

Matrix periods and competition periods of Boolean Toeplitz matrices II

Gi-Sang Cheon^{a,b}, Bumtlee Kang^b, Suh-Ryung Kim^{b,c}, and Homoon Ryu^{b,c}

^a *Department of Mathematics, Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 16419, Rep. of Korea*

^b *Applied Algebra and Optimization Research Center, Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 16419, Rep. of Korea*

^c *Department of Mathematics Education, Seoul National University, Seoul 08826, Rep. of Korea*

gscheon@skku.edu, lokbt@hotmail.com, srkim@snu.ac.kr, and ryuhomun@naver.com

Abstract

This paper is a follow-up to the paper [Matrix periods and competition periods of Boolean Toeplitz matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 672:228–250, (2023)]. Given subsets S and T of $\{1, \dots, n-1\}$, an $n \times n$ Toeplitz matrix $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ is defined to have 1 as the (i, j) -entry if and only if $j-i \in S$ or $i-j \in T$. In the previous paper, we have shown that the matrix period and the competition period of Toeplitz matrices $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ satisfying the condition (\star) $\max S + \min T \leq n$ and $\min S + \max T \leq n$ are d^+/d and 1, respectively, where $d^+ = \gcd(s+t \mid s \in S, t \in T)$ and $d = \gcd(d, \min S)$. In this paper, we claim that even if (\star) is relaxed to the existence of elements $s \in S$ and $t \in T$ satisfying $s+t \leq n$ and $\gcd(s, t) = 1$, the same result holds. There are infinitely many Toeplitz matrices that do not satisfy (\star) but the relaxed condition. For example, for any positive integers k, n with $2k+1 \leq n$, it is easy to see that $T_n\langle k, n-k; k+1, n-k-1 \rangle$ does not satisfy (\star) but satisfies the relaxed condition. Furthermore, we show that the limit of the matrix sequence $\{A^m(A^T)^m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is $T_n\langle d^+, 2d^+, \dots, \lfloor n/d^+ \rfloor d^+ \rangle$.

1 Introduction

A *binary Boolean ring* $(\mathbb{B}, +, \cdot)$ is a set $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$ with two binary operations $+$ and \cdot on \mathbb{B} defined by

$$\begin{array}{c|cc} + & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{c|cc} \cdot & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{array}$$

Let \mathbb{B}_n be the set of $n \times n$ *Boolean matrices* with entries from a binary Boolean ring. Take $A \in \mathbb{B}_n$. The *matrix period* of A is the smallest positive integer p for which there is a positive integer M such that $A^m = A^{m+p}$ for any integer $m \geq M$. We note that the rows i and j of A^m have a common nonzero entry in some column if and only if the (i, j) -entry

of $A^m(A^T)^m$ is 1. Consider the matrix sequence $\{A^m(A^T)^m\}_{m=1}^\infty$. Since $|\mathbb{B}_n| = 2^{n^2}$, there is the smallest positive integer q such that

$$A^{q+i}(A^T)^{q+i} = A^{q+r+i}(A^T)^{q+r+i}$$

for some positive integer r and every nonnegative integer i . Then there is also the smallest positive integer p such that $A^q(A^T)^q = A^{q+p}(A^T)^{q+p}$. Those integers q and p are called the *competition index* and *competition period* of A , respectively, which was introduced by Cho and Kim [3]. Refer to [4, 5, 6, 7, 8] for further results on competition indices and competition periods of digraphs.

A $(0,1)$ -matrix $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{B}_n$ is called a *Boolean Toeplitz matrix* if $a_{ij} = a_{j-i} \in \mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$, *i.e.* A is of the Toeplitz form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & \cdots & a_{n-1} \\ a_{-1} & a_0 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & a_1 \\ a_{-n+1} & \cdots & a_{-1} & a_0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Accordingly, a Boolean Toeplitz matrix $A \in \mathbb{B}_n$ is determined by two nonempty subsets S and T , not necessarily disjoint, of $[n-1] := \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ so that $a_{ij} = 1$ if and only if $j-i \in S$ or $i-j \in T$. We assume that $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_{k_1}\}$ and $T = \{t_1, \dots, t_{k_2}\}$ where

$$1 \leq s_1 < \dots < s_{k_1} < n \quad \text{and} \quad 1 \leq t_1 < \dots < t_{k_2} < n.$$

Note that $S = \{j \mid a_j = 1\}$ and $T = \{i \mid a_{-i} = 1\}$. In this context, we denote a Boolean Toeplitz matrix A associated with index sets S and T by $T_n \langle s_1, \dots, s_{k_1}; t_1, \dots, t_{k_2} \rangle$ or simply by $T_n \langle S; T \rangle$. Accordingly,

$$s_1 = \min S, \quad s_{k_1} = \max S, \quad t_1 = \min T, \quad \text{and} \quad t_{k_2} = \max T.$$

Given two finite subsets S and T of \mathbb{Z} , we denote $\gcd(S+T)$ and $\gcd(S \cup T)$ by

$$\gcd(s+t \mid s \in S, t \in T) \quad \text{and} \quad \gcd(r \mid r \in S \cup T),$$

respectively.

Given a Boolean square matrix A , we call the digraph with adjacency matrix A *the digraph of A* and denote it by $D(A)$. In a digraph, if there is a directed walk W from a vertex u to a vertex v , then we write

$$u \xrightarrow{W} v,$$

and if W has length 1, then (u, v) is an arc and we simply write

$$u \rightarrow v.$$

Let $A = T_n \langle S; T \rangle$ be a Toeplitz matrix. Cheon et al. [1] gave a necessary condition for $D(A)$ having a directed walk of a specific length from a vertex to a vertex as follows.

Lemma 1.1 ([1]). *Let W be a (u, v) -directed walk of length m in $D(A)$. Then there are nonnegative integer sequences $(a_i)_{i=1}^{k_1}$ and $(b_i)_{i=1}^{k_2}$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a_i s_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} b_i t_i = v - u \quad \text{and} \quad m = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} b_i.$$

They also gave a sufficient condition for $D(A)$ having a directed walk from a certain vertex to a certain vertex in the following way. Yet, this sufficient condition possesses a rather strong condition $s_{k_1} + t_{k_2} \leq n$.

Lemma 1.2 ([1]). *Let $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a Toeplitz matrix with $s_{k_1} + t_{k_2} \leq n$. Suppose that there exist two integers $u, v \in [n]$ and some nonnegative integers a_s and b_t for $s \in S$ and $t \in T$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{s \in S} a_s s - \sum_{t \in T} b_t t = v - u.$$

Then there exists a directed walk from u to v in $D(A)$.

Subsequently, the authors [11] improved Lemma 1.2 by substituting the condition $s_{k_1} + t_{k_2} \leq n$ with

$$(\star) \quad s_1 + t_{k_2} \leq n \quad \text{and} \quad s_{k_1} + t_1 \leq n,$$

albeit only guaranteeing it for sufficiently long walks by Theorem 2.3. In [11], the periods of Toeplitz matrices satisfying (\star) are given. In this paper, we extend the Toeplitz matrix family whose periods can be computed from the family of Toeplitz matrices satisfying (\star) to the family of “walk-ensured” Toeplitz matrices as follows. In [11], it is shown that the family of Toeplitz matrices satisfying (\star) is contained in the family of walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices.

Theorem 1.3 ([11]). *Let $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a Toeplitz matrix. If (\star) holds, then A is a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix.*

We now present the definition of walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices.

Definition 1.4. A Toeplitz matrix $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ is *walk-ensured* if there exists a positive integer M such that whenever a pair of vertices u and v in $D(A)$ satisfies $v - u \equiv \ell s_1 \pmod{d^+}$ for an integer $\ell \geq M$ and $d^+ = \gcd(S + T)$, there exists a directed (u, v) -walk of length ℓ in $D(A)$.

For instance, a primitive Toeplitz matrix is obviously walk-ensured. In general, determining whether or not a Toeplitz matrix is walk-ensured is not easy.

In this paper, we provide periods of walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices (Theorem 4.1) and methods for calculating the period of a Toeplitz matrix satisfying specific conditions even if it is not necessarily walk-ensured (Theorems 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4).

Though we have found a way to determine periods of walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices, but actually identifying walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices is not easy as we mentioned above. In this context, we propose a method to find a parameter to be added to S or T that preserves walk-ensuredness when a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ is given (Theorem 5.4). By using this method, we present two large families of walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices (Theorems 5.1 and 5.2).

Sections 2 and 3 prepare the ground work to derive our main results given in Sections 4 and 5 stated above. Section 3 especially introduces contractions of digraphs derived from residue classes to gain a concise overview of digraph structure, and investigates the relationship between the digraph D of a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix and the contraction of D .

2 Preliminaries

The following sets were introduced in [11] to deal with directed walks in the digraph of a Toeplitz matrix. For convenience, we mean by a *directed walk of a matrix A* a directed walk of the digraph of A .

Definition 2.1 ([11]). For a Toeplitz matrix $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ and a positive integer i , we introduce the following sets:

- $P_i(A) = \{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_n \mid \ell \equiv is_1 \pmod{d^+}\}$ where $d^+ = \gcd(S + T)$;
- $Q_i(A) = \{\sum_{j=1}^{k_1} a_j s_j - \sum_{j=1}^{k_2} b_j t_j \in \mathcal{I}_n \mid a_j, b_j \in \mathbb{Z}_0^+, \sum_{j=1}^{k_1} a_j + \sum_{j=1}^{k_2} b_j = i\}$;
- $R_i(A)$ is the set of $\ell \in \mathcal{I}_n$ such that, for any vertices u and v with $v - u = \ell$, there exists a directed (u, v) -walk of length i in $D(A)$

where $\mathcal{I}_n = [-n + 1, n - 1]$.

For example, let $A = T_6\langle 2, 4; 5 \rangle$ and $i = 2$. Then $\gcd(S + T) = 1$ and so $P_2(A) = \{-5, -4, \dots, 4, 5\}$. One may check that $Q_2(A) = \{2 \times 2, 2 - 5, 4 - 5\} = \{-3, -1, 4\}$. There are no walks from 5 to 2 and from 3 to 2, so $R_2(A) = \{4\}$.

In general, by Lemma 1.1 and the following proposition, we see that

$$R_i(A) \subseteq Q_i(A) \subseteq P_i(A) \tag{1}$$

for any Toeplitz matrix A and a positive integer i .

Proposition 2.2 ([11]). *For nonempty sets $S, T \subseteq [n - 1]$, let $d = \gcd(S + T)$. Then for any integers a_i, b_j ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a_i s_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} b_i t_i \equiv \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a_i + \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} b_i \right) s_1 \pmod{d}.$$

The reverse direction of containment in (1) holds under certain conditions.

Theorem 2.3 ([11]). *For a Toeplitz matrix $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ with $\min S + \max T \leq n$ and $\max S + \min T \leq n$, there exists a positive integer M such that $P_i(A) = Q_i(A) = R_i(A)$ for any $i \geq M$.*

We generally refer to a Toeplitz matrix with such an M in the above theorem as a “walk-ensured” Toeplitz matrix.

Proposition 2.4. *A Toeplitz matrix $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ is walk-ensured if and only if there exists some positive integer M such that $P_i(A) = R_i(A)$ for every integer $i \geq M$.*

Proof. By the definitions of $P_i(A)$ and $R_i(A)$, A is walk-ensured if and only if there exists some positive integer M such that $P_i(A) \subseteq R_i(A)$ for any $i \geq M$. Yet, by (1), $P_i(A) \subseteq R_i(A)$ if and only if $P_i(A) = R_i(A)$ for any positive integer i . Therefore A is walk-ensured if and only if there exists some positive integer M such that $P_i(A) = R_i(A)$ for every integer $i \geq M$. \square

3 Contractions of digraphs derived from residue classes

For a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix A , $P_i(A) = R_i(A)$ by Proposition 2.4. Accordingly, the following lemma demonstrates that the directed walks between two vertices exist periodically in terms of their lengths.

Lemma 3.1 ([11]). *For nonempty sets $S, T \subseteq [n-1]$, let $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$, $d^+ = \gcd(S+T)$, and $d = \gcd(S \cup T)$. Then the following are true for any positive integer i :*

- (a) $P_i(A) = P_{i+d^+/d}(A)$;
- (b) $P_i(A), \dots, P_{i-1+d^+/d}(A)$ are mutually disjoint;
- (c) $P_i(A) = \{\ell \in \mathcal{I}_n \mid \ell - s_1 \in P_{i-1}(A) \text{ or } \ell + t_1 \in P_{i-1}(A)\}$ for any $i \geq 2$

where \mathcal{I}_n denotes the set of integers on the interval $[-n+1, n-1]$.

In the digraph of a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$, two vertices belonging to the same congruence classes of modulo $d = \gcd(S \cup T)$ are strongly connected as shown in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *Let D be the digraph of a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$, and $d = \gcd(S \cup T)$. If $u \equiv v \pmod{d}$, then there is a directed (u, v) -walk in D .*

Proof. Let $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$. There are some integers p and q such that $d = ps_1 + qd^+$ by Bézout’s identity where $d^+ = \gcd(S+T)$. By the hypothesis, $d \mid v - u$ and so there exists

some integer k such that $v - u = kd$. Since A is walk-ensured, there exists some positive integer m such that $P_i(A) = R_i(A)$ for any $i \geq m$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} v - u &= kd \\ &= pks_1 + qkd^+ \\ &\equiv pks_1 \pmod{d^+} \\ &\equiv pks_1 + md^+/ds_1 \pmod{d^+} \end{aligned}$$

and so $v - u \in P_{pk+md^+/d}(A)$ by Lemma 3.1(a). Since $pk + md^+/d \geq m$, $P_{pk+md^+/d}(A) = R_{pk+md^+/d}(A)$. Therefore $v - u \in R_{pk+md^+/d}(A)$ and so there is a directed (u, v) -walk. \square

Based on Proposition 3.2, we introduce a contraction of a digraph by using certain residue classes as follows.

Definition 3.3. For a digraph D of order n and a positive integer d , let D/\mathbb{Z}_d be the digraph obtained from D by contracting the vertices in the congruence class $\{v \in [n] \mid v \equiv i \pmod{d}\}$ of i to i for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, d$, that is, there is an arc (i, j) in D/\mathbb{Z}_d if and only if there is an arc (m, l) in the digraph of D such that $i \equiv m \pmod{d}$ and $j \equiv l \pmod{d}$.

For the digraph D of a Toeplitz matrix with a rather simple structure, D/\mathbb{Z}_d can be easily determined.

Proposition 3.4. *Given integers d, n, s with $d \nmid s$ and $s \leq n - d$, $D(T_n\langle s; \emptyset \rangle)/\mathbb{Z}_d = D(T_d\langle r; d - r \rangle)$ where r is the remainder when s is divided by d .*

Proof. Let r be an integer with $r \equiv s \pmod{d}$ and $0 < r < d$. By definition, there are arcs

$$(1, 1 + s), (2, 2 + s), \dots, (d, d + s) \tag{2}$$

in the digraph of $T_n\langle s; \emptyset \rangle$. Then, for any integer $1 \leq i \leq d - r$, there is an arc $(i, i + r)$ in D .

Now consider an integer i with $d - r + 1 \leq i \leq d$. Then $i + s \equiv i + r - d \pmod{d}$ and $1 \leq i + r - d \leq d$. Therefore there is an arc $(i, i + r - d)$ in D by (2). Therefore the digraph of $T_d\langle r; d - r \rangle$ is a subgraph of D .

Take any arc (i, j) in D . Then $j - i \equiv s \pmod{d}$. Since $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $1 \leq j \leq d$, $-d + 1 \leq j - i \leq d - 1$. Since $0 < r \leq d - 1$, $j - i = r$ or $r - d$. Therefore D is a subgraph of the digraph of $T_d\langle r; d - r \rangle$. Thus $D = T_d\langle r; d - r \rangle$. \square

Proposition 3.5. *Let D be the digraph of $T_n\langle s; n - s \rangle$. Then D is a disjoint union of directed cycles each of which has the vertex set $\{i, i + d, \dots, i + (n/\gcd(n, s) - 1)d\}$ for some $i \in [d]$.*

Proof. If $v \leq n - s$, then $N^+(v) = \{v + s\}$ and if $v > n - s$, then $N^+(v) = \{v - (n - s)\}$. Moreover, if $v > s$, then $N^-(v) = \{v - s\}$ and if $v \leq s$, then $N^-(v) = \{v + (n - s)\}$.

Therefore every vertex in D has indegree one and outdegree one. Thus D is a disjoint union of directed cycles.

Let $\gcd(n, s) = d$. If there is a (u, v) -arc, then $v - u \equiv s \pmod{n}$. Take a cycle $C := v_1 \rightarrow v_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v_k \rightarrow v_1$. Then $0 = (v_1 - v_k) + (v_k - v_{k-1}) + \cdots + (v_2 - v_1) \equiv ks \pmod{n}$. Therefore $k \mid n/\gcd(n, s)$. Moreover, if there is a (u, v) -arc, then $u \equiv v \pmod{d}$. Thus

$$\{v_1, \dots, v_k\} \subseteq \{i, i + d, \dots, i + (n/\gcd(n, s) - 1)d\}$$

for some $i \in [d]$. Hence

$$\{v_1, \dots, v_k\} = \{i, i + d, \dots, i + (n/\gcd(n, s) - 1)d\}$$

since $k \mid n/\gcd(n, s)$. □

The following is an immediate consequence of Propositions 3.4 and 3.5.

Corollary 3.6. *Given integers d, n, s with $d \nmid s$ and $s \leq n - d$, $D(T_n\langle s; \emptyset \rangle)/\mathbb{Z}_d$ is a disjoint union of directed cycles.*

In the rest of paper, we will investigate the effect on the lengths of directed walks between two vertices when adding parameter $s^* \in [n - 1]$ to either S or T in the Toeplitz matrix $T_n\langle S, T \rangle$. To this end, we provide a method to determine the existence of directed walks of a specific length between two vertices in $D(T_n\langle S \cup s^*; T \rangle)$ using a simpler digraph $D(T_n\langle s^*; \emptyset \rangle)/\mathbb{Z}_d$.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a Toeplitz matrix and $d = \gcd(S \cup T)$. If there is a directed (u, v) -walk with ℓ s^* -arcs in the digraph of $T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle$ for some $s^* \in [n - 1]$, then there is a directed (u', v') -walk W of length ℓ in $D(T_n\langle s^*; \emptyset \rangle)/\mathbb{Z}_d$ for some integers $u', v' \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ with $u' \equiv u \pmod{d}$ and $v' \equiv v \pmod{d}$.*

Proof. Let $D^* = T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle$ and $D_d = D(T_n\langle s^*; \emptyset \rangle)/\mathbb{Z}_d$. For any directed (u_0, v_0) -walk of length ℓ_0 with no s^* -arc in D^* , there are some nonnegative integers a_i and b_i such that

$$v_0 - u_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a_i s_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} b_i t_i.$$

Since $d \mid s_i$ and $d \mid t_j$ for any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k_1\}$ and $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k_2\}$, it follows that

$$d \mid v_0 - u_0.$$

Suppose that there is a directed (u, v) -walk W of length ℓ in $T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle$. If there is no s^* -arc in W , then $u \equiv v \pmod{d}$ and so there is a directed (u', u') -walk u' where u' is an integer in $\{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ with $u' \equiv u \pmod{d}$.

Now, suppose there is an s^* -arc in W . Then

$$W = u_1 \xrightarrow{W_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{s^*} u_2 \xrightarrow{W_2} v_2 \xrightarrow{s^*} \cdots \xrightarrow{s^*} u_{\ell+1} \xrightarrow{W_{\ell+1}} v_{\ell+1}$$

for some directed walks $W_1, \dots, W_{\ell+1}$ with no s^* -arcs and some positive integer ℓ . Since there is no s^* -arc in W_i , $v_i \equiv u_i \pmod{d}$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell+1\}$. Therefore there are vertices $w_1, \dots, w_{\ell+1}$ in D_d satisfying $w_i \equiv u_i \equiv v_i \pmod{d}$. For any integer $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$, since there is an s^* -arc (v_i, u_{i+1}) in D^* , there is an arc (w_i, w_{i+1}) in F . Therefore there is a directed $(w_1, w_{\ell+1})$ -walk of length ℓ in D_d . \square

Lemma 3.8. *Let $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix. If there is a directed (u', v') -walk of length ℓ in $D(T_n\langle s^*; \emptyset \rangle)/\mathbb{Z}_d$ for $d = \gcd(S \cup T)$ and some $s^* \in [n-1]$, then there is a directed (u, v) -walk with ℓ s^* -arcs in the digraph of $T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle$ for every vertices u and v with $u \equiv u' \pmod{d}$ and $v \equiv v' \pmod{d}$.*

Proof. Let $D^* = T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle$ and $D_d = D(T_n\langle s^*; \emptyset \rangle)/\mathbb{Z}_d$. Suppose there is a directed (u', v') -walk W' in D_d . Then W' has the following form

$$W' = u_0 \rightarrow u_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow u_\ell$$

for some nonnegative integer ℓ and some vertices u_0, u_1, \dots, u_ℓ with $u_0 = u'$ and $u_\ell = v'$. Take any $i \in \{0, \dots, \ell-1\}$. Since there is an arc (u_i, u_{i+1}) in D_d , there is an s^* -arc (v_i, w_{i+1}) in D^* with $v_i \equiv u_i \pmod{d'}$ and $w_{i+1} \equiv u_{i+1} \pmod{d'}$. By Proposition 3.2, there is a directed (u_i, v_i) -walk and (w_{i+1}, u_{i+1}) -walk in D^* . Thus there is a directed (u_i, u_{i+1}) -walk in D^* . Since i was arbitrarily chosen, there is a directed (u_0, u_ℓ) -walk in D^* . By Proposition 3.2, there are a directed (u, u_0) -walk and (u_ℓ, v) -walk and so there is a directed (u, v) -walk with ℓ s^* -arcs in D^* . \square

4 Periods of Toeplitz matrices

In this section, we provide the periods of Toeplitz matrices. Firstly, we compute the periods of walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices. Then we propose several methods to find the periods of Toeplitz matrices even if they are not walk-ensured.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix. Then the period of A is $\gcd(S+T)/\gcd(S \cup T)$. Furthermore, if $\gcd(S+T) \leq n$, then the graph sequence $\{C^m(D(A))\}_{m=1}^\infty$ converges.*

Proof. Take any two vertices u and v in $D(A)$. By Lemma 1.1 and Proposition 2.2, if there is a directed (u, v) -walk of length ℓ in $D(A)$, then $v - u \in P_\ell(A)$. Since A is walk-ensured, $P_\ell(A) = R_\ell(A)$ for a sufficiently large integer ℓ . Therefore, if $v - u \in P_\ell(A)$, then there is a directed (u, v) -walk of length ℓ . Thus

(S1) there is a directed (u, v) -walk of length ℓ if and only if $v - u \in P_\ell(A)$.

Since (u, v) -entry of A^ℓ is 1 if and only if there is a directed (u, v) -walk of length ℓ , it is true by the above observation that (u, v) -entry of A^ℓ is 1 if and only if $v - u \in P_\ell(A)$. Thus the period of A is equal to the period of the sequence $\{P_i(A)\}_{i=1}^\infty$. By

Lemma 3.1(a) and (b), $\{P_i(A)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ has period $\gcd(S+T)/\gcd(S\cup T)$. Hence the period of A is $\gcd(S+T)/\gcd(S\cup T)$.

To show the ‘‘furthermore’’ part, suppose that

$$\gcd(S+T) \leq n. \quad (3)$$

Take vertices $x, y \in [n]$. By the definition of ℓ -step competition graph, $xy \in C^\ell(D(A))$ if and only if there is a vertex z in $[n]$ such that there are a directed (x, z) -walk of length ℓ and a directed (y, z) -walk of length ℓ in $D(A)$. By (S1), $xy \in C^\ell(D(A))$ if and only if $z - x \in P_\ell(A)$ and $z - y \in P_\ell(A)$.

Suppose $x \equiv y \pmod{d^+}$ where $d^+ = \gcd(S+T)$. By the division algorithm, there exists some integer $w \in [d^+] \subseteq [n]$ such that $ls_1 + x \equiv w \pmod{d^+}$, which implies $w - x \in P_\ell(A)$. By (3), $w \in [d^+] \subseteq [n]$ and so w is a vertex in $D(A)$. Since $x \equiv y \pmod{d^+}$, $w - y \in P_\ell(A)$. Therefore we have shown that if $x \equiv y \pmod{d^+}$, then $xy \in C^\ell(D(A))$.

By the definition of $P_\ell(A)$, if $xy \in C^\ell(D(A))$, then $x \equiv y \pmod{d^+}$. Thus $xy \in C^\ell(D(A))$ if and only if $x \equiv y \pmod{d^+}$. Eventually, we have shown that, for a sufficiently large ℓ , the adjacency matrix of $C^\ell(D(A))$ is $T_n\langle d^+, 2d^+, \dots, \lfloor n/d^+ \rfloor d^+ \rangle$. Hence the graph sequence $\{C^m(D(A))\}_{m=1}^\infty$ converges to $T_n\langle d^+, 2d^+, \dots, \lfloor n/d^+ \rfloor d^+ \rangle$. \square

Given square matrices $A = (a_{ij})$ and $B = (b_{ij})$ of order n , we write $A \leq B$ if $a_{ij} \leq b_{ij}$ for every $i, j \in [n]$. We note that if $A \leq B$, then $D(A)$ is a subdigraph of $D(B)$ and so every directed walk in $D(A)$ is also a directed walk in $D(B)$. Therefore,

$$(S2) \quad \text{if } A \leq B, \text{ then } A^m \leq B^m.$$

Theorem 4.2. *Let $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix. Assume that S^* and T^* are subsets of $[n-1]$ such that $S \subseteq S^*$ and $T \subseteq T^*$. If $\gcd(S+T) = \gcd(S^*+T^*)$, then $T_n\langle S^*; T^* \rangle$ has period $\gcd(S+T)/\gcd(S\cup T)$.*

Proof. Let $B = T_n\langle S^*; T^* \rangle$. Since $\gcd(S^*+T^*) = \gcd(S+T)$,

$$P_i(A) = P_i(B)$$

for any positive integer i . By the definition of walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix, there exists some positive integer M such that $P_m(A) = R_m(A)$ for any integer $m \geq M$. By (S2), since $A \leq B$, for any positive integer m , $A^m \leq B^m$ holds.

Suppose $m \geq M$ and there is a directed (u, v) -walk of length m in $D(B)$. Then $v - u \in P_m(B)$ by Lemma 1.1 and Proposition 2.2. Since $P_m(A) = P_m(B)$ and $P_m(A) = R_m(A)$, there exists a directed (u, v) -walk of length m in $D(A)$. Thus, if there exists a directed (u, v) -walk of length m in $D(B)$, then there exists a directed (u, v) -walk of length m in $D(A)$. Therefore $A^m \geq B^m$ for every $m \geq M$. Thus $A^m = B^m$ for every $m \geq M$. Hence A and B have the same period. By Theorem 4.1, B has period $\gcd(S+T)/\gcd(S\cup T)$. \square

Theorem 4.3. *Let $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix and B be an $n \times n$ Boolean matrix with $A \leq B$. If $D(B - A)/\mathbb{Z}_d$ for $d = \gcd(S\cup T)$ has a source or a sink, then the periods of A and B are the same.*

Proof. Let p and q be the periods of A and B , respectively. Suppose that $D(B-A)/\mathbb{Z}_d$ has a sink u and W is a directed (u, u) -walk in $D(B)$ in $D(B)$. We claim that W consists of arcs in $D(A)$. Suppose, to the contrary, that xy be the first arc on W that is not in $D(A)$. Since there is a directed (u, x) -walk in $D(A)$, $d \mid x - u$. Let w be a vertex in $D(B-A)/\mathbb{Z}_d$ with $w \equiv y \pmod{d}$. Then, since $x \rightarrow y$ in $D(B-A)$, $u \rightarrow w$ in $D(B-A)/\mathbb{Z}_d$, which contradicts to the fact that u is a sink. Therefore every directed walk from u in $D(B)$ consists of arcs in $D(A)$. Thus the (u, u) -entry of A^m is greater than equal to the (u, u) -entry of B^m . By the hypothesis that $A \leq B$ and (S2), $A^m \leq B^m$ and so the (u, u) -entry of A^m and the (u, u) -entry of B^m are the same. Therefore

(S3) the period of $\{(A^m)_{uu}\}_{m=1}^\infty$ and the period of $\{(B^m)_{uu}\}_{m=1}^\infty$ are the same.

We note that $0 \in P_m(A)$ if and only if $m \equiv 0 \pmod{d^+/d}$ where $d^+ = \gcd(S+T)$ for any positive integer m . Since A is walk-ensured, there exists an integer M such that $P_m(A) = R_m(A)$ for any integer $m \geq M$. Therefore, for every integer $m \geq M$ with $m \equiv 0 \pmod{d^+/d}$, we have $(A^m)_{uu} = 1$. On the other hand, by Lemma 1.1 and Proposition 2.2, if $(A^m)_{uu} = 1$ for some positive integer m , then $0 \in P_m(A)$ and so $m \equiv 0 \pmod{d^+/d}$. Thus the period of $\{(A^m)_{uu}\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is d^+/d which equals p by Theorem 4.1. Since q is divided by the period of $\{(B^m)_{uu}\}_{m=1}^\infty$, $p \mid q$ by (S3). Therefore $q = kp$ for some positive integer k . Thus, for sufficiently large m and any nonnegative integer i ,

$$B^m = B^{m+ikp}. \quad (4)$$

By Theorem 2.3, there exists a (v, v) -directed walk of length ℓp in $D(A)$ for any vertex v and every integer ℓ with $\ell p \geq M$ for sufficiently large M . Then, since $A \leq B$, there exists a (v, v) -directed walk of length ℓp in $D(B)$ for any vertex v and every integer ℓ with $\ell p \geq M$. Therefore $B^j \leq B^{j+\ell p}$ for any positive integer j and every integer ℓ with $\ell p \geq M$. Then

$$B^m \leq B^{m+\ell p} \leq B^{m+2\ell p} \leq \dots \leq B^{m+k\ell p} = B^m,$$

by (4). Therefore $B^m = B^{m+\ell p}$ for sufficiently large m and any integer ℓ with $\ell p \geq M$. Thus B also has the period p . \square

Corollary 4.4. *Let $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix. Then, for any integer s^* satisfying*

$$n - \gcd(S \cup T) < s^* < n,$$

the periods of $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ and $T_n\langle S \cup \{s^\}; T \rangle$ are the same.*

Proof. Let $d = \gcd(S \cup T)$. Suppose that $n - \gcd(S \cup T) < s^* < n$. Then $n - s^* < d$. We note that there are exactly $n - s^*$ s^* -arcs in $D(T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle)$:

$$(1, 1 + s^*), (2, 2 + s^*), \dots, (n - s^*, n).$$

We also observe that

$$T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle - T_n\langle S; T \rangle = T_n\langle s^*; \emptyset \rangle.$$

Since $n - s^* < d$, there are at most $d - 1$ arcs in $D(T_n\langle s^*; \emptyset \rangle)/\mathbb{Z}_d$ by definition. Therefore there is a sink in $D(T_n\langle s^*; \emptyset \rangle)/\mathbb{Z}_d$. Hence $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ and $T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle$ have the same period by Theorem 4.3. \square

5 Walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices

In the previous section, we provided a way to compute the period of walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices. Yet, it is not easy to identify walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices. In this section, we present two sufficient conditions for Toeplitz matrices being walk-ensured which can be easily verified as true or false but significantly relaxes (\star) as follows.

Theorem 5.1. *For any integers s, t with $s + t \leq n$ and $\gcd(s, t) = 1$, if $s \in S \subseteq [n - 1]$ and $t \in T \subseteq [n - 1]$, then $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ is a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix.*

Theorem 5.2. *Let S and T be subsets of $[n - 1]$ for some positive integer n satisfying $s_1 + t_1 \leq n$, $\max\{s_{k_1}, t_{k_2}\} \leq n - \gcd(s_1, t_1)$, Then $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ is a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix.*

Example 5.3. For any positive integers k, n with $2k + 1 \leq n$, $T_n\langle k, n - k; k + 1, n - k - 1 \rangle$ is a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix by Theorem 5.1 (or Theorem 5.2), even if the condition (\star) is violated. In addition to this, any number of Toeplitz matrices that do not satisfy (\star) but can be identified as a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix by Theorem 5.1 or 5.2 can be constructed.

As a matter of fact, the above two theorems can be easily derived from the following theorem.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix with $d = \gcd(S \cup T)$. Then for any positive integer $s^* \leq n - d$, $T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle$ and $T_n\langle S; T \cup \{s^*\} \rangle$ are also walk-ensured Toeplitz matrices.*

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a Toeplitz matrix with elements $s \in S$ and $t \in T$ satisfying $s + t \leq n$ and $\gcd(s, t) = 1$. By Theorem 1.3, $T_n\langle s; t \rangle$ is a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix. Since $\gcd(s, t) = 1$, $d = \gcd(S^* \cup T^*) = 1$ for any $S^* \subseteq S$ and $T^* \subseteq T$ containing $s \in S^*$ and $t \in T^*$. Thus any element in $S \cup T$ is less than or equal to $n - d$. Therefore we may apply Theorem 5.4 repeatedly until we expand $T_n\langle s; t \rangle$ to $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ keeping the “walk-ensured” property. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.2. By Theorem 1.3, $T_n\langle s_1; t_1 \rangle$ is a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix. Since $\max(S \cup T) \leq n - \gcd(\min S, \min T)$, for any $i \in [k_1 - 1]$ and $j \in [k_2 - 1]$, $s_{i+1} \leq n - \gcd(s_1, \dots, s_i, t_1, \dots, t_j)$ and $t_{j+1} \leq n - \gcd(s_1, \dots, s_i, t_1, \dots, t_j)$. Thus we may apply Theorem 5.4 repeatedly to have a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$. \square

The rest of this section is devoted to proving Theorem 5.4. By the symmetry of $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$, it is sufficient to show $T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle$ is walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix for any positive integer $s^* \leq n - d$ to prove Theorem 5.4.

The following lemma provides a way of computing $\gcd(S^* \cup T)$ and $\gcd(S^* + T)$ in terms of $\gcd(S \cup T)$ and $\gcd(S + T)$ where $S^* = S \cup \{s^*\}$.

Lemma 5.5. *For nonempty subsets S and T of $[n]$ and $s^* \in [n]$, let $d = \gcd(S \cup T)$, $d^+ = \gcd(S + T)$, and $S^* = S \cup \{s^*\}$. Then*

$$\gcd(S^* \cup T) = \gcd(d, s^* - s) \quad \text{and} \quad \gcd(S^* + T) = \gcd(d^+, s^* - s)$$

for any $s \in S$.

Proof. We note that $S^* \cup T = (S \cup T) \cup \{s^*\}$. Then $\gcd(S^* \cup T) = \gcd(d, s^*)$. Since $d \mid s$, we have $\gcd(d, s^*) = \gcd(d, s^* - s)$. Therefore $\gcd(S^* \cup T) = \gcd(d, s^* - s)$.

Since $S^* + T = (S + T) \cup \{s^* + t \mid t \in T\}$, $\gcd(S^* + T) = \gcd(d^+, \gcd(s^* + t \mid t \in T))$. Since $d^+ \mid s + t$ for any $t \in T$,

$$\begin{aligned} \gcd(d^+, \gcd(s^* + t \mid t \in T)) &= \gcd(d^+, \gcd(s^* + t - (s + t) \mid t \in T)) \\ &= \gcd(d^+, s^* - s). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\gcd(S^* + T) = \gcd(d^+, s^* - s)$. □

Lemma 5.6. *Let $T_n\langle S; T \rangle$ be a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix. Assume that u and v are vertices in $D(T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T)$ satisfying $v - u \equiv cs^* + \alpha s_1 \pmod{d^+}$ for some integers $c \geq 0$ and α where $d^+ = \gcd(S + T)$, $s^* \leq n - d$ and $d \nmid s^*$ for $d = \gcd(S \cup T)$. Then there is a directed (u, v) -walk of length $\alpha + (d^+/d)m$ in $D(T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T)$ for some positive integer m .*

Proof. Let $A = T_n\langle S; T$ and $A^* = T_n\langle S \cup \{s^*\}; T \rangle$. Since $s^* \leq n - d$ and $d \nmid s^*$ by hypothesis, $D(T_n\langle s^*; \emptyset \rangle)/\mathbb{Z}_d$ is a disjoint union of directed cycles by Corollary 3.6. Then there exists a directed walk of length c starting from u . Therefore, by Lemma 3.8, there exists a directed walk W_0 with c s^* -arcs starting from u' in $D(A^*)$ where u' is a vertex with $u' \equiv u \pmod{d}$. Let v' be the terminus of W_0 . Since $u \equiv u' \pmod{d}$, there exists a directed (u, u') -walk W' in $D(A)$ by Proposition 3.2. Since $D(A)$ is a subdigraph of $D(A^*)$, W' is a directed (u, u') -walk in $D(A^*)$. Since $u \equiv u' \pmod{d}$ and $v' - u' \equiv cs^* \pmod{d}$, $v' - u \equiv cs^* \pmod{d}$. Since $p \equiv cs^* \pmod{d}$,

$$\begin{aligned} v - v' &= (v - u) - (v' - u) \\ &\equiv cs^* - cs^* \pmod{d} \\ &\equiv 0 \pmod{d}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore there exists a directed (v', v) -walk W'' in $D(A)$ by Proposition 3.2. Since $D(A)$ is a subdigraph of $D(A^*)$, W'' is a directed (v', v) -walk in $D(A^*)$. Thus

$$u \xrightarrow{W'} u' \xrightarrow{W_0} v' \xrightarrow{W''} v$$

is a directed (u, v) -walk with c s^* -arcs in $D(A^*)$. We denote this directed (u, v) -walk by W .

Let ℓ be the length of W , a_i be the number of s_i -arcs in W , b_j be the number of t_j -arcs in W for each $i \in [k_1]$ and $j \in [k_2]$. Then

$$v - u = cs^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a_i s_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} b_i t_i$$

and $\ell = \sum a_i + \sum b_i + c$. Since $v - u \equiv c(s^* - s_1) + \alpha s_1 \pmod{d^+}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} cs^* + \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a_i s_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} b_i t_i &= v - u \\ &= p \\ &\equiv cs^* + (\alpha - c)s_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a_i s_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} b_i t_i \equiv (\alpha - c)s_1 \pmod{d^+}$. By Proposition 2.2, $\sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a_i s_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} b_i t_i \equiv (\sum a_i + \sum b_i)s_1 \pmod{d^+}$. Since $\ell = \sum a_i + \sum b_i + c$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha - c)s_1 &\equiv \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} a_i s_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k_2} b_i t_i \pmod{d^+} \\ &\equiv (\ell - c)s_1 \pmod{d^+}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Lemma 3.1,

$$\ell - \alpha = (d^+/d)m \tag{5}$$

for some integer m . □

We will prove Theorem 5.4 by considering the following two cases: (i) $d \nmid s^*$; (ii) $d \mid s^*$.

5.1 The case $d \nmid s^*$

Let $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$, $S^* = S \cup \{s^*\}$, $A^* = T_n\langle S^*; T \rangle$, and $d^+ = \gcd(S + T)$. Since $d^* = \gcd(s^* - s_1, d^+)$ by Lemma 5.5, there exist some integers a and b such that $d^* = (s^* - s_1)a + d^+b$ by Bézout's Identity. Fix a positive integer α and take an element $p \in P_\alpha(A^*)$ and vertex v in $D(A^*)$ with $v - p \in V(D(A^*))$. Then $p \equiv \alpha s_1 \pmod{d^*}$ and so $p - \alpha s_1 = kd^*$ for some integer k . Therefore $p - \alpha s_1 = kd^* = k((s^* - s_1)a + d^+b)$ and so

$$p \equiv ka(s^* - s_1) + \alpha s_1 \pmod{d^+}.$$

By the division algorithm, there exist some integers c and q such that $ka = qd^+ + c$ and $0 \leq c < d^+$. Thus we have

$$p \equiv c(s^* - s_1) + \alpha s_1 \pmod{d^+}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 5.6,

(S4) there exists a directed walk $W_{p,v}$ of length $\alpha + (d^+/d)m_{p,v}$ for some integer $m_{p,v}$.

Let M be a positive integer such that $P_i(A) = R_i(A)$ for any integer $i \geq M$ and

$$M^* = \max\{\alpha + (d^+/d)m_{p,v} + M \mid \alpha \in [d^+/d], p \in P_\alpha(A^*), v \in V(D(A^*)) \text{ with } v-p \in V(D(A^*))\}.$$

Take any positive integer $i \geq M^*$ and $p \in P_i(A^*)$. By the division algorithm, there is a positive integer $\alpha \in [d^+/d]$ satisfying $i \equiv \alpha \pmod{d^+/d}$. Then, by Lemma 3.1(a), $P_i(A^*) = P_\alpha(A^*)$ and so $p \in P_\alpha(A^*)$.

To show $p \in R_i(A^*)$, it is sufficient to show that there is a directed (x, y) -walk of length i for any vertices x, y in $V(D(A^*))$ such that $y - x = p$. Let y, x be vertices in $V(D(A^*))$ such that $y - x = p$. By (S4), there is a directed (x, y) -walk $W_{p,x}$ of length $\alpha + (d^+/d)m_{p,x} =: \ell$ for some integer $m_{p,x}$. Since $i \equiv \alpha \pmod{d^+/d}$, we have $i \equiv \ell \pmod{d^+/d}$. Then, by Lemma 3.1(a), $P_0(A) = P_{i-\ell}(A)$ and so $0 \in P_{i-\ell}(A)$. By the definitions of M^* and ℓ , $M^* \geq \ell + M$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} i - \ell &\geq i - (M^* - M) \\ &\geq M^* - (M^* - M) \\ &= M. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the choice of M , $P_{i-\ell}(A) = R_{i-\ell}(A)$. Therefore $0 \in R_{i-\ell}(A)$ and so there exists a directed (y, y) -walk W^* of length $(i - \ell)$ (note that $y - y = 0$). Finally, we have a directed (x, y) -walk

$$x \xrightarrow{W_{p,x}} y \xrightarrow{W^*} y$$

of length i . Since x and y were selected arbitrarily among the pairs of vertices with difference p , we have $p \in R_i(A^*)$. Since p was arbitrarily chosen, $P_i(A^*) \subseteq R_i(A^*)$ and so $P_i(A^*) = R_i(A^*)$. Therefore $P_i(A^*) = R_i(A^*)$ for any integer $i \geq M^*$. Hence A^* is a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix.

5.2 The case $d \mid s^*$

Let s^* be a positive integer such that $s^* \leq n - d$. Let $A = T_n\langle S; T \rangle$, $S^* = S \cup \{s^*\}$, $A^* = T_n\langle S^*; T \rangle$, $d^+ = \gcd(S + T)$, and $d^* = \gcd(S^* + T)$. By Lemma 5.5,

$$d^* = \gcd(d^+, s^* - s_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \gcd(S^* \cup T) = \gcd(d, s^* - s_1)$$

where $s_1 = \min S$. By the definition of d , $d \mid s_1$ and so $d \mid s^* - s_1$. Then $\gcd(S^* \cup T) = \gcd(d, s^* - s_1) = d$. Since $d^* = \gcd(d^+, s^* - s_1)$, $d^* \mid d^+$. Moreover, by Bézout's identity, there are some integers a and b such that $d^* = ad^+ + b(s^* - s_1)$.

Since A is a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix, there is a positive integer M such that $P_i(A) = R_i(A)$ for every integer $i \geq M$. Let

$$M^* = d^+(M + d^+ + 1)$$

and ℓ be a positive integer with $\ell \geq M^*$. We will show that $P_\ell(A^*) \subseteq R_\ell(A^*)$.

To this end, take $p \in P_\ell(A^*)$. Then $p \equiv \ell s_1 \pmod{d^*}$ and so there is an integer i such that $\ell s_1 - p = id^*$. Thus $p \equiv \ell s_1 + id^* \pmod{d^+}$. By the division algorithm, there is an integer c satisfying

$$0 \leq c \leq d^+ - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad ib \equiv c \pmod{d^+}. \quad (6)$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} p &\equiv \ell s_1 + id^* \pmod{d^+} \\ &\equiv \ell s_1 + i(ad^+ + b(s^* - s_1)) \pmod{d^+} \\ &\equiv (\ell - c)s_1 + cs^* \pmod{d^+}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

To show $p \in R_\ell(A^*)$, take any vertices u and v satisfying $v - u = p$. For any $i \in \{0, \dots, c-1\}$, let v_i be the vertex in $[d]$ satisfying

$$v_i \equiv u + is^* \pmod{d}.$$

Since $v_i \in [d]$ and $s^* \leq n - d$, there exists a s^* -arc $(v_i, v_i + s^*)$ and we let

$$u_{i+1} = v_i + s^* \quad (8)$$

for any $i \in \{0, \dots, c-1\}$. In the following, we will take two steps to show that there is a directed (u, v) -walk of length ℓ . In the first step, we construct a directed (u_j, v_j) -walk of length at most $M + d^+$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, c-1$. In the second step, we will construct a directed (u_c, v_c) -walk of length $\ell - \ell'$ where ℓ' is the length of

$$u = u_0 \xrightarrow{W_0} v_0 \xrightarrow{s^*} u_1 \xrightarrow{W_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{s^*} \dots \xrightarrow{s^*} u_c.$$

Then there is a directed (u, v) -walk W of length ℓ :

$$u = u_0 \xrightarrow{W_0} v_0 \xrightarrow{s^*} u_1 \xrightarrow{W_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{s^*} \dots \xrightarrow{s^*} u_c \xrightarrow{W_c} v_c = v.$$

Step 1. Fix $j \in \{0, \dots, c-1\}$. We note that $v_0 \equiv u_0 \pmod{d}$ and, for $j \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_j - u_j &= v_j - (v_{j-1} + s^*) && \text{(by (8))} \\ &\equiv (u + js^*) - (u + (j-1)s^* + s^*) \pmod{d} \\ &\equiv 0 \pmod{d}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $v_j - u_j = \ell_j d$ for some integer ℓ_j . Since $d = \gcd(d^+, s_1)$, by Bézout's identity, there are some integers x and y such that $d = xd^+ + ys_1$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} v_j - u_j &= \ell_j(xd^+ + ys_1) \\ &\equiv \ell_j ys_1 \pmod{d^+}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $v_j - u_j \in P_{\ell_j y}(A)$. By the division algorithm, there exists an integer α_j satisfying

$$0 < \alpha_j \leq \frac{d^+}{d} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_j y - M \equiv \alpha_j \pmod{d^+/d}. \quad (9)$$

Then $P_{\ell_j y}(A) = P_{M+\alpha_j}(A)$ by Lemma 3.1(a) and so $v_j - u_j \in P_{M+\alpha_j}(A)$. Since $P_{M+\alpha_j}(A) = R_{M+\alpha_j}(A)$, there is a directed (u_j, v_j) -walk W_j of length $M + \alpha_j$.

Step 2. Since W_0, \dots, W_{c-1} are directed walks in A , we have

$$v_j - u_j \equiv (M + \alpha_j)s_1 \pmod{d^+} \quad (10)$$

by Lemma 1.1 and Proposition 2.2. Then

$$\begin{aligned} v_c - u_c &= (v_c - u_0) - ((u_c - v_{c-1}) + (v_{c-1} - u_{c-1}) + \cdots + (v_1 - u_1) + (u_1 - v_0) + (v_0 - u_0)) \\ &= (v - u) - \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} (u_{j+1} - v_j) - \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} (v_j - u_j) \quad (\because u_0 = u, v_c = v) \\ &= p - cs^* - \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} (v_j - u_j) \quad (\because v - u = p, (8)) \\ &\equiv p - cs^* - \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} (M + \alpha_j)s_1 \pmod{d^+} \quad (\text{by (10)}) \\ &\equiv (\ell - c)s_1 + cs^* - cs^* - \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} (M + \alpha_j)s_1 \pmod{d^+} \quad (\text{by (7)}) \\ &\equiv (\ell - c - \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} (M + \alpha_j))s_1 \pmod{d^+} \end{aligned}$$

and so $v_c - u_c \in P_{\ell - c - \ell^*}(A)$ where $\ell^* = \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} (M + \alpha_j)$. Since $\ell \geq M^* = d^+(M + d^+ + 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell - c - \ell^* &\geq d^+(M + d^+ + 1) - c - \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} (M + \alpha_j) \\ &\geq d^+(M + d^+ + 1) - c - \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} (M + d^+/d) \quad (\text{by (9)}) \\ &= d^+(M + d^+ + 1) - c(M + d^+/d + 1) \\ &\geq d^+(M + d^+ + 1) - (d^+ - 1)(M + d^+/d + 1) \quad (\text{by (6)}) \\ &\geq M + d^+ + 1 \\ &\geq M. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $P_{\ell-c-\ell^*}(A) = R_{\ell-c-\ell^*}(A)$ by the choice of M and so $v_c - u_c \in R_{\ell-c-\ell^*}(A)$. Thus there is a directed (u_c, v_c) -walk W_c of length $\ell - c - \ell^*$. Hence the existence of a directed (u, v) -walk W of length ℓ is verified. Since u and v were selected arbitrarily among the pairs of vertices with difference p , we have $p \in R_\ell(A^*)$. Since p was arbitrarily chosen, $P_\ell(A^*) \subseteq R_\ell(A^*)$. Therefore $P_i(A^*) = R_i(A^*)$ for any integer $i \geq M^*$. Hence A^* is a walk-ensured Toeplitz matrix.

6 Acknowledgement

This work was partially supported by Science Research Center Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) Grant funded by the Korean Government (MSIP)(NRF-2016R1A5A1008055). G.-S. Cheon was partially supported by the NRF-2019R1A2C1007518. Bumtue Kang was partially supported by the NRF-2021R1C1C2014187. S.-R. Kim and H. Ryu were partially supported by the Korea government (MSIP) (NRF-2017R1E1A1A03070489 and NRF-2022R1A2C1009648).

References

- [1] G.-S.Cheon, J.-H.Jung, B. Kang, and S.-R. Kim, *Exponents of primitive directed Toeplitz graphs, Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, Published online: 21 May 2020.
- [2] R.A. Brualdi, H.J. Ryser, *Combinatorial Matrix Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- [3] H. H. Cho and H. K. Kim. The competition index of a nearly reducible boolean matrix. *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.*, 50(6):2001-2011, 2013.
- [4] H. H. Cho and H. K. Kim. Competition indices of strongly connected digraphs. *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.*, 48(3):637-646, 2011.
- [5] H. K. Kim. Competition indices of tournaments. *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.*, 45(2):385-396, 2008.
- [6] H. K. Kim. Generalized competition index of a primitive digraph. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 433(1):72-79, 2010.
- [7] H. K. Kim. Characterization of irreducible boolean matrices with the largest generalized competition index. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 466:218-232, 2015.
- [8] H. K. Kim and S. G. Park. A bound of generalized competition index of a primitive digraph. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 436(1):86-98, 2012.
- [9] G. S. Cheon, B. Kang, S.-R. Kim, and H. Ryu. Row graphs of Toeplitz matrices. *under review*.

- [10] H. H. Cho, S.-R. Kim, and Y. Nam. The m -step competition graph of a digraph. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 105(1-3):115-127, 2000.
- [11] G. S. Cheon, B. Kang, S.-R. Kim, and H. Ryu. Matrix periods and competition periods of Boolean Toeplitz matrices. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 672(1):228-250, 2023.