

A COMBINATORIAL PROOF OF A PARTITION PERIMETER INEQUALITY

HUNTER WALDRON

ABSTRACT. In this short note, we use compositions to study the partition perimeter, a statistic defined to be one less than the sum of the number of parts and the largest part. This leads to some generalizations of known theorems. Our main result is a combinatorial proof that for $m > 2$ and $n > m$, there are strictly more m -distinct partitions than m -regular partitions with perimeter n , which provides an affirmative answer to a question from a recent paper of Amdeberhan et al. Additional refinements and applications of this are still being investigated.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Compositions. A finite sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ of positive integers is a *composition*. If the inequalities $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_\ell$ are also satisfied, λ is a *partition*. The terms of this sequence are the *parts* of λ , the *size* is $|\lambda| = \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_\ell$, and the length $\ell(\lambda)$ is the number of parts. The empty sequence $()$ is defined to be the unique partition of size 0 where convenient, and for $i > \ell(\lambda)$ we take $\lambda_i = 0$. For example, the 8 compositions with size 4 are (4) , $(3, 1)$, $(2, 2)$, $(2, 1, 1)$, $(1, 1, 1, 1)$, $(1, 3)$, $(1, 2, 1)$, and $(1, 1, 2)$. Only the first 5 of these are partitions.

Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{P} be the sets of all compositions and partitions, respectively. The partition generating function has the well-known infinite product representation

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}} z^{\ell(\lambda)} q^{|\lambda|} = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 - zq^n}$$

whereas the generating function for compositions (see [5] for more) carrying the same statistics is the rational expression

$$\sum_{c \in \mathcal{C}} z^{\ell(c)} q^{|c|} = \frac{1}{1 - qz/(1 - q)}.$$

Evidently, the combinatorics of partitions carries much more sophistication than that of compositions in general – at least when size is the object of study. Indeed, finding a formula for the number of compositions with a given property is often easy. For instance, there are $\binom{n-1}{k-1}$ compositions with size n and k parts, the coefficient of $z^k q^n$ above.

1.2. The partition perimeter. The *gaps* $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1}$ between neighboring parts of a partition λ may take on any non-negative value, and so

$$c = (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + 1, \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 + 1, \dots, \lambda_{\ell-1} - \lambda_\ell + 1, \lambda_\ell)$$

can be made to be any composition by choosing the appropriate λ . By inspection, λ and c have the same length, and $|c| = \lambda_1 + \ell(\lambda) - 1$. We call this last value the *perimeter* of λ , and define the *perimeter map* $p: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ partwise by the rule


$$\lambda_i = 1 + \sum_{j=i}^{\ell(c)} (c_j - 1)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq \ell(c)$. This construction is the inverse of the one given above, recovering the parts of λ from the gaps.

Armed with this bijection, we are able to translate the information of compositions and partitions into one another, leading to new results. We offer a few applications of this idea. Proposition 2.3 and our main result Theorem 2.8 are partition results with proofs using compositions as an intermediate step. Proposition 2.6 is the opposite.

The *Young diagram* of a composition c is a visual representation of c as a grid of squares aligned on the left, with c_i squares in the i th row. For partitions, the perimeter may be interpreted as the squares with an edge or corner on the bottom or the right of the Young diagram, which is illustrated here. Equivalently, the perimeter is also the squares furthest to the left and on the top, which is sometimes called the largest *hook* of the partition.

Example 1.1. The Young diagram of the composition $c = (3, 1, 2, 4, 2)$ is shown on the left, and the partition $p(c) = (8, 6, 6, 5, 2)$ on the right.



In existing literature, the zig-zag graphs of MacMahon [3] are essentially the same construction that the perimeter map gives, but reflected. We choose this slightly modified convention for compatibility with Young diagrams.

We may also write c as an m -*modular* diagram for $m \geq 2$, which is a Young diagram where the furthest squares on the right are filled with any value from 1 to m , and all others with m , such that the sum of the numbers in the i th row is c_i . This is illustrated below in example 2.2.

2. APPLICATIONS OF THE PERIMETER MAP

Before proceeding, we need the following elementary result. Here we use the notation $\equiv R \pmod{m}$ to mean congruent to some $r \in R$ modulo m .

Lemma 2.1. *Let $m \geq 2$, $R \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, m-1\}$ be non-empty, and $n \geq 1$. The compositions with size n and parts $\equiv R \pmod{m}$ are equinumerous with the compositions of size n and parts in $R \cup \{m\}$, with last part in R .*

We offer a proof of Lemma 2.1 in two flavors, analytic and bijective. The latter will be needed for the proof of our main result.

Analytic proof of Lemma 2.1. Let q be a formal variable (or take $q \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|q| < 1/m$ to guarantee that the geometric series converge), and write $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_k\}$. By summing over compositions with number of

parts i , the generating function for compositions with parts $\equiv R \pmod{m}$ is


$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{q^{r_1} + \dots + q^{r_k}}{1 - q^m} \right)^i \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - (q^{r_1} + \dots + q^{r_k}) / (1 - q^m)} - 1 \\ &= \frac{q^{r_1} + \dots + q^{r_k}}{1 - (q^{r_1} + \dots + q^{r_k} + q^m)} \\ &= (q^{r_1} + \dots + q^{r_k}) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (q^{r_1} + \dots + q^{r_k} + q^m)^i \end{aligned}$$

which after some standard manipulations gives us the generating function for compositions with parts in $R \cup \{m\}$ and last part in R , again summed by number of parts i . □

Bijjective proof of Lemma 2.1. Let c be a composition with parts $\equiv R \pmod{m}$. Writing c as an m -modular diagram, rotate each part one quarter turn clockwise, leaving the m -modular diagram of a composition with parts in $R \cup \{m\}$ and last part in R . Since the numbers were unchanged, this resulting composition has the same size.

For the inverse, given a composition c with parts in $R \cup \{m\}$ and last part in R , iterate upwards in the m -modular diagram starting from c 's last part. Collect the square not containing m and then all squares containing m directly above, then rotate counter-clockwise to form a part $\equiv R \pmod{m}$. Repeat until all squares are exhausted. □

Example 2.2. With $m = 4$ and $R = \{1, 3\}$, the composition $(7, 9, 1, 7, 3)$ under this bijection maps to $(4, 3, 4, 4, 1, 1, 4, 3, 3)$.



Our first result readily follows from Lemma 2.1 with some minor technical work.


Proposition 2.3. *Let $m \geq 3, n \geq 1$, and $R \subseteq \{1, \dots, m - 2\}$ be non-empty. The partitions with perimeter n and gaps $\equiv R \pmod{m}$ are equinumerous with the partitions with perimeter n and gaps between parts in $R \cup \{m - 1\}$ and last part in R .*

Proof. Let $R + 1 = \{r + 1 \mid r \in R\}$, so $R + 1 \subseteq \{2, \dots, m - 1\}$. Gaps $\equiv R \pmod{m}$ become compositions with parts $\equiv R + 1 \pmod{m}$ and last part $\equiv R \pmod{m}$. Add one to the last part to make all parts satisfy the first of these conditions, so now we may apply the bijection in Lemma 2.1 to get compositions with parts in $R + 1 \cup \{m\}$ and last part in $R + 1$, and at least 2. Delete one from the last part, putting it in R . This describes partitions with gaps between parts in $R \cup \{m - 1\}$, with the last part in R as desired. □

2.1. Composition conjugation. The *conjugate* λ' of a partition λ is the partition constructed by replacing the i th row of λ with the i th column in λ 's Young diagram. Performing the same process with a composition will generally not produce another composition. We define composition conjugation instead through the formula $c' = p^{-1}(p(c)')$. Since partition conjugation preserves perimeter by swapping length and first part, composition conjugation preserves size. As the example below makes clear, if a composition c has size n and k parts, then c' will have $n - k + 1$ parts.

Remark 2.4. The conjugate is similarly defined for zig-zag graphs, which gives the same map, albeit reflected. For more on composition conjugation, see the work of Munagi. (for instance [4] and the references therein).

Example 2.5. The conjugate of the composition $c = (3, 2, 1, 4, 3, 1)$ is $c' = (2, 1, 2, 1, 1, 3, 2, 1, 1)$.



For $m \geq 2$ the m -distinct partitions are those with any part appearing less than m times, which conjugate to give m -flat partitions, where gaps between parts are less than m . Since these two families of partitions are related through conjugation, the associated compositions of the same size are equinumerous. This immediately leaves us with the following after considering which compositions these are.

Proposition 2.6. *For $m \geq 2$ and $n, k \geq 1$, the compositions with size n and k parts, all at most m and last part less than m , are equinumerous with the compositions with size n and $n - k + 1$ parts, with no continuous sequence of $m - 1$ or more 1's, excluding the last part.*

An m -regular partition has no parts $\equiv 0 \pmod{m}$. These are related to the aforementioned partitions by the following theorem of Glaisher, which with $m = 2$ is due previously to Euler.

Theorem 2.7. *For $m \geq 2$ and $n \geq 1$, the m -regular and m -distinct partitions of size n are equinumerous.*

Straub [7] found that when size is replaced with perimeter, this also holds when $m = 2$. As noted by Amdeberhan et al. [1], Staub's result fails to generalize for $m > 2$. In their paper, they asked if there exists a combinatorial proof that this becomes an inequality. We provide such a proof here.

Theorem 2.8. *Let $m > 2$ and $n > m$. There are strictly more m -distinct partitions than m -regular partitions with perimeter n .*

proof. An m -regular partition is described by compositions c with the following property:

$$(*) \quad 1 + \sum_{j=i}^{\ell(c)} (c_j - 1) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{m} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq \ell(c)$$


It is sufficient to construct a size-preserving, injective map φ from these compositions to those with parts $\not\equiv 0 \pmod{m}$, since we can then apply the bijection in Lemma 2.1 with $R = \{1, \dots, m - 1\}$ to get compositions that have all parts at most m and last part less than m . These describe m -flat partitions, which we may conjugate to get m -distinct partitions.

Let c be a composition with the property (*). From c we construct a composition $\varphi(c) = d$ using the following iterative algorithm, starting at c 's last part. The algorithm is designed to ignore parts that are already $\not\equiv 0 \pmod{m}$, and transform the others in such a way that a corresponding partition part becomes a multiple of m , to violate (*).

- 1: Initialize with $i = \ell(c)$, $j = 1$, and $d = ()$
- 2: **while** $i \neq 0$ **do**
- 3: Let $j = j + c_i - 1$.
- 4: **if** $c_i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{m}$ **then**
- 5: Append c_i to the start of d (that is, c_i becomes the new first part of d)
- 6: **else**
- 7: Let r be the remainder after dividing j by m
- 8: Append the part $m - r$ to the start of d
- 9: Append the part $c_i - (m - r)$ to the start of d
- 10: **end if**
- 11: Let $i = i - 1$
- 12: **end while**

From this construction, that $|c| = |d|$ is immediate. Moreover, from (*), $j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{m}$ will hold at every step, so in the case of lines 7 through 9, r will never be 0, which implies that the parts $m - r$ and $c_i - (m - r)$ are $\not\equiv 0 \pmod{m}$ as well. Therefore each part of d is $\not\equiv 0 \pmod{m}$.

Example 2.9. With $m = 3$, φ sends $c = (6, 2, 4, 3, 2)$ to $d = (4, 2, 2, 4, 1, 2, 2)$.



For injectivity, suppose that some composition d is in the image of φ . Like in the algorithm, we iterate i from d 's last part to the top, with the goal of uniquely determining the parts of the preimage. Start with $c = ()$ and $j = 1$, and increment j by $d_i - 1$ at each step.

If $j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{m}$ then we must be in the case of line 5, so append d_i to the top of c . Otherwise, we are in the case of lines 7 through 9 and so we must append $d_i + d_{i-1}$ to the start of c . We must then subtract 1 from i an additional time, and also add 1 to j since the action of splitting the composition part into two in c has the effect of decreasing j by 1 in d . Continue until all parts of d are exhausted, which leaves a uniquely determined c .

Finally, since we require that $n > m$, one can easily check that the composition of size n

$$(m-1, 2, \underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{n-m-1 \text{ many } 1\text{'s}})$$

cannot be in the image of φ , so surjectivity fails and the inequality is strict. This completes the proof. \square

2.2. Closing remarks. For the cases not in the statement of Theorem 2.8, φ is surjective (and indeed the identity map) when $1 \leq n \leq m$ since the two sets of compositions coincide, and also when $m = 2$ for all $n \geq 1$ for the same reason, since $(*)$ becomes compositions with odd parts. This implies Straub's theorem.

Many authors have noted that the following families of compositions are all enumerated by F_n , the n th Fibonacci number. There are combinatorial proofs of this fact in existing literature (See for instance [6] or [2]). A proof using generating functions is a simple exercise as well. Recall that $F_0 = 0$, $F_1 = 1$, and $F_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n-2}$ for $n \geq 2$.

- 1) Compositions of n with odd parts.
- 2) Compositions of n with parts 1 and 2, and last part 1.
- 3) Compositions of $n + 1$ with parts greater than 1.

Lemma 2.1 with $m = 2$ and $R = \{1\}$ gives a bijection from 1) to 2), and by identifying 3) with compositions of n where only the last part may be 1, Proposition 2.6 gives a bijection from 2) to 3).

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Amdeberhan et al., *Refinements of beak-type partition identities*, *Discrete Mathematics* **345** (2022), no. 12.
- [2] J. B. Gil and J. A. Tomasko, *Fibonacci colored compositions and applications*, *Integers* **21** (2021).
- [3] P. A. MacMahon, *Combinatory Analysis*, vol. 1, Cambridge University Press, 1915.
- [4] A. Munagi, *Integer compositions and higher-order conjugation*, *Journal of Integer Sequences* **21** (2018), 1–22.
- [5] R. Schneider and A. Sills, *Composition-theoretic series in partition theory*, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2209.06745.pdf>, 2022.
- [6] A. Sills, *Compositions, Partitions, and Fibonacci Numbers*, *Fibonacci Quarterly* **49** (2011), no. 4, 348–354.
- [7] A. Straub, *Core partitions into distinct parts and an analog of Euler's theorem*, *European Journal of Combinatorics* **57** (2016), 40–49.