DIMACS Technical Report 2001-14
April 2001

An inequality for polymatroid functions and its applications[1]

by

E. Boros[2] K. Elbassioni[3] V. Gurvich[4] L. Khachiyan[5]

[1]This research was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research (Grant N00014-92-J-1375). The first author is also grateful for the partial support by the National Science Foundation (Grant DMS 98-06389). 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. The research of the fourth author was also supported by the National Science Foundation (Grant CCR-9618796).

[2]RUTCOR, Rutgers University, 640 Bartholomew Road, Piscataway NJ 08854-8003; (boros@rutcor.rutgers.edu).

[3]Department of Computer Science, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903; (elbassio@paul.rutgers.edu).

[4]RUTCOR, Rutgers University; 640 Bartholomew Road, Piscataway NJ 08854-8003; (gurvich@rutcor.rutgers.edu)

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

ABSTRACT

An integral-valued set function $f : 2^V \mapsto \mathbb{Z}$ is called polymatroid if it is submodular, non-decreasing, and $f(\emptyset) = 0$. Given a polymatroid function f and an integer threshold $t \geq 1$, let $\alpha = \alpha(f,t)$ denote the number of maximal sets $X \subseteq V$ satisfying $f(X) < t$, let $\beta = \beta(f,t)$ be the number of minimal sets $X \subseteq V$ for which $f(X) \geq t$, and let $n = |V|$. We show that if $\beta \geq 2$ then $\alpha \leq \beta^{(\log t)/c}$, where $c = c(n,\beta)$ is the unique positive root of the equation $1 = 2^c(n^{c/\log\beta} - 1)$. In particular, our bound implies that $\alpha \leq (n\beta)^{\log t}$ for all $\beta \geq 1$. We also give examples of polymatroid functions with arbitrarily large t, n, α and β for which $\alpha \geq \beta^{(.551\log t)/c}$.

More generally, given a polymatroid function $f : 2^V \mapsto \mathbb{Z}$ and an integral threshold $t \geq 1$, consider an arbitrary hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ such that $|\mathcal{H}| \geq 2$ and $f(H) \geq t$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the family of all maximal independent sets X of $\mathcal{H}$ for which $f(X) < t$. Then $|\mathcal{S}| \leq |\mathcal{H}|^{(\log t)/c(n,|\mathcal{H}|)}$. As an application, we show that given a system of polymatroid inequalities $f_1(X) \geq t_1, \ldots, f_m(X) \geq t_m$ with quasi-polynomially bounded right hand sides $t_1, \ldots, t_m$, all minimal feasible solutions to this system can be generated in incremental quasi-polynomial time. In contrast to this result, the generation of all maximal infeasible sets is an NP-hard problem for many polymatroid inequalities of small range.

Key Words: dualization, incremental algorithm, independent set, matroid, submodular function, polymatroid function, system of polymatroid inequalities, transversal hypergraph.

1 Introduction

1.1 Main results

Let V be a finite set of cardinality $|V| = n$, let $f : 2^V \mapsto \mathbb{Z}_+$ be a set-function taking non-negative integral values, and let $r = r(f)$ denote the *range* of f, i.e., $r(f) = \max\{f(X) \mid X \subseteq V\}$. The set-function f is called *Boolean* if $r = 1$, *monotone* if $f(X) \leq f(Y)$ whenever $X \subseteq Y$, and *submodular* if

$$f(X \cup Y) + f(X \cap Y) \leq f(X) + f(Y) \tag{1}$$

holds for all subsets $X, Y \subseteq V$. Finally, f is called a *polymatroid function* if it is monotone, submodular and $f(\emptyset) = 0$. Let us remark that in general, determining the range of a submodular set function may be an NP-hard problem, while $r(f) = f(V)$ holds for polymatroid functions.

Given a monotone function $f : 2^V \mapsto \{0, 1, \ldots, r\}$, and an integral threshold $t \in \{1, ..., r\}$ let us denote by $\mathcal{B}_t = \mathcal{B}_t(f)$ the family of all minimal subsets $X \subseteq V$ for which $f(X) \geq t$, and analogously, let us denote by $\mathcal{A}_t = \mathcal{A}_t(f)$ the family of all maximal subsets $X \subseteq V$ for which $f(X) < t$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{A}_t = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}_t)$, where $\mathcal{I}(\cdot)$ denotes the family of all maximal independent sets for the hypergraph $(\cdot)$. Throughout the paper we shall use the notation $\alpha = |\mathcal{A}_t(f)|$ and $\beta = |\mathcal{B}_t(f)|$.

Theorem 1 *For every polymatroid function f and threshold $t \in \{1, \ldots, r(f)\}$ such that $\beta \geq 2$ we have the inequality*

$$\alpha \leq \beta^{(\log t)/c(n,\beta)}, \tag{2}$$

where $c(n, \beta)$ is the unique positive root of the equation

$$1 = 2^c(n^{c/\log\beta} - 1). \tag{3}$$

In addition, $\alpha \leq n$ holds if $\beta = 1$.

Let us first remark that by (3), $1 = n^{-c/\log\beta} + (n\beta)^{-c/\log\beta} \geq 2(n\beta)^{-c/\log\beta}$, and hence $\beta^{1/c(n,\beta)} \leq n\beta$. Consequently, for $\beta \geq 2$ (in which case $n \geq 2$ is implied, too) we can replace (2) by the simpler but weaker inequality

$$\alpha \leq (n\beta)^{\log t}. \tag{4}$$

In fact, (4) holds even in case of $\beta = 1$, because if the hypergraph $\mathcal{B}_t$ consists only of a single hyperedge $X \subseteq V$, then $|\mathcal{A}_t| \leq |X| \leq n$ follows immediately by the relation $\mathcal{A}_t = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}_t)$. On the other hand, for large β the bound of Theorem 1 becomes increasingly stronger than (4). For instance, $c(n, n) = \log(1 + \sqrt{5}) - 1 > .694$, $c(n, n^2) > 1.102$, and $c(n, n^\sigma) \sim \log\sigma$ for large σ.

Let us remark next that the bound of Theorem 1 is reasonably sharp. As we shall show in Section 3, for any positive integers k and l there exists a polymatroid function f of range $r = 2^k$ for which $n = kl$, $|\mathcal{A}_r| = l^k$, and $|\mathcal{B}_r| = kl(l-1)/2$. Thus, letting $t = r$ and $l = 2^k$, we obtain an infinite family of polymatroid functions for which

$$\alpha \geq \beta^{(.551 \log t)/c(n,\beta)} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha \geq (n\beta)^{(\frac{1}{3}+o(1)) \log t}, \tag{5}$$

as $t = r \to \infty$, see Section 3 for more detail. In Section 3 we also show that our lower bounds (5) can be achieved within the subclass of rank functions defined on the subsets of some linear space. Namely, we can construct kl subspaces $V_{ij} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2^k}$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, $j = 0, \ldots, l-1$ of dimension 2^{k-1} each, such that for any i and $j \neq j'$ we have $\dim(V_{ij} \cup V_{ij'}) = 2^k$, while for every $(j_1, j_2, ..., j_k) \in \{0, 1, ..., l-1\}^k$ the inequality $\dim(\bigcup_{i=1}^k V_{ij_i}) < 2^k$ holds.

Let us finally note that for many classes of polymatroid functions, β cannot be bounded by a quasi-polynomial estimate of the form $(n\alpha)^{\text{poly} \log r}$. Let us consider for instance, a graph $G = t \times K_2$ consisting of t disjoint edges, and let $f(X)$ be the number of edges X intersects, for $X \subseteq V(G)$. Then f is a polymatroid function of range $r = t$, and we have $n = 2t$, $\alpha = |\mathcal{A}_t| = t$ and $\beta = |\mathcal{B}_t| = 2^t$.

We will strengthen Theorem 1 as follows. Given a non-empty hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ on the vertex set V, a polymatroid function $f : 2^V \mapsto \mathbb{Z}_+$, and a integral positive threshold t, the pair (f, t) is called a *polymatroid separator* for $\mathcal{H}$ if $f(H) \geq t$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

Theorem 2 *Let (f,t) be a polymatroid separator for a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ of cardinality $|\mathcal{H}| \geq 2$. Then*

$$|\mathcal{A}_t(f) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| \leq |\mathcal{H}|^{(\log t)/c(n,|\mathcal{H}|)}, \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$ is the family of all maximal independent sets for $\mathcal{H}$.

In particular, if (f,t) is a polymatroid separator for a non-empty hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, then $|\mathcal{A}_t(f) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| \leq (n|\mathcal{H}|)^{\log t}$.

Clearly, Theorem 1 is a special case of Theorem 2 for $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{B}_t(f)$. Since the right-hand side of (6) monotonically increases with $|\mathcal{H}|$, we will only need to prove Theorem 2 for *Sperner* hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}$, i.e., under the assumption that that none of the hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$ contains another hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a non-empty Sperner hypergraph on the vertex set V. A polymatroid separator (f,t) is called *exact for* $\mathcal{H}$ if $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{B}_t(f)$ and consequently, $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{A}_t(f)$. It is immediate to see that for exact separators (f,t), Theorem 2 implies $r(f) \geq t \geq |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})|^{c(n,|\mathcal{H}|)/\log|\mathcal{H}|}$ whenever $|\mathcal{H}| \geq 2$. As we shall see in Section 2.1, any Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ has an exact polymatroid separator (f,t) such that $r(f) = t = |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})|$ holds.

A polymatroid separator (f,t) is called *linear* if the set-function f is modular, i.e., if equality holds in (1) for all $X, Y \subseteq V$. As shown in [6, 9], if (f,t) is a linear separator for a non-empty hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, then $|\mathcal{A}_t(f) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| \leq n|\mathcal{H}|$. Unlike (6), this bound does not depend on t and holds even for real-valued linear separators.

1.2 Generating minimal feasible sets for systems of polymatroid inequalities

Before proceeding further we shall discuss some algorithmic implications of Theorem 2 related to the complexity of enumerating all minimal solutions to a system of polymatroid inequalities

$$f_i(X) \geq t_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{7}$$

over the subsets $X \subseteq V$. Specifically, letting $\mathcal{B}$ denote the family of all minimal feasible sets for (7), we consider the following problem:

$GEN(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{H})$: *Given a system of polymatroid inequalities (7) and a collection $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ of minimal feasible sets for (7), either find a new minimal feasible set $H \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{H}$ for (7), or show that $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{B}$.*

In what follows, we assume that each of the polymatroid functions $f_i : 2^V \mapsto \mathbb{Z}$ is defined via a (quasi) polynomial-time evaluation oracle, and that $t_1, \ldots, t_m$ are given positive integral thresholds. We mention in passing that since $\min\{f, t\}$ is a polymatroid function whenever f is polymatroid, we could also assume without loss of generality that $t_i = range(f_i)$.

Clearly, we can incrementally generate all sets in $\mathcal{B}$ by initializing $\mathcal{H} = \emptyset$ and then iteratively solving the above generation problem $|\mathcal{B}| + 1$ times. It is easy to see that the first minimal feasible set $H \in \mathcal{B}$ can be found (or $\mathcal{B} = \emptyset$ can be recognized) by evaluating (7) $n + 1$-times. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{I}(\{H\}) = \{V \setminus \{x\} \mid x \in H\}$, the second minimal feasible set can also be identified (or $\mathcal{B} = \{H\}$ can be recognized) in another $n + |H|$ evaluations of (7). Thus, in what follows we can assume $|\mathcal{H}| \geq 2$ without any loss of generality.

By definition, each pair (f_i, t_i) is a polymatroid separator for $\mathcal{H}$, and therefore Theorem 2 implies the inequalities

$$|\mathcal{A}_{t_i}(f_i) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| \leq |\mathcal{H}|^{(\log t_i)/c(n,|\mathcal{H}|)}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, m.$$

Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$ be the hypergraph of all maximal infeasible sets for (7), then $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} \mathcal{A}_{t_i}(f_i)$. Hence we arrive at the following bound.

Corollary 1 *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the family of all minimal feasible sets for the system of polymatroid inequalities (7) and let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be an arbitrary subfamily of $\mathcal{B}$ of size $|\mathcal{H}| \geq 2$. Then*

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| \leq m|\mathcal{H}|^{(\log t)/c(n,|\mathcal{H}|)} \leq m(n|\mathcal{H}|)^{\log t}, \tag{8}$$

where $t = \max\{t_1, \ldots, t_m\}$. In particular, $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})| \leq m|\mathcal{B}|^{(\log t)/c(n,|\mathcal{B}|)}$.

As mentioned earlier, if the functions f_i in (7) are linear, then (8) can be improved to show that $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| \leq mn|\mathcal{H}|$.

Corollary 1 shows that if the right hand sides of (7) are quasi-polynomially bounded, i.e., $t = \max\{t_1, \ldots, t_m\} \leq 2^{\mathrm{poly}\log nm}$, then for any non-empty hypergraph $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ we have

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| \leq \text{quasi-poly}(n, m, |\mathcal{H}|). \tag{9}$$

By definition, the family $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^V$ of all minimal feasible sets for (7) is a Sperner hypergraph. Furthermore, the hypergraph $\mathcal{B}$ has a (quasi) polynomial-time superset oracle, i.e., given a set $X \subseteq V$, we can determine in (quasi) polynomial time whether or not X contains some set $H \in \mathcal{B}$ (this is equivalent to checking the feasibility of X for (7)). As shown in [4, 6, 9, 12], for any Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{B}$ defined via a (quasi) polynomial-time superset oracle, problem $GEN(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{H})$ reduces in (quasi) polynomial time to $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})|$ instances of the *hypergraph dualization problem*:

Given two explicitly listed Sperner families $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^V$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$, either find a new maximal independent set $X \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H}) \setminus \mathcal{G}$ or show that $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$.

Combining the above reduction with (9) and the fact that the hypergraph dualization problem can be solved in quasi-polynomial time $poly(n) + (|\mathcal{H}| + |\mathcal{G}|)^{o(\log(|\mathcal{H}|+|\mathcal{G}|)}$ (see [11]), we readily obtain the following result.

Theorem 3 *Consider a system of polymatroid inequalities (7) in which the right hand sides are bounded by a quasi-polynomial in the dimension of the system. Suppose further that (7) has a quasi-polynomial-time feasibility oracle. Then problem $GEN(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{H})$ can be solved in quasi-polynomial time, and hence all minimal feasible sets for (7) can be enumerated in incremental quasi-polynomial time.*

We discuss some special cases and applications of Theorem 3 in Section 2. It is worth mentioning that in all of our examples, generating all maximal infeasible sets for (7) turns out to be NP-hard.

1.3 Proper mappings of independent sets into binary trees

Our proof of Theorem 2 makes use of a combinatorial construction which may be of independent interest. Theorem 2 states that for any polymatroid separator (f, t) of a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ we have

$$r(f) \geq t \geq |\mathcal{S}|^{c(n,|\mathcal{H}|)/\log(|\mathcal{H}|)},$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H}) \cap \{X \mid f(X) < t\}$, i.e., the range of f must increase with the size of $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$. Thus, to prove the theorem we must first find ways to provide lower bounds on the range of a polymatroid function. To this end we shall show that the number of independent sets which can be organized in a special way into a binary tree structure provides such a lower bound.

Let $\mathbf{T}$ denote a binary tree, $V(\mathbf{T})$ denote its node set, and let $L(\mathbf{T})$ denote the set of its leaves. Clearly, every leaf is a node of degree 1, while all other nodes are of degree 3, except a unique node s of degree 2, which is called the *root* of $\mathbf{T}$. For every node $v \in V(\mathbf{T})$ let $\mathbf{T}(v)$ be the binary sub-tree rooted at v. Obviously, for every two nodes u, v of $\mathbf{T}$ either the sub-trees $\mathbf{T}(u)$ and $\mathbf{T}(v)$ are disjoint, or one of them is a sub-tree of the other. The nodes u and v are called *incomparable* in the first case, and *comparable* in the second case.

Given a Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ and a binary tree $\mathbf{T}$, let us consider mappings $\phi : L(\mathbf{T}) \mapsto \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$ assigning maximal independent sets $I_l \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$ to the leaves $l \in L(\mathbf{T})$. Let us associate furthermore to every node $v \in V(\mathbf{T})$ the intersection $S_v = \bigcap_{l \in L(\mathbf{T}(v))} I_l$. Let us call finally the mapping ϕ *proper* if it is injective, i.e., assigns different independent sets to different leaves, and if the sets $S_u \cup S_v$ are not independent whenever u and v are incomparable nodes of $\mathbf{T}$. Let us point out that the latter condition means that the set $S_u \cup S_v$, for incomparable nodes u and v, must contain a hyperedge $H \in \mathcal{H}$, as a subset. Since the intersection of independent sets is always independent, it follows, in particular that both S_v and S_u are non-empty independent sets (otherwise their union could not be non-independent.) Finally, since all non-root nodes $u \in V(\mathbf{T})$ have at least one incomparable node $v \in V(\mathbf{T})$, we get that the sets S_u, for $V(\mathbf{T}) \setminus \{s\}$ are all non-empty and independent.

Lemma 1 *Let us consider a Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ and a polymatroid separator (f, t) of it, and let us denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the subfamily of maximal independent sets, separated by (f, t) from $\mathcal{H}$, as before. Let us assume further that $\mathbf{T}$ is a binary tree for which there exists a proper mapping $\phi : L(\mathbf{T}) \mapsto \mathcal{S}$. Then, we have*

$$r(f) \geq t \geq |L(\mathbf{T})|. \tag{10}$$

Let us note that if a proper mapping exists for a binary tree $\mathbf{T}$, then we can associate a hyperedge $H_u \in \mathcal{H}$ to every node $u \in V(\mathbf{T}) \setminus L(\mathbf{T})$ in the following way: Let v and w be the two successors of u (since u is not a leaf, it has exactly two successors in $\mathbf{T}$). Since v and w are incomparable, the union $S_v \cup S_w$ must contain a hyperedge from $\mathcal{H}$. Let us choose such a hyperedge, and denote it by H_u. Let us observe next that if $l \in L(\mathbf{T}(v))$ and $l' \in L(\mathbf{T}(w))$, then $S_v \subseteq I_l$ and $S_w \subseteq I_{l'}$, and thus $H_u \subseteq I_l \cup I_{l'}$. In other words, to construct a large binary tree for which there exists a proper mapping, we have to find a way of splitting the family of independent sets, repeatedly, such that the union of any two independent sets, belonging to different parts of the split must contain a hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$. We shall show next that indeed, such a construction is possible.

Lemma 2 *For every Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^V$, $|\mathcal{H}| \geq 2$, and for every subfamily $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$ of its maximal independent sets there exists a binary tree $\mathbf{T}$ and a proper mapping $\phi : L(\mathbf{T}) \mapsto \mathcal{S}$, such that*

$$|L(\mathbf{T})| \geq |\mathcal{S}|^{c(n,|\mathcal{H}|)/\log|\mathcal{H}|}, \tag{11}$$

where $n = |V|$.

Clearly, Lemmas 1 and 2 imply Theorem 2, which in turn implies Theorem 1. Lemmas 1 and 2 will be proved in Section 4.

Let us remark that in the special case when the Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{H} = E(G)$ is the edge set of a connected graph G and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$, Lemma 2 follows from the results by Balas and Yu (1989) (see also [2, 19]). In this case Theorem 4 of [3] claims that

$$2^p \leq |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| \leq \delta^p + 1, \tag{12}$$

where δ is the number of pairs of vertices in V at distance 2 (in particular, $\delta < n^2/2$), and p is the cardinality of a maximum induced matching in G. Any such matching can be used to construct a proper mapping $\phi : L(\mathbf{T}) \mapsto \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$ for a uniform binary tree $\mathbf{T}$ of depth p, i.e., for which $|L(\mathbf{T})| = 2^p$. Namely, let $e_i = (v_0^i, v_1^i)$ for $i = 1, ..., p$ denote the edges of the induced matching. For each binary vector $x = (x_1, x_2, ..., x_p) \in \{0,1\}^p$ let us associate a subset $\tilde{I}_x$ defined by $\tilde{I}_x = \{v_{x_i}^i \mid i = 1, ..., p\}$. Finally, let $I_x \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$ be a maximal independent set of G containing $\tilde{I}_x$, for $x \in \{0,1\}^p$. (Since the edges e_1, ..., e_p form an induced matching, all sets $\tilde{I}_x$, $x \in \{0,1\}^p$ are independent.) Thus, the sets I_x, $x \in \{0,1\}^p$ are pairwise distinct maximal independent sets of G by the above construction, and $e_i \subseteq I_x \cup I_y$ whenever $x_i \neq y_i$. Naturally, the leaves of the binary tree $\mathbf{T}$ of depth p are also encoded by the binary sequences of length p. Thus a mapping ϕ is defined by assigning I_x to the leaf coded with x, and it is not difficult to verify that this mapping is proper (and that the edge e_i will be the associated hyperedge at each node of $\mathbf{T}$ at depth $i-1$, for $i = 1, ..., p$).

By these definitions, $\log |L(\mathbf{T})| = p$ and $\log |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| \leq p \log \delta$, according to (12), and hence

$$|L(\mathbf{T})| \geq |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})|^{1/\log \delta} \geq |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})|^{1/(2 \log n)},$$

whereas the bound of Lemma 2 gives:

$$|L(\mathbf{T}) \geq |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})|^{c(n,|\mathcal{H}|)/\log |\mathcal{H}|}.$$

For this reason, Lemma 2 can be viewed as an extension of Theorem 4 of [3] from graphs to hypergraphs (even though we could not generalize directly the notion of an induced matching).

Let us remark here that according to the above results, the existence of a "large" induced matching in a graph, or more generally, the existence of a "large" binary tree with a proper mapping in a hypergraph can be viewed as the reason for the existence of "many" maximal independent sets. These reasons, however, may not be easy to exhibit for a given graph or hypergraph. The problem of finding the maximum size induced matching in a graph is known to be NP-hard (see e.g. [21]) and it is even hard to approximate it well (see [10]). The complexities of the corresponding problems of finding or approximating well the largest binary tree with a proper mapping are open.

2 Some polymatroid separators

In this Section we discuss a number of polymatroid separators as well as some stronger forms of Theorems 1 and 2 for specific cases.

2.1 Partial unions and transversals of a hypergraph. Fairly independent sets.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an explicitly given hypergraph on a finite vertex set V. For a set $X \subseteq V$, define

$$f(X) = |\{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid X \cap H \neq \emptyset\}| \tag{13}$$

to be the number of hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$ which have a non-empty intersection with X. The function f is polymatroid and $r(f) = |\mathcal{H}|$. For a given threshold $t \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{H}|\}$, the hypergraph $\mathcal{B}_t$ consists of all *partial t-transversals*, i.e., all minimal vertex sets which intersect at least t hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$. (Equivalently, the complement to each partial t-transversal is a *fairly independent set*, i.e., a maximal vertex set containing at most $|\mathcal{H}| - t$ hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$.)

For $t = |\mathcal{H}|$ the set family $\mathcal{B}_t$ is identical to the transversal hypergraph $\mathcal{H}^d$ of $\mathcal{H}$. This readily implies the following claim.

Proposition 1 *Every Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ (and hence every monotone Boolean function) has an exact polymatroid separator of the form (13).*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{H}^{dd} = \mathcal{H}$ holds for any Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, applying definition (13) to $\mathcal{H}^d$ we obtain a polymatroid function f' of range $r(f') = |\mathcal{H}^d|$ such that the family of all minimal feasible sets for $f'(X) \geq r$ is exactly $\mathcal{H}$. □

We mention in passing that each hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ also admits a monotone *supermodular* separator $h(X) = |\{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid H \subseteq X\}|$ of range $|\mathcal{H}|$.

Returning to the polymatroid function f defined by (13), we can identify the hypergraph $\mathcal{A}_t = \mathcal{A}_t(f)$ with the family of all maximal subsets of V that avoid at least $|\mathcal{H}| - t + 1$ hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$. Equivalently, the complement to each set $X \in \mathcal{A}_t$ is a *partial* $(|\mathcal{H}| - t + 1)$-*union*, that is a minimal vertex set containing at least $|\mathcal{H}| - t + 1$ hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$.

As shown in [7, 8], the inequality of Theorem 1 can be strengthened for the class of polymatroid functions (13) as follows:

$$|\mathcal{A}_t| \leq t|\mathcal{B}_t| \text{ for any } t \in \{1, \dots, r\}. \tag{14}$$

Moreover, the above bounds may be sharp for arbitrarily large hypergraphs $\mathcal{H}$ and $t \in \{1, \dots, |\mathcal{H}|\}$. (Theorem 2 can also be strengthened to a similar sharp linear bound, see [7, 8].)

Given a list of hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$ and a threshold $t \in \{1, \ldots, |\mathcal{H}|\}$, we can easily check whether or not a given vertex set X contains a partial t-transversal (we only need to check if X intersects at least t hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$). This gives a polynomial-time feasibility oracle for $f(X) \geq t$. From Theorem 3 we thus conclude that all partial t-transversals $X \in \mathcal{B}_t$ for a given hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ can be enumerated in incremental quasi-polynomial time.

Since problem $GEN(\mathcal{B}_t, \mathcal{X})$ can be solved in quasi-polynomial time, it is unlikely to be NP-hard. In contrast to this result, problem $GEN(\mathcal{A}_t, \mathcal{X})$ is known to be NP-hard. Specifically, it is NP-complete to decide if $\mathcal{X} \neq \mathcal{A}_t$ for an explicitly given set family $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_t$ (see [17] and also [8] for more detail).

2.2 Maximal frequent and minimal infrequent sets for binary matrices

The notion of frequent sets in data-mining can be related naturally to the polymatroid separator (13) considered above. Let $\mathcal{D} : \mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{C} \mapsto \{0, 1\}$ be a given $m \times n$ binary matrix. To each subset of columns $X \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, we associate the subset $R(X) \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ of all those rows $r \in \mathcal{R}$ for which $\mathcal{D}(r, c) = 1$ in every columns $c \in X$. The cardinality of $R(X)$ is called the *support* of X and is easily seen to be an anti-monotone supermodular function of X. Hence

$$f(X) = m - |R(X)| \tag{15}$$

is a polymatroid function of range m. In fact, the above definition is identical to that given in (13) if we let $\mathcal{H}$ to be the hypergraph defined by the anti-incidence matrix $\mathcal{D}$.

A column set X is called *t-frequent* if $|R(X)| \geq t$ and *maximal t-frequent* if no superset of X is t-frequent. The generation of (maximal) frequent sets of a given binary matrix is an important task of knowledge discovery and data mining (see, for instance, [1]). Let $\mathcal{F}_t(\mathcal{D})$ be the family of all maximal frequent sets for $\mathcal{D}$, then $\mathcal{F}_t(\mathcal{D})$ is exactly the hypergraph $\mathcal{A}_{m-t+1}(f)$ for the submodular function f defined by (15). Denoting by $\mathcal{I}_t(\mathcal{D}) = \mathcal{B}_{m-t+1}(f)$ the family of all minimal columns sets X for which $|R(X)| < t$, i.e., all minimal *t-infrequent sets*, we can conclude that

$$|\mathcal{F}_t(\mathcal{D})| \leq (m - t + 1)|\mathcal{I}_t(\mathcal{D})|, \quad t \in \{1, \ldots, m\}. \tag{16}$$

As for (14), these inequalities are best possible. For instance, they are sharp when $\mathcal{D}$ is an $m \times (m - t + 1)$ matrix, in which every entry is 1, except the diagonal entries in the first $m - t + 1$ rows, which are 0. In addition, (16) stays accurate, up to a factor of $\log m$, even when $m \gg n$ and $|\mathcal{F}_t|$ and $|\mathcal{I}_t|$ are arbitrarily large, see [8] for more detail. It is also worth mentioning that $|\mathcal{F}_t|$ cannot be bounded by a quasi-polynomial in $|\mathcal{I}_t|$ and n, the number of columns of $\mathcal{D}$.

2.3 Weighted transversals

Extending the notion of partial t-transversals to weighted hypergraphs we arrive at weighted transversals [9]. Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^V$, we assign an m-dimensional non-negative integral weight vector $w = w(H) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$ to each hyperedge $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and consider the system of m polymatroid inequalities

$$f(X) = \sum \{w(H) \mid X \cap H \neq \emptyset,\ H \in \mathcal{H}\} \geq t \tag{17}$$

where $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$ is a given threshold vector. The minimal solutions $X \subseteq V$ to the above system are called *weighted* transversals for $(\mathcal{H}, w)$. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the set of all weighted transversals for (17) and let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$ denote the hypergraph of all maximal infeasible sets for (17). Considering that each weighted hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ can be regarded as a collection of m multi-hypergraphs $(\mathcal{H}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_m)$, where multi-hypergraph $\mathcal{H}_i$ contains $w_i(H)$ copies of edge $H \in \mathcal{H}$, we conclude from (14) that $|\mathcal{A}| \leq (t_1 + \ldots + t_m)|\mathcal{B}|$. This bound depends on the threshold vector and can be arbitrarily large with respect to n and m when the range of (17) becomes high. However, it can be shown [9] that regardless of the weights used in the definition of the hypergraph of weighted transversals, for any non-empty hypergraph $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ we have the inequality

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})| \leq m \sum_{X \in \mathcal{X}} |\{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid H \cap X \neq \emptyset\}| \tag{18}$$

where as before $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{X})$ denotes the family of all maximal independent sets for $\mathcal{X}$. In particular, it follows that $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})| \leq m|\mathcal{H}||\mathcal{X}|$, which for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{B}$ gives

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})| \leq m|\mathcal{H}||\mathcal{B}|. \tag{19}$$

As earlier, Theorem 3 implies an incremental quasi-polynomial algorithm for generating all minimal weighted transversals for a given weighted hypergraph $(\mathcal{H}, w)$ and threshold vector t. Generating all maximal solutions to (17) is NP-hard already for scalar unit weights $w(H) \equiv 1$.

2.4 Monotone systems of Boolean and integer inequalities

This example can be viewed as a special case of weighted transversals. Consider a system of m linear inequalities in n binary variables

$$Ax \geq b, \quad x \in \{0,1\}^n \tag{20}$$

where A is a given non-negative $m \times n$ -matrix and b is a given m-vector. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of columns of A, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be the hypergraph on the vertex set $\mathcal{C}$ whose hyperedges are the n singletons (columns). We have $|\mathcal{H}| = n$ and each column of the $m \times n$ matrix A can now be interpreted as a non-negative m-dimensional weight vector assigned to the corresponding hyperedge of $\mathcal{H}$. Under this interpretation, (20) is a special case of (17) and we can identify the hypergraph $\mathcal{B}$ of partial transversals with the set of all minimal Boolean solutions to (20). Accordingly, the hypergraph $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$ can be viewed as the set of all maximal infeasible vectors for (20). From (18) we now conclude that for any non-empty set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ of minimal feasible solutions to (20) we have the inequalities

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{X}) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})| \leq m \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(x) \leq nm|\mathcal{X}|, \tag{21}$$

where $p(x)$ is number of positive components of x. In particular, for any feasible system (20) we obtain

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})| \leq nm|\mathcal{B}|. \tag{22}$$

The above bounds are sharp when $m = 1$, for instance, for the inequality $x_1 + \ldots + x_n \geq n$. For large m, these bounds are accurate up to a factor polylogarithmic in m. For instance, for any positive integer k, the system of $m = 2^k$ inequalities in $n = 2k$ binary variables

$$x_{i_1} + x_{i_2} + \cdots + x_{i_k} \geq 1,\ i_1 \in \{1,2\},\ i_2 \in \{3,4\}, \ldots, i_k \in \{2k-1, 2k\}$$

has 2^k maximal infeasible binary vectors and only k minimal feasible binary vectors, i.e.,

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})| = \frac{nm}{2(\log m)^2}|\mathcal{B}|.$$

As shown in [6, 7], inequalities (21) and (22) actually hold for any *monotone* system of inequalities (20) in binary variables, i.e., under the assumption that for any feasible vector $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, any binary vectors $y \geq x$ is also feasible for (20). (For instance, (20) is monotone if the matrix A is non-negative.) In fact, inequalities (21) and (22) also hold for any monotone system of m linear inequalities in n *integer* variables

$$Ax \geq b, \quad x \in \mathcal{C} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid 0 \leq x \leq c\}, \tag{23}$$

where c is a given n vector some or all components of which may be infinite. All minimal feasible integer solutions to a monotone system of integer inequalities (23) can be enumerated in incremental quasi-polynomial time. On the other hand, the problem of generating all maximal infeasible binary vectors for (20) is NP-hard already for binary matrices A and $b = (2, 2, \ldots, 2)$, see [16] and also[6, 7] for more detail.

2.5 Spanning a linear space by linear subspaces.

The transversal hypergraph problem is equivalent to the following set covering problem: Given an r-element ground set $\mathcal{R}$ and a family $\mathcal{V}$ of n subsets of $\mathcal{R}$, enumerate all minimal subfamilies of $\mathcal{V}$ which cover the entire set $\mathcal{R}$. Replacing $\mathcal{R}$ by the vector space $\mathbf{F}^r$ over some field $\mathbf{F}$, and replacing each given subset of $\mathcal{V}$ by a linear subspace of $\mathbf{F}^r$, we arrive at the following *space covering* problem:

Given a collection $\mathcal{V} = \{V_1, \ldots, V_n\}$ *of* n *linear subspaces of* $\mathbf{F}^r$, *enumerate all minimal subsets* X *of* $V = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ *such that* $\mathrm{Span}\langle\bigcup_{i\in X} V_i\rangle = \mathbf{F}^r$.

Generalizing further, consider the polymatroid inequality

$$f(X) = \dim(\bigcup_{i\in X} V_i) \geq t, \tag{24}$$

where $t \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ is a given threshold. Note that when each subspace V_i is spanned by a subset R_i of vectors from some fixed basis of $\mathbf{F}^r$, the value of $f(X)$ is just the size of $\bigcup_{i\in X} R_i$, and hence (24) includes the class of polymatroid inequalities discussed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2. This shows that generating all maximal infeasible sets $\mathcal{A}_t = \mathcal{A}_t(f)$ for (24) is NP-hard.

Let $\mathcal{B}_t = \mathcal{B}_t(f)$ be the collection of all minimal solutions $X \subseteq V$ to (24). When $t = r$ and the given subspaces V_i are all lines, i.e.,

$$V_i = \mathrm{Span}\langle b_i\rangle \quad \text{for given vectors } b_i \in \mathbf{F}^r, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n,$$

the set $\mathcal{B}_t$ can be identified with the collection of all column bases of the $r \times n$ matrix $[b_1, \ldots, b_n]$. Accordingly, we then have $|\mathcal{A}_r| \leq r|\mathcal{B}_r|$, where $\mathcal{A}_r = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}_r)$ is the collection of all hyperplanes of the vectorial matroid $M = \{b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$. It is an open problem whether there exists an efficient randomized algorithm for nearly uniform sampling from within the set of bases of a given matrix. However, for any matroid M defined by a polynomial-time independence oracle, all bases of M can be enumerated in incremental polynomial time by using depth-first search on $\mathcal{B}_r$ with the obvious adjacency relation: two bases $X, X' \in \mathcal{B}_r$ are adjacent if $|X \cap X'| \geq r - 1$, where r is the rank of M. (All hyperplanes of M can also be enumerated in incremental polynomial time by using the characteristic property of hyperplanes:

> (*) If H and H' are two distinct hyperplanes in M and $b \notin H \cup H'$ then there exists a hyperplane H'' such that $b \cup (H \cap H') \subseteq H''$.

If $\mathcal{H} = \{H_1, \ldots, H_k\}$ is an incomplete collection of hyperplanes closed with respect to (*) then $\mathcal{H}$ defines a matroid M' of rank $r' < r$, which can be checked by constructing a base for M', i.e., a minimal transversal to the collection of co-circuits $M \setminus H_1, \ldots, M \setminus H_k$.)

It is easy to see that if the dimension of each input subspace V_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, is bounded by some constant d, then we can still enumerate all sets in $\mathcal{B}_t$ in incremental polynomial time and the size of $\mathcal{A}_r$ can be bounded by a d-degree polynomial in r and $|\mathcal{B}_r|$. Theorems 1 and 3 state that for all $t \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$, the size of $\mathcal{A}_t$ can be bounded by a $\log t$-degree polynomial in n and $|\mathcal{B}_t|$, and that all sets in $\mathcal{B}_t$ can be enumerated in incremental quasi-polynomial time, regardless of the dimensions of the input subspaces V_i.

It is interesting to mention that even though the space covering problem can be solved in incremental quasi-polynomial time for any input subspaces $V_1, \ldots, V_n$, the following close modification of the problem is NP-hard: Enumerate all minimal subsets $X \subseteq V$ such that

$\mathrm{Span}\langle\bigcup_{i\in X} V_i\rangle$ contains a given linear subspace V_0. In fact, the above *subspace* covering problem is NP-hard even when V_0 is a line and $\dim(V_i) = 2$ for all $i = 1,\ldots,n$. If all the input subspaces are lines, i.e., $V_i = \mathrm{Span}\langle b_i\rangle$, $i = 0,1,\ldots,n$, the problem calls for enumerating all minimal dependent sets ($\equiv$ circuits) containing b_0 in the vectorial matroid $M = \{b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$. The latter problem can be done in incremental polynomial time for any matroid M defined by a polynomial-time independence oracle. (First, we can enumerate all circuits of M in incremental polynomial time because any circuit of M is a co-circuit of the dual matroid M^* and vice versa. Second, assuming without loss of generality that M is connected, by Lehman's theorem ([22], p.74) any circuit in M can be expressed via two circuits containing b_0, and hence (# circuits of M) $\leq$ (# circuits through b_0)^2. More efficient cycle generation algorithm for graphs can be found in [20].)

It is also worth mentioning the NP-hardness of the *conic* variant of the space covering problem: Given a collection of r-dimensional polyhedral cones $K_1,\ldots,K_n$ defined by their rational generators, enumerate all minimal sets $X \subseteq \{1,\ldots,n\}$ such that $\mathrm{Cone}\langle\bigcup_{i\in X} K_i\rangle$ spans the entire space. The following problem is also NP-hard [14]: Given a rational r-vector b and a collection of n dihedral cones $K_i = \mathrm{Cone}\langle a_i, a'_i\rangle$, $i = 1,\ldots,n$, enumerate all minimal sets $X \subseteq \{1,\ldots,n\}$ for which $b \in \mathrm{Cone}\langle\bigcup_{i\in X} K_i\rangle$. Replacing the input dihedral cones by rays we obtain the *vertex enumeration* problem: Enumerate all vertices of a given polyhedron $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Ax = b, x \geq 0\}$. The incremental complexity of the vertex enumeration problem is not known. In particular, it is not known whether there exists a quasi-polynomial-time algorithm which, given a rational polytope $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Ax = b, x \geq 0\}$ and a collection Q of the vertices of P, can determine if $P = \mathrm{Conv.hull}\langle Q\rangle$.

2.6 Spanning collections of graphs.

Let R be a finite set of r vertices and let $E_1,\ldots,E_n \subseteq R\times R$ be a collection of n graphs on R. Given a set $X \subseteq \{1,\ldots,n\}$ define $k(X)$ to be the number of connected components in the graph $(R, \bigcup_{i\in X} E_i)$. Then $k(X)$ is an anti-monotone supermodular function and hence for any integral threshold t, the inequality

$$f(X) = r - k(X) \geq t$$

is polymatroid. In particular, $\mathcal{B}_{r-1}$ is the family of all minimal collections of the input graphs $E_1,\ldots,E_n$ which interconnect all vertices in R. (If the n input graphs are just n disjoint edges, then $\mathcal{B}_{r-1}$ is the set of all spanning trees in the graph $E_1\cup\ldots\cup E_n$.) Since $k(X)$ can be evaluated at any set X in polynomial time, Theorem 3 implies that for each $t \in \{1,\ldots,r\}$, all elements of $\mathcal{B}_t$ can be enumerated in incremental quasi-polynomial time. In particular, given a collection of n *equivalence relations* (partitions) on R, we can enumerate in incremental quasi-polynomial time all minimal subsets of the given relations whose transitive closure puts all elements of R in one equivalence class (or produces at most $r-t$ equivalence classes).

Interestingly, enumerating all minimal collections of $E_1,\ldots,E_n$ connecting two distinguished vertices $s,t \in R$ turns out to be NP-hard even if the input sets $E_1,\ldots,E_n$ are disjoint and contain at most 2 edges each, see [12]. Needless to say that as before, generating all maximal collections of $E_1, \dots, E_n$ for which the number of connected components of $(R, \bigcup_{i \in X} E_i)$ exceeds a given threshold remains NP-hard.

2.7 Matroids

Several other examples of polymatroid functions can be found, for instance, in Lovász [15] and Welsh [22]. Let M be a matroid with the rank function $\rho : 2^M \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$, and let $M_1, \dots, M_n$ be some subsets of M. For each $X \subseteq V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $f(X) = \rho(\bigcup_{i \in X} M_i)$. Then f is a polymatroid function. In fact, every polymatroid function arises by this construction from some matroid, see [13, 18], and also [15]. Since Theorem 3 holds for systems of polymatroid inequalities, we can also combine any number of matroid examples.

3 A lower bound for $|\mathcal{A}_t|$

In this section we demonstrate that inequality (2) of Theorem 1 is reasonably tight.

3.1 A hypergraph example

In our first example, let $\mathcal{H}$ be the edge set of the graph $G = k \times K_l$ consisting of k pairwise disjoint copies of a clique on l vertices. In this (hyper)graph, the number of vertices is $n = |V| = kl$, the number of (hyper)edges is $|\mathcal{H}| = k\binom{l}{2}$, the number of maximal independent sets is $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| = l^k$, and we can prove the following statement.

Lemma 3 *For the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ defined above, there exists an exact polymatroid separator (f, t), such that $t = r(f) = 2^k$.*

Proof. For $X \subseteq V$, define $f(X)$ by

$$f(X) = \begin{cases} 2^k, & \text{if } X \text{ contains an edge of } \mathcal{H} \\ 2^k - 2^{\gamma(X)}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\gamma(X)$ denotes the number of l-cliques of G disjoint from X. In particular, $f(X) = 2^k - 1$ if (and only if) X is a maximal independent set of $\mathcal{H}$, and $f(X) = 2^k$ if X contains an edge of $\mathcal{H}$. Let us also note that f is obviously monotone, by the above definition. Thus, with $t = 2^k$ the pair (f, t) is indeed an exact separator of $\mathcal{H}$.

It remains to show that f is submodular. For this, let X and Y be two arbitrary subsets of the vertex set V. If both X and Y contain an edge of $\mathcal{H}$, then (1) holds trivially, since we have 2^{k+1} on the right hand side, and we have $f(Z) \leq 2^k$ for all subsets $Z \subseteq V$ by definition. Furthermore, if one of these sets contains an edge of $\mathcal{H}$, say X, then of course $X \cup Y$ does too, and hence (1) reduces to $f(X \cap Y) \leq f(Y)$ which holds again trivially by the monotonicity of f. Let us assume next that neither X nor Y contain an edge of $\mathcal{H}$, but $X \cup Y$ does. In this case $\gamma(X \cap Y) \geq 1 + \max(\gamma(X), \gamma(Y))$ holds, implying $2^{\gamma(X\cap Y)} \geq 2^{\gamma(X)} + 2^{\gamma(Y)}$, from which (1) follows. Let us assume finally that $X \cup Y$ does not contain an edge of $\mathcal{H}$. In this case $\gamma(X \cap Y) \geq \max(\gamma(X), \gamma(Y))$ and $\gamma(X \cap Y) + \gamma(X \cup Y) \geq \gamma(X) + \gamma(Y)$ both hold, implying $2^{\gamma(X\cap Y)} + 2^{\gamma(X\cup Y)} \geq 2^{\gamma(X)} + 2^{\gamma(Y)}$, from which (1) follows again. $\square$

The above lemma now implies that with $t = r(f) = 2^k$ we have $\beta = |\mathcal{H}| = k\binom{l}{2}$, $\alpha = l^k$ and $n = |V| = kl$. For $l = 2^k$ and $k \to \infty$, we thus obtain $\log n / \log \beta \to 1/2$ and hence $c(n, \beta)$ converges to the root of the equation $2^c(2^{c/2} - 1) = 1$. This gives $c = 1.102...$, and consequently

$$\alpha > \beta^{(.551 \log t)/c(n,\beta)}$$

for k sufficiently large.

3.2 A rank function example

Let us next show that the polymatroid function f defined above can be realized as the rank function of some linear subspaces of the vector space $\mathbf{F}^r$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ over a (possibly large) field $\mathbf{F}$.

For positive integers k, l let $\mathbf{F}$ be a field with $l \leq |\mathbf{F}|$ (we shall use, as customary, $+$ and $\times$ to denote the two field operations, and we write 0 and 1 for the unit elements of these operations, respectively). Furthermore, let $n = kl$, let $G = k \times K_l$ be the graph, as above, and let $\mathcal{H}$ be again the edge set of G. Let us introduce the notations $K = \{1, 2, ..., k\}$ and $L = \{0, 1, ..., l-1\}$, and let us denote the vertex set of G by $V = K \times L$. We shall associate to each vertex $(i, j) \in V$ a linear subspace V_{ij} of $\mathbf{F}^r$, where $r = 2^k$. These subspaces will be chosen in such a way that every two subspaces corresponding to the same clique of G intersect only in the origin (and hence generate the whole space $\mathbf{F}^r$), while the intersection of arbitrary s subspaces ($1 \leq s \leq k$), each corresponding to distinct cliques of G, is of dimension 2^{k-s}.

Let $\{b_x \mid x \in \{0,1\}^k\}$ be an arbitrary basis in $\mathbf{F}^r$, indexed by the $r = 2^k$ elements of the binary cube of dimension k, and let $\lambda_0 = 0$, $\lambda_1 = 1$, $\lambda_2 \ldots, \lambda_{l-1}$ be distinct elements of $\mathbf{F}$ (hence the requirement $l \leq |\mathbf{F}|$). For every $z \in L^k$, and every index vector $x \in \{0,1\}^k$, define the product

$$\Lambda_z(x) = \prod_{i:x_i=1} \lambda_{z_i} \prod_{i:x_i=0} (1 - \lambda_{z_i}).$$

It is easily verified that $\sum_{x\in\{0,1\}^k} \Lambda_z(x) = 1$ for all $z \in L^k$, and that for any two binary vectors $x, y \in \{0,1\}^k$, we have $\Lambda_x(y) = 1$ if $x = y$, and $\Lambda_x(y) = 0$ otherwise. Let us now associate a (unique) vector

$$b_z = \sum_{x\in\{0,1\}^k} \Lambda_z(x) b_x \tag{25}$$

of $\mathbf{F}^r$ to every $z \in L^k$. Observe that for $z = x \in \{0,1\}^k$, we get a basis element $b_z = b_x$ by our selection of $\lambda_0 = 0, \lambda_1 = 1$.

Let us next define the linear subspace V_{ij}, for $(i,j) \in V$, to be the subspace generated by the vectors $b_z \in \mathbf{F}^r$ whose index vector z has value j in its i-th coordinate:

$$V_{ij} = \langle b_z \mid z_i = j \rangle.$$

We will show below that this construction has the announced properties. To simplify notation, we shall need a few more definitions.

For index vectors $x, y \in L^k$, and a subset $S \subseteq K$, we denote by $x[S]$ the restriction of x to S, by $y[\overline{S}]$ the restriction of y to the complementary set $\overline{S} = K \setminus S$, and by $z = x[S], y[\overline{S}]$ the vector defined by

$$z_j = \begin{cases} x_j & \text{if } j \in S, \\ y_j & \text{if } j \notin S. \end{cases}$$

Let us note that $\Lambda_{a[S],b[\overline{S}]}(x[S], y[\overline{S}]) = \Lambda_{a[S]}(x[S])\Lambda_{b[\overline{S}]}(y[\overline{S}])$ holds by the above definitions, for all $a, b \in L^k$, $x, y \in \{0,1\}^k$ and $S \subseteq K$.

Lemma 4 *For any $S \subseteq K$ and $w = (j_i \mid i \in S) \in L^S$, the set of vectors*

$$\left\{ \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^S} \Lambda_w(y) b_{y,x} \;:\; x \in \{0,1\}^{\overline{S}} \right\} \tag{26}$$

forms a basis for the vector space $V_{S,w} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle b_z \mid z[S] = w \rangle$. In particular, $\dim(V_{S,w}) = 2^{k-|S|}$.

Proof. First, let us observe that for each $x \in \{0,1\}^{\overline{S}}$, the vector $a = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^S} \Lambda_w(y) b_{y,x}$ lies in the space $V_{S,w}$ since $a = b_z$ with $z[S] = w$ and $z[\overline{S}] = x$. Let us observe next that these vectors are linearly independent: suppose, on the contrary, that there exist scalars $\mu_x \in \mathbf{F}$, $x \in \{0,1\}^{\overline{S}}$, not all zero, such that

$$0 = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^{\overline{S}}} \mu_x \left(\sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^S} \Lambda_w(y) b_{y,x} \right).$$

Then, by the linear independence of the basis $\{b_x \mid x \in \{0,1\}^k\}$ of $\mathbf{F}^r$, we obtain that

$$\mu_x \Lambda_w(y) = 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \{0,1\}^{\overline{S}} \quad \text{and} \quad y \in \{0,1\}^S. \tag{27}$$

But summing up equations (27) for a particular $x \in \{0,1\}^{\overline{S}}$ over all $y \in \{0,1\}^S$, and using $\sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^S} \Lambda_w(y) = 1$, we get $\mu_x = 0$, for all $x \in \{0,1\}^{\overline{S}}$, a contradiction, proving that (26) is indeed a family of linearly independent vectors. Let us note finally that these vectors span the entire subspace $V_{S,w}$, since any vector b_z with $z[S] = w$ in this subspace can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} b_z &= \sum_{u\in\{0,1\}^k} \Lambda_z(u) b_u \\ &= \sum_{u\in\{0,1\}^k} \Lambda_{z[\overline{S}]}(u[\overline{S}])\Lambda_{z[S]}(u[S]) b_u \\ &= \sum_{x\in\{0,1\}^{\overline{S}}} \Lambda_{z[\overline{S}]}(x) \left(\sum_{y\in\{0,1\}^S} \Lambda_w(y) b_{y,x}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows from the above observations. $\square$

For $z', z'' \in L^k$, let us denote by $[z', z'']$ the set of all those vectors $z \in L^k$ for which $z_i \in \{z'_i, z''_i\}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Lemma 5 *Let $z', z'' \in L^k$ be such that $z'_i \neq z''_i$ for all $i \in K$. Then the set $B_{z',z''} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{b_z \mid z \in [z', z'']\}$ forms a basis for $\mathbf{F}^r$.*

Proof. Let $M_{z',z''} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\Lambda_z(x))_{x,z}$ be the $2^k \times 2^k$-matrix whose rows are indexed by the vectors $x \in \{0,1\}^k$, and whose columns are indexed by the vectors $z \in [z', z'']$. To prove that the set $B_{z',z''}$ is linearly independent, it is enough by (25) to show that the matrix $M_{z',z''}$ is non-singular. Indeed, we claim that

$$|\det(M_{z',z''})| = \prod_{i=1}^{k} (\lambda_{z'_i} - \lambda_{z''_i})^{2^{k-1}}, \tag{28}$$

from which the lemma will follow by the distinctness of $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{l-1}$. To prove (28), we first observe that the left hand side is a polynomial in $\mathbf{F}[\lambda_{z'_1}, \ldots, \lambda_{z'_k}, \lambda_{z''_1}, \ldots, \lambda_{z'_k}]$, of degree 2^{k-1} in each variable λ_{z_i}. Let $i \in K$ and let $u, v \in L^k$ be such that $u_i = z'_i$, $v_i = z''_i$, and $u[K \setminus \{i\}] = v[K \setminus \{i\}] = w \in L^{K\setminus\{i\}}$. Then for any $x \in \{0,1\}^k$, it is easy to see that $\Lambda_u(x) - \Lambda_v(x) = (-1)^{x_i}(\lambda_{z''_i} - \lambda_{z''_i})\Lambda_w(x[K \setminus \{i\}])$. In particular, if we subtract the two columns of $M_{z',z''}$ indexed by u, v, we obtain $\lambda_{z'_i} - \lambda_{z''_i}$ as a factor for the determinant expression in (28). Repeating this argument for every $i \in K$ and every $w \in L^{K\setminus\{i\}}$, we conclude that the right hand side of (28) is a divisor of the left hand side. Since both polynomials are of the same degree in all variables by our earlier observation, and since they attain the same value at, say, $z' = (0, \ldots, 0)$, $z'' = (1, \ldots, 1)$, (28) follows. $\square$

Lemma 6 *For all $i \in K$, and for all $j, j' \in L$, $j \neq j'$, the subspaces V_{ij} and $V_{ij'}$ span the entire space $\mathbf{F}^r$, i.e., $\dim(V_{ij} \cup V_{ij'}) = 2^k$.*

Proof. Let $z', z'' \in L^k$ be such that $z'_i \neq z''_i$ for all $i \in K$, $z'_i = j$, and $z''_i = j'$. Since the basis set $B_{z',z''}$ is contained in $V_{ij} \cup V_{ij'}$, the lemma follows. $\square$

Lemma 7 *Let $z', z'' \in L^k$ be such that $z'_i \neq z''_i$ for all $i \in K$. Then for any $i \in K$, we have $V_{i,z'_i} = \langle b_z \mid z \in [z', z''],\ z_i = z'_i \rangle$.*

Proof. From Lemma 4, we have $\dim(V_{i,z'_i}) = 2^{k-1}$, and from Lemma 5, the set $\{b_z \mid z \in [z', z''],\ z_i = z'_i\}$ is linearly independent. Since this set is contained in V_{i,z'_i} by definition, the lemma follows. $\square$

Lemma 8 *For $S \subseteq K$ and $w = (j_i \mid i \in S) \in L^S$, we have*

$$\dim(\bigcup_{i \in S} V_{i,j_i}) = 2^k - 2^{k-|S|}. \tag{29}$$

Proof. Fix $z', z'' \in L^k$ such that $z'_i \neq z''_i$ for all $i \in K$, and $z'[S] = w$, and let $B = B_{z',z''}$ be the basis set defined by these two vectors. For $i \in S$ let $B^i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} B \cap V_{i,j_i}$, and let $B^{S,w} = \bigcup_{i \in S} B^i$. It is then immediate from the definitions and Lemma 7 that $\bigcup_{i \in S} V_{i,j_i} = \langle B^{S,w} \rangle$, and thus it is enough, by Lemma 5, to count the number of elements in the set $B^{S,w}$. Using the inclusion-exclusion formula, we obtain

$$\dim(\textstyle\bigcup_{i \in S} V_{i,j_i}) = |B^{S,w}| \quad = \sum_{\substack{Q \subseteq S \\ Q \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{|Q|-1} |\bigcap_{i \in Q} B^i|.$$

Therefore, since $|\bigcap_{i \in Q} B^i| = |\{b_z \in B_{z',z''} \ : \ z[Q] = w[Q]\}| = 2^{k-|Q|}$, we get

$$\dim(\bigcup_{i \in S} V_{i,j_i}) = \sum_{\substack{Q \subseteq S \\ Q \neq \emptyset}} (-1)^{|Q|-1} 2^{k-|Q|} = \sum_{m=1}^{|S|} (-1)^{m-1} \binom{|S|}{m} 2^{k-m} = 2^k - 2^{k-|S|},$$

implying the Lemma. $\square$

We are now ready to verify that our construction indeed has the desired properties. For a subset $X \subseteq V = K \times L$ let us define

$$g(X) = \dim(\bigcup_{(i,j) \in X} V_{ij}),$$

and let us set $t = 2^k$. It follows by Lemma 6 that if X contains an edge of the graph G, then $g(X) = 2^k$, i.e, that $\mathcal{B}_t(g) = \mathcal{H}$. It also follows by Lemma 8 that $g(X) = 2^k - 2^{k-|X|} \leq 2^k - 1$ for any independent set $X \subset V$. i.e., $\mathcal{A}_t(g) = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$. In other words, g is the same set-function as the function f described in the previous subsection.

4 Proofs

In this section we prove Lemmas 1 and 2, which are the key statements needed to prove our main results.

Proof of Lemma 1. Let us recall that (f, t) is a polymatroid separator of the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$, separating the maximal independent sets $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}, f, t)$ from $\mathcal{H}$, and that to every node v of $\mathbf{T}$ we have associated an independent set $S_v = \bigcap_{l \in L(\mathbf{T}(v))} I_l$, where $I_l \in \mathcal{S}$ denotes the maximal independent set assigned to the leaf $l \in L(\mathbf{T})$ by the proper assignment ϕ.

To prove the statement of the lemma, we shall show by induction that

$$f(S_w) \leq t - |L(\mathbf{T}(w))| \tag{30}$$

holds for every node w of the binary tree $\mathbf{T}$. Since f is non-negative, it follows that

$$|L(\mathbf{T}(w))| \leq t \leq r(f)$$

which, if applied to the root of $\mathbf{T}$, proves the lemma. To see (30), let as apply induction by the size of $L(\mathbf{T}(w))$. Clearly, if $w = l$ is a leaf of $\mathbf{T}$, then $|L(\mathbf{T}(l))| = 1$, $S_w = I_l \in \mathcal{S}$, and (30) follows by the assumption that (f, t) is separating $\mathcal{H}$ from $\mathcal{S}$. Let us assume now that w is a node of $\mathbf{T}$ with u and v as its immediate successors. Then $|L(\mathbf{T}(w))| = |L(\mathbf{T}(u))| + |L(\mathbf{T}(v))|$, and $S_w = S_u \cap S_v$. By our inductive hypothesis, and since f is submodular, we have the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} f(S_u \cup S_v) + f(S_w) &\leq f(S_u) + f(S_v) \\ &\leq t - |L(\mathbf{T}(u))| + t - |L(\mathbf{T}(v))| \\ &= 2t - |L(\mathbf{T}(w))|. \end{aligned}$$

Since ϕ is a proper mapping, the set $S_u \cup S_v$ contains a hyperedge $H \in \mathcal{H}$, and thus $f(S_u \cup S_v) \geq f(H) \geq t$ by the monotonicity of f, and by our assumption that (f, t) is a separator for $\mathcal{H}$. Thus, from the above inequality we get $t + f(S_w) \leq f(S_u \cup S_v) + f(S_w) \leq 2t - |L(\mathbf{T}(w))|$, from which (30) follows. $\square$

Before proving the statement of Lemma 2, we shall need some more definitions and two technical lemmas.

For a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ and a vertex $v \in V = V(\mathcal{H})$ let us denote by $d_{\mathcal{H}}(v)$ the *degree* of vertex v in $\mathcal{H}$, i.e., $d_{\mathcal{H}}(v)$ is the number of hyperedges of $\mathcal{H}$ containing v. Furthermore, for $X \subseteq V$ let $\mathcal{H}^X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid H \supseteq X\}$, and let us simply write $\mathcal{H}^v$ if $X = \{v\}$.

Lemma 9 *For every Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^V$ on $n = |V| > 1$ vertices, with $m = |\mathcal{H}| \geq n$ hyperedges, there exists a vertex $v \in V$ for which*

$$m\frac{1}{n} \leq d_{\mathcal{H}}(v) \leq m\left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Proof. Let us define

$$X = \{v \in V \mid d_{\mathcal{H}}(v) < m\frac{1}{n}\}$$

and

$$Y = \{v \in V \mid d_{\mathcal{H}}(v) > m(1-\frac{1}{n})\},$$

and let us assume indirectly that $X \cup Y = V$ form a partition of the vertex set.

Let us observe first that $|X| < n$ must hold, since otherwise a contradiction

$$m \leq \sum_{H\in\mathcal{H}} |H| = \sum_{v\in X} d_{\mathcal{H}}(v) < n\frac{m}{n} = m,$$

would follow.

Let us observe next that $|X| > 0$ must hold, since otherwise

$$\sum_{H\in\mathcal{H}} |H| = \sum_{v\in V} d_{\mathcal{H}}(v) = \sum_{v\in Y} d_{\mathcal{H}}(v) > n \times m(1-\frac{1}{n}) = m(n-1)$$

follows, implying the existence of a hyperedge $H \in \mathcal{H}$ of size $|H| = n$, i.e., $V \in \mathcal{H}$. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is Sperner, $1 = m < n$ would follow, contradicting our assumptions.

Let us observe finally that the number of those hyperedges which avoid some points of Y cannot be more than $|Y|m/n$, and since $|Y| < n$ by our previous observation, there must exist a hyperedge $H \in \mathcal{H}$ containing Y. Thus, all other hyperedges must intersect X, and hence we have

$$m-1 \leq \sum_{H\in\mathcal{H}} |H \cap X| = \sum_{v\in X} d_{\mathcal{H}}(v) < |X|\frac{m}{n} \leq m\frac{n-1}{n}$$

by our first observation. From this $m < n$ would follow, contradicting again our assumption that $m \geq n$. This last contradiction hence proves X and Y cannot cover V, and thus follows the lemma. □

Lemma 10 *Given a hypergraph $\mathcal{H}$ and a subfamily $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$ of its maximal independent sets, $|\mathcal{S}| \geq 2$, there exists a hyperedge $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and a vertex $v \in H$ such that*

$$|\mathcal{S}^v| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{n} \text{ and } |\mathcal{S}^{H\setminus v}| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{n|\mathcal{H}|}.$$

Proof. Let us note first that if $2 \leq |\mathcal{S}| < n$, then the statement is almost trivially true, and thus we can assume that $|\mathcal{S}| \geq n$.

Let us then apply Lemma 9 for the Sperner hypergraph $\mathcal{S}^c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{V \setminus I \mid I \in \mathcal{S}\}$, and obtain that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{n} \leq d_{\mathcal{S}^c}(v) \leq |\mathcal{S}|(1 - \frac{1}{n})$$

holds for some $v \in V$, since $|\mathcal{S}| = |\mathcal{S}^c|$ obviously. Thus, from the second inequality we obtain

$$|\mathcal{S}^v| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{n}.$$

To see the second inequality of Lemma 10, let us note that members of $\mathcal{S}^c$ are minimal transversals of $\mathcal{H}$, and thus for every $T \in \mathcal{S}^c$, $T \ni v$ there exists a hyperedge $H \in \mathcal{H}$ for which $H \cap T = \{v\}$, by the definition of minimal transversals. Thus,

$$\bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}: H \ni v} \{T \in \mathcal{S}^c \mid T \cap H = \{v\}\} \supseteq \{T \in \mathcal{S}^c \mid T \ni v\}$$

holds, from which

$$\sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}: H \ni v} |\mathcal{S}^{H \setminus v}| \geq d_{\mathcal{S}^c}(v) \geq \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{n}$$

follows. Therefore, since $|\{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid H \ni v\}| = d_{\mathcal{H}}(v) \leq |\mathcal{H}|$ holds obviously, there must exist a hyperedge $H \in \mathcal{H}$, $H \ni v$, for which

$$|\mathcal{S}^{H \setminus v}| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{S}|}{n|\mathcal{H}|}$$

holds, implying thus the lemma. □

Proof of Lemma 2. Let us denote by $L(\alpha)$ the maximum number of leaves of a binary tree $\mathbf{T}$ with a proper mapping $\phi : V(\mathbf{T}) \to \mathcal{S}$, where $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$ is an arbitrary subfamily of maximal independent sets of $\mathcal{H}$. To simplify notation, let us write $\alpha = |\mathcal{S}|$ and $\beta = |\mathcal{H}|$. To prove the statement, we need to show that

$$L(\alpha) \geq \alpha^{c/\log \beta} \tag{31}$$

where $c = c(n, \beta)$ is as defined in (3).

Let us prove this inequality by induction on α. Clearly, if $\alpha = 1$, then $L(1) = 1$ holds, and we have equality in (31).

Let us assume next that we already have verified the claim for all subfamilies of size smaller than α, and let us consider a subfamily $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})$ of size $\alpha = |\mathcal{S}|$. According to Lemma 10, we can choose two disjoint subfamilies $\mathcal{S}', \mathcal{S}'' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ such that $|\mathcal{S}'| \geq \frac{\alpha}{n}$ and $|\mathcal{S}''| \geq \frac{\alpha}{n\beta}$, and such that for any pair of sets $S' \in \mathcal{S}'$ and $S'' \in \mathcal{S}''$ the union $S' \cup S''$ contains a member of $\mathcal{H}$. Thus, building binary trees with proper mappings separately for $\mathcal{S}'$ and $\mathcal{S}''$, and joining them as two siblings of a common root, we obtain a binary tree with a proper mapping for $\mathcal{S}$. Since the right hand side of our claim is a monotone function of α, we can conclude for the number of leaves in the obtained binary tree that

$$L(\alpha) \geq L(\frac{\alpha}{n}) + L(\frac{\alpha}{n\beta}). \tag{32}$$

Applying now our inductive hypothesis, we get

$$\begin{aligned} L(\alpha) &\geq \left(\frac{\alpha}{n}\right)^{c/\log\beta} + \left(\frac{\alpha}{n\beta}\right)^{c/\log\beta} \\ &= \alpha^{c/\log\beta}\left[n^{-c/\log\beta} + (n\beta)^{-c/\log\beta}\right] \\ &= \alpha^{c/\log\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by (3). This proves (31), and hence the lemma follows. □

Note that the right hand side of (31) is the least possible solution of the recursion (32).

5 Generating minimal integer solutions of a system of submodular inequalities in an integral box

In this section, we discuss a generalization of the previous results, which replaces polymatroid set-functions by submodular functions defined on integral boxes. Let $\mathcal{C} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid 0 \leq x \leq c\}$ be an integral box, where $c \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ is a given finite n-vector. A function $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \{0, 1, \ldots, r\}$, where $r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, is said to be submodular if

$$f(x \vee y) + f(x \wedge y) \leq f(x) + f(y)$$

holds for all $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$, where $\vee$ and $\wedge$ denote, as usual, the join and meet operators over $\mathcal{C}$:

$$\begin{aligned} x \vee y &= (\max\{x_1, y_1\}, \ldots, \max\{x_n, y_n\}), \\ x \wedge y &= (\min\{x_1, y_1\}, \ldots, \min\{x_n, y_n\}). \end{aligned}$$

As before, f is said to be monotone if $f(x) \leq f(y)$ whenever $x \leq y$, and is called polymatroid if it is monotone, submodular, and $f(0) = 0$.

Given a polymatroid function f with range r and an integral threshold $t \in \{1, ..., r\}$ let us denote by $\mathcal{B}_t = \mathcal{B}_t(f)$ the family of all minimal vectors $x \in \mathcal{C}$ for which $f(x) \geq t$, and by $\mathcal{A}_t = \mathcal{A}_t(f)$ the family of all maximal vectors $x \in \mathcal{C}$ for which $f(x) < t$. It follows that $\mathcal{A}_t = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}_t)$, where $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\text{maximal } x \in \mathcal{C} \mid x \not\geq b, \text{for all } b \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is the family of all maximal independent vectors for $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$. As in the Boolean case $\mathcal{C} = \{0,1\}^n$, we shall use the notation $\alpha = |\mathcal{A}_t|$ and $\beta = |\mathcal{B}_t|$.

Theorems 1 and 2 admit the following generalizations:

Theorem 4 *For every polymatroid function $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$ and threshold $t \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $\beta \geq 2$ we have the inequality*

$$\alpha \leq \beta^{(\log t)/c(2n,\beta)}. \tag{33}$$

Let $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be a set of integral n-vectors, $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$ a polymatroid function and $t \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ a threshold. As before, we say that (f, t) is a separator for $\mathcal{H}$ if $f(x) \geq t$ for all $x \in \mathcal{H}$.

Theorem 5 *Let (f, t) be a polymatroid separator for a set $\mathcal{H}$ of at least two points in $\mathcal{C}$. Then*

$$|\mathcal{A}_t(f) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{H})| \leq |\mathcal{H}|^{(\log t)/c(2n,|\mathcal{H}|)}. \tag{34}$$

Using the same argument as that preceding Theorem 3, and the fact that the dualization problem on boxes can still be solved in quasi-polynomial time, see [5], we readily arrive at the following generalization of Theorem 3.

Theorem 6 *Consider a system of polymatroid inequalities*

$$f_i(x) \geq t_i, \;\; i = 1, \dots, m, \qquad x \in \mathcal{C},$$

in which the right hand sides are bounded by a quasi-polynomial function in the size of the system. Suppose further that this system has a quasi-polynomial time feasibility oracle. Then all minimal feasible solutions for the system can be enumerated in incremental quasi-polynomial time.

Our proof of Theorem 5 makes use of a generalization of Lemma 2. To state this generalization, we need first to extend the notion of proper mappings of maximal independent sets to binary trees. Call a family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ an antichain if no two elements are comparable in $\mathcal{A}$. Given a binary tree $\mathbf{T}$, an antichain $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, and a collection $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$ of maximal independent elements of $\mathcal{B}$, let us consider again mappings $\phi : L(\mathbf{T}) \mapsto \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$ that assign a maximal independent element $a^l \in \mathcal{A}$ to each leaf l of $\mathbf{T}$. To each node v of the tree $\mathbf{T}$, we associate the element $x^v = \bigwedge_{l \in L(\mathbf{T}(v))} a^l$. The mapping ϕ will be called proper if it assigns different independent elements to different leaves, and if the element $x^u \vee x^v$ is not independent whenever u and v are incomparable nodes of $\mathbf{T}$. The latter condition implies that for every pair of incomparable nodes $u, v \in V(\mathbf{T})$, there exists an element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ for which $a \leq x^u \vee x^v$.

Lemma 11 *Let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be an antichain of size $|\mathcal{B}| \geq 2$ in an n-dimensional integral box $\mathcal{C}$ and let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$. Then there exists a binary tree $\mathbf{T}$ and a proper mapping $\phi : L(\mathbf{T}) \mapsto \mathcal{A}$, such that*

$$|L(\mathbf{T})| \geq |\mathcal{A}|^{c(2n,|\mathcal{B}|)/\log|\mathcal{B}|}. \tag{35}$$

Proof. By induction on $|\mathcal{A}|$. For $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in V \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{1, \ldots, n\}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_b^i &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid a_i \geq b_i\}, \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{A}_b^{V\setminus i} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid a_j \geq b_j \text{ for all } j \in V \setminus i\}. \end{aligned}$$

We shall make use of the following lemma.

Lemma 12 *For every antichain $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and every $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$, there exist $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and an $i \in V$ such that*

$$|\mathcal{A}_b^i| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{2n} \text{ and } |\mathcal{A}_b^{V\setminus i}| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{2n|\mathcal{B}|}.$$

Then, to build a binary tree $\mathbf{T}$ on $\mathcal{A}$, let us associate to its root the pair $i \in V$, $b \in \mathcal{B}$ which satisfies the conditions of Lemma 12, and let us use members of $\mathcal{A}_a^i$ to label all left-leaves of $\mathbf{T}$, and use $\mathcal{A}_a^{V\setminus i}$ to label all right-leaves. Clearly, $0 < |\mathcal{A}_b^i| < |\mathcal{A}|$, $0 < |\mathcal{A}_b^{V\setminus i}| < |\mathcal{A}|$, and both are collections of maximal independent elements of $\mathcal{B}$. Therefore, we can conclude by induction that there exist binary trees $\mathbf{T}_1$ and $\mathbf{T}_2$ of sufficiently large number of leaves, and proper mappings $\phi_1 : L(\mathbf{T}_1) \mapsto \mathcal{A}_b^i$ and $\phi_2 : L(\mathbf{T}_2) \mapsto \mathcal{A}_b^{V\setminus i}$ such that

$$\bigwedge_{l \in L(\mathbf{T}_1)} a_i^l \geq b_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad \bigwedge_{l \in L(\mathbf{T}_2)} a^l[V \setminus i] \geq b[V \setminus i],$$

and thus the join of these two elements is at least b. The lemma then follows by the same argument used in the proof of Lemma 2. □

For $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, let us define

$$d_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid a_i \geq x\}|.$$

Lemma 13 *Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be an antichain in an n-dimensional integral box $\mathcal{C}$, and let $\epsilon > 0$ be a given constant. If $n > 1$ and $m = |\mathcal{A}| \geq 1 + 1/\epsilon$, then there exists an $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $0 \leq x \leq \max\{c_1, \ldots, c_n\}$ and*

$$m\frac{1}{(1+\epsilon)n} \leq d_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \leq m\left(1 - \frac{1}{(1+\epsilon)n}\right).$$

Proof. Let us define the vector $y \in \mathbb{C}$ by setting

$$y_i = \max\{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 0 \le x \le c_i,\ d_{\mathcal{A}}(x) > m(1 - \frac{1}{(1+\epsilon)n})\},$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and let $Y = \{i \in V \mid y_i = c_i\}$. Assume indirectly that for every $i \in V$, and every $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $y_i < x \le c_i$, we have $d_{\mathcal{A}}(x) < m/(1+\epsilon)n$. Let us observe first that $Y \neq V$ must hold, since otherwise

$$\begin{aligned} |\bigcup_{i=1}^{n}\{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid a_i < y_i\}| &\le \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid a_i < y_i\}| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n}(m - d_{\mathcal{A}}(y_i)) < n\frac{m}{(1+\epsilon)n} < m, \end{aligned}$$

implying that there exists an $a^o \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $a^o \ge y = c$. But this would imply that $m = 1$, since $\mathcal{A}$ is an antichain, contradicting our assumptions. Now since there is an $a^o \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $a^o \ge y$ and $\mathcal{A}$ is an antichain, it follows that, for all other elements $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{a^o\}$, there must exist an $i \in V$ for which $a_i > y_i$. Consequently,

$$m - 1 \le \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} |\{i \in V \mid a_i > y_i\}| = \sum_{i \notin Y} d_{\mathcal{A}}(y_i + 1) < n\frac{m}{(1+\epsilon)n},$$

and therefore we get $m < 1 + 1/\epsilon$, again a contradiction. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 12. Assume without loss of generality that $|\mathcal{A}| \ge 2$. Let us apply Lemma 13 with $\epsilon = 1$ for the antichain $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{B})$, and obtain an $i \in V$ and an $0 \le x \le c_i$ such that

$$|\mathcal{A}|\frac{1}{2n} \le d_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \le |\mathcal{A}|\left(1 - \frac{1}{2n}\right).$$

Let us next note that for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ for which $a_i < x$, there exists an element $b \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $b_i \le x$, and $b_j \le a_j$ for all $j \neq i$, by the maximality of the independent element a. Thus,

$$\frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{2n} \le |\mathcal{A}| - d_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \le |\bigcup_{b \in \mathcal{B}}\{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid a_i < x, a_j \ge b_j \text{ for all } j \neq i\}|$$

holds, from which we conclude that there must exist a $b \in \mathcal{B}$ such that

$$|\{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid a_i < x, a_j \ge b_j \text{ for all } j \neq i\}| \ge \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{2n|\mathcal{B}|}.$$

This gives immediately $|\mathcal{A}_b^{V\setminus i}| \ge |\mathcal{A}|/(2n|\mathcal{B}|)$. On the other hand, since $b_i \le x$ and $d_{\mathcal{A}}(x) \ge |\mathcal{A}|/(2n)$, we obtain $|\mathcal{A}_b^i| = d_{\mathcal{A}}(b_i) \ge |\mathcal{A}|/(2n)$, and the first inequality of the lemma follows. $\square$

References

[1] 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.

[2] V.E. Alekseev. On the number of dead-end independent sets in graphs from hereditary classes, *Combinatoric-algebraic methods in discrete optimization* **6** (1991) 5-8 (Nizhni Novgorod, in Russian).

[3] E. Balas and C. S. Yu, On graphs with polynomially solvable maximal-weight clique problem, *Networks* **19** (1989) 247-253.

[4] J. C. Bioch and T. Ibaraki, Complexity of identification and dualization of positive Boolean functions, *Information and Computation* 123 (1995) 50-63.

[5] E. Boros, K. Elbassioni, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan and K.Makino, On generating all minimal integer solutions for a monotone system of linear inequalities, to appear in: *Automata, Languanges and Programming, 28th International Colloquium, ICALP 2001* (DIMACS Technical Report 2001-12, Rutgers University).

[6] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan and K.Makino, Generating partial and multiple transversals of a hypergraph, In: *Automata, Languanges and Programming, 27th International Colloquium, ICALP 2000* (Montanari, J.D.P. Rolim and E. Welzl, eds.), pp. 588-599 (Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, July 2000).

[7] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan and K. Makino, Dual bounded generation: partial and multiple transversals of a hypergraph, to appear in *SIAM J. Computing.* (DIMACS Technical Report 1999-62, Rutgers University).

[8] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan and K. Makino, An inequality limiting the number of maximal frequent sets, DIMACS technical report 2000-37, Rutgers University.

[9] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan and K. Makino, Generating weighted transversals of a hypergraph, to appear in the *Proceedings of the 2nd Japanese-Hungarian Symposium on Discrete Mathematics and Its Applications*, Budapest, April 20-23, 2001. (DIMACS technical report 2000-17, Rutgers University)

[10] W. Duckworth, D. Manlove, and M. Zito. On the approximability of the maximum induced matching problem, to appear in *Journal of Combinatoril Optimization*, 2000.

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

[12] V. Gurvich and L. Khachiyan, On generating the irredundant conjunctive and disjunctive normal forms of monotone Boolean functions, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 96-97 (1999) 363-373. (See also Rutcor Research Report, RRR-35-95, Rutgers University.)

[13] T. Helgason, Aspects of the theory of hypermatroids, in Hypergraph Seminar, eds C. Berge and D.K. Ray-Chaudhuri), Lecture Notes in Math. 411 (1975) Springer, 191-214.

[14] L. Khachiyan, Transversal hypergraphs and families of polyhedral cones, to appear in : *Advances in Convex Analysis and Global Optimization, Proc. of the International conference dedicated to the memory of K. Carathéodory, Samos, Greece, June 2000*, P. Pardalos ed. (Kluwer, 2001).

[15] L. Lovász, Submodular functions and convexity. In: *Mathematical Programming: The State of the Art*, Bonn 1982, pp. 235-257, (Springer Verlag, 1983).

[16] K. Makino and T. Ibaraki, Interor and exterior functions of Boolean functions, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 69 (1996) 209-231.

[17] K. Makino and T. Ibaraki, Inner-core and outer-core functions of partially defined Boolean functions, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 1996-97, issue 1-3 (1999), 307-326.

[18] C.G.H. McDiarmid, Rado's theorem for polymatroids, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc.* **78** (1975) 263-281.

[19] E. Prisner, Graphs with few cliques, *Graph theory, combinatorics and algorithms*, **1,2** (Kalamazoo, MI, 1992) 945-956, Wisley-Intersi. Publ., Wisley, New York, 1995.

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

[21] Larry J. Stockmeyer and Vijay V. Vazirani. NP-completeness of some generalizations of the maximum matching problem. Information Processing Letters, 15(1):14-19, 19 August 1982.

[22] D.J.A. Welsch, Matroid Theory (Academic Press, London, New York, San Francisco 1976).