

Topological Representation of the Transit Sets of k -Point Crossover Operators

Manoj Changat¹, Prasanth G. Narasimha-Shenoi², Ferdoos Hossein Nezhad¹, Matjaž Kovše³, Shilpa Mohandas¹, Abisha Ramachandran¹, Peter F. Stadler⁴

Abstract

k -point crossover operators and their recombination sets are studied from different perspectives. We show that transit functions of k -point crossover generate, for all $k > 1$, the same convexity as the interval function of the underlying graph. This settles in the negative an open problem by Mulder about whether the geodesic convexity of a connected graph G is uniquely determined by its interval function I . The conjecture of Gitchoff and Wagner that for each transit set $R_k(x, y)$ distinct from a hypercube there is a unique pair of parents from which it is generated is settled affirmatively. Along the way we characterize transit functions whose underlying graphs are Hamming graphs, and those with underlying partial cube graphs. For general values of k it is shown that the transit sets of k -point crossover operators are the subsets with maximal Vapnik-Chervonenkis dimension. Moreover, the transit sets of k -point crossover on binary strings form topes of uniform oriented matroid of VC-dimension $k + 1$. The Topological Representation Theorem for oriented matroids therefore implies that k -point crossover operators can be represented by pseudosphere arrangements. This provides the tools necessary to study the special case $k = 2$ in detail.

1 Introduction

Crossover operators are a crucial component of Genetic Algorithms and related approaches in Evolutionary Computation. Their purpose is to combine the genetic information of two parents to produce one or more offsprings that are “mixtures” of their parents. In this contribution we will be concerned with the specific setting of crossover operators for strings of fixed length n over an alphabet \mathcal{A} of $a \geq 2$ letters. Given two parental strings $x = (x_1 x_2 \dots x_n)$ and $y = (y_1 y_2 \dots y_n)$ one may for instance construct recombinant offsprings of the form $(x_1 x_2 \dots x_i y_{i+1} y_{i+2} \dots y_n)$ and $(y_1 y_2 \dots y_i x_{i+1} x_{i+2} \dots x_n)$. The index i serves as a breakpoint at which the two parents recombine. This so-called one-point crossover can be generalized to two or more breakpoints.

Definition 1 *Given $x, y, z \in \mathcal{A}^n$ we say that z is a k -point crossover offspring of x and y if there are indices $0 = i_0 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_k = n$ so that for all ℓ , $1 \leq \ell \leq k$, either $z_j = x_j$ for all $j \in \{i_{\ell-1} + 1, \dots, i_\ell\}$ or $z_j = y_j$ for all $j \in \{i_{\ell-1} + 1, \dots, i_\ell\}$.*

¹Department of Futures Studies, University of Kerala, Trivandrum, IN 695 581, India, {mchangat,ferdows.h.n,rshilpam,cyanabisha}@gmail.com

²Department of Mathematics, Government College, Chittur, Palakkad, IN 678 104, India, prasantgns@gmail.com

³School of Basic Sciences, IIT Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India, kovse@iitbbs.ac.in

⁴Bioinformatics Group, Department of Computer Science & Interdisciplinary Center for Bioinformatics, Universität Leipzig, Härtelstraße 16-18, D-04107 Leipzig, Germany; German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Competence Center for Scalable Data Services and Solutions Dresden-Leipzig, Leipzig Research Center for Civilization Diseases, and Centre for Biotechnology and Biomedicine at Leipzig University at Universität Leipzig; Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Inselstraße 22, D-04103 Leipzig, Germany; RNomics Group, Fraunhofer Institute for Cell Therapy and Immunology, D-04103 Leipzig, Germany; Institute for Theoretical Chemistry, University of Vienna, Währingerstrasse 17, A-1090 Wien, Austria; Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Rd., Santa Fe NM 87501, USA., studla@bioinf.uni-leipzig.de

Note that this definition states that x and y are broken up into *at most* k intervals that are alternately included into z . This convention simplifies the mathematical treatment considerably and also conforms to the usual practice of including crossovers with fewer than the maximum number of breakpoints. Uniform crossover, where each letter z_i is freely chosen from one of the two parents, is obtained by allowing $k = n - 1$ breakpoints. We note, furthermore, that our definition ensures that the parental strings are also included in the set of possible offsprings.

Properties of k -point crossover have been studied extensively in the past. [English(1997)] described key algebraic properties and isomorphisms between the search spaces induced by crossover and mutation with small populations have been analyzed by [Culberson(1995)]. A formal treatment of multi-point crossover with an emphasis on disruption analysis can be found in [DeJong and Spears(1992)]. A general review of genetic algorithms from the perspective of stochastic processes on populations can be found in [Schmitt(2001)]. In this context, crossover operators are represented by stochastic matrices. A similar matrix-based formalism is explored in [Stadler *et al.*(2000)Stadler, Seitz, and Wagner]. Coordinate transformations, more precisely the Walsh transform [Goldberg(1989)] and its generalizations to non-binary alphabets [Field(1995)] have played an important role in explaining the functioning of GAs in terms of building blocks and the Schema theorem [Holland(1975)]. As a generalization, an abstract treatment of crossover in terms of equivalence relations has been given by [Radcliffe(1994)].

[Gitchoff and Wagner(1996)] proposed to consider the function $R : X \times X \rightarrow 2^X$ that assigns to each possible pair of parents the set of all possible recombinants. They asked which properties of R could be used to characterize crossover operators in general and explored properties of k -point crossover on strings. In particular, they noted the following four properties:

- (T1) $x, y \in R(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$,
- (T2) $R(x, y) = R(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in X$,
- (T3) $R(x, x) = \{x\}$ for all $x \in X$,
- (GW4) $z \in R(x, y)$ implies $|R(x, z)| \leq |R(x, y)|$.

Mulder introduced the concept of *transit functions* characterized by the axioms (T1), (T2), and (T3) as a unifying approach to intervals, convexities, and betweenness in graphs and posets in last decade of the 20th century. Available as preprint only but frequently cited for more than a decade, the seminal paper was published only recently [Mulder(2008)]. For example, given a connected graph G , its geodetic intervals, i.e., the sets of vertices lying on shortest paths between a pair of prescribed endpoints $x, y \in V(G)$ form a transit function usually denoted by $I_G(x, y)$ [Mulder(1980)] and referred as the interval function of a graph G . Unequal crossover, where (T3) is violated, has been rarely explored in the context of evolutionary computation, which the exception of the work by [Shpak and Wagner(1999)]. In this contribution we restrict ourselves exclusively to the simpler case of homologous string recombination. *Thus, from here on we will assume that R satisfies (T1), (T2), and (T3).*

A common interpretation of transit functions is to view $R(x, y)$ as the subset of X lying *between* x and y . Indeed, a transit function is a *betweenness* if it satisfies the two additional axioms

- (B1) $z \in R(x, y)$ and $z \neq y$ implies $y \notin R(x, z)$.
- (B2) $z \in R(x, y)$ implies $R(x, z) \subseteq R(x, y)$.

It is natural, therefore, to regard a pair of distinct points x and y without other points between them as *adjacent*. The corresponding graph G_R has X as its vertex set and $\{x, y\} \in E(G_R)$ if and only if $R(x, y) = \{x, y\}$ and $x \neq y$. The graph G_R is known as the *underlying graph* of R .

[Moraglio and Poli(2004)] introduced the notion of *geometric crossover operators* relative to a connected reference graph G with vertex set X by requiring – in our notation – that $R(x, y) \subseteq I_G(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. In the setting of [Moraglio and Poli(2004)], the reference graph G was given externally in terms of a metric on X . When studying crossover in its own right it seems natural to consider the transits sets of R in relation to the intervals of G_R itself. Hence we say that R is *MP-geometric* if

(MG) $R(x, y) \subseteq I_{G_R}(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$.

Note the condition (MG) is an axiom for transit functions independent of any externally prescribed structure on X . [Mulder(2008)] considered a different notion of “geometric” referring transit functions that satisfy (B2) and the axiom

(B3) $z \in R(x, y)$ and $w \in R(x, z)$ implies $z \in R(w, y)$.

Mulder’s version of “geometric” is less pertinent for our purposes because crossover operators usually violate (B2).

Another interpretation of R , which is just as useful in the context of crossover operators, is to regard $R(x, y)$ as the set of offsprings reachable from the parents x and y in a single generation. It is natural then to associate with R a function $\widehat{R} : X \times X \rightarrow 2^X$ so that $z \in \widehat{R}(x, y)$ if and if only z eventually can be generated from x and y and all their following generations of offsprings. Formally, $z \in \widehat{R}(x, y)$ if there is a finite sequence of pairs $\{x_k, y_k\}$ so that $z \in R(x_m, y_m)$, $\{x_k, y_k\} \in R(x_{k-1}, y_{k-1})$ for all $k = 1, \dots, m$, $x_0 = x$, and $y_0 = y$. By construction, $R(x, y) \subseteq \widehat{R}(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. If R is a transit function, then \widehat{R} is also a transit function.

We say that $R(x, y)$ is *closed* if $R(x, y) = \widehat{R}(x, y)$. Equivalently, a transit set $R(x, y)$ is closed if and only if $R(u, v) \subseteq R(x, y)$ holds for all $u, v \in R(x, y)$, since in this case nothing can be generated from the children of x and y that is not accessible already from x and y itself. In particular, all singletons and all adjacencies, i.e., individual vertices and the edges of G_R , are always closed. A transit function R is called *monotone* if it satisfies

(M) For all $x, y \in X$ and $u, v \in R(x, y)$ implies $R(u, v) \subseteq R(x, y)$,

i.e., if all transit sets are closed. By construction, \widehat{R} satisfies (M) for any transit function R . A simple argument⁵ shows that $\widehat{R}(x, y) = \{x, y\}$ if and only if $R(x, y) = \{x, y\}$. Thus R and \widehat{R} have the same underlying graph $G_{\widehat{R}} = G_R$. The sets $\{\widehat{R}(x, y) | x, y \in X\}$, finally, generate a convexity \mathfrak{C}_R consisting of all intersections of the (finitely many) transit sets $\widehat{R}(x, y)$.

One of the most fruitful lines of research in the field of transit functions is the search for axiomatic characterizations of a wide variety of different types of graphs and other discrete structures in terms of their transit functions. [Nebeský(2001)] showed that a function $I : V \times V \rightarrow 2^V$ is the geodesic interval function of a connected graph if and only if I satisfies a set of axioms that are phrased in terms of I only. Later, [Mulder and Nebeský(2009)] improved the axiomatic characterization of $I(u, v)$ by formulating a nice set of (minimal) axioms. The all-paths function A of a connected graph G (defined as $A(u, v) = \{z \in V(G) : z \text{ lies on some } u, v\text{-path in } G\}$) admits a similar axiomatic characterization [Changat *et al.*(2001)Changat, Klavžar, and Mulder]. These results

⁵(i) $R(x, y) \subseteq \widehat{R}(x, y)$ by definition, (ii) $R(x, y) = \{x, y\}$ implies $\widehat{R}(x, y) = \{x, y\}$, (iii) if $\widehat{R}(x, y) = \{x, y\}$ but $R(x, y) \neq \{x, y\}$ either (i) or axiom (T1) is violated.

immediately raise the question whether other types of transit functions can be characterized in terms of transit axioms only.

Since k -point crossover on strings over a fixed alphabet forms a rather specialised class of recombination operators we ask here whether it can be defined completely in terms of properties of its transit function R_k . Beyond the immediate interest in k -point crossover operators we can hope in this manner to identify generic properties of crossover operators also on more general sets X .

This contribution is organised as follows. In section 2 we consider transit functions whose underlying graphs G_R are Hamming graphs since, as we show in section 3, k -point crossover belongs to this class. We then investigate the properties of k -point crossover in more detail from the point of view of transit functions. In section 4 we switch to a graph-theoretical perspective and derive a complete characterization of k -point crossover on binary alphabets, making use of key properties of partial cubes. In order to generalize these results we consider topological aspects of k -point crossover in section 6 and explore its relationship with oriented matroids. We conclude our presentation with several open questions.

2 Hamming Graphs and their Geodesic Intervals

In most applications, k -point crossover will be applied to binary strings or, less frequently, to strings over a larger, fixed-size alphabet \mathcal{A} . In a population genetics context, however, the number of alleles may be different for each locus, hence we consider the most general case here, where each sequence position is taken from a distinct alphabet \mathcal{A}_i with $a_i := |\mathcal{A}_i| \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. The Hamming graph $\prod_i K_{a_i}$ is the Cartesian products of complete graphs K_{a_i} with a_i vertices; we refer to the book by [Hammack *et al.*(2011)Hammack, Imrich, and Klavžar] for more details on Hamming graphs and product graphs in general. The special case $a_i = 2$ for all i is usually called n -dimensional hypercube K_2^n . The shortest path distance on $\prod_i K_{a_i}$ is the Hamming distance $d(x, y)$, which counts the number of sequence positions at which the string x and y differ.

Given a transit function R and a point $x \in X$ let $\delta(x) = |\{y \in X \mid |R(x, y)| = 2\}|$, i.e., $\delta(x) = \delta_R(x)$ is the degree of x in the underlying graph G_R . We write $\delta(R) = \max_{x \in X} \delta(x)$ for the maximal degree of the underlying graph.

The purpose of this section is to characterize transit functions whose underlying graphs are Hamming graphs. Our starting point is the following characterization of hypercubes, which follows from results by [Mulder(1980)] and [Laborde and Rao Hebbare(1982)]:

Proposition 1 *Suppose G is connected and each pair of distinct adjacent edges lies in exactly one 4-cycle. Then G is isomorphic to n -dimensional hypercube if and only if the minimum degree δ of G is finite and $|V(G)| = 2^\delta$.*

Graphs with the property that any pair of vertices has zero or exactly 2 common neighbours are called $(0, 2)$ -graphs [Mulder(1980)]. We note that the condition $|V(G)| = 2^\delta$ in Proposition 1 is necessary as demonstrated by the example in Fig. 1. Proposition 1 can be translated into the language of transit functions as follows:

Corollary 1 *Let R be a transit function on a set X with a connected underlying graph. Then the underlying graph G_R is isomorphic to n -dimensional hypercube K_2^n if and only if R satisfies:*

- (A1) *For every x, u, v such that $|R(x, u)| = |R(x, v)| = 2$ there exist unique y such that $|R(y, u)| = |R(y, v)| = 2$,*




Figure 1. The last condition of Proposition 1, i.e., $|V(G)| = 2^\delta$, is necessary as demonstrated by this example of a $(0, 2)$ -graph that is not a hypergraph [Mulder(1980)]. It satisfies all but the last requirement from the proposition.

(A2) $\delta(R) = n$ and $|X| = 2^n$.

Later, [Mollard(1991)] generalized Proposition 1 to arbitrary Hamming graphs. For any vertex x in the graph G let $N_i(x)$ denote the number of maximal i -cliques K_i in G that contain the vertex x .

Proposition 2 ([Mollard(1991)]) *Let G be a simple connected graph such that two non-adjacent vertices in G either have exactly 2 common neighbors or none at all, and suppose G has neither $K_4 \setminus e$ nor $K_2 \square K_3 \setminus e$ (Figure 2) as induced subgraph. Then $N_i(x)$ is independent of x and G is isomorphic to the Hamming graph if and only if $|V(G)| = \prod_{h=1}^p h^{N_h(x)}$, where p is the maximum integer such that $N_p(x)$ is nonzero.*




Figure 2. The forbidden induced subgraphs $K_4 \setminus e$ and $K_2 \square K_3 \setminus e$ appearing in Proposition 2.

These results can again be translated into the language of transit functions:

Corollary 2 *Let R be a transit function with a connected underlying graph. Then the underlying graph G_R is isomorphic to Hamming graph K_a^n if and only if R satisfies:*

(A1) *For every x, u, v such that $|R(x, u)| = |R(x, v)| = 2$ there exists unique y such that $|R(y, u)| = |R(y, v)| = 2$,*

(A2') $\delta(R) = n(a - 1)$ and $|X| = a^n$,

(A3) *There exist no x, y, u, v such that $|R(x, u)| = |R(x, v)| = |R(y, u)| = |R(y, v)| = |R(x, y)| = 2$ and $|R(u, v)| > 2$,*

(A4) *There exist no x, y, u, v, w, z such that $|R(x, u)| = |R(x, v)| = |R(y, u)| = |R(y, v)| = |R(v, w)| = |R(y, z)| = |R(w, z)| = |R(x, w)| = 2$ and $|R(u, v)|, |R(u, w)|, |R(u, z)|, |R(x, y)|, |R(x, z)|, |R(v, z)|, |R(y, w)| > 2$.*

The representation of Hamming graphs as n -fold Cartesian products of complete graphs $H = \prod_{i=1}^n K_{a_i}$ implies a “coordinatization”, that is, a labeling of the vertices that reflects this product structure. The geodesic intervals in Hamming graphs then have very simple description:

$$I_H(x, y) = \{z = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \mid z_i \in \{x_i, y_i\} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n\} \quad (1)$$

where (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) and (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n) are the coordinates of the vertices x and y . Thus $G_{I_H(x, y)}$ is a subhypercube of dimension $d(x, y)$ as shown in example in the book by [Hammack *et al.* (2011) Hammack, Imrich, and Klavžar]. The intervals of Hamming graphs have several properties that will be useful for our purposes. A graph is called antipodal if for every vertex v there is a unique “antipodal vertex” \bar{v} with maximum distance from v .

Lemma 1 *Let Q be an induced sub-hypercube of a Hamming graph H . Then for every $x \in Q$ there is a unique vertex $\bar{x} \in Q$ so that $Q = I_H(x, \bar{x})$.*

Proof This follows from a well known fact that hypercubes are antipodal graphs [Mulder(1980)]. \square It is well known that I_H satisfies the monotone axiom (M) and thus also (B2).

Lemma 2 *Let Q' and Q'' be two induced sub-hypercubes in a Hamming graph H . Then $Q' \cap Q''$ is again an induced (possibly empty) sub-hypercube of H .*

Proof For every coordinate i , $Q'_i = \{x_i \mid x' \in Q'\}$ and $Q''_i = \{x_i \mid x'' \in Q''\}$ contains at most two different letters from the alphabet \mathcal{A}_i . $Q' \cap Q'' = \prod_i (Q'_i \cap Q''_i)$, and hence a hypercube. \square As an immediate consequence we note that I_H satisfies even the stronger property

(MM) For all $u, v, x, y \in X$ holds: if $R(u, v) \cap R(x, y) \neq \emptyset$ then there are $p, q \in X$ so that $R(u, v) \cap R(x, y) = R(p, q)$.

The disadvantage of the results so far is that we have to require explicitly that G_R is connected. In the light of condition (MG) above it seems natural to require connectedness of G_R for recombination operators in general.

To-date, only sufficient conditions for connectedness of G_R are known. Following ideas outlined by [van de Vel(1983)], we can show directly that the following property is sufficient:

(CG) For all $a, x, y, z \in X$: If $R(a, x) \subseteq R(a, y)$, then $R(a, x) \subseteq R(a, z) \subseteq R(a, y)$ if and only if $z \in R(x, y)$.

As a technical device we will employ the partial order \leq_a of X defined, for given $a \in X$, by $x \leq_a y$ if and only if $R(a, x) \subseteq R(a, y)$. As usual, we write $x <_a y$ if $x \leq_a y$ and $x \neq y$. For $R = I_G$ we have the equivalence $x \in I_G(a, y)$ if and if only $x \leq_a y$.

Lemma 3 *The underlying graph G_R of a transit function R is connected if R satisfies axiom (CG).*

Proof Let R be a transit function satisfying axiom (CG). Let $a, b \in X$ be two distinct elements, and let $\mathbf{C} = (a = a_0, a_1, \dots, a_t = b)$ be a maximal \leq_a -chain between a and b , where the elements are labeled in increasing order $a = a_0 <_a a_1 <_a a_2 <_a \dots <_a a_t = b$.

We claim that, for any i , $0 \leq i \leq n$, elements a_i and a_{i+1} form an edge in G_R . To see this assume that, on the contrary, there is an element $x \in R(a_i, a_{i+1}) \setminus \{a_i, a_{i+1}\}$ for some i . Then (CG) implies $R(a, a_i) \subseteq R(a, x) \subseteq R(a, a_{i+1})$, i.e., $a_i <_a x <_a a_{i+1}$,

contradicting maximality of the chain \mathbf{C} . Hence \mathbf{C} consists of consecutive edges whence G_R is a connected graph. \square

However, property (CG) is much too strong for our purposes: Setting $x = a$ makes the condition in (CG) trivial, i.e., the axiom reduces to “ $R(a, z) \subseteq R(a, y)$ if and only if $z \in R(a, y)$ ”. Since $R(a, z) \subseteq R(a, y)$ implies $z \in R(a, y)$ we are simply left with axiom (B2), i.e., (CG) implies (B2). As we shall see below, however, string crossover in general does not satisfy (B2) and thus (CG) cannot hold in general. Similarly, we cannot use Lemma 1 of [Changat *et al.*(2010)Changat, Mathew, and Mulder], which states that G_R is connected whenever R is a transit function satisfying (B1) and (B2).

Allowing conditions not only on R but also on its closure \widehat{R} we can make use of the fact that $G_R = G_{\widehat{R}}$. Since \widehat{R} satisfies the monotonicity axiom (M) by construction, (B2) is also satisfied. Thus R_G is connected if at least one of the following two conditions is satisfied: (i) \widehat{R} satisfies (B1), or (ii) \widehat{R} satisfies

(CG') $x \in \widehat{R}(a, z)$ and $z \in \widehat{R}(a, y)$ if and only if $z \in \widehat{R}(x, y)$

The latter is equivalent to (CG) whenever R satisfies (M). To see this observe that $R(a, x) \subseteq R(a, y)$ implies $x \in R(a, y)$ and by (M) $R(x, y) \subseteq R(a, y)$.

So far, we lack a condition for the connectedness of G_R that can be expressed by first order logic in terms of R alone.

3 Basic Properties of k -Point Crossover

We first show that the underlying graphs of k -point crossover transit functions are Hamming graphs.

Lemma 4 $G_{R_k} = \prod_{i=1}^n K_{a_i}$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$.

Proof Since $R_j(x, y) \subseteq R_k(x, y)$ for $j \leq k$ by definition, it suffices to consider R_1 . By definition, $R_1(x, y) = \{x, y\}$ if and only if x and y differ in a single coordinate, i.e., for which $d(x, y) = 1$, i.e., x and y are adjacent in $\prod_{i=1}^n K_{a_i}$. Obviously, $R_k(x, y) = R_1(x, y)$ in this case. If there are two or more sequence positions that are different between the parents, then the crossover operator can “cut” between them to produce and generate an off-spring different from either parent so that $|R_1(x, y)| > 2$. \square

From Lemma 4 and Corollary 2 we immediately conclude that the k -point crossover transit function R_k satisfies (A1), (A2'), (A3), and (A4).

Lemma 5 Let R_k be the k -point crossover function. Then $\widehat{R}_k(x, y) = I_{G_{R_k}}(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$ and all $k \geq 1$.

Proof By construction $z \in \widehat{R}_k(x, y)$ agrees in each position with at least one of the parents, i.e., $z_i \in \{x_i, y_i\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and thus $\widehat{R}_k(x, y) \subseteq I_{G_R}(x, y)$. Conversely, choose an arbitrary $z \in I_G(x, y)$. Find the first position k in the coordinate representation in which z disagrees with x and form the recombinant $y' \in R_1(x, y)$ that agrees with x for $i < k$ and with y for all $i \geq k$. Then form the $x' \in R_1(x, y') \subseteq \widehat{R}_1(x, y)$ by recombining again after position k . By construction, x' agrees with z at least for all $i \leq k$, i.e., in at least one position more than x . Since $x' \in \widehat{R}_1(x, y)$ we can repeat the argument at most n time to find a sequence $x^{(n)} \in \widehat{R}_1(x, y)$ that agrees with z in all positions. Since $R_1(x, y) \subseteq R_k(x, y)$ for all $k \geq 1$, we conclude that $z \in \widehat{R}_k(x, y)$. \square As an immediate corollary we have:

Corollary 3 k -point crossover is MP-geometric for all $k \geq 1$.

MP-geometricity is a desirable property for crossover operators in general because it ensures that repeated application eventually produces the entire geodesic interval of the underlying graph structure.

Lemma 5 also implies a negative answer to one of the questions posed by [Mulder(2008)]: “Is the geodesic convexity uniquely determined by the geodesic interval function $I(u, v)$ of a connected graph?”. More precisely, Lemma 5 shows that the k -point crossover transit function R_k also generates the geodesic convexity and hence that the geodesic convexity is not uniquely determined by the interval function I as the $I_{G_{R_k}}(x, y)$, being the interval in a hypercube, is itself convex.

A trivial consequence of Lemma 5, furthermore, is the well known fact that the transit function of uniform crossover R_{n-1} is the interval function on the Hamming graph:

Corollary 4 $R_{n-1}(x, y) = \widehat{R_{n-1}}(x, y) = I_{G_R}(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$.

For small distances, k -point crossover also produces the full geodesic interval in a single step:

Lemma 6 $R_k(x, y) = I_{G_R}(x, y)$ if and only if $d(x, y) \leq k + 1$.

Proof If $d(x, y) \leq k + 1$ we can place one cross-over cut between any two position at which x and y differ. In this way we obtain all possible recombinations, i.e., $R_k(x, y)$ is a subhypercube of dimension $k + 1$ in the underlying graph G_R . Conversely if $d(x, y) > k + 1$ then there is $z \in I_{G_R}(x, y)$ such that z requires more than k cross-over cuts between positions at which x and y , which completes the proof. \square

Next, we observe that the transit sets of k -point crossover can be constructed recursively.

Theorem 1 $R_k(u, v) = \bigcup_{z \in R_{k-1}(u, v)} [R_1(u, z) \cup R_1(z, v)]$.

Proof W.l.o.g we can assume that $u = 0 \dots 0$ and $v = 1 \dots 1$. Let $a \in R_k(u, v)$ and without loss of generality we can assume that a ends with 0. Let a_j denote the coordinate, with the last appearance of 1 in a . Let b be an element with $b_i = a_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq j$ and $b_i = 1$ otherwise. It follows that $b \in R_{k-1}(u, v)$ and moreover $a \in R_1(b, v)$. \square

A key property in the theory of transit functions is the so-called Pasch axiom

(Pa) For $p, a, b \in X$, $a' \in R(p, a)$ and $b' \in R(p, b)$ implies that $R(a', b) \cap R(b', a) \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 7 R_1 satisfies the Pasch axiom (Pa).

Proof Consider three arbitrary strings a, b , and p . Then $a' \in R_1(a, p)$ is a concatenation of a prefix of a with the corresponding suffix of p , or *vice versa*. Each $b' \in R_1(b, p)$ has an analogous representation, leading to four cases depending on whether p is a prefix or a suffix of a' and b' , resp., see Fig. ???. In case 1, $a' \in R_1(b', a)$ if a' has a shorter p -suffix than b' . Otherwise $b' \in R_1(a', b)$. In case 2, a' has a p -prefix up to k and b' has a p -suffix starting at l . If the two parts of p overlap, i.e., $l \leq k$ then $(b_1 \dots b_l, p_{l+1} \dots p_k, a_{k+1} \dots a_n) \in R_1(b, a') \cap R_1(a, b')$. If $k < l$ then a common crossover product is obtained by recombining both b with a' and a with b' at position k . Case 3, a' has a p -suffix and b' has an p -prefix, can be treated analogously. Case 4, in which p matches a prefix of both a' and b' can be treated as in case 1. In summary, thus $R_1(a', b) \cap R_1(a, b') \neq \emptyset$ for any choice of $a' \in R_1(a, p)$ and $b' \in R_1(b, p)$, i.e., R_1 satisfies (Pa). \square

Theorem 2 R_k satisfies axiom (Pa) for all $k \geq 1$.




Figure 3. Sketch of the proof of Lemma 7. We distinguish 6 cases depending on how a' and b' are constructed in $R_1(a, p)$ and $R_1(b, p)$, respectively. The red lines indicate the explicit construction of an element in $R_1(a, b) \cap R_1(a', b)$.

Proof For fixed a, b, p let $a' \in R_k(a, p)$ and $b' \in R_k(b, p)$. By Theorem 1 we have

$$R_k(a', b) = \bigcup_{z \in R_{k-1}(a', b)} [R_1(a', z) \cup R_1(z, b)] \quad R_k(a, b') = \bigcup_{y \in R_{k-1}(a, b')} [R_1(b', y) \cup R_1(y, a)]$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} R_k(a', b) \cap R_k(a, b') &= \\ &= \left(\bigcup_{z \in R_{k-1}(a', b)} [R_1(a', z) \cup R_1(z, b)] \right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{y \in R_{k-1}(a, b')} [R_1(b', y) \cup R_1(y, a)] \right) = \\ &= \left(\left(\bigcup_{z \in R_{k-1}(a', b)} [R_1(a', z) \cup R_1(z, b)] \right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{y \in R_{k-1}(a, b')} R_1(b', y) \right) \right) \cup \\ &= \left(\left(\bigcup_{z \in R_{k-1}(a', b)} [R_1(a', z) \cup R_1(z, b)] \right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{y \in R_{k-1}(a, b')} R_1(y, a) \right) \right) \\ &\supseteq \bigcup_{\substack{z \in R_{k-1}(a', b) \\ y \in R_{k-1}(b', a)}} [R_1(a', z) \cap R_1(y, a)] \end{aligned}$$

Since $z = b \in R_{k-1}(a', b)$ and $y = b' \in R_{k-1}(a, b')$ we conclude

$$R_k(a', b) \cap R_k(a, b') \supseteq R_1(a', b) \cap R_1(a, b') \neq \emptyset \text{ by Lemma 7.} \quad \square$$

The Pasch axiom (Pa) implies in particular (B3), as shown by [van de Vel(1993)].

Lemma 1 of [Mulder and Nebeský(2009)] therefore implies that R_k also satisfies

$$(C4) \quad z \in R(x, y) \text{ implies } R(x, z) \cap R(z, y) = \{z\},$$

which in turn implies (B1).

Furthermore, \widehat{R} also satisfies (M) and therefore in particular (B2). As an immediate consequence we conclude that \widehat{R}_k is geometric in the sense of Nebeský. Note that this is not true for R_k itself since (B2) is violated for all $k < n - 1$ for all pairs of vertices with distance $d(x, \bar{x}) = n$. Lemma 1 of [Changat *et al.*(2010)Changat, Mathew, and Mulder],

furthermore, implies that $G_{\widehat{R}_k} = G_{R_k}$ is connected since \widehat{R}_k is a transit function satisfying (B1) and (B2).

The requirement that G is connected in Corollary 1 and 2 can therefore be replaced also by requiring that \widehat{R} satisfies (Pa).

The main result of [Nebeský(1994)], see also [Mulder and Nebeský(2009)], states that a geometric transit function R equals the interval function of its underlying graph, $R = I_{G_R}$, if and only if R satisfies in addition the two axioms

(S1) $|R(x, y)| = |R(z, w)| = 2$, $x \in R(y, w)$, and $y, w \in R(x, z)$, implies $z \in R(y, w)$.

(S2) $|R(x, y)| = |R(y, w)| = 2$, $y \in R(x, y)$, $w \notin R(x, z)$, $z \notin R(y, w)$ implies $y \in R(x, w)$.

Again we need (S1) and (S2) to hold for \widehat{R} rather than R itself.

Lemma 8 *The 1-point crossover operator R_1 satisfies the (S1) axiom.*

Proof Let R_1 be 1-point crossover operator. Since $|R(u, x)| = |R(v, y)| = 2$, it follows that u and x as well as v and y differ in only a single coordinate. Writing $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n)$ and assuming $u \in R(x, y)$ we must have either

(1) $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n)$, or

(2) $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n) = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$.

W.l.o.g., suppose u is of the form (1), therefore $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i$ and $u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n = y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n$. Let $x \in R(u, v)$. Since u is of the form (1), we have $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_i = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i$ and $x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n = v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n$. Let $y \in R(u, v)$. since u is of the form (1), we have $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_i = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i$ and $y_{i+1}, \dots, y_n = u_{i+1}, \dots, u_n$. Hence $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_n)$ can be written as

$v = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$, which implies $v \in R(x, y)$. Thus the axiom (S1) follows. \square

Lemma 9 *The 1-point crossover operator R_1 satisfies axiom (S2).*

Proof From $|R(u, x)| = |R(v, y)| = 2$, it follows that u and x differ in only one coordinate, say i , and v and y differ in a single coordinate, say j . W.l.o.g., let $i \leq j$. Since $v \notin R(x, y)$, y and v differ only in position j , we conclude that

(*) $x_j, \dots, x_n \neq v_j, \dots, v_n$.

From $x \in R(u, v)$ and (*) we obtain $x_1, \dots, x_{j-1} = v_1, \dots, v_{j-1} = y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}$. Hence $x_j, \dots, x_n = u_j, \dots, u_n$. Therefore $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_j, \dots, x_n) = (y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}, u_j, \dots, u_n)$. This implies $x \in R(u, y)$ and axiom (S2) follows. \square

As shown in [Mulder and Nebeský(2009)], the axiom

(MO) $R(x, y) \cap R(y, z) \cap R(z, x) \neq \emptyset$

implies both (S1) and (S2).

On hypercubes, i.e., assuming an alphabet with just two letters, uniform crossover $R = \widehat{R}_k$ satisfies $|R(x, y) \cap R(y, z) \cap R(z, x)| = 1$. The unique *median* $m = R(x, y) \cap R(y, z) \cap R(z, x)$ is defined coordinate-wise by majority voting of $x_i, y_i, z_i \in \{0, 1\}$, see [Mulder(1980)]. On hypercubes, \widehat{R}_k thus satisfy (MO). This argument fails, however, for general Hamming graphs. The reason is that axiom (MO)

fails for each position at which the three sequences x, y, z are pairwise distinct:
 $\{0, 1\} \cap \{1, 2\} \cap \{2, 0\} = \emptyset$.

For $z \in R_k(x, y)$ let I denote the set of indices $0 = i_0 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_k = n$ from definition 1 such that z is a k -point crossover offspring of x and y . If z is an offspring such that x is placed before y in the definition we denote this by $z = x \times_I y$ and $z = y \times_I x$ otherwise.

Lemma 10 *Let $d(a, b) > k + 1$. If $s = a \times_I b$, $t = a \times_I b$ and $|I| = k$, then $s \times_j t \notin R_k(a, b)$ and $t \times_j s \notin R_k(a, b)$ holds for all $j \notin I$.*

Proof Since $j \notin I$ it follows that $s \times_j t = (a \times_I b) \times_j (b \times_I a)$ and $t \times_j s = (b \times_I a) \times_j (a \times_I b)$, we have $s \times_j t, t \times_j s \in R_{k+1}(a, b) \setminus R_k(a, b)$. \square

[Gitchoff and Wagner(1996)] conjectured that for each transit set $R_k(x, y)$ there is a unique pair of parents from which it is generated unless $R_k(x, y)$ is a hypercube. We settle this conjecture affirmatively:

Theorem 3 *If $d(u, v), d(x, y) > k + 1$ then $R_k(u, v) = R_k(x, y)$ if and only if $\{u, v\} = \{x, y\}$.*

Proof The implication from right to left is trivial. For other direction we use Lemma 10. Assume, for contradiction, that $R_k(u, v) = R_k(x, y)$ and $\{u, v\} \neq \{x, y\}$. Then $x, y \in R_k(u, v)$ and $u, v \in R_k(x, y)$. From $R_k(u, v) = R_k(x, y)$ it follows also that $\widehat{R}_k(u, v) = \widehat{R}_k(x, y)$, which in turn implies $d(u, v) = d(x, y)$. Therefore, there exists a set of indices I , $|I| = k$, such that $x = u \times_I v$ and $y = v \times_I u$. From $d(x, y) > k + 1$ and Lemma 10 we conclude that there exist $j \notin I$ such that $x \times_j y \notin R_k(u, v)$. Hence $R_k(u, v) \neq R_k(x, y)$. This contradiction completes the proof of the theorem. \square

For the special case $k = 1$, Theorem 3 for $k = 1$ implies the following statement.

(H3) For every $x, y, u, v \in X$, $u \neq v$, $x \neq y$, $|R(x, y)| > 4$, $R(u, v) \subseteq R(x, y)$ implies that either $R(u, v) = \{u, v\}$ or $\{u, v\} = \{x, y\}$.

For $x, y \in X$ with $d(x, y) = t \geq 3$, the transit set $R_1(x, y)$ induces a cycle of size $2t$, an hence the only other transit sets that are included in $R_1(x, y)$ are singletons and edges.

4 Graph theoretical approach for k -point crossover operators

Transit sets $R(x, y)$ inherit a natural graph structure as an induced subgraph of the underlying graph G_R . In the case of crossover operators and their corresponding transit sets $R_k(x, y)$, the distance in the underlying graph plays a crucial role in their characterization.

Recall that n -dimensional hypercubes are antipodal graphs, i.e., for any vertex v there is a unique antipodal vertex \bar{v} with $d(v, \bar{v}) = \text{diam}(G) = n$, where $\text{diam}(G)$ denotes the diameter of graph G . The vertex \bar{v} is obtained from v by reversing all coordinates.

Theorem 4 *$R_k(x, y)$ induces an antipodal graph such that $\bar{x} = y$, $\bar{y} = x$, and for each $u \in R_k(x, y)$ of the form $u = x \times_I y$ we have $\bar{u} = y \times_I x$.*

Proof The definition of R_k immediately implies that x and y are at the maximal distance from each other and every other $v \in R_k(x, y)$, $v = x \times_I y$, has a unique vertex at maximal distance in $R_k(x, y)$, that is $\bar{v} = y \times_I x$. \square

Note that here v and \bar{v} are antipodal in a subgraph $R_k(x, y)$ and will not be antipodal in the underlying graph G_R , unless $d(v, \bar{v}) = \text{diam}(G_R)$. This is not the only property inherited from hypercubes. We say that H is an *isometric subgraph* of a graph G if for every pair of vertices $u, v \in V(H)$ the distance from G is preserved, i.e., if $d_H(u, v) = d_G(u, v)$. Isometric subgraphs of hypercubes are known as *partial cubes* [Hammack *et al.*(2011)Hammack, Imrich, and Klavžar, Ovchinnikov(2011)]. [Gitchoff and Wagner(1996)] showed (1) that $R_1(x, y)$ induces C_{2t} , a cycle of length $2t$, where $t = d(x, y)$, and (2) that $d_{C_{2t}}(u, v) = d_{G_{R_1}}(u, v)$ holds for every pair $u, v \in R_1(x, y)$. In other words $R_1(x, y)$ is a partial cube. Theorem 1 implies that this result holds in general:

Corollary 5 *The k -point crossover operator R_k induces a partial cube.*

In particular, therefore, R_k always induces a connected subgraph of G_R .

In the remainder of this section we consider only the binary case.

Definition 2 *Let R be a transit function R on a set X . Then we set $uv \parallel xy$ if and only if $v, x \in R(u, y)$ and $u, y \in R(v, x)$.*

The binary relation \parallel was introduced by [Dress(2007)] in the context of a characterisation of so called X -nets, a structure from phylogenetic combinatorics that is intimately connected with partial cubes. Indeed, [Dress(2007)] showed that \parallel can be used to characterize partial cubes:

Proposition 3 ([Dress(2007)]) *Let G be a graph and $R = I_G$, then G is a partial cube if and only if the relation \parallel is an equivalence relation on the set of its edges.*

By the definition, the relation \parallel is reflexive and symmetric. Therefore it suffices to require that \parallel is a transitive relation. Proposition 3 thus can be translated into the language of transit functions:

Theorem 5 *Let R be a transit function on a set X . Then the underlying graph G_R is partial cube if and only if R satisfies:*

(AX) *for all $a, b, c, d, e, f \in X$, with $|R(a, b)| = |R(c, d)| = |R(e, f)| = 2$ and $ab \parallel cd$ and $cd \parallel ef$ it follows that $ab \parallel ef$.*

It is worth noting that the axiom (AX) can be also described purely in a transit sets notation as follows:

(AX') *for all $a, b, c, d, e, f \in X$, with $|R(a, b)| = |R(c, d)| = |R(e, f)| = 2$ and $b, c \in R(a, d)$, $a, d \in R(b, c)$, $d, e \in R(c, f)$ and $c, f \in R(d, e)$ it follows that $b, e \in R(a, f)$ and $a, f \in R(b, e)$.*

For a partial cube G , the equivalence classes of the relation \parallel are called *cuts* and we denote the set of all cuts by $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n\}$, where n is the dimension of the smallest hypercube into which G embeds isometrically. Cuts form a minimal edge partition of the edge set in a partial cube with the property that removal of all edges from a given cut results in a disconnected graph with exactly two connected components. These are called *splits* [Dress *et al.*(2012)Dress, Huber, Koolen, Moulton, and Spillner, Ovchinnikov(2011)].

Cuts of the partial cubes correspond to the coordinates in the corresponding isometric embedding into the hypercube and they induce a binary labelling of the




Figure 4. $R_2(0000, 1111)$ together with colored cuts.

strings: for a cut C_i vertices from one part of the split induced by C_i are labeled “0” in coordinate i , and vertices from the other part of the split are labeled “1” in coordinate i . For a any pair of parallel edges xy, uv in a partial cube the notation can be chosen such that $d(u, x) = d(v, y) = d(u, y) - 1 = d(v, x) - 1$. The distance between any two vertices in a partial cube therefore can be computed as the Hamming distance between the corresponding binary labelings, which in turn correspond to the number of cuts that separate the two vertices. In other words, any shortest path between two vertices in a partial cube is determined by the cuts it traverses. Moreover, any shortest path traverses each cut at most once. We refer to [Hammack *et al.*(2011)Hammack, Imrich, and Klavžar, Ovchinnikov(2011)] for the details; there, the cuts are called Θ -classes.

Let us denote the cuts appearing in the partial cube $R_1(x, y)$ by $C(x, y)$. We have $|C(x, y)| = d(x, y)$. For any pair of vertices x, y in a hypercube with $d(x, y) = t$ we have $t!$ possible ways to choose a shortest path between them, because each of the $t!$ possible orders in which the corresponding cuts that are traversed results in a distinct path. Therefore there are also $t!$ ways to choose an isometric cycle through x and y . The definition of the 1-point crossover operator, on the other hand, identifies a unique isometric cycle between $x, y \in V(G_R)$.

The binary labelling of vertices in a partial cube naturally induces a lexicographic ordering of vertices. Similarly, by taking first the labelling of the minimal vertex and concatenating it with the labelling of the remaining vertex, we can also lexicographically order the edges of a partial cube. The idea can further be generalized to a lexicographic ordering of all paths and cuts of a partial cube. The following result shows the 1-point crossover is intimately related to this lexicographic order.

Theorem 6 *Let $x, y \in X = \{0, 1\}^n$. Then $R_1(x, y)$ consist of all vertices appearing on lexicographically minimal and maximal paths between x and y .*

Proof The statement follows immediately from the definition of the 1-point crossover operator. \square

Problem 1 *Is it true that $R_k(x, y)$ consist of all vertices appearing on $\frac{k!}{2}$ pairs of first and last lexicographically minimal and maximal paths between x and y ?*

For $x, y \in X \setminus \{0, 1\}^n$ and any shortest path between them, there is exactly one path along which the cuts appear in the reverse order. Consider any $u \in R_1(x, y) \setminus \{x, y\}$.




Figure 5. $R_1(000, 111)$ in K_2^3 is represented with black vertices and fat edges. Lexicographic ordering of the vertices of K_2^3 : starting at 000 bottom-up and then in each level from left to right; labelling of the edges corresponds to the induced lexicographic ordering of cuts.

There is exactly one shortest path between u and x in $R_1(x, y)$. For $k > 1$ and $d(x, y) = t$ both x and y have exactly t neighbours in $R_k(x, y)$. Moreover as shown above, see example 4, for $u \in R_k(x, y)$, it may be the case that $R_k(x, u) = \widehat{R}_k(x, u) \subseteq R_k(x, y)$. Hence the lexicographic order of cuts does not uniquely determine a shortest path in $R_k(u, x)$. The structure of $R_k(u, v)$ hence is much richer and calls for more “dimensions”. We explore this structure in more details in the sections 6 below.

Problem 2 Compute the size of cuts for R_k , i.e., the number of edges belonging to the common cut.

The degree sequence of the graphs induced by 1-point crossover and uniform crossover operators are monotone. In the first case all values are equal to 2, and in the second case they equal the length of the string n .

Problem 3 Let $d(a, b) = t > k + 1 > 2$. Determine degree sequences of the graphs induced by $R_k(a, b)$.

We will solve this problem completely for the special case of 2-point crossover operators in Section 6.

Lemma 11 Let $a, b \in X = \{0, 1\}^n$ and $k > 1$. Then the maximum and minimum degree of a graph induced by $R_k(a, b)$ equal n and $k + 1$, respectively.

Proof Clearly the graph induced by $R_2(a, b)$ includes all neighbours of x and y in $\{0, 1\}^n$, hence the maximum degree of a graph induced by $R_2(a, b)$, and consequently of graphs induced by $R_k(a, b)$, for $k > 2$, is n . W.l.o.g., let $a = 0 \dots 0$ and $b = 1 \dots 1$. Then $R_k(a, b)$ consist of all binary strings with less than $k + 1$ blocks of consecutive 0’s or 1’s. Hence the minimum degree in a graph induced by $R_k(a, b)$ is attained by vertex corresponding to a binary string consisting of exactly k different blocks of consecutive

0's or 1's, and they have exactly $k + 1$ neighbours in a graph induced by $R_k(a, b)$. \square A solution of Problem 3 could help solve

Problem 4 Does R_k induce a k -connected graph?

For an axiomatic characterization of R_1 in terms of transit functions axioms it is easy to translate graph theoretic properties related to the fact that $R_1(x, y)$ induces an isometric cycle in $\{0, 1\}^n$ in the language of transit functions. In addition, however, it would also be necessary to express a consistent ordering of the cuts that appear in the isometric cycles in terms of transit function. While this appears possible, it seems to be cumbersome and does not promise additional insights into the structure of the transit sets. Hence we do not pursue this issue further.

5 Combinatorial Properties of Recombination Sets

Since the monotonicity axiom (M) fails for k -point crossover with $k < n - 1$, [Gitchoff and Wagner(1996)] proposed the axiom

(GW3) For all $x, y \in X$ and all $u, v \in R(x, y)$ holds $|R(u, v)| \leq |R(x, y)|$.

stipulating monotonicity in size. This is proper relaxation of (M), which obviously (M) implies (GW3). In order to derive explicit expressions for $|R_k(x, y)|$ we note that, for given vertices x and y , the hypercube can be relabeled in such a way that x becomes the all-zero string and y is a 01-string with 1's at exactly the positions where x and y differ. Thus the size of the recombination sets $|R_k(x, y)| =: r_k(t)$ depends only on the order k of the recombination operator and the Hamming distance $t := d(x, y)$. In the following we write

$$\Phi_h(n) := \sum_{i=0}^h \binom{n}{i}. \quad (2)$$

In order to compute $r_k(t)$, we have to distinguish the case of small and large Hamming distances.

Theorem 7 Let $1 \leq k < t$. Then

$$r_k(t) = \begin{cases} 2^t & \text{if } t \leq k \\ 2\Phi_k(t-1) & \text{if } t > k \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Proof Consider two strings x and y . From [Gitchoff and Wagner(1996)] we know that $|R_1(x, y)| = 2t$. For all children of x and y that are obtained by i -point crossover, $1 \leq i \leq k$ with exactly i cuts, we have i possibilities for choosing the cuts along $t - 1$ positions. This amounts a total of $\binom{t-1}{i}$ possibilities. In 2 different choices for the ordering of parents. If $t \leq k$ cuts may be placed simultaneously between any two positions in which x and y differ, i.e., i takes values from 0 to $t - 1$. Thus $r_k(t) = 2 \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} \binom{t-1}{i} = 2\Phi_{t-1}(t-1) = 2 \cdot 2^{t-1} = 2^t$. For $t > k$ the number of possible cuts is limited by k and hence $r_k(t) = 2\Phi_k(t-1)$. \square Parts of this result were already observed by [Gitchoff and Wagner(1996)]. In particular, $r_1(t) = 2t$ for $t > 1$, $r_2(t) = t^2 - t + 2$ for $t > 2$, $r_k(k+1) = 2^{k+1}$, and $r_k(k+2) = 2^{k+1} - 2$.

The latter equation shows that $R_{k-1}(x, y)$ for $d(x, y) = k + 1$ misses exactly two points compared to $R_k(x, y)$, i.e., $R_k(x, y) \setminus R_{k-1}(x, y) = \{a, b\}$. Thus we can conclude immediately that $a = x \times_I y$, $b = y \times_I x$ with $|I| = k$. Since every x, y , $x \neq y$, has a unique a, b with the above property, we obtain another simpler proof of the Theorem 3.

From $r_k(t) = 2^t$ for $t \leq k + 1$ and the fact that $\widehat{R}_k(x, y)$ is a hypercube K_2^t of dimension t for $d(x, y) = t$ we immediately conclude that $R_k(x, y)$ is also a hypercube for $t \leq k + 1$.

Let G be partial cube and let H be a graph obtained by contracting some of the cuts of G , i.e. by forgetting some of the coordinates in binary labelling of vertices. If H is isomorphic to some hypercube, then we say that H is a *cube minor* of G .

Lemma 12 *Consider $R_k(x, y)$ as an induced subgraph of the boolean hypercube K_2^n , and suppose $d(x, y) \geq k + 1$. Then the largest cube minors of $R_k(x, y)$ are isomorphic to K_2^{k+1} .*

Proof This is an immediate consequence of Lemma 6 and Theorem 1. □

The Vapnik-Chervonenkis dimension (or VC-dimension) measures the complexity of set systems. Originally introduced in learning theory by [Vapnik and Chervonenkis(1971)], it has found numerous applications e.g. in statistics, combinatorics and computational geometry, see monograph edited by [Vovk *et al.*(2015)Vovk, Papadopoulos, and Gammerman]. Consider a base set X and family $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^X$. A set $C \subseteq X$ is *shattered* by \mathcal{H} if $\{Y \cap C | Y \in \mathcal{H}\} = 2^C$. The VC-dimension of \mathcal{H} is the largest integer d_{VC} such that there is a set C of cardinality d_{VC} that is shattered by \mathcal{H} . For $\mathcal{H} = \emptyset$, $d_{VC} = -1$ by definition.

Clearly, X is shattered by $\mathcal{H} = 2^X$, hence the VC-dimension of the Boolean hypercube $\{0, 1\}^d$ is d . Now consider an even cycle C_{2t} of length $2t$, isometrically embedded into t dimensional hypercube. It is not hard to check that the VC-dimension of C_{2t} is 2 for any $t \geq 2$. More generally, the VC-dimension of a partial cube G , with d cuts, equals the dimension of the largest cube-minor in G , because this is the largest cardinality of a set of coordinates that can be shattered by the set of all d of cuts of G .

Theorem 8 *The VC-dimension of $R_k(x, y)$ equals $k + 1$ whenever $d(x, y) > k$. Otherwise the VC-dimension of $R_k(x, y)$ equals $d(x, y)$.*

Proof If $d(x, y) \leq k$ then $R_k(x, y)$ induces graph isomorphic to d -dimensional hypercube, where $d = d(x, y)$. Let $d = d(x, y)$. If $d > k$ then we need to contract $d - k - 1$ cuts (ignore the corresponding coordinates) to obtain a cube minor of dimension $k + 1$. □

6 Topological representation of the k -point crossover operators

Oriented matroids [Björner *et al.*(1999)Björner, Las Vergnas, Sturmfels, White, and Ziegler] are an axiomatic combinatorial abstraction of geometric and topological structures such as vector configurations, (pseudo)hyperplane arrangements, convex polytopes, point configurations in the Euclidean space, directed graphs, linear programs, etc. They reflect properties such as linear dependencies, facial relationship, convexity, duality, and have bearing on solutions of associated optimization problems. Beyond their connection with many areas of mathematics, the theory of oriented matroids has in recent years found applications in diverse areas of science and technology, including metabolic network analysis [Gagneur and Klamt(2004), Müller and Bockmayr(2013), Müller *et al.*(2014)Müller, Regensburger, and Steuer, Reimers(2014)], electronic circuits [Chaiken(1996)], geographic information science [Stell and Webster(2007)], and quantum gravity [Brunnemann and Rideout(2010)].

In order to explore the relationships of k -point crossover operators and oriented matroids it will be convenient to change the coordinates of the vertices of the hypercube

K_n^2 . For the remainder of this section we write $+$ instead of 1 and $-$ instead of 0 to conform with the traditional notation in this field. Among several equivalent axiomatizations of oriented matroids, the face or covector axioms best captures the geometric flavour and thus is the most convenient one for our purposes.

Let E be a finite set. A *signed vector* X on E is a vector $(X_e : e \in E)$ with coordinates $X_e \in \{+, 0, -\}$. The support of a sign vector X is the set $\underline{X} = \{e \in E \mid X_e \neq 0\}$. The *composition* $X \circ Y$ of two signed vectors X and Y is the signed vector on E defined by $(X \circ Y)_e = X_e$, if $X_e \neq 0$, and $(X \circ Y)_e = Y_e$ otherwise, and their difference set is $D(X, Y) = \{e \in E \mid X_e = -Y_e\}$. We denote by \leq the product (partial) ordering on $\{-, 0, +\}^E$ relative to the standard ordering $- < 0 < +$ of signs.

An *oriented matroid* M is ordered pair (E, \mathcal{F}) of a finite set E and a set of *covectors* $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^E$ satisfying the following (face or covector) axioms:

(F0) $0 = (0, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathcal{F}$.

(F1) If $X \in \mathcal{F}$, then $-X \in \mathcal{F}$.

(F2) If $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}$, then $X \circ Y \in \mathcal{F}$.

(F3) If $X, Y \in \mathcal{F}$ and $e \in D(X, Y)$, then there exists $Z \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $Z_e = 0$ and $Z_f = (X \circ Y)_f$ for all $f \in E \setminus D(X, Y)$.

A simple example for an oriented matroid are the sign vectors of a vector subspace. More precisely, consider a subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{|E|}$, define, for every $v \in V$, its sign vector $s(v)$ coordinate-wise by $s_e(v) = \text{sgn}(v_e)$ for all $e \in E$, and denote by \mathcal{F} the set of all sign vectors of V . Then $M = (E, \mathcal{F})$ satisfies the axioms (F0)-(F3). Oriented matroids obtained from a vector space in this manner are called representable or linear.

The set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{F}$ of non-zero covectors that are minimal with respect to the partial order \leq are called cocircuits or vertices of M . The set $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{F}$ of covectors that are maximal with respect to \leq are called topes of M . The set of cocircuits determines the set of covectors: every covector $X \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \{0\}$ has a representation of the form $X = V_1 \circ V_2 \circ \dots \circ V_k$, where V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k are cocircuits, and $V_1, V_2, \dots, V_k \leq X$. Similarly, the topes determine the oriented matroid: X is a covector if and only if its composition with any tope is again a tope, i.e., $\mathcal{F} = \{X \in \{+, -, 0\}^E \mid \forall T \in \mathcal{T} : X \circ T \in \mathcal{T}\}$.

$M = (E, \mathcal{F})$ is called *uniform* of rank r if the support sets of cocircuits are exactly the subsets of E with $r + 1$ elements. The big face lattice $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ is a lattice obtained by adding the unique maximal element $\widehat{1}$ to the partial order \leq on \mathcal{F} . The rank of a covector X is defined as its height in $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ and rank of oriented matroid is the maximal rank of its covectors.

As an example consider $R_2(x, y)$ with $d(x, y) = 5$. It can be verified that the elements of $R_2(\text{-----}, \text{+++++})$ are exactly the topes of the oriented matroid corresponding to the Rhombododecahedron in Fig. 6. Its big face lattice is shown in Figure 7.

This observation can be generalized with the help of the following

Proposition 4 ([Gärtner and Welzl(1994)]) $T \subseteq \{+, -\}^X$ of VC-dimension d is the set of topes of a uniform oriented matroid M on X if and only if $T = -T$ and $|T| = 2\Phi_{d-1}(|X| - 1)$.

By Proposition 8 and Theorems 7 and 4 this immediately implies

Theorem 9 For $x, y \in \{+, -\}^X$, with $d(x, y) = |X| = n$ the elements of $R_k(x, y)$ form the set of topes of a uniform oriented matroid M on X with VC-dimension $k + 1$ and corank $n - k - 1$.




Figure 6. The rhombododecahedral graph $R_2(----, +++)$ with the binary labeling corresponding to the isometric embedding into 4-dimensional hypercube.




Figure 7. Big face lattice of the rhombicdodecahedron generated using SageMath.

One of the cornerstones of the theory of oriented matroids is the Topological Representation Theorem, which connects oriented matroids with pseudosphere arrangements, see Appendix A for detailed definitions. Together with Theorem 9, it immediately implies the following topological characterization of the recombination sets of k -point crossover:

Theorem 10 For $x, y \in \{+, -\}^X$, with $d(x, y) = |X| = n$, the recombination set $R_k(x, y)$ can be topologically represented by a pseudosphere arrangement of dimension k , where the minimal elements in the big face lattice correspond to the intersections of exactly k pseudospheres, and there are $2^{\binom{n}{k-1}}$ such intersections.

The significance of this result is that it provides a representation of crossover operators in terms of topological objects. In order to illustrate the usefulness of Theorem 10, we now turn to a full characterization of the transit graphs of 2-point crossover operators. The smallest non-trivial examples are the graphs $R_2(----, +++)$ in Fig. 6 and $R_2(-----, +++++)$ in Fig. 8.

Theorem 11 $R_2(a, b)$ with $d(a, b) = t > 3$ induces antipodal planar quadrangulation, that is, a partial cube of diameter t with $t^2 - t + 2$ vertices, $2t^2 - 2t$ edges, $t^2 - t$ quadrangles, and all cuts of size $2t - 2$.

Proof Let $|V|$, $|E|$, $|Q|$ and $|C|$ denote number of vertices, edges, 4-faces, and edges in a cut, respectively. From the definition of crossover operator, we can arbitrarily permute coordinates, hence it follows that each cut has the same number of edges, this justifies that we study $|C|$. From Theorem 9 it follows that vertices of $R_2(a, b)$ form the set of topes of uniform oriented matroid of rank 3 and corank $t - 3$. As shown by [Fukuda and Handa(1993)] and in the book by [Björner et al.(1999)Björner, Las Vergnas, Sturmfels, White, and Ziegler], rank 3 oriented matroids can be represented by pseudocircle arrangement on \mathbb{S}^2 . The corresponding tope graph is therefore planar. Hence $R_2(a, b)$ induces in particular a planar antipodal partial cube.




Figure 8. The transit graph $R_2(-----, +++++)$.




Figure 9. Topological representation of rhombododecahedron (l.h.s.) in terms of its pseudocircle arrangement (dotted curves) and the corresponding hyperplane arrangement (r.h.s.).

Corank $t - 3$ implies that each intersection of pseudocurves is the intersection of exactly two of them. Hence all faces of the dual – the tope graph – are 4-cycles, therefore $R_2(a, b)$ induces planar quadrangulation. Moreover, each intersection of two pseudocircles corresponds to cocircuit. In uniform oriented matroid of corank $t - 3$ there are exactly $2\binom{t}{t-2}$ cocircuits, which correspond to the 4-cycles in the dual graph.

Quadrangulations are maximal planar bipartite graphs – no edge can be added so that graph remains planar and bipartite. Using Euler formula for planar graphs [Nishizeki and Chiba(1988)], we obtain $|E| = 2|V| - 4$. Theorem 7, furthermore, implies $|E| = 2t^2 - 2t$ and thus $|C| = |E|/t = 2t - 2$. \square

As an example, Fig. 9 shows the pseudocircle arrangement of transit graph $R_2(-----, +++++)$ of Fig.6 and its equivalent hyperplane arrangement.

In order to get a better intuition on the structure of the graphs induced by 2-point crossover operators, we finally derive their degree sequence.

Theorem 12 *Let $d(a, b) = t > 3$. The degree sequence of a graph induced by $R_2(a, b)$ equals $(t, t, 4, \dots, 4, 3, \dots, 3)$, where there are $t^2 - 3t$ vertices of degree 4 and $2t$ vertices of degree 3.*

Proof W.l.o.g., let $a = 0 \dots 0$ and $b = 1 \dots 1$. For any vertex $c = x \dots xyx \dots x$, $x, y \in \{0, 1\}$ we have that $c \in R_2(a, b)$, hence $\deg(a) = \deg(b) = t$. Let $c \in R_2(a, b) \setminus \{a, b\}$. Then we have two cases:

Case 1. $c = xx \dots xxyy \dots yy$ and $\{x, y\} = \{0, 1\}$. Then c has at most four neighbours in $R_2(a, b)$: $c_1 = yx \dots xxyy \dots yy$, $c_2 = xx \dots xxyy \dots yx$, $c_3 = xx \dots xyyy \dots yy$ and $c_4 = xx \dots xxyy \dots yy$. Since $t > 3$ it follows c also has at least three neighbours in $R_2(a, b)$.

Case 2. $c = x \dots xxyy \dots yyxx \dots x$ and $\{x, y\} = \{0, 1\}$. Then c has at most four neighbours in $R_2(a, b)$: $c_1 = x \dots xxxy \dots yyxx \dots x$, $c_2 = x \dots xyyy \dots yyxx \dots x$, $c_3 = x \dots xxyy \dots yxxx \dots x$ and $c_4 = x \dots xxyy \dots yyyx \dots x$. Since $t > 3$ it follows c also has at least three neighbours in $R_2(a, b)$.

Let x_3 and x_4 denote the number of vertices of degree 3 and 4 respectively. By the handshaking lemma $2|E| = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \deg(v)$. Therefore, it follows from arguments above and Theorem 11 that

$$4t^2 - 4t = 2t + \sum_{v \in V(G) \setminus \{a, b\}} \deg(v)$$

$$4t^2 - 6t = 3x_3 + 4x_4$$

Theorem 11 also implies $t^2 - t = x_3 + x_4$. Solving this system of linear equations yields $x_3 = 2t$ and $x_4 = t^2 - 3t$. \square

7 Concluding remarks

Crossover operators are a key ingredient in the construction of algorithms in Evolutionary and Genetic Programming. Their purpose is to construct offsprings that are a ‘‘mixture’’ of the two parental genotypes, an idea that is captured well by the concept of transit functions. In this contribution we have investigated in detail the transit sets of homologous crossover operators for strings of fixed length and their combinatorial, graph theoretic, and topological properties.

As shown by [Gitchoff and Wagner(1996)] 1-point crossover operators correspond to circles, that is, rather simple 2-dimensional objects. For $k > 1$ we have shown that k -point crossover operators are of more complex nature and correspond to higher dimensional objects, which is appropriately measured by the VC-dimension. For the case of binary alphabets, we explored the close connection with oriented matroids and found that the elements of transit sets form the topes. Furthermore, there is an equivalent characterization in terms of pseudosphere arrangements. Since string recombination operators effectively only distinguishes whether a sequences position is equal or different between the two parents, the results on the graph-theoretical structures of the transit rests directly carry over to arbitrary Hamming graphs.

Linear oriented matroids are exactly those that can be represented by sphere arrangements, i.e., every member of such arrangement is $(d - 1)$ -dimensional sphere in \mathbb{S}^d , which is in turn equivalent to the representation of oriented matroid by a central hyperplane arrangement, e.g. their tope graphs are zonotopes. This suggest the following open

Problem 5 *Are uniform oriented matroids corresponding to the k -point crossover operators realizable? In the case of positive answer, find equations describing the hyperplanes in the corresponding hyperplane arrangement.*

The results presented here also suggest to consider transit sets of recombination operators for state spaces other than strings. Natural candidates are many crossover operators for permutation problems. A subset of these was compared e.g. by [Puljić and

Manger(2013)] and [Bala and Sharma(2015)] but very little is known about the algebraic, combinatorial, and topological properties. Interestingly, the 1-point crossover operator R_1 satisfies all axioms except (B2) of the axioms characterizing the interval function of an arbitrary connected graph. Nevertheless, there are striking differences even though both functions induce the same convexity as noted in Lemma 5.

Finally, recombination operators influence in a critical manner they way how genetic information is passed down through the generalizations in diploid populations. The corresponding nonassociative algebraic structures so far have been studied mostly as generalizations of Mendel's laws [Bernstein(1923), Etherington(1939)], see also the books by [Wörz-Busekros(1980)] and [Lyubich(1992)]. We suspect that a better understanding of the structure of recombination operators will also be of interest in this context.

acknowledgements 1 *This work was supported in part by the Government of India, Department of Atomic Energy (grant no. 2/48(2)/2014/NBHM(R.P)-R&D II/14364 to MC), and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft within the EUROCORES Programme EUROGIGA (project GReGAS) of the European Science Foundation (grant no. STA 850/11-1 to PFS).*

References

- Bala and Sharma(2015). Bala A, Sharma AK, 2015. A comparative study of modified crossover operators. In: Saini H, Ghrera SP, Sehgal VK, editors, Third International Conference on Image Information Processing (ICIIP), (pp. 281–284). Piscataway, NJ: IEEE.
- Bernstein(1923). Bernstein S, 1923. Demonstration mathématique de la loi d'hérédité de Mendel. *Comptes Rendus Acad Sci Paris* 177:528–531.
- Björner *et al.*(1999)Björner, Las Vergnas, Sturmfels, White, and Ziegler. Björner A, Las Vergnas M, Sturmfels B, White N, Ziegler G, 1999. *Oriented matroids*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn.
- Bokowski *et al.*(2005)Bokowski, King, Mock, and Streinu. Bokowski J, King S, Mock S, Streinu I, 2005. The topological representation of oriented matroids. *Discrete Comput Geom* 33:645–668.
- Brunnemann and Rideout(2010). Brunnemann J, Rideout D, 2010. Oriented matroids – combinatorial structures underlying loop quantum gravity. *Classical and Quantum Gravity* 27:205008.
- Chaiken(1996). Chaiken S, 1996. Oriented matroid pairs, theory and an electric application. In: *Matroid theory* (Seattle, WA, 1995), vol. 197 of *Contemp. Math.*, (pp. 313–331). Providence, RI: Amer. Math. Soc.
- Changat *et al.*(2001)Changat, Klavžar, and Mulder. Changat M, Klavžar S, Mulder HM, 2001. The all-paths transit function of a graph. *Czech Math J* 51:439–448.
- Changat *et al.*(2010)Changat, Mathew, and Mulder. Changat M, Mathew J, Mulder HM, 2010. The induced path function, monotonicity and betweenness. *Discr Appl Math* 156:426–433.
- Culberson(1995). Culberson JC, 1995. Mutation-crossover isomorphisms and the construction of discriminating functions. *Evol Comp* 2:279–311.

-
- DeJong and Spears(1992). DeJong K, Spears WM, 1992. A formal analysis of the role of multi-point crossover in genetic algorithms. *Ann Math Artif Intelligence* 5:1–26.
- Dress(2007). Dress AWM, 2007. The category of x -nets. In: Feng J, Jost J, Qian M, editors, *Networks: from biology to theory*, (pp. 3–22). London, UK: Springer.
- Dress *et al.*(2012)Dress, Huber, Koolen, Moulton, and Spillner. Dress AWM, Huber KT, Koolen J, Moulton V, Spillner A, 2012. *Basic phylogenetic combinatorics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- English(1997). English TM, 1997. Some geometric and algebraic results on crossover. In: *Evolutionary Programming VI*, vol. 1213 of *Lect. Notes Comp. Sci.*, (pp. 285–295). Heidelberg: Springer Verlag.
- Etherington(1939). Etherington IMH, 1939. Genetic algebras. *Proc Roy Soc Edinburgh* 59:242–258.
- Field(1995). Field P, 1995. Nonbinary transforms for genetic algorithm problems. *Complex Systems* 9:11–28.
- Folkman and Lawrence(1978). Folkman J, Lawrence J, 1978. Oriented matroids. *J Combin Theory Ser B* 25:199–236.
- Fukuda and Handa(1993). Fukuda K, Handa K, 1993. Antipodal graphs and oriented matroids. *Discrete Math* 111:245–256.
- Gagneur and Klamt(2004). Gagneur J, Klamt S, 2004. Computation of elementary modes: a unifying framework and the new binary approach. *BMC bioinformatics* 5:1.
- Gärtner and Welzl(1994). Gärtner B, Welzl E, 1994. Vapnik-Chervonenkis dimension and (pseudo-)hyperplane arrangements. *Discrete Comput Geom* 12:399–432.
- Gitchoff and Wagner(1996). Gitchoff P, Wagner GP, 1996. Recombination induced hypergraphs: A new approach to mutation-recombination isomorphism. *Complexity* 2:47–43.
- Goldberg(1989). Goldberg D, 1989. Genetic algorithms and Walsh functions: a gentle introduction. *Complex Systems* 3:129–152.
- Hammack *et al.*(2011)Hammack, Imrich, and Klavžar. Hammack R, Imrich W, Klavžar S, 2011. *Handbook of product graphs*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2nd ed. edn.
- Holland(1975). Holland J, 1975. *Adaptation in Natural and Artificial Systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Laborde and Rao Hebbare(1982). Laborde JM, Rao Hebbare SP, 1982. Another characterization of hypercubes. *Discrete Math* 39:161–166.
- Lyubich(1992). Lyubich YI, 1992. *Mathematical Structures in Population Genetics*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Mollard(1991). Mollard M, 1991. Two characterizations of generalized hypercube. *Discrete Math* 93:63–74.

-
- Moraglio and Poli(2004). Moraglio A, Poli R, 2004. Topological interpretation of crossover. In: Deb K, Poli R, Banzhaf W, Beyer HG, Burke E, Darwen P, Dasgupta D, Floreano D, Foster J, Harman M, Holland O, Lanzi PL, Spector L, Tettamanzi A, editors, Genetic and Evolutionary Computation – GECCO 2004, vol. 3102 of *Lect. Notes Comp. Sci.*, (pp. 1377–1388).
- Mulder(1980). Mulder HM, 1980. The Interval Function of a Graph, vol. 132 of *Math. Centre Tracts*. Amsterdam, NL: Math. Centre.
- Mulder(2008). Mulder HM, 2008. Transit functions on graphs (and posets). In: Changat M, Klavžar S, Mulder HM, Vijayakumar A, editors, Convexity in Discrete Structures, RMS Lecture Notes Series, (pp. 117–130).
- Mulder and Nebeský(2009). Mulder HM, Nebeský L, 2009. Axiomatic characterization of the interval function of a graph. *European J Combin* 30:1172–1185.
- Müller and Bockmayr(2013). Müller AC, Bockmayr A, 2013. Fast thermodynamically constrained flux variability analysis. *Bioinformatics* 29:903–909.
- Müller *et al.*(2014)Müller, Regensburger, and Steuer. Müller S, Regensburger G, Steuer R, 2014. Enzyme allocation problems in kinetic metabolic networks: Optimal solutions are elementary flux modes. *J Theor Biol* 347:182–190.
- Nebeský(1994). Nebeský L, 1994. A characterization of the interval function of a connected graph. *Czech Math J* 44:173–178.
- Nebeský(2001). Nebeský L, 2001. The interval function of a connected graph and a characterization of geodesic graphs. *Math Bohem* 126:247–254.
- Nishizeki and Chiba(1988). Nishizeki T, Chiba N, 1988. Planar graphs: Theory and algorithms. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Ovchinnikov(2011). Ovchinnikov S, 2011. Graphs and cubes. New York, NY: Springer.
- Puljić and Manger(2013). Puljić K, Manger R, 2013. Comparison of eight evolutionary crossover operators for the vehicle routing problem. *Math Commun* 18:359–375.
- Radcliffe(1994). Radcliffe NJ, 1994. The algebra of genetic algorithms. *Ann Math Artif Intelligence* 10:339–384.
- Reimers(2014). Reimers AC, 2014. Metabolic Networks, Thermodynamic Constraints, and Matroid Theory. Ph.D. thesis, Freie Universität Berlin.
- Schmitt(2001). Schmitt LM, 2001. Theory of genetic algorithms. *Theor Comp Sci* 259:1–61.
- Shpak and Wagner(1999). Shpak M, Wagner GP, 1999. Asymmetry of configuration space induced by unequal crossover: implications for a mathematical theory of evolutionary innovation. *Artificial Life* 6:25–43.
- Stadler *et al.*(2000)Stadler, Seitz, and Wagner. Stadler PF, Seitz R, Wagner GP, 2000. Evolvability of complex characters: Population dependent Fourier decomposition of fitness landscapes over recombination spaces. *Bull Math Biol* 62:399–428. Santa Fe Institute Preprint 99-01-001.

-
- Stell and Webster(2007). Stell J, Webster J, 2007. Oriented matroids as a foundation for space in GIS. *Computers environment and urban systems* 31:379–392.
- van de Vel(1983). van de Vel M, 1983. Matching binary convexities. *Topology Appl* 16:207–235.
- van de Vel(1993). van de Vel M, 1993. *Theory of convex structures*, vol. 50. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Vapnik and Chervonenkis(1971). Vapnik VN, Chervonenkis AY, 1971. On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities. *Theory Probab Appl* 16:264–280.
- Vovk *et al.*(2015)Vovk, Papadopoulos, and Gammerman. Vovk V, Papadopoulos H, Gammerman A, editors, 2015. *Measures of Complexity: Festschrift for Alexey Chervonenkis*. Heidelberg: Springer.
- Wörz-Busekros(1980). Wörz-Busekros A, 1980. *Algebras in Genetics*, vol. 36. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Appendix A: Pseudosphere Arrangements

Consider the d -dimensional sphere \mathbb{S}^d in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} and the corresponding $(d+1)$ -dimensional ball $\mathbb{B}^{d+1} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \mid x_1^2 + \dots + x_{d+1}^2 \leq 1\}$, whose boundary surface is \mathbb{S}^d .

A pseudosphere $S \subset \mathbb{S}^d$ is a tame embedded $(d-1)$ -dimensional sphere. Its complement in \mathbb{B}^d consist of exactly two regions, hence S can be oriented, by labelling one region by S_e^+ and the other by S_e^- . A pseudosphere arrangement $\mathcal{S} = \{S_e \mid e \in E\}$ in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d is a collection of $(d-1)$ -dimensional pseudospheres on the d -dimensional unit sphere \mathbb{S}^d , where the intersection of any number of spheres is again a sphere and the intersection of an arbitrary collection of closed sides is either a sphere or a ball, i.e., for all $R \subset E$ holds

- (i) $S_R = \mathbb{S}^d \cap_{i \in R} S_i$ is empty or homeomorphic to a sphere.
- (ii) If $e \in E$ and $S_R \not\subset S_e$ then $S_R \cap S_e$ is a pseudosphere in S_R , $S_R \cap S_e^+ \neq \emptyset$ and $S_R \cap S_e^- \neq \emptyset$.

For a pseudosphere arrangement \mathcal{S} , the position vector $\sigma(x)$ of a point $x \in \mathbb{S}^d$ is defined as

$$\sigma(x)_e = \begin{cases} +, & \text{for } x \in S_e^+ \\ 0, & \text{for } x \in S_e^+ \\ -, & \text{for } x \in S_e^- \end{cases}.$$

The set of all position vectors of \mathcal{S} is denoted by $\sigma(\mathcal{S})$.

A famous theorem due to [Folkman and Lawrence(1978)] establishes a correspondence between oriented matroids and pseudosphere arrangement.

Topological Representation Theorem *Let $M = (E, \mathcal{F})$ be an oriented matroid of rank d . Then there exists a pseudosphere arrangement \mathcal{S} in \mathbb{S}^d such that $\sigma(\mathcal{S}) = \mathcal{F}$. Conversely, if \mathcal{S} is a pseudosphere arrangement in \mathbb{S}^d , then $(E, \sigma(\mathcal{S}))$ is an oriented matroid of rank d .*

A simple alternative proof was given by [Bokowski *et al.*(2005)Bokowski, King, Mock, and Streinu].

A pseudosphere arrangement naturally induces a cell complex on \mathbb{S}^d , whose partial order of faces corresponds precisely to the partial order \leq on covectors of the corresponding oriented matroid. This fact serves as motivation for concept of covectors in the theory of oriented matroids.