

*Pacific  
Journal of  
Mathematics*

**JACOBI-TRUDI DETERMINANTS  
AND CHARACTERS OF MINIMAL AFFINIZATIONS**

STEVEN V SAM

# JACOBI–TRUDI DETERMINANTS AND CHARACTERS OF MINIMAL AFFINIZATIONS

STEVEN V SAM

**In their study of characters of minimal affinizations of representations of orthogonal and symplectic Lie algebras, Chari and Greenstein conjectured that certain Jacobi–Trudi determinants satisfy an alternating sum formula. In this note, we prove their conjecture and slightly more. The proof relies on some symmetries of the ring of symmetric functions discovered by Koike and Terada. Using results of Hernandez, Mukhin and Young, and Naoi, this implies that the characters of minimal affinizations in types B, C, and D are given by a Jacobi–Trudi determinant.**

## Introduction

In [Chari and Greenstein 2011] (henceforth abbreviated [CG]), the authors study a class of modules over the current algebra  $\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t]$ , where  $\mathfrak{g}$  is either a special orthogonal or symplectic Lie algebra (over the complex numbers). These modules are related to the minimal affinizations, a class of irreducible representations for the quantum loop algebra  $U_q(\mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}])$ . We refer the reader to [CG, §3] for background and references. A character formula, which is similar to a Jacobi–Trudi determinant, for these modules is conjectured in [CG, Conjecture 1.13]. This is inspired by [Nakai and Nakanishi 2006], which conjectures that the characters of minimal affinizations are given by such determinants (see also [Nakai and Nakanishi 2007a; 2007b] for related work).

The aim of this note is to prove [CG, Conjecture 1.13] (see Theorem 1.1). We will give a uniform proof for all types. The conjecture reduces to a combinatorial statement about characters of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , so we will not need to discuss current or loop algebras any further. In fact, we will prove an extension of the combinatorial statement which removes a restriction on the highest weights considered. Furthermore, using results of Hernandez, Mukhin and Young, and Naoi, this gives a character formula for minimal affinizations of representations of  $\mathfrak{g}$  in types B, C, and D (see Remark 1.3).

The method of proof involves passing to a suitable limit (with respect to the rank of the Lie algebra) to take advantage of additional symmetries. This suggests that

---

The author was supported by a Miller research fellowship.

MSC2010: primary 05E05; secondary 17B10.

Keywords: minimal affinizations, classical Lie algebras, symmetric functions.



Let  $\omega_i$  be the fundamental weights, and let  $\lambda$  be a dominant integral weight which is a linear combination of  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{n-1}$  (so in particular, we avoid the spin representations in the orthogonal case). We will use a basis  $e_1, \dots, e_{\text{rank}(\mathfrak{g})}$  for the weight lattice of  $G$  (see [Fulton and Harris 1991, §16.1, §18.1] for details; there the basis is denoted  $L_1, \dots, L_{\text{rank}(\mathfrak{g})}$ ). Given  $\lambda = a_1\omega_1 + \dots + a_{n-1}\omega_{n-1}$ , we associate to it the partition

$$(a_1 + \dots + a_{n-1}, a_2 + \dots + a_{n-1}, \dots, a_{n-1}).$$

So in particular, the notation  $\lambda_i = a_i + \dots + a_{n-1}$  is defined. Then we have  $\lambda = \lambda_1 e_1 + \dots + \lambda_{n-1} e_{n-1}$ . Let  $V_\lambda$  be the corresponding highest weight representation of  $G$ . We will denote  $V = V_1$ , the vector representation. We sometimes use the notation  $V_\lambda^O$  or  $V_\lambda^{\text{Sp}}$  to emphasize that we are dealing with the orthogonal or symplectic case, respectively.

In general, all finite-dimensional irreducible representations  $V_\lambda$  of  $G$  can be indexed by partitions  $\lambda$  (see [Fulton and Harris 1991, §17.3, §19.5] or [Sam and Snowden 2013, §4.1]). We may assume that  $\ell(\lambda) \leq \text{rank}(\mathfrak{g})$  as long as we are ambivalent about the presence of the sign representation in the orthogonal group case. (The reason we do not use the special orthogonal group is because some irreducible representations of the even orthogonal group are not irreducible when restricted to the special orthogonal group, and so the latter group does not behave as well from the perspective of stability.)

Now we rephrase the definitions in [CG, §1.13] in this notation. First, we have  $i_\lambda = \ell(\lambda)$ . In the orthogonal case,  $\Psi_\lambda = \{e_i + e_j \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq \ell(\lambda)\}$ , and in the symplectic case,  $\Psi_\lambda = \{e_i + e_j \mid 1 \leq i \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)\}$ . Define the set

$$\Gamma(\lambda, \Psi_\lambda) = \left\{ (\mu, s) \mid \lambda = \mu + \sum_{\beta \in \Psi_\lambda} n_\beta \beta, n_\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \sum_{\beta \in \Psi_\lambda} n_\beta = s \right\}.$$

By the definitions of  $\Psi_\lambda$ , we see that  $(\mu, s) \in \Gamma(\lambda, \Psi_\lambda)$  implies that  $s = (|\lambda| - |\mu|)/2$ .

Define  $\mathbf{h}_k = \text{char}(V_k^O)$  in the orthogonal case and  $\mathbf{h}_k = \sum_{0 \leq r \leq k/2} \text{char}(V_{k-2r}^{\text{Sp}})$  in the symplectic case. In both cases, define the Jacobi–Trudi determinant

$$H_\lambda = \det(\mathbf{h}_{\lambda_i - i + j}).$$

For  $(\nu, s) \in \Gamma(\lambda, \Psi_\lambda)$ , define

$$C_{\nu, s}^\lambda = \dim \text{hom}_G(V_\nu, \bigwedge^s(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes V_\lambda)$$

(see [CG, §2.7], but there it is  $c$  instead of  $C$ ; we use  $c$  for Littlewood–Richardson coefficients).

All of the above definitions make sense for any partition  $\lambda$  with  $\ell(\lambda) \leq \text{rank}(\mathfrak{g})$ . To make this clear, we spell out the conversion between partitions and weights now. Let  $r = \text{rank}(\mathfrak{g})$  and let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$  be a partition.

- If  $G = \mathrm{Sp}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$ , then  $V_\lambda$  is irreducible with highest weight

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1})\omega_i + \lambda_r\omega_r.$$

- If  $G = \mathrm{O}_{2r+1}(\mathbb{C})$ , then  $V_\lambda$  is irreducible with highest weight

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} (\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1})\omega_i + 2\lambda_r\omega_r.$$

- If  $G = \mathrm{O}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$ , then there are two cases. In both cases,  $V_\lambda$  is an irreducible representation of  $\mathrm{O}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$ , but we distinguish between what happens when we pass to the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{so}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$ .

- If  $\lambda_r = 0$ , then  $V_\lambda$  is an irreducible representation of  $\mathfrak{so}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$  with highest weight

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r-2} (\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1})\omega_i + \lambda_{r-1}(\omega_{r-1} + \omega_r).$$

- If  $\lambda_r > 0$ , then as a representation of  $\mathfrak{so}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$ ,  $V_\lambda$  is the direct sum of irreducible representations with highest weights

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r-2} (\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1})\omega_i + (\lambda_{r-1} - \lambda_r)\omega_{r-1} + (\lambda_{r-1} + \lambda_r)\omega_r$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r-2} (\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1})\omega_i + (\lambda_{r-1} + \lambda_r)\omega_{r-1} + (\lambda_{r-1} - \lambda_r)\omega_r.$$

In the orthogonal case, let  $d_v^\lambda$  be the multiplicity of  $V_v^{\mathrm{Sp}}$  in  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda(V^{\mathrm{Sp}})$ : here  $V^{\mathrm{Sp}}$  is the vector representation for  $\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$  with  $n \geq \ell(\lambda)$  and  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda(V^{\mathrm{Sp}})$  is considered as a representation of  $\mathrm{Sp}(2n)$ . By [Koike and Terada 1987, Proposition 1.5.3], this multiplicity is independent of  $n$  as long as  $n \geq \ell(\lambda)$ , and we have

$$d_v^\lambda = \sum_{\eta} c_{v, (2\eta)^\dagger}^\lambda.$$

Similarly, in the symplectic case, let  $d_v^\lambda$  be the multiplicity of  $V_v^{\mathrm{O}}$  in  $\mathcal{S}_\lambda(V^{\mathrm{O}})$  (note that we are using branching rules for the *other* group in both cases). Then we have

$$d_v^\lambda = \sum_{\eta} c_{v, 2\eta}^\lambda.$$

When  $\ell(\lambda) \leq n - 1$ , the following main result proves [CG, Conjecture 1.13].

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\lambda$  be a partition with  $\ell(\lambda) \leq \text{rank}(\mathfrak{g})$ . Then*

$$(1.2) \quad \sum_{(v,s) \in \Gamma(\lambda, \Psi_\lambda)} (-1)^s C_{v,s}^\lambda \mathbf{H}_v = \text{char}(V_\lambda).$$

Also  $\mathbf{H}_\lambda = \sum_v d_v^\lambda \text{char}(V_v)$ .

**Remark 1.3.** Under the restriction  $\ell(\lambda) \leq n - 1$ , Chari and Greenstein constructed the module  $P(\lambda, 0)^{\Gamma(\lambda, \Psi_\lambda)}$  in [CG], and Theorem 1.1 together with [CG, Theorem 2] shows that its character is  $\mathbf{H}_\lambda$ . In types B and C, Naoi [2013, Remark 4.7] shows that these modules are the “graded limits” of the minimal affinizations of the corresponding simple modules  $V_\lambda$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . A similar result is obtained for a special class of highest weights in type D in [Naoi 2014]. In particular, the characters (considered as representations of  $\mathfrak{g}$ ) of both modules are the same. So the character of the minimal affinization is also  $\mathbf{H}_\lambda$ . In type B, this follows from [Hernandez 2007] (see [Naoi 2013, Remark 4.7]) or from [Mukhin and Young 2012, Corollary 7.6].  $\square$

## 2. Some identities

Let  $Q_{-1}$  be the set of partitions with the following inductive definition. The empty partition belongs to  $Q_{-1}$ . A nonempty partition  $\mu$  belongs to  $Q_{-1}$  if and only if the number of rows in  $\mu$  is one more than the number of columns, i.e.,  $\ell(\mu) = \mu_1 + 1$ , and the partition obtained by deleting the first row and column of  $\mu$ , i.e.,  $(\mu_2 - 1, \dots, \mu_{\ell(\mu)} - 1)$ , belongs to  $Q_{-1}$ . The first few partitions in  $Q_{-1}$  are  $0, (1, 1), (2, 1, 1), (2, 2, 2)$ . Define  $Q_1 = \{\lambda \mid \lambda^\dagger \in Q_{-1}\}$ . We record this definition as the following formula:

$$(2.1) \quad Q_1^\dagger = Q_{-1}.$$

The significance of these sets are the following decompositions (see [Macdonald 1995, I.A.7, Examples 4, 5]):

$$(2.2) \quad \wedge^i(\text{Sym}^2(E)) = \bigoplus_{\substack{\mu \in Q_1 \\ |\mu|=2i}} S_\mu(E),$$

$$(2.3) \quad \wedge^i(\wedge^2(E)) = \bigoplus_{\substack{\mu \in Q_{-1} \\ |\mu|=2i}} S_\mu(E).$$

We need two of Littlewood’s identities [Koike and Terada 1987, Proposition 1.5.3]:

$$(2.4) \quad \text{char}(V_\lambda^O) = \sum_{\mu \in Q_1} (-1)^{|\mu|/2} \sum_v c_{\mu,v}^\lambda s_v,$$

$$(2.5) \quad \text{char}(V_\lambda^{\text{Sp}}) = \sum_{\mu \in Q_{-1}} (-1)^{|\mu|/2} \sum_v c_{\mu,v}^\lambda s_v.$$

**Lemma 2.6.** Fix  $(\nu, s) \in \Gamma(\lambda, \Psi_\lambda)$ , where  $\ell(\lambda) \leq \text{rank}(\mathfrak{g})$  and  $s = (|\lambda| - |\nu|)/2$ . Then  $C_{\nu,s}^\lambda = \sum_{\mu \in Q_{-1}} c_{\mu,\nu}^\lambda$  in the orthogonal case (for the symplectic case, use  $Q_1$  instead of  $Q_{-1}$ ).

Conversely, if this sum is nonzero, then  $(\nu, s) \in \Gamma(\lambda, \Psi_\lambda)$  for  $s = (|\lambda| - |\nu|)/2$ .

*Proof.* In the orthogonal case, we have  $\mathfrak{g} = V_{1,1} = \wedge^2(V)$ . So we need to calculate the multiplicity of  $V_\nu$  in  $\wedge^s(\wedge^2(V)) \otimes V_\lambda$ , where  $s = (|\lambda| - |\nu|)/2$ . By (2.3), we get

$$\wedge^s(\wedge^2(V)) = \bigoplus_{\substack{\mu \in Q_{-1} \\ |\mu|=2s}} S_\mu(V).$$

(In the symplectic case we instead have  $\mathfrak{g} = V_2 = \text{Sym}^2(V)$ , so all of the following statements will hold if we replace  $Q_{-1}$  with  $Q_1$ .) We claim that the multiplicity of  $V_\nu$  in  $S_\mu(V) \otimes V_\lambda$  is the Littlewood–Richardson coefficient  $c_{\mu,\nu}^\lambda$ .

If  $\ell(\mu) \leq \text{rank}(\mathfrak{g})$ , then as a representation of the orthogonal group (also in the symplectic case),  $S_\mu(V)$  is the sum of  $V_\mu$  and other  $V_\alpha$ , where  $|\alpha| < |\mu|$  up to twisting  $V_\alpha$  with a sign character (this follows from the explicit formula in [Koike and Terada 1987, Proposition 2.5.1]). Also, if  $V_\nu$  appears in  $V_\alpha \otimes V_\lambda$ , then we must have  $|\nu| \geq |\lambda| - |\alpha|$  by a basic argument with weights. This implies that the multiplicity of  $V_\nu$  in  $S_\mu(V) \otimes V_\lambda$  is the same as the multiplicity of  $V_\nu$  in  $V_\mu \otimes V_\lambda$  under our hypothesis that  $|\nu| + |\mu| = |\lambda|$ . Furthermore, the multiplicity in this case is the Littlewood–Richardson coefficient  $c_{\mu,\nu}^\lambda$  [ibid., Proposition 2.5.2].

If  $\ell(\mu) > \text{rank}(\mathfrak{g})$ , then the multiplicity of  $V_\nu$  in  $S_\mu(V) \otimes V_\lambda$  is 0 since all  $V_\alpha$  in  $S_\mu(V)$  satisfy  $|\alpha| < |\mu|$ . Also,  $c_{\mu,\nu}^\lambda = 0$  since  $\mu \not\subseteq \lambda$ . This proves the claim and the second sentence of the lemma.

Now we handle the last sentence of the lemma. So suppose that  $c_{\mu,\nu}^\lambda \neq 0$  for some  $\mu \in Q_{-1}$ . Set  $s = (|\lambda| - |\nu|)/2 = |\mu|/2$ . The weights of  $S_\mu(V) \subset \wedge^s(\mathfrak{g})$  are linear combinations of  $s$  roots of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . In particular,  $\lambda$  is the sum of  $\nu$  and  $s$  roots  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The possible roots of  $\mathfrak{g}$  are  $e_i \pm e_j$  and  $\pm e_i$ . Since  $|\nu + e_i - e_j| = |\nu|$  and  $|\nu \pm e_i| = |\nu| \pm 1$ , the  $s$  roots  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$  must all be of the form  $e_i + e_j$ , so  $(\nu, s) \in \Gamma(\lambda, \Psi_\lambda)$ . □

### 3. Proof of main theorem

**Lemma 3.1.** Pick  $X \in \{B, C, D\}$ . Fix a partition  $\lambda$  with  $\ell(\lambda) \leq n$ . Then (1.2) is true for the representation  $V_\lambda$  for  $X_n$  if and only if it is true for the representation  $V_\lambda$  for  $X_m$  for any  $m \geq n$ .

*Proof.* By [Koike and Terada 1987, Corollary 2.5.3], the tensor product decomposition  $V_\lambda \otimes V_\mu$  is independent of  $m$  if  $m \geq \ell(\lambda) + \ell(\mu)$ , and in this case, the tensor product decomposes as a sum of  $V_\alpha$  with  $\ell(\alpha) \leq \ell(\lambda) + \ell(\mu)$ . The definition of  $H_\lambda$  involves multiplying at most  $\ell(\lambda) \leq m$  characters, all indexed by one-row partitions,

so its definition is independent of  $m$ . Certainly the set  $\Gamma(\lambda, \Psi_\lambda)$  does not depend on  $m$  if  $m \geq \ell(\lambda)$ . So it remains to show that the coefficients  $C_{v,s}^\lambda$  are independent of  $m$ , but this follows from [Lemma 2.6](#).  $\square$

In particular, we may assume that  $n = \infty$ . In this limit, we can use some additional symmetries of the character ring  $\Lambda$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then  $\Lambda$  is the ring of symmetric functions, but is equipped with a new basis which was studied in [\[ibid.\]](#). Write  $s_{[\lambda]} = \text{char}(V_\lambda)$ . We use  $s_{[\lambda]}^{\text{Sp}}$  or  $s_{[\lambda]}^{\text{O}}$  if we need to emphasize the group. Then the  $s_{[\lambda]}$ , as  $\lambda$  ranges over all partitions, forms a basis for this character ring. The idea is to use [\(2.4\)](#) or [\(2.5\)](#) to exhibit the change of basis between  $s_{[\lambda]}$  and the usual Schur functions  $s_\mu = \text{char}(S_\mu(V))$ . There is an involution (which is an algebra automorphism), denoted  $i_{\text{O}}$  in the orthogonal case and  $i_{\text{Sp}}$  in the symplectic case, that sends  $s_{[\lambda]}$  to  $s_{[\lambda^\dagger]}$  [\[ibid., Theorem 2.3.4\]](#). Also, we recall that the linear map  $\omega: s_\lambda \mapsto s_{\lambda^\dagger}$  is an algebra automorphism [\[Macdonald 1995, §I.3\]](#). We need the following identity [\[Koike and Terada 1987, Theorem 2.3.2\]](#):

$$(3.2) \quad \omega(s_{[\lambda]}^{\text{Sp}}) = s_{[\lambda^\dagger]}^{\text{O}}.$$

**Lemma 3.3.** *The involution  $i_{\text{O}}$  or  $i_{\text{Sp}}$  sends  $\mathbf{H}_v$  to the Schur function  $s_{v^\dagger}$ .*

*Proof.* In the orthogonal case,  $i_{\text{O}}(\mathbf{h}_k) = s_{[1^k]} = \text{char}(\wedge^k V) = s_{1^k}$ , and in the symplectic case,

$$i_{\text{Sp}}(\mathbf{h}_k) = \sum_{0 \leq r \leq k/2} s_{[1^{k-2r}]} = \text{char}(\wedge^k V) = s_{1^k}$$

by basic properties of the decomposition of exterior powers under the action of the symplectic group. Since  $i_{\text{O}}$  and  $i_{\text{Sp}}$  are algebra homomorphisms, we see that  $\mathbf{H}_v = \det(\mathbf{h}_{v_i - i + j})$  gets sent to  $\det(s_{1^{v_i - i + j}})$ , which is the Schur function  $s_{v^\dagger}$  by the Jacobi–Trudi formula [\[Macdonald 1995, §I.3, equation \(3.5\)\]](#).  $\square$

Now we focus on the orthogonal case (the symplectic case is almost identical). By [\(2.4\)](#),

$$s_{[\lambda]} = \sum_{\mu \in Q_1} (-1)^{|\mu|/2} \sum_v c_{\mu,v}^\lambda s_{v^\dagger}.$$

Since  $c_{\mu,v}^\lambda = c_{\mu^\dagger,v^\dagger}^{\lambda^\dagger}$  (use that  $s_\mu s_\nu = \sum_\lambda c_{\mu,\nu}^\lambda s_\lambda$  [\[Macdonald 1995, §I.9\]](#) and the involution  $\omega$  defined above), and  $Q_1^\dagger = Q_{-1}$  [\(2.1\)](#), we can rewrite this as

$$s_{[\lambda^\dagger]} = \sum_{\mu \in Q_{-1}} (-1)^{|\mu|/2} \sum_v c_{\mu,v}^\lambda s_{v^\dagger}.$$

In particular, the coefficient of  $s_{v^\dagger}$  is  $\sum_{\mu \in Q_{-1}} (-1)^{(|\lambda| - |\nu|)/2} c_{\mu,v}^\lambda$ . By [Lemma 2.6](#), we get

$$s_{[\lambda^\dagger]} = \sum_{(v,s) \in \Gamma(\lambda, \Psi_\lambda)} (-1)^s c_{v,s}^\lambda s_{v^\dagger}.$$



Finally, apply the involution  $i_O$  to this equation and use [Lemma 3.3](#) to get (1.2). The last part of the theorem follows directly from [Lemma 3.3](#) and (3.2).

## References

- [Chari and Greenstein 2011] V. Chari and J. Greenstein, “Minimal affinizations as projective objects”, *J. Geom. Phys.* **61**:3 (2011), 594–609. [MR 2012a:17019](#) [Zbl 1207.81040](#)
- [Fulton and Harris 1991] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation theory: A first course*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **129**, Springer, New York, 1991. [MR 93a:20069](#) [Zbl 0744.22001](#)
- [Hernandez 2007] D. Hernandez, “On minimal affinizations of representations of quantum groups”, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **276**:1 (2007), 221–259. [MR 2008h:17014](#) [Zbl 1141.17011](#)
- [Koike and Terada 1987] K. Koike and I. Terada, “Young-diagrammatic methods for the representation theory of the classical groups of type  $B_n$ ,  $C_n$ ,  $D_n$ ”, *J. Algebra* **107**:2 (1987), 466–511. [MR 88i:22035](#) [Zbl 0622.20033](#)
- [Macdonald 1995] I. G. Macdonald, *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials*, 2nd ed., Clarendon Press, New York, 1995. [MR 96h:05207](#) [Zbl 0824.05059](#)
- [Mukhin and Young 2012] E. Mukhin and C. A. S. Young, “Path description of type B  $q$ -characters”, *Adv. Math.* **231**:2 (2012), 1119–1150. [MR 2955205](#) [Zbl 0608.4095](#)
- [Nakai and Nakanishi 2006] W. Nakai and T. Nakanishi, “Paths, tableaux and  $q$ -characters of quantum affine algebras: The  $C_n$  case”, *J. Phys. A* **39**:9 (2006), 2083–2115. [MR 2006k:17028](#) [Zbl 1085.17011](#)
- [Nakai and Nakanishi 2007a] W. Nakai and T. Nakanishi, “Paths and tableaux descriptions of Jacobi–Trudi determinant associated with quantum affine algebra of type  $C_n$ ”, *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.* **3** (2007), Paper 078, 20. [MR 2008f:17030](#) [Zbl 1142.17009](#)
- [Nakai and Nakanishi 2007b] W. Nakai and T. Nakanishi, “Paths and tableaux descriptions of Jacobi–Trudi determinant associated with quantum affine algebra of type  $D_n$ ”, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **26**:2 (2007), 253–290. [MR 2008e:17013](#) [Zbl 1171.17004](#)
- [Naoi 2013] K. Naoi, “Demazure modules and graded limits of minimal affinizations”, *Represent. Theory* **17** (2013), 524–556. [MR 3120578](#) [Zbl 0629.0062](#)
- [Naoi 2014] K. Naoi, “Graded limits of minimal affinizations in type  $D$ ”, *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.* **10** (2014), Paper 047, 20. [MR 3210588](#)
- [Sam and Snowden 2013] S. V. Sam and A. Snowden, “Stability patterns in representation theory”, preprint, 2013. [arXiv 1302.5859v1](#)

Received August 16, 2013. Revised October 15, 2013.

STEVEN V SAM  
 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY  
 933 EVANS HALL  
 BERKELEY, CA 94720  
 UNITED STATES  
[svs@math.berkeley.edu](mailto:svs@math.berkeley.edu)

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

[msp.org/pjm](http://msp.org/pjm)

Founded in 1951 by E. F. Beckenbach (1906–1982) and F. Wolf (1904–1989)

## EDITORS

Don Blasius (Managing Editor)  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555  
[blasius@math.ucla.edu](mailto:blasius@math.ucla.edu)

Paul Balmer  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555  
[balmer@math.ucla.edu](mailto:balmer@math.ucla.edu)

Robert Finn  
Department of Mathematics  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305-2125  
[finn@math.stanford.edu](mailto:finn@math.stanford.edu)

Sorin Popa  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555  
[popa@math.ucla.edu](mailto:popa@math.ucla.edu)

Vyjayanthi Chari  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Riverside, CA 92521-0135  
[chari@math.ucr.edu](mailto:chari@math.ucr.edu)

Kefeng Liu  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1555  
[liu@math.ucla.edu](mailto:liu@math.ucla.edu)

Jie Qing  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Santa Cruz, CA 95064  
[qing@cats.ucsc.edu](mailto:qing@cats.ucsc.edu)

Daryl Cooper  
Department of Mathematics  
University of California  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3080  
[cooper@math.ucsb.edu](mailto:cooper@math.ucsb.edu)

Jiang-Hua Lu  
Department of Mathematics  
The University of Hong Kong  
Pokfulam Rd., Hong Kong  
[jhlu@maths.hku.hk](mailto:jhlu@maths.hku.hk)

Paul Yang  
Department of Mathematics  
Princeton University  
Princeton NJ 08544-1000  
[yang@math.princeton.edu](mailto:yang@math.princeton.edu)

## PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor, [production@msp.org](mailto:production@msp.org)

## SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

ACADEMIA SINICA, TAIPEI  
CALIFORNIA INST. OF TECHNOLOGY  
INST. DE MATEMÁTICA PURA E APLICADA  
KEIO UNIVERSITY  
MATH. SCIENCES RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIV.  
OREGON STATE UNIV.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIV. OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY  
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS  
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES  
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE  
UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO  
UNIV. OF CALIF., SANTA BARBARA

UNIV. OF CALIF., SANTA CRUZ  
UNIV. OF MONTANA  
UNIV. OF OREGON  
UNIV. OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
UNIV. OF UTAH  
UNIV. OF WASHINGTON  
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

These supporting institutions contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its contents or policies.

---

See inside back cover or [msp.org/pjm](http://msp.org/pjm) for submission instructions.

---

The subscription price for 2014 is US \$410/year for the electronic version, and \$535/year for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues and changes of subscribers address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163, U.S.A. The Pacific Journal of Mathematics is indexed by [Mathematical Reviews](#), [Zentralblatt MATH](#), [PASCAL CNRS Index](#), [Referativnyi Zhurnal](#), [Current Mathematical Publications](#) and [Web of Knowledge \(Science Citation Index\)](#).

---

The Pacific Journal of Mathematics (ISSN 0030-8730) at the University of California, c/o Department of Mathematics, 798 Evans Hall #3840, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, is published twelve times a year. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 4163, Berkeley, CA 94704-0163.

---

PJM peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW<sup>®</sup> from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**  
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2014 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Volume 272    No. 1    November 2014

---

Nonconcordant links with homology cobordant zero-framed surgery manifolds	1
JAE CHOON CHA and MARK POWELL	
Certain self-homotopy equivalences on wedge products of Moore spaces	35
HO WON CHOI and KEE YOUNG LEE	
Modular transformations involving the Mordell integral in Ramanujan's lost notebook	59
YOUN-SEO CHOI	
The $D$ -topology for diffeological spaces	87
J. DANIEL CHRISTENSEN, GORDON SINNAMON and ENXIN WU	
On the Atkin polynomials	111
AHMAD EL-GUINDY and MOURAD E. H. ISMAIL	
Evolving convex curves to constant-width ones by a perimeter-preserving flow	131
LAIYUAN GAO and SHENGLIANG PAN	
Hilbert series of certain jet schemes of determinantal varieties	147
SUDHIR R. GHORPADE, BOYAN JONOV and B. A. SETHURAMAN	
On a Liu–Yau type inequality for surfaces	177
OUSSAMA HIJAZI, SEBASTIÁN MONTIEL and SIMON RAULOT	
Nonlinear Euler sums	201
ISTVÁN MEZŐ	
Boundary limits for fractional Poisson $a$ -extensions of $L^p$ boundary functions in a cone	227
LEI QIAO and TAO ZHAO	
Jacobi–Trudi determinants and characters of minimal affinizations	237
STEVEN V SAM	
Normal families of holomorphic mappings into complex projective space concerning shared hyperplanes	245
LIU YANG, CAIYUN FANG and XUECHENG PANG	