

# On vanishing of Kronecker coefficients

Christian Ikenmeyer  
Texas A. & M. University

Ketan D. Mulmuley \*  
The University of Chicago

Michael Walter  
Stanford University

July 13, 2015

## Abstract

It is shown that:

- (1) The problem of deciding positivity of Kronecker coefficients is NP-hard.
- (2) There exists a positive ( $\#P$ )-formula for a subclass of Kronecker coefficients whose positivity is NP-hard to decide.
- (3) For any  $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ , there exists  $0 < a < 1$  such that, for all  $m$ , there exist  $\Omega(2^{m^a})$  partition triples  $(\lambda, \mu, \mu)$  in the Kronecker cone such that: (a) the Kronecker coefficient  $k_{\mu, \mu}^{\lambda}$  is zero, (b) the height of  $\mu$  is  $m$ , (c) the height of  $\lambda$  is  $\leq m^\epsilon$ , and (d)  $|\lambda| = |\mu| \leq m^3$ .

The last result takes a step towards proving the existence of occurrence-based representation-theoretic obstructions in the context of the GCT approach to the permanent vs. determinant problem. Its proof also illustrates the effectiveness of the explicit proof strategy of GCT.

## 1 Introduction

The existence of representation-theoretic obstructions [MS08] in the context of the geometric complexity theory (GCT) approach to the permanent vs. determinant problem (cf. the overview [Mul11] and the references therein) depends crucially [MS08, BLMW11, BCI11, Kum11] on the existence of vanishing Kronecker coefficients with the partition triples satisfying some rigid shape restrictions. One such important shape restriction proved in [BCI11] is that these triples must lie in the moment cone [Kir84] associated with the Kronecker coefficients, called the Kronecker cone. A similar result is proved in [Kum11]. As pointed out in [Kum11], this makes the problem of showing existence of such partition triples rather challenging, since the asymptotic techniques of algebraic geometry and representation theory, such as the ones based on the effective description [BS00, Kly04, Res10, VW15] of the linear inequalities defining the Kronecker cone, cannot be used to prove this existence. The main result in this article (Theorem 1.4) proves existence of a superpolynomial number of partition triples, with vanishing

---

\*Supported by NSF grant CCF-1017760. A part of this work was done in the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing, Berkeley.

Kronecker coefficients, in the Kronecker cone of the given partition size satisfying a relaxed form of the additional shape restrictions that arise in GCT. This constitutes a concrete step towards proving existence of occurrence-based representation-theoretic obstructions in GCT.

Its proof, based on the explicit proof strategy of GCT formulated in [Mul11, Mul10a, Mul10b], also yields results concerning the complexity of Kronecker coefficients that are of independent interest. The first such result (Theorem 1.1) shows that the problem of deciding positivity of Kronecker coefficients is NP-hard. The second result (Theorem 1.2) gives the first known instance of a positive ( $\#P$ ) formula for a subclass of Kronecker coefficients whose positivity is NP-hard to decide.

We now state these results in more detail.

## 1.1 NP-hardness of deciding positivity of Kronecker coefficients

Given a partition  $\alpha : \alpha_0 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_{r-1}$  (a sequence of non-negative integers), let  $V_\alpha(GL_r(\mathbb{C}))$  denote the corresponding Weyl module (irreducible representation) of  $GL_r(\mathbb{C})$ . Consider the natural homomorphism from  $H = GL_r(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_r(\mathbb{C})$  to  $G = GL(\mathbb{C}^r \otimes \mathbb{C}^r) = GL_{r^2}(\mathbb{C})$ . Given partitions  $\lambda : \lambda_0 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{r^2-1}, \mu : \mu_0 \geq \dots \geq \mu_{r-1}$ , and  $\pi : \pi_0 \geq \dots \geq \pi_{r-1}$  with  $|\lambda| = |\mu| = |\pi|$ , where  $|\lambda| = \sum_i \lambda_i$  denotes the *size* of  $\lambda$ , the *Kronecker coefficient*  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  is defined to be [FH91] the multiplicity of the irreducible  $H$ -module  $V_\mu(GL_r(\mathbb{C})) \otimes V_\pi(GL_r(\mathbb{C}))$  in the irreducible  $G$ -module  $V_\lambda(G)$ , considered as an  $H$ -module via the natural homomorphism from  $H$  to  $G$ . Let KRONECKER be the problem of deciding positivity of  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$ , given  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\pi$  in unary.

This problem is of fundamental interest in the context of the explicit proof strategy [Mul11, Mul10a, Mul10b] of GCT. It is known [KT01, BMS11] that positivity of Littlewood-Richardson coefficients, which are special cases of Kronecker coefficients, can be decided in strongly polynomial time. In contrast:

**Theorem 1.1.** *KRONECKER is NP-hard.*

It was conjectured in [Mul10b] that the problem of deciding positivity of Kronecker coefficients is in  $P$ . This result shows that this is not so, in general, assuming that  $P \neq NP$ . However, only the weaker version of this conjecture for rectangular Kronecker coefficients [MS08, BCI11] (cf. Section 1.3) is needed in GCT, since only such coefficients arise in the study of the orbit closure of the determinant. For the same reason, the evidence in support of the conjecture in [Mul10b], based on the conditional derandomization in [Mul12] of Noether’s Normalization Lemma for the orbit-closure of the determinant, applies only to the rectangular Kronecker coefficients. The proof of Theorem 1.1, in conjunction with the additional result (Theorem 6.9) proved in this article, provides good evidence in support of this weaker conjecture as needed in GCT.

## 1.2 A $\#P$ -formula for a subclass of partitions of type NP

One outstanding unsolved problem of classical representation theory is to find a positive formula for Kronecker coefficients “akin to” the well known positive Littlewood Richardson rule; cf Stanley[Sta02] for its history and importance. In classical representation theory, the phrase “akin to” is used only informally. A formal complexity-theoretic version of this problem is to find a  $\#P$ -formula for Kronecker coefficients. Thus, by a positive formula, we mean a  $\#P$ -formula henceforth.

Call a subclass  $\Pi$  of partition triples of *type NP* if the problem of deciding positivity of  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$ , with  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi) \in \Pi$ , is NP-hard. Call  $\Pi$  of *type P* if the problem of deciding positivity of  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$ , with  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi) \in \Pi$ , is in  $P$ .

All positive rules known so far for restricted classes of Kronecker coefficients have been for subclasses of partition triples of type P, as known or conjecturally. For example, the classical Littlewood-Richardson rule gives a positive rule for Littlewood-Richardson coefficients which, as already mentioned, constitute a special class of Kronecker coefficients. The corresponding subclass of partition triples is of type P, since the problem of deciding positivity of Littlewood-Richardson coefficients is in  $P$  [KT01, BMS11]. The article [BMS15] gives a positive rule for Kronecker coefficients when two of the partitions have height at most two. The corresponding subclass of partition triples is of type P, since the Kronecker coefficient can be computed in this case (and more generally, for partitions of bounded height) in polynomial time [CDW12]. The article [Bla12] gives a positive rule for Kronecker coefficients when one of the partitions is a hook. The corresponding subclass of partition triples is of type P conjecturally, since the problem of deciding positivity of Kronecker coefficients, when one of the partitions is a hook, is conjecturally in  $P$  (in view of Theorem 6.6).

The following result gives the first known instance of a positive rule for Kronecker coefficients for a subclass of partition triples of type NP.

**Theorem 1.2.** *There exists a #P-formula for Kronecker coefficients for a subclass of partition triples of type NP. Here the partition triples can be specified in unary or binary.*

The proof of this result exhibits an explicit such subclass of partition triples of type NP; cf. Sections 2 and 3.

This result provides good evidence in support of the conjecture in [Mul10b] that there exists a #P-formula for Kronecker coefficients in general—this would imply that KRONECKER is in NP, which is not known so far.

### 1.3 Exceptional Kronecker coefficients

For a given partition  $\lambda$  with size  $|\lambda|$  divisible by  $r$ , let  $\delta(\lambda)$  denote the rectangular partition  $(d, \dots, d)$  ( $r$  times) where  $d = |\lambda|/r$ . We call the Kronecker coefficient  $k_{\delta(\lambda), \delta(\lambda)}^\lambda$  *rectangular*.

For a given  $r$ , the *Kronecker cone* is defined as

$$\text{Kron}(r) := \overline{\{(\lambda, \mu, \pi)/l \mid \lambda, \mu, \pi \in \mathbb{N}^r, l \in \mathbb{Q}^+, k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda > 0\}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{3r}.$$

It is known [Kir84] to be a polyhedral cone.

The following definition gives the exceptional properties that a Kronecker coefficient must have for it to be useful in the context of the GCT approach to the VP vs. VNP problem [MS08, BLMW11].

Let  $\text{ht}(\lambda)$  denote the height, i.e., the number of non-zero parts of  $\lambda$ .

**Definition 1.3.** *Fix any constant  $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ , and a constant  $b > 1$ . We call a partition triple  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$ , with  $\lambda, \mu$  and  $\pi$  of the same size,  $(\epsilon, b)$ -exceptional if:*

- (0)  $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda = 0$ ,
- (1)  $\mu = \pi = \delta(\lambda)$ , with  $|\lambda| = |\mu| = |\pi|$  divisible by  $r := \text{ht}(\mu) = \text{ht}(\pi)$ ,
- (2)  $\text{ht}(\lambda) \leq r^\epsilon$ ,
- (3)  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi) \in \text{Kron}(r)$ ,
- (4)  $|\lambda| = |\mu| = |\pi| \leq r^b$ ,

- (5) the multiplicity  $p(\lambda)$  of the Weyl module  $V_\lambda(GL_{r,2}(\mathbb{C}))$  in  $Sym^d(Sym^r(\mathbb{C}^{r^2}))$ ,  $d = |\lambda|/r$ , is positive, and
- (6)  $\lambda_0 \geq |\lambda|(1 - r^{\epsilon/2-1})$ .

We also call such partition tuples *exceptional*, without mentioning  $\epsilon$  and  $b$ , if it is understood that  $\epsilon$  can be chosen to be arbitrarily small,  $b$  is a large enough constant depending on  $\epsilon$ , and  $r \rightarrow \infty$ .

By [BCI11], (1) implies (3), assuming that the height of  $\lambda$  is  $\leq r^2$ , which is so by (2).

The constraint (3) is significant. Proving existence of the partition triples as in Definition 1.3 is delicate because of this constraint. Indeed, it may be possible to prove existence of superpolynomially many partition triples satisfying the constraints other than (1) and (3) using the known linear inequalities [BS00, Kly04, Res10, VW15] defining the Kronecker cone. But the constraint (3) implies that such asymptotic techniques based on the description of the Kronecker cone cannot be used to demonstrate existence of partition triples as in Definition 1.3. This is the main significance of the results in [BCI11, Kum11]

By the Saturation Theorem [KT99, DW00], Littlewood-Richardson coefficients cannot vanish for the partition triples that lie in the analogously defined Littlewood-Richardson cone. The constraint (3) also implies that to prove existence of the partition triples as in Definition 1.3, one needs to understand the failure of the saturation property for the Kronecker coefficients in one way or another.

The constraint (6) is motivated by [KL14]. It is shown there that this constraint holds if  $V_\lambda(G)$  is a representation-theoretic obstruction [MS08] in the context of the permanent vs. determinant problem.

It is a priori not at all clear that for any given constant  $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$  and a large enough constant  $b > 1$  depending on  $\epsilon$ , exceptional partition triples exist for arbitrary  $r$ . The experimental evidence [Ike12] for small values of  $r$  (with suitable  $\epsilon$  and  $b$ ) suggests that they are very rare, though they do exist for these small values. Thus an important problem in the context of GCT is to show that exceptional partition triples exist and that their number is large enough (as desired for the reasons explained in Section 1.7), although their density can be expected to be extremely small.

## 1.4 Construction of superpolynomially many partition triples in the Kronecker cone with vanishing Kronecker coefficients

As the first step towards this goal, we relax the constraint (1) to its weaker form that only requires that  $\mu = \pi$ , the constraint (5) to its weaker form that only requires that  $\lambda$  is not a hook<sup>1</sup>, and ignore the constraint (6). A priori, it is not clear that partition triples as needed exist even after this shape relaxation, because of the constraint (3), which is retained.

The following result shows that the number of vanishing Kronecker coefficients with this relaxation in Definition 1.3 is superpolynomial.

**Theorem 1.4** (The main result). *For any  $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ , there exists  $0 < a < 1$ , such that, for all  $m$ , there exist  $\Omega(2^{m^a})$  partition triples  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  such that*

- (0)  $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda = 0$ ,
- (1)  $\mu = \pi$ ,
- (2)  $ht(\mu) = m$ , and  $ht(\lambda) \leq m^\epsilon$ ,

---

<sup>1</sup>Since it can be shown that  $p(\lambda) = 0$  if  $\lambda$  is a hook.

- (3)  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi) \in \text{Kron}(m)$ ,
- (4)  $|\lambda| = |\mu| = |\pi| \leq m^3$ , and
- (5)  $\lambda$  is not a hook.

Furthermore:

**Theorem 1.5.** *Assuming  $\text{coNP} \neq \text{NP}$ , the set of partition triples satisfying the constraints (0)-(5) in Theorem 1.4, and the additional constraints that:*

- (6)  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \mu) \in \text{Kron}(m')$ , where  $m'$  is the maximum of the heights of  $\lambda^T$ ,  $\mu^T$  and  $\mu$ , and
- (7)  $(\lambda, \mu^T, \mu^T) \in \text{Kron}(m'')$ , where  $m''$  is the maximum of the heights of  $\lambda$  and  $\mu^T$ ,

is superpolynomial in  $m$ , as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

Here  $\lambda^T$  denote the transpose of  $\lambda$ . Its Young diagram is obtained by transposing the Young diagram of  $\lambda$ . It is well known that

$$k_{\mu, \mu}^{\lambda} = k_{\mu^T, \mu}^{\lambda^T} = k_{\mu^T, \mu^T}^{\lambda}.$$

The constraints (3), (6), and (7) together guarantee that vanishing of  $k_{\mu, \mu}^{\lambda}$  cannot be shown using the defining inequalities of the Kronecker cone [BS00, Kly04, Res10, VW15] in conjunction with this identity.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 shows that the partition triples  $(\lambda, \mu, \mu)$ 's satisfying the constraints therein can even be constructed *explicitly*. This means there is a one-to-one  $\text{poly}(m)$ -time-computable map from the set of Boolean strings of length  $\leq m^a$  to the set of partitions triples  $(\lambda, \mu, \mu)$ 's with the properties (0)-(5) in this result.

Though Theorem 1.4 shows existence of superpolynomially many partition triples satisfying the constraints therein, the density of such partition triples is exponentially small, since  $a$  therein is much smaller than 1; cf. Section 5.1.1. This may explain why vanishing Kronecker coefficients with the partition triples in the Kronecker cone occur so rarely in computer experiments, as observed in [Ike12].

## 1.5 Proof technique

Theorem 1.1 is proved by extending the NP-completeness technique in [BDLG01] in conjunction with the fundamental lower and upper bounds on Kronecker coefficients established in [Man97, BI13, Val00]. Theorem 1.2 is a byproduct of this proof.

A refined form of Theorem 1.1 lies at the heart of the proof of Theorem 1.4. Specifically, it is shown that (Theorem 4.2) the problem of deciding positivity of  $k_{\mu, \pi}^{\lambda}$  remains NP-hard under polynomial-time Karp reductions even when the partitions  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$ 's are required to satisfy the constraints (1)-(5) in Theorem 1.4. This is done by extending the proof technique of Theorem 1.4 using the result in [BCI11] that  $(\lambda, \delta(\lambda), \delta(\lambda))$ , for  $|\lambda|$  divisible by  $r$ , lies in the Kronecker cone whenever the height of  $\lambda$  is  $\leq r^2$ . By [For79], if there exists a co-sparse NP-complete language under polynomial-time Karp-reductions, then  $P = \text{NP}$ . (Here we call a language *sparse* if the number of strings in it of bitlength  $\leq N$  is bounded by a fixed polynomial in  $N$ . It is called *co-sparse* if its complement is sparse.) Hence this refined form (Theorem 4.2) of Theorem 1.1, in conjunction with [For79], implies that the set of partition triples satisfying the constraints (0)-(5) in Theorem 1.4 is non-sparse, i.e., has size superpolynomial in  $m$ , assuming that  $P \neq \text{NP}$ .

To prove Theorem 1.4, we have to get rid of the  $P \neq NP$  assumption and replace the superpolynomial bound by  $\Omega(2^{m^a})$  bound for some  $a > 0$ . This is done by showing (cf. Theorem 5.2) that there is an injective polynomial-time Karp reduction from the 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING problem [GJ79] to the problem of deciding positivity of Kronecker coefficients, with the partition triples satisfying the constraints (1)-(5) in Theorem 1.4. Hence, the  $\Omega(2^{m^a})$  bound in Theorem 1.4 follows from a similar lower bound on the number of instances of the 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING problem with “NO” answer. This proof automatically shows that  $\Omega(2^{m^a})$  partition triples satisfying the constraints in Theorem 1.4 can be constructed explicitly. This follows by fixing a suitable set of  $2^{N^b}$  instances, for some constant  $b > 0$ , of the 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING problem of bitlength  $\leq N$  with “NO” answer, and mapping them injectively, via a sequence of polynomial time Karp reductions, to  $\Omega(2^{m^a})$  such partition triples.

Theorem 1.5 is proved by extending the proof of Theorem 1.4 using an additional result here (Lemma 5.3), which extends the hardness vs. non-sparseness result in [For79], and the result in [BCMW], which shows that the membership problem for the Kronecker cone is in  $NP \cap coNP$ .

## 1.6 Effectiveness of the explicit proof strategy

Perhaps the most novel aspect of this paper is the synthesis of the representation theory of Kronecker coefficients with the theory of NP-completeness to prove unconditionally existence of superpolynomially many partition triples in the Kronecker cone with vanishing Kronecker coefficients.

In principle, the existence of partition triples satisfying the constraints in Theorem 1.4 may be proved by a nonconstructive technique. Yet, the only way we can prove this existence at present is by constructing such partitions *explicitly*, using the theory of algorithms, as done in the proof of Theorem 1.4. Thus this proof illustrates effectiveness of the explicit proof strategy [Mul11, Mul10a, Mul10b] of GCT in a nontrivial setting.

## 1.7 On the existence of representation-theoretic obstructions

For most exceptional partition triples  $(\lambda, \delta(\lambda), \delta(\lambda))$ 's (cf. Definition 1.3), the Weyl module  $V_\lambda(G)$ ,  $G = GL_{r,2}(\mathbb{C})$ , can be expected to be an (occurrence-based) representation-theoretic obstruction [MS08] in the context of the GCT approach to the permanent vs. determinant problem. Thus, if the number of exceptional  $\lambda$ 's is large (superpolynomial), then most of them can be expected to yield occurrence-based representation theoretic obstructions. Hence Theorem 1.4 may be taken as a step towards proving the existence of occurrence-based representation-theoretic obstructions in the context of the GCT approach to the permanent vs. determinant problem.

We can expect a result similar to Theorem 1.4 even for vanishing rectangular Kronecker coefficients, and more strongly, for Kronecker coefficients associated with exceptional partition triples as in Definition 1.3. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that the proof technique of Theorem 1.4 can be used to demonstrate their existence, since the problem of deciding positivity of rectangular Kronecker coefficients is not expected to be NP-hard. Rather it is conjectured [Mul10b] to be in  $P$ , and this is supported by the result (Theorem 6.9) here. If it were NP-hard, we could have used the proof technique of Theorem 1.4 to demonstrate existence of superpolynomially many vanishing rectangular Kronecker coefficients.

Nevertheless, the explicit proof strategy, which turned to be so effective in this paper, can be expected to play a crucial role in the proof of the existence of representation-theoretic obstructions. One such explicit approach is formulated in [Mul10b].

## 1.8 Organization

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the lower and upper bounds for the Kronecker coefficients that are needed for the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. These proofs are given in Section 3. A refinement of Theorem 1.1, which is needed for the proof of Theorem 1.4, is proved in Section 4. Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 are proved in Section 5. Section 6 proves additional results in support of the conjecture in [Mul10b] that the problem of deciding positivity of rectangular Kronecker coefficients is in  $P$ .

## 2 Lower and upper bounds for the Kronecker coefficient

In this section, we give representation-theoretic proofs of some known lower and upper bounds from [Man97, BI13, Val00] for the Kronecker coefficients; cf. Lemma 2.3. These bounds as well as their representation-theoretic interpretation given here will play a crucial role in the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in Section 3. In what follows, we often identify partitions with their Young diagrams.

We begin with:

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\pi$  denote Young diagrams with  $n$  boxes each and no more than  $r$  columns. Then the Kronecker coefficient  $k_{\mu, \pi}^{\lambda}$  is equal to the multiplicity of the irreducible representation  $V_{\lambda^T}(\mathrm{GL}(r)) \otimes V_{\mu^T}(\mathrm{GL}(r)) \otimes V_{\pi^T}(\mathrm{GL}(r))$  of  $\mathrm{GL}(r)^3$  in the anti-symmetric subspace  $\Lambda^n(\mathbb{C}^r)^{\otimes 3}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\tilde{k}_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}^{\kappa}$  denote the multiplicity of the irreducible representation  $V_{\alpha}(\mathrm{GL}(r)) \otimes V_{\beta}(\mathrm{GL}(r)) \otimes V_{\gamma}(\mathrm{GL}(r))$  of  $\mathrm{GL}(r)^3$  in the Weyl module  $V_{\kappa}(\mathrm{GL}(r^3))$ . Our original definition of the Kronecker coefficient is easily seen to be equivalent to  $\tilde{k}_{\lambda, \mu, \pi}^{(n)}$  (e.g., [Wal14], but this is standard), and so we need to show that

$$\tilde{k}_{\lambda, \mu, \pi}^{(n)} = \tilde{k}_{\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T}^{(1^n)}. \quad (1)$$

Given a partition  $\kappa$ , let  $[\kappa]$  denote the Specht module (i.e. an irreducible representation) of  $S_n$ . By Schur-Weyl duality,  $\tilde{k}_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}^{\kappa}$  is also equal to the multiplicity of  $[\kappa]$  in the triple tensor product  $[\alpha] \otimes [\beta] \otimes [\gamma]$ . Since the representations of the symmetric group are self-dual, this shows that:

$$\tilde{k}_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma}^{\kappa} = \dim([\alpha] \otimes [\beta] \otimes [\gamma] \otimes [\kappa])^{S_n}$$

Since  $[\lambda^T] = [\lambda] \otimes [(1^n)]$ ,  $[(1^n)] \otimes [(1^n)] = [(n)]$ , and  $[(n)]$  is the trivial representation, (1) follows at once.  $\square$

Given a point set  $P \subseteq \{0, \dots, r-1\}^3$ , let  $x_P(i)$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq r-1$ , be the number of points in  $P$  with the  $x$ -coordinate  $i$ . Let  $x_P = (x_P(0), \dots, x_P(r-1))$ . It is called the  $x$ -marginal of  $P$ . Define the  $y$ -marginal  $y_P$  and the  $z$ -marginal  $z_P$  similarly. We call  $(x_P, y_P, z_P)$  the *marginals* of  $P$ .

Let  $t_{\mu, \pi}^{\lambda}$  be the number of point sets  $P \subseteq \{0, \dots, r-1\}^3$  with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$ . Note that  $\lambda_i^T$  is equal to the number of boxes in the  $i$ -th column of  $\lambda$ .

The coefficients  $t_{\mu, \pi}^{\lambda}$  have a pleasant representation-theoretical interpretation that is closely related to Lemma 2.1. To see this, observe that we can associate with any point set  $P = \{(x_1, y_1, z_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n, z_n)\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, r-1\}^3$  of cardinality  $n$  the following vector:

$$\psi_P = \bigwedge_{j=1}^n e_{x_j} \otimes e_{y_j} \otimes e_{z_j} \in \bigwedge^n (\mathbb{C}^r)^{\otimes 3},$$

where  $\{e_i\}$  is the standard basis of  $\mathbb{C}^r$ . The vectors  $\psi_P$  form a basis of  $\Lambda^n(\mathbb{C}^r)^{\otimes 3}$  as  $P$  ranges over all such point sets. Moreover, each  $\psi_P$  is a weight vector for the  $GL(r)^3$ -action, whose weight is determined by the marginals of the point set  $P$ . Thus we obtain the following result.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\pi$  denote Young diagrams with  $n$  boxes each and no more than  $r$  columns. Then  $t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$  is equal to the weight multiplicity of  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$  in the anti-symmetric  $GL(r)^3$ -module  $\Lambda^n(\mathbb{C}^r)^{\otimes 3}$ .*

Following [Val00], we call a subset  $P \subseteq \{0, \dots, r-1\}^3$  a *pyramid* if, for any  $(x, y, z) \in P$  and  $0 \leq x' \leq x, 0 \leq y' \leq y, 0 \leq z' \leq z$ , we have that  $(x', y', z') \in P$ . (It would also be natural to call such  $P$  a *3-partition* [Man97].) Let  $p_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$  denote the number of pyramids with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$ . From our representation-theoretic interpretation, we directly obtain the following fundamental bounds, which were proved previously using different methods in [Man97, BI13] (cf. [Val00]):

**Lemma 2.3.** *For all partitions  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\pi$ , we have that  $p_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda \leq k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda \leq t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$ .*

*Proof.* The upper bound on  $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$  follows directly from Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, since the irreducible representations of  $GL(r)^3$  in  $\Lambda^n(\mathbb{C}^r)^{\otimes 3}$  are in one-to-one correspondence with their highest weight vectors, and every highest weight vector is a weight vector.

For the lower bound, suppose that  $P = \{(x_1, y_1, z_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n, z_n)\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, r-1\}^3$  is a pyramid with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$ . We will show that  $\psi_P$  is not only a weight vector, but in fact a highest weight vector. For this, we need to argue that  $\psi$  is annihilated by all triples of strictly upper-triangular matrices, which form the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{n}$  of the unipotent subgroup of  $GL(r)^3$  corresponding to our choices. Thus consider  $(E_{x', x}, 0, 0)$ , where  $E_{x', x}$  denotes the upper triangular matrix with a single 1 in the  $x'$ -th row and  $x$ -th column, and otherwise zero (here  $x' < x$ ). Its action on  $\psi_P$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (E_{x', x}, 0, 0) \cdot \psi_P &= \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j-1} E_{x', x} e_{x_j} \otimes e_{y_j} \otimes e_{z_j} \wedge \bigwedge_{j'=1, j' \neq j}^n e_{x_{j'}} \otimes e_{y_{j'}} \otimes e_{z_{j'}} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j-1} \delta_{x, x_j} e_{x'} \otimes e_{y_j} \otimes e_{z_j} \wedge \bigwedge_{j'=1, j' \neq j}^n e_{x_{j'}} \otimes e_{y_{j'}} \otimes e_{z_{j'}} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

since each summand vanishes individually. Indeed, if  $x \neq x_j$  then  $\delta_{x, x_j} = 0$  and so the summand is zero. Otherwise, if  $x = x_j$  then  $(x_j, y_j, z_j) \in P$  and  $x' < x$  imply that  $(x', y_j, z_j) \in P$  by the pyramid condition; therefore  $e_{x'} \otimes e_{y_j} \otimes e_{z_j}$  appears twice in the wedge product and so the summand vanishes as well. The same argument applies to the other generators  $(0, E_{y', y}, 0)$  and  $(0, 0, E_{z', z})$  of  $\mathfrak{n}$ . Thus we conclude that the pyramid condition ensures that  $\psi_P$  is a highest weight vector.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.4.** *Let  $\lambda, \mu, \pi$  be partitions such that any point set with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$  is necessarily a pyramid. Then  $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda = t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda = p_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$ .*

### 3 Kronecker coefficients with #P-formulae

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Towards that end, we first derive a sufficient condition on the marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$  such that any compatible point set is necessarily a pyramid (and hence Corollary 2.4 is applicable). Adapting the approach of [BDLG01], consider the marginals of a point set  $P$  such that  $P_r \subseteq P \subsetneq P_{r+1}$ , where

$$P_r = \{(x, y, z) \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}^3 : x + y + z \leq r-1\}$$

denotes the simplex of side length  $r \geq 1$ . For any such point set, we can compute the projection of its barycenter  $b_P := \sum_{p \in P} p$  onto the diagonal  $(1, 1, 1)$  in the following way:

$$b_P \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = b_r \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + r(n - |P_r|) =: p(n),$$

where  $b_r$  denotes the barycenter of  $P_r$ , and  $n$  denotes the total number of points in  $P$ . We note that this value depends on  $n$  only, since  $r$  is necessarily equal to the maximal  $r$  such that  $|P_r| = r(r+1)(r+2)/6 \leq n$ . Let us call  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$ , with  $|\lambda| = |\mu| = |\pi| = n \neq 0$ , *simplex-like* if there exists some  $r$  such that the Young diagrams of  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\pi$  have at most  $r + 1$  columns, and

$$\sum_{i=0}^r i \lambda_i^T + \sum_{j=0}^r j \mu_j^T + \sum_{k=0}^r k \pi_k^T = p(n).$$

Whether  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  is simplex-like can be checked in polynomial time (even assuming that  $\lambda, \mu$  and  $\pi$  are given in binary).

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  be simplex-like. Then any point set  $P$  with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$  is necessarily of the form  $P_r \subseteq P \subsetneq P_{r+1}$ , for some  $r \geq 1$ . In particular,  $P$  is a pyramid.*

*Proof.* The level sets of the function  $p \mapsto p \cdot (1, 1, 1)$  restricted to the positive octant are precisely the faces  $\{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{N}^3 : x + y + z = k - 1\}$  of the simplices  $P_k$ . Thus it is geometrically obvious that for an arbitrary point set  $P$  with  $n$  elements,  $b_P \cdot (1, 1, 1)$  is never smaller than  $p(n)$ , and that it attains this minimum if and only if  $P_r \subseteq P \subsetneq P_{r+1}$ , for some  $r \geq 1$  (cf. [BDLG01]). Therefore, it suffices to show that our assumptions imply that  $b_P \cdot (1, 1, 1) = p(n)$ . This is indeed true as shown in the following computation, which relies on the fact that the barycenter is purely a function of the marginals:

$$b_P \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{(x,y,z) \in P} (x + y + z) = \sum_{i=0}^r i \lambda_i^T + \sum_{j=0}^r j \mu_j^T + \sum_{k=0}^r k \pi_k^T = p(n).$$

The last step follows because  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  is simplex-like.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.2.** *Let  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  be simplex-like. Then  $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda = t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda = p_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$ . In particular, this family of Kronecker coefficients has a  $\#P$ -formula. Here  $\lambda, \mu$  and  $\pi$  can be given in unary or binary.*

*Proof.* This follows from Lemma 3.1, Corollary 2.4, and the fact that  $t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$  has a  $\#P$ -formula. The last sentence follows because the bit-length of the unary specification of a simplex-like partition triple is polynomial in the bit-length of its binary specification.  $\square$

One important class of simplex-like marginals is the following. Let  $(\varphi^T, \varphi^T, \varphi^T)$  denote the marginals of the simplex  $P_{2r}$ , where  $r \geq 1$ . Define

$$\lambda^T := \varphi^T + (d_{2r}, \dots, d_0), \quad \mu^T = \pi^T := \varphi^T + (1^{r+1}, 0^r), \quad (2)$$

where  $d = (d_0, \dots, d_{2r}) \in \mathbb{N}^{2r+1}$  is such that  $\sum_k d_k = r + 1$  and  $\sum_k k d_k = r(r + 1)$ —this also implies that  $\sum_k k d_{2r-k} = r(r + 1)$ . It is not hard to see that these marginals are simplex-like. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{2r} i \lambda_i^T + \sum_{j=0}^{2r} j \mu_j^T + \sum_{k=0}^{2r} k \pi_k^T &= b_{2r} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{i=0}^{2r} i d_{2r-i} + \sum_{j=0}^r j + \sum_{k=0}^r k \\ &= b_{2r} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + 2r(r + 1). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|P_{2r}| \leq n = |P_{2r}| + (r + 1) < |P_{2r+1}|$ , this is indeed equal to  $p(n)$ , where  $n$  is the number of boxes of each of  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\pi$ . These marginals arise while embedding permutation matrices on top of the simplex  $P_{2r}$ , and in [BDLG01] it was shown using this construction that:

**Theorem 3.3** (cf. [BDLG01]). *The problem of deciding positivity of  $t_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$ , given  $\lambda, \mu$  and  $\pi$  in unary, is NP-hard with respect to polynomial-time Karp reductions, even when  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$  is restricted to be of the form (2).*

Thus it follows at once from Theorem 3.2, in conjunction with this result, that:

**Theorem 3.4.** *The problem of deciding positivity of the Kronecker coefficient  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$ , given  $\lambda, \mu$  and  $\pi$  in unary, is NP-hard with respect to polynomial-time Karp reductions, even when  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$  is restricted to be of the form (2).*

This proves Theorem 1.1. Theorem 1.2 follows from this result and Theorem 3.2.

## 4 Refined NP-hardness result

Let RESTRICTED KRONECKER be the problem of deciding positivity of  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$ , when  $\lambda, \mu$  and  $\pi$  satisfy the constraints (1)-(5) in Theorem 1.4. Specifically:

**Definition 4.1.** *Fix a constant  $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ . Then RESTRICTED KRONECKER is the problem of deciding, given  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and partitions  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\pi$  in unary, with  $ht(\mu) = ht(\pi) = m$ , whether the Kronecker coefficient  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  is positive, assuming that:*

- (1)  $\mu = \pi$ ,
- (2)  $ht(\lambda) \leq m^\epsilon$ ,
- (3)  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  is in the Kronecker cone  $Kron(m)$ ,
- (4)  $|\lambda| = |\mu| = |\pi| \leq m^3$ , and
- (5)  $\lambda$  is not a hook.

For the proof of Theorem 1.4, we need the following refinement of Theorem 3.4:

**Theorem 4.2.** *RESTRICTED KRONECKER is NP-hard with respect to polynomial-time Karp reductions.*

We now prove this result. For this, we need some auxiliary results.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  be partitions so that  $ht(\lambda) \leq h^2$ , where  $h$  is the height of the smallest column of  $\mu$ . Then  $(\lambda, \mu, \mu)$  is in the Kronecker cone  $Kron(l)$ , where  $l = \max\{ht(\lambda), ht(\mu)\}$ .*

*Proof.* It is shown in [BCI11] that  $(\lambda, \delta, \delta)$  is in the Kronecker cone whenever  $\delta$  is a rectangle of height at least  $h$ , and  $ht(\lambda) \leq h^2$ . As the Kronecker cone is a cone, this is also true if we rescale each of  $\lambda$  and  $\delta$  by an arbitrary positive number.

Let us write  $\mu$  as a sum of rectangles  $\delta^{(1)} + \dots + \delta^{(k)}$ , where our assumption implies that each  $\delta^{(j)}$  has height at least  $h$ . It is easy to see that  $\lambda$  can be written as a sum  $\lambda^{(1)} + \dots + \lambda^{(k)}$ , where each  $\lambda^{(j)}$  is a rational partition with the same size as  $\delta^{(j)}$  (i.e.,  $|\lambda^{(j)}| = |\delta^{(j)}|$ ), and with no more than  $h^2$  rows. By the preceding argument, each  $(\lambda^{(j)}, \delta^{(j)}, \delta^{(j)})$  is in the Kronecker cone  $Kron(l)$ . As cones are closed under addition,  $(\lambda, \mu, \mu)$  is likewise in the Kronecker cone.  $\square$

Next, we generalize Theorem 3.2 to a larger class of marginals. Let  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  be simplex-like, and let  $P$  be a corresponding point set with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$ , so that  $P_r \subseteq P \subsetneq P_{r+1}$  for some  $r$  (Lemma 3.1). Let  $Q$  denote the following point set obtained by adjoining  $P$  to a rectangular box of size  $a \times b \times c$ , where  $b, c \geq r + 1$ :

$$Q = \{0, \dots, a-1\} \times \{0, \dots, b-1\} \times \{0, \dots, c-1\} \cup \{(a+x, y, z) : (x, y, z) \in P\}. \quad (3)$$

Then the marginals of  $Q$  are given by  $(\tilde{\lambda}^T, \tilde{\mu}^T, \tilde{\pi}^T)$ , where

$$\tilde{\lambda}^T = ((bc)^a, \lambda^T), \quad \tilde{\mu}^T = \mu^T + ((ac)^b), \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\pi}^T = \pi^T + ((ab)^c),$$

so that

$$\tilde{\lambda} = (a^{bc} + \lambda, \quad \tilde{\mu} = (b^{ac}, \mu), \quad \tilde{\pi} = (c^{ab}, \pi). \quad (4)$$

We call  $(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\pi})$  *pedestalled-simplex-like* if it is of the form (4) for some simplex-like  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  with at most  $r + 1$  columns each,  $a \geq 0$ , and  $b, c \geq r + 1$ . Then we have the following generalization of Lemma 3.1.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\pi})$  be pedestalled-simplex-like, i.e., of the form (4) for some simplex-like  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$ . Then (3) defines a bijection between point sets  $P$  with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$  and point sets  $Q$  with marginals  $(\tilde{\lambda}^T, \tilde{\mu}^T, \tilde{\pi}^T)$ . In particular, any such point set  $Q$  is a pyramid.*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that any point set  $Q$  with marginals  $(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\pi})$  is of the form (3). For this, observe that according to the definition of  $\tilde{\lambda}$ , the first  $a$  x-slices of  $Q$  contain exactly  $bc$  points each. On the other hand, the definition of  $\tilde{\mu}$  and  $\tilde{\pi}$  implies that there are at most  $b$  non-zero y-slices and at most  $c$  non-zero z-slices, so that  $Q$  is a point set in  $\mathbb{N} \times \{0, \dots, b-1\} \times \{0, \dots, c-1\}$ . It follows that the first  $a$  x-slices must each be filled completely without holes by rectangles of size  $b \times c$ . Therefore we may write  $Q$  in the form (3), and it is clear that  $P$  has the correct marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$ . Since  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  is simplex-like,  $P_r \subseteq P \subseteq P_{r+1}$  (Lemma 3.1). Finally, observe that any  $Q$  of the form (3) is clearly a pyramid.  $\square$

The following result generalizes Theorem 3.2.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $(\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\pi})$  be pedestalled-simplex-like, i.e., of the form (4) for some simplex-like  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$ . Then:*

$$k_{\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\pi}}^{\tilde{\lambda}} = t_{\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\pi}}^{\tilde{\lambda}} = t_{\mu, \pi}^{\lambda} = k_{\mu, \pi}^{\lambda}$$

*Proof.* The first equality follows from Corollary 2.4, as according to Lemma 4.4 any point set with marginals  $(\tilde{\lambda}^T, \tilde{\mu}^T, \tilde{\pi}^T)$  is necessarily a pyramid. The middle equality follows from Lemma 4.4. The last equality is Theorem 3.2.  $\square$

#### 4.1 Proof of Theorem 4.2

We apply the pedestal construction to marginals of the form (2). Let us choose a rectangular box of size  $c \times s \times s$ , where  $s = 2r + 1$ . That is, we set

$$\lambda^T = ((s^2)^c, (\varphi^T + (d_{2r}, \dots, d_0))), \quad \mu^T = \pi^T = ((cs)^s) + \varphi^T + (1^{r+1}, 0^r), \quad (5)$$

for some  $d = (d_0, \dots, d_{2r}) \in \mathbb{N}^{2r+1}$  such that  $\sum_k d_k = r + 1$  and  $\sum_k k d_k = r(r + 1)$ , where  $\varphi^T$  denotes the marginal of the simplex  $P_{2r} = P_{s-1}$ . Furthermore, we set  $c := \lceil s^{2/\epsilon-1} \rceil$ .

The problem of deciding positivity of  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$ , with  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  restricted as above, is NP-hard, since by Theorem 4.5, these Kronecker coefficients agree with the ones in Theorem 3.4, and we can transform instances of the latter to instances of the former in polynomial time (as  $\epsilon$  is fixed).

We now verify that the five constraints in Definition 4.1 are all satisfied. The first is clearly satisfied. For the second,

$$\text{ht}(\lambda) = s^2 \leq (cs)^\epsilon \leq \text{ht}(\mu)^\epsilon = m^\epsilon,$$

by our choice of  $c = c(s)$ . The third follows from Lemma 4.3, as  $\text{ht}(\lambda) = s^2$ , while every column in  $\mu$  is of height at least  $cs \geq s$ . The fourth follows, since

$$|\lambda| = cs^2 + |\varphi^T| + \sum_k d_k = cs^2 + (s-1)(s)(s+1)/6 + r + 1 \leq (cs)^3 \leq \text{ht}(\mu)^3 = m^3,$$

assuming that  $r$  is large enough. Finally, it is clear that  $\lambda$  is not a hook. □

## 5 Construction of vanishing Kronecker coefficients with partition triples in the Kronecker cone

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.4 and 1.5.

### 5.1 Proof of Theorem 1.4

By Fortune [For79], if there exists a co-sparse NP-complete language under polynomial-time Karp-reductions, then  $P = NP$ . Theorem 4.2, in conjunction with this result, implies that, assuming  $P \neq NP$ , the set of partitions triples satisfying the constraints (0)-(5) in Theorem 1.4 is non-sparse, i.e, its cardinality is superpolynomial in  $m$ . (The result in [For79] applies to NP-complete sets, rather than NP-hard sets. But we can still apply this result to the NP-complete set of simplex-like partition triples (cf. Theorem 3.4) with positive Kronecker coefficients to get the desired conclusion.) To prove Theorem 1.4, we have to get rid of the  $P \neq NP$  assumption, and replace the superpolynomial bound by  $\Omega(2^{m^a})$  bound, for some positive constant  $a$ . This is achieved by Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 5.2 below.

Recall [GJ79] that the 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING problem is to decide, given a set  $M \subseteq W \times X \times Y$ , where  $W$ ,  $X$ , and  $Y$  are disjoint sets of size  $q$ , whether  $M$  contains a matching, that is, a subset  $M' \subseteq M$  of size  $q$  such that no two elements of  $M'$  agree in any coordinate. Without loss of generality, we assume henceforth that each element in  $W \cup X \cup Y$  appears in some triple of  $M$ . We denote any such instance of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING by the tuple  $(M, W, X, Y, q)$ . It is known [GJ79] that the 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING problem is NP-complete.

**Lemma 5.1.** *The number of instances  $(M, W, X, Y, q)$ 's of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING with total bit-length  $\leq N$  such that  $M$  does not have a matching is  $\Omega(2^{N^b})$  for some positive constant  $b < 1$ .*

*Furthermore, such instances can be constructed explicitly. This means there is a polynomial-time-computable one-to-one map from binary strings of length  $\leq N^b$  to instances of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING problem without matching.*

*Proof.* Consider any fixed instance  $(M_0, W_0, X_0, Y_0, q_0)$  of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING, such that  $M_0$  does not have a matching. Its bitlength is thus a constant. Given any instance  $(M, W, X, Y, q)$  of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING, with  $W, X$  and  $Y$  disjoint from  $W_0, X_0$  and  $Y_0$ , consider the padded instance  $(M \cup M_0, W \cup W_0, X \cup X_0, Y \cup Y_0, q + q_0)$ . Clearly,  $M \cup M_0$  also does not have a matching. Furthermore, the number of instances of the form  $(M \cup M_0, W \cup W_0, X \cup X_0, Y \cup Y_0, q + q_0)$  with bitlength

$\leq N$  is clearly  $\Omega(2^{N^b})$  for some positive constant  $b < 1$ , and such padded instances can be constructed explicitly.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.2.** *There exists an injective polynomial-time Karp reduction  $\phi$  from the set of instances  $(M, W, X, Y, q)$ 's of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING of total bit-length  $n$  to the set of partition triples  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$ 's satisfying the conditions (1)-(5) in Theorem 1.4, with  $m = \text{poly}(n)$ , such that  $M$  contains a matching iff the Kronecker coefficient associated with the partition triple  $\phi(E)$  is positive.*

Note that partition triples satisfying the conditions (1)-(5) in Theorem 1.4 are precisely instances of RESTRICTED KRONECKER; cf. Definition 4.1.

*Proof.* Since 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING is in NP, it follows from Theorem 4.2 that there exists a polynomial-time Karp reduction  $\phi$  from 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING to the RESTRICTED KRONECKER problem of deciding positivity of the Kronecker coefficient  $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$ , with  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  satisfying the constraints (1)-(5) in Theorem 1.4. We have to show that this reduction  $\phi$  can be chosen to be injective. We can obtain such an injective reduction  $\phi$  by composing the following sequence of injective polynomial-time-computable Karp-reductions:

(I) Reduction from 3-DIMENSIONAL-MATCHING to 4-PARTITION (cf. Theorem 4.3 in [GJ79]): The 4-PARTITION problem is to decide, given a set  $A$  of size  $4m$ , a positive integer bound  $B$ , a positive integer size  $s(a)$  for each  $a \in A$  such that  $B/5 < s(a) < B/3$  and  $\sum_{a \in A} s(a) = mB$ , whether  $A$  can be partitioned into  $m$  disjoint subsets  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ , each of size four, such that, for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $\sum_{a \in A_i} s(a) = B$ . We denote such an instance of 4-PARTITION by the tuple  $(A, m, B, s)$ . The reduction [GJ79] maps a given instance  $(M, W, X, Y, q)$  of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING to an instance  $(A, m, B, s)$  of 4-partition, where:

(1): The set  $A$  has  $4|M| = O(q^3)$  elements, one for each occurrence of a member of  $W \cup X \cup Y$  in a triple in  $M$  and one for each triple in  $M$ .

(2): Let  $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_q\}$ ,  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_q\}$ , and  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_q\}$ . Given any  $z \in W \cup X \cup Y$ , let  $N(z)$  denote the number of triples in  $M$  that contain  $z$ , and let  $z[1], z[2], \dots, z[N(z)]$  denote the elements in  $A$  corresponding to  $z$ . Let  $r = 32q$ . Let

$$\begin{aligned}
s(w_i[1]) &= 10r^4 + ir + 1, & 1 \leq i \leq q, \\
s(w_i[l]) &= 11r^4 + ir + 1, & 1 \leq i \leq q, 2 \leq l \leq N(w_i), \\
s(x_j[1]) &= 10r^4 + jr^2 + 2, & 1 \leq j \leq q, \\
s(x_j[l]) &= 11r^4 + jr^2 + 2, & 1 \leq j \leq q, 2 \leq l \leq N(x_j), \\
s(y_k[1]) &= 10r^4 + kr^3 + 4, & 1 \leq k \leq q, \\
s(y_k[l]) &= 8r^4 + kr^3 + 4, & 1 \leq k \leq q, 2 \leq l \leq N(y_k).
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

(3): Let  $u_l$  denote the single element corresponding to a particular triple  $m_l = (w_i, x_j, y_k) \in M$ . For any such  $u_l$ , let  $s(u_l) = 10r^4 - kr^3 - jr^2 - ir + 8$ .

(4): Let  $B = 40r^4 + 15$ .

Note that  $\max\{s(a) | a \in A\} \leq 2^{16}|A|^4$ . This means 4-PARTITION is NP-complete in the strong sense [GJ79].

It can be checked that this reduction is injective.

(II) Reduction from 4-PARTITION to 3-PARTITION (cf. Theorem 4.4 in [GJ79]): Here the 3-PARTITION problem is to decide, given a set  $A$  of size  $3m$ , a positive integer bound  $B$ , a positive integer size  $s(a)$  for each  $a \in A$  such that  $B/4 < s(a) < B/2$  and  $\sum_{a \in A} s(a) = mB$ , whether  $A$  can be partitioned into  $m$  disjoint subsets  $A_1, \dots, A_m$ , each of size three, such that, for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,

$\sum_{a \in A_i} s(a) = B$ . We denote such an instance of 3-PARTITION by the tuple  $(A, m, B, s)$ . The reduction [GJ79] maps an instance  $(A, m, B, s)$  of 4-PARTITION, with  $|A| = 4m$  and  $\max\{s(a) | a \in A\} \leq 2^{16}|A|^4$ , to the instance  $(A', m', B', s')$  of 3-PARTITION, where  $A'$  has  $m' = O(m^2)$  elements: one element  $w_i$  for each element  $a_i$  of  $A$ , two elements  $u_{i,j}$  and  $\bar{u}_{i,j}$  for each pair  $(a_i, a_j)$  of elements from  $A$ , and  $8m^2 - 3m$  filler elements  $u_k^*$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq 8m^2 - 3m$ . Their sizes are:

$$\begin{aligned} s'(w_i) &= 4(5B + s(a_i)) + 1, \\ s'(u_{i,j}) &= 4(6B - s(a_i) - s(a_j)) + 2, \\ s'(\bar{u}_{i,j}) &= 4(5B + s(a_i) + s(a_j)) + 2, \\ s'(u_k^*) &= 20B. \end{aligned}$$

We let  $B' = 64B + 4$ .

It can be checked that this reduction is injective.

(III) Reduction from 3-PARTITION to MACHINE FLOW, the decision version of the two-machine flow scheduling problem with unit processing times defined in Chapter 3 in [Yu96] (where it is called F2UD'): The MACHINE FLOW problem is to decide, given two machines M1 and M2, each of which can process at most one job at a time, and  $n$  jobs  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , where each job takes unit processing time and the job  $j$  is assigned a delay  $l_j$  that describes the minimum amount of time between the completion of the job  $j$  on M1 and its start on M2, and a threshold  $y$ , whether there exists a feasible schedule of the jobs so that the last job is completed before time  $y$ .

The reduction [Yu96] from 3-PARTITION to MACHINE FLOW goes as follows.

Without loss of generality, we consider a modified version of 3-PARTITION by multiplying the partition elements by  $4m$ . Thus we are given a set of positive integers  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_{3m}\}$  and a positive integer  $B$  such that (1)  $B < a_i < 2B$  for all  $i$ , (2)  $\sum_j a_j = 4mB$ , (3)  $a_i = 0 \pmod{m}$  for all  $i$ , and (4)  $4B = 0 \pmod{m}$ . The problem is to decide if  $A$  can be partitioned into  $m$  disjoint 3-element subsets  $A_1, \dots, A_m$  such that  $\sum_{a_j \in A_i} a_j = 4B$ , for all  $i$ .

An instance of this modified version of 3-PARTITION is mapped to an instance of MACHINE FLOW with delays (1)  $l_j = a_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq 3m$ , (2)  $l_j = 0$  for  $3m + 1 \leq j \leq 4mB$ , (3)  $l_j = u + 1$  for  $4mB + 1 \leq j \leq mu$ , where  $u = 4(m + 1)B$ , and (4) the threshold  $y = n + 4mB + 2$ , where  $n = mu$  is the total number of jobs.

It can be checked that this reduction is injective.

(IV) Reduction from MACHINE FLOW to RN3DM (Restricted Numerical 3-Dimensional Matching), cf. page 31 in [Yu96]: Here the RN3DM problem is to decide, given a positive integer set  $U = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$  and a positive integer  $e$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^n u_j + n(n + 1) = ne$ , whether there exist two  $n$ -permutations  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  such that  $j + \lambda(j) + u_{\mu(j)} = e$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . (It can be assumed that each  $u_i < e - 1$ ).

The reduction (cf. Corollary 3 on page 32 in [Yu96]) maps an instance of MACHINE FLOW to that of RN3DM given by  $u_j = l_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , and  $e = y$ . We assume that the instance of MACHINE FLOW here arises in the reduction from 3-PARTITION to MACHINE FLOW given in (III) above. This will ensure that  $\sum_j u_j + n(n + 1) = ne$  and each  $u_i < e - 1$ , which we require for (V) below to be injective.

It can be checked that this reduction is injective.

(V) Reduction from RN3DM to RNMTS (Restricted Numerical Matching with Target Sums), cf. [BDLGdV08]: Here the RNMTS problem is to decide, given positive integers  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  such that  $2 \leq y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \dots \leq y_n \leq 2n$  and  $\sum_i y_i = n(n + 1)$ , if there exist  $n$ -permutations  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  such that  $\sigma(k) + \pi(k) = y_k$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ .

RN3DM is mapped to RNMTS by letting  $y_j = e - u_j$  and then reordering  $y_j$ 's as per their values.

It can be checked that this reduction is injective.

(VI) Reduction from RNMTS to PERMUTATION; cf. [BDLGdV08]: Here the PERMUTATION problem (cf. page 69 in [BDLGdV08], where it is called PERMUTATION( $S_3$ )) is to decide, given non-negative integers  $z_2, \dots, z_{2n} \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ , whether there exists an  $n \times n$  permutation matrix  $P$  such that  $\sum_{i,j:i+j=l} P_{i,j} = z_l$  for  $2 \leq l \leq 2n$ .

The reduction [BDLGdV08] maps an instance  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$  of RNMTS to an instance  $z = (z_2, \dots, z_{2n})$  of PERMUTATION by setting  $z_l = |\{k \leq n \mid y_k = l\}|$ .

It can be checked that this reduction is injective.

(VII) Reduction from PERMUTATION to SPECIAL-CONSISTENCY [BDLG01]: Here SPECIAL-CONSISTENCY is the problem addressed in Theorem 3.3, namely, the problem of deciding positivity of  $t_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$ , given  $\lambda, \mu$  and  $\pi$  in unary, when  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$  is restricted to be of the form (2).

The reduction [BDLG01] maps an instance  $z = (z_2, \dots, z_{2n})$  of PERMUTATION to an instance  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  of SPECIAL-CONSISTENCY satisfying (2), with  $r = n - 1$  and  $d_i = z_{i+2}$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq 2r$  (it can be shown that  $\sum_k d_k = r + 1$ , and  $\sum_k k d_k = r(r + 1)$ ).

This reduction is injective.

(VIII) Reduction from SPECIAL-CONSISTENCY to RESTRICTED KRONECKER, given in the proof of Theorem 4.2 in this article.

It can be checked that this reduction is also injective. □

Theorem 1.4 follows from Theorem 5.2 and Lemma 5.1. □

This proof also shows that the superpolynomially many partition triples in Theorem 1.4 can be constructed explicitly (as defined in Section 1.4).

*Remark:* In the preceding proof, we can use, in place of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING, any problem in NP which has a polynomial-time-computable padding [BH77] function, and which can be reduced injectively by a polynomial-time Karp reduction to RESTRICTED KRONECKER. For example, SAT also has a polynomial-time-computable padding function, and it can also be reduced injectively by a polynomial-time Karp reduction to RESTRICTED KRONECKER. This reduction is obtained by composing the injective reduction from SAT to 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING given in [GJ79] with the injective reduction from 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING to RESTRICTED KRONECKER given in the proof of Theorem 5.2.

### 5.1.1 Example

Though the reduction  $\phi$  in Theorem 5.2 is polynomial-time computable, the blow-up in the size can be substantial. For example, let us start with a trivial instance of the 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING problem, wherein  $q = 2$ ,  $W = \{w_1, w_2\}$ ,  $X = \{x_1, x_2\}$ ,  $Y = \{y_1, y_2\}$ , and  $M = \{(w_1, x_1, y_1), (w_2, x_1, y_2), (w_1, x_2, y_2)\}$ . Clearly,  $M$  does not contain a matching. It can be checked that  $\phi(M, W, X, Y, q)$ , with  $\epsilon = 1$  in the condition (2) of Theorem 1.4, is a partition triple whose height is  $> 10^{16}$  and the total size is  $> 10^{46}$ . By Theorem 5.2, the Kronecker coefficient associated with this partition triple is zero. One cannot verify this fact directly using a computer, since computation of Kronecker coefficients for partition triples of this height and size is far beyond the reach of computer algebra systems. Thus Theorem 5.2 maps instances of 3-DIMENSIONAL MATCHING which do not contain matching for trivial reasons to partition triples whose associated Kronecker coefficients vanish for highly nontrivial reasons.

## 5.2 Proof of Theorem 1.5

For the proof of Theorem 1.5, we need the following lemma, which proves a variant of the result in Fortune [For79] that coNP-complete languages cannot be sparse unless  $P = NP$ .

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a coNP-hard language given as a disjoint union*

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}' \cup \mathcal{L}'',$$

where  $\mathcal{L}'$  is sparse (i.e., there are only  $\text{poly}(n)$  words of length  $n$  in  $\mathcal{L}'$ ) and  $\mathcal{L}'' \in NP \cap \text{coNP}$ . Then  $\text{coNP} = NP$ .

*Proof.* We will show that the assumptions imply that  $\text{SAT}^c$  (the complement of SAT) is in NP—this would imply that  $\text{coNP} \subseteq NP$ , and hence,  $\text{coNP} = NP$ . For this, we adapt the proof in [Mah82, For79].

Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is coNP-hard, there exists a polynomial-time Karp reduction  $R$  such that  $R(\text{SAT}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}^c$  and  $R(\text{SAT}^c) \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}''$  is in  $NP \cap \text{coNP}$ , there exist non-deterministic Turing machines  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  such that, given input  $x$ ,  $M_1$  halts (in polynomial time) if and only if  $x \in \mathcal{L}''$ , while  $M_2$  halts (in polynomial time) if and only if  $x \notin \mathcal{L}''$ .

Let  $F$  be a formula for which we have to decide unsatisfiability. We perform depth-first search on the binary tree obtained by self-reducing  $F$  (the root of this tree is  $F$ , and the children of a node  $G$  are  $G_0$  and  $G_1$ , the formulas of smaller size obtained by specializing the first variable in  $G$  to true or false, and applying trivial simplifications), starting at the root node. We maintain a table  $\mathcal{U}$  of labels ( $R$ -values) of unsatisfiable formulae, starting with  $\mathcal{U} := \{R(\text{false})\}$ . At each node  $G$ , we first compute  $R(G)$  and then do one of the following:

1. If  $R(G) \in \mathcal{U}$ , prune the subtree and return to the parent node.
2. Otherwise, if  $G = \text{true}$ , enter an infinite loop.
3. Otherwise, run both non-deterministic Turing machines  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  in parallel on the input  $R(G)$  until one of the two halts (which will always happen, for some sequence of non-deterministic choices, in polynomial time):
  - (a) If  $M_1$  halts (in which case  $R(G) \in \mathcal{L}'' \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ , and hence,  $G$  is unsatisfiable), add  $R(G)$  to  $\mathcal{U}$ , prune the subtree and return to the parent node.
  - (b) If  $M_2$  halts, visit both children  $G_0$  and  $G_1$ . Upon return (if this happens), it will always be true that  $G_0$  and  $G_1$  are unsatisfiable, and hence  $R(G_0), R(G_1) \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $G$  is unsatisfiable. Thus add  $R(G)$  to  $\mathcal{U}$  and return to the parent node.

It is clear that this algorithm can be understood as a non-deterministic Turing machine that halts if and only if  $F$  is unsatisfiable.

It suffices to show that, if  $F$  is unsatisfiable, this algorithm halts in polynomial time. For this, it suffices to show that the number of *interior* nodes that are visited by the algorithm is polynomial in the size  $|F|$  of the formula  $F$  (since the tree is binary, the number of visited leaves is at most twice the number of visited interior nodes). Now observe that interior nodes only arise in the case where  $M_2$  halts on input  $R(G)$ , in which case  $R(G) \in \mathcal{L}'$ . Thus any interior node is necessarily labeled by an element of the sparse set  $\mathcal{L}'$ . We can thus conclude the argument precisely as in [Mah82, Lemma 2.2]: If  $G$  and  $G'$  are two interior nodes that have the same label,  $R(G) = R(G') \in \mathcal{L}'$ , then they necessarily ought to appear in the same branch of the search tree (because we proceed by depth-first search). As the depth of the tree is no more than  $m$  – the number of variables in  $F$  – we find that each label can occur at

most  $m$  times. Therefore, the number of visited interior nodes can be upper bounded by  $m \cdot p(q(|F|))$ , where  $q$  is a polynomial that bounds the increase in length induced by the reduction  $R$  and  $p = p(n)$  is a polynomial that bounds the number of strings of length  $\leq n$  in the sparse set  $\mathcal{L}'$ . We conclude that  $\text{SAT}^c \in \text{NP}$ .  $\square$

Another ingredient needed for the proof of Theorem 1.5 is the following result.

**Theorem 5.4** (cf. [BCMW]). *The problem of deciding if  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi) \in \text{Kron}(m)$  is in  $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$ . Here  $m$  denotes the maximum height of  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$ , or  $\pi$ , and the partition triple  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  is given in unary.*

*Proof of Theorem 1.5:* For given  $m$ , let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the set of partition triples  $(\lambda, \mu, \mu)$ 's satisfying the constraints (0)-(5) in Theorem 1.4. Let  $\mathcal{L}'$  be the set of partition triples  $(\lambda, \mu, \mu)$ 's satisfying the constraints (0)-(5) in Theorem 1.4 and (6)-(7) in Theorem 1.5. Let  $\mathcal{L}''$  be the set of partition triples satisfying the constraints (0)-(5) in Theorem 1.4 such that either (6) or (7) in Theorem 1.5 is violated. Then, clearly,  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}' \cup \mathcal{L}''$ . In the definition of  $\mathcal{L}''$ , we can drop the constraint (0), since it is automatically satisfied if (6) or (7) is violated (as  $k_{\mu, \mu}^\lambda = k_{\mu^t, \mu}^{\lambda^t} = k_{\mu^t, \mu^t}^\lambda$ ). By Theorem 5.4, the problem of deciding whether a partition triple belongs to the Kronecker cone is in  $\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{L}'' \in \text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$ . By Theorem 4.2,  $\mathcal{L}$  is  $\text{coNP}$ -hard. It now follows from Lemma 5.3 that  $\mathcal{L}'$  is not sparse, assuming  $\text{coNP} \neq \text{NP}$ . This proves Theorem 1.5.  $\square$

## 6 Correlation between the complexities of $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$ and $t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$

There seems to be a surprising correlation between the complexities of  $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$  and  $t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$ . On one hand, positivity of  $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$  is, in general,  $\text{NP}$ -hard to decide (Theorem 3.4), just as it is for  $t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$  (Theorem 3.3). On the other hand, suppose  $\Pi$  is a subclass of partition triples such that the problem of deciding positivity of  $t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$ , for  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi) \in \Pi$ , is in  $P$ . While the corresponding problem of deciding positivity of  $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$ , for  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi) \in \Pi$ , may not always be in  $P$ , the results in this section suggest that it may indeed be so for many “natural” subclasses  $\Pi$ . In particular, Theorem 6.9 proved in this section suggests that the problem of deciding positivity of  $k_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$ , when  $\mu$  and  $\pi$  are rectangular ( $= \delta(\lambda)$ ), is in  $P$ , as conjectured in [Mul10b].

### 6.1 Interpretation of the $t$ -function in terms of hypergraphs

We begin with a lemma that is needed for proving these results.

**Definition 6.1.** *Let  $\lambda, \mu$  and  $\pi$  be partitions of size  $d$ . An obstruction predesign of type  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  is a hypergraph with  $d$  indistinguishable vertices with three layers (types) of hyperedges. Every vertex lies in exactly one hyperedge of each layer. For every column in  $\lambda$  of length  $k$  there is a hyperedge in layer 1 with  $k$  vertices. The same holds for  $\mu$  in layer 2 and  $\pi$  in layer 3. An obstruction design is an obstruction predesign such that no two vertices share all three hyperedges.*

Note that hypergraphs with *indistinguishable vertices* are the same as hypergraph isomorphism classes.

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $\tilde{t}_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$  be the number of obstruction designs of type  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$ . Then  $t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda > 0$  iff  $\tilde{t}_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Recall from Section 2 that  $t_{\mu, \pi}^\lambda$  is the number of point sets  $P \subseteq \mathbb{N}^3$  with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$ . We define the  $k$ -th slice of a point set in direction  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ , to be its subset consisting of the points that have  $k$  as their  $i$ -th coordinate. (Here the directions 1, 2, and 3 correspond to the  $x$ ,  $y$ , and  $z$  coordinates, respectively.)

We now prove that  $t_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda > 0$  iff  $\tilde{t}_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda > 0$ . From a point set  $P$  with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$ , we can define an obstruction design of type  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  by taking  $P$  to be the hypergraph vertex set and making each slice in direction  $i$  a hyperedge in layer  $i$ . Conversely, from an obstruction design of type  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  we can obtain a point set with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$  as follows: For each layer we give consecutive numbers (starting at 0) to each hyperedge, beginning with the largest hyperedge and continuing in a manner such that the hyperedge sizes form a nonincreasing sequence, i.e., a partition of  $d$ . Since every vertex lies in exactly one hyperedge of each layer, every vertex gives rise to a triple of nonnegative integers, and the triples are pairwise distinct because no two vertices share all 3 hyperedges. These triples form a point set with marginals  $(\lambda^T, \mu^T, \pi^T)$ .  $\square$

Note that  $t_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  need not always be equal to  $\tilde{t}_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$ ; this can happen when the hyperedge sizes are not all distinct. Though, by the preceding result, the problems of deciding positivity of  $t_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  and  $\tilde{t}_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  are equivalent, obstruction designs introduced here will turn out to be convenient in the proofs that follow.

## 6.2 Littlewood-Richardson coefficients

Given partitions  $\lambda, \mu, \pi$  such that  $|\lambda| = |\mu| + |\pi|$ , let  $\iota := |\lambda| + \lambda_1$ . Let  $\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\pi}$  be the partitions  $\lambda, \mu, \pi$  with a long first row put on top of their Young diagrams such that  $|\tilde{\lambda}| = |\tilde{\mu}| = |\tilde{\pi}| = 3\iota$ . Then [Mur38]  $k_{\tilde{\mu},\tilde{\pi}}^{\tilde{\lambda}}$  is equal to the Littlewood-Richardson coefficient  $c_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  associated with the partition triple  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$ .

The problem of deciding positivity of  $k_{\tilde{\mu},\tilde{\pi}}^{\tilde{\lambda}} = c_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  has a strongly polynomial time algorithm [KT01, BMS11]. This is consistent with the following result.

**Theorem 6.3.** *For any  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\pi$ ,  $t_{\tilde{\mu},\tilde{\pi}}^{\tilde{\lambda}} > 0$ . In particular, the problem of deciding positivity of  $t_{\tilde{\mu},\tilde{\pi}}^{\tilde{\lambda}}$  is trivial.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.2, it suffices to construct a hypergraph to show that  $\tilde{t}_{\tilde{\mu},\tilde{\pi}}^{\tilde{\lambda}} > 0$ .

We call a hyperedge that contains only a single vertex a *singleton*. The key property of the constructed hypergraph will be that every vertex lies in 2 singletons and another hyperedge. By construction  $\tilde{\lambda}, \tilde{\mu}$ , and  $\tilde{\pi}$  each have at least  $2\iota$  columns with a single box. We split the  $3\iota$  vertices into three equally sized parts. The vertices of the first part are contained in singleton hyperedges of layer 2 and layer 3. The vertices of the second part are contained in singleton hyperedges of layer 1 and layer 3. The vertices of the third part are contained in singleton hyperedges of layer 1 and layer 2. The remaining hyperedges of layer  $i$  are constructed by freely partitioning the vertices in the  $i$ -th part according to the desired hyperedge sizes. Since no two vertices share all three hyperedges, the theorem is proved.  $\square$

## 6.3 Partitions of constant height

It is known that positivity of  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  can be decided in polynomial time when  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\pi$  have constant heights. This is consistent with the following result.

**Theorem 6.4.** *Fix a constant  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $|\lambda| = |\mu| = |\pi|$  and  $ht(\lambda) \leq c$ ,  $ht(\mu) \leq c$ ,  $ht(\pi) \leq c$ , then positivity of  $t_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda > 0$  can be decided in polynomial time.*

The algorithm is a hybrid algorithm based on the number of boxes  $|\lambda|$ . The values for  $t$  in the case  $|\lambda| < (c+2)c$  are stored in a database of constant size. The case  $|\lambda| \geq (c+2)c$  is trivial, as the following lemma shows.

**Lemma 6.5.** *If  $ht(\lambda) \leq c$ ,  $ht(\mu) \leq c$ ,  $ht(\pi) \leq c$ , and  $|\lambda| = |\mu| = |\pi| \geq (c+2)c$ , then  $t_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda > 0$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 6.2, it suffices to construct a hypergraph showing that  $\tilde{t}_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda > 0$ .

If  $|\lambda|$  is divisible by  $c$ , then we arrange the vertices in a rectangular array whose columns contain  $c$  vertices each. Otherwise we add an extra column containing less than  $c$  vertices. The crucial property is that since  $|\lambda| \geq (c+2)c$  each row contains at least  $c+2$  vertices.

Proceeding columnwise from top to bottom and from left to right, we greedily assign vertices to hyperedges of the first layer according to the column lengths of  $\mu$ . Note that each hyperedge constructed thus lies either in a single column or in two adjacent columns. Likewise, proceeding rowwise from left to right and from top to bottom, we greedily assign vertices to hyperedges of the second layer according to the column lengths of  $\pi$ . Since each row contains at least  $c+2$  vertices, a layer 2 hyperedge cannot contain two vertices from the same or adjacent columns.

Consider two vertices  $v$  and  $w$  that lie in the same layer 1 hyperedge. They either lie in the same column or in adjacent columns. Therefore no layer 2 hyperedge can contain both  $v$  and  $w$ . This shows that we can choose an arbitrary layer 3 hyperedge arrangement and see that  $\tilde{t}_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda > 0$ .  $\square$

Note that  $t_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda > 0$  and  $t_{\mu',\pi'}^{\lambda'} > 0$  implies  $t_{\mu+\mu',\pi+\pi'}^{\lambda+\lambda'} > 0$ , and that Lemma 6.5 shows that for constant height the semigroup of triples with positive  $t_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  is finitely generated, as it is known for  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  as well.

## 6.4 When one partition is a hook

Blasiak [Bla12] has given a  $\#P$ -formula for  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  when  $\lambda$  is a hook. The problem of deciding positivity of  $k_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$  in this case may be conjectured to be in  $P$  in view of the following result.

**Theorem 6.6.** *Positivity of  $t_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda$ , given  $\lambda, \mu$ , and  $\pi$  in unary, can be decided in polynomial time if  $\lambda$  is a hook.*

Let  $\lambda = (D - k + 1, 1^{k-1})$  be a hook partition with  $D$  boxes. The Young diagram  $\lambda$  has  $D - k$  columns that contain only a single box and a single column with  $k$  boxes. Let  $\mu$  and  $\pi$  be arbitrary partitions of  $D$ . By Lemma 6.2, it suffices to decide in polynomial time whether  $\tilde{t}_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda > 0$ , i.e., if an obstruction design of type  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  exists.

The first key observation is the following. If we fix all the hyperedges in the  $\mu$  and  $\pi$  layers and ask whether an obstruction design of type  $(\lambda, \mu, \pi)$  exists with these prescribed hyperedges, then this is easy to answer: For fixed set partitions  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  that have hyperedge sizes  $\mu^T$  and  $\pi^T$ , respectively, let  $\tilde{t}_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda(\alpha, \beta)$  denote the number of obstruction designs whose  $\mu$  layer is  $\alpha$  and whose  $\pi$  layer is  $\beta$ . We call two vertices that lie in the same  $\mu$ -hyperedge and the same  $\pi$ -hyperedge  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -equivalent.

**Claim 6.7.**  $\tilde{t}_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda(\alpha, \beta) = 0$  iff  $k$  is larger than the number of  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -equivalence classes.

*Proof.* Fix  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . If  $k$  is larger than the number of  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -equivalence classes, then by the pigeonhole principle the  $\lambda$ -hyperedge of size  $k$  must contain two  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -equivalent vertices. Therefore this construction does not yield an obstruction design. If  $k$  is smaller than the number of  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -equivalence classes, the  $\lambda$ -hyperedge of size  $k$  can be chosen to contain pairwise  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -nonequivalent vertices. The other vertices are singletons in the  $\lambda$  layer, so this construction yields an obstruction design.  $\square$

Thus being able to answer the question whether  $\tilde{t}_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda > 0$  is equivalent to answering the following question: Given hyperedge size vectors  $\mu^T$  and  $\pi^T$ , what is the maximal number of  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -equivalence classes, where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  have hyperedge sizes  $\mu^T$  and  $\pi^T$ , respectively? We will formalize this as a max flow problem with integer edge capacities (given in unary). Such a problem can be solved in polynomial time using the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm. We construct a directed graph with a source vertex, one

vertex for each column of  $\mu$ , one vertex for each column of  $\pi$ , and one sink vertex. There are edges from the source vertex to the  $\mu$ -vertices whose capacity equals the number of boxes in the corresponding column of  $\mu$ . Analogously there are edges from the  $\pi$ -vertices to the sink vertex whose capacity equals the number of boxes in the corresponding column of  $\pi$ . Moreover, there is a capacity 1 edge from every  $\mu$ -vertex to every  $\pi$ -vertex. The Ford-Fulkerson algorithm finds in polynomial time an integer solution to the problem of sending the maximum amount of flow through this network with respect to the capacity constraints. Combined with Claim 6.7 the following claim implies that the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm can be used to decide in polynomial time whether  $\tilde{t}_{\mu,\pi}^\lambda > 0$  is positive.

**Claim 6.8.** *A solution with flow at least  $k$  exists iff there exist  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  such that the number of  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -equivalence classes is at least  $k$ .*

*Proof.* Given  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  with at least  $k$  equivalence classes we construct a solution to the flow problem by sending one flow unit for each equivalence class: For the equivalence class corresponding to the  $i$ th  $\mu$ -column and  $j$ th  $\pi$ -column we send a unit from the source vertex to the  $i$ th  $\mu$ -vertex, from there to the  $j$ th  $\pi$ -vertex and then to the sink vertex. This satisfies the capacity constraints and is a solution to the flow problem that sends at least  $k$  flow units.

From a solution of the max flow problem we readily generate a solution to a relaxed max flow problem where we remove the capacities on the edges from the  $\mu$ -vertices to the  $\pi$ -vertices. We send flow units on additional arbitrary paths from the source to the sink. Once all capacities are saturated we are guaranteed to send exactly  $D$  flow units. From this new solution we construct set partitions  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  by defining that the size of the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -equivalence class corresponding to the  $i$ th  $\mu$ -column and the  $j$ th  $\pi$ -column is the amount of flow from the  $i$ th  $\mu$ -vertex to the  $j$ th  $\pi$ -vertex. So if the original solution had at least  $k$  flow units, then there are at least  $k$   $(\alpha, \beta)$ -equivalence classes in our construction.  $\square$

## 6.5 Rectangular Kronecker coefficients


It is conjectured in [Mul10b] that the problem deciding positivity of the rectangular Kronecker coefficient  $k_{\delta(\lambda), \delta(\lambda)}^\lambda$  is in  $P$ . This is supported by the following result.

**Theorem 6.9.** *Let  $\lambda$  be any partition with  $dr$  boxes and at most  $\min(d^2, r^2)$  rows, and let  $\delta = \delta(\lambda) = (d, \dots, d)$  ( $r$  times). Then  $t_{\delta, \delta}^\lambda > 0$ . In particular, the problem of deciding positivity of  $t_{\delta, \delta}^\lambda$  is trivial.*

Since  $k_{\delta, \delta}^\lambda = 0$  if  $\text{ht}(\lambda) > \min(d^2, r^2)$ , the constraint on  $\lambda$  here is very natural.


*Proof.* By Lemma 6.2, it suffices to prove positivity of  $\tilde{t}_{\delta, \delta}^\lambda$ . We do this by an explicit construction.

The case  $d \geq r$  is easier, so we handle this case first. We have to construct an obstruction design with  $dr$  vertices and go about it as follows. Let  $i \bmod d$  denote the remainder when dividing  $i$  by  $d$ . The vertex set  $V$  is a subset of the  $d \times d$  grid  $\{(i, j) \mid 0 \leq i, j < d\}$ . We have  $(i, j) \in V$  iff  $(i + j) \bmod d \in \{0, 1, \dots, r - 1\}$ . For example, for  $r = 4$  and  $d = 6$ , the vertex set is arranged as follows (row 0 is at the top, column 0 is at the left):



Note that every row and every column has exactly  $r$  boxes. The rows correspond to the hyperedges of the first layer, where the columns correspond to the hyperedges of the second layer. Note that no matter how the hyperedges of the third layer are placed, no two vertices can share all three hyperedges, because no two vertices even share their two hyperedges in layer one and two. Therefore an arbitrary placement of the third layer shows  $t_{\delta,\delta}^\lambda > 0$ .

For  $d < r$  an analogous construction can be made, but several vertices share a location, see the example  $r = 6$  and  $d = 4$  below.



Note that in this construction, if  $\frac{r}{d} > 2$ , then three or more vertices lie at the same position. As in the case  $d \geq r$ , the rows correspond to the hyperedges of the first layer, where the columns correspond to the hyperedges of the second layer. But now the third layer cannot be placed arbitrarily, but care has to be taken. The hyperedges can be placed in any order, but not at arbitrary positions. When a hyperedge is placed, it first uses those places where several vertices are grouped together (and of course only uses one from each such place). If there are places with more than two vertices, the hyperedge first takes vertices from those places with the most vertices. This greedy method ensures that no hyperedge contains a pair of vertices from the same place, because by the length restriction on  $\lambda$  a hyperedge cannot use more than  $d^2$  vertices.  $\square$

## References

- [BCI11] P. Bürgisser, M. Christandl, and C. Ikenmeyer, *Nonvanishing of Kronecker coefficients for rectangular shapes*, *Advances in Mathematics* **227** (2011), no. 5, 2082–2091.
- [BCMw] P. Bürgisser, M. Christandl, K. Mulmuley, and M. Walter, *On the complexity of the membership problem for moment polytopes*, under preparation.
- [BDLG01] S. Brunetti, A. Del Lungo, and Y. Gerard, *On the computational complexity of reconstructing three-dimensional lattice sets from their two-dimensional X-rays*, *Linear algebra and its applications* **339** (2001), no. 1, 59–73.
- [BDLGdV08] S. Brunetti, A. Del Lungo, P. Gritzmann, and S. de Vries, *On the reconstruction of binary and permutation matrices under (binary) tomographic constraints*, *Theoretical Computer Science* **406** (2008), 63–71.
- [BH77] L. Berman and J. Hartmanis, *On isomorphisms and density of NP and other complete sets*, *SIAM J. Comput.* **6** (1977), 305–322.
- [BI13] P. Bürgisser and C. Ikenmeyer, *Explicit lower bounds via geometric complexity theory*, *Proceedings of the forty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, ACM, 2013, pp. 141–150.
- [Bla12] J. Blasiak, *Kronecker coefficients for one hook shape*, arXiv:1209.2018 (2012).
- [BLMW11] P. Bürgisser, J. Landsberg, L. Manivel, and J. Weyman, *An overview of mathematical issues arising in the geometric complexity theory approach to  $VP \neq VNP$* , *SIAM Journal on Computing* **40** (2011), no. 4, 1179–1209.

- [BMS11] J. Blasiak, K. Mulmuley, and M. Sohoni, *Geometric complexity theory III: on deciding nonvanishing of a Littlewood-Richardson coefficient*, Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics (2011), 1–8.
- [BMS15] ———, *Geometric complexity theory IV: nonstandard quantum group for the Kronecker problem*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society **235** (2015), no. 1109.
- [BS00] A. Berenstein and R. Sjamaar, *Coadjoint orbits, moment polytopes, and the Hilbert-Mumford criterion*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (2000), no. 2, 433–466.
- [CDW12] M. Christandl, B. Doran, and M. Walter, *Computing Multiplicities of Lie Group Representations*, Proc. 53rd IEEE FOCS, 2012, pp. 639–648.
- [DW00] H. Derksen and J. Weyman, *Semi-invariants of quivers and saturation for Littlewood-Richardson coefficients*, JAMS **13** (2000), no. 3, 467–479.
- [FH91] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation theory: A first course*, Springer, 1991.
- [For79] S. Fortune, *A note on sparse complete sets*, SIAM Journal on Computing **8** (1979), no. 3, 431–433.
- [GJ79] M. Garey and D. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability*, W. H. Freeman and company, New York, 1979.
- [Ike12] C. Ikenmeyer, *Geometric complexity theory, tensor rank, and Littlewood-Richardson coefficients*, Ph.D. thesis, Institute of Mathematics, University of Paderborn, 2012, Online available at <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:hbz:466:2-10472>.
- [Kir84] F. Kirwan, *Convexity properties of the moment mapping, III*, Invent. Math. **77** (1984), 547–552.
- [KL14] H. Kadish and J. Landsberg, *Padded polynomials, their cousins, and geometric complexity theory*, Communications in Algebra **42** (2014), no. 5, 2171–2180.
- [Kly04] A. Klyachko, *Quantum marginal problem and representations of the symmetric group*, arXiv:quant-ph/0409113 (2004).
- [KT99] A. Knutson and T. Tao, *The Honeycomb model of  $GL_n(\mathbb{C})$  tensor products I: proof of the saturation conjecture*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **12** (1999), 1055–1090.
- [KT01] ———, *Honeycombs and sums of Hermitian matrices*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. **48** (2001), 175–186.
- [Kum11] S. Kumar, *A study of the representations supported by the orbit closure of the determinant*, arXiv:1109.5996 (2011).
- [Mah82] S. Mahaney, *Sparse complete sets for NP: Solution of a conjecture by Berman and Hartmanis*, Journal of Computer and System Sciences **25** (1982), 130–143.
- [Man97] L. Manivel, *Applications de Gauss et pléthysme*, Annales de l’institut Fourier, vol. 47, Chartres: L’Institut, 1950–, 1997, pp. 715–774.
- [MS08] K. Mulmuley and M. Sohoni, *Geometric complexity theory II: towards explicit obstructions for embeddings among class varieties*, SIAM J. Comput. **38** (2008), no. 3, 1175–1206.

- [Mul10a] K. Mulmuley, *Explicit proofs and the flip*, arXiv:1009.0246 (2010).
- [Mul10b] ———, *Geometric complexity theory VI: the flip via positivity*, Technical report, Computer Science Department, the University of Chicago (2010).
- [Mul11] ———, *On P vs. NP and geometric complexity theory*, JACM **58** (2011), no. 2.
- [Mul12] ———, *Geometric complexity theory V: equivalence between black-box derandomization of polynomial identity testing and derandomization of Noether’s Normalization Lemma*, Proceedings of the 53rd FOCS, IEEE, 2012, Full version: ArXiv: 1209.5993.
- [Mur38] F. Murnaghan, *The analysis of the Kronecker product of irreducible representations of the symmetric group*, Amer. J. Math. **60** (1938), no. 3, 761–784.
- [Res10] N. Ressayre, *Geometric invariant theory and the generalized eigenvalue problem*, Invent. Math. **180** (2010), 389–441.
- [Sta02] R. Stanley, *Positivity problems and conjectures in algebraic combinatorics*, In Mathematics: Frontiers and Perspectives (2002), 295–319.
- [Val00] E. Vallejo, *Plane partitions and characters of the symmetric group*, Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics **11** (2000), no. 1, 79–88.
- [VW15] M. Vergne and M. Walter, *Inequalities for Moment Cones of Finite-Dimensional Representations*, arXiv:1410.8144v2 (2015).
- [Wal14] M. Walter, *Multipartite Quantum States and their Marginals*, Ph.D. thesis, ETH Zurich, 2014, arXiv:1410.6820.
- [Yu96] W. Yu, *The two-machine flow shop problem with delays and the one-machine total tardiness*, Ph.D. thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology, 1996.