

Symmetry Implies Isomorphism for Certain Maximum Length Circuit Codes

Kevin M. Byrnes *

November 10, 2021

Abstract

A classic result due to Douglas [2] establishes that, for odd spread k and dimension $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + 3)$, all maximum length (d, k) circuit codes are isomorphic. Using a recent result of Byrnes [1] we extend Douglas's theorem to prove that, for k even ≥ 4 and $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + 4)$, all maximum length symmetric (d, k) circuit codes are isomorphic.

Let $I(d)$ denote the graph of the d -dimensional hypercube. A cycle C of $I(d)$ is a d -dimensional circuit code of spread k , also called a (d, k) circuit code, if it satisfies the distance requirement:

$$d_{I(d)}(x, y) \geq \min\{d_C(x, y), k\} \quad \forall x, y \in C \quad (1)$$

where $d_{I(d)}(x, y)$ and $d_C(x, y)$ denote the minimum path length between vertices x and y in $I(d)$ and C , respectively. Computing the maximum length of a (d, k) circuit code, $K(d, k)$, for a given dimension d and spread k is an extremely challenging computational problem, and significant analysis is required to make the problem tractable even for small values of d and k [4, 3, 5]. Exact formulas for $K(d, k)$ (for particular infinite families of (d, k) pairs) are exceedingly rare. In a groundbreaking paper, Douglas [2] (building upon the previous work of Singleton [6]) established the following formulas for $K(d, k)$.

Theorem 1 ([2] Theorem 4). *Let k be odd and let $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + 3)$, then $K(d, k) = 4k + 4$. Furthermore there is a unique, up to isomorphism of $I(d)$, (d, k) circuit code of length $K(d, k)$.*

Theorem 2 ([2] Theorem 3). *Let k be even and let $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + 4)$. Then $K(d, k) = 4k + 6$.*

Theorem 3 ([2] Theorem 5). *Let k be odd and ≥ 9 , and let $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + 5)$. Then $K(d, k) = 4k + 8$.*

Note that isomorphism of all maximum length (d, k) circuit codes is only established in the case where k is odd and $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + 3)$, as in Theorem 1.

While a circuit code, C , can be represented as a sequence of vertices $C = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ of $I(d)$, it is typically more convenient to express C in another form. Consider any bijection between the vertices of $I(d)$ and the set of binary vectors of length d such that: two vertices are adjacent in $I(d)$ if and only if their attendant vectors differ in a single position, and x_1 is mapped to $\vec{0}$. Then we may equivalently describe a circuit code C by its *transition sequence* $T(C) = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_N)$ where τ_i denotes the single position in which the vectors attendant to x_i and x_{i+1} differ (with $x_{N+1} = x_1$ as C is a cycle). A *transition* (or *transition variable*) is a particular τ_i , while the *transition elements* are the unique values assumed by $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_N\}$, without loss of generality

*E-mail: dr.kevin.byrnes@gmail.com

the set $[d] = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$. A transition sequence is *symmetric* if $\tau_i = \tau_{N/2+i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \frac{N}{2}$. We consider two (d, k) circuit codes C and C' to be isomorphic if $T(C)$ can be transformed into $T(C')$ by a cyclic shift and a permutation of $[d]$ (reflecting the fact that C and C' are identical up to the selection of the starting vertex and some symmetry of $I(d)$). In this note we use the concept of a symmetric transition sequence to establish an isomorphism result analogous to Theorem 1 in the case where k is even and $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + 4)$.

Lemma 4. *Let k be even and ≥ 4 and let $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + 4)$. Then the maximum length of a symmetric (d, k) circuit code is $4k + 6$. Furthermore there is a unique, up to isomorphism of $I(d)$, symmetric (d, k) circuit code of length $4k + 6$.*

To establish Lemma 4 we require the concept of a bit run. Recall (from [1]) that a *segment* of $T(C) = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_N)$ is a cyclically consecutive subsequence $\omega = (\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}, \dots, \tau_j)$ (with subscripts $> N$ reduced modulo N). We say that a segment ω is a *bit run* if all of the transitions in ω are distinct (i.e. assume distinct values). Singleton [6] showed that if a (d, k) circuit code is sufficiently long, then it contains a bit run of length $k + 2$.

Theorem 5 ([6] Theorem 1). *Let C be a (d, k) circuit code with transition sequence $T(C)$ and having length $|C| > 2(k + 1)$. Then for any segment ω of $T(C)$ with length $\geq k + 3$, either the first or last $k + 2$ transitions of ω are a bit run.*

For any segment ω of $T(C)$, define $\delta(\omega)$ as the number of transition elements appearing an odd number of times in ω . Suppose that $N = |C| > 2k$ and $\omega = (\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}, \dots, \tau_{j-1})$, then we have the following inequalities (see [1] equations (2)-(4)):

$$\delta(\omega, \tau_j) = \delta(\omega) \pm 1, \quad (2)$$

$$\delta(\omega) = |\omega|, \text{ if } |\omega| \leq k + 1, \quad (3)$$

$$\delta(\omega) \geq k, \text{ if } k \leq |\omega| \leq N - k. \quad (4)$$

Let $\mathcal{F}(d, k, k + l)$ denote the family of all (d, k) circuit codes C such that $T(C)$ contains a bit run of length $\geq k + l$, and let $S(d, k, k + l)$ denote the maximum length of a symmetric circuit code in $\mathcal{F}(d, k, k + l)$. We derive Lemma 4 as a corollary to a recent result of [1]:

Theorem 6. *Let k and l be integers ≥ 2 of opposite parity with $k \geq 2l + 1$ if k is odd, and $k \geq 2l - 2$ if k is even, and let $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + l + 1)$. Then: (i) $S(d, k, k + l) = 4k + 2l$, and (ii) for $l = 2$ or 3 there is a unique (up to isomorphism) symmetric circuit code in $\mathcal{F}(d, k, k + l)$ of length $S(d, k, k + l)$.*

Proof of Lemma 4. From Theorems 2 and 6 it immediately follows that the maximum length of a symmetric (d, k) circuit code (for k even ≥ 4 and $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + 4)$) is $4k + 6$. Furthermore, by Theorem 6 part (ii), to prove isomorphism of all maximum length symmetric (d, k) circuit codes it suffices to show that for any such circuit code C , $T(C)$ contains a bit run of length $k + 3$ (implying all such circuit codes are in $\mathcal{F}(d, k, k + 3)$). By Theorem 5, $T(C)$ must contain a bit run of length $k + 2$, so we may assume that $T(C)$ has the form:

$$T(C) = (\underbrace{1, 2, \dots, k + 2, x}_{\omega_1}, \underbrace{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k}_{\omega_2}, \omega_1, x, \omega_2). \quad (5)$$

We begin with some preliminary observations. By construction, ω_1 is a bit run, and since $|(x, \omega_2)| = k + 1$, the segment (x, ω_2) is also a bit run by (3). Thus every transition element

in $[d]$ appears at most twice in (ω_1, x, ω_2) (at most once in each non-overlapping bit run), and since $|T(C)| = K(d, k)$ all d transition elements appear at least once in (ω_1, x, ω_2) (for if the transition element $t \in [d]$ were not present in (ω_1, x, ω_2) , then $T' = (\omega_1, x, \omega_2, t, \omega_1, x, \omega_2, t)$ would be a symmetric (d, k) circuit code of length $4k + 8$). Define $\psi_i = (\beta_i, \dots, \beta_k, 1, \dots, i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, and define $\rho_j = (j + 3, \dots, k + 2, x, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, k - 1$. Since $|\psi_i| = |\rho_j| = k + 1 \forall i \in [k]$ and $\forall j \in [k - 1]$, both ψ_i and ρ_j are bit runs, implying:

$$\beta_i > i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, k \text{ and } \beta_j \notin \{j + 3, \dots, k + 2\} \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, k - 1. \quad (6)$$

Now, $(3, \dots, k + 2, x)$ is a segment of length $k + 1$ and so is a bit run. If $x \notin \{1, 2\}$ then the segment (ω_1, x) of $T(C)$ is a bit run of length $k + 3$, completing the proof. Thus we will assume that $x \in \{1, 2\}$. First we establish that $(\omega_2, 1, 2)$ is a bit run. Clearly $x \notin \omega_2$ as (x, ω_2) is bit run. Consider the segment of $T(C)$, $\omega = (x, \omega_2, 1, 2)$, which has length $k + 3$. Since $|T(C)| = 4k + 6 > 2(k + 1)$, by Theorem 5 either the first or last $k + 2$ transitions of ω constitute a bit run. If $x = 1$ this implies that $(\omega_2, 1, 2)$ must be a bit run, while if $x = 2$ then (since $(\omega_2, 1)$ is a bit run by (3)) both $(x, \omega_2, 1)$ and $(\omega_2, 1, 2)$ are bit runs.

If $3 \notin \omega_2$ then $(\omega_2, 1, 2, 3)$ is a bit run of length $k + 3$ in $T(C)$ and we are done, so we will suppose that $3 \in \omega_2$. From (6) it follows that $3 \in \{\beta_1, \beta_2\}$. Define ω as: $\omega = (x, \omega_2, 1, 2, 3)$, then $|\omega| = k + 4$. Since $(\omega_2, 1, 2)$ is a bit run, both x and $3 \in (\omega_2, 1, 2)$ by assumption, and $x \neq 3$, we have: $\delta(\omega) = |\omega| - 2 \cdot |(\omega_2, 1, 2) \cap \{x, 3\}| = k + 4 - 2 \cdot |\{x, 3\}| = k$. This implies $4 \notin \omega_2$, otherwise the segment $\omega' = (\omega, 4)$ would have $\delta(\omega') = k - 1$ (following from (2)), which violates (4). Now we split into cases depending upon whether $\beta_1 = 3$ or $\beta_2 = 3$ (note that since ω_2 is a bit run exactly one of these alternatives holds).

Case 1: $\beta_1 = 3$.

Observe that $1, 2, 4 \notin \omega_2$ and $3 \notin \{\beta_2, \dots, \beta_k\}$. Thus $(\beta_2, \dots, \beta_k, 1, 2, 3, 4)$ is a bit run in $T(C)$ of length $k + 3$.

Case 2: $\beta_2 = 3$.

Define $\omega = (4, \dots, k + 2, x, \beta_1, 3, \beta_3)$, then $|\omega| = k + 3$. Since $x \in \{1, 2\}$ and $x \notin \omega_2$, ω fails to be a bit run only if β_1 or $\beta_3 \in [4, k + 2] = \{4, 5, \dots, k + 2\}$. By (6): $\beta_1 \notin [4, k + 2]$, and if $\beta_3 \in [4, k + 2]$ then $\beta_3 < 6$. As we have established that $1, 2, 4 \notin \omega_2$ and $\beta_3 \neq \beta_2 = 3$, the second implication can be sharpened to: $\beta_3 = 5$. Therefore: $1, 2, 4 \notin \omega_2$ and both 3 and $5 \notin \{\beta_4, \dots, \beta_k\}$. In this case we claim that $\omega' = (\beta_4, \dots, \beta_k, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$ is a bit run of length $k + 3$ in $T(C)$. If not, then we must have $6 \in \{\beta_4, \dots, \beta_k\}$, but the segment $\omega'' = (x, \omega_2, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$ has length $k + 7$ and the only repeated transition elements are: $1 \text{ xor } 2, 3, 5,$ and 6 (each occurring twice in ω''). This means $\delta(\omega'') = |\omega''| - 2 \cdot |(x, \omega_2) \cap (1, \dots, 6)| = k + 7 - 8 = k - 1$, violating (4). Thus $6 \notin \{\beta_4, \dots, \beta_k\}$ and so ω' is a bit run in $T(C)$ of length $k + 3$.

In all cases, we have shown that $T(C)$ contains a bit run of length $k + 3$, completing the proof. \square

Before concluding, we note that the main technical result in the proof of Lemma 4 (the existence of a bit run of length $k + 3$) also follows (after modification) from Case II of the proof of [2] Theorem 3 (what we have labelled as Theorem 1). Specifically, there it is shown that for k even and $d = \frac{1}{2}(3k + 4)$ if a (d, k) circuit code C with $|C| \geq 4k + 8$ exists, then $T(C)$ must contain a bit run of length $k + 3$. However, it appears possible to modify the proof to use the weaker condition $|C| \geq 4k + 6$. Since the main purpose of this note is to observe how all symmetric (d, k) circuit codes (for d and k as in Lemma 4) of length $4k + 6$ are isomorphic as a consequence of Theorem 6, rather than establishing the existence of a $k + 3$ bit run in

any (potentially asymmetric) such (d, k) circuit code of length $\geq 4k + 6$, we have presented an alternate, more accessible, proof.

References

- [1] K. M. Byrnes. The maximum length and isomorphism of circuit codes with long bit runs. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.04839>, 2020.
- [2] R. J. Douglas. Some results on the maximum length of circuits of spread k in the d -cube. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 6(4):323–339, 1969.
- [3] S. Hood, D. Recoskie, J. Sawada, and D. Wong. Snakes, coils, and single-track circuit codes with spread k . *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, 30(1):42–62, 2013.
- [4] K. J. Kochut. Snake-in-the-box-code for dimension 7. *Journal of Combinatorial Mathematics and Combinatorial Computing*, 20:175–185, 1996.
- [5] P.R.J. Östergård and V.H. Pettersson. On the maximum length of coil-in-the-box codes in dimension 8. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 179:193–200, 2014.
- [6] R. C. Singleton. Generalized snake-in-the-box codes. *IEEE Trans. Electronic Computers*, 15:596–602, 1966.