

# The Sorting Index and Permutation Codes

William Y.C. Chen<sup>1</sup>, George Z. Gong<sup>2</sup>, Jeremy J.F. Guo<sup>3</sup>

Center for Combinatorics, LPMC-TJKLC  
Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P.R. China

<sup>1</sup>chen@nankai.edu.cn, <sup>2</sup>sxgong@mail.nankai.edu.cn, <sup>3</sup>guojf@mail.nankai.edu.cn

## Abstract

In the combinatorial study of the coefficients of a bivariate polynomial that generalizes both the length and the reflection length generating functions for finite Coxeter groups, Petersen introduced a new Mahonian statistic  $sor$ , called the sorting index. Petersen proved that the pairs of statistics  $(sor, cyc)$  and  $(inv, rl-min)$  have the same joint distribution over the symmetric group, and asked for a combinatorial proof of this fact. In answer to the question of Petersen, we observe a connection between the sorting index and the B-code of a permutation defined by Foata and Han, and we show that the bijection of Foata and Han serves the purpose of mapping  $(inv, rl-min)$  to  $(sor, cyc)$ . We also give a type  $B$  analogue of the Foata-Han bijection, and we derive the equidistribution of  $(inv_B, Lmap_B, Rmil_B)$  and  $(sor_B, Lmap_B, Cyc_B)$  over signed permutations. So we get a combinatorial interpretation of Petersen's equidistribution of  $(inv_B, nmin_B)$  and  $(sor_B, l'_B)$ . Moreover, we show that the six pairs of set-valued statistics  $(Cyc_B, Rmil_B)$ ,  $(Cyc_B, Lmap_B)$ ,  $(Rmil_B, Lmap_B)$ ,  $(Lmap_B, Rmil_B)$ ,  $(Lmap_B, Cyc_B)$  and  $(Rmil_B, Cyc_B)$  are equidistributed over signed permutations. For Coxeter groups of type  $D$ , Petersen showed that the two statistics  $inv_D$  and  $sor_D$  are equidistributed. We introduce two statistics  $nmin_D$  and  $l'_D$  for elements of  $D_n$  and we prove that the two pairs of statistics  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  and  $(sor_D, l'_D)$  are equidistributed.

**Keywords:** Permutation statistics, Mahonian statistics, Coxeter groups, Set-valued statistics, Bijections

**AMS Subject Classifications:** 05A05, 05A15, 20F55

## 1 Introduction

This paper is concerned with a combinatorial study of the Mahonian statistic  $sor$ , introduced by Petersen [10]. This statistic is also interpreted by Wilson [11, 12] as the total distance moved rightward in the random generation of a permutation based on the Fisher-Yates shuffle algorithm.

Let  $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . The set of permutations of  $[n]$  is denoted by  $S_n$ . Let us recall the definition of the sorting index of a permutation  $\sigma$  in  $S_n$ . Notice that  $\sigma$  has a unique

decomposition into transpositions

$$\sigma = (i_1, j_1)(i_2, j_2) \cdots (i_k, j_k)$$

such that

$$j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_k$$

and

$$i_1 < j_1, i_2 < j_2, \dots, i_k < j_k.$$

The sorting index is defined by

$$sor(\sigma) = \sum_{r=1}^k (j_r - i_r).$$

Based on the cycle decomposition of a permutation, Foata and Han [6] introduced the B-code of a permutation. We observe that the sorting index of a permutation can be easily expressed in terms of its B-code. Given a permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$  with B-code  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ , it can be seen that the sorting index of  $\sigma$  is given by

$$sor(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^n (i - b_i).$$

Petersen [10] has shown that the sorting index  $sor$  is a Mahonian statistic, that is, it has the same distribution as the number of inversions. He also introduced the sorting indices for Coxeter groups of type  $B$  and type  $D$  and showed that they are Mahonian as well.

Let us recall some notation and terminology. For  $n \geq 1$ , given a permutation  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_n \in S_n$ , a pair  $(\sigma_i, \sigma_j)$  is called an inversion if  $i < j$  and  $\sigma_i > \sigma_j$ . Let  $inv(\sigma)$  denote the number of inversions of  $\sigma$ . An element  $\sigma_i$  is said to be a right-to-left minimum of  $\sigma$  if  $\sigma_i < \sigma_j$  for all  $j > i$ . The number of right-to-left minima of  $\sigma$  is denoted by  $rl-min(\sigma)$ . The number of elements of  $\sigma$  that are not right-to-left minima is denoted by  $nmin(\sigma)$ . Similarly, one can define a left-to-right maximum. The number of left-to-right maxima of  $\sigma$  is denoted by  $lr-max(\sigma)$ . The number of cycles of  $\sigma$  is denoted by  $cyc(\sigma)$ . The reflection length of  $\sigma$ , denoted  $l'(\sigma)$ , is the minimal number of transpositions needed to express  $\sigma$ .

By using two factorizations of the diagonal sum, i.e.,  $\sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \sigma$ , in the group algebra  $\mathbb{Z}[S_n]$ , Petersen has shown that  $(sor, cyc)$  and  $(inv, rl-min)$  have the same joint distribution by deriving the following generating function formulas:

$$\sum_{\sigma \in S_n} q^{sor(\sigma)} t^{cyc(\sigma)} = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} q^{inv(\sigma)} t^{rl-min(\sigma)} = t(t+q) \cdots (t+q+q^2 + \cdots + q^{n-1}).$$

He raised the question of finding a bijection that maps a permutation with inversion number  $k$  to a permutation with sorting index  $k$ . We find that a bijection constructed by Foata and Han [6] on  $S_n$  serves the purpose of mapping  $(inv, rl-min)$  to  $(sor, cyc)$ .

The bijection of Foata and Han is devised for the purpose of deriving the equidistribution of the six pairs of set-valued statistics  $(Cyc, Rmil)$ ,  $(Cyc, Lmap)$ ,  $(Rmil, Lmap)$ ,  $(Lmap, Rmil)$ ,  $(Lmap, Cyc)$  and  $(Rmil, Cyc)$  over  $S_n$ . It should be mentioned that the equidistribution of the three pairs of set-valued statistics  $(Lmap, Cyc)$ ,  $(Cyc, Lmap)$ ,  $(Lmap, Rmil)$  reduces to the equidistribution of the three pairs of integer-valued statistics  $(lr-max, cyc)$ ,  $(cyc, lr-max)$  and  $(lr-max, lr-min)$  established by Cori [4] by employing labeled Dyck paths and the Ossona de Mendez Rosenstiehl algorithm [5] on hypermaps.

As for Coxeter groups of type  $B$ , the sorting index can be analogously defined and it is Mahonian, see Petersen [10]. Let  $sor_B, inv_B, nmin_B$  and  $l'_B$  denote the statistics on signed permutations analogous to  $sor, inv, nmin$  and  $l'$  for permutations. Petersen obtained the following formulas for the joint distributions of  $(inv_B, nmin_B)$  and  $(sor_B, l'_B)$ :

$$\sum_{\sigma \in B_n} q^{sor_B(\sigma)} t^{l'_B(\sigma)} = \sum_{\sigma \in B_n} q^{inv_B(\sigma)} t^{nmin_B(\sigma)} = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + t[2i]_q - t).$$

We shall present a bijection on  $B_n$  which implies the equidistribution of  $(inv_B, Lmap_B, Rmil_B)$  and  $(sor_B, Lmap_B, Cyc_B)$  where  $Lmap_B, Rmil_B$  and  $Cyc_B$  are set-valued statistics. In particular, this bijection transforms  $(inv_B, nmin_B)$  to  $(sor_B, l'_B)$ . We introduce the A-code and the B-code of a signed permutation, which are analogous to the A-code and the B-code of a permutation. We show that the triple of statistics  $(inv_B, Lmap_B, Rmil_B)$  of a signed permutation can be computed from its A-code whereas the triple of statistics  $(sor_B, Lmap_B, Cyc_B)$  can be computed from its B-code. To be more specific, let  $\sigma$  be a signed permutation in  $B_n$  with A-code  $c$ . Let  $\sigma'$  be the signed permutation in  $B_n$  with B-code  $c$ . Then the triple of statistics  $(inv_B, Lmap_B, Rmil_B)$  of  $\sigma$  coincides with the triple of statistics  $(sor_B, Lmap_B, Cyc_B)$  of  $\sigma'$ . We also show that the six pairs of set-valued statistics  $(Cyc_B, Rmil_B)$ ,  $(Cyc_B, Lmap_B)$ ,  $(Rmil_B, Lmap_B)$ ,  $(Lmap_B, Rmil_B)$ ,  $(Lmap_B, Cyc_B)$  and  $(Rmil_B, Cyc_B)$  are equidistributed over  $B_n$ . As a consequence, we see that the four pairs of statistics  $(sor_B, l'_B)$ ,  $(inv_B, nmin_B)$ ,  $(inv_B, nmax_B)$  and  $(sor_B, nmax_B)$  are equidistributed over  $B_n$ .

For Coxeter groups of type  $D$ , let  $sor_D$  and  $inv_D$  denote the statistics analogous to  $sor$  and  $inv$ . Let  $D_n$  denote the subgroup of  $B_n$  consisting of all signed permutations with an even number of minus signs. In this case, Petersen has shown that  $sor_D$  and  $inv_D$  have the same generating function, that is,

$$\sum_{\sigma \in D_n} q^{sor_D(\sigma)} = \sum_{\sigma \in D_n} q^{inv_D(\sigma)} = [n]_q \prod_{r=1}^{n-1} [2r]_q.$$

We shall introduce two statistics  $nmin_D$  and  $\tilde{l}'_D$  analogous to  $nmin$  and  $l'$ , and we shall construct a bijection in order to show that the pairs of statistics  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  and  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$  are equidistributed over  $D_n$ . Moreover, we prove that the bivariate generating

functions for  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  and  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$  are both equal to

$$D_n(q, t) = \prod_{r=1}^{n-1} (1 + q^r t + qt \cdot [2r]_q) .$$

## 2 The bijection of Foata and Han

In this section, we give a brief description of Foata and Han's bijection [6] on permutations. Then we shall show that this bijection indeed transforms  $(inv, rl-min)$  to  $(sor, cyc)$ .

The group of permutations of  $[n]$  is also known as a Coxeter group of type  $A$ . The *length* of a permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$ , denoted by  $l(\sigma)$ , is defined to be the minimal number of adjacent transpositions needed to express  $\sigma$ . It is not difficult to see that  $inv(\sigma) = l(\sigma)$ .

We adopt the notation of Foata and Han [6]. They have investigated several set-valued statistics which are defined as follows. Given a permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$ , it can be decomposed as a product of disjoint cycles whose minimum elements are  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_r$ . Define  $Cyc \sigma$  to be the set

$$Cyc \sigma = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_r\}.$$

Let  $\omega = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$  be a word in which the letters are positive integers. The left to right maximum place set of  $\omega$ , denoted by  $Lmap \omega$ , is the set of all places  $i$  such that  $x_j < x_i$  for all  $j < i$ , while the right to left minimum letter set of  $\omega$ , denoted by  $Rmil \omega$ , is the set of all letters  $x_i$  such that  $x_j > x_i$  for all  $j > i$ . For a permutation  $\sigma$  of  $[n]$ , recall that  $lr-max(\sigma)$  is the number of left-to-right maxima of  $\sigma$ ,  $rl-min(\sigma)$  is the number of right-to-left minima of  $\sigma$ , and  $cyc(\sigma)$  is the number of cycles of  $\sigma$ . It is easy to see that the cardinalities of  $Lmap \sigma$ ,  $Rmil \sigma$  and  $Cyc \sigma$  reduce to  $lr-max(\sigma)$ ,  $rl-min(\sigma)$  and  $cyc(\sigma)$ , respectively.

The Lehmer code [9] of a permutation  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_n$  of  $[n]$  is defined to be the sequence  $Leh \sigma = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ , where

$$a_i = |\{j \mid 1 \leq j \leq i, \sigma_j \leq \sigma_i\}|.$$

Let  $SE_n$  denote the set of integer sequences  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  such that  $1 \leq a_i \leq i$  for all  $i$ . Then  $Leh: S_n \rightarrow SE_n$  is a bijection. Foata and Han [6] defined the A-code of a permutation  $\sigma$  to be a sequence

$$\text{A-code } \sigma = Leh \mathbf{i}\sigma$$

where  $\mathbf{i}: \sigma \mapsto \sigma^{-1}$  denotes the inverse operation on  $S_n$  with respect to product of permutations. For example, for  $\sigma = 31524$ , then  $\mathbf{i}\sigma = 24153$ . Here a permutation  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_n \in S_n$  stands for a one-to-one function on  $[n]$  which maps  $i$  to  $\sigma_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . We multiply permutations from right to left, that is, for  $\pi, \sigma \in S_n$ , we have  $\pi\sigma(i) = \pi(\sigma(i))$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

For an integer sequence  $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \text{SE}_n$ , define  $\text{Max } a$  to be the set  $\{i \mid a_i = i\}$ . Given a permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$ , Foata and Han [6] have shown that the A-code leads to a bijection from  $S_n$  to  $\text{SE}_n$  and the two set-valued statistics  $\text{Rmil}$  and  $\text{Lmap}$  of  $\sigma$  are determined by its A-code, that is,

$$\text{Rmil } \sigma = \text{Max (A-code } \sigma), \quad (2.1)$$

$$\text{Lmap } \sigma = \text{Rmil (A-code } \sigma). \quad (2.2)$$

Following the notation in [6], we rewrite (2.1) and (2.2) as

$$(\text{Rmil}, \text{Lmap}) \sigma = (\text{Max}, \text{Rmil}) \text{ A-code } \sigma. \quad (2.3)$$

Given a permutation  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_n \in S_n$ , the B-code can be defined as follows. For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $k_i$  be the smallest integer  $k \geq 1$  such that  $(\sigma^{-k})(i) \leq i$ , where  $\sigma$  is considered as a bijective function on  $[n]$ . Then  $b_i = (\sigma^{-k_i})(i)$ . In fact, the B-code of a permutation can be easily determined by the cycle decomposition. To compute  $b_i$ , we assume that  $i$  appears in a cycle  $C$ . If  $i$  is the smallest element of  $C$ , then we set  $b_i = i$ . Otherwise, we choose  $b_i$  to be the element  $j$  of  $C$  such that  $j < i$  and  $j$  is the closest to  $i$ . Notice that  $C$  is viewed as a directed cycle and the distance from  $j$  to  $i$  is meant to be the number of steps to reach  $i$  from  $j$  along the cycle. For example, let  $\sigma = 24513$ . Using the cycle decomposition  $\sigma = (1\ 2\ 4)(3\ 5)$ , we get the B-code  $(1, 1, 3, 2, 3)$ .

Foata and Han have shown that the B-code is a bijection from  $S_n$  to  $\text{SE}_n$  and the pair of set-valued statistics  $(\text{Cyc}, \text{Lmap})$  of  $\sigma$  can be determined by the B-code of  $\sigma$ , that is,

$$(\text{Cyc}, \text{Lmap}) \sigma = (\text{Max}, \text{Rmil}) \text{ B-code } \sigma. \quad (2.4)$$

Combining the A-code and the B-code, Foata and Han [6] found a bijection  $\phi$  on  $S_n$  as given by

$$\phi = (\text{B-code})^{-1} \circ \text{A-code}.$$

The bijection  $\phi$  implies the following equidistributions.

**Theorem 2.1 (Foata and Han [6])** *The six pairs of set-valued statistics  $(\text{Cyc}, \text{Rmil})$ ,  $(\text{Cyc}, \text{Lmap})$ ,  $(\text{Rmil}, \text{Lmap})$ ,  $(\text{Lmap}, \text{Rmil})$ ,  $(\text{Lmap}, \text{Cyc})$ ,  $(\text{Rmil}, \text{Cyc})$  are equidistributed over  $S_n$ :*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} S_n & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{i}} & S_n & \xrightarrow{\phi^{-1}} & S_n & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{i}} & S_n & \xrightarrow{\phi} & S_n & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{i}} & S_n \\ \binom{\text{Cyc}}{\text{Rmil}} & & \binom{\text{Cyc}}{\text{Lmap}} & & \binom{\text{Rmil}}{\text{Lmap}} & & \binom{\text{Lmap}}{\text{Rmil}} & & \binom{\text{Lmap}}{\text{Cyc}} & & \binom{\text{Rmil}}{\text{Cyc}} \end{array}.$$

We now turn to the sorting index. Petersen has shown that the pairs of statistics  $(\text{sor}, \text{cyc})$  and  $(\text{inv}, \text{rl-min})$  have the same joint distribution over permutations and asked for a combinatorial interpretation of this fact. We shall show that the map  $\phi$  transforms the pair of statistics  $(\text{inv}, \text{rl-min})$  of a permutation  $\sigma$  to the pair of statistics  $(\text{sor}, \text{cyc})$  of the permutation  $\phi(\sigma)$ . The following lemma shows that the pair of statistics  $(\text{inv}, \text{rl-min})$  of  $\sigma$  can be computed from the A-code of  $\sigma$ .

**Lemma 2.2** *Let  $\sigma$  be a permutation in  $S_n$  with A-code  $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ . Then we have*

$$inv(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^n (i - a_i), \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$rl\text{-}min(\sigma) = |\text{Max } a|. \quad (2.6)$$

*Proof.* By the definition of the A-code, we find

$$inv(\sigma) = \binom{n}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i - 1),$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (i - a_i).$$

From (2.3) it follows that  $rl\text{-}min(\sigma) = |\text{Rmil } \sigma| = |\text{Max } a|$ , as desired.  $\blacksquare$

The following lemma shows that the pair of statistics  $(sor, cyc)$  of  $\sigma$  can be recovered from the B-code.

**Lemma 2.3** *Let  $\sigma$  be a permutation in  $S_n$  with B-code  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ . Then we have*

$$sor(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^n (i - b_i), \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$cyc(\sigma) = |\text{Max } b|. \quad (2.8)$$

*Proof.* Let us examine the algorithm of Foata and Han to recover a permutation  $\sigma$  from its B-code  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n) \in \text{SE}_n$ . Start with the identity permutation  $\sigma^{(0)} = 12 \cdots n$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the permutation  $\sigma^{(i)}$  is obtained by exchanging  $i$  and the letter at the  $b_i$ -th place in  $\sigma^{(i-1)}$ . Notice that it may happen that  $i = b_i$ . Then the resulting permutation  $\sigma^{(n)}$  is precisely the permutation with B-code  $b$ , that is,  $\sigma = \sigma^{(n)}$ . So we may write  $\sigma^{(i)} = \sigma^{(i-1)}(b_i, i)$ , where  $(b_i, i)$  is called a transposition even when  $b_i = i$ . Thus we obtain a decomposition of  $\sigma$  into transpositions

$$\sigma = (b_1, 1)(b_2, 2) \cdots (b_n, n).$$

Then by the definition of the sorting index, we see that

$$sor(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^n (i - b_i).$$

It follows from (2.4) that  $cyc(\sigma) = |\text{Cyc } \sigma| = |\text{Max } b|$ . This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Combining Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, we conclude that the bijection  $\phi = (\text{B-code})^{-1} \circ \text{A-code}$  transforms  $(inv, rl\text{-}min)$  to  $(sor, cyc)$ , that is, for any  $\sigma \in S_n$ ,

$$(inv, rl\text{-}min) \sigma = (sor, cyc) \phi(\sigma).$$

By Theorem 2.1, the bijection  $\phi$  preserves the set-valued statistic  $\text{Lmap}$ . Since

$$lr\text{-}max(\sigma) = |\text{Lmap } \sigma|,$$

$\phi$  preserves the statistic  $lr\text{-}max$ . Observing that

$$rl\text{-}min(\sigma) = lr\text{-}max(\mathbf{i}\sigma),$$

we arrive at the following equidistributions.

**Theorem 2.4** *The four pairs of statistics  $(sor, cyc)$ ,  $(inv, rl\text{-}min)$ ,  $(inv, lr\text{-}max)$  and  $(sor, lr\text{-}max)$  are equidistributed over  $S_n$ :*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} S_n & \xrightarrow{\phi^{-1}} & S_n & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{i}} & S_n & \xrightarrow{\phi} & S_n \\ \binom{sor}{cyc} & & \binom{inv}{rl\text{-}min} & & \binom{inv}{lr\text{-}max} & & \binom{sor}{lr\text{-}max}. \end{array}$$

### 3 A bijection on signed permutations

In this section, we construct a bijection which serves as a combinatorial interpretation of the equidistribution of the pairs of statistics  $(inv_B, nmin_B)$  and  $(sor_B, l'_B)$  over signed permutations. In fact, this bijection implies the equidistribution of  $(inv_B, \text{Lmap}_B, \text{Rmil}_B)$  and  $(sor_B, \text{Lmap}_B, \text{Cyc}_B)$  over  $B_n$ . Moreover, we show that the six pairs of set-valued statistics  $(\text{Cyc}_B, \text{Rmil}_B)$ ,  $(\text{Cyc}_B, \text{Lmap}_B)$ ,  $(\text{Rmil}_B, \text{Lmap}_B)$ ,  $(\text{Lmap}_B, \text{Rmil}_B)$ ,  $(\text{Lmap}_B, \text{Cyc}_B)$  and  $(\text{Rmil}_B, \text{Cyc}_B)$  are equidistributed over  $B_n$ .

Let us recall some definitions. The hyperoctahedral group  $B_n$  is the group of bijections  $\sigma$  on  $\{1, 2, \dots, n, \bar{1}, \bar{2}, \dots, \bar{n}\}$  such that  $\sigma(\bar{i}) = \overline{\sigma(i)}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , where  $\bar{i}$  denotes  $-i$ . Clearly, one can represent an element  $\sigma \in B_n$  by a signed permutation  $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n$  of  $[n]$ , that is, a permutation of  $[n]$  with some elements associated with the minus sign.

The group  $B_n$  has the following Coxeter generators

$$S^B = \{(\bar{1}, 1), (1, 2), (2, 3), \dots, (n-1, n)\}.$$

The set of reflections of  $B_n$  is

$$T^B = \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \cup \{(\bar{i}, j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\},$$

where the transposition  $(i, j)$  means to exchange  $i$  and  $j$  and exchange  $\bar{i}$  with  $\bar{j}$  provided that  $i \neq \bar{j}$ , and  $(\bar{i}, i)$  means to exchange  $i$  and  $\bar{i}$ . For  $\sigma \in B_n$ , let  $N(\sigma)$  denote the number of negative elements in the signed permutation notation.

As for permutations, Petersen [10] defined the sorting index for a signed permutation. Let  $\sigma$  be a signed permutation in  $B_n$ . By using the straight selection sort algorithm [8] of type  $B$ , Petersen has shown that  $\sigma$  has a unique factorization into a product of signed transpositions in  $T^B$ :

$$\sigma = (i_1, j_1)(i_2, j_2) \cdots (i_m, j_m), \quad (3.1)$$

where  $0 < j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_m \leq n$ . Then the sorting index of  $\sigma$  is defined by

$$sor_B(\sigma) = \sum_{r=1}^m (j_r - i_r - \chi(i_r < 0)).$$

For example, let  $\sigma = 5\bar{4}\bar{3}1\bar{2}$ . Then we have

$$\sigma = (\bar{1}, 2)(\bar{3}, 3)(\bar{2}, 4)(1, 5)$$

and  $sor_B(\sigma) = 2 - (-1) - 1 + 3 - (-3) - 1 + 4 - (-2) - 1 + 5 - 1 = 16$ .

For a signed permutation  $\sigma \in B_n$ , the length of  $\sigma$ , denoted  $l_B(\sigma)$ , is defined to be the minimal number of transpositions in  $S^B$  needed to express  $\sigma$ , see [1]. The reflection length of  $\sigma$ , denoted  $l'_B(\sigma)$ , is the minimal number of transpositions in  $T^B$  needed to express  $\sigma$ . The type  $B$  inversion number of  $\sigma$ , denoted  $inv_B(\sigma)$ , also denoted  $finv$  in [7], is defined as

$$inv_B(\sigma) = |\{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \sigma_i > \sigma_j\}| + |\{(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n, \bar{\sigma}_i > \sigma_j\}|.$$

Like the case of type  $A$ , we have  $inv_B(\sigma) = l_B(\sigma)$ , see [1, Section 8.1].

Recall that for a permutation  $\pi \in S_n$ , we have  $l'(\pi) = n - cyc(\pi)$ . Similarly, the reflection length of a signed permutation can be determined from its cycle decomposition. A signed permutation  $\sigma$  can be expressed as a product of disjoint signed cycles, see, Brenti [2], Chen and Stanley [3]. For example, let  $\sigma = \bar{6}\bar{7}4\bar{3}51\bar{2}$ . Then  $\sigma$  can be written as  $\sigma = (1\bar{6})(5)(\bar{7}\bar{2})(4\bar{3})$ . A signed cycle is said to be balanced if it contains an even number of minus signs, see [3]. Let  $cyc_B(\sigma)$  denote the number of balanced cycles of  $\sigma$ . It is not difficult to see that  $l'_B(\sigma) = n - cyc_B(\sigma)$ .

We introduce some set-valued statistics for signed permutations which are analogous to those for permutations. For a signed permutation  $\sigma$ , let  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_r$  be the balanced signed cycles of  $\sigma$ . Let  $c_i$  be the smallest absolute value of elements of  $C_i$ . Define  $Cyc_B$  to be the set  $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_r\}$ .

Let  $\omega = \omega_1\omega_2 \cdots \omega_n$  be a word of length  $n$ , where  $\omega_i$  is an integer. The left to right maximum place set of  $\omega$ , denoted  $Lmap_B \omega$ , and the right to left minimum letter set of  $\omega$ , denoted  $Rmil_B \omega$ , are defined as follows,

$$Lmap_B \omega = \{i \mid \omega_i > |\omega_j| \text{ for any } j < i\},$$

$$\text{Rmil}_B \omega = \{\omega_i \mid 0 < \omega_i < |\omega_j| \text{ for any } j > i\}.$$

When  $\sigma$  is a signed permutation, the cardinality of  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma$  is denoted by  $lr\text{-max}_B(\sigma)$  and the cardinality of  $\text{Rmil}_B \sigma$  is denoted by  $rl\text{-min}_B(\sigma)$ . Let

$$n\text{min}_B(\sigma) = |\{i : \sigma_i > |\sigma_j| \text{ for some } j > i\}| + N(\sigma)$$

and

$$n\text{max}_B(\sigma) = |\{i : 0 < \sigma_i < |\sigma_j| \text{ for some } j < i\}| + N(\sigma).$$

Evidently,  $n\text{min}_B(\sigma) = n - rl\text{-min}_B(\sigma)$  and  $n\text{max}_B(\sigma) = n - lr\text{-max}_B(\sigma)$ .

The following theorem is due to Petersen [10].

**Theorem 3.1** *The pairs of statistics  $(inv_B, n\text{min}_B)$  and  $(sor_B, l'_B)$  are equidistributed over  $B_n$ :*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in B_n} q^{sor_B(\sigma)} t^{l'_B(\sigma)} = \sum_{\sigma \in B_n} q^{inv_B(\sigma)} t^{n\text{min}_B(\sigma)}.$$

Petersen presented two different factorizations of the diagonal sum  $\sum_{\sigma \in B_n} \sigma$  and showed that the two sides of the above equation are both equal to

$$B_n(q, t) = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 + t[2i]_q - t).$$

We shall construct a bijection  $\psi: B_n \rightarrow B_n$  which transforms  $(inv_B, \text{Lmap}_B, \text{Rmil}_B)$  to  $(sor_B, \text{Lmap}_B, \text{Cyc}_B)$ . This bijection can be described in terms of two codes, the A-code and the B-code for signed permutations. For a signed permutation  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_n \in B_n$ , let  $\mathbf{i}: \sigma \mapsto \sigma^{-1}$  denote the inverse operation on  $B_n$  with respect to product of signed permutations. We define the Lehmer code of the signed permutation  $\sigma$  to be the integer sequence  $\text{Leh } \sigma = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ , where for each  $i$ ,

$$a_i = \text{sign } \sigma_i \cdot |\{j \mid 1 \leq j \leq i, |\sigma_j| \leq |\sigma_i|\}|.$$

Then the A-code of a signed permutation  $\sigma$  is defined to be an integer sequence

$$\text{A-code } \sigma = \text{Leh } \mathbf{i}\sigma.$$

Let  $\text{SE}_n^B$  be the set of integer sequences  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  such that  $a_i \in [-i, i] \setminus \{0\}$ . For an integer sequence  $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \text{SE}_n^B$ ,  $\text{Max } a$  stands for the set  $\{i \mid a_i = i\}$ .

The following proposition shows that the two set-valued statistics  $\text{Rmil}_B$  and  $\text{Lmap}_B$  for a signed permutation  $\sigma$  can be recovered from the Lehmer code of  $\sigma$ . The proof is straightforward, and hence it is omitted.

**Proposition 3.2** Leh:  $B_n \longrightarrow \text{SE}_n^{\text{B}}$  is a bijection and for each  $\sigma \in B_n$ , we have

$$\text{Rmil}_{\text{B}} \text{Leh } \sigma = \text{Rmil}_{\text{B}} \sigma, \quad (3.2)$$

and

$$\text{Max Leh } \sigma = \text{Lmap}_{\text{B}} \sigma. \quad (3.3)$$

For example, let  $\sigma = 5\bar{7}1\bar{4}9\bar{2}\bar{6}\bar{3}8$ . Then we have

$$\text{Leh } \sigma = (1, -2, 1, -2, 5, -2, -5, 3, 8)$$

and

$$\text{Rmil}_{\text{B}} \text{Leh } \sigma = \text{Rmil}_{\text{B}} \sigma = \{1, 3, 8\},$$

$$\text{Max Leh } \sigma = \text{Lmap}_{\text{B}} \sigma = \{1, 5\}.$$

The above proposition implies that the A-code is a bijection from  $B_n$  to  $\text{SE}_n^{\text{B}}$ . It is easy to see that  $\text{Rmil}_{\text{B}} \mathbf{i}\sigma = \text{Lmap}_{\text{B}} \sigma$  and  $\text{Rmil}_{\text{B}} \sigma = \text{Lmap}_{\text{B}} \mathbf{i}\sigma$ . So we are led to the following theorem which shows that the two set-valued statistics  $\text{Rmil}_{\text{B}}$  and  $\text{Lmap}_{\text{B}}$  for a signed permutation  $\sigma$  can be determined by the A-code of  $\sigma$ .

**Theorem 3.3** For any  $\sigma \in B_n$ , we have

$$(\text{Rmil}_{\text{B}}, \text{Lmap}_{\text{B}}) \sigma = (\text{Max}, \text{Rmil}_{\text{B}}) \text{A-code } \sigma. \quad (3.4)$$

Next we define the B-code for a signed permutation. Let  $\sigma = \sigma_1\sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_n \in B_n$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $k_i$  be the smallest integer  $k \geq 1$  such that  $|\sigma^{-k}(i)| \leq i$ . We define the B-code of  $\sigma$  to be the integer sequence  $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$  with  $b_i = (\sigma^{-k_i})(i)$ . For example, the B-code of the signed permutation  $\sigma = 3\bar{1}\bar{6}\bar{5}42$  is  $(1, -1, 1, -4, -4, -3)$ .

The B-code of a signed permutation can be also defined recursively as follows. First, the B-codes of the two signed permutations of  $B_1$  are defined as B-code  $1 = (1)$  and B-code  $\bar{1} = (-1)$ . For  $n \geq 2$ , we write a signed permutation  $\sigma \in B_n$  as a product of disjoint signed cycles. There are two cases.

- Case 1. Assume that  $n$  has a positive sign in  $\sigma$  or  $\sigma_n = \bar{n}$ . Let  $\sigma' \in B_{n-1}$  be the signed permutation obtained from  $\sigma$  by deleting  $n$  (or  $\bar{n}$ ) in its cycle decomposition. Here if  $n$  (or  $\bar{n}$ ) is in a cycle of length 1, we just delete this cycle. Let  $b' = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})$  be the B-code of  $\sigma'$ . Then we define the B-code of  $\sigma$  to be  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, \sigma^{-1}(n))$ .
- Case 2. Assume that  $n$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma_n \neq \bar{n}$ . Changing the sign of  $\sigma_n$  and deleting  $\bar{n}$  in the cycle decomposition of  $\sigma$ , we obtain a signed permutation in  $B_{n-1}$ , denoted by  $\sigma'$ . Let  $b' = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})$  be the B-code of  $\sigma'$ . Then we define the B-code of  $\sigma$  to be  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, \sigma^{-1}(n))$ .

The following theorem shows that the set-valued statistics  $\text{Lmap}_B$  and  $\text{Cyc}_B$  of a signed permutation can be computed from the B-code.

**Theorem 3.4** *The B-code is a bijection from  $B_n$  to  $\text{SE}_n^B$ . Furthermore, for any  $\sigma \in B_n$ , we have*

$$(\text{Cyc}_B, \text{Lmap}_B) \sigma = (\text{Max}, \text{Rmil}_B) \text{B-code } \sigma. \quad (3.5)$$

*Proof.* From the recursive definition, it is readily seen that the B-code is a bijection from  $B_n$  to  $\text{SE}_n^B$ . We shall use induction on  $n$  to prove (3.5). Clearly, the statement holds for  $n = 1$ . Assume that (3.5) holds for  $n - 1$ , where  $n \geq 2$ . Let  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_n$  be a signed permutation of  $B_n$  with B-code  $b$ . Assume that  $\sigma'$  is the signed permutation of  $B_{n-1}$  given in the recursive definition of the B-code. Let  $b' = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})$  be the B-code of  $\sigma'$ .

Now we claim that  $\text{Cyc}_B \sigma = \text{Max } b$ . There are two cases according to the sign of  $n$  in  $\sigma$ .

First, we consider the case when  $n$  has a positive sign in  $\sigma$ . If  $\sigma_n \neq n$ , let  $t = \sigma^{-1}(n)$ . Since  $\sigma'$  is obtained from  $\sigma$  by deleting  $n$  in its cycle form, the B-code of  $\sigma$  is  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, t)$ . Since  $0 < t < n$ , we have  $\text{Cyc}_B \sigma = \text{Cyc}_B \sigma'$  and  $\text{Max } b' = \text{Max } b$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $\text{Cyc}_B \sigma' = \text{Max } b'$ . Hence  $\text{Cyc}_B \sigma = \text{Max } b$ . If  $\sigma_n = n$ , it can be easily checked that

$$\text{Cyc}_B \sigma = \text{Cyc}_B \sigma' \cup \{n\} = \text{Max } b' \cup \{n\} = \text{Max } b.$$

Then we consider the case when  $n$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma$ . If  $\sigma_n = \bar{n}$ , it is easy to see that

$$\text{Cyc}_B \sigma = \text{Cyc}_B \sigma' = \text{Max } b' = \text{Max } b.$$

If  $\sigma_n \neq \bar{n}$ , let  $t = \sigma^{-1}(n)$ . Since  $n$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma$ , we have  $t < 0$ . Since  $b' = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})$  is the B-code of  $\sigma'$ , we find that the B-code of  $\sigma$  is  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, t)$ . Since  $-n < t < 0$ , we have  $\text{Cyc}_B \sigma = \text{Cyc}_B \sigma'$  and  $\text{Max } b' = \text{Max } b$ . By the induction hypothesis, we get  $\text{Cyc}_B \sigma' = \text{Max } b'$ . Thus we obtain  $\text{Cyc}_B \sigma = \text{Max } b$ .

We now turn to the proof of the relation  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Rmil}_B b$ . There are four cases.

Case 1:  $\sigma_n = n - 1$ . By the recursive definition of the B-code, we express  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$  in the one-line notation as follows. For convenience, we display the identity permutation on the top,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \cdots & |\sigma^{-1}(n)| & \cdots & n-1 & & n \\ \sigma = & \sigma_1 & \cdots & v \cdot n & \cdots & \sigma_{n-1} & n-1 \\ \sigma' = & \sigma_1 & \cdots & v \cdot (n-1) & \cdots & \sigma_{n-1}. & \end{array}$$

Here  $v = 1$  if  $n$  has a positive sign in  $\sigma$  and  $v = -1$  if  $n$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma$ . It can be readily seen that  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Lmap}_B \sigma'$ . Since  $b' = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})$  is the B-code of  $\sigma'$ ,

we have  $b_{n-1} = \sigma^{-1}(n)$  and the B-code of  $\sigma$  is  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, \sigma^{-1}(n))$ . It follows that  $\text{Rmil}_B b = \text{Rmil}_B b'$ . By the induction hypothesis, we get  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma' = \text{Rmil}_B b'$ . Hence we deduce that  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Rmil}_B b$ .

Case 2:  $\sigma_n = \overline{n-1}$ . If  $n$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma$ , let  $t$  be the positive integer such that  $\sigma_t = \bar{n}$ . As in Case 1, we express  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$  as follows

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} & 1 & \cdots & t & \cdots & n-1 & n \\ \sigma = & \sigma_1 & \cdots & \bar{n} & \cdots & \sigma_{n-1} & \overline{n-1} \\ \sigma' = & \sigma_1 & \cdots & n-1 & \cdots & \sigma_{n-1}. \end{array}$$

Clearly,  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Lmap}_B \sigma' \setminus \{t\}$ . Since  $b' = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})$  is the B-code of  $\sigma'$ , we have  $b_{n-1} = \sigma'^{-1}(n-1) = t$ . From the recursive construction of the B-code, it follows that the B-code of  $\sigma$  is  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, -t)$ . This implies that  $\text{Rmil}_B b = \text{Rmil}_B b' \setminus \{t\}$ . By the induction hypothesis, we obtain  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma' = \text{Rmil}_B b'$ . Therefore  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Rmil}_B b$ . If  $n$  has a positive sign in  $\sigma$ , let  $t$  be the positive integer such that  $\sigma_t = n$ . Then  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$  can be expressed as follows

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} & 1 & \cdots & t & \cdots & n-1 & n \\ \sigma = & \sigma_1 & \cdots & n & \cdots & \sigma_{n-1} & \overline{n-1} \\ \sigma' = & \sigma_1 & \cdots & \overline{n-1} & \cdots & \sigma_{n-1}. \end{array}$$

In this case, we have  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Lmap}_B \sigma' \cup \{t\}$ . Since  $b' = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})$  is the B-code of  $\sigma'$ , then  $b_{n-1} = -t$  and the B-code of  $\sigma$  is  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, t)$ . It follows that  $\text{Rmil}_B b = \text{Rmil}_B b' \cup \{t\}$ . By the induction hypothesis, we deduce that  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma' = \text{Rmil}_B b'$ . So we arrive at  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Rmil}_B b$ .

Case 3:  $\sigma_n \neq n-1$ ,  $\sigma_n \neq \overline{n-1}$  and  $|\sigma^{-1}(n-1)| < |\sigma^{-1}(n)|$ . If  $n$  has a positive sign in  $\sigma$ , let  $\sigma_t = n$ . Following the similar argument as in Case 2, we have  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Lmap}_B \sigma' \cup \{t\}$  and  $\text{Rmil}_B b = \text{Rmil}_B b' \cup \{t\}$ . By the induction hypothesis, we deduce that  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma' = \text{Rmil}_B b'$ . Hence  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Rmil}_B b$ . If  $n$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma$ , it can be verified that  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Lmap}_B \sigma'$  and  $\text{Rmil}_B b = \text{Rmil}_B b'$ . Therefore, we obtain  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Rmil}_B b$ .

Case 4:  $\sigma_n \neq n-1$ ,  $\sigma_n \neq \overline{n-1}$  and  $|\sigma^{-1}(n-1)| > |\sigma^{-1}(n)|$ . If  $n$  has a positive sign in  $\sigma$ , let  $\sigma_t = n$ . We write  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma'$  as follows

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} & 1 & \cdots & t & \cdots & |\sigma^{-1}(n-1)| & \cdots & n-1 & n \\ \sigma = & \sigma_1 & \cdots & n & \cdots & v_{n-1} \cdot (n-1) & \cdots & \sigma_{n-1} & \sigma_n \\ \sigma' = & \sigma_1 & \cdots & \sigma_n & \cdots & v_{n-1} \cdot (n-1) & \cdots & \sigma_{n-1}, \end{array}$$

where  $v_{n-1} = 1$  if  $n-1$  appears as an element in  $\sigma$  and  $v_{n-1} = -1$  if  $\overline{n-1}$  appears as an element in  $\sigma$ . It can be seen that

$$\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = (\text{Lmap}_B \sigma' \cap [1, t-1]) \cup \{t\}.$$

Since  $b' = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})$  is the B-code of  $\sigma'$ , we have  $b_{n-1} = \sigma^{-1}(n-1)$  and the B-code of  $\sigma$  is  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1}, t)$ . Hence we get

$$\text{Rmil}_B b = (\text{Rmil}_B b' \cap [1, t-1]) \cup \{t\}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, we obtain  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma' = \text{Rmil}_B b'$ . Thus we get  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Rmil}_B b$ . If  $n$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma$ , it can be checked that  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Lmap}_B \sigma' \cap [1, -\sigma^{-1}(n) - 1]$  and  $\text{Rmil}_B b = \text{Rmil}_B b' \cap [1, -\sigma^{-1}(n) - 1]$ . By the induction hypothesis, we conclude that  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Rmil}_B b$ . This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

In fact, it can be shown that the pair of statistics  $(\text{inv}_B, \text{nmin}_B)$  of a signed permutation  $\sigma$  can be recovered from its A-code and the pair of statistics  $(\text{sor}_B, l'_B)$  can be recovered from its B-code.

We now describe how to recover a signed permutation  $\sigma$  from its A-code  $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \text{SE}_n^B$ . It is essentially the same as the procedure to recover a permutation from the inversion code.

We start with the empty word  $\sigma^{(0)}$ , then it will take  $n$  steps to construct a signed permutation  $\sigma$  with A-code  $a$ . At the first step, if  $a_1 = 1$ , then set  $\sigma^{(1)} = 1$ . If  $a_1 = -1$ , then set  $\sigma^{(1)} = \bar{1}$ . For  $1 < i \leq n$ , assume that at step  $i$ , we have constructed a signed permutation  $\sigma^{(i-1)} \in B_{i-1}$ . If  $|a_i| = 1$ , the signed permutation  $\sigma^{(i)}$  is obtained by inserting the element  $i$  with a sign of  $a_i$  before the first element of  $\sigma^{(i-1)}$ . If  $|a_i| > 1$ , then the signed permutation  $\sigma^{(i)}$  is obtained from  $\sigma^{(i-1)}$  by inserting the element  $i$  with a sign of  $a_i$  immediately after the  $(|a_i| - 1)$ -th element in  $\sigma^{(i-1)}$ . Eventually, the signed permutation  $\sigma^{(n)}$  is a signed permutation  $\sigma$  with A-code  $a$ . For example,  $a = (1, 1, -3, -2, 3)$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{(0)} &= \emptyset, \\ a_1 = 1, \quad \sigma^{(1)} &= 1, \\ a_2 = 1, \quad \sigma^{(2)} &= 2\ 1, \\ a_3 = -3, \quad \sigma^{(3)} &= 2\ 1\ \bar{3}, \\ a_4 = -2, \quad \sigma^{(4)} &= 2\ \bar{4}\ 1\ \bar{3}, \\ a_5 = 3, \quad \sigma^{(5)} &= 2\ \bar{4}\ 5\ 1\ \bar{3}. \end{aligned}$$

So the signed permutation  $2\ \bar{4}\ 5\ 1\ \bar{3}$  corresponds to the A-code  $(1, 1, -3, -2, 3)$ .

The relationship between a signed permutation  $\sigma$  and its B-code  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$  can be described as follows. Let  $\sigma'$  be the signed permutation obtained from  $\sigma$  as in the recursive construction of the B-code. So the B-code of  $\sigma'$  is  $b' = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{n-1})$ . If  $n$  has a positive sign in  $\sigma$  or  $\sigma_n = \bar{n}$ , then  $\sigma'$  is obtained from  $\sigma$  by deleting  $n$  in its cycle decomposition. Let  $(i, i)$  denote the identity permutation for any  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Since  $b_n = \sigma^{-1}(n)$ , we have  $\sigma = \sigma'(b_n, n)$ . We note here that  $\sigma'$  is considered as a signed permutation of  $B_n$  which maps  $n$  to  $n$ . If  $n$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma$  and  $\sigma_n \neq \bar{n}$ , then  $\sigma'$  is obtained from  $\sigma$  by changing the sign of  $\sigma_n$  and deleting  $\bar{n}$  in its cycle

decomposition. Since  $b_n = \sigma^{-1}(n)$ , it is readily seen that  $\sigma = \sigma'(b_n, n)$ . Again here  $\sigma'$  is considered as a signed permutation of  $B_n$  which maps  $n$  to  $n$ . Hence we obtain that  $\sigma = (b_1, 1)(b_2, 2) \cdots (b_n, n)$ .

The following lemma gives expressions of  $inv_B(\sigma)$  and  $nmin_B(\sigma)$  in terms of the A-code of  $\sigma$ .

**Lemma 3.5** *For a signed permutation  $\sigma \in B_n$  with A-code  $a = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ , we have*

$$inv_B(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^n (i - a_i - \chi(a_i < 0)) \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$nmin_B(\sigma) = n - |\text{Max } a|. \quad (3.7)$$

*Proof.* Consider the procedure to recover a signed permutation from the A-code  $a$ . It is easily seen that after the  $i$ -th step, the type  $B$  inversion number increases by  $i - a_i$  when  $a_i > 0$  and by  $i - a_i - 1$  when  $a_i < 0$ . Hence we have

$$inv_B(\sigma^{(i)}) - inv_B(\sigma^{(i-1)}) = i - a_i - \chi(a_i < 0).$$

Since  $inv_B(\sigma^{(0)}) = 0$ , we find

$$inv_B(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^n (i - a_i - \chi(a_i < 0)).$$

In view of (3.4), it is easy to see that  $nmin_B(\sigma) = n - rl-min_B(\sigma) = n - |\text{Rmil}_B \sigma| = n - |\text{Max } a|$ . This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

The following lemma shows that  $sor_B(\sigma)$  and  $l'_B(\sigma)$  can be expressed in terms of the B-code of  $\sigma$ .

**Lemma 3.6** *For a signed permutation  $\sigma \in B_n$  with B-code  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ , we have*

$$sor_B(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^n (i - b_i - \chi(b_i < 0)) \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$l'_B(\sigma) = n - |\text{Max } b|. \quad (3.9)$$

*Proof.* Since  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$  is the B-code of  $\sigma$ , it has been shown that

$$\sigma = (b_1, 1)(b_2, 2) \cdots (b_n, n).$$

By the definition of the sorting index of  $\sigma$ , we see that

$$sor_B(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^n (i - b_i - \chi(b_i < 0)).$$

From (3.5) it follows that  $l'_B(\sigma) = n - cyc_B(\sigma) = n - |\text{Cyc}_B \sigma| = n - |\text{Max } b|$ . This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

Combining Theorem 3.3, Theorem 3.4, Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6, we obtain the equidistribution of  $(inv_B, \text{Lmap}_B, \text{Rmil}_B)$  and  $(sor_B, \text{Lmap}_B, \text{Cyc}_B)$  over  $B_n$ .

**Theorem 3.7** *The map  $\psi: B_n \rightarrow B_n$  defined by  $\psi = (\text{B-code})^{-1} \circ \text{A-code}$  is a bijection. For any  $\sigma \in B_n$ , we have*

$$(inv_B, \text{Lmap}_B, \text{Rmil}_B) \sigma = (sor_B, \text{Lmap}_B, \text{Cyc}_B) \psi(\sigma). \quad (3.10)$$

In particular,

$$(inv_B, nmin_B) \sigma = (sor_B, l'_B) \psi(\sigma). \quad (3.11)$$

Notice that  $\text{Cyc}_B \sigma = \text{Cyc}_B \mathbf{i}\sigma$  and  $\text{Lmap}_B \sigma = \text{Rmil}_B \mathbf{i}\sigma$ . Thus Theorem 3.7 implies the following equidistributions which can be viewed as type  $B$  analogues of the equidistributions given in Theorem 2.1.

**Theorem 3.8** *The six pairs of set-valued statistics  $(\text{Cyc}_B, \text{Rmil}_B)$ ,  $(\text{Cyc}_B, \text{Lmap}_B)$ ,  $(\text{Rmil}_B, \text{Lmap}_B)$ ,  $(\text{Lmap}_B, \text{Rmil}_B)$ ,  $(\text{Lmap}_B, \text{Cyc}_B)$  and  $(\text{Rmil}_B, \text{Cyc}_B)$  are equidistributed over  $B_n$ :*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} B_n & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{i}} & B_n & \xrightarrow{\psi^{-1}} & B_n & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{i}} & B_n & \xrightarrow{\psi} & B_n & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{i}} & B_n \\ \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Cyc}_B \\ \text{Rmil}_B \end{array} \right) & & \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Cyc}_B \\ \text{Lmap}_B \end{array} \right) & & \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Rmil}_B \\ \text{Lmap}_B \end{array} \right) & & \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Lmap}_B \\ \text{Rmil}_B \end{array} \right) & & \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Lmap}_B \\ \text{Cyc}_B \end{array} \right) & & \left( \begin{array}{c} \text{Rmil}_B \\ \text{Cyc}_B \end{array} \right). \end{array}$$

The above theorem for set-valued statistics reduces to the following equidistributions of pairs of statistics of signed permutations. It is clear that  $nmin_B(\sigma) = nmax_B(\mathbf{i}\sigma)$ . Since the bijection  $\psi$  preserves  $\text{Lmap}_B$ , it is easy to see that  $\psi$  also preserves the statistic  $nmax_B$ . Hence we are led to the following assertion.

**Corollary 3.9** *The four pairs of statistics  $(sor_B, l'_B)$ ,  $(inv_B, nmin_B)$ ,  $(inv_B, nmax_B)$  and  $(sor_B, nmax_B)$  are equidistributed over  $B_n$ :*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} B_n & \xrightarrow{\psi^{-1}} & B_n & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{i}} & B_n & \xrightarrow{\psi} & B_n \\ \left( \begin{array}{c} sor_B \\ l'_B \end{array} \right) & & \left( \begin{array}{c} inv_B \\ nmin_B \end{array} \right) & & \left( \begin{array}{c} inv_B \\ nmax_B \end{array} \right) & & \left( \begin{array}{c} sor_B \\ nmax_B \end{array} \right). \end{array}$$

## 4 A bijection on $D_n$

In this section, we define two statistics  $nmin_D$  and  $\tilde{l}'_D$  for elements of a Coxeter group of type  $D$  and we construct a bijection to derive the equidistribution of the pairs of statistics  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  and  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$ . This yields a refinement of Petersen's equidistribution of  $inv_D$  and  $sor_D$ .

The type  $D$  Coxeter group  $D_n$  is the subgroup of  $B_n$  consisting of signed permutations with an even number of minus signs in the signed permutation notation. As a set of generators for  $D_n$ , we take

$$S^D = \{(\bar{1}, 2), (1, 2), (2, 3), \dots, (n-1, n)\}.$$

For simplicity, let  $s_i = (i, i+1)$  for  $1 \leq i < n$  and  $s_{\bar{1}} = (\bar{1}, 2)$ . The set of reflections of  $D_n$  is

$$R^D = \{(i, j) : 1 \leq |i| < j \leq n\}.$$

For  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_n \in D_n$ , the type  $D$  inversion number of  $\sigma$  is given by

$$inv_D(\sigma) = |\{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \sigma_i > \sigma_j\}| + |\{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \bar{\sigma}_i > \sigma_j\}|.$$

The length of  $\sigma$ , denoted  $l_D(\sigma)$ , is the minimal number of transpositions in  $S^D$  needed to express  $\sigma$ . It is known that  $l_D(\sigma) = inv_D(\sigma)$ , see [1, Section 8.2].

It is well-known that the generating function of  $l_D$  is

$$\sum_{\sigma \in D_n} q^{l_D(\sigma)} = [n]_q \prod_{r=1}^{n-1} [2r]_q, \quad (4.1)$$

see [1].

Recall that the set of reflections of  $B_n$  is

$$T^B = \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \cup \{(\bar{i}, j) : 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\}.$$

For  $\sigma \in D_n$ , it has a unique factorization into a product of signed transpositions in  $T^B$ :

$$\sigma = (i_1, j_1)(i_2, j_2) \cdots (i_k, j_k), \quad (4.2)$$

where  $0 < j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_k \leq n$ . Petersen defined the type  $D$  sorting index of  $\sigma$  as

$$sor_D(\sigma) = \sum_{r=1}^k (j_r - i_r - 2\chi(i_r < 0)).$$

It has been shown by Petersen that  $sor_D$  has the same generating function as  $inv_D$ .

**Theorem 4.1** For  $n \geq 4$ ,

$$\sum_{\sigma \in D_n} q^{sor_D(\sigma)} = [n]_q \prod_{r=1}^{n-1} [2r]_q. \quad (4.3)$$

Thus,  $sor_D$  is Mahonian.

Next we define two statistics  $\tilde{l}'_D$  and  $nmin_D$  for a signed permutation  $\sigma \in D_n$ . For  $1 \leq |i| < j \leq n$ , we adopt the notation  $t_{ij}$  for the transposition  $(i, j)$ . For  $1 < i \leq n$ , we define  $t_{\bar{i}i} = (\bar{i}, i)(\bar{1}, 1)$ . Then we set

$$T^D = \{t_{ij} : 1 \leq |i| < j \leq n\} \cup \{t_{\bar{i}i} : 1 < i \leq n\}.$$

We denote by  $\tilde{l}'_D(\sigma)$  the minimal number of elements in  $T^D$  that are needed to express  $\sigma$ . Define the statistic  $nmin_D$  as follows

$$nmin_D(\sigma) = |\{i : \sigma_i > |\sigma_j| \text{ for some } j > i\}| + N(\sigma \setminus \{\bar{1}\}),$$

where  $N(\sigma \setminus \{\bar{1}\})$  is the number of minus signs associated with elements greater than 1 in the signed permutation notation of  $\sigma$ .

The following theorem is a refinement of the equidistribution of  $inv_D$  and  $sor_D$ . We shall give a combinatorial proof and an algebraic proof.

**Theorem 4.2** For  $n \geq 2$ , the two pairs of statistics  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  and  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$  are equidistributed over  $D_n$ . Moreover, we have

$$\sum_{\sigma \in D_n} q^{inv_D(\sigma)} t^{nmin_D(\sigma)} = \prod_{r=1}^{n-1} (1 + q^r t + qt \cdot [2r]_q), \quad (4.4)$$

$$\sum_{\sigma \in D_n} q^{sor_D(\sigma)} t^{\tilde{l}'_D(\sigma)} = \prod_{r=1}^{n-1} (1 + q^r t + qt \cdot [2r]_q). \quad (4.5)$$

To give a combinatorial proof of the equidistribution of  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  and  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$  in Theorem 4.2, we introduce the co-sorting index  $sor'_D$  which turns out to be equivalent to the sorting index  $sor_D$ . To define the co-sorting index, we need the factorization of an element  $\sigma \in D_n$  into elements in  $T^D$ . More precisely, similarly as (3.1), we can uniquely express  $\sigma \in D_n$  as

$$\sigma = t_{i_1 j_1} t_{i_2 j_2} \cdots t_{i_m j_m},$$

where  $1 < j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_m \leq n$ . For example, let  $\sigma = \bar{2} \bar{4} 5 \bar{1} \bar{3}$ . Then we have  $\sigma = t_{12} t_{\bar{3}3} t_{\bar{2}4} t_{35}$ . Then the co-sorting index of  $\sigma$  is defined by

$$sor'_D(\sigma) = \sum_{r=1}^m (j_r - i_r - 2\chi(i_r < 0)).$$

**Lemma 4.3** For any  $\sigma \in D_n$ , we have  $\text{sor}_D(\sigma) = \text{sor}'_D(\sigma)$ .

*Proof.* Write  $\sigma$  in the following form

$$\sigma = t_{i_1 j_1} t_{i_2 j_2} \cdots t_{i_m j_m}, \quad (4.6)$$

where  $t_{i_1 j_1}, t_{i_2 j_2}, \dots, t_{i_m j_m} \in T^D$  and  $1 < j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_m \leq n$ . Since the co-sorting index of  $\sigma$  can be expressed in terms of the factorization (4.6), to prove the equivalence of the sorting index and the co-sorting index of  $\sigma$ , we wish to rewrite (4.6) as a product of transpositions in  $T^B$  from which the sorting index of  $\sigma$  can be determined.

In fact, it can be shown that  $\sigma$  can be written as a product of transpositions in  $T^B$  which is either of the form

$$(p_1, j_1)(p_2, j_2) \cdots (p_m, j_m), \quad (4.7)$$

or of the form

$$(\bar{1}, 1)(p_1, j_1)(p_2, j_2) \cdots (p_m, j_m), \quad (4.8)$$

where for  $1 \leq k \leq m$ ,

$$p_k = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ or } \bar{1}, & \text{if } i_k = 1, \\ 1 \text{ or } \bar{1}, & \text{if } i_k = \bar{1}, \\ i_k, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

To this end, we claim that for  $1 \leq r \leq m$ ,  $t_{i_r j_r} t_{i_{r+1} j_{r+1}} \cdots t_{i_m j_m}$  can be expressed as a product of transpositions in  $T^B$  which is either of the form

$$(p_r, j_r)(p_{r+1}, j_{r+1}) \cdots (p_m, j_m) \quad (4.10)$$

or of the form

$$(\bar{1}, 1)(p_r, j_r)(p_{r+1}, j_{r+1}) \cdots (p_m, j_m), \quad (4.11)$$

where  $p_k$  is given as in (4.9). Let us first consider the case  $r = m$ . In this case, if  $i_m \neq \bar{j}_m$ , then  $t_{i_m j_m}$  equals  $(i_m, j_m)$  which is of the form (4.10). If  $i_m = \bar{j}_m$ , then  $t_{i_m j_m}$  equals  $(\bar{1}, 1)(i_m, j_m)$  which is of the form (4.11).

Assume the claim holds for  $r$ , where  $1 < r \leq m$ . We aim to show that it holds for  $r - 1$ . If  $t_{i_r j_r} t_{i_{r+1} j_{r+1}} \cdots t_{i_m j_m}$  can be expressed in the form (4.10), then we have

$$t_{i_{r-1} j_{r-1}} t_{i_r j_r} \cdots t_{i_m j_m} = \begin{cases} (\bar{1}, 1)(i_{r-1}, j_{r-1})(p_r, j_r) \cdots (p_m, j_m), & \text{if } i_{r-1} = \overline{j_{r-1}}, \\ (i_{r-1}, j_{r-1})(p_r, j_r) \cdots (p_m, j_m), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which is either of the form (4.11) or of the form (4.10). We now assume that  $t_{i_r j_r} t_{i_{r+1} j_{r+1}} \cdots t_{i_m j_m}$  can be expressed in the form (4.11). It follows that

$$t_{i_{r-1} j_{r-1}} t_{i_r j_r} \cdots t_{i_m j_m} = \begin{cases} (i_{r-1}, j_{r-1})(p_r, j_r) \cdots (p_m, j_m), & \text{if } i_{r-1} = \overline{j_{r-1}}, \\ (\bar{1}, 1)(\overline{i_{r-1}}, j_{r-1})(p_r, j_r) \cdots (p_m, j_m), & \text{if } i_{r-1} = 1 \text{ or } \bar{1}, \\ (\bar{1}, 1)(i_{r-1}, j_{r-1})(p_r, j_r) \cdots (p_m, j_m), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which is either of the form (4.10) or of the form (4.11). Thus we have verified that the claim holds for any  $1 \leq r \leq m$ .

Now we have shown that  $\sigma$  can be expressed as (4.7) or (4.8). Then the sorting index  $sor_D(\sigma)$  can be determined by this factorization, namely,

$$sor_D(\sigma) = \sum_{r=1}^m (j_r - p_r - 2\chi(p_r < 0)).$$

By (4.9), we find that

$$j_r - p_r - 2\chi(p_r < 0) = j_r - i_r - 2\chi(i_r < 0)$$

for  $1 \leq r \leq m$ . In view of (4.6), we see that

$$sor'_D(\sigma) = \sum_{r=1}^m (j_r - i_r - 2\chi(i_r < 0)).$$

It follows that  $sor_D(\sigma) = sor'_D(\sigma)$ . This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

To justify the equidistribution of  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  and  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$ , we shall give a bijection which transforms  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  to  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$ . The bijection will be described in terms of two codes, called the E-code and the F-code of an element of  $D_n$ . It will be shown that the pair of statistics  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  can be computed from the E-code whereas the pair of statistics  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$  can be computed from the F-code.

Given an element  $\sigma \in D_n$ , the E-code of  $\sigma$  is an integer sequence  $e = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$  generated by the following procedure. We wish to construct a sequence of signed permutations  $\sigma^{(n)}, \sigma^{(n-1)}, \dots, \sigma^{(1)}$  where  $\sigma^{(i)} \in D_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . First, we set  $\sigma^{(n)} = \sigma$ . For  $i$  from  $n$  to  $2$ , we construct  $\sigma^{(i-1)}$  from  $\sigma^{(i)}$ . Consider the letter  $i$  in  $\sigma^{(i)}$ . If  $i$  has a positive sign in  $\sigma^{(i)}$ , then assume that  $i$  appears at the  $p$ -th position in  $\sigma^{(i)}$ . In this case, we set  $e_i = p$  and let  $\sigma^{(i-1)}$  be the signed permutation obtained from  $\sigma^{(i)}$  by deleting the element  $i$ . If  $i$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma^{(i)}$ , then we assume that  $\bar{i}$  appears at the  $p$ -th position in  $\sigma^{(i)}$ . We then set  $e_i = -p$ . Let  $\sigma'$  be the signed permutation obtained from  $\sigma^{(i)}$  by deleting  $\bar{i}$ , and let  $\sigma^{(i-1)}$  be the signed permutation obtained from  $\sigma'$  by changing the sign of the element at the first position. It can be seen that the resulting signed permutation  $\sigma^{(1)}$  is the identity permutation  $1$ . Finally, we set  $e_1 = 1$ . For example, let  $\sigma = 2\bar{4}51\bar{3}$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{(5)} &= 2\bar{4}\mathbf{5}1\bar{3}, & e_5 &= 3, \\ \sigma^{(4)} &= 2\bar{4}1\bar{3}, & e_4 &= -2, \\ \sigma^{(3)} &= \bar{2}1\bar{3}, & e_3 &= -3, \\ \sigma^{(2)} &= \mathbf{2}1, & e_2 &= 1, \\ \sigma^{(1)} &= 1, & e_1 &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the E-code of  $\sigma = 2\bar{4}51\bar{3}$  is  $(1, 1, -3, -2, 3)$ .

It can be checked that the above procedure is reversible. In other words, one can recover an element  $\sigma \in D_n$  from an E-code  $e = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$ . For  $1 < r \leq n$ , it is routine to verify that

$$\text{inv}_D(\sigma^{(r)}) - \text{inv}_D(\sigma^{(r-1)}) = r - e_r - 2\chi(e_r < 0) \quad (4.12)$$

and

$$\text{nmin}_D(\sigma^{(r)}) - \text{nmin}_D(\sigma^{(r-1)}) = 1 - \chi(e_r = r). \quad (4.13)$$

So we are led to the following formulas for  $\text{inv}_D(\sigma)$  and  $\text{nmin}_D(\sigma)$ .

**Proposition 4.4** *Given an element  $\sigma \in D_n$ , let  $e = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$  be its E-code. Then we have*

$$\text{inv}_D(\sigma) = \sum_{r=1}^n (r - e_r - 2\chi(e_r < 0)) \quad (4.14)$$

and

$$\text{nmin}_D(\sigma) = n - \sum_{r=1}^n \chi(e_r = r). \quad (4.15)$$

We now define the F-code of an element  $\sigma \in D_n$  as an integer sequence  $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n)$  determined by the following procedure. To compute the F-code  $f$ , we will generate a sequence of signed permutations  $\sigma^{(n)}, \sigma^{(n-1)}, \dots, \sigma^{(1)} \in D_n$ . Let us begin with  $\sigma^{(n)} = \sigma$ . For  $i$  from  $n$  to  $2$ , we construct  $\sigma^{(i-1)}$  from  $\sigma^{(i)}$ . Consider the letter  $i$  in  $\sigma^{(i)}$ . If  $i$  has a positive sign in  $\sigma^{(i)}$ , say  $\sigma^{(i)}(p) = i$ , then let  $f_i = p$  and let  $\sigma^{(i-1)}$  be the signed permutation obtained from  $\sigma^{(i)}$  by exchanging the letter  $i$  and the letter at the  $i$ -th position. If  $i$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma^{(i)}$  and  $\sigma^{(i)}(i) = \bar{i}$ , then let  $f_i = -i$  and let  $\sigma^{(i-1)}$  be the signed permutation obtained from  $\sigma^{(i)}$  by changing both the signs of the element at the  $i$ -th position and the element at the first position. If  $i$  has a minus sign in  $\sigma^{(i)}$  and  $\sigma^{(i)}(i) \neq \bar{i}$ , say  $\sigma^{(i)}(p) = \bar{i}$ , then let  $f_i = -p$  and let  $\sigma^{(i-1)} = \sigma^{(i)}(\bar{p}, i)$ . It can be readily seen that the resulting signed permutation  $\sigma^{(1)}$  is the identity permutation  $12 \cdots n$ . Finally, we set  $f_1 = 1$ . For example, let  $\sigma = \bar{2}\bar{4}5\bar{1}\bar{3}$ . Then we proceed as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{(5)} &= \bar{2}\bar{4}\mathbf{5}\bar{1}\bar{3}, & f_5 &= 3, \\ \sigma^{(4)} &= \bar{2}\bar{4}\bar{3}\bar{1}5, & f_4 &= \bar{2}, \\ \sigma^{(3)} &= \bar{2}1\bar{\mathbf{3}}45, & f_3 &= \bar{3}, \\ \sigma^{(2)} &= \mathbf{2}1345, & f_2 &= 1, \\ \sigma^{(1)} &= 12345, & f_1 &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the F-code of  $\sigma = \bar{2}\bar{4}5\bar{1}\bar{3}$  is  $(1, 1, -3, -2, 3)$ . It is easily seen that the above procedure is reversible. So we can recover  $\sigma$  from its F-code.

The following proposition gives expressions of  $\text{sor}_D$  and  $\tilde{l}'_D(\sigma)$  in terms of the F-code.

**Proposition 4.5** *Given an element  $\sigma \in D_n$ , let  $f = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n)$  be its F-code. Then we have*

$$\text{sor}_D(\sigma) = \sum_{r=1}^n (r - f_r - 2\chi(f_r < 0)) \quad (4.16)$$

and

$$\tilde{l}'_D(\sigma) = n - \sum_{r=1}^n \chi(f_r = r). \quad (4.17)$$

*Proof.* For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , we let  $t_{ii}$  denote the identity permutation. Examining the procedure to construct the F-code of  $\sigma$ , we see that for  $1 < r \leq n$ , we have

$$\sigma^{(r)} = \sigma^{(r-1)} t_{f_r r}. \quad (4.18)$$

It follows that

$$\sigma^{(r)} = t_{f_1 1} t_{f_2 2} \cdots t_{f_r r}. \quad (4.19)$$

By the definition of the co-sorting index, we find

$$\text{sor}'_D(\sigma^{(r)}) - \text{sor}'_D(\sigma^{(r-1)}) = r - f_r - 2\chi(f_r < 0). \quad (4.20)$$

Applying Lemma 4.3, we get

$$\text{sor}_D(\sigma^{(r)}) - \text{sor}_D(\sigma^{(r-1)}) = r - f_r - 2\chi(f_r < 0). \quad (4.21)$$

Summing (4.21) over  $r$  gives (4.16).

To prove (4.17), it suffices to show that

$$\tilde{l}'_D(\sigma^{(r)}) - \tilde{l}'_D(\sigma^{(r-1)}) = 1 - \chi(f_r = r) \quad (4.22)$$

for  $1 < r \leq n$ . If  $f_r = r$ , it is clear that  $\sigma^{(r)} = \sigma^{(r-1)}$ . So (4.22) holds in this case. If  $f_r \neq r$ , let  $\tilde{l}'_D(\sigma^{(r)}) = l$ . Then  $\sigma^{(r)}$  can be decomposed as

$$\sigma^{(r)} = t_{i_1 j_1} t_{i_2 j_2} \cdots t_{i_l j_l} \quad (4.23)$$

where  $t_{i_1 j_1}, t_{i_2 j_2}, \dots, t_{i_l j_l} \in T^D$ . For  $t = t_{ij} \in T^D$  and  $1 < k \leq n$ , we say that  $t$  fixes  $k$  if and only if  $k \neq i, \bar{i}, j$  or  $\bar{j}$  in the sense that if  $k \neq i, \bar{i}, j$  or  $\bar{j}$ , then  $t_{ij}$  maps  $k$  to  $k$  when we consider  $t_{ij}$  as a map on  $\{1, 2, \dots, n, \bar{1}, \bar{2}, \dots, \bar{n}\}$ . It can be verified that for any  $1 < k \leq n$  and  $t_1, t_2 \in T^D$ , there exist  $t_3, t_4 \in T^D$  such that  $t_1 t_2 = t_3 t_4$  and  $t_3$  fixes  $k$ . Thus we can use (4.23) to derive an expression of  $\sigma^{(r)}$  of the form

$$\sigma^{(r)} = t_{i'_1 j'_1} t_{i'_2 j'_2} \cdots t_{i'_l j'_l} \quad (4.24)$$

where  $t_{i'_1 j'_1}, t_{i'_2 j'_2}, \dots, t_{i'_l j'_l} \in T^D$  and  $t_{i'_p j'_p}$  fixes  $r$  for  $1 \leq p \leq l-1$ . Since  $f_r \neq r$ , it follows from (4.19) that  $\sigma^{(r)}$  maps  $f_r$  to  $r$ . Hence we deduce that  $t_{i'_l j'_l} = t_{f_r r}$ . By (4.18) and (4.24), we get

$$t_{i'_1 j'_1} t_{i'_2 j'_2} \cdots t_{i'_{l-1} j'_{l-1}} = \sigma^{(r-1)}.$$

Hence we arrive at

$$\tilde{l}'(\sigma^{(r-1)}) \leq l - 1.$$

From (4.18), it is clear that

$$l \leq \tilde{l}'(\sigma^{(r-1)}) + 1,$$

so we conclude that

$$l = \tilde{l}'(\sigma^{(r-1)}) + 1. \quad (4.25)$$

This completes the proof of (4.17).  $\blacksquare$

Combining Propositions 4.4 and 4.5, we obtain a bijection  $\rho: D_n \rightarrow D_n$  which leads to the equidistribution of  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  and  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$ . More precisely, the bijection  $\rho$  is given by

$$\rho = \text{F-code}^{-1} \circ \text{E-code}.$$

Then we arrive at the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.6** *The bijection  $\rho$  transforms  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  to  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$ , that is, for any  $\sigma \in D_n$ , we have*

$$(inv_D, nmin_D) \sigma = (sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D) \rho(\sigma). \quad (4.26)$$

We now present a proof of Theorem 4.2 based on two different factorizations of the diagonal sum  $\sum_{\sigma \in D_n} \sigma$  in the group algebra  $\mathbb{Z}[D_n]$ . It turns out that the bivariate generating functions of  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$  and  $(sor_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$  are both equal to

$$D_n(q, t) = \prod_{r=1}^{n-1} (1 + q^r t + qt \cdot [2r]_q).$$

To derive the bivariate generating function of  $(inv_D, nmin_D)$ , we recall Petersen's factorization of the diagonal sum  $\sum_{\sigma \in D_n} \sigma$ . The elements  $\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_{n-1}$  of the group algebra of  $D_n$  are recursively defined as follows. Recall that  $s_i = (i, i+1)$  for  $1 \leq i < n$  and  $s_{\bar{1}} = (\bar{1}, 2)$ . For  $i = 1$ , let

$$\Psi_1 = 1 + s_1 + s_{\bar{1}} + s_1 s_{\bar{1}}.$$

For  $i \geq 2$ , let

$$\Psi_i = 1 + s_i \Psi_{i-1} + s_i \cdots s_2 s_1 s_{\bar{1}} s_2 \cdots s_i.$$

Petersen found the following factorization.

**Proposition 4.7** *For  $n \geq 2$ ,*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in D_n} \sigma = \Psi_1 \Psi_2 \cdots \Psi_{n-1}.$$

For an element  $\sigma \in D_n$ , we define the weight of  $\sigma$  to be

$$\mu(\sigma) = q^{\text{inv}_D(\sigma)} t^{\text{nm}_{in_D}(\sigma)}.$$

As usual, the weight function is considered as a linear map on  $\mathbb{Z}[D_n]$ . It can be routinely checked that

$$\mu(\Psi_i) = 1 + tq^i + tq(1 + q + \cdots + q^{2i-1}) = 1 + tq^i + tq[2i]_q. \quad (4.27)$$

We are now ready to finish the proof of relation (4.4) concerning the bivariate generating function of  $(\text{inv}_D, \text{nm}_{in_D})$ .

*Proof of (4.4) in Theorem 4.2.* By Proposition 4.7 and formula (4.27), we see that (4.4) can be rewritten as

$$\mu(\Psi_1 \cdots \Psi_{n-1}) = \psi(\Psi_1) \cdots \psi(\Psi_{n-1}).$$

Notice that for  $i \geq 1$  and  $i+2 \leq k \leq n$ , each term of  $\Psi_i$  fixes  $k$ . Here we say an element  $\sigma \in D_n$  fixes  $k$  if and only if  $\sigma$  maps  $k$  to  $k$ . Thus  $\Psi_i$  can be considered as an element of  $\mathbb{Z}[D_j]$  for  $i < j < n$ . Clearly, the weight function  $\mu$  is also well-defined in this sense. Therefore we only need to show that

$$\mu(\Psi_1 \cdots \Psi_{n-2} \Psi_{n-1}) = \mu(\Psi_1 \cdots \Psi_{n-2}) \mu(\Psi_{n-1}).$$

It suffices to prove that

$$\mu(\sigma \cdot \Psi_{n-1}) = \mu(\sigma) \cdot \mu(\Psi_{n-1}) \quad (4.28)$$

for any  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \in D_{n-1}$ . Here  $\sigma$  is considered as an element of  $D_n$  which fixes  $n$ . It can be verified that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \cdot \Psi_{n-1} &= \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} n + \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-2} n \sigma_{n-1} + \cdots + \sigma_1 n \cdots \sigma_{n-1} + n \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \\ &\quad + \bar{n} \bar{\sigma}_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} + \bar{\sigma}_1 \bar{n} \cdots \sigma_{n-1} + \cdots + \bar{\sigma}_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \bar{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\sigma \cdot \Psi_{n-1}) &= \mu(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} n) + \mu(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-2} n \sigma_{n-1}) + \cdots + \psi(\sigma_1 n \cdots \sigma_{n-1}) + \mu(n \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1}) \\ &\quad + \mu(\bar{n} \bar{\sigma}_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1}) + \mu(\bar{\sigma}_1 \bar{n} \cdots \sigma_{n-1}) + \cdots + \mu(\bar{\sigma}_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \bar{n}) \\ &= \mu(\sigma) + qt \mu(\sigma) + \cdots + q^{n-2} t \mu(\sigma) + q^{n-1} t \mu(\sigma) \\ &\quad + q^{n-1} t \mu(\sigma) + q^n t \mu(\sigma) + \cdots + q^{2n-2} t \mu(\sigma) \\ &= (1 + tq^{n-1} + tq(1 + q + \cdots + q^{2n-3})) \mu(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Hence (4.28) follows from (4.27). This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

To prove formula (4.5) for the bivariate generating function of  $(\text{sor}_D, \tilde{l}'_D)$ , we recall another factorization of the diagonal sum  $\sum_{\sigma \in D_n} \sigma$  due to Petersen. For  $2 \leq j \leq n$ , let

$$\Phi_j = 1 + \sum_{\substack{i \neq 0 \\ \bar{j} \leq i < j}} t_{ij}.$$

**Proposition 4.8** For  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$\sum_{\sigma \in D_n} \sigma = \Phi_2 \Phi_3 \cdots \Phi_n.$$

For an element  $\sigma \in D_n$ , we define another weight function

$$\nu(\sigma) = q^{\text{sor}_D(\sigma)} t^{\tilde{l}'_D(\sigma)}.$$

Again, the weight function  $\nu$  is considered as a linear map. It can be checked that

$$\nu(\Phi_i) = 1 + tq^{i-1} + tq(1 + q + \cdots + q^{2i-3}) = 1 + tq^{i-1} + tq[2i - 2]_q. \quad (4.29)$$

We conclude this paper with a proof of (4.5).

*Proof of (4.5) in Theorem 4.2.* By Proposition 4.8 and (4.29), we find that (4.5) can be expressed in the following form

$$\nu(\Phi_2 \cdots \Phi_n) = \nu(\Phi_2) \cdots \nu(\Phi_n).$$

As in the proof of (4.4), we only need to show that

$$\nu(\Phi_2 \cdots \Psi_n) = \nu(\Phi_2 \cdots \Phi_{n-1}) \nu(\Phi_n).$$

It suffices to prove that

$$\nu(\sigma \cdot \Phi_n) = \nu(\sigma) \cdot \nu(\Phi_n), \quad (4.30)$$

for any  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \in D_{n-1}$ . Again,  $\sigma$  is considered as an element of  $D_n$  which fixes  $n$ . Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \cdot \Phi_n &= \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} n + \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-2} n \sigma_{n-1} + \cdots + \sigma_1 n \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \sigma_2 + n \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \sigma_1 \\ &\quad + \bar{n} \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \bar{\sigma}_1 + \sigma_1 \bar{n} \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \bar{\sigma}_2 + \cdots + \bar{\sigma}_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \bar{n}, \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\sigma \cdot \Phi_n) &= \nu(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} n) + \nu(\sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_{n-2} n \sigma_{n-1}) + \cdots + \nu(\sigma_1 n \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \sigma_2) + \nu(n \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \sigma_1) \\ &\quad + \nu(\bar{n} \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \bar{\sigma}_1) + \nu(\sigma_1 \bar{n} \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \bar{\sigma}_2) + \cdots + \nu(\bar{\sigma}_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{n-1} \bar{n}) \\ &= \nu(\sigma) + qt \nu(\sigma) + \cdots + q^{n-2} t \nu(\sigma) + q^{n-1} t \nu(\sigma) \\ &\quad + q^{n-1} t \nu(\sigma) + q^n t \nu(\sigma) + \cdots + q^{2n-2} t \nu(\sigma) \\ &= (1 + tq^{n-1} + tq(1 + q + \cdots + q^{2n-3})) \nu(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

Hence (4.30) follows from (4.29). This completes the proof.  $\blacksquare$

**Acknowledgments.** This work was supported by the 973 Project, the PCSIRT Project of the Ministry of Education, and the National Science Foundation of China.

## References

- [1] A. Björner and F. Brenti, *Combinatorics of Coxeter Groups*, Springer, New York, 2005.
- [2] F. Brenti,  $q$ -Eulerian polynomials arising from Coxeter groups, *European J. Combin.* 15 (1994) 417-441.
- [3] W.Y.C. Chen and R.P. Stanley, Derangements on the  $n$ -cube, *Discrete Math.* 115 (1993) 65-70.
- [4] R. Cori, Indecomposable permutations, hypermaps and labeled Dyck paths, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 116 (2009) 1326-1343.
- [5] P. Ossona de Mendez and P. Rosenstiehl, Transitivity and connectivity of permutations, *Combinatorica* 24 (2004) 487-502.
- [6] D. Foata and G.-H. Han, New permutation coding and equidistribution of set-valued statistics, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 410 (2009) 3743-3750.
- [7] D. Foata and G.-H. Han, Signed words and permutations, I: a fundamental transformation, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 135 (2007) 31-40.
- [8] D.E. Knuth, *The Art of Computer Programming*, Vol. 3, Addison-Wesley, 1998.
- [9] D.H. Lehmer, Teaching combinatorial tricks to a computer, in: *Proc. Sympos. Appl. Math.*, Vol. 10, Amer. Math. Soc, Providence, RI, 1960, pp. 179-193.
- [10] T.K. Petersen, The sorting index, *Adv. Appl. Math.* 47 (2011) 615-630.
- [11] M.C. Wilson, An interesting new Mahonian permutation statistic, *Electron. J. Combin.* 17 (2010) R147.
- [12] M.C. Wilson, Random and exhaustive generation of permutations and cycles, *Ann. Combin.* 12 (2009) 509-520.