Supplement to the article: Averaging of Decomposable Graphs by Dynamic Programming and Sampling

Kustaa Kangas Teppo Niinimäki Mikko Koivisto University of Helsinki, Department of Computer Science, Helsinki Institute for Information Technology HIIT, Finland {jwkangas,tzniinim,mkhkoivi}@helsinki.fi

A FAST TRANSFORM FOR DISJOINT PAIRS

Let α be a function that associates each pair of disjoint subsets of $V = \{1, ..., n\}$ with a real number. Define the function $\hat{\alpha}$ by letting

$$\hat{\alpha}(S,R) = \sum_{S \subseteq C \subseteq S \cup R} \alpha(C,R \setminus C)$$

for all disjoint subsets S and R of V. Furthermore, define $\alpha_0 = \alpha$ and for i = 1, ..., n, recursively

$$\alpha_i(S,R) = \alpha_{i-1}(S,R) + [i \in R] \cdot \alpha_{i-1}(S \cup \{i\}, R \setminus \{i\})$$

This recurrence gives us a way to compute the transform:

Lemma 8. It holds that $\alpha_n = \hat{\alpha}$.

Proof. For a subset $X \subseteq V$ and element $i \in V$, we write X_i for the set $X \cap \{1, \ldots, i\}$ and X^i for the set $X \cap \{i + 1, \ldots, n\} = X \setminus X_i$.

We will show by induction on i that

$$\alpha_i(S,R) = \sum_{S_i \subseteq C \subseteq (S \cup R)_i} \alpha(C \cup S^i, (R_i \setminus C) \cup R^i).$$
 (5)

This clearly holds for i = 0, as then the only term in the sum is $\alpha(\emptyset \cup S^0, (R_0 \setminus \emptyset) \cup R^0) = \alpha(S, R) = \alpha_0(S, R)$.

Suppose then that i > 0. Consider first the case that $i \notin R$. Then, by the definition and the induction hypothesis,

$$\alpha_i(S,R) = \sum_{S_{i-1} \subseteq C \subseteq (S \cup R)_{i-1}} \alpha(C \cup S^{i-1}, (R_{i-1} \setminus C) \cup R^{i-1}).$$

Writing C' for the set $C \cup (S \cap \{i\})$ we now obtain

$$\alpha_i(S,R) = \sum_{S_i \subseteq C' \subseteq (S \cup R)_i} \alpha(C' \cup S^i, (R_i \setminus C') \cup R^i),$$

which matches the induction hypothesis (5).

Consider then the case that $i \in R$. Observe that $i \notin S$, since S is disjoint from R. As above, expand $\alpha_{i-1}(S, R)$ using the induction hypothesis into

$$\sum_{S_{i-1} \subseteq C \subseteq (S \cup R)_{i-1}} \alpha(C \cup S^{i-1}, (R_{i-1} \setminus C) \cup R^{i-1}),$$

which equals

$$\sum_{\substack{S_i \subseteq C' \subseteq (S \cup R)_i \\ i \neq C'}} \alpha(C' \cup S^i, (R_i \setminus C') \cup R^i).$$

Likewise, expand $\alpha_{i-1}(S\cup\{i\},R\backslash\{i\})$ using the induction hypothesis into

$$\sum_{S_{i-1}\subseteq C\subseteq (S\cup R)_{i-1}} \alpha(C'\cup S^{i-1}, (R_{i-1}\setminus C')\cup (R\setminus\{i\})^{i-1}),$$

where we write C' for $C \cup \{i\}$. Observe that this sum equals

$$\sum_{\substack{S_i \subseteq C' \subseteq (S \cup R)_i \\ i \in C'}} \alpha(C' \cup S^i, (R_i \setminus C') \cup R^i),$$

because $i \notin S$ and $i \in R$. Adding up the obtained two sums over C' yields

$$\alpha_i(S,R) = \sum_{S_i \subseteq C' \subseteq (S \cup R)_i} \alpha(C' \cup S^i, (R_i \setminus C') \cup R^i),$$

which matches the induction hypothesis (5).

B PROOF OF LEMMA 4

In order to prove Lemma 4, we first prove the following lemma:

Lemma 9. Backtracking starting from g(C, U) makes at most |U| recursive nonterminating visits to g (including the visit to g(C, U)).

Proof. We show the claim by induction over |U|. The case |U| = 0 is trivial as it terminates. Suppose that $|U| \ge 1$ and

the claim holds for smaller U. The visit to g(C, U) is followed by recursive visits to (i) $g(C, U \setminus R)$ and (ii) h(C, R). By the induction assumption (i) amounts to at most |U| - |R| recursive nonterminating visits to g. Visit (ii) is followed by a visit to f succeeded by a visit to $g(C', R \setminus C')$ for some C' with $R \cap C' \neq \emptyset$. Thus, by the induction assumption, (ii) amounts to at most |R| - 1 recursive nonterminating visits to g. The total, including the visit to g(C, U), is thus at most (|U| - |R|) + (|R| - 1) + 1 = |U|. \Box

Now we can prove Lemma 4:

Proof of Lemma 4. Observe that the first two visits are to $f(\emptyset, V)$ and to g(C, U) where $|U| \le |V| - 1$. By Lemma 9, there are thus at most n - 1 nonterminating visits to g. Also note that a visit to h is always from a nonterminating visit to g and a visit to f always from a visit to h (except the first visit). The result follows.

C PROOF OF LEMMA 5

In order to prove Lemma 5, we first prove the following lemma:

Lemma 10. Consider backtracking from g(C, U) onwards. Let $\{(C_1, U_1), (C_2, U_2), \dots, (C_d, U_d)\}$ be the set pairs of the recursive nonterminating visits to g, including (C, U). Then there exists an ordering of the d set pairs such that

$$|C_i| + |U_i| \le |C| + |U| - i + 1$$
 for all $i = 1, \dots, d$.

Proof. We show the claim by induction over |U|. The case |U| = 0 is trivial as there are no recursive visits. Suppose that $|U| \ge 1$ and the claim holds for smaller U. The visit to g(C, U) is followed by recursive visits to (i) $g(C, U \setminus R)$ and (ii) h(C, R).

First, let $(C_1, U_1) = (C, U)$. Clearly then the claim holds for i = 1.

Let then $\{(C_2, U_2), \ldots, (C_{d'+1}, U_{d'+1})\}$ be the d' set pairs of g visited in branch (i). By the induction assumption and the fact that $U \cap R \neq \emptyset$, there exists an ordering over these set pairs such that for all $i = 2, \ldots, d' + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |C_i| + |U_i| &\leq |C| + |U \setminus R| - (i-1) + 1 \\ &\leq |C| + |U| - i + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the claim holds for $i = 2, \ldots, d' + 1$.

Finally, branch (ii) makes, via h and f, a recursive visit to $g(C', R \setminus C')$ for some C' with $R \cap C' \neq \emptyset$. Let $(C_{d'+2}, U_{d'+2}), \ldots, (C_{d'+d''+1}, U_{d'+d''+1})$ be the d'' set pairs of g visited in branch (ii). By the induction assumption, there exists an ordering over these set pairs such that for all $i = d' + 2, \dots, d' + d'' + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |C_i| + |U_i| &\leq |C'| + |R \setminus C'| - (i - d' - 1) + 1 \\ &\leq (|C| + |R| - 1) - i + (|U| - |R|) + 2 \\ &= |C| + |U| - i + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality uses the fact that $C' \cup R = S \cup R \subset C \cup R$, where S is selected during the visit to h, and the fact that by Lemma 9, $d' \leq |U \setminus R| = |U| - |R|$. As d' + d'' + 1 = d, the claim thus holds for $i = d' + 1, \ldots, d$, which completes the proof.

Now we can prove Lemma 5:

Proof of Lemma 5. For g the claim directly follows by applying Lemma 10. As a visit to h(C, R) is always from a nonterminating visit to g(C, U) with some U such that $C \cup R \subseteq C \cup U$, the claim follows for h. Finally, except the first visit, any other visit to f(S, R) is always from a visit to h(C, R) with some C such that $|S \cup R| \le |C \cup R| - 1$. Thus we can index the remaining set pairs from 2 to d_f such that the claim holds for them. Then (S_1, R_1) must be set to (\emptyset, V) so that $|S_1| + |R_1| \le n$ and the claim follows also for i = 1.