

matrices, e.g., [2]. In particular, the van der Waerden conjecture remains unresolved [1]. Let $\vartheta(n, k)$ ($\mathcal{B}(n, k)$) denote the class of all order $n(0, 1)$ -matrices having exactly $n-k$ (at most $n-k$) zeros per line. It is the purpose of this paper to determine the minimum permanent within $\mathcal{B}(n, n-2)$. Specifically we shall show:

THEOREM 1. *The minimum permanent in $\mathcal{B}(n, n-2)$ is U_n for n even and $-1 + U_n$ for n odd.*

Before turning to the proof we shall make a simplification (Lemma 1) and obtain some useful formulae (Lemma 2). Use will be made of the fact that members of $\vartheta(n, n-2)$ are combinatorially equivalent to $(0, 1)$ -complements of the direct sum of $(0, 1)$ -complements of matrices of type (2) of orders p_1, p_2, \dots, p_v where $n = p_1 + p_2 + \dots + p_v$ is a partition of n with all $p_i \geq 2$.

LEMMA 1. *The minimum permanent in $\mathcal{B}(n, n-2)$ can be found in the union of the following two subclasses of $\mathcal{B}(n, n-2)$:*

- (i) $\vartheta(n, n-2)$
- (ii) *the class of order n matrices of the form:*

$$(3) \quad \left[\begin{array}{c|cccc} 0 & 1 & 1 & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \\ \hline 1 & & & & & \\ 1 & & & & & \\ \cdot & & & & & \\ \cdot & & & & & \\ \cdot & & & & & \\ 1 & & & & & \end{array} \right]$$

with $B \in \vartheta(n-1, n-3)$. (Note, since the constant line sum of B is two less than its order, all combinatorially inequivalent forms for B have been implicitly described above.)

Proof. If A has minimum permanent within the class $\mathcal{B}(n, n-2)$ then we can assume that every one in A is in some line with sum exactly equal to $n-2$, else such a one can be removed without change in the permanent value. For convenience we shall say such a reduced A has “property R ”. Now suppose $A \notin \vartheta(n, n-2)$. Clearly A cannot have a line, say a row, of sum n since by property R every column would contain two zeros and hence since the matrix is square, some row would contain more than two zeros, i.e., $A \notin \mathcal{B}(n, n-2)$. It follows that A has both a row and a column with sum $n-1$. Let the first column of A be such a column, taking its zero to be in the first row. By property R the last $n-1$ rows have row sums equal to $n-2$ so the first row must be the one with sum $n-1$. Hence A is of the form (3) with the row sums of B equal to $n-3$. Repeating the argument for the column sums of B we conclude $B \in \vartheta(n-1, n-3)$.

It is obvious that an even simpler application of property R solves the analogous

problem of the minimum permanent in $\mathcal{B}(n, n-1)$. Namely, the minimum permanent in this class is D_n , the n th derangement number, for which an explicit formula is known but which can be equivalently defined as the permanent of the (0, 1)-complement of the order n identity matrix [3].

By a "list" we mean a finite unordered set of positive integers. A particular list of length μ will be denoted either as

$$(4) \quad [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\mu]$$

or, more commonly as

$$(5) \quad (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\mu).$$

The notation (5) will be used rather than (4) when some terms have possibly been suppressed, i.e.,

$$(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\mu) = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\mu, p_{\mu+1}, \dots, p_{\mu+\nu}]$$

for some non-negative integer ν and for some positive integers $p_{\mu+1}, \dots, p_{\mu+\nu}$. By $U[p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\mu]$ we shall denote the permanent of the matrix which is the (0, 1)-complement of the direct sum of (0, 1)-complements of matrices of type (2) of orders p_1, p_2, \dots, p_μ , respectively. If some $p_i=1$, the corresponding summand will be an order one zero matrix. By (1) the value $U[p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\mu]$ is independent of the ordering of the p_i 's and by Lemma 1 $U[p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\mu]$, for some partition $n=p_1+p_2+\dots+p_\mu$ of n , is the minimum permanent wanted. $U(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\mu)$ has the same definition as $U[p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\nu]$, the notation implying that indication of some matrix summands might have been suppressed. In particular, an equation involving $U(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_\mu)$, $U(q_1, q_2, \dots, q_\nu)$, etc., holds when identical, arbitrary (positive integer) terms are adjoined to all lists.

LEMMA 2. If $k > 1, l > 1$,

$$(6) \quad U(k, l) = U(k+l) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k+l-1} U(i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} U(i, l) - \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} U(k, i).$$

If $k=1, l > 1$, (6) has the modified form

$$(7) \quad \sum_{i=1}^l U(1, i) = 3 \sum_{i=1}^{l-1} U(i) + 2U(l) + U(l+1).$$

If $l > 2$,

$$(8) \quad U(1, l) = U(l-1) + U(l) + U(l+1).$$

Proof. If the zero in the (1, 1) position of the matrix A_n in (2) is replaced by a one, the new permanent value, per A_n^1 , is

$$U_n + \text{per } A_{n-1}^1$$

so by induction,

$$(9) \quad \text{per } A_n^1 = \sum_{i=1}^n U_i.$$

for $U(k, l)$ by induction. Assume the result for $U(k', l')$ for all pairs $k', l' (k' > 1$ and $l' > k' + 1)$ satisfying $k' < k$ or $l' < l$ if $k' = k$. Again by (6),

$$(12) \quad U(k, l) - U(k, l-1) = U(k+l) + U(k+l-1) - U(1, l) - \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} U(i, l) + U(1, l-1) + \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} U(i, l-1) - U(k, l-1).$$

Using (8) for the terms $U(1, l)$, $U(1, l-1)$ and applying the induction hypothesis to the two summations in (12) we obtain the result wanted.

The proof of Theorem 1 has now been reduced to a consideration of those lists of the form

$$[k, k, \dots, k, k+1, k+1, \dots, k+1] \quad \text{with } k \geq 1.$$

We next note that:

$$(13) \quad U(k, k) \geq U(2k) \quad \text{if } k \geq 1.$$

Applying (11) to (6) and making use of (8) (assuming $k \geq 3$), we have

$$(14) \quad U(k, k) = U(2k) + 2U(1) + 2U(2k-1) - 2U(k-1, k)$$

$$(15) \quad U(k, k+1) = U(2k+1) + 2U(1) + U(2k-1) + U(2k) - U(k-1, k) - U(k, k).$$

Equating the two expressions for $U(k, k) - U(2k) - 2U(1)$ as obtained from (14), (15) we get

$$(16) \quad U(k, k+1) - U(2k+1) = U(k-1, k) - U(2k-1).$$

So (14) becomes

$$(17) \quad U(k, k) - U(2k) = 2\{U(1) + U(5) - U(2, 3)\}, \quad k \geq 3$$

after successive applications of (16). For $k=2$ (14), (15) must be modified, but similarly equating the analogous expressions for $U(2, 2) - U(4) - 2U(1)$ we obtain

$$U(2, 3) - U(5) = U(1, 2) - U(3) - U(2).$$

Consequently, for $k > 1$, (17) becomes

$$U(k, k) - U(2k) = 2\{U(1) + U(2) + U(3) - U(1, 2)\}$$

and using (7) for $l=2$,

$$U(k, k) - U(2k) = 2\{U(1, 1) - 2U(1) - U(2)\}.$$

If we consider the terms in the permanent value $U(1, 1)$ we have

$$(18) \quad U(1, 1) = U(2) + 2U(1) + U()$$

and therefore (17), for $k > 1$ can be written

$$U(k, k) - U(2k) = 2U()$$

so that $U(k, k) - U(2k) \geq 0$ if $k > 1$ and the same result follows from (18) for $k=1$.

To complete the proof of Theorem 1 we note that $U[k, k+1] = -1 + U[2k+1]$ for $k \geq 1$. This is readily checked for $k=1, 2$ and for $k \geq 3$ (16) gives us

$$U[k, k+1] - U[2k+1] = U[2, 3] - U[5] = -1.$$

A final point should be noted: For all $n \neq 3$, the minimum permanent in $\mathcal{B}(n, n-2)$ is attained in $\vartheta(n, n-2)$.

REFERENCES

1. Andrew M. Gleason, *Remarks on the van der Waerden permanent conjecture*, J. Combinatorial Theory, **8** (1970), 54–64.
2. W. B. Jurkat and H. J. Ryser, *Matrix factorizations of determinants and permanents*, J. Algebra, **3** (1966), 1–27.
3. H. J. Ryser, *Combinatorial mathematics*, Wiley, New York, 1963.
4. J. Touchard, *Sur un problème de permutations*, C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, **198** (1934), 631–633.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE
NORTHRIDGE, CALIFORNIA 91324
U.S.A.