

On the distances between Latin Squares

Reshma Ramadurai

Joint work with Nick Cavenagh

University of Waikato

Nov 23, 2015

Partial Latin Square: of *order* n is an array of n symbols with n rows and n columns such that each symbol appears at most once in each row and each column.

Partial Latin Square: of order n is an array of n symbols with n rows and n columns such that each symbol appears at most once in each row and each column.

Example:

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 0 | | 2 | |
| 3 | | | |
| | | 0 | |
| 1 | | | 0 |

P_1

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 0 | | 2 | |
| 3 | | | |
| | | 0 | |
| 1 | | | 3 |

P_2

Partial Latin Square: of order n is an array of n symbols with n rows and n columns such that each symbol appears at most once in each row and each column.

Example:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

$P_1 \rightarrow L_1$

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 0 | | 2 | |
| 3 | | | |
| | | 0 | |
| 1 | | | 3 |

P_2

Partial Latin Square: of order n is an array of n symbols with n rows and n columns such that each symbol appears at most once in each row and each column.

Example:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

$P_1 \rightarrow L_1$

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 0 | | 2 | |
| 3 | | | |
| | | 0 | |
| 1 | | ? | 3 |

P_2

Partial Latin Square: of order n is an array of n symbols with n rows and n columns such that each symbol appears at most once in each row and each column.

Example:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

L_1

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 0 | | 2 | |
| 3 | | | |
| | | 0 | |
| 1 | | | 3 |

P_2

Latin Square: of order n is an array of n symbols with n rows and n columns such that each symbol appears exactly once in each row and each column.

Partial Latin Square: of order n is an array of n symbols with n rows and n columns such that each symbol appears at most once in each row and each column.

Example:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

L_1

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 0 | | 2 | |
| 3 | | | |
| | | 0 | |
| 1 | | | 3 |

P_2

Latin Square: of order n is an array of n symbols with n rows and n columns such that each symbol appears exactly once in each row and each column.

In fact...

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 0 | | 2 | |
| 3 | | | |
| | | 0 | |
| 1 | | | 0 |

P_1

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 0 | | 2 | |
| 3 | | | |
| | | 0 | |
| 1 | | | 0 |

P_1

In fact...

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

L_1

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 0 | | 2 | |
| 3 | | | |
| | | 0 | |
| 1 | | | 0 |

P_1

In fact...

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

L_1

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

L_2

In fact...

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

L_1

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

L_2

Furthermore...

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

L_3

| n | $L(n, n)$ | reference |
|-----|------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | 1 | |
| 2 | 1 | |
| 3 | 1 | |
| 4 | 4 | |
| 5 | 56 | Euler (1782), Cayley (1890), MacMahon (1915; incorrect value) |
| 6 | 9408 | Frolov (1890) and Tarry (1900) |
| 7 | 16942080 | Frolov (1890; incorrect), Norton (1939; incomplete), Sade (1948), Saxena (1951) |
| 8 | 535281401856 | Wells (1967) |
| 9 | 377597570964258816 | Bammel and Rothstein (1975) |
| 10 | 7580721483160132811489280 | McKay and Rogoyski (1995) |
| 11 | 5363937773277371298119673540771840 | McKay and Wanless (2005) |
| 12 | 1.62×10^{44} | McKay and Rogoyski (1995) |
| 13 | 2.51×10^{56} | McKay and Rogoyski (1995) |
| 14 | 2.33×10^{70} | McKay and Rogoyski (1995) |
| 15 | 1.5×10^{86} | McKay and Rogoyski (1995) |

Distance $d(L, L')$:

Distance $d(L, L')$: between two (partial) Latin squares L and L' of the same order is defined to be $|L \setminus L'|$, i.e., the number of cells in which they differ.

Distance $d(L, L')$: between two (partial) Latin squares L and L' of the same order is defined to be $|L \setminus L'|$, i.e., the number of cells in which they differ.

Example:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | 3 | | 1 |
| | | | |
| | 1 | | 3 |
| | | | |

$L_2 \setminus L_1$

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | |

$L_3 \setminus L_1$

Distance $d(L, L')$: between two (partial) Latin squares L and L' of the same order is defined to be $|L \setminus L'|$, i.e., the number of cells in which they differ.

Example:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | 3 | | 1 |
| | | | |
| | 1 | | 3 |
| | | | |

$L_2 \setminus L_1$

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | |

$L_3 \setminus L_1$

Question: Given L , what is the minimum distance, $dist(L)$, to a distinct Latin square of the same order?

Latin trade:

Latin trade: is a partial Latin square such that there exists a disjoint mate on the same set of occupied cells with the same symbols in the corresponding rows and columns.

Latin trade: is a partial Latin square such that there exists a disjoint mate on the same set of occupied cells with the same symbols in the corresponding rows and columns.

Example:

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | 3 | | 1 |
| | | | |
| | 1 | | 3 |
| | | | |

$L_2 \setminus L_1$

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 3 | 2 |
| | | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | |

$L_3 \setminus L_1$

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | 1 | | 3 |
| | | | |
| | 3 | | 1 |
| | | | |

$L_1 \setminus L_2$

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 2 | 3 |
| | | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 3 | | 1 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | |

$L_1 \setminus L_3$

Alternatively, we can define $dist(L)$ as the size of the smallest Latin trade in L .

Alternatively, we can define $dist(L)$ as the size of the smallest Latin trade in L .

Note: $L - (L \setminus L') + (L' \setminus L) = L'$.

Alternatively, we can define $dist(L)$ as the size of the smallest Latin trade in L .

Note: $L - (L \setminus L') + (L' \setminus L) = L'$.

Example:

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|----------------|
| 0 | 3 ₁ | 2 | 1 ₃ |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 ₃ | 0 | 3 ₁ |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

$L_1 \rightarrow L_2$

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0 | 1 | 3 ₂ | 2 ₃ |
| 3 | 0 | 2 ₁ | 1 ₂ |
| 1 ₂ | 2 ₃ | 0 | 3 ₁ |
| 2 ₁ | 3 ₂ | 1 ₃ | 0 |

$L_1 \rightarrow L_3$

Alternatively, we can define $dist(L)$ as the size of the smallest Latin trade in L .

Note: $L - (L \setminus L') + (L' \setminus L) = L'$.

Example:

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|----------------|
| 0 | 3 ₁ | 2 | 1 ₃ |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 2 | 1 ₃ | 0 | 3 ₁ |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

$L_1 \rightarrow L_2$

| | | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 0 | 1 | 3 ₂ | 2 ₃ |
| 3 | 0 | 2 ₁ | 1 ₂ |
| 1 ₂ | 2 ₃ | 0 | 3 ₁ |
| 2 ₁ | 3 ₂ | 1 ₃ | 0 |

$L_1 \rightarrow L_3$

Can be shown that $dist(L) \geq 4$.

Intercalates: are Latin trades of size 4.

Intercalates: are Latin trades of size 4.

Example:

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| 6 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

Addition table for $(\mathbb{Z}_2)^3$.

Known results:

Suppose $I(n)$ is the maximum number of intercalates in a Latin square of order n , then

- $I(n) = n^2(n - 1)/4$ if $n = 2^k$.
- $I(n) = n(n - 1)(n - 3)/4$ if $n = 2^k - 1$.
- Browning, Cameron and Wanless, 2014:
 $I(n) \geq (n - 1)(n - 3)(n - 15)/8$.

Known results:

Suppose $I(n)$ is the maximum number of intercalates in a Latin square of order n , then

- $I(n) = n^2(n - 1)/4$ if $n = 2^k$.
- $I(n) = n(n - 1)(n - 3)/4$ if $n = 2^k - 1$.
- Browning, Cameron and Wanless, 2014:
 $I(n) \geq (n - 1)(n - 3)(n - 15)/8$.

In fact,

Theorem (McKay, Wanless 1999): For most Latin squares,

$$I(n) \geq n^{3/2-\varepsilon}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

What about the maximum minimum distance?

What about the maximum minimum distance?

Example: Suppose B_n is the Latin square given by the addition table for integers mod n , then

What about the maximum minimum distance?

Example: Suppose B_n is the Latin square given by the addition table for integers mod n , then

- Drápal and Kepka, 1989: $\text{dist}(B_p) \geq e \log p + 3$, where p is prime.
(Alternate proof independently by Cavenagh, and also by Cavenagh and Wanless.)
- Szabados, 2014: $\text{dist}(B_n) \leq 5 \log_2 n + 3$.

Definition: Define $dist(n) = \max\{dist(L) : L \text{ is a Latin square of order } n\}$.

Definition: Define $dist(n) = \max\{dist(L) : L \text{ is a Latin square of order } n\}$.

Example:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | | |
| | 0 | | 1 |
| 1 | | 0 | |
| | | 1 | 0 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |

Definition: Define $dist(n) = \max\{dist(L) : L \text{ is a Latin square of order } n\}$.

Example:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | | |
| | 0 | 1 | |
| | | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | | | 0 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 |

Definition: Define $dist(n) = \max\{dist(L) : L \text{ is a Latin square of order } n\}$.

Example: cycle trades

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0_1 | 1_0 | | |
| | 0_1 | 1_0 | |
| | | 0_1 | 1_0 |
| 1_0 | | | 0_1 |

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0_1 | 1_2 | 2_3 | 3_0 |
| 1_0 | 2_1 | 3_2 | 0_3 |

Definition: Define $dist(n) = \max\{dist(L) : L \text{ is a Latin square of order } n\}$.

Example: cycle trades

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0_1 | 1_0 | | |
| | 0_1 | 1_0 | |
| | | 0_1 | 1_0 |
| 1_0 | | | 0_1 |

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0_1 | 1_2 | 2_3 | 3_0 |
| 1_0 | 2_1 | 3_2 | 0_3 |

Thus, $dist(n) \leq 2n$.

Definition: Define $dist(n) = \max\{dist(L) : L \text{ is a Latin square of order } n\}$.

Example: cycle trades

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0_1 | 1_0 | | |
| | 0_1 | 1_0 | |
| | | 0_1 | 1_0 |
| 1_0 | | | 0_1 |

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0_1 | 1_2 | 2_3 | 3_0 |
| 1_0 | 2_1 | 3_2 | 0_3 |

Thus, $dist(n) \leq 2n$.

Conjecture (Cavenagh, 2003): $dist(n) = O(\log n)$.

Definition: Define $dist(n) = \max\{dist(L) : L \text{ is a Latin square of order } n\}$.

Example: cycle trades

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0_1 | 1_0 | | |
| | 0_1 | 1_0 | |
| | | 0_1 | 1_0 |
| 1_0 | | | 0_1 |

| | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0_1 | 1_2 | 2_3 | 3_0 |
| 1_0 | 2_1 | 3_2 | 0_3 |

Thus, $dist(n) \leq 2n$.

Conjecture (Cavenagh, 2003): $dist(n) = O(\log n)$.

Theorem (Cavenagh and R.): $dist(n) = O(\sqrt{n})$.

Defining set, D : is a partial Latin square that has a unique completion to a Latin square.

Defining set, D : is a partial Latin square that has a unique completion to a Latin square.

Theorem (Cavenagh and R.): A defining set in a Latin square of order n has size $\Omega(n^{3/2})$.

Defining set, D : is a partial Latin square that has a unique completion to a Latin square.

Theorem (Cavenagh and R.): A defining set in a Latin square of order n has size $\Omega(n^{3/2})$.

Conjectured: $\left\lfloor \frac{n^2}{4} \right\rfloor$.

Best known previously: $n \left\lfloor \frac{(\log n)^{1/3}}{2} \right\rfloor$.