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Abstract

In this paper, we introduce a new family of graphs, \( \Gamma(n, a) \). We show that it is an infinite family of tetravalent half-transitive Cayley graphs. Apart from that, we determine some structural properties of \( \Gamma(n, a) \).
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1. Introduction

A graph \( G = (V, E) \) is said to be vertex-transitive, edge-transitive and arc-transitive if the automorphism group of \( G \), \( \text{Aut}(G) \), acts transitively on the vertices, on the edges and on the arcs of \( G \) respectively. It is known that an arc-transitive graph is both vertex-transitive and edge-transitive. However, a graph which is both vertex-transitive and edge-transitive may not be arc-transitive, the smallest example being the Holt graph \([9]\) on 27 vertices. Such graphs are called half-transitive graphs. For other definitions related to algebraic graph theory, one is referred to \([8]\).

The study of half-transitive graphs was initiated by Tutte \([12]\), who proved that any half-transitive graph is of even degree. Since any connected 2-regular is a cycle and a cycle is arc-transitive, the first possibility of finding a half-transitive graph is a 4-regular or tetravalent graph. The first example of tetravalent half-transitive graphs were given by Bouwer \([2]\) and the smallest example was given in Holt \([9]\). Though numerous papers have been published in the last 50 years, the classification of tetravalent half-transitive graphs is not yet complete. In absence of complete classification, two major approaches have been fruitful so far: the first is to characterize half-transitive graphs of some particular orders like \( p^3, p^4, p^5, pq, 2pq \) etc \([4], [5], [6], [7]\), and the second is to come up with infinite families of half-transitive graphs \([3], [13]\).

In this paper, we introduce a new family of tetravalent half-transitive graphs, \( \Gamma(n, a) \). It turns out that it is family of Cayley graphs of order \( 3n \) and for \((n, a) = (9, 4)\), we get
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the Holt graph. In fact, our construction is a generalization of an alternative construction of Holt graph (See the last paragraph of [5]).

**Definition 1.1.** Let \( n \) be a positive integer such that \( 3 \mid \varphi(n) \), where \( \varphi \) denote the Euler Totient function. Then \( \mathbb{Z}_n^* \), the group of units of \( \mathbb{Z}_n \), is a group of order a multiple of 3. Let \( a \) be a element of order 3 in \( \mathbb{Z}_n^* \) and \( b = a^2 \mod n \). Define \( \Gamma(n, a) \) to be the graph with vertex-set \( \mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_3 \) and the edge-set comprises of edges of the form \( (i, j) \sim (ai \pm 1, j - 1) \) and \( (i, j) \sim (bi \pm b, j + 1) \), where the operations in the first and second coordinates are done in modulo \( n \) and modulo 3 respectively.

It is obvious that \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is tetravalent. One can check that \( \Gamma(9, 4) \) is the Holt graph. It is also to be noted that for a particular \( n \), we can have two graphs, \( \Gamma(n, a) \) and \( \Gamma(n, b) \). However, these two graphs are isomorphic via the automorphism \( \tau : \Gamma(n, a) \to \Gamma(n, a^2) \) defined by \( \tau(i, j) = (ai, -j) \). So, without loss of generality, we assume that \( a < b \), where \( a, b \in \{2, \ldots, n - 2\} \).

On the other hand, let \( n \) be a positive integer such that \( a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2 \) be four elements of order 3 in \( \mathbb{Z}_n^* \) with \( a_1b_1 \equiv 1 \mod n \) and \( a_2b_2 \equiv 1 \mod n \). Then, by the above argument, \( \Gamma(n, a_1) \cong \Gamma(n, b_1) \) and \( \Gamma(n, a_2) \cong \Gamma(n, b_2) \). However, \( \Gamma(n, a_1) \) may not be isomorphic to \( \Gamma(n, a_2) \), e.g., for \( n = 63 \), we have \( 4 \cdot 16 \equiv 1 \mod 63 \) and \( 22 \cdot 43 \equiv 1 \mod 63 \), but \( \Gamma(63, 4) \) is not isomorphic to \( \Gamma(63, 22) \), as odd girth of \( \Gamma(63, 4) \) is 9, whereas that of \( \Gamma(63, 22) \) is 21.

The definition of \( \Gamma(n, a) \) requires that \( 3|\varphi(n) \). We discuss the form of \( n \), for which this holds. Let \( n = p_1^{\alpha_1}\alpha_1 p_2^{\alpha_2}\alpha_2 \ldots p_k^{\alpha_k}\alpha_k \), where \( p_i \) are primes. Then \( \varphi(n) = p_1^{\alpha_1-1}p_2^{\alpha_2-1} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k-1}(p_1 - 1)(p_2 - 1) \cdots (p_k - 1) \). As \( 3|\varphi(n) \), either \( 3|p_i^{\alpha_i-1} \) or \( 3|p_i - 1 \) for some \( i \), i.e., \( 9|n \) or \( p_i \equiv 1 \mod 3 \) for some \( i \). Thus \( n \) is either of the form \( 9t \) or \( pt \) where \( p \) is a prime of the form \( 1 \mod 3 \) and \( t \) is a positive integer.

At this junction, it is important to mention that authors in [1] constructed a family of graphs \( M(a; m, n) \) and proved the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** ([1], Theorem 3.3). Let \( n \geq 9 \) be odd and \( a^3 \equiv 1 \mod n \). Then \( M(a; 3, n) \) is half-transitive.

While the current work was in progress, it caught our attention that our construction \( \Gamma(n, a) \), coincidentally, is same as \( M(a; 3, n) \) (Although the definitions are given in completely different way). However for two reasons we decided to carry on with the project:

1. Firstly, the proof techniques are entirely different: While their proof is built on semiregular automorphisms and blocks, ours is based on 6-cycles present in the graph.

2. Secondly and most importantly, we prove that \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is half-transitive for all \( n \) except 7 and 14, i.e., \( n \) is not necessarily odd (See Theorem 1.1). In other words, comparing with Theorem 1.1 we prove the half-transitivity of a larger family of graphs.

In Section 2, we discuss some structural properties of \( \Gamma(n, a) \) and in Section 3, we discuss the parameters related to the automorphism group of \( \Gamma(n, a) \). In Section Appendix, we provide the SageMath [11] code for computing the automorphism group of \( \Gamma(n, a) \).
2. Structural Properties of $\Gamma(n, a)$

**Theorem 2.1.** $\Gamma(n, a)$ is bipartite if and only if $n$ is even.

*Proof:* If $n$ is even, then consider the sets $X = \{(i, j) : i \text{ is even}\}$ and $Y = \{(i, j) : i \text{ is odd}\}$. Note that as $n$ is even and $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_n^*$, therefore $a, b$ are odd. Thus, if $i$ is even, then $ai \equiv 1$ and $bi \equiv b$ are odd, and if $i$ is odd, then $ai \equiv 1$ and $bi \equiv b$ are even. Thus, no two vertices in $X$ (or $Y$) are adjacent and hence $\Gamma(n, a)$ is bipartite.

On the other hand, if $n$ is odd, as $\Gamma(n, a)$ is Hamiltonian (See Corollary 3.1), it has an odd cycle of length $3n$. Hence $\Gamma(n, a)$ is not bipartite. \(\square\)

**Theorem 2.2.** Then chromatic number $\chi$ of $\Gamma(n, a)$ is given by

$$\chi = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ 3, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

*Proof:* The proof is obvious, if $n$ is even. If $n$ is odd, consider the sets $A_0 = \{(i, 0) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$, $A_1 = \{(i, 1) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$ and $A_2 = \{(i, 2) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$. The theorem is true as $A_0, A_1$ and $A_2$ are independent sets in $\Gamma(n, a)$ and $\Gamma(n, a)$ is not bipartite. \(\square\)

**Lemma 2.1.** If $n = p$, where $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ is a prime, then girth of $\Gamma(n, a)$ is 3.

*Proof:* As $a^3 \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ and $a \not\equiv 1 \pmod{n}$, we have $n|a^3 - 1 = (a - 1)(a^2 + a + 1)$. As $n$ is prime, we have $a^2 + a + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$. The lemma follows from the observation that $(0, 0) \sim (1, 2) \sim (a + 1, 1) \sim (a^2 + a + 1, 0) = (0, 0)$ is a 3-cycle. \(\square\)

**Lemma 2.2.** $\Gamma(n, a)$ always have a cycle of length 6 and hence girth of $\Gamma(n, a)$ is less than or equal to 6.

*Proof:* Consider the cycle $(0, 0) \sim (1, 2) \sim (a - 1, 1) \sim (a^2 - a + 1, 0) \sim (-a^2 + a, 2) \sim (b, 1) \sim (0, 0)$. Clearly it is a 6-cycle, provided the vertices are distinct. If two vertices are not distinct, then we have either $a - 1 \equiv b$ or $-a^2 + a \equiv 1$ or $a^2 - a + 1 \equiv 0$, i.e., in all cases, we should have $a^2 - a + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$, i.e., $a^3 + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$. This implies $2 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$, a contradiction. \(\square\)

**Lemma 2.3.** $\Gamma(n, a)$ does not have any 4-cycle.

*Proof:* Let, if possible, $\Gamma(n, a)$ has a 4-cycle. As $\Gamma(n, a)$ is edge-transitive (by Theorem 3.3), without loss of generality, we can assume that it has $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 2)$ as two of its adjacent vertices. Now, the other three neighbours of $(0, 0)$ are $X = \{(b, 1), (-b, 1), (-1, 2)\}$ and that of $(1, 2)$ are $Y = \{(2b, 0), (a + 1, 1), (a - 1, 1)\}$. To reach a contradiction, it suffices to show that $X$ and $Y$ does not have any edge between them.

We start with $(2b, 0) \in Y$. If $(2b, 0) \sim (-1, 2)$, then by the adjacency criterion, we have $2ab \pm 1 \equiv -1 \pmod{n}$, i.e., $-1 \equiv 3, 1 \pmod{n}$, i.e., $n$ divides 2 or 4, a contradiction. If $(2b, 0) \sim (b, 1)$, then by the adjacency criterion, we have $ab \pm 1 \equiv 2b \pmod{n}$, i.e., $2b \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$. Now, $2b \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ implies that $b$ is zero divisor in $\mathbb{Z}_n$, a contradiction. So, let $2b \equiv 2 \pmod{n}$. If $n$ is odd, this implies $b \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$, a contradiction. If $n = 2m$ is even, then this implies $b \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$, i.e., $b = m + 1$ (as $b \neq 1$). However, this in turn implies $b^3 = m(m^2 + m + 3) + 1$. Note that $m^2 + m + 3$ is odd irrespective of $m$ is odd/even.
Thus \(b^3 \neq 1 \mod 2m\), a contradiction. Thus, \((2b, 0) \not\sim (b, 1)\). Similarly, it can be shown that \((2b, 0) \not\sim (–b, 1)\). Thus \((2b, 0)\) is not adjacent to any vertices in \(X\).

Now, let us consider \((a + 1, 1) \in Y\). The only possible neighbour of \((a + 1, 1)\) in \(X\) is \((-1, 2)\). If \((a + 1, 1) \sim (-1, 2)\), then we have \((a + 1)b \pm b \equiv -1 \mod n\). As \(-1 \neq 1 \mod n\), we have \(1 + 2b \equiv -1 \mod n\), i.e., \(2b \equiv -2 \mod n\). But, as in previous case, this leads to a contradiction, thereby establishing that \((a + 1, 1) \not\sim (-1, 2)\).

Similarly, it can be shown that \((a – 1, 1) \in Y\) has no neighbour in \(X\). Hence the lemma follows.

\[\square\]

**Corollary 2.4.** If \(n\) is even, then girth of \(\Gamma(n, a)\) is 6.

**Proof:** This follows from Theorem 2.1, Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3.

**Lemma 2.5.** If \(9 | n\), then \(\Gamma(n, a)\) is triangle-free.

**Proof:** If possible, let \(\Gamma(n, a)\) contains a triangle. As \(\Gamma(n, a)\) is edge-transitive, without loss of generality, we can assume that two of the vertices of the triangle are \((0, 0)\) and \((1, 2)\). Then the third vertex is of the form \((x, 1)\). As it is adjacent to \((0, 0)\), \(x \equiv \pm b \mod n\) and as it is adjacent to \((1, 2)\), \(x \equiv a + 1 \mod n\). Combining these two, we get \(x \equiv a + 1 \equiv \pm b \equiv a^2 \mod n\). Thus, we have four cases:

**Case 1:** \(a – 1 \equiv a^2 \mod n\). In this case, multiplying both sides by \(a\), we have \(a^2 – a \equiv 1 \mod n\), i.e., \(n \not| 2\), a contradiction.

**Case 2:** \(a + 1 \equiv a^2 \mod n\). In this case, multiplying both sides by \(a\), we have \(a^2 + a \equiv 1 \mod n\), i.e., \(2a \equiv 0 \mod n\), a contradiction, as \(a\) is not a zero-divisor.

**Case 3:** \(a – 1 \equiv -a^2 \mod n\). In this case, multiplying both sides by \(a\), we have \(a^2 – a \equiv -1 \mod n\), i.e., \(2a \equiv 2 \mod n\). Again, as in the proof of Lemma 2.3, we reach a contradiction.

**Case 4:** \(a + 1 \equiv -a^2 \mod n\), i.e., \(a^2 + a + 1 \equiv 0 \mod n\). As \(9 | n\), we have \(9 | (a^2 + a + 1)\). Moreover, as \(a\) is a unit in \(\mathbb{Z}_n\), we have \(gcd(9, a) = 1\). Thus \(a\) is of the form \(9k + i\), where \(i = 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8\). Now, it can be checked for all such choices of \(i\), \(a^2 + a + 1\) is not a multiple of \(9\), a contradiction.

Combining all the cases, the lemma holds.

\[\square\]

**Lemma 2.6.** Let \(9 | n\). Then girth of \(\Gamma(n, a)\) = \(\begin{cases} 5 & \text{if } n = 9 \\ 6 & \text{if } n \neq 9 \end{cases}\)

**Proof:** If \(n\) is an even multiple of 9, then the lemma follows from Corollary 2.4. So, we assume that \(n = 9k\) where \(k\) is odd. Clearly \((0, 0) \sim (1, 2) \sim (5, 1) \sim (6, 2) \sim (7, 1) \sim (0, 0)\) is a 5-cycle in \(\Gamma(9, 4)\), the Holt graph. Thus from Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.5, it follows that girth of \(\Gamma(9, 4)\) is 5.

If possible, let \(n = 9k\) where \(k \geq 3\) is an odd number and girth of \(\Gamma(n, a)\) is 5. Let \(C\) be a 5-cycle in \(\Gamma(n, a)\). As \(\Gamma(n, a)\) is edge-transitive (by Theorem 3.3), without loss of generality, we can assume that \(C\) has \((0, 0)\) and \((1, 2)\) as two of its adjacent vertices. Let \(X = \{(-1, 2), (b, 1), (-b, 1)\}\) be the other three neighbours of \((0, 0)\) and \(Y = \{(2a^2, 0), (a + 1, 1), (a – 1, 1)\}\) be the other three neighbours of \((1, 2)\). Since \(C\) is a 5-cycle, some vertex in \(X\) and some vertex in \(Y\) must have a common neighbour.
We will show that this is not possible. As each $X$ and $Y$ has 3 vertices, we need to check that all possible 9 pairs do not have any common neighbour. However, as the proof technique is similar for all the pairs, we show it only for one pair, namely $(b, 1) = (a^2, 1)$ and $(a + 1, 1)$. The common neighbour, if any, of $(a^2, 1)$ and $(a + 1, 1)$, is of the form $(x, 0)$ or $(x, 2)$.

**Case 1:** Let $(x, 0)$ be the common neighbour of $(a^2, 1)$ and $(a + 1, 1)$. Then, by the adjacency criterion, we have $x \equiv a^3 + 1 \equiv a^2 + a + 1 \pmod{n}$, i.e., $a^2 + a + 1 \equiv 0$ or $2 \pmod{n}$. If $a^2 + a + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$, then we land in Case 3 or Case 4 of the proof of Lemma 2.5 and hence a contradiction. If $a^2 + a + 1 \equiv 2 \pmod{n}$, then also we land in Case 3 of Lemma 2.5 and hence a contradiction. If $a^2 + a - 1 \equiv 2 \pmod{n}$, i.e., $a^2 + a - 3 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$, then multiplying both sides by $a$, we get $a^2 - 3a + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$. Hence, subtracting on equation from the other, we have $2(1 - a) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$. Now, as $n$ is odd, this implies $a \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$, a contradiction to the fact that $o(a) = 3$ in $\mathbb{Z}_n^*$.

**Case 2:** Let $(x, 1)$ be the common neighbour of $(a^2, 1)$ and $(a + 1, 1)$. Then, by the adjacency criterion, we have $x \equiv 1 + a^2 \equiv a \equiv a^2 \pmod{n}$, i.e., $a + a^2 \equiv 1$ or $1 + 2a^2 \pmod{n}$. If $a \equiv a^2 \equiv 1$, then we reach either Case 1 or Case 3 of the proof of Lemma 2.5 and hence a contradiction. Also, if $a + a^2 \equiv 1 + 2a^2 \pmod{n}$, we reach Case 1 of the proof of Lemma 2.5 and hence a contradiction. If $a - a^2 \equiv 1 + 2a \pmod{n}$, i.e., $3a^2 - a + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$, then multiplying both sides by $a$, we get $a^2 - a - 3 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$. Subtracting one equation from the other yields $2(2a + 1) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$. As $n$ is odd, this implies $2a \equiv -1 \pmod{n}$. Cubing both the sides, we get $8 \equiv 8a^3 \equiv -1 \pmod{n}$, which is possible only if $n = 9$, a contradiction.

Finally, combining both the cases, the lemma holds.

3. Automorphisms of $\Gamma(n, a)$

Let $G = \text{Aut}(\Gamma(n, a))$. We start by noting the following automorphisms of $\Gamma(n, a)$.

$$
\alpha : (i, j) \mapsto (i + a^{-j}, j); \quad \beta : (i, j) \mapsto (i, j + 1); \quad \gamma : (i, j) \mapsto (-i, j);
$$

It can be shown that $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in G$ and $o(\alpha) = n, o(\beta) = 3$ and $o(\gamma) = 2$. Moreover, we have the following relations: $\alpha\beta = \beta\alpha^2$, $\alpha\gamma = \gamma\alpha^{-1}$ and $\beta\gamma = \gamma\beta$.

**Theorem 3.1.** $\Gamma(n, a)$ is a Cayley graph.

**Proof:** Let $H = \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle$. Clearly it forms a subgroup of $G$. Also as $o(\alpha) = n, o(\beta) = 3$ and $\alpha\beta = \beta\alpha^2$, we have

$$
H = \{\alpha^i\beta^j : 0 \leq i \leq n - 1, 0 \leq j \leq 2\} \text{ and } |H| = 3n = |\Gamma(n, a)|.
$$

We will show that $H$ acts regularly on $\Gamma(n, a)$. As $|H| = |\Gamma(n, a)|$, it is enough to show that $H$ acts transitively on $\Gamma(n, a)$. As $i \mapsto i + a^{-j}$ is a permutation of $\mathbb{Z}_n$ order $n$ and $j \mapsto j + 1$ is a permutation of $\mathbb{Z}_3$ order 3, the action of $H$ on $\Gamma(n, a)$ is transitive.

Note that $H$ is a semidirect product of $\langle \alpha \rangle$ and $\langle \beta \rangle$, as $\beta^{-1}\alpha\beta = \alpha^2$ and $a^2$ and $n$ are coprime, and $\Gamma(n, a) = \text{Cay}(H, S)$ where $S = \{\beta^2\alpha, \beta^2\alpha^{-1}, \beta\alpha^b, \beta\alpha^{-b}\}$. We now recall a result on hamiltonicity of Cayley graphs.
Theorem 3.2 ([10], Theorem 3.3). Every connected Cayley graph of a semidirect product of a cyclic group of prime order by an abelian group of odd order is Hamiltonian.

Corollary 3.1. \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is Hamiltonian, if \( n \) is odd.

**Proof:** By Theorem 3.1, we have \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is a Cayley graph on \( H \) and \( H \) is a semidirect product of cyclic group of order 3, namely \( \langle \beta \rangle \) and another cyclic group of odd order \( n \), namely \( \langle \alpha \rangle \). Thus, by Theorem 3.2 \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is Hamiltonian.  

Theorem 3.3. \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is edge-transitive.

**Proof:** As \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is Cayley, it is vertex-transitive. Hence, it is enough to show that any two edges incident to \((0,0)\) can be permuted by an automorphism. As \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is tetravalent, the four vertices adjacent to \((0,0)\) are namely: \((1,2), (-1,2), (b,1)\) and \((-b,1)\). Let us name the following edges:

\[
\begin{align*}
  e_1 : & \quad (0,0) \sim (1,2) & e_2 : & \quad (0,0) \sim (-1,2) \\
  e_3 : & \quad (0,0) \sim (b,1) & e_4 : & \quad (0,0) \sim (-b,1)
\end{align*}
\]

It is to be noted that \( \gamma(e_1) = e_2, \alpha \beta \gamma(e_1) = \vec{e}_3 \) and \( \gamma \alpha \beta \gamma(e_1) = \vec{e}_4 \). The reverse arrow on top denote that the orientation of the edge changed. Hence, the theorem.

For \( n = 7, 14 \), SageMath [11] computation shows that \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is arc-transitive. Next we prove that \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is not arc-transitive if \( n \neq 7, 14 \). For that, we show that there does not exist any graph automorphism \( \varphi \) which maps the arc \( e_3 \) to \( e_1 \), i.e., \( \varphi((0,0)) = (0,0) \) and \( \varphi((b,1)) = (1,2) \).

If possible, let such an automorphism \( \varphi \) exists with \( \varphi((0,0)) = (0,0) \) and \( \varphi((b,1)) = (1,2) \). As \((1,2)\) is adjacent to \((0,0)\), its image under \( \varphi \) should be one among \((b,1), (-b,1), (-1,2)\). However, the next theorem shows that this can not hold.

Theorem 3.4. If \( \varphi \) is an automorphism of \( \Gamma(n, a) \) such that \( n \neq 7, 14 \) and \( \varphi((0,0)) = (0,0) \) and \( \varphi((b,1)) = (1,2) \), then \( \varphi((1,2)) \notin \{(b,1), (-b,1), (-1,2)\} \).

Thus, from Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.4, we get the desired result as follows:

Theorem 3.5. \( \Gamma(n, a) \) is half-transitive if \( n \neq 7, 14 \).

4. Proof of Theorem 3.4

To prove Theorem 3.4, we prove a lemma and three theorems. Throughout this section, \( \varphi \) denote an automorphism of \( \Gamma(n, a) \) and \( G \) denote the full automorphism group of \( \Gamma(n, a) \).

**Lemma 4.1.** The following relations can not hold.

1. \( 2a - 4b = 0 \), 2. \( 2a + 4b = 0 \) except \( n = 9 \), 3. \( 4a - 2b = 0 \) except \( n = 7, 14 \), 4. \( 4a + 2b = 0 \) except \( n = 18 \), 5. \( 2a - 2b = 0 \), 6. \( 2a + 2b = 0 \), 7. \( 4a + 4 = 0 \), 8. \( 2a + 6 = 0 \), 9. \( 2(a + b - 1) = 0 \), 10. \( 2(b - a + 1) = 0 \), 11. \( 2(a - b + 1) = 0 \), 12. \( 2(a + b + 2) = 0 \), 13. \( 2(a - b - 2) = 0 \).

**Proof:** 1. \( 2a - 4b \), i.e., \( 8 = 64 \), i.e., \( 56 = 0 \), i.e., \( n \mid 56 \), hence \( n = 7, 14, 28, 56 \) and...
the possible values of $b$ are $4, 11, 25, 25$ respectively. In all these cases $2b \neq 4$, which is a contradiction.

2. $2a + 4b = 0$, i.e., $8 = -64$, i.e., $72 = 0$, i.e., $n \mid 72$, hence $n = 9, 18, 36, 72$ and the possible values of $b$ are $7, 13, 25, 49$. But the relation holds only if $n = 9$ and $b = 7$.

3. $4a - 2b = 0$, $8 = 64$, i.e., $56 = 0$, i.e., $n \mid 56$, hence $n = 7, 14, 28, 56$ and the possible values of $(a, b)$ are $(2, 4), (9, 11), (9, 25), (9, 25)$ respectively. But the relation holds only if $n = 7, 14$.

4. $4a + 2b = 0$, i.e., $64 = -8$, i.e., $72 = 0$, i.e., $n \mid 72$, hence $n = 9, 18, 36, 72$ and the possible values of $(a, b)$ are $(4, 7), (7, 13), (13, 25), (25, 49)$ respectively. But the relation holds only if $n = 18$.

5. $2a - 2b = 0$, i.e., $2a \equiv 2(\text{mod } n)$. If $n$ is odd then $a = 1$, which is impossible. Let $n$ be even and $n = 2m$. Then we have $m \mid a - 1$, i.e., $a = mt + 1$, for some $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. As $a \neq 1$ so $a = m + 1$, i.e., $a^3 - 1 = m(m^2 + 3m + 3)$. Note that irrespective of $m$ is odd or even, $(m^2 + 3m + 3)$ is odd, say $(2s + 1)$, for some $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. So we have $a^3 - 1 = m(2s + 1)$, i.e., $a^3 - 1 \equiv m(\text{mod } n)$, which is a contradiction.

6. The proof is same as 5.

7. $4a + 4 = 0$, i.e., $4a \equiv -4(\text{mod } n)$. If $n$ is odd then $a = -1$, which is impossible. Let $n$ be even and $n = 2m$, then we have $m \mid 2(a + 1)$, i.e., $2a = mt - 2$, for some $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. As $2a \neq -2$ so $2a = m - 2$, i.e., $8(a^3 - 1) = m(m^2 - 6m + 12) - 16$. If $m$ is even then $(m^2 - 6m + 12)$ is even, say $2u$, for some $u \in \mathbb{Z}$. So we have $8(a^3 - 1) = 2mu - 16$, i.e., $8(a^3 - 1) \equiv -16(\text{mod } n)$, which is a contradiction. If $m$ is odd then $(m^2 - 6m + 12)$ is odd, say $2v + 1$, for some $u \in \mathbb{Z}$. So we have $8(a^3 - 1) = m(2v + 1) - 16$, i.e., $8(a^3 - 1) \equiv m - 16(\text{mod } n)$, which is a contradiction as $m \neq 16$.

8. $2a + 6 = 0$, i.e., $8 = -216$, i.e., $224 = 0$, i.e., $n \mid 224$, i.e., $n = 7, 14, 28, 56, 112, 224$. However, in all these cases, the possible values of $a$ does not allow $2a + 6 = 0$.

9. $2(a + b - 1) = 0$, i.e., $2(1 + a - b) = 0$, i.e., $4a = 0$, contradicting that $a$ is a unit.

10. The proof is same as 9.

11. $2(a - b + 1) = 0$, i.e., $2(1 - a + b) = 0$, i.e., $2(a - b + 1) + 2(1 - a + b) = 0$, i.e., $4 = 0$, which is a contradiction.

12. $2(a + b + 2) = 0$, i.e., $2(a + 2b) = 0$, i.e., $4(a + b + 2) - 2(1 + a + 2b) = 0$, i.e., $2(a + 3) = 0$, i.e., $8 = -216$, i.e., $224 = 0$, i.e., $n \mid 224$, i.e., $n = 7, 14, 28, 56, 112, 224$. In all these cases $2a + 6 \neq 0$, which is a contradiction.

13. $2(a - b - 2) = 0$, i.e., $2(1 - a - 2b) = 0$, i.e., $2(a - b - 2) + 2(1 - a - 2b) = 0$, i.e., $6b + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a + 6 = 0$. Rest of the proof is same as 8.

Theorem 4.1. If $\varphi \in G$ and $\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0), \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2), \varphi((1, 2)) = (-1, 2)$ then $n = 7$ or 14.

Proof: Consider the cycle $C : (0, 0) \sim (b, 1) \sim (a + b, 2) \sim (1 + a + b, 0) \sim (a + 1, 1) \sim (1, 2) \sim (0, 0)$. Then $\varphi(C) : (0, 0) \sim (1, 2) \sim \varphi((a + b, 2)) \sim \varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \sim \varphi((a + 1, 1)) \sim (-1, 2) \sim (0, 0)$. As $\varphi((a + b, 2)) \sim (1, 2)$ and $\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0)$ so $\varphi((a + b, 2)) \in \{(2b, 0), (a \pm 1, 1)\}$. Again, since $\varphi((a + 1, 1)) \sim (-1, 2)$ and $\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0)$ imply $\varphi((a + 1, 1)) \in \{(-2b, 0), (-a \pm 1, 1)\}$. Also $\varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \sim \varphi((a + b, 2))$ and
\[ \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2) \] imply

\[ \varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \in \{(2a \pm b, 1), (3, 2), (1 + 2b, 2), (b + a \pm 1, 0), (1 - 2b, 2), (b - a \pm 1, 0)\}. \tag{1} \]

If \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (-2b, 0) \) then \( \varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \sim \varphi((a + 1, 1)) \) and \( \varphi((1, 2)) = (-1, 2) \) imply

\[ \varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \in \{(-3, 2), (-2a \pm b, 1)\} \tag{2} \]

From the Equations 1 and 2 we have,

- either \(-3 = 3\), i.e., \(6 = 0\), i.e., \(n = 6\) which is impossible.
- or \(-3 = 1 + 2b\), i.e., \(2a + 4b = 0\), which is possible only when \(n = 9\), (by Lemma 4.1). However, direct Sagemath computation for \(n = 9\) shows that such \(\varphi\) does not exist.
- or \(-3 = 1 - 2b\), i.e., \(2a - 4b = 0\), which is impossible by Lemma 4.1.
- or \(-2a \pm b = 2a \pm b\), i.e., \(4a = 0\) or \(4a - 2b = 0\) or \(4a + 2b = 0\). Though the first one is impossible, the other two can hold only if \(n = 7, 14, 18\) (by Lemma 4.1). However, direct Sagemath computation for \(n = 7, 14, 18\) shows that such \(\varphi\) does not exist.

Hence \(\varphi((a + 1, 1)) \neq (-2b, 0)\).

If \(\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (-a + 1, 1)\), then \(\varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \sim \varphi((a + 1, 1)) \) and \(\varphi((1, 2)) = (-1, 2) \) imply

\[ \varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \in \{(-1 + 2b, 2), (-b + a \pm 1, 0)\} \tag{3} \]

From the Equations 1 and 3 we have

- either \(-b + a \pm 1 = b - a \pm 1\), i.e., \(2(a - b) = 0\) or \(2(b - a + 1) = 0\) or \(2(b - a - 1) = 0\), all of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.
- or \(-b + a \pm 1 = b + a \pm 1\), i.e., \(2b = 0\) or \(2a - 2b = 0\) or \(2a + 2b = 0\), all of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.
- or \(-1 + 2b = 3\), i.e., \(2a - 4b = 0\), which is impossible by Lemma 4.1.
- or \(-1 + 2b = 1 + 2b\), i.e., \(2 = 0\), which is a contradiction.
- or \(-1 + 2b = 1 - 2b\), i.e., \(4a - 2b = 0\) which can hold only if \(n = 7\) or \(14\). (by Lemma 4.1) However, direct Sagemath computation for \(n = 7, 14\) shows that such \(\varphi\) does not exist.

Hence \(\varphi((a + 1, 1)) \neq (-a + 1, 1)\).

If \(\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (-a - 1, 1)\) then \(\varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \sim \varphi((a + 1, 1)) \) and \(\varphi((1, 2)) = (-1, 2) \) imply

\[ \varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \in \{(-1 - 2b, 2), (-b - a \pm 1, 0)\} \tag{4} \]

From the Equations 1 and 4 we have
From the Equations 5 and 7 we have,\[\phi(a) = (1 + 2b, 0)\]

Again \[\phi(a) = b - a \pm 1\]

or \[a = 2\pm\] which is a contradiction.

or \[b = 2\pm\] all of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.

or \[b = 2\pm\] (which are impossible by Lemma 4.1), but \[2(1+a+b) = 0\] may hold.

Therefore we have \[\phi((1+a+b,0)) = (1+a+b,0)\], \[\phi((a+1,1)) = (-a-1,1)\], \[\phi((a+b,2)) = (a+1,1)\] with \[2(a+b+1) = 0\].

Consider the cycle \[C' : (1+a+b,0) \sim (a+1,1) \sim (1+2b,2) \sim (2a,0) \sim (b+2,1) \sim (a+b,2) \sim (1+a+b,0)\]. Then \[\phi(C') : (1+a+b,0) \sim (-a-1,1) \sim \phi((1+2b,2)) \sim \phi((2a,0)) \sim \phi((b+2,1)) \sim (a+1,1) \sim (1+a+b,0)\].

Now \[\phi((b+2,1)) \sim (a+1,1), \phi((1+a+b,0)) = (1+a+b,0)\] and \[\phi((b,1)) = (1,2)\] imply \[\phi((b+2,1)) \in \{(1+2b,2)\} = 0, (b+a-1,0)\].

Again \[\phi((1+2b,2)) \sim (-a-1,1), \phi((a+b+1,0)) = (a+b+1,0) = (-a-b-1,0)\] and \[\phi((b,1)) = (1,2)\] imply \[\phi((1+2b,2)) \in \{(-1-2b,2), (-b-a+1,0)\}\] and \[\phi((a+1,1)) = (a+1,1)\] imply

\[\phi((2a,0)) \in \{b+2a \pm b,0\}, (a+1,1), (a+1-2b,1), (1+b-a \pm 1,2)\]. \[\phi((2a,0)) \in \{(-1-2b,2), (-b-a+1,0)\}\]

Let \[\phi((1+2b,2)) = (-1-2b,2)\]. \[\phi((2a,0)) \sim \phi((1+2b,2))\] and \[\phi((a+1,1)) = (-a-1,1)\] imply

\[\phi((2a,0)) \in \{(-1-2b,2), (-b-a+1,0)\}\]

From the Equations 5 and 6 we have

- either \[-2-2b = 3,\ i.e., 2a+4b = 0,\ which\ can\ hold\ only\ if\ n = 9.\] (by Lemma 4.1).
  However, direct Sagemath computation rules out this possibility.

- or \[-2-2b = 1+2b,\ i.e., 4a+2b = 0,\ which\ can\ hold\ only\ if\ n = 18.\] (by Lemma 4.1).
  However, direct Sagemath computation rules out this possibility.

- or \[-2-2b = 1-2b,\ i.e., 2 = 0,\ which\ is\ a\ contradiction.

- or \[-2-a = 1 = b-a \pm 1,\ i.e., 2b = 0,\ or 2a+2b = 0, \ or 2a-2b = 0\ all\ of\ which\ are\ impossible\ by\ Lemma 4.1.

- or \[-2-a = 1 = b+a \pm 1,\ i.e., 2(b+a-1) = 0\ or 2(b+a) = 0\ (which\ are\ impossible\ by\ Lemma 4.1),\ but 2(1+a+b) = 0\ may\ hold.

Hence \[\phi((1+2b,2)) = (-1-2b,2)\] is possible only if \[n = 7\] or \[14\]. Moreover, direct Sagemath computation for \[n = 7\] and \[14\] confirms the possibility.

Let \[\phi((1+2b,2)) = (-b-a+1,0)\]. \[\phi((2a,0)) \sim \phi((1+2b,2))\] and \[\phi((a+1,1)) = (-a-1,1)\] imply

\[\phi((2a,0)) \in \{(-a-1+2b,1), (-1-b+a \pm 1,2)\}.\] \[\phi((2a,0)) \in \{(-a-1+2b,1), (-1-b+a \pm 1,2)\}.\]}

From the Equations 5 and 7 we have,
• either \(-1 - b + a \pm 1 = 1 + b - a \pm 1\), i.e., \(2(b - a + 1) = 0\) or \(2(a - b) = 0\) or \(2(a - b - 2) = 0\), all of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.

• or \(-a - 1 + 2b = a + 1 - 2b\), i.e., \(2(a + 1 - 2b) = 0\), i.e., \(2(a + b - 2) = 0\). Hence combining \(2(a + b + 1) = 0\) and \(2(a + b - 2) = 0\), we have \(6 = 0\), which is impossible.

• or \(-a - 1 + 2b = a + 3\), i.e., \(2(a + b - 2) = 0\). Therefore from \(2(a + b + 1) = 0\) and \(2(a + b - 2) = 0\) we have \(2a = 4\), i.e., \(n = 7\) or 14.

Hence \(\varphi((1 + 2b, 2)) = (-b - a + 1, 0)\) may be possible if \(n = 7\) or 14. Moreover, direct Sagemath computation for \(n = 7\) and 14 confirms the possibility.

Therefore for \(\varphi \in G\) we can have \(\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0)\), \(\varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2)\), \(\varphi((1, 2)) = (-1, 2)\) only if \(n = 7\) or 14.

**Theorem 4.2.** If \(\varphi \in G\) and \(\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0)\), \(\varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2)\) then \(\varphi((1, 2)) \neq (b, 1)\).

**Proof:** If possible let \(\varphi \in G\) and \(\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0)\), \(\varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2)\) and \(\varphi((1, 2)) = (-b, 1)\). Consider the cycle \(C : (0, 0) \sim (b, 1) \sim (a + b, 2) \sim (1 + a + b, 0) \sim (a + 1, 1) \sim (1, 2) \sim (0, 0)\). Therefore for \(\varphi \in G\) we have \(\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0)\), \(\varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2)\) and \(\varphi((1, 2)) = (-b, 1)\). Hence \(\varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \in \{(2a + b, 1), (3, 2), (1 + 2b, 2), (b + a + 1, 0), (1 - 2b, 2), (b - a + 1, 0)\}\). (8)

Depending upon the value of \(\varphi((a + 1, 1))\), one of the three cases, namely (Case A: \(\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (-2, 0)\), (Case B: \(\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (-a - b, 2)\) and (Case C: \(\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (-a + b, 2)\)) must hold. However, before resolving this three cases, we prove a claim which will be crucial in the following proof.

**Claim:** \(\varphi((-1 - a - b, 0)) \in \{(-2a + b, 1), (-3, 2), (-1 + 2b, 2), (-b + a + 1, 0), (-1 - 2b, 2), (-b - a + 1, 0), (2a + 1, 2), (3b, 1), (b + 2, 1), (1 + a \pm b, 0), (b - 2, 1), (1 - a \pm b, 0)\}\).

**Proof of Claim:** As \((-b, 1) \sim (0, 0)\) and \((-1, 2) \sim (0, 0)\), we have \(\varphi((-b, 1))\), \(\varphi((-1, 2)) \in \{(b, 1), (-1, 2)\}\).

**Case 1:** \(\varphi((-b, 1)) = (-1, 2)\) and \(\varphi((-1, 2)) = (b, 1)\). Consider the cycle \(C' : (0, 0) \sim (-b, 1) \sim (-a - b, 2) \sim (-1 - a - b, 0) \sim (-a - 1, 1) \sim (-1, 2) \sim (0, 0)\), then \(\varphi(C') : (0, 0) \sim (-1, 2) \sim \varphi((-a - b, 2)) \sim \varphi((-1 - a - b, 0)) \sim \varphi((-a - 1, 1)) \sim (b, 1) \sim (0, 0)\). As \(\varphi((-a - b, 2)) \sim (-1, 2)\) and \(\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0)\) so \(\varphi((-a - b, 2)) \in \{ (2b, 0), (-a + 1, 1)\}\).

Now \(\varphi((-1 - a - b, 0)) \sim \varphi((-a - b, 2)) \) and \(\varphi((-b, 1)) = (-1, 2)\) imply

\(\varphi((-1 - a - b, 0)) \in \{(-2a + b, 1), (-3, 2), (-1 + 2b, 2), (-b + a + 1, 0), (-1 - 2b, 2), (-b - a + 1, 0)\}\). (9)

**Case 2:** \(\varphi((-b, 1)) = (b, 1)\) and \(\varphi((-1, 2)) = (-1, 2)\). Consider the cycle \(C' : (0, 0) \sim (-b, 1) \sim (-a - b, 2) \sim (-1 - a - b, 0) \sim (-a - 1, 1) \sim (-1, 2) \sim (0, 0)\), then
\(\varphi(C') : (0, 0) \sim (b, 1) \sim \varphi((-a-b, 2)) \sim \varphi((-1-a-b, 0)) \sim \varphi((-a-1, 1)) \sim (b, 1) \sim (0, 0).\)

As \(\varphi((-a-b, 2)) \sim (b, 1)\) and \(\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0)\) so \(\varphi((-a-b, 2)) \in \{(a \pm b, 2)\}.\)

\(\varphi((-a-1, 1)) \sim (-1, 2)\) and \(\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0)\) imply \(\varphi((-a-1, 1)) \in \{(-2b, 0), (-a+1, 1)\}.\)

Now \(\varphi((-1-a-b, 0)) \sim \varphi((-a-b, 2))\) and \(\varphi((-b, 1)) = (b, 1)\) imply

\[\varphi((-1-a-b, 0)) \in \{(2a \pm 1, 2), (3b, 1), (b+2, 1), (1+a \pm b, 0), (b-2, 1), (1-a \pm b, 0)\}.\] (10)

Combining Case 1 and 2, the claim follows.

Now, we turn towards the three cases mentioned earlier.

**Case A:** If \(\varphi((a+1, 1)) = (-2, 0)\) then \(\varphi((1+a+b, 0)) \sim \varphi((a+1, 1))\) and \(\varphi((1, 2)) = (-b, 1)\) imply

\[\varphi((1+a+b, 0)) \in \{(-3b, 1), (-2a \pm 1, 2)\}\] (11)

From the Equations 8 and 11 we have,

- either \(-3b = 2a \pm b\), i.e., \(-2b = 2a\) or \(2b = -4\). By Lemma 4.1, this can hold only if \(n = 9\). However, direct SageMath computation for \(n = 9\) show that such \(\varphi\) does not exist.

- or \(-2a \pm 1 = 3\), i.e., \(-2a = 4\) or \(-2a = 2\), i.e., \(4a + 2b = 0\) or \(2a + 2b = 0\). By Lemma 4.1, \(2a + 2b = 0\) can not hold and \(4a + 2b = 0\) can hold only if \(n = 18\). However, direct SageMath computation for \(n = 18\) shows that such \(\varphi\) does not exist.

- or \(-2a \pm 1 = 1 - 2b\), i.e., \(2a = 2b\), \(2(b - a - 1) = 0\), both of which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1

- or \(-2a \pm 1 = 1 + 2b\), i.e., \(2a + 2b = 0\) (which is impossible by the Lemma 4.1) but

\[2a + 2b + 2 = 0\] may hold. (12)

When \(\varphi((a+1, 1)) = (-2, 0)\), \(\varphi((1+a+b, 0)) = (1+2b, 2)\), \(\varphi((a+b, 2)) = (a+1, 1)\) then we have the Equation 12. As \(2a + 2b + 2 = 0\), i.e., \(a + b + 1 = -a - b - 1\), then \(\varphi((-1-a-b, 0)) = (1+2b, 2)\). But from the Equations 9 and 10 we have \(\varphi((-1-a-b, 0)) \neq (1+2b, 2)\), which is a contradiction. Hence \(\varphi((a+1, 1)) \neq (-2, 0)\) and **Case A** can not hold.

**Case B:** If \(\varphi((a+1, 1)) = (-a - b, 2)\) then \(\varphi((1+a+b, 0)) \sim \varphi((a+1, 1))\) and \(\varphi((1, 2)) = (-b, 1)\) imply

\[\varphi((1+a+b, 0)) \in \{(-b-2, 1), (-1-a \pm b, 0)\}\] (13)

From the Equations 8 and 13 we have, **Case B(1):** either \(-b - 2 = 2a \pm b\), i.e., \(2a + 2b = 0\), which is impossible by the Lemma 4.1 or

\[2a + 2b + 2 = 0\] may hold. (14)
Case B(3): or we have \(-1 - a \pm b = b - a \pm 1\), i.e., \(2a + 2b = 0\) or \(2a = 0\) which are impossible by Lemma 4.1 but \(-1 - a - b = b + a + 1\), i.e.,

\[
2a + 2b + 2 = 0 \text{ may hold.} \tag{15}
\]

Case B(3): or we have \(-1 - a \pm b = b - a \pm 1\). This gives rise to four equations, out of which three are impossible by Lemma 4.1 namely \(2 = 0, 2b = 0\) and \(2a + 2b = 0\). The only possibility which remains is \(-1 - a + b = b - a - 1\) and it is an identity.

So assuming this identity, we have \(\varphi((a+1, 1)) = (-a-b, 2), \varphi((a+b+1, 0)) = (b-a-1, 0)\) and \(\varphi((a+b, 2)) = (a-1, 1)\). Similarly we can show that \(\varphi((a-1, 1)) = (-a+b, 2), \varphi((b-a+1, 0)) = (b+a-1, 0)\) and \(\varphi((a-b, 2)) = (a+1, 1)\). Now \(\varphi((a+b, 2)) = (a-1, 1)\), \(\varphi((a-b, 2)) = (a+1, 1)\) and \(\varphi((2, 0)) \sim \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2)\) imply \(\varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0)\).

Now, consider the cycle \(C_2 : (a+b+1, 0) \sim (a+1, 1) \sim (1, 2) \sim (2b, 0) \sim (2a+b, 1) \sim (a+b+2, 2) \sim (a+b+1, 0)\). So \(\varphi(C_2) : (b-a-1, 0) \sim (-a-b, 2) \sim (-b, 1) \sim \varphi((2b, 0)) \sim \varphi((2a+b, 1)) \sim \varphi((a+b+2, 2)) \sim (b-a-1, 0)\).

Again \(\varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0), \varphi((a+1, 1)) = (-a-b, 2)\) and \(\varphi((2b, 0)) \sim (-b, 1)\) imply \(\varphi((2b, 0)) \in \{-a+b, 2, -2, 0\}\). And \(\varphi((a+b, 2)) = (a-1, 1)\), \(\varphi((a+1, 1)) = (-a-b, 2)\) and \(\varphi((a+b+2, 2)) \sim (b-a-1, 0)\) imply \(\varphi((a+b+2, 2)) \in \{-b-a+2, 2, -1-2b+a, 1\}\).

Case B(3)(a): If \(\varphi((a+b+2, 2)) = (-b-a+2, 2)\) then \(\varphi((a+b+1, 0)) = (b-a-1, 0)\) and \(\varphi((2a+b, 1)) \sim \varphi((a+b+2, 2))\) imply

\[
\varphi((2a+b, 1)) \in \{(a-1+3b, 0), (-1-b+2a \pm 1, 1)\}. \tag{17}
\]

From the Equations 16 and 17 we have,

- either \(-1-b+2a \pm 1 = -b+2\), which imply either \(2a-2b = 0\) which is impossible by Lemma 4.1 or \(4a-2b = 0\) which is possible only for \(n = 7\) or 14. However, direct SageMath computation for \(n = 7\) and 14 show that such \(\varphi\) does not exist.

- or \(-1-a+3b = -1-a \pm b\), i.e., \(2a+4b = 0\) which is possible only for \(n = 9\) or \(2a+2b = 0\), which is impossible by Lemma 4.1. And finally direct SageMath computation for \(n = 9\) show that such \(\varphi\) does not exist.

- or \(-1-b+2a \pm 1 = -3b\), i.e., \(2a+2b = 0\) or \(2a+2b-2 = 0\), both of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.

Hence \(\varphi((a+b+2, 2)) \neq (-b-a+2, 2)\).

Case B(3)(b): If \(\varphi((a+b+2, 2)) = (a-1-2b, 1)\), then \(\varphi((a+b+1, 0)) = (b-a-1, 0)\) and \(\varphi((2a+b, 1)) \sim \varphi((a+b+2, 2))\) imply

\[
\varphi((2a+b, 1)) \in \{(b-a-3, 0), (1-b-2a \pm b, 2)\}. \tag{18}
\]

From the Equations 16 and 18 we have,
• either \( b - a - 3 = -1 + a \pm b \), i.e., \( 2a + 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a - 2b + 2 = 0 \), both of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.

• or \( 1 - b - 2a \pm b = -2a \pm 1 \). These gives rise two four equations, out of which three are impossible by Lemma 4.1, namely \( 2 = 0 \), \( 2b = 0 \) and \( 2a - 2b = 0 \). The only possibility which remains is \( 1 - b - 2a + b = -2a + 1 \) and it is an identity.

So assuming this to be the case, we have \( \psi((2b,0)) = (-2,0) \), \( \psi((a+b+2,2)) = (a-1-2b,1) \) and \( \psi((2a+b,1)) = (-2a+1,2) \).

Now consider the cycle \( C_3 : (2b,0) \sim (2a+b,1) \sim (a+b+2,2) \sim (1+a+3b,0) \sim (3a+1,1) \sim (3,2) \sim (2b,0) \). So \( \psi(C_3) : (-2,0) \sim (-2a+1,2) \sim (a-1-2b,1) \sim \psi((1+a+3b,0)) \sim \psi((3a+1,1)) \sim \psi((3,2)) \sim (-2,0) \). Now, \( \psi((2b,0)) = (-2,0) \), \( \psi((2a+b,1)) = (-2a+1,2) \) and \( \psi((3,2)) \sim (-2,0) \) imply \( \psi((3,2)) \in \{(3b,1),(-2a-1,2)\} \).

Again \( \psi((2a+b,1)) = (-2a+1,2) \), \( \psi((a+b+1,0)) = (b-a+1,0) \) and \( \psi((1+a+3b,0)) \sim (a-1-2b,1) \) imply \( \psi((1+a+3b,0)) \in \{(1-2a-2b,2), (b-a-3,0)\} \). Finally \( \psi((2b,0)) = (-2,0) \) and \( \psi((3a+1,1)) \sim \psi((3,2)) \) imply

\[
\psi((3a+1,1)) \in \{(-4,0), (-3a \pm b,2), (-2-2b,0), (-2b-a \pm 1,1)\}.
\] (19)

**Case B(3)(b)(1):** If \( \psi((1+a+3b,0)) = (1-2a-2b,2) \) then \( \psi((3a+1,1)) \sim \psi((1+a+3b,0)) \) implies

\[
\psi((3a+1,1)) \in \{(b-2a-2b \pm 0,0), (a-2-2b \pm 1,1)\}.
\] (20)

From the Equations (19) and (20) we have,

• either \( b - 2a - 2 \pm b = -4 \), i.e., \( 2a - 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a - 2b - 2 = 0 \), both of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.

• or \( b - 2a - 2 \pm b = -2 - 2b \), i.e., \( 2a - 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a - 4b = 0 \), both of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.

• or \( a - 2 - 2b \pm 1 = -2b - a \pm 1 \), i.e. \( 2a - 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a = 0 \) or \( 4a - 2b = 0 \). By Lemma 4.1, the first two are impossible and the third one may hold only for \( n = 7 \) or 14. However, direct SageMath computation for \( n = 7 \) and 14 show that such \( \psi \) does not exist.

So we have \( \psi((1+a+3b,0)) \neq (1-2b-2a,2) \).

**Case B(3)(b)(2):** If \( \psi((1+a+3b,0)) = (b-a-3,0) \) then \( \psi((3a+1,1)) \sim \psi((1+a+3b,0)) \) implies

\[
\psi((3a+1,1)) \in \{(a-1-3b \pm b,1), (b-1-3a \pm 1,2)\}.
\] (21)

From the Equations (19) and (21) we have,

• either \( a - 1 - 3b \pm b = -2b - a \pm 1 \), i.e., \( 2a = 0 \) or \( 2a - 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a - 2b - 2 = 0 \), all of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.
or $1 - b - 3a \pm 1 = -3a \pm b$. Out of the four relations that we get, three of them (namely, $2 = 0$, $2a - 2b = 0$ and $2b = 0$) are invalid by Lemma 4.1 and the fourth is an identity, i.e., $1 - b - 3a - 1 = -3a - b$.

So we have $\varphi((3a + 1, 1)) = (-3a - b, 2)$, $\varphi((3, 2)) = (-3b, 1)$, $\varphi((a + 1 + 3b, 0)) = (b - a - 3, 0)$. Similarly we can show that $\varphi((3a - 1, 1)) = (-3a + b, 2)$ and $\varphi((-a + 1 + 3b, 0)) = (a + b - 3, 0)$.

Now $\varphi((2b, 0)) = (-2, 0)$, $\varphi((3a + 1, 1)) = (-3a - b, 2)$, $\varphi((3a - 1, 1)) = (-3a + b, 2)$ and $\varphi((4b, 0)) \sim \varphi((3, 2)) = (-3b, 1)$ imply $\varphi((4b, 0)) = (-4, 0)$.

Proceeding in this way, we can show that $\varphi((2kb, 0)) = (-2k, 0)$, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. So we have $\varphi((2, 0)) = (-2a, 0)$, where $k = a$, which is a contradiction as we have shown earlier that $\varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0)$ and $2b \neq -2a$. Therefore $\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) \neq (b - a - 1, 0)$.

**Case B(1):** When $\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (-a - b, 2)$, $\varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) = (2a + b, 1)$, $\varphi((a + b, 2)) = (2b, 0)$ then we have the Equation 14. As $2a + 2b = 0$, i.e., $a + b + 1 = a - b - 1$, then $\varphi((-1 - a - b, 0)) = (2a + b, 1)$. But from the Equations 9 and 10 we have $\varphi((-1 - a - b, 0)) \neq (2a + 1, 1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence $\varphi((+1 + a + b, 0)) \neq (2a + b, 1)$.

**Case B(2):** Now when $\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (-a - b, 2)$, $\varphi((a + b, 1, 0)) = (a + b + 1, 0)$, $\varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1)$ then we have the Equation 15. Consider the cycle $C_1 : (a + b + 1, 0) \sim (a + 1, 1) \sim (1 + 2b, 2) \sim (2a, 0) \sim (b + 2, 1) \sim (a + b, 2) \sim (a + b + 1, 0)$. Then $\varphi(C_1) : (a + b + 1, 0) \sim (-a - b, 2) \sim \varphi((1 + 2b, 2)) \sim \varphi((2a, 0)) \sim \varphi((b + 2, 1)) \sim (a + 1, 1) \sim (a + b + 1, 0)$.

Now $\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a + b + 1, 0) = (a - b - 1, 0)$, $\varphi((a, 1)) = (-b, 1)$ and $\varphi((1 + 2b, 2)) \sim (-a - b, 2)$ imply $\varphi((1 + 2b, 2)) \in \{(-1 + a + b, 0), (-b - 2, 1)\}$. Again, $\varphi((a, 1)) = (1, 2)$, $\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a + b + 1, 0)$ and $\varphi((b + 2, 1)) \sim \varphi((a + 1, 1))$ imply $\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (-a - b, 2)$ and $\varphi((2a, 0)) \sim \varphi((1 + 2b, 2))$ imply

$$\varphi((2a, 0)) \in \{(-b - 1 + a \pm b, 1), (-a - b + 2, 2), (-1 - 2a, 1, 0), (-a - 3b, 2)\}. \quad (22)$$

**Case B(2)(a):** Now if $\varphi((b + 2, 1)) = (b + a - 1, 0)$ then $\varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1)$ and $\varphi((2a, 0)) \sim \varphi((a + b, 2))$ imply

$$\varphi((2a, 0)) \in \{(a + 1 - 2b, 1, 1 + b - a \pm 1, 2)\}. \quad (23)$$

From the Equations 22 and 23 we have

- either $1 + b - a \pm 1 = -a - b + 2$, i.e., $2b = 0$ or $2a - 2b = 0$, both of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.

- or $1 + b - a \pm 1 = -a - 3b$, i.e., $4b = 0$ which is impossible or $4a + 2b = 0$, which, by Lemma 4.1 holds only if $n = 18$. However, direct SageMath computation for $n = 18$ shows that such $\varphi$ does not exist.

- or $a + 1 - 2b = -b - 1 + a \pm b$, i.e., $2 = 0$ or $2a - 2b = 0$, both of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.
Hence $\varphi((b+2,1)) \neq (b+a-1,0)$.

**Case B(2)(b):** Now if $\varphi((b+2,1)) = (1+2b,2)$ then $\varphi((a+b,2)) = (a+1,1)$ and $\varphi((2a,0)) \sim \varphi((b+2,1))$ imply

$$\varphi((2a,0)) \in \{(a+3,1), (b+2a \pm b,0)\}. \quad (24)$$

From the Equations 22 and 24, we have

- either $a+3 = -b-1 + a \pm b$, i.e., $4 = 0$ or $2a+4b = 0$, which, by Lemma 4.1, can hold only if $n = 9$. However, direct SageMath computation for $n = 9$ shows that such $\varphi$ does not exist.

- or $b+2a \pm b = -1 - 2a \pm 1$, i.e., $2(a+b+2) = 0$ or $4a = 0$ or $2a+4b = 0$ or $4a+2b = 0$. By Lemma 4.1, the first two are impossible and the next two can hold only if $n = 9$ or 18. But those are also ruled out by SageMath computation.

Hence $\varphi((b+2,1)) \neq (1+2b,2)$ and hence $\varphi((a+1,1)) \neq (-a-b,2)$, i.e., **Case B** can not hold.

**Case C:** If $\varphi((a+1,1)) = (-a+b,2)$ then $\varphi((1,2)) = (-b,1)$ and $\varphi((a+b+1,0)) \sim \varphi((a+1,1))$ imply

$$\varphi((1+a+b,0)) \in \{(-b+2,1), (-1+a \pm b,0)\} \quad (25)$$

From the Equations 8 and 25, we have

- either $-b+2 = 2a \pm b$, i.e., $2a-2b = 0$ or $2(a+b-1) = 0$, both of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1.

- or $-1+a \pm b = b-a \pm 1$, i.e., $2a = 0$ or $2a-2b = 0$ or $2(a-b-1) = 0$ and all of them are ruled out by Lemma 4.1.

- or $-1+a \pm b = b+a \pm 1$. This gives rise two four conditions, out of which three (namely, $2 = 0$, $2a+2b = 0$ and $2b = 0$) are ruled out by Lemma 4.1 and the fourth one is the identity $-1+a+b = b+a-1$.

So we have $\varphi((a+b+1,0)) = (a-1+b,0)$, $\varphi((a+b,2)) = (a+1,1)$ and $\varphi((a+1,1)) = (-a+b,2)$.

Similarly we can show that $\varphi((-a+b+1,0)) = (-a-1+b,0)$, $\varphi((-a-b,2)) = (a-1,1)$ and $\varphi((a-1,1)) = (-a-b,2)$.

Now $\varphi((a+b+2)) = (a+1,1), \varphi((a-1,2)) = (a-1,1)$ and $\varphi((2,0)) \sim \varphi((b,1)) = (1,2)$ imply $\varphi((2,0)) = (2b,0)$.

Consider the cycle $C_2 : (a+b+1,0) \sim (a+1,1) \sim (1,2) \sim (2b,0) \sim (2a+b,1) \sim (a+b+2,2) \sim (a+b+1,0)$. So $\varphi(C_2) : (a+1+b,0) \sim (a+b,2) \sim (-a+1,0) \sim \varphi((2,0)) \sim \varphi((a+1+b,1)) \sim \varphi((a+b+2,2)) \sim (a-1+b,0)$. Now, $\varphi((0,0)) = (0,0)$, $\varphi((a+1,0)) = (-a+b,2)$ and $\varphi((2b,0)) \sim (-b,1)$ imply $\varphi((2b,0)) \in \{(-a-b,2), (-2,0)\}$. Again, $\varphi((a+b,2)) = (a+1,1), \varphi((a+1,1)) = (-a+b,2)$ and $\varphi((a+b+2,2)) \sim (a-1+b,0)$.
Case C(1): If ϕ((a + b + 2, 2)) ∈ {(b − a + 2, 2), (1 − 2b + a, 1)}. Also, ϕ((1, 2)) = (−b, 1) and ϕ((2a + b, 1)) ∼ ϕ((2b, 0)) imply
\[ \varphi((2a + b, 1)) \in \{(−1 − a ± b, 0), (−b − 2, 1), (−3b, 1), (−2a ± 1, 2)\}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (26)

Case C(2): If ϕ((a + b + 2, 2)) = (b − a + 2) then ϕ((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a + b − 1, 0) and ϕ((2a + b, 1)) ∼ ϕ((a + b + 2, 2)) imply
\[ \varphi((2a + b, 1)) \in \{(a − 1 + 3b, 0), (1 − b + 2a ± 1, 1)\}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (27)

From the Equations 26 and 27 we have

- either $1 − b + 2a ± 1 = −b − 2$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$ or $4a + 2b = 0$. By Lemma \[4.1\], the first is an impossibility and the second one can hold only if $n = 18$. However, that is also ruled out by SageMath computation for $n = 18$.

- or $a − 1 + 3b = −1 − a ± b$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$ or $2a + 4b = 0$. By Lemma \[4.1\], the first is an impossibility and the second one can hold only if $n = 9$. However, that is also ruled out by SageMath computation for $n = 9$.

- or $1 − b + 2a ± 1 = −3b$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$, which is impossible by the Lemma \[4.1\] but,
\[ 2a + 2b + 2 = 0 \] may hold. \hspace{1cm} (28)

When $\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a − 1 + b, 0)$, $\varphi(((a + b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1)$ and $\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (−a + b, 2)$ then we have the Equation 28. As $2a + 2b + 2 = 0$, i.e., $a + b + 1 = −a − b − 1$, then $\varphi((−1 − a − b, 0)) = (a − 1 + b, 0)$. But from the Equations 9 and 10 we have $\varphi((-1 − a − b, 0)) \neq (a − 1 + b, 0)$, which is a contradiction. Hence $\varphi((a + b + 2, 2)) \neq (b − a + 2, 2)$.

Case C(2): If $\varphi((a + b + 2, 2)) = (a + 1 − 2b, 1)$, then $\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a − 1 + b, 0)$ and $\varphi((2a + b, 1)) ∼ ϕ((a + b + 2, 2))$ imply
\[ \varphi((2a + b, 1)) \in \{(b + a − 3, 0), (1 + b − 2a ± b, 2)\}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (29)

From the Equations 26 and 29 we have,

- either $b + a − 3 = −1 − a ± b$, i.e., $2a − 2b = 0$ or $2a + 2b − 2 = 0$, both of which are impossible by Lemma \[4.1\]

- or $1 + b − 2a ± b = −2a ± 1$, This gives rise to four conditions, out of which three (namely $2b = 0$, $2 − 0$ and $2a + 2b = 0$) are ruled out by Lemma \[4.1\] and the fourth one is the identity $1 + b − 2a − b = −2a + 1$.

So we have $\varphi((2a + b, 1)) = (−2a + 1, 2)$. Also previously, we had $\varphi((2b, 0)) = (−2, 0)$ and $\varphi((a + b + 2, 2)) = (1 − 2b + a, 1)$.

Now consider the cycle $C_3 : (2b, 0) ∼ (2a + b, 1) ∼ (a + b + 2, 2) ∼ (1 + a + 3b, 0) ∼ (3a + 1, 1) ∼ (3, 2) ∼ (2b, 0)$. So $\varphi(C_3) : (−2, 0) ∼ (−2a + 1, 2) ∼ (1 + a − 2b, 1) ∼$
\(\varphi((1 + a + 3b, 0)) \sim \varphi((3a + 1, 1)) \sim \varphi((3, 2)) \sim (-2, 0).\) Now, \(\varphi((2b, 0)) = (-2, 0), \varphi((2a + b, 1)) = (-2a + 1, 2)\) and \(\varphi((3, 2)) \sim (-2, 0)\) imply \(\varphi((3, 2)) \in \{(-3b, 1), (-2a - 1, 2)\}.

Again \(\varphi((2a + b, 1)) = (-2a + 1, 2), \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a + b - 1, 0)\) and \(\varphi((1 + a + 3b, 0)) \sim (1 + a - 2b, 1)\) imply \(\varphi((1 + a + 3b, 0)) \in \{2b + 1 - 2a, 2, (a + b - 3, 0)\}.\) Also, \(\varphi((2b, 0)) = (-2, 0)\) and \(\varphi((3a + 1, 1)) \sim \varphi((3, 2))\) imply

\[
\varphi((3a + 1, 1)) \in \{(-4, 0), (-3a \pm b, 2), (-2 - 2b, 0), (-2b - a \pm 1, 1)\}. \tag{30}
\]

**Case C(2)(a):** If \(\varphi((1 + a + 3b, 0)) = (2b + 1 - 2a, 2),\) then \(\varphi((3a + 1, 1)) \sim \varphi((1 + a + 3b, 0))\) implies

\[
\varphi((3a + 1, 1)) \in \{(2a + b - 2 \pm b, 0), (2 + a - 2b \pm 1, 1)\}. \tag{31}
\]

From the Equations 30 and 31 we have

- either \(2 + a - 2b \pm 1 = -2b - a \pm 1,\) i.e. \(2a + 2b = 0\) or \(2a = 0\) (which are impossible by Lemma 4.1) or \(4a + 2b = 0\) which can hold only if \(n = 18\). But direct SageMath computation for \(n = 18\) ruled out this case.

- or \(2a + b - 2 \pm b = -2 - 2b,\) i.e., \(2a + 2b = 0\) (impossible by Lemma 4.1) or \(2a + 4b = 0,\) which can hold only if \(n = 9\). But direct SageMath computation ruled out this possibility.

- or \(2a + b - 2 \pm b = -4,\) i.e., \(2a + 2b = 0,\) which is impossible by the Lemma 4.1 but

\[
2a + 2b + 2 = 0 \text{ may hold.} \tag{32}
\]

Thus, if \(\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a - 1 + b, 0), \varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1)\) and \(\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (-a + b, 2)\) holds, then we have \(2a + 2b + 2 = 0.\) As \(2a + 2b + 2 = 0,\) i.e., \(a + b + 1 = -a - b - 1,\) then \(\varphi((-1 - a - b, 0)) = (a - 1 + b, 0).\) But from the Equations 9 and 10 we have \(\varphi((-1 - a - b, 0)) \neq (a - 1 + b, 0),\) which is a contradiction. Thus, Equation 32 does not hold.

So we have \(\varphi((1 + a + 3b, 0)) \neq (2b + 1 - 2a, 2).\)

**Case C(2)(b):** If \(\varphi((1 + a + 3b, 0)) = (a + b - 3, 0),\) then \(\varphi((3a + 1, 1)) \sim \varphi((1 + a + 3b, 0))\) implies

\[
\varphi((3a + 1, 1)) \in \{(1 + a - 3b \pm b, 1), (b + 1 - 3a \pm 1, 2)\}. \tag{33}
\]

From the Equations 30 and 33 we have,

- either \(1 + a - 3b \pm b = -2b - a \pm 1,\) i.e., \(2a = 0\) or \(2a + 2b = 0\) or \(2a - 2b = 0,\) all of which are impossible by Lemma 4.1

- or \(b + 1 - 3a \pm 1 = -3a \pm b.\) This gives rise to four conditions. Out of which three (namely, \(2 = 0, 2a + 2b = 0\) and \(2b = 0\)) are ruled out by Lemma 4.1 and fourth one is the identity \(b + 1 - 3a - 1 = -3a + b.\)
So we have $\varphi((3a+1,1)) = (-3a+b,2)$, $\varphi((3,2)) = (-3b,1)$, $\varphi((a+1+3b,0)) = (a+b-3,0)$.

Similarly we can show that $\varphi((3a-1,1)) = (-3a-b,2)$ and $\varphi((-a+1+3b,0)) = (-a+b-3,0)$.

Now $\varphi((2b,0)) = (-2,0)$, $\varphi((3a+1,1)) = (-3a+b,2)$, $\varphi((3a-1,1)) = (-3a-b,2)$ and $\varphi((4b,0)) \sim \varphi((3,2)) = (-3b,1)$ imply $\varphi((4b,0)) = (-4,0)$.

Proceeding this way, we can show that $\varphi((2kb,0)) = (-2k,0)$, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. So we have $\varphi((2,0)) = (-2a,0)$, where $k = a$, which is a contradiction as we have shown that $\varphi((2,0)) = (2b,0)$ and $2b \neq -2a$. Therefore we have $\varphi((a+1,1)) \neq (-a+b,2)$ and Case C cannot hold.

As none of the Cases A, B and C hold, the assumption that $\varphi((1,2)) = (-b,1)$ is wrong. Hence the lemma follows.

**Theorem 4.3.** If $\varphi \in G$ and $\varphi((0,0)) = (0,0)$, $\varphi((b,1)) = (1,2)$, $\varphi((1,2)) = (b,1)$ then $n \geq 7$ or 14.

**Proof:** Consider the cycle $C_0 : (0,0) \sim (b,1) \sim (a+b,2) \sim (a+b+1,0) \sim (a+1,1) \sim (1,2) \sim (0,0)$. Then $\varphi(C_0) : (0,0) \sim (1,2) \sim \varphi((a+b,2)) \sim \varphi((a+b+1,0)) \sim \varphi((a+1,1)) \sim (b,1) \sim (0,0)$. $\varphi((0,0)) = (0,0)$ and $\varphi((a+b,2)) \sim (1,2)$ imply $\varphi((a+b,2)) \in \{(2b,0),(a \pm 1,1)\}$. $\varphi((0,0)) = (0,0)$ and $\varphi((a+1,1)) \sim (b,1)$ imply $\varphi((a+1,1)) \in \{(2,0),(a \pm b,2)\}$. Now $\varphi((b,1)) = (b,1)$ and $\varphi((a+b+1,0)) \sim \varphi((a+b,2))$ imply

$$\varphi((1+a+b,0)) \in \{(2a \pm b,1),(3,2),(1+2b,2),(b+a \pm 1,0),(1-2b,2),(b-a \pm 1,0)\}.$$ (34)

Depending upon the value of $\varphi((a+1,1))$, we split it into three cases a, b and c.

**Case a:** If $\varphi((a+1,1)) = (2,0)$ then $\varphi((1+a+b,0)) \sim \varphi((a+1,1))$ and $\varphi((1,2)) = (-b,1)$ imply

$$\varphi((1+a+b,0)) \in \{(3b,1),(2a \pm 1,2)\}$$ (35)

From the Equation (34) and (35) we have,

- either $3b = 2a \pm b$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $4b - 2a = 0$, which are impossible by Lemma 4.1,

- or $2a \pm 1 = 1 + 2b$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a - 2b - 2 = 0$, which are impossible by Lemma 4.1,

- or $2a \pm 1 = 1 - 2b$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a + 2b - 2 = 0$, which are impossible by Lemma 4.1,

- or $2a \pm 1 = 3$, i.e., $2a = 2$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a = 4$, i.e., $4a - 2b = 0$. By Lemma 4.1, $2a - 2b = 0$ cannot hold and $4a - 2b = 0$ can hold only if $n = 7, 14$. However direct SageMath computation for $n = 7, 14$ shows that such $\varphi$ does not exist.

Therefore we have $\varphi((a+1,1)) \neq (2,0)$ and hence Case a cannot hold.

**Case b:** If $\varphi((a+1,1)) = (a+b,2)$ then $\varphi((1+a+b,0)) \sim \varphi((a+1,1))$ and $\varphi((1,2)) = (b,1)$ imply

$$\varphi((1+a+b,0)) \in \{(b+2,1),(1+a \pm b,0)\}$$ (36)

From the Equation (34) and (36) we have,
From the Equation 38 and 39 we have,

- either \( b + 2 = 2a \pm b \), i.e., \( 2a = 2 \), i.e., \( 2a - 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a - 2b - 2 = 0 \), which are impossible.

- or \( 1 + a \pm b = b - a \pm 1 \), i.e., \( 2a = 0 \) or \( 2a + 2 = 0 \), i.e., \( 2a + 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a - 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a - 2b + 2 = 0 \), which are impossible.

- or \( 1 + a \pm b = b + a \pm 1 \). This gives rise four equations out of which three are impossible by Lemma 4.1, namely \( 2 = 0 \), \( 2b = 0 \), \( 2b - 2 = 0 \), i.e., \( 2a - 2b = 0 \). The only possibility which remains is \( 1 + a + b = b + a + 1 \), which is an identity. So assuming this to be the case we have \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2) \), \( \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a + b + 1, 0) \) and \( \varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1) \).

**Case c:** If \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2) \) then \( \varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \sim \varphi((a + 1, 1)) \) and \( \varphi((1, 2)) = (b, 1) \) imply

\[
\varphi((1 + a + b, 0)) \in \{(b - 2, 1), (1 - a \pm b, 0)\} \tag{37}
\]

From the Equation 34 and 37 we have,

- either \( b - 2 = 2a \pm b \), i.e., \( 2a + 2 = 0 \), i.e., \( 2a + 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a - 2b + 2 = 0 \), which are impossible.

- or \( 1 - a \pm b = b + a \pm 1 \), i.e., \( 2 = 0 \) or \( 2a - 2 = 0 \), i.e., \( 2a - 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a + 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a + 2b - 2 = 0 \), which are impossible.

- or \( 1 - a \pm b = b - a \pm 1 \), this gives rise four equations out of which three are impossible by Lemma 4.1, namely \( 2 = 0 \), \( 2a = 0 \), \( 2a - 2b = 0 \). The only possibility which remains is \( 1 - a + b = b - a + 1 \), which is an identity. So assuming this to be the case we have \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2) \), \( \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0) \) and \( \varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a - 1, 1) \).

Combining the feasible cases in Case b and Case b, we have \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) \in \{(a \pm b, 2)\} \), \( \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) \in \{(b \pm a + 1, 0)\} \) and \( \varphi((a + b, 2)) \in \{(a + 1, 1)\} \).

Now consider the cycle \( C_0' : (0, 0) \sim (1, 2) \sim (a - b, 2) \sim (b - a + 1, 0) \sim (a - 1, 1) \sim (1, 2) \sim (0, 0) \). Then \( \varphi(C_0') : (0, 0) \sim (1, 2) \sim \varphi((a - b, 2)) \sim \varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) \sim \varphi((a - 1, 1)) \sim (b, 1) \sim (0, 0) \). \( \varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0) \) and \( \varphi((a - b, 2)) \sim (1, 2) \) imply \( \varphi((a - b, 2)) \in \{(2b, 0), (a \pm 1, 1)\} \). \( \varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0) \) and \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) \sim (b, 1) \) imply \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) \in \{(2b, 0), (a \pm 1, 2)\} \). Now \( \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2) \) and \( \varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) \sim \varphi((a - b, 2)) \) imply

\[
\varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) \in \{(2a \pm b, 1), (3, 2), (1 + 2b, 2), (b \pm a + 1, 0), (1 - 2b, 2), (b - a \pm 1, 0)\}. \tag{38}
\]

**Case a':** If \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (2, 0) \) then \( \varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) \sim \varphi((a - 1, 1)) \) and \( \varphi((1, 2)) = (-b, 1) \) imply

\[
\varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) \in \{(3b, 1), (2a \pm 1, 2)\} \tag{39}
\]

From the Equation 38 and 39 we have,

- either \( 3b = 2a \pm b \), i.e., \( 2a - 2b = 0 \) or \( 4b - 2a = 0 \), which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1.
• or $2a \pm 1 = 1 + 2b$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a - 2b - 2 = 0$, which are impossible by the Lemma 4.4

• or $2a \pm 1 = 1 - 2b$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$ or $2a + 2b - 2 = 0$, which are impossible by the Lemma 4.4

• or $2a \pm 1 = 3$, i.e., $2a = 2$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a = 4$, i.e., $4a - 2b = 0$. By Lemma 4.1, $2a - 2b = 0$ can not hold and $4a - 2b = 0$ can hold only if $n = 7, 14$. Therefore we have $\varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (2, 0)$ only if $n = 7, 14$.

Case b’: If $\varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2)$ then $\varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) \sim \varphi((a - 1, 1))$ and $\varphi((1, 2)) = (b, 1)$ imply

$$\varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) \in \{(b + 2, 1), (1 + a \pm b, 0)\}$$

(40)

From the Equation 38 and 40 we have,

• either $b + 2 = 2a \pm b$, i.e., $2a = 2$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a - 2b - 2 = 0$, which are impossible.

• or $1 + a \pm b = b - a \pm 1$, i.e., $2a = 0$ or $2a + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$ or $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a - 2b + 2 = 0$, which are impossible.

Case c’: If $\varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2)$ then $\varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) \sim \varphi((a - 1, 1))$ and $\varphi((1, 2)) = (b, 1)$ imply

$$\varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) \in \{(b - 2, 1), (1 - a \pm b, 0)\}$$

(41)

From the Equation 38 and 41 we have,

• either $b - 2 = 2a \pm b$, i.e., $2a + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$ or $2a - 2b + 2 = 0$, which are impossible.

• or $1 - a \pm b = b + a \pm 1$, i.e., $2 = 0$ or $2a - 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a + 2b = 0$ or $2a + 2b - 2 = 0$, which are impossible.

• or $1 - a \pm b = b - a \pm 1$, this gives rise four equations out of which three are impossible by Lemma 4.4, namely $2 = 0$, $2b = 0$, $2b - 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$. The only possibility which remains is $1 - a + b = b - a + 1$, which is an identity. So assuming this to be the case we have $\varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2)$, $\varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0)$ and $\varphi((a - b, 2)) = (a - 1, 1)$.
Combining these three cases we have \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) \in \{(a \pm b, 2), (b - a + 1, 0)\} \), \( \varphi((a - b, 2)) \in \{(a \pm 1, 1)\} \). \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (2, 0) \), \( \varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) = (3, 2) \), \( \varphi((a - b, 2)) = (2b, 0) \) only if \( n = 7, 14 \).

Depending upon the values of \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) \) and \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) \) (that we get from Cases a, b, c and \( a', b', c' \)), we have four different cases namely **Case A:** \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2) \) and \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (2, 0) \) only if \( n = 7, 14 \), **Case B:** \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2) \) and \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (2, 0) \) only if \( n = 7, 14 \), **Case C:** \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2) \) and \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2) \) and **Case D:** \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2) \) and \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2) \). However, before resolving these four cases, we prove a claim which will be crucial in the following proof.

**Claim:** \( \varphi((1 - a - b, 0)) \in \{(-1 + a \pm b, 0), (-b \pm 2, 2), (-a - b, 2), (2a \pm 1, 0)\} \) and imply \( \varphi((-1, 2)) \sim \varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0) \) imply \( \varphi((a - b, 1)) \), \( \varphi((-1, 2)) \in \{(-b, 1), (-1, 2)\} \).

**Proof of Claim:** \( \varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0) \), \( \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2) \), \( \varphi((1, 2)) = (b, 1) \), \( \varphi((b - 1, 1)) \sim \varphi((a - b, 2)) \): \( \varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0) \) imply \( \varphi((a - b, 2)) \in \{(-a \pm b, 2), (-2, 0)\} \). \( \varphi((-a - 1, 1)) \sim (-1, 2) \) and \( \varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0) \) imply \( \varphi((-a - b, 1)) \in \{(-a + 1, 1), (-2b, 0)\} \). \( \varphi((-a - b - 1, 0)) \sim \varphi((-a - b, 2)) \) and \( \varphi((-b, 1)) = (-b, 1) \) imply \( \varphi((a - b - 1, 0)) \in \{(-1 + a \pm 1, 0), (-b \pm 2, 2), (-a - b, 2), (2a \pm 1, 2), (-3b, 1)\} \).

(42) 

**Case 2:** Let \( \varphi((-b, 1)) = (-b, 1) \) and \( \varphi((-1, 2)) = (-b, 1) \). Again consider the cycle \( C'' : (0, 0) \sim (-b, 1) \sim (-a + 2, 2) \sim (-a - b - 1, 0) \sim (-a - 1, 1) \sim (-1, 2) \sim (0, 0) \). Then \( \varphi(C'') : (0, 0) \sim (-1, 2) \sim \varphi((-a - b, 2)) \sim \varphi((-a - b - 1, 0)) \sim \varphi((-a - 1, 1)) \sim (-1, 2) \sim (0, 0) \). \( \varphi((-a - 2, 2)) \sim (-1, 2) \) and \( \varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0) \) imply \( \varphi((-a - 1, 1)) \sim (-1, 2) \) and \( \varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0) \) imply \( \varphi((-a - 1, 1)) \in \{(-a + 1, 1), (-2b, 0)\} \). \( \varphi((-a - b - 1, 0)) \sim \varphi((-a - b, 2)) \) and \( \varphi((-b, 1)) = (-b, 1) \) imply \( \varphi((a - b - 1, 0)) \in \{(-1 + a + b, 1), (-1 + 2b, 2), (-b - a + 1, 0), (-1 - 2b, 2), (2a + b, 1), (-3, 2)\} \).

(43) 

**Case A:** Let \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2) \), \( \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (b + a + 1, 0) \), \( \varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1) \), \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (2, 0) \), \( \varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) = (3, 2) \) and \( \varphi((a - b, 2)) = (2b, 0) \). This map exists only if \( n = 7, 14 \). This can also be checked with direct SageMath computation.

**Case B:** Let \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2) \), \( \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0) \), \( \varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a - 1, 1) \), \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (2, 0) \), \( \varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) = (3, 2) \) and \( \varphi((a - b, 2)) = (2b, 0) \). Such \( \varphi \) can hold only if \( n = 7, 14 \). However direct SageMath computation for \( n = 7, 14 \) shows that such \( \varphi \) does not exist, hence this map does not exist for all \( n \).

**Case C:** Let \( \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2) \), \( \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0) \), \( \varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a - 1, 1) \), \( \varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2) \), \( \varphi((b - a + 1, 0)) = (b + a + 1, 0) \), \( \varphi((a - b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1) \). Now \( \varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a - 1, 1) \), \( \varphi((a - b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1) \), \( \varphi((2, 0)) \sim \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2) \) imply \( \varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0) \).
Consider the cycle \( C_1 : (2, 0) \sim (b, 1) \sim (a + b, 2) \sim (a + b + 1, 0) \sim (2b + a + 1, 1) \sim (2a + 1, 2) \sim (2, 0) \). Then \( \varphi(C_1) : (2b, 0) \sim (1, 2) \sim (a + b, 1) \sim (b + a + 1, 0) \sim \varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \sim \varphi((2a + 1, 2)) \sim (2b, 0) \). \( \varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \sim (b - a + 1, 0) \) and \( \varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a - 1, 1) \) imply \( \varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \in \{(a - 1 + 2b, 1), (2 - b + a, 2)\} \). Now \( \varphi((2a + 1, 2)) \sim (2b, 0) \) and \( \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2) \) imply

\[ \varphi((2a + 1, 2)) \in \{(2a \pm b, 1), (3, 2)\}. \]  
\tag{44}

**Case C(a):** If \( \varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) = (a - 1 + 2b, 1) \) then \( \varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \sim \varphi((2a + 1, 2)) \) and \( \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0) \) imply

\[ \varphi((2a + 1, 2)) \in \{(1 - b + 2a \pm b, 2), (b - a + 3, 0)\}. \]  
\tag{45}

From the Equation 44 and 45 we have, \( 1 - b + 2a \pm b = 3 \), i.e., \( 2a - 2b - 2 = 0 \) or \( 2a - 2 = 0 \), i.e., \( 2a - 2b = 0 \), which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1 hence \( \varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \neq (a - 1 + 2b, 1) \).

**Case C(b):** If \( \varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) = (2 - b + a, 2) \) then \( \varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \sim \varphi((2a + 1, 2)) \) and \( \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0) \) imply

\[ \varphi((2a + 1, 2)) \in \{(2a - b \pm 1, 1), (3b - a + 1, 0)\}. \]  
\tag{46}

From the Equation 44 and 46 we have, \( 2a - 1 + b \pm 1 = 2a \pm b \), This gives rise four equations out of which three are impossible by Lemma 4.1 namely \( 2 = 0, 2b = 0, 2b - 2 = 0 \), i.e., \( 2a - 2b = 0 \). The only possibility which remains is \( 2a + b = 2a + b \), which is an identity. So assuming this to be the case we have \( \varphi((a + 1, 2)) = (2a + b, 1), \varphi((2a + a + 1, 1)) = (2 - b + a, 2) \).

Now consider the cycle \( C' : (2, 0) \sim (b, 1) \sim (a + b, 2) \sim (1 + a - b, 0) \sim (2b + 1 - a, 1) \sim (2a - 1, 2) \sim (2, 0) \). Then \( \varphi(C') : (2b, 0) \sim (1, 2) \sim (a - 1, 1) \sim \varphi((1 + a - b, 0)) \sim \varphi((2b + 1 - a, 1)) \sim \varphi((2a - 1, 2)) \sim (2b, 0) \). \( \varphi((2a - 1, 2)) \sim (2b, 0), \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2) \) and \( \varphi((2a + 1, 2)) = (2a + b, 1) \) imply \( \varphi((2a - 1, 2)) \in \{(2a - b, 1), (3, 2)\} \). Now \( \varphi((1 + a - b, 0)) \sim (a - 1, 1), \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0) \) and \( \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2) \) imply \( \varphi((1 + a - b, 0)) \in \{(b - a - 1, 0), (1 - 2b, 2)\}. \( \varphi((2b + 1 - a, 1)) \sim \varphi((1 + a - b, 0)) \) and \( \varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a - 1, 1) \) imply

\[ \varphi((2b + 1 - a, 1)) \in \{(a - 1 - 2b, 1), (1 - b - a \pm 1, 2), (a - 3, 1), (b - 2a \pm b, 0)\}. \]  
\tag{47}

**Case C(b)(1):** If \( \varphi((2a - 1, 2)) = (3, 2) \) then \( \varphi((2b + 1 - a, 1)) \sim \varphi((2a - 1, 2)) \) and \( \varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0) \) imply

\[ \varphi((2b + 1 - a, 1)) \in \{(4b, 0), (3a \pm 1, 1)\}. \]  
\tag{48}

From the Equations 47 and 48 we have,

- either \( 4b = b - 2a \pm b \), i.e., \( 2a + 2b = 0 \) or \( 2a + 4b = 0 \), which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1.
• $3a \pm 1 = a - 3$, i.e., $2a + 4 = 0$, i.e., $4a + 2b = 0$ or $2a + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$. By Lemma 4.1 $2a + 2b = 0$ is impossible and $4a + 2b = 0$ holds only if $n = 18$. But this is also ruled out by SageMath computation for $n = 18$.

• or $3a \pm 1 = a - 1 - 2b$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$, which is impossible by the Lemma 4.1 but $2a + 2b + 2 = 0$ may hold. We have this Equation when $\varphi((a+b+1,0)) = (b-a+1,0)$. So $2a + 2b + 2 = 0$ imply $a + b + 1 = -a - b - 1$, hence $\varphi((-a-b-1,0)) = (b-a+1,0)$. But from the Equations 42 and 43 we have $\varphi((-a-b-1,0)) \neq (b-a+1,0)$, which is a contradiction. Hence $\varphi((2a-1,2)) \neq (3,2)$.

**Case C(b)(2):** If $\varphi((2a-1,2)) = (2b-1,1)$ then $\varphi((2b+1-a,1)) \sim \varphi((2a-1,2))$ and $\varphi((2,0)) = (2b,0)$ imply

$$\varphi((2b+1-a,1)) \in \{(2b-2,0), (2-a \pm b,2)\}. \quad (49)$$

From the Equations 47 and 49 we have,

• either $2b - 2 = b - 2a \pm b$, i.e., $2a - 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2b + 2a - 2 = 0$, which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1.

• or $2 - a \pm b = 1 - b - a \pm 1$, This gives rise four equations out of which three are impossible by Lemma 4.1, namely $2 = 0$, $2b = 0$, $2b + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$. The only possibility which remains is $2 - a - b = 2 - b - a$, which is an identity. So assuming this to be the case we have $\varphi((2b+1-a,0)) = (2-b-a,0)$, $\varphi((2a-1,2)) = (2a-b,1)$ and $\varphi((1+a-b,0)) = (b-a-1,0)$.

Now $\varphi((3b,1)) \sim \varphi((2,0)) = (2b,0)$, $\varphi((2a+1,2)) = (2a+b,1)$ and $\varphi((2a-1,2)) = (2a-b,1)$ imply $\varphi((3b,1)) = (3,2)$.

Consider the cycle $C_2: (2,0) \sim (3b,1) \sim (3a + b + 2,0) \sim (3a + b + 2,1) \sim (2a + 1,2) \sim (2a + 1,1) \sim (3a + b + 2,0) \sim (3a + b + 2,1) \sim (2a + b,1) \sim (2b,0)$. Then $\varphi(C_2) : (2b,0) \sim (3,2) \sim \varphi((3a + b,2)) \sim \varphi(3a + b,0) \sim (a-b+2,2) \sim (2a+b,1) \sim (2b,0)$. $\varphi((3a + b,2)) \sim (3,2)$ and $\varphi((2,0)) = (2b,0)$ imply $\varphi((3a + b,2)) \in \{(4b,0), (3a \pm 1,1)\}$. $\varphi((3a + b,0)) \sim (a-b+2,2)$, $\varphi((a+b+1,0)) = (b-a+1,0)$ and $\varphi((2a+1,2)) = (2a+b,1)$ imply

$$\varphi((3a+b,0)) \in \{(2a+b-2,1), (3b-a+1,0)\}. \quad (50)$$

**Case C(b)(2)(a):** If $\varphi((3a+b,2)) = (4b,0)$ then $\varphi((3a+b,0)) \sim \varphi((3a+b,2))$ and $\varphi((3b,1)) = (3,2)$ imply

$$\varphi((3a+b,0)) \in \{(4a \pm b,1), (5,2)\}. \quad (51)$$

From the Equations 50 and 51 we have, $4a \pm b = 2a+b-2$, i.e., $2a+2 = 0$, i.e., $2a+2b = 0$, which is impossible by the Lemma 4.1 but $2a+2b+2 = 0$ may hold. We have this Equation when $\varphi((a+b+1,0)) = (b-a+1,0)$. So $2a + 2b + 2 = 0$ imply $a + b + 1 = -a - b - 1$, which is impossible by Lemma 4.1.
hence $\varphi((-a - b - 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0)$. But from the Equations 42 and 43 we have $\varphi((-a - b - 1, 0)) \neq (b - a + 1, 0)$, which is a contradiction. Hence $\varphi((3a + b, 2)) \neq (4b, 0)$.

**Case C(b)(2)(b):** If $\varphi((3a + b, 2)) = (3a + 1, 1)$ then $\varphi((3 + a + b, 0)) \sim \varphi((3a + b, 2))$ and $\varphi((3b, 1)) = (3, 2)$ imply

$$\varphi((3 + a + b, 0)) \in \{(3b + a \pm 1, 0), (3 + 2b, 2)\}. \quad (52)$$

From the Equations 50 and 52 we have $3b + a \pm 1 = 3b - a + 1$, i.e., $2a = 0$ or $2a - 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$, which is impossible by the Lemma 4.1. Hence $\varphi((3a + b, 2)) \neq (3a + 1, 1)$.

**Case C(b)(2)(c):** If $\varphi((3a + b, 2)) = (3a - 1, 1)$ then $\varphi((3 + a + b, 0)) \sim \varphi((3a + b, 2))$ and $\varphi((3b, 1)) = (3, 2)$ imply

$$\varphi((3 + a + b, 0)) \in \{(3b - a \pm 1, 0), (3 - 2b, 2)\}. \quad (53)$$

From the Equations 50 and 53 we have, $3b - a \pm 1 = 3b - a + 1$, this gives rise to two equations, out of one is impossible, namely $2 = 0$. The only possibility which remains is $3b - a + 1 = 3b - a + 1$, which is an identity. So assuming this to be the case, we have $\varphi((3a + b, 2)) = (3a - 1, 1)$ and $\varphi((3 + a + b, 0)) = (3b - a + 1, 0)$.

Now consider the cycle $C'_2 : (2, 0) \sim (3b, 1) \sim (3a - b, 2) \sim (3a - b, 0) \sim (2b - a - 1, 1) \sim (2a - 1, 2) \sim (2, 0)$. $\varphi(C'_2) : (2b, 0) \sim (3, 2) \sim \varphi((3a - b, 2)) \sim \varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \sim \varphi((2b - a - 1, 1)) \sim (2a - b, 1) \sim (2b, 0)$. $\varphi((3a - b, 2)) \sim (3, 2) \sim \varphi((a - b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1)$ and $\varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0)$ imply $\varphi((3a - b, 2)) \in \{(3a + 1, 1), (2a + 1, 0)\}$. $\varphi((2b - a - 1, 1)) \sim (2a - b, 1) \sim (2b, 0)$ imply $\varphi((2b - a - 1, 1)) \in \{(2 - a \pm b, 2), (2b - 2, 0)\}$.

Now $\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \sim \varphi((3a - b, 2))$ and $\varphi((3b, 1)) = (3, 2)$ imply

$$\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \in \{(4a \pm b, 1), (5, 2), (3 + 2b, 2), (3b + a \pm 1, 0)\}. \quad (54)$$

**Case C(b)(2)(d):** If $\varphi((2b - a - 1, 1)) = (2b - 2, 0)$ then $\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \sim \varphi((2b - a - 1, 1))$ and $\varphi((2a - 1, 2)) = (2a - b, 1)$ imply

$$\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \in \{(2a - 3b, 1), (2 - 2a \pm 1, 2)\}. \quad (55)$$

From the Equations 54 and 55 we have,

- either $2a - 3b = 4a \pm b$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$ or $2a + 4b = 0$. By Lemma 4.1 $2a + 2b = 0$ can not hold and $2a + 4b = 0$ can hold only if $n = 9$. However, direct SageMath computation for $n = 9$ shows that such $\varphi$ does not exist.

- or $2 - 2a \pm 1 = 5$, i.e., $2a + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$ or $2a + 4 = 0$, i.e., $4a + 2b = 0$. By Lemma 4.1 $2a + 2b = 0$ can not hold and $4a + 2b = 0$ can hold only if $n = 18$. However, direct SageMath computation for $n = 18$ shows that such $\varphi$ does not exist.

- or $2 - 2a \pm 1 = 3 + 2b$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$, which is impossible by the Lemma 4.1 but $2a + 2b + 2 = 0$ may hold. We have this Equation when $\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0)$. So $2a + 2b + 2 = 0$ imply $a + b + 1 = -a - b - 1$, hence $\varphi((-a - b - 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0)$. But from the Equations 42 and 43 we have $\varphi((-a - b - 1, 0)) \neq (b - a + 1, 0)$, which is a contradiction. Hence $\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \neq (2b + 3, 2)$. 

24
Hence $\varphi((2b - a - 1, 1)) \neq (2b - 2, 0)$.

**Case C(b)(2)(e):** If $\varphi((2b - a - 1, 1)) = (2 - a - b, 2)$ then $\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \sim \varphi((2b - a - 1, 1))$ and $\varphi((2a - 1, 2)) = (2a - b, 1)$ imply

$$\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \in \{(2a - b - 2, 1), (2b - 1 - a \pm b, 0)\}. \quad (56)$$

From the Equations 54 and 56 we have

- either $2b - 1 - a \pm b = 3b + a \pm 1$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$ or $2a = 0$ or $2a + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$, which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1 but $2a + 2b + 2 = 0$ may hold. We have this Equation when $\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0)$. So $2a + 2b + 2 = 0$ imply $a + b + 1 = -a - b - 1$, hence $\varphi((a - b - 1, 1)) = (b - a + 1, 0)$. But from the Equations 42 and 43 we have $\varphi((a - b - 1, 0)) \neq (b - a + 1, 0)$, which is a contradiction. Hence $\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \neq (3b + a + 1, 0)$.

- or $2a - b - 2 = 4a \pm b$, i.e., $2a + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$ which is impossible by the Lemma 4.1 but $2a + 2b + 2 = 0$ may hold. We have this Equation when $\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (b - a - 1, 0)$. So $2a + 2b + 2 = 0$ imply $a + b + 1 = -a - b - 1$, hence $\varphi((a - b - 1, 0)) = (b - a + 1, 0)$. But from the Equations 42 and 43 we have $\varphi((a - b - 1, 0)) \neq (b - a + 1, 0)$, which is a contradiction, so $\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \neq (4a + b, 1)$.

Hence $\varphi((2b - a - 1, 1)) \neq (2 - a - b, 2)$.

**Case C(b)(2)(f):** If $\varphi((2b - a - 1, 1)) = (2 - a + b, 2)$ then $\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \sim \varphi((2b - a - 1, 1))$ and $\varphi((2a - 1, 2)) = (2a - b, 1)$ imply

$$\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) \in \{(2a - b + 2, 1), (2b - 1 + a \pm b, 0)\}. \quad (57)$$

From the Equations 54 and 57 we have,

- either $2a - b + 2 = 4a \pm b$, i.e., $2a - 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a + 2b - 2 = 0$ which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1.

- or $2b - 1 + a \pm b = 3b + a \pm 1$, this gives rise to four equations, out of three are impossible by the Lemma 4.1 namely $2 = 0$, $2b = 0$, $2b + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$. The only possibility which remains is $3b + a - 1 = 3b + a - 1$, which is an identity. So assuming this to be the case, we have $\varphi((3 - a - b, 0)) = (3b + a - 1, 1)$, $\varphi((2b - a - 1, 1)) = (2 - a + b, 2)$ and $\varphi((3b - a - 2, 2)) = (3b + a + 1, 1)$.

Now $\varphi((4, 0)) \sim \varphi((3b, 1)) = (3, 2), \varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0), \varphi((3a + b, 2)) = (3a - 1, 1)$ and $\varphi((3a - b, 2)) = (3a + 1, 1)$ imply $\varphi((4, 0)) = (4b, 0), \varphi((2b, 0)) \sim \varphi((1, 2)) = (b, 1), \varphi((0, 0)) = (0, 0), \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2)$ and $\varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2)$ imply $\varphi((2b, 0)) = (2, 0)$.

Proceeding this way we can show that $\varphi((2k, 0)) = (2kb, 0)$, forall $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. So we have $\varphi((2b, 0)) = (2a, 0)$, where $k = a$, which is a contradiction as we have shown that
\[\varphi((2b, 0)) = (2, 0)\] and \[2a \neq 2\] by Lemma 4.1. Therefore we have \[\varphi((a + 1, 1)) \neq (a - b, 2)\] and \[\varphi((a - 1, 1)) \neq (a + b, 2)\].

**Case D:** Let \[\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2), \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a + b + 1, 0), \varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1), \varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2)\]. From (Equation 58) and (Equation 59) we have, \[2 = 0, 2 = 0\] which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1. Hence \[\varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1), \varphi((a - b, 2)) = (a - 1, 1)\] and \[\varphi((2, 0)) \sim \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2)\] imply \[\varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0)\].

Consider the cycle \(C_1: (2, 0) \sim (b, 1) \sim (a + b, 2) \sim (a + b + 1, 0) \sim (2a + 1, 2) \sim (2a, 0)\). Then \[\varphi(C_1): (2b, 0) \sim (1, 2) \sim (a + b + 1, 0) \sim \varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \sim (2b, 0)\]. \[\varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \sim (a + b + 1, 0), \varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2)\] and \[\varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1)\] imply \[\varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \in \{(a + 1 + 2b, 1), (2b + a + 2, a, 2)\}\]. Now \[\varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \sim (2b, 0)\] and \[\varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2)\] imply
\[\varphi((2a, 1, 2)) \in \{(2a + 1 + b + 1, 1), (3b + a + 1, 0)\}\] (59)

**Case D(a):** If \[\varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) = (a + 1 + 2b, 1)\] then \[\varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \sim \varphi((2a + 1, 2))\] and \[\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a + b + 1, 0)\] imply
\[\varphi((2a + 1, 2)) \in \{(1 + b + 2a + b, 2), (b + a + 3, 0)\}\] (58)

From the Equation 58 and 59 we have, \[1 + b + 2a + b = 3\] i.e., \[2a - 2 = 0\], i.e., \[2a - 2b = 0\] or \[2a + 2b - 2 = 0\], which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1. Hence \[\varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \neq (a + 1 + 2b, 1)\].

**Case D(b):** If \[\varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) = (2 + b + a, 2)\] then \[\varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) \sim \varphi((2a + 1, 2))\] and \[\varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a + b + 1, 0)\] imply
\[\varphi((2a + 1, 2)) \in \{(2a + 1 + b + 1, 1), (3b + a + 1, 0)\}\] (60)

From the Equation 58 and 59 we have, \[2a + 1 + b + 1 = 2a + b\]. This gives rise to four equations out of which three are impossible by Lemma 4.1 namely \[2 = 0, 2b = 0, 2b + 2 = 0\], i.e., \[2a + 2b = 0\]. The only possibility which remains is \[2a + b = 2a + b\], which is an identity. So assuming this to be the case we have \[\varphi((2a + 1, 2)) = (2a + b, 1), \varphi((2b + a + 1, 1)) = (2 + b + a, 2)\].

Now consider the cycle \(C_1: (2, 0) \sim (b, 1) \sim (a + b, 2) \sim (1 + a - b, 0) \sim (2b + 1 - a, 1) \sim (2a - 1, 2) \sim (2, 0)\). Then \[\varphi(C_1): (2b, 0) \sim (1, 2) \sim (a + 1, 1) \sim \varphi((1 + a - b, 0)) \sim \varphi((2a + 1 - a, 1)) \sim \varphi((2a - 1, 2))\]. \[\varphi((2a - 1, 2)) \sim (2b, 0), \varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2)\] and \[\varphi((2a + 1, 2)) = (2a + b, 1)\] imply \[\varphi((2a - 1, 2)) \in \{(2a - b, 1), (3, 2)\}\]. Now \[\varphi((1 + a - b, 0)) \sim (a + 1, 1), \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a + b + 1, 0)\] and \[\varphi((b, 1)) = (1, 2)\] imply \[\varphi((1 + a - b, 0)) \in \{(b + a - 1, 0), (1 + 2b, 2)\}\]. \[\varphi((2b + 1 - a, 1)) \sim \varphi((1 + a - b, 0))\] and \[\varphi((a + b, 2)) = (a + 1, 1)\] imply \[\varphi((2b + 1 - a, 1)) \in \{(a + 1 - 2b, 1), (1 + b - a + 1, 2), (a + 3, 1), (b + 2a + b, 0)\}\]. (61)

**Case D(b)(1):** If \[\varphi((2a - 1, 2)) = (3, 2)\] then \[\varphi((2a - 1, 2)) \sim \varphi((2a - 1, 2))\] and \[\varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0)\] imply \[\varphi((2b + 1 - a, 1)) \in \{(4b, 0), (3a + 1, 1)\}\]. (62)

From the Equations 61 and 62 we have,
• either $4b = b + 2a \pm b$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a - 4b = 0$, which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1.

• $3a \pm 1 = a + 1 - 2b$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$ or $2a + 2b - 2 = 0$, which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1.

• $3a \pm 1 = a + 3$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a = 4$, i.e., $4a - 2b = 0$. Now $2a - 2b = 0$ s impossible by the Lemma 4.1, but $4a - 2b = 0$ holds only if $n = 7, 14$.

Thus $\varphi((2a - 1, 2)) = (3, 2)$ only if $n = 7, 14$.

Case D(b)(2): If $\varphi((2a - 1, 2)) = (2a - b, 1)$ then $\varphi((2b + 1 - a, 1)) \sim \varphi((2a - 1, 2))$ and $\varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0)$ imply

$$\varphi((2b + 1 - a, 1)) \in \{(2b - 2, 0), (2 - a \pm b, 2)\}. \quad (63)$$

From the Equations 61 and 63 we have,

• either $2b - 2 = b + 2a \pm b$, i.e., $2a + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a - 2b + 2 = 0$, which are impossible by the Lemma 4.1.

• or $2 - a \pm b = 1 + b - a \pm 1$, This gives rise four equations out of which three are impossible by Lemma 4.1, namely $2 = 0, 2b = 0, 2b - 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$. The only possibility which remains is $2 = 2 = 2 = 2$, which is an identity. So assuming this to be the case we have $\varphi((2b + 1 - a, 0)) = (2b - a, 0), \varphi((2a - 1, 2)) = (2a - b, 1)$ and $\varphi((1 + a - b, 0)) = (b + a = 1, 0)$.

Now $\varphi((3b, 1)) \sim \varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0), \varphi((2a + 1, 2)) = (2a + b, 1)$ and $\varphi((2a - 1, 2)) = (2a - b, 1)$ imply $\varphi((3b, 1)) = (3, 2)$.

Consider the cycle $C_2 : (2, 0) \sim (3b, 1) \sim (3a + b, 2) \sim (3 + a + b, 0) \sim (2a + b + 1, 1) \sim (2a + b + 2, 2) \sim (2a + b, 1) \sim (2b, 0)$. Then $\varphi(C_2) : (2b, 0) \sim (3, 2) \sim \varphi((3a + b, 2) \sim \varphi((3 + a + b, 0)) \sim (a + b + 2, 2) \sim (2a + b, 1) \sim (2b, 0)$. $\varphi((3a + b, 0)) \sim (a + b + 2, 2), \varphi((a + b + 1, 0)) = (a + b + 1, 0)$ and $\varphi((2a + 1, 2)) = (2a + b, 1)$ imply $\varphi((3a + b, 0)) \in \{(2a + b + 2, 1), (3b + a + 1, 0)\}$. $\varphi((3a + b, 2)) \sim (3, 2)$ and $\varphi((2, 0)) = (2b, 0)$ imply

$$\varphi((3a + b, 2)) \in \{(4b, 0), (3a + 1, 1)\}. \quad (64)$$

Case D(b)(2)(a): If $\varphi((3a + b, 0)) = (2 + b + 2a, 1)$ then $\varphi((3a + b, 2) \sim \varphi((3 + a + b, 0))$ and $\varphi((2a + 1, 1)) = (a + b + 2, 2)$ imply

$$\varphi((3a + b, 2)) \in \{(2a + 1 + 2b \pm 1, 0), (3b + a + 2, 2)\}. \quad (65)$$

From 64 and 65 we have, $2a + 1 + 2b \pm 1 = 4b$, i.e., $2a - 2b = 0$ or $2a - 2b + 2 = 0$, which are impossible by Lemma 4.1. Hence If $\varphi((3 + a + b, 0)) \neq (2 + b + 2a, 1)$.

Case D(b)(2)(b): If $\varphi((3a + b, 0)) = (a + 1 + 3b, 0)$ then $\varphi((3a + b, 2) \sim \varphi((3 + a + b, 0))$ and $\varphi((2a + 1, 1)) = (a + b + 2, 2)$ imply

$$\varphi((3a + b, 2)) \in \{(1 + b + 3a \pm b, 1), (b + a + 4, 2)\}. \quad (66)$$
From [64] and [66] we have, $1+b+3a \pm b = 3a \pm 1$, this give rise to four equations, out of three are impossible by the Lemma 4.1 namely $2 = 0$, $2b = 0$ and $2b + 2 = 0$, i.e., $2a + 2b = 0$. The only possibility which remains is $1 + 3a = 3a + 1$, which is an identity. So assuming to be the case, we have $\varphi((3a+b,2)) = (3a+1,1)$ and $\varphi((3a+b,0)) = (3b+a+1,0)$.

Now consider the cycle $C_2'' : (2,0) \sim (3b,1) \sim (3a-b,2) \sim (3-a+b,0) \sim (2b-1+a,1) \sim (2a+1,2)$. Then $\varphi(C_2'') : (2b,0) \sim (3,2) \sim \varphi((3a-b,2)) \sim \varphi((3-a+b,0)) \sim \varphi((2b-1+a,1)) \sim (2a+b,1)$. $\varphi((2b-1+a,1)) \sim (2a+b,1)$, $\varphi((3-a+b,0)) = (3a-b,2)) = (a-1,1)$ and $\varphi((2,0)) = (2b,0)$ imply $\varphi((3a-b,2)) \in \{(3a-1,1),(4b,0)\}$. $\varphi((2b-1+a,1)) \sim (2a+b,1)$, $\varphi((2a+b+1,1)) = (a+b+2,2)$ and $\varphi((2,0)) = (2b,0)$ imply $\varphi((2b-1+a,1)) \in \{(2a+b,1),(2a+2,0)\}$. Now $\varphi((3-a+b,0)) \sim \varphi((3a-b,2))$ and $\varphi((3b,1)) = (3,2)$ imply

$$\varphi((3-a+b,0)) \in \{(3b+1-a,0),(3a+2,2),(a+2b-2,1)\}. \quad (67)$$

**Case D(b)(2)(c):** If $\varphi((2b-1+a,1)) = (2b+2,0)$ then $\varphi((3-a+b,0)) \sim \varphi((2b-1+a,1))$, $\varphi((3b,1)) = (3,2)$ and $\varphi((2a+1,2)) = (2a+b,1)$ imply

$$\varphi((3-a+b,0)) \in \{(2a+3b,1),(3+2a,2)\}. \quad (68)$$

From the Equations [67] and [68] we have,

- either $2a+3b = 4a \pm b$, i.e., $2a-2b = 0$ or $2a-4b = 0$, which are impossible by Lemma 4.1
- or $3+2a = 3-2b$, i.e., $2a+2b = 0$, which is impossible by Lemma 4.1
- or $3+2a = 5$, i.e., $2a-2 = 0$, i.e., $2a-2b = 0$, which is impossible by Lemma 4.1

Hence $\varphi((2b-1+a,1)) \neq (2b+2,0)$.

**Case D(b)(2)(d):** If $\varphi((2b-1+a,1)) = (2a+b,2)$ then $\varphi((3-a+b,0)) \sim \varphi((2b-1+a,1))$, $\varphi((b-a+1,0)) = (b+1,0)$ and $\varphi((2a+1,2)) = (2a+b,1)$ imply

$$\varphi((3-a+b,0)) \in \{(3b+1-a,0),(2a+b-2,1)\}. \quad (69)$$

From the Equations [67] and [69] we have,

- either $2a+b-2 = 4a \pm b$, i.e., $2a+2 = 0$, i.e., $2a+2b = 0$ or $2a-2b+2 = 0$, which are impossible by Lemma 4.1
- $3b+1-a = 3b-a \pm 1$, this give rise to two equations, out of one is impossible, namely $2 = 0$. The only possibility which remains is $3b+1-a = 3b-a+1$, which is an identity. So assuming to be the case, we have, $\varphi((3-a+b,0)) = (3b-a+1,0)$, $\varphi((3a-b,2)) = (3a-1,1)$ and $\varphi((2b+a-1,1)) = (2+a-b,2)$.

Now $\varphi((4,0)) \sim \varphi((3b,1)) = (3,2)$, $\varphi((2,0)) = (2b,0)$, $\varphi((3a+b,2)) = (3a+1,1)$ and $\varphi((3a-b,2)) = (3a-1,1)$ imply $\varphi((4,0)) = (4b,0)$. $\varphi((2b,0)) \sim \varphi((1,2)) = (b+1)$, $\varphi((0,0)) = (0,0)$, $\varphi((a+1,1)) = (a+b,2)$ and $\varphi((a-1,1)) = (a-b,2)$ imply $\varphi((2b,0)) = (2,0)$.
Proceeding this way we can show that $\varphi((2k, 0)) = (2kb, 0)$, forall $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. So we have $\varphi((2b, 0)) = (2a, 0)$, where $k = a$, which is a contradiction as we have shown that $\varphi((2b, 0)) = (2, 0)$ and $2a \neq 2$ by Lemma 4.1. Therefore from the case $\textbf{D}(b)(1)$ we have $\varphi((a + 1, 1)) = (a + b, 2)$ and $\varphi((a - 1, 1)) = (a - b, 2)$ only if $n = 7, 14$. This completes the proof.

Now, the proof of Theorem 3.4 follows from Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3.

5. Open Issues

In this paper, we introduced an infinite family of half-transitive Cayley graphs. However, a few issues are still pending and can be topics for further research.

1. **Full Automorphism Group:** It was shown that $\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle$ is a subgroup of the full automorphism group. It remains to be shown (as observed in SageMath) that $G = \langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle$ for $n \neq 7, 14$.

2. **Structural Properties of $\Gamma(n, a)$:** We have computed the girth for some special values of $n$ and shown that $\Gamma(n, a)$ is Hamiltonian if $n$ is odd. However, the girth and Hamiltonicity for general values of $n$ are still unanswered. Similarly, other structural properties like diameter, domination number are few open issues.
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Appendix: Sage Code for $\Gamma(n, a)$ for $n = 7, a = 2$

```python
n=7
a=2
b=mod(a^2,n)
A=list(var('A_%d' % i) for i in range(n))
B=list(var('B_%d' % i) for i in range(3))
C = cartesian_product([A, B])
V=C.list()
E=[]
Gamma=Graph()
Gamma.add_vertices(V)
for i in range(n):
    for j in range(3):
        E.append(((A[i],B[j]),(A[mod(a*i+1,n)],B[mod(j-1,3)])))
        E.append(((A[i],B[j]),(A[mod(a*i-1,n)],B[mod(j-1,3)])))
        E.append(((A[i],B[j]),(A[mod(b*i+b,n)],B[mod(j+1,3)])))
        E.append(((A[i],B[j]),(A[mod(b*i-b,n)],B[mod(j+1,3)])))
Gamma.add_edges(E)
G=Gamma.automorphism_group()
for f in G:
    if f((A[0],B[0]))==(A[0],B[0]) and f((A[b],B[1]))==(A[1],B[2]) and f((A[1],B[2]))==(A[n-1],B[2]):
        print "sucess"
```
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