

THE ARITY GAP OF AGGREGATION FUNCTIONS AND FURTHER EXTENSIONS

MIGUEL COUCEIRO, ERKKO LEHTONEN, AND TAMÁS WALDHAUSER

ABSTRACT. The aim of this paper is to completely classify all aggregation functions based on the notion of arity gap. We first establish explicit descriptions of the arity gap of the Lovász extensions of pseudo-Boolean functions and, in particular, of the Choquet integrals. Then we consider the wider class of order-preserving functions between arbitrary, possibly different, posets, and show that similar explicit descriptions still hold for this function class which subsumes that of aggregation functions.

1. INTRODUCTION

The process of merging or combining sets of values (often real values) into a single one is usually achieved by the so-called aggregation functions. Usually, an aggregation function on $\mathbb{I} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is a mapping $M: \mathbb{I}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{I}^n$ which is nondecreasing and fulfills the boundary conditions $M(\bigwedge \mathbb{I}^n) = \bigwedge \mathbb{I}$ and $M(\bigvee \mathbb{I}^n) = \bigvee \mathbb{I}$. Classical examples of aggregation functions include weighted arithmetic means (discrete versions of Lebesgue integrals), as well as certain non-additive fuzzy integrals such as the Choquet integral [3] and the Sugeno integral [22, 23]. (The latter was recently brought to the more general setting of lattice polynomial functions; see [8, 18].)

The importance of aggregation functions is made apparent by their wide use, not only in pure mathematics (e.g., in the theory of functional equations, measure and integration theory), but also in several applied fields such as operations research, computer and information sciences, economics and social sciences, as well as in other experimental areas of physics and natural sciences. The growing need to fuse several inputs into a single output in such a way that the resulting value somehow represents all the inputs led to the theory of aggregation whose main problem is to propose and describe aggregation functions suitable for a required application. For general background, see [1, 12] and for a recent reference, see [11].

In this paper, we study the arity gap of aggregation functions. Essentially, the arity gap of a function $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ ($n \geq 2$) that depends on all of its variables can be defined as the minimum decrease in the number of essential variables when variables of f are identified. Salomaa [21] showed that the arity gap of any Boolean function is at most 2. This result was extended to functions defined on arbitrary

Date: January 26, 2023.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 08A40.

Key words and phrases. Arity gap, variable identification minors, ordered sets, order-preserving function, aggregation function, Choquet integral, pseudo-Boolean function, Lovász extension, Owen extension.

¹The present project is supported by the National Research Fund, Luxembourg, and cofunded under the Marie Curie Actions of the European Commission (FP7-COFUND), and supported by the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research under grant no. K77409.

finite domains by Willard [25], who showed that the same upper bound holds for the arity gap of any function $f: A^n \rightarrow B$, provided that $n > |A|$. In fact, he showed that if the arity gap of such a function f is 2, then f is totally symmetric. Salomaa's [21] result on the upper bound for the arity gap of Boolean functions was strengthened in [5], where Boolean functions were completely classified according to their arity gap. Using tools provided by Berman and Kisielewicz [2] and Willard [25], in [6] a similar explicit classification was established for all pseudo-Boolean functions, i.e., functions $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. As it turns out, this leads to analogous classifications of wider classes of functions. In [7], this result on pseudo-Boolean functions was the key step in showing that among lattice polynomial functions (Sugeno integrals) only truncated ternary medians (ternary medians, respectively) have arity gap 2; all the others have arity gap 1.

Similar techniques are used in Section 3 to derive explicit descriptions of the arity gap of well-known extensions of pseudo-Boolean functions to the whole real line, namely, Owen and Lovász extensions. As the latter subsume Choquet integrals, as a by-product we get a complete classification of Choquet integrals according to their arity gap.

As mentioned, both the Sugeno and Choquet integrals constitute particular examples of aggregation functions. Thus, it is natural to ask for analogous descriptions of the arity gap of aggregation functions. This question is considered and answered in Section 4 for the more general class of order-preserving functions. To this extent, we first present a complete classification of functions over arbitrary domains according to their arity gap (originally established in [6] for functions over finite domains), which is then used to derive a dichotomy theorem based on the arity gap (and the so-called quasi-arity), and to explicitly determine those order-preserving functions that have arity gap 1 and those that have arity gap 2.

2. PRELIMINARIES: ARITY GAP AND THE SIMPLE MINOR RELATION

Throughout this paper, let A and B be arbitrary sets with at least two elements. A B -valued function (of several variables) on A is a mapping $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ for some positive integer n , called the *arity* of f . A -valued functions on A are called *operations on A* . Operations on $\{0, 1\}$ are called *Boolean functions*. We denote the set of real numbers by \mathbb{R} . Functions $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are referred to as *pseudo-Boolean functions*. For a natural number $n \geq 1$, we denote $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$.

The i -th variable is said to be *essential* in $f: A^n \rightarrow B$, or f is said to *depend* on x_i , if there is a pair

$$((a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n), (a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n)) \in A^n \times A^n,$$

called a *witness of essentiality* of x_i in f , such that

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \neq f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n).$$

The number of essential variables in f is called the *essential arity* of f , and it is denoted by $\text{ess } f$. If $\text{ess } f = m$, we say that f is *essentially m -ary*.

For $n \geq 2$, define

$$A_{\neq}^n := \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A^n : a_i = a_j \text{ for some } i \neq j\}.$$

We also define $A_{=}^1 := A$. Note that if A has less than n elements, then $A_{\neq}^n = A^n$.

Consider $f: A^n \rightarrow B$. Any function $g: A^n \rightarrow B$ satisfying $f|_{A_{\neq}^n} = g|_{A_{\neq}^n}$ is called a *support* of f . The *quasi-arity* of f , denoted $\text{qa } f$, is defined as the minimum of

the essential arities of the supports of f , i.e., $\text{qa } f = \min_g \text{ess } g$, where g ranges over the set of all supports of f . If $\text{qa } f = m$, we say that f is *quasi- m -ary*.

A function $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ is said to be obtained from $g: A^m \rightarrow B$ by *simple variable substitution*, or f is a *simple minor* of g , if there is a mapping $\sigma: \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = g(x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(m)}) \quad \text{for all } (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in A^n.$$

The simple minor relation constitutes a quasi-order \leq on the set of all B -valued functions of several variables on A which is given by the following rule: $f \leq g$ if and only if f is obtained from g by simple variable substitution. If $f \leq g$ and $g \leq f$, we say that f and g are *equivalent*, denoted $f \equiv g$. If $f \leq g$ but $g \not\leq f$, we denote $f < g$. It can be easily observed that if $f \leq g$ then $\text{ess } f \leq \text{ess } g$, with equality if and only if $f \equiv g$. For background, extensions and variants of the simple minor relation, see, e.g., [4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 20, 24, 26]. For $f: A^n \rightarrow B$, we denote

$$\text{ess}^< f = \max_{g < f} \text{ess } g,$$

and we define the *arity gap* of f by $\text{gap } f = \text{ess } f - \text{ess}^< f$. It is easily observed that

$$\text{gap } f = \min_{i \neq j} (\text{ess } f - \text{ess } f_{i \leftarrow j}),$$

where i and j range over the set of indices of essential variables of f .

In the sequel, whenever we consider the arity gap of some function f , we will assume that all variables of f are essential. This is not a significant restriction, because every non-constant function is equivalent to a function with no inessential variables and equivalent functions have the same arity gap.

Salomaa [21] proved that the arity gap of every Boolean function with at least two essential variables is at most 2. This result was generalized by Willard [25, Lemma 1.2] in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let A be a finite set. Suppose $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ depends on all of its variables. If $n > |A|$, then $\text{gap } f \leq 2$.*

In [5], Salomaa's result was strengthened into an explicit classification of Boolean functions in terms of arity gap (see Theorem 2.2).

Theorem 2.2. *For $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, we have $\text{gap } f = 2$ if and only if f is equivalent to one of the following Boolean functions:*

- $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_m + c$,
- $x_1 x_2 + x_1 + c$,
- $x_1 x_2 + x_1 x_3 + x_2 x_3 + c$,
- $x_1 x_2 + x_1 x_3 + x_2 x_3 + x_1 + x_2 + c$,

where addition and multiplication are done modulo 2 and $c \in \{0, 1\}$. Otherwise $\text{gap } f = 1$.

Based on this, a complete classification of pseudo-Boolean functions according to their arity gap was presented in [6] (see Theorem 2.3).

Theorem 2.3. *For a pseudo-Boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which depends on all of its variables, $\text{gap } f = 2$ if and only if f satisfies one of the following conditions:*

- $n = 2$ and f is a nonconstant function satisfying $f(0, 0) = f(1, 1)$,
- $f = g \circ h$, where $g: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow B$ is injective and $h: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a Boolean function with $\text{gap } h = 2$, as listed in Theorem 2.2.

Otherwise $\text{gap } f = 1$.

Remark 2.4. It is noteworthy that there is a complete one-to-one correspondence between pseudo-Boolean functions and *set functions*, i.e., functions $v: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some $n \geq 1$. This correspondence is based on the natural order-isomorphism between $\{0, 1\}^n$ and the power set $2^{[n]} = \mathcal{P}([n])$ of $[n]$. For a pseudo-Boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we can associate a set function $v_f: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $v_f(T) = f(\mathbf{e}_T)$, where \mathbf{e}_T denotes the characteristic vector of $T \subseteq [n]$. Conversely, for a set function $v: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $f_v: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the pseudo-Boolean function defined by $f_v(\mathbf{e}_T) = v(T)$. Clearly, $f_{v_f} = f$ and $v_{f_v} = v$ for every pseudo-Boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and every set function $v: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

The study of the arity gap of functions $A^n \rightarrow B$ culminated into the characterization presented in Theorem 2.5, originally proved in [6]. We need to introduce some terminology to state the result.

Let $\mathcal{P}(A)$ be the power set of A , and define $\text{oddsupp}: \bigcup_{n \geq 1} A^n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A)$ by

$$\text{oddsupp}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \{a_i : |\{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} : a_j = a_i\}| \text{ is odd}\}.$$

A partial function $f: S \rightarrow B$, $S \subseteq A^n$, is said to be *determined by* oddsupp if $f = f^* \circ \text{oddsupp}|_S$ for some function $f^*: \mathcal{P}(A) \rightarrow B$.

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that $f: A^n \rightarrow B$, $n \geq 2$, depends on all of its variables.*

- (i) *For $3 \leq p \leq n$, $\text{gap } f = p$ if and only if $\text{qa } f = n - p$.*
- (ii) *For $n \neq 3$, $\text{gap } f = 2$ if and only if $\text{qa } f = n - 2$ or $\text{qa } f = n$ and $f|_{A^n}$ is determined by oddsupp .*
- (iii) *For $n = 3$, $\text{gap } f = 2$ if and only if there is a nonconstant unary function $h: A \rightarrow B$ and $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in \{0, 1\}$ such that*

$$f(x_1, x_0, x_0) = h(x_{i_1}),$$

$$f(x_0, x_1, x_0) = h(x_{i_2}),$$

$$f(x_0, x_0, x_1) = h(x_{i_3}).$$

- (iv) *Otherwise $\text{gap } f = 1$.*

Remark 2.6. The notion of a function being determined by oddsupp is due to Berman and Kisielewicz [2]. Willard [25] showed that if $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ where A is finite, $n > \max(|A|, 3)$ and $\text{gap } f = 2$, then f is determined by oddsupp .

Remark 2.7. While Theorem 2.5 was originally stated and proved in the setting of functions with finite domains, its proof presented in [6] does not make use of any assumption on the cardinalities of the domain and codomain – as long as they contain at least two elements. Hence the theorem immediately generalizes for functions with arbitrary domains.

3. THE ARITY GAP OF LOVÁSZ AND OWEN EXTENSIONS

In this section, we consider well-known extensions of pseudo-Boolean functions and generalize Theorem 2.3 accordingly. For further background on pseudo-Boolean functions, we refer the reader to Hammer and Rudeanu [13].

As it is well-known, every pseudo-Boolean function can be uniquely represented by a multilinear polynomial expression. A common way to construct such representations makes use of the notion of “Möbius transform”.

Let $v: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a set function. The *Möbius transform* (or *Möbius inverse*) of v is the map $m_v: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$m_v(S) = \sum_{T \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S|-|T|} v(T), \quad \text{for all } S \subseteq [n].$$

In view of Remark 2.4, we say that $m: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the Möbius transform of $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ if $m = m_{v_f}$.

Theorem 3.1 ([13]). *Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a pseudo-Boolean function. Then*

$$(1) \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} m_{v_f}(S) \prod_{i \in S} x_i, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n.$$

Remark 3.2. Theorem 3.1 motivates the terminology “Möbius inverse of v ” since it implies in particular that for every $S \subseteq [n]$, $v(S) = \sum_{T \subseteq S} m_v(T)$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a pseudo-Boolean function and consider its corresponding set function v_f . If x_i is inessential in f , then $m_{v_f}(S) = 0$ whenever $i \in S$. In particular, f depends on x_i if and only if x_i appears in the multilinear polynomial representation (1) of f .*

Proof. Observe that for each $i \in [n]$ and any $S \subseteq [n]$ such that $i \in S$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_{v_f}(S) &= \sum_{T \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S|-|T|} v_f(T) \\ &= \sum_{T \subseteq S \setminus \{i\}} (-1)^{|S|-|T \cup \{i\}|} v_f(T \cup \{i\}) + \sum_{T \subseteq S \setminus \{i\}} (-1)^{|S|-|T|} v_f(T). \end{aligned}$$

Now, if x_i is inessential in f and $i \in S$, then for every $T \subseteq S \setminus \{i\}$ we have $v_f(T \cup \{i\}) = v_f(T)$. Thus, $m_{v_f}(S) = 0$. \square

There are several ways of extending a pseudo-Boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to a function on \mathbb{R} . Perhaps the most natural is the multilinear polynomial extension. The *Owen extension* [19] (or *multilinear extension*) of a pseudo-Boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the mapping $P_f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$P_f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} m_{v_f}(S) \prod_{i \in S} x_i, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Clearly, f coincides with the restriction of P_f to $\{0, 1\}^n$.

Another extension of pseudo-Boolean functions to functions on \mathbb{R} is the so-called “Lovász extension”. The *Lovász extension* [16] of a pseudo-Boolean function $f: \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the mapping $F_f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$F_f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} m_{v_f}(S) \bigwedge_{i \in S} x_i, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Observe that the Lovász extension of a pseudo-Boolean function f is the unique extension of f which is linear on the standard simplices

$$\mathbb{R}_\sigma^n = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_{\sigma(1)} \leq x_{\sigma(2)} \leq \cdots \leq x_{\sigma(n)}\},$$

for any permutation σ on $[n]$.

Remark 3.4. The defining expressions of Owen and Lovász extensions differ only in the fact that the connecting operations between variables are the product and the minimum, respectively. In the sequel, this observation can be used to translate the results concerning Lovász extensions into analogous results about Owen extensions.

Remark 3.5. Every function $F: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$(2) \quad F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} m(S) \bigwedge_{i \in S} x_i,$$

where $m: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, uniquely determines a pseudo-Boolean function, namely, $f = F|_{\{0,1\}^n}$ and for every $S \subseteq [n]$, $v_f(S) = \sum_{T \subseteq S} m(T)$. We shall refer to any map of the form (2) as a *Lovász extension*.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $f: \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a pseudo-Boolean function. Then the i -th variable is essential in f if and only if the i -th variable is essential in F_f .*

Proof. As observed, f coincides with F_f on $\{0,1\}^n$, and thus if the i -th variable is inessential in F_f , then the i -th variable is inessential in f .

Conversely, if the i -th variable is inessential in f , then by Lemma 3.3 it follows that x_i does not appear in the defining expression of F_f . Hence, the i -th variable is inessential in F_f . \square

Corollary 3.7. *Let $f: \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a pseudo-Boolean function. Then $\text{gap } f = \text{gap } F_f$. In particular, $\text{gap } F_f \leq 2$.*

Using Theorems 2.2 and 2.3, we obtain the following explicit descriptions of those Lovász extensions that have arity gap 2.

Theorem 3.8. *A Lovász extension $F: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has arity gap 2 if and only if F is of one of the following forms:*

- (1) $F \equiv \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} ((-1)^{|S|-1} 2^{|S|-1} b + (-1)^{|S|} 2^{|S|-1} a) \bigwedge_{i \in S} x_i,$
- (2) $F \equiv a + (b-a)x_1 + (a-b)(x_1 \wedge x_2),$
- (3) $F \equiv a + (b-a)((x_1 \wedge x_2) + (x_1 \wedge x_3) + (x_2 \wedge x_3)) + 2(a-b)(x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3),$
- (4) $F \equiv a + (b-a)((x_1 + x_2) + (a-b)((x_1 \wedge x_2) + (x_1 \wedge x_3) + (x_2 \wedge x_3)))$
 $+ 2(b-a)(x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3),$
- (5) $F \equiv a + (b-a)x_1 + (c-a)x_2 + (2a-b-c)(x_1 \wedge x_2),$

for some $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$. Otherwise, $\text{gap } F = 1$.

Proof. Let $f: \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the pseudo-Boolean function determined by F . By Theorems 2.2 and 2.3, $\text{gap } f = 2$ if and only if

- (1) $f \equiv (b-a)(x_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus x_n) + a,$
- (2) $f \equiv (b-a)(x_1 x_2 \oplus x_1) + a,$
- (3) $f \equiv (b-a)(x_1 x_2 \oplus x_1 x_3 \oplus x_2 x_3) + a,$
- (4) $f \equiv (b-a)(x_1 x_2 \oplus x_1 x_3 \oplus x_2 x_3 \oplus x_1 \oplus x_2) + a,$ or
- (5) $f: \{0,1\}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is nonconstant such that $f(0,0) = f(1,1)$, say, $f(0,0) = f(1,1) = a$, $f(1,0) = b$ and $f(0,1) = c$,

where \oplus denotes addition modulo 2, and $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$. The theorem now follows by computing the Möbius transform of v_f in each possible case. \square

As mentioned, Lovász extensions subsume certain important (non-additive) fuzzy integrals, namely, the so-called Choquet integrals, originally defined in terms of “fuzzy measures” or “capacities” (see [3]; see also [11, 12] for later references).

A *fuzzy measure* on $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ is any order-preserving map $v: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ satisfying $v(\emptyset) = 0$ and $v([n]) = 1$. The *Choquet integral* of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to v is defined by

$$\mathcal{C}_v(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} x_{(i)} (v(A_{(i)}) - v(A_{(i+1)})),$$

where (\cdot) indicates the permutation on $[n]$ such that $x_{(1)} \leq x_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq x_{(n)}$, and $A_{(i)} = \{(i), \dots, (n)\}$ and $A_{(n+1)} = \emptyset$. As it turns out [17], Choquet integrals coincide exactly with the Lovász extensions of those order-preserving pseudo-Boolean functions f that fulfill $f(c, \dots, c) = c$ for $c \in \{0, 1\}$. As an immediate corollary to Theorem 3.8, we thus get the explicit description of Choquet integrals with arity gap 2.

Corollary 3.9. *A Choquet integral $\mathcal{C}_v: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has arity gap 2 if and only if*

$$\mathcal{C}_v \equiv a + (b - a)((x_1 \wedge x_2) + (x_1 \wedge x_3) + (x_2 \wedge x_3)) + 2(a - b)(x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3).$$

Similar techniques to those developed in this section, were successfully used in [7] to classify yet another important class of fuzzy integrals, namely, the so-called “Sugeno integrals” [22, 23]. As observed in [8, 18], a convenient way to introduce and extend these aggregation functions is via lattice polynomial functions, that is, functions which can be obtained as compositions of the lattice operations and applied to variables (projections) and constants. Sugeno integrals can then be viewed as idempotent lattice polynomial functions. A well-known example of a Sugeno integral on a distributive lattice A is the *median function* $\text{med}: A^3 \rightarrow A$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{med}(x_1, x_2, x_3) &= (x_1 \wedge x_2) \vee (x_1 \wedge x_3) \vee (x_2 \wedge x_3) \\ &= (x_1 \vee x_2) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_3) \wedge (x_2 \vee x_3). \end{aligned}$$

Polynomial functions over bounded distributive lattices were explicitly classified according to their arity gap in [7].

Theorem 3.10 ([7]). *Let $f: A^n \rightarrow A$ be a polynomial function over a bounded distributive lattice A . Then $\text{gap } f = 2$ if and only if*

$$f \equiv (a \vee \text{med}(x_1, x_2, x_3)) \wedge b,$$

where $a < b$. Otherwise $\text{gap } f = 1$.

As a corollary it then follows that the only Sugeno integrals with arity gap 2 are the ternary medians.

In the next section, we extend these results to the superclass of order-preserving maps between possibly different ordered sets A and B .

4. THE ARITY GAP OF ORDER-PRESERVING FUNCTIONS

Let $(A; \leq)$ be a partially ordered set. We say that $(A; \leq)$ is

- *upwards directed* if every pair of elements of A has an upper bound,
- *downwards directed* if every pair of elements of A has a lower bound,
- *bidirected* if $(A; \leq)$ is both upwards directed and downwards directed,

- *pseudo-directed* if every pair of elements of A has an upper bound or a lower bound.

Remark 4.1. Every upwards directed or downwards directed poset is pseudo-directed. In particular, every semilattice, every lattice, and every bounded poset is pseudo-directed.

Let $(A; \leq_A)$ and $(B; \leq_B)$ be partially ordered sets. A function $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ is said to be *order-preserving* (with respect to the partial orders \leq_A and \leq_B) if for all $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in A^n$, $f(\mathbf{a}) \leq_B f(\mathbf{b})$ whenever $\mathbf{a} \leq_A \mathbf{b}$, where $\mathbf{a} \leq_A \mathbf{b}$ denotes the componentwise ordering of tuples, i.e., $\mathbf{a} \leq_A \mathbf{b}$ if and only if $a_i \leq_A b_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $(A; \leq_A)$ be a pseudo-directed poset, and let $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ a function. If x_i is essential in f then there are elements $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_i \in A$ such that $a_i <_A b_i$ and*

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \neq f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n).$$

Moreover, if B is partially ordered by \leq_B and f is order-preserving with respect to \leq_A and \leq_B , then

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) <_B f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n).$$

Proof. Since x_i is essential in f , there exist elements $a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a', b', a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n \in A$ such that

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a', a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \neq f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b', a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n).$$

By the assumption that $(A; \leq)$ is pseudo-directed, a' and b' have an upper bound or a lower bound. Assume first that a' and b' have an upper bound c . We clearly have that

$$(3) \quad f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a', a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \neq f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, c, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \quad \text{or}$$

$$(4) \quad f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b', a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) \neq f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, c, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n).$$

The claim thus follows by choosing $b_i := c$ and $a_i := a'$ if (3) holds or $a_i := b'$ if (4) holds.

Otherwise a' and b' have a lower bound, and a similar argument shows that the claim holds also in this case.

If f is order-preserving with respect to \leq_A and \leq_B , then we have in fact that

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, a_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n) <_B f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, b_i, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_n). \quad \square$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $(A; \leq_A)$ be a bidirected poset, let $(B; \leq_B)$ be any poset, and let $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ ($n \geq 2$) be an order-preserving function that depends on all of its variables. Then, for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ($i \neq j$), x_j is essential in $f_{i \leftarrow j}$. Furthermore, if $i < j$, then there exist elements $c, d, a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ such that $c <_A d$ and*

$$(5) \quad f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, c, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{j-1}, c, a_{j+1}, \dots, a_n) <_B f(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1}, d, a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{j-1}, d, a_{j+1}, \dots, a_n).$$

Proof. Assume, without loss of generality, that $i = 1$, $j = 2$. Since x_1 is essential in f , by Lemma 4.2 there exist elements $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1 \in A$ such that $a_1 <_A b_1$ and $f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) <_B f(b_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$. By the assumption that $(A; \leq)$ is bidirected,

there exist a lower bound c of a_1 and a_2 and an upper bound d of b_1 and a_2 . Again, by the monotonicity of f ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{1\leftarrow 2}(a_1, c, a_3, \dots, a_n) &= f(c, c, a_3, \dots, a_n) \leq_B f(a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n) \\ &<_B f(b_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n) \leq_B f(d, d, a_3, \dots, a_n) = f_{1\leftarrow 2}(a_1, d, a_3, \dots, a_n), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that x_2 is essential in $f_{1\leftarrow 2}$ and inequality (5) holds. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Let $(A; \leq_A)$ be a bidirected poset, let $(B; \leq_B)$ be any poset, and let $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ ($n \geq 2$) be an order-preserving function that depends on all of its variables. Then $\text{qa } f \geq n - 1$ and $f|_{A_{\underline{n}}}$ is not determined by oddsupp .*

Proof. Suppose first, on the contrary, that $\text{qa } f = n - p$ for some $p \geq 2$. Let g be a support of f with essential arity $n - p$. Then g has at least two inessential variables, say x_i and x_j , and these variables are clearly inessential in $g_{i\leftarrow j}$ as well. But, since $f_{i\leftarrow j} = g_{i\leftarrow j}$, this constitutes a contradiction to Lemma 4.3 which asserts that x_j is essential in $f_{i\leftarrow j}$.

Suppose then, on the contrary, that $f|_{A_{\underline{n}}}$ is determined by oddsupp . Then $f|_{A_{\underline{n}}} = f^* \circ \text{oddsupp}$ for some $f^*: \mathcal{P}(A) \rightarrow B$. We clearly have that for all $c, d, a_3, \dots, a_n \in A$, $\text{oddsupp}(c, c, a_3, \dots, a_n) = \text{oddsupp}(d, d, a_3, \dots, a_n)$ (note that $(c, c, a_3, \dots, a_n), (d, d, a_3, \dots, a_n) \in A_{\underline{n}}$); hence $f(c, c, a_3, \dots, a_n) = f(d, d, a_3, \dots, a_n)$. This contradicts Lemma 4.3. \square

Proposition 4.5. *Let $(A; \leq_A)$ be a bidirected poset, let $(B; \leq_B)$ be any poset, and let $f: A^3 \rightarrow B$ be an order-preserving function that depends on all of its variables. Then $\text{gap } f = 2$ if and only if there is a nonconstant order-preserving unary function $h: A \rightarrow B$ such that*

$$f(x_1, x_0, x_0) = h(x_0), \quad f(x_0, x_1, x_0) = h(x_0), \quad f(x_0, x_0, x_1) = h(x_0).$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.5, the condition is sufficient. For necessity, assume that $\text{gap } f = 2$. Then, by Theorem 2.5, there is a nonconstant unary function $h: A \rightarrow B$ and $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in \{0, 1\}$ such that

$$f(x_1, x_0, x_0) = h(x_{i_1}), \quad f(x_0, x_1, x_0) = h(x_{i_2}), \quad f(x_0, x_0, x_1) = h(x_{i_3}).$$

We claim that $i_1 = i_2 = i_3 = 0$. Suppose, on the contrary, that $i_1 = 1$. By Lemma 4.2, there exist elements $a, b, c \in A$ such that $b <_A c$ and $f(a, b, b) <_B f(a, c, c)$, but this is a contradiction to $f(a, b, b) = h(a) = f(a, c, c)$. Similarly, we can derive a contradiction from the assumption that $i_2 = 1$ or $i_3 = 1$.

The monotonicity of h follows from the monotonicity of f . For, if $a \leq_A b$, then

$$h(a) = f(a, a, a) \leq_B f(b, b, b) = h(b). \quad \square$$

Theorem 4.6. *Let $(A; \leq_A)$ be a bidirected poset, let $(B; \leq_B)$ be any poset, and let $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ ($n \geq 2$) be an order-preserving function that depends on all of its variables. Then $\text{gap } f = 2$ if and only if $n = 3$ and there is a nonconstant order-preserving unary function $h: A \rightarrow B$ such that*

$$f(x_1, x_0, x_0) = h(x_0), \quad f(x_0, x_1, x_0) = h(x_0), \quad f(x_0, x_0, x_1) = h(x_0).$$

Otherwise, $\text{gap } f = 1$.

Proof. Immediate consequence of Theorem 2.5 and Propositions 4.4 and 4.5. \square

By imposing stronger assumptions on the underlying posets, we obtain more stringent descriptions of order-preserving functions with arity gap 2.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $(A; \leq_A)$ and $(B; \leq_B)$ be lattices, and let $h: A \rightarrow B$ be a lattice homomorphism. Let $f: A^3 \rightarrow B$ be an order-preserving function such that*

$$f(x_1, x_0, x_0) = h(x_0), \quad f(x_0, x_1, x_0) = h(x_0), \quad f(x_0, x_0, x_1) = h(x_0).$$

If the homomorphic image of $(A; \leq_A)$ by h is a distributive sublattice of $(B; \leq_B)$, then $f = \text{med}(h(x_1), h(x_2), h(x_3))$, where med denotes the ternary median function on $\text{Im } h$.

Proof. By the monotonicity of f and the assumption that A is a lattice, we have that for all $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in A$,

$$\begin{aligned} h(a_1 \wedge a_2) = f(a_1 \wedge a_2, a_1 \wedge a_2, a_3) &\leq f(a_1, a_2, a_3) \\ &\leq f(a_1 \vee a_2, a_1 \vee a_2, a_3) = h(a_1 \vee a_2). \end{aligned}$$

A similar argument shows that for all $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we have

$$h(a_i \wedge a_j) \leq f(a_1, a_2, a_3) \leq h(a_i \vee a_j).$$

By the assumption that B is a lattice, it follows from the above inequalities that

$$\begin{aligned} h(a_1 \wedge a_2) \vee h(a_2 \wedge a_3) \vee h(a_1 \wedge a_3) &\leq f(a_1, a_2, a_3) \\ &\leq h(a_1 \vee a_2) \wedge h(a_2 \vee a_3) \wedge h(a_1 \vee a_3). \end{aligned}$$

Since h is a lattice homomorphism, we have that

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} &h(a_1 \wedge a_2) \vee h(a_2 \wedge a_3) \vee h(a_1 \wedge a_3) \\ &= (h(a_1) \wedge h(a_2)) \vee (h(a_2) \wedge h(a_3)) \vee (h(a_1) \wedge h(a_2)), \end{aligned}$$

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} &h(a_1 \vee a_2) \wedge h(a_2 \vee a_3) \wedge h(a_1 \vee a_3) \\ &= (h(a_1) \vee h(a_2)) \wedge (h(a_2) \vee h(a_3)) \wedge (h(a_1) \vee h(a_2)). \end{aligned}$$

By the assumption that $\text{Im } h$ is a distributive sublattice of B , the right-hand sides of (6) and (7) are equal, and they are actually equal to $\text{med}(h(a_1), h(a_2), h(a_3))$. We conclude that $f(a_1, a_2, a_3) = \text{med}(h(a_1), h(a_2), h(a_3))$. \square

Corollary 4.8. *Let $(A; \leq_A)$ be a chain and let $(B; \leq_B)$ be any lattice. Let $f: A^n \rightarrow B$ be an order-preserving function. Then $\text{gap } f = 2$ if and only if $n = 3$ and $f = \text{med}(h(x_1), h(x_2), h(x_3))$ for some nonconstant order-preserving unary function $h: A \rightarrow B$ (here med denotes the median function on $\text{Im } h$).*

Proof. The condition is clearly sufficient. For necessity, assume that $\text{gap } f = 2$. By Theorem 4.6, $n = 3$ and there is a nonconstant order-preserving unary function $h: A \rightarrow B$ such that

$$f(x_1, x_0, x_0) = h(x_0), \quad f(x_0, x_1, x_0) = h(x_0), \quad f(x_0, x_0, x_1) = h(x_0).$$

Since every order-preserving function h is a lattice homomorphism from a chain A to any lattice B and the homomorphic image of A by h is a chain and hence a distributive sublattice of B , it follows from Lemma 4.7 that $f = \text{med}(h(x_1), h(x_2), h(x_3))$. \square

To illustrate the use of the results obtained in this section, we present an alternative proof of Theorem 3.10.

Proof of Theorem 3.10. It is well-known that lattice polynomial functions are order-preserving. Therefore Theorem 4.6 applies, and $\text{gap } f \leq 2$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $\text{ess } f = n$. Suppose that $\text{gap } f = 2$. Then, by Theorem 4.6, $n = 3$ and there is a nonconstant order-preserving unary function $h: A \rightarrow A$ such that

$$f(x_1, x_0, x_0) = h(x_0), \quad f(x_0, x_1, x_0) = h(x_0), \quad f(x_0, x_0, x_1) = h(x_0).$$

Since f is a polynomial function, h is a polynomial function as well, and hence $h(x) = (a \vee x) \wedge b$ for some $a, b \in A$, $a < b$. In particular, h is a lattice homomorphism. Since A is a distributive lattice, $\text{Im } h$ is a distributive sublattice of A , and Lemma 4.7 then implies that

$$f = \text{med}(h(x_1), h(x_2), h(x_3)) = h(\text{med}(x_1, x_2, x_3)).$$

Clearly, if f has the above form, then $\text{gap } f = 2$. Since $\text{gap } f \leq 2$, the last claim of the theorem follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] G. BELIAKOV, A. PRADERA, T. CALVO, *Aggregation Functions: A Guide for Practitioners*, Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing, vol. 221, Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [2] J. BERMAN, A. KISIELEWICZ, On the number of operations in a clone, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **122** (1994) 359–369.
- [3] G. CHOQUET, Theory of capacities, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **5** (1953) 131–295.
- [4] M. COUCEIRO, On the lattice of equational classes of Boolean functions and its closed intervals, *J. Mult.-Valued Logic Soft Comput.* **18** (2008) 81–104.
- [5] M. COUCEIRO, E. LEHTONEN, On the effect of variable identification on the essential arity of functions on finite sets, *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.* **18** (2007) 975–986.
- [6] M. COUCEIRO, E. LEHTONEN, Generalizations of Świerczkowski’s lemma and the arity gap of finite functions, *Discrete Math.* **309** (2009) 5905–5912.
- [7] M. COUCEIRO, E. LEHTONEN, The arity gap of polynomial functions over bounded distributive lattices, arXiv:0910.5131.
- [8] M. COUCEIRO, J.-L. MARICHAL, Characterizations of discrete Sugeno integrals as polynomial functions over distributive lattices, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* **161**:5 (2010) 694–707.
- [9] M. COUCEIRO, M. POUZET, On a quasi-ordering on Boolean functions, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **396** (2008) 71–87.
- [10] A. FEIGELSON, L. HELLERSTEIN, The forbidden projections of unate functions, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **77** (1997) 221–236.
- [11] M. GRABISCH, J.-L. MARICHAL, R. MESIAR, E. PAP, *Aggregation Functions*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, vol. 127, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2009.
- [12] M. GRABISCH, T. MUROFUSHI, M. SUGENO (eds.), *Fuzzy Measures and Integrals. Theory and Applications*, Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing, vol. 40, Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2000.
- [13] P. L. HAMMER, S. RUDEANU, *Boolean Methods in Operations Research and Related Areas*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1968.
- [14] E. LEHTONEN, Descending chains and antichains of the unary, linear, and monotone subfunction relations, *Order* **23** (2006) 129–142.
- [15] E. LEHTONEN, Á. SZENDREI, Equivalence of operations with respect to discriminator clones, *Discrete Math.* **309** (2009) 673–685.
- [16] L. LOVÁSZ, Submodular function and convexity. In: A. Bachem, M. Grötschel, B. Korte (eds.), *Mathematical programming. The state of the art. Bonn 1982*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York–Tokyo, 1983, pp. 235–257.
- [17] J.-L. MARICHAL, Aggregation of interacting criteria by means of the discrete Choquet integral. In: T. Calvo, G. Mayor, R. Mesiar (eds.), *Aggregation Operators: New Trends and Applications*, Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing, vol. 97, Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2002, pp. 224–244.
- [18] J.-L. MARICHAL, Weighted lattice polynomials, *Discrete Math.* **309** (2009) 814–820.
- [19] G. OWEN, Multilinear extensions of games, *Management Science* **18** (1972) 64–79.

- [20] N. PIPPENGER, Galois theory for minors of finite functions, *Discrete Math.* **254** (2002) 405–419.
- [21] A. SALOMAA, On essential variables of functions, especially in the algebra of logic, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I. Math.* **339** (1963) 3–11.
- [22] M. SUGENO, *Theory of Fuzzy Integrals and Its Applications*, Ph.D. thesis, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Tokyo, 1974.
- [23] M. SUGENO, Fuzzy measures and fuzzy integrals—a survey. In: M. M. Gupta, G. N. Saridis, B. R. Gaines (eds.), *Fuzzy Automata and Decision Processes*, North-Holland, New York, 1977, pp. 89–102.
- [24] C. WANG, Boolean minors, *Discrete Math.* **141** (1991) 237–258.
- [25] R. WILLARD, Essential arities of term operations in finite algebras, *Discrete Math.* **149** (1996) 239–259.
- [26] I. E. ZVEROVICH, Characterizations of closed classes of Boolean functions in terms of forbidden subfunctions and Post classes, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **149** (2005) 200–218.

(M. Couceiro) MATHEMATICS RESEARCH UNIT, UNIVERSITY OF LUXEMBOURG, 6, RUE RICHARD COUDENHOVE-KALERGI, L-1359 LUXEMBOURG, LUXEMBOURG
E-mail address: miguel.couceiro@uni.lu

(E. Lehtonen) COMPUTER SCIENCE RESEARCH UNIT, UNIVERSITY OF LUXEMBOURG, 6, RUE RICHARD COUDENHOVE-KALERGI, L-1359 LUXEMBOURG, LUXEMBOURG
E-mail address: erkko.lehtonen@uni.lu

(T. Waldhauser) MATHEMATICS RESEARCH UNIT, UNIVERSITY OF LUXEMBOURG, 6, RUE RICHARD COUDENHOVE-KALERGI, L-1359 LUXEMBOURG, LUXEMBOURG AND BOLYAI INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED, ARADI VÉRTANÚK TERE 1, H-6720 SZEGED, HUNGARY
E-mail address: twaldha@math.u-szeged.hu