

DIMENSION STATISTICS OF REPRESENTATIONS OF FINITE GROUPS

ARVIND AYYER AND DIPENDRA PRASAD

ABSTRACT. This paper discusses what the dimension data of irreducible representations of a finite group looks like in some specific cases, including unipotent and reductive groups over finite fields.

The essence of our investigation is whether the dimension data of irreducible representations of a finite group can be “geometerized”, to become equal to the cardinality of certain orbit spaces.

The first part of this paper deals with nilpotent and reductive groups over finite fields, whereas the second part deals with the symmetric group S_n . The main conclusion that we want to bring out to contrast these two cases is that for reductive groups over finite fields, the dimension data is concentrated (in a statistical sense) in a neighborhood of the maximal dimension, whereas for the symmetric group, it is spread out.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction: wishful thinking	2
1.1. Examples against	2
1.2. Examples in favor	3
2. Finite nilpotent groups: Kirillov theory	4
3. A question on nilpotent groups	5
4. Finite reductive groups	6
5. Asymptotically collinear	7
6. Reductive groups, $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, varying q	8
7. Reductive group $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, varying n	9
8. Symmetric groups: Plancherel measure	11
9. Symmetric groups: uniform measure	13
9.1. Comparing dimensions and class sizes	17

Date: December 5, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 20C30, 20C33, 05A17.

Key words and phrases. dimension statistics, nilpotent groups, reductive groups, conjugacy classes, co-adjoint orbits, Kirillov theory, wavefront set, Gelfand-Graev representation, unipotent representation, Vershik-Kerov theory, asymptotic collinearity, partition function, Hardy-Ramanujan formula, Stirling’s formula.

10. Summary	19
Acknowledgements	20
References	20

1. INTRODUCTION: WISHFUL THINKING

This paper is about finite dimensional representations of finite groups. Representations will always be understood over complex vector spaces, thus, as conjugacy class of homomorphisms:

$$\phi : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C}),$$

for some integer n . One knows that, up to isomorphism, there are only finitely many irreducible representations π of a finite group G , equal to the number of conjugacy classes in G , and if d_π are their dimensions, then

$$\sum_{\pi} d_{\pi}^2 = |G|,$$

the sum being taken over the irreducible representations of G . On the other hand,

$$\sum_g |C_g| = |G|,$$

now the sum taken over the distinct conjugacy classes C_g in G passing through $g \in G$.

The paper is written under the wishful thinking that the two ways of writing the cardinality of G are the same, not only after taking the sum (of the same number of terms), but are the same, term-by-term, in some cases. Actual term-by-term equality may be hard to achieve, so we make two allowances:

- (1) Instead of relating $\sum_{\pi} d_{\pi}^2 = |G|$, with the “class equation” $\sum_g |C_g| = |G|$ of G , we relate it to the class equation of any group G' acting on a space X with $|X| = |G|$, and writing out X as the disjoint union of orbits $G' \cdot x$ of the action of G' on X .
- (2) Instead of expecting $d_{\pi}^2 = |G' \cdot x|$, we demand an approximate equality.

Both of these issues will get clarified as we discuss a few examples.

1.1. Examples against. There are any number of examples to illustrate that our wishful thinking is ill-founded even in the simplest of examples. Thus for the symmetric group S_3 , we have the two equalities written as

$$6 = 1 + 1 + 4 = 1 + 2 + 3,$$

and for the symmetric group S_4 , we have the two equalities written as

$$24 = 1 + 1 + 4 + 9 + 9 = 1 + 6 + 8 + 6 + 3,$$

and in either case, there is no way to recognize the sums giving 6 or 24 to be equal term-by-term.

As another example, if we take either the quaternionic group or the dihedral group of order 8, which are nilpotent groups, to which we will soon be turning our attention to, we have

$$8 = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 4 = 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 + 2,$$

which is also against our hope. Thus, our wishful thinking is not true, certainly not for all groups — actually, at the moment, for no non-abelian group. The rest of the article thus discusses cases where it is true at least after some modifications.

1.2. Examples in favor. For any finite abelian group, all conjugacy classes are of size 1 and all irreducible representations are 1 dimensional, hence the equality of the two sizes trivially holds.

For the group $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$, it is well known [FH91, Chapter 5] that there are:

- (1) $(q - 1)$ representations of dimension 1.
- (2) $(q - 1)$ irreducible representations of dimension q .
- (3) $(q - 1)(q - 2)/2$ irreducible representations of dimension $(q + 1)$, the *principal series representations*.
- (4) $(q^2 - q)/2$ irreducible representations of dimension $(q - 1)$, the *discrete series representations*.

Also, it is well-known that the various conjugacy classes in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$ are as follows:

- (1) $(q - 1)$ central conjugacy classes of order 1.
- (2) $(q - 1)$ conjugacy classes of the form $z \cdot u$ where z is a scalar matrix in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$, and u is a unipotent matrix. These have order $(q^2 - 1)$.
- (3) $(q - 1)(q - 2)/2$ conjugacy classes of non-scalar diagonalisable over \mathbb{F}_q matrices in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$, which have order $q(q + 1)$.
- (4) $(q^2 - q)/2$ conjugacy classes of matrices in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$ which are diagonalizable over \mathbb{F}_{q^2} but not over \mathbb{F}_q . These have order $(q^2 - q)/2$.

Thus, although d_π^2 is not quite the order of the corresponding classes, they are closely related, both being polynomials of degree 0 or degree 2.

An even more striking example arises for $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$, where besides irreducible representations of dimension 1, q , $(q + 1)$, $(q - 1)$, for q odd, there are also those of dimension

- (1) $(q + 1)/2$, exactly two of them,
- (2) $(q - 1)/2$, exactly two of them.

In this case if we look at conjugacy classes not in $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$, but in $G' = \mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$, we notice that there is a unique conjugacy class represented by the unique element of order 2 in $(\mathbb{F}_q^\times \times \mathbb{F}_q^\times)/\Delta(\mathbb{F}_q^\times)$, and by the unique element of order 2 in $(\mathbb{F}_{q^2}^\times)/(\mathbb{F}_q^\times)$, for which the centralizer has an “extra” element of order 2 coming from the Weyl group. The corresponding conjugacy classes in $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$ are of order

- (1) $q(q+1)/2$.
- (2) $(q^2 - q)/2$.

Thus, in these cases, the polynomials in q which appear in $|d_\pi|^2$ and $|C_g|$, do not have the same leading term, but rather $2|d_\pi|^2$ and $|C_g|$ have the same leading term, the presence of the factor 2 will, for the more general case for $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, be related to the number of irreducible components an irreducible representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ has when restricted to $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

2. FINITE NILPOTENT GROUPS: KIRILLOV THEORY

Let N be a connected unipotent algebraic group over \mathbb{F}_q , with Lie algebra \mathfrak{n} , a finite dimensional vector space over \mathbb{F}_q with $\dim N = \dim \mathfrak{n}$. The group $N(\mathbb{F}_q)$, a nilpotent group, operates on \mathfrak{n} by the adjoint action, and also on $\mathfrak{n}^* = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{n}, \mathbb{F}_q)$, via the dual action, called the co-adjoint action.

In what follows, we will consider only those unipotent groups N for which $\exp : \mathfrak{n} \rightarrow N(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and $\log : N(\mathbb{F}_q) \rightarrow \mathfrak{n}$ are defined and are inverses of each other, and that the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula holds. Under these conditions, the stabilizer in $N(\mathbb{F}_q)$ of any element in \mathfrak{n} or in \mathfrak{n}^* are connected unipotent groups;

For the following theorem, see for instance [Sri79, Theorem 7.7].

Theorem 2.1 (Kirillov). *Fix a non-trivial additive character $\psi : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$. Then associated to a co-adjoint orbit represented by $\lambda : \mathfrak{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$, there is an irreducible representation π_λ of $N(\mathbb{F}_q)$ obtained as an induced representation,*

$$\mathrm{Ind}_{H_\lambda}^{N(\mathbb{F}_q)}(\lambda|_{H_\lambda}),$$

where $H_\lambda \subset N(\mathbb{F}_q)$ containing the stabilizer N_λ of λ in $N(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Thus, H_λ is a subgroup of $N(\mathbb{F}_q)$, on which λ makes sense as a character, such that,

$$[N(\mathbb{F}_q) : N_\lambda] = [N(\mathbb{F}_q) : H_\lambda]^2.$$

In more detail, under the symplectic pairing,

$$B_\lambda(x, y) = \lambda([x, y]),$$

the Lie algebra of H_λ is a maximal isotropic subspace of \mathfrak{n} , whereas the Lie algebra of N_λ is the null space of B_λ , consisting of elements x of \mathfrak{n} such that

$$B_\lambda(x, y) = \lambda([x, y]) = 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathfrak{n}.$$

Thus, the equality, $[N(\mathbb{F}_q) : N_\lambda] = [N(\mathbb{F}_q) : H_\lambda]^2$, is a reflection of the fact that on a non-degenerate symplectic vector space, the dimension of a maximal isotropic subspace is half the dimension of the vector space.

Question 2.2. *The theorem of Kirillov, recalled above, makes a precise relationship between representations of unipotent groups and the co-adjoint orbit; in particular, it implies that the dimension data d_π^2 and the order of co-adjoint orbits are the same. But it needs restrictions on the unipotent groups involved which would not be satisfied say for the group of upper triangular matrices in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ if $n > p$, where p is the characteristic of the field.*

Is the cruder question relating the dimension data d_π^2 and the order of co-adjoint orbits still valid in these omitted cases?

3. A QUESTION ON NILPOTENT GROUPS

In this section, we discuss certain situations where the original question relating the dimension data d_π^2 with the order of conjugacy classes in $N = N(\mathbb{F}_q)$ holds, without the need for the co-adjoint orbits.

Looking at one dimensional representations of N , we must then have the center of N , $Z(N)$, of the same cardinality as $N/[N, N]$ (sometimes called the co-center of N). This is already not such a simple condition to achieve among nilpotent groups. Keeping this condition in mind, we can ask a more refined condition that we introduce now.

Recall that the *lower central series* of a nilpotent group N is defined by

$$N_{i+1} = [N, N_i], i \geq 0, \text{ with } N_0 = N.$$

On the other hand, the *upper central series* of a nilpotent group N is defined by

$$N^{i+1} = \{n \in N \mid [n, m] \in N^i \text{ for all } m \in N\}, i \geq 0, \text{ with } N^0 = 1.$$

Definition 3.1 (Selfdual nilpotent group). *A nilpotent group N of nilpotency class d (the smallest integer d such that $N_d = 1$; it is also the smallest integer d such that $N^d = N$) will be called a selfdual nilpotent group if*

- (1) *the lower central series and the upper central series are the same, i.e.*

$$N_i = N^{d-i}, \text{ for all } i \geq 0,$$

- (2) *The successive quotients of the lower central series (and hence of the upper central series) look the same from the top as from the bottom, i.e.,*

$$N_i/N_{i+1} \cong N_{d-i-1}/N_{d-i} \text{ for all } i \geq 0.$$

Remark 3.2. $N = N_1 \times N_2$ is a selfdual nilpotent group if and only if N_1, N_2 are. Thus in what follows, it suffices to consider only indecomposable nilpotent groups N which cannot be written as a non-trivial product $N_1 \times N_2$.

The definition above is made in the hope that for such selfdual nilpotent groups, the original question relating the dimension data d_π^2 with the conjugacy classes in N holds, as the following examples show, for which we refer to [Jam80]¹.

- (1) There is a nilpotent group N_5 of order p^5 and of nilpotency class 3, such that $Z(N_5) \cong N_5/[N_5, N_5] \cong \mathbb{Z}/p \oplus \mathbb{Z}/p$, and for this N_5 , all non-central conjugacy classes are of size p^2 and any irreducible representation is of dimension 1 or p . So for this group, the original question relating the dimension data d_π^2 with the size of the conjugacy classes in N_5 holds.
- (2) There are groups N of order p^6 and nilpotency class 2, in which $Z(N)$ and $N/[N, N]$ are elementary abelian of order p^3 , and therefore isomorphic. Again all non-central conjugacy classes are of size p^2 and any irreducible representation is of dimension 1 or p .

Question 3.3. (1) *Are there selfdual p -groups N for which N_{i+1}/N_i are arbitrarily assigned groups, keeping the selfduality condition?*
 (2) *Is it true that the dimension data d_π^2 is the same as the data of the size of the conjugacy classes in a selfdual p -group?*

4. FINITE REDUCTIVE GROUPS

We already saw in the introduction that our question holds (in an approximate sense) for $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$. In this section we discuss what happens more generally for finite reductive groups of Lie type.

Here is the precise theorem for which we refer to Kawanaka [Kaw87, Theorem 2.4.1.ii(b)]². For this theorem, we note that the dimension of an irreducible representation π of $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, where G is a reductive algebraic group over \mathbb{F}_q , is expressible as a polynomial in q of degree b_π (with leading coefficient a_π , which we will not need in this work).

Theorem 4.1. *For each irreducible representation π of $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, there is a unipotent conjugacy class $\gamma_\pi \in G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, such that the dimension of the conjugacy class of γ_π is $2b_\pi$.*

In this theorem, the unipotent conjugacy class $\gamma_\pi \in G(\mathbb{F}_q)$ associated to a representation π is what is called the *wavefront* set of π which is the largest unipotent conjugacy class for which the representation has a *Generalized Gelfand-Graev* model, for which we refer to [Kaw87], and [Lus92]. Theorem 4.1 is usually stated for p large enough (compared to G , in particular for the exponential and log to make sense).

In a different vein, the following theorem of Lusztig, called the Jordan decomposition of representations, analogous to the Jordan decompositions of elements in an algebraic

¹The authors thank Manoj Yadav for these examples and the reference.

²The authors thank Jiajun Ma for the precise reference.

group, reduces questions about dimension of irreducible representations to dimension of what are called *unipotent representations*.

Theorem 4.2. (*Lusztig*) Any irreducible representation π of $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, gives rise to a semi-simple element $s \in G^\vee(\mathbb{F}_q)$, for G^\vee , the dual group, and a unipotent representation π_u of $G^\vee(s)$ such that,

$$\dim \pi = \dim \pi_u \cdot \frac{|G(\mathbb{F}_q)|_{p'}}{|G^\vee(s)|_{p'}}.$$

More precisely, any irreducible representation π of $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, is obtained via Lusztig induction from $G^\vee(s)$ (assuming it is connected, and is a “twisted” Levi subgroup) of the unipotent representation π_u of $G^\vee(s)$ multiplied by a character of $G^\vee(s)$.

5. ASYMPTOTICALLY COLLINEAR

Much of the present work is motivated by comparing the dimensions $\{d_\pi\}$ of irreducible representations π of a finite group G with something more directly associated to the group such as the size of the conjugacy classes in G . In this regard, we must have a way to compare $\{d_\pi\}$ with some other numbers $\{c_\lambda\}$ with the understanding that the index sets for π and for λ may not be related, and yet the unordered set of numbers $\{d_\pi\}$ and $\{c_\lambda\}$ may be close to each other (in some ordering). First we consider a case when these numbers have the same index sets:

Definition 5.1. (*Asymptotically collinear*) Suppose $a^{(n)} = (a_1^{(n)}, \dots, a_{\ell_n}^{(n)})$ and $b^{(n)} = (b_1^{(n)}, \dots, b_{\ell_n}^{(n)})$ are two ℓ_n -tuple of numbers of the same size ℓ_n , such that $\ell_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We say that $a^{(n)}$ and $b^{(n)}$ are asymptotically collinear if the angle between the vectors tends to 0, i.e.

$$(1) \quad \frac{(a^{(n)}, b^{(n)})}{\|a^{(n)}\| \|b^{(n)}\|} \rightarrow 1$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The motivation for this definition is the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality which is an equality if and only if the vectors are collinear.

Here is a case where it is not important how one orders $\{d_\pi\}$ and $\{c_\lambda\}$: it is the case when $\{c_\lambda\}$ is identically constant, in which case, we have the notion of an *asymptotically constant* data, and this is the only notion used in this work.

Definition 5.2. (*Asymptotically constant*) A sequence $a^{(n)}$ of vectors of size ℓ_n , such that $\ell_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is said to be asymptotically constant if it is asymptotically collinear with the constant vector $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots)$ of size ℓ_n , i.e.,

$$(2) \quad \frac{(a^{(n)}, \mathbf{1})}{\|a^{(n)}\| \|\mathbf{1}\|} \rightarrow 1$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We make one more definition.

Definition 5.3. (*Asymptotically log constant*) A sequence $a^{(n)}$ of vectors of size ℓ_n , such that $\ell_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ is said to be asymptotically log constant if

$$(3) \quad \frac{\ln(a^{(n)}, \mathbf{1})}{\ln(\|a^{(n)}\| \|\mathbf{1}\|)} \rightarrow 1$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Remark 5.4. It is easy to see that if $a^{(n)}$ are integer valued as will be the case in our applications, asymptotically constant implies asymptotically log constant, though the converse is not true. Being asymptotically log constant is an easier condition to check, which is the reason to have introduced it here.

6. REDUCTIVE GROUPS, $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, VARYING q

As noted for the case of $GL_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$, the dimension of most of the irreducible representations of $GL_2(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is approximately q . In this section, we prove more generally that “most” irreducible representations of $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, where G is a connected reductive algebraic group over \mathbb{F}_p , and $q = p^a$ goes to infinity, have the same dimension for any given q , which can then be seen to be roughly q^d which is the order of its p -Sylow subgroup. More precisely, we prove in the next theorem that the dimension data $\{d_\pi\}$ associated to $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is asymptotically constant as q goes to infinity.

Theorem 6.1. Let G be a connected reductive algebraic group over \mathbb{F}_p , and q a power of p . Then as q tends to infinity, the dimension of irreducible representations $\{d_\pi\}$ of $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$ become asymptotically constant, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(d_\pi, \mathbf{1})}{\|d_\pi\| \|\mathbf{1}\|} = 1.$$

Proof. As

$$\frac{(d_\pi, \mathbf{1})}{\|d_\pi\| \|\mathbf{1}\|} = \frac{\sum d_\pi}{\sqrt{|G(\mathbb{F}_q)|} \cdot \sqrt{|C(\mathbb{F}_q)|}},$$

where $C(\mathbb{F}_q)$ denotes the set of conjugacy classes in $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, we need to estimate $|C(\mathbb{F}_q)|$, the cardinality of $C(\mathbb{F}_q)$, and also the sum $\sum d_\pi$.

Evaluating the sum $\sum d_\pi$ over all π might be a difficult question for a general reductive group. However, as the Gelfand-Graev representation:

$$\text{Ind}_{N(\mathbb{F}_q)}^{G(\mathbb{F}_q)} \psi,$$

where $\psi : N(\mathbb{F}_q) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$ is a non-degenerate character, contains representations of $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$ with multiplicity at most 1 (with those which appear, called *generic representations*), we find that,

$$\sum d_\pi \geq \frac{|G(\mathbb{F}_q)|}{|N(\mathbb{F}_q)|}.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{(d_\pi, \mathbf{1})}{\|\{d_\pi\}\| \|\mathbf{1}\|} = \frac{\sum d_\pi}{\sqrt{|G(\mathbb{F}_q)|} \cdot \sqrt{|C(\mathbb{F}_q)|}} \geq \frac{|G(\mathbb{F}_q)|/|N(\mathbb{F}_q)|}{\sqrt{|G(\mathbb{F}_q)|} \cdot \sqrt{|C(\mathbb{F}_q)|}}.$$

By [FG12, Theorem 1.1(2)], we have

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|C(\mathbb{F}_q)|}{q^r} = 1,$$

where r is the rank of the group G , i.e., the dimension of its maximal tori.

Further, as is well-known, for any reductive group G , in particular for tori T ,

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|G(\mathbb{F}_q)|}{q^{\dim G}} = 1.$$

Combining these results in the previous inequality, it follows that,

$$\liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(d_\pi, \mathbf{1})}{\|\{d_\pi\}\| \|\mathbf{1}\|} \geq 1.$$

On the other hand, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\limsup_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(d_\pi, \mathbf{1})}{\|\{d_\pi\}\| \|\mathbf{1}\|} \leq 1.$$

This proves our Theorem. □

The following corollary follows from the proof of the above theorem.

Corollary 6.2. *Generic representations of $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$ make the dominant contribution to the sum of dimensions d_π of irreducible representations of $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, more precisely:*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum d_\pi}{|(G/N)(\mathbb{F}_q)|} = 1.$$

7. REDUCTIVE GROUP $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, VARYING n

In this section we consider the collection of groups $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, in which we fix q , but vary n . In a certain sense, this collection of groups is like “fattened” symmetric group S_n , and one may hope that phenomenon seen for the collection of groups $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, in which we fix q , but vary n have something in common with S_n in which n varies.

For the calculations in this section, we need the sum of dimensions of representations of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ as well as the number of irreducible representations of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, both of which are available in the literature, and which we next recall.

Theorem 7.1 (Gow [Gow83]). *Let q be a power of a prime. The sum of the degrees of the irreducible characters of $G = \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ equals the number of symmetric matrices in G . If $n = 2m + 1$, this sum is*

$$q^{m^2+m}(q^{2m+1} - 1)(q^{2m-1} - 1) \cdots (q - 1).$$

If $n = 2m$, this sum is

$$q^{m^2+m}(q^{2m-1} - 1)(q^{2m-3} - 1) \cdots (q - 1).$$

Here is the theorem about the number of conjugacy classes in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$. The first part is due to Feit and Fine for which we refer to Macdonald [Mac81, Eq. (1.13)], and the second part is due to Fulman and Guralnick [FG12, Proposition 3.5(i)].

Theorem 7.2. *Let $C_n(q)$ be the number of conjugacy classes in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Then,*

- (1) $\sum_{n \geq 0} C_n(q)t^n = \prod_{r \geq 1} \left(\frac{1 - t^r}{1 - qt^r} \right)$, and thus $C_n(q)$ is a polynomial in q of degree n , and with leading term 1.
- (2) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{C_n(q)}{q^n} = 1$.

Theorem 7.3. *The dimension data $\{d_\pi\}$ arising out of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ for q fixed but with n varying, are asymptotically log constant, and we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(d_\pi, \mathbf{1})^2}{\|d_\pi\|^2 \|\mathbf{1}\|^2} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\gamma(q)},$$

where

$$\gamma(q) = \sum_{i \geq 0} q^{-i(i+1)/2}.$$

Proof. For the ease of writing, we let:

- (1) $B_n(q)$ be the sum of the dimensions of the irreducible representations of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ which is given by the Theorem 7.1,
- (2) $C_n(q)$ be the number of conjugacy classes in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, which is given by Theorem 7.2, and
- (3) $D_n(q) = (q^n - 1)(q^n - q) \cdots (q^n - q^{n-1})$ is the order of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

Writing $C_n(q) = C_n q^n$, for $n = 2m + 1$ an odd integer, and using Theorem 7.1,

$$\frac{B_n(q)^2}{C_n(q) \cdot D_n(q)} = \frac{1}{C_n} \frac{(1 - \frac{1}{q})(1 - \frac{1}{q^3}) \cdots (1 - \frac{1}{q^{2m+1}})}{(1 - \frac{1}{q^2})(1 - \frac{1}{q^4}) \cdots (1 - \frac{1}{q^{2m}})},$$

and a similar expression for n even by using Theorem 7.1, we find that for any n odd or even,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B_n(q)^2}{C_n(q) \cdot D_n(q)} = \frac{(1 - \frac{1}{q})(1 - \frac{1}{q^3}) \cdots}{(1 - \frac{1}{q^2})(1 - \frac{1}{q^4}) \cdots}$$

Here we have used Theorem 7.2(2) according to which $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_n = 1$.

Next, by a theorem due to Gauss [And76, page 23], we have:

$$\sum_{i \geq 0} t^{i(i+1)/2} = \prod_{i \geq 1} \frac{(1 - t^{2i})}{(1 - t^{2i-1})},$$

in which substituting $t = 1/q$, gives the assertion in the Theorem. This easily implies that the dimension data $\{d_\pi\}$ are asymptotically log constant. \square

Remark 7.4. *A similar analysis could be tried for other infinite families of groups, such as $U_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, $SL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, $Sp_{2n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$, $SO_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, but we have not done that.*

8. SYMMETRIC GROUPS: PLANCHEREL MEASURE

We now come to the main motivation for this work, viz. symmetric groups. An (*integer*) *partition* is a sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$ satisfying $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_k \geq 1$. Let $\mathcal{P}(n)$ be the set of partitions summing to n and $p(n) = |\mathcal{P}(n)|$. We begin by recalling that conjugacy classes in S_n are parameterized by $\mathcal{P}(n)$. Irreducible representations of S_n are also parameterized by $\mathcal{P}(n)$ [Sag01].


Let c_λ be the size of the conjugacy class in S_n corresponding to the partition $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)$. Writing λ in *frequency notation* as $\lambda = \langle 1^{a_1}, 2^{a_2}, \dots, n^{a_n} \rangle$, it is a standard result that

$$(4) \quad c_\lambda = \frac{n!}{\prod_{i=1}^n i^{a_i} a_i!}.$$

For example, the class size of the partition $(3, 2, 2, 2, 1) = \langle 1^1, 2^3, 3^1 \rangle$ is

$$c_{(3,2,2,2,1)} = \frac{10!}{1^1 1! 2^3 3! 3^1 1!} = 25200.$$

Partitions, and the associated representations, are often visualized through the *Young diagram*, an array of left justified boxes. For example, the Young diagram of the partition $\lambda = (5, 2)$, giving rise to a representation π_λ of S_7 is:



The dimension d_λ of an irreducible representation π_λ of S_n is given by the celebrated *hook-length formula* [FGT54],

$$(5) \quad d_\lambda = \dim(\pi_\lambda) = \frac{n!}{\prod_{(i,j) \in \lambda} h_{i,j}},$$

where $h_{i,j}$ is one plus the sum of the number of boxes to the right and the number of boxes below the box at coordinate (i, j) . These set of boxes form the *hook* emanating from that box. If we denote by λ' the *conjugate partition* obtained by transposing the Young diagram of λ about the main diagonal, we can write

$$h_{i,j} = \lambda_i - i + \lambda'_j - j + 1.$$

For example, the hook lengths associated to each of the boxes in the above partition are filled in below:

6	5	3	2	1
2	1			

Thus, the dimension of the representation $\pi_{(5,2)}$ of S_7 is

$$d_\lambda = \frac{7!}{6 \times 5 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 \times 2 \times 1} = 14.$$

The dimension of irreducible representations of S_n though calculable by the hook length formula, does not give a good understanding of what the actual d_λ are, for a given symmetric group S_n . In particular, the answer to the following questions are not known:

- Question 8.1.** (1) *What is m_n , the maximal dimensional irreducible representation of S_n ?*
 (2) *What are the partitions λ giving rise to the maximal dimensional irreducible representations of S_n ? Perhaps it is unique up to the conjugation action $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda'$ which corresponds to the twisting by the sign character of S_n ?*

The data of dimensions for $n = 20$ and $n = 30$ are given in Figure 1. This means, for instance, that for $n = 20$, the leftmost column in the first histogram says that there are about 330 partitions of 20 whose dimensions are less than 2×10^7 .

It is known [Rom15, Theorem 1.24] that the answer to the above question is related to the limit shape result of Vershik–Kerov [VK77] and Logan–Shepp [LS77]. See also numerics by Kerov–Pass [KP89] from 1989 and Vershik–Pavlov [VP09] from 2009.

The main theorem related to this question is due to Vershik and Kerov, but before stating their theorem, we recall the following definition.

Definition 8.2. *The Plancherel measure on $\mathcal{P}(n)$ is a probability measure given by the formula*

$$\mathbb{P}l^{(n)}(\lambda) = \frac{d_\lambda^2}{n!}$$




FIGURE 1. Histogram of dimensions of irreducible representations of S_{20} and S_{30} . The x -axis on the left (resp. right) plot is scaled by 10^7 (resp. 10^{13}).

for every partition $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)$.

Theorem 8.3 (Vershik and Kerov [VK85]). *There are constants $a, b > 0$ such that,*

$$e^{-a\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{m_n^2}{n!} \leq e^{-b\sqrt{n}}.$$

Furthermore, there are constants $c > d > 0$ such that the set $X(c, d)$,

$$X(c, d) = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n) \mid e^{-c\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{d_\lambda^2}{n!} \leq e^{-d\sqrt{n}} \right\},$$

has measure 1 according to the Plancherel measure in the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Further, Vershik and Kerov conjectured something stronger in the same paper, which was proved by Bufetov [Buf12].

Theorem 8.4 (Bufetov). *There exists a constant $H > 0$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}l^{(n)} \left\{ \lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n) : \left| H + \frac{\ln \mathbb{P}l^{(n)}(\lambda)}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \leq \epsilon \right\} = 1.$$

These theorems have the character that the dimension data is concentrated at one point for the Plancherel measure in the limit, similar to what we considered in the previous section on reductive algebraic groups. However, our work in the next section will be involved with the uniform measure on $\mathcal{P}(n)$, first studied by Vershik [Ver96].

9. SYMMETRIC GROUPS: UNIFORM MEASURE

In this section, we will study the dimension data for $\mathcal{P}(n)$, where each partition is given equal weight (unlike the Plancherel measure where the partition λ has weight proportional to d_λ^2); this measure on $\mathcal{P}(n)$ is called the *uniform measure*. This study will be done by looking at the first three moments of d_λ , viz. d_λ^0 , d_λ^1 , and d_λ^2 , which are

respectively $p(n)$, the number of involutions in S_n , and $n!$. Understanding a function by studying its moments is a standard technique in analytic number theory!

An important fact about symmetric groups is that all its representations are defined over \mathbb{Q} which has as a consequence the following classical result. Let $I(n) = |\{s \in S_n | s^2 = 1\}|$ be the number of involutions in S_n . For the symmetric group S_n , let d_λ denote the dimension of all the irreducible representations. Then as all irreducible representations of S_n are defined over \mathbb{Q} , generalities in group representations imply that

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda = I(n).$$

There are several formulas for $I(n)$; see for example [OEI25, Sequence A000085]. For example, one of the most standard formula, which follows by looking at conjugacy classes of involutions represented by a product of disjoint involutions which could be taken to be $(1, 2), (3, 4), \dots$, is

$$I(n) = \sum_{0 \leq 2k \leq n} \frac{n!}{2^k k! (n - 2k)!}.$$

One of the questions that we considered in the previous sections of this paper is whether the dimension data is asymptotically constant or asymptotically log constant, and we found this to be the case for $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$ as q varies, and also for $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ as n varies. We analyse similar questions for the symmetric group S_n next, and find that this is not the case, so there is a spread or a distribution among dimension of representations not seen before.

Theorem 9.1. *In the limit as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the angle between $(d_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)}$ and the constant vector $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$ is $\pi/2$. In particular, the dimension data is not asymptotically constant.*

Proof. Taking the square of the quantity on the left of (1), we need to compute

$$(6) \quad \frac{A_n}{B_n} := \frac{\left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda\right)^2}{p(n) \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda^2\right)}.$$

All the terms involved above have well-known asymptotic expansions which we will use to estimate A_n/B_n .

In what follows, for sequences X_n, Y_n of real numbers going to infinity, we will say that

$$X_n \simeq Y_n,$$

if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (X_n/Y_n) = 1$, or equivalently $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} [\ln(X_n) - \ln(Y_n)] = 0$.

By the Hardy–Ramanujan asymptotic formula [And76, Equation (5.1.2)], we have

$$(7) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda^0 = p(n) \simeq \frac{1}{4n\sqrt{3}} e^{\pi\sqrt{\frac{2n}{3}}} =: \alpha(n).$$

A famous approximation to the number of involutions in S_n due to Chowla–Herstein–Moore [CHM51, MW55] gives

$$(8) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda = |I(n)| \simeq \frac{(n/e)^{n/2} e^{\sqrt{n}}}{\sqrt{2}e^{1/4}} =: \beta(n).$$

The standard Stirling’s approximation formula for the factorial gives

$$(9) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda^2 = n! \simeq \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n =: \gamma(n)$$

Using (8), (7) and (9) for the definition of $\alpha(n), \beta(n), \gamma(n)$, we obtain the following expression for $\ln(\beta(n)^2/[\alpha(n) \cdot \gamma(n)])$ (up to a constant):

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \left(\frac{n \ln(n)}{2} - \frac{n}{2} + \sqrt{n} \right) - \left(n \ln(n) - n + \frac{\ln(n)}{2} + \pi \sqrt{\frac{2n}{3}} - \ln(n) \right) \\ = \left(2 - \frac{\pi\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \sqrt{n} + \frac{\ln(n)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

which in the limit tends to $-\infty$ since:

$$2 - \frac{\pi\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}} < 0.$$

On the other hand, $\ln(A_n/B_n)$ is at a uniformly bounded distance from $\ln(\beta(n)^2/[\alpha(n) \cdot \gamma(n)])$, thus $\ln(A_n/B_n)$ also goes to $-\infty$, proving the Theorem. \square

The proof of the previous theorem gives the following corollary.

Corollary 9.2. *For any real number $a > 0$ which is less than $a_0 = \frac{\pi\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}} - 2$, and for any integer n which is large enough,*

$$\frac{\left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda \right)^2}{p(n) \cdot n!} \leq e^{-a\sqrt{n}}.$$

Corollary 9.3. *Let m_n be the maximal among the dimensions of irreducible representations of S_n . Let A_n be a positive real number less than 1, and define a positive real numbers $C_n \leq 1$ by:*

$$C_n p(n) = |\{\lambda \mid m_n A_n \leq d_\lambda \leq m_n\}|.$$

Then for the real number $a_0 > 0$ which appears in Corollary 9.2,

$$(A_n C_n)^2 \leq e^{-a_0 \sqrt{n}}.$$

Proof. Observe that by the definition of C_n , we have

$$(10) \quad m_n A_n C_n p(n) \leq \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda,$$

and

$$(11) \quad m_n^2 A_n^2 C_n p(n) \leq \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda^2 = n! \leq m_n^2 p(n).$$

Therefore, by (10) and (11),

$$\frac{\left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda\right)^2}{p(n) \cdot n!} \geq \frac{(m_n A_n C_n p(n))^2}{p(n) n!} \geq (A_n C_n)^2.$$

By Corollary 9.2, for any $a < a_0$, and n large enough,

$$(A_n C_n)^2 \leq \frac{\left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} d_\lambda\right)^2}{p(n) \cdot n!} \leq e^{-a \sqrt{n}},$$

proving the Corollary. □

Here is a particular case of this corollary justifying our assertion that the dimension data d_λ for the symmetric group is “spread out”, unlike the case of reductive groups.

Corollary 9.4. *Let m_n be the maximal among the dimensions of irreducible representations of S_n . Let A be a fixed positive real number less than 1, and define a positive real numbers $C_n \leq 1$ by:*

$$C_n p(n) = |\{\lambda \mid m_n A \leq d_\lambda \leq m_n\}|,$$

then C_n tends to 0; equivalently, fewer and fewer proportion of partitions λ have $m_n A \leq d_\lambda \leq m_n$.

Remark 9.5. *In Corollary 9.3, we have the inequality $(A_n C_n)^2 \leq e^{-a_0 \sqrt{n}}$. It would be nice to have a lower bound for $A_n C_n$. Perhaps this inequality is itself an equality.*

One can also compare the average size of a uniformly random partition of n with m_n , the maximal dimension. From the definition, the former becomes using (8) and (7),

$$(12) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n)} \frac{d_\lambda}{p(n)} \simeq 2\sqrt{6} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^{n/2} n \exp \left(\sqrt{n} \left(1 - \pi \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \right) - \frac{1}{4} \right).$$

We call the right hand side of (12) the *asymptotic average dimension* as a function of n . We compare the average dimension, the maximal dimension and this asymptotic average in Figure 2. Although the figure seems to suggest that the average and maximal dimension are similar in size, the conclusion in this section is that the graphs will diverge as n gets larger.




FIGURE 2. A comparative logarithmic plot of the average dimension of a uniformly random partition of size n (in blue), the maximum dimension of a partition of n (in magenta) as n varies from 1 to 30, and the asymptotic average dimension (in red).

9.1. Comparing dimensions and class sizes. As the question on dimension data of irreducible representations of S_n does not seem not amenable to a direct calculation, we try to model the dimension data in some statistical way. We will follow our initial hope that the dimensions are related to the size of conjugacy classes in a certain average sense.

To get some idea if this seems reasonable, we plot the histograms of $\ln(d_\lambda^2)$ and $\ln c_\lambda$ together in Figure 3, and find that the agreement is indeed very good.

Let us quantify this more precisely. Recall that c_λ is the number of elements in the conjugacy class of type λ . Define the multisets

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} A^n &= \{\ln(d_\lambda^2) \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n\} \\ B^n &= \{\ln c_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n\}. \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 3. Comparative histogram of log of squares of dimensions and class sizes of S_{20} and S_{30} . The yellow part is $\ln c_\lambda$, the blue part is $\ln(d_\lambda^2)$ and the intersection is coloured green. The number of bins has been specified to be 20 and 30 respectively.

Thus both the sets, A^n, B^n are multisets contained in the interval $[0, n \ln(n)]$, consisting of $p(n)$ points. For real numbers α, β such that $0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 1$, define

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} A^n[\alpha, \beta] &= \{x \in A^n \mid x \in [\alpha n \ln(n), \beta n \ln(n)]\} \\ B^n[\alpha, \beta] &= \{x \in B^n \mid x \in [\alpha n \ln(n), \beta n \ln(n)]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Question 9.6. *For any interval $[\alpha, \beta] \subset [0, 1]$, is it true that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A^n[\alpha, \beta]|}{|B^n[\alpha, \beta]|} = 1?$$

We present some data in regard to this question in Figure 4. The left figure shows strong support for a positive answer to the question, but the right figure is not as supportive. However, the latter could be an artefact of ‘the law of small numbers’.




FIGURE 4. The ratio $|A^n[\alpha, \beta]|/|B^n[\alpha, \beta]|$ plotted for $\alpha = 0.4$ and $\beta = 0.8$ on the left, and $\alpha = 0.2$ and $\beta = 0.6$ on the right, for n ranging from 5 to 40.

We can refine this even further. Let

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} a^{n,k} &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n) \\ \lambda_1 = k}} \log(d_\lambda^2), \\ b^{n,k} &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}(n) \\ \lambda_1 = k}} \log(c_\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

be sums of subsets of A^n and B^n respectively. See Figure 5 for the comparative plots of these numbers.




FIGURE 5. A joint list plot of $a^{n,k}$ (in orange) and $b^{n,k}$ (in blue) for k ranging from 1 to n , with $n = 20$ on the left and $n = 40$ on the right.

10. SUMMARY

Beginning with the seminal work of McKay [McK76] tabulating the maximal dimensional representations of S_n , for $n \leq 75$, and asking the question about the maximal dimensional representation, there are many theorems already proved by Vershik–Kerov [VK85] and Kerov–Pass [KP89], about the maximal dimensional representations, and even about the distribution of their dimensions. These results are statistical in nature though, and maximal dimensional representations for a fixed n are still not understood.

One of the findings in this work is that the angle between the dimension data (d_π) and the constant vector $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$ is

- (1) 0 for $G(\mathbb{F}_q)$, where G is a reductive algebraic group over \mathbb{F}_q , as $q \rightarrow \infty$,
- (2) an angle strictly between 0 and $\pi/2$ for $GL_n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and
- (3) $\pi/2$ for S_n as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Finally, the data that we have analyzed seem to suggest that the dimensions of irreducible representations of symmetric groups are closely related to their conjugacy classes. Here it may be emphasized that for symmetric groups, there is a natural construction of an irreducible representation associated to a conjugacy class in it; however,

when we are talking about relating the dimension data to the data of the sizes of the conjugacy classes, it is not subordinate to this correspondence. Analysing the order of conjugacy classes in S_n seems a much easier question, and tabulating their statistical behaviour may be useful in its own right.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank U.K. Anandavardhanan, Purvi Gupta, Jianjun Ma and Manoj Yadav for discussions on the themes arising in this work. We thank ICTS for bringing the authors together to work on this problem. The first author (AA) acknowledges support the DST FIST program - 2021 [TPN - 700661]. The second author (DP) thanks ANRF, India for its support through the JC Bose National Fellowship of the Govt. of India, project number JBR/2020/000006.

REFERENCES

- [And76] George E. Andrews. *The theory of partitions*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Amsterdam, 1976. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 2.
- [Buf12] Alexander I. Bufetov. On the Vershik-Kerov conjecture concerning the Shannon-McMillan-Breiman theorem for the Plancherel family of measures on the space of Young diagrams. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 22(4):938–975, 2012.
- [CHM51] S. Chowla, I. N. Herstein, and W. K. Moore. On recursions connected with symmetric groups. I. *Canad. J. Math.*, 3:328–334, 1951.
- [FG12] Jason Fulman and Robert Guralnick. Bounds on the number and sizes of conjugacy classes in finite chevalley groups with applications to derangements. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 364(6):3023–3070, 2012.
- [FGT54] James Sutherland Frame, G. de B. Robinson, and R. M. Thrall. The hook graphs of the symmetric group. *Canad. J. Math.*, 6:316–324, 1954.
- [FH91] W. Fulton and J. Harris. *Representation theory*, volume 129 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991. A first course.
- [Gow83] Roderick Gow. Properties of the characters of the finite general linear group related to the transpose-inverse involution. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 3(3):493–506, 1983.
- [Jam80] Rodney James. The groups of order p^6 (p an odd prime). *Math. Comp.*, 34(150):613–637, 1980.
- [Kaw87] Noriaki Kawanaka. Shintani lifting and Gel’fand-Graev representations. In *The Arcata Conference on Representations of Finite Groups (Arcata, Calif., 1986)*, volume 47, Part 1 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 147–163. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987.
- [KP89] S. V. Kerov and A. M. Pass. Representations, maximal with respect to dimension, of symmetric groups. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI)*, 172:160–166, 172, 1989.
- [LS77] B.F. Logan and L.A. Shepp. A variational problem for random Young tableaux. *Adv. Math.*, 26:206–222, 1977.
- [Lus92] George Lusztig. A unipotent support for irreducible representations. *Adv. Math.*, 94(2):139–179, 1992.

- [Mac81] Ian G Macdonald. Numbers of conjugacy classes in some finite classical groups. *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 23(1):23–48, 1981.
- [McK76] John McKay. The largest degrees of irreducible characters of the symmetric group. *Math. Comp.*, 30(135):624–631, 1976.
- [MW55] Leo Moser and Max Wyman. On solutions of $xd=1$ in symmetric groups. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 7:159–168, 1955.
- [OEI25] OEIS. The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences. Published electronically at <http://oeis.org>, 2025.
- [Rom15] D. Romik. *The surprising mathematics of longest increasing subsequences*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [Sag01] Bruce E. Sagan. *The symmetric group*, volume 203 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2001. Representations, combinatorial algorithms, and symmetric functions.
- [Sri79] Bhama Srinivasan. *Representations of finite Chevalley groups*, volume 764 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1979. A survey.
- [Ver96] A. M. Vershik. Statistical mechanics of combinatorial partitions, and their limit configurations. *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.*, 30(2):19–39, 96, 1996.
- [VK77] A.M. Vershik and S.V. Kerov. Asymptotics of Plancherel measure of symmetric group and the limiting form of Young tables. *Sov. Math. Dolk.*, 18:527–531, 1977.
- [VK85] A. M. Vershik and S. V. Kerov. Asymptotic behavior of the maximum and generic dimensions of irreducible representations of the symmetric group. *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.*, 19(1):25–36, 96, 1985.
- [VP09] A. M. Vershik and D. Pavlov. Numerical experiments in problems of asymptotic representation theory. *Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)*, 373:77–93, 346–347, 2009.

ARVIND AYYER, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE 560012, INDIA.

Email address: `arvind@iisc.ac.in`

DIPENDRA PRASAD, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IIT BOMBAY, POWAI, MUMBAI 400076, INDIA

Email address: `prasad.dipendra@gmail.com`