

Packing sets of patterns

Alexander Burstein*

Department of Mathematics
Howard University
Washington, DC 20059, USA
aburstein@howard.edu

Peter Hästö†

Department of Mathematical Sciences
P.O. Box 3000
90014 University of Oulu, Finland
peter.hasto@helsinki.fi

MR Subject Classifications: Primary 05A15; Secondary 05A16

Abstract

Packing density is a permutation occurrence statistic which describes the maximal number of permutations of a given type that can occur in another permutation. In this article we focus on containment of sets of permutations. Although this question has been tangentially considered previously, this is the first article focusing exclusively on it. We find the packing density for various special sets of permutations and study permutation and pattern co-occurrence.

1 Introduction

The string 413223 contains two subsequences, 133 and 122, each of which is *order-isomorphic* (or simply *isomorphic*) to the string 122, i.e. ordered in the same way as 122. In this situation we call the string 122 a *pattern*. Herb Wilf first proposed the systematic study of pattern containment in his 1992 address to the SIAM meeting on Discrete Mathematics. However, several earlier results on pattern containment exist, for example, those by Knuth [10] and Tarjan [14].

Most results on pattern containment actually deal with *pattern avoidance*, in other words, enumerate or consider properties of strings over a totally ordered alphabet which avoid a given pattern or set of patterns. There is considerably less research on other aspects of pattern containment, specifically, on packing patterns into strings over a totally ordered alphabet, but see [1, 8, 9, 11, 13] for the permutation case and [4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17] for the more general pattern case.

Although several of the above cited papers have defined packing density for sets of patterns, virtually all of them have subsequently restricted the attention to the case when the set contains

*Research supported in part by the NSA Young Investigator Grant H98230-06-1-0037.

†Corresponding author.

only one pattern. In this paper we take the next step in studying the set packing question: in Section 2 we study the packing density of so-called layered permutations which have been the focus of much research also in the single permutation case. In Section 3 we calculate the packing density of various sets of three-letter patterns. In Section 4 we study the average co-occurrence of patterns and calculate the leading term of the covariance of any two permutation patterns of the same length n (as a polynomial in n) and, in general, of any two patterns of the same length over the same alphabet.

Notation

Let $[k] = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ be our canonical totally ordered alphabet on k letters, and consider the set $[k]^n$ of n -letter words over $[k]$. We say that a pattern $\pi \in [l]^m$ *occurs* in $\sigma \in [k]^n$, or π *hits* σ , or that σ *contains* the pattern π , if there is a subsequence of σ order-isomorphic to π .

Given a word $\sigma \in [k]^n$ and a set of patterns $\Pi \subseteq [l]^m$, let $\nu(\Pi, \sigma)$ be the total number of occurrences of patterns in Π (Π -patterns, for short) in σ . Obviously, the largest possible number of Π -occurrences in σ is $\binom{n}{m}$, when each subsequence of length m of σ is an occurrence of a Π -pattern. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\Pi, k, n) &= \max\{\nu(\Pi, \sigma) \mid \sigma \in [k]^n\}, \\ d(\Pi, \sigma) &= \frac{\nu(\Pi, \sigma)}{\binom{n}{m}} \quad \text{and} \\ \delta(\Pi, k, n) &= \frac{\mu(\Pi, k, n)}{\binom{n}{m}} = \max\{d(\Pi, \sigma) \mid \sigma \in [k]^n\}, \end{aligned}$$

the maximum number of Π -patterns in a word in $[k]^n$, the probability that a subsequence of σ of length m is an occurrence of a Π -pattern, and the maximum such probability over words in $[k]^n$, respectively. A permutation $\sigma \in [k]^n$ such that $\nu(\Pi, \sigma) = \mu(\Pi, k, n)$ is called Π -*maximal*.

We want to consider the asymptotic behavior of $\delta(\Pi, k, n)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $k \rightarrow \infty$. R. Barton [4] proved that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta(\Pi, n, n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \delta(\Pi, n, k) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \delta(\Pi, n, k),$$

so we can mend the definition from [6] and define the common limit $\delta(\Pi)$ to be the packing density of the set of patterns Π . If $\Pi = \{\pi\}$, then we use also $\delta(\pi)$ for $\delta(\Pi)$.

2 Sets of layered permutations

In this section we deal with sets of layered permutations. Recall that a permutation is said to be *layered* if it is a strictly increasing sequence of strictly decreasing substrings. These substrings are called the layers of the permutation. For instance, $\widehat{21543}$ is layered with layers 21 of length 2 and 543 of length 3. Obviously, a layered permutation is determined by the sequence of lengths of its layers, so we can denote $\widehat{21543}$ simply by [2, 3].

It has been shown that if Π consists of layered permutations, then there is a Π -maximal permutation which is layered [1, Theorem 2.2]. For the case of a single layered permutation $\pi = [m_1, \dots, m_r]$ (i.e. π has r layers of lengths m_1, \dots, m_r) Price [11] showed that

$$(2.1) \quad \delta(\pi) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\substack{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s \geq 0 \\ \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_s = 1}} p_s(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s),$$

where

$$(2.2) \quad p_s(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s) = \binom{m}{m_1, \dots, m_r} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq s} \lambda_{i_1}^{m_1} \dots \lambda_{i_r}^{m_r}.$$

The sequences $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s)$ in (2.1) are called *partitions of unity*, and we write $\lambda \vdash 1$. For each s , the π -maximal permutation is approximately $[\lfloor m\lambda_1^* \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor m\lambda_s^* \rfloor]$ for a maximizing partition of unity $\lambda^* \vdash 1$. If for every n , there is a permutation $\sigma_n \in S_n$ with r layers (recall that r is the number of layers of π) such that

$$\delta(\pi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d(\pi, \sigma_n),$$

then the permutation π is called *simple* [8]. For example, $[2, 2, 2, 2, 2]$ is simple, but $[2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2]$ is not simple (by Examples 6.4 and 6.5 of [11]). A partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s) \vdash 1$ is *optimal* if $p_s(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s) = \delta(\pi)$ and s is the least integer such that there exists $\lambda \vdash 1$ with this property.

The next result shows that [8, Theorem 3.3] partially generalizes to the case of sets of permutations.

Proposition 2.3. *Let Π be a set of layered permutations of length m and r layers such that the optimal partition of unity $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s) \vdash 1$ is increasing (i.e. $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_s$). Let m_- be the length of the shortest layer of all permutations in Π . If $m_- \geq \max\{\log_2(r+1), 2\}$, then Π is simple, and the packing density of Π equals*

$$\delta(\Pi) = \sup_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r) \vdash 1} \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \binom{m}{m_1^\pi, \dots, m_r^\pi} \lambda_1^{m_1^\pi} \dots \lambda_r^{m_r^\pi},$$

where m_i^π is the length of the i^{th} layer of π and the supremum is taken over all partitions of unity with r parts.

Proof. As in the proof of [8, Theorem 3.3], we conclude that the maximizing partition of unity of any $\pi \in \Pi$ has r layers. Hence Π is simple. The last formula follows directly from this. \square

One might think that it is always the case that a set of simple permutations is simple. We have not been able to prove it, however.

In some cases it is easy to show that the condition of the previous proposition holds. A layered permutation is said to be increasing, if its layer sizes are increasing. If Π is a set of increasing layered permutations, then the maximizing sequence (λ_i) is also increasing. The proof of this

fact is the same as in the case of only a single permutation, see [8, Lemma 3.2]. Another obvious case is when the set Π is symmetric, in the sense that it contains all the permutations with certain layer sizes, like the set $\{\{2, 1, 1\}, \{1, 2, 1\}, \{1, 1, 2\}\}$.

Let us next consider some special sets of layered permutations. The prototypical case for the next theorem are permutations $[m, 2]$ and $[m, 1, 1]$. In this case the permutations differ only in that the last two letters are interchanged, but as can be seen below, this is not the reason that we are able to calculate the packing density.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $m, n \geq 2$ and let $\Pi(m, n)$ be the set of all permutations whose first layer has length m and whose subsequent layers have total length n . Then we have*

$$\delta(\Pi(m, n)) = \binom{m+n-1}{n} \frac{(m-1)^{m-1} n^n}{(m+n-1)^{m+n-1}}.$$

Note that $\delta(\Pi(m, n)) = \delta([m-1, n])$ if $m \geq 3$.

Proof. Let P_K be the set of sequences $(\lambda_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ of non-negative real numbers with $\sum \lambda_i = 1$ and $\lambda_i = 0$ for $i > K$. Using (2.1) and (2.2) we obtain

$$\delta(\Pi(m, n)) = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(\lambda_i) \in P_K} F((\lambda_i)),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F((\lambda_i)) &= \binom{m+n}{n} \sum_{i < j} \lambda_i^m \lambda_j^n + \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \binom{m+n}{m, n-p, p} \sum_{i < j < k} \lambda_i^m \lambda_j^{n-p} \lambda_k^p + \dots \\ &= \binom{m+n}{n} \left(\sum_{i < j} \lambda_i^m \lambda_j^n + \sum_{p=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{p} \sum_{i < j < k} \lambda_i^m \lambda_j^{n-p} \lambda_k^p + \dots \right) \\ &= \binom{m+n}{n} \sum_i \lambda_i^m \left(\sum_{j > i} \lambda_j \right)^n. \end{aligned}$$

Fix $K \geq 2$ and choose $(\lambda_i) \in P_K$ such that $\sup_{(\bar{\lambda}_i) \in P_K} F((\bar{\lambda}_i)) = F((\lambda_i))$. (This is possible by continuity of F and compactness.) By discarding leading zeros if necessary we may assume that $\lambda_1 > 0$; also $F((\lambda_i)) = 0$ if $\lambda_1 = 1$, so the maximizing property implies that this is not the case; hence $\lambda_1 \in (0, 1)$. Denote $\Lambda_i = \sum_{i < j} \lambda_j$. We define $\lambda'_1 = c\lambda_1$ and $\lambda'_i = d\lambda_i$ for $i > 1$. Moreover, we choose $d(c) = (1 - c\lambda_1)/(1 - \lambda_1)$, in order to have $\sum \lambda'_i = 1$ so that $(\lambda'_i) \in P_k$. Since the original sequence $(\lambda_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ was maximal in P_K , we have

$$\sum_i \lambda_i^m \Lambda_i^n \geq \sum_i \lambda_i^m \left(\sum_{j > i} \lambda'_j \right)^n = c^m d^n \lambda_1^m \Lambda_1^n + d^{m+n} \sum_{i > 1} \lambda_i^m \Lambda_i^n.$$

Let us denote

$$\alpha = \lambda_1^m \Lambda_1^n = \lambda_1^m (1 - \lambda_1)^n$$

and $\beta = \sum_{i>1} \lambda_i^m \Lambda_i^n$. Then our previous conclusion implies that the function

$$G(c) = c^m d(c)^n \alpha + d(c)^{m+n} \beta$$

has a maximum at $c = 1$. Differentiating this function and evaluating at $c = d = 1$ gives

$$G'(1) = \left(m - \frac{n\lambda_1}{1-\lambda_1}\right) \alpha - (m+n) \frac{\lambda_1}{1-\lambda_1} \beta.$$

Since 1 is a maximum, the derivative equals zero, so

$$\beta = \frac{m(1-\lambda_1) - n\lambda_1}{(m+n)\lambda_1} \alpha.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_i \lambda_i^m \Lambda_i^n = \alpha + \beta = \frac{m}{(m+n)\lambda_1} \alpha = \frac{m}{m+n} \lambda_1^{m-1} (1-\lambda_1)^n.$$

Clearly, the last expression is maximized by $\lambda_1 = (m-1)/(m+n-1)$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(\lambda_k) \in P_K} F((\lambda_i)) &= \binom{m+n}{n} \frac{m}{m+n} \sup_{0 < \lambda_1 < 1} \lambda_1^{m-1} (1-\lambda_1)^n \\ &= \binom{m+n}{n} \frac{m}{m+n} \frac{(m-1)^{m-1} n^n}{(m+n-1)^{m+n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since this expression does not depend on K , we see that it is also the limit as $K \rightarrow \infty$ of $\sup_{(\lambda_k) \in P_K} F((\lambda_i))$, from which we obtain $\delta(\Pi(m, n))$. Taking also into account [8, Theorem 1.2] we see that it equals $\delta([m-1, n])$ when $m \geq 3$. \square

Remark 2.5. We can make the previous theorem slightly more general by allowing different first terms. Let $M \geq 3$ and let $M > m_1 > \dots > m_r \geq 2$. Then we can find the packing density of the set

$$\Pi(m_1, M - m_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi(m_r, M - m_r)$$

by finding the maximum over λ_1 of the real valued function

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^r m_i \lambda_1^{m_i-1} (1-\lambda_1)^{M-m_i}.$$

The proof of this fact is very similar to the proof of Theorem 2.4, and is thus omitted.

Using the method of the previous proof, we get an upper bound for the packing density of much more general types of permutations. In the general case, the upper bound is not attained, however.

Corollary 2.6. *Let $m_1 \geq 3$ and $m = m_1 + \dots + m_r \geq 5$. Then*

$$\delta([m_1, \dots, m_r]) \leq \delta([m_1 - 1, m - m_1]) \delta([m_2, \dots, m_r]).$$

Proof. With the notation of the previous proof:

$$\delta([m_1, \dots, m_r]) = \lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(\lambda_k) \in P_K} \binom{m}{m_1, \dots, m_r} \sum_{i_1 < \dots < i_r} \lambda_{i_1}^{m_1} \cdots \lambda_{i_r}^{m_r}.$$

We split the sum into two parts,

$$\alpha = \lambda_1^{m_1} \sum_{1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r} \lambda_{i_2}^{m_2} \cdots \lambda_{i_r}^{m_r},$$

and the rest, denoted by β . As in the previous proof, we set $\lambda'_1 = c\lambda_1$ and $\lambda'_i = d\lambda_i$ for $i > 1$, construct the function $F(c)$, calculate the derivative, and set it equal to zero. As before, we calculate

$$\alpha + \beta = \frac{m_1}{m\lambda_1} \alpha.$$

Using a rescaling and the definition of packing density we find

$$\frac{\alpha}{\lambda_1^{m_1}} = \sum_{1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r} \lambda_{i_2}^{m_2} \cdots \lambda_{i_r}^{m_r} \leq \binom{m - m_1}{m_2, \dots, m_r}^{-1} (1 - \lambda_1)^{m - m_1} \delta([m_2, \dots, m_r]).$$

We note that $\binom{m}{m_1, \dots, m_r} \binom{m - m_1}{m_2, \dots, m_r}^{-1} = \binom{m}{m_1}$. Thus we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta([m_1, \dots, m_r]) &= \binom{m}{m_1, \dots, m_r} \frac{m_1}{m\lambda_1} \alpha \\ &\leq \binom{m}{m_1} \frac{m_1}{m} \delta([m_2, \dots, m_r]) \sup_{0 < \lambda_1 < 1} \lambda_1^{m_1 - 1} (1 - \lambda_1)^{m - m_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the last supremum is reached for $\lambda_1 = (m_1 - 1)/(m - 1)$, from which the claim follows by noting that

$$\delta([m_1 - 1, m - m_1]) = \binom{m}{m_1} \frac{m_1}{m} \frac{(m_1 - 1)^{m_1 - 1} (m - m_1)^{m - m_1}}{(m - 1)^{m - 1}}$$

by [8, Theorem 1.2] □

3 Three-letter patterns

In this section we calculate the packing density for sets of patterns of length three, except the set $\{121, 212\}$, which we did not manage to deal with. For permutations this was done in [1]. In the interest of clarity we first prove some lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *We have $\delta([1, 2], [2, 1]) = 3/4$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Theorem 2.4 we have

$$\delta([1, 2], [2, 1]) = \binom{3}{2} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{(\lambda_i) \in P_k} F((\lambda_i)),$$

where now P_k is the set of sequences $(\lambda_i)_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$ of positive real numbers with $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$ and $\lambda_i = 0$ for $|i| > k$; and

$$F((\lambda_i)) = \sum_{i_1 < i_2} \lambda_{i_1} \lambda_{i_2}^2 + \lambda_{i_2} \lambda_{i_1}^2 = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{i \neq j} \lambda_i \lambda_j^2 = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda_j^2 (1 - \lambda_j).$$

Here we used that $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$ in the last step. We conclude by a simple algebraic identity and the fact that a square is a non-negative number:

$$F((\lambda_i)) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda_j^2 (1 - \lambda_j) = \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{4} - \left(\lambda_j - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \right) \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Hence $\delta([1, 2], [2, 1]) \leq 3/4$. For every $k > 0$ we have

$$d(\{[1, 2], [2, 1]\}, [k, k]) = \binom{2k}{3}^{-1} k^2 (k-1) = \frac{6k^2(k+1)}{2k(2k-1)(2k-2)} \rightarrow \frac{3}{4} \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty,$$

which implies that $\delta([1, 2], [2, 1]) \geq 3/4$ and completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.2. *We have $\delta(112, 122) = \delta([2, 1], [1, 2]) = \frac{3}{4}$.*

Proof. Since both 112 and 122 are non-decreasing, it is clear that the maximizing pattern must be non-decreasing. We may assume that the maximizing pattern is of the form

$$\sigma = 1^{s_1} 2^{s_2} \dots n^{s_n}.$$

Consider then the permutation of type $\sigma' = [s_1, \dots, s_n]$. It is clear that every occurrence of 112 in σ corresponds to an occurrence of $[2, 1]$ in σ' , similarly for 122 and $[1, 2]$. Thus the claim follows by Lemma 3.1. \square

Lemma 3.3. *We have $\delta(112) = \delta(112, 121) = \delta(112, 121, 211) = 2\sqrt{3} - 3$.*

Proof. The numerical value $\delta(112) = 2\sqrt{3} - 3$ is from [6, Example 2.12]. We next complete the proof by showing that $\delta(112) = \delta(112, 121, 211)$. The remaining equality follows from this, since the density certainly grows if we add more patterns to a set.

Let σ be a word and consider adjacent distinct letters at σ_i and σ_{i+1} and let σ' be the pattern with these letters interchanged. Then

$$d(112, 121, 211; \sigma) = d(112, 121, 211; \sigma');$$

to see this notice that the number of occurrences of 112 which hit at most one of the two letters at position i and $i + 1$ is the same in σ and σ' . The same holds for the other two patterns. So it remains to consider occurrences involving both of these positions. Assume $\sigma_i < \sigma_{i+1}$. Then if 112 hits σ at positions $j < i < i + 1$ it is clear that 121 hits σ' in the same positions. Similarly a hit of 121 at $i < i + 1 < j$ is turned into a hit of 211 at the same positions. If $\sigma_i > \sigma_{i+1}$, then the situation is reversed. Hence in each case the total number of occurrences is preserved.

We have now shown that we may exchange adjacent letters in σ . Doing this a sufficient number of times we may assume that σ is nondecreasing. But then all the hits are of type 112, hence

$$d(112, 121, 211; \sigma) = d(112; \sigma).$$

Since σ was arbitrary, the claim follows. \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let S be a set of three-letter patterns on $[2]^3$.*

1. *If S includes either of the patterns 111 and 222, then $\delta(S) = 1$.*
2. *Otherwise, if S includes either of the sets $\{112, 122\}$ or $\{211, 221\}$, then $\delta(S) = 3/4$.*
3. *Otherwise, if $S = \{112, 121, 211, 212\}$ or $S = \{121, 122, 221, 212\}$, then $\delta(S) = \frac{5}{4}(2\sqrt{3} - 3)$.*
4. *Otherwise, if S includes any of the patterns 112, 122, 211 or 221, then $\delta(S) = 2\sqrt{3} - 3$.*
5. *Otherwise, if S equals $\{121\}$ or $\{212\}$, then $\delta(S) = \frac{1}{4}(2\sqrt{3} - 3)$.*
6. *Otherwise, if $S = \{121, 212\}$, then $\delta(S) \geq 1/4$.*

Proof. The claim in case 1 is clear. Thus we assume that $111, 222 \notin S$.

For Case 2 we may assume, by taking the complement if necessary, that $\{112, 122\} \subset S \subset \{112, 122, 121, 211, 212, 221\}$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3 it follows that

$$\delta(112, 122, 121, 211, 212, 221) = \delta(112, 122).$$

Then it follows from Lemma 3.2 that $\delta(S) = 3/4$.

For Case 3 we may assume that $S = \{112, 121, 211, 212\}$. We argue as in Lemma 3.3: let σ be a word and consider adjacent distinct letters at σ_i and σ_{i+1} and let σ' be the pattern with these letters interchanged. As we saw before, the set $\{112, 121, 211\}$ hits σ and σ' the same number of times. So to calculate the hits of $\{112, 121, 211\}$ we may assume that σ is increasing and count the hits of 112. Let $\sigma = 1^{\mu_1} 2^{\mu_2} \cdots s^{\mu_s}$ where the μ_i are non-negative integers with $\sum \mu_i = |\sigma|$. Thus the contribution of these hits can be expressed as (a factor times)

$$\mu_1^2 \sum_{i=2}^s \mu_i + \mu_2^2 \sum_{i=3}^s \mu_i + \cdots + \mu_{s-1}^2 \mu_s.$$

Then we shuffle around the letters to make optimal hits for 212, namely,

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\mu_1, \dots, \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s-1}, \mu_s, \frac{1}{2}\mu_{s-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{2}\mu_1\right),$$

which corresponds to (the same factor times)

$$\left(\frac{\mu_1}{2}\right)^2 \sum_{i=2}^s \mu_i + \left(\frac{\mu_2}{2}\right)^2 \sum_{i=3}^s \mu_i + \cdots + \left(\frac{\mu_{s-1}}{2}\right)^2 \mu_s.$$

But this is just 1/4 of the previous sum. Thus, by a “lucky” coincidence, both sums are maximized by the same relative frequencies of letters, so we find that

$$\delta(S) = \delta(\{112, 121, 211\}) + \delta(212) = \frac{5}{4} \delta(\{112, 121, 211\}).$$

Case 4 follows from Lemma 3.3, and combined with the previous equation this implies also Case 3. For the case 5, we found above that $\delta(121) = \delta(212) = \frac{1}{4}(2\sqrt{3} - 3)$.

So it remains to investigate the case $S = \{121, 212\}$. Consider the permutation $\sigma = 121212 \dots$ of length $2n$. The number of hits of 121 with the 2 matching the k^{th} 2 in σ equals $k(n - k)$. Thus the total number of hits of 121 is

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} k(n - k) = \binom{n+1}{3}.$$

The number of hits of S is twice this, hence $\delta(S) \geq d(S, \sigma) = 2 \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \binom{n+1}{3} / \binom{2n}{3} = 1/4$. \square

4 Average pattern co-occurrence

In this section we deal with average, rather than maximal, pattern co-occurrence.

Consider S_n as a sample space with uniform distribution. Let $\pi \in S_m$, and let X_π be a random variable such that $X_\pi(\tau)$ is the number of occurrences of pattern π in a given permutation $\tau \in S_n$.

It is an easy exercise to show that, even though the maximal number of times a pattern can occur in a permutation (or a word, in general) differs with the pattern, the average number of occurrences of any pattern over all permutations of a given length is the same.

Lemma 4.1. $E(X_\pi) = \frac{1}{m!} \binom{n}{m} \sim \frac{1}{(m!)^2} n^m$ for any pattern $\pi \in S_m$.

Proof. Pick an m -letter subset S of $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ in $\binom{n}{m}$ ways. There is a unique permutation $\pi(S)$ of S order-isomorphic to π , out of $m!$ equally likely permutations in which the elements of S can occur in $\tau \in S_n$. Let $Y_{\pi(S)}$ be a random variable such that $Y_{\pi(S)}(\tau)$ is the number of occurrences of $\pi(S)$ in τ . Then

$$P(Y_{\pi(S)}(\tau) = 1) = \frac{1}{m!} \quad \text{and} \quad P(Y_{\pi(S)}(\tau) = 0) = 1 - \frac{1}{m!},$$

so $E(Y_{\pi(S)}) = 1/m!$. This is true for any $S \subseteq [n]$ such that $|S| = m$, and we have $X_\pi = \sum_{S \subseteq [n], |S|=m} Y_{\pi(S)}$, hence,

$$E(X_\pi) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n], |S|=m} E(Y_{\pi(S)}) = \frac{1}{m!} \binom{n}{m}. \quad \square$$

Therefore, the average pattern occurrence is the same. However, the average pattern co-occurrence, measured by the covariance $\text{Cov}(X_{\pi_1}, X_{\pi_2})$, does depend on the pattern. We will start by considering the average pattern co-occurrence with itself, i.e. $\text{Var}(X_\pi)$. That, via the standard deviation $\sigma(X_\pi)$, will also tell us how tightly the distribution of X_π is grouped around the mean of Lemma 4.1.

Let P_π be the permutation matrix of π , in other words, $P_\pi = [\delta(\pi(i), j)]_{m \times m}$, where δ is the Kronecker symbol. Note that P_π is orthogonal, so $P_{\pi^{-1}} = P_\pi^{-1} = P_\pi^T$. Also, for an integer $m > 0$, and integers $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, define

$$[i, j]_m = \binom{i-1+j-1}{i-1} \binom{m-i+m-j}{m-i}.$$

Let A_m be the $m \times m$ matrix with $(A_m)_{ij} = [i, j]_m$, which have been studied e.g. in [2].

Theorem 4.2. $\text{Var}(X_\pi) = c(\pi)n^{2m-1} + O(n^{2m-2})$ for any pattern $\pi \in S_m$, $m > 1$, where

$$c(\pi) = \frac{1}{((2m-1)!)^2} \left(\text{Tr}(A_m P_\pi A_m P_\pi^{-1}) - \binom{2m-1}{m-1}^2 \right) > 0.$$

The trace in the above formula can be expressed as

$$\text{Tr}(A_m P_\pi A_m P_\pi^{-1}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_m$$

For the standard deviation this gives $\sigma(X_\pi) = \sqrt{c(\pi)} n^{m-\frac{1}{2}} + O(n^{m-1})$ for any pattern $\pi \in S_m$.

Proof. Since $\text{Var}(X_\pi) = E(X_\pi^2) - E(X_\pi)^2$, and the value of $E(X_\pi)$ was determined in Lemma 4.1, it remains only to consider $E(X_\pi^2)$. We have

$$E(X_\pi^2) = E \left(\left(\sum_{S \subseteq [n], |S|=m} Y_{\pi(S)} \right)^2 \right) = \sum_{\substack{S_1, S_2 \subseteq [n] \\ |S_1|=|S_2|=m}} E(Y_{\pi(S_1)} Y_{\pi(S_2)}).$$

Of course, $Y_{\pi(S_1)} Y_{\pi(S_2)} = 1$ if and only if both $\pi(S_1)$ and $\pi(S_2)$ are subsequences of π , otherwise, $Y_{\pi(S_1)} Y_{\pi(S_2)} = 0$.

Let $S = S_1 \cup S_2$, and $|S_1 \cap S_2| = \ell$, so $|S| = 2m - \ell$. We can pick a subset $S \subseteq [n]$ in $\binom{n}{2m-\ell}$ ways. Note that any such S is order-isomorphic to $[2m - \ell] = \{1, 2, \dots, 2m - \ell\}$. Hence, the number of permutations $\rho(S)$ of S such that $\rho \upharpoonright_{S_1} \cong \pi$ and $\rho \upharpoonright_{S_2} \cong \pi$ is the same for any S of cardinality $2m - \ell$ and depends only on m and ℓ .

Therefore, $E(X_\pi^2)$ is a linear combination of $\left\{ \binom{n}{2m-\ell} \mid 0 \leq \ell \leq m \right\}$ with coefficients that are rational functions in m and ℓ . The degrees in n of both $E(X_\pi^2)$ and $E(X_\pi)^2$ are $2m$, and

the coefficient of n^{2m} in $E(X_\pi)^2$ is $1/(m!)^4$. On the other hand, $S = S_1 \cup S_2$, $|S| = 2m$ and $|S_1| = |S_2| = m$ imply that $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$, so $Y_{\pi(S_1)}$ and $Y_{\pi(S_2)}$ are independent, and hence

$$P(Y_{\pi(S_1)}Y_{\pi(S_2)} = 1) = P(Y_{\pi(S_1)} = 1)P(Y_{\pi(S_2)} = 1) = \left(\frac{1}{m!}\right)^2.$$

Let $[x^d]P(x)$ denote the coefficient of x^d in a given polynomial $P(x)$. Since there are $\binom{2m}{m}$ ways to partition a set S of size $2m$ into two subsets of size m , the coefficient of $\binom{n}{2m}$ in $E(X_\pi^2)$ is $\binom{2m}{m}/(m!)^2$. Hence,

$$[n^{2m}]E(X_\pi^2) = \frac{1}{(2m)!} \frac{1}{(m!)^2} \binom{2m}{m} = \frac{1}{(m!)^4}.$$

Thus $[n^{2m}]E(X_\pi^2) = [n^{2m}]E(X_\pi)^2$, so $\deg_n(\text{Var}(X_\pi)) \leq 2m - 1$, and hence, $[n^{2m-1}]\text{Var}(X_\pi) \geq 0$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned} [n^{2m-1}]E(X_\pi)^2 &= [n^{2m-1}] \left(\frac{1}{m!} \binom{n}{m} \right)^2 = \frac{2}{(m!)^2} \cdot [n^m] \binom{n}{m} \cdot [n^{m-1}] \binom{n}{m} \\ &= \frac{2}{(m!)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{m!} \cdot \left(-\frac{\binom{m}{2}}{m!} \right) = -\frac{m(m-1)}{(m!)^4} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the coefficient of n^{2m-1} in the $\binom{n}{2m}$ -term of $E(X_\pi^2)$ is

$$-\frac{\binom{2m}{2}}{(2m)!} \frac{1}{(m!)^2} \binom{2m}{m} = -\frac{m(2m-1)}{(m!)^4},$$

so we only need to find the coefficient of n^{2m-1} in the $\binom{n}{2m-1}$ -term of $E(X_\pi^2)$.

As we noted before, all subsets $S \subseteq [n]$ of the same size (in our case, of size $2m - 1$) are equivalent, so we may assume $S = [2m - 1] = \{1, 2, \dots, 2m - 1\}$. We want to find the number of permutations ρ of S such that there exist subsets $S_1, S_2 \subseteq S$ of size m for which we have $|S_1 \cap S_2| = 1$ (so $S_1 \cup S_2 = S$) and $\rho \upharpoonright_{S_1} \cong \pi$ and $\rho \upharpoonright_{S_2} \cong \pi$.

Suppose that we want to choose S_1 and S_2 as above, together with their positions in S , in such a way that the unique intersection element e is in the i th position in $\pi(S_1)$ and the j th position in $\pi(S_2)$ (of course, $1 \leq i, j \leq m$). Then e occupies position $\pi^{-1}(e) = (i-1) + (j-1) + 1 = i + j - 1$ in S . Hence, there are $\binom{i-1+j-1}{i-1}$ ways to choose the positions for elements of $\pi(S_1)$ and $\pi(S_2)$ to the left of e , and $\binom{m-i+m-j}{m-j}$ ways to choose the positions for elements of $\pi(S_1)$ and $\pi(S_2)$ to the right of e . On the other hand, both $\pi(S_1)$ and $\pi(S_2)$ are naturally order-isomorphic to π , hence, under that isomorphism e maps to $\pi(i)$ as an element of S_1 and to $\pi(j)$ as an element of S_2 . Similarly, since e is the unique intersection element, exactly $\pi(i) - 1$ elements in S_1 and exactly $\pi(j) - 1$ elements in S_2 , all distinct, must be less than e , and the rest of the elements of S must be greater than e , so we must have $e = (\pi(i) - 1) + (\pi(j) - 1) + 1 = \pi(i) + \pi(j) - 1$. There are $\binom{\pi(i)-1+\pi(j)-1}{\pi(i)-1}$ ways to choose the elements of S_1 and S_2 which are less than e , and $\binom{m-\pi(i)+m-\pi(j)}{m-\pi(j)}$ ways to choose the elements of S_1 and S_2 which are greater than e .

Thus, the positions of e in $\pi(S_1)$ and $\pi(S_2)$ uniquely determine the position $\pi^{-1}(e)$ and value e of the intersection element; there are $[i, j]_m$ ways to choose which other positions are occupied by $\pi(S_1)$ and which ones, by $\pi(S_2)$; and there are $[\pi(i), \pi(j)]_m$ ways to choose which other values are in $\pi(S_1)$ and which ones are in $\pi(S_2)$.

Now that we have chosen both positions and values of elements of S_1 and S_2 , we can produce a unique permutation $\rho(S)$ of S which satisfies our conditions above. Simply fill the positions for S_1 and S_2 by elements of $\pi(S_1)$ and $\pi(S_2)$, respectively, in the order in which they occur.

Since the total number of permutations of S is $(2m-1)!$, the coefficient of n^{2m-1} in the $\binom{n}{2m-1}$ -term of $E(X_\pi^2)$ is

$$\frac{1}{(2m-1)!} \cdot \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^m \binom{i-1+j-1}{i-1} \binom{m-i+m-j}{m-j} \binom{\pi(i)-1+\pi(j)-1}{\pi(i)-1} \binom{m-\pi(i)+m-\pi(j)}{m-\pi(j)}}{(2m-1)!} = \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_m}{((2m-1)!)^2}.$$

The coefficient of n^{2m-1} in $\text{Var}(X_\pi)$ is, by the previous equations,

$$\begin{aligned} [n^{2m-1}] \text{Var}(X_\pi) &= \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_m}{((2m-1)!)^2} - \frac{m(2m-1)}{(m!)^4} + \frac{m(m-1)}{(m!)^4} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_m}{((2m-1)!)^2} - \frac{1}{(m!(m-1)!)^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{((2m-1)!)^2} \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_m - \binom{2m-1}{m-1}^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $c(\pi)$ is the leading coefficient of $\text{Var}(X_\pi)$ (a polynomial in n), we have $c(\pi) \geq 0$. The following lemma implies that $c(\pi) > 0$, which finishes the proof of Theorem 4.2. \square

In the next theorem we use the notation $a!! := 0!1!\cdots a!$.

Lemma 4.3. For any $\pi \in S_m$, $\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_m > \binom{2m-1}{m-1}^2$.

Proof. The matrix A_m is symmetric and hence diagonalizable. Moreover, identity (Rabbit) of [2],

$$\det \left[\binom{i+j+a+b}{i+a} \binom{2n-i-j-a-b}{n-i-a} \right]_{0 \leq i,j \leq n} = \frac{(a+b)!(2n+1)!^{m+1}}{a!b!} \cdot \frac{(2n-m)!!m!!(m+a+b)!!(2n-m-a-b)!!a!!b!!(n-m-a-1)!!(n-m-b-1)!!}{(2n+1)!!(n-a)!!(n-b)!!(m+a)!!(m+b)!!(a+b)!!(2n-2m-a-b-1)!!},$$

implies that all leading principal minors of A_m are positive, so A_m is positive definite, and hence all eigenvalues of A_m are positive. Each row and column of A_m sums to $\frac{1}{2} \binom{2m}{m-1} = \binom{2m-1}{m-1}$, so $[1, 1, \dots, 1]$ is an eigenvector for the eigenvalue $\binom{2m-1}{m-1}$. The same is true of the similar matrix $P_\pi A_m P_\pi^{-1}$. Let $D_m = [d_{ij}]_{m \times m}$ be the $m \times m$ diagonal matrix so that d_{ii} 's are the eigenvalues of

A_m and $d_{11} = \binom{2m-1}{m-1}^1$. Then $A_m = BD_mB^{-1}$ for some orthogonal matrix B , so recalling that $\text{Tr}(MN) = \text{Tr}(NM)$ for any M, N where MN and NM exist, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Tr}(A_m P_\pi A_m P_\pi^{-1}) &= \text{Tr}(BD_mB^{-1}P_\pi BD_mB^{-1}P_\pi^{-1}) = \text{Tr}(D_mB^{-1}P_\pi BD_mB^{-1}P_\pi^{-1}B) \\ &= \text{Tr}(D_m(B^{-1}P_\pi B)D_m(B^{-1}P_\pi B)^{-1}) = \text{Tr}(D_mCD_mC^{-1}),\end{aligned}$$

and the matrix $C = B^{-1}P_\pi B = [c_{ij}]_{m \times m}$ is orthogonal, i.e. $C^{-1} = C^T$. Let \mathbf{b}_i be the i th column of $B = [b_{ij}]_{m \times m}$. Then $c_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^m b_{ki}b_{\pi(k)j}$. In particular, the column $\mathbf{b}_1 = [1, \dots, 1]^T$ remains unchanged for any permutation $\pi \in S_n$, so $c_{1j} = \mathbf{b}_1 \cdot \mathbf{b}_j = \delta(1, j)$ and $c_{i1} = \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \mathbf{b}_1 = \delta(i, 1)$. Now we know that

$$\text{Tr}(D_mCD_mC^T) = \sum_{i,k=1}^m d_{ii}d_{kk}c_{ik}^2,$$

$d_{ii} > 0$, $c_{11} = 1$, $c_{i1} = c_{1i} = 0$ for $i > 1$, so c_{ij} are not all zero for $i, j > 1$ (otherwise C is not invertible, let alone orthogonal), and hence

$$\text{Tr}(D_mCD_mC^T) > \binom{2m-1}{m-1}^2.$$

This proves the lemma. □

Remark 4.4. Note that the sum $\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_m$ is invariant under the symmetry operations on S_m : reversal $\mathbf{r} : i \mapsto m - i + 1$, complement $\mathbf{c} : \pi(i) \mapsto m - \pi(i) + 1$, and inverse $\mathbf{i} : \pi \mapsto \pi^{-1}$. Invariance under \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{c} also extends to permutations of multisets. Thus permutations π in the same symmetry class $\bar{\pi}$ have the same $c(\pi)$. The values of

$$\Delta(\pi) = ((2m-1)!)^2 c(\pi) = \sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_m - \binom{2m-1}{m-1}^2$$

for symmetry classes in S_4 ($m = 4$) are given in the table below:

$\bar{\pi}$	1234	1243	1432	1342	2413
$\Delta(\pi)$	491	359	327	239	91

Remark 4.5. It is easy to see that, for a given m , $\Delta(\pi)$ attains its maximum when $\pi = id_m = 12 \dots m$ since the sequences $\{[i, j]_m\}$ and $\{[\pi(i), \pi(j)]_m\}$ (with multiplicities) are arranged in the same order. It would be interesting to characterize the permutations π_* for which $\Delta(\pi_*) = \min_{\pi \in S_m} \Delta(\pi)$. For small values of m , these permutations π_* are in the symmetry classes of:

m	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
$\pi_*(m)$	1	12	132	2413	25314	361452	3614725	37145826	629471583

¹In fact, it is known that the eigenvalues of A are $\binom{2m-1}{i-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, although we are presently unable to find a reference (or proof) for this claim. It follows that $d_{ii} = \binom{2m-1}{m-i}$. These stronger claims are not needed in the rest of the proof.

Interestingly, the patterns $\pi_*(m)$ are either involutions (e.g. for all $1 \leq m \leq 9$ except $m = 4$) or centrally symmetric, i.e. invariant under $\mathbf{r} \circ \mathbf{c}$ (e.g. for $m = 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8$), or both. They are also less avoided than most patterns of the same length, and in fact, are the least avoided patterns for $m \leq 5$. We believe (but cannot prove) that this is not a coincidence.

We can consider the co-occurrence of any two permutation patterns similarly. Since the proof is similar to the variance case, it is omitted.

Theorem 4.6. *For any patterns $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in S_m$, $m > 1$, the covariance $\text{Cov}(X_{\pi_1}, X_{\pi_2})$ is given by*

$$\text{Cov}(X_{\pi_1}, X_{\pi_2}) = c(\pi_1, \pi_2)n^{2m-1} + O(n^{2m-2}),$$

where

$$c(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \frac{1}{((2m-1)!)^2} \left(\text{Tr}(A_m P_{\pi_1} A_m P_{\pi_2}^{-1}) - \binom{2m-1}{m-1}^2 \right).$$

The trace in the above formula is

$$\text{Tr}(A_m P_{\pi_1} A_m P_{\pi_2}^{-1}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi_1(i), \pi_2(j)]_m$$

Considering symmetry classes of pairs of patterns (see Remark 4.4), we see that there are 7 classes of pairs of 3-letter permutations: $\{123, 123\}$, $\{132, 132\}$, $\{123, 132\}$, $\{132, 213\}$, $\{132, 231\}$, $\{123, 231\}$, $\{123, 321\}$ (listed in the order of decreasing asymptotical covariance). The first two pairs obviously have a positive covariance, but of the other five pairs, only $\{123, 132\}$ has a positive covariance.

It would be interesting to characterize the pairs $\{\pi_1, \pi_2\}$ according to the sign or magnitude of their covariance.

We now consider patterns contained in words, where repeated letters are allowed both in the pattern and the ambient string. The additional condition on a pattern $\pi \in [l]^m$ on words, i.e. on a pattern of m letters over an alphabet $[l] = \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$, is that π must contain all letters in $[l]$. We will also assume that the ambient strings are in the set $[k]^n$.

Theorem 4.7. *Let π be a map of $[m] = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ onto $[l] = \{1, 2, \dots, l\}$. Then for any positive integers $l \leq m$,*

$$\text{Var}(X_\pi) = c(\pi)n^{2m-1}k^{2l-1} + O(n^{2m-2}k^{2l-1} + n^{2m-1}k^{2l-2}),$$

where

$$c(\pi) = \frac{1}{(2m-1)!(2l-1)!} \left(\text{Tr}(A_m P_\pi A_l P_\pi^{-1}) - \frac{(2m-1)!(2l-1)!}{((m-1)!)^2(l!)^2} \right).$$

The trace in the above formula is

$$\text{Tr}(A_m P_\pi A_l P_\pi^{-1}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_l.$$

Remark 4.8. Note also that, given $1 \leq l \leq m$, Theorem 4.7 applies to $!S(m, l)$ patterns τ , where $S(m, l)$ is the Stirling number of the second kind.

The proof of Theorem 4.7 is an obvious extension of the proof of Theorem 4.2. Unfortunately, the same extension to words does not work for Lemma 4.3, but only yields

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_l > \binom{2m-1}{m} \binom{2l-1}{l} = \frac{l}{m} \left(\frac{(2m-1)!(2l-1)!}{((m-1)!)^2(l!)^2} \right),$$

which is a weaker result than the desired inequality

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi(i), \pi(j)]_l > \frac{(2m-1)!(2l-1)!}{((m-1)!)^2(l!)^2}.$$

There is a similar covariance result on words as well.

Theorem 4.9. *For any patterns $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in [l]^m$, $1 < l \leq m$, the covariance $\text{Cov}(X_{\pi_1}, X_{\pi_2})$ is*

$$\text{Cov}(X_{\pi_1}, X_{\pi_2}) = c(\pi_1, \pi_2)n^{2m-1}k^{2l-1} + O(n^{2m-2}k^{2l-1} + n^{2m-1}k^{2l-2}),$$

where

$$c(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \frac{1}{(2m-1)!(2l-1)!} \left(\text{Tr}(A_m P_{\pi_1} A_l P_{\pi_2}^{-1}) - \frac{(2m-1)!(2l-1)!}{((m-1)!)^2(l!)^2} \right).$$

The trace in the above formula is

$$\text{Tr}(A_m P_{\pi_1} A_m P_{\pi_2}^{-1}) = \sum_{i,j=1}^m [i, j]_m [\pi_1(i), \pi_2(j)]_l.$$

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank the referee for useful comments.

References

- [1] M.H. Albert, M.D. Atkinson, C.C. Handley, D.A. Holton and W. Stromquist, On packing densities of permutations, *Electron. J. Combin.* **9(1)** (2002), #R5.
- [2] T. Amdeberhan and S.B. Ekhad, A condensed condensation proof of a determinant evaluation conjectured by Greg Kuperberg and Jim Propp, *J. Comb. Theory Ser. A* **78** (1997), 169–170.
- [3] E. Babson and E. Steingrímsson, Generalized permutation patterns and a classification of the Mahonian statistics, *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, B44b:18pp, 2000.
- [4] R.W. Barton, Packing densities of patterns, *Electron. J. Combin.* **11(1)** (2004), #R80.

- [5] M. Bóna, B.E. Sagan and V.R. Vatter, Pattern frequency sequences and internal zeros, *Adv. Appl. Math.* **28** (2002), 395–420.
- [6] A. Burstein, P. Hästö and T. Mansour, Packing patterns into words, *Electron. J. Combin.* **9(2)** (2002–2003), #R20.
- [7] A. Burstein, Enumeration of words with forbidden patterns, Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1998.
- [8] P.A. Hästö, The packing density of other layered permutations, *Electron. J. Combin.* **9(2)** (2002), #R1.
- [9] M. Hildebrand, B. Sagan and V. Vatter, Bounding quantities related to the packing density of $1(m+1)m\dots 2$, *Adv. Appl. Math.* **33** (2004), no. 3, 633–653.
- [10] D.E. Knuth, The Art of Computer Programming, vols. 1, 3, Addison-Wesley, NY, 1968, 1973.
- [11] A. Price, Packing densities of layered patterns, Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1997.
- [12] R. Simion and F.W. Schmidt, Restricted Permutations, *Europ. J. Combin.* **6** (1985), 383–406.
- [13] W. Stromquist, Packing layered posets into posets, manuscript, unpublished, 1993.
- [14] R. Tarjan, Sorting using networks of queues and stacks, *J. Association for Computing Machinery* **19** (1972), 341–346.
- [15] D. Warren, Optimal packing behavior of some two-block patterns, *Ann. Combin.* **8** (2004), no. 3, 355–367.
- [16] D. Warren, Packing densities of more 2-block patterns, *Adv. Appl. Math.* **36** (2006), no. 2, 202–211.
- [17] D. Warren, A mild generalization of two results of Hästö, preprint (2005).