DIMACS Technical Report 2000-21
August 2000

An Incremental RNC Algorithm for Generating All Maximal Independent Sets in Hypergraphs of Bounded Dimension

by

E. Boros[1]
RUTCOR, Rutgers University
640 Bartholomew Road
Piscataway NJ 08854
(boros@rutcor.rutgers.edu)

K. Elbassioni
Department of Computer Science
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903
(elbassio@paul.rutgers.edu)

V. Gurvich
Russian Academy of Sciences
Moscow, Russia
(gurvich@rutcor.rutgers.edu)

L. Khachiyan[1]
Department of Computer Science
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903
(leonid@cs.rutgers.edu)

[1]Permanent Members of DIMACS

[2]The research of the first and third authors was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research (Grant N00014-92-J-1375), and the National Science Foundation (Grant DMS 98-06389). The research of the third and forth authors was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (Grant CCR-9618796). Visits of the third author to Rutgers University were also supported by DIMACS, the National Science Foundation's Center for Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science.

ABSTRACT

We show that for hypergraphs of bounded edge size, the problem of extending a given list of maximal independent sets is NC-reducible to the computation of an arbitrary maximal independent set for an induced sub-hypergraph. The latter problem is known to be in RNC. In particular, our reduction yields an incremental RNC dualization algorithm for hypergraphs of bounded edge size, a problem previously known to be solvable in polynomial incremental time. We also give a similar parallel algorithm for the dualization problem on the product of arbitrary lattices which have a bounded number of immediate predecessors for each element.

1 Introduction

Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^V$ be a hypergraph (set family) on a finite vertex set V. A vertex set $I \subseteq V$ is called *independent* if I contains no hyperedge of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq 2^V$ denote the family of all maximal independent sets of $\mathcal{A}$. We assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is given by a list of its hyperedges and consider the problem of incrementally generating $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$:

$MIS(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{I})$: *Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{A}$ and a collection $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ of maximal independent sets for $\mathcal{A}$, either find a new maximal independent set $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \mathcal{I}$, or prove that the given collection is complete: $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$.*

Our objective in this note is to show that for hypergraphs of bounded dimension,

$$\dim(\mathcal{A}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{|A| \ : \ A \in \mathcal{A}\} \leq const,$$

problem $MIS(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{I})$ can be efficiently solved in parallel:

Theorem 1 *$MIS(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{I}) \in NC$ for $dim(\mathcal{A}) \leq 3$, and $MIS(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{I}) \in RNC$ for $dim(\mathcal{A}) = 4, 5, \ldots$*

The statements of Theorem 1 were previously known [4, 23] only for $\mathcal{I} = \emptyset$, when $MIS(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{I})$ turns into the classical problem of computing a single maximal independent set for $\mathcal{A}$ (see [1, 12, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 25]). We show that conversely, $MIS(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{I})$ can be reduced to the above special case.

Theorem 2 *If $dim(\mathcal{A}) \leq const$, then problem $MIS(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{I})$ is NC-reducible[1] to problem $MIS(\mathcal{A}',\emptyset)$, where $\mathcal{A}'$ is some induced partial hypergraph of $\mathcal{A}$.*

(Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^V$, a subfamily $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is called a *partial hypergraph* of $\mathcal{A}$, while $\{A \cap U | A \in \mathcal{A}'\}$ for some $U \subseteq V$ is called an *induced partial hypergraph* of $\mathcal{A}$.)

Note that if $I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ is an independent set, the complement $B = V \setminus I$ is a *transversal* to $\mathcal{A}$, i.e. $B \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, and vice versa. Hence $\{B \mid B = V \setminus I, I \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})\} = \mathcal{A}^d$, where $\mathcal{A}^d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{B \mid B \text{ minimal transversal to } \mathcal{A}\}$ is the *transversal* or *dual* hypergraph of $\mathcal{A}$. For this reason, $MIS(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{I})$ can be equivalently stated as the *hypergraph dualization problem*:

$DUAL(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$: *Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{A}$ and a collection $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^d$ of minimal transversals to $\mathcal{A}$, either find a new minimal transversal $B \in \mathcal{A}^d \setminus \mathcal{B}$ or show that $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}^d$.*

The hypergraph dualization problem has applications in combinatorics [29], graph theory [19, 24, 30, 31], artificial intelligence [13], game theory [17, 18, 28], reliability theory [10, 28], database theory [2, 6, 7, 27, 32], integer programming [6, 7], and learning theory [3]. It is an open question whether problem $DUAL(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$, or equivalently $MIS(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{I})$, can be solved in polynomial time for arbitrary hypergraphs. The fastest currently known algorithm [14] for $DUAL(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ is quasi-polynomial and runs in time $O(nm) + m^{o(\log m)}$,

[1] In fact, our reduction is in AC_0

where $n = |V|$ and $m = |\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|$. However, as shown in [13, 5], for hypergraphs of bounded dimension problem $DUAL(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ can be solved in polynomial time. Theorem 1 strengthens this result by implying that $DUAL(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in NC$ for $\dim(\mathcal{A}) \leq 3$ and $DUAL(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \in RNC$ for $\dim(\mathcal{A}) = 4, 5, \ldots$. As mentioned above, Theorem 1 is a corollary of Theorem 2 and the results of [4, 23].

A vertex set S is called a *sub-transversal* of $\mathcal{A}$ if $S \subseteq B$ for some minimal transversal $B \in \mathcal{A}^d$. Our proof of Theorem 2 makes use of a characterization of sub-transversals suggested in [5]. Even though it is NP-hard in general to test whether a given set $S \subseteq V$ is a sub-transversal of $\mathcal{A}$, for $|S| \leq const$ the sub-transversal criterion of [5] is in NC. This turns out to be sufficient for the proof of Theorem 2.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Sections 2 and 3 we recall the sub-transversal criterion of [5] and prove Theorem 2. Then in Section 4 we discuss a generalization of the sub-transversal criterion and Theorem 2 for the dualization problem on the Cartesian products of n lattices. More precisely, given n lattices $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_n$ and a set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \mathcal{P}_n$, we consider the problem of generating all maximal elements in $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{A}^+$, where $\mathcal{A}^+$ is the (upper) ideal generated by $\mathcal{A}$. If $\mathcal{P} = \{0,1\}^n$ is the product of n chains $\{0,1\}$, then this problem is equivalent to the generation of the transversal hypergraph for $\mathcal{A}$. In general, when $\mathcal{A}$ is a set in $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{P}_n$, we define $\dim(\mathcal{A}) = \max\{|\mathrm{Supp}(a)| : a \in \mathcal{A}\}$, where $\mathrm{Supp}(a)$ is the *support* of $a \in \mathcal{P}$, i.e., the set of all non-minimal components of a. Then we show that for $\dim(\mathcal{A}) \leq const$, the dualization problem on $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{P}_n$ is NC-reducible to the maximal independent set problem for some hypergraphs of dimension at most $\dim(\mathcal{A})$, provided that the number of immediate predecessors of any element in each factor-lattice $\mathcal{P}_i$ is also bounded by a constant.

2 Characterization of sub-transversals to a hypergraph

Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^V$, a subset $S \subseteq V$, and a vertex $v \in S$, let $\mathcal{A}_v(S) = \{A \in \mathcal{A} \mid A \cap S = \{v\}\}$ denote the family of all hyperedges of $\mathcal{A}$ whose intersection with S is exactly v. Let further $\mathcal{A}_0(S) = \{A \in \mathcal{A} \mid A \cap S = \emptyset\}$ denote the partial hypergraph consisting of the hyperedges of $\mathcal{A}$ disjoint from S. A selection of $|S|$ hyperedges $\{A_v \in \mathcal{A}_v(S) \mid v \in S\}$ is called *covering* if there exists a hyperedge $A \in \mathcal{A}_0(S)$, such that $A \subseteq \bigcup_{v \in S} A_v$. Proposition 1 below states that a non-empty set S is a sub-transversal of $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if there exists a non-covering selection for S.

Proposition 1 (cf. [5]) *Let $S \subseteq V$ be a non-empty vertex set in a hypergraph $\mathcal{A} \in 2^V$.*

i) *If S is a sub-transversal for $\mathcal{A}$, then there exists a non-covering selection $\{A_v \in \mathcal{A}_v(S) \mid v \in S\}$ for S.*

ii) *Given a non-covering selection $\{A_v \in \mathcal{A}_v(S) \mid v \in S\}$ for S, we can extend S to a minimal transversal of $\mathcal{A}$ by solving problem $MIS(\mathcal{A}', \emptyset)$ for the induced partial hypergraph*

$$\mathcal{A}' = \{A \cap U \mid A \in \mathcal{A}_0(S)\} \subseteq 2^U, \tag{1}$$

where

$$U = V \setminus \bigcup_{v \in S} A_v. \tag{2}$$

Proof. Let us start with the following observations:

(a) If $S \subseteq B \subseteq V$, then $\mathcal{A}_v(B) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_v(S)$ holds for all $v \in S$.

(b) If B is a transversal to $\mathcal{A}$, then B is minimal if and only if $\mathcal{A}_v(B) \neq \emptyset$ for all $v \in B$.

Observation (a) follows directly from the definitions of $\mathcal{A}_v(S)$ and $\mathcal{A}_v(B)$. To see (b), note that if $\mathcal{A}_v(B) = \emptyset$ for some $v \in B$, then $B \setminus \{v\}$ is still a transversal to $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof of (i) Suppose that $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq B$, where $B \in \mathcal{A}^d$ is a minimal transversal. By observations (a) and (b), we have $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{A}_v(B) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_v(S)$ for each $v \in S$. Consider then a selection of the form $\{A_v \in \mathcal{A}_v(B) \mid v \in S\}$. If it covers a hyperedge $A \in \mathcal{A}_0(S)$, then A would be disjoint from B, contradicting the fact that $B \in \mathcal{A}^d$.

Proof of (ii) Suppose we are given a non-covering selection $\{A_v \in \mathcal{A}_v(S) | \ v \in S\}$. If $\mathcal{A}_0(S) = \emptyset$, then S is obviously a transversal to $\mathcal{A}$. Hence by (b), S itself is a minimal transversal to $\mathcal{A}$. Let us assume now that $\mathcal{A}_0(S) \neq \emptyset$ and consider the hypergraph $\mathcal{A}'$ as defined in (1)-(2). Since the given selection is non-covering and $\mathcal{A}_0(S) \neq \emptyset$, we conclude that the vertex and edge sets of $\mathcal{A}'$ are not empty, and $\mathcal{A}'$ contains no empty edges. Let T be a minimal transversal to $\mathcal{A}'$. (Such a transversal can be computed by letting $T = U \setminus I$, where $I = output(MIS(\mathcal{A}', \emptyset))$.) It is easy to see that $S \cup T$ is a transversal to $\mathcal{A}$. Moreover, $S \cup T$ is minimal, since if we delete a vertex $v \in S$, then $A_v \cap [(S \setminus \{v\}) \cup T] = \emptyset$, while deleting a vertex $v \in T$ results in an empty intersection with some $A \in \mathcal{A}_0(S)$. □

Unfortunately, if the cardinality of S is not bounded, finding a non-covering selection for S (equivalently, testing if S is a sub-transversal) is NP-hard. In fact, this is so even for $\dim(\mathcal{A}) = 2$ (i.e., for graphs and transversals $\equiv$ vertex covers).

Proposition 2 *Given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and a vertex set $S \subseteq V$, it is NP-complete to determine whether S can be extended to a minimal vertex cover.*

Proof. We use a polynomial transformation from the satisfiability problem. Let $C = C_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge C_m$ be a conjunctive normal form, and let us consider the graph $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of all clauses and literals of C, and where E consists of the pairs $(x, \overline{x})$ of mutually negating literals, and the pairs (C_i, u) formed by a clause and one of its literals. Then the set $S = \{C_1, \ldots, C_m\}$ can be extended to a minimal vertex cover of G if and only if C is satisfiable. □

We close this section with the observation that if the size of S is bounded by a constant, then there are only polynomially many selections $\{A_v \in \mathcal{A}_v(S) \mid v \in S\}$ for S. All of these selections, including the non-covering ones, can be easily enumerated in parallel.

Corollary 1 *For any fixed c, there is an NC algorithm which, given a hypergraph $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^V$ and a set S of at most c vertices, determines whether S is a sub-transversal to $\mathcal{A}$ and if so, finds a non-covering selection $\{A_v \in \mathcal{A}_v(S) \mid v \in S\}$.*

Note that Corollary 1 holds for hypergraphs $\mathcal{A}$ of arbitrary dimension.

3 Proof of Theorem 2

We prove the theorem for the equivalent problem $DUAL(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, i.e. show that for $\dim(\mathcal{A}) \leq const$, problem $DUAL(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is NC-reducible to $MIS(\mathcal{A}', \emptyset)$, for some induced partial hypergraph $\mathcal{A}'$ of $\mathcal{A}$. Our reduction consists of several steps.

Step 1. Delete all hyperedges of $\mathcal{A}$ that contain other hyperedges of $\mathcal{A}$. Clearly, this does not change the minimal transversals to $\mathcal{A}$. We assume in the sequel that no hyperedge of $\mathcal{A}$ contains another hyperedge of $\mathcal{A}$, i.e., that

$$\mathcal{A} \text{ is Sperner.} \tag{3}$$

Note that the dual hypergraph $\mathcal{A}^d$ is Sperner by definition, and hence $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^d$ is Sperner as well.

Step 2 (optional). Delete all vertices in V that are not covered by some $A \in \mathcal{A}$ so that we have $V = \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A$. If $\bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B$ is a proper subset of V, a new minimal transversal in $\mathcal{A}^d \setminus \mathcal{B}$ can be found as follows:

- Pick a vertex $u \in V \setminus \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B$.
- The set $S = \{u\}$ is a sub-transversal to A. In view of (3), any hyperedge $A_u \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $u \in A_u$ is a non-covering selection for S.
- Let $u \in T \in \mathcal{A}^d$, then $T \notin \mathcal{B}$, because none of the transversals in $\mathcal{B}$ contains u. By Proposition 1, the problem of extending $S = \{u\}$ to a minimal transversal T is equivalent to that of computing a maximal independent set for hypergraph (1) with $U = V \setminus A_u$.

We can thus assume without loss of generality that

$$\bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A = \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} B = V.$$

Step 3. By definition, each set $B \in \mathcal{B}$ is a minimal transversal to $\mathcal{A}$. This implies that each set $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is transversal to $\mathcal{B}$. Check whether each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is a *minimal* transversal to $\mathcal{B}$. Suppose that some $A^o \in \mathcal{A}$ is not minimal, i.e. there is a vertex $u \in A^o$ such that $A^* = A^o \setminus \{u\}$ is still transversal to $\mathcal{B}$. Then we can proceed as follows.

- Let $\mathcal{A}' = \{A \cap U \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\}$, where $U = V \setminus A^*$.

- By (3), we have $A \cap U \neq \emptyset$ for each hyperedge $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence any minimal transversal T to $\mathcal{A}'$ is also a minimal transversal for $\mathcal{A}$.

- It easy to see that $T \notin \mathcal{B}$. This is because any set $B \in \mathcal{B}$ intersects A^* whereas T is disjoint from A^*. This reduces the computation of a new element in $\mathcal{A}^d \setminus \mathcal{B}$ to problem $MIS(\mathcal{A}', \emptyset)$.

In the sequel we assume in addition to (3) that each set in $\mathcal{A}$ is a minimal transversal to $\mathcal{B}$:

$$\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}^d. \tag{4}$$

Before proceeding to the next step of the reduction, we pause to make some observations. Clearly, $(\mathcal{A}^d)^d = \mathcal{A}$ for any Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{A}$. Therefore, if $B \neq \mathcal{A}^d$ then $\mathcal{A} \neq \mathcal{B}^d$. By (4), we then have $\mathcal{B}^d \setminus \mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$. Hence we arrive at the following duality criterion: $\mathcal{A}^d \setminus \mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if there is a sub-transversal S to $\mathcal{B}$ such that

$$|S| \leq \dim(\mathcal{A}), \quad \text{and} \tag{5}$$

$$S \not\subseteq A \quad \text{for all} \quad A \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{6}$$

The "if" part is obvious and holds even without assumption (4). To show the "only if" part, consider an arbitrary minimal transversal $T \in \mathcal{B}^d \setminus \mathcal{A}$. Clearly, T satisfies (6). Let S be a minimal subset of T that still satisfies (6) and let v be an arbitrary vertex in S. Since $S \setminus \{v\}$ does not satisfy (6) we have $S \setminus \{v\} \subseteq A$ for some $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Assuming $|S| > \dim(\mathcal{A})$, we obtain $A = S \setminus \{v\}$ by (6). Hence $A \subset S \subseteq T$. However, both A and T are minimal transversals to $\mathcal{B}$. This contradiction shows (5).

So far, we have not relied on the assumption that $\dim(\mathcal{A})$ is bounded. We need this assumption to guarantee that the next step of our reduction is in NC.

Step 4 (Duality test.) For each set S satisfying (5), (6) and the condition that

$$A \not\subseteq S \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A}, \tag{7}$$

check whether or not

$$S \text{ is a sub-transversal to } \mathcal{B}. \tag{8}$$

Recall that by Proposition 1, S satisfies (8) if and only if there is a selection

$$\{B_v \in \mathcal{B}_v(S) \mid v \in S\} \tag{9}$$

which covers no set $B \in \mathcal{B}_0(S)$. Here as before, $\mathcal{B}_0(S) = \{B \in \mathcal{B} \mid B \cap S = \emptyset\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_v(S) = \{B \in \mathcal{B} \mid B \cap S = \{v\}\}$ for $v \in S$.

If conditions (5), (6),(7) and (8) cannot be met, we conclude that $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}^d$ and halt.

Step 5. Suppose we have found a non-covering selection (9) for some set S satisfying (5), (6), (7) (and hence (8)). We claim that the set

$$Z = S \bigcup \left[V \setminus \bigcup_{v \in S} B_v \right]$$

is independent in $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose to the contrary that $A \subseteq W$ for some $A \in \mathcal{A}$. By (6), there is a vertex $u \in S$ such that $u \notin A$. Then $A \cap B_u = \emptyset$, yielding a contradiction.

Note also that Z is transversal to $\mathcal{B}$ because selection (9) is non-covering.

Let $\mathcal{A}' = \{A \cap U \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\}$, where $U = V \setminus Z$, and let T be a minimal transversal to $\mathcal{A}'$. (As before, we can let $T = U \setminus output(MIS(\mathcal{A}', \emptyset)$.) Since Z is an independent set of $\mathcal{A}$, we have $T \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, i.e., T is transversal to $\mathcal{A}$. Clearly, T is minimal, i.e. $T \in \mathcal{A}^d$. It remains to argue that T is a *new* minimal transversal to $\mathcal{A}$, i.e., $T \notin \mathcal{B}$. This follows from the fact that Z is transversal to $\mathcal{B}$ and disjoint from T. □

Remark Theorems 1 and 2 can be extended to so-called *fairly independent sets*. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^V$ be a hypergraph and let $t \in \{0, 1, \ldots, |\mathcal{A}| - 1\}$ be a given threshold. A vertex set $I \subseteq V$ is called fairly independent or t-independent if I contains at most t hyperedges of $\mathcal{A}$. For $t = 0$ each fairly independent set is thus an indepent set of $\mathcal{A}$. Let us call a vertex set $U \subseteq V$ a *t-union* if U contains at least t hyperedges of $\mathcal{A}$, and let $\mathcal{A}_{u_t}$ denote the hypergraph of all minimal t-unions. It is not difficult to see that a vertex set $I \subseteq V$ is t-independent in $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if I is a standard independent set of $\mathcal{A}_{u_{t+1}}$. Furthemore, if t and $\dim(\mathcal{A})$ are both bounded, then $\mathcal{A}_{u_{t+1}}$ can be constructed in NC and the dimension of $\mathcal{A}_{u_{t+1}}$ is bounded as well. Hence for $t \leq const$, all maximal t-independent sets in a hypergraph of bounded dimension can be incrementally generated by an RNC algorithm.

The sub-transversal criterion of Proposition 1 can also be extended to t-independent sets. Call a vertex set $T \subseteq V$ a *t-transversal* to $\mathcal{A}$ if T is disjoint from at most t hyperedges of $\mathcal{A}$. Note that T is a t-transversal if and only if $I = V \setminus T$ is t-independent in $\mathcal{A}$. By definition, a vertex set S is a *t-sub-transversal* if S is a subset of some minimal t-transversal T. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a selection of $|S|$ *subfamilies* of hyperedges $\{\mathcal{B}_v \subseteq \mathcal{A}_v(S) \mid v \in S\}$ and let $k_v = |\mathcal{B}_v|$. Denote by l the number of hyperedges in $\mathcal{A}_0$ covered by the union of all sets in $\mathcal{B}$. Call $\mathcal{B}$ a *t-selection* if $l \leq t < l + k_v$ for all $v \in S$. Proposition 1 can be generalized as follows: *A non-empty vertex set S is a t-sub-transversal of $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if there exists a t-selection for S.* Note that in this criterion, we can consider only those selections $\mathcal{B}$ for which $k_v \leq t + 1$ for all $v \in S$. In particular, for $t = 0$ we obtain $l = 0$ and $k_v \equiv 1$, which is equivalent to the definition of non-covering selections introduced in Section 2.

4 Maximal independent sets in products of lattices

In this section, we discuss a generalization of problem $MIS(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{I})$ in which the input hypergraphs $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{I}$ are replaced by two subsets of a partially ordered set $\mathcal{P}$. Given a subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$, let $\mathcal{A}^+ = \{x \in \mathcal{P} \mid x \succcurlyeq a, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and $\mathcal{A}^- = \{x \in \mathcal{P} \mid x \preccurlyeq a, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ denote the ideal and the filter generated by $\mathcal{A}$. Any element in $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{A}^+$ is called *independent of* $\mathcal{A}$. Let $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ be the set of all maximal independent elements for $\mathcal{A}$, then

$$\mathcal{A}^+ \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})^- = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}^+ \cup \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})^- = \mathcal{P}.$$

Consider the following problem:

$MIS(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$: *Given a set $\mathcal{A}$ in a poset $\mathcal{P}$ and a collection of maximal independent elements $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$, either find a new maximal independent element $x \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \mathcal{B}$, or prove that $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$.*

Clearly, the above problem can be efficiently solved in parallel for any explicitly given poset, i.e, when $\mathcal{P}$ is represented by the list of its elements and their precedence graph. If $\mathcal{P}$ is the product of n chains $\{0,1\}$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} = \{0,1\}^n$ is (the set of characteristic vectors of the hyperedges of) a hypergraph on n vertices, we obtain problem $MIS(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{I})$ stated in the Introduction. We are interested in the more general case where $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{P}_n$ for explicitly given posets $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_n$. For instance, partially ordered sets as attribute values arise in many data analysis applications, e.g., chains or products of chains in [9, 11, 26], lattices and products of lattices in [8]. Frequently a partially defined monotone binary function $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is sought to explain the data, where the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ represent some attributes ranging over such posets. In many applications, $f : \mathcal{P} \to \{0,1\}$ is defined by sets $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{P}_n$ of positive and negative samples, i.e. $f(x) = 1$ for $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and $f(x) = 0$ for $x \in \mathcal{B}$ is assumed. Due to monotonicity, we can assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are both antichains, and that $\mathcal{A}^+ \cap \mathcal{B}^- = \emptyset$. Now, determining whether f is totally defined and if not, finding a point $x \in \mathcal{P} \setminus (\mathcal{A}^+ \cap \mathcal{B}^-)$, is easily seen to be equivalent to problem $MIS(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$.

In what follows, we assume that each poset $\mathcal{P}_i$ has a unique minimum element 0_i, and let $\mathrm{Supp}(x) = \{i \mid x_i \succ 0_i\}$ denote the set of non-minimal components of $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathcal{P}$. As mentioned in the Introduction, we define $\dim(\mathcal{A}) = \max\{|\mathrm{Supp}(a)| : a \in \mathcal{A}\}$. We also denote by $x^\perp$ the set of immediate predecessors of x, i.e.,

$$x^\perp = \{y \in \mathcal{P} \mid z \preccurlyeq x,\ z \neq x \ \Rightarrow\ z \preccurlyeq y \text{ for some } y \in x^\perp\},$$

and let $\text{in-deg}(\mathcal{P}) = \max\{|x^\perp| :\ x \in \mathcal{P}\}$. Clearly, we have $\text{in-deg}(\mathcal{P}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{in-deg}(\mathcal{P}_i)$ for $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{P}_n$. If $\mathcal{P}$ is a lattice, we let $x \vee y$ and $x \wedge y$ denote the maximum and minimum of $x, y \in \mathcal{P}$.

Theorems 1 and 2 admit the following generalizations.

Theorem 1′ *Let $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{P}_n$, where each poset $\mathcal{P}_i$ is a lattice of in-degree $\leq$ const, and let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ be two given sets such that $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$. Then $MIS(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}) \in NC$ for $dim(\mathcal{A}) \leq 3$, and $MIS(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}) \in RNC$ for $dim(\mathcal{A}) = 4, 5, \ldots$*

Theorem 2′ *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1′, $MIS(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ is NC-reducible to $MIS(\mathcal{P}',\mathcal{A}',\emptyset)$, where $\mathcal{P}' = \{z\}^+$ for some $z \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{A}' = \{z \vee a \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$.*

Note that for any $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_n) \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $\mathcal{P}' = \{z\}^+ = \{z_1\}^+ \times \ldots \times \{z_n\}^+$, i.e. $\mathcal{P}'$ is still the product of n lattices $\mathcal{P}'_i = \{z_i\}^+$ whose in-degrees are bounded by the in-degrees of the original lattices $\mathcal{P}_i$. Moreover, we have $0'_i = z_i$ in $\mathcal{P}'_i$, and for this reason the dimension of $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}'$ does not exceed the dimension of $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{P}$. In addition, it is easy to see that Theorem 2′ is indeed a generalization of Theorem 2. If $\mathcal{P} = \{0,1\}^n$, then z is the characteristic vector of some set $Z \subseteq V = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $\{Z\}^+$ is the family of all supersets of Z. Furthermore, each element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is then the characteristic vector of some hyperedge $A \subseteq V$. Under this interpretation, $\mathcal{A}' = \{z \vee a \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ can be regarded as the hypergraph $\{Z \cup A \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Problem $MIS(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{A}', \emptyset)$ calls for computing a set $X \subseteq V$ such that $Z \subseteq X$ and X is a maximal independent set for $\{Z \cup A \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Letting $U = V \setminus Z$, the latter problem is easily seen to be equivalent to computing a maximal independent set for the induced hypergraph $\{A \cap U \mid A \in \mathcal{A}\}$, as stated in Theorem 2.

In addition to Theorems $1'$ and $2'$, we show that if each poset $\mathcal{P}_i$ has a unique minimum element, then problem $MIS(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{A}, \emptyset)$ can be reduced to the maximal independent set problem for some hypergrpaphs.

Theorem 3 *For each fixed c, there is an NC-algorithm which, given posets* $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_n$ *with unique minumum elements* $0_i \in \mathcal{P}_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, *and a set* $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \mathcal{P}_n$ *such that* $dim(\mathcal{A}) \leq c$, *reduces* $MIS(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{A}, \emptyset)$ *to the maximal independent set problem for some hypergraphs of dimension at most c.*

Note that Theorem 3 holds for the posets $\mathcal{P}_i$ of arbitrarily large in-degrees and does not require that these posets be lattices. It is also clear that Theorem $1'$ is a corollary of Theorems 3 and $2'$.

4.1 Characterization of sub-minimal elements of an ideal

Our proof of Theorem $2'$ makes use of an analogue of Proposition 1. This analogue, Proposition 3 below, assumes that each of the posets $\mathcal{P}_i$, $i \in V = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, is a lower semi-lattice, i.e., for any two elements $x, y \in \mathcal{P}_i$ there is a unique minimum element $x \wedge y$. As before, we denote by $x^\perp$ the set of immediate predecessors of x. Note that if $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{P}_n$, then any element $y \in x^\perp$ has the form $y = (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n)$, where $y_i \in x_i^\perp$ is an immediate predecessor of x_i in $\mathcal{P}_i$ and $i \in \mathrm{Supp}(x)$.

Given a set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ and a vector $s \in \mathcal{P}$, we say that s is *sub-minimal for* $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$ if $s \preccurlyeq x$ for some minimal element x of the ideal $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$. We call a subset $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ a *majorant for* $s^\perp$ if for any $y \in s^\perp$ there is an element $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ such that $b \succcurlyeq y$.

Proposition 3 *Let* $\mathcal{B}$ *be a given set in* $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{P}_n$, *where each poset* $\mathcal{P}_i$ *is a lower semi-lattice. A vector* $s \in \mathcal{P}$ *is sub-minimal for* $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$ *if and only if there is a majorant* $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ *for* $s^\perp$ *and a vector* $z \in \{s\}^+ \cap (\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-)$ *such that*

(a) $z[S]$ *is minimal in* $\mathcal{P}[S] \setminus \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}[S]^-$,

(b) $z_i = \wedge\{b_i \mid b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}\}$ *for all* $i \in V \setminus S$, *and*

(c) $|\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}| \leq \sum\{in\text{-}deg(\mathcal{P}_i) \mid i \in S\}$,

where $S = Supp(s)$ *and* $z[S]$, $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}[S]$ *are the restrictions respectively, of* z *and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ *on* S.

Let us note that if $|\mathrm{Supp}(s)|$ and all poset in-degrees $\max\{|x^\perp| : x \in \mathcal{P}_i\}$ are bounded, then $|\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}| \leq \mathit{const}$ and hence there are only polynomially many sets $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ satisfying condition (c). In additon, (b) and the boundedness of $|\mathrm{Supp}(S)|$ imply that for each $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$, there are only polynomially many candidate vectors z that can satisly (a). It is clear that all such sets $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and vectors $z \in \mathcal{P}$ can be generated and tested efficiently in parallel. We shall also make use of the following fact.

Proposition 4 *Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^+ \cap \mathcal{B}^- = \emptyset$. Let us assume further that $s \notin \mathcal{A}^-$ is sub-minimal for $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$, and let $z \in \mathcal{P}$ be the vector proving this, as in Proposition 3. Then, $z \notin \mathcal{A}^+$.*

Proof of Proposition 3. To show the "only if" part, suppose that s is sub-minimal for $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$, and let x be a minimal element in $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$ such that $s \preccurlyeq x$. Denote by $Y \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ the set of all elements of the form $y = (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n)$, where $i \in S = \mathrm{Supp}(s)$ and $y_i \in x_i^\perp$. Clearly, $Y \subseteq x^\perp$ and $|Y| \leq \sum\{\text{in-deg}(\mathcal{P}_i) \mid i \in S\}$. By the minimality of x in $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$, for each $y \in Y$ we can find an element $b = b(y) \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $b \succcurlyeq y$. Since $s \preccurlyeq x$, it follows that any immediate predecessor of s can be majorized by some $y \in Y$. Hence we conclude that $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}} = \bigcup\{\ b(y) \mid y \in Y\}$ is a majorant for $s^\perp$. By definition, $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ satisfies (c). Now letting

$$z_i = \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if} \quad i \in S \\ \wedge\{b_i \mid b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}\} & \text{if} \quad i \in V \setminus S, \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

we readily obtain (b). To prove (a), let us first show that $x[S] \notin \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}[S]^-$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $b[S] \succcurlyeq x[S]$ for some $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$. By the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$, we have

$$b \succcurlyeq y = (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, y_i, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n) \tag{11}$$

for some $i \in S$ and $y_i \in x_i^\perp$. We cannot have $b_i \succcurlyeq x_i$ because this would imply $x \in \mathcal{B}^-$. Hence $b_i \not\succcurlyeq x_i$ for some $i \in S$, and consequently, $b[S] \not\succcurlyeq x[S]$. We have thus shown that $x[S] \in \mathcal{P}[S] \setminus \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}[S]^-$. Now it is easy to see that $x[S]$ is minimal in $\mathcal{P}[S] \setminus \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}[S]^-$, because any immediate predecessor of $x[S]$ in $\mathcal{P}[S]$ can be majorized by the restriction $b[S]$ of some vector $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$, see (11). By the first line of (10), we have $z[S] = x[S]$ and (a) follows. It remains to show that $z \in \{s\}^+ \cap (\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-)$. To this end, note that $x \preccurlyeq z$, because $x[S] = z[S]$ and for any $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and $i \in V \setminus S$ we have $x_i \preccurlyeq b_i$, see (11) and the second line of (10). The inequality $x \preccurlyeq z$ implies that $z \in \{s\}^+ \cap (\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-)$, because on the one hand $s \preccurlyeq x$, and on the other hand $x \notin \mathcal{B}^-$.

The "if" part of the proof does not require condition (c). Since $z \notin \mathcal{B}^-$, there is a vector $x \notin \mathcal{B}^-$, minimal in $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$, such that $x \preccurlyeq z$. We have $x[S] = z[S]$ for this vector, since by (a) and (b), any decrease of z in a coordinate $i \in S$ would yield a vector majorized by some $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$. From $x[S] = z[S]$ and $z \succcurlyeq s$ it follows that $x \succcurlyeq s$, thus proving that s is sub-minimal for $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$. □

Proof of Proposition 4. Suppose, to the contrary, that $z \succcurlyeq a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$. By (b), $b[V \setminus S] \succcurlyeq z[V \setminus S]$. This implies $b[V \setminus S] \succcurlyeq a[V \setminus S]$. Since $\mathcal{A}^+ \cap \mathcal{B}^- = \emptyset$, it follows that $b[S] \not\succcurlyeq a[S]$ for all $b \in \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$, i.e., $a[S] \notin \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}[S]^-$. On the other hand, $z[S] \succcurlyeq a[S]$ by our assumption that $z \succcurlyeq a$. Now the minimality of $z[S]$ in $\mathcal{P}[S] \setminus \widetilde{\mathcal{B}}[S]^-$ implies that $z[S] = a[S]$. However, Proposition 3 also says that $z \succcurlyeq s$ and hence $a[S] \succcurlyeq s[S]$. Recalling that $S = \mathrm{Supp}(s)$, we conclude that $a \succcurlyeq s$, i.e., $s \in \mathcal{A}^-$. □

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2′

The proof is analogous to that of Theorem 2.

Without loss of generality we can assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is an antichain in $\mathcal{P}$ (cf. Step 1 in Section 3).

If there exists a vector $a \in \mathcal{A}$ which is not minimal in $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$, then we can find an element $z \in a^\perp$ such that $z \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$. This can be done fast in parallel. We can then compute a new maximal independent point $b' \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \mathcal{B}$ by letting $b' = output(MIS(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{A}', \emptyset))$, where $\mathcal{P}' = \{z\}^+$ and $\mathcal{A}' = \{z \vee a \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ (cf. Step. 3 in the proof of Theorem 2′). It is clear that b' is indeed a new maximal independent element for $\mathcal{A}$ because $b' \succcurlyeq z$ and $z \notin \mathcal{B}^-$. (Note that if $\mathcal{P}$ is not an upper semi-lattice then the set $\mathcal{A}'$ of all minimal elements of $\{z\}^+ \cap \mathcal{A}^+$ may be exponentially large.)

Let us assume now that

$$\text{Each } a \in \mathcal{A} \text{ is minimal in } \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-. \tag{12}$$

If

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \mathcal{B}, \tag{13}$$

then there is a vector $x \in \mathcal{P} \setminus (\mathcal{A}^+ \cup \mathcal{B}^-)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that x is minimal in $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$. We have $x \notin \mathcal{A}^-$ because otherwise $x \in \mathcal{B}^-$ by (12). Let s be a minimal element in $\{x\}^-$ such that $s \notin \mathcal{A}^-$, then $|\mathrm{Supp}(s)|$ does not exceed $\dim(\mathcal{A}) + 1$. Thus, (13) implies that

$$\begin{gathered}\text{There is a vector } s \notin \mathcal{A}^- \text{ such that } |\mathrm{Supp}(s)| \leq \dim(\mathcal{A}) + 1 \\ \text{and } s \text{ is sub-mininimal for } \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-.\end{gathered} \tag{14}$$

Conversely, (14) implies (13) even without (12) and the assumption that $|\mathrm{Supp}(s)| \leq dim(\mathcal{A}) + 1$. To see this, observe that if $s \notin \mathcal{A}^-$ is sub-minimal for $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{B}^-$, then by Proposition 4 we can find a vector $z \notin \mathcal{A}^+$ which satisfies the conditions of Proposition 3. In particular, $z \notin \mathcal{B}^-$, which implies (13).

As mentioned in Section 4.1, Proposition 3 gives an NC test for (14) provided that the dimension of $\mathcal{A}$ and the in-degrees of all posets $\mathcal{P}_i$ are bounded (cf. Step 4 in Section 3). Moreover, if we find an s satisfying (14), then, according to Propositions 3 and 4, we also obtain an element $z \in \mathcal{P} \setminus (\mathcal{A}^+ \cup \mathcal{B}^-)$. Letting $\mathcal{A}' = \{z \vee a \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$, any solution to $MIS(\{z\}^+, \mathcal{A}', \emptyset)$ yields a new element in $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$. □

4.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Consider the following problem:

$MIS(\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{A}, \emptyset)$: Given $2n$ non-empty finite posets $\mathcal{R}_i \subseteq \mathcal{P}_i$, $i \in V = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, each of which has a unique minimum element, and a set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{P}_n$, find a maximal $\mathcal{A}$-independent element x in $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_1 \times \cdots \times \mathcal{R}_n$.

Denoting by 0_i and r_i the minimum elements of $\mathcal{P}_i$ and $\mathcal{R}_i$, respectively, we shall assume without loss of generatity that

$$r = (r_1, \ldots, r_n) \notin \mathcal{A}^+, \tag{15}$$

for otherwise $\mathcal{R}$ contains no $\mathcal{A}$-independent element. As before, we let $\mathrm{Supp}(a) = \{i \in V \mid a_i \succ 0_i\}$ and let $\dim(\mathcal{A}) = \max\{|\mathrm{Supp}(a)| : a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ denote the dimension of $\mathcal{A}$. Our goal is to show that for $\dim(\mathcal{A}) \leq c$, problem $MIS(\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{A}, \emptyset)$ is NC-reducible to the maximal independent set problem for some hypergraphs of dimensions $\leq c$. This will prove Theorem 3 because $MIS(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{A}, \emptyset)$ is a special case of $MIS(\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{A}, \emptyset)$ for $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{P}$. Our reduction iteratively decreases $|\mathcal{A}|$ and the maximum cardinality of the posets $\mathcal{R}_i$.

Step 1. If $\max\{|\mathcal{R}_i| : \ i \in V\} = 1$, return $x = r$ and halt.

Step 2. If $\mathcal{A} = \emptyset$, return any maximal point in $\mathcal{R}$ and halt.

Step 3. Let $\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(a) = \{i \in V \mid a_i \succ r_i\}$. In view of (15), we have $|\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(a)| \geq 1$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Remove all points $a \in \mathcal{A}$ with $|\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(a)| = 1$ and reduce $\mathcal{R}$ accordingly:

$$\mathcal{R}_i \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \bigcup\{\ a_i^+ \mid \mathrm{Supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(a) = \{i\},\ a \in \mathcal{A}\}, \quad \mathcal{A} \leftarrow \{a \in \mathcal{A} : \ |\mathrm{Supp}_{\mathcal{R}}(a)| \geq 2\}.$$

Step 4. For each $i \in V = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, topologically sort poset $\mathcal{R}_i$, i.e., find a one-to-one mapping $\phi_i : \mathcal{R}_i \to \{1, \ldots, |\mathcal{R}_i|\}$ such that $\phi_i(x) < \phi_i(y)$ whenever $x \prec y$ in $\mathcal{R}_i$. Let $\mathcal{R}_i^u = \{x \in \mathcal{R}_i \mid \phi_i(x) \geq \lceil |\mathcal{R}_i|/2 \rceil\}$ and let $\mathcal{Q}_i$ denote the antichain consisting of all minimal elements of $\mathcal{R}_i^u$. Note that $\mathcal{R}_i^u$ and hence $\mathcal{Q}_i$ are not empty for all $i \in V$.

Step 5. Let $U = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{Q}_i$, and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^U$ be the hypergraph whose hyperedges are:
1) all pairs of the form $\{x, y\}$, where $x \neq y$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{Q}_i$ for some $i \in V$, and
2) all collections H of at most $c = \dim(\mathcal{A})$ elements of U such that H contains at most one element from each $\mathcal{Q}_i$ and $\pi(H) \succcurlyeq a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$, where $\pi(H) = (\pi_1(H), \ldots, \pi_n(H)) \in \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{Q}_n$ is the vector with the following components:

$$\pi_i(H) = \begin{cases} H \cap \mathcal{Q}_i & \text{if } H \cap \mathcal{Q}_i \neq \emptyset \\ r_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

Step 6. Compute a maximal independent set I for $\mathcal{H}$. Note that $I \neq \emptyset$ since $\mathcal{H}$ does not contain singletons. Also, by the definition of $\mathcal{H}$, the independent set I contains at most one element from each antichain $\mathcal{Q}_i$ and the vector $\pi(I) \in \mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{Q}_n \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ is independent of $\mathcal{A}$.

Step 7. Go to Step 1 and compute $MIS(\mathcal{R}' \subseteq \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{A}', \emptyset)$, where $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R}'_1 \times \ldots \times \mathcal{R}'_n$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}'_i = \begin{cases} \mathcal{R}_i & \text{if } |\mathcal{R}_i| = 1 \\ \mathcal{R}_i \cap \{\pi_i(I)\}^+ & \text{if } I \cap \mathcal{Q}_i \neq \emptyset \\ \mathcal{R}_i \setminus \mathcal{R}_i^u & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and $\mathcal{A}' = \{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid \{a\}^+ \cap \mathcal{R}' \neq \emptyset\}$.

The correctness of the above iterative procedure can be seen from the following observations:

- Each poset $\mathcal{R}'_i$ still has a unique minimum element r'_i;
- Since $\pi(I)$ is independent of $\mathcal{A}$, the new minimum element $r' = (r'_1, \ldots, r'_n)$ satisfies (15);
- Let $x \in \mathcal{R}'$ be a maximal $\mathcal{A}'$-independent element in $\mathcal{R}'$. Then x is a maximal $\mathcal{A}$-independent element of $\mathcal{R} \cap \{\pi(I)\}^+$. Hence x is also a maximal $\mathcal{A}$-independent element of $\mathcal{R}$, i.e., x solves the original problem $MIS(\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{A}, \emptyset)$.

Since each iteration almost halves the maximum size of the posets $\mathcal{R}_i$, our reduction consists of $O\big(\log(\max\{|\mathcal{R}_i| : \ i \in V\})\big)$ iterations and Theorem 3 follows.

References

[1] N. Alon, L. Babai, A. Itai, A fast randomized parallel algorithm for the maximal independent set problem, J. Algorithms 7 (1986) 567-583

[2] R. Agrawal, H. Mannila, R. Srikant, H. Toivonen and A. I. Verkamo, Fast discovery of association rules, In U. M. Fayyad, G. Piatetsky-Shapiro, P. Smyth and R. Uthurusamy eds., *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 307-328, AAAI Press, Menlo Park, California, 1996.

[3] M. Anthony and N. Biggs, *Computational Learning Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

[4] P. Beame, M. Luby, Parallel search for maximal independence given minimal dependence, Proceedings of the First SODA Conference (1990) 212-218.

[5] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, and P.L. Hammer, Dual subimplicants of positive Boolean functions, *Optimization Methods and Software*, 10 (1998) 147-156. (RUTCOR Research Report 11-93.)

[6] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan and K.Makino, Generating weighted transversals of a hypergraph. DIMACS Technical Report 2000-17, Rutgers University,

[7] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan and K.Makino, Generating partial and multiple transversals of a hypergraph, ICALP, July 2000, Extended Abstract.

[8] E. Boros, P.L. Hammer and J.N. Hooker, Predicting cause-effect relationships from incomplete discrete observations, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* **7** (1994), 481-491.

[9] E. Boros, P. L. Hammer, T. Ibaraki, A. Kogan, Logical analysis of numerical data, *Mathematical Programming*, 79 (1997) 163-190,

[10] C. J. Colbourn, *The combinatorics of network reliability*, Oxford University Press, 1987.

[11] Y. Crama, P. L. Hammer and T. Ibaraki, Cause-effect relationships and partially defined boolean functions, *Annals of Operations Research* 16 (1988) 299-326.

[12] E. Dahlhaus, M. Karpinski, An efficient algorithm for 3MIS problem, Technical Report TR-89-052, September 1989, International Computer Science Institute, Berkeley, CA.

[13] T. Eiter and G. Gottlob, Identifying the minimal transversals of a hypergraph and related problems, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 24 (1995) 1278-1304.

[14] M. L. Fredman and L. Khachiyan, On the complexity of dualization of monotone disjunctive normal forms. *J. of Algorithms*, 21 (1996) 618-628.

[15] M. Goldberg, T. Spencer, Constructing a maximal independent set in parallel, SIAM J. Disc. Math. 2 (1989) 322-328.

[16] M. Goldberg, T. Spencer, A new parallel algorithm for the maximal independent set problem, SIAM J. Computing 18 (1989) 419-427.

[17] V. Gurvich, To theory of multistep games, *USSR Comput. Math. and Math Phys.* **13-6** (1973) 1485-1500.

[18] V. Gurvich, Nash-solvability of games in pure strategies, *USSR Comput. Math and Math. Phys.* **15-2** (1975) 357-371.

[19] D. S. Johnson, M. Yannakakis and C. H. Papadimitriou, On generating all maximal independent sets, *Information Processing Letters*, 27 (1988) 119-123.

[20] R. Karp, V. Ramachandran, Parallel algorithms for shared memory machines, in Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science, J. van Leeuwen, ed., North Holland (1990) 869-941.

[21] R. Karp, A. Wigderson, A fast parallel algorithm for the maximal independent set problem, JACM 32 (1985) 762-773.

[22] P. Kelsen, An efficient parallel algorithm for finding an mis in hypergraphs of dimension 3, Manuscript, Dept. of Computer Sciences, Univ. of Texas, Austin, TX, Jan. 1990.

[23] P. Kelsen, On the parallel complexity of computing a maximal independent set in a hypergraph, Proceedings of the 24-th Anual ACM STOC Conference (1992).

[24] E. Lawler, J. K. Lenstra and A. H. G. Rinnooy Kan, Generating all maximal independent sets: NP-hardness and polynomial-time algorithms, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 9 (1980) 558-565.

[25] M. Luby, Removing randomness in parallel computation without a processor penalty, 29-th FOCS (1988) 162-173.

[26] Mangasarian, Mathematical programming in machine learning, in G. Di. Pillo and F. Giannessi eds. Nonlinear Optimization and Applications (Plenum Publishing, New York, 1996) 283-295.

[27] H. Mannila and K. J. Räihä, Design by example: An application of Armstrong relations, *Journal of Computer and System Science* 22 (1986) 126-141.

[28] K. G. Ramamurthy, *Coherent Structures and Simple Games*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1990.

[29] R. C. Read, Every one a winner, or how to avoid isomorphism when cataloging combinatorial configurations, *Annals of Discrete Mathematics* 2 (1978) 107-120.

[30] R. C. Read and R. E. Tarjan, Bounds on backtrack algorithms for listing cycles, paths, and spanning trees, *Networks* 5 (1975) 237-252.

[31] S. Tsukiyama, M. Ide, H. Ariyoshi and I. Shirakawa, A new algorithm for generating all maximal independent sets, *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 6 (1977) 505-517.

[32] J. D. Ullman, *Principles of Database and Knowledge Base Systems*, Vols. 1 and 2, Computer Science Press, 1988.