

# A Mereological Approach to Higher-Order Structure in Complex Systems: from Macro to Micro with Möbius

Abel Jansma\*

*Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Germany and  
School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom*

(Dated: July 3, 2024)

Relating microscopic interactions to macroscopic observables is a central challenge in the study of complex systems. Addressing this question requires understanding both pairwise and *higher-order* interactions, but the latter are less well understood. We present a unified mathematical formalism for deriving higher-order interactions from macroscopic observables, relative to a chosen decomposition of the system into its parts. Applying this framework to a diverse range of systems, we demonstrate that many existing notions of higher-order interactions, from epistasis in genetics and many-body couplings in physics, to synergy in game theory and artificial intelligence, naturally and uniquely arise from an appropriate mereological decomposition through the Möbius inversion theorem. By revealing the common mathematical structure underlying seemingly disparate phenomena, our work highlights the fundamental role of decomposition choice in the definition and estimation of higher-order interactions. We discuss how this unifying perspective can facilitate the transfer of insights across domains, guide the selection of appropriate system decompositions, and enable the search for new notions of interaction. To illustrate how this works in practice, we derive a new decomposition of the Kullback-Leibler divergence, and show that it correctly disentangles divergences among the variables of simulated spin models. Our results suggest that the Möbius inversion theorem provides a powerful and practical lens for understanding the emergence of complex behaviour from the interplay of microscopic parts, with applications across a wide range of disciplines.

arXiv:2404.14423v4 [physics.data-an] 2 Jul 2024

---

\* abel.jansma@mis.mpg.de

## CONTENTS

I. Introduction	2
A. Higher-order interactions	3
B. Aim and Contributions	3
C. Related work	3
II. Möbius Inversion as a Mereological Framework	4
A. Preliminaries	4
B. Decomposing Systems from Macro to Micro	5
C. Inverting decompositions with Möbius functions	6
III. Möbius Inversions in Complex Systems	7
A. Information theory	8
1. Entropy and Mutual Information	8
2. The Partial Information Decomposition	8
B. Biology	9
1. Epistasis	9
2. Epidemiology	10
3. Neuroscience	11
C. Physics	11
1. Equilibrium dynamics	11
2. Statistical mechanics	12
3. Quantum & Statistical Field Theory	13
D. Chemistry	14
E. Game Theory	14
F. Artificial Intelligence	15
IV. Application: Decomposing the KL-divergence	15
V. Discussion	17
Acknowledgements	19
A. Möbius Inversions and Mereology in Statistics	19
References	20

## I. INTRODUCTION

Much of the study of complex systems is focused on characterizing general principles of complexity. Famously, certain network or graph theoretical quantities have proven useful to describe the structure of complex systems in fields ranging from physics to biology and the social sciences [13, 27, 33, 60, 67, 73, 91]. In addition, concepts from a specific discipline, like phase transitions in physics or evolution in biology, have led to both qualitative and quantitative understanding of complex systems in other fields [21, 35, 77, 82, 99]. This paper makes another such attempt at revealing a general principle of complex systems, and aims to show that there is a unified theory of *higher-order interactions* that is intimately related to the decomposition of a system into its parts. While this is not in itself a surprising or novel observation—parts obviously need to be defined before they can interact—we for the first time cast this intuition into a precise and useful form. We show that various notions of higher-order interactions across scientific fields are manifestations of a single principle—the Möbius inversion theorem—that describes how higher-order interactions emerge from decompositions, or *mereologies*, of complex systems. In doing so, the framework presented here provides both a unified theory, and a precise definition of *higher-order interactions*, which often refers in a somewhat vague way to non-additive interactions between parts of a system. In particular, we aim to show that when a system is decomposed into parts that allow for a partial ordering, then the notion of higher-order structure is *uniquely* determined, and certain quantities are *higher-order* with respect to precisely this partial order. We provide a range of examples that show that this approach reproduces famous examples of higher-order quantities in various scientific disciplines, and illustrate how the formalism can be used to define and estimate new kinds of interactions.

## A. Higher-order interactions

It is hard to imagine a scientific question that cannot be reduced to the problem of quantifying interactions and their effects. However, interactions are commonly only studied among pairs of variables. Interactions that involve more than two variables are often collectively referred to as *higher-order* interactions. Such higher-order interactions have historically been ignored for multiple reasons: their estimation typically requires more data, they are harder to interpret, and pairwise models have been surprisingly successful. In addition, pairwise interactions can be concisely represented as a graph, allowing them to be analysed with the powerful tools of graph theory. Higher-order interactions, in contrast, can only be represented as a *hypergraph*, a generalisation of a graph that allows for edges to connect more than two nodes. Hypergraphs are not as well-understood as graphs, and the tools to analyse them are less developed, though significant progress is being made [25, 30, 53, 57].

While it has been shown that there are certain situations in which pairwise models are generally good approximations [62, 88], higher-order interactions have proven to be of crucial importance to the rich dynamics and multistability of complex systems [76, 81, 87], which has inspired recent work that studied higher-order interactions in their own right [6, 7, 72]. In practice, fields as disparate as biology and physics have recognized the importance of higher-order interactions, motivating the attempt at a unified theory of higher-order interactions made in this paper.

In biology, higher-order interactions among genetic variants and mutations have been shown to play a key role in the emergence of phenotype from genotype [24, 51]. Similarly, at the level of transcription, non-additive higher-order effects control bone morphogenetic protein (BMP) signalling [2, 48], embryonic development of *Drosophila* [3] and the emergence of cell type from gene expression [41, 43]. On an ecological scale, certain species of lichen crucially depend on a symbiosis that involves more than two species [85], and higher-order interactions among species in the *Drosophila* gut microbiome affect the longevity of the host [31]. Also in the brain, which is generally thought of as a network of pairwise connected neurons, higher-order and synergistic functional interactions among brain regions are associated with more complex and integrative cognitive processes than additive ones [58]. Each of these examples will be shown to be expressible in the framework of Möbius inversions in Section III B.

However, higher-order interactions are perhaps most ubiquitous in physics, which has a long history of introducing non-pairwise terms into models. For example, while the Ising model on a lattice is commonly defined with only pairwise nearest-neighbour interactions, a coarse-graining or renormalisation of the lattice necessarily introduces higher-order interactions among the spins [59]. Furthermore, spin models with varying and arbitrary-order interactions have been extensively studied in their own right, and are generally referred to as spin glasses due to their importance to the study of glassy materials [29, 44, 46]. In (quantum) field theory, scattering amplitudes are generally approximated by perturbative methods that sum increasing orders of particle interactions [69, 92]. Both these examples will be shown to be expressible in the framework of Möbius inversions in Section III C.

## B. Aim and Contributions

This study demonstrates how a complex system's higher-order structure emerges uniquely from its *mereological* decomposition into parts. Our approach, based on the Möbius inversion theorem, offers several key insights. First, it reveals a common mathematical structure underlying seemingly disparate notions of higher-order interactions across scientific domains. Second, it provides a general method for deriving microscopic interactions from macroscopic observables, relative to a chosen mereology. Third, it reveals the choice of decomposition to be key in determining the nature of the higher-order interactions. We further aim to inspire novel system decompositions that lead to new kinds of higher-order interactions and facilitate the transfer of insights across scientific disciplines. This perspective mathematizes how the definition and estimation of interactions in a system is uniquely fixed by an assumed underlying mereology, resonating with Plato's call to "carve it at its joints" [70].

## C. Related work

That the Möbius inversion theorem can be useful in the study of complex systems is itself not a novel observation. For example, Section III will show that many instances of its use are based on the relationship between moments and cumulants of a probability distribution, which have previously been realised as Möbius inversions [75, 83]. Furthermore, within information theory, deriving general principles of complexity based on system decompositions has been explored before in [4], and the authors of [40, 52] use Möbius inversion to connect different concepts from information theory. However, each of these examples only considers decompositions with the structure of a Boolean algebra, and as such essentially reduces to the set-theoretic inclusion-exclusion principle. While solving the system of equations associated to the partial information decomposition (Section III A) has historically been referred to as a Möbius inversion, the corresponding Möbius function has only

recently been identified as a result of the framework developed in the current manuscript [42]. The approach presented in this manuscript holds for a more general class of partial orders we call mereologies, and it will be demonstrated that mereologies different from Boolean algebras are ubiquitous.

## II. MÖBIUS INVERSION AS A MEREOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

In this section, we introduce various ways to decompose a system and relate the parts to the whole. Bringing together parts to form a whole is the original meaning of algebra (*al-jabr* being Arabic for reunion of parts), and we indeed find that system decomposition can be fruitfully described with an algebraic technique known as a Möbius inversion. Before we present the central framework, we first define the terms and notations used in this paper.

### A. Preliminaries

**Definition 1.** Let  $P$  be a set. A partial order on  $P$  is a binary relation  $\leq$  with the following properties for all  $a, b, c \in P$ :

$$\text{Reflexivity: } a \leq a \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Transitivity: } a \leq b \text{ and } b \leq c \implies a \leq c \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Antisymmetry: } a \leq b \text{ and } b \leq a \iff a = b \quad (3)$$

Whenever  $a \leq b$  we say that  $a$  is less than or equal to  $b$ . Two elements  $a, b \in P$  are comparable when either  $a \leq b$  or  $b \leq a$ , and incomparable otherwise. When  $a \neq b$  and  $a \leq b$ , then we write  $b > a$ , and say that  $a$  is greater than  $b$ .

The tuple  $(P, \leq)$  is referred to as a partially ordered set, or poset, but we often just write  $P$  when the ordering is clear from context. Given a subset  $S \subseteq P$ , an element  $b \in P$  is a lower bound for  $S$  if  $\forall s \in S : b \leq s$  (upper bounds are defined similarly). An interval  $[a, b]$  on  $P$  is a set  $\{x : a \leq x \leq b\}$ , and a poset is called locally finite if all such intervals are finite.

One can impose extra structure on the poset to form special cases. For example, a poset in which any two elements are comparable is called a totally ordered set, and a poset with a unique least (resp. largest) element is called a *rooted* (resp. *co-rooted*) poset. A poset  $P$  in which every two elements  $a, b \in P$  have a unique greatest lower bound  $a \wedge b \in P$  and least upper bound  $a \vee b$  is called a *lattice*.

Given a poset  $(P, \leq)$ , one can study how functions on the underlying set  $P$  interact with the ordering. For example, a function  $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called *monotone* if  $a \leq b$  implies  $f(a) \leq f(b)$ . However, there is a particular rich theory of functions on *intervals* on locally finite posets, largely due to Rota [74]. Functions on intervals exploit the full structure of the poset, and form an algebraic structure known as the incidence algebra, where the algebra's multiplication operation  $*$  on two functions  $f, g : P \times P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined as the convolution of their values over the interval:

$$(f * g)(a, b) = \sum_{x: a \leq x \leq b} f(a, x)g(x, b) \quad (4)$$

Of particular interest are three elements of the incidence algebra: the *delta function*  $\delta_P$ , *zeta function*  $\zeta_P$  and the *Möbius function*  $\mu$ .

**Definition 2** (Delta function). Let  $(P, \leq)$  be a locally finite poset. Then the delta function  $\delta_P : P \times P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined as

$$\delta_P(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

**Definition 3** (Zeta function). Let  $(P, \leq)$  be a locally finite poset. Then the zeta function  $\zeta_P : P \times P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined as

$$\zeta_P(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \leq y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

**Definition 4** (Möbius function). Let  $(P, \leq)$  be a locally finite poset. Then the Möbius function  $\mu_P : P \times P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is defined as

$$\mu_P(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x = y \\ - \sum_{z: x \leq z < y} \mu_P(x, z) & \text{if } x < y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

When the underlying poset is clear from context, or irrelevant, we sometimes omit the subscript. Note that  $\delta$  corresponds to the multiplicative unit ( $\delta * f = f * \delta = f$  for all  $f$  in the incidence algebra), and that multiplying a function  $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with the zeta function amounts an integral over the poset:  $(f * \zeta)(x, y) = \sum_{x \leq z \leq y} f(z)$  (to properly define the multiplication, interpret  $f$  as a function on  $P \times P$  that is constant in its first argument). One of the most important results in the theory of incidence algebra then states that the Möbius function is the multiplicative inverse of the zeta function ( $\mu * \zeta = \zeta * \mu = \delta$ ) and that therefore the following theorem holds:

**Theorem 1** (Möbius inversion theorem, Rota [74]). *Let  $P = (S, \leq)$  be a finite poset and  $\tau, \eta \in S$ . Let  $f : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a function on  $P$ , and let  $\mu_P$  be the Möbius function on  $P$ . Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

$$f(\tau) = \sum_{\eta \leq \tau} g(\eta) \quad (8)$$

$$g(\tau) = \sum_{\eta \leq \tau} \mu_P(\eta, \tau) f(\eta) \quad (9)$$

The Möbius inversion theorem states that sums over a poset can be inverted by looking up the Möbius function of the poset. This powerful result forms the basis of this study. In the following sections, we will show how this theorem can be applied to a wide range of systems, and how it can be used to define and estimate many well-established notions of higher-order structure in complex systems.

## B. Decomposing Systems from Macro to Micro

Given a system  $S$  with parts  $s_i$ , consider an arbitrary property  $Q(S)$  of the system. A purely additive property would be one where

$$Q(S) = \sum_i q(s_i) \quad (10)$$

where  $q(s_i)$  is the contribution of the part  $s_i$  to the property  $Q(S)$ . Since  $Q(S)$  is built from contributions of the parts, we think of  $Q$  as describing a macroscopic (or global) property, while  $q$  describes microscopic (or local) quantities or interactions. For example, the height of a person with two genetic variants can be written as  $H(\{g_1, g_2\}) = h(\emptyset) + h(\{g_1\}) + h(\{g_2\})$ , where  $h(\emptyset)$  is the height of a person without any of the variants, and  $h(\{g_i\})$  is the contribution of the genetic variant  $g_i$  to the person's height  $H(\{g_1, g_2\})$ . Note the difference in interpretation between  $H$  and  $h$  here:  $H$  is the length of a person and easy to measure, whereas  $h$  is the length added by a genetic variant which is generally impossible to directly observe.

However, many interesting properties of complex systems are non-additive and emerge from complex interactions among the components. Still, it is reasonable to assume that  $Q$  could be decomposed into properties of the components in a nonadditive or interacting way (as anything else would entail  $Q$  being *strongly* emergent and *fundamentally* not derivable from a description of its parts). To allow for nonadditive effects, we expand the summand to include contributions from more complex, non-atomic parts of the system. Note that this is somewhat analogous to introducing nonlinear terms in the design matrix of a linear regression problem. This invites one to instead write

$$Q(S) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{D}(S)} q(t) \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}(S)$  is some kind of decomposition of  $S$  that relates the whole to its parts. When  $S$  has a set-like structure, two natural choices for  $\mathcal{D}(S)$  would be the set of subsets (i.e. the powerset) or partitions of  $S$ . These two decompositions can be partially ordered by inclusion and refinement, respectively, as shown in Figures 1 and 2. Choosing a particular  $\mathcal{D}(S)$  amounts to a mereological claim about the system  $S$  and property  $Q$ , so should be informed by prior knowledge of the system or the method of observation. For this reason, we refer to such system decompositions as *mereologies*:

**Definition 5** (Mereology). *A mereology  $\mathcal{D}(S)$  on a system  $S$  is a co-rooted poset with  $S$  as its unique largest element.*

Note that in particular every topology on a finite set  $S$  gives rise to a mereology on  $S$  through ordering the open sets by inclusion. However, a mereology is more general in the sense that it need not be closed under unions or intersections. In fact, the full system is not required to be a set at all (it can, for example, be an ordered set, or a graph).

In the example of a person's height, it is natural to decompose the set of genetic variants into subsets of variants, based on the assumption that the only property of a variant that affects height is its presence or absence. This invites one to write  $H(\{g_1, g_2\}) = h(\emptyset) + h(\{g_1\}) + h(\{g_2\}) + h(\{g_1, g_2\})$ , indicating that the height is determined by the individual variants, but also by an interaction term  $h(\{g_1, g_2\})$  between them.




FIG. 1. The powerset of a set of  $n$  variables, ordered by set inclusion, forms a lattice known as a Boolean algebra. Shown here are the transitive reductions (Hasse diagrams) of the Boolean algebras on 2 (left), 3 (middle) and 4 (right) variables. For arbitrary  $n$ , the Hasse diagrams of a Boolean algebra describes an  $n$ -cube.




FIG. 2. The partitions of a set of  $n$  variables, ordered by refinement, form a lattice. Shown here are the transitive reductions (Hasse diagrams) of the partition lattices on 2 (left), 3 (middle) and 4 (right) variables.

### C. Inverting decompositions with Möbius functions

If  $\mathcal{D}(S)$  is a mereology, Equation (11) can be written as


$$Q(S) = \sum_{t \leq S} q(t) \quad (12)$$

where the sum is now over elements from the mereology. If the microscopic contributions  $q(t)$  are known, then predicting the macroscopic quantity  $Q(S)$  is known as the *forward problem*. However, in many cases we might only be able to observe  $Q(S)$ , and not the individual contributions  $q(t)$ . To reverse-engineer  $q(t)$  from  $Q(S)$ , Equation (12) should be inverted to express  $q(t)$  in terms of observations of  $Q$  on different elements of the mereology. To invert sums like equation (12) over posets, one can use the Möbius inversion theorem:

$$q(S) = \sum_{t \leq S} \mu_{\mathcal{D}(S)}(t, S) Q(t) \quad (13)$$

This is a powerful result: the problem of inverting the decomposition (which amounts to solving a large system of equations) has been reduced to looking up the Möbius function of the mereology.

The result can be represented diagrammatically as follows. Let  $\Sigma$  be a set of systems of interest, and  $\Delta$  the set of mereologies on them. Let  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}} = \{f | f : \mathcal{D}(S) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$  be the set of functions on a given mereology  $\mathcal{D}(S)$ . Consider a map  $\mathcal{O}_q : \Delta \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}$  that assigns a definition  $q$  of microscopic interactions to a decomposition, and a map  $\mathcal{O}_Q : \Delta \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{D}}$  that assigns a definition  $Q$  of macroscopic observables. The two definitions  $q$  and  $Q$  are called  $\mathcal{D}$ -compatible if the following diagram commutes:



If  $Q$  and  $q$  are  $\mathcal{D}$ -compatible, then the forward problem is solved by multiplying  $q$  by  $\zeta_{\mathcal{D}}$ , and the inverse problem is solved by multiplying  $Q$  by  $\mu_{\mathcal{D}}$ . In fact, the Möbius inversion theorem states that for any macroscopic observable  $Q$  there is a *unique* notion of microscopic higher-order interaction  $q$  that is  $\mathcal{D}$ -compatible with  $Q$ , and *vice versa*.

Since different systems might admit similar mereologies, the Möbius function can be precomputed and the inversion can be done in a single step. In practice, the most common mereologies on a system are the powerset and partition lattices from Figures 1 and 2, and the Möbius function of these lattices is well-known. Denoting the powerset lattice by  $\mathcal{P}(S)$ , and the partition lattice by  $\Pi(S)$ , the Möbius functions are given by

$$\mu_{\mathcal{P}(S)}(x, y) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{|y|-|x|} & \text{if } x \leq y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

$$\mu_{\Pi(S)}(x, S) = (-1)^{|x|-1} (|x| - 1)! \quad (15)$$

where  $|x|$  is the cardinality of the set  $x$ . These expressions are well-known and have been used to invert decompositions across scientific disciplines, as will be discussed in more detail in Section III.

In the example of genetic variants determining a person's height, inserting Equation (14) into (13) allows us to calculate the effect of individual genetic variants, as well as the interaction between them, from observations of a population's height. To see this, order the powerset of genetic variants  $\mathcal{P}(\{g_1, g_2\}) = \{\emptyset, \{g_1\}, \{g_2\}, \{g_1, g_2\}\}$  by inclusion. Then Eq. (13) yields (omitting curly brackets for clarity)

$$h(g_1) = (g_1) - H(\emptyset) \quad (16)$$

$$h(g_2) = H(g_2) - H(\emptyset) \quad (17)$$

$$h(g_1, g_2) = H(g_1, g_2) - H(g_1) - H(g_2) + H(\emptyset) \quad (18)$$

$$= (H(g_1, g_2) - H(g_2)) - (H(g_1) - H(\emptyset)) \quad (19)$$

This is easily interpreted: the effect of a single genetic variant is the difference between the height of a person with only that variant and the height of a person without any of the variants. The interaction among two variants  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  is the difference between the effect of  $g_1$  in people with  $g_2$ , and the effect of  $g_1$  in people without  $g_2$ . Given a population sample containing people with all combinations of these variants, both of these quantities can be directly estimated. This argument straightforwardly extends to higher-order effects: the third-order interaction among three genetic variants  $g_1, g_2, g_3$  is given by

$$h(g_1, g_2, g_3) = H(g_1, g_2, g_3) - H(g_1, g_2) - H(g_1, g_3) - H(g_2, g_3) + H(g_1) + H(g_2) + H(g_3) - H(\emptyset) \quad (20)$$

In genetics, interaction terms like  $h(g_1, g_2)$  are called epistatic effects and commonly defined and estimated using exactly this estimator [10, 31] (see Section III B), though not generally linked to Möbius inversions. Note that the bottom elements of the mereology, namely the sets  $\{\emptyset, \{g_1\}, \{g_2\}\}$ , correspond to a reductionistic theory, i.e. a theory without higher-order interactions. This principle holds in general: reductionistic theories correspond to theories based on only the bottom part of a mereology. Higher-order interactions are thus 'higher' with respect to the ordering of the mereology, which allows one to compare and order different interactions and theories.

This is further illustrated by the examples presented in Section III, where we show in more detail how this construction can be applied to systems with a clear mereological structure, and how it reproduces many well-established notions of higher-order structure in complex systems.

### III. MÖBIUS INVERSIONS IN COMPLEX SYSTEMS

We aim to show that the framework presented in Section II reproduces many established notions of higher-order interactions throughout the sciences. First, the role of Möbius inversions in information theory is discussed in Section III A. Within the natural sciences, multiple kinds of interactions in biology (Section III B), physics (Section III C), and chemistry (Section III D) are discussed. We discuss the role that Möbius inversions play in game theory and artificial intelligence in Sections III E and III F, respectively. An overview of all dualities between macroscopic and microscopic quantities is given in Table I of the Discussion. The wide range of examples covered here serve mainly to illustrate the broad applicability of the framework, but it is by no means necessary to understand the details of all of them to appreciate the general idea. Some of the examples in this section are related to the relationship between statistical moments and cumulants. We chose to focus on scientific applications of the framework, but a description of various kinds of moments and cumulants in terms of mereological decompositions is included in Appendix A for completeness.

## A. Information theory

### 1. Entropy and Mutual Information

Given a set  $X$  of random variables  $X_i$ , the joint entropy  $H(X)$  is the total amount of uncertainty about the state of  $X$  before an observation, or equivalently, the amount of information gained by observing  $X$  to be in a particular state  $x$ . It is defined as

$$H(X) = - \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} p(X = x) \log p(X = x) \quad (21)$$

where  $\mathcal{X}$  is the set of all possible states of  $X$ , and  $p(X = x)$  is the probability of observing state  $x$ . One might assume that the total information in the system can be decomposed into information contained in different parts of the system. To do this, we impose the powerset mereology on  $X$ . The joint entropy can then be written as

$$H(X) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{P}(X)} I(S) \quad (22)$$

where  $I(S)$  is the information contributed by the part  $S$ , given by a Möbius inversion over the powerset mereology on  $X$ :

$$I(X) = \sum_{S \subseteq X} \mu_{\mathcal{P}}(S, X) H(S) \quad (23)$$

$$= \sum_{S \subseteq X} (-1)^{|S|-|X|} H(S) \quad (24)$$

For two variables  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  this yields

$$I(X_1) = H(X_1) \quad (25)$$

$$I(X_2) = H(X_2) \quad (26)$$

$$I(X_1, X_2) = H(X_1, X_2) - H(X_1) - H(X_2) \quad (27)$$

This is, up to a minus sign, exactly the definition of mutual information, which is the amount of information shared between two variables (or equivalently: the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the joint distribution and the product of the marginals):

$$I(X_1, X_2) = \sum_{x_1, x_2} p(x_1, x_2) \log \frac{p(x_1, x_2)}{p(x_1)p(x_2)} \quad (28)$$

In general, the mutual information among a set of variables, also referred to as their *interaction information*, is indeed given by the Möbius inversion of the entropy of the powerset of the variables, with some authors adding a minus sign to even orders to ensure a positive sign for single-variable entropies. This is a well-established result, and has historically been explained through an analogy between Shannon information theory and set theory [97].

In fact, the same argument holds for the pointwise information, or surprisal  $h(x) = -\log p(X = x)$ , which is the amount of information gained by observing a particular realisation  $X = x$ . A Möbius inversion on  $\mathcal{P}(X)$  then leads to the definition of pointwise mutual information:

$$i(X_1, X_2) = \log \frac{p(x_1, x_2)}{p(x_1)p(x_2)} \quad (29)$$

This construction has previously been discussed in more detail in [40]. Note that when only the smallest elements of the powerset mereology—the singleton sets—have non-zero interactions, the theory reduces to its ‘reductionistic’ version where all variables are independent.

The powerset decomposition of entropy and surprisal is the simplest option, by far the most common, and the basis of all Shannon information theory. However, in recent years, other decompositions have been proposed, motivated at least in part by the fact that higher-order mutual information can become negative, which has hindered its operational interpretation.

### 2. The Partial Information Decomposition

The partial information decomposition (PID) framework, introduced by Williams and Beer [95], proposes that the information a set of predictor variables  $X$  contains about a target  $Y$  can be decomposed into various



terms representing synergistic information (available only in the joint state of the variables), unique information (exclusively contained in a single predictor variable), and redundant information (shared among multiple predictor variables). For instance, given two predictor variables  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , the information they carry about  $Y$ , denoted  $I(\{X_1, X_2\}; Y)$ , can be decomposed as follows:

$$I(\{X_1, X_2\}; Y) = \Pi(\{X_1\}; Y) + \Pi(\{X_2\}; Y) + \Pi(\{X_1\}\{X_2\}; Y) + \Pi(\{X_1, X_2\}; Y) \quad (30)$$

where  $\Pi(\{X_i\}; Y)$  represents the unique information carried by  $X_i$  about  $Y$ ,  $\Pi(\{X_1, X_2\}; Y)$  denotes the synergistic information available only from the joint state of the variables, and  $\Pi(\{X_1\}\{X_2\}; Y)$  represents the redundant information about  $Y$  shared by  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ . To construct information sources from an arbitrary set  $S$  of predictor variables, one should consider redundancies among all possible combinations of subsets of  $S$ . However, note that the redundancy among a set  $a$  and a set  $b$  reduces to the unique information of  $a$  if  $a \subseteq b$ . This restricts the set of information sources to combinations of predictor subsets that are mutually incomparable by the ordering  $\subseteq$ . Such incomparable sets are called *antichains* of the poset  $(\mathcal{P}(S), \subseteq)$ . The antichains are then turned into the redundancy mereology  $\mathcal{R}_n$  by setting  $A \leq B$  if for every  $b \in B$  there is an  $a \in A$  such that  $a \subseteq b$ . The Hasse diagram of this lattice of antichains is shown in Figure 3 for up to  $|S| = 4$ . The information  $I(S; Y)$  that a set of variables  $S$  carries about  $Y$  can then be written as a sum of ‘partial’ information contributions  $I_\partial$  over the  $\mathcal{R}_n$  mereology:

$$I(S; Y) = \sum_{R \leq S} I_\partial(R; Y) \quad (31)$$

This can be inverted to get expressions of the individual contributions  $I_\partial(R; Y)$  in terms of the mutual information  $I(T; Y)$ :

$$I_\partial(R; Y) = \sum_{T \leq R} \mu_{\mathcal{R}_n}(T, R) I(T; Y) \quad (32)$$

Again, if only the bottom element  $I_\partial(\{\{t\} \mid t \in S\}; Y)$  is non-zero, the theory reduces to its ‘reductionistic’ version where all information is fully redundant. The inversion in Equation (32), however, is far from trivial as  $|\mathcal{R}_n| = \mathcal{D}(n)$ , where  $\mathcal{D}(n)$  is the  $n$ th Dedekind number. The series of Dedekind numbers grows so quickly that it is only known up to  $\mathcal{D}(9)$  [39, 89]. This makes naively solving the system of associated equations computationally infeasible for large  $n$ . Nevertheless, based on the presented framework, a closed-form expression for the Möbius function on the redundancy lattice has recently been derived and used to calculate the PID where this was not possible before [42].

Note, however, that even when the Möbius function can be calculated, there is an ambiguity in the definition of  $I(T; Y)$  when the antichain  $T$  contains more than a single set of variables. Consequently, solving the PID requires a well-defined notion of information on arbitrary antichains. A significant portion of the literature on the PID has focused on constructing such definitions, but no consensus has been reached thus far.

Recently, the PID framework has been extended to accommodate multiple target variables and information dynamics in time [61]. The associated  $\Phi$ ID mereology is the product of the standard redundancy mereologies associated to the individual targets. Since the Möbius function of a product of lattices is the product of Möbius functions of the lattices [86], the  $\Phi$ ID calculation reduces to that of the normal PID, so benefits from the same speed-up offered in [42].

## B. Biology

### 1. Epistasis

In the last decade, improved genetic sequencing of genomes and transcriptomes has revealed that some traits depend on many, if not most genes. This change in perspective has been described as a transition from monogenic, to polygenic and omnigenic models [14]. Furthermore, the effect of a single genetic variant can depend on the presence of other genetic variants, a type of genetic interaction called epistasis. As in the example of a person’s height in Section II, a general phenotype  $F(G)$  that depends on the presence ( $g_i = 1$ ) or absence ( $g_i = 0$ ) of a set of genetic variants  $g_i \in G$  can be decomposed into the sum of the effects of subsets  $g_i \in \mathcal{P}(G)$  of genetic variants. A Möbius inversion on the lattice of subsets of genetic variants gives the following definitions for genetic effects and epistatic interactions  $I(g)$ :

$$F(g = \mathbf{1}, G \setminus g = \mathbf{0}) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(g)} I(s) \quad (33)$$

$$\iff I(g) = \sum_{s \subseteq g} (-1)^{|s| - |g|} F(s = \mathbf{1}, G \setminus s = \mathbf{0}) \quad (34)$$




FIG. 3. The redundancy terms of a powerset of  $n$  variables can be partially ordered: if  $A$  and  $B$  are redundancy terms, then  $A \leq B$  if for every  $b \in B$  there is an  $a \in A$  such that  $a \leq b$ . Shown here are the transitive reductions (Hasse diagrams) of the redundancy lattices on 2 (left), 3 (middle) and 4 (right, labels not shown) variables. Note that redundancies among  $n$  variables are the antichains in the powerset of  $n$ -variables.

That is, the interaction among a set of genes  $g$  can be expressed in terms of observed phenotypes of individuals with varying genotypes. For example, the interaction among three genes  $g_1, g_2, g_3$  is given by

$$I_{g_1 g_2 g_3} = I(\{g_1, g_2, g_3\}) = F(1, 1, 1, \mathbf{0}) - F(1, 1, 0, \mathbf{0}) - F(1, 0, 1, \mathbf{0}) - F(0, 1, 1, \mathbf{0}) + F(1, 0, 0, \mathbf{0}) + F(0, 1, 0, \mathbf{0}) + F(0, 0, 1, \mathbf{0}) - F(0, 0, 0, \mathbf{0}) \quad (35)$$

This expression is indeed commonly used to estimate epistasis. The authors of [10] arrive at a similar expression based on volumes of polytopes, which has been used to describe epistasis among genetic variants [24] as well as in the context of microbiomes [31].

Even though interactions are necessarily defined with respect to some outcome, this need not be a phenotype in the traditional sense of the word. One possible outcome that requires no macroscopic measurements, for example, is the population probability of a particular gene expression pattern. If we represent gene expression as a binary vector  $\mathbf{G}$ , where  $G_i = 1$  if gene  $i$  is expressed above some threshold, then inverting the log-probability of observing transcriptome  $\mathbf{G}$  gives the following definition of the interaction among genes  $g_i$ :

$$I(\mathbf{g}) = \sum_{\mathbf{s} \subseteq \mathbf{g}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\mathbf{g}|} \log p(\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{g} \setminus \mathbf{s} = \mathbf{0}) \quad (36)$$

which can be directly estimated from a population sample. A method to estimate such interactions from single-cell RNA-seq data was recently developed, and used to identify novel cell states and types in various organisms [43].

Instead of inferring the log-probability, i.e. the surprisal, one could also invert its expected value, i.e. the entropy. As explained in Section III A, this yields (higher-order) mutual information, which is used by the algorithm that won the DREAM2 challenge of inferring gene regulatory networks from expression data [90].

## 2. Epidemiology

The central challenge in epidemiology is to understand the influence of various factors on an individual's health outcomes. One example is estimating the effect a vaccine has on disease risk. However, disease risk after vaccination is not only determined by the vaccine itself, but also by innate factors like the individual's immune system and external factors like the presence of other pathogens, as well as interactions among these. Typically, the effect on outcome  $Y$  of a factor  $X$  is isolated from all other factors by randomly dividing the population into groups, and then intervening such that  $X = 1$  in group 1, and  $X = 0$  in group 2. The *Average Treatment Effect* (ATE) is then defined as

$$ATE(Y; X) = E(Y|X = 1) - E(Y|X = 0) \quad (37)$$

However, in observational studies, where randomisation followed by intervention is not possible, the effect of  $X$  generally cannot be isolated, and the outcome  $Y$  depends on a potentially large set of factors  $S$  on which one might impose the powerset mereology:

$$E(Y|S = 1) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{P}(S)} I(s) \quad (38)$$

where  $I(s)$  now represents the effect of the collection of factors  $s$  on the outcome  $Y$ . The effect of a single factor  $s = X$  is then seen to be given by an ATE in the absence of the other factors:

$$I(X) = E(Y|X = 1, S \setminus X = 0) - E(Y|X = 0, S \setminus X = 0) \quad (39)$$

whereas the second- and higher-order terms correspond to higher-order epidemiological interactions among the factors [9]. For example, the interaction among two factors  $X_1, X_2$  is given by

$$I(X_1, X_2) = E(Y|X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1, S \setminus \{X_1, X_2\} = 0) - E(Y|X_1 = 1, X_2 = 0, S \setminus \{X_1, X_2\} = 0) \quad (40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & - E(Y|X_1 = 0, X_2 = 1, S \setminus \{X_1, X_2\} = 0) + E(Y|X_1 = 0, X_2 = 0, S \setminus \{X_1, X_2\} = 0) \\ & = ATE(Y; X_1|X_2 = 1, S \setminus \{X_1, X_2\} = 0) - ATE(Y; X_1|X_2 = 0, S \setminus \{X_1, X_2\} = 0) \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

In theory, this allows one to estimate drug or treatment interactions from population statistics, though without further knowledge of the conditional dependencies or the causal graph the interactions are not guaranteed to reflect the true ‘causal’ relationships.

### 3. Neuroscience

The history of neuroscience can accordingly be described by evolving views on what the appropriate mereological decomposition of the brain is: from neurons, to neural circuits, to hierarchical structures, to the currently popular approach that focuses on different spatial and functional regions [8]. To describe the correlations and higher-order relationships between parts of the brain, both the classical approach to higher-order information theory and the PID are commonly used, reflecting concurrent use of both the powerset and redundancy mereology [26, 36, 64, 80, 94]

## C. Physics

### 1. Equilibrium dynamics

Statistical physics is largely focused on relating the large-scale behaviour of a system to the microscopic interactions. Commonly, this is done through an energy function  $E : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  that maps a state  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  of the system to its energy. Writing down a form of  $E$  amounts to choosing a decomposition of the system into parts. For example, the Ising model assumes that the energy of a system  $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ ,  $s_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , decomposes into singleton and pairwise contributions and is given by

$$E(S = s) = - \sum_{i,j=1}^n J_{ij} s_i s_j - \sum_{i=1}^n h_i s_i \quad (42)$$

or, for a subsystem  $\hat{S} \subseteq S$

$$E(\hat{S} = \mathbf{1}, S \setminus \hat{S} = \mathbf{0}) = - \sum_{i,j: s_i, s_j \in \hat{S}} J_{ij} - \sum_{i: s_i \in \hat{S}} h_i \quad (43)$$

where  $h_i$  is the external field acting on spin  $i$  and  $J_{ij}$  is the interaction strength between spins  $i$  and  $j$ , typically only non-zero for nearest neighbours on a lattice. Limiting the interactions to linear and pairwise quantities only is an assumption imposed by the Ising model. A more general form of the energy function would be

$$E(S = s) = - \sum_{t \in \mathcal{P}(S)} J_t \prod_{i: S_i \in t} s_i \quad (44)$$

where  $J_t$  is the interaction strength of the part  $t$ . If one is given the parameters  $J_t$ , the *forward Ising problem* is calculating the behaviour of the system  $S$  under the influence of the energy function  $E$ . The *inverse Ising problem* is inferring the parameters  $J_t$  from observations of  $S$ . The inverse problem is in general intractable, as direct observations of the energy are not possible. However, at equilibrium, the probability of observing a state  $s$  is given by the Boltzmann distribution

$$p(s) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-E(s)} \quad (45)$$



These are precisely the well-known Ursell functions of statistical mechanics. Ursell functions are also called connected correlation functions, because  $u(\pi)$  corresponds to a connected part of a diagram when  $|\pi| = 1$ . While the first three Ursell functions coincide with the mixed central moments, the higher-order Ursell functions are different, and used throughout statistical mechanics. Ursell functions are related to the higher-order interactions of the mechanics and are essentially the cumulants of the theory, which is why they rely on exactly the same mereology of moments as was described in Section A. Note, however, that Ursell functions are the partition-inverse of the moments, while the higher-order interactions of equilibrium dynamics are the powerset-inverse of the energy.

### 3. Quantum & Statistical Field Theory

In quantum and statistical field theory, random variables are replaced by field operators  $\phi(x)$ . The correlation functions—or *Green's functions*—are then defined as expectation values of time-ordered products of field operators in the vacuum state  $|\Omega\rangle$ :

$$G^{(4)}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = \langle \Omega | T \phi(x_1) \phi(x_2) \phi(x_3) \phi(x_4) | \Omega \rangle \quad (57)$$

$$= \mathcal{Z}^{-1} \int \mathcal{D}\phi e^{iS[\phi]} \phi(x_1) \phi(x_2) \phi(x_3) \phi(x_4) \quad (58)$$

where  $T$  is the time-ordering operator,  $S[\phi]$  is the action of the field theory,  $\mathcal{Z} = \int \mathcal{D}\phi e^{iS[\phi]}$ , and the integral is over all possible field configurations. Such time-ordered correlation functions are of central interest because they determine the particle scattering probabilities [54, 69] and thus form the macroscopic observables.

As in the case of statistical classical mechanics, one can impose the partition mereology:

$$G^{(4)}(X) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi(X)} u(\pi) \quad (59)$$

This can of course be represented by the same diagrams as in the case of statistical mechanics in Equation 53, but there is an important difference. By expanding  $e^{iS[\phi]}$  as a power series around the non-interacting theory up to certain order and applying Wick's theorem to the resulting products of operators, one can show that the connected correlation functions are given by the sum of all Feynman diagrams with the same external vertices, but with an arbitrary number of internal vertices and loops. To emphasise that the diagrammatic representations of the decomposition may contain arbitrary internal processes, we draw the quantum diagrams with a shaded internal circle:

Statistical Mechanics:



Quantum Field Theory:



A single connected component of one of the diagrams now represents an infinite sum over Feynman diagrams. For example, in a theory with quartic interactions:

$$\text{---} \bullet \text{---} = \text{---} \bullet \text{---} + \text{---} \bullet \text{---} + \text{---} \bullet \text{---} + \dots + \text{---} \bullet \text{---} + \dots \quad (60)$$

A Möbius inversion over the partition mereology then gives an expression for the connected components of these graphs in terms of the correlation functions. For example:

$$\text{---} \bullet \text{---} = \langle \Omega | T \phi(x_1) \phi(x_2) | \Omega \rangle - \langle \Omega | \phi(x_1) | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \phi(x_2) | \Omega \rangle - 1 \quad (61)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{---} \bullet \text{---} &= \langle \Omega | T \phi(x_1) \phi(x_2) \phi(x_3) | \Omega \rangle - \langle \Omega | \phi(x_1) | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \phi(x_2) \phi(x_3) | \Omega \rangle \\ &\quad - \langle \Omega | \phi(x_2) | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \phi(x_1) \phi(x_3) | \Omega \rangle - \langle \Omega | \phi(x_3) | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \phi(x_1) \phi(x_2) | \Omega \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\quad + 2 \langle \Omega | \phi(x_1) | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \phi(x_2) | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \phi(x_3) | \Omega \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

$$\quad + 2 \langle \Omega | \phi(x_1) | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \phi(x_2) | \Omega \rangle \langle \Omega | \phi(x_3) | \Omega \rangle \quad (64)$$

While this looks similar to the decomposition of the moments in Section A, it should be emphasised that the correlation functions treated here are not the moments of some probability distribution over field configurations. Rather, the analogy holds only at the level of the expectation values, and the fact that one can define a moment generating function  $\mathcal{Z}[J]$ , as well as a cumulant generating function  $\log(\mathcal{Z}[J])$ . This fact has been used for decades to define cumulants in any setting where a suitable notion of *average* can be defined, and is known as the generalised cumulant expansion method [50]. Such approaches have been used to define connected correlations in networks of neurons [66], on belief propagation graphs [16, 93], and in chemical dynamics [23, 47].

## D. Chemistry

A significant challenge in chemistry is predicting the properties of molecules from their atomic configuration, commonly referred to as the quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR). To describe a molecular property  $Q$  in terms of the configuration of a molecule  $M$ , one might associate a graph  $G_M$  with the molecule, where the nodes are atoms and the edges are bonds. The property  $Q$  can then be expressed as a sum over the subgraphs of  $G_M$ :

$$Q(M) = \sum_{G \leq G_M} q(G) \quad (65)$$

where  $q(G)$  is the contribution of the subgraph  $G$  to the property  $Q$ . A straightforward Möbius inversion over this subgraph mereology is of course possible, but some chemical properties are more naturally described by other mereologies. For example, a molecule's resonance energy is most naturally decomposed into contributions from acyclic graphs only. Motivated by such chemical questions, the authors of [5] derived a closed-form expression for the Möbius function on this poset of acyclic graphs.

Also studied in chemistry is how properties of a family of molecules are related. The authors of [37], for instance, study how toxic molecules from the family of chlorobenzenes are to guppies. A chlorobenzene is a benzene molecule where one or more hydrogen atoms have been replaced by chlorine atoms. That means that there is a certain partial order one can impose on the set of 13 possible chlorobenzenes (taking into account the 6-fold rotational symmetry of the benzene ring). Namely, two chlorobenzenes  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are related by  $c_1 \leq c_2$  if  $c_2$  can be created from  $c_1$  by adding a single chlorine atom. The toxicity  $T$  can then be expressed as a sum over the toxic contributions  $t$  of the chlorobenzenes that come before it in the reaction chain:

$$T(c) = \sum_{c' \leq c} t(c') \quad (66)$$

Similarly, the authors of [38] construct the poset of adding methyl groups to cyclobutanes. As the molecules higher-up in the partial order are constructed from the lower ones, one could expand the property of a molecule in terms of the contributions of the molecules that come before it. This means that every molecule defines its own poset and thus Möbius function, but these have been calculated and used to verify that higher-order contributions decrease so that truncating the expansion at a certain level leads to a good approximation of the property [38]. In chemistry, this method is known as the ‘posetic cluster expansion’.

## E. Game Theory

In coalitional game theory, players can form coalitions and cooperate, potentially increasing their expected payoff. The core idea is that value might add synergistically, or superadditively (for example: a pair of shoes might be worth more than twice the value of an individual shoe). Therefore, one could decompose the total value  $v(S)$  of a coalition  $S$  into the sum of the synergistic contributions  $w(R)$  of all subsets of  $S$ :

$$v(S) = \sum_{R \subseteq S} w(R) \quad (67)$$

If the value of the coalitions is known, then this can be inverted over the powerset mereology to yield a definition of the synergistic contributions  $w(R)$ :

$$w(R) = \sum_{R \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S|-|R|} v(S) \quad (68)$$

Calculating the coalition synergy is of great practical interest because it allows the coalition payoff to be fairly distributed among its members. Since the synergy of a given coalition cannot be attributed to any single member, it should be distributed evenly among all members. The fair expected payout for any individual player  $i$  in a coalition involving  $N$  players is then the average synergy that player  $i$  adds to each possible subcoalition that includes them:

$$\phi_i = \sum_{S \subseteq N: i \in S} \frac{w(S)}{|S|} \quad (69)$$

This is a very well-known quantity, known as the Shapley value for player  $i$  [79]. It is more commonly written as

$$\phi_i = \frac{1}{|N|} \sum_{S \subseteq N \setminus \{i\}} \binom{|N|-1}{|S|} (v(S \cup \{i\}) - v(S)) \quad (70)$$

The Shapley value is thus the Möbius inverse of the normalised synergy over the subcoalition mereology. It is the unique payout function that satisfies such favourable and practical properties that its inventor was awarded the Nobel Prize in Economics. Choosing a different normalisation in the decomposition of  $\phi_i$ , one that for example depends on the identity of player  $i$ , an identical Möbius inversion recovers a family of distribution rules [11].

## F. Artificial Intelligence

Modern artificial intelligence systems are complex and involve many interacting parts. While the practical and commercial success of machine learning models has been undeniable, a good understanding of the relationship between the microscopic structure of the model and its emergent macroscopic behaviour is still lacking in most applications. In many situations, like medical applications, relating the microscopic structure of a model to its macroscopic behaviour is a crucial step towards widespread adoption.

Predictive machine learning models are generally trained on many features, but once the final model has been constructed it can be difficult to determine how much each feature contributes to the prediction. One way to address this issue is to decompose the prediction of the model into contributions of individual features, and using the Shapley value from the previous section to assign a total contribution to each feature, replacing the value function  $v(S)$  with the model's prediction, and marginalising over the features not in  $S$  [17, 28, 96]. This allows one to determine which features are most important for a particular model's prediction, as well as which groups of features show synergistic effects.

In generative machine learning, the features do not contribute to a prediction, but to a probability distribution. Energy-based models like Restricted Boltzmann Machines, in which the probability of a sample is essentially the Boltzmann weight of a statistical physics model, have led to particularly fruitful insights into the relationship between a model's internal structure and the encoded distribution. An argument similar as in section III C 1 revealed that the Möbius inverse of the model's energy function over the powerset mereology captures the feature interactions, with higher-order interactions corresponding to synergistic effects among the features [19, 40, 41, 65].

Even before the modern success of machine learning techniques, the study of artificial intelligence has inspired formal methods to model reasoning agents. Dempster-Shafer theory, or *evidence* theory, is a generalisation of Bayesian probability theory [20, 78] (though its precise relationship to Bayesian inference is controversial [22]) that formalises how agents combine evidence to update beliefs. Given a system  $S$ , the set  $U$  of possible states of  $S$  is called a *universe*. A proposition  $p$  about the state of  $S$  can be identified with the subset of  $U$  in which  $p$  is true. The set of all propositions therefore naturally admits a powerset mereology on  $U$ . Every proposition  $A$  is then assigned a *belief mass*  $m(A)$  through the belief assignment function  $m : \mathcal{P}(X) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , where  $\sum_{T \in \mathcal{P}(U)} m(T) = 1$ . The belief mass of  $A$  is the belief added by observing  $A$  that was not available upon observing a strict subset of  $A$ . The total belief an agent has about a proposition  $A$  is then given by a sum over the powerset mereology on the universe:

$$Bel(A) = \sum_{B \subseteq A} m(B) \quad (71)$$

such that the belief assignment function can be expressed in terms of the belief of agents after observing varying evidence

$$m(A) = \sum_{B \subseteq A} (-1)^{|A|-|B|} Bel(B) \quad (72)$$

which is used to define the generalised Bayesian update rule. While historically Dempster-Shafer theory has used the powerset mereology, modern approaches have generalised this to other mereologies where properties of the Möbius function are known [32, 98].

## IV. APPLICATION: DECOMPOSING THE KL-DIVERGENCE

To illustrate how the presented framework might be used to derive new measures of interactions, we introduce a novel decomposition of the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence. The KL-divergence is a measure of the difference between two probability distributions  $p$  and  $q$  and is of central importance in machine learning, statistics, and information geometry. It is defined as:

$$D_{KL}(p|q) = \sum_x p(X=x) \log \frac{p(X=x)}{q(X=x)} \quad (73)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p} \left[ \log \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} \right] \quad (74)$$

In general,  $p$  and  $q$  are multivariate distributions and  $X = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$ , so the sum is over the entire state multivariate state space  $\mathcal{X}$  of  $X$ . The KL-divergence assigns a number to the average difference between  $p$  and  $q$ , but does not tell you where this difference comes from—in this sense it is a ‘macroscopic’ or ‘global’ property of the two distributions. A large KL-divergence could be the result of a small difference in the mean of each variable, or a large difference among only a few of the higher-order moments. Disentangling this information could yield useful and actionable insights, for example when the KL-divergence is used as a training loss in an optimisation problem. Knowing where the discrepancy between the target and model distribution comes from can help in understanding the model’s behaviour and improving it.

Let us assume that the ordering of the variables does not matter and impose the powerset mereology. Let  $D_{KL}(p|q; X)$  be the KL-divergence between two multivariate distributions  $p$  and  $q$  over a set  $X$  of  $n$  variables. We can decompose the KL-divergence into the sum of ‘microscopic’ contributions  $\Delta_{p|q}$  of all subsets of  $X$ :

$$D_{KL}(p|q; X) = \sum_{S \subseteq X} \Delta_{p|q}(S) \quad (75)$$

$$\Downarrow$$

$$\Delta_{p|q}(X) = \sum_{S \subseteq X} (-1)^{|X|-|S|} D_{KL}(p|q; S) \quad (76)$$

To make sense of this formula, we have to decide on a definition of  $D_{KL}(p|q; T)$  when  $T \subseteq X$ . One obvious choice is to define it as the KL-divergence between the marginal distributions  $p_T$  and  $q_T$  where all variables outside of  $T$  are marginalised over.

$$D_{KL}(p|q; T) = D_{KL}(p_T|q_T) \quad (77)$$

where  $p_T(T = t) = \sum_x p(X \setminus T = x, T = t)$  and similarly for  $q_T$ . For example, when  $X = \{X_1, X_2, X_3\}$ , the third-order contribution to the KL-divergence is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{p|q}(X_1, X_2, X_3) &= D_{KL}(p|q) - D_{KL}(p_{X_1, X_2}|q_{X_1, X_2}) - D_{KL}(p_{X_1, X_3}|q_{X_1, X_3}) \\ &\quad - D_{KL}(p_{X_2, X_3}|q_{X_2, X_3}) + D_{KL}(p_{X_1}|q_{X_1}) + D_{KL}(p_{X_2}|q_{X_2}) + D_{KL}(p_{X_3}|q_{X_3}) \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

To investigate if the  $\Delta_{p|q}$  measure indeed separates different contributions to the KL-divergence, we calculate the KL-divergence between a reference distribution and various Ising models with up to 3-point interactions. Consider the following Ising distribution:

$$p(x; h, J, K) = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left( \sum_i h_i x_i + \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} K_{ijk} x_i x_j x_k \right) \quad (79)$$

where the spins  $x_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ . The uniform distribution corresponds to an Ising model  $p(x; 0, 0, 0)$  with  $h_i = J_{ij} = K_{ijk} = 0$ . We compare  $p(x; 0, 0, 0)$  to Ising models with only an external field, only pairwise nearest-neighbour coupling, or only 3-point interactions. To do so, define  $h^{(0)}$ ,  $J^{(0)}$ , and  $K^{(0)}$  as:

$$h_i^{(0)} = h_0 \delta_0^i \quad J_{ij}^{(0)} = J_{01} \delta_0^i \delta_1^j \quad K_{ijk}^{(0)} = K_{012} \delta_0^i \delta_1^j \delta_2^k \quad (80)$$

where  $\delta_j^i$  is the Kronecker delta. The corresponding Ising distributions are given by

$$q_1(x) := p(x; h^{(0)}, 0, 0) = Z^{-1} \exp(h_0 x_0) \quad (81)$$

$$q_2(x) := p(x; 0, J^{(0)}, 0) = Z^{-1} \exp(J_{01} x_0 x_1) \quad (82)$$

$$q_3(x) := p(x; 0, 0, K^{(0)}) = Z^{-1} \exp(K_{012} x_0 x_1 x_2) \quad (83)$$

In each of these three interacting scenarios, we vary the strength of the non-zero coupling from  $-1$  to  $1$ , and calculate the KL-divergence  $D_{KL}(p(x; 0, 0, 0)|q_i(x))$ , as well as its decomposition into  $\Delta_{p|q}$  terms. The results for Ising models on 4 variables are shown in Figure 4 (an associated Jupyter notebook is available at <https://github.com/AJnsm/KLdecomposition>). As expected, the KL-divergence grows with the absolute coupling strength, but the  $\Delta_{p|q}$ ’s offer more information and precisely disentangle the various contributions. For example, when varying  $K_{012}$ , all  $\Delta_{p|q}$  at orders 1 and 2 are zero, and only  $\Delta_{p|q}(012)$  is non-zero among the 3rd-order terms. Similar disentangling can be seen when varying 1- or 2-point couplings. This shows that the decomposition is able to precisely identify the variables that are responsible for the deviation from the uniform distribution.

In practice, the reference distribution will generally not be uniform, since one often compares an empirical distribution to a model distribution—neither of which should *a priori* be uniform. To validate the behaviour of the  $\Delta_{p|q}$ ’s in a more realistic scenario, we also calculated and decomposed the KL-divergence between two






FIG. 4. The KL-divergence between the uniform distribution and an interaction Ising model ( $n = 4$ ) grows with the interaction strength, but the decomposition reveals that this growth is not uniform across all subsets of variables. In fact, the decomposition is able to exactly identify the set of variables that is responsible for the deviation from the uniform distribution.




FIG. 5. Decomposing the KL-divergence between two interacting Ising models ( $n = 4$ ) also indicates which variables are responsible for the discrepancy, though at weak coupling this identification becomes harder, especially for higher-order discrepancies. Errors bars are standard errors on the mean across 100 initialisations of randomised interacting reference distributions.

interacting Ising models. In this case, the reference distributions are those with random couplings  $h^{(r)}$ ,  $J^{(r)}$ , and  $K^{(r)}$ :

$$h_i^{(r)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad J_{ij}^{(r)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)\delta_1^{(j-i)\bmod N} \quad K_{ijk}^{(r)} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)(1 - \delta_i^j)(1 - \delta_i^k)(1 - \delta_j^k) \quad (84)$$

where for each set of indices, a single sample is drawn from the standard normal, which is then assigned to all permutations of the indices to enforce symmetry of  $J$  and  $K$ . The reference distribution is then given by  $p(x; h^{(r)}, J^{(r)}, K^{(r)})$ . The other distribution  $q_i(x)$  is a copy of this distribution, but with one of the  $i$ th-order couplings varying from  $-10$  to  $10$  (namely,  $h_0$ ,  $J_{01}$ , or  $K_{012}$ , see Figure 5). We then calculate the KL-divergence between the interacting reference distribution  $p(x; h^{(r)}, J^{(r)}, K^{(r)})$  and each  $q_i$ . The results across 100 initialisations of the randomised reference distribution are shown in Figure 5. The largest  $\Delta_{p|q}$  still clearly identify the set of variables that is responsible for the discrepancy, but at weak coupling—that is, small discrepancy—small but significantly non-zero  $\Delta_{p|q}$  among other variables make identifying the true source of the discrepancy more difficult or impossible, especially for higher-order discrepancies.

## V. DISCUSSION

The aim of this study has been to provide a unified perspective on the various notions of higher-order interactions in complex systems. We have shown that decomposing a system into a mereological structure leads to a unique definition of the interactions among the parts, through a Möbius inversion of the outcome of interest. Furthermore, this presented a precise meaning of the word *higher-order*, namely higher with respect to the partial order of the mereology. In particular, the smallest elements of each of the studied mereologies corresponded to the ‘reductionistic’ parts of the theory. We found that this approach reproduces well-known notions of higher-order structure in a variety of scientific fields, an overview of which is provided in Table I. While some of the relationships in Table I have previously been described as Möbius inversions, to our knowledge this is the first time that the shared structure underlying these definitions has been made explicit. In addition, the framework lays out an approach for defining new kinds of microscopic interactions relative to a macroscopic quantity and its mereology. To illustrate this in practice, we used our framework to derive a new decomposition of the KL-divergence that allows for the identification of the variables that are responsible for the discrepancy between two distributions.

Field of Study	Macro Quantity	Mereology	Micro Quantity/Interactions
Statistics	Moments	Powerset	Central moments
	Moments	Partitions	Cumulants
	Free moments	Non-crossing partitions	Free cumulants
	Path signature moments	Ordered partitions	Path signature cumulants
Information Theory	Entropy	Powerset	Mutual information
	Surprisal	Powerset	Pointwise mutual information
	Joint Surprisal	Powerset	Conditional interactions
	Mutual Information	Antichains	Synergy/redundancy atoms
Biology	Pheno- & Genotype	Powerset	Epistasis
	Gene expression profile	Powerset	Genetic interactions
	Population statistics	Powerset	Synergistic treatment effects
Physics	Ensemble energies	Powerset	Ising interactions
	Correlation functions	Partitions	Ursell functions
	Quantum corr. functions	Partitions	Scattering amplitudes
Chemistry	Molecular property	Subgraphs	Fragment contributions
	Molecular property	Reaction poset	Cluster contributions
Game Theory	Coalition value	Powerset	Coalition synergy
	Shapley value	Powerset	Normalised coalition synergy
Artificial Intelligence	Generative model probabilities	Powerset	Feature interactions
	Predictive model predictions	Powerset	Feature contributions
	Dempster-Shafer Belief	Distributive	Evidence weight
	$D_{KL}(p q)$	Powerset	$\Delta_{p q}$

TABLE I. An overview of the various ways in which macroscopic quantities can be linked to microscopic interactions by the Möbius inversion associated with a certain decomposition.

It should be noted that the Möbius inversion theorem can also be scientifically practical beyond its use in the mereological framework presented here. For example, it has been used by the author of [15] to derive an expression for phonon densities in a crystal lattice, but in the context of a number-theoretic trick rather than a decomposition of the system. Similarly, the inclusion-exclusion principle is ubiquitous, but not always indicative of an instance of the presented framework. In this study, our aim has been to explicitly show how the Möbius inversion theorem defines interactions relative to a chosen mereology, not to give a review of all the ways in which the theorem can be applied.

As a general rule, observations of a system provide access to the macroscopic features (moments, phenotypes, energies, predictions, *etc*), which can then be used to infer the microscopic interactions (cumulants, genetic interactions, Ising interactions, feature contributions, *etc*), so the Möbius inversion theorem can offer a solution to the inverse problem and quantify emergence by revealing to which extent the atomic contributions at the bottom of the mereology are insufficient to explain macroscopic properties. However, such a statement must be accompanied by two caveats. First, note that a Möbius inversion only solves the inverse problem relative to a chosen mereology. While there are no universal criteria for a ‘good’ decomposition, the mereology should be motivated by knowledge of the system’s structure and the macroscopic property of interest. For example, a partition-based mereology may be natural when the macroscopic property depends on how different parts come together, while the powerset mereology is more suited to properties that depend on binary configurations of the parts. When there is a natural structure to the parts, like in the case of noncommuting variables or chemical structures, a decomposition that respects this structure, like non-crossing partitions or subgraphs, can be more appropriate. If the chosen mereology is not appropriate, then a Möbius inversion will not lead to meaningful microscopic interactions either. One example of this is the Möbius inversion on the partition mereology that related scattering amplitudes of quantum field theory to correlation functions. The Möbius inversion still gave infinite sums over Feynman diagrams, not the contribution of individual diagrams, so the interesting microscopic interactions (connected parts of individual diagrams) were not directly accessible from the macroscopic observables. Furthermore, collections of particles can carry more structure, like fermion number and colour, which also implies that partitions are not the most appropriate decomposition for the problem. The microscopic interactions therefore inherit their justification from the mereology, and are not guaranteed to be ‘real’ or useful.

As a second caveat, note that some canonic examples of emergence cannot be studied with the presented framework, because the Möbius inversion is only possible if the macroscopic quantity is defined on every element of the mereology. For many classic examples of emergence, like bird flocks, temperature, *etc*, this is not possible (a single bird does not flock, and a single molecule has no temperature). An interesting example of this problem arose in the partial information decomposition. Under the antichain mereology, estimating the contribution

of the information atoms is only possible with a suitable definition of redundant information on each of the antichains. Much of the PID literature has focused on resolving this ambiguity in different ways, but no consensus has been reached so far. However, this also highlights how versatile the Möbius inversion framework is: even when the decomposition results in ambiguity, different resolutions of this ambiguity can give rise to a rich set of higher-order structure, which in the case of the PID have been used to characterise different properties of neural information processing [58, 80, 94].

A particularly interesting phenomenon not explored in the present study is that of order dualities. As was already observed in [40], inverting a lattice leads to dual notions of higher-order interactions. In information theory, the dual to information theory was found to be conditional mutual information, and a similar dual was derived for Ising interactions. It is an unexplored but interesting question whether the quantities dual to the ones presented here also offer a meaningful interpretation. It is clear that the rooted mereologies used in this study can be inverted to yield new mereologies, but deriving the corresponding dual interactions is left for future work.

Another exciting possibility is using the presented framework to transfer insights from one scientific discipline to another. For example, in the so-called *cluster variation method*, physical intuition has motivated the truncation of sums over lattice subsets to obtain approximations to thermodynamic quantities of crystals [45]. This summation can be seen as a truncated Möbius inversion over the lattice of physical crystal lattice sites [1, 63], and could be explored as an approximation scheme in other settings as well. In fact, precisely such a truncation has been suggested in decompositions of chemical properties of molecules [38]. Whether it is useful to describe partial sums over scattering diagrams similarly as truncated Möbius inversions is—to our best knowledge—an open question. In addition, the authors of [43] use causal discovery methods to improve the estimation of genetic interactions (the Möbius inverse of gene-expression profiles). Since the estimation of microscopic interactions from macroscopic observables can require many observations, similar methods might be able to improve the estimability of higher-order interactions in other fields.

Further future work could explore different kinds of mereologies and the higher-order structure they imply. For example, a recent study has started to explore the combinatorics of nucleotide sequences in polyploid genomes by decomposing sequencing data over the lattice of integer partitions ordered by refinement [71], and it has long been noted that the secondary structure of RNA molecules can be described in terms of non-crossing partitions [68]. Another setting seemingly well-suited to our framework is the renormalisation group, which studies how interactions change under coarse-grainings, i.e. under a change in mereology. More speculatively, mereologies beyond locally finite partial orders could be explored by suitably generalising the Möbius inversion theorem. It is well-known that the Möbius inversion theorem can be generalised to a more general class of skeletal categories that includes not just posets but also monoids and groupoids [18, 34, 55, 56], as well as to bialgebras [49]. Whether these more general decompositions faithfully and fruitfully describe higher-order structure in complex systems is a mostly unexplored and open question. We hope that this work inspires others to explore novel mereologies and discover new types of higher-order structures in complex systems.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The connections to game theory, chemistry, and path statistics were the result of fruitful discussions with Jürgen Jost, Guillermo Restrepo, and Darrick Lee, respectively. The author is also grateful to Eckehard Olbrich and Fernando Rosas for insightful discussions on the partial information decomposition, as well as to Hadleigh Frost for his comments on diagrammatic sums in quantum field theory, and Joachim Kock for his comments on mereology.

## Appendix A: Möbius Inversions and Mereology in Statistics

Of central importance in statistics are the moments of a distribution. Given a joint distribution  $p$  over  $N$  variables  $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_N) \in \mathcal{X}$ , and a set  $S$  of integers that denote a subset  $\mathbf{X}_S := \{X_i \mid i \in S\} \subseteq \mathbf{X}$ , the mixed moment of a set of variables  $S$  is given by

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{i \in S} X_i\right) = \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathcal{X}} p(X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_N = x_N) \prod_{i \in S} X_i \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$:= \langle S \rangle \quad (\text{A2})$$

If we assume that there is no inherent ordering to the variables, then it is natural to decompose the moment into elemental contributions  $e(t)$  of elements of the powerset mereology on  $S$ :

$$\langle S \rangle = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{P}(S)} e(T) \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$= \sum_{T \subseteq S} e(T) \quad (\text{A4})$$

To find out what the contributions  $e(t)$  are, we can invert this sum using a Möbius inversion. Note, however, that the quantities  $X_i$  might be dimensionful quantities, so to make this sum well-defined, we interpret  $\langle S \rangle$  as the product  $\langle \prod_{i \in S} X_i \rangle \prod_{i \in S \setminus S} \langle X_i \rangle$ , and write the full Möbius inversion as

$$e(S) = \sum_{T \subseteq S} \mu_{\mathcal{P}}(T, S) \langle T \rangle \prod_{S_i \in S \setminus T} \langle X_i \rangle \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$= \sum_{T \subseteq S} (-1)^{|T| - |S|} \langle T \rangle \prod_{S_i \in S \setminus T} \langle X_i \rangle \quad (\text{A6})$$

which for the case of three variables  $X_1, X_2, X_3$  yields

$$e(X_i) = \langle X_i \rangle \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$e(X_i, X_j) = \langle X_i, X_j \rangle - \langle X_i \rangle \langle X_j \rangle \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$e(X_1, X_2, X_3) = \langle X_1, X_2, X_3 \rangle - \langle X_1, X_2 \rangle \langle X_3 \rangle - \langle X_1, X_3 \rangle \langle X_2 \rangle - \langle X_2, X_3 \rangle \langle X_1 \rangle + 2 \langle X_1 \rangle \langle X_2 \rangle \langle X_3 \rangle \quad (\text{A9})$$

These are exactly the mixed central moments (it can be readily verified that this construction generalises to all higher-order moments), so that central moments are the Möbius inverse of mixed moments with respect to the powerset mereology.

What happens if we impose a different mereology on the moments? For example, one might decompose a moment into contributions from all possible partitions  $\pi$  of the system:

$$\langle S \rangle = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi(S)} \kappa(\pi) \quad (\text{A10})$$

where now  $\kappa(\pi)$  is the contribution of the partition  $\pi$  to the mixed moment, and  $\Pi(S)$  is the set of all partitions of  $S$ . To respect the dimensions of  $X$  we define the moment of a partition to be the product of moments of the blocks, so we can invert (A10) over the lattice of partitions ordered by refinement:

$$\kappa(S) = \sum_{\pi \in \Pi(S)} \mu_{\Pi}(\pi, S) \prod_{\pi_i \in \pi} \langle \pi_i \rangle \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$= \sum_{\pi \in \Pi(S)} (-1)^{|\pi| - 1} (|\pi| - 1)! \prod_{\pi_i \in \pi} \langle \pi_i \rangle \quad (\text{A12})$$

where we have written  $S$  for the partition  $\{S\}$ . This happens to be the same as the central moments for up to three variables, but is different afterwards. The  $\kappa$  are called the mixed cumulants, and famously offer an equivalent way to characterise the distribution  $p$ .

Note that a decomposing a set of variables  $S$  into subsets or partitions only makes sense if the variables commute. In the noncommutative case, it is more natural to decompose  $S$  into so-called *non-crossing* partitions. A partition is non-crossing if there is no chain of elements  $A > B > C > D$  such that  $A$  and  $C$  are in the same block,  $B$  and  $D$  are in the same block, but  $A$  and  $D$  are in different blocks. For example, the partition  $\{\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}\}$  is non-crossing, but  $\{\{1, 3\}, \{2, 4\}\}$  is not. The Möbius function of the lattice of non-crossing partitions is known to be given by signed Catalan numbers, and can be used to define the noncommutative version of cumulants, called *free cumulants* [84]. When sampling from stochastic processes, one might encounter path-valued variables. The statistics of such path-values samples can be summarised in a sequence of *path signature moments*. The authors of [12] argue that the sequential nature of these path-valued variables makes it most natural to decompose them into *ordered partitions*, which under their refinement order result in yet another mereology. Inverting the path signature moments over this ordered partition mereology yields the path signature cumulants, which are the natural generalisation of the cumulants to path-valued variables. These examples illustrate how different assumptions on the variables can be translated into different mereologies, which each lead to different notions of higher-order structure.

---

[1] G. An. A note on the cluster variation method. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 52:727–734, 1988.

- [2] Y. E. Antebi, J. M. Linton, H. Klumpe, B. Bintu, M. Gong, C. Su, R. McCardell, and M. B. Elowitz. Combinatorial signal perception in the bmp pathway. *Cell*, 170(6):1184–1196, 2017.
- [3] D. N. Arnosti, S. Barolo, M. Levine, and S. Small. The eve stripe 2 enhancer employs multiple modes of transcriptional synergy. *Development*, 122(1):205–214, 1996.
- [4] N. Ay, E. Olbrich, N. Bertschinger, and J. Jost. A geometric approach to complexity. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 21(3), 2011.
- [5] D. Babić and N. Trinajstić. Möbius inversion on a poset of a graph and its acyclic subgraphs. *Discrete applied mathematics*, 67(1-3):5–11, 1996.
- [6] F. Battiston, E. Amico, A. Barrat, G. Bianconi, G. Ferraz de Arruda, B. Franceschiello, I. Iacopini, S. Kéfi, V. Latora, Y. Moreno, et al. The physics of higher-order interactions in complex systems. *Nature Physics*, 17(10):1093–1098, 2021.
- [7] F. Battiston, G. Cencetti, I. Iacopini, V. Latora, M. Lucas, A. Patania, J.-G. Young, and G. Petri. Networks beyond pairwise interactions: Structure and dynamics. *Physics Reports*, 874:1–92, 2020.
- [8] W. Bechtel. Decomposing the mind-brain: A long-term pursuit. *Brain and Mind*, 3:229–242, 2002.
- [9] S. V. Beentjes and A. Khamseh. Higher-order interactions in statistical physics and machine learning: A model-independent solution to the inverse problem at equilibrium. *Physical Review E*, 102(5):053314, 2020.
- [10] N. Beerenwinkel, L. Pachter, and B. Sturmfels. Epistasis and shapes of fitness landscapes. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 1317–1342, 2007.
- [11] A. Billot and J.-F. Thisse. How to share when context matters: The möbius value as a generalized solution for cooperative games. *Journal of Mathematical Economics*, 41(8):1007–1029, 2005.
- [12] P. Bonnier and H. Oberhauser. Signature cumulants, ordered partitions, and independence of stochastic processes. 2020.
- [13] S. P. Borgatti, A. Mehra, D. J. Brass, and G. Labianca. Network analysis in the social sciences. *science*, 323(5916):892–895, 2009.
- [14] E. A. Boyle, Y. I. Li, and J. K. Pritchard. An expanded view of complex traits: from polygenic to omnigenic. *Cell*, 169(7):1177–1186, 2017.
- [15] N.-x. Chen. Modified möbius inverse formula and its applications in physics. *Physical review letters*, 64(11):1193, 1990.
- [16] M. Chertkov and V. Y. Chernyak. Loop series for discrete statistical models on graphs. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, 2006(06):P06009, 2006.
- [17] S. Cohen, G. Dror, and E. Ruppín. Feature selection via coalitional game theory. *Neural computation*, 19(7):1939–1961, 2007.
- [18] M. Content, F. Lemay, and P. Leroux. Catégories de möbius et fonctorialités: un cadre général pour l’inversion de möbius. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 28(2):169–190, 1980.
- [19] G. Cossu, L. Del Debbio, T. Giani, A. Khamseh, and M. Wilson. Machine learning determination of dynamical parameters: The ising model case. *Physical Review B*, 100(6):064304, 2019.
- [20] A. Dempster. Upper and lower probabilities induced by a multi-valued mapping. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 38, 1967.
- [21] D. C. Dennett. Darwin’s dangerous idea. *The Sciences*, 35(3):34–40, 1995.
- [22] J. Dezert, A. Tchamova, D. Han, and J.-M. Tacnet. Why dempster’s fusion rule is not a generalization of bayes fusion rule. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Information Fusion*, pages 1127–1134. IEEE, 2013.
- [23] C. Domb and G. Joyce. Cluster expansion for a polymer chain. *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics*, 5(9):956, 1972.
- [24] H. Eble, M. Joswig, L. Lamberti, and W. B. Ludington. Master regulators of biological systems in higher dimensions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(51):e2300634120, 2023.
- [25] M. Eidi and J. Jost. Ollivier ricci curvature of directed hypergraphs. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1):12466, 2020.
- [26] A. Erramuzpe, G. J. Ortega, J. Pastor, R. G. De Sola, D. Marinazzo, S. Stramaglia, and J. M. Cortes. Identification of redundant and synergetic circuits in triplets of electrophysiological data. *Journal of neural engineering*, 12(6):066007, 2015.
- [27] J. W. Essam. Graph theory and statistical physics. *Discrete Mathematics*, 1(1):83–112, 1971.
- [28] D. Fryer, I. Strümke, and H. Nguyen. Shapley values for feature selection: The good, the bad, and the axioms. *Ieee Access*, 9:144352–144360, 2021.
- [29] E. Gardner. Spin glasses with p-spin interactions. *Nuclear Physics B*, 257:747–765, 1985.
- [30] G. Ghoshal, V. Zlatić, G. Caldarelli, and M. E. Newman. Random hypergraphs and their applications. *Physical Review E*, 79(6):066118, 2009.
- [31] A. L. Gould, V. Zhang, L. Lamberti, E. W. Jones, B. Obadia, N. Korasidis, A. Gavryushkin, J. M. Carlson, N. Beerenwinkel, and W. B. Ludington. Microbiome interactions shape host fitness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(51):E11951–E11960, 2018.
- [32] M. Grabisch. Belief functions on lattices. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 24(1):76–95, 2009.
- [33] M. Grandjean. A social network analysis of twitter: Mapping the digital humanities community. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 3(1):1171458, 2016.
- [34] J. Haigh. On the möbius algebra and the grothendieck ring of a finite category. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(1):81–92, 1980.
- [35] G. M. Hodgson. Generalizing darwinism to social evolution: Some early attempts. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 39(4):899–914, 2005.
- [36] R. A. Ince, B. L. Giordano, C. Kayser, G. A. Rousselet, J. Gross, and P. G. Schyns. A statistical framework for neuroimaging data analysis based on mutual information estimated via a gaussian copula. *Human brain mapping*, 38(3):1541–1573, 2017.

- [37] T. Ivanciuc, O. Ivanciuc, and D. J. Klein. Posetic quantitative superstructure/activity relationships (qssars) for chlorobenzenes. *Journal of chemical information and modeling*, 45(4):870–879, 2005.
- [38] T. Ivanciuc, D. J. Klein, and O. Ivanciuc. Posetic cluster expansion for substitution-reaction networks and application to methylated cyclobutanes. *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry*, 41:355–379, 2007.
- [39] C. Jäkel. A computation of the ninth dedekind number. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.00895*, 2023.
- [40] A. Jansma. Higher-order interactions and their duals reveal synergy and logical dependence beyond shannon-information. *Entropy*, 25(4):648, 2023.
- [41] A. Jansma. *Higher-order interactions in single-cell gene expression*. PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh, 2023.
- [42] A. Jansma, F. E. Rosas, and P. Mediano. The fast möbius transform: An efficient approach to decompose information (forthcoming). 2024.
- [43] A. Jansma, Y. Yao, J. Wolfe, L. Del Debbio, S. V. Beentjes, C. P. Ponting, and A. Khamseh. High order expression dependencies finely resolve cryptic states and subtypes in single cell data. *bioRxiv*, pages 2023–12, 2023.
- [44] E. T. Jaynes. Information theory and statistical mechanics. *Physical review*, 106(4):620, 1957.
- [45] R. Kikuchi. A theory of cooperative phenomena. *Physical review*, 81(6):988, 1951.
- [46] T. R. Kirkpatrick and D. Thirumalai. p-spin-interaction spin-glass models: Connections with the structural glass problem. *Physical Review B*, 36(10):5388, 1987.
- [47] D. Klein, T. Schmalz, and L. Bytautas. Chemical sub-structural cluster expansions for molecular properties. *SAR and QSAR in Environmental Research*, 10(2-3):131–156, 1999.
- [48] H. E. Klumpe, M. A. Langley, J. M. Linton, C. J. Su, Y. E. Antebi, and M. B. Elowitz. The context-dependent, combinatorial logic of bmp signaling. *Cell systems*, 13(5):388–407, 2022.
- [49] J. Kock. From möbius inversion to renormalisation. *Communications in Number Theory and Physics*, 14(1):171–198, 2020.
- [50] R. Kubo. Generalized cumulant expansion method. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 17(7):1100–1120, 1962.
- [51] E. Kuzmin, B. VanderSluis, W. Wang, G. Tan, R. Deshpande, Y. Chen, M. Usaj, A. Balint, M. Mattiazzi Usaj, J. Van Leeuwen, et al. Systematic analysis of complex genetic interactions. *Science*, 360(6386):eaao1729, 2018.
- [52] L. Lang, P. Baudot, R. Quax, and P. Forré. Information decomposition diagrams applied beyond shannon entropy: A generalization of hu’s theorem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.09393*, 2022.
- [53] W. Leal, G. Restrepo, P. F. Stadler, and J. Jost. Forman–ricci curvature for hypergraphs. *Advances in Complex Systems*, 24(01):2150003, 2021.
- [54] H. Lehmann, K. Symanzik, and W. Zimmermann. Zur formulierung quantisierter feldtheorien. *Il Nuovo Cimento (1955-1965)*, 1:205–225, 1955.
- [55] T. Leinster. Notions of möbius inversion. *Bulletin of the Belgian Mathematical Society-Simon Stevin*, 19(5):909–933, 2012.
- [56] P. Leroux. Les categories de möbius. *Cahiers Topol. Geom. Diff.*, 16:280–282, 1976.
- [57] Q. F. Lotito, F. Musciotto, A. Montresor, and F. Battiston. Higher-order motif analysis in hypergraphs. *Communications Physics*, 5(1):79, 2022.
- [58] A. I. Luppi, P. A. Mediano, F. E. Rosas, N. Holland, T. D. Fryer, J. T. O’Brien, J. B. Rowe, D. K. Menon, D. Bor, and E. A. Stamatakis. A synergistic core for human brain evolution and cognition. *Nature Neuroscience*, 25(6):771–782, 2022.
- [59] H. J. Maris and L. P. Kadanoff. Teaching the renormalization group. *American journal of physics*, 46(6):652–657, 1978.
- [60] O. Mason and M. Verwoerd. Graph theory and networks in biology. *IET systems biology*, 1(2):89–119, 2007.
- [61] P. A. Mediano, F. E. Rosas, A. I. Luppi, R. L. Carhart-Harris, D. Bor, A. K. Seth, and A. B. Barrett. Towards an extended taxonomy of information dynamics via integrated information decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13186*, 2021.
- [62] L. Merchan and I. Nemenman. On the sufficiency of pairwise interactions in maximum entropy models of networks. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 162:1294–1308, 2016.
- [63] T. Morita. Cluster variation method and möbius inversion formula. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 59:819–825, 1990.
- [64] E. L. Newman, T. F. Varley, V. K. Parakkattu, S. P. Sherrill, and J. M. Beggs. Revealing the dynamics of neural information processing with multivariate information decomposition. *Entropy*, 24(7):930, 2022.
- [65] H. C. Nguyen, R. Zecchina, and J. Berg. Inverse statistical problems: from the inverse ising problem to data science. *Advances in Physics*, 66(3):197–261, 2017.
- [66] G. K. Ocker, K. Josić, E. Shea-Brown, and M. A. Buice. Linking structure and activity in nonlinear spiking networks. *PLoS computational biology*, 13(6):e1005583, 2017.
- [67] G. A. Pavlopoulos, M. Secrier, C. N. Moschopoulos, T. G. Soldatos, S. Kossida, J. Aerts, R. Schneider, and P. G. Bagos. Using graph theory to analyze biological networks. *BioData mining*, 4:1–27, 2011.
- [68] R. Penner and M. S. Waterman. Spaces of rna secondary structures. *Advances in Mathematics*, 101(1):31–49, 1993.
- [69] M. E. Peskin. *An introduction to quantum field theory*. CRC press, 2018.
- [70] Plato. Phaedrus 265e. <http://data.perseus.org/citations/urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0059.tlg012.perseus-eng1:265e>, 370 BC.
- [71] T. R. Ranallo-Benavidez, K. S. Jaron, and M. C. Schatz. Genomescope 2.0 and smudgeplot for reference-free profiling of polyploid genomes. *Nature communications*, 11(1):1432, 2020.
- [72] F. E. Rosas, P. A. Mediano, A. I. Luppi, T. F. Varley, J. T. Lizier, S. Stramaglia, H. J. Jensen, and D. Marinazzo. Disentangling high-order mechanisms and high-order behaviours in complex systems. *Nature Physics*, 18(5):476–477, 2022.
- [73] R. Rosen. Some results in graph theory and their application to abstract relational biology. *The bulletin of mathematical biophysics*, 25(2):231–241, 1963.
- [74] G.-C. Rota. On the foundations of combinatorial theory i. theory of möbius functions. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 2(4):340–368, 1964.

- [75] G.-C. Rota and J. Shen. On the combinatorics of cumulants. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 91(1-2):283–304, 2000.
- [76] H. Schawe and L. Hernández. Higher order interactions destroy phase transitions in deffuant opinion dynamics model. *Communications Physics*, 5(1):32, 2022.
- [77] M. Scheffer, J. Bascompte, W. A. Brock, V. Brovkin, S. R. Carpenter, V. Dakos, H. Held, E. H. Van Nes, M. Rietkerk, and G. Sugihara. Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nature*, 461(7260):53–59, 2009.
- [78] G. Shafer. *A mathematical theory of evidence*, volume 42. Princeton university press, 1976.
- [79] L. S. Shapley et al. A value for n-person games. 1953.
- [80] S. P. Sherrill, N. M. Timme, J. M. Beggs, and E. L. Newman. Partial information decomposition reveals that synergistic neural integration is greater downstream of recurrent information flow in organotypic cortical cultures. *PLoS computational biology*, 17(7):e1009196, 2021.
- [81] P. S. Skardal and A. Arenas. Higher order interactions in complex networks of phase oscillators promote abrupt synchronization switching. *Communications Physics*, 3(1):218, 2020.
- [82] R. Solé. *Phase transitions*, volume 3. Princeton University Press, 2011.
- [83] T. Speed and H. Silcock. Cumulants and partition lattices v. calculating generalized k-statistics. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 44(2):171–196, 1988.
- [84] R. Speicher. Free probability theory and non-crossing partitions. *Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire [electronic only]*, 39:B39c–38, 1997.
- [85] T. Spribille, V. Tuovinen, P. Resl, D. Vanderpool, H. Wolinski, M. C. Aime, K. Schneider, E. Stabentheiner, M. Toome-Heller, G. Thor, et al. Basidiomycete yeasts in the cortex of ascomycete macrolichens. *Science*, 353(6298):488–492, 2016.
- [86] R. P. Stanley. Enumerative combinatorics volume 1 second edition. *Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics*, 2011.
- [87] T. Tanaka and T. Aoyagi. Multistable attractors in a network of phase oscillators with three-body interactions. *Physical Review Letters*, 106(22):224101, 2011.
- [88] G. Tkacik, E. Schneidman, M. J. Berry II, and W. Bialek. Ising models for networks of real neurons. *arXiv preprint q-bio/0611072*, 2006.
- [89] L. Van Hirtum, P. De Causmaecker, J. Goemaere, T. Kenter, H. Riebler, M. Lass, and C. Plessl. A computation of d (9) using fpga supercomputing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03039*, 2023.
- [90] J. Watkinson, K.-c. Liang, X. Wang, T. Zheng, and D. Anastassiou. Inference of regulatory gene interactions from expression data using three-way mutual information. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1158(1):302–313, 2009.
- [91] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz. Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *nature*, 393(6684):440–442, 1998.
- [92] S. Weinberg. *The quantum theory of fields*, volume 2. Cambridge university press, 1995.
- [93] M. Welling, A. E. Gelfand, and A. T. Ihler. A cluster-cumulant expansion at the fixed points of belief propagation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.4916*, 2012.
- [94] M. Wibral, C. Finn, P. Wollstadt, J. T. Lizier, and V. Priesemann. Quantifying information modification in developing neural networks via partial information decomposition. *Entropy*, 19(9):494, 2017.
- [95] P. L. Williams and R. D. Beer. Nonnegative decomposition of multivariate information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1004.2515*, 2010.
- [96] B. Williamson and J. Feng. Efficient nonparametric statistical inference on population feature importance using shapley values. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 10282–10291. PMLR, 2020.
- [97] R. W. Yeung. A new outlook on shannon's information measures. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 37(3):466–474, 1991.
- [98] C. Zhou. Belief functions on distributive lattices. *Artificial Intelligence*, 201:1–31, 2013.
- [99] W. H. Zurek. Quantum darwinism. *Nature physics*, 5(3):181–188, 2009.