

# Additive indecomposability of submodular set functions and its generalization\*

Toshiaki Murofushi (Tokyo Institute of Technology)  
Katsushige Fujimoto (Fukushima University)  
Yoshinari Sawata (Tokyo Institute of Technology)

## 1 Introduction

This paper deals with a decomposition of a submodular set function into a sum of submodular set functions on subdomains and its generalization. Submodular set functions have an important role in mathematical programming [3], and a supermodular set function, which is the conjugate of a submodular set function (see Section 2), also is an important concept called a convex game in cooperative game theory [6]. Therefore, the additive decomposition of submodular set functions has broad application possibilities.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 explains basic concepts such as inclusion-exclusion family, submodularity, and (weak)  $k$ -monotonicity. Section 3 shows the results on additive decompositions of set functions we have obtained so far. Section 4 gives the main results, that is, conditions for additive indecomposability, which provide a foothold for further investigation of additive decompositions.

## 2 Preliminaries

For a finite set  $X$ , the number of elements of  $X$  is denoted by  $|X|$ , the power set of  $X$  by  $2^X$ , and, for an integer  $k$  such that  $0 \leq k \leq |X|$ , the family of  $k$ -element subsets of  $X$  is denoted by  $\binom{X}{k}$ , i.e.,

$$\binom{X}{k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{Y \in 2^X \mid |Y| = k\}.$$

Throughout this paper,  $E$  is assumed to be a finite set.

A family  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $E$  is called an *antichain* if  $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $A \subseteq A'$  together imply  $A = A'$ . For antichains  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , we write  $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq \mathcal{B}$  if for every  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  there is  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $A \subseteq B$ ; then  $\sqsubseteq$  is a partial ordering on the class of all antichains over  $E$ , and the class forms a lattice with the following meet:

$$\mathcal{A} \sqcap \mathcal{B} = \text{Max}\{A \cap B \mid A \in \mathcal{A}, B \in \mathcal{B}\},$$

---

\*This work is partially supported by grants from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, the 21st Century COE Program "Creation of Agent-Based Social Systems Sciences" and Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C), 19510136, 2007.

where, for a family  $\mathcal{F}$  of sets,  $\text{Max}\mathcal{F}$  is defined by

$$\text{Max}\mathcal{F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{M \in \mathcal{F} \mid M \text{ is maximal in } \mathcal{F} \text{ with respect to set inclusion } \subseteq\}.$$

A function  $f : 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $f(\emptyset) = 0$  is called a *set function* on  $E$ . An antichain  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $E$  is called an *inclusion-exclusion family*, or an *inclusion-exclusion antichain*, with respect to a set function  $f$  on  $E$  if (IE) below holds:

$$\langle \text{IE} \rangle: \quad f(X) = \sum_{\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset} (-1)^{|\mathcal{B}|+1} f\left(X \cap \bigcap \mathcal{B}\right) \quad \text{for all } X \subseteq E.$$

If an antichain  $\mathcal{A}$  contains a subset  $A$  such that  $f(X) = f(X \cap A)$  for every  $X \subseteq E$ , then  $\mathcal{A}$  is an inclusion-exclusion family with respect to  $f$ , and  $\mathcal{A}$  is called a *trivial inclusion-exclusion family*; for example,  $\{E\}$  is a trivial inclusion-exclusion family with respect to any set function on  $E$ . For antichains  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , if  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ , and if  $\mathcal{A}$  is an inclusion-exclusion family with respect to a set function  $f$ , then so is  $\mathcal{B}$ . If  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are inclusion-exclusion antichains with respect to a set function  $f$ , then so is  $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}$ . Therefore, every set function has its least (with respect to  $\subseteq$ ) inclusion-exclusion antichain.

For a set function  $f$  on  $E$ , the *sign inversion*  $-f$  of  $f$  and the *conjugate*, or *dual*,  $f^\#$  of  $f$  are defined as follows [3]:

$$(-f)(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -f(X), \quad f^\#(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(E) - f(E \setminus X)$$

for every  $X \subseteq E$ . For any set function  $f_A$  on  $A \subseteq E$ , we regard  $f_A$  as a set function on  $E$  by defining  $f_A(X) = f_A(X \cap A)$  for every  $X \in 2^E \setminus 2^A$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq 2^E$  and  $\{f_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$  be a collection of set functions  $f_A$  on  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . Then the following holds:

$$f = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} f_A \iff -f = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} (-f_A) \iff f^\# = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} f_A^\#;$$

note that, for every set function  $f_A$  on  $A \subseteq E$ , the conjugate  $f_A(A) - f_A(A \setminus (\cdot))$  over  $A$  coincides, as a set function on  $E$ , with the conjugate  $f_A(E) - f_A(E \setminus (\cdot))$  over  $E$ .

A set function  $f$  is said to be *submodular* if the following inequalities hold [3]:

$$f(X \cup Y) + f(X \cap Y) \leq f(X) + f(Y) \quad \text{for all } X, Y \subseteq E.$$

A set function  $f$  is said to be *supermodular* if  $f^\#$  is submodular.

The *difference function*  $\bigwedge f : 2^E \times \mathbb{N}^{(2^E)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of a set function  $f$  on  $E$  is defined recursively as follows [2]:

$$\begin{aligned} \bigwedge f(X, \emptyset) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(X), \\ \bigwedge f(X, \mathcal{Y} \uplus \{Y\}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge f(X, \mathcal{Y}) - \bigwedge f(X \cap Y, \mathcal{Y}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{N}$  is the set of nonnegative integers,  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a multiset over  $2^E$ — $\mathcal{Y} : 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}(Z) \in \mathbb{N}$  is the multiplicity of  $Z \in 2^E$  in  $\mathcal{Y}$ —,  $\uplus$  is the sum of multisets, and it holds that

$$(\mathcal{Y} \uplus \{Y\})(Z) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{Y}(Z) + 1 & \text{if } Z = Y, \\ \mathcal{Y}(Z) & \text{if } Z \neq Y. \end{cases}$$

When  $|\mathcal{Y}| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{Z \in 2^E} \mathcal{Y}(Z) = k$ , we write  $\bigwedge f(X, \mathcal{Y})$  as  $\bigwedge_k f(X, \mathcal{Y})$  also.

- (i) [2] For a positive integer  $k$ , a set function  $f$  is said to be  $k$ -monotone if  $\bigwedge_k f \geq 0$ , i.e.,  $\bigwedge f(X, \mathcal{Y}) \geq 0$  whenever  $X \in 2^E$  and  $\mathcal{Y} \in \binom{2^E}{k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{N}^{(2^E)} \mid |\mathcal{X}| = k\}$ .
- (ii) [1] For an integer  $k$  greater than 1, a set function  $f$  is said to be *weakly  $k$ -monotone* if for every  $\mathcal{X} \in \binom{2^E}{k}$

$$f\left(\bigcup \mathcal{X}\right) \geq \sum_{\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \neq \emptyset} (-1)^{|\mathcal{Y}|+1} f\left(\bigcap \mathcal{Y}\right),$$

where, for  $\mathcal{Z} \in \mathbb{N}^{(2^E)}$ ,  $\bigcup \mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}} Z = \bigcup(\text{supp } \mathcal{Z})$ ,  $\bigcap \mathcal{Z} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}} Z = \bigcap(\text{supp } \mathcal{Z})$ ,  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$  means  $\mathcal{Z}(Z) > 0$ , and  $\text{supp } \mathcal{Z}$  is the ordinary set  $\{Z \mid \mathcal{Z}(Z) > 0\} \subseteq 2^E$  called the support of  $\mathcal{Z}$ .

The 1-monotonicity is equivalent to the ordinary monotonicity, i.e.,  $X \subseteq Y \implies f(X) \leq f(Y)$ . The concept of weak 1-additivity is not defined. There are the following relations between submodularity and weak 2-monotonicity:

$$f \text{ is submodular} \iff -f \text{ is weakly 2-monotone} \iff f^\# \text{ is weakly 2-monotone.}$$

For every integer  $k$  greater than 1, a set function  $f$  is  $k$ -monotone iff  $f$  is monotone and weakly  $k$ -monotone. If  $k$  and  $k'$  are integers such that  $1 \leq k \leq k'$ , and if a set function  $f$  is  $k'$ -monotone, then  $f$  is  $k$ -monotone. If  $k$  and  $k'$  are integers such that  $2 \leq k \leq k'$ , and if a set function  $f$  is weakly  $k'$ -monotone, then  $f$  is weakly  $k$ -monotone.

### 3 Additive decomposition

This paper deals with the following additive decomposition of a set function  $f$  on  $E$  with respect to an antichain  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $E$ .

(AD): A set function  $f$  on  $E$  is decomposable into a sum of set functions  $f_A$  over all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ , that is, there exists a collection  $\{f_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$  such that each  $f_A$  is a set function on  $A$  and

$$f = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} f_A. \quad (1)$$

A necessary and sufficient condition for the additive decomposition (AD) is (IE), that is,  $\mathcal{A}$  is an inclusion-exclusion family with respect to  $f$  [5].

If  $f$  is a submodular set function, and if an antichain  $\mathcal{A}$  is an inclusion-exclusion family with respect to  $f$ , there does not always exist a collection  $\{f_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$  of *submodular* set functions satisfying Eq. (1), while there always exists a collection  $\{f_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$  of set functions satisfying Eq. (1). That is to say, the antichain  $\mathcal{A}$  being an inclusion-exclusion family is only a necessary condition and not a sufficient condition for a submodular set function  $f$  to be decomposable into a sum of submodular set functions  $f_A$  over all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ .

So far, the authors have obtained two theorems showing sufficient conditions for the decomposition of submodular set functions into a sum of submodular set functions and their generalizations [4][7]. We show below the two generalized additive decomposition

theorems. For an antichain  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $E$ , a set function  $f$  on  $E$  is said to have a  $k$ -monotone [resp. weakly  $k$ -monotone]  $\mathcal{A}$ -decomposition if there exists a collection  $\{f_A\}_{A \in \mathcal{A}}$  such that each  $f_A$  is a  $k$ -monotone [resp. weakly  $k$ -monotone] set function on  $A$  and Eq. (1) holds. The two theorems deal with the following three types of conditions  $\cap(k, l, \mathcal{A})$ ,  $M(k', k, \mathcal{A})$ , and  $wM(k', k, \mathcal{A})$  on positive integers  $k$ ,  $k'$ , and  $l$  such that  $k \leq k'$  and an antichain  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$\cap(k, l, \mathcal{A})$ :  $|\cap \mathcal{B}| \leq k$  for any  $\mathcal{B} \in \binom{\mathcal{A}}{l}$ .

$M(k', k, \mathcal{A})$ : Every  $k'$ -monotone set function  $f$  with  $\mathcal{A}$  as an inclusion-exclusion family has a  $k$ -monotone  $\mathcal{A}$ -decomposition.

$wM(k', k, \mathcal{A})$ : Every weakly  $k'$ -monotone set function  $f$  with  $\mathcal{A}$  as an inclusion-exclusion family has a weakly  $k$ -monotone  $\mathcal{A}$ -decomposition.

Condition  $wM(k', 1, \mathcal{A})$  is not considered.

**Theorem 1** (Generalized Additive Decomposition Theorem A). *For a positive integer  $k$  and an antichain  $\mathcal{A}$ , the three conditions  $\cap(k, 2, \mathcal{A})$ ,  $M(k, k, \mathcal{A})$ , and  $wM(k, k, \mathcal{A})$  are equivalent to each other.*

**Theorem 2** (Generalized Additive Decomposition Theorem B). *Let  $k$  and  $k'$  be positive integers,  $k \leq k'$ , and  $\mathcal{A}$  be an antichain. Then  $\cap(k-1, k'-k+2, \mathcal{A})$  is a sufficient condition for each of  $M(k', k, \mathcal{A})$  and  $wM(k', k, \mathcal{A})$ .*

## 4 Indecomposability

Our present subject is the unification of Theorems 1 and 2, that is, necessary and sufficient conditions for  $M(k', k, \mathcal{A})$  and  $wM(k', k, \mathcal{A})$ . We have found a cue to this subject, and we give it below. Note that, for every integer  $k$  greater than 1, a monotone set function  $f$  has a  $k$ -monotone  $\mathcal{A}$ -decomposition iff it has a weakly  $k$ -monotone  $\mathcal{A}$ -decomposition.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $k$ ,  $k'$ ,  $l$ ,  $n$  be positive integers such that  $k \leq k' \leq l \leq n-3$ , and  $E$  be an  $n$ -element set. If*

$$(n-l)(l-k'+1) - 2(l-k+1) > 0, \quad (2)$$

*then there exists a  $k'$ -monotone set function  $f$  on  $E$  with  $\binom{E}{l+2}$  as the least inclusion-exclusion family such that  $f$  does not have a  $k$ -monotone  $\binom{E}{l+2}$ -decomposition.*

If  $\mathcal{A}$  is a non-trivial inclusion-exclusion family with respect to a set function  $f$ , a  $k$ -monotone  $\mathcal{A}$ -decomposition of  $f$  is said to be *non-trivial*.

**Corollary 1.** Let  $k$  and  $k'$  be positive integers such that  $k \leq k'$ , and  $E$  be an  $n$ -element set. If

$$n > 3k' - 2k + 2,$$

then there exists a  $k'$ -monotone set function on  $E$  with a non-trivial inclusion-exclusion family such that  $f$  has no non-trivial  $k$ -monotone decomposition.

**Corollary 2.** Let  $k$  and  $k'$  be positive integers such that  $k \leq k'$ , and  $E$  be an  $n$ -element set. If

$$n > k' + 1 + \sqrt{8(k' - k) + 1},$$

then there exist a  $k'$ -monotone set function  $f$  and an inclusion-exclusion antichain  $\mathcal{A}$  with respect to  $f$  such that  $f$  does not have a  $k$ -monotone  $\mathcal{A}$ -decomposition.

## References

- [1] J.-P. Barthélemy, Monotone functions on finite lattices: an ordinal approach to capacities, belief and necessity functions, in: J. Fodor, B. De Baets, and P. Perny, eds., *Preferences and Decisions under Incomplete Knowledge*, Physica-Verlag, 2000, 195–208.
- [2] G. Choquet, Theory of capacities, *Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, 5 (1954) 131–295.
- [3] S. Fujishige, *Submodular Functions and Optimization*, 2nd ed., Elsevier, 2005.
- [4] T. Murofushi, Y. Sawata, and K. Fujimoto, Decomposition of fuzzy measures into a sum of fuzzy measures on subdomains, *Proc. 10th Intern. Fuzzy System Association World Congr.* (2003) 159–162.
- [5] T. Murofushi, Inclusion-exclusion families with respect to set functions, *27th Linz Seminar on Fuzzy Set Theory*, Abstracts (2006) 103–106.
- [6] B. Peleg and P. Sudhölter, *Introduction to the Theory of Cooperative Games*, Kluwer, 2003.
- [7] Y. Sawata, K. Fujimoto, and T. Murofushi, Decomposition of set functions into a sum of set functions on subdomains, submitted.