

Study of Critical Sets in Latin Squares by using the Autotopism Group

R. M. Falcón¹

*Departamento de Matemática Aplicada I.
E. T. S. de Arquitectura. Universidad de Sevilla.
Avda. Reina Mercedes 2. 41012 - Sevilla (Spain).*

Abstract

Given a Latin square L and a subset \mathfrak{F} of its autotopism group $\mathcal{U}(L)$, we study in this paper some properties and results which partial Latin squares contained in L inherit from $\mathcal{U}(L)$, by using \mathfrak{F} . In particular, we define the concept of \mathfrak{F} -critical set of L and we ask ourselves about the smallest one contained in L .

Keywords: Latin Square, Autotopism Group.

1 Introduction

A Latin square L of order n is a $n \times n$ array with elements chosen from the set $N = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, such that each symbol occurs precisely once in each row and each column. The set of Latin squares of order n is denoted by $LS(n)$. If $L = (l_{i,j}) \in LS(n)$, the *orthogonal array representation of L* is the set of n^2 triples $\{(i, j, l_{i,j}) : i, j \in N\}$. The previous set is identified with L and so, it is written $(i, j, l_{i,j}) \in L$, for all $i, j \in N$. It is said that L is an *entropic Latin square* if $l_{i_j l_{st}} = l_{i_s l_{jt}}$, for all $i, j, s, t \in N$.

¹ Email: rafalgan@us.es

Let S_n be the symmetric group on N . An *isotopism of Latin squares of order n* is then a triple $\Theta = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathcal{I}_n = S_n \times S_n \times S_n$. If we apply Θ to a Latin square $L \in LS(n)$, it is verified that α, β and γ are respectively, permutations of rows, columns and symbols of L . The resulting square L^Θ is also a Latin square and it is said to be *isotopic* to L . In particular, if $L = (l_{i,j})$, then $L^\Theta = \{(i, j, \gamma(l_{\alpha^{-1}(i), \beta^{-1}(j)})) : 0 \leq i, j \leq n-1\}$. An isotopism which maps L to itself is an *autotopism*. The stabilizer subgroup of L in S_n^3 is its *autotopism group*, $\mathcal{U}(L) = \{\Theta \in \mathcal{I}_n : L^\Theta = L\}$.

A *partial Latin square*, P , of order n , is a $n \times n$ array with elements chosen from a set of n symbols, such that each symbol occurs at most once in each row and in each column. The set of partial Latin squares of order n is denoted by $PLS(n)$. The *size* of P , $|P|$, is the number of non-blank cells. If $L \in LS(n)$ we will denote by $L_{i,j}$ the partial Latin square contained in L such that the unique filled cell of $L_{i,j}$ is $(i, j, l_{i,j})$. Thus, given $P \in PLS(n)$ we can ever find a subset $I_P \subseteq N \times N$ such that $P = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I_P} L_{i,j}$.

It is said that P can be *completed* to a Latin square $L \in LS(n)$ if $P \subseteq L$. If L is the unique one in such conditions, it is said that P is *uniquely completable to L* and it is denoted $P \in UC(L)$. If besides any proper subset of P can be completed at least to two distinct Latin squares it is said that P is a *critical set* of L and it is denoted $P \in CS(L)$. Given $L \in LS(n)$, $scs(L)$ denotes the size of the smallest critical set of L and $scs(n)$ denotes the minimum of $scs(L)$ for all $L \in LS(n)$. Analogously, $lcs(L)$ denotes the size of the largest critical set of L and $lcs(n)$ denotes the maximum of $lcs(L)$ for all $L \in LS(n)$.

2 Extended autotopisms of partial Latin squares

An *isotopism of partial Latin squares of order n* will be a triple $\Theta = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathcal{I}_n$, where $\gamma(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $P \in PLS(n)$ be contained in a Latin square $L \in LS(n)$ and let $\Theta \in \mathcal{I}_n$. The following asserts are verified:*

- a) P^Θ is also in $PLS(n)$ and $|P^\Theta| = |P|$,
- b) If $Q \in PLS(n)$ verifies that $P \subseteq Q$, then $P^\Theta \subseteq Q^\Theta$.
- c) If P can be completed to L , then P^Θ can be completed to L^Θ . □

Lemma 2.2 *Given $L \in LS(n)$, let $\Theta_1, \Theta_2 \in \mathcal{U}(L)$ be two distinct autotopisms of L . Let us consider $L_{i_1, j_1}, L_{i_2, j_2} \in PLS(n)$ with $(i_1, j_1) \neq (i_2, j_2)$. Then $L_{i_1, j_1}^{\Theta_1} \neq L_{i_2, j_2}^{\Theta_1}$ and $L_{i_1, j_1}^{\Theta_1} \neq L_{i_1, j_1}^{\Theta_2}$. □*

Now, let us consider $L \in LS(n)$ and let $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$. If $P \in PLS(n)$ can be completed to L , we will define $P^{\mathfrak{F}} \in PLS(n)$ as $P^{\mathfrak{F}} = \bigcup_{\Theta \in \mathfrak{F}} P^{\Theta}$. Then, we will say that $P^{\mathfrak{F}}$ is an *extended autotopy* of P .

Lemma 2.3 *Let us suppose $L \in LS(n)$, $P \in PLS(n)$ contained in L and $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$. Then, $|P^{\mathfrak{F}}| \leq |P| \cdot |\mathfrak{F}|$. \square*

Example 2.4 Let $L = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in LS(2)$. So, $\mathcal{U}(L) = \{(Id, Id, Id), ((Id, (01), (01)), ((01), Id, (01))), ((01), (01), Id)\}$. Let us take now by example $\mathfrak{F} = \{(Id, Id, Id), (Id, (01), (01))\}$, $P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix} \in PLS(2)$ and $Q = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * \\ * & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in PLS(2)$. Then, we can prove that $P^{\mathfrak{F}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ * & * \end{pmatrix}$ and $P^{\mathcal{U}(L)} = L = Q^{\mathfrak{F}} = Q^{\mathcal{U}(L)}$. \triangleleft

In general, given $L \in LS(n)$, there does not exist a subset \mathfrak{F} of $\mathcal{U}(L)$ and $P \in PLS(n)$ such that $P \subset L$ and $P^{\mathfrak{F}} = L$. This is due to that the most of Latin squares has only the trivial autotopism group [1], $\mathcal{U}(L) = \{(Id, Id, Id)\}$. We can therefore ask ourselves about conditions under which we can obtain a similar result to Example 2.4:

Theorem 2.5 *Every entropic Latin square is an extended autotopy of each of its proper partial Latin squares. \square*

Example 2.6 Let $L = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in LS(3)$. It is entropic and verifies that $|\mathcal{U}(L)| = 18$ [1]. Let $\mathfrak{F} = \{(\alpha_s, \alpha_t, \alpha_{l_{st}})\}_{s,t \in N}$, where $\alpha_0 = Id$, $\alpha_1 = (012)$, $\alpha_2 = (021)$. So, $|\mathfrak{F}| = 9$ and $P^{\Theta} = L$ for all $P \in PLS(3)$ contained in L . \triangleleft

3 Critical sets by considering $\mathcal{U}(L)$

Given $L \in LS(n)$ and $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$, let $\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$ be the subgroup of $\mathcal{U}(L)$ generated by composing the elements of $\mathfrak{F} \cup \mathfrak{F}^{-1}$, where $\mathfrak{F}^{-1} = \{\Theta^{-1} = (\alpha^{-1}, \beta^{-1}, \gamma^{-1}) : \Theta = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathfrak{F}\} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$. Now, given $P \in PLS(n)$ contained in L , let us denote by $\mathfrak{F}(P)$ the partial Latin square $P^{\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle}$. We will then say that P is *uniquely \mathfrak{F} -completable to L* and it will be denoted by $P \in UC_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ if $\mathfrak{F}(P) \in UC(L)$. We will say that C is a *\mathfrak{F} -critical set of L* if $C \in UC_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ and $P \notin UC_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ for all $P \subset C$. So, we are interested in the smallest size $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ of a \mathfrak{F} -critical set of L .

Lemma 3.1 *Let $L \in LS(n)$. The next assertions are verified:*

- Given $\mathfrak{F}_1, \mathfrak{F}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$ such that $\mathfrak{F}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{F}_2$, then $scs_{\mathfrak{F}_2}(L) \leq scs_{\mathfrak{F}_1}(L)$.*
- If $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$ is such that $|\langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle| \geq lcs(L)$, then $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L) = 1$. \square*

Lemma 3.2 Let $L \in LS(n)$, $P \in PLS(n)$ contained in L and $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$. Let $C \in CS(L)$ be such that $|C| = scs(L)$. If $C \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(P)$ then, $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L) \leq |P|$. So, $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L) \leq scs(L)$, for all $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$, such that $\mathfrak{F} \neq \emptyset$. \square

Proposition 3.3 Let $L \in LS(n)$, $P \in PLS(n)$ contained in L and $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$. Then, $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L) = \min_{P \in PLS(n)} \{|P| : \exists C \in CS(L) \text{ such that } C \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(P)\}$. \square

Example 3.4 Let $L = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 \\ 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \in LS(5)$, $C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & * & * & * \\ 1 & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & 2 \\ * & * & * & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \in CS(L)$ and $P =$

$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & 1 & 2 \\ * & * & * & * & * \end{pmatrix} \in PLS(5)$. Let $\mathfrak{F} = \{((04321), Id, (04321))\} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$. So, $C \subseteq$
 $P \cup P^{\mathfrak{F}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & * & * & * \\ 1 & 2 & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & 1 & 2 \\ * & * & * & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$ and therefore, $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L) \leq 4 < 6 = scs(L)$. \triangleleft

3.1 An algorithm to obtain an upper bound of $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$

Lemma 3.5 Let $L = (l_{ij}) \in LS(n)$, $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$, $P \in PLS(n)$ be contained in L such that $|P| = scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ and $C \in CS(L)$ be contained in $\mathfrak{F}(P)$. For all $i, j \in N$, there exist $(s, t, l_{st}) \in C$ and $\Theta \in \langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$ such that $L_{i,j}^{\Theta} = L_{s,t}$. \square

Lemma 3.6 Let $L \in LS(n)$, $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$, $P \in PLS(n)$ be contained in L such that $|P| = scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ and $C \in CS(L)$ be contained in $\mathfrak{F}(P)$. Then $P \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(C)$. \square

In general, given $L = (l_{ij}) \in LS(n)$, $P = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I_P} L_{i,j} \in PLS(n)$ contained in L and $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$, we must be interested in an algorithm which allows us to obtain the number $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$. To do it, let $\mathfrak{F}(P) = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I_{\mathfrak{F}(P)}} L_{i,j} \in PLS(n)$, which is contained in L . Given $(i, j, l_{ij}) \in \mathfrak{F}(P)$, let us consider:

$$S_{i,j}^P = \{(s, t, l_{st}) \in P \text{ such that } L_{i,j} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(L_{s,t})\} \subseteq P.$$

Lemma 3.7 Let $L \in LS(n)$, $P, Q \in PLS(n)$ be both contained in L and $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$. If $Q \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(P)$ and $P \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(Q)$, then $P = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I_Q} S_{i,j}^P$ and $Q = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I_P} S_{i,j}^Q$. \square

Theorem 3.8 Let $L \in LS(n)$ and $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}(L)$. Then $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ is equal to:

$$\min_{C \in CS(L)} \left\{ \min \left\{ |P| : \exists I_P \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{F}(C)} \text{ being } P = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I_P} L_{i,j}, C = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I_P} S_{i,j}^C \right\} \right\}.$$

Proof. Let $C \in CS(L)$ and $I_P \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{F}(C)}$ be such that $C = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I_P} S_{i,j}^C$, being $P = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I_P} L_{i,j} \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(C)$. So, given $(s, t, l_{st}) \in C$, there exists $\Theta \in \langle \mathfrak{F} \rangle$ and $(i, j) \in I_P$ such that $L_{s,t}^\Theta = L_{i,j}$. Then, $L_{i,j}^{\Theta^{-1}} = L_{s,t}$ and so, $(s, t, l_{st}) \in \mathfrak{F}^{-1}(P) = \mathfrak{F}(P)$. Therefore, we have that $C \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(P)$. So, from Proposition 3.3, $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ is smaller than the signaled minimum. Now, let $P \in PLS(n)$ contained in L be such that $|P| = scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$. From Proposition 3.3, there exist $C \in CS(L)$ contained in $\mathfrak{F}(P)$. Besides, from Lemma 3.6, $P \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(C)$. So, Lemma 3.7 involves $C = \bigcup_{(i,j) \in I_P} S_{i,j}^C$, being $I_P \subseteq I_{\mathfrak{F}(C)}$, and therefore, by using Proposition 3.3 again, $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ is bigger than the signaled minimum. \square

The computation of the minimum of the previous theorem allows us to obtain $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ but it can be an arduous process. In a concrete case, a first upper bound of $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ can be given by the following way: let $C \in CS(L)$ be such that $|C| = scs(L)$. Let us obtain $\mathfrak{F}(C)$ and next all the sets $S_{i,j}^C$. If the cardinality of all these sets is one, then we cannot improve the upper bound of $scs(L)$ by using this critical set C . In the other case, let $n_1 > 1$ be the maximum of the mentioned cardinalities and let us take S_{i_1, j_1}^C a set with cardinality n_1 . Let us now fixe $(s_1, t_1, l_{s_1 t_1}) \in S_{i_1, j_1}^C$ and let $\Theta_1 \in \mathfrak{F}$ be such that $L_{s_1, t_1}^{\Theta_1} = L_{i_1, j_1}$. Let us then consider $C_1 = C \setminus (S_{i_1, j_1}^C \setminus \{(s_1, t_1, l_{s_1 t_1})\})$ and $P_1 = C_1^{\Theta_1} \subseteq C^{\Theta_1}$. So, $|P_1| = |C_1| < |C|$ and it can be seen that $C \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(P_1)$ and therefore, $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L) \leq |C_1| < scs(L)$. Now we can take the same procedure with C_1 instead of C . If the cardinality of all the corresponding $S_{i,j}^{C_1}$ is one, then we cannot improve the upper bound of $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L)$ by using this method with C . In the other case, we take $S_{i_2, j_2}^{C_1}$ a set with cardinality $n_2 > 1$, the maximum of the mentioned cardinalities, and we fixe $(s_2, t_2, l_{s_2 t_2}) \in S_{i_2, j_2}^{C_1}$. Let us observe that it is necessary to take $(s_2, t_2, l_{s_2 t_2}) = (s_1, t_1, l_{s_1 t_1})$ whenever it is possible. So, we consider $C_2 = C_1 \setminus (S_{i_2, j_2}^{C_1} \setminus \{(s_2, t_2, l_{s_2 t_2})\}) \subseteq C_1$, being $\Theta_2 \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that $L_{s_2, t_2}^{\Theta_2} = L_{i_2, j_2}$. Let $P_2 = C_2^{\Theta_2} \subseteq C_1^{\Theta_2}$. By construction, $C_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(P_2)$ and so, $P_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(C_1) \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{F}(P_2)) = \mathfrak{F}(P_2)$. Finally, $C \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(P_1) \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(\mathfrak{F}(P_2)) = \mathfrak{F}(P_2)$. Therefore, $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L) \leq |P_2| = |C_2| < |C_1|$. We repeat all this procedure until we find that the maximum cardinality of all the corresponding sets $S_{i,j}$ is one.

Example 3.9 In Example 3.4, where $\mathfrak{F}(C) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & * & 3 & 4 \\ 1 & 2 & * & 4 & 0 \\ 2 & 3 & * & 0 & 1 \\ 3 & 4 & * & 1 & 2 \\ 4 & 0 & * & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$, we can see that,

for all $i \in N$, $|S_{i,j}^C| = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j = 1 \text{ or } 3, \\ 2, & \text{if } j = 0 \text{ or } 4. \end{cases}$. Let us then take for example $S_{0,0}^C = \{(0,0,0), (1,0,0)\}$ and let us consider $(0,0,0) \in S_{0,0}^C$. So, $C_1 =$

$C \setminus L_{1,0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & 2 \\ * & * & * & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$. Besides, it will be $P_1 = C_1$ because $L_{0,0}^{Id} = L_{0,0}$.

So, $C \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(P_1) = \mathfrak{F}(C)$ and $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L) \leq |C_1| = 5$. Now, for all $i \in N$, $|S_{i,j}^{C_1}| = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j = 0, 1 \text{ or } 3, \\ 2, & \text{if } j = 4. \end{cases}$ Let us take $S_{3,4}^{C_1} = \{(3, 4, 2), (4, 4, 3)\}$ and

let us consider $(3, 4, 2) \in S_{0,0}^C$. So, $C_2 = C_1 \setminus L_{3,4} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * & 2 \\ * & * & * & 2 & * \end{pmatrix} = P_2$, as

$L_{3,4}^{Id} = L_{3,4}$. So, $C \subseteq \mathfrak{F}(P_2) = \mathfrak{F}(C)$ and $scs_{\mathfrak{F}}(L) \leq |C_1| = 4$, as we have seen in Example 3.4. Thus, $S_{i,j}^{C_2} = 1$ for all i, j and so, the algorithm finishes. \triangleleft

References

- [1] B. D. McKay, A. Meynert and W. Myrvold, Small Latin Squares, Quasigroups and Loops, Journal of Combinatorial Designs 15 (2007) 98-119.