

# involve

a journal of mathematics

Arranging kings  $k$ -dependently  
on hexagonal chessboards

Robert Doughty, Jessica Gonda, Adriana Morales, Berkeley Reiswig,  
Josiah Reiswig, Katherine Slyman and Daniel Pritikin





# Arranging kings $k$ -dependently on hexagonal chessboards

Robert Doughty, Jessica Gonda, Adriana Morales, Berkeley Reiswig,  
Josiah Reiswig, Katherine Slyman and Daniel Pritikin

(Communicated by Arthur T. Benjamin)

Tessellate the plane into rows of hexagons. Consider a subset of  $2n$  rows of these hexagons, each row containing  $2n$  hexagons, forming a rhombus-shaped chessboard of  $4n^2$  spaces. Two kings placed on the board are said to “attack” each other if their spaces share a side or corner. Placing kings in alternating spaces of every other row results in an arrangement where no two of the  $n^2$  kings are attacking each other. According to our specific distance metric,  $n^2$  is in fact the largest number of kings that can be placed on such a board with no two kings attacking one another, for a maximum “density” of  $\frac{1}{4}$ . We consider a generalization of this maximum density problem, instead requiring that no king attacks more than  $k$  other kings for  $0 \leq k \leq 12$ . For instance when  $k = 2$  the density is at most  $\frac{1}{3}$ . For each  $k$  we give constructive lower bounds on the density, and use systems of inequalities and discharging arguments to yield upper bounds, where the bounds match in most cases.

## 1. Introduction

Consider the task of arranging as many king pieces as possible on a standard  $8 \times 8$  chessboard so that no two squares containing kings share a side or corner. Note that the board partitions into sixteen  $2 \times 2$  patches, and at most one king can reside in any patch. Yet placing a king in the upper left corner of each patch satisfies our requirements. So, in an optimal placement we have sixteen kings occupying  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the board. We can generalize this problem as follows. Consider whole numbers  $k$  and  $n$ . What is the maximum number of kings that can be placed on an  $n \times n$  board such that each king-occupied space shares at most  $k$  edges and corners with other king-occupied spaces? Note that in the previous example,  $k = 0$  and  $n = 8$ . In fact, in [Ionascu et al. 2008] the following question is investigated:

---

*MSC2010:* 90C05, 90C27.

*Keywords:*  $k$ -dependence, combinatorial chessboard, optimization, discharging, linear programming.

Given a whole number  $k \leq 8$  (8 being the maximum number of squares a king can attack), what is the maximum number  $s$  of kings that can be placed on an  $m \times n$  board so that no king attacks more than  $k$  other kings? When  $m$  and  $n$  are large, how large can the density  $s/(mn)$  be?


Similar problems have also been studied on alternate boards. For instance, [Bode et al. 2003] studies a similar problem on triangular boards with  $k = 0$ , and [Bode and Harborth 2003] looks at a similar problem for knights on both triangular and hexagonal boards with  $k = 0$ . Other interesting articles on combinatorial chessboard problems include [Fricke et al. 1995; Haynes et al. 1998; Hedetniemi et al. 1998; Watkins 2004]. In this paper, we consider a board in which the spaces are regular hexagons arranged into an  $n \times n$  rhombus as in Figure 1. As in Władysław Gliński’s hexagonal chess [Bodlaender 1996], a *king* occupying a hexagon will be said to *attack* the 12 other hexagons “nearest” its hexagon (as shown in the left half of Figure 2). In particular, we study the following:

Given a whole number  $k \leq 12$ , what is the maximum number  $s$  of kings that can be placed on an  $n \times n$  hexagonal board so that no king attacks more than  $k$  other kings? When  $n$  is large, how large can the density  $s/n^2$  be?


For most values of  $k$ , we find tight bounds on the optimal density  $s/n^2$  when  $n$  is large. For those values of  $k$  where our bounds are not tight, the gaps between our upper and lower bounds are reasonably close, and we conjecture that a limiting density exists.

### 2. Notation and terminology

We establish some definitions and notation since we are not using the normal  $n \times n$  chessboard. Consider a tiling of the plane by regular hexagons, each hexagon having two vertical sides. We call a finite collection of hexagons a *hexagonal board* and call each hexagon in that tiling a *space*. For convenience we consider only hexagonal boards  $\mathcal{B}_n$  where the hexagons form an  $n \times n$  rhombus in the plane as in Figure 1, where  $n \geq 5$ . We label the spaces on our board (as in Figure 1)



**Figure 1.** An  $n \times n$  hexagonal board in the shape of a rhombus.



**Figure 2.** Some examples of  $\mathcal{R}(v)$  shaded on a  $5 \times 5$  board.

from top to bottom, left to right, as  $a_{i,j}$ , where  $i$  denotes the row the space is in and  $j$  denotes the diagonal column the space is in. We make this assumption since any finite set of spaces in the tiling will be contained in a suitably large rhombus of hexagons. We use scripted capital letters (such as  $\mathcal{A}$ ) to name subsets of a board  $\mathcal{B}_n$  and nonscripted letters (such as  $a$  or  $A$ ) to label individual spaces of a board  $\mathcal{B}_n$ . To avoid distinguishing between a space and a king occupying that space, we introduce the following terminology. When a subset  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathcal{B}_n$  is specified, we refer to each space  $v \in \mathcal{B}_n$  as being a *king* if  $v \in \mathcal{A}$ . We define the *realm* (or *neighborhood*) of a space  $v \in \mathcal{B}_n$ , denoted  $\mathcal{R}(v)$ , to be the set of spaces a king in space  $v$  attacks. In particular, we define the spaces in  $\mathcal{R}(v)$  to create a “wrap-around” property on the board as follows: Given a space  $a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{B}_n$  we define  $g, g', g'', g''', h, h', h'', h''' \in (1, 2, \dots, n)$  as

$$\begin{aligned} g &\equiv i - 2 \pmod{n}, & h &\equiv j - 2 \pmod{n}, \\ g' &\equiv i - 1 \pmod{n}, & h' &\equiv j - 1 \pmod{n}, \\ g'' &\equiv i + 1 \pmod{n}, & h'' &\equiv j + 1 \pmod{n}, \\ g''' &\equiv i + 2 \pmod{n}, & h''' &\equiv j + 2 \pmod{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we define  $\mathcal{R}(a_{i,j})$  to be the set of spaces

$$\{a_{g,h'}, a_{g',h}, a_{g',h'}, a_{g',j}, a_{g',h''}, a_{i,h'}, a_{i,h''}, a_{g'',h'}, a_{g'',j}, a_{g'',h''}, a_{g'',h'''}, a_{g''',h''}\}.$$

Note that if the board is less than  $4 \times 4$ , the realm of a king overlaps itself. To simplify matters, the theorems in this paper only address  $n \times n$  boards where  $n \geq 4$ , so a king’s realm always contains 12 spaces. (This is because realm spaces that are otherwise prevented by the boundary of the board are instead extended past the boundary and associated with the opposite side. Additionally when  $n \geq 4$  it is impossible for the realm to overlap itself.) As an example,

$$\mathcal{R}(a_{1,1}) = \{a_{(n-1),n}, a_{n,(n-1)}, a_{n,n}, a_{n,1}, a_{n,2}, a_{1,n}, a_{1,2}, a_{2,n}, a_{2,1}, a_{2,2}, a_{2,3}, a_{3,2}\}.$$

A *placement of kings* on a hexagonal board  $\mathcal{B}_n$  is a subset  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $\mathcal{B}_n$ , the members of which we call *kings*. If  $u, v$  are kings,  $u$  is said to *attack*  $v$  if  $v \in \mathcal{R}(u)$ . A placement of kings  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $k$ -*dependent* if  $\mathcal{R}(v)$  contains at most  $k$  kings for all  $v \in \mathcal{A}$ . We denote the collection of all  $k$ -dependent placements of kings on  $\mathcal{B}_n$  by  $\mathcal{B}_n(k)$ .

Our notation of a  $k$ -dependent arrangement of kings relates to the following graph-theoretic terminology. For a graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a vertex  $v \in V$ , the set of vertices directly joined by an edge to  $v$  is denoted by  $N(v)$ . A subset  $\mathcal{A}$  of  $V$  is called *independent* if  $N(a) \cap \mathcal{A} = \emptyset$  for each vertex  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , and more generally,  $\mathcal{A}$  is called  *$k$ -dependent* (for a specified constant  $k$ ) if  $|N(a) \cap \mathcal{A}| \leq k$  for each  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ . The  *$k$ -dependence number* of  $G = (V, E)$  is the maximum cardinality among  $k$ -dependent subsets of  $V$ .

The *maximum  $k$ -count* on  $\mathcal{B}_n$ , denoted by  $\text{MNK}(k, n)$ , is the maximum size of a  $k$ -dependent arrangement or placement of kings on  $\mathcal{B}_n$ . That is,

$$\text{MNK}(k, n) = \max\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)\}$$

when  $n \geq 4$ . We let  $\mu(k)$  denote the least upper bound of the density of kings in  $k$ -dependent placements. That is,

$$\mu(k) = \sup\left\{\frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{n^2} : \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k), n \geq 4\right\}.$$

Alternatively,  $\mu(k) = \sup\{\text{MNK}(k, n)/n^2 : n \geq 4\}$ .

### 3. Initial upper bounds

Following tradition, we refer to the following technique as *linear programming*, even though we are not optimizing some objective function subject to constraints in the standard sense. For each  $k$ , we produce a simple system of linear inequalities valid for all  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$ . Summing these inequalities will yield upper bounds for  $\mu(k)$ . Let  $T(k)$  be the maximum number of kings in  $\mathcal{R}(v)$  for  $v \in \mathcal{A}^c = \mathcal{B}_n \setminus \mathcal{A}$  over all  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$  for  $n \geq 4$ . That is, if  $v$  is a non-king with respect to some  $k$ -dependent placement, then the largest number of kings possible in  $\mathcal{R}(v)$  is  $T(k)$ . Given a placement  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_n$  the *indicator function* of  $\mathcal{A}$  over  $\mathcal{B}_n$  is

$$\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(w) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } w \in \mathcal{A}, \\ 0 & \text{if } w \in \mathcal{A}^c. \end{cases}$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Given  $n \geq 4$ , for all  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$  we have*

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \frac{T(k)}{T(k) - k + 12} n^2.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$ . Then for each  $v \in \mathcal{B}_n$ , we have that  $\sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(v)} \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(w)$  is the number of kings that are in the realm of  $v$ . We consider the inequality

$$(T(k) - k) \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(v) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(v)} \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(w) \leq T(k). \tag{1}$$

If  $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(v) = 0$ , then (1) holds by the definition of  $T(k)$ . Suppose  $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(v) = 1$ . Then  $\sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(v)} \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(w) \leq k$  because  $\mathcal{A}$  is a  $k$ -dependent placement of kings. Therefore, since  $(T(k) - k) \cdot 1 + k \leq T(k)$ , inequality (1) holds whether or not  $\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(v) = 0$ . Now, we sum the inequalities of form (1), over all choices of  $v \in \mathcal{B}_n$ , and simplify the result:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_n} \left( (T(k) - k) \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(v) + \sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(v)} \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(w) \right) &\leq \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_n} T(k), \\ \left( (T(k) - k) \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_n} \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(v) \right) + 12 \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_n} \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(v) &\leq T(k) n^2, \\ (T(k) - k + 12) \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_n} \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(v) &\leq T(k) n^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \frac{T(k)}{T(k) - k + 12} n^2. \quad \square$$

Therefore, Theorem 3.1 establishes that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{n^2} \leq \frac{T(k)}{T(k) - k + 12}$$

for all  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 12\}$  and  $n \geq 4$ .

**Finding  $T$ -values.** For each  $k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 12\}$ , Theorem 3.1 gives us an upper bound for  $|\mathcal{A}|/n^2$ , the fraction of  $\mathcal{B}_n$  that can be occupied by a  $k$ -dependent set of kings. Since these upper bounds depend upon  $k$  and  $T(k)$ , we must find the exact values of  $T(k)$  for each separate choice of  $k$ . We refer to values of  $T(k)$  as  $T$ -values.


The following illustrates our process for finding the  $T$ -values for each  $k$ . To see why  $T(0) = 4$ , suppose  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(0)$  for some  $n \geq 4$  and consider some  $v \in \mathcal{A}^c$ . We label the spaces in  $\mathcal{R}(v)$  as in Figure 3. Partition  $\mathcal{R}(v)$  into the sets  $\{A, B, C\}$ ,  $\{D, E, F\}$ ,  $\{G, H, I\}$ , and  $\{J, K, L\}$ . Since  $\mathcal{A}$  is 0-dependent, the maximum number of kings in each of  $\{A, B, C\}$ ,  $\{D, E, F\}$ ,  $\{G, H, I\}$ , and  $\{J, K, L\}$  is 1. Therefore,  $T(0) \leq 4$ . Also, since  $\{A, D, G, J\}$  is a 0-dependent placement, we have  $T(0) \geq 4$ . Therefore  $T(0) = 4$ .

Figure 4 demonstrates lower bounds for all remaining  $T$ -values. The reader can check by hand that  $T(k)$  equals the lower bound given below each picture.


Therefore, Theorem 3.1 establishes upper bounds for  $\mu(k)$  as seen below:

$k$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Upper bound for $\mu(k)$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{5}{16}$	$\frac{3}{8}$	$\frac{8}{17}$	$\frac{5}{9}$	$\frac{10}{17}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{12}{17}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{4}{5}$	$\frac{6}{7}$	$\frac{12}{13}$	1

A board consisting entirely of kings would be 12-dependent. Therefore,  $\mu(12) = 1$ .




**Figure 3.**  $\mathcal{R}(v)$  partitioned into four subsets.



**Figure 4.** Lower bounds for the  $T$ -values for  $0 \leq k \leq 12$ .


### 4. Lower bounds

Ideally, we wish to find matching upper and lower bounds for  $\mu(k)$  for each  $k$ , so as to determine  $\mu(k)$  exactly. In this section we give constructive lower bounds for each such  $\mu(k)$ . To establish lower bounds for  $\mu(k)$  we create patterns via “puzzle pieces”. We use them to construct arbitrarily large  $k$ -dependent placements with calculable density. To construct these placements, we “stamp” the puzzle piece



**Figure 5.** The shaded region represents the puzzle piece  $P(0)$ , which has been stamped nine times to create a 0-dependent placement on a  $6 \times 6$  board.





**Figure 6.** Puzzle pieces  $P(k)$  that result in a  $k$ -dependent placement.

(using translated copies) as many times as needed to fill large  $n \times n$  boards. For example, in Figure 5, the shaded region represents a  $2 \times 2$  puzzle piece, which we stamped a total of nine times to create a  $6 \times 6$  placement. This results in a 0-dependent placement. We call this method of obtaining a  $k$ -dependent placement the *stamping method*. For a given  $k$ , we define  $P(k)$  (as in Figure 6) to be a particular  $s \times l$  puzzle piece which results in a  $k$ -dependent placement. Additionally, for a given  $P(k)$ , we define  $K(k)$  to be the number of kings in  $P(k)$ . We denote the number of rows in  $P(k)$  by  $s(k)$  and the number of diagonal columns in  $P(k)$  by  $l(k)$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** For a given  $k$ , puzzle piece  $P(k)$ , and  $n \geq \max\{s, l, 4\}$ , we have

$$\mu(k) \geq \frac{K(k)}{s(k)l(k)}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $n = q_1s(k) + r_1 = q_2l(k) + r_2$  for integers  $q_1, q_2, r_1, r_2 \geq 0$ , where  $r_1 < s(k)$  and  $r_2 < l(k)$ . Consider a particular  $k$  and its corresponding puzzle piece  $P(k)$  placed in the top-left of the  $n \times n$  board. Let  $\mathcal{Z}$  be the set of kings in the  $n \times n$  board at this stage. We define

$$\mathcal{Z}' = \{a_{i+cs, j+dl} : a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{Z}, c \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, q_1 - 1\}, d \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, q_2 - 1\}\}.$$

Therefore,  $\mathcal{Z}'$  is the placement of kings arising from a specific stamp and the process of stamping it in  $\mathcal{B}_n$ .

Since  $q_1q_2$  is the number of copies of the puzzle piece on the  $n \times n$  board,  $|\mathcal{Z}'| = K(k)q_1q_2$ . Thus, since  $\text{MNK}(k, n)$  is the maximum number of kings on a  $k$ -dependent  $n \times n$  board, we have  $\text{MNK}(k, n) \geq K(k)q_1q_2$  for  $n \geq \max\{s, l\}$ . Also, note that  $q_1 = (n - r_1)/s(k)$  and  $q_2 = (n - r_2)/l(k)$ . So it follows that

$$q_1q_2 = \frac{(n - r_1)(n - r_2)}{s(k)l(k)}.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\text{MNK}(k, n)}{n^2} \geq \frac{K(k)(n - r_1)(n - r_2)}{s(k)l(k)n^2}.$$

This implies

$$\mu(k) \geq \sup \left\{ \frac{K(k)(n - r_1)(n - r_2)}{s(k)l(k)n^2} : n \geq \max\{s, l, 4\} \right\} = \frac{K(k)}{s(k)l(k)}. \quad \square$$


Our choices of  $P(k)$  for  $0 \leq k \leq 12$  are shown in Figure 6. Each of these is crafted carefully to optimize the maximum proportion of kings, yielding the best lower bound we can manage. The following is a table of the lower bounds we constructed for  $\mu(k)$  using the stamping method:

$k$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Lower bound for $\mu(k)$	$\frac{1}{4}$	$\frac{7}{25}$	$\frac{1}{3}$	$\frac{2}{5}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{4}{7}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{3}{4}$	$\frac{7}{9}$	$\frac{6}{7}$	$\frac{12}{13}$	1

### 5. Tightening the upper bounds

Although the upper and lower bounds for  $\mu(k)$  were matched for some  $k$  using the methods in Sections 3 and 4, we were unable to match others. In this section we use two additional methods to attempt to bring down the upper bound for  $\mu(k)$  to match the lower bound.

**Taxation.** We now use a standard discharging method, which we refer to as *taxation*, to improve the upper bound for  $\mu(k)$  when  $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . In this method, we call any non-king space a *pawn*. So, for a placement of kings  $\mathcal{A}$ , the set of pawns is  $\mathcal{A}^c$ . To understand taxation, consider the following scenario. Initially, each pawn starts with  $X$  dollars. Then each pawn pays all its money to the kings adjacent



**Figure 7.** Examples of a taxation rule.

to it, following taxation rules. For example, each pawn could start with \$60 and distribute it evenly among all the kings adjacent to it. Some examples of a pawn following this taxation rule can be seen in Figure 7, where the shaded spaces are kings and the white spaces are pawns.

An  $\$X$  taxation rule for  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$  is a function  $f : \mathcal{A}^c \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, X]$  such that  $\sum_{K \in \mathcal{A}} f(P, K) = X$  for every  $P \in \mathcal{A}^c$ . Note that in an  $\$X$  taxation rule,  $\sum_{(P, K) \in \mathcal{A}^c \times \mathcal{A}} f(P, K) = X|\mathcal{A}^c|$ . When  $f$  is understood, we denote the value of funds a king  $K$  receives by  $F(K) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{A}^c} f(P, K)$ . In an  $\$X$  taxation rule, we know that the total amount of taxes paid, and also received, is  $\$X|\mathcal{A}^c|$ . So if each king receives a known minimum amount of money,  $\$Y$ , we can calculate an upper bound for  $|\mathcal{A}|$ .

**Theorem 5.1.** Consider a placement of kings  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$ , where  $n \geq 4$ . If, following an  $\$X$  taxation rule,  $F(K) \geq Y$  for all  $K \in \mathcal{A}$ , then

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \frac{X}{X + Y} n^2.$$

*Proof.* Consider a placement  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$ . The number of kings is  $|\mathcal{A}|$ , and the number of pawns is  $n^2 - |\mathcal{A}|$ . Suppose for some  $\$X$  taxation rule  $f$ , we have  $F(K) \geq Y$  for each king  $K \in \mathcal{A}$ . Comparing the amounts paid by pawns and received by kings, we see that

$$Y|\mathcal{A}| \leq X(n^2 - |\mathcal{A}|) \implies (X + Y)|\mathcal{A}| \leq Xn^2 \implies |\mathcal{A}| \leq \frac{X}{X + Y} n^2. \quad \square$$

For a given  $k$ , a *general  $\$X$  taxation plan (tax plan)*  $G(\mathcal{A})$  is a function  $G$  that assigns an  $\$X$  taxation rule  $f$  to each  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$ . Given such a  $G$ , let

$$\mathcal{Y}_G = \min\{F(K) : K \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } \mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)\}.$$

**Corollary 5.2.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{Y}_G \geq Y$  for some  $\$X$  taxation rule  $G$ . Then

$$\mu(k) \leq \frac{X}{X + Y}.$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mathcal{Y}_G \geq Y$  for some  $\$X$  taxation rule  $G$ . For all  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$ ,

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \frac{X}{X + \mathcal{Y}_G} n^2 \leq \frac{X}{X + Y} n^2,$$

where the first inequality follows from Theorem 5.1. So,  $(X/(X + Y))n^2$  is an upper bound on  $|\mathcal{A}|$  for all  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$ . Thus,  $X/(X + Y)$  is an upper bound for  $\mu(k)$ .  $\square$

For each  $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , we choose a convenient  $X$  and  $Y$  and show that there exists an  $\$X$  tax plan  $G$  such that  $\mathcal{Y}_G \geq Y$ . Thus, by Corollary 5.2,  $\mu(k) \leq X/(X + Y)$ . To achieve this, it is helpful to partition each placement  $\mathcal{A}$  into parts and analyze how much funding each part receives collectively. We define a *cluster* in a placement of kings  $\mathcal{A}$  to be a nonempty set  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  such that for each  $v, w \in \mathcal{K}$ , there exists a sequence  $v = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s = w$ , where  $v_i$  and  $v_{i+1}$  are adjacent for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s - 1\}$ . When a tax plan is understood, we denote the funds a cluster  $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  receives by  $F(\mathcal{K}) = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} F(K)$ . Since each  $k$ -dependent placement of kings is partitioned into clusters in our arguments, it suffices to show that  $\$Y|\mathcal{K}| \leq F(\mathcal{K})$  for each cluster  $\mathcal{K} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$  we consider.

**Corollary 5.3.** *Consider an  $\$X$  tax plan for a given  $k$  and  $n \geq 4$ . Suppose for each  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$  that  $\mathcal{A}$  partitions into clusters where  $\$Y|\mathcal{K}| \leq F(\mathcal{K})$  for each cluster  $\mathcal{K}$  in that partition. Then  $\mu(k) \leq X/(X + Y)$ .*


In all of our tax plans, any pawn with no adjacent kings is assumed to divide its money equally between all the kings in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since we are looking for a maximum number of kings on  $\mathcal{B}_n(k)$  for some  $k$  with  $n \geq 4$ , we need not worry about the case  $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$ , so there will always be at least one king in any relevant arrangement. In the remainder of this subsection the following notation is used in the diagrams. A *white* hexagon denotes a pawn. A *shaded* hexagon denotes a king. We omit proofs of the following four propositions, as they took many pages of case analysis.

*Tax plan for  $k = 1$ .* We show that  $\mu(1) \leq \frac{7}{25}$  using a taxation argument. We employ a tax plan where each pawn starts with  $\$14$  and distributes it evenly among kings adjacent to it unless the pawn and king arrangement is one shown in Figure 8. When the arrangement is as in Figure 8(a), the pawn  $P_1$  pays  $\$6$  to  $K_1$  and  $\$8$  to  $K_2$ . When the arrangement is as in Figure 8(b)–(c) the pawn  $P_2$  pays  $\$8$  to  $K_1$  and  $\$6$  to  $K_2$ . When the arrangement is as in Figure 8(d)–(e) the pawn  $P_3$  pays  $\$8$  to  $K_1$  and  $\$6$  to  $K_2$ . Note that the orientation of these figures is arbitrary, with respect to rotation and reflection.

**Proposition 5.4.** *Every king in a 1-dependent arrangement on  $\mathcal{B}_n$  receives at least  $\$36$  using the aforementioned tax plan.*

By Proposition 5.4,  $\mu(1) \leq \frac{7}{25}$ .

*Tax plan for  $k = 2$ .* We show that  $\mu(2) \leq \frac{1}{3}$  using a taxation argument. We employ a tax plan where each pawn starts with  $\$6$  and distributes it evenly among kings adjacent to it unless the pawn and king arrangement is as shown in Figure 9. When the arrangement is as in Figure 9, the pawn  $P_1$  pays  $\$3$  to  $K_1$  and  $\$1.50$  each to  $K_2$  and  $K_3$ .



**Figure 8.** Pawn and king arrangements for the tax plan for  $k = 1$ .

**Proposition 5.5.** *Every king in a 2-dependent arrangement on  $\mathcal{B}_n$  receives at least \$12 using the aforementioned tax plan.*

By Proposition 5.5,  $\mu(2) \leq \frac{1}{3}$ .

*Tax plan for  $k = 3$ .* We show that  $\mu(3) \leq \frac{2}{5}$  using a taxation argument. We employ a tax plan where each pawn starts with \$4 and distributes it evenly among kings adjacent to it unless the pawn and king arrangement is as shown in Figure 9. When the arrangement is as in Figure 9, the pawn  $P_1$  pays \$2 to  $K_3$  and \$1 each to  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ .

**Proposition 5.6.** *Every king in a 3-dependent arrangement on  $\mathcal{B}_n$  receives at least \$6 using the aforementioned tax plan.*


By Proposition 5.6,  $\mu(3) \leq \frac{2}{5}$ .

*Tax plan for  $k = 4$ .* We show that  $\mu(4) \leq \frac{1}{2}$  using a taxation argument. We employ a tax plan where each pawn starts with \$60 and distributes it evenly amongst all kings adjacent to it.

**Proposition 5.7.** *Every king in a 4-dependent arrangement on  $\mathcal{B}_n$  receives at least \$60 using the aforementioned tax plan.*

By Proposition 5.7,  $\mu(4) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ .

**Further linear programming.** We improve our bounds using a more general form of linear programming we call *weighting patterns*. In this method, we seek more complicated linear inequality constraints that are valid for all  $k$ -dependent sets.



**Figure 9.** The special case for  $k = 2$  and  $k = 3$ .

Given  $n \geq 4$  and a *weighting function*  $\varpi : \mathcal{B}_n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , not everywhere zero, let  $W(\varpi)$  denote the *total weight*,  $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_n} \varpi(v)$ , of  $\varpi$ . Given  $k$  and  $\varpi$  on  $\mathcal{B}_n$ , let  $M_k(n, \varpi)$  denote the maximum value of  $\sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_n} \varpi(v) \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(v)$  over all  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$ . So, for any such  $\varpi$  and any  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$ , we always have

$$\sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}_n} \varpi(v) \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(v) \leq M_k(n, \varpi).$$

To define a weighting function  $\varpi$  we refer to a figure with mapped values in their corresponding spaces. For example, if we defined  $\varpi$  by Figure 10(a), then  $\varpi(a_{5,4}) = 10740$ . Given a weighting function  $\varpi$ , we define the *shifted function*  $\varpi_{x,y} : \mathcal{B}_n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by  $\varpi_{x,y}(a_{i,j}) = \varpi(a_{(i+x) \bmod n, (j+y) \bmod n})$ . Note that  $\varpi_{0,0} = \varpi$ .

**Theorem 5.8.** *Consider any weighting function  $\varpi$  on  $\mathcal{B}_n$ . Then*

$$\mu(k) \leq \frac{M_k(n, \varpi)}{W(\varpi)}$$

whenever  $n \geq n_0 \geq 4$ , where  $n_0$  is the minimum value such that the weighting pattern  $\varpi$  fits within an  $n_0 \times n_0$  rhombus.

*Proof.* Given  $n \geq n_0 \geq 4$ , let  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$ , and let  $\Gamma = \{0, 1, 2, \dots, n - 1\}$ . For any  $x, y \in \Gamma$ , we know that  $\varpi_{x,y}$  is also a weighting function on  $\mathcal{B}_n$ . Thus we have

$$\sum_{a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{B}_n} \varpi_{x,y}(a_{i,j}) \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(a_{i,j}) \leq M_k(n, \varpi).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x,y \in \Gamma} \left( \sum_{a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{B}_n} \varpi_{x,y}(a_{i,j}) \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(a_{i,j}) \right) &\leq \sum_{x,y \in \Gamma} M_k(n, \varpi), \\ \sum_{a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{B}_n} \left( \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(a_{i,j}) \left( \sum_{x,y \in \Gamma} \varpi_{x,y}(a_{i,j}) \right) \right) &\leq n^2 M_k(n, \varpi), \\ \sum_{a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{B}_n} \left( \chi_{\mathcal{A}}(a_{i,j}) \left( \sum_{x,y \in \Gamma} \varpi(a_{(i+x) \bmod n, (j+y) \bmod n}) \right) \right) &\leq n^2 M_k(n, \varpi), \\ \sum_{a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{B}_n} (\chi_{\mathcal{A}}(a_{i,j}) W(\varpi)) &\leq n^2 M_k(n, \varpi), \end{aligned}$$


and thus

$$|\mathcal{A}| \cdot W(\varpi) \leq n^2 M_k(n, \varpi) \implies \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{n^2} \leq \frac{M_k(n, \varpi)}{W(\varpi)}.$$


Since  $n \geq 4$  and  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{B}_n(k)$  were arbitrary, we have

$$\mu(k) \leq \frac{M_k(n, \varpi)}{W(\varpi)}.$$


□




(a)  $k = 5$



(b)  $k = 6$



(c)  $k = 7$



(d)  $k = 9$

**Figure 10.** Weighting functions  $\varpi$  for  $k \in \{5, 6, 7, 9\}$ .

Using Theorem 5.8, we improve our upper bounds for some  $\mu(k)$  values by conveniently choosing the weighting patterns in Figure 10 to define  $\varpi$  for  $k \in \{5, 6, 7, 9\}$ . The shaded hexagons represent a  $k$ -dependent placement of kings resulting in the largest  $M_k(n, \varpi)$ .

Applying four weighting functions and employing a tedious case analysis yields the following upper bounds for  $\mu(k)$ :

$k$	5	6	7	9
Upper bound for $\mu(k)$	$\frac{902416}{1636944}$	$\frac{11099}{17872}$	$\frac{4520}{6474}$	$\frac{12287}{15359}$

### 6. Conclusion

When the upper and lower bounds for  $\mu(k)$  match, we know

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{\text{MNK}(k, n)}{n^2} \right) = \mu(k).$$

In the cases where the upper and lower bounds for  $\mu(k)$  do not match, it remains to determine the values of  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\text{MNK}(k, n)/n^2)$ , if indeed these limits exist. In summary, combining results from various methods, the best results we found concerning the values of  $\mu(k)$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(0) &= \frac{1}{4}, & \mu(1) &= \frac{7}{25}, & \mu(2) &= \frac{1}{3}, & \mu(3) &= \frac{2}{5}, & \mu(4) &= \frac{1}{2}, \\ \frac{8}{15} &\leq \mu(5) \leq \frac{902416}{1636944}, & \frac{3}{5} &\leq \mu(6) \leq \frac{11099}{17872}, & \frac{2}{3} &\leq \mu(7) \leq \frac{4520}{6474}, & \mu(8) &= \frac{3}{4}, \\ \frac{7}{9} &\leq \mu(9) \leq \frac{12287}{15359}, & \mu(10) &= \frac{6}{7}, & \mu(11) &= \frac{12}{13}, & \mu(12) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Although our bounds for  $\mu(k)$  are tight for most values of  $k$ , we were unable to match the bounds for  $k \in \{5, 6, 7, 9\}$ . The tightness of these bounds can perhaps be improved through computer programming and other mathematical methods. For example, one could try a “reverse taxation” process to lower the upper bound for  $\mu(9)$ . In such a process the kings would be given money to distribute to the pawns, potentially limiting the number of cases in the case analysis. Additionally, a computer could be used to test larger weighting patterns, although we have reason to believe that it is unlikely they will lead to a tight bound. Finally, by computer search or by hand, one could search for patterns which raise the lower bound.

To create a new problem, one can investigate  $\mu(k)$  on similar boards with a change in the realm of a king. Moreover, one can consider boards consisting of other shapes, or in higher dimensions. For example, one could examine the  $k$ -dependence of kings on an  $n \times n$  rhombus tiled with equilateral triangles, a parallelepiped whose surface is tiled with equilateral triangles, or a parallelepiped internally tiled with regular tetrahedra. A similar type of problem one might investigate is the domination number as in [Haynes et al. 1998] of an  $n \times n$  hexagonal board on a torus using our king’s realm. One could also examine the domination number of a board with respect to different realms or of a different board altogether. We encourage the investigation of these problems, because they seem to us ideal problems for upper-level undergraduates with backgrounds or interests in discrete mathematics.



### Acknowledgements

The last-named author (Pritikin) mentored the remaining authors in this research, for which they are grateful. All authors extend their thanks to the SUMSRI program at Miami University for funding the research.

### References

- [Bode and Harborth 2003] J.-P. Bode and H. Harborth, “Independence for knights on hexagon and triangle boards”, *Discrete Math.* **272**:1 (2003), 27–35. MR 2019197 Zbl 1029.05111
- [Bode et al. 2003] J.-P. Bode, H. Harborth, and M. Harborth, “King independence on triangle boards”, *Discrete Math.* **266**:1–3 (2003), 101–107. MR 1991709 Zbl 1015.05067
- [Bodlaender 1996] H. Bodlaender, “Glinksy’s hexagonal chess”, website, 1996, available at <http://www.chessvariants.com/hexagonal.dir/hexagonal.html>.
- [Fricke et al. 1995] G. H. Fricke, S. M. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, A. A. McRae, C. K. Wallis, M. S. Jacobson, H. W. Martin, and W. D. Weakley, “Combinatorial problems on chessboards: a brief survey”, pp. 507–528 in *Graph theory, combinatorics, and algorithms, I* (Kalamazoo, MI, 1992), edited by Y. Alavi and A. Schwenk, Wiley, New York, 1995. MR 1405836 Zbl 0843.05061
- [Haynes et al. 1998] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater, *Fundamentals of domination in graphs*, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics **208**, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998. MR 1605684 Zbl 0890.05002
- [Hedetniemi et al. 1998] S. M. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, and R. Reynolds, “Combinatorial problems on chessboards, II”, pp. 133–162 in *Domination in graphs*, edited by T. W. Haynes et al., Monogr. Textbooks Pure Appl. Math. **209**, Dekker, New York, 1998. MR 1605691 Zbl 0888.05036
- [Ionascu et al. 2008] E. J. Ionascu, D. Pritikin, and S. E. Wright, “ $k$ -dependence and domination in kings graphs”, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **115**:9 (2008), 820–836. MR 2463293 Zbl 1203.05119
- [Watkins 2004] J. J. Watkins, *Across the board: the mathematics of chessboard problems*, Princeton University Press, 2004. MR 2041306 Zbl 1108.00007

Received: 2015-07-22      Revised: 2015-07-31      Accepted: 2015-09-17

doughtrl@miamioh.edu	Miami University, Oxford, OH 45162, United States
jlg131@zips.uakron.edu	The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44304, United States
adriana.morales@upr.edu	University of Puerto Rico, San Juan, 00931, Puerto Rico
berkeleyreiswig@gmail.com	Anderson University, Anderson, SC 29621, United States
jreiswig@math.sc.edu	University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, United States
kat.slyman@gmail.com	Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC 27106, United States
pritikd@miamioh.edu	Department of Mathematics, Miami University, 123 Bachelor Hall, 301 S. Patterson Ave., Oxford, OH 45056, United States



# involve

msp.org/involve

## INVOLVE YOUR STUDENTS IN RESEARCH

*Involve* showcases and encourages high-quality mathematical research involving students from all academic levels. The editorial board consists of mathematical scientists committed to nurturing student participation in research. Bridging the gap between the extremes of purely undergraduate research journals and mainstream research journals, *Involve* provides a venue to mathematicians wishing to encourage the creative involvement of students.

### MANAGING EDITOR

Kenneth S. Berenhaut Wake Forest University, USA

### BOARD OF EDITORS

Colin Adams	Williams College, USA	Suzanne Lenhart	University of Tennessee, USA
John V. Baxley	Wake Forest University, NC, USA	Chi-Kwong Li	College of William and Mary, USA
Arthur T. Benjamin	Harvey Mudd College, USA	Robert B. Lund	Clemson University, USA
Martin Bohner	Missouri U of Science and Technology, USA	Gaven J. Martin	Massey University, New Zealand
Nigel Boston	University of Wisconsin, USA	Mary Meyer	Colorado State University, USA
Amarjit S. Budhiraja	U of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA	Emil Minchev	Ruse, Bulgaria
Pietro Cerone	La Trobe University, Australia	Frank Morgan	Williams College, USA
Scott Chapman	Sam Houston State University, USA	Mohammad Sal Moslehian	Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran
Joshua N. Cooper	University of South Carolina, USA	Zuhair Nashed	University of Central Florida, USA
Jem N. Corcoran	University of Colorado, USA	Ken Ono	Emory University, USA
Toka Diagana	Howard University, USA	Timothy E. O'Brien	Loyola University Chicago, USA
Michael Dorff	Brigham Young University, USA	Joseph O'Rourke	Smith College, USA
Sever S. Dragomir	Victoria University, Australia	Yuval Peres	Microsoft Research, USA
Behrouz Emamizadeh	The Petroleum Institute, UAE	Y.-F. S. Pétermann	Université de Genève, Switzerland
Joel Foisy	SUNY Potsdam, USA	Robert J. Plemmons	Wake Forest University, USA
Errin W. Fulp	Wake Forest University, USA	Carl B. Pomerance	Dartmouth College, USA
Joseph Gallian	University of Minnesota Duluth, USA	Vadim Ponomarenko	San Diego State University, USA
Stephan R. Garcia	Pomona College, USA	Bjorn Poonen	UC Berkeley, USA
Anant Godbole	East Tennessee State University, USA	James Propp	U Mass Lowell, USA
Ron Gould	Emory University, USA	József H. Przytycki	George Washington University, USA
Andrew Granville	Université Montréal, Canada	Richard Rebarber	University of Nebraska, USA
Jerrold Griggs	University of South Carolina, USA	Robert W. Robinson	University of Georgia, USA
Sat Gupta	U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA	Filip Saidak	U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA
Jim Haglund	University of Pennsylvania, USA	James A. Sellers	Penn State University, USA
Johnny Henderson	Baylor University, USA	Andrew J. Sterge	Honorary Editor
Jim Hoste	Pitzer College, USA	Ann Trenk	Wellesley College, USA
Natalia Hritonenko	Prairie View A&M University, USA	Ravi Vakil	Stanford University, USA
Glenn H. Hurlbert	Arizona State University, USA	Antonia Vecchio	Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Italy
Charles R. Johnson	College of William and Mary, USA	Ram U. Verma	University of Toledo, USA
K. B. Kulasekera	Clemson University, USA	John C. Wierman	Johns Hopkins University, USA
Gerry Ladas	University of Rhode Island, USA	Michael E. Zieve	University of Michigan, USA

### PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor


Cover: Alex Scorpan

See inside back cover or [msp.org/involve](http://msp.org/involve) for submission instructions. The subscription price for 2016 is US \$160/year for the electronic version, and \$215/year (+\$35, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues from the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to MSP.

*Involve* (ISSN 1944-4184 electronic, 1944-4176 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 798 Evans Hall #3840, c/o University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

Involve peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW<sup>®</sup> from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**  
nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2016 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

# involve

2016

vol. 9

no. 4

Affine hyperbolic toral automorphisms COLIN THOMSON AND DONNA K. MOLINEK	541
Rings of invariants for the three-dimensional modular representations of elementary abelian $p$ -groups of rank four THÉO PIERRON AND R. JAMES SHANK	551
Bootstrap techniques for measures of center for three-dimensional rotation data L. KATIE WILL AND MELISSA A. BINGHAM	583
Graphs on 21 edges that are not 2-apex JAMISON BARSOTTI AND THOMAS W. MATTMAN	591
Mathematical modeling of a surface morphological instability of a thin monocrystal film in a strong electric field AARON WINGO, SELAHITTIN CINAR, KURT WOODS AND MIKHAIL KHENNER	623
Jacobian varieties of Hurwitz curves with automorphism group $\mathrm{PSL}(2, q)$ ALLISON FISCHER, MOUCHEN LIU AND JENNIFER PAULHUS	639
Avoiding approximate repetitions with respect to the longest common subsequence distance SERINA CAMUNGOL AND NARAD RAMPERSAD	657
Prime vertex labelings of several families of graphs NATHAN DIEFENDERFER, DANA C. ERNST, MICHAEL G. HASTINGS, LEVI N. HEATH, HANNAH PRAWZINSKY, BRIAHNA PRESTON, JEFF RUSHALL, EMILY WHITE AND ALYSSA WHITTEMORE	667
Presentations of Roger and Yang's Kauffman bracket arc algebra MARTIN BOBB, DYLAN PEIFER, STEPHEN KENNEDY AND HELEN WONG	689
Arranging kings $k$ -dependently on hexagonal chessboards ROBERT DOUGHTY, JESSICA GONDA, ADRIANA MORALES, BERKELEY REISWIG, JOSIAH REISWIG, KATHERINE SLYMAN AND DANIEL PRITIKIN	699
Gonality of random graphs ANDREW DEVEAU, DAVID JENSEN, JENNA KAINIC AND DAN MITROPOLSKY	715



1944-4176(2016)9:4;1-1