

Binary Stretch Embedding of Weighted Graphs

Javad B. Ebrahimi^{1*} and Mehri Oghbaei Bonab¹

¹Department of Mathematical Sciences, Sharif University of Technology,
Azadi Avenue, Tehran, 11155-9415, Tehran, Iran.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: javad.ebrahimi@sharif.edu;
Contributing authors: m.oghbaei95@sharif.edu;

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce and study the problem of *binary stretch embedding* of edge-weighted graph. This problem is closely related to the well-known *addressing problem* of Graham and Pollak. Addressing problem is the problem of assigning the shortest possible length strings (called “addresses”) over the alphabet $\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}, *\}$ to the vertices of an input graph G with the following property. For every pair u, v of vertices, the number of positions in which one of their addresses is $\mathbf{1}$, and the other is $\mathbf{0}$ is exactly equal to the distance of u, v in graph G . When the addresses do not contain the symbol $*$, the problem is called *isometric hypercube embedding*. As far as we know, the isometric hypercube embedding was introduced by Firsov in 1965. It is known that such addresses do not exist for general graphs.

Inspired by the addressing problem, in this paper, we introduce the *binary stretch embedding problem*, or BSEP for short, for the edge-weighted undirected graphs. We also argue how this problem is related to other graph embedding problems in the literature.

Using tools and techniques such as Hadamard codes and the theory of linear programming, several upper and lower bounds as well as exact solutions for certain classes of graphs will be discovered.

As an application of the results in this paper, we derive improved upper bounds or exact values for the maximum size of Lee metric codes of certain parameters.

Keywords: Graph, Hadamard code, Addressing problem, Linear programming, Plotkin bound, Metric embedding, Lee metric code

1 Introduction

In this paper, we introduce and study the problem of *binary stretch embedding* of an edge-weighted graph. This problem is closely related to the well-known *addressing problem* of Graham and Pollak. We utilize the result of this study to derive novel bounds for Lee metric codes of certain parameters.

In the continuation, we describe both of these problems as well as Lee metric codes in detail.

Consider the set of n -tuples from the alphabet set $\{0, 1, *\}$ (called “addresses”). The distance between two addresses is defined as the number of places where one has a 0 and the other a 1 (Thus, the stars do not contribute to the distance). An addressing of a graph G is an assignment of addresses to the vertices such that the distance of any two vertices in G is equal to the distance of their addresses. For a given graph G , what is the smallest possible n such that an addressing of length n exists? This number is called the addressing number of G and is denoted by $N(G)$. In [1], the addressing problem is presented and defined as part of a switching theory application.

Moreover, the addressing number of graph G is equal to the biclique partition number of its distance multigraph. This is shown by Graham and Pollak in [1], [2]. The biclique partition number of a graph G , denoted by $bp(G)$, is the minimum number of complete bipartite subgraphs (bicliques) of G that cover all the edges of G . The distance multigraph of G , denoted by $D(G)$, is a multigraph with the same vertices of G . In $D(G)$, the multiplicity of any edge $e = uv$ is the distance between u and v in G . One can observe that the defined notion of distance is not a metric on the set $\{0, 1, *\}$. Thus, it is natural to ask the same problem for the binary alphabet equipped with the Hamming distance. In fact, for the binary alphabet, the problem becomes the following question. What is the smallest integer l such that there exists an isometry (i.e. distance preserving map) $\phi : (V(G), d_G) \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^l, d_H)$? Here, d_G is the distance function on G with respect to the weight of edges. Also, d_H is the usual Hamming distance (See 2.1 for the definition). This problem is closely related to the “isometric hypercube embedding” problem, which only asks about the existence of any ϕ , regardless of the length l .

As far as we know, this problem was first introduced in the paper [3] by Firsov. Isometric embedding into hypercubes is further studied in [4], [5], [6]. Moreover, in [7] and [8], isometric Hamming embedding of unweighted graphs is investigated. The book [9] by Deza and Laurent, and the notes [10] and [11], by Matousek and Chepoi are great references to isometric embedding and metric embedding in general.

Isometric hypercube embedding problem has applications in the design of DNA strands [12], communication, and coding theory [3], [13]. For weighted graphs, isometric Hamming embedding has been studied recently in [14].

It has been shown in [6], [15] that there exist graphs that do not admit any isometric embedding into hypercubes, no matter how large we pick l . For instance, one can easily show that there is no addressing for K_3 over the binary alphabet, where K_3 is a complete graph with 3 vertices. However, it is still a legitimate question to ask for the smallest length l such that there exists a function $\phi : (V(G), d) \rightarrow (\{0, 1\}^l, d_H)$ such that for every pair u, v of the vertices, $d(u, v) \leq d_H(\phi(u), \phi(v))$. This problem is

introduced and studied in the current paper. In Section 3, the precise formulation of this problem as well as a related version of it has been described

These types of questions are studied in the field of metric embedding of graphs, which has also received significant attention, primarily due to their applications in computer science and algorithm design. (See [16], [17].)

We can take one further step by considering edge-weighted graphs. For a connected weighted graph G with a weight function \mathbf{w} , we can still ask for the minimum length of binary addressing. This means, for all $u, v \in V(G)$ we have $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^l$, such that $d_{\mathbf{w}}(u, v) \leq d_H(\phi(u), \phi(v))$. Here, $d_{\mathbf{w}}(u, v)$ is the weighted distance of u, v . The smallest such l is denoted by $c(G, \mathbf{w})$.

Note that whenever the graph has n vertices and the weight function is constant d , our problem reduces to the following well-known problem in the context of error-correcting codes: What is the minimum length binary code, containing n codewords, and, minimum distance d ?

We also define $c_{\lambda}(G, \mathbf{w})$ as $c(G, \lambda \cdot \mathbf{w})$ in which $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{w}$ is a weight function which assigns the weight $\lambda \cdot w(e)$ to the edge e . Here, λ is a positive integer scalar. Observe that in this notation, $c_1(G, \mathbf{w}) = c(G, \mathbf{w})$.

Unlike isometric embedding, which does not necessarily exist for arbitrary graphs, function ϕ exists for every connected weighted graph G , provided that the length l is large enough. Thus, $c_{\lambda}(G, \mathbf{w})$ is well defined for any connected graph G , positive integer weight \mathbf{w} and positive integer scalar λ . The main challenge is to minimize the size of the corresponding vectors (which we call the *binary addresses*).

In Table C, we compare several graph embedding-type problems to those we introduce in this paper.

1.1 Informal Statement of Our Results

Before going into the technical details, we informally outline the main results of this paper.

- **General upper and lower bounds and some exact results:**

In Lemma 1, we derive lower and upper bounds on $c(G, \mathbf{w})$ for arbitrary edge-weighted graph G in terms of other graph parameters. This, in turn, provides an exact formula for $c(G, \mathbf{w})$ for certain graphs. This result is formally stated and proved in Theorem 6.

- **Integer programming formulation and its linear relaxation:**

In 4.2.1, we formulate the problem as an integer program. We consider the linear relaxation problem and present the relationship between the relaxed problem and λ -BSEP. Corollary 12.3 contains this result.

In Theorem 13, by using the weak duality theorem, we derive a lower bound for the relaxed problem. This, in turn, implies a stronger lower bound for $c(G, \mathbf{w})$.

By utilizing Hadamard codes, we find an upper bound at most twice the lower bound. This will provide a 2-approximation solution for the linear problem. Corollary 10.1 summarizes this result. This result helps us to find the integrality gap of the relaxed problem.

- **BSEP for the Cartesian product of graphs:**

Using the results in the previous parts and based on the Cartesian product of graphs, we construct a family of graphs with the exact solutions to BSEP or its linear relaxation counterpart.

- **Application to Lee metric codes:**

We present an application of our results in the context of Lee metric codes. As a theorem, we obtain a relation between the size of Lee codewords and binary error correction codes. This will help us to employ our findings to improve the bounds on the size of Lee metric codes of certain parameters. Table 5 summarises the improved bounds.

1.2 Organization of the Paper

In the rest of this paper, we start with an overview of the preliminaries. This includes the basic definitions and notations of coding theory, graph theory, and linear programming which we use in the subsequent sections.

In Section 3, we formally define the BSEP and λ -BSEP for edge-weighted graphs.

Next, we present the main results of the paper. Finally, as an application of our result, we present new bounds for Lee metric codes of certain parameters.

In Appendix A, we present an alternative proof for one of the theorems as the Plotkin type bound.

Appendix B contains a table that summarizes notations. In Appendix C, to gain a better understanding of the subject of this work, we compare some other graph embedding problems to those introduced in this paper.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we review basic definitions and notations from coding theory, graph theory, and linear programming.

2.1 Metric Space and Coding Theory Terminology

First, we define the metric space and then a particular case of mapping between metrics.

Definition 1 (Metric space). *A metric space is a set M together with a distance function $d : M \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying the following properties:*

1. $\forall x \in M, d(x, x) = 0$
2. *If $x \neq y, d(x, y) > 0$*
3. $\forall x, y \in M, d(x, y) = d(y, x)$
4. $\forall x, y, z \in M, d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$ (*Triangle inequality*).

There are different mappings between metric spaces. One of them is defined as follows.

Definition 2 (Stretch mapping). *A mapping ϕ from metric space (X, d) to another metric space (Y, d') is stretch mapping when: $\forall a, b \in X, d(a, b) \leq d'(\phi(a), \phi(b))$.*

Let Q be a set of size q and d be some metric over Q . A code C of length n is a subset $C \subseteq Q^n$. When $q = 2$, we call the code “binary”. The elements of C are

called codewords. The metric d naturally extends over the set $Q^n = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) : a_i \in Q, \forall 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. We abuse the notation and denote the extended metric by d . One can easily check that the distance measure $d : Q^n \times Q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ defined by $d((x_1, \dots, x_n), (y_1, \dots, y_n)) := \sum_{i=1}^n d(x_i, y_i)$ is a metric. The minimum distance of the code C is defined as $\min_{x, y \in Q^n, x \neq y} d(x, y)$.

An example of a metric space is when M is a finite set and the distance function d_H is defined as follows: $d_H(a, b) = 1$ when $a \neq b$ else 0. This metric space is called the Hamming space, and the function d_H is called the Hamming distance. Another example of a metric space is the Lee metric, which is defined as follows. Take $Q = \{0, 1, \dots, q-1\}$ and $d(i, j) = \min\{|i-j|, q-|i-j|\}$. The intuition of the Lee metric is that if one arranges the numbers $0, 1, \dots, q-1$ cyclically around a cycle, the Lee distance of i and j is the length of the shorter arc these two vertices form. We define the concatenation of two codes as follows.

Definition 3 (Concatenation). *If $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$, $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$. Then the concatenation of u , v denoted by uv is defined as the length $m+n$ string $uv = (u_1, \dots, u_m, v_1, \dots, v_n)$.*

The Hadamard code is a set of 2^{m+1} codewords of length 2^m over the binary alphabet with the minimum distance of 2^{m-1} .

We denote the maximum size of a binary code of length n and the minimum distance d by $A_2(n, d)$. The Plotkin bound states that: If $2d > n$, then $A_2(n, d) \leq \frac{2d}{2d-n}$.

Similarly, $A_q^L(n, d)$ denotes the maximum number of Lee codes over an alphabet set of size q , length n , and minimum distance of d .

2.2 Graph Theory Terminology

We follow the notation of [18] for graph theory basics. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. A (u, v) -path is a path with endpoints u, v .

An edge-weighted graph (or weighted graph) is a graph $G = (V, E)$ together with a weight function $\mathbf{w} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. In this paper, we only consider positive integer weights and those weighted graphs for which each edge is the shortest path between its endpoints, which we call “weight-minimal” graphs (see [14]). We denote a weighted graph G with the weight function \mathbf{w} by (G, \mathbf{w}) or $G_{\mathbf{w}}$. The weight of a subgraph H of (G, \mathbf{w}) is the sum of the weights of the edges in H . For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , the smallest weight (u, v) -path is denoted by $d_{\mathbf{w}}(u, v)$ or $d_G(u, v)$ when there is no ambiguity about \mathbf{w} . The diameter of a weighted connected graph (G, \mathbf{w}) is defined as $\max_{u, v \in V} d_{\mathbf{w}}(u, v)$ and is denoted by $\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$. Moreover, we define $h_p(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w})$ and $h_c(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w})$ as the lowest weight of a Hamilton path and the lowest weight of a Hamilton cycle in the graph $G_{\mathbf{w}}$, respectively.

The Cartesian product $G \square H$ of two graphs G and H , is a graph that has the vertex set as the Cartesian product $V(G) \times V(H)$. Also, two vertices (u, u') and (v, v') are connected in $G \square H$ if and only if either $u = v$ and u' and v' are neighbors in H , or $u' = v'$ and u and v are neighbors in G . Also, graphs G , and H are called factors. When two graphs are weighted such as (G_1, \mathbf{w}_1) and (G_2, \mathbf{w}_2) , the Cartesian product of them is denoted by $(G_1 \square G_2, \mathbf{w}_1 \square \mathbf{w}_2)$. In Section 4.3, by $G_1 \square G_2$ we mean $(G_1 \square G_2, \mathbf{w}_1 \square \mathbf{w}_2)$.

2.3 Linear Programming Terminology

In this paper, we consider the standard form of linear programs, namely:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & C^T X \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & AX \geq b, \quad X \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

where C is a vector defining the linear objective function, and A is the constraint matrix. Also, b is a vector. The feasible region of this problem is the set of all X with $AX \geq b, X \geq 0$ (means all the entries of vector X are non-negative). When the extra integrality condition on X is imposed, the problem is called the integer program of the original linear program. The dual program will be the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & b^T Y \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & A^T Y \leq C, \quad Y \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

One of the main results in this field is the weak duality theorem, which states: Let x^* be a feasible solution to the primal and let y^* be a feasible solution to the dual. Then, we have $b^T y^* \leq C^T x^*$.

3 Problem Formulation

In this section, we introduce the notion of binary address and present the problem formulation of BSEP and λ -BSEP.

Definition 4 (BSEP). *A binary addressing of a weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) is a function $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$ in which m is some positive integer number and for all $u, v \in V(G)$, we have $d_G(u, v) \leq d_H(f(u), f(v))$. (Here, d_G and d_H are the graph distance and the Hamming distance, respectively.) The number m is called the length of the binary addressing of f , and $f(u)$ is referred to the binary address (or “address” for short) of the vertex u . BSEP is the problem of finding the minimum integer m for which a binary addressing of length m exists. This parameter is called the binary addressing number of (G, \mathbf{w}) and is denoted by $c(G, \mathbf{w})$.*

In other words, BSEP asks about the smallest hypercube graph such that we can embed the vertices of an edge-weighted graph to the vertices of the hypercube in such a way that the distances stretch. Alternatively, if we think of an edge-weighted graph as a discrete metric space, we would like to know the smallest size Hamming space such that there exists a metric stretching mapping from the graph to that space.

Definition 5 (λ -BSEP). *For an edge-weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , and for the positive integer scalar λ , the λ -BSEP is the following question:*


Find the value of $c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})$. Recall that $c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w}) = c(G, \lambda \cdot \mathbf{w})$ in which $\lambda \cdot \mathbf{w}$ stands for the weight function obtained from λ scaling of \mathbf{w} (hence the name λ -scaling) and $c(G, \mathbf{w})$ is defined in Definition 4.

Remark 1. *If we let $\mathbf{1}$ be the constant weight $\mathbf{1}$ on all the edges of a connected graph G , then we have $c(G, \mathbf{1}) \leq N(G)$.*

Remark 2. *Note that if one can answer BSEP for a graph G and arbitrary weight \mathbf{w} , they can answer λ -BSEP as well. Thus, it might look bizarre to define λ -BSEP as*

a separate problem. The actual reason behind the definition of λ -BSEP, is that for a given weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , the asymptotic behavior of the answer to λ -BSEP, as λ approaches infinity, is related to the fractional version of BSEP. We thoroughly cover this subject in section 4.2.

Example 1. Consider the following weighted graph. One can assign these addresses of length 3 to the vertices:



$A : 000 \quad B : 001 \quad C : 111 \quad D : 100$

Since we have an edge with a weight of 3, we need at least 3 bits. Therefore, for this graph, we have $c(G, \mathbf{w}) = 3$.

Observation 1. Let (H, \mathbf{w}') be an induced subgraph of (G, \mathbf{w}) , then $c(H, \mathbf{w}') \leq c(G, \mathbf{w})$.

Our problem has an equivalent formulation in terms of edge partitioning of weighted graphs, as follows.

Problem 1. For any weight-minimal graph G , $c(G, \mathbf{w})$ is equal to the minimum number of simple bipartite graphs that partition all edges of distance multigraph of G .

4 Main Results

In this section, we present the main results of the paper. To better organize the presentations, we split the results into three parts. First, we derive upper and lower bounds for $c(G, \mathbf{w})$ for the general graphs. This will help to find the exact value for this parameter for certain graphs. Next, we investigate the linear programming version of our problem. Finally, we study the parameter $c(G, \mathbf{w})$ for the Cartesian product of graphs.

4.1 Results about $c(G, \mathbf{w})$

In this subsection, we derive upper and lower bounds on $c(G, \mathbf{W})$ in terms of other graph theoretic parameters and also the exact value of it for some family of graphs. Later in Subsection 4.3, we utilize the results of this subsection to derive an exact value of c for other graph families.

4.1.1 Lower and Upper Bounds on $c(G, \mathbf{w})$

In this part, as a warm-up, we present one upper and two lower bounds on $c(G, \mathbf{w})$ for an arbitrary connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) . In the subsequent sections, we derive tighter bounds.

Lemma 1. For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , we have:

1. $c(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$
2. $c(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq \lceil \log |V| \rceil$
3. $c(G, \mathbf{w}) \leq h_p(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w})$
4. $c(G, \mathbf{w}) \leq t \cdot (n - 1)$ in which $t = \min_T \max_{e \in T} w(e)$. The minimum is taken over all spanning trees T of G .

Proof. By considering the distance of the addresses of two nodes at $\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$, we can conclude part 1.

The part 2 is also trivial since different vertices must receive distinct addresses. Note that for a complete graph with constant weights $\mathbf{1}$, the bound holds with equality.

For part 3, consider the lowest-weight Hamilton path in the graph. For this path, the following simple algorithm gives valid addresses of length $h_p(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w})$. For the first vertex of path v_1 , we assign an all-zero address of length $h_p(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w})$. Next, for the second vertex in the path, which is connected to v_1 with the edge of weight w_1 , we assign an address with the same length of $h_p(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w})$ with exactly w_1 ones at the end of the code and so forth as below:

$$\left\{ \underbrace{0 \dots 0}_{h_p(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w}) \text{ times}}, \quad 0 \dots 0 \quad \underbrace{1 \dots 1}_{h_p(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w}) - w_1 \text{ times}}, \quad \dots, \quad \underbrace{1 \dots 1}_{h_p(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w}) \text{ times}} \right\}$$

Note that for this address assignment, for any two nodes u, v , there exists at least one path (namely the Hamilton path which we started with) such that the Hamming distance of the assigned addresses matches the distance of u, v on that path.

Finally, for the last part, we first take T to be a spanning tree whose maximum weight edge has the least weight among all spanning trees of G . By removing all the edges of G outside T , we can only increase the value c ; i.e. $c(G, \mathbf{w}) \leq c(T, \mathbf{w})$. The assertion immediately follows by the fact that for trees, the binary addressing of the unweighted trees is no more than the addressing of it which is known to be equal to $n - 1$ (See [1]). The extra t factor simply compensates for the fact that the result of addressing number of trees only works for unweighted trees but here, the maximum weight of T is t . \square

Corollary 1.1. *For the weighted path graph (P, \mathbf{w}) , we have $c(P, \mathbf{w}) = \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(P)$.*

Proof. The first lower bound in the above theorem matches the upper bound given in the mentioned algorithm. Thus, the corollary follows trivially. \square

Proposition 2. *$c(G, \mathbf{1}) = \log |V(G)| = m$ if and only if hypercube Q_m is a subgraph of G .*

Proof. If $Q_m \subseteq G$, then $m \leq c(G, \mathbf{1}) \leq \log |V(G)| = m$. Also, when $c(G, \mathbf{1})$ is exactly $\log |V(G)| = m$, it means that all binary codes with length m are used. As we should have the graph distance of any pair of vertices less than their Hamming distance, it implies that Q_m is an induced subgraph of G . \square

In the next example, we find the c for the cocktail party graph which is a complete m -partite graphs, where each part has exactly 2 vertices. This graph is denoted by $K_{m \times 2}$. This graph is equivalent to K_{2m} deleting a perfect matching.

Example 2. Let $(K_{m \times 2}, \mathbf{1})$ be a simple cocktail party graph. Then we have $c(K_{m \times 2}, \mathbf{1}) = \lceil \log_2 2m \rceil$.

Example 3. For a simple cocktail party graph $(K_{m \times 2}, \mathbf{1})$, the distance multigraph will be a K_{2m} and a perfect matching. Its edges can be partitioned with exactly $\lceil \log_2 2m \rceil$ simple bipartite graphs.

Remark 3. The addressing number for cocktail party graphs is still unknown. One can see the upper and lower bounds for that in [19] and [20].

4.1.2 Cycle Graphs

In this part, we compute the exact value of $c(C_n, \mathbf{w})$ for every cycle C_n and any arbitrary weight function \mathbf{w} . In Corollary 6.1 we use this result to obtain a tighter upper bound for $c(G, \mathbf{w})$ for any arbitrary graph G . We start by taking \mathbf{w} as the constant weight $\mathbf{1}$.

Lemma 3. For any integer $n \geq 3$ we have $c(C_n, \mathbf{1}) = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$.

Proof. The lower bound follows from part 1 of Lemma 1. For the upper bound, we proceed as follows: We start from an arbitrary vertex and assign the all-zero binary address of length $\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$ to it. Then, we traverse the cycle in one direction, and every time we reach a vertex, we assign an address by changing the leftmost 0 bits of the previous address to 1. At some point, we will assign all-one address to some vertex. From that point on, we change the leftmost 1 entries of the previous address to 0. For instance, for C_6 , we have the following addresses assigned to its nodes.

$$\{000, 001, 011, 111, 110, 100\}$$

This construction guarantees that $c(C_n, \mathbf{1}) \leq \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil$. This bound matches the lower bound, and the result follows immediately. \square

When the weight function is arbitrary, finding the exact value of $c(C_n, \mathbf{w})$ is more tricky. Besides the bounds in Lemma 1, we have the following upper bounds for $c(C_n, \mathbf{w})$.

Lemma 4. For any positive integer n and weight function \mathbf{w} , we have:

1. $c(C_n, \mathbf{w}) \leq \min_{u \in V(G)} \max_{u \neq v} d(u, v)$,
2. $c(C_n, \mathbf{w}) \leq (\sum_{i=1}^n w_i) - \max_i w_i$.

Proof. For 1, suppose that $\min_{u \in V(G)} \max_{u \neq v} d(u, v) = k$ and this value is attained at two vertices u' and v' . Therefore, there are two weighted paths along the cycle from u' to v' . One with weight k and another with weight less than or equal to k . We assign all-zero address with length k to u' and all-one address with the same length to v' . Consider an arbitrary vertex such as z' along the path from u' to v' with a larger weight. The minimum weighted path from u' to z' is along this larger weight path. The reason is that k is the minimum of all maximum weighted paths between any pair of vertices. Moreover, the minimizer pair is (u', v') . Also, we can conclude that the minimum weighted path from z' to v' is along this larger weight path from u' to v' . Therefore, the addresses with length k , starting from all-zero address and adding ones from both sides to it, are the binary addresses for (C_n, \mathbf{w}) , and we have:

$$c(C_n, \mathbf{w}) \leq \min_{u \in V(G)} \max_{u \neq v} d(u, v) = k$$

The second part of the lemma follows from part 3 of Lemma 1. \square

Next, we find the exact value of $c(C_n, \mathbf{w})$. We do so, first, for $n = 3$. Then, we use this case to extend the result to arbitrary values of n .

Lemma 5. *For graph C_3 , when the weights on edges are $\{a, b, c\}$ such that they satisfy the triangle inequality, $c(C_3, \mathbf{w}) = \lceil \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rceil$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, suppose that $a \leq b \leq c$. Let $l = c(C_3, \mathbf{w})$ and c_1, c_2, c_3 be binary addresses of length l for the vertices u, v, z of C_3 , respectively. Therefore, we have:

$$c \leq d(c_1, c_2), \quad b \leq d(c_1, c_3), \quad a \leq d(c_2, c_3)$$

By summing up these inequalities, we obtain that $a + b + c \leq d(c_1, c_2) + d(c_2, c_3) + d(c_1, c_3) \leq 2l$. The last inequality is due to the fact that each coordinate of the addresses contributes at most 2 to the summation $d(c_1, c_2) + d(c_2, c_3) + d(c_1, c_3)$.

On the other hand, 3 codes with the length k can be:

$$\underbrace{0 \dots 0}_k, \quad \underbrace{1 \dots 1}_c 0 \dots 0, \quad 0 \dots 0 \underbrace{1 \dots 1}_b$$

The equality in the theorem follows immediately. \square

Theorem 6. *For every weighted cycle (C_n, \mathbf{w}) in which the weight function \mathbf{w} satisfies the triangle inequality, we have $c(C_n, \mathbf{w}) = \lceil \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}{2} \rceil$.*

Proof. First of all, the weight-minimal graph satisfies the triangle inequality. We give lower and upper bounds for $c(C_n, \mathbf{w})$ as follows:

1. For any pair of distinct vertices u, v on a cycle C_n , there are two (u, v) -paths on C_n . Let $f(u, v)$ and $F(u, v)$ be the lengths of the shorter and the longer (u, v) -paths, respectively. Clearly, $f(u, v) + F(u, v) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i$.

Let u, v be two vertices on the cycle such that they maximize $f(u, v)$. This pair is a minimizer for $F(u, v)$.

The cycle C_n has two (u, v) -paths, which we call C_1 and C_2 . Assume that C_2 is the path of larger weight. We claim that C_2 contains at least one more vertex. If not, then C_2 is a single edge with a weight more than the (u, v) -path, C_1 which violates the triangle inequality. Let z be the internal vertex of C_2 . Consider the vertices u, z . Let C_3 be the (u, z) -path on C_n which passes through the vertex v . Also, let C_4 be the other (u, z) -path on the cycle. We claim that the weighted distance between u and z is equal to the weight of C_4 . If this is not the case, we must have $w(C_3) < w(C_4)$. On the other hand, C_3 includes C_1 . Therefore, $w(C_1) \leq w(C_3)$. So, $f(u, z) > f(u, v)$. This contradicts the fact that u, v maximizes $f(u, v)$.

Similarly, if we consider the pair v, z , we conclude that their weighted distance is equal to the weight of the (v, z) -path that does not path through u .

Now, consider, a 3-cycle, $u'v'z'$ such that $d(u', v') = d_{C_n}(u, v)$, $d(u', z') = d_{C_n}(u, z)$, and $d(v', z') = d_{C_n}(v, z)$. Clearly, each binary addressing of C includes

a valid addressing for this 3-cycle. Since we already know the answer for 3-cycles by Lemma 5, we conclude that we need at least $\lceil \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}{2} \rceil$ bits for these 3 vertices on the cycle.

2. Here, we propose the following assignment structure:

Instead of each edge with a weight $w_i > 1$, we put $w_i - 1$ vertices on that edge. Then, we put a weight of 1 on all those w_i edges.

The result will be a simple cycle with $n + \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i - 1)$ vertices and weights of all 1. For this simple cycle by Lemma 3, we need $\lceil \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}{2} \rceil$ bits. The fact that this address assignment is valid is straightforward.

These two parts imply the result of the theorem. \square

Corollary 6.1. *For every connected weighted graph $c(G, \mathbf{w})$, we have $c(G, \mathbf{w}) \leq \lceil \frac{h_c(G, \mathbf{w})}{2} \rceil$.*

In the next example, our cases are weighted graphs with 4 vertices.

Example 4. *Let (G, \mathbf{w}) be a connected weighted graph with 4 vertices. Then, $(G, \mathbf{w}) = \max_{i=1}^4 \lceil \frac{T_i}{2} \rceil$, where T_i is the weight of each C_3 , subgraph of G by removing the i -th vertex from G .*

Proof. Let u, v, z be a maximum weight triangle subgraph of $G_{\mathbf{w}}$ such that the weights of edges uv, vz, uz in $G_{\mathbf{w}}$ are c, a, b , respectively.

We consider two cases:

1. If $a \geq uw, b \geq vw, c \geq zw$ then, in this scenario, any addresses for the fourth vertex w , in the graph with weights $a, b, c, uw = a, vw = b, zw = c$ works for our graph with the given weights. It is easy to check that for this revised graph with mentioned weights, addresses with length $\lceil \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rceil$ will work.
2. If $zw = c + \gamma$, since we have the maximum sum of weights on Δuvz , and our triangle inequality condition holds, we have $uw \leq a - \gamma$ and $vw \leq b - \gamma$. Thus, we assign the address $c(u) + c(v) + c(z) + \bar{\gamma}$ to the fourth vertex w (Here $c(u)$ is the address on the vertex u , and $\bar{\gamma}$ is a binary vector with ones in those positions that $c(u)$ and $c(v)$ have ones in common). Therefore, in this case, the length of addresses will be $\lceil \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rceil$. \square

4.2 Results about λ -BSEP

Consider a connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) and a positive integer number λ . By a λ -BSEP of (G, \mathbf{w}) , we mean the problem of labeling the vertices of G by the shortest possible length binary strings (i.e. a function $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^l$) such that for every pair of $u, v \in V(G)$, $\lambda d_G(u, v) \leq d_H(\phi(u), \phi(v))$.

The minimum value of l for the parameter λ is denoted by $c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})$. Observe that $c_1(G, \mathbf{w})$ is precisely $c(G, \mathbf{w})$ and in general, $c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w}) = c(G, \lambda \cdot \mathbf{w})$. The following lemma states the subadditivity behavior of c_λ when we fix the weighted graph but we let λ vary.

Lemma 7. *Let λ_1, λ_2 be two positive integers. Then, we have $c_{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}(G, \mathbf{w}) \leq c_{\lambda_1}(G, \mathbf{w}) + c_{\lambda_2}(G, \mathbf{w})$.*

Proof. Let $\phi_i : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^{c_{\lambda_i}(G, \mathbf{w})}$ be labeling of λ -BSEP for (G, \mathbf{w}) , when $i = 1, 2$. Now, the concatenation ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 is indeed a $(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)$ -labeling for (G, \mathbf{w}) . \square

This property of c_λ is called “sub-additivity”, which has interesting consequences. The next lemma is one such property:

Lemma 8. *For every $\lambda > 0$, and connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , we have $c(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq \frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda}$.*

Proof. Using the sub-additivity property of c_λ and by induction on λ , we have $c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w}) \leq \lambda c_1(G, \mathbf{w}) = \lambda c(G, \mathbf{w})$. \square

A corollary of the previous two lemmas is the following one:

Corollary 8.1. *For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) and every positive integer λ , we have $c(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq \frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda}$.*

Inwards, Corollary 8.1 says that the c_λ , normalized by λ is a lower bound on $c(G, \mathbf{w})$. This is analogous to other graph theoretical parameters and their fractional counterparts such as a fractional chromatic number. As we will see in the next section, this concept can be best described using integer programming formulation and its linear relaxation.

Another consequence of the sub-additivity of c_λ is the asymptotic behaviour of $\frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda}$. For this, we need to use the following results about sub-additive sequences.

Lemma 9 (Fekete [21]). *Let $\{a_n\}$ be a sequence of non-negative real numbers with the sub-additive property, $a_i + a_j \geq a_{i+j}$ for all $i, j \geq 1$. Then, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{n}$ exists and equals to $\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{a_n}{n}$.*

Corollary 9.1. *For any connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , the $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda}$ exists.*

Proof. The proof is immediate since all the assumptions of Fekete’s lemma are satisfied. \square

Denote this limit by $\beta(G, \mathbf{w})$. That is $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda} := \beta(G, \mathbf{w})$.

Note that by Lemma 8, we have $c(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq \frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda}$. By taking different values of λ , we get different lower bounds for $c(G, \mathbf{w})$. Therefore, one might ask for λ , which $\frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda}$ is the minimum.

Example 5. *Consider the cycle graph C_3 with all $\mathbf{1}$ as weights. The c_2 for this graph is 3. Therefore, we have $\frac{c_2(C_3, \mathbf{1})}{2} = \frac{3}{2}$. If we consider $\lambda = 3$ by Lemma 5, we get $c_3(C_3, \mathbf{1}) = 5$. Then, we have $\frac{c_3(C_3, \mathbf{1})}{3} = \frac{5}{3}$.*

On the other hand, by Lemma 5 and 8, we have $c_\lambda(C_3, \mathbf{1}) = \lceil \frac{3\lambda}{2} \rceil \geq \frac{3\lambda}{2}$. Therefore, $\inf_{n \geq 1} \frac{c_n(C_3, \mathbf{1})}{n} = \frac{3}{2}$.

For general graphs, in the next subsection, we will come back to this question.

The next theorem is a stronger version of Lemma 1.

Theorem 10. *For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) :*

1. $c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq \lambda \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$ for all positive integer λ .
2. $c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w}) \leq 2\lambda \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$ for some large enough λ .

Proof. For 1, the reason based on Lemma 1, is as follows:

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda} \geq \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\max_{u \neq v} d_{G_{\lambda, \mathbf{w}}}(u, v)}{\lambda} = \max_{u \neq v} d_{G_{\mathbf{w}}}(u, v) = \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$$

For 2, the main tool to achieve the upper bound for $\beta(G, \mathbf{w})$ is Hadamard codes. A Hadamard code of length m is a set of $m+1$ vectors in $\{0, 1\}^{m+1}$ such that the Hamming distance between any two of them is equal to $\frac{m+1}{2}$.

It is known that for any positive integer k , a Hadamard code with $m = 2^k - 1$ exists. (see [22]). Now, let $m = 2^k - 1$ be an integer such that $m \geq \max\{n, 2\lambda \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)\}$. Let \mathcal{H} be a Hadamard code of length m .

By the choice of m , \mathcal{H} has at least n elements. Pick any subset of \mathcal{H} of size n and call its elements x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n . Define $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m$, $\phi(v_i) := x_i$.

For any two vertices v_1, v_2 we have $d_H(x_i, x_j) = d_H(\phi(u), \phi(v)) = \frac{m+1}{2} \geq \lambda \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$.

Thus, $c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w}) \leq m = \max\{n, 2\lambda \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)\}$. Therefore, $\beta(G, \mathbf{w}) \leq \frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda} \leq \frac{\max\{n, 2\lambda \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)\}}{\lambda} = 2\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$.

The last inequality holds when λ is large enough. \square

Notice that for a small value of λ , the maximum of n and $2\lambda \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$ might be n . However, by increasing λ , the term n becomes irrelevant. This is why in part 2 of Lemma 1 we have the lower bound $\lceil \log n \rceil$ which depends on the size of the graph while for the fractional version (i.e. normalized λ -BSEP), we do not have the analogous lower bound.

Corollary 10.1. *For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , we have:*

$$\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G) \leq \beta(G, \mathbf{w}) \leq 2\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$$

Example 6. *As we saw in the proof of part 2 of Lemma 1, $c(K_n, \mathbf{1}) = \lceil \log n \rceil$ while $\beta(K_n, \mathbf{1}) \leq 2\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(K_n) = 2$.*

Remark 4. *For any weighted cycle (C_n, \mathbf{w}) , we have $\beta(C_n, \mathbf{w}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}{2}$ and when the sum of weights is an even number, we have the equality of $\beta(C_n, \mathbf{w})$ and $c(C_n, \mathbf{w})$.*

4.2.1 Integer Programming Formulation and Its Linear Relaxation

We aim to express our problem as an integer program in this section. Suppose that there exist valid binary addresses for the weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) with n vertices of length l . Therefore, we have a $n \times l$ binary matrix M , which we aim to minimize the l . Now, take any subset $A \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\} = [n]$. Also, take the i -th column of the matrix M , as c_i . Any c_i has some 1's, we put those numbers of coordinates in the set C_i . Next, we define S_A for each subset $A \subseteq [n]$ as below:

$$S_A := |\{i | C_i = A\}|, \text{ where } |\cdot| \text{ is the cardinal of a set.}$$

We can observe that for any two distinct sets A and B and a fixed i , the intersection of $\{i | C_i = A\}$ and $\{i | C_i = B\}$ is empty. This is because each column can only have one set of coordinates for the 1's, and this set cannot be equal to both A and B unless they are the same sets.

Now, let v_i and v_j be two distinct vertices of G . By definition, the number of positions k , in which one of the addresses of v_i, v_j is 1, and the other one is 0 must be at least $d_G(v_i, v_j) = w_{ij}$. In mathematical notation, we have:

$$\forall 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \quad \sum_{i \notin A, j \in A} S_A + \sum_{j \notin B, i \in B} S_B \geq w_{ij}$$

Also, clearly, $S_A \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Furthermore, the summation of all S_A 's is equal to the length of the addresses since each coordinate has a contribution 1 to exactly one S_A .

Conversely, if there exists an integer solution for the following integer program IP_1 , one can immediately construct valid addresses for G .

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & l = \sum_{A \subseteq [n]} S_A \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \notin A, j \in A} S_A + \sum_{j \notin B, i \in B} S_B \geq w_{ij}, \quad \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \\ & S_A \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad \forall A \subseteq [n]. \end{aligned}$$

We may summarize the above discussion in the following theorem:

Theorem 11. *For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , $c(G, \mathbf{w}) = OPT_{I_1}$, where OPT_{I_1} is the optimal solution of the integer program IP_1 .*

Analogously, we define integer and linear programs for λ -scale binary addressing problems. Namely, let IP_λ and LP_λ be the following integer and linear programs indexed by the positive integer λ .

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & l_\lambda = \sum_{A \subseteq [n]} S_A \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \notin A, j \in A} S_A + \sum_{j \notin B, i \in B} S_B \geq \lambda w_{ij}, \quad \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \\ & S_A \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \quad \forall A \subseteq [n]. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that Theorem 11 implies that OPT_{I_λ} is equal to $c(G, \lambda \mathbf{w})$. where OPT_{I_λ} is the optimal value of IP_λ . Let \mathcal{P}_λ be the feasible region of LP_λ . Thus, OPT_{I_λ} is a point of \mathcal{P}_λ , which minimizes the objective function $\sum_{A \subseteq [n]} S_A$.

Similarly, IP_λ is a lattice point (i.e. a point with integral coordinates) of \mathcal{P}_λ with minimum sum of coordinates.

We know from linear programming that the minimum of a linear function over a polyhedron if it exists, is attained at a corner point. Hence, if \mathcal{P}_λ is an integral polyhedron (i.e. a polyhedron with all the corner points to be integral), then $OPT_{I_\lambda} = OPT_{L_\lambda}$.

For arbitrary integer weights, the corner points of \mathcal{P}_1 are not necessarily integral. However, since the corner points of a polyhedron defined by a set of linear constraints with rational coefficients are always rational (see [23]), the corner points of \mathcal{P}_1 are rational. Let μ be the common denominator of all the coordinates of all the corners of \mathcal{P}_1 . Using the next lemma, we will prove that the polyhedron \mathcal{P}_μ is integral.

Lemma 12. *For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , and every positive integer λ we have $\mathcal{P}_\lambda = \lambda \mathcal{P}_1$ where $\lambda \mathcal{P}_1 = \{x | x = \lambda x' \text{ for some } x' \in \mathcal{P}_1\}$.*

Proof. First, suppose that $x = \lambda x'$ for some $x' \in \mathcal{P}_1$. Thus, x' satisfies all inequalities of the form $\forall A : \sum_{i \notin A, j \in A} x'_A + \sum_{j \notin A, i \in A} x'_A \geq w_{ij}$. This implies that: $\forall A \subseteq [n], \forall i \neq j \in [n], \sum_{i \notin A, j \in A} \lambda x'_A + \sum_{j \notin A, i \in A} \lambda x'_A \geq \lambda w_{ij}$. Therefore, $\lambda x' \in \lambda \mathcal{P}_1$. Conversely, a similar argument shows that if $x \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda$, then $x = \lambda x'$ for some $x' \in \mathcal{P}_1$. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 12.1. *For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) and every positive integer λ , $OPT_{I_\lambda} = \lambda OPT_{I_1}$.*

Proof. Since the objective is a linear function, the assertion is a direct implication of the previous lemma. \square

Corollary 12.2. *For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , there exists an integer μ such that \mathcal{P}_μ is an integral polyhedron.*

Proof. As we saw earlier, \mathcal{P}_1 has rational corners. Thus, if we consider μ as the least common multiple of all the coordinates of all the corners of \mathcal{P}_1 , then $\mu \mathcal{P}_1 = \mathcal{P}_\mu$ has integral corners. \square

Corollary 12.3. *For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , there exists a number μ such that $\beta(G, \mathbf{w}) = \frac{c_\mu(G, \mathbf{w})}{\mu}$.*

Proof. Set μ to be the number defined in the previous corollary. Since \mathcal{P}_μ is integral by Corollary 12.2, we know that $OPT_{L_\mu} = OPT_{I_\mu} = c_\mu(G, \mathbf{w})$. On the other hand, $OPT_{L_\mu} = \mu \beta(G, \mathbf{w})$. Thus $\beta(G, \mathbf{w}) = \frac{c_\mu(G, \mathbf{w})}{\mu}$. \square

What this corollary implies is that the best lower bound of the type $\frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda}$ for $c(G, \mathbf{w})$ is attained for some finite μ . For instance, for C_3 with constant weight $\mathbf{1}$, we saw in Example 5 that when $\lambda = 2$ the minimum of $\frac{c_\lambda(C_3, \mathbf{1})}{\lambda}$ is attained.

An interesting particular case is when G is a complete graph of size n and $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{1}$. Then, Corollary 12.3 implies that among all codes of size n , there exist two constants m (length of code) and r (the minimum distance of the code), such that $\frac{m}{r}$ is the minimum. Alternatively, $\frac{r}{m}$ is the maximum. In the field of error correction codes, the quantity $\frac{r}{m}$ is called the relative distance of the code.

Example 7. *For $n = 4$, we will try to find the largest relative distance among all the codes with 4 codewords. As we saw, the maximum of $\frac{r}{m}$ is attained when $\frac{m}{r}$ is the minimum. The minimum of $\frac{m}{r}$ is precisely $\beta(K_4, \mathbf{1})$. We can now utilize Example 4, to get that $\beta(K_4, \mathbf{1}) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_\lambda(K_4, \mathbf{1})}{\lambda} = \frac{\lceil \frac{3\lambda}{2} \rceil}{\lambda} = \frac{3}{2}$. Hence, the best relative distance of a code of size 4 is $\frac{3}{2}$, and is achieved by the following code:*

$$\{(0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 0, 1), (0, 1, 1)\}$$

Now, we consider the dual program of LP_1 . The following linear maximization is the dual of LP_1 and we call it LP'_1 .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} w_{ij} z_{ij} \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{|\{i,j\} \cap A|=1} z_{ij} \leq 1, \quad \forall A \subseteq [n], \\
& \quad \quad z_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq n.
\end{aligned} \tag{LP'_1}$$

This problem has an interesting combinatorial interpretation. Think of z_{ij} 's as some non-negative numbers assigned to the edges of $G_{\mathbf{w}}$ (which is a complete graph). Let A be some subset of $[n]$. This set corresponds to one of the constraints in the above program. The variables contributing to this constraint, (i.e. $\sum_{|\{i,j\} \cap A|=1} z_{ij} \leq 1$) correspond to the edges of $G_{\mathbf{w}}$ that have exactly one endpoint in A . In other words, the constraints of LP'_1 correspond to the cuts of the graph $G_{\mathbf{w}}$, and they require that for every cut A , the sum of the values z_{ij} 's corresponding to the edges in the cut, is no more than 1. Thus, the optimal solution of LP'_1 is exactly the solution to the following combinatorial problem.

Problem 2. *A complete weighted graph H on n vertices is given such that the weight of the edge $v_i v_j$ is equal to the positive integer w_{ij} . We want to assign positive numbers z_{ij} to the edges of H such that:*

1. *For every cut (A, A^c) , the sum of z_{ij} 's on the edges of the cut is at most 1.*
2. *The quantity $\sum w_{ij} z_{ij}$ is maximized.*

Clearly, every feasible solution of LP'_1 is a lower bound for OPT_{L_1} , according to the weak duality theorem. In particular, let $z_{ij} := \frac{1}{\lfloor \frac{n^2}{4} \rfloor}$. We claim that such z_{ij} 's form a feasible solution. This is simply because the size of the maximum cut of H is $\lfloor \frac{n^2}{4} \rfloor$. Hence for every cut (A, A^c) , we have:

$$\sum_{|\{i,j\} \cap A|=1} z_{ij} = |A|(n - |A|) \leq \lfloor \frac{n^2}{4} \rfloor \times \frac{1}{\lfloor \frac{n^2}{4} \rfloor} = 1.$$

The objective function in this case is equal to $\sum w_{ij} z_{ij} = \frac{\sum w_{ij}}{\lfloor \frac{n^2}{4} \rfloor}$. Therefore, we get the following lower bound for $\beta(G, \mathbf{w})$.

Theorem 13. *For every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) , if the weight of the edge $v_i v_j$ in $G_{\mathbf{w}}$ is w_{ij} , then $\beta(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq \frac{\sum w_{ij}}{\lfloor \frac{n^2}{4} \rfloor}$.*

Corollary 13.1. *Under the assumptions of the previous theorem, for every subset $B \subseteq V(G)$, we have $\beta(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq \frac{\sum_{v_i, v_j \in B} w_{ij}}{\lfloor \frac{|B|^2}{4} \rfloor}$.*

Proof. The corollary follows from the previous theorem and Observation 1. \square

In Appendix A, we show that Theorem 13 is analogous to the Plotkin bound in the theory of error correction codes.

Example 8. *Consider K_4 with weights of $\{w_{12}, w_{13}, w_{14}, w_{23}, w_{24}, w_{34}\}$ on its edges. The constraints of the Dual-LP for this graph are related to 4 bipartite graphs in the form of $K_{1,3}$ and 3 bipartite graphs in the form of $K_{2,2}$. In fact, for this case, the*

linear programming is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max w_{12}z_{12} + w_{13}z_{13} + w_{14}z_{14} + w_{23}z_{23} + w_{24}z_{24} + w_{34}z_{34} \\
& \text{s.t. } z_{12} + z_{13} + z_{14} \leq 1, \quad z_{12} + z_{23} + z_{24} \leq 1, \\
& \quad z_{13} + z_{23} + z_{34} \leq 1, \quad z_{14} + z_{24} + z_{34} \leq 1, \\
& \quad z_{13} + z_{14} + z_{23} + z_{24} \leq 1, \quad z_{12} + z_{14} + z_{23} + z_{34} \leq 1, \\
& \quad z_{12} + z_{13} + z_{24} + z_{34} \leq 1, \quad z_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq 4.
\end{aligned}$$

4.2.2 Integrality Gap

In a feasible linear minimization problem M , let M_{int} be the minimum value at an integral feasible point. Also, denote the global minimum value by M_{frac} . The integrality gap of M is defined as the ratio $IG := \frac{M_{int}}{M_{frac}}$.

In this part, we find bounds for the integrality gap of integer program IP_1 and its relaxed linear program LP_1 . Since the problem is a minimization problem, the integrality gap IG is always at least 1. The upper bound is provided in the following result.

Proposition 14. *For a weighted graph with n vertices, the integrality gap of integer program IP_1 and its relaxed linear program LP_1 , is at most $\lceil \log n \rceil$.*

Proof. Using Corollary 10.1, we can infer that the lower bound of the relaxed minimum value of LP_1 is $\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$. Meanwhile, the upper bound of the integer minimum value of IP_1 is $\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G) \times \lceil \log n \rceil$. This is because we can assign distinct addresses to each vertex and repeat them $\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$ times. Hence, the length of binary addresses will be $\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G) \times \lceil \log n \rceil$. \square

Remark 5. *Note that for graphs with small edge weights but large diameter (for instance, for a simple path whose diameter is as big as $O(n)$ but the edge weights are all 1), the bound $\lceil \log(n) \rceil \times \text{diam}(G)$ is poor compared to the bound in part 4 of Lemma 1.*

4.3 Cartesian Product of Graphs

Our goal in this section is to study the values of c, β parameters under the Cartesian product operation. In the language of coding theory, one can concatenate two binary addresses of (G_1, \mathbf{w}_1) and (G_2, \mathbf{w}_2) to obtain one for $(G_1 \square G_2, \mathbf{w}_1 \square \mathbf{w}_2)$. This will give an upper bound for $c(G_1 \square G_2, \mathbf{w}_1 \square \mathbf{w}_2)$ ($\beta(G_1 \square G_2, \mathbf{w}_1 \square \mathbf{w}_2)$) in terms of $c(G_1, \mathbf{w}_1)$ and $c(G_2, \mathbf{w}_2)$ ($\beta(G_1, \mathbf{w}_1)$, $\beta(G_2, \mathbf{w}_2)$, respectively). The next statement formalizes this simple observation.

Observation 2. *For the Cartesian product of k weighted graphs $(G_1, \mathbf{w}_1), \dots, (G_k, \mathbf{w}_k)$, we have:*

$$c(\square_{i=1}^k G_i, \square_{i=1}^k \mathbf{w}_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k c(G_i, \mathbf{w}_i).$$

What remains to answer is the question of whether these bounds are the exact answers.

Although we do not know the answer, we present sufficient conditions under which

$c(G_1 \square G_2, \mathbf{w}_1 \square \mathbf{w}_2) = c(G_1, \mathbf{w}_1) + c(G_2, \mathbf{w}_2)$, or $\beta(G_1 \square G_2, \mathbf{w}_1 \square \mathbf{w}_2) = \beta(G_1, \mathbf{w}_1) + \beta(G_2, \mathbf{w}_2)$. Here, we present some definitions.

Definition 6. Let f be a real-valued function on weighted graphs (G, \mathbf{w}) ($f(G)$ for short), then:

- (i) We say a function f is proper if:
 - For any G_1, G_2 , $f(G_1 \square G_2) \geq f(G_1) + f(G_2)$,
 - For all G , $f(G) \leq c(G, \mathbf{w})$.
- (ii) We say a function f is strongly proper if:
 - For any G_1, G_2 , $f(G_1 \square G_2) \geq f(G_1) + f(G_2)$,
 - For all G , $f(G) \leq \beta(G, \mathbf{w})$.

(iii) For a proper f , a graph is called f -proper when $f(G) = c(G, \mathbf{w})$.

(iv) For a strongly proper f , a graph is called f -strongly proper, when $f(G) = \beta(G, \mathbf{w})$.

Note that a strongly proper function is also a proper one since $\beta(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq f(G, \mathbf{w})$ implies $c(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq f(G, \mathbf{w})$. However, if f is strongly proper and (G, \mathbf{w}) is f -strongly proper, then (G, \mathbf{w}) does not need to be f -proper. This is because $f(G, \mathbf{w}) = \beta(G, \mathbf{w})$ does not necessarily implies that $f(G, \mathbf{w}) = c(G, \mathbf{w})$. In fact, in most cases, it is not. The following lemma provides some proper and strongly proper functions.

Lemma 15. Let f be a real-valued function on weighted graphs. Then we have:

1. $f(G) = \lceil \log |V(G)| \rceil$ is proper. (When graph G is unweighted.)
2. $f(G) = \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$ is strongly proper.
3. $f(G) = \max_{\substack{H \subseteq G \\ |H|=2k}} \frac{\sum_{e \in H} w_e}{\frac{|H|^2}{4}}$ is strongly proper.
4. $f(G) = \max_{\substack{H \subseteq G \\ |H|=3}} \frac{\sum_{e \in H} w_e}{2}$ is strongly proper.

Proof. 1. By definitions, the proof follows immediately.

2. For every graphs G_1, G_2 , we have $\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G_1 \square G_2) = \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G_1) + \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G_2)$. In addition to part 1 of Lemma 1, the result follows.

3. From Corollary 13.1, we know this $f \leq \beta(G, \mathbf{w})$ for each G . Also, consider this f takes its maximum in $H_1 \subseteq G_1$ and $H_2 \subseteq G_2$. Then, we have:

$$f(G_1 \square G_2) \geq \frac{\sum_{e \in H_1 \square H_2} w_e}{\frac{|H_1|^2 |H_2|^2}{4}} = \frac{|H_1|^2 \sum_{e \in H_2} w_e + |H_2|^2 \sum_{e \in H_1} w_e}{\frac{|H_1|^2 |H_2|^2}{4}} = \frac{\sum_{e \in H_2} w_e}{\frac{|H_2|^2}{4}} + \frac{\sum_{e \in H_1} w_e}{\frac{|H_1|^2}{4}} = f(G_2) + f(G_1).$$

4. Similar to previous proof, $f \leq \beta(G, \mathbf{w})$. Moreover, suppose this f takes its maximum in triangles $T_1 \subseteq G_1$ and $T_2 \subseteq G_2$. Then:

$$f(G_1 \square G_2) \geq \frac{\sum_{e \in T_1 \square T_2} w_e}{2} \geq \frac{3 \sum_{e \in T_2} w_e + 3 \sum_{e \in T_1} w_e + \sum_{e \text{ else}} w_e}{2} \geq \frac{\sum_{e \in T_2} w_e}{2} + \frac{\sum_{e \in T_1} w_e}{2} = f(G_2) + f(G_1).$$

□

The following lemma is the main tool for the subsequent results in this section. It also clarifies the importance of Definition 6 and Lemma 15.

Lemma 16. *Let f be a function on weighted graphs, then:*

1. *If f is a proper function and G_1, G_2 are f -proper graphs, then $G_1 \square G_2$ is f -proper graph too.*
2. *For the Cartesian product of graphs (G_1, \mathbf{w}_1) and (G_2, \mathbf{w}_2) , we can conclude that, $\beta(G_1 \square G_2, \mathbf{w}_1 \square \mathbf{w}_2) \leq \beta(G_1, \mathbf{w}_1) + \beta(G_2, \mathbf{w}_2)$.*
3. *If f is a strongly proper function and G_1, G_2 are f -strongly proper graphs, then $G_1 \square G_2$ is f -strongly proper graph too.*

Proof. 1. By using Definition 6, we have $c(G_1) + c(G_2) \geq c(G_1 \square G_2) \geq f(G_1 \square G_2) \geq f(G_1) + f(G_2) = c(G_1) + c(G_2) \Rightarrow f(G_1 \square G_2) = c(G_1 \square G_2)$. Therefore, $G_1 \square G_2$ is f -proper graph.

2. Corollary 12.3, and the concatenating addresses of vertices of graphs G_1, G_2 lead us to the result.

3. Similar to the first part of the proof, we can conclude that:

$$\beta(G_1) + \beta(G_2) \geq \beta(G_1 \square G_2) \geq f(G_1 \square G_2) \geq f(G_1) + f(G_2) = \beta(G_1) + \beta(G_2) \\ \Rightarrow f(G_1 \square G_2) = \beta(G_1 \square G_2). \text{ Then, } G_1 \square G_2 \text{ is } f\text{-strongly proper graph.} \quad \square$$

Corollary 16.1. *For graph $G = \square_{i=1}^k K_{n_i}$, where $n_i = 2^{m_i}$, we have $c(G, \mathbf{1}) = \sum_{i=1}^k c(K_{n_i}, \mathbf{1})$.*

Proof. From part 2 of Lemma 1 and part 1 of Lemma 15, we can conclude that $c(G, \mathbf{1}) = \sum_{i=1}^k c(K_{n_i}, \mathbf{1}) = \sum_{i=1}^k m_i$. \square

Remark 6. *Similar to the result of Corollary 16.1 about addressing number of the Cartesian product of graphs, i.e. $N(\square_{i=1}^k K_{n_i})$ can be found in [24].*

Corollary 16.2. *If $c(G_i, \mathbf{w}_i) = \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G_i)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, then we have $c(\square_{i=1}^k G_i, \square_{i=1}^k \mathbf{w}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k c(G_i, \mathbf{w}_i)$.*

Proof. To prove this statement, we part 2 of Lemma 15 and the following chain of equalities and inequalities, $\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(\square_{i=1}^k G_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G_i) \leq c(\square_{i=1}^k G_i, \square_{i=1}^k \mathbf{w}_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k c(G_i, \mathbf{w}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k \text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G_i)$. \square

Corollary 16.3. *For any number of weighted paths (P_i, \mathbf{w}_i) , we have $c(\square_{i=1}^k P_i, \square_{i=1}^k \mathbf{w}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k c(P_i, \mathbf{w}_i)$.*

Proof. The proof follows from part 2 of Lemma 15. \square

We conclude this subsection by the next two theorems and a corollary of them.

Theorem 17. *Let (C_n, \mathbf{w}) and (P_m, \mathbf{w}') be weighted cycle and weighted path, respectively. Then, the parameter c of $(C_n, \mathbf{w}) \square (P_m, \mathbf{w}')$ is $c(C_n, \mathbf{w}) + c(P_m, \mathbf{w}')$.*

Proof. We can apply part 4 of Lemma 15 when the path P_m has more than 3 vertices. Consider the first, last, and a vertex in between these vertices. Then, the value of the strongly proper function in part 4 of Lemma 15 is $\frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} w'_i}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} w'_i$. Moreover, (C_n, \mathbf{w}) is f -proper graph too. Then, $C_n \square P_m$ is f -proper graph by Lemma 16. \square

Theorem 18. *Let (C_n, \mathbf{w}) and (C_m, \mathbf{w}') be weighted cycles such that at least one of them is even (i.e. $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 2k$ or $\sum_{i=1}^m w'_i = 2k'$). Then, we have $c((C_n, \mathbf{w}) \square (C_m, \mathbf{w}')) = c(C_n, \mathbf{w}) + c(C_m, \mathbf{w}')$.*

Proof. Consider 3 vertices u', v', z' as the proof of Theorem 6 on the first factor of C_n . Then, by considering these vertices; u' in the first factor of C_n , v' on some factor in the middle, and z' on the last factor in this graph Cartesian product, we get an induced triangle. The length of the binary addresses for this induced subgraph should be $\lceil \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i + \sum_{i=1}^m w'_i}{2} \rceil$. Moreover, we have $c((C_n, \mathbf{w}) \square (C_m, \mathbf{w}')) \leq \lceil \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}{2} \rceil + \lceil \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m w'_i}{2} \rceil$. Due to the condition of this theorem, these upper and lower bounds for c of the Cartesian graph match. \square

Corollary 18.1. *Assume that each graph (G_i, \mathbf{w}_i) has at most 4 vertices or even weight sum, then we have $c(\square_{i=1}^k G_i, \square_{i=1}^k \mathbf{w}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k c(G_i, \mathbf{w}_i)$.*

Theorem 19. *For the Cartesian products of k weighted cycles, we have $\beta(\square_{i=1}^k C_i, \square_{i=1}^k \mathbf{w}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^k \beta(C_i, \mathbf{w}_i)$.*

Proof. The proof is the result of Remark 4, and part 4 of lemma 15. \square

5 Applications

In this section, we show some ways that our problem can be applied to Lee metric codes which are very useful in DNA sequence storage.

Recall the Lee metric codes, and the maximum number of Lee codes, denoted as $A_q^L(n, d)$. It is worth noting that any Lee code over the alphabet set \mathbb{Z}_q corresponds to a set of vectors whose entries are vertices of a cycle graph with q vertices. That is, we may identify the elements of \mathbb{Z}_q with the vertices of a q -cycle such that the Lee distance of any two elements in \mathbb{Z}_q is the same as the shortest distance between the corresponding vertices in the cycle.

Imagine that two vectors of length n over \mathbb{Z}_q , alternatively over the cycle C_q , of Lee distance d is given. Suppose that a binary addressing of length l is also provided. Thus, if we replace each coordinate of the initial vectors with the corresponding address, we obtain vectors that are of length $n.l$ and their pairwise Hamming distance is at least d . Replacing entries with their addresses will turn the vectors into longer ones over the binary alphabet while the distance (previously Lee distance, now, Hamming distance) is not reduced. The following relation exists between $A_2(n \lceil \frac{q}{2} \rceil, d)$ and $A_q^L(n, d)$.

Theorem 20. *Consider a simple cycle graph C_q , and $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$. We have $A_q^L(n, d) \leq A_2(n \lceil \frac{q}{2} \rceil, d)$.*

Proof. Let us consider a Lee code with symbols that are the names of vertices, $1, 2, \dots, q$, and length n . Referring to lemma 3, it follows that the binary addresses of this graph have a length of $\lceil \frac{q}{2} \rceil$. Consequently, we can derive at least $A_q^L(n, d)$ binary codewords of length $n \lceil \frac{q}{2} \rceil$ and minimum distance d . \square

In numerous papers, the lower and upper bounds of Lee metric codes have been investigated. By the previous theorem, we can improve the upper bound for $A_6^L(8, 14)$, which was less than or equal to 7, using linear programming methods (refer to [25], [26], [27]). We show that the upper bound is 6. This is because there are exactly 6 binary codewords with a length of 24 and a minimum distance of 14. Therefore, we have $A_6^L(8, 14) \leq A_2(8 \times 3, 14) = 6$.

Corollary 20.1. *Consider a constant-weighted cycle graph (C_q, \mathbf{w}) , and $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$. We have $A_q^L(n, d) \leq A_2(n^{\lceil \frac{wq}{2} \rceil}, dw)$.*

The best upper bound for Lee codes on C_{17} with $n = 4$ and $d = 19$ is 11 (See [25]). By applying Theorem 6 to C_{17} with a constant weight of 2, denoted as $c(C_{17}, 2)$, we obtain a length of 17. Consequently, based on Corollary 20.1, we deduce that $A_{17}^L(4, 19) \leq A_2(68, 38)$. Furthermore, utilizing the well-known Plotkin bound, we find that $A_2(68, 38) \leq 2 \lfloor \frac{38}{38 \times 2 - 68} \rfloor = 8$. Hence, $A_{17}^L(4, 19) \leq 8$.

Similarly, we improved other upper bounds for the size of Lee codes. Here, as compared to the results of [25], the following bounds in the table have been improved. To find all these improved bounds, we used Theorems 20 and Corollary 20.1.

New Upper Bounds Obtained by Our Method for $A_q^L(n, d)$					
q	n	d	Constant weight of \mathbf{w}	Previous upper bound	Our upper bound
5	10	17	2	3	*2
6	8	14	1	7	*6
6	9	20	1	3	*2
17	3	18	1	3	*2
17	3	19	1	3	*2
17	4	19	2	11	8
17	4	20	2	8	6
17	4	21	2	6	4
17	4	23	2	3	*2
17	4	24	2	3	*2
17	5	23	2	15	12
17	5	24	2	11	8
17	5	25	2	8	6
17	5	26	2	6	4
17	5	27	2	5	4
17	5	29	2	3	*2
17	5	30	2	3	*2
17	5	31	2	3	*2
17	6	27	2	20	18
17	6	28	2	14	10
17	6	29	2	10	8
17	6	30	2	7	6
17	6	31	2	6	4

The * indicates a tight bound.

Appendix A Plotkin Bound Approach

Here, we show that Theorem 13 is indeed a Plotkin-type bound. Consider we wrote all the assigned addresses of each vertex as a row of a 0,1 matrix. Hence, we have a $n \times c_\lambda(K_n, \mathbf{w})$ binary matrix. Now, we count these addresses in two ways: columns and rows of the matrix. First, we can conclude that: every two addresses have at least $\lambda \cdot w_{ij}$ distance, and we have $\binom{n}{2}$ pair addresses. Also, in the j -th column, let z_j be the number of 0's in that column. Then, the number of 1's will be $n - z_j$. So, each 0 with each 1 makes one distance and the maximum value is $\lfloor \frac{n^2}{4} \rfloor$. Therefore, we will have $\frac{c_\lambda(K_n, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda} \geq \frac{\sum w_{ij}}{\lfloor \frac{n^2}{4} \rfloor}$. As a result, we have for every connected weighted graph (G, \mathbf{w}) with n vertices, $\beta(G, \mathbf{w}) \geq \frac{\sum w_{ij}}{\lfloor \frac{n^2}{4} \rfloor}$.

Appendix B Table of Notations

Notation:	Definition:
$\text{diam}_{\mathbf{w}}(G)$	Diameter of graph (G, \mathbf{w})
$G \square H$	Cartesian product of graph G and H
(G, \mathbf{w}) or $G_{\mathbf{w}}$	Graph G with weight function \mathbf{w}
$h_p(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w})$	The lowest weight of Hamilton path of G
$h_c(G_{\mathbf{w}}, \mathbf{w})$	The lowest weight of Hamilton cycle of G
$c(G, \mathbf{w})$	Min m s.t. $\exists f : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^m, \forall u, v \in V, d_G(u, v) \geq d_H(f(u), f(v))$ such f is called binary addressing and $f(u)$ is the address of vertex u .
$c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})$	$c(G, \lambda \cdot \mathbf{w})$
$\beta(G, \mathbf{w})$	$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{c_\lambda(G, \mathbf{w})}{\lambda}$

Appendix C Table of Comparison of Problems

$f : V(G) \rightarrow s^m$				
Problem name	Alphabet s , graph G	Condition	Objective	Introduced
Addressing Problem	$\{0, 1, *\}, U$	$d(f(u), f(v)) = d(u, v)$	Minimizing m	Graham & Pollak[1]
Isometric Hypercube Embedding	$\{0, 1\}, U$	$d(f(u), f(v)) = d(u, v)$	Existence of embedding	Firsov [3]
λ -Scale Embedding into Q_n	$\{0, 1\}, U$	$d(f(u), f(v)) = \lambda d(u, v)$	Existence of embedding	Shpectorov [6]
Bi-Lipschitz Embedding	Metric spaces, U	$d(u, v) \leq d(f(u), f(v)) \leq cd(u, v)$	Existence of embedding	Bourgain [28]
BSEP	$\{0, 1\}, W$	$d(f(u), f(v)) \geq d(u, v)$	Minimizing m	This paper
λ -BSEP	$\{0, 1\}, W$	$d(f(u), f(v)) \geq \lambda d(u, v)$	Value of $\beta(G, \mathbf{w})$	This paper

U stands for unweighted graphs, and W for weighted ones. Also, Q_n is the hypercube.

References

- [1] Graham, R., Pollak, H.: On the addressing problem for loop switching. Bell System Tech (1971)
- [2] Graham, R., Pollak, H.: On embedding graphs in squashed cubes (1972)
- [3] Firsov, V.: Isometric embedding of a graph in a boolean cube. Cybernetics (1965)
- [4] Djoković, D.Ž.: Distance-preserving subgraphs of hypercubes. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B **14**(3), 263–267 (1973)
- [5] Graham, R.L., Winkler, P.M.: On isometric embeddings of graphs. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society (1985)
- [6] Shpectorov, S.V.: On scale embeddings of graphs into hypercubes. European Journal of Combinatorics (1993)
- [7] Wilkeit, E.: Isometric embeddings in hamming graphs. Journal of Combinatorial Theory (1990)
- [8] Winkler, P.M.: Isometric embedding in products of complete graphs. Discrete Applied Mathematics (1984)

- [9] Deza, M.M., Laurent, M., Weismantel, R.: Geometry of Cuts and Metrics vol. 2. Springer, France (1997)
- [10] Matousek, J.: Lecture notes on metric embeddings. Preprint (2013)
- [11] Bandelt, H.-J., Chepoi, V.: Metric graph theory and geometry: a survey. Contemporary Mathematics **453**, 49–86 (2008)
- [12] Berleant, J.D.: Rational design of *DNA* sequences with non-orthogonal binding interactions (2023)
- [13] Kautz, W.H.: Unit-distance error-checking codes. IRE Transactions on Electronic Computers (1958)
- [14] Berleant, J., Sheridan, K., Condon, A., Williams, V.V., Bathe, M.: Isometric hamming embeddings of weighted graphs. Discrete Applied Mathematics (2023)
- [15] Deza, M., Shpectorov, S.: Recognition of the 1 -graphs with complexity (nm) , or football in a hypercube. European Journal of Combinatorics **17**(2-3), 279–289 (1996)
- [16] Rosenberg, A.L.: Issues in the study of graph embeddings. In: International Workshop on Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science (1980)
- [17] Makarov, Kiselev, Nikitinsky, Subelj: Survey on graph embeddings and their applications to machine learning problems on graphs. PeerJ Computer Science (2021)
- [18] Bondy, J.A., Murty, U.S.R.: Graph Theory. Springer, London (2008)
- [19] Zaks, J.: Nearly-neighborly families of tetrahedra and the decomposition of some multigraphs. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **48**(2), 147–155 (1988)
- [20] Hoffman, A.J.: On a problem of zaks. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **93**(2), 371–377 (2001)
- [21] Fekete, M.: Über die verteilung der wurzeln bei gewissen algebraischen gleichungen mit ganzzahligen koeffizienten. Mathematische Zeitschrift (1923)
- [22] Hamming, R.W.: Error detecting and error correcting codes. The Bell system technical journal (1950)
- [23] Matousek, Gartner, B.: Understanding and Using Linear Programming. Springer, Berlin (2007)
- [24] Cioabă, Elzinga, Markiewitz, Meulen, V., Vanderwoerd: Addressing graph products and distance-regular graphs. Discrete Applied Mathematics (2017)

- [25] Astola, H., Tabus, I.: Bounds on the size of lee-codes. In: (ISPA), IEEE (2013)
- [26] Polak, S.C.: Semidefinite programming bounds for lee codes. *Discrete Mathematics* (2019)
- [27] Astola, H., Tabus, I.: On the linear programming bound for linear lee codes. SpringerPlus (2016)
- [28] Bourgain, J.: On lipschitz embedding of finite metric spaces in hilbert space. *Israel Journal of Mathematics* (1985)