, we provide the proof of Theorem 2.5.

3. EXTENSION ON THE ASM-SIDE

In this section, we will elaborate on arrowed monotone triangles, namely, their genesis, a variant and a generalization. The next table gives an overview of the various related “ASM-objects”.

objects	weight	enumeration	definition
monotone triangles (MTs)	non-monomial	Theorem 3.1	Section 2, Eq. 3.1
down-arrowed MTs	monomial	Theorem 3.1	Section 3.1
arrowed MTs	monomial	Theorem 2.2	Definition 2.1
extended arrowed MTs	monomial	Theorem 3.2	Section 3.2

3.1. A multivariate weight on monotone triangles. Consider for an $n \times n$ ASM $A = (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ the matrix obtained by adding to each entry all the entries that are in the same column above, i.e., $S = (\sum_{i'=1}^i a_{i'j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$. It is not hard to see that this always results in a $\{0,1\}$ -matrix with i occurrences of 1’s in the i -th row. The corresponding monotone triangle is obtained by recording row by row the columns of the 1’s in S in n centered rows.

An example is given next.

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{matrix} & & & & & 2 \\ & & & & 1 & 4 \\ & & & 1 & 2 & 5 \\ & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 5 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \end{matrix}$$

This procedure establishes a bijection between $n \times n$ ASMs and monotone triangles with bottom row $1, 2, \dots, n$. It was shown in [Fis06] that the number of monotone triangles with bottom row k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n is

$$\prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n} (E_{k_p} + E_{k_q}^{-1} + E_{k_p} E_{k_q}^{-1}) \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \frac{k_j - k_i + j - i}{j - i}.$$

A crucial observation for what follows is that $\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \frac{k_j - k_i + j - i}{j - i}$ is the number of semistandard tableaux of shape (k_n, \dots, k_1) . Note that such semistandard tableaux are in easy bijective correspondence with Gelfand-Tsetlin patterns with bottom row k_1, \dots, k_n , which are defined just as monotone triangles with the exception that the condition on the strict increase along rows is dropped. As this number is the specialization of the Schur polynomial $s_{(k_n, k_{n-1}, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ at $(X_1, \dots, X_n) = (1, \dots, 1)$ and the Schur polynomial can be interpreted as a multivariate generating function of Gelfand-Tsetlin patterns (or, equivalently, of semistandard tableaux), this brings us to the obvious question whether we can also “introduce” the variables X_1, \dots, X_n in the operator formula, by replacing $\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \frac{k_j - k_i + j - i}{j - i}$ in the operator formula with $s_{(k_n, k_{n-1}, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ and possibly modifying the operator polynomial. Our first main result will show that this is indeed possible. In order to formulate it, we need a number of statistics.

Each entry $m_{i,j}$ of a monotone triangle $M = (m_{i,j})_{1 \leq j \leq i \leq n}$ that is not in the bottom row is in precisely one of the following categories.

- $m_{i+1,i} < m_{i,j} < m_{i+1,j+1}$: in this case, $m_{i,j}$ is said to be *special*.
- $m_{i,j} = m_{i+1,j}$: in this case, $m_{i,j}$ is said to be *left-leaning*.
- $m_{i,j} = m_{i+1,j+1}$: in this case, $m_{i,j}$ is said to be *right-leaning*.

In our running example

$$\begin{matrix} & & & & & & & & 4 \\ & & & & & & & 2 & 5 \\ & & & & & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ & & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \end{matrix},$$

the 2 in row 3 is special, while the 3 in row 3 is left-leaning and 5 in row 2 is right-leaning. We define the following statistics for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$:

$$\begin{array}{ll} s_i(M) = \# \text{ of special entries in row } i & s(M) = \# \text{ of all special entries} \\ l_i(M) = \# \text{ of left-leaning entries in row } i & l(M) = \# \text{ of all left-leaning entries} \\ r_i(M) = \# \text{ of right-leaning entries in row } i & r(M) = \# \text{ of all right-leaning entries} \end{array}$$

For our example, this gives the following.

$$\begin{aligned} (s_1(M), s_2(M), s_3(M), s_4(M), s_5(M)) &= (1, 0, 2, 1, 0), & s(M) &= 4, \\ (l_1(M), l_2(M), l_3(M), l_4(M), l_5(M)) &= (0, 1, 1, 1, 3), & l(M) &= 6, \\ (r_1(M), r_2(M), r_3(M), r_4(M), r_5(M)) &= (0, 1, 0, 2, 2), & r(M) &= 5. \end{aligned}$$

Further, we let $s_0(M) = r_0(M) = l_0(M) = 0$ and define now for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$

$$d_i(M) = \sum_{j=1}^i m_{i,j} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_{i-1,j} + r_{i-1}(M) - l_{i-1}(M).$$

In our example, we obtain

$$(d_1(M), d_2(M), d_3(M), d_4(M), d_5(M), d_6(M)) = (4, 3, 3, 3, 4, 3)$$

We introduce the following weight on monotone triangles,

$$(3.1) \quad W_0(M) = u^{r(M)} v^{l(M)} \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{d_i(M)} (w + uX_i + vX_i^{-1})^{s_{i-1}(M)}.$$

When setting

$$(3.2) \quad u = v = 1, w = -1 \text{ and } (X_1, \dots, X_n) = (1, \dots, 1),$$

the weight specializes to 1. The weight of our example is

$$u^5 v^6 X_1^4 X_2^3 X_3^3 X_4^4 X_5^3 (w + uX_2 + vX_2^{-1}) (w + uX_4 + vX_4^{-1})^2 (w + uX_5 + vX_5^{-1}).$$

In order to state a formula for the generating function of monotone triangles with fixed bottom row, we need an extension of Schur polynomials to sequences of integers $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ that are not necessarily partitions. Let σ be the unique permutation on $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with

$$\lambda_{\sigma(1)} + n - \sigma(1) \geq \lambda_{\sigma(2)} + n - \sigma(2) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{\sigma(n)} + n - \sigma(n).$$

If the sequence is not strictly decreasing, we define $s_\lambda(X_1, \dots, X_n) = 0$. Otherwise let p be a non-negative integer such that $\lambda_{\sigma(n)} + n - \sigma(n) + p \geq 0$. Then we define

$$s_\lambda(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{-p} s_\mu(X_1, \dots, X_n),$$

with

$$\mu = (\lambda_{\sigma(1)} + 1 - \sigma(1) + p, \lambda_{\sigma(2)} + 2 - \sigma(2) + p, \dots, \lambda_{\sigma(n)} + n - \sigma(n) + p).$$


We have the following explicit formula for the generating function of monotone triangles with fixed bottom row k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n .

Theorem 3.1. *The generating function of monotone triangles M with bottom row $k_1 < \dots < k_n$ and with respect to the weight $W_0(M)$ is*

$$\prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n} (uE_{k_p} + vE_{k_q}^{-1} + wE_{k_p}E_{k_q}^{-1}) s_{(k_n, k_{n-1}, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n).$$

It is disturbing that the weight of a monotone triangle is not a monomial in u, v, w, X_1, \dots, X_n , because otherwise the exponents of $u, v, w, X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ could simply be interpreted as statistics of the objects. This can be changed by considering a slight modification: We will associate with each monotone triangle $3^{s(A)}$ objects and introduce weights for them, such that these weights are indeed monomials in u, v, w, X_1, \dots, X_n and the sum of weights of the $3^{s(A)}$ objects is the weight of the corresponding monotone triangle.

The modification is straightforward: Each special entry of a monotone triangle can “choose” between being left-leaning, right-leaning or central; left-leaning is indicated for special entries by \swarrow , right-leaning is indicated by \searrow , and if there is no “decoration”, then the special entry is central. An example is as follows.



Monotone triangles where the special entries are decorated in that way are said to be *down-arrowed monotone triangles* (to distinguish them from arrowed monotone triangles). Concerning the weight, we can adopt the conventions we had for monotone triangles in the sense that now also special entries that are left-leaning contribute to the corresponding $l_{i-1}(M)$, and thus to the power of u and “negatively” to the power of X_i , while special entries that are right-leaning contribute to the corresponding $r_{i-1}(M)$, and thus to the power of v , and “positively” to the power of X_i . The total number of central entries is denoted by $c(M)$, and is the exponent of w . Note that in our running example the entry 2 in row 3 is central. Thus the weight is

$$u^6 v^8 w X_1^4 X_2^2 X_3^3 X_4^4 X_5^3 X_6^3.$$

Theorem 3.1 provides the generating function of down-arrowed monotone triangles with fixed bottom row.

3.2. Extended monotone triangles. There are certain similarities between the down-arrowed monotone triangles and the *arrowed monotone triangles* as described in Definition 2.1: Each monotone triangle is assigned a set of these special arrowed monotone triangles (namely those that have the monotone triangle as the underlying one when simply ignoring the arrows) such that the weight of the monotone triangle is the sum of weights of the arrowed monotone triangles assigned to it (the weights of the monotone triangles in these two settings differ by the factor in (3.3)). The weight assigned to a fixed arrowed monotone triangle is also a monomial in u, v, w, X_1, \dots, X_n . The advantage of arrowed monotone triangles is that they allow certain generalizations, including the extension to integer sequences k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n that are not necessarily increasing. Also arrowed monotone triangles will be crucial for our proof of Theorem 3.1.

This extension to not necessarily increasing bottom rows requires the notion of signed sets, which is a pair of disjoint sets $\underline{S} = (S^+, S^-)$. The size of a signed set is

$$|\underline{S}| = |S^+| - |S^-|.$$

Signed sets can obviously also be considered as ordinary sets with a sign function, and the size is then the generating function with respect to the sign. More generally, for given weights on the elements of \underline{S} , the generating function is defined as

$$\sum_{s \in S^+} W(s) - \sum_{s \in S^-} W(s).$$

Theorem 3.2. *The generating function of arrowed monotone triangles with bottom row k_1, \dots, k_n is*

$$\prod_{i=1}^n (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_i + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_i^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) + \omega(\emptyset))$$

$$\prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n} (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot E_{k_p} + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot E_{k_q}^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) \cdot E_{k_p} E_{k_q}^{-1} + \omega(\emptyset) \cdot \text{id})$$

$$s_{(k_n, k_{n-1}, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n).$$

3.3. Theorem 3.2 implies Theorem 3.1. We consider arrowed monotone triangles with strictly increasing bottom row that have no \emptyset 's assigned as decoration, which clearly corresponds to setting $\omega(\emptyset) = 0$ in Theorem 3.2. Neglecting the decorations of such arrowed monotone triangles gives monotone triangles, in fact, all monotone triangles can be obtained that way (but, in general, each of them will appear multiple times, with several possible decorations). We will show the following: given a monotone triangle, then the sum of weights of all associated arrowed monotone triangles equals the weight of the fixed monotone triangle (as defined in Section 3.1) up to the factor

$$(3.3) \quad \prod_{i=1}^n (uX_i + vX_i^{-1} + w)$$

when setting $\omega(\nearrow) = u, \omega(\nwarrow) = v, \omega(\bowtie) = w$. In order to show this, it suffices to consider the situation of two consecutive row.

Suppose $k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_i$ and that l_1, \dots, l_{i-1} is interlacing in the sense that

$$k_1 \leq l_1 \leq k_2 \leq l_2 \leq k_3 \leq \dots \leq l_{i-1} \leq k_i$$

with $l_1 < l_2 < \dots < l_{i-1}$. One should think of (l_1, \dots, l_{i-1}) and (k_1, \dots, k_i) as two consecutive rows in a monotone triangle. For a monotone triangle M , the weight $W_0(M)$ can be “structured” according to the contribution of pairs of consecutive rows, i.e., the contribution of the pair of rows $i-1$ and i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, is

$$u^{r_{i-1}(A)} v^{l_{i-1}(A)} X_i^{d_i(A)} (w + uX_i + vX_i^{-1})^{s_{i-1}(A)}.$$

In this sense, the contribution of the rows (l_1, \dots, l_{i-1}) and (k_1, \dots, k_i) to the weight of a monotone triangle is as follows:

$$(3.4) \quad (uX_i)^{\# \text{ of right-leaning } l_j} (vX_i^{-1})^{\# \text{ of left-leaning } l_j} (w + uX_i + vX_i^{-1})^{\# \text{ of special } l_j} X_i^{k_1 + \dots + k_i - l_1 - \dots - l_{i-1}}$$

We determine all possible arrow assignments to k_1, \dots, k_i in arrowed monotone triangles. We say that l_j is NL (for non left-leaning) if $l_j \neq k_j$, and it is NR (for non right-leaning) if $l_j \neq k_{j+1}$.

- If l_j is NL, then we may assign \nearrow to k_j .
- If l_{j-1} is NR, then we may assign \nwarrow to k_j .
- If l_j is NL and l_{j-1} is NR, we may assign \bowtie to k_j .
- Each k_j has to be assigned at least one arrow (which is possible since $l_{j-1} = k_j = l_j$ is excluded).

As for arrowed monotone triangles, the contribution of the pair of the rows $i-1$ and i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, is

$$(uX_i)^{\# \nearrow \text{ in row } i} (vX_i^{-1})^{\# \nwarrow \text{ in row } i} w^{\# \bowtie \text{ in row } i} X_i^{\text{sum of entries in row } i - \text{sum of entries in row } i-1}$$

We need to determine the sum of weights over all arrow assignments for a particular choice of (l_1, \dots, l_{i-1}) and (k_1, \dots, k_i) .

Observe that we have a choice for the decoration of k_j if and only if one of the following is satisfied.

- $j \neq 1, i$, and l_{j-1} is NR and l_j is NL.
- $j = 1$ and l_1 is NL.
- $j = i$ and l_{i-1} is NR.

In these cases, we are completely free to choose between \nearrow , \nwarrow and \bowtie . A \bowtie contributes w , a \nearrow contributes uX_i , while \nwarrow contributes vX_i^{-1} . In summary, the contribution of such a k_j is

$$w + uX_i + vX_i^{-1}.$$

We say that k_j is up-special in this case. If, on the other hand, k_j is not up-special then either $l_{j-1} = k_j$ or $l_j = k_j$. In the first case, $k_j < l_j$, k_j needs to be decorated with \nearrow , and we have a contribution of uX_j to the weight, while in the second case $l_{j-1} < k_j$, k_j needs to be decorated with \nwarrow , and we have a contribution of vX_i^{-1} to the weight. Noting that l_{j-1} is right-leaning in the first case, and l_j is left-leaning in the second case, we have the following total weight

$$(uX_n)^{\# \text{ of right-leaning } l_j} (vX_n^{-1})^{\# \text{ of left-leaning } l_j} (w + uX_n + vX_n^{-1})^{\# \text{ of up-special } k_j\text{'s}} \times X_i^{k_1 + \dots + k_i - l_1 - \dots - l_{i-1}}.$$

The assertion follows now after comparing with (3.4) and observing that the number of special elements among the l_j (i.e., those with $k_i < l_i < k_{i+1}$) is precisely one less than the number of up-special elements among the k_j : if we work through $k_1, l_1, k_2, \dots, l_{n-1}, k_n$, then we will see that up-special k_j 's and special l_j 's alternate, starting and ending with up-special k_j 's, noting also that k_1 and k_i are already up-special if $k_1 \neq l_1$ and $l_{i-1} \neq k_i$, respectively.

4. EXTENSION ON THE DPP-SIDE

In this section, we will elaborate on various versions of the extended ‘‘DPP-objects’’. The following table gives a first overview.

objects	weight	definition
set-valued balanced CSPPs (SBCSPPs)	monomial	Definition 2.4
extended DPP paths	non-monomial	Section 4
DPP pairs	monomial	Definition 4.1
balanced CSPPs (BCSPPs)	non-monomial	Definition 4.2

It is well-known that DPPs can be encoded by families of non-intersection lattice paths in the plane as follows (our convention differs from the one more frequently used by the reflection along the line $y = x$). Let $A_i = (0, i - 2)$ and $E_i = (i, 0)$, $i = 2, \dots, n$. We choose $S \subseteq \{2, \dots, n\}$, and consider families of $|S|$ non-intersecting lattice paths starting in $(A_i)_{i \in S}$ and ending in $(E_i)_{i \in S}$, with unit right steps and unit down-steps. Here such families of paths are referred to as *DPP paths*, or *n-DPP paths* to stress n . The family that corresponds to the example from the introduction is provided in Figure 1.

The corresponding CSSPP of class 2 is obtained as follows. We extend each path at the end point E_i by an additional down-step. Now the entries of the CSSPP correspond to the down-steps as follows. Each path corresponds to a row of the CSSPP, with the topmost path




FIGURE 1. Family of non-intersecting lattice paths that corresponds to a CSSPP of class 2.

corresponding to the top row. The entries are obtained as the distances of the down-steps from the y -axis by adding 1 to each of them, where the bottommost down-step of a path corresponds to the first part of the corresponding row. (The usual convention, where the picture is reflected along the line $y = x$, would have clearly allowed us to speak essentially about the heights of the vertical steps, but we will see the advantage of the current convention in our setting.)

Our next goal is to define related objects and assign certain weights to them such that when we specialize the weights in a certain way, all objects have weights $0, 1, -1$, thereby establishing a signed set (ignoring objects with weight 0 then) such that the following is satisfied:

- There is a very simple sign reversing involution on a subset of them that “cancels” all objects with negative weight (i.e, the negative part of the signed set is fully contained in this subset).
- There is a very simple bijection between the remaining objects (all of which have weight 1) and the families of non-intersecting lattice paths as described above.

We start with the observation that, in the above “picture”, we can also add the starting point $A_1 = (0, -1)$ and the end point $E_1 = (1, 0)$, because there is simply no path from A_1 to E_1 using the given step set. We now define the following different starting points and end points: $A'_i = (-i, i - 2)$ and $E'_i = (i, -2)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Again we choose a subset $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, and consider families of $|S|$ non-intersecting lattice paths starting in $(A'_i)_{i \in S}$ and ending in $(E'_i)_{i \in S}$. Now the step set depends on the region we are in:

- Strictly left of the y -axis, we allow unit up-steps and unit right-steps.
- In the region $\{(x, y) | x \geq 0, y \geq -1\}$, we allow unit down-steps and unit right-steps.
- Weakly right of the y -axis, if we go below the $y = -1$ line (which we do when we make the final step to reach E_i), we can either perform a unit down-step or a diagonal-step $(1, -1)$.
- The paths should remain weakly below the line $y = n - 2$.

An example for the case $n = 8$ is provided in Figure 2. These families of paths are said to be the extended (n) -DPP paths.




FIGURE 2. Extended DPP paths

We assign weights to such families by assigning weights to the individual steps; the weight of a path is then the product of all step weights and the weight of a family is the product of all path weights, multiplied by $v^{\binom{n+1}{2}}$ if we consider order n objects. The weight of an edge depends on the region, as indicated in Figure 3.

- Strictly left of the y -axis, a unit up step that ends in (p, q) has weight $X_m v^{-1} w + 1$ with $m = p + q + 2$, while a right step that ends in (p, q) has weight $X_m v^{-1}$ also with $m = p + q + 2$.
- In the region $\{(x, y) | x \geq 0, y \geq -1\}$, a unit right step at height m above the x -axis has weight $u X_{m+2}$, while down-steps have weight 1.
- As for the last step, we have weight w for the diagonal steps and weight 1 for the down-steps.

Next we will argue why the specialization given in (3.2) brings us to ordinary non-extended DPP paths: In this case all edge weights are $\pm 1, 0$. In particular, we have 0 weight for all up steps left for the y -axis, so we can assume in this case that we have only right steps from A'_i until we reach the y -axis, which will then be reached “at” A_i , and so we can simply let the paths start there. What remains are edges with weights ± 1 , where the edges with weight -1 are precisely the (possible) diagonal-steps that reach E'_i . However, such paths can actually be identified with paths that reach E_i by a down-step that is preceded by a horizontal step. Thus we can also assume that paths with diagonal-steps cancel such paths (from right to left), so that all paths end with two down-step. Thus it suffices to consider paths that end in E_i instead of E'_i .

We also want to introduce a slight variation of these families of non-intersecting lattice paths so that each object actually gets assigned a monomial in u, v, w, X_1, \dots, X_n (and the exponents can be viewed as statistics). For that we only need to consider a variation that concerns the vertical edges strictly left of the y -axis (since their weights are not monomials): We simply duplicate them and assign to one of them the weight $X_m v^{-1} w$ (where its top vertex (p, q) satisfies $p + q + 2 = m$), while the other gets assigned 1.




FIGURE 3. The weights of the extended DPP paths, where an integer i stands for $X_i v^{-1} w + 1$, \bar{i} stands for $X_i v^{-1}$, and \widehat{i} stands for $u X_i$; no label means that the step has weight 1.

Finally, we work out how these families of non-intersecting lattice paths correspond to pairs of a CSSPP and a row strict shifted plane partition (RSSPP), where the latter is defined as a filling of a shifted Young diagram with positive integers that decrease strictly along rows and weakly down columns: The CSSPP corresponds to the portions of the paths that are right of the y -axis and the RSSPP to the portions of the paths that are left of the y -axis. The entries correspond to the horizontal steps, and are essentially determined by their heights. The diagonal steps indicate that respective row lengths of the two plane partitions differ by 1. The pair of shifted PPs that correspond to the extended DPP paths from Figure 2 is displayed next.

$$L = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 8 & 7 & 6 & 5 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ \hline & 7 & 6 & 4 & 2 & 1 & \\ \hline & & 5 & 3 & 2 & & \\ \hline & & & 3 & 1 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad R = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 8 & 8 & 7 & 7 & 6 & 4 & 1 \\ \hline & 7 & 6 & 5 & 5 & & \\ \hline & & 4 & 4 & 4 & & \\ \hline & & & 3 & 2 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

More precisely, the R -PP collects the heights of the horizontal steps increased by 2 of the portions of the paths that are located right of the y -axis, while the L -PP is determined by the horizontal steps of the portions of the paths left of the y -axis as follows: again add 2 to these heights, subtract their distances (of their rightmost points) from the y -axis, and read these numbers from right to left.

In general, we have a pair of an RSSPP L and an CSSPP R with parts in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (1) The number of parts in row i of L is equal to or one greater than the number of parts in row i of R .
- (2) The first part of row i of L is greater than or equal to the first part of the correspond row of R .

(3) The first part of row i of R is greater than the first part of row $i + 1$ of L .

The weight of R is as follows:

$$W(R) = w^{\# \text{ of } i \text{ with } \ell(R_i)=\ell(L_i)-1} \prod_{i=1}^n (uX_i)^{\# \text{ of } i \text{ in } R},$$

where $\ell(L_i), \ell(R_i)$ denote the lengths of rows i in L and R , respectively. As for the weight of L , let L_i denote the set of elements in the i -th row of L , and L_i^c its complement in $\{1, \dots, \max(L_i)\}$. Then we set

$$W(L) = \prod_i \prod_{j \in L_i} X_j v^{-1} \prod_{j \in L_i^c} (X_j v^{-1} w + 1).$$

Again, we would prefer monomials as weights and that can actually be achieved by using set-valued RSSPP: a *set-valued RSSPP* is a filling of a shifted Young diagram with non-empty sets of positive integers such that

- there is a strict decrease along rows in the sense that, for two adjacent cells in a row, all elements in the left cell are greater than all elements in the right cell, and
- there is a weak decrease down columns in the sense that the maximal elements of the sets decrease.

Definition 4.1. *An (n-)DPP pair is a pair of a set-valued RSSPP L and an CSSPP R with parts in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that the following conditions are fulfilled:*

- (1) *The number of cells in row i of L is equal to or one greater than the number of cells in row i of R .*
- (2) *The maximum part of row i of L is greater than or equal to the maximum part of row i of R .*
- (3) *The maximum part of row i of R is greater than the maximum part of row $i + 1$ of L .*

The weight of R is as follows:

$$W(R) = w^{\# \text{ of } i \text{ with } \ell(R_i)=\ell(L_i)-1} \prod_{i=1}^n (uX_i)^{\# \text{ of } i \text{ in } R},$$

where $\ell(L_i), \ell(R_i)$ denote the lengths of rows i in L and R , respectively. As for the weight of L , let L_i denote the set of elements in the i -th row of L , then we set

$$W(L) = \prod_i w^{|L_i| - (\# \text{ of cells in row } i)} \prod_{j \in L_i} X_j v^{-1}.$$

The total weight of the DPP pair (L, R) is then

$$W(L, R) = v^{\binom{n+1}{2}} \cdot W(L) \cdot W(R).$$

Properties (2) and (3) allow us to combine L and R into a single column strict plane partition: reflecting L along the main diagonal and merge the reflected L and R into a single CSPP such that the first cell of row i of L (before reflecting) is left of the first cell of row i of R and below the first cell of row $i - 1$ of R . In our example we obtain (with the entries in L underlayed with blue).

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

Definition 4.2. A BCSPD $D = (d_{i,j})$ of order n is a CSPP with parts in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ whose shape λ is balanced.

To define the weight, let for each column j , S_j denote the integers in $\{1, 2, \dots, d_{j,j}\}$ that are not in column j below the main diagonal. Then the weight is defined as follows.

$$W(D) = W(\lambda) \cdot u^{\#\text{of cells strictly above the main diagonal}} \cdot v^{\binom{n+1}{2} - \#\text{of cells on and below the main diagonal}} \\ \times \prod_{i,j}^n X_{d_{i,j}} \prod_j \prod_{e \in S_j} (X_e v^{-1} w + 1)$$

Again, it is more desirable to have objects whose weights are monomials in u, v, w, X_1, \dots, X_n , and this finally led to Definition 2.4.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2

We start by providing the Jacobi-Trudi-type determinant for the extended Schur polynomials $s_{(k_n, k_{n-1}, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$. We define an extension of *complete homogeneous symmetric functions* to negative parameters: As usual we have for non-negative integers k

$$h_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = k, l_i \geq 0} X_1^{l_1} X_2^{l_2} \dots X_n^{l_n},$$

while for negative k , we define

$$h_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) = (-1)^{n+1} \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = k, l_i < 0} X_1^{l_1} X_2^{l_2} \dots X_n^{l_n}.$$

It can be checked² that the Jacobi-Trudi-type determinant for the extended Schur polynomials reads as follows:

$$s_{(k_n, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} (h_{k_i + i - j}(X_1, \dots, X_n))$$

Applying elementary column operations based on the identity

$$(5.1) \quad h_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) = h_k(X_1, \dots, \widehat{X}_i, \dots, X_n) + X_i \cdot h_{k-1}(X_1, \dots, X_n),$$

it is easy to see that also

$$(5.2) \quad s_{(k_n, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} (h_{k_i + i - j}(X_{n-j+1}, \dots, X_n)).$$

²This can be done using Lemma 7.2. In fact, one obtains the determinant (5.2) that way. In this paper, we only need the Jacobi-Trudi extension of the Schur polynomials.

A combinatorial interpretation of $s_{(k_n, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ as generating function is provided by the subset of arrowed monotone triangle with bottom row k_1, \dots, k_n with all entries being decorated with \emptyset . This corresponds to setting

$$(5.3) \quad \omega(\nearrow) = \omega(\nwarrow) = \omega(\bowtie) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \omega(\emptyset) = 1.$$

In the special case $0 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \dots \leq k_n$, these objects are known as Gelfand-Tsetlin patterns (which are in easy bijection with semistandard tableau), however, the important thing to note is that we now have an interpretation as signed objects for all $(k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. The fact that the generating function is given by the extended Schur polynomial is a consequence of Theorem 3.2.

Let $\alpha(k_1, \dots, k_n; X_1, \dots, X_n)$ denote the generating function of arrowed monotone triangles with bottom row k_1, \dots, k_n , as considered in Theorem 3.2. The proof is by induction with respect to n . We have

$$\alpha(k_1; X_1) = (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_1 + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_1^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) + \omega(\emptyset)) \cdot X_1^{k_1},$$

and this coincides with the formula. We set

$$V_{p,q,n} = \omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_n E_q + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_n^{-1} E_p^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) \cdot E_p^{-1} E_q + \omega(\emptyset) \cdot \text{id}$$

and have the following recursion, which is immediate from the definition.

$$(5.4) \quad \alpha(k_1, \dots, k_n; X_1, \dots, X_n) = X_n^{k_1 + \dots + k_n} \times \left[V_{k_1, k'_1, n} V_{k_2, k'_2, n} \cdots V_{k_n, k'_n, n} \sum_{l_1=k'_1}^{k_2} \sum_{l_2=k'_2}^{k_3} \cdots \sum_{l_{n-1}=k'_{n-1}}^{k_n} X_n^{-l_1 - l_2 - \dots - l_{n-1}} \alpha(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}) \right]_{k_i=k'_i}$$

Indeed, if we delete the bottom row of an arrowed monotone triangle, we obtain an arrowed monotone triangle with one row less. Moreover, $\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_n E_{k'_i}$ in $V_{k_i, k'_i, n}$ corresponds to decorating k_i with \nearrow , $\omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_n^{-1} E_{k_i}^{-1}$ corresponds to decorating k_i with \nwarrow , $\omega(\bowtie) \cdot E_{k_i}^{-1} E_{k'_i}$ corresponds to decorating k_i with \bowtie , and $\omega(\emptyset) \cdot \text{id}$ corresponds to decorating k_i with \emptyset .

Here and in the following $\sum_{i=a}^b f(i)$ has to be interpreted as $\sum_{i \in \underline{[a, b]}} f(i)$. Using the induction hypothesis, the right-hand side is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & X_n^{k_1 + \dots + k_n} \left[V_{k_1, k'_1, n} V_{k_2, k'_2, n} \cdots V_{k_n, k'_n, n} \sum_{l_1=k'_1}^{k_2} \sum_{l_2=k'_2}^{k_3} \cdots \sum_{l_{n-1}=k'_{n-1}}^{k_n} X_n^{-l_1 - l_2 - \dots - l_{n-1}} \right. \\ & \quad \times \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_i + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_i^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) + \omega(\emptyset)) \\ & \quad \left. \prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n-1} (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot E_{l_p} + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot E_{l_q}^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) \cdot E_{l_p} E_{l_q}^{-1} + \omega(\emptyset) \cdot \text{id}) \right. \\ & \quad \left. \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n-1} (h_{l_i + i - j}(X_{n-j}, \dots, X_{n-1})) \right]_{k_i=k'_i}. \end{aligned}$$

We define the following difference operator $\Delta_{k, X}$:

$$\Delta_{k, X} p(k) := p(k) - X \cdot p(k-1)$$

Note that

$$(5.5) \quad \Delta_{k, X_i} h_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) = h_k(X_1, \dots, X_n) - X_i \cdot h_{k-1}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = h_k(X_1, \dots, \widehat{X_i}, \dots, X_n)$$

and

$$(5.6) \quad \sum_{l_i=k_i}^{k_{i+1}} X_n^{-l_i} \Delta_{l_i, X_n} p(l_i) = \sum_{l_i=k_i}^{k_{i+1}} (X_n^{-l_i} p(l_i) - X_n^{-l_i+1} p(l_i - 1)) = X_n^{-k_{i+1}} p(k_{i+1}) - X_n^{-k_i+1} p(k_i - 1).$$

Using

$$\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n-1} (h_{l_i+i-j}(X_{n-j}, \dots, X_{n-1})) = \Delta_{l_1, X_n} \Delta_{l_2, X_n} \cdots \Delta_{l_{n-1}, X_n} \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n-1} (h_{l_i+i-j}(X_{n-j}, \dots, X_n)),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & X_n^{k_1+\dots+k_n} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_i + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_i^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) + \omega(\emptyset)) \\ & \times \left[V_{k_1, k'_1, n} V_{k_2, k'_2, n} \cdots V_{k_n, k'_n, n} \sum_{l_1=k'_1}^{k_2} \sum_{l_2=k'_2}^{k_3} \cdots \sum_{l_{n-1}=k'_{n-1}}^{k_n} X_n^{-l_1-l_2-\dots-l_{n-1}} \right. \\ & \left. \Delta_{l_1, X_n} \Delta_{l_2, X_n} \cdots \Delta_{l_{n-1}, X_n} \widehat{\alpha}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_n) \right]_{k_i=k'_i} \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\alpha}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_n) &= \prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n-1} (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot E_{l_p} + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot E_{l_q}^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) \cdot E_{l_p} E_{l_q}^{-1} + \omega(\emptyset) \cdot \text{id}) \\ & \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n-1} (h_{l_i+i-j}(X_{n-j}, \dots, X_n)). \end{aligned}$$

Now we apply (5.6).

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & X_n^{k_1+\dots+k_n} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_i + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_i^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) + \omega(\emptyset)) \\ & \times \left[V_{k_1, k'_1, n} V_{k_2, k'_2, n} \cdots V_{k_n, k'_n, n} \sum_{\substack{(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}): \\ l_i=k'_i-1 \text{ or } l_i=k_{i+1}}} (-1)^{\#\{i: l_i=k'_i-1\}} X_n^{-l_1-l_2-\dots-l_{n-1}} \widehat{\alpha}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_n) \right]_{k_i=k'_i} \end{aligned}$$

The sum over the (l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}) has 2^{n-1} terms. Next we argue that the summands with $l_{i-1} = k_i, l_i = k'_i - 1$ for at least one i evaluate to zero after applying $V_{k_i, k'_i, n}$ and setting $k_i = k'_i$ afterwards. We set

$$\widehat{\beta}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_n) = \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n-1} (h_{l_i+i-j}(X_{n-j}, \dots, X_n)),$$

and using $X^{-l} E_l^{\pm 1} a(l) = X^{-l} a(l \pm 1) = X^{\pm 1} E_l^{\pm 1} X^{-l} a(l)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & X_n^{-l_1-l_2-\dots-l_{n-1}} \widehat{\alpha}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}) \\ &= \prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n-1} (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_n E_{l_p} + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_n^{-1} E_{l_q}^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) \cdot E_{l_p} E_{l_q}^{-1} + \omega(\emptyset) \cdot \text{id}) \\ & \quad X_n^{-l_1-l_2-\dots-l_{n-1}} \widehat{\beta}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_n) \\ &= \prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n-1} V_{l_q, l_p, n} X_n^{-l_1-l_2-\dots-l_{n-1}} \widehat{\beta}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_n). \end{aligned}$$

We consider a summand in (5.7) with $l_{i-1} = k_i$ and $l_i = k'_i - 1$. Up to some unimportant factors and specializations (we omit the first line of (5.7), V_{k_j, k'_j} for $j \neq i$, the sign $(-1)^{\#j: l_j = k'_j - 1}$ as well as the specialization $k_j = k'_j$ for $j \neq i$), such a summand in (5.7) can also be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[V_{l_{i-1}, l_i, n} \prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n-1} V_{l_q, l_p, n} X_n^{-l_1 - l_2 - \dots - l_{n-1}} \widehat{\beta}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_n) \right]_{l_{i-1} = k_i, l_i = k_i - 1} \\ &= \left[X_n V_{l_{i-1}, l_i, n} V_{l_i, l_{i-1}, n} \prod_{\substack{1 \leq p < q \leq n-1 \\ (p, q) \neq (i-1, i)}} V_{l_q, l_p, n} X_n^{-l_1 - l_2 - \dots - l_{n-1}} E_{l_i}^{-1} \widehat{\beta}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_n) \right]_{l_{i-1} = l_i = k_i}. \end{aligned}$$

(In the first line, the crucial observation is that we can replace $V_{k_i, k'_i, n}$ from (5.7) with $V_{l_{i-1}, l_i, n}$, taking $l_{i-1} = k_i$ and $l_i = k'_i - 1$ into account and the specialization.) The summand vanishes since $E_{l_i}^{-1} \widehat{\beta}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is asymmetric in l_{i-1}, l_i and

$$V_{l_{i-1}, l_i, n} V_{l_i, l_{i-1}, n} \prod_{\substack{1 \leq p < q \leq n-1 \\ (p, q) \neq (i-1, i)}} V_{l_q, l_p, n}$$

is symmetric in l_{i-1}, l_i as this implies that the function in brackets is also asymmetric. It follows that (5.7) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & X_n^{k_1 + \dots + k_n} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_i + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_i^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) + \omega(\emptyset)) \left[V_{k_1, k'_1, n} V_{k_2, k'_2, n} \dots V_{k_n, k'_n, n} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i-1} X_n^{-k'_1 - \dots - k'_{i-1} - k_{i+1} - \dots - k_n + i - 1} \widehat{\alpha}(l_1, \dots, l_{n-1}; X_1, \dots, X_n) \right]_{k'_j = k_j}. \end{aligned}$$

In this expression, the i -th summand is independent of k_i, k'_i , and the action of V_{k_i, k'_i} is then simply multiplication with $\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_n + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_n^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) + \omega(\emptyset)$, which is due to its independence of i an overall factor and fits as last factor within the product in the front. Moreover, the i -th summand is independent of k_j for $j < i$, and so we may replace V_{k_j, k'_j} by V_{k_i, k'_j} (since the summand is also independent of k_i), and for a similar reason we can replace V_{k_j, k'_j} by V_{k_j, k_i} for $j > i$. We can specialize $k_j = k'_j$ now, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & X_n^{k_1 + \dots + k_n} \prod_{i=1}^n (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_i + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_i^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) + \omega(\emptyset)) \\ & \quad \times \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i-1} \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} V_{k_i, k_j} \prod_{j=i+1}^n V_{k_j, k_i} X_n^{-k_1 - \dots - k_{i-1} - k_{i+1} - \dots - k_n + i - 1} \\ & \quad \times \widehat{\alpha}(k_1 - 1, \dots, k_{i-1} - 1, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_n; X_1, \dots, X_n). \end{aligned}$$

We use $X^{-l} E_l^{\pm 1} a(l) = X^{-l} a(l \pm 1) = X^{\pm 1} E_l^{\pm 1} X^{-l} a(l)$ again to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \prod_{i=1}^n (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot X_i + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot X_i^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) + \omega(\emptyset)) \\ & \quad \prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n} (\omega(\nearrow) \cdot E_{k_p} + \omega(\nwarrow) \cdot E_{k_q}^{-1} + \omega(\bowtie) \cdot E_{k_p} E_{k_q}^{-1} + \omega(\emptyset) \cdot \text{id}) \\ & \quad \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i-1} X_n^{k_i + i - 1} \widehat{\beta}(k_1 - 1, \dots, k_{i-1} - 1, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_n; X_1, \dots, X_n). \end{aligned}$$

we rewrite the expression from Theorem 3.2 for $\omega(\emptyset) = 0, \omega(\nearrow) = u, \omega(\nwarrow) = v, \omega(\bowtie) = w$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{i=1}^n (uX_i + vX_i^{-1} + w) \prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n} (uE_{k_p} + vE_{k_q}^{-1} + wE_{k_p}E_{k_q}^{-1}) s_{(k_n, k_{n-1}, \dots, k_1)}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^n (uX_i + vX_i^{-1} + w) \prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n} (uE_{k_p} + vE_{k_q}^{-1} + wE_{k_p}E_{k_q}^{-1}) \frac{\mathbf{ASym}_{X_1, \dots, X_n} \left[\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{k_i+i-1} \right]}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (X_j - X_i)} \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^n (uX_i + vX_i^{-1} + w) \frac{\mathbf{ASym}_{X_1, \dots, X_n} \left[\prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n} (uE_{k_p} + vE_{k_q}^{-1} + wE_{k_p}E_{k_q}^{-1}) \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{k_i+i-1} \right]}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (X_j - X_i)} \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^n (uX_i + vX_i^{-1} + w) \frac{\mathbf{ASym}_{X_1, \dots, X_n} \left[\prod_{1 \leq p < q \leq n} (uX_p + vX_q^{-1} + wX_pX_q^{-1}) \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{k_i+i-1} \right]}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (X_j - X_i)} \\
&= \frac{\mathbf{ASym}_{X_1, \dots, X_n} \left[\prod_{1 \leq p \leq q \leq n} (uX_q + vX_p^{-1} + w) \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{k_i+n-i} \right]}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (X_j - X_i)}.
\end{aligned}$$

From now on, we will consider the special case $(k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n) = (1, 2, \dots, n)$, and therefore, we have the following expression.

$$\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^n \frac{\mathbf{ASym}_{X_1, \dots, X_n} \left[\prod_{1 \leq p \leq q \leq n} (uX_q + vX_p^{-1} + w) \right]}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (X_j - X_i)}$$

We need the following lemma to obtain a determinantal expression.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $n \geq 1$, and $\mathbb{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n), \mathbb{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ be algebraically independent indeterminants. Then*

$$\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} (X_i^j - Y_i^j) = \widehat{\mathbf{ASym}} \left[\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (X_j - Y_i) \right],$$

with

$$\widehat{\mathbf{ASym}} [f(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y})] = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n} \text{sgn } \sigma f(X_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, X_{\sigma(n)}; Y_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, Y_{\sigma(n)}).$$

Proof. The proof is by induction with respect to n . The result is obvious for $n = 1$. Let $L_n(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y}), R_n(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y})$ denote the left and right-hand side of the identity in the statement, respectively. By the induction hypothesis, we can assume $L_{n-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}; Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-1}) = R_{n-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}; Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-1})$. We show that both $L_n(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y})$ and $R_n(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y})$ can be computed recursively using $L_{n-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}; Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-1})$ and $R_{n-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}; Y_1, \dots, Y_{n-1})$, respectively, with the same recursion. For the right-hand side, we have

$$R_n(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i+1} \left(\prod_{k=1}^n (X_k - Y_i) \right) R_{n-1}(X_1, \dots, \widehat{X}_i, \dots, X_n; Y_1, \dots, \widehat{Y}_i, \dots, Y_n),$$

where \widehat{X}_i and \widehat{Y}_i means that X_i and Y_i are omitted. In order to deal with the left-hand side, we first observe

$$(7.1) \quad \sum_{j=0}^n (X_i^j - Y_i^j) e_{n-j}(-X_1, \dots, -X_n) = (-1)^{n-1} \prod_{k=1}^n (X_k - Y_i),$$

where $e_j(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ denotes the j -th elementary symmetric function. Note that the summand for $j = 0$ on the left-hand side is actually 0, and can therefore be omitted. Now consider

the following system of linear equations with n unknowns $c_j(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y})$, $1 \leq j \leq n$, and n equations.

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (X_i^j - Y_i^j) c_j(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y}) = (-1)^{n-1} \prod_{k=1}^n (X_k - Y_i), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

The determinant of this system of equations is obviously $L_n(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y})$, which is non-zero as the rows are linearly independent. By (7.1), we know that the unique solution of this system is given by $c_j(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y}) = e_{n-j}(-X_1, \dots, -X_n)$. On the other hand, by Cramer's rule,

$$c_n(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y}) = \frac{\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left(\begin{cases} X_i^j - Y_i^j, & \text{if } j < n \\ (-1)^{n-1} \prod_{k=1}^n (X_k - Y_i), & \text{if } j = n \end{cases} \right)}{L_n(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y})}.$$

The assertion now follows from $c_n(\mathbb{X}; \mathbb{Y}) = e_0(-X_1, \dots, -X_n) = 1$ and expanding the determinant in the numerator with respect to the last column. \square

Letting Y_i from the lemma be $-vX_i^{-1}$ and X_j be $uX_j + w$, we obtain

$$\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^n \frac{\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} ((uX_i + w)^j - (-vX_i^{-1})^j)}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (X_j - X_i)}.$$

We aim at deriving a Jacobi-Trudi-type determinant. We add t -times the $(n-i)$ -th column to the $(n-i+1)$ -st column, for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, in this order. We repeat this for $i = 1, \dots, n-2$, then for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-3$, etc. We obtain

$$(7.2) \quad \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^n \frac{\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} ((uX_i + w + t)^{j-1} (uX_i + w) + (-vX_i^{-1} + t)^{j-1} vX_i^{-1})}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (X_j - X_i)},$$

and set $t = -w$.

The general procedure we use to obtain a Jacobi-Trudi-type determinant is provided in the following lemma. It is related to [BDFZJ12, Eq. (43)].

Lemma 7.2. *Let $f_j(X)$ be formal Laurent series for $1 \leq j \leq n$, and define*

$$f_j[X_1, \dots, X_i] = \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{f_j(X_k)}{\prod_{1 \leq l \leq i, l \neq k} (X_k - X_l)}.$$

Then

$$\frac{\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} (f_j(X_i))}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (X_j - X_i)} = \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} (f_j[X_1, \dots, X_i]).$$

Moreover, we have

$$f_j[X_1, \dots, X_i] = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \langle X^{i+k-1} \rangle f_j(X) \cdot h_k(X_1, \dots, X_i),$$

where $\langle X^{i+k-1} \rangle f_j(X)$ denotes the coefficient of X^{i+k-1} in $f_j(X)$.

Proof. Let T_n denote the $n \times n$ lower triangular matrix defined as follows.

$$(T_n)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \prod_{1 \leq l \leq i, l \neq j} (X_j - X_l), & i \geq j \\ 0, & i < j \end{cases}$$

The first assertion follows from multiplying $(f_j(X_i))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ from the left with T_n and the multiplicativity of the determinant.

By linearity, it suffices to show the second formula for monomials, that is, we need to show

$$(7.3) \quad \sum_{k=1}^i \frac{X_k^m}{\prod_{1 \leq l \leq i, l \neq k} (X_k - X_l)} = h_{m-i+1}(X_1, \dots, X_i).$$

We first consider the case $m \geq 0$. We multiply the identity with t^m , sum over all $m \geq 0$, and obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^i (1 - tX_k)^{-1} \prod_{1 \leq l \leq i, l \neq k} (X_k - X_l)^{-1} = t^{i-1} \prod_{l=1}^i (1 - tX_l)^{-1}.$$

This is equivalent to the original identity. We divide by the right-hand side, replace t by t^{-1} and arrive at

$$\sum_{k=1}^i \prod_{1 \leq l \leq i, l \neq k} \frac{t - X_l}{X_k - X_l} = 1.$$

The left-hand side is obviously a polynomial in t of degree no greater than $i-1$ and it evaluates to 1 for $t = X_1, \dots, X_i$. Thus the polynomial is 1. As for $m < 0$, we also multiply (7.3) with t^m and sum over all $m < 0$. Noting that

$$\sum_{m < 0} h_{m-i+1}(X_1, \dots, X_i) t^m = - \prod_{l=1}^i (1 - tX_l)^{-1}$$

(expand the right-hand side as a formal power series in t^{-1}), the result follows in the same way. \square

In our case, we need to consider

$$\begin{aligned} f_j(X) &= (uX)^{j-1}(uX + w) + (-vX^{-1} - w)^{j-1}vX^{-1} \\ &= u^j X^j + u^{j-1}wX^{j-1} + \sum_{k \geq 0} \binom{j-1}{k} (-1)^{j-1} v^{k+1} X^{-k-1} w^{j-1-k} \end{aligned}$$

(see (7.2) and set $t = -w$) and therefore

$$\langle X^l \rangle f_j(X) = [l = j]u^j + [l = j-1]u^{j-1}w + \binom{j-1}{-l-1} (-1)^{j-1} v^{-l} w^{j+l},$$

where we use the Iverson bracket, i.e., $[\text{statement}] = 1$ if the statement is true, and $[\text{statement}] = 0$ otherwise. Therefore, the entry (i, j) of the matrix underlying the determinant we can derive using Lemma 7.2 is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} ([k = j - i + 1]u^j + [k = j - i]u^{j-1}w + \binom{j-1}{-k-i} (-1)^{j-1} v^{-k-i+1} w^{j+k+i-1}) \cdot h_k(X_1, \dots, X_i) \\ &= u^j h_{j-i+1}(X_1, \dots, X_i) + u^{j-1}w h_{j-i}(X_1, \dots, X_i) + \sum_{l \geq 1} \binom{j-1}{l-1} (-1)^{j-1} v^l w^{j-l} h_{-l-i+1}(X_1, \dots, X_i). \end{aligned}$$

We define two matrices

$$A_n = \left(u^j h_{j-i+1}(X_1, \dots, X_i) + u^{j-1}w h_{j-i}(X_1, \dots, X_i) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n},$$

and

$$B_n = \left(\sum_{l \geq 1} \binom{j-1}{l-1} (-1)^{j-1} v^l w^{j-l} h_{-l-i+1}(X_1, \dots, X_i) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n},$$

so that the determinant can also be written as $\det(A_n + B_n)$.

We will compute the inverse of B_n because we aim at considering

$$\det(A_n + B_n) = \det(B_n) \det(B_n^{-1} A_n + I_n),$$

where I_n denotes the identity matrix. In the end, we will interpret $\det(B_n^{-1} A_n + I_n)$ combinatorially.

The matrix B_n can obviously be decomposed as follows.

$$B_n = (h_{-j-i+1}(X_1, \dots, X_i))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot \left(\binom{j-1}{i-1} (-1)^{j-1} v^i w^{j-i} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$$

Note that it is not hard to see that $\det(B_n) = v^{\binom{n+1}{2}} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} X_i^{-n}$, which cancels the prefactor in (7.2): The first factor of B_n can be brought into triangular form by elementary column operations using (5.1), while the second factor is already in triangular form.

Using Vandermonde summation, it is easy to check that

$$\left[\left(\binom{j-1}{i-1} (-1)^{j-1} v^i w^{j-i} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \right]^{-1} = \left(\binom{j-1}{i-1} (-1)^{j-1} v^{-j} w^{j-i} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}.$$

We also need the following

$$(7.4) \quad (h_{j-i}(X_j, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot (h_{1-i-j}(X_1, \dots, X_i))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} = (h_{1-i-j}(X_1, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n},$$

which can be shown using (5.1). Moreover, we have

$$(7.5) \quad \left[(h_{1-i-j}(X_1, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \right]^{-1} = \left((-1)^{i+j} e_{i+j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n},$$

as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^{j+k} h_{1-i-k}(X_1, \dots, X_n) e_{k+j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^{j+k+n-1} X_1^{-1} \dots X_n^{-1} h_{i+k-1-n}(X_1^{-1}, \dots, X_n^{-1}) e_{k+j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^n X_1^{-1} \dots X_n^{-1} \langle t^{1-i-k} \rangle \left[\prod_{l=1}^n (t - X_l^{-1})^{-1} \right] \langle t^{k+j-1} \rangle \left[\prod_{l=1}^n (1 - t X_l) \right] \\ &= (-1)^n X_1^{-1} \dots X_n^{-1} \langle t^{j-i} \rangle \left[\prod_{l=1}^n (t - X_l^{-1})^{-1} (1 - t X_l) \right] = (-1)^n X_1^{-1} \dots X_n^{-1} \langle t^{j-i} \rangle [(-1)^n X_1 \dots X_n] = [i = j]. \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side of (7.5) can be decomposed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left((-1)^{i+j} e_{i+j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\ &= \left((-1)^i e_{i-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-j}) X_{n-j+1} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot \left((-1)^j e_{j-1}(X_{n-i+2}, \dots, X_n) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \end{aligned}$$

Combining all this, we obtain for B_n^{-1}

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\binom{j-1}{i-1} (-1)^{j-1} v^{-j} w^{j-i} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot \left[(h_{1-i-j}(X_1, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \right]^{-1} \cdot (h_{j-i}(X_j, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\
&= \left(\binom{j-1}{i-1} (-1)^{j-1} v^{-j} w^{j-i} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot \left((-1)^{i+j} e_{i+j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot (h_{j-i}(X_j, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\
&= \left(\binom{j-1}{i-1} (-1)^{j-1} v^{-j} w^{j-i} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot \left((-1)^i e_{i-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-j}) X_{n-j+1} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\
&\quad \cdot \left((-1)^j e_{j-1}(X_{n-i+2}, \dots, X_n) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot (h_{j-i}(X_j, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\
&= \left(\binom{j-1}{i-1} v^{-j} w^{j-i} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot \left(e_{i-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-j}) X_{n-j+1} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\
&\quad \cdot \left((-1)^{j-1} e_{j-1}(X_{n-i+2}, \dots, X_n) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot (h_{j-i}(X_j, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now multiply A_n from the left with the product of all these matrices. First we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& (h_{j-i}(X_j, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot (u^j h_{j-i+1}(X_1, \dots, X_i) + u^{j-1} w h_{j-i}(X_1, \dots, X_i))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \\
&= (u^j h_{j-i+1}(X_1, \dots, X_n) + u^{j-1} w h_{j-i}(X_1, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n},
\end{aligned}$$

which follows (in a manner very similar to (7.4)) from (5.1). The entry (i, j) from the matrix

$$\left((-1)^{j-1} e_{j-1}(X_{n-i+2}, \dots, X_n) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot (u^j h_{j-i+1}(X_1, \dots, X_n) + u^{j-1} w h_{j-i}(X_1, \dots, X_n))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$$

simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^{k-1} e_{k-1}(X_{n-i+2}, \dots, X_n) \left[u^j h_{j-k+1}(X_1, \dots, X_n) + u^{j-1} w h_{j-k}(X_1, \dots, X_n) \right] \\
&= u^j \sum_{k \geq 0} \langle t^k \rangle \left[\prod_{l=n-i+2}^n (1 - tX_l) \right] \langle t^{j-k} \rangle \left[\prod_{l=1}^n (1 - tX_l)^{-1} \right] \\
&+ w u^{j-1} \sum_{k \geq 0} \langle t^k \rangle \left[\prod_{l=n-i+2}^n (1 - tX_l) \right] \langle t^{j-k-1} \rangle \left[\prod_{l=1}^n (1 - tX_l)^{-1} \right] \\
&= u^j \langle t^j \rangle \left[\prod_{l=1}^{n-i+1} (1 - tX_l)^{-1} \right] + w u^{j-1} \langle t^{j-1} \rangle \left[\prod_{l=1}^{n-i+1} (1 - tX_l)^{-1} \right] \\
&= u^j h_j(X_1, \dots, X_{n-i+1}) + w u^{j-1} h_{j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-i+1})
\end{aligned}$$

Then, the entry (i, j) of

$$\left(e_{i-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-j}) X_{n-j+1} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot (u^j h_j(X_1, \dots, X_{n-i+1}) + w u^{j-1} h_{j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-i+1}))_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$$

is equal to

$$\sum_{l=1}^n e_{i-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l}) X_{n-l+1} \left[u^j h_j(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l+1}) + w u^{j-1} h_{j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l+1}) \right].$$

Finally, the entry (i, j) of $B_n^{-1} A_n$, i.e.,

$$\left(\binom{j-1}{i-1} v^{-j} w^{j-i} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \cdot \left(\sum_{l=1}^n e_{i-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l}) X_{n-l+1} [u^j h_j(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l+1}) + w u^{j-1} h_{j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l+1})] \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$$

is equal to

$$\sum_{l=1}^n u^{j-1} [u h_j(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l+1}) + w h_{j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l+1})] \times \sum_{k=i-1}^n \binom{k-1}{i-1} v^{-k} w^{k-i} e_{k-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l}) X_{n-l+1},$$

which we interpret as the generating function of weighted lattice paths that start in $(-i, i-2)$ and end in $(j, 0)$ as follows. In fact, we will now establish the connection to the extended DPP-paths as defined in Section 4.

- Recall that strictly left of the y -axis, we have unit up-steps and unit right-steps in DPP-paths. The term

$$(7.6) \quad \sum_{k=i-1}^n \binom{k-1}{i-1} v^{-k} w^{k-i} e_{k-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l}) X_{n-l+1}$$

takes into account for precisely this, namely for the portion of the path from $(-i, i-2)$ to $(0, n-l-1)$, where the step that reaches $(0, n-l-1)$ is a right-step. By definition of DPP-paths the m -th step contributes $X_m v^{-1}$ if it is a right-step and either 1 or $X_m v^{-1} w$ if it is an up-step. Since the last step is prescribed and has weight $X_{n-l+1} v^{-1}$, we need to choose a path from $(-i, i-2)$ to $(-1, n-l-1)$, which has in total $n-l$ steps of which $i-1$ have to be right steps. We call the m -th step *special* if X_m appears as a factor in its weight. We choose $k-1$ steps to be special, and note that this is reflected through $e_{k-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l})$ in (7.6). Among the $k-1$ special steps we choose the positions of the $i-1$ right-steps (all right-steps are special): this is reflected in $\binom{k-1}{i-1}$ in (7.6). The $i-1$ right-steps have each an additional multiplicative weight of v^{-1} and each of the $k-i$ special up-steps has an additional multiplicative weight of $v^{-1} w$.

- Next we have to deal with the portion that goes from $(0, n-l-1)$ to $(j, -2)$. This will be obtained by interpreting the term

$$u^{j-1} [u h_j(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l+1}) + w h_{j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l+1})]$$

for $1 \leq l \leq n$.

- Observe that

$$u^j h_j(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l+1})$$

actually corresponds to the paths from $(0, n-l-1)$ to $(j, -1)$ with only down-steps and right-steps. Right-steps at height $m-2$ over the x -axis contribute $u X_m$ to the weight. We add to such a path a down-step at the end to reach $(j, -2)$.

- On the other hand,

$$u^{j-1} w h_{j-1}(X_1, \dots, X_{n-l+1})$$

is obviously the generating function for paths from $(0, n-l-1)$ to $(j-1, -1)$, with the same weight, except that we have to multiply w , overall. We add to such a path a diagonal-step $(1, -1)$ to reach $(j, -2)$, and interpret w as the weight of the diagonal-step.

In summary, one can also say that right of and on the y -axis, we consider paths from $(0, n-l-1)$ to $(j, -2)$, with down-steps and right-step above and on the line $y = -1$, as well as down-steps and diagonal-steps $(1, -1)$ from “level” -1 to “level” -2 . Each horizontal step at level -1 and higher gets a weight uX_m , with m is obtained by adding 2 to the level. A diagonal-step contribute w to the weight.

- In the end, we need to multiply with $v^{\binom{n+1}{2}}$, which comes from $\det(B_n)$.

Now we use the Lindström-Gessel-Viennot lemma [Lin73, GV85, GV89] to interpret the determinant

$$\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} ([i = j] + W((-i, i-2) \rightarrow (j, -2)))$$

as the generating function of extended n -DPP paths, where $W((-i, i-2) \rightarrow (j, -2))$ is the generating function of lattice paths from $(-i, i-2)$ to $(j, -2)$ with the weights as given above. Indeed, we mimic how one can be led to Andrews’ definition of descending plane partitions: we can write the determinant also as

$$\sum_{r=0}^n \sum_{1 \leq u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_r \leq n} \det_{1 \leq i, j \leq r} (W((-u_i, u_i-2) \rightarrow (u_j, -2))).$$

The Lindström-Gessel-Viennot lemma now asserts that $\det_{1 \leq i, j \leq r} (W((-u_i, u_i-2) \rightarrow (u_j, -2)))$ is the weighted count of non-intersecting lattice paths from $A'_{u_1}, \dots, A'_{u_r}$ to $E'_{u_1}, \dots, E'_{u_r}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.5.

8. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Ilse Fischer thanks Matjaž Konvalinka for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [ABF20] A. Ayer, R. Behrend, and I. Fischer. Extreme diagonally and antidiagonally symmetric alternating sign matrices of odd order. *Adv. Math.*, 367:107125, 56, 2020.
- [AF20] A. Ayer and I. Fischer. Bijective proofs of skew Schur polynomial factorizations. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 174:105241, 40, 2020.
- [And79] G. Andrews. Plane partitions. III. The weak Macdonald conjecture. *Invent. Math.*, 53(3):193–225, 1979.
- [BDFZJ12] R. Behrend, P. Di Francesco, and P. Zinn-Justin. On the weighted enumeration of alternating sign matrices and descending plane partitions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 119(2):331–363, 2012.
- [BDFZJ13] R. Behrend, P. Di Francesco, and P. Zinn-Justin. A doubly-refined enumeration of alternating sign matrices and descending plane partitions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 120(2):409–432, 2013.
- [Bre99] D. Bressoud. *Proofs and confirmations. The story of the alternating sign matrix conjecture*. MAA Spectrum. Mathematical Association of America and Cambridge University Press, Washington, DC and Cambridge, 1999.
- [Fis06] I. Fischer. The number of monotone triangles with prescribed bottom row. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 37(2):249–267, 2006.
- [Fis10] I. Fischer. The operator formula for monotone triangles—simplified proof and three generalizations. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 117(8):1143–1157, 2010.
- [FK] I. Fischer and M. Konvalinka. The mysterious story of square ice, piles of cubes, and bijections. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 117 (38).
- [FK20a] I. Fischer and M. Konvalinka. A bijective proof of the ASM theorem, part I: the operator formula. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 27(3):Paper 3.35, 29 pp. (electronic), 2020.

- [FK20b] I. Fischer and M. Konvalinka. A bijective proof of the ASM theorem, part II: ASM enumeration and ASM-DPP relation. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, page rnaa304, 2020.
- [GV85] I. Gessel and G. Viennot. Binomial determinants, paths, and hook length formulae. *Adv. in Math.*, 58(3):300–321, 1985.
- [GV89] I. Gessel and G. Viennot. Determinants, paths and plane partitions, 1989.
- [Kra06] C. Krattenthaler. Descending plane partitions and rhombus tilings of a hexagon with a triangular hole. *European J. Combin.*, 27(7):1138–1146, 2006.
- [Kup96] G. Kuperberg. Another proof of the alternating-sign matrix conjecture. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (3):139–150, 1996.
- [Lin73] B. Lindström. On the vector representations of induced matroids. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 5:85–90, 1973.
- [MRR83] W. Mills, D. P. Robbins, and H. Rumsey, Jr. Alternating sign matrices and descending plane partitions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 34(3):340–359, 1983.
- [MRR86] W. Mills, D. P. Robbins, and H. Rumsey, Jr. Self-complementary totally symmetric plane partitions. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 42(2):277–292, 1986.
- [RR86] D. P. Robbins and H. Rumsey, Jr. Determinants and alternating sign matrices. *Adv. in Math.*, 62(2):169–184, 1986.
- [Zei96] D. Zeilberger. Proof of the alternating sign matrix conjecture. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 3(2):Research Paper 13, 84 pp. (electronic), 1996. The Foata Festschrift.

LACIM, UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL, CANADA
URL: <https://homepage.univie.ac.at/florian.aigner/>

UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, AUSTRIA
URL: <https://www.mat.univie.ac.at/~ifischer/>