

A Digital/Analog Signal Processing Method to Compute the Number of Hamiltonian Paths

Bryce Kim

01/03/2016

Abstract

This paper explores finding the number n_h of undirected hamiltonian paths in a graph using lumped/ideal circuits, specifically low-pass filters. Ideal analog computation allows one to compute n_h in a short period of time, but in practice, precision problems disturb this ideal nature. A digital/algorithmic approach is proposed, and then it is shown that the approach/method operates under theoretically feasible time.

1 Algorithmic approach

In this paper, all graphs are assumed to be undirected. This introduction captures all aspects of what this paper is about, and thus readers can be assured that just by reading the introduction, one is almost done reading the paper. The rest of this paper is about implementations of the ideas presented in this introduction. Key primary insights are written in bold typeface, and secondary insights that are nevertheless of some importance will often be listed in itemized lists.

1.1 Two Goals

The first goal of this paper is showing how the counting variant of the hamiltonian path problem is effectively a signal processing problem. By reduction, this means that several important computation problems are “isomorphic” to signal processing problems.

The second goal of this paper is exploring whether feasible computation of the number of hamiltonian paths in an undirected graph is possible, via signal processing understanding of the hamiltonian path problem. For analog computation, the concept of “feasible” is obscure, but for digital computation, “feasible” will refer to computation in polynomial time.

For both cases, the answer is yes.

1.2 Two Core Concepts

These two core concepts are used to convert a hamiltonian path counting problem into a signal processing problem.

1.2.1 Core Concept 1: Reducing a graph to a function $f(t)$

As the title of this sub-subsection says, the first core concept is reducing an undirected graph to $f(t) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

Initially, one forms $x(t)$ before forming $f(t)$. **Each vertex is assigned a separate angular frequency.** Then each walk of a graph restricted to containing $|V| = n$ vertex visits is also assigned an angular frequency. By the definition of a walk, visiting one vertex more than once is allowed. Let us call such walks as n -walks for simplification.

Each n -walk can be assigned angular frequency by simply summing up angular frequency of each vertex by visit order. Thus, the angular frequency of a n -walk, expanded as the sum of vertex terms, may have one vertex added more than once.

The main reason for this function conversion is that in this process, all hamiltonian paths share the same angular frequency, because they have to contain all vertices in an undirected graph. Thus, one would like to have walks that are not hamiltonian paths to not share the angular frequency of hamiltonian paths. This is done by using particular angular frequency assigning methods so that each n -walk that shares the same set of vertices along with the same vertex-corresponding visit frequencies, has the same angular frequency. Of course this is not the only way, but this is the most straightforward way of proceeding.

By visit frequency, if a n -walk visited some vertex v_a twice, then the visit frequency of v_a is 2.

Then I “shift” angular frequencies so that **hamiltonian path angular frequency is zero**, which forms $y(t)$. **This allows one to formulate a hamiltonian path counting problem as the signal processing problem of finding the period-adjusted average - or simply, the zero frequency amplitude - of the Fourier series $y(t)$.**

For convenience, I scale time/angular frequency, which gives one a Fourier series form of an input graph: $f(t)$.

1.2.2 The Core Concept 1 (CC1) implementation: The function form of a graph can be constructed easily

Definition 1.1 (double exponentiation, $n^{17 \cdot 3n^{17}}$). Due to latex style issue, $n^{17 \cdot 3n^{17}} = n^u$ where $u = 17 \cdot 3n^{17} = 51n^{17}$ may be seen as n^u with $17 \cdot 3n^{17}$, which is not the author’s intention. Unless otherwise explicitly said, anything that is expressed in form of n^u never has u that is exponential relative to n and is always a polynomial function of n . That is, when double exponentiation appears of the form $n^{k_1 \cdot k_2}$, it should always be seen as $(n^{k_1})^{k_2} = n^{k_1 \cdot k_2}$.

Definition 1.2 (Z^+ , Z_+ , Z^- , Z_-). Z^+ or Z_+ refers to the set of positive integers. Similarly, Z^- refers to the set of negative integers.

Definition 1.3 (“less than”, “more than”, “greater than”, “smaller than”). Unless otherwise noted, these are all comparisons in magnitude/size/absolute value.

Definition 1.4 (Base- n expansion). Base- n expansion of some number k is basically expressing k in base- n : $k = \pm \sum_{p=-\infty}^{\infty} a_p n^p$ with $0 \leq a_p < n$.

The power of base- n is that if important parameters are the finite sums (that is, $k = \pm \sum_{p=b_l}^{b_h} a_p n^p$, with b_l and b_h finite), instead of infinite sums, then analysis becomes much easier. For studying numerical approximation of k (if exact value cannot be known), one can just focus on finite number of numerical digits.

Definition 1.5 (graph, n). A graph G is denoted with $G = (V, E)$ as done in the standard literature. $n = |V|$ is assumed whenever n appears.

Definition 1.6 (walk, n -walk, hamiltonian path). A walk is defined as in the standard graph theory vocabulary. A walk that has n vertices is called n -walk. Let us represent a walk with a list (tuple) of vertices in a traversing order from the start vertex to the end vertex. By the definition of a walk, one vertex can appear more than once in a list. A hamiltonian path, as defined in the standard graph theory vocabulary, is a walk with n distinct vertices, where $|V| = n$.

Definition 1.7 (vertex). A vertex is assigned a number. Each distinct vertex has a distinct number. Let $V = \{n, n^2, n^3, \dots, n^n\}$. From now on, one can assume a vertex as a number whenever appropriate.

Definition 1.8 (n_h , n_p). n_h is the number of hamiltonian paths of G . n_p is the total number of n -walks of G .

Definition 1.9 (Vertex-number). The vertex-number of a walk is defined as the sum of all elements (vertices) in the list of a walk.

Note that the vertex-number of a walk represents the angular frequency of a walk in $x(t)$, as will be seen. It is certainly possible that two walks may occupy the same frequency. If there are k walks that occupy the same frequency ω_a , then the amplitude at the frequency would be k in Fourier series language, or $k\delta(\omega - \omega_a)$ in Fourier transform language where $\delta(\omega)$ is a dirac delta function.

The maximum number of vertices inside a walk is restricted to n , for sake of convenience.

Definition 1.10 (Permutation of a list). A permutation of a list is a re-ordering of list elements in ξ . For example, for $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)$, $\xi_\alpha = (\xi_n, \xi_{n-3}, \xi_{n-4}, \dots, \xi_1)$ is a permutation of ξ .

Lemma 1.1. *Given V as defined above, a vertex-number can only be formed out of a permutation of a single vertex-number list.*

Proof. The proof is simply the basis representation theorem, where basis are elements in V . One exception to this proof, though, arises when a list ξ representing a walk may be of (k, k, \dots, k) with $|\xi| = n$ and $k = n^i$, or in words, there are n k 's in ξ . In this case, $nk = n^{i+1}$, meaning the vertex-number ξ equals one of vertices in V . But this should not matter whenever walks one deals with have same number of vertices. \square

Following from above:

Definition 1.11 (Contribution of each n -walk to $x(t)$). From above, each walk has a vertex number k . Each n -walk is said to contribute e^{ikt} to $x(t)$.

Definition 1.12 (Amplitude). For any arbitrary function $\alpha(t)$ expressible as $\alpha(t) = \sum_{\omega=-\infty}^{\infty} A_{\omega} e^{i\omega t/d}$ where d is constant and does not vary with ω , A_{ω} is said to be amplitude of $\alpha(t)$ at angular frequency ω .

1.2.3 CC1 continuation: grid: $x(t)$

Definition 1.13 (Grid, wires). A grid consists of n depths, with each depth being equivalent to a column. Each depth contains n vertices as in V . Each wire connects a vertex v_{α} from i th depth to a vertex point of v_{β} in $i+1$ th depth. A wire is connected between v_{α} to v_{β} if and only if $(v_{\alpha}, v_{\beta}) \in E$.

Definition 1.14 (Function transmission: first depth case). In the first depth (first column), each vertex v_{α} transmits $e^{iv_{\alpha}t}$.

Definition 1.15 (Function transmission except for first and n th depth). Defining for each v_{α} in arbitrary i th depth. All incoming wire transmissions $w_{\zeta}(t)$ from each wire ζ from $i-1$ th depth to v_{α} in i th depth are summed, or equivalently $w_{\lambda} = \sum_{\zeta} w_{\zeta}$. And then multiply by $e^{iv_{\alpha}t}$ and transmit $u_{v_{\alpha}} = e^{iv_{\alpha}t} w_{\lambda}$ to each wire starting from v_{α} .

Definition 1.16 (Vertex point function transmission: n th depth case). All incoming wire transmissions $w_{\zeta}(t)$ from each wire ζ from $n-1$ th depth to v_{α} in n th depth are summed, or equivalently $w_{\lambda} = \sum_{\zeta} w_{\zeta}$. And then multiply by $e^{iv_{\alpha}t}$, resulting in $s_{v_{\alpha}} = e^{iv_{\alpha}t} w_{\lambda}$. $x_{ideal}(t) = \sum_{v \in V} s_v$ is the output of the grid, not considering quantization errors involved.

For each depth i , $\sum_{v \in V} u_v$ shows the sum of all vertex-numbers representing i -walk.

1.2.4 CC1 continuation: post-grid: $y(t)$

Simply, this post-grid procedure is all about calculating $y(t) = x(t)e^{-ia_n t}$ where $a_h = \sum_{i=1}^n n^i$, the hamiltonian frequency of $x(t)$. Thus, $y(t)$ has 0 has hamiltonian frequency.

1.2.5 CC1 continuation: post-grid: $f(t)$

$f(t)$ is defined as $f(t) = y(ct)$. c was defined as $c = 2/(2n^{n+1})$.

Let the angular frequencies of $f(t)$ be labelled with u . $u = 0$ refers to hamiltonian frequency.

From now on, when it is said “every u ,” this refers to every u with non-zero amplitude in $f(t)$.

1.2.6 The polynomial form of $f(t)$

The polynomial form of $y(t)$ is easily obtained by expanding e^{ivt} of each vertex v to the imposed polynomial degree n_d (defined below) and do multiplication of the polynomial form of e^{ivt} with the sum of incoming polynomials. This gives us final accuracy up to polynomial degree n_d .

1.2.7 Core Concept 2: Taking advantage of known information: signal processing tools, staged

Definition 1.17 (polynomial term, polynomial form). The polynomial term of degree d of some function $g(t)$ is the $A_d t^d / d!$ term that exists in the Taylor expansion of $g(t)$ around $t = 0$. The polynomial form of some function $g(t)$ of the assigned degree n_d refers to the truncated Taylor expansion of $g(t)$ around $t = 0$, where polynomial terms of degree greater than n_d are thrown out.

Definition 1.18 (function, t). All functions are assumed to be of $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, with t being an independent variable.

Definition 1.19 (finite-degree truncation error). Finite-degree truncation errors of the polynomial form of some $g(t)$ are the errors caused by Taylor-expanding $g(t)$ around $t = 0$ and truncating polynomial terms of degree greater than n_d .

Definition 1.20 (polynomial coefficient error). Polynomial coefficient errors of the polynomial form of some $g(t)$ are the errors caused by finite-precision limit placed when storing the digits of polynomial coefficients of each polynomial term $A_k t^k$ of the polynomial form of some $g(t)$, with higher polynomial terms truncated. I will ignore this type of problem until the very end of this introduction section.

Definition 1.21 ($H(s)$, $H_r(s)$). For $H(s)$, depending on context initially, it will refer to general linear filters, given in Laplace transform with variable s . However, for most of time $H(s) = 1/(s + 1)$. $H_r(s) = -1/(s - 1)$.

Definition 1.22 (forward-step, backward-step, pair-step, step, T_e). A pair-step consists of one forward-step, followed by one backward-step. By “followed by,” I refer to the fact that the input of the backward-step of a pair-step is the output of the forward step of the pair-step. Forward-steps take filter $H(s)$ and receives the input from the output of the preceding pair-step. Backward-steps take filter $H(s)$ also. The outputs of forward-steps assume the value 0 at $t = 0$, while the

outputs of backward-steps assume the value 0 at $t = T_e$. In this paper, T_e is set as $T_e = 1$. A step may refer to a forward-step or a backward-step. Notice that for backward-steps, one can prefer to think of the filtering process as reversing the time scale of the input - thus $t = T_e$ now becomes $t = 0$ and $t = 0$ now becomes T_e - and then applying the filter $H_r(s)$.

Definition 1.23 (cycle, (inter-)cycle transition, k_c). A cycle consists of $n_s/2$ pair-steps. Inter-cycle transition, cycle-cycle transition or simply cycle transition refers to what happens to the output of the last pair-step of one cycle to make it the input of the first pair-step of the following cycle. After getting the polynomial form of the output of the last pair-step of cycle c , one rescales the time scale t by the new scale $k_c t' = t$ (with $k_c > 1$). Let t' be simply referred to as t for cycle $c + 1$. The polynomial form of the output of the pair-step $n_s/2$ of cycle c in the new time scale is then used for the input for the first pair-step of cycle $c + 1$. I will use $k_c = 1.5$ for the implementation of this paper.

Definition 1.24 (cycle input, cycle output). The cycle input of cycle c is the input of the first pair-step of cycle c . The cycle output of cycle c is the output of the last pair-step of cycle c .

Definition 1.25 (steady-state response, transient response). Steady-responses are the responses that can be written as Fourier series. Transient responses are the responses that cannot be written as Fourier series. These concepts are adapted from sinusoidal filtering literature, where transient response is the response that dies off to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Here, transient response is defined more broadly - however, for purposes of this paper, these distinctions will not matter. A different definition is provided just for convenience of explanations in this paper.

Definition 1.26 (transient response/steady-state response restriction). In this paper, I will restrict transient response to those that may have chance of being generated by allowed graphs (transforming to $f(t)$). That is, there should be some steady-state response (including $f(t)$ itself) input that generates transient response, and steady-state responses themselves must be allowed by the given input graph G .

Definition 1.27 ($n, n_d, n_s, n_c, n_h, f(t)$). $|V| = n$, where $G = (V, E)$ refers to input undirected graph. n_d refers to the highest polynomial degree imposed for the polynomial form of filter input and output. n_s refers to the number of steps in a cycle. $n_s/2$ thus is the number of pair-steps in a cycle. For this paper's implementation, let $n_d = n^5$, $n_s = n^{15}$. n_c refers to the number of cycles in the whole procedure. Because there are at maximum n^{n+1} angular frequencies, and since $H(s)$ assumes cut-off angular frequency of 1 ($f(t) = y(2t/n^{(n+1)})$ with $V = \{n, n^2, \dots, n^n\}$), n_c should be set so that $(k_c)^{n_c} > n^{n+1}$. $n_c = n^4$ would work fine for any large $n > n_0$ for the chosen implementation of k_c . n_h is the number of hamiltonian paths in an undirected graph input.

Definition 1.28 (pair-step implementation and clarification regarding zero $t = T_e = 1$ initial condition for backward-steps). It has been and will be said

that at $t = T_e = 1$, pair-step output must be zero in terms of the polynomial form. But this raises the question: let pair-step input be $g(t)$ and output that simply applied filter $(H(s))^2$ be $g_z(t)$. Should we add $-g_z(1)ee^{-t}$ to $g_z(t)$ to form the pair-step output $g_o(t)$, or should we do set output value as zero for the output polynomial? It is the former - adding $-g_z(1)ee^{-t}$ - that is chosen for this paper. This makes analysis simpler though at the cost of having to introduce e into coefficients. After having formed $g_o(t)$, one truncates e^{-t} to the required finite polynomial degree n_d , and the polynomial form of $g_o(t)$ then becomes the input for the next pair-step.

Every tool used in this paper are standard analog filtering tools - for the algorithmic approach, the tools are just re-adapted - after a function form of an input graph is discussed.

The “ideal analog computation” approach - or simply, the analog approach, is discussed first. This is because the analog approach provides a core foundation for what the digital/algorithmic approach - or even the practical analog computation approach - needs to achieve additionally.

For now, assume that the vertex set V of an undirected graph used for $x(t)$ - defined in terms of assigned angular frequencies - is $V = \{n, n^2, \dots, n^n\}$. (The corresponding $y(t)$ is simply multiplying $x(t)$ by $e^{-i\omega_h t}$, where $\omega_h = \sum_{i=1}^n n^i$.) As will be seen, this set satisfies the aforementioned required separation of walks. For the ideal analog computation approach (assuming the GPAC model for ideal analog computers), solving the aforementioned zero-frequency signal processing problem is very easy. Just use a first-order filter $H(s) = 1/(s + 1)$, and scale angular frequencies of $y(t)$ to be high angular frequencies when forming $f(t)$. (In actual implementation, time scaling will be done by adjusting time scaling of $x(t)$ first, and obtaining $f(t)$ by shifting by time-scale-adjusted hamiltonian angular frequency.) Then, in terms of analog time, one can obtain the number of hamiltonian paths - n_h - in relatively practical time.

The problem is boosting to high frequencies is often infeasible. Like what one sees when a real number is represented in a digital computer (not considering symbolic calculations, for now), real analog systems also suffer from errors, deviating from ideal, especially for high-frequency areas. Thus, one needs to go around high-frequency issues in practice.

However, sticking to other sets of angular frequencies naively also is infeasible - IIR filter suffers from transient response for a sinusoidal input, and for angular frequency regions that practical analog computers often work, transient response takes very long time.

FIR digital filters are also infeasible. **For the assumed vertex set, cut-off angular frequency required is approximately $1/n^{n+1}$ when the highest angular frequency of non-zero amplitude in $f(t)$ is around 1** (recall that $f(t)$ is time-scaled $y(t)$). Thus, in digital domain, one requires exponentially many taps relative to $|V| = n$ before getting solely steady-state filter output - otherwise, one suffers from aliasing problems (recalling the Nyquist-Shannon sampling condition). And this is even not considering the effects of digitally-induced truncation errors of filter input samples.

Thus comes the idea of staged signal processing. Use filter $H(s)$, **but several times in stages - steps and cycles**. Each step is essentially applying $H(s)$ with some modifications such as time reversal. Each cycle is steps grouped together, with step i 's output used for step $i + 1$'s input, with modification such as time reversal. After one cycle, consisting of steps, is completed, time t is rescaled with the new time scale t' so that $t' = k_c t$. In terms of Fourier series, this is equivalent to boosting angular frequency by multiplicative factor k_c . **This is the core insight that allows one to go around slow transient response problem**. Of course this comes with own problems, which are the center of analysis of the Core Concept 2.

This staged signal processing is essentially passing filter input to a cascade of filters - but with modification. We will see that essentially, these modifications are equivalent to changing initial conditions of filters. First, I will list the reasons for some of the important choices made for this staged signal processing method.

- CH0: Inputs and Outputs are all stored in form of polynomials. There are then two sources of errors: imprecision in storing polynomial coefficients and truncation due to finite (highest) polynomial degree. The latter will be discussed predominantly, since the former issue is easy to resolve. CH0 is largely a core assumption that does not really have justifying reasons, except that polynomials do seem to be the natural choices. Future papers may find better input/output representations other than polynomials.
- CH1A: The IIR, instead of FIR, filter $H(s) = 1/(s + 1)$ is used. The nature of FIR filters makes one difficult to analyze warm-up response - or in IIR filter language, transient response. Technically, it is possible to write down the z-transform of filter output minus desired steady-state response by actually calculating the subtraction. But since our analysis intends to be general, one cannot just pick an example and go ahead. (Continuing in CH1B.)
- CH1B: One can of course decide to study steady-state response only in this staged signal processing, in case of using a FIR filter. However, note that FIR filters require warm-up period to reach steady-state response, just like how IIR filters have infinite impulse response. (Continuing in CH1C.)
- CH1C: Suppose some function $g(t)$, and consider Laplace transform $G(s)$. Transforming time $t = T$ to be $t = 0$ results in $g_2(t)$, with Laplace transform $G_2(s) = G(s)e^{sT}$. Taylor expand e^{sT} , and one sees the terms like $sT + (sT)^2/2 + \dots$, which are essentially differentiator terms. Recall that to reach steady-state response, several taps are needed for digital FIR filters. (Continuing in CH1D.)
- CH1D: Recall that our filter inputs and outputs are polynomials. Now consider the filter output of step i being used as the filter input for step $i + 1$, and FIR filters are used. One shifts time so that the filter input for

step $i + 1$ is only of steady-state response (recall the difficulty of analysis with FIR transient response) from the new time scale $t = 0$ (with step $i + 1$ input for $t < 0$ being zero). But polynomials suffer from finite degree truncation. And time shift represents differentiating step $i + 1$ filter input. Thus, errors build up very significantly. (Continuing in CH1E.)

- CH1E: Thus, an IIR filter, which does not have characteristics of differentiators, is used. But by the same logic of CH1 so far, one would not wish to filter a given input for some time interval T for a single step, then shifts time T as the new time $t = 0$ for the next step and filter again for some time interval T . (Continuing in CH1F.)
- CH1F: But one actually does wish to take advantage of the filtering already done from $t = 0$ to $t = T$ at each step. **This is what would differentiate staged signal processing from just passing filter input to a cascade of filters, compactly represented in Laplace transform domain as multiplication of several filters.** For a naive/simple cascade of first-order filters, by “integrator” nature of IIR filters, cycle input $g(t) = 1$ results in cycle output $g_o(t) = \sum_{u=n_s}^{\infty} A_{g,u} t^u / u$, where n_s refers to the number of steps/filters simply/naively cascaded in each cycle. But our polynomials for inputs and outputs are supposed to be of finite degree, and since the number of cycles depend on $|V| = n$, this procedure cannot succeed, **if we have to impose $n_d < n_s$ for good reasons.** $n_d < n_s$ would mean that $g_o(t)$ becomes zero. (Continuing in CH1G.)
- CH1G: **This is what motivates us to introducing forward and backward steps.** What a forward-step and a backward-step do is provided in the definition above for forward-step and backward-step. The goal is to take the advantage of filtering done in preceding steps, but also to allow the polynomial coefficients we have to reflect on that advantage. I will discuss some motivating intuitions and hindsight behind CH1G in a separate sub-subsection. Also, the connection with the CC2P1 proposition below should be noted. (Continuing in CH1H.)
- CH1H: For a pair-step, for input $g(t)$, additional $k_i e^{-t}$ factor is introduced to the pair-step output, in addition to inverse laplace transform of $G(s)H(s)H(s)$: let this be $g_l(t)$. Let the output be $o_i(t) = g_l(t) + k_i e^{-t}$. The fact that the additional factor has the form of $k_i e^{-t}$ can easily be shown from Laplace transform property of backward-steps. k_i needs to be set so that at $t = T_e$, $o_i(t)$ becomes zero, as defined for backward-steps. (Continuing in CH1I.)
- CH1I: Because of finite-(polynomial)-degree truncation, k_i also needs to be adjusted. That is, because the finite-degree-truncated polynomial form of $o_i(t)$ is set to be zero, instead of $o_i(t)$ being assumed zero, at $t = T_e$, k_i needs to incorporate this effect. Or differently but equivalently said, For a pair-step, the additional effect is caused by finite polynomial degree limit. Recall that for a backward step, it is assumed that at $t = T_e$, filter output

is zero. Because filter output is calculated via the polynomial form, this polynomial form is zero at $t = T_e$. Thus, k_i in $O_i(s)$ of CH1I is affected by this, but it can easily be shown that this is very insignificant. (Continuing in CH1J.)

- CH1J: Let us return to the comparison of FIR filters against IIR filters. FIR filters are of differentiator types. Thus, filter input is being differentiated, and because filter inputs are stored as polynomials, suffering from finite degree truncation errors, stored polynomial coefficients of filter outputs suffer from truncation error. By contrast, IIR filters are of integrator type. Thus, assuming that filter input and output share the same highest polynomial degree, filter output polynomial does not suffer from imprecision in polynomial coefficients (the coefficients decided to be stored), as long as filter input polynomial coefficients were accurate/precise, except the $k_i e^{-t}$ term. (As said before, ignore the errors due to finite-digit limit of storing polynomial coefficients for now, as they will be shown to be trivial.) (Continuing in CH1K.)
- CH1K: $k_i e^{-t}$ terms are affected by finite-degree truncation effects. For transient response and low-frequency steady-state response inputs, it is easy to see that truncation effects are minimal - see the CC2P1 sub-subsection. For high-frequency steady-state response input, however, truncation effects become very large. To avoid k_i exploding and to avoid the value of the polynomial form of high-frequency steady-state responses from becoming in comparable (magnitude) size from $t = 0$ to $t = T_e$ compared to zero-frequency steady-state response, the polynomial degree principle is applied. This is crucial in order for extraction of n_h to occur, and for that, see the separate sub-subsection discussing the extraction of n_h .

1.2.8 CH1G

The motivating intuition behind CH1G and the concept of forward and backward step comes from the following. Suppose that for a forward-step, filter $H(s)$ is applied, but for a backward step filter $H_r(s)$ is applied, with zero $t = T_e = 1$ initial condition. Then $H(s)H_r(s)$ with $t = 1$ initial condition adjustment results in:

$$\frac{e^{-t}}{2} - \frac{e^t}{2e^2}$$

Notice that at $t = 0$, we saw input e^{-t} with the value 1 at $t = 0$ decay to the above, with the value $1/2 - 1/(2e^2)$. This motivates one to exploit this feature. Fortunately, it is possible to take advantage of this feature with a backward-step that applies filter $H(s)$ as was implemented with the zero initial condition at $t = T_e = 1$. This point would more clearly be demonstrated by the CC2P1 proposition below. Before going to the entire Core Concept 2 Propositions, I will explain the CC2P1 proposition first.

1.2.9 CC2P1: Core Concept 2 Proposition 1

Consider inverse laplace transform of $H(s)H(s)$ with T_e initial condition adjustment (this case deals with the transient response caused by the steady-state response input for the forward-step, and the backward-step response to that transient response) - let the resulting function be $g_o(t)$:

$$g_o(t) = te^{-t} - e^{-t}$$

Notice that from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$, $|g_o(t)| \leq e^{-t}$. By the integration nature of convolution (and consider the principle of causal LTI systems), one can say that the upper magnitude of the pair-step response to input $g_o(t)$ is less than or equal to the pair-step response to e^{-t} for the time range from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$. Then consider input $g(t) = e^{-t}$, passed to a pair-step. Then output would be:

$$g_{o,2}(t) = \frac{t^2}{2}e^{-t} - \frac{1}{2}e^{-t}$$

$|g_{o,2}(t)| \leq e^{-t}/2$, which by considering causal LTI nature and integration nature of convolution again would mean that the upper magnitude of the pair-step response to input $g_{o,2}(t)$ is less than or equal to the pair-step response to $e^{-t}/2$ for the time range from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$. Thus, if $g(t)$ was the cycle input, then cycle output would be bounded above in magnitude by the pair-step response to $(1/2)^{n_s/2-1}e^{-t}$ from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$. Taking the account of the above case of forward-step transient response generated by steady-state response, one gets the small version of CC2P1 proposition.

But before stating the small CC2P1 proposition, let us reflect on one more matter: finite-degree truncation effect. It is easy to see that for $g(t) = e^{-t}$ and step responses to it, the upper magnitude bound to finite-degree truncation effects of backward-step output is $u_g(t) = 2en_d e^{-t}/(n_d)! \approx 5n_d e^{-t}/(n_d)!$. The form of $k_g e^{-t}$ is used, as these effects arise because of zero $t = T_e$ initial condition for backward steps.

Notice then that one can first start off analysis as if there is no finite-degree truncation effect, and then study how pair-steps respond to finite-degree truncation effects, after figuring out additional response for a single pair-step due to finite-degree truncation. This allows one to “shrink” the bound of $u_g(t)$ as pair-steps pass by. Now stating the small CC2P1 principle.

Proposition 1.2 (small CC2P1 proposition: time-zero transient response reduction). *Consider the transient response input $g(t) = ke^{-t}$ at step i (either backward or forward) of cycle c . Then the output of the last pair-step of cycle c is bounded above in magnitude by $k(1/2)^{q_v} e^{-t}$, where $q_v = n_s/2 - cl(i/2)$ and $cl(u)$ refers to the least natural number above or equal to u from $t = 0$ to $t = 1$. Thus, from the point of $t = 0$, the value k decreases to $k(1/2)^{q_v}$. To incorporate finite-degree truncation effect, one may set $q_v = n_s/2 - cl(i/2) - 1$. In general, the output of pair-step $i_2/2$ of cycle c with input $g(t)$ of step i of cycle c is bounded above in magnitude by $k(1/2)^{q_v} e^{-t}$, with $q_v = i_2/2 - cl(i/2) - 1$. Restriction $q_v \geq 1$ applies for all cases.*

But one has to consider how response of steps to $g(t)$ evolve, as one moves from one cycle to the next cycle (inter-cycle transition).

Recall that the polynomial form is limited to degree n_d . This suggests that because $k_c t' = t$ where $k_c = 1.5$, one may state the bound of multiplicative increase in polynomial coefficients as $(k_c)^{n_d}$. Or, consider the form $t^k e^{-t}/k!$. Using the new time scale involves multiplying by $(k_c)^{n_d}$ to incorporate the change to $t^k/k!$ and then changing e^{-t} to $e^{-k_c t'}$. For convenience, let us refer to the new time scale as simply t whenever context is obvious. Note that $|e^{-t}| > |e^{-2t}|$ from $t = 0$ to $t = \infty$. Finite-degree truncation effects analysis is the same as in one-cycle analysis (except for already-accounted multiplicative increase in polynomial coefficients), because the same n_d limit is in place, and $(k_c)^u \ll u!$ for $u > n_d$. This allows one to state the full CC2P1 proposition.

Proposition 1.3 (time-zero transient response reduction. (CC2P1 Proposition)). *Consider the transient response output $g(t) = ke^{-t}$ of either (forward or backward) step i output of cycle c caused by the steady-state step i input of cycle c (or equivalently, the steady-state step $i - 1$ output of cycle c). Let $g(t)$ solely be the input to step $i + 1$ of cycle c . And we run the filter until the end of cycle $c + 1$. Then the response one gets back as cycle $c + 1$ output at $t = 0$ is guaranteed to have absolute magnitude of $k(k_c/2)^{q_v} e^{-t}$, with $q_v = n_s - cl((i - 1)/2) - 1$ and $q_v \geq 1$ restriction. Since $k_c = 1.5$, and $1.5/2 < 1$, sufficient decaying occurs.*

Proposition 1.4 (CC2P1-additional emphasis). *Recall the n_d polynomial form degree restriction. This means that filter responses that would have been obtained without zero $t = T_e$ initial condition and with ordinary zero $t = 0$ initial condition for backward-steps would become completely zero after passing through $n_d + 2$ steps. Thus, effectively what we do for transient responses by passing through pair-steps is converting transient responses of the form $t^k e^{-t}/k!$ with e^{-t} transient responses, so that polynomial coefficients do not “explode” as one engages in inter-cycle transition but also do not lose steady-state response information. Furthermore, this “swap” allows one to contain our analysis of transient response to two-cycle basis. What is meant by two-cycle basis is explained in the below definition.*

Definition 1.29 (Two-cycle basis). Recall that the CC2P1 proposition is defined over two cycles. This is because of finite polynomial degree limit set as n_d . By the polynomial degree principled, defined in the next sub-subsection, $n_d \ll n_s$. This means that if backward-steps did not exist and every step was a forward step, then by the end of the next cycle $c + 1$, the effects of transient response that is generated by the steady-state response of step s of cycle c would disappear completely. Thus, one can ignore time rescaling problem that complicates analysis, because at the end of cycle c , all transient responses must have started from transient response that newly appeared because of steady-state response or to satisfy $t = T_e$ zero initial condition of backward-steps at steps of cycle c .

This, of course does not mean that steady-state response would appear immediately - in fact, consider input $g(t) = 1$. From $t = 0$ to $t = 1$, $g(t)$ is bounded

above by ee^{-t} . Thus, the same $t = 0$ value reduction would occur.

But notice that by the definition of steady-state response, it always remains part of filter output. Steady-state response does not disappear, and appearance of disappearance is caused by transient responses steady-state response generate. This statement is true even when considering the change in the definition in this paper. (To recall: transient response was defined in basis of Fourier series/analysis distinction, rather than decaying-to-zero or not distinction.)

For now, this point would remain words without mathematical contents. But in the sub-subsection “Extracting the number of hamiltonian paths,” the statement would gain mathematical contents.

To summarize, the CC2P1 proposition states that pair-step methods, fed with transient response input, reduce input magnitude at $t = 0$ sufficiently after passing through n_s steps. The CC2P1 proposition takes advantage of the form of inverse laplace transform of $1/(s + 1)^{k+1}$ being $t^k e^{-t}/k!$.

1.2.10 The Core Concept 2 Propositions (CC2P): First Continuation

Consider signal $w(t) = Ae^{i(2.25)^{(n^2)}t}$, where $|V| = n$, and A is amplitude. $w(t)$ can be considered as the result of steady-state response output obtained, having passed through $2n^2$ cycles (with $k_c = 1.5$). Consider $w(t)$ as a new cycle input. Pass $w(t)$ into a pair-step and consider steady-state response $w_o(t)$. IIR filters do allow us to forget about the effects of finite polynomial degree in filtered polynomial coefficient errors for each filtering for a forward step. However, that only the finite-degree-limited polynomial form of $w_o(t)$ is available means significantly for a backward-step, as $t = T_e = 1$ zero initial condition is imposed. This was all mentioned in CH1J, with two concerns: maintaining the value from $t = 0$ to $t = T_e = 1$ of the polynomial form of high-frequency steady-state response really small, and preventing the explosion of k_i in CH1J. Both concerns are very important in the extraction of n_h .

Think of $(\omega t)^k/k!$ term of the polynomial form of each sinusoid. Substitute $\omega = (2.25)^{(n^2)}$, and one sees that for polynomial $k = n^{k_2}$, where $k_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ is some constant, $k!$ factor is insufficient to curb explosion in $(\omega t)^k$, if A is not small enough. Filtering does not change angular frequencies of steady-state response - it only changes amplitude.

This inspires the following principle:

Proposition 1.5 (Polynomial degree principle). *The highest polynomial degree imposed for every step and cycle’s input and output is much less than the number of steps in a cycle. In this paper, the number of steps is equal and fixed for every cycle. Imposed polynomial degree is also fixed for every polynomial form used. Thus, to use the terms defined, $n_d \ll n_s$.*

It is now easy to see by the Polynomial degree principle, more range of frequencies of steady-state response are compatible with minimal value of the polynomial form of steady-state response from $t = 0$ to $t = T_e = 1$.

One can consider $q_m = (n_d + 1)(n^n)(k_c)^{n_c n_d}/(2^{n_s/2})$ as the magnitude upper

bound at some time t (from $t = 0$ to $t = T_e = 1$) for the sum of steady-state responses of angular frequency $\omega \geq k_c$ at the end of some cycle c . The bound is inspired by the fact that there are $n_d + 1$ polynomial terms, n^n being the maximum steady-state response amplitude sum magnitude, $2^{n_s/2}$ coming from how steady-state response decays at angular frequency 1 (or -1) from the start of one cycle to the end, $(k_c)^{n_c n_d} / n_d!$ inspired by the term $(\omega t)^{n_d} / n_d!$ in the polynomial form of steady state response of angular frequency ω , with ω substituted with $(k_c)^{n_c}$ and $n_d!$ eliminated to 1. For our parameter values, which satisfy the “implemented” Polynomial degree principle, this remains very small.

By the same argument above, the upper magnitude bound of the additional effect to k_i that is caused by high-frequency steady-state response is less than or equal to $q_m e$: $\Delta|k_i| \leq q_m e$.

Proposition 1.6 (“Implemented” polynomial degree principle). $n^n / (2^{n_s/2}) \ll 1 / (k_c)^{n_c n_d}$. By \ll , it is implemented so that $RHS/LHS \approx n^{(n^{14})}$, as can be calculated using parameters.

1.2.11 CC2P: Second Continuation

Proposition 1.7 (Separate-analysis principle for steady-state $|\omega| \geq k_c$ (high-frequency steady-state CC2P2 Proposition)). (Single-step:) The upper magnitude bound of the generated transient response at $t = 0$ to steady-state input with single angular frequency $|\omega| \geq k_c$ is $1/n^{(n^{13})}$. Note that ω here refers to operative angular frequency at some given cycle c , not the angular frequency of the first cycle. Steady-state response of angular frequency $|\omega| \geq k_c$ at $t = 1$ itself is assumed to have the upper magnitude bound of $1/n^{(n^{13})}$.

Proposition 1.8 (Low-frequency steady-state CC2P2 Proposition: for steady-state input of $|\omega| < k_c$). (Single-step:) The upper magnitude bound of the generated forward-step or backward-step transient response at $t = 0$ to steady-state step input of single angular frequency $|\omega| < k_c$ is $n^n e$. This fact is too obvious to require a proof, as n^n is the maximum magnitude of total steady-state response, plus the extra factor e which incorporates the zero $t = T_e$ initial condition issue of backward-steps.

For multi-step, one invokes the CC2P1 proposition for analysis.

1.2.12 CC2P: Summing up

There are $n_s n_c$ steps that cause transient response. By the end of cycle n_c , if there is zero zero-frequency steady-state response, meaning $n_h = 0$, the whole transient response would collapse to upper bound magnitude of $n_s n_c / n^{(n^{13})}$ at $t = 0$. This does not mean that zero-frequency steady-state response is easily recoverable, for if $n_h > 0$, then it will cause its own transient responses, clouding over itself. This can be noticed by the fact that the logic behind CC2P1 proposition can be modified to apply to zero-frequency steady-state input.

1.2.13 Extracting the number of hamiltonian paths: n_h .

Thus, the extraction part. A system of equations will be used to extract n_h , the number of hamiltonian paths in a given undirected graph G .

It is clear from the discussion that the sum of transient responses at the end of the last cycle is:

$$tr(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_d+1} k_{i,r} \frac{t^{i-1}}{(i-1)!} e^{-t}$$

Steady-state responses are divided into zero-frequency steady-state response, which remains untouched in comparison to original $f(t)$, and steady-state responses at other angular frequencies.

I will later incorporate non-zero-angular-frequency (or simply “high-frequency” for now) steady-state responses into picture, but for now let us consider them to be zero. Consider input $k_{0,s} \in \mathbb{N}$ and analyze how a pair-step responds to the input.

$$st_0(t) = k_{0,s} (1 + (1 - e)^{-t} - te^{-t})$$

Inspired from this observation, let us dissect the polynomial form of the final output as follows:

$$o_f(t) = k_0 + k_1 e^{-t} + k_2 t e^{-t} + k_3 \frac{t^2}{2} e^{-t} + \dots \quad (1)$$

Because of the way the dissection is created, and since our final output is given as the polynomial, the visible four terms are sufficient to study k_0 , if we truncated other polynomial terms of degree greater than 2.

Let us perform system of equations analysis, or regression without “error” terms specified. (Error terms actually implicitly are coming from high-frequency steady-state responses.) Taylor expansion of e^{-t} provides us with the following system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} k_0 + k_1 &= c_0 \\ -k_1 + k_2 &= c_1 \\ \frac{k_1}{2} - k_2 + \frac{k_3}{2} &= c_2 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $o_{mf}(t) = c_0 + c_1 t + c_2 t^2$, which is the truncated form of the polynomial form of $o_f(t)$ restricted to degree 2. Thus, this modifies the final-step procedure as first changing the input polynomial form to be truncated to degree 2, then continues with the ordinary pair-step executions.

In this setting, it is quite easy to see that $k_2 = -k_0$ (recall $st_0(t)$), because transient response input to a pair-step cannot generate $k_2 t e^{-t}$ terms. Thus, the system of equations change to:

$$\begin{aligned} k_0 + k_1 &= c_0 \\ -k_1 - k_0 &= c_1 \\ \frac{k_1}{2} + k_0 + \frac{k_3}{2} &= c_2 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Eliminate the second tautological equation, and one gets:

$$\begin{aligned} k_0 + k_1 &= c_0 \\ k_0 + \frac{k_1}{2} + \frac{k_3}{2} &= c_2 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We now have three variables but only two equations. The way to proceed is by providing an additional relationship between k_1 and k_0 or k_3 . But notice that it is definite that $k_3 t^2 e^{-t}/2$ is not created by zero-frequency steady-state response input in the final modified pair-step. Thus, one can separate how zero-frequency steady-state input for the final modified pair-step creates an additional $k_{i,s0} e^{-t}$ term to satisfy the zero $t = T_e = 1$ initial condition with how “output” $k_3 t^2 e^{-t}/2$ must be balanced by an additional $k_{i,tr} e^{-t}$ term to satisfy the zero $t = T_e = 1$ initial condition. Additionally, finite degree truncation effects must be considered for both separated factors. Thus one gets this:

$$k_1 = -ek_0 - \frac{ek_3}{2} \quad (5)$$

Substitute the RHS of Equation 5 into the k_1 variables of Equation 4, and one gets the following solution:

$$k_0 = \left(\frac{2-e}{e} c_0 + 2c_2 \right) \frac{e}{2-e} = c_0 + \frac{2e}{2-e} c_2 \quad (6)$$

Thus, this identifies k_0 , but the assumption was that there was zero high-frequency steady-state response input to the final modified pair-step. Because linear system of equations is additively separable, consider separately how high-frequency steady-state response would be dissected into the “regression” form. High-frequency steady-state input results in high-frequency steady-state output and transient response caused by the high-frequency steady-state input. But notice that Equation 6 applies here too, as this is the equation use to calculate k_0 . That is, replace k_0, c_0, c_2 by $k_{0,sn}, c_{0,sn}, c_{2,sn}$, which come from the truncated form of the polynomial form of the output to the truncated form of the polynomial form of the sum of high-frequency steady-state inputs. Apply Equation 6, and it is clear that because $c_{0,sn}$ and $c_{2,sn}$ are much smaller than 1, k_0 cannot be close to some positive integer values.

Thus, this demonstrates our analysis without considering high-frequency steady-state input is sufficient for our purpose.

And as could have been anticipated, k_0 to the nearest integer is indeed n_h . And we are done.

1.3 Algorithmic approach conclusion

Thus, through clever multi-stage involving backward-steps, one arrives at the theoretically feasible method to compute n_h .

1.3.1 Drawing the result from limited additional information

It may seem at first that because there are exponentially many angular frequencies considered with equal angular frequency, there is no way one can efficiently draw out n_h .

However, we do not need accurate information of amplitudes of $f(t)$ at angular frequencies other than zero. Furthermore, we know where maximum angular

frequency with non-zero amplitude possibly lies, and where minimum non-zero angular frequency with non-zero amplitude lies. We also know that maximum sum of amplitudes and each amplitude can only be of magnitude n^n at maximum.

Just like compressed sensing uses limited additional information - for example assumption of sparsity - to draw out results, limited information does allow us to get the desired result n_h .

1.4 Pseudocode for grid

Algorithm 1: Grid procedure for calculating $f(t)$

Input: Graph $G = (V, E)$, $|V| = n$, t , precision = n^{205} binary digits
Output: $f(t)$
 Let *depth* be d , *vertex* be v , *wire* be w ;
 Array w is always in n^{205} -fixed-point-binary-digit-precision;
 e^{ivt} stands for "calculate e^{ivt} as subroutine under given precision, here n^{205} ;
 $V[l] == n^l$, where l goes from 1 to n ;
 $t \leftarrow t/n^{n+1}$;
 $a \leftarrow \sum_{v \in V} v$;
 $d \leftarrow 1$;
repeat
 repeat
 $j \leftarrow 1$;
 repeat
 if $(V[j], V[l]) \in E$ **then**
 $w[V[l]][d] \leftarrow w[V[l]][d] + w[V[j]][d - 1]$;
 $j \leftarrow j + 1$;
 until $j > n$;
 $w[V[l]][d] \leftarrow w[V[l]][d] * e^{iV[l]t}$;
 $l \leftarrow l + 1$;
until $l > n$;
 $f(t) \leftarrow (\sum_v w[v][n]) * e^{-iat}$;
 $d \leftarrow d + 1$;
until $d > n$;

2 Introduction: analog approach

Before going on, in practice and in theory there is no good frequency multiplier except for a signal of single frequency sinusoid. Thus, the use of frequency multiplier is a conceptual one. One may replace frequency multipliers for time stretchers, as will be seen in the real deviations section. However, even those are not complete solutions.

In general, analog methods do suffer from several problems, and this paper only will address some of these problems.

Graph $G = (V, E)$ is defined with a set V of vertices along with a set E of undirected edges connecting vertices. We will denote a walk by the following formalism: $a - b - c$ where a, b, c are vertices and $-$ represents edges. Generally, a, b, c will be represented with positive integers.

$n = n_v$ is the cardinality of V , n_e is the cardinality of E . A n -walk is defined to be a walk with n vertices. This is the only class of walks we will have interests in this paper.

We will re-interpret Hamiltonian path existence problem using a $n \times n$ grid and others.

Definition 2.1. The grid contains n vertical columns. Each column contains n vertices, and the vertices in the same column are not connected by wires.

Definition 2.2. All vertices are numbered with positive integers greater than 1.

Definition 2.3. Each wire transmits a voltage signal $f(t)$. For our consideration, location does not matter, so all of our signals are solely function of time. These signals can be transformed into the Fourier transform frequency representation.

Definition 2.4. As part of lumped circuit assumption, we will assume that wires have no time delay. (ideal wire)

Definition 2.5. For each vertex x at column $a > 1$, if vertex y satisfies $(x, y) \in E$ or $(y, x) \in E$, vertex y frequency multiplier (or oscillator, in case of $a - 1 = 1$) at column $a - 1$ is connected by a wire to the sum operator at vertex x /column a .

Definition 2.6. As we allow self-loops, while $(x, x) \notin E$, vertex x at column $a - 1$ is connected by a wire to the sum operator at vertex x /column a .

Definition 2.7. Each vertex x at column 1, the first column, only has an ideal oscillator, transmitting e^{ixt} to wires connected to the second column.

Definition 2.8. A sum operator just sums up the signals transmitted by wires.

Definition 2.9. Each sum operator at vertex x /column a is connected to a frequency multiplier at the same vertex/column, with frequency multiplication factor of x . Frequency multiplier transforms $e^{iw_1t} + e^{iw_2t} + \dots$ into $e^{ixw_1t} + e^{ixw_2t} + \dots$.

Definition 2.10. At column n , after signals pass through frequency multipliers connected to sum operators, any wire incident from column n is connected to a final sum operator, which produces the final signal $y(t)$.

Thus it is clear that we need $n(n - 1) + 1$ sum operators (or adders, equivalently) and $n(n - 1)$ frequency multipliers for the grid above. The number of wires are dependent on E , but the maximum number of wires required is $n^2(n - 1) + n(n - 1) + n$, where the last n comes the wires that connect column n to the last sum operator, and $n(n - 1)$ comes from the wires that connect a single sum operator to a single frequency multipliers.

The output of the circuit grid defined above is $y(t)$, as mentioned above. Let $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$.

Definition 2.11. The final sum operator, which produces the signal $y(t)$ is connected to the ideal mixer M , which outputs the product of $y(t)$ with e^{-iut} where $u = v_1 v_2 v_3 \dots v_n$. In Fourier transform, this is equivalent to converting $Y(\omega)$ with $Y(\omega + u)$, where $Y(\omega)$ is Fourier transform of $y(t)$. Let the output of M be $k(t)$.

From the above, it is clear that Ce^{iut} inside $y(t)$ represents hamiltonian paths, with C representing the number of hamiltonian paths. In $k(t)$, frequency 0 represents hamiltonian paths, as all frequencies are shifted left by u .

Because our chosen low-pass filter will be first-order, we will also pass $k(t)$ to a frequency multiplier that multiplies frequencies by v_n^{4n} where v_n is the greatest-numbered vertex, to ensure that the frequencies other than zero frequency parts of $k(t)$ will be sufficiently high frequencies. (Multiplying zero by v_n^{4n} is zero) For higher-order filters, like third-order filter, this additional frequency-multiplying process will not be needed. We will call the resulting signal $j(t)$.

As a side note, instead of having input tape in Turing machine, we have to re-wire $n \times n$ grid every time graph input changes. This $n \times n$ grid serves as an input to the system involving a low-pass filter.

2.1 Restriction on vertex indices

However, a close look will reveal that it is required for us to restrict on vertex indices. Hamiltonian u may be decomposed into a product of n numbers that are in V , and yet all these numbers may not be distinct, required for u to represent hamiltonian paths. One simple way to address this problem is by required all vertex indices to be prime numbers. For simplification, assume that $v_1 = 2$ and $v_n = p_n$ where p_k represents k th prime number with $p_1 = 2$. It is known that $p_n < n(\ln n + \ln \ln n)$, shown in Rosser (1941). Thus we only need to check non-exponential number of natural numbers to obtain n prime numbers to be used as indices for vertices.

3 Analog approach: low-pass filter

Now that we defined the final output $k(t)$, the question is how we process $k(t)$ to give us some information about the number of hamiltonian paths, or C . To do this, we pass it to a low-pass filter. But we cannot simply assume an ideal low-pass filter, represented by $H(\omega) = \text{rect}(\omega)$, where $\text{rect}(\omega) = 1$ for $-0.5 < \omega < 0.5$ and $\text{rect}(\omega) = 0$ otherwise, because there is no such an ideal filter even to the approximate level.

Thus we will choose a simple physical first-order RC low-pass filter.

By Kirchhoff's Voltage Law, the low-pass filter in figure 1 has the ODE of:

$$\frac{dV_{out}}{dt} + \frac{V_{out}}{\tau} = \frac{V_{in}}{\tau}$$

where $\tau = RC$. As this ODE is linear, to figure out the behavior of this low-pass filter, we first consider $V_{in} = De^{i\omega t}$, where ω is some arbitrary frequency.

Using initial capacitor voltage condition at the starting time $t = 0$ as $V_{out:t=0} = 0$,

$$V_{out} = \frac{D}{1 + i\omega\tau} \left[e^{i\omega t} - e^{-t/\tau} \right]$$

Assume that $v_n > n + 1$. Also for calculation convenience, assume that $\tau = RC = 1$. In steady state $t = \infty$, because every ω of $j(t)$ except zero is greater than/equal to v_n^{4n} , and the total number of walks in G with n total vertices can only have maximum of n^n n -walks, $j(\infty)$'s value mostly comes from the hamiltonian/zero-frequency part. Other frequency parts only contribute less than $1/n^{3n}$ in magnitude. Thus at time ∞ , the number of hamiltonian paths is discovered from the magnitude of $j(\infty)$, $|j(\infty)|$. However, calculations must be done on finite time, so the steady-state case only forms a background for our discussions, not the main part.

Note that in ordinary signal processing, keeping phase errors small is very important, but for the use of signal processing tools to analyze hamiltonian paths, phase errors are not of any concern.

3.1 Time Complexity of the Circuit

But moving to the finite time is simple: figure out the time when $e^{-t/\tau}$ decays to $1/n^{4n}$. Then high frequency parts only contribute a negligible value to $j(t)$. Now since $\tau = 1$ assumption is made, set equality $e^{-t_c} = 1/n^{4n}$. Taking the natural log to each side, $t_c = 4n \ln n < 4n^2$. Thus, the critical time, which is when the exponential decaying factor decays to $1/n^{4n}$, increases approximately linearly as the size of input n increases.

After this critical value, the value of $|j(t)|$ can simply be sampled by a digital computer to get the number of hamiltonian paths. Note that theoretically only one sample is required to measure the number of hamiltonian paths. This is because frequency 0 does not have any oscillating part, and thus will have constant offset relative to 0.

Thus time complexity of the circuit to solve the number of hamiltonian paths is $O(n \log n)$, which is smaller than $O(n^2)$.

3.2 Size and Time Complexity

The above demonstrates that the number of needed components and needed time does not grow exponentially as the input graph size increase. All the values used in the circuit does not require exponentially-growing number of digits in a digital computer, as the graph size increases.

4 Analog approach: alternative circuit formation

In this section, I will describe another way of building a circuit that represents a graph. This method eliminates the use of frequency multipliers, and replaces them with ordinary multipliers.

Start with the original idea that each vertex x at column 1 transmits e^{ixt} to the wires x at column 1 are connected to. All wires going to vertex y at column $i > 1$ are first met with a sum operator, but now followed by an ordinary multiplier of $sum \times e^{iyt}$. The method will be explained in detail below.

Definition 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 will be used as before. Section 1.1 changes to the following:

Definition 4.1 (The set V of vertex numbers). The set V is defined as $V = \{n, n^2, \dots, n^n\}$, which represents the set of vertex numbers (or equivalently vertex indices), with $|V| = n$, the number of vertices.

Definition 4.2 (n -walk). A n -walk $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)$ with $\xi_i \in V$ and $(\xi_i, \xi_{i+1}) \in E$ or $\xi_i = \xi_{i+1}$, a list, is a walk that has n vertices. A n -walk may contain self-loops or loops. One may consider a n -walk as a list of n vertex numbers that may contain one vertex number more than once.

Definition 4.3 (Permutation of a list). A permutation of a list is a re-ordering of list elements of ξ .

Definition 4.4 (Uniqueness of n -walk frequency). Let a n -walk ξ be $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)$, which is a list. Let $\omega = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$. ω is a unique n -walk frequency of G if it can only be the sum of some permutations of one list.

Lemma 4.1. For $V = \{n, n^2, \dots, n^n\}$, there cannot exist a n -walk frequency such that it is not unique.

Proof. The proof is simply the basis representation theorem, except that the case where n vertex numbers that are same are in the list. In such a case, $\omega = n \cdot n^i$. But then $\omega = n^{i+1} = 1 \cdot n^{i+1}$, and $\xi = (n^{i+1})$ is the only possible alternative representation of ω . But the alternative list only has one vertex. Thus, there cannot exist a n -walk frequency that is not unique. \square

Definition 1.5 needs to change as follows:

Definition 4.5. For each vertex x at column $a > 2$, if vertex y satisfies $(x, y) \in E$ or $(y, x) \in E$, vertex y mixer at column $a - 1$, which multiplies e^{iyt} to a signal it receives, is connected by a wire to the sum operator at vertex x /column a . In case of each vertex x at column $a = 2$, if vertex y satisfies $(x, y) \in E$ or $(y, x) \in E$, vertex y oscillator (output of e^{iyt}) at column 1 is connected by a wire to the sum operator at vertex x /column 2.

Definition 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8 are kept. Definition 1.9 and 1.10 change to the following:

Definition 4.1. Each sum operator at vertex x /column $a \geq 2$ is connected to a mixer at the same column and the same vertex, which shifts frequency by x . A mixer, with shift factor of x , transforms $e^{iw_1t} + e^{iw_2t} + \dots$ into $e^{i(w_1+x)t} + e^{i(w_2+x)t} + \dots$, because it multiplies e^{ixt} to the signal it receives.

Definition 4.2. At column n , after signals pass through mixers connected to sum operators, any wire incident from column n is connected to a final sum operator instead, which produces the final signal $y(t)$.

Complexity remains the same: one needs $n(n-1) + 1$ sum operators and $n(n-1)$ mixers/multipliers. (multipliers here are not frequency multipliers, but ordinary signal multipliers) The number of wires required remains the same. Definition 1.11 changes to the following:

Definition 4.3. The final sum operator, which produces the signal $y(t)$ is connected to the ideal mixer M , which outputs the product of $y(t)$ with e^{-iut} where $u = v_1 + v_2 + v_3 + \dots + v_n$, with $v_i \in V$. In Fourier transform, this is equivalent to converting $Y(\omega)$ with $Y(\omega + u)$, where $Y(\omega)$ is Fourier transform of $y(t)$. Let the output of M be $k(t)$.

Now $k(t)$ has zero frequency as its hamiltonian path frequency, as in the original formulation.

One may choose to add frequency multiplier after the final mixer M so that a simple first-order low-pass filter can be used. However, one may instead choose to increase the difference between each vertex number, such as $V = \{n, n^n, n^{2n}, \dots, n^{n^2}\}$. This way, one does not have to add an extra frequency multiplier, which is likely to diverge from its ideal behavior, as I will discuss.

5 Analog approach: real deviations: perils of high frequency and frequency multipliers

While the system described above is a physical system, not just a logical system, it is nevertheless still an ideal system. Oscillators are not perfect oscillators, resistors and capacitors are not ideal ones, wires have impedance. Thermal effects may change system properties.

But the most fundamental problem is the fact that the systems above are based on lumped-circuit analysis. Lumped circuit analysis works for low frequencies, because the length of wires can be made short enough to satisfy lumped-circuit assumptions. But one cannot shorten wires forever, and this makes lumped-circuit analysis to break for high frequencies. No longer discussion of lumped capacitors, resistors and inductors becomes a simple one.

At first, this seems to necessitate the need to discuss distributed circuits and transmission lines analysis. However, there may be a way that allows us to think in terms of lumped circuit analysis, even though the idea is not perfect yet.

The core idea behind the below method is time-stretching.

Step 1 Assume $V = \{n, n^2, \dots, n^n\}$ (alternative circuit formation), and the resulting $k(t)$. At Step 1, one first start with a low-pass filter of transfer function of $H(s) = 1/(s + 1/2)$. $H(s)$ has a cut-off frequency of $1/2$. And then one applies filter n^2 times, with a new filter operation starting after the previous filter operated for n^2 seconds. This results in time complexity of $O(n^4)$ seconds. Let the output be $k_1(t)$.

Note 1-2 Now assume hypothetically that the operating range of $H(s)$ is from 0 to $|\omega| = 2$, and for the frequencies inside the range, low-pass filtering works properly, but for other frequencies, it may be possible that some signals are not filtered. But these signals are not amplified.

Step 2 After Step 1, time-stretch the output $k_1(t)$ by factor of 2. That is the new time t' satisfies $t' = t/2$ for original t . Thus, angular frequency of 4 now becomes 2, and angular frequency of 2 now becomes 1. Angular frequency of 0 remains to be 0. The output is $k'_1(t)$. Repeat Step 1, but instead with input of $k'_1(t)$. The output is $k_2(t)$. Repeat the same process, which is time-stretching $k_i(t)$ by factor of 2, and low-pass filtering of $k'_i(t)$ and getting the output $k_{i+1}(t)$.

One continues the process until reaching $i = \log_2 n + 1$: by then, all angular frequencies are dealt with low-pass filtering. This allows the length of wires to be invariant even as n increases, and allows us to continue using lumped-circuit analysis. The above circuit process takes $O(n^5)$ seconds.

The question then now shifts to how time-stretching is done. One of the recent technology developed is photonic time-stretching, which is used for time-stretch analog-to-digital converters. The details of photonic time-stretching are wide-ranging, and thus I will not discuss these details. However, the only three requirements for practical time-stretching imposed by the paper's method are: 1. DC signal inside $k(t)$ is kept as close as possible, 2. frequencies close to the range from $\omega = -1$ to $\omega = 1$ are kept mostly zero when $V = \{n, n^2, \dots, n^n\}$, 3. some deviations from ideal filtering behavior for $|\omega| > 1$ are fine only if they do not significantly change amplitude behaviors. [Bhushan 1998], as one of first examples of applying photonic time-stretching, can be referenced for more information.

The above implicitly assumed optical-electrical signal converter and vice versa, which may be ideal or non-ideal. This part would not be discussed.

If errors introduced by real deviations affect the zero-frequency part below a certain threshold, they may safely be ignored. For example, multiplying by e^{-iut} may not shift frequency u to 0 in real-time systems. Usually, however, frequencies do spread out, and often 0 frequency part is not emptied.

While there are many non-ideal issues that affect oscillators (and possibly for mixers and frequency multipliers too), if we assume time-decaying realistic oscillators, Q-factor may be used to gauge this performance part. Assume that this decaying time is associated with our measurement time also - which means that measurement time is just enough to allow us computation before signals

almost disappear completely. More theoretically, Gabor limit is there:

$$\sigma_t \sigma_f \geq \frac{1}{4\pi}$$

While the above formula only gives the bound, assume that every system has equal $\sigma_t \sigma_f$. If our measurement time increases, so must decaying times. Representing this as increase in σ_t , σ_f will decrease. In case of an oscillator, this is equal to becoming close to an ideal oscillator. Thus increasing necessary decaying time will help the performance of oscillators. As thus, the size of input is not an extra constraint for Q factor problems of real-time systems. Many problems, whether small or not, require more details and are left out here. Future papers will address these issues

6 References

Baumgardner, J. et al. (2009). ‘Solving a Hamiltonian Path Problem with a bacterial computer’, *Journal of Biological Engineering*, 3(11): 109–124.

Bhushan, A.S. et al. (1998). ‘Time-stretched analogue-to-digital conversion’, *Electronic Letters*, 34(9): 839–841.

Haist, T. et al. (2007). ‘An Optical Solution For The Traveling Salesman Problem’. *Optics Express*, 15(16): 10473–10482.

Powell, M.J.D., *Approximation theory and methods*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1981, p. 56.

Rosser, J. (1941) ‘Explicit bounds for some functions of prime numbers’, *Amer. J. Math.* 63, 211-232. MR 2:150e

Sartakhti, J. et al. (2013). ‘A new light-based solution to the Hamiltonian path problem’. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 29(2): 520-527.

This figure "lowpass.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1504.05429v6>