

Optimizing alphabet reduction pairs of arrays

Jean-François Culus* and Sophie Toulouse†

June 18, 2024

Abstract

In [1], we introduced a family of combinatorial designs, which we call *alphabet reduction pairs of arrays*, or ARPAs for short. These designs depend on three integer parameters q , $p \leq q$ and $k \leq p$: q is the size of the symbol set $\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_q\}$ in which the coefficients of the arrays take their values; p is the maximum number of distinct symbols allowed in a row of the second array of the pair; k is the larger integer for which the two arrays of the pair coincide — up to the order of their rows — on any k -ary subset of their columns. The first array must contain at least one occurrence of the word $\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_q$. Intuitively, the idea is to cover “as many as possible” occurrences of this word of q symbols with “as few as possible” words of at most p different symbols.

These designs are related to the approximability of *Constraint Satisfaction Problems with bounded constraint arity*, known as k CSPs. In this context, we are particularly interested in ARPAs in which the frequency of the word $\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_q$ is maximal. Our goal is precisely to study such ARPAs, which we call *optimal*.

We introduce a seemingly simpler family of designs as *Cover pairs of arrays* (CPAs). The arrays of a CPA take Boolean coefficients, and must still be equal (up to the order of their rows) on any k -ary subset of their columns. The purpose is, as it were, to cover “as many as possible” occurrences of the word of q ones using “as few as possible” q -length Boolean words of weight at most p . We show that, when it comes to maximizing the frequency of the word either $\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_q$ or $1 1 \dots 1$ (depending on the family of designs considered), ARPAs and CPAs are equivalent. We prove the optimality of the ARPAs given in [1] for the case $p = k$. In addition, we provide optimal ARPAs for the cases $k = 1$ and $k = 2$. We emphasize the fact that both families of combinatorial designs are related to the approximability of k CSPs.

Keywords: Combinatorial designs; Alphabet reduction pair of arrays; Cover pair of arrays; ; Linear programming; Approximability of k CSPs.

1 Introduction

For a positive integer q , we consider the set $\Sigma_q = \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ of q symbols. In [1], we introduced a family of combinatorial designs, which we here call *alphabet reduction pairs of arrays* (ARPA for short), along with the associated quantities of interest.

Definition 1.1 (Alphabet reduction pairs of arrays). *Let $k > 0$, $p \geq k$ and $q \geq p$ be three integers. Two arrays Q and P with q columns on symbol set Σ_q form a (q, p) -alphabet reduction pair of arrays (for short, a (q, p) -ARPA) of strength k if they satisfy:*

(Γ_Q) Q contains at least one occurrence of the row $0 1 \dots q-1$;

(Γ_P) each row of P involves at most p distinct symbols;

*jean-francois.culus@st-cyr.terre-net.defense.gouv.fr MEMIAD, UA, Crec Saint-Cyr, France

†sophie.toulouse@lipn.univ-paris13.fr LIPN (UMR CNRS 7030), Institut Galilée, Université Paris 13, France

Table 1: (q, p) -ARPAs of strength 2 and 3. We use the grey color to emphasis the rows $0 \ 1 \ \dots \ q - 1$ in array Q .

$(Q, P) \in \Gamma(4, 3, 2)$								$(Q, P) \in \Gamma(5, 4, 3)$											
Q^0	Q^1	Q^2	Q^3	P^0	P^1	P^2	P^3	Q^0	Q^1	Q^2	Q^3	Q^4	P^0	P^1	P^2	P^3	P^4		
0	1	2	3	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	1	0	3		
0	1	2	3	0	1	2	2	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	2	3	4		
0	1	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	2	3	4		
0	0	2	2	0	0	2	3	0	1	1	0	4	0	1	1	3	4		
3	1	2	2	3	1	2	3	0	1	1	3	3	0	1	1	3	4		
3	0	0	3	3	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	3	0	1	2	0	4		
$R^*(Q, P)/R(Q, P) = 2/6 = 1/3$								0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	3		
$(Q, P) \in \Gamma(5, 3, 2)$																			
Q^0	Q^1	Q^2	Q^3	Q^4	P^0	P^1	P^2	P^3	P^4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	3
0	1	2	3	4	3	3	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	3
1	2	2	1	4	1	1	2	1	4	4	0	1	0	3	4	0	1	0	4
3	3	2	2	4	0	2	2	2	4	4	0	2	3	4	4	0	2	0	3
3	3	3	3	3	0	1	3	3	3	4	1	1	3	4	4	1	1	0	3
1	1	3	1	3	1	2	3	1	3	4	1	2	0	4	4	1	2	3	4
0	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	4	1	2	3	3	4	1	2	3	4
$R^*(Q, P)/R(Q, P) = 1/6$										$R^*(Q, P)/R(Q, P) = 3/15 = 1/5$									

$(k_=)$ if we extract k columns from Q , and the same k columns from P , then we obtain — up to the order of the rows — the same array.

$\Gamma(q, p, k)$ denotes the set of such pairs of arrays. Furthermore, let $R^*(Q, P)$ and $R(Q, P)$ refer to, respectively, the number of occurrences of the row $0 \ 1 \ \dots \ q - 1$ in Q , and the number of rows in P . Then we define $\gamma(q, p, k)$ as the highest ratio $R^*(Q, P)/R(Q, P)$ reached over $\Gamma(q, p, k)$.

Notice that, according to condition $(k_=)$, arrays Q and P have the same number of rows. Table 1 shows ARPAs when $(q, p, k) \in \{(4, 3, 2), (5, 3, 2), (5, 4, 3)\}$.

1.1 Motivation and previous results

Optimization *constraint satisfaction problems* (CSPs for short) over Σ_q involve a finite set of variables with domain Σ_q , and real-valued functions termed *constraints*, each depending on a subset of the variables. The goal is to find an assignment of the variables that maximizes the weighted sum of these constraint values. k CSP $-q$ refers to the CSP over Σ_q where each constraint involves at most k variables. For a positive integer q and a CSP instance I over Σ_q , we denote by $\text{opt}(I)$ its optimal value, by $\text{wor}(I)$ its worst solution value, and by $\text{opt}_p(I)$ the optimal value when restricting solutions to coordinates with at most $p < q$ distinct values. A value $\text{apx}(I)$ approximates $\text{opt}(I)$ within a differential factor ρ where $\rho \in (0, 1]$ if it satisfies $(\text{apx}(I) - \text{wor}(I))/(\text{opt}(I) - \text{wor}(I)) \geq \rho$. By extension, a solution x of I is ρ -differential approximate if its objective value approximates $\text{opt}(I)$ within a differential factor of ρ .

ARPAs are related to CSPs in that the higher the ratio $R^*(Q, P)/R(Q, P)$ in an ARPA of $\Gamma(q, p, k)$ is, the better we can say that $\text{opt}_p(I)$ approximates $\text{opt}(I)$, and the more we benefit for k CSP $-q$ from using a hypothetical approximation algorithm for k CSP $-p$. Specifically:

Theorem 1.1 ([1]). *For all constant integers $k \geq 2$, $p \geq k$ and $q \geq p$, on any instance I of k CSP $-q$, the best solutions among those whose components take at most p distinct values are $\gamma(q, p, k)$ -differential approximate. Formally, $\text{opt}_p(I)$ satisfies:*

$$(\text{opt}_p(I) - \text{wor}(I))/(\text{opt}(I) - \text{wor}(I)) \geq \gamma(q, p, k)$$

Moreover, $k\text{CSP}-q$ reduces to $k\text{CSP}-p$ with an expansion of $\gamma(q, p, k)$ on the differential approximation guarantee. In other words, if there exists a polynomial-time algorithm for $k\text{CSP}-p$ computing ρ -differential approximate solutions (where $\rho \in (0, 1]$), it can be applied to $k\text{CSP}-q$ to compute solutions that are $\rho \times \gamma(q, p, k)$ -differential approximate.

Hence, as far as CSPs are concerned, we are interested in the frequency of the row $0\ 1\ \dots\ q-1$ in array Q . The following bounds are known for $\gamma(q, p, k)$:

Theorem 1.2 ([1]). *Let $k > 0$, $p \geq k$ and $q \geq p$ be three integers. If $p = q$, then $\gamma(q, q, k) = 1$. If $q > p > k$, then $\gamma(q, p, k) \geq \gamma(q - p + k, k, k)$. If $p = k < q$, then:*

$$\gamma(q, k, k) \geq 2 / (\sum_{r=0}^k \binom{q}{r} \binom{q-1-r}{k-r} + 1) \quad (1)$$

From Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, and the fact that $2\text{CSP}-2$ is approximable within differential ratio $2 - \pi/2$ [2], we deduced in [1] that, for all integers $q > 2$, $2\text{CSP}-q$ is approximable within a differential ratio of $(2 - \pi/2)/(q - 1)^2$.

1.2 Outline and notations

We continue the study of the numbers $\gamma(q, p, k)$ started in [1]. Note that the lower bound given for the case where $q > p = k$ comes from a recursive construction starting with the trivial pair $Q = P = (0\ 1\ \dots\ k-1)$ of arrays. For the case where $q > p > k$, we simply extend each row of the arrays of a $(q - p + k, k)$ -ARPA of strength k by $q - p + k\ q - p + k + 1\ \dots\ q - 1$. In [1], we identify two issues concerning the lower bounds given in Theorem 1.2: proving that, as we conjecture, the stated bound is tight for the case $p = k$; providing finer estimates of $\gamma(q, p, k)$ when $p > k$.

Essentially, when computing $\gamma(q, p, k)$, our goal is to cover as many occurrences of the row $0\ 1\ \dots\ q-1$ as possible, using the smallest collection of rows, each with coordinates taking at most p distinct values. Given an index $j \in \Sigma_q$, the most critical aspect of a coefficient a in column j of Q or P is whether it matches j or not. When $a \neq j$, the specific value of a becomes less significant, except for ensuring that the subarrays of k columns of Q and P coincide. These considerations lead us to introduce the following family of combinatorial designs:

Definition 1.2 (Cover pair of arrays). *Let $k > 0$, $d \geq k$ and $\nu \geq d$ be three integers. Two arrays N and D with ν columns on symbol set Σ_2 form a (ν, d) -cover pair of arrays ((ν, d) -CPA for short) of strength k if they satisfy condition (k_-) and:*

(Δ_N) N contains at least one occurrence of the row $1\ 1\ \dots\ 1$;

(Δ_D) each row of D has at most d non-zero coordinates.

$\Delta(\nu, d, k)$ denotes the set of such pairs of arrays. Furthermore, let $R^*(N, D)$ and $R(N, D)$ refer to, respectively, the number of occurrences of the row $1\ 1\ \dots\ 1$ in N , and the number of rows in D . Then we define $\delta(\nu, d, k)$ as the maximum ratio $R^*(N, D)/R(N, D)$ over $\Delta(\nu, d, k)$.

Table 2 shows CPAs of strength 2 and 3. In Section 2, we show that the lower bound for $\gamma(q, k, k)$ given in [1] is an upper bound for $\delta(q, k, k)$ (Theorem 2.2) and thus the exact value of $\gamma(q, k, k)$. We also introduce a subfamily of CPAs, called *regular*, which will be used in the rest of the paper. In Section 3, we show how to derive ARPAs from regular CPAs (Theorem 3.1). In Section 4, we provide some characterization of regular CPAs that maximize the frequency of the all-ones row using linear programming (Theorem 4.7). In Section 5, we conclude that computing $\gamma(q, p, k)$ reduces to computing $\delta(q, p, k)$ (Corollary 5.1). In addition, we derive the exact value of $\gamma(q, k, k)$, $\gamma(q, p, 2)$ and $\gamma(q, p, 1)$ from the results of the previous sections (Corollary 5.2). Finally, in Section 6, we briefly discuss the results obtained and directions for further research.

Notations. For a positive integer ν , $[\nu]$ refers to the discrete interval $\{1, \dots, \nu\}$. Unless otherwise specified, we index the coordinates of rows occurring in (q, p) -ARPAs by Σ_q , and the coordinates of rows occurring in (ν, d) -CPAs by $[\nu]$. The rows of an array with R rows are indexed by $[R]$. For an array M , M_r and M^j denote its row of index r and its column of index j , respectively.

Table 2: (ν, d) -CPAs of strength 2 and 3. We use the grey color to emphasis the rows 1 1 ... 1 in array N .

$(N, D) \in \Delta(4, 3, 2)$										$(N, D) \in \Delta(5, 4, 3)$									
N^1	N^2	N^3	N^4	D^1	D^2	D^3	D^4	N^1	N^2	N^3	N^4	N^5	D^1	D^2	D^3	D^4	D^5		
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0		
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1		
1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1		
1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1		
0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1		
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
$R^*(N, D)/R(N, D) = 2/6 = 1/3$																			
$(N, D) \in \Delta(5, 3, 2)$										$(N, D) \in \Delta(5, 4, 3)$									
N^1	N^2	N^3	N^4	N^5	D^1	D^2	D^3	D^4	D^5	N^1	N^2	N^3	N^4	N^5	D^1	D^2	D^3	D^4	D^5
1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$R^*(N, D)/R(N, D) = 1/6$																			

2 Cover pairs of arrays

2.1 From alphabet reduction to cover pairs of arrays

An ARPA can naturally be interpreted as a CPA. For instance, the ARPAs of Table 1 can be interpreted as the CPAs of Table 2.

Definition 2.1. For a positive integer q , we define the surjective map $\pi_q : \Sigma_q^q \rightarrow \Sigma_2^q$ associating with a word $u = (u_0, \dots, u_{q-1})$ of Σ_q^q the word $\pi_q(u) = (\pi_q(u)_1, \dots, \pi_q(u)_q)$ defined for $j \in [q]$ by $\pi_q(u)_j = 1$ if $u_{j-1} = j - 1$, and 0 otherwise. By extension, given an array M with rows in Σ_q^q , $\pi_q(M)$ refers to the array obtained from M by substituting for each row M_r of M the row $\pi_q(M_r)$.

For two pairs of arrays, (Q, P) with rows in Σ_q^q and (N, D) with rows in Σ_2^q , we say that (Q, P) can be interpreted as (N, D) if we can order their rows in such a way that $(\pi_q(Q), \pi_q(P)) = (N, D)$.

Proposition 2.1. Let $k \geq 1$, $p \geq k$ and $q \geq p$ be three integers. Then for all $(Q, P) \in \Gamma(q, p, k)$, there exists $(N, D) \in \Delta(q, p, k)$ such that $R^*(N, D) = R^*(Q, P)$ and $R(N, D) = R(Q, P)$.

Proof. Define (N, D) as $(\pi_q(Q), \pi_q(P))$. By definition of π_q , the number of rows in N and D is the same as in Q and P , and the all-ones row occurs as many often in N as the row $0 \ 1 \ \dots \ q - 1$ in Q . Furthermore, (N, D) clearly satisfies (k_-) . For (Δ_D) , observe that the number of distinct symbols in a word $u = (u_0, \dots, u_{q-1}) \in \Sigma_q^q$ is an upper bound on the number of coordinates u_j of u satisfying $u_j = j$, and thus, on the number of non-zero coordinates of the word $\pi_q(u)$. \square

Let $k > 0$ and $\nu \geq k$ be two integers. In [1], we established inequality (1). We prove that the converse inequality is true. We more precisely show that CPAs verify the following property:

Theorem 2.2. Let $k \geq 1$ and $\nu > k$ be two integers. Then for all $(N, D) \in \Delta(\nu, k, k)$, we have: $R^*(N, D)/R(N, D) \leq 2/(\sum_{h=0}^k \binom{\nu}{h} \binom{\nu-1-h}{k-h} + 1)$.

Proof (sketch). Given $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$, we denote by respectively b_i and a_i the number of rows with i non-zero coordinates in N and, if $i \leq k$, in D . In particular, $b_\nu = R^*(N, D)$, while $\sum_{i=0}^k a_i + \sum_{i=0}^\nu b_i = 2R(N, D)$. (N, D) satisfies (k_-) if and only if, for any two subsets H, L of $[\nu]$ such that $H \cap L = \emptyset$ and

$|H \cup L| = k$, the number of rows $u = (u_1, \dots, u_\nu)$ satisfying $u_H = (1, \dots, 1)$ and $u_L = (0, \dots, 0)$ is the same in both arrays. For a fixed $h \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, summing these equalities over all possible pairs (H, L) yields equality:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{H, L \subseteq [\nu]: H \cap L = \emptyset, |H|=h, |L|=k-h} \left\{ r \in [R(N, D)] : N_r^j = 1, j \in H \wedge N_r^j = 0, j \in L \right\} \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{H, L \subseteq [\nu]: H \cap L = \emptyset, |H|=h, |L|=k-h} \left\{ r \in [R(N, D)] : D_r^j = 1, j \in H \wedge D_r^j = 0, j \in L \right\} \right| \end{aligned}$$

Let $u \in \{0, 1\}^\nu$. If u has i non-zero coordinates, then $u_H = (1, \dots, 1)$ holds for $\binom{i}{h}$ h -cardinality subsets H of $[\nu]$, and $u_L = (0, \dots, 0)$ holds for $\binom{\nu-i}{k-h}$ $(k-h)$ -cardinality subsets L of $[\nu]$. A row N_r or D_r with i non-zero coordinates therefore is involved $\binom{i}{h} \times \binom{\nu-i}{k-h}$ times in the sum above. From these observations, we deduce that the numbers $b_i, i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$ and $a_i, i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ satisfy:

$$\sum_{i=h}^{\nu-k+h} \binom{i}{h} \binom{\nu-i}{k-h} b_i = \sum_{i=h}^k \binom{i}{h} \binom{\nu-i}{k-h} a_i, \quad h \in \{0, \dots, k\} \quad (2)$$

From (2), we can derive by induction on integer h the following identity:

$$a_h - b_h = (-1)^{k-h} \sum_{i=k+1}^{\nu} \binom{i}{h} \binom{i-1-h}{k-h} b_i, \quad h \in \{0, \dots, k\} \quad (3)$$

As the proof of identity (3) is technical and does not shed any new light on the manipulated structures, we invite the reader to refer to section 7.1 of the appendix. Now, we successively deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} 2R(N, D) &= \sum_{h=0}^k (a_h + b_h) + \sum_{h=k+1}^{\nu} b_h \\ &\geq \sum_{h=0}^k |a_h - b_h| + \sum_{h=k+1}^{\nu} b_h \\ &\geq \sum_{h=0}^k \sum_{i=k+1}^{\nu} \binom{i}{h} \binom{i-1-h}{k-h} b_i + \sum_{h=k+1}^{\nu} b_h \quad \text{by (3)} \\ &\geq \sum_{h=0}^k \binom{\nu}{h} \binom{\nu-1-h}{k-h} b_\nu + b_\nu \end{aligned}$$

As $b_\nu = R^*(N, D)$, the conclusion is straightforward. \square

From Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 2.1, we deduce that the lower bound on $\gamma(q, k, k)$ given in [1] is tight (see Corollary 5.2). The rest of the paper focuses on a specific family of cover pairs of arrays, called *regular*.

2.2 Regular pairs of arrays

Definition 2.2. *The weight of a Boolean vector is the number of its non-zero coordinates. For a positive integer ν , we define an array M with rows from Σ_2^ν as regular if, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$, Boolean words of length ν and weight i all occur with the same frequency in M . By extension, a CPA (N, D) is termed regular if both N and D are regular.*

For instance, the right-hand side CPA of Table 2 is regular. In this CPA, every word of weight respectively 0, 3 and 5 occurs twice, once and three times in N , and every word of weight respectively 1 and 4 occurs once and twice in D .

Proposition 2.3. *For all positive integers $k, d \geq k$ and $\nu \geq d$, if there exists $(N, D) \in \Delta(\nu, d, k)$ that realizes $\delta(\nu, d, k)$, then there exists $(N', D') \in \Delta(\nu, d, k)$ that realizes $\delta(\nu, d, k)$, and is regular.*

Proof (sketch). If (N, D) is not regular, then we build (N', D') as follows: for $M \in \{N, D\}$, we insert in M' all permutations over $[\nu]$ of all rows of M . This new pair of arrays is a regular element of $\Delta(\nu, d, k)$ satisfying $R^*(N', D')/R(N', D') = R^*(N, D)/R(N, D)$. \square

Since the numbers $\delta(\nu, d, k)$ we are interested in can be achieved by regular arrays, we will henceforth restrict our focus to regular CPAs. We note that an array M of such CPAs is fully characterized by the number of occurrences of the words of each word weight that is allowed in M .

Definition 2.3. Let $d \geq 1$ and $\nu \geq d$ be two integers. With a (ν, d) -CPA (N, D) , we associate the vector $(y, x) \in \mathbb{N}^{\nu+1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d+1}$ where for $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$, y_i indicates the number of times the ν -dimensional Boolean words of weight i occur in N and, if $i \leq d$, x_i indicates the number of times the ν -dimensional Boolean words of weight i occur in D . We refer to (y, x) as the representative vector of (N, D) .

For example, the representative vector of the $(5, 4)$ -CPA of Table 2 is the vector:

$$(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, y_5, x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = (2, 0, 0, 1, 0, 3, 0, 1, 0, 0, 2)$$

Proposition 2.4. Let $k \geq 1$, $d \geq k$, $\nu \geq d$ be three integers, and $(y, x) \in \mathbb{N}^{\nu+1} \times \mathbb{N}^{d+1}$. Then (y, x) is the representative vector of a (regular) (ν, d) -CPA (N, D) of strength k if and only if $y_\nu > 0$, and:

$$\sum_{i=h}^{\nu-k+h} \binom{\nu-k}{i-h} y_i = \sum_{i=h}^d \binom{\nu-k}{i-h} x_i, \quad h \in \{0, \dots, k\} \quad (4)$$

When this occurs, we have

$$R^*(N, D) = y_\nu$$

and $R(N, D) = \sum_{i=0}^{\nu} \binom{\nu}{i} y_i = \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{\nu}{i} x_i = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\nu} \binom{\nu}{i} y_i + \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{\nu}{i} x_i \right) / 2.$

Proof. We only argue that (N, D) satisfies (k_-) if and only if (y, x) satisfies (4) (the rest being trivial). Firstly, we observe that (N, D) satisfies (k_-) if and only if, for all k -cardinality subsets K of $[\nu]$ and all $v \in \Sigma_2^k$, there are as many rows in N and D that coincide with v on their coordinates with index in K . Formally, N and D must satisfy:

$$|\{r \in [R(N, D)] : N_r^K = v\}| = |\{r \in [R(N, D)] : D_r^K = v\}|, \quad K \subseteq [\nu], |K| = k, v \in \Sigma_2^k \quad (5)$$

Given such a pair (K, v) , let h be the number of non-zero coordinates of v . For $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$, the number of words $u \in \Sigma_2^\nu$ of weight i that satisfy $u_K = v$ corresponds to the choice of $i - h$ non-zero coordinates among coordinates u_j , $j \in [\nu] \setminus K$. Since such words occur y_i times in N and, when $i \leq d$, x_i times in D , we deduce that there are in N and D respectively $\sum_{i=0}^{\nu-k} \binom{\nu-k}{i-h} y_i$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{\nu-k} \binom{\nu-k}{i-h} x_i$ rows that coincide with v on their coordinates with index in K . \square

3 From cover to alphabet reduction pairs of arrays

It follows from Theorem 2.2 and Proposition 2.1 that the numbers $\gamma(q, k, k)$ and $\delta(q, k, k)$ are both equal to the lower bound we gave in [1] for $\gamma(q, k, k)$. Proposition 2.1 shows more generally how to interpret a (q, p) -ARPA of strength k as a (q, p) -CPA of strength k . Next, we show conversely how to transform a regular (ν, d) -CPA (N, D) of strength k into a (ν, d') -ARPA of strength k , where d' is some integer in $\{d, d+1, d+2\}$ depending on (N, D) . This is a first step towards generalizing the equality between the numbers $\gamma(q, k, k)$ and $\delta(q, k, k)$ to the case where $p > k$.

3.1 Construction

Let $k \geq 1$, $d \geq k$ and $\nu > d$ be three integers. We consider a regular CPA $(N, D) \in \Delta(\nu, d, k) \setminus \Delta(\nu, d-1, k)$ where N and D have no row in common. By assumption $(N, D) \notin \Delta(\nu, d-1, k)$, the words of weight d occur at least once in D . There thus exists in $\{k, \dots, \nu-1\}$ a greatest integer r such that the words of weight r occur at least once in (N, D) .

As N and D have no common rows, (N, D) can be represented unambiguously by a single family $z = (z_0, \dots, z_\nu) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu+1}$ of integer values. To be precise, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$, $|z_i|$ indicates the number of occurrences of the words of weight i in (N, D) . Moreover, these words occur in N if $z_i < 0$ and in D if $z_i > 0$. If (y, x) is the representative vector of (N, D) , then z is simply defined for $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$ by:

$$z_i = \begin{cases} -y_i & \text{if } i > d \\ x_i - y_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Note that, according to Proposition 2.4, (N, D) satisfies (k_-) if and only if z satisfies:

$$\sum_{i=h}^{\nu-k+h} \binom{\nu-k}{i-h} z_i = 0, \quad h \in \{0, \dots, k\} \quad (7)$$

Input: The encoding $z = (z_0, \dots, z_\nu) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\nu+1}$ of a regular CPA from $\Delta(\nu, d, k) \setminus \Delta(\nu, d-1, k)$
Output: The encoding $\tilde{z} : \Sigma_\nu^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ of an ARPA from $\Gamma(\nu, d', k)$ for some $d' \in \{k, \dots, \nu\}$

```

/* Initializations */
1 foreach  $u \in \Sigma_\nu^\nu$  do
2    $\tilde{z}(u) \leftarrow 0$ ;
3  $r \leftarrow \max \{i \in \{d, \dots, \nu-1\} : z_i \neq 0\}$ ;
   /* Rows derived from the all-ones word */
4  $\tilde{z}((0, 1, \dots, \nu-1)) \leftarrow z_r$ ;
   /* Rows derived from the Boolean words of weight  $r$  */
5 foreach  $J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu$  with  $|J| = r$  do
6    $\tilde{z}(g(J)) \leftarrow z_r$ ;
   /* Rows derived from the Boolean words of weight  $< r$  */
7 foreach  $i \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$  such that  $z_i \neq 0$  do
8   foreach  $J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu$  with  $|J| = i$  do
9     for  $c = 0$  to  $c_*(J)$  do
10      if  $c < c_*(J)$  then
11         $\tilde{z}(g^c(J)) \leftarrow \binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-1-i} / \binom{\nu-1-i}{r-i} \times z_i$ ;
12      else if  $c = c_*(J) < \nu - r$  then
13         $\tilde{z}(g(J)) \leftarrow \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} / \binom{\nu-1-i}{r-i} \times z_i$ ;

```

Algorithm 1: Construction of Theorem 3.1

We derive from (N, D) an ARPA (Q, P) of strength k that can be interpreted as (N, D) . Similarly to (N, D) , we represent (Q, P) by means of a function $\tilde{z} : \Sigma_\nu^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ where for $u \in \Sigma_\nu^\nu$, $\tilde{z}(u)$ indicates the number of times u occur as a row, in Q if $\tilde{z}(u) < 0$, in P if $\tilde{z}(u) > 0$. The construction is described in Algorithm 1. Examples of this process are illustrated in Table 3. In this algorithm, for a subset J of Σ_ν , $c_*(J)$ refers to the smallest integer in $J \cup \{\nu - r\}$. Furthermore, for any $J \subseteq \Sigma_q$ and any $c \in \{0, \dots, c_*(J) - 1\}$, $g(J) = (g(J)_0, \dots, g(J)_{\nu-1})$ and $g^c(J) = (g^c(J)_0, \dots, g^c(J)_{\nu-1})$ refer to the words of Σ_ν^ν defined for $j \in \Sigma_\nu$ by:

$$g(J)_j = \begin{cases} j & \text{if } j \in J \\ c_*(J) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad g^c(J)_j = \begin{cases} j & \text{if } j \in J \\ c+1 & \text{if } j \notin J \text{ and } j \leq c \\ c & \text{if } j \notin J \text{ and } j > c \end{cases},$$

We denote by $u(J) = (u(J)_0, \dots, u(J)_{\nu-1})$ the indicator vector of J . This vector is defined for $j \in \Sigma_\nu$ by $u(J)_j = 1$ if $j \in J$ and 0 otherwise. By construction, $g(J)$ and $g^c(J)$ both satisfy for all $j \in \Sigma_\nu$ that their coordinate of index j coincides with j if and only if $j \in J$. The Boolean words $\pi_\nu(g(J))$ and $\pi_\nu(g^c(J))$ therefore both coincide with $u(J)$.

We subsequently demonstrate that (Q, P) can be interpreted as (N, D) , satisfies (Γ_P) with respect to some specific integer $d' \in \{k, \dots, \nu\}$ contingent on (N, D) , and (k_-) , thereby establishing the following theorem:

Theorem 3.1. *Let $k \geq 1$, $d \geq k$ and $\nu > d$ be three integers, and let $(N, D) \in \Delta(\nu, d, k) \setminus \Delta(\nu, d-1, k)$ such that (N, D) is regular, and N and D have no row in common. We denote by r the greatest weight of words other than the all-ones word that occur in (N, D) . Let d' be the integer in $\{k, \dots, \nu\}$ defined*

Table 3: (ν, d) -ARPAs of strength 2 (on the left) and 3 (on the right) that are derived from regular (ν, d) -CPAs of the same strength using Algorithm 1. Colors grey and black identify the coefficients with value respectively 1 and 0 in the original CPAs.

$(Q, P) \in \Gamma(5, 2, 2)$					$(Q, P) \in \Gamma(5, 4, 3)$															
Q^0	Q^1	Q^2	Q^3	Q^4	P^0	P^1	P^2	P^3	P^4	Q^0	Q^1	Q^2	Q^3	Q^4	P^0	P^1	P^2	P^3	P^4	
0	1	2	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	0	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	0	4
1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	0	4	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	3	4	
1	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	3	2	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	
2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	4	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	2	3	4	
2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	0	0	0	3	4	1	1	2	3	4	
1	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	1	1	2	3	4	
2	2	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	
3	3	3	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	1	1	0	0	0	
1	0	0	0	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	3	4	1	0	2	0	0	
2	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	
3	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	

by:

$$d' = \begin{cases} d+2 & \text{if } r > d, \\ d+1 & \text{if } r = d, \text{ and the words of weight } d-1 \text{ occur at least once in } D, \\ d & \text{otherwise (thus } r = d \text{ and the rows in } D \text{ have weight } \neq d-1). \end{cases}$$

Then from (Q, P) , we can derive an ARPA $(Q, P) \in \Gamma(\nu, d', k)$ that can be interpreted as (N, D) .

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Fact 3.2. (Q, P) can be interpreted as (N, D) .

Proof. We must show that, for any $J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu$, the word $u(J)$ occurs in $\pi_\nu(Q)$ and in $\pi_\nu(P)$ as frequently as it does in N and D , respectively. Let $i = |J|$. Equivalently, we must show that the number of rows of the form $g(J)$ or $g^c(J)$, $c \in \{0, \dots, c_*(J) - 1\}$ in Q and P is the same as the number of rows $u(J)$ in N and D , respectively. If $i \in \{\nu, r\}$ or $z_i = 0$, the claim is trivial. Thus assume that $i < r$ and $z_i \neq 0$. Our goal is to prove the equality $\sum_{c=0}^{c_*(J)-1} \tilde{z}(g^c(J)) + \tilde{z}(g(J)) = z_i$. Now, we have:

$$\sum_{c=0}^{c_*(J)-1} \tilde{z}(g^c(J)) + \tilde{z}(g(J)) = \frac{z_i}{\binom{\nu-1-i}{r-i}} \times \left(\sum_{c=0}^{c_*(J)-1} \binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-1-i} + \binom{\nu-c_*(J)-1-i}{r-i} \right)$$

By using the identity $\binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-1-i} = \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} - \binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-i}$, we can simplify this expression to obtain the desired equality. \square

Fact 3.3. (Q, P) satisfies (Γ_P) with respect to integer d' as defined in Theorem 3.1.

Proof. By construction, P contains words of the form either $g(J)$ or $g^c(J)$, where J is a subset of Σ_ν . A word $g(J)$ may not occur in P unless $z_{|J|} > 0$, while $z_{|J|}$ may not be positive unless $|J| \leq d$. Furthermore, the coordinates of $g(J)$ are drawn from the set $J \cup \{\nu - r\}$. It should be noted that $\nu - r \in J$ provided that $|J| \geq r$. Consequently, the number of distinct values taken by the coordinates of the words $g(J)$ that occur in P is bounded above by d if $r = d$, by $d + 1$ otherwise (thus $r > d$).

A word $g^c(J)$ may not occur in P unless $z_{|J|} > 0$, $|J| \leq d$ and $|J| < r$. The largest cardinality of a subset J for which a word $g^c(J)$ occurs in P therefore is at most d if $r > d$, exactly $d - 1$ if $r = d$ and $z_{d-1} > 0$, at most $d - 2$ otherwise (thus $r = d$ and $z_{d-1} = 0$). Since the coordinates of $g^c(J)$ come from the set $J \cup \{c, c + 1\}$, the conclusion is straightforward. \square

Fact 3.4. (Q, P) satisfies (k_-) .

Proof. (Q, P) satisfies (k_-) if and only if, given any k symbols $j_1, \dots, j_k \in \Sigma_\nu$, for all $w \in \Sigma_\nu^k$, there are as many rows in Q and P that coincide with w on their coordinates of index (j_1, \dots, j_k) . Equivalently, \tilde{z} must satisfy:

$$\sum_{u=(u_0, \dots, u_{\nu-1}) \in \Sigma_\nu^\nu : u_K = w} \tilde{z}(u) = 0, \quad K = (j_1, \dots, j_k) \in \Sigma_\nu^k, |\{j_1, \dots, j_k\}| = k, w \in \Sigma_\nu^k \quad (8)$$

Consider then a sequence K of k pairwise distinct symbols from Σ_ν . Since (Q, P) can be interpreted as (N, D) , which satisfies (k_-) , we already know that \tilde{z} satisfies (8) at (K, K) . It remains for us to show that \tilde{z} satisfies (8) at (K, w) for all $w \in \Sigma_\nu^k \setminus \{K\}$. Equivalently, we must show that \tilde{z} satisfies (8) at $((H, L), (H, v))$, for all partitions of K into two subsequences H with $|H| = h < k$ and $L = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{k-h})$, and all words $v = (v_1, \dots, v_{k-h}) \in \Sigma_\nu^{k-h}$ such that $v_s \neq \ell_s, s \in [k-h]$. We denote by $R(H, L, v)$ the left-hand side of (8) taken at $((H, L), (H, v))$. Namely:

$$R(H, L, v) := \sum_{u=(u_0, \dots, u_{\nu-1}) \in \Sigma_\nu^\nu : u_H = H \wedge u_L = v} \tilde{z}(u) \quad (9)$$

We assume without loss of generality that $\ell_1 < \dots < \ell_{k-h}$. By construction, the vectors $u \in \Sigma_\nu^\nu$ for which $\tilde{z}(u)$ is assigned a non-zero value are of the form $g(J)$ or $g^c(J)$ where $J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu$, c is a natural number less than or equal to $c_*(J)$, and $z_{|J|} \neq 0$. Notably, no row u in (Q, P) may satisfy $(u_{\ell_1}, \dots, u_{\ell_{k-h}}) = (v_1, \dots, v_{k-h})$ unless there exist two natural numbers $s < k-h$ and c such that $v_1 = \dots = v_s = c+1 \neq \ell_1, \dots, \ell_s, v_{s+1} = \dots = v_{k-h} = c \neq \ell_{s+1}, \dots, \ell_{k-h}$, and $c \leq c_*(H)$.

For such data (H, L, v) , Algorithm 1 contributes to $R(H, L, v)$:

- if $s = 0$, at line 6, setting $\tilde{z}(g(J))$ to z_r for each r -cardinality subset J of Σ_ν such that $c_*(J) = c$ and $H \subseteq J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu \setminus L$.
- If $c < c_*(H)$, at line 11, setting $\tilde{z}(g^c(J))$ to $\binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-1-i} / \binom{\nu-1-i}{r-i} \times z_i$ for each $i \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$ such that $z_i \neq 0$, and each i -cardinality subset J of Σ_ν such that $c_*(J) > c$ and $H \subseteq J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu \setminus L$. This assumes that $c < \ell_{s+1}$ and, if $s > 0$, $\ell_s \leq c$.
- If $s = 0$ and $\ell_{k-h} \leq c-1$, at line 11, setting $\tilde{z}(g^{c-1}(J))$ to $\binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-1-i} / \binom{\nu-1-i}{r-i} \times z_i$ for each $i \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$ such that $z_i \neq 0$, and each $J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu$ such that $|J| = i, c_*(J) \geq c$ and $H \subseteq J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu \setminus L$.
- If $s = 0$ and $c < \nu - r$, at line 13, setting $\tilde{z}(g(J))$ to $\binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} / \binom{\nu-1-i}{r-i} \times z_i$, for each $i \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$ such that $z_i \neq 0$, and each $J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu$ such that $|J| = i, c_*(J) = c$ and $H \subseteq J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu \setminus L$.

We denote by λ the cardinality of the set $\{c+1, \dots, \nu-1\} \cap L$. This cardinality notably is the positive integer $k-h-s$ when the second case occurs, and zero when the third case occurs. Let $i \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ such that $z_i \neq 0$. For $J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu$ with $|J| = i$, by definition of $c_*(J)$, we have $J \subseteq \{c_*(J), \dots, \nu-1\}$. Furthermore, if $c_*(J) < \nu - r$ or $|J| = r$, then $c_*(J) \in J$. Consequently, if $s = 0$, line either 6 or 13 (depending on i) of Algorithm 1 assigns a non-zero value to $\tilde{z}(g(J))$ for each $J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu$ such that $|J| = i$ and $H \cup \{c\} \subseteq J \subseteq \{c, \dots, \nu-1\} \setminus L$. The number of such subsets J of Σ_ν is $\binom{\nu-c-1-h-\lambda}{i-1-h}$ if $c \notin H$ and $\binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda}{i-h}$ otherwise. We define:

$$\binom{\nu-c-1-h-\lambda}{r-1-h} z_r + \sum_{i=h+1}^{r-1} \binom{\nu-c-1-h-\lambda}{i-1-h} \times \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} / \binom{\nu-1-i}{r-i} \times z_i \quad (10)$$

$$\binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda}{r-h} z_r + \sum_{i=h}^{r-1} \binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda}{i-h} \times \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} / \binom{\nu-1-i}{r-i} \times z_i \quad (11)$$

From the preceding observations, we deduce that the contribution of lines 6 and 13 of the algorithm to $R(H, L, v)$ is (10) if $s = 0$ and $c \notin H$, (11) if $s = 0$ and $c \in H$, and 0 otherwise.

Now let $i \in \{0, \dots, r-1\}$ be such that $z_i \neq 0$. If $c \notin H, c < \nu - r$ and either $s = 0$ and $c < \ell_1$, or $s > 0$ and $\ell_s \leq c < \ell_{s+1}$, line 11 of Algorithm 1 assigns a non-zero value to $\tilde{z}(g^c(J))$ for each $J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu$ such that $|J| = i$ and $H \subseteq J \subseteq \{c+1, \dots, \nu-1\} \setminus \{\ell_{s+1}, \dots, \ell_{k-h}\}$. The number of such subsets J of

Table 4: The non-trivial cases to consider for the evaluation of $R(H, L, v)$, and the corresponding expression of $R(H, L, v)$ as a sum of the quantities (10), (11), (12) and (13).

- C1 $s > 0, \ell_s \leq c < \ell_{s+1}$ (thus $\lambda = k - h - s \neq 0, k - h$), $c \notin H$ and $c < \nu - r$: $R(H, L, v) = (12)$
- C2 $s = 0, \ell_1 < c < \ell_{k-h}$ (thus $\lambda \neq 0, k - h$), $c \notin H$ and $c < \nu - r$: $R(H, L, v) = (10)$
- C3 $s = 0, c < \ell_1$ (thus $\lambda = k - h$), $c \notin H$ and $c < \nu - r$: $R(H, L, v) = (10) + (12)$
- C4 $s = 0, \ell_{k-h} < c$ (thus $\lambda = 0$) and $c \notin H$: $R(H, L, v) = (10) + (13)$
- C5 $s = 0, c < \ell_{k-h}$ (thus $\lambda \neq 0$), $c \in H$ and $c < \nu - r$: $R(H, L, v) = (11)$
- C6 $s = 0, \ell_{k-h} < c$ (thus $\lambda = 0$), $c \in H$: $R(H, L, v) = (11) + (13)$

Table 5: The expression of $R(H, L, v)$ as a sum of terms $f_z(h', \lambda', c')$ where $h' + \lambda' < k$ and $c' \leq \nu - r$.

Case	$R(H, L, v)$	Conditions satisfied by h, λ and c
C1	$\begin{cases} f_z(h, \lambda, \nu - r) & \text{if } c = \nu - r - 1 \\ f_z(h, \lambda, c + 1) - f_z(h, \lambda - 1, c + 2) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$c < \nu - r, 0 < \lambda < k - h$
C2	$f_z(h + 1, \lambda - 1, c + 1)$	$c < \nu - r, 0 < \lambda < k - h$
C3	$\begin{cases} f_z(h, k - h - 1, \nu - r) & \text{if } c = \nu - r - 1 \\ f_z(h, k - h - 1, c + 1) - f_z(h, k - h - 1, c + 2) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$c < \nu - r$
C4	$\begin{cases} f_z(h, 0, \nu - r) & \text{if } c = \nu - r \\ f_z(h, 0, c) - f_z(h, 0, c + 1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$c \leq \nu - r, h < k$
C5	$f_z(h, \lambda - 1, c + 1)$	$c < \nu - r, 0 < \lambda \leq k - h$
C6	$f_z(h, 0, c)$	$c \leq \nu - r, h < k$

Σ_ν is $\binom{\nu - c - 1 - h - \lambda}{i - h}$, where $\lambda = k - h - s > 0$. If $s = 0$ and $\ell_{k-h} < c$, then line 11 of Algorithm 1 assigns a non-zero value to $\tilde{z}(g^{c-1}(J))$ for each $J \subseteq \Sigma_\nu$ such that $|J| = i$ and $H \subseteq J \subseteq \{c, \dots, \nu - 1\}$. The number of such subsets J of Σ_ν is $\binom{\nu - c - h}{i - h}$. We define:

$$\sum_{i=h}^{r-1} \binom{\nu - c - 1 - h - \lambda}{i - h} \times \binom{\nu - c - 2 - i}{r - 1 - i} / \binom{\nu - 1 - i}{r - i} \times z_i \quad (12)$$

$$\sum_{i=h}^{r-1} \binom{\nu - c - h}{i - h} \times \binom{\nu - c - 1 - i}{r - 1 - i} / \binom{\nu - 1 - i}{r - i} \times z_i \quad (13)$$

According to the preceding discussion, the contribution of line 11 of the algorithm to $R(H, L, v)$ is (12) if $c \notin H, c < \nu - r$ and either $s > 0$ and $\ell_s \leq c < \ell_{s+1}$, or $s = 0$ and $c < \ell_1$, (13) if $s = 0$ and $\ell_{k-h} < c$, and 0 otherwise.

Hence, when it is not trivially zero (meaning that no word $u \in \Sigma_\nu'$ satisfies $u_H = H, u_L = v$ and $\tilde{z}(u) \neq 0$), $R(H, L, v)$ is the sum of one or more of the quantities (10), (11), (12) and (13). The cases to be considered for the evaluation of $R(H, L, v)$ are summarized in Table 4. Note that (10) and (11) are trivially zero when $c = \nu - r$ and $\lambda > 0$. This explains why in this table we do not consider for c the value $\nu - r$ for the case neither C2 nor C5. We define:

$$f_z(h', \lambda', c') := \sum_{i=h'}^r \binom{\nu - c' - h' - \lambda'}{i - h'} \binom{\nu - c' - i}{r - i} / \binom{\nu - 1 - i}{r - i} \times z_i, \quad h', \lambda', c' \in \mathbb{N} \quad (14)$$

It is not too hard to see that, as indicated in Table 5, for each of the 6 cases identified, $R(H, L, v)$ writes as the sum of one or two terms of the form $f_z(h', \lambda', c')$, with parameters h', λ', c' verifying $h' + \lambda' < k$ and $c' \leq \nu - r$. A formal proof of these expressions can be found in section 7.3 of the appendix. Now, we prove:

$$f_z(h', \lambda', c') = 0, \quad h', \lambda', c' \in \mathbb{N}, c' \leq \nu - r, h' + \lambda' < k \quad (15)$$

Consider three natural numbers h', λ', c' such that $c' \leq \nu - r$ and $h' + \lambda' < k$. Pascal's rule implies the following equalities:

$$\binom{\nu - c' - h' - \lambda'}{i - h'} = \binom{\nu - c' - h' - \lambda' + 1}{i - h'} - \binom{\nu - c' - h' - \lambda'}{i - h' - 1}, \quad i \in \{h', \dots, r\}$$

If $\lambda' > 0$, we deduce that $f_z(h', \lambda', c') = f_z(h', \lambda' - 1, c') - f_z(h' + 1, \lambda' - 1, c')$. Now assume $\lambda' = 0$. We have the following equalities:

$$\binom{\nu - c' - h'}{i - h'} \binom{\nu - c' - i}{r - i} / \binom{\nu - 1 - i}{r - i} = \binom{\nu - c' - h'}{r - h'} \binom{\nu - 1 - h'}{i - h'} / \binom{\nu - 1 - h'}{r - h'}, \quad i \in \{h', \dots, r\},$$

Accordingly, $f_z(h', 0, c')$ can be expressed as:

$$f_z(h', 0, c') = \binom{\nu - c' - h'}{r - h'} / \binom{\nu - 1 - h'}{r - h'} \times \sum_{i=h'}^r \binom{\nu - 1 - h'}{i - h'} z_i \quad (16)$$

We observe:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=h'}^r \binom{\nu - 1 - h'}{i - h'} z_i &= \sum_{i=h'}^r \sum_{j=0}^{k-h'-1} \binom{k-h'-1}{j} \binom{\nu - k}{i - h' - j} z_i \quad (\text{by Vandermonde's identity}) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{k-h'-1} \binom{k-h'-1}{j} \sum_{i=h'}^r \binom{\nu - k}{i - h' - j} z_i = \sum_{j=0}^{k-h'-1} \binom{k-h'-1}{j} \sum_{i=h'+j}^{\nu - k + h' + j} \binom{\nu - k}{i - h' - j} z_i \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the fact that $z_i = 0$ for all $i \in \{r + 1, \dots, \nu - 1\}$, while the binomial coefficient $\binom{\nu - k}{i - h' - j}$ is zero for all $i > \nu - k + h' + j$. We thus deduce from (7) and (16) that $f_z(h, 0, c')$ equals 0. Hence, provided that $h' + \lambda' < k$ and $c' \leq \nu - r$, $f_z(h', \lambda', c')$ satisfies the recurrence relation and the initial conditions:

$$f_z(h', \lambda', c') = \begin{cases} f_z(h', \lambda' - 1, c') - f_z(h' + 1, \lambda' - 1, c') & \text{if } \lambda' > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

According to (17), for three such integers h' , λ' and c' , $f_z(h', \lambda', c')$ can be expressed as the weighted sum of terms of the form $f_z(h'', 0, c')$ where $h'' \leq h' + \lambda' < k$, all of which are zero. Thus, relation (15) holds, and the proof is complete. \square

Facts 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 establish Theorem 3.1. Note that the proposed construction easily extends to pairs (N, D) of arrays that share some collection M of rows in common. Basically, it suffices to substitute the row $g(J(u))$ for each row $u = (u_0, \dots, u_{\nu-1})$ of M in both arrays. The rest of the transformation remains unchanged. However, we are hardly interested in such pairs of arrays whose shared rows can be considered superfluous.

4 Characterizing optimal regular CPAs through linear programming

Given three integers $k > 0$, $d \geq k$ and $\nu > d$, the best we can deduce from Theorem 3.1 is that $\gamma(\nu, d + 2, k) \geq \delta(\nu, d, k)$. Our focus is on understanding how close the integer d' , as defined in Theorem 3.1, can be to d . To investigate this proximity, we thoroughly analyze the regular (ν, d) -CPAs of a given strength k that realize $\delta(\nu, d, k)$.

According to Propositions 2.3 and 2.4, $\delta(\nu, d, k)$ is the value of the mathematical program $P_{\nu, d, k}$ in integer variables below:

$$P_{\nu, d, k} := \begin{cases} \max & 2y_\nu / \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\nu} \binom{\nu}{i} y_i + \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{\nu}{i} x_i \right) \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_{i=h}^d \binom{\nu - k}{i - h} x_i - \sum_{i=h}^{\nu - k + h} \binom{\nu - k}{i - h} y_i = 0, \quad h \in \{0, \dots, k\} \\ & y_\nu > 0 \\ & y_0, \dots, y_\nu, x_0, \dots, x_d \in \mathbb{N} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

We consider the continuous relaxation of $P_{\nu, d, k}$. For this new problem, we observe that, given any positive real λ , two solution vectors $(y, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and $(\lambda y, \lambda x)$ are either both feasible or both infeasible. Moreover, two such vectors realize the same objective value. Accordingly, setting the value of y_ν to any positive value leaves the set of values of the feasible solutions unchanged. These considerations lead us to introduce the linear program $LP_{\nu, d, k}$ in continuous variables below:

$$LP_{\nu, d, k} := \begin{cases} \min & \sum_{i=0}^{\nu-1} \binom{\nu}{i} y_i + \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{\nu}{i} x_i \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_{i=k}^d \binom{\nu - k}{i - k} x_i - \sum_{i=k}^{\nu-1} \binom{\nu - k}{i - k} y_i = 1 \quad (c_k) \\ & \sum_{i=h}^d \binom{\nu - k}{i - h} x_i - \sum_{i=h}^{\nu - k + h} \binom{\nu - k}{i - h} y_i = 0 \quad (c_h), \quad h \in \{0, \dots, k - 1\} \\ & y_0, \dots, y_{\nu-1}, x_0, \dots, x_d \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

This program can be considered equivalent to $P_{\nu,d,k}$ in that we can deduce from a feasible solution of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$ with value v a feasible solution of $P_{\nu,d,k}$ — and thus, a regular (ν, d) -CPA of strength k — with value $2/(v+1)$, and vice-versa.

Proposition 4.1. *For all integers $k \geq 1$, $d \geq k$, $\nu > d$, if $\text{opt}(LP_{\nu,d,k})$ denotes the optimum value of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$, then $\delta(\nu, d, k) = 2/(\text{opt}(LP_{\nu,d,k}) + 1)$.*

Proof. We first show that $\text{opt}(LP_{\nu,d,k}) \leq 2/\delta(\nu, d, k) - 1$. Let $(N, D) \in \Delta(\nu, d, k)$ be a regular CPA with (y, x) as the representative vector. We define $(y', x') \in \mathbb{Q}^\nu \times \mathbb{Q}^{d+1}$ by:

$$\begin{cases} y'_i = y_i/y_\nu, & i \in \{0, \dots, \nu-1\} \\ x'_i = x_i/y_\nu, & i \in \{0, \dots, d\} \end{cases}$$

It follows from Proposition 2.4 that (y, x) is a feasible solution of $P_{\nu,d,k}$, with value $R^*(N, D)/R(N, D)$. By construction, (y', x') consequently is a feasible solution of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$, with value:

$$1/y_\nu \times \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\nu-1} \binom{\nu}{i} y_i + \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{\nu}{i} x_i \right) = \frac{2R(N, D) - R^*(N, D)}{R^*(N, D)} = 2R(N, D)/R^*(N, D) - 1$$

We then deduce from Proposition 2.3 that $\text{opt}(LP_{\nu,d,k}) \leq 2/\delta(\nu, d, k) - 1$.

We now conversely show that $\delta(\nu, d, k) \geq 2/(\text{opt}(LP_{\nu,d,k}) + 1)$. Let (y^*, x^*) be an optimal solution of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$. We can assume that (y^*, x^*) is an extremal point of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$ and thus, that the coordinates of y^* and x^* are rational numbers. So there is a positive integer R^* such that (R^*y^*, R^*x^*) has integer coordinates. Since (y^*, x^*) satisfies constraints (c_h) , $h \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$, (R^*y^*, R^*x^*) satisfies constraints (4) of $P_{\nu,d,k}$. We thus know from Proposition 2.4 that (R^*y, R^*x) is the representative vector of a regular (ν, d) -CPA (N, D) of strength k such that $R^*(N, D) = R^*$ and $2R(N, D) = \sum_{i=0}^{\nu-1} \binom{\nu}{i} R^*y_i^* + R^* + \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{\nu}{i} R^*x_i^*$. This CPA therefore satisfies:

$$R^*(N, D)/R(N, D) = 2/\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\nu-1} \binom{\nu}{i} y_i^* + 1 + \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{\nu}{i} x_i^* \right) = 2/(\text{opt}(LP_{\nu,d,k}) + 1)$$

We deduce that $\delta(\nu, d, k) \geq 2/(\text{opt}(LP_{\nu,d,k}) + 1)$. □

Thereafter, we represent bases of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$ by means of two sets $Y \subseteq \{0, \dots, \nu-1\}$ and $X \subseteq \{0, \dots, d\}$ of word weights that identify the set $\{y_i \mid i \in Y\} \cup \{x_i \mid i \in X\}$ of basic variables.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $k \geq 1$, $d \geq k$, $\nu > d$ be three integers, Y be a subset of $\{0, \dots, \nu-1\}$, and X be a subset of $\{0, \dots, d\}$. Then (Y, X) is a base of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$ if and only if $Y \cap X = \emptyset$ and $|Y \cup X| = k+1$.*

Proof. For $i \in \{0, \dots, d\}$, it is clear that two variables y_i and x_i cannot both be basic variables. We represent the constraint matrix of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$ by the $(k+1) \times (\nu+d+1)$ matrix M where:

- for $h \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, $M_{h,0}, \dots, M_{h,\nu+d}$ are the coefficients associated with the constraint (c_h) ;
- for $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu+d\}$, $M_{0,i}, \dots, M_{k,i}$ are the coefficients associated with the variable y_i if $i < \nu$, $x_{i-\nu}$ otherwise.

Accordingly, M is defined for $(h, i) \in \{0, \dots, k\} \times \{0, \dots, \nu+d\}$ by:

$$M_{h,i} = \begin{cases} -\binom{\nu-k}{i-h} & \text{if } i < \nu \\ \binom{\nu-k}{i-\nu-h} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

We show that this matrix has full rank. To that end, we consider $k+1$ reals $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k$ such that:

$$\sum_{h=0}^k \lambda_h M_{h,i} = 0, \quad i \in \{0, \dots, \nu+d\} \quad (19)$$

We observe that the left-hand side of equality (19) taken at ν satisfies:

$$\sum_{h=0}^k \lambda_h M_{h,\nu} = \sum_{h=0}^k \lambda_h \binom{\nu-k}{\nu-\nu-h} = \lambda_0$$

Thus, (19) is satisfied at rank ν if and only if $\lambda_0 = 0$. Now assume that $\lambda_0 = \dots = \lambda_{i-1} = 0$ for some positive integer $i \leq k$ (recall that $k \leq d$). The left-hand side of equality (19) taken at $\nu + i$ satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{h=0}^k \lambda_h M_{h,\nu+i} &= \sum_{h=i}^k \lambda_h M_{h,\nu+i} \quad (\text{by induction hypothesis}) \\ &= \sum_{h=i}^k \lambda_h \binom{\nu-k}{\nu+i-\nu-h} = \lambda_i \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (19) is satisfied at rank $\nu + i$ if and only if $\lambda_i = 0$. We conclude that the numbers $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k$ are all zero. \square

Now that we have characterized the bases of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$, we want to know the expression of its basic solutions. To this end, we present a technical lemma that will be used to establish this expression.

Lemma 4.3. *For all sets A, B of (real) numbers such that $|A| < |B|$, we have:*

$$h(A, B) := \sum_{i \in B} \frac{\prod_{a \in A} (i-a)}{\prod_{b \in B \setminus \{i\}} (i-b)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |B| = |A| + 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } |B| > |A| + 1 \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

Proof. We show that quantities $h(A, B)$ satisfy for all $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $|A| < |B|$ the recurrence relation and the initial conditions:

$$h(A, B) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A = \emptyset \wedge |B| = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } A = \emptyset \wedge |B| > 1 \\ f(A \setminus \{a\}, B \setminus \{b\}) + (b-a) \times f(A \setminus \{a\}, B), \quad a \in A, b \in B & \text{if } A \neq \emptyset \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

When $A = \emptyset$, we consider the polynomial:

$$P(X) := \sum_{i \in B} \prod_{b \in B \setminus \{i\}} \frac{X-b}{i-b}$$

$P(X)$ is the Lagrange interpolating polynomial for the nodes $(b, 1)$, $b \in B$. By construction, this polynomial has degree at most $|B| - 1$, and takes value 1 at each $b \in B$. We deduce that $P(X)$ is the constant polynomial 1. Observe that $h(\emptyset, B)$ is the coefficient of $X^{|B|-1}$ in $P(X)$. Since $P(X) = 1$, this coefficient is equal to 1 if $|B| = 1$ (iff $|B| - 1 = 0$), and 0 otherwise.

When $A \neq \emptyset$, we successively write:

$$\begin{aligned} h(A, B) &= \sum_{i \in B \setminus \{b\}} \frac{\prod_{a' \in A} (i-a')}{\prod_{b' \in B \setminus \{i\}} (i-b')} + \frac{\prod_{a' \in A} (b-a')}{\prod_{b' \in B \setminus \{b\}} (b-b')} \\ &= \sum_{i \in B \setminus \{b\}} \frac{(i-b+b-a) \times \prod_{a' \in A \setminus \{a\}} (i-a')}{\prod_{b' \in B \setminus \{i\}} (i-b')} + \frac{(b-a) \times \prod_{a' \in A \setminus \{a\}} (b-a')}{\prod_{b' \in B \setminus \{b\}} (b-b')} \\ &= \sum_{i \in B \setminus \{b\}} \frac{\prod_{a' \in A \setminus \{a\}} (i-a')}{\prod_{b' \in B \setminus \{b, i\}} (i-b')} + (b-a) \times \sum_{i \in B} \frac{\prod_{a' \in A \setminus \{a\}} (i-a')}{\prod_{b' \in B \setminus \{i\}} (i-b')} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, relation (21) holds. It follows from (21) that $h(A, B)$ can be expressed as the weighted sum of terms of the form $h(\emptyset, B')$ with $B' \subseteq B$ and $|B'| \in \{|B| - |A|, \dots, |B|\}$, including a single term with $|B'| = |B| - |A|$, having a coefficient of 1. This sum is thus 1 if $|B| - |A| = 1$ and 0 otherwise. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Let $k \geq 1$, $d \geq k$, $\nu > d$ be three integers, and (Y, X) be a base of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$. Then the basic variables of the corresponding basic solution are defined by (the other variables are all zero):*

$$\begin{cases} y_i &= - \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} / \binom{\nu}{i}, \quad i \in Y \\ x_i &= \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} / \binom{\nu}{i}, \quad i \in X \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Proof. We know from Proposition 4.2 that $Y \cap X = \emptyset$. To simplify the presentation of the proof, we define $Z := Y \cup X \cup \{\nu\}$, and consider the $(\nu + 1)$ -dimensional vector z defined by $z_i = 0$, $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\} \setminus Z$, and:

$$z_i = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } i = \nu \\ \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} / \binom{\nu}{i} & \text{if } i \in Y \cup X \end{cases}, \quad i \in Z \quad (23)$$

Our objective is to demonstrate that the proposed solution satisfies the constraints $(c_0), \dots, (c_k)$ of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$. Equivalently, we want to show that z satisfies equalities (7). For $h \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, we define the two sets $A_h := \{0, \dots, \nu\} \setminus (\{h, \dots, \nu - k + h\} \cup Z)$ and $B_h := Z \cap \{h, \dots, \nu - k + h\}$. We observe that the quantities $\sum_{i=h}^{\nu-k+h} \binom{\nu-k}{i-h} z_i$, $h \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ can be expressed as follows depending on these sets:

$$\sum_{i=h}^{\nu-k+h} \binom{\nu-k}{i-h} z_i = (-1)^{k-h+1} \frac{\prod_{i \in Z \setminus \{\nu\}} \binom{\nu-i}{i-h}}{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \binom{\nu-i}{i-h}} \times \sum_{i \in B_h} \frac{\prod_{a \in A_h} \binom{i-a}{i-a}}{\prod_{b \in B_h \setminus \{i\}} \binom{i-b}{i-b}}, \quad h \in \{0, \dots, k\} \quad (24)$$

A detailed proof of identity (24) can be found in section 7.4 of the appendix. Let $h \in \{0, \dots, k\}$. By Proposition 4.2, we know that $|Z| = |Y \cup X| + 1 = k + 2$. Hence, we deduce from the definition of the sets A_h and B_h that their cardinalities satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} |A_h| &= |\{0, \dots, \nu\}| - |\{h, \dots, \nu - k + h\}| - |Z| + |B_h| \\ &= (\nu + 1) - (\nu - k + 1) - (k + 2) + |B_h| = |B_h| - 2 \end{aligned}$$

So it follows from Lemma 4.3 that z does indeed satisfy equalities (7). \square

Note that Proposition 4.4 notably implies that $LP_{\nu,d,k}$ has no degenerate basic solution provided that $d < \nu$. We now use expression (22) of the basic solutions to characterize the feasible bases, i.e., the bases whose associated basic solution is feasible.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $k \geq 1$, $d \geq k$, $\nu > d$ be three integers, and (Y, X) be a base of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$. Then (Y, X) is feasible if and only if its elements taken by decreasing order alternately belong to X and Y .*

Proof. We know from Proposition 4.2 that $Y \cup X$ is a set of $k + 1$ totally ordered elements. Given $i \in Y \cup X$, we denote by $rg(i)$ the rank of i in $Y \cup X$. The base (Y, X) is feasible if and only if the coordinates of its associated basic solution (y, x) are all non-negative. Let $i \in X$. By (22), we have:

$$x_i = \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} / \binom{\nu}{i} = \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{|i-a|} / \binom{\nu}{i} \times (-1)^{k+1-rg(i)}$$

x_i consequently is non-negative if and only if $rg(i) \equiv k + 1 \pmod{2}$. We symmetrically deduce from (22) that, for all $i \in Y$, y_i is non-negative if and only if $rg(i) \not\equiv k + 1 \pmod{2}$. \square

In particular, Proposition 4.5 implies that the largest index in a feasible base (Y, X) belongs to X , and is therefore less than or equal to d . We now switch to *optimal* feasible bases.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $k \geq 1$, $d \geq k$, $\nu > d$ be three integers, and (Y, X) be a feasible base of $LP_{\nu,d,k}$. If (Y, X) is optimal, then $d \in X$ and $0 \in Y \cup X$.*

Proof. We denote by $v(Y, X)$ the objective value of the basic solution associated with (Y, X) . Since (Y, X) is feasible, the coordinates of this solution are all non-negative. So we deduce from (22) that $v(Y, X)$ can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} v(Y, X) &= \sum_{i \in Y} \binom{\nu}{i} \times \left| \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} / \binom{\nu}{i} \right| + \sum_{i \in X} \binom{\nu}{i} \times \left| \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} / \binom{\nu}{i} \right| \\ &= \sum_{i \in Y \cup X} \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{|i-a|} \end{aligned}$$

Let $i \in Y \cup X$. Equivalently, we can write:

$$v(Y, X) = \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{|i-a|} + \sum_{j \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-i}{|j-i|} \times \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i, j\}} \frac{\nu-a}{|j-a|}$$

Let i_* and i^* denote the smallest and greatest elements of $Y \cup X$, respectively. We observe that $v(Y, X)$, as a function of i , is strictly decreasing over $\{i^*, \dots, d\}$ and strictly increasing over $\{0, \dots, i_*\}$. Now, we know from Proposition 4.5 that the bases $(Y, X \setminus \{i^*\} \cup \{d\})$, and either $(Y, X \setminus \{i_*\} \cup \{0\})$ or $(Y \setminus \{i_*\} \cup \{0\}, X)$ (depending on $k \bmod 2$) of $LP_{\nu, d, k}$ are feasible provided that (Y, X) is. We conclude that (Y, X) cannot be optimal unless $i^* = d$ and $i_* = 0$. \square

We summarize in Theorem 4.7 what we have learned about optimal CPAs in this section. It is a straightforward consequence of Propositions 4.1 to 4.6.

Theorem 4.7. *Let $k \geq 1$, $d \geq k$, $\nu > d$ be three integers, and i_0, \dots, i_{k+1} be $k + 2$ integers verifying:*

$$i_0 = 0 < i_1 < \dots < i_{k-1} < i_k = d < i_{k+1} = \nu \quad (25)$$

Also let R^* be a positive integer verifying:

$$R^* \times \prod_{s \in \{0, \dots, k\} \setminus \{r\}} \frac{\nu - i_s}{|i_r - i_s|} / \binom{\nu}{i_r} \in \mathbb{N}, \quad r \in \{0, \dots, k\} \quad (26)$$

Then there exists a regular (ν, d) -CPA (N, D) of strength k in which, for $r \in \{0, \dots, k + 1\}$, the words of weight i_r occur $R^* \times \prod_{s \in \{0, \dots, k\} \setminus \{r\}} \frac{\nu - i_s}{|i_r - i_s|} / \binom{\nu}{i_r}$ times, in D if $r \equiv k \bmod 2$, in N otherwise (the words of any other weight are not involved).

Furthermore, $\delta(\nu, d, k)$ is the maximum value, over all sequences (i_0, \dots, i_{k+1}) of integers satisfying (25), taken by the expression:

$$2 / \left(1 + \sum_{r=0}^k \prod_{s=0}^{r-1} (\nu - i_s) / (i_r - i_s) \times \prod_{s=r+1}^k (\nu - i_s) / (i_s - i_r) \right) \quad (27)$$

5 Consequences on numbers $\gamma(q, p, k)$

We draw consequences of Theorems 3.1 and 4.7.

Corollary 5.1. *For all three integers $k \geq 1$, $p \geq k$ and $q \geq p$, we have $\gamma(q, p, k) = \delta(q, p, k)$.*

Proof. The case $p = q$ is obvious, since $\gamma(q, q, k) = \delta(q, q, k) = 1$. Thus assume $q > p$. We know from Proposition 2.1 that $\delta(q, p, k) \geq \gamma(q, p, k)$. Conversely, according to Theorem 4.7, there exists a regular CPA (N, D) that realizes $\delta(q, p, k)$, in which the rows of D are of weight either p or $\leq p - 2$, and the rows of N are of weight either q or $< p$. Theorem 3.1 then allows to derive from (N, D) a (q, p) -ARPA (Q, P) of strength k such that $R^*(Q, P) / R(Q, P) = R^*(N, D) / R(N, D) = \delta(q, p, k)$. So $\gamma(q, p, k) \geq \delta(q, p, k)$, completing the proof. \square

Corollary 5.2. *Let $k \geq 1$, $p \geq k$, $q > p$ be three integers such that $p = k$ or $k \in \{1, 2\}$. Then $\delta(q, p, k)$ — and thus, $\gamma(q, p, k)$ — is equal to:*

$$2 / (1 + \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{q}{i} \binom{q-i-1}{k-i}) \text{ if } p = k \quad (28)$$

$$p/q \text{ if } k = 1 \quad (29)$$

$$\lceil p/2 \rceil \lfloor p/2 \rfloor / ((q - \lceil p/2 \rceil) (q - \lfloor p/2 \rfloor)) \text{ if } k = 2 \quad (30)$$

Proof. According to Theorem 4.7, $\delta(q, p, k)$ coincides with the maximal value taken by expression (27) over all $k + 2$ integers $i_0, \dots, i_{k+1} \in \Sigma_q$ satisfying:

$$i_0 = 0 < i_1 < \dots < i_{k-1} < i_k = p < i_{k+1} = q \quad (25)$$

When $p = k$, i_0, \dots, i_k necessarily are $0, \dots, k$. In this case, (27) evaluates:

$$2 / \left(1 + \sum_{r=0}^k \prod_{s=0}^{r-1} \frac{q-s}{r-s} \times \prod_{s=r+1}^k \frac{q-s}{s-r} \right) = 2 / \left(1 + \sum_{r=0}^k \binom{q}{r} \times \binom{q-r-1}{k-r} \right)$$

Table 6: ARPAs realizing $\gamma(6, 2, 2)$ and $\gamma(5, 3, 3)$. These ARPAs are derived from regular CPAs of Theorem 4.7 using Algorithm 1. Colors grey and black identify the coefficients with value respectively 1 and 0 in the original CPAs.

$\gamma(6, 2, 2) = 1/25$							$\gamma(5, 3, 3) = 1/25$														
Q^0	Q^1	Q^2	Q^3	Q^4	Q^5	P^0	P^1	P^2	P^3	P^4	P^5	Q^0	Q^1	Q^2	Q^3	Q^4	P^0	P^1	P^2	P^3	P^4
0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	4
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	3	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	0	0	0	4	1	1	2	0	4	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	3	4	0
1	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	2	2	2	3	4
2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	4	2	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	3	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	3	0	0	3	3	3	3	3	5	1	1	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0
2	2	1	3	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	5	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	0	0	0
3	3	3	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	1	1	1	1	1
3	3	3	3	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	2	1	0	2	0	0
1	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4	1	0	0	3	2	2
2	2	1	1	4	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	4	1	0	0	3	0
3	3	3	2	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	4	2	2	1	3	1
4	4	4	4	4	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	4	2	2	1	3	1
1	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	2
2	2	1	1	1	5	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
3	3	3	2	2	5	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	4
4	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	4

(Alternatively, we can for this case consider Theorems 1.2 and 2.2 and Proposition 2.1.)

If $k = 1$, then $i_0 = 0$ and $i_1 = p$, and (27) evaluates:

$$2 / \left(1 + \frac{q-p}{p-0} + \frac{q-0}{p-0} \right) = 2 / (1 + 2q/p - p/p) = p/q$$

When $k = 2$, considering $i_0 = 0 < i_1 < i_2 = p$, $\delta(q, p, 2)$ is the maximum value taken over all $i_1 \in [p-1]$ by expression:

$$2 / \left(1 + \frac{(q-i_1)(q-p)}{(i_1-0)(p-0)} + \frac{(q-0)(q-p)}{(i_1-0)(p-i_1)} + \frac{(q-0)(q-i_1)}{(p-0)(p-i_1)} \right) = 2 / \left(1 + \frac{(q-i_1)(q-p)}{i_1 p} + \frac{q(q-p)}{i_1(p-i_1)} + \frac{q(q-i_1)}{p(p-i_1)} \right)$$

Upon simplification, this expression equals $i_1(p-i_1)/((q-i_1)(q-p+i_1))$, and is maximized at $i_1 \in \{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor, \lceil p/2 \rceil\}$. \square

Table 6 shows the ARPAs derived from Theorems 4.7 and 3.1 when $(q, k) \in \{(6, 2), (5, 3)\}$ and $p = k$. These ARPAs are equivalent to those given by the recursive construction proposed in [1], in that they can be interpreted as the same CPAs.

We further explain the arrays obtained for cases $k = 1$ and $k = 2$. When $k = 1$, we consider the basic solution (y^*, x^*) of $LP_{q,p,1}$ with non-zero coordinates:

$$\begin{cases} y_0^* &= 1/\binom{q}{0} \times (q-p)/(p-0) &= q/p - 1 \\ x_p^* &= 1/\binom{q}{p} \times (q-0)/(p-0) &= 1/\binom{q-1}{p-1} \end{cases}$$

To derive from this solution of $LP_{q,p,1}$ a CPA with the required characteristics, for $R^* = \binom{q-1}{p-1}$, we define the solution $(y, x) = (R^* y^*, R^* x^*)$ of $P_{q,p,1}$. This vector has non-zero coordinates:

$$y_0 = (q-p)/p \times \binom{q-1}{p-1} = \binom{q-1}{p} \quad x_p = 1/\binom{q-1}{p-1} \times \binom{q-1}{p-1} = 1 \quad y_q = \binom{q-1}{p-1}$$

Table 7: ARPAs realizing $\gamma(4, 2, 1)$, $\gamma(5, 3, 1)$ and $\gamma(5, 4, 1)$. These ARPAs are derived from regular CPAs of Theorem 4.7 using Algorithm 1. Colors grey and black identify the coefficients with value respectively 1 and 0 in the original CPAs.

$\gamma(4, 2, 1) = 3/6 = 1/2$	$\gamma(5, 3, 1) = 6/10 = 3/5$	$\gamma(5, 4, 1) = 4/5$
$\begin{array}{cccc cccc} Q^0 & Q^1 & Q^2 & Q^3 & P^0 & P^1 & P^2 & P^3 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccccc cccc} Q^0 & Q^1 & Q^2 & Q^3 & Q^4 & P^0 & P^1 & P^2 & P^3 & P^4 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccccc cccc} Q^0 & Q^1 & Q^2 & Q^3 & Q^4 & P^0 & P^1 & P^2 & P^3 & P^4 \end{array}$
$\begin{array}{cccc cccc} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 3 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccccc cccc} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 4 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 3 & 4 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccccc cccc} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 0 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 4 \\ 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \end{array}$

Since these coordinates are integral, (y, x) is the representative vector of a regular (q, p) -CPA (N, D) of strength 1 verifying $R^*(N, D)/R(N, D) = p/q = \delta(q, p, 1)$. We can then use the construction underlying Theorem 3.1 to transform this CPA into a (q, p) -ARPA (Q, P) of strength 1 such that $R^*(Q, P)/R(Q, P) = R^*(N, D)/R(N, D) = \delta(q, p, 1)$. Table 7 shows the ARPAs obtained when $(q, p) \in \{(4, 2), (5, 3), (5, 4)\}$.

When $k = 2$, the proof of Corollary 5.2 involves the basic solution (y^*, x^*) of $LP_{q,p,2}$ with non-zero coordinates:

$$\begin{cases} x_0^* = \frac{(q-p)(q-\lfloor p/2 \rfloor)}{(p-0)(\lfloor p/2 \rfloor - 0)} / \binom{q}{0} & = \frac{(q-p)(q-\lfloor p/2 \rfloor)}{p \lfloor p/2 \rfloor} \\ y_{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor}^* = \frac{(q-p)(q-0)}{(p-\lfloor p/2 \rfloor)(\lfloor p/2 \rfloor - 0)} / \binom{q}{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor} & = \frac{q-p}{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor} / \binom{q-1}{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor - 1} \\ x_p^* = \frac{(q-\lfloor p/2 \rfloor)(q-0)}{(p-\lfloor p/2 \rfloor)(p-0)} / \binom{q}{p} & = \frac{q-\lfloor p/2 \rfloor}{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor} / \binom{q-1}{p-1} \end{cases}$$

Let $R^* > 0$. According to the proof of Proposition 4.1, (R^*y^*, R^*, R^*x^*) is the representative vector of a regular (q, p) -CPA (N, D) of strength 2 such that $R^*(N, D)/R(N, D) = \delta(q, p, 2)$ if and only if R^* is a positive integer such that $R^* \times x_0^*$, $R^* \times y_{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor}^*$ and $R^* \times x_p^*$ are integral. For example, when $p \in \{3, 4\}$, the smallest such integer is $q - 2$, $(q - 3)(q - 1)$ or $(q - 3)(q - 1)/3$, depending on $q \bmod 3$. Thus, in the case where $p \in \{3, 4\}$, we obtain the following optimal solutions (y^*, x^*) and (y, x) of $LP_{q,p,2}$ and $P_{q,p,2}$, depending on p and $(q \bmod 3)$ (for both solutions, we specify only their non-zero coordinates):

case considered		solution (y^*, x^*) of $LP_{q,p,2}$			solution $(y, x) = (R^*y, R^*, R^*x)$ of $P_{q,p,2}$			
p	$q \bmod 3$	x_0^*	$y_{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor}^*$	x_p^*	x_0	$y_{\lfloor p/2 \rfloor}$	x_p	y_q
3	∇	$\frac{(q-3)(q-1)}{3}$	$\frac{q-3}{2}$	$\frac{1}{q-2}$	$\binom{q-1}{3}$	$\binom{q-2}{2}$	1	$q - 2$
4	2	$\frac{(q-4)(q-2)}{8}$	$\frac{q-4}{2(q-1)}$	$\frac{3}{(q-1)(q-3)}$	$3 \binom{q-1}{4}$	$\binom{q-3}{2}$	3	$(q - 3)(q - 1)$
	0, 1				$\binom{q-1}{4}$	$\binom{q-3}{2}/3$	1	$(q - 3)(q - 1)/3$

From (y, x) , we derive (q, p) -ARPAs (Q, P) of strength 2 verifying $R^*(Q, P)/R(Q, P) = \delta(q, p, 2)$ using Algorithm 1. Table 8 shows the ARPAs obtained when $(q, p) \in \{(4, 2), (5, 3), (5, 4)\}$.

6 Concluding remarks and further research

Corollary 5.1 implies that k CSP- q reduces to k CSP- p with an expansion of $\delta(q, p, k)$ on the differential approximation guarantee. It is worth noting that $\delta(\nu, d, k)$ also is a lower bound for the ratio of the maximum difference between two solution values over a Hamming ball of radius d to the instance

Table 8: ARPAs realizing $\gamma(4, 3, 2)$, $\gamma(5, 3, 2)$ and $\gamma(5, 4, 2)$. These ARPAs are derived from regular CPAs of Theorem 4.7 using Algorithm 1. Colors grey and black identify the coefficients with value respectively 1 and 0 in the original CPAs.

$\gamma(4, 3, 2) = 2/6 = 1/3$								$\gamma(5, 3, 2) = 3/18 = 1/6$										$\gamma(5, 4, 2) = 8/18 = 4/9$									
Q^0	Q^1	Q^2	Q^3	P^0	P^1	P^2	P^3	Q^0	Q^1	Q^2	Q^3	Q^4	P^0	P^1	P^2	P^3	P^4	Q^0	Q^1	Q^2	Q^3	Q^4	P^0	P^1	P^2	P^3	P^4
0	1	2	3	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	0
0	1	2	3	0	1	0	3	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	0	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	3	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	0	4
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	2	3	1	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	0	3	4
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	4	1	1	2	1	4	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	0	3	4
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	4	1	1	1	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4
1	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	4	2	2	2	3	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4
1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	4
1	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	3	4
1	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4
2	2	1	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	1	1	2	3	4
1	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	1	1	2	3	4
1	0	0	0	4	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0
2	2	1	1	4	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0

diameter $|\text{opt}(I) - \text{wor}(I)|$, on instances I of kCSP-q that consider ν variables (this result is yet to be published). Deriving from Theorem 4.7 the value of $\delta(\nu, d, k)$ for more triples (ν, d, k) would therefore provide more refined answers to two questions concerning the differential approximability of CSPs.

However, our ongoing research focuses on a deeper exploration of both ARPAs and CPAs. We are particularly interested in understanding their dynamics when the objective is to minimize the number of rows in the arrays (in which case regular designs may be suboptimal), or when considering arrays with no repeated rows (in which case CPAs of a given set of parameters may not exist). In the context of ARPAs, our focus extends to investigating the slight relaxation where any two words (u_1, \dots, u_ℓ) and $(u_1 + a, \dots, u_\ell + a)$ are considered equivalent (see [1]). Such designs yield a better expansion on the approximation guarantee when reducing kCSP-q to kCSP-p , if we restrict to instances of kCSP-q in which the constraints are stable under the shift by a same quantity of all the variables. Identifying general constructs for this relaxation of ARPAs seems to pose an intriguing challenge.

References

- [1] J.-F. CULUS ET S. TOULOUSE, *2 csps all are approximable within a constant differential factor*, in Combinatorial Optimization, J. Lee, G. Rinaldi et A. R. Mahjoub, eds., vol. 10856 de Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Cham, 2018, Springer International Publishing, p. 389–401.
- [2] Y. NESTEROV, *Semidefinite relaxation and nonconvex quadratic optimization*, Optimization Methods and Software, 9 (1998), p. 141–160.

7 Omitted proofs

7.1 Proof of identity (3) (Theorem 2.2)

First, we establish a technical lemma that is involved in the proof of identity (3).

Lemma 7.1. For three natural numbers $a, b, c \leq b$, we define:

$$S(a, b, c) := \sum_{r \geq 0} (-1)^r \binom{a}{r} \binom{b-r}{c-r} \quad (31)$$

For five natural numbers $a, b, c \leq b, d$ and $e \leq d$, we define:

$$U(a, b, c, d, e) := \sum_{r \geq 0} (-1)^r \binom{a}{r} \binom{b-r}{c-r} \binom{d-r}{e-r} \quad (32)$$

These numbers satisfy identities:

$$S(a, b, c) = \binom{b-a}{c}, \quad a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}, b \geq \max\{a, c\} \quad (33)$$

$$U(a, a-1, c, d, e) = (-1)^c \binom{d-a}{d-e}, \quad a, c, d, e \in \mathbb{N}, d \geq a > c \geq d-e \geq 0 \quad (34)$$

Proof. Let $a \in \mathbb{N}$. We show by induction on the integer b that for all natural numbers $b \geq a$ and $c \leq b$, identity (33) is satisfied at (a, b, c) .

When $b = a$, given $c \in \{0, \dots, a\}$, considering for $r \in \{0, \dots, c\}$ the equality $\binom{a}{r} \binom{a-r}{c-r} = \binom{a}{c} \binom{c}{r}$, we have: $S(a, a, c) = \binom{a}{c} \times \sum_{r=0}^c (-1)^r \binom{c}{r}$. We deduce that $S(a, a, c)$ equals 1 if $c = 0$ and 0 otherwise, just as the same as $\binom{0}{c}$. Identity (33) therefore is satisfied at (a, a, c) for all natural numbers $c \leq a$. Now suppose that it is satisfied at $(b-1, a, c)$ for all natural numbers $c \leq b-1$, where b is some integer greater than a . We consider $S(a, b, c)$ where $c \leq b$. If $c = 0$, then $S(a, b, 0) = (-1)^0 \binom{a}{0} \binom{b}{0} = 1$. If $c = b$, then $S(a, b, b) = \sum_{r=0}^a (-1)^r \binom{a}{r} \binom{b-r}{b-r}$, which equals 1 if $a = 0$ and 0 otherwise. In both cases, $S(a, b, c)$ coincides with $\binom{b-a}{c}$. Thus assume $c \in \{1, \dots, b-1\}$. In this case, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} S(a, b, c) &= \sum_{r \geq 0} (-1)^r \binom{a}{r} \left(\binom{b-1-r}{c-r} + \binom{b-1-r}{c-1-r} \right) && \text{by Pascal's rule} \\ &= S(a, b-1, c) + S(a, b-1, c-1) \\ &= \binom{b-a-1}{c} + \binom{b-a-1}{c-1} && \text{by induction hypothesis} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $S(a, b, c) = \binom{b-a}{c}$, what concludes the proof for (33). For (34), we establish the following relation by induction on the integer c :

$$U(a, a-1, c, d, e) = \sum_{i=0}^c (-1)^{c-i} \binom{a}{i} S(i, d, e), \quad a, c, d, e \in \mathbb{N}, a > c, d \geq e \quad (35)$$

When $c = 0$, for all natural numbers $a > 0, d$ and $e \leq d$, we have:

$$U(a, a-1, 0, d, e) = (-1)^0 \binom{a}{0} \binom{a-1-0}{0-0} \binom{d-0}{e-0} = \binom{d}{e} = (-1)^0 \binom{a}{0} S(0, d, e)$$

Relation (35) therefore is satisfied at rank $c = 0$. Now assume that it is at rank $c-1$ where c is some positive integer, and consider rank c . Given three natural numbers $a > c, d$ and $e \leq d$, we successively observe:

$$\begin{aligned} U(a, a-1, c, d, e) &= \sum_{r \geq 0} (-1)^r \binom{a}{r} \left(\binom{a-r}{c-r} - \binom{a-1-r}{c-1-r} \right) \binom{d-r}{e-r} && \text{by Pascal's rule} \\ &= \binom{a}{c} \times \sum_{r \geq 0} (-1)^r \binom{c}{r} \binom{d-r}{e-r} - U(a, a-1, c-1, d, e) \\ &= \binom{a}{c} S(c, d, e) - \sum_{i=0}^{c-1} (-1)^{c-1-i} \binom{a}{i} S(i, d, e) && \text{by induction hypothesis} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^c (-1)^{c-i} \binom{a}{i} S(i, d, e) \end{aligned}$$

Relation (35) therefore holds. Now consider four natural numbers a, c, d, e such that $d \geq a > c \geq d-e \geq 0$. We successively observe:

$$\begin{aligned} U(a, a-1, c, d, e) &= \sum_{i=0}^c (-1)^{c-i} \binom{a}{i} \times \binom{d-i}{e} && \text{from (35) and (33), as } d \geq \max\{c, e\} \\ &= (-1)^c \times S(a, d, d-e) && \text{by assumption } c \geq d-e \\ &= (-1)^c \times \binom{d-a}{d-e} && \text{by assumption } d \geq a \end{aligned}$$

So relation (34) holds. \square

Let $k > 0$ and $\nu > k$ be two integers. Then consider $\nu + k + 2$ natural numbers $a_i, i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and $b_i, i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$ that are supposed to satisfy:

$$\sum_{i=h}^{\nu-k+h} \binom{i}{h} \binom{\nu-i}{k-h} b_i = \sum_{i=h}^k \binom{i}{h} \binom{\nu-i}{k-h} a_i, \quad h \in \{0, \dots, k\} \quad (2)$$

Our task is to establish the following identity:

$$a_h - b_h = (-1)^{k-h} \sum_{i=k+1}^{\nu} \binom{i}{h} \binom{i-1-h}{k-h} b_i, \quad h \in \{0, \dots, k\} \quad (3)$$

Proof. Equality (2) of rank $h = k$ in particular indicates that $\sum_{i=k}^{\nu} \binom{i}{k} b_i = a_k$ or, equivalently, $a_k - b_k = \sum_{i=k+1}^{\nu} \binom{i}{k} b_i$. (3) therefore is satisfied at rank k . Now suppose that it is verified at ranks $h + 1, \dots, k$ for some $h \in \{0, \dots, k - 1\}$ and consider rank h . The equality (2) of rank h is verified if and only if:

$$\binom{\nu-h}{k-h} (b_h - a_h) = \sum_{\ell=h+1}^k \binom{\ell}{h} \binom{\nu-\ell}{k-h} (a_\ell - b_\ell) - \sum_{i=k+1}^{\nu-k+h} \binom{i}{h} \binom{\nu-i}{k-h} b_i$$

By induction hypothesis, for each $\ell \in \{h + 1, \dots, k\}$, we can substitute for $a_\ell - b_\ell$ the expression $(-1)^{k-\ell} \sum_{i=k+1}^{\nu} \binom{i}{\ell} \binom{i-1-\ell}{k-\ell} b_i$. Accordingly,

$$b_h - a_h = \sum_{i=k+1}^{\nu} b_i \times \left(\sum_{\ell=h+1}^k (-1)^{k-\ell} \binom{i}{\ell} \binom{i-1-\ell}{k-\ell} \times \binom{\ell}{h} \binom{\nu-\ell}{k-h} - \binom{i}{h} \binom{\nu-i}{k-h} \right) / \binom{\nu-h}{k-h} \quad (36)$$

Let $i \in \{k + 1, \dots, \nu\}$. Considering identity $\binom{i}{\ell} \binom{\ell}{h} = \binom{i}{h} \binom{i-h}{\ell-h}$, $\ell \in \{h + 1, \dots, k\}$, the coefficient of b_i in the right-hand side of (36) is equal to:

$$\binom{i}{h} / \binom{\nu-h}{k-h} \times \left(\sum_{\ell=h+1}^k (-1)^{k-\ell} \binom{i-h}{\ell-h} \binom{i-1-\ell}{k-\ell} \binom{\nu-\ell}{k-h} - \binom{\nu-i}{k-h} \right) \quad (37)$$

Let $C := \sum_{\ell=h+1}^k (-1)^{k-\ell} \binom{i-h}{\ell-h} \binom{i-1-\ell}{k-\ell} \binom{\nu-\ell}{k-h}$. We successively observe:

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \sum_{j=1}^{k-h} (-1)^{k-h-j} \binom{i-h}{j} \binom{i-1-h-j}{k-h-j} \binom{\nu-h-j}{k-h} \\ &= (-1)^{k-h} \times \left(U(i-h, i-h-1, k-h, \nu-h, \nu-k) - \binom{i-1-h}{k-h} \binom{\nu-h}{k-h} \right) \quad \text{according to (32)} \\ &= (-1)^{k-h} \times \left((-1)^{k-h} \binom{\nu-i}{k-h} - \binom{i-1-h}{k-h} \binom{\nu-h}{k-h} \right) \quad \text{by (34)} \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because the integers ν, h, i, k satisfy $\nu - h \geq i - h > k - h \geq 0$. We thus deduce from expression (37) that the coefficient of b_i in the right-hand side of (36) is equal to:

$$\binom{i}{h} / \binom{\nu-h}{k-h} \times \left(\binom{\nu-i}{k-h} - (-1)^{k-h} \binom{i-h-1}{k-h} \binom{\nu-h}{k-h} - \binom{\nu-i}{k-h} \right) = -(-1)^{k-h} \binom{i}{h} \binom{i-h-1}{k-h}$$

Hence, identity (3) is indeed satisfied at rank h , which concludes the proof. \square

7.2 Extended proof of Proposition 2.3

We consider a (ν, d) -CPA (N, D) of strength k . Given a permutation σ on $[\nu]$ and an array $M \in \{N, D\}$, we denote by $\sigma(M)$ the $R(N, D) \times \nu$ array over Σ_2 obtained from M by permuting the coordinates of each row of M according to σ . Namely, the r th row of $\sigma(M)$ is the word:

$$\sigma(M)_r := \left(M_r^{\sigma(1)}, \dots, M_r^{\sigma(\nu)} \right)$$

For $M \in \{N, D\}$, we define M' as the union of the arrays (viewed as collections of rows) $\sigma(M)$ over the set $S([\nu])$ of permutations on $[\nu]$. Formally:

$$(N', D') := \left(\cup_{\sigma \in S([\nu])} \sigma(N), \cup_{\sigma \in S([\nu])} \sigma(D) \right)$$

We must show that the pair (N', D') of arrays belongs to $\Delta(\nu, d, k)$, is regular, and satisfies:

$$R^*(N', D') / R(N', D') = R^*(N, D) / R(N, D)$$

Proof. Two rows M_r and $\sigma(M)_r$ having the same weight, D' clearly satisfies (Δ_D) . Furthermore, for each $M \in \{N, D\}$ and each $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$, the number of rows of weight i in M' is $\nu!$ times the number of rows of weight i in M . In particular, we have $R^*(N', D')/R(N', D') = R^*(N, D)/R(N, D)$. Also observe that each pair $(\sigma(N), \sigma(D))$, $\sigma \in S([\nu])$ of arrays satisfies (k_-) provided that (N, D) does; (N', D') therefore satisfies (k_-) .

It remains us to show that (N', D') is regular. Let $M \in \{N, D\}$, $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\}$, and $u \in \Sigma'_2$ be a word of weight i . The number of times u occurs as a row in M' corresponds to the number of pairs $(\sigma, r) \in S([\nu]) \times [R(N, D)]$ such that:

$$\left(M_r^{\sigma(1)}, \dots, M_r^{\sigma(\nu)} \right) = u \quad (38)$$

(38) requires that M_r has the same weight as u , and σ maps the non-zero coordinates of M_r to the ones of u (and the zero coordinates of M_r to the ones of u). We deduce that the number of times u occurs as a row in M' is $i! \times (\nu - i)!$ times the number of rows of weight i in M . (N', D') is indeed regular, since this number depends only on i . \square

7.3 Proof of the expressions given in Table 5 (Fact 3.4)

We must show that the expressions of $R(H, L, v)$ given in Table 5 are correct.

Proof. • Case C1.: $R(H, L, v)$ is expression (12) with a positive parameter λ . Substituting in (12) for each coefficient $\binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-1-i}$ the difference $\binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} - \binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-i}$, one gets:

$$\begin{aligned} R(H, L, v) &= \sum_{i=h}^{r-1} \binom{\nu-c-1-h-\lambda}{i-h} \times \left(\binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} - \binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-i} \right) / \binom{\nu-1-i}{r-i} \times z_i \\ &= f_z(h, \lambda, c+1) - f_z(h, \lambda-1, c+2) \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because z_r has the same coefficient in $f_z(h, \lambda-1, c+2)$ as in $f_z(h, \lambda, c+1)$. Namely, this coefficient is 0 if $c > \nu - r - 1 - \lambda$ (what is in particular satisfied at $c = \nu - r - 1$ provided that $\lambda > 0$), and $\binom{\nu-c-1-\lambda}{r-h}$ otherwise.

• Cases C2. and C5.: $R(H, L, v)$ is either (10) or (11). These expressions coincide with respectively $f_z(h+1, \lambda-1, c+1)$ and $f_z(h, \lambda-1, c+1)$, except for the coefficient they associate with z_r . However, since $c < \nu - r$, expression $\binom{\nu-c-1-r}{0} / \binom{\nu-1-r}{0}$ equals 1. The coefficient of z_r in $R(H, L, v)$ therefore is the same as in $f_z(h+1, \lambda-1, c+1)$ and $f_z(h, \lambda-1, c+1)$ for respectively the former and the latter case.

• Case C3.: $R(H, L, v)$ is the sum of (10) and (12) with a positive value for the parameter λ . For $i \in \{h, \dots, r-1\}$, we write:

$$\begin{aligned} &\binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda-1}{i-h-1} \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} + \binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda-1}{i-h} \binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-1-i} \\ &= \left(\binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda-1}{i-h-1} + \binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda-1}{i-h} \right) \times \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} - \binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda-1}{i-h} \binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-i} \\ &= \binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda}{i-h} \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} - \binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda-1}{i-h} \binom{\nu-c-2-i}{r-i} \end{aligned}$$

The coefficient of z_i in $R(H, L, v)$ therefore is the same as in $f_z(h, \lambda-1, c+1) - f_z(h, \lambda-1, c+2)$. Notice that the coefficient of z_r in $R(H, L, v)$ is $\binom{\nu-c-1-h-\lambda}{r-1-h}$.

If $c = \nu - r - 1$, $f_z(h, \lambda-1, c+2)$ and $f_z(h, \lambda-1, \nu-r+1)$ are both zero. Furthermore, the coefficient of z_r in $f_z(h, \lambda-1, \nu-r)$ and $R(H, L, v)$ is respectively $\binom{r-h-\lambda-1}{r-h}$ and $\binom{r-h-\lambda}{r-1-h}$, while these two binomial coefficients coincide provided that $\lambda > 0$.

If $c < \nu - r - 1$, the difference $\binom{\nu-c-h-\lambda}{r-h} - \binom{\nu-c-1-h-\lambda}{r-h}$ between the coefficients of z_r in $f_z(h, \lambda-1, c+1)$ and $f_z(h, \lambda-1, c+2)$ coincides with the coefficient of z_r in $R(H, L, v)$.

• Case C6.: $R(H, L, v)$ is the sum of (11) taken at $\lambda = 0$ and (13). Therefore, we have:

$$R(H, L, v) = \binom{\nu-c-h}{r-h} z_r + \sum_{i=h}^{r-1} \left(\binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} + \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-1-i} \right) \times \binom{\nu-c-h}{i-h} / \binom{\nu-1-i}{r-i} \times z_i = f_z(h, 0, c)$$

The last equality holds because the coefficient of z_r in $f_z(h, 0, c)$ is equal to $\binom{\nu-c-h}{r-h}$ provided that $c \leq \nu - r$.

• Case C4: $R(H, L, v)$ is the sum of (10) taken at $\lambda = 0$ and (13). When $c = \nu - r$, we observe that expressions (10)+(13) and (11)+(13) evaluate the same. Thus assume $c < \nu - r$. For $i \in \{h, \dots, r-1\}$, we write:

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{\nu-c-1-h}{i-1-h} \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} + \binom{\nu-c-h}{i-h} \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-1-i} \\ &= \binom{\nu-c-h}{i-h} \times \left(\binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-1-i} + \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} \right) - \binom{\nu-c-1-h}{i-h} \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} \\ &= \binom{\nu-c-h}{i-h} \binom{\nu-c-i}{r-i} - \binom{\nu-c-1-h}{i-h} \binom{\nu-c-1-i}{r-i} \end{aligned}$$

The coefficient of z_i in $R(H, L, v)$ therefore is the same as in $f_z(h, 0, c) - f_z(h, 0, c+1)$. Furthermore, provided that $c < \nu - r$, the difference $\binom{\nu-c-h}{r-h} - \binom{\nu-c-1-h}{r-h}$ between the coefficients of z_r in $f_z(h, 0, c)$ and $f_z(h, 0, c+1)$ is equal to the coefficient $\binom{\nu-c-1-h}{r-1-h}$ of z_r in (10) and thus, in $R(H, L, v)$. \square

7.4 Proof of identity (24) (Proposition 4.4)

We denote by (Y, X) a base of $LP_{\nu, d, k}$, by Z the set $Y \cup X \cup \{\nu\}$ of integers, and by z the $(\nu+1)$ -dimensional vector z defined by $z_i = 0$, $i \in \{0, \dots, \nu\} \setminus Z$, and:

$$z_i = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } i = \nu \\ \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} / \binom{\nu}{i} & \text{if } i \in Y \cup X \end{cases}, \quad i \in Z \quad (23)$$

Furthermore, for $h \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, A_h and B_h refer to the sets of integers respectively

$$(\{0, \dots, \nu\} \setminus \{h, \dots, \nu - k + h\}) \setminus Z \text{ and } Z \cap \{h, \dots, \nu - k + h\}.$$

Our goal is to establish identity:

$$\sum_{i=h}^{\nu-k+h} \binom{\nu-k}{i-h} z_i = (-1)^{k-h+1} \frac{\prod_{i \in Y \cup X} (\nu-i)}{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} (\nu-i)} \times \sum_{i \in B_h} \frac{\prod_{a \in A_h} (i-a)}{\prod_{b \in B_h \setminus \{i\}} (i-b)}, \quad h \in \{0, \dots, k\} \quad (24)$$

Proof. First assume $h = k$. By definition (23) of z , we have:

$$\sum_{i=k}^{\nu} \binom{\nu-k}{i-k} z_i = \sum_{i \in (Y \cup X) \cap \{k, \dots, \nu-1\}} \binom{\nu-k}{i-k} / \binom{\nu}{i} \times \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} - 1$$

For $i \in Z \cap \{k, \dots, \nu-1\}$, we observe:

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{\nu-k}{i-k} / \binom{\nu}{i} &= \frac{(\nu-k)!}{\nu!} \times \frac{i!}{(i-k)!} = \prod_{a=0}^{k-1} \frac{i-a}{\nu-a} \\ \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} &= \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} \times \frac{\nu-i}{\nu-i} = - \frac{\prod_{a \in (Y \cup X)} (\nu-a)}{\prod_{a \in Z \setminus \{i\}} (i-a)} \end{aligned}$$

We successively deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=k}^{\nu} \binom{\nu-k}{i-k} z_i &= - \frac{\prod_{a \in Y \cup X} (\nu-a)}{\prod_{a=0}^{k-1} (\nu-a)} \times \sum_{i \in (Y \cup X) \cap \{k, \dots, \nu-1\}} \frac{\prod_{a=0}^{k-1} (i-a)}{\prod_{a \in Z \setminus \{i\}} (i-a)} - 1 \\ &= - \frac{\prod_{a \in Y \cup X} (\nu-a)}{\prod_{a=0}^{k-1} (\nu-a)} \times \sum_{i \in B_k} \frac{\prod_{a=0}^{k-1} (i-a)}{\prod_{a \in Z \setminus \{i\}} (i-a)} \\ &= - \frac{\prod_{a \in Y \cup X} (\nu-a)}{\prod_{a=0}^{k-1} (\nu-a)} \times \sum_{i \in B_k} \frac{\prod_{a \in A_k} (i-a)}{\prod_{b \in B_k \setminus \{i\}} (i-a)} \end{aligned}$$

For the last equality, note that for $i \in B_k$, we have $\{0, \dots, k-1\} \setminus (Z \setminus \{i\}) = \{0, \dots, k-1\} \setminus Z = A_k$, and $(Z \setminus \{i\}) \setminus \{0, \dots, k-1\} = (Z \cap \{k, \dots, \nu\}) \setminus \{i\} = B_k \setminus \{i\}$.

For $h \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, we similarly observe:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=h}^{\nu-k+h} \binom{\nu-k}{i-h} z_i &= \sum_{i \in (Y \cup X) \cap \{h, \dots, \nu-k+h\}} \binom{\nu-k}{i-h} / \binom{\nu}{i} \times \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} \quad \text{by (23)} \\
&= \sum_{i \in B_h} \frac{(\nu-k)!}{\nu!} \times \frac{i!(\nu-i)!}{(i-h)!(\nu-k-i+h)!} \times \prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} \frac{\nu-a}{i-a} \times \frac{\nu-i}{\nu-i} \\
&= \frac{\prod_{a \in Y \cup X} (\nu-a)}{\prod_{a=0}^{k-1} (\nu-a)} \times \sum_{i \in B_h} \frac{\prod_{a=0}^{h-1} (i-a)}{\prod_{a \in (Y \cup X) \setminus \{i\}} (i-a)} \times \frac{\prod_{a=\nu-k+h+1}^{\nu} (a-i)}{\nu-i} \\
&= \frac{\prod_{a \in Y \cup X} (\nu-a)}{\prod_{a=0}^{k-1} (\nu-a)} \times (-1)^{k-h} \sum_{i \in B_h} \frac{\prod_{a \in \{0, \dots, \nu\} \setminus \{h, \dots, \nu-k+h\}} (i-a)}{\prod_{a \in Z \setminus \{i\}} (i-a)} \\
&= \frac{\prod_{a \in Y \cup X} (\nu-a)}{\prod_{a=0}^{k-1} (\nu-a)} \times (-1)^{k-h} \sum_{i \in B_h} \frac{\prod_{a \in A_h} (i-a)}{\prod_{a \in B_h \setminus \{i\}} (i-a)}
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds if we consider that for $i \in B_h$, the sets $(\{0, \dots, \nu\} \setminus \{h, \dots, \nu-k+h\}) \setminus (Z \setminus \{i\})$ and $(Z \setminus \{i\}) \setminus (\{0, \dots, \nu\} \setminus \{h, \dots, \nu-k+h\})$ of integers coincide with A_h and $B_h \setminus \{i\}$, respectively. \square