

# Inversion Complexity of Functions of Multi-Valued Logic

V. V. Kochergin\*, A. V. Mikhailovich†

October, 2015

## Abstract

The minimum number of NOT gates in a logic circuit computing a Boolean function is called the inversion complexity of the function. In 1957, A. A. Markov determined the inversion complexity of every Boolean function and proved that  $\lceil \log_2(d(f) + 1) \rceil$  NOT gates are necessary and sufficient to compute any Boolean function  $f$  (where  $d(f)$  is the maximum number of value changes from greater to smaller over all increasing chains of tuples of variables values). This result is extended to  $k$ -valued functions computing in this paper. Thereupon one can use monotone functions “for free” like in the Boolean case. It is shown that the minimum sufficient number of non-monotone gates for the realization of the arbitrary  $k$ -valued logic function  $f$  is equal to  $\lceil \log_2(d(f) + 1) \rceil$  if Post negation (function  $x + 1 \pmod{k}$ ) is used in NOT nodes and is also equal to  $\lceil \log_k(d(f) + 1) \rceil$ , if Łukasiewicz negation (function  $k - 1 - x$ ) is used in NOT nodes. Similar extension for another classical result of A. A. Markov for the inversion complexity of a system of Boolean functions to  $k$ -valued logic functions has been obtained.

*Keywords:* multi-valued logic functions, logic circuits, circuit complexity, nonmonotone complexity, inversion complexity, Markov’s theorem.

Let  $P_k$  be the set of all functions of  $k$ -valued logic and  $M$  be the set of all functions that are monotone relative to order  $0 < 1 < \dots < k -$

---

\*Lomonosov Moscow State University (Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics, Bogoliubov Institute for Theoretical Problems of Microphysics); vvkoch@yandex.ru

†National Research University Higher School of Economics; anna@mikhaylovich.com

1. We will investigate the complexity of the realization of  $k$ -valued logic functions by circuits [1] (also known as combinational machine or circuits of computation [2]) over bases  $B$  of the form:

$$B = M \cup \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p\}, \quad \omega_i \in P_k \setminus M, \quad i = 1, \dots, p,$$

where the weight of any function from  $M$  equals zero, the weight of function  $\omega_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , equals 1.

Let us denote the sum of the weights of the elements from circuit  $S$  by *non-monotone complexity*  $I_B(S)$  of circuit  $S$  over basis  $B$ . In other words it is the number of circuit elements corresponding to non-monotone basis functions. Let  $f \in P_k$ ,  $F \subseteq P_k$ . We denote the minimum non-monotone complexity of the circuit that realizes function  $f$  (system  $F$  respectively) by *non-monotone complexity*  $I_B(f)$  of function  $f$  (*complexity*  $I_B(F)$  of the system  $F$  respectively) over basis  $B$ .

We emphasize two natural bases — basis  $B_P$  that consists of all non-monotone functions and Post negation ( $x + 1 \pmod{k}$ ), and basis  $B_L$  that consists of all non-monotone functions and Łukasiewicz negation ( $k - 1 - x$ ). We will use the term *inversion complexity* that is similar to the Boolean function case [3, 4] because of these two bases, although it is slightly unsuitable.

A.A. Markov [3, 4] obtained the exact inversion complexity value for an arbitrary Boolean function or a Boolean function system over basis  $B_0 = M \cup \{\bar{x}\}$  [3, 4] (the exact statement of this result is given below). E.I. Nechiporuk [6] obtained the exact inversion complexity value for an arbitrary Boolean function realization by a Boolean formula (this result was reobtained much later in [7, 8]). Some results dealt with the inversion complexity can be also found in [9–13]. In this paper classical Markov's results are extended to the case of  $k$ -valued logic functions. The presentation of the results corresponds with the presentation of Markov's results in [14].

The set  $\{0, 1, \dots, k - 1\}$  is denoted by  $E_k$ . A sequence of tuples

$$\tilde{\alpha}_1 = (\alpha_{11}, \dots, \alpha_{1n}), \quad \tilde{\alpha}_2 = (\alpha_{21}, \dots, \alpha_{2n}), \quad \dots, \quad \tilde{\alpha}_r = (\alpha_{r1}, \dots, \alpha_{rn})$$

from the set  $E_k^n$  is called *an increasing chain with respect to order*  $0 < 1 < \dots < k - 1$  or just *chain*, if all tuples  $\tilde{\alpha}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_2, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_r$  are different and the following inequalities hold

$$\alpha_{ij} \leq \alpha_{i+1,j}, \quad i = 1, \dots, r - 1, \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

The tuples  $\tilde{\alpha}_1$  and  $\tilde{\alpha}_r$  are called *initial* and *terminal* tuples of the chain respectively.

Let  $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  be a function of  $k$ -valued logic. An ordered pair of tuples  $\tilde{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  and  $\tilde{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$ ,  $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta} \in E_k^n$ , is called a *jump for the function  $f$* , if

- 1)  $\alpha_j \leq \beta_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ ;
- 2)  $f(\tilde{\alpha}) > f(\tilde{\beta})$ .

A *jump for a system of functions* is a pair of tuples which is a jump for any function of the system.

Let  $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$ ,  $m \geq 1$ , be a system of  $k$ -valued logic function with arguments  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Let  $C$  be a chain of the form

$$\tilde{\alpha}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_2, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_r.$$

*Decrease  $d_C(F)$  of the system  $F$  over chain  $C$*  is the number of jumps for the system  $F$  of the form  $(\tilde{\alpha}_i, \tilde{\alpha}_{i+1})$ .

*Decrease  $d(F)$  of the system  $F$*  is the maximum  $d_C(F)$  over all chains  $C$ .

Now we can give the exact statement for the Markov's classical result [3, 4]. Let  $F$  be a system of Boolean functions. Then  $I_{B_0}(F) = \lceil \log_2(d(F) + 1) \rceil$ .

Let

$$d(B) = \max\{d(\omega_1), \dots, d(\omega_p)\}.$$

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $F$  be a system of  $k$ -valued logic functions. Then*

$$I_B(F) \geq \lceil \log_{d(B)+1}(d(F) + 1) \rceil.$$

First we prove an auxiliary statement.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $F$  be a system of  $k$ -valued logic functions. Then*

$$d(F) \leq (d(B) + 1)^{I_B(F)} - 1.$$

*Proof.* Let  $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$ ,  $m \geq 1$ , be a set of functions of  $k$ -valued logics with arguments  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . The proof is by induction on  $I_B(F)$ .

If  $I_B(F) = 0$  the all functions from  $F$  are monotone. Hence,  $d(F) = 0$ .

Assume that the assertion is valid for any  $G \subset P_k$  such that  $I_B(G) \leq I_B(F) - 1$ . Consider circuit  $S$  with  $n$  inputs  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  which realizes function system  $F$  and contains exactly  $I_B(F)$  elements of unit weight. Let us select the first such vertex (according to any correct numeration) and denote the corresponding gate by  $E$ . Gate  $E$  corresponds to  $t$ -place function  $\omega$ ,  $\omega \in \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_p\}$ . Denote by  $h_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, h_t(x_1, \dots, x_t)$  functions that are given at the inputs of  $E$ . Denote by  $S'$  a circuit that is obtained from the

circuit  $S$  by replacement of gate  $E$  with one more input with variable  $y$ . The circuit  $S'$  realizes system  $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$  with the following properties:

$$f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = g_i(\omega(h_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, h_t(x_1, \dots, x_n)), x_1, \dots, x_n), \\ i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Moreover,  $I_B(G) \leq I_B(F) - 1$ .

Consider a chain

$$C = (\tilde{\alpha}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_2, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_r)$$

such that  $d(F) = d_C(F)$ .

Let us consider the sequence  $C'$  of  $(n+1)$ -tuples:

$$(\omega(h_1(\tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, h_t(\tilde{\alpha}_1)), \tilde{\alpha}_1), \dots, (\omega(h_1(\tilde{\alpha}_r), \dots, h_t(\tilde{\alpha}_r)), \tilde{\alpha}_r).$$

The sequence  $C'$  is not a chain, but it can be split into  $p$  parts (each part consists of consecutive elements from  $C'$ )  $C'_1, \dots, C'_p$  such that each  $C'_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , is a chain and  $p$  satisfies the inequalities  $1 \leq p \leq d(B) + 1$ .

By the induction assumption relation

$$d_{C'_i}(G) \leq d(G) \leq (d(B) + 1)^{I_B(G)} - 1 = (d(B) + 1)^{I_B(F) - 1} - 1$$

is valid for all  $j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . Now, using equalities

$$f_i(\tilde{\alpha}) = g_i(\omega(h_1(\tilde{\alpha}), \dots, h_t(\tilde{\alpha})), \tilde{\alpha}), \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

we get

$$d_C(F) \leq \sum_{i=1}^p d_{C'_i}(G) + p - 1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^p ((d(B) + 1)^{I_B(F) - 1} - 1) + p - 1 \leq (d(B) + 1)^{I_B(F)} - 1.$$

Thus, Lemma 1 is proved.  $\square$

**Proof of the Theorem 1.** Lemma 1 implies the inequality

$$d(F) \leq (d(B) + 1)^{I_B(F)} - 1.$$

$I_B(F)$  is an integer. Thus, we obtain the necessary estimation. Thus, Theorem 1 is proved.

**Remark.** The estimation from Theorem 1 is approximate even if  $k = 2$ . Indeed, let us consider system  $F = \{\bar{x}, \bar{y}\}$ . The decrease of the system equals 2. While any circuit, that uses only one non-monotone element, realizes a two-argument function with decrease of 1. Thus, the inversion complexity of the system cannot equal 1 in any basis.

Now we pass on to the upper bound estimation. Let  $f_1(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \dots, f_s(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  be a tuple of  $k$ -valued logic functions. A function  $g(z_1, \dots, z_s, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , such that

$$\begin{aligned} g(1, 0, \dots, 0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= f_1(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \\ g(0, 1, \dots, 0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= f_2(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \\ &\vdots \\ g(0, \dots, 0, 1, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= f_s(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \end{aligned}$$

is called  $s$ -connector for the tuple  $f_1(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \dots, f_s(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ .

A set of  $s$ -connectors for a set of  $s$ -tuples of functions (one  $s$ -connector for each  $s$ -tuple) is called  $s$ -connector for the set.

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $B$  be a basis of the form  $B = M \cup \{\omega(x_1, \dots, x_q), \omega \in P_k \setminus M, q \geq 1\}$ . Let  $F_1 = \{f_{11}, \dots, f_{s1}\}, \dots, F_M = \{f_{1m}, \dots, f_{sm}\}$  be arbitrary set of  $s$ -tuples of  $k$ -valued logic functions. Then there is an  $s$ -connector  $G$  of the set such that*

$$I_B(G) \leq \max\{I_B(F_1), \dots, I_B(F_s)\}.$$

*Proof.* The proof is by induction on  $r = \max\{I_B(F_1), \dots, I_B(F_s)\}$ .

If  $r = 0$  then the functions from  $F_i, i = 1, \dots, s$ , are monotone. Then let  $G$  be the following set:

$$\{g_j \mid g_j = \max(\min(\phi(z_1), f_{1j}), \dots, \min(\phi(z_s), f_{sj}), j = 1, \dots, m\},$$

where

$$\phi(z) = \begin{cases} k - 1, & \text{if } z \neq 0; \\ 0, & \text{elsewhere.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $r > 0$  (induction step). Denote by  $S_i(\tilde{x})$  any circuit with inputs  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  that realizes the function system  $F_i, i = 1, \dots, s$ , which contains  $\max\{I_B(F_i), 1\}$  gates, corresponding to function  $\omega$ . Let us select the first vertex (according to any correct numeration) corresponding to the function  $\omega$  in circuit  $S_i(\tilde{x})$ . Denote by  $h_{i1}(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, h_{iq}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  functions that are given at the inputs of the gate. Denote by  $S'$  a circuit with inputs  $y, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  which is obtained from the circuit  $S$  by replacing the selected gate with one more input with variable  $y$ . Denote by  $f'_{ij}(y, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), j = 1, \dots, m$ , functions that are realized at the outputs of circuit  $S_i(y, \tilde{x})$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} f_{ij}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= \\ &f'_{ij}(\omega(h_{i1}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \dots, h_{iq}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)), x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad j = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose  $F'_i = \{f'_{i1}, \dots, f'_{im}\}$ . Since  $I_B(F'_i) \leq r - 1$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , by the induction assumption there is a set of functions

$$G' = \{g'_j(z_1, \dots, z_s, y, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \mid j = 1, \dots, m\},$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} I_B(G') &\leq \max\{I_B(F'_1), \dots, I_B(F'_s)\} \leq r - 1; \\ g'_j(1, 0, \dots, 0, y, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= f'_{1j}(y, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \quad j = 1, \dots, m; \\ g'_j(0, 1, \dots, 0, y, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= f'_{2j}(y, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \quad j = 1, \dots, m; \\ &\vdots \\ g'_j(0, 0, \dots, 1, y, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= f'_{sj}(y, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \quad j = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned}$$

Let us replace variable  $y$  by function

$$\begin{aligned} Y(z_1, \dots, z_s, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= \\ \omega(\max(\min(\phi(z_1), h_{11}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)), \dots, \min(\phi(z_s), h_{s1}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n))), \dots, \\ &\max(\min(\phi(z_1), h_{1q}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)), \dots, \min(\phi(z_s), h_{sq}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)))) \end{aligned}$$

in function  $g'_j(z_1, \dots, z_s, y, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ ,

Since equalities

$$\begin{aligned} Y(1, 0, \dots, 0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= \omega(h_{11}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \dots, h_{1q}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)), \\ Y(0, 1, \dots, 0, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= \omega(h_{21}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \dots, h_{2q}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)), \\ &\vdots \\ Y(0, 0, \dots, 1, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= \omega(h_{s1}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \dots, h_{sq}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)) \end{aligned}$$

are valid, we get that function

$$\begin{aligned} g_j(z_1, \dots, z_s, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) &= \\ &g'_j(z_1, \dots, z_s, Y(z_1, \dots, z_s, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \end{aligned}$$

is  $s$ -connector for the tuple  $f_{1j}, \dots, f_{sj}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, m$ . Moreover, there are inequalities  $I_B(G) \leq 1 + I_B(G') \leq r$  for the set  $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ .

Lemma 2 is proved.  $\square$

Let  $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  be an arbitrary  $k$ -valued logic function,  $C = (\tilde{\alpha}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_2, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_r)$  be an arbitrary chain of tuples from  $E_k^n$ . Denote by  $u_C(f)$  the maximum length of subsequence  $\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_2, \dots, \tilde{\beta}_t$  of sequence  $C$  such that  $f(\tilde{\beta}_1) > f(\tilde{\beta}_2) > \dots > f(\tilde{\beta}_t)$ .

Inversion power  $u(f)$  of the function  $f$  is the maximum  $u_C(f)$  over all chains  $C$  from  $E_k^n$ . Obviously, for any function  $f$  the inequalities  $1 \leq u(f) \leq d(f) + 1$  hold. Moreover, if function  $f$  is not monotone then  $u(f) \geq 2$ .

Inversion power  $u(B)$  of basis  $B$  is the maximum  $u(f)$  over all functions  $f$  from  $B$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $F$  be a system of  $k$ -valued logic functions. Then*

$$I_B(F) \leq \lceil \log_{u(B)}(d(F) + 1) \rceil.$$

*Proof.* Let  $u(B) = s$ . Suppose  $\omega(x_1, \dots, x_q) \in B$  such that  $u(\omega) = s$ . Let  $B' = M \cup \{\omega(x_1, \dots, x_q)\}$ . Since  $I_{B'}(F) \geq I_B(F)$  it is enough to prove the inequality  $I_{B'}(F) \leq \lceil \log_s(d(F) + 1) \rceil$ . The proof is by induction on  $R(F) = \lceil \log_s(d(F) + 1) \rceil$ .

If  $R(F) = 0$ , then  $d(F) = 0$ . Hence, all the functions from  $F$  are monotone. Thus,  $I_B(F) = 0$ .

For the induction step let  $G$  be a set of functions such that  $R(G) \leq R(F) - 1$ . Suppose the Theorem statement is correct for  $G$ .

Denote by  $T_1$  a set of  $n$ -tuples of elements from  $E_k$  such that for any chain  $C$  with terminal tuple from  $T_1$  the inequality  $d_C(F) < s^{R(F)-1}$  holds, that is

$$T_1 = \{\tilde{\alpha} \in E_k^n \mid d_C(F) < s^{R(F)-1} \text{ for any chain } C \text{ with terminal tuple } \tilde{\alpha}\}.$$

Further, denote by  $T_i$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, s - 1$ , a set of  $n$ -tuples with elements from  $E_k$  such that for any chain of elements from  $E_k^n \setminus (T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_{i-1})$  with a terminal tuple from  $T_i$  inequality  $d_C(F) < s^{R(F)-1}$  holds, that is

$$T_i = \{\tilde{\alpha} \in E_k^n \setminus (T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_{i-1}) \mid d_C(F) < s^{R(F)-1} \text{ for any chain } C, \\ C \subset E_k^n \setminus (T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_{i-1}), \text{ with terminal tuple } \tilde{\alpha}\}.$$

Finally, let

$$T_s = E_k^n \setminus (T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_{s-1}).$$

Note that if  $\tilde{\alpha} \in T_i$  and  $\tilde{\beta} \prec \tilde{\alpha}$  then  $\tilde{\beta} \in T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_{i-1}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ .

Now we prove that for any chain  $C$  of elements from  $T_s$ , the inequality  $d_C(F) < s^{R(F)-1}$  also holds. Assume the converse. Hence, there is a chain  $C_s$  with initial tuple  $\tilde{\alpha}_s$ ,  $\tilde{\alpha}_s \in T_s$ , such that  $d_{C_s}(F) \geq s^{R(F)-1}$ . Since  $\tilde{\alpha}_s \notin T_s$ , there is a chain  $C_{s-1}$  with initial tuple  $\tilde{\alpha}_{s-1}$ ,  $\tilde{\alpha}_{s-1} \in T_{s-1}$  and terminal tuple  $\tilde{\alpha}_s$ ,  $\tilde{\alpha}_s \in T_s$ , such that  $d_{C_{s-1}}(F) \geq s^{R(F)-1}$ . Similarly, for  $i = s - 2, \dots, 1$ , there is a chain  $C_i$  with initial tuple  $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ ,  $\tilde{\alpha}_i \in T_i$ , and terminal tuple  $\tilde{\alpha}_{i+1}$ ,  $\tilde{\alpha}_{i+1} \in T_{i+1}$ , such that  $d_{C_i}(F) \geq s^{R(F)-1}$ .

Then for chain  $C = C_1 \cup \dots \cup C_s$  the relations

$$d_C(F) = d_{C_1}(F) + \dots + d_{C_s}(F) \geq s (s^{R(F)-1}) = s^{R(F)} > d(F),$$

hold. This contradicts the definition of  $d(F)$ .

Let  $f_j \in F = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$ . Suppose

$$f_{ij}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_{i-1}; \\ f_j(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), & \text{if } (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in T_i; \\ k-1, & \text{if } (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in T_{i+1} \cup \dots \cup T_s; \end{cases}$$

$i = 1, \dots, s$ .

Let

$$F_i = \{f_{ij} \mid f_j \in F\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, s.$$

By the definition of the set  $F_i$  the inequalities  $d(F_i) < s^{R(F)-1}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ , hold. Hence, inequalities

$$d(F_i) \leq s^{R(F)-1} - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, s,$$

are valid. Thus,

$$R(F_i) = \lceil \log_s(d(F_i) + 1) \rceil \leq \lceil \log s^{R(F)-1} \rceil = R(F) - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, s.$$

By the definition of the value  $s = u(\omega)$  there is a chain  $(\beta_{11}, \dots, \beta_{1q}), (\beta_{21}, \dots, \beta_{2q}), \dots, (\beta_{s1}, \dots, \beta_{sq})$ , such that  $\omega(\beta_{11}, \dots, \beta_{1q}) > \omega(\beta_{21}, \dots, \beta_{2q}) > \dots > \omega(\beta_{s1}, \dots, \beta_{sq})$ .

We define functions  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_q$  by the following equalities

$$\xi_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \beta_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \dots, s, \quad j = 1, \dots, q,$$

which are valid for all tuples  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  from  $T_i$ .

Let  $b_i = \omega(\beta_{11}, \dots, \beta_{1q})$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ .

We define functions  $\lambda_j(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, k-1$ . Let

$$\lambda_j(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x < j; \\ 1, & \text{if } x \geq j. \end{cases}$$

We define functions  $\mu_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . Let

$$\mu_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in T_1 \cup \dots \cup T_{i-1}; \\ 1, & \text{if } (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in T_i \cup \dots \cup T_s. \end{cases}$$



Note that all these functions are monotone.

Consider  $s$ -connector  $G = \{g_j(z_1, \dots, z_s, \tilde{x}) \mid j = 1, \dots, m\}$  for the tuple of function  $\{(f_{1j}(\tilde{x}), \dots, f_{sj}(\tilde{x})) \mid j = 1, \dots, m\}$ . By Lemma 2 there exists such an  $s$ -connector.

Replace variable  $z_i, i = 1, \dots, s$ , by function

$$Z_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \min \{ \lambda_{b_i}(\omega(\xi_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, \xi_q(x_1, \dots, x_n))), \mu_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \}.$$

in function  $g_j(z_1, \dots, z_s, \tilde{x}), j = 1, \dots, m$ .

Since function  $Z_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  equals 1 on tuples from  $T_i$  and equals 0 on the other tuples, we get that for all tuples  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  from  $T_i$  inequalities

$$g_j(Z_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, Z_s(x_1, \dots, x_n), x_1, \dots, x_n) = f_{ij}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f_j(x_1, \dots, x_n), \quad i = 1, \dots, s, \quad j = 1, \dots, m,$$

are valid.

To realize functions  $Z_1, \dots, Z_s$  one have used monotone functions gates and one gate corresponding to function  $\omega$ . By induction assumption we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_{B'}(F) &\leq I_{B'}(G) + 1 \leq \max\{I_{B'}(F_1), \dots, I_{B'}(F_s)\} + 1 \leq \\ &\leq \max\{\lceil \log_s(d(F_1) + 1) \rceil, \dots, \lceil \log_s(d(F_s) + 1) \rceil\} \leq \lceil \log_s s^{R(F)-1} \rceil + 1 = R(F). \end{aligned}$$

That completes induction step.

Theorem 2 is proved.  $\square$

If basis  $B$  is such that  $d(B) + 1 = u(B)$ , Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 give the exact value for non-monotone complexity in basis  $B$  for any system of  $k$ -valued logic functions. Obviously, this equality holds for bases  $B_P$  and  $B_L$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $F$  be a system of  $k$ -valued logic functions. Then*

$$I_{B_P}(F) = \lceil \log_2(d(F) + 1) \rceil, \quad I_{B_L}(F) = \lceil \log_{k-1}(d(F) + 1) \rceil.$$

A Shannon function for inversion complexity over basis  $B$  of  $n$ -argument function and a system of  $m$  functions are defined in standard way:

$$I_B(n) = \max_{f \in P_k(n)} I_B(f), \quad I_B(n, m) = \max_{F = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}, f_j \in P_k(n)} I_B(F).$$

Let

$$T(k, n) = (k - 1)n - \left\lfloor \frac{(k - 1)n}{k} \right\rfloor + 1 = (k - 2)n + \left\lceil \frac{n}{k} \right\rceil + 1.$$

**Theorem 4.** For any  $n$  and  $m$ ,  $n \geq 1$ ,  $m \geq 2$ , inequalities

$$I_{BP}(n) = \lceil \log_2 T(k, n) \rceil, \quad I_{BP}(n, m) = \lceil \log_2((k-1)n+1) \rceil;$$
$$I_{BL}(n) = \lceil \log_{k-1} T(k, n) \rceil, \quad I_{BL}(n, m) = \lceil \log_{k-1}((k-1)n+1) \rceil.$$

hold.

This study (research grant No 14-01-0144) supported by The National Research University — Higher School of Economics' Academic Fund Program in 2014/2015.

The first author was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project no. 14-01-00598).

## References

- [1] O. B. Lupanov, *Asymptotic Estimations of Complexity of Control Systems*, Moscow: Mosc. State Univ. Press (1984) (in Russian).
- [2] J. E. Savage, *The complexity of computing*, New York: Wiley (1976).
- [3] A. A. Markov, On the inversion complexity of systems of functions, *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, **116** (6), 917–919 (1957) (in Russian). English translation in: *J. of ACM*, **5** (4), 331–334 (1958).
- [4] A. A. Markov, On the inversion complexity of systems of Boolean functions, *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, **150** (3), 477–479 (1963) (in Russian). English translation in: *Soviet Math. Doklady*, **4**, 694–696 (1963).
- [5] E. N. Gilbert, Lattice theoretic properties of frontal switching functions *J. Math. Phys.*, **33**, 56-67 (1954).
- [6] E. I. Nechiporuk, On the complexity of circuits in some bases containing nontrivial elements with zero weights, *Problemy Kibernetiki*, **8**, 123–160 (1962) (in Russian).
- [7] H. Morizumi, A note on the inversion complexity of Boolean functions in Boolean formulas, *Cornell University Library*, [arXiv.org > cs > arXiv:0811.0699](https://arxiv.org/abs/0811.0699).
- [8] H. Morizumi, Limiting negations in formulas, *Lect. Notes in Comput. Sci.*, **5555**, 36th ICALP, Part I, 701–712 (2009).

- [9] M. J. Fischer, The complexity of negation-limited networks — a brief survey, *Springer Lect. Notes in Comput. Sci.*, **33**, 71–82 (1975).
- [10] K. Tanaka, T. Nishino and R. Beals, Negation-limited circuit complexity of symmetric functions, *Inf. Proc. Lett.*, **59** (5), 273–279 (1996).
- [11] S. Sung and K. Tanaka, Limiting negations in bounded-depth circuits: an extension of Markovs theorem, *Lect. Notes in Comput. Sci.*, **2906**, 108–116 (2003).
- [12] S. Guo, T. Malkin, I. C. Oliveira and A. Rosen, The power of negations in cryptography, *Lect. Notes in Comput. Sci.*, **9014**, 36–65 (2015).
- [13] V. V. Kochergin and A. V. Mikhailovich, Some extensions of the inversion complexity of Boolean functions, *Cornell University Library, arXiv.org > cs > arXiv:1506.04485*.
- [14] S. Jukna, *Boolean Function Complexity. Advances and Frontiers*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2012).