

Unlabeled sample compression schemes for oriented matroids

Tilen Marc¹

*Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Ljubljana, Slovenia
Institute of Mathematics, Physics, and Mechanics, Ljubljana, Slovenia*

April 4, 2022

Abstract

A long standing sample compression conjecture asks to linearly bound the size of the optimal sample compression schemes by the Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) dimension of an arbitrary class. In this paper we explore the rich metric and combinatorial structure of oriented matroids (OMs) to construct proper unlabeled sample compression schemes for the classes of topes of OMs bounded by their VC-dimension. The result extends to the topes of affine OMs, as well as to the topes of the complexes of OMs that possess a corner peeling. The main tool that we use are the solutions of certain linear programs in OMs.

1 Introduction

Sample compression schemes were introduced [15] as a generalization of the underlying structure of statistical learning algorithms. The main idea is to allow a compression of labeled samples into a smaller size with a possibility of reversing (reconstructing) the map. Depending on the sample space, the challenge is to construct a compression scheme of minimal size.

Let U be a finite set, usually called the *universe*, and \mathcal{C} some family of subsets of U , sometimes referred to as a *concept class*. It is convenient to view \mathcal{C} as a set of $\{+, -\}$ -vectors, i.e. $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{+, -\}^U$, and we shall denote with c_u the u -th coordinate of $c \in \mathcal{C}$. A *sample* s is simply an element of $\{+, -, 0\}^U$, and its *support* is $\underline{s} = \{u \in U \mid s_u \neq 0\}$. We say that a sample s is *realized* by \mathcal{C} if $s \leq c$ for some $c \in \mathcal{C}$, where \leq denotes the product ordering of elements of $\{+, -, 0\}^U$ relative to the ordering $0 \leq +, 0 \leq -$. For a concept class \mathcal{C} , let $RS(\mathcal{C})$ be the set of all samples realizable by \mathcal{C} .

Definition 1.1. An unlabeled sample compression scheme of size k , for a concept class $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \{+, -\}^U$, is defined by a (compressor) function

$$\alpha : RS(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \binom{U}{\leq k}$$

and a (reconstructor) function

$$\beta : \text{Im}(\alpha) := \alpha(RS(\mathcal{C})) \rightarrow \{-, +\}^U,$$

such that for any realizable sample s of \mathcal{C} , the following conditions hold: $\alpha(s) \subseteq \underline{s}$ and $s \leq \beta(\alpha(s))$.

If the reconstruction function maps into \mathcal{C} , the compression scheme is known as *proper*, otherwise we call it *improper* [8]. *Labeled* sample compression schemes (which are not the topic of this paper and are easier to construct) map into subsamples instead of $\binom{U}{\leq k}$, i.e. $\alpha s \mapsto s'$ such that $s' \leq s$.

¹Electronic address: tilen.marc@fmf.uni-lj.si

Consider the following example. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{++++, +++-, ++--, +---, ----, ----+, ----+, -++-, -++\}$, where we denote the coordinates by $U = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. As we will see, \mathcal{C} can be geometrically seen as a set of topes of an oriented matroid or as vertices of a 8-cycle embedded into a hypercube $\{+, -\}^U$, see Figure 1. We give a proper unlabeled sample compression scheme of size 2 and it is an easy exercise (also following from the results of this paper) to extend this map to each $2n$ -cycle.

	++++	→	{1, 4}	+++−	→	{3, 4}	++−−	→	{2, 3}	+−−−	→	{}	−−−−	→	{1}
	−−−+	→	{4}	−−++	→	{3}	−+++	→	{2}	+++0	→	{1, 3}	++−0	→	{2, 3}
	+−−0	→	{}	−−−0	→	{1}	−−+0	→	{3}	−+0+	→	{2}	+00+	→	{1, 4}
	+0−	→	{2, 4}	+−0−	→	{}	−−0−	→	{1}	−−0+	→	{4}	−+0+	→	{2}
	+0++	→	{1, 4}	+0+−	→	{3, 4}	+0−−	→	{}	−0−−	→	{1}	−0+−	→	{4}
	−0++	→	{3}	0+++	→	{2}	0+−−	→	{3, 4}	0+−−	→	{2, 3}	0−−−	→	{}
α :	0−−+	→	{4}	0−++	→	{3}	+00+	→	{1, 2}	+−00	→	{}	−−00	→	{1}
	−+00	→	{2}	+0+0	→	{1, 3}	+0−0	→	{}	−0−0	→	{1}	−0+0	→	{3}
	0++0	→	{2}	0+−0	→	{2, 3}	0−−0	→	{}	0−+0	→	{3}	+00+	→	{1, 4}
	+00−	→	{}	−00−	→	{1}	−00+	→	{4}	0+0+	→	{2}	0+0−	→	{2, 4}
	0−0−	→	{}	0−0+	→	{4}	00+−	→	{3}	00+−	→	{3, 4}	00−−	→	{}
	00−+	→	{4}	+000	→	{}	−000	→	{1}	0+00	→	{2}	0−00	→	{}
	00+0	→	{3}	00−0	→	{}	000+	→	{4}	000−	→	{}	0000	→	{}
			{}	→	+−−−	{3}	→	−−++	{1, 3}	→	++++	{2, 4}	→	+−−−	
β :			{1}	→	−−−−	{4}	→	−−−+	{1, 4}	→	++++	{3, 4}	→	++++	
			{2}	→	−+++	{1, 2}	→	++++	{2, 3}	→	+−−−				

Consider again \mathcal{C} as a family of subsets of U . A subset X of U is *shattered* by \mathcal{C} if for all $Y \subset X$ there exists $S \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $S \cap X = Y$. We will denote by $\overline{X}(\mathcal{C})$ the family of all the subsets of U that are shattered by \mathcal{C} . The *Vapnik-Chervonenkis dimension* (VC-dimension) $vc(\mathcal{C})$ of \mathcal{C} is the cardinality of the largest subset of U shattered by \mathcal{C} [19]. This well established measurement can be considered as a complexity measure of a set system.

A long standing conjecture of [10] is asking if any set family \mathcal{C} of VC-dimension d has a sample compression scheme of size $O(d)$. The investigation of geometrically structured concept classes lead to many surprising results, and strong bounds on the sizes of their compression schemes were derived [4, 6, 12, 17, 18]. In particular, compression schemes for set families such as maximum concept classes, ample sets, intersection-closed concept classes, etc., were designed. Deep connections between the structure of metric set families and compression schemes were established.

Recently, a focus was turned towards Oriented Matroids (OMs) [5, 8, 9]. These well studied structures provide a common generalization and framework for studying properties of many geometric objects such as hyperplane arrangements, linear programming, convex polytopes, directed graphs, neural codes, etc. Thanks to the Topological Representation Theorem [16], OMs can be represented as arrangements of pseudo-hyperplanes giving a deep geometrical insight into their structure. In particular, OMs can be determined by their topes (see Figure 1), which can be seen as concept classes. The Complexes of Oriented Matroids (COMs) [3] further generalize the structure of OMs.

In [9], authors tackled the problem of constructing sample compression schemes by extending a concept class to another one, known to have a (small) sample compression scheme. Their results imply improper labeled schemes with size linearly bounded by its VC-dimension for certain COMs, as well as improper unlabeled schemes for OMs. An alternative, more direct approach was given in [8], constructing proper labeled compression schemes for COMs (and hence also OMs) with size bounded by their VC-dimension. Same bound on the unlabeled sample compression schemes for realizable (by hyperplane arrangements) affine OMs was given in [4].

In the present paper we extend this line of work by providing proper unlabeled compression schemes for OMs of size bounded by their VC-dimension. We extend this result to COMs that possess corner peelings, answering a question from [8]. Similarly than in [6], we construct the schemes geometrically, where in our case the main tool are solutions to oriented matroid linear programs.

Partial cubes are graphs that can be isometrically embedded into hypercubes, with respect to the shortest path distance. For a partial cube G the isometric embedding into a minimal dimension hypercube is up to an isomorphism unique and allows to partition the edges of G in so called Θ -classes E_e , $e \in U$, defined as all the edges of G that correspond to the flipping of a coordinate e in the hypercube [11]. Each E_e is a cut between two *halfspaces* E_e^+ and E_e^- of G , defined as all the vertices having e -coordinate $+$ or $-$, respectively.

We need to define two opposite operations on partial cubes. Define a *contraction* $\pi_e(G)$ as the partial cube obtained from G by contracting all the edges in E_e , or equivalently by deleting the coordinate e in the embedding of G into a hypercube. Similarly define $\pi_A(G)$ for $A \subset U$. The reverse of a contraction is an *expansion*. Let G be the contraction of H with respect to E_e , and let E_e^- and E_e^+ be both halfspaces of H with respect to coordinate e . Then the contraction π_e maps E_e^- and E_e^+ into intersecting sets G_1, G_2 . These two sets allow us to simply expand G back into H , hence we say that we expand G along G_1 and G_2 . Note that contractions preserve the property of a graph being the tope graph of an OM and are also known as deletions in the theory of OMs.

As a partial cube G embedded into $\{+, -\}^U$ can be seen as a set system, we can denote with $\overline{X}(G)$ the set of subsets of U , that are shattered by vertices of G . It follows directly from the definition, that $V \in \overline{X}(G)$ if and only if $\pi_{U \setminus V}$ is isomorphic to a hypercube.

A subgraph (or a subset of vertices) H of G is *convex* if for every $x, y \in H$ all the shortest x, y -paths lie in H . When we speak about a convex set in an OM, we mean the convex set of the tope graph of the OM. We denote with $\mathcal{H}(G)$ the set of all convex subgraphs of G . For a convex graph C we shall denote with $\text{osc}(C)$ the set of the Θ -classes E_e that *osculate* C , i.e. some edge of E_e connects C and $G \setminus C$, and with $\text{cross}(C)$ the set of all the Θ -classes that *cross* C , i.e. some edge of E_e is contained in C . In partial cubes, convex sets correspond to the intersection of halfspaces [11], which in turn implies that sets $\text{osc}(C)$ and $\text{cross}(C)$ are disjoint. A convex set C in a partial cube G is said to be *full*, if $\pi_{\text{cross}(C)}(G)$ has the VC-dimension $d = \text{vc}(G)$. We denote with $\mathcal{H}_f(G)$ the set of all full convex subsets of G .

Turning back to OMs, for each covector $X \in \mathcal{L}$ in an OM $\mathcal{M} = (U, \mathcal{L})$ define $\mathcal{T}(X) = \{X \circ Y \mid Y \in \mathcal{T}\}$. Set $\mathcal{T}(X)$ induces a subgraph of the tope graph G of \mathcal{M} and can be geometrically interpreted as the graph of all the regions adjacent to a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that represents X . It follows directly from the axioms of OMs, that $\mathcal{T}(X)$ for each $X \in \mathcal{L}$ induces convex subgraph the is the tope graph of a (smaller) OM. Another type of important covectors of \mathcal{M} are *cocircuits*. These are the minimal elements of $(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{00\dots 0\}, \leq)$. In particular, for each cocircuit X , set $\mathcal{T}(X)$ induces the tope graph of an OM with VC-dimension $\text{vc}(G) - 1$.

2.2 Affine OMs, linear programming and corners

An *affine OM* $\mathcal{A} = (U, \mathcal{L})$ is simply a halfspace of an OM \mathcal{M} , i.e. $\mathcal{L} = \{X \setminus \{e\} \in \overline{\mathcal{L}} \mid X_e = +\}$ for $\mathcal{M} = (U \cup \{e\}, \overline{\mathcal{L}})$. The tope graph of an affine OM corresponds to a halfspace of the tope graph of an OM. As in OMs, elements of \mathcal{L} are referred to as covectors, we can similarly define topes, and cocircuits are minimal elements of (\mathcal{L}, \leq) . The rank of \mathcal{A} is one less than the rank of \mathcal{M} , hence the same holds for the VC-dimensions of their tope graphs. The connection between cocircuits and shattered sets is even stronger: if V is shattered by the tope graph G of an affine OM, then there exists a cocircuit X such that $\mathcal{T}(X)$ shatters V , and if V is maximal, X is unique. In particular, the VC-dimension of the tope graph G equals to $\text{vc}(\mathcal{T}(X))$ for a cocircuit X .

Topologically speaking, affine OMs can be represented as (non-central) pseudo-hyperplane arrangements, see Figure 2. Consider such a representation with pseudo-hyperplanes. The 0-dimensional intersections of hyperplanes, i.e. points, correspond to cocircuits of \mathcal{A} . On the other hand, the 1-dimensional intersections, i.e. pseudo-lines, can be seen as sequences of cocircuits that lie on them. We will refer to these sequences of cocircuits as simply *lines*.

Now fix $f \in U$ of an affine OM $\mathcal{A} = (U, \mathcal{L})$. Coordinate f in the topological representation corresponds to a pseudo-hyperplane H_f . Each line of \mathcal{A} then either crosses H_f or is disjoint with it. This allows to orient each lines of \mathcal{A} with respect to f , meaning that all the lines that cross the pseudo-hyperplane H_f are oriented to cross it from the negative to the positive side. One can think of the orientation of the




Figure 2: Orientation of lines in a rank 2 affine OM \mathcal{A} with respect to pseudo hyperplane f resulting in a graph on cocircuits of \mathcal{A} . Cocircuit X is an optimal solution to the linear program with respect to convex set C (intersection of half-spaces) in direction of f . Furthermore, D is a corner of the tope graph $\mathcal{T}(X)$, such that $\mathcal{T}(X) \cap C \subset D$, see Lemma 2.3.

lines as a graph, known as the *cocircuit graph*: the vertices are cocircuits of \mathcal{A} , two cocircuit adjacent if they lie consecutive on a line, some edges being half-edges, and some edges being oriented. For an example, see Figure 2.

Consider now a convex set C , i.e. an intersection of halfspaces $\cap \{H_e^{s_e} \mid e \in V, s_e \in \{+, -\}\}$ for some $V \subset U$. The task of *linear programming (LP)* in OMs is to find a cocircuit X , on the boundary of C , that has no in-edges from other cocircuits on the boundary of C . We call such X an *optimal solution* to the linear program. See Figure 2, for an example. One of the main results with respect to linear programming in OMs is the following. For our purposes will say that a convex set C of an affine OM \mathcal{A} is *bounded* in the direction of f , if all the unbounded regions of C in the topological representation of \mathcal{A} lie in H_e^- .

Theorem 2.2 ([5] Theorem 10.1.13). *Let $\mathcal{A} = (U, \mathcal{L})$ be an affine OM, $f \in U$, and C non-empty convex set bounded in the direction of f . Then C has an optimal solution to the linear program with respect to f .*

We refer the reader to [5] for all the technical details. In this paper we only need the existence of the solution for specific LPs that we construct later in Section 3. Also note that we define a LP for any convex set, i.e. for intersection of chosen halfspaces, while it is more standard to define a LP for the intersection of all positive halfspace of an affine OM. The equivalence is trivial.

The last concept we need to introduce are corners of OMs [13]. Let $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'$ be OMs where \mathcal{M}' is an expansion of \mathcal{M} along coordinate $f \in U$. For G the tope graph of \mathcal{M} let the expansion be along G_1 and G_2 . If for every cocircuit X of \mathcal{M} holds, that $\mathcal{T}(X)$ is either completely in G_1 or completely in G_2 , then we say that the expansion is in *general position*. In this case we also say for f in \mathcal{M}' that it is in general position. A *corner* of G is $D = G \setminus G_1$. Note that by the definition $G \setminus D = G_1$ is a halfspace of a the tope graph of an OM, hence the tope graph of an affine OM. For example, if $G \cong C_{2n}$, then a corner D consists of $n - 1$ consecutive vertices on the cycle, while if $G \cong Q_n$, a corner D must be a single vertex.

In the following lemma we establish a connection between corners and solutions to LPs that we will use later. The lemma is illustrated in Figure 2.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (U, \mathcal{L})$ be an affine OM and $f \in U$ in general position. Let X be a cocircuit of \mathcal{A} , and $\mathcal{T}(X)$ the tope graph of an OM corresponding to X . Then there exists a corner D of $\mathcal{T}(X)$, such that for any convex set C , if X is a solution to a LP with respect to C in the direction of f , then $\mathcal{T}(X) \cap C \subset D$.*

Proof. Let G be the tope graph of \mathcal{A} and let $\text{cross}(\mathcal{T}(X))$ be the set of Θ -classes of G that cross $\mathcal{T}(X)$. Consider $H = \pi_{U \setminus (\text{cross}(\mathcal{T}(X)) \cup \{f\})}(G)$ and orient the lines of H with respect to f . This results in a cocircuit

graph having only one vertex (cocircuit $X_{\text{cross}(\mathcal{T}(X)) \cup \{f\}}$) not crossed by f , and it follows from [16, Theorem 8 in Chapter 9] that one can expand H with an element g in the following way: in the topological representation of H , hyperplane H_g crosses the point corresponding to $X_{\text{cross}(\mathcal{T}(X)) \cup \{f\}}$ while orienting the lines with respect to g gives the same orientation as orienting it according to f .

It follows from the above that g defines an expansion in general position of $\mathcal{T}(X)$ and let D be the corner of it. By the way D was constructed, it consists of precisely those topes of $\mathcal{T}(X)$, whose corresponding regions in the topological representation have all the lines on the boundary directed away from X . This implies that if C is a convex set such that X is a solution to a LP with respect to C in the direction of f , then $\mathcal{T}(X) \cap C \subset D$. \square

2.3 Reconstructible maps

We are ready to start analyzing sample compression schemes of OMs. As stated above, we shall treat OMs simply as their tope graphs, naturally embedded into hypercubes. In particular, we will produce proper unlabeled compression schemes for the concept classes of the topes of OMs.

We define a map that will help us build sample compression schemes and is closely connected to the representation map form [6]. Recall that $\mathcal{H}(G)$ denotes the set of all convex sets in G , while $\overline{X}(G)$ are all the sets that G (as a set system) shatters.

Definition 2.4. *Let G be a partial cube. We shall say that a map*

$$a : \mathcal{H}(G) \rightarrow \overline{X}(G)$$

is a reconstructible map, if the following holds:

- (a) *For every convex set $C \in \mathcal{H}(G)$, it holds $a(C) \subset \text{osc}(C)$.*
- (b) *For every $V \in \text{Im}(a)$, the intersection $\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(G), a(C)=V} C$ is non-empty.*

The following connects reconstructible maps with proper unlabeled compression schemes of small size. Note that the connection between samples and convex sets was also established in [8].

Lemma 2.5. *If a partial cube G has a reconstructible map, then it has a proper unlabeled compression scheme of size at most $\text{vc}(G)$.*

Proof. Assume G , embedded into $\{+, -\}^U$, has a reconstructible map a . Let $s \in \text{RS}(G)$ be a sample realizable by G and c a vertex of G that realizes s . Define a convex set $C = \bigcap_{e \in U, s_e \in \{+, -\}} E_e^{s_e}$, i.e. C is the intersection of halfspaces of G defined by the coordinates of s . By definition, $c \in C$, hence C is non-empty. Define $\alpha(s) = a(C)$. Moreover, for any $V \subset \text{Im}(a)$ define $\beta(V)$ to be any vertex from the intersection $\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(G), a(C)=V} C$, which is non-empty by the definition reconstructible maps.

We now prove that α, β form a proper unlabeled compression scheme of size at most $\text{vc}(G)$. First we argue that $\alpha(s) \subset \underline{s}$ for every realizable sample s . Let C be the convex set corresponding to s as defined above. By definition of C , for every $e \in \text{osc}(C)$, it must hold that $s_e \in \{+, -\}$. Hence $\text{osc}(C) \subset \underline{s}$, and since $\alpha(s) \subset \text{osc}(C)$, the condition holds.

Secondly, we argue that $s \leq \beta(\alpha(s))$ for every $s \in \text{RS}(G)$. Let C be the convex set corresponding to s and let $s_e \in \{+, -\}$, for $e \in U$. Then by definition, C is a subset of $E_e^{s_e}$, i.e. $c_e = s_e$ for every vertex of C . In particular this holds for $c = \beta(\alpha(s))$, since c is chosen from the intersection $\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(G), a(C)=V} C$. We proved that $s_e = \beta(\alpha(s))_e$ if $s_e \in \{+, -\}$, while if $s_e = 0$ it clearly holds $s_e \leq \beta(\alpha(s))_e$.

Finally, the size of the compression scheme is bounded by $\text{vc}(G)$, since by the definition of VC-dimension, the sets in $\overline{X}(G)$ are bounded by $\text{vc}(G)$. The compression scheme is proper, since $\beta(\alpha(s)) = c$ is a vertex of G . \square

In [8], a map close to the reconstructible map was proven to exist for OMs, which served the authors to establish labeled compression schemes. The map does not map all convex sets but only the full ones. We restate their result in our setting

Lemma 2.6 (Lemma 14 in [8]). *Let G be an OM. Then there exists a map*

$$b : \mathcal{H}_f(G) \rightarrow \overline{X}(G)$$

such that

- (a) *For every convex set $C \in \mathcal{H}_f(G)$, it holds $|b(C)| = \text{vc}(G)$.*
- (b) *For every convex set $C \in \mathcal{H}_f(G)$, it holds $b(C) \subset \text{osc}(C)$.*
- (c) *If $b(C^1) = b(C^2)$ for convex sets $C^1, C^2 \in \mathcal{H}_f(G)$, $C^1 \neq C^2$, then for some $e \in b(C^1)(= b(C^2))$ the Θ -class E_e separates C^1 and C^2 .*

We will be using this map for mapping convex sets in a corner. Hence we need to prove the following.

Lemma 2.7. *Let G be the tope graph of an OM and D a corner of G . Then every convex set C in G that is a subset of D is full. Moreover, there are no two different $C^1, C^2 \subset D$, such that $b(C^1) = b(C^2)$.*

Proof. First note the following simple fact about OMs, see for example [14]: for the tope graph of any OM G and its Θ -class E_e , it holds that the rank of $\pi_e(G)$ is less than the rank of G if and only if G is the Cartesian product $G \cong K_2 \square H$ for some tope graph of an OM H , where edges in E_e correspond to edges of the factor K_2 .

By the definition of a corner, there exist an expansion in general position of G w.r.t. G_1, G_2 , such that $D = G \setminus G_1$. By the above, if the rank of $\pi_e(G)$, for some Θ -class e , is less than the rank of G , then G includes two cocircuits isomorphic to H , each of them must be completely in G_1 or in G_2 , by the definition of the expansion in general position. In this case, since neither G_1 or G_2 covers the whole G , one of them is completely in G_1 . Hence $\pi_e(G_1)$ must cover the whole $\pi_e(G)$.

Now consider $\pi_{\text{cross}(C)}(C)$. Since none of the Θ -classes that osculate C were contracted, $\pi_{\text{cross}(C)}(G_1)$ does not cover $\pi_{\text{cross}(C)}(C)$. Then $\pi_{\text{cross}(C)}(G)$ is not covered by $\pi_{\text{cross}(C)}(G_1)$, thus by the above $\pi_{\text{cross}(C)}(G)$ must have the same rank as G . This proves the first statement of the lemma.

Now let there be $C^1, C^2 \subset D$ such that $b(C^1) = b(C^2)$. Since $b(C^1)$ is shattered by G and $|b(C^1)| = \text{vc}(G)$, the rank of $\pi_{E \setminus b(C^1)}(G)$ is $\text{vc}(G)$, i.e. $\pi_{E \setminus b(C^1)}(G)$ is a hypercube of dimension $\text{vc}(G)$. By the above, $\pi_{E \setminus b(C^1)}(D)$ is a corner of the hypercube $\pi_{E \setminus b(C^1)}(G)$, hence must be a single vertex. This implies that $\pi_{E \setminus b(C^1)}(C^1) = \pi_{E \setminus b(C^2)}(C^2)$, thus for every $e \in b(C^1)$, both C^1 and C^2 must be either in E_e^+ or E_e^- . By the property (c) of b , $C^1 = C^2$. \square

3 Main result

The main result of this paper is the following.

Theorem 3.1. *Every OM \mathcal{M} has a reconstructible map, thus a proper unlabeled compression scheme of size $\text{vc}(\mathcal{M})$.*

The theorem directly follows from Propositions 3.2 and 3.3, see Figure 3.

Proposition 3.2. *Let G be the tope graph of an OM and let D be a corner of G . Assume that the tope graph (of an affine OM) $G \setminus D$ has a reconstructible map \overline{a} . Then \overline{a} can be extended to a reconstructible map a of G , with $|a(C)| = \text{vc}(G)$ for every $C \subset D$.*

Proof. Denote $G_1 = G \setminus D$, which is an the tope graph of an affine OM with $\text{vc}(G_1) = \text{vc}(G) - 1$. Let $\overline{a} : \mathcal{H}(G_1) \rightarrow \overline{X}(G_1)$ be the assumed reconstructible map of G_1 . Define $a : \mathcal{H}(G) \rightarrow \overline{X}(G)$:

- (i) If $C \in \mathcal{H}(G)$ is such that $C \cap G_1 \neq \emptyset$, then define $a(C) = \overline{a}(C \cap G_1)$.
- (ii) If $C \in \mathcal{H}(G)$ is such that $C \subseteq D$, then define $a(C) = b(C)$, where b is the map from Lemma 2.6. By Lemma 2.7 every convex $C \subseteq D$ is full, hence the map is well defined.

Each $V \in \text{Im}(a)$ is by definition shattered by G_1 in case (i) and by G in case (ii). Now we prove that a is a reconstructible map, by proving that conditions (a) and (b) hold. Note that the convex sets from the first condition map to sets of cardinality $< \text{vc}(G)$, while convex sets in the second condition map to sets of cardinality exactly $\text{vc}(G)$.

(a) For every convex set $C \in \mathcal{H}(G)$, it holds $a(C) \subset \text{osc}(C)$:

In the case C is such that $C \cap G_1 \neq \emptyset$, the condition holds since if $e \in \text{osc}_{G_1}(C \cap G_1)$, then $e \in \text{osc}_G(C)$ due to the fact that G_1 is an isometric subgraph.


In the case $C \subseteq D$, the condition follows by property (b) of map b .

(b) For every $U \in \text{Im}(a)$, intersection $\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(G), a(C)=U} C$ is non-empty.

If $|U| < r$, then $\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(G), a(C)=U} C = \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(G_1), \bar{a}(C)=U} C \neq \emptyset$.

In the case $|U| = r$, exactly one convex set is mapped to U , hence the property follows.

□



(a) A corner of the tope graph of an OM.

(b) To define a reconstructible map we add a hyperplane g and for each convex set C solve a LP w.r.t C and g .

Figure 3: Defining a reconstructible map for an OM: cut a corner of the tope graph of an OM as in (a), define it for an affine OM by Proposition 3.3 as in (b), and extend it to the OM by Proposition 3.2.

Proposition 3.3. *Every affine OM \mathcal{A} has a reconstructible map, thus a proper unlabeled sample compression scheme of size bounded by $\text{vc}(H)$.*

Proof. Let H be the tope graph of \mathcal{A} . Consider an expansion in general position of H , and let it be along H_1, H_2 . In particular, such an expansion always exists and we can even take such that $H_2 = H$, by so called perturbations, see [5, Definition 7.2.3]. Denote with g the element of the expansion. Since we took $H_2 = H$, it holds that $H_1 = (H_1 \cap H_2)$, and it is well known in the theory of OMs that $(H_1 \cap H_2)$ is also the tope graph of an affine OM [5, Section 3.3]. Furthermore it holds $\text{vc}(H_1) = \text{vc}(H) - 1$, and we can inductively assume that it has a reconstructible map \bar{a} .

Define a in the following way:

- (i) If $C \subset G_1$ is such a convex set, that $C \cap H_1 \neq \emptyset$, then define $a(C) = \bar{a}(C \cap H_1)$.
- (ii) If $C \subset G_1$ is such a convex set, that $C \cap H_1 = \emptyset$, then define $a(C)$ in the following way. One can consider C as a subset of the OM expanded by g , where it lies completely in the positive halfspace

w.r.t. coordinate g . Let cocircuit X be the solution to the LP with respect to C and g , given by Theorem 2.2. In fact, since $C \cap H_1 = \emptyset$, the program is bounded, as well as $\mathcal{T}(X)$ is not crossed by E_g . By Lemma 2.3, $C \cap \mathcal{T}(X)$ is included in a corner D of $\mathcal{T}(X)$. Inductively, we can assume that the affine OM $\mathcal{T}(X) \setminus D$ has a reconstructible map, which can be extended to a reconstructible map b on $\mathcal{T}(X)$, by Proposition 3.2. In fact, b is such that $|b(C)| = \text{vc}(\mathcal{T}(X))$ for every $C \subset D$. Define $a(C) = b(C \cap \mathcal{T}(X))$. Since E_g does not cross $\mathcal{T}(X)$, $g \neq a(C)$. See Figure 3 for an example.

The VC-dimension of an affine OM is the same as the VC-dimension of the tope graphs of its cocircuits. Hence note that in case (i) $|a(C)| < \text{vc}(H)$, since \bar{a} is a reconstructible map of H_1 with $\text{vc}(H_1) = \text{vc}(H) - 1$. In case (ii) $|a(C)| = \text{vc}(H)$, since $C \cap D$ is by design in the corner D of $\mathcal{T}(X)$ and for all such sets $|b(C \cap \mathcal{T}(X))| = \text{vc}(\mathcal{T}(X)) = \text{vc}(H)$.

We now prove that a is a reconstructible map.

(a) For every convex set $C \in \mathcal{H}(G_1)$ it holds $a(C) \subset \text{osc}(C)$:

First we analyse case (i), hence assume C is such that $C \cap H_1 \neq \emptyset$. Every E_e that osculates $C \cap H_1$ in H_1 also osculates C in H . Hence $a(C) = \bar{a}(C \cap H_1) \subset \text{osc}_{H_1}(C \cap H_1) \subset \text{osc}_H(C)$.

Similar analysis can be done in case (ii). If E_e osculates $C \cap \mathcal{T}(X)$ in $\mathcal{T}(X)$, then it also osculates C in H . Hence $a(C) = b(C \cap \mathcal{T}(X)) \subset \text{osc}_{\mathcal{T}(X)}(C \cap \mathcal{T}(X)) \subset \text{osc}_H(C)$.

(b) For every $V \in \text{Im}(a)$, the intersection $\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(G), a(C)=V} C$ is non-empty. If $|V| < \text{vc}(H)$, then all the convex sets that are mapped into V are from case (i), hence $\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(H), a(C)=V} C = \bigcap_{C' \in \mathcal{H}(H_1), \bar{a}(C')=V} C' \neq \emptyset$, since \bar{a} is a reconstructible map.

Let now $|V| = \text{vc}(H)$. Since V is shattered by G and the size of V is equal to the rank of H there exist a unique cocircuit X of H , that is crossed by all the Θ -classes in V . Hence $\bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(H), \bar{a}(C)=V} C = \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(H), X \text{ is a solution of a LP w.r.t. } C \text{ and } g, \text{ and } b(C \cap \mathcal{T}(X))=V} C = \bigcap_{C \in \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{T}(X)), b(C)=V} C \neq \emptyset$, where b is the reconstructible map of $\mathcal{T}(X)$.

Finally, every $V \in \text{Im}(a)$ is shattered by H , since it is shattered by H_1 or by $\mathcal{T}(X)$ for some cocircuit X of H . This finishes the proof. \square

Proper unlabeled sample compression schemes and corner peeling

Complexes of Oriented Matroids (COMs) were introduced in [3] as a generalization of OMs (and affine OMs) preserving many properties without demanding to be centrally symmetric. The class of tope graphs of COMs includes many interesting classes of graphs, such as ample classes (lopsided sets) [2], hypercellular graphs [7], median graphs [11], etc. They can be formally defined by replacing property **(Sym)**, with a weaker one:

Definition 3.4. A complex of an oriented matroids (COM) is a system of sign vectors $\mathcal{M} = (U, \mathcal{L})$ satisfying properties **(C)**, **(SE)**, and

(FS) $X \circ -Y \in \mathcal{L}$ for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}$.

It remains an open problem to find unlabeled sample compression schemes for ample classes, hence it is also unknown if unlabeled sample compression schemes for COMs exist. One way to analyze COMs is to see them as a union of OMs glued together in a particular way [3]. In [13], a *corner* of the tope graph of a COM G was defined as such a set $D \subset G$ that D is a corner of a unique maximal sub-OM, more precisely D lies in a unique maximal convex subgraph H , that is a tope graph of an OM, and D is a corner of H , see Figure 4.

Removing a corner D in a tope graph of a COM G results in $G \setminus D$ also being a COM [13]. A COM G is said to have a *corner peeling* if one can partition its vertices into D_1, \dots, D_k , such that D_i is a corner of $G \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} D_j$.

We have the following corollary of Proposition 3.2:




Figure 4: The tope graph of a COM with VC-dimension 2 having corners D_1, \dots, D_6 .

Corollary 3.5. *Every COM G that has a corner peeling, has a reconstructible map, thus a proper unlabeled sample compression scheme of size bounded by $\text{vc}(G)$.*

Proof. Let D be a corner of G and inductively assume that $G \setminus D$ has a reconstructible map \bar{a} . Expanding \bar{a} to a reconstructible map a of G can be done identically as in the proof of Proposition 3.2, by defining $a(C) = \bar{a}(C \cap (G \setminus D))$ if $C \cap (G \setminus D)$ is non-empty and $a(C) = b(C)$ otherwise, where b is given by Lemma 2.6 for the unique sub-OM H , that includes D .

The only point that needs to be proved to repeat the proof of Proposition 3.2 is that the image of \bar{a} and image of b , limited to convex sets of D , do not intersect. The crucial point is that for every $V = b(C), C \subset D$, set V is not shattered in $G \setminus D$, so $V \neq \bar{a}(C)$ for all C . It follows from [13, Lemma 5.8], that if V is shattered by a COM G , it must be shattered by a sub-OM. Since b maps to sets of order equal to $\text{vc}(H)$ and H is a maximal sub-OM, it is a unique sub-OM that shatters V . But H does not exist in $G \setminus D$. \square

The above result generalizes the result [18] that ample classes with corner peelings have proper unlabeled sample compression schemes bounded by their VC-dimension. In fact, our result in this particular case gives the same maps as the representation maps of [6] imply. As a consequence of our result hypercellular graphs [7] (hence also bipartite cellular graphs [1]), COMs with VC-dimension at most 2 and realizable COMs all have proper unlabeled sample compression schemes bounded by their VC-dimension, since they were proved to have a corner peeling [13]. Moreover, by results of [9], partial cubes with VC-dimension 2 can be extended to COMs with the same VC-dimension, implying that they have (improper) unlabeled compression schemes of size 2.

4 Acknowledgment

The research was partially supported by ARRS projects P1-0297, N1-0095, J1-1693 and N1-0218.

References

- [1] H.-J. BANDELT AND V. CHEPOI, *Cellular bipartite graphs*, European J. Combin., 17 (1996), pp. 121–134.
- [2] H.-J. BANDELT, V. CHEPOI, A. DRESS, AND J. KOOLEN, *Combinatorics of lopsided sets*, European J. Combin., 27 (2006), pp. 669–689.
- [3] H.-J. BANDELT, V. CHEPOI, AND K. KNAUER, *COMs: complexes of oriented matroids.*, J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A, 156 (2018), pp. 195–237.
- [4] S. BEN-DAVID AND A. LITMAN, *Combinatorial variability of Vapnik-Chervonenkis classes with applications to sample compression schemes*, Discrete Appl. Math., 86 (1998), pp. 3–25.

- [5] A. BJÖRNER, M. LAS VERGNAS, B. STURMFELS, N. WHITE, AND G. M. ZIEGLER, *Oriented matroids*, vol. 46 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Second ed., 1999.
- [6] J. CHALOPIN, V. CHEPOI, S. MORAN, AND M. K. WARMUTH, *Unlabeled sample compression schemes and corner peelings for ample and maximum classes*, *J. Comput. System Sci.*, (2022), pp. 1–28.
- [7] V. CHEPOI, K. KNAUER, AND T. MARC, *Hypercellular graphs: Partial cubes without Q_3^- as partial cube minor*, *Discrete Math.*, (2019), p. 111678.
- [8] V. CHEPOI, K. KNAUER, AND M. PHILIBERT, *Labeled sample compression schemes for complexes of oriented matroids*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.15168, (2021).
- [9] V. CHEPOI, K. KNAUER, AND M. PHILIBERT, *Ample completions of oriented matroids and complexes of uniform oriented matroids*, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 36 (2022), pp. 509–535.
- [10] S. FLOYD AND M. WARMUTH, *Sample compression, learnability, and the vapnik-chervonenkis dimension*, *Mach. Learn.*, 21 (1995), pp. 269–304.
- [11] R. HAMMACK, W. IMRICH, AND S. KLAVŽAR, *Handbook of product graphs*, *Discrete Math. Appl.*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2011.
- [12] D. HELMBOLD, R. SLOAN, AND M. K. WARMUTH, *Learning nested differences of intersection-closed concept classes*, *Mach. Learn.*, 5 (1990), pp. 165–196.
- [13] K. KNAUER AND T. MARC, *Corners and simpliciality in oriented matroids and partial cubes*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.11403, (2020).
- [14] K. KNAUER AND T. MARC, *On tope graphs of complexes of oriented matroids*, *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 63 (2020), pp. 377–417.
- [15] N. LITTLESTONE AND M. WARMUTH, *Relating data compression and learnability*, unpublished, (1986).
- [16] A. MANDEL, *Topology of oriented matroids*, PhD Thesis, (1982).
- [17] S. MORAN AND M. K. WARMUTH, *Labeled compression schemes for extremal classes*, in *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, Springer, 2016, pp. 34–49.
- [18] B. I. RUBINSTEIN AND J. H. RUBINSTEIN, *A geometric approach to sample compression.*, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 13 (2012).
- [19] V. N. VAPNIK AND A. Y. CHERVONENKIS, *On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities*, in *Measures of complexity*, Springer, 2015, pp. 11–30.