

Visibility in Hypercubes

Maria Axenovich * Dingyuan Liu †

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Karlsruhe, Germany.

February 7, 2024

Abstract

A set \mathcal{X} of vertices in a graph G is a mutual-visibility set if any two vertices u and v in \mathcal{X} “see” each other in G , that is, there exists a shortest u - v path in G that contains no elements of \mathcal{X} as internal vertices. The mutual-visibility number of a graph G , denoted $\mu(G)$, is the largest size of a mutual-visibility set in G . This notion was introduced by Di Stefano and studied for various product graphs, particularly hypercubes, motivated by communication analysis in networks. Cicerone, Fonso, Di Stefano, Navarra, and Piselli showed that $2^n/\sqrt{n} \leq \mu(Q_n) \leq 2^{n-1}$. We prove that $\mu(Q_n) \geq 0.186 \cdot 2^n$ using a breakthrough result on daisy-free hypergraphs by Ellis, Ivan, and Leader. We also consider so-called total mutual-visibility number for graphs and give asymptotically tight bounds on this parameter for hypercubes.

1 Introduction

Mutual-visibility is a natural and fundamental concept in Euclidean space. A set of points in Euclidean space is called a *mutual-visibility set* if for any two points, there is no third point on their line segment. Determining the maximum size of a mutual-visibility subset of a given point set is one of the most intensively studied objects in discrete geometry, as it is equivalent to finding the maximum subset without collinear triples. Note that the line segment in Euclidean space is essentially a shortest path between two points, when we consider the mutual-visibility in more general topologies, where there is no line segment or the line segment between two points is not unique, it is sensible to reformulate the concept via the shortest path. If we further represent a point set in some topology as a graph, then the problem naturally transforms into studying the mutual-visibility in graphs. Apart from the interesting geometric background, the mutual-visibility in graphs is also propelled by its pivotal role in efficient and "confidential" communication in computer or social networks. The systematic investigation of mutual-visibility in graphs was pioneered by Di Stefano [9], and has garnered extensive attention and subsequent research [2–8, 14, 15, 19, etc.] in recent years.

Let G be an arbitrary graph and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq V(G)$ be a subset of vertices. For any two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, we say that u and v are \mathcal{X} -*visible* if there exists a shortest u - v path in G that contains no vertices from $\mathcal{X} \setminus \{u, v\}$. Note that any two adjacent vertices are \mathcal{X} -visible.

Definition 1.1. *Let G be a graph. A set \mathcal{X} of vertices in G is a mutual-visibility set if every two vertices $u, v \in \mathcal{X}$ are \mathcal{X} -visible.*

*E-mail: maria.aksenovich@kit.edu

†E-mail: liu@mathe.berlin

The size of a largest mutual-visibility set in G is then called the *mutual-visibility number* of G , denoted by $\mu(G)$. The exact value of $\mu(G)$ is only known for very few graph classes, e.g., cliques, complete bipartite graphs, trees, cycles, grids [9], butterflies [4], Cartesian products of paths and cycles [14], Cartesian products of cliques, and direct products of cliques [8]. It has been shown in the initial work by Di Stefano [9] that determining $\mu(G)$ for any given graph G is an NP-complete problem. By considering the mutual-visibility set consisting of all neighbors of the maximum degree vertex, we can find a large mutual-visibility set in any dense graph. Finding large mutual-visibility sets in sparse graphs is more challenging. Among those graphs, the hypercube stands out as a widely researched mathematical object and an exemplary model for network structures. Let n be a positive integer. The n -dimensional hypercube Q_n is a graph on the vertex set $2^{[n]}$, such that two vertices $A, B \in 2^{[n]}$ form an edge in Q_n if and only if their *symmetric difference* $A\Delta B := (A \setminus B) \cup (B \setminus A)$ has size 1. The primary objective of this paper is to explore the mutual-visibility phenomenon in hypercubes. A recent result by Cicerone, Fonso, Di Stefano, Navarra, and Piselli [4] shows that

$$\frac{2^n}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \mu(Q_n) \leq 2^{n-1}.$$

Here, we prove that $\mu(Q_n)$ is at least a constant fraction of 2^n , and hence determine $\mu(Q_n)$ up to a multiplicative constant.

Theorem 1.2. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\mu(Q_n) \geq 0.186 \cdot 2^n.$$

We derive Theorem 1.2 from the following lower bound using the extremal function for special hypergraphs called daisies. Here, we follow the notation of Bollobás, Leader, and Malvenuto [1].

Definition 1.3. *Let $r, s, t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\min\{r, s\} \geq t$, an (r, s, t) -daisy $\mathcal{D}_r(s, t)$ is a collection of all r -element sets T satisfying $A \subseteq T \subseteq B$, for some given $A \subseteq B$ with $|A| = r - t$ and $|B| = r + s - t$.*

The *Turán function* for (r, s, t) -daisies, denoted by $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))$, is defined as the maximum size of a family $\mathcal{F}_r \subseteq \binom{[n]}{r}$, such that \mathcal{F}_r contains no copy of $\mathcal{D}_r(s, t)$. The next theorem reveals the connection between $\mu(Q_n)$ and the extremal function $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))$. For $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we let $[m, n]$ denote the set of all integers k with $m \leq k \leq n$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $n, s, t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s - t \geq \max\{3, t\}$, then*

$$\mu(Q_n) \geq \frac{1}{s-t} \left(\sum_{r \in [0, t-1]} \binom{n}{r} + \sum_{r \in [t, n]} \text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t)) \right).$$

Using a simple probabilistic method, one can show that $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t)) \geq (1 - 1/\log \log n) \binom{n}{r}$ with $s = 2t \geq 2 \log \log n$. Theorem 1.4 then implies the lower bound on $\mu(Q_n)$ of roughly $\frac{2^n}{\log \log n}$. To derive the lower bound stated in Theorem 1.2, we shall make use of the recent breakthrough in the Turán density of daisies.

Definition 1.5. *Let $r, s, t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\min\{r, s\} \geq t$, the Turán density of (r, s, t) -daisies is defined as*

$$\pi(\mathcal{D}_r(s, t)) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))}{\binom{n}{r}}.$$

A conjecture by Bollobás et al. [1] says that for any $s \geq t \geq 2$, the Turán density $\pi(\mathcal{D}_r(s, t))$ tends to 0 as r tends to infinity. Rather unexpectedly, this conjecture has been refuted in a recent paper of Ellis, Ivan, and Leader [10]. In our proof of Theorem 1.2 we use the following statement from the proof of Theorem 5 [10]:

Theorem 1.6 (Ellis et al. [10]). *Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ be a fixed prime power, then*

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \pi(\mathcal{D}_r(q+2, 2)) \geq \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^{-k}).$$

We also study a natural variant of mutual-visibility introduced by Cicerone, Di Stefano, Klavžar, and Yero [7].

Definition 1.7. *Let G be a graph. A set \mathcal{X} of vertices in G is a total mutual-visibility set if every two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ are \mathcal{X} -visible.*

The *total mutual-visibility number* $\mu_t(G)$ is defined as the size of a largest total mutual-visibility set in G . Since a total mutual-visibility set is always a mutual-visibility set, we have $\mu_t(G) \leq \mu(G)$. The exact value of $\mu_t(G)$ is also known for rather few graph classes, see [2–5, 7, 8, 15, 19]. Furthermore, determining $\mu_t(G)$ for any given graph G , as demonstrated in [5], is also NP-complete. We obtain some tight bounds on $\mu_t(Q_n)$, improving the previous result $\mu_t(Q_n) \geq 2^{n-2}/(n^2 - n)$ by Bujtás, Klavžar, and Tian [3].

Theorem 1.8. *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$\frac{2^{n-1}}{n} \leq \mu_t(Q_n) \leq \frac{2^n}{n}.$$

If $n = 2^m - 1$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\frac{2^n}{n+1} \leq \mu_t(Q_n) \leq \frac{2^n}{n}.$$

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2.1, we exhibit our construction of a large mutual-visibility set in Q_n . Section 2.2 is dedicated to proving Theorem 1.4. We then derive Theorem 1.2 from Theorem 1.4 in Section 2.3. Finally, we prove Theorem 1.8 in Section 3.1.

2 Mutual-visibility in Q_n

2.1 Construction of a mutual-visibility set

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in [0, n]$, we let $\mathcal{L}_r := \binom{[n]}{r}$ denote the r -th layer of Q_n . The following lemma shows that the union of two appropriately distanced layers forms a mutual-visibility set. It is a variant of a result by Cicerone et al. [4, Theorem 1], for completeness, we provide the corresponding proof.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r_1, r_2 \in [0, n]$ with $r_1 + 3 \leq r_2$. For any distinct vertices $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_{r_1} \cup \mathcal{L}_{r_2}$, there exists a shortest A - B path in Q_n that is internally disjoint from $\mathcal{L}_{r_1} \cup \mathcal{L}_{r_2}$ and only goes through the layers between \mathcal{L}_{r_1} and \mathcal{L}_{r_2} .*

Proof. Fix arbitrary $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_{r_1} \cup \mathcal{L}_{r_2}$, $A \neq B$.

Case 1: $|A| = |B|$, see Figures 1, 2.

Without loss of generality assume $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_{r_1}$, the case of $A, B \in \mathcal{L}_{r_2}$ follows by a similar argument. From $|A| = |B|$ we can deduce that $|A \setminus B| = |B \setminus A|$. Let $A \setminus B = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ and $B \setminus A = \{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ for some $k \geq 1$. If $k = 1$, then $(A, A \cup \{b_1\}, B)$ is a desired shortest A - B path.




Figure 1: the shortest A - B path when $k = 1$

If $k \geq 2$, we first take $(A, A \cup \{b_1\})$. Then, we iteratively add b_{i+1} and delete a_i for $i \in [k-1]$ till we reach the vertex $A \cup \{b_1, \dots, b_k\} \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}\}$. Finally, we delete a_k and reach B , completing the construction of a desired shortest A - B path.




Figure 2: the shortest A - B path when $k \geq 2$

Case 2: $|A| \neq |B|$, see Figures 3, 4.

Assume that $A \in \mathcal{L}_{r_1}$ and $B \in \mathcal{L}_{r_2}$. It follows that $|B \setminus A| - |A \setminus B| = r_2 - r_1$. Let $B \setminus A = \{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ for some $k \geq r_2 - r_1$. If $A \setminus B = \emptyset$, then we obtain the desired A - B path by simply adding elements of $B \setminus A$ to A one at a time.




Figure 3: the shortest A - B path when $A \setminus B = \emptyset$

If $A \setminus B \neq \emptyset$, let $A \setminus B = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ with $m = k - (r_2 - r_1)$. We first take $(A, A \cup \{b_1\})$, then we iteratively add b_{i+1} and delete a_i for $i \in [m]$ till we reach the vertex $A \cup \{b_1, \dots, b_{m+1}\} \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$; afterwards we add b_{m+2}, \dots, b_k one by one and eventually reach B . This constructs the shortest A - B path $(A, A \cup \{b_1\}, A \cup \{b_1, b_2\}, A \cup \{b_1, b_2\} \setminus \{a_1\}, \dots, A \cup \{b_1, \dots, b_{m+1}\} \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_m\}, \dots, B)$.




Figure 4: the shortest A - B path when $A \setminus B \neq \emptyset$

□

By taking the union of $\mathcal{L}_{n/2}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{n/2+3}$, Cicerone et al. [4] obtained the lower bound

$$\mu(Q_n) \geq 2 \cdot \frac{2^n}{\sqrt{\pi n/2}} \geq \frac{2^n}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

We consider dense subsets of more layers without breaking the mutual-visibility. To achieve this, we will choose every d th layer and delete certain elements in each chosen layer, creating “holes”. By Lemma 2.1 the mutual-visibility will be guaranteed between every two consecutive chosen layers. For every A, B from non-consecutive chosen layers, we shall make sure that there exists a shortest A - B path going through the holes in the selected layers in between, see Figure 5.




Figure 5: the constructed A - B path

Lemma 2.2. *Let $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$, $d \geq 3$. For $r \in [0, n]$ we let \mathcal{F}_r be a subfamily of \mathcal{L}_r , such that*

$$\forall A, B \in 2^{[n]} \text{ with } |A| + d \leq r \leq |B| - d, \exists T \in \mathcal{L}_r \setminus \mathcal{F}_r : A \cap B \subseteq T \subseteq A \cup B. \quad (2.1)$$

Let $\lambda \in [d]$ and $I_\lambda = \{r \in [0, n] : r \equiv \lambda \pmod{d}\}$. Then $\mathcal{X} := \bigcup_{r \in I_\lambda} \mathcal{F}_r$ is a mutual-visibility set in Q_n .

Proof. We see that \mathcal{X} is a union of its layers, $\mathcal{F}_r = \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{L}_r$, $r \in I_\lambda$. If $|I_\lambda| < 2$, then either \mathcal{X} is an empty set or \mathcal{X} resides within one layer of Q_n , from which it follows immediately that \mathcal{X} is a mutual-visibility set in Q_n . Now suppose $|I_\lambda| \geq 2$ and fix arbitrary $A, B \in \mathcal{X}$, $A \neq B$. Without loss of generality assume $|A| \leq |B|$.

Case 1: A and B belong to the union of two consecutive layers in \mathcal{X} .

Since there are $d - 1 \geq 2$ layers of Q_n between two consecutive layers of \mathcal{X} , Lemma 2.1 implies that there exists a shortest A - B path that is internally disjoint from \mathcal{X} .

Case 2: A and B belong to two non-consecutive layers in \mathcal{X} .

Let $r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_k$ with $k \geq 3$, where $A \in \mathcal{F}_{r_1}$ and $B \in \mathcal{F}_{r_k}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{r_2}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{r_{k-1}}$ are all the

layers of \mathcal{X} between \mathcal{F}_{r_1} and \mathcal{F}_{r_k} . We then construct an A - B path that is internally disjoint from \mathcal{X} by the following procedure.

(1) Let $T_1 = A$ and $T_k = B$. For $i \in [2, k-1]$, we iteratively find a vertex $T_i \in \mathcal{L}_{r_i} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{r_i}$ satisfying

$$T_{i-1} \cap T_k \subseteq T_i \subseteq T_{i-1} \cup T_k, \quad (2.2)$$

the existence of such T_i is guaranteed by (2.1).

(2) Let $i \in [k-1]$. Since $T_i \in \mathcal{L}_{r_i}$ and $T_{i+1} \in \mathcal{L}_{r_{i+1}}$ with $r_i + 3 \leq r_{i+1}$, by Lemma 2.1 there exists a shortest T_i - T_{i+1} path P_i that is internally disjoint from \mathcal{X} . Moreover, because P_i only passes through the layers between T_i and T_{i+1} , the paths P_1, \dots, P_{k-1} are also pairwise internally disjoint.

(3) Let $P := \bigcup_{i \in [k-1]} P_i$ be our desired A - B path.

It remains to show that P is indeed a shortest A - B path. Note that P is a shortest A - B path in Q_n if and only if $|V_{j+1}\Delta T_k| < |V_j\Delta T_k|$ holds for any consecutive vertices V_j, V_{j+1} in P . Since $V_j V_{j+1}$ is an edge, V_{j+1} is obtained by either adding an element $x \notin V_j$ to V_j , or deleting an element $y \in V_j$ from V_j . Assume the edge $V_j V_{j+1}$ lies in the path P_i . If $V_{j+1} = V_j \cup \{x\}$, recall that P_i is a shortest T_i - T_{i+1} path, we have $x \in T_{i+1} \setminus T_i$. On the other hand, by property (2.2) we have $T_{i+1} \subseteq T_i \cup T_k$, which implies that $x \in T_k$. Therefore, $|V_{j+1}\Delta T_k| = |(V_j\Delta T_k) \setminus \{x\}| < |V_j\Delta T_k|$. If $V_{j+1} = V_j \setminus \{y\}$, then we have $y \in T_i \setminus T_{i+1}$, similar to the previous case. Again by property (2.2) we have $T_i \cap T_k \subseteq T_{i+1}$, namely, $y \notin T_k$. Then it follows that $|V_{j+1}\Delta T_k| = |(V_j\Delta T_k) \setminus \{y\}| < |V_j\Delta T_k|$. \square

2.2 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $d = s - t$ and $\lambda \in [d]$, note that $d \geq \max\{3, t\}$. For every $r \in [0, n]$, we define \mathcal{F}_r in the following way. If $r \in [0, t-1]$, then we let \mathcal{F}_r be the whole layer \mathcal{L}_r . If $r \in [t, n]$, then we let \mathcal{F}_r be a maximum subfamily of \mathcal{L}_r , such that \mathcal{F}_r contains no copy of (r, s, t) -daisy $\mathcal{D}_r(s, t)$. We want to show that \mathcal{F}_r satisfies (2.1), namely,

$$\forall A, B \in 2^{[n]} \text{ with } |A| + d \leq r \leq |B| - d, \exists T \in \mathcal{L}_r \setminus \mathcal{F}_r : A \cap B \subseteq T \subseteq A \cup B.$$

If $r < d$ or $r > n - d$, given that there exist no such $A, B \in 2^{[n]}$ with $|A| + d \leq r \leq |B| - d$, \mathcal{F}_r fulfills the above property. Hence, without loss of generality assume $d \leq r \leq n - d$. Then due to $|A \cap B| \leq |A| \leq r - d \leq r - t$ and $|A \cup B| \geq |B| \geq r + d \geq r + s - t$, there exist some $A' \in \mathcal{L}_{r-t}$ and $B' \in \mathcal{L}_{r+s-t}$ with $A \cap B \subseteq A' \subseteq B' \subseteq A \cup B$. Because \mathcal{F}_r is a $\mathcal{D}_r(s, t)$ -free family, we have

$$\{T \in \mathcal{L}_r : A' \subseteq T \subseteq B'\} \not\subseteq \mathcal{F}_r,$$

implying that at least one such T with $A' \subseteq T \subseteq B'$ lies in $\mathcal{L}_r \setminus \mathcal{F}_r$. Recall the way we choose A' and B' , we conclude that \mathcal{F}_r fulfills property (2.1). Let $\lambda \in [d]$ and $I_\lambda = \{r \in [0, n] : r \equiv \lambda \pmod{d}\}$. By Lemma 2.2, $\mathcal{X} := \bigcup_{r \in I_\lambda} \mathcal{F}_r$ is a mutual-visibility set in Q_n . Accordingly, the mutual-visibility number $\mu(Q_n)$ is bounded from below by $|\mathcal{X}| = \sum_{r \in I_\lambda} |\mathcal{F}_r|$. Choose $\lambda \in [d]$ to maximize $|\mathcal{X}|$. Then by averaging it follows that

$$\mu(Q_n) \geq d^{-1} \sum_{r \in [0, n]} |\mathcal{F}_r| = \frac{1}{s-t} \left(\sum_{r \in [0, t-1]} \binom{n}{r} + \sum_{r \in [t, n]} \text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t)) \right). \quad \square$$

2.3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

We shall now derive Theorem 1.2 from Theorem 1.4. To do so, we first recall some properties of $\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))$ and $\pi(\mathcal{D}_r(s, t))$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let r, s, t , be positive integers with $\min\{r, s\} \geq t$. Then for all $n \geq r$,*

$$\frac{\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))}{\binom{n}{r}} \geq \frac{\text{ex}(n+1, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))}{\binom{n+1}{r}}.$$

Lemma 2.4. *Let s and t be positive integers such that $s \geq t$. Then for all $r \geq t$,*

$$\pi(\mathcal{D}_r(s, t)) \geq \pi(\mathcal{D}_{r+1}(s, t)).$$

Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 are actually simple observations and have been mentioned in the literature, see, e.g., Keevash [13] and Sidorenko [18]. We also provide their short proofs in Appendix, for the reader's convenience.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Since the stated lower bound is trivial when $n \leq 3$, without loss of generality we assume $n > 3$. Then, we apply Theorem 1.6 with $q = 3$, it holds that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \pi(\mathcal{D}_r(5, 2)) \geq \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - 3^{-k}) > 0.56.$$

Accordingly, Lemma 2.4 implies $\pi(\mathcal{D}_r(5, 2)) \geq 0.56$ for all $r \geq 2$. Due to Lemma 2.3, this further leads to

$$\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(5, 2)) \geq 0.56 \binom{n}{r}$$

for all $n \geq r \geq 2$. Now apply Theorem 1.4 with $s = 5$ and $t = 2$, we obtain

$$\mu(Q_n) \geq \frac{1}{5-2} \left(\sum_{r \in [0,1]} \binom{n}{r} + \sum_{r \in [2,n]} \text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(5, 2)) \right) \geq 0.186 \cdot 2^n. \quad \square$$

3 Total mutual-visibility in Q_n

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we find it helpful in this section to regard the hypercube Q_n as a graph on the vertex set $\{0, 1\}^n$. For $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$, the *Hamming distance* between x and y , denoted $\text{dist}(x, y)$, is the number of coordinates where x and y differ. Then, two vertices $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ form an edge in Q_n if and only if $\text{dist}(x, y) = 1$. Note that the length of a shortest x - y path in Q_n is equal to $\text{dist}(x, y)$. Bujtás et al. [3] showed the following characterization of a total mutual-visibility set in Q_n .

Lemma 3.1 ([3, Theorem 6]). *$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ is a total mutual-visibility set in Q_n if and only if \mathcal{X} contains no two vertices with Hamming distance 2.*

By taking a random subset of $\{0, 1\}^n$ and applying the deletion method to the pairs of vertices with Hamming distance 2, Bujtás et al. [3] proved the lower bound $\mu_t(Q_n) \geq 2^{n-2}/(n^2 - n)$ for all $n \geq 2$. The same bound (with a slightly better constant) can also be derived from a greedy algorithm. On the other hand, our improvement on the lower bound comes from a coding theory perspective.

A subset \mathcal{X} of $\{0, 1\}^n$ is a *single error correcting code*, if the Hamming distance between any two elements of \mathcal{X} is at least 3. Let for $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, $\mathcal{B}(x, 1)$ be the set of all elements from $\{0, 1\}^n$ at Hamming distance at most 1 from x , i.e., a unit ball with center x . Note that $|\mathcal{B}(x, 1)| = n + 1$ and if \mathcal{X} is a single error correcting code, then for any distinct $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{B}(x, 1) \cap \mathcal{B}(y, 1) = \emptyset$. Thus, the size of \mathcal{X} is at most $2^n/(n + 1)$. In particular, if $|\mathcal{X}| = 2^n/(n + 1)$, then \mathcal{X} is called a *perfect single error correcting code*. Hamming [12] showed that perfect codes exist for certain values of n .

Lemma 3.2 (Hamming [12]). *Let $n = 2^m - 1$ for some integer $m \geq 2$. Then there exists a perfect single error correcting code in $\{0, 1\}^n$.*

The *weight* of an element $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is defined to be the number of 1's in x . Given $w \in [0, n]$, let $A(n, 4, w)$ denote the largest size of a set \mathcal{X} of elements from $\{0, 1\}^n$ with weight w and pairwise Hamming distance at least 4. Employing a simple combinatorial argument, Graham and Sloane [11] proved the following lower bound on $A(n, 4, w)$. We include the proof here for completeness.

Lemma 3.3 ([11, Theorem 1]). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w \in [0, n]$, then $A(n, 4, w) \geq \binom{n}{w}/n$.*

Proof. For $\lambda \in [n]$ we define $\mathcal{C}_{w, \lambda}$ to be the set of $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with weight w and $\|x\| \equiv \lambda \pmod{n}$, where $\|x\|$ denotes the sum of non-zero entries' positions in x . For example $\|(0, 1, 1)\| = 2 + 3 = 5$. Because all elements in $\mathcal{C}_{w, \lambda}$ have the same weight, the pairwise Hamming distance in $\mathcal{C}_{w, \lambda}$ is even. If $x, y \in \mathcal{C}_{w, \lambda}$ and $\text{dist}(x, y) = 2$, then $\|x\| \not\equiv \|y\| \pmod{n}$, a contradiction. Namely, the pairwise Hamming distance in $\mathcal{C}_{w, \lambda}$ is at least 4. Moreover, $|\cup_{\lambda \in [n]} \mathcal{C}_{w, \lambda}| = \binom{n}{w}$, since each element from $\{0, 1\}^n$ of weight w is in $\mathcal{C}_{w, \lambda}$, for some λ . Let \mathcal{C}_w be the largest among all $\mathcal{C}_{w, \lambda}$. By averaging we have $|\mathcal{C}_w| \geq \binom{n}{w}/n$. \square

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.8

Proof of Theorem 1.8. We start by showing the stated upper bound on $\mu_t(Q_n)$. Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ be a maximum total mutual-visibility set in Q_n , by Lemma 3.1 we know that \mathcal{X} forbids the Hamming distance 2. We define a bipartite graph G on the vertex set $\mathcal{X} \cup (\{0, 1\}^n \setminus \mathcal{X})$, such that $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \mathcal{X}$ are adjacent if and only if $\text{dist}(x, y) = 2$. We shall count the number of edges in G . First, for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there are $\binom{n}{2}$ vertices in $\{0, 1\}^n$ with Hamming distance 2 from x , that is, the number of ways to flip two coordinates of x . Since $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ forbids the Hamming distance 2, all such vertices are in $\{0, 1\}^n \setminus \mathcal{X}$, namely,

$$e(G) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} d_G(x) = |\mathcal{X}| \binom{n}{2}. \quad (3.1)$$

On the other hand, we claim that $d_G(y) \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ holds for every $y \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \mathcal{X}$. Suppose there exists some $y \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \mathcal{X}$ with $d_G(y) > \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Each neighbor of y is obtained by flipping two coordinates of y . Thus, by the pigeonhole principle, there must exist two neighbors $u, v \in \mathcal{X}$ of y and distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$, such that u is obtained by flipping the i -th and k -th coordinates of y , and v is obtained by flipping the j -th and k -th coordinates of y . But then the Hamming distance between u and v is exactly 2, a contradiction. Therefore,

$$e(G) = \sum_{y \in \{0, 1\}^n \setminus \mathcal{X}} d_G(y) \leq \frac{(2^n - |\mathcal{X}|)n}{2}.$$

Together with (3.1), we deduce the upper bound $\mu_t(Q_n) = |\mathcal{X}| \leq \frac{2^n}{n}$.

Now we prove the lower bounds on $\mu_t(Q_n)$.

Case 1: $n = 2^m - 1$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

If $m = 1$, then Q_n is isomorphic to K_2 . In this case, the whole vertex set of Q_n is a total mutual-visibility set, hence, $\mu_t(Q_n) \geq 2^n/(n+1)$. If $m \geq 2$, then Lemma 3.2 implies that there exists a subset $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n$ with pairwise Hamming distance at least 3 and $|\mathcal{X}| \geq 2^n/(n+1)$. By Lemma 3.1, such \mathcal{X} is a total mutual-visibility set in Q_n , accordingly, $\mu_t(Q_n) \geq 2^n/(n+1)$.

Case 2: n is an arbitrary natural number.

Let $w \in [0, n]$. Consider a set \mathcal{C}_w of elements from $\{0, 1\}^n$ with weight w and pairwise Hamming distance at least 4, such that $|\mathcal{C}_w| \geq \binom{n}{w}/n$. Such a set exists by Lemma 3.3. Furthermore, we define

$$\mathcal{A} := \bigcup_{\substack{w \in [0, n] \\ w \in \{0, 1\} \pmod{4}}} \mathcal{C}_w \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B} := \bigcup_{\substack{w \in [0, n] \\ w \in \{2, 3\} \pmod{4}}} \mathcal{C}_w.$$

It is easy to see that \mathcal{A} forbids the Hamming distance 2. Indeed, for any two elements $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with weight $w(x) \leq w(y)$, if $\text{dist}(x, y) = 2$, then either $w(x) = w(y)$ or $w(x) - w(y) = 2$. If $w(x) = w(y)$, then x and y must belong to the same \mathcal{C}_w , meaning that $\text{dist}(x, y) \geq 4$. If $w(x) - w(y) = 2$, then $w(x) \in \{0, 1\} \pmod{4}$ and $w(y) \in \{0, 1\} \pmod{4}$ can not hold simultaneously, a contradiction. By symmetry, \mathcal{B} also forbids the Hamming distance 2. Then, Lemma 3.1 assures that both \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are total mutual-visibility sets in Q_n . Furthermore, since $|\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}| = \sum_{w=0}^n |\mathcal{C}_w| \geq 2^n/n$, we have $\mu_t(Q_n) \geq \max\{|\mathcal{A}|, |\mathcal{B}|\} \geq 2^{n-1}/n$. \square

4 Concluding Remarks

In this paper we have showed tight bounds (up to a multiplicative constant) for $\mu(Q_n)$ and $\mu_t(Q_n)$. Moreover, our proofs give explicit constructions of almost optimal mutual-visibility and total mutual-visibility sets in a hypercube.

A natural generalization of hypercubes is the so-called *Hamming graph* $H(n, q)$ with $n, q \in \mathbb{N}$, which is defined as a graph on the vertex set $[q]^n$, where two vertices $u, v \in [q]^n$ form an edge if and only if their Hamming distance equals 1. Bujtás et al. [3] proved non-trivial bounds for $\mu_t(H(n, q))$. It might be possible to improve the lower bounds using certain probabilistic techniques and non-binary error-correcting codes, see, e.g., Lindström [16] and Schönheim [17]. On the other hand, $\mu(H(n, q))$ for $n > 2$ has not been studied to the best of our knowledge, and would be interesting to investigate.

Acknowledgements The research was partially supported by the DFG grant FKZ AX 93/2-1. The first author thanks Gabriele Di Stefano for introducing her to the notion of mutual-visibility in graphs. The authors thank Felix Christian Clemen for useful discussions.

References

- [1] Béla Bollobás, Imre Leader, and Claudia Malvenuto. "Daisies and Other Turán Problems." *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* 20.5 (2011): 743–747.
- [2] Boštjan Brešar and Ismael G. Yero. "Lower (total) mutual-visibility number in graphs." *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 465 (2024): 128411.

- [3] Csilla Bujtás, Sandi Klavžar, and Jing Tian. "Total mutual-visibility in Hamming graphs." arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.05168 (2023).
- [4] Serafino Cicerone, Alessia Di Fonso, Gabriele Di Stefano, Alfredo Navarra, and Francesco Piselli. "Mutual visibility in hypercube-like graphs." arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14443 (2023).
- [5] Serafino Cicerone, Gabriele Di Stefano, Lara Droždek, Jaka Hedžet, Sandi Klavžar, and Ismael G. Yero. "Variety of mutual-visibility problems in graphs." *Theoretical Computer Science* 974 (2023): 114096.
- [6] Serafino Cicerone, Gabriele Di Stefano, and Sandi Klavžar. "On the mutual visibility in Cartesian products and triangle-free graphs." *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 438 (2023): 127619.
- [7] Serafino Cicerone, Gabriele Di Stefano, Sandi Klavžar, and Ismael G. Yero. "Mutual-visibility in strong products of graphs via total mutual-visibility." arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07835 (2022).
- [8] Serafino Cicerone, Gabriele Di Stefano, Sandi Klavžar, and Ismael G. Yero. "Mutual-visibility problems on graphs of diameter two." arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02373 (2024).
- [9] Gabriele Di Stefano. "Mutual visibility in graphs." *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 419 (2022): 126850.
- [10] David Ellis, Maria-Romina Ivan, and Imre Leader. "Turán Densities for Daisies and Hypercubes." arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16289 (2024).
- [11] Ron Graham and Neil Sloane. "Lower Bounds for Constant Weight Codes." *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 26.1 (1980): 37–43.
- [12] Richard W. Hamming. "Error detecting and error correcting codes." *The Bell system technical journal* 29.2 (1950): 147–160.
- [13] Peter Keevash. "Hypergraph Turán Problems." *Surveys in Combinatorics* 392 (2011): 83–140.
- [14] Danilo Korže and Aleksander Vesel. "Mutual-visibility sets in Cartesian products of paths and cycles." arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15201 (2023).
- [15] Dorota Kuziak and Juan A. Rodríguez-Velázquez. "Total Mutual-Visibility in Graphs with Emphasis on Lexicographic and Cartesian Products." *Bulletin of the Malaysian Mathematical Sciences Society* 46.6 (2023): 197.
- [16] Bernt Lindström. "On Group and Nongroup Perfect Codes in q Symbols." *Mathematica Scandinavica* 25.2 (1969): 149–158.
- [17] J. Schönheim. "On linear and nonlinear single-error-correcting q -nary perfect codes." *Information and Control* 12.1 (1968): 23–26.
- [18] Alexander Sidorenko. "Turán numbers of r -graphs on $r + 1$ vertices." arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.02006 (2022).
- [19] Jing Tian and Sandi Klavžar. "Graphs with total mutual-visibility number zero and total mutual-visibility in Cartesian products." arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.07193 (2022).

Appendix

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Let $n \geq r$ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n+1]}{r}$ be a maximum $\mathcal{D}_r(s, t)$ -free family, i.e., $|\mathcal{F}| = \text{ex}(n+1, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))$. For every $A \in \binom{[n+1]}{n}$, we define $\mathcal{F}_A := \mathcal{F} \cap \binom{A}{r}$. Since \mathcal{F}_A is a $\mathcal{D}_r(s, t)$ -free family with ground set of size n , we have $|\mathcal{F}_A| \leq \text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))$. On the other hand, every member of \mathcal{F} is contained in $\binom{[n+1-r]}{n-r} = n+1-r$ different \mathcal{F}_A 's, then we can bound $\text{ex}(n+1, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))$ as follows

$$\text{ex}(n+1, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t)) = |\mathcal{F}| = \frac{\sum_{A \in \binom{[n+1]}{n}} |\mathcal{F}_A|}{n+1-r} \leq \frac{(n+1)\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))}{n+1-r}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\frac{\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))}{\binom{n}{r}} \geq \frac{(n+1-r)\text{ex}(n+1, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))}{(n+1)\binom{n}{r}} = \frac{\text{ex}(n+1, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))}{\binom{n+1}{r}}. \quad \square$$

Proof of Lemma 2.4. Let $n \geq r \geq t$ and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \binom{[n+1]}{r+1}$ be a largest $\mathcal{D}_{r+1}(s, t)$ -free family. For every $x \in [n+1]$, we define $\mathcal{F}_x := \{A \setminus \{x\} : A \in \mathcal{F} \text{ with } x \in A\}$. It is a simple observation that \mathcal{F}_x is a $\mathcal{D}_r(s, t)$ -free family with ground set of size n , then we have $|\mathcal{F}_x| \leq \text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))$. Moreover, since every member of \mathcal{F} contributes one member to $r+1$ different \mathcal{F}_x 's, we obtain the following bound

$$\text{ex}(n+1, \mathcal{D}_{r+1}(s, t)) = |\mathcal{F}| = \frac{\sum_{x \in [n+1]} |\mathcal{F}_x|}{r+1} \leq \frac{(n+1)\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))}{r+1}.$$

Accordingly,

$$\frac{\text{ex}(n, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))}{\binom{n}{r}} \geq \frac{(r+1)\text{ex}(n+1, \mathcal{D}_{r+1}(s, t))}{(n+1)\binom{n}{r}} = \frac{\text{ex}(n+1, \mathcal{D}_r(s, t))}{\binom{n+1}{r+1}},$$

taking the limit for $n \rightarrow \infty$, it holds that $\pi(\mathcal{D}_r(s, t)) \geq \pi(\mathcal{D}_{r+1}(s, t))$. □