

Bounds for Permutation Arrays under Kendall Tau Metric*

Sergey Bereg William Bumpass Mohammadreza Haghpanah Brian Malouf
I. Hal Sudborough

Abstract

Permutation arrays under the Kendall- τ metric have been considered for error-correcting codes. Given n and $d \in [1..(\binom{n}{2})]$, the task is to find a large permutation array of permutations on n symbols with pairwise Kendall- τ distance at least d . Let $P(n, d)$ denote the maximum size of any permutation array of permutations on n symbols with pairwise Kendall- τ distance d . New algorithms and several theorems are presented, giving improved lower bounds for $P(n, d)$. Also, (n, m, d) -arrays are defined, which are permutation arrays on n symbols with Kendall- τ distance d , with the restriction that symbols $1..(n-m)$ appear in increasing order. Let $P(n, m, d)$ denote the maximum size of any (n, m, d) -array. For example, (n, m, d) -arrays are useful for recursively computing lower bounds for $P(n, d)$. Lower and upper bounds are given for $P(n, m, d)$.

1 Introduction

In [1, 2, 5, 8, 10, 11], permutation arrays under the Kendall- τ metric were studied. This complemented many studies of permutation arrays under other metrics, such as the Hamming metric [3] [4] [6], Chebyshev metric [9] and several others [7]. The use of the Kendall- τ metric was motivated by applications of error correcting codes and rank modulation in flash memories [8].

Let $[1..n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and let S_n denote the set of all permutations over $[1..n]$. Let σ and π be two permutations (or strings¹) over an alphabet $\Sigma \subseteq [1..n]$. The *Kendall- τ distance* between σ and π , denoted by $d(\sigma, \pi)$, is the minimum number of adjacent transpositions (bubble sort operations) required to transform σ into π . For an array (set) A of permutations (strings), the pairwise Kendall- τ distance of A , denoted by $d(A)$, is $\min\{d(\sigma, \pi) \mid \sigma, \pi \in A, \sigma \neq \pi\}$. An array A of permutations on $[1..n]$ with $d(A) = d$ will be called a (n, d) -PA or simply an (n, d) -array. Let $P(n, d)$ denote the maximum cardinality of any (n, d) -PA A .

Vijayakumaran [10] showed several lower bounds for $P(5, d)$ and $P(6, d)$ using integer linear programming. Buzaglo and Etzion [5] showed many new bounds, including $P(7, 3) \geq 588$ using two permutation representatives and a set of permutations generated by specific automorphism operations. We also show results using automorphisms, namely those given in Table 1. Details of these automorphisms are given in Section 4 with additional details in an appendix.

We also used other programs to compute good lower bounds:

1. *Maximum Clique.* Let $G_{n,d} = (S_n, E)$ be a graph where two nodes are connected by an edge if the corresponding permutations are at Kendall- τ distance at least d . A clique in $G_{n,d}$ is an (n, d) -array. Compute $P(n, d)$ as the maximum size of a clique in $G_{n,d}$.

¹If σ and τ are strings then every symbol must appear the same number of times in them.

2. *Random Greedy.* Choose a random (n, d) -array of small size (1-5). Proceed through all remaining permutations in lexicographic order and add them to the set if they have Kendall- τ distance at least d .

In Tables 1 and 2 are given sporadic results obtained by these techniques. Blank positions in our tables signify other papers have the best lower bounds known *e.g.* [5], [10]. All other lower bounds we give are larger than the previous lower bounds, except for the two noted in Table 1.

n:d	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6	102 ^(*)						
7	588 ^(*)	336	126	84	42		
8	3,752	2,240	672	448	168		
9					1,008		288

Table 1: Improved lower bounds on $P(n, d)$ by automorphisms. (The bounds for $P(6, 3)$ and $P(7, 3)$ are from [10] and [5], respectively.)

n:d	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8						115	57
9	26,831	15,492	3,882	2,497	see Table 1	608	see Table 1
10	233,421	133,251	29,145	18,344	5,629	3,832	1,489
11			247,014	153,260	42,013	28,008	9,747

n:d	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18—
7	13	8	7	4					
8	43	26	21	15	12	8			
9	195	101	79	46	37	24	19	15	15
10	1,070	491	371	196	153	90	71		
11	6,890	2,861	2,108	1,007	773	415	329	191	131
12	50,649	19,227	13,935	6,087	4,564	2,250	1,730	936	740

Table 2: Improved lower bounds by random Greedy.

In [2] Barg and Mazumdar described their Theorem 4.5, which is given below:

Theorem 1. [2] Let $m = ((n - 2)^{t+1} - 1)/(n - 3)$, where $n - 2$ is a prime power. Then

$$P(n, 2t + 1) \geq \frac{n!}{t(t + 1)m}.$$

This was improved by Wang, Zhang, Yang, and Ge in [11].

Theorem 2. [11] Let $m = ((n - 2)^{t+1} - 1)/(n - 3)$, where $n - 2$ is a prime power. Then

$$P(n, 2t + 1) \geq \frac{n!}{(2t + 1)m}. \tag{1}$$

For example, by choosing $t = 1$ and $n = 11$, one obtains, by Theorem 2, $P(11, 3) \geq 1,330,560$. Theorem 2 applies only when n is two greater than the power of a prime. To compute good lower

bounds for $P(n, d)$ when n is not two greater than the power of a prime, one needs other techniques (such as those given in Theorems 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12). The lower bounds given by Theorem 2 are close to corresponding upper bounds when t is small, but not so close when t is large, say larger than n). For example, observe that, in the right side of the inequality (1), $\frac{n!}{(2t+1)^m} < 1$, when $t \geq n$, because $m = ((n-2)^{t+1} - 1)/(n-3)$, and $(n-2)^{t+1} > n!$ when $t > n \geq 4$. On the other hand, $P(2^i \cdot 6, 2^i \cdot 15) \geq 2^{2^i}$, for every integer $i \geq 0$. This follows from Theorem 3.

Theorem 3. *For all $n \geq 3$ and all $d \geq 2$, $P(2n, 2d) \geq P(n, d)^2$.*

Proof. Let A be a (n, d) -array of permutations on $[1..n]$. Let O be the function from $[1..n]$ to $[1..2n]$ defined by $O(i) = 2i - 1$, for all i , and let E be the function from $[1..n]$ to $[1..2n]$ defined by $E(i) = 2i$, for all i . By a slight abuse of notation, let O and E also denote the corresponding string homomorphisms. Create the array $C = \{c_1c_2\dots c_{2n} = (O(\sigma), E(\tau)) \mid \sigma = a_1a_2\dots a_n, \tau = b_1b_2\dots b_n \in A \text{ and } c_1c_3\dots c_{2n-1} = O(\sigma), \text{ and } c_2c_4\dots c_{2n} = E(\tau)\}$. Set C is a $(2n, 2d)$ -array with $|A|^2$ elements. That is, for any permutation in C , odd (and only odd) index positions have an odd numbered symbol. For any adjacent symbols, say a_i and a_{i+1} in σ it takes at least two adjacent transpositions to exchange the corresponding symbols, $O(a_i)$ and $O(a_{i+1})$ in $(O(\sigma), E(\tau))$, for any τ , due to the even numbered symbol between them. Changing the order of the even numbered symbols doesn't make it easier to rearrange the odd numbered symbols. The argument is similar to the rearrangement of the even numbered symbols. \square

Observe $P(6, 15) = 2$, as a set with a permutation π on six symbols and the reversal of π has Kendall- τ distance 15. So, $P(2^i \cdot 6, 2^i \cdot 15) \geq 2^{2^i}$, for all integer $i \geq 0$, follows from Theorem 3. As the lower bounds given by Theorem 2, in these cases, is less than one, Theorem 2 can be significantly improved when t is large. Several additional examples of such improved lower bounds are shown in Tables 8 and 9. Note that the recursive technique given in Theorem 8 below also doesn't provide good lower bounds in such cases, as $d > n$ implies $\lceil \frac{n+1}{d} \rceil = 1$.

Corollary 4. *For all $n \geq 3$ and $d \geq 2$ with $d \leq n$, $P(2n, 2d) \geq 2 \cdot P(n, d)^2$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3. Create the array $D = \{c_1c_2\dots c_{2n} = (O(\sigma), E(\tau)), d_1d_2\dots d_{2n} = (E(\sigma), O(\tau)) \mid \sigma = a_1a_2\dots a_n, \tau = b_1b_2\dots b_n \in A \text{ and } c_1c_3\dots c_{2n-1} = O(\sigma), \text{ and } c_2c_4\dots c_{2n} = E(\tau), d_1d_3\dots d_{2n-1} = E(\sigma), \text{ and } d_2d_4\dots d_{2n} = O(\tau)\}$. As it takes $2n$ adjacent transpositions to transform an alternating odd-even string into an alternating even-odd string, or vice-versa, D is a $(2n, 2d)$ -array with $2 \cdot |A|^2$ elements, when $d \leq n$. \square

For example, we see (from Table 9), $P(13, 13) \geq 14, 158$. By Corollary 4, $P(26, 26) \geq 400, 897, 928$. By Theorem 2, $P(26, 26) \geq 16, 959, 621$. Again, using Corollary 4 gives a better lower bound.

Corollary 5. *For all $n \geq 3$, all $d \geq 2$, and $s \geq 2$, $P(sn, sd) \geq P(n, d)^s$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3. Let A be a (n, d) -array. Create a new set of permutations, say Q , so that in every permutation in Q , index $\equiv k \pmod{s}$ positions contain (and only contain) index $\equiv k \pmod{s}$ symbols. Further, for the i^{th} equivalence class \pmod{s} , the string of symbols in positions in the i^{th} equivalence class \pmod{s} is a string in A transformed by $T_i(j) = s \cdot (j - 1) + i$. \square

For example, Corollary 5 implies $P(3^i \cdot 6, 3^i \cdot 15) \geq 2^{3^i}$, for all integer $i \geq 0$. The following theorems from [8] allow one to obtain good lower bounds in many cases.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	$P_{\tau_i}(14, 11)$
τ_1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	47,851
τ_2	0	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	36,250
τ_3	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	19,227
τ_4	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19,227
τ_5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	19,227

Table 3: $(14, 2, 11)$ -array with 5 permutations τ_1, \dots, τ_5 . Since the first 12 symbols in all τ_i are sorted, they are replaced by zeros. The last column contains lower bounds for $P_{\tau_i}(14, 11), i = 1, \dots, 5$.

Theorem 6. [8] For all $n \geq 1$ and even $d \geq 2$, we have $P(n, d) \geq \frac{1}{2}P(n, d - 1)$.

Theorem 7. [8] For all $n, d \geq 1$ we have $P(n + 1, d) \leq (n + 1) \cdot P(n, d)$.

Using Theorems 7 and 2 we have $P(14, 11) \geq P(15, 11)/15 \geq 15!/(11 \cdot 402234 \cdot 15) \approx 19,703.2$

Theorem 8. [8] For all $n, d > 1$ we have $P(n + 1, d) \geq \lceil \frac{n+1}{d} \rceil P(n, d)$.

For example, to compute a lower bound for $P(14, 11)$ one can use, iteratively, Theorem 8 to obtain $P(14, 11) \geq \lceil \frac{14}{11} \rceil \cdot \lceil \frac{13}{11} \rceil \cdot P(12, 11) = 4 \cdot P(12, 11)$. By computation (using the random greedy algorithm) we have $P(12, 11) \geq 19,277$, so

$$P(14, 11) \geq 77,108. \quad (2)$$

Theorems 11 and 12, described in the next section, give a technique to compute better lower bounds, in cases where t is large, as summarized in Tables 8 and 9.

2 Recursive Techniques

There is often a better way to compute $P(n, d)$ from $P(n - m, d)$, for various $m \geq 1$, than an iterative use of Theorem 8. Let $S_{n,m}$ be the set of permutations on $[1..n]$ with the restriction that the first $n - m$ symbols are in sorted order, for a given $m < n$. (The first $n - m$ symbols in sorted order means they can be replaced by zeroes, although the strings with zeroes are not permutations.) A set $A \subseteq S_{n,m}$ with Kendall- τ distance d is called a (n, m, d) -PA or (n, m, d) -array. Let $P(n, m, d)$ denote the maximum cardinality of any (n, m, d) -array A .

In [8] Theorem 8 was proved using the set $\{1, d+1, 2d+1, \dots, \lceil \frac{n+1}{d} \rceil d + 1\}$, which is a $(n+1, 1, d)$ -array. In general, a (n, m, d) -array can be much larger than one obtained by an iterative use of Theorem 8. We exhibit a $(14, 2, 11)$ -array with 5 permutations τ_1, \dots, τ_5 in Table 3.

For any integer $n > 1$ let $\pi_1(a, s)$ denote the string $n \dots n - 1$, and let $\pi_2(a, s)$ denote the string $n - 1 \dots n$, where 'a' is the number of dots between the two symbols n and $n - 1$ and 's' is the position of the first symbol of the pair. We call the number 'a' the *separation number* and the number 's' the *starting position*. For example, consider the set of permutations $A_{9,2,3}$, for $n = 9$, $m = 2$ and $d = 3$, where the symbols in $[1..7]$ are in order and replace any blank positions or dots:

- $\pi_1(0, s), s \in \{1, 3, 5, 7\}$,
- $\pi_2(0, s), s \in \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$,

9 8 - - - - -
- 8 9 - - - - -
- - 9 8 - - - - -
- - - 8 9 - - - - -
- - - - 9 8 - - - - -
- - - - - 8 9 - - - - -
- - - - - - 9 8 - - - - -
- - - - - - - 8 9 - - - - -
9 - - - 8 - - - - -
8 - - - 9 - - - - -
- 9 - - - - 8 - - - - -
- 8 - - - - - 9 - - - - -
- - - 9 - - - 8 - - - - -
- - - 8 - - - 9 - - - - -
9 - - - - - - - 8 - - - - -
8 - - - - - - - 9 - - - - -

Table 4: A $(9, 2, 3)$ -array $A_{9,2,3}$.

- $\pi_1(3, s)$ and $\pi_2(3, s), s \in \{1, 4\}$,
- $\pi_1(4, s)$ and $\pi_2(4, s), s \in \{2\}$,
- $\pi_1(7, s)$ and $\pi_2(7, s), s \in \{1\}$.

To illustrate our notation, the set $A_{9,2,3}$ is shown in Table 4 (where, for convenience, the symbols in [1..7], which appear in order, are replaced with -'s). The $(9, 2, 3)$ -array $A_{9,2,3}$ has sixteen elements, so $P(9, 2, 3) \geq 16$. (Our search program does not find any larger $(9, 2, 3)$ -array, so this may be optimal.)

Similarly, we give a $(10, 2, 3)$ -array $A_{10,2,3}$ with elements:

- $\pi_1(0, s), s \in \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9\}$,
- $\pi_2(0, s), s \in \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$,
- $\pi_1(3, s)$ and $\pi_2(3, s), s \in \{1, 3, 6\}$,
- $\pi_1(4, s)$ and $\pi_2(4, s), s \in \{4\}$.
- $\pi_1(6, s)$ and $\pi_2(6, s), s \in \{1\}$.
- $\pi_1(7, s)$ and $\pi_2(7, s), s \in \{2\}$.

The $(10, 2, 3)$ -array $A_{10,2,3}$ has twenty-one elements, so $P(10, 2, 3) \geq 21$. (Our search program again does not find any larger $(10, 2, 3)$ -array.)

Consider, permutations $\pi_1(0, s)$ and $\pi_2(0, s+1)$ (or, respectively, $\pi_2(0, s)$ and $\pi_1(0, s+1)$), with all symbols other than $n-1$ and n in order. The Kendall- τ distance between them is three because one needs two adjacent transpositions to move the symbol n (respectively, $n-1$) from position s to position $s+2$ and one needs one additional adjacent transpositions to move the symbol $n-1$, (respectively n) in position $s+1$, where it occurs initially, back to position $s+1$ after its displacement by the movement of the symbol n (respectively, $n-1$). Clearly, $d(\pi_1(r, u), \pi_1(s, t)) \geq 3$ if $|r-s| \geq 3$,

as it takes at least 3 adjacent transpositions to change the separation distance r in one case to the separation distance s in the other. Also, $d(\pi_1(r, u), \pi_1(s, t)) \geq 3$ if $s \geq r + 1$ and $t \geq u + 1$. As an example of the latter, note that $\pi_1(7, 1)$ and $\pi_1(8, 2)$ have distance three, as it takes one transposition to move n in position 1 to position 2 and two more adjacent transpositions to move $n - 1$ from position 8 to position 10.

In this way, one can verify that $A_{9,2,3}$ and $A_{10,2,3}$ have Kendall- τ distance three.

Generally, define:

- $D_{n,2,3} = \{ \pi_1(0, s) \mid s \in \{1, 3, \dots, n - 1\} \}$, if n is even,
- $D_{n,2,3} = \{ \pi_1(0, s) \mid s \in \{1, 3, \dots, n - 2\} \}$, if n is odd,
- $E_{n,2,3} = \{ \pi_2(0, s) \mid s \in \{2, 4, \dots, n - 2\} \}$, if n is even,
- $E_{n,2,3} = \{ \pi_2(0, s) \mid s \in \{2, 4, \dots, n - 1\} \}$, if n is odd,
- $F_{n,2,3} = \{ \pi_1(a, s), \pi_2(a, s) \mid s \in \{1, 4, 7, \dots\}, a \in \{3, 7, 11, \dots\} \}$,
- $G_{n,2,3} = \{ \pi_1(b, t), \pi_2(b, t) \mid t \in \{2, 5, 8, \dots\}, b \in \{4, 8, 12, \dots\} \}$.

(The values of s, t, a, b are such that the resulting permutation has length n).

Let $B_{n,2,3} = D_{n,2,3} \cup E_{n,2,3} \cup F_{n,2,3} \cup G_{n,2,3}$. Observe that $B_{n,2,3}$ has pairwise Kendall- τ distance 3. This follows from the discussion in the previous paragraph, when starting positions and separation numbers are close; otherwise, note that either separation numbers or starting positions differ by at least 3. (As illustrated in Table 4.)

Theorem 9. For all $n \geq 5$, $P(n, 2, 3) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{(n+1)^2}{6}, & \text{if } n \equiv 5 \pmod{6}, \\ \frac{n^2+2n-6}{6} & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \text{ or } n \equiv 4 \pmod{6}, \\ \frac{n^2+2n-3}{6} & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \text{ or } n \equiv 3 \pmod{6}, \\ \frac{n^2+2n-2}{6} & \text{if } n \equiv 2 \pmod{6}. \end{cases}$

Proof. We show that $B_{n,2,3}$ has the given sizes. Clearly, $|D_{n,2,3}| + |E_{n,2,3}| = n - 1$. We assume that initially degree two polynomials can be used to describe each case, find the polynomials using Lagrange's formula, and then verify the correctness of the computed polynomial for other values. That is, we obtain the unique degree 2 polynomial passing through three given points. The results are dependent on, for which i , $n \equiv i \pmod{6}$. For instance, when $n \equiv 5 \pmod{6}$, we have $|B_{17,2,3}| = 54$, $|B_{29,2,3}| = 150$, and $|B_{41,2,3}| = 294$. This yields the unique degree 2 polynomial: $\frac{(n+1)^2}{6}$. The polynomial is verified to be the correct size of $B_{n,2,3}$, for other values, when $n \equiv 5 \pmod{6}$. Other cases are done similarly. \square

Observe that $|A_{10,2,3}| = 21$, whereas $|B_{10,2,3}| = 19$. This is due to the fact that, $\pi_1(3, s)$ and $\pi_2(3, s)$, in $A_{10,2,3}$, are chosen for $s \in \{1, 3, 6\}$, not for $s \in \{1, 4, 7\}$.

Note that a two-fold iterative use of Theorem 8 gives

$$P(n, 2, 3) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{n^2}{9}, & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{3}, \\ \frac{n^2+n-2}{9} & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \pmod{3}, \text{ and} \\ \frac{n^2+2n+1}{9} & \text{if } n \equiv 2 \pmod{3}. \end{cases}$$

So, Theorem 9 yields a better result $P(n, 2, 3) \geq n^2/6 + n/3 - 1$, for all $n \geq 5$. We show $P(n, 2, 3) \leq n^2/5 + 5.8n - 12$ in Theorem 16.

Consider a two-fold iterative use of Theorem 8 for $n = 14$ and $d = 4$. The result is shown in Figure 1.

14	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	-
14	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	14	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	-
14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	13	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	14	-	-
14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	13
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	13	-

Figure 1: Sixteen permutations in $S_{14,2}$ obtained by the proof of Theorem 8, given in [8], with "-" representing all missing elements (they are in order).

Observe that additional permutations in $S_{14,2}$ can be added to those shown in Figure 1 and create a (14,2,4)-array with 25 elements. The additional ones are shown in Figure 2.

-	-	14	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	13	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-
-	-	14	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	14	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	14	-	-	-	-
-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	13	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	13	-	-	-

Figure 2: Nine additional permutations in $S_{14,2}$ with "-" representing all missing elements.

The additional elements shown in Figure 2 are at distance at least four from all other elements in Figure 1 and 2. For example, the first permutation in Figure 2 is at distance four from the first one in Figure 1, as both symbols, 14 and 13, need to be moved two positions. Similarly, the first permutation in Figure 2 is at distance four from the second one in Figure 1, as the symbol 13 needs to be moved three positions and the symbol 14 needs to be moved one. Also, the first two permutations in Figure 2 are at distance five, as the symbol 14 needs to move four positions, and to restore the symbol 13 to its original position, one more adjacent transposition is needed.

Note that the additional permutations in Figure 2 have a similar structure to the ones shown in Figure 1. The difference is that the permutations in Figure 2 are positioned in the "gaps" between elements in those shown in Figure 1. Let $S_{n+2,2,4}$ denote the set of all permutations given by the two-fold use of Theorem 8, as illustrated in Figure 1 for $n = 14$, together with the "additional"

permutations, as illustrated in Figure 2 for $n = 14$, which are all permutations with the symbol ' n ' in all positions $\equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ and the symbol ' $n - 1$ ' in all positions $\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.

This example is the basis for the following theorem:

$$\mathbf{Theorem 10.} \text{ For all } n \geq 4, P(n + 2, 2, 4) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{n(n+4)}{8} + 1, & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}, \\ \frac{(n+3)(n+1)}{8}, & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \text{ or } n \equiv 3 \pmod{4}, \\ \frac{(n+2)^2}{8}, & \text{if } n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}, \end{cases}$$

Proof. Consider the first two cases. The proof for the other cases follows in a similar manner. In each case, we calculate the size of $S_{n+2,2,4}$.

For the first case, notice that $\frac{n(n+4)}{8} + 1 = \left(\frac{n+4}{4}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{n}{4}\right)^2$. The term $\left(\frac{n+4}{4}\right)^2$ comes from a two-fold use of Theorem 8, and it is equal to $\lceil \frac{n+1}{4} \rceil \cdot \lceil \frac{n+2}{4} \rceil$, when $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$. The second term $\left(\frac{n}{4}\right)^2$ comes from the insertion of the additional elements, as exhibited in Table 2. As shown in our discussion of the example, the entire set of permutations thus formed has pairwise Kendall- τ distance 4.

For the second case, notice that $\frac{(n+3)(n+1)}{8} = \left(\frac{n+3}{4}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{n-1}{4}\right)^2 + \frac{n-1}{4}$. The first term, $\left(\frac{n+3}{4}\right)^2$, comes from a two-fold use of Theorem 8, and is equal to $\lceil \frac{n+1}{4} \rceil \cdot \lceil \frac{n+2}{4} \rceil$, when $n \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. The last two terms come from the insertion of the additional elements, as exhibited in Table 2. Observe that when $n \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, there is an extra position at the end from those used in the two-fold use of Theorem 8 and this allows for $\frac{n-1}{4}$ additional permutations than without the extra position. As shown in our discussion of the example, the entire set of permutations thus formed has pairwise Kendall- τ distance 4. \square

Our search program does not find better results for $P(n + 2, 2, 4)$, for any $n \leq 250$. In fact, the search program finds a number for $P(n + 2, 2, 4)$ that is exactly the same as those given in Theorem 10. So, Theorem 10 may be optimum. A general theorem for the use of $P(n, m, d)$ is given below:

$$\mathbf{Theorem 11.} \text{ For any } m < n \text{ and } d, P(n, d) \geq P(n, m, d) \cdot P(n - m, d).$$

Proof. Let A be a (n, m, d) -array and B be a $(n - m, d)$ -array. For each permutation π in A and each permutation τ in B , form the permutation (π, τ) by substituting the $n - m$ symbols in the order given by τ for the first $n - m$ symbols, given in order, in π .

It is easily seen that $d((\pi, \tau), (\rho, \sigma)) \geq d$, if either $\pi \neq \rho$ or $\sigma \neq \tau$. That is, for $\pi, \rho \in A$, if $\pi \neq \rho$, then $d(\pi, \rho) \geq d$. Clearly, changing the order of the other $n - m$ symbols, which appear in order in permutations in A , does not make the distance smaller. A symmetric argument applies when σ, τ are different permutations in the $(n - m, d)$ -array B . \square

Using Theorem 11, for example, we obtain $P(14, 11) \geq 5 \cdot P(12, 11) \geq 5 \cdot 19,277 = 96,135$ which is better than obtained by Theorem 8. The recursion implicit in Theorem 11 is also useful for computing $P(n, d)$ for large n . Consider, for example, $n = 18$. There are $18! = 6,402,373,705,728,000$ permutations on eighteen symbols, so it is infeasible to compute, say, $P(18, 15)$ directly. However, the task becomes easier by dividing it into two parts, namely computing separately $P(18, 8, 15)$ and $P(10, 15)$. That is, computing $P(10, 15)$ involves looking at $10! = 3,628,800$ permutations and computing $P(18, 8, 15)$ involves looking at $\binom{18}{8} \cdot 8! = 43,758 \cdot 40,320 = 1,764,323,000$ permutations.

Moreover, one can improve on Theorem 11 using a modification. That is, given a (n, m, d) -array A , for each τ in A , find the set of permutations of the remaining $n - m$ symbols with the m symbols of τ fixed in their positions. The m fixed symbols of τ can make different arrangements of the

remaining $n - m$ symbols be at larger distance than they would be without the fixed symbols. Let $P_\tau(n, d)$ denote the maximum cardinality of any (n, d) -PA with the (largest) m symbols fixed in the positions they occur in τ , but where the other $n - m$ symbols can be in any order. Alternatively, we denote this quantity by $P(n, d; i_1, \dots, i_m)$, where i_1, \dots, i_m are the fixed positions of symbols $n - m + 1, \dots, n$, not necessarily in that order. For example, in Table 3, for the arrangement τ_1 , there are 47,851 permutations in $P_{\tau_1}(14, 11)$ by filling in the symbols of [1..12], whereas our bound for $P(12, 11)$ is 19,227. That is, the fixed symbols 13 and 14 in positions 7 and 8, respectively, allow more arrangements of the additional twelve symbols to be at distance 11.

Theorem 12. *For any (n, m, d) -array A , $P(n, d) \geq \sum_{\tau \in A} P_\tau(n, d)$.*

Proof. Let A be a (n, m, d) -array and, for each permutation $\pi \in A$, let τ be a permutation in an (n, d) -PA with the highest m symbols in the same position as in π . Form the new permutation (π, τ) by substituting the $n - m$ symbols in the order given by τ for the first $n - m$ symbols, given in order, in π .

It is easily seen, as in the proof of Theorem 11, that $d((\pi, \tau), (\rho, \sigma)) \geq d$, if either $\pi \neq \rho$ or $\sigma \neq \tau$. \square

For example, we saw the result $P(14, 11) \geq 96,125$ using Theorem 11, with a $(14, 2, 11)$ -array with five permutations $\tau_i, i = 1, \dots, 5$ as shown in Table 3. We computed lower bounds for $P_{\tau_i}(14, 11)$, as shown in the last column of this table. By Theorem 12, we obtain the improved lower bound of $P(14, 11) \geq \sum_{i=1}^5 P_{\tau_i}(14, 11) \geq 141,782$.

Since the greedy approach with randomness was successful in computing permutation arrays, we adapted it for computing permutation arrays using Theorems 11 and 12. There are two computational problems in applying Theorem 12:

Problem IndexPA. List in lexicographic order permutations π in $S_{n,m}$.

Problem FixedPA. Given a permutation τ , list in lexicographic order permutations in S_n such that m largest numbers fixed in the positions they occur in τ .

Recall that the standard algorithm for listing permutations in S_n in lexicographic order is as follows. The first permutation is $\pi = (1, 2, \dots, n)$. If π is the current permutation, then (i) find the largest i with $\pi(i) < \pi(i+1)$ (stop if i is not found), (ii) swap $\pi(i)$ and the smallest $\pi(j) > \pi(i), j > i$, and (iii) reverse $\pi(i+1), \dots, \pi(n)$.

Surprisingly, this algorithm can be applied to solve problem IndexPA if

- (i) we start with sequence $s = (0, \dots, 0, n - m + 1, \dots, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and
- (ii) when s is computed, we output a permutation where zeros s are replaced by $1, 2, \dots, n - m$ in this order.

To solve problem FixedPA, we can assume that $1, 2, \dots, n - m$ are in positions $k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_{n-m}$ in τ , *i.e.*, $\tau(k_i) = i, i \in [1..n - m]$. Problem FixedPA can be solved by listing permutations π in S_{n-m} in lexicographic order and reporting corresponding permutations π' defined as

$$\pi'(i) = \begin{cases} \tau(i) & \text{if } \tau(i) > n - m, \\ \pi(\tau(i)) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

3 Lower and upper bounds for $P(n, m, d)$ and $P(n, d)$.

Similar to Theorem 8, we give a theorem about recursively computing $P(n, m + 1, d)$. The proof is nearly identical to the proof of Theorem 8, but now involves $n - m$ instead of n .

Theorem 13. For any $m < n$ and d , $P(n, m + 1, d) \geq \lceil \frac{n-m}{d} \rceil \cdot P(n, m, d)$.

Proof. Similar to the proof of Theorem 8 one can place, into any permutation σ of a (n, m, d) -array A , the new symbol " $n - m$ " and replace any one of the following: the first zero, the $d + 1$ -st zero, the $2d + 1$ -th zero, etc. As the Kendall- τ distance is at least d between any two of these placements, the resulting new permutations are at distance at least d . \square

There are $\frac{n!}{(n-m)!}$ permutations in $S_{n,m}$ for finding $P(n, m, d)$. When m is small, this is relatively small compared to the $n!$ permutations to explore for finding $P(n, d)$. Also, $P(n, m, d)$ generalizes $P(n, d)$ as $P(n, d) = P(n, n, d)$. Finding exact values or bounds for $P(n, m, d)$ is an interesting problem in its own right. Clearly, $P(n, 1, d) = \lceil n/d \rceil$. In general, by Theorem 13

$$P(n, m, d) \geq \left\lceil \frac{n-m+1}{d} \right\rceil \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n-m+2}{d} \right\rceil \cdots \left\lceil \frac{n}{d} \right\rceil. \quad (3)$$

Note that the lower bound (3) can be improved in a manner similar to that done for $P(n, d)$. Computed values of $P(n, m, d)$ are shown in Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15. Others can be seen in Tables 10 and 11.

We denote by ε the identity permutation $(1, 2, \dots, n)$.

Proposition 14. $P(n, m, d) \geq 2$ if $d \leq mn - m(m + 1)/2$. The bound for d is tight for all $n > m \geq 1$.

Proof. Let $\pi = (n, n-1, \dots, n-m+1, 1, 2, \dots, n-m)$. The bubble sort for π uses $n-1$ transpositions for symbol n , $n-2$ transpositions for symbol $n-1$, etc. Then $d(\varepsilon, \pi) = (n-1) + (n-2) + \dots + (n-m) = nm - (1 + 2 + \dots + m) = mn - m(m+1)/2$.

The bound is tight since for any permutation $\sigma \neq \pi$, $d(\varepsilon, \sigma) < mn - m(m+1)/2$. \square

We improve the bound in Equation 3 for $m = 2$.

Theorem 15. For any $d \geq 1$, (a) $P(n, 2, d) \geq 3$, if $d \leq n + \lfloor n/3 \rfloor - 2$, and (b) $P(n, 2, d) \geq 5$ if $d \leq n - 2$.

Proof. (a) Let $\tau_1 = (n-1, n, 1, 2, \dots, n-2)$, $\tau_2 = (1, \dots, x-1, n-1, x, \dots, n-2, n)$ and $\tau_3 = (1, \dots, x, n, x+1, \dots, n-1)$ where $x = \lfloor n/3 \rfloor$, see an example in Table 5. Transformation of τ_1 to τ_2 requires $n-1$ transpositions for symbol $n-1$ and $x-1$ transpositions for symbol n . Then $d(\tau_1, \tau_2) = n+x-2 \geq d$. Similarly $d(\tau_1, \tau_3) = (n-2)+x \geq d$, and $d(\tau_2, \tau_3) = (n-x)+(n-x-2) = 2n-2x-2 \geq n+x-2 \geq d$.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
τ_1	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
τ_2	1	2	9	3	4	5	6	7	8
τ_3	1	2	3	8	4	5	6	7	9

Table 5: $P(9, 2, 10) \geq 3$.

(b) Suppose $n = 2k$. Consider 5 permutations $\tau_i, i = 1, \dots, 5$ where symbols $n-1$ and n are placed at positions 1 and 2 for τ_1 , $n-1$ and n for τ_2 , k and $k+1$ for τ_3 , 1 and n for τ_4 , n and 1 for τ_5 , see an example in Table 6. We show that $d(\tau_i, \tau_j) \geq n-2$ if $1 \leq i < j \leq 5$. For all pairs $i, j \in \{1, 2, 4, 5\}$ with $i < j$, transformation of τ_i to τ_j requires $n-2$ transpositions for only one

of two symbols $n - 1$ or n . Transformation of τ_3 to any $\tau_i, i = 1, 2, 4$ requires $k - 1$ transpositions for each symbol $n - 1$ and n . Transformation of τ_3 to any τ_5 requires $k - 1$ transpositions for each symbol $n - 1$ and n after transposition of $n - 1$ and n .

Similarly, a $(n, 2, n - 2)$ -array can be constructed for $n = 2k + 1$ where symbols n and $n - 1$ are placed at positions k and $k + 1$ for τ_3 , see an example in Table 7. \square

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
τ_1	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
τ_2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12
τ_3	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	0	0	0	0	0
τ_4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
τ_5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

Table 6: $P(12, 2, 10) \geq 5$. The first 10 symbols in all τ_i are in the sorted order and replaced by zeros.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
τ_1	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
τ_2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13
τ_3	0	0	0	0	0	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
τ_4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
τ_5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Table 7: An example for $P(13, 2, 11) \geq 5$.

We have constructed a program for computing $P(n, m, d)$ for various values of n, m , and d . For each of the $\binom{n}{m}$ positions for m symbols out of n , and each of the possible $m!$ orders of the m symbols, the program uses the random/Greedy strategy described earlier. That is, it chooses a specified number of random choices first and then tries adding all remaining possible permutations in increasing order. When m is small, the program finds solutions quickly. It allows one to compute $P(15, 12)$, for example, without examining all $15!$ permutations of 15 symbols. That is, by Theorem 11 one can first compute, for example, $P(15, 6, 12)$, which as shown in Table 14 is at least 622, and then compute $P(12, 12)$.

We prove an upper bound for $P(n, 2, 3)$.

Theorem 16. *For all $n \geq 4$, $P(n, 2, 3) \leq n^2/5 + 5.8n - 12$.*

Proof. There are $n^2 - n$ permutations in $S_{n,2}$. We assume $n \geq 4$. Let R_1 be the set of permutations $\pi \in S_{n,2}$ such that $\pi(1) \in \{n - 1, n\}$ or $\pi(n) \in \{n - 1, n\}$. Let R_2 be the set of permutations $\pi \in S_{n,2}$ such that $|\pi^{-1}(n - 1) - \pi^{-1}(n)| = 1$.² Let $R = R_1 \cup R_2$ and $R_{12} = R_1 \cap R_2$. Then

$$|R| = |R_1| + |R_2| - |R_{12}| = (4n - 6) + (2n - 2) - 4 = 6n - 12.$$

For a permutation $\pi \in S_{n,2}$, let $B_1(\pi)$ be the set of permutations $\sigma \in S_{n,2}$ such that $d(\pi, \sigma) \leq 1$. If $\pi \in S_{n,2} \setminus R$ then $|B_1(\pi)| = 5$. Let A be an $(n, 2, 3)$ -array. Then the balls of radius one $B_1(\pi), \pi \in A$ are disjoint. The union of balls $B_1(\pi), \pi \in A \setminus R$ has size $5 \cdot |A \setminus R| \leq n^2 - n$. Therefore $|A| \leq (n^2 - n)/5 + |R| = n^2/5 + 5.8n - 12$. \square

² $\pi^{-1}(n - 1)$ and $\pi^{-1}(n)$ are the positions of $n - 1$ and n in π , respectively.

The upper bound of Theorem 16 is the Gilbert-Varshamov type bound for $d = 3$. It can be generalized to any odd $d \geq 3$ and any $m \geq 2$. Let $V_{m,k} = |\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^m \mid \sum_{i=1}^m |x_i| \leq m\}|$.

Theorem 17. *For all $m \geq 2$ and $k \geq 1$, $P(n, m, 2k + 1) \leq n^m/V_{m,k} + O(n^{m-1})$.*

Proof. We assume that m and k are constants. Let $d = 2k + 1$. There are $n(n-1)\dots(n-m+1)$ permutations in $S_{n,m}$. Every permutation π in $S_{n,m}$ can be specified as m -tuple $p = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m)$ such that $\pi(p_1) = n - m + 1, \dots, \pi(p_m) = n$, i.e. p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m are the positions of symbols $n - m + 1, \dots, n$, respectively. Let R be the set of m -tuples p such that $|p_i - p_j| \leq d$ for some two positions p_i and p_j , $1 \leq i < j \leq m$. Then $|R| = O(n^{m-1})$.

For a permutation $\pi \in S_{n,m}$, let $B_k(\pi)$ be the set of permutations $\sigma \in S_{n,m}$ such that $d(\pi, \sigma) \leq k$. If $\pi \in S_{n,m} \setminus R$ then $|B_k(\pi)| = V_{m,k}$. Let A be an (n, m, d) -array. Then the balls of radius k $B_k(\pi), \pi \in A$ are disjoint. The union of balls $B_k(\pi), \pi \in A \setminus R$ has size $V_{m,k} \cdot |A \setminus R| \leq |S_{n,m}|$. Therefore $|A| \leq |S_{n,m}|/V_{m,k} + |R| = n^m/V_{m,k} + O(n^{m-1})$. \square

One can show that $V_{m,1} = 2m + 1$ for $m \geq 2$. Then

$$P(n, m, 3) \leq n^2/(2m + 1) + O(n^{m-1}). \quad (4)$$

Since $V_{2,2} = |\{(0, \pm 2), (\pm 2, 0), (a, b) : |a|, |b| \leq 1\}| = 13$,

$$P(n, 2, 5) \leq n^2/13 + O(n). \quad (5)$$

As shown in Tables 8 and 9, Theorems 11 and 12 are useful for obtaining improved lower bounds for $P(n, d)$ when the Kendall- τ distance d is close to n . Some of the improvements are substantial. For example, we obtain 8,413,437 as a lower bound for $P(16, 11)$, whereas Theorem 2 gives a lower bound of 1,700,585. We also give lower bounds for $P(n, m, d)$, for $8 \leq d \leq 15$ and $10 \leq n \leq 20$ in Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15, which are given in the appendix.

Many of the improved lower bounds given in Tables 8 and 9 are explained in Tables 10 and 11. Some computations took a week (or more) on Apple MacBook Air computers with an M1 or M2 processor. Most of the results are obtained by Theorem 12 using a computation of $P(n, m, d)$. There are many choices for the value of m . Most of our results are with $m = 8$.

In Tables 8 and 9, "previous" results are given by Theorem 2, with the use of Theorems 6, 7, and 8, when appropriate. Tables 10 and 11 give the methods we used to obtain improved lower bounds.

4 Automorphism Lower Bounds

It is known that for a permutation $\pi(x) : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$, where \mathbb{F}_q denotes a finite field of order q , the operations of multiplying by a non-zero constant a , adding a constant c , and adding to the argument a constant b , each yields another permutation on \mathbb{F}_q . This is a well-known equivalence relation on permutation polynomials. That is, $a\pi(x + b) + c$, for all non-zero a and all $b, c \in \mathbb{F}_q$, is again a permutation. We use this to search for sets of permutations at specified Kendall- τ distance d . That is, the search can be done for a set of representative permutations and expanded into a full set of permutations using operations on the representatives. Our program verifies that the full set of permutations has the stipulated Kendall- τ distance.

n:d	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12 (previous)	899,809 (720,304)	595,160 (360,152)	129,298 (46,741)	85,091 (23,371)	73,105 (3,305)	see Table 2	see Table 2
13 (previous)	- (9,363,942)	- (4,681,971)	629,301 (607,632)	520,253 (303,816)	236,764 (42,962)	158,208 (21,481)	51,046 (3,196)
14 (previous)	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	6,522,803 (5,232,791)	3,693,995 (2,616,396)	930,601 (313,063)	571,415 (156,532)	177,098 (19,704)
15 (previous)	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- (39,245,930)	6,846,611 (4,695,943)	3,878,969 (2,347,972)	1,182,803 (295,549)
16 (previous)	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- (33,259,910)	30,193,558 (16,629,955)	8,413,437 (1,700,585)
17 (previous)	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	66,863,784 (28,909,942)
18 (previous)	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- (520,378,955)

Table 8: Improved lower bounds for $P(n, d)$ using Theorem 12, for $5 \leq d \leq 11$. Previous results from "Theorem 2*", meaning Theorem 2, with appropriate use of Theorems 6, 7, and 8.

- Use the operation $\pi(x) + c$ on the 17 representatives shown in Table 17. This gives 102 permutations for $P(6, 3)$.
- Use the operations $a\pi(x) + c$ on the 14 representatives given in Table 16. This gives 1,008 permutations for $P(9, 7)$.
- Use the operations $a\pi(x) + c$ on the 8 representatives given in Table 19. This gives 576 permutations for $P(9, 8)$.
- Use the operations $a\pi(x) + c$ on the four representatives given in Table 18. This gives 288 permutations for $P(9, 9)$.
- Use the operations $\pi(x) + c$ on the 12 representatives given in Figure 20. This gives 84 permutations for $P(7, 6)$.
- Use the operation $a\pi(x) + c$ on the 8 representatives given in Figure 21. This gives 448 permutations for $P(8, 6)$.
- Use the operation $a\pi(x) + c$ on 67 representatives given in Figure 23. This gives 3,752 permutations for $P(8, 3)$.
- Use the operation $a\pi(x) + c$ on 12 representatives given in Table 22. This gives 672 permutations for $P(8, 5)$.
- Use the operation $a\pi(x) + c$ on 40 representatives given in Table 24 representatives. This gives 2,242 permutations for $P(8, 4)$.
- Use the operation $a\pi(x) + c$ on 3 representatives given in Table 25. This gives 168 permutations for $P(8, 7)$.
- Use the operation $\pi(x) + c$ on the 48 permutations given in Table 26. This gives 336 permutations for $P(7, 4)$.

n:d	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
12 (previous)	see Table 2	see Table 2	see Table 2	see Table 2	see Table 2	see Table 2	418 (1)
13 (previous)	29,859 (1,598)	14,158 (246)	10,756 (123)	5,527 (20)	4,322 (10)	1,024 (2)	771 (1)
14 (previous)	112,338 (9,852)	55,730 (1,283)	41,673 (642)	15,674 (86)	8,941 (43)	4,429 (6)	3,190 (3)
15 (previous)	706,114 (147,775)	190,218 (19,237)	159,967 (9,619)	66,194 (1,283)	44,416 (642)	20,842 (88)	14,610 (44)
16 (previous)	4,977,819 (850,293)	1,665,481 (89,935)	1,043,093 (44,968)	394,158 (4,872)	259,662 (2,436)	111,714 (269)	77,044 (135)
17 (previous)	38,745,418 (14,454,970)	12,013,922 (1,528,892)	7,398,247 (764,446)	2,657,379 (82,813)	1,706,757 (41,407)	687,795 (4,567)	462,163 (2,284)
18 (previous)	- (260,189,477)	96,452,048 (27,520,040)	57,732,698 (13,760,020)	19,618,333 (1,490,629)	12,411,066 (745,315)	4,671,851 (82,206)	3,099,772 (41,103)
19 (previous)	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	- Theorem 2*	39,236,666 (18,600,815)	24,822,132 (9,300,408)	9,343,702 (965,441)	6,199,544 (482,721)

Table 9: Improved lower bounds for $P(n, d)$ using Theorem 12, for $12 \leq d \leq 18$. Previous results from "Theorem 2*", meaning Theorem 2, with appropriate use of Theorems 6, 7, and 8.

- Use the operation $\pi(x) + c$ on the 18 permutations given in Table 27. This gives 126 permutations for $P(7, 5)$.

n:d	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	$\sum_{i \in A} P(n, 5; i)$ $A = \{2, 7, 12\}$	$m = 8$ —A—=81,954	$\sum_{i \in A} P(n, 7; i)$ $A = \{3, 10\}$	$\sum_{i \in A} P(n, 8; i)$ $A = \{3, 11\}$	$\sum_{i \in A} P(n, 9; i)$ $A = \{3, 12\}$	-	-
13			$m = 8$ $ A = 12, 604$	$m = 8$ $ A = 81, 954$	$\sum_{i \in A} P(n, 9; i)$ $A = \{3, 12\}$	$\sum_{i \in A} P(n, d; i)$ $A = \{2, 12\}$	$\sum_{i \in A} P(n, d; i)$ $A = \{2, 13\}$
14				$m = 8$ $ A = 14, 779$	$m = 8$ $ A = 26, 300$	$m = 8$ $ A = 18, 620$	$m = 8$ $ A = 7, 909$
15					$m = 8$ $ A = 50, 126$	$m = 8$ $ A = 35, 264$	$m = 8$ $ A = 14, 715$
16						$m = 8$ $ A = 63, 538$	$m = 8$ $ A = 26, 075$
17							$m = 8$ $ A = 44, 489$

Table 10: Methods used to obtain lower bounds. An entry "m = 8", for example, means the lower bound was obtained computing an $(n, 8, d)$ -array A and then computing $\sum_{\tau \in A} P_{\tau}(n, d)$.

5 Conclusions and Open Questions

Theorems 11 and 12 give many improved lower bounds. Tables 1, 2, 8, and 9 give improvements on previous results. As previously stated in Section 1, lower bounds obtained by our recursive technique can be much larger than those given by Theorem 2.

Our work on good patterns for (n, m, d) -arrays continues. We conjecture that (n, m, d) -arrays can be used to compute other improved lower bounds for $P(n, d)$. Another interesting direction for future research is upper bounds for $P(n, m, d)$. We conjecture that some lower bounds in Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15 are tight. An interesting open problem is the asymptotic behavior of $P(n, 2, 3)$. If $P(n, 2, 3)/n^2$ tends to a constant c , what is the value of c ? By Theorems 9 and 16, $\frac{1}{6} \leq c \leq \frac{1}{5}$.

References

- [1] A. Abdollahi, J. Bagherian, F. Jafari, M. Khatami, F. Parvaresh, and R. Sobhani. New bounds on the size of permutation codes with minimum Kendall τ -distance of three. *arXiv*, abs/2206.10193, 2022.
- [2] A. Barg and A. Mazumdar. Codes in permutations and error correction for rank modulation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(7):3158–3165, 2010.
- [3] S. Bereg, A. Levy, and I. H. Sudborough. Constructing permutation arrays from groups. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 86(5):1095–1111, 2018.
- [4] S. Bereg, Z. Miller, L. G. Mojica, L. Morales, and I. H. Sudborough. New lower bounds for permutation arrays using contraction. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 87:2105–2128, 2019.

$n:d$	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
13	$P(n, d; 7)$	$P(n, d; 7)$	$P(n, d; 7)$	$P(n, d; 7)$	$P(n, d; 7)$	$m = 8$ $ A = 316$	$m = 8$ $ A = 258$
14	$m = 8$ $ A = 5,880$	$\Sigma\{P(n, d; i, j)\}$ $ \{(i, j) \in A\} $ $A = \{(3, 7),$ $(13, 14), (2, 12)\}$	$\Sigma\{P(n, d; i, j)\}$ $ \{(i, j) \in A\} $ $A = \{(1, 3),$ $(4, 14), (6, 11)\}$	$\Sigma\{P(n, d; i, j)\}$ $ \{(i, j) \in A\} $ $A = \{(2, 3),$ $(6, 14), (14, 6)\}$	$m = 8$ $ A = 962$	$m = 8$ $ A = 576$	$m = 8$ $ A = 472$
15	$m = 8$ $ A = 10,860$	$m = 7$ $ A = 1,382$	$m = 8$ $ A = 4,017$	$m = 8$ $ A = 2,165$	$m = 8$ $ A = 1,719$	$m = 8$ $ A = 1,012$	$m = 8$ $ A = 821$
16	$m = 8$ $ A = 19,215$	$m = 8$ $ A = 9,139$	$m = 8$ $ A = 6,983$	$m = 8$ $ A = 3,705$	$m = 8$ $ A = 2,926$	$m = 8$ $ A = 1,708$	$m = 8$ $ A = 1,385$
17	$m = 8$ $ A = 32,647$	$m = 8$ $ A = 15,287$	$m = 8$ $ A = 11,647$	$m = 8$ $ A = 6,134$	$m = 8$ $ A = 4,841$	$m = 8$ $ A = 2,776$	$m = 8$ $ A = 2,249$
18		$m = 8$ $ A = 24,912$	$m = 8$ $ A = 18,914$	$m = 8$ $ A = 9,856$	$m = 8$ $ A = 7,722$	$m = 8$ $ A = 4,413$	$m = 8$ $ A = 3,551$

Table 11: Methods used to obtain lower bounds. An entry "m = 8", for example, means the lower bound was obtained computing an $(n, 8, d)$ -array A and then computing $\sum_{\tau \in A} P_{\tau}(n, d)$.

- [5] S. Buzaglo and T. Etzion. Bounds on the size of permutation codes with the Kendall tau metric. *IEEE Trans. on Inform. Theory*, 61(6):3241–3250, 2015.
- [6] W. Chu, C. J. Colbourn, and P. Dukes. Constructions for permutation codes in powerline communications. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 2004.
- [7] M. M. Deza and T. Huang. Metrics on permutations, a survey. *J. Comb. Inf. System Sci.*, 23:173–185, 1998.
- [8] A. Jiang, M. Schwartz, and J. Bruck. Correcting charge-constrained errors in the rank-modulation scheme. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(5):2112–2120, 2010.
- [9] T. Kløve, T.-T. Lin, S.-C. Tsai, and W.-G. Tzeng. Permutation arrays under the Chebyshev distance. *IEEE Trans. on Info. Theory*, 56(6):2611 – 2617, 2010.
- [10] S. Vijayakumaran. Largest permutation codes with Kendall τ -metric in S_4 and S_5 . *IEEE Communications Letters*, 20(10):1912–1915, 2016.
- [11] X. Wang, Y. Zhang, Y. Yang, and G. Ge. New bounds of permutation codes under Hamming metric and Kendall's τ -metric. *Des. Codes Cryptography*, 85(3):533–545, 2017.

Appendix

n:m	2	3	4	5	6	n:m	2	3	4	5	6
10	5	14	37	113	335	10	3	9	24	63	162
11	5	16	55	186	645	11	5	15	34	99	301
12	6	21	73	285	1145	12	5	16	46	149	523
13	6	26	99	428	1920	13	6	18	59	219	861
14	8	31	130	625	3117	14	6	22	78	315	1383
15	8	37	172	884	4872	15	7	26	100	445	2119
16	10	45	219	1233	7367	16	8	31	128	610	3165
17	10	52	278	1676	10828	17	8	36	162	824	4613
18	13	61	344	2227	15567	18	10	42	201	1097	6589
19	13	71	426	2939	21862	19	10	49	244	1427	9179
20	15	80	517	3805	30196	20	12	55	292	1827	12581

Table 12: Lower bounds for $P(n, m, 8)$ (left) and $P(n, m, 9)$ (right).

n : m	2	3	4	5	6	n : m	2	3	4	5	6
10	3	7	19	48	125	10	3	6	13	27	73
11	5	10	27	76	226	11	3	7	16	41	128
12	5	13	37	116	394	12	3	10	22	61	214
13	6	16	50	167	644	13	5	11	31	96	344
14	6	18	64	241	1011	14	5	13	37	120	539
15	6	21	83	342	1570	15	5	17	55	163	810
16	6	25	103	467	2337	16	6	20	70	220	1193
17	8	30	129	629	2239	17	6	23	86	366	1716
18	8	35	158	829	3185	18	7	26	106	472	2413
19	10	40	192	1084	4405	19	8	31	127	618	3362
20	10	46	233	4184	6017	20	8	35	151	789	4571

Table 13: Lower bounds for $P(n, m, 10)$ (left) and $P(n, m, 11)$ (right).

n : m	2	3	4	5	6	n : m	2	3	4	5	6
10	2	6	13	26	58	10	2	4	10	20	37
11	3	7	17	40	101	11	2	6	13	28	63
12	3	9	23	59	168	12	3	7	16	40	103
13	3	10	30	84	273	13	3	9	22	56	163
14	5	13	37	117	420	14	3	10	27	79	247
15	5	16	45	159	622	15	5	12	35	106	370
16	5	17	58	216	919	16	5	15	44	141	533
17	6	20	72	287	1323	17	5	16	52	181	757
18	6	22	87	375	1859	18	6	18	63	242	1058
19	6	25	103	485	2580	19	6	20	73	308	1447
20	8	30	125	620	3503	20	6	23	90	390	1965

Table 14: Lower bounds for $P(n, m, 12)$ (left) and $P(n, m, 13)$ (right).

$n : m$	2	3	4	5	6
10	2	4	10	16	30
11	2	4	11	23	51
12	3	6	15	34	85
13	3	7	18	48	133
14	3	9	24	65	203
15	3	10	30	88	298
16	5	13	38	118	431
17	5	15	46	153	609
18	5	16	54	197	844
19	6	18	63	254	1163
20	6	20	75	323	1568

$n : m$	2	3	4	5	6
10	2	4	6	12	19
11	2	4	10	20	31
12	2	5	12	21	48
13	3	6	15	30	72
14	3	7	16	40	107
15	3	9	23	52	154
16	3	10	29	84	221
17	5	12	35	109	385
18	5	14	41	138	530
19	5	16	41	174	720
20	5	17	46	220	961

Table 15: Lower bounds for $P(n, m, 14)$ (left) and $P(n, m, 15)$ (right).

0 1 2 4 8 3 7 5 6	0 1 2 7 8 5 3 4 6	0 1 3 4 7 2 8 6 5	0 1 3 8 2 6 7 4 5
0 1 3 8 4 6 5 7 2	0 1 4 5 6 7 3 8 2	0 1 4 5 8 2 7 6 3	0 1 6 2 3 4 7 8 5
0 1 6 2 8 7 5 4 3	0 1 6 4 5 2 3 8 7	0 1 6 7 3 4 8 5 2	0 1 7 2 4 6 8 5 3
0 1 7 4 8 3 5 2 6	0 1 8 5 7 4 6 3 2		

Table 16: Representatives for $P(9,7)$.

0 1 2 3 5 4	0 1 2 4 5 3	0 1 3 5 4 2	0 1 5 4 2 3	0 2 3 4 1 5	0 2 4 5 1 3
0 2 5 3 4 1	0 3 1 4 2 5	0 3 2 5 1 4	0 3 4 2 5 1	0 3 5 4 1 2	0 4 1 5 3 2
0 4 2 1 3 5	0 4 5 3 2 1	0 5 2 1 3 4	0 5 3 1 2 4	0 5 4 2 1 3	

Table 17: Representatives for $P(6,3)$,

0 1 2 6 5 8 7 4 3	0 1 3 8 4 5 2 6 7	0 1 4 6 5 3 7 2 8	0 1 5 2 4 7 3 6 8
-------------------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------

Table 18: Representatives for $P(9,9)$.

0 1 2 3 8 4 6 5 7	0 1 2 5 8 6 3 7 4	0 1 4 5 2 8 6 7 3	0 1 5 3 2 4 6 8 7
0 1 5 6 4 8 3 7 2	0 1 6 4 7 2 5 8 3	0 1 6 7 3 2 8 5 4	0 1 8 3 6 5 7 2 4

Table 19: Representatives for $P(9,8)$.

0 1 3 6 5 4 2	0 1 4 2 3 6 5	0 1 6 2 5 4 3	0 2 3 4 1 5 6	0 2 3 6 5 1 4
0 3 4 6 1 2 5	0 3 5 4 1 2 6	0 4 5 6 3 1 2	0 5 2 4 3 6 1	0 5 3 6 1 2 4
0 6 3 5 4 2 1	0 6 4 2 1 3 5			

Table 20: Representatives for $P(7,6)$.

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

Table 21: Representatives for $P(8,6)$.

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

Table 22: Representatives for $P(8,5)$.

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

Table 23: Representatives for $P(8,3)$.

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

Table 24: Representatives for $P(8,4)$.

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

Table 25: Representatives for $P(8,7)$.

0 1 2 4 3 6 5	0 1 2 5 4 6 3	0 1 3 2 6 5 4	0 1 3 4 2 5 6	0 1 4 5 6 2 3
0 1 5 3 6 2 4	0 1 6 2 3 4 5	0 1 6 5 2 4 3	0 2 1 3 5 4 6	0 2 3 4 1 6 5
0 2 3 6 5 4 1	0 2 4 1 5 3 6	0 2 4 6 5 1 3	0 2 5 1 6 3 4	0 2 5 3 4 1 6
0 2 5 6 4 3 1	0 2 6 1 4 3 5	0 3 1 5 2 4 6	0 3 1 6 5 4 2	0 3 2 5 1 6 4
0 3 2 6 1 4 5	0 3 4 1 6 2 5	0 3 4 2 5 1 6	0 3 4 5 6 1 2	0 3 6 5 4 2 1
0 4 2 1 6 3 5	0 4 2 5 3 6 1	0 4 3 1 5 2 6	0 4 3 6 2 5 1	0 4 5 1 2 3 6
0 4 6 1 3 2 5	0 4 6 5 1 2 3	0 5 1 2 3 4 6	0 5 2 4 1 6 3	0 5 3 1 4 6 2
0 5 3 6 2 1 4	0 5 4 1 6 3 2	0 5 4 3 6 2 1	0 5 6 1 4 2 3	0 6 1 4 2 5 3
0 6 1 5 3 4 2	0 6 2 5 3 1 4	0 6 3 1 4 2 5	0 6 3 2 4 5 1	0 6 3 5 1 2 4
0 6 4 2 3 1 5	0 6 4 5 3 2 1	0 6 5 2 4 1 3		

Table 26: Representatives for $P(7,4)$.

0 1 4 2 5 3 6	0 1 4 6 3 2 5	0 1 5 2 6 4 3	0 2 1 3 5 4 6	0 2 4 5 6 3 1
0 2 6 4 1 3 5	0 3 1 5 6 4 2	0 3 2 4 5 1 6	0 3 2 6 1 4 5	0 3 5 4 6 2 1
0 4 3 1 5 2 6	0 4 3 6 2 1 5	0 4 5 1 6 3 2	0 5 1 3 4 2 6	0 5 3 2 6 1 4
0 6 1 2 5 3 4	0 6 5 2 4 1 3	0 6 5 3 4 1 2		

Table 27: Representatives for $P(7,5)$.