

COUNTING GRAY CODES FOR AN IMPROVED UPPER BOUND OF THE GRÜNBAUM-HADWIGER-RAMOS PROBLEM

JONATHAN KLIEM

ABSTRACT. We give an improved upper bound for the Grünbaum-Hadwiger-Ramos problem: Let $d, n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $d \geq 2^n(1 + 2^{k-1})$. Given 2^{n+1} measures on \mathbb{R}^d . There exist k hyperplanes in \mathbb{R}^d that partition it into 2^k sets of equal size with respect to all measures. This is an improvement to the previous bound $d \geq 2^{n+k}$ by Mani-Levitska, Vrećica & Živaljević in 2006.

It is achieved by classifying the number of certain Gray code patterns modulo 2. The reduction was developed by Blagojević, Frick, Haase & Ziegler in 2016.

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Counting Gray codes	2
2.1.	Gray codes	2
2.2.	Equiparting matrices	4
3.	Reduction to Equiparting matrices	8
	Acknowledgements	11
	References	12

1. INTRODUCTION

The Grünbaum-Hadwiger-Ramos problem is to find the minimal $d = \Delta(j, k)$ such that any j masses can be equipartitioned by k hyperplanes into 2^k pieces. For a brief history, we refer the reader to Blagojević, Frick, Haase, & Ziegler [1]. The lower bound developed by Ramos [6] is

$$\Delta(j, k) \geq \frac{2^k - 1}{k} j.$$

It is conjectured to be tight.

It holds for $k = 1$ by the Ham Sandwich theorem. For $k = 2$ it is shown to be tight for $j = 2^n - 1, 2^n, 2^n + 1$ by Blagojević, Frick, Haase, & Ziegler [1, Thm. 1.5]. Partial results were known before, see [1]. The current best general upper bound is

$$\Delta(j, k) \leq j + (2^{k-1} - 1)2^{\lfloor \log_2 j \rfloor}$$

or equivalently

$$\Delta(2^n + r, k) \leq 2^{n+k-1} + r \quad \text{for } 0 \leq r < 2^n$$

by Mani-Levitska, Vrećica & Živaljević [4]. Other bounds exist for $\Delta(1, 3)$ by Hadwiger [2] and $\Delta(2, 3), \Delta(4, 3), \Delta(1, 4), \Delta(2, 4)$ by [1]. We will generalize this bound:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $j, k \geq 1$ be integers. It holds that*

$$\Delta(j, k) \leq \left\lceil j + (2^{k-1} - 1)2^{\lfloor \log_2(j - \frac{1}{2}) \rfloor} \right\rceil.$$

Equivalently, for integers $j = 2^n + r$, $n \geq 0$, and $1 \leq r \leq 2^n$ it holds that

$$\Delta(2^n + r, k) \leq 2^{n+k-1} + r \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta(1, k) \leq \begin{cases} 2^{k-2} + 1, & \text{if } k \geq 2 \\ 1, & \text{if } k = 1. \end{cases}$$

Date: October 15, 2021.

J.K. receives funding by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft DFG under Germany's Excellence Strategy – The Berlin Mathematics Research Center MATH+ (EXC-2046/1, project ID: 390685689).

This bound is equivalent to the bound by [4] unless $k > 1$ and j is a power of two. For $j = 2^{n+1}$ we improve the old upper bound 2^{n+k} to $2^{n+k-1} + 2^n$. This has already been done for $\Delta(2^{n+1}, 2)$ and $\Delta(2, 3)$, $\Delta(4, 3)$ by [1]. We complete those sporadic cases to Theorem 1.1 for $k > 1$.

In particular, we give an independent proof to [4] for the previous known upper bound. Their bound was derived from a Fadell–Husseini index calculation using the product scheme. Our proof relies on equivariant obstruction theory with the join scheme. (See [1, Section 1.1] for more detail.)

Note that [1] provides a better and tight bound for $\Delta(2^n - 1, 2)$, which cannot be generalized for $k > 2$. To conclude the introduction, we remark that for $j = 1$ and $k > 1$ our new bound

$$\Delta(1, k) \leq 2^{k-2} + 1$$

is already implied by the reduction of Hadwiger and Ramos $\Delta(1, k) \leq \Delta(2, k - 1)$ and our new bound

$$\Delta(2, k - 1) \leq 2^{k-2} + 1.$$

2. COUNTING GRAY CODES

Blagojević, Frick, Haase and Ziegler [1] have approached the Grünbaum-Hadwiger-Ramos problem with obstruction theory and developed a reduction of this problem to a combinatorial problem. The topological problem can be solved by counting equivalence classes of certain 0, 1-matrices modulo 2 with number of rows equal to k . They have classified this parity for the matrices corresponding to $k = 2$. For $j \leq 9$, $k = 3$ and $j \leq 2$, $k = 4$ they have counted some of them with the help of a computer to obtain new bounds for $\Delta(2, 3)$ and $\Delta(4, 3)$, see [1, Table 1]. By the reduction of Hadwiger and Ramos they could derive bounds for $\Delta(1, 4)$ and $\Delta(2, 4)$.

Instead of listing all those matrices, one can use an iterator to count more matrix classes. This helped to understand the underlying structure: For $j > 2$ we provide a full classification, when the number of equivalence classes is odd.

2.1. Gray codes. We will use notation from Knuth [3, pp. 292–294]. However, while Knuth considers Gray cycles, where the Hamiltonian path completes to a Hamiltonian cycle, we will not restrict to this case. We will also start indexing with 1 instead of 0.

Definition 2.1 ([1, Sec. 1.3]). A k -bit Gray code is a $k \times 2^k$ binary matrix containing all column vectors in $\{0, 1\}^k$ such that two consecutive vectors differ in only one entry.

A Gray code can be seen as a Hamiltonian path on the edge graph of a hypercube.

Definition 2.2. The *standard k -bit Gray code* is a path inductively obtained. The standard 1-bit Gray code is $((0), (1))$. For $k > 1$ the standard k -bit Gray code is given by

- each vector of the standard $(k - 1)$ -bit Gray code with 0 appended,
- in reverse order each vector of the standard $(k - 1)$ -bit Gray code with 1 appended.

Thus the standard k -bit Gray code visits the front facet by the standard $(k - 1)$ -bit Gray code and then in reverse order the back facet.

Example 2.3. The standard 3-bit Gray code is

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We will see later that for $j > 2$ we only need to consider standard k -bit Gray codes.

Definition 2.4. Let $G = (g_1, \dots, g_{2^k})$ be a k -bit Gray code. Then the *delta sequence* of G

$$\delta(G) := (\delta_1(G), \dots, \delta_{2^k-1}(G))$$

is defined by $\delta_i(G)$ being the row of the bit change from g_i to g_{i+1} for each $i = 1, \dots, 2^k - 1$.

A *k -bit delta sequence* is a vector, which is the delta sequence of some k -bit Gray code.

Example 2.5. The standard 3-bit Gray code has delta sequence $(1, 2, 1, 3, 1, 2, 1)$. The standard 4-bit Gray code has delta sequence $(1, 2, 1, 3, 1, 2, 1, 4, 1, 2, 1, 3, 1, 2, 1)$. In general, δ_i of the standard k -bit Gray code is equal to one plus the 2-adic order of i .

Let D be a k -bit delta sequence. For each choice of a first column $g_1 \in \{0, 1\}^k$ there exists exactly one Gray code G with first column g_1 and $\delta(G) = D$.

$(\mathbb{Z}/2)^k \rtimes \mathfrak{S}_k =: \mathfrak{S}_k^\pm$, the symmetric group of the k -dimensional cross polytope, acts on the set of all Gray codes by permuting rows and inverting all bits in one row. \mathfrak{S}_k^\pm also acts on $[k]^{2^k-1}$ by

$$((\beta_1, \dots, \beta_k) \rtimes \tau) \cdot (d_1, \dots, d_{2^k-1}) = (\tau(d_1), \dots, \tau(d_{2^k-1})).$$

With this action, the map δ from all k -bit Gray codes to $[k]^{2^k-1}$ is \mathfrak{S}_k^\pm -equivariant.

Note that \mathfrak{S}_k^\pm acts freely on k -bit Gray codes. On the other hand, \mathfrak{S}_k acts freely on k -bit delta sequences (but not on $[k]^{2^k-1}$) and $(\mathbb{Z}/2)^k$ acts trivially on k -bit delta sequences.

Definition 2.6. Let D be a k -bit delta sequence. The *transition counts*

$$c(D) := (c_1(D), \dots, c_k(D))$$

are defined by letting $c_i(D)$ be the number of i 's in D , for every $i = 1, \dots, k$.

The transition counts of a Gray code are the transition counts of its delta sequence.

Example 2.7. The transition counts of the standard k -bit Gray code are $(2^{k-1}, 2^{k-2}, \dots, 4, 2, 1)$.

\mathfrak{S}_k^\pm acts on transition counts by trivial action of $(\mathbb{Z}/2)^k$ and by \mathfrak{S}_k permuting coordinates. With this action, taking the transition counts is \mathfrak{S}_k^\pm -equivariant.

Lemma 2.8. Let $D = (d_1, \dots, d_{2^k-1})$ be a k -bit delta sequence. Suppose for some $0 \leq i < k$ it holds that

$$c_k(D) = 1, \quad c_{k-1}(D) = 2, \quad \dots, \quad c_{k-i+1}(D) = 2^{i-1}.$$

Then, $c_{k-i}(D) \geq 2^i$.

Proof. We induce on i for all k . For $i = 0$ the statement holds as $c_k(D) \geq 1$. Suppose now that $i > 0$ and

$$c_k(D) = 1, \quad c_{k-1}(D) = 2, \quad \dots, \quad c_{k-i+1}(D) = 2^{i-1}.$$

As $c_k(D) = 1$ it follows that the k -th bit must change at central position. Then, $\overline{D}_1 := (d_1, \dots, d_{2^{k-1}-1})$ and $\overline{D}_2 := (d_{2^{k-1}+1}, \dots, d_{2^k-1})$ are both $(k-1)$ -bit delta sequences such that

$$c_{k-1}(\overline{D}_1) + c_{k-1}(\overline{D}_2) = 2, \quad c_{k-2}(\overline{D}_1) + c_{k-2}(\overline{D}_2) = 4, \quad \dots, \quad c_{k-i+1}(\overline{D}_1) + c_{k-i+1}(\overline{D}_2) = 2^{i-1},$$

which implies by induction that

$$c_{k-1}(\overline{D}_1) = c_{k-1}(\overline{D}_2) = 1, \quad c_{k-2}(\overline{D}_1) = c_{k-2}(\overline{D}_2) = 2, \quad \dots, \quad c_{k-i+1}(\overline{D}_1) = c_{k-i+1}(\overline{D}_2) = 2^{i-2},$$

and therefore $c_{k-i}(\overline{D}_1) \geq 2^{i-1}$ and $c_{k-i}(\overline{D}_2) \geq 2^{i-1}$. \square

Definition 2.9. Let D be a k -bit delta sequence. The *shuffle count* of D is the number of delta sequences \tilde{D} with $c(D) = c(\tilde{D})$.

We show that exactly the shuffle count of the standard k -bit Gray code and its \mathfrak{S}_k^\pm -orbit are odd:

Lemma 2.10. Let D be the delta sequence of the standard k -bit Gray code. The shuffle count of D is 1.

Proof. For $k = 1$ the statement is clear. Let $\tilde{D} = (\tilde{d}_1, \dots, \tilde{d}_{2^k-1})$ be a k -bit delta sequence with $c(\tilde{D}) = c(D)$. $c_k(\tilde{D}) = c_k(D) = 1$ implies that the only k -bit change must be at central position and $\tilde{d}_{2^k-1} = k$ as desired. By Lemma 2.8 it follows that $\overline{\tilde{D}}_1 := (\tilde{d}_1, \dots, \tilde{d}_{2^{k-1}-1})$ and $\overline{\tilde{D}}_2 := (\tilde{d}_{2^{k-1}+1}, \dots, \tilde{d}_{2^k-1})$ are both $(k-1)$ -bit delta sequences such that $c(\overline{\tilde{D}}_1) = c(\overline{\tilde{D}}_2) = (2^{k-2}, 2^{k-3}, \dots, 1)$. By induction this implies that $\overline{\tilde{D}}_1$ and $\overline{\tilde{D}}_2$ are the delta sequence of the standard $(k-1)$ -bit Gray code. \square

Lemma 2.11. Let $D = (d_1, \dots, d_{2^k-1})$ be a k -bit delta sequence. If the shuffle count of D is odd, then D is the delta sequence of the standard k -bit Gray code.

Proof. Denote by D^R the sequence of D in reversed order. If D is a delta sequence, then so is D^R . Hence the parity of the shuffle count is equal to the parity of the number of symmetric delta sequences \tilde{D} with $c(\tilde{D}) = c(D)$. If the shuffle count of D is odd, then w.l.o.g. D itself is symmetric. Let G be a Gray code with $\delta(G) = D$. As the statement is invariant under the group action of \mathfrak{S}_k^\pm , we may assume that the central entry of D is k .

As D is symmetric, it follows that for each $i = 1, \dots, 2^{k-1}$ the columns G_i and G_{2^k-i+1} differ exactly in the bit k . This implies that $c_k(D) = 1$ and $\overline{D}_1 := (d_1, \dots, d_{2^{k-1}-1})$ and $\overline{D}_2 := (d_{2^{k-1}+1}, \dots, d_{2^k-1}) = \overline{D}_1^R$ are $(k-1)$ -bit delta sequences. As the shuffle count of D is odd, we may assume that \overline{D}_1 itself has odd shuffle count. By induction this implies that \overline{D}_1 is the standard $(k-1)$ -bit Gray code and then D is the standard k -bit Gray code. \square

2.2. Equiparting matrices. We generalize [1, Def. 1.1] as follows:

Definition 2.12. Let $\mathbf{c}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{c}_k = j(2^k - 1)$. A binary matrix \mathcal{G} of size $k \times j2^k$ is a $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrix if

- (1) $\mathcal{G} = (G_1, \dots, G_j)$ for Gray codes G_1, \dots, G_j with the property that the last column of G_i is equal to the first column of G_{i+1} for $1 \leq i < j$; and
- (2) the transition counts of \mathcal{G} are given by

$$c(\mathcal{G}) = c(G_1) + \dots + c(G_j) = (\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k).$$

If $\mathbf{c}_1 > \mathbf{c}_2 = \mathbf{c}_3 = \dots = \mathbf{c}_k$, we have a $(\mathbf{c}_1 - \mathbf{c}_2)$ -equiparting matrix from [1, Def. 1.1].

Let \mathfrak{S}_k act on $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ by permutation and let $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}$ denote the stabilizer subgroup. Then $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}^\pm$ acts on $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrices by acting on all Gray codes simultaneously. We say that two $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrices \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{G}' are equivalent, if they are in one $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}$ -orbit. Note that $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}^\pm$ acts freely on $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrices.

We obtain the following classification of the parity of non-equivalent $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrices:

Theorem 2.13. Let $j \geq 1$, $k \geq 2$ be integers. Denote by $E(j, k)$ the smallest integer such that the number of non-equivalent $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrices is odd for some $E(j, k) \geq \mathbf{c}_1 \geq \mathbf{c}_2 \geq \dots \geq \mathbf{c}_k \geq 0$ with $\mathbf{c}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{c}_k = j(2^k - 1)$.

Then

$$E(1, k) \leq 2^{k-2} + 1$$

and

$$E(2^n + r, k) = 2^{n+k-1} + r$$

for all $1 \leq r \leq 2^n$ and $n \geq 0$.

Proposition 3.5 establishes that $\Delta(j, k) \leq E(j, k)$ and concludes our proof of Theorem 1.1. This reduction has basically been shown in [1] and we generalize it in Section 3.

The exact value of $E(1, k)$ remains unknown as we do not understand the precise structure of non-equivalent Gray codes (equiparting matrices for $j = 1$). It has been verified to be tight by computation for $k \leq 5$.

2.2.1. Proof of Theorem 2.13. k -bit Gray codes G with transition count $c_k(G) = 1$ are exactly given by composition of two $(k-1)$ -bit Gray codes. Let $\mathbf{c}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{c}_{k-1} = 2(2^{k-1} - 1)$ be such that the number of non-equivalent $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{k-1})$ -equiparting matrices is odd. Then it holds that $\mathbf{c}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{c}_{k-1} + 1 = (2^k - 1)$ and the number of non-equivalent $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{k-1}, 1)$ -equiparting matrices is odd. Hence $E(1, k) \leq E(2, k - 1)$. It suffices to show

$$E(2^n + r, k) = 2^{n+k-1} + r$$

and we assume $2^n + r = j > 1$. In order to do so, we use delta sequences and make a few observations:

Definition 2.14. A sequence

$$\mathcal{D} = (D_1, \dots, D_j)$$

is a $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequence, if it is a delta sequence of a $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrix

$$\mathcal{G} = (G_1, \dots, G_j),$$

i.e. for each $i = 1, \dots, j$ it holds that $\delta(G_i) = D_i$.

As before $(\mathbb{Z}/2)^k$ acts trivially on $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequences and as above $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}$ acts freely by diagonal action. We say that two $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequences are equivalent, if they are in one $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}$ -orbit. Thus the number of non-equivalent $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrices is equal to the number of non-equivalent $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequences.

We denote by $N(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ the number of non-equivalent $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequences modulo 2. To determine this it suffices to consider only the standard k -bit Gray code:

Lemma 2.15. Let $j, k \geq 2$ and let $\mathbf{c}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{c}_k = j(2^k - 1)$.

- (1) Let (D_1, \dots, D_j) be a $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequence. Let $1 \leq i \leq j$ and let \tilde{D} be a delta sequence with $c(\tilde{D}) = c(D_i)$. Then

$$(D_1, \dots, D_{i-1}, \tilde{D}, D_{i+1}, \dots, D_j)$$

is equivalent to (D_1, \dots, D_j) if and only if $D_i = \tilde{D}$.

- (2) $N(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ is determined by considering only permutations of delta sequences of the standard k -bit Gray code.

Proof. (1) Let $\tau \in (\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}$ with

$$\tau \cdot (D_1, \dots, D_j) = (D_1, \dots, D_{i-1}, \tilde{D}, D_{i+1}, \dots, D_j).$$

\mathfrak{S}_k acts freely on delta sequences and as $j > 1$ it follows that $\tau = \text{id}$ and $\tilde{D} = D_i$.

(2) Follows from (1) and Lemmas 2.10 and 2.11. □

We observe another group action: \mathfrak{S}_j acts on $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequences by

$$\sigma \cdot (D_1, \dots, D_j) := (D_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, D_{\sigma^{-1}(j)}).$$

This action commutes with the action of $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}$ and it is the key in determining $N(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$: If the \mathfrak{S}_j -orbit of (D_1, \dots, D_j) contains an even number of non-equivalent elements, (D_1, \dots, D_j) needs not be considered for the parity of $N(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$.

Definition 2.16. The *multiplicity* of (D_1, \dots, D_j) is the multiset formed by:

$$|\{i \in \{1, \dots, j\} : D_i = D\}|$$

for all $D \in \{D_1, \dots, D_j\}$.

Example 2.17. Let D, D', D'' be pairwise distinct.

- (D, D, D', D') has multiplicity $(2, 2)$.
- (D, D, D, D', D') has multiplicity $(2, 3)$.
- (D, D, D', D'', D'') has multiplicity $(1, 2, 2)$.

Note that the multiplicity of a $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequence is $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}$ -invariant and \mathfrak{S}_j -invariant.

Proposition 2.18. $N(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ is determined by considering only $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequences of multiplicity

- (1) $(\frac{j}{2}, \frac{j}{2})$, where j is a power of two and
- (2) (a_1, \dots, a_ℓ) , where the base-2 digits of the a_i decompose the base-2 digits of j .

Lemma 2.19. The 2-adic valuation of $\binom{j}{a}$ is

$$\nu_2 \left(\binom{j}{a} \right) = s_2(a) + s_2(j-a) - s_2(j),$$

where $s_2(d)$ is the sum of the base-2 digits of j .

Proof. By a formula of Legendre, see [5, Theorem 2.6.4], the 2-adic valuation of $j!$ is given by

$$\nu_2(j!) = j - s_2(j).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 2.18. Let $\mathcal{D} := (D_1, \dots, D_j)$ be a $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequence of multiplicity (a_1, \dots, a_ℓ) . As \mathfrak{S}_j and $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}$ commute, the number of non-equivalent elements of the \mathfrak{S}_j -orbit of \mathcal{D} is equal to the size of the \mathfrak{S}_j -orbit divided by the cardinality G of

$$\mathcal{G} := \{\tau \in (\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)} \mid \exists \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_j : \tau \mathcal{D} = \sigma \mathcal{D}\}.$$

If $\tau \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\tau(D_{i_1}) = D_{i_2}$, both D_{i_1} and D_{i_2} must have the same cardinality in (D_1, \dots, D_j) . As $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}$ acts freely on delta sequences, $\tau(D_{i_1}) = D_{i_2}$ completely determines τ and the (a_1, \dots, a_ℓ) can be sorted as follows:

$$(a_1, \dots, a_{\frac{\ell}{G}}, a_1, \dots, a_{\frac{\ell}{G}}, \dots, a_1, \dots, a_{\frac{\ell}{G}}).$$

Note that j must be divisible by G and that $G - \nu_2(G) \geq s_2(G)$. This inequality is tight exactly for $G \in \{1, 2\}$. There are

$$S := \binom{j}{a_1} \binom{j-a_1}{a_2} \dots \binom{j-a_1-a_2-\dots-a_{\ell-1}}{a_\ell}$$

elements in the \mathfrak{S}_j -orbit of \mathcal{D} . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_2(S) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \left(s_2(a_i) + s_2(j - a_1 - \dots - a_i) - s_2(j - a_1 - \dots - a_{i-1}) \right) \\ &= s_2(0) - s_2(j) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} s_2(a_i). \end{aligned}$$

If the number of non-equivalent elements of the \mathfrak{S}_j -orbit of \mathcal{D} is even, \mathcal{D} may be disregarded for the parity of $N(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$. So suppose that it is odd, i.e. $\nu_2(G) = \nu_2(S)$. However,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_2(S) &= -s_2(j) + G \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\ell}{G}} s_2(a_i) \\ &\geq -s_2(G) s_2\left(\frac{j}{G}\right) + G \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\ell}{G}} s_2(a_i) \\ &\stackrel{(1)}{\geq} -(G - \nu_2(G)) s_2\left(\frac{j}{G}\right) + G \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\ell}{G}} s_2(a_i) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \nu_2(G) s_2\left(\frac{j}{G}\right) + G \left(-s_2\left(\frac{j}{G}\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{\ell}{G}} s_2(a_i) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\geq} \nu_2(G) s_2\left(\frac{j}{G}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

$$\stackrel{(3)}{\geq} \nu_2(G). \tag{3}$$

So the above inequalities must be tight. This implies:

- $G \in \{1, 2\}$ by 1.
- The base-2 digits of $a_1, \dots, a_{\frac{\ell}{G}}$ decompose the base-2 digits of $\frac{j}{G}$ by 2.
- G is odd or $\frac{j}{G}$ is a power of two by 3.

□

To determine $N(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ for $j = 2^n + r$ for $1 \leq r < 2^n$ it suffices therefore to consider only $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequences (D_1, \dots, D_j) of

- (1) multiplicity $(2^n, a_2, \dots, a_\ell)$ for $r < 2^n$ and
- (2) multiplicity (2^{n+1}) or $(2^n, 2^n)$ for $r = 2^n$.

By Lemma 2.15 it suffices to consider those (D_1, \dots, D_j) that are each a permutation of the delta sequence of the standard k -bit Gray code. Recall that the standard k -bit Gray code has transition counts $(2^{k-1}, 2^{k-2}, \dots, 1)$. If 2^n of the (D_1, \dots, D_j) are equal, the maximal transition count is therefore at least $2^n 2^{k-1} + r$. We have shown that

$$E(2^n + r, k) \geq 2^{n+k-1} + r.$$

The following two proposition show equality and conclude our proof:

Proposition 2.20. *Let $k = 2$ and let $2 \leq j = 2^n + r$ with $1 \leq r < 2^n$. Then*

$$N(2^n + 2r, 2^{n+2} + r) = 1.$$

Proof. There exist exactly two 2-bit delta sequences with transition counts $(1, 2)$ resp. $(2, 1)$. Hence the number of $(2^n + 2r, 2^{n+2} + r)$ -delta sequences is $\binom{j}{r} = \binom{2^n + r}{r}$. By Lemma 2.19:

$$\nu_2\left(\binom{2^n + r}{r}\right) = s_2(r) + s_2(2^n) - s_2(2^n + r) = s_2(r) + 1 - s_2(2^n + r) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 0 < r < 2^n, \\ 1, & \text{if } r = 2^n. \end{cases}$$

However, if $r = 2^n$, then $|\mathfrak{S}_{(2^n+2r, 2^{n+2}+r)}| = 2$ and in each case we have $N(2^n + 2r, 2^{n+2} + r) = 1$. □

Proposition 2.21. *Let $k > 2$ and $2 \leq j = 2^n + r$ with $1 \leq r < 2^n$. Define $w = \min(r, 2^{n-1})$ and $s = r - w$ such that $j = 2^n + w + s$. Then*

$$N(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k) = 1,$$

where

$$\mathbf{c}_i = \begin{cases} 2^{i-1} 2^n + 2^i w + 2^{i+1} s, & \text{if } i < k-1, \\ 2^{k-2} 2^n + 2^{k-1} w + 2s, & \text{if } i = k-1, \\ 2^{k-1} 2^n + w + s, & \text{if } i = k. \end{cases}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{c}_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{c}_k &= (2^{k-2} - 1)(2^n + 2w + 4s) + 2^{k-2}2^n + 2^{k-1}w + 2s + 2^{k-1}2^n + w + s \\
&= (2^{k-2} - 1)j + (2^{k-2} - 1)(w + 3s) + w + 3s + 2^{k-2}2^n + 2^{k-1}(2^n + w) \\
&= (2^{k-2} - 1)j + 2^{k-2}(2^n + w + s) + 2^{k-2}2s + 2^{k-1}(2^n + w) \\
&= (2^{k-2} - 1)j + 2^{k-2}j + 2^{k-1}j \\
&= (2^k - 1)j.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. It holds that

$$\mathbf{c}_{k-1} - \mathbf{c}_{k-2} = 2^{k-3}2^n + 2^{k-2}w - (2^{k-1} - 2)s > \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } s = 0, \\ 2^{k-3}2w + 2^{k-2}w - 2^{k-1}w = 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathbf{c}_k - \mathbf{c}_{k-1} = 2^{k-2}2^n + w + s - 2^{k-1}w - 2s.$$

Hence

$$\mathbf{c}_1 < \mathbf{c}_2 < \cdots < \mathbf{c}_{k-2} < \mathbf{c}_{k-1} \leq \mathbf{c}_k$$

and the last inequality is tight exactly if $r = 2^n$. This implies that

$$|(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)}| = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } r = 2^n, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (1) Let $r < 2^n$. Note that $n > 1$ in this case and that w and r are integers. By Proposition 2.18 it suffices to consider $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequences of multiplicity $(2^n, a_2, \dots, a_\ell)$. If $w = 2^{n-1}$, then $a_2 \geq 2^{n-1}$. By Lemma 2.15 it suffices to consider those sequences that consist of permutations of the standard k -bit Gray code.

Suppose $\mathcal{D} = (D_1, \dots, D_j)$ is such sequence. W.l.o.g. we reorder \mathcal{D} such that $D_1 = \cdots = D_{2^n}$ and such that $D_{2^n+1} = \cdots = D_{2^n+a_2}$. We will show that $a_2 = w$ and that

$$c(D_m) = \begin{cases} (1, 2, 4, \dots, 2^{k-1}), & \text{if } m \leq 2^n, \\ (2, 4, \dots, 2^{k-1}, 1), & \text{if } 2^n < m \leq 2^n + w, \\ (4, 8, \dots, 2^{k-1}, 2, 1), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$c_k(\mathcal{D}) = 2^{k-1}2^n + w + s$ and c_k being strictly the largest implies

$$c_k(D_m) = \begin{cases} 2^{k-1}, & \text{if } m \leq 2^n \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Suppose $s > 0$. This implies $w = 2^{n-1}$ and

$$\mathbf{c}_{k-1} \equiv 2s \pmod{2^n}$$

with $2s < 2^n$. However,

$$\nu_2(c_{k-1}(D_1)) = \cdots = \nu_2(c_{k-1}(D_{2^n})) \geq 0$$

and

$$\nu_2(c_{k-1}(D_{2^n+1})) = \cdots = \nu_2(c_{k-1}(D_{2^n+w})) \geq 1.$$

Therefore,

$$c_{k-1}(D_1) + \cdots + c_{k-1}(D_j) \equiv c_{k-1}(D_{2^n+w+1}) + \cdots + c_{k-1}(D_j) \pmod{2^n}.$$

As they are all at least 2, we conclude that

$$c_{k-1}(D_{2^n+w+1}) = \cdots = c_{k-1}(D_j) = 2.$$

Next we use induction on i to show the $c_i(D_m)$ for $i \leq k-2$. By induction we have that

$$c_i(D_m) \geq \begin{cases} 2^{i-1}, & \text{if } m \leq 2^n, \\ 2^i, & \text{if } 2^n < m \leq 2^n + w, \\ 2^{i+1}, & \text{if } 2^n + w < m \leq 2^n + w + s. \end{cases}$$

As $\mathbf{c}_i = 2^{i-1}2^n + 2^i w + 2^{i+1} s$, it follows that the inequalities are tight. The values for $c_{k-1}(D_m)$ follow as they are the only values left.

The \mathfrak{S}_j -orbit of \mathcal{D} has size $\binom{2^n+w+s}{s} \binom{2^n+w}{w}$, which is not divisible by two.

(2) Let $r = 2^n$. In this case

$$(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k) = (2j, 4j, \dots, 2^{k-2}j, 2^{k-1}2^n + 2^n, 2^{k-1}2^n + 2^n).$$

We only need to consider $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -delta sequences of permutations of standard k -bit Gray codes of multiplicity (2^{n+1}) or $(2^n, 2^n)$. Such a sequence does not exist for multiplicity (2^{n+1}) so we consider the other case.

Suppose $\mathcal{D} = (D_1, \dots, D_j)$ is such sequence. As noted above, the transition count $c_i(\mathcal{D}) \geq 2^{k-1}2^n + 2^n$ for two of the i . It immediately follows that 2^n of the (D_1, \dots, D_j) have transition counts $(2, 4, \dots, 2^{k-2}, 1, 2^{k-1})$ and the others have transition counts $(2, 4, \dots, 2^{k-2}, 2^{k-1}, 1)$.

The \mathfrak{S}_j -orbit has size $\binom{2^{n+1}}{2^n}$, which is divisible by two, but not by four. Those come in pairs of equivalent permutations, hence the number of non-equivalent elements is odd. \square

3. REDUCTION TO EQUIPARTING MATRICES

We will briefly summarize the approach in [1] along with a slight generalization. W.l.o.g. the masses are assumed to be finite Borel measures. Via the inclusion

$$\iota: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d+1}, \quad (y_1, \dots, y_d) \mapsto (1, y_1, \dots, y_d)$$

we parametrize oriented affine hyperplanes in \mathbb{R}^d by S^d with two non-proper hyperplanes that cannot correspond to solutions. A vector $v \in S^d$ corresponds to a hyperplane

$$\{r \in \mathbb{R}^d: \langle \iota(r), v \rangle = 0\}$$

with induced positive and negative side.

A collection $\mathcal{M} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_j)$ of finite Borel measures on \mathbb{R}^d induces a map

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\mathcal{M}}: \quad X_{d,k} = (S^d)^{*k} &\rightarrow W_k \oplus (U_k)^{\oplus j} \cong \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \oplus (\mathbb{R}(\mathbb{Z}/2)^k)^{\oplus j} \\ \lambda_1 v_1 + \dots + \lambda_k v_k &\mapsto \left(\lambda_1 - \frac{1}{k}, \dots, \lambda_k - \frac{1}{k}\right) \oplus (\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_k) \cdot \phi_{\mathcal{M}}(v_1, \dots, v_k), \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_{\mathcal{M}}$ assigns k oriented hyperplanes with normals (v_1, \dots, v_k) to each measure evaluated on each of the (possibly empty) 2^k regions minus $\frac{1}{2^k} \mu_i(\mathbb{R}^d)$. This map is \mathfrak{S}_k^{\pm} -equivariant as explained in [1, Section 2.3]. If 0 is in the image for all collections of measures, then $\Delta(j, k) \leq d$.

If 0 lies not in the image, then $\psi_{\mathcal{M}}$ can be composed with the radial projection $\nu: (W_k \oplus U_k^{\oplus j}) \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow S(W_k \oplus U_k^{\oplus j})$.

Denote by $X_{d,k}^{>1}$ the subset of non-trivial stabilizer. 0 lies not in the image of $X_{d,k}^{>1}$ and in fact any two maps $\psi_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\psi_{\mathcal{M}'}$ restricted to $X_{d,k}^{>1}$ are \mathfrak{S}_k^{\pm} -homotopic [1, Prop 2.2]. This yields:

Proposition 3.1 ([1, Thm. 2.3 (ii)]). *Let $d, k, j \geq 1$ be integers and let $\mathcal{M} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_j)$ be finite Borel measures on \mathbb{R}^d .*

If there is no \mathfrak{S}_k^{\pm} -equivariant map

$$X_{d,k} \rightarrow S(W_k \oplus U_k^{\oplus j})$$

whose restriction to $X_{d,k}^{>1}$ is \mathfrak{S}_k^{\pm} -homotopic to $\nu \circ \psi_{\mathcal{M}}|_{X_{d,k}^{>1}}$, then $\Delta(j, k) \leq d$.

$X_{d,k}$ is equipped with a CW-structure in [1, Section 3] such that $X_{d,k}^{>1}$ is a subcomplex. This allows to use relative equivariant obstruction theory. We assume the reader to be familiar with this CW-structure.

We proceed as described in [1, Section 2.6]. Let $N_2 = (2^k - 1)j + k - 2$ be the dimension of the sphere $S(W_k \oplus U_k^{\oplus j})$ and let θ be some $(N_2 + 1)$ -cell of $X_{d,k}$ and let Z be the union of $X_{d,k}^{>1}$ with the \mathfrak{S}_k^{\pm} -orbit of θ . It suffices to show that the map $\nu \circ \psi_{\mathcal{M}}|_{X_{d,k}^{>1}}$ cannot be \mathfrak{S}_k^{\pm} -equivariantly extended to Z .

An extension to the N_2 -skeleton $Z^{(N_2)}$ can be extended to Z if and only if the obstruction cocycle

$$\mathfrak{o}(g) \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}_k^{\pm}}^{N_2+1}(Z, X_{d,k}^{>1}, \pi_{N_2}(S(W_k \oplus U_k^{\oplus j})))$$

is zero. If this cochain is not a coboundary, i.e.

$$0 \neq [\mathfrak{o}(g)] \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{S}_k^{\pm}}^{N_2+1}(Z, X_{d,k}^{>1}, \pi_{N_2}(S(W_k \oplus U_k^{\oplus j}))),$$

then this map cannot be extended to Z independent of the choice on the N_2 -skeleton.

Proposition 3.2. *Let θ be an $(N_2 + 1)$ -cell of $X_{d,k}$ whose boundary $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_m, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n$ can be grouped in pairs such that η_i and ζ_i are in one \mathfrak{S}_k^\pm -orbit for each $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Suppose \mathcal{M} is a collection of measures such that 0 is not in the image of $\psi_{\mathcal{M}}$ restricted to the boundary of θ and that the number of 0s in the image of the interior of θ is finite and odd, then $\Delta(j, k) \leq d$.

Proof. Denote by e_θ the element in the cellular chain group $\mathcal{C}_{N_2+1}(Z, X_{d,k}^{>1})$ corresponding to θ . The image of the boundary of θ under $\psi_{\mathcal{M}}$ does not contain zero. Then by [1, Section 2.6] $\mathfrak{o}(g)(e_\theta)$ is the same as the number of $x \in \text{relint } \theta$ with $\psi_{\mathcal{M}}(x) = 0$ modulo 2.

We proceed as in [1, Proof of Theorem 1.4]. Suppose there exists a cochain

$$\mathfrak{h} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{S}_k^\pm}^{N_2}(Z, X_{d,k}^{>1}; \pi_{N_2}(S(W_k \oplus U_k^{\oplus j})))$$

such that $\delta\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{o}(g)$, then in particular

$$\mathfrak{o}(g)(e_\theta) = (\delta\mathfrak{h})(e_\theta) = \mathfrak{h}(\eta_1 + \dots + \eta_m + \zeta_1 + \dots + \zeta_n).$$

However, $\mathfrak{h}(\eta_i) = \pm\mathfrak{o}(\zeta_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. This is a contradiction and hence the obstruction cocycle is not a coboundary and the map cannot be extended to Z . By Proposition 3.1 this implies that $\Delta(j, k) \leq d$. \square

Let $d \geq 1$, $j \geq 1$ and $k \geq 2$ be integers such that $dk \geq (2^k - 1)j$. Let further $\ell_1 \geq \dots \geq \ell_k \geq 0$ be integers with $\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_k = dk - (2^k - 1)j$.

Consider the cell

$$\theta = D_{\ell_1+1, \ell_2+1, \dots, \ell_k+1}^{+,+, \dots, +}(1, 2, \dots, k).$$

This cell has dimension

$$(d+2)k - k - (\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_k) - 1 = k + (2^k - 1)j - 1 = N_2 + 1$$

as desired.

By definition, θ parametrizes all arrangements $\mathcal{H} = (H_1, \dots, H_k)$ of k linear oriented hyperplanes in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} with normal vectors x_1, \dots, x_k such that x_i has the first ℓ_i coordinates zero and coordinate $\ell_i + 1$ strictly greater than x_{i-1} , where $x_0 := 0$.

Lemma 3.3. *The boundary of θ can be grouped in pairs of \mathfrak{S}_k^\pm -orbit elements.*

Proof. The cells in the boundary are obtained by introducing one of the following equalities:

$$0 = x_{\ell_1+1,1}, \quad x_{\ell_2+1,1} = x_{\ell_2+1,2}, \quad \dots, \quad x_{\ell_k+1,k-1} = x_{\ell_k+1,k}.$$

(A) The equality $0 = x_{\ell_1+1,1}$ induces cells:

$$\eta_1 := D_{\ell_1+2, \ell_2+1, \dots, \ell_k+1}^{+,+, \dots, +}(1, 2, \dots, k), \quad \zeta_1 := D_{\ell_1+2, \ell_2+1, \dots, \ell_k+1}^{-,+, \dots, +}(1, 2, \dots, k)$$

that are related, as sets via $\zeta_1 = \varepsilon_1 \cdot \eta_1$ (ε_1 is the group element flipping the normal of the first hyperplane).

(B) Let $b \in 2, \dots, k$ and suppose $\ell_{b-1} \geq \ell_b + 1$. Let a be minimal such that $\ell_a \leq \ell_b + 1$ (possibly $a = b$). For the relative interior of θ it holds that

$$0 <_{\ell_b+2} x_a <_{\ell_b+2} x_{a+1} <_{\ell_b+2} \dots <_{\ell_b+2} x_{b-1} <_{\ell_b+1} x_b$$

and a is minimal with this property. When introducing the equality $x_{\ell_b+1,b} = x_{\ell_b+1,b-1}$ there are $b - a + 1$ possible positions for the b -th hyperplane, each position with both signs. This equality induces the cells

$$\eta_{b,b} := D_{\ell_1+1, \dots, \ell_{b-1}+1, \ell_b+2, \ell_{b+1}+1, \dots, \ell_k+1}^{+,+, \dots, +}(1, \dots, k)$$

$$\zeta_{b,b} := \varepsilon_b \cdot \eta_{b,b},$$

$$\eta_{b-1,b} := \tau_{b-1,b} \cdot \eta_{b,b},$$

$$\zeta_{b-1,b} := \varepsilon_{b-1} \cdot \tau_{b-1,b} \cdot \eta_{b,b} = \varepsilon_{b-1} \cdot \eta_{b-1,b},$$

$$\eta_{b-2,b} := \tau_{b-2,b-1} \cdot \tau_{b-1,b} \cdot \eta_{b,b},$$

$$\zeta_{b-2,b} := \varepsilon_{b-2} \cdot \tau_{b-2,b-1} \cdot \tau_{b-1,b} \cdot \eta_{b,b} = \varepsilon_{b-2} \cdot \eta_{b-2,b},$$

...

$$\eta_{a,b} := \tau_{a,a+1} \cdot \tau_{a+1,a+2} \cdot \dots \cdot \tau_{b-1,b} \cdot \eta_{b,b},$$

$$\zeta_{a,b} := \varepsilon_a \cdot \tau_{a,a+1} \cdot \tau_{a+1,a+2} \cdot \dots \cdot \tau_{b-1,b} \cdot \eta_{b,b} = \varepsilon_a \cdot \eta_{a,b}.$$

$\tau_{c,d}$ swaps the hyperplanes c and d .

(C) Let $b \in 2, \dots, k$ and suppose $\ell_{b-1} = \ell_b$. The equality $x_{\ell_b+1,b} = x_{\ell_b+1,b-1}$ induces two cells

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{b,b} &:= D_{\ell_1+1, \dots, \ell_{b-1}+1, \ell_b+2, \ell_{b+1}+1, \dots, \ell_k+1}^{+, \dots, +}(1, \dots, k) \\ \zeta_{b-1,b} &:= \tau_{b-1,b} \cdot \eta_{b,b}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Consider the binomial moment curve

$$\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \quad t \mapsto \left(t, \binom{t}{2}, \binom{t}{3}, \dots, \binom{t}{d} \right)$$

and points

$$q_1 := \gamma(0), \quad q_2 := \gamma(1), \quad \dots, \quad q_{\ell_1+1} = \gamma(\ell_1).$$

We obtain the following parametrization:

Lemma 3.4. *The cell θ parametrizes those (v_1, \dots, v_k) in $(S^d)^k$ corresponding to affine oriented hyperplanes $\mathcal{H} = (H_1, \dots, H_k)$ in \mathbb{R}^d such that*

- $\{q_1, \dots, q_{\ell_i}\} \subset H_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$,
- if $\ell_i = \ell_{i+1}$ for any $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, then $v_{\ell_i+1,i} \leq v_{\ell_{i+1}+1,i+1}$, where $v_{\ell_i+1,i}$ is the (ℓ_i+1) th-coordinate of the unit normal vector of the hyperplane H_i ,
- $v_{\ell_i+1,i} \geq 0$ for any $i = 1, \dots, k$,

and for the relative interior of θ additionally

- $q_{\ell_i+1} \notin H_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$,
- if $\ell_i = \ell_{i+1}$ for any $i = 1, \dots, k-1$, then $v_{\ell_i+1,i} < v_{\ell_{i+1}+1,i+1}$,
- $v_{\ell_i+1,i} > 0$ for any $i = 1, \dots, k$.

By parametrize we mean the restriction of $X_{d,k}$ to the embedding of $(S^d)^k$:

$$\left\{ (\lambda_1 v_1, \dots, \lambda_k v_k) \in X_{d,k} : \lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_k = \frac{1}{k} \right\}.$$

If $\psi_{\mathcal{M}}(x) = 0$, then x lies in the image of the embedding.

Proof. Analog to [1, Lem. 3.13].

□

We are now ready to use Theorem 2.13:

Proposition 3.5. $\Delta(j, k) \leq E(j, k)$.

Along with Theorem 2.13 this proves Theorem 1.1.

Proof. Suppose that $d = E(j, k) = \mathbf{c}_1 \geq \mathbf{c}_2 \geq \dots \geq \mathbf{c}_k \geq 0$ with

$$\mathbf{c}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{c}_k = j(2^k - 1)$$

such that the number of non-equivalent $(\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrices is odd. Define

$$\ell_1 := d - \mathbf{c}_1, \quad \dots, \quad \ell_k := d - \mathbf{c}_k.$$

Consider the cell

$$\begin{aligned}\theta &= D_{\ell_1+1, \ell_2+1, \dots, \ell_k+1}^{+, \dots, +}(1, 2, \dots, k) \\ &= D_{d-\mathbf{c}_1+1, d-\mathbf{c}_2+1, \dots, d-\mathbf{c}_k+1}^{+, \dots, +}(1, 2, \dots, k).\end{aligned}$$

In order to use Proposition 3.2 it remains to find measures \mathcal{M} such that the image of $\psi_{\mathcal{M}}$

- does not contain 0 restricted to the boundary of θ ,
- contains an odd number of 0s restricted to the relative interior of θ .

We proceed as in [1, Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2]. However, in [1] it was omitted to show that the 0s are in the relative interior of θ so we provide a proof here for completeness.

A measure on \mathbb{R} induces a measure on \mathbb{R}^d via the map $\gamma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. For points $p_0 < p_1 < \dots < p_{2^k}$ we construct a Borel measure $\mu_{p_0, \dots, p_{2^k}}$ on \mathbb{R}^d induced by μ on \mathbb{R} as follows

- $\mu([p_i, p_{i+1}]) = 1$ for $i = 0, \dots, 2^k - 1$ and 1 is uniformly distributed on this interval,
- $\mu((-\infty, p_0]) = 0$,
- $\mu([p_{2^k}, \infty)) = 0$.

The measure $\mu_{p_0, \dots, p_{2^k}}$ can only be equiparted into 2^k pieces by k hyperplanes, if at least $2^k - 1$ points in $\gamma((p_0, p_{2^k}))$ are contained in one of the hyperplanes H_1, \dots, H_k . More than $2^k - 1$ points are needed, unless the hyperplanes contain exactly the points $\gamma(p_1), \dots, \gamma(p_{2^k-1})$. If we encode the intervals $[p_0, p_1], \dots, [p_{2^k-1}, p_{2^k}]$ with vectors in $\{0, 1\}^k$ according to the region, an equipartition of $\mu_{p_0, \dots, p_{2^k}}$ by $2^k - 1$ points corresponds exactly to a k -bit Gray code.

Overall we choose points

$$\ell_1 = p_{1,0} < \dots < p_{1,2^k} = p_{2,0} < \dots < p_{2,2^k} = \dots = p_{j,0} < \dots < p_{j,2^k}$$

and obtain measures

$$\mathcal{M} = \left(\mu_{p_{1,0}, \dots, p_{1,2^k}}, \dots, \mu_{p_{j,0}, \dots, p_{j,2^k}} \right).$$

An equipartition of all measures simultaneously can only be obtained with at least $j(2^k - 1)$ intersection points of the H_1, \dots, H_k with $\gamma((p_{1,0}, p_{j,2^k}))$. The equipartitions with exactly $j(2^k - 1)$ intersection points are encoded by equiparting matrices.

According to Lemma 3.4, for an arrangement (H_1, \dots, H_k) in θ , the hyperplane H_i contains the points q_1, \dots, q_ℓ on $\gamma(\mathbb{R})$ for each $i = 1, \dots, k$. Each hyperplane can have at most d intersection points with $\gamma(\mathbb{R})$ and

$$dk = \ell_1 + \dots + \ell_k + j(2^k - 1).$$

So, hyperplane arrangements in θ have at most $j(2^k - 1)$ intersection points with $\gamma((p_{1,0}, p_{j,2^k}))$. We conclude that arrangements in the $(\mathfrak{S}_k)_{(\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_k)}^\pm$ -orbit of θ that equipart \mathcal{M} into 2^k pieces are in one-to-one correspondence with $(\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrices.

The number of non-equivalent $(\mathfrak{c}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}_k)$ -equiparting matrices is odd by assumption. If each of those arrangements has a representative in the relative interior of θ , we are done, as \mathfrak{S}_k^\pm acts free on the θ -orbit.

Clearly, for $i = 1, \dots, k$ no hyperplane H_i in such an arrangement may contain the point q_{ℓ_i+1} and we conclude $v_{\ell_i+1, i} \neq 0$. According to Lemma 3.6, we can choose the points $p_{1,0} < \dots < p_{j,2^k}$ such that $\ell_i = \ell_{i+1}$ for any $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ implies $v_{\ell_i+1, i} \neq v_{\ell_{i+1}+1, i+1}$. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let $d > \ell_1 > 0$ and $n \geq 2(d - \ell_1)$ be integers. There exist $\ell_1 < \pi_1 < \dots < \pi_n$ in \mathbb{R} such that for any two oriented hyperplanes H_v, H_w parametrized by $v, w \in S^d$ and $\ell \leq \ell_1$ with the following properties*

- (1) $v_i = w_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, i.e. H_v, H_w contain q_1, \dots, q_ℓ ,
- (2) $v_{\ell+1} \neq 0 \neq w_{\ell+1}$, i.e. H_v, H_w do not contain $q_{\ell+1}$,
- (3) the sets

$$H_v \cap \{\gamma(\pi_1), \dots, \gamma(\pi_n)\}, \quad H_w \cap \{\gamma(\pi_1), \dots, \gamma(\pi_n)\}$$

are disjoint and both of cardinality $d - \ell$,

it holds that $v_{\ell+1} \neq w_{\ell+1}$.

Proof. Let π_1, \dots, π_n be algebraically independent with $\ell_1 < \pi_1 < \dots < \pi_n$. Suppose

$$H_v \cap \{\gamma(\pi_1), \dots, \gamma(\pi_n)\} = \{\gamma(\pi_{I_1}), \dots, \gamma(\pi_{I_{d-\ell}})\}, \quad H_w \cap \{\gamma(\pi_1), \dots, \gamma(\pi_n)\} = \{\gamma(\pi_{J_1}), \dots, \gamma(\pi_{J_{d-\ell}})\}.$$

This means that $\pi_{I_1}, \dots, \pi_{I_{d-\ell}}$ are roots of the polynomial

$$1v_1 + tv_2 + \binom{t}{2}v_3 + \dots + \binom{t}{d}v_{d+1}$$

in $\mathbb{Q}(v_1, \dots, v_{d+1})[t]$. As $v_1 = \dots = v_\ell = 0$ and $v_1^2 + \dots + v_{d+1}^2 = 1$, they are algebraic over $\mathbb{Q}(v_{\ell+1}, \dots, v_d)$.

Likewise, $\pi_{J_1}, \dots, \pi_{J_{d-\ell}}$ are algebraic over $\mathbb{Q}(w_{\ell+1}, \dots, w_d)$. By assumptions the transcendence degree of $\mathbb{Q}(\pi_{I_1}, \dots, \pi_{I_{d-\ell}}, \pi_{J_1}, \dots, \pi_{J_{d-\ell}})$ is $2(d - \ell)$. This implies that $v_{\ell+1}$ and $w_{\ell+1}$ are algebraically independent and in particular distinct. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Pavle Blagojević for proposing to study [1], for many valuable discussions and for providing relevant references.

REFERENCES

- [1] Blagojević, P., Frick, F., Haase, A., Ziegler, G.: Hyperplane mass partitions via relative equivariant obstruction theory. *Documenta Mathematica* 21, 735–771 (2016).
- [2] Hadwiger, H.: Simultane Verteilung zweier Körper. *Arch. Math.* 17, 274–278 (1966).
- [3] Knuth, D.: *The Art of Computer Programming, Volume 4A: Combinatorial Algorithms, Part 1*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2011.
- [4] Mani-Levitska, P., Vrećica, S., Živaljević, R.: Topology and combinatorics of partitions of masses by hyperplanes. *Adv. Math.* 207, 266–296 (2006).
- [5] Moll, V.: *Numbers and functions: From a classical-experimental mathematician’s point of view*. Student Mathematical Library, vol. 65, American Mathematical Society, 2012.
- [6] Ramos, E.: Equipartition of mass distributions by hyperplanes. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* 15, 147–167 (1996).

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, FU BERLIN, ARNIMALLEE 2, 14195 BERLIN, GERMANY
Email address: jonathan.kliem@fu-berlin.de