

Optimal Leapfrogging, A Complete Guide

Sam K. Miller, Arthur T. Benjamin

IN PROGRESS FOR SUBMISSION (revision: 7/8/2021)

1 Introduction

Suppose we have some checkers placed in the lower left corner of a Go board, and we wish to move them to the upper right corner in as few moves as possible. There are no opponent pieces present, and the pieces move as they would in the game of Chinese Checkers, where for one move, a piece may either shift one unit in any direction, or repeatedly leapfrog over other pieces.

Let us consider the Go board as a subset of the non-negative integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^2 . As an example, suppose we have four pieces placed at the coordinates $(0, 0)$, $(1, 0)$, $(0, 1)$, and $(1, 1)$, and wish to move them to the squares $(9, 9)$, $(10, 9)$, $(9, 10)$, and $(10, 10)$. For the pieces to complete the task in as few moves as possible, the pieces must first be moved into a configuration such that they may jump over each other in an optimal way.

We may intuitively attempt lining the checkers up diagonally in what we will call a *snake configuration*, that is, moving the pieces to coordinates $(0, 0)$, $(1, 1)$, $(2, 2)$, and $(3, 3)$. By repeating the three-move process of shifting the backmost piece to the right $[(0, 0) \rightarrow (1, 0)]$, leapfrogging that piece to the front $[(1, 0) \rightarrow (3, 4)]$, then shifting it right again $[(3, 4) \rightarrow (4, 4)]$, we can reach our destination in $4 + 4 + (3 \times 7) = 29$ moves.

However a faster method exists. We first move the pieces into what we call a *serpent configuration*, with the pieces on coordinates $(0, 0)$, $(1, 0)$, $(1, 1)$, and $(2, 1)$. Then we repeat the two-move process of leapfrogging the backmost piece to the front $[(0, 0) \rightarrow (2, 2)]$ then leapfrogging the new backmost piece to the front again $[(1, 0) \rightarrow (3, 1)]$, we may reach our destination in $1 + 1 + (2 \times 8) = 18$ moves. This is indeed the fastest way of moving the checkers from the bottom left to the upper right.

We define a measure of the movement efficiency of a placement of pieces, and it may be shown that under this measure, the serpent is the most efficient configuration possible. In fact, it was shown by Auslander, Benjamin, and Wilkerson that the serpent configuration is maximally efficient, with only three configurations attaining this efficiency. For any non-maximal configurations, their efficiency was conjectured to have a strict upper bound, which we prove. [1]

2 Abstracting the game

Suppose we have p indistinguishable pieces and wish to move them in the positive direction over the integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^n . If a piece is located at coordinate $l \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, and some other coordinate $l + e_i$ is not occupied by a piece (for unit vector e_i), then the piece may *shift* there. Alternatively if $l + e_i$ is occupied but $l + 2e_i$ is not, the piece may *hop* over the occupant of $l + e_i$ to land at $l + 2e_i$, where

it may remain or continue hopping over other adjacent pieces. One legal *move* consists of either a shift or a *jump*, a sequence of one or more hops by a single piece.

Define a **placement** of size p as a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}^n , denoted by $X = \{\vec{x}_1, \dots, \vec{x}_p\}$. Define the *centroid* of placement X to be

$$c(X) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{u=1}^p \vec{x}_u$$

For placements X, Y , define their *displacement* as

$$d(X, Y) = \sum_{i=1}^n |c_i(X) - c_i(Y)|$$

For $m \geq 1$, an *m-move trajectory* X_0, X_1, \dots, X_m is a sequence of placements where X_{u+1} is reachable from X_u in a single legal move. The *speed* of an *m-move trajectory* from X_0 to X_m is

$$s = \frac{d(X_0, X_m)}{m}.$$

We say that placements X, Y are *translates* if there exists $\vec{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $X + \vec{a} = Y$. X and Y are represented by the same *configuration* of pieces, and we define the *speed* of a configuration C to be the maximum speed attained by any trajectory between two translates represented by C .

Auslander, Benjamin, and Wilkerson proved in 1993 the following: the maximum speed of any configuration C is 1, and that only three configurations (called *speed-of-light* configurations) attain this "speed of light" for $d \geq 1$. [1] These configurations are:

- The **atom** $\{x\}$ (if $p = 1$)
- The **frog** $\{x, x + e_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ (if $p = 2$)
- The **serpent** $\{x, x + e_i, x + e_i + e_j, x + 2e_i + e_j\}$ $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ (if $p = 4$ and $d > 1$)

It was conjectured that the maximum attainable speed for any configuration on $p \neq 1, 2, 4$ is $2/3$, which we may observe is attained by the snake configuration with any number of pieces. [1] We will show that $2/3$ is indeed the maximum possible speed attainable for any non-speed-of-light configuration in any dimension $n \geq 2$.


3 Definitions and Properties

Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and placement $X \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Then *border* l_m is defined by:

$$l_m = \{x \in X : \|x\| = m\}$$

For a placement X , we may define the *tail* (respectively, *head*) of X , by $t(X) = \min_u |l_u| > 0$ (respectively, $h(X) = \max_u |l_u| > 0$). Define the *width* of a placement X $w(X) = h(X) - t(X) + 1$. Define the *back border* (respectively, *front border* of X as $T(X) := l_{t(X)}$ (respectively, $H(X) := l_{h(X)}$).

We now define an underlying configuration which reoccurs in optimal play. A *ladder* of length $k > 0$ is subset of a placement X : $L = \{p_0, p_1, \dots, p_k\} \subseteq X$ such that p_0 is able to hop over p_1, \dots, p_k successively. If $\{p_0\} = T(X)$ and $p_k \in H(X)$, then we say L is a *true ladder* of X . We call the move consisting of p_0 jumping over the rest of the ladder pieces an *climb*, call p_0 the *base* of the ladder, and the other pieces the *rungs*.



An example of a ladder.

Proposition 3.0.1. If a configuration X contains a true ladder L , X has even width.

Proof. Observe that when a piece p hops over another piece p' , p either increases or decreases what border it belongs to by 2. Therefore since l_0 jumps from $B_{t(X)}$ to $B_{h(X)+1}$, this implies $h(X) + 1 - t(X)$ is even. \square

Proposition 3.0.2. A placement X with $n > 1$ pieces can perform a move that simultaneously increases $t(X)$ and $h(X)$ if and only if it has a true ladder.

Proof. (\Leftarrow) Performing a ladder climb increases both $t(X)$ and $h(X)$, as l_0 moves from $T(X)$, leaving that border empty, and jumps in front of $l_k \in H(X)$, thus advancing the front border.

(\Rightarrow) If a move on X exists that advances the front and back borders forward, since only one piece can change positions, the back border must only have one piece, and it must be the piece which moves. Call this piece p . Since $n > 1$ $w(X) > 1$, so p must jump from $T(X)$ to in front of $H(X)$. Denote the sequence of pieces hopped over by p by p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k . Since $p_k \in H(X)$, $\{p_0, p_1, \dots, p_k\}$. \square

We may classify possible moves into seven categories.

- *Ascent*: A move that increases $h(X)$ and $t(X)$.
- *Front Push*: A move that increases $h(X)$ but not $t(X)$.
- *Back Push*: A move that increases $t(X)$ but not $h(X)$.
- *Dead Move*: A move that changes neither the tail nor head of X
- *Front Retreat*: A move that decreases the head of X
- *Back Retreat*: A move that decreases the tail of X

- *Reverse Ladder Climb*: A move that decreases both the head and the tail of X .

An ascent is necessarily a ladder climb for nontrivial placements. For a legal m -move trajectory $M = \{X_0, X_1, \dots, X_m\}$, where X_0 is a translate of X_M , define the *moveset* of M as a collection of moves $m(M) = \{x_0 \rightarrow x'_0, \dots, x_{m-1} \rightarrow x'_{m-1}\}$, where x_i is the location of the piece that moves in X_i , and x'_i is the location of the moved piece in X_{i+1} .

For a move trajectory M , let $A(M)$ represent the number of ascents in $m(M)$, $FP(M)$ represent the number of front pushes, $BP(M)$ the number of back pushes, $DM(M)$ the number of dead moves, $FR(M)$ the number of front retreats, $BR(M)$ the number of back retreats, and $RA(M)$ the number of reverse ascents.

Now, define the *efficiency* $\omega(M)$ of a trajectory M or it's corresponding moveset $m(M)$ as follows:

$$\omega(M) := A(M) - (1/2) \cdot (FP(M) + BP(M)) - 2 \cdot DM(M) - (7/2) \cdot (FR(M) + BR(M)) - 5 \cdot RA(M)$$

Note that if we partition a trajectory $M = M_1 \oplus M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_k$, then $\omega(M) = \omega(M_1) + \dots + \omega(M_k)$.

Lemma 3.1. A m -move trajectory M of a configuration C has speed greater than $2/3$ if and only if $\omega(M) > 0$

Proof. Since the move types are mutually exclusive, $A(M) + FP(M) + BP(M) + DM(M) + FR(M) + BR(M) + RA(M) = m$. Additionally, the displacement of M can be characterized by $A(M) - RA(M) + (1/2) \times (FP(M) - FR(M) + BP(M) - BR(M))$. Therefore the speed of M is

$$\frac{A(M) - RA(M) + FP(M)/2 - FR(M)/2 + BP(M)/2 - BR(M)/2}{A(M) + FP(M) + BP(M) + DM(M) + FR(M) + BR(M) + RA(M)}.$$

Therefore,

$$2/3 < \frac{A(M) - RA(M) + FP(M)/2 - FR(M)/2 + BP(M)/2 - BR(M)/2}{A(M) + FP(M) + BP(M) + DM(M) + FR(M) + BR(M) + RA(M)} \iff 0 < \omega(M)$$

□

Theorem 3.2. For any trajectory M with no two ascents occurring in a row and not both beginning and ending with an ascent, $\omega(M) \leq 0$.

Proof. After an ascent, if a front push, back push, front retreat, or back retreat occurs, this changes the width of the placement, and since prior to the first move the placement had even parity, for another ascent to occur, another one of the listed moves must occur.

Without loss of generality let us assume M begins with an ascent, therefore it cannot end with one. Let us partition the moveset $m(M)$ into separate blocks B_1, \dots, B_k where each block begins with an ascent and contains no other ascents. Since no two ascents can occur in a row, each block must consist of at least two moves. Additionally since each new block must begin with an ascent, a block must end with a placement with even width.

B_i contains one ascent and at least one other move a . If a is any type of move besides a front or back push, $\omega(B_i)$ is negative. Otherwise, if a is a front push or back push the resulting placement has odd width and another front push, back push, front retreat, or back retreat must occur. This implies $\omega(B_i) \leq 0$, with equality holding only when B_i is of the form $\{A, FP/BP, FP/BP\}$. Since $B_i \leq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\omega(M) \leq 0$, as desired.

□

We add the condition that M cannot both begin and end with an ascent due to the cyclic nature of translations - if such a translation begins and ends with an ascent, and $M = \{X_0, \dots, X_m\}$, then all other configurations represented in the orbit have translations with consecutive ladder climbs. For simplicity, when we say "in a row" from now on, we will act as if a moveset for translates is cyclic and count the first move as adjacent to the last move.

4 $p = 1, 2, 4$

For a configuration which is not speed of light, observe that it may reach speed arbitrarily close to speed 1 by first shifting into a speed-of-light configuration, repeating its set of moves sufficiently long, then moving back to the original configuration. We will consider only trajectories which do not use this strategy. Rigorously, if a trajectory between translates does not perform any moves corresponding to any "speed-of-light" configuration's optimal moveset, call the corresponding configuration *non-speed-of-light*.


Theorem 4.1. A non-speed-of-light configuration C with 1, 2, or 4 pieces cannot have speed greater than $2/3$.

Proof. There is only one configuration with 1 piece which is speed of light, so $p = 1$ is true.

For $p = 2$, any trajectory containing a jump (which must be an ascent) must contain the frog's optimal trajectory (a jump), therefore any non-speed-of-light configuration is limited to only shifts. Therefore, the optimal trajectory of C cannot contain any ascents, thus C cannot have speed greater than $2/3$.

For $p = 4$, if C has optimal trajectory without two ascents in a row, C has speed at most $2/3$. Suppose then that C has two ascents in a row, without loss of generality let us assume its trajectory begins with two ascents. C must have even width, and every border must contain a piece due to the parity of the ends of each successive ladder. Since C can perform two ascents in a row, it has width 4. $C = \{p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4\}$ with p_i on l_i . Say p_1 has jump $p_1 : \xrightarrow{p_2} a_1 \xrightarrow{p_4} a_2$ for open locations a_1, a_2 . $d(p_1, p_2) = 1$, $d(a_1, p_2) = 1$, and $d(a_1, p_4) = 1$. Similarly, write the next move by p_2 as $p_2 : \xrightarrow{p_3} b_1 \xrightarrow{p_1=a_2} b_2$. $d(p_2, p_3) = 1$, $d(p_3, b_1) = 1$, and $d(a_2, b_1) = 1$.

Suppose p_1, p_2 , and p_4 are colinear (p_1 on x , p_2 on $x + u_i$, p_4 on $x + 3u_i$), $a_2 = x + 4u_i$ and $a_1 = x + 2u_i$. However for p_2 to jump over p_3 and p_1 , it must start on a_1 , a contradiction. Say p_1 starts on x , p_2 on $x + u_i$, then a_1 is $x + 2u_i$, p_4 starts on $x + 2u_i + u_j$, and a_2 is $x + 2u_i + 2u_j$. There are only two locations both adjacent to p_2 and 2 away from a_2 , a_1 and $x + u_i + u_j$. However if p_3 is on $x + u_i + u_j$ and we perform the two ascents, we have performed the serpent configuration's trajectory, a contradiction. Thus it is impossible for a non-speed-of-light configuration C to have two ascents in a row, so C must have speed at most $2/3$. \square




We cannot place p_3 without a contradiction.

5 $p = 3$

Theorem 5.1. No configuration of 3 pieces C exists with speed greater than $2/3$.

Proof. To show this, we will demonstrate that no placement X exists for $p = 3$ such that two successive ascents are possible. If X has two or three pieces occupying the same border, then the back or front border has two pieces, rendering successive ascents impossible. Otherwise assume X has pieces occupying all different borders. The only possible way for X to be able to perform a ladder climb is if it has width 4, since a piece jumping over two other pieces can travel distance at most 4. Let us consider the four borders passing through X , without loss of generality say $l_1 - l_4$. l_1 and l_4 must contain one piece each, p_1 and p_3 respectively, implying the last piece, p_2 can either lay on l_2 or l_3 . If p_2 lies on l_3 , p_1 cannot jump. Otherwise, p_2 lays on l_2 . If p_1 can perform an ascent, the pieces now lay on l_2 , l_4 , and l_5 , which implies p_2 cannot jump.



After a jump, p is isolated and cannot jump.

Therefore no placement X with $p = 3$ pieces exists such that two consecutive ascents can be performed, as desired. No such configuration of \mathbb{Z}^n exists with speed greater than $2/3$. \square

6 $p > 4$

Lemma 6.1. For $p > 4$, there does not exist a trajectory with moveset containing more than 4 consecutive ascents.

Proof. The proof follows similarly to the proof of Theorem 3 in "Optimal Leapfrogging" \square

Suppose we have some configuration C with greater than 4 pieces with an m -move trajectory M . If $m(M)$ contains no two successive ascents, M has speed less than or equal to $2/3$. Suppose $m(M)$ at some point has two consecutive ascents, and without loss of generality M begins with consecutive ascents.

Proposition 6.1.1. If configuration C has a translation with moveset M such that M begins with two consecutive ascents, M has even width and at least one piece occupying every border between the front and back borders of M .

Proof. C must have a true ladder and therefore must have even width. Note that a ladder must have its base on opposite border parity as its rungs (which all must have the same border parity). The two ladders corresponding to the consecutive ascents (which are ladder climbs) must have bases on successive borders, and their rungs must span all of C up to parity, therefore any border in the span of C must have at least 1 piece from one of the two ladders on it. \square

Define a piece's *measure* by taking its location modulo 2, $\overline{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)}_2$. Note that when a piece jumps, its measure stays constant. This restricts the number of locations in \mathbb{Z}^n a piece can jump to, given its starting position.

Define a *isolating partition* of M as follows. First, partition $m(M)$ sequentially into blocks A_1, \dots, A_k such that each block begins with two or more consecutive ascents, but does not have consecutive ascents anywhere else and does not end with an ascent. Then, within each block A_i , sub-partition the blocks the in the same manner we did previously, that is creating a new sub-partition $A_{(i,j)}$ at each ladder climb, so $A_i = A_{(i,1)} + \dots + A_{(i,j_i)}$, where j_i is the number of ladder climbs in partition A_i .

Let $L(A_i)$ be the number of ladder climbs A_i begins with. It is clear $\omega(A_i) < L(A_i)$. We wish to show $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$, since $\omega(M) = \omega(\sum A_i) = \sum \omega(A_i)$. Since A_i can only begin with 2, 3, or 4 ladder climbs, we only have these three cases to consider.


Two translations with the same beginning and end placements, and with the same number of moves, must have the same speed. Therefore, in considering M , if we desire, we may instead consider some other arbitrary moveset M' with the same number of moves, and start and end placements, as M and any result proven about the speed of M will hold for M' .

Let us make the following change to any moveset M as a whole - if at any point, we have placement X with $l_{t(X)}$ containing two pieces p_1, p_2 , and proceed to first front push with p_1 , make moves not affecting p_1 or p_2 or the borders, then a back push with p_2 , switch the ordering of the two moves if performing the moves in reverse order results in two legal moves. This changes the move types - we now first have a dead move, then an ascent. This also changes the partitioning of the moveset. If we are not able to reverse the ordering, then we leave that sequence as is. This does not alter $\omega(M)$, as a front push followed by a back push contributes -1 , as does a dead move followed by an ascent.

Lemma 6.2. If some subpartition $A_{i,j}$ begins in configuration $C_{i,j}$ with the second border of $C_{i,j}$ containing 2 or more pieces, with the first move an ascent, $\omega(A_{i,j}) \leq -1$. Moreover, if $\omega(A_{i,j}) = -1$, $A_{i,j}$ consists of an ascent and a dead move, either the resulting $C_{i,j+1}$ has its second border containing 2 or more pieces, or $C_{i,j}$ has a *twist configuration*, pieces on $x, x + e_u, x + e_u + e_v, x + e_u + e_v - e_w$ (it is possible some of u, v, w are equal).

Proof. Let the back border be l_1 . The only way for any $\omega(A_{i,j}) = 0$ is if it begins with an ascent, then has two moves which are some combination of front and back pushes. However after the ascent in $A_{i,j}$, a back push is not possible. If we perform a dead move or do not move one of those two pieces, $\omega(A_{i,j}) \leq -1$. Let us then assume we move those pieces, p_1 and p_2 , let p_1 front push and p_2 back push. However by our earlier stipulation, we must reverse these moves if possible, which implies $\omega(A_{i,j}) = -1$ if the moves are reversible. If they are not reversible, p_2 must have interfered with p_1 's ladder climb, which implies the pieces have same measure. Thus $d(p_1, p_2) > 3$ (as they are on the same border), and therefore there must be two pieces on l_3 and we cannot ladder climb, thus $\omega(A_{i,j}) \leq -1$.

Additionally if the moves were not reversible, $\omega(A_{i,j}) < -1$, as the only way for $\omega(A_{i,j}) = -1$ is for the next two moves to be front or back pushes, but we may use the same argument as above to demonstrate that we either have not left $A_{i,j}$ or were forced to perform a dead move instead. Thus if $\omega(A_{i,j}) = -1$, we know $A_{i,j}$ consists of an ascent and a dead move.



We must make 3 moves, after the ladder climb we optimally either perform a dead move or a front/back push, removing the possibility of an ascent after.

If $\omega(A_{i,j}) = -1$, the first move in $A_{i,j}$ was a ladder climb so there are pieces p_0, p_1 on $x, x + e_u$ respectively. First, suppose $d(p_2, p_1) = 2$ for $p_2 \in l_2$. Then p_2 is located at $x + e_u + e_v - e_w$, the most general option for p_2 to lie on border l_2 . The unique point both pieces can jump over in the forward direction is $x + e_u + e_v$, so we are left with exactly the twist configuration on the first 3 borders.


Otherwise suppose there is no piece at $x + e_u + e_v$ - since p_2 ascends after p_1 moves, there must be $p_3 \in l_3$ that p_2 jumped over, but p_1 could not have jumped over p_3 for its move so there either must be a second piece on l_3 or p_1 must have shifted to l_3 .

Otherwise, p_1 and p_2 are more than distance 2 apart and therefore must have either jumped over separate pieces, or one piece must have shifted up to the third border. Therefore $C_{i,j+1}$ must have two pieces on l_2 . \square

From here, we will assume the backmost border of any starting placement is l_1 .

Lemma 6.3. If a partition A_i begins with exactly four consecutive ladder climbs, $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$.

Proof. First observe that the width of the starting configuration is at least 6, since we have more than 4 pieces.



The forced start and end of the configuration. The x's mark where pieces cannot be, and the red borders must contain at least 2 pieces.

Climbing pieces, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 , must be in a serpent configuration both before and after the ascents, and after, they must be the four frontmost pieces. Suppose p_1 starts on l_1 . $|l_5| \geq 2$, containing the pieces that p_2 and p_4 jumped over, since if p_2 and p_4 jumped over the same piece at $x + 2e_i + 2e_j$, this would block the climb of p_1 . Therefore after the four jumps, we are now in $A_{i,4}$ and unable to back push. The only pieces that may front push are $p_1 \dots p_4$. Say p_4 hopped over $p_5 \in l_5$ and p_2 hopped over $p'_5 \in l_5$. p_5 cannot lay on the same plane as $p_1 \dots p_4$.

Suppose neither p_5 nor p'_5 lie on the plane containing $p_1 \dots p_4$. Of $p_1 \dots p_4$, p_5 can only jump over p_4 and p'_5 can only jump over p_2 , as they have adjacent measures. Therefore if p_5 or p'_5 is to ascend from its current position, p_3 or p_1 must shift to complete a ladder and p_5 or p'_5 must leave the border first, both dead moves, so $\omega(A_{i,4}) \leq -3$.

Otherwise consider if p'_5 lays on the plane containing $p_1 \dots p_4$, it must then be located at $x + e_u + 3e_v$, which must be at least distance 4 away from p'_5 . p_5 and p'_5 have different measures. Suppose p'_5 ascends from its spot, so p_5 must move. p_5 may either dead move, or front push after a dead move from p_3 . p_1 or p_3 must also move to clear a ladder for p'_5 , so a dead move and two pushes must be performed. However since $d(p'_5, p_5) > 2$, $|l_6| \geq 2$ or p_5 shifted onto l_6 , even if p'_5 can ascend, $\omega(A_{i,4}) \leq -2$ and $\omega(A_{i,5}) \leq -1$.

Otherwise, if the next ascent happens from beyond l_5 , p_5 and p'_5 must all vacate. If one of those pieces front pushes by doing a ladder climb described previously, the other must back push - however we must reverse these moves which results in two dead moves, and we may always reverse these since p_5 and p'_5 cannot have the same measure, so $\omega(A_{i,4}) \leq -3$. Therefore we must perform a dead move and back push to vacate the border, and a corresponding front push at the front of the configuration. If there were two or more pieces on l_6 , we still cannot ascend, so $\omega(A_{i,4}) \leq -3$. Otherwise, this one piece must be at $x + 3e_u + 2e_v$ since both p_1 and p_3 must have hopped over it, however this location cannot be adjacent to p_5 , so p_5 must have shifted and thus we still cannot ladder climb. Thus $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$. □


Lemma 6.4. If a partition A_i begins with exactly three consecutive ascents $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$.

Proof. We have $\omega(A_i) < 3$, and we see $\omega(A_{i,1} + A_{i,2}) = 2$, as these subpartitions are only the first two ladder climbs, and $2 < i \leq l_i$, $\omega(A_{i,l}) \leq 0$. We wish to find two A_{i,j_1} and A_{i,j_2} with $\omega(A_{i,j_1}) < 0$

and $\omega(A_{i,j_2}) < 0$, or alternatively one $A_{i,j}$ such that $\omega(A_{i,j}) \leq -2$.

Without loss of generality let us assume p_1 began at x on l_1 , p_2 began at $x + e_u$, and p_3 began at $x + e_u + e_v$ for $u \neq v$.

Suppose l_4 contains two or more pieces, p_4 and p'_4 . By the shape of the configuration, only one of l_4 and l'_4 may ladder climb to the front. If one piece ladder climbs to the front and the other back pushes, we are reduced to the case from the previous lemma of four ascents, since the situation mirrors that of before. Otherwise, one piece is forced to dead move since neither piece can front push, and this forces $\omega(A_{i,j}) \leq 1/2$, and $\omega(A_{i,j}) \leq 0$ follows.



The forced start and end of the configuration if l_4 contains 1 piece..

Otherwise, l_4 only contains one piece p_4 , which implies we must have started in a serpent subconfiguration as before. If l_5 contains one piece p_5 , p_2 must have hopped over p_5 but $x + 2e_u + 2e_v$ must be unoccupied, so $d(p_5, p_4) > 2$. The next ascent can only occur optimally from l_4 , so a piece must move adjacent to p_4 , a dead move. If any other moves occur before the ascent, $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$, otherwise after p_4 ascends, there are 2 pieces on l_5 so $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$.

Thus l_5 must contain at least 2 pieces, one adjacent to p_5 , and one that p_2 hops over in its ascent. Call these p_5 and p'_5 respectively, as before p_5 is not coplanar with $p_1 \dots p_4$. Suppose p_4 makes the next ascent from l_4 - it cannot do so immediately, but if there remain 2 pieces on l_5 , the lemma asserts $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$. Thus before p_4 ascends, p'_5 must move. If p'_5 performs a dead move and another piece moves, $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$. If p'_5 performs a dead move, then p_4 ascends, we may switch the order of the moves if we can, so the moveset began with four consecutive ascents. If we cannot switch the order of the moves, p'_5 must have been a part of the ladder in the p_4 ascent, however as in the previous proof, there must be 2 pieces on l_6 , and p_5 cannot ascend without a dead move from p_1 or p_3 which forces $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$. Lastly, suppose after the three ascents p'_5 performed a front push after a front push from p_3 . Since p_4 needed to jump over p_3 to complete the snake, p_4 cannot ladder climb unless a piece moves to p_3 's former spot - this must be a dead move, thus $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$.

Otherwise, suppose the next ascension occurs on l_5 or beyond. p_4 must back push, and a corresponding front push must occur since we can't back push again (and if we perform anything else $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$). Now there are at least two pieces on l_5 , and we are forced to front push from l_5 with p'_5 , then perform another push. If we back push, we are forced to swap the move order, and since p_5 and p'_5 have different measure, we always can, so this forces $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$. Otherwise, we


must perform another front push, however then p_5 still cannot ascend as it is not coplanar with $p_1 \dots p_3$ or p'_5 and thus can jump over at most only one of those, which forces $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$.

We have exhausted all cases and therefore $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$ as desired.

□

Lemma 6.5. If a partition A_i begins with exactly two consecutive ascents, $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$.

Proof. We see that we must start as depicted:




After the ascents the front two borders must have only two adjacent pieces:

If after an ascent, we make any sequence of moves besides exactly two pushes followed by another ascent, we must have a subpartition with negative score, call this suboptimal. If there is a suboptimal subpartition, $\omega(A_i) \leq 0$.

If for any configuration, the frontmost two borders l_{j-1}, l_j have one piece each, and the backmost border l_1 has 1 piece on it, l_2 has 2 or more pieces, and it has even width, suboptimality is forced. This also holds if instead of l_2 having two pieces, it has one, but the piece on l_1 is not adjacent. If we perform the next ascent from l_1 , suboptimality is forced. Alternatively, we perform two front pushes to move one of the pieces on l_1 to l_{j+2} first. We can either push the frontmost piece forward to create a ladder or perform a front push by ladder climbing from further back, then we ladder climb a piece on l_2 . However we cannot ascend after as either there cannot be a ladder leading to the front, as l_j is vacant, or the four frontmost pieces form a snake. Otherwise, if we perform the next ladder climb on l_2 , we must push the backmost piece forward, and move one of the pieces off l_{i+1} . However this second move must be a dead move, as l_{i+1} is not on the right parity of border to front push by ladder climb. We cannot perform an ascent in 2 moves or less otherwise, thus suboptimality is always forced in this scenario.

If l_3 contains two or more pieces, suboptimality is forced. If l_3 contains exactly one piece p_3 (located at $x + e_i + e_j$) but two pieces on l_4 , or one piece which p_3 cannot jump over, we apply our previous observation.



The only possible starting configuration where we can perform a third ascent optimally.

Otherwise p_4 on l_4 must be jumped over by both p_1 and p_3 , forcing it to be on $x + 2e_i + e_j$ and forcing there to be no pieces on $x + 2e_i + 2e_j$ and $x + 3e_i + e_j$. To avoid suboptimality the next ladder climb occurs on l_3 or l_4 . If p_4 can jump forward, there must be two pieces on l_5 , assign them as p_5 and p'_5 as in the previous proofs. If after the next two moves l_5 has two pieces, or one piece but p_4 cannot jump, suboptimality is forced. Thus in the next two moves we must make two front pushes with one a ladder climb from l_5 , then an ascent.

If p_4 made the next ascent, p_3 had to jump forward and p'_5 front pushed, after the ascent, the frontmost pieces are a snake. If there was only one piece on l_6 it must be located on $x + 3e_i + 2e_j$ and thus cannot be adjacent to p_5 . Either p_5 cannot hop or there are at least 2 pieces on l_6 , so this must be suboptimal.

If p_3 made the next ascent, p'_5 front pushed by ladder climbing. Either l_5 is empty or it contains p_5 . Either there are 2 pieces on l_6 or both p_1 and p_3 hopped over one piece at $x + 3e_i + 2e_j$, but p'_5 could not have started adjacent to this square so there must be 2 pieces on l_6 . Additionally the third to front border cannot have a piece on it, which forces the next climb to come from l_5 . Due to the configuration's front structure, p_4 must necessarily back push, which forces a piece on l_5 , and the front structure is forced to front push, but since there are two pieces on l_6 , suboptimality is forced. \square

Theorem 6.6. If C is a configuration with $p > 4$, C has speed less than or equal to $2/3$.

Proof. Consider any m -move trajectory M of C . If M contains no consecutive ladder climbs $\omega(M) \leq 0$. Otherwise, adjust M as necessary to get M' and perform an isolating partition of M' . $\omega(M) = \omega(M') = \omega(\sum A_i) = \sum \omega(A_i) \leq 0$. Since in any case $\omega(M) \leq 0$, M has speed less than $2/3$. \square

References

- [1] Arthur T. Benjamin Joel Auslander and Daniel S. Wilkerson. Optimal leapfrogging. *Mathematics Magazine*, 66(1):14–19, 1993.