Noncommutative birational rowmotion on a rectangle

A case study in noncommutative dynamics

Darij Grinberg (Drexel University)
joint work with Tom Roby (UConn)

29 March 2023, Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan, Stockholm

slides: http://www.cip.ifi.lmu.de/~grinberg/algebra/kth2023.pdf

paper: https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.11156

FPSAC abstract: https://www.cip.ifi.lmu.de/~grinberg/algebra/fps2023.pdf

Introduction: Posets

- A **poset** ($=$ partially ordered set) is a set P with a reflexive, transitive and antisymmetric relation.
- We use the symbols $<$, $\leq$, $>$ and $\geq$ accordingly.
- We draw posets as Hasse diagrams:





- We only care about finite posets here.
- We say that $u \in P$ **is covered by** $v \in P$ (written $u \lessdot v$) if we have $u < v$ and there is no $w \in P$ satisfying $u < w < v$.
- We say that $u \in P$ **covers** $v \in P$ (written $u \gtrdot v$) if we have $u > v$ and there is no $w \in P$ satisfying $u > w > v$.

- Let P be a finite poset. We define $\widehat{P}$ to be the poset obtained by adjoining two new elements 0 and 1 to P and forcing
  - 0 to be less than every other element, and
  - 1 to be greater than every other element.

Example:

$P =$



$\Longrightarrow$

$\widehat{P} =$



- A **linear extension** of P means a list $(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)$ of all elements of P (each only once) such that $i < j$ whenever $v_i < v_j$.
- For instance,



  has two linear extensions $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$ and $(\beta, \alpha, \gamma, \delta)$.
- Every finite poset has at least one linear extension.

- An **order ideal** of a poset P is a subset S of P such that if $v \in S$ and $w \le v$, then $w \in S$.
- Examples (the elements of the order ideal are marked in red):



- We let $J(P)$ denote the set of all order ideals of P.

- **Classical rowmotion** is the rowmotion studied by Striker/Williams (arXiv:1108.1172). It has appeared many times before, under different guises:
  - Brouwer/Schrijver (1974) (as a permutation of the antichains),
  - Fon-der-Flaass (1993) (as a permutation of the antichains),
  - Cameron/Fon-der-Flaass (1995) (as a permutation of the monotone Boolean functions),
  - Panyushev (2008), Armstrong-Stump-Thomas (2011) (as a permutation of the antichains or "nonnesting partitions", with relations to Lie theory).

- Let P be a finite poset. **Classical rowmotion** is the map $\mathbf{r} : J(P) \to J(P)$ which sends every order ideal S to a new order ideal $\mathbf{r}(S)$ defined as follows:
  - **Invert colors** (i.e., take the complement $P \setminus S$).
  - **Boil down to generators** (i.e., take the set M of minimal elements of this complement).
  - **Complete downwards** (i.e., take the set J of all $w \in P$ such that there exists an $m \in M$ such that $w \leq m$).

  Then, $\mathbf{r}(S) = J$.

Example:

Let S be the following order ideal ($\bullet$ = inside order ideal):



- Let P be a finite poset. **Classical rowmotion** is the map $\mathbf{r} : J(P) \to J(P)$ which sends every order ideal S to a new order ideal $\mathbf{r}(S)$ defined as follows:
  - **Invert colors** (i.e., take the complement $P \setminus S$).
  - **Boil down to generators** (i.e., take the set M of minimal elements of this complement).
  - **Complete downwards** (i.e., take the set J of all $w \in P$ such that there exists an $m \in M$ such that $w \leq m$).

  Then, $\mathbf{r}(S) = J$.

Example:

Mark the elements of the complement blue.



- Let P be a finite poset. **Classical rowmotion** is the map $\mathbf{r} : J(P) \to J(P)$ which sends every order ideal S to a new order ideal $\mathbf{r}(S)$ defined as follows:
  - **Invert colors** (i.e., take the complement $P \setminus S$).
  - **Boil down to generators** (i.e., take the set M of minimal elements of this complement).
  - **Complete downwards** (i.e., take the set J of all $w \in P$ such that there exists an $m \in M$ such that $w \leq m$).

  Then, $\mathbf{r}(S) = J$.

Example:

Leave only the minimal elements:



- Let P be a finite poset. **Classical rowmotion** is the map $\mathbf{r} : J(P) \to J(P)$ which sends every order ideal S to a new order ideal $\mathbf{r}(S)$ defined as follows:
  - **Invert colors** (i.e., take the complement $P \setminus S$).
  - **Boil down to generators** (i.e., take the set M of minimal elements of this complement).
  - **Complete downwards** (i.e., take the set J of all $w \in P$ such that there exists an $m \in M$ such that $w \leq m$).

  Then, $\mathbf{r}(S) = J$.

Example:

$\mathbf{r}(S)$ is the order ideal generated by M ("everything below M"):



Classical rowmotion is a permutation of $J(P)$, hence has finite order. This order can be fairly large.

Classical rowmotion: properties

Classical rowmotion is a permutation of $J(P)$, hence has finite order. This order can be fairly large.
However, **for some types of** P, the order can be explicitly computed or bounded from above.
See Striker/Williams (arXiv:1108.1172) for the first generation of results.

- If P is a $p \times q$-rectangle:



(shown here for $p = 2$ and $q = 3$), then $\operatorname{ord}(\mathbf{r}) = p + q$.

Example:
Let S be the order ideal of the 2×3-rectangle given by:



Example:
$\mathbf{r}(S)$ is



Example:
$\mathbf{r}^2(S)$ is



Example:

$\mathbf{r}^3(S)$ is



Example:

$\mathbf{r}^4(S)$ is



Example:
$\mathbf{r}^5(S)$ is



which is precisely the S we started with.

$\mathrm{ord}(\mathbf{r}) = p + q = 2 + 3 = 5.$

Classical rowmotion: properties

Further posets for which classical rowmotion has small order:

- If P is a Δ-shaped triangle with sidelength $p-1$:



  (shown here for $p=4$), then $\operatorname{ord}(\mathbf{r}) = 2p$ (if $p>2$).

- In this case, $\mathbf{r}^p$ is "reflection in the y-axis" (i.e., the central vertical axis).

Further posets for which classical rowmotion has small order:

- If P is a Δ-shaped triangle with sidelength $p-1$:



(shown here for $p=4$), then $\operatorname{ord}(\mathbf{r}) = 2p$ (if $p>2$).

- In this case, $\mathbf{r}^p$ is "reflection in the y-axis" (i.e., the central vertical axis).
- More general examples come from finite Weyl groups (Armstrong/Stump/Thomas, arXiv:1101.1277) and from minuscule weights of classical groups (Rush/Shi, arXiv:1108.5245; Okada, arXiv:2004.05364).

There is an alternative definition of classical rowmotion, which splits it into many little steps.

- If P is a poset and $v \in P$, then the v-**toggle** is the map $\mathbf{t}_v : J(P) \to J(P)$ which takes every order ideal S to:
  - $S \cup \{v\}$, if v is not in S but all elements of P covered by v are in S already;
  - $S \setminus \{v\}$, if v is in S but none of the elements of P covering v is in S;
  - S otherwise.
- Simpler way to state this: $\mathbf{t}_v(S)$ is:
  - $S \triangle \{v\}$ (symmetric difference) if this is an order ideal;
  - S otherwise.

  ("Try to add or remove v from S; if this breaks the order ideal axiom, leave S fixed.")

- Let $(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)$ be a **linear extension** of P; this means a list of all elements of P (each only once) such that $i < j$ whenever $v_i < v_j$.
- Cameron and Fon-der-Flaass showed that

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{t}_{v_1} \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_2} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_n}.$$

Example:

Start with this order ideal S:



- Let $(v_1, v_2, ..., v_n)$ be a **linear extension** of P; this means a list of all elements of P (each only once) such that $i < j$ whenever $v_i < v_j$.
- Cameron and Fon-der-Flaass showed that

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{t}_{v_1} \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_2} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_n}.$$

Example:
First apply $\mathbf{t}_{(2,2)}$, which changes nothing:



- Let $(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)$ be a **linear extension** of P; this means a list of all elements of P (each only once) such that $i < j$ whenever $v_i < v_j$.
- Cameron and Fon-der-Flaass showed that

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{t}_{v_1} \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_2} \circ \ldots \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_n}.$$

Example:

Then apply $\mathbf{t}_{(1,2)}$, which adds $(1,2)$ to the order ideal:



Classical rowmotion: the toggling definition

- Let $(v_1, v_2, ..., v_n)$ be a **linear extension** of P; this means a list of all elements of P (each only once) such that $i < j$ whenever $v_i < v_j$.
- Cameron and Fon-der-Flaass showed that

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{t}_{v_1} \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_2} \circ ... \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_n}.$$

Example:
Then apply $\mathbf{t}_{(2,1)}$, which removes $(2,1)$ from the order ideal:



- Let $(v_1, v_2, ..., v_n)$ be a **linear extension** of P; this means a list of all elements of P (each only once) such that $i < j$ whenever $v_i < v_j$.
- Cameron and Fon-der-Flaass showed that

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{t}_{v_1} \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_2} \circ ... \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_n}.$$

Example:

Finally apply $\mathbf{t}_{(1,1)}$, which changes nothing:



- Let $(v_1, v_2, ..., v_n)$ be a **linear extension** of P; this means a list of all elements of P (each only once) such that $i < j$ whenever $v_i < v_j$.
- Cameron and Fon-der-Flaass showed that

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{t}_{v_1} \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_2} \circ ... \circ \mathbf{t}_{v_n}.$$

Example:
So this is $\mathbf{r}(S)$:



Goals of the talk

- define **noncommutative birational rowmotion**: a generalization of classical rowmotion on several levels, due to David Einstein, James Propp, Tom Roby and myself, based on ideas of Anatol Kirillov and Arkady Berenstein.
- extend the "order $p + q$" theorem for rectangles to this generalization.
- ask some questions.

- Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a ring (not necessarily commutative).
- A $\mathbb{K}$-**labelling of** P will mean a function $\widehat{P} \to \mathbb{K}$.
- The values of such a function will be called the **labels** of the labelling.
- We will represent labellings by drawing the labels on the vertices of the Hasse diagram of $\widehat{P}$.

Example: This is a $\mathbb{Q}$-labelling of the 2×2-rectangle:



- For any $v \in P$, define the **birational v-toggle** as the partial map $T_v : \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ defined by

$$(T_v f)(w) = \begin{cases} f(w), & \text{if } w \neq v; \\ \left(\sum\limits_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P}; \\ u \lessdot v}} f(u)\right) \cdot \overline{f(v)} \cdot \overline{\sum\limits_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P}; \\ u \gtrdot v}} \overline{f(u)}}, & \text{if } w = v \end{cases}$$

  for all $w \in \widehat{P}$.
  Here (and in the following), $\overline{m}$ means m^{-1} whenever $m \in \mathbb{K}$.

- For any $v \in P$, define the **birational v-toggle** as the partial map $T_v : \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ defined by

$$\left(T_v f\right)(w) = \begin{cases} f(w), & \text{if } w \neq v; \\ \left(\sum\limits_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P}; \\ u \lessdot v}} f(u)\right) \cdot \overline{f(v)} \cdot \overline{\sum\limits_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P}; \\ u \gtrdot v}} \overline{f(u)}}, & \text{if } w = v \end{cases}$$

  for all $w \in \widehat{P}$.
  Here (and in the following), $\overline{m}$ means m^{-1} whenever $m \in \mathbb{K}$.
- This is a **partial** map. If any of the inverses does not exist in $\mathbb{K}$, then $T_v f$ is undefined!

- For any $v \in P$, define the **birational v-toggle** as the partial map $T_v : \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ defined by

$$(T_v f)(w) = \begin{cases} f(w), & \text{if } w \neq v; \\ \left(\sum\limits_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P}; \\ u \lessdot v}} f(u) \right) \cdot \overline{f(v)} \cdot \overline{\sum\limits_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P}; \\ u \gtrdot v}} \overline{f(u)}}, & \text{if } w = v \end{cases}$$

  for all $w \in \widehat{P}$.
  Here (and in the following), $\overline{m}$ means m^{-1} whenever $m \in \mathbb{K}$.
- This is a **partial** map. If any of the inverses does not exist in $\mathbb{K}$, then $T_v f$ is undefined!
- Notice that this is a **local change** to the label at v; all other labels stay the same.

- For any $v \in P$, define the **birational v-toggle** as the partial map $T_v : \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ defined by

$$(T_v f)(w) = \begin{cases} f(w), & \text{if } w \neq v; \\ \left(\sum\limits_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P}; \\ u \lessdot v}} f(u) \right) \cdot \overline{f(v)} \cdot \overline{\sum\limits_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P}; \\ u \gtrdot v}} \overline{f(u)}}, & \text{if } w = v \end{cases}$$

  for all $w \in \widehat{P}$.
  Here (and in the following), $\overline{m}$ means m^{-1} whenever $m \in \mathbb{K}$.
- This is a **partial** map. If any of the inverses does not exist in $\mathbb{K}$, then $T_v f$ is undefined!
- Notice that this is a **local change** to the label at v; all other labels stay the same.
- If $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, then $T_v^2 = \mathrm{id}$ (on the range of T_v).

- We define **(noncommutative) birational rowmotion** as the partial map

$$R := T_{v_1} \circ T_{v_2} \circ \cdots \circ T_{v_n} : \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}},$$

where $(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)$ is a linear extension of P.

- This is indeed independent on the linear extension, because:

- We define **(noncommutative) birational rowmotion** as the partial map

$$R := T_{v_1} \circ T_{v_2} \circ \cdots \circ T_{v_n} : \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}} \dashrightarrow \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}},$$

  where $(v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n)$ is a linear extension of P.
- This is indeed independent on the linear extension, because:
  - T_v and T_w commute whenever v and w are incomparable (or just don't cover each other);
  - we can get from any linear extension to any other by switching incomparable adjacent elements.

Example:
Let us "rowmote" a (generic) $\mathbb{K}$-labelling of the 2×2-rectangle:



Birational rowmotion: example

Example:

Let us "rowmote" a (generic) $\mathbb{K}$-labelling of the 2×2-rectangle:



We have $R = T_{(1,1)} \circ T_{(1,2)} \circ T_{(2,1)} \circ T_{(2,2)}$ (using the linear extension $((1,1),(1,2),(2,1),(2,2))$).

That is, toggle in the order "top, left, right, bottom".

Example:
Let us "rowmote" a (generic) $\mathbb{K}$-labelling of the 2×2-rectangle:

original labelling f	labelling $T_{(2,2)} f$
	

We are using $R = T_{(1,1)} \circ T_{(1,2)} \circ T_{(2,1)} \circ T_{(2,2)}$.

Example:
Let us "rowmote" a (generic) $\mathbb{K}$-labelling of the 2×2-rectangle:

original labelling f	labelling $T_{(2,1)} T_{(2,2)} f$
$\begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small] & b \arrow[d, dash] & \\ & z \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\ x \arrow[dr, dash] & & y \arrow[dl, dash] \\ & w \arrow[d, dash] & \\ & a & \end{tikzcd}$	$\begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small] & b \arrow[d, dash] & \\ & (x+y)\overline{z}b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\ {\color{red} w\overline{x}(x+y)\overline{z}b} \arrow[dr, dash] & & y \arrow[dl, dash] \\ & w \arrow[d, dash] & \\ & a & \end{tikzcd}$

We are using $R = T_{(1,1)} \circ T_{(1,2)} \circ {\color{red} T_{(2,1)}} \circ T_{(2,2)}$.

Example:

Let us "rowmote" a (generic) $\mathbb{K}$-labelling of the 2×2-rectangle:

original labelling f	labelling $T_{(1,2)} T_{(2,1)} T_{(2,2)} f$
	

We are using $R = T_{(1,1)} \circ T_{(1,2)} \circ T_{(2,1)} \circ T_{(2,2)}$.

Example:

Let us "rowmote" a (generic) $\mathbb{K}$-labelling of the 2×2-rectangle:

original labelling f

$$\begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small]
 & b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & z \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\
x \arrow[dr, dash] & & y \arrow[dl, dash] \\
 & w \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & a &
\end{tikzcd}$$

labelling $T_{(1,1)} T_{(1,2)} T_{(2,1)} T_{(2,2)} f = Rf$

$$\begin{tikzcd}[column sep=tiny]
 & b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & (x+y)\overline{z}b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\
w\overline{x}(x+y)\overline{z}b \arrow[dr, dash] & & w\overline{y}(x+y)\overline{z}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\
 & \color{red}{a\overline{w} \cdot \overline{\overline{w\overline{x}(x+y)\overline{z}b} + \overline{w\overline{y}(x+y)\overline{z}b}}} \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & a &
\end{tikzcd}$$

We are using $R = \color{red}{T_{(1,1)}} \circ T_{(1,2)} \circ T_{(2,1)} \circ T_{(2,2)}$.

Example:
Let us "rowmote" a (generic) $\mathbb{K}$-labelling of the 2×2-rectangle:

original labelling f	labelling $T_{(1,1)} T_{(1,2)} T_{(2,1)} T_{(2,2)} f = Rf$

$$\begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small]
& b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
& z \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\
x \arrow[dr, dash] & & y \arrow[dl, dash] \\
& w \arrow[d, dash] & \\
& a &
\end{tikzcd}
\qquad
\begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small]
& b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
& (x+y)\overline{z}b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\
w\overline{x}(x+y)\overline{z}b \arrow[dr, dash] & & w\overline{y}(x+y)\overline{z}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\
& \textcolor{red}{a\overline{z}b} \arrow[d, dash] & \\
& a &
\end{tikzcd}$$

We have used $R = T_{(1,1)} \circ T_{(1,2)} \circ T_{(2,1)} \circ T_{(2,2)}$ and simplified the result.

- Why is this called birational rowmotion?
- Indeed, it generalizes classical rowmotion of order ideals:
  - Let $\operatorname{Trop}\mathbb{Z}$ be the **tropical semiring** over $\mathbb{Z}$. This is the set $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$ with "addition" $(a, b) \mapsto \max\{a, b\}$ and "multiplication" $(a, b) \mapsto a + b$. This is a semifield.

- Why is this called birational rowmotion?
- Indeed, it generalizes classical rowmotion of order ideals:
  - Let $\operatorname{Trop}\mathbb{Z}$ be the **tropical semiring** over $\mathbb{Z}$. This is the set $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$ with "addition" $(a, b) \mapsto \max\{a, b\}$ and "multiplication" $(a, b) \mapsto a + b$. This is a semifield.
  - To every order ideal $S \in J(P)$, assign a $\operatorname{Trop}\mathbb{Z}$-labelling $\operatorname{tlab} S$ defined by

$$(\operatorname{tlab} S)(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v \notin S \cup \{0\}; \\ 0, & \text{if } v \in S \cup \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

This map $\operatorname{tlab} : J(P) \to (\operatorname{Trop}\mathbb{Z})^{\widehat{P}}$ is injective.

- Why is this called birational rowmotion?
- Indeed, it generalizes classical rowmotion of order ideals:
  - Let $\operatorname{Trop}\mathbb{Z}$ be the **tropical semiring** over $\mathbb{Z}$. This is the set $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$ with "addition" $(a, b) \mapsto \max\{a, b\}$ and "multiplication" $(a, b) \mapsto a + b$. This is a semifield.
  - To every order ideal $S \in J(P)$, assign a $\operatorname{Trop}\mathbb{Z}$-labelling $\operatorname{tlab} S$ defined by

$$(\operatorname{tlab} S)(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v \notin S \cup \{0\}; \\ 0, & \text{if } v \in S \cup \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

    This map $\operatorname{tlab} : J(P) \to (\operatorname{Trop}\mathbb{Z})^{\widehat{P}}$ is injective.
  - Let $\mathbf{t}_v$ be the order ideal v-toggle, and let $\mathbf{r}$ be order ideal rowmotion. Then:

$$T_v \circ \operatorname{tlab} = \operatorname{tlab} \circ \mathbf{t}_v, \qquad R \circ \operatorname{tlab} = \operatorname{tlab} \circ \mathbf{r}.$$

- Why is this called birational rowmotion?
- Indeed, it generalizes classical rowmotion of order ideals:
  - Let $\operatorname{Trop}\mathbb{Z}$ be the **tropical semiring** over $\mathbb{Z}$. This is the set $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\}$ with "addition" $(a, b) \mapsto \max\{a, b\}$ and "multiplication" $(a, b) \mapsto a + b$. This is a semifield.
  - To every order ideal $S \in J(P)$, assign a $\operatorname{Trop}\mathbb{Z}$-labelling $\operatorname{tlab} S$ defined by

$$(\operatorname{tlab} S)(v) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v \notin S \cup \{0\}; \\ 0, & \text{if } v \in S \cup \{0\}. \end{cases}$$

    This map $\operatorname{tlab} : J(P) \to (\operatorname{Trop}\mathbb{Z})^{\widehat{P}}$ is injective.
  - Let $\mathbf{t}_v$ be the order ideal v-toggle, and let $\mathbf{r}$ be order ideal rowmotion. Then:

$$T_v \circ \operatorname{tlab} = \operatorname{tlab} \circ \mathbf{t}_v, \qquad R \circ \operatorname{tlab} = \operatorname{tlab} \circ \mathbf{r}.$$

  - Don't like semifields? Use $\mathbb{Q}$ and take the "tropical limit".

- If $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, then birational rowmotion R has nice orders for nice posets (mostly Grinberg/Roby 2014):
  - If P is a rectangle $[p] \times [q]$, then $R^{p+q} = \mathrm{id}$.

- If $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, then birational rowmotion R has nice orders for nice posets (mostly Grinberg/Roby 2014):
  - If P is a rectangle $[p] \times [q]$, then $R^{p+q} = \text{id}$.
  - If P is a "right half" $\triangleright$ of the square $[p] \times [p]$, then $R^{2p} = \text{id}$.

- If $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, then birational rowmotion R has nice orders for nice posets (mostly Grinberg/Roby 2014):
  - If P is a rectangle $[p] \times [q]$, then $R^{p+q} = \mathrm{id}$.
  - If P is a "right half" $\triangleright$ of the square $[p] \times [p]$, then $R^{2p} = \mathrm{id}$.
  - If P is a "top half" Δ or "bottom half" ∇ of the square $[p] \times [p]$, then $R^{2p} = \mathrm{id}$, and moreover R^p is reflection across the vertical axis.

- If $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, then birational rowmotion R has nice orders for nice posets (mostly Grinberg/Roby 2014):
  - If P is a rectangle $[p] \times [q]$, then $R^{p+q} = \mathrm{id}$.
  - If P is a "right half" $\triangleright$ of the square $[p] \times [p]$, then $R^{2p} = \mathrm{id}$.
  - If P is a "top half" Δ or "bottom half" ∇ of the square $[p] \times [p]$, then $R^{2p} = \mathrm{id}$, and moreover R^{p} is reflection across the vertical axis.
  - More generally, if P is the minuscule poset associated to a minuscule weight λ of a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, then $R^{h} = \mathrm{id}$, where h is the Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}$. (Soichi Okada, doi:10.37236/9557 .)

- If $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, then birational rowmotion R has nice orders for nice posets (mostly Grinberg/Roby 2014):
  - If P is a rectangle $[p] \times [q]$, then $R^{p+q} = \text{id}$.
  - If P is a "right half" $\triangleright$ of the square $[p] \times [p]$, then $R^{2p} = \text{id}$.
  - If P is a "top half" Δ or "bottom half" ∇ of the square $[p] \times [p]$, then $R^{2p} = \text{id}$, and moreover R^{p} is reflection across the vertical axis.
  - More generally, if P is the minuscule poset associated to a minuscule weight λ of a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, then $R^{h} = \text{id}$, where h is the Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}$. (Soichi Okada, doi:10.37236/9557 .)
  - If P is an "n-graded forest" (a forest with all leaves having rank n), then $R^{\ell} = \text{id}$ for $\ell = \operatorname{lcm}(1, 2, \ldots, n+1)$.

- In general, even if $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, R can have infinite order – e.g., for the following two posets:



Birational rowmotion: some chaos

- In general, even if $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, R can have infinite order – e.g., for the following two posets:



- Things get even more complicated when $\mathbb{K}$ is noncommutative...

- In general, even if $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, R can have infinite order – e.g., for the following two posets:



- Things get even more complicated when $\mathbb{K}$ is noncommutative...
- Take this poset:



This satisfies $R^6 = \mathrm{id}$ if $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, but nothing like that in general.

Birational rowmotion: some chaos

- In general, even if $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, R can have infinite order – e.g., for the following two posets:



- Things get even more complicated when $\mathbb{K}$ is noncommutative...
- Take this poset:



  This satisfies $R^6 = \mathrm{id}$ if $\mathbb{K}$ is commutative, but nothing like that in general.
- However, not all is lost!

- Let p and q be two positive integers. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a ring. Let P be the $p \times q$-rectangle poset: i.e.,

$$P := [p] \times [q], \qquad \text{where } [m] := \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}.$$

(The order on P is entrywise.)

Example: For $p = 3$ and $q = 4$, this is



.

- Let p and q be two positive integers. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a ring. Let P be the $p \times q$-rectangle poset: i.e.,

$$P := [p] \times [q], \qquad \text{where } [m] := \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}.$$

(The order on P is entrywise.)

- Let $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ be a $\mathbb{K}$-labelling. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$.

- Let p and q be two positive integers. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a ring. Let P be the $p \times q$-rectangle poset: i.e.,

$$P := [p] \times [q], \qquad \text{where } [m] := \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}.$$

(The order on P is entrywise.)

- Let $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ be a $\mathbb{K}$-labelling. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$.

Periodicity theorem (* 2015, † 2022 G & Roby):

If a and b are invertible and $R^{p+q} f$ is well-defined, then

$$\left(R^{p+q} f\right)(x) = a\overline{b} \cdot f(x) \cdot \overline{a} b \qquad \text{for each } x \in \widehat{P}.$$

Note that $a\overline{b} \cdot f(x) \cdot \overline{a}b$ is **not** generally conjugate to $f(x)$.

Birational rowmotion: the rectangle case

- Let p and q be two positive integers. Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a ring. Let P be the $p \times q$-rectangle poset: i.e.,

$$P := [p] \times [q], \qquad \text{where } [m] := \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}.$$

(The order on P is entrywise.)

- Let $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ be a $\mathbb{K}$-labelling. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$.

Periodicity theorem (* 2015, † 2022 G & Roby):

If a and b are invertible and $R^{p+q} f$ is well-defined, then

$$\left(R^{p+q} f\right)(x) = a\overline{b} \cdot f(x) \cdot \overline{a}b \qquad \text{for each } x \in \widehat{P}.$$

Reciprocity theorem (* 2015, † 2022 G & Roby):

Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $(i, j) \in P$. If $R^\ell f$ is well-defined and $\ell \geq i + j - 1$, then

$$\left(R^\ell f\right)(i, j) = a \cdot \overline{\left(R^{\ell - i - j + 1} f\right) \underbrace{(p + 1 - i, q + 1 - j)}_{= \text{antipode of } (i,j) \text{ in } P}} \cdot b.$$

- **Example:** Iteratively apply R to a labelling of the 2×2-rectangle.
  Here is $R^0 f$:



- **Example:** Iteratively apply R to a labelling of the 2×2-rectangle.
  Here is $R^1 f$:



Birational rowmotion: the rectangle case, example

- **Example:** Iteratively apply R to a labelling of the 2×2-rectangle.
  Here is $R^2 f$:

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
 & b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & w\left(\overline{x}+\overline{y}\right) b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\
a \cdot \overline{x+y} \cdot x\left(\overline{x}+\overline{y}\right) b \arrow[dr, dash] & & a \cdot \overline{x+y} \cdot y\left(\overline{x}+\overline{y}\right) b \arrow[dl, dash] \\
 & a\overline{b}z \cdot \overline{x+y} \cdot b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & a &
\end{tikzcd}
$$

- **Example:** Iteratively apply R to a labelling of the 2×2-rectangle.
  Here is $R^3 f$:

$$\begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small]
 & b \arrow[d, no head] & \\
 & a\overline{w}b \arrow[dl, no head] \arrow[dr, no head] & \\
\ldots \arrow[dr, no head] & & a\overline{b}z \cdot \overline{x+y} \cdot \overline{\overline{x}+\overline{y}} \cdot \overline{y} \cdot (x+y)\,\overline{w}b \arrow[dl, no head] \\
 & a\overline{b} \cdot \overline{\overline{x}+\overline{y}} \cdot \overline{w}b \arrow[d, no head] & \\
 & a &
\end{tikzcd}$$

- **Example:** Iteratively apply R to a labelling of the 2×2-rectangle.
  Here is $R^4 f$:

$$
\begin{tikzcd}
 & b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & a\overline{b}z\overline{a}b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\
\ldots \arrow[dr, dash] & & a\overline{b} \cdot \overline{\overline{x}+\overline{y}} \cdot \overline{x+y} \cdot y\left(\overline{x}+\overline{y}\right)\left(x+y\right)\overline{a}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\
 & a\overline{b}w\overline{a}b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & a &
\end{tikzcd}
$$

Birational rowmotion: the rectangle case, example

- **Example:** Iteratively apply R to a labelling of the 2×2-rectangle.
  Here is $R^4 f$:

$$\begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small]
 & b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & a\overline{b}z\overline{a}b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\
a\overline{b}x\overline{a}b \arrow[dr, dash] & & a\overline{b}y\overline{a}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\
 & a\overline{b}w\overline{a}b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & a &
\end{tikzcd}$$

  (after nontrivial simplifications).

- **Example:** Iteratively apply R to a labelling of the 2×2-rectangle.
  Here is $R^4 f$:

$$\begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small]
 & b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & a\overline{b}z\overline{a}b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\
a\overline{b}x\overline{a}b \arrow[dr, dash] & & a\overline{b}y\overline{a}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\
 & a\overline{b}w\overline{a}b \arrow[d, dash] & \\
 & a &
\end{tikzcd}$$

  This confirms the periodicity theorem for $p = q = 2$.
- Note that this is similar to Kontsevich's periodicity conjecture, proved by Iyudu/Shkarin (arXiv:1305.1965).

Birational rowmotion: the rectangle case, example

- Here are $R^0 f, R^1 f, \ldots, R^4 f$ for a generic $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{[2]\times[2]}}$ again, this time fully simplified and with the $f(0) = a$ and $f(1) = b$ labels removed:

$$R^0 f = \begin{tikzcd} & z \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\ x \arrow[dr, dash] & & y \arrow[dl, dash] \\ & w & \end{tikzcd} \quad ; \quad R^1 f = \begin{tikzcd} & (x+y)\,\overline{z}b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\ w\overline{x}\,(x+y)\,\overline{z}b \arrow[dr, dash] & & w\overline{y}\,(x+y)\,\overline{z}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\ & a\overline{z}b & \end{tikzcd}$$

$$R^2 f = \begin{tikzcd} & w\,(\overline{x}+\overline{y})\,b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\ a\overline{y}b \arrow[dr, dash] & & a\overline{x}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\ & a\overline{b}z\overline{x+y}b & \end{tikzcd} \quad ; \quad R^3 f = \begin{tikzcd} & a\overline{w}b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\ a\overline{b}z\overline{x+y}y\overline{w}b \arrow[dr, dash] & & a\overline{b}z\overline{x+y}x\overline{w}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\ & a\overline{b}\cdot\overline{\overline{x}+\overline{y}}\cdot\overline{w}b & \end{tikzcd}$$

- Here are $R^0 f, R^1 f, \ldots, R^4 f$ for a generic $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{[2]\times[2]}}$ again, this time fully simplified and with the $f(0) = a$ and $f(1) = b$ labels removed:

$$R^0 f = \begin{array}{ccc} & z & \\ x & & y \\ & w & \end{array} \quad ; \quad R^1 f = \begin{array}{ccc} & (x+y)\,\overline{z}b & \\ w\overline{x}\,(x+y)\,\overline{z}b & & w\overline{y}\,(x+y)\,\overline{z}b \\ & a\overline{z}b & \end{array}$$

$$R^2 f = \begin{array}{ccc} & w\,(\overline{x}+\overline{y})\,b & \\ a\overline{y}b & & a\overline{x}b \\ & a\overline{b}z\overline{x+y}b & \end{array} \quad ; \quad R^3 f = \begin{array}{ccc} & a\overline{w}b & \\ a\overline{b}z\overline{x+y}y\overline{w}b & & a\overline{b}z\overline{x+y}x\overline{w}b \\ & a\overline{b}\cdot\overline{\overline{x}+\overline{y}}\cdot\overline{w}b & \end{array}$$

Equally colored labels are related by reciprocity. Can you spot some more?

- Here are $R^0 f, R^1 f, \ldots, R^4 f$ for a generic $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{[2]\times[2]}}$ again, this time fully simplified and with the $f(0) = a$ and $f(1) = b$ labels removed:

$$R^0 f = \begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small] & z \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\ x \arrow[dr, dash] & & y \arrow[dl, dash] \\ & w & \end{tikzcd} \quad ; \quad R^1 f = \begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small] & (x+y)\,\overline{z}b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\ w\overline{x}\,(x+y)\,\overline{z}b \arrow[dr, dash] & & w\overline{y}\,(x+y)\,\overline{z}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\ & a\overline{z}b & \end{tikzcd}$$

$$R^2 f = \begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small] & w\,(\overline{x}+\overline{y})\,b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\ a\overline{y}b \arrow[dr, dash] & & a\overline{x}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\ & a\overline{b}z\overline{x+y}b & \end{tikzcd} \quad ; \quad R^3 f = \begin{tikzcd}[column sep=small] & a\overline{w}b \arrow[dl, dash] \arrow[dr, dash] & \\ a\overline{b}z\overline{x+y}y\overline{w}b \arrow[dr, dash] & & a\overline{b}z\overline{x+y}x\overline{w}b \arrow[dl, dash] \\ & a\overline{b}\cdot\overline{\overline{x}+\overline{y}}\cdot\overline{w}b & \end{tikzcd}$$

Here are some more instances of reciprocity. (There are more.)

The commutative case

- In 2014, we proved both theorems for commutative $\mathbb{K}$.

The commutative case

- In 2014, we proved both theorems for commutative $\mathbb{K}$.
- *Proof outline (inspired by A. Y. Volkov, arXiv:hep-th/0606094):*
  - WLOG assume $\mathbb{K}$ is a field (because our claims boil down to polynomial identities).

The commutative case

- In 2014, we proved both theorems for commutative $\mathbb{K}$.
- *Proof outline (inspired by A. Y. Volkov, arXiv:hep-th/0606094):*
  - WLOG assume $\mathbb{K}$ is a field (because our claims boil down to polynomial identities).
  - Show that "almost all" labellings of P are in the image of a certain map Grasp_0 from the matrix space $\mathbb{K}^{p \times (p+q)}$ to $\mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$.

- In 2014, we proved both theorems for commutative $\mathbb{K}$.
- *Proof outline (inspired by A. Y. Volkov, arXiv:hep-th/0606094):*
  - WLOG assume $\mathbb{K}$ is a field (because our claims boil down to polynomial identities).
  - Show that "almost all" labellings of P are in the image of a certain map Grasp_0 from the matrix space $\mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)}$ to $\mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$.

    Explicitly, if $A \in \mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)}$ is any matrix, then $(\mathrm{Grasp}_0 A)(0) = (\mathrm{Grasp}_0 A)(1) = 1$ and

    $$(\mathrm{Grasp}_0 A)(i,j) = \frac{\det(A[1:i \mid i+j-1:p+j])}{\det(A[0:i \mid i+j:p+j])}$$

    for all $(i,j) \in P$, where the $A[a:b \mid c:d]$s are certain submatrices of A. (Note that this map Grasp_0 actually factors through the Grassmannian.)

- In 2014, we proved both theorems for commutative $\mathbb{K}$.
- *Proof outline (inspired by A. Y. Volkov, arXiv:hep-th/0606094):*
  - WLOG assume $\mathbb{K}$ is a field (because our claims boil down to polynomial identities).
  - Show that "almost all" labellings of P are in the image of a certain map Grasp_0 from the matrix space $\mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)}$ to $\mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$.
  - Construct a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)} \arrow[r, dotted, "\operatorname{Grasp}_0"] \arrow[d, "\rho"'] & \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}} \arrow[d, dotted, "R"] \\
\mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)} \arrow[r, dotted, "\operatorname{Grasp}_0"] & \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}
\end{tikzcd},$$

    where ρ is (more or less) rotating the matrix horizontally (last column to front).

The commutative case

- In 2014, we proved both theorems for commutative $\mathbb{K}$.
- *Proof outline (inspired by A. Y. Volkov, arXiv:hep-th/0606094):*
  - WLOG assume $\mathbb{K}$ is a field (because our claims boil down to polynomial identities).
  - Show that "almost all" labellings of P are in the image of a certain map Grasp_0 from the matrix space $\mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)}$ to $\mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$.
  - Construct a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)} \arrow[r, dotted, "\mathrm{Grasp}_0"] \arrow[d, "\rho"'] & \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}} \arrow[d, dotted, "R"] \\
\mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)} \arrow[r, dotted, "\mathrm{Grasp}_0"] & \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}
\end{tikzcd},$$

    where ρ is (more or less) rotating the matrix horizontally (last column to front).
  - Conclude that $R^{p+q} = \mathrm{id}$ because $\rho^{p+q} = \mathrm{id}$.

The commutative case

- In 2014, we proved both theorems for commutative $\mathbb{K}$.
- *Proof outline (inspired by A. Y. Volkov, arXiv:hep-th/0606094):*
    - WLOG assume $\mathbb{K}$ is a field (because our claims boil down to polynomial identities).
    - Show that "almost all" labellings of P are in the image of a certain map Grasp_0 from the matrix space $\mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)}$ to $\mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$.
    - Construct a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)} \arrow[r, dotted, "\mathrm{Grasp}_0"] \arrow[d, "\rho"'] & \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}} \arrow[d, dotted, "R"] \\
\mathbb{K}^{p\times(p+q)} \arrow[r, dotted, "\mathrm{Grasp}_0"] & \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}
\end{tikzcd},$$

      where ρ is (more or less) rotating the matrix horizontally (last column to front).
    - Conclude that $R^{p+q} = \mathrm{id}$ because $\rho^{p+q} = \mathrm{id}$.
    - Reciprocity also easy using Grasp_0.

First attempts at general proof

- This looks easy; the devil is in the details (particularly the "almost all" part: not just Zariski density but also some rescaling required).

First attempts at general proof

- This looks easy; the devil is in the details (particularly the "almost all" part: not just Zariski density but also some rescaling required).
- Can this be generalized to arbitrary $\mathbb{K}$?

First attempts at general proof

- This looks easy; the devil is in the details (particularly the "almost all" part: not just Zariski density but also some rescaling required).
- Can this be generalized to arbitrary $\mathbb{K}$?
- **In some sense, yes:** Replace determinants by quasideterminants (Gelfand/Retakh, arXiv:q-alg/9705026; see also arXiv:math/0208146).

- This looks easy; the devil is in the details (particularly the "almost all" part: not just Zariski density but also some rescaling required).
- Can this be generalized to arbitrary $\mathbb{K}$?
- **In some sense, yes:** Replace determinants by quasideterminants (Gelfand/Retakh, arXiv:q-alg/9705026; see also arXiv:math/0208146).

  Specifically, redefine Grasp_0 by

$$(\mathrm{Grasp}_0\, A)\,(i,j) = (-1)^i\, q_{0,i+j-1}^{\{1:i|i+j:p+j\}}\,(A)\,.$$

  The "algebra" works!

First attempts at general proof

- This looks easy; the devil is in the details (particularly the "almost all" part: not just Zariski density but also some rescaling required).
- Can this be generalized to arbitrary $\mathbb{K}$?
- **In some sense, yes:** Replace determinants by quasideterminants (Gelfand/Retakh, arXiv:q-alg/9705026; see also arXiv:math/0208146).
  Specifically, redefine Grasp_0 by
  $$(\operatorname{Grasp}_0 A)(i,j) = (-1)^i \, q_{0,i+j-1}^{\{1:i|i+j:p+j\}}(A) .$$
  The "algebra" works!
- Unfortunately, the technical parts no longer work:
  - What does "almost all" mean for noncommutative $\mathbb{K}$?

First attempts at general proof

- This looks easy; the devil is in the details (particularly the "almost all" part: not just Zariski density but also some rescaling required).
- Can this be generalized to arbitrary $\mathbb{K}$?
- **In some sense, yes:** Replace determinants by quasideterminants (Gelfand/Retakh, arXiv:q-alg/9705026; see also arXiv:math/0208146).

  Specifically, redefine Grasp_0 by

$$(\operatorname{Grasp}_0 A)(i,j) = (-1)^i \, q_{0,i+j-1}^{\{1:i|i+j:p+j\}}(A).$$

  The "algebra" works!
- Unfortunately, the technical parts no longer work:
  - What does "almost all" mean for noncommutative $\mathbb{K}$?
  - Can we WLOG assume that $\mathbb{K}$ is a skew field?

- This looks easy; the devil is in the details (particularly the "almost all" part: not just Zariski density but also some rescaling required).
- Can this be generalized to arbitrary $\mathbb{K}$?
- **In some sense, yes:** Replace determinants by quasideterminants (Gelfand/Retakh, arXiv:q-alg/9705026; see also arXiv:math/0208146).
  Specifically, redefine Grasp_0 by
  $$(\mathrm{Grasp}_0 A)(i,j) = (-1)^i \, q_{0,i+j-1}^{\{1:i|i+j:p+j\}}(A).$$
  The "algebra" works!
- Unfortunately, the technical parts no longer work:
  - What does "almost all" mean for noncommutative $\mathbb{K}$?
  - Can we WLOG assume that $\mathbb{K}$ is a skew field?
    No: e.g., the identity $x\overline{yx}y = 1$ holds in all skew fields but not in all rings.

First attempts at general proof

- This looks easy; the devil is in the details (particularly the "almost all" part: not just Zariski density but also some rescaling required).
- Can this be generalized to arbitrary $\mathbb{K}$?
- **In some sense, yes:** Replace determinants by quasideterminants (Gelfand/Retakh, arXiv:q-alg/9705026; see also arXiv:math/0208146).
  Specifically, redefine Grasp_0 by
  $$(\operatorname{Grasp}_0 A)(i,j) = (-1)^i \, q_{0,i+j-1}^{\{1:i \mid i+j:p+j\}}(A) \, .$$
  The "algebra" works!
- Unfortunately, the technical parts no longer work:
  - What does "almost all" mean for noncommutative $\mathbb{K}$?
  - Can we WLOG assume that $\mathbb{K}$ is a skew field?
    No: e.g., the identity $x\overline{yx}y = 1$ holds in all skew fields but not in all rings.
- We now believe this approach is a dead end.

- New proofs of periodicity and reciprocity in the commutative-$\mathbb{K}$ case were found by Gregg Musiker and Tom Roby in arXiv:1801.03877.
  They proceed by giving an explicit formula for $\left(R^k f\right)(i, j)$.
  For instance, $\left(R^3 f\right)(3, 2)$

$$= \frac{1}{A_{02}+A_{11}+A_{20}} (A_{01}A_{02}A_{11}A_{12} + A_{01}A_{02}A_{12}A_{20} + A_{01}A_{02}A_{20}A_{21} + A_{02}A_{10}A_{12}A_{20} + A_{02}A_{10}A_{20}A_{21} + A_{10}A_{11}A_{20}A_{21}),$$

where

$$A_{ij} := (f(i, j+1) + f(i+1, j)) \diagup f(i+1, j+1).$$

- New proofs of periodicity and reciprocity in the commutative-$\mathbb{K}$ case were found by Gregg Musiker and Tom Roby in arXiv:1801.03877.
  They proceed by giving an explicit formula for $\left(R^k f\right)(i,j)$.
  For instance, $\left(R^3 f\right)(3,2)$

  $$= \frac{1}{A_{02}+A_{11}+A_{20}} (A_{01}A_{02}A_{11}A_{12} + A_{01}A_{02}A_{12}A_{20} + A_{01}A_{02}A_{20}A_{21} \\ + A_{02}A_{10}A_{12}A_{20} + A_{02}A_{10}A_{20}A_{21} + A_{10}A_{11}A_{20}A_{21}),$$

  where

  $$A_{ij} := \left(f(i,j+1) + f(i+1,j)\right) \big/ f(i+1,j+1).$$

- General formula for $\left(R^k f\right)(i,j)$ involves sums over NILPs (non-intersecting lattice path families) in numerator and denominator, as well as index shifting and a case split ("small" k and "large" k behave differently).

Enter Musiker

- New proofs of periodicity and reciprocity in the commutative-$\mathbb{K}$ case were found by Gregg Musiker and Tom Roby in arXiv:1801.03877.
  They proceed by giving an explicit formula for $\left(R^k f\right)(i,j)$.
  For instance, $\left(R^3 f\right)(3,2)$
  $$= \frac{1}{A_{02}+A_{11}+A_{20}} (A_{01}A_{02}A_{11}A_{12} + A_{01}A_{02}A_{12}A_{20} + A_{01}A_{02}A_{20}A_{21} + A_{02}A_{10}A_{12}A_{20} + A_{02}A_{10}A_{20}A_{21} + A_{10}A_{11}A_{20}A_{21}),$$
  where
  $$A_{ij} := \left(f(i,j+1) + f(i+1,j)\right) \big/ f(i+1,j+1).$$
- General formula for $\left(R^k f\right)(i,j)$ involves sums over NILPs (non-intersecting lattice path families) in numerator and denominator, as well as index shifting and a case split ("small" k and "large" k behave differently).
- Lattice paths can be generalized to noncommutative $\mathbb{K}$, but NILPs? Unclear in what order to multiply different paths.

What now?

- We are back at square 1: no known theory available.

What now?

- We are back at square 1: no known theory available.
- Let's play around with the setting.
  Step 1: Introduce notations...

A new beginning

- Fix p, q, P and f. Assume that $R^{\ell} f$ is well-defined for all necessary ℓ. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$.

A new beginning

- Fix p, q, P and f. Assume that $R^\ell f$ is well-defined for all necessary ℓ. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$.
- For any $x \in \widehat{P}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, write

$$x_\ell := \left(R^\ell f\right)(x).$$

Thus, $x_0 = f(x)$ and $0_\ell = a$ and $1_\ell = b$.

A new beginning

- Fix p, q, P and f. Assume that $R^{\ell} f$ is well-defined for all necessary ℓ. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$.
- For any $x \in \widehat{P}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, write

$$x_{\ell} := \left(R^{\ell} f\right)(x).$$

Thus, $x_0 = f(x)$ and $0_{\ell} = a$ and $1_{\ell} = b$.

- The definition of R yields

$$(Rf)(v) = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} f(u)\right) \cdot \overline{f(v)} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{(Rf)(u)}} \qquad \text{for each } v \in P.$$

(In both sums, u ranges over $\widehat{P}$; this is implied from now on.)

- Fix p, q, P and f. Assume that $R^\ell f$ is well-defined for all necessary ℓ. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$.
- For any $x \in \widehat{P}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, write

$$x_\ell := \left(R^\ell f\right)(x).$$

Thus, $x_0 = f(x)$ and $0_\ell = a$ and $1_\ell = b$.
- The definition of R yields

$$(Rf)(v) = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} f(u)\right) \cdot \overline{f(v)} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{(Rf)(u)}} \qquad \text{for each } v \in P.$$

(In both sums, u ranges over $\widehat{P}$; this is implied from now on.)
- In other words,

$$v_1 = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_0\right) \cdot \overline{v_0} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_1}} \qquad \text{for each } v \in P.$$

Transition equation

- We have just shown that

$$v_1 = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_0\right) \cdot \overline{v_0} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_1}} \qquad \text{for each } v \in P.$$

Transition equation

- We have just shown that

$$v_1 = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_0\right) \cdot \overline{v_0} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_1}} \qquad \text{for each } v \in P.$$

- Similarly,

$$v_{\ell+1} = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_\ell\right) \cdot \overline{v_\ell} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_{\ell+1}}} \qquad \text{for each } v \in P \text{ and } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Transition equation

- We have just shown that

$$\overline{v_1} = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_0\right) \cdot \overline{v_0} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_1}} \qquad \text{for each } v \in P.$$

- Similarly,

$$\overline{v_{\ell+1}} = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_\ell\right) \cdot \overline{v_\ell} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_{\ell+1}}} \qquad \text{for each } v \in P \text{ and } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

- So far, we have just rewritten our setup using the (more convenient) $x_\ell := \left(R^\ell f\right)(x)$ notation.

- We must prove:

periodicity: $x_{p+q} = a\overline{b} \cdot x_0 \cdot \overline{a}b$;

reciprocity: $x_\ell = a \cdot \overline{y_{\ell-i-j+1}} \cdot b$

$$\text{if } x = (i, j) \text{ and } y = (p+1-i, q+1-j)\,.$$

Simplifying the goal

- We must prove:

  periodicity: $x_{p+q} = a\overline{b} \cdot x_0 \cdot \overline{a}b$;

  reciprocity: $x_\ell = a \cdot \overline{y_{\ell-i-j+1}} \cdot b$

  if $x = (i, j)$ and $y = (p+1-i, q+1-j)$.

- Periodicity follows from reciprocity: Indeed, if $x = (i, j)$ and $x' = (p+1-i, q+1-j)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} x_{p+q} &= a \cdot \overline{x'_{p+q-i-j+1}} \cdot b && \text{(by reciprocity)} \\ &= a \cdot \overline{a \cdot \overline{x_0} \cdot b} \cdot b && \text{(by reciprocity again)} \\ &= a\overline{b} \cdot x_0 \cdot \overline{a}b. \end{aligned}$$

- We must prove:

  periodicity: $x_{p+q} = a\overline{b} \cdot x_0 \cdot \overline{a}b$;

  reciprocity: $x_\ell = a \cdot \overline{y_{\ell-i-j+1}} \cdot b$

  if $x = (i, j)$ and $y = (p+1-i, q+1-j)$.

- Periodicity follows from reciprocity: Indeed, if $x = (i, j)$ and $x' = (p+1-i, q+1-j)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} x_{p+q} &= a \cdot \overline{x'_{p+q-i-j+1}} \cdot b && \text{(by reciprocity)} \\ &= a \cdot \overline{a \cdot \overline{x_0} \cdot b} \cdot b && \text{(by reciprocity again)} \\ &= a\overline{b} \cdot x_0 \cdot \overline{a}b. \end{aligned}$$

  Thus, it suffices to prove reciprocity.

Simplifying the goal

- We must prove:

  periodicity: $x_{p+q} = a\overline{b} \cdot x_0 \cdot \overline{a}b$;

  reciprocity: $x_\ell = a \cdot \overline{y_{\ell-i-j+1}} \cdot b$

  if $x = (i, j)$ and $y = (p+1-i, q+1-j)$.

- Periodicity follows from reciprocity: Indeed, if $x = (i, j)$ and $x' = (p+1-i, q+1-j)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} x_{p+q} &= a \cdot \overline{x'_{p+q-i-j+1}} \cdot b && \text{(by reciprocity)} \\ &= a \cdot \overline{a \cdot \overline{x_0} \cdot b} \cdot b && \text{(by reciprocity again)} \\ &= a\overline{b} \cdot x_0 \cdot \overline{a}b. \end{aligned}$$

  Thus, it suffices to prove reciprocity.

- Moreover, reciprocity in general follows from reciprocity for $\ell = i + j - 1$ (just apply it to $R^k f$ instead of f otherwise).

- A **path** shall mean a sequence $(v_0 \gtrdot v_1 \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_k)$ of elements of $\widehat{P}$. We call it a path from v_0 to v_k.

- A **path** shall mean a sequence $(v_0 \gtrdot v_1 \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_k)$ of elements of $\widehat{P}$. We call it a path from v_0 to v_k.
- For each $v \in P$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$A_\ell^v := v_\ell \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_\ell} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \forall_\ell^v := \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_\ell} \cdot \overline{v_\ell}}.$$

Also, set $A_\ell^v = \forall_\ell^v = 1$ when $v \in \{0, 1\}$.

- A **path** shall mean a sequence $(v_0 \gtrdot v_1 \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_k)$ of elements of $\widehat{P}$. We call it a path from v_0 to v_k.
- For each $v \in P$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$A_\ell^v := v_\ell \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_\ell} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \forall_\ell^v := \sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_\ell} \cdot \overline{v_\ell}.$$

  Also, set $A_\ell^v = \forall_\ell^v = 1$ when $v \in \{0, 1\}$.
- For any path $\mathbf{p} = (v_0 \gtrdot v_1 \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_k)$, set

$$A_\ell^{\mathbf{p}} := A_\ell^{v_0} A_\ell^{v_1} \cdots A_\ell^{v_k} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \forall_\ell^{\mathbf{p}} := \forall_\ell^{v_0} \forall_\ell^{v_1} \cdots \forall_\ell^{v_k}.$$

- A **path** shall mean a sequence $(v_0 \gtrdot v_1 \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_k)$ of elements of $\widehat{P}$. We call it a path from v_0 to v_k.
- For each $v \in P$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$A_\ell^v := v_\ell \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_\ell} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \forall_\ell^v := \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_\ell} \cdot \overline{v_\ell}}.$$

Also, set $A_\ell^v = \forall_\ell^v = 1$ when $v \in \{0, 1\}$.

- For any path $\mathbf{p} = (v_0 \gtrdot v_1 \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_k)$, set

$$A_\ell^{\mathbf{p}} := A_\ell^{v_0} A_\ell^{v_1} \cdots A_\ell^{v_k} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \forall_\ell^{\mathbf{p}} := \forall_\ell^{v_0} \forall_\ell^{v_1} \cdots \forall_\ell^{v_k}.$$

- If u and v are elements of $\widehat{P}$, set

$$A_\ell^{u \to v} := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path from } u \text{ to } v} A_\ell^{\mathbf{p}} \qquad \text{and}$$

$$\forall_\ell^{u \to v} := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path from } u \text{ to } v} \forall_\ell^{\mathbf{p}}.$$

- **Path formulas:**
  (a) We have
  $$u_\ell = \overline{\forall_\ell^{1\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$
  (b) We have
  $$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to 0} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

- **Path formulas:**
  (a) We have
  $$u_\ell = \overline{\forall_\ell^{1\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$
  (b) We have
  $$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to 0} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$
- *Proof idea:* The ℓ is constant. Hence, we omit it, writing $\forall^v$ for $\forall_\ell^v$.

- **Path formulas:**

  (a) We have

$$u_\ell = \overline{\forall_\ell^{1 \to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

  (b) We have

$$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u \to 0} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

- *Proof idea:* The ℓ is constant. Hence, we omit it, writing $\forall^v$ for $\forall_\ell^v$.

  (a) Rewrite the claim as $\forall^{1 \to u} = b\overline{u_\ell}$.

- **Path formulas:**

  (a) We have

$$u_\ell = \overline{\nabla_\ell^{1\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

  (b) We have

$$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to 0} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

- *Proof idea:* The ℓ is constant. Hence, we omit it, writing ∇^v for ∇_ℓ^v.

  (a) Rewrite the claim as $\nabla^{1\to u} = b\overline{u_\ell}$.
  Prove this by downwards induction on u.

- **Path formulas:**

  (a) We have

$$u_\ell = \overline{\forall_\ell^{1\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

  (b) We have

$$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to 0} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

- *Proof idea:* The ℓ is constant. Hence, we omit it, writing $\forall^v$ for $\forall_\ell^v$.

  (a) Rewrite the claim as $\forall^{1\to u} = b\overline{u_\ell}$.
  Prove this by downwards induction on u.
  Induction step: Given $v \in P$ such that $\forall^{1\to u} = b\overline{u_\ell}$ for all $u \gtrdot v$. Since any path $1 \to v$ passes through a unique $u \gtrdot v$, we have

$$\forall^{1\to v} = \sum_{u \gtrdot v} \forall^{1\to u}\forall^v = \sum_{u \gtrdot v} b\overline{u_\ell}\forall^v \qquad \text{(by induction hypothesis)}$$
$$= b\overline{v_\ell} \qquad \text{(by definition of } \forall^v\text{)}, \qquad \text{qed.}$$

- **Path formulas:**

  (a) We have

  $$u_\ell = \overline{\nabla_\ell^{1\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

  (b) We have

  $$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to 0} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

- *Proof idea:* The ℓ is constant. Hence, we omit it, writing ∇^v for ∇_ℓ^v.

  (b) Analogous, but use upwards induction instead.

- **Path formulas:**
  (a) We have
  $$u_\ell = \overline{\forall_\ell^{1\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$
  (b) We have
  $$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to 0} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$
  (c) We have
  $$u_\ell = \overline{\forall_\ell^{(p,q)\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$
  (d) We have
  $$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to (1,1)} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

- **Path formulas:**
  (a) We have
  $$u_\ell = \overline{\forall_\ell^{1\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$
  (b) We have
  $$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to 0} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$
  (c) We have
  $$u_\ell = \overline{\forall_\ell^{(p,q)\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$
  (d) We have
  $$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to (1,1)} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$
- *Proof idea:* Each path $1 \to u$ begins with the step $1 \gtrdot (p,q)$. Thus, $\forall_\ell^{1\to u} = \forall_\ell^{(p,q)\to u}$ (since $\forall_\ell^1 = 1$). Hence, **(c)** follows from **(a)**.

- **Path formulas:**

  (a) We have
  $$u_\ell = \overline{\forall_\ell^{1\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

  (b) We have
  $$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to 0} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

  (c) We have
  $$u_\ell = \overline{\forall_\ell^{(p,q)\to u}} \cdot b \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

  (d) We have
  $$u_\ell = A_\ell^{u\to (1,1)} \cdot a \qquad \text{for each } u \in P.$$

- *Proof idea:* Each path $1 \to u$ begins with the step $1 \gtrdot (p,q)$. Thus, $\forall_\ell^{1\to u} = \forall_\ell^{(p,q)\to u}$ (since $\forall_\ell^1 = 1$). Hence, **(c)** follows from **(a)**.
  Similarly, **(d)** follows from **(b)**.

- **Transition equation in A-$\forall$-form:**

$$\forall^v_{\ell+1} = A^v_\ell \qquad \text{for each } v \in \widehat{P} \text{ and } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

- **Transition equation in A-$\forall$-form:**

$$\forall^v_{\ell+1} = A^v_\ell \qquad \text{for each } v \in \widehat{P} \text{ and } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

- *Proof idea:* Above we showed that

$$v_{\ell+1} = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_\ell \right) \cdot \overline{v_\ell} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_{\ell+1}}}.$$

Take reciprocals on both sides, multiply by $\overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_{\ell+1}}}$ and rewrite using $\forall^v_{\ell+1}$ and A^v_ℓ.

- **Transition equation in A-$\forall$-form:**

$$\forall^{v}_{\ell+1} = A^{v}_{\ell} \qquad \text{for each } v \in \widehat{P} \text{ and } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

- *Proof idea:* Above we showed that

$$v_{\ell+1} = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_\ell\right) \cdot \overline{v_\ell} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_{\ell+1}}}.$$

  Take reciprocals on both sides, multiply by $\overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_{\ell+1}}}$ and rewrite using $\forall^{v}_{\ell+1}$ and A^{v}_{ℓ}.

- As a consequence of $\forall^{v}_{\ell+1} = A^{v}_{\ell}$, we have

$$\forall^{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell+1} = A^{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell} \qquad \text{for each path } \mathbf{p} \text{ and each } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

- **Transition equation in A-$\forall$-form:**

$$\forall^v_{\ell+1} = A^v_\ell \qquad \text{for each } v \in \widehat{P} \text{ and } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

- *Proof idea:* Above we showed that

$$v_{\ell+1} = \left(\sum_{u \lessdot v} u_\ell\right) \cdot \overline{v_\ell} \cdot \overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_{\ell+1}}}.$$

  Take reciprocals on both sides, multiply by $\overline{\sum_{u \gtrdot v} \overline{u_{\ell+1}}}$ and rewrite using $\forall^v_{\ell+1}$ and A^v_ℓ.

- As a consequence of $\forall^v_{\ell+1} = A^v_\ell$, we have

$$\forall^{\mathbf{p}}_{\ell+1} = A^{\mathbf{p}}_\ell \qquad \text{for each path } \mathbf{p} \text{ and each } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

  Hence, $\forall^{u \to v}_{\ell+1} = A^{u \to v}_\ell$ for any $u, v \in \widehat{P}$.

- Now, for the bottommost element $(1, 1)$ of P, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(1,1)_1 &= \overline{\forall_1^{(p,q)\to(1,1)}} \cdot b && \text{(by path formula } \textbf{(c)}\text{)} \\
&= \overline{A_0^{(p,q)\to(1,1)}} \cdot b && \left(\text{since } \forall_{\ell+1}^{u\to v} = A_\ell^{u\to v}\right) \\
&= a \cdot \overline{(p,q)_0} \cdot b && \text{(by path formula } \textbf{(d)}\text{)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, reciprocity is proved for $i = j = 1$.

Reciprocity at $(1, 1)$

- Now, for the bottommost element $(1, 1)$ of P, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(1,1)_1 &= \overline{\forall_1^{(p,q)\to(1,1)}} \cdot b && \text{(by path formula } \textbf{(c)}\text{)} \\
&= \overline{A_0^{(p,q)\to(1,1)}} \cdot b && \left(\text{since } \forall_{\ell+1}^{u\to v} = A_\ell^{u\to v}\right) \\
&= a \cdot \overline{(p,q)_0} \cdot b && \text{(by path formula } \textbf{(d)}\text{)}.
\end{aligned}$$

  Thus, reciprocity is proved for $i = j = 1$.
- What now?

- We can simplify our goal one bit further. Consider the "neighborhood" of an element of our rectangle P:

$$\begin{tikzcd}[arrows=-]
u & & v & \text{(rank } k+1) \\
& m \arrow[ul] \arrow[ur] & & \text{(rank } k) \\
s \arrow[ur] & & t \arrow[ul] & \text{(rank } k-1)
\end{tikzcd}$$

(where the **rank** of an $(i, j) \in P$ is defined to be $i + j - 1$). Say we have shown (our "induction hypotheses") that reciprocity holds for each of s, t, m, u; that is, we have

$$s_\ell = a \cdot \overline{s'_{\ell-(k-1)}} \cdot b, \qquad t_\ell = a \cdot \overline{t'_{\ell-(k-1)}} \cdot b,$$
$$m_\ell = a \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b, \qquad u_\ell = a \cdot \overline{u'_{\ell-(k+1)}} \cdot b$$

for all sufficiently high ℓ, where x' denotes the antipode of x (that is, if $x = (i, j)$, then $x' = (p + 1 - i, q + 1 - j)$).

The case $j = 1$ suffices: part 1

- We can simplify our goal one bit further. Consider the "neighborhood" of an element of our rectangle P:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
u & & v & & (\text{rank } k+1) \\
& m \arrow[ul, dash] \arrow[ur, dash] & & & (\text{rank } k) \\
s \arrow[ur, dash] & & t \arrow[ul, dash] & & (\text{rank } k-1)
\end{tikzcd}$$

(where the **rank** of an $(i, j) \in P$ is defined to be $i + j - 1$). Say we have shown (our "induction hypotheses") that reciprocity holds for each of s, t, m, u; that is, we have

$$s_\ell = a \cdot \overline{s'_{\ell-(k-1)}} \cdot b, \qquad t_\ell = a \cdot \overline{t'_{\ell-(k-1)}} \cdot b,$$
$$m_\ell = a \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b, \qquad u_\ell = a \cdot \overline{u'_{\ell-(k+1)}} \cdot b$$

for all sufficiently high ℓ, where x' denotes the antipode of x (that is, if $x = (i, j)$, then $x' = (p + 1 - i, q + 1 - j)$).
Claim: Then, reciprocity also holds for v; that is, we have $v_\ell = a \cdot \overline{v'_{\ell-(k+1)}} \cdot b$ for all $\ell \geq k + 1$.

The case $j = 1$ suffices: part 2

- *Proof idea.* Fix $\ell \geq k+1$, and compare the transition equations

$$m_\ell = (s_{\ell-1} + t_{\ell-1}) \cdot \overline{m_{\ell-1}} \cdot \overline{\overline{u_\ell} + \overline{v_\ell}} \qquad \text{and}$$

$$m'_{\ell-k} = (u'_{\ell-k-1} + v'_{\ell-k-1}) \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-k-1}} \cdot \overline{\overline{s'_{\ell-k}} + \overline{t'_{\ell-k}}}$$

using the induction hypotheses $m_\ell = a \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b$,

$$s_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{s'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b, \qquad t_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{t'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b,$$

$$m_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-1-k}} \cdot b, \qquad u_\ell = a \cdot \overline{u'_{\ell-(k+1)}} \cdot b,$$

noting that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} u & & v \\ & m & \\ s & & t \end{array} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{ccc} t' & & s' \\ & m' & \\ v' & & u' \end{array} .$$

- *Proof idea.* Fix $\ell \geq k+1$, and compare the transition equations

$$m_\ell = (s_{\ell-1} + t_{\ell-1}) \cdot \overline{m_{\ell-1}} \cdot \overline{\overline{u_\ell} + \overline{v_\ell}} \qquad \text{and}$$

$$m'_{\ell-k} = \left(u'_{\ell-k-1} + v'_{\ell-k-1}\right) \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-k-1}} \cdot \overline{\overline{s'_{\ell-k}} + \overline{t'_{\ell-k}}}$$

using the induction hypotheses $m_\ell = a \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b$,

$$s_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{s'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b, \qquad t_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{t'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b,$$

$$m_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-1-k}} \cdot b, \qquad u_\ell = a \cdot \overline{u'_{\ell-(k+1)}} \cdot b,$$

noting that



After subtracting $u_\ell = a \cdot \overline{u'_{\ell-(k+1)}} \cdot b$, out comes $v_\ell = a \cdot \overline{v'_{\ell-(k+1)}} \cdot b$.

The case $j = 1$ suffices: part 2

- *Proof idea.* Fix $\ell \geq k+1$, and compare the transition equations

$$m_\ell = (s_{\ell-1} + t_{\ell-1}) \cdot \overline{m_{\ell-1}} \cdot \overline{\overline{u_\ell} + \overline{v_\ell}} \qquad \text{and}$$
$$m'_{\ell-k} = (u'_{\ell-k-1} + v'_{\ell-k-1}) \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-k-1}} \cdot \overline{\overline{s'_{\ell-k}} + \overline{t'_{\ell-k}}}$$

  using the induction hypotheses $m_\ell = a \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b$,

$$s_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{s'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b, \qquad t_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{t'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b,$$
$$m_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-1-k}} \cdot b, \qquad u_\ell = a \cdot \overline{u'_{\ell-(k+1)}} \cdot b,$$

  noting that



- This argument still works if s, t or u does not exist.

The case $j = 1$ suffices: part 2

- *Proof idea.* Fix $\ell \geq k+1$, and compare the transition equations

$$m_\ell = (s_{\ell-1} + t_{\ell-1}) \cdot \overline{m_{\ell-1}} \cdot \overline{\overline{u_\ell} + \overline{v_\ell}} \qquad \text{and}$$
$$m'_{\ell-k} = (u'_{\ell-k-1} + v'_{\ell-k-1}) \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-k-1}} \cdot \overline{\overline{s'_{\ell-k}} + \overline{t'_{\ell-k}}}$$

  using the induction hypotheses $m_\ell = a \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b$,

$$s_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{s'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b, \qquad t_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{t'_{\ell-k}} \cdot b,$$
$$m_{\ell-1} = a \cdot \overline{m'_{\ell-1-k}} \cdot b, \qquad u_\ell = a \cdot \overline{u'_{\ell-(k+1)}} \cdot b,$$

  noting that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} u & & v \\ & m & \\ s & & t \end{array} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{ccc} t' & & s' \\ & m' & \\ v' & & u' \end{array} .$$

- This argument still works if s, t or u does not exist.
- Thus, in order to prove reciprocity for all (i, j), it suffices (by induction) to prove it in the case when $j = 1$.

Where are we?

- So we have proved reciprocity for $i = j = 1$, and we need to prove it for $j = 1$.

Where are we?

- So we have proved reciprocity for $i = j = 1$, and we need to prove it for $j = 1$.
- The next case to try is $(i, j) = (2, 1)$. We need to show that

$$(2,1)_2 = a \cdot \overline{(p-1,q)_0} \cdot b.$$

Where are we?

- So we have proved reciprocity for $i = j = 1$, and we need to prove it for $j = 1$.
- The next case to try is $(i, j) = (2, 1)$. We need to show that

$$(2,1)_2 = a \cdot \overline{(p-1,q)_0} \cdot b.$$

- Using the path formulas (as in the case $i = j = 1$), we can boil this down to

$$A_1^{(p,q)\to(2,1)} = \forall_1^{(p-1,q)\to(1,1)}.$$

- So we have proved reciprocity for $i = j = 1$, and we need to prove it for $j = 1$.
- The next case to try is $(i, j) = (2, 1)$. We need to show that

$$(2,1)_2 = a \cdot \overline{(p-1,q)_0} \cdot b.$$

- Using the path formulas (as in the case $i = j = 1$), we can boil this down to

$$A_1^{(p,q)\to(2,1)} = \forall_1^{(p-1,q)\to(1,1)}.$$

  Note the lack of rowmotion in this formula! The ℓ here is constantly 1, so it is a property of a single labeling. Thus, we drop the subscripts.

- **Our new goal:** Prove that

$$A^{(p,q)\to(2,1)} = \forall^{(p-1,q)\to(1,1)}.$$

- More generally:
- **Conversion lemma:** Let u and u' be two adjacent elements on the top-right edge of P (that is, $u = (k, q)$ and $u' = (k-1, q)$). Let d and d' be two adjacent elements on the bottom-left edge of P (that is, $d = (i, 1)$ and $d' = (i-1, 1)$). Then,



$$A_\ell^{u \to d} = \forall_\ell^{u' \to d'} \qquad \text{for each } \ell \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In short:

$$A^{u \to d} = \forall^{u' \to d'}.$$

- If we can prove the conversion lemma, we will obtain reciprocity not only for $(i, j) = (2, 1)$, but also for all (i, j) on the bottom-left edge of P (that is, for the entire case $j = 1$), because we can argue as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(i,1)_i &= \overline{\forall_i^{(p,q)\to(i,1)}} \cdot b && \text{(by path formula } \textbf{(c)}\text{)} \\
&= \overline{A_{i-1}^{(p,q)\to(i,1)}} \cdot b && \left(\text{since } \forall_{\ell+1}^{u\to v} = A_\ell^{u\to v}\right) \\
&= \overline{\forall_{i-1}^{(p-1,q)\to(i-1,1)}} \cdot b && \text{(by the conversion lemma)} \\
&= \overline{A_{i-2}^{(p-1,q)\to(i-1,1)}} \cdot b && \left(\text{since } \forall_{\ell+1}^{u\to v} = A_\ell^{u\to v}\right) \\
&= \overline{\forall_{i-2}^{(p-2,q)\to(i-2,1)}} \cdot b && \text{(by the conversion lemma)} \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \overline{\forall_{1}^{(p-i+1,q)\to(1,1)}} \cdot b && \text{(by the conversion lemma)} \\
&= \overline{A_{0}^{(p-i+1,q)\to(1,1)}} \cdot b && \left(\text{since } \forall_{\ell+1}^{u\to v} = A_\ell^{u\to v}\right) \\
&= a \cdot \overline{(p-i+1,q)_0} \cdot b && \text{(by path formula } \textbf{(d)}\text{)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

- This proves reciprocity

$$(i,1)_\ell = a \cdot \overline{(p-i+1,q)_{\ell-i}} \cdot b$$

for $\ell = i$.

- This proves reciprocity

$$(i, 1)_\ell = a \cdot \overline{(p - i + 1, q)_{\ell - i}} \cdot b$$

for $\ell = i$.
The case $\ell > i$ follows by applying this to $R^{\ell - i} f$ instead of f.

- This proves reciprocity

$$(i,1)_\ell = a \cdot \overline{(p-i+1,q)_{\ell-i}} \cdot b$$

for $\ell = i$.
The case $\ell > i$ follows by applying this to $R^{\ell-i} f$ instead of f.

- Thus, we only need to prove the conversion lemma. We can now drop all subscripts forever!

- Let us again look at the picture:



We must prove $A^{u \to d} = \forall^{u' \to d'}$.

- Let us again look at the picture:



We must prove $A^{u \to d} = \forall^{u' \to d'}$.

- How do we interpolate between paths $u \to d$ and paths $u' \to d'$?

- We define a **path-jump-path** to be a sequence

$$\mathbf{p} = (v_0 \gtrdot v_1 \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_i \blacktriangleright v_{i+1} \gtrdot v_{i+2} \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_k)$$

of elements of P, where the relation $x \blacktriangleright y$ means "y is one step down and some steps to the right of x" (that is, if $x = (r, s)$, then $y = (r - k, s + k - 1)$ for some $k > 0$). We say that this path-jump-path $\mathbf{p}$ has **jump at** i.

- We define a **path-jump-path** to be a sequence

$$\mathbf{p} = (v_0 \gtrdot v_1 \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_i \blacktriangleright v_{i+1} \gtrdot v_{i+2} \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_k)$$

of elements of P, where the relation $x \blacktriangleright y$ means "y is one step down and some steps to the right of x" (that is, if $x = (r, s)$, then $y = (r - k, s + k - 1)$ for some $k > 0$).
We say that this path-jump-path $\mathbf{p}$ has **jump at** i.
Example of a path-jump-path:



(The red edge is the jump.)

- We define a **path-jump-path** to be a sequence

$$\mathbf{p} = (v_0 \gtrdot v_1 \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_i \blacktriangleright v_{i+1} \gtrdot v_{i+2} \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_k)$$

of elements of P, where the relation $x \blacktriangleright y$ means "y is one step down and some steps to the right of x" (that is, if $x = (r, s)$, then $y = (r - k, s + k - 1)$ for some $k > 0$).
We say that this path-jump-path $\mathbf{p}$ has **jump at** i.
For any such path-jump-path $\mathbf{p}$, we set

$$E_{\mathbf{p}} := A^{v_0} A^{v_1} \cdots A^{v_{i-1}} v_i \overline{v_{i+1}} \forall^{v_{i+2}} \forall^{v_{i+3}} \cdots \forall^{v_k}.$$

(Here, we are omitting the ℓ subscripts – so v_i means $(v_i)_\ell$ and v_{i+1} means $(v_{i+1})_\ell$.)

- We define a **path-jump-path** to be a sequence

$$\mathbf{p} = (v_0 \gtrdot v_1 \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_i \blacktriangleright v_{i+1} \gtrdot v_{i+2} \gtrdot \cdots \gtrdot v_k)$$

of elements of P, where the relation $x \blacktriangleright y$ means "y is one step down and some steps to the right of x" (that is, if $x = (r, s)$, then $y = (r - k, s + k - 1)$ for some $k > 0$).
We say that this path-jump-path $\mathbf{p}$ has **jump at** i.
For any such path-jump-path $\mathbf{p}$, we set

$$E_{\mathbf{p}} := A^{v_0} A^{v_1} \cdots A^{v_{i-1}} v_i \overline{v_{i+1}} \forall^{v_{i+2}} \forall^{v_{i+3}} \cdots \forall^{v_k}.$$

- Now, if $k = \operatorname{rank} u - \operatorname{rank}(d')$, then

$$A^{u \to d} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } k-1}} E_{\mathbf{p}},$$

since $A^d = d\overline{d'}$, and similarly

$$\forall^{u' \to d'} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } 0}} E_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

- So we need to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } k-1}} E_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } 0}} E_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

Proving the conversion lemma: moving the jump

- So we need to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } k-1}} E_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } 0}} E_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

- Reasonable to expect that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } i}} E_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } i+1}} E_{\mathbf{p}}$$

for each $0 \leq i < k - 1$.

- So we need to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } k-1}} E_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } 0}} E_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

- Reasonable to expect that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } i}} E_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } i+1}} E_{\mathbf{p}}$$

  for each $0 \leq i < k - 1$.

- This is indeed true and can be proved by a "local" argument (rewriting two consecutive steps of the path).

Proving the conversion lemma: moving the jump

- So we need to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } k-1}} E_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } 0}} E_{\mathbf{p}}.$$

- Reasonable to expect that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } i}} E_{\mathbf{p}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \text{ is a path-jump-path } u \to d' \\ \text{with jump at } i+1}} E_{\mathbf{p}}$$

  for each $0 \leq i < k - 1$.

- This is indeed true and can be proved by a "local" argument (rewriting two consecutive steps of the path).
- This is similar to the "zipper argument" in lattice models. (Is there a Yang–Baxter equation lurking?)

Proving the conversion lemma: the civilized version, part 1

- Modulo the details omitted, this finishes the proof of the reciprocity theorem.

- Modulo the details omitted, this finishes the proof of the reciprocity theorem.
- However, the path-jump-path argument is somewhat messy. We can make it slicker by rewriting it in matrix notation:

- Modulo the details omitted, this finishes the proof of the reciprocity theorem.
- However, the path-jump-path argument is somewhat messy. We can make it slicker by rewriting it in matrix notation:
- Define three $P \times P$-matrices $\mathbf{A}$, $\boldsymbol{\forall}$ and $\mathbf{U}$ by

$$\mathbf{A}_{x,y} := A^x [x \gtrdot y], \qquad \boldsymbol{\forall}_{x,y} := \forall^y [x \gtrdot y],$$
$$\mathbf{U}_{x,y} := x\overline{y} [x \blacktriangleright y] \qquad \text{for all } x, y \in P.$$

Here, $[\mathcal{A}]$ is the Iverson bracket (i.e., truth value) of a statement $\mathcal{A}$; the relation $x \blacktriangleright y$ means "y is one step down and some steps to the right of x" as before. And again, we are omitting the ℓ subscripts, so $x\overline{y}$ actually means $x_\ell \overline{y_\ell}$.
- Now, we claim that

$$\mathbf{AU} = \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\forall}.$$

- Now, we claim that $\mathbf{AU} = \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\forall}$.
  Indeed, this follows easily from the following neat lemma: If

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & u & \\ \diagup & & \diagdown \\ v & & w \\ \diagdown & & \diagup \\ & d & \end{array}$$

  are four adjacent elements of P, then

  $\overline{w} \cdot \forall^d \cdot d = \overline{u} \cdot A^u \cdot v$ and $\overline{v} \cdot \forall^d \cdot d = \overline{u} \cdot A^u \cdot w$.

  (The u and d here are unrelated to the u and d from the conversion lemma!)

- Now, we claim that $\mathbf{AU} = \mathbf{U\forall}$.
  Indeed, this follows easily from the following neat lemma: If

  $$\begin{array}{ccc} & u & \\ v & & w \\ & d & \end{array}$$

  are four adjacent elements of P, then

  $$\overline{w} \cdot \forall^d \cdot d = \overline{u} \cdot A^u \cdot v \qquad \text{and} \qquad \overline{v} \cdot \forall^d \cdot d = \overline{u} \cdot A^u \cdot w.$$

- From $\mathbf{AU} = \mathbf{U\forall}$, we easily obtain

  $$\mathbf{A}^{\circ k}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U\forall}^{\circ k} \qquad \text{for any } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

  where $A^{\circ k}$ means the k-th power of a matrix A.

- Now, we claim that $\mathbf{AU} = \mathbf{U\forall}$.
  Indeed, this follows easily from the following neat lemma: If

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & u & \\ v & & w \\ & d & \end{array}$$

  are four adjacent elements of P, then

$$\overline{w} \cdot \forall^d \cdot d = \overline{u} \cdot A^u \cdot v \qquad \text{and} \qquad \overline{v} \cdot \forall^d \cdot d = \overline{u} \cdot A^u \cdot w.$$

- From $\mathbf{AU} = \mathbf{U\forall}$, we easily obtain

$$\mathbf{A}^{\circ k}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U\forall}^{\circ k} \qquad \text{for any } k \in \mathbb{N},$$

  where $A^{\circ k}$ means the k-th power of a matrix A.
- Setting $k = \operatorname{rank} u - \operatorname{rank} d$ and comparing the (u, d')-entries of both sides, we quickly obtain $A^{u \to d} = \forall^{u' \to d'}$ (since $x \blacktriangleright d'$ holds only for $x = d$, and since $u \blacktriangleright x$ holds only for $x = u'$).
  This proves the conversion lemma again.

- We consider these new proofs to be simpler and nicer than our 2014 one for the commutative case.

Is that all? Part 1: Semirings

- We consider these new proofs to be simpler and nicer than our 2014 one for the commutative case.
- However, in some sense they are still imperfect.

Is that all? Part 1: Semirings

- We consider these new proofs to be simpler and nicer than our 2014 one for the commutative case.
- However, in some sense they are still imperfect.
- **Recall:** Classical rowmotion is (a restriction of) birational rowmotion on the tropical **semi**field.

- We consider these new proofs to be simpler and nicer than our 2014 one for the commutative case.
- However, in some sense they are still imperfect.
- **Recall:** Classical rowmotion is (a restriction of) birational rowmotion on the tropical **semi**field.
  Semifields are not rings! (No subtraction.)

- We consider these new proofs to be simpler and nicer than our 2014 one for the commutative case.
- However, in some sense they are still imperfect.
- **Recall:** Classical rowmotion is (a restriction of) birational rowmotion on the tropical **semi**field.
  Semifields are not rings! (No subtraction.)
  In the **commutative** case, the theorems hold for semifields (and, more generally, commutative semirings) because they hold for fields and because they are "essentially" polynomial identities (once you clear denominators).

- We consider these new proofs to be simpler and nicer than our 2014 one for the commutative case.
- However, in some sense they are still imperfect.
- **Recall:** Classical rowmotion is (a restriction of) birational rowmotion on the tropical **semi**field.
  Semifields are not rings! (No subtraction.)
  In the **commutative** case, the theorems hold for semifields (and, more generally, commutative semirings) because they hold for fields and because they are "essentially" polynomial identities (once you clear denominators).
  This **fails** for noncommutative $\mathbb{K}$!
- **Scary example** (David Speyer, MathOverflow #401273): If x and y are two elements of a ring such that $x + y$ is invertible, then

$$x \cdot \overline{x+y} \cdot y = y \cdot \overline{x+y} \cdot x.$$

  But this is not true if "ring" is replaced by "semiring"!

- Thus, we are left with a

Question:

Are the periodicity and reciprocity theorems still true if “ring” is replaced by “semiring”? (I.e., we no longer require $\mathbb{K}$ to have a subtraction.)

- Thus, we are left with a

Question:

Are the periodicity and reciprocity theorems still true if "ring" is replaced by "semiring"? (I.e., we no longer require $\mathbb{K}$ to have a subtraction.)

- Note that the main hurdle is the argument that reduced the general case to the $j = 1$ case. That argument used subtraction!

- Thus, we are left with a

Question:

Are the periodicity and reciprocity theorems still true if “ring” is replaced by “semiring”? (I.e., we no longer require $\mathbb{K}$ to have a subtraction.)

- Note that the main hurdle is the argument that reduced the general case to the $j = 1$ case. That argument used subtraction!
- We have partial results, e.g., for $p = q = 3$ and for $p = 2$.

- Other posets remain to be studied.

Conjecture:

Let P be the triangle-shaped poset $\Delta(p)$ or its reflection $\nabla(p)$. Let $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ be a labelling such that $R^p f$ exists. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$. Then, for each $x \in \widehat{P}$, we have

$$(R^p f)(x) = a\overline{b} \cdot f(x') \cdot \overline{a}b,$$

where x' is the reflection of x across the y-axis.



- Other posets remain to be studied.

Conjecture:

Let P be the triangle-shaped poset $\Delta(p)$ or its reflection $\nabla(p)$. Let $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ be a labelling such that $R^p f$ exists. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$. Then, for each $x \in \widehat{P}$, we have

$$(R^p f)(x) = a\overline{b} \cdot f(x') \cdot \overline{a}b,$$

where x' is the reflection of x across the y-axis.

- We have a similar conjecture for other kinds of triangles and (still unproved even in the commutative case!) for trapezoids.

- Other posets remain to be studied.

Conjecture:

Let P be the triangle-shaped poset $\Delta(p)$ or its reflection $\nabla(p)$. Let $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ be a labelling such that $R^p f$ exists. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$. Then, for each $x \in \widehat{P}$, we have

$$(R^p f)(x) = a\overline{b} \cdot f(x') \cdot \overline{a}b,$$

where x' is the reflection of x across the y-axis.

- We have a similar conjecture for other kinds of triangles and (still unproved even in the commutative case!) for trapezoids.
- As already mentioned, other simple posets such as



do not have periodic behavior for noncommutative $\mathbb{K}$.

- Other posets remain to be studied.

Conjecture:

Let P be the triangle-shaped poset $\Delta(p)$ or its reflection $\nabla(p)$. Let $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ be a labelling such that $R^p f$ exists. Let $a = f(0)$ and $b = f(1)$. Then, for each $x \in \widehat{P}$, we have

$$(R^p f)(x) = a\overline{b} \cdot f\left(x'\right) \cdot \overline{a}b,$$

where x' is the reflection of x across the y-axis.

- We have a similar conjecture for other kinds of triangles and (still unproved even in the commutative case!) for trapezoids.

Question:

What other results like ours are known in the noncommutative case?

- **Tom Roby**: collaboration
- **Mathematisches Forschungsinstitut Oberwolfach**: hospitality in July/August 2021
- **Banff International Research Station**: 2021 conference where this was first presented
- **Svante Linusson**: invitation
- **Michael Joseph, Tim Campion, Max Glick, Maxim Kontsevich, Gregg Musiker, Pace Nielsen, James Propp, Pasha Pylyavskyy, Bruce Sagan, Roland Speicher, David Speyer, Hugh Thomas, and Jurij Volcic**: discussions
- **Sage and Sage-combinat**: computations
- **the birational combinatorics community**: keeping the subject exciting since 2013
- **you**: your patience

Some references

- David Einstein, James Propp, *Combinatorial, piecewise-linear, and birational homomesy for products of two chains*, 2013. http://arxiv.org/abs/1310.5294
- David Einstein, James Propp, *Piecewise-linear and birational toggling*, 2014. https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.3455
- Darij Grinberg, Tom Roby, *Iterative properties of birational rowmotion*, 2014. http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.6178
- Michael Joseph, Tom Roby, *Birational and noncommutative lifts of antichain toggling and rowmotion*, 2019. https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.09658
- Michael Joseph, Tom Roby, *A birational lifting of the Stanley-Thomas word on products of two chains*, 2020. https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.03811
- Gregg Musiker, Tom Roby, *Paths to Understanding Birational Rowmotion on Products of Two Chains*, 2019. https://arxiv.org/abs/1801.03877

- **Zamolodchikov periodicity conjecture in type AA** (proved by A. Yu. Volkov, arXiv:hep-th/0606094v1): Let r and s be positive integers. Let $Y_{i,\ j,\ k}$ be elements of a commutative ring for $i \in [r]$ and $j \in [s]$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume that

$$Y_{i,\ j,\ k+1} Y_{i,\ j,\ k-1} = \frac{(1 + Y_{i+1,\ j,\ k})(1 + Y_{i-1,\ j,\ k})}{(1 + 1/Y_{i,\ j+1,\ k})(1 + 1/Y_{i,\ j-1,\ k})}$$

for all $i,\ j,\ k$, where sums involving "off-grid" points (e.g., $1 + Y_{0,\ j,\ k}$) are understood as 1.
Then, $Y_{i,\ j,\ k+2(r+s+2)} = Y_{i,\ j,\ k}$ for all $i,\ j,\ k$.

- **Zamolodchikov periodicity conjecture in type AA** (proved by A. Yu. Volkov, arXiv:hep-th/0606094v1): Let r and s be positive integers. Let $Y_{i,\ j,\ k}$ be elements of a commutative ring for $i \in [r]$ and $j \in [s]$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume that

$$Y_{i,\ j,\ k+1} Y_{i,\ j,\ k-1} = \frac{(1 + Y_{i+1,\ j,\ k})(1 + Y_{i-1,\ j,\ k})}{(1 + 1/Y_{i,\ j+1,\ k})(1 + 1/Y_{i,\ j-1,\ k})}$$

  for all $i,\ j,\ k$, where sums involving "off-grid" points (e.g., $1 + Y_{0,\ j,\ k}$) are understood as 1.
  Then, $Y_{i,\ j,\ k+2(r+s+2)} = Y_{i,\ j,\ k}$ for all $i,\ j,\ k$.
- **Observation (Max Glick and others, ca. 2015?):** This is equivalent to periodicity of birational rowmotion ($R^{p+q} = 1$) for $[p] \times [q]$, where $p = r + 1$ and $q = s + 1$, when the ring is commutative. Explicitly,

$$Y_{i,\ j,\ i+j-2k} = (R^k f)(i, j+1) \diagup (R^k f)(i+1, j).$$

  (Fine points omitted.)

- **Zamolodchikov periodicity conjecture in type AA** (proved by A. Yu. Volkov, arXiv:hep-th/0606094v1): Let r and s be positive integers. Let $Y_{i,\ j,\ k}$ be elements of a commutative ring for $i \in [r]$ and $j \in [s]$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume that

$$Y_{i,\ j,\ k+1} Y_{i,\ j,\ k-1} = \frac{(1 + Y_{i+1,\ j,\ k})(1 + Y_{i-1,\ j,\ k})}{(1 + 1/Y_{i,\ j+1,\ k})(1 + 1/Y_{i,\ j-1,\ k})}$$

  for all $i,\ j,\ k$, where sums involving "off-grid" points (e.g., $1 + Y_{0,\ j,\ k}$) are understood as 1.
  Then, $Y_{i,\ j,\ k+2(r+s+2)} = Y_{i,\ j,\ k}$ for all $i,\ j,\ k$.
- **Observation (Max Glick and others, ca. 2015?):** This is equivalent to periodicity of birational rowmotion ($R^{p+q} = 1$) for $[p] \times [q]$, where $p = r + 1$ and $q = s + 1$, when the ring is commutative.
- **Disappointment:** Zamolodchikov periodicity does not generalize to noncommutative rings (no matter how we order the five factors).

- A recent preprint by Joseph Johnson and Ricky Ini Liu (*Birational rowmotion and the octahedron recurrence*, `arXiv:2204.04255`) reproves the "order $p + q$" theorem for commutative $\mathbb{K}$ in a simpler way (besides doing a number of other interesting things).

- A recent preprint by Joseph Johnson and Ricky Ini Liu (*Birational rowmotion and the octahedron recurrence*, arXiv:2204.04255) reproves the "order $p+q$" theorem for commutative $\mathbb{K}$ in a simpler way (besides doing a number of other interesting things).
- The main idea of their proof is to reduce birational rowmotion to the octahedron recurrence, and prove the latter is periodic using lattice paths and LGV.

- A recent preprint by Joseph Johnson and Ricky Ini Liu (*Birational rowmotion and the octahedron recurrence*, arXiv:2204.04255) reproves the "order $p+q$" theorem for commutative $\mathbb{K}$ in a simpler way (besides doing a number of other interesting things).
- The main idea of their proof is to reduce birational rowmotion to the octahedron recurrence, and prove the latter is periodic using lattice paths and LGV.
- We don't know if the octahedron recurrence is well-behaved for noncommutative $\mathbb{K}$ (too many options to check), but LGV certainly is not available.

- A recent preprint by Joseph Johnson and Ricky Ini Liu (*Birational rowmotion and the octahedron recurrence*, arXiv:2204.04255) reproves the "order $p+q$" theorem for commutative $\mathbb{K}$ in a simpler way (besides doing a number of other interesting things).
- The main idea of their proof is to reduce birational rowmotion to the octahedron recurrence, and prove the latter is periodic using lattice paths and LGV.
- We don't know if the octahedron recurrence is well-behaved for noncommutative $\mathbb{K}$ (too many options to check), but LGV certainly is not available.
- Lemma 4.1 in the Johnson-Liu preprint generalizes our conversion lemma in the commutative case from single paths to k-tuples of nonintersecting paths. We don't know how this could be done in the noncommutative case; it is unclear in what order to multiply labels from different paths.

One more little result

Proposition (2022, G & Roby):

Let P be any finite poset. Let $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$. Then,

$$f(1) \cdot \sum_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P};\\ u \gtrdot 0}} \overline{(Rf)(u)} \cdot f(0) = \sum_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P};\\ u \lessdot 1}} f(u),$$

assuming that the inverses $\overline{(Rf)(u)}$ are well-defined.

One more little result

Proposition (2022, G & Roby):

Let P be any finite poset. Let $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$. Then,

$$f(1) \cdot \sum_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P};\\ u \gtrdot 0}} \overline{(Rf)(u)} \cdot f(0) = \sum_{\substack{u \in \widehat{P};\\ u \lessdot 1}} f(u),$$

assuming that the inverses $\overline{(Rf)(u)}$ are well-defined.

Corollary (2022+, G & Roby):

Let P be any finite poset. Let $f \in \mathbb{K}^{\widehat{P}}$ with $f(0) = f(1) = 1$. Then, the quantity

$$\sum_{\substack{u,v \in \widehat{P};\\ u \lessdot v}} f(u) \cdot \overline{f(v)}$$

is unchanged under birational rowmotion (i.e., when we replace f by Rf).