
Using Gröbner Bases to Investigate Flag Algebras and Association Scheme Fusion

Douglas A. Leonard

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Auburn University, Auburn, AL, USA.
leonada@auburn.edu

Summary. This paper is meant primarily as a *tutorial* on how to phrase problems in association schemes in the language of Gröbner bases and use the computational results provided by those bases, though it does contain fusion scheme computations not previously found in the literature.

Key words: Gröbner bases, Flag algebras, Association schemes

1 Introduction

It is instructive to see how the use of *Gröbner bases* [2] can clarify certain computational and theoretic aspects of various topics. Here the choice of topics come from *association schemes* and *fusion of flag algebras* arising from *generalized n -gons* and *2 -($v, k, 1$) designs* [6]. Three different ways of using concepts related to Gröbner bases are given as a guide for using such concepts in similar types of problems.

Often it is the case that combinatorialists have to sort out some form of truth about a given object based on its parameters. This can translate into pages and pages of manipulations of intermediate results involving polynomial equations, with the attendant derivations and justifications. But these problems can usually be easily rephrased in terms of finding common zeros of a system of polynomial equations, and knowing for what values of the parameters this happens. This is exactly what Gröbner bases are meant to accomplish. So Gröbner basis theory can provide direct computational answers without the need for further justification, once problems are phrased in terms of *generators* (polynomials that should be zero) for an *ideal* in a *multivariate polynomial ring*, and the need to know the corresponding *varieties* (set of common zeros). This should be useful either to those wishing to use Gröbner bases to clarify and/or simplify computations or to those interested in seeing how Gröbner bases can be used in “applied theoretical” settings.

And it could conceivably use the same system of equations to produce results overlooked in some ad hoc approach to solving them.

Now consider the concrete problem of investigating a parameterized series of *association schemes*, describing the *structure constants*, determining fusion partitions, and investigating those fusions found. Much of this work was done by the Soviet school for *metric* (one parameter) schemes (see, for example, the survey [4] and <http://www.ricam.oeaw.ac.at/specsem/SRS/groeb/download/Muzychuk.pdf>). See also [9].

The next natural stage is to investigate *dihedral* (two parameter) schemes in the terminology of Zieschang, coming mainly from flag algebras, which were introduced by a number of authors [5, 10, 7, 11, 13].

The paper [6], which started this investigation, used ad hoc methods to do the computations. So here those methods have been replaced by the systematic Gröbner basis methods, which make the actual computations invisible to the reader. There are new computations relative to *fusion* expanding on this previous work, with the MAGMA [8] code that generated them, to whet the appetite of the audience.

2 Gröbner Basis Preliminaries

There are many good books covering this material, with [3] being the first author's favorite. The following is a brief introduction to ideals and varieties in polynomial rings for those unfamiliar with the topic. Given some *variables* x_n, \dots, x_1 and a *coefficient ring* R , $R[x_n, \dots, x_1]$ denotes the ring of (finite) R -linear combinations of (finite) products in these variables, and seems to be called either a *multivariate polynomial ring* or a *free(associative)algebra*, depending on whether the variables *commute* with each other or not. Even to be able to write down polynomials in a canonical way, it is necessary to have a *monomial order* (a *total order* with obvious extra properties). The (default) *lexicographical monomial order* is based on comparing products by considering their *indices* (that is, *exponents*) lexicographically. So, for instance, in the multivariate polynomial ring $R[x_3, x_2, x_1]$ the order looks like

$$1 \prec x_1 \prec x_1^2 \prec \dots \prec x_2 \prec x_2x_1 \prec \dots \prec x_2^2 \prec \dots \prec x_3 \prec \dots$$

which can be described by $x_3^{i_3}x_2^{j_2}x_1^{i_1} \succ x_3^{j_3}x_2^{j_2}x_1^{j_1}$ iff $(i_3 > j_3)$ or $(i_3 = j_3 \text{ and } i_2 > j_2)$ or $(i_3 = j_3 \text{ and } i_2 = j_2 \text{ and } i_1 > j_1)$. The generic *total degree orders* are the *grevlex* and *glex* orders (short for *graded reverse lexicographical* and *graded lexicographical*), in which total degree is the first concern. These give orders that look like

$$1 \prec x_1 \prec x_2 \prec x_3 \prec x_1^2 \prec x_2x_1 \prec x_3x_1 \prec x_2^2 \prec \dots$$

and

$$1 \prec x_1 \prec x_2 \prec x_3 \prec x_1^2 \prec x_2x_1 \prec x_2^2 \prec x_3x_1 \prec \dots$$

respectively. These can be defined in ways similar to those above; but the non-singular matrices

$$A_{grevlex} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad A_{glex} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

can be used to reduce these to the lexicographical case by converting the column vector of exponents

$$\begin{pmatrix} i_3 \\ i_2 \\ i_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{to} \quad \begin{pmatrix} i_3 + i_2 + i_1 \\ i_3 + i_2 \\ i_3 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{pmatrix} i_3 + i_2 + i_1 \\ i_3 \\ i_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

respectively.

The *leading monomial* of f , denoted here by $LM(f)$ is the largest monomial occurring in f , relative to the given order. Its coefficient is called the *leading coefficient*, denoted by $LC(f)$, and the product $LC(f)LM(f) =: LT(f)$ is called the *leading term*. (Warning: Some authors interchange the words term and monomial, and there is no uniformity of notation in the literature.)

An *ideal* I (two-sided in the case of free algebras) is a subset of a ring closed under addition of its elements and under multiplication by ring elements. Ideals describing *finitely-presented algebras* (that is, free associative algebras modulo said ideals) are commonly given in terms of a (finite) set of *generators* (referred to as *relations* when the variables are called generators!) $I := \langle g_1, g_2, \dots, g_m \rangle$, so that I consists of all (finite) R -linear combinations of g_1, \dots, g_m .

As with vector spaces, where arbitrary generating sets are not as useful as maximal linearly independent sets, called (*vector space*) *bases*, it should be no surprise that arbitrary generating sets for ideals (which are unfortunately called *bases* in some of the literature) are not as important or useful as *Gröbner bases*, those generating sets B relative to which a “canonical” remainder $NormalForm(f, B)$ for f after division by the elements of B (in any order) can be defined.

A more useful computational definition of Gröbner bases is in terms of *SPolynomials*. If h is a *least common multiple* of $LM(f)$ and $LM(g)$, then $SPoly(f, g) := \frac{h}{LT(f)}f - g\frac{h}{LT(g)}$ (with suitable generalization in the non-commutative case). Then B is a Gröbner basis if $SPoly(f, g)$ reduces to 0 after division by the elements of B for all choices of $f, g \in B$. In fact this is the foundation for all forms of the *Buchberger algorithm*; namely that given any generating set, it is possible to produce a Gröbner basis by computing SPolynomials, reducing them by division relative to the current generating set, and appending the results to the generating set if necessary, possibly reducing the other elements along the way, until the set is closed under this combined operation of computing SPolynomials and reducing them.

If one has a collection of equations of the form $f_i = h_i$ that can be written in polynomial form in terms of some (not necessarily polynomial) variables,

then it is possible to use $g_i := f_i - h_i$ as generators for an ideal in a polynomial ring. Common solutions to the collection of equations then become common zeros of the elements of the ideal I or equivalently of the elements of the Gröbner basis B . These common zeros are called *points* of the *variety* $\mathcal{V}(I) := \{v : g(v) = 0 \text{ for all } g \in I\}$. This variety is generally computed by finding a Gröbner basis relative to some easy ordering, changing it to a (factored) Gröbner basis relative to a lex order, and recursively computing coordinates of the elements of the variety.

The importance of all this to a field such as *algebraic combinatorics* is that in the study of a collection of objects relative to a set of parameters, it is typical that questions may be phrased in terms of what parameter values are necessary or sufficient to guarantee the feasibility or existence of such objects. Then equations satisfied by the parameters can be turned into generators for an ideal for which the variety gives such parameter values. That means that rather than haphazardly sorting through a collection of equations, looking for results about the parameters, it is possible to merely compute a Gröbner basis and a variety, letting the Gröbner basis theory replace all the intermediate results, derivations, and justifications.

Sometimes there are unexpected added benefits beyond this, in that proper phrasing of problems in terms of Gröbner bases may give insight into the combinatorial structures, definitions, or other aspects of a problem. This will be exemplified below by considering *generalized n -gons* and 2 -($v, k, 1$) *designs*.

3 Algebraic Combinatorics Preliminaries

A matrix algebra W over the field \mathbf{C} of complex numbers is called a *coherent algebra* iff the identity matrix, I , is in W , the all-ones matrix, J is in W , the transpose, A^T of A is in W , if A is, and the entry-wise products of elements of W are in W . It is well known that each coherent algebra W contains an unique basis of $(0, 1)$ matrices $\{A_0, A_2, \dots, A_{r-1}\}$ such that $A_0 + A_1 + \dots + A_{r-1} = J$ and $A_i^T = A_i$. The use of this standard basis can be used to reformulate the notion of a coherent algebra in terms of relations and their graphs, called *coherent configurations*. And if $A_0 = I$, these are called *association schemes*.

Many significant examples of classes of combinatorial objects may be reformulated in terms of coherent configurations or association schemes, a few being discussed below.

The fact that W is an algebra implies the existence of (non-negative integer) *structure constants* $p_{i,j,k}$ such that $A_i A_j = \sum_{k=1}^r p_{i,j,k} A_k$. If the A_i 's are treated as variables instead of $(0, 1)$ matrices, the algebras are called *table algebras* [1]. While in many cases it is crucially important to keep track of all combinatorial information about a coherent algebra W , many significant feasible conditions are obtained by viewing it merely as a table algebra. In particular, a question about the existence of coherent subalgebras of a given coherent algebra (*fusions*) may be solvable based only on the knowledge of

the structure constants. Classes of table algebras may be defined in terms of parameters and relations among those parameters, which suggests applying Gröbner basis techniques to produce feasibility conditions.

4 Definitions

Start with finite sets \mathcal{V} , of v vertices, and \mathcal{B} , of b blocks. The basic combinatorial structure called a *1-design* is merely a subset \mathcal{D} of $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{B}$ such that $r := \#\{l \in \mathcal{B} : (p, l) \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is independent of $p \in \mathcal{V}$ and $k := \#\{p \in \mathcal{V} : (p, l) \in \mathcal{D}\}$ is independent of $l \in \mathcal{B}$. Elements $(p, l) \in \mathcal{D}$ are called *flags*; and there are $vr = bk$ such.

A 1-design such that any two vertices are incident with *at most one* block and any two blocks are incident with at most one vertex is called a *partial linear space*. (Geometers tend to use the word *point* in place of vertex, the word *line* in place of block, and the parameters $s := k - 1$ and $t := r - 1$ instead of k and r respectively.) Normally the study of vertices is linked to the study of the (symmetric) $(0, 1)$ *adjacency matrix*, A , with

$$A(p_i, p_j) = 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad (p_i, l), (p_j, l) \in \mathcal{D} \quad \text{for some } l \in \mathcal{B}.$$

But here the focus is initially on flags; so let L denote the (symmetric) $(0, 1)$ *collinearity matrix* indexed by the flags, with

$$L((p_1, l_1), (p_2, l_2)) = 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad l_1 = l_2, \quad p_1 \neq p_2;$$

and let N denote the (symmetric) $(0, 1)$ *concurrence matrix* indexed by the flags, with

$$N((p_1, l_1), (p_2, l_2)) = 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad p_1 = p_2, \quad l_1 \neq l_2.$$

These matrices already satisfy the conditions

$$L^2 = (s - 1)L + sI, \quad N^2 = (t - 1)N + tI$$

(with I denoting the $vr \times vr$ identity matrix).

Generalized n -gons were first introduced by Tits [12] in 1959. Standard definitions are in terms of *distance* and *adjacency*, and are geometric in flavor, descriptive of the fact that each point should be contained in an n -gon and in no smaller polygon. In terms of flags and the matrices L and N above this translates into the following matrix-theoretic definition, which obscures the geometric origin. Let

$$\begin{aligned} A_{4i} &:= (NL)^i, & A_{4i+1} &:= L(NL)^i, \\ A_{4i+2} &:= N(LN)^i, & A_{4i+3} &:= (LN)^{i+1}, \end{aligned}$$

denote the various *flag adjacency matrices* (a possibly unexpected benefit of this non-geometric approach). Then \mathcal{D} will be called a *generalized n -gon*

if $(A_j, 0 \leq j \leq 2n-1)$ is a linearly independent set over \mathbf{Z} , and hence a *basis* for the \mathbf{Z} -module it generates; but $A_{2n} = A_{2n-1}$. (It is a straightforward, instructive exercise to see that this really corresponds to the geometric concept above.)

Since $A_0 = I$, $A_{4i+1}^T = A_{4i+1}$, $A_{4i+2}^T = A_{4i+2}$, $A_{4i+3}^T = A_{4i+4}$, and $\sum_{j=0}^{2n-1} A_j = J$, the all 1's matrix; the ordered set $(A_j : 0 \leq j \leq 2n-1)$ is a basis for the \mathbf{Z} -module it generates, lacking only a multiplication to be the *adjacency algebra* of an *association scheme*.

If the two matrices L and N are *not* known, and the parameters t and s are *not* known either, then it is possible to study generalized n -gons by starting with the *coefficient ring* $\mathbf{Z}[t, s]$ (with a *lex* monomial order $t \succ s$), and then a *free (associative) algebra* $\mathbf{Z}[t, s][y, x]$ in two *non-commutative* variables (with a *total degree* monomial order with $y \succ x$). The former means that when writing polynomials in the variables t and s , $t^i s^j$ should be treated as larger than $t^k s^l$ if either $(i > k)$ or $(i = k \text{ and } j > l)$ (and that one shouldn't write $s^j t^i$). The latter means that when writing polynomials in the (non-commuting) variables y and x monomials, a string such as $yxxyx$ should be treated as larger than either xyx or $yxxy$, the first because the total degree is greater, the second because the total degree is the same but at the leftmost difference in the strings $y \succ x$. (One of the first important lessons one learns when working with multivariate polynomial rings is that a proper choice of monomial order is perhaps the most critical step in any problem, and the step most easily ignored completely by those not used to this area.)

Then this should be made into a *finitely-presented algebra* (quotient ring in two non-commuting variables, representing the two non-commuting matrices N and L respectively)

$$\mathbf{Z}[t, s][y, x] / \langle f_1, f_2, f_3 \rangle$$

with $f_1 := x^2 - (s-1)x - s$, $f_2 := y^2 - (t-1)y - t$, and $f_3 := (yx)^l - (xy)^l$ if $n = 2l$ or $f_3 := y(xy)^l - (xy)^l x$ if $n = 2l+1$. The import here is that the *ideal* $I := \langle f_1, f_2, f_3 \rangle$ consists of all those polynomials that are supposed to be equal to zero under the given assumptions. (Such a (table) algebra, depending only on the structure constants and not on some $(0, 1)$ matrices, may exist whether or not a corresponding n -gon does. At this stage it is not even necessary to assume knowledge of classical necessary conditions for the existence of such n -gons.)

5 An Application of SPolynomials and Reduction

Buchberger's algorithm for computing *Gröbner bases* for ideals (such as $\langle f_1, f_2, f_3 \rangle$ above) is based on the central observation above that *bases* (as opposed to *generating sets*) for ideals should be *closed* under the operation of *reduction of SPolynomials*. Consider an example of this type of computation for the n -gon case with $n = 2l+1$. Since $LM(yf_3) = y^2(xy)^l = LM(f_2(xy)^l)$, the corresponding (non-commutative) *SPolynomial* would be

$$SPolynomial(f_3, f_2) := yf_3 - f_2(xy)^l = -y(xy)^lx + (t-1)y(xy)^l + t(xy)^l,$$

which would then be *reduced* to a *remainder*

$$(yf_3 - f_2(xy)^l) + f_3x + (xy)^lf_1 - (t-1)f_3 = (t-s)((xy)^lx + (xy)^l)$$

using the explicit division by the set $\{f_1, f_2, f_3\}$ given.

Thus a single SPolynomial computation, and the use of the assumption that $(xy)^lx$ and $(xy)^l$ are linearly independent, already forces $t-s=0$. So it follows that:

Proposition 1. *Generalized $(2l+1)$ -gons with parameter pairs (t, s) can only exist if $t = s$.*

Remark. Again, this can be viewed as a result about table algebras.

6 Structure Constants of Association Schemes

In light of the proposition above, consider only generalized $2l$ -gons in their finitely-presented algebra form. If a *total degree* monomial order (with $a_i \succ a_j$ for $i > j$) is used, then a *minimal, reduced* Gröbner basis (that is, one with a minimal number of elements, and no leading monomial of one dividing any monomial of another) for the ideal of relations, \mathcal{I} , will have *all* its elements of the form

$$a_i a_j - NormalForm(a_i a_j, \mathcal{I})$$

with

$$NormalForm(a_i a_j, \mathcal{I}) = \sum_{k=0}^{2n-1} p_{i,j,k} a_k,$$

describing the multiplication in the algebra, as well as determining the *structure constants* $p_{i,j,k}$ that make this the *adjacency algebra* of an *association scheme*. (If this is not immediately obvious, see the proof below.)

Thus a simple Gröbner basis computation relative to an appropriate total degree monomial order gives constructively the following result (with concrete examples below):

Proposition 2.

$$\mathbf{Z}[t, s][a_{4l-1}, \dots, a_1] / \mathcal{I}$$

with \mathcal{I} the ideal of relations with generating set containing the basis relations from the definition of a generalized $2l$ -gon:

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &:= a_1^2 - (s-1)a_1 - s, \\ f_2 &:= a_2^2 - (t-1)a_2 - t, \\ f_3 &:= (a_2 a_1)^l - (a_1 a_2)^l; \end{aligned}$$

together with the relations gotten from the definitions of the a_j 's:

$$\begin{aligned} (a_2 a_1)^i - a_{4i}, & \quad a_1 (a_2 a_1)^i - a_{4i+1}, & \quad a_2 (a_1 a_2)^i - a_{4i+2}, \\ (a_1 a_2)^{i+1} - a_{4i+3}, & \quad 0 \leq i < l, \end{aligned}$$

corresponds to the adjacency algebra of an association scheme. (Note that $a_0 = 1$ is implicit in the calculations, and sometimes explicit in the theory.)

Moreover, if a total degree monomial order (with $a_i \succ a_j$ for $i > j$) is used, then a minimal, reduced Gröbner basis for \mathcal{I} will have all its elements of the form

$$a_i a_j - \text{NormalForm}(a_i a_j, \mathcal{I})$$

with

$$\text{NormalForm}(a_i a_j, \mathcal{I}) = \sum_{k=0}^{4l-1} p_{i,j,k} a_k,$$

which corresponds to a complete description of the algebra multiplication and a determination of the structure constants $p_{i,j,k}$.

Proof. Given that the a_i are linearly independent, there can be no relations with leading monomial of degree 1. Given that the a_i 's form an algebra, $a_i a_j$ must be expressible as a linear combination $\sum_k p_{i,j,k} a_k$, since all elements of the algebra are of this form. Hence $a_i a_j - \sum_{k=0}^{4l-1} p_{i,j,k} a_k$ must be basis elements in any total degree monomial order Gröbner basis. And any monomial of total degree greater than 2 is divisible by one of degree 2, so can't be a leading monomial in any *minimal* total degree Gröbner basis. \square

7 Fusion

Now consider a *partition* Π of the set $\{0, \dots, 4l-1\}$, and the corresponding *fusion* of classes (sum of their respective matrices)

$$B_\gamma := \sum \{A_k : k \in \gamma\}, \quad \gamma \in \Pi.$$

This could conceivably determine a *fusion scheme*; that is, be an association scheme with fewer classes than the original, if $\{0\}$ is a part, $\gamma' := \{k' : k \in \gamma, A_k^T = A_{k'}\}$ is a part for each $\gamma \in \Pi$, and the structure constant $P_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} := \sum_{i \in \alpha} \sum_{j \in \beta} p_{i,j,k}$ is independent of the choice of $k \in \gamma$, for all parts α, β , and γ in Π .

This can be viewed as another Gröbner basis problem, but this time in the *multivariate polynomial coefficient ring* $\mathbf{Z}[t, s]$ (with two *commuting* variables t and s , the *integer* parameters). The ideal in question is generated by the relations (forced by the third item above):

$$\sum_{i \in \alpha} \sum_{j \in \beta} p_{i,j,k_1} - \sum_{i \in \alpha} \sum_{j \in \beta} p_{i,j,k_2}$$

for all α, β , and γ in Π and all $k_1, k_2 \in \gamma$, provided Π is a good partition (that is, satisfying the first two items above). (This is a slightly different condition than that of *good sets* in [6].) Then the *variety* of this ideal determines all possible parameter pairs (t, s) for which the good partition Π produces a fusion scheme. Of course, it is necessary to restrict the variety to pairs of *positive integers*, and probably to ignore the *trivial* case $t = 1 = s$ in which the original generalized $2l$ -gon is merely a $2l$ -gon, and fusion corresponds to *Schur rings* over the dihedral group of order $2l$. The varieties involved are computed most easily using a *lexicographical* monomial order on $\mathbf{Z}[t, s]$ and a *factored, minimal, reduced* Gröbner basis.

8 2- $(v, k, 1)$ Designs

Consider a similar problem of *flag adjacency matrices* for $2-(v, k, 1)$ designs (also called Steiner systems $S(2, k, v)$ or just 2-designs); that is, 1-designs for which every 2 vertices determine an unique block. The matrices for this are similar in flavor to those for the generalized n -gons:

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &:= I, & A_1 &:= L, & A_2 &:= N, & A_3 &:= LN, \\ A_4 &:= NL, & A_5 &:= LNL, & A_6 &:= NLN - LNL \end{aligned}$$

with

$$LNLN = sA_6 + (s-1)A_5 + sA_4, \quad NLNL = sA_6 + (s-1)A_5 + sA_3.$$

Since $A_0 = I$, $A_1^T = A_1$, $A_2^T = A_2$, $A_3^T = A_4$, $A_5^T = A_5$, $A_6^T = A_6$, and $\sum_{j=0}^6 A_j = J$, the all 1's matrix; the ordered set $(A_j : 0 \leq j \leq 6)$ is a basis for the \mathbf{Z} -module it generates, lacking only a multiplication to be the *adjacency algebra* of an *association scheme*.

Then this should be made into a *finitely-presented algebra* as before

$$\mathbf{Z}[t, s][y, x] / \langle f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4 \rangle$$

with $f_1 := x^2 - (s-1)x - s$, $f_2 := y^2 - (t-1)y - t$, and $f_3 := (yx)^2 - s(yxy - xyx) - (s-1)xyx - sxy$, $f_4 := (xy)^2 - s(yxy - xyx) - (s-1)xyx - sxy$.

Remark. When $s < t$, $A_6 \neq 0$, so this is a rank 7 association scheme. However, if $s = t$, then $A_6 = 0$ and the $2-(v, k, 1)$ design is a *projective plane* or equivalently a *generalized 3-gon*, covered earlier.

9 Code and Output

There are also technical difficulties to be considered when using existing computer algebra packages. For instance, in MAGMA, the coefficient ring of a

finitely-presented algebra needs to be a field. So it is necessary to use $\mathbf{Q}(t, s)$, the function field in two variables over the rational field \mathbf{Q} , with a total degree monomial order, and then map results to $\mathbf{Q}[t, s]$ with the desired *lex* monomial order, where factorization can be done.

The MAGMA code below has been automated so that the only parameter input necessary is l (meaning $n/2$). The output is a list of partitions giving rise to fusion schemes, together with a factored Gröbner basis from which it is relatively easy to read the corresponding parameter pairs (t, s) , if such positive integer pairs exist.

Although the computations are (for better or worse) no longer visible to the reader, it is instructive to have some idea of what is happening. As an example from the generalized quadrangle case, the partition $\Pi := [[1, 2, 3, 4, 7][5, 6]]$ could only give a fusion scheme if $ts^2 - 2ts$, $t^2 - 2t - s^2 + 2s$, $t^2s - ts^2$, and $t^2 - ts^2 + 3ts - 4t + s^2 - 4s + 4$ (gotten from the fusion condition 3 above) are all zero. An *interreduction* of these generators already gives a Gröbner basis $(t^2 - 2t, ts - 2t, s^2 - 2s)$ for the ideal they generate. And a recursive calculation of s and t gives $s = 0, t = 0$, $s = 2, t = 0$, or $s = 2, t = 2$. Of these 3 rational points in the variety, clearly only $(t, s) = (2, 2)$ is useful in this fusion context. (Currently the code actually produces a modified Gröbner basis $(t - 2, s - 2)$ by removing factors such as t and s which can't ever lead to positive integer solutions.) There are examples for which the solutions must be done by hand. For instance, in partition 48 in the hexagon output below, one factor is $T^2 - TS + 2T + 1$ which gives a one dimensional variety $s = (t + 1)^2/t$ over the rationals, but only the single positive integer solution $s = 4, t = 1$.

The code is written to search for a good partition, compute differences of coefficients that should be equal for fusion to occur, find a Gröbner basis for ideal of all such differences, and output same, at least in the cases in which there might conceivably be an element in the variety with all coordinates positive. In most cases, it is relatively easy to read off any parameter pairs with both entries positive integers, and to ignore those with only the trivial solution $t = 1 = s$.

Note that the code produces a Gröbner basis describing the original adjacency algebra before tackling the fusion problem (an expected benefit); so it is possible to see the structure constants, not in a table or even in the form $a_i a_j = \sum_k p_{i,j,k} a_k$, but in the form $a_i a_j - \sum_k p_{i,j,k} a_k$.

10 Concluding Remarks

There are further computations available at the author's home page: <http://www.dms.auburn.edu/~leonada>. Interpretation of the results obtained is of independent interest. Such interpretation for 4-gons and Steiner designs is contained in [6]. But as a striking example of the significance of this interpretation step, note that 3-gons with $s = t = 4$, [4] correspond to a sporadic

strongly regular graph with $v = 105$, $k = 32$, $\lambda = 4$, $\mu = 12$. This graph is a subgraph of the famous sporadic McLaughlin graph on 275 vertices.

Note also that even though a scheme itself may not exist, some fusion of the table algebra may have a combinatorial interpretation.

Acknowledgments

It is important to recognize RICAM (Austrian Academy of Sciences), RISC (Johannes Kepler University), and Bruno Buchberger personally for the opportunities provided by the D1 Workshop during the Special Semester on Gröbner bases at Linz, Austria in May, 2006, without which this paper would not have been written. The desirability of such a tutorial paper on the use of Gröbner bases in algebraic combinatorics was suggested by Mikhail Klin, who is also responsible for the underlying topics and much of the historical combinatorial context as well.

Appendix A

```
//common code to search for fusion
R<T,S>:=PolynomialRing(Q,2);
co:=function(f,mon) return MonomialCoefficient(f,mon);
end function;
fusion:=function(J) return &+[A.(N+1-j): j in J];
end function;
prod:=function(I,J) return NormalForm(fusion(I)*fusion(J),ID);
end function;
relations:=function(I,J,K)
  W:=prod(I,J);
  return [(co(W,A.(N+1-K[1]))-co(W,A.(N+1-k)))
    @hom<FF->R|T,S>: k in K];
end function;
RELATIONS:=function(part)
  rel:=[];
  for i in [1..#part] do for j in [1..#part]
  do for k in [1..#part] do
    rel:=rel cat relations(part[i],part[j],part[k]);
  end for; end for; end for;
  return rel;
end function;
max:=function(PV,j)
  if j gt 1 then
    return Maximum({PV[i]: i in [1..j-1]});
  else
    return -1;
  end if;
end function;
```

```

end function;
partno:=0; goodpartno:=0; vector:=[1:i in [1..N]]; v1:=N;
while v1 gt 1 do
  Bound:=max(vector,N+1);
  B:=[[: i in [1..Bound]]];
  for i in [1..N] do Append(~B[vector[i]],i); end for;
  symmetric:=true;
  for i in [1..Bound] do
    if #{vector[AT[j]]: j in B[i]} ne 1
      then symmetric:=false; break; end if;
  end for;
  if symmetric then
    partno+=1;
    id:=ideal<R|RELATIONS(B)>;
    gb:=GroebnerBasis(id);
    pos_sol:=true;
    if #gb ne 0 then
      for i in [1..#gb] do
        m:=Minimum(Coefficients(gb[i]));
        if m gt 0 then pos_sol:=false; break; end if;
      end for;
    end if;
    if pos_sol then
      goodpartno+=1;
      partno, "partition" cat IntegerToString(goodpartno)
      cat "=",B;
      if #gb ne 0 then
        for i in [1..#gb] do Factorization(gb[i]);
        end for;
      end if;
    end if;
  end if;
  v2:=v1;
  bound:=1+max(vector,v1);
  if vector[v1] ge bound then
    while vector[v1] ge bound and v1 gt 1 do
      vector[v1]:=1;
      v1-=1;
      v2:=N;
      if v1 gt 1 then bound:=1+max(vector,v1); end if;
    end while;
    if v1 gt 1 then
      vector[v1]+=1;
      v1:=v2;
    end if;
  end if;
end if;

```

```

else
    if v1 gt 1 then
        vector[v1]+:=1;
    end if;
end if;
end while;
//preamble code for generalized n-gons
l:=2;//the only parameter that needs to be changed from
//one run to the next n-gons for n=2l, as rank N+1
//association schemes of flags
N:=4*l-1;
AT:=[i : i in [1..N]];
for i in [1..l-1] do AT[4*i]:=4*i-1; AT[4*i-1]:=4*i; end for;
Q:=RationalField();
FF<t,s>:=FunctionField(Q,2);
A:=FreeAlgebra(FF,N);
AssignNames(~A,["a" cat IntegerToString(N+1-i): i in [1..N]]);
a1:=A.N;a2:=A.(N-1);
rel1:=a1^2-s-(s-1)*a1;
rel2:=a2^2-t-(t-1)*a2;
rel3:=(a2*a1)^l-(a1*a2)^l;
def1:=[(a1*a2)^i-A.(N-4*i+2): i in [1..l]];
def2:=[(a2*a1)^i-A.(N-4*i+1): i in [1..l-1]];
def3:=[a1*(a2*a1)^i-A.(N-4*i): i in [1..l-1]];
def4:=[a2*(a1*a2)^i-A.(N-4*i-1): i in [1..l-1]];
ID:=ideal<A|rel1,rel2,rel3,def1,def2,def3,def4>;
G:=GroebnerBasis(ID);G;#G;
//Gr"obner basis for the association scheme of a generalized
//quadrangle
a7^2 -(t^2s^2-t^2s+t^2-ts^2-t+s^2-s+1)*a7
      -(t^2s^2-t^2s-ts^2+ts+s^2-s)*a6
      -(t^2s^2-t^2s+t^2-ts^2+ts-t)*a5-(t^2s^2-t^2s-ts^2+ts)*a4
      -(t^2s^2-t^2s-ts^2+ts)*a3-(t^2s^2-ts^2)*a2
      -(t^2s^2-t^2s)*a1-(t^2s^2)*a0,
a7*a6-(t^2s-t^2-ts+t+s-1)*a7-(t^2s-2ts+s)*a6
      -(t^2s-t^2-ts+t)*a5-(t^2s-ts)*a4
      -(t^2s-ts)*a3-(t^2s)*a1,
a7*a5-(ts^2-ts+t-s^2+s-1)*a7-(ts^2-ts-s^2+s)*a6
      -(ts^2-2ts+t)*a5-(ts^2-ts)*a4
      -(ts^2-ts)*a3-(ts^2)*a2,
a7*a4-(ts-t-s+1)*a7-(ts-s)*a6-(ts-t)*a5-(ts)*a3,
a7*a3-(ts-t-s+1)*a7-(ts-s)*a6-(ts-t)*a5-(ts)*a4,
a7*a2-(t-1)*a7-(t)*a5,
a7*a1-(s-1)*a7-(s)*a6,
a6*a7-(t^2s-t^2-ts+t+s-1)*a7-(t^2s-2ts+s)*a6

```

$$\begin{aligned}
& -(t^2s-t^2-ts+t)*a5 \\
& -(t^2s-ts)*a4-(t^2s-ts)*a3-(t^2s)*a1, \\
a6^2 & -(t^2-2t+1)*a7-(ts-t)*a6-(t^2-t)*a5-(t^2s-ts)*a2 \\
& -(t^2s)*a0, \\
& a6*a5-(ts-t-s+1)*a7-(ts-s)*a6-(ts-t)*a5-(ts)*a3, \\
& a6*a4-(t-1)*a7-(ts-t)*a4-(ts)*a2, \\
& a6*a3-(t-1)*a7-(t)*a5, \\
& a6*a2-(t-1)*a6-(t)*a4, \\
& a6*a1-(1)*a7, \\
& a5*a7-(ts^2-ts+t-s^2+s-1)*a7-(ts^2-ts-s^2+s)*a6 \\
& -(ts^2-2ts+t)*a5-(ts^2-ts)*a4-(ts^2-ts)*a3-(ts^2)*a2, \\
& a5*a6-(ts-t-s+1)*a7-(ts-s)*a6-(ts-t)*a5-(ts)*a4, \\
a5^2 & -(s^2-2s+1)*a7-(s^2-s)*a6-(ts-s)*a5-(ts^2-ts)*a1-(ts^2), \\
& a5*a4-(s-1)*a7-(s)*a6, \\
& a5*a3-(s-1)*a7-(ts-s)*a3-(ts)*a1, \\
& a5*a2-(1)*a7, \\
& a5*a1-(s-1)*a5-(s)*a3, \\
& a4*a7-(ts-t-s+1)*a7-(ts-s)*a6-(ts-t)*a5-(ts)*a3, \\
& a4*a6-(t-1)*a7-(t)*a5, \\
& a4*a5-(s-1)*a7-(ts-s)*a4-(ts)*a1, \\
a4^2 & -(1)*a7, \\
& a4*a3-(s-1)*a6-(ts-s)*a2-(ts)*a0, \\
& a4*a2-(1)*a6, \\
& a4*a1-(s-1)*a4-(s)*a2, \\
& a3*a7-(ts-t-s+1)*a7-(ts-s)*a6-(ts-t)*a5-(ts)*a4, \\
& a3*a6-(t-1)*a7-(ts-t)*a3-(ts)*a2, \\
& a3*a5-(s-1)*a7-(s)*a6, \\
& a3*a4-(t-1)*a5-(ts-t)*a1-(ts)*a0, \\
a3^2 & -(1)*a7, \\
& a3*a2-(t-1)*a3-(t)*a1, \\
& a3*a1-(1)*a5, \\
& a2*a7-(t-1)*a7-(t)*a5, \\
& a2*a6-(t-1)*a6-(t)*a3, \\
& a2*a5-(1)*a7, \\
& a2*a4-(t-1)*a4-(t)*a1, \\
& a2*a3-(1)*a6, \\
a2^2 & -(t-1)*a2-(t)*a0, \\
& a2*a1-(1)*a4, \\
& a1*a7-(s-1)*a7-(s)*a6, \\
& a1*a6-(1)*a7, \\
& a1*a5-(s-1)*a5-(s)*a4, \\
& a1*a4-(1)*a5, \\
& a1*a3-(s-1)*a3-(s)*a2, \\
& a1*a2-(1)*a3, \\
a1^2 & -(s-1)*a1-(s)*a0
\end{aligned}$$

```

//edited fusion partitions for generalized 4-gons,
//eliminating those with only  $t=1=s$ 
//with the Gröbner basis for each to describe those pairs
//(t,s) for which fusion occurs
partition1=[[1,2,3,4,5,6,7]]
[]
partition3=[[1,2,3,4,5,7],[6]]
[T-1]
partition4=[[1,2,3,4,6,7],[5]]
[S-1]
partition5=[[1,2,3,4,7],[5,6]]
[T-2,S-2]
partition10=[[1,2,7],[3,4],[5,6]]
[T-2,S-2]
partition11=[[1,2],[3,4],[5,6],[7]]
[T-S]
partition13=[[1,3,4,5,6,7],[2]]
[]
partition14=[[1,3,4,6],[2,5,7]]
[S-1]
partition15=[[1,3,4,6],[2,5],[7]]
[S-1]
partition17=[[1,3,4,6],[2,7],[5]]
[S-1]
partition18=[[1,3,4,6],[2],[5,7]]
[]
partition19=[[1,3,4,6],[2],[5],[7]]
[S-1]
partition20=[[1,6,7],[2,3,4,5]]
[T-1]
partition21=[[1,6],[2,3,4,5],[7]]
[T-1]
partition22=[[1],[2,3,4,5,6,7]]
[]
partition23=[[1,7],[2,3,4,5],[6]]
[T-1]
partition24=[[1],[2,3,4,5],[6,7]]
[]
partition25=[[1],[2,3,4,5],[6],[7]]
[T-1]
partition27=[[1,5,6],[2],[3,4,7]]
[T-1,S2-4*S+3]=[T-1,(S-3)(S-1)]
partition29=[[1,6,7],[2,5],[3,4]]
[T-1,S-3]
partition30=[[1,6],[2,5,7],[3,4]]

```

```

[T-3,S-1]
partition32=[[1],[2,5,6],[3,4,7]]
[T^2-4*T+3,S-1]=[(T-3)(T-1),S-1]
partition33=[[1],[2,5,7],[3,4,6]]
[S-1]
partition34=[[1],[2,5],[3,4],[6],[7]]
[S-1]
partition35=[[1,6,7],[2],[3,4,5]]
[T-1]
partition36=[[1,6],[2],[3,4],[5],[7]]
[T-1]
partition38=[[1],[2],[3],[4],[5],[6],[7]]
[]

//edited fusion partitions for generalized 6-gons,
//eliminating those with only t=1=s
//with the Gr\"obner basis for each to describe those pairs
//(t,s) for which fusion occurs
partition1=[[1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11]]
[]
partition7=[[1,2,3,4,5,7,8,9,10,11],[6]]
[T-1]
partition8=[[1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,11],[5]]
[S-1]
partition26=[[1,2],[3,4],[5,6],[7,8],[9,10],[11]]
[T-S]
partition30=[[1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11],[2]]
[]
partition34=[[1,3,4,5,6,7,8,10],[2],[9,11]]
[T-S]
partition37=[[1,3,4,6,9,11],[2,5,7,8,10]]
[S-1]
partition41=[[1,3,4,6,9,11],[2,5,10],[7,8]]
[T^2-5*T+4,S-1]=[(T-1)(T-4),S-1]
partition42=[[1,3,4,6,9,11],[2,5],[7,8],[10]]
[S-1]
partition45=[[1,3,4,6,9,11],[2,7,8,10],[5]]
[S-1]
partition46=[[1,3,4,6,9,11],[2,7,8],[5,10]]
[T-2,S-1]
partition47=[[1,3,4,6,9,11],[2,10],[5,7,8]]
[T-2,S-1]
partition48=[[1,3,4,6,9,11],[2],[5,7,8,10]]
[T^2*S-T^2-T*S^2+3*T*S-2*T+S-1]=[(S-1)(T^2-TS+2T+1)] so S=1
or (T=1,S=4)

```



```

partition49=[[1,3,4,6],[2],[5,7,8,10],[9,11]]
[]
partition54=[[1,3,4,6,9,11],[2],[5],[7],[8],[10]]
[S-1]
partition55=[[1,3,4,9],[2,7,8,10],[5],[6,11]]
[S-1]
partition58=[[1,6,7,8,9],[2,3,4,5,10,11]]
[T-1]
partition62=[[1,6,9],[2,3,4,5,10,11],[7,8]]
[T-1,S^2-5*S+4]=[T-1,(S-4)(S-1)]
partition63=[[1,6],[2,3,4,5,10,11],[7,8],[9]]
[T-1]
partition67=[[1],[2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11]]
[]
partition69=[ [1],[2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9],[10,11]]
[T-S]
partition72=[[1,7,8,9],[2,3,4,5,10,11],[6]]
[T-1]
partition73=[[1,7,8],[2,3,4,5,10,11],[6,9]]
[T-1,S-2]
partition74=[[1,9],[2,3,4,5,10,11],[6,7,8]]
[T-1,S-2]
partition75=[[1],[2,3,4,5,10,11],[6,7,8,9]]
[T^2*S-T*S^2-3*T*S-T+S^2+2*S+1]=[(T-1)(TS-S^2-2S-1)] so T=1
or (S=1,T=4)
partition76=[[1],[2,3,4,5],[6,7,8,9],[10,11]]
[]
partition81=[[1],[2,3,4,5,10,11],[6],[7],[8],[9]]
[T-1]
partition83=[[1,7,8,9],[2,3,4,10],[5,11],[6]]
[T-1]
partition100=[[1],[2,5,7,8,10],[3,4,6,9,11]]
[S-1]
partition105=[[1],[2,5,10],[3,4,11],[6,9],[7,8]]
[T^2-5*T+4,S-1]=[(T-4)(T-1),S-1]
partition106=[[1],[2,5],[3,4],[6,9],[7,8],[10],[11]]
[S-1]
partition108=[[1,6,7,8,9],[2],[3,4,5,10,11]]
[T-1]
partition113=[[1,6,9],[2],[3,4,11],[5,10],[7,8]]
[T-1,S^2-5*S+4]=[T-1,(S-4)(S-1)]
partition114=[[1,6],[2],[3,4],[5,10],[7,8],[9],[11]]
[T-1]
partition124=[[1],[2],[3],[4],[5],[6],[7],[8],[9],[10],[11]]
[]

```

```

//edited fusion partitions for generalized 6-gons,
//eliminating those with only t=1=s
//with the Gr\"obner basis for each to describe those pairs
//(t,s) for which fusion occurs
partition1=[[1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15]]
[]
partition10=[[1,2,3,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15],[6]]
[T-1]
partition16=[[1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15],[5]]
[S-1]
partition40=[[1,2],[3,4],[5,6],[7,8],[9,10],[11,12],[13,14],
[15]]
[T-S]
partition49=[[1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15],[2]]
[]
partition53=[[1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,14],[2],[13,15]]
[T-S]
partition55=[[1,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,13,15],[2],[9,11,12,14]]
[T-1,S-2]
partition56=[[1,3,4,6,9,11,12,14],[2,5,7,8,10,13,15]]
[S-1]
partition61=[[1,3,4,6,9,11,12,14],[2,5,7,8,15],[10,13]]
[T-2,S-1]
partition67=[[1,3,4,6,9,11,12,14],[2,5,15],[7,8],[10,13]]
[T-2,S-1]
partition68=[[1,3,4,6,9,11,12,14],[2,5],[7,8],[10,13],
[15]]
[S-1]
partition73=[[1,3,4,6,9,11,12,14],[2,7,8,10,13,15],[5]]
[S-1]
partition78=[[1,3,4,6,9,11,12,14],[2,7,8,13],[5],[10,15]]
[S-1]
partition82=[[1,3,4,6,9,11,12,14],[2],[5,7,8,10,13,15]]
[S-1]
partition84=[[1,3,4,6,9,11,12,14],[2],[5,7,8,10],[13,15]]
[S-1]
partition87=[[1,3,4,6,13,15],[2],[5,7,8,10],[9,11,12,14]]
[T-1,S-2]
partition88=[[1,3,4,6],[2],[5,7,8,10],[9,11,12,14],[13,15]]
[]
partition100=[[1,3,4,6,9,11,12,14],[2],[5],[7],[8],[10],[13],[15]]
[S-1]
partition101=[[1,3,4,9],[2,7,8,13],[5],[6,11,12,14],[10,15]]
[S-1]
partition104=[[1,6,7,8,9,14,15],[2,3,4,5,10,11,12,13]]

```

```

[T-1]
partition110=[[1,6,7,8,15],[2,3,4,5,10,11,12,13],[9,14]]
[T-1,S-2]
partition115=[[1,6,15],[2,3,4,5,10,11,12,13],[7,8],[9,14]]
[T-1,S-2]
partition116=[[1,6],[2,3,4,5,10,11,12,13],[7,8],[9,14],
[15]]
[T-1]
partition120=[[1],[2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15]]
[]
partition122=[[1],[2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13],[14,15]]
[T-S]
partition124=[[1],[2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,14,15],[10,11,12,13]]
[T-2,S-1]
partition125=[[1,7,8,9,14,15],[2,3,4,5,10,11,12,13],[6]]
[T-1]
partition130=[[1,7,8,14],[2,3,4,5,10,11,12,13],[6],[9,15]]
[T-1]
partition134=[[1],[2,3,4,5,10,11,12,13],[6,7,8,9,14,15]]
[T-1]
partition136=[[1],[2,3,4,5,10,11,12,13],[6,7,8,9],[14,15]]
[T-1]
partition138=[[1],[2,3,4,5,14,15],[6,7,8,9],[10,11,12,13]]
[T-2,S-1]
partition139=[[1],[2,3,4,5],[6,7,8,9],[10,11,12,13],[14,15]]
[]
partition152=[[1],[2,3,4,5,10,11,12,13],[6],[7],[8],[9],
[14],[15]]
[T-1]
partition156=[[1,7,8,14],[2,3,4,10],[5,11,12,13],[6],[9,15]]
[T-1]
partition183=[[1],[2,5,7,8,10,13,15],[3,4,6,9,11,12,14]]
[S-1]
partition185=[[1],[2,5,7,8,15],[3,4,6,9,14],[10,13],[11,12]]
[T-2,S-1]
partition197=[[1],[2,5,15],[3,4,14],[6,9],[7,8],[10,13],
[11,12]]
[T-2,S-1]
partition198=[[1],[2,5],[3,4],[6,9],[7,8],[10,13],[11,12],
[14],[15]]
[S-1]
partition203=[[1,6,7,8,9,14,15],[2],[3,4,5,10,11,12,13]]
[T-1]
partition205=[[1,6,7,8,15],[2],[3,4,5,10,13],[9,14],[11,12]]
[T-1,S-2]

```

```

partition221=[[1,6,15],[2],[3,4,13],[5,10],[7,8],[9,14],
[11,12]]
[T-1,S-2]
partition222=[[1,6],[2],[3,4],[5,10],[7,8],[9,14],[11,12],
[13],[15]]
[T-1]
partition259=[[1],[2],[3],[4],[5],[6],[7],[8],[9],[10],[11],
[12],[13],[14],[15]]
[]

//preamble code for 2-(v,k,1) designs
N:=6;
AT:= [1,2,4,3,5,6];
Q:=RationalField();
FF<t,s>:=FunctionField(Q,2);
A:=FreeAlgebra(FF,N);
AssignNames(~A,["a" cat IntegerToString(N+1-i): i in
[1..N]]);
a1:=A.6;
a2:=A.5;
a3:=A.4;
a4:=A.3;
a5:=A.2;
a6:=A.1;
rel1:=a1^2-s-(s-1)*a1;rel1;
rel2:=a2^2-t-(t-1)*a2;rel2;
rel3:=(a2*a1)^2-s*a6-(s-1)*a5-s*a3;rel3;
rel4:=(a1*a2)^2-s*a6-(s-1)*a5-s*a4;rel4;
def1:=a1*a2-A.4;def1;
def2:=a2*a1-A.3;def2;
def3:=a1*a2*a1-A.2;def3;
def4:=(a2*a1*a2)-(a1*a2*a1)-A.1;def4;
ID:=ideal<A|rel1,rel2,rel3,rel4,def1,def2,def3,def4>;
G:=GroebnerBasis(ID);G;#G;
//Gr\"obner basis for the association scheme of a 2-(v,k,1)
//design with parameters (t,s)
a6^2 -(t^2s-2ts^2-2ts-t+s^3+3s^2+2s)*a6
      -(t^2s-2ts^2-ts+s^3+s^2)*a5-(t^2s-2ts^2-ts+s^3+s^2)*a4
      -(t^2s-2ts^2-ts+s^3+s^2)*a3-(t^2s-2ts^2-ts+s^3+s^2)*a2
      -(t^2s-ts^2)*a1-(t^2s-ts^2)*a0,
a6*a5-(ts^2-s^3-s^2)*a6-(ts^2-ts-s^3+s^2)*a5
      -(ts^2-ts-s^3+s^2)*a4
      -(ts^2-s^3)*a3-(ts^2-s^3)*a2,
a6*a4-(ts-s^2-s)*a6-(ts-t-s^2+s)*a5-(ts-t-s^2+s)*a4
      -(ts-s^2)*a3-(ts-s^2)*a2,

```

```

a6*a3-(ts-s^2-s)*a6-(ts-s^2)*a5-(ts-s^2)*a4,
a6*a2-(t-s-1)*a6-(t-s)*a5-(t-s)*a4,
a6*a1-(s)*a6,
a5*a6-(ts^2-s^3-s^2)*a6-(ts^2-ts-s^3+s^2)*a5-(ts^2-s^3)*a4
    -(ts^2-ts-s^3+s^2)*a3
    -(ts^2-s^3)*a2,
a5^2 -(s^3-s^2)*a6-(ts+s^3-3s^2+2s-1)*a5-(s^3-2s^2+s)*a4
    -(s^3-2s^2+s)*a3
    -(s^3-s^2)*a2-(ts^2-ts)*a1-(ts^2)*a0,
a5*a4-(s^2)*a6-(s^2-2s+1)*a5-(s^2-s)*a4-(s^2-s)*a3-(s^2)*a2,
a5*a3-(s^2-s)*a6-(s^2-2s+1)*a5-(s^2-s)*a4-(ts-s)*a3-(ts)*a1,
a5*a2-(s)*a6-(s-1)*a5-(s)*a4,
a5*a1-(s-1)*a5-(s)*a3,
a4*a6-(ts-s^2-s)*a6-(ts-s^2)*a5-(ts-s^2)*a3,
a4*a5-(s^2-s)*a6-(s^2-2s+1)*a5-(ts-s)*a4-(s^2-s)*a3-(ts)*a1,
a4^2 -(s)*a6-(s-1)*a5-(s)*a3,
a4*a3-(s-1)*a6-(s-1)*a5-(ts-s)*a2-(ts)*a0,
a4*a2-(1)*a6-(1)*a5,
a4*a1-(s-1)*a4-(s)*a2,
a3*a6-(ts-s^2-s)*a6-(ts-t-s^2+s)*a5-(ts-s^2)*a4-(ts-t-s^2+s)
    *a3-(ts-s^2)*a2,
a3*a5-(s^2)*a6-(s^2-2s+1)*a5-(s^2-s)*a4-(s^2-s)*a3-(s^2)*a2,
a3*a4-(t-1)*a5-(ts-t)*a1-(ts)*a0,
a3^2 -(s)*a6-(s-1)*a5-(s)*a4,
a3*a2-(t-1)*a3-(t)*a1,
a3*a1-(1)*a5,
a2*a6-(t-s-1)*a6-(t-s)*a5-(t-s)*a3,
a2*a5-(s)*a6-(s-1)*a5-(s)*a3,
a2*a4-(t-1)*a4-(t)*a1,
a2*a3-(1)*a6-(1)*a5,
a2^2 -(t-1)*a2-(t)*a0,
a2*a1-(1)*a4,
a1*a6-(s)*a6,
a1*a5-(s-1)*a5-(s)*a4,
a1*a4-(1)*a5,
a1*a3-(s-1)*a3-(s)*a2,
a1*a2-(1)*a3,
a1^2 -(s-1)*a1-(s)*a0
//fusion partitions for 2-(v,k,1) designs (with t>s),
//except for those partitions with only t=1=s
partition1=[[1,2,3,4,5,6]]
[]
%partition2=[[1,2,3,4,5],[6]]
%[T-S]
partition3=[[1,2,3,4,6],[5]]

```

```

[S-1]
%partition4=[[1,2,3,4],[5,6]]
%[T-1]
%partition6=[[1,2,5],[3,4],[6]]
%[T-S,S^2-5*S+4]=[T-1,(S-4)(S-1)]
%partition7=[[1,2],[3,4],[5],[6]]
%[T-S]
partition9=[[1,3,4,5,6],[2]]
[]
%partition11=[[1,3,4,5],[2],[6]]
%[T-S]
%partition12=[[1,3,4],[2,5],[6]]
%[T-2,S-2]
partition13=[[1,5],[2,3,4,6]]
[S-2]
%partition14=[[1,5],[2,3,4],[6]]
%[T-2,S-2]
partition15=[[1,6],[2,3,4,5]]
[T-S-1]
partition16=[[1],[2,3,4,5,6]]
[]
partition17=[[1],[2,3,4,5],[6]]
[]
partition18=[[1,6],[2,3,4],[5]]
[T-2,S-1]
partition20=[[1,6],[2,5],[3,4]]
[T-4,S-3]
partition21=[[1],[2,5],[3,4],[6]]
[S-1]
partition22=[[1,6],[2],[3,4,5]]
[T-S-1]
partition23=[[1],[2],[3],[4],[5],[6]]
[]

```

References

1. Z. Arad and M. E. Muzychuk (eds.) *Standard Integral Table Algebras Generated by a Non-real Element of Small Degree*. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 1773, Springer, Berlin, 2002.
2. B. Buchberger, Gröbner bases, an algorithmic method in polynomial ideal theory, in N. K. Bose (ed.) *Multidimensional System Theory*, pp. 184–232, Reidel, Dordrecht, 1985.

3. D. Cox, J. Little, and D. O'Shea, *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms, An Introduction to Computational Algebraic Geometry and Commutative Algebra*, 3rd edn. Springer, Berlin, 2007.
4. I. A. Faradžev, M. H. Klin, and M. E. Muzichuk, Cellular rings and groups of automorphisms of graphs, in *Investigations in Algebraic Theory of Combinatorial Objects*. Math. Appl. (Soviet Ser.), Vol. 84, pp. 1–152, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1994.
5. R. Kilmoyer and L. Solomon, On the theorem of Feit–Higman, *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, **15** (1973), 310–322.
6. M. Klin, C. Pech, and P.-H. Zieschang, Flag Algebras of Block Designs, I. Initial Notions. Steiner 2-designs and Generalized Quadrangles, *Math-AL-10-1998*, Technische Universität, Dresden, November 1998
7. R. A. Liebler, Tactical configurations and their generic ring, *Eur. J. Comb.*, **9** (1988), 581–592.
8. The MAGMA computational algebra system for algebra, number theory and geometry, The University of Sydney Computational Algebra Group, <http://magma.maths.usyd.edu.au/magma>.
9. E. Martinez-Moro, Computations on character tables of association schemes, in *Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing*, CASC'99, Munich, pp. 293–307, Springer, Berlin, 1999.
10. U. Ott, Some remarks on representation theory in finite geometries, in *Geometries and Groups*. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 893, pp. 68–110, Springer, Berlin, 1981.
11. K. W. Smith, Flag algebras of a symmetric design, *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, **48** (1988), 209–228.
12. J. Tits, Sur la trialité et certains groupes qui s'en déduisent, *Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math.*, **2** (1959), 14–60.
13. P. -H. Zieschang, On dihedral configurations and their Coxeter geometries, *Eur. J. Comb.*, **18** (1997), 341–354.

Algorithmic Algebraic Combinatorics and Gröbner Bases

Klin, M.; Jones, G.A.; Jurisic, A.; Muzychuk, M.;

Ponomarenko, I. (Eds.)

2009, XII, 311 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-642-01959-3