



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Chuang, J., Miyachi, H. & Tan, K. M. (2004). A v-analogue of Peel's theorem. *Journal of Algebra*, 280(1), pp. 219-231. doi: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2004.04.017

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://city-ref-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/14056/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2004.04.017>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

A v -ANALOGUE OF PEEL'S THEOREM

JOSEPH CHUANG, HYOHE MIYACHI, AND KAI MENG TAN

ABSTRACT. We compute the v -decomposition numbers $d_{\lambda\mu}(v)$ for λ being a hook partition, and μ e -regular.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout we fix an integer $e \geq 2$. Lascoux, Leclerc, and Thibon [8] used the representation theory of the quantum affine algebra $U_v(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e)$ to introduce for every pair of partitions λ and σ , with σ e -regular, a polynomial $d_{\lambda\sigma}(v)$ with integer coefficients (which depends on e). They conjectured these polynomials to be v -analogues of decomposition numbers for Hecke algebras at complex e -th root of unity (hence the term ‘ v -decomposition numbers’); this conjecture was proved later by Ariki [1]. These v -decomposition numbers are also known to be parabolic affine Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials.

Leclerc’s lectures [9] are a good introduction to this subject as well as a convenient reference for the results we need here.

The purpose of this note is to prove the following theorem, which describes the v -decomposition numbers corresponding to rows labelled by hook partitions:

Theorem 1. *For $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, let $\alpha_i^n = (n-i, 1^i)$ and denote its ‘ e -regularised’ partition by $(\alpha_i^n)^R$ (see §2.1).*

(1) *If $e \geq 3$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\alpha_i^n(\alpha_i^n)^R}(v) &= \begin{cases} v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor}, & \text{if } e \nmid n, \text{ or both } e \mid n \text{ and } i < n - \frac{n}{e}, \\ v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + 1}, & \text{if } e \mid n \text{ and } i \geq n - \frac{n}{e}; \end{cases} \\ d_{\alpha_i^n(\alpha_{i-1}^n)^R}(v) &= v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + 1}, & \text{if } e \mid n \text{ and } 1 \leq i < n - \frac{n}{e}; \\ d_{\alpha_i^n(\alpha_{i+1}^n)^R}(v) &= v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor}, & \text{if } e \mid n \text{ and } n - \frac{n}{e} \leq i < n; \\ d_{\alpha_i^n\sigma}(v) &= 0, & \text{for all other } e\text{-regular } \sigma \text{'s}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) *If $e = 2$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\alpha_i^n(\alpha_j^n)^R}(v) &= \begin{cases} v^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor}, & \text{if } j \leq i < n-j \text{ and } i-j \text{ even,} \\ v^{(i+1)/2}, & \text{if } 2 \mid n, j < i < n-j, i \text{ odd and } j \text{ even,} \\ v^{i/2+1}, & \text{if } 2 \mid n, j < i < n-j, i \text{ even and } j \text{ odd;} \end{cases} \\ d_{\alpha_i^n\sigma}(v) &= 0, & \text{for all other } e\text{-regular } \sigma \text{'s}. \end{aligned}$$

Date: January 2004.

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 17B37; Secondary: 20C08.

Peel [13] initiated the study of the corresponding decomposition numbers of symmetric group algebras in odd characteristic, and this is continued by James [4, Theorem 6.22] and James-Mathas [6, Theorem 7.6] for Hecke algebras at complex e -th root of unity with $e \geq 2$. When we use these theorems of James and James-Mathas together with Ariki's theorem [1], we can then conclude that these v -decomposition numbers, when non-zero, are monic monomials. However, we do not make use of this fact here and work entirely in the context of the basic $U_v(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e)$ -module (or the Fock space), thereby providing another proof of these corresponding decomposition numbers of Hecke algebras when we evaluate these v -decomposition numbers at $v = 1$ and use Ariki's theorem.

This paper is organised as follows: in section 2, we introduce the background theory and obtain some useful preliminary results. We then prove part (1) and (2) of Theorem 1 in sections 3 and 4 respectively.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Partitions. A partition is a nonincreasing sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ of nonnegative integers. We write $|\lambda| = \sum_i \lambda_i$. If $|\lambda| = n$, we say that λ is a partition of n . We denote the set of partitions of n by $\mathcal{P}_n$, and write $\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_n \mathcal{P}_n$ for the set of all partitions. A partition λ is e -regular if and only if there is no i such that $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i+1} = \dots = \lambda_{i+e-1} \neq 0$. We identify a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ with its Young diagram

$$\{(j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \times \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid 1 \leq k \leq \lambda_j\}.$$

The standard lexicographic and dominance ordering on $\mathcal{P}_n$ are denoted by $>$ and $\triangleright$ respectively, and we introduce a total ordering $\succ$ on $\mathcal{P}$ as follows: $\lambda \succ \mu$ if, and only if, either $|\lambda| > |\mu|$ or both $|\lambda| = |\mu|$ and $\lambda > \mu$.

Given any integer j , we write $\bar{j}$ for its residue class modulo e . The residue of a node (j, k) in a Young diagram μ is $\overline{k - j}$. If (j, k) has residue i , we say that (j, k) is an i -node. If in removing (j, k) from μ , we obtain a Young diagram λ then we call (j, k) a removable i -node of μ or an indent i -node of λ .

A ladder $\ell = \ell_r$ is a set of nodes of the form

$$\{(j, k) \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \times \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid k = (1 - e)j + r\}.$$

All nodes in ℓ_r have residue $\bar{r}$. The intersection of a ladder with the Young diagram λ is a ladder of λ . If we replace each ladder of λ by the same number of nodes as high up as possible in the same ladder, then we obtain an e -regular partition which is labelled λ^R [5, 6.3.48].

2.2. The algebra $U_v(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e)$ and its basic module. The algebra $U = U_v(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e)$ is the associative algebra over $\mathbb{C}(v)$ with generators e_i, f_i, k_i, k_i^{-1} ($0 \leq i \leq e - 1$), d, d^{-1} subject to certain relations for which the interested reader may refer to, for example, [9, §4]. An important U -module is the Fock space representation $\mathcal{F}$ [3, 12], which as a $\mathbb{C}(v)$ -vector space has a basis $\{s(\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}}$. For our purposes an explicit description of the action of just the f_i 's on $\mathcal{F}$ will suffice.

Let λ be a partition with m indent i -nodes $(j_1, k_1), (j_2, k_2), \dots, (j_m, k_m)$, and write μ for the partition obtained by adding these m indent nodes to λ .

Let N_r be the number of indent i -nodes of λ not equal to (j_s, k_s) for all s that are situated to the right of (j_r, k_r) minus the number of removable i -nodes of λ situated to the right of (j_r, k_r) . Let $N(\lambda, \mu) = \sum_{r=1}^m N_r$. We have

$$f_i^{(m)} s(\lambda) = \sum_{\mu} v^{N(\lambda, \mu)} s(\mu),$$

where $f_i^{(m)} = f_i^m / (\prod_{r=1}^m \frac{v^r - v^{-r}}{v - v^{-1}})$, and the sum is over all Young diagrams μ obtained from λ by adding m indent i -nodes.

We identify the basic U -module $M(\Lambda_0)$ with the U -submodule of $\mathcal{F}$ generated by $s(\emptyset)$. This is an irreducible highest weight module for U , and has a distinguish basis $\{G(\sigma)\}$, called the canonical basis or lower global crystal basis, which is indexed by e -regular partitions σ [7]. Let $\langle -, - \rangle$ denote the inner product on $\mathcal{F}$ for which $\{s(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is orthonormal. Then the v -decomposition number $d_{\lambda\sigma}(v)$ is defined as $\langle G(\sigma), s(\lambda) \rangle$, the coefficient of $s(\lambda)$ in $G(\sigma)$. These v -decomposition numbers are shown to have the following properties:

Theorem 2 ([8, Theorem 6.8], [14]; see also [11, Theorem 6.28]). *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\sigma\sigma}(v) &= 1, \\ d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) &\in v\mathbb{N}[v] \text{ for all } \lambda \neq \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, $d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) \neq 0$ only if $\lambda \trianglelefteq \sigma$, and λ and σ have the same e -core.

Lascoux, Leclerc and Thibon provided a recursive combinatorial algorithm to calculate $G(\sigma)$'s. Now commonly known as the LLT algorithm, it is based on the following principle:

Theorem 3. *Let σ be an e -regular partition, and let $\tilde{\sigma}$ be the partition obtained by removing the rightmost ladder of σ , which has residue r and size k . Then*

$$f_r^{(k)}(G(\tilde{\sigma})) = G(\sigma) + \sum_{\substack{\mu \triangleleft \sigma \\ \mu \text{ } e\text{-regular}}} L_{\mu}(v) G(\mu),$$

with $L_{\mu}(v) = L_{\mu}(v^{-1}) \in \mathbb{N}[v, v^{-1}]$.

2.3. Notations. We adopt the following notations in this paper:

- (1) If $x, y, x - y \in \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{N}[v, v^{-1}] s(\lambda)$, then we write $y \mid x$.
For example, $d_{\lambda\mu}(v) s(\lambda) \mid G(\mu)$ by Theorem 2, and, keeping the notation of Theorem 3, $G(\sigma), L_{\lambda}(v) G(\lambda) \mid f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))$.
- (2) If $x \in \mathcal{F}$, then $[x]_{\text{hook}} = \sum_n \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \langle x, s(\alpha_i^n) \rangle s(\alpha_i^n)$, the 'hook-part' of x .
- (3) If $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $\bar{k}$ denotes the residue class of k modulo e , and

$$\delta_k = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } e \mid k; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (4) We denote the hook partition $(n - i, 1^i)$ (for $0 \leq i < n$) by α_i^n .

2.4. Some useful results. We collate together some results which we shall require.

Proposition 4. *Keep the notations of Theorem 3, and let $\langle f_r^{(k)}(G(\tilde{\sigma})), s(\lambda) \rangle = p(v)$ ($\lambda \triangleleft \sigma$).*

- (1) *If $p(v) = 1$, then λ is e -regular, $L_\lambda(v) = 1$ and $d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) = 0$.*
- (2) *If $p(v) = v^m$ with $m > 0$, and $d_{\lambda\mu}(v) \neq v^m$ for all e -regular μ with $\lambda \triangleleft \mu \triangleleft \sigma$, then $d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) = v^m$.*
- (3) *If $p(v) \in \mathbb{N}[v]$, and $\langle f_r^{(k)}(G(\tilde{\sigma})), s(\mu) \rangle \in v\mathbb{N}[v]$ for all e -regular μ with $\lambda \triangleleft \mu \triangleleft \sigma$, then $L_\lambda(v) = p(0)$ and $d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) = p(v) - p(0)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3, $p(v) = d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) + \sum_\mu L_\mu(v)d_{\lambda\mu}(v)$, where the sum runs over e -regular partitions $\mu \triangleleft \sigma$.

If $p(v) = v^m$ with $m \geq 0$, then since $L_\mu(v) \in \mathbb{N}[v, v^{-1}]$, $d_{\lambda\mu}(v), d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) \in \mathbb{N}[v]$, we have either

- $d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) = v^m$, or
- $d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) = 0$, and $L_{\mu_0}(v) = 1$, $d_{\lambda\mu_0}(v) = v^m$ for some e -regular $\mu_0 \triangleleft \sigma$ while $L_\mu(v)d_{\lambda\mu}(v) = 0$ for all other e -regular $\mu \triangleleft \sigma$.

Thus, (2) follows since $d_{\lambda\mu_0}(v) \neq v^m$ with $m > 0$ implies $\lambda \triangleleft \mu_0$ by Theorem 2, while (1) follows since $d_{\lambda\nu}(v) \neq 1$ unless $\lambda = \nu$ by Theorem 2.

For (3), if $L_\mu(v) \neq 0$ for some $\lambda \triangleleft \mu \triangleleft \sigma$, let μ_0 be maximal in the dominance order among these. Then $\langle f_r^{(k)}(G(\tilde{\sigma})), s(\mu_0) \rangle = d_{\mu_0\sigma}(v) + L_{\mu_0}(v)$ by Theorems 2 and 3. Thus,

$$L_{\mu_0}(v) = \langle f_r^{(k)}(G(\tilde{\sigma})), s(\mu_0) \rangle - d_{\mu_0\sigma}(v) \in v\mathbb{N}[v]$$

by our hypothesis and Theorem 2. But this contradicts $L_\mu(v) = L_\mu(v^{-1})$. Thus, $L_\mu(v) = 0$ for all $\lambda \triangleleft \mu \triangleleft \sigma$, so that $p(v) = d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) + L_\lambda(v)$. If $p(v) = a_0 + a_1v + \cdots + a_mv^m$, then the fact that $L_\lambda(v) = L_\lambda(v^{-1}) \in \mathbb{N}[v, v^{-1}]$, as well as $d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) \in v\mathbb{N}[v]$, forces $L_\lambda(v) = a_0 = p(0)$ and $d_{\lambda\sigma}(v) = a_1v + \cdots + a_mv^m = p(v) - p(0)$. $\square$

The following lemma follows immediately from the Young diagram of a hook partition.

Lemma 5. *We have $[f_r(s(\lambda))]_{\text{hook}} = 0$ unless $\lambda = \alpha_i^n$ for some $i, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i < n$, and*

$$[f_r(s(\alpha_i^n))]_{\text{hook}} = \delta_{n-i-r} s(\alpha_i^{n+1}) + \delta_{r+i+1} v^{\delta_{n+1}-\delta_n+\delta_r} s(\alpha_{i+1}^{n+1}).$$

In particular, if $x \in \mathcal{F}$, then $[f_r(x)]_{\text{hook}} = [f_r([x]_{\text{hook}})]_{\text{hook}}$.

The following v -decomposition numbers are computed by Lyle in her Ph.D. thesis.

Proposition 6 ([10, Theorem 2.2.3]).

- (1) *If $e \geq 3$ and $e \mid n$, then $d_{(n-1,1),(n)}(v) = v = d_{(n-1,2),(n+1)}(v)$.*
- (2) *If $e = 2$ and $0 \leq i < n/2$, then*

$$d_{(n-i,i)\sigma}(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sigma = (n-i, i); \\ v, & \text{if } \sigma = (n-i+1, i-1) \text{ and } 2 \mid n; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3. PART (1) OF THEOREM 1

Throughout this section, we assume $e \geq 3$. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote its quotient and remainder, when i is divided by $e-1$, by q_i and s_i respectively. If $0 \leq i < n$, let

$$\beta_i^n = \begin{cases} (n-i, (q_i+1)^s, q_i^{e-1-s_i}), & \text{if } n-i > q_i+1; \\ ((q_i+1)^{s_i+1}, q_i^{e-2-s_i}, n-i-1), & \text{if } n-i \leq q_i+1. \end{cases}$$

Then $\beta_i^n = (\alpha_i^n)^R$. It is not difficult to check that the condition $n-i > q_i+1$ is equivalent to $i \leq (n-1)(1 - \frac{1}{e})$. Furthermore, if $j = \lfloor (n-1)(1 - \frac{1}{e}) \rfloor$, then

$$\beta_0^n > \beta_1^n > \cdots > \beta_j, \quad \beta_{j+1} < \beta_{j+2} < \cdots < \beta_{n-1},$$

and $\beta_j \geq \beta_{j+1}$ with equality if and only if $e \mid n$.

Before we state the main theorem of this section, we prove the following proposition, which helps to take care of a special case later:

Proposition 7. *Suppose $i, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ satisfy $e \mid n$, $(e-1) \mid i$ and $0 < n-i < i/(e-1)$. Then $d_{\beta_{i-1}^n \beta_i^n}(v) = v$ and $d_{\beta_{i-2}^n \beta_i^n}(v) = 0$.*

Proof. The rightmost ladder of $\beta_i^n = (q_i+1, q_i^{e-2}, n-i-1)$ has size 1 and residue $\overline{q_i}$, and removing it produces $\beta_{i-1}^{n-1} = (q_i^{e-1}, n-i-1)$. Since $\beta_{i-1}^n = (q_i^{e-1}, n-i)$ has a unique removable $\overline{q_i}$ -node (removal of this node produces β_{i-1}^{n-1}), so that $\langle f_{\overline{q_i}}(s(\mu)), s(\beta_{i-1}^n) \rangle = 0$ for all $\mu \neq \beta_{i-1}^{n-1}$, we have

$$\langle f_{\overline{q_i}}(G(\beta_{i-1}^{n-1})), s(\beta_{i-1}^n) \rangle = \langle f_{\overline{q_i}}(s(\beta_{i-1}^{n-1})), s(\beta_{i-1}^n) \rangle = v.$$

Now if $\beta_{i-1}^n \triangleleft \lambda \triangleleft \beta_i^n$, then $\lambda = (q_i+1, q_i^{e-3}, q_i-1, n-i)$, so that λ has a unique removable $\overline{q_i}$ -node, and its removal produces $\tilde{\lambda} = (q_i^{e-2}, q_i-1, n-i)$. Thus,

$$\langle f_{\overline{q_i}}(G(\beta_{i-1}^{n-1})), s(\lambda) \rangle = \langle f_{\overline{q_i}}(d_{\tilde{\lambda} \beta_{i-1}^{n-1}}(v) s(\tilde{\lambda})), s(\lambda) \rangle = d_{\tilde{\lambda} \beta_{i-1}^{n-1}}(v),$$

so that $d_{\beta_{i-1}^n \beta_i^n}(v) = v$ by Theorem 2 and Proposition 4(3).

For $d_{\beta_{i-2}^n \beta_i^n}(v)$, note that $\beta_{i-2}^n = (q_i^{e-2}, q_i-1, n-i+1)$ has a unique removable $\overline{q_i}$ -node, and removing it produces $\nu = (q_i^{e-2}, q_i-2, n-i+1)$. We have $d_{\nu \beta_{i-1}^{n-1}}(v) = d_{(m-2,2),(m)}(v)$ where $m = q_i - n - i + 1$, by [2, Theorem 1], which in turn equals v by Proposition 6(1). Hence

$$\langle f_{\overline{q_i}}(G(\beta_{i-1}^{n-1})), s(\beta_{i-2}^n) \rangle = \langle f_{\overline{q_i}}(v s(\nu)), s(\beta_{i-2}^n) \rangle = 1.$$

Thus, by Proposition 4(1), $d_{\beta_{i-2}^n \beta_i^n}(v) = 0$. $\square$

The following is a reformulation of Part (1) of Theorem 1.

Theorem 8. *Suppose $e \geq 3$. Then*

$$[G(\beta_i^n)]_{\text{hook}} = \begin{cases} v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_i^n) + \delta_n v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor + 1} s(\alpha_{i+1}^n), & \text{if } i \leq (n-1)(1 - \frac{1}{e}); \\ v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_n} s(\alpha_i^n) + \delta_n v^{\lfloor (i-1)/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_{i-1}^n), & \text{if } i > (n-1)(1 - \frac{1}{e}). \end{cases}$$


Furthermore, $[G(\sigma)]_{\text{hook}} = 0$ for all other e -regular σ 's.

Note. When $e \mid n$ and $i = \lfloor (n-1)(1 - \frac{1}{e}) \rfloor$, then the formulas for $[G(\beta_i^n)]_{\text{hook}}$ and $[G(\beta_{i+1}^n)]_{\text{hook}}$ as stated in Theorem 8 coincide as expected, since $G(\beta_i^n) = G(\beta_{i+1}^n)$.

Proof. We prove by induction. For $n = 0, 1$, the theorem is trivially true. Let σ be an e -regular partition of n such that $[G(\sigma)]_{hook} \neq 0$, and assume the theorem holds for all e -regular partitions $\lambda \prec \sigma$. Suppose the rightmost ladder of σ has residue r and size k , and removing this ladder produces $\tilde{\sigma}$. By Theorem 3 and Lemma 5, $[G(\tilde{\sigma})]_{hook} \neq 0$, so that by induction hypothesis, $\tilde{\sigma} = \beta_i^{n-k}$ for some i . Let $q, s \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $i = q(e-1) + s$, with $0 \leq s < e-1$.

We have the following two cases to consider:

Case 1. $i \leq (n-k-1)(1 - \frac{1}{e})$:



$$\tilde{\sigma} = \beta_i^{n-k} = (n-k-i, (q+1)^s, q^{e-1-s})$$

From the above Young diagram of $\tilde{\sigma}$, we see that the rightmost ladder of σ has size 1 (i.e. $k=1$), containing either the indent node in the first or second row of $\tilde{\sigma}$, the latter only if $n-1-i = q+2$ and $s \geq 1$. These two sub-cases correspond to $r = \overline{n-1-i}$ and $r = \bar{q}$ respectively, and will be considered separately. We note that by induction hypothesis, we have

$$(*) \quad [G(\tilde{\sigma})]_{hook} = v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_i^{n-1}) + \delta_{n-1} v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor + 1} s(\alpha_{i+1}^{n-1}).$$

Case 1a. $r = \overline{n-1-i}$: In this subcase, $\sigma = \beta_i^n$. From (*), Theorem 3 and Lemma 5, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} [f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook} &= [v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor} f_r(s(\alpha_i^{n-1})) + \delta_{n-1} v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor + 1} f_r(s(\alpha_{i+1}^{n-1}))]_{hook} \\ &= v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_i^n) + \delta_n v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_{i+1} + 1} s(\alpha_{i+1}^n) \\ &= v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_i^n) + \delta_n v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor + 1} s(\alpha_{i+1}^n). \end{aligned}$$

By induction hypothesis, if $\lambda < \sigma$, $d_{\alpha_i^n \lambda}(v) = 0$, and $d_{\alpha_{i+1}^n \lambda}(v) = 0$ unless $\lambda = \beta_{i+1}^n$, in which case $d_{\alpha_{i+1}^n \lambda}(v) = v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor}$. Thus, by Proposition 4(2),

$$[G(\sigma)]_{hook} = v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_i^n) + \delta_n v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor + 1} s(\alpha_{i+1}^n)$$

as required.

Case 1b. $r = \bar{q}$: Here, $s \geq 1$ and $n-1-i = q+2$. By Lemma 5, $f_r(s(\alpha_i^{n-1})) = 0$. Since $[G(\sigma)]_{hook} \neq 0$, we see from (*), Theorem 3 and Lemma 5 that $[f_r(\delta_{n-1} s(\alpha_{i+1}^{n-1}))]_{hook} \neq 0$. This forces $e \mid (n-1)$ and $s = e-2$. Thus $\tilde{\sigma} = (q+2, (q+1)^{e-2}, q)$

and $\sigma = ((q+2)^2, (q+1)^{e-3}, q) = \beta_{i+2}^n$ and

$$\begin{aligned} [f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook} &= [f_r(v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor + 1} s(\alpha_{i+1}^{n-1}))]_{hook} \\ &= v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor + \delta_r} s(\alpha_{i+2}^n) \\ &= v^{\lfloor (i+2)/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_{i+2}^n) \end{aligned}$$


By induction hypothesis and Proposition 4(2),

$$[G(\sigma)]_{hook} = [f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook} = v^{\lfloor (i+2)/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_{i+2}^n)$$

as required.

Case 2. $i > \lfloor (n-k-1)(1 - \frac{1}{e}) \rfloor$: By induction hypothesis, we have

$$(**) \quad [G(\tilde{\sigma})]_{hook} = v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_{n-k}} s(\alpha_i^{n-k}) + \delta_{n-k} v^{\lfloor (i-1)/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_{i-1}^{n-k}).$$



$$\tilde{\sigma} = \beta_i^{n-k} = ((q+1)^{s+1}, q^{e-2-s}, n-k-i-1)$$

From the above Young diagram of $\tilde{\sigma}$, we see that the rightmost ladder of σ contains either of the first two indent nodes of $\tilde{\sigma}$, or both. These three sub-cases correspond to (a) $k=1$, $r = \overline{q+1}$, (b) $k=1$, $r = \overline{-i-1}$ and (c) $k=2$, $r = \overline{q+1} = \overline{-i-1}$ respectively:

Case 2a. $k=1$, $r = \overline{q+1}$: Since $[G(\sigma)]_{hook} \neq 0$, we see from (**), Theorem 3 and Lemma 5(1) that either $[f_r(s(\alpha_i^{n-1}))]_{hook}$ or $[f_r(\delta_{n-1}s(\alpha_{i-1}^{n-1}))]_{hook} \neq 0$. Suppose that $[f_r(\delta_{n-1}s(\alpha_{i-1}^{n-1}))]_{hook} \neq 0$. Then $e \mid (n-1)$, and $s=0$ by Lemma 5(1). If $n-i-1=q$, then $\tilde{\sigma} = \beta_{i-1}^n$, and we have dealt with this in subcase 1b. If $n-i-1 < q$, then by Proposition 7, we have $d_{\beta_{i-1}^{n-1}\tilde{\sigma}}(v) = v$ and $d_{\beta_{i-2}^{n-1}\tilde{\sigma}}(v) = 0$. As the two removable nodes of $\beta_{i-1}^n = (q^{e-1}, n-i)$ have residue r , and removing them in turn produces $\beta_{i-1}^{n-1} = (q^{e-1}, n-i-1)$ and $\beta_{i-2}^{n-1} = (q^{e-2}, q-1, n-i)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma})), s(\beta_{i-1}^n) \rangle &= \langle f_r(vs(\beta_{i-1}^{n-1})), s(\beta_{i-1}^n) \rangle \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $G(\beta_{i-1}^n) \mid f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))$ by Proposition 4(1). Since

$$\begin{aligned} [f_r(v^{\lfloor (i-1)/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_{i-1}^{n-1}))]_{hook} &= v^{\lfloor (i-1)/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_{i-1}^n) \\ &= d_{\alpha_{i-1}^n \beta_{i-1}^n}(v) s(\alpha_{i-1}^n) \end{aligned}$$

from induction hypothesis, we see that $[f_r(v^{\lfloor (i-1)/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_{i-1}^{n-1}))]_{hook}$ gives zero contribution to $[G(\sigma)]_{hook}$.

We thus conclude that $[f_r(s(\alpha_i^{n-1}))]_{hook} \neq 0$. Consequently, $s = \overline{n-2}$ (equivalently, $r = \overline{n-i-1}$) or $s = e-2$. If $s =$

$\overline{n-2} \neq e-2$, then since $\beta_i^n = ((q+1)^{s+1}, q^{e-2-s}, n-i-1)$ has two removable r -nodes, and removing them in turn produces $\tilde{\sigma}$ and $\mu = ((q+1)^{s+1}, q^{e-3-s}, q-1, n-i-1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma})), s(\beta_i^n) \rangle &= \langle f_r(s(\sigma) + d_{\mu\tilde{\sigma}}(v)s(\mu)), s(\beta_i^n) \rangle \\ &= 1 + v d_{\mu\tilde{\sigma}}(v) \end{aligned}$$

Note that by [2, Theorem 1], $d_{\mu\tilde{\sigma}}(v) = d_{(m-1,1),(m)}(v)$, where $m = q - (n-i-2)$, which in turn equals v by Lemma 5(2). Thus $\langle f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma})), s(\beta_i^n) \rangle = 1 + v^2$. Now, if $\beta_i^n \triangleleft \lambda \triangleleft \sigma$, then

$$\lambda = ((q+1)^{s+2}, q^{e-3-s}, n-i-2),$$

which has a unique removable r -node that upon removal produces $\tilde{\lambda} = ((q+1)^{s+2}, q^{e-4-s}, q-1, n-i-2) \not\triangleleft \tilde{\sigma}$. Thus,

$$\langle f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma})), s(\lambda) \rangle = d_{\tilde{\lambda}\tilde{\sigma}}(v) \langle f_r(s(\tilde{\lambda})), s(\lambda) \rangle = 0$$

by Theorem 2, so that $G(\beta_i^n) \mid f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))$ (and $d_{\beta_i^n \sigma}(v) = v^2$) by Proposition 4(3). But

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma})), s(\alpha_i^n) \rangle &= \langle f_r(v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_{n-1}} s(\alpha_i^{n-1}), s(\alpha_i^n) \rangle \\ &= v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_{n-1}} \\ &= d_{\alpha_i^n \beta_i^n}(v), \end{aligned}$$

so that $[f_r(v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_{n-1}} s(\alpha_i^{n-1}))]_{hook}$ gives zero contribution to $[G(\sigma)]_{hook}$, a contradiction. Thus, $s = e-2$, and hence $\sigma = \beta_{i+1}^n$ and

$$\begin{aligned} [f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook} &= [f_r(v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_{n-1}} s(\alpha_i^{n-1}))]_{hook} \\ &= \delta_n v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_{n-1}} s(\alpha_i^n) + v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_r + \delta_n} s(\alpha_{i+1}^n) \\ &= \delta_n v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_i^n) + v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor + \delta_n} s(\alpha_{i+1}^n) \end{aligned}$$

By induction hypothesis and Proposition 4(2) (similar to that used in Case 1a), we have $[G(\sigma)]_{hook} = [f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook}$ as required.

Case 2b. $k = 1$, $r = \overline{-i-1}$: Here, $\sigma = \beta_{i+1}^n$, and

$$\begin{aligned} [f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook} &= [f_r(v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_{n-1}} s(\alpha_i^{n-1}) + \delta_{n-1} v^{\lfloor (i-1)/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_{i-1}^{n-1}))]_{hook} \\ &= \delta_n v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_i^n) + v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_n + \delta_r} s(\alpha_{i+1}^{n-1}) \\ &= \delta_n v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_i^n) + v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor + \delta_n} s(\alpha_{i+1}^{n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

By induction hypothesis and Proposition 4(2) (similar to that used in Case 1a), we have $[G(\sigma)]_{hook} = [f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook}$ as required.

Case 2c. $k = 2$, $r = \overline{q+1}$: Here, $\tilde{\sigma} = ((q+1)^{e-1}, q)$, $\sigma = (q+2, (q+1)^{e-1}) = \beta_i^n$, and

$$\begin{aligned} [f_r^{(2)}(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook} &= [f_r^{(2)}(v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_i^{n-2}))]_{hook} \\ &= v^{\lfloor i/e \rfloor + \delta_r} s(\alpha_{i+1}^n) \\ &= v^{\lfloor (i+1)/e \rfloor} s(\alpha_{i+1}^n) \end{aligned}$$

By induction hypothesis and Proposition 4(2), we have $[G(\sigma)]_{hook} = [f_r^{(2)}(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook}$ as required.

□

4. PART (2) OF THEOREM 1

In this section, we deal with the case of $e = 2$. Let $\beta_i^n = (n - i, i)$ for $i < n/2$. Then $\beta_i^n = (\alpha_i^n)^R = (\alpha_{n-1-i}^n)^R$.

The following is just a reformulation of part (2) of Theorem 1.

Theorem 9. For $0 \leq i < n/2$,

$$[G(\beta_i^n)]_{hook} = \sum_{\substack{i \leq j < n-i \\ j \equiv i \pmod{2}}} \left(v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} s(\alpha_j^n) + \delta_n v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1 + \delta_{i+1}} s(\alpha_{j+1}^n) \right).$$

Furthermore, $[G(\sigma)]_{hook} = 0$ for all other 2-regular σ 's.

Proof. We prove by induction on n . The theorem is trivially true for $n = 0, 1$. Now suppose that $[G(\sigma)]_{hook} \neq 0$, and that the theorem holds for all 2-regular $\mu \prec \sigma$. Let $\tilde{\sigma}$ be the partition obtained by removing the last ladder of σ , which has size k and residue r . Then $[G(\tilde{\sigma})]_{hook} \neq 0$ by Theorem 3 and Lemma 5. By inductive hypothesis, $\tilde{\sigma} = \beta_i^{n-k} = (n - k - i, i)$ for some $i < (n - k)/2$. Thus, $1 \leq k \leq 3$.

Case 1: $k = 1$: In this case, $\sigma = \beta_i = (n - i, i)$ with $i < (n - 1)/2$, and $r = \overline{n - i - 1}$. By inductive hypothesis,

$$[G(\tilde{\sigma})]_{hook} = \sum_{\substack{i \leq j < n-1-i \\ j \equiv i \pmod{2}}} \left(v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} s(\alpha_j^{n-1}) + \delta_{n-1} v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1 + \delta_{i+1}} s(\alpha_{j+1}^{n-1}) \right).$$

Thus, by Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook} &= \sum_{\substack{i \leq j < n-1-i \\ j \equiv i \pmod{2}}} \left(v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} [f_r(s(\alpha_j^{n-1}))]_{hook} + \delta_{n-1} v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1 + \delta_{i+1}} [f_r(s(\alpha_{j+1}^{n-1}))]_{hook} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i \leq j < n-1-i \\ j \equiv i \pmod{2}}} \left(v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} s(\alpha_j^n) + \delta_n v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1 + \delta_{i+1}} s(\alpha_{j+1}^n) + \delta_{n-1} v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1} s(\alpha_{j+2}^n) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i \leq j < n-1-i \\ j \equiv i \pmod{2}}} \left(v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} s(\alpha_j^n) + \delta_n v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1 + \delta_{i+1}} s(\alpha_{j+1}^n) \right) + \delta_{n-1} [G(\beta_{i+2}^n)]_{hook}, \end{aligned}$$

by inductive hypothesis. Now by Proposition 6(2),

$$d_{\beta_j^{n-1}\tilde{\sigma}}(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j = i; \\ v, & \text{if } j = i + 1 \text{ and } 2 \mid (n - 1); \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, $\langle f_r(s(\lambda)), s(\beta_j^n) \rangle = 0$ unless $\lambda = \beta_{j-1}^{n-1}$ (when $r = \bar{j}$) or β_j^{n-1} (when $r = \overline{n-j-1}$). As such, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f_r(G(\tilde{\sigma})), s(\beta_j^n) \rangle &= \sum_{\lambda} d_{\lambda\tilde{\sigma}}(v) \langle f_r(s(\lambda)), s(\beta_j^n) \rangle \\ &= \delta_{r-j} v^{\delta_n - \delta_{n-1}} d_{\beta_{j-1}^{n-1}\tilde{\sigma}}(v) + \delta_{r-n+j+1} d_{\beta_j^{n-1}\tilde{\sigma}}(v) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j = i; \\ 1, & \text{if } j = i+2 \text{ and } 2 \mid (n-1); \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, keeping the notations of Theorem 3, we have in fact $L_{\beta_{i+2}^n}(v) = \delta_{n-1}$, and $L_{\beta_j^n}(v) = 0$ for all $j \neq i, i+2$ by Proposition 4(3). Hence, together with induction hypothesis, we have

$$[G(\sigma)]_{hook} = \sum_{\substack{i \leq j < n-i \\ j \equiv i \pmod{2}}} \left(v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} s(\alpha_j^n) + \delta_n v^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1 + \delta_{i+1}} s(\alpha_{j+1}^n) \right)$$

as claimed.

Case 2: $k = 2$: In this case, $\sigma = (a+1, a) = \beta_a^n$ and $\tilde{\sigma} = (a, a-1) = \beta_{a-1}^{n-2}$, where $n = 2a+1$, and $r = \bar{a}$. By induction hypothesis, $[G(\tilde{\sigma})]_{hook} = v^{\lfloor (a-1)/2 \rfloor} s(\alpha_{a-1}^{n-2})$, so that by Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [f_r^{(2)}(G(\tilde{\sigma}))]_{hook} &= v^{\lfloor (a-1)/2 \rfloor + \delta_a} s(\alpha_a^n) \\ &= v^{\lfloor a/2 \rfloor} s(\alpha_a^n). \end{aligned}$$

Since $d_{\alpha_a^n \mu}(v) = 0$ for all $\mu \triangleleft \sigma$ by induction hypothesis, we have $[G(\sigma)]_{hook} = v^{\lfloor a/2 \rfloor} s(\alpha_a^n)$ by Proposition 4(2) as claimed.

Case 3: $k = 3$: In this case, $\sigma = (3, 2, 1)$. As σ is a 2-core partition, we have $G(\sigma) = \sigma$ by Theorem 2, contradicting $[G(\sigma)]_{hook} \neq 0$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Ariki. On the decomposition numbers of the Hecke algebra of $G(m, 1, n)$. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 36(4):789–808, 1996.
- [2] J. Chuang, H. Miyachi, K.M. Tan. Row and column removal in the q -deformed Fock space. *J. Algebra*, 254:84–91, 2002.
- [3] T. Hayashi. q -analogues of Clifford and Weyl algebras—spinor and oscillator representations of quantum enveloping algebras. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 127(1):129–144, 1990.
- [4] G. D. James. The decomposition matrices of $GL_n(q)$ for $n \leq 10$. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3), 60(2):225–265, 1990.
- [5] G. D. James and A. Kerber. *The representation theory of the symmetric group*, volume 16 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., 1981.
- [6] G. D. James and A. Mathas. Hecke algebras of type A with $q = -1$. *J. Algebra*, 184:102–158, 1996.
- [7] M. Kashiwara. On crystal bases of the Q -analogue of universal enveloping algebras. *Duke Math. J.*, 63(2):465–516, 1991.
- [8] A. Lascoux, B. Leclerc, and J.-Y. Thibon. Hecke algebras at roots of unity and crystal bases of quantum affine algebras. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 181(1):205–263, 1996.

- [9] B. Leclerc. Symmetric functions and the Fock space representation of $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_n)$. Lectures at the Newton Institute, Cambridge, 2001.
- [10] S. Lyle. *Some topics in the representation theory of the symmetric and general linear groups*, Ph.D. thesis, Imperial College, London, 2003.
- [11] A. Mathas. *Iwahori-Hecke algebras and Schur algebras of the symmetric group*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [12] K. Misra and T. Miwa. Crystal base for the basic representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}(n))$. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 134(1):79–88, 1990.
- [13] M. H. Peel. Hook representations of the symmetric groups, *Glasgow Math. J.*, 12:136–149, 1971.
- [14] M. Varagnolo and E. Vasserot. On the decomposition matrices of the quantized Schur algebra. *Duke Math. J.*, 100(2):267–297, 1999.

(J. Chuang) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL, UNIVERSITY WALK, BRISTOL BS8 1TW, UNITED KINGDOM.

E-mail address: joseph.chuang@bris.ac.uk

(H. Miyachi) GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, NAGOYA UNIVERSITY, CHIKUSA-KU, NAGOYA 464-8602, JAPAN.

E-mail address: miyachi@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp

(K. M. Tan) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE, 2, SCIENCE DRIVE 2, SINGAPORE 117543.

E-mail address: tankm@nus.edu.sg