

# Counting packings of generic subsets in finite groups

Roland Bacher

November 4, 2010

*Abstract*<sup>1</sup>: A packing of subsets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  in a group  $G$  is a sequence  $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  such that  $g_1\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, g_n\mathcal{S}_n$  are disjoint subsets of  $G$ . We give a formula for the number of packings if the group  $G$  is finite and if the subsets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  satisfy a genericity condition.

## 1 Introduction

A (*left-*)*packing* of  $n$  non-empty subsets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  in a group  $G$  is an element  $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  of  $G^n$  such that the left-translates  $g_1\mathcal{S}_1, g_2\mathcal{S}_2, \dots, g_n\mathcal{S}_n$  of the sets  $\mathcal{S}_i$  are disjoint. If  $G$  is a finite group with  $N$  elements, the number of packings of  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  is bounded by  $N^n$  and thus finite. The sets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots$  are labelled by their indices. In particular, permuting the elements  $g_1, \dots, g_n$  of a packing  $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G^n$  of  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathcal{S}_2 = \dots = \mathcal{S}_n$  yields a different packing. Moreover, in the case where  $\mathcal{S}_1$  for example is of the form  $\mathcal{S}_1 = H\mathcal{S}_1$  for some subgroup  $H$  of  $G$ , a packing  $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  gives rise to  $\#(H)$  distinct packings  $(hg_1, g_2, \dots, g_n)$ ,  $h \in H$ .

Given  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in G^n$ , remark that there is an obvious one-to-one map between packings of  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n \subset G$  and packings of  $a_1\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, a_n\mathcal{S}_n \subset G$ .

This paper deals with enumerative properties of left-packings. Using the involutive antiautomorphism  $g \mapsto g^{-1}$ , its content can easily be modified in order to deal with right-packings  $\mathcal{S}_1g_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_ng_n$ .

Counting packings of arbitrary subsets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  in finite groups is probably difficult. There are however easy upper and lower bounds:

**Proposition 1.1.** *Let  $\alpha = \alpha(G; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n)$  denote the number of packings of subsets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  in a finite group  $G$  with  $N$  elements. Given an additional subset  $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$  of  $G$ , we denote by  $\tilde{\alpha} = \tilde{\alpha}(G; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n, \mathcal{S}_{n+1})$  the number of packings of  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n, \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ . We have*

$$\left( N - \#(\mathcal{S}_{n+1}) \sum_{i=1}^n \#(\mathcal{S}_i) \right) \alpha \leq \tilde{\alpha} \leq \left( N - \sum_{i=1}^n \#(\mathcal{S}_i) \right) \alpha .$$

<sup>1</sup>Keywords: Packings in groups, additive combinatorics, additive number theory, Stirling number, enumeration of hypertrees Math. class: 05C30, 11B73, 11P99

In particular, we have

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \left( N - \sum_{i=1}^n \sharp(\mathcal{S}_i) \right) \alpha \quad (1)$$

if  $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$  is a singleton.

A family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  of subsets in a group  $G$  with identity element  $e$  is *generic* if for every sequence  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  of  $k \leq n$  distinct elements in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  and for every choice of elements  $g_{i_j} \in \mathcal{S}_{i_j}^{-1} \mathcal{S}_{i_j} \setminus \{e\}$ , we have

$$g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_k} \neq e.$$

Otherwise stated, a subset  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  of a group  $G$  is generic if every non-trivial relation, written as a word with letters in the alphabets  $\mathcal{G}_i = \mathcal{S}_i^{-1} \mathcal{S}_i \setminus \{e\}$ , in the subgroup generated by the sets  $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_n$  involves at least two elements in one of the sets  $\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_n$ .

In the case of an additive abelian group  $G$ , the genericity condition boils down to the fact that the subset  $(\mathcal{S}_1 - \mathcal{S}_1) \times \cdots \times (\mathcal{S}_n - \mathcal{S}_n)$  of the group  $G^n$  intersects the subgroup  $\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in G^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 0\}$  of  $G^n$  only in the identity element  $(0, \dots, 0)$ .

**Remark 1.2.** A generic family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  of subsets in the additive group  $\mathbb{Z}$  with prescribed cardinalities  $s_i = \sharp(\mathcal{S}_i)$  can be constructed by starting with  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{0, \dots, s_1 - 1\}$  and by defining  $\mathcal{S}_i$  recursively as  $\mathcal{S}_i = \{0, k_i, 2k_i, \dots, (s_i - 1)k_i\}$  where  $k_i$  is an arbitrary natural integer strictly larger than  $\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \max(\mathcal{S}_j) - \min(\mathcal{S}_j)$ . A generic family is thus for example given by the sets  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{0, 2\}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_i = \{0, 2^{i-1}\}$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_n = \{0, 2^{n-1}\}$ .

Reducing such a generic family modulo a natural integer  $N$  yields a generic family in the finite group  $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$  except if  $N$  is a divisor of a non-zero integer in the finite set  $\{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{S}_i - \mathcal{S}_i\}$ .

The aim of this paper is to describe a universal formula for the number of packings for a generic family of subsets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  in a finite group  $G$ . The number of associated packings depends then only on the cardinalities of  $G$  and  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$ . A trivial example is given by  $n$  subsets reduced to singletons. The associated number of packings in a finite group with  $N$  elements is then easily seen to be given by  $n! \binom{N}{n} = N(N-1) \cdots (N-n+1)$ .

The study of generic packings in groups is, as far as I am aware, a new addition to the already large set of classical notions of packings. Well-known and well-studied examples are Euclidean lattice-packings and sphere-packings in metric spaces. The corresponding theory has however a different flavour since one tries to pack a huge (often infinite) number of spheres as tightly as possible. Packings of generic families in finite groups are not dense at all: Typically the cardinalities of the sets  $\mathcal{S}_i \subset G$  of a generic family are very small compared to the cardinality  $N$  of  $G$  and we are not interested

in density but in enumerative properties. Another source of packing-related notions is additive and elementary number theory: The existence of an infinity of twin primes for example is obviously equivalent to the question whether the set  $\mathcal{P} \cap (2 + \mathcal{P})$  is infinite with  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{Z}$  denoting the set of prime numbers.

Concerning the dual notion of packings, the following question is natural: Is there an interesting notion for generic packings in arbitrary groups?

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 contains the main result, Theorem 2.1. It expresses the number of packings of a generic family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  in a finite group in terms of a formal power series  $U = U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots) \in A[[x]]$  with coefficients in the ring  $A = \mathbb{Z}[\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots]$  of polynomials in elementary symmetric functions  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$  defined by  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sigma_k t^k = \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + \#(\mathcal{S}_j)t)$ . The series  $U$  is given explicitly by formula (4) and involves combinatorial integers  $t_{i,j}(n)$  (defined recursively by formula (3)) which extend Stirling numbers of the first kind. The first few coefficients of  $U$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} & 1 - \sigma_2 x - ((1 - \sigma_1)\sigma_3 + \sigma_4)x^2 \\ & - ((2 - 3\sigma_1 + \sigma_1^2)\sigma_4 + (5 - 3\sigma_1)\sigma_5 + 3\sigma_6)x^3 \\ & - ((6 - 11\sigma_1 + 6\sigma_1^2 - \sigma_1^3)\sigma_5 + (26 - 26\sigma_1 + 6\sigma_2^2)\sigma_6 \\ & + (35 - 15\sigma_1)\sigma_7 + 15\sigma_8)x^4 + \dots \end{aligned}$$

with omitted terms divisible by  $x^5$ . Theorem 2.1 and Proposition 1.1 imply easily that  $U$  satisfies the functional equation

$$(1 - \sigma_1 x)U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots) = U(x, 1 + \sigma_1, \sigma_1 + \sigma_2, \sigma_2 + \sigma_3, \dots). \quad (2)$$

Section 3 discusses the combinatorics of packings associated to arbitrary (not necessarily generic) families  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  of subsets in a group.

In Section 4, we refine the results of section 3 by applying them to generic packings. The underlying combinatorics are then simpler and imply the existence of a formal power series  $\tilde{U}(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$  such that the formula

$$N^n \tilde{U}(N^{-1}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$$

(with  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$  defined by  $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sigma_k t^k = \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + \#(\mathcal{S}_j)t)$ ) gives the number of packings for a generic family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  of  $n$  non-empty subsets in a finite group with  $N$  elements. Although this approach does not yield an explicit formula for  $\tilde{U}$  it gives some useful information on the coefficients of  $\tilde{U}$ . Moreover, such a series  $\tilde{U}$  is unique and satisfies the functional equation (2) as an easy consequence (equivalent to identity (1) of Proposition 1.1) of its very definition.

Section 5 starts with establishing the uniqueness of a solution to the functional equation (2) under certain conditions satisfied by the series  $\tilde{U}$  considered in Section 4. Since our formulae for the series  $U$  satisfy these



We consider the formal power series  $U \in A[[x]]$  with coefficients in the ring  $A = \mathbb{Z}[\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots]$  of integral polynomials in  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$  defined by

$$U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots) = 1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} x^n \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} \sigma_i \sum_{j=0}^{2n-i} t_{i,j}(n) (-\sigma_1)^j. \quad (4)$$

**Theorem 2.1.** *The number of packings of a generic family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  of  $n$  non-empty subsets in a finite group  $G$  with  $N$  elements is given by the formula*

$$N^n U(N^{-1}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots) \quad (5)$$

where

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \sigma_i t^i = \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + \#\mathcal{S}_j t)$$

and where the series  $U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$  is given by formula (4).

Remark that formula (5) of Theorem 2.1 is polynomial in  $N$  for fixed complex numbers  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$  such that  $\sigma_{n+1} = \sigma_{n+2} = \dots = 0$ . Indeed, the coefficient of  $x^n$  in  $U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$  belongs to the ideal generated by  $\sigma_{n+1}, \sigma_{n+2}, \dots, \sigma_{2n} \in \mathbb{Z}[\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots]$ .

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on combinatorial properties of generic packings and on a functional equation for  $U$  described by the following result which is an almost obvious consequence of Theorem 2.1 and equality (1) in Proposition 1.1.

**Proposition 2.2.** *Suppose that  $\tilde{U} \in \mathbb{C}[[x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots]]$  gives the number of packings  $N^n \tilde{U}(N^{-1}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$  with  $\sum_{i=0}^n \sigma_i t^i = \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + \#\mathcal{S}_j t)$  for every generic family of  $n$  non-empty subsets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n \subset G$  in a finite group  $G$  with  $N = \#\mathcal{S}_j$  elements.*

We have then

$$(1 - \sigma_1 x) \tilde{U}(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots) = \tilde{U}(x, \tilde{\sigma}_1, \tilde{\sigma}_2, \tilde{\sigma}_3, \dots) \quad (6)$$

where  $\tilde{\sigma}_i = \sigma_{i-1} + \sigma_i$ , using the convention  $\sigma_0 = 1$ .

**Proof** Equation (6) corresponds to equation (1) if  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$  are symmetric elementary functions of a finite set of natural integers. The general case follows by remarking that the algebra of symmetric polynomials is a free polynomial algebra on the set of elementary symmetric polynomials.  $\square$

**Remark 2.3.** *Iterating the identity (6)  $n$  times with  $\tilde{U} = U$  given by formula (4) we have*

$$U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots) \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} (1 - (\sigma_1 + j)x) = U(x, \tilde{\sigma}_1, \tilde{\sigma}_2, \tilde{\sigma}_3, \dots)$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma}_k = \sum_{j=0}^{\min(k,n)} \binom{n}{j} \sigma_{k-j} .$$

A particular case is the specialization

$$U \left( x, \binom{n}{1}, \binom{n}{2}, \binom{n}{3}, \dots \right) = \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 - jx)$$

associated to generic families  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  given by  $n$  singletons.

### 3 Combinatorics of packings for arbitrary families $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$ of subsets in a group $G$

**Proof of Proposition 1.1** Let  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  be  $n$  subsets in a finite group  $G$  with  $N$  elements and let  $\mathcal{S}_{n+1}$  be an additional subset of  $G$ . A packing of  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  given by  $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G^n$  extends to a packing  $(g_1, \dots, g_n, g_{n+1}) \in G^{n+1}$  of  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$  if and only if  $g_{n+1} \in G \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^n g_i \mathcal{S}_i (\mathcal{S}_{n+1})^{-1})$  where  $\mathcal{S}^{-1}$  denotes the set of inverses. Since  $g_i \mathcal{S}_i (\mathcal{S}_{n+1})^{-1}$  contains at most  $\#(\mathcal{S}_{n+1}) \#(\mathcal{S}_i)$  elements, we have the first inequality.

Consider now a fixed element  $x \in \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ . We have

$$\# \left( \cup_{i=1}^n g_i \mathcal{S}_i (\mathcal{S}_{n+1})^{-1} \right) \geq \# \left( \cup_{i=1}^n g_i \mathcal{S}_i x^{-1} \right) = \# \left( \cup_{i=1}^n g_i \mathcal{S}_i \right)$$

Since  $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  is a packing, we have

$$\# \left( \cup_{i=1}^n g_i \mathcal{S}_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \#(\mathcal{S}_i)$$

showing the second inequality.

Equality (1) is obvious for  $\#(\mathcal{S}_{n+1}) = 1$ .  $\square$

We fix a group  $G$  and a family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  of  $n$  non-empty subsets in  $G$ . Given an element  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$  of  $G^n$ , we consider the corresponding *intersection graph*  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{g})$  with vertices  $1, \dots, n$  and edges  $\{i, j\}$  between distinct vertices  $i, j$  if  $g_i \mathcal{S}_i \cap g_j \mathcal{S}_j \neq \emptyset$  in  $G$ . Observe that  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$  in  $G^n$  defines a packing if and only if  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{g})$  is the trivial graph with  $n$  isolated vertices.

Given a finite simple graph  $\Gamma$  with vertices  $1, \dots, n$  and edges  $E(\Gamma)$ , we consider the sets

$$\mathcal{R}_\Gamma = \{ (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G^n \mid g_i \mathcal{S}_i \cap g_j \mathcal{S}_j \neq \emptyset \text{ for every } \{i, j\} \in E(\Gamma) \} .$$

An element  $\mathbf{g}$  in  $G^n$  belongs thus to  $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma$  if and only if  $\Gamma$  is a subgraph of the intersection graph  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{g})$ .

We denote by  $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma$  the equivalence classes of  $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma$  defined by  $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \sim (h_1, \dots, h_n)$  if  $g_i h_i^{-1} = g_j h_j^{-1}$  for every edge  $\{i, j\}$  of  $\Gamma$ . Two elements  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)$  and  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_n)$  of  $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma$  represent thus the same equivalence class of  $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma$  if and only if the function  $i \mapsto g_i h_i^{-1}$  is constant on (vertices of) connected components.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Suppose that  $G$  is a finite group having  $N$  elements. We have then*

$$\#\mathcal{R}_\Gamma = \#\mathcal{E}_\Gamma N^{c(\Gamma)}$$

where  $c(\Gamma)$  denotes the number of connected components of  $\Gamma$ .

**Proof** We set  $c = c(\Gamma)$  and we denote the connected components of  $\Gamma$  by  $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_c$ . We get a free action of  $G^c$  on  $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma$  by considering

$$(a_1, \dots, a_c) \cdot (g_1, \dots, g_n) \mapsto (a_{\gamma(1)}^{-1} g_1, \dots, a_{\gamma(n)}^{-1} g_n)$$

where  $\gamma(i) \in \{1, \dots, c\}$  is defined by the inclusion of the vertex  $i$  in the  $\gamma(i)$ -th connected component  $\Gamma_{\gamma(i)}$  of  $\Gamma$ . This action is transitive and elements of  $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma$  are thus in one-to-one correspondence with orbits of this action on the set  $G^n$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** *Fixing an element  $(g_1, \dots, g_n)$  representing an equivalence class of  $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma$  and choosing elements  $a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{S}_i, a_{j,i} \in \mathcal{S}_j$  such that  $g_i a_{i,j} = g_j a_{j,i}$  for every edge  $\{i, j\}$  in a spanning forest of  $\Gamma$ , one sees that  $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma$  consists of at most  $(\max_i \#\mathcal{S}_i)^{2c-2}$  distinct equivalence classes.*

**Proposition 3.3.** *The number  $\alpha = \alpha(G; \mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n)$  of packings of a family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  in a finite group  $G$  with  $N$  elements is given by*

$$\alpha = \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}} (-1)^{e(\Gamma)} \#\mathcal{E}_\Gamma N^{c(\Gamma)}$$

where the sum is over the Boolean poset  $\mathcal{B}$  of all  $2^{\binom{n}{2}}$  simple graphs with vertices  $1, \dots, n$  and where  $e(\Gamma) = \#\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ , respectively  $c(\Gamma)$ , denotes the number of edges, respectively connected components, of a graph  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}$ .

**Proof** Proposition 3.1 shows that it is enough to prove the equality

$$\alpha = \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}} (-1)^{e(\Gamma)} \#\mathcal{R}_\Gamma .$$

An element  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G^n$  defines a packing if and only if its intersection graph  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{g})$  is trivial. It provides thus a contribution of 1 to  $\alpha$  in this case since it is only involved as an element of  $\mathcal{R}_\Gamma$  if  $\Gamma$  is the trivial graph with isolated vertices  $1, \dots, n$  and no edges.

An element  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in G^n$  with non-trivial intersection graph  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{g})$  containing  $e \geq 1$  edges yields a contribution of 0 to  $\alpha$  since contributions coming from the  $2^{e-1}$  subgraphs of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{g})$  containing an even number of edges cancel out with contributions associated to the  $2^{e-1}$  subgraphs having an odd number of edges.  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** *Introducing*

$$\alpha_\Gamma = \{\mathbf{g} \in G^n \mid \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{g}) = \Gamma\},$$

we have  $\alpha = \alpha_T$  where  $T$  denotes the trivial graph with  $n$  isolated vertices  $1, \dots, n$ . The above proof of Proposition 3.3 computes  $\alpha$  by applying Moebius inversion (more precisely, its dual form, see Proposition 3.7.2 of [4])

$$\alpha = \sum_{\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}} \mu(\Gamma) \#(\mathcal{R}_\Gamma)$$

(with  $\mu(\Gamma) = (-1)^{e(\Gamma)}$  denoting the Moebius function of the Boolean lattice  $\mathcal{B}$  of all simple graphs on  $1, \dots, n$ ) to the numbers

$$\#(\mathcal{R}_\Gamma) = \sum_{\Gamma \subset \Gamma'} \alpha_{\Gamma'}$$

given by Proposition 3.1.

## 4 Proving the existence of $U$

We consider a fixed generic family of  $n$  non-empty finite subsets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  in a finite group  $G$  having  $N$  elements.

In this section we prove the existence of a series  $\tilde{U}(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$  such that the number of associated packings is given by

$$N^n \tilde{U}(N^{-1}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$$

(see equation 5) with  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$  defined by  $\sum_{i=0}^n \sigma_i t^i = \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + \#(\mathcal{S}_j)t)$ .

We recall that a simple graph  $\Gamma$  is a *block graph* (or a cordal and diamond-free graph) if all its cycles occur in maximal cliques (ie. in maximal complete subgraphs) of  $\Gamma$ . Block graphs can be identified with hyperforests, see Section 7. Examples are given by forests and disjoint unions of complete graphs.

**Proposition 4.1.** *All intersection graphs  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{g})$ ,  $\mathbf{g} \in G^n$  associated to a generic family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n \subset G$  are block graphs.*

**Proof** Consider an oriented cycle formed by  $k$  cyclically consecutive vertices  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{k-1}, i_k, i_{k+1} = i_1$  of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{g})$ . For every  $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  there exist thus two (not necessarily distinct) elements  $a_{i_j}, b_{i_j} \in \mathcal{S}_{i_j}$  such that  $g_{i_j} a_{i_j} = g_{i_{j+1}} b_{i_{j+1}}$ . This implies the relation

$$g_{i_1} a_{i_1} (g_{i_2} b_{i_2})^{-1} \cdots g_{i_k} a_{i_k} (g_{i_1} b_{i_1})^{-1} = e. \quad (7)$$

Setting  $c_{i_j} = b_{i_j}^{-1} a_{i_j}$ , relation (7) is equivalent to the relation  $c_{i_1} \cdots c_{i_k} = e$  with  $c_{i_j} \in \mathcal{S}_{i_j}^{-1} \mathcal{S}_{i_j}$ . Genericity of the family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  shows  $a_{i_j} = b_{i_j}$  for all  $j$  and the sets  $g_{i_j} \mathcal{S}_{i_j}$  intersect in the common element  $g_{i_1} a_{i_1} = \cdots = g_{i_k} a_{i_k}$ . All vertices  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{t})$  are thus adjacent and contained in a maximal clique of  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{t})$ .  $\square$



**Lemma 4.2.** *The intersection  $g_i\mathcal{S}_i \cap g_j\mathcal{S}_j$  associated to an edge  $\{i, j\}$  in an intersection graph  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{g})$  is reduced to a unique element if  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  is a generic family of  $G$ .*

**Proof** Otherwise there exist two distinct elements  $a_i, b_i \in \mathcal{S}_i$  and two distinct elements  $a_j, b_j \in \mathcal{S}_j$  such that  $g_i a_i = g_j a_j$  and  $g_i b_i = g_j b_j$ . This implies the relation  $a_i^{-1} b_i b_j^{-1} a_j = e$  in contradiction with the definition of genericity.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  be a generic family of subsets in a group  $G$  and let  $\Gamma$  be a block graph with vertices  $1, \dots, n$ .*

*We have*

$$\#(\mathcal{E}_\Gamma) = \prod_{j=1}^n (\#(\mathcal{S}_j))^{d_h(j)}$$

where  $d_h(j)$  denotes the number of non-trivial maximal cliques containing  $j$ .

**Proof** Let  $\mathbf{g} \in G^n$  represent a class of  $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma$ . The proof of Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.2 show that each maximal clique of  $\Gamma$  with vertices  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  corresponds to a unique element  $a = \bigcap_{j=1}^k g_{i_j} \mathcal{S}_{i_j}$  of  $G$ . This defines maps  $\mathbf{g} \rightarrow g_{i_j}^{-1} a$  which depend only on the class of  $\mathbf{g}$  in  $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma$  and extend to a map from  $\mathcal{E}_\Gamma$  to  $\prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{S}_j^{d_h(j)}$  which is one-to-one.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.4.** *There exists a series  $\tilde{U} \in \mathbb{Z}[x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots]$  such that the number of packings of a generic family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  of  $n$  non-empty subsets in a finite group  $G$  with  $N$  elements is given by*

$$N^n \tilde{U}(N^{-1}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$$

where  $\sum_{i=0}^n \sigma_i t^i = \prod_{j=1}^n (1 + \#(\mathcal{S}_j) t)$ .

Moreover, every monomial in  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$  contributing to the coefficient  $x^k$  of  $\tilde{U}$  is divisible by an element of the set  $\{\sigma_{k+1}, \dots, \sigma_{2k}\}$  and is of degree at most  $2k$  with respect to the grading given by  $\deg(\sigma_i) = i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots$ .

**Proof** Using Moebius inversion in the poset of block graphs (ordered by inclusion) with  $n$  labelled vertices  $1, \dots, n$ , one gets an expression for the number of packings which involves only symmetric functions of  $\#(\mathcal{S}_1), \dots, \#(\mathcal{S}_n)$  by Proposition 4.3. The contribution to  $N^{n-k}$  for  $k \geq 1$  comes only from block graphs involving  $k + c$  non-isolated vertices in exactly  $c$  non-trivial connected components. Such a block graph contributes a monomial divisible by  $\sigma_{k+c}$ . Since  $c \leq \frac{k+c}{2}$ , the degree of such a monomial contribution is maximal and equals  $2k$  if and only if  $\Gamma$  is a forest consisting of  $k$  disjoint edges involving  $2k$  vertices.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $\tilde{U} \in \mathbb{Z}[[x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots]]$  be a series such that  $N^n \tilde{U}(N^{-1}, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$  is the number of packings for every generic family  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n$  of  $n$  non-empty subsets in a finite group  $G$  with  $N$  elements. Then  $\tilde{U}$  is unique and satisfies the functional equation (6) of Proposition 2.2.*

**Proof** If  $\tilde{U}_1 \neq \tilde{U}_2$  are two such series, the difference

$$D = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} D_n x^n = \tilde{U}_1(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots) - \tilde{U}_2(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots)$$

is not identically zero. Thus there exists an integer  $n$  such that the polynomial  $D_n \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{2n}]$  is non-zero. The definition of  $\tilde{U}_i$  shows that the symmetric polynomial  $P_n(s_1, \dots, s_{2n})$  obtained by the polynomial substitution given by  $\sum_{k=0}^{2n} \sigma_k t^k = \prod_{j=1}^{2n} (1 + s_j t)$  in  $D_n$  is identically zero for all  $s_1, \dots, s_{2n} \in \mathbb{N}$ . This implies  $P_n(s_1, \dots, s_{2n}) = 0$  and  $D_n = 0$  since  $P$  determines  $D_n \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{2n}]$  uniquely.

Proposition 2.2 states that  $\tilde{U}$  satisfies the functional equation (6).  $\square$

## 5 Proof of Theorem 2.1

**Proposition 5.1.** *There exists at most a unique series  $\tilde{U} \in \mathbb{Z}[[x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots]]$  with the following properties:*

(i)  $\tilde{U}$  satisfies the identity (6) of Proposition 2.2,

(ii)  $\tilde{U}$  is of the form  $\tilde{U} = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n x^n$  with  $a_n \in \mathbb{Z}[\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots]$  a polynomial of degree  $\leq 2n$  with respect to the grading  $\deg(\sigma_i) = i$  and  $a_n$  is an element of the ideal generated by  $\sigma_{n+1}, \sigma_{n+2}, \sigma_{n+3}, \dots$ .

**Proof** Consider  $D = \tilde{U}_1 - \tilde{U}_2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} D_n x^n$  for two different series  $\tilde{U}_1, \tilde{U}_2$  satisfying the conditions of Proposition 5.1. Let  $n \geq 1$  be the smallest integer such that  $D_n \neq 0$ . Let  $m \geq n + 1$  be the smallest integer such that  $D_n = \sum_{k=m}^{2n} \sigma_k C_{n,k}$  with  $C_{n,k} \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots]$  and  $C_{n,m} \neq 0$ . Since  $D_n$  is of degree  $\leq 2n$  with respect to the grading given by  $\deg(\sigma_i) = i$ , we have  $C_{n,m} \in \mathbb{C}[\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{2n-m}] \subset \mathbb{C}[\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-1}]$ .

Equation (6) and minimality of  $n$  imply

$$D_n(1 + \sigma_1, \sigma_1 + \sigma_2, \sigma_2 + \sigma_3, \dots) = D_n(\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots)$$

or equivalently

$$\sum_{k=m}^{2n} (\sigma_{k-1} + \sigma_k) C_{n,k} (1 + \sigma_1, \sigma_1 + \sigma_2, \sigma_2 + \sigma_3, \dots) = \sum_{k=m}^{2n} \sigma_k C_{n,k} (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots).$$

Comparison of both sides modulo the ideal  $I$  generated by  $\sigma_m, \sigma_{m+1}, \sigma_{m+2}, \dots$  gives

$$C_{n,m} (1 + \sigma_1, \sigma_1 + \sigma_2, \sigma_2 + \sigma_3, \dots) = 0$$

contradicting  $C_{n,m} \neq 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.2.** *The series  $U$  defined by formula (4) satisfies equation (6) of Proposition 2.2.*

**Proof** Remark first that both series  $(1 - \sigma_1 x)U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots) - 1$  and  $U(x, 1 + \sigma_1, \sigma_1 + \sigma_2, \dots) - 1$  are linear in  $\sigma_2, \sigma_3, \dots$ . Considering the coefficient of  $\sigma_i \sigma_1^j x^n$  of both series, equation (6) amounts to the identity

$$t_{i,j}(n) + t_{i,j-1}(n-1) = \sum_{k=j}^n (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j} (t_{i,k}(n) + t_{i+1,k}(n))$$

or equivalently to

$$t_{i,j}(n) + t_{i,j-1}(n-1) = \sum_k (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j} (t_{i,k}(n) + t_{i+1,k}(n)) \quad (8)$$

where  $\sum_k f(k) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} f(k)$  since  $\binom{k}{j} (t_{i,k}(n) + t_{i+1,k}(n)) = 0$  for  $k < j$  or  $k \geq n$ . We prove (8) by induction on  $n$ . Setting  $t_{i,j}(0) = 0$  it holds for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$ . Applying the recursion relation (3) which holds for all  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$  if  $n \geq 2$  to the right-hand side

$$R = \sum_k (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j} (t_{i,k}(n) + t_{i+1,k}(n))$$

of (8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \sum_{k=j}^n (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j} \left( \right. \\ &\quad (i-2)t_{i-1,k}(n-1) + t_{i-1,k-1}(n-1) + (i-3)t_{i-2,k}(n-1) \\ &\quad \left. + (i-1)t_{i,k}(n-1) + t_{i,k-1}(n-1) + (i-2)t_{i-1,k}(n-1) \right) \\ &= L + C \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L &= (i-2) \sum_k (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j} (t_{i-1,k}(n-1) + t_{i,k}(n-1)) \\ &\quad + \sum_k (-1)^{k+j-1} \binom{k}{j-1} (t_{i-1,k}(n-1) + t_{i,k}(n-1)) \\ &\quad + (i-3) \sum_k (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j} (t_{i-2,k}(n-1) + t_{i-1,k}(n-1)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
C &= - \sum_k (-1)^{k+j-1} \binom{k}{j-1} (t_{i-1,k}(n-1) + t_{i,k}(n-1)) \\
&\quad + \sum_k (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j} (t_{i-1,k-1}(n-1) + t_{i,k-1}(n-1)) \\
&\quad + \sum_k (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j} (t_{i,k}(n-1) + t_{i-1,k}(n-1)) \\
&= \sum_k (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j-1} (t_{i-1,k}(n-1) + t_{i,k}(n-1)) \\
&\quad + \sum_k (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k}{j} (t_{i-1,k}(n-1) + t_{i,k}(n-1)) \\
&\quad - \sum_k (-1)^{k+j} \binom{k+1}{j} (t_{i-1,k}(n-1) + t_{i,k}(n-1)) \\
&= \sum_k (-1)^{k+j} \left( \binom{k}{j-1} + \binom{k}{j} - \binom{k+1}{j} \right) (t_{i-1,k}(n-1) + t_{i,k}(n-1)) \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

Using induction on  $n$  and applying (8) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= (i-2)(t_{i-1,j}(n-1) + t_{i-1,j-1}(n-2)) \\
&\quad + (t_{i-1,j-1}(n-1) + t_{i-1,j-2}(n-2)) \\
&\quad + (i-3)(t_{i-2,j}(n-1) + t_{i-2,j-1}(n-2))
\end{aligned}$$

We have thus

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= (i-2)t_{i-1,j}(n-1) + t_{i-1,j-1}(n-1) + (i-3)t_{i-2,j}(n-1) \\
&\quad + (i-2)t_{i-1,j-1}(n-2) + t_{i-1,j-2}(n-2) + (i-3)t_{i-2,j-1}(n-2)
\end{aligned}$$

and applying (3) we get

$$L = t_{i,j}(n) + t_{i,j-1}(n-1)$$

which is the left-hand-side involved in (8).  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 2.1** By Proposition 5.2, the series  $U$  defined by formula (4) satisfies condition (i) of Proposition 5.1. It satisfies condition (ii) by construction. By Proposition 4.5 it coincides with the series  $\tilde{U}$  given by Proposition 4.4.  $\square$

## 6 The Moebius function for the poset of block graphs

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a poset (partially ordered set) with a unique minimal element  $m$  such that  $\{y \in \mathcal{P} \mid y < x\}$  is finite for all  $x \in \mathcal{P}$ . This allows the

definition of a Moebius function  $\mu$  given recursively by  $\mu(m) = 1$  and  $\mu(x) = -\sum_{y < x} \mu(y)$  for all  $x > m$ . Given a function  $f : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  with finite support, the value  $f(m)$  can then be recovered from the function  $g(x) = \sum_{y \geq x} f(y)$  using Moebius inversion

$$f(m) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{P}} \mu(x)g(x) ,$$

see Proposition 3.7.2 of [4] (we use only the values  $\mu(m, x)$  of the Moebius function and write  $\mu(x) = \mu(m, x)$  in analogy with the usual, well-known number-theoretic Moebius function of natural integers). Moebius inversion was the main ingredient in the proof of Proposition 4.4. We did however not compute the Moebius function for the poset  $\mathcal{HF}$  (with  $\mathcal{HF}$  standing for HyperForest, see Remark 6.2 and Section 7) of all block graphs (ordered by inclusion) with vertices  $1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$  and finitely many edges. The poset  $\mathcal{HF}$  has a minimal element given by the trivial graph having only isolated vertices. The subset

$$\{\Gamma' \in \mathcal{HF} \mid \Gamma' \subset \Gamma\}$$

of all block subgraphs of a fixed block graph  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{HF}$  with  $n$  edges contains at most  $2^n$  elements given by removing suitable subsets of edges from  $\Gamma$ . The poset  $\mathcal{HF}$  has thus a Moebius function which is described by the following result.

**Proposition 6.1.** *The Moebius function  $\mu(\Gamma)$  on a vertex-labelled block graph  $\Gamma$  with respect to the poset  $\mathcal{HF}$  of all vertex-labelled block graphs having finitely many edges is given by*

$$\mu(\Gamma) = \prod_{j \geq 2} (-(j-2)!)^{\kappa_j}$$

where  $\kappa_j$  denotes the number of maximal cliques with  $j$  vertices in  $\Gamma$ .

**Remark 6.2.** *The poset  $\mathcal{HF}$  coincides with the poset of all hyperforests (ordered by inclusion) having vertices  $\mathbb{N}$  and a finite number of hyperedges. It is in fact a lattice with wedge  $\Gamma_1 \wedge \Gamma_2$  given by the intersection and join  $\Gamma_1 \vee \Gamma_2$  given by the smallest block graph containing  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  as subgraphs.*

**Proof** Remark first that the order relation on the poset of all (vertex-labelled) block subgraphs of  $\Gamma$  is the product over all order-relations on block graphs induced by maximal cliques of  $\Gamma$ . We have thus  $\mu(\Gamma) = \prod_{j \geq 2} (\mu(K_j))^{\kappa_j}$  where  $K_j$  is a complete subgraph on  $j$  labelled vertices and where  $\kappa_j$  is the number of maximal cliques with  $j$  vertices in  $\Gamma$ .

In order to compute  $\mu(K_j)$ , the combinatorial description for the existence of a suitable series  $\tilde{U}$  given by the proof of Proposition 4.4 shows that  $\mu(K_{j+1})$  is given by the coefficient of  $\sigma_{j+1}x^j$  in  $U$ . By Theorem 2.1 whose proof does not depend on Proposition 6.1 this coefficient equals  $-t_{j+1,0}(j) = -(j-2)!$  where the last identity follows easily from formula (3) defining  $t_{i,j}(n)$  recursively.  $\square$

**Remark 6.3.** *It would be interesting to have a simple direct proof that  $\mu(K_n) = -(n-2)!$  for a complete graph  $K_n$  with  $n \geq 2$  vertices in the poset  $\mathcal{HF}$ .*

## 7 Enumeration of weighted hypertrees

A *hypergraph* is a generalized graph with edges replaced by *hyperedges* defined as finite subsets of at least two vertices. Calling  $n$ -simplex a hyperedge with  $n+1$  vertices, allowing simplices reduced to one vertex and adding a closure property we get the definition of a simplicial complex.

A *path* in a hypergraph is a finite sequence  $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_n$  of vertices such that  $v_{i-1}$  and  $v_i$  belong to a common hyperedge for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . A hypergraph is *connected* if every pair  $v, w$  of vertices can be joined by a path  $v_0 = v, v_1, \dots, v_n = w$ . A *cycle* of a hypergraph is a cyclic path  $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}, v_n = v_0$  of  $n$  distinct vertices such that the  $n$  ordinary edges  $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}, i = 0, \dots, n-1$  belong to  $n$  distinct hyperedges. A *hyperforest* is a hypergraph without cycles. A connected hyperforest is a *hypertree*. Associating to every maximal clique of a block graph the hyperedge with the same vertices we get a one-to-one map between block graphs and hyperforests.

We recall that Stirling numbers of the second kind  $S_2(n, k)$ , defined by the equality

$$e^{t(e^x-1)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^n}{n!} \left( \sum_{k=0}^n S_2(n, k) t^k \right),$$

count the number of partitions of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  into  $k$  non-empty subsets. The following result, first proven by Husimi, see [2] or [1] generalizes Cayley's theorem (corresponding to the case  $k = n-1$  of ordinary trees) to hypertrees.

**Theorem 7.1.** (*Husimi*) *The number of hypertrees with  $k$  hyperedges and  $n$  labelled vertices is given by*

$$n^{k-1} S_2(n-1, k).$$

Identifying hypertrees with the corresponding block graphs and introducing the resulting Moebius function  $\mu(T) = \prod_{j \geq 2} (-(j-2)!)^{\kappa_j}$  of a hypertree having  $\kappa_j$  hyperedges involving  $j$  vertices for  $j \geq 2$  we have the following result:

**Theorem 7.2.** *We have*

$$(-1)^n \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}(n, k)} \mu(T) = n^{k-1} S_1(n-1, k)$$

where  $\mathcal{T}(n, k)$  denotes the set of all labelled hypertrees with  $n$  vertices and  $k$  hyperedges and where  $S_1(n, k)$  denotes the Stirling number of the first kind

defined by

$$\sum_{k=0}^n S_1(n, k)x^k = x(x-1)(x-2)\cdots(x-n+1) = \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} (x-j) .$$

**Proof** Each hypertree  $T$  with vertices  $1, \dots, n$  consisting of  $k$  hyperedges yields a contribution of  $\mu(T) \prod_{i=1}^n s_i^{\deg_h(i)}$  (with  $\deg_h(i)$  denoting the number of hyperedges containing the vertex  $i$ ) to the coefficient  $(-1)^k t_{n, k-1}(n-1) = -(-1)^n S_1(n-1, k)$  of the monomial  $\sigma_n \sigma_1^{k-1} x^{n-1}$  in  $U$  and all contributions are of this form. Setting  $s_1 = s_2 = \dots = s_n = 1$  yields the result.  $\square$

## 8 Computational aspects and examples

The computation of  $U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$  up to  $o(x^n)$  is straightforward using the recurrence relation (3). For a given fixed numerical value of  $\sigma_1$ , the following trick reduces memory requirement and speeds the computation up: Setting

$$c_n(\sigma_1) = (\gamma_{n+1}(\sigma_1, n), \gamma_{n+2}(\sigma_1, n), \dots, \gamma_{2n}(\sigma_1, n))$$

with  $\gamma_i(\sigma_1, n) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} t_{i,j}(n)(-\sigma_1)^j$  we have

$$U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots) = 1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \langle c_n(\sigma_1), (\sigma_{n+1}, \dots, \sigma_{2n}) \rangle x^n$$

where  $\langle a, b \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i$  for  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  and  $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ . The coefficients  $\gamma_i(\sigma_1, n)$  of  $c_n(\sigma_1)$  can be computed from the coefficients of  $c_{n-1}(\sigma_1)$  by the formula

$$\gamma_i(\sigma_1, n) = (i-2-\sigma_1)\gamma_{i-1}(\sigma_1, n-1) + (i-3)\gamma_{i-2}(\sigma_1, n-1)$$

with missing coefficients omitted in the case of  $i = n+1$  or  $i = 2n$ .

The coefficients of the first vectors  $c_1(0), c_2(0), c_3(0), \dots$  are given by the rows of

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & & & & & \\ 1 & 1 & & & & \\ 2 & 5 & 3 & & & \\ 6 & 26 & 35 & 15 & & \\ 24 & 154 & 340 & 315 & 105 & , \end{array}$$

see A112486 of [3].

### 8.1 The examples $U(x, -1, -1, -1, \dots)$ and $U(x, 0, -1, -1, -1, \dots)$

The series

$$U(x, -1, -1, -1, -1, \dots) - 1$$

is the generating series of the sequence

$$S(n) = \sum_{i,j} t_{i,j}(n)$$

enumerating the sums of the triangles  $T(n)$  defined by the integers  $t_{i,j}(n)$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & (1+x)U(x, -1, -1, -1, -1, \dots) \\ &= U(x, 0, -2, -2, -2, -2, \dots) \\ &= 2U(x, 0, -1, -1, -1, -1, \dots) - 1 \end{aligned}$$

where  $U(x, 0, -1, -1, -1, \dots) - 1$  corresponds to the generating series of the sequence

$$s(n) = \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} t_{i,0}(n)$$

starting as

$$1, 2, 10, 82, 938, 13778, 247210, 5240338, 128149802, 3551246162, \dots,$$

cf. A112487 of [3], and obtained by summing the integers of the first column of the triangles  $T(1), T(2), \dots$ . In particular, we have  $2s(n) = S(n-1) + S(n)$  or equivalently

$$2 \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} t_{i,0}(n) = \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} \sum_{j=0}^{2n-i} t_{i,j}(n) + \sum_{i=n}^{2n-2} \sum_{j=0}^{2n-2-i} t_{i,j}(n-1)$$

for all  $n \geq 2$ .

## 8.2 A family of rational examples

**Proposition 8.1.** *Let  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$  be a sequence of complex numbers of the form  $\sigma_n = (-1)^n P(n)$  for all  $n \geq A$  where  $A$  is some natural integer and where  $P(s) \in \mathbb{C}[s]$  is a polynomial. Then  $U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots)$  is a rational series.*

**Proof** Let  $d$  denote the degree of  $P$ . Applying identity (6) of Proposition 2.2 iteratively  $d+1$  times we get a series of the form  $U(x, \tilde{\sigma}_1, \tilde{\sigma}_2, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_{A+d+2}, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$  which is a polynomial.  $\square$

As an illustration we consider the series  $U(x, y, 1, -1, 1, \dots)$ . Proposition 2.2 shows

$$(1-xy)U(x, y, 1, -1, 1, -1, \dots) = (U(1+y, 1+y, 0, 0, \dots)) = 1 - (1+y)x.$$

We have thus  $U(x, y, 1, -1, 1, \dots) = 1 - \frac{x}{1-xy}$ .



### 8.3 Coefficients of $U(x, \sigma_1, P(2), P(3), P(4), \dots)$

**Proposition 8.2.** *Let  $P(s) \in \mathbb{C}[s]$  be a polynomial of degree  $d$ . There exist constants  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{C}$  such that*

$$[x^n]U(x, \sigma_1, P(2), P(3), P(4), \dots) = \sum_{h=0}^d \alpha_h [x^{n+h}]U(x, \sigma_1, 1, 1, 1, 1, \dots)$$

for all  $n \geq 1$  with  $[x^n]U$  denoting the coefficient of  $x^n$  in the series  $U$ .

**Proof** The proof is by induction on  $d$  and holds certainly for  $d = 0$ . Setting  $\gamma_i(n) = \sum_{j=n+1}^{2n} t_{i,j}(n)(-\sigma_1)^j$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= -i^d \gamma_i(n+1) + i^d(i-2-\sigma_1)\gamma_{i-1}(n) + i^d(i-3)\gamma_{i-2}(n) \\ &= -i^d \gamma_i(n+1) + (i-1)^{d+1} \gamma_{i-1}(n) + (i-2)^{d-2} \gamma_{i-2}(n) + \\ &\quad + Q_1(i-1)\gamma_{i-1}(n) + Q_2(i-2)\gamma_{i-2}(n) \end{aligned}$$

where  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are polynomials of degree  $\leq d$ .

Summing over  $i$  (for a fixed integer  $n$ ) and using induction on  $d$  implies the result.  $\square$

## 9 Modular properties

**Proposition 9.1.** *The series  $U(x, \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots) \in \mathbb{F}_p[[x]]$  is rational if  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots$  is an ultimately periodic sequence of elements in  $\mathbb{F}_p$ .*

**Proof** Since we work over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , one can restrict the indices  $i, j$  of the coefficients  $t_{i,j}(n)$  to finite subsets. This implies that the coefficients of  $U(x, \sigma_1, \dots)$  are ultimately periodic.  $\square$

The easiest non-trivial case of Proposition 9.1 is perhaps given by the generating series  $U(x, 0, -1, -1, -1, \dots) - 1$  associated to the sequence

$$s(n) = \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} t_{i,0}(n) = 1 - U(x, 0, -1, -1, -1, \dots)$$

obtained by summing all coefficients in the first column of the triangular arrays  $T(1), T(2), \dots$

Experimentally, there exists seemingly a sequence

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0 &= -1, \alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_2 = 0, \alpha_3 = \frac{1}{3}, \alpha_4 = \frac{5}{18}, \alpha_5 = \frac{149}{540}, \alpha_6 = \frac{553}{2025}, \\ \alpha_7 &= \frac{1849741}{6804000}, \alpha_8 = \frac{775167119}{2857680000}, \alpha_9 = \frac{325214957371}{1200225600000}, \dots \end{aligned}$$

of rational numbers such that

$$(1 + x^{p-1}) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} s(n)x^n \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{p-1} \alpha_n x^{p-n} \pmod{p}$$

for every prime number  $p$ .

The rational sequence  $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots$  has experimentally an asymptotic expansion given by

$$\alpha_n \sim \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k^{k-n}}{k!} \left(\frac{2}{e^2}\right)^k .$$

In particular, it seems to converge to

$$\frac{2}{e^2} = .27067056647322538378799 \dots .$$

The generating series  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha_n x^n$  seems to have a positive real root approximately given by

$$.469988171695013162992878063240573355384683977952459810170161 .$$

The error term

$$\epsilon_n = \alpha_n - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k^{k-n}}{k!} \left(\frac{2}{e^2}\right)^k$$

seems to be of the form

$$\epsilon_n \sim \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{s(n+1)} C(n)$$

with  $C(n) = \gamma_0 - \frac{1}{12n^2} + \frac{\gamma_4}{n^4} + \frac{\gamma_6}{n^6} + \dots \in \mathbb{R}[\frac{1}{n^2}]$  where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 &\sim 3.25889135327093 \\ \gamma_4 &\sim -.0120865999417078 \\ \gamma_6 &\sim .0312295100177430 \end{aligned}$$

More (probably correct) digits for  $\gamma_0$  are given by

$$3.25889135327092945459791735692 .$$

**Remark 9.2.** *The constant  $\gamma_0$  appearing in the error term  $C(n)$  seems also to be related to the maximal index  $m_n$  such that  $t_{m_n,0}(n) = \max_i(t_{i,0}(n))$  with  $m_n$  given asymptotically by  $\frac{\gamma_0}{2}$  and it seems also to be involved in the asymptotics of  $s(n)$ , given experimentally by*

$$s(n) \sim \left(\frac{n\gamma_0}{e}\right)^n \sum_{k \geq 1} \tilde{\gamma}_k n^{-k}$$

where  $\gamma_0 \sim 3.258891 \dots$  is as above and where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma}_1 &\sim .553942974899091 \\ \tilde{\gamma}_2 &\sim .239725616524017 \\ \tilde{\gamma}_3 &\sim .099867601803607 . \end{aligned}$$

## References

- [1] I.M. Gessel, L.H. Kalikow, *Hypergraphs and a functional equation of Bouwkamp and de Bruijn*. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 110 (2005), no. 2, 275–289.
- [2] K. Husimi, *Note on Mayer's theory of cluster integrals*, Journal of Chemical Physics **18** (1950), 682–684.
- [3] N.J.A. Sloane, The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, published electronically at <http://oeis.org>.
- [4] R. P. Stanley, *Enumerative Combinatorics, Volume I*, Cambridge University Press (1997).

Roland BACHER  
INSTITUT FOURIER  
Laboratoire de Mathématiques  
UMR 5582 (UJF-CNRS)  
BP 74  
38402 St Martin d'Hères Cedex (France)  
e-mail: Roland.Bacher@ujf-grenoble.fr