Combinatorial reciprocity for non-intersecting paths

Special Session on Enumerative Combinatorics, AMS Fall Central Sectional Meeting, Creighton University, Omaha, NE

Sam Hopkins (Howard University) based on joint work with Gjergji Zaimi

October 7th, 2023

A combinatorial reciprocity theorem asserts $f(-n) = \pm g(n)$, where f(n) and g(n) are two related counting functions. It's a "hidden duality." For example, the most basic combinatorial reciprocity theorem is

$$\binom{-n}{k} = -1^k \binom{n}{k}$$

where $\binom{n}{k}$ of course counts the number of k-subsets of $[n] = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$, and $\binom{n}{k}$ counts the number of k-multisets on [n].

In order to make sense of $\binom{-n}{k}$, we observe that

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n(n-1)\cdots(n-(k-1))}{k!}$$

is a polynomial in n, which can then be evaluated at negative numbers.

Combinatorial reciprocity for polynomials



There are many combinatorial reciprocity theorems for polynomial counting functions, including:

- for the order polynomial Ω_P(n) of a poset P;
- for the chromatic polynomial $\chi_G(n)$ of a graph G;
- for the Ehrhart polynomial $L_{\mathcal{P}}(n)$ of a lattice polytope \mathcal{P} .

Combinatorial reciprocity beyond polynomials

But sometimes we can make sense of f(-n), and prove combinatorial reciprocity theorems, for counting functions f(n) that are not polynomials.

We say that $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfies a *linear recurrence* if there are $d \ge 0$ and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{C}$ (with $\alpha_d \neq 0$) for which

$$f(n+d) + \alpha_1 f(n+d-1) + \alpha_2 f(n+d-2) + \cdots + \alpha_d f(n) = 0$$

for $n \ge 0$. E.g.: polynomials, quasi-polynomials, exponential functions. For such an f, we define f(-n) by "running the recurrence backwards." That is, we set

$$f(-n) = \frac{-1}{\alpha_d} \left(f(-n+d) + \alpha_1 f(-n+d-1) + \cdots + \alpha_{d-1} f(-n+1) \right)$$

for $n \geq 1$.

Bounded Dyck paths

Recall that a *Dyck path* is a lattice path in \mathbb{Z}^2 from (0,0) to (2n,0), whose steps are (1,1) or (1,-1), and which never goes below the x-axis. We say a Dyck path is *r*-bounded if it never goes above the line y = r.



Example

Let f(n) be the number of 3-bounded Dyck paths of length 2n. **Exercise**: Show $f(n) = F_{2n-1}$, where F_n are the *Fibonacci* (or *Pingala*) *numbers* defined by $F_1 = F_2 = 1$ and $F_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n-2}$ for n > 2. Therefore, $f(n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}(\varphi^{2n-1} + \varphi^{-2n+1})$, and thus f(-n) = f(n+1).

Reciprocity for fans of bounded Dyck paths

For two Dyck paths D and D', we write $D \le D'$ if D is weakly below D'. An *m*-fan of Dyck paths is a tuple $D_1 \le \cdots \le D_m$ of nested Dyck paths.



Let d(m, k; n) = # *m*-fans of (2k + 1)-bounded Dyck paths of length 2n.

Theorem (Cigler-Krattenthaler, 2020)

d(m, k; n) satisfies a linear recurrence, and d(m, k; -n) = d(k, m; n+1).

See also follow up work of Jang-Kim-Kim-Song-Song, 2022 on reciprocity for other kinds of bounded lattice paths (Motzkin, Schröder, et cetera).

Sam Hopkins

Reciprocity for non-intersecting paths

Acyclic planar networks

An *acyclic planar network* is an acyclic directed graph G = (V, E)embedded in a disk, with boundary vertices s_1, \ldots, s_m (*sources*) and t_m, \ldots, t_1 (*sinks*) in clockwise order, and with *edge weights* $w : E \to \mathbb{C}$. We write $\pi : s_i \to t_j$ to mean π is a path in G connecting s_i to t_j , and we write $\Pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k) : (s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_k}) \to (t_{j_1}, \ldots, t_{j_k})$ to mean Π is a tuple of paths $\pi_{\ell} : s_{i_{\ell}} \to t_{j_{\ell}}$. The tuple Π is *non-intersecting* if no two of its paths share any vertices. We set $w(\pi) = \prod_{e \in \pi} w(e)$ and $w(\Pi) = \prod_{\pi \in \Pi} w(\pi)$.



The above non-intersecting tuple Π : $(s_1, s_3) \rightarrow (t_2, t_3)$ has $w(\Pi) = x$, because by convention edges without labels have weight one.

Sam Hopkins

Reciprocity for non-intersecting paths

Let G be an acyclic planar network for which there is a unique, weight one non-intersecting tuple of paths connecting all the sinks to all the sources. Let G^n denote n copies of G glued together like this (red lines = identify):

$$S_{m} \xrightarrow{t_{m}} G \xrightarrow{s_{m} t_{m}} G \xrightarrow{t_{m}} f_{m}$$

For $I = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\}, J = \{j_1 < \cdots < j_k\} \subseteq [m] \text{ let } f(I, J; n) = \sum w(\Pi)$ a sum over non-intersecting tuples $\Pi : (s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_k}) \to (t_{j_1}, \ldots, t_{j_k})$ in G^n .

Theorem (H.–Zaimi, 2023)

f(I, J; n) satisfies a linear recurrence. $f(I, J; -n) = -1^{\sigma(I)+\sigma(J)}f(I^c, J^c; n)$ where for $K \subseteq [m]$ we use $\sigma(K) = \sum_{i \in K} i$ and $K^c = [m] \setminus K$. Unsurprisingly, the LGV lemma is a major ingredient in our proof.

For network G, let $P_G = (p_{i,j})$ be *path matrix* of G: $p_{i,j} = \sum_{\pi: s_i \to t_i} w(\pi)$.

For an $m \times m$ matrix M and k-subsets $I, J \subseteq [m]$, let M[I, J] denote the $k \times k$ submatrix of M with column indices in I and row indices in J.

Lemma (Lindström–Gessel–Viennot)

For
$$I = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_k\}, J = \{j_1 < \cdots < j_k\} \subseteq [m],$$

$$\det(\mathsf{P}_G[I,J]) = \sum w(\Pi)$$

a sum over non-intersecting tuples $\Pi : (s_{i_1}, \ldots, s_{i_k}) \to (t_{j_1}, \ldots, t_{j_k})$ in G.

The other ingredient in our proof is a result from elementary linear algebra.

For an $m \times m$ matrix M, let $\operatorname{com}_k(M)$ and $\operatorname{adj}_k(M)$ be the *k*th *compound* and *adjugate* matrices of M. These are $\binom{m}{k} \times \binom{m}{k}$ matrices whose rows & columns are indexed by *k*-subsets $I, J \subseteq [m]$. Specifically, the entries are:

$$\operatorname{com}_k(\mathsf{M})_{I,J} = \mathsf{det}(\mathsf{M}[I,J]) \text{ and } \operatorname{adj}_k(\mathsf{M})_{I,J} = -1^{\sigma(I) + \sigma(J)} \mathsf{det}(\mathsf{M}[I^c,J^c])$$

Lemma (Generalized cofactor expansion of determinant)

For any $0 \le k \le m$,

$$\operatorname{com}_k(\mathsf{M}) \times \operatorname{adj}_k(\mathsf{M}) = \operatorname{adj}_k(\mathsf{M}) \times \operatorname{com}_k(\mathsf{M}) = \mathsf{det}(\mathsf{M}) \cdot \mathsf{I},$$

where I is the $\binom{m}{k} \times \binom{m}{k}$ identity matrix.

10/16

Recovering reciprocity for fans of bounded Dyck paths

To recover the fans of bounded Dyck paths reciprocity from our result, we use this network *G*:



It's easy to see that non-intersecting tuples of paths in G^n correspond to fans of bounded Dyck paths.



11/16

Another important network: Schur polynomials

Consider the following network G:



For appropriate *I*, *J* depending on λ and μ , non-intersecting tuples in *G* correspond to SSYT of shape λ/μ .



Thus, the Schur polynomial $s_{\lambda/\mu}(z_1, \ldots, z_n)$ is the generating function of these non-intersecting tuples.

Sam Hopkins

What does our reciprocity result say for this Schur polynomial network G?

Fix $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_k) \in \mathbb{C}^k$. Let $\mathbf{z}^n = (z_1, \ldots, z_k, z_1, \ldots, z_k, \ldots, z_1, \ldots, z_k)$, with each value repeated *n* times. Then, our result yields the following:

Theorem

 $s_{\lambda/\mu}(\mathbf{z}^n)$ satisfies a linear recurrence, and $s_{\lambda/\mu}(\mathbf{z}^{-n}) = -1^{|\lambda/\mu|} s_{\lambda^t/\mu^t}(\mathbf{z}^n)$.

More generally, for any homogeneous symmetric function f of degree m, we have that $f(\mathbf{z}^n)$ is a polynomial in n and $f(\mathbf{z}^{-n}) = -1^m \omega f(\mathbf{z}^n)$, where $\omega \colon \Lambda \to \Lambda$ is the canonical involution on the ring of symmetric functions Λ . (This will appear as an exercise in the *new edition* of Stanley's EC2.)

Extends to quasi-symmetric functions, combinatorial Hopf algebras, etc.

How this project happened: MathOverflow

math**overflow**

- MO:372642
- MO:372811
- MD:373030
- MD:430249

J. Cigler asked a series of questions on MathOverflow about bounded Dyck paths of "negative length." These attracted comments and answers, including from R. Stanley. Subsequently, J. Cigler and C. Krattenthaler wrote their paper. I noticed the non-intersecting paths interpretation of Cigler's inquiries, and asked a follow-up MO question. G. Zaimi answered, explaining the argument with compound and adjugate matrices. I later asked an MO question about the symmetric function reciprocity, and again R. Stanley and G. Zaimi provided interesting answers. Then, G. Zaimi and I wrote our joint paper.

Open problems

- Find more **interesting networks** to which we can apply the non-intersecting paths reciprocity theorem. For example, can we recover the Motzkin, Schröder, ... reciprocity of Jang et al. this way?
- In an unpublished manuscript from when he was an undergraduate, D. Speyer proved a combinatorial reciprocity theorem for counting perfect matchings in a linearly growing sequence of graphs:

http://www-personal.umich.edu/~speyer/TransferMatrices.pdf Generalizes an earlier reciprocity result of J. Propp for domino tilings. Is there a connection to the non-intersecting paths reciprocity?

• Find a **bijective** proof of the relationship between compound and adjugate matrices, even in the special case of a path matrix P_G.

Thank you!

these slides are on my website:

https://www.samuelfhopkins.com/docs/reciprocity_talk.pdf

and the relevant papers are:

- J. Cigler and C. Krattenthaler. "Bounded Dyck paths, bounded alternating sequences, orthogonal polynomials, and reciprocity." Forthcoming, *European J. Combin.*, 2024. arXiv:2012.03878
- S. Hopkins, G. Zaimi. "Combinatorial reciprocity for non-intersecting paths." *Enumer. Comb. Appl.* 3, no. 2, 2023. arXiv:2301.00405
- J. Jang, D. Kim, J. S. Kim, M. Song, and U.-K. Song. "Negative moments of orthogonal polynomials." *Forum Math. Sigma* 11, 2023. arXiv:2201.11344