

Performance Analysis of the Solving Algorithm for the Kuramoto Model with Rank One Coupling

Owen Coss*

June 2, 2020

Abstract

This paper is a follow up to a previous work that presented an algorithm to efficiently find all of the equilibria of the Kuramoto model with nonuniform coupling described by a rank one matrix. The algorithm was shown experimentally to be more efficient than previously used methods, but its performance was not fully characterized. This paper analyzes the effectiveness of the “pruning” method used to skip cases with no solutions. The approach utilized is to construct a weighted graph where every path through the graph corresponds to the algorithm’s performance on an input. The maximum weight path then corresponds to the worst case performance of the algorithm. This paper shows that even in the worst case, the pruning method employed is very effective at skipping cases with no solutions.

This paper is a follow up to a previous work that presented a solving algorithm for the Kuramoto model [2] with rank one coupling [1]. In that paper, the algorithm was experimentally shown to be more efficient than other solving methods, but was not fully characterized. This paper examines the “pruning” method that was used to skip cases and shows that it efficiently skips cases without solutions. The structure of this paper is as follows. The introduction has a brief summary of the two algorithms from [1]. Section one explains how the algorithms can be converted into a weighted graph. Sections two and three then examine the maximum weight paths for the two algorithms and show the worst case performances are $n|S|$ and $|S|$ extraneous cases checked where n is the number of oscillators and S is the set of cases with solutions.

The essence of the algorithms from [1] involve the idea of pruning out cases that have no solutions. To do so, a pruning function is used.

Definition 0.1 *The **pruning function** $P_\ell : \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ takes the binary representation of m , zeroes out everything to the right of the ℓ^{th} zero from the right (left padding with zeros as needed), and then subtracts one. If that number is negative, then it returns 0, otherwise it returns that number.*

Example 0.2 *Note that $23 = 10111_2$. Then*

$$P_1(23) = 01111_2 = 15$$

$$P_2(23) = 0$$

The cases to be checked can be numbered from 0 to $2^n - 1$. The pruning algorithm starts with case $2^n - 1$ and works its way down. If a solution for a case is found, then the next case is checked. However, if the case has no solutions, then a number of subsequent cases are also known

*Department of Mathematics, North Carolina State University (otcoss@gmail.com)

to have no solutions and can be pruned. In the case of the rank one coupled Kuramoto model, P_1 can always be employed, but in special circumstances, P_2 can be used instead to more aggressively prune out extraneous cases. A simplified representation of this algorithm is as follows.

Algorithm 0.3 (Prune ℓ)

1. $j \leftarrow 2^n - 1$
2. While $j > 0$ do
 - (a) If case j has a solution, $j \leftarrow j - 1$
 - (b) Else, $j \leftarrow P_\ell(j)$

Remark 0.4 Note that the case associated with 0 never has a solution, so it can always be skipped.

1 Graph Setup

This section shows how Algorithm 0.3 can be converted into a weighted graph. The first step is to adjust the algorithm to count how many times it checked a case and how many times it found a case with a solution. Throughout the rest of the paper, S will be the set of cases that have solutions. We will only consider situations that have at least one solution, so $S \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 1.1 The *efficiency algorithm* E_ℓ is the algorithm that takes as its input a nonempty subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ for some given integers $n \geq 2$ and $\ell > 0$ and outputs a pair of integers (R, C) according to the following steps:

In: $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ s.t. $S \neq \emptyset$

Out: (R, C)

1. $j \leftarrow 2^n - 1, R \leftarrow 0, C \leftarrow 0$
2. While $j > 0$ do
 - (a) $C \leftarrow C + 1$
 - (b) If $j \in S$ then
 - i. $R \leftarrow R + 1$
 - ii. $j \leftarrow j - 1$
 - (c) Else
 - i. $j \leftarrow P_\ell(j)$

For a given ℓ and n , an input $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$, $S \neq \emptyset$ is called **valid** if $R = |S|$ where (R, C) is the output of $E_\ell(S)$. Let S_ℓ be the set of all valid inputs.

The outputs of the efficiency algorithm E_ℓ on a valid input S can be interpreted as

- R = the number of cases checked that are required to be checked
- C = the total number of cases that are checked

Comparing the sizes of R and C quantifies the efficiency of the pruning algorithm P_ℓ since the closer C is to R , the less work was wasted checking unnecessary cases. We restrict the input to valid sets since we will assume that the algorithm we are abstracting is correct, i.e., it will not skip over any case that does have a solution. The following Lemma presents an immediate fact about valid inputs.

Lemma 1.2 $2^n - 1 \in S$ for any $S \in S_\ell$.

Proof: Note that the n digit binary representation of $2^n - 1$ is all ones. Therefore $P_\ell(2^n - 1) = 0$ for any $\ell > 0$. Suppose that $2^n - 1 \notin S$ for some $S \in S_\ell$. Then $E_\ell(S) = (0, 1)$, but $|S| > 0$ by definition of S_ℓ . Since this is a contradiction, we must have $2^n - 1 \in S$. \square

In order to consider the algorithmic complexity, we will build a graph that represents all the possible outputs of E_ℓ as all the possible paths through this graph. Building all possible (R, C) pairs produced by $E_\ell(S_\ell)$ can be done recursively by working backwards. Let E_ℓ^m be the same as E_ℓ except that the algorithm starts “in the middle” by initializing j to m in Step 1 of Definition 1.1. For a given $S \in S_\ell$, at any case $m < 2^n - 1$, there are two options:

- $m \in S$, in which case we get $E_\ell^m(S) = (\alpha + 1, \beta + 1)$ where (α, β) is the result of $E_\ell^{m-1}(S)$.
- $m \notin S$, in which case we get $E_\ell^m(S) = (\alpha, \beta + 1)$ where (α, β) is the result of $E_\ell^{P_\ell(m)}(S)$.

For $m = 2^n - 1$, we have only the first option by Lemma 1.2.

To determine the asymptotic complexity, we want to show that $\max_{(R,C) \in E_\ell(S_\ell)} \frac{C}{R} = f(n)$. To do so, we can rewrite any (R, C) pair as $(\alpha, f(n) \cdot \alpha + p)$ where p is the “par number” of the pair. If $p \leq 0$ for every pair, then the ratio is at most $f(n)$, and if $p = 0$ for some pair, then the maximum is exactly $f(n)$. Consider the two cases above again.

- $m \in S$, so we have $E_\ell^m(S) = (\alpha + 1, f(n) \cdot (\alpha + 1) + (p - f(n) + 1))$ where $(\alpha, f(n) \cdot \alpha + p)$ is the result of $E_\ell^{m-1}(S)$. Therefore the new par number is lower by $f(n) - 1$.
- $m \notin S$, so we get that $E_\ell^m(S) = (\alpha, f(n) \cdot \alpha + (p + 1))$ where $(\alpha, f(n) \cdot \alpha + p)$ is the result of $E_\ell^{P_\ell(m)}(S)$. Therefore the new par number is one higher.

To represent this graphically, we can connect the node $(m-1)$ to (m) with an edge having weight $-f(n) + 1$ for $m \leq 2^n - 1$, and we can connect the node $(P_\ell(m))$ to (m) with an edge having weight $+1$ for $m < 2^n - 1$. Showing that $\max_{(R,C) \in E_\ell(S_\ell)} \frac{C}{R} = f(n)$ can now be done by showing that the maximum weight path through this graph is zero.

Before beginning to examine the efficiency of P_1 and P_2 , several lemmas regarding the binary representation of sign cases are required.

Lemma 1.3 The $k \geq 1$ digit binary representation of $2^{k-1} \leq m < 2^k$ has a leading one.

Proof: 2^{k-1} has the binary representation of a one followed by $k - 1$ zeros. $2^k - 1$ has the binary representation of k ones. Thus every number in between must start with a one and have some combination of $k - 1$ ones and zeros. \square

Lemma 1.4 *The $k \geq 2$ digit binary representation of $2^{k-1} \leq m \leq 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 1$ starts with “10.”*

Proof: 2^{k-1} has the binary representation of a one followed by $k - 1$ zeros. $2^k - 2^{k-2} - 1$ has the binary representation of a “10” followed by $k - 2$ ones. Thus every number in between starts with “10” and has some combination of $k - 2$ ones and zeros. \square

Lemma 1.5 *The $k \geq 3$ digit binary representation of $2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-3} \leq m \leq 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 1$ starts with “101.”*

Proof: $2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-3}$ has a binary representation that starts with “101” followed by $k - 3$ zeros. $2^k - 2^{k-2} - 1$ has a binary representation that starts with “101” followed by $k - 3$ ones. Thus every number in between starts with “101” and has some combination of $k - 3$ ones and zeros. \square

Lemma 1.6 *The $k \geq 3$ digit binary representation of $2^{k-1} \leq m \leq 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-3} - 1$ starts with “100.”*

Proof: 2^{k-1} has a binary representation of a one followed by $k - 1$ zeros. $2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-3} - 1$ has a binary representation that starts with “100” and is followed by $k - 3$ ones. Thus every number in between starts with “100” and has some combination of $k - 3$ ones and zeros. \square

Example 1.7 *Let $k = 4$.*

- *Lemma 1.3: Every $8 \leq m < 16$ starts with a leading one*

$$8 = 1000_2, 9 = 1001_2, 10 = 1010_2, \dots, 15 = 1111_2$$

- *Lemma 1.4: Every $8 \leq m \leq 11$ starts with “10.”*

$$8 = 1000_2, 9 = 1001_2, 10 = 1010_2, 11 = 1011_2$$

- *Lemma 1.5: Every $10 \leq m \leq 11$ starts with “101.”*

$$10 = 1010_2, 11 = 1011_2$$


- *Lemma 1.6: Every $8 \leq m \leq 9$ starts with “100.”*

$$8 = 1000_2, 9 = 1001_2$$

2 Prune 1

We will show that $\max_{(R,C) \in E_1(S_1)} \frac{C}{R} = n + 1$.

Example 2.1 *Let $n = 3$. Then the graph representing E_1 is*




where blue lines have weight -3 and red lines have weight $+1$. For $S = \{6, 7\} \in S_1$, $E_1(S)$ would start with $j = 7$, go to 6, go to 5, skip to 3, then skip to 0, returning $(2, 4) = (2, 4 \cdot 2 - 4)$, so this particular example finishes four under par for the max ratio C/R of 4. We can convert the steps of E_1 on S into a path in the graph above by reversing the order of the j values. Traveling from (0) to (3) on the red edge then to (5) on the red edge, then to (6) on the blue edge, then to (7) on the blue edge gives a total weight of $1 + 1 + -3 + -3 = -4$, the par number for S .

It is useful to break the full graph for E_1 into several parts. Consider the weighted directed graph G_k for $k \geq 2$ with nodes (0) , $(2^{k-1} - 1)$, (2^{k-1}) , \dots , $(2^k - 1)$ with edges based on the following rules.


- An edge with weight $-n$ goes from (m) to $(m + 1)$ for $2^{k-1} - 1 \leq m < 2^k - 1$.
- An edge with weight $+1$ goes from $(P_1(m))$ to (m) for $2^{k-1} - 1 \leq m < 2^k - 1$.

Note that (0) will have no incoming edges, $(2^{k-1} - 1)$ will have one incoming edge of weight $+1$, (2^{k-1}) , \dots , $(2^k - 2)$ will each have two incoming edges, one of weight $-n$ and one of weight $+1$, and $(2^k - 1)$ will have one incoming edge of weight $-n$. There are no other edges. Also note that edges go from a smaller number to a larger. Joining G_2 , G_3 , \dots , G_n together and examining the maximum weight path gives the worst case performance for E_1 .

Example 2.2 G_2 , G_3 , and G_4 . Blue edges have weight $-n$ and red edges have weight $+1$. The graph for E_1 when $n = 4$ is $G_2 \cup G_3 \cup G_4$.



Example 2.3 G_5 . Blue edges have weight $-n$ and red edges have weight $+1$.




Definition 2.4 Let

$$\begin{aligned} I_t^k &= 2^k - 1 & II_t^k &= 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2 \\ I_b^k &= 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 1 & II_b^k &= 2^{k-1} - 1 \end{aligned}$$

Then G_k for $k \geq 3$ can be split into two “boxes” as follows:

- B_1 : The induced subgraph of G_k by taking $(0), (I_b^k), \dots, (I_t^k)$.
- B_2 : The induced subgraph of G_k by taking $(0), (II_b^k), \dots, (II_t^k)$.

Example 2.5 Boxes of G_4 . Blue edges have weight $-n$ and red edges have weight $+1$. Dashed edges go between boxes.



Recursive Structure G_{k+1} can be constructed from G_k using the following propositions.

Proposition 2.6 B_1 of G_{k+1} for $k \geq 2$ is the same as G_k with 2^k added to every nonzero node except that (I_b^{k+1}) has a blue edge from (II_t^{k+1}) and a red edge from (II_b^{k+1}) instead of (0) .

Proof:

- Nodes:

It is sufficient to show that the top and bottom nodes of G_k with 2^k added match the top and bottom nodes of B_1 of G_{k+1} since all the nodes in between are sequential.

$$II_b^k + 2^k = (2^{k-1} - 1) + 2^k \qquad I_t^k + 2^k = (2^k - 1) + 2^k$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 2^{k+1} - (2^{k+1} - 2^k - 2^{k-1}) - 1 &&= 2^{k+1} - 1 \\
&= 2^{k+1} - 2^{k-1} - 1 &&= I_t^{k+1} \\
&= I_b^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

- Blue Edges:


$(m + 2^{k-1})$ and $((m + 1) + 2^{k-1})$ are still adjacent. Also (I_b^{k+1}) and (II_t^{k+1}) are adjacent.

- Red Edges:

Note that for $2^{k-1} \leq m < I_t^k$ the k digit binary representation of m starts with a one by Lemma 1.3 and has at least one zero since I_t^k consists of k ones. Adding 2^k to m left-appends a one to the binary representation. Therefore $P_1(m + 2^k) = P_1(m) + 2^k$ since the left-most one will be unaffected by P_1 . Furthermore, I_b^{k+1} has the binary representation of “10” followed by $k - 1$ ones. Therefore $P_1(I_b^{k+1}) = II_b^{k+1}$.

□

Example 2.7 B_1 of G_4 and G_3 .



Proposition 2.8 B_2 of G_{k+1} for $k \geq 2$ is the same as $G_k \setminus (I_t^k)$ with 2^{k-1} added to every nonzero node.

Proof:

- Nodes:

It is sufficient to show that the top and bottom nodes of $G_k \setminus (I_t^k)$ with 2^{k-1} added match the top and bottom nodes of Box II of G_{k+1} since all the nodes in between are sequential.

$$\begin{aligned}
II_b^k + 2^{k-1} &= (2^{k-1} - 1) + 2^{k-1} && (I_t^k - 1) + 2^{k-1} = (2^k - 2) + 2^{k-1} \\
&= 2^k - 1 && = 2^{k+1} - (2^{k+1} - 2^k - 2^{k-1}) - 2 \\
&= II_b^{k+1} && = 2^{k+1} - 2^{k-1} - 2 \\
&&& = II_t^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

- Blue Edges:

$(m + 2^{k-1})$ and $((m + 1) + 2^{k-1})$ are still adjacent.

- Red Edges:

The k digit binary representation of $II_b^k < m < I_t^k$ has a leading one by Lemma 1.3 and at least one zero since I_t^k is k ones. Consider two cases.

- $P_1(m)$ has a leading one in its k digit binary representation:


Then $P_1(m + 2^{k-1}) = P_1(m) + 2^{k-1}$.

- $P_1(m)$ has a leading zero in its k digit binary representation:

Then m must have the form “10...01...1” and $P_1(m) = II_b^k$. Therefore, $m + 2^{k-1}$ has the form “100...01...1” and $P_1(m + 2^{k-1}) = II_b^{k+1} = II_b^k + 2^{k-1}$.

□

Example 2.9 B_2 of G_4 and G_3 .



We can make some additional observations about the structure of G_k .

Proposition 2.10 *The only edge from (0) goes to (II_b^k) .*

Proof: (Proof by induction)

- Base Cases: Observe that this is true for G_2, G_3 , and G_4 in Example 2.2.
- Suppose for induction that the claim holds for G_N where $N \geq 4$ and consider G_{N+1} . By Proposition 2.6, B_1 of G_{N+1} is a copy of G_N except that the only edge from (0) has been changed. By Proposition 2.8, B_2 of G_{N+1} is a copy of $G_N \setminus (I_t^k)$, so it will have only one edge from (0) which goes to (II_b^{N+1}) .

□

Proposition 2.11 *There are only two edges from B_2 to B_1 of G_k , namely a blue edge from $\textcircled{II_t^k}$ to $\textcircled{I_b^k}$ and a red edge from $\textcircled{II_b^k}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^k}$.*

Proof: Immediate from Proposition 2.6. \square

Maximum Weight Path Now that the structure of the graph has been examined we will use the recursive structure to examine the maximum weight path.

Theorem 2.12 *The maximum weight path from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^k}$ in G_k for $k \geq 2$ is zero when $n = k$.*

Proof: (Proof by induction)

- Base Cases: The maximum weight path in G_2, G_3 , and G_4 is zero as can be seen Example 2.2 with $n = k$.
- Suppose for induction that G_N has a maximum weight path of zero and consider G_{N+1} . By Proposition 2.10, all paths from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^{N+1}}$ must use the red edge from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{II_b^{N+1}}$. There are two cases to consider by Proposition 2.11.

- A path from $\textcircled{II_b^{N+1}}$ to $\textcircled{II_t^{N+1}}$ inside B_2 and then the blue edge from $\textcircled{II_t^{N+1}}$ to $\textcircled{I_b^{N+1}}$ is taken.

Note that this path is a copy of a path in G_N except that blue edges have a weight that is one less, so the maximum weight is at most zero. Furthermore, a path from $\textcircled{I_b^{N+1}}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^{N+1}}$ has a maximum weight of at most zero since it is a copy of a path in G_N by Proposition 2.6 except with a “cheaper” replacement for the edge from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{II_b^N}$.

- The red edge from $\textcircled{II_b^{N+1}}$ to $\textcircled{I_b^{N+1}}$ is taken.


Any path from $\textcircled{I_b^{N+1}}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^{N+1}}$ is a copy of a path from $\textcircled{II_b^N}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^N}$ by Proposition 2.6 except that blue edges have a weight that is one less. The blue edge from $\textcircled{I_t^{N+1} - 1}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^{N+1}}$ must be taken which cancels out the extra red path. Therefore the maximum weight path is zero.

\square

Corollary 2.13 *The maximum weight path from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{2^n - 1}$ in $G_2 \cup G_3 \cup \dots \cup G_n$ is zero.*

Proof: Note that if $n > k$, then the maximum weight path from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^k}$ in G_k is less than zero since all the blue edges are more negative, the red edges are unchanged, and at least one blue edge from $\textcircled{I_t^k - 1}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^k}$ must be taken. Therefore, taking the edge from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{II_b^k}$ and then a path to $\textcircled{I_t^k}$ is “cheaper” than the edge from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{II_b^{k+1}}$. Hence the maximum weight path must take the edge from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{II_b^n}$ and thus lies entirely within G_n . \square

Example 2.14 $G_2 \cup G_3 \cup G_4 \cup G_5$.




By construction of the graph for E_1 , Corollary 2.13 gives us $\max_{(R,C) \in E_1(S_1)} \frac{C}{R} = n + 1$. Thus for any $S \in S_1$, the number of cases checked C is at worst $(n + 1)R$, so at most $n|S|$ extraneous cases are checked.

3 Prune 2

We will show that $\max_{(R,C) \in E_2(S_2)} \frac{C}{R} = 2$.

Example 3.1 Let $n = 3$. Then the graph representing E_1 is



where blue lines have weight -1 and red lines have weight $+1$. For $S = \{6, 7\} \in S_2$, $E_2(S)$ would start with $j = 7$, go to 6, go to 5, then skip to 0, returning $(2, 3) = (2, 2 \cdot 2 - 1)$, so this particular example finishes one under par for the max ratio C/R of 2. We can convert the steps of E_2 on S into a path in the graph above by reversing the order of the j values. Traveling from (0) to (5) on the red edge, then to (6) on the blue edge, then to (7) on the blue edge gives a total weight of $1 + -1 + -1 = -1$, the par number for S .


Again, it is useful to break the graph of E_2 into several parts. Consider the weighted directed graph G_k for $k \geq 2$ with nodes (0) , $(2^{k-1} - 1)$, (2^{k-1}) , \dots , $(2^k - 1)$ with edges based on the following rules.

- An edge with weight -1 goes from (m) to $(m + 1)$ for $2^{k-1} - 1 \leq m < 2^k - 1$.
- An edge with weight $+1$ goes from $(P_2(m))$ to (m) for $2^{k-1} - 1 \leq m < 2^k - 1$.


Note that (0) will have no incoming edges, $(2^{k-1} - 1)$ will have one incoming edge of weight $+1$, (2^{k-1}) , \dots , $(2^k - 2)$ will each have two incoming edges, one of weight -1 and one of weight $+1$, and

$(2^k - 1)$ will have one incoming edge of weight -1 . There are no other edges. Also note that edges go from a smaller number to a larger. Joining G_2, G_3, \dots, G_n together and examining the maximum weight path gives the worst case performance for E_2 .

Example 3.2 $G_2, G_3,$ and G_4 . Blue edges have weight -1 and red edges have weight $+1$. The graph for E_2 when $n = 4$ is $G_2 \cup G_3 \cup G_4$.



Example 3.3 G_5 . Blue edges have weight -1 and red edges have weight $+1$.




Definition 3.4 Let

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 I_t^k = 2^k - 1 & III_t^k = 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-4} - 2 \\
 I_b^k = 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 1 & III_b^k = 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-3} - 1 \\
 II_t^k = 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2 & IV_t^k = 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-3} - 2 \\
 II_b^k = 2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-4} - 1 & IV_b^k = 2^{k-1} - 1
 \end{array}$$


Then G_k for $k \geq 4$ can be split into four “boxes” as follows:

- B_1 : The induced subgraph of G_k by taking $(0), (I_b^k), \dots, (I_t^k)$.
- B_2 : The induced subgraph of G_k by taking $(0), (II_b^k), \dots, (II_t^k)$.
- B_3 : The induced subgraph of G_k by taking $(0), (III_b^k), \dots, (III_t^k)$.
- B_4 : The induced subgraph of G_k by taking $(0), (IV_b^k), \dots, (IV_t^k)$.

Example 3.5 Boxes of G_4 . Blue edges have weight -1 and red edges have weight $+1$. Dashed edges go between boxes.



Example 3.6 Boxes of G_5 . Blue edges have weight -1 and red edges have weight $+1$. Dashed edges go between boxes.



Recursive Structure G_{k+1} can be constructed from G_k using the following propositions.

Proposition 3.7 B_1 of G_{k+1} for $k \geq 3$ is the same as G_k with 2^k added to every nonzero node except that (I_b^{k+1}) has a blue edge from (II_t^{k+1}) .

Proof:

- Nodes:

It is sufficient to show that the top and bottom nodes of G_k with 2^k added match the top and bottom nodes of B_1 of G_{k+1} since all the nodes in between are sequential.

$$\begin{aligned}
 IV_b^k + 2^k &= (2^{k-1} - 1) + 2^k & I_t^k + 2^k &= (2^k - 1) + 2^k \\
 &= 2^{k+1} - (2^{k+1} - 2^k - 2^{k-1}) - 1 & &= 2^{k+1} - 1 \\
 &= 2^{k+1} - 2^{k-1} - 1 & &= I_t^{k+1} \\
 &= I_b^{k+1}
 \end{aligned}$$

- Blue Edges:

$(m + 2^k)$ and $(m + 1) + 2^k$ are still adjacent. Also (I_b^{k+1}) and (II_t^{k+1}) are adjacent.


- Red Edges:

Note that adding 2^k to $0 < m < 2^k$ is the same as left-appending a one to the k digit binary representation of m . Consider two subcases.

- m has < 2 zeros in its k digit binary representation where $2^{k-1} - 1 \leq m < 2^k - 1$:
Then $P_2(m) = P_2(m + 2^k) = 0$.
- m has ≥ 2 zeros in its k digit binary representation where $2^{k-1} - 1 \leq m < 2^k - 1$:
By Lemma 1.3, $m + 2^k$ has a binary representation that starts with “11.” Thus $P_2(m + 2^k) = 2^k + P_2(m)$ since the left-most one is unaffected by P_2 .

□

Example 3.8 B_1 of G_4 and G_3 .



Proposition 3.9 $B_2 \cup (IV_b^{k+1})$ of G_{k+1} for $k \geq 4$ is the same as $B_2 \cup B_3 \cup (IV_b^k)$ of G_k with $3 \cdot 2^{k-2}$ added to every node $III_b^k \leq m \leq II_t^k$ and adding 2^{k-1} to IV_b^k .

Proof:

- Nodes:

It is sufficient to show that the top and bottom nodes of $B_2 \cup B_3$ of G_k with $3 \cdot 2^{k-2}$ added match the top and bottom nodes of B_2 of G_{k+1} , since all the nodes in between are sequential, and that $IV_b^k + 2^{k-1} = IV_b^{k+1}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
III_b^k + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2} &= (2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-3} - 1) + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2} \\
&= (2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-3} - 1) + (2^{k-1} + 2^{k-2}) \\
&= 2^{k+1} - (2^{k+1} - 2^k - 2^{k-1}) - 2^{k-3} - 1 \\
&= 2^{k+1} - 2^{k-1} - 2^{k-3} - 1 \\
&= II_b^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
II_t^k + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2} &= (2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2) + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2} \\
&= (2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2) + (2^{k-1} + 2^{k-2}) \\
&= 2^{k+1} - (2^{k+1} - 2^k - 2^{k-1}) - 2 \\
&= 2^{k+1} - 2^{k-1} - 2 \\
&= II_t^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
IV_b^k + 2^{k-1} &= (2^{k-1} - 1) + 2^{k-1} \\
&= 2^k - 1 \\
&= IV_b^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

- Blue Edges:

$(m + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2})$ and $((m + 1) + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2})$ are still adjacent.

- Red Edges:


By Lemma 1.5, every node in $B_2 \cup B_3$ of G_k except (III_b^k) starts with “101” and has at least one more zero. Adding $3 \cdot 2^{k-2} = 2^{k-1} + 2^k$ means that these nodes now have $k + 1$ digits and start with “1011.” Consider two subcases.

- m has 2 zeros in its k digit binary representation where $III_b^k < m \leq II_t^k$:
Then $P_2(m) = IV_b^k$ and $P_2(m + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2}) = IV_b^{k+1}$.
- m has > 2 zeros in its k digit binary representation where $III_b^k < m \leq II_t^k$:
Then $P_2(m + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2}) = P_2(m) + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2}$ since the leading “10” of m is unaffected by P_2 .

By Lemma 1.6, $III_b^k + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2} = III_b^k + 2^{k-1} + 2^{k-2}$ starts with “1010” followed by $k - 3$ ones. Thus $P_2(III_b^k) = IV_b^k$ and $P_2(III_b^k + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2}) = IV_b^{k+1}$.

□

Example 3.10 $B_2 \cup \textcircled{31}$ of G_6 and $B_2 \cup B_3 \cup \textcircled{15}$ of G_5 .



Proposition 3.11 B_3 of G_{k+1} for $k \geq 4$ is the same as B_4 of G_k with $3 \cdot 2^{k-2}$ added to every node $IV_b^k \leq m \leq IV_t^k$ except $\textcircled{III_b^{k+1}}$ has a red edge from $\textcircled{IV_b^{k+1}}$ instead of $\textcircled{0}$ and a new blue edge from $\textcircled{IV_t^{k+1}}$.

Proof:

- Nodes:

It is sufficient to show that the top and bottom nodes of B_4 of G_k with $3 \cdot 2^{k-2}$ added match the top and bottom nodes of B_3 of G_{k+1} since all the nodes in between are sequential.

$$\begin{aligned}
 IV_b^k + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2} &= (2^{k-1} - 1) + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2} \\
 &= (2^{k-1} - 1) + (2^{k-1} + 2^{k-2}) \\
 &= 2^k + 2^{k-2} - 1 \\
 &= 2^{k+1} - (2^{k+1} - 2^k) + 2^{k-2} - 1 \\
 &= 2^{k+1} - 2^k + 2^{k-2} - 1 \\
 &= 2^{k+1} - (2^{k-1} + 2^{k-1}) + 2^{k-2} - 1 \\
 &= 2^{k+1} - 2^{k-1} - (2^{k-1} - 2^{k-2}) - 1 \\
 &= 2^{k+1} - 2^{k-1} - 2^{k-2} - 1 \\
 &= III_b^{k+1}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 IV_t^k + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2} &= (2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-3} - 2) + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2} \\
 &= (2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2^{k-3} - 2) + (2^{k-1} + 2^{k-2})
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 2^k + 2^{k-1} - 2^{k-3} - 2 \\
&= 2^{k+1} - (2^{k+1} - 2^k - 2^{k-1}) - 2^{k-3} - 2 \\
&= 2^{k+1} - 2^{k-1} - 2^{k-3} - 2 \\
&= III_t^{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

- Blue Edges:

$(m + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2})$ and $((m + 1) + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2})$ are still adjacent. Also, (IV_t^{k+1}) and (III_b^{k+1}) are adjacent.

- Red Edges:



By Lemma 1.6, the k digit binary representation for $2^{k-1} \leq m \leq IV_t^k$ starts with “100.” Thus $m + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2}$ has $k + 1$ digits and starts with “1010.” Consider two cases.

- The k digit binary representation of $P_2(m)$ for $2^{k-1} \leq m \leq IV_t^k$ starts with “100”:
Then $P_2(m + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2}) = P_2(m) + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2}$.
- The k digit binary representation of $P_2(m)$ for $2^{k-1} \leq m \leq IV_t^k$ is “011...1” = IV_b^k :
Then $P_2(m + 3 \cdot 2^{k-2}) = “10011...1” = III_b^{k+1}$.

Also, $P_2(III_b^{k+1}) = “011...1 = IV_b^{k+1}$.

□

Example 3.12 B_3 of G_6 and B_4 of G_5 .



Proposition 3.13 B_4 of G_{k+1} for $k \geq 4$ is the same as $B_2 \cup B_3 \cup B_4$ of G_k with 2^{k-1} added to every nonzero node.

Proof:

- Nodes:

It is sufficient to show that the top and bottom nodes of $B_2 \cup B_3 \cup B_4$ of G_k with 2^{k-1} added match the top and bottom nodes of B_4 of G_{k+1} since all the nodes in between are sequential.

$$\begin{aligned} IV_b^k + 2^k &= (2^{k-1} - 1) + 2^{k-1} \\ &= 2^k - 1 \\ &= IV_b^{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} II_t^k + 2^{k-1} &= (2^k - 2^{k-2} - 2) + 2^{k-1} \\ &= 2^{k+1} - (2^{k+1} - 2^k - 2^{k-1}) - 2^{k-2} - 2 \\ &= 2^{k+2} - 2^{k-1} - 2^{k-2} - 2 \\ &= IV_t^{k+1} \end{aligned}$$

- Blue Edges:

$(m + 2^{k-1})$ and $((m + 1) + 2^{k-1})$ are still adjacent.

- Red Edges:


By Lemma 1.4, every node in $B_2 \cup B_3 \cup B_4$ of G_k except (IV_b^k) has k digits and starts with “10.” Adding 2^{k-1} means they will have $k+1$ digits and start with “100.” Consider two cases.

- The k digit representation of $P_2(m)$ for $IV_b^k < m \leq II_t^k$ starts with “10”:
Then $P_2(m + 2^{k-1}) = P_2(m) + 2^{k-1}$.
- The k digit representation of $P_2(m)$ for $IV_b^k < m \leq II_t^k$ is “011...1” = IV_b^k :
Then $P_2(m + 2^{k-1}) = IV_b^{k+1}$.

Also, $P_2(IV_b^{k+1}) = 0$.

□

Example 3.14 B_4 of G_6 and $B_2 \cup B_3 \cup B_4$ of G_5 .



We can make some additional observations about the structure of G_k .

Proposition 3.15 $B_2 \cup B_3$ of G_k has no edge from $\textcircled{0}$ and B_4 of G_k has only one edge from $\textcircled{0}$ which goes to $\textcircled{IV_b^k}$ for $k \geq 4$.

Proof: (Proof by induction)

- Base case: Observe that this is true for G_4 and G_5 in examples 3.5 and 3.14.
- Suppose the proposition is true for $k \geq 4$. Consider G_{k+1} .

By Proposition 3.9, B_2 of G_{k+1} is a copy of $B_2 \cup B_3$ of G_k , so will have no edges from $\textcircled{0}$.

By Proposition 3.11, B_3 of G_{k+1} is a copy of B_4 of G_k except that the (only) edge from $\textcircled{0}$ has been changed, so it will have no edges from $\textcircled{0}$.


By Proposition 3.13, B_4 of G_{k+1} is a copy of $B_2 \cup B_3 \cup B_4$ of G_k , so it will have only one edge from $\textcircled{0}$ which goes to $\textcircled{IV_b^{k+1}}$.

□

Proposition 3.16 B_1 of G_k has only one edge from outside of B_1 which is the edge with weight -1 from $\textcircled{II_t^k}$ to $\textcircled{I_b^k}$.

Proof: Immediate from Proposition 3.7. □

Example 3.17 Putting all of the above Propositions together allows for G_{k+1} to be built from G_k



Maximum Weight Path

Theorem 3.18 The maximum weight path from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^k}$ in G_k for $k \geq 2$ is zero.

Proof: (Proof by induction)

- Base cases: Checking $G_2, G_3, G_4,$ and G_5 in examples 3.2 and 3.3 shows that the maximum weight path from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{I_t^k}$ is 0 for $k = 2, 3, 4, 5$. Also, the “bottom halves” of G_4 and G_5 , i.e. $B_2 \cup B_3 \cup B_4$, has a maximum weight path of zero from $\textcircled{IV_b^k}$ to $\textcircled{I_b^k}$. (See examples 3.3 and 3.5.)
- Assume for induction that G_k has a maximum weight path of zero and that the maximum weight path from $\textcircled{IV_b^k}$ to $\textcircled{I_b^k}$ is zero for $k \leq N$ where $N \geq 5$. Consider G_{N+1} . By Propositions 3.7 and 3.15 there are two choices to travel from $\textcircled{0}$.

- A path from $\textcircled{0}$ to B_1 is taken:

Then the path is entirely contained inside G_N by Proposition 3.7, so the maximum weight is zero by the inductive hypothesis.

- The path from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{IV_b^{N+1}}$ is taken:

Here again there are two options by Proposition 3.16.

- A path from $\textcircled{IV_b^{N+1}}$ to a node in B_4 is taken:

By Propositions 3.9 and 3.11, all such paths must go through $\textcircled{III_b^{N+1}}$. By Proposition 3.13, this portion of the path is identical to the bottom half of G_N , so by the inductive hypothesis, this portion has a maximum weight of zero. Again, by Propositions 3.9 and 3.11, the path from $\textcircled{III_b^{N+1}}$ to $\textcircled{I_b^{N+1}}$ is a copy of the bottom half of G_N except with fewer edges of weight $+1$, thus this portion of the path must have a maximum weight of at most zero. Therefore, $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{IV_b^{N+1}}$ and then the path from $\textcircled{IV_b^{N+1}}$ to $\textcircled{I_b^{N+1}}$ has a maximum weight of at most one, which is the same as taking the direct path from $\textcircled{0}$ to $\textcircled{I_b^{N+1}}$. Since the direct path is completely contained in G_N by Proposition 3.7, it results in a maximum weight path of zero. Replacing the direct path with a longer path through the bottom half with the same weight will still result in a maximum weight path of zero.


- A path from (IV_b^{N+1}) to a node in B_2 is taken:
 Since $(IV_b^{N+1}) \cup B_2$ of G_{N+1} is a copy of $(IV_b^N) \cup B_2 \cup B_3$ of G_N by Proposition 3.9, the maximum weight path is zero by the inductive hypothesis.
- The path from (IV_b^{N+1}) to (III_b^{N+1}) in B_3 is taken:
 By Proposition 3.11, B_3 of G_{N+1} is a copy of B_4 of G_N . This in turn is a copy of $B_2 \cup B_3 \cup B_4$ of G_{N-1} by Proposition 3.13. Thus the maximum weight path from (III_b^{N+1}) to (II_b^{N+1}) is zero by the inductive hypothesis. Therefore, taking the edge from (IV_b^{N+1}) to (III_b^{N+1}) and then a path from there to (II_b^{N+1}) has the same weight as taking the edge from (IV_b^{N+1}) to (II_b^{N+1}) directly, so the maximum weight path is again zero by the above case.

□

Corollary 3.19 *The maximum weight path from (0) to $(2^n - 1)$ in $G_2 \cup G_3 \cup \dots \cup G_n$ is zero.*

Proof: Note that taking a red edge from (0) to a node in G_k and then the path from that node to (I_t^k) has maximum weight zero by the above theorem while the red edge from (0) to (I_t^k) has a weight of one. Therefore the maximum weight path must take a red edge from (0) to a node in G_n . Thus the maximum weight path lies entirely in G_n . □

Example 3.20 $G_2 \cup G_3 \cup G_4 \cup G_5$.



By construction of the graph for E_2 , Corollary 3.19 gives us $\max_{(R,C) \in E_2(S_2)} \frac{C}{R} = 2$. Thus for any $S \in S_2$, the number of cases checked C is at worst $2R$, so at most $|S|$ extraneous cases are checked.

References

- [1] O. Coss, H. Hong, J. D. Hauenstein, and D. K. Molzahn, *Locating and Counting Equilibria of the Kuramoto Model with Rank-One Coupling*, SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom, 2 (2018), pp. 45–71.

- [2] Y. Kuramoto, *Self-entrainment of a population of coupled non-linear oscillators*, International Symposium on Mathematical Problems in Theoretical Physics: January 23–29, 1975, Kyoto University, Kyoto/Japan, Springer, Berlin, 1975, pp. 420–422.