

DISCONNECTED CLIQUES IN DERANGEMENT GRAPHS

SARA ANDERSON, W. RILEY CASPER, SAM FLEYSHMAN, AND MATT RATHBUN

ABSTRACT. We obtain a correspondence between pairs of $N \times N$ orthogonal Latin squares and pairs of disconnected maximal cliques in the derangement graph with N symbols. Motivated by methods in spectral clustering, we also obtain modular conditions on fixed point counts of certain permutation sums for the existence of collections of mutually disconnected maximal cliques. We use these modular obstructions to analyze the structure of maximal cliques in X_N for small values of N . We culminate in a short, elementary proof of the nonexistence of a solution to Euler’s 36 Officer Problem.

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1782, Euler published the first mathematical analysis of so-called Graeco-Latin squares, now known as orthogonal Latin squares, *Recherches sur une Nouvelle Espèce de Quarrés Magiques* [7]. He proved that orthogonal Latin squares of size $2n + 1$ and $4n$ always exist, and hypothesized (incorrectly) that orthogonal Latin squares of size $4n + 2$ were impossible. Intriguingly, it is only in sizes 2 and 6 that orthogonal Latin squares cannot exist. A rigorous proof that orthogonal Latin squares of size $N = 6$ do not exist was claimed by Clausen [9], but the manuscript is lost to history; the first verifiable proof of the insolvability of the problem is due to Tarry [18]. Tarry’s proof involved a case analysis of 17 families of Latin squares, and 9408 separate cases. Since then, several mathematicians and computer scientists have considered the problem. Pertaining to Euler’s original conjecture, in 1984, Stinson [17] provided a 3-page combinatorial (dis)proof. More recently, Chen and Wang in 2018 [21] used quasi-difference matrices, and Ward in 2019 [22] approached it using (n, k) -nets.

While these proofs are short and elegant, they all rely on considerable expertise in the field of combinatorial design theory. We propose a novel perspective on mutually orthogonal Latin squares (MOLS) by demonstrating an original correspondence between pairs of $N \times N$ orthogonal Latin squares and pairs of disconnected maximal cliques in the derangement graph of S_N . We draw connections between MOLS and network analysis, casting the problems in a new light and thereby admitting additional, powerful tools into the area. In particular, spectral analysis provides naturally motivated insight into the clique structure of the derangement graph. As the kernel of the Laplacian matrix is associated with the connected components of a graph, highly interconnected regions separate from other interconnected regions in the derangement graph should align well with the eigenspace of the lowest eigenvalues of its Laplacian. As the representation theory of S_N is well-understood, the eigendata of the derangement graph can be nicely leveraged in a way that, we hope, will be accessible to a wider range of mathematicians from different fields, bringing a wealth of knowledge about network analysis to bear on combinatorial questions about MOLS.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C69, 05C40, 20C30.

Key words and phrases. graph theory, spectral analysis, Cayley graphs, Latin squares, MOLS, representation theory, modular representation theory.

Beyond Euler’s original problem, constructions and investigations of sets of MOLS are ongoing areas of active research. Applications and interest include experimental design ([20], [15]), coding and quantum information theory ([3], [11]), and cryptography ([13], [19]). Investigations into both the existence and construction of sets of higher order orthogonal Latin squares continues to be quite active (e.g., [4], [6], [16]). As late as 2023, Egan and Wanless enumerated how many Latin squares (up to order 9) have orthogonal pairs (and how many they have) ([5]). While an example of a pair of orthogonal Latin squares of order 10 graced the cover of *Scientific American* in 1959 ([8]), it remains unknown what the largest number of MOLS is – there are at most 6, and Gill and Wanless recently made progress towards showing there are at most 3 ([10]). Still, despite considerable efforts ([14]), no set of three MOLS of order 10 have yet been found.

It is expected that the lens of this paper and the techniques used can be harnessed for further analysis of questions related to higher order MOLS. We explore some of the immediate consequences for small values of N , and indicate, throughout the paper, potential for more elaborate applications. The heart of the paper is Section 2, where we lay out the correspondence between disconnected maximal cliques in the derangement graph and orthogonal Latin squares, describe the spectral clustering motivation, and employ these ideas to provide modular obstructions to the existence of disconnected maximal cliques. In Section 3, we showcase some of the conclusions that can be drawn in the toy cases of $N = 3, 4$, and 5, to show the potential utility of the methods. Finally, in Section 4, we turn to Euler’s 36 Officer Problem, and provide a short, elementary proof with tools that will be more native to non-combinatorialists.

2. MAXIMAL CLIQUES IN THE DERANGEMENT GRAPH

The **derangement graph** X_N with symbols $\{1, \dots, N\}$ is the undirected graph whose vertices are the elements of S_N , where there is an edge between $\sigma, \tau \in S_N$ if and only if $\sigma\tau^{-1}$ is a derangement. In other words, X_N is the Cayley graph of the symmetric group S_N with edges defined by derangements.

A **clique** in a graph X is a collection of vertices whose induced subgraph is a complete subgraph of X . Often, this induced subgraph is itself also referred to as a clique. A clique is called a **maximal clique** if it is not a proper subgraph of any other clique in X . We say that two cliques C and \tilde{C} in X are **disconnected** if there are no edges in X between vertices in C and vertices in \tilde{C} . Often the members of a clique will be enumerated, in which case we call the clique an **ordered clique**.

The derangement graph has the property that all maximal cliques have the same size. This is equivalent to the fact that any partial Latin square can be completed, which was first proved by Hall in [12] and is a consequence of Hall’s Marriage Theorem. For convenience, we include an elementary proof here in our context of maximal cliques.

Proposition 2.1. *The maximal cliques in X_N all have N elements.*

Proof. Suppose that $C = \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^m \subseteq S_N$ is a maximal clique in X_N . Then $\sigma_i(1) \neq \sigma_j(1)$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, and therefore $m \leq N$.

Now suppose that $m < N$. For each $1 \leq k \leq N$, define

$$B_k = \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \{\sigma_1(k), \dots, \sigma_m(k)\}.$$

Then, for each k , B_k contains $N - m$ elements. Furthermore, each integer between 1 and N occurs in exactly $N - m$ of the sets B_1, \dots, B_N . Therefore, for every subset

$I \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$, the fibers of the function

$$\{(x, k) : k \in I, x \in B_k\} \rightarrow \bigcup_{j \in I} B_j, \quad (x, k) \mapsto x$$

have cardinality at most $N - m$. Hence $\bigcup_{i \in I} B_i$ has cardinality at least that of I .

Let $i_1 = 1$ and choose an element $b_1 \in B_{i_1}$. More generally, suppose i_1, \dots, i_k and b_1, \dots, b_k are defined. Then for $I_k = \{1, \dots, N\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$, the set $\bigcup_{i \in I_k} B_i$ has at least $N - k$ elements. Choose $b_{k+1} \in \bigcup_{i \in I_k} B_i$ and let $i_{k+1} \in I_k$ with $b_{k+1} \in B_{i_{k+1}}$. Then the function σ defined by

$$\sigma : i_k \mapsto b_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq N$$

is a permutation and by definition $\sigma(k) \neq \sigma_j(k)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $1 \leq k \leq N$. Hence $C \cup \{\sigma\}$ is a clique, contradicting the maximality of C . \square

2.1. Latin Squares and Disconnected Maximal Cliques. In this section, we provide a novel correspondence between pairs of orthogonal maximal cliques in X_N and pairs of orthogonal Latin squares. We start by reviewing the basic definition.

An $N \times N$ **Latin square** is an $N \times N$ matrix A with each number $1, \dots, N$ appearing exactly once in every row or column. Two Latin squares A and B are said to be **orthogonal** if the set of ordered pairs $\{(A_{ij}, B_{ij}) : 1 \leq i, j \leq N\}$ has exactly N^2 elements. In other words, when we overlay A and B , every ordered pair (a, b) with $1 \leq a, b \leq N$ shows up exactly one time. More generally, a collection of Latin squares is said to be **mutually orthogonal** if every pair in the collection is an orthogonal pair.

Given a pair (A, B) of orthogonal $N \times N$ Latin squares, we define a pair (C, \tilde{C}) of disconnected ordered maximal cliques in X_N by setting

$$C = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{C} = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_N\},$$

where here σ_j and ω_j are the permutations defined by

$$\sigma_j : A_{jk} \mapsto B_{jk}, \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_j : A_{kj} \mapsto B_{kj}, \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j, k \leq N.$$

Call this correspondence $\Gamma : (A, B) \mapsto (C, \tilde{C})$.

Remark 2.2. There is a different correspondence between Latin squares and ordered maximal cliques in X_N that might appear more obvious, where we associate each row with the permutation it defines. However, this correspondence does not send orthogonal pairs of Latin squares to disconnected cliques.

We will show that Γ is a bijection. To start, notice that differences between vertices in disconnected maximal cliques must each fix a unique point.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that $C = \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\tilde{C} = \{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are two disconnected maximal cliques. Then for any $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, the permutation $\sigma_i \omega_j^{-1}$ has exactly one fixed point.*

Proof. For each $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, let $B_{ij} = \{1 \leq a \leq N : \sigma_i \omega_j^{-1}(a) = a\}$. Since C and \tilde{C} are disconnected, B_{ij} is nonempty. It follows that $\bigcup_j B_{ij}$ has at least N elements and at most N elements. Moreover, if $j \neq k$, then $\omega_j \omega_k^{-1}$ is a derangement and consequently $B_{ij} \cap B_{ik} = \emptyset$. It follows that each B_{ij} is a singleton set. \square

For convenience, we will call a permutation that fixes exactly one element a **near-derangement**.

Using the previous lemma, we can establish a correspondence from ordered maximal cliques to orthogonal Latin squares inverting the previous correspondence.

Theorem 2.4. *The correspondence $\Gamma : (A, B) \mapsto (C, \tilde{C})$ is a bijection between pairs (A, B) of $N \times N$ orthogonal Latin squares and pairs of disconnected ordered maximal cliques.*

Proof. Suppose that $C = \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\tilde{C} = \{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are two disconnected ordered maximal cliques. For any pair of integers $1 \leq i, j \leq N$, let a_{ij} and b_{ij} be the unique integers in $\{1, \dots, N\}$ satisfying

$$\sigma_i(a_{ij}) = b_{ij} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_j(a_{ij}) = b_{ij}.$$

Define A and B to be the matrices with entries $A_{ij} = a_{ij}$ and $B_{ij} = b_{ij}$. Since $\sigma_i \sigma_k^{-1}$ is a derangement, $a_{ij} \neq a_{kj}$ for $i \neq k$. Similarly, $a_{ij} \neq a_{ik}$, $b_{ij} \neq b_{kj}$ and $b_{ij} \neq b_{ik}$. Therefore A and B are Latin squares. If $a_{ij} = a_{k\ell}$ and $b_{ij} = b_{k\ell}$, then $\sigma_i \sigma_k^{-1}$ fixes $b_{k\ell}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore A and B are orthogonal. It is easy to check that the function $\Omega : (C, \tilde{C}) \rightarrow (A, B)$ and Γ are inverses. Thus Γ is a bijection. \square

2.2. Eigendata and Spectral Clustering. One really appealing idea to come out of the relation between orthogonal Latin squares and disconnected maximal cliques is our ability to rephrase the problem of finding mutually orthogonal Latin squares as a graph clustering problem. Graph clustering is a standard problem in network analysis where we seek to partition the vertices of a graph into cliques or more general collections of vertices called **clusters** with the property that inside each cluster, the induced subgraph has more edges relative to the number of edges occurring between different clusters.

Recall that the **Laplacian** of a graph X is $L = D - A$, where D and A are the degree matrix and adjacency matrix of X , respectively. One very effective technique for graph clustering is **spectral clustering**, wherein the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of the Laplacian matrix are leveraged in order to find natural splits in the graph structure. The intuition for this comes from the characterization of the kernel of the Laplacian.

The indicator functions of the connected components of a disconnected graph form a basis of the kernel of its Laplacian. Therefore if C is a part of a graph X which is strongly interconnected, but weakly connected to the rest of the graph, the indicator function of C should look almost like an element of the kernel of the Laplacian. In particular, we expect its expansion in terms of the eigendata of the Laplacian to be concentrated in the eigenvalues close to zero. Alternatively, it should be close to orthogonal to the eigenvectors with largest eigenvalue.

The derangement graph is a Cayley graph with the property that the generators of the edge set (derangements) are closed under conjugation. In this case, the matrix entries of irreducible representations form eigenfunctions of the Laplacian L_N of X_N , viewed as an operator acting on $L^2(S_N)$. There are several sources of this fact about the spectral data of Cayley graphs for representations over \mathbb{C} [1, 2]. The result may be extended to other fields with a little bit of care and some additional assumptions about the characteristic of the field. For completeness, we include a proof of this fact over an arbitrary field now.

Theorem 2.5. *Let \mathbb{F} be a field and $\pi : S_N \rightarrow M_r(\mathbb{F})$ be a representation of S_N over \mathbb{F} , with π irreducible over the algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$. Then the matrix entries $\pi_{jk} : S_N \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ are all eigenfunctions of the Laplacian L_N of the derangement graph X_N of S_N . If $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) \nmid r$, the corresponding eigenvalue is independent of j, k and given by $\lambda_\pi = |\Delta_N| - \frac{1}{r} \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta_N} \text{tr}(\pi(\sigma))$, where here Δ_N is the set of derangements in S_N .*

Proof. Suppose that $\pi : S_N \rightarrow M_r(\mathbb{F})$ is an irreducible representation over $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$. The Laplacian of the derangement graph is $L_N = |\Delta_N|I - A_N$ for A_N the adjacency matrix

of X_N . The action of L_N on the function space $L^2(S_N)$ is given by

$$(L_N f)(\tau) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta_N} f(\sigma\tau).$$

Consider the matrix $Q = \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta_N} \pi(\sigma)$. The (j, k) -entry of π satisfies

$$(L_N \pi_{jk})(\tau) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta_N} \pi_{jk}(\sigma\tau) = (Q\pi(\tau))_{jk}.$$

Since Δ_N is closed under conjugation,

$$Q = \sum_{\sigma \in \omega^{-1}\Delta_N\omega} \pi(\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta_N} \pi(\omega\sigma\omega^{-1}) = \pi(\omega)Q\pi(\omega)^{-1}$$

for all $\omega \in S_N$. Consequently, the eigenspaces of Q are π -invariant submodules of $\overline{\mathbb{F}}^r$. Since π is irreducible, there are no nontrivial proper submodules. Thus any eigenspace must be the whole space, making $Q = cI$ for some $c \in \mathbb{F}$. Moreover, by taking the trace of Q , we find $c = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta} \text{tr}(\pi(\sigma))$. It follows that $L_N \pi_{jk} = \lambda_\pi \pi_{jk}$ with λ_π defined as in the statement of the theorem. \square

In the case of the derangement graph X_N , the largest real eigenvalue of the Laplacian is $\lambda_{std} = D_N \left(1 + \frac{1}{N-1}\right)$, where D_N is the number of derangements of S_N . The associated eigenspace is spanned by the matrix entries of the standard representation of S_N . This suggests that we should consider disconnected cliques through the lens of their projections onto the eigenspace of the standard representation.

Explicitly, we are motivated to consider the projection, P_{std} , of functions onto the eigenspace of the standard representation (non-normalized, as the normalization would involve dividing by N , and we will soon be considering finite fields):

$$P_{std} : L^2(S_N) \rightarrow L^2(S_N), \quad P_{std}(f) : \tau \mapsto \sum_{\sigma \in S_N} \sum_{1 \leq j, k \leq N} f(\sigma) (\pi_{std}(\sigma))_{jk} (\pi_{std}(\tau))_{jk}.$$

In practice, no information is lost by projecting onto the span of the eigenspace of the standard representation and the trivial representation, and this so-called **natural representation** will simplify the exposition considerably. We will thus work with the (non-reduced) natural representation, which associates each permutation with the corresponding permutation matrix in $M_N(\mathbb{F})$. In this case, the indicator function 1_B of a subset $B \subseteq S_N$ satisfies

$$P_{nat}(1_B) : \tau \mapsto \sum_{\sigma \in B} \text{tr}(\pi_{nat}(\sigma\tau^{-1})) = \sum_{\sigma \in B} n(\sigma; \tau),$$

where here

$$n(\sigma; \tau) = \# (\text{fixed points of } \sigma\tau^{-1}). \quad (1)$$

Remark 2.6. Here, spectral clustering led us to focus on the standard (or natural) representation. However, there is great potential utility in projections onto other eigenspaces for further explorations into mutually orthogonal Latin squares of higher order.

2.3. Modular Obstructions to Existence. A key insight appearing in [17] is that working over \mathbb{F}_2 leads to interesting obstructions to the existence of pairs of orthogonal Latin squares. This leads us to consider the *modular* natural representation of S_N over a finite field \mathbb{F} . When the characteristic of \mathbb{F} does not divide N , the dimension of the image $P_{nat}(L^2(S_N))$ of the projection P_{nat} is $(N-1)^2 + 1$. However, in the “modular setting” when the characteristic divides N , this dimension suddenly drops to $(N-1)^2 + 4 -$

$2N$. This leads to interesting linear dependencies between the projections of elements of $L^2(S_N)$ that do not exist in the non-modular setting. Note that as an abuse of notation, for any field \mathbb{F} we will still write $L^2(S)$ to represent \mathbb{F} -valued functions defined on a finite set S , even when \mathbb{F} has positive characteristic.

To start, suppose that we have a collection of r mutually disconnected maximal cliques C_1, \dots, C_r . Then we consider the span of the collection

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ P_{nat}(1_\sigma) : \sigma \in \bigcup_i C_i \right\}.$$

The sum over any maximal clique C_i of the projections is the constant function:

$$\sum_{\sigma \in C_i} P_{nat}(1_\sigma) : \tau \mapsto N.$$

If the characteristic of \mathbb{F} divides N , this gives us r linear dependencies coming from the r cliques, which we call the **clique dependencies**. The clique dependencies show the subspace spanned by \mathcal{B} will have dimension at most $r(N - 1)$ over \mathbb{F} .

However, in this modular setting, one can sometimes show that the dimension must be even smaller. This leads to **modular obstructions**, additional conditions on expressions calculating fixed points modulo this characteristic. This is the main utility of the following theorem.

Theorem 2.7. *Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field whose characteristic divides N . Suppose that $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^r$ is a collection of disconnected maximal cliques in X_N . Then the span of*

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ P_{nat}(1_\sigma) : \sigma \in \bigcup_{i=1}^r C_i \right\} \subseteq L^2(S_N)$$

has dimension at most $(N^2 - 4N + r + 5)/2$.

Before proving this theorem, it is worth noting the kinds of obstructions this provides when we are dealing with just a pair of disconnected maximal cliques C and \tilde{C} (i.e., when $r = 2$). In this case, for the obstruction to determine any kind of additional relation, we must have $2 \leq N \leq 6$. Then the number of elements of \mathcal{B} will be larger than the dimension of its span by more than one, leading to linear dependencies other than the clique dependencies. The number of expected non-clique dependencies is summarized in Table 1. Once N exceeds 6, the guaranteed number of dependencies falls to zero.

N	$ \mathcal{B} $	$\dim \text{span} \mathcal{B}$	$\#$ non-clique dep.
3	6	≤ 2	≥ 2
4	8	≤ 3	≥ 3
5	10	≤ 6	≥ 2
6	12	≤ 9	≥ 1

TABLE 1. Expected number of non-clique dependencies for a pair of disconnected maximal cliques. Each dependency induces a modular obstruction to the existence of the cliques.

Remark 2.8. When $r > 2$, we obtain interesting dependencies for higher values of N . For example, the corresponding modular obstructions may be a route to determining the existence of larger collections of mutually orthogonal Latin squares for $N = 10$, which is an open problem.

Each dependency corresponds to a function $f : \bigcup_i C_i \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$, which we may assume is not constant on any clique (since we excluded clique dependencies), satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{\sigma \in C_i} f(\sigma) P_{nat}(\mathbf{1}_\sigma) = 0 \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Evaluating this on $\tau \in S_N$ gives

$$\sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{\sigma \in C_i} f(\sigma) n(\sigma; \tau) = 0 \pmod{\text{char}(\mathbb{F})},$$

for $n(\sigma; \tau)$ defined in Equation (1). We will explore the role of each of these obstructions in more detail in the next sections.

In order to prove Theorem 2.7, we need to first show that the dimension of the image $P_{nat}(L^2(S_N))$ of the projection operator P_{nat} drops in the modular setting.

Theorem 2.9. *Suppose that $\text{char}(\mathbb{F})$ divides N . Then*

$$\dim P_{nat}(L^2(S_N)) = (N - 1)^2 - 2N + 4.$$

Proof. Let $V \subseteq M_N(\mathbb{F})$ be the subspace of matrices whose row and column sums are all the same. This is the \mathbb{F} -span of the set of permutation matrices $\{\pi_{nat}(\sigma) : \sigma \in S_N\}$. The \mathbb{F} -vector space $M_N(\mathbb{F})$ has a natural bilinear form $\langle A, B \rangle = \text{tr}(AB^T)$. The dimension of V is $(N - 1)^2 + 1$, so by the rank-nullity theorem, the dimension of the orthogonal complement V^\perp in $M_N(\mathbb{F})$ is $2N - 2$.

Now consider the set

$$W = \text{span}\{R_2 - R_1, \dots, R_N - R_1, C_2 - C_1, \dots, C_N - C_1\},$$

where R_j and C_j are the matrices with all 1's in row j or column j , respectively, and zeros elsewhere. The dimension of W is $2N - 3$ and $W \oplus \text{span}\{R_1 - C_1\} \subseteq V^\perp$ so $W \oplus \text{span}\{R_1 - C_1\} = V^\perp$. Since we are working in a field where $N = 0$, we also see that $W \subseteq V$, and since $R_1 - C_1 \notin V$, we must have $W = V \cap V^\perp$.

If $f \in L^2(S_N)$, then $P_{nat}(f)$ is the function

$$P_{nat}(f) : \tau \mapsto \sum_{\sigma \in S_N} f(\sigma) \text{tr}(\pi_{nat}(\sigma \tau^{-1})).$$

The bilinear form on $M_N(\mathbb{F})$ combined with π_{nat} induces a linear transformation

$$V \mapsto L^2(S_N), \quad A \mapsto f_A, \quad \text{where } f_A(\tau) := \text{tr}(A \pi_{nat}(\tau)^T).$$

In particular, the image of this transformation is $P_{nat}(L^2(S_N))$. Since the permutation matrices span V , the kernel is exactly $V \cap V^\perp = W$. Thus, it induces an \mathbb{F} -vector space isomorphism $V/W \cong P_{nat}(L^2(S_N))$. The statement of the theorem follows immediately. \square

Using this, we can now provide a simple proof of Theorem 2.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.7. Consider the vector space

$$V = \text{span} \left\{ (P_{nat}(1_\sigma), 1_{C_1}(\sigma), \dots, 1_{C_r}(\sigma)) : \sigma \in \bigcup_j C_j \right\} \subseteq P_{nat}(L^2(S_N)) \oplus \mathbb{F}^r.$$

Let $\vec{1} \in \mathbb{F}^r$ be the vector of all 1's. If $\sigma, \tilde{\sigma} \in \bigcup_j C_j$ belong to the same clique, then the inner product of $P_{nat}(1_\sigma)$ and $P_{nat}(1_{\tilde{\sigma}})$ is 0 in \mathbb{F} . Otherwise, if they belong to different cliques, the inner product is 1. Thus if $(f, \vec{v}) \in V$, then $(f, \vec{v} - \vec{1}) \in V^\perp$, so $\dim V^\perp \geq \dim V$. It follows by rank-nullity that

$$2 \dim(V) \leq \dim(V) + \dim(V^\perp) = \dim P_{nat}(L^2(S_N)) + r.$$

Thus

$$\dim(V) \leq (N^2 + r - 4N + 5)/2.$$

□

3. STRUCTURE OF MAXIMAL CLIQUES FOR SMALL N

While the maximal clique structures in the derangement graphs when $N \leq 5$ are digestible with software (or in some cases, by hand calculation), and the composition of orthogonal Latin squares is well-understood, these cases provide a fertile testing ground for the techniques presented here, and perhaps motivation for further analysis of less charted territory.

3.1. Maximal cliques in X_3 . The existence of two non-clique dependencies in $L^2(S_3)$ from Theorem 2.7 leads immediately to the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *If there exist disconnected maximal cliques C and \tilde{C} in X_3 , then there exist two distinct non-constant functions $f_1, f_2 : C \cup \tilde{C} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ each satisfying the property that for all $\tau \in S_3$,*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in C \cup \tilde{C}} f_i(\sigma) n(\sigma; \tau) = 0 \pmod{3}.$$

In this case, of course, we know that there *do* exist two disconnected maximal cliques, C and \tilde{C} , and that the six permutations comprising them account for the entirety of S_3 . We may, however, see conditions on the functions f_1 and f_2 that will prove useful later.

Observe that we may assume $e \in C$, so that all permutations in C have zero fixed points (mod 3), and those in \tilde{C} have one. Then, in particular, $\sum_{\sigma \in \tilde{C}} f_i(\sigma) = 0 \pmod{3}$.

By taking τ to be any near-derangement from \tilde{C} , we could conclude that $C\tau^{-1}$ consists of near-derangements, $\tilde{C}\tau^{-1}$ consists of the identity and two derangements, so that $\sum_{\sigma \in C} f_i(\sigma) = 0 \pmod{3}$, as well.

This is, naturally, the full extent of the information that can be gained; exactly two such functions do exist (up to constant multiples, and cyclic permutation), and this provides no obstruction to the existence of the two cliques.

3.2. Maximal cliques in X_4 . The analogue of Corollary 3.1 for X_4 is the following.

Corollary 3.2. *If there exist disconnected maximal cliques C and \tilde{C} in X_4 , then there exist three distinct proper subsets $R_1, R_2, R_3 \subset C \cup \tilde{C}$, each satisfying the property that for all $\tau \in S_4$,*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in R_i} n(\sigma; \tau) = 0 \pmod{2}.$$

Suppose that two disconnected maximal cliques C and \tilde{C} exist. In this case, we can glean a great deal of information about these subsets R_i , and, in turn, this imparts a complete picture of the maximal cliques in X_4 .

Let us isolate one of the R_i , and let $R = R_i \cap C$ and $\tilde{R} = R_i \cap \tilde{C}$. By translating, we can assume $e \in R$. Then, as in the case of X_3 , R consists of the identity and derangements, and \tilde{R} consists of near-derangements. By taking τ to be the identity and one of the near-derangements of \tilde{R} , respectively, we see that both

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \tilde{R}} n(\sigma; e) = 0 \pmod{2}, \text{ and} \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_{\sigma \in R} n(\sigma; e) = 0 \pmod{2}. \quad (3)$$

In particular, then, R and \tilde{R} each have two elements, and satisfy:

- $R = \{e, \delta\}$ for some derangement δ ,
- $\tilde{R} = \{\eta_1, \eta_2\}$ for some near-derangements η_1, η_2 ,
- $\eta_1\delta^{-1}$ and $\eta_2\delta^{-1}$ are near-derangements and $\eta_1\eta_2^{-1}$ is a derangement.

For $j = 1, 2$, let a_j and c_j be the fixed points of η_j and $\eta_j\delta^{-1}$, respectively. This implies that $\delta(b_j) = c_j$ and $\eta_j(b_j) = c_j$ for some b_j . Since δ is a derangement, it must be a 4-cycle or a 2,2-cycle. We consider the case where δ is a 4-cycle. Up to inversion, δ must take the form of $(a_1 \ x \ a_2 \ y)$ or $(a_1 \ a_2 \ x \ y)$ for some values $x, y \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \setminus \{a_1, a_2\}$. Now, consider $\tau_1 = (a_1 \ a_2)$ and $\tau_2 = (a_1 \ x)$. Observe that for $k = 1, 2$,

$$\sum_{\sigma \in R \cup \tilde{R}} n(\sigma; \tau_k) = n(\delta; \tau_k) \pmod{2}.$$

These τ restrict the form of δ in a contradictory manner, as neither form results in an even number of fixed points for both $\delta\tau_1^{-1}$ and $\delta\tau_2^{-1}$. We conclude that δ cannot be a 4-cycle.

Now, we note that same argument applies for each of R_1, R_2 , and R_3 . All three of the subsets cannot contain e and δ , or the resulting dependencies together with the clique dependency coming from \tilde{C} would imply that, for each $\tau \in S_4$, $n(e; \tau) + n(\delta; \tau) = 0 \pmod{2}$, which cannot be true. We conclude that C must contain at least two 2,2-cycles, from which it follows that C contains all three 2,2-cycles. That is, there is a unique maximal clique in X_4 containing the identity with a disconnected partner maximal clique.

Finally, the same argument shows that $\tilde{C}\eta_1^{-1} = C$, so that any maximal clique disconnected from C is simply a translation of C . Thus, we can verify the existence of precisely three mutually orthogonal Latin squares of order 4, all related by translations.

3.3. Maximal cliques in X_5 . In the case $N = 5$, an understanding of the structure of disconnected pairs of maximal cliques can be obtained directly by elementary means, as shown below. Even so, it is interesting to view it from the point of view of the modular obstructions in X_5 , which we examine a posteriori.

The analog of Corollary 3.1 for X_5 is the following.

Corollary 3.3. *If there exist disconnected maximal cliques C and \tilde{C} in X_5 , then there exist two distinct non-constant functions $f_1, f_2 : C \cup \tilde{C} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, 4\}$ each satisfying the property that for all $\tau \in S_5$,*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in C \cup \tilde{C}} f_i(\sigma)n(\sigma; \tau) = 0 \pmod{5}.$$

The first thing we can show is that a maximal clique with the identity for which there exists a disconnected maximal clique, cannot contain an odd derangement. We start with a weaker statement.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose C and \tilde{C} are two disconnected maximal cliques in X_5 and that C contains the identity. Then C does not contain four odd derangements.*

Proof. Suppose $C = \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^5$ with $\sigma_5 = e$ and $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_4$ all odd derangements. Then we may choose an enumeration a_1, \dots, a_5 of $\{1, \dots, 5\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_1 &= (a_5 a_1)(a_2 a_3 a_4), & \sigma_2 &= (a_5 a_2)(a_3 a_1 a_4), \\ \sigma_3 &= (a_5 a_3)(a_2 a_4 a_1), & \sigma_4 &= (a_5 a_4)(a_2 a_1 a_3).\end{aligned}$$

If ω is an element of \tilde{C} , then $\sigma_i \omega^{-1}$ must be a near-derangement for all i . The only elements of S_5 with this property are

$$(a_1 a_2)(a_3 a_4), \quad (a_1 a_3)(a_2 a_4), \quad \text{and} \quad (a_1 a_4)(a_2 a_3).$$

Since \tilde{C} must contain five elements, this is a contradiction. \square

Using this lemma, we can immediately prove that C cannot contain any odd derangements at all.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose C and \tilde{C} are two disconnected maximal cliques in X_5 and that C contains the identity. Then C does not contain any odd derangements.*

Proof. Suppose that C contains an odd derangement σ . If C contains fewer than 3 odd derangements, then we can replace C with $C\sigma^{-1}$ and \tilde{C} with $\tilde{C}\sigma^{-1}$, obtaining two new disconnected maximal cliques with $C\sigma^{-1}$ having at least three odd derangements. Thus without loss of generality, we may assume $C = \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^5$ with $\sigma_5 = e$ and $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3$ odd derangements. However, any maximal clique in X_5 containing the identity and at least three odd derangements, must contain four odd derangements. By the previous Lemma, this is a contradiction. \square

As a consequence, we see that if C and \tilde{C} are maximal cliques in X_5 and C contains the identity, then C must be made up of only the identity and four 5-cycles. Likewise, \tilde{C} must be a translation of a clique made up of only the identity and four 5-cycles. We show that these five cycles must be all powers of one-another.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that C is a maximal clique in X_5 which contains the identity. Then*

$$C = \{e, \sigma, \sigma^2, \sigma^3, \sigma^4\},$$

for some five-cycle σ .

Proof. By the previous lemma, we know that $C = \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^5$ for some permutations with $\sigma_5 = e$ and $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_4$ all 5-cycles. As $C\tau^{-1}$ is always a maximal clique,

$$\sum_{i=1}^5 n(\sigma_i; \tau) = 5$$

for all $\tau \in S_5$. Taking $\tau = \sigma_1^{-1}$, this implies that there exists j with

$$n(\sigma_j; \sigma_1^{-1}) \geq 2.$$

This means we have

$$\sigma_1 = (a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 a_5), \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_j = (a_3 a_2 a_1 x y),$$

for some enumeration a_1, \dots, a_5 of $\{1, \dots, 5\}$ and $x, y \in \{x_4, x_5\}$ distinct. Since $\sigma_1 \sigma_j^{-1}$ is a derangement, we must have $x = a_5$ and $y = a_4$. Therefore $\sigma_j = \sigma_1^{-1}$. The only other 5 cycles that are derangements of σ_1 and σ_1^{-1} are

$$\sigma_1^2 = (a_1 a_3 a_5 a_2 a_4), \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_1^3 = (a_1 a_4 a_2 a_5 a_3).$$

This completes the proof. \square

To summarize, C must consist of powers of a 5-cycle $C = \{\sigma^k\}_{k=0}^4$. Likewise, \tilde{C} is a translation of the powers of a 5-cycle. In particular, we can take $C = \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^5$ and $\tilde{C} = \{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^5$ be two disconnected maximal cliques with $\sigma_i = \sigma^i$, and $\omega_i = \omega^i \alpha$ for some 5-cycles σ and ω and some permutation α .

The essence of Corollary 3.3 is that the four-dimensional \mathbb{F}_5 -subspace of $L^2(C \cup \tilde{C})$,

$$V = \text{span}\{f_1, f_2, 1_C, 1_{\tilde{C}}\},$$

has the property that $n(\cdot; \tau) \in V^\perp$ for all $\tau \in S_5$. This implies that the space

$$U = \text{span}\{n(\cdot; \tau) : \tau \in S_5\}$$

is at most six-dimensional. The structure of the cliques above implies that the space

$$U|_C := \{f|_C : f \in U\}$$

defined by restricting functions on $C \cup \tilde{C}$ to C is three dimensional. In particular, if $\sigma = (a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 a_5)$, then U_C is spanned by the restrictions of $n(\cdot; \omega_1) = 1_C$, $n(\cdot; (a_1 a_2))$, and $n(\cdot; (a_1 a_2 a_3))$. Similarly, $\dim U|_{\tilde{C}} = 3$, and it follows that $\dim U \leq 6$. In this way, the structure of the cliques that we discovered makes the modular obstruction obvious for $N = 5$.

4. EULER'S 36 OFFICER PROBLEM

4.1. Maximal cliques in X_6 . Throughout this section, we will assume that two disconnected maximal cliques C and \tilde{C} exist, resulting ultimately in a contradiction. We start by exploring the modular obstruction(s) in this situation.

Corollary 4.1. *If there exist disconnected maximal cliques C and \tilde{C} in X_6 , then there exists a proper subset $R \subseteq C \cup \tilde{C}$, satisfying the property that for all $\tau \in S_6$,*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in R} n(\sigma; \tau) = 0 \pmod{2}.$$

Also there exists a non-constant function $f : C \cup \tilde{C} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ satisfying the property that for all $\tau \in S_6$,

$$\sum_{\sigma \in C \cup \tilde{C}} f(\sigma) n(\sigma; \tau) = 0 \pmod{3}.$$

Isolating the first condition, note that the set R must satisfy the property that $R \cap C$ and $R \cap \tilde{C}$ are both nonempty and even, so the number of elements in R is 4, 6, 8, 10 or 12. Also if R satisfies the corollary, so do the sets

$$(C \cap R') \cup (\tilde{C} \cap R), \quad (C \cap R) \cup (\tilde{C} \cap R'), \quad \text{and} \quad (C \cup \tilde{C}) \cap R'.$$

Thus without loss of generality, R can be taken to have exactly two elements in C and two elements in \tilde{C} . By translating, we can also assume $e \in R \cap C$. To summarize, for $N = 6$ there must exist a set R with the following list of properties

- $R = \{e, \delta, \eta_1, \eta_2\}$ for some derangement δ and near-derangements η_1 and η_2 ,

- $\eta_1\delta^{-1}$ and $\eta_2\delta^{-1}$ are near-derangements and $\eta_1\eta_2^{-1}$ is a derangement, and
- $\sum_{\sigma \in R} n(\sigma; \tau)$ is even for all $\tau \in S_6$.

4.2. Nonexistence proof. To prove that no 6×6 pair of orthogonal Latin squares exists, we will prove that no subset $R \subseteq S_6$ with the properties outlined in the previous section can exist.

For each j , let a_j and c_j be the fixed points of η_j and $\eta_j\delta^{-1}$, respectively. This in particular implies $\delta(b_j) = c_j$ and $\eta_j(b_j) = c_j$ for some b_j .

Lemma 4.2. *Assume R exists. Then the sets D , E , F , G , and H defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \{a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2\}, \\ E &= \{\delta(a_1), \delta^{-1}(a_1), \eta_2(a_1), \eta_2^{-1}(a_1), a_1, a_2\}, \\ F &= \{\delta(a_2), \delta^{-1}(a_2), \eta_1(a_2), \eta_1^{-1}(a_2), a_1, a_2\}, \\ G &= \{c_1, c_2, b_2, \delta(c_2), \eta_1(b_2), \delta(\eta_1^{-1}(c_2))\}, \\ H &= \{c_1, c_2, b_1, \delta(c_1), \eta_2(b_1), \delta(\eta_2^{-1}(c_1))\}, \end{aligned}$$

are all sets with six elements.

Proof. Assume E has fewer than six elements. Then we can choose $1 \leq q \leq 6$ with $q \notin E$. Consequently, the transposition $\tau = (a_1 \ q)$ makes $\delta\tau$ and $\eta_1\tau$ both derangements. Moreover $\eta_2\tau$ still has a single fixed point, so $\sum_{\sigma \in R} n(\sigma; \tau) = 5$, which is a contradiction.

Next, consider the set

$$R\delta^{-1} = \{e, \tilde{\delta} := \delta^{-1}, \tilde{\eta}_1 = \eta_1\delta^{-1}, \tilde{\eta}_2 = \eta_2\delta^{-1}\}.$$

The associated fixed-point data is

$$\tilde{a}_1 = c_1, \tilde{a}_2 = c_2, \tilde{b}_1 = \delta(a_1), \tilde{c}_1 = a_1, \tilde{b}_2 = \delta(a_2), \tilde{c}_2 = a_2.$$

The same arguments as above implies that $\{\tilde{a}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \tilde{\delta}(\tilde{a}_2), \tilde{\delta}^{-1}(\tilde{a}_2), \tilde{\eta}_1(\tilde{a}_2), \tilde{\eta}_1^{-1}(\tilde{a}_2)\}$ is a set of 6 distinct elements, i.e., all six elements of G are distinct. A similar argument proves that F and H each have six elements.

Finally, using the distinctness of the elements of E , F , G , and H , together with the facts that δ is a derangement shows that D has six elements as well. \square

We leverage this lemma now to restrict the possible cycle types of δ . For example, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.3. *Assume R exists. Then the derangement δ cannot be a 2, 2, 2-cycle.*

Proof. Since E has six elements, $\delta^2(\delta^{-1}(a_1)) = \delta(a_1) \neq \delta^{-1}(a_1)$. Therefore δ doesn't have order 2. \square

As a more complicated observation, we have the following.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume R exists. Then*

$$b_1 \in \{\delta(a_2), \eta_1(a_2)\}, \quad \text{and} \quad c_1 \in \{\delta^{-1}(a_2), \eta_1^{-1}(a_2)\},$$

and also

$$b_2 \in \{\delta(a_1), \eta_2(a_1)\}, \quad \text{and} \quad c_2 \in \{\delta^{-1}(a_1), \eta_2^{-1}(a_1)\}.$$

Proof. From Lemma 4.2, $b_2 \in E$, and $b_2 \neq a_1$ and $b_2 \neq a_2$. Moreover, if $b_2 = \delta^{-1}(a_1)$ or $b_2 = \eta_2^{-1}(a_1)$, then $c_2 = a_1$. This is a contradiction, so $b_2 \in \{\delta(a_1), \eta_2(a_1)\}$. The other statements are obtained in a similar fashion. \square

The previous lemma can be further refined.

Lemma 4.5. *We must have $\delta(a_1) = b_2$ or $\delta(c_2) = a_1$; and $\delta(a_2) = b_1$ or $\delta(c_1) = a_2$.*

Proof. Suppose $\delta(a_1) \neq b_2$ and $\delta(c_2) \neq a_1$. Then, by Lemma 4.4, $\eta_2(a_1) = b_2$ and $\eta_2(c_2) = a_1$. It follows that η_2 has the three cycle $(c_2 \ a_1 \ b_2)$, forcing η_2 to be a 2, 3-cycle. Now, by Lemma 4.2, $b_1 \neq c_2$ and $c_1 \neq b_2$, so $\{b_1, c_1\} = \{\delta(a_1), \delta^{-1}(a_1)\}$. But this means, η_2 maps b_1 to c_1 , which contradicts $\eta_2\eta_1^{-1}$ being a derangement. The other statement of the lemma is proved similarly. \square

Remark 4.6. This lemma allows us to make a final simplifying assumption. By swapping η_1 and η_2 , and possibly by inverting all the elements of R , we may assume $b_2 = \delta(a_1)$.

Corollary 4.7. *Assume R exists. Then the derangement δ cannot be a 2, 4-cycle.*

Proof. Suppose δ is a 2, 4-cycle. Since E and F have six elements, both a_1 and a_2 must belong to the 4-cycle of δ . Consequently

$$\delta = (\delta^{-1}(a_1) \ a_1 \ \delta(a_1) \ a_2)(\eta_2^{-1}(a_1) \ \eta_2(a_1)).$$

However, since $b_2 = \delta(a_1)$ (see Remark 4.6), this would imply $a_2 = c_2$, which is a contradiction. \square

Now we remark that if R has the properties described above, so too do $R\delta^{-1}$, $R\eta_1^{-1}$, and $R\eta_2^{-1}$. We leverage these facts now.

Corollary 4.8. *Assume R exists. Then the derangement δ cannot be a 3, 3-cycle.*

Proof. In Remark 4.6, we assumed $b_2 = \delta(a_1)$, so that $c_2 = \delta^2(a_1)$, and $\delta(c_2) = \delta^3(a_1)$ are all different in G . Therefore a_1 is not part of a 3-cycle in δ , so δ cannot be a 3, 3-cycle. \square

Corollary 4.9. *Assume R exists. Then the derangement δ cannot be a 6-cycle.*

Proof. Suppose that δ is a 6-cycle. The set $R\eta_2^{-1}$ has the same properties as R , and contains the derangement $\eta_1\eta_2^{-1}$. The above arguments then imply $\eta_1\eta_2^{-1}$ must be a 6-cycle. This implies that η_1 and η_2 have to have opposite signs. Therefore one must be a 2, 3-cycle and the other must be a 5-cycle.

If η_j is type 2, 3 and η_k is type 5, then the fact that E and F both have six elements implies $\eta_j = (\eta_j^{-1}(a_k) \ a_k \ \eta_j(a_k))(\delta(a_k) \ \delta^{-1}(a_k))$. Recall that $b_2 = \delta(a_1)$. Therefore if $j = 2$, our expression for η_j says that $\delta^2(a_1) = \delta(b_2) = \eta_2(b_2) = \delta^{-1}(a_1)$. This is impossible, since δ is a 6-cycle. Therefore $j = 1$. If $\delta(a_2) = b_1$, then $\delta^2(a_2) = \delta(b_1) = \eta_1(b_1) = \eta_1(\delta(a_2)) = \delta^{-1}(a_2)$, which is impossible, as δ is a 6-cycle. Thus, $\delta(a_2) \neq b_1$, and by Lemma 4.4, $\eta_1(a_2) = b_1$, so $\eta_1^{-1}(a_2) = c_1$, making

$$\eta_1 = (c_1 \ a_2 \ b_1)(\delta(a_2) \ \delta^{-1}(a_2)).$$

The 5-cycle η_2 is then given by $\eta_2 = (\eta_2^{-1}(a_1) \ a_1 \ \eta_2(a_1) \ x \ y)$ for some values $x, y \in \{\delta(a_1), \delta^{-1}(a_1)\}$. If $\delta(a_1) = x$, then since $\delta(a_1) = b_2$, we would have $\delta^{-1}(a_1) = \eta_2(\delta(a_1)) = \eta_2(b_2) = \delta(b_2) = \delta^2(a_1)$, which is impossible since δ has order 6. Consequently, the only remaining possibility is that $\eta_2 = (\eta_2^{-1}(a_1) \ a_1 \ \eta_2(a_1) \ \delta^{-1}(a_1) \ \delta(a_1))$.

Now, as $\delta(a_1) = b_2$, and $\eta_2(b_2) = \delta(b_2) = c_2$, we have $\eta_2^{-1}(a_1) = \delta^2(a_1)$. Thus, either $\delta = (\delta^{-1}(a_1) \ a_1 \ \delta(a_1) \ \delta^{-1}(a_2) \ a_2 \ \delta(a_2))$, or $\delta = (\delta^{-1}(a_1) \ a_1 \ \delta(a_1) \ \delta^{-2}(a_2) \ \delta^{-1}(a_2) \ a_2)$. The latter is impossible, as then, from E , $\delta^{-1}(a_2) = \eta_2(a_1)$, and so $\eta_2^2(a_1) = \delta^{-1}(a_1) = \delta(a_2) = \eta_1(\delta^{-1}(a_2)) = \eta_1(\eta_2(a_1))$, which contradicts $\eta_1\eta_2^{-1}$ being a derangement.

Finally then, we consider b_1 . Observe, $b_1 \neq a_1$, $b_1 \neq b_2 = \delta(a_1)$, $b_1 \neq c_2 = \delta(b_2) = \delta^2(a_1)$, and $b_1 \neq a_2 = \delta^3(a_1)$. Also, $c_1 \neq a_1$, so $b_1 \neq \delta^{-1}(a_1)$, and from η_1 , $b_1 \neq \delta(a_2) = \delta^{-2}(a_1)$. This leaves no remaining options for b_1 , which completes the contradiction. \square

Summarizing the above results, we've proved the following theorem.

Theorem 4.10. *There do not exist two disconnected maximal cliques in X_6 .*

Corollary 4.11. *There do not exist two 6×6 mutually orthogonal Latin squares.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research of W.R.C. has been supported by an AMS-Simons Research Enhancement Grant, and RSCA intramural grant 0359121 from CSUF; that of Sam Fleyshman and Sara Anderson was supported by CSUF's Math Summer Research Program and a Deland Summer Research Fellowship.

REFERENCES

- [1] László Babai. Spectra of Cayley graphs. *J. of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 27(2):180–189, 1979.
- [2] Persi Diaconis and Mehrdad Shahshahani. Generating a random permutation with random transpositions. *J. Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 57:159–179, 1981.
- [3] Steven T. Dougherty. A coding-theoretic solution to the 36 officer problem. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 4(2):123–128, 1994.
- [4] David A. Drake and Wendy Myrvold. The non-existence of maximal sets of four mutually orthogonal Latin squares of order 8. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 33(1):63–69, 2004.
- [5] Judith Egan and Ian M. Wanless. Enumeration of MOLS of small order. *Math. Comp.*, 85(298):799–824, 2016.
- [6] A. El-Mesady and Shaaban M. Shaaban. Generalization of MacNeish's Kronecker product theorem of mutually orthogonal latin squares. *AKCE International Journal of Graphs and Combinatorics*, 18(2):117–122, 2021.
- [7] L. Euler. Recherches sur une nouvelle espece de quarres magiques. *Verhandelingen uitgegeven door het zeeuwisch Genootschap der Wetenschappen te Vlissingen*, 9:85–239, 1782.
- [8] Martin Gardner. Mathematical games, 1959.
- [9] Gauss. Letter from Schumacher to Gauss, regarding Thomas Clausen. *Werke* Bd. 12, p. 16, August 10, 1842.
- [10] Michael J. Gill and Ian M. Wanless. Pairs of MOLS of order ten satisfying non-trivial relations. *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, 91(4):1293–1313, 2023.
- [11] Joanne L Hall and Asha Rao. Mutually orthogonal latin squares from the inner products of vectors in mutually unbiased bases. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 43(13):135302, mar 2010.
- [12] P. Hall. On Representatives of Subsets. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 10(1):26–30, 1935.
- [13] Zhu Z. Chen Y. et. al. Hua, Z. Color image encryption using orthogonal latin squares and a new 2d chaotic system. *Nonlinear Dyn.*, 104:4505–4522, 2021.
- [14] Brendan D. McKay, Alison Meynert, and Wendy Myrvold. Small Latin squares, quasigroups, and loops. *J. Combin. Des.*, 15(2):98–119, 2007.
- [15] Douglas C. Montgomery. *Design and analysis of experiments*. Wiley, 10th edition, 2017.
- [16] Noah Rubin, Curtis Bright, Kevin K. H. Cheung, and Brett Stevens. Integer and constraint programming revisited for mutually orthogonal latin squares, 2021.
- [17] D.R Stinson. A short proof of the nonexistence of a pair of orthogonal latin squares of order six. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 36(3):373–376, 1984.
- [18] G. Tarry. Le problème des 36 Officiers. *Compte Rendu de l'Association Française pour l'Avancement des Sciences. Secrétariat de l'Association*, 2:170–203, 1901.
- [19] Serge Vaudenay. On the need for multipermutations: Cryptanalysis of md4 and safer. In Bart Preneel, editor, *Fast Software Encryption*, pages 286–297, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1995. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [20] K Vengadesan, T Anbupalam, and N Gautham. An application of experimental design using mutually orthogonal latin squares in conformational studies of peptides. *Biochemical and biophysical research communications*, 316(3):731–737, 2004.
- [21] Kun Wang and Kejun Chen. A short disproof of Euler's conjecture based on quasi-difference matrices and difference matrices. *Discrete Math.*, 341(4):1114–1119, 2018.
- [22] Harold N. Ward. Thirty-six officers and their code, 2019.

Email address: sara.anderson@cgu.edu

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY, CLAREMONT, CA 91711, U.S.A

Email address: wcasper@fullerton.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON, CA 92831, U.S.A.

Email address: fleyshmans1@csu.fullerton.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON, CA 92831, U.S.A.

Email address: mrathbun@fullerton.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON, CA 92831, U.S.A.