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## Implications, Dihypergraphs

- Set $V$ of vertices (attributes)
- Dependencies in V : implications $B \rightarrow h, B \subseteq \mathrm{~V}, h \in \mathrm{~V}$
- Represented by a dihypergraph $\mathcal{H}=(\mathrm{V}, \mathcal{E})$, the arc $(B, h)$ models $B \rightarrow h$
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Dihypergraphs, Closure systems

- $F$ models $(B, h)$ if $B \subseteq F \Longrightarrow h \in F$
- $F$ closed in $\mathcal{H}$ if $F$ models $\mathcal{E}$ (forward chaining)
- $\mathcal{F}=\{F \subseteq \vee \mid F$ closed in $\mathcal{H}\}$ is a closure system:
$\triangleright V \in \mathcal{F}$
$\triangleright F_{1}, F_{2} \in \mathcal{F} \Longrightarrow F_{1} \cap F_{2} \in \mathcal{F}$


Closure systems, Meet-irreducible



- $\emptyset$ obtained by intersection, brings no informationsame for 4, 3, 5, 45, 345, 1234524 cannot be obtained, it is meet-irreducible Meet-irreducible $\mathcal{M} \equiv$ reduced context



## Problem

## Problem - Enumerating Meet-Irreducible

- Input: a dihypergraph $\mathcal{H}=(\mathrm{V}, \mathcal{E})$.
- Output: the set $\mathcal{M}$ of meet-irreducible elements of $\mathcal{F}$.
- survey in [Bertet et al., 2018]
- Negative side:
$\triangleright$ harder than hypergraph dualization [Khardon, 1995]
$\triangleright$ pseudo-intent recognition coNP-C [Babin, Kuznetsov, 2013]
- Positive side:
$\triangleright$ generic algorithms [Mannila, Räihä, 1992]
$\triangleright$ classes of closure systems [Beaudou et al., 2017, Defrain et. al., 2019]


## Strategy

- Acyclic split of $\mathcal{H}$ :
$\triangleright$ bipartition $\left(\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right)$ of V s.t. any arc $(B, h)$ is either in $\mathrm{V}_{1}$, in $\mathrm{V}_{2}$ or $B \subseteq \mathrm{~V}_{1}$ and $h \in \mathrm{~V}_{2}$
$\triangleright$ partitions $\mathcal{H}$ into $\mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}\right], \mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{2}\right]$ and a bipartite dihypergraph $\mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right]$
- Application :
$\triangleright$ characterization of $\mathcal{M}$
$\triangleright$ recursive application to obtain hierarchical decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$

Acyclic split


## Closure system construction

- First case: $\mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right]$ has no arcsSecond case: $\mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right]$ has arcs
- $F_{2} \in \mathcal{F}_{2}$ combined with any $F_{1} \in \mathcal{F}_{1}$ copies of $\mathcal{F}_{1}$ on each $F_{2} \in \mathcal{F}_{2} \mathcal{F}$ direct product of $\mathcal{F}_{1}, \mathcal{F}_{2}$ Extensions of $F_{2}$ are controlled by $\mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right]$ Increasing copies of ideals of $\mathcal{F}_{1}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{2}$



## Formal sum-up

- $\left(\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right)$ is an acyclic split of $\mathcal{H}$
- trace (projection) $\mathcal{F}: \mathrm{V}_{1}=\left\{F \cap \mathrm{~V}_{1} \mid F \in \mathcal{F}\right\}$
- $\mathcal{F}$ is built by adding parts of $\mathcal{F}_{1}$ to each $F_{2} \in \mathcal{F}_{2}$ :
$\triangleright \operatorname{Ext}\left(F_{2}\right)=\left\{F \in \mathcal{F} \mid F \cap V_{2}=F_{2}\right\}$, extensions of $F_{2} \in \mathcal{F}_{2}$
$\triangleright \operatorname{Ext}\left(F_{2}\right)$ corresponds to an ideal of $\mathcal{F}_{1}$ controlled by $\mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right]$
$\triangleright F_{2} \subseteq F_{2}^{\prime}$ implies $\operatorname{Ext}\left(F_{2}\right): \mathrm{V}_{1} \subseteq \operatorname{Ext}\left(F_{2}^{\prime}\right): \mathrm{V}_{1}$
$\triangleright F_{2}^{\prime} \succ F_{2}$ implies that extensions of $F_{2}^{\prime}$ cover extensions of $F_{2}$
- Note: $\operatorname{Ext}\left(\mathrm{V}_{2}\right): \mathrm{V}_{1}$ is $\mathcal{F}_{1}$

Meet-irreducible identification


## Meet-irreducible characterization

## Theorem (Nourine, V., 2020+)

Let $\mathcal{H}=(\mathrm{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a dihypergraph and $\left(\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right)$ an acyclic split of $\mathcal{H}$. Meet-irreducible elements of $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ are given by the following equality:

$$
\mathcal{M}=\left\{M_{1} \cup V_{2} \mid M_{1} \in \mathcal{M}_{1}\right\} \cup\left\{F \in \max _{\subseteq}\left(\operatorname{Ext}\left(M_{2}\right)\right) \mid M_{2} \in \mathcal{M}_{2}\right\}
$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{1}, \mathcal{M}_{2}$ are meet-irreducible elements of $\mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}\right], \mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{2}\right]$ respectively.

Hierarchical decomposition


## Finding maximal extensions



- $\mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right]$ defines the antichain of minimum forbidden extensions Pick an hypergraph $\mathcal{H}=(\mathrm{V}, \mathcal{E})$, turn each arc $B$ into $(B, z)$ Acyclic split $(V, z)$ Extensions of $\emptyset$ are determined by $\operatorname{MIS}(\mathcal{H})$


## Finding maximal extensions

## Problem - Finding Maximal Extensions (FME)

- Input: a dihypergraph $\mathcal{H}=(\mathrm{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with acyclic split $\left(\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right), \mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}\right], \mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{2}\right]$, $\mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{2}\right], \mathcal{M}_{1}, \mathcal{M}_{2}$ and $F_{2} \in \mathcal{F}_{2}$.
- Output: $\max \subseteq\left(\operatorname{Ext}\left(F_{2}\right)\right)$.
- Open in general
- if $\mathcal{H}\left[\mathrm{V}_{1}\right]$ has no arcs, $\mathrm{FME} \equiv$ hypergraph dualization!
$\Longrightarrow$ output quasi-polynomial time algorithm [Fredman, Khachiyan, 1996]


## New tractable cases



Main idea: connecting blocks in an acyclic way

## Ranked convex geometries



- ranked convex geometry


## Theorem [Defrain et. al., 2019]

Enumerating meet-irreducible elements $\mathcal{M}$ from $\mathcal{H}$ in ranked convex geometries can be done in output quasi-polynomial time.

## Conclusion

- Problem:
$\triangleright$ enumeration of meet-irreducible elements of a dihypergraph (implications)
$\triangleright$ harder than hypergraph dualization in general
- Our contribution (Nourine, V., 2020+):
$\triangleright$ use of a decomposition operation, acyclic split
$\triangleright$ recursive characterization of $\mathcal{M}$
$\triangleright$ application to new tractable classes of closure systems, generalizing [Defrain et. al., 2019]
- Future works:
$\triangleright$ characterize/improve tractable cases
$\triangleright$ translation in the other way
Thank you for your attention!
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