

Realizations with five subsquares

Tara Kemp

^a*School of Mathematics and Physics, ARC Centre of Excellence, Plant Success in Nature and Agriculture, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, 4072, Australia*

Abstract

Given an integer partition (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k) of n , is it possible to find an order n latin square with k disjoint subsquares of orders h_1, \dots, h_k ? This question was posed by L.Fuchs and is only partially solved. Existence has been determined in general when $k \leq 4$, and in this paper we will complete the case when $k = 5$. We also prove some less general results for partitions with $k = 5$.

Keywords: latin square, partitioned incomplete, realization

1. Introduction

For an integer partition $P = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$, a realization of P is a latin square with k disjoint subsquares whose orders are h_1, \dots, h_k . The problem of existence of a realization was originally posed by L.Fuchs [6] as a question about quasigroups with disjoint subquasigroups, however, this is equivalent to a realization or a partitioned incomplete latin square (PILS). The problem is only partially solved, with existence completely determined for partitions with at most four parts or with at most two distinct parts.

Definition 1.1. A *latin square* of order n is an $n \times n$ array, L , on a set of n symbols such that each symbol occurs exactly once in each row and column. An entry of L is defined by its row and column position as $L(i, j)$.

An $m \times m$ sub-array of L that is itself a latin square of order m is a *subsquares* of L . Subsquares are disjoint if they share no row, column or symbol of L .

Ex. 1.2. A latin square of order 8 is given in Figure 1, with subsquares of orders 1, 2 and 3 highlighted.

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

Figure 1: A latin square of order 8 with subsquares highlighted

We will assume that all latin squares of order n use the symbols of $[n]$, where $[n]$ is the set of integers $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Given an integer a , let $a + [n]$ be the set $\{a + 1, a + 2, \dots, a + n\}$.

Definition 1.3. An *integer partition* of n is a sequence of non-increasing integers $P = (h_1, h_2, h_3, \dots)$ where $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} h_i = n$.

Email address: t.kemp@uq.net.au (Tara Kemp)

We will represent an integer partition $P = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k)$ by $(h_1 h_2 \dots h_k)$ or $(h_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} h_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \dots h_{i_m}^{\alpha_m})$, where there are α_j copies of h_{i_j} in the partition.

Definition 1.4. For an integer partition $P = (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k)$ of n with $h_1 \geq h_2 \geq \dots \geq h_k > 0$, a *2-realization* of P , denoted $2\text{-RP}(h_1 h_2 \dots h_k)$, is a latin square of order n with pairwise disjoint subsquares of order h_i for each $i \in [k]$. We say that a 2-realization is in *normal form* if the subsquares are along the main diagonal and the i^{th} subsquare, H_i , is of order h_i .

A 2-realization of the partition $(3^1 2^1 1^3)$ is shown in Example 1.2.

The existence of a 2-realization for a given partition is only a partially solved problem. We will now provide some of the known results. For partitions with a small number of parts, existence has been determined in [4].

Theorem 1.5. *Take a partition (h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k) of n with $h_1 \geq h_2 \geq \dots \geq h_k > 0$. Then a $2\text{-RP}(h_1 h_2 \dots h_k)$*

- *always exists when $k = 1$;*
- *never exists when $k = 2$;*
- *exists when $k = 3$ if and only if $h_1 = h_2 = h_3$;*
- *exists when $k = 4$ if and only if $h_1 = h_2 = h_3$, or $h_2 = h_3 = h_4$ with $h_1 \leq 2h_4$.*

There are some known results for specific cases of partitions when $k = 5$, which can be found in [1] and [7]. In this paper we will complete the general $k = 5$ case.

Existence has also been determined when the subsquares are of at most two distinct orders. Theorem 1.6 is from Dénes and Pásztor [2], and Theorem 1.7 is a combination of results from Heinrich [3] and Kuhl et al. [8], which completes the cases not covered above.

Theorem 1.6. *For $k \geq 1$ and $a \geq 1$, a $2\text{-RP}(a^k)$ exists if and only if $k \neq 2$.*

Theorem 1.7. *For $a > b > 0$ and $k > 4$, a $2\text{-RP}(a^u b^{k-u})$ exists if and only if $u \geq 3$, or $0 < u < 3$ and $a \leq (k-2)b$.*

There are two necessary conditions for the existence of a 2-realization from Colbourn [1], however they were shown by Colbourn to not be sufficient.

Theorem 1.8. *If a $2\text{-RP}(h_1 h_2 \dots h_k)$ exists, then $h_1 \leq \sum_{i=3}^k h_i$.*

Theorem 1.9. *If a $2\text{-RP}(h_1 h_2 \dots h_k)$ exists, then*

$$n^2 - \sum_{i=1}^k h_i^2 \geq 3 \left(\sum_{i \in D} h_i \right) \left(\sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \right)$$

for any $D \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ and $\overline{D} = \{1, 2, \dots, k\} \setminus D$.

2. Constructions

In this section, we will introduce the methods that will be used to prove our main result.

Definition 2.1. Given partitions P, Q, R of n , where $P = (p_1, \dots, p_u)$, $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_v)$, $R = (r_1, \dots, r_t)$, let O be a $u \times v$ array of multisets, with elements from $[t]$. For $i \in [u]$ and $j \in [v]$, let $O(i, j)$ be the multiset of symbols in cell (i, j) and let $|O(i, j)|$ be the number of symbols in the cell, including repetition.

Then O is an *outline rectangle* associated to (P, Q, R) if

1. $|O(i, j)| = p_i q_j$, for all $(i, j) \in [u] \times [v]$;
2. symbol $l \in [t]$ occurs $p_i r_l$ times in the row $(i, [v])$;

1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	2	2	1
1	2	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	3	3	2	3	2
3	4	4	4	4	4	2
3	4	4	4	4	4	2
1	1	2	2	1	1	1
2	2	3	4	1	2	3
1	2	2	2	1	3	1

Figure 2: An outline rectangle associated to $(5^1 2^1 1^1, 4^1 2^2, 3^2 1^2)$.

3. symbol $l \in [t]$ occurs $q_j r_l$ times in the column $([u], j)$.

Ex. 2.2. The array in Figure 2 is an outline rectangle associated to (P, Q, R) , for partitions $P = (5^1 2^1 1^1)$, $Q = (4^1 2^2)$ and $R = (3^2 1^2)$.

Definition 2.3. Given partitions P, Q, R of n , where $P = (p_1, \dots, p_u)$, $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_v)$ and $R = (r_1, \dots, r_w)$, and a latin square L of order n , the *reduction modulo* (P, Q, R) of L , denoted O , is the $u \times v$ array of multisets obtained by amalgamating rows $(p_1 + \dots + p_{i-1}) + [p_i]$ for all $i \in [u]$, columns $(q_1 + \dots + q_{j-1}) + [q_j]$ for all $j \in [v]$, and symbols $(r_1 + \dots + r_{k-1}) + [r_k]$ for all $k \in [w]$.

When amalgamating symbols, for $k \in [w]$ we will map all symbols in $(r_1 + \dots + r_{k-1}) + [r_k]$ to symbol k .

Ex. 2.4. The outline rectangle in Figure 2 is a reduction modulo (P, Q, R) of the latin square in Example 1.2, where $P = (5^1 2^1 1^1)$, $Q = (4^1 2^2)$ and $R = (3^2 1^2)$.

If an outline rectangle O is a reduction modulo (P, Q, R) of a latin square L , then we say that O *lifts* to L .

Hilton [5] has proven the following theorem.

Theorem 2.5. *Let P, Q, R be partitions of n . For every outline rectangle O associated to (P, Q, R) , there is a latin square L of order n such that O lifts to L .*

This theorem is an important result, since it means that constructing an outline rectangle is enough to prove the existence of a latin square. In order to find realizations, we give the following construction, which has been used before in other work.

Construction 2.6. For a partition $P = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$, an outline rectangle modulo (P, P, P) with cell (i, i) filled with h_i^2 copies of symbol i for all $i \in [k]$ lifts to a 2-realization of P .

A *rational outline rectangle* is similar to an outline rectangle, except that the number of copies of a symbol in a cell is a non-negative rational number.

Definition 2.7. For the partitions P, Q, R of n , where $P = (p_1, \dots, p_u)$, $Q = (q_1, \dots, q_v)$, $R = (r_1, \dots, r_t)$, let $O_k(i, j)$ be a non-negative rational number for all $i \in [u]$, $j \in [v]$ and $k \in [t]$.

Then the function $O_k(i, j)$ forms a *rational outline rectangle* associated to (P, Q, R) if

1. $\sum_{k \in [t]} O_k(i, j) = p_i q_j$, for all $(i, j) \in [u] \times [v]$;
2. $\sum_{j \in [v]} O_k(i, j) = p_i r_k$, for all $i \in [u]$ and $k \in [t]$;
3. $\sum_{i \in [u]} O_k(i, j) = q_j r_k$, for all $j \in [v]$ and $k \in [t]$.

Ex. 2.8. Figure 3 gives a rational outline rectangle for the partitions $P = (5^1 2^1 1^1)$, $Q = (4^1 2^2)$ and $R = (3^2 1^2)$, where $k : x$ in cell (i, j) represents that $O_k(i, j) = x$.

We now add an extra property to these outline rectangles which will be useful later.

1 : 17/2 2 : 5 3 : 7/2 4 : 3	1 : 5/2 2 : 9/2 3 : 1 4 : 2	1 : 4 2 : 11/2 3 : 1/2
1 : 2 2 : 9/2 3 : 1/2 4 : 1	1 : 3 2 : 1	1 : 1 2 : 1/2 3 : 3/2 4 : 1
1 : 3/2 2 : 5/2	1 : 1/2 2 : 1/2 3 : 1	1 : 1 4 : 1

Figure 3: A rational outline rectangle associated to $(5^1 2^1 1^1, 4^1 2^2, 3^2 1^2)$.

Definition 2.9. A rational outline rectangle O is *symmetric* if $O_k(i, j) = O_c(a, b)$ for every permutation (a, b, c) of (i, j, k) .

With this definition, a symmetric rational outline rectangle must have $P = Q = R$ and thus $u = v = t$.

Given a rational outline rectangle, it would be helpful to be able to transform it into an outline rectangle. The following is one method for obtaining an outline rectangle from a symmetric rational outline rectangle. In all further results, note that $\{x\} = x - \lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the fractional part of a rational number x .

Lemma 2.10. For a partition $P = (p_1, \dots, p_u)$ of n , let O be a symmetric rational outline rectangle associated to (P, P, P) and let B be $u \times u$ array of multisets, where $y(i, j)$ denotes the number of entries in cell (i, j) of B , such that

- $y(i, j) = \sum_{k \in [u]} \{O_k(i, j)\}$;
- the number of copies of symbol j in row i of B is $y(i, j)$;
- and the number of copies of symbol j in column i of B is $y(i, j)$.

Then there exists an outline rectangle associated to (P, P, P) .

Proof. Construct a new $u \times u$ array of multisets in the symbols of $[u]$, denoted A , as follows. Given the symmetric rational outline rectangle O , let the number of copies of symbol k in cell (i, j) of A be $A_k(i, j)$, and take $A_k(i, j) = \lfloor O_k(i, j) \rfloor$ for all $i, j, k \in [u]$. Clearly each $A_k(i, j)$ is a non-negative integer.

Observe that cell (i, j) now contains $\sum_{k \in [u]} A_k(i, j) \leq p_i p_j$ entries. Since $O_k(i, j)$ is equivalent up to permutation of (i, j, k) , we have that the number of copies of symbol i in row j or column j is $\sum_{k \in [u]} A_k(i, j) \leq p_i p_j$.

Take an array L to be the cell-wise union $A \cup B$. Note that $y(i, j) = p_i p_j - \sum_{k \in [u]} A_k(i, j)$. From the conditions required of B , it is clear that the number of entries in cell (i, j) of L is $p_i p_j$. Similarly, there are $p_i p_j$ copies of symbol j in row i and $p_i p_j$ copies in column i .

Therefore, L is an outline rectangle associated to (P, P, P) . \square

Ex. 2.11. The array in Figure 4A shows a symmetric rational outline rectangle O associated to (P, P, P) , where $P = (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)$, and the array in Figure 4B shows the corresponding array A .

Observe that the cells on the main diagonal of A have the correct number of entries, and all other cells are missing exactly one entry. Since O is a symmetric rational outline rectangle, there is also one copy of each symbol missing in every row and column, except the row/column where the symbol is in the main diagonal cell. Thus, the array in Figure 5 is satisfactory for the array B , as defined in Lemma 2.10.

Theorem 2.12. If O is a symmetric rational outline rectangle associated to (P, P, P) for $P = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$, and $O_i(i, i) = h_i^2$ for all $i \in [k]$, then an outline rectangle found using Lemma 2.10 has exactly h_i^2 copies of symbol i in cell (i, i) and lifts to a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_k$).

To simplify notation, we will say that the rational outline rectangle O lifts to a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_k$) if $O_i(i, i) = h_i^2$ for all $i \in [k]$.

1 : 25	3 : 31/3 4 : 19/3 5 : 10/3	2 : 31/3 4 : 10/3 5 : 4/3	2 : 19/3 3 : 10/3 5 : 1/3	2 : 10/3 3 : 4/3 4 : 1/3
3 : 31/3 4 : 19/3 5 : 10/3	2 : 16	1 : 31/3 4 : 4/3 5 : 1/3	1 : 19/3 3 : 4/3 5 : 1/3	1 : 10/3 3 : 1/3 4 : 1/3
2 : 31/3 4 : 10/3 5 : 4/3	1 : 31/3 4 : 4/3 5 : 1/3	3 : 9	1 : 10/3 2 : 4/3 5 : 4/3	1 : 4/3 2 : 1/3 4 : 4/3
2 : 19/3 3 : 10/3 5 : 1/3	1 : 19/3 3 : 4/3 5 : 1/3	1 : 10/3 2 : 4/3 5 : 4/3	4 : 4	1 : 1/3 2 : 1/3 3 : 4/3
2 : 10/3 3 : 4/3 4 : 1/3	1 : 10/3 3 : 1/3 4 : 1/3	1 : 4/3 2 : 1/3 4 : 4/3	1 : 1/3 2 : 1/3 3 : 4/3	5 : 1

1 : 25	3:10 4:6 5:3	2:10 4:3 5:1	2:6 3:3 5:0	2:3 3:1 4:0
3:10 4:6 5:3	2 : 16	1:10 4:1 5:0	1:6 3:1 5:0	1:3 3:0 4:0
2:10 4:3 5:1	1:10 4:1 5:0	3 : 9	1:3 2:1 5:1	1:1 2:0 4:1
2:6 3:3 5:0	1:6 3:1 5:0	1:3 2:1 5:1	4 : 4	1:0 2:0 3:1
2:3 3:1 4:0	1:3 3:0 4:0	1:1 2:0 4:1	1:0 2:0 3:1	5 : 1

(A) The rational outline rectangle O (B) The multiset array A Figure 4: Arrays O and A as defined in Lemma 2.10 with $P = (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)$.

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

Figure 5: The array B as defined in Lemma 2.10 with $P = (5, 4, 3, 2, 1)$.

3. Sufficient conditions for $k = 5$

Kuhl et al. provide the following conjecture in [7].

Conjecture 3.1. *A 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_5$) exists if and only if $n^2 - \sum_{i=1}^5 h_i^2 \geq 3 \left(\sum_{i \in D} h_i \right) \left(\sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \right)$ for all subsets D of [5] where $|D| = 3$.*

Observe that the necessary and sufficient condition for existence in Conjecture 3.1 is a specific case of Theorem 1.9, so it is already shown to be necessary. In this section, we will prove that the condition is also sufficient, without relying on any previous results on the existence of realizations.

Lemma 3.2. *For $P = (h_1, \dots, h_5)$, if $n^2 - \sum_{i=1}^5 h_i^2 \geq 3 \left(\sum_{i \in D} h_i \right) \left(\sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \right)$ for all subsets D of [5] where $|D| = 3$, then there exists a rational outline rectangle which lifts to a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_5$).*

Proof. Suppose that $n^2 - \sum_{i=1}^5 h_i^2 \geq 3 \left(\sum_{i \in D} h_i \right) \left(\sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \right)$ for all subsets D of [5] where $|D| = 3$.

Given the partition $(h_1 \dots h_5)$, let O be an empty 5×5 array. Denote the number of copies of symbol k in cell (i, j) of O by $x_k(i, j)$. Then let

$$x_k(i, j) = \begin{cases} h_i^2, & \text{if } i = j = k, \\ 0, & \text{if } i = j \neq k, i = k \neq j \text{ or } i \neq j = k, \\ \frac{1}{6} \left(n^2 - \sum_{m \in [5]} h_m^2 - 3(h_i + h_j + h_k)(n - h_i - h_j - h_k) \right), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly the cells (i, i) for all $i \in [5]$ have only h_i^2 copies of symbol i . Thus, if O is a valid rational outline rectangle, it will lift to a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_5$).

For the cell (i, j) , where $i \neq j$, the number of entries in the cell is

$$\sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} x_k(i, j) = \frac{3}{6} \left(n^2 - \sum_{k \in [5]} h_k^2 - \sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} (h_i + h_j + h_k)(n - h_i - h_j - h_k) \right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} (h_i + h_j + h_k)(n - h_i - h_j - h_k) &= n \sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} (h_i + h_j + h_k) - \sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} (h_i + h_j + h_k)^2 \\ &= n(2h_i + 2h_j + n) - \sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} (h_i^2 + h_j^2 + h_k^2 + (2h_i + 2h_j)h_k + 2h_i h_j) \\ &= n(2h_i + 2h_j + n) - 2h_i h_j - \sum_{k \in [5]} (h_k^2 + (2h_i + 2h_j)h_k) \\ &= n(2h_i + 2h_j + n) - 2h_i h_j - n(2h_i + 2h_j) - \sum_{k \in [5]} h_k^2 \\ &= n^2 - \sum_{k \in [5]} h_k^2 - 2h_i h_j \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the number of entries in cell (i, j) is

$$\sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} x_k(i, j) = \frac{1}{2} (n^2 - \sum_{k \in [5]} h_k^2 - n^2 + \sum_{k \in [5]} h_k^2 + 2h_i h_j) = h_i h_j.$$

Observe that $x_k(i, j) = x_k(j, i) = x_i(j, k) = x_i(k, j) = x_j(i, k) = x_j(k, i)$, so the number of times that symbol j appears in row i is

$$\sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} x_j(i, k) = \sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} x_k(i, j) = h_i h_j$$

and the number of times that j appears in column i is

$$\sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} x_j(k, i) = \sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} x_k(i, j) = h_i h_j.$$

Finally, we check that all of the $x_k(i, j)$ are non-negative. With $D = \{i, j, k\}$, our initial assumption gives that

$$n^2 - \sum_{m \in [5]} h_m^2 \geq 3(h_i + h_j + h_k)(n - h_i - h_j - h_k).$$

It follows that

$$\frac{1}{6} \left(n^2 - \sum_{m \in [5]} h_m^2 - 3(h_i + h_j + h_k)(n - h_i - h_j - h_k) \right) \geq 0.$$

Therefore, for any partition $P = (h_1 \dots h_5)$ which satisfies the given condition, O is a rational outline rectangle associated to (P, P, P) which lifts to a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_5$). \square

Theorem 3.3. *For any partition $P = (h_1 \dots h_5)$, a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_5$) exists if and only if $n^2 - \sum_{i=1}^5 h_i^2 \geq 3(\sum_{i \in D} h_i)(\sum_{j \in \bar{D}} h_j)$ for all subsets D of $[5]$ where $|D| = 3$.*

Proof. As mentioned earlier, if a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_5$) exists then Theorem 1.9 gives that $n^2 - \sum_{i=1}^5 h_i^2 \geq 3 \left(\sum_{i \in D} h_i \right) \left(\sum_{j \in \bar{D}} h_j \right)$ for all subsets D of $[5]$ where $|D| = 3$. Thus the forward direction is proven already.

We prove the existence of a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_5$) by resolving the symmetric rational outline rectangle constructed in Lemma 3.2 as in Lemma 2.10. Let A be a 5×5 array of multisets and denote the number of copies of symbol k in cell (i, j) by $A_k(i, j)$. Now let $A_k(i, j) = \lfloor x_k(i, j) \rfloor$, where $x_k(i, j)$ is as defined in Lemma 3.2. So

$$A_k(i, j) = \begin{cases} h_i^2, & \text{if } i = j = k, \\ 0, & \text{if } i = j \neq k, i = k \neq j \text{ or } i \neq j = k, \\ \left\lfloor \frac{1}{6} \left(n^2 - \sum_{m \in [5]} h_m^2 - 3(h_i + h_j + h_k)(n - h_i - h_j - h_k) \right) \right\rfloor, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using Lemma 2.10, we now only need to construct the array B in order to have a complete outline rectangle.

Let $y(i, j)$ be the number of entries needed in cell (i, j) . Thus

$$y(i, j) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } i = j, \\ \sum_{k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}} \{x_k(i, j)\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $y(i, j)$ also represents the number of copies of j needed in row i or column i , that $y(i, j) = y(j, i)$ and that $0 \leq y(i, j) \leq 2$. Thus, we only need to consider the $\binom{5}{2} = 10$ pairs where $i < j$. Similarly, we are only concerned about the values of $x_k(i, j)$ where $i \neq j \neq k$, and since $x_k(i, j) = x_k(j, i) = x_i(j, k) = x_i(k, j) = x_j(k, i) = x_j(i, k)$, the order of i, j and k is not important. Also, we are working with $\{x_k(i, j)\}$, so let $x(i, j, k) = \{x_{k'}(i', j')\}$ for any $\{i', j', k'\} = \{i, j, k\} \subset [5]$, where $i < j < k$.

To aid in understanding the possible values of $y(i, j)$, we will visualise the $y(i, j)$ values as edges of a graph. We use a vertex for each $i \in [5]$, and join two vertices i and j by an edge with a style corresponding to the value of $y(i, j)$. We use dashed edges for 0, solid edges for 1 and dotted edges for 2. The graph will be a complete graph on 5 points.

We aim to show that there are only 9 possible graphs, up to permutation of the vertices. These graphs are shown in Figure 6.




Figure 6: The nine possible graphs representing the values of $y(i, j)$.

To prove that these are the only possible graphs, we will start by assuming that at least one edge is 0.

At least one edge labelled 0

In this case, we now show that any such graph must satisfy the following property.

- If $y(i, j) = 0$, then either $y(i, k) = 0$ for all $k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}$ or $y(i, k) = 1$ for all $k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}$.

Suppose, without loss of generality, that $y(1, 2) = 0$. This implies that $x(1, 2, k) = 0$ for all $k \in \{3, 4, 5\}$. Now consider the values of $y(1, j)$ for $j \in \{3, 4, 5\}$.

$$\begin{aligned} y(1, 3) &= x(1, 2, 3) + x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 3, 5) = x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 3, 5) \\ y(1, 4) &= x(1, 2, 4) + x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 4, 5) = x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 4, 5) \\ y(1, 5) &= x(1, 2, 5) + x(1, 3, 5) + x(1, 4, 5) = x(1, 3, 5) + x(1, 4, 5) \end{aligned}$$

These three values are dependent on combinations of just three x values. Also $y(1, j) \leq 1$, and if $y(1, j) = 1$ then both values of $x(i, j, k)$ must be positive. Thus, if $y(1, j) = 0$ for some $j \in \{3, 4, 5\}$, it is not possible for the other two y values to be 1. Therefore, if $y(i, j) = 0$, then either $y(i, k) = 0$ for all $k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}$ or $y(i, k) = 1$ for all $k \in [5] \setminus \{i, j\}$.

We will now find all possible graphs with at least one dashed (0) edge. We begin by assuming that $y(i, j) = 0$ for some $i, j \in [5]$ where $i \neq j$. So we know that there must be a dashed edge, and, from property (1), for any vertex with a dashed edge, the remaining edges are either all 0 or all 1. Thus, each vertex incident with a dashed edge has two options, as shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7: The options for a single vertex.

Given these conditions, suppose that some $y(i, j) = 0$, so there is a dashed line in the graph. Using the two states from Figure 7, each state then has two scenarios for the leftmost vertex.




Figure 8: The updated scenarios with the edges added for a second vertex.

The remaining edges of the first three graphs are then forced.




Figure 9: Three possible graphs with an edge labelled 0.

For the final graph, suppose that $y(1, 2) = 0$ is the dashed edge. Then as above, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= y(1, 3) = x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 3, 5) \\ 1 &= y(1, 4) = x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 4, 5) \\ 1 &= y(1, 5) = x(1, 3, 5) + x(1, 4, 5) \end{aligned}$$

It follows from the first two equations that $x(1, 3, 5) = x(1, 4, 5)$, and so $x(1, 3, 4) = x(1, 3, 5) = x(1, 4, 5) = 0.5$. Repeating this for $1 = y(2, 3) = y(2, 4) = y(2, 5)$, we know that $x(2, 3, 4) = x(2, 3, 5) = x(2, 4, 5) = 0.5$.

The empty edges of the graph correspond to $y(3, 4)$, $y(3, 5)$ and $y(4, 5)$. With what was found above, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} y(3, 4) &= 0.5 + 0.5 + x(3, 4, 5) = 1 + x(3, 4, 5) \\ y(3, 5) &= 0.5 + 0.5 + x(3, 4, 5) = 1 + x(3, 4, 5) \\ y(4, 5) &= 0.5 + 0.5 + x(3, 4, 5) = 1 + x(3, 4, 5) \end{aligned}$$

Since $x(3, 4, 5) < 1$, it must be that $y(3, 4) = y(3, 5) = y(4, 5) = 1$.

Thus, the only valid solution to the final graph is shown in Figure 10.




Figure 10: The final graph with an edge labelled 0.

We have shown that there are three unique graphs with at least one dashed (0) edge up to permutation of the vertices, and these are the first three graphs of the nine in Figure 6.

Observe that none of these graphs include a dotted line (2), so there cannot be both $y(i, j) = 0$ and $y(a, b) = 2$ at the same time.

We must now determine the possible graphs when $y(i, j) \in \{1, 2\}$.

All edges labelled 1 or 2

First, we will state a property that the graph must satisfy.

- *Rule 1:* For any $i \in [5]$, the set of values $\{y(i, k) \mid k \in [5] \setminus \{i\}\}$ cannot be $\{1, 1, 2, 2\}$.

Suppose, without loss of generality, that $y(1, 2) = y(1, 3) = 2$. Then since $x(1, 2, 3) < 1$, we must have $x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 3, 5) > 1$ and $x(1, 2, 4) + x(1, 2, 5) > 1$. Now, $y(1, 4) + y(1, 5) = x(1, 2, 4) + x(1, 2, 5) + x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 3, 5) + 2x(1, 4, 5) > 2$. Thus, at least one of $y(1, 4)$ and $y(1, 5)$ must be 2. Therefore, for any $i \in [5]$, the set of values $\{y(i, k) \mid k \in [5] \setminus \{i\}\}$ cannot be $\{1, 1, 2, 2\}$. This means that in such a set, there are at least 3 copies of either 1 or 2.

The next property we require is:

- *Rule 2:* The subgraphs in Figure 11 are not possible.




Figure 11: Three edge patterns which are impossible.

Consider the set of values $\{y(i, k) \mid k \in [5] \setminus \{i\}\}$. Without loss of generality, let $i = 1$. Suppose also that $y(1, 2) = 1$ and $y(1, 3) = y(1, 4) = y(1, 5) = 2$. Then

$$5 = y(1, 3) + y(1, 4) + y(1, 5) - y(1, 2) = 2(x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 3, 5) + x(1, 4, 5)).$$

Since $y(2, 3) + y(2, 4) + y(2, 5) - y(1, 2) \geq 2$, we get that $2(x(2, 3, 4) + x(2, 3, 5) + x(2, 4, 5)) \geq 2$. We can combine this to get that

$$\begin{aligned} 2(y(3, 4) + y(3, 5) + y(4, 5)) &= 2(x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 3, 5) + x(1, 4, 5)) + 2(x(2, 3, 4) + \\ &\quad x(2, 3, 5) + x(2, 4, 5)) + 6x(3, 4, 5) \\ &\geq 7. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $y(3, 4) + y(3, 5) + y(4, 5) > 3$, so at least one of these values is 2.

Suppose instead that $y(1, 2) = 2$ and $y(1, 3) = y(1, 4) = y(1, 5) = 1$. Then

$$1 = y(1, 3) + y(1, 4) + y(1, 5) - y(1, 2) = 2(x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 3, 5) + x(1, 4, 5)).$$

Since $y(2, 3) + y(2, 4) + y(2, 5) - y(1, 2) \leq 4$, we get that $2(x(2, 3, 4) + x(2, 3, 5) + x(2, 4, 5)) \leq 4$. We can combine this to get

$$\begin{aligned} 2(y(3, 4) + y(3, 5) + y(4, 5)) &= 2(x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 3, 5) + x(1, 4, 5)) + 2(x(2, 3, 4) + \\ &\quad x(2, 3, 5) + x(2, 4, 5)) + 6x(3, 4, 5) \\ &\leq 5 + 6x(3, 4, 5) \\ &< 11. \end{aligned}$$

Implying $y(3, 4) + y(3, 5) + y(4, 5) < 6$. So at least one of these values is 1.

These restrictions show that the first two graphs of Figure 11 are not possible.

Suppose that $y(i, j) = y(k, l) = 1$ and $y(i, k) = y(j, l) = 2$ for $i \neq j \neq k \neq l$. Without loss of generality, let $(i, j) = (1, 2)$ and $(k, l) = (3, 4)$. Since $y(1, 3) = 2$, we know that $x(1, 2, 3) + x(1, 3, 4) > 1$. Also, $2 = y(1, 2) + y(3, 4) = x(1, 2, 3) + x(1, 3, 4) + x(1, 2, 4) + x(2, 3, 4) + x(1, 2, 5) + x(3, 4, 5)$, so $x(1, 2, 4) + x(2, 3, 4) < 1$. However, this implies that $y(2, 4) = x(1, 2, 4) + x(2, 3, 4) + x(2, 4, 5) = 1$. Therefore, it is not possible to have $y(i, j) = y(k, l) = 1$ and $y(i, k) = y(j, l) = 2$ for $i \neq j \neq k \neq l$.

This implies that the last graph in Figure 11 is not possible, which completes Rule 2.

We now need only dotted and solid edges, and we will consider the assignment to 1 and 2 to be interchangeable. Rule 1 specifies that at each vertex there are two options, without considering whether solid edges are 1 or 2. Figure 12 shows the possible graphs that can be constructed from these two options. The second row shows the three possible options for each of the two graphs when considering the leftmost vertex and Rule 1. To complete these graphs, it is necessary to consider both of Rules 1 and 2. Of these six graphs, the first graph has 2 solutions (up to permutation of the vertices), the fifth graph has none and the rest have a unique solution, so we are left with the six graphs given in the third row.

By swapping the assignment of 1 and 2 to edge styles, these graphs provide the remaining six graphs of Figure 6 up to permutation of the vertices. Therefore, we have shown that the nine graphs are the only possible options.

Constructing an array from a graph

As defined earlier, the edge values correspond to the number of missing entries in a cell of A , as well as the number of missing copies of a given symbol in a row or column. We will label the vertices of our graph as shown in Figure 13, with 1 at the top and moving anti-clockwise.

Note that each graph in Figure 6 has a different number of repetitions of 0, 1 and 2. Thus, we will refer to each graph by these numbers. Given one of these graphs, the aim is to construct an array B which has the required number of symbols and repetitions in each cell, row and column. The first graph in Figure 6 has all 0 edges, which would be an empty array, thus we do not need an array in this case. For five of the other eight graphs, the corresponding array B is shown in Figure 14. The arrays for the remaining three graphs can be constructed using these same arrays: take the union of $0^4 1^6$ and 1^{10} to get $1^4 2^6$, $0^1 1^9$ and 1^{10} to get $1^1 2^9$, and two copies of 1^{10} for 2^{10} . The union of the arrays A and B provides a complete outline rectangle, and due to the entries in the cells (i, i) , this outline rectangle will lift to a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_5$) by Theorem 2.12.

If the graph for a given partition is a vertex permutation of the ones given in Figure 6, then the array given in Figure 14 should have the rows, columns and symbols permuted the same way. □

We can use this result to settle the open cases in the following theorem, which can be found in Colbourn [1].

Theorem 3.4. *If $k \geq 5$, $\mu \geq 1$, and $3\mu \geq h_1 \geq h_2 \geq \dots \geq h_k \geq \mu$, then a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_k$) exists, except possibly when $k = 5$ and $\mu = 6$.*




Figure 12: All graphs options for edges labelled 1 or 2, showing each step as edges are added.




Figure 13: The vertex labelling used to construct arrays from the possible graphs.

Colbourn [1] also showed that partitions meeting this condition satisfy the necessary conditions given earlier.

Lemma 3.5. *If $k \geq 5$ and $(k - 2)h_k \geq h_1 \geq \dots \geq h_k > 0$, then the conditions of Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.9 are satisfied.*

We now complete the open cases of Theorem 3.4 and obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 3.6. *If $k \geq 5$, $h_k > 0$ and $h_1 \leq 3h_k$, then a $2\text{-RP}(h_1 \dots h_k)$ exists.*

Proof. We need only consider the case when $k = 5$. By Lemma 3.5, we know that the conditions of Theorem 1.9 are met, and thus the conditions of Theorem 3.3 are met also. \square

4. Increasing a partition by a constant

In [7], Kuhl et al. provide the following theorem, however the proof does not cover all possible cases.

Theorem 4.1. *Let q and r_i be positive integers and $n_i = 5q + r_i$, for each $i \in [5]$. If a $2\text{-RP}(r_1 \dots r_5)$ exists, then a $2\text{-RP}(n_1 \dots n_5)$ exists.*

		5	3	4
	4		5	2
	5	2		3
	3	4	2	

(A) $0^4 1^6$

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

(B) $0^1 1^9$

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

(C) 1^{10}

	4,5	2	2	3
3,5		1	1	4
4	1		5	2
2	3	5		1
2	1	4	3	

(D) $2^1 1^9$

	4,5	2,4	3,5	2,3
3,5		1	1	4
4,5	1		2	1
2,3	1	5		1
2,4	3	1	1	

(E) $2^4 1^6$

Figure 14: The arrays used for B given a set of values for $y(i, j)$.

Within the proof, it is stated that a $2\text{-RP}(q^4(q + r_i)^1)$ exists for all q , however this is only true when $q \geq \frac{r_i}{2}$ as given in Theorem 1.7. Thus, the proof only holds when $q \geq \frac{r_i}{2}$ for all $i \in [5]$.

Although we have completely determined existence for partitions with five parts in the previous section, the proof of this result provides an interesting method of construction and we now prove a stronger result using a similar approach.

Theorem 4.2. *If a $2\text{-RP}(r_1 r_2 r_3 r_4 r_5)$ exists, then a $2\text{-RP}(n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4 n_5)$ exists where $n_i = r_i + q$ for any positive integer q .*

Proof. We will first show that this statement holds when $q = 1$, and then the result follows by induction.

Since a $2\text{-RP}(r_1 r_2 r_3 r_4 r_5)$ exists, there is an outline square for this realization. Let this outline square be O . Let B be the array in Figure 16, and let A be the latin square in Figure 15.

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

Figure 15: The array A as defined in Theorem 4.2.

By taking $L = O \cup A \cup B$, we get an outline square for a $2\text{-RP}(n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4 n_5)$.

Cell (i, j) of L must contain $n_i n_j = (r_i + 1)(r_j + 1) = r_i r_j + r_i + r_j + 1$ entries, which is $r_i + r_j + 1$ more than the same cell of O . Similarly, row i and column i must each contain $n_i n_j$ copies of symbol j . Thus, since A has 1 copy of every symbol in every row and column, and 1 entry per cell, the array B must have $r_i + r_j$ symbols in cell (i, j) and $r_i + r_j$ copies of symbol j in row or column i .

Also note that the cells (i, i) of L will contain only symbol i as required.

The array B satisfies these requirements, and all values are non-negative integers since $r_1 \leq r_3 + r_4 + r_5$ by the existence of a $2\text{-RP}(r_1 r_2 r_3 r_4 r_5)$. \square

Given the simplicity of this result and the construction method used in the proof, it would be useful to have a similar result for partitions with $k \geq 6$. While we believe that the statement itself holds for such partitions, the method of construction cannot be extended the same way. We conclude by deriving a necessary condition for the existence of the array B as used in Theorem 4.2, but for general k . We then show that this condition is only met in general when $k = 6, 7$.

1 : $2r_1$	3 : $r_2 + r_3$ 4 : $r_1 - r_3$	4 : $r_3 + r_4$ 5 : $r_1 - r_4$	2 : $r_1 - r_5$ 5 : $r_4 + r_5$	2 : $r_2 + r_5$ 3 : $r_1 - r_2$
3 : $r_1 - r_2$ 4 : $r_2 - r_5$ 5 : $r_2 + r_5$	2 : $2r_2$	1 : $r_2 + r_3$	1 : $r_1 - r_3$ 3 : $r_2 + r_3 + r_4 - r_1$	3 : $r_2 - r_4$ 4 : $r_4 + r_5$
2 : $r_1 + r_3 - r_4 - r_5$ 4 : $r_4 + r_5$	1 : $r_2 - r_3$ 4 : $r_3 - r_5$ 5 : $r_3 + r_5$	3 : $2r_3$	1 : $r_1 + r_3 - r_2 - r_5$ 2 : $r_2 + r_4 + r_5 - r_1$	1 : $r_3 + r_5$
2 : $r_2 + r_4 + r_5 - r_1$ 3 : $r_1 - r_5$ 5 : $r_1 - r_2$	1 : $r_3 + r_4$ 5 : $r_2 - r_3$	2 : $r_1 - r_5$ 5 : $r_3 + r_4 + r_5 - r_1$	4 : $2r_4$	1 : $r_1 - r_3$ 3 : $r_3 + r_4 + r_5 - r_1$
2 : $r_1 - r_3$ 3 : $r_2 + r_3 + r_5 - r_1$ 4 : $r_1 - r_2$	1 : $r_1 - r_4$ 4 : $r_2 + r_4 + r_5 - r_1$	1 : $r_1 - r_2$ 2 : $r_2 + r_3 + r_5 - r_1$	1 : $r_2 + r_4 + r_5 - r_1$ 3 : $r_1 - r_2$	5 : $2r_5$

Figure 16: The array B as used in Theorem 4.2.

Lemma 4.3. For a partition $P = (h_1 \dots h_k)$ of n , let B be a $k \times k$ array of multisets such that

- cell (i, j) contains $h_i + h_j$ symbols;
- row i has $h_i + h_j$ copies of symbol j ;
- column i has $h_i + h_j$ copies of symbol j ;
- and the entries in cell (i, i) are only symbol i .

Then $(2k - 2 - 3|D|) \sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \geq (k + 2 - 3|D|) \sum_{i \in D} h_i$ for all subsets $D \subseteq [k]$.

Proof. Given a subset D of $[k]$, we will consider the number of copies of symbol $a \in D$ in the cells (i, j) for $i, j \in \overline{D}$ and compare this to the total number of symbols in those cells.

Let $d = |D|$ and permute the parts of P so that $D = [d]$. Consider the three subarrays shown in Figure 17, where E is a $d \times d$ array of multisets.

E	
F	G

Figure 17: Subarrays of the array B .

In column a of $E \cup F$ for $a \in D$, there are $h_a + h_b$ copies of symbol $b \in D$. Thus, there are $|D|h_a + \sum_{b \in D} h_b$ copies of symbols from D in a column, and so there are $2|D| \sum_{a \in D} h_a$ copies of symbols from D across all columns of $E \cup F$. Within the array E , the cells (a, a) have exactly $2h_a$ copies of symbol $a \in D$. Therefore, in the subarray F there are at most $2(|D| - 1) \sum_{a \in D} h_a$ copies of symbols from D .

Similarly, row i of $F \cup G$ for $i \in \overline{D}$ has $|D|h_i + \sum_{b \in D} h_b$ symbols from D , and so there are $|D| \sum_{i \in \overline{D}} h_i + (k - |D|) \sum_{a \in D} h_a$ copies of symbols in D across all of $F \cup G$. Thus, in the subarray G there are at least $|D| \sum_{i \in \overline{D}} h_i + (k - 3|D| + 2) \sum_{a \in D} h_a$ copies of symbols from D . Noting that the cells (i, i) for $i \in \overline{D}$ must only contain symbol i , there are $2(k - |D| - 1) \sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j$ cells in G which may contain symbols of D , and thus

$$(2k - 3|D| - 2) \sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \geq (k - 3|D| + 2) \sum_{a \in D} h_a.$$

□

For a subset with $|D| = 3$, this yields the necessary condition $(2k - 11) \sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \geq (k - 7) \sum_{i \in D} h_i$. Take the partition $P = (h_1^3 1^{k-3})$ and $D = [3]$, with $h_1 = (2k - 11)(k - 3)$. A realization exists for the partition P and for $((h_1 + 1)^3 2^{k-3})$ by Theorem 1.7 when $k \geq 5$. However, $(2k - 11)(k - 3) \leq (k - 7) \cdot 3(2k - 11)(k - 3)$ when $k \geq 8$. Therefore, it is clear that this array B cannot always be constructed when $k \geq 8$, even when both a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_k$) and 2-RP($n_1 \dots n_k$) exist for $n_i = h_i + 1$.

When $k \in \{6, 7\}$, it is possible that the array B can be constructed for any partition which has a realization.

Lemma 4.4. *For $k \in \{6, 7\}$, if a 2-RP($h_1 \dots h_k$) exists then $(2k - 2 - 3|D|) \sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \geq (k + 2 - 3|D|) \sum_{i \in D} h_i$ for all subsets $D \subseteq [k]$.*

Proof. Observe that for a subset $D' \subseteq [k]$, if $|D'| = k - |D|$, then $2k - 3|D'| - 2 = -(k - 3|D| + 2)$ and $k - 3|D'| + 2 = -(2k - 3|D| - 2)$. Thus, we need only consider subsets with $|D| \leq \frac{k}{2}$.

Considering different values of $|D|$, the possible conditions to be satisfied for $k = 6$ are:

1. $|D| = 1$: $7 \sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \geq 5 \sum_{i \in D} h_i$
2. $|D| = 2$: $2 \sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \geq \sum_{i \in D} h_i$
3. $|D| = 3$: $\sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \geq -1 \sum_{i \in D} h_i$

Clearly (3) is always satisfied, since the sums are always positive. Since a realization exists, it is given by Theorem 1.8 that $h_1 \leq \sum_{i=3}^k h_i$, and so (1) is always true. Similarly, $h_1 + h_2 \leq 2 \sum_{i=2}^k h_i$, which satisfies (2).

The conditions for $k = 7$ are:

1. $|D| = 1$: $3 \sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \geq 2 \sum_{i \in D} h_i$
2. $|D| = 2$: $2 \sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \geq \sum_{i \in D} h_i$
3. $|D| = 3$: $3 \sum_{j \in \overline{D}} h_j \geq 0$

All three conditions are satisfied by the same reasons used for $k = 6$.

□

Acknowledgement

Funding: The author would like to acknowledge the support of the Australian Government through a Research Training Program (RTP) Scholarship.

References

- [1] C.J. Colbourn. “On a Latin square problem of Fuchs”. In: *Australas. J. Combin* 71 (2018), pp. 501–536.
- [2] J. Dénes and E. Pásztor. “Some problems on quasigroups”. In: *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Fiz. Oszt. Közl* 13 (1963), pp. 109–118.
- [3] K. Heinrich. “Disjoint subquasigroups”. In: *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* 3.3 (1982), pp. 547–563.
- [4] K. Heinrich. “Latin squares composed of four disjoint subsquares”. In: *Combinatorial Mathematics V: Proceedings of the Fifth Australian Conference, Held at the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, August 24–26, 1976*. Springer, 1976, pp. 118–127.
- [5] A.J.W. Hilton. “The reconstruction of latin squares with applications to school timetabling and to experimental design”. In: *Combinatorial Optimization II* (1980), pp. 68–77.
- [6] A.D. Keedwell and J. Dénes. *Latin squares and their applications*. Elsevier, 2015.

- [7] J. Kuhl, D. McGinn, and M.W. Schroeder. “On the existence of partitioned incomplete Latin squares with five parts”. In: *Australasian Journal of Combinatorics* 74.1 (2019), pp. 46–60.
- [8] J. Kuhl and M.W. Schroeder. “Latin squares with disjoint subsquares of two orders”. In: *Journal of Combinatorial Designs* 26.5 (2018), pp. 219–236.