

ASYMPTOTICS OF THE EXTREMAL EXCEDANCE SET STATISTIC

RODRIGO FERRAZ DE ANDRADE, ERIK LUNDBERG, AND BRENDAN NAGLE

ABSTRACT. For non-negative integers r and s with $r + s = n - 1$, let $[b^r a^s]$ denote the number of permutations $\pi \in S_n$ which have the property that $\pi(i) > i$ if, and only if, $i \in [r] = \{1, \dots, r\}$. Answering a question of Clark and Ehrenborg (2010), we determine asymptotics on $[b^r a^s]$ when $r = \lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor$:

$$[b^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor} a^{\lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil}] = \left(\frac{1}{2 \log 2 \sqrt{1 - \log 2}} + o(1) \right) \left(\frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)^n n!.$$

We also determine asymptotics on $[b^r a^s]$ for a suitably related $r = \Theta(s) \rightarrow \infty$. Our proof depends on multivariate asymptotic methods of R. Pemantle and M. C. Wilson.

We also consider two applications of our main result. One, we determine asymptotics on the number of permutations $\pi \in S_n$ which simultaneously avoid the vincular patterns 21-34 and 34-21, i.e., for which π is order-isomorphic to neither $(2,1,3,4)$ nor $(3,4,2,1)$ on any coordinates $1 \leq i < i+1 < j < j+1 \leq n$. We also determine asymptotics on the number of n -cycles $\pi \in C_n$ which avoid stretching pairs, i.e., those for which $1 \leq \pi(i) < i < j < \pi(j) \leq n$.

Keywords: excedance, exceedance, descent, vincular pattern, generalized pattern, pattern avoidance, combinatorial dynamics, asymptotic enumeration, multivariate asymptotics

1. INTRODUCTION

The main results of this paper (Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 below) consider the asymptotics of the number of permutations $\pi \in S_n$ with excedance word $b^r a^s$, where $r + s = n - 1$. To present our results, we use the following notation and terminology, taken mostly from [6].

1.1. Preliminaries. Let S_n denote the set of permutations on $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For $\pi \in S_n$ and $i \in [n - 1]$, we say that i is an *excedance* of π if $\pi(i) > i$. We write $E(\pi) = \{i \in [n - 1] : \pi(i) > i\}$ for the set of excedances of π . We define the *excedance word* $w(\pi) = (w_1, \dots, w_{n-1}) \in \{a, b\}^{n-1}$ of π by, for each $i \in [n - 1]$, $w_i = b$ if $i \in E(\pi)$ and $w_i = a$ if $i \notin E(\pi)$, i.e., $\pi(i) \leq i$. For a word $w \in \{a, b\}^{n-1}$, let $[w]$ denote the number of permutations $\pi \in S_n$ that have excedance word w .

In this paper, we consider words $w \in \{a, b\}^{n-1}$ of the following form. For non-negative integers $r + s = n - 1$, let $b^r a^s \in \{a, b\}^{n-1}$ denote the word whose first r coordinates equal b and whose last s coordinates equal a . R. Ehrenborg and E. Steingrímsson [11] showed that $[b^r a^s]$ is maximized when $r = n - 1 - s \in \{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor, \lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil\}$. E. Clark and R. Ehrenborg [6, Concluding Remarks] posed the following problem.

Question 1.1. *What are the asymptotics of $[b^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor} a^{\lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil}]$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$?*

In this paper, we address Question 1.1 (see Theorem 1.2 below), and more generally, in Theorem 1.3 we address the asymptotics of $[b^r a^s]$ for a wider range of $r + s = n - 1$. We also provide some further applications of our main results.

1.2. Historical remark. An important counterpart of the notion of an excedance is that of a *descent*. For $\pi \in S_n$ and $i \in [n - 1]$, we say that i is a *descent* of π if $\pi(i) > \pi(i + 1)$. Two of the classically studied permutation statistics are the number of descents and the number of excedances (both considered by MacMahon [16]). The more modern study of permutation statistics has included the dual consideration of

The third author was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 1001781.

the number of permutations with prescribed descent set (and, respectively, excedance set). In particular, Niven [17] and, independently, de Bruijn [9] showed that the most common descent set is realized by the *alternating permutations*. The alternating permutations are enumerated by the Euler numbers E_n whose asymptotics are classical:

$$E_n = \left(\frac{4}{\pi} + o(1) \right) \left(\frac{2}{\pi} \right)^n n! \quad (1.1)$$

(This result follows from André's Theorem [2].) The most common excedance set was specified by the above-mentioned result [11], and the excedance set counterpart of equation (1.1) is provided by Theorem 1.2 below.

1.3. Main Results. Our first result provides an answer to Question 1.1.

Theorem 1.2.

$$\left[b^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor} a^{\lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil} \right] = \left(\frac{1}{2 \log 2 \sqrt{1 - \log 2}} + o(1) \right) \left(\frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)^n n!.$$

We prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 4.

More generally, we establish bivariate asymptotics for $[b^{r-1}a^s]$ when the parameters r and s tend to infinity within a certain *sector*. (We define the concept of an ε_0 -sector S_{ε_0} in equation (1.4) below.) Our result is somewhat technical to present, and we require several considerations. First, define the function $Q : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$Q(x, y) = xye^{-x-y} [ye^{-y} + xe^{-x} - xy(e^{-y} + e^{-x})], \quad x, y > 0. \quad (1.2)$$

Second, define the function $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ by

$$f(t) := \frac{(1 - e^t) \log(1 - e^{-t})}{t}. \quad (1.3)$$

It is important for us that f is invertible, as is claimed in the following fact¹.

Fact 1. *The function $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ defined in (1.3) is a strictly decreasing bijection.*

Third, set

$$\varepsilon_0 = f(1) = (e - 1)(1 - \log(e - 1)) \approx 0.7881\dots,$$

$$\text{and define the } \varepsilon_0\text{-sector } S_{\varepsilon_0} = \left\{ (r, s) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : \varepsilon_0 \leq \frac{s}{r} \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon_0} \right\}. \quad (1.4)$$

Our main result will provide asymptotics for $[b^{r-1}a^s]$ for $r, s \rightarrow \infty$ with $(r, s) \in S_{\varepsilon_0}$. To that end, for each $(r, s) \in S_{\varepsilon_0}$, set $x = x(r, s) := f^{-1}(s/r)$ and $y = y(r, s) := f^{-1}(r/s)$ (cf. Fact 1). Our main result is now stated as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *For $(r, s) \in S_{\varepsilon_0}$, let $x = x(r, s)$, $y = y(r, s)$, and $Q(x, y)$ be defined as above. Then, the following holds uniformly for $r, s \rightarrow \infty$ with $(r, s) \in S_{\varepsilon_0}$:*

$$[b^{r-1}a^s] = r!s! \left(e^{-y} + O(s^{-1/2}) \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} x^{-r} y^{-s} \sqrt{\frac{ye^{-y}}{sQ(x, y)}}.$$

Theorem 1.3 is proved in Section 3 using a result of R. Pemantle and M.C. Wilson [18, 19, 20] concerning multivariate asymptotics.

¹The proof of Fact 1 is standard, but for completeness, we have included a proof in the Appendix.

1.4. Applications. We discuss two applications of Theorem 1.2. The first application falls within the well-studied area of *pattern avoidance*. (Namely, we consider the simultaneous avoidance of a certain pair of vincular patterns). The second concerns objects related to vincular patterns, which have become known as *stretching pairs*. Initially, it will not be obvious how Theorem 1.2 provides the applications (see the two following corollaries) we state, but we will make this connection clear at the end of the Introduction.

1.4.1. Vincular patterns. For $1 \leq k \leq n$, fix $\pi_0 \in S_k$ and $\pi \in S_n$. We say that π contains π_0 as a *pattern* if there exist $1 \leq \ell_1 < \dots < \ell_k \leq n$ such that $(\pi(\ell_1), \pi(\ell_2), \dots, \pi(\ell_k))$ is order-isomorphic to π_0 . Now, write $\pi_0 = (a_1, \dots, a_k) = (\pi_0(1), \dots, \pi_0(k))$, and let $\pi_0^* = (a_1, \varepsilon_1, a_2, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_{k-1}, a_k)$ be any sequence where, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, ε_i is either a dash ‘-’, or the empty string. We say that $\pi \in S_n$ admits π_0^* as a *vincular pattern* (also known as a *generalized pattern*²) if π_0 occurs as a pattern at the positions $1 \leq \ell_1 < \dots < \ell_k \leq n$, and for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\varepsilon_i \neq -$ implies $\ell_{i+1} = \ell_i + 1$, i.e., ℓ_i, ℓ_{i+1} are consecutive in π .

As an illustrative example, we note that the permutation $(3, 5, 2, 4, 1) = 35241$ contains 132 as a classical pattern (realized uniquely by the 3, 5, and 4 occurring in that order). However, 35241 does not contain 1-32 as a vincular pattern, since the 5 and 4 are not adjacent.

For $\pi_0 \in S_k$ and π_0^* as above, write $\alpha_n(\pi_0^*)$ for the number of permutations $\pi \in S_n$ avoiding π_0^* as a vincular pattern. Elizalde and Noy [13] studied the limiting behavior of $(\alpha_n(\pi_0^*)/n!)^{1/n}$ for several ‘dashless’ (consecutive) vincular patterns π_0^* of length 3. For example, they showed that for $\pi_0^* = 123 = (1, 2, 3)$ (with no dashes), one has $(\alpha_n(123)/n!)^{1/n} \rightarrow 3\sqrt{3}/(2\pi)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Elizalde [12] showed that for $\pi_0^* = 1-23-4 = (1, -, 2, 3, -, 4)$, one has $(\alpha_n(1-23-4)/n!)^{1/n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In [8], it was shown that for all sufficiently large even integers n , $(\alpha_n(21-34)/n!)^{1/n} \geq 1/2 + o(1)$, which answered a question of S. Elizalde [12]. Using Theorem 1.2, we are able to improve this last result by a factor of $1/\log 2$. To that end, let $\alpha_n(\{21-34, 34-21\})$ denote the number of permutations avoiding both 21-34 and 34-21 as vincular patterns.

Corollary 1.4.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\alpha_n(\{21-34, 34-21\})}{n!} \right)^{1/n} = \frac{1}{2 \log 2} \approx 0.7213\dots$$

As such,

$$\alpha_n(21-34) \geq \alpha_n(\{21-34, 34-21\}) = \left(\frac{1}{2 \log 2} + o(1) \right)^n n!.$$

We prove Corollary 1.4 at the end of this section. It is an open problem to determine the exact value of the following limit (assuming that it exists):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\alpha_n(21-34)}{n!} \right)^{1/n}.$$

1.4.2. Stretching pairs. For a permutation $\pi \in S_n$, we call a pair $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ a *stretching pair* if $\pi(i) < i < j < \pi(j)$. For example, in the permutation $\pi = (2, 1, 3, 5, 4) = 21354$, the pair $2 < 4$ is a stretching pair of π , since $\pi(2) = 1 < 2 < 4 < 5 = \pi(4)$. Stretching pairs naturally arise in cyclic permutations within the context of a well-known result of Sharkovsky [21] in discrete dynamical systems. More recently, stretching pairs in n -cycles were studied in [8, 15, 22] from a combinatorial point of view. Let $C_n \subset S_n$ denote the set of n -cycles, and let C_n^* denote those n -cycles which contain no stretching pairs. Theorem 1.2 allows us to determine the limiting behavior of $(|C_{n+1}^*|/n!)^{1/n}$.

Corollary 1.5.

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{|C_{n+1}^*|}{n!} \right)^{1/n} = \frac{1}{2 \log 2}.$$

We now proceed to the proofs of Corollaries 1.4 and 1.5.

²The notion was introduced by Babson and Steingrimsson [4]. The terminology *vincular pattern* first appeared in [5].

1.5. Proofs of Corollaries 1.4 and 1.5. The following lemma allows us to connect Theorem 1.2 to Corollaries 1.4 and 1.5. As we show in Section 2, Lemma 1.6 is (mostly) a consequence of a result of Clarke, Steingrímsson, and Zeng [7, Proposition 3].

Lemma 1.6.

- (1) $|C_{n+1}^*| = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} [b^k a^{n-1-k}]$.
- (2) $|C_{n+1}^*| \leq \alpha_n(\{21-34, 34-21\}) \leq |C_{n+1}^*| + |C_{n+2}^*| \leq 2|C_{n+2}^*|$.

We now conclude Corollaries 1.4 and 1.5. Indeed, recall that it was proven in [11] that $[b^k a^{n-1-k}]$ is maximized when $k \in \{[(n-1)/2], \lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil\}$. As such, we may use Statement (1) of Lemma 1.6 to infer

$$\left[b^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor} a^{\lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil} \right] \leq |C_{n+1}^*| \leq n \left[b^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor} a^{\lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil} \right]$$

so that Corollary 1.5 is now immediate. Using Corollary 1.5 and Statement (2) of Lemma 1.6, Corollary 1.4 is now immediate.

Remark 1. Statement (1) of Lemma 1.6 also provides an exact combinatorial evaluation of $|C_{n+1}^*|$ that may be of independent interest. Indeed, Clark and Ehrenborg [6] showed that for all integers $M, N \geq 0$,

$$[b^M a^N] = \sum_{i \geq 0} (S(M+1, i+1) S(N+1, i+1) i!(i+1)!),$$

where $S(s, t)$, $s, t \in \mathbb{N}$, denotes the Stirling number of the second kind. As such,

$$|C_{n+1}^*| = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sum_{i \geq 0} (S(k+1, i+1) S(n-k, i+1) i!(i+1)!),$$

which complements our result in Corollary 1.5.

2. PROOF OF LEMMA 1.6

First we state a Lemma from [7, Proposition 3]. Define, for a permutation $\pi \in S_n$, $\text{DesBot}(\pi) = \{\pi(i) : \pi(i) < \pi(i-1)\}$ to be the (so-called) *Descent Bottoms Set*.

Lemma 2.1 (Clarke, Steingrímsson, Zeng [7]). *There exists a bijection $\Phi : S_n \rightarrow S_n$ so that for any $\pi \in S_n$, $E(\pi) = \text{DesBot}(\Phi(\pi))$.*

We include (for completeness) a proof of Lemma 2.1 using a different³ bijection Φ (which was suggested to us by Emeric Deutsch [10]).

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Define the bijection Φ as follows. Let $\pi \in S_n$ be given in its *standard cycle decomposition*, $SCD(\pi)$, i.e., each cycle begins with its smallest entry and cycles appear in ascending order according to their initial entries. Define $p = \Phi(\pi) \in S_n$ to be the permutation which, in one-line notation $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ where $i \mapsto p_i$, is obtained by first reversing the order of entries within each cycle of π , and then removing all parentheses. For example, if $\pi = (1 \ 5 \ 2 \ 8)(3 \ 6 \ 7)(4 \ 9)$, then $\Phi(\pi) = (8, 2, 5, 1, 7, 6, 3, 9, 4)$.

It is easy to show that Φ is a bijection by constructing its inverse function. Fix $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n) \in S_n$, and construct $SCD(\pi)$ for $\pi = \Phi^{-1}(p)$ as follows. Find the index k_1 for which $p_{k_1} = 1$. Take the consecutively indexed entries from p_1 to p_{k_1} and reverse their order to obtain the first cycle for π . Find the index $k_2 > k_1$ for which p_{k_2} is the smallest element of $[n] \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_{k_1}\}$. Construct the second cycle for π by reversing the order of the entries starting with p_{k_1+1} and ending with p_{k_2} . Having constructed the first j cycles for π , find the index $k_{j+1} > k_j$ so that $p_{k_{j+1}}$ is the smallest element of $[n] \setminus \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{k_j}\}$, and obtain the next cycle by reversing the order of the entries starting with p_{k_j+1} and ending with $p_{k_{j+1}}$. By construction, π will be in standard cycle decomposition and $\Phi(\pi) = p$.

³According to Ehrenborg and Steingrímsson [11], there are several variations of the bijection Φ , originating with the early work of Foata and Schützenberger [14].

We now verify that Φ has the promised property: for all $\pi \in S_n$, $E(\pi) = \text{DesBot}(p = \Phi(\pi))$. To that end, fix $\pi \in S_n$, and write $p = \Phi(\pi) = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$. For $j \in [n]$, we show $j \in E(\pi) \iff j \in \text{DesBot}(p)$. We consider two cases, depending on how j appears in $SCD(\pi)$.

Case 1. In $SCD(\pi)$, j does not appear last in its cycle. Then, $\pi(j)$ is the next consecutive entry appearing in the same cycle as j . Set $k = p^{-1}(j)$ so that $p_k = j$. Then, by the construction of Φ , $p_{k-1} = \pi(j)$. Now,

$$j \in E(\pi) \iff p_{k-1} = \pi(j) > j = p_k \iff j = p_k \in \text{DesBot}(p),$$

as desired.

As an example of the argument above, consider again

$$\pi = (1\ 5\ 2\ 8)(3\ 6\ 7)(4\ 9) \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(\pi) = (8, 2, 5, 1, 7, 6, 3, 9, 4). \quad (2.1)$$

If $j = 1$, then $\pi(1) = 5 > 1$, and so $1 \in E(\pi)$. Correspondingly, $p(3) = p_3 = 5 > 1 = p_4 = p(4)$, and so $1 = p(4) \in \text{DesBot}(p)$. Alternatively, if $j = 5$, then $\pi(5) = 2 < 5$, and so $5 \notin E(\pi)$. Correspondingly, $p(3) = p_3 = 5 > 2 = p_2 = p(2)$, and so $5 = p(3) \notin \text{DesBot}(p)$.

Case 2. In $SCD(\pi)$, j appears last in its cycle. Then, $\pi(j)$ is the first entry in the cycle containing j . Since π is in standard cycle decomposition, $\pi(j) \leq j$, in which case $j \notin E(\pi)$. If j is in the first cycle of π , then $p_1 = j \notin \text{DesBot}(p)$, as desired. Assume, therefore, that j is not in the first cycle of π . Let the cycle immediately preceding that of j begin with a , and let the cycle containing j begin with $b = \pi(j)$. Then, $a < b = \pi(j) \leq j$. Moreover, in the notation of Case 1, we have $p_{k-1} = a < j = p_k$ (for some $k \in [n]$) so that $p_k = j \notin \text{DesBot}(p)$, as desired.

As an example of the argument above, consider again the example of π and $\Phi(\pi)$ in (2.1). If $j = 7$, then $\pi(7) = b = 3 < 7$, and so $7 \notin E(\pi)$. Correspondingly, $a = 1 = p_4 = p(4) < 7 = p_5 = p(5)$, and so $7 = p(5) \notin \text{DesBot}(p)$. \square

2.1. Proof of Lemma 1.6: Statement (1). To prove Statement (1) of Lemma 1.6 from Lemma 2.1, we make the following two observations.

Observation 1. Let $\pi \in S_{n+1}$ have no fixed points. Then, π admits no stretching pairs if and only if there exists $\ell \in [n]$ so that $E(\pi) = [\ell]$.

Proof. Indeed, clearly no $\pi \in S_{n+1}$ whose excedence set takes the form $E(\pi) = [\ell]$ can have stretching pairs. Suppose $\pi \in S_{n+1}$ has neither stretching pairs nor fixed points, and let $\ell \in [n]$ be the maximum integer for which $[\ell] \subseteq E(\pi)$. Then $[\ell] = E(\pi)$, since otherwise $j \in E(\pi) \setminus [\ell]$ would give the stretching pair $\ell + 1 < j$. \square

Observation 2. There is a bijection $F : C_{n+1} \rightarrow S_n$ so that for each $\pi \in C_{n+1}$ and for each $\ell \in [n]$, $E(\pi) = [\ell]$ if and only if $\text{DesBot}(F(\pi)) = [\ell - 1]$.

Proof. Indeed, fix $\pi \in C_{n+1}$ and define $F(\pi) = p \in S_n$ by the rule $p(i) = \pi^{n+1-i}(1) - 1$. For $j \in [n]$, we show $j + 1 \in E(\pi)$ if and only if $j \in \text{DesBot}(p)$. Write $j = p(i)$ for some $i \in [n]$ so that $j + 1 = p(i) + 1 = \pi^{n+1-i}(1)$ and $\pi(j + 1) = \pi^{n+1-(i-1)}(1) = p(i - 1) + 1$. Now, $\pi(j + 1) - (j + 1) = p(i - 1) - p(i)$ is positive if, and only if, $j + 1 \in E(\pi)$ and if, and only if, $j = p(i) \in \text{DesBot}(p)$. \square

To prove Statement (1) of Lemma 1.6, we note that every $\pi \in C_{n+1}$ is without fixed points, and so Observation 1 gives the disjoint union

$$C_{n+1}^* = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^n \{\pi \in C_{n+1} : E(\pi) = [\ell]\} \implies |C_{n+1}^*| = \sum_{\ell=1}^n |\{\pi \in C_{n+1} : E(\pi) = [\ell]\}|.$$

Applying Observation 2 and Lemma 2.1 (in this order) then gives

$$|C_{n+1}^*| = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |\{\pi \in S_n : \text{DesBot}(\pi) = [k]\}| = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |\{\pi \in S_n : E(\pi) = [k]\}| = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} [b^k a^{n-1-k}],$$

as promised.

2.2. Proof of Lemma 1.6: Statement (2). Let $\alpha_n = \alpha_n(\{21-34, 34-21\})$ denote the number of permutations $\pi \in S_n$ which avoid both of the vincular patterns 21–34 and 34–21. For an $(n+1)$ -cycle $\pi \in C_{n+1}$, we say that a stretching pair $\pi(i) < i < j < \pi(j)$ is *typical* if $\pi(j) \neq n+1$, and *exceptional* otherwise. Let $E_{n+1} \subset C_{n+1}$ denote the set of $(n+1)$ -cycles π whose only stretching pairs are exceptional. The following statement⁴ is an easy fact from Section 4.1 of [8].

Proposition 2.2 (Cooper et al. [8]). *There is a bijection $\phi : C_{n+1} \rightarrow S_n$ with the property that $\pi \in C_{n+1}^* \cup E_{n+1}$ if and only if $\phi(\pi)$ avoids both of the vincular patterns 21–34 and 34–21.*

Proposition 2.2 gives the identity $\alpha_n = |E_{n+1}| + |C_{n+1}^*|$, and hence, $\alpha_n \geq |C_{n+1}^*|$, which is the lower bound in Statement (2) of Lemma 1.6. It remains to prove the upper bound. We shall establish an injection $\iota : E_{n+1} \rightarrow C_{n+2}^*$, in which case $|E_{n+1}| \leq |C_{n+2}^*|$ and the upper bound in Statement (2) of Lemma 1.6 then follows.

To define ι , it will be convenient to work rather with $C_{n+2}[0, n+1]$, which is the set of $(n+2)$ -cycles defined on the elements $[0, n+1] = \{0, 1, \dots, n+1\}$. We take $C_{n+2}^*[0, n+1]$ to be the set of $\pi \in C_{n+2}[0, n+1]$ with no stretching pairs. Now, fix $\pi \in E_{n+1}$, and write $j_0 = \pi^{-1}(n+1)$. By construction, all stretching pairs $i < j$ in $\pi \in E_{n+1}$ have $j = j_0$. Define $p = \iota(\pi) \in C_{n+2}^*[0, n+1]$ by the following rule: $p(0) = n+1$, $p(j_0) = 0$, and $p(i) = \pi(i)$ for all remaining $i \in [n+1]$. Clearly, ι is an injection and $p = \iota(\pi)$ is an $(n+2)$ -cycle on the elements $[0, n+1]$. Note that all stretching pairs of π have been eliminated in $p = \iota(\pi)$, and no new ones arise.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

We begin by outlining the main approach to our proof of Theorem 1.3. To that end, we note a result of Clark and Ehrenborg (see [6, Thm. 3.1]) that $[b^r a^s]$ has bivariate exponential generating function

$$\sum_{r,s \geq 0} \frac{[b^r a^s]}{r!s!} x^r y^s = \frac{e^{-x} e^{-y}}{(e^{-x} + e^{-y} - 1)^2} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(\frac{e^{-y}}{e^{-x} + e^{-y} - 1} \right). \quad (3.1)$$

Now, for (x, y) in a neighborhood of $(0, 0)$, write

$$\frac{e^{-y}}{e^{-x} + e^{-y} - 1} = \sum_{r,s \geq 0} A_{r,s} x^r y^s. \quad (3.2)$$

We will apply a result of Pemantle and Wilson [18, 19, 20] to the coefficients $A_{r,s}$ when $(r, s) \in S_{\varepsilon_0}$ (cf. equation (1.4)), which will provide asymptotics on these coefficients. From there, Theorem 1.3 will follow, since by equation (3.1) we have

$$[b^{r-1} a^s] = r!s! A_{r,s}. \quad (3.3)$$

While the plan above is straightforward, the details take some work. Indeed, the result of Pemantle and Wilson is a highly technical statement, and much of our work will be in showing that it can be applied to the setting we need. Let us now proceed to the result of Pemantle and Wilson.

3.1. Preliminaries and the result of Pemantle and Wilson. In all that follows, suppose $F : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a meromorphic function, where we write $F(x, y) = G(x, y)/H(x, y)$ for some holomorphic functions $G, H : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We write $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_F = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : H(x, y) = 0\}$ for the variety of singularities of F . We say that H *vanishes to order one* on \mathcal{V} if $\nabla H(x, y) \neq \vec{0}$ for each $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$. We write $\mathbf{dir}(x, y) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}} \{(xH_x, yH_y)\}$.

On the variety \mathcal{V} , we have the following important concept of a *strictly minimal point*.

⁴The bijection ϕ in Proposition 2.2 is easy to state. If $(n+1 a_1 \dots a_n) \in C_{n+1}$ is given in cyclic notation $n+1 \mapsto a_1 \mapsto \dots \mapsto a_n \mapsto n+1$, then $\phi(\pi) = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in S_n$, which we've written in customary notation $i \mapsto a_i$.

Definition 1. A point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ is called *strictly minimal* if the closed bidisk

$$\overline{D}(0, |x|) \times \overline{D}(0, |y|) = \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z| \leq |x|, |w| \leq |y|\}$$

intersects \mathcal{V} only at the point (x, y) .

The following result of Pemantle and Wilson appeared as Theorem 3.1 in [18], as Corollary 3.21 in [19], and as Theorem 9.5.7 in [20].

Theorem 3.1 (Pemantle, Wilson [18, 19, 20]). *Let $F = G/H : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a meromorphic function with variety of singularities $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_F$. Write $F(x, y) = \sum_{r,s \geq 0} A_{r,s} x^r y^s$ outside of \mathcal{V} , and assume H vanishes to order one on \mathcal{V} .*

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, and assume that for each $(r, s) \in S_\varepsilon$ (cf. equation (1.4)), there exists $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ so that the following conditions hold:

- (i) $(r, s) \in \mathbf{dir}(x, y)$, where the point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ is strictly minimal;
- (ii) As $(r, s) \in S_\varepsilon$ varies, the point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ varies smoothly over some compact set;
- (iii) The point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ satisfies that $G(x, y) \neq 0$, and also,

$$Q(x, y) := -y^2 H_y^2 x H_x - y H_y x^2 H_x^2 - x^2 y^2 (H_y^2 H_{xx} + H_x^2 H_{yy} - 2H_x H_y H_{xy}) \neq 0.$$

Then as $r, s \rightarrow \infty$ with $(r, s) \in S_\varepsilon$, we have

$$A_{r,s} = \left(G(x, y) + O(s^{-1/2}) \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} x^{-r} y^{-s} \sqrt{\frac{-y H_y}{s Q(x, y)}}, \quad (3.4)$$

where the error estimate $O(s^{-1/2})$ is uniform over S_ε .

3.2. Deriving Theorem 1.3 from Theorem 3.1. From equation (3.1), set

$$F(x, y) = \frac{e^{-y}}{e^{-x} + e^{-y} - 1}, \quad G(x, y) = e^{-y}, \quad H(x, y) = e^{-x} + e^{-y} - 1, \quad (3.5)$$

and $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_F = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : H(x, y) = e^{-x} + e^{-y} - 1 = 0\}$.

Clearly, G and H are holomorphic functions so that F is meromorphic with variety of singularities given by \mathcal{V} . Clearly, ∇H is never zero, and therefore H vanishes to order one on \mathcal{V} .

Fix $(r, s) \in S_{\varepsilon_0}$ (cf. equation (1.4)). To apply Theorem 3.1, we must guarantee the existence of a point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ so that Conditions (i)–(iii) above hold. To find the desired point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$, consider the equation

$$r \frac{e^x}{x} = s \frac{e^y}{y} \quad \text{on the variety } \mathcal{V}. \quad (3.6)$$

Using the identity $y = -\log(1 - e^{-x})$ on \mathcal{V} , we see that equation (3.6) holds if, and only if,

$$y = \frac{s}{r} \cdot \frac{x e^y}{e^x} = \frac{s}{r} \cdot \frac{x}{e^x - 1}.$$

Again using $y = -\log(1 - e^{-x})$ on \mathcal{V} , we see that equation (3.6) holds for x satisfying

$$-\log(1 - e^{-x}) = \frac{s}{r} \cdot \frac{x}{e^x - 1} \quad \implies \quad \frac{s}{r} = \frac{(1 - e^x) \log(1 - e^{-x})}{x}. \quad (3.7)$$

Recall from equation (1.3) that f is invertible.

Returning to equation (3.7), one solution $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ to equation (3.6) has $x = f^{-1}(s/r) > 0$, where f is the function defined by equation (1.3). Using symmetric calculations and $x = -\log(1 - e^{-y})$ on \mathcal{V} , we also find that this solution has $y = f^{-1}(r/s) > 0$.

Thus, for fixed $(r, s) \in S_{\varepsilon_0}$, we have identified the promised point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ by $x = f^{-1}(s/r)$ and $y = f^{-1}(r/s)$. It remains to show that this fixed point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ satisfies Conditions (i)–(iii) of Theorem 3.1.

Verifying Condition (i). Consider $\mathbf{dir}(x, y) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{(xH_x, yH_y)\} \stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{(-xe^{-x}, -ye^{-y})\}$. Since $x = f^{-1}(s/r)$ and $y = f^{-1}(r/s)$ are solutions of equation (3.6), write

$$k = r \frac{e^x}{x} = s \frac{e^y}{y} \implies r = kxe^{-x} \text{ and } s = kye^{-y} \implies (r, s) \in \mathbf{dir}(x, y),$$

as promised. To see that (x, y) is strictly minimal, we will apply the following lemma (which we prove in the next subsection).

Lemma 3.1. *If $(a, b) \in \mathcal{V} \cap (0, 1)^2$ (cf. equation (3.5)), then (a, b) is strictly minimal on \mathcal{V} .*

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Fix $(a, b) \in \mathcal{V} \cap (0, 1)^2$, where we recall from equation (3.5) that

$$\mathcal{V} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : H(x, y) = e^{-x} + e^{-y} - 1 = 0\}.$$

To show that (a, b) is strictly minimal on \mathcal{V} , we prove that

$$\min_{z \in \overline{D}(0, a)} \Re e^{-z} \text{ is achieved at only } z = a, \quad (3.8)$$

and so symmetrically,

$$\min_{w \in \overline{D}(0, b)} \Re e^{-w} \text{ is achieved at only } w = b.$$

As such, if $(z, w) \in \overline{D}(0, a) \times \overline{D}(0, b)$ satisfies $(z, w) \neq (a, b)$, we have

$$\Re H(z, w) = \Re e^{-z} + \Re e^{-w} - 1 > e^{-a} + e^{-b} - 1 = 0,$$

in which case $H(z, w) \neq 0$ and so $(z, w) \notin \mathcal{V}$.

To show the statement (3.8), we solve for all $z \in \overline{D}(0, a)$ which minimize $\Re e^{-z}$ (and show that only $z = a$ works). We begin by making the following initial considerations. For $z \in \overline{D}(0, a)$, we write $z = u + iv$ so that $u^2 + v^2 \leq a^2$ and $\Re e^{-z} = e^{-u} \cos v$. Note that $\Re e^{-z} = e^{-u} \cos v$ is a harmonic function (it is the real part of an analytic function). As such, the maximum principle [1, Sec. 6.2] ensures that the minimum value of $\Re e^{-z} = e^{-u} \cos v$ over $\overline{D}(0, a)$ is attained at the boundary $\partial D(0, a) = \{z \in \overline{D}(0, a) : |z|^2 = u^2 + v^2 = a^2\}$. As such, we will always assume $v \neq 0$, for otherwise $z = u = \pm a$, and the following hold:

- (1) $z = -a$ does not minimize $\Re e^{-z} = e^{-u} \cos v$ (since $e^a > e^{-a}$ with $a > 0$),
- (2) $z = a$ is what we promise in the statement (3.8).

To minimize $\Re e^{-z} = e^{-u} \cos v$ subject to $|z|^2 = u^2 + v^2 = a^2$, we use the Lagrange multiplier rule: for a scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, set

$$\nabla (e^{-u} \cos v) = \lambda \nabla (u^2 + v^2) \implies (-e^{-u} \cos v, -e^{-u} \sin v) = (2\lambda u, 2\lambda v). \quad (3.9)$$

In light of the rule (3.9), we may now also assume $u \neq 0$, for otherwise, $\cos v = 0$ implies $0 \neq v = k\pi/2$ for some (necessarily nonzero) $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and so $1 > a = v^2 = k^2\pi^2/4 \geq \pi^2/4 > 2$. At this stage of our analysis, we will have proven the statement (3.8) if we can show that

$$\text{no } z = u + iv \in \partial \overline{D}(0, a) \text{ with } u \neq 0 \neq v \text{ satisfy equation (3.9)}. \quad (3.10)$$

Indeed, with $u \neq 0 \neq v$, we may rewrite equation (3.9) to say

$$\frac{\sin v}{v} = -2\lambda e^{-u} = \frac{\cos v}{u} \implies v = u \tan v, \quad (3.11)$$

which we now rewrite in polar coordinates. For $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, let $u = a \cos \theta$ and $v = a \sin \theta$, where we may assume from $u \neq 0 \neq v$ that $\theta \notin \{0, \pi/2, \pi, 3\pi/2\}$. Then equation (3.11) is equivalent to

$$a \sin \theta = a \cos \theta \tan(a \sin \theta) \implies \tan \theta = \tan(a \sin \theta) \implies a \sin \theta = \theta + k\pi \text{ where } k \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (3.12)$$

We now investigate the possible values of $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ in equation (3.12). Since $a \in (0, 1)$ and $\theta \in (0, 2\pi)$, we have

$$|\theta + k\pi| = a|\sin \theta| < |\sin \theta| < \min\{1, \theta\} \quad (3.13)$$




FIGURE 1. The Sector S_{ε_0} in the rs -plane (left), and the real section of \mathcal{V} (right) in the xy -plane with the set of minimal points (x, y) corresponding to S_{ε_0} plotted in bold.

and so only $k \in \{-1, -2\}$ are possible. However, $k \neq -1$ because the two sides of $a \sin \theta = \theta - \pi$ will have opposite signs. Moreover, $k \neq -2$ because

$$2\pi - \theta = -a \sin \theta = a \sin(-\theta) = a \sin(2\pi - \theta) \leq a |\sin(2\pi - \theta)| < |\sin(2\pi - \theta)| \leq 2\pi - \theta.$$

Thus, we have proven the statement (3.10), and hence the statement (3.8), which concludes the proof of Lemma 3.1. \square

To apply Lemma 3.1, we have already noted that $x, y > 0$ (cf. Fact 1), so it remains to show that $x, y < 1$. Now, since $(r, s) \in S_{\varepsilon_0}$ (cf. equation (1.4)), we have $\frac{s}{r}, \frac{r}{s} > \varepsilon_0$, where we note from equation (1.4) that $f(1) = \varepsilon_0$. Thus, since f is monotone decreasing, we must have $x = f^{-1}(s/r) < 1$ and $y = f^{-1}(r/s) < 1$ so that, by Lemma 3.1, (x, y) is strictly minimal.

Verifying Condition (ii). It is easy to verify Condition (ii). Indeed, by the Inverse Function Theorem, $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ varies smoothly as $(r, s) \in S_{\varepsilon_0}$ varies. Moreover, $(x, y) \in \mathcal{V}$ varies over the trace of the curve $(f^{-1}(t), f^{-1}(1/t))$ for $t \in [\varepsilon_0, 1/\varepsilon_0]$ (see Figure 1), which is the continuous image of a compact set.

Verifying Condition (iii). It is slightly tedious to verify Condition (iii). To begin, note that the function $G(x, y) = e^{-y}$ from equation (3.5) is never zero. We show that the function $Q(x, y)$ is always positive on $\mathcal{V} \cap (\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$. It is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned} Q(x, y) &= -y^2 H_y^2 x H_x - y H_y x^2 H_x^2 - x^2 y^2 (H_y^2 H_{xx} + H_x^2 H_{yy} - 2H_x H_y H_{xy}) \\ &= xy e^{-x-y} [ye^{-y} + xe^{-x} - xy(e^{-y} + e^{-x})], \end{aligned}$$

which we defined in equation (1.2). Now, $x > 0$ and $y > 0$ imply that $xy e^{-x-y} > 0$, so we will disregard this factor. Moreover, in the expression above, $e^{-y} + e^{-x} = 1$ on \mathcal{V} , so we consider the simpler function

$$P(x, y) = ye^{-y} + xe^{-x} - xy,$$

and prove that $P(x, y)$ is positive on $\mathcal{V} \cap (\mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^+)$. Using $1 + x < e^x$ on \mathcal{V} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + x < e^x = \frac{1}{1 - e^{-y}} &\implies x < \frac{e^{-y}}{1 - e^{-y}} \implies \\ P(x, y) = ye^{-y} - x(y - e^{-x}) &> ye^{-y} - \left(\frac{e^{-y}}{1 - e^{-y}} \right) (y - e^{-x}) = \frac{e^{-y}}{1 - e^{-y}} (e^{-x} - ye^{-y}). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the first factor above is positive on $y > 0$, so it suffices to consider $R(x, y) = e^{-x} - ye^{-y}$. However, on \mathcal{V} , we have $R(x, y) = 1 - e^{-y}(1 + y) > 0$, since $1 + y < e^y$. This confirms Condition (iii).

We now conclude the proof of Theorem 1.3. We apply Theorem 3.1 to $e^{-y}/(e^{-x} + e^{-y} - 1)$ (cf. equations (3.2) and (3.5)) to conclude that for $r, s \rightarrow \infty$ with $(r, s) \in S_{\varepsilon_0}$,

$$A_{r,s} = \left(e^{-y} + O(s^{-1/2}) \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} x^{-r} y^{-s} \sqrt{\frac{ye^y}{sQ(x,y)}}$$

and so, by equation (3.3), we have

$$[b^{r-1}a^s] = r!s!A_{r,s} = r!s! \left(e^{-y} + O(s^{-1/2}) \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} x^{-r} y^{-s} \sqrt{\frac{ye^y}{sQ(x,y)}},$$

as promised.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

The proof of Theorem 1.2 involves specializing Theorem 1.3 to the case $r - 1 = \lfloor (n - 1)/2 \rfloor$ and $s = \lceil (n - 1)/2 \rceil$, and therefore, consists of calculations. We split the proof into two cases, depending on the parity of n , and begin with the easier (cleaner) case.

4.1. Proof of Theorem 1.2 (n is even). When n is even, we have $r = s = n/2$, and so $x = y = f^{-1}(1)$, where f is the function defined in equation (1.3). As we saw in the proof of Theorem 1.3, (x, y) is a strictly minimal point on $\mathcal{V} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : e^{-x} + e^{-y} - 1 = 0\}$, and so we easily calculate $x = y = \log 2$. It remains to substitute $r = s = n/2$ and $x = y = \log 2$ into the asymptotic expression of Theorem 1.2. We proceed in a piecemeal way.

To begin, note first that with $x = y = \log 2$ and $r = s = n/2$, we have

$$Q(x, y) = \frac{1}{4}(1 - \log 2) \log^3 2 \quad \implies \quad x^{-r} y^{-s} \sqrt{\frac{ye^{-y}}{sQ(x, y)}} = \frac{2}{\log^{n+1} 2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n(1 - \log 2)}}. \quad (4.1)$$

With $r = s = n/2$, we use Stirling's approximation to conclude

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} r!s! = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\left(\frac{n}{2} \right)! \right)^2 = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right) \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2^{n+1}} n!. \quad (4.2)$$

With $y = \log 2$ and $s = n/2$, the error term of Theorem 1.3 is

$$e^{-y} + O(s^{-1/2}) = \frac{1}{2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right). \quad (4.3)$$

Multiplying equations (4.1)–(4.3) together yields

$$\left[b^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor} a^{\lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil} \right] = \left(\frac{1}{2 \log 2 \sqrt{1 - \log 2}} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \left(\frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)^n n!,$$

which is slightly stronger than promised.

4.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2 (n is odd). The calculations here are similar, and we claim that equations (4.1)–(4.3) still hold as long as we dampen them to include some error factor of $(1 + o(1))$, where $o(1) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. When n is odd, we have $r = (n + 1)/2 = s + 1$, and it is routine to update equation (4.2) to say

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} r!s! = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{n+1}{2} \right)! \left(\frac{n-1}{2} \right)! = (1 + o(1)) \frac{\sqrt{n}}{2^{n+1}} n!. \quad (4.4)$$

Now,

$$x = f^{-1}\left(\frac{s}{r}\right) = f^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{2}{n+1}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad y = f^{-1}\left(\frac{r}{s}\right) = f^{-1}\left(1 + \frac{2}{n-1}\right), \quad (4.5)$$

and so by the continuity of f^{-1} , we have $x, y \rightarrow f^{-1}(1) = \log 2$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By continuity alone, we may update equation (4.3) and parts of equation (4.1) to say

$$e^{-y} + O(s^{-1/2}) = \frac{1}{2} + o(1) \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$Q(x, y) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{4} (1 - \log 2) \log^3 2 \implies \sqrt{\frac{ye^{-y}}{sQ(x, y)}} = (1 + o(1)) \frac{2}{\log 2} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n(1 - \log 2)}}. \quad (4.7)$$

With its large exponents, we need to be slightly more careful with the the factor $x^{-r}y^{-s}$ in equation (4.1).

The function f defined in equation (1.3) is analytic, invertible, and f' is nonzero. As such, f^{-1} is analytic, and so we use Taylor's theorem to perform a linear approximation of $f^{-1}(z)$ near $a = 1$. Set $d = (f^{-1})'(1)$. We update equation (4.5) to say

$$\begin{aligned} x &= f^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{2}{n+1}\right) = f^{-1}(1) - d\frac{2}{n+1} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) = \log 2 - d\frac{2}{n+1} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) \\ \text{and } y &= f^{-1}\left(1 + \frac{2}{n-1}\right) = f^{-1}(1) + d\frac{2}{n-1} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) = \log 2 + d\frac{2}{n-1} + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

and so $xy = \log^2 2 + \Theta(1/n^2)$. Now, with $r = (n+1)/2 = s+1$,

$$\begin{aligned} x^r y^s &= x(xy)^s = x \left(\log^2 2 + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)\right)^s \stackrel{(4.8)}{=} (\log^{2s+1} 2) \left(1 + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) \left(1 + \Theta\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right)\right)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \log^n 2 \implies x^{-r} y^{-s} = \frac{1}{\log^n 2} (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Now, multiplying equations (4.4), (4.6), (4.7), and (4.9) yields

$$\left[b^{\lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor} a^{\lceil (n-1)/2 \rceil} \right] = \left(\frac{1}{2 \log 2 \sqrt{1 - \log 2}} + o(1) \right) \left(\frac{1}{2 \log 2} \right)^n n!,$$

as promised.

APPENDIX: PROOF OF FACT 1

Recall that we wish to prove $f(t) = t^{-1}(1 - e^t) \log(1 - e^{-t})$ is a strictly decreasing bijection from \mathbb{R}^+ onto \mathbb{R}^+ . To that end, it is straightforward to check that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} f(t) = +\infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} f(t) = 0$ (the numerator of the second limit tends to 1). By continuity, we immediately conclude that $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is onto.

The remainder of the Appendix is reserved to proving that $f : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is strictly decreasing, and in particular, that f' is negative on \mathbb{R}^+ . In what follows, we make the substitution $t = \log p$, where $p \in (1, \infty)$, and we consider the function

$$F(p) = f(\log p) = \frac{(1-p) \log(1 - \frac{1}{p})}{\log p} = \frac{(1-p) (\log(p-1) - \log p)}{\log p} = \frac{(1-p) \log(p-1)}{\log p} - (1-p).$$

We will show that F' is negative on $(1, \infty)$, and since $t = \log p$ is increasing in $p \in (1, \infty)$, we will infer that f' is negative on \mathbb{R}^+ . This will conclude our proof.

Observe that

$$F'(p) - 1 = \frac{1}{\log^2 p} \left[\log p \left[(-1) \log(p-1) + (1-p) \frac{1}{p-1} \right] - (1-p) \log(1-p) \cdot \frac{1}{p} \right],$$

so that

$$F'(p) = -\frac{p(\log p) \log(p-1) + p \log p + (1-p) \log(p-1) - p \log^2 p}{p \log^2 p}.$$

We show that the numerator

$$N(p) = p(\log p) \log(p-1) + p \log p + (1-p) \log(p-1) - p \log^2 p$$

is positive on $(1, \infty)$, which then implies that F' is negative on $(1, \infty)$. For that, we first note that $N(p) \rightarrow 0^+$ as $p \rightarrow 1^+$. As such, it suffices to show that N' is positive on $(1, \infty)$.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} N'(p) &= (\log p) \log(p-1) + \log(p-1) + \frac{p}{p-1} \log p + \log p + 1 - \log(p-1) - 1 - \log^2 p - 2 \log p \\ &= (\log p) \left[\frac{1}{p-1} - \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{p-1} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\log p > 0$ on $(1, \infty)$. The second factor above is also positive, since $\log(1+x) < x$ holds for all $x = 1/(p-1) \in \mathbb{R}$.

REFERENCES

1. L. V. Ahlfors, *Complex analysis: An introduction of the theory of analytic functions of one complex variable*, Second edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Toronto-London, 1966.
2. D. André, *Développement de sec x and tan x*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 88 (1879), 965-979.
3. L. Alseda, J. Llibre, M. Misiurewicz, *Combinatorial Dynamics and Entropy in Dimension One*, second ed., Advanced Series in Nonlinear Dynamics, vol. 5, World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 2000.
4. E. Babson, E. Steingrímsson, *Generalized permutation patterns and a classification of the Mahonian statistics*, Sm. Lothar. Combin. 44 (2000) Art. B44b, 18 pp.
5. M. Bousquet-Mélou, A. Claesson, M. Dukes, S. Kitaev, *(2+2)-free posets, ascent sequences and pattern avoiding permutations*, J. Comb. Thy. Series A, 117 (2010), 884-909.
6. E. Clark, R. Ehrenborg, *Explicit expressions for the extremal excedance set statistics*, Eur. J. Comb., 31, No. 1, (2010), 270-279.
7. R. J. Clarke, E. Steingrímsson, and J. Zeng, *New Euler-Mahonian statistics on permutations and words*, Adv. Appl. Math. 18 (1997), 237-270.
8. J. Cooper, E. Lundberg, B. Nagle *Generalized Pattern Frequency in Large Permutations*, The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics, 20 (2013), P28.
9. N. G. de Bruijn, *Permutations with given ups and downs*, Nieuw Arch. Wisk. 18 (1970), 61-65.
10. E. Deutsch, private communication
11. R. Ehrenborg, E. Steingrímsson *The excedance set of a permutation*, Adv. in Appl. Math. 24 (2000), 284-299.
12. S. Elizalde, *Asymptotic enumeration of permutations avoiding generalized patterns*, Adv. in Appl. Math. 36 (2006), 138-155.
13. S. Elizalde, M. Noy, *Consecutive patterns in permutations*, Adv. in Appl. Math. 30 (2003), 110-125.
14. D. Foata and M. P. Schützenberger, *Théorie géométriques des polynômes eulériens*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 138, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970.
15. E. Lundberg, *Almost all orbit types imply period-3*, Topology and its Applications, 154, No. 14 (2007), 2741-2744.
16. P. A. MacMahon, *Combinatory Analysis*, Vols. 1 and 2, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 1915 (reprinted by Chelsea, New York, 1955).
17. I. Niven, *A combinatorial problem of finite sequences*, Nieuw Arch. Wisk. 16 (1968), 116-123.
18. R. Pemantle, M. C. Wilson, *Asymptotics of multivariate sequences: I. smooth points of the singular variety*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A 97 (2002), 129-161.
19. R. Pemantle, M. C. Wilson, *Twenty Combinatorial Examples of Asymptotics Derived from Multivariate Generating Functions*, SIAM Rev. 50 (2008), 199272.
20. R. Pemantle, M. C. Wilson, *Analytic Combinatorics in Several Variables*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 2013.
21. A. N. Sharkovsky, *Coexistence of cycles of a continuous map of a line into itself*, Ukrain. Mat. Zh. 16 (1964), 61-71 (Russian); English translation, Internat. J. Bifur. Chaos Appl. Sci. Engrg. 5 (1995), 1263-1273.
22. N.J.A. Sloane, *On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences. Published electronically at <http://oeis.org/>, sequence A136127.*

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47906
E-mail address: rferrazd@math.purdue.edu

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY, BOCA RATON, FL 33431
E-mail address: elundber@fau.edu

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA, TAMPA, FL 33620
E-mail address: bnagle@math.usf.edu