

A combinatorial view of Holant problems on higher domains

Yin Liu

Google
Mountain View, CA 94043, USA
hughliu@google.com

Abstract. On the Boolean domain, there is a class of symmetric signatures called “Fibonacci gates” for which a beautiful P-time combinatorial algorithm has been designed for the corresponding Holant problems. In this work, I give a combinatorial view for $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F})$ problems on a domain of size 3 where \mathcal{F} is a set of arity 3 functions with inputs taking values on the domain of size 3 and the functions share some common properties. The combinatorial view can also be extended to the domain of size 4. Specifically, I extend the definition of “Fibonacci gates” to the domain of size 3 and the domain of size 4. Moreover, I give the corresponding combinatorial algorithms.

Keywords: Holant problem · Combinatorial algorithm · Higher domain.

1 Introduction and background

In a lot of fields in computer science, machine learning and statistical physics, counting problems play a role. Holant problems encompass a broad class of counting problems [1,2,7,8,10,12,16,17,19,23,24,25]. This framework extends edge-coloring models [21,22] while the latter is when the constraint functions are symmetric. These problems also extend counting constraint satisfaction problems (a.k.a. CSP). It was proved that some prototypical Holant problems including counting perfect matchings, cannot be expressed as vertex-coloring models known as graph homomorphisms [14,18]. The complexity classification program of counting problems is to classify the computational complexity of these problems.

A Holant problem on a domain of size D is defined on a graph $G = (V, E)$ where V, E represent the set of vertices and edges respectively. In our context, edges are variables and vertices are constraints. Given a set of constraint functions \mathcal{F} defined on D , a *signature grid* $\Omega = (G, \pi)$ assigns to each vertex $v \in V$ a function (a.k.a. signature) $f_v \in \mathcal{F}$. The goal is to compute the following *partition* function

$$\text{Holant}_{\Omega} = \sum_{\sigma: E \rightarrow D} \prod_{v \in V} f_v(\sigma|_{E(v)}).$$

σ is each edge assignment and the summation contains in total $|E|^D$ many assignments. $E(v)$ are edges incident to vertex v . The computational problem


is denoted by $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F})$. Specifically, on the Boolean domain, it is over all $\{0,1\}$ -edge assignments. On the domain of size 3, it is over all $\{R,G,B\}$ -edge assignments, signifying three colors Red, Green and Blue. And for size 4, it is over all $\{R,G,B,W\}$ -edge assignments. On the Boolean domain, if every vertex has the EXACT-ONE function (which evaluates to 1 if exactly one incident edge is 1, and evaluates to 0 otherwise), then the partition function gives the number of perfect matchings. As another example, on domain size k , if every vertex has the ALL-DISTINCT function, then the partition function calculates the number of valid k -edge colorings.

A Holant^* problem is a class of Holant problems where we assume all the unary signatures are freely available. In other words, Holant^* considers function sets containing all unary functions. $\text{Holant}^*(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Holant}(\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{U})$ where we denote by \mathcal{U} the set of all unary functions.

A *symmetric* signature is a function that is invariant under any permutation of its variables. The value of such a signature depends only on the numbers of each domain assigned to its input variables (i.e., edges). The number of variables is its arity; unary, binary, ternary signatures have arities 1, 2, 3 respectively. We denote a symmetric ternary signature g on a domain of size 3 by a “triangle” consisting of 10 numbers:

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
 & & g_{3,0,0} & & \\
 & & g_{2,1,0} & g_{2,0,1} & \\
 & g_{1,2,0} & g_{1,1,1} & g_{1,0,2} & \\
 g_{0,3,0} & g_{0,2,1} & g_{0,1,2} & g_{0,0,3} &
 \end{array}$$

where $g_{i,j,k}$ is the value on inputs having i Red, j Green and k Blue. Similarly, we denote a symmetric ternary signature g on a domain of size 4 by a “tetrahedron”:



For the classification of counting CSP, researchers have made a lot of progress [3] [4,5,13]. Also, for Holant problems, [6,11,15] are some of the milestone works.

Specifically, in [9], “Fibonacci gates” is firstly proposed and studied on the Boolean domain. However, studying Holant problems on higher domains is particularly challenging. There are few existing works on higher domains. Among them, one is [11], in which a dichotomy for $\text{Holant}^*(f)$ is proved where f is a ternary complex symmetric function on domain size 3. Another piece of work is [6] which investigates some higher domain problems including κ -edge coloring and derives some dichotomies. Another one is [20] which proves some Holant dichotomies on domains 3 and 4 in restricted settings.

Essentially, people only have scratched a little of higher domain classification programs and there are still many unknowns to explore.

My contribution In this paper, I focus on problems on domain sizes 3 and 4 while this time I am more interested in problems with the “Fibonacci” feature. I explore the quintessential nature of such specific signatures. I define “*Generalized Fibonacci Gates*” on higher domains (Definitions 1 and 2), show that those problems are tractable and deliver our combinatorial algorithms (Theorems 1 and 2). With these new exploration and discovery, I conjecture that there are Fibonacci Gates and the associated P-time algorithms on all higher domains.

2 Fibonacci Gates on a domain of size 3

By an orthogonal holographic transformation [24], a domain 3 ternary symmetric signature is tractable when it is of the form $g = \alpha^{\otimes 3} + \beta^{\otimes 3} + \gamma^{\otimes 3}$ where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}^3$ are mutually orthogonal to each other (specifically, $Tg = ae_1^{\otimes 3} + be_2^{\otimes 3} + ce_3^{\otimes 3}$ is tractable, for some $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ and T is an orthogonal matrix). Viewing $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)^T, \beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)^T, \gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)^T$, I show that we can w.l.o.g. find $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $\alpha_i \beta_i \gamma_i \neq 0$. Otherwise, it’s easy to prove that either one of α, β, γ is a 0 vector in which case the problem is reducible to a lower domain, or, with some permutation of the three domains, $\alpha = c(1, 0, 0)^T, c \neq 0$ and β, γ both have the form of $(0, *, *)^T$ and the original signature g is domain separable, also reducible to a lower domain and we have the corresponding dichotomies.

Therefore, it suffices to consider a signature of the form

$$g = p \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ a \\ b \end{bmatrix}^{\otimes 3} + q \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ c \\ d \end{bmatrix}^{\otimes 3} + r \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ e \\ f \end{bmatrix}^{\otimes 3}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} ac + bd = -1 \\ ae + bf = -1 \\ ce + df = -1 \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

And g can be written as (here I denote by $g_{i,j,k}$ the value of g when i incident edges are assigned color RED and j edges GREEN and k edges BLUE.)

$$\begin{array}{cccc} & & & g_{3,0,0} \\ & & & g_{2,1,0} \quad g_{2,0,1} \\ & & g_{1,2,0} \quad g_{1,1,1} \quad g_{1,0,2} \\ g_{0,3,0} \quad g_{0,2,1} \quad g_{0,1,2} \quad g_{0,0,3} \end{array}$$

Similarly, we can verify that the equations of x, y, s, t represented by a, b, c, d, e, f satisfy the linear recurrence relation 3.

Another important thing is that if we find such s, x, y, t , we can then recover the orthogonal matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ a & c & e \\ b & d & f \end{bmatrix}$ by calculating the corresponding a, c, e . In fact, from Equation 1 and Equation 4, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} x^2 &= (bdf)^2 = (-1 - ac)(-1 - ae)(-1 - ce) \\ &= -((ace)^2 + (a + c + e)ace + (ac + ae + ce) + 1) \\ &= -y^2 + (s + y)y - (ac + ae + ce) - 1 \end{aligned}$$

Let $X = -y = ace, Y = s + y = a + c + e, Z = -x^2 - y^2 + (s + y)y - 1 = ac + ae + ce$, we know that a, c, e are the three roots of equation

$$t^3 - Yt^2 + Zt - X = 0.$$

Definition 1. We call a domain 3 symmetric signature g (arity ≥ 2) a generalized Fibonacci gate (with parameter s, x, y, t where $sy + xt + 1 = x^2 + y^2$) if

$$\begin{cases} g_{i-2,j+2,k} = g_{i,j,k} + sg_{i-1,j+1,k} + xg_{i-1,j,k+1} \\ g_{i-2,j+1,k+1} = xg_{i-1,j+1,k} + yg_{i-1,j,k+1} \\ g_{i-2,j,k+2} = g_{i,j,k} + yg_{i-1,j+1,k} + tg_{i-1,j,k+1} \end{cases}$$

$\forall i, 2 \leq i \leq \text{arity}(g)$. Specifically, any unary signature is a Fibonacci gate.

A set of signatures \mathcal{F} is called generalized Fibonacci if for some $s, x, y, t \in \mathbb{C}$, $sy + xt + 1 = x^2 + y^2$, every signature in \mathcal{F} is a generalized Fibonacci gate with parameters s, x, y, t .

Theorem 1. On a domain of size 3, for any finite set of generalized Fibonacci gates \mathcal{F} , the Holant problem $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F})$ is computable in polynomial time.

Proof. If $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_k$ are the connected components of a graph Γ , then

$$\text{Holant}_\Gamma = \prod_{j=1}^k \text{Holant}_{\Gamma_j}.$$

So we only need to consider connected graphs as inputs.

Suppose Γ has n nodes and m edges. First we cut all the edges in Γ . A node with degree d can be viewed as an \mathcal{F} -gate with d dangling edges. Now step by step we merge two dangling edges into one regular edge in the original graph, until we recover Γ after m steps. We prove that all the intermediate \mathcal{F} -gates still have generalized Fibonacci signatures with the same parameters s, x, y, t , and at every step we can compute the intermediate signature in polynomial time. After m steps we get Γ as an \mathcal{F} -gate with no dangling edge; the only value of its signature is the Holant value we want. To carry this out, we only need to prove




Fig. 1. First operation




Fig. 2. Second operation

that it is true for one single step. There are two cases, depending on whether the two dangling edges to be merged are in the same component or not. These two operations are illustrated in Figures 1 and 2.

In the first case, the two dangling edges belong to two components before their merging (Figure 1). Let F have dangling edges y_1, y_2, \dots, y_r, z and G have dangling edges $y_{r+1}, \dots, y_{r+w}, z'$. After merging z and z' , we have a new \mathcal{F} -gate H with dangling edges y_1, \dots, y_{r+w} . Inductively the signatures of F and G are both generalized Fibonacci gates with the same parameters s, x, y, t . We show that this remains so for the resulting \mathcal{F} -gate H .

We first prove that H is symmetric. We only need to show that the value of H is unchanged if the values of two inputs are exchanged. Because F and G are symmetric, if both inputs are from $\{y_1, \dots, y_r\}$ or from $\{y_{r+1}, \dots, y_{r+w}\}$, the value of H is clearly unchanged. Suppose one input is from $\{y_1, \dots, y_r\}$ and the other is from $\{y_{r+1}, \dots, y_{r+w}\}$. By the symmetry of F and G we may assume these two inputs are y_1 and y_{r+1} . Thus we will fix an arbitrary assignment for $y_2, \dots, y_r, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w}$, and we want to show $H(u, y_2, \dots, y_r, v, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w}) = H(v, y_2, \dots, y_r, u, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w})$ where $u, v \in \{R, G, B\}$.

We will suppress the fixed values $y_2, \dots, y_r, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w}$ and denote

$$\begin{aligned} F_{uz} &= F(u, y_2, \dots, y_r, z) \\ G_{vz} &= G(v, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w}, z) \\ H_{uv} &= H(u, y_2, \dots, y_r, v, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w}). \end{aligned}$$

Then by the definition of Holant, $H_{uv} = F_{uR}G_{vR} + F_{uG}G_{vG} + F_{uB}G_{vB}$, $u, v \in \{R, G, B\}$. To make the notation simpler, we use subscript $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ to represent $\{RR, RG, RB, GG, GB, BB\}$ respectively now. We also use M_{ij} to denote F_iG_j .

Because F is a generalized Fibonacci gate with parameters s, x, y, t , we have $F_4 = F_1 + sF_2 + xF_3$, $F_5 = xF_2 + yF_3$, and $F_6 = F_1 + yF_2 + tF_3$. Similar for G . Then we have the following

$$\begin{aligned} H_{RG} &= F_{RR}G_{GR} + F_{RG}G_{GG} + F_{RB}G_{GB} = F_1G_2 + F_2G_4 + F_3G_5 \\ &= F_1G_2 + F_2(G_1 + sG_2 + xG_3) + F_3(xG_2 + yG_3) \\ &= M_{12} + M_{21} + sM_{22} + xM_{23} + xM_{32} + yM_{33} \\ H_{GR} &= F_{GR}G_{RR} + F_{GG}G_{RG} + F_{GB}G_{RB} = F_2G_1 + F_4G_2 + F_5G_3 \\ &= F_2G_1 + (F_1 + sF_2 + xF_3)G_2 + (xF_2 + yF_3)G_3 \\ &= M_{12} + M_{21} + sM_{22} + xM_{23} + xM_{32} + yM_{33} \end{aligned}$$

So $H_{RG} = H_{GR}$. Similarly we can prove $H_{uv} = H_{vu}$ for other $u, v \in \{R, G, B\}$. Hence H is symmetric. We thus can use 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 as subscripts for H too.

Now we show that $H(y_1, \dots, y_{r+w})$ is also a generalized Fibonacci gate with parameters s, x, y, t . Since we have proved that H is symmetric, we can choose any two input variables to prove it being Fibonacci. Again, we choose y_1 and y_{r+1} . (This assumes that y_1 and y_{r+1} exist, i.e., F and G are not unary functions. If either one of them is unary, the proof is just as easy.) For any fixed values of all other variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_1 &= H_{RR} = F_{RR}G_{RR} + F_{RG}G_{RG} + F_{RB}G_{RB} = F_1G_1 + F_2G_2 + F_3G_3 \\ &= M_{11} + M_{22} + M_{33} \\ H_2 &= H_{RG} = F_{RR}G_{GR} + F_{RG}G_{GG} + F_{RB}G_{GB} = F_1G_2 + F_2G_4 + F_3G_5 \\ &= F_1G_2 + F_2(G_1 + sG_2 + xG_3) + F_3(xG_2 + yG_3) \\ &= sM_{22} + yM_{33} + (M_{12} + M_{21}) + x(M_{23} + M_{32}) \\ H_3 &= H_{RB} = F_{RR}G_{BR} + F_{RG}G_{BG} + F_{RB}G_{BB} = F_1G_3 + F_2G_5 + F_3G_6 \\ &= F_1G_3 + F_2(xG_2 + yG_3) + F_3(G_1 + yG_2 + tG_3) \\ &= xM_{22} + tM_{33} + (M_{13} + M_{31}) + y(M_{23} + M_{32}) \\ H_4 &= H_{GG} = F_{GR}G_{GR} + F_{GG}G_{GG} + F_{GB}G_{GB} = F_2G_2 + F_4G_4 + F_5G_5 \\ &= F_2G_2 + (F_1 + sF_2 + xF_3)(G_1 + sG_2 + xG_3) + (xF_2 + yF_3)(xG_2 + yG_3) \\ &= M_{11} + (s^2 + x^2 + 1)M_{22} + (x^2 + y^2)M_{33} \\ &\quad + s(M_{12} + M_{21}) + x(M_{13} + M_{31}) + x(s + y)(M_{23} + M_{32}) \\ H_5 &= H_{GB} = F_{GR}G_{BR} + F_{GG}G_{BG} + F_{GB}G_{BB} = F_2G_3 + F_4G_5 + F_5G_6 \\ &= F_2G_3 + (F_1 + sF_2 + xF_3)(xG_2 + yG_3) + (xF_2 + yF_3)(G_1 + yG_2 + tG_3) \\ &= x(s + y)M_{22} + y(x + t)M_{33} + x(M_{12} + M_{21}) \\ &\quad + y(M_{13} + M_{31}) + (1 + sy + xt)M_{23} + (x^2 + y^2)M_{32} \\ &= x(s + y)M_{22} + y(x + t)M_{33} + x(M_{12} + M_{21}) + y(M_{13} + M_{31}) \\ &\quad + (x^2 + y^2)(M_{23} + M_{32}) \end{aligned}$$

(Here we use the condition that $x^2 + y^2 = sy + xt + 1$.)

$$\begin{aligned}
H_6 &= H_{BB} = F_{BR}G_{BR} + F_{BG}G_{BG} + F_{BB}G_{BB} = F_3G_3 + F_5G_5 + F_6G_6 \\
&= F_3G_3 + (xF_2 + yF_3)(xG_2 + yG_3) + (F_1 + yF_2 + tF_3)(G_1 + yG_2 + tG_3) \\
&= M_{11} + (x^2 + y^2)M_{22} + (y^2 + t^2 + 1)M_{33} \\
&\quad + y(M_{12} + M_{21}) + t(M_{13} + M_{31}) + y(t + x)(M_{23} + M_{32})
\end{aligned}$$

Using the relation of s, x, y, t (i.e., $sy + xt + 1 = x^2 + y^2$), we can easily prove that $H_4 = H_1 + sH_2 + xH_3$, $H_5 = xH_2 + yH_3$, $H_6 = H_1 + yH_2 + tH_3$.

Next we consider the second case, where the two dangling edges to be merged are in the same component (Figure 2). Obviously, the signature for the new gate H is symmetric. If F below is the signature before the merging operation,

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
& & & F_1 & & \\
& & & F_2 & & F_3 \\
& & F_4 & & F_5 & & F_6 \\
& F_7 & & F_8 & & F_9 & & F_{10} \\
F_{11} & & F_{12} & & F_{13} & & F_{14} & & F_{15} \\
& & & \dots & & & & &
\end{array}$$

then the signature after the merging operation is H below

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
& & & F_1 + F_4 + F_6 & & \\
& & & F_2 + F_7 + F_9 & & F_3 + F_8 + F_{10} \\
F_4 + F_{11} + F_{13} & & & F_5 + F_{12} + F_{14} & & & F_6 + F_{13} + F_{15} \\
& & & \dots & & &
\end{array}$$

Such an operation preserves the linear recurrence. It follows that H is also a generalized Fibonacci gate with parameters s, x, y, t , and the signature has already been computed.

3 Fibonacci Gates on a domain of size 4

We now move on to domain 4. Similarly, through an orthogonal transformation, we know that a ternary domain 4 symmetric signature is tractable when it is of the form $g = \alpha^{\otimes 3} + \beta^{\otimes 3} + \gamma^{\otimes 3} + \delta^{\otimes 3}$ where $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{C}^3$ are mutually orthogonal to each other. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4)^T$, $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4)^T$, $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4)^T$, $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4)^T$. Like on domain 3, we focus on the case that there is some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ such that $\alpha_i\beta_i\gamma_i\delta_i \neq 0$. By renaming the i -th domain to be the first domain, we can assume $\alpha_1\beta_1\gamma_1\delta_1 \neq 0$. Then it has the form of

$$g = q \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ t_1 \\ t_2 \\ t_3 \end{bmatrix}^{\otimes 3} + r \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ t_4 \\ t_5 \\ t_6 \end{bmatrix}^{\otimes 3} + s \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ t_7 \\ t_8 \\ t_9 \end{bmatrix}^{\otimes 3} + t \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ t_{10} \\ t_{11} \\ t_{12} \end{bmatrix}^{\otimes 3} \quad (5)$$

where the four vectors are orthogonal to each other and $qrst \neq 0$.

Figure 3 shows a domain 4 signature whose four domains are $\{R, G, B, W\}$ respectively. Here we denote by $g_{w,x,y,z}$ the value of g when w incident edges




Fig. 3. g

are assigned color RED, x edges GREEN, y edges BLUE and z edges WHITE. Similar to domain 3 signatures, if it is defined by Equation 5, then there exist 10 parameters $a, b, c, d, e, f, h, i, j, p$ such that in each “medium-sized” tetrahedron (i.e., depth-2 tetrahedron) consisting of 10 numbers in “3 layers”,

$$\begin{cases} g_{w-2,x+2,y,z} = g_{w,x,y,z} + ag_{w-1,x+1,y,z} + bg_{w-1,x,y+1,z} + cg_{w-1,x,y,z+1} \\ g_{w-2,x,y+2,z} = g_{w,x,y,z} + dg_{w-1,x+1,y,z} + eg_{w-1,x,y+1,z} + fg_{w-1,x,y,z+1} \\ g_{w-2,x,y,z+2} = g_{w,x,y,z} + hg_{w-1,x+1,y,z} + ig_{w-1,x,y+1,z} + jg_{w-1,x,y,z+1} \\ g_{w-2,x+1,y+1,z} = bg_{w-1,x+1,y,z} + dg_{w-1,x,y+1,z} + pg_{w-1,x,y,z+1} \\ g_{w-2,x+1,y,z+1} = cg_{w-1,x+1,y,z} + pg_{w-1,x,y+1,z} + hg_{w-1,x,y,z+1} \\ g_{w-2,x,y+1,z+1} = pg_{w-1,x+1,y,z} + fg_{w-1,x,y+1,z} + ig_{w-1,x,y,z+1} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

and the 10 parameters also satisfy

$$\begin{cases} ad + be + cf + 1 = b^2 + d^2 + p^2 \\ dh + ei + fj + 1 = f^2 + i^2 + p^2 \\ ha + ib + jc + 1 = h^2 + c^2 + p^2 \\ p^3 - (bi + cf + dh + 1)p + bfh + cdi = 0 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The coefficients could be written as in Figure 4. It’s a **top view of six tetrahedra** each consisting of 4 values. Three of them have a 1 on top and three of them have a 0 on top. Each of these tetrahedra corresponds to a linear relationship mentioned in Equation 6. For example, the bottom tetrahedron is the one with a “1” on top and a, b, c at the bottom. This corresponds to the linear relation $g_{w-2,x+2,y,z} = g_{w,x,y,z} + ag_{w-1,x+1,y,z} + bg_{w-1,x,y+1,z} + cg_{w-1,x,y,z+1}$ in Equation 6. Moreover, the “dot product” (i.e., sum of element-wise product) of every two different tetrahedra with a 1 on top is equal to the “dot product”




Fig. 4. Parameters of domain 4 fibonacci gate

of the tetrahedron (with a 0 on top) between the two with itself. For example, in Figure 4, for tetrahedron indicated by 1, d, e, f and tetrahedron indicated by 1, h, i, j , the tetrahedron between them is the one indicated by 0, p, f, i , and $\langle \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ d \\ e \\ f \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ h \\ i \\ j \end{bmatrix} \rangle = \langle \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ p \\ f \\ i \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ p \\ f \\ i \end{bmatrix} \rangle$ is one of the first three equations in 7. Last but not least, there is a **cubic equation** regarding the center parameter p in Equation 7, $p^3 - (bi + cf + dh + 1)p + bfh + cdi = 0$.

It's worth mentioning that there are also another 3 quadratic relationships (Equation 8) among the parameters, however, with some calculation, they are incorporated in Equation 7.

$$\begin{cases} ap + bf + ci = bc + dp + ph \\ bh + di + pj = cp + pf + hi \\ cd + pe + hf = bp + df + pi \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

In Figure 4, basically Equation 8 says that the “dot product” of each “corner tetrahedron” and the one in the opposite direction is equal to the “dot product” of the two “side tetrahedra”. For example, the first equation shows that tetrahedron 1, a, b, c dot producting with tetrahedron 0, p, f, i produces the same result as tetrahedron 0, b, d, p dot producting with 0, c, p, h . These 3 relations will be useful when we prove the combinatorial algorithm later.

In this way, the 10 parameters have in total four constraints 7 and so the degree of freedom is 6 which is the same as that of a matrix whose four columns

are orthogonal to each other written in $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ t_1 & t_4 & t_7 & t_{10} \\ t_2 & t_5 & t_8 & t_{11} \\ t_3 & t_6 & t_9 & t_{12} \end{bmatrix}$. With the 10 parameters

satisfying Equation 7, we can form uniquely a n -arity domain 4 signature from the “top” 4 signature values, i.e., $g_{n,0,0,0}$, $g_{n-1,1,0,0}$, $g_{n-1,0,1,0}$, and $g_{n-1,0,0,1}$.

Similar to domain 3, we have the following definition of Fibonacci gates and a corresponding tractable theorem. We leave the verbose proof in Appendix.

Definition 2. *We call a domain 4 symmetric signature g (arity ≥ 2) a generalized Fibonacci gate (with parameters $a, b, c, d, e, f, h, i, j, p$ which satisfy Equation 7) if it satisfies Equation 6 $\forall w, 2 \leq w \leq \text{arity}(g)$. Any unary signature is also a Fibonacci gate.*

A set of signatures \mathcal{F} is called generalized Fibonacci if for some $a, b, c, d, e, f, h, i, j, p \in \mathbb{C}$ which satisfy Equation 7, every signature in \mathcal{F} is a generalized Fibonacci gate with parameters $a, b, c, d, e, f, h, i, j, p$.

Theorem 2. *On a domain of size 4, for any finite set of generalized Fibonacci gates \mathcal{F} , the Holant problem $\text{Holant}(\mathcal{F})$ is computable in polynomial time.*

Acknowledgments. I sincerely thank my PhD advisor Jin-Yi Cai. He really ought to be a coauthor for this paper for his contribution, but graciously declined. I am greatly indebted to his guidance and technical help. I also would like to thank Austen Z. Fan for his insightful discussion.

References

1. Backens, M.: A full dichotomy for Holant^c, inspired by quantum computation. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **50**(6), 1739–1799 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1137/20M1311557>
2. Backens, M., Goldberg, L.A.: Holant clones and the approximability of conservative Holant problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms* **16**(2), 23:1–23:55 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1145/3381425>
3. Bulatov, A.A.: A dichotomy theorem for constraint satisfaction problems on a 3-element set. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)* **53**(1), 66–120 (2006), <https://doi.org/10.1145/1120582.1120584>
4. Cai, J.Y., Chen, X.: Complexity of counting CSP with complex weights. *JACM* **64**(3), 19:1–19:39 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1145/2822891>
5. Cai, J.Y., Chen, X., Lu, P.: Nonnegative weighted #CSP: An effective complexity dichotomy. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **45**(6), 2177–2198 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1032314>
6. Cai, J.Y., Guo, H., Williams, T.: The complexity of counting edge colorings and a dichotomy for some higher domain Holant problems. In: 55th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2014, Philadelphia, PA, USA, October 18–21, 2014. pp. 601–610. IEEE Computer Society (2014), <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2014.70>
7. Cai, J.Y., Guo, H., Williams, T.: A complete dichotomy rises from the capture of vanishing signatures. *SIAM J. Comput.* **45**(5), 1671–1728 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1137/15M1049798>
8. Cai, J.Y., Lu, P.: Holographic algorithms: From art to science. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **77**(1), 41–61 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2010.06.005>

9. Cai, J.Y., Lu, P., Xia, M.: Holographic algorithms by Fibonacci gates and Holographic reductions for hardness. In: 2008 49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science. pp. 644–653 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2008.34>
10. Cai, J.Y., Lu, P., Xia, M.: Holant problems and counting CSP. In: Proceedings of the forty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing. pp. 715–724 (2009), <https://doi.org/10.1145/1536414.1536511>
11. Cai, J.Y., Lu, P., Xia, M.: Dichotomy for Holant* problems with domain size 3. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2013, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, January 6-8, 2013. pp. 1278–1295. SIAM (2013), <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973105.93>
12. Cai, J.Y., Lu, P., Xia, M.: Holographic algorithms with matchgates capture precisely tractable planar $\#$ CSP. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **46**(3), 853–889 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1073984>
13. Dyer, M., Richerby, D.: An effective dichotomy for the counting constraint satisfaction problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **42**(3), 1245–1274 (2013), <https://doi.org/10.1137/100811258>
14. Freedman, M., Lovász, L., Schrijver, A.: Reflection positivity, rank connectivity, and homomorphism of graphs. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **20**(1), 37–51 (2007)
15. Fu, Z., Yang, F., Yin, M.: On blockwise symmetric matchgate signatures and higher domain $\#$ CSP. *Inf. Comput.* **264**, 1–11 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2018.09.012>
16. Guo, H., Huang, S., Lu, P., Xia, M.: The complexity of weighted Boolean $\#$ CSP modulo k . In: 28th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, STACS. pp. 249–260 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2011.249>
17. Guo, H., Lu, P., Valiant, L.G.: The complexity of symmetric Boolean parity Holant problems. *SIAM J. Comput.* **42**(1), 324–356 (2013), <https://doi.org/10.1137/100815530>
18. Hell, P., Nešetřil, J.: Graphs and homomorphisms, Oxford lecture series in mathematics and its applications, vol. 28. Oxford University Press (2004)
19. Kowalczyk, M., Cai, J.Y.: Holant problems for 3-regular graphs with complex edge functions. *Theory Comput. Syst.* **59**(1), 133–158 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00224-016-9671-7>
20. Liu, Y., Fan, A.Z., Cai, J.Y.: Restricted Holant dichotomy on domains 3 and 4. In: COCOA 2023, Proceedings, Part II. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 14462, pp. 83–96. Springer (2023)
21. Szegedy, B.: Edge coloring models and reflection positivity. *Journal of the American mathematical Society* **20**(4), 969–988 (2007)
22. Szegedy, B.: Edge coloring models as singular vertex coloring models. *Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg pp. 327–336 (2010)
23. Valiant, L.G.: Accidental algorithms. In: 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS. pp. 509–517. IEEE (2006), <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2006.7>
24. Valiant, L.G.: Holographic algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **37**(5), 1565–1594 (2008), <https://doi.org/10.1137/070682575>
25. Xia, M.: Holographic reduction: A domain changed application and its partial converse theorems. *Int. J. Softw. Informatics* **5**(4), 567–577 (2011), http://www.ijsi.org/ch/reader/view_abstract.aspx?file_no=i109

Appendix

We give the proof of Theorem 2 here.

Proof. If $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_k$ are the connected components of a graph Γ , then

$$\text{Holant}_\Gamma = \prod_{j=1}^k \text{Holant}_{\Gamma_j}.$$

So we only need to consider connected graphs as inputs.

Suppose Γ has n nodes and m edges. First we cut all the edges in Γ . A node with degree d can be viewed as an \mathcal{F} -gate with d dangling edges. Now step by step we merge two dangling edges into one regular edge in the original graph, until we recover Γ after m steps. We prove that all the intermediate \mathcal{F} -gates still have generalized Fibonacci signatures with the same parameters $a, b, c, d, e, f, h, i, j, p$, and at every step we can compute the intermediate signature in polynomial time. After m steps we get Γ as an \mathcal{F} -gate with no dangling edge; the only value of its signature is the Holant value we want. To carry this out, we only need to prove that it is true for one single step. There are two cases, depending on whether the two dangling edges to be merged are in the same component or not.

These two operations are illustrated in Figures 1 and 2.

In the first case, the two dangling edges belong to two components before their merging (Figure 1). Let F have dangling edges y_1, y_2, \dots, y_r, z and G have dangling edges $y_{r+1}, \dots, y_{r+w}, z'$. After merging z and z' , we have a new \mathcal{F} -gate H with dangling edges y_1, \dots, y_{r+w} . Inductively the signatures of F and G are both generalized Fibonacci gates with the same parameters $a, b, c, d, e, f, h, i, j, p$. We show that this remains so for the resulting \mathcal{F} -gate H .

We first prove that H is symmetric. We only need to show that the value of H is unchanged if the values of two inputs are exchanged. Because F and G are symmetric, if both inputs are from $\{y_1, \dots, y_r\}$ or from $\{y_{r+1}, \dots, y_{r+w}\}$, the value of H is clearly unchanged. Suppose one input is from $\{y_1, \dots, y_r\}$ and the other is from $\{y_{r+1}, \dots, y_{r+w}\}$. By the symmetry of F and G we may assume these two inputs are y_1 and y_{r+1} . Thus we will fix an arbitrary assignment for $y_2, \dots, y_r, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w}$, and we want to show $H(u, y_2, \dots, y_r, v, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w}) = H(v, y_2, \dots, y_r, u, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w})$ where $u, v \in \{R, G, B, W\}$.

We will suppress the fixed values $y_2, \dots, y_r, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w}$ and denote

$$F_{uz} = F(u, y_2, \dots, y_r, z)$$

$$G_{vz} = G(v, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w}, z)$$

$$H_{uv} = H(u, y_2, \dots, y_r, v, y_{r+2}, \dots, y_{r+w}).$$

Then by the definition of Holant, $H_{uv} = F_{uR}G_{vR} + F_{uG}G_{vG} + F_{uB}G_{vB} + F_{uW}G_{vW}$, $u, v \in \{R, G, B, W\}$. To make the notation simpler, we use subscript $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$ to represent $\{RR, RG, RB, RW, GG, GB, GW, BB, BW, WW\}$ now. We also use M_{ij} to denote F_iG_j now.

Because F is a generalized Fibonacci gate with parameters $a, b, c, d, e, f, h, i, j, p$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F_4 &= F_0 + aF_1 + bF_2 + cF_3 \\
F_7 &= F_0 + dF_1 + eF_2 + fF_3 \\
F_9 &= F_0 + hF_1 + iF_2 + jF_3 \\
F_5 &= bF_1 + dF_2 + pF_3 \\
F_6 &= cF_1 + pF_2 + hF_3 \\
F_8 &= pF_1 + fF_2 + iF_3
\end{aligned}$$

Similar for G . Then we have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{RG} &= F_{RR}G_{GR} + F_{RG}G_{GG} + F_{RB}G_{GB} + F_{RW}G_{GW} \\
&= F_0G_1 + F_1G_4 + F_2G_5 + F_3G_6 \\
&= F_0G_1 + F_1(G_0 + aG_1 + bG_2 + cG_3) \\
&\quad + F_2(bG_1 + dG_2 + pG_3) + F_3(cG_1 + pG_2 + hG_3) \\
&= M_{01} + M_{10} + aM_{11} + dM_{22} + hM_{33} \\
&\quad + b(M_{12} + M_{21}) + c(M_{13} + M_{31}) + p(M_{23} + M_{32})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{GR} &= F_{GR}G_{RR} + F_{GG}G_{RG} + F_{GB}G_{RB} + F_{GW}G_{RW} \\
&= F_1G_0 + F_4G_1 + F_5G_2 + F_6G_3 \\
&= F_1G_0 + (F_0 + aF_1 + bF_2 + cF_3)G_1 \\
&\quad + (bF_1 + dF_2 + pF_3)G_2 + (cF_1 + pF_2 + hF_3)G_3 \\
&= M_{01} + M_{10} + aM_{11} + dM_{22} + hM_{33} \\
&\quad + b(M_{12} + M_{21}) + c(M_{13} + M_{31}) + p(M_{23} + M_{32})
\end{aligned}$$

So $H_{RG} = H_{GR}$. Similarly we can prove $H_{uv} = H_{vu}$ for other $u, v \in \{R, G, B, W\}$. Hence H is symmetric. We thus can use 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 as subscripts for H too.

Now we show that $H(y_1, \dots, y_{r+w})$ is also a generalized Fibonacci gate with parameters $a, b, c, d, e, f, h, i, j, p$. Since we have proved that H is symmetric, we can choose any two input variables to prove it being Fibonacci. Again, we choose y_1 and y_{r+1} . (This assumes that y_1 and y_{r+1} exists, i.e., F and G are not unary functions. If either one of them is unary, the proof is just as easy.) For any fixed values of all other variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
H_0 &= H_{RR} \\
&= F_{RR}G_{RR} + F_{RG}G_{RG} + F_{RB}G_{RB} + F_{RW}G_{RW} \\
&= F_0G_0 + F_1G_1 + F_2G_2 + F_3G_3 \\
&= M_{00} + M_{11} + M_{22} + M_{33}
\end{aligned}$$

H_0 is the evaluation of H_{uv} where u and v both take color R . For the rest, similarly, the notations are introduced above and the equations below also explain that clearly.

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_1 &= H_{RG} \\
 &= F_{RR}G_{GR} + F_{RG}G_{GG} + F_{RB}G_{GB} + F_{RW}G_{GW} \\
 &= F_0G_1 + F_1G_4 + F_2G_5 + F_3G_6 \\
 &= F_0G_1 + F_1(G_0 + aG_1 + bG_2 + cG_3) \\
 &\quad + F_2(bG_1 + dG_2 + pG_3) + F_3(cG_1 + pG_2 + hG_3) \\
 &= aM_{11} + dM_{22} + hM_{33} + (M_{01} + M_{10}) \\
 &\quad + b(M_{12} + M_{21}) + c(M_{13} + M_{31}) + p(M_{23} + M_{32})
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_2 &= H_{RB} \\
 &= F_{RR}G_{BR} + F_{RG}G_{BG} + F_{RB}G_{BB} + F_{RW}G_{BW} \\
 &= F_0G_2 + F_1G_5 + F_2G_7 + F_3G_8 \\
 &= F_0G_2 + F_1(bG_1 + dG_2 + pG_3) \\
 &\quad + F_2(G_0 + dG_1 + eG_2 + fG_3) + F_3(pG_1 + fG_2 + iG_3) \\
 &= bM_{11} + eM_{22} + iM_{33} + (M_{02} + M_{20}) \\
 &\quad + d(M_{12} + M_{21}) + p(M_{13} + M_{31}) + f(M_{23} + M_{32})
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_3 &= H_{RW} \\
 &= F_{RR}G_{WR} + F_{RG}G_{WG} + F_{RB}G_{WB} + F_{RW}G_{WW} \\
 &= F_0G_3 + F_1G_6 + F_2G_8 + F_3G_9 \\
 &= F_0G_3 + F_1(cG_1 + pG_2 + hG_3) \\
 &\quad + F_2(pG_1 + fG_2 + iG_3) + F_3(G_0 + hG_1 + iG_2 + jG_3) \\
 &= cM_{11} + fM_{22} + jM_{33} + (M_{03} + M_{30}) \\
 &\quad + p(M_{12} + M_{21}) + h(M_{13} + M_{31}) + i(M_{23} + M_{32})
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 H_4 &= H_{GG} \\
 &= F_{GR}G_{GR} + F_{GG}G_{GG} + F_{GB}G_{GB} + F_{GW}G_{GW} \\
 &= F_1G_1 + F_4G_4 + F_5G_5 + F_6G_6 \\
 &= F_1G_1 + (F_0 + aF_1 + bF_2 + cF_3)(G_0 + aG_1 + bG_2 + cG_3) \\
 &\quad + (bF_1 + dF_2 + pF_3)(bG_1 + dG_2 + pG_3) \\
 &\quad + (cF_1 + pF_2 + hF_3)(cG_1 + pG_2 + hG_3) \\
 &= M_{00} + (1 + a^2 + b^2 + c^2)M_{11} \\
 &\quad + (b^2 + d^2 + p^2)M_{22} + (c^2 + p^2 + h^2)M_{33} \\
 &\quad + a(M_{01} + M_{10}) + b(M_{02} + M_{20}) + c(M_{03} + M_{30}) \\
 &\quad + (ab + bd + cp)(M_{12} + M_{21}) + (ac + bp + ch)(M_{13} + M_{31}) \\
 &\quad + (bc + dp + ph)(M_{23} + M_{32})
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H_5 &= H_{GB} \\
&= F_{GR}G_{BR} + F_{GG}G_{BG} + F_{GB}G_{BB} + F_{GW}G_{BW} \\
&= F_1G_2 + F_4G_5 + F_5G_7 + F_6G_8 \\
&= F_1G_2 + (F_0 + aF_1 + bF_2 + cF_3)(bG_1 + dG_2 + pG_3) \\
&\quad + (bF_1 + dF_2 + pF_3)(G_0 + dG_1 + eG_2 + fG_3) \\
&\quad + (cF_1 + pF_2 + hF_3)(pG_1 + fG_2 + iG_3) \\
&= (ab + bd + cp)M_{11} + (bd + de + pf)M_{22} + (cp + pf + ih)M_{33} \\
&\quad + b(M_{01} + M_{10}) + d(M_{02} + M_{20}) + p(M_{03} + M_{30}) \\
&\quad + (1 + ad + be + cf)M_{12} + (b^2 + d^2 + p^2)M_{21} \\
&\quad + (ap + bf + ci)M_{13} + (bc + pd + hp)M_{31} \\
&\quad + (bp + df + pi)M_{23} + (cd + pe + hf)M_{32} \\
&= (ab + bd + cp)M_{11} + (bd + de + pf)M_{22} + (cp + pf + ih)M_{33} \\
&\quad + b(M_{01} + M_{10}) + d(M_{02} + M_{20}) + p(M_{03} + M_{30}) \\
&\quad + (b^2 + d^2 + p^2)(M_{12} + M_{21}) + (bc + pd + hp)(M_{13} + M_{31}) \\
&\quad + (bp + df + pi)(M_{23} + M_{32})
\end{aligned}$$

Here in the expression of H_5 , the last equivalence is by Equations 7 and 8.

$$\begin{aligned}
H_6 &= H_{GW} \\
&= F_{GR}G_{WR} + F_{GG}G_{WG} + F_{GB}G_{WB} + F_{GW}G_{WW} \\
&= F_1G_3 + F_4G_6 + F_5G_8 + F_6G_9 \\
&= F_1G_3 + (F_0 + aF_1 + bF_2 + cF_3)(cG_1 + pG_2 + hG_3) \\
&\quad + (bF_1 + dF_2 + pF_3)(pG_1 + fG_2 + iG_3) \\
&\quad + (cF_1 + pF_2 + hF_3)(G_0 + hG_1 + iG_2 + jG_3) \\
&= (ac + bp + ch)M_{11} + (bp + df + pi)M_{22} + (ch + pi + hj)M_{33} \\
&\quad + c(M_{01} + M_{10}) + p(M_{02} + M_{20}) + h(M_{03} + M_{30}) \\
&\quad + (ap + bf + ci)M_{12} + (bc + dp + ph)M_{21} \\
&\quad + (1 + ah + bi + cj)M_{13} + (c^2 + p^2 + h^2)M_{31} \\
&\quad + (bh + di + pj)M_{23} + (cp + pf + hi)M_{32} \\
&= (ac + bp + ch)M_{11} + (bp + df + pi)M_{22} + (ch + pi + hj)M_{33} \\
&\quad + c(M_{01} + M_{10}) + p(M_{02} + M_{20}) + h(M_{03} + M_{30}) \\
&\quad + (bc + dp + ph)(M_{12} + M_{21}) + (c^2 + p^2 + h^2)(M_{13} + M_{31}) \\
&\quad + (cp + pf + hi)(M_{23} + M_{32})
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, in the expression of H_6 , the last equivalence is by Equations 7 and 8.

$$\begin{aligned}
H_7 &= H_{BB} \\
&= F_{BR}G_{BR} + F_{BG}G_{BG} + F_{BB}G_{BB} + F_{BW}G_{BW} \\
&= F_2G_2 + F_5G_5 + F_7G_7 + F_8G_8 \\
&= F_2G_2 + (bF_1 + dF_2 + pF_3)(bG_1 + dG_2 + pG_3) \\
&\quad (F_0 + dF_1 + eF_2 + fF_3)(G_0 + dG_1 + eG_2 + fG_3) \\
&\quad + (pF_1 + fF_2 + iF_3)(pG_1 + fG_2 + iG_3) \\
&= M_{00} + (b^2 + d^2 + p^2)M_{11} + (1 + d^2 + e^2 + f^2)M_{22} \\
&\quad + d(M_{01} + M_{10}) + e(M_{02} + M_{20}) + f(M_{03} + M_{30}) \\
&\quad + (bd + de + fp)(M_{12} + M_{21}) + (bp + df + pi)(M_{13} + M_{31}) \\
&\quad + (dp + ef + fi)(M_{23} + M_{32}) + (p^2 + f^2 + i^2)M_{33}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
H_8 &= H_{BW} \\
&= F_{BR}G_{WR} + F_{BG}G_{WG} + F_{BB}G_{WB} + F_{BW}G_{WW} \\
&= F_2G_3 + F_5G_6 + F_7G_8 + F_8G_9 \\
&= F_2G_3 + (bF_1 + dF_2 + pF_3)(cG_1 + pG_2 + hG_3) \\
&\quad + (F_0 + dF_1 + eF_2 + fF_3)(pG_1 + fG_2 + iG_3) \\
&\quad + (pG_1 + fG_2 + iG_3)(F_0 + hF_1 + iF_2 + jF_3) \\
&= (bc + dp + ph)M_{11} + (dp + ef + fi)M_{22} + (ph + fi + ij)M_{33} \\
&\quad + p(M_{01} + M_{10}) + f(M_{02} + M_{20}) + i(M_{03} + M_{30}) \\
&\quad + (bp + df + pi)M_{12} + (cd + pe + hf)M_{21} \\
&\quad + (bh + di + pj)M_{13} + (cp + pf + hi)M_{31} \\
&\quad + (1 + dh + ei + fj)M_{23} + (p^2 + f^2 + i^2)M_{32} \\
&= (bc + dp + ph)M_{11} + (dp + ef + fi)M_{22} + (ph + fi + ij)M_{33} \\
&\quad + p(M_{01} + M_{10}) + f(M_{02} + M_{20}) + i(M_{03} + M_{30}) \\
&\quad + (bp + df + pi)(M_{12} + M_{21}) + (cp + pf + hi)(M_{13} + M_{31}) \\
&\quad + (p^2 + f^2 + i^2)(M_{32} + M_{23})
\end{aligned}$$

§Similarly, in the expression of H_8 , the last equivalence is by Equations 7 and

$$\begin{aligned}
H_9 &= H_{WW} \\
&= F_{WR}G_{WR} + F_{WG}G_{WG} + F_{WB}G_{WB} + F_{WW}G_{WW} \\
&= F_3G_3 + F_6G_6 + F_8G_8 + F_9G_9 \\
&= F_3G_3 + (cF_1 + pF_2 + hF_3)(cG_1 + pG_2 + hG_3) \\
&\quad + (pF_1 + fF_2 + iF_3)(pG_1 + fG_2 + iG_3) \\
&\quad + (F_0 + hF_1 + iF_2 + jF_3)(G_0 + hG_1 + iG_2 + jG_3) \\
&= M_{00} + (c^2 + p^2 + h^2)M_{11} + (p^2 + f^2 + i^2)M_{22} \\
&\quad + (1 + h^2 + i^2 + j^2)M_{33} \\
&\quad + h(M_{01} + M_{10}) + i(M_{02} + M_{20}) + j(M_{03} + M_{30}) \\
&\quad + (cp + pf + hi)(M_{12} + M_{21}) + (ch + pi + hj)(M_{13} + M_{31}) \\
&\quad + (ph + fi + ij)(M_{23} + M_{32})
\end{aligned}$$

Consider $H_0 + aH_1 + bH_2 + cH_3$, in fact,

$$\begin{aligned}
&H_0 + aH_1 + bH_2 + cH_3 \\
&= M_{00} + (1 + a^2 + b^2 + c^2)M_{11} \\
&\quad + (1 + ad + be + cf)M_{22} + (1 + ah + bi + cj)M_{33} \\
&\quad + a(M_{10} + M_{01}) + b(M_{20} + M_{02}) + c(M_{30} + M_{03}) \\
&\quad + (ab + bd + cp)(M_{12} + M_{21}) \\
&\quad + (ac + bp + ch)(M_{13} + M_{31}) \\
&\quad + (ap + bf + ci)(M_{23} + M_{32}) \\
&= M_{00} + (1 + a^2 + b^2 + c^2)M_{11} \\
&\quad + (b^2 + d^2 + p^2)M_{22} + (c^2 + p^2 + h^2)M_{33} \\
&\quad + a(M_{10} + M_{01}) + b(M_{20} + M_{02}) + c(M_{30} + M_{03}) \\
&\quad + (ab + bd + cp)(M_{12} + M_{21}) \\
&\quad + (ac + bp + ch)(M_{13} + M_{31}) \\
&\quad + (bc + dp + ph)(M_{23} + M_{32})
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equivalence is by Equations 7 and 8, and the final value is just H_4

Similarly, we easily prove the linear relations between H_5, H_6, \dots, H_9 and H_0, H_1, H_2, H_3 and conclude that H also satisfies the relation 6 with the same suite of parameters.

Next we consider the second case, where the two dangling edges to be merged are in the same component (Figure 2). Obviously, the signature for the new gate H is symmetric. If F in Figure 5 is the signature before the merging operation, then the signature after the merging operation is H as in Figure 6. Note that both figures can be extended downward following the relations.

Such an operation preserves the linear recurrence. It follows that H is also a generalized Fibonacci gate with parameters $a, b, c, d, e, f, h, i, j, p$, and the signature has already been computed.




Fig. 5. Signature F . It can be extended downward (having more layers).




Fig. 6. Signature H . It can be extended downward (having more layers).