

---

# COMPOSABLE CONSTRAINT MODELS FOR PERMUTATION ENUMERATION

---

A PREPRINT

**Ruth Hoffmann**  
School of Computer Science,  
University of St Andrews,  
Scotland  
rh347@st-andrews.ac.uk

**Özgür Akgün**  
School of Computer Science,  
University of St Andrews,  
Scotland  
ozgur.akgun@st-andrews.ac.uk

**Christopher Jefferson**  
School of Computer Science and Engineering,  
Central South University,  
PR China  
caj21@st-andrews.ac.uk

## ABSTRACT

Constraint programming (CP) is a powerful tool for modeling mathematical concepts and objects and finding both solutions or counter examples. One of the major strengths of CP is that problems can easily be combined or expanded. In this paper, we illustrate that this versatility makes CP an ideal tool for exploring problems in permutation patterns.

We declaratively define permutation properties, permutation pattern avoidance and containment constraints using CP and show how this allows us to solve a wide range of problems. We show how this approach enables the arbitrary composition of these conditions, and also allows the easy addition of extra conditions. We demonstrate the effectiveness of our techniques by modelling the containment and avoidance of six permutation patterns, eight permutation properties and measuring five statistics on the resulting permutations. In addition to calculating properties and statistics for the generated permutations, we show that arbitrary additional constraints can also be easily and efficiently added.

This approach enables mathematicians to investigate permutation pattern problems in a quick and efficient manner. We demonstrate the utility of constraint programming for permutation patterns by showing how we can easily and efficiently extend the known permutation counts for a conjecture involving the class of 1324 avoiding permutations. For this problem, we expand the enumeration of 1324-avoiding permutations with a fixed number of inversions to permutations of length 16 and show for the first time that in the enumeration there is a pattern occurring which follows a unique sequence on the Online Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.

## 1 Introduction

The concept of permutation pattern classes emerged from an exercise question in from the Art of Computer Programming Volume 1 (Section 2.2.1, Exercise 5) by Knuth (1968), in which Knuth explored which permutations can be sorted in a limited stack-based system, called stack-sortable permutations. Simion and Schmidt (1985) were among the pioneers in characterizing and enumerating sets of permutations based on the patterns that they avoid. Further enumeration results garnered interest because the number of the original set of permutations, identified in Knuth's exercise, proved to be the Catalan numbers.

The enumeration results and subsequent research were primarily motivated by a conjecture proposed by Herbert Wilf at the 1992 SIAM meeting. This conjecture stated that every permutation pattern class that avoids one permutation pattern exhibits an exponential growth rate. Marcus and Tardos (2004) later confirmed and proved this conjecture.

There are several systems which use computational techniques to assist with the enumeration of permutation classes and sets, some examples include *Permuta* Ardal et al. (2021), *PatternClass* Albert et al. (2012), *Combinatorial Specification Searcher* Émile Nadeau et al. (2021) and *PermCode* (previously *PermLab*) Albert (2012). *Permuta* is a Python package which supports the enumeration of permutation classes using the BiSC algorithm by Magnusson and Ulfarsson (2012). *PatternClass* is a GAP package that encodes the permutations and classes into regular languages, enabling efficient investigation of permutation sets. *Combinatorial Specification Searcher* is an

other Python package that provides a more exploratory approach by asking the user to define strategies on how to build combinatorial sets from other sets. It combines these into a general enumeration algorithm. PermCode is a Java library with a graphical user interface which allows for the exploration of the sets of permutations which avoid classical patterns.

Constraint programming (CP) is a generic and powerful paradigm that allows the expression of complex combinatorial problems in a declarative manner. In CP problems are expressed declaratively by giving a list of variables whose values must be found, and stating relationships between variables in the form of constraints. This declarative expression is called a model. CP solvers take this declarative version of the problem and use a range of different algorithms to solve the problem efficiently. The primary advantage of CP is that it allows the user to focus on the problem formulation, while the computer takes responsibility for the problem-solving methodology.

In the context of studying permutation patterns, constraint programming can offer significant benefits. Permutation patterns provide a prominent and widely researched topic within the domain of combinatorial mathematics. These patterns, which involve the arrangement of numbers in a certain order, exhibit intricate and complex structures. Constraint programming allows us to model these structures and constraints explicitly, enabling systematic and efficient exploration of the solution space.

In this paper we express problems in the high-level constraint language Essence by Frisch et al. (2008). Essence, as implemented by the system Conjure by Akgün et al. (2022), provides more abstract representation of combinatorial problems. Conjure converts high-level specifications given in Essence into a range of different formats, allowing many different constraint solvers (and related technologies, such as Mixed Integer Programming and Boolean Satisfiability) to be used when solving. This automation not only reduces the possibility of errors in translation but also frees the user to concentrate on the higher-level aspects of problem modelling. In this paper, we mainly use the constraint solver Minion created by Gent et al. (2006), which has been used to solve several large scale combinatorial problems in the past, including the number of semi-groups of order 10 Distler et al. (2012) and for the enumeration of set-theoretic solutions to the Yang-Baxter equation Akgün et al. (2022).

In this paper we show how CP can aid the research in permutation patterns through the following contributions:

1. A systematic and comprehensive treatment of 6 kinds of permutation pattern (as both avoidance and containment) as well as 13 properties and 5 statistics. Each one is implemented as a standalone constraint model. This is presented in Section 2.
2. The models of the patterns, properties and statistics are structured in a way that allows seamless composition of the individual models. Section 3 illustrates this compositionality.
3. An evaluation of the flexible compositional constraint programming approach in 2 settings, one extended illustrative example and one example showing how composable CP models can extend current results such as a conjecture in Claesson et al. (2012). In Section 3.1 and Section 3.2 we present the examples.
4. 2 new conjectures resulting from the model enumerating 1324-avoiding permutations with a fixed number of inversions which come from extending the computational results in Claesson et al. (2012).

We believe our library of models, which can be easily composed in a "pick and mix" fashion, will further the research in permutation patterns by allowing for more efficient computational experimentation and exhaustive search as the constraint programming approach avoids the need for the traditional "generate-and-test" approach, which generates intermediate assignments that only satisfy some of the properties for later filtering.

This "generate-and-test" approach, which requires specialised algorithms to be created to find all permutations which satisfy some given property, can work very well for that property but this approach is difficult to extend and requires considerable expertise in programming to add new properties. On the other hand, combining CP models can immediately allow highly efficient searching for a combination of properties, and our experience is adding new patterns in CP is significantly easier than create new bespoke state-of-the-art programs for searching for new patterns.

## 2 Library of Models

We will consider a *permutation*  $\sigma$  to be an arrangement of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . The size of the set a permutation  $\sigma$  is defined on is called the length of the permutation and is denoted  $|\sigma|$ .  $S_n$  is used to denote for the set of all permutations of length  $n$ .  $\sigma$  can be viewed as a bijective function, where  $\sigma(i)$  denotes the  $i$ th member of the permutation and  $\sigma^{-1}(j)$  gives the index where  $j$  occurs in the permutation.

Two sequences  $\pi = \pi(1), \dots, \pi(n)$  and  $\sigma = \sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(n)$  of the same length are said to be *order isomorphic* Atkinson (1999) if  $\forall i, j, \pi(i) \leq \pi(j)$  if and only if  $\sigma(i) \leq \sigma(j)$ .




Figure 1: Plot representation of the permutation 521634. The x-axis represents the indexes of the permutation, and the y-axis represents the values. Reading left to right, the location of the dot in the  $i$ th column represents the  $i$ th value in the permutation.

Conditions		Statistics
Pattern Avoidance/Containment	Properties	Number of
Classic	Simple	Inversions
Vincular	Plus-Decomposable	Ascents
Bivincular	Minus-Decomposable	Descents
Mesh	Blockwise Simple	Excedances
Boxed Mesh	Derangement	Major Index
Consecutive	Non-Derangement	
	Involution	
	Parity	

Table 1: Table of all permutation patterns, properties and statistics modelled

We will represent permutations by giving the arrangement of the set (often called sequence notation) and as a permutation plot. Figure 1 gives an example of a permutation plot.

The rest of this Section defines the patterns, properties and statistics which we have currently implemented. These terms are summarised in Table 1.

All CP models from the upcoming sections with definitions can be found in a supplementary repository Özgür Akgün et al. (2023). This repository contains executable CP models, sample parameter files, raw data for our computational experiments and scripts that can be used to fully rerun the experiments. In addition, the repository contains a Jupyter notebook that can be used to interactively run model fragments through Conjure. The notebook also contains the example scenarios from Section 3.

## 2.1 Pattern types

A permutation pattern identifies a subsequence of a permutation which satisfies a list of constraints. If a subsequence of a permutation satisfies the requirements of a given permutation pattern, it is said to *involve* or *contain* the pattern. If no part of a permutation matches a permutation pattern then it *avoids* the pattern. There are many types of permutation patterns, in this section we introduce the ones considered in this paper.

We say that a permutation  $\pi = \pi(1) \dots \pi(k)$  is *classically contained* in a permutation  $\sigma = \sigma(1) \dots \sigma(m)$ , where  $k \leq m$ , if there is a subsequence  $\sigma(i_1) \dots \sigma(i_k)$  in  $\sigma$  that is order isomorphic to  $\pi$ . For example, the permutation  $\pi = 123$  can be found in  $\sigma = 521634$  as the order isomorphic subsequence  $134 = \sigma(3)\sigma(5)\sigma(6)$ . Being *classically contained* is a partial order on the set of permutations Brignall (2010). In Figure 2(a) on the left is the pattern permutation, on the right we have highlighted an occurrence of the classical pattern by circling the elements. The other patterns we discuss all extend classical patterns by adding further conditions.

*Vincular patterns* (introduced by Babson and Steingrímsson (2000)) specify adjacency conditions. Let  $\pi = \pi(1) \dots \pi(k)$ ,  $\sigma = \sigma(1) \dots \sigma(m)$  and let  $A \subseteq \{0, \dots, k\}$ . To simplify the pattern definition, we define  $\pi(0) = 0$  and  $\pi(k+1) = k+1$ . An occurrence of the vincular pattern  $(\pi, A)$  in  $\sigma$  is a subsequence  $\sigma(i_1) \dots \sigma(i_k)$  of  $\sigma$  such that  $\sigma(i_1) \dots \sigma(i_k)$  is an occurrence of  $\pi$  in the classical sense, and  $\forall a \in A. i_{a+1} = i_a + 1$ . We call  $A$  the set of *adjacencies*.

For example, the vincular pattern  $(132, \{1\})$  can be found in  $\sigma = 521634$  as the subsequence  $164 = \sigma(3)\sigma(4)\sigma(6)$ . Figure 2(b) shows an example of a vincular pattern by showing the pattern with the order isomorphic subsequence

and highlights the adjacency requirement by shading the column between the indices both in the pattern and the permutation which contains the pattern.

*Bivincular patterns* (as introduced in Bousquet-Mélou et al. (2010)) are vincular patterns which have an additional set defining which values have to be adjacent.

More formally, an occurrence of the bivincular pattern  $(\pi, A, B)$  in  $\sigma$ , with  $A, B \subseteq \{0, \dots, k\}$  and  $|\pi| = k$ , is a subsequence  $\sigma(i_1) \dots \sigma(i_k)$  of  $\sigma$  such that the following all hold:

- $\sigma(i_1) \dots \sigma(i_k)$  is an occurrence of  $\pi$  in the classical sense,
- $\forall a \in A. i_{a+1} = i_a + 1$
- $\forall b \in B. j_{b+1} = j_b + 1$

where  $\{\sigma(i_1), \dots, \sigma(i_k)\} = \{j_1, \dots, j_k\}$  and  $j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k$ . By convention  $i_0 = j_0 = 0$  and  $i_{k+1} = j_{k+1} = n + 1$ . As with vincular patterns,  $A$  is the set of adjacencies of indexes, but now the set  $B$  defines the adjacencies of values. For example, the bivincular pattern  $(312, \{2\}, \{2\})$  can be found in  $\sigma = 521634$  as the subsequence  $534 = \sigma(1)\sigma(5)\sigma(6)$ . Figure 2(c) illustrates this bivincular containment with the pattern permutation and the shading of the adjacency in values (rows) and indices (columns) highlighted.

All of the above patterns can be generalised as *mesh patterns*, which were introduced in Brändén and Claesson (2011). A mesh pattern of length  $k$  is a pair  $(\pi, R)$  with  $\pi \in S_k$  and  $R \subseteq [0, k] \times [0, k]$ , a set of pairs of integers. The elements of  $R$  identify the lower left corners of unit squares in the plot of  $\pi$  and specify forbidden regions. An occurrence of a mesh pattern  $(\pi, R)$  in a permutation  $\sigma$  is a subsequence  $\sigma(i_1) \dots \sigma(i_k)$  such that the following holds

- $\sigma(i_1) \dots \sigma(i_k)$  is order isomorphic to  $\pi$
- $(x, y) \in R \Rightarrow$  there does not exist  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : i_x < i < i_{x+1} \wedge \sigma(i_{\pi^{-1}(y)}) < \sigma(i) < \sigma(i_{\pi^{-1}(y+1)})$ .

For this definition we extend the subsequence  $i_j$ ,  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  with  $i_0 = 0$ ,  $i_{k+1} = n + 1$ ,  $\pi(0) = 0$ ,  $\pi(k + 1) = k + 1$ ,  $\sigma(0) = 0$  and  $\sigma(n + 1) = n + 1$ . The extra terms for  $i_j$ ,  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  in the second part of the definition above allow mesh patterns to constrain a permutation outside of the pattern. An example of a mesh pattern in  $\sigma = 521634$  is  $(132, (0, 0), (2, 1), (2, 2))$ , which can be found as the subsequence  $263 = \sigma(2)\sigma(4)\sigma(5)$ . This example is illustrated in Figure 2(d), where each of the forbidden regions/squares is shaded.

A *boxed mesh pattern* (or *boxed pattern*, as introduced in Avgustinovich et al. (2013)), is a special case of a mesh pattern  $P = (\pi, R)$  where  $\pi$  is a permutation of length  $k$  and  $R = [1, k - 1] \times [1, k - 1]$ .  $P$  is then denoted by  $\boxed{\pi}$ . For example the boxed pattern  $\boxed{231}$  is contained in the permutation  $236514$  as the subsequence  $351 = \sigma(2)\sigma(4)\sigma(5)$ . Figure 2(e) shows this example, and illustrates that for a boxed mesh pattern the box inside the permutation is the forbidden region.

*Consecutive patterns* are a special case of vincular patterns, where it is necessary that *all* entries are adjacent. For example, the consecutive pattern  $(312, \{1, 2\})$  can be found inside  $152463$  as the subsequence  $524 = \sigma(2)\sigma(3)\sigma(4)$ . This example is shown in Figure 2(f).

We say a permutation  $\sigma$  *avoids* any of the above pattern types, if the permutation  $\pi$  of the pattern is classically avoided in  $\sigma$ , or it is classically contained in  $\sigma$  but for every occurrence of the classical pattern the additional constraints on indices or values are not upheld.

So for example the permutation  $\sigma = 12345$  avoids the classic pattern  $\pi = 21$ , as there are no occurrences of it. Figure 3(a) attempts to illustrate this avoidance. Similarly, the permutation  $\sigma = 12345$  avoids the mesh pattern  $(132, (0, 0), (2, 0), (2, 1), (2, 2))$  as there is no classical occurrence of  $132$  in  $\sigma$ , as can be seen from Figure 3(b). Finally,  $(132, (0, 0), (2, 0), (2, 1), (2, 2))$  is not contained in the permutation  $\sigma = 652413$  even though there is an occurrence of  $132$  in the  $\sigma$ , namely as  $243 = \sigma(3)\sigma(4)\sigma(6)$ , but there is an element of the permutation that violates the forbidden region. In Figure 3(c) we can see that the element  $1 = \sigma(5)$  is in the  $(2, 0)$  shaded/forbidden region.

## 2.2 Permutation Properties

In addition to containing (or avoiding) patterns in permutations and enumerating these permutations, permutations can have certain structural properties. We give some of the most common properties here, all of which we will model with CP. Table 1 contains a list of the properties which we have modelled thus far. For each property, we can require solutions to either do, or do not, satisfy the property.

An *interval* of a permutation  $\pi$  corresponds to a set of contiguous indices  $I = [a, b]$  such that the set of values  $\pi(I) = \{\pi(i) : i \in I\}$  is also contiguous. Every permutation of length  $n$  has intervals of lengths 0, 1 and  $n$ . If a permutation




Figure 2: Examples of all patterns and for each an example containment in a larger permutation. In each subfigure the pattern is on the left and an occurrence of the pattern is indicated in the right permutation. We highlight a classic occurrence (the elements that are order isomorphic to the pattern permutation) with circles around the nodes. All additional constraints (in terms of adjacency in index or values, or the forbidden cells/regions) are shaded. In the target permutation the shaded regions scale with respect to the elements which are representative of the classic pattern.

$\pi$  has no other intervals, then  $\pi$  is said to be *simple* Brignall (2010). For example,  $\pi = 1632547$  is not simple as it contains the intervals  $\pi(3)\pi(4)$ ,  $\pi(5)\pi(6)$ ,  $\pi(3)\pi(4)\pi(5)\pi(6)$ ,  $\pi(2)\pi(3)\pi(4)\pi(5)\pi(6)$ ,  $\pi(2)\pi(3)\pi(4)\pi(5)\pi(6)\pi(7)$  and  $\pi(1)\pi(2)\pi(3)\pi(4)\pi(5)\pi(6)$ , as indicated in Figure 4(a) through bold boxes around the intervals. The permutation 246135 in Figure 4(d) is simple, as the only intervals it contains are of length 0, 1 or the whole permutation.

Given a permutation  $\sigma = \sigma(1) \dots \sigma(m)$  of length  $m$  and non-empty permutations  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$  the *inflation* of  $\sigma$  by  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$ , written as  $\sigma[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m]$ , is the unique permutation obtained by replacing each entry  $\sigma(i)$  by an interval that is order isomorphic to  $\alpha_i$ , where the relative ordering of the intervals corresponds to the ordering of the entries of  $\sigma$ . Conversely, a *block-decomposition* or *deflation* of a permutation  $\pi$  is any expression of  $\pi$  written as an inflation  $\pi = \sigma[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m]$ . For example 521634 can be decomposed as  $3142[1, 21, 1, 12]$ . In Figure 4(e) we have highlighted the blocks of the permutation 521634, we can observe that the blocks are placed order isomorphic to 3142.

A permutation  $\pi$  is *plus-decomposable* if it has a block-decomposition of the form  $\pi = 12[\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$  for non-empty permutations  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ . For example 213654 is a plus-decomposable permutation, but 546123 or 521634 (which is also not simple) are not. Figure 4(b) shows the blocks of 213654, plus-decomposable permutations will always be in this layout (elements in the bottom left quadrant, and elements in the top right quadrant).

A permutation  $\pi$  is *minus-decomposable* if it has a block-decomposition of the form  $\pi = 21[\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$  for non-empty permutations  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$ . For example 546123 is a minus-decomposable permutation. But 213654 (which is plus-decomposable) or 236145 (which is not simple) are not. Figure 4(c) contains the minus-decomposable permutation




Figure 3: Examples of pattern avoidance. In subfigures (a) and (b) there is no subsequence in the target permutation which is order isomorphic to the pattern permutation (i.e. there is no occurrence of the classic pattern in the target permutation). Subfigure (c) avoids the mesh pattern even though the pattern permutation is contained classically, in each occurrence (there is only one) there are (at least one) elements in the target permutation which lie in the shaded/forbidden region.

546123. All minus-decomposable permutations will have a similar layout, with elements in the top left quadrant, followed by elements in the bottom right quadrant.

A permutation  $\pi \in S_n$  is *block-wise simple* if and only if it has no interval which can be decomposed into  $12[\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$  or  $21[\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$ . This property was introduced in Bagno et al. (2023) alongside an equivalent recursive definition. For example  $2413[3142, 1, 1, 1] = 4253716$  is block-wise simple (Figure 4(f)), but  $24513$  is not as the interval  $45$  can be decomposed into  $12[1, 1]$  (Figure 4(g)).

A fixed point of a permutation  $\pi$  is an integer  $i$  such that  $\pi(i) = i$ . A *derangement* is a permutation with no fixed points.  $4312$  is a derangement whereas  $1234$  is not. As shown in Figure 4(i) none of the elements of the permutation  $4312$  are on the red diagonal (which represents  $\pi(i) = i$ ).

Similarly, a *nonderangement* is a permutation with at least one fixed point.  $2431$  is a non-derangement whereas  $4321$  is not. The plot of  $2431$  in Figure 4(j) shows  $\pi(3) = 3$  lies on the diagonal.

A permutation  $\pi \in S_n$  is called an *involution* if  $\pi = \pi^{-1}$ , or equivalently if  $\forall i, j. \pi(i) = j \iff \pi(j) = i$ .  $1243$  is an involution but  $2431$  is not. Figure 4(h) contains the plot of the involution  $1243$ .

A permutation  $\pi \in S_n$  is said to have *parity* if the values at odd indexes are odd and the values in even indexes are even, i.e.  $\pi(i) \equiv i \pmod{2}, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . For example the permutation  $3412$  has parity, whereas  $2413$  as in the latter for example the value  $2$  (even) is at index  $1$  which is odd. Figure 4(k) and Figure 4(l) show the plots of the two example permutations.

### 2.3 Permutation Statistics

Currently we support 5 different permutation statistics, where we count the occurrences of some property of the elements of the permutation. The constraint solvers will output the statistics alongside the solution permutations. The statistics we currently consider are ascents, descents, inversions, excedances and the Major index (as listed in Table 1).

These statistics can be collected as part of finding the solutions, or constrained. These constraints on the statistics can be arbitrary arithmetic statements, for example permutations with 5 descents, or the number of descents and ascents added together is a multiple of three.




Figure 4: Examples permutation properties. Intervals (of length 1 and up to  $n-1$ , where  $n$  is the length of the permutation) and blocks are indicated using squares around the nodes that contain them. The red diagonal line for the derangement/non-derangement indicates the  $\pi(i) = i$  fixed point property.

An *ascent* in a permutation  $\sigma$  is an index  $i$  such that  $\sigma(i) < \sigma(i+1)$ . Similarly, a *descent* is an  $i$  such that  $\sigma(i) > \sigma(i+1)$ . A pair of indices  $(i, j)$  in a permutation  $\sigma$  such that  $i < j$  and  $\sigma(i) > \sigma(j)$  is called an *inversion*. An *excedance* is an index where  $\sigma(i) > i$ . So for a permutation  $\sigma$  the statistics are

- the number of *inversions*  $\text{inv}(\sigma) = |\{(i, j) : i < j \text{ and } \sigma(i) > \sigma(j)\}|$
- the number of *descents*  $\text{des}(\sigma) = |\{i : \sigma(i) > \sigma(i+1)\}|$
- the number of *ascents*  $\text{asc}(\sigma) = |\{i : \sigma(i) < \sigma(i+1)\}|$
- the number of *excedances*  $\text{exc}(\sigma) = |\{i : \sigma(i) > i\}|$ .
- the *Major index*, which is the sum of the positions of the descents  $\text{maj}(\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma(i) > \sigma(i+1)} i$ .

As an example, in the permutation  $\sigma = 7164523$ ,  $\text{inv}(\sigma) = 14$ ,  $\text{des}(\sigma) = 3$ ,  $\text{asc}(\sigma) = 3$ ,  $\text{exc}(\sigma) = 2$  and  $\text{maj}(\sigma) = 9$ .

### 3 Composability in Action

We demonstrate the composability of the models using an illustrative (albeit hypothetical) example scenarios and one example which extends the enumeration of solutions to a conjecture in Claesson et al. (2012). The latter model gives rise to 2 new conjectures.

Length	Number of permutations found			
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4
5	42	8	2	0
6	132	41	19	1
7	429	180	102	2
8	1,430	730	455	9
9	4,862	2,841	1,865	19
10	16,796	10,815	7,321	53
11	58,786	40,700	28,096	106
12	208,012	152,325	106,555	255
13	742,900	568,883	401,729	493
14	-	-	-	1,118
15	-	-	-	2,120
16	-	-	-	4,664

Table 2: Running the 4 steps on various permutation lengths. Dash indicates timeout after 1-hour of Minion search

### 3.1 Hypothetical Example

Suppose we are a permutation pattern researcher seeking insights into the set of permutations that classically avoid the permutation 1324. It is worth noting that the growth function for this set of permutations has yet to be discovered; see OEIS (OEIS Foundation Inc., 2023, A061552). A mathematician working on this problem will adopt some assumptions, enumerate permutations under these assumptions and refine these assumptions by studying the enumeration. Given the rapid growth of the numbers, we examine prevalent patterns and properties within our permutations, either contained or avoided, and aim to filter them out. To illustrate how the CP approach easily cuts down the number of solutions without having to go through generating permutations and then filtering them we have split this example into 4 steps, in each step we add more constraints (patterns and/or properties). We then show how many solution permutations are found at each step in Table 2, with **step 4** containing all properties (which is the full model for our example problem). As the permutation pattern researcher we would only work with **step 4**, rather than illustrative which contain fewer constraints.

In the context of exploring permutations that traditionally avoid the permutation 1324, let us assume we have finished exploring permutations that contain the following mesh pattern:

$(213, (0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 0))$ , so from now on we want to focus on permutations which avoid this pattern (**step 1**,  $\text{Av}(\{1324, (213, (0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 0))\})$ ). Consider that we decide to look at permutations which contain both the classic pattern 132 and the mesh pattern  $(123, (1, 2), (2, 1), (1, 3), (3, 1))$  (**step 2**,  $\text{Co}(\{132, (123, (1, 2), (2, 1), (1, 3), (3, 1))\})$ ).

We instantiate a constraint programming model that combines the four patterns above. We can also add properties, for example: minus-decomposable and involution (**step 3**, minus-decomposable; **step 4**, involution).

Existing approaches allow a limited form of compositionality: they support the enumeration of permutations that avoid a set of (mesh) patterns simultaneously, as every pattern type can be turned into a mesh pattern. So the traditional approach would be to enumerate the set of permutations which avoid the two patterns 1324 and  $(213, (0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 0))$ . We would then need to iterate over this enumeration and filter permutations to identify those containing the patterns 132 and  $(123, (1, 2), (2, 1), (1, 3), (3, 1))$ .

As an example, for length 9 there are  $9! = 362880$  permutations of which, 4862 avoid the two patterns (**step 1**). 2841 of these permutations then contain the other two patterns (**step 2**). 1865 of these are minus-decomposable (**step 3**) and finally only 19 are also involutions (**step 4**). Using a composed constraint programming model for this problem we are able to directly enumerate the 19 permutations of interest without going through several levels of generate-and-test. We conduct the same experiment on permutation lengths ranging from 5 to 16. Table 2 shows the number of permutations enumerated at each step. This table demonstrates that this technique is more efficient than generate-and-test based methods, as the numbers between the columns/steps decrease rapidly. For some permutation lengths (14–16), generate-and-test is not feasible because earlier steps cannot be fully enumerated within the 1-hour time limit we gave to Minion (a CP solver) Gent et al. (2006), but the combination of all properties can be enumerated.

In addition to only enumerating permutations of interest, we can ask for permutation statistics to be listed together with the enumeration as well. For example we can request the number of descents and the number of inversions for each the permutations in the final set within the same constraint programming model.



### 3.2 1324-avoiding permutations with a fixed number of inversions

Let us now look at the impact the constraint programming approach has on a combination of property type and property that was investigated by Claesson et al. (2012). We will focus on the conjecture 13 stated in Claesson et al. (2012). This involves combining the 1324 classical pattern avoidance with a fixed number of inversions.

**Conjecture 1.** *Claesson et al. (2012)*

*For all nonnegative integers  $n$  and  $k$ , we have  $S_n^k(1324) \leq S_{n+1}^k(1324)$  (where  $S_n^k(1324)$  is the set of permutations of length  $n$  with  $k$  inversions and which avoid 1324).*

For example, the set  $S_5^9(1324) = \{45321, 53421, 54231, 54312\}$  is the set of permutations of length 5 with each with 9 inversions and avoiding 1324 classically.

In the paper Claesson et al. (2012) present results of an exhaustive enumeration algorithm, which found results of all inversions for permutations up to length 15. Unfortunately, the authors do not disclose how the algorithm worked, but we hypothesise that it might have been a generate and test approach. Which first generates all 1324 avoiding permutations and then filtered for the number of inversions.

As discussed before the constraint programming approach avoids this and thus we have been able to expand the enumeration further, and give additional insights into the conjecture. Further, there was no need for a specialised algorithm or coding to test this conjecture, we only had to combine our previously created model pieces for classical avoidance and counting inversions. While we are unable to fully prove the conjecture, our results demonstrate further support for the result.

Looking at Table 3 (this is a pattern that can be observed in Claesson et al. (2012) as well) there is a point at which the number of permutations per inversion count does not change. In other words, there is a point at which it does not matter what the length ( $n$ ) of the permutation is the number of permutations which avoid 1324 and have a given number of inversion is the same as  $n + 1$ . To confirm this we have expanded the calculations to the permutations of length 16 and all possible number of inversions. Further, we are able to strongly suggest at which point this enumeration does not change, up to 20 inversions.

We enumerated the permutations for this problem for permutation lengths from 1 to 25 and for the number of inversions ranging from 0 to 20. We used a large compute server with 256 cores and 1TB of memory for this task. Each enumeration is allowed to use up to 250 cores on this machine. The longest running instance (length 23 and number of inversions 20) took just over 5 days in this parallel computing setting, which is the equivalent of running the same enumeration on a single core for 3.5 years. This parallel setting highlights a significant advantage of employing CP: the feasibility of leveraging high-performance, parallel CP solvers, such as Minion, which can take advantage of the widely accessible multi-core machine without requiring any special development.

Table 3 only contains some of these results, the full enumeration of up to length 16 (over all inversions) and up to length 23 (up to 20 inversions) can be found in our repository Özgür Akgün et al. (2023).

**Conjecture 2.** *Let  $k$  be a given number of inversions, the number of permutations in  $S_n^k(1324)$  will grow as long as  $n \leq k + 2$ .*

Further we have evidence that there is an identifiable sequence which the stabilising points create.

**Conjecture 3.** *Let  $n$  be a given length of permutations, then  $S_n^k(1324)$  for  $k \in \{0, \dots, n - 2\}$  will be the first  $n - 1$  entries of (OEIS Foundation Inc., 2023, A000712).*

## 4 Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a new approach to enumerating permutations under multiple conditions by leveraging constraint programming. This approach allows for a declarative definition of permutations properties and pattern avoidance/containment conditions. Conditions and properties can be arbitrarily composed. We have demonstrated the versatility of this approach by modelling the pattern avoidance/containment by applying it to 2 examples, one of which demonstrates how the constraint programming approach avoids having to generate a large number of permutations before filtering for the ones based on the additional properties/constraints.

In the second example this paper demonstrated the utility of the library of constraint models by extending the computational results from Claesson et al. (2012), to find more evidence towards their conjecture as well as identifying 2 new conjectures. This allowed us to leverage the parallel support of modern CP solvers to solve in 5 days what would have taken 3.5 years on a single CPU core.

This work contributes to the growing body of research on permutation enumeration. The constraint programming based approach complements existing computational tools, offering an alternative method that allows for greater flexibility when solving non-standard permutation enumeration problems.

The application of constraint programming to this important field in mathematics empowers mathematicians with a new flexible tool for investigating complex permutation enumeration problems. We expect our approach to inspire further research in this area and potentially lead to new mathematical discoveries.

Length	Number of permutations found with a fixed number of inversions																				
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	1																				
2	1	1																			
3	1	2	2	1																	
4	1	2	5	6	5	3	1														
5	1	2	5	10	16	20	20	15	9	4	1										
6	1	2	5	10	20	32	51	67	79	80	68	49	29	14	5	1					
7	1	2	5	10	20	36	61	96	148	208	268	321	351	347	308	241	165	98	49	20	6
8	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	106	171	262	397	568	784	1019	1264	1478	1628	1681	1619	1441	1173
9	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	181	286	443	664	985	1416	1988	2715	3589	4579	5631	6654	7559
10	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	296	467	714	1077	1582	2305	3284	4617	6374	8665	11521	15012
11	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	477	738	1127	1682	2477	3584	5134	7240	10100	13915	18976
12	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	748	1151	1732	2577	3768	5450	7766	10976	15312	21171
13	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1161	1756	2627	3868	5634	8098	11526	16216	22632
14	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1766	2651	3918	5734	8282	11858	16786	23568
15	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1770	2661	3942	5784	8382	12042	17118	24138
16	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1770	2665	3952	5808	8432	12142	17302	24470
17	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1770	2665	3956	5818	8456	12192	17402	24654
18	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1770	2665	3956	5822	8466	12216	17452	24754
19	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1770	2665	3956	5822	8470	12226	17476	24804
20	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1770	2665	3956	5822	8470	12230	17486	24828
21	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1770	2665	3956	5822	8470	12230	17490	24838
22	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1770	2665	3956	5822	8470	12230	17490	24842
23	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1770	2665	3956	5822	8470	12230	17490	24842
A000712	1	2	5	10	20	36	65	110	185	300	481	752	1165	1770	2665	3956	5822	8470	12230	17490	24842

Table 3: The enumeration of permutations avoiding 1324 classically and containing a fixed number of inversions. The rows are the length of the permutation, the columns the number of inversions. The full results can be found in the supplementary repository Özgür Akgün et al. (2023). The last row shows the first 21 elements of the sequence A000712 (OEIS Foundation Inc., 2023, A000712).

## References

- Ö. Akgün, A. M. Frisch, I. P. Gent, C. Jefferson, I. Miguel, and P. Nightingale. Conjure: Automatic generation of constraint models from problem specifications. *Artificial Intelligence*, 310:103751, 2022.
- Ö. Akgün, M. Mereb, and L. Vendramin. Enumeration of set-theoretic solutions to the yang-baxter equation. *Math. Comput.*, 91(335):1469–1481, 2022. doi:10.1090/MCOM/3696. URL <https://doi.org/10.1090/mcom/3696>.
- M. Albert. Permlab: Software for permutation patterns, 2012. URL <https://github.com/mchllbrt/PermCode>.
- M. Albert, S. Linton, and R. Hoffmann. Patternclass–permutation pattern classes, 2012. URL <https://gap-packages.github.io/PatternClass/>.
- R. P. Ardal, T. K. Magnusson, Émile Nadeau, B. J. Kristinsson, B. A. Gudmundsson, C. Bean, H. Ulfarsson, J. S. Eliasson, M. Tannock, A. B. Bjarnason, J. Pantone, and A. B. Arnarson. Permuta, Apr. 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4725759>.
- M. D. Atkinson. Restricted permutations. *Discret. Math.*, 195(1-3):27–38, 1999. doi:10.1016/S0012-365X(98)00162-9. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X\(98\)00162-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X(98)00162-9).
- S. Avgustinovich, S. Kitaev, and A. Valyuzhenich. Avoidance of boxed mesh patterns on permutations. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 161(1-2):43–51, Jan. 2013. ISSN 0166-218X. doi:10.1016/j.dam.2012.08.015.
- E. Babson and E. Steingrímsson. Generalized permutation patterns and a classification of the mahonian statistics. *Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire [electronic only]*, 44:B44b–18, 2000.
- E. Bagno, E. Eisenberg, S. Reches, and M. Sigron. Blockwise simple permutations, 2023.
- M. Bousquet-Mélou, A. Claesson, M. Dukes, and S. Kitaev.  $(2+2)$ -free posets, ascent sequences and pattern avoiding permutations. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 117(7):884–909, 2010.
- P. Brändén and A. Claesson. Mesh patterns and the expansion of permutation statistics as sums of permutation patterns. *The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics*, pages P5–P5, 2011.
- R. Brignall. A survey of simple permutations. *Permutation patterns*, 376:41–65, 2010.
- A. Claesson, V. Jelínek, and E. Steingrímsson. Upper bounds for the stanley–wilf limit of 1324 and other layered patterns. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 119(8):1680–1691, 2012. ISSN 0097-3165. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2012.05.006>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0097316512000891>.
- A. Distler, C. Jefferson, T. Kelsey, and L. Kotthoff. The semigroups of order 10. In M. Milano, editor, *Principles and Practice of Constraint Programming*, pages 883–899, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-642-33558-7.
- A. M. Frisch, W. Harvey, C. Jefferson, B. Martínez-Hernández, and I. Miguel. Essence: A constraint language for specifying combinatorial problems. *Constraints*, 13(3):268–306, 2008.
- GAP. *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.12.2*. The GAP Group, 2022. URL <https://www.gap-system.org>
- I. P. Gent, C. Jefferson, and I. Miguel. Minion: A fast scalable constraint solver. In *ECAI*, pages 98–102, 2006.
- D. E. Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming, Volume I: Fundamental Algorithms*. Addison-Wesley, 1968.
- H. Magnusson and H. Ulfarsson. Algorithms for discovering and proving theorems about permutation patterns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.7110*, 2012.

- 
- A. Marcus and G. Tardos. Excluded permutation matrices and the stanley–wilf conjecture. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 107(1):153–160, 2004.
- P. Nightingale, Ö. Akgün, I. P. Gent, C. Jefferson, I. Miguel, and P. Spracklen. Automatically improving constraint models in savile row. *Artificial Intelligence*, 251:35–61, 2017.
- OEIS Foundation Inc. The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, 2023. Published electronically at <http://oeis.org>.
- R. Simion and F. W. Schmidt. Restricted permutations. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 6(4):383–406, 1985.
- Émile Nadeau, C. Bean, H. Ulfarsson, J. S. Eliasson, and J. Pantone. Combinatorial specification searcher (permutaTriangle/comb\_spec\_searcher): Version 4.0.0, June 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4946832>.
- Özgür Akgün, R. Hoffmann, and C. Jefferson. stacs-cp/composable-permutation-patterns, Nov. 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10215929>.