# Getting Hype About Hyper-Bishops: Probabilities of safe squares on higher-dimensional chess boards.

1. Bishops 2. Hyper-Rooks 2.1 Hyper-Rooks Definitions We consider two generalisations of rooks in a higher dimension d. The first, which we call Hyper-Rooks, can move into any square on d orthogonal spaces of dimension d-1, which for 3 dimensions means that they move in 3 orthogonal planes. The second, that we call "Line-Rooks" keeps them moving in d orthogonal lines. 3-dimensional Line-Rook and Hyper-Rook movement patterns Pieces to Dominate  $\approx k n^{k-1}$ Squares Seen 2.2 Rook Averages Then, we consider two variations on our basic combinatorial tool. For Hyper-Rooks, the probability a square on a k-dimensional chessboard of size n being safe is approximately  $\binom{n^k - kn^{k-1}}{n} / \binom{n^k}{n}.$ Meanwhile Line Rooks give us a probability of  $\binom{n^k - kn + k - 1}{n^{k-1}} / \binom{n^k}{n^{k-1}}.$ Depiction of the rings on a 7 by 7 chessboard, as well as the attacking path of a bishop Using the same techniques that [MST21] used of bounding the probability with the extreme possibilities, we get that  $\lim_{n \to \infty} \binom{n^k - kn^{k-1}}{n} / \binom{n^k}{n} = \frac{1}{e^k},$  $\lim_{n \to \infty} \binom{n^k - kn + k - 1}{n^{k-1}} / \binom{n^k}{n^{k-1}} = \frac{1}{e^k}.$ (1) 06%. These align incredibly well with the [MST21] probability of  $\frac{1}{c^2}$ . We also showed that the variance of the probability a square was safe tends towards 0 as n approaches infinity.

$$\binom{n^2 - an - b}{n} / \binom{n^2}{n},$$



$$\sum_{r=1}^{(n-1)/2} \left( \frac{4(2r)}{n^2} \cdot \frac{\binom{n^2 - 2n + 2r + 3}{n}}{\binom{n^2}{n}} \right)$$

**1.1 Introduction** Among various chess-based problems in mathematics, there are a number based around the *n*-queens problem, concerning the number of configurations of *n* queens on a chessboard such that none can take any others (see, for example [Rou60]). The full behaviour of these is only understood for small n. We consider variations of a problem introduced by Miller, Sheng, and Turek showed in 2020 ([MST21]) about the percentage of safe squares when n rooks are placed randomly on an  $n \times n$  chessboard. They showed that in the limit  $n \to \infty$ , the percentage of safe squares converges to  $1/e^2$ . Inspired by this paper, we generalize to bishops, queens, and various higher-dimensional interpretations of the standard pieces. **Definition 1.1** (Seen and Safe). We say that a space is safe if there are no pieces that in a single move could move onto it in one move. Similarly, a piece sees a space if it could enter the space in one move. **1.2 Combinatorial Tools** Frequently, we use variations on the ratio (from [MST21]) which represents the percentage of ways to place n pieces on an  $n \times n$  chessboard that leave a certain target square, where the target square is seen pieces in an + b squares. The first binomial coeficient is the number of ways to place the n pieces in the  $n^2 - an - b$ squares that don't see the target square, while the second is the total number of ways to place all n pieces. 1.3 Bishops and Rings **Definition 1.2** (Chessboard Rings). We define the  $k^{th}$  ring on a chessboard to be the set of squares that lie the same distance from the edge, beginning with the 1st ring as either the center square or the center four squares, for odd or even chess boards respectively. at (3,1) From our definition of Rings, we have that a bishop attacks 2n - 2r squares, where r is its ring, defining the centermost ring as r = 0. This means that the percentage of safe squares on an  $n \times n$  board with n bishops is Then, we take the limit, finding that the average percentage of safe squares is

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{r=1}^{(n-1)/2} \left( \frac{4(2r)}{n^2} \cdot \frac{\binom{n^2 - 2n + 2r + 3}{n}}{\binom{n^2}{n}} \right) = \frac{2}{e^2} \approx 27.0$$

Number Theory and Probability Group - SMALL 2024 - Williams College

# Caroline Cashman, Joe Cooper, Raul Marquez, Jenna Shuffelton; Advisor: Steven J. Miller (sjm1@williams.edu)



i)	+	(y -	$\neg j)$ –	-(z -	(-k)	=0,
i)	+	(y -	- j) -	-(z -	(-k)	=0,
i)	_	(y -	- $j)$ -	-(z -	(-k)	=0,
i)		( <i>y</i> –	- j) -	- $(z$ -	(-k)	= 0.