

Dependent sets of constant weight binary vectors

NEIL J. CALKIN

¹ School of Mathematics,
Georgia Institute of Technology,

Atlanta, GA 30332-0160

We determine lower bounds for the number of random binary vectors, chosen uniformly from vectors of weight k , needed to obtain a dependent set.

1. Introduction

In this paper we determine lower bounds for the number of random binary vectors of weight k needed to obtain a dependent set of vectors with probability 1.

We denote by $S_{n,k}$ the set of binary vectors having k 1's. If we choose a random sequence $\underline{u}_1, \underline{u}_2, \dots, \underline{u}_m$ uniformly from $S_{n,k}$, how large must m be for these vectors to be dependent (over GF(2)) with probability 1?

In the case $k = 1$ this is exactly the birthday problem: given a set of n elements, how long must a sequence chosen (with replacement) be before an element occurs at least twice with probability close to 1. It is a standard combinatorics exercise to show that so long as $m/\sqrt{(n)} \rightarrow \infty$, a sequence of length m will almost surely contain a repetition as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In the case $k = 2$, we can view the vectors of weight two as being edges in a graph on $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$: here a dependent set of vectors corresponds exactly to a set of edges which contain a cycle. There are two distinct modes of behaviour here: first, if the edges are chosen without replacement, and if the number of edges is cn then the probability that there is a cycle is strictly less than 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if $c < 1/2$ and tends to 1 if $c \geq 1/2$ [2]. If the edges are chosen with replacement, then if we choose cn edges, there is a positive probability that we get a repeated edge. Hence the probability increases up to $c = 1/2$, at which point we almost surely get a cycle.

In what follows, we will assume that k is a fixed integer greater than or equal to 3.

Denote by $p_{n,k}(m)$ the probability that $\underline{u}_1, \underline{u}_2, \dots, \underline{u}_m$ are linearly dependent. We will prove the following:

Theorem 1.1. For each k there is a constant β_k so that if $\beta < \beta_k$ then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} p_{n,k}(\beta n) = 0.$$

Furthermore, $\beta_k \sim 1 - \frac{e^{-k}}{\log(2)}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

We obtain this theorem as a corollary of the following: let r be the rank of the set $\{\underline{u}_1, \underline{u}_2, \dots, \underline{u}_m\}$, and let $s = m - r$ (equivalently, the dimension of the kernel of the matrix having columns $\underline{u}_1, \underline{u}_2, \dots, \underline{u}_m$).

Theorem 1.2. a) If $\beta < \beta_k$ and $m = m(n) < \beta n$ then $E(2^s) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. b) If $\beta > \beta_k$ and $m = m(n) > \beta n$ then $E(2^s) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Similar results have been obtained for different models by Balakin, Kolchin and Khokhlov [1, 3]: their methods are completely different.

Our approach is the following: we consider a Markov chain derived from a suitable random walk on the hypercube 2^n ; using this we will determine an exact expression for $E(2^s)$. We then estimate $E(2^s)$ to determine β_k .

2. A random walk on the hypercube, and an associated Markov chain

We define a random walk on the hypercube 2^n as follows: let $\underline{u}_1, \underline{u}_2, \dots, \underline{u}_m, \dots$ be vectors chosen uniformly at random from $S_{n,k}$. Define

$$\underline{x}_0 = \underline{0}, \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{x}_i = \underline{x}_{i-1} + \underline{u}_i$$

(so the steps in the walk correspond to flipping k random bits).

We associate with this random walk the following Markov chain: we define y_i to be the weight of \underline{x}_i . Then y_0, y_1, \dots, y_m , is a Markov chain with states $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. The transition matrix A for this chain, with $A = \{a_{pq}\}$, where a_{pq} is the probability of moving from state q to state p is given by

$$a_{pq} = \frac{\binom{q}{\frac{k-p+q}{2}} \binom{n-q}{\frac{k+p-q}{2}}}{\binom{n}{k}}$$

where the binomial coefficients are interpreted to be 0 if $k + p + q$ is odd.

Theorem 2.1. The eigenvalues λ_i and corresponding eigenvectors \underline{e}_i for A , $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$, are given by

$$\lambda_i = \sum_{t=0}^k (-1)^t \frac{\binom{i}{t} \binom{n-i}{k-t}}{\binom{n}{k}} \quad (2.1)$$

and the j th component of \underline{e}_i is given by

$$\underline{e}_i[j] = \sum_{t=0}^j (-1)^t \binom{i}{t} \binom{n-i}{j-t}.$$

Proof: We first show that \underline{e}_i is an eigenvector for A with eigenvalue λ_i : indeed the j th coefficient of $A\underline{e}_i$ is

$$\sum_{l=0}^n \frac{\binom{l}{\frac{k-j+l}{2}} \binom{n-l}{\frac{k+j-l}{2}}}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{t=0}^l (-1)^t \binom{i}{t} \binom{n-i}{l-t}$$

and the j th coefficient of $\lambda_i \underline{e}_i$ is

$$\sum_{s=0}^k (-1)^s \frac{\binom{i}{s} \binom{n-i}{k-s}}{\binom{n}{k}} \sum_{t=0}^j (-1)^t \binom{i}{t} \binom{n-i}{j-t}$$

Observe now that

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

since each is the coefficient of x^j in

$$(1-x)^i (1+x)^{n-i} = \left(1 - \frac{2}{1+x}\right)^i (1+x)^n.$$

Hence it is sufficient to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=0}^n \binom{l}{\frac{k-j+l}{2}} \binom{n-l}{\frac{k+j-l}{2}} \sum_{t=0}^j (-1)^{t+i} 2^t \binom{i}{t} \binom{n-t}{j} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^k (-1)^s \binom{i}{s} \binom{n-i}{k-s} \sum_{t=0}^j (-1)^t \binom{i}{t} \binom{n-i}{j-t}. \end{aligned}$$

We show this by multiplying both sides by $x^j y^k$ and summing over j and k . Writing $j = l - 2r + k$, the left hand side becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l,k,r,t} \binom{l}{r} \binom{n-l}{k-r} \binom{i}{t} \binom{n-t}{l} (-1)^{i+t} 2^t x^{l+k-2r} y^k \\ &= \sum_{l,r,t} \binom{l}{r} \binom{i}{t} \binom{n-t}{l} (-1)^{i+t} 2^t x^{l-r} (1+xy)^{n-l} y^r \\ &= \sum_{l,t} \binom{i}{t} \binom{n-t}{l} (-1)^{i+t} 2^t (1+xy)^{n-l} (x+y)^l \\ &= \sum_t (-1)^{i+t} \binom{i}{t} 2^t (1+xy)^t (1+x)^{n-t} (1+y)^{n-t} \\ &= (1+x)^n (1+y)^n \left(\frac{2(1+xy)}{(1+x)(1+y)} - 1 \right)^i \\ &= (1-x)^i (1+x)^{n-i} (1-y)^i (1+y)^{n-i}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly the right hand side becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j,k,s,t} \binom{i}{s} \binom{n-i}{k-s} \binom{i}{t} \binom{n-i}{j-t} (-1)^{s+t} x^j y^k \\ &= \sum_{s,t} \binom{i}{s} \binom{i}{t} (-1)^{s+t} x^t y^s (1+x)^{n-i} (1+y)^{n-i} \\ &= (1-x)^i (1+x)^{n-i} (1-y)^i (1+y)^{n-i} \end{aligned}$$

as required. Hence \underline{e}_i is an eigenvector with eigenvalue λ_i for each i .

Moreover, we see that the \underline{e}_i 's are linearly independent (as vectors over Q): indeed: we have:

Lemma 2.2. *Let U be the matrix whose columns are $\underline{e}_0, \underline{e}_1, \dots, \underline{e}_n$. Then $U^2 = 2^n I$, and if Λ is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues, then $A = 1/2^n U \Lambda U$.*

Proof: The ij th entry of U^2 is

$$\sum_{l=0}^n \underline{e}_l[i] \underline{e}_j[l] = \sum_{l,s,t} (-1)^s \binom{l}{s} \binom{n-l}{i-s} (-1)^t \binom{j}{t} \binom{n-j}{l-t}.$$

Multiplying by x^i and summing over i we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i,l,s,t} (-1)^{s+t} \binom{l}{s} \binom{n-l}{i-s} \binom{j}{t} \binom{n-j}{l-t} x^i \\ &= \sum_{l,s,t} (-1)^{s+t} \binom{l}{s} \binom{j}{t} \binom{n-j}{l-t} (1+x)^{n-l} x^s \\ &= \sum_{l,t} (-1)^t \binom{j}{t} \binom{n-j}{l-t} (1+x)^{n-l} (1-x)^l \\ &= \sum_t (-1)^t \binom{j}{t} (1+x)^j 2^{n-j} \left(\frac{1-x}{1+x} \right)^t \\ &= 2^n x^j \end{aligned}$$

from which we see that $U^2 = 2^n I$. Hence the eigenvectors are linearly independent as claimed.

Observation: the eigenvectors do not depend upon k : hence the matrices A and A' corresponding to distinct values of k commute. This corresponds roughly to the idea that when walking around the hypercube it doesn't matter if you take a step of size l then a step of size k , or a step of size k then a step of size l .

We can now compute the probability that $\underline{u}_1, \underline{u}_2, \dots, \underline{u}_t$ sum to $\underline{0}$: indeed, this is exactly the 0th coefficient in A^t , which is equal to

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \frac{1}{2^n} \lambda_i^t \binom{n}{i}$$

(since $A = 1/2^n U\Lambda U$).

Hence if $\underline{u}_1, \underline{u}_2, \dots, \underline{u}_m$ are vectors with k 1's chosen independently at random, then the expected number of subsequences $\underline{u}_{a_1}, \underline{u}_{a_2}, \dots, \underline{u}_{a_t}$ which sum to $\underline{0}$ is exactly

$$E(2^s) = \sum_{t=0}^m \binom{m}{t} \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{1}{2^n} \lambda_i^t \binom{n}{i} = \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{1}{2^n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m.$$

3. Asymptotics of λ_i

In order to estimate the size of $E(2^s)$, we require asymptotics for the value of λ_i .

Lemma 3.1. a) $|\lambda_i| < 1$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$.

b) If $i > \frac{n}{2}$ then $\lambda_i = (-1)^k \lambda_{n-i}$.

c) Let $0 < c < \frac{1}{2}$. If $i = cn$ then

$$\lambda_i = \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^k - \frac{4\binom{k}{2}}{n} \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^{k-2} \frac{i}{n} \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right) + O\left(\frac{k^3}{c^2 n^2}\right)$$

Proof: Parts a) and b) are immediate from the definition of λ_i . To prove part c), since k is fixed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{k} &= \frac{n^k}{k!} \left(1 - \frac{\binom{k}{2}}{n} + O\left(\frac{k^3}{n^2}\right)\right) \\ \binom{i}{t} &= \frac{i^t}{t!} \left(1 - \frac{\binom{t}{2}}{i} + O\left(\frac{t^3}{i^2}\right)\right) \\ \binom{n-i}{k-t} &= \frac{(n-i)^{k-t}}{(k-t)!} \left(1 - \frac{\binom{k-t}{2}}{n-i} + O\left(\frac{(k-t)^3}{(n-i)^2}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\frac{\binom{i}{t} \binom{n-i}{k-t}}{\binom{n}{k}} = \left(\frac{i}{n}\right)^t \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right)^{k-t} \binom{k}{t} \left(1 + \frac{\binom{k}{2}}{n} - \frac{\binom{t}{2}}{i} - \frac{\binom{k-t}{2}}{n-i} + O\left(\frac{k^3}{c^2 n^2}\right)\right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i &= \sum_{t=0}^k (-1)^t \binom{i}{n}^t \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right)^{k-t} \binom{k}{t} \left(1 + \frac{\binom{k}{2}}{n} - \frac{\binom{t}{2}}{i} - \frac{\binom{k-t}{2}}{n-i} + O\left(\frac{k^3}{c^2 n^2}\right)\right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^k + \frac{\binom{k}{2}}{n} \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^k - \frac{\binom{k}{2}}{i} \left(\frac{i}{n}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^{k-2} \\ &\quad - \frac{\binom{k}{2}}{n-i} \left(\frac{n-i}{n}\right)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^{k-2} + O\left(\frac{k^3}{c^2 n^2}\right) \\ &= \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^k + \frac{\binom{k}{2}}{n} \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^{k-2} \left(\left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^2 - \frac{i}{n} - \frac{n-i}{n}\right) + O\left(\frac{k^3}{c^2 n^2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^k - \frac{4\binom{k}{2}}{n} \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^{k-2} \left(-\frac{4i}{n} + 4\frac{i^2}{n}\right) + O\left(\frac{k^3}{c^2 n^2}\right) \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^k - \frac{4\binom{k}{2}}{n} \left(1 - \frac{2i}{n}\right)^{k-2} \left(\frac{i}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right) + O\left(\frac{k^3}{c^2 n^2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

Observe that since we are assuming that $k \geq 3$ throughout, when i is close to $\frac{n}{2}$, say $\frac{n}{2} - i = \frac{n^\theta}{2}$, we have

$$\lambda_i = \left(\frac{1}{n^{1-\theta}}\right)^k - \frac{4\binom{k}{2}}{n} \left(\frac{1}{n^{1-\theta}}\right)^{k-2} + O\left(\frac{k^3}{n^2}\right)$$

Then, provided that $\theta < 1 - \frac{1}{k}$, we see that if $\frac{n}{2} - i = \frac{n^\theta}{2}$, then $\lambda_i n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In the estimation of $E(2^s)$ we will use this to show that the middle part of the sum is asymptotic to 1.

4. Asymptotics of $E(2^s)$

Define

$$f(\alpha, \beta) = -\log 2 - \alpha \log(\alpha) - (1 - \alpha) \log(1 - \alpha) + \beta \log(1 + (1 - 2\alpha)^k)$$

and let (α_k, β_k) be the root of

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\alpha, \beta) &= 0 \\
\frac{\partial f(\alpha, \beta)}{\partial \alpha} &= 0
\end{aligned}$$

We shall show:

Lemma 4.1. *If $\beta < \beta_k$ and $m < \beta n$ then $\sum_i 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and if $\beta > \beta_k$ and $m > \beta n$ then $\sum_i 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof: we proceed as follows: since our goal is to show that the behaviour of $E(2^s)$ changes when m goes from below $\beta_k n$ to above $\beta_k n$, and since our value β_k is less than 1, we may assume that $\frac{m}{n} < 1 - \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$. We shall show:

- a) the extreme tails of the sum for $E(2^s)$ are small
- b) the middle range of the sum contributes 1 to the sum
- c) and d) the rest of the sum is small if $\frac{m}{n} < \beta < \beta_k$ and large if $\frac{m}{n} > \beta > \beta_k$.
- a) there is an $\epsilon > 0$ so that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\epsilon n} 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty$$

Indeed,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\epsilon n} 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m < \sum_{i=0}^{\epsilon n} 2^{m-n} \binom{n}{i}$$

$$< n\epsilon 2^{m-n} \binom{n}{\epsilon n}$$

and provided ϵ is sufficiently small, this tends to 0 (indeed, if $-\delta \log 2 - \epsilon \log \epsilon + \epsilon < 0$ then the sum tends to 0).

Similarly,

$$\sum_{i=(1-\epsilon)n}^n 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, if $E(2^s) \rightarrow \infty$ for some $m < (1 - \delta)n$, we must have the major contribution from

$$\sum_{i=\epsilon n}^{(1-\epsilon)n} 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m.$$

b) We now show that the middle range of the sum contributes 1 to $E(2^s)$. Indeed, in the range $\frac{n}{2} - n^{4/7} < i < \frac{n}{2} + n^{4/7}$

$$(1 + \lambda_i)^m = \left(1 + o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right)^m = 1 + o(1)$$

we have

$$\sum_{i=\frac{n}{2}-n^{4/7}}^{\frac{n}{2}+n^{4/7}} 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m \sim \sum_{i=\frac{n}{2}-n^{4/7}}^{\frac{n}{2}+n^{4/7}} 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

c) We now show that we can widen the interval about the middle:

$$\sum_{i=\frac{n}{2}(1-\epsilon)}^{\frac{n}{2}(1+\epsilon)} 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m \rightarrow 1.$$

Since $\lambda_{n-i} = (-1)^k \lambda_i$, it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{i=\frac{n}{2}(1-\epsilon)}^{\frac{n}{2}-n^{4/7}} 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m \rightarrow 0.$$

In this range,

$$\lambda_i < \epsilon^k - \frac{\binom{k}{2}}{n} \epsilon^{k-2} + O\left(\frac{k^3}{n^2}\right).$$

Hence

$$(1 + \lambda_i)^m < e^{n\epsilon^k} e^{-\binom{k}{2}\epsilon^{k-2}}$$

and since $k \geq 3$, the $n\epsilon^k$ term in the exponent is dominated by the $-n\epsilon^2$ term from the binomial coefficient, provided that ϵ is sufficiently small.

d) We now consider the remainder of the sum (or rather, the part in $(0, \frac{n}{2})$): if k is even, the remaining part follows by symmetry, and if k is odd, then $(1 + \lambda_i)^m < 1$ for $i > n/2$, and the remaining part tends to 0).

Define

$$f(\alpha, \beta) = -\log 2 - \alpha \log \alpha - (1 - \alpha) \log(1 - \alpha) + \beta \log(1 + (1 - 2\alpha)^k).$$

Then if $f(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{m}{n}) < \gamma < 0$ the corresponding term of the sum is exponentially small, and if $f(\frac{i}{n}, \frac{m}{n}) > \gamma > 0$ the corresponding term of the sum is exponentially large. Thus, if $f(\alpha, \frac{m}{n}) < \gamma < 0$ for all α in $(\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)$, we have

$$\sum_{i=\epsilon n}^{\frac{n}{2}(1-\epsilon)} 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m < n e^{\gamma n + o(n)} \rightarrow 0,$$

and if $f(\alpha, \frac{m}{n}) > \gamma > 0$ for some α in $(\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)$, then

$$\sum_{i=\epsilon n}^{\frac{n}{2}(1-\epsilon)} 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m > \binom{n}{\alpha n} (1 + \lambda_{\alpha n})^m 2^{-n} > e^{\gamma n + o(n)} \rightarrow \infty.$$

Now let β_k be so that if $\beta < \beta_k$ then $f(\alpha, \beta) < 0$ for all α in $(\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)$, and if $\beta > \beta_k$ then there is an alpha in $(\epsilon, 1 - \epsilon)$ so that $f(\alpha, \beta) > 0$. Thus we wish to find α_k, β_k so that

$$f(\alpha_k, \beta_k) = 0 \text{ and } \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} f(\alpha, \beta) = 0.$$

As k goes to ∞ , the value of β_k is asymptotic to

$$1 - \frac{e^{-k}}{\log 2} - \frac{1}{2 \log 2} (k^2 - 2k + \frac{2k}{\log 2} - 1) e^{-2k} + O(k^4) e^{-3k}.$$

To see this, we observe first that

$$\alpha_k = e^{-k}$$

and

$$\beta_k = 1 - \frac{e^{-k}}{\log 2}$$

are close to a root (by considering a small constant times the error term, and expanding out $f(\alpha, \beta)$, we see that both $f(\alpha, \beta)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} f(\alpha, \beta)$ change sign as the constant changes).

Furthermore, there are no other roots α in $(0, 1/2)$ and β in $(0, 1)$: indeed, we note

(i) that for any root of the two equations, indeed, for any root of $f(\alpha, \beta)$ with $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, either $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ or $\alpha \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$.

(ii) if α is close to $\frac{1}{2}$, then there it is not part of a root (by expanding out $f(\alpha, \beta)$ in terms of α and observing that the term involving β is of order α^k , and since $k \geq 3$ and $\beta \leq 1$, we cannot have a root.

(iii) by considering the expansion in α , we observe that $k\alpha \rightarrow 0$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. (iv) now, by expanding out both $f(\alpha, \beta)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} f(\alpha, \beta)$, we see that the root is as claimed. Using a symbolic algebra package (in our case Maple), it is easy now to see that β_k has an asymptotic expansion

$$\beta_k \sim 1 - \frac{e^{-k}}{\log 2} - \frac{1}{2 \log 2} (k^2 - 2k + \frac{2k}{\log 2} - 1) e^{-2k} + O(k^4) e^{-3k}$$

as k goes to infinity.

This completes the proof of the lemma.

Now, since $E(2^s) = \sum_i 2^{-n} \binom{n}{i} (1 + \lambda_i)^m$ this completes the proof of theorem 1.2, and Theorem 1.1 follows by the simple observation that since s is integer valued, the probability that $2^s > 1$ is less than $E(2^s) - 1$.

References

- [1] G. V. Balakin, V. F. Kolchin and V. I. Khokhlov. Hypercycles in a random hypergraph *Diskretnaya Matematika* 3, No. 3, 1-2-108 (1991) (in Russian).
- [2] P. Erdős and A. Renyi. On the evolution of random graphs. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hungar. Acad. Sci.* 5,17-61 (1960).
- [3] V. F. Kolchin and V. I. Khokhlov. On the number of cycles in a non-equiprobably random graph. *Diskretnaya Matematika* 2, No.3,137-145 (1990) (in Russian).