

On the Maiorana–McFarland Class Extensions

Nikolay Kolomeec, Denis Bykov

Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk, Russia
 nkolomeec@gmail.com, den.bykov.2000i@gmail.com

Abstract

The closure $\mathcal{M}_m^\#$ and the extension $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m$ of the Maiorana–McFarland class \mathcal{M}_m in $m = 2n$ variables relative to the extended-affine equivalence and the bent function construction $f \oplus \text{Ind}_U$ are considered, where U is an affine subspace of \mathbb{F}_2^m of dimension $m/2$. We obtain an explicit formula for $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m|$ and an upper bound for $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m^\#|$. Asymptotically tight bounds for $|\mathcal{M}_m^\#|$ are proved as well, for instance, $|\mathcal{M}_8^\#| \approx 2^{77.865}$. Metric properties of \mathcal{M}_m and $\mathcal{M}_m^\#$ are also investigated. We find the number of all closest bent functions to the set \mathcal{M}_m and provide an upper bound of the same number for $\mathcal{M}_m^\#$. The average number $E(\mathcal{M}_m)$ of $m/2$ -dimensional affine subspaces of \mathbb{F}_2^m such that a function from \mathcal{M}_m is affine on each of them is calculated. We obtain that similarly defined $E(\mathcal{M}_m^\#)$ satisfies $E(\mathcal{M}_m^\#) < E(\mathcal{M}_m)$ and $E(\mathcal{M}_m^\#) = E(\mathcal{M}_m) - o(1)$.

Keywords: Bent functions, the Maiorana–McFarland class, minimum distance, affinity, affine equivalence, subspaces.

1 Introduction

Bent functions are Boolean functions having interesting applications in cryptography, coding theory, algebra, etc. They are maximal nonlinear Boolean functions in an even number of variables. Many books such as [1–5] are dedicated to them or contain information on them; some problems from student olympiads are dedicated to them as well [6]. The investigations of bent functions were started in the 1960s both in the USA and the USSR [1], the term appeared in [7]. At the same time, there are many open problems in this area. For instance, the number of all bent functions in $m = 2n$ variables is unknown if $m \geq 10$.

There are important primary subclasses of bent functions such as the Maiorana–McFarland class \mathcal{M}_m [8] containing bent functions

$$f(x, y) = \langle x, \pi(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi(y), \quad x, y \in \mathbb{F}_2^{\frac{m}{2}},$$

where π is a permutation on $\mathbb{F}_2^{\frac{m}{2}}$ and $\varphi : \mathbb{F}_2^{\frac{m}{2}} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$. Also, there are two most famous secondary constructions that can generate additional bent functions using some given class \mathcal{K} .

- The extended-affine equivalence, which generates $\mathcal{K}^\#$ containing all $f(xA \oplus a) \oplus h(x)$ for each $f \in \mathcal{K}$ in m variables, invertible $m \times m$ matrix A over \mathbb{F}_2 , $a \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$ and affine $h : \mathbb{F}_2^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$.
- The construction from [9], which generates $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ containing

$$f \oplus \text{Ind}_U \quad (1)$$

for each $f \in \mathcal{K}$ in m variables and $\frac{m}{2}$ -dimensional affine subspace $U \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^m$ such that f is affine on U .

However, the cardinalities of $\mathcal{K}^\#$, $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{K}}^\# = \widehat{\mathcal{K}}^\#$ are unknown for most of significant classes, and the calculation of them looks unfeasible. This work demonstrates that at least for \mathcal{M}_m we can make progress in this direction. We obtain the exact value of $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m|$, prove asymptotically tight bounds for $|\mathcal{M}_m^\#|$ and propose an upper bound for $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m^\#|$, for instance,

$$|\mathcal{M}_m^\#| = \frac{(2^m - 1) \cdot \dots \cdot (2^{\frac{m}{2}+1} - 1)}{(2^{\frac{m}{2}} - 1) \cdot \dots \cdot (2^1 - 1)} |\mathcal{M}_m| - o(2^{\frac{m}{2}}!), \quad (2)$$

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m| = \left(\frac{1}{18}2^m + \frac{430}{63}\right) |\mathcal{M}_m| + o(|\mathcal{M}_m|) \quad (3)$$

and $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m^\#| < (\frac{4}{3}2^m + 30)|\mathcal{M}_m^\#|$ for $m \geq 10$. Note that the proved estimations are much more precise than the trivial

$$|\mathcal{M}_m^\#| \leq (2^m - 2^0) \cdot \dots \cdot (2^m - 2^{m-1}) |\mathcal{M}_m| \text{ and}$$

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m| \leq 2^{\frac{m}{2}}(2^1 + 1) \cdot \dots \cdot (2^{\frac{m}{2}} + 1) |\mathcal{M}_m|$$

that follows from [10]. The class \mathcal{M}_m is very important due to the simplicity of its functions. Its cardinality $2^{2^{\frac{m}{2}}} 2^{\frac{m}{2}}!$ was often used as a lower bound for the number of all bent functions prior to work [11]. The class $\mathcal{M}_m^\#$ is called *the completed Maiorana–McFarland* class. A natural question addressed to constructions is to generate bent functions outside $\mathcal{M}_m^\#$, see, for instance, [12–19]. There is the \mathcal{D} class [12] constructed using (1) and f from a subset of \mathcal{M}_m , i.e. $\mathcal{D} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m$. In addition, there are other approaches to the obtained results.

First, all bent functions $\mathcal{N}(f)$ that are generated using the construction (1) and some given bent function f in m variables are exactly all bent functions at the Hamming distance $2^{\frac{m}{2}}$ from f [20]. It is the minimum possible distance between two bent functions. Moreover, $\mathcal{N}(f)$ are all closest bent functions to $f \in \mathcal{M}_m^\#$. We can define the set $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m)$ as

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m) = \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{M}_m} \mathcal{N}(f) \setminus \mathcal{M}_m = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m \setminus \mathcal{M}_m$$

that consists of all closest bent functions to the set \mathcal{M}_m . Similarly, we determine $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m^\#) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m^\# \setminus \mathcal{M}_m^\#$ which is the set of all closest bent functions to $\mathcal{M}_m^\#$. Their cardinalities are

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m| = |\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m)| + |\mathcal{M}_m| \text{ and } |\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m^\#| = |\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m^\#)| + |\mathcal{M}_m^\#|.$$

Thus, we also find the exact value of $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m)|$ and the upper bound for $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m^\#)|$, which are interesting metric properties of \mathcal{M}_m and $\mathcal{M}_m^\#$.

Secondly, any function $f \in \mathcal{M}_m$ is constructed as the concatenation of $2^{\frac{m}{2}}$ affine functions $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^{\frac{m}{2}} \mapsto \langle \pi(y), x \rangle \oplus \varphi(y)$ which are distinct up to adding a constant, i.e. f is affine on the affine subspaces $\mathbb{F}_2^{\frac{m}{2}} \times \{y\}$ of \mathbb{F}_2^m , where $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^{\frac{m}{2}}$. A natural combinatorial problem arises: what is the number of such $\frac{m}{2}$ -dimensional affine subspaces of \mathbb{F}_2^m in total? According to (1), the answer is $|\mathcal{N}(f)|$. Note that $\frac{m}{2}$ is the maximum possible dimension of such subspaces, see, for instance, [3]. In this work, we obtain the expected value $E(\mathcal{M}_m)$ of $|\mathcal{N}(f)|$ for a random $f \in \mathcal{M}_m$:

$$E(\mathcal{M}_m) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_m|} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_m} |\mathcal{N}(f)|.$$

Similarly, we determine $E(\mathcal{M}_m^\#)$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}_m^\#$. We obtain the exact value of $E(\mathcal{M}_m)$, which can be also expressed as

$$E(\mathcal{M}_m) = \frac{10}{3}2^m - 2^{\frac{m}{2}} + \frac{176}{21} + o(1), \quad (4)$$

and prove that $E(\mathcal{M}_m^\#) < E(\mathcal{M}_m)$ (their difference is negligible) allowing us to estimate $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m^\#|$. Taking into account the principle of constructing $f \in \mathcal{M}_m$, we can make the assumption that $E(\mathcal{K}) < E(\mathcal{M}_m)$ for any sufficiently large \mathcal{K} .

The outline. In Sections 2, necessary definitions are given. Section 3 contains the criterion from [21] for describing $\mathcal{N}(f)$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}_m$. We rewrite it in a more convenient form for this work (Section 3.1, Theorem 1) and point out a simple subcase generating most of the bent functions from $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m)$ (Section 3.2, Theorem 2). Section 4 studies intersections of $\mathcal{N}(f)$ and $\mathcal{N}(g)$ for $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_m$ (Theorem 3), its results are used for the calculation of $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m)|$ and are important in the context of the mentioned subcase.

In Section 5, the explicit formula for $E(\mathcal{M}_m)$ is proved (Theorem 4) as well as some properties of this number (Corollaries 1, 2 and 3), see, for instance (4). Next, we give the explicit formula for $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m)|$ in Section 6 (Theorem 5). Its asymptotic and some estimations are also given (Corollaries 4 and 5). The results imply the expression (3) for $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m|$ (Remark 3).

In Section 7, we move to the $\mathcal{M}_m^\#$ class and prove some of its properties (Lemma 8 and Corollary 6). Section 8 proves the bounds for $|\mathcal{M}_m^\#|$ (Theorem 6, Corollary 8 and Proposition 6) that can be transformed to (2). For instance,

$|\mathcal{M}_8^\#| \approx 2^{77.865}$ (see Table 4) that was estimated as at most $2^{81.38}$ in [22]. Section 9 contains an upper bound for $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_m^\#)|$ obtained from $E(\mathcal{M}_m^\#)$. The main result here is $E(\mathcal{M}_m^\#) < E(\mathcal{M}_m)$ for $m \geq 10$ and $E(\mathcal{M}_m^\#) = E(\mathcal{M}_m) - o(1)$ (Theorem 7). This implies the mentioned bound for $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_m^\#|$ (Corollary 9 and Remark 6).

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Boolean functions

Let $\mathbb{F}_2^n = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) : x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{F}_2\}$ be the vector space over the field \mathbb{F}_2 consisting of two elements, the addition be denoted by \oplus and $\langle x, y \rangle = x_1y_1 \oplus \dots \oplus x_ny_n$, $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$.

A (vectorial) Boolean function in n variables is $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ ($F : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^m$), Ind_S is the characteristic Boolean function of a set $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$. The Hamming distance between $f, g : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ is equal to the number of $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ such that $f(x) \neq g(x)$.

$F : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^m$ is called *linear* if $F(x \oplus y) = F(x) \oplus F(y)$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. It can be represented as $x \mapsto xA$ for some matrix A over \mathbb{F}_2 of size $n \times m$. By adding a constant from \mathbb{F}_2^m to linear functions, we get the set of all *affine* functions.

Functions $f, g \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ are *EA-equivalent* if $g = f \circ A \oplus h$, i.e. $g(x) = f(A(x)) \oplus h(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, where $A : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is affine and invertible, $h : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ is affine.

2.2 Subspaces and restrictions

A *linear subspace* of \mathbb{F}_2^n is a nonempty $L \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ such that $x, y \in L$ implies $x \oplus y \in L$. The set $U = a \oplus L = \{a \oplus x : x \in L\}$ is called an *affine subspace* of \mathbb{F}_2^n , where $a \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. Also, $[U] = L = a \oplus U$. Their *dimensions* are $\dim L = \log_2 |L|$ and $\dim U = \log_2 |U|$. The set of all k -dimensional affine (linear) subspaces of \mathbb{F}_2^n is denoted by $\mathcal{A}_{n,k}$ ($[\mathcal{A}_{n,k}]$). The *orthogonal* L^\perp to $L \in [\mathcal{A}_{n,k}]$ is $\{y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n : \langle x, y \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } x \in L\}$ and belongs to $[\mathcal{A}_{n,n-k}]$. The cardinality of $[\mathcal{A}_{n,k}]$ is

$$\mathcal{S}_n^k = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{2^n - 2^i}{2^k - 2^i} = \frac{(2^n - 1) \cdot \dots \cdot (2^{n-k+1} - 1)}{(2^k - 1) \cdot \dots \cdot (2^1 - 1)} \quad (5)$$

for $0 \leq k \leq n$ and 0 otherwise, $|\mathcal{A}_{n,k}| = 2^{n-k} \mathcal{S}_n^k$.

A *restriction* of $F : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^m$ to $S \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is denoted by $F|_S$. A function $H : U \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^m$ is *affine (linear)*, if $H = F|_U$ for some affine (linear) F and U is an affine (linear) subspace of \mathbb{F}_2^n . We will also say that F is affine on U if $F|_U$ is affine.

2.3 Indices and information coordinates

Let $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$, where $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k \leq n$. The following notations for $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^k$ are used:

- $x_I = (x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k}) \in \mathbb{F}_2^k$,
- $y^I = z \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, where $z_{i_1} = y_1, \dots, z_{i_k} = y_k$ and $z_j = 0$ for $j \notin I$, i.e. $(y^I)_I = y$ holds.

Also, $\bar{I} = \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I$. For $H : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^k$, we denote by H^I the function $x \mapsto H(x)^I$ and the same for π_I , where $\pi : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$. If $I = \{i\}$, $\pi_i = \pi_I$ will be also used.

The set I is called *an information set of $L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}$* if

$$\{(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_k}) : x \in L\} = \mathbb{F}_2^k.$$

One can find some I for any $L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}$ using Gaussian elimination for its basis matrix. It is well known that I is an information set of $L \iff \bar{I}$ is an information set of $[L]^\perp$. One more of its important properties is that any coset of $[L]$ can be uniquely determined as $a^{\bar{I}} \oplus L$, where $a \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n-k}$.

Hereinafter, \mathcal{I} is some arbitrary fixed mapping that for any $L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}$, $0 \leq k \leq n$, gives us its information set $I = \mathcal{I}(L)$. We need it only to choose information sets deterministically.

2.4 Bent functions and the Maiorana–McFarland class

A function $f : \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ is a *bent function* if it is at the maximum possible Hamming distance from the set of all affine Boolean functions in $2n$ variables; they form the set \mathcal{B}_{2n} . Though $m = 2n$ is used in the introduction (which makes the dependence of the estimates on the number of variables more clear), we use bent functions in $2n$ variables elsewhere.

The *Maiorana–McFarland class \mathcal{M}_{2n}* consists of

$$f_{\pi, \varphi}(x, y) = \langle x, \pi(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi(y),$$

where $\pi : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is invertible and $\varphi : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$. All such functions are bent functions. Let us denote by \mathcal{P}_n the set of all invertible $\pi : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and define for each $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n$

$$\mathcal{L}_k(\pi) = \{U \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k} : \pi(U) = \{\pi(x) : x \in U\} \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}\}.$$

Also, $\Gamma_n = \mathbb{F}_2^n \times \{0 \in \mathbb{F}_2^n\}$. We note that any $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ is affine on each coset of Γ_n .

The *completed Maiorana–McFarland class $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$* is the closure of \mathcal{M}_{2n} with respect to EA-equivalence. In fact, we can consider only linear transformations

of coordinates since $f(x \oplus a) \oplus h(x) \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ for any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$, $a \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$ and affine $h : \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$. The set of all bent functions \mathcal{B}_{2n} is closed with respect to EA-equivalence.

3 The closest bent functions to a given bent function

It is known [20, Corollary 3] that all bent functions at the minimum possible distance 2^n from a given $f \in \mathcal{B}_{2n}$ can be generated using the construction (1).

Proposition 1 (see [20]). *Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_{2n}$ and $U \subset \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$, $|U| = 2^n$. Then $f \oplus \text{Ind}_U \in \mathcal{B}_{2n} \iff U \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n}$ and $f|_U$ is affine.*

In the case of $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$ there always exists a bent function at the distance 2^n from f , i.e. we can define the set

$$\mathcal{N}(f) = \{f \oplus \text{Ind}_U : U \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n} \text{ and } f|_U \text{ is affine}\} \quad (6)$$

and refer to it as *the set of all closest bent functions to f* . Similarly,

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{K}) = \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{K}} \mathcal{N}(f) \setminus \mathcal{K} \quad (7)$$

is *the set of all closest bent functions to the class \mathcal{K}* , where \mathcal{K} is either \mathcal{M}_{2n} or $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$. Also, $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|$ and $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)|$ are directly connected with $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}|$ and $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}^\#|$:

$$|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}| = |\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})| + |\mathcal{M}_{2n}|, \quad |\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}^\#| = |\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)| + |\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$$

since $f \oplus \text{Ind}_{\Gamma_n} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ for any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$.

3.1 The case of $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$

The criterion [21, Theorem 3] describes $\mathcal{N}(f)$ for any $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$. We provide it swapping x and y . Also, $\langle M \rangle$ is the linear span of the rows of a matrix M over \mathbb{F}_2 .

Proposition 2 (see [21]). *Let $f_{\pi,\varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ and $U = (a, b) \oplus \langle M \rangle$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and M over \mathbb{F}_2 represented as*

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} T & S \\ P & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where S and P of size $k \times n$ and $(n - k) \times n$ have full rank, $0 \leq k \leq n$ and T is arbitrary of size $k \times n$. Then $f_{\pi,\varphi} \oplus \text{Ind}_U \in \mathcal{B}_{2n} \iff$ the following conditions are satisfied:

1. $\pi(b \oplus \langle S \rangle) = \pi(b) \oplus \langle P \rangle^\perp$,
2. $u \in \mathbb{F}_2^k \mapsto \langle uT \oplus a, \pi(uS \oplus b) \rangle \oplus \varphi(uS \oplus b)$ is affine.

Let us describe a construction allowing us to represent any $U \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n}$ in the unique way.

Proposition 3. *Any $U \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n}$ can be uniquely expressed as*

$$\mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L, R, H) = \{(H^{\mathcal{I}(R^\perp)}(y) \oplus z, y) : y \in L, z \in R\},$$

where $L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}$, $R \in [\mathcal{A}_{n,n-k}]$, and $H : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^k$ is affine, $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L, R, H)$ is linear \iff L and H are linear. Also, $[\mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L, R, H)] \cap \Gamma_n = R$.

Proof. First of all, $\mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L, R, H) \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n}$. Indeed, let $L' = [L]$, $b \in L$ and $I = \mathcal{I}(R^\perp)$, i.e. \bar{I} is some information set of R . By definition, there exist linear $A : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^k$ and $a \in \mathbb{F}_2^k$ such that $H = A|_L \oplus a$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L, R, H) &= \{(A^I(b \oplus y) \oplus a^I \oplus z, b \oplus y) : y \in L', z \in R\} \\ &= (A^I(b) \oplus a^I, b) \oplus \mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L', R, A). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$U' = \mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L', R, A) \in [\mathcal{A}_{2n,n}]$ holds since $L', R, A|_{L'}$ are linear and $|U'| = 2^{\dim L} \cdot 2^{\dim R} = 2^n$. Also, $U' \cap \Gamma_n = R$. The equality (9) gives us $2^{n-\dim R} \cdot 2^{n-\dim L} = 2^n$ cosets of U' which are distinct for distinct $(a, b \oplus L')$.

The representation is unique. Indeed, distinct (L', R) generate distinct U' . Also, if $A(y) \neq A'(y)$ for some $y \in L'$, then the cosets $A^I(y) \oplus R$ and $A'^I(y) \oplus R$ are distinct due to the choice of I . This implies $\mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L', R, A) \neq \mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L', R, A')$.

Hence, we only need to prove that any $U' \in [\mathcal{A}_{2n,n}]$ can be represented in this way. Let us choose a basis matrix M of U' in the form (8) that can be obtained, for instance, from the reduced row echelon form after Gaussian elimination. Moreover, Gaussian elimination can transform T to W^I without changing P and S , where W is a matrix of size $k \times k$ and $I = \mathcal{I}(\langle P \rangle^\perp)$. This means that

$$\begin{aligned} U' &= \{((uW)^I \oplus vP, uS) : u \in \mathbb{F}_2^k, v \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n-k}\} \\ &= \{((V(y)W)^I \oplus z, y) : y \in \langle S \rangle, z \in \langle P \rangle\}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $V : y \mapsto u$ such that $uS = y$. Since V is linear, $U' = \mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(\langle S \rangle, \langle P \rangle, W \circ V)$. \square

Next, we rewrite the criterion in terms of Proposition 3.

Theorem 1. *Let $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$. Then $\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi, \varphi})$ consists of all $f_{\pi, \varphi} \oplus \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L, [\pi(L)]^\perp, H)}$, where*

1. $L \in \mathcal{L}_k(\pi)$ for $0 \leq k \leq n$,

2. both $H : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^k$ and $x \in L \mapsto \langle H(x), \pi_I(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x)$ are affine, $I = \mathcal{I}([\pi(L)])$.

Distinct (L, H) correspond to distinct bent functions.

Proof. According to Proposition 3, we can represent any $U \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n}$ as $U = \mathcal{U}_n^I(b \oplus L, R, H)$, where $L \in [\mathcal{A}_{n,k}]$ and $R \in [\mathcal{A}_{n,n-k}]$ whose basis matrices are S and P , and $H(x) = xA \oplus c$ for some matrix A of size $n \times k$. Since $x \in b \oplus L$ can be represented as $b \oplus uS$ and $z \in R$ as vP , where $u \in \mathbb{F}_2^k$, $v \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n-k}$, each element of U can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} (H^I(uS \oplus b) \oplus vP, uS \oplus b) &= (((uS \oplus b)A \oplus c)^I \oplus vP, b \oplus uS) \\ &= (bA^I \oplus c^I, b) \oplus (u(SA)^I \oplus vP, uS), \quad u \in \mathbb{F}_2^k, \quad v \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n-k}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, one of basis matrices of U is

$$\begin{pmatrix} (SA)^I & S \\ P & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The first condition of Proposition 2 gives us that $b \oplus L \in \mathcal{L}_k(\pi)$ and $R = [\pi(b \oplus L)]^\perp$. The second condition is the affinity of

$$\begin{aligned} u \in \mathbb{F}_2^k \mapsto \langle u(SA)^I \oplus (bA \oplus c)^I, \pi(uS \oplus b) \rangle \oplus \varphi(uS \oplus b) \\ = \langle H^I(uS \oplus b), \pi(uS \oplus b) \rangle \oplus \varphi(uS \oplus b) \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to the affinity of the function $x \in b \oplus L \mapsto \langle H(x), \pi_I(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x)$ due to $H_i^I \equiv 0$ for $i \in \bar{I}$. \square

For shortness, we will denote any bent function from $\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi,\varphi})$ or $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ by $f_{\pi,\varphi}^{L,H}$ which is equal to

$$f_{\pi,\varphi}(x, y) \oplus \text{Ind}_L(y) \cdot \text{Ind}_{H^{\mathcal{I}([\pi(L)])}(y) \oplus [\pi(L)]^\perp}(x), \quad (11)$$

where L and H satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1. Though H is not defined on $\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L$, $\text{Ind}_L(y) = 0$ for any $y \notin L$.

We also note that the properties of $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n$ related to its $\mathcal{L}_k(\pi)$ were studied, for instance, in [23–26].

3.2 The most important special cases

Let us pay attention to the most important special cases of Theorem 1. We start with one described in [21, Corollary 2] that gives us the lower bound ℓ_{2n} for $|\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi,\varphi})|$.

Proposition 4 (see [21]). *Let $f_{\pi,\varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$. Then $|\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi,\varphi}) \cap \mathcal{M}_{2n}| = \ell_{2n}$, where $\ell_{2n} = 2^{2n+1} - 2^n$. Moreover, $f_{\pi,\varphi}^{L,H} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n} \iff \dim L \leq 1$, where $f_{\pi,\varphi}^{L,H} \in \mathcal{N}(f_{\pi,\varphi})$, see (11).*

One more description of $\mathcal{N}(f) \cap \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ can be found in [10, Proposition 10]. We also note that this bound is accurate for some n [21, 27].

Finally, we consider the case of $\dim L = 2$ which generates most of the bent functions from $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$, see Sections 5 and 6. Let us recall the following well-known property.

Lemma 1. *Let $H : L \rightarrow U$, where L and U are affine subspaces of \mathbb{F}_2^n and \mathbb{F}_2^k , $\dim L = 2$ and $\dim U \leq 2$. Then H is affine $\iff \bigoplus_{x \in L} H(x) = 0$. Any invertible H is affine.*

Theorem 2. *Let $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ and $L \in \mathcal{L}_2(\pi)$. Let $a, b, c \in L$ such that $\pi_I(a) = (0, 1)$, $\pi_I(b) = (1, 0)$ and $\pi_I(c) = (1, 1)$, where $I = \mathcal{I}([\pi(L)])$. Then $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} \in \mathcal{N}(f_{\pi, \varphi}) \iff$*

1. $H(a), H(b), H_1(c)$ are arbitrary 5 bits,
2. $H_2(c) = H_2(a) \oplus H_1(b) \oplus H_1(c) \oplus \sum_{x \in L} \varphi(x)$,
3. $H(a \oplus b \oplus c) = H(a) \oplus H(b) \oplus H(c)$.

These give us $|\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi, \varphi})| \geq \ell_{2n} + 2^5 |\mathcal{L}_2(\pi)|$.

Proof. We only need to check the second condition of Theorem 1. Let $H : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^2$ is arbitrary. According to Lemma 1, the function $x \in L \mapsto \langle H(x), \pi_I(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x)$ is affine \iff

$$0 = \bigoplus_{x \in L} (\langle H(x), \pi_I(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x)) = \bigoplus_{x \in L} \varphi(x) \oplus H_2(a) \oplus H_1(b) \oplus H_1(c) \oplus H_2(c).$$

This is satisfied \iff the second point is true. At the same time, the third point $H(a \oplus b \oplus c) = H(a) \oplus H(b) \oplus H(c)$ is satisfied $\iff H$ is affine. \square

4 Intersections of $\mathcal{N}(f)$ and $\mathcal{N}(g)$ for $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$

The calculation of the cardinalities of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ requires information related to intersections of $\mathcal{N}(f)$ and $\mathcal{N}(g)$ for $f, g \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$. This is the most technically complex section, but it contains, however, a briefly formulated result (see Remark 1) which will be used only in Section 6. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *Let $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H}, f_{\pi', \varphi'}^{L', H'} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ and $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} = f_{\pi', \varphi'}^{L', H'}$. Then $L = L'$, $\pi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \pi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$ and $\varphi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \varphi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$. Also, $\dim L \geq 3$ implies $(\pi, \varphi, H) = (\pi', \varphi', H')$.*

Proof. Since $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H}, f_{\pi', \varphi'}^{L', H'} \notin \mathcal{M}_{2n}$, Proposition 4 claims that $\dim L \geq 2$ and $\dim L' \geq 2$. Let $I = \mathcal{I}([\pi(L)])$ and $J = \mathcal{I}([\pi'(L')])$ Then (11) gives us that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, \pi(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi(y) \oplus \text{Ind}_L(y) \text{Ind}_{H^I(y) \oplus [\pi(L)]^\perp}(x) = \\ \langle x, \pi'(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi'(y) \oplus \text{Ind}_{L'}(y) \text{Ind}_{H^{I'}(y) \oplus [\pi'(L')]^\perp}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Let us fix some $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. The function on the left is affine $\iff y \in L$. Indeed, $\dim[\pi(L)]^\perp = n - \dim \pi(L) \leq n - 2$, i.e. $\text{Ind}_{H^I(y) \oplus [\pi(L)]^\perp}$ cannot be affine. Similarly, the function on the right is affine $\iff y \in L'$. Hence, (12) implies $L = L'$.

Fixing some $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L$ in (12), we obtain

$$\langle x, \pi(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi(y) = \langle x, \pi'(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi'(y) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n,$$

i.e. $\pi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \pi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$, $\varphi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \varphi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$ and $\pi(L) = \pi'(L')$.

Let $R = [\pi(L)]^\perp$ and, again, fix some $y \in L$ in (12):

$$\langle x, \pi(y) \oplus \pi'(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi(y) \oplus \varphi'(y) = \text{Ind}_{H^I(y) \oplus R}(x) \oplus \text{Ind}_{H^{I'}(y) \oplus R}(x). \quad (13)$$

Suppose that it is satisfied for $\dim L > 2$. The function on the left is affine. But the function on the right is affine only if the cosets $H^I(y) \oplus R$ and $H^{I'}(y) \oplus R$ coincide for all $y \in L$. Otherwise, the function on the right will take 1 exactly $2^{n - \dim L + 1} < 2^{n-1}$ times for some $y \in L$, i.e. it cannot be affine. However, the coincidence of the cosets for all $y \in L$ implies that the function on the left must be identically zero for all $y \in L$, i.e. $\pi = \pi'$ and $\varphi = \varphi'$. Finally, Theorem 1 guarantees that $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} \neq f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H'}$ if $H \neq H'$. \square

Thus, we only need to consider the case of Theorem 2.

Lemma 3. *Let $L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,2}$, $\varphi : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$, $\sigma, \sigma' : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^2$ be invertible and both $H : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^2$ and $h : x \in L \mapsto \langle H(x), \sigma(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x)$ be affine. Let us define $\varphi' : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ as*

$$\varphi'(x) = \varphi(x) \oplus \langle H(x), \sigma(x) \oplus \sigma'(x) \rangle \oplus \text{Ind}_{\{\sigma(x)\}}(\sigma'(x)) \oplus 1,$$

$x \in L$, and $H' : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^2$ in the following way:

1. $H'(x) = H(x) \iff \sigma'(x) = \sigma(x)$ for all $x \in L$,
2. $\langle H'(x) \oplus H(x), \sigma'(x) \oplus \sigma(x) \rangle = 0$ for all $x \in L$.

Then H' is uniquely determined and affine. Moreover, $h' : x \in L \mapsto \langle H'(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi'(x)$ is affine as well.

Proof. Let $\delta(x) = \sigma(x) \oplus \sigma'(x)$ and $T(x) = H(x) \oplus H'(x)$, $x \in L$. According to the conditions, $T(x) = 0 \iff \delta(x) = 0$ and $\langle T(x), \delta(x) \rangle = 0$ for all $x \in L$. Moreover, T is uniquely determined $\iff H'$ is uniquely determined; and T is affine $\iff H'$ is affine.

It is clear that T is uniquely determined. Indeed, for $\delta(x) \neq 0$ the equation $\langle u, \delta(x) \rangle = 0$, $u \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$, has exactly two solutions $\{0, \delta(x)\}^\perp$ and one of them is

$u = 0$. It means that $T(x)$ must be equal to the nonzero solution due to $T(x) \neq 0$ for this case. If $\delta(x) = 0$, then $T(x) = 0$ as well.

Let us show that T is affine. According to Lemma 1, we need to prove that

$$\bigoplus_{x \in L} T(x) = 0. \quad (14)$$

Since σ and σ' are invertible, they are affine due to Lemma 1. This means that δ is affine as their sum. Hence, either δ is invertible or the number of solutions of $\delta(x) = b$ is even for any $b \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$.

If δ is invertible, then T is invertible as well. Indeed, if $\delta(x) = 0$, then $T(x) = 0$. Otherwise $T(x)$ is the only nonzero element of $\{0, \delta(x)\}^\perp$; they are distinct for distinct $\delta(x)$. Thus, T is affine due to Lemma 1.

If δ is not invertible, then $\delta(x) = b$ has an even number of solutions (or does not have solutions). Also, if $\delta(x_1) = \delta(x_2) = b$, $x_1, x_2 \in L$, then $T(x_1) = T(x_2)$ and $T(x_1) \oplus T(x_2) = 0$ as well. Hence, (14) is satisfied.

Let us prove that the function h' is affine. First, the equality

$$\langle H(x), \delta(x) \rangle \oplus \langle H'(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle = \langle H(x), \sigma(x) \rangle \oplus \langle T(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle$$

holds since both its parts are equal to $\langle H(x), \sigma(x) \rangle \oplus \langle H(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle \oplus \langle H'(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle$. Secondly, using $\varphi'(x) = \varphi(x) \oplus \langle H(x), \delta(x) \rangle \oplus \text{Ind}_{\{0\}}(\delta(x)) \oplus 1$ and the equality above, we obtain that $h'(x) \oplus 1$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle H'(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x) \oplus \langle H(x), \delta(x) \rangle \oplus \text{Ind}_{\{0\}}(\delta(x)) \oplus 1 \oplus 1 \\ &= \langle H(x), \sigma(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x) \oplus \langle T(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle \oplus \text{Ind}_{\{0\}}(\delta(x)) \\ &= h(x) \oplus \langle T(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle \oplus \text{Ind}_{\{0\}}(\delta(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Since h is affine, it is enough to prove that the function $r : x \in L \mapsto \langle T(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle \oplus \text{Ind}_{\{0\}}(\delta(x))$ is affine. According to Lemma 1, r is affine \iff it takes 0 an even number of times. Let us calculate this number.

If $\delta(x) = 0$, then $T(x) = 0$ and $r(x) = \langle T(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle \oplus \text{Ind}_{\{0\}}(\delta(x)) = 1$, which is not interesting for us.

Let $\delta(x) \neq 0$. Then $T(x) \neq 0$ and $\text{Ind}_{\{0\}}(\delta(x)) = 0$, i.e. $r(x) = \langle T(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle$. Note that

$$\langle T(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle = \langle T(x), \sigma(x) \rangle \quad (15)$$

due to $\langle T(x), \delta(x) \rangle = 0$. Thus, $\langle T(x), \sigma(x) \rangle = 0 \iff \langle T(x), \sigma'(x) \rangle = 0$. But the equation $\langle T(x), y \rangle = 0$ has exactly two solutions: some nonzero $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$ and 0. Since $\sigma(x) \neq \sigma'(x)$ in this case, either $(\sigma(x) = y, \sigma'(x) = 0)$ or $(\sigma(x) = 0, \sigma'(x) = y)$. Moreover, we cannot have more than two such x since σ and σ' are invertible.

Let $\sigma(x) = y$ and $\sigma'(x) = 0$. Since σ and σ' are invertible, there always exists an additional $x' \in L$, $x' \neq x$, such that $\sigma(x') = 0$ and $\sigma'(x') \neq 0$, i.e. $\delta(x') \neq 0$. We can use (15) for x' and obtain $r(x') = \langle T(x'), \sigma'(x') \rangle = 0$.

If $\sigma(x) = 0$ and $\sigma'(x) = y$, we immediately obtain some $x' \neq x$ with $\sigma'(x') = 0 \neq \sigma(x')$, i.e. $\delta(x') \neq 0$ and $r(x') = 0$.

Thus, either there are exactly two $x, x' \in L$ such that $r(x) = r(x') = 0$ or $r(x) \equiv 1$. Consequently, r and h' are affine. \square

Let us union the proved properties into one theorem.

Theorem 3. *Let $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ and $I = \mathcal{I}([\pi(L)])$. Then*

1. *The case of $\dim L \leq 1$ is impossible.*
2. *If $\dim L = 2$, $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} \in \mathcal{N}(f_{\pi', \varphi'})$ for exactly 24 distinct $f_{\pi', \varphi'} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$. Moreover, $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} = f_{\pi', \varphi'}^{L', H'} \iff$*
 - (a) $L' = L$, $\pi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \pi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$ and $\varphi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \varphi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$,
 - (b) $\varphi'|_L$ and $H' : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^2$ are uniquely determined as

$$\varphi'(y) = \varphi(y) \oplus \langle H(y), \pi_I(y) \oplus \pi'_I(y) \rangle \oplus \text{Ind}_{\{\pi(y)\}}(\pi'(y)) \oplus 1,$$

$$\langle H'(y) \oplus H(y), \pi_I(y) \oplus \pi'_I(y) \rangle = 0$$

$$\text{and } H'(y) = H(y) \iff \pi'(y) = \pi(y).$$

3. *If $\dim L \geq 3$, $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} \in \mathcal{N}(f_{\pi', \varphi'}) \iff \pi = \pi'$ and $\varphi = \varphi'$.*

Proof. The first point follows from Proposition 4. Due to Lemma 2, the third point is satisfied and $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} = f_{\pi', \varphi'}^{L', H'}$ requires $L = L'$, $\pi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \pi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$ and $\varphi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \varphi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$.

Let us prove the case of $\dim L = 2$. According to the proof of Lemma 2, $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} = f_{\pi', \varphi'}^{L, H'}$, where $\pi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \pi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$ and $\varphi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \varphi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} \iff$ (13) is satisfied for any $y \in L$:

$$\langle x, \pi(y) \oplus \pi'(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi(y) \oplus \varphi'(y) = \text{Ind}_{H^I(y) \oplus R}(x) \oplus \text{Ind}_{H'^I(y) \oplus R}(x), \quad (16)$$

where $R = [\pi(L)]^\perp = [\pi'(L)]^\perp$ and the second condition of Theorem 1 is satisfied for affine $H' : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^2$.

Next, let us choose any possible $\pi'|_L$. We note that the coincidence of the cosets from the indicators implies that $H(y) = H'(y)$ since \bar{I} is some information set of R , see Section 2. Assuming that (16) is satisfied, $H(y) = H'(y)$ implies $\pi(y) = \pi'(y)$ and $\varphi(y) = \varphi'(y)$, where y is some element of L . Moreover, $\pi(y) = \pi'(y)$ implies $H(y) = H'(y)$ due to $\dim R = n - 2$. The formulas from the condition provide the same since I is an information set of $\pi(L)$.

Let us consider $y \in L$ such that $\pi(y) \neq \pi'(y)$, i.e. $H(y) \neq H'(y)$ is also required. First, we point out that $\pi(y) \oplus \pi'(y) \in [\pi(L)]$. Secondly, the choice of

I provides that any $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ can be uniquely represented as $z^I \oplus x'$, where $x' \in R$ and $z \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, \pi(y) \oplus \pi'(y) \rangle &= \langle z^I \oplus x', \pi(y) \oplus \pi'(y) \rangle = \\ &= \langle z^I, \pi(y) \oplus \pi'(y) \rangle \oplus 0 = \langle z, \pi_I(y) \oplus \pi'_I(y) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\text{Ind}_{H^I(y) \oplus R}(x)$ transforms to $\text{Ind}_{\{H(y)\}}(z)$. Consequently, (16) is equivalent to

$$\langle z, \pi_I(y) \oplus \pi'_I(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi(y) \oplus \varphi'(y) = \text{Ind}_{\{H(y), H'(y)\}}(z),$$

where $z \in \mathbb{F}_2^2$. Since $\langle z, \pi_I(y) \oplus \pi'_I(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi(y) = 1$ has exactly two solutions, (16) is satisfied \iff these solutions are $z = H(y)$ and $z = H'(y)$, i.e. (16) transforms to

$$\begin{cases} \langle H(y), \pi_I(y) \oplus \pi'_I(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi(y) \oplus \varphi'(y) = 1, \\ \langle H'(y), \pi_I(y) \oplus \pi'_I(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi(y) \oplus \varphi'(y) = 1. \end{cases}$$

This system is equivalent to the following:

$$\begin{cases} \langle H(y) \oplus H'(y), \pi_I(y) \oplus \pi'_I(y) \rangle = 0, \\ \varphi'(y) = \varphi(y) \oplus \langle H(y), \pi_I(y) \oplus \pi'_I(y) \rangle \oplus 1. \end{cases}$$

Since $H(y) \neq H'(y)$ and $\pi(y) \neq \pi'(y)$ in this case, the formulas from the statement of the theorem are obtained.

At the same time, we still need to prove that H' is uniquely determined and $f_{\pi', \varphi'}^{L, H'}$ belongs to $\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi', \varphi'})$, i.e. the obtained H' satisfies the second condition of Theorem 1. However, all conditions of Lemma 3 are satisfied for $\sigma = \pi_I|_L$, $\sigma' = \pi'_I|_L$ and H . Moreover, $\pi(y) = \pi'(y) \iff \sigma(y) = \sigma'(y)$ due to the choice of I , where $y \in L$. Hence, Lemma 3 gives us that both H' and $y \in L \mapsto \langle H'(y), \pi'(y) \rangle \oplus \varphi'(y)$ are affine and H' is uniquely determined, i.e. $f_{\pi', \varphi'}^{L, H'} \in \mathcal{N}(f_{\pi', \varphi'})$ by Theorem 1. Since we choose any $\pi'|_L$ with $\pi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \pi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$ and then uniquely determine φ' and H' , there are exactly $4! = 24$ distinct $f_{\pi', \varphi'}$ such that $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} \in \mathcal{N}(f_{\pi', \varphi'})$. \square

Remark 1. Theorem 3 constructs all $f_{\pi', \varphi'}^{L', H'}$ that are equal to some given $f_{\pi, \varphi}^{L, H} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ using $L' = L$ of dimension 2 and all 24 distinct π' such that $\pi'|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L} = \pi|_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L}$. After that the given formulas uniquely determine φ' and H' .

5 The expected value of $|\mathcal{N}(f)|$ for $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$

Let us introduce

$$E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}} |\mathcal{N}(f)|$$

which is the expected value of the number of $U \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n}$ such that a random $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ is affine on U . We also need to define

$$\rho_{n,k} = 2^{2(n-k)} (\mathcal{S}_n^k)^2 2^k! (2^n - 2^k)! / 2^n!. \quad (17)$$

The most important values are

$$\rho_{n,2} = \frac{2^{2n-3}}{3} + \frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{2^{n+2} - 12}, \quad n \geq 2, \quad (18)$$

$$\rho_{n,3} = \frac{5}{224} \frac{2^n (2^n - 1)(2^n - 2)(2^n - 4)}{(2^n - 3)(2^n - 5)(2^n - 6)(2^n - 7)}, \quad n \geq 3. \quad (19)$$

Let us start with auxiliary properties.

5.1 Auxiliary results

The following result related to the expected value of $|\mathcal{L}_k(\pi)|$ for $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n$, was proved in [26, Proposition 5]. For completeness, we give it with the proof which is not difficult.

Lemma 4 (see [26]). *Let $0 \leq k \leq n$. Then*

$$\sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n} |\mathcal{L}_k(\pi)| = 2^n! \rho_{n,k}.$$

Proof. Let $\delta_{\pi,L} = 1$ if $\pi(L) \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}$ and 0 otherwise, where $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}$. Let us rewrite the sum above in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n} |\mathcal{L}_k(\pi)| &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}} \delta_{\pi,L} = \sum_{L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n} \delta_{\pi,L} \\ &= \sum_{L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}} |\{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n : \pi(L) \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}\}|. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Let us choose any $L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}$ and calculate the number of distinct $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n$ such that $\pi(L) \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}$. First, we can choose any k -dimensional affine subspace of \mathbb{F}_2^n as $\pi(L)$. The same π cannot have distinct $\pi(L)$, i.e. we can choose $\pi(L)$ in $2^{n-k} \mathcal{S}_n^k$ ways. Secondly, $\pi|_L$ can be chosen in $|\pi(L)|! = 2^k!$ ways since $\pi(L)$ is already defined. Each such $\pi|_L$ can be extended to the whole \mathbb{F}_2^n in $(2^n - 2^k)!$ ways since $\pi(\mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus L) = \mathbb{F}_2^n \setminus \pi(L)$. Finally, taking into account that the initial L can be chosen in $2^{n-k} \mathcal{S}_n^k$ ways and (20), we obtain that

$$\sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n} |\mathcal{L}_k(\pi)| = 2^{n-k} \cdot \mathcal{S}_n^k \cdot 2^{n-k} \cdot \mathcal{S}_n^k \cdot 2^k! \cdot (2^n - 2^k)!.$$

This completes the proof. □

A quite easy one is [26, Proposition 7], we provide it in a little bit simplified form.

Lemma 5 (see [26]). *It holds that $\rho_{n,k} > \rho_{n+1,k}$, where $n \geq k$. Also, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=4}^{n-1} \rho_{n,k} = 0$.*

In addition to properties of permutations, we prove the one related to the second condition of Theorem 1.

Lemma 6. *Let $\pi : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^k$ be invertible, where $L \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}$. Let the set $\mathcal{H}_{\pi,\varphi}$ for $\varphi : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ consist of all affine $H : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^k$ such that the function $x \in L \mapsto \langle \pi(x), H(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x)$ is affine as well. Then*

$$\sum_{\varphi: \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2} |\mathcal{H}_{\pi,\varphi}| = 2^{2^n - 2^k + (k+1)^2}.$$

Proof. The sum from the statement of the lemma is equal to $2^{2^n - 2^k} \sum_{\varphi|_L: L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2} |\mathcal{H}_{\pi,\varphi}|$ since any $\varphi|_L$ can be extended to φ in $2^{2^n - 2^k}$ ways. Next,

$$\sum_{\varphi|_L: L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2} |\mathcal{H}_{\pi,\varphi}| = \sum_{\varphi|_L: L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2} \sum_H \delta_{\varphi,H} = \sum_H \sum_{\varphi|_L: L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2} \delta_{\varphi,H},$$

where $\delta_{\varphi,H} = 1$ if $x \in L \mapsto \langle \pi(x), H(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x)$ is affine and 0 otherwise. Next, it is not difficult to see that for each fixed pair π, H the restriction $\delta_{\varphi,H} = 1$ is satisfied exactly for 2^{k+1} distinct $\varphi|_L$ since $\varphi|_L$ is defined up to its affine part. The number of distinct affine $H : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^k$ is 2^{k^2+k} . \square

5.2 The expression for $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$

Now we are ready to find the expression for $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$.

Theorem 4. $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) = \ell_{2n} + \sum_{k=2}^n \rho_{n,k} \cdot 2^{(k+1)^2 - 2^k}$.

Proof. Theorem 1 gives us that

$$|\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi,\varphi})| = \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_k(\pi)} |\mathcal{H}_{\pi_L,\varphi}|, \quad (21)$$

where $\pi_L = \pi_{\mathcal{I}([\pi(L)])}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\pi_L,\varphi}$ is defined in Lemma 6 (L6) according to the second condition of Theorem 1. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{f_{\pi,\varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_k(\pi)} |\mathcal{H}_{\pi_L,\varphi}| &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n} \sum_{\varphi: \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_k(\pi)} |\mathcal{H}_{\pi_L,\varphi}| \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_k(\pi)} \sum_{\varphi: \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2} |\mathcal{H}_{\pi_L,\varphi}| \end{aligned}$$

$2n$	$\rho_{n,3} \cdot 2^8$	$\rho_{n,4} \cdot 2^9$	$\sum_{k=3}^{n-1} \rho_{n,k} \cdot 2^{(k+1)^2-2^k}$
8	17.902098	512	17.9020979020979034
10	9.355732	0.0032743174336464	9.3590067076487955
12	7.203453	0.0000071066250978	7.2034599713804699
14	6.394514	0.0000000489712760	6.3945141111150132
16	6.040081	0.0000000005242934	6.0400809074314523
18	5.873799	0.0000000000068280	5.8737987726531991
20	5.793219	0.0000000000000976	5.7932190779699999
22	5.753549	0.0000000000000015	5.7535493917318199
24	5.733867	0.0000000000000000	5.7338671451801089

Table 1: The values for estimating $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ and $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\stackrel{\text{L6}}{=} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_k(\pi)} 2^{2^n - 2^k + (k+1)^2} \\
&= 2^{2^n - 2^k + (k+1)^2} \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_n} |\mathcal{L}_k(\pi)| \\
&\stackrel{\text{L4}}{=} 2^{2^n} 2^n! 2^{(k+1)^2 - 2^k} \rho_{n,k}. \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

According to (21), $k = 0$ and $k = 1$ are the cases of Proposition 4 generating exactly ℓ_{2n} bent functions from \mathcal{M}_{2n} . Thus, (21) and (22) provide that $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ is equal to

$$\sum_{f_{\pi,\varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}} \frac{|\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi,\varphi})|}{|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|} = \ell_{2n} + \sum_{k=2}^n 2^{(k+1)^2 - 2^k} \rho_{n,k}.$$

We also note that $k = 2$ is the case of Theorem 2. □

The equality (18) implies the following.

Corollary 1. $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) = \frac{10}{3}2^{2n} - 2^n + \frac{8}{3} + \frac{8}{2^n-3} + 2^{(n+1)^2-2^n} + \sum_{k=3}^{n-1} 2^{(k+1)^2-2^k} \rho_{n,k}$, where $n \geq 2$. Rounded values of the last sum can be found in Table 1.

Corollary 2. $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) < \frac{10}{3}2^{2n} - 2^n + 29$ for $n \geq 5$.

Proof. By Corollary 1: $\frac{8}{3} + \frac{8}{2^n-3} < 3$ and $2^{(n+1)^2-2^n} \leq 16$ if $n \geq 5$. The sum $\sum_{k=3}^{n-1} 2^{(k+1)^2-2^k} \rho_{n,k}$ is less than 10, see Table 1 and Lemma 5. □

Corollary 3. $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) = \frac{10}{3}2^{2n} - 2^n + \frac{176}{21} + o(1)$. It can also be written as $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) = \ell_{2n} + \frac{4}{3}2^{2n} + \frac{176}{21} + o(1)$ or $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) = \frac{5}{3}\ell_{2n} + \frac{2}{3}2^n + \frac{176}{21} + o(1)$.

Proof. Let us note that

$$\sum_{k=4}^{n-1} 2^{(k+1)^2-2^k} \rho_{n,k} \leq 2^9 \sum_{k=4}^{n-1} \rho_{n,k},$$

since $2^{(k+1)^2-2^k}$ is equal to 2^9 for $k = 4$, 2^4 for $k = 5$ and is less than 1 for $k \geq 6$. Thus, Lemma 5 guarantees that

$$\sum_{k=4}^{n-1} 2^{(k+1)^2-2^k} \rho_{n,k} = o(1). \quad (23)$$

By Theorem 4, the equality above, (18) and (19), $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{2n} + 2^5 \rho_{n,2} + 2^8 \rho_{n,3} + \sum_{k=4}^{n-1} 2^{(k+1)^2-2^k} \rho_{n,k} + 2^{(n+1)^2-2^n} \\ = 2^{2n+1} - 2^n + 2^5 \left(\frac{2^{2n-3}}{3} + \frac{1}{12} \right) + 2^8 \cdot \frac{5}{224} + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

which is equal to $\frac{10}{3}2^{2n} - 2^n + \frac{8}{3} + \frac{40}{7} + o(1)$ as well as to all equalities from the statement of the corollary. \square

Thus, a random $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$, which is constructed using 2^n distinct (up to adding a constant) affine functions in n variables, is affine on approximately $\frac{5}{3}\ell_{2n}$ or $\frac{10}{3}2^{2n}$ distinct $U \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n}$. Taking into account the lower bound $|\mathcal{N}(f)| \geq \ell_{2n}$ (see Proposition 4), the expected value of $|\mathcal{N}(f)|$ is asymptotically $\frac{5}{3}$ times greater than the minimum possible value of $|\mathcal{N}(f)|$. Indeed, there are bent functions $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ with $|\mathcal{N}(f)| = \ell_{2n} + o(\ell_{2n})$ [27]. Moreover, the bound ℓ_{2n} is accurate for some n [21, 27]. As we will show in Section 9, the situation is exactly the same for $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$ due to $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#) = E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) - o(1)$ (see Theorem 7).

Also, we point out that the number of variables here is $m = 2n$. Hence, the construction (1) for some random $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ generates slightly more bent functions than the trivial one that just adds to the given bent function one of 2^{2n+1} affine functions. At the same time, it can be considered as a generalization of the construction (1) for affine subspaces of \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} of arbitrary dimension [12]. It would be interesting to know how many bent functions this generalized construction generates, since its properties are also connected with the affinity [28].

6 The cardinalities of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}$

Here we find the explicit expressions for $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|$ and $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}|$ using the results of Sections 4 and 5.

Theorem 5. $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_2)| = 0$ and for $n \geq 2$ the following holds:

$$|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})| = \left(\frac{4}{3} \rho_{n,2} + \sum_{k=3}^n \rho_{n,k} \cdot 2^{(k+1)^2-2^k} \right) |\mathcal{M}_{2n}|.$$

Moreover, the case of Theorem 2 generates $\frac{4}{3}\rho_{n,2}|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|$ bent functions from $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$.

$2n$	$ \mathcal{M}_{2n} $	$ \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) $	$ \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n} $	$ \mathcal{B}_{2n} $
2	8	0	8	8
4	384	512	896	896
6	$\approx 2^{23.299}$	$\approx 2^{31.320}$	$\approx 2^{31.326}$	$\approx 2^{32.337}$
8	$\approx 2^{60.250}$	$\approx 2^{69.338}$	$\approx 2^{69.341}$	$\approx 2^{106.291}$

Table 2: The cardinality of $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|$ and $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}|$

Proof. Similarly to the proof of Theorem 4, (21), Proposition 4 and Theorem 3 give us that $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|$ is equal to

$$\frac{1}{24} \sum_{f_{\pi,\varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_2(\pi)} |\mathcal{H}_{\pi_L,\varphi}| + \sum_{k=3}^n \sum_{f_{\pi,\varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_k(\pi)} |\mathcal{H}_{\pi_L,\varphi}|.$$

Indeed, the functions generated in the case of $k \in \{0, 1\}$ belong to \mathcal{M}_{2n} . The case of $k \geq 3$ generates the functions belonging to only one $\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi,\varphi})$, see Theorem 3. Finally, if $k = 2$, each function is calculated exactly 24 times in the sum $\sum_{f_{\pi,\varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}} \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_2(\pi)} |\mathcal{H}_{\pi_L,\varphi}|$. The equality (22) completes the proof. \square

Corollary 4. $\frac{|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|}{|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|} = \frac{1}{18}2^{2n} + \frac{1}{9} + \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2^{n-9}} + 2^{(n+1)^2-2^n} + \sum_{k=3}^{n-1} 2^{(k+1)^2-2^k} \rho_{n,k}$, where $n \geq 2$. See also Table 1.

Corollary 5. $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})| = \left(\frac{1}{18}2^{2n} + \frac{367}{63}\right)|\mathcal{M}_{2n}| + o(|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|)$.

Proof. Since (23) holds, Corollary 4 and (19) give us that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|}{|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|} = \frac{2^{2n}}{18} + \frac{1}{9} + 2^8 \rho_{n,3} + o(1) = \frac{2^{2n}}{18} + \frac{1}{9} + \frac{40}{7} + o(1)$$

that is exactly what we need. \square

Remark 2. Note that $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})| > \left(\frac{1}{18}2^{2n} + \frac{367}{63}\right)|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|$ for $n \geq 2$. Also, $\left(\frac{1}{18}2^{2n} + \frac{1}{9} + \frac{1}{3 \cdot 2^{n-9}}\right)|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|$ bent functions can be generated using Theorem 2.

Remark 3. Since $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}| = |\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})| + |\mathcal{M}_{2n}|$, Theorem 5 and Corollaries 4, 5 give us expressions for $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}|$ as well. For instance, $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}| = \left(\frac{1}{18}2^{2n} + \frac{430}{63}\right)|\mathcal{M}_{2n}| + o(|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|)$.

Table 2 provides $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|$ and $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}|$ for small n . Interestingly, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_2 = \mathcal{B}_2$, $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_4 = \mathcal{B}_4$ and almost half of bent functions from \mathcal{B}_6 belong to $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_6$.

7 An approach to describe $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$

To estimate the cardinalities of $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)$, we need a convenient representation of $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$. Let us start with the property detecting functions from it, see, for instance, [29, Lemma 33]. It is also given in [9] in terms of derivatives.

Lemma 7 (see [29]). *A function $f : \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\# \iff$ there exists some $U \in [\mathcal{A}_{2n,n}]$ such that f is affine on each coset of U .*

We introduce the following denotations.

- Let $U_1, \dots, U_{\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n}$ be all elements of $[\mathcal{A}_{2n,n}]$, $U_1 = \Gamma_n$.
- Let \mathcal{M}_{U_i} consist of all $f \in \mathcal{B}_{2n}$ which are affine on each coset of U_i , $1 \leq i \leq \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n$.

According to Lemma 7,

$$\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\# = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n} \mathcal{M}_{U_i}. \quad (24)$$

Moreover, these sets are connected through affine equivalence.

Lemma 8. *Let linear $A : \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$ be invertible and $A^{-1}(U_1) = U_i$ for some i , $1 \leq i \leq \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n$. Then*

$$\mathcal{M}_{U_i} = \mathcal{M}_{2n} \circ A = \{f \circ A : f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}\}$$

and $\mathcal{N}(f) \circ A = \mathcal{N}(f \circ A)$. In particular, $|\mathcal{M}_{U_i}| = |\mathcal{M}_{2n}|$ for any i and $|\mathcal{N}(f)| = |\mathcal{N}(f \circ A)|$.

Proof. It is clear that $\mathcal{M}_{2n} \circ A \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{U_i}$. Indeed, any function from $\mathcal{M}_{2n} \circ A$ is affine on each coset of U_i since any $f(A(x))$ is affine on each coset of $A^{-1}(U_1) = U_i$, where $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$. Similarly, any bent function $f \in \mathcal{M}_{U_i} \circ A^{-1}$ is affine on each coset of U_1 , i.e. f can be represented in the following form:

$$f(x, y) = \langle x, \sigma(y) \rangle \oplus \psi(y),$$

where $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, $\sigma : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $\psi : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$. But it is well known that f cannot be a bent function if σ is not invertible, see, for instance, [5]. Hence, $\mathcal{M}_{U_i} = \mathcal{M}_{2n} \circ A$.

Let $U \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n}$ and $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$. It is clear that $f \oplus \text{Ind}_U \in \mathcal{B}_{2n} \iff$ the function

$$f(A(x)) \oplus \text{Ind}_U(A(x)) = f(A(x)) \oplus \text{Ind}_{A^{-1}(U)}(x) \quad (25)$$

is a bent function. This implies $\mathcal{N}(f \circ A) = \mathcal{N}(f) \circ A$. \square

Thus, the following upper bound for $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$ is correct:

$$|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#| \leq \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n |\mathcal{M}_{2n}|. \quad (26)$$

Moreover, we will prove that it is asymptotically tight (Section 8). This bound is much more precise than the trivial

$$|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#| \leq (2^{2n} - 2^0) \cdot \dots \cdot (2^{2n} - 2^{2n-1}) |\mathcal{M}_{2n}|.$$

We note that the functions belonging to only one of $\mathcal{M}_{U_1}, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{U_{\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n}}$ will be mainly taken into account in Sections 8 and 9. See, for instance, Propositions 5, 6 and Lemma 10 that will allow us to omit other ones. Such functions are said to have *the unique \mathcal{M} -subspace*. The set of them for some f in $2n$ variables is defined as

$$\mathcal{M}(f) = \{U_i : f \in \mathcal{M}_{U_i}, 1 \leq i \leq \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n\}.$$

They were investigated, for instance, in [19, 30].

We will use the following criterion for detecting if $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_{U_i}$ (equivalently, $U_i \in \mathcal{M}(f)$), which is the direct consequence of Theorem 1.

Corollary 6. *Let $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ and $U = \mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L, R, H)$, where $L \in [\mathcal{A}_{n,k}]$, $R \in [\mathcal{A}_{n,n-k}]$ and $H : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^k$ is linear. Then $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_U \iff$ the following conditions are satisfied:*

1. $\pi|_{a \oplus L}$ is affine and $[\pi(a \oplus L)] = R^\perp$ for any $a \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$,
2. $x \in a \oplus L \mapsto \langle H(a \oplus x), \pi_I(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x)$ is affine for any $a \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, where $I = \mathcal{I}([\pi(L)])$.

Proof. Let $a \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{F}_2^k$. It is clear that any coset of U is represented as $\{(H^I(a \oplus y) \oplus b^I \oplus z, y) : y \in a \oplus L, z \in R\}$. Also, let $\xi_b : x \in a \oplus L \mapsto \langle H(x \oplus a) \oplus b, \pi_I(x) \rangle \oplus \varphi(x)$. According to Theorem 1, $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_U \iff [\pi(a \oplus L)] = R^\perp$, and ξ_b is affine for each a and b .

Let ξ_b be affine for each b . Then $\xi_b \oplus \xi_0$ is affine as well,

$$\xi_b(x) \oplus \xi_0(x) = \langle b, \pi_I(x) \rangle, \quad x \in a \oplus L.$$

Hence, π_I is affine on $a \oplus L$. But I is an information set of $[\pi(a \oplus L)] = [\pi(L)] = R^\perp$ and, therefore, of $\pi(a \oplus L) \in \mathcal{A}_{n,k}$. This means that $y_{\bar{I}} = B(y_I)$ for all $y \in \pi(a \oplus L)$, where $B : \mathbb{F}_2^k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{n-k}$ is some affine function. Consequently, $\pi|_{a \oplus L}$ must be affine.

At the same time, the affinity of $\pi|_{a \oplus L}$ implies that $\xi_b(x)$ is affine for each $b \iff \xi_0$ is affine. Thus, $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_U \iff [\pi(a \oplus L)] = R^\perp$, and $\pi|_{a \oplus L}, \xi_0$ are affine. \square

8 Bounds for $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$

In this section we propose bounds for $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$ and prove that they are asymptotically tight. We start with the main advantage of Corollary 6, which is the possibility to construct all functions from $\mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_U$ for any $U \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n}$.

Lemma 9. *Let $U \in [\mathcal{A}_{2n,n}]$ and $\dim(U \cap \Gamma_n) = k < n$. Then*

$$|\mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_U| = 2^k! 2^{(2n-2k+1)2^k} \prod_{i=0}^{n-k-1} (2^{n-k} - 2^i)^{2^k}.$$

Proof. Let us construct all suitable $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$. We can represent U as $\mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L, R, H)$, where $R = U \cap \Gamma_n$, $L \in [\mathcal{A}_{n, n-k}]$ and $H : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{n-k}$ is linear, see Proposition 3. Let $a_1 \oplus L, \dots, a_{2^k} \oplus L$ and $b_1 \oplus R^\perp, \dots, b_{2^k} \oplus R^\perp$ be all distinct cosets of L and R^\perp , $a_1, \dots, a_{2^k}, b_1, \dots, b_{2^k} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$.

According to the conditions of Corollary 6, $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_U \iff$ we choose a permutation π and φ in the following way.

1. π transforms $a_1 \oplus L, \dots, a_{2^k} \oplus L$ to $b_1 \oplus R^\perp, \dots, b_{2^k} \oplus R^\perp$ in any order. Since π must be invertible, we have $2^k!$ possibilities to choose $\pi(a_1 \oplus L), \dots, \pi(a_{2^k} \oplus L)$.

2. π is affine on each of $a_1 \oplus L, \dots, a_{2^k} \oplus L$ and invertible. The number of such transformations is $2^{n-k}(2^{n-k} - 2^0) \dots (2^{n-k} - 2^{n-k-1})$ for each of 2^k cosets. Overall, we can choose π in $2^k! 2^{(n-k)2^k} \prod_{i=0}^{n-k-1} (2^{n-k} - 2^i)^{2^k}$ ways to satisfy the first condition of Corollary 6.

3. For each $1 \leq i \leq 2^k$, the second condition of Corollary 6 is satisfied \iff the given H and already chosen π determine $\varphi|_{a_i \oplus L}$ up to an affine function, i.e. there are 2^{n-k+1} ways to choose $\varphi|_{a_i \oplus L}$ and $2^{(n-k+1)2^k}$ ways to choose φ . The result is the product of ways to choose π and then φ . \square

Proposition 5. *There are at least $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}| - \vartheta_{2n}$ bent functions $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ with $|\mathcal{M}(f)| = 1$, where ϑ_{2n} is equal to*

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (\mathcal{S}_n^k)^2 2^{(n-k)^2} 2^k! 2^{(2n-2k+1)2^k} \prod_{i=0}^{n-k-1} (2^{n-k} - 2^i)^{2^k}. \quad (27)$$

Proof. The set of bent functions belonging to \mathcal{M}_{2n} with the unique \mathcal{M} -subspace is $\mathcal{M}_{2n} \setminus (\mathcal{M}_{U_2} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{M}_{U_{\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n}})$, see Section 7. The lower bound for its cardinality is $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}| - \sum_{i=2}^{\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n} |\mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_{U_i}|$. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that

$$\vartheta_{2n} = \sum_{i=2}^{\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n} |\mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_{U_i}|. \quad (28)$$

Lemma 9 gives us $|\mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_{U_i}|$ depending on $\dim(U_i \cap \Gamma_n) = k$. Due to Proposition 3, the number of $U = \mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L, R, H) \in [\mathcal{A}_{2n, n}]$ such that $\dim(U \cap \Gamma_n) = \dim R = k$ is equal to $2^{(n-k)^2} \mathcal{S}_n^k \mathcal{S}_n^{n-k}$. We can choose any $R \in [\mathcal{A}_{n, k}]$, any $L \in [\mathcal{A}_{n, n-k}]$ and any linear $H : L \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{n-k}$. Applying Lemma 9, we obtain that (27) is equal to $\sum_{i=2}^{\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n} |\mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_{U_i}|$. \square

This can be rewritten in the following way.

Corollary 7. *The expected value of $|\mathcal{M}(f)|$ for a random $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ is equal to the following:*

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}} |\mathcal{M}(f)| = 1 + \frac{\vartheta_{2n}}{|\mathcal{M}_{2n}|}.$$

Its values for small n can be found in Table 3.

$2n$	Expected $ \mathcal{M}(f) $	$2n$	Expected $ \mathcal{M}(f) $
2	3	10	$1 + 2^{-46.501079}$
4	15	12	$1 + 2^{-133.377320}$
6	8.6	14	$1 + 2^{-341.189209}$
8	$1 + 2^{-10.349626}$	16	$1 + 2^{-822.845858}$

Table 3: The approximated expected value of $|\mathcal{M}(f)|$, $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$

$2n$	Lower	Upper	$2n$	Lower	Upper
2	< 0	4.584963	10	176.365947	176.365947
4	< 0	13.714246	12	397.742211	397.742211
6	< 0	33.745257	14	894.931155	894.931155
8	77.864341	77.865447	16	2005.776948	2005.776948

Table 4: Bounds for $\log_2 |\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$ from Theorem 6

Proof. Indeed, similarly to (20) in the proof of Lemma 4, $\sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}} |\mathcal{M}(f)| = |\mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_{2n}| + \sum_{i=2}^{\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n} |\mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_{U_i}|$ since each $\mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_{U_i}$ is exactly the set $\{f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n} : U_i \in \mathcal{M}(f)\}$. The equality (28) completes the proof. \square

Theorem 6. For ϑ_{2n} defined in (27) the following holds:

$$\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n |\mathcal{M}_{2n}| - \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n \vartheta_{2n} \leq |\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#| \leq \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n |\mathcal{M}_{2n}|.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Proposition 5 and (24). Indeed, $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\# = \cup_{i=1}^{\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n} \mathcal{M}_{U_i}$ and each \mathcal{M}_{U_i} contains at least $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}| - \vartheta_{2n}$ bent functions that do not belong to \mathcal{M}_{U_j} for $i \neq j$. \square

Remark 4. We note that the lower bound from Theorem 6 takes into account only $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$ with $|\mathcal{M}(f)| = 1$.

Table 4 contains the values of the bounds for $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$ from Theorem 6, where n is small. Note that only $|\mathcal{M}_2^\#| = 8$, $|\mathcal{M}_4^\#| = 896$ and $|\mathcal{M}_6^\#| = 5425430528$ are known, they consist of all bent functions. Theorem 6 gives us $|\mathcal{M}_8^\#| \approx 2^{77.865}$, which is better than known $|\mathcal{M}_8^\#| < 2^{81.38}$ [22].

8.1 The asymptotics of $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$ and additional bounds

Let us estimate ϑ_{2n} and apply the results to $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$.

Proposition 6. $(2^n - 1)^2 2^{3 \cdot 2^{n-1} + 1} 2^{n-1}! \leq \vartheta_{2n}$. Also,

$$\vartheta_{2n} < 2^{3 \cdot 2^{n-1} + 2n + 1} 2^{n-1}! \text{ for any } n \geq 7. \quad (29)$$

Proof. According to (27), $\vartheta_{2n} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T_k$, where

$$T_k = \mathcal{S}_n^{k^2} 2^{(n-k)^2} 2^k! 2^{(2n-2k+1)2^k} \prod_{i=0}^{n-k-1} (2^{n-k} - 2^i)^{2^k}. \quad (30)$$

It means that $T_{n-1} = 2^{3 \cdot 2^{n-1} + 1} (2^n - 1)^2 2^{n-1}!$, i.e. $T_{n-1} = U_n - o(U_n)$, where $U_n = 2^{3 \cdot 2^{n-1} + 2n+1} 2^{n-1}!$. This proves the lower bound. Thus, it is sufficient to prove that $T_0 + \dots + T_{n-2} = o(U_n)$ and $T_0 + \dots + T_{n-2} \leq R_n$, where

$$R_n = 2^{3 \cdot 2^{n-1} + n+1} 2^{n-1}! = 2^{-n} U_n < U_n - T_{n-1}.$$

Let $k \leq n - 2$. First,

$$\mathcal{S}_n^k = 2^{k(n-k)} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{1 - 2^{i-n}}{1 - 2^{i-k}} \leq 2^{k(n-k)+k} \quad (31)$$

since $1 - 2^{i-n} \leq 1$ and $1 - 2^{i-k} \geq 1/2$. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{S}_n^{k^2} 2^{(n-k)^2} = \mathcal{S}_n^k \mathcal{S}_n^{n-k} 2^{(n-k)^2} \leq 2^{2k(n-k)+n+(n-k)^2} = 2^{(n-k)(n+k)+n} \leq 2^{n^2+n}.$$

At the same time $(2^{n-k} - 2^0) \dots (2^{n-k} - 2^{n-k-1}) \leq 2^{(n-k)^2-1}$, which implies that

$$2^{(2n-2k+1)2^k} \prod_{i=0}^{n-k-1} (2^{n-k} - 2^i)^{2^k} \leq 2^{((n-k)^2+2(n-k))2^k} = 2^{\frac{(n-k)(n-k+2)}{2^{n-k}} 2^n} \leq 2^{2^{n+1}}.$$

Also,

$$\frac{2^k!}{2^{k+1}!} \leq (2^k)^{-2^k} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2^k!}{2^{n-1}!} \leq 2^{-(n-2)2^{n-2}}. \quad (32)$$

As a result, we obtain that

$$T_k \leq 2^{n^2+n+2^{n+1}} 2^k! \leq 2^{n^2-n-1+2^{n-1}-(n-2)2^{n-2}} U_n, \quad (33)$$

which directly implies that $T_0 + \dots + T_{n-2} = o(U_n)$. Similarly,

$$T_k \leq 2^{n^2-1-(n-4)2^{n-2}} R_n \quad \text{and}$$

$$n^2 - 1 - (n - 4)2^{n-2} \leq -48 \quad \text{for any } n \geq 7.$$

Due to (32) and (33), $T_0 + \dots + T_{n-2} < R_n$ holds. \square

Table 5 shows us rounded values of ϑ_{2n} for small n and its upper bound (29).

Remark 5. Proposition 6 is correct for $n \geq 5$, see Table 5.

Corollary 8. $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#| = \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n |\mathcal{M}_{2n}| - o(2^{2n})$.

The proof directly follows from Theorem 6, Proposition 6 and (32). Also, Proposition 6 gives us the bound

$$|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#| > \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n (2^{2n} 2^n! - 2^{3 \cdot 2^{n-1} + 2n+1} 2^{n-1}!), \quad n \geq 5 \quad (34)$$

as well as a more accurate asymptotic expression in the case of applying it together with Stirling's formula.

Table 5: Rounded values of $\log_2 \vartheta_{2n}$ and its upper bound

$2n$	$\log_2 \vartheta_{2n}$	\log_2 of (29)	$\log_2(\mathcal{S}_{2n}^n \vartheta_{2n})$	$\log_2 \mathcal{M}_{2n} $
8	49.900515	48.299208	67.515821	60.250140
10	103.162185	103.250140	129.864868	149.663264
12	226.617823	226.663264	264.364890	359.995144
14	502.972513	502.995144	553.741947	844.161722
16	1117.150429	1117.161722	1182.931089	1939.996287

9 An upper bound for $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)|$

We will estimate the $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)|$ using

$$E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#} |\mathcal{N}(f)|.$$

The main idea is the following lemma.

Lemma 10. *Let $f \in \mathcal{M}_U \cap \mathcal{M}_{U'}$ for distinct $U, U' \in [\mathcal{A}_{2n,n}]$. Then $|\mathcal{N}(f)| \geq 2^{2n+2} - 2^{n+3}$. In particular, $|\mathcal{N}(f)| > E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ if $n \geq 5$.*

Proof. Due to Corollary 2, $2^{2n+2} - 2^{n+3} > E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$ if $n \geq 5$.

According to Lemma 8, we can assume that $U' = \Gamma_n$, i.e. $\mathcal{M}_{U'} = \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ and $f = f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n} \cap \mathcal{M}_U$. Since $U \neq \Gamma_n$, $\dim R \leq n - 1$ holds, where $R = U \cap \Gamma_n$. Also, Proposition 3 and Corollary 6 give us that $U = \mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L, R, H)$, where $[\pi(L)] = R^\perp$ and $L \in [\mathcal{A}_{n, n - \dim R}]$.

Let $\dim R = n - 1$, i.e. $\dim L = 1$. According to Corollary 6, $[\pi(a \oplus L)] = R^\perp$ for all $a \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. It implies that $\pi(a \oplus L) \cup \pi(a' \oplus L) \in \mathcal{A}_{n,2}$ for any two distinct cosets $a \oplus L$ and $a' \oplus L$, $a' \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. Thus, $(a \oplus L) \cup (a' \oplus L) \in \mathcal{L}_2(\pi)$. Therefore, $|\mathcal{L}_2(\pi)| \geq \frac{2^{n-1} \cdot (2^{n-1} - 1)}{2} = 2^{2n-3} - 2^{n-2}$ since there are 2^{n-1} distinct cosets of L . By Theorem 2, $\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi, \varphi})$ contains at least $\ell_{2n} + 2^5 |\mathcal{L}_2(\pi)| \geq 2^{2n+2} - 2^{n+3}$ elements.

Let $\dim R \leq n - 2$. We recall that $\mathcal{N}(f_{\pi, \varphi})$ contains ℓ_{2n} -element subsets G and G' relatively to $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_U$ and $f_{\pi, \varphi} \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$, see Proposition 4 and Lemma 8. However, we must take into account that some elements of G and G' may coincide. Let us find an upper bound for $|G \cap G'|$ since $|G \cup G'| = 2\ell_{2n} - |G \cap G'|$. Suppose that some $g \in G \cap G'$ is constructed using $S \in \mathcal{A}_{2n,n}$, i.e. $S = \mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L', R', H')$ due to Theorem 1. We need to estimate the number of such S .

Proposition 4 and Lemma 8 give us that $\dim([S] \cap \Gamma_n) \geq n - 1$ and $\dim([S] \cap U) \geq n - 1$. Hence, $\dim([S] \cap U \cap \Gamma_n) \geq n - 2$. At the same time, $\dim R = \dim(U \cap \Gamma_n) \leq n - 2$ which is possible only if $R = [S] \cap U \cap \Gamma_n$. Consequently, $R \subset [S]$ and $\dim R = n - 2$. Due to Proposition 3, $R \subset R'$ since $R, R' \subset \Gamma_n$ and $R' = [S] \cap \Gamma_n$.

Next, $\dim([S] \cap \Gamma_n) = n - 1$. Indeed, it is shown that $\dim([S] \cap \Gamma_n) \geq n - 1$, but $\dim([S] \cap \Gamma_n) = n$ implies $[S] = \Gamma_n$ which together with $\dim([S] \cap U) \geq n - 1$ contradicts $\dim R = n - 2$.

According to Proposition 4, $L' \in \mathcal{L}_1(\pi)$. To calculate the number of all possible $S = \mathcal{U}_n^{\mathcal{I}}(L', R', H')$, we need to calculate the number of possible $L' \in \mathcal{L}_1(\pi)$ such that $R \subset R' = [\pi(L')]^\perp$ and H' . In the case of $\dim L' = 1$ the second condition of Theorem 1 is satisfied for any affine H' , there are $2^{1+1} = 4$ of them.

Next, $R'^\perp = [\pi(L')] = [\pi(\{x, y\})]$ for all distinct $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. Since $\pi(\{x, y\})$ is any element of $\mathcal{A}_{n,1}$, each distinct R' will appear 2^{n-1} times, i.e. for each coset of R'^\perp . At the same time, we are interested only in $R' \supset R$. There are 3 of such R' . We can union $(n - 2)$ -dimensional R with any of its coset that is not equal to R to obtain $(n - 1)$ -dimensional R' . Thus, $|G \cap G'| \leq 4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2^{n-1} = 3 \cdot 2^{n+1}$, and $|G \cup G'| \geq 2\ell_{2n} - 3 \cdot 2^{n+1} = 2^{2n+2} - 2^{n+3}$. \square

This allows us to obtain the following upper bound.

Theorem 7. *Let $n \geq 5$. Then $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#) < E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})$. Moreover, $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#) = E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) - o(1)$.*

Proof. In terms of Section 7, let $\mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*$ be all functions from \mathcal{M}_{U_i} that do not belong to \mathcal{M}_{U_j} for any $1 \leq j < i$. Then (24) implies that $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#| = \sum_{i=1}^m |\mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*|$, i.e. $\{\mathcal{M}_{U_1}^*, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{U_m}^*\}$ is the partition of $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$, $m = \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n$. Therefore,

$$E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#| = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*} |\mathcal{N}(f)|. \quad (35)$$

At the same time, Lemma 8 guarantees that

$$E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|\mathcal{M}_{2n}| = \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*} |\mathcal{N}(f)| + \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{U_i} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*} |\mathcal{N}(f)|.$$

But for each $f \in \mathcal{M}_{U_i} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*$ the condition of Lemma 10 is satisfied. Hence, Lemma 10 implies the following inequality:

$$\sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{U_i} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*} |\mathcal{N}(f)| >^* E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})(|\mathcal{M}_{U_i}| - |\mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*|). \quad (36)$$

The used $>^*$ means that we must use \geq if $\mathcal{M}_{U_i} = \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*$. At the same time, there is some i with $\mathcal{M}_{U_i} \neq \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*$. For instance, the bent function $\langle x, y \rangle$ belongs to both $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{F}_2^n \times \{0 \in \mathbb{F}_2^n\}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\{0 \in \mathbb{F}_2^n\} \times \mathbb{F}_2^n}$. Next, (36) and the equality above imply

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*} |\mathcal{N}(f)| <^* E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|\mathcal{M}_{2n}| - E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|\mathcal{M}_{U_i}| \\ + E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|\mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*| = E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|\mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*|. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this inequality to (35), we obtain that

$$E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#| < \sum_{i=1}^m E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|\mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*| = E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|.$$

Let us provide a lower bound for $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)$. First of all, there is the bound $|\mathcal{N}(f)| \leq 2^n(2^1 + 1) \cdot \dots \cdot (2^n + 1) \leq 2^{n(n+5)/2}$, see [10]. Also, $|\mathcal{M}_{U_i} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*| \leq \vartheta_{2n}$ due to Proposition 5 and Lemma 8. Thus,

$$\sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{U_i} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*} |\mathcal{N}(f)| \leq 2^{n(n+5)/2} \vartheta_{2n}$$

which can be used similarly to (36):

$$\sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{U_i}^*} |\mathcal{N}(f)| \geq E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|\mathcal{M}_{2n}| - 2^{n(n+5)/2} \vartheta_{2n}.$$

Substituting this inequality to (35), we obtain that

$$E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#| \geq \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n E(\mathcal{M}_{2n})|\mathcal{M}_{2n}| - \mathcal{S}_{2n}^n 2^{n(n+5)/2} \vartheta_{2n}.$$

Taking into account (26), Proposition 6 and (32), this gives us $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#) \geq E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) - o(1)$. \square

Let us estimate the cardinality of $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}^\#$.

Corollary 9. *Let $n \geq 5$. Then $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)| < (E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}) - \ell_{2n})|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$. In particular, $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)| < (\frac{4}{3}2^{2n} + 29)|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$ and $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}^\#| < (\frac{4}{3}2^{2n} + 30)|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$.*

Proof. It is clear that $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)| \leq \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#} (|\mathcal{N}(f)| - \ell_{2n}) = E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#| - \ell_{2n}|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$ since each $\mathcal{N}(f)$ contains at least ℓ_{2n} bent functions from $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$, see Proposition 4 and Lemma 8. Theorem 7 and Corollary 2 complete the proof. \square

Remark 6. Due to Theorem 7, $E(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)$, $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)|$ and $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}^\#|$ can be estimated more precisely using Corollary 1.

The estimations of $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$ from Theorem 6 can also be used. Note that providing a lower bound for $|\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#)|$ and $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}^\#|$ looks more difficult since even finding $\mathcal{N}(f) \cap \mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$ is not an easy problem.

10 Conclusion

We have analyzed the affinity of random $f \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}$ and $g \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$ on n -dimensional affine subspaces of \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} and have obtained that the properties of \mathcal{M}_{2n} and $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$ are similar. The results have allowed us to establish $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}^\#|$ in a quite

constructive way, precisely enough estimate $|\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#|$ and obtain the upper bound for $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}^\#|$. These also imply certain metric properties of \mathcal{M}_{2n} and $\mathcal{M}_{2n}^\#$. The missed thing is a lower bound for $|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_{2n}^\#|$ which is a topic for further research.

Acknowledgements The work is supported by the Mathematical Center in Akademgorodok under the agreement No. 075–15–2022–282 with the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Russian Federation.

References

- [1] N. Tokareva, *Bent Functions: Results and Applications to Cryptography*. Academic Press, 2015.
- [2] S. Mesnager, *Bent Functions: Fundamentals and Results*. Cham: Springer, 2018.
- [3] O. A. Logachev, A. A. Sal’nikov, and V. V. Yashchenko, *Boolean Functions in Coding Theory and Cryptography*. Providence: American Mathematical Society, 2012.
- [4] T. W. Cusick and P. Stanica, *Cryptographic Boolean Functions and Applications: Second edition*. Academic Press, 2017.
- [5] C. Carlet, *Boolean Functions for Cryptography and Coding Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [6] S. Agievich, A. Gorodilova, V. Idrisova, N. Kolomeec, G. Shushuev, and N. Tokareva, “Mathematical problems of the Second International Students’ Olympiad in Cryptography,” *Cryptologia*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 534–565, 2017.
- [7] O. Rothaus, “On “bent” functions,” *J. Comb. Theory Ser. A.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 300–305, 1976.
- [8] R. L. McFarland, “A family of difference sets in non-cyclic groups,” *J. Comb. Theory Ser. A.*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 1–10, 1973.
- [9] J. F. Dillon, “Elementary hadamard difference sets,” Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. Maryland, College Park, 1974.
- [10] N. Kolomeec, “The graph of minimal distances of bent functions and its properties,” *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, vol. 85, pp. 395–410, 2017.
- [11] V. N. Potapov, A. A. Taranenkov, and Y. V. Tarannikov, “An asymptotic lower bound on the number of bent functions,” *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, vol. 92, pp. 639–651, 2024.

- [12] C. Carlet, “Two new classes of bent functions,” in *Proc. Advances in cryptology — EUROCRYPT ’93*, ser. Lect. Notes Comput. Sci., vol. 765, Lofthus, Norway, May 23–27, 1993, pp. 77–101.
- [13] F. Zhang, E. Pasalic, N. Cepak, and Y. Wei, “Bent functions in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} outside the completed Maiorana-McFarland class,” in *Proc. Codes, Cryptology and Information Security (C2SI 2017)*, ser. Lect. Notes Comput. Sci., vol. 10194, Rabat, Morocco, Apr. 10–12, 2017, pp. 298–313.
- [14] F. Zhang, N. Cepak, E. Pasalic, and Y. Wei, “Further analysis of bent functions from \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} which are provably outside or inside $\mathcal{M}^\#$,” *Discrete Appl. Math.*, vol. 285, pp. 458–472, 2020.
- [15] S. Kudin and E. Pasalic, “A complete characterization of $\mathcal{D}_0 \cap \mathcal{M}^\#$ and a general framework for specifying bent functions in \mathcal{C} outside $\mathcal{M}^\#$,” *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, vol. 90, no. 8, pp. 1783–1796, 2022.
- [16] S. Kudin, E. Pasalic, N. Cepak, and F. Zhang, “Permutations without linear structures inducing bent functions outside the completed Maiorana-McFarland class,” *Cryptogr. Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 101–116, 2022.
- [17] A. Bapic, E. Pasalic, F. Zhang, and S. Hodzic, “Constructing new superclasses of bent functions from known ones,” *Cryptogr. Commun.*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 1229–1256, 2022.
- [18] E. Pasalic, A. Bapic, F. Zhang, and Y. Wei, “Explicit infinite families of bent functions outside the completed Maiorana-McFarland class,” *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, vol. 91, pp. 2365–2393, 2023.
- [19] A. Polujan, “Boolean and vectorial functions: A design-theoretic point of view,” Ph.D. dissertation, Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Fakultät für Mathematik, Magdeburg, Germany, 2021.
- [20] N. A. Kolomeec and A. V. Pavlov, “Properties of bent functions with minimal distance,” *Prikl. Diskr. Mat.*, no. 4(6), pp. 5–20, 2009, (in Russian).
- [21] D. A. Bykov and N. A. Kolomeec, “On a lower bound for the number of bent functions at the minimum distance from a bent function in the Maiorana-McFarland class,” *J. Appl. Industr. Math.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 507–520, 2023.
- [22] P. Langevin and G. Leander, “Counting all bent functions in dimension eight 99270589265934370305785861242880,” *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, vol. 59, pp. 193–205, 2011.

- [23] W. E. Clark, X. Hou, and A. Mihailovs, “The affinity of a permutation of a finite vector space,” *Finite Fields Appl.*, vol. 13, pp. 80–112, 2007.
- [24] S. Li, W. Meidl, A. Polujan, A. Pott, C. Riera, and P. Stănică, “Vanishing flats: A combinatorial viewpoint on the planarity of functions and their application,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 66, no. 11, pp. 7101–7112, 2020.
- [25] N. Kolomeec and D. Bykov, “On the image of an affine subspace under the inverse function within a finite field,” *Des. Codes Cryptogr.*, vol. 92, pp. 467–476, 2024.
- [26] N. A. Kolomeec, “On permutations that break subspaces of specified dimensions,” *Prikl. Diskr. Mat.*, no. 65, pp. 5–20, 2024, (in Russian).
- [27] D. A. Bykov and N. A. Kolomeec, “On the closest bent functions to a given Maiorana–McFarland bent function,” *J. Appl. Industr. Math.*, 2025, submitted.
- [28] N. Kolomeec, “Some general properties of modified bent functions through addition of indicator functions,” *Cryptogr. Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 909–926, 2021.
- [29] A. Canteaut, M. Daum, H. Dobbertin, and G. Leander, “Finding nonnormal bent functions,” *Discrete Appl. Math.*, vol. 154, no. 2, pp. 202–218, 2006.
- [30] E. Pasalic, A. Polujan, S. Kudin, and F. Zhang, “Design and analysis of bent functions using \mathcal{M} -subspaces,” *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 4464–4477, 2024.