

# On the Metric Dimension of $K_a \times K_b \times K_c$

Valentin Gledel<sup>a,b</sup>, Gerold Jäger<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Computing Science, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden*

## Abstract

In this work we determine the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_b \times K_c$  for all  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $a \leq b \leq c$  as follows. For  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b \leq c$ , this value is  $c - 1$ , for  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b > c$ , it is  $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$ , and for  $3a = b + c$ , it is  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$ . The only open case is  $3a > b + c$ , where two values are possible, namely  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$  and  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$ . This result extends previous results of [1], who computed the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_b$ , and of [2], who computed the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_a \times K_a$ <sup>1</sup>

We prove our result by introducing and analyzing a new variant of Static Black-Peg Mastermind, in which each peg has its own permitted set of colors. For all cases, we present strategies which we prove to be both feasible and optimal. Our main result follows, as the number of questions of these strategies is equal to the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_b \times K_c$ .

*Keywords:* Metric Dimension, Graph Theory, Game Theory, Static Black-Peg Mastermind

## 1. Introduction

The metric dimension is an important property of an undirected and unweighted graph  $G = (V, E)$ . It is defined as the minimum size of a set  $U \subseteq V$  so that every vertex  $v \in V$  is uniquely determined by the vector of distances between  $v$  and the vertices in  $U$ . The concept of metric dimension has been mentioned first in [3] and was then independently re-introduced in [4, 5]. The metric dimension has been studied for several graph classes,

<sup>1</sup>In comparison to [2] we use the notation  $K_a$  instead of  $\mathbb{Z}_a$ , as this notation of complete graphs is more common in graph theory.

see e.g. [6, 7, 8, 9]. Determining whether the metric dimension of a graph is smaller than or equal to a given value is NP-complete [10, 11].

In this paper, we aim to determine the metric dimension of a cross product of complete graphs. The following results are known for this problem. The metric dimension of  $K_p^c = K_p \times K_p \times \cdots \times K_p$  is in  $\Theta(p/\log p)$ , if  $c$  is constant [12], the metric dimension of  $K_b \times K_c$  is  $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b+c-1) \rfloor$  if  $2b \geq c$  and  $c-1$  otherwise [1], and as a special case it is  $\lceil (4a-1)/3 - 1 \rceil$  for  $K_a \times K_a$  [13], and finally, the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_a \times K_a$  is  $\lfloor \frac{3}{2}a \rfloor$  for  $a \geq 2$ .

We make our investigation into the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_b \times K_c$  by introducing a variant of Mastermind, which is a famous board game invented by Meierowitz in 1970. The original game is played by two players, the *codemaker* and the *codebreaker*, where the codemaker chooses a secret code consisting of 4 pegs and 6 possible colors for each peg and where the codebreaker must discover this code by making a sequence of guesses (or questions) from the set of possible secrets until the correct secret has been found. In each answer, the codemaker gives black and white pegs, one black peg for each peg of the question which is correct in both position and color, and one white peg for each peg which is correct only in color. The problem we consider extends Mastermind in the following ways.

- We generalize the number of pegs from 4 to  $p$ .
- We generalize the number of colors from 6 to  $c$ .
- The codemaker gives only black pegs as answers (and thus no longer white pegs, i.e., any information regarding correct colors in incorrect positions).
- The game is static, i.e., the codebreaker gives all questions already at the beginning of the game, waits for all answers and has a final question to give the (correct) question.
- Each peg has its own set of colors  $a, b, c$  for given positive integers  $a, b, c$ .

Almost all such extensions of Mastermind have already been investigated (see for example [14, 15, 16] for Mastermind with  $p$  pegs and  $c$  colors, [17, 18] for Black-Peg Mastermind, [2, 13, 16, 19] for Static Mastermind).

The only novel extension is the last one, i.e., the extension of each peg to an own color set. More concretely, we generalize Mastermind to Static Black-Peg  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind or  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind for short, and define it as follows. We have two players, the *codemaker* and the *codebreaker*. The

codemaker chooses a secret code by assigning a color to each peg, chosen from a set of  $a$  colors for the first peg,  $b$  colors for the second peg and  $c$  colors for the third peg. The codebreaker must discover this code by making a sequence of questions of possible secrets at the beginning of the game, where the set of secrets is the same as the set of questions. Each answer of the codemaker consists of black pegs, one black peg for each peg of the question which is correct in both position and color. The codebreaker then receives all answers and finally has to reply with the (not any more) secret code. The goal is to find the a sequence of questions with minimum cardinality so that the codebreaker knows the secret from the received answers. We call this an optimal strategy Note that it can be assumed w.l.o.g that  $a \leq b \leq c$ . To simplify the study, we will suppose it to be the case through this paper, unless stated otherwise.

As explained in [2] for the particular case of  $(a, a, a)$ -Mastermind, the cardinality of an optimal strategy is equal to the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_b \times K_c$ . To obtain our result, we extend methods from [2]. We find that optimal strategies mostly consist of questions of the following kind: on one peg the corresponding color occurs only once over all questions, and on the other two pegs the colors occur exactly twice. As result, we obtain different values for the four main cases  $3a > b + c$ ,  $3a = b + c$ ,  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b \leq c$ ,  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b > c$ . Our results are summarized in Table 1

$3a > b + c$	$\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1 \leq f(a, b, c) \leq \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$
	$f(a, a, 2a - 1) = 2a - 1 = \lfloor \frac{a+a+2a-1}{2} \rfloor$
	$f(a, a, a) = \lfloor \frac{3a}{2} \rfloor$ (result from [2])
$3a = b + c$	$(a, b, c) \neq (4, 6, 6) \rightarrow f(a, b, c) = \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$
	$f(4, 6, 6) = 8 = \lfloor \frac{4+6+6}{2} \rfloor$
$3a < b + c$	$2b \leq c \rightarrow f(a, b, c) = c - 1$
	$2b > c \rightarrow f(a, b, c) = \lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$

Table 1: Summary of the results appearing in this paper.

The outline of this work is as follows. We start with some notations and preliminaries in Section 2. After providing some key lemmas in Section 3, we determine the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_b \times K_c$  in the following sections and prove the results of Table 1. We provide a general lower bound for the metric dimension  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$  in Section 4. We show an upper bound for the metric dimension  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$  for the case  $3a \geq b + c$  in Section 5. In Section 6, as subcases of  $3a \geq b + c$ , we consider the cases of  $(a, b, c) = (a, a, 2a)$  and of  $(a, b, c) = (a, a, 2a - 1)$  and show that the metric dimension is  $2a - 1$ . In Section 7 we show that for the case  $3a = b + c$ , the lower bound  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$  is attained, except for  $(a, b, c) = (4, 6, 6)$ . In Section 8 we show that for the case  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b \leq c$ , the metric dimension is  $c - 1$  and that for the case  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b > c$ , the metric dimension is  $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$ . Finally, in Section 9, we discuss our results and the remaining open case, and as possible future work we suggest to prove three conjectures.

## 2. Notations and Preliminaries

Let  $\mathbb{N}$  be the set of positive integers, and for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $[n]$  be the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . We aim to determine the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_b \times K_c$ , which we denote by  $f(a, b, c)$  for  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ .

We define a *strategy* for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind to be a set of questions. For a secret  $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$  and a question  $q = (q_1, q_2, q_3)$ , let  $g(s, q) = i$  for  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ , if the question  $q$  receives  $i$  black pegs for the secret  $s$ . A strategy  $Q$  is *feasible* if for all secrets  $s, s'$  with  $s \neq s'$  there is a question  $q \in Q$  such that  $g(s, q) \neq g(s', q)$ . Thus, a *feasible strategy* is one which lets the codebreaker win no matter which secret the codemaker chooses, An *optimal* strategy is one which is minimal in size.

We make use of the following terminology from [2].

- Definition 1(a)** *Two questions  $(d_1, d_2, d_3)$  and  $(e_1, e_2, e_3)$  are neighboring if there is exactly one index  $i \in [3]$  such that  $d_i = e_i$ .*
- (b) *Two questions  $(d_1, d_2, d_3)$  and  $(e_1, e_2, e_3)$  are double-neighboring, if there are exactly two indices  $i \in [3]$  such that  $d_i = e_i$ .*
- (c) *For a given strategy and  $f_1, f_2, f_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ , a question  $q$  is a  $(f_1, f_2, f_3)$ -question, if for  $i \in [3]$ , the  $i$ -th color of  $q$  occurs  $f_i$  times on the  $i$ -th peg (throughout the entire strategy). We extend this by allowing  $a_i$  to be  $\star$ , meaning that it is not relevant how often the  $i$ -th color occurs on the  $i$ -th peg.*

**Definition 2.** Consider a strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind. The strategy graph  $G = (V, E)$  of this strategy is defined as the undirected graph whose vertex set  $V$  is the set of all questions, and in which two vertices are adjacent if and only if they are neighboring questions. If two questions are double-neighboring, then the strategy graph has multiple edges.

In the following we often consider strategies consisting of the following types of questions, each of which is named by a letter:

$$\begin{array}{ll} (1, 2, 2)\text{-questions} \rightarrow \text{type } A & (2, 1, 1)\text{-questions} \rightarrow \text{type } D \\ (2, 1, 2)\text{-questions} \rightarrow \text{type } B & (1, 2, 1)\text{-questions} \rightarrow \text{type } E \\ (2, 2, 1)\text{-questions} \rightarrow \text{type } C & (1, 1, 2)\text{-questions} \rightarrow \text{type } F \end{array}$$

In the corresponding strategy graph each vertex is of degree 1 or 2. Thus, the graph consists of connected components each of which is either a path or a cycle.

In the following, we list the questions in a given strategy as follows. We order the blocks in an arbitrary way. We start with the questions of one block, continue with the questions of another block until the last block. Each path starts with one of its extreme vertices while each cycle starts with an arbitrary vertex. Thus, in one block, the next question is one such that the corresponding vertices are adjacent, i.e., the questions are neighboring.

### 3. Key lemmas

In this section we present several lemmas which are needed for the feasibility and optimality proofs later. We start with the following lemma [2, Lemma 3, Lemma 4(a),(b)]. Its proof from [2] holds for the case  $a = b = c$ , but it works just as well without this assumption.

**Lemma 3.** Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ . Every feasible strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind has the following properties:

- (a) There exists at most one color which does not occur on the first peg of any question.  
Analogous statements hold for the second peg and for the third peg.
- (b) There is at most one  $(1, 1, \star)$ -question.  
Analogous statements hold for the cases of  $(1, \star, 1)$ -questions and  $(\star, 1, 1)$ -questions.  
In particular, setting  $\star = 1$ , there can be at most one  $(1, 1, 1)$ -question.

- (c) *The strategy does not contain three distinct questions one of which is a  $(1, 1, \star)$ -question, one of which is a  $(1, \star, 1)$ -question, and the third one of which is a  $(\star, 1, 1)$ -question.*
- (d) *Assume that there is a color which does not occur on the first peg and a color which does not occur on the second peg. Then the strategy cannot contain a  $(1, 1, \star)$ -question. Analogous statements hold for the first and the third peg, and for the second and the third peg.*
- (e) *Assume that there is a color which does not occur on the first peg and a color which does not occur on the second peg. Then the strategy cannot contain both a  $(1, \star, 1)$ -question and a  $(\star, 1, 1)$ -question. Analogous statements hold for the first and the third peg (where the strategy cannot contain both a  $(1, 1, \star)$ -question and a  $(\star, 1, 1)$ -question), and for the second and the third peg (where the strategy cannot contain both a  $(1, 1, \star)$ -question and a  $(1, \star, 1)$ -question).*
- (f) *If the strategy contains two double-neighboring  $(2, 2, 1)$ -questions, then it contains no  $(1, 1, \star)$ -question, and it holds that on at least one of the first two pegs all colors occur. Analogous questions hold for double-neighboring  $(2, 1, 2)$ -questions and for two double-neighboring  $(1, 2, 2)$ -questions.*
- (g) *Assume that the strategy contains a  $(2, 2, 1)$ -question, a  $(2, \star, 1)$ -question and a  $(\star, 2, 1)$ -question, where the first and the second question are neighboring on the first peg, and the first and the third question are neighboring on the second peg. Then the strategy contains no  $(1, 1, \star)$ -question, and it holds that on at least one of the first two pegs all colors occur in the questions. Analogous statements hold for a  $(2, 1, 2)$ -question, a  $(\star, 1, 2)$ -question and a  $(2, 1, \star)$ -question, and for a  $(1, 2, 2)$ -question, a  $(1, \star, 2)$ -question and a  $(1, 2, \star)$ -question.*

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $a \leq b \leq c$ . Then it holds that  $f(a, b, c) \geq c - 1$ .*

*Proof.* This follows directly from Lemma 3(a), as having less questions would lead to at least two missing colors in the last peg.  $\square$

The next lemma shows that an increase of the colors on one peg increases the metric dimension not more than by 1.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then it holds that  $f(a, b, c + 1) \leq f(a, b, c) + 1$ ,  $f(a, b + 1, c) \leq f(a, b, c) + 1$ , and  $f(a + 1, b, c) \leq f(a, b, c) + 1$ .*

*Proof.* We first show that  $f(a, b, c + 1) \leq f(a, b, c) + 1$ . Let  $Q$  be an optimal strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind, i.e., it has  $f(a, b, c)$  questions. The statement holds for  $a = b = c = 1$  because, obviously,  $f(1, 1, 1) = 0$  and  $f(1, 1, 2) = 1$ . Thus, assume in the following that  $\max\{a, b, c\} \geq 2$  and thus  $|Q| \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $(q_1, q_2, q_3) \in Q$  be arbitrary and define  $Q' = Q \cup \{(q_1, q_2, c + 1)\}$ . We show that  $Q'$  is a feasible strategy for  $(a, b, c + 1)$ -Mastermind by showing that all pairs of secrets  $s = (x, y, z)$  and  $s' = (x', y', z')$  are distinguished by at least one question of  $Q'$ .

- $z, z' \neq c + 1$ .

The secrets  $s$  and  $s'$  are secrets of  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind and therefore must be distinguished by at least one question  $q \in Q \subseteq Q'$ . Hence, the statement is verified.

- $z = z' = c + 1$ .

Since  $Q$  is feasible, there exists a question  $q = (q'_1, q'_2, q'_3)$  of  $Q$  that distinguishes  $(x, y, c)$  and  $(x', y', c)$ .

We consider two subcases.

- $q'_3 \in [c - 1]$ .

Then  $g(q, (x, y, c)) = g(q, s)$  and  $g(q, (x', y', c)) = g(q, s')$ .

- $q'_3 = c$ .

Then  $g(q, (x, y, c)) = 1 + g(q, s)$  and  $g(q, (x', y', c)) = 1 + g(q, s')$ .

In both cases,  $g(q, (x, y, c)) - g(q, (x', y', c)) = g(q, s) - g(q, s')$  and since  $q$  distinguishes  $(x, y, c)$  and  $(x', y', c)$ , it also distinguishes  $s$  and  $s'$ .

- $z = c + 1$  and  $z' \neq c + 1$ .

If  $(q_1, q_2, c + 1)$  distinguishes  $s$  and  $s'$  then there is nothing to show. Thus, assume that  $g((q_1, q_2, c + 1), s) = g((q_1, q_2, c + 1), s') = X$  for some  $X \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ . We have  $g((q_1, q_2, q_3), s) = X - 1$  and  $g((q_1, q_2, q_3), s') \in \{X, X + 1\}$ , proving that  $(q_1, q_2, q_3) \in Q'$  distinguishes  $s$  and  $s'$ .

- $z \neq c + 1$  and  $z' = c + 1$ .

This case is analogous to the case  $z = c + 1$  and  $z' \neq c + 1$ .

In conclusion, all possible pairs of secrets of  $(a, b, c + 1)$ -Mastermind are indeed distinguished by  $Q'$ . Since this reasoning holds for all feasible strategies  $Q$ ,  $f(a, b, c + 1) \leq f(a, b, c) + 1$  follows.

The proofs of the statements  $f(a, b + 1, c) \leq f(a, b, c) + 1$  and  $f(a + 1, b, c) \leq f(a, b, c) + 1$  are entirely analogous.  $\square$

**Remark 6.** *Given a feasible strategy  $Q$  for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind, the proof of Lemma 5 gives a construction for a feasible strategy for  $(a, b, c + 1)$ -Mastermind as follows. Choose an arbitrary question  $(q_1, q_2, q_3) \in Q$ . Then add the question  $(q_1, q_2, c + 1)$  to  $Q$  and obtain the strategy  $Q'$  for  $(a, b, c + 1)$ -Mastermind.*

*Analogously, the proof also gives constructions for a feasible strategy for  $(a, b + 1, c)$ -Mastermind and for a feasible strategy for  $(a + 1, b, c)$ -Mastermind.*

Now let us present a way to decrease the value of the number of colors of one peg so that we still have a feasible strategy. For this, it seems quite intuitive that we always have  $f(a, b, c) \leq f(a + 1, b, c)$  (and similarly for the second and third peg). To prove this result, one could show how to transform any strategy for  $(a + 1, b, c)$ -Mastermind into a strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind using the same number of questions. One way to do this would be to "change" one color in the first peg to another color. However, this does not always lead to a feasible strategy. For seeing this, consider Table 2, where (a) gives a strategy for  $(3, 3, 3)$ -Mastermind with 4 questions and (b) the corresponding strategy for  $(2, 3, 3)$ -Mastermind after changing the 3 of the first peg of  $q_4$  into a 2. However, this does not yield a feasible strategy, as the secrets  $(2, 1, 2)$  and  $(1, 3, 3)$  are not distinguished.

In the next lemma, we provide sufficient conditions to transform a feasible strategy for  $(a + 1, b, c)$ -Mastermind into a feasible strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind using the same number of questions. To do so, we first need the following definition, formalizing the notion of "changing a color" used earlier.

**Definition 7.** *Let  $a \geq 2$ , let  $Q$  be a feasible strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind, and let  $i, j \in [a]$  be two distinct colors of the first peg. Then we obtain a strategy  $Q_1(i, j)$  for  $(a - 1, b, c)$ -Mastermind by replacing each occurrence of  $j$  with  $i$  and then decreasing each color on the first peg that is greater than  $j$  by 1. We call this strategy  $Q_1(i, j)$  the projection strategy from color  $j$  to*



Peg	1	2	3
$q_1$	1	1	1
$q_2$	1	2	2
$q_3$	2	2	3
$q_4$	3	3	1

(a) Feasible strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind.

Peg	1	2	3
$q_1$	1	1	1
$q_2$	1	2	2
$q_3$	2	2	3
$q_4$	2	3	1

(b) Non-feasible strategy for  $(2, 3, 3)$ -Mastermind obtained from the strategy of (a).

Table 2: Strategies for  $(3, 3, 3)$ -Mastermind and  $(2, 3, 3)$ -Mastermind.

$i$  for the first peg. We define the projection strategies  $Q_2(i, j)$  and  $Q_3(i, j)$  for the second and third peg analogously (where  $b \geq 2$ ,  $i, j \in [b]$  and  $c \geq 2$ ,  $i, j \in [c]$ , respectively).

**Lemma 8.** *Let  $a \geq 2$ , let  $Q$  be a feasible strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind, and consider distinct colors  $i, j \in [a]$  of the first peg. If for all  $y \in [b]$  and  $z \in [c]$  there exists a question  $(q_1, q_2, q_3) \in Q$  such that  $q_1 \in \{i, j\}$ ,  $q_2 \neq y$  and  $q_3 \neq z$ , then the projection strategy  $Q_1(i, j)$  is feasible for  $(a - 1, b, c)$ -Mastermind.*

*Analogous statements hold for the second peg and  $(a, b - 1, c)$ -Mastermind, and for the third peg with  $(a, b, c - 1)$ -Mastermind.*

*Proof.* W.l.o.g., consider the projection  $Q_1(a - 1, a)$ , as the projection principle is the same for every peg, and by changing the color names, every projection for the first peg is analogous to a  $Q_1(a - 1, a)$  projection.

In the following we show that each pair of secrets  $s = (x, y, z)$  and  $s' = (x', y', z')$  of  $(a - 1, b, c)$ -Mastermind is distinguished by at least one question of  $Q_1(a - 1, a)$ . As  $s$  and  $s'$  are also secrets of  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind, there is a question  $q = (q_1, q_2, q_3)$  of  $Q$  that distinguishes these secrets.

If  $q_1 \neq a$ , then  $q \in Q_1(a - 1, a)$  distinguishes  $s$  and  $s'$ . Assume therefore in the following that  $q_1 = a$ . Then  $q$  has been replaced by  $q' = (a - 1, b, c)$  in  $Q_1(a - 1, a)$ . We have the following four cases.

- $x, x' \neq a - 1$ .

Then  $g(q, s) = g(q', s)$  and  $g(q, s') = g(q', s')$ , so  $s$  and  $s'$  are still distinguished.

- $x = x' = a - 1$ .

Then  $g(q, s) = g(q', s) - 1$  and  $g(q, s') = g(q', s') - 1$ , and the difference in the number of black pegs remains the same. Therefore,  $q'$  distinguishes  $s$  and  $s'$ .

- $x = a - 1$  and  $x' \neq a - 1$ .

Then by assumption there is a question  $(q'_1, q'_2, q'_3) \in Q$  such that  $q'_1 \in \{a - 1, a\}$ ,  $q'_2 \neq y'$  and  $q'_3 \neq z'$ . Therefore, the question  $(a - 1, q'_2, q'_3)$  is in  $Q_1(a - 1, a)$ . For this question it holds that  $g((a - 1, q'_2, q'_3), s) \geq 1$  and  $g((a - 1, q'_2, q'_3), s') = 0$ . Therefore, it distinguishes  $s$  and  $s'$ .

- $x \neq a - 1$  and  $x' = a - 1$ .

This case is analogous to the case  $x = a - 1$  and  $x' \neq a - 1$ .

In conclusion, each pair of secrets of  $(a - 1, b, c)$ -Mastermind is distinguished by  $Q_1(a - 1, a)$ .

The proofs of the two other projection strategies work analogously.  $\square$

**Corollary 9.** *If there exists an optimal strategy  $Q$  and colors  $i, j$  which fulfill the conditions of Lemma 8, then it holds that  $f(a - 1, b, c) \leq f(a, b, c)$  (and analogous for the second and the third peg).*

In the remainder of this paper, we will introduce several strategies using questions of type A, B, C. We will use the following lemma to prove the feasibility of these strategies. To do so, we provide a list of patterns such that strategies avoiding all these patterns are feasible.

Let  $T \in \{A, B, C\}$  be a type of question. The *single peg* of  $T$  is the peg that contains the color occurring only in the question of type  $T$ , and the two other pegs are the *double pegs* of  $T$ . For example, the single peg of a question of type A is the first peg and the other two pegs are its double pegs.

We say that a set of  $k$  questions is a *sequence of type*  $T_1 T_2 \dots T_k$  if these questions can be arranged in a sequence  $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k$  such that

- (a)  $q_i$  and  $q_{i+1}$  are neighboring to each other for all  $i \in [k - 1]$ , and
- (b)  $q_i$  is of type  $T_i \in \{A, B, C\}$  for all  $i \in [k]$ .

**Lemma 10.** *Let a set  $Q$  of questions contain only questions of type A, B and C and avoid the following patterns:*

- (1) *two colors missing on the same peg,*

- (2) a missing color on each peg,
- (3) a sequence of type  $TTT$  and missing colors on both of the double pegs of  $T$ .
- (4) a sequence of type  $TTT$  and a pair of double-neighboring  $TT$ ,
- (5) a sequence of type  $T_1T_1T_2T_2$  ( $T_1 \neq T_2$ ) with a missing color on the peg that is double for both  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ ,
- (6) a sequence of type  $T_1T_1T_2T_3T_3$ , where all three types distinct,
- (7) two different sequences of the same type  $T_1T_2$  ( $T_1 \neq T_2$ ),
- (8) a sequence of type  $T_1T_2$  ( $T_1 \neq T_2$ ), a sequence of type  $T_2T_2$  of double-neighboring questions, and a missing color on the single peg of  $T_2$ ,
- (9) a sequence of type  $TT$  of double-neighboring questions, with missing colors on both the double pegs of  $T$ ,
- (10) two different sequences of type  $TT$  of double-neighboring questions,
- (11) two different sequences of types  $T_1T_1$  and  $T_2T_2$ , both of these consisting of double-neighboring questions, and missing colors on the single pegs of both  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , and
- (12) sequences of types  $AA$ ,  $BB$ , and  $CC$  of double-neighboring questions. Then  $Q$  is a feasible strategy.

*Proof.* Let  $Q$  be a strategy which consists only of questions of type  $A$ ,  $B$  or  $C$  and which avoids all the listed patterns. Furthermore, let  $s_1 = (x_1, y_1, z_1)$  and  $s_2 = (x_2, y_2, z_2)$  be two secrets with  $s_1 \neq s_2$ . We show that  $Q$  distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

First, let us prove a claim that will simplify the proof.

*Claim.* Let  $x_1 \neq x_2$ ,  $y_1 \neq y_2$ ,  $z_1 \neq z_2$ .

- (a) Then the following are the only questions which do not distinguish  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ :
  - (i) questions  $q$  with  $g(q, s_1) = g(q, s_2) = 0$ , i.e., which contain neither  $x_1$  nor  $x_2$  on the first peg, neither  $y_1$  nor  $y_2$  on the second peg, neither  $z_1$  nor  $z_2$  on the third peg, ]

(ii) questions  $(x_i, y_j, \star)$ ,  $(x_i, \star, z_j)$ ,  $(\star, y_i, z_j)$  for  $i, j \in [2]$ ,  $i \neq j$ , where “ $\star$ ” stands for a color different from the colors of the two secrets on this peg.

(b) In particular,  $(x_i, y_j, z_k)$  for  $i, j, k \in [2]$  distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

(c) In particular, a question distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ , if the color on one peg is the color of  $s_1$  (resp.  $s_2$ ), and the colors on the two other pegs differ from the colors of  $s_2$  (resp.  $s_1$ ).

*Proof (Claim).* (a) As  $x_1 \neq x_2$ ,  $y_1 \neq y_2$ ,  $z_1 \neq z_2$  hold,  $g(q, s_1) = g(q, s_2) > 0$  implies  $g(q, s_1) = g(q, s_2) = 1$ . Then the color on one peg of this question is only equal to the color of  $s_1$ , the color on another peg is only equal to the color of  $s_2$ . and the color on the remaining peg is different from both colors of  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  on this peg,

(b) This follows, as these questions are not listed in (a).

(c) This follows, as these questions are not listed in (a).

Since  $s_1 \neq s_2$  holds,  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  differ in at least one peg. W.l.o.g., let  $x_1 \neq x_2$ . As  $Q$  avoids pattern 1, there is a question  $q_1$  containing  $x_1$  or  $x_2$  on the first peg, say  $q_1 = (x_1, \star, \star)$ .

If  $q_1$  contains neither  $y_2$  on the second nor  $z_2$  on the third peg, then it distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ . Thus, we can assume w.l.o.g. that  $q_1$  contains  $y_2$  on the second peg. Moreover, we can also assume that  $y_1 \neq y_2$ . This is because  $y_1 = y_2$  implies that  $q_1$  contains  $z_2$  on the third peg and  $z_1 \neq z_2$  and we could let the third peg take this role. In summary, assume in the following that  $Q$  contains a question  $q_1 = (x_1, y_2, \star)$  with  $x_1 \neq x_2$  and  $y_1 \neq y_2$ .

We consider different cases, depending on the type of  $q_1$ . To follow the proof more easily, Figure 1 shows the state of the questions at the start of each subcase of the proof. This information is also repeated in the margin at the beginning of each subcase.




Figure 1: The questions and the colors of the secrets  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  at the start of each subcase of Lemma 10

**Case 1:**  $q_1$  is of type  $A$ .

Since  $q_1$  is of type  $A$ , no other question contains the color  $x_1$  on the first peg and there is a question  $q_2$ , different from  $q_1$ , which contains  $y_2$  on the second peg.<sup>2</sup> Similarly to  $q_1$ , if  $q_2$  does not contain  $z_1$ , it distinguishes

$$q_1: (x_1, y_2, *) - A$$

<sup>2</sup>In the following, we will omit the reference to the peg in question when talking about the colors  $x_i, y_i, z_i$  ( $i \in [2]$ ), as these colors always refer to the first, second, and third peg, respectively. Thus we write, e.g., that a question does not contain  $z_2$  when we mean that it does not contain that color on the third peg.

$s_1$  and  $s_2$  (because it also does not contain  $x_1$ ). Hence,  $q_2 = (\star, y_2, z_1)$ . Moreover, we have  $z_1 \neq z_2$ . Thus, in Case 1,  $x_1 \neq x_2, y_1 \neq y_2, z_1 \neq z_2$  holds, and we can apply the claim.

We now look at the type of  $q_2$ . Note that it cannot be of type  $B$ , since  $q_2$  contains  $y_2$  which is also in  $q_1$ .

**Case 1.1:**  $q_2$  is of type  $A$ .

Since  $q_2$  is of type  $A$ , there is a question  $q_3$ , different from  $q_2$ , that contains  $z_1$ . If  $q_3 = q_1$ , then we have  $q_1 = (x_1, y_2, z_1)$  and  $x_1 \neq x_2, y_1 \neq y_2, z_1 \neq z_2$ , therefore  $q_1$  distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ . We can then assume that  $q_1 \neq q_3$ .

$$\begin{array}{l} q_1 : (x_1, y_2, \star) - A \\ q_2 : (\star, y_2, z_1) - A \end{array}$$

Similarly to previous cases,  $q_3$  must contain either  $x_2$  or  $y_2$ , as otherwise it would distinguish  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ . However, since  $y_2$  is already in  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ , it cannot occur in  $q_3$ . Therefore,  $q_3 = (x_2, \star, z_1)$  and  $q_3$  is either of type  $A$  or of type  $B$ .

**Case 1.1.1:**  $q_3$  is of type  $A$ .

Since  $Q$  avoids pattern 3, either  $y_1$  or  $z_2$  occur in some question  $q_4$ . W.l.o.g, we can assume that  $q_4 = (\star, y_1, \star)$ . Note that  $q_4 \neq q_3$ , as otherwise  $q_4 = (x_2, y_1, z_1)$ , which is not possible by Claim (b). Further,  $q_4 \notin \{q_1, q_2\}$  holds as both questions contain  $y_2$ . Thus,  $q_4 \notin \{q_1, q_2, q_3\}$ . As  $x_2$  occurs in  $q_3$ , and  $q_3$  is of type  $A$ , Claim (a) yields  $q_4 = (\star, y_1, z_2)$ . Since  $q_4$  is of type  $A, B$  or  $C$ , there exists a question  $q_5$  that contains  $y_1$  or  $z_2$ . Moreover, since  $Q$  avoids pattern 4,  $q_5$  cannot contain both  $y_1$  and  $z_2$ . Since  $q_1$  and  $q_3$  are of type  $A$ ,  $q_5$  cannot contain  $x_1$  or  $x_2$  either. Therefore,  $q_5$  will either contain  $y_1$  and neither  $x_2$  nor  $z_2$ , or  $q_5$  will contain  $z_2$  and neither  $x_1$  nor  $y_1$ . By Claim (c), in both cases,  $q_5$  distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

$$\begin{array}{l} q_1 : (x_1, y_2, \star) - A \\ q_2 : (\star, y_2, z_1) - A \\ q_3 : (x_2, \star, z_1) - A \end{array}$$

**Case 1.1.2:**  $q_3$  is of type  $B$ .

As  $q_3$  is of type  $B$ , there exists another question  $q_4$  that contains  $x_2$ , and by Claim (a), it must also contain  $y_1$  or  $z_1$ . Since  $z_1$  already occurs in the questions  $q_2$  and  $q_3$ ,  $q_4 = (x_2, y_1, \star)$  follows.

$$\begin{array}{l} q_1 : (x_1, y_2, \star) - A \\ q_2 : (\star, y_2, z_1) - A \\ q_3 : (x_2, \star, z_1) - B \end{array}$$

**Case 1.1.2.1:**  $q_4$  is of type  $B$ .

Since  $Q$  avoids pattern 5,  $z_2$  is not a missing color, and it must occur in a question  $q_5$ . Then  $q_5$  must be different from  $q_2$  and  $q_3$ , which contain  $z_1$ , and from  $q_1$ , as otherwise  $q_5 = (x_1, y_2, z_2)$  would hold, and  $q_4$ , as otherwise  $q_5 = (x_2, y_1, z_2)$  would hold, each of these cases contradicting Claim (b). Moreover, since  $q_1$  is of type  $A$  and  $q_4$  of

$$\begin{array}{l} q_1 : (x_1, y_2, \star) - A \\ q_2 : (\star, y_2, z_1) - A \\ q_3 : (x_2, \star, z_1) - B \\ q_4 : (x_2, y_1, \star) - B \end{array}$$

type  $B$ ,  $q_5$  contains neither  $x_1$  nor  $y_1$ , but contains  $z_2$ . Therefore, by Claim (c),  $q_5$  distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

**Case 1.1.2.2:**  $q_4$  is of type  $C$ .

Then there exists another question  $q_5$  that contains  $y_1$ . Because of  $y_1 \neq y_2$ , it is different from  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ . As  $q_3$  and  $q_4$  contain  $x_2$ ,  $q_5$  cannot contain it. By Claim (a), must contain  $z_2$ , i.e.,  $q_5 = (\star, y_1, z_2)$ . Since  $y_1$  occurs in both  $q_4$  and  $q_5$ ,  $q_5$  cannot be of type  $B$ . It cannot be of type  $C$  either, as  $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_5$  would give the sequence  $AABCC$  which is forbidden by pattern 6. So  $q_5$  must be of type  $A$ . Therefore, there is another question  $q_6$  that contains  $z_2$ . This question cannot contain  $x_1$ , which only occurs in  $q_1$ , nor  $y_1$ , which occurs in both  $q_4$  and  $q_5$ . However, it contains  $z_2$ . Therefore, by Claim (c),  $q_6$  distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

$q_1: (x_1, y_2, \star) - A$
$q_2: (\star, y_2, z_1) - A$
$q_3: (x_2, \star, z_1) - B$
$q_4: (x_2, y_1, \star) - C$

**Case 1.2:**  $q_2$  is of type  $C$ .

Since  $Q$  avoids pattern 2, at least one color from  $x_2, y_1$  or  $z_2$  occurs in a question. Note that the cases where  $x_2$  or  $z_2$  occur in a question are symmetric. Moreover, if  $q_3$  contains  $x_2$ , it must also contain  $y_1$ , since  $z_1$  occurs in the question  $q_2$  of type  $C$ . Analogously, if  $q_3$  contains  $z_2$ , it must also contain  $y_1$ , since  $x_1$  occurs in the question  $q_1$  of type  $A$ . If  $y_1$  occurs in a question, it must also contain  $x_2$  or  $z_2$ . Therefore, we can assume w.l.o.g. that there exists a question  $q_3 = (x_2, y_1, \star)$ .

$q_1: (x_1, y_2, \star) - A$
$q_2: (\star, y_2, z_1) - C$

**Case 1.2.1:**  $q_3$  is of type  $A$ .

Since  $q_3$  is of type  $A$ , there is another question  $q_4$  that contains  $y_1$ . As the question  $q_3$  of type  $A$  contains  $x_2$ ,  $q_4$  cannot contain  $x_2$  and it must contain  $z_2$ .  $q_4$  question cannot be of type  $B$ , as  $y_1$  occurs in question  $q_3$  and it cannot be of type  $C$  as  $Q$  avoids pattern 7 and both pairs of questions  $q_1q_2$  and  $q_3q_4$  would both be a sequence  $AC$ . Therefore,  $q_4$  is of type  $A$ . Note now that if we forget questions  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ , the questions  $q_3$  and  $q_4$  are exactly in the same situation as questions  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  in Case 1.1. This case has been concluded with the fact that  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are distinguished, and thus this is also the case here.

$q_1: (x_1, y_2, \star) - A$
$q_2: (\star, y_2, z_1) - C$
$q_3: (x_2, y_1, \star) - A$

**Case 1.2.2:**  $q_3$  is of type  $B$ .

There exists another question  $q_4$  that contains  $x_2$ . It cannot be question  $q_2$ , as then  $q_4 = (x_2, y_2, z_1)$  would distinguish  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  by Claim (b). Moreover, since  $q_2$  is of type  $C$  and  $q_3$  of type  $B$ ,  $q_4$  can contain neither  $y_1$  nor  $z_1$ . Therefore, by Claim (c), it distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

$q_1: (x_1, y_2, \star) - A$
$q_2: (\star, y_2, z_1) - C$
$q_3: (x_2, y_1, \star) - B$

**Case 1.2.3:**  $q_3$  is of type  $C$ .

Since  $q_3$  is of type  $C$ , there exist questions  $q_4$  and  $q_5$ , different from  $q_3$ , that contain  $x_2$  and  $y_1$ , respectively.

$q_1: (x_1, y_2, \star) - A$
$q_2: (\star, y_2, z_1) - C$
$q_3: (x_2, y_1, \star) - C$

$q_4 \neq q_5$ .

Then  $q_4$  can contain neither  $y_1$ , which occurs in both  $q_3$  and  $q_5$ , nor  $z_1$ , which occurs in the question  $q_2$  of type  $C$ . Therefore, by Claim (c), it distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

$q_4 = q_5$ .

Then we have the sequence  $AC$  of the questions  $q_1q_2$  and the double-neighboring questions  $q_3q_4$ . Since  $Q$  avoids pattern 8, there is no missing color on the third peg (the single peg of type  $C$ ). Thus, there must be a question  $q_6$  that contains  $z_2$  and is not equal to  $q_2$  since  $z_1 \neq z_2$ . The cases where  $q_6 \in \{q_1, q_3, q_4\}$  lead to  $q_6 = (x_1, y_2, z_2)$ ,  $q_6 = (x_2, y_1, z_2)$  and  $q_6 = (x_2, y_1, z_2)$ , respectively. By Claim (b), in all three cases,  $q_6$  distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ . Therefore,  $q_6$  is a new question. However,  $q_6$  can neither contain  $x_1$ , which occurs on the single peg of  $q_1$ , nor  $y_1$ , which occurs in both  $q_3$  and  $q_4$ . Therefore, by Claim (c), it distinguishes  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

**Case 2:**  $q_1$  is of type  $B$ .

By symmetry, switching the roles of pegs 1 and 2, this works analogously to Case 1.

**Case 3:**  $q_1$  is of type  $C$ .

Then there exists another question  $q_2$  that contains  $x_1$  and another question  $q_3$  that contains  $y_2$ . These two questions can be the same, in the case that  $q_2 = q_3$  is double neighboring to  $q_1$ . Let us now study two cases depending on whether they are different questions or not.

$q_1: (x_1, y_2, \star) - C$
------------------------------

**Case 3.1:**  $q_2 \neq q_3$ .

To avoid distinguishing  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ ,  $q_2$  must contain  $z_2$  and  $q_3$  must contain  $z_1$ , with  $z_1 \neq z_2$ . Thus, for the remainder of Case 3.1 we can assume that  $x_1 \neq x_2$ ,  $y_1 \neq y_2$ , and  $z_1 \neq z_2$ , which means that we can apply the claim.

$q_1: (x_1, y_2, \star) - C$
$q_2: (x_1, \star, \star)$
$q_3: (\star, y_2, \star)$

If not both of  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  occur in other questions, we are back in Case 1, where we replace type  $A$  with type  $C$ . Thus, let  $q_4$  be another question that contains  $z_1$ , and let  $q_5$  be another question that contains  $z_2$ . Both these questions must be different from  $q_1$ , as otherwise  $q_4 = (x_1, y_2, z_1)$  and  $q_5 = (x_1, y_2, z_2)$ , which by Claim (b) would distinguish  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .



For  $q_4$  and  $q_5$  to not distinguish  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  it must be the case that  $q_4$  contains  $x_2$  and  $q_5$  contains  $y_1$ , both colors also occurring in other questions, as otherwise again we would be in Case 1. However, then  $q_2$  is of type  $B$ ,  $q_3$  of type  $A$ ,  $q_4$  of type  $B$  and  $q_5$  of type  $A$ , with  $q_2q_5$  and  $q_4q_3$  both forming sequences of type  $BA$ , which is forbidden by pattern 7. Therefore, if we are not in Case 1, we have a question distinguishing  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

Note that with this case, we have finished the proof in all cases in which one of the colors of the secrets is not part of the double pegs of double-neighboring questions. We can then assume in the following that every color of the secrets only occurs as part of double-neighboring questions.

**Case 3.2:**  $q_2 = q_3$ .

Since  $Q$  avoids pattern 9, one of  $x_2$  and  $y_1$  occurs in another question. Assume w.l.o.g. that there exists another question  $q_3$  (note that as we are in the case  $q_2 = q_3$ , we can renumber and continue with  $q_3$ , which now is different from  $q_2$ ) that contains  $x_2$ . If  $q_3$  does not distinguish  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ , it must contain either  $y_1$  or  $z_1$ , which leads to the following two cases.

$q_1 : (x_1, y_2, \star) - C$
$q_2 : (x_1, y_2, \star) - C$

**Case 3.2.1:**  $q_3$  contains  $y_1$ .

By the assumption above,  $q_3$  is of type  $C$ , double-neighboring to another question  $q_4$  on the two first pegs. However,  $q_1q_2$  and  $q_3q_4$  would be two pairs of double-neighboring questions of type  $CC$  which is impossible since  $Q$  avoids pattern 10.

$q_1 : (x_1, y_2, \star) - C$
$q_2 : (x_1, y_2, \star) - C$
$q_3 : (x_2, y_1, \star)$

**Case 3.2.2:**  $q_3$  contains  $z_1$ .

Similar to Case 3.2.1,  $q_3$  must be double-neighboring to a question  $q_4$  on the first and third peg. We now have two pairs of double-neighboring questions,  $q_1q_2$  of type  $CC$  and  $q_3q_4$  of type  $BB$ . Since  $Q$  avoids pattern 11, it is impossible that both the second and third peg have missing colors. W.l.o.g, we can thus assume that there is a question  $q_5$  that contains  $y_1$ . It must also contain  $z_2$ , since  $x_2$  already occurs in  $q_3$  and  $q_4$ . By assumption, it is double-neighboring to another question  $q_6$  on  $y_1$  and  $z_2$ . However, if this were the case, we would have three pairs of double-neighboring questions,  $q_1q_2$  of type  $CC$ ,  $q_3q_4$  of type  $BB$  and  $q_5q_6$  of type  $AA$ , which is forbidden by pattern 12. Therefore, this case cannot occur either.

$q_1 : (x_1, y_2, \star) - C$
$q_2 : (x_1, y_2, \star) - C$
$q_3 : (x_2, \star, z_1)$

In conclusion, if a strategy contains only questions of types  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$

and avoids all of the 12 patterns listed, it must be feasible.  $\square$

**Remark 11.** *Let a strategy have only questions of type A, B or C. Then by Lemma 10, avoiding the patterns 1 to 12 is sufficient for the feasibility of a strategy. On the other hand, it is easy to see that if a strategy contains one of the patterns (except possibly pattern 2), it is not feasible.*

We end this section by noting a lower bound for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind when  $b$  and  $c$  are not too far apart, using results from Cáceres *et al.* [1].

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $a \leq b \leq c$  and  $2b > c$ . Then it holds that  $f(a, b, c) \geq \lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$ .*

*Proof.* First, by [1, Theorem 6.1], the metric dimension of  $K_b \times K_c$  is  $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$ , therefore  $f(1, b, c) = \lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$ . Moreover, by [1, Corollary 3.2], the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_b \times K_c$  is greater than or equal to  $K_b \times K_c$  and therefore  $f(1, b, c) \leq f(a, b, c)$  holds. The assertion follows.  $\square$

#### 4. General lower bound

In this section, we prove a general lower bound, which is formulated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 13.** *Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $f(a, b, c) \geq \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$  holds.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $Q$  is a feasible strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind, with  $x$  colors that occur only once on the first peg,  $y$  colors that occur only once on the second peg and  $z$  colors that occur only once on the third peg. Assume also that  $|Q| = \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - k$  with  $k \geq 0$ , and thus

$$2(a + b + c) \geq 4|Q| + 4k. \quad (1)$$

By Lemma 3(a), on each peg at most one color is missing.

**Case 1:** On each peg one color is missing.

Recall that  $x$  is the number of colors that occur exactly once on the first peg. As all other colors except for the missing one occur at least twice,  $|Q| \geq x + 2(a - x - 1)$ , and thus  $x \geq 2a - |Q| - 2$ . We obtain in the same way that  $y \geq 2b - |Q| - 2$  and  $z \geq 2c - |Q| - 2$ .

Thus, by (1),

$$x + y + z \geq 2(a + b + c) - 3|Q| - 6 \geq |Q| + 4k - 6.$$

If  $x + y + z \geq |Q| + 1$ , there must be a  $(1, 1, \star)$ , a  $(1, \star, 1)$  or a  $(\star, 1, 1)$ -question, but by Lemma 3(d) this is impossible, since there is a missing color on each peg. So  $x + y + z \leq |Q|$  and thus  $4k \leq 6$ , which shows that  $k \leq 1$ .

**Case 2:** There are two pegs with one color missing on each.

W.l.o.g., the missing colors occur on the first and the second peg and the third peg has no missing color. Analogously to Case 1, for the first two pegs we have  $x \geq 2a - |Q| - 2$  and  $y \geq 2b - |Q| - 2$ . On the third peg, since there is no missing color,  $|Q| \geq z + 2(c - z)$  holds and  $z \geq 2c - |Q|$  follows.

Thus, by (1),

$$x + y + z \geq 2(a + b + c) - 3|Q| - 4 \geq |Q| + 4k - 4.$$

Since there is a missing color on the first and on the second peg, by Lemma 3(d), no  $(1, 1, \star)$ -question can occur, and by Lemma 3(e), it is not possible that there is both a  $(1, \star, 1)$ -question and a  $(\star, 1, 1)$ -question. Furthermore, by Lemma 3(b), if one of these questions occurs, there is no other question of the same type. If  $x + y + z \geq |Q| + 2$ , one of these situations would have to be the case, which shows that  $x + y + z \leq |Q| + 1$ . Thus, we must have  $4k - 4 \leq 1$  and so  $k \leq 1$ .

**Case 3:** There is at most one peg having a missing color.

W.l.o.g., there are no missing colors occurring on the second and the third peg. As above, this means  $y \geq 2b - |Q|$  and  $z \geq 2c - |Q|$ . As there might be a missing color on the first peg, we have  $x \geq 2a - |Q| - 2$ .

Thus, by (1),

$$x + y + z \geq 2(a + b + c) - 3|Q| - 2 \geq |Q| + 4k - 2.$$

By Lemma 3(b), at most one  $(1, 1, \star)$ -question, at most one  $(1, \star, 1)$ -question, and at most one  $(\star, 1, 1)$ -question occurs. By Lemma 3(c), it is not possible that all of them occur at the same time. If  $x + y + z \geq |Q| + 3$ , this would be the case, which shows that  $x + y + z \leq |Q| + 2$ ,  $4k - 2 \leq 2$  and so  $k \leq 1$ .

Thus, the feasibility of  $Q$  implies that  $k \leq 1$ , which proves that  $|Q| \geq \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$  for all feasible strategies.  $\square$

## 5. The case of $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with $3a \geq b + c$

In this section, we prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 14.** *Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $a \leq b \leq c$  and  $3a \geq b + c$ . Then it holds that  $f(a, b, c) \leq \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$ .*

To establish this theorem, we define suitable feasible strategies. To do so, let  $c' = c$  if  $a + b + c$  is even and  $c' = c - 1$  if  $a + b + c$  is odd, so that  $a + b + c'$  is an even number. We can now define  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$ , such that the strategies to be constructed below contain  $x$  questions of type  $A$ ,  $y$  questions of type  $B$ , and  $z$  questions of type  $C$ :

$$x := 2a - \frac{a + b + c'}{2}, \quad y := 2b - \frac{a + b + c'}{2}, \quad z := 2c' - \frac{a + b + c'}{2}.$$

Note that  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  are integers, because  $a + b + c' \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ , and that  $x + y + z = \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$ . Moreover, since  $3a \geq b + c$  and  $b \geq a$ ,  $x$  and  $y$  are non-negative. If  $c' = c$  then  $z$  is also non-negative.

In the remaining case, where  $c' = c - 1$ ,  $z$  is non-negative if  $3(c - 1) \geq a + b$ . Assume now that  $3(c - 1) < a + b$ . It follows that  $c - 1 < a$ , because otherwise we would have  $3(c - 1) \geq 3a \geq b + c \geq a + b$ . Together, the inequalities  $a \leq b \leq c$  and  $c - 1 < a$  imply  $a = b = c$ . So,  $a + b + c - 3 = 3(c - 1) < a + b$  and thus  $c < 3$ . This leaves two cases:  $a = b = c = 1$ , where  $f(a, b, c) = 0$  and the statement of the theorem holds, or  $a = b = c = 2$ , which does not fall into the case  $c' = c - 1$  since  $a + b + c$  is even. Therefore, disregarding the uninteresting case  $a = b = c = 1$ ,  $z$  is always non-negative, too.

### 5.1. Strategy for the case $a + b + c \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$

In this subsection, we provide a strategy for the case  $3a \geq b + c$  and  $a + b + c \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$ . Observe that in this case,  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  are even.

As mentioned earlier, the strategy consists of  $x$  questions of type  $A$ ,  $y$  questions of type  $B$ , and  $z$  questions of type  $C$ . Each of these question types will form a block (recall that a block is a connected component of the strategy graph).

**Strategy 1.** ( $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$ -strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a \geq b + c$ ,  $a + b + c \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$  and  $(a, b, c) \notin \{(4, 4, 4), (4, 4, 5)\}$ )

First peg:

- First block: colors  $1, 2, \dots, x$ .
- Second block: colors  $x + 1, x + 1, x + 2, x + 2, \dots, x + y/2, x + y/2$ .
- Third block: colors  $x+y/2+1, x+y/2+1, x+y/2+2, x+y/2+2, \dots, a, a$ .

Second peg:

- First block: colors  $1, 1, 2, 2, \dots, x/2, x/2$ .
- Second block: colors  $x/2 + 1, x/2 + 2, \dots, x/2 + y - 1, x/2 + y$ .
- Third block: colors  $x/2+y+1, x/2+y+2, x/2+y+2, \dots, b, b, x/2+y+1$ .

Third peg:

- First block: colors  $1, 2, 2, \dots, x/2, x/2, 1$ .
- Second block: colors  $x/2 + 1, x/2 + 2, x/2 + 2, \dots, x/2 + y/2, x/2 + y/2, x/2 + 1$ .
- Third block: colors  $x/2 + y/2 + 1, x/2 + y/2 + 2, \dots, c' - 1, c'$ .

**Remark 15.** *Strategy 1 has the following characteristics:*

- (a) *It contains three (possibly empty) blocks, each forming a cycle of questions: one cycle consisting of  $x$  questions of type A, one consisting of  $y$  questions of type B, and one consisting of  $z$  questions of type C.*
- (b) *Each block can contain a double-neighboring pair of questions (if  $x = 2$ ,  $y = 2$  or  $z = 2$ ). However, because of  $(a, b, c) \notin \{(4, 4, 4), (4, 4, 5)\}$ , there can be at most two double-neighboring pairs of questions in total.*
- (c) *There are no missing colors on the first two pegs, and there is a single missing color on the third peg only in the case  $a + b + c \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ .*

Two examples for different triples  $(a, b, c)$  are given in Table 3(b),(c).

**Lemma 16.** *Strategy 1 is feasible for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind where  $a \leq b \leq c$ ,  $3a \geq b + c$ ,  $a + b + c \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$  and  $(a, b, c) \notin \{(4, 4, 4), (4, 4, 5)\}$ .*

*Proof.* We use Lemma 10 to prove that Strategy 1 is feasible. By Remark 15(a), the condition of having only questions of type A, B or C is fulfilled, and by Remark 15(c) the patterns 1, 2, 3, 9 and 11 do not occur.

Since no questions of different types are neighboring to each other, the patterns 5, 6, 7 and 8 do not occur.

Peg	1	2	3
$q_1$	1	1	1
$q_2$	1	1	2
$q_3$	1	2	3
$q_4$	2	3	3
$q_5$	3	4	4
$q_6$	4	4	4

Peg	1	2	3	Type
$q_1$	1	1	1	B
$q_2$	1	2	2	B
$q_3$	2	3	2	B
$q_4$	2	4	1	B
$q_5$	3	5	3	C
$q_6$	3	6	4	C
$q_7$	4	6	5	C
$q_8$	4	5	6	C

Peg	1	2	3	Type
$q_1$	1	1	1	A
$q_2$	2	1	1	A
$q_3$	3	2	2	B
$q_4$	3	3	3	B
$q_5$	4	4	3	B
$q_6$	4	5	2	B
$q_7$	5	6	4	C
$q_8$	5	7	5	C
$q_9$	6	7	6	C
$q_{10}$	6	8	7	C
$q_{11}$	7	8	8	C
$q_{12}$	7	6	9	C

(a)  $(a, b, c) = (4, 4, c)$  for  $c \in \{4, 5\}$  and 6 questions.

(b)  $(a, b, c) = (4, 6, 6)$ , yielding  $x = 0$  and  $y = z = 4$ , and thus 8 questions. (Note that for  $(4, 6, 7)$  the condition  $3a \geq b + c$  does not hold.)

(c)  $(a, b, c) = (7, 8, c)$  for  $c \in \{9, 10\}$ , yielding  $x = 2$ ,  $y = 4$ ,  $z = 6$  and thus 12 questions.

Table 3: Three examples of strategies for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a \geq b+c$  and  $a+b+c \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$ .

If two questions are double-neighboring, then the strategy contains no other questions of the same type. Therefore, the patterns 4 and 10 do not occur.

Lastly, note that since  $(a, b, c) \notin \{(4, 4, 4), (4, 4, 5)\}$  the strategy does not consist of three double-neighboring pairs of questions. To show this, let  $x = y = z = 2$  hold. Indeed, since  $x = 2a - (a + b + c')/2 = 2a - (x + y + z)$ , it follows that  $a = (2x + y + z)/2 = 4$ . Similarly, it follows that  $b = 4$  and  $c' = 4$ . Since we excluded this case, there are at most two double-neighboring questions and pattern 12 does not occur.

Therefore, none of the forbidden patterns of Lemma 10 occurs, and  $Q$  is feasible.  $\square$

**Remark 17.** *As stated in Lemma 16, Strategy 1 cannot be applied to  $(4, 4, 4)$  and  $(4, 4, 5)$ . Note, however, that these cases can nevertheless be solved with 6 questions. Indeed, the strategy described in Table 3(a) is feasible for both of these cases, too. For the feasibility we refer to a computer program which checks the feasibility of strategies by exhaustive search [20].*

5.2. Strategy for the case  $a + b + c \equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}$

We now provide a strategy for the case  $3a \geq b + c$  and  $a + b + c \equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}$ . Observe that in this case,  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$  are odd.

As before, the strategy has  $x$  questions of type  $A$ ,  $y$  questions of type  $B$ , and  $z$  questions of type  $C$ . The first two blocks consist of  $x - 1$  and  $y - 1$  questions of type  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively. The third block starts with one question of type  $A$  and one of type  $B$ , and continues with  $z$  questions of type  $z$ .

**Strategy 2.** ( $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$ -strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a \geq b + c$ , and  $a + b + c \equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}$ )

*First peg:*

- *First block:* colors  $1, 2, \dots, x - 1$ .
- *Second block:* colors  $x, x, x+1, x+1, \dots, x-1+(y-1)/2, x-1+(y-1)/2$ .
- *Third block:* colors  $x + (y - 1)/2, x + (y - 1)/2 + 1, x + (y - 1)/2 + 1, x + (y - 1)/2 + 2, x + (y - 1)/2 + 2, \dots, a, a$ .

*Second peg:*

- *First block:* colors  $1, 1, 2, 2, \dots, (x - 1)/2, (x - 1)/2$ .
- *Second block:* colors  $(x - 1)/2 + 1, (x - 1)/2 + 2, \dots, (x - 1)/2 + y - 2, (x - 1)/2 + y - 1$ .
- *Third block:* colors  $(x - 1)/2 + y, (x - 1)/2 + y + 1, (x - 1)/2 + y + 2, (x - 1)/2 + y + 2, \dots, b, b, (x - 1)/2 + y$ .

*Third peg:*

- *First block:* colors  $1, 2, 2, \dots, (x - 1)/2, (x - 1)/2, 1$ .
- *Second block:* colors  $(x - 1)/2 + 1, (x - 1)/2 + 2, (x - 1)/2 + 2, \dots, (x - 1)/2 + (y - 1)/2, (x - 1)/2 + (y - 1)/2, (x - 1)/2 + 1$ .
- *Third block:* colors  $(x - 1)/2 + (y - 1)/2 + 1, (x - 1)/2 + (y - 1)/2 + 1, (x - 1)/2 + (y - 1)/2 + 2, (x - 1)/2 + (y - 1)/2 + 2, \dots, c' - 1, c'$ .

**Remark 18.** Strategy 1 has the following characteristics:

Peg	1	2	3	Type
$q_1$	1	1	1	A
$q_2$	2	2	1	B
$q_3$	2	3	2	C
$q_4$	3	3	3	C
$q_5$	3	1	4	C

Peg	1	2	3	Type
$q_1$	1	1	1	A
$q_2$	2	1	1	A
$q_3$	3	2	2	B
$q_4$	3	3	3	B
$q_5$	4	4	3	B
$q_6$	4	5	2	B
$q_7$	5	6	4	A
$q_8$	6	7	4	B
$q_9$	6	8	5	C
$q_{10}$	7	8	6	C
$q_{11}$	7	9	7	C
$q_{12}$	8	9	8	C
$q_{13}$	8	6	9	C

(a)  $(a, b, c) = (3, 3, c)$  for  $c \in \{4, 5\}$ , yielding  $x = y = 1$  and  $z = 3$ , and thus 5 questions.

(b)  $(a, b, c) = (8, 9, c)$  for  $c \in \{9, 10\}$ , yielding  $x = 3$  and  $y = z = 5$ , and thus 13 questions.

Table 4: Two examples of strategies for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a \geq b + c$  and  $a + b + c \equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}$ .

- (a) *It contains three (possibly empty) blocks, each forming a cycle of questions. The first consists of  $x - 1$  questions of type A and the second of  $y - 1$  questions of type B. The third block contains one question of type A, one of type B, and  $z$  of type C.*
- (b) *The first and the second block can each contain a double-neighboring pair of questions, but there cannot be any other double-neighboring pairs.*
- (c) *There is no missing color on the first two pegs, and only one missing color on the third peg for the case  $a + b + c \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ .*

**Lemma 19.** *Strategy 2 is feasible for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind where  $a \leq b \leq c$ ,  $3a \geq b + c$  and  $a + b + c \equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}$ .*

*Proof.* We will use Lemma 10 to prove that Strategy 2 is feasible. By Remark 18(a), the condition of having only questions of types A, B or C is fulfilled. By Remark 18(c), none of the patterns 1, 2, 3, 9 and 11 can occur, and Remark 18(b) excludes pattern 12. Moreover, since there are no double



neighboring questions of type  $C$ , and the only possible missing color is on the third peg, which is the single peg of type  $C$ , pattern 8 does not occur.

Since all the questions of type  $A$  except one form a cycle in the first block, and all those of type  $B$  except one form a cycle in the second block, the patterns 4 and 10 do not occur.

Lastly, the only question of type  $A$  that is not neighboring to another one of type  $A$  is in the cycle of the third block, which contains only one question of type  $A$ . Similarly, the only question of type  $B$  that is not neighboring to another one is in the cycle of the third block, which contains only one question of type  $B$ . Therefore, none of the patterns 5, 6 and 7 occurs.

In summary, we have excluded all of the forbidden patterns of Lemma 10, which proves that the strategy is feasible.  $\square$

This lemma allows us to conclude the proof of Theorem 14.

*Proof of Theorem 14.* Recall that  $a \leq b \leq c$  and  $3a \leq b + c$ .

Our computer program [20] shows that the strategy of Table 3(a), which has  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor = 6$  questions, is feasible for the cases  $(4, 4, 4)$  and  $(4, 4, 5)$ . Lemmas 16 and 19 prove for all other cases that Strategy 1 is feasible for  $a + b + c \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$  and Strategy 2 is feasible for  $a + b + c \equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}$ , both of which consist of  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$  questions. This covers all cases, showing that  $f(a, b, c) \leq \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$ .  $\square$

Note that there is a gap of 1 between the lower bound of Theorem 13 and the upper bound given by Theorem 14. Indeed, in the following sections, we will show that it is possible to obtain better strategies in some cases.

## 6. The cases of $(a, a, 2a - 1)$ -Mastermind and $(a, a, 2a)$ -Mastermind

In this section, we will give a strategy with  $2a - 1$  questions for both  $(a, a, 2a - 1)$ -Mastermind and for  $(a, a, 2a)$ -Mastermind, and we will show that this strategy is optimal in both cases. Note that in the case  $(a, a, 2a - 1)$  the strategy of Section 5.2 already has  $2a - 1$  questions, and the strategy presented in this section gives an alternative way to reach a feasible strategy with this number of questions.

**Strategy 3.**  $((2a - 1)$ -strategy for  $(a, a, 2a - i)$ -Mastermind, where  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ )

1. *First peg:* colors  $1, 1, 2, 2, \dots, a - 1, a - 1, a$ .

Peg	1	2	3	Type
$q_1$	1	1	1	$D$
$q_2$	1	2	2	$C$
$q_3$	2	2	3	$C$
$q_4$	2	3	4	$C$
$q_5$	3	3	5	$C$
$q_6$	3	4	6	$C$
$q_7$	4	4	7	$C$
$q_8$	4	5	8	$C$
$q_9$	5	5	9	$E$

Peg	1	2	3
$q_1$	1	1	1
$q_2$	1	2	2
$q_3$	2	2	3
$q_4$	2	3	4
$q_5$	3	3	5
$q_6$	3	4	6
$q_7$	3	4	7
$q_8$	3	5	8
$q_9$	3	5	9
$q_{10}$	3	5	10

(a)  $(a, b, c) = (5, 5, c)$  for  $c \in \{9, 10\}$ , yielding 9 questions. (b)  $(a, b, c) = (3, 5, 11)$ , yielding 10 questions.

Table 5: An example of a strategy for  $(a, a, 2a - 1)$ -Mastermind and  $(a, a, 2a)$ -Mastermind, and one example for the case  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b \leq c$ .

2. *Second peg: colors 1, 2, 2,  $\dots$ ,  $a - 1$ ,  $a - 1$ ,  $a$ ,  $a$ .*

3. *Third peg: colors 1, 2, 3,  $\dots$ ,  $2a - 2$ ,  $2a - 1$ .*

**Remark 20.** *Strategy 3 has the following characteristics:*

(a) *It consists of one path consisting of a question  $q_1$  of type  $D$ ,  $2a - 3$  questions  $q_2, q_3, \dots, q_{2a-2}$  of type  $C$ , and a final question  $q_{2a-1}$  of type  $E$ .*

(b) *No double-neighboring questions occur.*

(c) *For the case  $c = 2a - 1$ , there is no missing color.*

*For the case  $c = 2a$ , there is only one missing color, namely color  $2a$  on the third peg.*

One example is given in Table 5(a) (note that the example of Table 5(b) is based on Table 5(a) and will be referred to in Section 8.1 about the case  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b \leq c$ ).

**Theorem 21.** *Let  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then it holds that  $f(a, a, 2a) = 2a - 1$ .*

*Proof.* First note that  $f(a, a, 2a) \geq 2a - 1$  directly follows from Corollary 4. It only remains to show that  $f(a, a, 2a) \leq 2a - 1$  holds. To do so, we will show that Strategy 3 is feasible.

Let  $Q$  be the set of questions of Strategy 3. We will use Lemma 10 to prove by contradiction that this strategy is feasible for  $(a, a, 2a)$ -Mastermind. For this sake, assume that there are two secrets  $s_1 = (x_1, y_1, z_1)$  and  $s_2 = (x_2, y_2, z_2)$  that are not distinguished by  $Q$ .

Consider the strategy  $Q' = Q \cup \{(a, 1, 2a+1)\}$  for  $(a, a, 2a+1)$ -Mastermind. As it has only questions of type  $C$  (note that the last question is neighboring both to  $q_1$  and  $q_{2a-1}$ ), the initial condition of Lemma 10 is fulfilled. As only the third peg has a missing color, and it has only one missing color, the patterns 1 and 2 do not occur. As no double-neighboring questions occur, the patterns 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 do not occur. Only questions of type  $C$  occur more than once, so the patterns 5, 6 and 7 do not occur. Lastly, since only questions of type  $C$  occur more than once and there is no missing color on the first and second peg, pattern 3 does not occur. Therefore, all the forbidden patterns of Lemma 10 do not occur, and thus the strategy is feasible for  $(a, a, 2a + 1)$ -Mastermind.

In particular,  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are valid secrets of  $(a, a, 2a + 1)$ -Mastermind and must be distinguished by  $Q'$ . Since we assumed that  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are not distinguished by  $Q$ , the only question that can distinguish them is  $(a, 1, 2a + 1)$ . Moreover, since  $2a+1$  is not a color of  $(a, a, 2a)$ -Mastermind, it holds that one of the secrets gets a black peg from the first or second peg while the other one does not. W.l.o.g., we can then assume that  $y_1 = 1$  and  $y_2 \neq 1$ . However, since we assumed that  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are not distinguished by  $Q$ ,  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  must receive the same number of black pegs from the question  $q_1 = (1, 1, 1) \in Q$ . Since  $s_1$  gets one black peg from it, we have  $x_2 = 1$  and  $x_1 \neq 1$ , or  $z_2 = 1$  and  $z_1 \neq 1$ .

**Case 1:**  $x_2 = 1$  and  $x_1 \neq 1$

The question  $q_2 = (1, 2, 2)$  gives at least one black peg for  $s_2$ , because  $x_2 = 1$ , and, since it cannot distinguish  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ , it must also give at least one black peg for  $s_1$ . Moreover,  $x_1 \neq 1$  and  $y_1 = 1$ , so we must have  $z_1 = 2$ .

Now consider the value of  $y_2$ .

If  $y_2 = 2$ , then  $q_2$  gives two black pegs for  $s_2$  and only one for  $s_1$ , distinguishing the two secrets.

If  $y_2 = i \notin [2]$ , then this color occurs in two questions of  $Q$ ,  $q_{2i-2} = (i-1, i, 2i-2)$  and  $q_{2i-1} = (i, i, 2i-1)$ . Since  $z_1 = 2$  and  $x_1$  cannot be both  $i-1$  and  $i$ , at least one of these questions will give zero black pegs for  $s_1$ , distinguishing  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

**Case 2:**  $z_2 = 1$  and  $z_1 \neq 1$

**Case 2.1:**  $x_1 = x_2$ .

Consider the questions containing the color  $y_2 = i$ . As before, it occurs in the questions  $q_{2i-2} = (i-1, i, 2i-2)$  and  $q_{2i-1} = (i, i, 2i-1)$ . Since  $x_1 = x_2$ , the first peg gives the same number of black pegs for the two secrets for each question. As, furthermore,  $z_1$  can occur in at most one of  $q_{2i-2}$  and  $q_{2i-1}$ , at least one of these two questions gives more black pegs for  $s_2$  than for  $s_1$ .

**Case 2.2:**  $x_1 \neq x_2$ .

Consider the value of  $x_1$ .

If  $x_1 = 1$ , then  $q_1$  gives two black pegs for  $s_1$  and only one for  $s_2$ , distinguishing  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ .

If  $x_1 = i \notin \{1, a\}$ , then there are two questions containing  $x_1$ , namely  $q_{2i-1} = (i, i, 2i-1)$  and  $q_{2i} = (i, i+1, 2i)$ , and at least one of them gives no black pegs for  $s_2$ , but at least one black peg for  $s_1$ .

Lastly, if  $x_1 = a$ , then the only way for  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  to not be distinguished by  $q_{2a-1}$  is that  $y_2 = a$  and  $y_1 \neq a$ . For  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  to not be distinguished by  $q_{2a-2}$ , which gives at least one black peg for  $s_2$ , we must have  $z_1 = 2a-2$ . Thus, no matter the value of  $x_2$ , the questions containing it will give more black pegs for  $s_2$  than for  $s_1$ .

In conclusion,  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are distinguished in all cases, and therefore  $Q$  is a feasible strategy. This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 22.** *Let  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $f(a, a, 2a-1) = 2a-1$  holds.*

*Proof.* Regarding the proof of the upper bound  $f(a, a, 2a-1) \leq 2a-1$ , we have shown in the proof of Theorem 21 that Strategy 3 is feasible for  $(a, a, 2a)$ -Mastermind. As this strategy does not contain the color  $2a$  on the third peg, it is also feasible for  $(a, a, 2a-1)$ -Mastermind.

Regarding the proof of the lower bound  $f(a, a, 2a-1) \geq 2a-1$ , for the sake of contradiction, assume that  $f(a, a, 2a-1) \leq 2a-2$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ . By Lemma 3(a), on each peg, at most one color is missing. For the third peg, this means that indeed one color is missing and each color except the missing one occurs there exactly once. We distinguish the following three cases.

**Case 1:** On at least one of the first two pegs, no color is missing.

By symmetry, we can assume w.l.o.g. that no color is missing on the first peg. By  $(a-2) \cdot 2 + 2 \cdot 1 = 2a-2$ , then at least two colors occur only once on the first peg, meaning that there are at least two  $(1, \star, 1)$  questions. By Lemma 3(b) this is not possible.

**Case 2:** On both the first and second peg, one color is missing, and on one of the first two pegs one color occurs only once.

W.l.o.g., on the first peg one color occurs only once, meaning that there is at least one  $(1, \star, 1)$ -question. Since one color is missing on the first and the third peg, by Lemma 3(d) this is not possible.

**Case 3:** On both the first and the second peg, one color is missing, and all other colors on the first and the second peg occur exactly twice.

All questions are  $(2, 2, 1)$ -questions. Consider a question  $q$ . Let  $q'$  be its neighbor on the first peg and  $q''$  be its neighbor in the second peg. If  $q' = q''$ , then  $q$  and  $q' = q''$  are double-neighborings. By Lemma 3(f), this is not possible since one color is missing on each of the first two pegs. However, by Lemma 3(g)  $q' \neq q''$  is not possible either, since one color is missing on each of the first two pegs.  $\square$

In this section, we have shown that in the case of  $(a, a, 2a)$ -Mastermind, the lower bound of Theorem 13 is reached, while in the case  $(a, a, 2a-1)$  (but also in the case  $(a, a, a)$  given by [2]) the upper bound of Theorem 14 is reached.

Note that for  $(a, a, 2a)$ -Mastermind we have  $3a = b + c$  and for  $(a, a, 2a-1)$ -Mastermind (and  $(a, a, a)$ -Mastermind), we have  $3a > b + c$ . In the next section, we will generalize this observation and show that we can reach the bound of Theorem 13 in almost all the cases with  $3a = b + c$ .

## 7. The case of $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with $3a = b + c$ .

In this section, we prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 23.** *Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $a \leq b \leq c$ ,  $3a = b + c$  and  $(a, b, c) \neq (4, 6, 6)$ . Then it holds that  $f(a, b, c) = \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$ .*

To establish this theorem, we define suitable feasible strategies. The case  $(a, a, 2a)$  has already been dealt with in Section 6, so in this section we will

focus on the case  $b > a$  (and thus  $c < 2a$ ). Note also that, in this case, it holds that  $a + b + c = 4a$ , i.e.,  $a + b + c$  is a multiple of 4.

We define  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $z$ , such that the strategies to be constructed below contain  $x$  questions of type  $A$ ,  $y$  questions of type  $B$ , and  $z$  questions of type  $C$ , as follows:

$$x := 1, \quad y := 2(b - a) - 1, \quad z := 2(c - a) - 1.$$

Note that  $x + y + z = 2(b + c) - 4a - 1$  and since  $3a = b + c$ , we have  $x + y + z = 2a - 1 = \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$ . Note also that  $y$  and  $z$  are odd numbers and, since we are in the case  $a < b$ , they are also positive.

We now provide a strategy for the case  $3a = b + c$  and  $z \geq 5$ . It consists of two blocks of questions, where the first block contains  $z - 1$  questions and the second block contains  $y + 2$  questions.

**Strategy 4.** ( $(\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1)$ -strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a = b + c$  and  $z \geq 5$ )

*First peg:*

- *First block: colors*  $1, 1, 2, 2, \dots, (z - 1)/2, (z - 1)/2$ .
- *Second block: colors*  $(z+1)/2, (z+1)/2, (z+1)/2+1, (z+1)/2+1, \dots, a-1, a-1, a$ .

*Second peg:*

- *First block: colors*  $1, 2, 2, 3, 3, \dots, (z - 1)/2, (z - 1)/2, 1$ .
- *Second block: colors*  $(z + 1)/2, (z + 1)/2 + 1, (z + 1)/2 + 2, \dots, b - 2, b - 1, (z + 1)/2$ .

*Third peg:*

- *First block: colors*  $1, 2, 3, \dots, z - 2, z - 1$ .
- *Second block: colors*  $z, z + 1, z + 1, \dots, c - 2, c - 2, c - 1, c - 1$ .

**Remark 24.** *Strategy 4 has the following characteristics:*

- (a) *It contains two blocks, each forming a cycle of questions. The first block contains  $z - 1$  questions of type  $C$ , and the second block contains one question of type  $C$ ,  $y$  questions of type  $B$ , and one question of type  $A$ .*

Peg	1	2	3	Type
$q_1$	1	1	1	$C$
$q_2$	1	2	2	$C$
$q_3$	2	2	3	$C$
$q_4$	2	1	4	$C$
$q_5$	3	3	5	$C$
$q_6$	3	4	6	$B$
$q_7$	4	3	6	$A$

(a)  $(a, b, c) = (4, 5, 7)$ , yielding  $x = 1$ ,  $y = 1$ ,  $z = 5$  and thus 7 questions.

Peg	1	2	3	Type
$q_1$	1	1	1	$C$
$q_2$	1	2	2	$C$
$q_3$	2	2	3	$C$
$q_4$	2	1	4	$C$
$q_5$	3	3	5	$C$
$q_6$	3	4	6	$B$
$q_7$	4	5	6	$B$
$q_8$	4	6	7	$B$
$q_9$	5	7	7	$B$
$q_{10}$	5	8	8	$B$
$q_{11}$	6	3	8	$A$

(b)  $(a, b, c) = (6, 9, 9)$ , yielding  $x = 1$ ,  $y = 5$ ,  $z = 5$  and thus 11 questions.

Peg	1	2	3	Type
$q_1$	1	1	1	$C$
$q_2$	1	2	2	$B$
$q_3$	2	1	2	$A$

(c)  $(a, b, c) = (2, 3, 3)$ , 3 questions.

Peg	1	2	3	Type
$q_1$	1	1	1	$C$
$q_2$	1	2	2	$C$
$q_3$	2	2	3	$C$
$q_4$	2	3	4	$B$
$q_5$	3	1	4	$A$

(d)  $(a, b, c) = (3, 4, 5)$ , 5 questions.

Table 6: Four examples of strategies for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a = b + c$ .

(b) *Since we are in the case  $z \geq 5$ , the first block contains at least 4 questions. Furthermore, the second block contains at least 3 questions. Therefore, no double-neighboring questions occur.*

(c) *A missing color occurs only on the second and third peg, but not on the first peg.*

Two examples for different triples  $(a, b, c)$  are given in Table 6(a),(b).

**Lemma 25.** *Strategy 4 is feasible for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind where  $a \leq b \leq c$ ,  $3a = b + c$ ,  $b > a$  and  $z \geq 5$ .*

*Proof.* We will use Lemma 10 to prove that Strategy 4 is feasible. By Remark 24(a), the condition of having only questions of type  $A$ ,  $B$  or  $C$  is fulfilled.

By Remark 24(b), the patterns 4, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 do not occur, since there are no double-neighboring questions.

By Remark 24(c), the patterns 1 and 2 do not occur. Moreover, since there is only one question of type  $A$  and the missing colors are on the second and third pegs (which are the double pegs of type  $A$ ), the pattern 3 does not occur either.

Lastly, since the first block contains only questions of type  $C$  and the second block contains only one question each of types  $A$  and  $C$ , the patterns 5, 6 and 7 cannot occur either.

Therefore, none of the forbidden patterns of Lemma 10 occurs, which proves that the strategy is feasible.  $\square$

Using Lemma 25, Theorem 21 and the computer search on the triples for the case  $z \leq 3$  we can now prove Theorem 23.

*Proof of Theorem 23.* Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $a \leq b \leq c$  and  $3a = b + c$ . We consider three cases.

- $b = a$ :

Then we have  $c = 2a$  and according to Theorem 21,  $f(a, b, c) = 2a - 1 = \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$ .

- $b > a$  and  $c \geq a + 3$ :

Then  $z = 2(c - a) - 1 \geq 5$  holds and according to Lemma 25, Strategy 4 is feasible and consists of  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$  questions.

- $b > a$  and  $c \leq a + 2$ :

Since  $z = 2(c - a) - 1 \leq 3$ , Strategy 4 is not defined for this case. However, this occurs only for finitely many triples  $(a, b, c)$ . Indeed, since  $b \leq c$ , we have  $3a = b + c \leq 2(a + 2)$  and  $a \leq 4$ . The only triples with  $a \leq 4$  and  $3a = b + c$  are  $(1, 1, 2)$ ,  $(2, 2, 4)$ ,  $(2, 3, 3)$ ,  $(3, 3, 6)$ ,  $(3, 4, 5)$ ,  $(4, 4, 8)$ ,  $(4, 5, 7)$  and  $(4, 6, 6)$ . The cases  $(1, 1, 2)$ ,  $(2, 2, 4)$ ,  $(3, 3, 6)$  and  $(4, 4, 8)$  are covered by the case  $(a, a, 2a)$  and the case  $(4, 5, 7)$  is covered by the case  $c \geq a + 3$ . The only remaining cases are the triples  $(2, 3, 3)$ ,  $(3, 4, 5)$  and  $(4, 6, 6)$ . Tables 6(c) and (d) give strategies for the cases  $(2, 3, 3)$  and  $(3, 4, 5)$ . These strategies use  $3 = \frac{2+3+3}{2} - 1$  and  $5 = \frac{3+4+5}{2} - 1$  questions, respectively. The computer program that can be found at [20] verifies that these strategies are feasible. For the case  $(4, 6, 6)$ , the same program shows by exhaustive search that no feasible strategy with 7 questions exists.  $\square$

## 8. The case of $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with $3a < b + c$

We divide this case into two subcases.



8.1. *The case of  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b \leq c$*

The following theorem shows that if  $c \geq 2b$ , the trivial lower bound  $c - 1$  is attained.

**Theorem 26.** *Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $a \leq b \leq c$ ,  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b \leq c$ . Then  $f(a, b, c) = c - 1$ .*

*Proof.* By Corollary 4, the lower bound follows.

To prove the upper bound, consider first Strategy 3 given for  $(b, b, 2b)$ -Mastermind with  $2b - 1$  questions.

We first turn this strategy into one for  $(b, b, c)$ -Mastermind using  $c - 1$  questions. We achieve this by applying Remark 6  $c - 2b$  times. We iteratively copy the last question and modify the color of the third peg to be the new color. This way, we indeed obtain a strategy for  $(b, b, c)$ -Mastermind using  $c - 1$  colors.

We then modify this strategy to a strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind using the same number of questions. We do this by applying Lemma 8  $b - a$  times. On the first peg, we iteratively project the largest color to its immediate predecessor. The first projection is  $Q_1(b - 1, b)$  and we apply Lemma 8 because the questions  $(b - 1, b - 1, 2b - 3)$ ,  $(b - 1, b, 2b - 2)$ , and  $(b, b, 2b - 1)$  are in the strategy and for all colors  $y \in [b]$  and  $z \in [c]$ , one of these questions differs from  $y$  on the second peg and differs from  $z$  on the third peg. Later on, when applying the projection  $Q_1(x - 1, x)$  for some value  $x$  with  $a + 1 \leq x \leq b - 1$ , Lemma 8 will still be applicable, since the questions  $(x, b - 1, 2b - 3)$ ,  $(x, b, 2b - 2)$  and  $(x, b, 2b - 1)$  will be in the strategy.

Thus, we have obtained a feasible strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind using  $c - 1$  questions.  $\square$

Below follows an explicit definition of the strategy constructed in the preceding proof.

**Strategy 5.**  *$((c - 1)$ -strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a < b + c$ ,  $2b \leq c$ )*

1. *First peg: colors  $1, 1, 2, 2, \dots, a - 1, a - 1, a, a, \dots, a$ .*
2. *Second peg: colors  $1, 2, 2, \dots, b - 1, b - 1, b, b, \dots, b$ .*
3. *Third peg: colors  $1, 2, \dots, c - 2, c - 1$ .*

One example is given in Table 5(b).

8.2. *The case of  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b > c$*

To obtain a strategy for the case where  $2b > c$ , let us first consider the case in which  $b + c \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $a = (b + c - 2)/3$ . Note that for fixed values of  $b$  and  $c$  such that  $b + c \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ ,  $(b + c - 2)/3$  is the largest integer value for  $a$  that still fits in the case  $3a < b + c$ .

For the sake of the strategy, we define

$$x := \frac{2}{3}(2b - c - 1), \quad y := \frac{2}{3}(2c - b - 1).$$

Note that  $3b - (b + c + 1) = 2b - c - 1$  and  $3c - (b + c + 1) = 2c - b - 1$  are multiples of 3, since  $b + c \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ . Therefore,  $x$  and  $y$  are even integers. Moreover,  $b - 1 = x + y/2$ ,  $c - 1 = y + x/2$  and  $x + y = \lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$  hold.

Now we present our strategy for this case.

**Strategy 6.** ( $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$ -strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $b + c \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $a = \frac{b+c-2}{3}$ )

1. *First peg: colors  $1, 1, 2, 2, \dots, a - 1, a - 1, a, a$*

*(except for  $(a, b, c) = (2, 4, 4)$ : colors  $1, 1, 1, 2$ ).*

2. *Second peg:*

- *First block:  $1, 2, \dots, x$ .*
- *Second block:  $x + 1, x + 2, x + 2, \dots, b - 1, b - 1, x + 1$ .*

3. *Third peg:*

- *First block: colors  $1, 2, 2, \dots, x/2, x/2, 1$ .*
- *Second block: colors  $x/2 + 1, x/2 + 2, \dots, c - 1$ .*

**Remark 27.** *Strategy 6 has the following characteristics:*

(a) *For  $(a, b, c) \neq (2, 4, 4)$ , it contains two (possibly empty) blocks, each forming a cycle of questions: one cycle consisting of  $x$  questions of type B, and one consisting of  $y$  questions of type C.*

*Note that it is possible that  $x = 0$ , in which case the first block is empty, or that  $x = 2$ , in which case the first block consists of a pair of double-neighboring questions.*

(b) *Only one pair of double-neighboring questions may occur in the first block (as shown later).*

(c) *There are only two missing colors, one on the second peg and one on the third peg.*

Three examples are given in Table 7(a),(b),(c), where the third one is the exceptional case  $(a, b, c) = (2, 4, 4)$ .

**Lemma 28.** *Strategy 6 is feasible for  $2b > c$ ,  $b + c \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ ,  $a = (b + c - 2)/3$  and  $c \geq 5$ .*

*Proof.* We will use Lemma 10 to prove that Strategy 6 is feasible. By Remark 27(a), the condition of having only questions of type  $A$ ,  $B$  or  $C$  is fulfilled.

By Remark 27(c), the patterns 1 and 2 do not occur.

All questions in the first block are of type  $B$ , neighboring to other questions of type  $B$ , and the questions in the second block are of type  $C$ , neighboring to other questions of type  $C$ . Thus, the patterns 5, 6, 7 and 8, where questions of different types are neighboring to each other, do not occur.

*Claim.*  $y \geq 4$ .

*Proof (Claim).* We have  $2b > c$ ,  $b \leq c$  and  $b + c \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ .

- For  $c = 5$ ,  $c = 6$ , only  $b = 3$  and  $b = 5$ , respectively, are possible. Then  $y = \frac{2}{3}(2c - b - 1) = 4$  follows.
- For  $c \geq 7$  we have

$$y = \frac{2}{3}(2c - b - 1) \geq \frac{2}{3}(2c - c - 1) = \frac{2}{3}(c - 1) \geq \frac{2}{3} \cdot 6 = 4.$$

By the claim, the second block does not consist of a pair of double-neighboring questions, and if  $x = 2$  holds, the first block forms the only double-neighboring question. So the patterns 10, 11 and 12, containing at least two pairs of double-neighboring questions, do not occur. Moreover, if  $x = 2$  holds, there are only two questions of type  $B$ , namely the ones in the double-neighboring pair, so pattern 4 does not occur.

Since there is no missing color on the first peg, the common double peg of types  $B$  and  $C$ , pattern 3 and 9 do not occur.

Therefore, none of the forbidden patterns of Lemma 10 occurs, and the strategy is feasible.  $\square$

**Remark 29.** If  $c \leq 4$ , the only possible cases are  $(a, b, c) = (1, 2, 3)$ , and  $(a, b, c) = (2, 4, 4)$ . The corresponding strategies can be found in Table 7(b),(c). Our computer program shows that both strategies are feasible [20].

**Theorem 30.** Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $a \leq b \leq c$  and  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b > c$ . Then it holds that  $f(a, b, c) = \lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$ .

*Proof.* First, using Lemma 12, we know that  $f(a, b, c) \geq \lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$ . It remains now to show that there always exists a feasible strategy matching this lower bound. We will use Strategy 6. To do so, we modify  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  so that the conditions of this strategy are fulfilled.

- $b + c \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ .

Let  $b' = b$  and  $c' = c$ .

- $b + c \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .

Let  $b' = b$  and  $c' = c - 1$ .

(If  $b = c$ , interchange the roles of the second and the third peg so that still  $b' \leq c'$  holds.)

- $b + c \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .

Let  $b' = b + 1$  and  $c' = c$ .

(If  $b = c$ , interchange the roles of the second and the third peg so that still  $b' \leq c'$  holds.)

Lastly, let  $a' = \frac{b+c'-2}{3}$ . We now have  $b' + c' \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and since  $2b > c$ ,  $b' \geq b$  and  $c' \leq c$ , we also have  $2b' > c'$ . We also have  $3a' = b' + c' - 2 < b' + c'$ .

We can now apply Strategy 6 to  $(a', b', c')$ -Mastermind and we obtain a strategy using  $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b' + c' - 1) \rfloor$  questions. We will then modify this strategy to obtain a strategy for  $(a', b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor$  questions.

- $b + c \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ .

$b' = b$  and  $c' = c$  hold. Therefore, we already have a strategy for  $(a', b', c')$ -Mastermind.

- $b + c \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .

Note that  $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c - 1) \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b + c) \rfloor$ . Since  $b' = b + 1$  and  $c' = c$ , the strategy for  $(a', b', c')$ -Mastermind has the right amount of questions. Moreover, in Strategy 6, there is a missing color on the second peg. So the strategy is also a valid strategy for  $(a', b, c)$ -Mastermind.

- $b + c \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .

Note that  $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b+c-1) \rfloor = 1 + \lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b+c-2) \rfloor$ . So the strategy for  $(a', b, c)$ -Mastermind needs one more question than the strategy for  $(a', b', c')$ -Mastermind. Using Remark 6 we know that we can obtain such a strategy by duplicating the last question and replacing the third peg by the color  $c$ .

Therefore, we have strategies for  $(a', b, c)$ -Mastermind using  $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b+c-1) \rfloor$  questions. If  $a < a'$ , by using Lemma 8 and by noticing that it can be applied to the strategy of Table 7(c) for  $(2, 4, 4)$ -Mastermind and whenever a sequence of four questions of the same type occurs in a strategy, which happens in Strategy 6 when  $c \geq 5$ , we can obtain strategies for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind using  $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b+c-1) \rfloor$  questions. This matches with the lower bound and finishes the proof.  $\square$

In summary, we have obtained the following explicit strategy.

**Strategy 7.** ( $\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(b+c-1) \rfloor$ )-strategy for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a < b+c$  and  $2b > c$ )

1. First peg: colors  $1, 1, 2, 2, \dots, a-1, a-1, a, a, \dots, a$ ,

except in three cases:

$(a, b, c) \in \{(2, 3, 4), (2, 4, 4)\}$ : colors  $1, 1, 1, 2$ ,

$(a, b, c) = (2, 4, 5)$ : colors  $1, 1, 1, 2, 2$ .

(Note that the triples  $(1, 1, 3)$  and  $(1, 2, 4)$  leading to the exceptional triple  $(1, 2, 3)$  do not fall in the case  $3a < b+c$  and  $2b > c$ .)

2. For  $b+c = 2 \pmod{3}$ :

- Second and third peg: use the same colors as in Strategy 6.

3. For  $b+c = 1 \pmod{3}$ :

- Set  $b' := b+1$ .
- Second and third peg: use the same colors as in Strategy 6 for  $(a, b', c)$ -Mastermind.

4. For  $b + c = 0 \pmod{3}$ :

- Set  $c' := c - 1$ .
- Second and third peg: use the same colors as in Strategy 6 for  $(a, b, c')$ -Mastermind.
- Add the question  $(a, x + 1, c)$ .

One further example is given in Table 7(d).

Peg	1	2	3	Type
$q_1$	1	1	1	$B$
$q_2$	1	2	2	$B$
$q_3$	2	3	2	$B$
$q_4$	2	4	1	$B$
$q_5$	3	5	3	$C$
$q_6$	3	6	4	$C$
$q_7$	4	6	5	$C$
$q_8$	4	7	6	$C$
$q_9$	5	7	7	$C$
$q_{10}$	5	5	8	$C$

(a)  $(a, b, c) = (5, 8, 9)$ , yielding  $x = 4$  and  $y = 6$  and thus 10 questions.

Peg	1	2	3
$q_1$	1	1	1
$q_2$	1	1	2

(b)  $(a, b, c) = (1, 2, 3)$ , yielding  $x = 0$  and  $y = 2$  and thus 2 questions.

Peg	1	2	3
$q_1$	1	1	1
$q_2$	1	2	1
$q_3$	1	3	2
$q_4$	2	3	3

(c)  $(a, b, c) = (2, 4, 4)$ , yielding  $x = 2$  and  $y = 2$  and thus 4 questions.

Peg	1	2	3
$q_1$	1	1	1
$q_2$	1	2	2
$q_3$	2	3	2
$q_4$	2	4	1
$q_5$	3	5	3
$q_6$	3	6	4
$q_7$	4	6	5
$q_8$	4	7	6
$q_9$	4	7	7
$q_{10}$	4	5	8
$q_{11}$	4	5	10

(d)  $(a, b, c) = (4, 8, 10)$ , yielding  $x = 4$  and  $y = 6$  and thus 11 questions.

Table 7: Four examples of strategies for  $(a, b, c)$ -Mastermind with  $3a < b + c$  and  $2b > c$ .

## 9. Discussion and Future Work

In this paper we have determined the metric dimension of  $K_a \times K_b \times K_c$  for  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ . The only not completely solved case is  $3a > b + c$ , where two values  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor - 1$  and  $\lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$  are possible, see Table 1.

Thus, we performed an exhaustive search by our computer program [20] on all of those triples  $(a, b, c)$  with  $a + b + c \leq 21$ , for which  $f(a, b, c)$  has not been obtained by the theoretical results of this paper, namely  $3a > b + c$  and  $(a, b, c) \notin \{(a, a, a), (a, a, 2a - 1)\}$ . More concretely, these are the following

triples:

$$(3, 3, 4), (3, 4, 4), (4, 4, 5), (4, 4, 6), (4, 5, 5), (4, 5, 6), \\ (5, 5, 6), (5, 6, 6), (5, 5, 7), (5, 5, 8), (5, 6, 7), (5, 6, 8), \\ (5, 7, 7), (6, 6, 7), (6, 6, 8), (6, 7, 7), (6, 6, 9), (6, 7, 8).$$

The computer runs showed that for all these cases, the upper bound is attained. Thus, we make the following conjecture:

**Conjecture.** *Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $a \leq b \leq c$ . If  $3a > b + c$  then it holds that  $f(a, b, c) = \lfloor \frac{a+b+c}{2} \rfloor$ .*

Naturally, one aim of our future work is to prove or disprove this conjecture and close the remaining gap of this work.

### Acknowledgement

We would like to thank Frank Drewes for many helpful discussions and proofreading of this paper.

This research was supported by the Kempe Foundation Grant No. JCK-2022.1 (Sweden).

### References

- [1] J. Cáceres, C. Hernando, M. Mora, I. Pelayo, M. Puertas, C. Seara, D. Wood, On the metric dimension of cartesian products of graphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 21 (2007) 423–441.
- [2] G. Jäger, F. Drewes, The metric dimension of  $\mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n \times \mathbb{Z}_n$  is  $\lfloor 3n/2 \rfloor$ , *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 806 (2020) 344–362.
- [3] L. Blumenthal, *Theory and Applications of Distance Geometry*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1953.
- [4] F. Harary, R. Melter, The metric dimension of a graph, *Ars Combin.* 2 (1976) 191–195.
- [5] P. Slater, Leaves of trees, *Congre. Numer.* 14 (1975) 549–559.

- [6] G. Chartrand, L. Eroh, M. Johnson, O. Oellermann, Resolvability in graphs and the metric dimension of a graph, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 105 (2000) 99–113.
- [7] H. Fernau, P. Heggernes, P. van't Hof, D. Meister, R. Saei, Computing the metric dimension for chain graphs, *Inform. Process. Lett.* 115 (2015) 671–676.
- [8] I. Yero, D. Kuziak, J. Rodríguez-Velázquez, On the metric dimension of corona product graphs, *Comput. Math. Appl.* 61 (2011) 2793–2798.
- [9] J. Rodríguez-Velázquez, D. Kuziak, I. Yero, J. Sigarreta, The metric dimension of strong product graphs, *Carpathian J. Math.* 31 (2015) 261–268.
- [10] M. Garey, D. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, W.H. Freeman & Co., New York, 1979.
- [11] S. Khuller, B. Raghavachari, A. Rosenfeld, Landmarks in graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 70 (1996) 217–229.
- [12] V. Chvátal, Mastermind, *Combinatorica* 3 (1983) 325–329.
- [13] G. Jäger, An optimal strategy for Static Black-Peg Mastermind with two pegs, in: T.-H. H. Chan, M. Li, L. Wang (Eds.), *Proc. 10th Annual Intl. Conf. Combinatorial Optimization and Applications (COCOA 2016)*, volume 10043 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2017, pp. 670–682.
- [14] P. Erdős, A. Rényi, On two problems of information theory, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci.* 8 (1963) 241–254.
- [15] G. Jäger, M. Peczarski, The number of pessimistic guesses in Generalized Mastermind, *Inform. Process. Lett.* 109 (2009) 635–641.
- [16] B. Doerr, C. Doerr, R. Spöhel, H. Thomas, Playing Mastermind with many colors, *Journal of the ACM* 63 (2016) 42:1–42:23.
- [17] M. Goodrich, On the algorithmic complexity of the Mastermind game with black-peg results, *Inform. Process. Lett.* 109 (2009) 675–678.
- [18] G. Jäger, M. Peczarski, The number of pessimistic guesses in Generalized Black-Peg Mastermind, *Inform. Process. Lett.* 111 (2011) 933–940.



- [19] W. Goddard, Static Mastermind, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* 47 (2003) 225–236.
- [20] Source code of the computer program of this article, Available from [http://abel.math.umu.se/~gerold/source\\_code\\_static\\_abc\\_mastermind.tar.gz](http://abel.math.umu.se/~gerold/source_code_static_abc_mastermind.tar.gz), 2023.