

# $m$ -SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS, NON-SYMMETRIC MACDONALD POLYNOMIALS AND POSITIVITY CONJECTURES

L. LAPOINTE

ABSTRACT. We study the space,  $R_m$ , of  $m$ -symmetric functions consisting of polynomials that are symmetric in the variables  $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, x_{m+3}, \dots$  but have no special symmetry in the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_m$ . We obtain  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials by  $t$ -symmetrizing non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials, and show that they form a basis of  $R_m$ . We define  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions through a somewhat complicated process involving their dual basis, tableaux combinatorics, and the Hecke algebra generators, and then prove some of their most elementary properties. We conjecture that the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials (suitably normalized and plethystically modified) expand positively in terms of  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions. We obtain relations on the  $(q, t)$ -Koska coefficients  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  in the  $m$ -symmetric world, and show in particular that the usual  $(q, t)$ -Koska coefficients are special cases of the  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$ 's. Finally, we show that when  $m$  is large, the positivity conjecture, modulo a certain subspace, becomes a positivity conjecture on the expansion of non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials in terms of non-symmetric Hall-Littlewood polynomials.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Macdonald polynomials are a family of symmetric functions depending on two parameters  $q$  and  $t$  [17]. It was shown in [10, 13] that the Schur expansion of the Macdonald polynomials (suitably normalized and plethystically modified) is positive, that is, that

$$\tilde{J}_\lambda(x; q, t) = \sum_{\mu} K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t) s_{\mu}(x) \quad \text{with } K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t) \in \mathbb{N}[q, t]$$

where  $\tilde{J}_\lambda(x; q, t)$  stands for the plethystically modified Macdonald polynomial indexed by the partition  $\lambda$ .

There exists a non-symmetric version  $E_\eta(x; q, t)$  of the Macdonald polynomials [8, 19] which are indexed by compositions and form a basis of the ring of polynomials in a given number  $N$  of variables. Even though many combinatorial properties of the non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials are similar in nature to those of the Macdonald polynomials, there was until now no known Macdonald positivity phenomenon in the non-symmetric case (except in special cases [1, 2]). One of the main goals of this article is to develop the correct framework in which to extend the original Macdonald positivity conjectures to the non-symmetric case. In order to describe this framework, which is that of the  $m$ -symmetric functions, we first need to make a detour through superspace.

Generalizations to superspace of the original Macdonald positivity conjecture were provided in [5, 6]. In this setting, the Macdonald polynomials, denoted  $J_\Lambda^{(\text{SUSY})}(q, t)$  and indexed by superpartitions, essentially correspond to non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials whose variables  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  (resp.  $x_{m+1}, \dots, x_N$ ) are antisymmetrized (resp.  $t$ -symmetrized), with  $m$  being the fermionic sector. In short,

$$J_\Lambda^{(\text{SUSY})}(q, t) \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{A}_{1, \dots, m} \mathcal{S}_{m+1, \dots, N}^t E_\eta(x; q, t) \tag{1.1}$$

where  $E_\eta(x; q, t)$  is a non-symmetric Macdonald polynomial, and where  $\mathcal{A}_{1, \dots, m}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{S}_{m+1, \dots, N}^t$ ) stands for the antisymmetrization (resp.  $t$ -symmetrization) operator. The extension of the original Macdonald positivity conjecture is then that

$$\tilde{J}_\Lambda^{(\text{SUSY})}(q, t) = \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) s_{\Omega}^{(\text{SUSY})} \quad \text{with } K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) \in \mathbb{N}[q, t] \tag{1.2}$$

where  $s_{\Omega}^{(\text{SUSY})} = J_{\Omega}^{(\text{SUSY})}(0, 0)$ , and where  $\tilde{J}_\Lambda^{(\text{SUSY})}(q, t)$  is a plethystically modified version of  $J_\Lambda^{(\text{SUSY})}(q, t)$ .

For quite a while we have suspected that applying the antisymmetrization operator  $\mathcal{A}_{1, \dots, m}$  in (1.1) was not necessary, and that the positivity conjectures could be extended to a much larger world. In this world, which we call the world of  $m$ -symmetric functions, the elements are symmetric in the variables  $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots$  while they have no special symmetry in the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  (the case  $m = 0$  corresponding to the usual symmetric

functions). To be more precise, we have suspected that defining the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials (up to a constant) as<sup>1</sup>

$$J_\Lambda(x; q, t) \propto \mathcal{S}_{m+1, \dots, N}^t E_\eta(x; q, t) \quad (1.3)$$

there existed a natural basis of  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions  $s_\Omega(x; t)$  (now depending on  $t$ ) such that

$$\tilde{J}_\Lambda(x; q, t) = \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) s_\Omega(x; t) \quad \text{with } K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) \in \mathbb{N}[q, t] \quad (1.4)$$

with  $\tilde{J}_\Lambda(x; q, t)$  a plethystically modified version of  $J_\Lambda(x; q, t)$ . Our main problem (which has baffled us for quite some time to say the least) has been to obtain a workable definition of the  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions  $s_\Omega(x; t)$ , that is, a definition allowing to demonstrate their elementary properties. We now describe the main ingredients of our solution to this problem which, as we will see, will allow us in particular to obtain the desired positivity conjectures for the non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials.

Bases of the ring  $R_m$  of  $m$ -symmetric functions are indexed by  $m$ -partitions  $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$  where  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$  is a (weak) composition and where  $\lambda$  is a partition. A natural basis of  $R_m$  is provided by

$$k_\Lambda(x; t) = H_{\mathbf{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_m; t) s_\lambda(x)$$

where  $H_{\mathbf{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_m; t)$  is a non-symmetric Hall-Littlewood polynomial and where  $s_\lambda(x)$  is a Schur function. Let  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_m$  be the unique bilinear scalar product on  $R_m$  such that the basis  $k_\Lambda(x; t)$  is self-dual. The reason to introduce this scalar product is that it proves more convenient to first define the dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions as

$$s_\Lambda^*(x; t) = \sum_{\Omega} D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) k_\Omega(x; t)$$

where the coefficients  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t)$  can be obtained recursively from the dominant case ( $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$  with  $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_m$ ), in which case it is a weighted sum over certain special skew tableaux (see (6.7) and Remark 27 for details). Their dual basis with respect to the scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_m$ , the sought-after  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions  $s_\Lambda(x; t)$  appearing in (1.4), are then the the unique basis of  $R_m$  such that

$$k_\Omega(x; t) = \sum_{\Lambda} D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) s_\Lambda(x; t)$$

This definition, even though not the most direct, will prove quite fruitful. We can show for instance that the Hecke algebra generators  $T_1, \dots, T_{m-1}$  are such that

$$T_i s_\Lambda(x; t) = s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(x; t) \quad \text{if } a_i > a_{i+1} \quad (1.5)$$

where  $\tilde{\Lambda} = (\tilde{\mathbf{a}}; \lambda)$  with  $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}$  obtained from  $\mathbf{a}$  by interchanging  $a_i$  and  $a_{i+1}$ . As such, it is possible to construct all  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions from those indexed by dominant  $m$ -partitions (unfortunately, we have not been able to obtain an explicit characterization of  $s_\Lambda(x; t)$  for a dominant  $\Lambda$ . This was the main motivation behind the introduction of the dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions which, on the contrary, have an explicit characterization when  $\Lambda$  is dominant). We can also show that non-symmetric Hall-Littlewood polynomials are a sub-family of the  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions:

$$s_{(\mathbf{a}; \emptyset)}(x; t) = H_{\mathbf{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_m; t)$$

Since  $R_0 \subseteq R_1 \subseteq R_2 \subseteq \dots$ , it proves natural to consider the inclusion  $i : R_m \rightarrow R_{m+1}$  and the restriction  $r : R_{m+1} \rightarrow R_m$  (which essentially consists in setting  $x_{m+1} = 0$ ). We obtain elegant formulas for the inclusion and restriction of the (dual)  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions, as well as for the inclusion and restriction of the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials (these are probably the most technical results contained in this article). These formulas allow, among other things, to derive simple properties of the coefficients  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  in (1.4) (see Propositions 43 and 46), which imply in particular that  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) = K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t)$  whenever  $\Omega = (0^m; \mu)$  and  $\Lambda = (0^m; \lambda)$ , that is, that the usual  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficients are special cases of the coefficients  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$ .

Every non-symmetric Macdonald polynomial turns out to be an  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomial when  $m$  is large enough (when  $m$  is as large as the length of the indexing composition to be more precise). The positivity conjecture expressed in (1.4) thus contains as a special case a generalization of the original Macdonald positivity conjecture for non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials. But a more remarkable phenomenon is at play. For any compositions  $\eta$  and  $\omega$ , we can define  $K_{\omega\eta}(q, t)$  without any reference to  $m$ . We can also show that for a given  $\eta$ , there is only a finite number of distinct coefficients  $K_{\omega\eta}(q, t)$ , and that, as long as  $m$  is large enough, there is no loss of information in working modulo the linear span  $\mathcal{L}_m$  of  $m$ -symmetric symmetric Schur functions  $s_\Lambda(x; t)$  such

<sup>1</sup>The  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials have also been considered in [12], where they are called ‘‘partially-symmetric Macdonald polynomials’’.

that  $\lambda \neq \emptyset$  in  $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$ . The positivity conjecture (1.4) thus implies the following positivity conjecture for non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials (properly normalized and plethystically modified) in terms of non-symmetric Hall-Littlewood polynomials

$$\tilde{J}_\eta(x; q, t) = \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m} K_{\omega\eta}(q, t) H_\omega(x_1, \dots, x_m; t) \pmod{\mathcal{L}_m}, \quad \text{with } K_{\omega\eta}(q, t) \in \mathbb{N}[q, t]$$

since, as we mentioned previously,  $s_{(\omega; \emptyset)}(x; t) = H_\omega(x_1, \dots, x_m; t)$ .

When  $q = t = 1$ , the usual  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficient  $K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t)$  is equal to the number of standard tableaux of shape  $\mu$  (in representation-theoretic terms, this corresponds to the dimension of the irreducible representation of the symmetric group indexed by the partition  $\mu$ ). We will show in a forthcoming article [7] that this property extends to the  $m$ -symmetric world. To be more precise, we will show that when  $q = t = 1$ ,  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  is equal to the number of standard tableaux of shape  $\mathbf{b} \cup \mu$ , where  $\mathbf{b} \cup \mu$  is the partition obtained by reordering the entries of the concatenation of  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mu$ , where  $\Omega = (\mathbf{b}; \mu)$  (in the case of compositions,  $K_{\omega\eta}(1, 1)$  is the number of standard tableaux of shape  $\omega^+$ , where  $\omega^+$  is the partition obtained by reordering the entries of  $\omega$ ). This suggests that the positivity conjectures in the  $m$ -symmetric case could still be connected to the representation theory of the symmetric group.

Our goal in introducing the positivity conjecture (1.4) was to define a much larger framework in which the extra structure could potentially lead to a combinatorial interpretation for the  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficients. This extra structure seems for instance to include special recursions and Butler-type rules for the coefficients  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  (see Conjectures 50, 51 and 52). We are thus still hopeful that this much richer framework holds the key to unraveling the mysterious combinatorics of the  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficients.

The article, being already quite long, does not contain the  $t = 1$  case (to be treated in [7]), or such topics as the relations between the elementary bases ( $m$ -symmetric monomials, power-sums, and Schur functions), or the introduction of a scalar product with respect to which the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials are orthogonal, which we all plan to study in forthcoming works. We have instead focused on establishing properties of the  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  coefficients, and, as such, have restricted ourselves to only presenting results that were necessary to establish such properties.

The outline of the article is the following. In Section 2, we give the necessary background on double affine Hecke algebras and non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials. It is interesting to note that we use a non-standard diagrammatic representation of compositions that, apart from providing a more elegant expression for the eigenvalues of the Cherednik operators, will prove useful when introducing the integral form of the non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials. In Section 3, we introduce the ring of  $m$ -symmetric functions. Generalizations of elementary concepts in symmetric function theory such as that of partition, Ferrers' diagram, and dominance order are presented. Various extensions of simple bases of the ring of symmetric functions, such as that of monomials and power-sums, are also given. The  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials are defined in Section 4. This somewhat technical section culminates in a proof (using the action of certain eigenoperators involving Cherednik operators on monomials) that the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials are unitriangularly related to the  $m$ -symmetric monomial basis, and thus form a basis of the ring of  $m$ -symmetric functions. Section 5 contains the tableaux combinatorics necessary to define the (dual)  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions. Two equivalent families of skew tableaux are introduced. It is shown that the bijection that connects them is compatible with the action of the symmetric group on words in special cases. This compatibility is then used to define a notion of charge on our families of skew tableaux. The (dual)  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions can finally be presented in Section 6. The dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions are first introduced using the  $k_\Lambda(x; t)$  basis and the Hecke algebra generators. After showing that the dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions form a basis of the ring of  $m$ -symmetric functions, the  $m$ -symmetric Schur function can be defined as their dual with respect to a certain scalar product. Properties of the (dual)  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions are then derived in Section 7. A recursion on the expansion coefficients  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t)$  is provided. This allows to obtain the action of the Hecke algebra generators on the (dual)  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions. Simple formulas for the inclusion and restriction of the (dual)  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions are then established. Our main conjecture, a positivity conjecture for  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials is featured in Section 8 after a notion of plethysm and the right normalization have been defined. Various relations on the Kostka coefficients  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  are later given in Section 9. These are the hardest results contained in this article (apart from actually finding the right definition of the  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions), as some of the relations depend on very technical results on  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials that are relegated to Appendix A in order not to interrupt the flow of the presentation. The case when  $m$  is large, in which case the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials reduce to non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials, is studied in Section 10. It is shown that the positivity conjecture on

$m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials, modulo a subspace spanned by certain  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions, now expresses how a non-symmetric Macdonald polynomial expands into non-symmetric Hall-Littlewood polynomials. Finally, Section 11 contains conjectures on the coefficients  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$ , including two rules reminiscent of Butler's rule on the  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficients.

## 2. NON-SYMMETRIC MACDONALD POLYNOMIALS

The non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials can be defined as the common eigenfunctions of the Cherednik operators [8], which are operators that belong to the double affine Hecke algebra and act on the ring  $\mathbb{Q}(q, t)[x_1, \dots, x_N]$ . We now give the relevant definitions [19, 20]. Let the exchange operator  $K_{i,j}$  be such that

$$K_{i,j}f(\dots, x_i, \dots, x_j, \dots) = f(\dots, x_j, \dots, x_i, \dots)$$

We then define the generators  $T_i$  of the affine Hecke algebra as

$$T_i = t + \frac{tx_i - x_{i+1}}{x_i - x_{i+1}}(K_{i,i+1} - 1), \quad i = 1, \dots, N-1, \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$T_0 = t + \frac{qt x_N - x_1}{qx_N - x_1}(K_{1,N}\tau_1\tau_N^{-1} - 1),$$

where  $\tau_i f(x_1, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_N) = f(x_1, \dots, qx_i, \dots, x_N)$  is the  $q$ -shift operator. The  $T_i$ 's satisfy the relations ( $0 \leq i \leq N-1$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} (T_i - t)(T_i + 1) &= 0 \\ T_i T_{i+1} T_i &= T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1} \\ T_i T_j &= T_j T_i, \quad i - j \neq \pm 1 \pmod N \end{aligned}$$

where the indices are taken modulo  $N$ . To define the Cherednik operators, we also need to introduce the operator  $\omega$  defined as:

$$\omega = K_{N-1,N} \cdots K_{1,2} \tau_1.$$

We note that  $\omega T_i = T_{i-1} \omega$  for  $i = 2, \dots, N-1$ .

We are now in position to define the Cherednik operators:

$$Y_i = t^{-N+i} T_i \cdots T_{N-1} \omega T_1^{-1} \cdots T_{i-1}^{-1},$$

where

$$T_j^{-1} = t^{-1} - 1 + t^{-1} T_j,$$

which follows from the quadratic relation satisfied by the generators of the Hecke algebra. The Cherednik operators obey the following relations:


$$\begin{aligned} T_i Y_i &= Y_{i+1} T_i + (t-1) Y_i \\ T_i Y_{i+1} &= Y_i T_i - (t-1) Y_i \\ T_i Y_j &= Y_j T_i \quad \text{if } j \neq i, i+1. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

It can be easily deduced from these relations that

$$(Y_i + Y_{i+1}) T_i = T_i (Y_i + Y_{i+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad (Y_i Y_{i+1}) T_i = T_i (Y_i Y_{i+1}). \quad (2.3)$$

An element  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)$  of  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^N$  is called a (weak) composition with  $N$  parts (or entries). It will prove convenient to represent a composition by a Young (or Ferrers) diagram. Given a composition  $\eta$  with  $N$  parts, let  $\eta^+$  be the partition obtained by reordering the entries of  $\eta$ . The diagram corresponding to  $\eta$  is the Young diagram of  $\eta^+$  with an  $i$ -circle (a circle filled with an  $i$ ) added to the right of the row of size  $\eta_i$  (if there are many rows of size  $\eta_i$ , the circles are ordered from top to bottom in increasing order). For instance, given  $\eta = (0, 2, 1, 3, 2, 0, 2, 0, 0)$ ,

we have



The Cherednik operators  $Y_i$ 's commute among each others,  $[Y_i, Y_j] = 0$ , and can be simultaneously diagonalized. Their eigenfunctions are the (monic) non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials (labeled by compositions). For  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ , the non-symmetric Macdonald polynomial  $E_\eta(x; q, t)$  is the unique polynomial with rational coefficients in  $q$  and  $t$  that is triangularly related to the monomials (in the Bruhat ordering on compositions)

$$E_\eta(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t) = x^\eta + \sum_{\nu \prec \eta} b_{\eta\nu}(q, t) x^\nu \tag{2.4}$$

and that satisfies, for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ,

$$Y_i E_\eta = \bar{\eta}_i E_\eta, \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{\eta}_i = q^{\eta_i} t^{1-r_\eta(i)} \tag{2.5}$$

with  $r_\eta(i)$  standing for the row (starting from the top) in which the  $i$ -circle appears in the diagram of  $\eta$ . The Bruhat order on compositions is defined as follows:

$$\nu \prec \eta \quad \text{iff} \quad \nu^+ < \eta^+ \quad \text{or} \quad \nu^+ = \eta^+ \quad \text{and} \quad w_\eta < w_\nu,$$

where  $w_\eta$  is the unique permutation of minimal length such that  $\eta = w_\eta \eta^+$  ( $w_\eta$  permutes the entries of  $\eta^+$ ). In the Bruhat order on the symmetric group,  $w_\eta < w_\nu$  iff  $w_\eta$  can be obtained as a proper subword of  $w_\nu$ . The Cherednik operators have a triangular action on monomials [18], that is,

$$Y_i x^\eta = \bar{\eta}_i x^\eta + \text{smaller terms} \tag{2.6}$$

where “smaller terms” means that the remaining monomials  $x^\nu$  appearing in the expansion are such that  $\nu \prec \eta$ .

The following three properties of the non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials will be needed below. The first one expresses the stability of the polynomials  $E_\eta$  with respect to the number of variables (see e.g. [20, eq. (3.2)]):

$$E_\eta(x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}, 0; q, t) = \begin{cases} E_{\eta_-}(x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}; q, t) & \text{if } \eta_N = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \eta_N \neq 0. \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

where  $\eta_- = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{N-1})$ . The second one gives the action of the operators  $T_i$  on  $E_\eta$ . It is a formula that will be fundamental for our purposes [3]:

$$T_i E_\eta = \begin{cases} \left( \frac{t-1}{1-\delta_{i,\eta}} \right) E_\eta + t E_{s_i \eta} & \text{if } \eta_i < \eta_{i+1}, \\ t E_\eta & \text{if } \eta_i = \eta_{i+1}, \\ \left( \frac{t-1}{1-\delta_{i,\eta}} \right) E_\eta + \frac{(1-t\delta_{i,\eta})(1-t^{-1}\delta_{i,\eta})}{(1-\delta_{i,\eta})^2} E_{s_i \eta} & \text{if } \eta_i > \eta_{i+1}, \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

$\delta_{i,\eta} = \bar{\eta}_i / \bar{\eta}_{i+1}$  and  $s_i \eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{i-1}, \eta_{i+1}, \eta_i, \eta_{i+2}, \dots, \eta_N)$ . The third property, together with the previous one, allows to construct the non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials recursively. Given  $\Phi_q = t^{1-N} T_{N-1} \cdots T_1 x_1$ , we have that [3]

$$\Phi_q E_\eta(x; q, t) = t^{r_\eta(1)-N} E_{\Phi\eta}(x; q, t) \tag{2.9}$$

where  $\Phi\eta = (\eta_2, \eta_3, \dots, \eta_{N-1}, \eta_1 + 1)$ .

Finally, we introduce the  $t$ -symmetrization operator:

$$\mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t = \sum_{\sigma \in S_{N-m}} T_\sigma \tag{2.10}$$

where the sum is over the permutations in the symmetric group  $S_{N-m}$  and where

$$T_\sigma = T_{i_1+m} \cdots T_{i_\ell+m} \quad \text{if} \quad \sigma = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_\ell}.$$

We stress that there is a shift by  $m$  in the indices of the Hecke algebra generators. Essentially, the  $t$ -symmetrization operator  $\mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t$  acts on the variables  $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots, x_N$  while the usual  $t$ -symmetrization operator  $\mathcal{S}_{0,N}^t$  acts on all variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$ .

**Remark 1.** We have by (2.1) that if any polynomial  $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  is such that  $T_i f(x_1, \dots, x_N) = t f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ , then  $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  is symmetric in the variables  $x_i$  and  $x_{i+1}$ . As such, from (2.8),  $E_\eta(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  is symmetric in the variables  $x_i$  and  $x_{i+1}$  whenever  $\eta_i = \eta_{i+1}$ . We also have that  $\mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  is symmetric in the variables  $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots, x_N$  for any polynomial  $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  given that it can easily be checked that

$$T_i \mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t = t \mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t \quad \text{for } i = m+1, \dots, N-1 \quad (2.11)$$

The  $t$ -symmetrization operator satisfies the following useful relations

$$(1 + T_N + T_{N-1}T_N + \dots + T_{m+1} \dots T_{N-1}T_N) \mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t = \mathcal{S}_{m,N+1}^t \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$(1 + T_m + T_{m+1}T_m + \dots + T_{N-1} \dots T_{m+1}T_m) \mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t = \mathcal{S}_{m-1,N}^t \quad (2.13)$$

We should note that, up to a constant, the usual Macdonald polynomial,  $P_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t)$ , is obtained by  $t$ -symmetrizing a non-symmetric Macdonald polynomial:

$$P_\lambda(x; q, t) \propto \mathcal{S}_{0,N}^t E_\eta(x; q, t)$$

where  $\eta$  is any composition that rearranges to  $\lambda$ .

### 3. THE RING OF $m$ -SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS

Let  $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbb{Q}(q, t)[h_1, h_2, h_3, \dots]$  be the ring of symmetric functions in the variables  $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots$  (the standard references on symmetric functions are [17, 21]), where

$$h_r = h_r(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots) = \sum_{i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_r} x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \dots x_{i_r}$$

Bases of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  are indexed by partitions  $\lambda = (\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k > 0)$  whose degree  $|\lambda|$  is  $|\lambda| = \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_k$  and whose length  $\ell(\lambda) = k$ . Each partition  $\lambda$  has an associated Young diagram with  $\lambda_i$  lattice squares in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row, from top to bottom (English notation). Any lattice square  $(i, j)$  in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row and  $j^{\text{th}}$  column of a Young diagram is called a cell. The conjugate of  $\lambda$ , denoted  $\lambda'$ , is the reflection of  $\lambda$  about the main diagonal. The partition  $\lambda \cup \mu$  is the non-decreasing rearrangement of the parts of  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ . If the partition  $\mu$  is contained in the partition  $\lambda$ , then the skew diagram  $\lambda/\mu$  is the diagram obtained by removing the diagram corresponding to  $\mu$  from the diagram of  $\lambda$ . The dominance order  $\geq$  is defined on partitions by  $\lambda \geq \mu$  when  $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_i \geq \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_i$  for all  $i$ , and  $|\lambda| = |\mu|$ .

The ring  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  can be thought as a subring of the ring of formal power series  $\mathbb{Q}(q, t)[[x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots]]$  since it consists of the elements of  $\mathbb{Q}(q, t)[[x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots]]$  that are symmetric in the variables  $x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots$ . In this spirit, we will define the ring  $R_m$  of  $m$ -symmetric functions as the subring of  $\mathbb{Q}(q, t)[[x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots]]$  made of formal power series that are symmetric in the variables  $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, x_{m+3}, \dots$ . In other words, we have

$$R_m \simeq \mathbb{Q}(q, t)[x_1, \dots, x_m] \otimes \mathbf{\Lambda}_m$$

where  $\mathbf{\Lambda}_m$  is the ring of symmetric functions in the variables  $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, x_{m+3}, \dots$ . The ring  $R_m$  is graded with respect to the total degree in  $x$


$$R_m = R_m^0 \oplus R_m^1 \oplus R_m^2 \oplus \dots$$

where  $R_m^d$  is the subspace of  $R_m$  made of formal power series of homogeneous degree  $d$ . It is immediate that  $R_0 = \mathbf{\Lambda}$  is the usual ring of symmetric functions and that  $R_0 \subseteq R_1 \subseteq R_2 \subseteq \dots$ . Bases of  $R_m$  are naturally indexed by  $m$ -partitions which are pairs  $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$ , where  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$  is a composition with  $m$  parts, and where  $\lambda$  is a partition. We will call the entries of  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\lambda$  the non-symmetric and symmetric entries of  $\Lambda$  respectively. In the following, unless stated otherwise,  $\Lambda$  and  $\Omega$  will always stand respectively for the  $m$ -partitions  $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$  and  $\Omega = (\mathbf{b}; \mu)$ . Observe that we use a different notation for the composition  $\mathbf{a}$  with  $m$  parts (which corresponds to the non-symmetric entries of  $\Lambda$ ) than for the composition  $\eta$  with  $N$  parts (which will typically index a non-symmetric Macdonald polynomial).

Given a composition  $\mathbf{a}$  and a partition  $\lambda$ ,  $\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda$  will denote the partition obtained by reordering the entries of the concatenation of  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\lambda$ . The degree of an  $m$ -partition  $\Lambda$ , denoted  $|\Lambda|$ , is the sum of the degrees of  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\lambda$ , that is,  $|\Lambda| = a_1 + \dots + a_m + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dots$ . We also define the length of  $\Lambda$  as  $\ell(\Lambda) = m + \ell(\lambda)$ . We will say that  $\mathbf{a}$  is dominant if  $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_m$ , and by extension, we will say that  $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$  is dominant if  $\mathbf{a}$  is dominant.

If  $\mathbf{a}$  is not dominant, we let  $\mathbf{a}^+$  be the dominant composition obtained by reordering the entries of  $\mathbf{a}$ . We also let  $\Lambda^+ = (\mathbf{a}^+; \lambda)$ .

There is a natural way to represent an  $m$ -partition by a Young diagram. The diagram corresponding to  $\Lambda$  is the Young diagram of  $\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda$  with an  $i$ -circle added to the right of the row of size  $a_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  (if there are many rows of size  $a_i$ , the circles are ordered from top to bottom in increasing order). For instance, given  $\Lambda = (2, 0, 2, 1; 3, 2)$ , we have



Observe that when  $m = 0$ , the diagram associated to  $\Lambda = (; \lambda)$  coincides with the Young diagram associated to  $\lambda$ . Also note that if  $\eta$  is a composition with  $m$  parts, then the diagram of  $\eta$  coincides with the diagram of the  $m$ -partition  $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \emptyset)$ , where  $\mathbf{a} = \eta$ . We let  $\Lambda^{(0)} = \mathbf{a} \cup \lambda$ , that is,  $\Lambda^{(0)}$  is the partition obtained from the diagram of  $\Lambda$  by discarding all the circles. More generally, for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , we let  $\Lambda^{(i)} = (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{1}^i) \cup \lambda$ , where  $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{1}^i = (a_1 + 1, \dots, a_i + 1, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_m)$ . In other words,  $\Lambda^{(i)}$  is the partition obtained from the diagram associated to  $\Lambda$  by changing all of the  $j$ -circles, for  $1 \leq j \leq i$ , into squares and discarding the remaining circles. Taking as above  $\Lambda = (2, 0, 2, 1; 3, 2)$ , we have  $\Lambda^{(0)} = (3, 2, 2, 2, 1)$ ,  $\Lambda^{(1)} = (3, 3, 2, 2, 1)$ ,  $\Lambda^{(2)} = (3, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1)$ ,  $\Lambda^{(3)} = (3, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1)$  and  $\Lambda^{(4)} = (3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 1)$ . We then define the dominance ordering on  $m$ -partitions to be such that

$$\Lambda \geq \Omega \iff \Lambda^{(i)} \geq \Omega^{(i)} \quad \text{for all } i = 0, \dots, m \tag{3.1}$$

where the order on the r.h.s. is the usual dominance order on partitions.

Let the  $m$ -symmetric monomial function  $m_\Lambda(x)$  be defined as

$$m_\Lambda(x) := x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_m^{a_m} m_\lambda(x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots) = x^\mathbf{a} m_\lambda(x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots)$$

where  $m_\lambda(x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots)$  is the usual monomial symmetric function in the variables  $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots$

$$m_\lambda(x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots) = \sum_{\alpha} x_{m+1}^{\alpha_1} x_{m+2}^{\alpha_2} \cdots$$

with the sum being over all darrangements  $\alpha$  of  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}, 0, 0, \dots)$ . It is immediate that  $\{m_\Lambda(x)\}_\Lambda$  is a basis of  $R_m$ , and more specifically, that

$$\{m_\Lambda(x) \mid d = |\Lambda|\}$$

is a basis of  $R_m^d$ . The following stronger statement holds.

**Proposition 2.** *For  $\ell = 1, \dots, m + 1$ , we have that  $\{x^\mathbf{a} m_\lambda(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}, \dots)\}_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda}$  is a basis of  $R_m$ . In particular, for  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)$ , we have that  $\{x^\mathbf{a} m_\lambda(x)\}_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda}$  is a basis of  $R_m$ .*

*Proof.* It is obvious that  $x^\mathbf{a} m_\lambda(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}, \dots)$  belongs to  $R_m$  since it is symmetric in  $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, x_{m+3}, \dots$ . We will show that

$$\{x^\mathbf{a} m_\lambda(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}, \dots) \mid d = |\mathbf{a}| + |\lambda|\}$$

is a basis of  $R_m^d$ . We proceed by induction from the base case  $\ell = m + 1$  which, as we have seen, holds. Having the right number of elements, we simply need to show that the  $x^\mathbf{a} m_\lambda(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}, \dots)$ 's are linearly independent. Suppose by contradiction that  $\ell \leq m$  and that in  $R_m^d$  we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda} c_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda} x^\mathbf{a} m_\lambda(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}, \dots) = 0$$

Extracting the power of  $x_\ell$  in  $x^\mathbf{a}$ , we get

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda} c_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda} x_\ell^{a_\ell} x^\mathbf{b} m_\lambda(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}, \dots) = 0$$

where  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$  is such that  $b_\ell = 0$  and  $b_i = a_i$  for  $i \neq \ell$ . Let  $k$  be the lowest value of  $a_\ell$  such that there exists a non-zero coefficient  $c_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda}$ . Extracting  $x_\ell^k$ , we get that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda} c_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda} x_\ell^{a_\ell - k} x^\mathbf{b} m_\lambda(x_\ell, x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+2}, \dots) = 0$$

Letting  $x_\ell = 0$  in this equation, we obtain

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda: a_\ell = k} c_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda} x^{\mathbf{b}} m_\lambda(0, x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+2}, \dots) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda: a_\ell = k} c_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda} x^{\mathbf{b}} m_\lambda(x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+2}, \dots) = 0$$

since  $m_\lambda(0, x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+2}, \dots) = m_\lambda(x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+2}, \dots)$ . Hence

$$x_\ell^k \sum_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda: a_\ell = k} c_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda} x^{\mathbf{b}} m_\lambda(x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+2}, \dots) = \sum_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda: a_\ell = k} c_{\mathbf{a}, \lambda} x^{\mathbf{a}} m_\lambda(x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+2}, \dots) = 0$$

Note that, by the minimality of  $k$ , there is a non-zero coefficient in the sum. This contradicts our induction hypothesis that  $\{x^{\mathbf{a}} m_\lambda(x_{\ell+1}, x_{\ell+2}, \dots) \mid d = |\mathbf{a}| + |\lambda|\}$  is a basis of  $R_m^d$ .  $\square$

The  $m$ -symmetric power sums are naturally defined as

$$p_\Lambda(x) := x_1^{a_1} \dots x_m^{a_m} p_\lambda(x) = x^{\mathbf{a}} p_\lambda(x)$$

It should be observed that the variables in  $p_\lambda$ , contrary to those of  $m_\lambda$  in  $m_\Lambda(x)$ , start at  $x_1$  instead of  $x_{m+1}$ . In this expression,  $p_\lambda(x)$  is the usual power-sum symmetric function

$$p_\lambda(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} p_{\lambda_i}(x)$$

where  $p_r(x) = x_1^r + x_2^r + \dots$ . From Proposition 2, we get immediately that  $\{p_\Lambda(x)\}_\Lambda$  is a basis of  $R_m$ .

Another basis of the ring of symmetric functions is provided by the Schur functions  $s_\lambda(x)$

$$s_\lambda(x) = \det(h_{\lambda_i - i + j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq \ell(\lambda)}$$

where  $h_i = 0$  if  $i < 0$ . Replacing  $p_\lambda(x)$  by the Schur function  $s_\lambda(x)$ , we define

$$k_\Lambda(x) := x_1^{a_1} \dots x_m^{a_m} s_\lambda(x) = x^{\mathbf{a}} s_\lambda(x)$$

It is then again obvious that  $\{k_\Lambda(x)\}_\Lambda$  is a basis of  $R_m$ . We stress that this basis is not the right extension of the Schur functions in the  $m$ -symmetric world (hence the notation  $k_\Lambda$  instead of  $s_\Lambda$ ). A  $t$ -generalization of the  $k_\Lambda(x)$  basis will nevertheless prove instrumental in the construction of the  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions.

#### 4. $m$ -SYMMETRIC MACDONALD POLYNOMIALS

The  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials in  $N$  variables are simply obtained by applying the  $t$ -symmetrization operator  $\mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t$  introduced in (2.10) on non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials. To be more specific, we associate to the  $m$ -partition  $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$  the composition  $\eta_{\Lambda,N} = (a_1, \dots, a_m, 0^n, \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}, \dots, \lambda_1)$ , where  $n = N - m - \ell(\lambda) \geq 0$ . The corresponding  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomial in  $N$  variables is then defined as

$$P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t) = \frac{1}{u_{\Lambda,N}(t)} \mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t E_{\eta_{\Lambda,N}}(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t) \quad (4.1)$$

with the normalization constant  $u_{\Lambda,N}(t)$  given by

$$u_{\Lambda,N}(t) = [n]_{t^{-1}}! \left( \prod_i [n_\lambda(i)]_{t^{-1}}! \right) t^{(N-m)(N-m-1)/2} \quad (4.2)$$

where  $n_\lambda(i)$  is the number of entries in  $\lambda$  that are equal to  $i$ , and where

$$[k]_q = \frac{(1-q)(1-q^2) \dots (1-q^k)}{(1-q)^k}$$

We will see later that the normalization constant  $u_{\Lambda,N}(t)$  is chosen such that the coefficient of  $m_\Lambda$  in  $P_\Lambda(x; q, t)$  is equal to 1.

**Remark 3.** We have that  $T_i$  commutes with  $\mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ . Hence, from Remark 1, if  $\Lambda$  is such that  $a_i = a_{i+1}$  then  $P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t)$  is symmetric in the variables  $x_i, x_{i+1}$ .

The  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials are stable with respect to the number of variables.

**Proposition 4.** Let  $N$  be the number of variables and suppose that  $N > m$ . Then

$$P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}, 0; q, t) = \begin{cases} P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}; q, t) & \text{if } N > m + \ell(\lambda) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$



*Proof.* It was shown in [20] (see formula (38) in Proposition 3, where the version of  $u_{\Lambda,N}(t)$  used therein is slightly different from the one we use here) that

$$\mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t E_{\eta_{\Lambda,N}} \Big|_{x_N=0} = \begin{cases} \frac{u_{\Lambda,N-1}(t)}{u_{\Lambda,N}(t)} \mathcal{S}_{m,N-1}^t E_{\eta_{\Lambda,N-1}} & \text{if } N > m + \ell(\lambda) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The proposition then follows immediately.  $\square$

Since the  $m$ -symmetric monomial functions  $m_\Lambda$  are also such that

$$m_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}, 0) = \begin{cases} m_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_{N-1}) & \text{if } N > m + \ell(\lambda) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

we have immediately the following corollary.

**Corollary 5.** *The expansion coefficients  $d_{\Lambda\Omega}(q, t)$  in*

$$P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t) = \sum_{\Omega} d_{\Lambda\Omega}(q, t) m_\Omega(x_1, \dots, x_N) \tag{4.3}$$

do not depend on the number of variables  $N$ . Moreover, the number of terms in the r.h.s. of (4.3) does not depend on  $N$  as long as  $N \geq m + |\Lambda|$  (the longest  $m$ -partition of a given degree  $d$  being  $(0^m; 1^d)$ ).

We see from Remark 1 that the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials are symmetric in the variables  $x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots, x_N$ . From the previous corollary, we can thus let  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and define the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials  $P_\Lambda(x; q, t) \in R_m$ , for  $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots)$ , as

$$P_\Lambda(x; q, t) = \sum_{\Omega} d_{\Lambda\Omega}(q, t) m_\Omega(x)$$

where the coefficients  $d_{\Lambda\Omega}(q, t)$  are those of (4.3).

**Remark 6.** *From the comment at the end of Section 2, when  $m = 0$  an  $m$ -Macdonald polynomial is a usual Macdonald polynomial. In the case  $m = 1$ , an  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomial corresponds to the  $\theta_1$  coefficient of a Macdonald polynomial in superspace with fermionic degree equal to 1 [5, 6].*

It is obvious from (2.2) that  $\mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t$  commutes with  $Y_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . It is then immediate from the definition of the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials and (2.5) that  $P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t)$  is an eigenfunction of  $Y_i$  with eigenvalue  $(\bar{\eta}_{\Lambda,N})_i$ . Now, it is not hard to see that the diagram of  $\eta_{\Lambda,N}$  is obtained from that of  $\Lambda$  by removing the circles filled with an  $m + 1, m + 2, \dots, N$ . Hence, for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , we have

$$Y_i P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t) = \varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t) P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t), \quad \text{with } \varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t) = q^{a_i} t^{1-r_\Lambda(i)} \tag{4.4}$$

where we recall that  $r_\Lambda(i)$  is the row in which the  $i$ -circle appears in the diagram associated to  $\Lambda$ . Letting

$$D = Y_{m+1} + \dots + Y_N - \sum_{i=\ell(\Lambda^*)+1}^N t^{1-i}$$

it is also quite easy to check, using (2.2) and (2.3), that  $D$  commutes with  $\mathcal{S}_{m,N}^t$ . Following the argument used previously in the case of  $Y_i$ , this implies that  $P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t)$  is an eigenfunction of  $D$  with eigenvalue

$$(\bar{\eta}_{\Lambda,N})_{m+1} + \dots + (\bar{\eta}_{\Lambda,N})_N - \sum_{i=\ell(\Lambda^*)+1}^N t^{1-i}$$

Observe that in the diagram of  $\eta_{\Lambda,N}$ , the circles in rows of length zero are located in rows  $\ell(\Lambda^*) + 1$  up to  $N$ . From our previous observation that the diagram of  $\eta_{\Lambda,N}$  is obtained from that of  $\Lambda$  by removing the circles filled with an  $m + 1, m + 2, \dots, N$  we then get that

$$D P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t) = \varepsilon_\Lambda^D(q, t) P_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t), \quad \text{with } \varepsilon_\Lambda^D(q, t) = \sum_i' q^{\Lambda_i^*} t^{1-i} \tag{4.5}$$

where the prime indicates that the sum is only over the rows of the diagram of  $\Lambda$  that do not end with a circle. We stress that the eigenvalues  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t)$  and  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^D(q, t)$  do not depend on the number  $N$  of variables.

Before proving that the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials are triangularly related to the monomials in the dominance order (3.1), we need the following.

**Proposition 7.** *The operators  $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$  and  $D$  have a triangular action on monomials (in the dominance order on  $m$ -partitions). To be more precise, for certain coefficients  $b_{\Lambda\Omega}^{(i)}(q, t)$  and  $b'_{\Lambda\Omega}(q, t)$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[q, t]$ , we have that*

$$Y_i m_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t) m_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N) + \sum_{\Omega < \Lambda} b_{\Lambda\Omega}^{(i)}(q, t) m_\Omega(x_1, \dots, x_N) \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$D m_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \varepsilon_\Lambda^D(q, t) m_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N) + \sum_{\Omega < \Lambda} b'_{\Lambda\Omega}(q, t) m_\Omega(x_1, \dots, x_N) \quad (4.7)$$

with  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t)$  and  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^D(q, t)$  given in (4.4) and (4.5) respectively.

*Proof.* It is obvious that the operators  $Y_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $D$  preserve  $R_m$  since, from (2.2) and (2.3), they all commute with  $T_j$  for  $j = m + 1, \dots, N - 1$ . We thus only need to show the triangularity and that the dominant coefficients are as indicated.

It is shown in [6] (see the proof of Proposition 6 therein) that if  $x^\gamma$  appears in  $Y_i x^\eta$ , then  $\gamma^{(0)} \leq \eta^{(0)}$  and  $\gamma^{(i)} \leq \eta^{(i)}$  for any  $i$ , where  $\gamma^{(0)} = \gamma^+$  and  $\gamma^{(i)} = (\gamma + 1^i)^+$ . We therefore get that a given ‘‘smaller term’’  $x^\gamma$  appearing in (2.6) is such that  $\gamma^{(0)} \leq \eta^{(0)}$  and  $\gamma^{(j)} \leq \eta^{(j)}$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Observe that if  $x^\gamma$  is a monomial that appears in  $m_\Omega$ , then  $\gamma^{(0)} = \Omega^{(0)}$  and  $\gamma^{(j)} = \Omega^{(j)}$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Hence, from our previous observation,

$$Y_i m_\Lambda = c_{i,\Lambda}(q, t) m_\Lambda + \sum_{\Omega < \Lambda} b_{\Lambda\Omega}^{(i)}(q, t) m_\Omega \quad \text{and} \quad D m_\Lambda = c'_\Lambda(q, t) m_\Lambda + \sum_{\Omega < \Lambda} b'_{\Lambda\Omega}(q, t) m_\Omega$$

for certain coefficients  $c_{i,\Lambda}(q, t)$ ,  $b_{\Lambda\Omega}^{(i)}(q, t)$ ,  $c'_\Lambda(q, t)$ , and  $b'_{\Lambda\Omega}(q, t)$ . It remains to show that  $c_{i,\Lambda}(q, t) = \varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t)$  and  $c'_\Lambda(q, t) = \varepsilon_\Lambda^D(q, t)$ . Let  $\eta$  be maximal in the order  $\prec$  on compositions among all the monomials  $x^\eta$  appearing in  $m_\Lambda$ . From (2.6), we then have that the coefficients of  $x^\eta$  in  $Y_i m_\Lambda$  and  $D m_\Lambda$  are respectively equal to  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t)$  and  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^D(q, t)$ . By symmetry, the coefficients of  $m_\Lambda$  are as wanted.  $\square$

**Proposition 8.** *We have that*

$$P_\Lambda(x; q, t) = m_\Lambda + \sum_{\Omega < \Lambda} d_{\Lambda\Omega}(q, t) m_\Omega \quad (4.8)$$

*Hence, the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials form a basis of  $R_m$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the result when the number of variables  $N$  is finite. The infinite case will then follow from Corollary 5.

First note that the eigenvalues  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t)$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^D(q, t)$  completely determine  $\Lambda$  (the powers of  $q$  in  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^D(q, t)$  determine  $\lambda$  while the power of  $q$  in  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t)$  determines  $a_i$ ). Suppose that there exists a term  $m_\Omega$  with non-zero coefficient in the monomial expansion of  $P_\Lambda$  such that  $\Omega \not\leq \Lambda$  and let  $\Gamma$  be maximal among those terms. From Proposition 7, the coefficients of  $m_\Gamma$  in  $Y_i P_\Lambda$  and  $D P_\Lambda$  are respectively  $\varepsilon_\Gamma^{(i)}$  and  $\varepsilon_\Gamma^D$ . But from (4.4) and (4.5), those coefficients are also equal to  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t)$  and  $\varepsilon_\Lambda^D(q, t)$ . Hence  $\varepsilon_\Gamma^{(i)} = \varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}$  and  $\varepsilon_\Gamma^D = \varepsilon_\Lambda^D$ . Since, as we have seen, those eigenvalues determine  $\Lambda$ , we have the contradiction that  $\Gamma \leq \Gamma = \Lambda$ .

Finally, we need to show that the coefficient of  $m_\Lambda$  in  $P_\Lambda$  is equal to 1. It is shown in [20] (see equation (5.35) therein) that, when  $m = 0$ , the coefficient of  $x^\lambda$  in  $\mathcal{S}_{1,N}^t E_{\eta_{\lambda,N}}$  is equal to the coefficient of  $x^\lambda$  in  $\mathcal{S}_{1,N}^t x^{\eta_{\lambda,N}}$ , which is itself equal to  $u_{\lambda,N}(t)$ . The same exact argument can be used to show that the coefficient of  $x^\Lambda$  in  $\mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{\eta_{\Lambda,N}}$  is equal to the coefficient of  $x^\Lambda$  in  $\mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t x^{\eta_{\Lambda,N}}$ , which is itself equal to  $u_{\Lambda,N}(t)$ . The coefficient of  $m_\Lambda$  in  $P_\Lambda$  is then equal to 1 given the normalization of  $P_\Lambda$ .  $\square$

## 5. TABLEAU COMBINATORICS

Before introducing the dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions, we need to introduce a few combinatorial concepts (standard references on the combinatorics of tableaux and the plactic monoid are [9, 21, 16]).

A (skew) tableau  $T$  of shape  $\lambda/\mu$  is a filling of the skew diagram  $\lambda/\mu$  with integers such that the entries are strictly increasing along columns (from top to bottom) and weakly increasing along rows (from left to right). The word associated to a skew tableau  $T$ , denoted,  $w(T)$  is the word obtained by reading successively the rows of  $T$  from bottom to top (the rows being read from left to right). Two words  $w$  and  $w'$  belong to the same plactic class,

denoted  $w \equiv w'$ , if they can be obtained from one another by a sequence of Knuth relations on three consecutive letters of the form

$$yzx \equiv yxz \quad \text{if } x < y \leq z \quad \text{or} \quad xzy \equiv zxy \quad \text{if } x \leq y < z$$

It can be shown that  $w(T)$  is in the same plactic class as the word  $w_c(T)$  obtained by reading successively the columns of  $T$  from left to right (the columns being read from bottom to top). For simplicity, we will use the same notation  $T$  for a (skew) tableau and for the word  $w(T)$  associated to it.

We will need the following elementary result.

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $T$  be a skew tableau which contains a letter  $b$  at the top each of its last  $\ell$  columns. Then  $T \equiv T'b^\ell$  where  $T'$  is the skew tableau obtained from  $T$  by removing the letter  $b$  at the top of each each of its last  $\ell$  columns.*

*Proof.* Reading the tableau  $T$  columnwise, consider the letter  $b$  at the top of the  $\ell$ 'th column from the end. This letter  $b$  can be moved rightwise outside of  $T$  by using a sequence of plactic relations of the type  $bC = Cb$ , where  $C$  is a column that contains a letter  $b$  at the top (this statement easily follows for instance from the Jeu de Taquin [9]). Doing this again and again, we obtain that  $T \equiv T'b^\ell$ .  $\square$

The action of the symmetric group on words is defined through the action of its generators  $\sigma_i$  in the following manner [15, 16]. Given a word  $w$ , let  $u$  denote the subword in letters  $a = i$  and  $b = i + 1$ . The action of  $\sigma_i$  affects only the subword  $u$  and is defined as follows: pair (or marry) every factor  $ba$  of  $u$ , and let  $u_1$  be the subword of  $u$  made out of the unpaired (or unmarried) letters. Pair every factor  $ba$  of  $u_1$ , and let  $u_2$  be the subword made out of the unpaired letters. Continue in this fashion as long as possible. When all factors  $ba$  are paired and unpaired letters of  $u$  are of the form  $a^r b^s$ , the operator  $\sigma_i$  is such that  $\sigma_i(a^r b^s) = a^s b^r$ . For instance, to obtain the action of  $\sigma_2$  on  $w = 123343222423$ , we have  $u = w_{\{2,3\}} = 233322223$ , and the successive pairings are

$$2\left(3(3(32)2)2\right)23, \tag{5.1}$$

which means that  $\sigma_2 u = 2333222233$  and consequently that  $\sigma_2 w = 123343222433$ . It can be shown [16] that the  $\sigma_i$ 's obey the Coxeter relations

$$\sigma_i^2 = 1, \quad \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i = \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_i \sigma_j = \sigma_j \sigma_i \quad \text{whenever } |i - j| > 1$$

As such, they provide an action of the symmetric group on words.

We now define the notion of charge [14, 16]. First recall that the evaluation of a word  $w$  is the vector  $(v_1, v_2, \dots)$ , where  $v_i$  is equal to the number of times the letter  $i$  appears in  $w$ . Now suppose that  $w$  is a word whose evaluation is dominant (that is, such that  $v_1 \geq v_2 \geq v_3 \geq \dots$ ). The charge is then computed by the following procedure. Let  $\ell = 0$ . Reading the word from right to left, we label with  $\ell$ , the first occurrence of letter 1, then the first occurrence of letter 2 following this 1, then the first occurrence of letter 3 following this 2, etc, with the condition that each time we reach the end of the word we start again at the beginning with the label  $\ell$  increased to  $\ell + 1$ . Once each of the letters 1, 2, 3, ... have been labeled, we repeat this procedure on the unlabeled letters, again starting with  $\ell = 0$ . The process ends when all letters have been labeled. For instance, we have that  $\text{charge}(1_0 2_0 1_0 4_1 1_0 2_1 3_1 2_1 3_1 4_2) = 0 + 0 + 0 + 1 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 2 = 7$ .

If the evaluation of  $w$  is not dominant, we use the action of the symmetric group on words defined previously to obtain a word  $\sigma(w)$  whose evaluation is dominant. The charge is then simply defined as  $\text{charge}(w) = \text{charge}(\sigma(w))$ .

We will order the letters  $1, 2, \dots, m$  in the usual way ( $1 < 2 < \dots < m$ ) while the letters  $\bar{1}, \bar{2}, \dots, \bar{m}$  will be ordered in the opposite way ( $\bar{1} > \bar{2} > \dots > \bar{m}$ ). When using the action of the symmetric group on words in the letters  $\bar{1}, \bar{2}, \dots, \bar{m}$ , we will let the generator  $\bar{\sigma}_i$  be the operator that exchanges the letters  $\overline{m-i}$  and  $\overline{m-i+1}$ . More generally, if  $\sigma = \sigma_{i_1} \cdots \sigma_{i_\ell}$ , we let  $\bar{\sigma} = \bar{\sigma}_{i_1} \cdots \bar{\sigma}_{i_\ell}$ . Also, when computing the charge of a word  $\bar{w}$  in the letters  $\bar{1}, \bar{2}, \dots, \bar{m}$ , we will simply let  $\text{charge}(\bar{w}) = \text{charge}(w)$ , where  $w$  is the word obtained from  $\bar{w}$  by letting  $\bar{i} \mapsto m+1-i$ .

We first define two important sets of tableaux.

**Definition 10.** *Let  $\Lambda$  and  $\Omega$  be  $m$ -partitions of the same degree.*

- (1)  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  is the set of skew tableaux  $\bar{T}$  of shape  $\mu/\lambda$  such that the letter  $\bar{i}$  appears  $a_i - b_i$  times and always within the first  $a_i$  columns of  $\bar{T}$ .
- (2)  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  is the set of skew tableaux  $T$  of shape  $(\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda)/\mu$  such that the letter  $i$  appears  $b_i$  times and always within the first  $a_i$  columns of  $T$ .

**Example 11.** If  $\Lambda = (4, 4, 2; 3, 2, 1)$  and  $\Omega = (1, 3, 1; 4, 3, 2, 1, 1)$ , the set  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  contains the skew tableaux

$$\begin{array}{c} \bar{T}_1 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \bar{1} \\ \hline & & & \bar{1} \\ \hline & & \bar{1} & \\ \hline \bar{3} & & & \\ \hline \bar{2} & & & \\ \hline \end{array} & \bar{T}_2 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \bar{1} \\ \hline & & & \bar{1} \\ \hline & & \bar{2} & \\ \hline \bar{3} & & & \\ \hline \bar{1} & & & \\ \hline \end{array} & \bar{T}_3 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \bar{1} \\ \hline & & & \bar{2} \\ \hline & & \bar{1} & \\ \hline \bar{3} & & & \\ \hline \bar{1} & & & \\ \hline \end{array} & \bar{T}_4 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \bar{2} \\ \hline & & & \bar{1} \\ \hline & & \bar{1} & \\ \hline \bar{3} & & & \\ \hline \bar{1} & & & \\ \hline \end{array} & \bar{T}_5 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \bar{1} \\ \hline & & & \bar{1} \\ \hline & & \bar{3} & \\ \hline \bar{2} & & & \\ \hline \bar{1} & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

while the set  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  contains the skew tableaux

$$\begin{array}{c} T_1 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & 2 \\ \hline & & & 2 \\ \hline & & 2 & \\ \hline & & 3 & \\ \hline 1 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} & T_2 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & 2 \\ \hline & & & 2 \\ \hline & & 2 & \\ \hline & & 1 & \\ \hline & & 3 & \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} & T_3 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & 2 \\ \hline & & & 1 \\ \hline & & 2 & \\ \hline & & 3 & \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} & T_4 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & 1 \\ \hline & & & 2 \\ \hline & & 2 & \\ \hline & & 3 & \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} & T_5 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & 2 \\ \hline & & & 2 \\ \hline & & 2 & \\ \hline & & 1 & \\ \hline & & 2 & \\ \hline 3 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

It is not a coincidence that the sets  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  in the previous example have the same cardinality. If  $\bar{T}$  belongs to  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$ , we let  $T = \mathbf{b}(\bar{T})$  be such that for any column  $c$  such that  $c \leq a_i$ , there is an  $i$  in column  $c$  of  $T$  iff there is no  $\bar{i}$  in column  $c$  of  $\bar{T}$  (with the columns of  $T$  obviously defined to be increasing from top to bottom). In Example 11, it can easily be checked that  $T_i = \mathbf{b}(\bar{T}_i)$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ . For instance,  $\bar{T}_1$  contains a  $\bar{1}$  in columns 2,3,4 while  $T_1$  contains a 1 in column 1 ( $a_1 = 4$ ),  $\bar{T}_1$  contains a  $\bar{2}$  in column 1 while  $T_1$  contains a 2 in column 2,3,4 ( $a_2 = 4$ ), and finally  $\bar{T}_1$  contains a  $\bar{3}$  in column 1 while  $T_1$  contains a 3 in column 2 ( $a_3 = 2$ ). We will see that  $\mathbf{b}$  provides a natural bijection between the sets  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  when  $\Lambda$  is dominant (recall that it means that  $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$  is such that  $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_m$ ).

**Lemma 12.** *The map  $\mathbf{b}$  is a bijection from  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  to  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  when  $\Lambda$  is dominant.*

*Proof.* We first prove that  $\mathbf{b}$  is an injection from  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  to  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$ . Let  $T = \mathbf{b}(\bar{T})$ , and let  $Q$  be the union of the skew tableaux  $\bar{T}$  and  $T$ . By definition of  $\mathbf{b}$ , a column  $c$  of  $Q$  such that  $a_\ell < c \leq a_{\ell-1}$  ( $\mathbf{a}$  is dominant) contains  $\ell - 1$  letters, with exactly one element of the pair  $\{i, \bar{i}\}$  appearing for each  $i = 1, \dots, \ell - 1$ . This implies that, for a given  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , every column of  $Q$  from 1 to  $a_i$  contains exactly one element of  $\{i, \bar{i}\}$ . Hence  $Q$  is a filling of the skew shape  $(\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda)/\lambda$  such that the letter  $i$  appears  $b_i$  times and always within the first  $a_i$  columns of  $T$ . It is thus immediate that  $T = Q/\bar{T}$  is a filling of the skew shape  $(\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda)/\mu$  such that the letter  $i$  appears  $b_i$  times and always within the first  $a_i$  columns of  $T$ . In order to prove that  $\mathbf{b}$  is injective, it thus only remains to prove that  $T$  is a skew tableau, which is equivalent to proving that  $Q$  is a skew tableau (given that  $\bar{T}$  is). It suffices to prove that there is never an  $m$  immediately to the left of a smaller letter (the argument can then be repeated for letters  $m - 1, \dots, 2$ ). Suppose that in column  $c$  there is an  $m$  to the left of a smaller letter (in column  $c'$ ). Since  $m$  always appears at the bottom of its column, this implies that  $Q$  (whose shape is a skew shape) has  $m$  letters in both column  $c$  and  $c'$ , that both columns start at the same row, and that column  $c'$  of  $Q$  cannot contain an  $m$  and thus contains an  $\bar{m}$ . Hence, the topmost letter  $\bar{m}$  in column  $c'$  of  $Q$  is to the right of a larger letter (since column  $c$  does not contain an  $\bar{m}$  given that it contains an  $m$ ), which contradicts the fact that  $\bar{T}$  is a skew tableau.

We now prove that  $\mathbf{b}$  is surjective. Let  $T \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  and let  $\bar{T} = \mathbf{b}(T)$  (observe that  $\mathbf{b}(T)$  makes sense since  $\mathbf{b}$  was defined symmetrically between  $\bar{T}$  and  $T$ ). We let again  $Q$  be the union of the skew tableaux  $T$  and  $\bar{T}$ . Using a similar argument as above, it is immediate that  $Q$  is a filling of the skew shape  $(\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda)/\lambda$  such that the letter  $\bar{i}$  appears  $a_i - b_i$  times and always within the first  $a_i$  columns of  $T$ . It is thus immediate that  $\bar{T} = Q/T$  is a filling of the skew shape  $\mu/\lambda$  such that the letter  $i$  appears  $a_i - b_i$  times and always within the first  $a_i$  columns of  $\bar{T}$ . We thus have left to show that  $\bar{T}$  is a skew tableau, or equivalently, that  $Q$  is a skew tableau. It suffices to prove that there is never an  $\bar{m}$  immediately to the right of a larger letter (the argument can then again be repeated for the letters  $\bar{m} - 1, \dots, 2$ ). Suppose that in column  $c$  there is an  $\bar{m}$  to the right of a larger letter (in column  $c'$ ). Since  $\mathbf{a}$  is dominant, we have that  $a_i \geq a_m \geq c$  for all  $i$ , which means that column  $c$  of  $Q$  contains exactly one occurrence of  $i$  or  $\bar{i}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . That is,  $Q$  contains  $m$  letters in column  $c$ . Since  $\bar{m}$  always appears at the top of its column, this implies that  $Q$  (whose shape is a skew shape) has  $m$  letters in both column  $c$  and  $c'$ , that both columns start at the same row, and that column  $c'$  of  $Q$  cannot contain an  $\bar{m}$  and thus contains an  $m$ . Hence, the letter  $m$  in column  $c'$  of  $Q$  is to the right of a smaller letter (since column  $c$  does not contain an  $m$  given that it contains an  $\bar{m}$ ), which contradicts the fact that  $T$  is a skew tableau.  $\square$

Those equivalent (or complementary) ways of representing the skew tableaux (as elements of  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  or  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$ ) will prove very useful.

When  $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_m$ , the action of the symmetric group on words commutes with the bijection  $\mathbf{b}$  in the following way.

**Lemma 13.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be such that  $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_m$ . Then, if  $\bar{T}' \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$ , we have that*

$$\mathbf{b} \circ \bar{\sigma}_{m-i}(\bar{T}') = \sigma_i \circ \mathbf{b}(\bar{T}') \tag{5.2}$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $\bar{\sigma}_{m-i}$  acts on the letters  $\overline{m - (m - i)} = \bar{i}$  and  $\overline{m - (m - i) + 1} = \overline{i + 1}$ . Let  $j = i + 1$  and  $T' = \mathbf{b}(\bar{T}')$ . When acting with  $\bar{\sigma}_{m-i}$  on  $\bar{T}'$  (resp.  $\sigma_i$  on  $T'$ ), we can forget the columns that either  $i$ ) contain an  $\bar{i}$  and a  $\bar{j}$  (resp. an  $i$  and a  $j$ ) or  $ii$ ) contain none of them, since those columns cannot contain unmarried  $\bar{i}, \bar{j}$  or  $i, j$ . In the remaining columns, we have that there is an  $\bar{i}$  (resp. a  $\bar{j}$ ) in  $\bar{T}'$  iff there is a  $j$  (resp. an  $i$ ) in  $T'$ , which means that, when restricting to those columns, the corresponding words  $\bar{w}$  and  $w$  will be such that the map  $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \mapsto j, i$  (corresponding to  $\mathbf{b}$ ) will send  $\bar{w}$  to  $w$ , and  $\bar{\sigma}_{m-i}(\bar{w})$  to  $\sigma_i(w)$ . Given that  $\mathbf{b}$  does not change the remaining columns, we have that  $\mathbf{b} \circ \bar{\sigma}_{m-i}(\bar{T}') = \sigma_i \circ \mathbf{b}(\bar{T}')$ .  $\square$

We now describe a natural injection of  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  into a larger family  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda'\Omega'}$  when  $\Lambda$  is dominant. Let  $\mathbf{a}^r = (a_{\ell+1}, \dots, a_m)$  and  $\mathbf{a}_{m-\ell} = (a_1^{m-\ell})$ , where  $\ell$  is the largest integer such that  $a_1 = a_2 = \dots = a_\ell$ , and define

$$\Lambda' = (a_1, a_1, \dots, a_1; \lambda \cup \mathbf{a}^r) \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega' = (\mathbf{b}; \mathbf{a}_{m-\ell} \cup \mu)$$

For  $T \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$ , we let  $\mathbf{i}(T)$  be the skew tableau obtained by translating down by  $m - \ell$  rows every entry of  $T$ .

**Example 14.** *Let  $\Lambda = (4, 3, 2; 3, 2, 2)$  and  $\Omega = (2, 3, 1; 4, 2, 2, 1, 1)$ . We then have  $\ell = 1$ ,  $\mathbf{a}^r = (3, 2)$ , and  $\mathbf{a}_{m-\ell} = (4, 4)$ , which implies that  $\Lambda' = (4, 4, 4; 3, 2, 2, 2)$  and  $\Omega' = (2, 3, 1; 4, 4, 4, 2, 2, 1, 1)$ . The map  $\mathbf{i}$  is then such that*

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & 1 & \\ \hline & & 2 & \\ \hline & 1 & & \\ \hline & 2 & & \\ \hline 2 & 3 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega} \quad \implies \quad \mathbf{i}(T) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & 1 & \\ \hline & & 2 & \\ \hline & 1 & & \\ \hline & 2 & & \\ \hline 2 & 3 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda'\Omega'}$$

**Lemma 15.** *The map  $\mathbf{i}$  is an injection from  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  into  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda'\Omega'}$  when  $\Lambda$  is dominant.*

*Proof.* The map  $\mathbf{i}$  is obviously injective. We thus simply need to prove that  $\mathbf{i}(T) \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda'\Omega'}$  whenever  $T \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$ . Observe that an element  $T'$  of  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda'\Omega'}$  is a skew tableau of shape  $(\mathbf{a}_{m-\ell} \cup (\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda)) / (\mathbf{a}_{m-\ell} \cup \mu)$  with the letter  $i$  appearing  $b_i$  times and within the first  $a_1$  columns of  $T'$ . Also note that the skew shape  $(\mathbf{a}_{m-\ell} \cup (\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda)) / (\mathbf{a}_{m-\ell} \cup \mu)$  is obtained from the skew shape  $(\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda) / \mu$  by simply translating down every row by  $m - \ell$  spaces. For  $T \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$ , we thus have that  $\mathbf{i}(T) \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda'\Omega'}$  since it is of the right skew shape and such that letter  $i$  appears  $b_i$  times and within the first  $a_i \leq a_1$  columns.  $\square$

**Corollary 16.** *Suppose that  $\Lambda$  is dominant and let  $\bar{\mathbf{i}} = \mathbf{b}^{-1} \circ \mathbf{i} \circ \mathbf{b} : \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega} \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda'\Omega'}$ . If  $\bar{T}' = \bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$  for some  $\bar{T} \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$ , then Lemma 13 holds and we have*

$$\mathbf{b} \circ \bar{\sigma}_{m-i}(\bar{T}') = \sigma_i \circ \mathbf{b}(\bar{T}') \tag{5.3}$$

It is easy to see that the injection  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}$  is such that if  $\bar{T} \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  then  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$  is the skew tableau of shape  $(\mathbf{a}_{m-\ell} \cup \mu) / (\lambda \cup \mathbf{a}^r)$  whose columns are those of  $\bar{T}$  with extra entries  $\bar{i}$  in columns  $a_i + 1$  to  $a_1$  for  $i = \ell + 1, \dots, m$ . Remarkably, modulo a plactic equivalence, we can find a simpler characterization of  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$ .

**Lemma 17.** *Suppose that  $\Lambda$  is dominant and let  $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{a}}$  be the word  $(\bar{\ell} + 1)^{a_1 - a_{\ell+1}} \dots \bar{m}^{a_1 - a_m}$  of evaluation  $(a_1 - a_m, a_1 - a_{m-1}, \dots, a_1 - a_{\ell+1})$  in the letters  $\bar{m}, \dots, \bar{\ell} + 1$  (with  $\ell$  such as defined before Lemma 15). Then  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T}) \equiv \bar{T} \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{a}}$ .*

*Proof.* By construction,  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$  contains a letter  $\bar{m}$  at the top of each of its last  $a_1 - a_m$  columns. Using Lemma 9, the word associated to  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$  is in the same plactic class as  $\mathcal{T} \bar{m}^{a_1 - a_m}$ , where  $\mathcal{T}$  is the skew tableau obtained from  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$  by removing the letter  $\bar{m}$  at the top of each of its last  $a_1 - a_m$  columns. Continuing in this manner for the letters  $\overline{m - 1}, \dots, \bar{\ell} + 1$ , we obtain that the word associated to  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$  is in the same plactic class as the word  $\bar{T} \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{a}}$  (from the observation just before the lemma,  $\bar{T}$  is obtained from  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$  by removing the entries  $\bar{i}$  in columns  $a_i + 1$  to  $a_1$  for  $i = \ell + 1, \dots, m$ ),  $\square$

**Example 18.** Using  $T$  as in Example 14, we have

$$\bar{T} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \bar{1} \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \bar{3} & & & \\ \hline \bar{1} & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \bar{i}(\bar{T}) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \bar{3} \\ \hline & & & \bar{2} \\ \hline & & & \bar{3} \bar{1} \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline \bar{3} & & & \\ \hline \bar{1} & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda'\Omega'}$$

It can then be easily checked that  $\bar{i}(\bar{T}) = \bar{1}\bar{3}\bar{3}\bar{1}\bar{2}\bar{3}$  is in the same plactic class as  $\bar{T}u_{\mathbf{a}} = \bar{1}\bar{3}\bar{1}\bar{2}\bar{3}\bar{3}$ .

We are now equipped to describe the notion of charge, depending on  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$ , for skew tableaux  $T \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$ , where  $\Lambda$  is dominant. We let

$$\text{charge}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}(T) = \text{Inv}(\mathbf{b}) + \text{charge}(\bar{T}u_{\mathbf{a}}) \quad (5.4)$$

where

$$\text{Inv}(\mathbf{b}) = \#\{i < j \mid b_i < b_j\} \quad (5.5)$$

is the number of inversions in  $\mathbf{b}$ . Observe that by Lemma 17,  $\text{charge}(\bar{T}u_{\mathbf{a}})$  can be replaced by  $\text{charge}(\bar{i}(\bar{T}))$  in (5.4). Also observe that  $\bar{T}u_{\mathbf{a}}$  in (5.4) is a word in the letters  $\bar{1}, \bar{2}, \dots, \bar{m}$  and that the charge of such words was defined in the paragraph before Definition 10.

**Example 19.** Let  $\Lambda = (4, 4, 3, 3; 2, 2, 1)$  and  $\Omega = (2, 3, 2, 2; 4, 2, 2, 1, 1)$ .

$$T = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \\ \hline & & 2 & 2 \\ \hline & & 3 & \\ \hline & 1 & 4 & \\ \hline & 2 & & \\ \hline 1 & 4 & & \\ \hline 3 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \bar{T} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & \bar{1} \bar{1} \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & & & \\ \hline & 3 & & \\ \hline 4 & & & \\ \hline 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$$

We then have that

$$\text{charge}_{(4,4,3,3),(2,3,2,2)}(T) = 1 + \text{charge}(\bar{2}\bar{4}\bar{3}\bar{1}\bar{1}\bar{3}\bar{4}) = 1 + \text{charge}(\bar{2}\bar{4}\bar{3}\bar{2}\bar{1}\bar{3}\bar{4}) = 1 + 3 = 4$$

where we have used the action of the symmetric group on words in the second equality.

## 6. DEFINITION OF THE (DUAL) $m$ -SYMMETRIC SCHUR FUNCTIONS

In the remainder of this article, we will use the notation  $s_i\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{i+1}, a_i, \dots, a_m)$ , and more generally  $s_i\Lambda = (s_i\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$ .

Let  $H_{\mathbf{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_m; t) = P_{\mathbf{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_N; 0, t)$  be the non-symmetric Hall-Littlewood polynomial (observe that the non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials only depend on the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  when  $q = 0$  and the indexing compositions have length at most  $m$ ). For  $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ , the action of the Hecke operator  $T_i$  on the non-symmetric Hall-Littlewood polynomials, which can be obtained by taking the limit  $q = 0$  in (2.8), is the following:

$$T_i H_{\mathbf{a}} = \begin{cases} H_{s_i\mathbf{a}} & \text{if } a_i > a_{i+1} \\ (t-1)H_{\mathbf{a}} + tH_{s_i\mathbf{a}} & \text{if } a_i < a_{i+1} \\ tH_{\mathbf{a}} & \text{if } a_i = a_{i+1} \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

We should note that the polynomial  $H_{\mathbf{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_m; t)$  can be constructed recursively from this formula since  $H_{\mathbf{a}} = x^{\mathbf{a}}$  when  $\mathbf{a}$  is dominant (it is not too difficult to show that  $x^{\mathbf{a}}$  satisfies in this case the corresponding eigenvalue problem). When  $t = 1$ , the operator  $T_i$  becomes  $K_{i,i+1}$  and it is then immediate from this construction that  $H_{\mathbf{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_m; 1) = x^{\mathbf{a}}$ . It is thus natural to define the following  $t$ -generalization of the  $k_{\Lambda}(x)$  basis:

$$k_{\Lambda}(x; t) = H_{\mathbf{a}}(x_1, \dots, x_m; t)s_{\lambda}(x)$$

We stress that

$$\{k_{\Lambda}(x; t) \mid \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m\}$$

is indeed a basis of  $R_m$  since we have seen that the special case  $k_{\Lambda}(x; 1) = k_{\Lambda}(x)$  is a basis of  $R_m$  (that is, the  $k_{\Lambda}(x; t)$ 's are linearly independent and thus form a basis of  $R_m$  by dimension considerations).

Since  $s_{\lambda}(x)$  commutes with  $T_i$  for all  $i$ , (6.1) implies immediately the following.

**Lemma 20.** For  $i = 1, \dots, m - 1$ , the operator  $T_i$  acts on  $k_\Lambda(x; t)$  as

$$T_i k_\Lambda = \begin{cases} k_{\tilde{\Lambda}} & \text{if } a_i > a_{i+1} \\ (t - 1)k_\Lambda + tk_{\tilde{\Lambda}} & \text{if } a_i < a_{i+1} \\ tk_\Lambda & \text{if } a_i = a_{i+1} \end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

where  $\tilde{\Lambda} = s_i \Lambda$ .

A bilinear scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_m$  on  $R_m$  is defined by requiring that the  $k_\Lambda(x; t)$  basis be self dual:

$$\langle k_\Lambda(x; t), k_\Omega(x; t) \rangle_m = \delta_{\Lambda\Omega} \quad (6.3)$$

The following proposition, which can easily be checked, is equivalent to Lemma 20.

**Proposition 21.** For  $i = 1, \dots, m - 1$ , let  $T_i^*$  be the adjoint of  $T_i$  with respect to the scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_m$ , that is,  $\langle T_i f, g \rangle_m = \langle f, T_i^* g \rangle_m$  for all  $f, g \in R_m$ . Then the  $T_i^*$ 's satisfy the relations

$$\begin{aligned} (T_i^* - t)(T_i^* + 1) &= 0 \\ T_i^* T_{i+1}^* T_i^* &= T_{i+1}^* T_i^* T_{i+1}^* \\ T_i^* T_j^* &= T_j^* T_i^*, \quad i - j \neq \pm 1 \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

and are such that

$$T_i^* k_\Lambda = \begin{cases} tk_{\tilde{\Lambda}} & \text{if } a_i > a_{i+1} \\ (t - 1)k_\Lambda + k_{\tilde{\Lambda}} & \text{if } a_i < a_{i+1} \\ tk_\Lambda & \text{if } a_i = a_{i+1} \end{cases} \quad (6.5)$$

where  $\tilde{\Lambda} = s_i \Lambda$ .

We are now ready to define the dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions. The definition will rely on the charge on skew tableaux introduced at the end of Section 5.

**Definition 22.** The dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions

$$s_\Lambda^*(x; t) = \sum_{\Omega} D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) k_\Omega(x; t) \quad (6.6)$$

are defined recursively in the following way. If  $\Lambda$  is dominant, then  $s_\Lambda^*(x; t)$  has the expansion coefficients

$$D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}} t^{\text{charge}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(T)} \quad (6.7)$$

Otherwise, if  $a_i < a_{i+1}$ , then

$$s_\Lambda^*(x; t) = t^{-1} T_i^* s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^*(x; t) \quad (6.8)$$

where  $\tilde{\Lambda} = s_i \Lambda$ .

Observe that (6.8) amounts to saying that

$$s_\Lambda^*(x; t) = t^{-\ell(\sigma)} T_{\sigma^{-1}}^* s_{\Lambda^+}^*(x; t) \quad (6.9)$$

where  $\sigma$  is the shortest permutation such that  $\sigma(\mathbf{a}) = (a_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma^{-1}(m)}) = \mathbf{a}^+$ .

The coefficients  $K_{\lambda/\nu, \mu}$  in  $s_\nu h_\mu = \sum_{\lambda} K_{\lambda/\nu, \mu} s_\lambda$  are given by the number of skew tableaux of shape  $\lambda/\nu$  and evaluation  $\mu$ . The next result easily follows from the well known triangularity of the coefficients  $K_{\lambda/\nu, \mu}$  in the case  $\nu = \emptyset$  [21].

**Lemma 23.** The coefficients  $K_{\lambda/\nu, \mu}$  are such that if  $K_{\lambda/\nu, \mu} \neq 0$ , then  $\lambda \geq \mu \cup \nu$ .

We will now prove that the dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions form a basis of  $R_m$

**Proposition 24.** The dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions at  $t = 1$  are unitriangularly related to the  $k_\Omega(x)$  basis. To be more specific, we have that  $D_{\Lambda\Lambda}(1) = 1$ , and  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(1) = 0$  unless  $\Omega \leq \Lambda$ :

$$s_\Lambda^*(x; 1) = k_\Lambda(x) + \sum_{\Omega < \Lambda} D_{\Lambda\Omega}(1) k_\Omega(x)$$

Hence, the dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions at  $t = 1$  form a basis of  $R_m$ . Consequently, the dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions  $s_\Lambda^*(x; t)$  for a generic  $t$  also form a basis of  $R_m$ .

*Proof.* We first prove that  $D_{\Lambda\Lambda}(1) = 1$ . First suppose that  $\Lambda$  is dominant. In this case, we need to show that there is a unique skew tableau  $T \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Lambda}$ . This is indeed the case since the only such skew tableau is the skew tableau of shape  $(\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda)/\lambda$  with a letter  $i$  in every column from 1 to  $a_i$ .

Since  $T_i = K_{i,i+1}$  when  $t = 1$ , we have also that  $T_i^* = K_{i,i+1}$  when  $t = 1$ . From (6.9), we obtain that  $K_{\sigma^{-1}}(s_{\Lambda^+}^*(x; 1)) = s_{\Lambda^+}^*(x; 1)$  if  $\sigma$  is the shortest permutation such that  $\sigma(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{a}^+$ . Using the fact that

$$K_{\sigma^{-1}}(k_{\Omega}(x; 1)) = x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}^{b_1} \cdots x_{\sigma^{-1}(m)}^{b_m} s_{\mu}(x) = x_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}^{a_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}} \cdots x_{\sigma^{-1}(m)}^{a_{\sigma^{-1}(m)}} s_{\lambda}(x) = k_{\Lambda}(x; 1)$$

iff  $\Omega = \Lambda^+$ , we conclude that  $D_{\Lambda\Lambda}(1) = D_{\Lambda^+\Lambda^+}(1) = 1$

We now prove that if  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(1) \neq 0$  then  $\Omega \leq \Lambda$ . We will prove the equivalent statement that if  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda,\Omega} \neq \emptyset$  and  $\Lambda$  is dominant, then

$$\Omega^{(0)} \leq \Lambda^{(0)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)} \leq \Lambda^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)}$$

for any  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_j \leq m$ . In this expression,  $\Lambda^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)}$  stands for the partition  $\mathbf{a}^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)} \cup \lambda$ , where  $\mathbf{a}^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)}$  is obtained from  $\mathbf{a}$  by increasing all the entries  $a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_j}$  by 1. Let  $T \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda,\Omega}$ . Then  $T$  is a skew tableau of shape  $(\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda)/\mu$  with the letter  $i$  appearing  $b_i$  times in the first  $a_i$  columns of  $T$ . This means that  $T$  would appear as one of the skew tableaux representing the coefficient of  $s_{\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda}$  in the Schur expansion of  $s_{\mu} h_{\mathbf{b}}$ . By Lemma 23, we have that  $\mathbf{b} \cup \mu \leq \mathbf{a} \cup \lambda$ , or equivalently, that  $\Omega^{(0)} \leq \Lambda^{(0)}$ . We will now see that we can add a letter  $i_{\ell}$  in column  $a_{i_{\ell}} + 1$  of  $T$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, j$ . First, a cell can be added in column  $a_{i_1} + 1$  of  $T$  since  $T$  has shape  $\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda$ . Let this cell be in row  $r$ . The letters in column  $a_{i_1} + 1$  are all smaller than  $i_1$  by definition of  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda,\Omega}$  (a letter  $n$  larger than  $i_1$  needs to appear in columns 1 to  $a_n$  for  $a_n \leq a_{i_1}$  given that  $\Lambda$  is assumed to be dominant). Now, let  $k$  be the number of  $a_j$ 's such that  $a_j = a_{i_1}$  and  $j \geq i_1$ . This implies that in  $\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda$  there are at least  $k$  rows of length  $a_{i_1}$  weakly below row  $r$ . So if there is a letter in column  $a_{i_1}$  and row  $r$  in  $T$ , there also needs to be letters in all  $k$  cells weakly below that cell in  $T$ . But there are only at most  $k - 1$  letters larger than  $a_{i_1}$  that can occupy those cells. Hence the letter in column  $a_{i_1}$  and row  $r$  in  $T$  cannot be larger than  $i_1$ . Repeating the same argument again and again we obtain that we can add a letter  $i_{\ell}$  in column  $a_{i_{\ell}} + 1$  of  $T$  for  $\ell = 1, \dots, j$  to form a skew tableau  $T'$  of shape  $(\mathbf{a}^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)} \cup \lambda)/\mu$  and evaluation  $\mathbf{b}^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)}$ . As before, this means that  $T'$  would appear as one of the the skew tableaux representing the coefficient of  $s_{\mathbf{a}^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)} \cup \lambda}$  in the Schur expansion of  $s_{\mu} h_{\mathbf{b}^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)}}$ . Hence  $\mathbf{b}^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)} \cup \mu \leq \mathbf{a}^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)} \cup \lambda$ , or equivalently  $\Omega^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)} \leq \Lambda^{(i_1, \dots, i_j)}$ , as wanted.  $\square$

Since the dual  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions do in fact form a basis, we can define the  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions,  $s_{\Lambda}(x; t)$ , as their dual basis with respect to the scalar product (6.3).

**Definition 25.** *The  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions  $s_{\Lambda}(x; t)$  are defined to be such that*

$$\langle s_{\Lambda}(x; t), s_{\Omega}^*(x; t) \rangle_m = \delta_{\Lambda\Omega}$$

*Equivalently, by duality, the  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions  $s_{\Lambda}(x; t)$  are the unique basis of  $R_m$  such that*

$$k_{\Omega}(x; t) = \sum_{\Lambda} D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) s_{\Lambda}(x; t) \tag{6.10}$$

*where the coefficients  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t)$  are those that appear in (6.6).*

## 7. PROPERTIES OF THE (DUAL) $m$ -SYMMETRIC SCHUR FUNCTIONS

We first establish a recursion for the coefficients  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t)$  appearing in the definitions of the (dual)  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions.

**Proposition 26.** *If  $a_i < a_{i+1}$ , then the coefficients  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t)$  in (6.6) are such that*

$$D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) = \begin{cases} t^{-1} D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}}(t) & \text{if } b_i > b_{i+1} \\ D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}}(t) + (1 - t^{-1}) D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}}(t) & \text{if } b_i < b_{i+1} \\ D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}}(t) & \text{if } b_i = b_{i+1} \end{cases} \tag{7.1}$$

*where  $\tilde{\Lambda} = s_i \Lambda$  and  $\tilde{\Omega} = s_i \Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose without loss of generality that  $\Omega$  is such that  $b_i > b_{i+1}$ . From (6.8) and Proposition 21, we have that

$$D_{\Lambda\Omega} k_{\Omega} + D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}} k_{\tilde{\Omega}} = t^{-1} T_i^* (D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}} k_{\Omega} + D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}} k_{\tilde{\Omega}}) = t^{-1} (D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}} t k_{\tilde{\Omega}} + D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}} (t - 1) k_{\tilde{\Omega}} + D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}} k_{\Omega})$$

Equating the coefficients of  $k_{\Omega}$  and  $k_{\tilde{\Omega}}$  on both sides, we obtain

$$D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) = t^{-1} D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}} \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}} = D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}} + (1 - t^{-1}) D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}}$$



which settles the first two cases since  $\tilde{\Omega}$  is such that  $\tilde{b}_i < \tilde{b}_{i+1}$ .

Now let  $\Omega$  be such that  $b_i = b_{i+1}$ . From (6.8) and Proposition 21, we obtain this time that

$$D_{\Lambda\Omega}k_{\Omega} = t^{-1}T_i^*(D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\Omega}k_{\Omega}) = t^{-1}T_i^*(D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\Omega}tk_{\Omega}) = D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\Omega}k_{\Omega}$$

which proves the last case.  $\square$

**Remark 27.** Proposition 26 provides another definition of the (dual)  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions as the coefficients  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t)$  can then be obtained recursively in the following way. If  $\Lambda$  is dominant then

$$D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}} t^{\text{charge}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(T)} \quad (7.2)$$

Otherwise  $a_i < a_{i+1}$  for some  $i$ , in which case  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t)$  satisfies the recursion (7.1). Even though the recursion involves negative terms, computer experimentation suggests that  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) \in \mathbb{N}[t]$  for all  $\Lambda$  and  $\Omega$ .

An easy property to establish is that  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t)$  is equal to zero unless  $\mathbf{b}$  is contained in  $\mathbf{a}$ , and  $\mu$  contains  $\lambda$ .

**Lemma 28.** If  $b_{\ell} > a_{\ell}$  for any  $\ell = 1, \dots, m$  or if  $\lambda \not\subseteq \mu$ , then  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) = 0$ .

*Proof.* We prove the result by induction on the number of inversions in  $\mathbf{a}$ . Suppose that  $\mathbf{a}$  is dominant. Then  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  is empty if  $b_{\ell} > a_{\ell}$  (it is then impossible to fit  $b_{\ell}$  letters  $\ell$  within the first  $a_{\ell}$  columns of the skew tableau) while  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  is empty by definition if  $\lambda \not\subseteq \mu$ . Hence  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t) = 0$  in that case. We now consider the general case. We immediately have that  $D_{\Lambda\Omega}(t)$  is zero by induction from Proposition 26 if  $\lambda \not\subseteq \mu$  since the recursion does not change  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ . Suppose that  $b_{\ell} > a_{\ell}$  and that  $a_i < a_{i+1}$ . If  $\ell \notin \{i, i+1\}$  then the result holds by induction from Proposition 26 since  $\tilde{a}_{\ell} = a_{\ell} < \tilde{b}_{\ell} = b_{\ell}$ . Now suppose that  $\ell = i$ . If  $b_i > b_{i+1}$  the result holds by induction from Proposition 26 since  $\tilde{a}_{i+1} = a_i < b_i = \tilde{b}_{i+1}$ . If  $b_i < b_{i+1}$  then  $a_i < b_{i+1}$  as well and the result holds again by induction from Proposition 26 since  $\tilde{a}_{i+1} = a_i < b_i = \tilde{b}_{i+1}$  or  $\tilde{a}_{i+1} = a_i < b_{i+1}$ . Finally, if  $b_i = b_{i+1}$  then the result holds by induction from Proposition 26 since  $\tilde{a}_{i+1} = a_i < b_i = b_{i+1}$ . The case  $\ell = i+1$  is similar to the case  $\ell = i$ .  $\square$

We will now see that the action of  $T_i^*$  on  $s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^*(x, t)$  is exactly as its action on  $k_{\Lambda}(x; t)$  given in Proposition 21.

**Proposition 29.** For  $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ , the operator  $T_i^*$  is such that

$$T_i^*s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* = \begin{cases} ts_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* & \text{if } a_i > a_{i+1} \\ (t-1)s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* + s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* & \text{if } a_i < a_{i+1} \\ ts_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* & \text{if } a_i = a_{i+1} \end{cases}$$

where  $\tilde{\Lambda} = s_i\Lambda$ .

*Proof.* The case  $a_i > a_{i+1}$  follows immediately from (6.8). In the case  $a_i < a_{i+1}$ , we have from  $t^{-1}T_i^*s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* = s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^*$  and (6.4) that

$$T_i^*s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* = t^{-1}(T_i^*)^2s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* = t^{-1}((t-1)T_i^* + t)s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^*$$

We thus obtain, using again  $t^{-1}T_i^*s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* = s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^*$ , that

$$T_i^*s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* = (t-1)s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^* + s_{\tilde{\Lambda}}^*$$

as wanted.

The case  $a_i = a_{i+1}$  is somewhat less trivial. First consider the case when  $\mathbf{a}$  is dominant. In this case, we need to prove that

$$T_i^*(D_{\Lambda\Omega}k_{\Omega} + D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}}k_{\tilde{\Omega}}) = t(D_{\Lambda\Omega}k_{\Omega} + D_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}}k_{\tilde{\Omega}}) \quad \text{for } b_i > b_{i+1} \quad (7.3)$$

and that

$$T_i^*D_{\Lambda\Omega}k_{\Omega} = tD_{\Lambda\Omega}k_{\Omega} \quad \text{if } b_i = b_{i+1} \quad (7.4)$$

If  $b_i = b_{i+1}$  then the result is obvious since  $T_i^*k_{\Omega} = tk_{\Omega}$  from Proposition 21.

We now focus on the case  $b_i > b_{i+1}$ . First observe that  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}}$  have the same cardinality. This is because  $a_i = a_{i+1}$  implies that the letters  $i$  and  $i+1$  satisfy the same restrictions (namely, that they need to be in the first  $a_i$  columns of their corresponding skew tableaux), and as such the generator  $\sigma_i$  of the action of the symmetric group on words provides a bijection between  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda\Omega}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\tilde{\Lambda}\tilde{\Omega}}$ .

By definition, we have that

$$\text{charge}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(T) = \text{Inv}(\mathbf{b}) + \text{charge}(\bar{T}') \quad \text{with } \mathbf{b}(\bar{T}') = \mathbf{i}(T). \quad (7.5)$$

Now,  $\mathfrak{b}(\bar{T}') = \mathfrak{i}(T)$  implies that  $\bar{T}' = \bar{\mathfrak{i}}(\bar{T})$ . We thus get from Corollary 16 that  $\sigma_i \mathfrak{b}(\bar{T}') = \mathfrak{b}(\bar{\sigma}_{m-i} \bar{T}')$ . Since  $\mathfrak{i}(T)$  is identical to  $T$  except for a trivial translation, we then have that

$$\mathfrak{b}(\bar{\sigma}_{m-i} \bar{T}') = \sigma_i \mathfrak{b}(\bar{T}') = \sigma_i \mathfrak{i}(T) = \mathfrak{i}(\sigma_i T)$$

Comparing the previous equation with (7.5), we see that  $\text{charge}_{\mathfrak{a}, \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}}(\sigma_i T) = \text{Inv}(\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}) + \text{charge}(\bar{\sigma}_{m-i} \bar{T}')$ . Therefore

$$\text{charge}_{\mathfrak{a}, \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}}(\sigma_i T) = \text{Inv}(\mathfrak{b}) + 1 + \text{charge}(\bar{T}') = \text{charge}_{\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}}(T) + 1$$

since the usual charge is invariant under the action of the symmetric group on words. We thus deduce that  $D_{\Lambda \tilde{\Omega}} = t D_{\Lambda \Omega}$ .

Hence, using  $T_i^*(k_\Omega + t k_{\tilde{\Omega}}) = t(k_\Omega + t k_{\tilde{\Omega}})$ , we obtain

$$T_i^*(D_{\Lambda \Omega} k_\Omega + D_{\Lambda \tilde{\Omega}} k_{\tilde{\Omega}}) = D_{\Lambda \Omega} T_i^*(k_\Omega + t k_{\tilde{\Omega}}) = t D_{\Lambda \Omega} (k_\Omega + t k_{\tilde{\Omega}}) = t(D_{\Lambda \Omega} k_\Omega + D_{\Lambda \tilde{\Omega}} k_{\tilde{\Omega}})$$

and the dominant case is seen to hold.

Finally, suppose that  $\mathfrak{a}$  is not dominant and that  $a_i = a_{i+1}$ . We will proceed by induction on the number of inversions of  $\mathfrak{a}$ , knowing that we have established the case when the number of inversions is zero. First suppose that  $j$  is such that  $\{j, j+1\}$  does not intersect  $\{i, i+1\}$  and such that  $s_j \mathfrak{a}$  has one fewer inversion than  $\mathfrak{a}$ . Using the formula  $T_j^* s_{s_j \Lambda}^* = t s_\Lambda^*$  that we have already established, we then have by induction that

$$T_i^* s_\Lambda^* = t^{-1} T_i^* T_j^* (s_{s_j \Lambda}^*) = t^{-1} T_j^* (T_i^* s_{s_j \Lambda}^*) = T_j^* s_{s_j \Lambda}^* = t s_\Lambda^*$$

Now suppose that  $s_{i-1} \mathfrak{a}$  has one fewer inversion than  $\mathfrak{a}$ . Then  $s_i s_{i-1} \mathfrak{a}$  will also have fewer inversions than  $\mathfrak{a}$  since  $a_i = a_{i+1}$ . Hence, using this time  $T_{i-1}^* T_i^* s_{s_i s_{i-1} \mathfrak{a}}^* = t^2 s_\Lambda^*$ , we have by induction that

$$T_i^* s_\Lambda^* = t^{-2} T_i^* (T_{i-1}^* T_i^* s_{s_i s_{i-1} \mathfrak{a}}^*) = t^{-2} T_{i-1}^* T_i^* (T_{i-1}^* s_{s_i s_{i-1} \mathfrak{a}}^*) = t^{-1} T_{i-1}^* T_i^* s_{s_i s_{i-1} \mathfrak{a}}^* = t s_\Lambda^*$$

where we have used the braid relations in (6.4). Finally, if  $s_{i+1} \mathfrak{a}$  has one fewer inversion than  $\mathfrak{a}$ , then  $s_i s_{i+1} \mathfrak{a}$  has also fewer inversions than  $\mathfrak{a}$  and we proceed as in the previous case.  $\square$

As we just saw, Proposition 29 is analogous to Proposition 21. By duality, the analog of Lemma 20 for the  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions is the following.

**Corollary 30.** *For  $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ , the operator  $T_i$  is such that*

$$T_i s_\Lambda = \begin{cases} s_{\tilde{\Lambda}} & \text{if } a_i > a_{i+1} \\ (t-1)s_\Lambda + t s_{\tilde{\Lambda}} & \text{if } a_i < a_{i+1} \\ t s_\Lambda & \text{if } a_i = a_{i+1} \end{cases}$$

where  $\tilde{\Lambda} = s_i \Lambda$ . In particular,  $s_\Lambda(x; t)$  is symmetric in  $x_i, x_{i+1}$  if  $a_i = a_{i+1}$ .

There are families of (dual)  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions for which we have explicit expressions.

**Proposition 31.** *If  $\Lambda = (0, 0, \dots, 0; \lambda)$  then  $s_\Lambda^*(x; t) = k_\Lambda(x; t) = s_\lambda(x)$ .*

*Proof.* From (6.6), it suffices to prove that if  $\Lambda = (0, 0, \dots, 0; \lambda)$  then  $D_{\Lambda \Omega}(t) = \delta_{\Lambda \Omega}$ . We are in the dominant case so we use the combinatorial formula. We have that  $\bar{T} \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda \Omega}$  is of shape  $\mu/\lambda$  with letter  $\bar{i}$  appearing  $(0 - b_i) = -b_i$  times. This is only possible if  $\mathfrak{b} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$  and  $\mu = \lambda$ , that is, if  $\Omega = \Lambda$ , in which case the only possible tableau  $\bar{T}$  is the empty tableau. Since  $\mathfrak{b}$  has no inversion and  $\text{charge}(u_{(0,0,\dots,0)})$  is equal to 0, we have established that  $D_{\Lambda \Omega}(t) = \delta_{\Lambda \Omega}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 32.** *If  $\Omega = (\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)$  then  $s_\Omega(x; t) = k_\Omega(x; t) = H_{\mathfrak{b}}(x_1, \dots, x_m; t)$ .*

*Proof.* We will prove that  $D_{\Lambda(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)}(t) = \delta_{\Lambda(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)}$ , which will prove our claim from (6.10). We will proceed by induction on the number of inversions in  $\mathfrak{a}$ . Suppose that  $\mathfrak{a}$  is dominant. In this case, we have that  $\bar{T} \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\Lambda(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)}$  is of shape  $\emptyset/\lambda$  with letter  $\bar{i}$  appearing  $a_i - b_i$  times. This is only possible if  $\lambda = \emptyset$  and  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}$ , that is, if  $\Lambda = (\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)$ , in which case the only tableau  $\bar{T}$  in  $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)}$  is the empty tableau  $\bar{T} = \emptyset$ . The corresponding tableau  $T \in \mathcal{S}_{(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)}$  is thus such that  $\text{charge}_{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{b}}(T) = \text{charge}(U_{\mathfrak{b}}) = 0$  since  $\mathfrak{b}$  is dominant. Hence, for  $\mathfrak{a}$  dominant, we have that  $D_{\Lambda(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)}(t) = \delta_{\Lambda(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)}$ .

We now consider the general case. Suppose that  $a_i < a_j$  for  $i < j$ . If  $b_i > b_{i+1}$  then obviously  $\Lambda \neq (\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)$ . Using (7.1), we thus have that  $D_{\Lambda(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)}(t) = t^{-1} D_{\tilde{\Lambda}(\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}; \emptyset)}(t) = 0$  by induction since  $\tilde{\Lambda} \neq (\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}; \emptyset)$  given that  $\Lambda \neq (\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)$ . The case  $b_i = b_{i+1}$ , which again implies that  $\Lambda \neq (\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)$ , also gives that  $D_{\Lambda(\mathfrak{b}; \emptyset)}(t) = 0$  by induction from (7.1). Finally, if

$b_i < b_{i+1}$ , we have that  $\tilde{\Lambda} \neq (\mathbf{b}; \emptyset)$ . Thus, using (7.1) again, we get by induction that  $D_{\Lambda(\mathbf{b}; \emptyset)} = D_{\tilde{\Lambda}(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}; \emptyset)} = \delta_{\tilde{\Lambda}(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}; \emptyset)} = \delta_{\Lambda(\mathbf{b}; \emptyset)}$ .  $\square$

Since an  $m$ -symmetric function is also an  $(m + 1)$ -symmetric function, it is natural to consider the inclusion  $i : R_m \rightarrow R_{m+1}$ . It is straightforward to verify that

$$i(p_{\Omega}(x)) = p_{\Omega^0}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad i(k_{\Omega}(x; t)) = k_{\Omega^0}(x; t)$$

where  $\Omega^0 = (\mathbf{b}^0; \mu)$  with  $\mathbf{b}^0 = (b_1, \dots, b_m, 0)$ . The restriction  $r : R_{m+1} \rightarrow R_m$  is defined on the other hand as

$$r(f) = f(x_1, \dots, x_m, 0, x_{m+2}, x_{m+3}, \dots) \Big|_{(x_{m+2}, x_{m+3}, \dots) \mapsto (x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots)}$$

It is again straightforward to check that

$$r(p_{\Omega}(x)) = \begin{cases} p_{\Omega_-}(x) & \text{if } b_{m+1} = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad r(k_{\Omega}(x; t)) = \begin{cases} k_{\Omega_-}(x; t) & \text{if } b_{m+1} = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7.6)$$

where  $\Omega_- = (\mathbf{b}_-; \mu)$  with  $\mathbf{b}_- = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$ . It is then immediate that  $r \circ i : R_m \rightarrow R_m$  is the identity and that

$$\langle i(f), g \rangle_{m+1} = \langle f, r(g) \rangle_m \quad (7.7)$$

for all  $f \in R_m$  and all  $g \in R_{m+1}$ . Remarkably, the inclusion and restriction of the (dual)  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions satisfy very elegant formulas.

**Proposition 33.** *For  $\Lambda = (a_1, \dots, a_m; \lambda)$ , we have that*

$$r(s_{\Lambda}^*) = s_{\hat{\Lambda}}^* \quad (7.8)$$

where  $\hat{\Lambda} = (a_1, \dots, a_{m-1}; \lambda \cup (a_m))$ . Equivalently, by duality and (7.7),


$$i(s_{\Lambda}) = \sum_{\Omega} s_{\Omega} \quad (7.9)$$

where the sum is over all  $\Omega$ 's such that  $\Omega = (a_1, \dots, a_m, a_{m+1}; \mu)$  with  $\mu \cup (a_{m+1}) = \lambda$ .


In other words, the  $m$ -partition  $\hat{\Lambda}$  in (7.8) is obtained from  $\Lambda$  by removing the  $m$ -circle, while the  $\Omega$ 's that appear in (7.9) are those whose diagram can be obtained from that of  $\Lambda$  by adding an  $(m + 1)$ -circle in any symmetric row (including that of size 0).

Before proving the proposition, we illustrate it with an example.

**Example 34.** *The diagram of  $\Lambda = (1, 3; 4, 3, 2)$  is*



Adding a 3-circle in all possible ways gives



Hence

$$i(s_{1,3;4,3,2}) = s_{1,3,4;3,2} + s_{1,3,3;4,2} + s_{1,3,2;4,3} + s_{1,3,0;4,3,2}$$

*Proof.* Since  $T_{\sigma}^*$  commutes with the restriction  $r : R_m \rightarrow R_{m-1}$  when  $\sigma \in S_{m-1}$ , we can suppose that  $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = (a_1, \dots, a_{m-1})$  is dominant. In this case,  $\mathbf{a}' = (a_1, \dots, a_{\ell-1}, a_m, a_{\ell}, \dots, a_{m-1})$ , where  $a_m$  is such that  $a_{\ell-1} \geq a_m > a_{\ell}$ , will also be dominant. Thus

$$s_{\Lambda}^* = t^{-m+\ell} T_{m-1}^* \cdots T_{\ell}^* s_{\Lambda'}^*$$

where  $\Lambda' = (\mathbf{a}'; \lambda)$ . It is easy to deduce from Proposition 29 and (7.6) that

$$r(t^{-m+\ell} T_{m-1}^* \cdots T_{\ell}^* H_{\mathbf{b}}) = \begin{cases} t^{\text{Inv}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) - \text{Inv}(\mathbf{b})} H_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}} & \text{if } b_{\ell} = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7.10)$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{b}} = (b_1, \dots, b_{\ell-1}, b_{\ell+1}, \dots, b_m)$ . Therefore

$$r(s_{\Lambda}^*) = \sum_{\Omega: \mathbf{b}_{\ell}=0} t^{\text{Inv}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) - \text{Inv}(\mathbf{b})} D_{\Lambda' \Omega} s_{\hat{\Omega}}$$

We thus only have to show that  $t^{\text{Inv}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) - \text{Inv}(\mathbf{b})} D_{\Lambda' \Omega} = D_{\hat{\Lambda} \hat{\Omega}}$  whenever  $b_{\ell} = 0$ .

Suppose that  $T \in \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda' \Omega}$ , where  $\Omega$  is such that  $b_{\ell} = 0$ . By definition,  $T$  is a skew tableau of shape  $(\mathbf{a}' \cup \lambda) / \mu = (\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda) / \mu$  that contains no letter  $\ell$ . If, for  $i = \ell + 1, \dots, m$ , we change every letter  $i$  in  $T$  into an  $i - 1$ , we obtain a skew tableau  $T' \in \mathcal{S}_{\hat{\Lambda} \hat{\Omega}}$  since  $(\mathbf{a} \cup \lambda) / \mu = (\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cup \lambda \cup (a_m)) / \mu$ . The map  $\mathbf{c} : \mathcal{S}_{\Lambda' \Omega} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\hat{\Lambda} \hat{\Omega}}$  that sends  $T$  to  $T'$  is easily seen to be a bijection. It now only remains to show that  $\text{charge}_{\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}}(T) + \text{Inv}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) - \text{Inv}(\mathbf{b}) = \text{charge}_{\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}}(T')$ , or after simplifications, that

$$\text{charge}(\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})) = \text{charge}(\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T}'))$$

The skew tableau  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$  is obtained from  $T$  by complementing every column from 1 to  $M = \max\{a_1, a_m\}$  (and complementing every column from 1 to  $a_1$  in the case of  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T}')$ ). Since  $T'$  can be obtained from  $T$  by changing every letter  $i > \ell$  into an  $i - 1$  (recall that  $T$  has no  $\ell$ ), the columns of  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T}')$  can be obtained from those of  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$  by removing the entry  $\bar{\ell}$  (it appears in every column since it does not appear in  $T$ ) and changing every  $\bar{i}$  such that  $i > \ell$  into an  $\bar{i} - \bar{1}$ . If we act with  $\bar{\sigma}_{m-\ell}$  on  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$  we will leave the columns with both an  $\bar{\ell}$  and an  $\bar{\ell} + \bar{1}$  unchanged while changing the  $\bar{\ell}$  into an  $\bar{\ell} + \bar{1}$  in the remaining ones. Therefore, if we act with  $\bar{\sigma}_1 \cdots \bar{\sigma}_{m-\ell}$  on  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})$ , the resulting skew tableau will have an  $\bar{m}$  in every column while the rest of the tableau will be exactly as in  $\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T}')$ . Since acting with the symmetric group does not change the charge and since the extra  $\bar{m}$ 's do not contribute to the charge (there is one such  $\bar{m}$  in every column), we have that indeed  $\text{charge}(\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T})) = \text{charge}(\bar{\mathbf{i}}(\bar{T}'))$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 35.** For  $\Lambda = (a_1, \dots, a_m; \lambda)$ , let  $\Lambda^0 = (a_1, \dots, a_m, 0; \lambda)$ . We have that

$$i(s_{\Lambda}^*) = s_{\Lambda^0}^*$$

Equivalently, by duality,

$$r(s_{\Lambda}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } a_m > 0 \\ s_{\Lambda_-} & \text{if } a_m = 0 \end{cases}$$

where  $\Lambda_- = (a_1, \dots, a_{m-1}; \lambda)$ .

*Proof.* Since  $T_{\sigma}^*$  commutes with the inclusion  $i$  when  $\sigma \in S_m$ , we can suppose that  $\Lambda$  is dominant. In this case  $\Lambda^0$  is also dominant.

Since  $a_{m+1} = 0$  in  $\Lambda^0$ , it is immediate that  $D_{\Lambda^0 \Gamma}(t) = 0$  unless  $\Gamma = (c_1, \dots, c_m, c_{m+1}; \nu)$  is such that  $c_{m+1} = 0$ . Hence the non-zero terms will be of the form  $D_{\Lambda^0 \Omega^0}(t)$ . We will see that  $D_{\Lambda^0 \Omega^0}(t) = D_{\Lambda \Omega}(t)$ , which will prove our claim.

The sets  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda^0, \Omega^0}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{\Lambda, \Omega}$  are easily seen to be equal. We thus only need to prove that

$$\text{charge}_{\mathbf{a}^0, \mathbf{b}^0}(T) = \text{charge}_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(T)$$

which amounts to proving that

$$\text{charge}(\bar{T} u_{\mathbf{a}}) = \text{charge}(\bar{T} u_{\mathbf{a}^0})$$

given that  $\text{Inv}(\mathbf{b}) = \text{Inv}(\mathbf{b}^0)$  (observe that the map that sends  $T$  to  $\bar{T}$  in the case of  $\mathbf{a}$  also sends  $T$  to  $\bar{T}$  in the case of  $\mathbf{a}^0$  since  $a_{m+1}^0 = 0$ ). Now, the only difference between  $u_{\mathbf{a}^0}$  and  $u_{\mathbf{a}}$  is that  $u_{\mathbf{a}^0}$  contains  $a_1$  extra letters  $\bar{m} + \bar{1}$  to the right. But those extra  $\bar{m} + \bar{1}$ 's do not contribute to the charge given that they lie to the right of every letter  $\bar{m}$  in  $\bar{T} u_{\mathbf{a}^0}$ , which implies that  $\text{charge}(\bar{T} u_{\mathbf{a}}) = \text{charge}(\bar{T} u_{\mathbf{a}^0})$ .  $\square$

## 8. MAIN CONJECTURE

Our main conjecture is a positivity conjecture for  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials in terms of  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions akin to the original Macdonald positivity conjecture [17] (now theorem [13]). Before stating the conjecture, we need to extend the notion of plethysm to  $R_m$ . Recall that the plethysm relevant to Macdonald polynomials is the linear map on the ring of symmetric functions that sends the power-sum  $p_{\lambda}$  to  $p_{\lambda} / \prod_i (1 - t^{\lambda_i})$  [4]. The notion of plethysm that we will need will simply be the linear map  $\wp : R_m \rightarrow R_m$  defined on the  $m$ -symmetric power-sums as

$$\wp(p_{\Lambda}) = \frac{p_{\Lambda}}{\prod_i (1 - t^{\lambda_i})} \quad (8.1)$$


We stress that the plethysm  $\wp$  only depends on the symmetric part  $\lambda$  of  $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$ .

We now introduce the proper normalization for the integral form of the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomial. Let

$$c_\Lambda(q, t) = \prod_{s \in \Lambda} (1 - q^{a(s)} t^{\ell(s)+1})$$

where the product is over the cells of  $\Lambda$  (excluding the circles). In the expression,  $a(s)$  and  $\ell(s)$  stand respectively for the arm-length and leg-length of  $s$ . The arm-length,  $a(s)$ , is equal to the number of cells in  $\Lambda$  strictly to the right of  $s$  (and in the same row). Note that if there is a circle at the end of its row, then it adds one to the arm-length of  $s$ . The leg-length,  $\ell(s)$ , is equal to the number of cells in  $\Lambda$  strictly below  $s$  (and in the same column). If at the bottom of its column there are  $k$  circles whose filling is smaller than the filling of the circle at the end of its row, then they add  $k$  to the value of the leg-length of  $s$ . If the row does not end with a circle then none of the circles at the bottom of its column contributes to the leg-length.

**Example 36.** The values of  $a(s)$  and  $\ell(s)$  in each cell of the diagram of  $\Lambda = (2, 0, 0, 2; 4, 1, 1)$  are



which gives

$$c_{(2,0,0,2;4,1,1)}(q, t) = (1 - t)(1 - qt)(1 - q^2t^3)(1 - q^3t^5)(1 - qt^2)(1 - q^2t^4)(1 - qt)(1 - q^2t^5)(1 - t^2)(1 - t)$$

Let the integral form of the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials be defined as<sup>2</sup>

$$J_\Lambda(x; q, t) = c_\Lambda(q, t) P_\Lambda(x; q, t)$$

We are finally ready to state our positivity conjecture for the  $m$ -Macdonald polynomials.

**Conjecture 37.** The  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials in their integral form are such that

$$\wp(J_\Lambda(x; q, t)) = \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) s_{\Omega}(x; t) \tag{8.2}$$

with  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) \in \mathbb{N}[q, t]$ .

**Example 38.** We have

$$\begin{aligned} \wp(J_{1,0;2}) &= t^2 s_{3,0;\emptyset} + qt^2 s_{0,3;\emptyset} + qt s_{0,0;3} + (qt^3 + t) s_{2,1;\emptyset} + (qt^2 + t) s_{2,0;1} + (q^2t^3 + t) s_{1,2;\emptyset} \\ &\quad + (q^2t^2 + 1) s_{1,0;2} + (q^2t^2 + qt) s_{0,2;1} + (q^2t^2 + q) s_{0,1;2} + (q^2t + q) s_{0,0;2,1} \\ &\quad + qt^2 s_{1,1;1} + qt s_{1,0;1,1} + q^2t s_{0,1;1,1} + q^2 s_{0,0;1,1,1} \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 39.** The symmetries  $K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t) = K_{\mu'\lambda'}(t, q)$  and  $K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t) = q^{n(\lambda')} t^{n(\lambda)} K_{\mu'\lambda'}(q^{-1}, t^{-1})$  (where  $n(\lambda) = \lambda_2 + 2\lambda_3 + 3\lambda_4 + \dots$ ) of the usual  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficients do not extend to the  $m$ -symmetric world (except in the case  $m = 1$ ). It seems however that  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) = K_{\Omega'\Lambda'}(t, q)$  whenever  $\Omega'$  and  $\Lambda'$  both exist, where  $\Lambda'$  is the  $m$ -partition whose diagram is the conjugate of the diagram of  $\Lambda$ .

**Remark 40.** The special case  $t = 1$  will be proven in [7] using a combinatorial interpretation quite similar to the major index statistic on tableaux (note that this does not provide a formula for the  $q = 1$  case since, as commented in the previous remark, the symmetry  $K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t) = K_{\mu'\lambda'}(t, q)$  of the usual  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficients does not extend to the  $m$ -symmetric world). One important consequence of the combinatorial interpretation at  $t = 1$  worth mentioning is that, as can be appreciated in Example 38,

$$K_{\Omega\Lambda}(1, 1) = \# \text{ of standard tableaux of shape } \mu \cup \mathbf{b}$$

Finding a combinatorial interpretation for the coefficients  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  thus amounts to finding a statistic on standard tableaux with extra circles.

The next section will be devoted to proving properties of the  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  coefficients.

---

<sup>2</sup>The integral form of the ‘‘partially symmetric Macdonald polynomials’’ in [12] is the same as our integral form.

9. THE  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  COEFFICIENTS

Before describing a few elementary relations satisfied by the  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  coefficients, we first need to establish certain results on the inclusion and restriction of  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials. The proofs will rely on properties of the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials that are proven in Appendix A. We start with the restriction, which can be obtained in general and which is surprisingly simple in the integral form.

**Proposition 41.** *For  $\Lambda = (a_1, \dots, a_m, a_{m+1}; \lambda)$ , the restriction  $r : R_{m+1} \rightarrow R_m$  is such that*

$$r(J_\Lambda(x; q, t)) = q^{a_{m+1}} t^{\#\{i \mid a_i < a_{m+1}\}} J_{\hat{\Lambda}}(x; q, t)$$

where  $\hat{\Lambda} = (a_1, \dots, a_m; \lambda \cup (a_{m+1}))$ .

*Proof.* First suppose that  $a_{m+1} = 0$ . Letting  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in Proposition 56, we have in this case that

$$J_\Lambda(x; q, t) \Big|_{x_{m+1}=0} = J_{\hat{\Lambda}}(x_{(m+1)}; q, t)$$

After relabelling the variables as  $(x_{m+2}, x_{m+3}, \dots) \mapsto (x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}, \dots)$  we obtain  $r(J_\Lambda(x; q, t)) = J_{\hat{\Lambda}}(x; q, t)$  as wanted.

If  $a_{m+1} \neq 0$ , letting this time  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in Proposition 57, we get that

$$J_\Lambda(x; q, t) \Big|_{x_{m+1}=0} = q^{a_{m+1}} t^{\#\{i \mid a_i < a_{m+1}\}} J_{\hat{\Lambda}}(x_{(m+1)}; q, t)$$

which gives that  $r(J_\Lambda(x; q, t)) = q^{a_{m+1}} t^{\#\{i \mid a_i < a_{m+1}\}} J_{\hat{\Lambda}}(x; q, t)$  after relabelling the variables.  $\square$

The inclusion of an  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomial is also quite simple when the symmetric part of the indexing  $m$ -partition is empty.

**Proposition 42.** *If  $\Lambda = (a_1, \dots, a_m; \emptyset)$ , then the inclusion  $i : R_m \rightarrow R_{m+1}$  is such that*

$$i(J_\Lambda(x; q, t)) = J_{\Lambda^0}(x; q, t)$$

where  $\Lambda^0 = (a_1, \dots, a_m, 0; \emptyset)$ .

*Proof.* We need to prove that  $i(c_\Lambda(q, t)P_\Lambda(x; q, t)) = c_{\Lambda^0}(q, t)P_{\Lambda^0}(x; q, t)$ . It is immediate that  $c_{\Lambda^0}(q, t) = c_\Lambda(q, t)$  since the only difference between the two diagrams is the extra circle  $m+1$  at the bottom of the diagram of  $\Lambda^0$ . But this circle  $m+1$  is larger than every other circle and therefore never contributes to a leg-length. We thus have to prove that  $i(P_\Lambda(x; q, t)) = P_{\Lambda^0}(x; q, t)$ . We will show that  $P_{\Lambda^0}(x; q, t)$  and  $P_\Lambda(x; q, t)$  are equal as polynomials in  $N$  variables, which will prove the proposition.

We have

$$P_\Lambda(x; q, t) = \frac{1}{u_\Lambda} \mathcal{S}_{m+1}^t E_{a_1, \dots, a_m, 0^{N-m}} = \frac{1}{u_\Lambda} \mathcal{S}_{m+2}^t \mathcal{O}_{m+1} E_{a_1, \dots, a_m, 0^{N-m}}$$

where

$$\mathcal{O}_{m+1} = 1 + T_{m+1} + T_{m+2}T_{m+1} + \dots + T_{N-1} \dots T_{m+1}$$

Since  $E_{a_1, \dots, a_m, 0^{N-m}}$  is symmetric in the variables  $x_{m+1}, \dots, x_N$ , we can easily check that  $\mathcal{O}_{m+1} E_{a_1, \dots, a_m, 0^{N-m}} = (1 - t^{N-m}) / (1 - t) E_{a_1, \dots, a_m, 0^{N-m}}$ , which implies that

$$P_\Lambda(x; q, t) = \frac{1}{u_\Lambda(t)} \left( \frac{1 - t^{N-m}}{1 - t} \right) \mathcal{S}_{m+2}^t E_{a_1, \dots, a_m, 0^{N-m}} = \frac{u_{\Lambda^0}(t)}{u_\Lambda(t)} \left( \frac{1 - t^{N-m}}{1 - t} \right) P_{\Lambda^0}(x; q, t)$$

But  $u_\Lambda(t) / u_{\Lambda^0}(t) = (1 - t^{N-m}) / (1 - t)$  due to the extra 0 in the symmetric entries of  $\Lambda$ , which gives that, in  $N$  variables,  $P_{\Lambda^0}(x; q, t) = P_\Lambda(x; q, t)$ .  $\square$

In order to better visualize the following proposition, it will prove convenient to denote, for  $\Lambda = (\mathbf{a}; \lambda)$  and  $\Omega = (\mathbf{b}; \mu)$ , the coefficient  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  as

$$\left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_m & \lambda \\ b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_m & \mu \end{array} \right)$$

In the remainder of the article, we will let  $\lambda \setminus \lambda_j$  stand for the partition obtained by removing the entry  $\lambda_j$  from the partition  $\lambda$ .

**Proposition 43.** *The coefficients  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  satisfy the following relations.*

(1) For any entry  $\lambda_j$  in  $\lambda$ , we have

$$q^{\lambda_j} t^{\#\{i \mid a_i < \lambda_j\}} \left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_m & \lambda \\ b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_m & \mu \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_m & \lambda_j \\ b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_m & 0 \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \lambda \setminus \lambda_j \\ \mu \end{array} \right)$$

(2)

$$\left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_m & \lambda \\ b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_m & \mu \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_m & 0 \\ b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_m & \mu \end{array} \right)$$

(3) For any entry  $\mu_j$  in  $\mu$ , we have

$$\left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_m & \emptyset \\ b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_m & \mu \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & a_2 & \cdots & a_m & 0 \\ b_1 & b_2 & \cdots & b_m & \mu_j \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \emptyset \\ \mu \setminus \mu_j \end{array} \right)$$

(4) If  $a_{i+1} = a_i$  then

$$\left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & \cdots & a_i & a_i & \cdots & a_m \\ b_1 & \cdots & b_i & b_{i+1} & \cdots & b_m \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \lambda \\ \mu \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & \cdots & a_i & a_i & \cdots & a_m \\ b_1 & \cdots & b_{i+1} & b_i & \cdots & b_m \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \lambda \\ \mu \end{array} \right)$$

(5) If  $b_{i+1} = b_i$  and  $a_i > a_{i+1}$  then

$$t \left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & \cdots & a_i & a_{i+1} & \cdots & a_m \\ b_1 & \cdots & b_i & b_i & \cdots & b_m \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \lambda \\ \mu \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{cccc|c} a_1 & \cdots & a_{i+1} & a_i & \cdots & a_m \\ b_1 & \cdots & b_i & b_i & \cdots & b_m \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \lambda \\ \mu \end{array} \right)$$

*Proof.* We will see that (1) is an easy consequence of Propositions 35 and 41. Applying  $r$  on both sides of (8.2), we get

$$r(\wp(J_{\Lambda^\diamond}(x; q, t))) = \sum_{\Delta} K_{\Delta \Lambda^\diamond} r(s_{\Delta}(x; t))$$

where  $\Lambda^\diamond = (a_1, \dots, a_m, \lambda_1; \lambda \setminus \lambda_1)$ . Since the plethysm  $\wp$  commutes with  $r$ , we have from Propositions 41 that

$$r(\wp(J_{\Lambda^\diamond}(x; q, t))) = q^{\lambda_1} t^{\#\{i \mid a_i < \lambda_1\}} \wp(J_{\Lambda}(x; q, t)) = q^{\lambda_1} t^{\#\{i \mid a_i < \lambda_1\}} \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega \Lambda} s_{\Omega}(x; t) \quad (9.1)$$

and from Proposition 35 that

$$\sum_{\Delta} K_{\Delta \Lambda^\diamond} r(s_{\Delta}(x; t)) = \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega \Lambda^\diamond} s_{\Omega}(x; t) \quad (9.2)$$

where  $\Omega^\diamond = (b_1, \dots, b_m, 0; \mu)$ . Equating (9.1) and (9.2), we obtain that  $q^{\lambda_1} t^{\#\{i \mid a_i < \lambda_1\}} K_{\Omega \Lambda}(q, t) = K_{\Omega \Lambda^\diamond}(q, t)$  as wanted.

Statement (2) is statement (1) with  $\lambda_j = 0$ . The proof is the same as the proof of statement (1).

For (3), let  $\Lambda = (a_1, \dots, a_m; \emptyset)$ . Using Proposition 42 and the commutativity of  $i$  and  $\wp$ , we have

$$\sum_{\Gamma} K_{\Gamma \Lambda}(q, t) i(s_{\Gamma}(x; t)) = i(\wp(J_{\Lambda}(x; q, t))) = \wp(J_{\Lambda^\diamond}(x; q, t)) = \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega \Lambda^\diamond}(q, t) s_{\Omega}(x; t)$$

We thus get from (7.9) that

$$\sum_{\Delta} K_{\Gamma \Lambda}(q, t) s_{\Delta}(x; t) = \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega \Lambda^\diamond}(q, t) s_{\Omega}(x; t)$$

where the sum is over all  $\Delta$ 's that can be obtained from  $\Gamma$  by adding a circle  $m+1$  on a symmetric entry. We thus have that  $K_{\Omega \Lambda^\diamond}(q, t) = K_{\Gamma \Lambda}(q, t)$  if  $\Omega$  can be obtained from  $\Gamma$  by adding a circle  $m+1$  on a symmetric entry (including a zero entry). But this is exactly the statement of (3) when the entry  $\mu_i$  is not equal to zero.

In (4),  $J_{\Lambda}(x; q, t)$  is in this case symmetric in  $x_i$  and  $x_{i+1}$  from Remark 3, and so is  $\wp(J_{\Lambda}(x; q, t))$ . Hence

$$T_i(\wp(J_{\Lambda}(x; q, t))) = t \wp(J_{\Lambda}(x; q, t)) = t \left( \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega \Lambda}(q, t) s_{\Omega}(x; t) \right) \quad (9.3)$$

On the other hand,

$$T_i(\wp(J_{\Lambda}(x; q, t))) = T_i \left( \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega \Lambda}(q, t) s_{\Omega}(x; t) \right) = \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega \Lambda}(q, t) T_i s_{\Omega}(x; t) \quad (9.4)$$

Suppose without loss of generality that  $\Omega = (\mathbf{b}; \mu)$  is such that  $b_i > b_{i+1}$  and let  $\tilde{\Omega} = s_i \Omega$ . We then have from Corollary 30 that  $T_i s_{\Omega} = s_{\tilde{\Omega}}$  and  $T_i s_{\tilde{\Omega}} = (t-1)s_{\tilde{\Omega}} + t s_{\Omega}$ . Thus, comparing the terms involving  $s_{\Omega}$  and  $s_{\tilde{\Omega}}$  in (9.3) and (9.4), we obtain

$$t K_{\Omega \Lambda}(q, t) s_{\Omega}(x; t) + t K_{\tilde{\Omega} \Lambda}(q, t) s_{\tilde{\Omega}}(x; t) = K_{\Omega \Lambda}(q, t) s_{\tilde{\Omega}}(x; t) + K_{\tilde{\Omega} \Lambda}(q, t) (t-1) s_{\tilde{\Omega}}(x; t) + t K_{\tilde{\Omega} \Lambda}(q, t) s_{\Omega}(x; t)$$

which, by linear independence of  $s_\Omega$  and  $s_{\tilde{\Omega}}$ , holds iff  $K_{\tilde{\Omega}\Lambda}(q, t) = K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$ .

Finally, we consider (5). Let  $\tilde{\Lambda} = s_i\Lambda$ . We have that  $c_\Lambda(q, t)$  and  $c_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)$  only differ by the circles  $i$  and  $i + 1$  that are switched. Because  $i$  and  $i + 1$  are consecutive numbers, all the cells in  $\Lambda$  and  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  will contribute the same value to  $c_\Lambda(q, t)$  and  $c_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)$  except the cell at the intersection of the two circles. This cell will contribute a factor of  $(1 - q^{at^{\ell+1}})$  in  $c_\Lambda(q, t)$  while in  $c_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)$  it will contribute a factor of  $(1 - q^{at^{\ell+2}})$  (given that the circle  $i$  is below the circle  $i + 1$  in  $\tilde{\Lambda}$ ), where the arm-length  $a$  and the leg-length  $\ell$  are relative to  $\Lambda$ . Using (2.8) with  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ , we also have in our case that

$$T_i P_\Lambda(x; q, t) = \left( \frac{t-1}{1-q^{-at-\ell-1}} \right) P_\Lambda(x; q, t) + \frac{(1-q^{at^{\ell+2}})(1-q^{at^\ell})}{(1-q^{at^{\ell+1}})^2} P_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(x; q, t)$$

since  $\bar{\eta}_i/\bar{\eta}_{i+1} = q^{at^{\ell+1}}$  and  $u_{\Lambda, N}(t) = u_{\tilde{\Lambda}, N}(t)$ . Therefore, taking  $c_\Lambda(q, t)$  and  $c_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)$  into account, we get

$$\begin{aligned} T_i J_\Lambda(x; q, t) &= \left( \frac{t-1}{1-q^{-at-\ell-1}} \right) J_\Lambda(x; q, t) + \frac{(1-q^{at^{\ell+2}})(1-q^{at^\ell})}{(1-q^{at^{\ell+1}})^2} \frac{c_\Lambda(q, t)}{c_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)} J_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(x; q, t) \\ &= \left( \frac{t-1}{1-q^{-at-\ell-1}} \right) J_\Lambda(x; q, t) + \left( \frac{1-q^{at^\ell}}{1-q^{at^{\ell+1}}} \right) J_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(x; q, t) \end{aligned} \quad (9.5)$$

from our previous observation on  $c_\Lambda(q, t)$  and  $c_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)$ . After applying the plethysm  $\wp$  (which commutes with  $T_i$ ), we obtain

$$T_i \wp(J_\Lambda(x; q, t)) = \left( \frac{t-1}{1-q^{-at-\ell-1}} \right) \wp(J_\Lambda(x; q, t)) + \left( \frac{1-q^{at^\ell}}{1-q^{at^{\ell+1}}} \right) \wp(J_{\tilde{\Lambda}}(x; q, t))$$

Focusing on the terms involving  $s_\Omega$  on both sides of the equation then yields

$$K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) T_i s_\Omega = \left( \frac{t-1}{1-q^{-at-\ell-1}} \right) K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) s_\Omega + \left( \frac{1-q^{at^\ell}}{1-q^{at^{\ell+1}}} \right) K_{\Omega\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t) s_\Omega$$

where we used the fact that  $s_\Omega$  cannot appear in any  $T_i s_\Gamma$  such that  $\Gamma \neq \Omega$ . We have from Corollary 30 that  $T_i s_\Omega = t s_\Omega$  since  $b_i = b_{i+1}$ , which implies that

$$t K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) = \left( \frac{t-1}{1-q^{-at-\ell-1}} \right) K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) + \left( \frac{1-q^{at^\ell}}{1-q^{at^{\ell+1}}} \right) K_{\Omega\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)$$

Combining the coefficients of  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$ , we obtain

$$t \left( \frac{1-q^{at^\ell}}{1-q^{at^{\ell+1}}} \right) K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) = \left( \frac{1-q^{at^\ell}}{1-q^{at^{\ell+1}}} \right) K_{\Omega\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)$$

which readily implies our claim.  $\square$

We get from Proposition 43(2) that the usual  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficients  $K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t)$  are special cases of the coefficients  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$ .

**Corollary 44.** *If  $\Lambda = (0^m; \lambda)$  and  $\Omega = (0^m; \mu)$  then*

$$K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) = K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t)$$

where  $K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t)$  is the usual Macdonald  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficient.

Let

$$\Psi_N = (1-t)(1 + T_{N-1} + T_{N-2}T_{N-1} + \dots + T_m \dots T_{N-1}) \Phi_q \quad (9.6)$$

where we recall that  $\Phi_q$  was defined in (2.9). The following proposition, which is the analog of (2.9) in the  $m$ -symmetric world, is proved in Appendix A.

**Proposition 45.** *For any  $N$  and any  $m \geq 1$ , we have that*

$$\Psi_N J_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t) = t^{-\#\{2 \leq j \leq m \mid a_j \leq a_1\}} J_{\Lambda^\square}(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t)$$

where  $\Lambda^\square = ((a_2, \dots, a_m); \lambda \cup (a_1 + 1))$ . In particular, if  $m = 1$ , we have

$$\Psi_N J_{(a_1; \lambda)}(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t) = J_{\lambda \cup (a_1 + 1)}(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t)$$

We can now establish the next proposition, which provides a decomposition of the usual  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficients in terms of  $(q, t)$ -coefficients at  $m = 1$  of lower degree.



**Proposition 46.** *For any entry  $\lambda_j$  in  $\lambda$ , the usual  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficient  $K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t)$  is such that*

$$K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t) = \left( \begin{array}{c} \lambda \\ \mu \end{array} \right) = \sum_{\mu_i} \left( \begin{array}{c} \lambda_j - 1 \\ \mu_i - 1 \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \lambda \setminus \lambda_j \\ \mu \setminus \mu_i \end{array} \right)$$

where the sum is over all distinct parts  $\mu_i$  in  $\mu$ . The positivity conjecture for  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials at  $m = 1$  is thus a refinement of the usual Macdonald positivity.

**Example 47.** *Taking  $\lambda = (3, 3)$  and  $\mu = (3, 2, 1)$ , the decomposition (which is unique in this case since  $\lambda$  has only one distinct entry) gives*

$$K_{(3,2,1),(3,3)}(q, t) = K_{(2;2,1),(2;3)}(q, t) + K_{(1;3,1),(2;3)}(q, t) + K_{(0;3,2),(2;3)}(q, t)$$

A computer calculation tells us that

$$K_{(2;2,1),(2;3)}(q, t) = q^4 t^3 + q^3 t^2 + q^2 t^2 + q^2 t + qt, \quad K_{(1;3,1),(2;3)}(q, t) = q^5 t^3 + q^4 t^2 + q^3 t^2 + q^3 t + q^2 t + q$$

and

$$K_{(0;3,2),(2;3)}(q, t) = q^5 t^2 + q^4 t^2 + q^4 t + q^3 t + q^2$$

which is consistent with the value of  $K_{(3,2,1),(3,3)}(q, t)$  found in [17]. Observe that the diagram of  $(2; 3)$  is obtained from that of  $\lambda = (3, 3)$  by transforming a box into a circle (indexed by a 1). Similarly, the diagram of  $(2; 2, 1)$ ,  $(1; 3, 1)$  and  $(0; 3, 2)$  are those that can be obtained from that of  $\mu = (3, 2, 1)$  by transforming a box into a circle.

*Proof.* We work in  $N$  variables. Consider the operator  $\tilde{\Psi}_N = \wp \circ \Psi_N \circ \wp^{-1}$ . From Proposition 45, we have that  $\tilde{\Psi}_N \circ \wp(J_{(a_1; \lambda)}) = \wp(J_{\lambda \cup (a_1)})$ . In order to obtain our decomposition, we thus need to obtain the action of  $\tilde{\Psi}_N$  on the  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions. Before obtaining that action, we will first show that  $\tilde{\Psi}_N$  is such that

$$\tilde{\Psi}_N(k_{(b_1; \mu)}(x; t)) = h_{b_1+1}(x) s_\mu(x) \tag{9.7}$$

From  $k_{(b_1; \mu)}(x; t) = x_1^{b_1} s_\mu$ , we get

$$\wp^{-1}(k_{(b_1; \mu)}(x; t)) = x_1^{b_1} \wp^{-1}(s_\mu)$$

Since  $\wp^{-1}(s_\mu)$  commutes with  $\Psi_N$ , we then have that

$$\Psi_N \circ \wp^{-1}(k_{(b_1; \mu)}(x; t)) = \wp^{-1}(s_\mu) \Psi_N(x_1^{b_1})$$

Now, in the case  $m = 1$ , the operator  $\Psi_N$  is such that

$$\Psi_N(x_1^{b_1}) = (1 - t)(1 + T_{N-1} + T_{N-2}T_{N-1} + \cdots + T_1 T_2 \cdots T_{N-1}) x_1^{b_1+1} = (1 - t) P_{(b_1+1)}(x_1, \dots, x_N; t)$$

where  $P_{(b_1+1)}(x_1, \dots, x_N; t)$  is the (symmetric) Hall-Littlewood polynomial indexed by a single entry [17]. In that case, it is known [4, 17] that

$$(1 - t) P_{(b_1+1)}(x_1, \dots, x_N; t) = \wp^{-1}(h_{b_1+1})$$

from which we obtain that  $\Psi_N(x_1^{b_1}) = \wp^{-1}(h_{b_1+1})$ . The map  $\wp^{-1}$  being a homomorphism, it then follows that

$$\Psi_N \circ \wp^{-1}(k_{(b_1; \mu)}(x; t)) = \wp^{-1}(s_\mu) \Psi_N(x_1^{b_1}) = \wp^{-1}(h_{b_1+1} s_\mu)$$

which implies (9.7).

We will now show that

$$\tilde{\Psi}_N(s_{(a_1; \lambda)}) = s_{\lambda \cup (a_1+1)} \tag{9.8}$$

In the  $m = 1$  case, every  $m$ -partition is dominant and we obtain from (6.10) and (6.6) that

$$k_{(b_1; \mu)} = \sum_{(a_1; \lambda)} s_{(a_1; \lambda)}$$

where the sum is over all  $(a_1; \lambda)$ 's such that  $(\lambda \cup (a_1))/\mu$  is a horizontal  $b_1$ -strip whose entries all lie within the first  $a_1$  columns. Therefore, it follows that

$$\tilde{\Psi}_N(k_{(b_1; \mu)}) = h_{b_1+1} s_\mu = \sum_{\nu} s_\nu = \sum_{(a_1; \lambda)} \tilde{\Psi}_N(s_{(a_1; \lambda)})$$

where the first sum is over all  $\nu$ 's such that  $\nu/\mu$  is a horizontal  $(b_1 + 1)$ -strip. Since the  $k_{(b_1; \mu)}$ 's form a basis of  $R_1$ , it suffices to prove that  $\tilde{\Psi}_N(s_{(a_1; \lambda)}) = s_{\lambda \cup (a_1+1)}$  implies that  $\tilde{\Psi}_N(k_{(b_1; \mu)}) = h_{b_1+1} s_\mu$ . We will see that it is indeed the case. We have

$$\sum_{(a_1; \lambda)} \tilde{\Psi}_N(s_{(a_1; \lambda)}) = \sum_{(a_1; \lambda)} s_{\lambda \cup (a_1+1)}$$

where the sum in the second sum can be thought as being over all  $(a_1; \lambda)$ 's such that  $(\lambda \cup (a_1 + 1))/\mu$  is a horizontal  $(b_1 + 1)$ -strip whose entries all lie within the first  $a_1 + 1$  columns (and including a cell in column  $a_1 + 1$ ). This implies that the map  $\nu \mapsto \lambda \cup (a_1 + 1)$ , where  $a_1 + 1$  is the rightmost column in  $\nu/\mu$ , is an obvious bijection between the  $\nu$ 's in  $\sum_{\nu} s_{\nu}$  and the  $(a_1; \lambda)$ 's in  $\sum_{(a_1; \lambda)} s_{\lambda \cup (a_1 + 1)}$ . Hence  $\tilde{\Psi}_N(s_{(a_1; \lambda)}) = s_{\lambda \cup (a_1 + 1)}$  implies  $\tilde{\Psi}_N(k_{(b_1; \mu)}) = h_{b_1 + 1} s_{\mu}$  and (9.8) holds.

Applying  $\tilde{\Psi}_N$  on both sides of

$$\wp(J_{(a_1; \lambda)}) = \sum_{(b_1; \mu)} K_{(b_1; \mu)(a_1; \lambda)}(q, t) s_{(b_1; \mu)}$$

we thus get from Proposition 45 that

$$\wp(J_{\lambda \cup (a_1 + 1)}) = \sum_{\nu} K_{\nu, \lambda \cup (a_1 + 1)}(q, t) s_{\nu} = \sum_{(b_1; \mu)} K_{(b_1; \mu)(a_1; \lambda)}(q, t) s_{\mu \cup (b_1 + 1)}$$

Equating the coefficients of  $s_{\nu}$  on both sides, the proposition then follows straightforwardly.  $\square$

## 10. NON-SYMMETRIC MACDONALD POLYNOMIALS AS $m$ -SYMMETRIC FUNCTIONS AND THE LARGE $m$ LIMIT

Suppose that  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\ell}, 0^{N-\ell})$  is a composition of length  $\ell$ . Then

$$T_i E_{\eta}(x; q, t) = t E_{\eta}(x; q, t)$$

for all  $i > \ell$  since  $\eta_i = \eta_{i+1} = 0$  in that case. Hence,  $\mathcal{S}_m^t E_{\eta}(x; q, t)$  is equal to  $E_{\eta}(x; q, t)$  times a constant whenever  $m \geq \ell$ . We thus get that if  $\Lambda = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\ell}, 0^{m-\ell}; \emptyset)$  then

$$P_{\Lambda}(x; q, t) = E_{\eta}(x; q, t)$$

since the coefficient of  $x^{\eta}$  is equal to 1 in both functions. That is, when  $m$  is large enough, a non-symmetric Macdonald polynomial is also an  $m$ -Macdonald polynomial. In this case, the integral form of the non-symmetric Macdonald polynomial,  $J_{\eta}(x; q, t) = c_{(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\ell}; \emptyset)}(q, t) E_{\eta}(x; q, t)$ , has the following expansion when considered as an  $m$ -symmetric function:

$$\wp(J_{\eta}(x; q, t)) = \sum_{\Omega} K_{\Omega(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\ell}, 0^{m-\ell}; \emptyset)}(q, t) s_{\Omega}(x; t)$$

As we have seen in Proposition 43, by increasing the value of  $m$ , one can move to the non-symmetric side the entries on the symmetric side of  $\Lambda$  and  $\Omega$ . We can also use this idea in the other direction. Let  $\omega$  be a composition of arbitrary length  $\ell'$ . Taking  $m \geq \max\{\ell, \ell'\}$ , we can define  $K_{\omega\eta}(q, t)$  as

$$K_{\omega\eta}(q, t) = \left( \begin{array}{cccccccc|c} \eta_1 & \cdots & \eta_{\ell} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \emptyset \\ \omega_1 & \cdots & \omega_{\ell} & \omega_{\ell+1} & \cdots & \omega_{\ell'} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \emptyset \end{array} \right)$$

where the number of columns on the non-symmetric side is  $m$  (we have supposed that  $\ell' > \ell$  only for the sake of illustrating the general behavior). Note that this definition does not depend on  $m$  because we can add any number of columns of 0's to the right without changing the value of  $K_{\omega\eta}(q, t)$  by Proposition 43(2). Now, from Proposition 43(2)(3)(4), we also have that

$$K_{\omega\eta}(q, t) = \left( \begin{array}{cccccccc|c} \eta_1 & \cdots & \eta_{\ell} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \emptyset \\ \omega_1 & \cdots & \omega_{\ell} & \nu_1 & \cdots & \nu_{\ell(\nu)} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \emptyset \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} \eta_1 & \cdots & \eta_{\ell} & \emptyset \\ \omega_1 & \cdots & \omega_{\ell} & \nu \end{array} \right) = K_{\Omega^{\omega}(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\ell}; \emptyset)}(q, t)$$

where  $\nu = (\omega_{\ell+1}, \dots, \omega_{\ell'})^+$  is the partition obtained by reordering the entries of  $(\omega_{\ell+1}, \dots, \omega_{\ell'})$ , and where  $\Omega^{\omega} = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{\ell}; \nu)$ . For a given  $\eta$ , there is thus only a finite number of distinct coefficients  $K_{\omega\eta}(q, t)$  (corresponding to the number of  $\ell$ -partitions of degree  $|\eta|$ ). We also have that if  $m \geq \ell + |\eta|$ , then every  $K_{\Omega(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\ell}; \emptyset)}$  is equal to a given  $K_{\omega\eta}(q, t)$  such that  $\ell(\omega) \leq m$ . As such, all the information is contained in the  $K_{\omega\eta}(q, t)$ 's such that  $\ell(\omega) \leq \ell + |\eta|$ .

Doing the expansion in the  $m$ -symmetric world (with  $m \geq \ell + |\eta|$ ), we obtain

$$\wp(J_{\eta}(x; q, t)) = \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m} K_{\omega\eta}(q, t) s_{(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m; \emptyset)}(x; t) \quad \text{mod } \mathcal{L}_m \quad (10.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_m$  is the linear span of  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions indexed by  $m$ -partitions whose symmetric side is not empty. From the discussion above, there is no loss of information in working modulo  $\mathcal{L}_m$ , as the full  $m$ -symmetric expansion can be recovered from the r.h.s. in (10.1). From Proposition 32, we also get  $s_{(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m; \emptyset)}(x; t) = H_{\omega}(x; t)$ . We thus have the following positivity conjecture on non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials.

**Conjecture 48.** *Let  $\eta$  be a composition of length  $\ell$ . Then, for  $m \geq \ell$ , we have that*

$$\wp(J_\eta(x; q, t)) = \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m} K_{\omega\eta}(q, t) H_\omega(x; t) \pmod{\mathcal{L}_m}$$

with  $K_{\omega\eta}(q, t) \in \mathbb{N}[q, t]$ .

**Remark 49.** *As discussed above, there is no loss of information in working modulo  $\mathcal{L}_m$  when  $m \geq \ell + |\eta|$ . Working modulo  $\mathcal{L}_m$  also has the advantage of allowing to compute the coefficients  $K_{\omega\eta}(q, t)$  without having to do the full expansion in the  $m$ -symmetric Schur function basis. Indeed, we can first expand  $\wp(J_\eta(x; q, t))$  in the  $k_\Omega(x; t)$  basis and then use the relation*

$$k_\Omega(x; t) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m} D_{(\mathbf{a}; \emptyset)\Omega}(t) H_{\mathbf{a}}(x; t) \pmod{\mathcal{L}_m} \quad (10.2)$$

which is obtained from (6.10) by simply killing the terms involving  $m$ -symmetric Schur functions indexed by  $m$ -partitions whose symmetric part is not empty (observe that Proposition 32 allows us to then change the remaining  $s_{(\mathbf{a}; \emptyset)}(x; t)$ 's into  $H_{\mathbf{a}}(x; t)$ 's).

## 11. CONJECTURES ON THE COEFFICIENTS $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$

It does not appear that a perfect analog of Proposition 46 exists when  $m > 0$ . We can however formulate the following conjecture which states that a certain portion of the coefficient  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  can be recovered from coefficients of lower degree and larger  $m$ .

**Conjecture 50.** *For any entry  $\lambda_j$  in  $\lambda$ , we have that*

$$t^{\#\{k \mid \lambda_j \leq a_k\}} \left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} a_1 & \cdots & a_m & \lambda \\ b_1 & \cdots & b_m & \mu \end{array} \right) - \sum_{\mu_i} t^{\#\{k \mid \mu_i \leq b_k\}} \left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} \lambda_j - 1 & a_1 & \cdots & a_m \\ \mu_i - 1 & b_1 & \cdots & b_m \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{c} \lambda \setminus \lambda_j \\ \mu \setminus \mu_i \end{array} \right) \in \mathbb{N}[q, t]$$

where the sum is over all distinct entries  $\mu_i$  in  $\mu$ .

The next conjecture tells us how Proposition 43(4) can be somehow extended when  $a_i \neq a_{i+1}$ .

**Conjecture 51.** *For a fixed  $i < m$ , let  $\tilde{\Omega} = s_i\Omega$  and*

$$A_i = \frac{\varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i)}(q, t)}{\varepsilon_\Lambda^{(i+1)}(q, t)} = q^{a_i - a_{i+1}} t^{r_\Lambda(i+1) - r_\Lambda(i)}$$

Then, if  $b_i > b_{i+1}$ , we have that

$$\frac{A_i t^{-1} K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) - K_{\tilde{\Omega}\Lambda}(q, t)}{A_i t^{-1} - 1} \in \mathbb{N}[q, t] \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) - K_{\tilde{\Omega}\Lambda}(q, t)}{1 - A_i t^{-1}} \in \mathbb{N}[q, t] \quad (11.1)$$

Note that if  $b_i < b_{i+1}$ , we only need to switch  $\Omega$  and  $\tilde{\Omega}$  in the relations.

Assuming that Conjecture 37 holds, the rule essentially states that in order to obtain  $K_{\tilde{\Omega}\Lambda}(q, t)$  from  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$ , one simply needs to multiply each monomial in  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  by either  $A_i t^{-1}$  or 1. Equivalently, in a given combinatorial interpretation using standard tableaux of the coefficients  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$ , the statistic associated to a given standard tableau would either gain  $A_i t^{-1}$  or remain invariant when going from  $\Lambda$  to  $\tilde{\Lambda}$ . This phenomenon is very reminiscent of Butler's rule on  $(q, t)$ -Kostka coefficients which relates the coefficients  $K_{\mu\lambda}(q, t)$  and  $K_{\mu\nu}(q, t)$ , where  $\nu$  is a partition that can be obtained from  $\lambda$  by moving exactly one box from a given position to another.

The next conjecture is similar to the previous one. It relates this time the entries  $K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t)$  and  $K_{\tilde{\Omega}\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)$ .

**Conjecture 52.** *For a fixed  $i < m$ , let  $\tilde{\Lambda} = s_i\Lambda$  and  $\tilde{\Omega} = s_i\Omega$ .*

(I) *If  $a_i > a_{i+1}$  and  $b_i > b_{i+1}$ , we have that*

$$\frac{t K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) - K_{\tilde{\Omega}\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)}{t - 1} \in \mathbb{N}[q, t] \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) - K_{\tilde{\Omega}\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)}{1 - t} \in \mathbb{N}[q, t] \quad (11.2)$$

(II) *If  $a_i > a_{i+1}$  and  $b_i < b_{i+1}$ , we have that*

$$\frac{t^2 K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) - K_{\tilde{\Omega}\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)}{t - 1} \in \mathbb{N}[q, t] \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{t K_{\Omega\Lambda}(q, t) - K_{\tilde{\Omega}\tilde{\Lambda}}(q, t)}{1 - t} \in \mathbb{N}[q, t] \quad (11.3)$$

Note again that if  $a_i < a_{i+1}$ , we simply need to interchange the roles of  $\Lambda$  and  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  in the relations.

**Acknowledgments.** We thank P. Mathieu and J. Morse for their useful comments. We also thank D. Orr for letting us know about the work contained in [12], and we are grateful to B. Goodberry for confirming that the integral form in [12] was the same as ours. This research was supported by the Fondo Nacional de Desarrollo Científico y Tecnológico de Chile (FONDECYT) Regular Grant #1210688.

#### APPENDIX A. SOME ADDITIONAL PROPERTIES OF THE $m$ -SYMMETRIC MACDONALD POLYNOMIALS

We prove in this appendix a few properties of the  $m$ -Symmetric Macdonald polynomials whose proofs were too technical to include in the main presentation. From now on, we will always work with a finite number  $N$  of variables. As such  $x$  will denote the variables  $(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ . Recall that  $x_{(i)}$  stands for  $(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_N)$ .

The following lemma on non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials is probably already known. The version given in [11] had stronger conditions but the proof is the same. We reproduce it for completeness.

**Lemma 53.** *Let  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)$  be a composition such that  $\eta_i = 0$  and  $\eta_j \neq 0$  whenever  $j > i$ . Then*

$$E_\eta(x) \Big|_{x_i=0} = E_{\eta_{(i)}}(x_{(i)}) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and

$$E_\eta(x_1, \dots, x_N) \Big|_{x_j=0} = 0 \quad \text{if } j > i. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $\eta_{(i)} = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{i-1}, \eta_{i+1}, \dots, \eta_N)$  stands for the composition  $\eta$  without its  $i$ -th entry.

*Proof.* We proceed by induction. We know from (2.7) that

$$E_\eta(x) \Big|_{x_N=0} = E_{\eta_{(N)}}(x_{(N)}) \quad \text{when } i = N \quad (\text{A.3})$$

while

$$E_\eta(x) \Big|_{x_N=0} = 0 \quad \text{when } i < N \text{ and } j = N \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Now, suppose by induction that

$$E_\eta(x) \Big|_{x_k=0} = E_{\eta_{(k)}}(x_{(k)}) \quad \text{when } i = k \quad (\text{A.5})$$

while

$$E_\eta(x) \Big|_{x_k=0} = 0 \quad \text{when } i < k \text{ and } j = k \quad (\text{A.6})$$

We thus need to prove that (A.5) and (A.6) still hold when  $k$  is replaced by  $k-1$ . We first consider the case (A.5). Suppose that  $i = k-1$ . Since  $\eta_{k-1} = 0$  and  $\eta_k \neq 0$  by hypothesis, we have from (2.8) that

$$T_{k-1}E_\eta(x) = c_\eta E_\eta(x) + tE_{s_{k-1}\eta}(x), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where  $c_\eta$  is an irrelevant constant. By definition of  $T_{k-1}$ , we also obtain

$$T_{k-1}E_\eta(x) = tE_\eta(x) + \frac{tx_{k-1} - x_k}{x_{k-1} - x_k} (E_\eta(x_1, \dots, x_{k-2}, x_k, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_N) - E_\eta(x)). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Since  $i = k-1$ , we have by hypothesis that  $E_\eta(x) \Big|_{x_k=0} = 0$  and that

$$E_{s_{k-1}\eta}(x) \Big|_{x_k=0} = E_{\eta_{(k-1)}}(x_{(k)}). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Equating the r.h.s. of (A.7) and (A.8), we thus get after letting  $x_k = 0$  that

$$tE_\eta(x_1, \dots, x_{k-2}, 0, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_N) = tE_{\eta_{(k-1)}}(x_{(k)}) \quad (\text{A.10})$$

which, after the change of variables  $x_{k-1} \mapsto x_k$ , is equivalent to

$$E_\eta(x) \Big|_{x_{k-1}=0} = E_{\eta_{(k-1)}}(x_{(k-1)}). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Hence (A.5) holds when  $k$  is replaced by  $k-1$ .

We now prove that (A.6) holds when  $k$  is replaced by  $k-1$ . Since  $i < j = k-1$ , we have by hypothesis that  $\eta_{k-1} \neq 0$  and  $\eta_k \neq 0$ . We thus obtain by induction that

$$E_\eta(x) \Big|_{x_k=0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad E_{s_{k-1}\eta}(x) \Big|_{x_k=0} = 0. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Therefore, after again equating the r.h.s. of (A.7) and (A.8) and letting  $x_k = 0$ , we get

$$tE_\eta(x_1, \dots, x_{k-2}, 0, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_N) = 0. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

But, after the change of variables  $x_{k-1} \mapsto x_k$ , this amounts to  $E_\eta(x)|_{x_{k-1}=0} = 0$ . □

**Lemma 54.** *If  $m + 1 < i < N$  and  $\eta_i > \eta_{i+1}$ , then*

$$\mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_\eta = \frac{(1-tA_i)}{t(1-A_i)} \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{s_i \eta} \tag{A.14}$$

where  $A_i = \bar{\eta}_i / \bar{\eta}_{i+1}$ .

*Proof.* For  $i > m + 1$ , we have  $\mathcal{S}_{m+1}^t T_i = t \mathcal{S}_{m+1}^t$  (this is similar to (2.11)). Hence, from (2.8), we get

$$t \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_\eta = \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t T_i E_\eta = \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t \left( \frac{(t-1)}{(1-A_i^{-1})} E_\eta + \frac{(1-tA_i)(1-t^{-1}A_i)}{(1-A_i)^2} E_{s_i \eta} \right) \tag{A.15}$$

Comparing the l.h.s and the r.h.s of (A.15), we then obtain

$$\frac{t(1-t^{-1}A_i)}{(1-A_i)} \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_\eta = \frac{(1-tA_i)(1-t^{-1}A_i)}{(1-A_i)^2} \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{s_i \eta}$$

which readily implies our claim. □

**Lemma 55.** *Suppose that  $\eta_{m+2} = \eta_{m+3} = \dots = \eta_{m+n+1} = 0$  (with  $n \geq 1$ ) are the only zero entries in  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)$  to the right of  $\eta_{m+1} > 0$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_\eta(x)|_{x_{m+1}=0} = \frac{A_{m+1}(1-t^n)}{t(1-t^{n-1}A_{m+1})} \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{\eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+1)}) \tag{A.16}$$

where  $A_{m+1} = \bar{\eta}_{m+1} / \bar{\eta}_{m+2}$ .

*Proof.* From (2.8), we get

$$T_{m+1} E_\eta|_{x_{m+1}=0} = \frac{(t-1)}{(1-A_{m+1}^{-1})} E_\eta|_{x_{m+1}=0} + \frac{(1-tA_{m+1})(1-t^{-1}A_{m+1})}{(1-A_{m+1})^2} E_{s_{m+1} \eta}|_{x_{m+1}=0}$$

But we also have directly using (2.1) that

$$T_{m+1} E_\eta|_{x_{m+1}=0} = (t-1) E_\eta|_{x_{m+1}=0} + E_\eta|_{(x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}) \mapsto (x_{m+2}, 0)}$$

The previous two equations then imply that

$$\frac{(1-t)}{(1-A_{m+1})} E_\eta|_{x_{m+1}=0} = E_\eta|_{(x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}) \mapsto (x_{m+2}, 0)} - \frac{(1-tA_{m+1})(1-t^{-1}A_{m+1})}{(1-A_{m+1})^2} E_{s_{m+1} \eta}|_{x_{m+1}=0} \tag{A.17}$$

First, suppose that  $n = 1$  (that is, that there is only one zero entry to the right of  $\eta_{m+1}$ ). From Lemma 53, we have

$$E_\eta|_{(x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}) \mapsto (x_{m+2}, 0)} = E_{\eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+1)}) \quad \text{and} \quad E_{s_{m+1} \eta}|_{x_{m+1}=0} = E_{\eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+1)})$$

Using those equalities in (A.17) gives after some simplifications

$$\frac{(1-t)}{(1-A_{m+1})} E_\eta|_{x_{m+1}=0} = \frac{A_{m+1}(1-t)^2}{t(1-A_{m+1})^2} E_{\eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+1)}) \tag{A.18}$$

and it is then immediate that (A.16) holds when  $n = 1$ . When  $n > 1$ , we need to work with  $\mathcal{S}_{m+1}^t$  on the left from the start to prove our claim. Using (A.14) again and again (and realizing that each time  $\eta_{m+1}$  is switched with the zero to its right, the corresponding factor  $A_{m+1}$  is multiplied by  $t$ ), we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{s_{m+1} \eta}|_{x_{m+1}=0} = \frac{(1-t^2 A_{m+1}) \dots (1-t^n A_{m+1})}{t^{n-1} (1-t A_{m+1}) \dots (1-t^{n-1} A_{m+1})} \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{s_{m+n} \dots s_{m+1} \eta}|_{x_{m+1}=0}$$

Lemma 53 gives

$$E_{s_{m+n} \dots s_{m+1} \eta}|_{x_{m+n}=0} = E_{(s_{m+n-1} \dots s_{m+1} \eta)_{(m+n)}}(x_{(m+n)}) = E_{s_{m+n-1} \dots s_{m+1} \eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+n)})$$

which implies that

$$E_{s_{m+n} \dots s_{m+1} \eta}|_{x_{m+1}=0} = E_{s_{m+n-1} \dots s_{m+1} \eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+1)})$$

since  $E_{s_{m+n} \dots s_{m+1} \eta}$  is symmetric in the variables  $x_{m+1}, \dots, x_{m+n}$  by Remark 1. We thus obtain

$$\mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{s_{m+1} \eta}|_{x_{m+1}=0} = \frac{(1-t^2 A_{m+1}) \dots (1-t^n A_{m+1})}{t^{n-1} (1-t A_{m+1}) \dots (1-t^{n-1} A_{m+1})} \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{s_{m+n-1} \dots s_{m+1} \eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+1)})$$

Now using (A.14) in the other direction (with a shift in  $t$  due to the loss of a zero to the left), we get

$$\mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{s_{m+1}\eta} \Big|_{x_{m+1}=0} = \frac{(1 - A_{m+1})(1 - t^n A_{m+1})}{(1 - t A_{m+1})(1 - t^{n-1} A_{m+1})} \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{\eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+1)})$$

On the other hand, using again Lemma 53 yields

$$E_\eta \Big|_{x_{m+n+1}=0} = E_{\eta_{(m+n+1)}}(x_{(m+n+1)})$$

which implies this time that

$$E_\eta \Big|_{x_{m+2}=0} = E_{\eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+2)})$$

given that  $E_\eta$  is symmetric in the variables  $x_{m+2}$  up to  $x_{m+n+1}$  and that  $\eta_{(m+n+1)} = \eta_{(m+2)}$ . Hence

$$E_\eta \Big|_{(x_{m+1}, x_{m+2}) \mapsto (x_{m+2}, 0)} = E_{\eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+2)}) \Big|_{x_{m+1} \mapsto x_{m+2}} = E_{\eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+1)})$$

Equation (A.17) then becomes

$$\frac{(1-t)}{(1-A_{m+1})} \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_\eta \Big|_{x_{m+1}=0} = \left( 1 - \frac{(1-t^n A_{m+1})(1-t^{-1} A_{m+1})}{(1-t^{n-1} A_{m+1})(1-A_{m+1})} \right) \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{\eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+1)})$$

which, after some straightforward manipulations, yields

$$\frac{(1-t)}{(1-A_{m+1})} \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_\eta \Big|_{x_{m+1}=0} = \frac{A_{m+1}(1-t^n)(1-t)}{t(1-t^{n-1} A_{m+1})(1-A_{m+1})} \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{\eta_{(m+2)}}(x_{(m+1)})$$

The claim (A.16) then follows after performing the obvious cancellations.  $\square$

**Proposition 56.** For  $\Lambda = (a_1, \dots, a_m; \lambda)$  and  $\Lambda^0 = (a_1, \dots, a_m, 0; \lambda)$ , we have that

$$c_{\Lambda^0}(q, t) P_{\Lambda^0}(x; q, t) \Big|_{x_{m+1}=0} = c_\Lambda(q, t) P_\Lambda(x_{(m+1)}; q, t)$$

where the number of variables  $N$  in  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$  is such that  $N > \ell(\Lambda)$ .

*Proof.* The extra circle  $m+1$  at the bottom of  $\Lambda^0$  does not affect any of the hook-lengths, from which we get that  $c_{\Lambda^0}(q, t) = c_\Lambda(q, t)$ . It is also easy to see that  $u_{\Lambda^0, N}(t) = u_{\Lambda, N-1}(t)$ . From the definition of the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials, we thus have left to prove that

$$\mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{\eta_{\Lambda^0, N}}(x; q, t) \Big|_{x_{m+1}=0} = \mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t E_{\eta_{\Lambda, N-1}}(x_{(m+1)}; q, t)$$

Suppose that in  $\eta_{\Lambda^0, N}$  there are zeroes in entries  $m+1$  up to  $m+n$ . From Lemma 53, we obtain that

$$E_{\eta_{\Lambda^0, N}}(x; q, t) \Big|_{x_{m+n}=0} = E_{\eta_{\Lambda, N-1}}(x_{(m+n)}; q, t)$$

which implies that

$$E_{\eta_{\Lambda^0, N}}(x; q, t) \Big|_{x_{m+1}=0} = E_{\eta_{\Lambda, N-1}}(x_{(m+1)}; q, t)$$

since  $E_{\eta_{\Lambda^0, N}}(x; q, t)$  is symmetric in the variables  $x_{m+1}, \dots, x_{m+n}$  by Remark 1. The proposition then follows given that  $\mathcal{S}_{m+1,N}^t$  does not depend on  $x_{m+1}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 57.** For  $\Lambda = (a_1, \dots, a_m; \lambda)$  and  $\Lambda^\diamond = (a_1, \dots, a_m, \lambda_j; \lambda \setminus \lambda_j)$ , we have that

$$c_{\Lambda^\diamond}(q, t) P_{\Lambda^\diamond}(x; q, t) \Big|_{x_{m+1}=0} = q^{\lambda_j} t^{\#\{i \mid a_i < \lambda_j\}} c_\Lambda(q, t) P_\Lambda(x_{(m+1)}; q, t)$$

where the number of variables  $N$  in  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$  is such that  $N > \ell(\Lambda)$ .

*Proof.* We have that

$$\frac{c_{\Lambda^\diamond}(q, t)}{c_\Lambda(q, t)} = \prod_{s \in \lambda_j} \frac{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)+1} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1 + \circ_\Lambda(s)}}{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1}} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where the product is over all boxes  $s$  in the row corresponding to  $\lambda_j$  in the diagram of  $\Lambda$  (the highest row of size  $\lambda_j$  that does not end with a circle in the diagram of  $\Lambda$ ), and where  $\circ_\Lambda(s)$  is equal to the number of circles in the column of  $s$  (the new circle  $m+1$  at the end of the row of size  $\lambda_j$  will always be larger than any circle in the column of  $s$ ).

We also have that the normalization  $u_{\Lambda, N}$  in (4.2) is such that

$$\frac{u_{\Lambda, N-1}(t)}{u_{\Lambda^\circ, N}(t)} = \frac{(1-t^{-n_\lambda(\lambda_j)})}{(1-t^{-n})} = \frac{(1-t^{n_\lambda(\lambda_j)})}{t^{n_\lambda(\lambda_j)-n}(1-t^n)} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Let  $\nu = \lambda \setminus \lambda_j$  and let  $\hat{\lambda}$  be the partition obtained from  $\lambda$  by removing all the parts larger than  $\lambda_j$ . Using (A.16), we obtain that

$$\mathcal{S}_{m+1, N}^t E_{\eta_{\Lambda^\circ, N}}(x; q, t) \Big|_{x_{m+1}=0} = \frac{A_{m+1}(1-t^n)}{t(1-t^{n-1}A_{m+1})} \mathcal{S}_{m+1, N}^t E_{a_1, \dots, a_m, \lambda_j, 0^{n-1}, \nu_{\ell(\nu)}, \dots, \nu_1}(x^{(m+1)}; q, t)$$

We now need to use (A.14) again and again to move  $\lambda_j$  to the right to obtain the composition

$$(a_1, \dots, a_m, 0^{n-1}, \lambda_{\lambda(\nu)}, \dots, \lambda_1) = \eta_{\Lambda, N-1}$$

Let  $f_\Lambda(q, t)$  be the constant that appears in this process, that is,

$$\mathcal{S}_{m+1, N}^t E_{a_1, \dots, a_m, \lambda_1, 0^{n-1}, \nu_{\ell(\nu)}, \dots, \nu_1}(x^{(m+1)}; q, t) = f_\Lambda(q, t) \mathcal{S}_{m+1, N}^t E_{\eta_{\Lambda, N-1}}(x^{(m+1)}; q, t)$$

Taking (A.19) and (A.20) into consideration and using  $A_{m+1} = q^{\lambda_j} t^{\#\{i | a_i < \lambda_j\} + \ell(\hat{\lambda})}$ , the proposition will follow from the definition of the  $m$ -symmetric Macdonald polynomials if we can prove that

$$\left( \prod_{s \in \lambda_j} \frac{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)+1} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1 + \circ_\Lambda(s)}}{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1}} \right) \frac{q^{\lambda_j} t^{\#\{i | a_i < \lambda_j\} + \ell(\hat{\lambda}) - n_\lambda(\lambda_j) + n - 1} (1 - t^{n_\lambda(\lambda_j)})}{(1 - q^{\lambda_j} t^{\#\{i | a_i < \lambda_j\} + \ell(\hat{\lambda}) + n - 1})} f_\Lambda(q, t) = q^{\lambda_1} t^\#$$

where we use the shorthand  $\#$  for  $\#\{i | a_i < \lambda_j\}$ . This amounts to showing that

$$f_\Lambda(q, t) = \left( \prod_{s \in \lambda_j} \frac{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1}}{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)+1} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1 + \circ_\Lambda(s)}} \right) \frac{(1 - q^{\lambda_j} t^{\#\{i | a_i < \lambda_j\} + \ell(\hat{\lambda}) + n - 1})}{t^{\ell(\hat{\lambda}) - n_\lambda(\lambda_j) + n - 1} (1 - t^{n_\lambda(\lambda_j)})} \quad (\text{A.21})$$

We proceed by induction on the number of exchanges that need to be done in order to move  $\lambda_j$  to the right.

If there are no exchanges to do, we need to show that  $f_\Lambda(q, t) = 1$ . In this case, we have  $n = 1$  and  $\lambda = (\lambda_j^{n_\lambda(\lambda_j)})$ . Moreover, in the diagram of  $\Lambda$ , all the rows that are shorter than  $\lambda_j$  end with a circle. Hence, if there is a cell  $s'$  immediately to the right of  $s$  in the row of  $\lambda_j$ , we get

$$\frac{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1}}{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s')+1} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s')+1 + \circ_\Lambda(s)}} = 1$$

The first product in  $f_\Lambda(q, t)$  thus simplifies to

$$\prod_{s \in \lambda_j} \frac{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1}}{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)+1} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1 + \circ_\Lambda(s)}} = \frac{(1 - t^{n_\lambda(\lambda_j)})}{(1 - q^{\lambda_j} t^{\#\{i | a_i < \lambda_j\} + n_\lambda(\lambda_j)})}$$

From (A.21), this yields that  $f_\Lambda(q, t) = 1$  since  $n = 1$  and  $n_\lambda(\lambda_j) = \ell(\hat{\lambda})$ .

We now consider the general case. First suppose that  $n = 1$  (the case in which there are no more 0's with which to do an exchange). The first exchange that needs to be done is with a circle in a row of size  $\lambda_\ell = \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}$ . From (A.14), it gives rise to the term

$$\frac{1 - q^{\lambda_j - \lambda_\ell} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s')+2 + \circ_\Lambda(s')}}{t(1 - q^{\lambda_j - \lambda_\ell} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s')+1 + \circ_\Lambda(s')})} \quad (\text{A.22})$$

where  $s'$  is the cell in the row of  $\lambda_j$  and column  $\lambda_j - \lambda_\ell + 1$ . The remaining exchanges are equal by induction to  $f_\Omega(q, t)$ , where  $\Omega$  is  $\Lambda$  with the row corresponding to  $\lambda_\ell$  now having a circle. Considering that  $n = 1$ , we obtain

$$f_\Omega(q, t) = \left( \prod_{s \in \lambda_1} \frac{1 - q^{a_\Omega(s)} t^{\ell_\Omega(s)+1}}{1 - q^{a_\Omega(s)+1} t^{\ell_\Omega(s)+1 + \circ_\Omega(s)}} \right) \frac{(1 - q^{\lambda_j} t^{\#\{i | a_i < \lambda_j\} + \ell(\hat{\lambda})})}{t^{\ell(\hat{\lambda}) - 1 - n_\lambda(\lambda_j)} (1 - t^{n_\lambda(\lambda_j)})} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

where we used the fact that, when compared to  $\Lambda$ ,  $\#$  increased by 1 while  $\ell(\lambda)$  decreased by one. We thus have to show that the product of (A.22) and (A.23) gives (A.21) in the case  $n = 1$ . After performing easy cancellations, this amounts to showing that

$$\frac{1 - q^{\lambda_j - \lambda_\ell} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s')+2 + \circ_\Lambda(s')}}{1 - q^{\lambda_j - \lambda_\ell} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s')+1 + \circ_\Lambda(s')}} \left( \prod_{s \in \lambda_1} \frac{1 - q^{a_\Omega(s)} t^{\ell_\Omega(s)+1}}{1 - q^{a_\Omega(s)+1} t^{\ell_\Omega(s)+1 + \circ_\Omega(s)}} \right) = \left( \prod_{s \in \lambda_1} \frac{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1}}{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)+1} t^{\ell_\Lambda(s)+1 + \circ_\Lambda(s)}} \right)$$

The only difference in the products over the cells  $s$  is when  $s = s'$ , where  $s'$  lies in the column of the extra circle in  $\Omega$  (in column  $\lambda_j - \lambda_\ell + 1$ ). Hence, we need to show that

$$\frac{1 - q^{\lambda_j - \lambda_\ell} t^{l_\Lambda(s') + 2 + \circ_\Lambda(s')}}{1 - q^{\lambda_j - \lambda_\ell} t^{l_\Lambda(s') + 1 + \circ_\Lambda(s')}} \frac{1 - q^{a_\Omega(s')} t^{l_\Omega(s') + 1}}{1 - q^{a_\Omega(s') + 1} t^{l_\Omega(s') + 1 + \circ_\Omega(s')}} = \frac{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s')} t^{l_\Lambda(s') + 1}}{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s') + 1} t^{l_\Lambda(s') + 1 + \circ_\Lambda(s')}}.$$

Using  $a_\Lambda(s') = a_\Omega(s') = \lambda_j - \lambda_\ell - 1$ ,  $l_\Lambda(s') = l_\Omega(s')$ , and  $\circ_\Omega(s') = \circ_\Lambda(s') + 1$ , the result is seen to hold.

Finally, in the case  $n > 1$ , the proof is exactly as in the previous case except that  $s'$  is now in the first column,  $\lambda_\ell$  is replaced by 0, and the quantities  $(1 - q^{\lambda_j} t^{\#\ell(\lambda)})$  and  $t^{\ell(\hat{\lambda}) - n_\lambda(\lambda_j)}$  are replaced by  $(1 - q^{\lambda_j} t^{\#\ell(\hat{\lambda}) + n - 1})$  and  $t^{\ell(\hat{\lambda}) - n_\lambda(\lambda_j) + n - 1}$  respectively.  $\square$

We will finish this appendix with a proof Proposition 45. Recall that its main statement says that for any  $N$  and any  $m \geq 1$ , we have that

$$\Psi_N J_\Lambda(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t) = t^{-\#\{2 \leq j \leq m \mid a_j \leq a_1\}} J_{\Lambda^\square}(x_1, \dots, x_N; q, t)$$

where  $\Lambda^\square = ((a_2, \dots, a_m); \lambda \cup (a_1 + 1))$ .

*Proof of Proposition 45.* We first establish that

$$\Psi_N \mathcal{S}_{m,N} = (1 - t) \mathcal{S}_{m-1,N} \Phi_q \tag{A.24}$$

for  $m \geq 1$ . From the braid relations, it is easy to see that

$$(T_{N-1} \cdots T_1) T_i = T_{i-1} (T_{N-1} \cdots T_1)$$

for all  $i = 2, \dots, N - 1$ . Hence, for  $m \geq 1$ , we obtain

$$\Phi_q \mathcal{S}_{m,N} = \mathcal{S}_{m-1,N-1} \Phi_q$$

where  $\Phi_q$  is defined in (2.9). It is then immediate from (2.12) that (A.24) holds.

Now, given that by definition

$$J_\Lambda = \frac{c_\Lambda(q, t)}{u_{\Lambda,N}(t)} \mathcal{S}_{m,N} E_{\Lambda,N}$$

we have to show that

$$\Psi_N \mathcal{S}_{m,N} E_{\eta_{\Lambda,N}} = t^{-\#\{2 \leq j \leq m \mid a_j \leq a_1\}} \frac{c_{\Lambda^\square}(q, t)}{c_\Lambda(q, t)} \frac{u_{\Lambda,N}(t)}{u_{\Lambda^\square,N}(t)} \mathcal{S}_{m-1,N} E_{\eta_{\Lambda^\square,N}} \tag{A.25}$$

When the circle indexed by a 1 in the diagram of  $\Lambda$  becomes a square, it will only change the contribution in  $c_\Lambda(q, t)$  of the cells in the column of the circle indexed by a 1 that lie in rows that do not end with a circle (otherwise the cell indexed by a 1 already contributes to the leg-length). Hence, also considering the change in the symmetric rows of length  $a_1 + 1$ , we obtain

$$\frac{c_{\Lambda^\square}(q, t)}{c_\Lambda(q, t)} = \left( \prod_{s \in \text{col}(1)} \frac{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)} t^{l_\Lambda(s) + 2}}{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)} t^{l_\Lambda(s) + 1}} \right) (1 - t^{n_\lambda(a_1 + 1) + 1}) \tag{A.26}$$

where the product is over the cells in the column of the circle indexed by 1 that lie in rows that do not end with a circle. We also have

$$\frac{u_{\Lambda,N}(t)}{u_{\Lambda^\square,N}(t)} = \left( \frac{1 - t^{-1}}{1 - t^{-n_\lambda(a_1 + 1) - 1}} \right) \frac{t^{(N-m)(N-m-1)/2}}{t^{(N-m+1)(N-m)/2}} = \left( \frac{1 - t}{1 - t^{n_\lambda(a_1 + 1) + 1}} \right) t^{n_\lambda(a_1 + 1) + m - N} \tag{A.27}$$

On the other hand, we obtain from (2.9) and (9.6) that

$$\Psi_N \mathcal{S}_{m,N} E_{\eta_{\Lambda,N}} = (1 - t) t^{r_\Lambda(1) - N} \mathcal{S}_{m-1,N} E_{\Phi(\eta_{\Lambda,N})} \tag{A.28}$$

Using Lemma 54 again and again to reorder the last entry of  $\Phi(\eta_{\Lambda,N})$ , we obtain

$$\mathcal{S}_{m-1,N} E_{\Phi(\eta_{\Lambda,N})} = t^{-\#\{j \mid \lambda_j > a_1 + 1\}} \left( \prod_{s \in \text{col}(1)} \frac{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)} t^{l_\Lambda(s) + 2}}{1 - q^{a_\Lambda(s)} t^{l_\Lambda(s) + 1}} \right) \mathcal{S}_{m-1,N} E_{\eta_{\Lambda^\square,N}}$$



where the product is again over the cells in the column of the circle indexed by 1 that lie in rows that do not end with a circle. Therefore, (A.28) becomes

$$\Psi_N \mathcal{S}_{m,N} E_{\eta_{\Lambda,N}} = (1-t)t^{r_{\Lambda}(1)-N-\#\{j|\lambda_j>a_1+1\}} \left( \prod_{s \in \text{col}(1)} \frac{1-q^{a_{\Lambda}(s)}t^{l_{\Lambda}(s)+2}}{1-q^{a_{\Lambda}(s)}t^{l_{\Lambda}(s)+1}} \right) \mathcal{S}_{m-1,N} E_{\eta_{\Lambda \square,N}}$$

Using (A.26) and (A.27), we then see from the previous equation that (A.25) will hold if

$$r_{\Lambda}(1) - N - \#\{j|\lambda_j > a_1 + 1\} = -\#\{2 \leq j \leq m | a_j \leq a_1\} + n_{\lambda}(a_1 + 1) + m - N$$

But this easily follows after realizing that  $r_{\Lambda}(1) = \ell(\Lambda) - \#\{2 \leq j \leq m | a_j \leq a_1\} - \#\{j|\lambda_j \leq a_1\}$  and that  $\ell(\Lambda) = m + \#\{j|\lambda_j \leq a_1\} + \#\{j|\lambda_j > a_1 + 1\} + n_{\lambda}(a_1 + 1)$ .  $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] P. Alexandersson and M. Sawhney, *Properties of non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials at  $q = 0$  and  $q = 1$* , Ann. Comb. **23** (2019), 219–239.
- [2] S. Assaf, *Non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials and a refinement of Kostka-Foulkes polynomials*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **370** (2018), 8777–8796.
- [3] T. H. Baker and P. J. Forrester *A  $q$ -analogue of the type A Dunkl Operator and Integral Kernel*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **14** (1997), 667–686.
- [4] F. Bergeron, Algebraic combinatorics and coinvariant spaces, CMS Treatise in Mathematics, A.K. Peters Publishers, 2009.
- [5] O. Blondeau-Fournier, P. Desrosiers, L. Lapointe and P. Mathieu, *Macdonald polynomials in superspace: conjectural definition and positivity conjectures*, Lett. Math. Phys. **101**, 27–47 (2012).
- [6] O. Blondeau-Fournier, P. Desrosiers, L. Lapointe and P. Mathieu, *Macdonald polynomials in superspace as eigenfunctions of commuting operators*, Journal of Combinatorics **3**, no. 3, 495–562 (2012).
- [7] L. Cárdenas and L. Lapointe, in preparation.
- [8] I. Cherednik, *Non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials*, Int. Math. Res. Notices **10** (1995) 483-515.
- [9] W. Fulton, Young tableaux, with applications to representation theory and geometry, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 35. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [10] A.M. Garsia and M. Haiman, *A graded representation model for Macdonald polynomials*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **99** (1993) 3607–10.
- [11] C. González and L. Lapointe, *The norm and the evaluation of the Macdonald polynomials in superspace*, European J. Combin. **83**, 103018, 30pp (2020).
- [12] B.G. Goodberry, Partially-symmetric Macdonald polynomials, Ph.D. Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 2022.
- [13] M. Haiman, *Hilbert schemes, polygraphs, and the Macdonald positivity conjecture*. J. Amer. Math. Soc., **14** (2001), 941–1006.
- [14] A. Lascoux and M.-P. Schützenberger, *Sur une conjecture de H.O. Foulkes*, C.R. Acad. Sc. Paris **294** (1978), 323–324.
- [15] A. Lascoux and M.-P. Schützenberger, *Le monoïde plaxique*, Quad. Ric. Sci. **109** (1981), 129–156.
- [16] M. Lothaire. Algebraic combinatorics on words. Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications **90**, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [17] I. G. Macdonald, Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials. 2nd edition, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.
- [18] I. G. Macdonald, *Affine Hecke algebras and orthogonal polynomials*, Séminaire Bourbaki 1994-95, exposé 797, p. 189-207.
- [19] I. G. Macdonald, Affine Hecke algebras and orthogonal polynomials, Cambridge Univ. Press (2003).
- [20] D. Marshall, *Symmetric and nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials*, Ann. Comb. **3** (1999), 385–415.
- [21] R.P. Stanley, Enumerative Combinatorics, vol. 2, Cambridge University Press, (1999).

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE TALCA, 2 NORTE 685, TALCA, CHILE.

Email address: llapointe@utalca.cl