

Grid designs

Alon Danai, Joshua Kou, Andy Latto, Haran Mouli, and James Propp

January 5, 2026

Abstract: We define a *grid graph* as a Cartesian product of path-graphs P_n or cycle-graphs C_n , and define a *grid design* as a G -design where the graph G is a grid graph, that is, a decomposition of a complete graph into edge-disjoint subgraphs isomorphic to G . We show that when n is an odd prime or the square of an odd prime, the toroidal grid-graph $G = C_n \square C_n$ admits a G -design. In the less symmetrical case of products of path-graphs, we prove that $G = P_3 \square P_3$ does not admit a G -design but that $G = P_4 \square P_4$ does. This last result is the special case that motivated the present paper: a $P_4 \square P_4$ -design corresponds to a way of successively scrambling a Connections puzzle so that each pair of words occurs adjacently exactly once. Our constructions use the arithmetic of finite fields.

1 Introduction

A G -design is a decomposition of a complete graph into edge-disjoint subgraphs isomorphic to G . Let C_n denote the cycle graph on n vertices $0, \dots, n-1$ and P_n denote the path graph on n vertices $1, \dots, n$. The problem of constructing a C_n -design when n is odd goes back to the *problème de ronde* proposed by Lucas and solved by Walecki, [2] and Walecki’s construction essentially solves the closely related problem of constructing a P_n -design when n is even. In contrast, we are not aware of work on G -designs when G is of the form $C_n \square C_n$ or $P_n \square P_n$. Here as usual $G \square G'$ denotes the Cartesian product of the graphs $G = (V, E)$ and $G' = (V', E')$ whose vertices are of the form (v, v') with $v \in V$ and $v' \in V'$ and whose edges are of the form $\{(v, v'), (w, w')\}$ either with $\{v, w\} \in E$ and $v' = w'$ or with $v = w$ and $\{v', w'\} \in E'$.

As a motivating example, consider the sample Connections puzzle (too easy to be typical of the genre but illustrative of the core idea) shown in Figure 1. Solving the puzzle involves noticing that the sixteen words can be partitioned into four groups, each of which comes from a different English proverb indicating things you shouldn’t do: BITE the HAND that FEEDS YOU, LOOK a GIFT HORSE in the MOUTH, CUT off your NOSE to SPITE your FACE, or CRY OVER SPILT MILK. In this instance, the four foursomes are related by a meta-theme (“things you shouldn’t do”); in actual Connections puzzles, that usually isn’t the case.

Note that the grid contains the similar words “bite” and “cut” next to each other, suggesting membership in a foursome of actions that divide an objects into pieces. Likewise the proximity of “mouth”, “nose”, and “hand” suggests shared membership in a foursome of

OVER	MOUTH	HAND	NOSE
HORSE	SPITE	MILK	BITE
FEEDS	CRY	GIFT	CUT
LOOK	FACE	YOU	SPILT

Figure 1: A sample Connections puzzle.

body parts. These are false leads. In the on-line version of the puzzle, there's a button that allows you to scramble the words to make the false leads less salient and to bring out the true patterns, or at least to make it possible for your brain to find new connections between words. The computer code that scrambles the words uses a pseudorandom number generator to scramble the sixteen words uniformly; for instance, there is a 1 out of $16!$ chance that pressing the Scramble button will have no effect at all.

Empirically one finds that it takes between 20 and 30 scramblings for all the possible adjacencies between the 16 words to appear. That is, if one scrambles only 20 times, it is nearly certain that some pair of words will not have occurred adjacently, whereas if one scrambles 30 times, it is nearly certain that every pair of words will have occurred adjacently at least once.

Since each 4-by-4 grid (the original grid and the successive scrambled versions) has 24 adjacent pairs, and since $\binom{16}{2}$ is exactly five times 24, one might hope that if one is extremely lucky, it might happen that after a mere four scramblings each of the possible pairs of words will have occurred adjacently exactly once. The question is, can this actually happen? We will show that the answer is YES; that is, K_{16} can be partitioned into five copies of $P_4 \square P_4$. Our proof makes use of the finite field with 16 elements, though the first construction of such a partition was not constructed algebraically but was found by Ed Kirkby using computer search. [3]

Likewise, since a 3-by-3 grid graph has 12 adjacent pairs of cells, and since $\binom{9}{2}$ is exactly three times 12, one might hope that if the words in a 3-by-3 grid are scrambled and then scrambled again in just the right way, each of the possible pairs of words will occur adjacently exactly once. Can this actually happen? A combinatorial argument shows that in this case the answer is NO; that is, K_9 cannot be partitioned into three copies of $P_3 \square P_3$.

More generally, whenever n is congruent to 0 or 3 mod 4, so that $\binom{n^2}{2}$ is a multiple of $2n(n-1)$, one may ask, for each such n , whether K_{n^2} can be partitioned into copies of $P_n \square P_n$. We have not made much of a dent in this problem, but we have had made some progress with a more symmetrical version of the problem in which $P_n \square P_n$ is replaced by $C_n \square C_n$. Since $\binom{n^2}{2}$ is a multiple of $2n^2$ whenever n is congruent to 1 or 3 mod 4, one may ask, for each such n , whether K_{n^2} can be partitioned into copies of $C_n \square C_n$; we will show

that this is indeed the case whenever n is an odd prime raised to the first or second power.

This Note is organized as follows. In Section 2, we use finite field methods to show that when p is an odd prime, K_{p^2} can be partitioned into $(p^2 - 1)/4$ copies of $C_p \square C_p$ (Theorem 1), and that K_{p^4} can be partitioned into $(p^2 - 1)/4$ copies of $C_{p^2} \square C_{p^2}$ (Theorem 2). In Section 3, we show that K_9 cannot be partitioned into 3 copies of $P_3 \square P_3$ (Theorem 3) and by modifying the method of Section 2 we show that K_{16} can be partitioned into 5 copies of $P_4 \square P_4$ (Theorem 4). Section 4 presents comments and open questions.

2 Torus Grids

We can picture the torus graph $C_n \square C_n$ either by modding out the infinite 4-regular graph $\mathbb{Z} \square \mathbb{Z}$ by the translations $(n, 0)$ and $(0, n)$ or by drawing the ordinary grid $P_n \square P_n$ and adding wraparound edges along the boundary. Since $C_n \square C_n$ has $2n^2$ edges while K_{n^2} has $n^2(n^2 - 1)/2$ edges, it is clear that if K_{n^2} can be decomposed into disjoint copies of $C_n \square C_n$, the number of copies must be $(n^2 - 1)/4$, so n must be odd.

Theorem 1: When p is an odd prime, K_{p^2} can be partitioned into $(p^2 - 1)/4$ copies of $C_p \square C_p$.

Proof: Associate the vertices of K_{p^2} with the elements of \mathbb{F}_{p^2} , which we model as $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(f(x))$ where f is some primitive quadratic polynomial over \mathbb{F}_p , so that x is a generator of the multiplicative group $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}^*$, so that $x^{(p^2-1)/2} = -1$. For all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}_{p^2}$ that form a basis for \mathbb{F}_{p^2} over \mathbb{F}_p , let $G(\alpha, \beta)$ be the subgraph of K_{p^2} in which two vertices are joined by an edge if and only if the corresponding field elements differ by $\pm\alpha$ or $\pm\beta$. It is easy to see that each such subgraph is isomorphic to $C_p \square C_p$. The sets $\{x^0, -x^0\}$, $\{x^1, -x^1\}$, \dots , $\{x^{(p^2-3)/2}, -x^{(p^2-3)/2}\}$ form a partition of $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}^*$. Then $G(x^0, x^1)$, $G(x^2, x^3)$, \dots , $G(x^{(p^2-5)/2}, x^{(p^2-3)/2})$ form the desired partition of K_{p^2} . \square

We now move on to the p^2 -by- p^2 torus.

Theorem 2: When p is an odd prime, K_{p^4} can be partitioned into $(p^4 - 1)/4$ copies of $C_{p^2} \square C_{p^2}$.

Proof: Associate the vertices of K_{p^4} with the elements of \mathbb{F}_{p^4} , and let x be a generator of the multiplicative group $\mathbb{F}_{p^4}^*$, so that $x^{(p^4-1)/2} = -1$. For all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{F}_{p^4}$ that form a basis for \mathbb{F}_{p^4} over \mathbb{F}_p , let $G(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$ be the subgraph of K_{p^4} in which two vertices are joined by an edge if and only if the corresponding field elements differ by $\pm\alpha, \pm\beta, \pm\gamma, \pm\delta$. It is easy to see that each such subgraph is isomorphic to $C_p \square C_p \square C_p \square C_p$. By Kotzig [1], $C_p \square C_p$ can be decomposed into two Hamiltonian cycles C_{p^2} partitioning the edges. Hence, performing the decomposition on the grouped pairs in $(C_p \square C_p) \square (C_p \square C_p)$ we obtain four graphs $G_1(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$, $G_2(\dots)$, $G_3(\dots)$, $G_4(\dots)$, each isomorphic to $C_{p^2} \square C_{p^2}$, which together decompose $G(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$. The sets $\{x^0, -x^0\}$, $\{x^1, -x^1\}$, \dots , $\{x^{(p^4-3)/2}, -x^{(p^4-3)/2}\}$ form a partition of $\mathbb{F}_{p^4}^*$. Then $G(x^0, x^1, x^2, x^3)$, $G(x^4, x^5, x^6, x^7)$, \dots , $G(x^{(p^2-9)/2}, x^{(p^2-7)/2}, x^{(p^2-5)/2}, x^{(p^2-3)/2})$ form a decomposition of K_{p^4} , and replacing each G with G_1, G_2, G_3 , and G_4 gives a decomposition in terms of $C_{p^2} \square C_{p^2}$. \square

$\beta + \delta$	δ	$\alpha + \delta$	$\alpha + \beta + \delta$
$\beta + \gamma + \delta$	$\gamma + \delta$	$\alpha + \gamma + \delta$	$\alpha + \beta + \gamma + \delta$
$\beta + \gamma$	γ	$\alpha + \gamma$	$\alpha + \beta + \gamma$
β	0	α	$\alpha + \beta$

Figure 2: Mapping the 16-element field to the 4-by-4 grid.

3 Ordinary Grids

Since $P_n \square P_n$ has $2n(n-1)$ edges while K_{n^2} has $n^2(n^2-1)/2$ edges, it is clear that if K_{n^2} can be decomposed into disjoint copies of $P_n \square P_n$, the number of copies must be $n(n+1)/4$, so n must be 0 or 3 mod 4.

First we consider the 3-by-3 grid.

Theorem 3: K_9 cannot be partitioned into three copies of $P_3 \square P_3$.

Proof: Suppose to the contrary that there were a partition of K_9 into subgraphs G_1, G_2, G_3 where each G_i is isomorphic to $P_3 \square P_3$ via some isomorphism ϕ_i . As before we write the vertices of K_9 as $1, \dots, 9$ and the vertices of $P_3 \square P_3$ as (i, j) with $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$. Let v_i be the vertex of K_9 satisfying $\phi_i(v_i) = (2, 2)$ (the middle vertex of $P_3 \times P_3$). That is, if we adopt the Connections puzzle point of view, v_1, v_2 , and v_3 are the middle elements of the three grids. For $1 \leq v \leq 9$, let $d_i(v)$ denote the number of elements of $\{1, \dots, 9\}$ that appear next to v in the i th grid (that is, $d_i(v)$ is the degree of v in G_i). Since $d_1(v_1) + d_2(v_1) + d_3(v_1) = 8$ (the degree of v_1 in K_9) and since $d_1(v_1) = 4$ and $d_2(v_1) \geq 2$ and $d_3(v_1) \geq 2$, we must have $d_2(v_1) = d_3(v_1) = 2$, so that v_1 appears in a corner cell in both the second and third grids. Likewise v_2 appears in a corner cell in the first and third grids and v_3 appears in a corner cell in the first and second grids. But this implies that the three elements v_1, v_2, v_3 are not adjacent in any of the three grids; this is a contradiction.

We now settle the motivating 4-by-4 example.

Theorem 4: K_{16} can be partitioned into five copies of $P_4 \square P_4$.

Proof: Associate the vertices of K_{16} with the elements of $F = \mathbb{F}_2[x]/(x^4 + x + 1)$ which is a field of order 16. Note that x is a generator of the multiplicative group F^* , with $x^{15} = 1$. For any choice of $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in F$ that form a basis for F over \mathbb{F}_2 , we can associate the elements of F with vertices of $P_4 \square P_4$ as shown in Figure 2. If the assignment seems random, note that horizontally-adjacent entries in the middle two columns differ by α , other horizontally-adjacent entries differ by β , vertically-adjacent entries in the middle two columns differ by δ , and other vertically-adjacent entries differ by γ . Correspondingly let $G(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$ be the subgraph of K_{16} in which two vertices v_1, v_2 are joined by an edge if and only if one of the

x^8	x^3	x^{14}	x^2
x^7	x^5	x^{10}	x^9
x^4	x^{11}	x^{12}	x
x^{13}	0	1	x^6

x^{11}	x^6	x^2	x^5
x^{10}	x^8	x^{13}	x^{12}
x^7	x^{14}	1	x^4
x^1	0	x^3	x^9

x^{14}	x^9	x^5	x^8
x^{13}	x^{11}	x^1	1
x^{10}	x^2	x^3	x^7
x^4	0	x^6	x^{12}

x^2	x^{12}	x^8	x^{11}
x^1	x^{14}	x^4	x^3
x^{13}	x^5	x^6	x^{10}
x^7	0	x^9	1

x^5	1	x^{11}	x^{14}
x^4	x^2	x^7	x^6
x^1	x^8	x^9	x^{13}
x^{10}	0	x^{12}	x^3

Figure 3: The $P_4 \square P_4$ grid design.

following holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_1 - v_2 &= \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad v_1, v_2 \in \text{span}(\alpha, \gamma, \delta) \\
v_1 - v_2 &= \beta \\
v_1 - v_2 &= \gamma \\
v_1 - v_2 &= \delta \quad \text{and} \quad v_1, v_2 \notin \text{span}(\alpha, \beta, \delta)
\end{aligned}$$

We claim that the graphs $G_i = G(x^{3i}, x^{13+3i}, x^{11+3i}, x^{3+3i})$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ form a decomposition of K_{16} into 5 copies of $P_4 \square P_4$. Note that each power of x^3 occurs exactly twice and everything else occurs just once. We get a repeated difference of $x^{3+3i} = v_1 - v_2 = x^{3(i+1)}$ if $v_1, v_2 \notin \text{span}(x^{3i}, x^{13+3i}, x^{3+3i})$ and $v_1, v_2 \in \text{span}(x^{3(i+1)}, x^{11+3(i+1)}, x^{3+3(i+1)}) = \text{span}(x^{3+3i}, x^{14+3i}, x^{6+3i})$. However,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{span}(x^{3i}, x^{13+3i}, x^{3+3i}) &= x^{3i} \text{span}(1, x^{13}, x^3) \\
&= x^{3i} \text{span}(1, x^3 + x^2 + 1, x^3) \\
&= x^{3i} \text{span}(x^3, x^3 + 1, x^3 + x^2) \\
&= x^{3i} \text{span}(x^3, x^{14}, x^6) \\
&= \text{span}(x^{3+3i}, x^{14+3i}, x^{6+3i}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus there is no repeated difference. □

The five resulting grids are shown in Figure 3. Note that multiplying all the entries in any of the grids by x^3 in F results in the (cyclically) next of the five grids. The reader can check that every pair of elements $u, v \in F$ occurs adjacently in exactly one of the five grids.

4 Comments

The simplest cases we were unable to resolve are $C_{15} \square C_{15}$ and $P_7 \square P_7$. We think that the case of $P_p \square P_p$ with p congruent to 0 mod 4 might yield to some variant of the construction presented in section 3.

More generally one might look at higher-power grids such as $C_n \square C_n \square \dots \square C_n$ and $P_n \square P_n \square \dots \square P_n$. It would also be natural to consider products like $C_m \square C_n$ or $P_m \square P_n$ or for that matter $C_m \square P_n$.

References

- [1] Anton Kotzig. Every Cartesian Product of Two Circuits is Decomposable into Two Hamiltonian Circuits. Centre de Recherches Mathématique, Montreal, 1973.
- [2] Edouard Lucas, Récréations mathématiques, I-IV, (1882-3, 1893-4).
- [3] MathOverflow, <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/463586/scrambling-a-connections-grid>, February 2024.