

# A PROOF OF THE KOTZIG–RINGEL–ROSA CONJECTURE

EDINAH K. GNANG

**ABSTRACT.** In graph theory, a graceful labeling of a graph with  $m$  edges is a labeling of its vertices with a subset of the integers ranging from 0 to  $m$  inclusive, such that no two vertices share a label, and each edge is uniquely identified by the absolute difference of labels assigned to its endpoints. The Kotzig–Ringel–Rosa conjecture asserts that every tree admits a graceful labeling. We provide a proof of this long standing conjecture via a functional reformulation of the conjecture and a composition lemma.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We say that a graph  $G$  admits a decomposition into copies of some other graph  $H$  if the edges of  $G$  (noted  $E(G)$ ) can be partitioned into edge-disjoint subgraphs isomorphic to  $H$ . Graph decomposition problems have a rich history. In 1847, Kirkman studied decompositions of complete graphs  $K_n$  and showed that they can be decomposed into copies of a triangle if and only if  $n$  is congruent to one or three modulo six. Wilson [Wil75] generalized this result by completely characterizing complete graphs which can be decomposed into copies of any graph, for large  $n$ . A very old conjecture of Steiner dating back to 1853, asserts that, for every  $k$ , (modulo an obvious divisibility condition), every sufficiently large complete  $r$ -uniform hypergraph can be decomposed into edge-disjoint copies of a complete  $r$ -uniform hypergraph on  $k$  vertices. This claim is also known as the “existence of designs” problem. Incidentally, the problem is of practical interest to the branch of statistics concerned with design of experiments. The conjecture was resolved only very recently in spectacular fashion by the work of Keevash [Kee14]. Graph and hypergraph decomposition problems form by now a very vast topic with many results and conjectures. We refer the reader to extensive surveys [Woz04, Yap88, Gal09]. More recently, two breakthrough results obtained by Montgomery, Pokrovskiy, and Sudakov [?] and independently obtained by Keevash and Staden [KS20] settle asymptotically in the affirmative, the long standing Ringel conjecture [Rin63] posed in 1963. The Ringel conjecture asserts that the complete graph  $K_{2n-1}$  can be decomposed into  $2n-1$  edge disjoint copies of any  $n$ -vertex tree. Both proofs constitute major tour de force in the application of the probabilistic method. Prior to these recent breakthroughs, the predominant approach to tackling Ringel’s conjecture had been via the much stronger Kotzig–Ringel–Rosa conjecture (or KRR conjecture for short) which dates back to 1964. The KRR conjecture asserts that vertices of any  $n$ -vertex tree  $T$  can be labelled injectively using  $n$  consecutive integers, such that the absolute difference of pairs of vertex labels spanning distinct edges are always distinct. Such a labeling is called a graceful labeling and the KRR conjecture is also known as the graceful labeling conjecture. This conjecture has attracted a lot of attention in the last 50 years but has only been proved for some special classes of trees, see e.g., [Gal09]. The most general result for this problem was obtained by Adamaszek, Allen, Grosu, and Hladký [AAGH16, AAGH20] who proved it asymptotically for trees with maximum degree  $O(n/\log n)$ . The main motivation for studying graceful labelings had been to prove Ringel’s conjecture. Indeed, a graceful labelling map  $f : V(T) \rightarrow \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ , yields an embedding of  $T$  into  $\{0, \dots, 2(n-1)\}$ . Using addition modulo  $2n-1$ , consider  $2n-1$  cyclic shifts  $T_0, \dots, T_{2(n-1)}$  of  $T$ , where the tree  $T_i$  is an isomorphic copy of  $T$  whose vertices are  $V(T_i) = \left\{ f(v) + i \mid v \in V(T) \right\}$  and whose edges are  $E(T_i) = \left\{ (f(x) + i, f(y) + i) \mid (x, y) \in E(T) \right\}$ . It is easy to check that if the map  $f$  gracefully labels

$T$  then the trees  $T_i$  are edge disjoint and therefore cyclically decompose  $K_{2n-1}$ . Our main result is a proof of the KRR conjecture using a functional reformulation of the conjecture and a composition lemma.

**Theorem 1.** *Every tree admits a graceful labeling.*

Our theorem provides the first non-asymptotic result establishing the existence of a decomposition of  $K_{2n-1}$  into any tree on  $n$  consecutive<sup>1</sup> vertices. Our result does not assume any restriction on the vertex degrees of the given tree. We describe in Section 2.1 the notation as well as some auxiliary enumeration results. Starting from section 2.2 we describe technical preliminaries required for the proof of our main result discussed in section 3.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

The KRR [Rin63, Ros66] conjecture, also known as the *Graceful Labeling Conjecture* (GLC), asserts that every tree admits a graceful labeling. For a detailed survey of the extensive literature on this problem, see [Gal09]. For the purposes of our discussion, we redefine graceful labelings of digraphs as vertex labelings which results in a bijection between vertex labels and *induced absolute subtractive edge labels*. For notational convenience, let  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  denote the set formed by the smallest  $n$  consecutive non-negative integers i.e.

$$\mathbb{Z}_n := [0, n) \cap \mathbb{Z}.$$

The present discussion is based upon a functional reformulation of the GLC which exploits properties of the transformation monoid  $\mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  i.e. the monoid formed by functions having  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  both as their domain and codomain. The binary operation of the monoid being the function composition operation.

**2.1. Functional formulation.** A rooted tree on  $n > 0$  vertices is associated with a function

$$(2.1) \quad f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} \text{ subject to } |f^{(n-1)}(\mathbb{Z}_n)| = 1,$$

where

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n, f^{(0)}(i) := i \text{ and } \forall k \geq 0, f^{(k+1)} = f^{(k)} \circ f = f \circ f^{(k)}.$$

In other words the function  $f$  has a unique fixed point (the root) which is attractive over its domain.

**Definition 2.** To an arbitrary function  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  we associate a *functional directed graph* denoted  $G_f$  whose vertex set, and directed edge set are respectively

$$V(G_f) = \mathbb{Z}_n, \quad E(G_f) = \{(i, f(i)) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}.$$

See figure 2.1

*Remark.* The automorphism group of  $G_f$  is denoted  $\text{Aut}(G_f)$  and defined such that


$$\text{Aut}(G_f) = \left\{ \sigma \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : \sigma f \sigma^{(-1)} = f \right\}.$$

**Definition 3.** Connected components of  $G_f$  partition the vertex set into equivalence classes prescribed by an equivalence relation. A vertex pair  $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n$  lies in the same connected component of  $G_f$  if there exist non-negative integers  $u, v$  such that

$$f^{(u)}(i) = f^{(v)}(j).$$

We denote by  $G_{f^\top}$  the directed graph obtained by reversing the orientation of every edge in  $G_f$ . When  $f$  is not bijective, the directed graph  $G_{f^\top}$  is not a functional directed graph since some of its vertices have out-degree  $\neq 1$ . When  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  is subject to the fixed point condition  $|f^{(n-1)}(\mathbb{Z}_n)| = 1$ , the graph  $G_f$  is a rooted, directed and  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ -spanning functional tree or a functional tree for short.

<sup>1</sup>In the sense of going clockwise or counterclockwise along the unit circle. The vertex set of  $K_{2n-1}$  is identified with  $(2n-1)$ -th roots of unity such that the  $k$ -th vertex of  $K_{2n-1}$  is identified with  $\exp\left(\frac{2\pi k \sqrt{-1}}{2n-1}\right)$ .

FIGURE 2.1.  $f(0) = 0, f(1) = 3, f(2) = 3, f(3) = 0, f(4) = 0, f(5) = 0$ 

**Definition 4.** Let  $G_f$  denote the functional directed graph of  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ . Induced *subtractive edge labels* of  $G_f$  correspond to integers occurring in the sequence  $(f(i) - i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n)$ . The  $i$ -th member of the sequence equal to  $f(i) - i$  is the induced subtractive edge label of the directed edge  $(i, f(i)) \in E(G_f)$ . In other words the set of induced subtractive edge labels of  $G_f$  is

$$\{f(i) - i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}.$$

Induced absolute subtractive edge labels of  $G_f$  correspond to absolute values of induced subtractive edge labels :

$$\{|f(i) - i| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}.$$

**Definition 5.** The functional directed graph  $G_f$  of  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  is *graceful* if there exist a bijection  $\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  such that

$$(2.2) \quad \{|\sigma f(i) - \sigma(i)| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\} = \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

Otherwise when no such bijection  $\sigma$  exist, the functional directed graph  $G_f$  is *ungraceful*. Finally, if  $\sigma$  is the identity permutation (denoted id), then  $G_f$  is *gracefully labeled*.

Note that when  $G_f$  is gracefully labeled, the set of induced subtractive edge labels of the bi-directed graph  $G_{f\tau} \cup G_f$  is equal to  $-\mathbb{Z}_n \cup \mathbb{Z}_n$ . For instance, the graph  $G_f$  of the function  $f : \mathbb{Z}_6 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_6$  defined by

$$f(0) = 0, f(1) = 3, f(2) = 3, f(3) = 0, f(4) = 0, f(5) = 0.$$

depicted in Figure 2.1 is a gracefully labeled functional tree.

The edge set of  $G_f$  is

$$E(G_f) = \{(0, 0), (1, 3), (2, 3), (3, 0), (4, 0), (5, 0)\}.$$

More generally, the sequence of  $\tau$ -*induced edge labels* of the functional directed graph  $G_f$  where  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  are defined with respect to an arbitrary  $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n}$ , as

$$(\tau(i, f(i)) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n).$$

For a given  $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n}$ , the digraph  $G_f$  of  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  is  $\tau$ -*Zen* if there exist a bijection  $\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  such that

$$\{\tau(\sigma(i), \sigma f(i)) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\} = \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

In particular, if  $\tau$  is chosen such that

$$\tau(i, j) = |j - i|, \forall (i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n,$$

then  $\tau$ -Zen graphs are graceful graphs and vice versa. Let  $S_n \subset \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  denote the symmetric group acting on elements of the set  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  in other words  $S_n$  denotes the subset of all bijective functions in  $\mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ . The following graceful expansion theorem describes a necessary and sufficient condition on  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  which ensures that its functional directed graph  $G_f$  is graceful.

**Theorem 6** (Graceful Expansion Theorem). *Let  $id \in S_n$  denote the identity element and let  $\varphi$  denote the involution  $(n-1-id) \in S_n$ . The graph  $G_f$  of  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  is graceful if and only if there exist a nonempty permutation subset  $\mathcal{G}_f \subset S_n$  as well as a corresponding sign function  $\mathfrak{s}_f \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathcal{G}_f \times \mathbb{Z}_n}$  such that*

$$(2.3) \quad f(i) = \sigma_\gamma^{(-1)} \varphi^{(t)} \left( \varphi^{(t)} \sigma_\gamma(i) + (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, \sigma_\gamma(i)) \cdot \gamma \sigma_\gamma(i) \right), \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \gamma \in \mathcal{G}_f \text{ and } t \in \{0, 1\},$$

for some  $\sigma_\gamma \in S_n$ .

*Proof.* We prove the claim by starting from the premise that  $G_f$  is graceful and derive the graceful expansion of  $f$  in equation 2.3 via a sequence of reversible steps. Thereby establishing both the forward and the backward claim. Recall that the premise that  $G_f$  is graceful is equivalent to the assertion that there exist a permutation representative  $\sigma$  of some coset of  $\text{Aut}(G_f)$  for which we have

$$\{|\sigma f(j) - \sigma(j)| : j \in \mathbb{Z}_n\} = \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

Thus establishing the existence of bijective map  $\gamma$  from vertex labels to induced absolute subtractive edge labels:

$$\gamma(i) = \left| \sigma f \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right|, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

Choosing  $\sigma$  from distinct cosets of  $\text{Aut}(G_f)$  subject to equation 2.2 may result in distinct permutations  $\gamma$ . We emphasize the dependence of the permutation  $\sigma$  on the permutation  $\gamma$  by writing  $\sigma_\gamma$ .

$$\left| \sigma_\gamma f \sigma_\gamma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| = \gamma(i), \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

Taking advantage of the involution symmetry, we write that for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$  and  $t \in \{0, 1\}$

$$\left| \varphi^{(t)} \sigma_\gamma f \sigma_\gamma^{(-1)}(i) - \varphi^{(t)}(i) \right| = \gamma(i), \quad \forall \begin{array}{l} i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ t \in \{0, 1\} \end{array}.$$

Removing the absolute value on the left hand side of the equation immediately above introduces the sign function  $\mathfrak{s}_f \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{\mathcal{G}_f \times \mathbb{Z}_n}$  on the right hand side. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \varphi^{(t)} \sigma_\gamma f \sigma_\gamma^{(-1)}(i) - \varphi^{(t)}(i) \right) &= (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, i) \cdot \gamma(i) \\ \iff \varphi^{(t)} \sigma_\gamma f \sigma_\gamma^{(-1)}(i) &= \varphi^{(t)}(i) + (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, i) \cdot \gamma(i) \\ \iff f(i) &= \sigma_\gamma^{(-1)} \varphi^{(t)} \left( \varphi^{(t)} \sigma_\gamma(i) + (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, \sigma_\gamma(i)) \cdot \gamma \sigma_\gamma(i) \right) \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.  $\square$

In equation 2.3, the bijection  $\gamma$  which maps vertex labels to induced absolute subtractive edge labels is called a *permutation basis* of the graceful expansion. For each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ , the integer  $\gamma(i)$  is the induced absolute subtractive edge label of the directed edge emanating from vertex  $i$  in the gracefully labeled graph  $G_{\sigma_\gamma f \sigma_\gamma^{-1}}$ . The parameter  $t \in \{0, 1\}$  in the graceful expansion of  $f$  described in equation 2.3 accounts for the complementary labeling symmetry expressed by the equality

$$(2.4) \quad \left( \varphi \sigma_\gamma f \sigma_\gamma^{(-1)}(i) - \varphi(i) \right) = (-1) \left( \sigma_\gamma f \sigma_\gamma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right), \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

**Example 7.** Consider the function

$$\begin{aligned} f \in \mathbb{Z}_4^{\mathbb{Z}_4} \text{ s.t. } f(i) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i = 0 \\ i - 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_4, \\ \varphi(i) &= 3 - i, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_4. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mathcal{G}_f \subset S_4$  be such that

$$\mathcal{G}_f = \{\gamma, \gamma'\} \text{ such that } \begin{array}{l} \gamma(0) = 0 \\ \gamma(1) = 2 \\ \gamma(2) = 1 \\ \gamma(3) = 3 \end{array} \text{ and } \begin{array}{l} \gamma'(0) = 3 \\ \gamma'(1) = 1 \\ \gamma'(2) = 0 \\ \gamma'(3) = 2 \end{array},$$

the corresponding sign assignments are specified by

$$\mathfrak{s}_f : \mathcal{G}_f \times \mathbb{Z}_4 \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\} \text{ such that } \begin{array}{l} \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, 0) = 0 \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, 1) = 1 \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, 2) = -1 \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, 3) = -1 \end{array} \text{ and } \begin{array}{l} \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma', 0) = 1 \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma', 1) = 1 \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma', 2) = 0 \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma', 3) = -1 \end{array}.$$

Finally representatives for distinct cosets of  $\text{Aut}(G_f)$  are  $\sigma_\gamma$  and  $\sigma_{\gamma'}$  defined such that

$$\begin{array}{l} \sigma_\gamma(0) = 0 \\ \sigma_\gamma(1) = 3 \\ \sigma_\gamma(2) = 1 \\ \sigma_\gamma(3) = 2 \end{array} \text{ and } \begin{array}{l} \sigma_{\gamma'}(0) = 2 \\ \sigma_{\gamma'}(1) = 1 \\ \sigma_{\gamma'}(2) = 3 \\ \sigma_{\gamma'}(3) = 0 \end{array}.$$

We easily check the validity of the only two possible graceful expansions of  $f$  prescribed with respect to permutation bases  $\gamma$  and  $\gamma'$  defined for all  $t \in \{0, 1\}$  and for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_4$  by

$$\sigma_\gamma^{(-1)} \varphi^{(t)} \left( \varphi^{(t)} \sigma_\gamma(i) + (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, \sigma_\gamma(i)) \cdot \gamma \sigma_\gamma(i) \right) = f(i) = \sigma_{\gamma'}^{(-1)} \varphi^{(t)} \left( \varphi^{(t)} \sigma_{\gamma'}(i) + (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma', \sigma_{\gamma'}(i)) \cdot \gamma' \sigma_{\gamma'}(i) \right).$$

**Definition 8.** Functional diraphs  $G_f, G_g$  of  $f, g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ , differ from one another by *fixed point swaps* if

$$\left\{ \{i, f(i)\} : \begin{array}{l} i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ i \neq f(i) \end{array} \right\} = \left\{ \{i, g(i)\} : \begin{array}{l} i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ i \neq g(i) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Let non-isomorphic graphs  $G_f$  and  $G_g$  be both connected and graceful. If  $G_f$  differs from  $G_g$  by swapping fixed points, then we devise from distinct graceful expansions of  $g$  distinct graceful expansions of  $f$  and vice versa. Incidentally, the set of permutation bases for graceful expansions of  $f$  bijectively maps onto the set of permutation bases for graceful expansions of  $g$ . In particular, every graceful relabeling of a connected graceful graph  $G_f$  admits a unique gracefully labeled swapped fixed point counterpart whose loop edge is located at the vertex labeled 0. Consequently, to characterize permutation bases of functions whose graphs have no single vertex component, it suffices to characterize permutation bases which fix 0. It is easy to see that a permutation  $\gamma$  subject to  $\gamma(0) = 0$ , is a basis for some graceful expansion if and only if

$$(2.5) \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{0\}, (\{i - \gamma(i), i + \gamma(i)\} \cap \mathbb{Z}_n) \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \gamma(i) \leq i \\ \text{or} \\ \gamma(i) \leq (n-1) - i \end{cases} \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

Note that given such a basis  $\gamma$  it is possible that for an input  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ , both conditions

$$\gamma(i) \leq i \text{ and } \gamma(i) \leq (n-1) - i$$

simultaneously hold. In that case  $\gamma$  is a permutation basis for two or more functions in  $\mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ . We now state and prove a result which characterizes permutation bases of graceful expansions for members of  $\mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  whose graphs have no single vertex component when  $n > 2$ .

**Theorem 9.** *There are exactly  $(\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor!) (\lceil \frac{n-1}{2} \rceil!)$  distinct permutations which fix 0, and occur as permutation bases for graceful expansions of members of  $\mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ .*

The proof of this claim follows as a corollary of theorem 6. Let  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  be subject to  $f(0) = 0$  and such that  $G_f$  is already gracefully labeled thereby simplifying the graceful expansion to the setting where  $\sigma_\gamma = \text{id}$  (the identity permutation). Our argument focuses on the row addition setup described below where  $t \in \{0, 1\}$ . The setup stems from the graceful expansion theorem

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
 \varphi^{(t)}(0) & \cdots & \varphi^{(t)}(i) & \cdots & \varphi^{(t)}(n-1) & \text{Row 1} \\
 + & & & & & \\
 (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}(\gamma, 0) \cdot \gamma(0) & \cdots & (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}(\gamma, i) \cdot \gamma(i) & \cdots & (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}(\gamma, n-1) \cdot \gamma(n-1) & \text{Row 2} \\
 \hline
 = & & \varphi^{(t)}f(i) & \cdots & \varphi^{(t)}f(n-1) & \text{Row 1 + Row 2}
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* For a permutation basis  $\gamma$  which fixes 0, observe that  $f(0) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{s}(\gamma, 0) = 0$ . This implies that  $f(n-1) = 0$  and  $G_f$  has no isolated vertex component. In a graceful expansion whose permutation basis  $\gamma$  fixes 0, there is a unique choice for  $\mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, n-1) \cdot \gamma(n-1)$ . That choice is

$$\mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, n-1) \cdot \gamma(n-1) = -(n-1) \iff f(n-1) = 0.$$

Following this assignment, there are two mutually exclusive choices for a column entry on the second row (of the row addition setup) whose absolute value equals  $(n-2)$ . These mutually exclusive choices yield corresponding mutually exclusive assignments

$$(2.6) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, 1) \cdot \gamma(1) = n-2 \iff f(1) = n-1 \\ \text{or} \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, n-2) \cdot \gamma(n-2) = -(n-2) \iff f(n-2) = 0 \end{array} \right. .$$

Following previous assignments (accounting thus far for column entries on the second row whose magnitudes are respectively  $(n-1)$  and  $(n-2)$ ), there are three mutually exclusive choices for the column entry on the second row whose magnitude is  $(n-3)$ . Mutually exclusive choices (not accounting for the choice made for the entry whose magnitude is equal to  $(n-2)$ ) yield mutually exclusive assignments

$$(2.7) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, 1) \cdot \gamma(1) = n-3 \iff f(1) = n-2 \\ \text{or} \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, 2) \cdot \gamma(2) = n-3 \iff f(2) = n-1 \\ \text{or} \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, n-3) \cdot \gamma(n-3) = -(n-3) \iff f(n-3) = 0 \\ \text{or} \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, n-2) \cdot \gamma(n-2) = -(n-3) \iff f(n-2) = 1 \end{array} \right. .$$

However either the first or the last assignment displayed in Eq. (2.7) is not possible per the previous choice made for the column entry of the second row whose magnitude equals  $(n-2)$  as described in Eq. (2.6). Therefore there are three mutually exclusive choices left for the column entry in the second row whose magnitude equals  $(n-3)$ . Similarly, following the third assignment (accounting thus far for the three choices made for column entries of the second row of magnitudes  $(n-1)$ ,  $(n-2)$  and  $(n-3)$ ), there are four mutually exclusive choices for a column entry of the second row whose magnitude equals  $(n-4)$ . Mutually exclusive choices for the entry of the second row with magnitude  $(n-4)$  (not accounting for the two previously made choices for entries of the second row having

magnitudes  $(n - 2)$  and  $(n - 3)$  ) yield mutually exclusive assignments

$$(2.8) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, 1) \cdot \gamma(1) = n - 4 \iff f(1) = n - 3 \\ \text{or} \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, 2) \cdot \gamma(2) = n - 4 \iff f(2) = n - 2 \\ \text{or} \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, 3) \cdot \gamma(3) = n - 4 \iff f(3) = n - 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, n - 4) \cdot \gamma(n - 4) = -(n - 4) \iff f(n - 4) = 0 \\ \text{or} \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, n - 3) \cdot \gamma(n - 3) = -(n - 4) \iff f(n - 3) = 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, n - 2) \cdot \gamma(n - 2) = -(n - 4) \iff f(n - 2) = 2 \end{array} \right.$$

Two of the six possible assignments described in equation 2.8 are not possible per the previous assignments made for column entries of magnitudes  $(n - 2)$  and  $(n - 3)$  as described by equation 2.6 and equation 2.7. Therefore there are four mutually exclusive choices left for the column entry in the second row whose magnitude equals  $(n - 4)$ . The argument proceeds accordingly in a similar vein all the way down to mutually exclusive choices for the column entry in the second row whose magnitude equals  $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$ . These choices for the partial assignment accounts for the  $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor!$  factor in the claim. Note that for each choice made in this partial assignment, the corresponding output of the sign function is uniquely determined. The remaining unassigned integers whose magnitudes ranges from 1 to  $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor$  can be arbitrarily permuted among the remaining unassigned column entries of the second row. Thus accounting for the remaining  $\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor!$  factor in the claim.  $\square$

The proof argument establishes that a permutation  $\gamma$  which fixes 0, can be a permutation basis for at most  $2^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor}$  distinct members of  $\mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  whose graphs are gracefully labeled. This upper bound is sharp when  $\gamma = \text{id}$ .

**Definition 10.**  $\text{GrL}(G_f)$  denotes the largest subset of distinct gracefully labeled functional directed graphs isomorphic to  $G_f$ . More formally we write

$$\text{GrL}(G_f) := \left\{ G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}} : \sigma \in S_n / \text{Aut}(G_f) \text{ and } \mathbb{Z}_n = \left\{ \left| \sigma f \sigma^{-1}(j) - j \right| : j \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right\}.$$

Theorem 6 yields a toy model illustration of the *composition lemma*. We discuss the composition lemma in more detail shortly. For now it suffices to say that the idea of the composition lemma is to relate graceful expansions of  $f$  to graceful expansions of some non-trivial iterate of  $f$ . As illustration, consider the setting where  $G_f$  is graceful and  $f \in S_n$ .

**Proposition 11.** *Let  $f \in S_n$  and let  $o_f$  denote the order of  $f$  i.e. the LCM of cycle lengths occurring in  $G_f$ . The iterate  $f^{(o_f-1)}$  admits a graceful expansion if and only if the original function  $f$  admits a graceful expansion.*

*Proof.* We proceed from the premise that  $f$  admits a graceful expansion and derive via a sequence of reversible steps a graceful expansion for  $f^{(o_f-1)}$ . Assume without loss of generality that  $G_f$  is gracefully labeled thereby simplifying the graceful expansion to the setting where  $\sigma_\gamma = \text{id}$ . By theorem 6, the graceful expansion of  $f$  is of the form

$$f(i) = \varphi^{(t)} \left( \varphi^{(t)}(i) + (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, i) \cdot \gamma(i) \right), \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \text{ and } t \in \{0, 1\}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\iff \varphi^{(t)}(i) &= \varphi^{(t)}f(i) + (-1)^{t+1} \cdot \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, i) \cdot \gamma(i), \\
\iff \varphi^{(t)}f^{(o_f-1)}(i) &= \varphi^{(t)}(i) + (-1)^{t+1} \cdot \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, f^{(o_f-1)}(i)) \cdot \gamma f^{(o_f-1)}(i), \\
\iff f^{(o_f-1)}(i) &= \varphi^{(t)}\left(\varphi^{(t)}(i) + (-1)^{t+1} \cdot \mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, f^{(o_f-1)}(i)) \cdot \gamma f^{(o_f-1)}(i)\right), \\
\iff f^{(o_f-1)}(i) &= \varphi^{(t)}\left(\varphi^{(t)}(i) + (-1)^t \cdot \mathfrak{s}_{f^{(o_f-1)}}(\gamma f^{(o_f-1)}, i) \cdot \gamma f^{(o_f-1)}(i)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{s}_{f^{(o_f-1)}}(\gamma f^{(o_f-1)}, i) = -\mathfrak{s}_f(\gamma, f^{(o_f-1)}(i)).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Accounting for the complementary labeling symmetry described in equation 2.4 and applying the argument used in the proof of proposition 11, to each non-trivial directed cycle occurring in  $G_f$ , it is easy to see that for all

$$f \in S_n \cup \left\{g : \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : \left|g^{(n-1)}(\mathbb{Z}_n)\right| = 1\right\},$$

$|\text{GrL}(G_f)|$  is a multiple of  $2^{\text{(number of connected components in } G_f\text{)}}$ .

**Example 12.** The GLC is easily verified for graphs of constant functions, that is the family of functional stars. Functional stars are functional directed graphs of identically constant functions. For instance take

$$f : \mathbb{Z}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$$

such that

$$f(i) = 0, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n.$$

We see that the functional directed graph of  $f$  is gracefully labeled. Furthermore for all  $n > 1$  we have

$$\text{GrL}(G_f) = \left\{G_f, G_{(n-1)\text{-id}f(n-1)\text{-id}}^{-1}\right\}.$$

**2.2. Preliminaries.** Recall that univariate polynomial notions such as the LCM and the GCD do not generally extend to multivariate polynomials. However we describe special settings where the notion of LCM extends to multivariate polynomials. Let polynomials  $F, H \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$  split into irreducible multilinear factors

$$F(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < m} (P_i(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}))^{\alpha_i}, \quad H(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < m} (P_i(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}))^{\beta_i}.$$

In the factorization above assume that  $\{\alpha_i, \beta_i : 0 \leq i < m\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and more importantly that each factor  $P_i(\mathbf{x})$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear combination of variables  $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$  of the form

$$P_i(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_n} a_{i,j} x_j, \quad \text{where } \left\{a_{i,j} : \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq i < m \\ 0 \leq j < n \end{array}\right\} \subset \mathbb{Q}.$$

Additionally, assume for each  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ , and each factor  $P_i$  when viewed as a univariate polynomial in  $x_k$  (with coefficients from the ring  $\mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{n-1}]$ ) has no common roots with any other factor in  $\{P_j : 0 \leq j \neq i < m\}$  in the field of fractions  $\mathbb{Q}(x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_{n-1})$ , in other words the resultant in the variable  $x_k$  given by

$$\prod_{\substack{0 \leq u < v < m \\ 0 \notin \{a_{v,k}, a_{u,k}\}}} \left( \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{k\}} \frac{a_{v,t}}{a_{v,k}} x_t - \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{k\}} \frac{a_{u,s}}{a_{u,k}} x_s \right)$$



does not vanish identically. In this restricted setting we can extend the notion of LCM and GCD to multivariate polynomials  $F$  and  $H$  as follows

$$\text{LCM}(F, H) = \prod_{0 \leq i < m} (P_i(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}))^{\max(\alpha_i, \beta_i)},$$

and

$$\text{GCD}(F, H) = \prod_{0 \leq i < m} (P_i(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}))^{\min(\alpha_i, \beta_i)}.$$

For convenience we adopt the falling factorial notation :

$$(x)^{\underline{n}} := \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n} (x - i).$$

Also for an arbitrary polynomial  $P(x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}]$  and  $g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_m}$ , we denote by  $P(g)$  the evaluation of  $P$  at the sequence  $(x_i = g(i) : i \in \mathbb{Z}_m)$  i.e.

$$P(g) := P(g(0), \dots, g(i), \dots, g(m-1)).$$

**Proposition 13.** *Every  $H \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}]$  admits a quotient-remainder expansion of the form*

$$H(x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_m} q_\ell(x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}) (x_\ell)^{\underline{n}} + \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_m}} H(g) \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left( \prod_{j_i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{g(i)\}} \frac{x_i - j_i}{g(i) - j_i} \right),$$

where  $q_\ell(x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}) \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}]$  for all  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_m$ .

*Proof.* We prove the claim by induction on  $m$  (the number of variables). The claim in the base case  $m = 1$ , is the assertion that for all  $n \geq 1$ ,  $H(x_0) \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0]$  admits an expansion of the form

$$H(x_0) = q(x_0) (x_0)^{\underline{n}} + r(x_0),$$

where  $r(x_0)$  is a polynomial of degree less than  $n$  called the remainder. Since the remainder  $r(x_0)$  is of degree at most  $(n-1)$  it is completely determined via Lagrange interpolation on  $n$  distinct evaluation points as follows

$$H(x_0) = q(x_0) (x_0)^{\underline{n}} + \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_1}} H(g(0)) \prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{g(0)\}} \left( \frac{x_0 - j_0}{g(0) - j_0} \right).$$

Therefore, the claim holds in the base case. Note that the same argument, including Lagrange interpolation, applies to univariate polynomials whose coefficients lie in a polynomial ring.

For the induction step, assume as induction hypothesis that the claim holds for all  $m$ -variate polynomials  $F \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}]$  namely assume that

$$F = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_m} t_\ell(x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}) (x_\ell)^{\underline{n}} + \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_m}} F(g) \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left( \prod_{j_k \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{g(k)\}} \frac{x_k - j_k}{g(k) - j_k} \right).$$

We now show that the hypothesis implies that the claim also holds for all  $(m+1)$ -variate polynomials with rational coefficients. Let  $H \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_m]$  be viewed as a univariate polynomial in  $x_m$  whose coefficients lie in the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}]$ . Invoking the Quotient–Remainder Theorem and Lagrange interpolation over this ring, we have

$$H = q_m(x_0, \dots, x_m) (x_m)^{\underline{n}} + \sum_{g(m) \in \mathbb{Z}_n} H(x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}, g(m)) \prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{g(m)\}} \left( \frac{x_m - j_m}{g(m) - j_m} \right).$$

Applying the induction hypothesis to  $m$ -variate polynomials in  $\{H(x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}, g(m)) : g(m) \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$  yields the desired claim.  $\square$

**Definition 14.** For an arbitrary  $H \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}]$ , the *canonical representative* of the congruence class of  $H$  modulo the ideal generated by  $\{(x_i)^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$  denoted

$$H \pmod{\{(x_i)^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}},$$

is the unique polynomial of degree at most  $(n-1)$  in each variable whose evaluations over the integer lattice  $\mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_m}$  i.e.  $(\mathbb{Z}_n)^m$  matches evaluations of  $H$  on the same lattice. Thus the canonical representative of

$$H \pmod{\{(x_i)^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}},$$

is

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_m}} H(g) \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left( \prod_{j_k \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{g(k)\}} \frac{x_k - j_k}{g(k) - j_k} \right).$$

The quotient–divisor part associated with the congruence class

$$H \pmod{\{(x_i)^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}},$$

is the polynomial

$$H - \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_m}} H(g) \prod_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left( \prod_{j_k \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{g(k)\}} \frac{x_k - j_k}{g(k) - j_k} \right).$$

We see that the quotient–divisor part vanishes identically on the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_m}$ .

Thus the canonical representative of  $H \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$  is obtained via Lagrange interpolation over evaluation points

$$\{(g, H(g)) : g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}\}.$$

Alternatively the canonical representative is obtained as the final remainder devised by performing Euclidean divisions irrespective of the order with which we perform the division by divisors successively taken from univariate polynomials  $\{(x_i)^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$ . This follows from the fact that generators  $\{(x_i)^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}$  for the corresponding ideal form a Groebner basis.

The next result recursively applies at each iteration the Quotient–Remainder Expansion Theorem 13 to the quotient–divisor part of the expansion to express the input polynomial as a  $\mathbb{Q}$ –linear combination of Lagrange basis polynomials. For an arbitrary  $g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_m}$ , let the associated Lagrange basis polynomial be

$$L_g(x_0, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_{m-1}) := \prod_{u \in \mathbb{Z}_m} \left( \prod_{v_u \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{g(u)\}} \frac{x_u - v_u}{g(u) - v_u} \right).$$

It follows from the diagonality criterion prescribed for all  $(f, g) \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} \times \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  by

$$L_f(f) = 1 \text{ and } L_f(g) = 0 \text{ when } f \neq g,$$

that Lagrange basis polynomials  $\{L_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) : f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}\}$  are linearly independent.

**Corollary 15.** *Let  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$  be a polynomial of degree at most  $d$  in any of its variables  $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$  then*

$$P(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq d+1-n} \left( \sum_{g_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+k}^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} b_{g_k} L_{g_k}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \right),$$

where for all  $t < d - n$ ,

$$b_{g_0} = P(g_0) \quad \text{and} \quad b_{g_{t+1}} = P(g_{t+1}) - \sum_{0 \leq k \leq t} \left( \sum_{g_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+k}^n} b_{g_k} L_{g_k}(g_{t+1}) \right).$$

*Proof.* Applying proposition 13 to  $P$  yields an expansion of the form

$$P(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_n} q_{0,\ell}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})(x_\ell)^n + \sum_{g_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+0}^n} P(g_0) L_{g_0}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}).$$

We set  $b_{g_0} = P(g_0)$  for all  $g_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+0}^n$  and we write

$$P(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_n} q_{0,\ell}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})(x_\ell)^n + \sum_{g_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+0}^n} b_{g_0} L_{g_0}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}).$$

The quotient divisor part

$$\sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_n} q_{0,\ell}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})(x_\ell)^n = P(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) - \sum_{g_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+0}^n} b_{g_0} L_{g_0}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}).$$

Applying proposition. 13 to the quotient remainder part, yields an expansion of  $P$  the form

$$P(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_n} q_{1,\ell}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})(x_\ell)^{n+1} + \sum_{g_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+1}^n} b_{g_1} L_{g_1}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) + \sum_{g_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+0}^n} P(g_0) L_{g_0}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}),$$

where

$$b_{g_1} = P(g_1) - \sum_{g_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+0}^n} b_{g_0} L_{g_0}(g_1).$$

Continuing in a similar vein we iterate proposition 13 on subsequent quotient–divisor parts. The procedure terminates at the iteration where the quotient–divisor part vanishes identically. Thus completing the proof.  $\square$

**2.3. Determinantal Certificate.** The following proposition expresses via a determinantal certificate a second necessary and sufficient condition for the functional directed graph  $G_f$  of  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  to be graceful.

**Proposition 16.** *The directed graph  $G_f$  of  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  is graceful if and only if*

$$0 \not\equiv \text{LCM} \left( \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i), \prod_{0 \leq u < v < n} \left( (x_{f(v)} - x_v)^2 - (x_{f(u)} - x_u)^2 \right) \right) \pmod{\{(x_k)^n : k \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}}$$

*Proof.* The LCM in the assertion is well defined since

$$\prod_{0 \leq u < v < n} \left( (x_{f(v)} - x_v)^2 - (x_{f(u)} - x_u)^2 \right) = \prod_{0 \leq u < v < n} (x_{f(v)} - x_v - x_{f(u)} + x_u)(x_{f(v)} - x_v + x_{f(u)} - x_u).$$

We see that the second input to the LCM corresponds to a product of  $\{-2, -1, 0, 1, 2\}$ –linear combination of variables. The first Vandermonde determinant factor

$$\prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i)$$

vanishes whenever two distinct variables are assigned the same vertex label from  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ . Similarly, the second Vandermonde determinant factor

$$\prod_{0 \leq u < v < n} \left( (x_{f(v)} - x_v)^2 - (x_{f(u)} - x_u)^2 \right)$$

vanishes whenever two distinct edges are assigned the same induced absolute subtractive edge label from  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ . Consider the following multiple of the LCM polynomial

$$F_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i) \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right).$$

It suffices to show that the functional directed graph  $G_f$  of  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  is graceful if and only if

$$0 \not\equiv F_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \pmod{\{(x_k)^{\frac{n}{2}} : k \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}}.$$

By proposition (13), the polynomial  $F_f$  admits an expansion of the form

$$F_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_n} q_\ell(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) (x_\ell)^{\frac{n}{2}} + \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} F_f(g) L_g(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}).$$

Note that for all  $g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$

$$F_f(g) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (g(j) - g(i)) \left( (gf(j) - g(j))^2 - (gf(i) - g(i))^2 \right).$$

Hence  $F_f(g)$  vanishes if  $g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} \setminus S_n$  on the other hand if  $\sigma \in S_n$  and  $G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}}$  is not a gracefully labeled then  $F_f(\sigma)$  also vanishes. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} F_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) &= \sum_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_n} q_\ell(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) (x_\ell)^{\frac{n}{2}} + \\ &\sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n \\ G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)}} \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (\sigma(j) - \sigma(i)) \left( (\sigma f(j) - \sigma(j))^2 - (\sigma f(i) - \sigma(i))^2 \right) L_\sigma(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that for all  $\gamma \in \{\sigma \in S_n : G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)\}$  we have

$$\prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (\gamma(j) - \gamma(i)) \left( (\gamma f(j) - \gamma(j))^2 - (\gamma f(i) - \gamma(i))^2 \right) \in \left\{ - \prod_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \left( (v!)^2 \frac{(n-1+v)!}{(2v)!} \right), \prod_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \left( (v!)^2 \frac{(n-1+v)!}{(2v)!} \right) \right\}.$$

We thus conclude that

$$0 \not\equiv F_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \pmod{\{(x_k)^{\frac{n}{2}} : k \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}}.$$

if and only if  $\emptyset \neq \text{GrL}(G_f)$  as claimed.  $\square$

We now briefly explain why the proposed polynomial construction is determinantal. Let  $\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{G}_f \in (\mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}])^{n \times n}$  with entries given by

$$\mathbf{V}[i, j] = (x_i)^j, \quad \mathbf{G}_f[i, j] = (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^{2i} \text{ for all } 0 \leq i, j < n,$$

The matrices  $\mathbf{V}$  and  $\mathbf{G}_f$  are Vandermonde matrices whose determinants are well known and are respectively

$$\det(\mathbf{V}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i),$$

and

$$\det(\mathbf{G}_f) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right).$$

By multiplicativity of the determinant, we have

$$\det(\mathbf{V}) \det(\mathbf{G}_f) = \det(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}_f).$$

The entries of the matrix product  $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}_f$  are such that

$$(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}_f)[i, j] = \frac{1 - \left(x_i (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2\right)^n}{1 - x_i (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2}, \forall 0 \leq i, j < n$$

and the polynomial of interest is

$$\det(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}_f) = F_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i) \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right).$$

We identify redundant factors by factoring  $\det(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}_f)$  into products of linear combinations of the variables as follows

$$\det(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}_f) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i) (x_{f(j)} - x_j - x_{f(i)} + x_i) (x_{f(j)} - x_j + x_{f(i)} - x_i).$$

We invoke the LCM as a means of removing from  $\det(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}_f)$  redundant factors from the determinantal construction. For instance when  $G_f$  is connected and contains no cycle other than the trivial cycle made by a loop edge and  $f(u) \leq u$  for all  $u \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ , then redundant factors appear only when

$$\begin{aligned} f(i) = f(j) \\ i < j \end{aligned} \quad \text{or} \quad d(i, f^{(2)}(i)) = 2.$$

where  $d(u, v)$  denotes the non-loop edge distance separating vertex  $u$  from vertex  $v$  in  $G_f$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LCM}(\det(\mathbf{V}), \det(\mathbf{G}_f)) &= \text{LCM} \left( \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i), \prod_{0 < i < j < n} \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right) \right) = \\ & \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i) \prod_{d(i, f^{(2)}(i))=2} (2x_{f(i)} - x_i - x_{f^{(2)}(i)}) \prod_{\substack{0 \leq i < j < n \\ f(i) = f(j)}} (2x_{f(j)} - x_j - x_i) \times \\ & \prod_{d(i, f^{(3)}(i))=3} \left( (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 - (x_{f^{(3)}(i)} - x_{f^{(2)}(i)})^2 \right) \prod_{\substack{0 < i < j < n \\ d(i, j) \geq 3}} \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally note that the canonical representative of  $\det(\mathbf{V}\mathbf{G}_f)^2$  is

$$\prod_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \left( (v!)^2 \frac{(n-1+v)!}{(2v)!} \right)^2 \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n \\ G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)}} \prod_{\substack{i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ j_i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{\sigma(i)\}}} \left( \frac{x_i - j_i}{\sigma(i) - j_i} \right).$$

3. THE TRANSFORMATION MONOID  $\mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  AND THE COMPOSITION LEMMA.

We briefly review basic properties of the transformation monoid  $\mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  relevant to our main result.

**Proposition 17.** *For all  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ , we have*

$$1 \leq \min_{\sigma \in S_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma f \sigma^{-1}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right| \leq \rho_f + \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \exists i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \text{ s.t. } f(i) = i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

where  $\rho_f$  denotes the minimum number of non-loop edge deletions required in  $G_f$  to obtain a spanning subgraph which is a union of disjoint paths possibly having loop edges.

*Proof.* The lower bound is attained when the  $n$  edges of  $G_f$  are assigned the same induced absolute subtractive edge label. We justify the upper-bound by considering any one of the possible deletions of  $\rho_f$  edges from  $G_f$  to obtain a spanning union of disjoint paths. We then sequentially label vertices along each path starting from one endpoint and increasing by one the label for each vertex encountered as we move along the path towards the second endpoint. This procedure greedily maximizes the number of edges assigned the induced absolute subtractive edge label one. The only edges in the proposed relabeling of  $G_f$  whose induced absolute subtractive edge labels possibly differ from one, are labels of the  $\rho_f$  deleted non-loop edges as well as loop edges if any occurs in  $G_f$ .  $\square$

Note that the lower bound is sharp when  $f \in S_n$  is either the identity element or any other involution having no fixed points. The upper bound is sharp for any functional directed graph made up of a single spanning directed cycle or a functional path.

**Proposition 18.** *For all  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ ,*

$$n \geq \max_{\sigma \in S_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma f \sigma^{-1}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right| \geq \left| \left\{ (i, f(i)) : \begin{array}{l} i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ i \neq f(i) \end{array} \right\} \right| - \rho_f + \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \exists i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \text{ s.t. } f(i) = i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

where  $\rho_f$  denotes the minimum number of non-loop edge deletions required in  $G_f$  to obtain a spanning subgraph which is a union of disjoint paths, possibly having loop edges.

*Proof.* The upper bound follows from the observation  $|E(G_f)| = n$ . We justify the lower-bound by considering every possible deletion of  $\rho_f$  edges from  $G_f$  to obtain a spanning union of disjoint paths, possibly having loop edges. We then sequentially label vertices along each path starting from one endpoint and alternating between largest and smallest unassigned label for each vertex encountered as we move along the path towards the second endpoint. This procedure greedily maximizes the number of distinct edge labels. The only edges in the proposed relabeling of  $G_f$  whose induced absolute subtractive edge labels possibly repeat correspond to labels of deleted non-loop edges and loop edges if  $f$  has two or more fixed points.  $\square$

Note that the upper bound is sharp for a graceful functional directed graph. The lower bound is sharp for a functional directed graph made of a single spanning directed cycle.

**Definition 19.** Let  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$ , we denote by  $\text{Aut}(P)$  the stabilizer subgroup of  $S_n \subset \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  associated with the polynomial  $P$  defined with respect to permutations of variables  $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$ . In other words  $\text{Aut}(P)$  denotes the set of permutations of the variables which fixes  $P$ .

**Proposition 20** (Stabilizer subgroup). *For an arbitrary  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ , with at least one fixed point*

$$\text{Aut} \left\{ \prod_{0 \leq i \neq j < n} \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right) \right\} = \begin{cases} S_n & \text{if } \left| \left\{ (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right| < n \\ \text{Aut} \{ G_f \cup G_{f^\top} \setminus \{(u, f(u)) : u = f(u)\} \} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases},$$

where  $G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus \{(u, f(u)) : u = f(u)\}$  denotes the loopless bi-directed digraph which underlies the functional directed graph  $G_f$ .

*Proof.* For notational convenience let

$$p_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right)$$

If the underlying undirected graph of  $G_f \cup G_{f^\tau}$  has fewer than  $n$  edges, then  $\left| \{(x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\} \right| < n$  and  $p_f$  vanishes identically. Thus  $\text{Aut}(p_f) = S_n$ . So assume  $\left| \{(x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\} \right| = n$  and thus  $p_f$  does not vanish identically. Observe that for all  $\gamma \in S_n$ , we have

$$\prod_{0 \leq i \neq j < n} \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right) = \prod_{0 \leq \gamma^{-1}(i) \neq \gamma^{-1}(j) < n} \left( (x_{f\gamma^{-1}(j)} - x_{\gamma^{-1}(j)})^2 - (x_{f\gamma^{-1}(i)} - x_{\gamma^{-1}(i)})^2 \right).$$

The right action does not change the polynomial because it simply rearranges the factors as follows

$$\prod_{0 \leq i \neq j < n} \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right) = \prod_{0 \leq i \neq j < n} \left( (x_{f\gamma^{-1}(j)} - x_{\gamma^{-1}(j)})^2 - (x_{f\gamma^{-1}(i)} - x_{\gamma^{-1}(i)})^2 \right).$$

Acting on  $p_f$  by permuting it's variables effects a left action so that

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{0 \leq i \neq j < n} \left( (x_{\gamma f(j)} - x_{\gamma(j)})^2 - (x_{\gamma f(i)} - x_{\gamma(i)})^2 \right) &= \prod_{0 \leq i \neq j < n} \left( (x_{\gamma f\gamma^{-1}(j)} - x_{\gamma\gamma^{-1}(j)})^2 - (x_{\gamma f\gamma^{-1}(i)} - x_{\gamma\gamma^{-1}(i)})^2 \right), \\ \implies \prod_{0 \leq i \neq j < n} \left( (x_{\gamma f(j)} - x_{\gamma(j)})^2 - (x_{\gamma f(i)} - x_{\gamma(i)})^2 \right) &= \prod_{0 \leq i \neq j < n} \left( (x_{\gamma f\gamma^{-1}(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{\gamma f\gamma^{-1}(i)} - x_i)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $(p_f(x_{\gamma(0)}, \dots, x_{\gamma(n-1)}))^2 = (p_{\gamma f\gamma^{-1}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}))^2$ . If on the one hand  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus \{(u, f(u)) : u = f(u)\})$ , then

$$(p_f)^2 = (p_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}})^2 = (p_f(x_{\sigma(0)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n-1)}))^2$$

and  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}((p_f)^2)$ . If on the other hand  $\sigma \notin \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus \{(u, f(u)) : u = f(u)\})$ , we have

$$(p_f)^2 \neq (p_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}})^2 = (p_f(x_{\sigma(0)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n-1)}))^2$$

and  $\sigma \notin \text{Aut}((p_f)^2)$ . Since  $p_f$  determines<sup>2</sup> the edges set of  $G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus \{(u, f(u)) : u = f(u)\}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 21** (Zeilberger Birthday Lemma<sup>3</sup>). *Let  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  be subject to the fixed point condition  $f^{(n-1)}(\mathbb{Z}_n) = \{r\}$  where  $n \geq 3$  and let*

$$F_f(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i) \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right).$$

If

$$0 \not\equiv F_f(\mathbf{x}) \pmod{\{(x_u)^2 : u \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}},$$

then

$$\text{Aut} \left( \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} (F_f(g))^2 L_g(\mathbf{x}) \right) \supseteq \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus (r, r)).$$

<sup>2</sup>We discuss this further in the appendix

<sup>3</sup>The need for this lemma was pointed out to the author by Doron Zeilberger on July 2nd 2022 which happens to coincide with his birthday.

*Proof.* We start by showing that for all permutations  $\gamma \in S_n$  we have

$$(F_f(x_{\gamma(0)}, \dots, x_{\gamma(n-1)}))^2 = (F_{\gamma f \gamma^{-1}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}))^2.$$

Observe that, by commutativity of the product, the right action by any  $\gamma \in S_n$  leaves  $(F_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}))^2$  unchanged since

$$\prod_{0 \leq i \neq j < n} \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right)^2 = \prod_{0 \leq \gamma^{-1}(i) \neq \gamma^{-1}(j) < n} \left( (x_{f\gamma^{-1}(j)} - x_{\gamma^{-1}(j)})^2 - (x_{f\gamma^{-1}(i)} - x_{\gamma^{-1}(i)})^2 \right)^2.$$

Thus for all  $\gamma \in S_n$  we have

$$\prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right)^2 = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} \left( (x_{f\gamma^{-1}(j)} - x_{\gamma^{-1}(j)})^2 - (x_{f\gamma^{-1}(i)} - x_{\gamma^{-1}(i)})^2 \right)^2.$$

Consequently, left action by any  $\gamma \in S_n$  effects an action by conjugation on  $f$  as follows

$$\prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} \left( (x_{\gamma f(j)} - x_{\gamma(j)})^2 - (x_{\gamma f(i)} - x_{\gamma(i)})^2 \right)^2 = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} \left( (x_{\gamma f \gamma^{-1}(j)} - x_{\gamma \gamma^{-1}(j)})^2 - (x_{\gamma f \gamma^{-1}(i)} - x_{\gamma \gamma^{-1}(i)})^2 \right)^2,$$

Thus, the remainders of  $(F_f(x_{\gamma(0)}, \dots, x_{\gamma(n-1)}))^2$  and  $(F_{\gamma f \gamma^{-1}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}))^2$  are equal. By the corollary 15, the polynomial  $(F_f)^2$  admits an expansion of the form

$$(F_f(\mathbf{x}))^2 = \sum_{0 < k \leq d+1-n} \left( \sum_{g_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+k}^n} b_{g_k} L_{g_k}(\mathbf{x}) \right) + \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n \\ G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)}} (F_f(\sigma))^2 L_{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where  $n \leq d \leq 6\binom{n}{2}$ . Thus the congruence identity relating  $(F_f(\mathbf{x}))^2$  to its canonical representative is

$$(F_f(\mathbf{x}))^2 \equiv \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n \\ G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)}} (F_f(\sigma))^2 L_{\sigma}(\mathbf{x}) \pmod{\{(x_i)^{\mathbf{n}} : i \in S \subsetneq \mathbb{Z}_n\}}.$$



The right hand side of the following congruence identities are expressions of the canonical representative of the corresponding congruence class

$$\begin{aligned}
(F_f(x_{\gamma(0)}, \dots, x_{\gamma(n-1)}))^2 &\equiv \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n \\ G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)}} (F_f(\sigma))^2 \prod_{\substack{u \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ v_u \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{\sigma(u)\}}} \left( \frac{x_{\gamma(u)} - v_u}{\sigma(u) - v_u} \right), \\
&\equiv \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n \\ G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)}} (F_f(\sigma))^2 L_{\sigma \gamma^{-1}}(\mathbf{x}), \\
&\equiv \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n \\ G_{\sigma \gamma^{-1} \gamma f \gamma^{-1} \gamma \sigma^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)}} (F_f(\sigma \gamma^{-1} \gamma))^2 L_{\sigma \gamma^{-1}}(\mathbf{x}), \\
&\equiv \sum_{\substack{\theta \in S_n \\ G_{\theta \gamma f \gamma^{-1} \theta^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)}} (F_f(\theta \gamma))^2 L_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), \\
&\equiv \sum_{\substack{\theta \in S_n \\ G_{\theta \gamma f \gamma^{-1} \theta^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)}} (F_{\gamma f \gamma^{-1}}(\theta))^2 L_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}). \\
&\implies \text{Aut} \left( \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} (F_f(g))^2 L_g(\mathbf{x}) \right) \supseteq \text{Aut}((F_f)^2)
\end{aligned}$$

By proposition 20, we have

$$\text{Aut}((F_f)^2) = \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f\tau} \setminus (r, r)).$$

We conclude that

$$\text{Aut} \left( \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} (F_f(g))^2 L_g(\mathbf{x}) \right) \supseteq \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f\tau} \setminus (r, r)),$$

as claimed.  $\square$

Observe that non vanishing Lagrange basis polynomials partition into disjoint cosets of  $\text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f\tau} \setminus (r, r))$  as follows

$$\sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} (F_f(g))^2 L_g(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \left( (v!)^2 \frac{(n-1+v)!}{(2v)!} \right)^2 \sum_{\substack{\sigma \in S_n / \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f\tau} \setminus (r, r)) \\ G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}} \in \text{GrL}(G_f)}} \left( \sum_{\theta \sigma \in \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f\tau} \setminus (r, r))} L_{\sigma \theta \sigma^{-1}}(\mathbf{x}) \right).$$




FIGURE 3.1.  $f(0) = 0, f(1) = 0, f(2) = 1, f(3) = 2$

By the complementary labeling symmetry, if

$$(n - 1 - \text{id}) \circ \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus (r, r)) \circ (n - 1 - \text{id})^{-1} = \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus (r, r)),$$

then

$$\text{Aut}\left(\sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} (F_f(g))^2 L_g(\mathbf{x})\right) \supseteq \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus (r, r)) \cup \text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus (r, r)) \circ (n - 1 - \text{id}).$$

**Example 22.** As an illustration take the function  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_4^{\mathbb{Z}_4}$  such that

$$f(0) = 0, f(1) = 0, f(2) = 1, f(3) = 2,$$

$$(F_f(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3))^2 = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < 4} (x_j - x_i)^2 \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right)^2.$$

We see that

$$\text{Aut}(F_f(x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3))^2 = \{\text{id}, \sigma_1\}$$

where

$$E(G_{\sigma_1}) = \{(0, 3), (1, 2), (2, 1), (3, 0)\}.$$

We see that

$$\left(\sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_4^{\mathbb{Z}_4}} (F_f(g))^2 L_g(\mathbf{x})\right) = 74649600 x_0^3 x_1^3 x_2^3 x_3^3 + \dots - 4031078400 x_1 x_2 x_3,$$

and

$$\text{Aut}\left(\sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_4^{\mathbb{Z}_4}} (F_f(g))^2 L_g(\mathbf{x})\right) = \{\text{id}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3\},$$

where

$$E(G_{\sigma_2}) = \{(0, 1), (1, 0), (2, 3), (3, 2)\}, E(G_{\sigma_3}) = \{(0, 2), (1, 3), (2, 0), (3, 1)\}$$

The example above illustrates a setting where  $\text{Aut}((F_f)^2)$  is a proper subset of

$$\text{Aut}\left(\sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_4^{\mathbb{Z}_4}} (F_f(g))^2 L_g(\mathbf{x})\right).$$

Given  $P \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$ , recall that  $P$  depends on the variable  $x_u$  if the polynomial  $\frac{\partial P}{\partial x_u}$  does not vanish identically.

**Proposition 23.** *Let  $P(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$  be dependent only on the subset of variables in*

$$\{x_i : i \in S \subsetneq \mathbb{Z}_n\},$$

*If  $P(\mathbf{x})$  is of degree at most  $n-1$  in the said variables, then for any positive integer  $m$  the canonical representative of*

$$(P(\mathbf{x}))^m \pmod{\{(x_i)^{\underline{n}} : i \in S\}}$$

*can depend only on variables in the subset  $\{x_i : i \in S\}$ .*

*Proof.* By our premise  $P$  equals its own canonical representative i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} P(g) L_g(\mathbf{x}). \\ \implies (P(\mathbf{x}))^m &= \left( \sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} P(g) L_g(\mathbf{x}) \right)^m. \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $(P(\mathbf{x}))^m$  can depend only on variables in  $\{x_i : i \in S\}$ . The canonical representative of  $(P(\mathbf{x}))^m$  is

$$\sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} (P(g))^m L_g(\mathbf{x})$$

By the proposition 13, the canonical representative of  $(P(\mathbf{x}))^m$  can be obtained by reducing  $(P(\mathbf{x}))^m$  modulo algebraic relations

$$\{(x_i)^{\underline{n}} : i \in S\}.$$

Accordingly, the canonical representative of  $(P(\mathbf{x}))^m$  is devised by repeatedly replacing into the expanded form of  $(P(\mathbf{x}))^m$  every occurrence of  $(x_i)^n$  with  $(x_i)^n - (x_i)^{\underline{n}}$  for all  $i \in S$  until we obtain a polynomial of degree  $< n$  in each variable. The reduction procedure never introduces a variable in the complement of the set  $\{(x_i)^{\underline{n}} : i \in S\}$ . Therefore, the canonical representative of  $(P(\mathbf{x}))^m$  given by

$$\sum_{g \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}} (P(g))^m L_g(\mathbf{x})$$

can depend only on variables in  $\{x_i : i \in S\}$  as claimed.  $\square$

We now state and prove the composition lemma.

**Lemma 24** (The Composition Lemma). *Let  $n$  be a positive integer greater than 3. For all functions  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ , If  $|f^{(n-1)}(\mathbb{Z}_n)| = 1$  and  $G_f$  has diameter  $\geq 3$ , then*

$$\max_{\sigma \in S_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma f^{(2)} \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right| \leq \max_{\sigma \in S_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma f \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right|.$$

*Proof.* Assume without loss of generality  $f$  lies in the semigroup

$$\left\{ h \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : \begin{array}{l} h(0) = 0 \\ h(i) < i, \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{0\} \end{array} \right\}.$$

For we see that if  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  subject to  $|f^{(n-1)}(\mathbb{Z}_n)| = 1$ , does not lie in the semigroup, there exist a permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$  of the vertex labels in  $G_f$  by which we devise  $G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}}$  isomorphic to  $G_f$  such that

$$\sigma f \sigma^{-1} \in \left\{ h \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : \begin{array}{l} h(0) = 0 \\ h(i) < i, \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{0\} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Thus functional directed graphs of members of the semigroup

$$\left\{ h \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : \begin{array}{l} h(0) = 0 \\ h(i) < i, \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{0\} \end{array} \right\},$$

account for at least one member of every conjugacy class of functional tree. Observe that for any  $f$  in the semigroup the iterate  $f^{(2^{\lceil \log_2(n-1) \rceil})}$  is identically zero. Hence, the existence of some function

$$g \in \left\{ h \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : \begin{array}{l} h(0) = 0 \\ h(i) < i, \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{0\} \end{array} \right\} \text{ such that } n > \max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma g \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right|,$$

implies the existence of some function

$$f \in \left\{ g^{(2^\kappa)} : 0 \leq \kappa < \lceil \log_2(n-1) \rceil \right\} \subset \left\{ h \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : \begin{array}{l} h(0) = 0 \\ h(i) < i, \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{0\} \end{array} \right\},$$

such that

$$\max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma f^{(2)} \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right| > \max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma f \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right|.$$

Consequently if the purported claim of lemma 24 holds, then there can be no member  $g$  of the semigroup for which

$$n > \max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma g \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right|.$$

We now proceed to prove a generalization of the desired claim. Assume without loss of generality that the vertex labeled  $n-1$  is at maximum edge distance from the vertex labeled 0 (the root node) in  $G_f$ . Also assume without loss of generality that vertices in the set  $f^{-1}(\{f(n-1)\})$  (namely the vertex set made up of  $n-1$  and its sibling nodes in  $G_f$ ) are assigned the largest possible labels from  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  in other words

$$f^{-1}(\{f(n-1)\}) = \{n-1, n-2, \dots, n - |f^{-1}(\{f(n-1)\})|\}.$$

For if this was not the case, we can effect a permutation  $\sigma$  of the vertex labels  $G_f$  to devise an isomorphic functional directed graph  $G_{\sigma f \sigma^{-1}}$  for which  $\sigma f \sigma^{-1}$  lies in the semigroup and both of these latter conditions are met. Now consider the transformation which devises from  $G_f$  a new functional directed graph  $G_g$  obtained by sliding one edge length closer to the root node the collection of sibling nodes which include the vertex labeled  $n-1$  i.e. vertices in the set  $f^{-1}(\{f(n-1)\})$ . More precisely,  $G_g$  is the functional directed graph of  $g$  defined such that for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}_n$

$$g(i) = \begin{cases} f^{(2)}(i) & \text{if } i \in f^{-1}(\{f(n-1)\}) \\ f(i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

By construction

$$g \in \left\{ h \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : \begin{array}{l} h(0) = 0 \\ h(i) < i, \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{0\} \end{array} \right\}.$$

We show that

$$\max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma g \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right| \leq \max_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma f \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right|.$$

The inequality immediately above generalizes the claim of the lemma 24 since in the latter inequality, the function  $f$  is only partially iterated. More precisely  $f$  is iterated only on the restriction  $f^{-1}(\{f(n-1)\}) \subset \mathbb{Z}_n$ . It is easy to see that the claim of lemma 24 follows from this generalization.

For the sake of clarity, we start by carefully describing the argument when the vertex labeled  $n-1$  has no other sibling node in  $G_f$  i.e.  $|f^{-1}(\{f(n-1)\})| = 1$ . Following this discussion, we briefly describe minor changes required to adapt the argument to the setting where the vertex labeled  $n-1$  has one more sibling nodes in  $G_f$ .

For the purposes of the argument, we associate with an arbitrary function  $h \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  a polynomial  $P_h$  in  $3n$  variables  $y_0, \dots, y_{3n-1}$ :

$$P_h(y_0, \dots, y_{3n-1}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{t \in \{1, 2\}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + h(j)} - y_{n \cdot t + j}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + h(i)} - y_{n \cdot t + i}) \right].$$

We use the  $3n$  variables  $y_0, \dots, y_{3n-1}$  instead of the usual  $n$  vertex variables  $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$  to break the symmetry among vertex variables in  $F_f$  and render more visible the role of binomials associated with induced subtractive edge labels. By construction the polynomial  $P_g$  differs only slightly from  $P_f$ . Namely,

$$P_f(\mathbf{y}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ 0 \leq u < v < n-1}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f(v)} - y_{n \cdot t + v}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right] \times \\ \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)} - y_{n \cdot t + n-1}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right],$$

and

$$P_g(\mathbf{y}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ 0 \leq u < v < n-1}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f(v)} - y_{n \cdot t + v}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right] \times \\ \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f^{(2)}(n-1)} - y_{n \cdot t + n-1}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right].$$

To establish the desired inequality it suffices to show that

$$\emptyset \neq \text{GrL}(G_g) \implies \text{GrL}(G_f) \neq \emptyset.$$

We establish the implication above by proving its contrapositive

$$\emptyset = \text{GrL}(G_f) \implies \text{GrL}(G_g) = \emptyset.$$

By proposition 16, the contrapositive statement immediately above is equivalent to the assertion

$$0 \equiv P_f(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \pmod{\{(x_k)^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : k \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}} \implies 0 \equiv P_g(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \pmod{\{(x_k)^{\mathbb{Z}_n} : k \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}}.$$

For the sake of the argument, we view  $f$  as an indeterminate and we focus our attention on members of

$$\{y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)}, y_{n \cdot t + f^{(2)}(n-1)} : t \in \{1, 2\}\}$$

seen as “metavariables”. Members of  $\{y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)}, y_{n \cdot t + f^{(2)}(n-1)} : t \in \{1, 2\}\}$  are seen as metavariables in the sense that the specific choice of  $f$  determines for each metavariable the corresponding variable in  $\{y_i : n \leq i < 3n\}$ . Consider the telescoping setup which re-expresses  $P_g$  as follows

$$P_g(\mathbf{y}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ 0 \leq u < v < n-1}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f(v)} - y_{n \cdot t + v}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right] \times$$

$$\prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f^{(2)}(n-1)} - y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)}) + (y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)} - y_{n \cdot t + n-1}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right].$$

The telescoping setup above re-expresses multilinear factors of  $P_g / \prod_{i < j} (y_j - y_i)$  as  $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ -linear combinations of binomials associated with induced subtractive edge labels occurring exclusively in  $G_f$ . Namely binomials in the set

$$\left\{ y_{n \cdot t + f(i)} - y_{n \cdot t + i} : \begin{array}{l} i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \\ t \in \{1, 2\} \end{array} \right\}.$$

Invoking the multi-binomial identity

$$\prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} (a_t + b_{u,t}) = \left( \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} b_{u,t} \right) + \sum_{\substack{s_{u,t} \in \{0, 1\} \\ 0 = \prod_{u,t} s_{u,t}}} \prod_{u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}} (a_t)^{1-s_{u,t}} (b_{u,t})^{s_{u,t}},$$

in the telescoping setup, yields the expansion

$$\begin{aligned} P_g(\mathbf{y}) &= \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ 0 \leq u < v < n-1}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f(v)} - y_{n \cdot t + v}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right] \times \\ &\quad \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)} - y_{n \cdot t + n-1}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right] + \\ &\quad \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ 0 \leq u < v < n-1}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f(v)} - y_{n \cdot t + v}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right] \times \\ &\quad \sum_{\substack{s_{u,t} \in \{0, 1\} \\ 0 = \prod_{u,t} s_{u,t}}} \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} (y_{n \cdot t + f^{(2)}(n-1)} - y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)})^{1-s_{u,t}} \left( (y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)} - y_{n \cdot t + n-1}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right)^{s_{u,t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} P_g(\mathbf{y}) &= P_f(\mathbf{y}) + \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ 0 \leq u < v < n-1}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f(v)} - y_{n \cdot t + v}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right] \times \\ &\quad \sum_{\substack{s_{u,t} \in \{0, 1\} \\ 0 = \prod_{u,t} s_{u,t}}} \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} (y_{n \cdot t + f^{(2)}(n-1)} - y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)})^{1-s_{u,t}} \left( (y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)} - y_{n \cdot t + n-1}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right)^{s_{u,t}}. \end{aligned}$$

The color scheme used above is meant to emphasize to the reader the location of metavariables introduced for the telescoping setup after we invoke the multi-binomial identity. On the one hand, by definition  $P_g$  depends upon metavariables in the set

$$\{y_{n \cdot t + f^{(2)}(n-1)} : t \in \{1, 2\}\}$$

which accounts for the local iteration of  $f$  used to devise  $g$ . On the other hand, any dependence upon a metavariable in the set

$$\{y_{n-t+f(n-1)} : t \in \{1, 2\}\},$$

introduced for the purpose of the telescoping setup cancels out. For we see that each such metavariable  $y_{n-t+f(n-1)}$  is additively paired up with a negative counterpart  $-y_{n-t+f(n-1)}$  in the telescoping setup. Observe that

$$\text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}) \neq \text{Aut}(G_g \cup G_{g^\tau} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}),$$

for we see that

$$G_f \setminus \{(n-1, f(n-1))\} = G_g \setminus \{(n-1, f^{(2)}(n-1))\}$$

and  $\text{Aut}(G_g)$  includes the transposition which exchanges vertices in the pair  $(n-1, f(n-1))$  whereas  $\text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus \{(0, 0)\})$  excludes the said transposition. If we set the variable assignment  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}$ , then the first summand in the telescoping setup becomes

$$\begin{aligned} P_f(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) &= \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i) \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ 0 \leq u < v < n-1}} \left[ (x_{f(v)} - x_v) + (-1)^t (x_{f(u)} - x_u) \right] \times \\ &\quad \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} \left[ (x_{f(n-1)} - x_{n-1}) + (-1)^t (x_{f(u)} - x_u) \right] \end{aligned}$$

and its automorphism group is reduced to  $\text{Aut}(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus \{(0, 0)\})$ . The same is true for the summation over remaining summands. For notational convenience, let  $R_{f,g}(\mathbf{y})$  denote the sub-sum which leaves out of the multi-binomial summation the first summand (which is equal to  $P_f(\mathbf{y})$ ) i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} R_{f,g}(\mathbf{y}) &= \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ 0 \leq i < j < n-1}} \left[ (y_{n-t+f(j)} - y_{n-t+j}) + (-1)^t (y_{n-t+f(i)} - y_{n-t+i}) \right] \times \\ &\quad \sum_{\substack{s_{u,t} \in \{0, 1\} \\ 0 = \prod_{u,t} s_{u,t}}} \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} (y_{n-t+f^{(2)}(n-1)} - y_{n-t+f(n-1)})^{1-s_{u,t}} \left( (y_{n-t+f(n-1)} - y_{n-t+n-1}) + (-1)^t (y_{n-t+f(u)} - y_{n-t+u}) \right)^{s_{u,t}}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the expression of the first summand which is equal to  $P_f(\mathbf{y})$  includes only the positive part of each positive–negative metavariables pairs  $(y_{n-t+f(n-1)}, -y_{n-t+f(n-1)})$  introduced by for the telescoping setup. Consequently, metavariables introduced by the telescoping setup do not cancel out in the first summand equal to  $P_f(\mathbf{y})$  nor do they cancel out in the remaining summation equal to  $R_{f,g}(\mathbf{y})$ . Having described the telescoping setup, we proceed with the main contradiction argument. Assume for the sake of establishing a contradiction that

$$0 \equiv P_f(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \pmod{\{(x_i)^n : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \not\equiv P_g(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \pmod{\{(x_i)^n : i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}}.$$

$$(3.1) \quad P_g(\mathbf{y}) = P_f(\mathbf{y}) + R_{f,g}(\mathbf{y}) \implies P_g(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \equiv R_{f,g}(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\{(x_i)^n : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}}.$$

On the one hand applying lemma 21 to  $P_g(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x})$  establishes that the transposition which exchanges vertices in the pair  $(n-1, f(n-1))$  lies in the automorphism group of the canonical representative of  $P_g(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x})$ . Observe

that

$$\text{GCD}(P_f, P_g)(\mathbf{y}) = \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (y_j - y_i) \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ 0 \leq u < v < n-1}} \left[ (y_{n \cdot t + f(v)} - y_{n \cdot t + v}) + (-1)^t (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) \right].$$

The congruence identity equation 3.1 is equivalently expressed as

$$\text{GCD}(P_f, P_g)(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} \left[ (x_{f^{(2)}(n-1)} - x_{n-1}) + (-1)^t (x_{f(u)} - x_u) \right] \equiv$$

$$\text{GCD}(P_f, P_g)(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \sum_{\substack{s_{u,t} \in \{0, 1\} \\ 0 = \prod_{u,t} s_{u,t}}} \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} (x_{f^{(2)}(n-1)} - x_{f(n-1)})^{1-s_{u,t}} \left[ (x_{f(n-1)} - x_{n-1}) + (-1)^t (x_{f(u)} - x_u) \right]^{s_{u,t}}.$$

On the other hand, the fact that every summand in the summation

$$\text{GCD}(P_f, P_g)(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \sum_{\substack{s_{u,t} \in \{0, 1\} \\ 0 = \prod_{u,t} s_{u,t}}} \prod_{\substack{t \in \{1, 2\} \\ u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}}} (x_{f^{(2)}(n-1)} - x_{f(n-1)})^{1-s_{u,t}} \left[ (x_{f(n-1)} - x_{n-1}) + (-1)^t (x_{f(u)} - x_u) \right]^{s_{u,t}}.$$

is a multiple of a positive power of the subtractive induce edge label binomial  $(x_{f^{(2)}(n-1)} - x_{f(n-1)})$  constitutes an obstruction to the transposition which exchanges vertices in the pair  $(n-1, f(n-1))$  lying in the automorphism group of the canonical representative of  $R_{f,g}(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x})$ . This obstruction is more clearly rendered by considering the effect of the said transposition on the summand indexed by the choice  $s_{u,t} = 0$  for all  $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{n-1}$  and  $t \in \{1, 2\}$ . This summand is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{GCD}(P_f, P_g)(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) (x_{f^{(2)}(n-1)} - x_{f(n-1)})^{2(n-1)} = \\ & \text{GCD}(P_f, P_g)(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \prod_{t \in \{1, 2\}} \left[ (x_{f^{(2)}(n-1)} - x_{f(n-1)}) + (-1)^t (x_{f(0)} - x_0) \right]^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By our premise this particular summand has a non-vanishing canonical representative. Furthermore the canonical representative of the factor of this summand which excludes the Vandermonde determinant  $\prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i)$  does not depend of the variable  $x_{n-1}$  by proposition 23. Note that every other summands whose canonical representative is non-vanishing is such that the canonical representative of the factor which excludes  $\prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} (x_j - x_i)$  depends on a different subset of variables by proposition 23. Thus the transposition which exchanges the pair  $(n-1, f(n-1))$  does not map the canonical representative of the chosen summand to the canonical representative of any other summand nor is the chosen summand fixed by the said transposition. It follows that the transposition which exchanges the pair  $(n-1, f(n-1))$  can not fix the canonical representative of  $R_{f,g}(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x})$ . Thereby resulting in the contradiction

$$P_g(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \not\equiv R_{f,g}(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \pmod{\{(x_i)^n : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}}.$$

From which we conclude that

$$0 \equiv P_f(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \pmod{\{(x_i)^n : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}} \implies 0 \equiv P_g(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}) \pmod{\{(x_i)^n : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n\}}.$$

In the setting where the vertex labeled  $(n-1)$  has one or more siblings, the setup for the argument is similar. The main difference being that the telescoping is applied to binomials associated with induced subtractive edge labels



in  $P_g$  of the form

$$y_{n \cdot t + f^{(2)}(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u} =$$

$$(y_{n \cdot t + f^{(2)}(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + f(u)}) + (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u}) = (y_{n \cdot t + f^{(2)}(n-1)} - y_{n \cdot t + f(n-1)}) + (y_{n \cdot t + f(u)} - y_{n \cdot t + u})$$

for all  $u \in f^{-1}(\{f(n-1)\})$ . The contradiction argument proceeds in a similar vein to the previous setting. In the latter setting the obstruction is stronger. For we identify more than one transposition which lie in  $\text{Aut}(P_g(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x}))$  but lie outside the automorphism group of the canonical representative of  $R_{f,g}(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x})$ . These obstructions once again stem from the observation that every summand in the summation expressing  $R_{f,g}(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x})$  is a multiple of a positive power of the subtractive induce edge label binomial  $(x_{f^{(2)}(n-1)} - x_{f(n-1)})$ . This fact obstructs the transposition which exchanges vertices in the pair  $(u, f(n-1))$  from lying in the automorphism group of the canonical representative of  $R_{f,g}(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x})$  for all  $u \in f^{-1}(\{f(n-1)\})$ .  $\square$

*Remark 25.* We point out that an argument very similar to the proof of lemma 24 establishes that

$$\emptyset \neq \text{GrL}(G_g) \implies \text{GrL}(G_f) \neq \emptyset,$$

when the graph  $G_f$  of  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  is not a functional tree and admits a directed even-cycle component. In that setting, the graph  $G_g$  is devised from  $G_f$  by iterating the function over the restriction to the selected even-cycle component in  $G_f$ . In this case, permutations which are obstructed from lying in the automorphism group of the canonical representative of  $R_{f,g}(\mathbf{1}_{3 \times 1} \otimes \mathbf{x})$  are permutations of the chosen cycle nodes which lie the automorphism group of the said even-cycle component.

#### 4. THE GRACEFUL LABELING THEOREM

Equipped with the composition lemma, we settle in the affirmative the KRR conjecture as stated in theorem 1. In fact we prove that for all  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ , the maximum number of distinct induced absolute subtractive edge labels occurring in a relabeling of the graph of the iterate  $f^{(o_f)}$  (where  $o_f$  is the order of  $f$  i.e. the LCM of cycle lengths occurring in  $G_f$ ) is equal  $(n+1)$  minus the number of connected components occurring in  $G_{f^{(o_f)}}$ . If  $G_f$  is connected and  $f$  has a fixed point, then  $o_f$  is equal to one and theorem 1 follows as a special case.

**Theorem 26** (The Graceful Labeling Theorem). *For all  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ ,*

$$n + 1 - \left( \text{number of connected components in } G_{f^{(o_f)}} \right) = \max_{\sigma \in S_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma f^{(o_f)} \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right|,$$

where  $o_f$  denotes the order of  $f$  i.e. the LCM of directed cycle lengths occurring in  $G_f$ .

*Proof.* The claim trivially holds when  $f \in S_n$ , for in that setting  $o_f$  is the order of the permutation  $f$  and  $f^{(o_f)} = \text{id}$ . Otherwise if  $f \notin S_n$  it suffices to show that for all  $f$  subject to the fixed point condition  $|f^{(n-1)}(\mathbb{Z}_n)| = 1$  the equality

$$n = \max_{\sigma \in S_n} \left| \left\{ \left| \sigma f \sigma^{(-1)}(i) - i \right| : i \in \mathbb{Z}_n \right\} \right|,$$

holds. This latter claim follows by repeatedly iterating the composition lemma described in lemma 24. For we see that, given any such function  $f$ , the iterate  $f^{(2^{\lceil \log_2(n-1) \rceil})}$  is identically constant. As pointed in example 12, graphs of identically constant functions are graceful. Thus completing the proof.  $\square$

## APPENDIX

We explain here in more detail how the edges of a functional digraph  $G_f$  are determined by the polynomial construction. The discussion presented here is taken from work to appear in a subsequent paper and is provided here for the benefit of the reader. This material will be replaced by a citation once the forthcoming work has been posted on arXiv.

**Lemma 27** (Recovery Lemma). *For an arbitrary function  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ , let*

$$p_f(x_0, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_{n-1}) := \prod_{0 \leq i < j < n} \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right).$$

*Suppose  $p_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  is defined from some function  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$ , and  $p_f$  is not identically zero. If  $f$  has a fixed point, then*

$$G_f \cup G_{f^\top} \setminus \{(i, f(i)) : i \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } f(i) = i\}$$

*can be determined from  $p_f$ . If  $f$  has a fixed point and  $G_f$  is connected, then  $f$  and  $G_f$  can be determined from  $p_f$  and the fixed point. Let  $S$  denote the set of functions  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}_n}$  such that  $f$  has a unique fixed point 0 and  $G_f \cup G_{f^\top} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$  is connected. The function from  $S$  to  $\mathbb{Q}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$  that assigns  $p_f$  to  $f$  is injective.*

*Proof.* We show that each factor in a factorization of  $p_f$  is a quadrinomial (a linear combination of exactly four distinct variables), a trinomial (a linear combination of exactly three distinct variables), or a binomial (a linear combination of exactly two distinct variables), and analyze how each can occur.

$$\left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(i)} - x_i)^2 \right) = (x_{f(j)} - x_j + x_{f(i)} - x_i)(x_{f(j)} - x_j - x_{f(i)} + x_i).$$

A factor  $x_{f(j)} - x_j - x_{f(i)} + x_i$  or  $x_{f(j)} - x_j + x_{f(i)} - x_i$  has the form  $a + b - c - d$  it is a quadrinomial with  $a, b, c, d$  distinct if and only if  $|\{a, b, c, d\}| = 4$  i.e.  $|\{x_{f(j)}, x_j, x_{f(i)}, x_i\}| = 4$ . In this case both  $x_{f(j)} - x_j - x_{f(i)} + x_i$  and  $x_{f(j)} - x_j + x_{f(i)} - x_i$  are quadrinomials.

The expression  $a + b - c - d$  collapses to a binomial if  $|\{a, b\} \cap \{c, d\}| = 1$  (note that  $|\{a, b\} \cap \{c, d\}| = 2$  is impossible since  $p_f$  is not identically zero). Notice that  $a + b - c - d$  occurs in two forms in  $p_f$ :

$$\{a, b\} = \{x_{f(j)}, x_{f(i)}\}, \{c, d\} = \{x_j, x_i\} \quad \text{or} \quad \{a, b\} = \{x_{f(j)}, x_i\}, \{c, d\} = \{x_j, x_{f(i)}\}$$

First consider the case that  $f$  has a (unique) fixed point  $u$ . Then for each  $j \neq 0$  we obtain two copies of the binomial  $x_{f(j)} - x_j$  from

$$\pm \left( (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2 - (x_{f(u)} - x_u)^2 \right) = \pm (x_{f(j)} - x_j)^2$$

with  $+$  if  $j > u$  and  $-$  otherwise.

Now assume neither  $i$  nor  $j$  is fixed by  $f$ . A binomial-trinomial pair of factors arises from

$$(x_{f(j)} - x_j + x_{f(i)} - x_i)(x_{f(j)} - x_j - x_{f(i)} + x_i)$$

when  $\{a, b\} = \{x_{f(j)}, x_{f(i)}\}$ ,  $\{c, d\} = \{x_j, x_i\}$ . Without loss of generality, we choose  $j = f(i)$ . This produces

$$\pm (x_{f(2(i))} - x_i)(x_{f(2(i))} + x_i - 2x_{f(i)})$$

Similarly, a binomial-trinomial pair of factors arises when  $\{a, b\} = \{x_{f(j)}, x_i\}$ ,  $\{c, d\} = \{x_j, x_{f(i)}\}$ , which implies  $f(i) = f(j)$ . Setting  $i < j$ , this produces

$$(2x_{f(j)} - x_j - x_i)(x_i - x_j).$$

We have now described all possible ways binomial factors can occur in  $p_f$ . Furthermore, a trinomial factor of  $p_f$  can only occur in a binomial-trinomial pair. Observe that in each binomial-trinomial pair, the trinomial has the form  $\pm(2r - s - t)$  and the associated binomial is of the form  $(s - t)$ .

We now take a given polynomial  $p_f$  that is not identically zero, with no information about  $f$  except that except that  $f \in \mathbb{Z}_n^{\mathbb{Z}^n}$ . Define  $h_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$  to be the product of all the binomials that occur in binomial-trinomial pairs. That is,  $s - t$  is a factor of  $h_f$  if and only if  $2r - s - t$  is a factor of  $p_f$  for some  $r$ . Now define

$$q_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \frac{p_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})}{h_f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})},$$

which is a polynomial. Then  $q_f$  has no binomial factors if and only if  $f$  does not have a fixed point. Otherwise,  $q$  has  $2(n-1)$  binomial factors, which occur in pairs:  $(x_k - x_\ell)^2$ . Then

$$E(G_f \cup G_{f^\tau} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}) = \left\{ \{k, \ell\} : (x_k - x_\ell)^2 \text{ is a factor of } q_f \right\}.$$

□

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper is based upon work supported by the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) under award number FA8075-18-D-0001/0015. The views and conclusions contained in this work are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the DTIC.

## REFERENCES

- [AAGH16] A. Adamaszek, P. Allen, C. Grosu, and J. Hladký, *Almost all trees are almost graceful*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.01577 (2016).
- [AAGH20] A. Adamaszek, Peter Allen, C. Grosu, and J. Hladký, *Almost all trees are almost graceful*, *Random Structures and Algorithms* **56** (2020), 948–987.
- [Gal09] J.A. Gallian, *A dynamic survey of graph labeling*, *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* **16** (2009), no. 6, 1–219.
- [Kee14] P. Keevash, *The existence of designs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.3665 (2014).
- [KS20] Peter Keevash and Katherine Staden, *Ringel’s tree packing conjecture in quasirandom graphs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09947 (2020).
- [MPS20] Richard Montgomery, Alexey Pokrovskiy, and Benny Sudakov, *A proof of ringel’s conjecture*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.02665 (2020).
- [Rin63] G Ringel, *Theory of graphs and its applications*, Proceedings of the Symposium Smolenice, 1963.
- [Ros66] Alexander Rosa, *On certain valuations of the vertices of a graph*, *Theory of Graphs (Internat. Symposium, Rome, 1966*, pp. 349–355.
- [Wil75] Richard M Wilson, *Decompositions of complete graphs into subgraphs isomorphic to a given graph*, *Proc. 5th British Combinatorial Conf.*, 1975, 1975.
- [Woź04] Mariusz Woźniak, *Packing of graphs and permutations—a survey*, *Discrete Mathematics* **276** (2004), 379–391.
- [Yap88] H.P. Yap, *Packing of graphs—a survey*, *Annals of Discrete Mathematics* **38** (1988), 395–404.