

How to partition or count an abstract simplicial complex, given its facets

Marcel Wild

November 24, 2021

Abstract. Given are the facets of an abstract (finite) simplicial complex \mathcal{SC} . We show how to partition \mathcal{SC} into few pieces, each one compactly encoded by the use of wildcards. Such a representation is useful for the optimization of target functions $\mathcal{SC} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Other applications concern combinatorial commutative algebra, the speed up of inclusion-exclusion, and Frequent Set Mining. Merely calculating the face-numbers of \mathcal{SC} can be done faster than partitioning \mathcal{SC} . Our method compares favorably to inclusion-exclusion and binary decision diagrams.

1 Introduction

A *simplicial complex* (also called *set ideal*) based on a set W of cardinality w is a family \mathcal{SC} of subsets $X \subseteq W$ (called *faces*) such that from $X \in \mathcal{SC}$, $Y \subseteq X$, follows $Y \in \mathcal{SC}$. In this article all structures are assumed to be finite. In particular, all simplicial complexes \mathcal{SC} contain maximal faces, called the *facets* F_i of \mathcal{SC} ($1 \leq i \leq h$). The facets uniquely determine \mathcal{SC} .

This article is about partitioning \mathcal{SC} into R pieces $r_i \subseteq \mathcal{SC}$. Usually R is small compared to $|\mathcal{SC}|$ and by the use of wildcards each r_i packs its many faces in a compact way. Roughly speaking r_i is a *multivalued row* of length w with components $0, 1, 2, e$. Sections 3 to 5 present methods geared to arbitrary simplicial complexes given by their facets. Sections 6 to 8 give applications of it all to inclusion-exclusion, to combinatorial commutative algebra and to Frequent Set Mining. More specifically, the section break up is as follows.

In Section 2 the facets are used, in junction with binary decision diagrams, to calculate $N = |\mathcal{SC}|$.

In Section 3 multivalued rows enter the picture in order to refine the calculation of N to the calculation of *all* numbers f_k of k -element faces ($1 \leq k \leq w$). This entails applying a certain e -algorithm to h constraints coupled to the h facets. In 3.1 we show that this approach outperforms inclusion-exclusion and binary decision diagrams. In 3.2 we briefly discuss the complexity of calculating f_k for a *specific* value $k \in [w]$.

In Section 4 we invest $\frac{1}{2}(h^2 - h)$ constraints in order to represent \mathcal{SC} *itself* as a disjoint union of few multivalued rows (which yields all f_k 's as a side product).

Section 5 shows how to get \mathcal{SC} partitioned in case not the facets but the *minimal non-faces* of \mathcal{SC} are provided. In this context a dual version of the e -algorithm, called n -algorithm applies.

Section 6 indicates how the n -algorithm can be used to skip a potentially large number of zero terms in the familiar length 2^n inclusion-exclusion expansion.

In Section 7 the e -algorithm is used to calculate the following objects that come along with the kind of simplicial complexes appearing in combinatorial commutative algebra: h -polynomials, reduced homology groups, and links of faces.

In Section 8 simplicial complexes coming from Frequent Set Mining are sliced in two ways: cardinality-wise and frequency-wise. This allows to calculate certain relevant probabilities. Furthermore we touch upon *closed* frequent sets and give a quick proof of the main result in [UAUA].

2 Calculating the cardinality of a simplicial complex from its facets

Given the facets of an arbitrary simplicial complex \mathcal{SC} , how can we compute its cardinality? That is of considerable interest e.g. for Frequent Set Mining (Sec.8). Say $W = [14] := \{1, 2, \dots, 14\}$, and \mathcal{SC}' is defined by its facets

$$F_1 = \{1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14\}, \quad F_2 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14\}$$

$$F_3 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14\}, \quad F_4 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12\}$$

$$F_5 = \{9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14\}, \quad F_6 = \{1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14\}.$$

Writing $\mathcal{P}(X)$ for the powerset of X inclusion-exclusion yields

$$(1) \quad |\mathcal{SC}'| = |\mathcal{P}(F_1) \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{P}(F_6)| = \sum_{i=1}^6 |\mathcal{P}(F_i)| - \sum \{|\mathcal{P}(F_i) \cap \mathcal{P}(F_j)| : 1 \leq i < j \leq 6\} \\ + \dots - \dots + |\mathcal{P}(F_1) \cap \dots \cap \mathcal{P}(F_6)|.$$

Since say $|\mathcal{P}(F_1) \cap \mathcal{P}(F_2)| = |\mathcal{P}(F_1 \cap F_2)| = 2^9$, adding and subtracting 64 powers of 2 yields $|\mathcal{SC}'| = 7600$. Unfortunately the inclusion-exclusion approach costs $O(2^h w)$ time units (in the usual RAM model). This is feasible only for small numbers h of facets.

Consider instead the Boolean function $b : \{0, 1\}^W \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ whose i th conjunction consists of the negated literals with indices *not* in the i th facet:

$$b(x) = (\bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_4 \wedge \bar{x}_9) \vee (\bar{x}_5 \wedge \bar{x}_{10}) \vee \dots \vee (\bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_4 \wedge \bar{x}_5 \wedge \bar{x}_8 \wedge \bar{x}_{12} \wedge \bar{x}_{13}).$$

It follows that $b(x) = 1$ if and only if the *support* of x , i.e. $X := \{i | x_i = 1\}$, belongs to \mathcal{SC}' . Therefore

$$|\mathcal{SC}'| = \text{SatisfiabilityCount}[b] = 7600,$$

where `SatisfiabilityCount` is a Mathematica-command that is based on the technique of binary decision diagrams (BDD), see [K]. Generally, if a counting problem that doesn't immediately yield to combinatorial evaluation can be recast as counting the number of models of a Boolean function, then BDD's are likely the fastest option. However, it is hard to assess the performance of BDD's on a theoretic level.

3 Getting the face numbers of a simplicial complex from its facets

How to compute the face numbers f_k of a simplicial complex that is given by its facets? Inclusion-exclusion still works, provided that in (1) instead of $\mathcal{P}(F_i)$ we use the k -slice $\mathcal{P}(F_i, k) := \{X \subseteq F_i : |X| = k\}$ throughout. Then the powers of 2 in (1) become some obvious binomial coefficients. But inclusion-exclusion is as inefficient as before. Unfortunately also BDD's are ruled out because incorporating a cardinality constraint into a Boolean function blows it out of proportion (see [W1]).

However, one can proceed as follows. Returning to our example, consider the complements $H_i := W \setminus F_i$ of the facets ($1 \leq i \leq 6$) and observe that for all $X \in \mathcal{P}(W)$ one has:

$$X \notin \mathcal{SC}' \Leftrightarrow (\forall i)(X \not\subseteq F_i) \Leftrightarrow (\forall i)(X \cap H_i \neq \emptyset).$$

Thus the complementary set filter $\mathcal{SF}' := \mathcal{P}(W) \setminus \mathcal{SC}'$ can be viewed as the *transversal hypergraph* $\mathcal{Tr}(\mathcal{H}')$, i.e. as the family of transversals of the hypergraph $\mathcal{H}' = \{H_1, \dots, H_6\}$. Because each k -element subset of W is in exactly one of \mathcal{SC}' and \mathcal{SF}' we deduce that

$$(2) \quad f_k = \binom{w}{k} - \tau_k \quad (1 \leq k \leq w),$$

where

$$\tau_k := \text{number of } k\text{-element transversals of the hypergraph at hand (here } \mathcal{H}').$$

The point is that $\mathcal{SF}' = \mathcal{Tr}(\mathcal{H}')$ is representable as a disjoint union of so called $\{0, 1, 2, e\}$ -valued¹ rows r_1 to r_7 (Table 1) from which the numbers τ_k are easily computable. We only discuss *what* this representation achieves, and refer to [W1] for *how* it is obtained.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
$r_1 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	e_2	e_3	e_3	e_4	2	e_2	e_3	e_3	e_4	e_4
$r_2 =$	2	2	0	0	1	e_3	e_3	e_4	1	2	e_3	e_3	e_4	e_4
$r_3 =$	2	2	0	0	0	e_1	e_1	e_2	1	1	2	2	e_2	2
$r_4 =$	2	2	0	0	0	e	e	0	1	1	2	1	0	1
$r_5 =$	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	e	e	2	2
$r_6 =$	e_1	e_1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	e_2	e_2
$r_7 =$	e	e	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2

Table 1

¹Interchangeably we speak of *multivalued rows* or just *rows*.

Namely, each r_i comprises a bunch of 0,1-strings x whose supports X are transversals of \mathcal{H}' . Besides the *don't care* symbol 2, which can be freely chosen to be either 0 or 1, we use the wildcard $ee\cdots e$ which means “at least one 1”. In other words, only $00\cdots 0$ is forbidden. If several such *e-bubbles* appear within a row, they are distinguished by indices. Thus say $x = (1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1)$ is a member of r_1 , generated by $e_1e_1 = 11$, $e_2e_2 = 10$, $e_3e_3e_3e_3 = 1000$, and $e_4e_4e_4 = 011$. Correspondingly $X = \{1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 14\} \in \mathcal{Tr}(\mathcal{H}')$.

Here is the general (up to permutation of the entries) definition of a $\{0, 1, 2, e\}$ -valued row:

$$(3) \quad r = \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{\alpha}, \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{\beta}, \underbrace{(2, \dots, 2)}_{\gamma}, \underbrace{(e_1, \dots, e_1)}_{\varepsilon_1}, \dots, \underbrace{(e_t, \dots, e_t)}_{\varepsilon_t}$$

Let $\text{zeros}(r)$ be the position-set of the 0's of r . Similarly define $\text{ones}(r)$ and $\text{twos}(r)$. For instance, the row r_2 in Table 1 has $\text{ones}(r_2) = \{5, 9\}$. The cardinality of a row r , i.e. the number of characteristic vectors contained in it, clearly is

$$(4) \quad |r| = 2^\gamma \cdot (2^{\varepsilon_1} - 1) \cdots (2^{\varepsilon_t} - 1).$$

Calculating the number $\text{Card}(r, k)$ of k -element members of r is easy for say $\text{Card}(r_6, 8) = 1$ and $\text{Card}(r_6, 6) = 8$, but is generally harder than (4). According to [W1, Thm.1] it holds that:

$$(5) \quad \text{Calculating } \text{Card}(r, 1), \text{Card}(r, 2), \dots, \text{Card}(r, k) \text{ costs } O(kw^2 \log^2 w).$$

We mention that merely calculating $\text{Card}(r, k)$ has the same complexity.

Generally τ_k can be calculated as

$$\tau_k = \sum_{i=1}^R \text{Card}(r_i, k),$$

where R will always denote the number of (final) rows obtained by the *e*-algorithm. In our example $R = 7$ and $\text{Card}(r_i, k)$ is the entry in the k -th row and i -th column of Table 2. (Here we ignore the “0-th” row $0, \dots, 0, 1$.)

k	r_1	r_2	r_3	r_4	r_5	r_6	r_7		τ_k as sum		$f_k = \binom{14}{k} - \tau_k$
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0		1
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0		14
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0		91
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0		364
4	48	12	4	0	2	0	0		66		935
5	312	66	24	2	9	4	2		419		1583
6	916	160	61	7	16	8	3		1171		1832
7	1606	225	85	9	14	5	1		1945		1487
8	1868	202	70	5	6	1	0		2152		851
9	1509	119	34	1	1	0	0		1664		338
10	858	45	9	0	0	0	0		912		89
11	339	10	1	0	0	0	0		350		14
12	89	1	0	0	0	0	0		90		1
13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0		14		0
14	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		1		0
$ r_i $ as sum	7560	840	288	24	48	18	6				

Table 2

As expected the numbers τ_k sum up to $|\mathcal{SF}'| = 8784$ (and so do the column sums $|r_i|$), and the f_k 's sum up to $|\mathcal{SC}'| = 7600$. Of course $8784 + 7600 = 2^{14}$.

For each hypergraph \mathcal{H} on $[w]$ one has $\mathcal{T}r(\mathcal{H}) \neq \emptyset$ since $[w] \in \mathcal{T}r(\mathcal{H})$. According to the proof of Theorem 3 of [W1] partitioning $\mathcal{T}r(\mathcal{H})$ into $R > 0$ many multivalued rows costs $O(Rh^2w^2)$. By (5) calculating $\text{Card}(r, 1), \dots, \text{Card}(r, w)$ for any fixed row r costs $O(w^2 \log^2 w)$. Hence we have derived the following.

Theorem 1: With notation as above the e -algorithm calculates all face numbers f_k ($1 \leq k \leq w$) in time $O(Rh^2w^3 \log^2 w)$.

If one wants f_k for only *one* fixed $k \in [w]$ this method often works well in practise (at least for random instances) but forbids a theoretic assessment since final rows r with $\text{Card}(r, k) = 0$ would be wasted² work which cannot be gauged unless such r are prevented altogether.

Coming back to the $O(Rh^2w^3 \log^2 w)$ bound in Theorem 1, unfortunately R seems to be boundable only by $N = |\mathcal{SC}'|$ although in practise often $R \ll N$. Consequently $O(Nh^2w^3 \log^2 w)$ looks as bad as $O(2^h w)$ for inclusion-exclusion because both $2^h < N$ and $2^h > N$ can occur. From this point of view Theorem 1 is not impressive. However, 2^h is a “real” cost factor whereas N isn’t (only R is). The bottom line, one should not judge an algorithm by its worst case complexity, but by its performance in practise.

3.1 So let’s compare the two methods (implemented with Mathematica 9.0) on some test cases. Specifically, we chose random collections of h many m -element subsets (= facets) of a

²If *all* f_k are sought, no r is useless since always $\text{Card}(r, k) \neq 0$ for *some* k . See also 3.2.

w -set and used the e -algorithm (= exclusion), respectively inclusion-exclusion, to calculate *all* face numbers f_k ($1 \leq k \leq w$). The times in sec. are listed in the last two columns of Table 3. All times below 500 sec are averages of 4 test runs; the variance was low. Less test runs may have been averaged for larger times. For the e -algorithm we also list the number R of final rows. It is obvious that in many cases R is minuscule with respect to $N = |\mathcal{SC}| > 2^m$.

Keeping w fixed inclusion-exclusion scales essentially proportional to 2^h , and so is soon outperformed as witnessed by the first three rows of Table 3. If h is fixed to a small value, inclusion-exclusion scales about proportional to w (since *all* of f_1, f_2, \dots, f_w are required). Therefore - a small triumph - it beats exclusion which struggles to handle larger and larger multivalued rows. For instance if $h = 15$ but $w = 2000$ (and $m = 400$) then inclusion-exclusion clocks in at 1035 sec whereas exclusion needs 15490 sec.

Dropping inclusion-exclusion let us focus on the comparatively benign exponential h -dependence of exclusion. By peculiarities of the e -algorithm not further discussed, it performs the better the smaller m/w . Table 3 exhibits three runs of h with m/w fixed to $\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{6}$ respectively. In the first run (with $w = 30$) the best least square fit $y = ab^h$ to the data points $(h_1, y_1) = (15, 0.11)$ to $(h_9, y_9) = (6000, 25766)$ has $a = 1566.1$ and $b = 1.00048$ (as opposed to $b \approx 2$ for inclusion-exclusion). The second run (with $w = 60$) has $a = 93.3$ and $b = 1.092$. The third run (with $w = 1200$) has $a = 305$ and $b = 1.144$.

w	h	m	R	exclusion	inclusion-exclusion
30	15	10	208	0.11	7.2
30	16	10	218	0.13	14.5
30	17	10	281	0.16	29.4
30	1000	10	78274	808	
30	2000	10	151193	3251	
30	3000	10	218768	7131	
30	4000	10	274166	12253	
30	5000	10	326621	18683	
30	6000	10	376290	25766	
60	10	40	1750	2.5	0.4
60	20	40	87312	89	383
60	30	40	929782	844	
60	40	40	2302535	2063	
60	50	40	10 340 983	8876	
60	60	40	20 187 530	17956	
1200	10	200	1825	47	5.1
1200	15	200	17245	395	163.5
1200	20	200	84018	1896	5265
1200	25	200	271738	7121	
1200	30	200	576208	16755	
1200	35	200	1 145 863	37777	
1200	40	200	1 931 528	64606	

Table 3

3.2 Rather than substituting N for R in Theorem 1, the experiments in 3.1 (and many others) show that the way to appreciate Theorem 1 is to view $R \ll N$ as small and to focus on how h and w influence the cost (namely as h^2 and w^3).

Still, independent of significance in practice, is there a theoretic bound for the time to calculate the f_k 's that doesn't involve R or N ? Yes there is. Let us first consider any *specific* value $k \in [w]$. By (2) the cost to calculate f_k is bound by the complexity to calculate τ_k , which is known to be fixed-parameter-tractable in time $O(d^{2k+1}h)$. See [FG, p.358] where the fixed parameters are k and $d := \max\{|H_i| : 1 \leq i \leq h\}$ with $H_i = W \setminus F_i$. Observe that using this method to calculate *all* f_k 's costs $O(d^{2w+1}hw)$ which wouldn't qualify as fixed-parameter-tractable because w (which cannot be "fixed") appears in the exponent. It would be interesting to pit this method against the one from Theorem 1.

4 Partitioning a simplicial complex, given its facets

The *face lattice* of a simplicial complex \mathcal{SC} based on W is $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{SC} \cup \{W\}$, ordered by inclusion. For all $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}$ the meet $X \wedge Y$ is $X \cap Y$; the join $X \vee Y$ is $X \cup Y$ provided $X \cup Y \in \mathcal{SC}$, and W otherwise. According to [KP] the *combinatorial face lattice enumeration problem* is the following: Given the facets F_1, \dots, F_h , calculate the diagram of \mathcal{L} , which thus entails a listing of all covering pairs of faces. Letting $N = |\mathcal{L}|$ (or $N = |\mathcal{SC}| = |\mathcal{L}| - 1$) this can be achieved [KP, Thm.5] in time $O(N \min(h, w)(|F_1| + \dots + |F_h|))$ which is $O(Nh^2w)$ or $O(Nhw^2)$ depending on whether $h \geq w$ or $h \leq w$. The space required is $O(N \min(h, w))$.

What about merely enumerating \mathcal{L} and dispensing with its edges? The naive way³ takes time $O(N^2hw)$. But \mathcal{L} being a closure system one can do it in time $O(Nhw^2)$ and space $O(hw)$. Namely, let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{P}([w])$ be *any* closure system which is given by its associated closure operator $c : \mathcal{P}([w]) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}([w])$. If computing an arbitrary closure $c(X)$ costs at most $f(w)$ then enumerating \mathcal{L} can be done⁴ in time $O(Nwf(w))$. It is clear that in our situation $f(w) = O(hw)$.

In this Section we present a method, very much different from [KP] or [GR], which delivers \mathcal{SC} in a compact way, i.e. not one by one.

We henceforth use the symbol \uplus for *disjoint* union. For $1 \leq p \leq h$ let $\mathcal{SC}_p \subseteq \mathcal{SC}$ be the simplicial complex generated by F_1, \dots, F_p , so $\mathcal{SC}_p = \mathcal{P}(F_1) \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{P}(F_p)$. By induction assume that $\mathcal{SC}_p = r_1 \uplus r_2 \uplus \dots \uplus r_m$ with $\{0, 1, 2, e\}$ -valued rows r_i . The basic procedure to extend this to a representation of \mathcal{SC}_{p+1} is as follows. We iteratively shrink $\mathcal{F}_{p+1}[0] = \mathcal{P}(F_{p+1})$ (viewed as $\{0, 2\}$ -valued row) in order to make it disjoint from \mathcal{SC}_p . Thus $\mathcal{F}_{p+1}[0] \supseteq \mathcal{F}_{p+1}[1] \supseteq \mathcal{F}_{p+1}[2] \supseteq \dots$ until $\mathcal{F}_{p+1}[p]$ is such that

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{SC}_{p+1} = \mathcal{SC}_p \cup \mathcal{F}_{p+1}[0] = \mathcal{SC}_p \uplus \mathcal{F}_{p+1}[p].$$

Since $\mathcal{F}_{p+1}[p]$ itself arises as disjoint union of multivalued rows, the induction hypothesis will carry over from \mathcal{SC}_p to \mathcal{SC}_{p+1} . It is clear that $\mathcal{F}_{p+1}[p]$ satisfies (6) if we set

³By this we mean enumerating in turn $\mathcal{P}(F_1)$ to $\mathcal{P}(F_h)$ and checking for each $X \in \mathcal{P}(F_i)$ whether it is among the faces retrieved so far.

⁴This follows at once from [GR] and earlier work of Ganter, albeit the $O(Nwf(w))$ bound is not explicitly stated in [GR]. More specifically, the elements of \mathcal{L} are output one by one with *delay* $O(wf(w))$.

$$(7) \quad \mathcal{F}_{p+1}[i] := \{X \in \mathcal{F}_{p+1}[i-1] : X \notin \mathcal{P}(F_i)\} \quad (1 \leq i \leq p).$$

For the simplicial complex $\mathcal{SC} = \mathcal{SC}_6$ from Section 2 the procedure unfolds as follows. (See Table 4; its rows r_1 to r_7 have nothing to do with r_1 to r_7 in Table 1.)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
$r_1 =$	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	2	$\mathcal{F}_1[0]$
	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	$\mathcal{F}_2[0]$
$r_2 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	0	2	2	2	e_1	0	2	2	2	2	$\mathcal{F}_2[1]$
	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	$\mathcal{F}_3[0]$
$r_3 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	e_2	0	0	2	e_1	e_2	0	0	2	2	$\mathcal{F}_3[2]$
	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	$\mathcal{F}_4[0]$
$r_4 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	e_2	e_3	e_3	0	e_1	e_2	e_3	e_3	0	0	$\mathcal{F}_4[3]$
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	$\mathcal{F}_5[0]$
$r_5 =$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	e_3	e_3	e_4	e_4	$\mathcal{F}_5[4]$
	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	2	2	0	0	2	$\mathcal{F}_6[0]$
	2	2	0	0	0	e_3	e_3	0	1	1	e_3	0	0	1	$\mathcal{F}_6[4]$
$r_6 =$	2	2	0	0	0	e_3	e_3	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	
$r_7 =$	e_5	e_5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	

Table 4

Starting with

$$r_1 := \mathcal{F}_1[0] = \mathcal{P}(F_1) = (2, 2, 0, 0, 2, 2, 2, 2, 0, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)$$

the only way for $X \in \mathcal{F}_2[0] = \mathcal{P}(F_2)$ not to be a member of r_1 is to have $X \cap \text{zeros}(r_1) = X \cap \{3, 4, 9\} \neq \emptyset$. Hence

$$r_2 := \mathcal{F}_2[1] = (2, 2, e_1, e_1, 0, 2, 2, 2, e_1, 0, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2).$$

Similarly $\mathcal{F}_3[1]$ arises from $\mathcal{F}_3[0]$ by putting $e_1 e_1 e_1$ on positions 3, 4, 9; and $r_3 := \mathcal{F}_3[2]$ arises from $\mathcal{F}_3[1]$ by putting $e_2 e_2$ on $\text{zeros}(\mathcal{P}(F_2)) = \{5, 10\}$. So far

$$\mathcal{SC}_3 = \mathcal{P}(F_1) \cup \mathcal{P}(F_2) \cup \mathcal{P}(F_3) = r_1 \uplus r_2 \uplus r_3,$$

and we continue the same way up to $\mathcal{F}_6[0]$ for which the subset $\mathcal{F}_6[5]$ can no longer be represented as a *single* $\{0, 1, 2, e\}$ -valued row. Instead we note that the partition

$$\mathcal{F}_6[4] = \{X \in \mathcal{F}_6[4] : X \cap \{6, 7\} \neq \emptyset\} \uplus \{X \in \mathcal{F}_6[4] : X \cap \{6, 7\} = \emptyset\}$$

displays as follows in terms of multivalued rows:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
$\mathcal{F}_6[4] =$	2	2	0	0	0	e_3	e_3	0	1	1	e_3	0	0	1
$r^+ =$	2	2	0	0	0	\mathbf{e}_3	\mathbf{e}_3	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
$r^- =$	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1

The rows r^- and r^+ are the *candidate sons* of r . Generally [W2, Sec. 4], with t as in (1), there can be up to t candidate sons and they are always such that the pending constraint can be smoothly imposed upon them. Here $r_6 := r^+ \subseteq \mathcal{F}_6[5]$ and $r^- \cap \mathcal{F}_6[5]$ can be written as a

multivalued row (namely r_7 in Table 4). Thus $\mathcal{F}_6[5] = r_6 \uplus r_7$, and so $\mathcal{SC}_6 = r_1 \uplus \cdots \uplus r_7$. The latter equality is also supported by the calculation

$$|r_1| + \cdots + |r_7| = 2048 + 3584 + 672 + 1260 + 9 + 24 + 3 = 7600$$

where 7600 is the number obtained in Section 2.

In general $\mathcal{F}_p[i-1]$ may be $\rho_1 \uplus \rho_2 \uplus \cdots$ and upon enforcing each row's disjointness from $\mathcal{P}(F_i)$ each ρ_j may in turn decay into a disjoint union of rows. The union of the latter rows yields $\mathcal{F}_p[i]$.

Theorem 2: Given are the facets $F_1, \dots, F_h \subseteq [w]$ of a simplicial complex \mathcal{SC} . Mentioned method (based on the e -algorithm) to partition \mathcal{SC} into R pieces costs $O(Rh^3w^2)$.

Proof: Since $\{F_1, \dots, F_h\}$ is an antichain (i.e. $F_i \not\subseteq F_j$ for $i \neq j$), no $\mathcal{P}(F_{p+1}) = \mathcal{F}_{p+1}[0]$ is contained in $\mathcal{SC}_p = \mathcal{P}(F_1) \cup \cdots \cup \mathcal{P}(F_p)$. Hence $\mathcal{F}_{p+1}[p] \neq \emptyset$ in (6). Representing $\mathcal{F}_{p+1}[p]$ by a disjoint union of $R_{p+1} > 0$ many $\{0, 1, 2, e\}$ -valued rows entails imposing on $\mathcal{F}_{p+1}[0]$ the p constraints $X \cap H_i \neq \emptyset$ (where $H_i := W \setminus F_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq p$), and this costs $O(R_{p+1}p^2w^2)$ before Theorem 1. In view of $R = 1 + R_2 + \cdots + R_h$ the claim now follows from

$$\sum_{p=1}^{h-1} O(R_{p+1}p^2w^2) = \sum_{p=1}^{h-1} O(Rp^2w^2) = O(Rh^3w^2).$$

□

Compare $O(Rh^3w^2)$ in Theorem 2 with the $O(Nhw^2)$ algorithm of [GR] for outputting the faces *one by one*. Albeit $hw^2 < h^3w^2$, this is outweighed by $N \gg R$. Also compare the $O(Rh^3w^2)$ cost of *partitioning* with the $O(Rh^2w^3 \log^2 w)$ cost for merely calculating the *face numbers* (Theorem 1).

4.1 One use of partitioning a simplicial complex \mathcal{SC} is optimization. Given a target function $f : [w] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, extend it to $f : \mathcal{SC} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ as usual by putting $f(X) := \sum \{f(i) : i \in X\}$. It is easy to find

$$\mu(\mathcal{SC}) := \max\{f(X) : X \in \mathcal{SC}\}$$

when $\mathcal{SC} = r_1 \uplus \cdots \uplus r_R$ is displayed as a disjoint union of multivalued rows. Namely,

$$\mu(\mathcal{SC}) = \max\{\mu(r_i) : 1 \leq i \leq R\}$$

where $\mu(r_i)$ is readily obtained, as can be gleaned from this example with $w = 15$:

$r =$	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	e_1	e_1	e_1	e_1	e_2	e_2	e_2
$f =$	8	5	-6	-2	3	-5	-7	8	-4	-2	5	4	-10	-8	-9

$\mu(r) = (-6) + (-2) + 3 + 8 + 5 + 4 + (-8) = 4$. More complicated target functions, such as quadratic forms, are also amenable to this approach.

4.2 Similar to 3.2 one may wonder: What if we wish to enumerate (in ordinary set notation) all f_k faces of *specific* cardinality k ? Let us generalize this to the task of enumerating the set

$I_k(P, \leq)$ of all k -element order ideals of a w -element poset (P, \leq) ; it is unlikely that the cost for the special case of simplicial complexes is much lower. If $|P| < k$ then $I_k(P, \leq) = \emptyset$. Otherwise pick any $u \in P$ and split $I_k(P, \leq)$ into the subsets

$$S^+ = \{X \in I_k(P, \leq) : u \in X\} \quad \text{and} \quad S^- = \{X \in I_k(P, \leq) : u \notin X\}.$$

At least one of S_+ and S_- is nonempty and there are obvious posets (P^+, \leq) and (P^-, \leq) such that S^+ and S^- bijectively correspond to $I_k(P^+, \leq)$ and $I_k(P^-, \leq)$ respectively. Iterate this for (P^+, \leq) and (P^-, \leq) and so forth. This gives rise to a binary recursion tree with root (P, \leq) whose f_k leaves are the k -element order ideals of P (we use the same notation f_k as for simplicial complexes). It is easy to see that all of these costs $O(f_k w^3)$. We mention that the whole procedure requires to carry along the sets $y \uparrow = \{v \in P : v \geq y\}$ and $y \downarrow = \{v \in P : v \leq y\}$ for all $y \in P$. Updating these sets when switching from P to $P^- = P \setminus (u \uparrow)$ costs $O(w^2)$.

A quite different $O(f_k w^3)$ algorithm to enumerate the k -element order ideals is given in [W4]. Its advantage, as in the present article (but tackling a specific k), is that the sought objects are output in clusters, not one by one.

5 Partitioning a simplicial complex, given its minimal nonfaces

Suppose \mathcal{SC} is a simplicial complex whose minimal non-faces G_1, \dots, G_q are known, i.e. the G_i 's are the generators of the set filter $\mathcal{SF} = \mathcal{P}(W) \setminus \mathcal{SC}$. Then \mathcal{SC} consists of all *noncovers* X of $\{G_1, \dots, G_q\}$ i.e. of all sets $X \subseteq W$ such that

$$(8) \quad (\forall 1 \leq i \leq q) \quad X \not\supseteq G_i.$$

Because (8) is equivalent to

$$(9) \quad (\forall 1 \leq i \leq q) \quad (W \setminus X) \cap G_i \neq \emptyset,$$

one can employ⁵ the transversal e -algorithm to enumerate all noncovers of $\{G_1, \dots, G_q\}$, and whence enumerate \mathcal{SC} ; this costs $O(Rq^2 w^2)$ where R is the number of final rows. Let us summarize.

Theorem 3: Given are the minimal non-faces $G_1, \dots, G_q \subseteq [w]$ of a simplicial complex \mathcal{SC} . Mentioned method (based on the n -algorithm) to partition \mathcal{SC} into R pieces costs $O(Rq^2 w^2)$.

For example, for the simplicial complex \mathcal{SC}' from Section 2 one computes 74 minimal non-faces G_i . Applying the noncover n -algorithm to the G_i 's displays \mathcal{SC}' as a disjoint union of 37

⁵In Section 3 we generated \mathcal{SF} (which suffices for the *face numbers* of \mathcal{SC}) by imposing h constraints $(W \setminus F_i) \cap X \neq \emptyset$. Here in contrast we generate \mathcal{SC} by imposing q constraints $(W \setminus X) \cap G_i \neq \emptyset$. Both tasks can be achieved by the e -algorithm. However, as mentioned in previous publications, for tasks such as the latter it is more succinct to use a dual version of the e -algorithm, called *n-algorithm*. Its output is a disjoint union of $\{0, 1, 2, n\}$ -valued rows where the wildcard $nn \dots n$ means *at least one 0 here*. The statement of Theorem 3 is mentioned in [W2, p.64], where the “negative clause base” is just our set of minimal nonfaces.

$\{0, 1, 2, n\}$ -valued rows. As another example, let \mathcal{SC} be the simplicial complex of all independent sets of a matroid \mathbf{M} on $[w]$, given by its minimal non-faces (the *circuits* of \mathbf{M}). Then \mathcal{SC} can be partitioned with the noncover n -algorithm. In this particular case the facets of \mathcal{SC} (the *bases* of \mathbf{M}) are equicardinal. In a similar vein, applying the n -algorithm to the so called *broken* circuits of \mathbf{M} yields a simplicial complex whose face numbers coincide (up to sign) with the coefficients of the chromatic polynomial of \mathbf{M} . If all G_i 's are of cardinality 2 then \mathcal{SC} is the set of all anticliques of some obvious graph. In this case the n -algorithm can be fine-tuned. Some of these and other topics will be expanded elsewhere. One of them will be previewed in a bit more detail in Section 6.

Unfortunately, if the minimal non-faces G_i are unknown, it is tough finding them. Specifically, calculating the G_i 's from the facets F_i amounts to the hard problem [EMG] of dualizing a monotone Boolean function. It may thus be faster to confront the $\frac{1}{2}(h^2 - h)$ many constraints from Section 4 and get \mathcal{SC} as disjoint union of $\{0, 1, 2, e\}$ -valued rows rather than the $\{0, 1, 2, n\}$ -valued rows of Theorem 3. Either h or q can be much larger than the other and usually one cannot tell in advance.

6 Application to inclusion-exclusion

As another target of the n -algorithm let's see how the calculations for inclusion-exclusion can be sped up. Say a_i ($1 \leq i \leq m$) are any m properties potentially applying to anyone of N_0 objects. If N is the number of objects enjoying all properties and if say $N(\bar{a}_2\bar{a}_4)$ is the number of objects violating a_2 and a_4 , then for say $m = 4$:

$$(10) \quad N = N_0 - \sum N(\bar{a}_i) + \sum N(\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_j) - \sum N(\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_j\bar{a}_k) + N(\bar{a}_1\bar{a}_2\bar{a}_3\bar{a}_4).$$

Often many terms $N(\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_j \dots)$ are zero, and obviously the corresponding sets $\{\bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j, \dots\}$ constitute a set filter $\mathcal{SF} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_m\})$, which may be coined the *irrelevant set filter*. Suppose again $m = 4$ and \mathcal{SF} is generated by $\{1, 4\} (= \{\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_4\})$, $\{3, 4\}$, $\{1, 2, 3\}$. The n -algorithm delivers the complementary simplicial complex \mathcal{SC} as a disjoint union of $\{0, 1, 2, n\}$ -valued rows, in our case $r_1 = (n, n, 1, 0)$ and $r_2 = (n, 2, 0, n)$. Thus r_1 provides (if we let in turn $nn = 00, 01, 10$) the nonzero terms $N(\bar{a}_3)$, $N(\bar{a}_2\bar{a}_3)$, $N(\bar{a}_1\bar{a}_3)$. Similarly r_2 provides the remaining six nonzero terms $N(\dots)$ in the expansion (10). It is interesting to pit this method against **SatisfiabilityCount** when the task is to count the models of a Boolean function given in disjunctive normal form [W3, Section 6].

The approach to pack \mathcal{SC} into multivalued rows is particularly appealing if each nonzero $N(\bar{a}_i\bar{a}_j \dots)$ is merely a function $g(k)$ of the *cardinality* $k = |\{\bar{a}_i, \bar{a}_j, \dots\}|$. That sometimes happens when the properties a_i are of a symmetric kind. Letting f_k be the number of k -faces of \mathcal{SC} (computed as in Theorem 2), formula (10) then improves to

$$(11) \quad N = N_0 + \sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^k g(k) f_k.$$

Formula (11) e.g. applies to the count of constrained permutations [W3, Section 3], respectively integer partitions [W3, Section 5]. In both cases the effort to find the minimal non-faces of \mathcal{SC}

(an issue raised at the end of Section 5) is moderate.

Sections 7 and 8 concern applications of the scenario where all facets are given (as opposed to the minimal non-faces).

7 Application to combinatorial commutative algebra

Following [MS] in Section 7 we adopt the notation Δ instead of \mathcal{SC} . We shall touch upon the h -polynomial (7.1), reduced homology groups (7.2), and the link of a face (7.3). The deliberations in 7.1 and 7.2 are less “ad hoc” than the ones in 7.3. Still, 7.3 gives some additional flavor of how the use of wildcards may benefit computational commutative algebra.

7.1 As to the h -polynomial

$$h(t) := \sum_{i=1}^w f_{i-1} t^i (1-t)^{w-i} = h_0 + h_1 t + \cdots + h_w t^w$$

of Δ , it is immediately computed from the face numbers f_i of Δ and has many applications [S]. Here *all* f_i are required and they⁶ can be calculated from the facets $F_i \in \Delta$ as in Section 3.

7.2 The i -th *reduced homology* $\tilde{H}_i(\Delta; K)$ over the field K is defined as follows. Let V_j be a vector space which has all j -faces as a K -basis. For certain K -linear *boundary maps* δ_i and δ_{i+1} of type

$$V_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\delta_{i+1}} V_i \xrightarrow{\delta_i} V_{i-1}$$

one can show that $\text{im}(\delta_{i+1}) \subseteq \text{ker}(\delta_i)$. Hence one can define the quotient K -vector space

$$(12) \quad \tilde{H}_i(\Delta; K) := \text{ker}(\delta_i) / \text{im}(\delta_{i+1}).$$

Often only the *dimension* of $\tilde{H}_i(\Delta; K)$ is at stake. This being

$$\begin{aligned} & \dim(\text{ker}(\delta_i)) - \dim(\text{im}(\delta_{i+1})) \\ &= \dim(V_i) - \dim(\text{im}(\delta_i)) - \dim(\text{im}(\delta_{i+1})), \end{aligned}$$

it suffices to show how to calculate $\dim(\text{im}(\delta_i))$. The latter is the rank of a w by f_i matrix M whose columns are the “signed” supports (i.e. having alternating entries ± 1) of the i -faces; see e.g. [MS, Example 1.18]. The i -faces can be delivered compactly encoded as shown in Section 4. Calculating $\text{rank}(M)$ is subtle and depends a lot on K , but for some researchers it may boil down to a hardwired command in their favorite programming language.

7.3 According to [MS, p.17] the *link* of a face X of a simplicial complex Δ is

$$(13) \quad \text{link}_\Delta(X) := \{Y \in \Delta : Y \cup X \in \Delta \text{ and } Y \cap X = \emptyset\},$$

⁶In combinatorial commutative algebra an i -face is defined as having cardinality $i+1$ (but *dimension* i). We stick to our definition of cardinality i .

i.e. the set of faces that are disjoint from X but whose union with X is small enough to stay in Δ . Of course $\Delta(X) := \text{link}_\Delta(X)$ is a simplicial complex itself. Simplicial complexes of type $\text{link}_\Delta(X)$ occur in many situations, e.g. when defining *Betti numbers*, or in Reisner's criterion for a Stanley-Reisner ring to be Cohen-Macaulay.

We close this Section by indicating how $\text{link}_\Delta(X)$ can be partitioned into multivalued rows. The quick answer is that the facets of $\text{link}_\Delta(X)$ are the maximal members G_j of the set family

$$\{F_i \setminus X : 1 \leq i \leq h, X \subseteq F_i\}$$

and so applying the method of Section 4 to the sets G_j does the job. However, an existing partition of Δ can be exploited to get a partition of $\text{link}_\Delta(X)$ faster. To do so define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Disjoint}(\Delta, X) &:= \{Y \in \Delta : Y \cap X = \emptyset\}, \\ \text{Minus}(\Delta, X) &:= \{Z \setminus X : Z \in \Delta, X \subseteq Z\}. \end{aligned}$$

Albeit a member of $\text{Minus}(\Delta, X)$ needs not be a face of \mathcal{SC} , it is clear that

$$(14) \quad \text{link}_\Delta(X) = \text{Disjoint}(\Delta, X) \cup \text{Minus}(\Delta, X).$$

As will be seen, $\Delta = r_1 \uplus \cdots \uplus r_R$ readily spawns partitions

$$\text{Disjoint}(\Delta, X) = \rho_1 \uplus \cdots \uplus \rho_\alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Minus}(\Delta, X) = \sigma_1 \uplus \cdots \uplus \sigma_\beta,$$

and so it follows from (13) that

$$(15) \quad \text{link}_\Delta(X) = \uplus\{\rho_i \cap \sigma_j : i \in [\alpha], j \in [\beta]\}.$$

It remains to write all nonempty $\rho_i \cap \sigma_j$ as a disjoint union of multivalued rows.

To fix ideas, take the simplicial complex $\Delta = \mathcal{SC}'$ from Section 2 which is $\Delta = r_1 \uplus \cdots \uplus r_7$ according to Table 4. For the face $X = \{6, 7, 10, 11\}$ one verifies that $\text{Disjoint}(\Delta, X) = \bar{r}_1 \uplus \bar{r}_2 \uplus \bar{r}_3 \uplus \bar{r}_4$ and $\text{Minus}(\Delta, X) = r'_1 \uplus r'_4 \uplus r'_6$ (see Table 5). Seven of the $4 \cdot 3 = 12$ intersections $\bar{r}_i \cap r'_j$ are empty, the other five happen to be expressible as *single* multivalued rows as shown in Table 5. According to (15), $\text{link}_\Delta(X)$ is the disjoint union of these rows.

In general the intersection of two multivalued row ρ_i and σ_j is handled by imposing the e -bubbles (and 0's and 1's) of one row upon the other. If merely $|\rho_i \cap \sigma_j|$ is required this can be obtained with inclusion-exclusion. Specifically, let the row with the fewer e -bubbles have m e -bubbles. Then m is the number of properties a_i to be dealt with (see also Sec.6).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
$\bar{r}_1 =$	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	2
$\bar{r}_2 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	0	0	0	2	e_1	0	0	2	2	2
$\bar{r}_3 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	1	0	0	2	e_1	0	0	0	2	2
$\bar{r}_4 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	1	0	0	0	e_1	0	0	1	0	0
$r'_1 =$	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	2
$r'_4 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	2	0	0	0	e_1	0	0	2	0	0
$r'_6 =$	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
$\bar{r}_1 \cap r'_1 =$	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	2
$\bar{r}_2 \cap r'_4 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	0	0	0	0	e_1	0	0	2	0	0
$\bar{r}_2 \cap r'_6 =$	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
$\bar{r}_3 \cap r'_4 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	1	0	0	0	e_1	0	0	0	0	0
$\bar{r}_4 \cap r'_4 =$	2	2	e_1	e_1	1	0	0	0	e_1	0	0	1	0	0

Table 5

8 Application to Frequent Set Mining

A property π defined on the subsets $X \subseteq W$, is called *monotone* if with X each subset of X enjoys π . Evidently the set of all X 's that enjoy π constitutes a simplicial complex. As to one particular monotone property to be dealt with, fix $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(W)$ and an integer $s \geq 1$. Then X is called *s^+ -frequent* (with respect to \mathcal{D}) if X is a subset of at least s members $T \in \mathcal{D}$. For instance, let $W = [4]$ and $\mathcal{D} := \{\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{3, 4\}\}$. Then the simplicial complex \mathcal{SC} of all 2^+ -frequent sets is $\mathcal{SC} = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{4\}, \{1, 2\}\}$.

In the framework of *Frequent Set Mining* (FSM) one refers to \mathcal{D} as the *database* and to its elements $T \in \mathcal{D}$ as *transactions*. For instance, the transactions could comprise the items bought by customers in a supermarket during a specific period of time. Hence an *itemset* X is s^+ -frequent if its items have been bought *together* at least s times. We write $\mathcal{Fr}(s^+)$ for the simplicial complex of all s^+ -frequent sets. If $\mathcal{Fr}(s^+)$ is small, its faces can be enumerated one by one, and in the early days of FSM the so called *A priori* algorithm got famous for doing just that: it even made it to the Top Ten Algorithms in Data Mining [WK, ch.4].

For large $\mathcal{Fr}(s^+)$ it may still be desirable to have all of $\mathcal{Fr}(s^+)$ available, but then $\mathcal{Fr}(s^+)$ must be encoded in compact form, somehow. As seen in Sections 4 and 5, this can be done if the facets of $\mathcal{Fr}(s^+)$ are available⁷. In 8.1 we discuss how some telling probabilities can be computed from the facets of $\mathcal{Fr}(s^+)$. Subsection 8.2 concerns so called *closed* frequent sets.

8.1 We shall focus on the calculation of certain numbers attached to $\mathcal{Fr}(1^+)$, $\mathcal{Fr}(2^+)$, and so on. Put $\mathcal{D} = \{T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m\}$. For simplicity assume that \mathcal{D} is an antichain. Then the facets of $\mathcal{SC} := \mathcal{Fr}(1^+)$ are just T_1 up to T_m . We are going to slice \mathcal{SC} in two ways. First, cardinality-wise as

⁷We mention in passing that the facets can be calculated from \mathcal{D} with another standard FSM algorithm, called *Dualize and Advance*.

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{SC} = \mathcal{SC}[0] \uplus \mathcal{SC}[1] \uplus \cdots \uplus \mathcal{SC}[\gamma],$$

where γ is the maximum cardinality of a facet. Second, frequency-wise as

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{SC} = \mathcal{Fr}(1) \uplus \mathcal{Fr}(2) \uplus \cdots \uplus \mathcal{Fr}(m),$$

where $\mathcal{Fr}(s) := \mathcal{Fr}(s^+) \setminus \mathcal{Fr}((s+1)^+)$ is the family of all *s-frequent*⁸ sets in the sense that they occur in *exactly* s transactions. Furthermore, let

$$fr(s, k) := |\mathcal{Fr}(s) \cap \mathcal{SC}[k]| \quad (0 \leq k \leq \gamma, \quad 1 \leq s \leq m)$$

be the number of k -element subsets of W which are s -frequent. These numbers can be computed as

$$fr(s, k) = fr(s^+, k) - fr((s+1)^+, k)$$

where

$$fr(s^+, k) := \text{number of } s^+\text{-frequent sets of cardinality } k.$$

Dually to $f(s^+, k)$ we define

$$f(s, k^+) := \text{number of } s\text{-frequent sets of cardinality } \geq k.$$

Obviously

$$f(s, k^+) = fr(s, k) + fr(s, k+1) + \cdots + fr(s, w).$$

Thus everything hinges on the numbers $fr(s^+, k)$. They can be calculated as in Section 3 provided we have⁹ the facets of all simplicial complexes $\mathcal{Fr}(s^+)$ ($1 \leq s \leq m$). To fix ideas, consider the concrete database $\mathcal{D} = \{T_1, \dots, T_7\}$ given by:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
T_1	x	\mathbf{x}	x		x		\mathbf{x}		\mathbf{x}
T_2	x	x	x	x		x		x	x
T_3			x		x	x		x	x
T_4		\mathbf{x}			x		\mathbf{x}		\mathbf{x}
T_5			x			x		x	
T_6		\mathbf{x}		x			\mathbf{x}	x	\mathbf{x}
T_7			x			x		x	x

Table 6

One calculates these associated numbers $fr(s, k)$ for $0 \leq s \leq 7$ and $1 \leq k \leq 9$:

⁸Be aware that in the FSM literature usually “ s -frequent” corresponds to our s^+ -frequent.

⁹As previously mentioned, *Dualize and Advance* can be employed, and one should also exploit the fact that the facets of $\mathcal{Fr}(s^+)$ help to find the facets of $\mathcal{Fr}((s+1)^+)$. The matter needs further investigation.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
0	0	2	23	69	97	76	35	9	1	312
1	0	13	44	53	29	8	1	0	0	148
2	2	11	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	28
3	2	4	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	11
4	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	$\binom{9}{1}$	$\binom{9}{2}$	$\binom{9}{3}$	$\binom{9}{4}$	$\binom{9}{5}$	$\binom{9}{6}$	$\binom{9}{7}$	$\binom{9}{8}$	$\binom{9}{9}$	511

Table 7

For instance, because of $fr(3, 3) = 4$ there are exactly four 3-frequent sets of cardinality 3, one of which is $\{2, 7, 9\}$ (indicated boldface in Table 6). Many more probabilities can be calculated from Table 7. Say, the probability that a random 3-element itemset is 2^+ -frequent, is

$$\frac{12 + 4 + 1}{\binom{9}{3}} \approx 0.202,$$

whereas the probability that a random 2^+ -frequent set has 3 elements, is

$$\frac{12 + 4 + 1}{28 + 11 + 9 + 2 + 1} \approx 0.333.$$

Similarly one reads from Table 7 that the probability of a 2^+ -frequent set X to be 2-frequent, is $\frac{28}{51} = 0.549$. If one additionally requires that $|X| \geq 2$ or $X \geq 3$ the corresponding probabilities obviously increase, in fact they are 0.619 and 0.714.

8.2 Here s will be fixed and we consider the simplicial complex $\mathcal{SC} := \mathcal{Fr}(s^+)$ with respect to some data base \mathcal{D} . For $X \in \mathcal{SC}$ put $\text{supp}(X) := \{T \in \mathcal{D} : X \subseteq T\}$. One calls $Y \in \mathcal{SC}$ *closed* if it is maximal with respect to its support:

$$(\forall X \in \mathcal{SC}) \quad X \supsetneq Y \Rightarrow \text{supp}(X) \subsetneq \text{supp}(Y).$$

The closed frequent sets play a prominent rôle in FSM. One verifies at once that they coincide with the members (apart from W) of the closure system \mathcal{C} generated by the facets F_1, \dots, F_h of \mathcal{SC} .

Given \mathcal{D} , the main result of [UAUA] states that the closed s^+ -frequent sets can be enumerated with polynomial delay. Here is a quick argument. The closure operator $cl : \mathcal{P}(W) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(W)$ coupled to \mathcal{C} is given by

$$cl(X) = \begin{cases} \bigcap \text{supp}(X), & \text{if } |\text{supp}(X)| \geq s \\ W, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Calculating $cl(X)$ costs $O(|\mathcal{D}|w)$, and so the [GR] method mentioned in Section 4 enumerates the members of \mathcal{C} with polynomial delay $|\mathcal{D}|w^2$.

From \mathcal{C} one can get a partition of \mathcal{SC} different from the two partitions considered in 8.1. Namely, \mathcal{SC} is the disjoint union of the set families

$$\mathcal{SC}[Y] := \{X \in \mathcal{SC} : \text{supp}(X) = \text{supp}(Y)\}$$

when Y runs through \mathcal{C} (here \mathcal{C} must be of moderate size). If Y_1, \dots, Y_m are all lower covers of Y in \mathcal{C} then

$$\mathcal{SC}[Y] = \{X \subseteq Y : X \not\subseteq Y_1 \text{ and } X \not\subseteq Y_2 \text{ and } \dots X \not\subseteq Y_m\}.$$

Hence starting with the $\{0, 2\}$ -valued row $\mathcal{P}(Y)$ and imposing on it the constraints $X \cap (W \setminus Y_i) \neq \emptyset$ ($1 \leq i \leq m$) will deliver $\mathcal{SC}[Y]$ as a disjoint union of few $\{0, 1, 2, e\}$ -valued rows. Such a representation may be useful for certain FSM tasks. Of course it all works for any closure systems \mathcal{C} (possibly unrelated to FSM). For instance [W3, Section 4.3] is an application geared at speeding up inclusion-exclusion.

References

- [EMG] T. Eiter, K. Makino, G. Gottlob, Computational aspects of monotone dualization: A brief survey, *Disc. Appl. Math.* 156 (2008) 2035-2049.
- [FG] I. Flum, M. Grohe, *Parametrized complexity theory*, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2006.
- [GR] B. Ganter, K. Reuter, Finding all closed sets: A general approach, *Order* 8 (1991) 283-290.
- [K] D. Knuth, *The Art of Computer Programming, Vol 4, Fascicle 1, Binary Decision Diagrams*, Addison-Wesley 2005.
- [KP] V. Kaibel, M.E. Pfetsch, Computing the face lattice of a polytope from its vertex-facet incidences, *Computational Geometry* 23 (2002) 281-290.
- [MS] E. Miller, B. Sturmfels, *Combinatorial Commutative Algebra*, Springer 2005.
- [S] R. Stanley, *Combinatorics and commutative algebra (2nd ed.)*, Progress in Math. Vol 41, Birkhäuser 1996.
- [UAUA] T. Uno, T. Asai, Y. Uchida, H. Arimura, LCM: An efficient algorithm for enumerating frequent closed item sets, *Proc. of the workshop on frequent itemset mining implementations*, 2003.
- [W1] M. Wild, Counting or producing all fixed cardinality transversals, *Algorithmica*, DOI 10.1007/s00453-012-9716-5.
- [W2] M. Wild, Compactly generating all satisfying truth assignments of a Horn formula, *Journal on Satisfiability, Boolean Modeling and Computation* 8 (2012) 63-82.
- [W3] M. Wild, Inclusion-exclusion meets exclusion, arXiv:1309.6927.
- [W4] M. Wild, Output-polynomial enumeration of all fixed-cardinality ideals of poset, respectively all fixed-cardinality subtrees of a tree, *Order online* April 2013.
- [WK] X. Wu, V. Kumar (editors), *The Top Ten Algorithms in Data Mining*, Chapman L Hall/CRC 2009.