

**Exercise 1** (Exercise 3). Prove that a word  $w$  has highest weight (i.e.,  $E_i(w) = 0$  for all  $i$ ) if and only if  $w$  is Yamanouchi

### Answer

First suppose  $w \in [n]^k$  is a word of length  $k$  on the alphabet  $[n]$ . Now suppose additionally that  $w$  is Yamanouchi. This means that for every  $s \leq k$ , the suffix

$$w_{k-s+1} \dots w_{k-1} w_k$$

contains at least as many  $i$ 's after the  $(i+1)$ 's. In particular this holds when  $s = k$ . So when applying the raising  $E_i$  operator we pair  $(i+1)$  with an  $i$  to its right as a parenthesis. There are as much  $i$ 's as  $(i+1)$ 's so every  $(i+1)$  is paired and so the  $E_i$  operator can't convert any  $(i+1)$  to an  $i$ .

As  $i$  is arbitrary, we can't apply any  $E_i$  to  $w$  which means that  $w$  has highest weight.

On the other hand<sup>a</sup> suppose  $w \in [n]^k$  has highest weight. Then for all  $i$ , we can't apply  $E_i$  to  $w$ . This means that in  $w$ , it is possible to match all the  $(i+1)$ 's with  $i$ 's that succeed them.

The previous fact lets us see that when reading  $w$  from right-to-left we will find at least as many  $i$ 's as we find  $(i+1)$ 's. In other words, this means that  $w$  is Yamanouchi.

<sup>a</sup>Once again, **Kelsey, Trent**, and myself have talked about this problem in order to under the idea.

**Exercise 2** (Exercise 4). Formulate and prove a Yamanouchi-type condition for  $w$  to be lowest weight, that is,  $F_i(w) = 0$  for all  $i \in [n]$ . Such a word is called anti-ballot.

### Answer

We will define anti-ballot by remembering the definition of ballot. Recall a ballot word  $w$  in  $[n]^k$  has the property that for every  $p \leq k$ , the prefix

$$w_1 w_2 \dots w_p$$

contains at least as many  $i$ 's before the  $(i+1)$ 's. So an anti-ballot word will contain as many  $(i+1)$ 's before the  $i$ 's. The claim is as follows:

*A word  $w$  has lowest weight if and only if  $w$  is anti-ballot.*

To prove this we first assume a word  $w$  is anti-ballot. Before applying  $F_i$  we notice that all the latter  $i$ 's must already be paired with a previous  $(i + 1)$  because the word is anti-ballot.

This property holds for all  $i$  so it happens that we can't apply  $F_i$  to  $w$ , thus  $w$  has lowest weight.

On the flip-side, if we assume  $w$  has lowest weight, it means that all  $i$ 's in  $w$  are matched with  $(i + 1)$  that precede them. So it must hold that there are at least as many  $(i + 1)$ 's as  $i$ 's in  $w$ . This condition holds for every  $i$  which means that  $w$  is anti-ballot.

*Remark 1.* It is important to notice that an anti-ballot word is not necessarily Yamanouchi even if it contains all the possible letters of the alphabet in question. The word

$$33 \dots 321$$

is anti-ballot but not Yamanouchi.

The examples from the crystal graphs contain Yamanouchi words on the top and anti-ballot words on the bottom.

**Exercise 3** (Exercise 7). How many ballot words of length  $n$  have only 1's and 2's?

#### Answer

Let us begin by counting the small cases:

- ◇ When  $k = 1$  we only have the word 1.
- ◇ When  $k = 2$  we have both 11 and 21.
- ◇ When  $k = 3$  we have 111, 211 and 121. We can't add 221 because it stops being Yamanouchi.
- ◇ For  $k = 4$  the words are 1111, 2111, 1211, 2211, 1121 and 2121.
- ◇ The next case is  $k = 5$  with

11111, 21111, 12111, 22111, 11211, 21211, 12211, 11121, 21121 and 12121.

- ◇ Notice now that we will get 20 possibilities for  $k = 6$  because Yamanouchi words on  $k = 5$  all have three 1's and two 2's so it's possible to add a 1 or a 2 on each possibility which brings our total to 20.