

On the spherical partition algebra

Katherine Ormeño Bastías^{*1}, Paul Martin^{†2}, and Steen Ryom-Hansen^{‡3}

¹Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad de Talca, Chile

²School of Mathematics, Leeds University, UK

³Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad de Talca, Chile

Abstract

We introduce and study the spherical partition algebras \mathcal{SP}_k for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, defined in general over $\mathbb{C}[x]$. We determine a basis for each \mathcal{SP}_k and hence determine the rank $\text{rk}_{\mathbb{C}[x]} \mathcal{SP}_k = bp_k$, where (bp_k) is the sequence A002774 in the OEIS. For $t \in \mathbb{C}$ we consider the specialized algebra $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$. For $t = n \in \mathbb{N}$, we describe the structure of $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ by giving the permutation module decomposition of the k 'th symmetric power of the defining module for the symmetric group algebra $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$. In general, we show that $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ is quasi-hereditary over \mathbb{C} for all $t \in \mathbb{C}$, except $t = 0$. We determine the decomposition numbers for $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ for every specialization $t \in \mathbb{C}$ except $t = 0$, (which includes semisimple and non-semisimple cases). In particular we determine the structure of all indecomposable projective modules; and the indecomposable tilting modules.

1 INTRODUCTION

The *partition algebra* \mathcal{P}_k arose around thirty years ago in the second named author's work on the Potts model in statistical mechanics, see [30]. Since then it has been understood that \mathcal{P}_k is in fact connected with many other areas of mathematics and physics, including Deligne's category $\text{Rep}(S_t)$, the Kronecker problem in the representation theory of the symmetric group, Schur algebras, and symmetric function theory, see for example [8], [10], [34], [38].

By definition, \mathcal{P}_k is a $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -algebra with basis indexed by the set partitions on $\{1, 2, \dots, k\} \cup \{1', 2', \dots, k'\}$. It has a large number of 'interesting' subalgebras (that is subalgebras with a 'name'), for example the half integer partition algebra, the quasi-partition algebra, the Temperley-Lieb algebra, the Motzkin algebra, the Brauer algebra, the quasi-Brauer algebra, the Rook algebra, the group algebra of the symmetric group \mathfrak{S}_k , and so on, see for example [9], [12], [42] and references therein, and it is also closely related to the bt -algebra of knot theory, see [1], [2], [5], [17], [44], [45].

In the present paper we introduce and study yet another subalgebra of \mathcal{P}_k , that we call the *spherical partition algebra* \mathcal{SP}_k . By definition, \mathcal{SP}_k is the $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -algebra given by idempotent truncation of \mathcal{P}_k , as follows

$$\mathcal{SP}_k = e_k \mathcal{P}_k e_k \tag{1.1}$$

where $e_k = \iota_k \left(\frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} \sigma \right)$ and $\iota : \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_k$ is the inclusion map, and so it may be seen as the partition algebra analogue of the *spherical Cherednik algebra*, considered for example in [40]. For any $t \in \mathbb{C}$, there is a specialization map $x \mapsto t$ for \mathcal{SP}_k and we denote by $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ the corresponding specialized algebra. We show that the $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$'s, for t running over \mathbb{C} , are algebras of fundamental interest in the representation theory of diagram algebras, and even beyond that.

A first main result of our paper, given in Theorem 2, is the determination of the rank $\text{rk}_{\mathbb{C}[x]} \mathcal{SP}_k$ of \mathcal{SP}_k . We find that $\text{rk}_{\mathbb{C}[x]} \mathcal{SP}_k = bp_k$ where bp_k is the cardinality of *bipartite partitions* BiPar_k of k . Bipartite partitions are classical combinatorial objects whose history goes back more than a century to the work of Macmahon and others, see for example [28]. The sequence $(bp_0, bp_1, bp_2, bp_3, bp_4, bp_5, \dots) = (1, 2, 9, 31, 109, 339, \dots)$ is A002774 in the On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, see <https://oeis.org/A002774>.

Let V be a vector space of dimension n . Then the second named author and V. Jones independently proved that $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ is in Schur-Weyl duality with the group algebra $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$, acting diagonally on $V_n^{\otimes k}$, see [19], [30]. This is

^{*}supported in part by ANID beca doctorado nacional 21202166 and EPSRC grant EP/W007509/1

[†]supported in part by EPSRC grant EP/W007509/1

[‡]supported in part by FONDECYT grant 1221112 and EPSRC grant EP/W007509/1

an important *double centralizer property* that allows us to pass representation theoretic information back and forth between the module categories for $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ and $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$.

A main motivation for our work is to establish an analogous *double centralizer property* involving $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ and $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$, but this time with commuting actions on the symmetric power space $S^k V_n$, and to study some of its consequences. We achieve this goal in section 6 of our paper, culminating in our Theorems 6 and 7. We obtain an isomorphism of $(\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n, \mathcal{SP}_k(n))$ -bimodules

$$S^k V_n \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n}} S(\lambda) \otimes G_k(\lambda) \quad (1.2)$$

where $S(\lambda)$ is the Specht module for $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ and $G_k(\lambda)$ is a simple module for $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$, for $\text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n} \subseteq \text{Par}_k$ a concretely defined subset of the set of partitions of k , see (6.18). Moreover, for $\lambda \in \text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n}$ we obtain an explicit dimension formula

$$\dim G_k(\lambda) = \sum_{\nu \in \text{Par}_k^{\leq n}} K_{\lambda, \Phi(\nu)} \quad (1.3)$$

where $K_{\lambda, \Phi(\nu)}$ is the Kostka number, and $\Phi : \text{Par}_k^{\leq n} \rightarrow \text{Par}_n$ is a 'multiplicity' function defined on the partitions of k of length less than n . A key ingredient in the proof of (1.3) is a direct sum decomposition of $S^k V_n$ in terms of *permutation modules* for $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$. A related version of this decomposition was obtained by Harman in [23], but for the reader's convenience we provide its (simple) proof in Theorem 3.

Considering small value of n , it is clear that the $G_k(\lambda)$'s do not exhaust all the simple $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ -modules, and therefore we embark on a systematic study of the representation theory of $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$, for all specializations $x \mapsto t \in \mathbb{C}$ (except $t = 0$ that we sometimes omit for brevity of the presentation). We find that $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ is semisimple if $t \notin \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2k - 2\}$ but not if $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2k - 2\}$ (although $S^k V_n$ is always a semisimple $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ -module, as can be read off from (1.2)).

A main ingredient in our study is the fact, shown for example by Xi and Doran-Wales, that \mathcal{P}_k is a *cellular algebra* in the sense of Graham and Lehrer, and therefore \mathcal{SP}_k is a cellular algebra too, being an idempotent truncation of a cellular algebra, see eg. [16], [20], [25] and [49]. The cell modules are of the form $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda)$ where the $\Delta_k(\lambda)$'s are cell modules for \mathcal{P}_k and $\lambda \in \Lambda^k = \bigcup_{l=0}^k \text{Par}_l$.

In section 7, we combine results due to Murphy, see [36], with specific diagrammatic calculations in order to obtain a basis for $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda)$. In particular, in Theorem 11 we show

$$\dim e_k \Delta_k(\lambda) = \sum_{i=l}^k \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \text{Par}_i \\ \Psi(\nu) \in \text{Par}_l}} K_{\lambda, \Psi(\nu)} |\text{Par}_{k-i}| \quad (1.4)$$

where $\Psi : \text{Par}_i \rightarrow \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \text{Par}_k$ is a new multiplicity function. In Corollary 12, we deduce from this that $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda) \neq 0$ if and only if $\lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k$ where $\Lambda_{sph}^k \subseteq \Lambda^k$ is another concretely defined subset of Λ^k , see (7.25).

The set Λ_{sph}^k is the natural index set for the representation theory of $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$. The simple $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ -modules are $\{e_k L_k(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k\}$, obtained via multiplication with e_k on the simple $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$ -modules $L_k(\lambda)$. This, combined with results by the second named author, see [31], leads to our main Theorem 20 that describes the decomposition numbers and dimensions of the simple modules for $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$, in all cases except $t = 0$.

Our proofs rely heavily on Corollary 15, stating that $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ is a quasi-hereditary algebra when $t \neq 0$. This is a key property for $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$, that also $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$ has. In the final section 9 of the paper, we take the opportunity to determine the indecomposable projective modules and the indecomposable tilting modules for both algebras.

In [37], S. Narayanan, D. Paul and S. Srivastava introduced the *multiset partition algebra* \mathcal{MP}_k via an explicit combinatorial definition of its structure coefficients. It was further generalized and studied by R. Orellana and M. Zabrocki in [39] and by A. Wilson in [47]. In [37] it was proved that $\mathcal{MP}_k(n)$ is in Schur-Weyl duality with $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ on $S^k V_n$ and so it follows that $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ and $\mathcal{MP}_k(n)$ are isomorphic when $n \geq 2k$. Actually A. Wilson has kindly informed us of a(n unpublished) proof showing that $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ and $\mathcal{MP}_k(t)$ are isomorphic in general. Given this, it is likely that the simple modules for $\mathcal{MP}_k(n)$ that are described in [37], [39] and [47] in terms of *semistandard multiset tableaux*, are the $G_k(\lambda)$'s of the present paper. In this sense, the Schur-Weyl duality results of our section 6 may be considered as a complimentary approach to some of the results for $\mathcal{MP}_k(n)$, developed in [37], [39] and

Suppose that $\lambda \in \text{Comp}_k$. For $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$ we write $\mathfrak{s} \sim \mathfrak{t}$ if \mathfrak{s} can be obtained from \mathfrak{t} by permuting the numbers within the rows of \mathfrak{t} . This defines an equivalence relation on $\text{Tab}(\lambda)$. The equivalence classes under \sim are called λ -*tabloids* and the tabloid represented by \mathfrak{t} is denoted $\{\mathfrak{t}\}$. We let $\{\text{Tab}(\lambda)\}$ denote the set of λ -tabloids.

Let \mathfrak{S}_k be the symmetric group on $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and let $\lambda \in \text{Par}_k$. Then there is a natural left \mathfrak{S}_k -action on $\text{Tab}(\lambda)$, with $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ acting on the entries of $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Tab}(\lambda)$. For example, if $\lambda = (4, 3, 2)$ and $\sigma = (1, 3, 2)(4, 6, 5)$ in cycle notation, then

$$\sigma \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 6 & 9 \\ \hline 2 & 5 & 8 & \\ \hline 4 & 7 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \right) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 3 & 2 & 5 & 9 \\ \hline 1 & 4 & 8 & \\ \hline 6 & 7 & & \\ \hline \end{array} . \quad (2.3)$$

Note that $\text{Tab}(\lambda) \cong \mathfrak{S}_k$, where \mathfrak{S}_k acts on \mathfrak{S}_k via left multiplication. Note also that the left \mathfrak{S}_k -action on $\text{Tab}(\lambda)$ induces a left \mathfrak{S}_k -action on $\{\text{Tab}(\lambda)\}$. Let $M(\lambda)$ be the free \mathbb{C} -vector space on $\{\text{Tab}(\lambda)\}$. Then the left \mathfrak{S}_k -action on $\{\text{Tab}(\lambda)\}$ gives rise to a left $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k$ -module structure on $M(\lambda)$. This is the *permutation module* for $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k$. We have

$$\dim M(\lambda) = \binom{k}{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p} \text{ where } \binom{k}{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p} \text{ is the multinomial coefficient.} \quad (2.4)$$

The irreducible $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k$ -modules are the *Specht modules* $\{S(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \text{Par}_k\}$, see for example [24]. We have $\dim S(\lambda) = \text{Std}(\lambda)$.

Let $\lambda \in \text{Par}_k$ and let $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_q) \in \text{Comp}_k$. Then a *semistandard* λ -tableau \mathfrak{s} of type μ is a filling of the nodes of λ , with the number 1 occurring μ_1 times, the number 2 occurring μ_2 times and so on, such that the numbers in each row of \mathfrak{s} are weakly increasing from left to right, whereas the numbers in each column of \mathfrak{s} are strictly increasing from top to bottom. For example, if $\lambda = (4, 3, 2)$ and $\mu = (3, 3, 3)$, the following are the two possible semistandard λ -tableaux of type μ

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\ \hline 2 & 2 & 3 & \\ \hline 3 & 3 & & \\ \hline \end{array} , \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 2 & 2 & \\ \hline 3 & 3 & & \\ \hline \end{array} . \quad (2.5)$$

The set of semistandard λ -tableaux of type μ is denoted $\text{SStd}(\lambda, \mu)$ and its cardinality $|\text{SStd}(\lambda, \mu)|$ is the *Kostka number* $K_{\lambda\mu}$. For example, for $\lambda = (4, 3, 2)$ and $\mu = (3, 3, 3)$ we have $K_{\lambda\mu} = 2$, as can be read off from (2.5).

Let $[M(\mu) : S(\lambda)]$ be the multiplicity of $S(\lambda)$ in $M(\mu)$. Then we have that

$$[M(\mu) : S(\lambda)] = K_{\lambda\mu}. \quad (2.6)$$

If $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_l) \in \text{Comp}_k$ is obtained from $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l) \in \text{Comp}_k$ via $\nu_i = \mu_{\sigma(i)}$ for some $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_l$, then there exists an isomorphism $M(\mu) \cong M(\nu)$ of $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k$ -modules. This is reflected in (2.6), since $K_{\lambda\mu} = K_{\lambda\nu}$ in that case.

3 BIPARTITE PARTITIONS

In this section we recall the notion of bipartite partitions and introduce the spherical partition algebra.

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we let BiPar_k be the set of *bipartite* partitions of k . That is, BiPar_k is the set of multisets $b = \{[x_1, y_1], [x_2, y_2], \dots, [x_a, y_a]\}$ of pairs $[x_i, y_i]$ such that x_i and y_i are nonnegative integers, not both zero, satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^a x_i = \sum_{i=1}^a y_i = k. \quad (3.1)$$

Let bp_k be the cardinality of BiPar_k . Then $bp_1 = 2$, since BiPar_1 consists of the multisets

$$\{[1, 1]\}, \{[1, 0], [0, 1]\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Similarly, $bp_2 = 9$, since BiPar_2 consists of the multisets

$$\begin{aligned} & \{[2, 2]\}, \{[1, 0], [1, 2]\}, \{[2, 1], [0, 1]\}, \{[1, 1], [1, 1]\}, \{[2, 0], [0, 2]\}, \{[2, 0], [0, 1], [0, 1]\} \\ & \{[1, 0], [1, 0], [0, 2]\}, \{[1, 1], [1, 0], [0, 1]\}, \{[1, 0], [1, 0], [0, 1], [0, 1]\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

We use the convention that $bp_0 = 1$. The sequence

$$(bp_0, bp_1, bp_2, bp_3, bp_4, bp_5, \dots) = (1, 2, 9, 31, 109, 339, \dots) \quad (3.4)$$

is A002774 in the OEIS, see <https://oeis.org/A002774>.

Bipartite partitions in BiPar_k are also known as *vector* partitions of $[k, k]$. Their history goes back to the work of Macmahon, and their combinatorics have been studied for example in [3], [21] and [28]. In the present paper, we shall see that they are also the dimensions of certain interesting algebras.

For $b = \{[x_1, y_1], [x_2, y_2], \dots, [x_a, y_a]\} \in \text{BiPar}_k$ we represent each part $[x_i, y_i]$ of b via two parallel horizontal lines of points, the top row containing x_i points and the bottom row containing y_i points, that are joined via a *propagating* line from the leftmost top point to the leftmost bottom point, for example

$$[5, 3] = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \end{array} \quad (3.5)$$

We represent b itself diagrammatically by concatenating the diagrams of the parts $[x_i, y_i]$ from left to right, for example for $b = \{[3, 1], [2, 2], [3, 2], [0, 4], [2, 1]\}$ we have

$$b \mapsto \begin{array}{c} \bullet \quad \bullet \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \quad \bullet \end{array} \quad (3.6)$$

Note that since elements of BiPar_k are multisets, this diagrammatic representation of $b \in \text{BiPar}_k$ is not unique, since any permutation of the parts of $b \in \text{BiPar}_k$ does not change b . For example we have

$$\{[2, 1], [1, 2]\} \mapsto \begin{array}{c} \bullet \quad \bullet \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \quad \bullet \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \quad \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \bullet \quad \bullet \end{array} \quad (3.7)$$

In order to remediate this nonuniqueness, we introduce for $b \in \text{BiPar}_k$ the *normal form* $N(b)$, using the appropriate lexicographic order. To be precise, suppose that $b = \{[x_1, y_1], [x_2, y_2], \dots, [x_a, y_a]\}$. Then we define $N(b) = ([x_{\sigma(1)}, y_{\sigma(1)}], [x_{\sigma(2)}, y_{\sigma(2)}], \dots, [x_{\sigma(a)}, y_{\sigma(a)}])$ where $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_a$ is chosen such that if $i \geq j$ then either $x_{\sigma(i)} < x_{\sigma(j)}$ or $(x_{\sigma(i)} = x_{\sigma(j)} \text{ and } y_{\sigma(i)} \leq y_{\sigma(j)})$. For example, we have

$$N(\{[1, 2], [2, 1], [4, 1], [0, 2], [0, 1], [1, 2], [1, 1], [3, 2]\}) = ([4, 1], [3, 2], [2, 1], [1, 2], [1, 2], [1, 1], [0, 2], [0, 1]) \quad (3.8)$$

Using the normal form $N(b)$, elements of BiPar_k may be viewed as sequences of pairs $[x_i, y_i]$ rather than multisets of such pairs. For $N(b)$ applied to b as in (3.6) we have

$$N(b) \mapsto \begin{array}{cccccccccccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\ \bullet & \bullet \\ \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup \\ \bullet & \bullet \\ 1' & 2' & 3' & 4' & 5' & 6' & 7' & 8' & 9' & 10' \end{array} \quad (3.9)$$

In [21], Garsia and Gessel gave another characterization of BiPar_k , that we shall need. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_l) \in \text{Par}_k$ and $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_l) \in \mathfrak{S}_l$ be a symmetric group element written in *permutation notation*, by which we mean that $\sigma_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$ and that σ maps i to σ_i for all i . Then λ is said to be σ -*compatible* if $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i+1}$ implies $\sigma_i < \sigma_{i+1}$.

Suppose now that $b = \{[x_1, y_1], [x_2, y_2], \dots, [x_a, y_a]\} \in \text{BiPar}_k$ and consider a diagrammatic representation for b as in (3.6). Define λ^{top} as the partition obtained from the nonzero x_i 's via reordering, and define similarly λ^{bot} . Next reorder the top points and bottom points of the diagram in such a way that there are no crossings between the propagating lines leaving parts of the same length in λ^{top} , and similarly for λ^{bot} , and let $GG(b)$ be the resulting diagram. Define $\lambda^{\text{top}, \text{pro}}$ to be the partition extracted from λ^{top} by eliminating the parts with no propagating lines, and define similarly $\lambda^{\text{bot}, \text{pro}}$. Then $\lambda^{\text{top}, \text{pro}}$ and $\lambda^{\text{bot}, \text{pro}}$ are partitions of the same length, say l , and so we may define $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_l) \in \mathfrak{S}_l$ by the condition that $\lambda_1^{\text{bot}, \text{pro}}$ is connected to $\lambda_{\sigma_1}^{\text{top}, \text{pro}}$, whereas $\lambda_2^{\text{bot}, \text{pro}}$ is connected to $\lambda_{\sigma_2}^{\text{top}, \text{pro}}$, and so on. With this notation, Theorem 2.1 of [21] states that $\lambda^{\text{bot}, \text{pro}}$ is σ -compatible whereas $\lambda^{\text{top}, \text{pro}}$ is σ^{-1} -compatible, and that BiPar_k is characterised by these properties. In other words, the diagram $GG(b)$ is another normal form for $b \in \text{BiPar}_k$. For example, for b as in (3.6), we have

$$GG(b) \mapsto \begin{array}{cccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \diagdown & \diagup & \diagdown & \diagup \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \end{array} \quad (3.10)$$


and so $\lambda^{top.prop} = (3, 3, 2, 2)$, $\lambda^{bot.prop} = (2, 2, 1, 1)$ and $\sigma = (1, 3, 2, 4)$.

We define the *propagating part* of $GG(b)$ to be the diagram obtained from $GG(b)$ by removing all components that are completely contained in the top line or in the bottom line of points. For example, for $GG(b)$ as in (3.10), the propagating part is



4 THE PARTITION ALGEBRA AND THE SPHERICAL PARTITION ALGEBRA

We next recall the partition algebra \mathcal{P}_k ; it was introduced by the second named author via considerations in statistical mechanics, see [30]. Let SetPar_k be the set of set partitions on $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$, that is the set of equivalence relations d on $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. For even subscript $2k$ we shall usually think of SetPar_{2k} as set partitions on $\{1, 2, \dots, k\} \cup \{1', 2', \dots, k'\}$. If $d \in \text{SetPar}_k$ we write $d = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_a\}$ where the d_i 's are the classes, or *blocks*, of d . If furthermore $d \in \text{SetPar}_{2k}$, we represent d diagrammatically using two parallel horizontal lines of points, just as for elements of BiPar_k , but this time labeling the top points $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and the bottom points $\{1', 2', \dots, k'\}$, from left to right. We draw lines between these points in such a way that the connected components, in graph theoretical sense, of the corresponding graph are exactly the blocks of d , for example




Note that, just as for elements of BiPar_k , this diagrammatic representation of $d \in \text{SetPar}_{2k}$ is not unique.


For $d = \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_a\} \in \text{SetPar}_{2k}$, we say that a block d_i is *propagating* if $d_i \cap \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \neq \emptyset$ and $d_i \cap \{1', 2', \dots, k'\} \neq \emptyset$. If $d_i \cap \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \neq \emptyset$ we say that $d_i \cap \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ is an *intersection top block* for d and if $d_i \cap \{1', 2', \dots, k'\} \neq \emptyset$ we say that $d_i \cap \{1', 2', \dots, k'\}$ is an *intersection bottom block* for d .

\mathcal{P}_k is the $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -algebra that, as a $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -module is free on SetPar_{2k} , and that has multiplication defined as follows. For elements $d, d_1 \in \text{SetPar}_{2k}$, let $d \circ_1 d_1$ be the concatenation of d and d_1 with d on top of d_1 . There may be one or several 'internal' connected components of $d \circ_1 d_1$, that is components that do not intersect any of the top or bottom points of $d \circ_1 d_1$. Let $d \circ_2 d_1$ be the diagram obtained from $d \circ_1 d_1$ by removing these N , say, internal components. There may still one or several 'internal points' of $d \circ_2 d_1$, that is points that are neither top or bottom points of $d \circ_2 d_1$, and we let $d \circ_3 d_1$ be the diagram obtained from $d \circ_2 d_1$ by eliminating these points. We may now view $d \circ_3 d_1$ as the diagram of a set partition and the product in \mathcal{P}_k of d and d_1 is defined as $dd_1 = x^N d \circ_3 d_1$. The product of two general elements of \mathcal{P}_k is defined as the linear extension of this.

For example, if



we have that



One checks that this rule gives rise to a well-defined associative multiplication on \mathcal{P}_k , in other words, dd_1 does not depend on the choices of diagrammatic representations for d and d_1 .

For any $t \in \mathbb{C}$ we define the specialized partition algebra $\mathcal{P}_k(t) = \mathcal{P}_k \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[x]} \mathbb{C}$ where \mathbb{C} is made into an $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -algebra via $x \mapsto t$.

As is well known, \mathfrak{S}_k is a Coxeter group on generators $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{k-1}\}$ where s_i is the simple transposition $s_i = (i, i + 1)$. Let $\mathbb{C}[x]\mathfrak{S}_k$ be the group algebra for \mathfrak{S}_k over $\mathbb{C}[x]$. Then there is a natural algebra inclusion

$\iota_k : \mathbb{C}[x]\mathfrak{S}_k \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_k$ given by

$$s_i \mapsto \begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & 2 & & i & & & n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \times & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1' & 2' & & i' & & & n' \end{array}. \quad (4.4)$$

Let $e_k = \iota_k \left(\frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k} \sigma \right)$. Then e_k is an idempotent of \mathcal{P}_k . We use it to introduce the protagonist of the present paper.

Definition 1. *The spherical partition algebra \mathcal{SP}_k is defined as the idempotent truncation of \mathcal{P}_k with idempotent e_k , that is*

$$\mathcal{SP}_k = e_k \mathcal{P}_k e_k. \quad (4.5)$$

Similarly, for $t \in \mathbb{C}$ we define the specialized spherical partition algebra $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ as $\mathcal{SP}_k(t) = e_k \mathcal{P}_k(t) e_k$.

Note that \mathcal{SP}_k is a subalgebra of \mathcal{P}_k , but not a unital subalgebra, since the one-element for \mathcal{SP}_k is e_k , and similarly for $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$.

5 RANK OF THE SPHERICAL PARTITION ALGEBRA

As a $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -module \mathcal{SP}_k is automatically free, since $\mathbb{C}[x]$ is a PID and \mathcal{SP}_k is a submodule of the free $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -module \mathcal{P}_k , and hence torsion-free. Our first task is to determine the rank of \mathcal{SP}_k .

For this, we first observe that any diagrammatic representation of $b \in \text{BiPar}_k$ may be viewed as an element of SetPar_{2k} . For example, for b as in (3.6), and hence $\mathbf{N}(b)$ as in (3.9), we have

$$b = \begin{array}{cccccccccccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 1' & 2' & 3' & 4' & 5' & 6' & 7' & 8' & 9' & 10' \end{array}, \quad \mathbf{N}(b) = \begin{array}{cccccccccccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 1' & 2' & 3' & 4' & 5' & 6' & 7' & 8' & 9' & 10' \end{array}. \quad (5.1)$$

We next recall some results and conventions from [49]. For $d \in \text{SetPar}_{2k}$ there is a canonical diagrammatic representation $\mathbf{N}(d)$ for d in which the propagating blocks all appear with only one propagating line, which connects the leftmost points of the corresponding top and bottom blocks. For example, for d as in (4.1), we have

$$d = \begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 1' & 2' & 3' & 4' & 5' & 6' & 7' & 8' & 9' \end{array}, \quad \mathbf{N}(d) = \begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 1' & 2' & 3' & 4' & 5' & 6' & 7' & 8' & 9' \end{array} \quad (5.2)$$

where we indicate with red and blue the two propagating blocks of $\mathbf{N}(d)$. For $l = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k$ we now let \mathcal{C}_l be the set

$$\mathcal{C}_l = \left\{ (d, S) \mid \begin{array}{l} d = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_p) \text{ is a set partition on } \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \text{ for } p \geq l \\ S \subseteq \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_p\} \text{ and } |S| = l \end{array} \right\}. \quad (5.3)$$

Then, by [49], there is a bijection f

$$f : \text{SetPar}_{2k} \cong \prod_{l=0}^k \mathcal{C}_l \times \mathfrak{S}_l \times \mathcal{C}_l. \quad (5.4)$$

For example, for d as in (5.2), we have

$$f(d) = f(\mathbf{N}(d)) = ((d_1, d_2, d_3), (d_2, d_3)) \times (1, 2) \times ((d'_1, d_2, d'_3, d'_4), (d'_1, d'_3)) \quad (5.5)$$

where, reading from left to right, $d_1 = \{1\}$, $d_2 = \{2, 3, 7, 8, 9\}$, corresponding to the first two intersection top blocks of d , etc.

We define $\text{SetPar}_{2k}^l \subseteq \text{SetPar}_{2k}$ as the set partitions whose diagrammatic representations have exactly l propagating blocks and get that f induces a bijection $\text{SetPar}_{2k}^l \cong \mathcal{C}_l \times \mathfrak{S}_l \times \mathcal{C}_l$.

There are natural commuting left and right \mathfrak{S}_k -actions on SetPar_{2k}^l and so we also get left and right \mathfrak{S}_k -actions on $\mathcal{C}_l \times \mathfrak{S}_l \times \mathcal{C}_l$, via f . These \mathfrak{S}_k -actions on $\mathcal{C}_l \times \mathfrak{S}_l \times \mathcal{C}_l$ are on the other hand not immediately 'visible', and so our first goal is to give another description of $\mathcal{C}_l \times \mathfrak{S}_l \times \mathcal{C}_l$ from which they can be read off. This will be useful for describing a basis for $\mathcal{SP}_k = e_k \mathcal{P}_k e_k$.

Let $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{t}_1$ be row standard tableaux whose shapes are compositions of k , such that \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{t} are of length r whereas \mathfrak{s}_1 and \mathfrak{t}_1 are of length r_1 , where r and r_1 are both greater than or equal to l . We then write $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s}_1) \sim_l (\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{t}_1)$ if $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s}_1) = (\rho\mathfrak{t}, \rho_1\mathfrak{t}_1)$ where ρ and ρ_1 are *row permutations* of \mathfrak{t} and \mathfrak{t}_1 , by which we mean that ρ and ρ_1 permute the rows of \mathfrak{t} and \mathfrak{t}_1 together with the numbers appearing in them. We further require that ρ and ρ_1 permute the first l rows of \mathfrak{t} and \mathfrak{t}_1 simultaneously, whereas they may permute the rows strictly below the l 'th row of \mathfrak{t} and \mathfrak{t}_1 independently. In other words, $\rho \in \mathfrak{S}_r$ and $\rho_1 \in \mathfrak{S}_{r_1}$ and $\rho|_{\{1,2,\dots,l\}} = \rho_1|_{\{1,2,\dots,l\}}$ where $\rho|_{\{1,2,\dots,l\}}$ and $\rho_1|_{\{1,2,\dots,l\}}$ denote the restrictions of ρ and ρ_1 to $\{1,2,\dots,l\}$. Here is an example with $l = 3$. We indicate with red the separation of the top l rows from the remaining lower rows of the tableaux.

$$\left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 9 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 10 \\ \hline 3 & 11 & \\ \hline 6 & 7 & \\ \hline 8 & & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} , \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 5 & 7 & & & \\ \hline 4 & 6 & & & \\ \hline 8 & 9 & & & \\ \hline 3 & & & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 10 & 11 & \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \sim_3 \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 10 \\ \hline 3 & 11 & \\ \hline 4 & 9 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline 6 & 7 & \\ \hline 8 & & \\ \hline \end{array} , \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 4 & 6 & & & \\ \hline 8 & 9 & & & \\ \hline 5 & 7 & & & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 10 & 11 & \\ \hline 3 & & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \right). \quad (5.6)$$

It is easy to check that \sim_l is an equivalence relation on pairs of row standard tableaux of length greater than l , and we define $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim_l}$ as the equivalence class represented by $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})$. Let $i \mapsto \min_{\mathfrak{t}}(i)$ be the function that gives the minimal (first) number of the i 'th row of the row standard tableau \mathfrak{t} . Then any class $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim_l}$ has a distinguished representative $(\mathfrak{s}^{incr}, \mathfrak{t}^{incr})$ for which $\min_{\mathfrak{s}^{incr}}$ is increasing on the restriction to $\{1, \dots, l\}$ and $\min_{\mathfrak{s}^{incr}}$ and $\min_{\mathfrak{t}^{incr}}$ are both increasing on the restriction to $\{l+1, l+2, \dots\}$. For example, in (5.6) the second pair is the distinguished representative for its class.

Now $\min_{\mathfrak{t}^{incr}}$ need not be increasing on the restriction to $\{1, \dots, l\}$, but there exists a row permutation ρ such that $\min_{\rho^{-1}\mathfrak{t}^{incr}}$ is increasing on the restriction to $\{1, \dots, l\}$. We may view ρ as an element of \mathfrak{S}_l . For example, in (5.6) we have $\rho = (1, 3, 2)$ in permutation notation. But ρ only depends on $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})$ through its class $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim_l}$, and so we define $\rho_{(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim_l}} = \rho$.

We next observe that any element d of SetPar_{2k}^l gives rise to a class $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim_l}$, by associating the intersection top blocks of d with the rows of \mathfrak{s} and the intersection bottom blocks of d with the rows of \mathfrak{t} , in such a way that intersection top and bottom blocks that are intersections of propagating blocks for d are associated with the first l rows of \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{t} , and with rows of the same row number if and only they are intersections of the same propagating block. For example, for d as in (5.2) the corresponding class is

$$\left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 2 & 3 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\ \hline 4 & 5 & 6 & & \\ \hline 1 & & & & \\ \hline \end{array} , \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 6 & 7 & 8 \\ \hline 1 & 2 & \\ \hline 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 9 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \sim_2. \quad (5.7)$$

One notes that the association just defined is a bijection between SetPar_{2k}^l and the set of classes $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim_l}$. Note also that the \mathfrak{S}_k -actions on SetPar_{2k}^l , under this bijection, correspond to the natural \mathfrak{S}_k -actions on \mathfrak{s} and \mathfrak{t} , as explained in (2.3), although the action on \mathfrak{t} should be chosen as a right action.

There is however also an obvious bijection between the set of classes $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim_l}$ and $\mathcal{C}_l \times \mathfrak{S}_l \times \mathcal{C}_l$. It maps $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim_l}$ to $(d_{\mathfrak{s}}, S_{\mathfrak{s}}) \times \rho_{(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim_l}} \times (d_{\mathfrak{t}}, S_{\mathfrak{t}})$ where $d_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is the set partition whose blocks are the rows of \mathfrak{s} , with $S_{\mathfrak{s}}$ being the blocks of the first l rows of \mathfrak{s} , and similarly for $d_{\mathfrak{t}}$ and $S_{\mathfrak{t}}$. Combining this with the bijection of the previous paragraph we have achieved our goal of describing the \mathfrak{S}_k -actions on $\mathcal{C}_l \times \mathfrak{S}_l \times \mathcal{C}_l$.

We now use it to prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 2. *The map $F : \text{BiPar}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{SP}_k$ given by $b \mapsto e_k N(b) e_k$ is injective. Moreover, the image of F , that is $\text{im}F = \{e_k N(b) e_k \mid b \in \text{BiPar}_k\}$, is a $\mathbb{C}[x]$ -basis for \mathcal{SP}_k and so $\text{rk}_{\mathbb{C}[x]} \mathcal{SP}_k = bp_k$.*

Proof: We first show simultaneously that F is injective and that $\text{im}F$ is a linearly independent set. Let $b \in \text{BiPar}_k$ and consider $N(b)$ as an element of SetPar_{2k} . Let $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim_l}$ be the class associated with $N(b)$ under the bijection explained in the paragraph before (5.7) and let $(\mathfrak{s}^{incr}, \mathfrak{t}^{incr})$ be its distinguished representative, as defined above.

Here is an example

$$(\mathfrak{s}^{incr}, \mathfrak{t}^{incr}) = \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 5 & 6 & 7 \\ \hline 8 & 9 & 10 \\ \hline 14 & 15 & \\ \hline 16 & 17 & \\ \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 11 & 12 & 13 & \\ \hline 18 & & & \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 \\ \hline 8 & 9 & \\ \hline 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 \\ \hline 14 & 15 & 16 & 17 \\ \hline 18 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \right). \quad (5.8)$$

Two properties can be observed in (5.8) and hold for general $(\mathfrak{s}^{incr}, \mathfrak{t}^{incr})$.

- I. We have $\rho_{(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim l}} = 1$ and so \mathfrak{t}^{incr} is the *row reading tableau*, in which the numbers $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ appear in order from left to right down the rows. Or, equivalently, $\min_{\mathfrak{t}^{incr}}$ is an increasing function.
- II. Let λ be the shape of \mathfrak{s}^{incr} . Then $\min_{\mathfrak{s}^{incr}}$ is also increasing, but only upon restriction to subsets I of the row indices for λ , for which $\{\lambda_i | i \in I\}$ is constant.

Using them we may now argue as follows. Let $\sigma, \sigma_1 \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ and suppose that $\sigma N(b) \sigma_1$ is of the form $N(b_1)$ for some $b_1 \in \text{BiPar}_k$. Then, passing to the pair $(\mathfrak{s}^{incr}, \mathfrak{t}^{incr})$ and using the properties, one sees that the only way to obtain an element in normal form by acting σ on \mathfrak{s}^{incr} and σ_1 on \mathfrak{t}^{incr} is that these two simultaneous actions only interchange numbers appearing in the same row. With this, we deduce that $b = b_1$. In other words, $N(b)$ is the only element from BiPar_k in normal form that appears in the expansion of $e_k N(b) e_k$. But this implies that F is injective and that imF is a linearly independent set, as claimed.

In order to prove that imF is a spanning set, it is enough to show that $e_k d e_k$ belongs to imF for any $d \in \text{SetPar}_{2k}$. Let therefore $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim l}$ be the class for d under the bijection constructed before (5.7). We first choose row permutations ρ and ρ_1 satisfying the conditions described in the paragraph before (5.6), such that $(\rho \mathfrak{s}, \rho_1 \mathfrak{t})$ has the shape of an element corresponding to $N(b)$ under the bijection, for some $b \in \text{BiPar}_k$. To be precise, by (3.8) this means that, when restricted to the top l rows, the shape of $\rho \mathfrak{s}$ is a partition, and so are the shapes of $\rho \mathfrak{s}$ and $\rho_1 \mathfrak{t}$, when restricted to the rows strictly below the l 'th row, whereas $\rho_1 \mathfrak{t}$ is only a partition on the restriction to the equally sized rows of $\sigma \mathfrak{s}$. Note that $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})_{\sim l} = (\rho \mathfrak{s}, \rho_1 \mathfrak{t})_{\sim l}$. But we may at this stage choose $\sigma, \sigma_1 \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ such that $(\sigma \rho \mathfrak{s}, \sigma_1 \rho_1 \mathfrak{t})$ is the distinguished representative of $N(b)$, for some $b \in \text{BiPar}_k$ as described below (5.8), which shows the claim. The Theorem is proved. \square

6 SCHUR-WEYL DUALITY FOR $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$

In this section we study the specialized spherical partition algebra $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Our main result is a double centralizer property involving $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ and \mathfrak{S}_n , both acting on the symmetric power $S^k V_n$ where V_n is a \mathbb{C} -vector space of dimension n . It is an analogue of Schur-Weyl duality, see [41], [48].

Fix a basis $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ for V_n . We consider V_n as a left $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -module via $\sigma v_i = v_{\sigma(i)}$ for $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. Let $V_n^{\otimes k} = \overbrace{V_n \otimes V_n \otimes \dots \otimes V_n}^k$. Then also $V_n^{\otimes k}$ is a left $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -module, via the diagonal action, that is

$$\sigma(v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_k}) = v_{\sigma(i_1)} \otimes v_{\sigma(i_2)} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{\sigma(i_k)} \quad \text{for } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n. \quad (6.1)$$

There is however also a natural $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k$ -module structure on $V_n^{\otimes k}$, given by place permutation. To distinguish it from the previous $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -module structure on $V_n^{\otimes k}$, we choose it to be a right module structure, in formulas:

$$(v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_k}) \sigma = v_{i_{\sigma(1)}} \otimes v_{i_{\sigma(2)}} \otimes \dots \otimes v_{i_{\sigma(k)}} \quad \text{for } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k. \quad (6.2)$$

In general, the two actions commute and so $V_n^{\otimes k}$ is a $(\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n, \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k)$ -bimodule.

We next define the k 'th symmetric power of V_n via

$$S^k V_n = (V_n^{\otimes k}) e_k \quad (6.3)$$

where $e_k \in \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k$ is the idempotent defined just below (4.4). It follows from the $(\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n, \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k)$ -structure on $V_n^{\otimes k}$ that $S^k V_n$ is a left $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -module.

For simplicity, we write

$$v_{i_1} v_{i_2} \cdots v_{i_k} = (v_{i_1} \otimes v_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_k}) e_k \quad (6.4)$$

and also

$$v_{i_1}^{a_1} v_{i_2}^{a_2} \cdots v_{i_p}^{a_p} = \left(\overbrace{v_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_1}}^{a_1} \otimes \overbrace{v_{i_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_2}}^{a_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \overbrace{v_{i_p} \otimes \cdots \otimes v_{i_p}}^{a_p} \right) e_k. \quad (6.5)$$

Then we have that

$$\{v_{i_1}^{m_1} v_{i_2}^{m_2} \cdots v_{i_p}^{m_p} \mid 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_k \leq n, \sum_i m_i = k\} \quad (6.6)$$

is a basis for $S^k V_n$ and so $\dim S^k V_n = \binom{k+n-1}{k}$.

Our first aim is to give a decomposition of the $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -module $S^k V_n$ in terms of permutation modules. Surprisingly, this appears to be new, and even the related $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -decomposition of $V_n^{\otimes k}$ was determined only recently in [11], see also [6] and [32].

Suppose that $\nu = (\nu_1^{a_1}, \nu_2^{a_2}, \dots, \nu_p^{a_p}) \in \text{Par}_k^{\leq n}$, that is $a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_p \leq n$. Then, setting $\Phi(\nu) = \text{ord}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p, d)$ where $d = n - (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_p)$, we obtain a function

$$\Phi : \text{Par}_k^{\leq n} \rightarrow \text{Par}_n. \quad (6.7)$$

The following Theorem gives the promised decomposition of the $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -module $S^k V_n$.

Theorem 3. a) *There is an isomorphism of $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -modules*

$$S^k V_n \cong \bigoplus_{\nu \in \text{Par}_k^{\leq n}} M(\Phi(\nu)) \quad (6.8)$$

where $M(\Phi(\nu))$ is the permutation module as in the paragraph before (2.4).

b) *The following multiplicity formula holds*

$$[S^k V_n : S(\lambda)] = \sum_{\nu \in \text{Par}_k^{\leq n}} K_{\lambda, \Phi(\nu)} \quad (6.9)$$

where $K_{\lambda, \Phi(\nu)}$ is the Kostka number.

Proof: In view of (2.6), **b)** of the Theorem follows immediately from **a)** of the Theorem, so let us show **a)**.

Choose $v = v_{i_1}^{m_1} v_{i_2}^{m_2} \cdots v_{i_p}^{m_p}$ an element of the basis for $S^k V_n$, given in (6.6), and let M be the $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -module generated by v . Note that the i_j 's are distinct and so there is $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ such that

$$\sigma(v) = v_1^{n_1} v_2^{n_2} \cdots v_p^{n_p} \text{ where } n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \dots \geq n_p. \quad (6.10)$$

Define now $\nu = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_p)$ and write $\nu = (\nu_1^{a_1}, \nu_s^{a_s}, \dots, \nu_s^{a_s})$ with $\nu_1 > \nu_2 > \dots > \nu_s$. Then one quickly checks that $\sigma(v)$ generates the $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -permutation module $M(\alpha)$ where $\alpha = \text{ord}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_s, d)$ for $d = n - (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_s)$, that is $M = M(\alpha)$ for $\alpha = \Phi(\nu)$ and $\nu = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s)$. This proves the Theorem. \square

Let us illustrate the argument of the proof of the Theorem using $k = 17$, $n = 15$ and

$$v = v_1 v_1 (v_2 v_2) v_3 v_3 (v_4) v_5 v_5 v_5 (v_6 v_6) v_7 (v_9) v_{10} v_{10} v_{10} \in S^{17} V_{15} \quad (6.11)$$

where we use parenthesis to group equal indices. Using the notation of the proof of the Theorem, this gives

$$\sigma(v) = v_1 v_1 v_1 (v_2 v_2 v_2) v_3 v_3 (v_4 v_4) v_5 v_5 (v_6 v_6) v_7 (v_8) v_9 \quad (6.12)$$

and so $\nu = (3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1) = (3^2, 2^4, 1^3)$ and $d = 15 - (2 + 4 + 3) = 6$, and hence $\alpha = \text{ord}(2, 4, 3, 6) = (6, 4, 3, 2)$. According to the Theorem we should therefore have $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_{15} v = M(\alpha)$.

On the other hand, the subgroup of \mathfrak{S}_{15} stabilizing $\sigma(v)$ is the Young subgroup

$$\mathfrak{S}_{1,2} \times \mathfrak{S}_{3,4,5,6} \times \mathfrak{S}_{7,8,9} \times \mathfrak{S}_{10,11,12,13,14,15} \quad (6.13)$$

corresponding to the multiplicities $(2, 4, 3)$ of ν and to d . Moreover, $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_{15} \sigma(v)$ is spanned by the elements

$$v_{i_1} v_{i_1} v_{i_1} (v_{i_2} v_{i_2} v_{i_2}) v_{i_3} v_{i_3} (v_{i_4} v_{i_4}) v_{i_5} v_{i_5} (v_{i_6} v_{i_6}) v_{i_7} (v_{i_8}) v_{i_9} \quad (6.14)$$

for distinct $i_j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 15\}$. But the elements in (6.14) are invariant under permutations of i_1 and i_2 , permutations of i_3, i_4, i_5, i_6 and permutations of i_7, i_8, i_9 and hence there are $\binom{15}{2,4,3,6}$ of them, as there should be.

Remark. Note that the proof of Theorem 3 does not use any special properties of \mathbb{C} and so the Theorem is valid for any ground field. Note also that, in view of the observation following (2.6), the omission of ord from the definition of Φ in (6.7) does not change the validity of Theorem 3.

To the best of our knowledge, the formula for the multiplicity $[S^k V_n : S(\lambda)]$ in Theorem 3 is new, but in the theory of symmetric functions there is another approach to $[S^k V_n : S(\lambda)]$, going back to the work of Aitken. We also need this approach, so let us briefly explain it. It uses power series.

Following the notation used in [29], we let $\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the ring of symmetric functions in infinitely many variables x_1, x_2, \dots , defined over \mathbb{Q} . Any basis for $\Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is indexed by Par and one prominent basis is $\{s_{\lambda} \mid \lambda \in \text{Par}\}$ the basis of Schur functions. Let R^k be the \mathbb{Q} -vector space with basis given by the irreducible characters for \mathfrak{S}_k and set $R = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} R^k$ with the convention that $R^0 = \mathbb{Q}$. Let $\text{ch} : R \rightarrow \Lambda_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the characteristic map. It satisfies $\text{ch}(\chi^{\lambda}) = s_{\lambda}$ where χ^{λ} is the character of $S(\lambda)$.

Letting ψ_n^k be the character of the \mathfrak{S}_n -module $S^k V_n$, we now have that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \text{ch}(\psi_n^k) t^k = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{Par}_n} s_{\lambda}(1, t, t^2, \dots) s_{\lambda}. \quad (6.15)$$

This is the formula showed by Aitken in [4], see also [46] and exercise 7.73 in [43]. For our purposes, the usefulness of it derives from the following expression for $s_{\lambda}(1, t, t^2, \dots)$, see for example Corollary 7.21.3 of [43].

$$s_{\lambda}(1, t, t^2, \dots) = \frac{t^{b(\lambda)}}{\prod_{u \in \lambda} [h(u)]}. \quad (6.16)$$

Here $[h(u)] = 1 - t^{h(u)}$ where $h(u)$ is the hook length of $u \in \lambda$, and $b(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} (i-1)\lambda_i$ for example

$$b \left(\begin{array}{cccccc} \square & \square & \square & \square & \square & \square \\ \square & \square & \square & \square & & \\ \square & \square & \square & & & \\ \square & \square & & & & \end{array} \right) = 7. \quad (6.17)$$

In the notation of symmetric function theory the expression in (6.15) is the *plethystic transformation* $h_n \left(\frac{X}{1-t} \right)$ of the complete symmetric function h_n where $X = x_1 + x_2 + \dots$, see for example Proposition 3.3.1 of the survey paper [22]. Since $h_n = s_n$, it is also equal to $s_n \left(\frac{X}{1-t} \right)$. Recall that plethystic transformation plays an important role in the theory of integrality and positivity of Macdonald polynomials. Indeed, these integrality and positivity properties only hold for the plethystically transformed Macdonald polynomials, not for the original Macdonald polynomials.

Combining the two formulas (6.15) and (6.16), one gets an expression for the multiplicity $[S^k V_n : S(\lambda)]$ by picking up the coefficient of t^k in the power series expansion of (6.16). This is less concrete than our closed formula in Theorem 3, but, as we shall now see, it allows us to determine exactly when $[S^k V_n : S(\lambda)] \neq 0$.

Lemma 4. *In the above setting we have that $[S^k V_n : S(\lambda)] \neq 0$ if and only if $k \geq b(\lambda)$.*

Proof: If $k < b(\lambda)$, it follows immediately from (6.15) and (6.16) that $[S^k V_n : S(\lambda)] = 0$. Conversely, if $k \geq b(\lambda)$ it follows from (6.15) and (6.16) that $[S^k V_n : S(\lambda)] \neq 0$ since any partition $\lambda \in \text{Par}_n$ has at least one node u of hook length 1 which gives a contribution $\frac{t^{b(\lambda)}}{[h(u)]} = t^{b(\lambda)}(1 + t + t^2 + \dots)$ to (6.16) that cannot be cancelled out. \square

In view of the Lemma we now define

$$\text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n} = \{\lambda \in \text{Par}_n \mid b(\lambda) \leq k\}. \quad (6.18)$$

For k big enough, we have $\text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n} = \text{Par}_n$. The next Lemma makes this statement precise.

Lemma 5. *We have $\text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n} = \text{Par}_n$ if and only if $\frac{n(n-1)}{2} \leq k$.*

Proof: For $\lambda \in \text{Par}_n$ we interpret $b(\lambda)$ as the sum of all the entries of the semistandard λ -tableau \mathfrak{t} on $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, obtained by inserting 0 in all the nodes of the first row of λ , 1 in all the nodes of the second row of λ , and so on. For example, for λ as in (6.17) we have that

$$\mathfrak{t} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 1 & 1 & & \\ \hline 2 & 2 & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad (6.19)$$

In view of this interpretation, it is clear that for λ running over Par_n , the maximal value of $b(\lambda)$ is obtained for the one column partition $\lambda = (1^n)$. But for this λ we have $b(\lambda) = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$, which shows the Lemma. \square

We now turn to our Schur-Weyl duality statement. It was shown in [19] and [30] that $V_n^{\otimes k}$ is a right module for $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$, with action commuting with the left $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -action on $V_n^{\otimes k}$ and so $V_n^{\otimes k}$ is a $(\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n, \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k)$ -bimodule. We do not need the actual formulas that define this $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -action, only the facts that the induced algebra homomorphism

$$\Upsilon : \mathcal{P}_k(n) \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n}(V_n^{\otimes k}), \quad \Upsilon(p)(v) = vp, \quad \text{where } p \in \mathcal{P}_k(n), v \in V_n^{\otimes k} \quad (6.20)$$

is surjective and is an isomorphism if $n \geq 2k$. The $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -action on $V_n^{\otimes k}$ induces an $\mathcal{SP}_k(n) = e_k \mathcal{P}_k(n) e_k$ -action on $S^k V_n = (V_n^{\otimes n}) e_k$, and hence an algebra homomorphism

$$\Upsilon_{sph} : \mathcal{SP}_k(n) \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n}(S^k V_n), \quad \Upsilon_{sph}(e_k p e_k)(v) = v e_k p e_k \quad \text{where } e_k p e_k \in \mathcal{SP}_k(n), v \in S^k V_n. \quad (6.21)$$

On the other hand, there is also an algebra homomorphism

$$\Xi : \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{P}_k(n)}(V_n^{\otimes k}), \quad \Xi(x) = xv, \quad \text{where } x \in \mathfrak{S}_n, v \in V_n^{\otimes k} \quad (6.22)$$

which is surjective, as follows from the surjectivity of Υ and Burnside's density Theorem, see for example [27] or Theorem 5.4 in [18], and Maschke's Theorem for $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$. It induces a homomorphism

$$\Xi_{sph} : \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{SP}_k(n)}(S^k V_n), \quad \Xi(x) = xv, \quad \text{where } x \in \mathfrak{S}_n, v \in S^k V_n. \quad (6.23)$$

The algebra surjections in (6.20) and (6.22) express the statement that the commuting actions of $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ and $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ on $V_n^{\otimes k}$ centralise each other, and therefore are in *Schur-Weyl duality* on $V_n^{\otimes k}$.

Note that in the statistical mechanical model underpinning the partition algebra $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$, that is the Potts model, the $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -module $V_n^{\otimes k}$ is the n -state Potts representation, see [30, §8.2]. In this setting, the commuting action of \mathfrak{S}_n is the Potts symmetry.

In view of (6.20) and (6.22), one may now hope that $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ and $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ are in Schur-Weyl duality on $S^k V_n$, via the maps Υ_{sph} and Ξ_{sph} given in (6.21) and (6.23). Our next result is that this indeed is the case.

Theorem 6. a) *The algebra homomorphism Υ_{sph} is surjective for all k, n and it is an isomorphism if $n \geq 2k$.*
b) *The algebra homomorphism Ξ_{sph} is surjective for all k, n .*

Proof: Let us first show that Υ_{sph} is surjective. Suppose that $f \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n}(S^k V_n)$. Since e_k is an idempotent in $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ we have that $S^k V_n$ is a $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -summand of $V_n^{\otimes k}$, that is $V_n^{\otimes k} \cong S^k V_n \oplus M$ where M is the $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -module $M = V_n^{\otimes k}(1 - e_k)$. Hence f can be extended to an endomorphism $f_{ext} \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n}(V_n^{\otimes n})$, via $f_{ext} = (f, 0)$ along this decomposition. But then, by (6.20), there is $p \in \mathcal{P}_k(n)$ such that $f_{ext} = \Upsilon(p)$ from which we deduce that $f = \Upsilon(e_k p e_k)$. This shows surjectivity of Υ_{sph} .

We next assume $n \geq 2k$ and calculate $\dim \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n}(S^k V_n)$. Using the basis in (6.6), an element f of $\text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(S^k V_n)$ can be described as a $\binom{k+n-1}{k} \times \binom{k+n-1}{k}$ matrix $A = \left(a_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k}^{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k} \right)$ for increasing sequences $i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_k \leq n$ and $j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \dots \leq j_k \leq n$. The condition that f is $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ -linear corresponds to requiring additionally that

$$\left(a_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k}^{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k} \right) = \left(a_{ord(\sigma(i_1), \sigma(i_2), \dots, \sigma(i_k))}^{ord(\sigma(j_1), \sigma(j_2), \dots, \sigma(j_k))} \right) \quad \text{for all } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n \quad (6.24)$$

where ord is the function that reorders the elements of a sequence to produce a weakly increasing sequence. For weakly increasing sequences (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k) and (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k) over $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ we define the matrix $A_{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k}^{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k} = \left(a_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k}^{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k} \right)$ via

$$a_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k}^{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if there exists } \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n \text{ such that: } \\ & (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k) = ord(\sigma(r_1), \sigma(r_2), \dots, \sigma(r_k)) \text{ and} \\ & (j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k) = ord(\sigma(s_1), \sigma(s_2), \dots, \sigma(s_k)) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6.25)$$

Then, by (6.24), the distinct matrices $A_{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k}^{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k}$ form a basis for $\text{End}_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n}(S^k V_n)$. We arrange pairs of weakly increasing sequences (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k) and (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k) over $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ in the form $\begin{pmatrix} s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k \\ r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k \end{pmatrix}$ and then get an \mathfrak{S}_n -action on them via $\sigma \begin{pmatrix} s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k \\ r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{ord}(\sigma(s_1), \sigma(s_2), \dots, \sigma(s_k)) \\ \text{ord}(\sigma(r_1), \sigma(r_2), \dots, \sigma(r_k)) \end{pmatrix}$. Then each matrix $A_{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_k}^{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k}$ only depends on the \mathfrak{S}_n -orbit of $\begin{pmatrix} s_1 s_2 \dots s_k \\ r_1 r_2 \dots r_k \end{pmatrix}$ and these orbits are in bijection with bipartite partitions in BiPar_k by letting equal numbers belong to the same part. For example, for $k = 16, n = 5$ we have that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 111122334445555 \\ 112223333335555 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \begin{array}{cccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \end{array} \quad (6.26)$$

Moreover, by the assumption $n \geq 2k$, each $b \in \text{BiPar}_k$ arises this way from such an \mathfrak{S}_n -orbit, and hence $\dim \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n}(S^k V_n) = bp_k$. Combining this with Theorem 2 we get that $\dim \mathcal{SP}_k(n) = \dim \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n}(S^k V_n)$ and so Υ_{sph} is an isomorphism if $n \geq 2k$. This proves **a)** of the Theorem, and **b)** follows from Burnside's density Theorem, once again, and Maschke's Theorem for $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$. \square

Define now $Z_{sph}^{k,n}$ as the image of Υ_{sph} , that is as the centralizer algebra $Z_{sph}^{k,n} = \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n}(S^k V_n)$. By joining the results of this section we get the following Theorem.

Theorem 7. a) *The irreducible $Z_{sph}^{k,n}$ -modules are indexed by $\text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n}$, see (6.18).*

b) *For $\lambda \in \text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n}$, let $G_k(\lambda)$ be the irreducible $Z_{sph}^{k,n}$ -module given in **a)**. Then there is an isomorphism of $(\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n, \mathcal{SP}_k(n))$ -bimodules*

$$S^k V_n \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n}} S(\lambda) \otimes G_k(\lambda) \quad (6.27)$$

where $G_k(\lambda)$ is viewed as an $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ -module via inflation along $\mathcal{SP}_k(n) \rightarrow Z_{sph}^{k,n}$.

c) *For $\lambda \in \text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n}$, we have $\dim G_k(\lambda) = \sum_{\nu \in \text{Par}_k^{\leq n}} K_{\lambda, \Phi(\nu)}$.*

d) *$Z_{sph}^{k,n}$ is a semisimple algebra and $\dim Z_{sph}^{k,n} = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n}} (\dim G_k(\lambda))^2$.*

Remark. The Theorem should be contrasted with Theorem 3.22 in [18], describing the decomposition of $V_n^{\otimes k}$ as a $(\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n, \mathcal{P}_k(n))$ -bimodule. In that 'classical' setting the role played by our $\text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n}$ is replaced by $\text{Par}_{par}^{k,n}$ defined as

$$\text{Par}_{par}^{k,n} = \{\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_l) \in \text{Par}_n \mid \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 + \dots + \lambda_l \leq k\}. \quad (6.28)$$

Note however that the proofs from the classical situation do not carry over to our setting.

Let us illustrate **d)** of Theorem 7, using $n = 6$ and $k = 3$. In that case $n \geq 2k$ and so by Theorem 2 and Theorem 6 we have $\dim Z_{sph}^{3,6} = \dim \mathcal{SP}_3 = 31$. On the other hand, from (6.18) we get $\text{Par}_{sph}^{3,6} = \{(6), (5, 1), (4, 2), (3, 3), (4, 1, 1)\}$ and since $\text{Par}_3^{\leq 6} = \text{Par}_3 = \{(3), (2, 1), (1^3)\}$ we have via the definition of Φ in (6.7) that $\{\Phi(\nu) \mid \nu \in \text{Par}_3^{\leq 6}\} = \{(5, 1), (4, 1, 1), (3, 3)\}$. The table in (6.29) gives the Kostka numbers $K_{\lambda, \Phi(\nu)}$ and hence $\dim G_3(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \text{Par}_{sph}^{3,6}$, via **c)** of the Theorem.

Summing the squares of the numbers of the last row of the table we get $3^2 + 4^2 + 2^2 + 1^2 + 1^2 = 31$, as we should.

λ					
$ \text{Std}(\lambda) $	1	5	9	5	10
$\Phi(\nu)$	1	5	9	5	10
	1	1	0	0	0
	1	2	1	0	1
	1	1	1	1	0
$\dim G_3(\lambda)$	3	4	2	1	1

(6.29)

Similarly, we can use the table to illustrate **b)** of the Theorem, at least at dimension level. Indeed, summing the products of the numbers of the first and the last row we get $1 \times 3 + 5 \times 4 + 9 \times 2 + 5 \times 1 + 10 \times 1 = 56 = \dim S^6 V_3$.

Remark. As already mentioned in the introduction, A. Wilson has shown that \mathcal{SP}_k coincides with the multiset partition algebra $\mathcal{MP}_k(x)$ that was introduced in [37]. The definition of $\mathcal{MP}_k(x)$ is quite different from the definition of \mathcal{SP}_k , but in Lemma 5.12 of [37] the authors prove that $\mathcal{MP}_k(x)$ arises from \mathcal{P}_k via idempotent truncation with respect to a certain idempotent e'_k , defined in terms of the *orbit basis* for \mathcal{P}_k . Wilson shows that the two idempotents e'_k and e_k in fact coincide.

7 CELLULARITY OF $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$

In this section we initiate the study of the representation theory of $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$, for arbitrary $t \in \mathbb{C}$.

It was shown in [31] that $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$ is semisimple if and only if $t \notin \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2k - 2\}$. This gives us immediately the following Theorem.

Theorem 8. *Suppose that $t \notin \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2k - 2\}$. Then $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ is a semisimple algebra.*

Proof: Let \mathcal{J}_k and $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{J}_k$ be the Jacobson radicals for $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$ and $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$, respectively. Then, by definition, $a \in \mathcal{J}_k$ if and only if $aL = 0$ for all irreducible $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$ -modules, and similarly for $\mathcal{S}\mathcal{J}_k$.

Since $t \notin \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2k - 2\}$ we have that $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$ is semisimple, which by definition means that $\mathcal{J}_k = 0$. On the other hand, it is known that the irreducible $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ -modules are the nonzero $e_k L$'s for L running over irreducible $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$ -modules, see (iv) of Theorem (4) of **A1** of the appendix to [13]. Suppose now that $e_k a e_k \in \mathcal{S}\mathcal{J}_k$. Then $e_k a e_k (e_k L) = 0$ and hence $e_k a e_k L = 0$ for all irreducible $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$ -modules L . But this means that $e_k a e_k \in \mathcal{J}_k$ and so $e_k a e_k = 0$, as claimed. \square

In general, even when $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$ is not semisimple, it is always a *cellular algebra* in the sense of [20], as was shown in [16] and [49], and so $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ becomes a cellular algebra as well, since it is an idempotent truncation of $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$.

Let us give the details of this statement, starting with the definition of a cellular algebra from [20].

Definition 9. *Suppose that \mathcal{A} is a \mathbb{k} -algebra over the domain \mathbb{k} . Suppose moreover that (Λ, \leq) is a poset such that for each $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there is a finite set $T(\lambda)$ and elements $C_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that*


$$\mathcal{C} = \{C_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} \mid \lambda \in \Lambda \text{ and } \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in T(\lambda)\} \tag{7.1}$$

is a \mathbb{k} -basis for \mathcal{A} . Then the pair (\mathcal{C}, Λ) is called a cellular basis for \mathcal{A} if

For $\lambda \in \Lambda^k$, we now give a description of the cell module $\Delta_k(\lambda)$ for $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$. For $\lambda \in \text{Par}_l \in \Lambda^k$ we let $\mathfrak{d}_\lambda \in T(\lambda)$ be the element defined via $\mathfrak{d}_\lambda = (t^\lambda, d, T)$ where $T = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \dots, \{l\}\}$ and $d = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \dots, \{l\}, \{l+1, l+2, \dots, k\}\}$. For $\mathfrak{c} = (\mathfrak{s}, c, S) \in T(\lambda)$ we set

$$C_{\mathfrak{c}} = C_{c\mathfrak{d}_\lambda} \pmod{\mathcal{P}_k^{\triangleright\lambda}(t)} \quad (7.8)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_k^{\triangleright\lambda}(t) = \text{span}\{C_{c\mathfrak{d}} \mid \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d} \in T(\mu), \mu \triangleright \lambda\}$ and have then $\Delta_k(\lambda) = \text{span}\{C_{\mathfrak{c}} \mid \mathfrak{c} \in T_k(\lambda)\}$. Then, by definition, $\Delta_k(\lambda)$ is the submodule of $\mathcal{P}_k(t)/\mathcal{P}_k^{\triangleright\lambda}(t)$ generated by $\{C_{\mathfrak{c}} \mid \mathfrak{c} \in T_k(\lambda)\}$. We represent a typical basis element $C_{\mathfrak{c}}$ for $\Delta_k(\lambda)$ as a *half diagram* as follows



thus leaving out \mathfrak{d}_λ from the diagram. The action of $a \in \mathcal{P}_k(t)$ on $C_{\mathfrak{c}} \in \Delta_k(\lambda)$, that is $aC_{\mathfrak{c}} \in \Delta_k(\lambda)$, is given by concatenation with a on top of $C_{\mathfrak{c}}$, followed by the elimination of internal blocks as in $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$, and of terms involving $\{C_{\mathfrak{d}} \mid \mathfrak{d} \notin T_k(\lambda)\}$ that are set equal to 0.

By construction we have

$$\dim \Delta_k(\lambda) = |T_k(\lambda)| = |\text{Std}(\lambda)| |C_l| \quad (7.10)$$

where C_l is as in (5.3). This formula can be explicitly expressed in terms of Stirling numbers of the second kind, as explained in [16].

We now pass to $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$. With the preparations just made we are in position to formulate and prove the promised cellularity of $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$.

Theorem 10. *The spherical partition algebra $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ is cellular on the poset Λ^k . The cell modules for $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ are $\{e_k \Delta_k(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda^k\}$.*

Proof: Defining $\mathfrak{c} = (\mathfrak{s}, d, S) \in T(\lambda)$ where $\lambda = (k)$, $\mathfrak{s} = t^\lambda$ and $d = S = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \dots, \{k\}\}$, we have $e_k = \frac{1}{k!} C_{\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{c}}$. From this it follows that $e_k^* = e_k$ and so we may apply Proposition 4.3 of [25]. This proves the Lemma. \square

Note that Proposition 4.3 of [25] does not give rise to a basis for $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda)$ and in fact our next goal is to construct such a basis.

For this we need several new notational ingredients. Suppose first that $\nu = (\nu_1^{a_1}, \nu_2^{a_2}, \dots, \nu_p^{a_p}) \in \text{Par}_i$. We then define the function

$$\Psi : \text{Par}_i \rightarrow \text{Par}, \Psi(\nu) = \text{ord}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p) \quad (7.11)$$

which may be considered as a variation of the function Φ defined in (6.7). Define also $p_i = |\text{Par}_i|$; this is just the classical partition function.

Suppose that \mathfrak{s} is a semistandard λ -tableau of type μ . Following section 7 in [36], we now set

$$x_{\mathfrak{s}} = \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_\mu \\ w t^\lambda \in \text{Std}(\lambda)}} x_{w t^\lambda} \in S(\lambda). \quad (7.12)$$

For example, for $\mathfrak{s} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 1 & 2 \\ \hline 2 & 3 & \\ \hline 3 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$ we have

$$x_{\mathfrak{s}} = x \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & 5 & \\ \hline 6 & & \\ \hline \end{array} + x \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 5 & \\ \hline 6 & & \\ \hline \end{array} + x \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & 6 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} + x \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 6 & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array}. \quad (7.13)$$

Moreover, for any $\tau \in \text{Comp}_i$ we define $d_\tau \in \text{SetPar}_i$ as the set partition whose blocks are the rows of t^τ . For example, if $\tau = (3, 2, 1, 3)$ we get $d_\tau = \{\{1, 2, 3\}, \{4, 5\}, \{6\}, \{7, 8, 9\}\}$.

Suppose now that $\lambda \in \text{Par}_l \subseteq \Lambda^k$ and that $\nu \in \text{Par}_i$ with $\Psi(\nu) \in \text{Par}_l$ for $l \leq i \leq k$. Suppose furthermore that \mathfrak{s} is a semistandard λ -tableau of type $\Psi(\nu)$ and that $\mu \in \text{Par}_{k-i}$. Using this information we define an element $x_{\nu, \mathfrak{s}, \mu} \in e_k \Delta_k(\lambda)$ as follows

$$x_{\nu, \mathfrak{s}, \mu} = e_k g((d_{\nu, \mu}, d_\nu) \otimes x_{\mathfrak{s}} \otimes \mathfrak{d}_\lambda) \quad (7.14)$$

Finally, since we already know that the $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda)$'s are the cell modules for the cellular algebra $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$, we get that \mathcal{B}_λ is even a cellular basis for $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda)$, which shows the Theorem. \square

By cellularity of $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ we have $\dim \mathcal{SP}_k(t) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda^k} (\dim e_k \Delta_k(\lambda))^2$, which via Theorem 2 and Theorem 11 becomes the following identity involving bp_k

$$bp_k = \sum_{\lambda \in \text{Par}_l \subseteq \Lambda^k} \left(\sum_{i=l}^k \sum_{\substack{\nu \in \text{Par}_i \\ \Psi(\nu) \in \text{Par}_l}} K_{\lambda, \Psi(\nu)} p_{k-i} \right)^2. \quad (7.20)$$

It may be surprising that the identity (7.20) can in fact be proved with combinatorial tools, as we shall now briefly explain.

Fix $\nu \in \text{Par}_i$, $\mu \in \text{Par}_j$ such that $\Psi(\nu), \Psi(\mu) \in \text{Par}_l$ for some $l \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ and consider their contribution to (7.20), that is

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \text{Par}_l} K_{\lambda, \Psi(\mu)} K_{\lambda, \Psi(\nu)}. \quad (7.21)$$

The sum in (7.21) has a combinatorial interpretation, which is a consequence of the RSK algorithm.


Indeed, let $\mathcal{N}_{\Psi(\mu), \Psi(\nu)}$ be the set of non-negative integer valued matrices with row sum $\Psi(\mu)$ and column sum $\Psi(\nu)$. For example, if $\mu = (2^3, 1^2)$ and $\nu = (3^2, 2^2, 1)$ we have $\Psi(\mu) = (3, 2)$ and $\Psi(\nu) = (2, 2, 1)$ and then $\mathcal{N}_{\Psi(\mu), \Psi(\nu)}$ consists of the matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7.22)$$

With this notation we have the following formula for (7.21), see for example Corollary 7.13.2 in [43], or Wikipedia https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robinson-Schensted-Knuth_correspondence.

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \text{Par}_l} K_{\lambda, \Psi(\mu)} K_{\lambda, \Psi(\nu)} = |\mathcal{N}_{\Psi(\mu), \Psi(\nu)}|. \quad (7.23)$$

Now each matrix in $\mathcal{N}_{\Psi(\mu), \Psi(\nu)}$ corresponds to the propagating part of an element of BiPar_k , in the normal form $GG(b)$ given by Garsia and Gessel, as in (3.10), with the entries of the matrix giving the number of propagating lines that connect equally sized parts. For example, for μ and ν as above, the five matrices in $\mathcal{N}_{\Psi(\mu), \Psi(\nu)}$ given by (7.22) correspond to the diagrams



in that order. Using this, and taking into the account the possibilities for the non-propagating part, we obtain our combinatorial proof of the identity (7.20).

We next draw a couple of consequences of Theorem 11. We first define $\Lambda_{sph}^k \subseteq \Lambda^k$ via

$$\Lambda_{sph}^k = \{\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_l) \in \Lambda^k \mid \bar{b}(\lambda) \leq k\} \quad (7.25)$$

where

$$\bar{b}(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^l i \lambda_i. \quad (7.26)$$

This definition should be contrasted with the definition of $\text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n}$ in (6.18). We get

Corollary 12. *With the above notation we have $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda) \neq 0$ if and only if $\lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k$.*

Proof: If $\lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k$ we consider $\nu = (l^{\lambda_l}, (l-1)^{\lambda_{l-1}}, \dots, 1^{\lambda_1})$. Then $|\nu| \leq k$ and $\Psi(\nu) = \lambda$ and so $K_{\lambda\Psi(\nu)} = K_{\lambda\lambda} \neq 0$ which implies $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda) \neq 0$, by Theorem 11.

Suppose now that $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda) \neq 0$. Then, by Theorem 11, we have $K_{\lambda\Psi(\nu)} \neq 0$ for some partition ν with $|\nu| \leq k$, which implies $\lambda \supseteq \Psi(\nu)$. Let $\nu = (\nu_1^{a_1}, \nu_2^{a_2}, \dots, \nu_l^{a_l})$ where $\nu_1 > \nu_2 > \dots > \nu_l$ and suppose that $\text{ord}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_l) = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_l)$, in other words $\Psi(\nu) = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_l)$. Then from $|\nu| \leq k$ we get

$$\nu_1 a_1 + \nu_2 a_2 + \dots + \nu_l a_l \leq k \implies \nu_1 b_l + \nu_2 b_{l-1} + \dots + \nu_l b_1 \leq k \implies l b_l + (l-1) b_{l-1} + \dots + 1 b_1 \leq k. \quad (7.27)$$

Let now \mathfrak{t} be the semistandard λ -tableau of type $\Psi(\nu)$ that exists because $K_{\lambda\Psi(\nu)} \neq 0$. In \mathfrak{t} the number 1 appears b_1 times, the number 2 appears b_2 times etc, and so the sum of the numbers appearing in \mathfrak{t} is $1b_1 + 2b_2 + \dots + lb_l$ which is less than k by (7.27). Let now \mathfrak{s} be the semistandard λ -tableau that is obtained from \mathfrak{t} by replacing each number in \mathfrak{t} by the row index of its node. The numbers in the i 'th row of \mathfrak{t} cannot be strictly less than i , and so also the sum of the numbers in \mathfrak{s} is smaller than k . On the other hand, \mathfrak{s} is the unique semistandard λ -tableau of type λ that has 1 in the nodes of the first row, 2 in the nodes of the second row, etc, and therefore the sum of numbers in \mathfrak{s} is $\bar{b}(\lambda)$. This proves the Corollary. \square

It follows from the Corollary that Λ_{sph}^k is a natural parametrizing index set for the representation theory of $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$. Let \mathcal{A} be a cellular algebra with cell datum $(\Lambda, T, \mathcal{C})$ as in Definition 9 and let $\{\Delta(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ be the associated set of cell modules. Each $\Delta(\lambda)$ is endowed with a \mathbb{k} -valued bilinear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda$ which is important for the representation theory of \mathcal{A} . To explain $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda$ one first chooses arbitrarily $t_0 \in T(\lambda)$. For basis elements $C_{\mathfrak{s}}, C_{\mathfrak{t}} \in \Delta(\lambda)$ one considers the expansion of $C_{t_0\mathfrak{t}} C_{\mathfrak{s}t_0}$ in the cellular basis for \mathcal{A} and then defines

$$\langle C_{\mathfrak{s}}, C_{\mathfrak{t}} \rangle_\lambda = \text{coeff}_{C_{t_0\mathfrak{t}}}(C_{t_0\mathfrak{t}} C_{\mathfrak{s}t_0}) \quad (7.28)$$

where $\text{coeff}_{C_{t_0\mathfrak{t}}}(C_{t_0\mathfrak{t}} C_{\mathfrak{s}t_0})$ is the coefficient of $C_{t_0\mathfrak{t}}$ in the above expansion.

Suppose now that \mathbb{k} is a field. We define $\text{rad}(\lambda) = \{v \in \Delta(\lambda) \mid \langle v, w \rangle_\lambda = 0 \text{ for all } w \in \Delta(\lambda)\}$. Then $\text{rad}(\lambda)$ is a submodule of $\Delta(\lambda)$ and moreover, by the general theory of cellular algebras developed in [20], the quotient module $L(\lambda) = \Delta(\lambda)/\text{rad}(\lambda)$ is either zero or irreducible, and the set of nonzero $L(\lambda)$'s forms a complete set of isomorphism classes for the irreducible \mathcal{A} -modules.

We get the following Theorem.

Theorem 13. *Suppose that $t \notin \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2k-2\}$. Then $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ is semisimple and $\{e_k \Delta_k(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k\}$ is a complete set of representatives for the isomorphism classes of irreducible $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ -modules.*

Proof. We know from Theorem 8 that $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ is semisimple. It then follows from Theorem 3.8 of [20] that the nonzero cell modules, that is $\{e_k \Delta_k(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k\}$, are irreducible and pairwise inequivalent. This shows the Theorem. \square

In the following we shall use the language of quasi-hereditary algebras, see for example the appendix to [13] for a good introduction to it. In our setting, the following Theorem is useful for us.

Theorem 14. *\mathcal{A} is quasi-hereditary if and only if $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda \neq 0$ for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$.*

For $t \neq 0$ it is known that $\mathcal{P}_k(t)$ is a quasi-hereditary algebra, see [14] or [26]. In Theorem 13 we showed that $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ is semisimple and determined its irreducible modules if $t \notin \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 2k-2\}$. Combining Theorem 11 with Theorem 14, we now obtain the quasi-heredity of $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ in the remaining cases, except when $t = 0$.

Corollary 15. *Suppose that $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2k-2\}$. Then $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$ is quasi-hereditary on the poset Λ_{sph}^k with standard modules $\{e_k \Delta(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k\}$.*

Proof: Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p) \in \Lambda_{sph}^k$ with $|\lambda| = l$. We then construct a special cellular basis element $x_{\nu, \mathfrak{s}, \mu}$ for $\Delta_k(\lambda)$ as in (7.14). For ν we use $\nu = (p^{\lambda_p}, (p-1)^{\lambda_{p-1}}, \dots, 1^{\lambda_1})$ which satisfies $|\nu| \leq k$ and $\Psi(\nu) = \lambda$. For \mathfrak{s} we use the unique semistandard λ -tableau of type $\Psi(\nu)$, which has 1 in the nodes of the first row, 2 in the nodes of the second row, and so on. Note that $x_{\mathfrak{s}} = x_{\lambda\lambda}$. Finally, for μ we use the one-row partition $\mu = (k-i)$ where $|\nu| = i$. For these choices we set $C_{t_0} = x_{\nu, \mathfrak{s}, \mu}$ and, in view of (7.28) and Theorem 14, we must calculate the coefficient of

$C_{t_0 t_0}$ in the expansion of $C_{t_0 t_0} C_{t_0 t_0}$ in terms of the cellular basis for $\mathcal{SP}_k(t)$. For example, for $k = 9$, $\lambda = (2, 2)$, $\nu = (2^2, 1^2)$ and $\mu = (3)$ we have diagrammatically

$$C_{t_0 t_0} = \text{[Diagram 1]}, \quad C_{t_0 t_0} C_{t_0 t_0} = \text{[Diagram 2]} \quad (7.29)$$

and must calculate the coefficient of $C_{t_0 t_0}$ in the expansion of $C_{t_0 t_0} C_{t_0 t_0}$. For this we first observe that $x_{\lambda\lambda}^2 = (\prod_{i=1}^p \lambda_i!) x_{\lambda\lambda}$.


We next consider the contribution to the coefficient of $C_{t_0 t_0}$ given by $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ from the expansion of the middle e_k of $C_{t_0 t_0} C_{t_0 t_0}$ in terms of the group element basis of $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_k$. We divide the elements $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ in three types, according to their contribution to the coefficient of $C_{t_0 t_0}$ in $C_{t_0 t_0} C_{t_0 t_0}$. A key point for what follows is the observation that this division is exhaustive.

1. We say that σ is of type 1 if it has the form $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2$ where σ_1 is a permutation of the numbers within blocks of $d_{\nu, \mu}$ and σ_2 is a permutation of the blocks of d_ν induced by an element from \mathfrak{S}_λ . In the example (7.29), this means that $\sigma_1 \in \mathfrak{S}_{1,2} \times \mathfrak{S}_{3,4} \times \mathfrak{S}_{7,8,9} \leq \mathfrak{S}_9$ and that $\sigma_2 \in \langle (1, 3)(2, 4), (5, 6) \rangle \leq \mathfrak{S}_9$. Each element of type 1 has a contribution of $(\prod_{i=1}^p \lambda_i!) \frac{t}{k!}$ to the coefficient of $C_{t_0 t_0}$ in the product $C_{t_0 t_0} C_{t_0 t_0}$. Below we give two examples of elements of type 1, the first of the form $\sigma = \sigma_1$ and the second of the form $\sigma = \sigma_2$.


$$\sigma_1 \{ \text{[Diagram 1]} \}, \quad \sigma_2 \{ \text{[Diagram 2]} \} \quad (7.30)$$

2. We say that σ is of type 2 if it has contribution $(\prod_{i=1}^p \lambda_i!) \frac{1}{k!}$ to the coefficient of $C_{t_0 t_0}$, in other words, the factor t appearing in the contribution coming from type 1 elements is no longer present. Type 2 elements arise the same way as type 1 elements, except that the blocks coming from d_μ are merged into the other blocks.

Below we give an example of an element of type 2.



3. Finally, we say that σ is of type 3 if it gives rise to a diagram with no contribution to $C_{t_0 t_0}$ in the expansion of $C_{t_0 t_0} C_{t_0 t_0}$, in other words, the diagram in question has strictly fewer than l propagating blocks. Here is an example.



Let A_1, A_2 and A_3 be the cardinalities of type 1, type 2 and type 3 elements, respectively. The numbers A_1, A_2 and A_3 can be calculated using combinatorial methods, but we do not need their exact values and shall therefore not do so. On the other hand, one easily checks that if $\lambda \neq \emptyset$ then $A_1 > 0$ whereas $A_2 > 0$ if $\lambda = \emptyset$.

Finally, to conclude the proof of the Corollary we now note that the coefficient of $C_{t_0 t_0}$ in $C_{t_0 t_0} C_{t_0 t_0}$ is $(\prod_{i=1}^p \lambda_i!) \frac{1}{k!} (A_1 t + A_2)$ and this is nonzero by the hypothesis on t . \square

8 THE DECOMPOSITION NUMBERS FOR $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ WHEN $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ IS NON-SEMISIMPLE.

In this section we shall use the results of the previous sections to determine the decomposition numbers for $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ when $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ is quasi-hereditary and non-semisimple, that is when $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2k - 2\}$.

Our arguments depend crucially on [31] in which the decomposition numbers for $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ are determined. The results in [31] are formulated in terms of the notion of n -pairs of partitions, which we need to explain. For this, let $\lambda \in \text{Par}_l$ and let $u \in \lambda$ be the (i, j) 'th node of λ . For $Q \in \mathbb{Z}$ we then define the Q -content of u as $c_\lambda^Q(u) = Q + j - i$ and let the Q -content diagram of λ be the diagram obtained from the Young diagram of λ by writing $c_\lambda^Q(u)$ in each node $u \in \lambda$. For example, for $\lambda = (5, 3, 3, 2, 2)$ the 2-content diagram is as follows



Definition 16. Let (λ, μ) be a pair of partitions of different orders. We then say that (λ, μ) is an n -pair if $\lambda \subset \mu$ and the Young diagram for μ is obtained from the Young diagram for λ by adding nodes in exactly one row. Furthermore, the rightmost of these nodes should be of $|\lambda|$ -content n .

Below we give two examples of n -pairs, in the first we choose $n = 4$ and in the second $n = 15$.

$$\left(\emptyset, \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array} \right), \quad \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline & & & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 12 & 13 & 14 & 15 & 16 & 17 & 18 \\ \hline 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 15 \\ \hline 10 & 11 \\ \hline \end{array} \right) \quad (8.2)$$

Note that there exists an alcove geometric description of n -pairs, see [7].

The following Lemma is immediate from Definition 8.1.

Lemma 17. Suppose that $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda \in \text{Par}$. Then there exists at most one $\mu \in \text{Par}$ such that (λ, μ) is an n -pair.

Proof. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1^{a_1}, \lambda_2^{a_2}, \dots, \lambda_p^{a_p}) \in \text{Par}_l$. If $\mu \in \text{Par}$ is obtained from λ by adding nodes to the i 'th row, then we must have $i \in \{1, a_1 + 1, a_1 + a_2 + 1, \dots, a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_p + 1\}$. Since the $|\lambda|$ -contents are constant along the diagonals of λ , we conclude from this that the possible values of n are all distinct, which shows the Lemma. Below we illustrate on the example $\lambda = (9^1, 5^3, 3^2)$, where we have indicated with red the possible values of n .

$$\lambda = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 30 & 31 & 32 & 33 & 34 & 35 & 36 & 37 & 38 & 39 \dots \\ \hline 29 & 30 & 31 & 32 & 33 & 34 & 35 & 36 & 37 \\ \hline 28 & 29 & 30 & 31 & 32 \\ \hline 27 & 28 & 29 & 30 & 31 \\ \hline 26 & 27 & 28 & 29 & 30 \\ \hline 25 & 26 & 27 \\ \hline 24 & 25 & 26 \\ \hline \end{array} \quad (8.3)$$

□

In [31] the following important Theorem was proved.

Theorem 18. Let $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2k - 2\}$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda^k$ let $L_k(\lambda) = \Delta_k(\lambda)/\text{rad}(\lambda)$ be the irreducible $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -module associated with λ . Then the following statements hold.

- Let $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^k$ with $\lambda \neq \mu$. Then there is a nonzero homomorphism of $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -modules $\Delta_k(\mu) \rightarrow \Delta_k(\lambda)$ if and only if (λ, μ) is an n -pair.
- Let $\lambda \in \Lambda^k$. If there is no $\mu \in \Lambda^k$ such that (λ, μ) is an n -pair then $\Delta_k(\lambda)$ is irreducible. Otherwise, $\Delta_k(\lambda)$ has decomposition factors $L_k(\lambda)$ and $L_k(\mu)$ where (λ, μ) is the unique n -pair with λ in the first factor.
- Let $\lambda \in \Lambda^k$ and suppose that $(\lambda^1, \lambda^2, \dots, \lambda^p)$ is a chain of partitions in Λ^k such that $\lambda = \lambda^1$ and such that each $(\lambda^i, \lambda^{i+1})$ is an n -pair for $i = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$. Furthermore, assume that the chain is maximal in the sense that there is no n -pair (λ^p, μ) with $\mu \in \Lambda^k$. Then there is a resolution of $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow \Delta_k(\lambda^p) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Delta_k(\lambda^2) \rightarrow \Delta_k(\lambda^1) \rightarrow L_k(\lambda) \rightarrow 0. \quad (8.4)$$

Note that (8.4) gives rise to the formula

$$\dim L_k(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^{i+1} \dim \Delta_k(\lambda^i). \quad (8.5)$$

In view of (7.10), this is an explicit formula for $\dim L_k(\lambda)$.

In order to apply Theorem 18 we need the following Lemma.

Lemma 19. Suppose that $\lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k$. Then $e_k L_k(\lambda) \neq 0$. It is an irreducible $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ -module and the set $\{e_k L_k(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k\}$ is a complete set of representatives for the isomorphism classes of irreducible the $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ -modules.

Proof. It follows from Corollary 15 that $e_k L_k(\lambda) \neq 0$ when $\lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k$. From this the remaining statements of the Lemma follow from the general cellular algebra theory, see [20]. \square

Combining, we obtain the following Theorem.

Theorem 20. **a)** $\{e_k L_k(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k\}$ is a complete set of representatives for the isomorphism classes of irreducible the $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ -modules.

b) Let $\lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k$. If there is no $\mu \in \Lambda_{sph}^k$ such that (λ, μ) is an n -pair then $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda)$ is an irreducible $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ -module. Otherwise, $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda)$ has decomposition factors $e_k L_k(\lambda)$ and $e_k L_k(\mu)$ where (λ, μ) is the unique n -pair with λ in the first factor.

c) Let $\lambda \in \Lambda_{sph}^k$ and suppose that $(\lambda^1, \lambda^2, \dots, \lambda^p)$ is a chain of partitions in Λ_{sph}^k such that $\lambda = \lambda^1$ and such that each $(\lambda^i, \lambda^{i+1})$ is an n -pair for $i = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$. Furthermore, assume that the chain is maximal in the sense that there is no n -pair (λ^p, μ) with $\mu \in \Lambda_{sph}^k$. Then there is a resolution of $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow e_k \Delta_k(\lambda^p) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow e_k \Delta_k(\lambda^2) \rightarrow e_k \Delta_k(\lambda^1) \rightarrow e_k L_k(\lambda) \rightarrow 0. \quad (8.6)$$

Proof. The statement in **a)** has already appeared in Lemma 19. The statement in **c)** follows from **c)** of Theorem 18 and the fact that left multiplication with e_k is an exact functor. To show the first statement of **b)**, we observe that under the hypothesis on λ the resolution (8.6) becomes

$$0 \rightarrow e_k \Delta_k(\lambda^1) \rightarrow e_k L_k(\lambda) \rightarrow 0 \quad (8.7)$$

which shows that $e_k \Delta_k(\lambda)$ is irreducible, as claimed. Finally, the second statement of **b)** follows from the corresponding statement in **b)** of Theorem 18 and exactness of left multiplication with e_k . \square

As above, we note that the resolution (8.6), combined with (7.17), gives rise to an explicit formula for the dimensions of the irreducible $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ -modules, as follows

$$\dim e_k L_k(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^{i+1} \dim e_k \Delta_k(\lambda^i). \quad (8.8)$$

Let us consider the example $\lambda = (1) \in \Lambda_{sph}^3$ with $k = n = 3$. Then the chain in **c)** of Theorem 20 has the form $\{\lambda^1, \lambda^2\}$ where $\lambda^1 = \lambda$ and $\lambda^2 = (3)$ and so the resolution in (8.6) becomes

$$0 \rightarrow e_3 \Delta_3(\lambda^2) \rightarrow e_3 \Delta_3(\lambda^1) \rightarrow e_3 L_3(\lambda) \rightarrow 0. \quad (8.9)$$

Using **b)** of Theorem 11 we get $\dim e_3 \Delta_3(\lambda^1) = 4$ and $\dim e_3 \Delta_3(\lambda^2) = 1$ and so we find that $\dim e_3 L_3(\lambda^1) = 3$.

It is interesting to compare this with $\dim G_3(\mu)$ where $\mu = (2, 1) \in \text{Par}_{sph}^{3,3}$. Note that $\bar{\mu} = \lambda$ where $\bar{\mu}$ is defined by $\bar{\mu} = (\mu_2, \dots, \mu_l)$ for $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_l)$. Using **c)** of Theorem 7 we obtain $\dim G_3(\mu) = 3$, that is $\dim G_3(\mu) = \dim e_3 L_3(\lambda)$.

We think that this equality is no coincidence. To be precise, for $\lambda \in \text{Par}_{sph}^{k,n}$ we think that it should be true that

$$\dim G_k(\lambda) = \dim e_k L_k(\bar{\lambda}). \quad (8.10)$$

We note that we have verified (8.10) for $k \leq 11$ using SageMath. We also note that for $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ the statement corresponding to (8.10) should be true as well but appears not to have been proved in the literature.

9 TILTING MODULES FOR $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ AND $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$

We already saw that $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ are quasi-hereditary algebras when $n \neq 0$ and therefore, in particular, they are endowed with families of *tilting modules*, see the appendix to [13]. In this section we take the opportunity to describe the structure of these tilting modules, using standard arguments from the theory of quasi-hereditary algebras. We observe that the same arguments also provide us with a description of the tilting modules for $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$.

We assume $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2k-2\}$ in which case $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$, as we already saw, is non-semisimple quasi-hereditary on the poset Λ^k defined in (7.4). Correspondingly, the category $\mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod}$ of finite dimensional $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -modules is a

highest weight category where the standard modules $\{\Delta_k(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda^k\}$ are as described in the paragraphs between (7.7) and (7.9) and the irreducible modules $\{L_k(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda^k\}$ as described in **c**) of Theorem 18.

$\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -mod is equipped with a duality $M \mapsto M^*$ via $M^* = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(M, \mathbb{C})$ where the $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -structure on M^* is given by

$$af(m) = f(a^*m) \text{ for } a \in \mathcal{P}_k(n), f \in M^*, m \in M \quad (9.1)$$

for $a \mapsto a^*$ the anti-automorphism coming from the cellular structure on $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$. Note that the $L_k(\lambda)$'s are self dual $L_k(\lambda) = L_k(\lambda)^*$ via

$$L_k(\lambda) \rightarrow L_k(\lambda)^*, v \mapsto \langle \cdot, v \rangle_\lambda. \quad (9.2)$$

The *costandard modules* $\{\nabla_k(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \Lambda^k\}$ for $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ are defined by $\nabla_k(\lambda) = \Delta_k(\lambda)^*$.

The following definitions and results are part of the general theory of quasi-hereditary algebras. Let $\mathcal{F}_k(\Delta)$ be the subcategory of $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -modules whose objects have Δ -filtrations, in other words, a $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -module M belongs to $\mathcal{F}_k(\Delta)$ if there is a filtration of $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -modules $0 \subset M_1 \subset M_2 \subset \dots \subset M_r = M$ such that for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ there is a $\lambda_i \in \Lambda^k$ such that $M_i/M_{i-1} = \Delta_k(\lambda_i)$. We define $\mathcal{F}_k(\nabla)$ in a similar way, that is $M \in \mathcal{F}_k(\nabla)$ if and only if $M^* \in \mathcal{F}_k(\Delta)$.

For $\lambda \in \Lambda^k$ we let $P_k(\lambda)$ be the projective cover of $L_k(\lambda)$ in $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -mod. Then $P_k(\lambda) \in \mathcal{F}_k(\Delta)$ and for any Δ -filtration $0 \subset M_1 \subset M_2 \subset \dots \subset M_{r-1} \subset M_r = P_k(\lambda)$ with $M_i/M_{i-1} = \Delta_k(\lambda_i)$ we have $\lambda_r = \lambda$ whereas $\lambda_j \triangleright \lambda$ for $j < r$. For $M \in \mathcal{F}_k(\Delta)$ we define $(M : \Delta_k(\lambda)) = \dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{P}_k(n)}(M, \nabla_k(\lambda))$ which is the number of times $\Delta_k(\lambda)$ occurs as a subfactor in a Δ -filtration of M . We then have the Brauer-Humphreys reciprocity formula

$$(P_k(\lambda) : \Delta_k(\mu)) = [\Delta_k(\mu) : L_k(\lambda)] \text{ for } \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^k \quad (9.3)$$

where $[\Delta_k(\mu) : L_k(\lambda)]$ denotes decomposition number multiplicity.

For $\lambda \in \Lambda^k$ we let $\mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod}^{\leq \lambda}$ be the subcategory of $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -mod consisting of modules with composition factors in $\{L_k(\mu) \mid \mu \leq \lambda\}$. Then $\mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod}^{\leq \lambda}$ is a highest weight category with standard modules $\{\Delta_k(\mu) \mid \mu \leq \lambda\}$ and costandard modules $\{\nabla_k(\mu) \mid \mu \leq \lambda\}$ and so we deduce from the description of projective covers that $\Delta_k(\lambda)$ is the projective cover of $L_k(\lambda)$ in $\mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod}^{\leq \lambda}$. If $\mu \triangleleft \lambda$ we then get from **b**) of Theorem 18 and Proposition A.3.3 in [13] that

$$\dim \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod}}^1(L_k(\lambda), L_k(\mu)) = \dim \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod}^{\leq \lambda}}^1(L_k(\lambda), L_k(\mu)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\lambda, \mu) \text{ is an } n\text{-pair} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9.4)$$

and if $\lambda \triangleleft \mu$ we get

$$\dim \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod}}^1(L_k(\lambda), L_k(\mu)) = \dim \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod}}^1(L_k(\mu)^*, L_k(\lambda)^*) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (\mu, \lambda) \text{ is an } n\text{-pair} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (9.5)$$

since $L_k(\mu)^* = L_k(\mu)$ and $L_k(\lambda)^* = L_k(\lambda)$.

We now fix a chain of partitions $\mathcal{C} = \{\lambda^1, \lambda^2, \dots, \lambda^p\}$ in Λ^k such that $(\lambda^i, \lambda^{i+1})$ is an n -pair for $i = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$. Suppose furthermore that the chain is maximal in both directions, in other words there is no $\mu \in \Lambda^k$ such that (μ, λ^1) is an n -pair or such that (λ^p, μ) is an n -pair. By Lemma 17, each $\lambda \in \Lambda^k$ belongs to a unique such maximal chain \mathcal{C} . Defining

$$\mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod}^{\mathcal{C}} = \{M \in \mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod} \mid [M : L_k(\lambda)] \neq 0 \implies \lambda \in \mathcal{C}\} \quad (9.6)$$

we get from (9.4) and (9.5) that $\mathcal{P}_k(n) = \bigoplus_{\mathcal{C}} \mathcal{P}_k(n)\text{-mod}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the block decomposition of $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -mod where \mathcal{C} runs over maximal chains in the above sense.

A $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$ -module T is called a *tilting module* if $T \in \mathcal{F}_k(\Delta) \cap \mathcal{F}_k(\nabla)$. For each $\lambda \in \Lambda^k$ there exists a unique indecomposable tilting module $T_k(\lambda)$ satisfying $[T_k(\lambda) : L_k(\lambda)] = 1$ and that $[T_k(\lambda) : L_k(\mu)] \neq 0 \implies \mu \leq \lambda$. Each tilting module T is a direct sum of such $T_k(\lambda)$'s.

Part **a**) of the following Theorem was obtained already in [31], but still we include it for completeness.

Theorem 21. *With the above notation, we have the following results.*

a) *If $j = 2, 3, \dots, p-1$ then the Loewy structure for $P_k(\lambda^j)$ is as follows*

$$\begin{array}{c} L_k(\lambda^j) \\ P_k(\lambda^j) = L_k(\lambda^{j-1}) \quad L_k(\lambda^{j+1}) \\ L_k(\lambda^j) . \end{array} \quad (9.7)$$

b) If $j = 1$ then the Loewy structure for $P_k(\lambda^1)$ is as follows

$$P_k(\lambda^1) = \Delta_k(\lambda^1) = \begin{array}{c} L_k(\lambda^1) \\ L_k(\lambda^2) \end{array} . \quad (9.8)$$

c) If $j = p$ then the Loewy structure for $P_k(\lambda^p)$ is as follows

$$P_k(\lambda^p) = \begin{array}{c} L_k(\lambda^p) \\ L_k(\lambda^{p-1}) \\ L_k(\lambda^p) \end{array} . \quad (9.9)$$

Proof: To prove **a)** we first observe that **b)** of Theorem 18 together with (9.3) imply that $(P_k(\lambda^j) : \Delta_k(\lambda^i)) = 1$ for $j = i$ or $j = i + 1$ and otherwise $(P_k(\lambda^j) : \Delta_k(\lambda^i)) = 0$. Therefore there are two Δ -factors in the Δ -filtration for $P_k(\lambda^j)$, namely $\Delta_k(\lambda^j)$ and $\Delta_k(\lambda^{j-1})$. On the other hand, defining $Q_k(\lambda) = \ker(P_k(\lambda) \rightarrow L_k(\lambda))$ we get from (9.4) and (9.5) that $\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{P}_k(n)}(Q_k(\lambda^j), L_k(\lambda^i)) = 1$ if $i = j - 1$ or $i = j + 1$ and otherwise $\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{P}_k(n)}(Q_k(\lambda^j), L_k(\lambda^i)) = 0$. Hence the Loewy structure for $P_k(\lambda^j)$ must be as indicated in **a)**.

To prove **b)** we once again use Theorem 18 and (9.3), but this time we find that $\Delta_k(\lambda^1)$ is the only Δ -factor of $P_k(\lambda^1)$, which shows **b)**.

Finally, to show **c)** we first note that **b)** of Theorem 18 gives $\Delta_k(\lambda^p) = L_k(\lambda^p)$. Since $P_k(\lambda^p)$ has Δ -factors $\Delta_k(\lambda^p)$ and $\Delta_k(\lambda^{p-1})$, as one sees from Theorem 18 and (9.3), the structure of $P_k(\lambda^p)$ must be the one indicated in **c)**. This proves the Theorem. \square

We now get the following Theorem, describing the indecomposable tilting modules for $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$.

Theorem 22. *The tilting module $T_k(\lambda^i)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ are given by the following.*

a) If $j = 1, 2, \dots, p - 1$ then $T_k(\lambda^j) = P_k(\lambda^{j+1})$.

b) $T_k(\lambda^p) = \Delta_k(\lambda^p)$.

Proof: The modules in **a)** are described in **a)** and **c)** of Theorem 21. They are self-dual and therefore tilting modules. The missing tilting module is $T_k(\lambda^p) = \Delta_k(\lambda^p)$, given in **b)**. \square

We finally mention that there are versions of Theorem 21 and Theorem 22 for $\mathcal{SP}_k(n)$ instead of $\mathcal{P}_k(n)$. In view of Theorem 20 the statements and proofs are here exactly the same as for Theorem 21 and Theorem 22.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Aicardi, J. Juyumaya, *Markov trace on the algebra of braids and ties*, Mosc. Math. J. **16**, No. 3, (2016), 397-431.
- [2] D. Arcis, J. Espinoza, *Tied-boxed algebras*, arXiv:2312.04844.
- [3] F. C. Auluck, *On partitions of bipartite numbers*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **49**, (1953), 72-83.
- [4] A. C. Aitken, *On induced permutation matrices and the symmetric group*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **5**, No. 1, (1936), 1-13.
- [5] E. Banjo, *The generic representation theory of the Juyumaya algebra of braids and ties*, Algebr. Represent. Theory **16**, No. 5, (2013), 1385-1395.
- [6] C. Bowman, S. Doty, S. Martin, *Integral Schur-Weyl duality for partition algebras*, Algebr. Comb. **5**, No. 2, (2022), 371-399.
- [7] C. Bowman, M. De Visscher, O. King, *The blocks of the partition algebra in positive characteristic*, Algebr. Represent. Theory **18**, No. 5, (2015), 1357-1388.
- [8] C. Bowman, M. De Visscher, R. Orellana, *The partition algebra and the Kronecker coefficients*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), no. 5, 3647-3667.
- [9] T. Ceccherini-Silberstein, F. Scarabotti, F. Tollu, *Representation Theory of the Symmetric Groups: The Okounkov-Vershik Approach, Character Formulas, and the Partition Algebras*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **121**, (2010).
- [10] J. Comes, V. Ostrik, *On blocks of Deligne's category $\underline{\text{Rep}}(S_t)$* , Adv. Math. **226**, No. 2, (2011), 1331-1377.

- [11] G. Benkart, T. Halverson, N. Harman, *Dimensions of irreducible modules for partition algebras and tensor power multiplicities for symmetric and alternating groups*, J. Algebr. Comb. **46**, (2017), 77–108.
- [12] Z. Daugherty, R. Orellana, *The quasi-partition algebra*, J. Algebra **404**, (2014), 124–151.
- [13] S. Donkin, *The q -Schur algebra*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **253**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. x, (1998), 179 pages.
- [14] S. Donkin, *Cellularity of endomorphism algebras of Young permutation modules*, J. Algebra **572**, (2021), 36–59.
- [15] S. Donkin, *Double centralisers and annihilator ideals of Young permutation modules*, J. Algebra **591**, (2022), 249–288.
- [16] W. F. Doran IV, D. B. Wales, *The Partition Algebra Revisited*, Journal of Algebra **231**, (2000), 265–330.
- [17] J. Espinoza, S. Ryom-Hansen, *Cell structures for the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra and the algebra of braids and ties*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **222**, No. 11, (2018), 3675–3720.
- [18] T. Halverson, A. Ram, *Partition algebras*, Eur. J. Comb. **26**, No. 6, (2005), 869–921.
- [19] V. F. R. Jones, *The Potts model and the symmetric group*, in Subfactors: Proceedings of the Taniguchi Symposium on Operator Algebras, (Kyuzeso, 1993), World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, (1994), 259–267.
- [20] J. J. Graham, G. I. Lehrer, *Cellular algebras*, Inventiones Mathematicae **123**, (1996), 1–34.
- [21] A. M. Garsia, I. Gessel, *Permutation statistics and partitions*, Adv. in Math. **31**(3), (1979), 288–305.
- [22] M. Haiman, *Combinatorics, symmetric functions, and Hilbert schemes*, Jerison, David (ed.) et al., Current developments in mathematics, 2002. Proceedings of the joint seminar by MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, 2002. Somerville, MA: International Press, 39–111, (2003).
- [23] N. Harman, *Representations of monomial matrices and restriction from GL_n to S_n* , arXiv:1804.04702.
- [24] G. D. James, *The representation Theory of the Symmetric Groups*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **682**, Edited by A. Dold and B. Eckman, Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1978.
- [25] S. König, C. C. Xi, *On the structure of cellular algebras*, Proceedings of ICRA VIII, Canadian Mathematical Society Conference Proceedings **24** (Canadian Mathematical Society, Ottawa, 1998), 365–385.
- [26] S. König, C. C. Xi, *When is a cellular algebra quasi-hereditary?*, Mathematische Annalen **315**, (1999), 281–293.
- [27] S. Lang, *Algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **211**, Springer-Verlag New York, 3rd ed., (2002), 934 pages.
- [28] P. A. Macmahon, *Combinatory analysis*, Vol. **1**. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, England, (1916).
- [29] I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*, Oxford University Press, second edition, (1995), 475 pages.
- [30] P. Martin, *Potts models and related problems in statistical mechanics*, Series on Advances in Statistical Mechanics, 5. Singapore etc.: World Scientific. xiii, (1991), 344 pages.
- [31] P. Martin, *The Structure of the Partition Algebras*, Journal of Algebra **183**, (1996), 319–358.
- [32] P. Martin, *The partition algebra and the Potts model transfer matrix spectrum in high dimensions*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33**, 3669, (2000).
- [33] P. Martin, G. Rollet, *The Potts model representation and a Robinson-Schensted correspondence for the partition algebra*, Compositio Math. **112**, (1998), 237–254.
- [34] P. Martin, D. Woodcock, *The partition algebras and a new deformation of the Schur algebras*, J. Algebra **203**, No. 1, (1998), 91–124.
- [35] A. Mathas, *Hecke algebras and Schur algebras of the symmetric group*, Univ. Lecture Notes **15**, A.M.S., Providence, R.I., 1999.
- [36] G. E. Murphy, *The Representations of Hecke Algebras of type A_n* , Journal of Algebra **173**, (1995), 97–121.
- [37] S. Narayanan, D. Paul, S. Srivastava, *The multiset partition algebra*, Isr. J. Math. **255**, No. 1, (2023), 453–500.
- [38] R. Orellana, M. Zabrocki, *Symmetric group characters as symmetric functions*, Adv. Math. **390**, (2021), 34 pages.
- [39] R. Orellana, M. Zabrocki, *Howe duality of the symmetric group and a multiset partition algebra*, Commun. Algebra **51**, No. 1, (2023), 393–413.
- [40] R. Rouquier, *Representations of rational Cherednik algebras*, Berman, Stephen (ed.) et al., Infinite-dimensional aspects of representation theory and applications. International conference on infinite-dimensional aspects of representation theory and applications, Charlottesville, VA, USA, May 18–22, 2004. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS). Contemp. Math. **392**, (2005), 103–131.
- [41] I. Schur, *Über die rationalen Darstellungen der allgemeinen linearen Gruppe*, (1927), Gesammelte Abhandlungen, Band III (German), herausgegeben von Alfred Brauer und Hans Rohrbach, Springer-Verlag, Berlin/New York, 1973.
- [42] T. Scrimshaw, *Cellular subalgebras of the partition algebra*, J. Comb. Algebra, (2023), published online first.
- [43] R. Stanley, *Enumerate Combinatorics, Volumen 2*, Cambridge University Press, (1999), pages 1–585.

- [44] S. Ryom-Hansen, *On the representation theory of an algebra of braids and ties*, J. Algebr. Comb. **33**, No. 1, (2011), 57-79.
- [45] S. Ryom-Hansen, *On the annihilator ideal in the bt-algebra of tensor space*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **226**, No. 8, (2000), 24 pages.
- [46] J-Y. Thibon, *The inner plethysm of symmetric functions and some of its applications*, Bayreuther Mathematische Schriften **40**, (1992), 177-201.
- [47] A. Wilson, *A diagram-like basis for the multiset partition algebra*, arXiv:2307.01353.
- [48] H. Weyl, *The classical groups, their invariants and representations* Princeton Mathematical Series. No. **1**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford: University Press. xii, (1939), 302 pages.
- [49] C. Xi, *Partition algebras are cellular*, Compositio Math. **119**, (1999), 99–109.