The Shuffle Theorem

The *shuffle theorem* of Carlsson and Mellit gives a combinatorial expression for coeffs of the symmetric function ∇e_n in terms of a q, t-weighted count of labeled lattice paths:

Theorem (Carlsson–Mellit [1] + Loehr–Remmel [2]):

For all μ , ν compositions with $|\mu| + |\nu| = n$,

$$\langle \nabla e_n, e_\mu h_\nu \rangle = \sum_{D \in \mathsf{PF}(\mu;\nu)} q^{\mathsf{area}(D)} t^{\mathsf{pmaj}(D)},$$

where $\mathsf{PF}(\mu;\nu)$ is a certain class of parking functions (viewed as lattice) paths).

area(D) = # whole squares between D and main diagonal. pmaj(D) is significantly more complicated.

Graphs

For all μ, ν with $|\mu| + |\nu| = n$, $G_{\mu,\nu}$ is a graph on vertex set [n] with:

- A clique K_{μ_i} for each component $\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_{\ell(\mu)}$ of μ_i
- An independent set \bar{K}_{ν_i} for each component $\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_{\ell(\nu)}$ of ν_{\perp}
- All possible edges between these blocks.

We fix a particular labeling of the vertices:

- The vertices of μ_i are $n (\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_{i-1})$ through $n - (\mu_1 + \cdots + \mu_i) + 1.$
- The vertices of ν_i are $n |\mu| (\nu_1 + \cdots + \nu_{i-1})$ through $n - |\mu| - (\nu_1 + \cdots + \nu_i) + 1.$

Attach a sink vertex 0 to each vertex of $G_{\mu,\nu}$ to get $\hat{G}_{\mu,\nu}$. Running example: $\hat{G}_{(4,3),(2,3)}$

Sandpiles

Sandpile configuration κ on G: assign a nonneg. number of "grains of" sand" to each nonsink vertex of G (sink has unlimited sand). If $\kappa(v) \geq \deg(v)$, v can topple and give one grain to each of its

neighbors. $\phi_v(\kappa) =$ resulting config. If v can't topple, κ is stable at v

Stable config κ is *recurrent* if, starting from $\phi_{\mathsf{sink}}(\kappa)$, nonsink verts can be ordered so that if we topple in this order the config always stays nonnegative.

https://alexanderlazar.github.io

Shuffle Theorems and Sandpiles

Michele D'Adderio Università di Pisa, Mark Dukes University College Dublin, Alessandro Iraci Università di Pisa, Alexander Lazar[†] Université Libre de Bruxelles, Yvan Le Borgne LaBRI, Anna Vanden Wyngaerd Université Libre de Bruxelles



(2004), no. 1, Research Paper 68, 64. MR 2097334

Computing delay The configuration in our example has toppling word 10, 9, 7, 6, 5, 3, 2, 11, 8, 4, 1, 12, and hence a **delay** of 6. Following our algorithm step-by-step gives the following: 0. Fire 0. 1. In Round 1, we skip 12, 11, 8, 4, and 1. 2. In Round 2, we skip 12 again, but 11, 8, 4, and 1 topple. 3. In Round 3, 12 topples. $3 \qquad 11$ $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 11 (4) (2)(5)(10)Figure 1. State of the configuration after Round 1. Nodes filled in gray have been toppled and are ignored in subsequent rounds. Main Result The bistatistic (level, delay) allows us to compute coeffs of ∇e_n in terms of graphs. Theorem (DADILLBVW): For all n and μ , ν compositions with $|\mu| + |\nu| = n$, we have $\langle \nabla e_n, e_\mu h_\nu \rangle = \sum q^{\mathsf{level}(\kappa)} t^{\mathsf{delay}(\kappa)},$ $\kappa \in \text{sortrec}(\mu; \nu)$ where sortrec($\mu; \nu$) is the set of sorted recurrent configs on $\hat{G}_{\mu,\nu}$. [1] Erik Carlsson and Anton Mellit, A proof of the shuffle conjecture, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **31** (2018), no. 3, 661–697. MR 3787405

[2] Nicholas A. Loehr and Jeffrey B. Remmel, Conjectured combinatorial models for the Hilbert series of generalized diagonal harmonics modules, Electron. J. Combin. 11





alexander.leo.lazar@ulb.be