

Improved Bounds for (b, k) -hashing

Stefano Della Fiore*, Simone Costa*, Marco Dalai*

Abstract

For fixed integers $b \geq k$, a problem of relevant interest in computer science and combinatorics is that of determining the asymptotic growth, with n , of the largest set for which a (b, k) -hash family of n functions exists. Equivalently, determining the asymptotic growth of a largest subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, b\}^n$ such that, for any k distinct elements in the set, there is a coordinate where they all differ.

An important asymptotic upper bound for general b, k , was derived by Fredman and Komlós in the '80s and improved for certain $b \neq k$ by Körner and Marton and by Arikan. Only very recently better bounds were derived for the general b, k case by Guruswami and Riazanov while stronger results for small values of $b = k$ were obtained by Arikan, by Dalai, Guruswami and Radhakrishnan and by Costa and Dalai. In this paper, we both show how some of the latter results extend to $b \neq k$ and further strengthen the bounds for some specific small values of b and k . The method we use, which depends on the reduction of an optimization problem to a finite number of cases, shows that further results might be obtained by refined arguments at the expense of higher complexity which could be reduced by using more sophisticated and optimized algorithmic approaches.

Keywords: perfect hashing, list decoding, zero-error capacity, extremal combinatorics
MSC: 68R05

1 Introduction

The problem considered in this paper has a twofold history which connects it naturally with combinatorial aspects of computer science and information theory. Let b, k and n be integers and let \mathcal{C} be a subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, b\}^n$ with the property that for any k distinct elements we can find a coordinate where they all differ. Such a set can be interpreted, by looking at it coordinate-wise, as a family of n hashing functions on some universe of size $|\mathcal{C}|$; the required property then says that the family is a perfect hash family, that is, any k elements in the universe are k -partitioned by at least one function. Otherwise, \mathcal{C} can be interpreted as a code of rate $\log(|\mathcal{C}|)/n$ for communication over a channel with b inputs. Assume that the channel is a $b/(k-1)$ channel, meaning that any $k-1$ of the b inputs share one output but no k distinct inputs do (see Figure 1). The required property for \mathcal{C} is what is needed for the receiver to always be able to produce a list of $k-1$ codewords of \mathcal{C} which must necessarily include the one that was sent; that is, zero-error communication with $(k-1)$ -list decoding is possible. Indeed, the condition implies that any k codewords use, in at least one coordinate, all k different symbols, and one of them will not be compatible with the received symbol in that coordinate. We refer the reader to [8], [9], [13], [14] for an overview of the more general context of this problem. Some recent important results in a different asymptotic setting can be found in [4].

We will call any subset \mathcal{C} of $\{1, 2, \dots, b\}^n$ with the described property a (b, k) -hash code. For the reasons mentioned above, bounding the size of (b, k) -hash codes is a combinatorial

*DII, University of Brescia, Via Branze 38, 25123 Brescia, Italy. Emails: s.dellafiore001@unibs.it, simone.costa@unibs.it, marco.dalai@unibs.it.




Figure 1: A $4/2$ channel. Edges represent positive probabilities. Here, zero-error communication is possible when decoding with list-size equal to 2.

problem which has been of interest in both computer science and information theory. It is known that (b, k) -hash codes of exponential size in n can be constructed and the quantity of interest is usually the rate of such codes. We will thus study the quantity

$$R_{(b,k)} = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{C}_n| \quad (1)$$

where the \mathcal{C}_n are (b, k) -hash codes of length n with maximal cardinality. Note that, throughout the paper, all logarithms are to base 2.

Few lower bounds on $R_{(b,k)}$ are known. First results in this sense were given by [9], [8] and a better bound was derived by [12] for $b = k = 3$. More recently, new lower bounds were derived in [16] for infinitely many other values of k . The first, landmark result concerning the upper bounds was obtained by Fredman-Komlós [9], who showed that

$$R_{(b,k)} \leq \frac{b^{k-1}}{b^{k-1}} \log(b - k + 2), \quad (2)$$

where $b^{k-1} = b(b-1) \cdots (b-k+2)$. Progresses have since been rare. A generalization of the bound given in equation (2) was derived by Körner and Marton [12] in the form

$$R_{(b,k)} \leq \min_{2 \leq j \leq k-2} \frac{b^{j+1}}{b^{j+1}} \log \frac{b-j}{k-j-1}. \quad (3)$$

This was further improved for different values of b and k by Arikan [3]. In the case $b = k$, an improvement was first obtained for $k = 4$ in [2] and then in [6], [7]. It was proved only recently in [10] that the Fredman-Komlós bound is not tight for any $b \geq k > 3$; explicit better values were given there for $b = k = 5, 6$, and for larger $b = k$ modulo a conjecture which is proved in [5], where further improvements are also obtained for $b = k = 5, 6$.

In this paper, we develop a new strategy to attack some of the cases which appear not to be optimally handled by those methods. This approach originated with the main goal of improving the results of [5] for the $b = k$ case, and we indeed derive better bounds for $5 \leq b = k \leq 8$. However, we also investigate in detail the case of $b > k$ showing that our method started in [5] and further extended in this paper improves on the existing literature for many $b \neq k$ cases. Since the case $b > k$ was not discussed in the recent mentioned papers [6], [10], we also analyze the results obtained with those methods once extended to $b \neq k$ and compare them with the ones of [12], [3], and our own, providing an updated review of the recent contributions in this field.

The generalization of the procedure used in [6] is rather easy. The interested reader will find, upon inspection of the proof of Theorem 3 in [6], that modulo using a hypergraph version of the Hansel Lemma (see Lemma 2 in the next section), Lemma 5 in [6] is generalized as follows. Define, for any two probability vectors p and q over $\{1, 2, \dots, b\}$, the function

$$\phi(p, q) := \sum_{\substack{(i,h): i \neq h \\ i, h \in \{1, \dots, b\}}} p_i p_h (1 - q_i - q_h).$$

Lemma 1 (Extension of Lemma 5 in [6]). *Let W a random variable taking values in a set \mathcal{W} . For each $\omega \in \mathcal{W}$, let $f^\omega \in \mathbb{R}^b$ be a probability vector with $b \geq 4$. Suppose $f := \mathbb{E}_W[f^\omega]$ is such that $\min_a f_a \geq \frac{1}{2b-2}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_W[\phi(f_W, f)] \leq \phi(f, f) \leq \frac{b^2 - 3b + 2}{b^2}.$$

The following argument used in [6, Theorem 3] can be applied here. Fix a (b, k) -hash C with sufficiently large length n . Suppose there exists a coordinate $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and a symbol $c \in \{1, 2, \dots, b\}$ such that $f_{i,c} < \frac{1}{2b-2}$, where f_i is the frequency vector of the symbols in the i -th coordinate of C , then we can build another (b, k) -hash code C' by removing all the codewords in C for which the symbol in the i -th coordinate is equal to c and by deleting this coordinate in the remaining codewords. Clearly C' has length $n - 1$. This process can be iterated in order to get a code in which $f_{i,a} \geq \frac{1}{2b-2}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n - t\}$ and for all $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, b\}$. The integer t represents the number of iterations.

Thanks to Lemma 1 and to the reduction process that we have just described, the only condition to check, in order to extend the procedure used in [6] for the (b, k) -case, is that the upper bound eventually obtained at the end of the procedure (equation (4) below) is greater than $\log \frac{2b-2}{2b-3}$ for every $b \geq k \geq 4$. Therefore we get the following bound

$$R_{(b,k)} \leq \left(\frac{1}{\log b} + \frac{b^2}{(b^2 - 3b + 2) \log \frac{b-2}{k-3}} \right)^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

The case of $b \neq k$ is not described in detail in [10] but, as the authors mention, it is straightforward. We do not write here the derivation since it involves complicated expressions with little additional insight. We thus only computed the numerical bounds obtained and point out the regime of (b, k) values where this method dominates other known ones.

In Table 1 we give a comparison between bounds (4) and (3), the bounds of [3] and [10] and our new bounds for different values of b and k . In Table 2 we show that for some (b, k) -cases the bound (4) is the best bound among all the current known bounds, in particular when b is much larger than k . Finally, in Table 3 we provide some (b, k) -cases where the bound of [10] is the current best known bound, in particular when b and k are large and nearly equal. Clearly, the cases reported in Tables 2 and 3 are not exhaustive, but they have been properly selected to point out that our method does not always provide the best bound. The integers in the parentheses for bounds [10], [3] and [12], in Tables 1, 2 and 3, represent the optimal value of a parameter which has the same role as j in (3) and which will be discussed later. When its value is not reported, it is equal to $k - 2$ for our bounds and for bounds of [10], [3] and [12]. Instead, for bound (4) it is always equal to 2.

The paper is structured as follows. In the Section 2 we give some background on the method used in the mentioned recent series of works to find upper bounds, presented here in the general form for the (b, k) case using the hypergraph version Hansel's lemma. In Section 3 we present the main new ingredient of this paper, which is a way to improve the bounds derived in [5] by means of a more careful analysis of a quadratic form that was also objective of that study. In Section 4, we show how this idea can be effectively implemented after an appropriate reduction of the problem to a list of cases that can be studied exhaustively.

The implementation of an exhaustive study over a finite set of non-reducible cases plays an important role in deriving the results of this paper, and we believe that further studies on this problem are likely to reveal that the use of new algorithmic techniques could have a relevant role also for future improvements.

2 Structure of the General Method

The best upper bounds on $R_{(b,k)}$ available in the literature can all be seen as different applications of a central idea, which is the study of (b, k) -hashing by comparison with a

Table 1: Upper bounds on $R_{(b,k)}$. All numbers are rounded upwards.

| (b, k) | Our method | [3] | [10] | [12] |
|----------|-----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| (5, 5) | 0.16894 ¹ | 0.23560 | 0.19079 | 0.19200 |
| (6, 5) | 0.34512 ¹ | 0.44149 | 0.43207 | 0.44027 |
| (6, 6) | 0.08475 ¹ | 0.15484 | 0.09228 | 0.09260 |
| (7, 6) | 0.19897 ² | 0.30554 | 0.23524 | 0.23765 |
| (8, 6) | 0.31799 ² | 0.44888 | 0.40330 | 0.41016 |
| (9, 6) | 0.43237 ² | 0.58303 | 0.58486 | 0.59455 |
| (10, 6) | 0.53909 ² | 0.73304 | 0.76977 | 0.78170 |
| (11, 6) | 0.63766 ² | 0.87038 | 0.95285 | 0.96640 |
| (12, 6) | 0.72848 ² | 0.99588 | 1.13118 | 1.14584 |
| (13, 6) | 0.81227 ² | 1.11084 | 1.30322 | 1.31855 |
| (14, 6) | 0.88978 ² | 1.21657 | 1.46822 | 1.48388 |
| (7, 7) | 0.04090 ¹ | 0.09747 | 0.04279 | 0.04284 |
| (8, 7) | 0.10865 ² | 0.20340 | 0.12134 | 0.12189 |
| (9, 7) | 0.19054 ² | 0.31204 | 0.22547 | 0.22761 |
| (10, 7) | 0.27741 ² | 0.41982 | 0.34615 | 0.35108 |
| (11, 7) | 0.36424 ² | 0.52472 | 0.47856 | 0.48538 |
| (12, 7) | 0.44850 ² | 0.65160 | 0.61698 | 0.62549 |
| (13, 7) | 0.52902 ² | 0.77148 | 0.75796 | 0.76792 |
| (14, 7) | 0.60538 ² | 0.88384 | 0.89915 | 0.91027 |
| (8, 8) | 0.01889 ¹ | 0.05769 | 0.01922 | 0.01923 |
| (9, 8) | 0.05616 ¹ | 0.12874 | 0.06001 | 0.06013 |
| (10, 8) | 0.10791 ² | 0.20754 | 0.12048 | 0.12096 |
| (11, 8) | 0.16878 ² | 0.29023 | 0.19680 | 0.19818 |
| (12, 8) | 0.23451 ² | 0.37434 | 0.28470 | 0.28797 |
| (13, 8) | 0.30214 ² | 0.45827 | 0.38245 | 0.38694 |
| (14, 8) | 0.36974 ² | 0.56612 | 0.48658 | 0.49227 |
| (10, 9) | 0.02773 ¹ | 0.07668 | 0.02874 | 0.02876 |
| (11, 9) | 0.05796 ² | 0.13098 | 0.06197 | 0.06208 |
| (12, 9) | 0.09730 ² | 0.19157 | 0.10746 | 0.10778 |
| (13, 9) | 0.14332 ² | 0.25611 | 0.16368 | 0.16444 |
| (14, 9) | 0.19382 ² | 0.32294 | 0.22865 | 0.23033 |
| (11, 10) | 0.01321 ¹ | 0.04289 | 0.01342 | 0.01343 |
| (12, 10) | 0.02978 ¹ | 0.07806 | 0.03093 | 0.03095 |
| (13, 10) | 0.05342 ² | 0.12009 | 0.05674 | 0.05681 |
| (14, 10) | 0.08332 ² | 0.16726 | 0.09071 | 0.09090 |
| (13, 11) | 0.01476 ¹ | 0.04400 | 0.01506 | 0.01506 |
| (14, 11) | 0.02815 ² | 0.07141 | 0.02915 | 0.02916 |
| (14, 12) | 0.00712 ¹ | 0.02361 | 0.00718 | 0.00718 |
| (15, 13) | 0.00335 ¹ | 0.01218 | 0.00336 | 0.00336 |

¹Bounds obtained with the procedure of Section 3, strictly improving also the generalization of [5] to the (b, k) -case.

²Bounds where the procedure of Section 3 reduces to the same solution obtained by generalization of [5].

Table 2: Upper bounds on $R_{(b,k)}$. All numbers are rounded upwards.

| (b, k) | [6]* | [5]* | [3] | [10] | [12] |
|----------|----------------|---------|------------|------------|------------|
| (5, 4) | 0.57303 | 0.66126 | 0.61142 | 0.74834 | 0.73697(0) |
| (6, 4) | 0.77709 | 0.87963 | 0.83904 | 1.09604 | 1.00000(0) |
| (7, 4) | 0.94372 | 1.03711 | 1.02931 | 1.40593 | 1.22239(0) |
| (100, 6) | 2.81342 | — | 3.61848(2) | 4.87959(2) | 4.32193(0) |
| (100, 7) | 2.67473 | — | 3.41158(2) | 4.47696(2) | 4.05889(0) |

Missing values indicate impossibility to compute the bound due to high computational complexity.

*The generalized bound for the (b, k) case.

Table 3: Upper bounds on $R_{(b,k)}$. All numbers are rounded upwards.

| (b, k) | [10] | [5]* | [3] | [12] |
|----------|------------------------------------|---------|---------|-----------------------------|
| (9, 9) | 8.4288 · 10 ⁻³ | 0.00946 | 0.03182 | 8.4300 · 10 ⁻³ |
| (10, 10) | 3.6287 · 10 ⁻³ | 0.00419 | 0.01642 | 3.6288 · 10 ⁻³ |
| (11, 11) | 1.53895 · 10 ⁻³ | 0.00181 | 0.00803 | 1.53897 · 10 ⁻³ |
| (12, 11) | 6.13036 · 10 ⁻³ | 0.00664 | 0.02266 | 6.13075 · 10 ⁻³ |
| (12, 12) | 6.44678 · 10 ⁻⁴ | 0.00077 | 0.00377 | 6.44679 · 10 ⁻⁴ |
| (13, 12) | 2.75350 · 10 ⁻³ | 0.00305 | 0.01143 | 2.75355 · 10 ⁻³ |
| (13, 13) | 2.672760 · 10 ⁻⁴ | 0.00033 | 0.00172 | 2.672761 · 10 ⁻⁴ |
| (14, 13) | 1.218595 · 10 ⁻³ | 0.00138 | 0.00556 | 1.218599 · 10 ⁻³ |

*The generalized bound for the (b, k) case.

combinations of binary partitions. This main line of approach to the problem comes from the original work of Fredman and Kórnlos [9]. A clear and productive formulation of the idea was given by Radhakrishnan in terms of Hansel's lemma [15], which remained the main tool used in all recent results [7], [10] and [5]. We state the Lemma here and briefly revise for the reader convenience how this was applied in those works.

Lemma 2 (Hansel for Hypergraphs [11], [14]). *Let K_r^d be a complete d -uniform hypergraph on r vertices and let G_1, \dots, G_m be c -partite d -uniform hypergraphs on those vertices such that $\cup_i G_i = K_r^d$. Let $\tau(G_i)$ be the number of non-isolated vertices in G_i . Then*

$$\log \frac{c}{d-1} \sum_{i=1}^m \tau(G_i) \geq \log \frac{r}{d-1}. \quad (5)$$

The application to (b, k) -hashing relies on the following observation. Given a (b, k) -hash code C , fix any j elements x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j in C , with $j = 2, \dots, k-2$. For any coordinate i let $G_i^{x_1, \dots, x_j}$ be the $(b-j)$ -partite $(k-j)$ -uniform hypergraph with vertex set $G \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j\}$ and edge set

$$E = \{(y_1, \dots, y_{k-j}) : x_{1,i}, \dots, x_{j,i}, y_{1,i}, \dots, y_{k-j,i} \text{ are all distinct}\}. \quad (6)$$

Since C is a (b, k) -hash code, then $\cup_i G_i^{x_1, \dots, x_j}$ is the complete $(k-j)$ -uniform hypergraph on $G \setminus \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j\}$ and so

$$\log \frac{b-j}{k-j-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \tau(G_i^{x_1, \dots, x_j}) \geq \log \frac{|C| - j}{k-j-1}. \quad (7)$$

This inequality allows one to upper bound $|C|$ by upper bounding the left hand side. Inequality (7) holds for any choice of x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j , so the main goal is proving that the left hand

side is not too large for all possible choices of x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j . The choice can be deterministic or we can take the expectation over any random selection.

Note that if the $x_{1,i}, x_{2,i}, \dots, x_{j,i}$ are not all distinct (let us say that they “collide”) then the hypergraph defined by (6) is empty, that is the corresponding τ in the left hand side of (7) is zero. So, using codewords x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j which collide in many coordinates helps in upper bounding $|\mathcal{C}|$. On the other hand, in a coordinate i where the codewords do *not* collide, $\tau(G_i^{x_1, \dots, x_j})$ depends on what a fraction of the code uses the remaining $b - j$ symbols in the alphabet. This can be made small “on average” if x_1, \dots, x_j are picked randomly. More precisely, let f_i be probability distribution of the i -th coordinate of \mathcal{C} , that is, $f_{i,a}$ is the fraction of elements of \mathcal{C} whose i -th coordinate is a . Then, we have

$$\tau(G_i^{x_1, \dots, x_j}) = \begin{cases} 0 & x_1, \dots, x_j \text{ collide in coordinate } i \\ \binom{|\mathcal{C}|}{|\mathcal{C}|-j} \left(1 - \sum_{h=1}^j f_{i, x_{hi}}\right) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (8)$$

So, one can make the left hand side in (7) small by using x_1, \dots, x_j which collide in many coordinates and at the same time have in the remaining coordinates symbols x_{hi} for which the $f_{i, x_{hi}}$ are not too small. This can be obtained “on average” if x_1, \dots, x_j are picked in some random way over the code, since this will force values with large $f_{i, x_{hi}}$ to appear frequently as the i -th coordinate in some of the x_1, \dots, x_j . There are different ways to turn this into a precise argument to bound the right hand side of (7). We refer the reader to [5] for a detailed discussion, and we only discuss here the procedure as used there, since it is the base for our current contribution.

The idea is to partition the code \mathcal{C} in subcodes \mathcal{C}_ω , $\omega \in \Omega$. The only requirement is that each subcode has size which grows unbounded with n and uses in any of its first ℓ coordinates only $(j - 1)$ symbols. It can be show, by an easy extension of the method used for the case $b = k$ and $j = k - 2$ in [5], that if the original code has rate R , then for any $\epsilon > 0$ one can do this with a choice of $\ell = n(R - \epsilon) / \log \left(\frac{b}{j-1}\right)$ for n large enough. Given such a partition of our code, if we select codewords x_1, \dots, x_j within the same subcode \mathcal{C}_ω , they will collide in the first ℓ coordinates and the corresponding contribution to the l.h.s. of (7) will be zero. We then add the randomization. We pick randomly one of the subcodes \mathcal{C}_ω and randomly select the codewords x_1, \dots, x_j within \mathcal{C}_ω . We then upper bound the expected value of the left hand side of (7) under this random selection to obtain an upper bound on $|\mathcal{C}|$, that is

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{|\mathcal{C}| - j}{k - j - 1} &\leq \log \frac{b - j}{k - j - 1} \mathbb{E}_\omega(\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i \in [\ell+1, n]} \tau(G_i^{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j}) | \omega]) \\ &= \log \frac{b - j}{k - j - 1} \sum_{i \in [\ell+1, n]} \mathbb{E}_\omega(\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j}) | \omega]). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Here, each subcode \mathcal{C}_ω is taken with probability $\lambda_\omega = |\mathcal{C}_\omega|/|\mathcal{C}|$, and x_1, \dots, x_j are taken uniformly at random (without repetitions) from \mathcal{C}_ω .

As mentioned before, let f_i be the probability distribution of the i -th coordinate of \mathcal{C} , and let instead $f_{i|\omega}$ be the distribution of the i -th coordinate of the subcode \mathcal{C}_ω (with components, say, $f_{i,a|\omega}$). Then, for $i > \ell$, we can write

$$\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{x_1, \dots, x_j}) | \omega] = (1 + o(1)) \sum_{\substack{\text{distinct} \\ a_1, \dots, a_j}} f_{i, a_1 | \omega} f_{i, a_2 | \omega} \cdots f_{i, a_j | \omega} (1 - f_{i, a_1} - \cdots - f_{i, a_j}) \quad (10)$$

where the $o(1)$ is meant as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and is due, under the assumption that \mathcal{C}_ω grows unbounded with n , to sampling without replacement within \mathcal{C}_ω . Now, since $\lambda_\omega = |\mathcal{C}_\omega|/|\mathcal{C}|$, f_i is actually the expectation of $f_{i|\omega}$ over the random ω , that is, using a different dummy variable μ to index the subcodes for convenience,

$$f_i = \sum_{\mu} \lambda_{\mu} f_{i|\mu}.$$

Using this in (10), one notices that when taking further expectation over ω it is possible to operate a symmetrization in ω and μ . If we denote with Ψ the polynomial function defined for two probability distribution $p = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_b)$ and $q = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_b)$ as

$$\Psi(p, q) = \frac{1}{(b-j-1)!} \sum_{\sigma \in S_b} p_{\sigma(1)} p_{\sigma(2)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j)} q_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(1)} q_{\sigma(2)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j)} p_{\sigma(j+1)}, \quad (11)$$

then the expectation of (10) over ω can be written as

$$\mathbb{E}_\omega[\tau(G_i^{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j})] = (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega, \mu \in \Omega} \lambda_\omega \lambda_\mu \Psi(f_{i|\omega}, f_{i|\mu}). \quad (12)$$

In [5], the global maximum of the function $\Psi(p, q)$, over arbitrary distributions p and q , say

$$\Psi_{\max} = \max_{p, q} \Psi(p, q), \quad (13)$$

was used to deduce the inequality, valid for any $i > \ell$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\omega[\tau(G_i^{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_j})] \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2} \Psi_{\max}. \quad (14)$$

Then

$$\log |C| \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2} (n - \ell) \Psi_{\max} \log \frac{b-j}{k-j-1}, \quad (15)$$

from which, using the value of ℓ described above, one deduces

$$R \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \frac{R}{\log\left(\frac{b}{j-1}\right)} \right] \Psi_{\max} \log \frac{b-j}{k-j-1}.$$

This gives the explicit bound

$$R_{(b,k)} \leq \left(\frac{2}{\Psi_{\max} \log \frac{b-j}{k-j-1}} + \frac{1}{\log\left(\frac{b}{j-1}\right)} \right)^{-1}. \quad (16)$$

A weakness in this bound comes from the fact that distributions p and q that maximize $\Psi(p, q)$ could exhibit some opposing asymmetries, in the sense that they give higher probabilities to different symbols. When used as a replacement for *each* of the pairs of $f_{i|\omega}$ and $f_{i|\mu}$ in (12), we have a rather conservative bound, because pairs (p, q) which give high values for $\Psi(p, q)$ will give low values for $\Psi(p; p)$ and $\Psi(q; q)$, and equation (12) contains a weighted contribution from all pairings of $f_{i|\omega}$ and $f_{i|\mu}$. In other words, observed that (12) is a quadratic form in the distribution λ with symmetric matrix $\Psi(p, q)$, if the matrix has maximum value Ψ_{\max} in some off-diagonal (p, q) -positions to which there correspond small “in-diagonal” values at (p, p) and (q, q) , then using Ψ_{\max} as a bound for the whole quadratic form can be quite a conservative estimate.

In this paper, we estimate (12) more carefully by clustering the possible distributions $f_{i|\omega}$ in different groups depending on how balanced or unbalanced they are, and bounding $\Psi(f_{i|\omega}, f_{i|\mu})$ for $f_{i|\omega}$ and $f_{i|\mu}$ in those different groups. From this, we deduce a bound on the quadratic form. Note that since in the problem under consideration (that is, as $n \rightarrow \infty$) we have no limit in the granularity of the distributions $f_{i,\omega}$, the quadratic form that we have to bound might in principle have a limiting value which is only achieved with a continuous distribution λ over the simplex of b -dimensional distributions \mathcal{P}_b . Still, once we consider a finite number of clusters r for the distributions $f_{i|\omega}$, our quadratic form is upper bounded by a corresponding r -dimensional one. In our derivation, we will use $b+1$ clusters with some symmetric structure which allows us to further reduce the complexity to an equivalent four dimensional form and then to a quadratics in one single variable.

3 Bounding the quadratic form

Based on the discussion in the previous section, we now enter the problem of determining better upper bounds on the right hand side of (12). We simplify here the notation and consider the quadratic form

$$\sum_{p,q} \lambda_p \lambda_q \Psi(p; q) \quad (17)$$

where p and q run over an arbitrary finite set of points in the simplex \mathcal{P}_b of b -dimensional probability distribution and λ is a probability distribution over such set. We consider partitions of \mathcal{P}_b in disjoint subsets to find upper bounds on the quadratic form (17) in terms of simpler ones. If we have a partition $\{\mathcal{P}_b^0, \mathcal{P}_b^1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_b^r\}$ of \mathcal{P}_b and we define

$$m_{i,h} = \sup_{p \in \mathcal{P}_b^i, q \in \mathcal{P}_b^h} \Psi(p, q), \quad \eta_i = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_b^i} \lambda_p,$$

then clearly

$$\sum_{p,q} \lambda_p \lambda_q \Psi(p, q) \leq \sum_{i,h} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_b^i} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{P}_b^h} \lambda_p \lambda_q m_{i,h} \leq \sum_{i,h} \eta_i \eta_h m_{i,h}. \quad (18)$$

This is a convenient simplification since we have now an r -dimensional problem which we might be able to deal with in some computationally feasible way. We will use this procedure with two different partitions in terms of how balanced or unbalanced the distributions are. We take $b+1$ subsets with some symmetry which allows us to further reduce the complexity.

Partition based on maximum value. We first consider a partition of \mathcal{P}_b in terms of the largest probability value which appears in a distribution. We use a parameter $\epsilon \leq 1/(j+1)$; all quantities will depend on ϵ but we do not write this in order to avoid cluttering the notation. We define b sets of unbalanced distributions

$$\check{\mathcal{P}}_b^i = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_b : p_i > 1 - \epsilon\}$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq b$, and correspondingly a set of balanced distributions

$$\check{\mathcal{P}}_b^0 = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_b : p_i \leq 1 - \epsilon \forall i\}.$$

Note that these are all disjoint sets since $\epsilon < 1/2$ when $j \geq 2$. Following the scheme mentioned above, we can consider the values $m_{i,h}$ and η_i for this specific partition. However, due to symmetry, the values $m_{i,h}$ can be reduced to only four cases, depending on whether p and q are both balanced, one balanced and one unbalanced, or both unbalanced, either on the same coordinate or on different coordinates.

Assuming $1 \leq i, h \leq b$ with $i \neq h$, the following quantities are then well defined and independent of the specific values chosen for i and h

$$\begin{aligned} \check{M}_1 &= \sup_{p,q \in \check{\mathcal{P}}_b^0} \Psi(p; q) & \check{M}_2 &= \sup_{p \in \check{\mathcal{P}}_b^0, q \in \check{\mathcal{P}}_b^i} \Psi(p; q) \\ \check{M}_3 &= \sup_{p,q \in \check{\mathcal{P}}_b^i} \Psi(p; q) & \check{M}_4 &= \sup_{p \in \check{\mathcal{P}}_b^i, q \in \check{\mathcal{P}}_b^h} \Psi(p; q) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

These values can then be used in (18) in place of the values $m_{i,h}$.

Partition based on the minimum value. We also consider a partition of \mathcal{P}_b using constraints from below. Again we use a parameter ϵ which will be then tuned. We assume here $\epsilon < 1/b$. Consider now the following disjoint sets of unbalanced distributions

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_b^i = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_b : p_i < \epsilon, p_h \geq p_i \forall h, p_h > p_i \forall h < i\}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq b$, that is, distributions in $\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_b^i$ have a minimum component in the i -th coordinate, which is smaller than ϵ , and strictly smaller than any of the preceding components (unless of course $i = 1$). Correspondingly, define a set of balanced distributions as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_b^0 = \{p \in \mathcal{P}_b : p_i \geq \epsilon \forall i\}.$$

The symmetry argument mentioned before also applies in this case and we can continue in analogy replacing the $m_{i,h}$ of (18) with the following quantities

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{M}_1 &= \sup_{p,q \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_b^0} \Psi(p; q) & \widehat{M}_2 &= \sup_{p \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_b^0, q \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_b^i} \Psi(p; q) \\ \widehat{M}_3 &= \sup_{p,q \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_b^i} \Psi(p; q) & \widehat{M}_4 &= \sup_{p \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_b^i, q \in \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_b^h} \Psi(p; q) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where again $1 \leq i, h \leq b$ with $i \neq h$.

Quadratic form. Applying the above scheme with the symmetric partitions we just defined, we can now rewrite the upper bound of equation (18) in the form

$$\sum_{p,q} \lambda_p \lambda_q \Psi(p; q) \leq \eta_0^2 M_1 + \eta_0 \sum_{i>0} \eta_i M_2 + \sum_{i>0} \eta_i^2 M_3 + 2 \sum_{0<i<h} \eta_i \eta_h M_4. \quad (21)$$

Call M the maximum value achieved by the right hand side of (21) over all possible probability distributions $\eta = \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_b$ (which will of course depend on whether we use the \widehat{M}_i 's or \widetilde{M}_i 's values in place of the M_i 's). Then we can replace Ψ_{\max} in (16) with M to derive the bound

$$R_{(b,k)} \leq \left(\frac{2}{M \log \frac{b-j}{k-j-1}} + \frac{1}{\log \left(\frac{b}{j-1} \right)} \right)^{-1}. \quad (22)$$

We will describe in the next Section our procedure to determine, or upper bound the values \widehat{M}_i , \widetilde{M}_i and the corresponding M . Here we only state the obtained results.

Using the partition based on the maximum value $\{\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}_b^i\}_{i=0,\dots,b}$ we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} R_{(7,7)} &\leq 0.0408975, & R_{(8,8)} &\leq 0.0188887, & R_{(9,8)} &\leq 0.0561537, \\ R_{(10,9)} &\leq 0.0277279, & R_{(11,10)} &\leq 0.0132033, & R_{(12,10)} &\leq 0.0297606, \\ R_{(13,11)} &\leq 0.0147502, & R_{(14,12)} &\leq 0.0071115, & R_{(15,13)} &\leq 0.0033539. \end{aligned}$$

Using the partition based on the minimum value $\{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_b^i\}_{i=0,\dots,b}$ we get:

Theorem 2. *We have*

$$\begin{aligned} R_{(5,5)} &\leq 0.1689325, & R_{(6,5)} &\leq 0.3451130, \\ R_{(6,6)} &\leq \frac{5}{59} \approx 0.0847458. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1. *All the underlined (b, k) -cases in Table 1 are obtained computing, as done in [5], the global maximum of Ψ , which is attained for uniform distributions. Then, the partitioning process in these particular cases cannot make any improvements.*

Based on the results in [7], on its generalization given in equation (4) and on Theorem 2 when $(b, k) = (6, 6)$, we are led to formulate the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1. *For $b \geq k > 3$,*

$$R_{(b,k)} \leq \min_{2 \leq j \leq k-2} \left(\frac{1}{\log \frac{b}{j-1}} + \frac{b^{j+1}}{b^{j+1} \log \frac{b-j}{k-j-1}} \right)^{-1}.$$

Note that the conjectured expression can be seen as a modification of the Körner-Marton bound in (3) which takes into account the effects of prefix-based partitions.

4 Computation of M

We start with a Lemma which shows that, subject to a condition which will be satisfied in our setting, the computation of M once the M_i 's are given is simple.

Lemma 3. *Let M_1, M_2, M_3 and M_4 be positive numbers such that $M_4 > M_3$ and, for a probability distribution $\eta = \eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_b$, define the function*

$$h(\eta_0, \eta_1, \dots, \eta_b) = \eta_0^2 M_1 + 2\eta_0 \sum_{i=1}^b \eta_i M_2 + \sum_{i=1}^b \eta_i^2 M_3 + 2 \sum_{i < h} \eta_i \eta_h M_4.$$

Then the maximum of h is achieved for $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = \dots = \eta_b$ and

$$\eta_0 = \begin{cases} \frac{M_2 - \frac{1}{b} M_3 - \frac{b-1}{b} M_4}{2M_2 - M_1 - \frac{1}{b} M_3 - \frac{b-1}{b} M_4}, & \text{if } M_2 > M_1, M_3, M_4 \\ 0 \text{ or } 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. Since $\sum_{i=1}^b \eta_i = (1 - \eta_0)$, h can be written as:

$$\eta_0^2 M_1 + 2(1 - \eta_0)\eta_0 M_2 + \sum_{i=1}^b \eta_i^2 M_3 + 2 \sum_{i < h} \eta_i \eta_h M_4.$$

Note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^b \eta_i^2 M_3 + 2 \sum_{i < h} \eta_i \eta_h M_4 = \sum_{i=1}^b \eta_i^2 (M_3 - M_4) + (1 - \eta_0)^2 M_4.$$

Since $M_3 < M_4$ and $\sum_{i=1}^b \eta_i = 1 - \eta_0$, this sum is maximized when $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = \dots = \eta_b = (1 - \eta_0)/b$. Therefore we have to maximize the quantity

$$\eta_0^2 M_1 + 2(1 - \eta_0)\eta_0 M_2 + \frac{1}{b}(1 - \eta_0)^2 (M_3 - M_4) + (1 - \eta_0)^2 M_4,$$

which is just a quadratic in η_0 that achieves its maximum in $[0, 1]$ at the point described in the statement of the Lemma. \square

We then enter the problem of computing the quantities defined in equations (19) and (20). This requires determining the maximum values taken by $\Psi(p; q)$ for p and q constrained to specific subsets $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_b^i$ or $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_b^i$. We first present some Lemmas which allow us to isolate a relatively small set of possible configurations for the p and q which give a maximum.

Lemma 4 (Extension of Lemma 3 in [5]). *Let t be an integer in $[2, b]$ and let, for any $i \in [1, t]$, $I_i, J_i \subseteq [0, 1]$ be nonempty intervals. We define $D = (D_p; D_q)$ to be the set of probability vectors (p, q) such that, for any $i \in [1, t]$, p_i belongs to I_i , q_i belongs to J_i , and, for any $i \in [t+1, b]$, $p_i = \bar{p}_i$ and $q_i = \bar{q}_i$. If $(\bar{p}; \bar{q})$ is a maximum for Ψ in D then either $\bar{p}_i = \bar{p}_h$ and $\bar{q}_i = \bar{q}_h$ for any $i, h \in [1, t]$ or there is a maximum for Ψ on the boundary of D .*

Proof. Let assume that $\bar{P} = (\bar{p}; \bar{q})$ is a maximum for Ψ in D and $\bar{p}_1, \bar{p}_2, \dots, \bar{p}_t$ or $\bar{q}_1, \bar{q}_2, \dots, \bar{q}_t$ are not all equal. By symmetry, assume without loss of generality that $\bar{p}_1 \neq \bar{p}_2$. Now, if \bar{P} is a maximum for Ψ under the hypothesis, 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 $i \in \{3, 4, \dots, b\}$. If \bar{P} is not on the boundary of D , then, using the Lagrange multiplier method we find that

$$\left. \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial p_1} \right|_{\bar{P}} = \left. \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial p_2} \right|_{\bar{P}}$$

and

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

Since Ψ is quadratic in p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 , all those derivaties are linear in these variables. More precisely, the relations can be rewritten as

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

and

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

where $a = \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial p_1 \partial p_2} \Big|_{\bar{P}}$, $b = \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial p_1 \partial q_2} \Big|_{\bar{P}} = \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial q_1 \partial p_2} \Big|_{\bar{P}} = c$, $d = \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial q_1 \partial q_2} \Big|_{\bar{P}}$ and a, b, c, d do not depend on p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 . If we set $\bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2 = x$, $\bar{q}_1 - \bar{q}_2 = y$, the previous equations become

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

In the case $ad - bc \neq 0$ the previous system admits only the solution $x = y = 0$, which means $\bar{p}_1 = \bar{p}_2$ and $\bar{q}_1 = \bar{q}_2$. But this is in contradiction with the assumption that $\bar{p}_1 \neq \bar{p}_2$. Therefore we can assume $ad - bc = 0$. Then there exists a line L of points $P(t)$ such that $P(1) = \bar{P}$, $P(0) = (\frac{\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2}{2}, \frac{\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2}{2}, \bar{p}_3, \dots, \bar{p}_b; \frac{\bar{q}_1 + \bar{q}_2}{2}, \frac{\bar{q}_1 + \bar{q}_2}{2}, \bar{q}_3, \dots, \bar{q}_b)$ and

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

We can parametrize L as

$$P(t) = P(0) + t \left(\frac{\bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2}{2}, \frac{-\bar{p}_1 + \bar{p}_2}{2}, 0, \dots, 0; \frac{\bar{q}_1 - \bar{q}_2}{2}, \frac{-\bar{q}_1 + \bar{q}_2}{2}, 0, \dots, 0 \right).$$

Then a simple calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Psi(P(t))}{dt} &= \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial p_1} \Big|_{P(t)} \frac{dp_1}{dt} + \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial p_2} \Big|_{P(t)} \frac{dp_2}{dt} + \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial q_1} \Big|_{P(t)} \frac{dq_1}{dt} + \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial q_2} \Big|_{P(t)} \frac{dq_2}{dt} = \\ &\left(\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial p_1} \Big|_{P(t)} - \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial p_2} \Big|_{P(t)} \right) \frac{\bar{p}_1 - \bar{p}_2}{2} + \left(\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial q_1} \Big|_{P(t)} - \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial q_2} \Big|_{P(t)} \right) \frac{\bar{q}_1 - \bar{q}_2}{2} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\Psi(P(t))$ is constantly equal to the value of Ψ in $\bar{P} = P(1)$. Moreover, since both $P(1)$ and $P(0)$ satisfy $p_1 + p_2 = c_1$, $q_1 + q_2 = c_2$ and $p_i = \bar{p}_i, q_i = \bar{q}_i$ for $i \in \{3, 4, \dots, b\}$, $P(t) = (p(t), q(t))$ is a line of probability vectors $p(t), q(t)$. Due to the form of D , $P(t)$ intersect the boundary of D in a point $M = (p_M, q_M)$ that is also a maximum for Ψ . Therefore, if $\bar{p}_1, \bar{p}_2, \dots, \bar{p}_t$ or $\bar{q}_1, \bar{q}_2, \dots, \bar{q}_t$ are not all equal, there exists also a maximum for Ψ on the boundary of D . \square

With essentially the same proof we obtain

Lemma 5 (Extension of Lemma 4 in [5]). *Let t be an integer in $[2, b]$ and let, for any $i \in [1, t]$, $I_i \subseteq [0, 1]$ be a nonempty interval. We define D_p to be the set of probability vectors p such that, for any $i \in [1, t]$, p_i belongs to I_i and, for any $i \in [t+1, b]$, $p_i = \bar{p}_i$. We also consider \bar{q} such that $\bar{q}_i = \bar{q}_h$ for i, h in $[1, t]$. Then, if $(\bar{p}; \bar{q})$ is a maximum for Ψ in $D = (D_p; \bar{q})$, we have that either $\bar{p}_i = \bar{p}_h$ for any $i, h \in [1, t]$ or there is a maximum for Ψ on the boundary of D .*

Remark 2. *In order to find the values \widetilde{M}_1 we need to restrict the function Ψ to a domain of the form $D = (D_p; D_q)$ where $D_p = D_q = [0, 1 - \epsilon]^b$. Now, due to Lemma 4, the only point we need to check in the inner part of D is $(1/b, \dots, 1/b; 1/b, \dots, 1/b)$: if this is not the maximum then there exists a maximum with at least one coordinate equal either to 0 or to $1 - \epsilon$. Moreover, if we suppose that the maximum has a fixed set of coordinates that are zero or $1 - \epsilon$, because of Lemmas 4 and 5 we can average the remaining components. More precisely, we have that \widetilde{M}_1 is assumed in one of the following points (where the number of zeros can be also zero).*

- If p and q have respectively l_1 and l_2 zeros and both have a $1 - \epsilon$ coordinate and the $1 - \epsilon$ are in different positions:

$$\overbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}^{l_1}, \underbrace{(\alpha, \dots, \alpha)}_{l_2}, \overbrace{(\beta, \dots, \beta)}^{b-l_1-l_2-2}, \gamma, 1 - \epsilon; \overbrace{(\delta, \dots, \delta)}^{l_1}, \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{l_2}, \overbrace{(\eta, \dots, \eta)}^{b-l_1-l_2-2}, 1 - \epsilon, \zeta);$$

- If p and q have respectively l_1 and l_2 zeros and both have a $1 - \epsilon$ coordinate and the $1 - \epsilon$ are in same position:

$$\overbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}^{l_1}, \underbrace{(\alpha, \dots, \alpha)}_{l_2}, \overbrace{(\beta, \dots, \beta)}^{b-l_1-l_2-1}, 1 - \epsilon; \overbrace{(\delta, \dots, \delta)}^{l_1}, \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{l_2}, \overbrace{(\eta, \dots, \eta)}^{b-l_1-l_2-1}, 1 - \epsilon);$$

- If p and q have respectively l_1 and l_2 zeros and p does not have a $1 - \epsilon$ coordinate but q has:

$$\overbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}^{l_1}, \underbrace{(\alpha, \dots, \alpha)}_{l_2}, \overbrace{(\beta, \dots, \beta)}^{b-l_1-l_2-1}, \gamma; \overbrace{(\delta, \dots, \delta)}^{l_1}, \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{l_2}, \overbrace{(\eta, \dots, \eta)}^{b-l_1-l_2-1}, 1 - \epsilon);$$

- If p and q have respectively l_1 and l_2 zeros and both do not have a $1 - \epsilon$ coordinate:

$$\overbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}^{l_1}, \underbrace{(\alpha, \dots, \alpha)}_{l_2}, \overbrace{(\beta, \dots, \beta)}^{b-l_1-l_2}, \overbrace{(\delta, \dots, \delta)}^{l_1}, \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{l_2}, \overbrace{(\eta, \dots, \eta)}^{b-l_1-l_2}.$$

Now, since all the domains \check{P}_b^i satisfy the hypotheses of Lemmas 4 and 5, we can apply similar reductions to calculate \widetilde{M}_2 , \widetilde{M}_3 , and \widetilde{M}_4 .

Regarding to the values \widehat{M}_i we proceed as before when $i \neq 3$. For \widehat{M}_3 , instead, we can extend the domain \widehat{P}_b^i to satisfy the hypotheses of the Lemmas, thus obtaining an upper bound on \widehat{M}_3 .

As we seen in Remark 2, Lemmas 4 and 5 reduce the maxima candidates to a finite set of possible configurations. Still, the number of such configurations increases with b and the ensuing optimization problems depend on 4 free variables. So, additional simplifications are needed to obtain numerical evaluations of the maxima. The following lemma implies that if we have (possibly multiple) minimum values in p and q their positions must be different in order to maximize Ψ . It will also follow that if the p -components are non-decreasing, i.e. $p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots \leq p_b$, then the q -components must be non-increasing, i.e. $q_1 \geq q_2 \geq \dots \geq q_b$, in order to maximize Ψ .

Lemma 6 (Extension of Lemma 5 in [5]). *If $p_1 \leq p_2$, and $q_1 \leq q_2$, then*

$$\Psi(p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_b; q_1, q_2, q_3, \dots, q_b) \leq \Psi(p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_b; q_2, q_1, q_3, \dots, q_b). \quad (23)$$

Proof. Using the definition of Ψ in eq. (11), inequality (23) can be restated by only considering the terms in the summation which differ in the two sides, that is, those corresponding to permutations σ such that $1 \in \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\}$, $\sigma(j+1) = 2$ and $2 \in \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\}$, $\sigma(j+1) = 1$. Hence inequality (23) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & (p_1 q_2 + p_2 q_1) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} \\ & \leq (p_1 q_1 + p_2 q_2) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} \end{aligned}$$

which can be restated as

$$\begin{aligned} & p_1(q_2 - q_1) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} \\ & \leq p_2(q_2 - q_1) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} \end{aligned}$$

This is always true since $p_1 \leq p_2$ and $q_1 \leq q_2$. \square

The following lemma considers the case when the p -vector has $b - j + 1$ or more zeros, this simplifies the ψ function, since the term $p_{\sigma(1)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j)} q_{\sigma(j+1)}$ in the definition of Ψ is always 0.

Lemma 7 (Extension of Lemma 6 in [5]). *Suppose that $q_1 \leq q_2 \leq \cdots \leq q_{j-1}$. If all the p_i are less than $1 - \alpha$ where $0 \leq \alpha < 1$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{j-1}, 0, \dots, 0; q_1, q_2, \dots, q_b) \\ & \leq \Psi(1 - \alpha, \alpha, 0, \dots, 0; q_1, q_2, q_3, \dots, q_b). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Proof. Let $0 \leq \delta \leq p_2$. We first prove that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{j-1}, 0, \dots, 0; q_1, q_2, \dots, q_b) \\ & \leq \Psi(p_1 + \delta, p_2 - \delta, \dots, p_{j-1}, 0, \dots, 0; q_1, q_2, \dots, q_b). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Using the definition of Ψ in eq. (11), inequality (25) can be restated by only considering the terms in the summation which differ in the two sides, that is, those corresponding to permutations σ such that $1 \in \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\}$, $\sigma(j+1) = 2$ and $2 \in \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\}$, $\sigma(j+1) = 1$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} & (p_1 q_2 + p_2 q_1) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} \\ & \leq ((p_1 + \delta) q_2 + (p_2 - \delta) q_1) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Inequality (25) is thus satisfied since $q_1 \leq q_2$ and $\delta \geq 0$. Moreover, given $h > i$ and δ such that $0 \leq \delta \leq p_h$, with the same argument we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi(p_1, \dots, p_i, \dots, p_h, \dots, p_{j-1}, 0, \dots, 0; q_1, q_2, \dots, q_b) \\ & \leq \Psi(p_1, \dots, p_i + \delta, \dots, p_h - \delta, \dots, p_{j-1}, 0, \dots, 0; q_1, q_2, \dots, q_b). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Using multiple times inequality (27) then inequality (24) is satisfied. \square

The following lemmas take care of the cases when there is at least one element greater or equal to $1 - \epsilon$ in p or q vector. If this element is p_1 , because of Lemma 6 we can assume q_1 is the minimum among the q -values if we are maximizing Ψ .

Lemma 8. *Assume that $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{j+1}$, $p_1 \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and $q_1 \leq q_2 \leq \cdots \leq q_b$. Then*

$$\Psi(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_b; q_1, q_2, \dots, q_b) \leq \Psi(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_b; 0, q_1 + q_2, q_3, \dots, q_b). \quad (28)$$

Proof. Using the definition of Ψ in eq. (11), inequality (28) can be restated by only considering the terms in the summation which differ in the two sides, that is, those corresponding

to permutations σ such that $1 \in \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\}$, $\sigma(j+1) = 2$ and $2 \in \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\}$, $\sigma(j+1) = 1$ and $\{1, 2\} \subseteq \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\}$. Hence inequality (28) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} & (p_1 q_2 + p_2 q_1) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} + \\ & (j-1) q_2 q_1 \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j)} p_{\sigma(j+1)} \\ & \leq \\ & p_1 (q_1 + q_2) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

That is

$$\begin{aligned} & p_2 q_1 \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} + \\ & (j-1) q_2 q_1 \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j)} p_{\sigma(j+1)} \\ & \leq \\ & p_1 q_1 \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & p_2 q_1 \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} + \\ & (j-1) q_2 q_1 \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j)} p_{\sigma(j+1)} \\ & \leq \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & q_1 \epsilon \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} + \\ & (j-1) q_1 \epsilon \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} q_2 q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j)} \\ & \leq \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & q_1 \epsilon \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + j \cdot q_1 \epsilon \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} \\ & \leq \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & (1 - \epsilon) q_1 \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} \\ & \leq \\ & p_1 q_1 \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Inequality (29) holds because $p_2, p_3, \dots, p_b \leq \epsilon$, inequality (30) because $q_2 \leq q_3 \leq \dots \leq q_b$, inequality (31) due to the assumption $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{j+1}$ and finally inequality (32) given that $p_1 \geq 1 - \epsilon$. \square

Lemma 9. Assume that $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$, $q_1 > 1 - \epsilon$ and $0 < \delta \leq \epsilon$, then

$$\Psi(1 - \epsilon + \delta, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_b; q_1, q_2, \dots, q_b) \leq \Psi(1 - \epsilon, p_2 + \delta, p_3, \dots, p_b; q_1, q_2, \dots, q_b). \tag{33}$$

Proof. Using the definition of Ψ in eq. (11), inequality (33) can be restated by only considering the terms in the summation which differ in the two sides, that is, those corresponding to permutations σ such that $1 \in \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\}$, $\sigma(j+1) = 2$ and $2 \in \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\}$, $\sigma(j+1) = 1$ and $\{1, 2\} \subseteq \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(j)\}$. Inequality (33) can be restated as

$$\begin{aligned}
& ((1 - \epsilon + \delta)q_2 + q_1 p_2) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} + \\
& (j-1)(1 - \epsilon + \delta)p_2 \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j)} q_{\sigma(j+1)} \\
& \leq \\
& ((1 - \epsilon)q_2 + q_1(p_2 + \delta)) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j+1)} + q_{\sigma(3)} \cdots q_{\sigma(j+1)} + \\
& (j-1)(1 - \epsilon)(p_2 + \delta) \sum_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}(3, \dots, b)} p_{\sigma(3)} \cdots p_{\sigma(j)} q_{\sigma(j+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Which is satisfied because $q_2 < q_1$ and $p_2 < 1 - \epsilon$. \square

The previous lemmas allow us to determine a finite list of maxima candidates for each \widetilde{M}_i and \widehat{M}_i . We have analytically determined and inspected using Mathematica all the possible maximum points. We have restricted our attention to (b, k) -cases for small b and k in order to avoid an excessive computational complexity obtaining the following results.

Proposition 1. *For $j = k - 2$, for the values of ϵ shown, we have that*

| (b, k) | ϵ | \widetilde{M}_1 | \widetilde{M}_2 | \widetilde{M}_3 | \widetilde{M}_4 |
|----------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| (7, 7) | 9/100 | 0.085679 | 0.092593 | 0.000006 | 0.000107 |
| (8, 8) | 3/25 | 0.038453 | 0.042840 | 0.000002 | 0.000022 |
| (9, 8) | 1/10 | 0.075870 | 0.076905 | 0.000001 | 0.000015 |
| (10, 9) | 1/15 | 0.036289 | 0.037935 | $3.4 \cdot 10^{-9}$ | $8.5 \cdot 10^{-8}$ |
| (11, 10) | 1/11 | 0.016928 | 0.018144 | $1.4 \cdot 10^{-9}$ | $2.7 \cdot 10^{-8}$ |
| (12, 10) | 1/20 | 0.030945 | 0.031036 | $2.1 \cdot 10^{-11}$ | $7.0 \cdot 10^{-9}$ |
| (13, 11) | 1/25 | 0.015057 | 0.015473 | $7.8 \cdot 10^{-14}$ | $3.5 \cdot 10^{-12}$ |
| (14, 12) | 1/13 | 0.007176 | 0.007529 | $1.2 \cdot 10^{-12}$ | $2.6 \cdot 10^{-11}$ |
| (15, 13) | 1/12 | 0.003360 | 0.003588 | $1.1 \cdot 10^{-13}$ | $2.3 \cdot 10^{-12}$ |

\widetilde{M}_1 attained at $(\frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b}; \frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b})$
 \widetilde{M}_2 attained at $(1, 0, \dots, 0; 0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1})$
 \widetilde{M}_3 attained at $(1 - \epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-1}; 1 - \epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-1})$
 \widetilde{M}_4 attained at $(1 - \epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, 0; 0, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, 1 - \epsilon)$

Proposition 2. *For $j = 3$, $(b, k) = (5, 5)$ and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{44}(4 + \sqrt{5})$ we have that*

| \widehat{M}_i | Attained at point $(p; q)$ | Values \approx |
|-----------------|--|------------------|
| \widehat{M}_1 | $(\epsilon, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta), \delta \approx 0.185275$ | 0.384033 |
| \widehat{M}_2 | $(0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta), \delta = \epsilon$ | 0.389226 |
| \widehat{M}_3 | $(\epsilon, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-2}, 0; \epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta), \beta \approx 0.454183$ | 0.374759 |
| \widehat{M}_4 | $(0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta), \delta = \epsilon$ | 0.389226 |

For $j = 3$, $(b, k) = (6, 5)$ and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{10}$ we have that

| \widehat{M}_i | Attained at point $(p; q)$ | Values \approx |
|-----------------|--|------------------|
| \widehat{M}_1 | $(\epsilon, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta), \delta \approx 0.153159$ | 0.555625 |
| \widehat{M}_2 | $(0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta), \delta \approx 0.130217$ | 0.558467 |
| \widehat{M}_3 | $(\epsilon, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-2}, 0; \epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta), \beta \approx 0.376930$ | 0.535106 |
| \widehat{M}_4 | $(0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta), \delta \approx 0.130217$ | 0.558467 |

For $j = 4$, $(b, k) = (6, 6)$ and $\epsilon = \frac{1}{20}$ we have that

| \widehat{M}_i | Attained at point $(p; q)$ | Values \approx |
|-----------------|---|------------------|
| \widehat{M}_1 | $(\frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b}; \frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b})$ | 0.185185 |
| \widehat{M}_2 | $(\epsilon, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta), \delta \approx 0.147757$ | 0.178857 |
| \widehat{M}_3 | $(\epsilon, 0, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-2}; 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ | 0.140664 |
| \widehat{M}_4 | $(1, 0, \dots, 0; 0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1})$ | 0.192000 |

Remark 3. The values reported for \widehat{M}_3 are not approximate values of the exact values of \widehat{M}_3 but, instead, they are upper bounds. We point out that the value \widehat{M}_1 for $b = k = 6$ is only attained for uniform distributions. This will be important for a qualitative analysis of our bound on $R_{(b,k)}$ for different values of b and k , see Section 5.

As a consequence of Propositions 1, 2 and equation (21) we are able to evaluate the values of M for both the partitions $\{\check{P}_b^i\}_{i=0,\dots,b}$ and $\{\widehat{P}_b^i\}_{i=0,\dots,b}$. Then we state the following theorem

Theorem 3. Using the partition $\{\check{P}_b^i\}_{i=0,\dots,b}$ we get

- for $(b, k) = (7, 7)$ we have that $M \approx 0.0861594$;
- for $(b, k) = (8, 8)$ we have that $M \approx 0.0388599$;
- for $(b, k) = (9, 8)$ we have that $M \approx 0.0758830$.
- for $(b, k) = (10, 9)$ we have that $M \approx 0.0363565$.
- for $(b, k) = (11, 10)$ we have that $M \approx 0.0170049$.
- for $(b, k) = (12, 10)$ we have that $M \approx 0.0309448$.
- for $(b, k) = (13, 11)$ we have that $M \approx 0.0150674$.
- for $(b, k) = (14, 12)$ we have that $M \approx 0.0071917$.
- for $(b, k) = (15, 13)$ we have that $M \approx 0.0033733$.

Using the partition $\{\widehat{P}_b^i\}_{i=0,\dots,b}$ we get

- for $(b, k) = (5, 5)$ we have that $M \approx 0.3873676$;
- for $(b, k) = (6, 5)$ we have that $M \approx 0.5567010$;
- for $(b, k) = (6, 6)$ we have that $M = \frac{5}{27} \approx 0.185185$.

Remark 4. For the underlined (b, k) -cases reported in Table 1, it is interesting to note that the maximum in (13) is only achieved for uniform distributions. This means that, for these particular cases, any new upper bounds that can be found on the quadratic form in equation (12) cannot further improve those bounds. Note that, for $(b, 4)$ -cases when $b \geq 4$, the maximum of the quadratic form in (12) is only achieved for uniform distributions if we suppose that the frequency of each symbol in all the coordinates of the code is greater or equal to $1/(2b-2)$. For the special case $b = k = 6$, the values we obtained for the M_i constants are such that the resulting η_0 in the statement of Lemma 3 is equal to 1. That is, the constant M is actually M_1 , which means that in our bound the worst case scenario is given by the balanced subcodes. The resulting value $M_1 = 5/27$ is actually the value attained by $\Psi(p, q)$ for uniform p and q . Roughly speaking, this should be interpreted as saying that our procedure is unable to give for $R_{(6,6)}$ a bound smaller than $5/59$ because such a rate might in principle be achieved if all subcodes have a uniform distribution on each coordinate. However, for such globally balanced codes, one can use a different argument based on the minimum distance of the code to get even stronger upper bounds on $R_{(b,k)}$. In the next Section, we combine the two procedures to deduce a rigorous proof that indeed the bounds shown in Table 1 are not sharp for different values of b and k .

5 A qualitative analysis on $R_{(b,k)}$

In this section we show that, at least for the underlined (b, k) -cases in Table 1 and for case $(b, k) = (6, 6)$, the bound in equation (22), with $M = \Psi(1/b, \dots, 1/b; 1/b, \dots, 1/b)$, is not sharp. We also show that, the bound given in equation (4) is not sharp for every $(b, 4)$ -cases with $b \geq 5$. In this discussion we use continuity arguments whose quantitative analysis would require many detailed, annoying and very difficult computations. For this reason, we do not provide explicit numerical improvements on $R_{(b,k)}$ and only show that the bounds on $R_{(b,k)}$ can be improved.

To prove our statement, we invoke an upper bound from [1] on the minimum hamming distance $d_H(C)$ of a b -ary code C with a given rate R . It suffices here to mention that, set $\delta := d_H(C)/n$, this bound is of the form $\delta \leq F(R)$ for a suitable decreasing continuous function F . Due to the monotonicity of F there exists a maximum value of R for which the inequality $R \leq \frac{(b-2)!}{(b-k+1)!b^{k-3}} F(R)$ is satisfied.

Using Mathematica on the specific bound in [1], one finds that

$$R \leq \frac{(b-2)^{k-3}}{b^{k-3}} F(R) \implies R < U_{(b,k)}$$

where $(b-2)^{k-3} = (b-2) \cdots (b-k+2)$ and $U_{(b,k)}$ takes the values shown in Table 4 for some (b, k) pairs. Note that most of these pairs are actually those underlined in Table 1.

Table 4: $U_{(b,k)}$ values

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| $U_{(6,6)} = 0.08469$ | $U_{(7,6)} = 0.13440$ | $U_{(8,6)} = 0.18125$ | $U_{(9,6)} = 0.22405$ |
| $U_{(10,6)} = 0.26268$ | $U_{(11,6)} = 0.29744$ | $U_{(12,6)} = 0.32874$ | $U_{(13,6)} = 0.35699$ |
| $U_{(14,6)} = 0.38258$ | $U_{(8,7)} = 0.07200$ | $U_{(9,7)} = 0.10510$ | $U_{(10,7)} = 0.13822$ |
| $U_{(11,7)} = 0.17025$ | $U_{(12,7)} = 0.20068$ | $U_{(13,7)} = 0.22930$ | $U_{(14,7)} = 0.25609$ |
| $U_{(10,8)} = 0.05749$ | $U_{(11,8)} = 0.08043$ | $U_{(12,8)} = 0.10419$ | $U_{(13,8)} = 0.12808$ |
| $U_{(14,8)} = 0.15163$ | $U_{(11,9)} = 0.03006$ | $U_{(12,9)} = 0.04465$ | $U_{(13,9)} = 0.06081$ |
| $U_{(14,9)} = 0.07799$ | $U_{(13,10)} = 0.02386$ | $U_{(14,10)} = 0.03412$ | $U_{(14,11)} = 0.01236$ |

Because of the continuity of F , this implies that there exist $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $\epsilon_2 > 0$ such that

$$R \leq \left(\frac{(b-2)^{k-3}}{b^{k-3}} + \epsilon_1 \right) F(R) + \epsilon_2 \implies R < U_{(b,k)} + 10^{-5}$$

We note that, if $p_1 = p_2 = \dots = p_b = 1/b$, given $i \neq h \in [1, b]$ and chosen at random $x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}, z \in [1, b]$ according to the distribution p , the probability that $i, h, x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}, z$ are all different is $(b-2)^{k-3}/b^{k-3}$. Therefore, by continuity, there exists $\epsilon_3 > 0$ such that given $i \neq h \in [1, b]$ and chosen at random $x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}, z \in [1, b]$ according to the distribution p' where $p'_1, p'_2, \dots, p'_b \in [1/b - \epsilon_3, 1/b + \epsilon_3]$, the probability that $i, h, x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}, z$ are all different is less than $(b-2)^{k-3}/b^{k-3} + \epsilon_1$. Now we divide the coordinates $i \in [1, n]$ into two sets according to whether the distribution f_i has all its values in $[1/b - \epsilon_3, 1/b + \epsilon_3]$ or not. More precisely, we define:

$$U_{\epsilon_3} := \{i \in [1, n] : f_{i,h} \in [1/b - \epsilon_3, 1/b + \epsilon_3], \forall h \in [1, b]\}.$$

We can assume, up to reordering the coordinates, that $U_{\epsilon_3} = [1, t]$ for some value t . Here we divide the discussion into two cases, according to size of t , and we show that in both cases a better bound on $R_{(b,k)}$ can be obtained.

A) Let us assume that $t < n(1 - \epsilon_2)$

As a consequence of Hansel's Lemma, we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} \log(|C|) &\leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [\ell+1, n]} \sum_{\omega, \mu \in \Omega} \lambda_\omega \lambda_\mu \Psi(f_{i|\omega}, f_{i|\mu}) \\ &\leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{i \in [\ell+1, t]} M + \sum_{i \in [t+1, n]} \sum_{\omega, \mu \in \Omega} \lambda_\omega \lambda_\mu \Psi(f_{i|\omega}, f_{i|\mu}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where M is the upperbound of equation (21) given in Theorem 3. Due to the following lemma, we are able to provide a better upper bound to the second term of the sum.

Lemma 10. *Assume that $f_{i,h} \notin [1/b - \epsilon_3, 1/b + \epsilon_3]$ for some $h \in [1, b]$. Then there exists $M' < M$ such that:*

$$\sum_{\omega, \mu \in \Omega} \lambda_\omega \lambda_\mu \Psi(f_{i|\omega}, f_{i|\mu}) \leq M'.$$

Proof. Consider first for simplicity the case when $f_{i,h} < 1/b - \epsilon_3$. Let $\Omega' \subseteq \Omega$ be the subset of the ω for which $f_{i,h|\omega} \geq 1/b - \epsilon_3/2$. Then, since

$$f_{i,h} = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \lambda_\omega f_{i,h|\omega} \geq \sum_{\omega \in \Omega'} \lambda_\omega f_{i,h|\omega} \geq (1/b - \epsilon_3/2) \sum_{\omega \in \Omega'} \lambda_\omega,$$

we deduce that

$$\sum_{\omega \in \Omega'} \lambda_\omega \leq \frac{1/b - \epsilon_3}{1/b - \epsilon_3/2}.$$

From Remarks 1, 3 and 4, we know that the maximum of the quadratic form in (12) is only achieved for uniform distributions. This means that $M = \Psi(1/b, \dots, 1/b; 1/b, \dots, 1/b)$ for the (b, k) -cases under consideration. Therefore there is some constant $M_{\epsilon_3} < M$ such that if either $f_{i,h|\omega}$ or $f_{i,h|\mu}$ are not Ω' , then $\Psi(f_{i|\omega}, f_{i|\mu}) \leq M_{\epsilon_3}$. This implies

$$\sum_{\omega, \mu \in \Omega} \lambda_\omega \lambda_\mu \Psi(f_{i|\omega}, f_{i|\mu}) \leq \left(\frac{1/b - \epsilon_3}{1/b - \epsilon_3/2} \right)^2 M + \left(1 - \left(\frac{1/b - \epsilon_3}{1/b - \epsilon_3/2} \right)^2 \right) M_{\epsilon_3}$$

and hence the statement of the lemma for the case $f_{i,h} < 1/b - \epsilon_3$. A similar proof holds for $f_{i,h} > 1/b + \epsilon_3$. \square

In the case $\ell \geq t$, we immediately obtain that $\log(|C|) \leq (n - \ell) \frac{M'}{2}$ which leads to the upperbound $R < \frac{M'}{2+M'}$ that is better than the one shown in Table 1. So we can assume $\ell < t$ and therefore:

$$\log(|C|) \leq (t - \ell) \frac{M}{2} + (n - t) \frac{M'}{2} \leq (n - n\epsilon_2 - \ell) \frac{M}{2} + n\epsilon_2 \frac{M'}{2}.$$

Since $\ell = \left\lfloor \frac{nR - 2 \log n}{\log(2+\bar{\epsilon})} \right\rfloor = \lfloor nR - 2 \log n \rfloor (1 + o(1))$, dividing by n we get:

$$R \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{M(1 - \epsilon_2 - R + 2 \frac{\log n}{n})}{1 - R + 2 \frac{\log n}{n}} + \frac{M'\epsilon_2}{1 - R + 2 \frac{\log n}{n}} \right] (1 - R + 2 \frac{\log n}{n})(1 + o(1)).$$

Set $M'' = \frac{M(1-\epsilon_2-R)}{1-R} + \frac{M'\epsilon_2}{1-R}$ we have that $M'' < M$ and, taking $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain:

$$R \leq \frac{M''}{2}(1 - R)(1 + o(1)).$$

It means that $R < \frac{M''}{2+M''}$ and since $M'' < M$, it follows that the bound is not sharp under the assumption of the case A.

B) Let us assume that $t \geq n(1 - \epsilon_2)$

Let us fix two words $u, u' \in C$ at minimum hamming distance and let us choose at random x, y . Because of Hansel Lemma we have that:

$$\log(|C|) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{u, u', x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}})].$$

We recall that $0 \leq \tau(G_i^{u, u', x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}}) \leq 1$ and, if $u_i \neq u'_i$, $\tau(G_i^{u, u', x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}})$ is the probability that given $z \notin \{u, u', x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}\}$ we have that $u_i, u'_i, x_{1i}, x_{(k-4)i}, z_i$ are all different. Since we have chosen at random also x_1, \dots, x_{k-4} , $\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{u, u', x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}})]$ coincides with the probability that given $x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}, z \notin \{u, u'\}$ we have that $u_i, u'_i, x_{1i}, x_{(k-4)i}, z_i$ are all different. Therefore $\mathbb{E}[\tau(G_i^{u, u', x_1, \dots, x_{k-4}})] \leq (b-2)^{k-3}/b^{k-3} + \epsilon_1$ for any $i \in [1, t]$ when $u_i \neq u'_i$, otherwise if $u_i = u'_i$ then the expected value is 0. This means that

$$\begin{aligned} \log(|C|) &\leq \left(\frac{(b-2)^{k-3}}{b^{k-3}} + \epsilon_1 \right) \sum_{i=1}^t 1_{u_i \neq u'_i} + \sum_{i=t+1}^n 1 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{(b-2)^{k-3}}{b^{k-3}} + \epsilon_1 \right) \sum_{i=1}^n 1_{u_i \neq u'_i} + \sum_{i=n(1-\epsilon_2)}^n 1 \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\log(|C|) \leq \left(\frac{(b-2)^{k-3}}{b^{k-3}} + \epsilon_1 \right) d_H(u, u') + n\epsilon_2.$$

Dividing by n and remembering that u, u' are at minimal hamming distance, we obtain that:

$$R \leq \left(\frac{(b-2)^{k-3}}{b^{k-3}} + \epsilon_1 \right) \delta + \epsilon_2 \leq \left(\frac{(b-2)^{k-3}}{b^{k-3}} + \epsilon_1 \right) F(R) + \epsilon_2.$$

But, because of the definition of ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 , this implies that $R < U_{(b,k)} + 10^{-5}$. It can be easily checked that the bound in Theorem 4 is strictly greater than $U_{(b,k)} + 10^{-5}$ for every (b, k) -cases under consideration and therefore:

Theorem 4.

$$R_{(b,k)} < \left(\frac{1}{\log \frac{b}{k-3}} + \frac{b^{k-1}}{b^{k-1} \log(b-k+2)} \right)^{-1}$$

for the (b,k) -cases shown in Table 4.

For cases $(b,4)$ when $b \geq 4$ we know thanks to [6] that the maximum of (10), under the constraint that $f_{i,a} \geq \frac{1}{2^{b-2}}$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and every $a = 1, \dots, b$, is only achieved for uniform distributions. Therefore we can use the Plotkin bound instead of the Aaltonen bound in order to prove that bound (4) is not sharp when $k = 4$ and $b \geq 5$.

Let C be a $(b,4)$ -hash code with rate R and suppose that the frequency of the symbols in all the coordinates of C is uniform. Then by Hansel we get

$$R \leq \frac{b-2}{b} \cdot \delta, \quad (34)$$

where $\delta = d_H(C)/n$. The Plotkin bound for q -ary codes with $\delta \leq (b-1)/b$ is the following

$$R \leq \log b \left(1 - \delta \cdot \frac{b}{b-1} \right). \quad (35)$$

Since equation (34) is increasing in δ while (35) is decreasing then we can combine the two bounds to get

$$R \leq \frac{b(b-1) \log b}{(b-1)(b-2) + b^2 \log(b)}. \quad (36)$$

It is easy to see that the bound given in (4) for $k = 4$ is always strictly greater than (36) for every $b > 4$. Then, by a continuity argument (as done previously) one can show that bound (4) for $k = 4$ is not sharp for every $b \geq 5$. Therefore we have the following theorem.

Theorem 5. For every integer $b > 4$

$$R_{(b,4)} < \left(\frac{1}{\log b} + \frac{b^2}{(b^2 - 3b + 2) \log(b-2)} \right)^{-1}.$$

Acknowledgements

This research was partially supported by Italian Ministry of Education under Grant PRIN 2015 D72F16000790001.

References

- [1] M. Aaltonen. *A new upper bound on nonbinary block codes*, *Discrete Math.* vol 83, 139-160, 1990.
- [2] E. Arikan, An upper bound on the zero-error list-coding capacity, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **40** (1994), 1237-1240.
- [3] E. Arikan, An improved graph-entropy bound for perfect hashing, *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory* (1994).
- [4] 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.
- [5] S. Costa, M. Dalai. *New bounds for perfect k -hashing*, in press on *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 2020.

- [6] 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.
- [7] 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.
- [8] P. Elias, Zero error capacity under list decoding, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **34** (1988), 1070–1074.
- [9] 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.
- [10] V. Guruswami, A. Riazanov, Beating Fredman-Komlos for perfect k -hashing, *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics* (2019).
- [11] G. Hansel, Nombre minimal de contacts de fermeture nécessaires pour réaliser une fonction booléenne symétrique de n variables, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, pp. 6037–6040, 1964.
- [12] J. Korner and K. Marton, New Bounds for Perfect Hashing via Information Theory, *European Journal of Combinatorics* **9** (1988), 523–530.
- [13] J. Korner, Fredman–Komlós bounds and information theory, *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods* **7** (1986), 560–570.
- [14] A. Nilli, “Perfect hashing and probability,” *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, vol. 3, pp. 407–409, 1994.
- [15] J. Radhakrishnan, Entropy and Counting, available at: <http://www.tcs.tifr.res.in/~jaikumar/Papers/EntropyAndCounting.pdf>.
- [16] C. Xing and C. Yuan, Beating the probabilistic lower bound on perfect hashing, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08792*, (2019).

Appendices

In the following two sections we report the list of all the maxima candidates for the partition based on maximum value and for the partition based on minimum value.

A Partition $\{\check{P}_b^i\}_{i=0,\dots,b}$

Maxima candidates for \check{M}_1

We should consider the finite list of cases provided by Remark 2. However due to Lemmas 6, 7 and 8 we can reduce that list as follows. Because of Lemma 7, a maximum with $b-j+1$ or more coordinates in p (resp. q) equal to zero is also attained in a point of the form $p = (1-\epsilon, \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0)$ ($q = (1-\epsilon, \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0)$). Due to Lemma 8, a maximum with exactly one element equals to $1-\epsilon$ in p (resp. q) must have zero value in the same coordinate of q (resp. p). Finally because of Lemma 6, we can assume that the zeros (and the $1-\epsilon$'s) are in different positions in vectors p and q . It is enough to consider the following cases

- 1) $(\frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b}; \frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b});$
- 2) $(0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$
where $\gamma + (b-1)\delta = 1;$
- 3) $(0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0)$
where $(b-2)\alpha + \beta = 1$ and $\gamma + (b-2)\delta = 1;$
- 4) $(0, 0, \frac{1}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-2}; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$
where $2\gamma + (b-2)\delta = 1;$
- 5) $(0, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0)$
where $(b-3)\alpha + 2\beta = 1$ and $2\gamma + (b-3)\delta = 1;$
- 6) $(0, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0, 0)$
where $(b-4)\alpha + 2\beta = 1$ and $2\gamma + (b-4)\delta = 1;$
- ...

$$\binom{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2} (0, \dots, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta; \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0, \dots, 0)$$

where $(2j-b)\alpha + 2(b-j)\beta = 1$ and $2(b-j)\gamma + (2j-b)\delta = 1;$

Exactly one coordinate of p equals to $1-\epsilon$

- 1) $(1-\epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-1}; 0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1});$
- 2) $(1-\epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, 0; 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta)$
where $(b-2)\gamma + \delta = 1;$
- 3) $(1-\epsilon, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta; 0, 0, \frac{1}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-2})$
where $\alpha + (b-2)\beta = \epsilon;$
- 4) $(1-\epsilon, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta, 0; 0, 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta)$
where $\alpha + (b-3)\beta = \epsilon$ and $(b-3)\gamma + \delta = 1;$
- 5) $(1-\epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-3}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-3}, 0, 0; 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, \delta)$
where $(b-3)\gamma + 2\delta = 1;$
- 6) $(1-\epsilon, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta, 0, 0; 0, 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, \delta)$
where $\alpha + (b-4)\beta = \epsilon$ and $(b-4)\gamma + 2\delta = 1;$
- ...

$$(b-j)(b-j+1) \quad (1-\epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta, 0, \dots, 0; 0, \dots, 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$$

where $(b-j-1)\alpha + (2j-b)\beta = \epsilon$ and $(2j-b)\gamma + (b-j)\delta = 1$;

$$(b-j)(b-j+1)+1 \quad (1-\epsilon, \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0, 0; 0, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$$

where $\gamma + (b-2)\delta = 1$;

$$(b-j)(b-j+1)+2 \quad (1-\epsilon, \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0; 0, 0, \frac{1}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-2});$$

...)

$$(b-j)(b-j+1)+b-j \quad (1-\epsilon, \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0; 0, \dots, 0, \frac{1}{j}, \dots, \frac{1}{j});$$

Exactly one coordinate of p and one coordinate of q equal to $1-\epsilon$

$$1) \quad (1-\epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, 0; 0, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, 1-\epsilon);$$

$$2) \quad (1-\epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-3}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-3}, 0, 0; 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, 1-\epsilon)$$

where $(b-3)\gamma + \delta = \epsilon$;

$$3) \quad (1-\epsilon, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta, 0, 0; 0, 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, 1-\epsilon)$$

where $\alpha + (b-4)\beta = \epsilon$ and $(b-4)\gamma + \delta = \epsilon$;

...)

$$\frac{(b-j)(b-j+1)}{2} \quad (1-\epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta, 0, \dots, 0; 0, \dots, 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 1-\epsilon)$$

where $(b-j-1)\alpha + (2j-b)\beta = \epsilon$ and $(2j-b)\gamma + (b-j-1)\delta = \epsilon$;

$$\frac{(b-j)(b-j+1)}{2} + 1 \quad (1-\epsilon, \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0, 0; 0, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 1-\epsilon)$$

where $\gamma + (b-3)\delta = \epsilon$;

$$\frac{(b-j)(b-j+1)}{2} + 2 \quad (1-\epsilon, \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0, 0; 0, 0, \frac{\epsilon}{b-3}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-3}, 1-\epsilon).$$

...)

$$\frac{(b-j)(b-j+1)}{2} + b-j \quad (1-\epsilon, \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0, 0; 0, \dots, 0, \frac{\epsilon}{j-1}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{j-1}, 1-\epsilon).$$

Maxima candidates for \widetilde{M}_2

We should consider the finite list of cases provided by Remark 2. However due to Lemmas 6 and 7 we can reduce that list to:

$$1) \quad (\frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b}; \frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b});$$

$$2) \quad (0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$$

where $\gamma + (b-1)\delta = 1$;

$$3) \quad (0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0)$$

where $(b-2)\alpha + \beta = 1$ and $\gamma + (b-2)\delta = 1$;

$$4) \quad (0, 0, \frac{1}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-2}; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$$

where $2\gamma + (b-2)\delta = 1$;

$$5) \quad (0, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0)$$

where $(b-3)\alpha + 2\beta = 1$ and $2\gamma + (b-3)\delta = 1$;

$$6) \quad (0, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0, 0)$$

where $(b-4)\alpha + 2\beta = 1$ and $2\gamma + (b-4)\delta = 1$;

...)

$$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2} \quad (0, \dots, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta; \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0, \dots, 0)$$

where $(2j-b)\alpha + (b-j)\beta = 1$ and $(b-j)\gamma + (2j-b)\delta = 1$.

Maxima candidates for \widetilde{M}_3

We should consider the finite list of cases provided by Remark 2. However due to Lemmas 6, 7 and 9 we can reduce that list to:

- 1) $(1 - \epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-1}; 1 - \epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-1})$;
- 2) $(1 - \epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, 0; 1 - \epsilon, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta)$
where $(b-2)\gamma + \delta = \epsilon$;
- 3) $(1 - \epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, 0; 1 - \epsilon, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, 0, \delta)$
where $(b-3)\alpha + \beta = \epsilon$ and $(b-3)\gamma + \delta = \epsilon$;
- 4) $(1 - \epsilon, \frac{\epsilon}{b-3}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-3}, 0, 0; 1 - \epsilon, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, \delta)$
where $(b-3)\gamma + 2\delta = \epsilon$;
- 5) $(1 - \epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, 0, 0; 1 - \epsilon, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, 0, \delta, \delta)$
where $(b-4)\alpha + \beta = \epsilon$ and $(b-4)\gamma + 2\delta = \epsilon$;
- 6) $(1 - \epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta, 0, 0; 1 - \epsilon, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, 0, 0, \delta, \delta)$
where $(b-5)\alpha + 2\beta = \epsilon$ and $(b-5)\gamma + 2\delta = \epsilon$;

...)

$$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2} (1 - \epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta, 0, \dots, 0; 1 - \epsilon, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, 0, \dots, 0, \delta, \dots, \delta)$$

where $(2j-b-1)\alpha + (b-j)\beta = \epsilon$ and $(2j-b-1)\gamma + (b-j)\delta = \epsilon$;

$$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2} + 1) (1 - \epsilon, \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0; 1 - \epsilon, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$$

where $\gamma + (b-2)\delta = \epsilon$;

$$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2} + 2) (1 - \epsilon, \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0; 1 - \epsilon, 0, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-2});$$

$$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2} + 3) (1 - \epsilon, \epsilon, 0, 0, \dots, 0; 1 - \epsilon, 0, 0, \frac{\epsilon}{b-3}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{b-3}).$$

...)

$$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2} + b - j + 1) (1 - \epsilon, \epsilon, 0, 0, \dots, 0; 1 - \epsilon, 0, \dots, 0, \frac{\epsilon}{j-1}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon}{j-1}).$$

Maxima candidates for \widetilde{M}_4

We should consider the finite list of cases provided by Remark 2. However due to Lemmas 6, 7 and 8 we can reduce that list to:

- 1) $(1 - \epsilon + \sigma, \frac{\epsilon-\sigma}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon-\sigma}{b-2}, 0; 0, \frac{\epsilon-\phi}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon-\phi}{b-2}, 1 - \epsilon + \phi)$
where $0 \leq \sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon$;
- 2) $(1 - \epsilon + \sigma, \frac{\epsilon-\sigma}{b-3}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon-\sigma}{b-3}, 0, 0; 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, 1 - \epsilon + \phi)$
where $0 \leq \sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon$ and $(b-3)\gamma + \delta = \epsilon - \phi$;
- 3) $(1 - \epsilon + \sigma, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta, 0, 0; 0, 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, 1 - \epsilon + \phi)$
where $0 \leq \sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon$, $\alpha + (b-4)\beta = \epsilon - \sigma$ and $(b-4)\gamma + \delta = \epsilon - \phi$;

...)

$$\frac{(b-j)(b-j+1)}{2} (1 - \epsilon + \sigma, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta, 0, \dots, 0; 0, \dots, 0, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 1 - \epsilon + \phi)$$

where $0 \leq \sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon$, $(b-j-1)\alpha + (2j-b)\beta = \epsilon - \sigma$ and $(2j-b)\gamma + (b-j-1)\delta = \epsilon - \phi$;

$$\frac{(b-j)(b-j+1)}{2} + 1) (1, 0, \dots, 0, 0; 0, \frac{\epsilon-\phi}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon-\phi}{b-2}, 1 - \epsilon + \phi)$$

where $0 \leq \phi \leq \epsilon$;

$$\frac{(b-j)(b-j+1)}{2} + 2) (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0; 0, 0, \frac{\epsilon-\phi}{b-3}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon-\phi}{b-3}, 1 - \epsilon + \phi)$$

where $0 \leq \phi \leq \epsilon$.

...)

$$\frac{(b-j)(b-j+1)}{2} + b - j) (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0; 0, \dots, 0, \frac{\epsilon-\phi}{j-1}, \dots, \frac{\epsilon-\phi}{j-1}, 1 - \epsilon + \phi)$$

where $0 \leq \phi \leq \epsilon$.

B Partition $\{\widehat{P}_k^i\}_{i=0, \dots, k}$

Maxima candidates for \widehat{M}_1

We should consider the finite list of cases provided by Remark 2. However due to Lemma 6 we can reduce that list to:

- 1) $(\frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b}; \frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b})$;
 - 2) $(\epsilon, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$ and $\gamma + (b-1)\delta = 1$;
 - 3) $(\epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, \epsilon)$
where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$, $(b-2)\alpha + \beta + \epsilon = 1$ and $\gamma + (b-2)\delta + \epsilon = 1$;
 - 4) $(\epsilon, \epsilon, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-2}; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$ and $2\gamma + (b-2)\delta = 1$;
 - 5) $(\epsilon, \epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, \epsilon)$
where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$, $(b-3)\alpha + \beta + 2\epsilon = 1$ and $2\gamma + (b-3)\delta + \epsilon = 1$;
 - 6) $(\epsilon, \epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, \epsilon, \epsilon)$
where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$, $(b-4)\alpha + 2\beta + 2\epsilon = 1$ and $2\gamma + (b-4)\delta + 2\epsilon = 1$;
- ...)

$$\frac{b(b+1)}{2}) (\epsilon, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon, 1 - (b-1)\epsilon; 1 - (b-1)\epsilon, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon).$$

Maxima candidates for \widehat{M}_2

We should consider the finite list of cases provided by Remark 2. However due to Lemmas 6 and 7 we can reduce that list to:

- 1) $(\alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}, \epsilon)$
where $\alpha \leq \epsilon$ and $\beta + (b-1)\alpha = 1$;
 - 2) $(\alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-2}, \epsilon, \epsilon)$
where $\alpha \leq \epsilon$ and $2\beta + (b-2)\alpha = 1$;
- ...)
- $b-1)$ $(\alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta; 1 - (b-1)\epsilon, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon)$
where $\alpha \leq \epsilon$ and $\alpha + (b-1)\beta = 1$;
- $b)$ $(\epsilon, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$ and $\gamma + (b-1)\delta = 1$;
- $b+1)$ $(\epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, \epsilon)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$, $\beta + (b-2)\alpha = 1 - \epsilon$ and $\gamma + (b-2)\delta = 1 - \epsilon$;
- $b+2)$ $(\epsilon, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, \epsilon, \epsilon)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$, $2\beta + (b-3)\alpha = 1 - \epsilon$ and $\gamma + (b-3)\delta = 1 - 2\epsilon$;

- ...
- $2b - 1$) $(\epsilon, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}; 1 - (b-1)\epsilon, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon)$;
- 2b) $(0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$ and $\gamma + (k-1)\delta = 1$;
- $2b + 1$) $(0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, \epsilon)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$, $\beta + (b-2)\alpha = 1$ and $\gamma + (b-2)\delta = 1 - \epsilon$;
- $2b + 2$) $(0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, \epsilon, \epsilon)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$, $2\beta + (b-3)\alpha = 1$ and $\gamma + (b-3)\delta = 1 - 2\epsilon$;
- ...
- $3b - 1$) $(0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1}; 1 - (b-1)\epsilon, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon)$;
- 3b) $(0, 0, \frac{1}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-2}; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$ and $2\gamma + (b-3)\delta = 1$;
- $3b + 1$) $(0, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, \epsilon)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$, $\beta + (b-3)\alpha = 1$ and $2\gamma + (b-3)\delta = 1 - \epsilon$;
- $3b + 2$) $(0, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, \epsilon, \epsilon)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$, $2\beta + (b-4)\alpha = 1$ and $2\gamma + (b-4)\delta = 1 - 2\epsilon$;
- ...
- $4b - 1$) $(0, 0, \frac{1}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-2}; 1 - (b-1)\epsilon, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon)$;
- ...
- $b^2 - b(j-2) - 1$) $(0, \dots, 0, \frac{1}{j}, \dots, \frac{1}{j}; 1 - (b-1)\epsilon, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon)$;
- $b^2 - b(j-2)$) $(0, \dots, 0, 1; \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta)$
where $\gamma, \delta \geq \epsilon$ and $\delta + (b-1)\gamma = 1$;
- $b^2 - b(j-2) + 1$) $(0, \dots, 0, 1; \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\epsilon}{b-1}, \epsilon)$;
- $b^2 - b(j-2) + 2$) $(0, \dots, 0, 1; \frac{1-2\epsilon}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1-2\epsilon}{b-2}, \epsilon, \epsilon)$;
- ...
- $b^2 - b(j-3) - 1$) $(0, \dots, 0, 1; 1 - (b-1)\epsilon, \epsilon, \dots, \epsilon, \epsilon)$.

Maxima candidates for \widehat{M}_3

We should consider the finite list of cases provided by Remark 2. However due to Lemmas 6 and 7 we can reduce that list to:

- 1) $(\sigma, \frac{1-\sigma}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\sigma}{b-1}; \phi, \frac{1-\phi}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\phi}{b-1})$
where $0 \leq \sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon$;
- 2) $(\sigma, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \phi, \frac{1-\phi}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1-\phi}{b-2}, 0)$
where $0 \leq \sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon$ and $\beta + (b-2)\alpha = 1 - \sigma$;
- 3) $(\sigma, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \phi, \frac{1-\phi}{b-3}, \dots, \frac{1-\phi}{b-3}, 0, 0)$
where $0 \leq \sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon$ and $2\beta + (b-3)\alpha = 1 - \sigma$;
- 4) $(\sigma, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \phi, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0)$
where $\sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon$, $\sigma + \beta + (b-3)\alpha = 1$ and $\phi + \gamma + (b-3)\delta = 1$;

5) $(\sigma, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \phi, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0, 0)$
where $0 \leq \sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon, \sigma + 2\beta + (b-4)\alpha = 1$ and $\phi + \gamma + (b-4)\delta = 1$;

6) $(\sigma, 0, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \phi, \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0, 0)$
where $0 \leq \sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon, \sigma + 2\beta + (b-5)\alpha = 1$ and $\phi + 2\gamma + (b-5)\delta = 1$;

...)

$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2}$) $(\sigma, 0, \dots, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta; \phi, \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0, \dots, 0)$
where $0 \leq \sigma, \phi \leq \epsilon, \sigma + (b-j)\beta + (2j-b-1)\alpha = 1$ and $\phi + (b-j)\gamma + (2j-b-1)\delta = 1$;

$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2} + 1$) $(\sigma, 0, \frac{1-\sigma}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1-\sigma}{b-2}; 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$
where $0 \leq \sigma \leq \epsilon$;

$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2} + 2$) $(\sigma, 0, 0, \frac{1-\sigma}{b-3}, \dots, \frac{1-\sigma}{b-3}; 0, 1, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$
where $0 \leq \sigma \leq \epsilon$;

...)

$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2} + b-j$) $(\sigma, 0, \dots, 0, \frac{1-\sigma}{j-1}, \dots, \frac{1-\sigma}{j-1}; 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$
where $0 \leq \sigma \leq \epsilon$.

Maxima candidates for \widehat{M}_4

We should consider the finite list of cases provided by Remark 2. However due to Lemmas 6 and 7 we can reduce that list to:

1) $(\frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b}; \frac{1}{b}, \dots, \frac{1}{b})$;

2) $(0, \frac{1}{b-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-1}; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$
where $\gamma + (b-1)\delta = 1$;

3) $(0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0)$
where $(b-2)\alpha + \beta = 1$ and $\gamma + (b-2)\delta = 1$;

4) $(0, 0, \frac{1}{b-2}, \dots, \frac{1}{b-2}; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta)$
where $2\gamma + (b-2)\delta = 1$;

5) $(0, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0)$
where $(b-3)\alpha + 2\beta = 1$ and $2\gamma + (b-3)\delta = 1$;

6) $(0, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \beta; \gamma, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0, 0)$
where $(b-4)\alpha + 2\beta = 1$ and $2\gamma + (b-4)\delta = 1$;

...)

$\frac{(b-j+1)(b-j+2)}{2}$) $(0, \dots, 0, \alpha, \dots, \alpha, \beta, \dots, \beta; \gamma, \dots, \gamma, \delta, \dots, \delta, 0, \dots, 0)$
where $(2j-b)\alpha + (b-j)\beta = 1$ and $(b-j)\gamma + (2j-b)\delta = 1$.