

QUASIPERIODS OF MAGIC LABELING QUASIPOLYNOMIALS

MARGARET BAYER^{*}, AMANDA BURCROFF[•], TYRRELL B. MCALLISTER[¶],
AND LEILANI PAI[§]

ABSTRACT. A **magic labeling** of a graph is a labeling of the edges by nonnegative integers such that the label sum over the edges incident to every vertex is the same. This common label sum is known as the **index**. We count magic labelings by maximum edge label, rather than index, using an Ehrhart-theoretic approach. In contrast to Stanley’s 1973 work showing that the function counting magic labelings with bounded index is a quasipolynomial with quasiperiod 2, we show by construction that the minimum quasiperiod of the quasipolynomial counting magic labelings with bounded maximum label can be arbitrarily large, even for planar bipartite graphs. Unfortunately, this rules out a certain Ehrhart-theoretic approach to proving Hartsfield and Ringel’s Antimagic Graph Conjecture. However, we show that this quasipolynomial is in fact a polynomial for any bipartite graph with matching preclusion number at most 1, which includes any bipartite graph with a leaf.

1. INTRODUCTION

A **magic labeling** of a graph is a function assigning to each edge of the graph a nonnegative integer so that the sum of the labels on the edges containing each vertex is the same. This common sum at each vertex is called the **index** of the magic labeling. The study of magic labelings of graphs was initiated by a problem proposed by Jiří Sedláček in 1966 [8], and the first paper devoted to the topic was by B. M. Stewart [10]. Interest in this topic grew significantly after the publication of Richard Stanley’s paper, “Linear homogeneous Diophantine equations and magic labelings of graphs” [9]. In that paper, Stanley showed that the number of magic labelings with index k is a quasipolynomial function of k with minimum quasiperiod at most 2.

^{*} UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, LAWRENCE, KS, USA

[•] HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MA, USA

[¶] UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING, LARAMIE, WY, USA

[§] UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN, LINCOLN, NE, USA

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 05C78; Secondary 52B20, 05C30.

In this paper, we count the number of magic labelings of a graph by the maximum label used, rather than by the index. The function that counts the number of magic labelings with maximum label at most k is again a quasipolynomial. Our main result ([Theorem 2.6](#) below) is that, in contrast to Stanley's result, the minimum quasiperiod of this quasipolynomial is unbounded. We show this by constructing, for each positive integer n , a planar bipartite graph for which the minimum quasiperiod is n .

This result is motivated by work of Matthias Beck and Maryam Farahmand in [\[1\]](#) on *antimagic* labelings, which are labelings of the edges of a graph by distinct labels in $\{1, 2, \dots, |E|\}$ such that the sums of the labels at each vertex are *distinct*. A famous open problem from 1990 posed in [\[5\]](#) is whether all connected graphs (except for K_2) have an antimagic labeling. See [\[3, Chapter 6\]](#) for a comprehensive summary of progress on this problem. Beck and Farahmand pursued a strategy for proving a weakened form of this conjecture, namely that for some fixed $s \geq 1$, every connected graph (except for K_2) has a labeling using only labels in $\{1, \dots, s|E|\}$ (allowing repeated labels) where the sums of the labels at each vertex are distinct. As shown in [\[1\]](#), this claim would follow if it were known that the function that counts the number of magic labelings with maximum label k has minimum quasiperiod at most s for every graph. Unfortunately, the present paper shows that no such bound on the minimum quasiperiod exists for general graphs, so the approach explored in [\[1\]](#) cannot succeed without significant modification.

While this minimum quasiperiod is unbounded in general, we show that the minimum quasiperiod is bounded for certain classes of graphs (see [Section 5](#)). In particular, we show that, if a graph contains an edge that attains the maximum label in every index-2 magic labeling, then this quasipolynomial has minimum quasiperiod at most 2. Furthermore, if the graph is additionally bipartite, then this quasipolynomial is in fact a polynomial. This suggests that Beck and Farahmand's approach may be adapted for special families of graphs. However, the classes of graphs that we consider are not closed under certain operations that they use in [\[1\]](#).

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper we let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph without multiple edges (but possibly with loops).

An **(edge) labeling** of G is a function $E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We view the labelings of G as the points of the integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^E that are in the positive orthant

$\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^E$ of the vector space \mathbb{R}^E . For each $L \in \mathbb{R}^E$, write

$$s_L(v) := \sum_{e \in E, e \ni v} L(e)$$

for the sum of the labels of the edges incident to v . A labeling L is **magic** if the value of $s_L(v)$ is the same for each vertex v of G . Thus, the magic labelings are the lattice points in the polyhedral cone $C_G \subseteq \mathbb{R}^E$ defined by

$$C_G := \{L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^E : s_L(v) = s_L(w) \text{ for all } v, w \in V\}.$$

See [3, Chapter 5] for a survey of results concerning magic labelings and related notions.

The primary object of study in this paper is the rational polytope $P_G \subseteq \mathbb{R}^E$ defined by

$$P_G := C_G \cap [0, 1]^E.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, a labeling L is a **k -labeling** if $L(e) \leq k$ for all edges $e \in E$. Thus, the magic k -labelings of G are precisely the integer-lattice points in the k^{th} dilate $kP_G := \{kL : L \in P_G\}$ of P_G . We are in particular interested in the function

$$M_G(k) := |kP_G \cap \mathbb{Z}^E|$$

that counts the number of magic k -labelings of G .

A better-studied counting function in the context of magic labelings is the function $S_G(k)$ that counts the magic labelings of G with index exactly k , where the **index** of a magic labeling L of G is the common value of $s_L(v)$ for all $v \in V$. This function corresponds to the polytope

$$Q_G := \{L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^E : s_L(v) = 1 \text{ for all } v \in V\},$$

since the number of magic labelings of G with index k is

$$S_G(k) = |kQ_G \cap \mathbb{Z}^E|.$$

Note that, since labelings are nonnegative, a magic labeling with index k is in particular a magic k -labeling. The corresponding statement regarding the polytopes is that $Q_G \subseteq P_G$. However, the dimension of Q_G is always strictly less than that of P_G .

From the point of view of Ehrhart theory, the definitions of M_G and of S_G immediately imply that they are the *Ehrhart quasipolynomials* of the polytopes P_G and Q_G , respectively. We briefly explain this connection, but we refer the reader to [2] for a thorough introduction to Ehrhart theory, including the properties of Ehrhart quasipolynomials stated here.

A function $F: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ (or $F: \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$) is a **quasipolynomial** of **degree** d if there exist an integer $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and polynomials $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_s \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, called the

constituents of F , such that $d = \max\{\deg(\phi_1), \dots, \deg(\phi_s)\}$ and $F(t) = \phi_r(t)$ whenever $t \equiv r \pmod{s}$. Such a positive integer s is a **quasiperiod** of F . The quasiperiods of F are precisely the positive integer multiples of the *minimum* quasiperiod of F , which we denote $\text{mqp}(F)$. Alternatively, F is a quasipolynomial of degree d if and only if $F(t) = \sum_{i=0}^d c_i(t) t^i$ for some sequence c_0, \dots, c_d of periodic **coefficient functions** $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with c_d not identically zero. Writing s_i for the minimum period of c_i for $0 \leq i \leq d$, we then have that $\text{mqp}(F) = \text{lcm}\{s_0, \dots, s_d\}$.

Now let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ be a d -dimensional **rational** polytope, meaning that $\text{vert}(P) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^N$, where $\text{vert}(P)$ denotes the set of vertices of P . By a celebrated theorem of Eugène Ehrhart, the function $\text{ehr}_P(t) := |tP \cap \mathbb{Z}^N|$ for $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ is a degree- d quasipolynomial called the **Ehrhart quasipolynomial** of P . Moreover, the *minimum* quasiperiod of ehr_P divides the **denominator** of P , which is defined to be $\text{den}(P) := \min\{t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} : \text{vert}(tP) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^N\}$. Thus, an upper bound on the denominator of P is also an upper bound on $\text{mqp}(\text{ehr}_P)$.

As discussed in the introduction, Beck and Farahmand showed in [1] that a proof of an upper bound on $\text{mqp}(M_G)$ independent of G would suffice to prove a weakened version of an open problem regarding antimagic graph labelings. However, we find below that no such upper bound on $\text{mqp}(M_G)$ exists.

In order to compute the denominator and minimum quasiperiod of a rational polytope $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$, we study a related semigroup in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} . The **semigroup of P** , denoted by $\Phi(P)$, has elements (L, k) where k is a nonnegative integer and L is a lattice point in kP . That is, the semigroup $\Phi(P)$ consists of the integer points in the **homogenized cone over P** , which is the cone generated by $P \times \{1\}$ in \mathbb{R}^{N+1} . The binary operation in the semigroup is entry-wise addition.

Definition 2.1. A nonzero element a of an additive semigroup Φ is **completely fundamental** if, for all $b, c \in \Phi$, if $b + c = ma$ for some positive integer m , then b and c are both nonnegative integer multiples of a .

We remark that, when $\Phi = \Phi(P)$ is the semigroup of a rational polytope P , then the completely fundamental elements of Φ are precisely the points $(d_v v, d_v)$ where v is a vertex of P and $d_v := \text{den}(v)$. Thus, the denominator of P can be expressed in terms of the completely fundamental elements of $\Phi(P)$.

Corollary 2.2. *The denominator of a polytope P is equal to the least common multiple of the final coordinates of the completely fundamental elements of $\Phi(P)$.*




FIGURE 1. The polytopes P_G and Q_G from Example 2.3 are shown in the xy -plane in blue and red, respectively. A portion of the homogenized cone over each polytope is shown in the corresponding color.

When $P \in \{P_G, Q_G\}$, we say that a magic labeling L is a **completely fundamental (magic) labeling** of $\Phi(P)$ if (L, k) is a completely fundamental element of $\Phi(P)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. An important subtlety is that which labelings are “completely fundamental” depends upon whether one is considering the polytope P_G of all magic labelings with labels $\leq k$ or the polytope Q_G of magic labelings of index exactly k .

Example 2.3. Let G be the graph with one node v and two loops at v . Then we can identify \mathbb{R}^E with \mathbb{R}^2 . Under this identification, P_G is the unit square $[0, 1]^2$, and Q_G is the line segment with endpoints $(1, 0)$ and $(0, 1)$. In Figure 1, the semigroup $\Phi(P_G)$ is the set of integer-lattice points (not shown) in the blue cone, and $\Phi(Q_G)$ is the set of such points in the red cone. The completely fundamental elements of $\Phi(P_G)$ are $(0, 0, 1)$, $(0, 1, 1)$, $(1, 0, 1)$, and $(1, 1, 1)$, corresponding to the four vertices of P_G . The completely fundamental elements of $\Phi(Q_G)$ are $(0, 1, 1)$ and $(1, 0, 1)$, corresponding to the two vertices of Q_G .

In 1973, Stanley proved a strong bound on the denominator of the polytope Q_G , which in turn implies the same bound on the minimum quasiperiod of the quasipolynomial $S_G(k)$ that counts the index- k magic labelings of G .

Stanley stated his result in terms of the “completely fundamental magic labelings of G ”, which in our nomenclature meant the completely fundamental labeling of $\Phi(Q_G)$ specifically.

Lemma 2.4 ([9, Proposition 2.7]). *For a finite graph G , every completely fundamental magic labeling of $\Phi(Q_G)$ has index 1 or 2. If G is additionally bipartite, then every completely fundamental magic labeling of $\Phi(Q_G)$ has index 1.*

Applying [Corollary 2.2](#) yields the following uniform bounds.

Proposition 2.5 ([9, Corollary 2.8]). *For all graphs G , the denominator of the polytope Q_G is at most 2. In particular, the minimum quasiperiod of $S_G(k)$ is at most 2.*

Our main theorem is that *no such bounds exist* on either the denominator of the polytope P_G or on the minimum quasiperiod of the quasipolynomial $M_G(k)$ that counts the magic k -labelings.¹

Theorem 2.6. *There exist graphs G for which the minimum quasiperiod of M_G is arbitrarily large. In particular, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, there exists a graph G_n (on $2n + 2$ vertices and $3n$ edges) such that P_{G_n} has a vertex with denominator $n - 1$, and the minimum quasiperiod of the quasipolynomial M_{G_n} is $n - 1$.*

The proof of this theorem appears at the end of [Section 4](#). The outline of the argument is as follows. The construction of G_n is at the beginning of [Section 3](#), and the fact that P_{G_n} has a vertex with denominator $n - 1$ is a direct consequence of [Theorem 3.5](#). Now, since the denominator is only an upper bound on the minimum quasiperiod of M_G , the strategy explored in [\[1\]](#) might still be salvaged if P_G exhibited so-called “period collapse” [\[6\]](#). However, in [Proposition 4.1](#) and [Corollary 4.7](#), we establish that the Ehrhart quasipolynomial M_{G_n} of P_{G_n} has “full period”. That is, the quasiperiod of the quasipolynomial attains the upper bound in [Corollary 2.2](#). In particular, the minimum quasiperiod of M_{G_n} is $n - 1$, as claimed in [Theorem 2.6](#).

Example 2.7. Consider 4 copies of the path on 3 vertices, where the ends of the paths are labeled by x_i and y_i for $1 \leq i \leq 4$. Let G_4 be the graph on 10 vertices obtained by identifying all the x_i vertices as a single vertex x

¹A claim to the contrary appears as Theorem 4 of [\[1\]](#). However, the authors of [\[1\]](#) report in private correspondence that the proof of their Theorem 4 contained an error and that an erratum is forthcoming.

and all the y_i vertices as a single vertex y . Then $M_{G_4}(k)$ is the following quasipolynomial with minimum quasiperiod 3:

$$M_{G_4}(k) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{18}k^4 + \frac{4}{9}k^3 + \frac{25}{18}k^2 + 2k + 1 & \text{if } k \equiv 0 \pmod{3}, \\ \frac{1}{18}k^4 + \frac{4}{9}k^3 + \frac{25}{18}k^2 + 2k + \frac{10}{9} & \text{if } k \equiv 1 \pmod{3}, \\ \frac{1}{18}k^4 + \frac{4}{9}k^3 + \frac{25}{18}k^2 + 2k + 1 & \text{if } k \equiv 2 \pmod{3}. \end{cases}$$

The fact that only the degree-0 coefficient varies is explained in the remark following the proof of [Corollary 4.7](#) below.

The contrast between our results and Stanley's results is rooted in the difference between $\Phi(P_G)$ and $\Phi(Q_G)$. It follows from [Theorem 2.6](#) and [Corollary 2.2](#) that the analogue of [Lemma 2.4](#) is false if we replace $\Phi(Q_G)$ with $\Phi(P_G)$, and moreover no uniform bound can be placed on the index of completely fundamental magic labelings of $\Phi(P_G)$.

However, an analogue of [Lemma 2.4](#) does hold for certain types of graphs. We show in [Section 5](#) that if G has an edge that attains the maximum label in every index-2 magic labeling, then the completely fundamental magic labelings of $\Phi(P_G)$ have index at most 2. Moreover, if G is additionally bipartite, then the completely fundamental magic labelings of $\Phi(P_G)$ have index at most 1. In particular, if G is any bipartite graph with a leaf, it follows that $M_k(G)$ is a polynomial.

3. UNBOUNDED COMPLETELY FUNDAMENTAL LABELINGS

In this section, we construct a family $\{G_n\}_{n \geq 2}$ of graphs for which there are completely fundamental magic labelings of $\Phi(P_{G_n})$ with arbitrarily large maximum label. This means that there is no uniform upper bound on the denominator of P_G .

Definition 3.1. For each integer $n \geq 2$, let G_n be the graph on the vertex set $\{a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_n, x, y\}$ with the following $3n$ edges:

- an edge from a_i to b_i for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,
- an edge from x to a_i for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and
- an edge from y to b_i for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

We will construct a completely fundamental magic labeling of $\Phi(P_{G_n})$ with maximum edge label $n - 1$.

Definition 3.2. Let L_* be the labeling on the edges of G_n where edges from a_i to b_i have label $n - 1$ and all other edges of label 1.




FIGURE 2. The construction of the graph G_n .

It is straightforward to check that L_* is a magic labeling of index n , but it remains to show that this is a completely fundamental labeling of $\Phi(P_{G_n})$. In order to show this, we first consider the perfect matchings on G_n . A **perfect matching** in G is a subset J of the edges such that each vertex in G is incident to exactly one edge of J . Note that a magic labeling of G of index 1 can be identified with a perfect matching of G by taking the set of edges of G with label 1.

Proposition 3.3. *For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let L_i be the perfect matching on G_n formed by taking the edge from x to a_i , from y to b_i , and all edges from a_j to b_j for $j \neq i$. All perfect matchings on G_n are of this form.*

Let $\max(L)$ denote the maximum label appearing in a labeling L , and write $\vec{0}$ for the trivial magic labeling under which every edge is labeled 0.

Lemma 3.4. *Any element of $\Phi(P_{G_n})$ can be written as a nonnegative integer combination of the elements $(L_1, 1)$, $(L_2, 1)$, \dots , $(L_n, 1)$, $(\vec{0}, 1)$, and $(L_*, n-1)$.*

Proof. Fix (L, k) in $\Phi(P_{G_n})$. By subtracting off copies of $(\vec{0}, 1)$, we can assume $k = \max(L)$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $u_i = L(xa_i)$, i.e., the label of the edge between x and a_i in L . The index of L is then $\sum_{i=1}^n u_i$. In order to have the correct sum at a_j , we must have $L(a_jb_j) = (\sum_{i=1}^n u_i) - u_j$. Similarly, $L(b_jy) = u_j$ in order to have the correct sum at b_j . The maximum label in L is then

$$\max(L) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n u_i \right) - \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} u_i.$$

Let m be such that $u_m = \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} u_i$. It is then straightforward to check that

$$(L, \max(L)) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (u_i - u_m) \cdot (L_i, 1) \right) + u_m \cdot (L_*, n-1).$$

Thus, we can conclude that $(L, \max(L))$ can be decomposed as desired. \square

Note that the magic labeling L_* is equal to the sum of the magic labelings L_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$. However, if we additionally choose an appropriate bound for the maximum label, this no longer holds. That is, the element $(L_*, n - 1)$ is not a sum of the elements $(L_i, 1)$ in $\Phi(P_{G_n})$, which is a consequence of the following result.

Theorem 3.5. *The completely fundamental elements of $\Phi(P_{G_n})$ are $(L_1, 1)$, $(L_2, 1)$, \dots , $(L_n, 1)$, $(\vec{0}, 1)$, and $(L_*, n - 1)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.4, it is enough to show that no multiple of one of these elements can be written as a positive integer combination of the others.

This clearly holds for $(\vec{0}, 1)$, since all other elements have a positive edge label. This also holds for $(L_*, n - 1)$ since $(\vec{0}, 1)$ and the $(L_i, 1)$ satisfy the property that the last entry is at least the index of the labeling, and this property is preserved under sums. Lastly, the theorem statement holds for each element $(L_i, 1)$, as the only other element with label 0 on the edge between a_i and b_i is $(\vec{0}, 1)$ and no multiple of $(\vec{0}, 1)$ is equal to a multiple of $(L_i, 1)$. \square

Remark 3.6. Each graph G_n can be generalized to a family of graphs $G_{n,p}$ for $p \geq 1$ as follows, while retaining the same Ehrhart quasipolynomial to count the magic labelings.

Let $G_{n,p}$ denote the graph obtained by taking two vertices x and y and connecting them by n distinct paths of length $2p + 1$. Since this graph is bipartite, any magic labeling can be decomposed as a sum of perfect matchings. Moreover, a perfect matching of $G_{n,p}$ is determined by a choice of edge incident to x , as is the case for G_n . This induces a bijection between perfect matchings on G_n and perfect matchings on $G_{n,p}$, and it is straightforward to show that this bijection can be extended additively to magic labelings. Thus, we have $M_{G_n}(k) = M_{G_{n,p}}(k)$.

4. THE EHRHART QUASIPOLYNOMIAL OF P_{G_n}

This section is focused on studying the Ehrhart quasipolynomial of P_{G_n} , where G_n is the graph constructed in Section 3. In Subsection 4.1, we give an explicit formula for this Ehrhart quasipolynomial as a sum of certain binomial coefficients. Ultimately, we are interested in finding the minimum quasiperiod of this quasipolynomial in order to prove the main result (Theorem 2.6). Using tools developed in Subsection 4.2, we precisely compute the minimum quasiperiod in Subsection 4.3.

4.1. Computing the Ehrhart Quasipolynomial of P_{G_n}

Let $M_n(k) := M_{G_n}(k)$ be the number of integer points in kP_{G_n} , where P_{G_n} is the polytope of magic labelings of G_n with maximum label at most 1. That is, M_n is the Ehrhart quasipolynomial of P_{G_n} . Equivalently, $M_n(k)$ is the number of integral magic labelings of G_n with maximum label at most k . For all $n \geq 1$, define the function $F_n: \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$F_n(k) := \sum_{\substack{j \in [0, k]_{\mathbb{Z}} \\ j \equiv k \pmod{n}}} \binom{j}{n}.$$

Proposition 4.1. *For $n \geq 2$ and nonnegative k , we have*

$$M_n(k) = \binom{k+n}{n} + F_{n-1}(k).$$

Proof. As in the proof of [Lemma 3.4](#), each magic labeling L of G_n is determined by the labels u_j that L assigns to the edges xa_j for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Moreover, the labeling L is a k -labeling if and only if the maximum label $\sum_{j=1}^n u_j - \min_{1 \leq \ell \leq n} u_\ell$ is at most k . Thus, we can directly calculate $M_n(k)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} M_n(k) &= \# \left\{ (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n u_j - u_\ell \leq k \text{ for all } \ell \right\} \\ &= \# \left\{ (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n u_j \leq k \right\} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \geq 1} \# \left\{ (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n u_j = k + i \text{ and } u_\ell \geq i \text{ for all } \ell \right\} \\ &= \binom{k+n}{n} + \sum_{i \geq 1} \binom{k - (i-1)(n-1)}{n-1} \\ &= \binom{k+n}{n} + \sum_{i \geq 0} \binom{k - i(n-1)}{n-1}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

4.2. Minimum quasiperiods and finite differences

In this subsection, we review a result of Sam and Woods [\[7\]](#) and observe that, as a direct consequence of their result, the minimum quasiperiod of a quasipolynomial F equals the minimum quasiperiod of the *first difference* of F . We will then use this fact in the next subsection to show that the minimum quasiperiod of F_n is n .

The **difference operator** $F \mapsto \Delta F$ is defined as follows. For any complex-valued function F defined on \mathbb{Z} , or on any interval $[a, \infty) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, the **first difference** of F is the function ΔF defined on the same domain by

$$\Delta F(t) := F(t + 1) - F(t).$$

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, the i^{th} **difference** of F is defined by $\Delta^i F := \Delta(\Delta^{i-1} F)$. The operator Δ satisfies an analogue of the fundamental theorem of calculus: If f and F are functions defined on $[a, \infty)$, then $\Delta \sum_{x=a}^{t-1} f(x) = f(t)$ and $\sum_{x=a}^{t-1} \Delta F(x) = F(t) - F(a)$ for all $t > a$. This operator thus gives rise to a rich “calculus of finite differences” [4]. Sam and Woods use this calculus in [7] to give elementary proofs of several foundational results in Ehrhart theory.

We now show that the difference operator preserves the minimum quasi-period of quasipolynomials:

$$(4.2) \quad \text{mqp}(\Delta F) = \text{mqp}(F).$$

The easy half of this equation is the inequality $\text{mqp}(\Delta F) \leq \text{mqp}(F)$. For, let $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_s \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ be the constituents of F . Then, for each $r \in [s]$ and $t \equiv r \pmod{s}$, we have that $\Delta F(t) = \phi_{r+1}(t+1) - \phi_r(t)$ (indices modulo s), which is a polynomial function of t . Thus, ΔF is a quasipolynomial, and s is a quasiperiod ΔF .

To complete the proof of Equation (4.2), it remains to prove that $\text{mqp}(F) \leq \text{mqp}(\Delta F)$. This inequality follows from [7, Lemma 2.1], a special case of which² is the following.

Theorem 4.3 ([7, Lemma 2.1]). *Let $f(t) = \sum_{i=0}^d c_i(t) t^i$ be a quasipolynomial, where c_i is a periodic function with minimum period s_i for $0 \leq i \leq d$. Let $F(t) := \sum_{x=0}^{t-1} f(x)$ for $t \geq 1$. Then $F(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} C_i(t) t^i$ for some periodic functions C_0, C_1, \dots, C_{d+1} such that the minimum period of C_i divides $\text{lcm}\{s_i, s_{i+1}, \dots, s_d\}$ for $0 \leq i \leq d$, and C_{d+1} is constant.³*

Equation (4.2) is now a straightforward corollary.

Corollary 4.4. *Let $F: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a quasipolynomial. Then ΔF is also a quasipolynomial, and $\text{mqp}(\Delta F) = \text{mqp}(F)$.*

²The authors of [7] consider the more general case in which the upper bound of summation in the definition of $F(t)$ is itself a quasipolynomial function of t of the form $t \mapsto \lfloor at/b \rfloor$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$.

³It may happen that $C_{d+1} = 0$, as for example when $f(t) := (-1)^t$. In general, $C_{d+1} = 0$ if and only if $\sum_{x=1}^{s_d} c_d(x) = 0$. Thus, the “anti-difference” operator does not increase the degree of every quasipolynomial.

Proof. From the argument immediately following Equation (4.2), it remains only to prove that $\text{mqp}(F) \leq \text{mqp}(\Delta F)$. Let

$$H(t) := F(t) - F(0) = \sum_{x=0}^{t-1} \Delta F(x).$$

Write $H(t) =: \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} C_i(t) t^i$, and let s'_i be the minimum period of C_i for $0 \leq i \leq d+1$. Put $\Delta F(t) =: \sum_{i=0}^d c_i(t) t^i$ and let s_i be the minimum period of c_i for $0 \leq i \leq d$. Then, by [Theorem 4.3](#),

$$\text{mqp}(F) = \text{mqp}(H) = \text{lcm}\{s'_0, \dots, s'_d\} \mid \text{lcm}\{s_0, \dots, s_d\} = \text{mqp}(\Delta F).$$

In particular, $\text{mqp}(F) \leq \text{mqp}(\Delta F)$. \square

4.3. Proof that F_n has minimum quasiperiod n

In this subsection, we apply the result of [Subsection 4.2](#) to show that F_n has minimum quasiperiod n , thereby completing the proof of [Theorem 2.6](#). Thus far, $F_n(k)$ has been defined only for nonnegative k . Henceforth, we also write F_n for the unique quasipolynomial extension of F_n to all of \mathbb{Z} .

Lemma 4.5. *Let $n \geq i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The i^{th} difference of F_n satisfies*

$$(4.6) \quad \Delta^i F_n(t) = \sum_{\substack{j \in [0, t]_{\mathbb{Z}} \\ j \equiv t \pmod{n}}} \binom{j}{n-i} \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

In particular,

$$\Delta^n F_n(t) = \left\lfloor \frac{t}{n} \right\rfloor + 1 \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and so $\Delta^n F_n$ is a quasipolynomial with minimum quasiperiod n .

Proof. The claim is trivial when $i = 0$. Proceeding by induction on i , we find that, for $n \geq i + 1$ and $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^{i+1} F_n(t) &= \Delta^i F_n(t+1) - \Delta^i F_n(t) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{j \in [0, t+1]_{\mathbb{Z}} \\ j \equiv t+1 \pmod{n}}} \binom{j}{n-i} - \sum_{\substack{j \in [0, t]_{\mathbb{Z}} \\ j \equiv t \pmod{n}}} \binom{j}{n-i} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{j \in [-1, t]_{\mathbb{Z}} \\ j \equiv t \pmod{n}}} \binom{j+1}{n-i} - \sum_{\substack{j \in [0, t]_{\mathbb{Z}} \\ j \equiv t \pmod{n}}} \binom{j}{n-i} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{j \in [0, t]_{\mathbb{Z}} \\ j \equiv t \pmod{n}}} \binom{j}{n - (i + 1)}.$$

(The condition that $n \geq i + 1$ is used to eliminate the $j = -1$ term in the first sum on the right-hand side of the third equation.) Thus, Equation (4.6) is proved. In particular, for $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$,

$$\Delta^n F_n(t) = \#\{j \in [0, t]_{\mathbb{Z}} : j \equiv t \pmod{n}\} = \left\lfloor \frac{t}{n} \right\rfloor + 1.$$

Therefore, $\Delta^n F_n(t) = \left\lfloor \frac{t}{n} \right\rfloor + 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

Corollary 4.7. *The minimum quasiperiod of F_n is n .*

Proof. By Lemma 4.5, $\Delta^n F_n$ has minimum quasiperiod n . Therefore, by Corollary 4.4, F_n itself has minimum quasiperiod n . □

Indeed, it follows from Theorem 4.3 that all coefficient functions of F_n are constant, except for the degree-0 coefficient function, which has minimum period n . For, in the notation of Theorem 4.3, $f(t) := \left\lfloor \frac{t}{n} \right\rfloor + 1 = \frac{1}{n}t + c_0(t)$, where $c_0(t) = -r_n(t)/n + 1$ and $r_n(t)$ is the remainder of t modulo n . Thus, $s_0 = n$ and $s_i = 1$ for $i \geq 1$. Any function F such that $\Delta F = f$ differs from $t \mapsto \sum_{x=0}^{t-1} f(x)$ by a constant and so the minimum quasiperiod of the coefficient function C_i of F divides $\text{lcm}\{s_i, \dots, s_d\} = 1$ for all i such that $d \geq i \geq 1$. That is, C_i is constant for all $i \geq 1$. By induction, every coefficient function of F_n , except for the degree-0 coefficient function, is constant.

We are now prepared to prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Let G_n be the graph from Definition 3.1. The element $(L_*, n - 1) \in \Phi(P_{G_n})$ from Definition 3.2 is completely fundamental in $\Phi(P_{G_n})$, as shown in Theorem 3.5. Hence P_{G_n} has denominator $n - 1$, as desired.

By Proposition 4.1, the magic labeling quasipolynomial $M_n(k)$ is a sum of a polynomial and the quasipolynomial F_{n-1} . We have by Corollary 4.7 that F_{n-1} has minimum quasiperiod $n - 1$. Therefore $M_n(k)$ also has minimum quasiperiod $n - 1$, thus proving the second statement. □

5. GRAPHS WITH SMALL MAGIC-LABELING QUASIPERIODS

Though Theorem 2.6 demonstrates that the quasipolynomial $M_G(k)$ can have arbitrarily large minimum quasiperiod, there are still large families of graphs for which we can give a uniform bound on the minimum quasiperiod.

In this section, we show that for a large family of graphs, including any graph with a leaf, the minimum quasiperiod of this quasipolynomial is at most 2.

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose there is an edge e in the graph G that attains the maximum label in every magic labeling of G of index 2. Then $M_G(k)$ is a quasipolynomial of quasiperiod at most 2. If G is furthermore bipartite, then $M_G(k)$ is a polynomial.*

Proof. Note that the statement holds trivially if the only magic labeling of G is the zero labeling, so we can suppose that G admits a nonzero magic labeling. Fix a magic labeling L of G of index greater than 2. By [Lemma 2.4](#), we can decompose L as a sum of at least two magic labelings L_i of G , each of index at most 2. Since e attains the maximum label in each L_i , it must also attain the maximum label in L . We then have $\max(L) = \sum_i \max(L_i)$, and hence $(L, \max(L)) = \sum_i (L_i, \max(L_i))$ in $\Phi(P_G)$. So we can conclude that $(L, \max(L))$ is not completely fundamental in $\Phi(P_G)$. Therefore, any completely fundamental element of $\Phi(P_G)$ has index (and hence maximum label) at most 2. It follows from [Corollary 2.2](#) that 2 is a quasiperiod of $M_G(k)$.

If G is bipartite, we can furthermore decompose L into a sum of magic labelings L_i of index 1 by [Lemma 2.4](#). The same approach then applies to show that any completely fundamental labeling of $\Phi(P_G)$ has index 1. Thus, [Corollary 2.2](#) implies that 1 is a quasiperiod of $M_G(k)$, i.e., $M_G(k)$ is a polynomial. \square

Corollary 5.2. *Let G be a graph with a leaf. Then $M_G(k)$ is a quasipolynomial of quasiperiod at most 2.*

Proof. The edge incident to the leaf vertex satisfies the hypotheses of [Proposition 5.1](#), as its label in any magic labeling must always equal the index and hence is maximal. \square

Remark 5.3. While the hypothesis of [Proposition 5.1](#) only applies to magic labelings of index 2, it is in fact equivalent to assert that the hypothesis holds for all magic labelings. This follows from [Lemma 2.4](#), as any magic labeling can be decomposed as a sum of magic labelings of index at most 2. Moreover, any magic labeling of index 1 can be doubled to yield a magic labeling of index 2.

Remark 5.4. Let G be a graph with an even number of vertices. The **matching preclusion number** $\text{mp}(G)$ of G is the minimum cardinality of an edge set S such that $G - S$ has no perfect matching. If G is bipartite, then the condition of [Proposition 5.1](#) is equivalent to the condition that $\text{mp}(G) \leq 1$.

Example 5.5. We can give a method for constructing a bipartite graph with matching preclusion number 1. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let G_i be a bipartite graph with a vertex v_i such that $G_i \setminus \{v_i\}$ has a perfect matching. Note that such a graph G_i must have odd size. Then consider the graph formed by connecting G_1 and G_2 by a single edge between v_1 and v_2 . The resulting graph has a perfect matching, since we can take the perfect matchings in $G_i \setminus \{v_i\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ along with the added edge. However, the graph obtained by removing the edge between v_1 and v_2 has no perfect matchings, since it consists of two components of odd size.

We have shown in this section that the quasiperiod of the quasipolynomial $M_G(k)$ is small for certain families of graphs, while we proved in [Subsection 4.3](#) that the quasiperiod is unbounded in general. This leaves much room for future progress in understanding how the quasipolynomial $M_G(k)$ behaves for other types of graphs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was completed in part at the 2022 Graduate Research Workshop in Combinatorics, which was supported in part by NSF grant #1953985, and a generous award from the Combinatorics Foundation. The second author was supported by the NSF GRFP and the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation. The authors thank Matt Beck and Maryam Farahmand for many helpful discussions. We also thank Jeremy Martin for early contributions to the project.

REFERENCES

- [1] Matthias Beck and Maryam Farahmand, *Partially magic labelings and the antimagic graph conjecture*, *Sém. Lothar. Combin.* **78B** (2017), Art. 86, 11.
- [2] Matthias Beck and Sinai Robins, *Computing the continuous discretely*, Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2007.
- [3] Joseph A. Gallian, *A dynamic survey of graph labeling*, *Electron. J. Combin.* **5** (1998), Dynamic Survey 6, 43.
- [4] Ronald L. Graham, Donald E. Knuth, and Oren Patashnik, *Concrete mathematics*, second ed., Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, MA, 1994.
- [5] Nora Hartsfield and Gerhard Ringel, *Pearls in graph theory*, Academic Press, Inc., Boston, MA, 1990.
- [6] Tyrrell B. McAllister, *Rational polytopes with Ehrhart coefficients of arbitrary period*, *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **390** (2021), Paper No. 113155, 7. MR 4213632
- [7] Steven V. Sam and Kevin M. Woods, *A finite calculus approach to Ehrhart polynomials*, *Electron. J. Combin.* **17** (2010), no. 1, Research Paper 68, 13.
- [8] Jiří Sedláček, *Problem 27*, *Theory of graphs and its applications: Proceedings of the Symposium held in Smolenice in June 1963*. (Miroslav Fiedler, ed.), Publishing House of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences; Academic Press, 1964.

- [9] Richard P. Stanley, *Linear homogeneous Diophantine equations and magic labelings of graphs*, Duke Math. J. **40** (1973), 607–632.
- [10] B. M. Stewart, *Magic graphs*, Canadian J. Math. **18** (1966), 1031–1059.