

Greedy Matchings in Bipartite Graphs with Ordered Vertex Sets

Hans Ulrich Simon

February 13, 2024

Abstract

We define and study greedy matchings in finite bipartite graphs. The latter are of the form $G = (L, R, E)$ where the vertex classes L and R are equipped with a linear ordering, respectively. We should think of the linear orderings as preference relations. It is shown that each vertex-ordered bipartite graph has a unique greedy matching. The proof uses (a weak form of) Newman’s lemma.¹ We say a matching M in G is of *order* $k < \infty$ if, on one hand, M matches all vertices in L and, on the other hand, M leaves the $|R| - k$ (but not more) vertices of lowest preference in R unmatched. If M does not match each vertex in L , then its order is defined as ∞ . The goal is now to find a matching of minimum order in G . We show that the linear ordering imposed on L can be chosen so that the resulting greedy matching is of minimum order. A similar result is shown for matchings with the PBT-property (a property that is relevant in the so-called Preference-Based Teaching model). Suppose that $G = (C, \mathcal{S}, E)$ is (a vertex-ordered version of) the consistency graph associated with a concept class C and the corresponding family \mathcal{S} of labeled samples. Suppose furthermore that the ordering of the samples in \mathcal{S} is chosen such that smaller samples are preferred over larger ones. It is shown in [2] that the largest sample that is assigned by the greedy matching to one of the concepts in C has size at most $\log |C|$. We show that this upper bound is tight modulo a constant by proving a matching lower bound for a specific family of concept classes. The study of greedy matchings in vertex-ordered bipartite graphs is motivated by problems in learning theory like illustrating or teaching concepts by means of labeled examples.

1 Introduction

Consider a bipartite graph $G = (L, R, E)$ with vertex sets L (the vertices on the left-hand side) and R (the vertices on the right-hand side). Imagine that we have imposed a linear ordering, called preference relation, on both vertex sets. A *greedy matching* in G is defined as a maximal matching M that can be produced edge-by-edge such that each new edge (to be inserted into M) is chosen in accordance with the following greedy-selection principle:

¹In its original form, this lemma states that a noetherian relation is confluent iff it is locally confluent.

1. Pick a most preferred vertex z taken either from the still unmatched vertices of L or taken from the still unmatched vertices of R (two options for choosing z).
2. Match the vertex z with the vertex of highest preference that is a possible partner of z .²

Suppose that y_1, \dots, y_N is a list of all elements in R such that y_k is the element with the k -highest preference. The *order* of a matching M is defined as the largest number k such that y_k is matched by M . A matching in G is called *L -saturating* if every $x \in L$ is matched by M . We aim at finding an L -saturating matching of smallest order. This problem arises naturally in learning theory, where we have a concept class $C \subseteq 2^X$ over a domain X at the place of L and the family \mathcal{S} of all realizable samples at the place of R . The graph $G = (C, \mathcal{S}, E)$ is then the so-called consistency graph which contains the edge (c, S) iff the concept c is consistent with the sample S . A C -saturating matching M assigns to each concept $c \in C$ a sample $M(c) \in \mathcal{S}$ so that c is consistent with $M(c)$ and so that different samples are assigned to different concepts. Intuitively, we can think of $M(c)$ as a sample which illustrates or, perhaps, even *teaches* c by means of labeled examples.

Example 1.1. *Suppose that M has the property that $S = M(c)$ does not only imply that c is consistent with S but also that each concept of higher preference than c is not consistent with S . Then c can be derived from S simply by choosing the most preferred concept that is consistent with S . We are then in the so-called Preference-Based Teaching model (= PBT-model). See [3] for a formal definition of this model.*

In order to discuss greedy matchings in the consistency graph $G = (C, \mathcal{S}, E)$, one has first to impose linear orderings on C and on \mathcal{S} . It looks natural, for instance, to prefer simple concepts over less simple ones and to prefer samples of small size over samples of larger size. However, one could also be interested in an ordering of the concepts in C that is cleverly chosen so that the resulting greedy matching is a C -saturating matching of smallest possible order.

The main results in this paper are as follows:

1. Each bipartite graph G with linearly ordered vertex sets has a unique greedy matching.³ This result is obtained by considering an abstract rewriting system whose objects are the matchings in G and whose binary relation between the objects has something to do with the above greedy-selection principle. The proof of uniqueness of the greedy matching will then be a simple application of Newman's lemma [4]. See Section 2 for details.
2. Suppose that G has an L -saturating matching. Then the greedy matching in G is an L -saturating matching of minimum order provided that the linear ordering of the vertices in L is chosen appropriately. A similar result holds for L -saturating matchings

²A "possible partner" of z is any still unmatched vertex that is adjacent to z .

³A related, but weaker, result is contained in [2]. See Section 2 for a more detailed discussion.

with the so-called PBT-property (a property that is relevant in the Preference-Based Teaching model). See Section 3 for details.

3. Suppose that $G = (C, \mathcal{S}, E)$ is the consistency graph associated with a concept class C and the corresponding family \mathcal{S} of labeled samples. Suppose furthermore that the linear ordering imposed on \mathcal{S} is chosen such that smaller samples are preferred over larger ones. Then the largest sample assigned by the greedy matching to one of the concepts in C has size at most $\log |C|$.⁴ This upper bound is tight modulo a constant, which is shown by presenting a matching lower bound for a specific family of concept classes. See Section 4 for details.

Tacit Agreement: All (directed or undirected) graphs considered in this paper are assumed to be finite.

2 Abstract Rewriting Systems and Greedy Matchings

In Section 2.1 we recall the definition of abstract rewriting systems and Newman’s lemma [4], but we restrict ourselves to the finite case. In the finite case, Newman’s lemma can be stated in a simple form and its proof becomes quite short and straightforward. In Section 2.2, we consider matchings in a vertex-ordered bipartite graph as the objects of an abstract rewriting system. Then we define the notion of greedy matchings and, as an application of Newman’s lemma, we show that every vertex-ordered bipartite graph has a unique greedy matching. The latter result is more general than a related result in [2].

2.1 Abstract Rewriting Systems (ARS)

A (*finite*) *abstract rewriting system (ARS)* is formally given by a directed graph $D = (V, A)$. We write $a \rightarrow b$ if $(a, b) \in A$. We write $a \xrightarrow{*} b$ and say that b is *reachable from* a if D contains a path from a to b . D is said to satisfy the *unique-sink condition* if, for every $a \in V$, there exists a sink $b \in V$ such that b is the only sink that is reachable from a . D is said to be *confluent* (resp. *locally confluent*) *at vertex* a if, for every choice of $b, c \in V$ such that $a \xrightarrow{*} b$ and $a \xrightarrow{*} c$ (resp. such that $a \rightarrow b$ and $a \rightarrow c$), there exists a vertex $d \in V$ such that $b \xrightarrow{*} d$ and $c \xrightarrow{*} d$. D is said to be *confluent* (resp. *locally confluent*) if it is confluent (resp. locally confluent) at every vertex $a \in V$. These notions are related as follows:

Lemma 2.1 (Newman’s Lemma specialized to finite ARS). *Suppose that $D = (V, A)$ is an acyclic digraph. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

1. D satisfies the unique-sink condition.
2. D is confluent.

⁴As explained in more detail in Section 4, this result is implicitly contained in [2].

3. D is locally confluent.

Proof. Suppose that D satisfies the unique-sink condition. Consider a triple $a, b, c \in V$ such that $a \xrightarrow{*} b$ and $a \xrightarrow{*} c$. There is a unique sink b' (resp. c') such that every path starting at b (resp. starting at c) and ending at a sink actually ends in b' (resp. in c'). Moreover, because D is acyclic, such paths $b \xrightarrow{*} b'$ and $c \xrightarrow{*} c'$ must exist. Hence we have the situation

$$\mathbf{b}' \xleftarrow{*} b \xleftarrow{*} a \xrightarrow{*} c \xrightarrow{*} \mathbf{c}'$$

where symbols representing sinks are written in bold. Applying now the unique-sink condition with start vertex a , we may conclude that $b' = c'$. It follows from this discussion that D is confluent.

If D is confluent, then it is all the more true that D is locally confluent.

Suppose that D is locally confluent. The *height* of $a \in V$ is defined as the length of the longest path from a to some sink. We will prove by induction on n that, for every $n \geq 0$, the unique-sink condition holds for every start vertex of height at most n . This is certainly true for $n = 0$ (in which case the start vertex is a sink itself). Assume it is true for start vertices of height at most n . Consider a vertex $a \in V$ of height $n + 1$ (if there is any). Let P_1 and P_2 be two arbitrarily chosen paths which start at a and end at a sink, say P_1 ends at the sink b' and P_2 ends at the sink c' . We have to show that $b' = c'$. This is immediate by induction if P_1 and P_2 start with the same arc. Let us therefore assume that P_1 starts with the arc $a \rightarrow b$, P_2 starts with the arc $a \rightarrow c$ and $b \neq c$. Since D is locally confluent and acyclic, there must exist a sink a' such that $b \xrightarrow{*} a'$ and $c \xrightarrow{*} a'$. Hence we have the situation

$$\mathbf{b}' \xleftarrow{*} b \leftarrow a \rightarrow c \xrightarrow{*} \mathbf{c}' \quad \text{and} \quad b \xrightarrow{*} \mathbf{a}' \xleftarrow{*} c$$

where, as before, symbols representing sinks are written in bold. The height of b is at most n . Hence the unique-sink condition holds for start vertex b . It follows that $b' = a'$. The analogous reasoning for start vertex c reveals that $c' = a'$, Hence $b' = c'$, which concludes the proof. \square

2.2 Greedy Matchings

Let $G = (L, R, E)$ be a bipartite graph with vertex sets L and R and with edge set E . We write $x \sim y$ if x and y are neighbors in G . Assume that we have imposed a linear order \succ_L on L and also a linear order \succ_R on R . We will then refer to $G = (L, R, E)$, equipped with linear \succ_L and \succ_R , as a *vertex-ordered* bipartite graph. In the sequel, we will simply use the symbol \succ and it will always be clear from context which of the two linear orderings it refers to. Intuitively we should think of \succ as a preference relation: $a \succ b$ means that a is preferred over b . Consider now the following ARS $D_G = (V, A)$:

1. The vertices in V represent matchings in G (including the empty matching), i.e.,

$$V = \{v_M : M \subseteq E \text{ is a matching in } G\} .$$

2. For each matching M in G , we denote by $L_M \subseteq L$ the set of vertices in L which are still unmatched by M and which are furthermore adjacent to at least one vertex in R that is also still unmatched by M . The set $R_M \subseteq R$ is defined analogously.
3. We include the arc $(v_M, v_{M'}) \in V \times V$ in A if and only if the sets L_M and R_M are non-empty and M' is of the form $M' = M \cup \{\{x^*, y^*\}\}$ such that at least one of the following two conditions is satisfied:

L-Condition: x^* is the vertex of highest preference in L_M and y^* is the vertex of highest preference in $\{y \in R_M : y \sim x^*\}$.

R-Condition: y^* is the vertex of highest preference in R_M and x^* is the vertex of highest preference in $\{x \in L_M : x \sim y^*\}$.

A few (rather obvious) remarks are in place here:

1. If $(v_M, v_{M'}) \in A$, then $|M'| = |M| + 1$, which implies that D_G is acyclic.
2. Either L_M and R_M are both empty or they are both non-empty. In the former case, M is maximal matching and v_M is a sink. In the latter case, M is not a maximal matching and v_M is not a sink.
3. Each non-sink v_M in D_G has outdegree 1 or 2. More precisely, v_M has outdegree 1 (resp. 2) if the vertex of highest preference in L_M is adjacent (resp. not adjacent) to the vertex of highest preference in R_M .

A matching $M \subseteq E$ in G is called a *maximal greedy matching* or simply a *greedy matching* if v_M is a sink in D_G (i.e, M is maximal matching in G) and $v_\emptyset \xrightarrow{*} v_M$ (i.e., the vertex representing M is reachable from the vertex representing the empty matching). Since D_G will in general contain many vertices of outdegree 2, it seems, at first glance, that there could be many distinct greedy matchings in G . However, we will show the following result:

Theorem 2.2. *Every vertex-ordered bipartite graph $G = (L, R, E)$ has a unique greedy matching.*

Proof. It suffices to show that D_G satisfies the unique-sink condition.⁵ Since D_G is acyclic, Newman's lemma applies and it suffices to show that D_G is locally confluent. Clearly D_G is locally confluent at any vertex v_M of outdegree 0 or 1. Consider therefore a vertex v_M of outdegree 2, say with an outgoing arc to v_{M_1} and another outgoing arc to v_{M_2} . We may assume that $M_1 = M \cup \{\{x_1^*, y_1^*\}\}$ satisfies the L -condition while $M_2 = M \cup \{\{x_2^*, y_2^*\}\}$ satisfies the R -condition. It follows that x_1^* is the vertex of highest preference in L_M and y_1^* is the vertex of highest preference in $\{y \in R_M : y \sim x_1^*\}$. Similarly, y_2^* is the vertex of highest preference in R_M and x_2^* is the vertex of highest preference in $\{x \in L_M : x \sim y_2^*\}$. Moreover

⁵The unique sink reachable from v_\emptyset then represents the unique greedy matching.

$x_1^* \neq x_2^*$ and $y_2^* \neq y_1^*$ (because, otherwise, the outdegree of v_M would be 1). Consider the matching

$$M_3 := M \cup \{\{x_1^*, y_1^*\}, \{x_2^*, y_2^*\}\} = M_1 \cup \{\{x_2^*, y_2^*\}\} = M_2 \cup \{\{x_1^*, y_1^*\}\} .$$

With respect to M_1 , M_3 satisfies the R -condition while, with respect to M_2 , M_3 satisfies the L -condition. Therefore $v_{M_1} \rightarrow v_{M_3}$ and $v_{M_2} \rightarrow v_{M_3}$. It follows from this discussion that D_G is locally confluent. \square

Let M_G denote the unique greedy matching in G . Let L_M and R_M be defined as in the definition of D_G above. Consider the following greedy procedure P_{greedy} for an edge-by-edge generation of M_G .

Initialization: $M \leftarrow \emptyset$.

Main Loop: If M is a maximal matching in G , then return $M_G = M$ and stop. Otherwise let x^* be the most preferred vertex in L_M , let y^* be the most preferred vertex in $\{y \in R_M : y \sim x^*\}$, and insert the edge $\{x^*, y^*\}$ into M .

Let P'_{greedy} be the corresponding procedure with exchanged roles of L and R . It was shown in [2] (without using ARS-theory) that the procedures P_{greedy} and P'_{greedy} construct the same matching. In terms of the paths in D_G , this means that *two very special paths* from v_\emptyset to a sink — the path all of whose arcs have been inserted into A on base of the L -condition and the path all of whose arcs have been inserted into A on base of the R -condition — end at the same sink. Theorem 2.2 is more general and implies that *all* paths from v_\emptyset to a sink must necessarily end at the same sink.

3 L-Saturating Matchings of Minimum Order

Let $G = (L, R, E)$ be a bipartite graph with a linearly ordered vertex set R . Let $y_1 \succ y_2 \succ \dots \succ y_N$ be an ordered list of the vertices in R . We say that a matching $M \subseteq E$ in G *saturates* L if every vertex in L is matched by M . The *order* of M is defined as the smallest number k such that M is an L -saturating matching that leaves y_{k+1}, \dots, y_N unmatched. If M is not L -saturating, then its order is ∞ .

In order to make the greedy matching in G unique, we will have to commit ourselves to a linear ordering of the vertices in L . For every fixed ordering \succ , we denote the resulting greedy matching in G by M_G^\succ . We will now pursue the question whether an L -saturating matching of minimum order can be obtained in a greedy fashion. We begin with the following result:

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that $G = (L, R, E)$ is a bipartite graph with a linearly ordered vertex set R . Then, for every matching M in G , there exists a linear ordering \succ of the vertices in L such that the order of M_G^\succ is less than or equal to the order of M (which implies that, if M is L -saturating, then M_G^\succ is L -saturating too).*

Proof. If M is not L -saturating, then its order is ∞ and there is nothing to show. We may therefore assume that M is L -saturating. Let $m = |L|$ and let k be the order of M . Let $y_{i(1)} \succ \dots \succ y_{i(m)}$ with $1 \leq i(1) < \dots < i(m) \leq k$ be an ordered list of those vertices in $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ that have an M -partner in L . For $j = 1, \dots, m$, let x_j denote the vertex in L with M -partner $y_{i(j)}$. Now impose the linear ordering $x_1 \succ \dots \succ x_m$ on the vertices in L . In other words, the vertices in L inherit the ordering from their M -partners in R . Think of M_G^\succ as being generated edge-by-edge by the procedure P_{greedy} . Let $y_{i'(j)}$ denote the M_G^\succ -partner of x_j . By a straightforward induction, we get $i'(j) \leq i(j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. Since the matching M leaves the vertices y_{k+1}, \dots, y_N unmatched, this is all the more true for the matching M_G^\succ . \square

From Theorem 3.1, the following result is immediate:

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose that $G = (L, R, E)$ is a bipartite graph that has an L -saturating matching and its vertex set R is equipped with a linear ordering. Then there exists a linear ordering \succ of the vertices in L such that M_G^\succ is an L -saturating matching of minimum order.*

Let now $G = (L, R, E)$ be a bipartite graph both of whose vertex sets are equipped with a linear ordering. An L -saturating matching M has the *PBT-property*⁶ if, for every triple x, y, x' such that y is the M -partner of x and $x' \succ x$, it follows that $x' \not\sim y$. In other words, the M -partner x of y is the vertex of highest preference in $\{x \in L : x \sim y\}$.

The following greedy procedure P_{greedy}^{PBT} is quite similar to the procedure P_{greedy} but it is tailor-made so as to return an L -saturating matching M_G^{PBT} with the PBT-property (if possible):

Initialization: $M \leftarrow \emptyset$.

Main Loop: 1. If $L_M = \emptyset$ then return $M_G^{PBT} = M$ and stop. Otherwise let x^* be the vertex of highest preference in L_M , set

$$R'_M \leftarrow \{y \in R_M : y \sim x^* \text{ but } y \not\sim x' \text{ for every } x' \succ x\},$$

and proceed with the next instruction.

2. If $R'_M = \emptyset$, then return $M_G^{PBT} = M$ and stop.⁷ Otherwise let y^* be the most preferred vertex in R'_M and insert the edge $\{x^*, y^*\}$ into M .

We refer to the matching M_G^{PBT} that is returned by procedure P_{greedy}^{PBT} as the greedy matching with the PBT-property. This matching is optimal in the following sense:

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that $G = (L, R, E)$ is a vertex-ordered bipartite graph that has an L -saturating matching with the PBT-property. Then M_G^{PBT} is also L -saturating. Moreover, among all L -saturating matchings with the PBT-property, M_G^{PBT} is of the smallest order.*

⁶PBT = Preference-Based Teaching

⁷In this case, the returned matching M_G^{PBT} is not L -saturating.

Proof. Let M be an arbitrary L -saturating matching with the PBT-property. Let $x_1 \succ \dots \succ x_m$ be an ordered list of all elements in L . Similarly, let $y_1 \succ \dots \succ y_N$ be an ordered list of all elements in R . Let k be the order of M , i.e., y_k is matched by M but y_{k+1}, \dots, y_N are unmatched. Let $y_{i(1)}, \dots, y_{i(m)}$ be the M -partners of $x_1 \dots, x_m$, respectively. Since M has the PBT-property, it follows that $y_{i(j)} \sim x_j$ and $y_{i(j)} \not\sim x_{j'}$ for all $j' = 1, \dots, j-1$. Thus, when P_{greedy}^{PBT} is about to match x_j , we can be sure that $y_{i(j)}$ is still unmatched. Hence P_{greedy}^{PBT} matches x_j with $y_{i(j)}$ or even with a y_i for some $i < i(j)$. We may conclude from this discussion that M_G^{PBT} is an L -saturating matching with the PBT-property that leaves the vertices y_{k+1}, \dots, y_N unmatched. Since M had been chosen arbitrarily, it follows that M_G^{PBT} is of the smallest possible order. \square

4 Bounds on the Order of L -Saturating Matchings

In this section, we will restrict ourselves to the following setting (which is the standard setting for binary classification problems in learning theory):

- At the place of the vertex set L , we have a class C of concepts over some finite domain X , i.e., $C \subseteq 2^X$. Each $c \in C$ is a function $c : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which assigns a binary label to each point in the domain.
- A pair $(x, b) \in X \times \{0, 1\}$ is called a *labeled example*. A set S of labeled examples is called a *sample*. A concept $c \in C$ is consistent with a sample S if, for every $(x, b) \in S$, we have that $c(x) = b$. A sample S is called *realizable by C* if C contains a concept that is consistent with S .
- At the place of R , we have the family \mathcal{S} of all C -realizable samples.
- The bipartite graph G is chosen as (a vertex-ordered version of) the *consistency graph* associated with C and X , i.e., $G = (C, \mathcal{S}, E)$ where

$$E = \{(c, S) \in C \times \mathcal{S} : c \text{ is consistent with } S\} .$$

- Samples of smaller size are preferred over samples of larger size, but ordering by cardinality is a partial ordering only. We assume that the \succ -ordering imposed on \mathcal{S} is a linear extension of the (partial) cardinality-ordering.
- Let $S_1 \succ \dots \succ S_N$ be an ordered list of all C -realizable samples. Let M be a matching of order k in G . Then S_k is the largest sample that is matched by M and $|S_k|$ is called the *cost caused by M* .

Since any concept $c \in C$ coincides with the unique concept in C that is consistent with the full sample $\{(x, c(x)) : x \in X\}$, it is clear that G has a C -saturating matching. In particular, the greedy matching in G is C -saturating. In [2], the authors raise the question of how the cost caused by the greedy matching in G can be bounded from above in terms of $|C|$. They make the following observation:

Remark 4.1 ([2]). Let $G = (C, \mathcal{S}, E)$ be (a vertex-ordered version of) the consistency graph associated with concept class C . Let M_G be the greedy matching in G and let q denote its cost. Consider a concept $c \in C$ whose M_G -partner is a sample $S \in \mathcal{S}$ of size q . Because the greedy matching would prefer, as a partner for c , any still unmatched proper subsample of S over S , it follows that all proper subsamples of S in \mathcal{S} are already matched with concepts of higher preference than c . Since there are 2^{q-1} proper subsamples of S in \mathcal{S} , we may conclude that $|C| \geq 2^{q-1} + 1 > 2^{q-1}$.

From this observation, the following upper bound is immediate:

Corollary 4.2. For any finite domain X , any concept class $C \subseteq 2^X$ and any linear ordering imposed on C , the cost caused by the greedy matching in the consistency graph $G = (C, \mathcal{S}, E)$ is bounded from above by $\lceil \log |C| \rceil$.

Proof. Let q denote the cost caused by the greedy matching in G . The inequality $|C| > 2^{q-1}$ from Remark 4.1 can be rewritten as $q < 1 + \log |C|$. Since q is an integer, it follows that $q \leq \lceil \log |C| \rceil$. \square

Somewhat surprisingly perhaps, this simply knitted upper bound is tight (modulo a small constant). More precisely, we will show the following result:

Theorem 4.3. There exists a universal constant γ_0 such that, for any finite domain X and for any linear ordering imposed on $C_{all} = 2^X = \{c : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}\}$, the cost caused by the greedy matching in the consistency graph $G = (C_{all}, \mathcal{S}, E)$ is bounded from below by $\gamma_0 \cdot \log |C_{all}|$.

Proof. For sake of brevity, set $n = |X|$ so that $|C_{all}| = 2^n$ and $\log |C_{all}| = n$. For $d = 0, 1, \dots, n$, set $\Phi_d(n) = \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{n}{i}$. It is well known [1] that $\Phi_d(n) \leq \left(\frac{en}{d}\right)^d$. The number of labeled samples of size at most d equals

$$\sum_{i=0}^d \binom{n}{i} 2^i \leq 2^d \Phi_d(n) \leq \left(\frac{2en}{d}\right)^d.$$

Let d^* be the smallest number $d \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $\left(\frac{2en}{d}\right)^d \geq 2^n$. For obvious reasons, the order of the greedy matching is bounded from below by d^* . Setting $\gamma^* = d^*/n \leq 1$, we obtain the inequality $\left(\frac{2e}{\gamma^*}\right)^{\gamma^* n} \geq 2^n$, or equivalently, $\left(\frac{2e}{\gamma^*}\right)^{\gamma^*} \geq 2$. Consider the function $h(\gamma) = \left(\frac{2e}{\gamma}\right)^\gamma$. Note that $h(1) = 2e > 2$.

Claim: The function $h(\gamma)$ is increasing in the interval $(0, 1]$ and $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} h(\gamma) = 1$.

The claim implies that there is a unique real number $0 < \gamma_0 \leq 1$ which satisfies $h(\gamma_0) = 2$ and $\gamma_0 = \min\{\gamma \in (0, 1] : h(\gamma) \geq 2\}$.⁸ Since $h(\gamma^*) = \left(\frac{2e}{\gamma^*}\right)^{\gamma^*} \geq 2$ and $0 < \gamma^* \leq 1$, it follows

⁸Numerical calculations reveal that $0.214 < \gamma_0 < 0.215$.

that $\gamma^* \geq \gamma_0$ and $d^* \geq \gamma_0 n$.

Although the verification of the above claim is an easy application of calculus, we will now present a proof thereby making the paper more self-contained. The function h can be written in the form

$$h(\gamma) = \exp \left[\gamma \cdot \ln \left(\frac{2e}{\gamma} \right) \right] = \exp(g(\gamma)) \quad \text{for } g(\gamma) = \gamma \cdot \ln \left(\frac{2e}{\gamma} \right) .$$

Since the exponential function is continuous and monotonically increasing, it suffices to show that $g(\gamma)$ is increasing in the interval $(0, 1]$ and $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} g(\gamma) = 0$. Building the first derivative of g , we get

$$g'(\gamma) = \ln \left(\frac{2e}{\gamma} \right) + \gamma \cdot \frac{\gamma}{2e} \cdot \frac{-2e}{\gamma^2} = \ln \left(\frac{2e}{\gamma} \right) - 1 .$$

Clearly $g'(\gamma) > 0$ for all $0 < \gamma < 2$. Hence $h(\gamma)$ is increasing in the interval $(0, 1]$ (and even in the interval $(0, 2)$). We observe that

$$\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} g(\gamma) = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} (\gamma \cdot \ln(2e)) + \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow 0} \left(\gamma \cdot \ln \left(\frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \right) = 0 + \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln(x)}{x} = 0 ,$$

which completes the proof of the claim. □

References

- [1] Suresh Chari, Pankaj Rohatgi, and Aravind Srinivasan. Improved algorithms via approximations of probability distributions. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 584–592, 1994.
- [2] Cèsar Ferri, Dario Garigliotti, Brigit Arve Toppe Håvardstun, Josè Hernández-Orallo, and Jan Arne Telle. When redundancy matters: Machine teaching of representations. arXiv2401.12711, 2024.
- [3] Ziyuan Gao, Christoph Ries, Hans U. Simon, and Sandra Zilles. Preference-based teaching. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(31):1–32, 2017.
- [4] Max A. H. Newman. On theories with a combinatorial definition of “equivalence”. *The Annals of Mathematics*, 43(2):223–243, 1942.