arXiv:2002.11025v1 [math.CO] 25 Feb 2020

New bounds for perfect k-hashing

Simone Costa* and Marco Dalai†

January 15, 2022

Abstract

Let $C \subseteq \{1,\dots,k\}^n$ be such that for any k distinct elements of C there exists a coordinate where they all differ simultaneously. Fredman and Komlós studied upper and lower bounds on the largest cardinality of such a set C, in particular proving that as $n \to \infty$, $|C| \leq \exp(nk!/k^{k-1} + o(n))$. Improvements over this result where first derived by different authors for $k = 4$. More recently, Guruswami and Riazanov showed that the coefficient $k!/k^{k-1}$ is certainly not tight for any $k > 3$, although they could only determine explicit improvements for $k = 5, 6$. For larger k, their method gives numerical values modulo a conjecture on the maxima of certain polynomials.

In this paper, we first prove their conjecture, completing the explicit computation of an improvement over the Fredman-Komlós bound for any k. Then, we develop a different method which gives substantial improvements for $k = 5, 6$.

Keywords: trifference, perfect k-hashing
MSC: 68R05

1 Introduction

For positive integers $k \geq 2$ and $n \geq 1$, consider a subset $C \subset \{1,\dots,k\}^n$ with the property that for any k distinct elements of C there exists a coordinate where they all differ. We call such a set a *perfect k-hash code* of length n, or simply k-hash for brevity. The name is motivated by the idea that if each coordinate of C is interpreted as a k-hash function on a set U of cardinality $|C|$, then any k elements of U are hashed onto $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ by at least one function.

Determining the largest possible cardinality of such a set C as a function of k and n is a classic combinatorial problem in theoretical computer science.

*DICATAM - Sez. Matematica, Università degli Studi di Brescia, Via Branze 43, I-25123 Brescia, Italy. email: simone.costa@unibs.it

†DII, Università degli Studi di Brescia, Via Branze 38, I-25123 Brescia, Italy. email: marco.dalai@unibs.it

One standard formulation is to study, for fixed k, the grow of the largest possible $|C|$ as n goes to infinity. It is known that $|C|$ grows exponentially in n. Then one usually defines the *rate* of the code as [1]

$$R = \frac{\log |C|}{n} \tag{1}$$

and asks for bounds on the rate of codes of maximal cardinality as $n \to \infty$. This formulation of the problem can also be cast as a problem, in information theory, of determining the zero-error capacity under list decoding for certain channels (REF). In this paper we consider upper bounds on R_k, defined as the limsup, as $n \to \infty$, of the rate of largest k-hash codes of length n.

A simple packing argument (see [7]) shows that for all $k \geq 2$ one has $R_k \leq \log(k/(k-1))$. For $k = 3$, the simplest non-trivial case, this evaluates to $\log(3/2) \approx 0.5850$ and is still the best known upper bound to date (the best lower bound is $1/4 \log(9/5) \approx 0.212$). For $k \geq 4$, the first important result was derived by Fredman and Komlós [8], who proved that

$$R_k \leq k!/k^{k-1}\,. \tag{2}$$

We also refer to [11], [12], [13] and [14] where the Fredman-Komlós bound (and some generalizations to hypergraphs) has been cast using the language of graph entropy and to [16] where a simple probabilistic proof has been presented. Improvements were obtained for $k = 4$ in [1], [2] and more recently in [5], [6]. The most recent progress we are aware of was obtained in [9] where the Fredman-Komlós bound is proved to be non-tight for any $k \geq 5$, with an explicit new numerical bound for $k = 5, 6$. For larger k, the authors show that an explicit improvement of the Fredman-Komlós bound can be obtained subject to a conjecture on the maxima of certain polynomials. Other recent papers on this topic that deserve to be recalled are [3] where the asymptotic behavior of R_k has been studied and [4] where the authors attempt to use the polynomial method to upperbound R_3 and they state some limitations of this method.

In this paper we make further progress on this problem. We first prove the conjecture formulated in [9] and thus complete their proof of explicit new upper bounds on R_k which beat the Fredman-Komlós bound for all $k \geq 5$. Our main contribution is then to expand on the idea used in [6] to derive a further improvement for $k = 5, 6$.

In Section 2 we give a brief summary of the approaches used in [6] and in [9], upon which we build our contribution. In Section 3 prove the conjecture stated in [9] and give a numerical evaluation of the ensuing bound for $k > 6$. In Section 4 we present our improvement for $k = 5, 6$.

[1] Here and in the whole paper $\log x$ is understood to be in base two.

2 Background

The bounds presented in [8], [2], [6] and [9] can all be derived by starting with the following Lemma on graph covering (see [17]).

Lemma 1 (Hansel [10]). *Let K_r be a complete graph on r vertices and let $G_1, \ldots, G_m$ be bipartite graphs on those same vertices such that $\cup_i G_i = K_r$. Let finally $\tau(G_i)$ represent the number of non-isolated vertices in G_i. Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \tau(G_i) \geq \log r \,. \tag{3}$$

The connection with k-hashing comes from the following application. Given a k-hash code C, fix any $(k-2)$-elements subset $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k-2}\}$ in C. For any coordinate i let $G_i^{x_1,\ldots,x_{k-2}}$ be the bipartite graph with vertex set $G \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k-2}\}$ and edge set

$$E = \{(v, w) : x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}, \ldots, x_{k-2,i}, v, w \text{ are all distinct}\} \,. \tag{4}$$

Then, since C is a k-hash code, we note that $\bigcup_i G_i^{x_1,\ldots,x_{k-2}}$ is the complete graph on $G \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k-2}\}$ and so

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau(G_i^{x_1,\ldots,x_{k-2}}) \geq \log(|C| - k + 2) \,. \tag{5}$$

This inequality can be used to prove upper bounds on $|C|$. Since it holds for any choice of $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k-2}$, one can show that the right hand side is small by proving that left hand side cannot be too large for all possible choices of $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k-2}$. One can either use it for some specific choice or take expectation over any random selection.

Let f_i be probability distribution of the i-th coordinate of C, that is, $f_{i,a}$ is the fraction of elements of C whose i-th coordinate is a. Note that the graph in (4) is empty if the $x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}, \ldots, x_{k-2,i}$ are not all distinct. We will say in this case that $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k-2}$ *collide* in coordinate i. Then, we have

$$\tau(G_i^{x_1,\ldots,x_{k-2}}) = \begin{cases} 0 & x_1, \ldots, x_k \text{ collide in coordinate } i \\ \left(\frac{|C|}{|C|-k+2}\right)\left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k-2} f_{i,x_{ji}}\right) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

So, one can make the left hand side in (5) small by either taking a set $x_1, \ldots, x_{k-2}$ which collide in many coordinates, so forcing the corresponding τ's to zero, or by taking a set which uses "popular" values in many coordinates.

The Fredman-Komlós bound is obtained by taking expectation in (5) over a uniform random extraction of $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k-2}$. By linearity of expectation the computation can be performed over each single coordinate.

Denoting with $\mathbb{E}$ the expectation, for large n and $|C|$

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1,\ldots,x_{k-2}})]\\&\quad=(1+o(1))\sum_{\substack{\text{distinct}\\a_1,\ldots,a_{k-2}}} f_{i,a_1}f_{i,a_2}\cdots f_{i,a_{k-2}}(1-f_{i,a_1}\cdots-f_{i,a_{k-2}})\end{aligned}$$

where the coefficient $o(1)$ is due to sampling without replacement. One can show that the worst-case f_i is the uniform distribution, which gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1,\ldots,x_{k-2}})]\le\frac{k!}{k^{k-1}}\,(1+o(1))\ . \tag{7}$$

The procedures used in [6] and [9] are based on the idea that one can also take $x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{k-2}$ uniformly from a subset $C'\subset C$ which ensures they collide in all coordinates i in some subset $T\subset\{1,2\ldots,n\}$. Then, if $g_{i,a}$ is the frequency of symbol a in the coordinate $i\notin T$ of C', one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1,\ldots,x_{k-2}})]\\&\quad=(1+o(1))\sum_{\substack{\text{distinct}\\a_1,\ldots,a_{k-2}}} g_{i,a_1}g_{i,a_2}\cdots g_{i,a_{k-2}}(1-f_{i,a_1}\cdots-f_{i,a_{k-2}})\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

The worst case g and f here, if taken independently, give in general a value which exceeds the $k!/k^{k-1}$ of (7). In [6], for $k=4$, it was shown that one can deal with this by also taking C' randomly from a partition of C (based on the values in positions $i\in T$), thus adding an additional (outer) expectation. In that case g_i is also random and constrained to satisfy $\mathbb{E}[g_i]=f_i$. Using some concavity argument it was shown that under this random selection the bound (7) still holds for $i\notin T$, thus gaining on average compared to [8]. However, for $k>4$ that approach seems infeasible. The idea used in [9] is to suppress the random selection of C' and show that one can carefully choose C' so that $x_1,\ldots,x_{k-2}$ collide in a portion of the coordinates large enough to more than compensate the increase in $\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1,\ldots,x_{k-2}})]$ for $i\notin T$ obtained in (8) with respect to (7). This leads to a proof that (2) is not tight for all $k>4$. However, explicit numerical improvements were only proved for $k=5,6$, and given for $k>6$ modulo a conjecture on the optimal value of some polynomials.

In the next two sections we present our contribution. First we prove the conjecture formulated by the authors in [9], thus completing their proof of the new bounds on R_k for all k. Then, we prove stronger results for $k=5,6$. Our idea is based on a symmetrization of (8) which allow us to resurrect the random selection of C' in an effective way, replacing the concavity argument of [6] with new bounds on the maxima of some polynomials.

3 Guruswami-Riazanov bounds

A crucial role in all bounds discussed in this paper is played by the sum appearing in equation (8). We simplify the notation and set, for general probability vectors $g = (g_1, \ldots, g_k)$ and $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_k)$,

$$\psi(g, f) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} g_{\sigma(1)} g_{\sigma(2)} \cdots g_{\sigma(k-2)} f_{\sigma(k-1)}\,, \tag{9}$$

observing that equation (8) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1,\ldots,x_{k-2}})] = (1 + o(1))\, \psi(g_i, f_i) \tag{10}$$

We can now prove the conjecture stated in [9].

Proposition 1 (Conjecture 1 [9])**.** *Under the constraints $f_i \geq \gamma, \forall i$, $\psi(g, f)$ attains a maximum in a point (g, f) with vector f of the form $f = (\gamma, \ldots, \gamma, 1-(k-1)\gamma)$.*

Proof. Since $\psi(g, f)$ is invariant under (identical) permutations on g and f, we can study maxima for which g_k is the minimum among the values $g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_k$ and show that for those points $f = (\gamma, \ldots, \gamma, 1-(k-1)\gamma)$. We prove this by considering the components of f one by one. Assume on the contrary that $f_1 > \gamma$. Given $\epsilon \leq f_1 - \gamma$, set $\tilde{f} = (f_1 - \epsilon, f_2 \ldots, f_{k-1}, f_k + \epsilon)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(g, \tilde{f}) = &\sum_{\sigma:\sigma(k-1)\neq 1,k} g_{\sigma(1)} g_{\sigma(2)} \cdots g_{\sigma(k-2)} f_{\sigma(k-1)} \\
&+ \sum_{\sigma:\sigma(k-1)=1} g_{\sigma(1)} g_{\sigma(2)} \cdots g_{\sigma(k-2)} (f_1 - \epsilon) \\
&+ \sum_{\sigma:\sigma(k-1)=k} g_{\sigma(1)} g_{\sigma(2)} \cdots g_{\sigma(k-2)} (f_k + \epsilon) \\
= \psi(g, f) &- \epsilon \cdot \sum_{\sigma:\sigma(k-1)=1} g_{\sigma(1)} g_{\sigma(2)} \cdots g_{\sigma(k-2)} \\
&+ \epsilon \cdot \sum_{\sigma:\sigma(k-1)=k} g_{\sigma(1)} g_{\sigma(2)} \cdots g_{\sigma(k-2)} \cdot
\end{aligned}$$

Since we assumed $g_1 \geq g_k$,

$$\sum_{\sigma:\sigma(k-1)=1} g_{\sigma(1)} g_{\sigma(2)} \cdots g_{\sigma(k-2)} \leq \sum_{\sigma:\sigma(k-1)=k} g_{\sigma(1)} g_{\sigma(2)} \cdots g_{\sigma(k-2)}. \tag{11}$$

and hence $\psi(g, \tilde{f}) \geq \psi(g, f)$. By repeating the above procedure for f_2, $f_3, \ldots, f_{k-1}$, we find that indeed $f = (\gamma, \ldots, \gamma, 1-(k-1)\gamma)$ maximizes $\psi(g, f)$ under the considered constraints whenever g_k is the minimum among $g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_k$, and in particular for the optimal g sorted in this way. □

k	5	6	7	8
Bound from [8]	0.19200	0.092593	0.04284	0.019227
Bound from [9]	0.19079	0.092279	0.04279	0.019213

Table 1: Numerical values for the bounds on R_k from [8] and from [9] in light of Proposition 1. All numbers are rounded upwards.

It terms of g, it was already shown in [9] that assuming the above result one could show that the maximum value of $\psi(g, f)$, under the constraint that $f_i \geq \gamma, \forall i$, is attained at a point (g, f) with g of the form $(\beta, \beta, \ldots, 1-(k-1)\beta)$. Assuming this, it was shown in [9] that a new explicit numerical bound can be given on R_k which strictly improves the Fredman-Komlós bound for all k. Table 1 gives numerical results[2] for the first values of k.

4 Better bounds for small k

In this section we combine insights from both the approaches of [6] and [9]. Instead of looking at one subcode C', as done in [9], we follow the idea in [6]. We consider a partition $\{C_\omega : \omega \in \Omega\}$ of our k-hash code C and randomly select a subcode C_ω. Then we randomly extract codewords $x_1, \ldots, x_{k-2}$ from C_ω and bound the expected value in (8) over both random code and codewords. At this point, we replace the concavity argument of [6] with a symmetrization trick combined with new bounds on the maxima of certain polynomials. This procedure leads to the following nontrivial improvement on the rates R_5 and R_6.

Theorem 1. *For $k = 5, 6$ the following bounds hold*

- $R_5 \leq 0.1697$*;*
- $R_6 \leq 0.0875$.

4.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Here our goal is to find a family of subcodes such that any $k-2$ codewords $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k-2}$ of a given subcode C_ω collide in all coordinates of $T = [1, \ell]$ for a carefully chosen value of ℓ, that is, for any coordinate $t \in T$ there exist i, j such that $x_{i,t} = x_{j,t}$. This will ensure that the coordinates from T contribute 0 to the LHS of (5). To do this, we cover all the possible prefixes of length ℓ; the following lemma can be seen as a special case of the known results on the fractional clique covering number (see [15]).

[2]We believe that due to a minor error in the computation, the bound given for R_5 in [9] is not really the best possible using their method. We report here the optimal.

Lemma 2. *For any positive ϵ, for ℓ large enough, there exists a partition Ω of $\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}^\ell$ such that:*

1. $|\Omega| \leq \left\lfloor \left(\frac{k}{k-3} + \epsilon\right)^\ell \right\rfloor$.
2. *For all $\omega \in \Omega$ and $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$, the i-th projection of ω has cardinality at most $k - 3$.*

In particular, for any $\omega \in \Omega$, any $k - 2$ sequences in ω collide in all coordinates $i = 1, \ldots, \ell$.

Proof. For any $i \in [1, k]$, consider the set $A_i = \{i, i + 1, \ldots, i + (k - 4)\}$, where the sums are performed modulo k in $[1, k]$. To a string $s = (i_1, \ldots, i_\ell)$ in $[1, k]^\ell$ we associate a set $\omega_s = A_{i_1} \times A_{i_2} \times \cdots \times A_{i_\ell} \subset [1, k]^\ell$. Fix a word $x \in [1, k]^\ell$, and choose uniformly at random the string s; the probability that $x \notin \omega_s$ is $1 - \left(\frac{k-3}{k}\right)^\ell$. Therefore, if we choose randomly h strings $s_1, \ldots, s_h$, the probability that $x \notin (\omega_{s_1} \cup \cdots \cup \omega_{s_h})$ is $\left(1 - \left(\frac{k-3}{k}\right)^\ell\right)^h$. Hence, the expected number of words $x \in [1, k]^\ell$ that do not belong to any of the $\omega_{s_1}, \ldots, \omega_{s_h}$ is

$$\mathbb{E}(|\{x \in [1, k]^\ell : \ x \notin \omega_{s_1} \cup \cdots \cup \omega_{s_h}\}|) = k^\ell \left(1 - \left(\frac{k-3}{k}\right)^\ell\right)^h .$$

If this value is smaller than 1, then there exists a choice of $s_1, \ldots, s_h$ such that that the family $\{\omega_{s_1}, \ldots, \omega_{s_h}\}$ covers the whole set $[1, k]^\ell$. This happens whenever

$$k^\ell \left(1 - \left(\frac{k-3}{k}\right)^\ell\right)^h < 1$$

or equivalently

$$h > \frac{-\ell \log k}{\log\left(1 - \left(\frac{k-3}{k}\right)^\ell\right)},$$

which holds for

$$h > \ell \left(\frac{k}{k-3}\right)^\ell \frac{\log k}{\log e}.$$

For ℓ large enough, setting $h = \left\lfloor \left(\frac{k}{k-3} + \epsilon\right)^\ell \right\rfloor$ we have the desired inequality.

Removing possible intersections between the sets ω_s we obtain a partition of $[1, k]^\ell$ with the desired properties, since condition 2) is satisfied by construction. □

Let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_h\}$ be a partition of $[1,k]^\ell$ as derived from Lemma 2 and consider the family of subcodes $C_{\omega_1}, \ldots, C_{\omega_h}$ of C defined by

$$C_\omega = \{x \in C : (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell) \in \omega\}.$$

Clearly, any $k-2$ codewords $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{k-2}$ of a given subcode C_ω collide in all coordinates of $T = [1,\ell]$. As in [6], define a subcode C_ω to be *heavy* if $|C_\omega| > n$ and to be *light* otherwise. We can show that, if ℓ is not too large, most of the codewords are contained in heavy subcodes. Indeed, if we consider ℓ such that $\left(\frac{k}{k-3} + \epsilon\right)^\ell \leq 2^{nR - 2\log n}$, that is $\ell \leq \frac{nR - 2\log n}{\log\left(\frac{k}{k-3}+\epsilon\right)}$, we have that

$$\left| \bigcup_{C_\omega \text{ is ligth}} C_\omega \right| \leq n \left(\frac{k}{k-3} + \epsilon\right)^\ell \leq n 2^{nR - 2\log n} = \frac{|C|}{n}.$$

This means that at least a fraction $(1 - 1/n)$ of the codewords are in heavy subcodes. If we remove from C the light codes, the rate changes by an amount $\frac{1}{n}\log(1-1/n)$, which vanishes as n grows. So, in the following we can assume, without loss of generality, that all the subcodes are heavy.

We are finally ready to describe our strategy to pick the codewords $x_1, \ldots, x_{k-2}$: first we choose a subcode C_ω with probability $\lambda_\omega = |C_\omega|/|C|$ and then we pick uniformly at random (and without replacement) $x_1, \ldots, x_{k-2}$ from C_ω. Since those codewords collide in all the coordinates from the set $T = [1,\ell]$, we obtain in (5):

$$\log(|C| - k + 2) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega}(\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i\in[\ell+1,n]} \tau(G_i^{x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{k-2}})]) \tag{12}$$

$$= \sum_{i\in[\ell+1,n]} \mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega}(\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{k-2}})]). \tag{13}$$

Let again f_i be probability distribution of the i-th coordinate of C, and let $f_{i|\omega}$ be the distribution of the subcode C_ω. Invoking (10) for the expectation over the random choice of $x_1, \ldots, x_{k-2}$, we can write for $i \in [\ell+1, n]$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega}(\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{k-2}})]) = (1 + o(1)) \sum_{\omega\in\Omega} \lambda_\omega \psi(f_{i|\omega}, f_i).$$

Since $f_i = \sum_{\mu\in\Omega} \lambda_\mu f_{i|\mu}$ and ψ is linear in its second variable, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega}(\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{k-2}})]) = (1 + o(1)) \sum_{\omega,\mu\in\Omega} \lambda_\omega \lambda_\mu \psi(f_{i|\omega}, f_{i|\mu}).$$

We exploit now a simple yet effective trick. Since the sum above is symmetric in ω and μ, we can write

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega}(\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{k-2}})])$$

$$= (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega,\mu\in\Omega} \lambda_\omega \lambda_\mu [\psi(f_{i|\omega}, f_{i|\mu}) + \psi(f_{i|\mu}, f_{i|\omega})]. \tag{14}$$

Here, we note that $f_{i|\omega}$ has no relation with $f_{i|\mu}$. Therefore we can just consider the following polynomial function over two generic probability vectors $p = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k)$ and $q = (q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_k)$

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(p;q) &:= \psi(p,q) + \psi(q,p) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} p_{\sigma(1)} p_{\sigma(2)} \cdots p_{\sigma(k-2)} q_{\sigma(k-1)} + q_{\sigma(1)} q_{\sigma(2)} \cdots q_{\sigma(k-2)} p_{\sigma(k-1)}.\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Because of (14), if M_k is the maximum of Ψ over probabilistic vectors p and q, equation (13) says that

$$\begin{aligned}\log |C| &\leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2} (n - \ell) \sum_{\omega, \mu \in \Omega} \lambda_\omega \lambda_\mu M_k \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2} (n - \ell) M_k.\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $|C| = 2^{nR}$ and taking $\ell = \left\lfloor \frac{nR - 2\log n}{\log\left(\frac{k}{k-3} + \epsilon\right)} \right\rfloor$, we obtain

$$R \leq (1 + o(1)) \left[1 - \frac{R - 2\log(n)/n}{\log\left(\frac{k}{k-3} + \epsilon\right)} \right] \frac{M_k}{2}.$$

Rearranging the terms, taking $n \to \infty$ first and then $\epsilon \to 0$, we deduce the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *Let M_k be the maximum of Ψ over probabilistic vectors $p = (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k)$ and $q = (q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_k)$. Then we have the following upperbound on R_k*

$$R_k \leq \left(\frac{2}{M_k} + \frac{1}{\log(k/(k-3))} \right)^{-1}.$$

In the next subsection we will prove that $M_5 = \frac{15(48+\sqrt{5})}{1936} \approx 0.389226$ and $M_6 = 24/125$. This implies Theorem 1.

4.2 Bounds on Ψ

The goal of this subsection is to find the maximum of the function Ψ as defined in (15). For this purpose we first introduce two lemmas that provide some restrictions on this maximum.

Lemma 3. *Let $\bar{p} = (\bar{p}_1, \ldots, \bar{p}_k)$ and $\bar{q} = (\bar{q}_1, \ldots, \bar{q}_k)$ be two probabilistic vectors. If $(\bar{p}; \bar{q})$ is a maximum for Ψ such that $\bar{p}_1, \bar{p}_2, \bar{q}_1, \bar{q}_2$ are nonzero, then also $(\frac{\bar{p}_1+\bar{p}_2}{2}, \frac{\bar{p}_1+\bar{p}_2}{2}, \bar{p}_3, \ldots, \bar{p}_k; \frac{\bar{q}_1+\bar{q}_2}{2}, \frac{\bar{q}_1+\bar{q}_2}{2}, \bar{q}_3, \ldots, \bar{q}_k)$ is a maximum for Ψ.*

Proof. If $\bar{P} = (\bar{p}; \bar{q})$ is a maximum for $\Psi(p; q)$ under the constraints $p_1 + p_2 + \cdots + p_k = 1$ and $q_1 + q_2 + \cdots + q_k = 1$, then it is a maximum also under the stronger constraints $p_1 + p_2 = c_1$, $q_1 + q_2 = c_2$ where $c_1 = \bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2$, $c_2 = \bar{q}_1 + \bar{q}_2$, and $p_i = \bar{p}_i, q_i = \bar{q}_i$ for $i \in \{3, 4, \ldots, k\}$. Because of the Lagrange multiplier method this means that:

$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial p_1}\Big|_{\bar{P}} = \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial p_2}\Big|_{\bar{P}}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial q_1}\Big|_{\bar{P}} = \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial q_2}\Big|_{\bar{P}}.$$

It follows that:

$$(\bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)a + (\bar{q}_1 - \bar{q}_2)b = 0$$

and

$$(\bar{q}_1 - \bar{q}_2)d + (\bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2)c = 0$$

where $a = \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2}\big|_{\bar{P}}$, $b = \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial p_1 \partial q_2}\big|_{\bar{P}} = \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial q_1 \partial p_2}\big|_{\bar{P}} = c$ and $d = \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial q_1 \partial q_2}\big|_{\bar{P}}$. If we set $\bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2 = x$, $\bar{q}_1 - \bar{q}_2 = y$, the previous equations became:

$$\begin{cases} ax + by = 0; \\ cx + dy = 0. \end{cases}$$

In the case $ad - bc \neq 0$ the previous system admits only the solution $x = y = 0$ that means $\bar{p}_1 = \bar{p}_2$ and $\bar{q}_1 = \bar{q}_2$. It is clear that here we have $\bar{p}_1 = \frac{\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2}{2} = \bar{p}_2$, $\bar{q}_1 = \frac{\bar{q}_1 + \bar{q}_2}{2} = \bar{q}_2$ and hence the thesis is satisfied.

Let us assume $ad - bc = 0$. Then there exists a line L of points $P(t)$ such that $P(1) = \bar{P}$, $P(0) = (\frac{\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2}{2}, \frac{\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2}{2}, \bar{p}_3, \ldots, \bar{p}_k; \frac{\bar{q}_1 + \bar{q}_2}{2}, \frac{\bar{q}_1 + \bar{q}_2}{2}, \bar{q}_3, \ldots, \bar{q}_k)$ and

$$\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial p_1}\Big|_{P(t)} - \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial p_2}\Big|_{P(t)} = \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial q_1}\Big|_{P(t)} - \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial q_2}\Big|_{P(t)} = 0.$$

It follows that $\Psi(P(t))$ is constantly equal to the value of Ψ in $\bar{P} = P(1)$. Since $(\frac{\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2}{2}, \frac{\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2}{2}, \bar{p}_3, \ldots, \bar{p}_k, \frac{\bar{q}_1 + \bar{q}_2}{2}, \frac{\bar{q}_1 + \bar{q}_2}{2}, \bar{q}_3, \ldots, \bar{q}_k)$ belongs to the line L, this point is also a maximum for Ψ. □

With essentially the same proof we also obtain the following result.

Lemma 4. *Let $\bar{p} = (\bar{p}_1, \ldots, \bar{p}_k)$ and $\bar{q} = (\bar{q}_1, \ldots, \bar{q}_k)$ be two probabilistic vectors. If $(\bar{p}; \bar{q})$ is a maximum for Ψ such that $\bar{p}_1, \bar{p}_2$ are nonzero while $\bar{q}_1 = \bar{q}_2 = 0$ then also $(\frac{\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2}{2}, \frac{\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2}{2}, \bar{p}_3, \ldots, \bar{p}_k; 0, 0, \bar{q}_3, \ldots, \bar{q}_k)$ is a maximum for Ψ.*

In the next two lemmas, we will provide some further restrictions on the maximum of Ψ using just some combinatorial arguments.

Lemma 5. *We have that:*

$$\Psi(0, p_2, \ldots, p_k; 0, q_2, \ldots, q_k) \leq \Psi(0, p_2, \ldots, p_k; q_2, 0, q_3, \ldots, q_k).$$

Proof. Because of the definition, we have that $\Psi(0, p_2, \ldots, p_k; 0, q_2, \ldots, q_k)$ evaluates as

$$\sum_{\sigma:\ \sigma(k)=1} p_{\sigma(1)}p_{\sigma(2)}\cdots p_{\sigma(k-2)}q_{\sigma(k-1)} + q_{\sigma(1)}q_{\sigma(2)}\cdots q_{\sigma(k-2)}p_{\sigma(k-1)}.$$

Similarly, we have that $\Psi(0, p_2, \ldots, p_k; q_2, 0, q_3, \ldots, q_k)$ equals

$$\sum_{\sigma:\ \sigma(k)=1} p_{\sigma(1)}p_{\sigma(2)}\cdots p_{\sigma(k-2)}q_{\sigma(k-1)} + q_{\sigma(1)}q_{\sigma(2)}\cdots q_{\sigma(k)}p_{\sigma(k-1)} + (k-2)p_2q_2\left(\sum_{\sigma\in Sym(3,\ldots,k)} p_{\sigma(3)}\cdots p_{\sigma(k-1)} + q_{\sigma(3)}\cdots q_{\sigma(k-1)}\right).$$

The claim follows since each term of the last sum is non negative. □

The following Lemma is in the same spirit of Proposition 1.

Lemma 6. *We have that:*

$$\Psi(p_1, \ldots, p_{k-3}, 0, 0, 0; q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_k) \leq \Psi\left(1, 0\ldots, 0; 0, \frac{1}{(k-1)}, \ldots, \frac{1}{(k-1)}\right).$$

Proof. We suppose, without loss of generality that q_1 is the minimum among the values $q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_{k-3}$. Setting $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_{k-3}, 0, 0, 0)$ and $q = (q_1, \ldots, q_k)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(p;q) = &\sum_{\sigma:\ \sigma(k-1)\notin\{1,2\}} q_{\sigma(1)}q_{\sigma(2)}\cdots q_{\sigma(k-2)}p_{\sigma(k-1)} \\ &+ \frac{p_1+p_2}{2}\sum_{\sigma:\ \{\sigma(k-1),\sigma(k)\}=\{1,2\}} q_{\sigma(1)}\cdots q_{\sigma(k-2)} \\ &+ (p_1q_2+q_1p_2)(k-2)\sum_{\sigma\in Sym(3,\ldots,k)} q_{\sigma(3)}\cdots q_{\sigma(k-1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, setting $p' = (p_1 + p_2, 0, p_3, \ldots, p_{k-3}, 0, 0, 0)$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(p';q) = &\sum_{\sigma:\ \sigma(k-1)\notin\{1,2\}} q_{\sigma(1)}q_{\sigma(2)}\cdots q_{\sigma(k-2)}p_{\sigma(k-1)} \\ &+ \frac{p_1+p_2}{2}\sum_{\sigma:\ \{\sigma(k-1),\sigma(k)\}=\{1,2\}} q_{\sigma(1)}\cdots q_{\sigma(k-2)} \\ &+ (p_1+p_2)q_2(k-2)\sum_{\sigma\in Sym(3,\ldots,k)} q_{\sigma(3)}\cdots q_{\sigma(k-1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $q_1 \leq q_2$ we have that

$$\Psi(p;q) \leq \Psi(p';q).$$

Reiterating the previous procedure, since q_1 is the minimum among the values $q_1, \ldots, q_{k-3}$, we obtain

$$\Psi(p_1, \ldots, p_{k-3}, 0, 0, 0; q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_k) \leq \Psi(1, 0, \ldots, 0, 0; q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_k). \quad (16)$$

Since q_1 does not appear in the value of $\Psi(1, 0, \ldots, 0, 0; q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_k)$, this is certainly maximized for $q_1 = 0$. Finally, due to the Muirhead's inequality, we obtain that the RHS of (16) is maximized for $q_2 = q_3 = \cdots = q_k = \frac{1}{k-1}$. □

As a consequence of the previous lemmas, Ψ attains a maximum in a point of one of the following types:

a) $\left(1, 0 \ldots, 0; 0, \frac{1}{(k-1)}, \ldots, \frac{1}{(k-1)}\right)$;

b) $(1/k, \ldots, 1/k; 1/k, \ldots, 1/k)$;

c) $(0, 0, \alpha, \ldots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \ldots, \delta, 0, 0)$
where $(k-4)\alpha + 2\beta = 1$ and $2\gamma + (k-4)\delta = 1$;

d) $(0, 0, \alpha, \ldots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \ldots, \delta, 0)$
where $(k-3)\alpha + \beta = 1$ and $2\gamma + (k-3)\delta = 1$;

e) $(0, 0, 1/(k-2), \ldots, 1/(k-2); \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \ldots, \delta)$
where $2\gamma + (k-2)\delta = 1$;

f) $(0, \alpha, \ldots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \delta, \ldots, \delta, 0)$
where $(k-2)\alpha + \beta = 1$ and $\gamma + (k-2)\delta = 1$;

g) $(0, 1/(k-1), \ldots, 1/(k-1); \gamma, \delta, \ldots, \delta)$
where $\gamma + (k-1)\delta = 1$.

In particular, because of Lemma 6, a maximum with three or more p-coordinates (resp. q-coordinates) equal to zero is also attained in a point of the form (a). Otherwise, there are at most two zero coordinates both for the vector p and for the vector q. Due to Lemma 5, we can then assume those zeros are in different positions and finally, using Lemma 3 and 4, we obtain the required characterization of the maximum.

For $k = 5, 6$, we have inspected using Mathematica all cases listed above and determined the maximum explicitly.

Theorem 2. *The following hold:*

- *for $k = 5$, the global maximum of Ψ is $\frac{15(48+\sqrt{5})}{1936} \approx 0.389226$ and is obtained in case (g) with $\delta = 1/44(4 + \sqrt{5})$ and $\gamma = 1 - 4\delta$;*
- *for $k = 6$, the global maximum of Ψ is $24/125 = 0.192$, obtained in case (a).*

Theorem 1 follows immediately from Theorem 2 and Proposition 2.

Remark 1. *For $k > 6$, the value obtained for p and q as in case (a), which we conjecture to be the true maximum, is too big to improve the known upper bounds on R_k.*

Acknowledgements

This research was partially supported by Italian Ministry of Education under Grant PRIN 2015 D72F16000790001. Helpful discussions with Jaikumar Radhakrishnan and Venkatesan Guruswami are gratefully acknowledged.

References

[1] E. Arikan, A Bound on the Zero-Error List Coding Capacity, *In Proceedings. IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory* (1993), 152–152.

[2] E. Arikan, An upper bound on the zero-error list-coding capacity, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **40** (1994), 1237–1240.

[3] S. Bhandari and J. Radhakrishnan, Bounds on the Zero-Error List-Decoding Capacity of the q/(q-1) Channel, 2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT), Vail, CO, 2018, pp. 906-910.

[4] S. Costa, M. Dalai, A gap in the slice rank of k-tensors *preprint*, available at arXiv:1905.07355.

[5] M. Dalai, V. Guruswami, and J. Radhakrishnan, An improved bound on the zero-error listdecoding capacity of the 4/3 channel, *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)* (2017), 1658–1662.

[6] M. Dalai, V. Guruswami, and J. Radhakrishnan, An improved bound on the zero-error listdecoding capacity of the 4/3 channel, in *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 749-756, Feb. 2020

[7] P. Elias, Zero error capacity under list decoding, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **34** (1988), 1070–1074.

[8] Michael L. Fredman and János Komlós, On the Size of Separating Systems and Families of Perfect Hash Functions, *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods* **5** (1984), 61–68.

[9] V. Guruswami, A. Riazanov, Beating Fredman-Komlos for perfect k-hashing, *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics* (2019).

[10] G. Hansel, "Nombre minimal de contacts de fermature nécessaires pour réaliser une fonction booléenne symétrique de n variables," *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, pp. 6037–6040, 1964.

[11] J. Korner, Coding of an information source having ambiguous alphabet and the entropy of graphs, *6th Prague Conference on Information Theory* (1973), 411–425.

[12] J. Korner, "Fredman–Komlós bounds and information theory," *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 560–570, 1986.

[13] J. Korner and K. Marton, New Bounds for Perfect Hashing via Information Theory, *European Journal of Combinatorics* **9** (1988), 523–530.

[14] J. Korner, Fredman–Komlós bounds and information theory, *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods* **7** (1986), 560–570.

[15] R.J. McEliece and E.C. Posner "Hide and seek, data storage, and entropy," *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, vol. 42, 5, pp. 1706–1716, 1971.

[16] A. Nilli, "Perfect hashing and probability," *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, vol. 3, pp. 407–409, 1994.

[17] J. Radhakrishnan, Entropy and Counting, available at: http://www.tcs.tifr.res. in/ jaikumar/Papers/EntropyAndCounting.pdf.