

# involve

a journal of mathematics

Commutation classes of double wiring diagrams

Patrick Dukes and Joe Rusinko



# Commutation classes of double wiring diagrams

Patrick Dukes and Joe Rusinko

(Communicated by Ravi Vakil)

We describe a new method for computing the graph of commutation classes of double wiring diagrams. Using these methods we compute the graph for five strings or less which allows us to confirm a positivity conjecture of Fomin and Zelevinsky when  $n \leq 4$ .

## 1. Introduction

In the theory of cluster algebras, the term Laurent phenomenon describes the mysterious instances in which recursively defined rational functions simplify to Laurent polynomials [Fomin and Zelevinsky 2002]. In many instances of the Laurent phenomenon, it is conjectured that the coefficients of the resulting Laurent polynomials are all positive.

One of the first examples of the Laurent phenomenon was found by Fomin and Zelevinsky [2000] when studying the relationships among minors of an  $n \times n$  matrix with real coefficients. In this work they showed that every minor of a matrix was positive if and only if a particular subset of minors known as *chamber minors* was positive. These chamber minors were indexed by regions of a combinatorial object known as a double wiring diagram. Further, the relationships among minors were described in terms of a graph that describes the relationships among classes of double wiring diagrams.

As an example of the Laurent phenomenon, Fomin and Zelevinsky proved that every minor of an  $n \times n$  matrix can be written as a Laurent polynomial in the chamber minors. They stated the following conjecture which remains open:

**Conjecture 1.1** [Fomin and Zelevinsky 2000]. *For any  $n$ -string double wiring diagram  $w$ , every minor of an  $n \times n$  matrix can be written as a Laurent polynomial with nonnegative coefficients in terms of the chamber minors of  $w$ .*

In this paper we confirm the conjecture for  $n \leq 4$ . To do so, we develop a new method of computing the graph of relationships among classes of double wiring

---

*MSC2010:* primary 05E15; secondary 15B48.


*Keywords:* wiring diagram, matrix positivity, Laurent phenomenon.

diagrams. We then use an original program for computing this graph based on this method, along with the algebra software Fermat [Lewis 2007] to compute the aforementioned Laurent polynomials.

In Section 2 of this paper we define *commutation classes of double wiring diagrams* and a graph which displays the relationships among these classes. In Section 3 we describe a new quiver representation of the commutation classes. This representation greatly simplifies the computation of the associated graph which we describe in Section 4. Finally, we return in Section 5 to the Laurent phenomenon and use our new computations to confirm the positivity conjecture for  $n \leq 4$ .

### 2. Double wiring diagrams

Fomin and Zelevinsky [2000] define an  $n$ -stringed double wiring diagram as two sets of  $n$  piecewise linear lines (black and gray) such that each line intersects every other line of the same color exactly once. We number gray lines from 1 to  $n$  with 1 on the top left and  $n$  on the bottom left. The black lines are labeled in the reverse order. In addition, for each chamber of the double wiring diagram we define the *chamber label* to be a pair of subsets  $(g, b)$  where  $g$  (respectively  $b$ ) is the subset of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  identifying the gray (respectively black) strings that pass below the chamber. See Figure 1 for an example of a double wiring diagram with the chamber labels.




**Figure 1.** A four string double wiring diagram with chamber labels.

It is possible that slightly different wiring diagrams yield the same collection of chamber labels. Following Fomin and Zelevinsky, we consider two wiring diagrams that share the same collection of chamber labels *isotopic*. For single wiring diagrams, such collections of diagrams are called commutation classes, which have been studied in [Bédard 1999; Carter and Marsh 2000].

**Definition 2.1.** A *commutation class of double wiring diagrams* is the collection of all double wiring diagrams that share the same collection of chamber labels.

Any two commutation classes of double wiring diagrams can be linked by a sequence of the braid moves pictured in Figure 2 [Fomin and Zelevinsky 2000]. Note that in each exchange only one chamber label changes. In a braid move from

wiring diagram  $w$  to wiring diagram  $w'$ , we call the chamber label of  $w$  that changes under the braid move, the *center* of the braid move. A braid move is *centered* at a chamber label if that label changes under the braid move.



**Figure 2.** Braid moves. Left: 2-move; right: 3-move.

Since any two commutation classes of wiring diagrams can be connected by a sequence of braid moves, it is natural to construct a graph describing these relationships.

**Definition 2.2.** The graph of commutation classes of wiring diagrams,  $\Phi_n$ , has a unique vertex for every commutation class of double wiring diagram with  $n$  strings. Two vertices are connected by an edge if their wiring diagrams differ by a single braid move.

Fomin and Zelevinsky [2000] prove that  $\Phi_n$  is a finite connected graph and compute  $\Phi_3$ . In this paper we present a method for computing  $\Phi_n$  and use it to construct  $\Phi_4$  and  $\Phi_5$ . We use these calculations to verify a positivity conjecture of Fomin and Zelevinsky when  $n \leq 4$ .


### 3. Using quivers to compute $\Phi_n$

We have found that it is easier to compute  $\Phi_n$  from the relationships among chamber labels than through the graphical structure of the wiring diagrams. This avoids the difficulty of keeping track of which wiring diagrams are in the same commutation class.

We introduce a quiver that describes the relevant relationships among the chamber labels of the double wiring diagram. This quiver is similar to a dual graph. The dual graph itself, however, is not an adequate data structure, as double wiring diagrams that are in the same commutation class may have differing dual graph structures.

**Definition 3.1.** For any double wiring diagram  $\omega$ , define the quiver  $Q(\omega)$  with vertices corresponding to chamber labels and an arrow from  $(g, b)$  to  $(g', b')$  if  $g' = g \cup \{g_j\}$  and  $b' = b \cup \{b_k\}$  for  $g_j, b_k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . We label the arrows of the quiver with the pair of numbers  $(g_j, b_k)$ . We refer to  $g_j$  (respectively  $b_k$ ) as the gray (respectively black) labels of the arrow.

Figure 3 shows  $Q(\omega)$  for the wiring diagram pictured in Figure 1. To keep track of the geometric relationship between the wiring diagram and the quiver we define the height and position of a vertex of a quiver, which roughly describe the location in the double wiring diagram of the corresponding chamber label.



**Figure 3.** Quiver diagram.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $v$  be a vertex of  $Q(w)$  corresponding to the chamber label  $(g, b)$ . We define the *height* of  $v$  to be the cardinality of  $g$ ;  $h(v) = |g|$ . We define the *position* of  $v$  denoted  $p(v) = \sum_{x \in b} x - \sum_{y \in g} y$ .

Notice that the height increases the higher up one moves in the diagram while the position increases from left to right.

In order to construct  $\Phi_n$  one needs to be able to identify the edges that are incident to a given vertex. This information is local in nature so we introduce language that allows us to discuss pieces of  $Q(w)$ .

**Definition 3.3.** A *subquiver* of  $Q(w)$  is any subset of the vertices of  $Q(w)$  together with a (possibly empty) set of arrows whose corresponding vertices are in the subset.

The following definitions provide the language needed to discuss the subquivers that are fundamental to the identifying braid moves.


**Definition 3.4.** A subquiver  $S$  of  $Q(w)$  is *complete* if it contains every arrow of  $Q$  that connects two vertices of  $S$ .

**Definition 3.5.** A subquiver  $S$  of  $Q(w)$  is *full* if, given that  $(g_1, b_1)$  and  $(g_2, b_2)$  are elements of  $S$  with height  $h$ ,  $S$  contains the vertices corresponding to all chamber labels with height  $h$  and position between the positions of  $(g_1, b_1)$  and  $(g_2, b_2)$ .

Notice that complete full subquivers completely determine a portion of a wiring diagram without missing arrows or vertices.

Using the language of complete full subquivers we can describe all of the edges that are incident to a vertex of  $\Phi_n$ . Recall, each edge of  $\Phi_n$  corresponds to a particular braid move centered at a particular chamber of the double wiring diagram.

**Theorem 3.6.** *There exists a 3-move centered at label  $(g, b)$  if and only if  $Q(w)$  contains a complete, full subquiver of one of the two types shown in Figure 4.*




**Figure 4.** Subquivers for 3-move.


*Proof.* Assume a 3-move exists. Then there must be a region of the wiring diagram isomorphic to Figure 2 (right). Constructing the subquiver from this diagram yields Figure 4.

For the other direction, assume  $Q(w)$  has a complete full subquiver isomorphic to Figure 4 (left). We examine the possible gray labels for this subquiver. Since the bottom vertex is connected to the top by a path of length three, we know that only three distinct edge labels may appear in this subquiver. We label the leftmost path from the bottom to the top that passes through  $(g, b)$ ,  $x, y, z$  as pictured in Figure 5.


For each four-cycle in Figure 5 only two distinct edge labels may be used since the bottom and top vertices are connected by a path of length two. This limits the potential labelings to those in Figure 6. The case of picture d) in the figure cannot exist because strings  $z$  and  $y$  are exchanged twice, which contradicts the definition of a double wiring diagram.



**Figure 5.** Grey labels for subquiver.



**Figure 6.** Possible labeled subquivers.



**Figure 7.** Invalid quiver labeling.


Repeat this argument for the black strings and label those cases  $A$  through  $H$ . We now determine which gray and black cases can be paired together. Since the labels must be distinct, the only potential pairs are  $(a, H)$ ,  $(b, G)$  and  $(c, F)$ , and their opposites  $(h, A)$ ,  $(g, B)$  and  $(f, C)$ .

If we draw a subquiver with the labels in the case  $(b, G)$ , as in Figure 7, we recover an extra arrow, which contradicts the hypothesis that the subquiver was complete. The pairs  $(c, F)$ ,  $(g, B)$  and  $(f, C)$  are symmetric to  $(b, G)$ , so they are also eliminated. This leaves only  $(a, H)$  and  $(h, A)$  as possible labelings.


By symmetry of the labelings we may assume the edge labels are of type  $(h, A)$ . Since this subquiver is full, there are no missing vertices. This means that changes in chamber labels of the same cardinality indicate a unique braid crossing as pictured in Figure 8 (left). No other crossings may occur in this region because the quiver is complete. Therefore, the strings must connect without creating any other crossings. This yields the 3-move pictured in Figure 8 (right). The proof for Figure 4 (right) follows the same argument with reflected labels.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.7.** *There exists a 2-move centered at label  $(g, b)$  if and only if  $Q(w)$  contains the full subquiver shown in Figure 9.*

*Proof.* Assume a 2-move exists. Then there must be a region of the wiring diagram isomorphic to Figure 2 (left). Constructing the quiver from this diagram yields the subquiver in Figure 9.




**Figure 8.** Reconstructed 3-move.




**Figure 9.** Subquiver for 2-move.

Now assume  $Q(w)$  contains the full subquiver in Figure 9. We examine the possible gray labels for the subquiver. Label the arrows to and from  $(g, b)$  as  $x$  and  $y$ . Since there is a path from the bottom vertex to the top vertex of length two, all arrows in the subquiver must be labeled  $x$  or  $y$ . Figure 10 shows the possible labelings. The case corresponding to picture d) can be eliminated because it would require strings  $x$  and  $y$  to be exchanged twice.




**Figure 10.** Quiver labelings.

We construct a similar pattern of possibilities for the black strings by labeling the arrows with  $X$  and  $Y$ . We need to determine which gray and black cases can be paired together. Since all of the labelings are distinct, the only potential pairs of cases are  $(b, C)$  and  $(c, B)$ ; see Figure 11.



**Figure 11.** Potential quiver labelings.

As the labelings are symmetric, we can assume without loss of generality that the diagram has edge labels of type  $(b, C)$ . Since this subquiver is full there are no missing vertices. This means that changes in chamber labels of the same height indicate a unique braid crossing as pictured in Figure 12 (left). Since no other crossings may occur in this region we connect the strings without creating any other crossings. Doing so yields the 2-move pictured in Figure 12 (right).  $\square$



**Figure 12.** Reconstructed 2-move.


### 4. Describing $\Phi_n$

Theorems 3.6 and 3.7 allow for the computation of the graph  $\Phi_n$  for any  $n$  using the following algorithm:

- (1) Choose an  $n$ -stringed double wiring diagram  $w$  with quiver  $Q(w)$ .
- (2) Using Theorems 3.6 and 3.7 find and connect all vertices incident to the vertex corresponding to  $w$ .
- (3) Repeat the previous step with the new set of vertices.
- (4) Repeat this process until no new vertices can be added.

Since  $\Phi_n$  is finite and connected this process will terminate and compute the entire graph. This process has been implemented in C++ using algorithms available at [Dukes 2011].

The smallest graph  $\Phi_2$  consists of two vertices connected by an edge. The graph of  $\Phi_3$  first appeared in [Fomin and Zelevinsky 2000]. Figure 13 shows a new



**Figure 13.**  $\Phi_3$  with Hamiltonian cycle highlighted.

	$\Phi_2$	$\Phi_3$	$\Phi_4$	$\Phi_5$
Vertices	2	34	4894	5520372
Edges	1	120	33300	60930112

**Table 1.**  $\Phi_n$  edge and vertex data.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
$\Phi_2$	2								
$\Phi_3$			16	18					
$\Phi_4$				2	522	1362	1754	1054	200

**Table 2.** Number of vertices of given degree for  $\Phi_2$  through  $\Phi_4$ .

	6	7	8	9	10	11
$\Phi_5$	84	28584	198596	632028	1165732	1402756
	12	13	14	15	16	
$\Phi_5$	1165888	651188	227520	44452	3544	

**Table 3.** Number of vertices of given degree for  $\Phi_5$ .

representation of  $\Phi_3$  which indicates the presence of a Hamiltonian path. Tables 1, 2 and 3 summarize information about  $\Phi_n$  for  $n \leq 5$ .

### 5. Total positivity conjecture

With these explicit computations of  $\Phi_n$  in hand, we return to the positivity conjecture of Fomin and Zelevinsky described in the introduction. We briefly review the setup of their work here. See [Fomin and Zelevinsky 2000] for a more complete description.

**Definition 5.1.** An  $n \times n$  matrix  $M$  with entries in  $\mathbb{R}$  is called *totally positive* if all minors of  $M$  are positive.

**Definition 5.2** (Fomin and Zelevinsky). Let  $w$  be an  $n$ -stringed double wiring diagram. For each chamber label  $(b, g)$  of  $w$  we define the minor  $\Delta_{g,b}$  to be the determinant of the matrix with rows of  $M$  corresponding to  $g$  and columns of  $M$  corresponding to  $b$ . We call the collection of all such minors the *chamber minors of  $w$* .

Fomin and Zelevinsky [2000] proved that for any commutation class of double wiring diagrams  $w$ , a matrix  $M$  is totally positive if and only if all of its chamber minors are positive. In addition they conjectured that every minor could be written as a Laurent polynomial in the chamber minors with nonnegative coefficients.

Using our computations from Section 3, we can confirm this conjecture for  $n \leq 4$ .

**Theorem 5.3.** *For  $n \leq 4$  and any  $n$ -stringed double wiring diagram  $w$ , every minor of an  $n \times n$  matrix can be written as a Laurent polynomial with nonnegative coefficients in terms of the chamber minors of  $w$ .*

*Proof.* Fomin and Zelevinsky [2000] show that if  $w$  and  $w'$  are linked by a braid move as pictured in Figure 2, then their chamber minors satisfy the equation

$$AD + BC = XY. \quad (1)$$

Using the program Fermat [Lewis 2007] and a C++ program written by the first author, we verify Theorem 5.3 using the following algorithm:

- (1) For each vertex  $v \in \Phi_n$  and minor  $\Delta$ , find a path from  $v$  to a vertex  $v'$  such that  $\Delta$  is a chamber minor of  $v'$ . This is possible since  $\Phi_n$  is connected and every minor appears as the chamber minor for some double wiring diagram.
- (2) At each edge of this path use Fermat to compute the new minor as a Laurent polynomial in terms of the previous minors using Equation (1). The Laurent theorem [Fomin and Zelevinsky 1999] guarantees the result will be a Laurent polynomial in the chamber minors of  $v$ . Repeat the process until  $\Delta$  is written as a Laurent polynomial in terms of the chamber minors of  $v$ .
- (3) Verify that the corresponding Laurent polynomial has all positive coefficients.

The relevant code and data files can be found in [Dukes 2011].  $\square$

**Example 5.4.** In this example we demonstrate that  $\Delta_{14,12}$  can be written as a Laurent polynomial in the chamber minors of  $w$  as in the wiring diagram in Figure 1 with nonnegative coefficients. First, the diagrams in Figure 14 determine a path in  $\Phi_4$  from  $w$  to a vertex corresponding to a diagram with  $\Delta_{14,12}$  as a chamber minor.

Each exchange along this path introduces a new chamber minor. Using (1), we compute the new chamber minor as a Laurent polynomial in terms of the chamber minors of  $w$ . The results of the Fermat computations of these Laurent polynomials are listed below.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{34,13} &= \frac{\Delta_{34,12}\Delta_{13,13} + \Delta_{134,123}\Delta_{3,1}}{\Delta_{13,12}} \\ &= \Delta_{134,123}\Delta_{13,12}^{-1}\Delta_{3,1} + \Delta_{34,12}\Delta_{13,12}^{-1}\Delta_{13,13}, \\ \Delta_{14,13} &= \frac{\Delta_{1,1}\Delta_{34,13} + \Delta_{4,1}\Delta_{13,13}}{\Delta_{3,1}} \\ &= \Delta_{134,123}\Delta_{13,12}^{-1} + \Delta_{34,12}\Delta_{13,12}^{-1}\Delta_{13,13}\Delta_{3,1}^{-1}\Delta_{1,1} + \Delta_{13,13}\Delta_{4,1}\Delta_{3,1}^{-1}, \\ \Delta_{14,12} &= \frac{\Delta_{14,13}\Delta_{34,12} + \Delta_{134,123}\Delta_{4,1}}{\Delta_{34,13}} = \Delta_{34,12}\Delta_{3,1}^{-1}\Delta_{1,1} + \Delta_{13,12}\Delta_{4,1}\Delta_{3,1}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$



- [Fomin and Zelevinsky 1999] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, “Double Bruhat cells and total positivity”, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **12**:2 (1999), 335–380. MR 2001f:20097 Zbl 0913.22011
- [Fomin and Zelevinsky 2000] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, “Total positivity: tests and parametrizations”, *Math. Intelligencer* **22**:1 (2000), 23–33. MR 2001b:15030 Zbl 1052.15500
- [Fomin and Zelevinsky 2002] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, “The Laurent phenomenon”, *Adv. in Appl. Math.* **28**:2 (2002), 119–144. MR 2002m:05013 Zbl 1012.05012
- [Lewis 2007] R. Lewis, “Fermat: a computer algebra system for polynomial and matrix computation”, 2007, <http://home.bway.net/lewis>.

Received: 2011-08-30

Revised: 2011-09-03

Accepted: 2011-09-14

pdukes3@gmail.com

*School of Computing, Clemson University,  
Clemson, SC 29634, United States*

rusinkoj@winthrop.edu

*Department of Mathematics, Winthrop University,  
Rock Hill, SC 29733, United States*

# involve

msp.berkeley.edu/involve

## EDITORS

### MANAGING EDITOR

Kenneth S. Berenhaut, Wake Forest University, USA, berenhs@wfu.edu

### BOARD OF EDITORS

Colin Adams	Williams College, USA colin.c.adams@williams.edu	David Larson	Texas A&M University, USA larson@math.tamu.edu
John V. Baxley	Wake Forest University, NC, USA baxley@wfu.edu	Suzanne Lenhart	University of Tennessee, USA lenhart@math.utk.edu
Arthur T. Benjamin	Harvey Mudd College, USA benjamin@hmc.edu	Chi-Kwong Li	College of William and Mary, USA ckli@math.wm.edu
Martin Bohner	Missouri U of Science and Technology, USA bohner@mst.edu	Robert B. Lund	Clemson University, USA lund@clemson.edu
Nigel Boston	University of Wisconsin, USA boston@math.wisc.edu	Gaven J. Martin	Massey University, New Zealand g.j.martin@massey.ac.nz
Amarjit S. Budhiraja	U of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA budhiraj@email.unc.edu	Mary Meyer	Colorado State University, USA meyer@stat.colostate.edu
Pietro Cerone	Victoria University, Australia pietro.cerone@vu.edu.au	Emil Minchev	Ruse, Bulgaria eminchev@hotmail.com
Scott Chapman	Sam Houston State University, USA scott.chapman@shsu.edu	Frank Morgan	Williams College, USA frank.morgan@williams.edu
Jem N. Corcoran	University of Colorado, USA corcoran@colorado.edu	Mohammad Sal Moslehian	Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran moslehian@ferdowsi.um.ac.ir
Toka Diagana	Howard University, USA tdiagana@howard.edu	Zuhair Nashed	University of Central Florida, USA znashed@mail.ucf.edu
Michael Dorff	Brigham Young University, USA mdorff@math.byu.edu	Ken Ono	Emory University, USA ono@mathcs.emory.edu
Sever S. Dragomir	Victoria University, Australia sever@matilda.vu.edu.au	Timothy E. O'Brien	Loyola University Chicago, USA tobrie1@luc.edu
Behrouz Emamizadeh	The Petroleum Institute, UAE bemamizadeh@pi.ac.ae	Joseph O'Rourke	Smith College, USA orourke@cs.smith.edu
Joel Foisy	SUNY Potsdam foisyjs@potsdam.edu	Yuval Peres	Microsoft Research, USA peres@microsoft.com
Errin W. Fulp	Wake Forest University, USA fulp@wfu.edu	Y.-F. S. Pétermann	Université de Genève, Switzerland petermann@math.unige.ch
Joseph Gallian	University of Minnesota Duluth, USA jgallian@d.umn.edu	Robert J. Plemmons	Wake Forest University, USA rplemmons@wfu.edu
Stephan R. Garcia	Pomona College, USA stephan.garcia@pomona.edu	Carl B. Pomerance	Dartmouth College, USA carl.pomerance@dartmouth.edu
Anant Godbole	East Tennessee State University, USA godbole@etsu.edu	Vadim Ponomarenko	San Diego State University, USA vadim@sciences.sdsu.edu
Ron Gould	Emory University, USA rg@mathcs.emory.edu	Bjorn Poonen	UC Berkeley, USA poonen@math.berkeley.edu
Andrew Granville	Université Montréal, Canada andrew@dms.umontreal.ca	James Propp	U Mass Lowell, USA jpropp@cs.uml.edu
Jerrold Griggs	University of South Carolina, USA griggs@math.sc.edu	József H. Przytycki	George Washington University, USA przytyck@gwu.edu
Ron Gould	Emory University, USA rg@mathcs.emory.edu	Richard Rebarber	University of Nebraska, USA rrebarbe@math.unl.edu
Sat Gupta	U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA sngupta@uncg.edu	Robert W. Robinson	University of Georgia, USA rwr@cs.uga.edu
Jim Haglund	University of Pennsylvania, USA jhaglund@math.upenn.edu	Filip Saidak	U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA f_saidak@uncg.edu
Johnny Henderson	Baylor University, USA johnny_henderson@baylor.edu	James A. Sellers	Penn State University, USA sellersj@math.psu.edu
Jim Hoste	Pitzer College jhoste@pitzer.edu	Andrew J. Sterge	Honorary Editor andy@ajsterge.com
Natalia Hritonenko	Prairie View A&M University, USA nahritonenko@pvamu.edu	Ann Trenk	Wellesley College, USA atrenk@wellesley.edu
Glenn H. Hurlbert	Arizona State University, USA hurlbert@asu.edu	Ravi Vakil	Stanford University, USA vakil@math.stanford.edu
Charles R. Johnson	College of William and Mary, USA crjohnso@math.wm.edu	Ram U. Verma	University of Toledo, USA verma99@msn.com
K. B. Kulasekera	Clemson University, USA kk@ces.clemson.edu	John C. Wierman	Johns Hopkins University, USA wierman@jhu.edu
Gerry Ladas	University of Rhode Island, USA gladas@math.uri.edu	Michael E. Zieve	University of Michigan, USA zieve@umich.edu

### PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor

Sheila Newbery, Senior Production Editor

Cover design: © 2008 Alex Scorpan

See inside back cover or <http://msp.berkeley.edu/involve> for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2012 is US \$105/year for the electronic version, and \$145/year (+\$35 shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues from the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to Mathematical Sciences Publishers, Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94704-3840, USA.

Involve (ISSN 1944-4184 electronic, 1944-4176 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840 is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

Involve peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW™ from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY



mathematical sciences publishers

<http://msp.org/>

A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Typeset in L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X

Copyright ©2012 by Mathematical Sciences Publishers

# involve

2012

vol. 5

no. 2

A Giambelli formula for the $S^1$ -equivariant cohomology of type $A$ Peterson varieties DARIUS BAYEGAN AND MEGUMI HARADA	115
Weak Allee effect, grazing, and S-shaped bifurcation curves EMILY POOLE, BONNIE ROBERSON AND BRITTANY STEPHENSON	133
A BMO theorem for $\epsilon$ -distorted diffeomorphisms on $\mathbb{R}^D$ and an application to comparing manifolds of speech and sound CHARLES FEFFERMAN, STEVEN B. DAMELIN AND WILLIAM GLOVER	159
Modular magic sudoku JOHN LORCH AND ELLEN WELD	173
Distribution of the exponents of primitive circulant matrices in the first four boxes of $\mathbb{Z}_n$ . MARIA ISABEL BUENO, KUAN-YING FANG, SAMANTHA FULLER AND SUSANA FURTADO	187
Commutation classes of double wiring diagrams PATRICK DUKES AND JOE RUSINKO	207
A two-step conditionally bounded numerical integrator to approximate some traveling-wave solutions of a diffusion-reaction equation SIEGFRIED MACÍAS AND JORGE E. MACÍAS-DÍAZ	219
The average order of elements in the multiplicative group of a finite field YILAN HU AND CARL POMERANCE	229



1944-4176(2012)5:2;1-B