



Sudoku Players' Forums

[FAQ](#) [Search](#) [Memberlist](#) [Usergroups](#)

[Profile](#) [You have no new messages](#) [Log out \[denis_berthier \]](#)

Abominable TRIAL-and-ERROR and lovely BRAIDS

Goto page [Previous](#) [1](#), [2](#), [3](#) ... [13](#), [14](#), [15](#)



[Sudoku Players' Forums Forum Index -> Advanced solving techniques](#)

[View previous topic](#) :: [View next topic](#)

Author

Message

denis_berthier

Posted: Mon Jan 18, 2010 6:56 pm Post subject:



Joined: 19 Jun 2007
Posts: 1187
Location: Paris, France

Red Ed wrote:

Thinking of a braid as a linearised presentation of c-nets-with-singles seems to be an appropriate thing, recognising prior art, and not something to be slapped down with claims of "confusion".

If the vague Sudopedia definition is "art", then you are not very ambitious about art.

The question is, where did c-nets lead to? Can you point any reference?

What is "prior art" reduced to a vague definition with no associated results?

Braids didn't come as a "linearised presentation of c-nets-with-singles" but as a generalisation of whips.

It turns out that they can be considered as c-nets, if you interpret these retrospectively in a particular way.

It is always easy to rewrite history. Communists were specialists of this. There has never been any idea that there could have been c-nets-with-other-than-singles. Speaking of c-nets-with-singles is a thus a deliberate falsification of history.

[Back to top](#)



Red Ed

Posted: Mon Jan 18, 2010 8:25 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Jun 2005
Posts: 1054

denis_berthier wrote:

It is always easy to rewrite history. Communists were specialists of this. There has never been any idea that there could have been c-nets-with-other-than-singles. Speaking of c-nets-with-singles is a thus a deliberate falsification of history.

What an astonishingly crass analogy. Ever heard of Godwin's Law?

Denis, it is standard good practice to draw associations between concepts, and obtuse to deny the existence of an association when (as in this case) it is so

clear. That you reached braids via whips is immaterial to the fact that braids(*) *can* be thought of as linearised presentations of c-nets-with-singles. That you formalised braids and built some theory around them is immaterial to the fact that braids(*) *can* be thought of as linearised presentations of c-nets-with-singles. To keep denying the association, as if no other form of T&E is worth even mentioning, seems symptomatic of severe NIH syndrome.

* - without additional "FP" patterns of course

[Back to top](#)



denis_berthier

Posted: Mon Jan 18, 2010 9:25 pm Post subject:



Joined: 19 Jun 2007
Posts: 1187
Location: Paris, France

Red Ed,

I have never denied that braids, or rather my T&E procedure, *can* be thought of as c-nets (in the same way as Notre Dame can be thought of as some assembly of stones).

I've even written:

denis_berthier wrote:

sudopedia wrote:

The player selects a candidate to be tested. When this candidate belongs to a bivalued cell, finding a contradiction allows the player to place the remaining candidate in that cell. The tested candidate is assumed to be true and the implications are analyzed until a contradiction is found or no further progress can be made.

This definition is that of a procedure - a trial and error procedure - not of a pattern. It is so vague that almost anything can be a contradiction net. In this sense, a braid is a contradiction net. But it would be more correct to say that my T&E procedure is a contradiction net in this sense.

This is of course after disregarding the totally irrelevant Sudopedia sentence "When this candidate belongs to a bivalued cell, finding a contradiction allows the player to place the remaining candidate in that cell".

As long as you don't say what "the implications are analyzed" means, this definition is empty of any concrete content. In addition to my previous remarks, it doesn't forbid to use ORed rlc's, which of course a braid doesn't allow and which would correspond to what I've defined as an nrczt-net.

I should therefore have written "my T&E procedure *can* be thought of as some specialised form of the c-nets pseudo-procedure".

And, to precise what you're speaking of, you should now speak of linearised-c-nets-with-singles-with-no-ORed-candidates.

My reference to communists was not aimed at you in particular (apologies if you understood it as such). But speaking of c-nets-with-singles *is* a falsification of history, even if you add a note: "without additional "FP" patterns of course". Changing the words is at the heart (is the art) of falsification. Re-read 1984.

I note that:

- you've been unable to give any reference to any result produced by the above vague definition of a c-net,
- you (and others) got interested in this after I introduced braids.

[Back to top](#)



Red Ed

Posted: Mon Jan 18, 2010 9:47 pm Post subject:



Joined: 06 Jun 2005
Posts: 1054

denis_berthier wrote:

I have never denied that braids, or rather my T&E procedure, *can* be thought of as c-nets (in the same way as Notre Dame can be thought of as some assembly of stones).

Good -- and that association is the most useful way for programmers to think about it.

If braids are Notre Dame then I can hardly wait for Versailles 😊

[Back to top](#)



denis_berthier

Posted: Mon Jan 18, 2010 10:03 pm Post subject:



Joined: 19 Jun 2007
Posts: 1187
Location: Paris, France

Red Ed wrote:

denis_berthier wrote:

I have never denied that braids, or rather my T&E procedure, *can* be thought of as c-nets (in the same way as Notre Dame can be thought of as some assembly of stones).

Good -- and that association is the most useful way for programmers to think about it.

Only in some particular way of programming them.

Red Ed wrote:

If braids are Notre Dame then I can hardly wait for Versailles

But you'll have to find another architect. I don't plan to invest much more time in Sudoku.

[Back to top](#)



Display posts from previous:



Sudoku Players' Forums
Forum Index -> Advanced solving techniques

All times are GMT + 1 Hour
Goto page [Previous](#) [1](#), [2](#), [3](#) ... [13](#), [14](#), [15](#)

Page 15 of 15

[Stop watching this topic](#)

Jump to:

You **can** post new topics in this forum

You **can** reply to topics in this forum
You **can** edit your posts in this forum
You **can** delete your posts in this forum
You **can** vote in polls in this forum

Powered by phpBB © 2001, 2005 phpBB Group