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Abstract

We show there is a bijection between the binary necklaces with \(n\) black beads and \(k\) white beads and the out-of-debt chip-firing states on the cyclic graph \(C_n\) starting with \(k\) chips on a vertex, when \(n\) is prime.

1 Introduction

Let \(n\) and \(k\) be two positive integers. The main objects of this paper are the following:

- The set \(\mathcal{N}_{n,k}\) of binary necklaces (i.e. equivalent up to cyclic rotations) of length \(n+k\) using \(n\) black beads and \(k\) white beads.

- The set \(\mathcal{F}_{n,k,t}\) of \((n,k)\)-codes, functions \(f : [n] \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\), for which their sum is \(k\) and the weighted sum is \(t\) modulo \(n\):

\[
\mathcal{F}_{n,k,t} := \{ f | \sum_{i \in [n]} f(i) = k, \sum_{i \in [n]} i f(i) \equiv t \pmod{n} \}.
\]

It was shown in [1] that there is a bijection between necklaces of length \(n\) and \(k\) colors, and \(\mathcal{F}_{n,k} := \bigcup_t \mathcal{F}_{n,k,t}\). Also the set \(\mathcal{F}_{n,k,0}\) turns out to be the collection of out-of-debt chip-firing states on the cyclic graph \(C_n\) starting with \(k\) chips on a vertex (going into debt before getting to the final state is allowed) [2]. In this paper we are going to show a bijection between \(\mathcal{N}_{n,k}\) and \(\mathcal{F}_{n,k,0}\) when \(n\) is prime. The main method is to show a bijection between \(\mathcal{F}_{n,k,t}\)'s (excluding one object from \(\mathcal{F}_{n,k,0}\)) via using a model where several slimes in a circle all move in the same direction.

2 Codes and Slimes

We will always envision \([n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}\) having a cyclic structure as in \(\mathbb{Z}_n\). A cyclic interval \([i,j]\) in \([n]\) denotes \(\{i, i+1, \ldots, j\}\) in \(\mathbb{Z}_n\). All intervals we consider in this paper will be cyclic intervals. Let \(f\) be an \((n,k)\)-code. Let \(t_f\) denote the largest among sum of two (position-wise) consecutive entries in \(f\). For a cyclic interval \([i,j]\) in \([n]\) of size at least 2, the corresponding sequence \(f_i, \ldots, f_j\) is a weak-slime of \(f\) if for any consecutive entries, the sum equals \(t_f\). A weak-slime is a slime if \(f_{i-1} + f_i, f_j + f_{j+1} < t_f\) (that is, if it is inclusion-wise maximal among weak-slimes). Notice that a slime has size at least 2 according to its definition. Given a slime \(s\) of size \(l\), its weight \(w(s)\) is defined as \(\lfloor \frac{l}{2} \rfloor\). The definition of the slimes guarantees that the slimes are disjoint. We denote the weight of the code \(w(f)\) to be the sum of the weights of all slimes inside the code.

For example, take a look at Figure \(\text{I}\). All three of them are \((11,11)\)-codes. The value \(t_f\), the largest among sum of two consecutive entries, is 3 for all of them. Let us label the positions...
from 1 to 11 starting from the topmost position and going around clockwise. Then the slimes are \(\{11, 1\}, \{2, 3, 4\}, \{7, 8, 9\} \) for the first code. The weight of that code is \(\left\lfloor \frac{2}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{3}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{3}{2} \right\rfloor = 3\).

Given a slime that has even size, its entries in \(f\) has to be of form \(a, b, \ldots, a, b\).

The (forward) move on this slime transforms it to
\[a - 1, b + 1, \ldots, a - 1, b + 1,\]
whereas the backward move transforms the sequence to
\[a + 1, b - 1, \ldots, a + 1, b - 1.\]

The moves are well-defined since \(a\) nor \(b\) can be 0. Otherwise, \(a\) or \(b\) will be \(t_f\) and the sequence can’t have both \(a\) and \(b\) at its endpoint to be a slime. For a slime that has odd size, it has to be of form
\[a, b, \ldots, a, b, a.\]

The (forward) move on this slime transforms the sequence to
\[a, b - 1, a + 1, b - 1, \ldots, a + 1, b - 1, a + 1,\]
whereas the backward move transforms the sequence to
\[a + 1, b - 1, \ldots, a + 1, b - 1, a.\]

Given an \((n, k)\)-code \(f\), let \(\phi_\rightarrow(f)\) be the code you get from \(f\) by doing a forward move on all slimes of \(f\) at the same time. We call this the (forward) migration of all slimes. Similarly let \(\phi_\leftarrow(f)\) be the code you get from \(f\) by doing a backward move on all slimes of \(f\) at the same time, and call this the backward migration of all slimes. The migration changes \(\sum if(i)\) modulo \(n\) by the weight of the code.

Again take a look at Figure 1. If we do the forward migration on the first code, we get the second code. If we do the forward migration of the second code, we get the third code. If we do the backward migration on the second code, we get the first code back.

**Lemma 1.** For any \((n, k)\)-code \(f\), we have \(\phi_\leftarrow(\phi_\rightarrow(f)) = f\).
**Corollary 1.** Rotation of the code just rotates each slime by the same amount.

**Proof.** Any even sized slime $s$ of form $a, b, \ldots, a, b$ after a forward move becomes either $a - 1, b + 1, \ldots, a - 1, b + 1$ or $a - 1, b + 1, \ldots, a - 1, b + 1, a - 1$ the latter absorbing a new element to the right. In the first case it is obvious the backward move returns it back to $s$. In the second case since $a - 1 + b < a + b$, the rightmost elements gets cut off and we get $s$ back as well. Similar analysis holds true for odd sized slimes. □

In Figure 1 notice that the weights of all three codes are the same. It is true in general that the migration operation preserves the number of slimes and the total weight as well:

**Lemma 2.** For any $(n, k)$-code $f$, migration does not change the weight. That is, we have $w(\phi_{-}(f)) = w(f) = w(\phi_{+}(f))$.

**Proof.** Given an odd-sized slime, its size is either maintained or decreased by 1 after a movement. Given an even-sized slime, its size is either maintained or increased by 1 after a movement. □

Let $c$ be the map from $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ to itself by a cyclic rotation of the entries:

$$c(f_0, \ldots, f_{n-1}) = (f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}, f_0).$$

We say that a map $\chi$ from $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ to itself is **rotation invariant** if $c\chi = \chi c$.

**Lemma 3.** For any $(n, k)$-code $f$, migration is rotation invariant. That is, $\phi_{+}(c(f)) = c(\phi_{+}(f))$.

**Proof.** Rotation of the code just rotates each slime by the same amount. □

Given an $(n, k)$-code $f$ with weight $w(f)$, let $i(f)$ denote the inverse of $w(f)$ modulo $n$. Define $\phi(f)$ to be the map that sends $f$ to $(\phi_{-})^{i(f)}(f)$. **Gradient**

**Corollary 1.** As long as $w(f)$ is coprime with $n$, the map $\phi$ is an invertible, rotation invariant map preserving the weight from $\mathcal{F}_{n,k}$ to itself.

Now define $\mathcal{F}'_{n,k,t}$ to be same as $\mathcal{F}_{n,k,t}$ when $t$ is nonzero and define $\mathcal{F}'_{n,k,0}$ as $\mathcal{F}_{n,k,0}$ minus codes of form $(a, a, \ldots, a)$ (the ones that have same entry everywhere). From the above property of $\phi$ we get the following:

**Proposition 1.** The map $\phi$ gives a bijection from $\mathcal{F}'_{n,k,t}$ to $\mathcal{F}'_{n,k,t+1}$ for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ when $n$ is prime.

**Proof.** When $n$ is prime, all $(n, k)$-codes except code of form $(a, \ldots, a)$ have weight coprime with $n$. In other words, every code of $\bigcup_{t} \mathcal{F}'_{n,k,t}$ have weight coprime with $n$. The rest follows from Corollary 1. □

## 3 Bijective with necklaces

In this section we show a bijection between $\mathcal{N}_{n,k}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{n,k,0}$ when $n$ is prime as promised. We are going to express necklaces of $\mathcal{N}_{n,k}$ as sequences $(g_0, \ldots, g_{n-1})$ where we label the black beads 1 to $n$ in some clockwise order, let $g_i$ count the number of white beads between black beads labeled $i$ and $i+1$. Let the sequences be equivalent under the cyclic shift (that is $(g_0, \ldots, g_{n-1}) \equiv (g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_{n-1}, g_0)$). In other words, we think of a necklace in $\mathcal{N}_{n,k}$ as a collection of codes $f, c(f), \ldots, c^{n-1}(f)$ which we call a **coven** of codes in $\mathcal{N}_{n,k}$. Since $n$ is prime, the period of such codes is a divisor of $n$, and since our $n$ is prime, it has to be either 1 or $n$. 

3
Lemma 4. There is a bijection between \( \mathcal{N}_{n,k} \) of period 1 and \( \mathcal{F}_{n,k,0} \setminus \mathcal{F}'_{n,k,0} \).

Proof. When \( k \) is not a multiple of \( n \), both sets are empty. When \( k \) is a multiple of \( n \), the only sequence is of form \( (a, \ldots, a) \) in both sets. \( \square \)

Let \( \mathcal{N}'_{n,k} \) denote the necklaces of \( \mathcal{N}_{n,k} \) of period \( n \). Now we devise a map from \( \mathcal{F}'_{n,k,0} \) to \( \mathcal{N}'_{n,k} \) based on how this coven behaves.

First in the case \( n \) and \( k \) are coprime, pick any necklace of \( \mathcal{N}'_{n,k} \). Set \( \sigma \) to be the map that sends \( f \in \mathcal{F}'_{n,k,0} \) to the necklace represented by \( \{f, c(f), \ldots, c^{n-1}(f)\} \).

Proposition 2 ([2]). When \( n \) and \( k \) are coprime, the \( \sigma \) map constructed above is a bijection between \( \mathcal{F}'_{n,k,0} \) and \( \mathcal{N}'_{n,k} \).

Proof. The rotation operation changes \( \sum if(i) \) by \( k \) which is comprime with \( n \). So in any coven \( \{f, \ldots, c^{n-1}(f)\} \), there is exactly one that lies in \( \mathcal{F}'_{n,k,0} \). \( \square \)

For example, take a look at Figure 2. They all correspond to the same necklace of \( \mathcal{N}_{3,7} \). The left code is in \( \mathcal{F}_{3,7,1} \), middle code is in \( \mathcal{F}_{3,7,2} \) and the right code is in \( \mathcal{F}_{3,7,0} \). The map \( \sigma \) would send the right code to the necklace that has 4, 2, 1 black beads between the three white beads (in clockwise order).

Now consider the case when \( k \) is a multiple of \( n \), which turns out to be considerably harder. Here \( \mathcal{F}'_{n,k,t} \) is a disjoint union of such covens. For each coven in \( \mathcal{F}_{n,k,0} \), fix an arbitrary representative \( f \). Let \( \sigma \) be a map from \( \mathcal{F}'_{n,k,0} \) to \( \mathcal{N}'_{n,k} \) that sends \( c^i(f) \) to \( \phi^i(f) \).

For example, take a look at Figure 3. They all correspond to the same necklace of \( \mathcal{N}_{3,3} \). The left code is in \( \mathcal{F}_{3,3,0} \), middle code is in \( \mathcal{F}_{3,3,0} \) and the right code is in \( \mathcal{F}_{3,3,3} \). The map \( \sigma \) would send the right code to the necklace that has 3, 0, 0 black beads between the three white beads (in clockwise order).
For example, take a look at Figure 3 and Figure 4. Figure 3 lists the only coven of $F_{3,3,0}$. We pick the leftmost code as the representative $f$. The middle code is $c(f)$ and the rightmost code is $c^2(f)$. Now look at Figure 4 which has $f, \phi(f), \phi^2(f)$ drawn. So $\sigma$ will map which code of Figure 3 to the code directly below in Figure 4.

**Proposition 3.** When $k$ is a multiple of $n$, the map $\sigma$ as above is a bijection between $F_{n,k,0}^{l}$ and $N_{n,k}^{l}$.

**Proof.** We will first show that the map is one-to-one. Assume for sake of contradiction the image of some $c^i(f)$ and $c^j(f)$ are the same. Since $\phi^i(f) \in F_{n,k,i}$, we must have $i = j$. But since $\phi$ is a bijective map, $\phi^i(f) = \phi^j(g)$ implies $f = g$ and we get a contradiction.

Next we show that the map is onto. Pick any necklace in $N_{n,k}^{l}$ which is a coven in $F_{n,k,t}$ since $k$ is a multiple of $n$. Thanks to $\phi$ being rotation invariant, applying $(\phi^{-1})^i$ on the coven gives a coven in $F_{n,k,0}^{l}$. Now pick $f$ that is the chosen representative of this coven. Then $c^i(f)$ will be sent to $\phi^i(f)$ under $\sigma$ and the coven of $\phi^i(f)$ will be the necklace that was originally chosen.

Combining Lemma 4 and Proposition 3 we get the following result:

**Theorem 1.** We have constructed a bijection between $N_{n,k}$ and $F_{n,k,0}$ when $n$ is prime.

It would be interesting to see if the same approach can be extended in the general case:

**Question 1.** Can one constructed a bijection between $N_{n,k}$ and $F_{n,k,0}$, for general $n$?

Notice that the map $\phi$ only depends on the weight of the code being coprime with $n$, instead of what $k$ is. So one approach would be to classify all codes whose weight is not coprime with $n$ and deal with them in some nice recursive way.
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