

Decomposition of admissible functions in weighted coupled cell networks*

Pedro Sequeira[†], João P. Hespanha[‡], and A. Pedro Aguiar[†]

Abstract. This work makes explicit the degrees of freedom involved in modeling the dynamics of a network, or some other first-order property of a network, such as a measurement function. Currently, the concept of an admissible function is defined through a very high-level description, with the shortcoming of being difficult to verify or design such a function. We introduce two decompositions in order to have a low-level representation of the underlying mathematical object. The first one is the more intuitive one and it solves the verification problem. More importantly, it provides us with essential definitions that prove crucial in order to define the second decomposition. The second decomposition is both verification and design friendly. Although this second decomposition only gives an equivalent representation under certain assumptions, it still proves to be a valid design tool even when they do not apply.

Key words. Coupled cell networks, Admissibility, Function decomposition, Stirling numbers

AMS subject classifications. 34A34, 41A63, 11B73

1. Introduction. Networks are ubiquitous structures, be it either in the natural world or in engineering. In order to study dynamical systems associated with such structures, the formalism of *coupled cell networks* (CCN) was introduced in [10], [5] and [4]. Here, the concept of *admissibility* was defined through the minimal properties that a function must obey in order for it to be a plausible modeling of the dynamics (or some other first-order property) of a network.

One pervasive phenomena that is often of concern when studying networks is synchronism. In fact, the CCN formalism has a very natural way of studying the existence of certain patterns of synchronism based on the network topology, through the use of *balanced partitions*.

The Kuramoto model [1], [3], [8], is one of the most famous and studied models regarding the study of synchrony of oscillators. Although there are variants, in this model, it is usually assumed that the network consists on a “large” amount of identical oscillators, *additive in the edges/weights* and weakly coupled in an all-to-all fashion. This extremely simple structure is deceiving as the Kuramoto model is extremely difficult to study. Furthermore, its simple and particular structure makes the CCN formalism seem excessive.

We argue that from the apparent but deceiving simplicity of the Kuramoto model, one should not automatically assume that this is one of the simplest oscillator-based networks to study. Although tempting, this reasoning should be avoided. Something looking simpler does not make it simpler. In fact, quite often, the opposite is true. Take for instance the study of the

*Submitted to the editors at 12 of January of 2022.

Funding: This work was supported in part by the FCT Project RELIABLE (PTDC/EEI-AUT/3522/2020), funded by FCT/MCTES and in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. ECCS-2029985. The work of P. Sequeira was supported by a Ph.D. Scholarship, grant SFRH/BD/119835/2016 from Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT), Portugal (POCH program).

[†]Faculdade de Engenharia, Universidade do Porto, Portugal (pedro.sequeira@fe.up.pt, pedro.aguiar@fe.up.pt).

[‡]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA ([hespanha@ece.ucsb.edu](mailto:hspanha@ece.ucsb.edu)).

stability of an equilibrium point. If none of the eigenvalues of the Jacobian at that point are in the imaginary axis, then the local stability of the equilibrium is the stability of the linearized system. On the other hand, if the Jacobian matrix is very simple, consider for instance the zero matrix, then this approach will not give us any information. Some other approach like finding a Lyapunov function would be required, which could potentially be very difficult. On the same note, assume we were interested in finding systems with stable limit cycles. If we constrained ourselves to the set of linear systems due to the fact that they are simple, that approach would lead us nowhere. A more extreme example of an apparently simple problem that proves to be far from simple is the Collatz conjecture.

For these reasons, we argue that the focus on very simple systems could, in fact, be holding us back. Refer to [7], in which it is experimentally observed that changing additive coupling dynamics to non-additive can enable persistent synchrony, with this phenomena appearing even in random networks, with no pre-constructed graph structure that would justify the existence of synchronism. The inability of the additive coupling system to exhibit such feature might mean that such a system is, in some sense, degenerate.

This motivates the extension of the CCN formalism to be able to study general, non-additive coupling scenarios in a practical manner.

In this work, we use the formalism for general weighted CCNs recently introduced in [9]. This formalism uses the algebraic structure of the commutative monoid to deal with arbitrary edge sets. This is the minimal structure, with the necessary symmetry properties, that is able to encode finite edges in parallel. There, an admissible function on a CCN is defined through the use of what is called oracle components/functions, which describe how cells of a given type respond to arbitrary finite in-neighborhoods. Then, finding the admissible function on a CCN is just taking the underlying oracle components/function and evaluate it at every cell, constrained to its particular in-neighborhoods of the network of interest.

The oracle components/function are the crucial mathematical objects that describe some first-order property of a network such as its dynamics or some measurement function. It is defined through a set of equality constraints to itself, which is a very high-level description. That is, from the definition, it is not clear how one could possibly verify with certainty, in a systematic manner, if a function satisfies the required properties. Moreover, one would not only be interested in verification, but also on the aspect of designing an oracle function from scratch. In this work, we build on top of this formalism in order to study CCNs, with the intent of dissecting the mathematical object that is the oracle components/function by making explicit its degrees of freedom.

Furthermore, we work under the assumption that the output sets of the oracle components are vector spaces. This is still fairly general since the tangent space of a manifold is a vector space. Therefore, this can be applied to spaces other than \mathbb{R}^n , such as spaces involving angles (torus) in the study of oscillators.

In [section 2](#) we provide the necessary background for understanding the rest of the work by summarizing the commutative monoid formalism for general weighted CCNs.

In [section 3](#) we study what we call a coupling decomposition. We decompose an oracle component \hat{f}_i by establishing a bijection between it and an infinite family of functions $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T_i|}}$, called coupling components. That is, they are equivalent representations of the same object.

However, the conditions necessary for $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ to satisfy, prove to be simple to verify in a completely systematic way, unlike the original \hat{f}_i . This decomposition is still not perfect, although it solves the verification question, it does not provide us with a design method. This is because the functions $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ prove to be related to one another. It is, however, an essential first step which allows us to define the important concept of the coupling order, which proves crucial in order to define a more useful representation for \hat{f}_i .

In section 4 we use the concept of coupling order, together with a projection-based approach, in order to find another infinite family of functions $\{^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$, called basis components, which are simple and decoupled, accomplishing simultaneously our verification and design goals. However, we are only sure to have a bijection of $\{^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ with \hat{f}_i and $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$, as long as we are dealing with (arbitrary) finite coupling orders. In the case of infinite coupling orders, we show that even though we might not have a bijection, this is still a good framework for design. In particular, we can build a valid \hat{f}_i with infinite coupling order by taking the limit of a sequence of oracle components with finite order. The relationships between the oracle components and the two decompositions is illustrated, with the relevant equations, in the diagram of Figure 1.1.

In section 5 we explain how the current CCN formalism and all the related results can be easily extended to be able deal with exogenous inputs and internal parameters.




Figure 1.1: Decomposition diagram.

2. Weighted multi-edge CCN's. In this section we briefly introduce the necessary concepts developed in [9] on top of which this work is built on.

2.1. Commutative monoids. The commutative monoid is the simplest algebraic structure that can be used to describe arbitrary finite parallels of edges. The “sum” operation is denoted by \parallel , with the meaning of “adding in parallel”. Similarly, the notation \sum is used to denote parallels of multiple edges. In this work, for a given commutative monoid \mathcal{M}_{ij} we denote its “zero” element as 0_{ij} . In our context, this element should be interpreted as “no edge”.

2.2. Partition Matrices. A partition on a set of cells \mathcal{C} can be represented though a partition matrix (also called characteristic matrix) $P \in \{0, 1\}^{|\mathcal{C}| \times r}$, such that, $[P]_{ck} = 1$ if the c^{th} cell is in the k^{th} set of the partition, and $[P]_{ck} = 0$ otherwise.

Note that given some matrix M of appropriate dimensions, PM is always well-defined as an expansion of M , where its rows get replicated. In the case of MP , we require the ability of

summing elements of M . In our context, the sum operations will be the previously mentioned monoid sum operations \parallel .

2.3. Multi-indexes. In this work we require the use of multi-index notation. A multi-index is an ordered n -tuple of integers (indexes). That is, an element of \mathbb{N}_0^n . Two particularly important multi-indexes are $\mathbf{0}_n$ and $\mathbf{1}_n$, which represent the tuple of n zeros and the tuple of n ones, respectively. Furthermore, we denote by 1_j the tuple such that its j^{th} entry is 1 and all the others are zero.

We will denote the multi-indexes with the same notation we use for vectors, using bold, as in $\mathbf{k} = [k_1, \dots, k_n]^\top$. Their norm is defined as $|\mathbf{k}| := \sum_{i=1}^n k_i$.

The elements (of the same tupleness n) can be multiplied by integers and added together freely, although subtraction and division are not always well-defined. For instance,

$$\mathbf{k} = 2\mathbf{1}_3 + 3\mathbf{1}_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 5 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

(note the difference between bold and non-bold).

The multi-indexes (of the same tupleness n) form a partial order in the straightforward way, that is, $\mathbf{k}^1 \geq \mathbf{k}^2$ if and only if $k_i^1 \geq k_i^2$ for every entry $1 \leq i \leq n$. Note that for $n > 1$ the order is partial since neither $\mathbf{k}^1 \geq \mathbf{k}^2$ nor $\mathbf{k}^1 \leq \mathbf{k}^2$ are required. This happens when there are $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ such that $k_i^1 > k_i^2$ and $k_j^1 < k_j^2$. In this case we say that the pair $(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2)$ is non-comparable.

We will often specify the tupleness n of a multi-index \mathbf{k} indirectly, by using $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_n$ in order to denote $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, or $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{1}_n$ to denote $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{N}^n$.

2.4. CCN formalism. According to [9], a general weighted coupled cell network is given by the following definition.

Definition 2.1. A network \mathcal{G} consists on a set of cells $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}$, where each cell has a type, given by an index set $T = \{1, \dots, |T|\}$ according to $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}: \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}} \rightarrow T$ and has an $|\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}| \times |\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}|$ in-adjacency matrix $M_{\mathcal{G}}$. The entries of $M_{\mathcal{G}}$ are elements of a family of commutative monoids $\{\mathcal{M}_{ij}\}_{i,j \in T}$ such that $[M_{\mathcal{G}}]_{cd} = m_{cd} \in \mathcal{M}_{ij}$, for any cells $c, d \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}}$ with types $i = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(c)$, $j = \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{G}}(d)$. \square

We will write the monoid operation and the identity element of \mathcal{M}_{ij} as \parallel_{ij} and 0_{ij} respectively.

Remark 1. The subscripts \mathcal{G} are omitted when the network of interest is clear from context. \square

2.5. Admissibility. Any admissible function is constructed through the evaluation of the following mathematical object on a CCN.

Definition 2.2. Consider the set of cell types T , and the related sets $\{\mathbb{X}_j, \mathbb{Y}_j\}_{j \in T}$ together with a family of commutative monoids $\{\mathcal{M}_{ij}\}_{j \in T}$, for a given fixed $i \in T$. Take a function \hat{f}_i defined on

$$(2.1) \quad \hat{f}_i: \mathbb{X}_i \times \bigcup_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}} \left(\mathcal{M}_i^{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbb{X}^{\mathbf{k}} \right) \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_i$$

where $\overset{\circ}{\cup}$ denotes the disjoint union and for multi-index \mathbf{k} we define $\mathbb{X}^{\mathbf{k}} := \mathbb{X}_1^{k_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{X}_{|T|}^{k_{|T|}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_i^{\mathbf{k}} := \mathcal{M}_{i1}^{k_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{M}_{i|T|}^{k_{|T|}}$.

The function \hat{f}_i is called an **oracle component of type i** , if it has the property that for every $x \in \mathbb{X}_i$, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}^{\mathbf{k}}$, $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{X}^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathcal{M}_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}$ and partition matrix P , that satisfy

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{x} = P\bar{\mathbf{x}} \\ P^\top \mathbf{w} = \bar{\mathbf{w}} \end{cases}$$

then

$$(2.3) \quad \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) = \hat{f}_i(x; \bar{\mathbf{w}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$$

Furthermore, if \mathbf{w} has its k^{th} element (corresponding to cell c_k) equal to 0_{ij} , with $j = \mathcal{T}(c_k)$, then

$$(2.4) \quad \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) = \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{-k}, \mathbf{x}_{-k})$$

where \mathbf{w}_{-k} , \mathbf{x}_{-k} denotes the result of removing the k^{th} element of the original vectors \mathbf{w} , \mathbf{x} . In (2.2), equality between states assumes compatible cell types. \square

The disjoint union allows us to distinguish neighborhoods of different types, that is, the set $\mathbb{X}_1 \times \mathbb{X}_1$ is always taken as a different set from $\mathbb{X}_1 \times \mathbb{X}_2$ even in the particular case of $\mathbb{X}_1 = \mathbb{X}_2$. Note that the implication given by (2.2) and (2.3) is equivalent to

$$(2.5) \quad \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}, P\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \hat{f}_i(x; P^\top \mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$$

This is described and illustrated in [9] as an **edge-compression** or an **edge-merging principle**.

Consider now, a permutation matrix P that preserves cell typing ($\mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{k}} = P\mathbb{X}_{\mathbf{k}}$), then

$$(2.6) \quad \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) = \hat{f}_i(x; P\mathbf{w}, P\mathbf{x})$$

Remark 2. It is assumed that given a state, we know the cell type that is associated with it. Note that if $\mathbb{X}_1 = \mathbb{X}_2$, we can extend the representation of two states of cells of type 1 and 2 at the same value x to $(1, x)$ and $(2, x)$ respectively. This makes it so that $x_1 = x_2$ can only happen when they are associated with cells of the same cell type.

This greatly simplifies the notation when dealing with oracle components, making it completely agnostic to permutations. In particular, in (2.6) we can disregard the condition that P needs to preserve cell typing. \square

In Definition 2.2 we slightly changed the original notation by interpreting $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{M}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ as a column vector instead of a row. This is merely cosmetic but it makes this work more clear. The **oracle set** is the set of all $|T|$ -tuples of oracle components, such that each element of the tuple represents one of the types in T . It is denoted as

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_T = \prod_{i \in T} \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ is the set of all oracle components of type i . We are always implicitly assuming sets $\{\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{Y}_i\}_{i \in T}$ and commutative monoids $\{\mathcal{M}_{ij}\}_{i,j \in T}$. Note that modeling some aspect of a network that follows our assumptions is effectively choosing one of the elements of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_T$, which we call **oracle functions**.

Lemma 2.1. *The sets $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ and $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_T$ are closed.* \square

Proof. Consider an adherent point $\hat{f}_i := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{f}_i$, with ${}^N \hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, from assumption, (2.5) is satisfied for every ${}^N \hat{f}_i$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}, P\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{f}_i(x; P^\top \mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$$

which means that \hat{f}_i also satisfies (2.5). The same reasoning applies with respect to (2.4). Therefore, $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ for every adherent point \hat{f}_i , which means that $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ is closed. Since the product of closed sets is closed, $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_T$ is also closed. \blacksquare

3. Decomposition into coupling components. We are now ready to develop our first decomposition scheme. In this section, we present a decomposition scheme for oracle components in which the output set \mathbb{Y}_i is a vector space. We start by illustrating the main ideas with an example.

Example 3.1. *Consider cell types $T = \{1, 2\}$ which denote the cell types ‘circle’ and ‘square’ respectively. Figure 3.1 presents a cell of type 1 with different types of inputs sets, denoted by the multi-indices [00], [01] and [02] respectively. We assume a particular oracle component*




Figure 3.1: Simple input sets.

$\hat{f}_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_1$ has been chosen. Consider the input set in Figure 3.1a. This cell does not depend on anything else in the network, it evolves only according to its own internal dynamics. We define the function $f_1^{[00]}: \mathbb{X}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_1$ as

$$f_1^{[00]}(x) := \hat{f}_1(x)$$

We use this to rewrite the function evaluation of the input set in Figure 3.1b as

$$\hat{f}_1(x; w_1, x_1) = f_1^{[00]}(x) + f_1^{[01]}(x; w_1, x_1)$$

where $f_1^{[01]}: \mathbb{X}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_{12} \times \mathbb{X}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_1$ is defined as

$$f_1^{[01]}(x; w_1, x_1) := \hat{f}_1(x; w_1, x_1) - f_1^{[00]}(x)$$

That is, we decompose the evaluation of the oracle component \hat{f}_1 into the internal dynamics of the cell ($f_1^{[00]}$) and the influence from its single in-neighbor of cell type 2 ($f_1^{[01]}$). Note that if the weight value is 0_{12} , this case reduces to the one in [Figure 3.1a](#), which implies that $f_1^{[01]}(x; 0_{12}, x_1) = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_1}$.

Consider now the input set in [Figure 3.1c](#). We can write its evaluation of the the oracle component as

$$\hat{f}_1 \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) = f_1^{[00]}(x) + f_1^{[01]}(x; w_1, x_1) + f_1^{[01]}(x; w_2, x_2) + f_1^{[02]} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

where $f_1^{[02]}: \mathbb{X}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_{12}^2 \times \mathbb{X}_2^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_1$ is defined as

$$f_1^{[02]} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) := \hat{f}_1 \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) - f_1^{[00]}(x) - f_1^{[01]}(x; w_1, x_1) - f_1^{[01]}(x; w_2, x_2)$$

The term $f_1^{[02]}$ describes a 2-order coupling effect of cells of type ‘square’ onto cells of type ‘circle’. By definition, it corresponds to what cannot be explained by the internal dynamics ($f_1^{[00]}$) (0-order coupling) and the 1-order coupling contributions from each ‘square’ in-neighbor ($f_1^{[01]}$). Note that if **any** of its weight parameters is 0_{12} , this reduces to the previous case and similarly we conclude that $f_1^{[02]} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_1}$. Moreover, note that

$$f_1^{[02]} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right) = f_1^{[02]} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_2 \\ w_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_2 \\ x_1 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

Consider now the case where $x_1 = x_2 = x_{12}$. This is equivalent to having an edge weight of $w_1 || w_2$ in [Figure 3.1b](#). This implies

$$(3.1) \quad f_1^{[01]}(x; w_1 || w_2, x_{12}) = f_1^{[01]}(x; w_1, x_{12}) + f_1^{[01]}(x; w_2, x_{12}) + f_1^{[02]} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{12} \\ x_{12} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

which means that $f_1^{[01]}$ and $f_1^{[02]}$ are related to one another and cannot be chosen independently. \square

The following definition is the generalization of this approach to arbitrary finite cell types and in-neighborhoods.

Definition 3.1. Consider the set of cell types T and the related sets $\{\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{Y}_i\}_{i \in T}$ where $\{\mathbb{Y}_i\}_{i \in T}$ are vector spaces. Given an oracle component \hat{f}_i , $i \in T$, we define the family of **coupling components** $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$, with

$$(3.2) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{k}}: \mathbb{X}_i \times \mathcal{M}_i^{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbb{X}^{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_i$$

defined recursively by

$$(3.3) \quad f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_\mathbf{s}) := \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_\mathbf{s}) - \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subset \mathbf{s}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}})$$

where $\mathbf{k} = \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})$ gives the corresponding multi-index of the types of cells \mathbf{s} and $x \in \mathbb{X}_i$, $\mathbf{x}_\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{X}^{\mathbf{k}}$, $\mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s} \in \mathcal{M}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$. \square

The recursive formula in (3.3) can be expanded and written explicitly in terms of \hat{f}_i as

$$(3.4) \quad f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subset \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}})$$

This is exactly the anchored decomposition [6] applied to an arbitrary finite set of variables. The decomposition is done with respect to the weights of $\mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s}$, anchoring them at 0_{ij} , for the appropriate $j \in T$. From the properties of the anchored decomposition we know immediately that if any of the entries of \mathbf{w} is 0_{ij} , then $f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$. From (2.4) we note that when we anchor some entry of $\mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s}$ to 0_{ij} we are also removing the functional dependence on the corresponding entry of $\mathbf{x}_\mathbf{s}$.

Moreover, note that for subsets of cells $\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2 \subset \mathbf{s}$ such that $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s}_1) = \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s}_2) = \mathbf{k}$, we indexed their associated function by \mathbf{k} instead of by \mathbf{s}_1 and \mathbf{s}_2 as is traditional in the anchored decomposition. This is proper since the functions $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ inherit from \hat{f}_i the property of being invariant to permutations.

From (3.3), it is direct that for any set of cells \mathbf{s} , we can use the family of functions $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ to evaluate the oracle component \hat{f}_i using the sum

$$(3.5) \quad \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subset \mathbf{s}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}})$$

which can also be written as

$$(3.6) \quad \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{k}} \leq \mathbf{k} \\ \mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}) = \bar{\mathbf{k}}}} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subset \mathbf{s} \\ \mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}) = \bar{\mathbf{k}}}} f_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}})$$

Remark 3. The number of multi-indices smaller or equal to \mathbf{k} is $\prod_{i \in T} (k_i + 1)$ and for each particular $\bar{\mathbf{k}}$ the number of terms in the sum is $\prod_{i \in T} \binom{k_i}{\bar{k}_i}$. \square

Remark 4. These functions operate on an arbitrary (but finite) set of cells \mathbf{s} . Even though there is no upper bound for the amount of terms in the sums, for any particular chosen \mathbf{s} the sum is always finite. Therefore, everything is well-defined and there are no convergence issues. \square

In summary, the decomposition according to Definition 3.1 gives us a family of functions $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$, which is an equivalent representation of a given oracle component function \hat{f}_i . Given one of these two objects, the other is fully determined according to either (3.4) or (3.5). The following result presents the necessary and sufficient conditions for $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ to be such that it corresponds to a valid \hat{f}_i . That is, for the corresponding \hat{f}_i to follow Definition 2.2.

Theorem 3.1. *The family of functions $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$, represents some valid oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$, and is related to it according to [Definition 3.1](#), if and only if for every $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$, $f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ has the following properties:*

1. *If P is any **permutation** matrix (of appropriate dimension), then*

$$(3.7) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) = f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; P\mathbf{w}, P\mathbf{x})$$

2. *If **any** of the entries of \mathbf{w} is 0_{ij} for some $j \in T$, then*

$$(3.8) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$$

3. *If $k_j > 0$, then $f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ and $f_i^{\mathbf{k}+1_j}$ are related by*

$$(3.9) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) = f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) + f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ + f_i^{\mathbf{k}+1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ is a set of cells such that $\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}}) = \mathbf{k} - 1_j$, and the indexes j_1 , j_2 and j_{12} denote cells of type j . \square

Before we are ready to prove this theorem, we need to further investigate the properties of functions with such structure.

Lemma 3.2. *Consider a set of functions $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$, such that they satisfy [Theorem 3.1](#). Given a set of cells \mathbf{s} , with $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{k}$, associated with weights and states \mathbf{w} , \mathbf{x} , such that $\mathbf{x} = P\bar{\mathbf{x}}$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{X}^{\mathbf{r}}$ for some a partition P , then*

$$(3.10) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{w}, P\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} f_i^{\mathbf{r}} \left(x; P_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}^{\top} \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} \right)$$

and

$$(3.11) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{r}} \left(x; P^{\top} \mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{x}} \right) = \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s} \\ \{\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{l_r} \neq \emptyset\}_P}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})} \left(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, P_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \bar{\mathbf{x}} \right)$$

where $P_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}$ is the submatrix of P obtained by selecting the rows associated with the set of cells $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$. Moreover, the subsets $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{l_r}$ denote the result of taking the equivalence classes of partition P , called \mathbf{s}_{l_r} , of type $l \in T$, with $1 \leq r \leq r_l$, and constraining them to a particular subset $\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}$. That is, $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{l_r} = \mathbf{s}_{l_r} \cap \bar{\mathbf{s}}$. \square

Proof. Note that any partition P can be constructed by a sequence of partitions

$$I = P_0 < P_1 < \dots < P_m = P$$

such that P_{k+1} is built by merging two of the classes of partition P_k , for all $0 \leq k < m$. Moreover, given any partition matrix P , its number of merges is always well-defined and

given by $\sum(|\mathbf{s}_{l_r}| - 1)$, where \mathbf{s}_{l_r} are the equivalence classes of the partition. This can also be written as $|\mathbf{s}| - \text{rank}(P)$.

We now prove the base cases $P = I$. For (3.10), this is satisfied thanks to Item 2 of Theorem 3.1 which cancels all the terms $\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subset \mathbf{s}$. For (3.11), every equivalence class has only one cell, therefore, the only subset $\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}$ such that we don't leave any class empty is \mathbf{s} itself, that is, the sum is over $\bar{\mathbf{s}} = \mathbf{s}$ and is also trivially true.

We now prove (3.10) by induction, that is, assume it is satisfied for a given P_k . Then, P_{k+1} is created by merging two of its classes $\mathbf{s}_{j_1}, \mathbf{s}_{j_2}$ (of type $j \in T$) into the class $\mathbf{s}_{j_{12}}$. That is, $P_k = [\mathbf{p}_{j_1} \ \mathbf{p}_{j_2} \ P_{-j_{12}}]$ and $P_{k+1} = [\mathbf{p}_{j_1} + \mathbf{p}_{j_2} \ P_{-j_{12}}]$.

Considering (3.10), with P_k and with states such that $\bar{x}_{j_1} = \bar{x}_{j_2} = \bar{x}_{j_{12}}$, we have,

$$f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \mathbf{w}, [\mathbf{p}_{j_1} \ \mathbf{p}_{j_2} \ P_{-j_{12}}] \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} f_i^{\mathbf{r}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top \\ \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix}^{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

where we can write the left hand side as a function of P_{k+1}

$$f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \mathbf{w}, [\mathbf{p}_{j_1} + \mathbf{p}_{j_2} \ P_{-j_{12}}] \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

and expand the right hand side using Item 3 of Theorem 3.1 into

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \left[f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top + \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix}^{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix}^{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) - f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix}^{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Note that the set of cells \mathbf{s} can be split into the disjoint sets \mathbf{s}_{j_1} and $\mathbf{s}_{-j_1} = \mathbf{s} \setminus \mathbf{s}_{j_1}$. Given any $\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}$, we have the induced subsets $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{j_1} = \bar{\mathbf{s}} \cap \mathbf{s}_{j_1}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{-j_1} = \bar{\mathbf{s}} \cap \mathbf{s}_{-j_1}$. Clearly, $\bar{\mathbf{s}} = \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{j_1} \cup \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{-j_1}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{j_1} \cap \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{-j_1} = \emptyset$.

Consider all the subsets $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ that are associated with a particular, fixed $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{-j_1}$. For all such $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$, the third term of the sum will be always the same, except with regard to the sign, which is related to the oddness of $|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|$.

Note that the set of such $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ with fixed particular $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{-j_1}$ can be obtained by doing the union of $\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{-j_1}$ with each element of the power set of \mathbf{s}_{j_1} . In the power set of a finite set, half of the subsets have an even size and the other half has odd size. Therefore, the third term of sum is canceled since it is summed the same amount of times it is subtracted. The same argument can be used in order to remove the second term of the sum. This means that the right hand side simplifies into

$$\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top + \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix}^{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

which means that (3.10) applies for P_{k+1} and by induction for any partition matrix P .

To prove (3.11) we use strong induction on the number of merges. That is, assume that it is

valid for any partition matrix whose number of merges is in $\{0, \dots, k\}$. Consider P_k with k merges. Then,

$$f_i^{\mathbf{r}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top \\ \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s} \\ \{\bar{s}_{l_r} \neq 0\}_{P_k}}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})} \left(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, [\mathbf{p}_{j_1} \quad \mathbf{p}_{j_2} \quad P_{-j_{12}}]_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

where this time the right hand side can be written directly in terms of P_{k+1}

$$\sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s} \\ \{\bar{s}_{l_r} \neq 0\}_{P_k}}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})} \left(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, [\mathbf{p}_{j_1} + \mathbf{p}_{j_2} \quad P_{-j_{12}}]_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

and the left hand side can be expanded into

$$f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top + \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) - f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) - f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

and rearranging this, we get

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top + \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) &= \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s} \\ \{\bar{s}_{l_r} \neq 0\}_{P_k}}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})} \left(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, [\mathbf{p}_{j_1} + \mathbf{p}_{j_2} \quad P_{-j_{12}}]_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &+ f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &+ f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top + \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix}^{\mathbf{s} \setminus \mathbf{s}_{j_2}} \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s} \setminus \mathbf{s}_{j_2}}$$

and the matrix on the right hand side is a (transposed) partition matrix. This number of merges is always less or equal to k (it is $k - |\mathbf{s}_{j_2}| + 1$), therefore the assumption applies and we can expand it into

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) &= f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top + \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix}^{\mathbf{s} \setminus \mathbf{s}_{j_2}} \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s} \setminus \mathbf{s}_{j_2}}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s} \\ \bar{s}_{j_2} = 0 \\ \{\bar{s}_{l_r} \neq 0\}_{P_k} (l_r \neq j_2)}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})} \left(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, [\mathbf{p}_{j_1} + \mathbf{p}_{j_2} \quad P_{-j_{12}}]_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and this reasoning applies identically for the other term.

We now have three sums over an identical term whose indexing can be merged so that we have

$$f_i^{\mathbf{r}-1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{p}_{j_1}^\top + \mathbf{p}_{j_2}^\top \\ P_{-j_{12}}^\top \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}, \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s} \\ \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{j_1} \cup \bar{\mathbf{s}}_{j_2} \neq \emptyset \\ \{\bar{\mathbf{s}}_{l_r} \neq \emptyset\}_{P_k} (l_r \neq j_1, j_2)}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})} \left(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, [\mathbf{p}_{j_1} + \mathbf{p}_{j_2} \quad P_{-j_{12}}]_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{x}_{j_{12}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{-j_{12}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

which corresponds exactly to (3.11) with respect to the sets of partition P_{k+1} , and by induction applies to every partition matrix P . \blacksquare

We are now ready to prove [Theorem 3.1](#).

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We begin by proving the \implies direction. That is, for a given \hat{f}_i , the family of functions $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ will have the properties in [Items 1 to 3](#).

[Item 1](#) is immediate from (3.4), which writes $f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}$ explicitly as a function of \hat{f}_i , summed over all subsets of \mathbf{s} . Since \hat{f}_i is invariant to permutations, so will be $f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}$.

This means that unlike what is traditional in the general anchored decomposition, we do not require to index the coupling components according to cells subsets (e.g., $f_i^{\mathbf{s}_1}$, $f_i^{\mathbf{s}_2}$) since they are functionally the same whenever $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s}_1) = \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s}_2)$. Instead we can freely index them according to their respective type multi-index. That is, our definition is self-consistent.

[Item 2](#) comes directly from the known properties of the anchored decomposition.

The proof of [Item 3](#) is by strong induction. Assume the statement to be true for all $\bar{\mathbf{k}} < \mathbf{k} = \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s}) + 1_j$.

From the definition of oracle component we have that

$$\hat{f}_i \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \| w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) = \hat{f}_i \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

whose left hand side can be decomposed as

$$\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} \left(f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})} (x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) + f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})+1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \| w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right)$$

and the right hand side as

$$\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} \left[f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})} (x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) + f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})+1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) + f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})+1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) + f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})+2_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right]$$

the first terms of both sides cancel each other. Using the assumption that [Item 3](#) holds for all $\bar{\mathbf{k}} < \mathbf{k}$, for every index $\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}$ the last term of the left hand side cancels with the last three

terms of the right hand side. Thus, what remains is those terms indexed with $\bar{\mathbf{s}} = \mathbf{s}$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})+1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}} \end{bmatrix} \parallel \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}} \end{bmatrix} \right) &= f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})+1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}} \end{bmatrix} \right) + f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})+1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad + f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})+2_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned}$$

This means that [Item 3](#) applies for $\mathbf{k} = \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s}) + 1_j$. The base case $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$ is trivially true. Therefore, [Item 3](#) applies for every $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$.

We now prove the \Leftarrow direction. That is, any given family of functions $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ with the properties in [Items 1 to 3](#), defines a valid oracle component \hat{f}_i .

To prove that, we show that [Definition 3.1](#) will always be respected for any input.

To prove [\(2.5\)](#) we start by expanding its left hand side using [\(3.5\)](#)

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}, P\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, P_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}\bar{\mathbf{x}})$$

The sum on the right hand side can be rewritten by grouping the subsets $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ according to which sets of the partition P they have elements in. That is,

$$\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{p}} \subseteq \text{classes}(P)} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \text{cells}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}) \\ \mathbf{s}_{l_r} \cap \bar{\mathbf{s}} \neq \emptyset, \forall l_r \in \bar{\mathbf{p}}}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, P_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}\bar{\mathbf{x}})$$

where $\text{classes}(P)$ denotes the equivalence classes of the partition represented by matrix P , which are encoded by its columns. Given a set of equivalence classes $\bar{\mathbf{p}} \subseteq \text{classes}(P)$, the set of cells that belong to those classes is denoted by $\text{cells}(\bar{\mathbf{p}})$. Moreover, $[P]_{\text{cells}(\bar{\mathbf{p}})}^{\bar{\mathbf{p}}}$ is the matrix obtained by constraining the columns of P to the classes in $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ and constraining the rows to $\text{cells}(\bar{\mathbf{p}})$. The conditions $\mathbf{s}_{l_r} \cap \bar{\mathbf{s}} \neq \emptyset$ ensure that each term $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ only appears once in the sum, corresponding to the particular set of equivalence classes $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ such that all of the cells in $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ are in $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$, and for each class of $\bar{\mathbf{p}}$ there is at least one cell $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ there.

Using [\(3.11\)](#), the inner sum can be simplified so that we obtain

$$\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{p}} \subseteq \text{classes}(P)} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\text{cells}(\bar{\mathbf{p}}))} \left(x; \left[P^\top \right]_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}}^{\text{cells}(\bar{\mathbf{p}})} \mathbf{w}_{\text{cells}(\bar{\mathbf{p}})}, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_{\bar{\mathbf{p}}} \right)$$

by applying [\(3.5\)](#) again, we obtain

$$\hat{f}_i(x; P^\top \mathbf{w}, \bar{\mathbf{x}})$$

which proves [\(2.5\)](#).

We now prove [\(2.4\)](#). From [\(3.5\)](#) we have

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, P_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}\bar{\mathbf{x}})$$

Assume \mathbf{w} has its c^{th} element equal to 0_{ij} for some $j \in T$. Then, all the terms corresponding to sets $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ such $c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}$, disappear thanks to [Item 2](#) of [Theorem 3.1](#). Thus, what remains is

$$\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s} \setminus \{c\}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, P_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}\bar{\mathbf{x}})$$

which, again from [\(3.5\)](#), simplifies into $\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{-c}, \mathbf{x}_{-c})$. ■

At this point, we have started with the definition of oracle components \hat{f}_i in [Definition 2.2](#). Then, we established a bijective correspondence between \hat{f}_i and a family of coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ in [Definition 3.1](#). Finally, [Theorem 3.1](#) completed the cycle by making it so that we can also start by first constructing a valid $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ and then obtaining the corresponding \hat{f}_i afterwards.

We are now interested in knowing how to manipulate this mathematical object through this new representation. Subsequently, we will provide some examples that illustrate such decomposition and properties.

Lemma 3.3. *Consider the oracle components \hat{f}_i and the ones in the sequence $({}^N \hat{f}_i)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that their corresponding coupling components are, respectively, $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ and $(\{{}^N f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}})_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{f}_i = \hat{f}_i \iff \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \{{}^N f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}} = \{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$$

□

Proof. We begin by proving the \implies direction. That is, assume $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{f}_i = \hat{f}_i$. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we know from [\(3.4\)](#), that for any set of cells \mathbf{s}

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} {}^N \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}) \end{aligned}$$

We now prove the \impliedby direction. That is, assume $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \{{}^N f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}} = \{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$.

For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, we know from (3.5), that for any set of cells \mathbf{s}

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} {}^N f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) \end{aligned}$$

Note that we can move the limits inside the sums since we are only dealing with finite sums, even though they could be arbitrarily (finitely) large. \blacksquare

Lemma 3.4. *For two oracle components $\hat{f}_i, \hat{g}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ with coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ and $\{g_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ respectively, the coupling components of $\hat{h}_i = \alpha \hat{f}_i + \hat{g}_i$ are given by $\{\alpha f_i^{\mathbf{k}} + g_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$, for any scalar α . \square*

Proof. This comes directly from writing the coupling components explicitly in terms of the oracle components as in (3.4). That is,

$$\begin{aligned} h_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) &= \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \left(\alpha \hat{f}_i + \hat{g}_i \right) (x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= \alpha \left(\sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \right) + \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}| - |\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \hat{g}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= \alpha f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) + g_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) \\ &= \left(\alpha f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})} + g_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})} \right) (x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) \end{aligned} \quad \blacksquare$$

We have shown that operating linearly on $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ is completely straightforward, with the coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ being affected component-wise according to the respective linear combination.

Corollary 3.5. *The coupling components of order 0, that is, $f_i^{\mathbf{0}}$, which describes the inner dynamics of a cell, are completely free and independent of the remaining coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} > \mathbf{0}}$. \square*

Corollary 3.6. *Consider $f_i^{\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{1}_j} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$ for some $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$, with $k_j \geq 1$, $j \in T$. Then, $f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ is **additive in the weights** with respect to type j . That is,*

$$(3.12) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \| w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) = f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) + f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

\square

The coupling decomposition allows us to define very important concepts that will prove essential in section 4.

Definition 3.2. We say that an oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ with coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ has (finite) **coupling order** $\gamma_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with respect to the cell type $j \in T$, if there is some $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$, with $k_j = \gamma_j$ such that $f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \neq 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$ and there is no such $\bar{\mathbf{k}} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$ with $\bar{k}_j > \gamma_j$. We say that $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ has infinite coupling order ($\gamma_j = \infty$) with respect to the cell type $j \in T$, if for every $k_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ there is some $\bar{\mathbf{k}} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$ such that $f_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}} \neq 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$, with $\bar{k}_j \geq k_j$. In particular, if $\gamma_j = 1$ or $\gamma_j = 0$, we say that it is **additive** or **uncoupled**, respectively, with regard to $j \in T$. \square

Corollary 3.7. Consider an oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ with finite coupling order $\gamma_j \geq 1$ for some $j \in T$. Then, for any $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$ such that $k_j = \gamma_j$, $f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ is additive in the weights with respect to type j . \square

Proof. If it is of order $k_j = \gamma_j$, then, $f_i^{\mathbf{k}+1_j} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$. The rest follows from **Corollary 3.6**. \blacksquare

Lemma 3.8. Consider an oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ such that for a particular $j \in T$ the associated commutative monoid \mathcal{M}_{ij} has an annihilator a_{ij} . Then the coupling order of \hat{f}_i with respect to cell type $j \in T$, is either infinite or 0 (uncoupled). \square

Proof. The proof is by contradiction. Assume \hat{f}_i has finite order $\gamma_j \geq 1$. Then, for every $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$, with $k_j = \gamma_j$, we have that $f_i^{\mathbf{k}+1_j} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$. From **Corollary 3.7**, $f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ is additive, which implies

$$(3.13) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \| a_{ij} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) = f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) + f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} a_{ij} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

since $w_{j_1} \| a_{ij} = a_{ij}$, this means that $f_i^{\mathbf{k}} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$, which contradicts the assumption that \hat{f}_i is of order γ_j . \blacksquare

We illustrate the decomposition into coupling components scheme with the following examples.

Example 3.2. Consider a single-type network such that

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) = f_i^0(x) + \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c x_c \right)^2$$

We can derive the commutative monoid that defines the edge merging. It has to obey

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^0(x) + ((w_1 \| w_2) x_{12})^2 &= f_i^0(x) + (w_1 x_{12} + w_2 x_{12})^2 \\ (w_1 \| w_2)^2 x_{12}^2 &= (w_1 + w_2)^2 x_{12}^2 \end{aligned}$$

from which we conclude that $w_1 \| w_2$ is either $w_1 + w_2$ or $-(w_1 + w_2)$. Note that for either case $0 \| 0 = 0$. Assume the second option to be true. From the properties of the commutative monoid

$$\begin{aligned} w \| (0 \| 0) &= (w \| 0) \| 0 \\ w \| 0 &= -w \| 0 \\ -w &= w \end{aligned}$$

That is, the second option will only allow the trivial situation in which all edges are 0. Therefore, we choose

$$w_1 \parallel w_2 = w_1 + w_2$$

Considering only one in-neighbor, we conclude that

$$f_i^1(x; w_1, x_1) = (w_1 x_1)^2$$

Similarly,

$$f_i^2\left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}\right) = 2(w_1 x_1)(w_2 x_2)$$

We can verify that [Item 3 of Theorem 3.1](#) is satisfied, that is

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^1(x; w_1 \parallel w_2, x_{12}) &= f_i^1(x; w_1, x_{12}) + f_i^1(x; w_2, x_{12}) + f_i^2\left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{12} \end{bmatrix}\right) \\ ((w_1 + w_2)x_{12})^2 &= (w_1 x_{12})^2 + (w_2 x_{12})^2 + 2w_1 w_2 x_{12}^2 \end{aligned}$$

which is indeed true. It can be seen that higher orders will all be 0. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) &= f_i^0(x) + \sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (w_c x_c)^2 + \sum_{\substack{c, d \in \mathbf{s} \\ c \neq d}} 2(w_c x_c)(w_d x_d) \\ &= f_i^0(x) + \sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} f_i^1(x; w_c, x_c) + \sum_{\substack{c, d \in \mathbf{s} \\ c \neq d}} f_i^2\left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_c \\ w_d \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_c \\ x_d \end{bmatrix}\right) \end{aligned}$$

□

We now extend the previous example to a general integer power

Example 3.3. Consider a single-type network such that

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^0(x) + \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c x_c \right)^n$$

with $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, the coupling components f^k for $k > 0$ are given according to

$$f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \binom{n}{\mathbf{m}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (w_c x_c)^{m_c}$$

where for $\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|}$

$$\binom{n}{\mathbf{m}} = \frac{n!}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (m_c!)}$$

This can also be written as

$$f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_\mathbf{s}) = n! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!}$$

The proof is by strong induction. Assume this to be true for $k \in \{1, \dots, a-1\}$. Choose some set of cells \mathbf{s} such that $|\mathbf{s}| = a$. From the recursive definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^a(x; \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_\mathbf{s}) &= \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{x}_\mathbf{s}) - \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subset \mathbf{s}} f_i^{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= f_i^0(x) + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \binom{n}{\mathbf{m}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (w_c x_c)^{m_c} - \left[f_i^0(x) + \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subset \mathbf{s} \\ \bar{\mathbf{s}} \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \binom{n}{\mathbf{m}} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} (w_c x_c)^{m_c} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \binom{n}{\mathbf{m}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (w_c x_c)^{m_c} \\ &= n! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \end{aligned}$$

The base case $k = 1$, given by

$$f_i^1(x; w_1, x_1) = (w_1 x_1)^n$$

satisfies the formula. □

Remark 5. Note that for $k > n$ there are no multi-indexes that satisfy simultaneously $\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k$ and $|\mathbf{m}| = n$. Therefore $f_i^k = 0$. The coupling order is then $\gamma = n$. □

Remark 6. As a sanity check we verify that *Item 3* of [Theorem 3.1](#) is satisfied.

First we can derive the commutative monoid that defines the edge merging. It has to obey

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^0(x) + ((w_1 \parallel w_2) x_{12})^n &= f_i^0(x) + (w_1 x_{12} + w_2 x_{12})^n \\ (w_1 \parallel w_2)^n x_{12}^n &= (w_1 + w_2)^n x_{12}^n \end{aligned}$$

If n is odd, then $w_1 \parallel w_2 = w_1 + w_2$. If n is even, we are in the same situation as in [Example 3.2](#) and $w_1 \parallel w_2 = w_1 + w_2$ for us to be in a non-trivial setting. Now, to verify

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|+2} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{12} \\ x_{12} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) &= f_i^{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|+1} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \parallel w_2 \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{12} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - f_i^{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|+1} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{12} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) - f_i^{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|+1} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_2 \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{12} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned}$$

we note that

$$\binom{n}{[m_1, m_2, \bar{\mathbf{m}}]} = \binom{m_1 + m_2}{[m_1, m_2]} \binom{n}{[m_1 + m_2, \bar{\mathbf{m}}]}$$

Using this, the left hand side can be written as

$$\sum_{m_1, m_2 \geq 1} \binom{m_1 + m_2}{[m_1, m_2]} w_1^{m_1} w_2^{m_2} x_{12}^{m_1 + m_2} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ m_1 + m_2 + |\bar{\mathbf{m}}| = n}} \binom{n}{[m_1 + m_2, \bar{\mathbf{m}}]} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} (w_c x_c)^{m_c}$$

and the right hand side as

$$\sum_{m_{12} \geq 1} ((w_1 + w_2)^{m_{12}} - w_1^{m_{12}} - w_2^{m_{12}}) x_{12}^{m_{12}} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ m_{12} + |\bar{\mathbf{m}}| = n}} \binom{n}{[m_{12}, \bar{\mathbf{m}}]} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} (w_c x_c)^{m_c}$$

using the binomial theorem on $(w_1 + w_2)^{m_{12}}$ we see that for a fixed m_{12} we have that

$$(w_1 + w_2)^{m_{12}} - w_1^{m_{12}} - w_2^{m_{12}} = \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2 \geq 1 \\ m_1 + m_2 = m_{12}}} \binom{m_{12}}{[m_1, m_2]} w_1^{m_1} w_2^{m_2}$$

Therefore, both sides are the same. \square

We now extend [Example 3.3](#) to the polynomial case.

Example 3.4. From [Example 3.3](#) and [Lemma 3.4](#) we have that for single-type networks such that

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^0(x) + \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c x_c \right)^n$$

The coupling components f_i^k for $k > 0$ are given according to

$$f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n n! \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ |\bar{\mathbf{m}}| = n}} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!}$$

\square

Example 3.5. Consider the exponential case

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^0(x) + \exp \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c x_c \right) - 1$$

The coupling components f_i^k for $k > 0$ are given according to

$$f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (\exp(w_c x_c) - 1)$$

This is proven by creating the sequence of oracle components $({}^N \hat{f}_i)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$${}^N \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^0(x) + \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{n!} \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c x_c \right)^n$$

that is, the oracle components obtained by replacing $\exp(\cdot) - 1$ by its N^{th} order Taylor series truncation. From [Example 3.4](#) we know that for the sequence $(\{{}^N f_i^k\}_{k \geq 0})_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$, the components ${}^N f_i^k$, for $k > 0$ are given according to

$${}^N f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq N}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!}$$

Since we know that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{f}_i = \hat{f}_i$, from [Lemma 3.3](#) we conclude that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|} = f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}$. That is,

$$f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!}$$

Here, the infinite sum $\sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}}$ is taken as

$$\sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}} := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq N}}$$

We can prove, however, that this particular infinite sum is absolutely convergent. That is,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}} \left| \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \right| = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{|w_c x_c|^{m_c}}{m_c!} = \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \sum_{m_c \geq 1} \frac{|w_c x_c|^{m_c}}{m_c!} = \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (\exp(|w_c x_c|) - 1) < \infty$$

This means that the order does not matter and we can freely rearrange the sum into

$$f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} = \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \sum_{m_c \geq 1} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} = \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (\exp(w_c x_c) - 1)$$

□

We now extend the previous results for multi-type networks.

[Example 3.6](#). Consider a multi-type network such that

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^0(x) + \prod_{j \in T} \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}_j} w_c x_c \right)^{n_j}$$

with $\mathbf{n} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$, and where $\mathbf{s}_j \subseteq \mathbf{s}$ represents sets of cells of type $j \in T$. Moreover, we consider the corner cases of the type $\mathbf{0}^0$ to be 1. Then, the coupling components $\{f^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ are given according to

$$f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}) = \prod_{j \in T} n_j! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}_j|} \\ |\mathbf{m}| = n_j}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}_j} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!}$$

Note that expanding the outer product gives

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}_1| = n_1 \\ \ddots \\ |\mathbf{m}_{|T|}| = n_{|T|}}} \left(\prod_{j \in T} n_j! \right) \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!}, \quad \text{with } \mathbf{m} := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{m}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{m}_{|T|} \end{bmatrix}$$

This is proven by strong induction. Assume this to be true for $|\mathbf{k}| \in \{1, \dots, a-1\}$. Choose some set of cells $\mathbf{s} := \{\mathbf{s}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathbf{s}_{|T|}\}$, such that $|\mathbf{s}| = a$. From the recursive definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}) \\ &= \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}) - \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subset \mathbf{s} \\ \bar{\mathbf{s}} \neq \emptyset}} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= \prod_{j \in T} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}_j|} \\ |\mathbf{m}| = n_j}} \binom{n_j}{\mathbf{m}_j} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}_j} (w_c x_c)^{m_c} - \left[\sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subset \mathbf{s} \\ \bar{\mathbf{s}} \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}_1| = n_1 \\ \ddots \\ |\mathbf{m}_{|T|}| = n_{|T|}}} \left(\prod_{j \in T} n_j! \right) \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \right] \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}_1| = n_1 \\ \ddots \\ |\mathbf{m}_{|T|}| = n_{|T|}}} \left(\prod_{j \in T} n_j! \right) \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} - \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subset \mathbf{s} \\ \bar{\mathbf{s}} \neq \emptyset}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}_1| = n_1 \\ \ddots \\ |\mathbf{m}_{|T|}| = n_{|T|}}} \left(\prod_{j \in T} n_j! \right) \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}_1| = n_1 \\ \ddots \\ |\mathbf{m}_{|T|}| = n_{|T|}}} \left(\prod_{j \in T} n_j! \right) \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \\ &= \prod_{j \in T} n_j! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}_j|} \\ |\mathbf{m}| = n_j}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}_j} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \end{aligned}$$

The base cases, with $|\mathbf{k}| = 1$, are given by

$$f_i^{1_j}(x; w_{j_1}, x_{j_1}) = \begin{cases} (w_{j_1} x_{j_1})^{n_j} & \mathbf{n} = n_j \mathbf{1}_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

which satisfies the formula for all $j \in T$. \square

Example 3.7. From [Example 3.6](#) and [Lemma 3.4](#), we have that for multi-type networks such that

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|}} a_{\mathbf{n}} \prod_{j \in T} \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}_j} w_c x_c \right)^{n_j}$$

with $\{a_{\mathbf{n}}\}_{\mathbf{n} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ with finite support.

The coupling components $\{f^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ are given according to

$$f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|}} a_{\mathbf{n}} \prod_{j \in T} n_j! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}_j|} \\ |\mathbf{m}| = n_j}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}_j} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!}$$

\square

Example 3.8. Consider multi-type networks such that

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + F \left(\sum_{j \in T} F_j \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}_j} w_c x_c \right) \right)$$

with

$$F(X) = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n X^n$$

$$F_j(X) = \sum_{n=1}^{N_j} a_n^j X^n, \quad \forall j \in T$$

This can be written in the form of [Example 3.7](#) by convolution of the Taylor coefficients of the functions F and $\{F_j\}_{j \in T}$. In particular,

$$a_{\mathbf{n}} = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n n! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|} \\ |\mathbf{m}| = n}} \prod_{j \in T} \left(\frac{1}{m_j!} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{l} \geq \mathbf{1}_{m_j} \\ \mathbf{l} \leq N_j \cdot \mathbf{1}_{m_j} \\ |\mathbf{l}| = n_j}} \prod_{i=1}^{m_j} a_{l_i}^j \right)$$

\square

We now introduce the second composition scheme.

4. Decomposition into basis components. In section 3 we introduced a scheme that decomposes any given oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ into a family of coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T_i|}}$ that have the properties described in Theorem 3.1. With that, one can easily verify in a very systematic way if some function \hat{f}_i that is used to model the behavior of cells in a network satisfies the properties given by Definition 2.2.

Although this decomposition works well for verification, it is lacking from the perspective of design. The reason for this is the Item 3 of Theorem 3.1. It forces all coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T_i|}}$ to be interdependent. Therefore, it is not clear at all what are exactly the degrees of freedom that are available for us, nor how one would even start when choosing such functions.

In this section, we use the previous decomposition as an essential stepping stone in order to create another with more desirable properties.

For that, we require the use of the multiplicity notation and also Stirling numbers of the first and second kinds, which we now describe.

4.1. Multiplicity notation. We now introduce the multiplicity notation, which simplifies the following work.

By $\mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s$, with $\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}$, we mean that each entry w_c of the vector \mathbf{w}_s is expanded into m_c entries of the same value. For instance, consider

$$\mathbf{w}_s = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{m} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

then,

$$\mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that the number of elements in the resulting vector $\mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s$ is $|\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}| = |\mathbf{m}|$, which in this case is 3. Moreover, multiplicities can be composed. That is, we can apply some $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$ to the previous $\mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s$, in order to obtain $\overline{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s$, which requires $\overline{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{m}|}$. For instance, we could have,

$$\overline{\mathbf{m}} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} \quad \overline{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_1 \\ w_2 \\ w_2 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

where the horizontal bars are just for illustration purposes in order to make the expansion of $\mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s$ into $\overline{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s$ clearer. Note that $|\overline{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}| = |\overline{\mathbf{m}}| = 5$. Moreover, applying the successive multiplicities ($\overline{\mathbf{m}}$ after \mathbf{m}) is equivalent to applying a single multiplicity \mathbf{M} , in our case, we

have,

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_s = \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_1 \\ w_2 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that $|\mathbf{M}| = |\overline{\mathbf{m}}| = 5$. We say that $\mathbf{M} = \overline{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}$, where $\overline{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}$ is the composition of the two multiplicities $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$ and \mathbf{m} . This should not be confused with extending \mathbf{m} according to $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$, which has a completely different meaning. In our example, we have

$$\overline{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{M}$$

The $|\mathbf{m}|$ entries of $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$ can be divided according to the values of \mathbf{m} , which in this case is a first block with one element and a second block with two elements. Note that each block will affect a different element of the original vector we are applying $\overline{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}$ to (e.g., \mathbf{w}_s), that is, each element of the i^{th} block of $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$ expands the i^{th} element of \mathbf{w}_s that amount of times. In conclusion, to find the equivalent multiplicity \mathbf{M} we just need to sum each block of the multiplicity $\overline{\mathbf{m}}$, in which, the blocks are defined according to \mathbf{m} .

4.2. Stirling numbers. The Stirling numbers of the first and second kinds are integers that appear in combinatorics, in particular when studying partitions and permutations. In this section we will define them with respect to their recurrence relations. The related results that will be used in the sections are presented and proved in [Appendix A](#).

Definition 4.1. *The unsigned Stirling numbers of the first kind, $\mathcal{S}_1(n, k)$, with $n, k \geq 0$, are given by the recurrence relation*

$$\mathcal{S}_1(n, k) = (n-1)\mathcal{S}_1(n-1, k) + \mathcal{S}_1(n-1, k-1), \quad n, k > 0$$

together with the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_1(0, 0) &= 1 \\ \mathcal{S}_1(0, k) &= 0 \quad k > 0 \\ \mathcal{S}_1(n, 0) &= 0 \quad n > 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 4.2. *The unsigned Stirling numbers of the second kind, $\mathcal{S}_2(n, k)$, with $n, k \geq 0$, are given by the recurrence relation*

$$\mathcal{S}_2(n, k) = k\mathcal{S}_2(n-1, k) + \mathcal{S}_2(n-1, k-1), \quad n, k > 0$$

together with the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_2(0, 0) &= 1 \\ \mathcal{S}_2(0, k) &= 0 \quad k > 0 \\ \mathcal{S}_2(n, 0) &= 0 \quad n > 0 \end{aligned}$$

□

4.3. Finite coupling order. Consider the spaces $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}}$, which consist of all $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$, such that all of its non-zero coupling components are inside the subset $\{f_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}\}_{\bar{\mathbf{k}} \leq \mathbf{k}}$. Similarly, $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \mathbf{k}}$ is defined in the same way with regard to $\{f_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}\}_{\bar{\mathbf{k}} < \mathbf{k}}$. That is, $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \mathbf{k}}$ is the subset of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}}$ with $f_i^{\mathbf{k}} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$.

Clearly, $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \mathbf{k}} \subset \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}}$. Moreover, $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}_1} \subset \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}_2}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \mathbf{k}_1} \subset \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \mathbf{k}_2}$ when $\mathbf{k}_1 < \mathbf{k}_2$.

From Lemma 3.4, both $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \mathbf{k}}$ are vector spaces.

On the other hand, $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \infty}$ is the set of all $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ with finite order, which is also a subspace. That is,

$$(4.1) \quad \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \infty} := \bigcup_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}} \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}}$$

Since we know that $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \mathbf{k}}$ is a vector subspace of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}}$ we define the complement subspace $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ as follows

$$(4.2) \quad \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}} = \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \mathbf{k}} \oplus \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$$

which means that

$$(4.3) \quad \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}} = \bigoplus_{\bar{\mathbf{k}} \leq \mathbf{k}} \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}$$

That is, any $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}}$ can be written as

$$(4.4) \quad \hat{f}_i = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{k}} \leq \mathbf{k}} b \hat{f}_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}, \quad b \hat{f}_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}}$$

We are now ready to investigate the structure of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ through the use of a projection operator.

Lemma 4.1. For a finite $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$, define $\mathcal{P}_i^{\mathbf{k}}: \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \mathbf{k}}$ in terms of the coupling components of $\hat{g}_i = \mathcal{P}_i^{\mathbf{k}}(\hat{f}_i)$ as

$$(4.5) \quad g_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) - \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

Then, $\mathcal{P}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ is a projection operator. □

Proof. First we prove that if $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}}$ then $\hat{g}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{< \mathbf{k}}$. Note that for $\mathcal{K}(s) = \mathbf{k}$, the sum in the right hand side is over the single index $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{1}_{|s|}$, which means that $g_i^{\mathbf{k}} = f_i^{\mathbf{k}} - f_i^{\mathbf{k}} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$. Consider now $\mathcal{K}(s) = \bar{\mathbf{k}}$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{k}} \leq \mathbf{k}$ is **false**, that is, either $\mathbf{k} \leq \bar{\mathbf{k}}$ or $(\bar{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{k})$ are non-comparable. Since $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}}$, then $f_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$ by definition. Moreover, there are no valid indexes in the sum, which means that $g_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$.

We have shown that the coupling components of \hat{g}_i are zero in the appropriate terms in order

to be in $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\mathbf{k}}$. However, we still need to prove that $\hat{g}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ in the first place. Since we know that $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ is a vector space, we can show instead that $\hat{h}_i = \hat{f}_i - \hat{g}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$. The coupling components of \hat{h}_i are given by

$$h_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c!} f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

Since $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\mathbf{k}}$ from assumption, we know that $f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ obeys all the items in [Theorem 3.1](#). Furthermore, from [Corollary 3.7](#), $f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ is additive in the weights.

We start by proving that \hat{h}_i satisfies [Item 1](#) of [Theorem 3.1](#). That is,

$$h_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = h_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; P\mathbf{w}_s, P\mathbf{x}_s)$$

which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c!} f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \bar{m}_c!} f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \bar{\mathbf{m}}[P\mathbf{w}_s], \bar{\mathbf{m}}[P\mathbf{x}_s])$$

Note that a term given by a particular index \mathbf{m} on the left hand side corresponds exactly to the index $\bar{\mathbf{m}} = P\mathbf{m}$ since

$$f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; [P\mathbf{m}][P\mathbf{w}_s], [P\mathbf{m}][P\mathbf{x}_s]) = f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

We have established a bijection between the terms of both sums, which means that the sums are equal and \hat{h}_i satisfies [Item 1](#) of [Theorem 3.1](#).

If any entry of \mathbf{w}_s is zero, all the terms in the right hand side cancel, which means that \hat{h}_i satisfies [Item 2](#) of [Theorem 3.1](#).

Finally, we verify

$$\begin{aligned} h_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})+2_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) &= h_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})+1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \| w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad - h_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})+1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) - h_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{s}})+1_j} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The left hand side can be expanded as

$$\sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2 \geq 1 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ (m_1+m_2) \cdot 1_j + \mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{m_1! m_2! \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} m_c!} f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} m_1 \\ m_2 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} m_1 \\ m_2 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

and the right hand side written as

$$\sum_{\substack{m_{12} \geq 1 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathcal{S}}|} \\ m_{12} \cdot 1_j + \mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{m}}) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{m_{12}! \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}} m_c!} \left[f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \mathbf{m} \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \| w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x} \right) \right. \\ \left. - f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \mathbf{m} \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x} \right) - f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \mathbf{m} \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x} \right) \right]$$

with $\mathbf{m} = \begin{bmatrix} m_{12} \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \end{bmatrix}$. Using the property that $f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ is additive in the weights with regard to type j , we can write

$$f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \mathbf{m} \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \| w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \end{bmatrix}, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x} \right) = \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2 \geq 0 \\ m_1 + m_2 = m_{12}}} \frac{m_{12}!}{m_1! m_2!} f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} m_1 \\ m_2 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} m_1 \\ m_2 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

which means that the right hand side is

$$\sum_{\substack{m_{12} \geq 1 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathcal{S}}|} \\ m_{12} \cdot 1_j + \mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{m}}) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{m_{12}! \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}} \bar{m}_c!} \left[\sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2 \geq 1 \\ m_1 + m_2 = m_{12}}} \frac{m_{12}!}{m_1! m_2!} f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} m_1 \\ m_2 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} m_1 \\ m_2 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}} \end{bmatrix} \right) \right]$$

Note that we can cancel the terms $m_{12}!$ and rearrange the result into a single sum, over each valid tuple $(m_1, m_2, \bar{\mathbf{m}})$. This gives exactly the left hand side, which means that \hat{h}_i satisfies item [Item 3](#) of [Theorem 3.1](#).

Therefore, $\hat{h}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$, which implies $\hat{g}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$.

Now we show that $\mathcal{P}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ is idempotent. Assume that $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\mathbf{k}}$, then $f_i^{\mathbf{k}} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$ by definition.

This means that whole sum in the right hand side disappears and we have that $g_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)} = f_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)}$.

Finally, we prove that $\mathcal{P}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ is linear. That is, for $\hat{h}_i = \alpha \hat{f}_i + \hat{g}_i$, $\mathcal{P}_i^{\mathbf{k}}(\hat{h}_i) = \alpha \mathcal{P}_i^{\mathbf{k}}(\hat{f}_i) + \mathcal{P}_i^{\mathbf{k}}(\hat{g}_i)$.

Note that from Lemma 3.4 we have that $h_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)} = \alpha f_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)} + g_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& h_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) - \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} h_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\
&= \left(\alpha f_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)} + g_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)} \right)(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) - \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} \left(\alpha f_i^{\mathbf{k}} + g_i^{\mathbf{k}} \right)(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\
&= \alpha \left(f_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) - \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \right) \\
&+ g_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) - \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} g_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s)
\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.2. *Every element $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ has its coupling components of the form*

$$(4.6) \quad f_i^{\mathcal{K}(s)}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s) = \mathbf{k}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

that is, defined by a single function ${}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$, with

$$(4.7) \quad {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}: \mathbb{X}_i \times \mathcal{M}_i^{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbb{X}^{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_i$$

such that

1. If P is any **permutation** matrix (of appropriate dimension), then

$$(4.8) \quad {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) = {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; P\mathbf{w}, P\mathbf{x})$$

2. If **any** of the entries of \mathbf{w} is 0_{ij} for some $j \in T$, then

$$(4.9) \quad {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x}) = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$$

3. If $k_j > 0$, then ${}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ is **additive in the weights** with respect to type j . That is

$$(4.10) \quad {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \| w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{s}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{s}} \end{bmatrix} \right) = {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_1} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{s}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{s}} \end{bmatrix} \right) + {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \left(x; \begin{bmatrix} w_{j_2} \\ \mathbf{w}_{\bar{s}} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} x_{j_{12}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{\bar{s}} \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

□

Proof. Every element of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ can be obtained from choosing some $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{k}}$ and projecting it into $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ using $I - \mathcal{P}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$, where I is the identity transformation. ■

For the case of finite order oracle components $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ we are now ready to relate the coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ to a new family of functions $\{{}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ based on the vector space decomposition of (4.3), whose elements are given according to Corollary 4.2.

Theorem 4.3. *For every finite order $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$, we can relate its coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ to a set of **basis components** $\{{}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ that have the same properties as in Corollary 4.2. We can relate the two families of functions according to the following equivalent relations*

$$(4.11) \quad f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

$$(4.12) \quad {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{m}|-|\mathbf{s}|}}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

and in general for multiplicities $\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}$,

$$(4.13) \quad f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} \left(\prod_{c \in s} \frac{m_c!}{M_c!} \mathcal{S}_2(M_c, m_c) \right) {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

$$(4.14) \quad {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{M}|-|\mathbf{m}|} \left(\prod_{c \in s} \frac{m_c!}{M_c!} \mathcal{S}_1(M_c, m_c) \right) f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

□

Proof. Firstly, note that for every $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$, all the sums are actually finite sums in disguise and there are no convergence issues. In particular, the sums indexed at $\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}$ and $\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}$ have finite support. Note that if $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$, then there is some $\mathbf{K} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$ such that $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\mathbf{K}}$, and the conditions $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{K}$ and $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{K}$ can be added to them. For every $\mathbf{K} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$, the sum in (4.11), truncated at $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{K}$, comes directly from the decomposition of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\mathbf{K}}$ in (4.3) and (4.4), together with the form of the elements $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ from Corollary 4.2 and Lemma 3.4, the last of which applies since we are dealing with finite sums. Using (4.11) we generalize it into (4.13). Direct substitution gives

$$f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{m}|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{m}|} \bar{m}_i!} {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s})}(x; \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

since we are dealing with finite sums we can freely reorder the terms such that we merge together the pairs $(\bar{\mathbf{m}}, \mathbf{m})$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}$. That is,

$$f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{m}|} \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{m}|} \bar{m}_i!} {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

which from [Corollary A.6](#) simplifies into [\(4.13\)](#).

We now use this to verify [\(4.12\)](#)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{m}|-|s|}}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s)}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{m}|-|s|}}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c} \sum_{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} \left(\prod_{c \in s} \frac{m_c!}{M_c!} \mathcal{S}_2(M_c, m_c) \right) {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}s)}(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_s) \end{aligned}$$

exchanging the order of the two sums and simplifying we get

$$\sum_{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{M}|}}{\prod_{c \in s} M_c!} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \prod_{c \in s} (-1)^{m_c} (m_c - 1)! \mathcal{S}_2(M_c, m_c) \right) {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}s)}(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

which from [Corollary A.10](#) simplifies into [\(4.12\)](#).

Same as before, we use [\(4.12\)](#) to generalize it into [\(4.14\)](#). Direct substitution gives

$${}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s)}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{m}|}} \frac{(-1)^{|\bar{\mathbf{m}}|-|\mathbf{m}|}}{\prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{m}|} \bar{m}_i} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}s)}(x; \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

merging together the pairs $(\bar{\mathbf{m}}, \mathbf{m})$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}$, we obtain

$${}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s)}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{M}|-|\mathbf{m}|} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{m}|} \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{m}|} \bar{m}_i} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}s)}(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

note that $|\bar{\mathbf{m}}| = |\mathbf{M}|$. From [Corollary A.5](#), this simplifies into [\(4.14\)](#).

In summary, we know [\(4.11\)](#) from previous results and then proved the sequence [\(4.11\)](#) \implies [\(4.13\)](#) \implies [\(4.12\)](#) \implies [\(4.14\)](#). We now prove that the four relations are equivalent to one another. This is done by closing the cycle, that is, proving [\(4.14\)](#) \implies [\(4.11\)](#).

The right hand side of [\(4.11\)](#) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s)}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} \sum_{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{M}|-|\mathbf{m}|} \left(\prod_{c \in s} \frac{m_c!}{M_c!} \mathcal{S}_1(M_c, m_c) \right) f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}s)}(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_s) \end{aligned}$$

exchanging the order of the two sums and simplifying we get

$$\sum_{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{M}|}}{\prod_{c \in s} M_c!} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \prod_{c \in s} (-1)^{m_c} \mathcal{S}_1(M_c, m_c) \right) f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}s)}(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

which from [Corollary A.9](#) simplifies into [\(4.11\)](#). ■

An important but evident result from [Theorem 4.3](#) is the following.

Corollary 4.4. Consider a finite order $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$, with coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ and with basis components $\{{}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$. Then,

$$(4.15) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{0}} = {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{0}}$$

□

This can be generalized with the help of the following definition.

Definition 4.3. Consider an oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$, with coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$. We say that a given index $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$ is a **locally maximal order** if $f_i^{\mathbf{k}} \neq 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$ and $f_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$ for all $\bar{\mathbf{k}} \geq \mathbf{k}$ such that \mathbf{k} and $\bar{\mathbf{k}}$ have zeros in the same entries. □

Lemma 4.5. Consider a finite order $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$, with coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ and with basis components $\{{}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$.

A given index $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$ is a locally maximal order with respect to $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ if and only if it is also a locally maximal order with respect to $\{{}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$.

Furthermore, if $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$ is a locally maximal order, then,

$$(4.16) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{k}} = {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$$

□

Proof. Assume $\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$ is a locally maximal order with respect to $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$. This implies, from (4.12), that ${}^b f_i^{\bar{\mathbf{k}}} = 0_{\mathbb{Y}_i}$ whenever $\mathbf{k} < \bar{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\mathbf{k}, \bar{\mathbf{k}}$ have zeros in the same entries. Moreover, when $\bar{\mathbf{k}} = \mathbf{k}$, (4.12) simplifies into (4.16).

The exact same reasoning applies in order to prove the converse direction using (4.11). ■

The following result allows us to build any $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ directly from the specification of a simple and decoupled family of basis components $\{{}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$.

Theorem 4.6. For every finite coupling order $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$, we can relate its oracle components \hat{f}_i to a set of basis components $\{{}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ that have the same properties as in [Corollary 4.2](#).

$$(4.17) \quad \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}s)}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

□

Proof. We plug in (4.11) on (3.5), which gives

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\bar{s} \subseteq s} \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{s}|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \bar{s}} m_c!} {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\bar{s})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_{\bar{s}}, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_{\bar{s}})$$

The result comes directly from merging the two sums. ■

Similarly to [Lemma 3.4](#), we see that the representation on this second decomposition is also linear.

Lemma 4.7. *For two finite order oracle components $\hat{f}_i, \hat{g}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ with basis components $\{^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ and $\{^b g_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ respectively, the basis components of $\hat{h}_i = \alpha \hat{f}_i + \hat{g}_i$ are given by $\{\alpha ^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}} + ^b g_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ for any scalar α . \square*

Proof. This comes directly from writing the basis components explicitly in terms of the coupling components as in [\(4.12\)](#), together with [Lemma 3.4](#).

$$\begin{aligned}
& ^b h_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{m}|-|s|}}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c} \left(\alpha f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{ms})} + g_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{ms})} \right) (x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\
&= \alpha \left(\sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{m}|-|s|}}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c} f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{ms})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \right) + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{m}|-|s|}}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c} g_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{ms})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\
&= \alpha ^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) + ^b g_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) \\
&= \left(\alpha ^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})} + ^b g_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})} \right) (x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) \quad \blacksquare
\end{aligned}$$

The following examples illustrate the proposed decomposition.

Example 4.1. *Consider a single-type finite order oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ with basis components $\{^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}}$ such that, for some fixed $n > 0$*

$$^b f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \begin{cases} n! \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (w_c x_c) & |\mathbf{s}| = n \\ f_i^0(x) & |\mathbf{s}| = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $\{^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}}$ satisfy [Items 1 to 3 of Corollary 4.2](#). Using [Theorem 4.6](#) we can find the corresponding oracle component directly. That is,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) &= \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c!} ^b f_i^{|\mathbf{m}|}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\
&= f_i^0(x) + n! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \\
&= f_i^0(x) + \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c x_c \right)^n
\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the same oracle component as in [Example 3.3](#).

As a sanity check we can easily verify from [\(4.11\)](#) that the coupling components $\{f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}}$ match

the previously calculated ones. In particular, for $|\mathbf{s}| > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) &= \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c!} {}^b f_i^{|\mathbf{m}|}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\ &= n! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that [Lemma 4.5](#) is verified for $|\mathbf{s}| = n$. That is, $f_i^n = {}^b f_i^n$. \square

We now extend [Example 4.1](#) to the polynomial case.

Example 4.2. Consider a single-type finite order oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ with basis components $\{{}^b f_i^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ such that, for some fixed $N > 0$

$${}^b f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \begin{cases} a_{|\mathbf{s}|} |\mathbf{s}|! \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (w_c x_c) & 0 < |\mathbf{s}| \leq N \\ f_i^0(x) & |\mathbf{s}| = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $\{{}^b f_i^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ satisfy [Items 1 to 3](#) of [Corollary 4.2](#).

From [Example 4.1](#) and [Lemma 4.7](#), we conclude that the corresponding oracle component is given by

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^0(x) + \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c x_c \right)^n$$

which is exactly the same oracle component as in [Example 3.4](#). \square

We now extend the previous result for multi-type networks.

Example 4.3. Consider a multi-type finite order oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ with basis components $\{{}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ such that, for $\{a_{\mathbf{n}}\}_{\mathbf{n} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ with finite support,

$${}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \begin{cases} a_{\mathbf{k}} \prod_{j \in T} k_j! \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}_j} (w_c x_c) & \mathbf{k} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|} \\ f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) & \mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}_{|T|} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $\{{}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ satisfy [Items 1 to 3](#) of [Corollary 4.2](#). The corresponding oracle

component is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) &= \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c!} {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\
&= f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}_1| = n_1 \\ \vdots \\ |\mathbf{m}_{|T|}| = n_{|T|}}} a_{\mathbf{n}} \left(\prod_{j \in T} n_j! \right) \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \\
&= f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|}} a_{\mathbf{n}} \prod_{j \in T} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m}_j \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s_j|} \\ |\mathbf{m}_j| = n_j}} n_j! \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}_j} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \\
&= f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + \sum_{\mathbf{n} > \mathbf{0}_{|T|}} a_{\mathbf{n}} \prod_{j \in T} \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}_j} w_c x_c \right)^{n_j}
\end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the same oracle component as in [Example 3.7](#). \square

We now consider a slightly more complicated type of basis components.

Example 4.4. Consider a single-type finite order oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ with basis components $\{{}^b f_i^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ such that, for some fixed $n > 0$

$${}^b f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \begin{cases} (n-k)!k! \left(\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c \right) e_k(\mathbf{x}_s) & |\mathbf{s}| = n \\ f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) & |\mathbf{s}| = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where e_k denotes what is called elementary symmetric polynomials. With the multi-index notation this can be written as

$$e_k(\mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{q}| = k}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} x_c^{q_c}$$

It is clear that $\{{}^b f_i^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ satisfy [Items 1 to 3](#) of [Corollary 4.2](#). We show that the oracle components $\{f_i^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ can be found to be

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c \right)^{n-k} \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c x_c \right)^k$$

To prove this, firstly note that,

$$e_k(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{m} \\ |\mathbf{q}| = k}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} x_c^{q_c} \binom{m_c}{q_c}$$

using [Theorem 4.6](#),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) &= \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} {}^b f_i^{|\mathbf{m}|}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\
 &= f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} {}^b f_i^{|\mathbf{m}|}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\
 &= f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + (n-k)!k! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in s} m_c!} \left(\prod_{c \in s} w_c^{m_c} \right) e_k(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\
 &= f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + (n-k)!k! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \left(\prod_{c \in s} \frac{w_c^{m_c}}{m_c!} \right) \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{m} \\ |\mathbf{q}|=k}} \prod_{c \in s} x_c^{q_c} \binom{m_c}{q_c} \\
 &= f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + (n-k)!k! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ \mathbf{q} \leq \mathbf{m} \\ |\mathbf{q}|=k}} \prod_{c \in s} \frac{w_c^{m_c - q_c} (w_c x_c)^{q_c}}{(m_c - q_c)! q_c!}
 \end{aligned}$$

Define $p_c := m_c - q_c$. Then, we can write this in terms of \mathbf{p} as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) &= f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + (n-k)!k! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ \mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{p}|=n-k \\ |\mathbf{q}|=k}} \prod_{c \in s} \frac{w_c^{p_c} (w_c x_c)^{q_c}}{p_c! q_c!} \\
 &= f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + \left[(n-k)! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{p}|=n-k}} \prod_{c \in s} \frac{w_c^{p_c}}{p_c!} \right] \left[k! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{q}|=k}} \prod_{c \in s} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{q_c}}{q_c!} \right] \\
 &= f_i^{\mathbf{0}}(x) + \left(\sum_{c \in s} w_c \right)^{n-k} \left(\sum_{c \in s} w_c x_c \right)^k
 \end{aligned}$$

which completes our proof. \square

For completeness sake, we present in [Theorem 4.8](#) the inverse result of [Theorem 4.6](#). That is, we express the basis components in terms of the oracle components. In this result, we use a generalization of Stirling numbers called r -Stirling numbers, which are defined in [\[2\]](#).

Definition 4.4. *The unsigned r -Stirling numbers of the first kind, $\mathcal{S}_1^r(n, k)$, with $r, n, k \geq 0$, are given by the recurrence relation*

$$\mathcal{S}_1^r(n, k) = (n-1)\mathcal{S}_1^r(n-1, k) + \mathcal{S}_1^r(n-1, k-1), \quad n > r, k > 0$$

together with the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_1^r(r, k) &= \delta_{r, k} \\ \mathcal{S}_1^r(n, k) &= 0 \quad n < r \\ \mathcal{S}_1^r(n, 0) &= 0 \quad n > r\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 7. Note that $\mathcal{S}_1^0(n, k) = \mathcal{S}_1(n, k)$. Moreover, $\mathcal{S}_1^1(n, k) = \mathcal{S}_1(n, k)$ when $n > 0$. □

The related results that are necessary to prove [Theorem 4.8](#) are presented and proved in [Appendix B](#).

Theorem 4.8. For every finite order $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$, we can express the set of basis components $\{^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$, which have the same properties as in [Corollary 4.2](#), in terms of its oracle components \hat{f}_i . In particular, for any $\mathbf{K} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}$ such that $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\mathbf{K}}$, we have that

$$(4.18) \quad {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}|} \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}\bar{\mathbf{s}}) \leq \mathbf{K}}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{M}|}}{\prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} M_c} C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{K}) \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}})$$

where $C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{K})$ is defined as

$$(4.19) \quad C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{K}) = \prod_{j \in T} \frac{|\mathbf{s}_j \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}_j|!}{(K_j - |\mathbf{M}_j|)!} \mathcal{S}_1^{|\mathbf{M}_j|+1}(K_j + 1, |\mathbf{s}_j \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}_j| + |\mathbf{M}_j| + 1)$$

□

Proof. We first note that [\(3.4\)](#) can be generalized into

$$f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) = \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \leq \mathbf{m}}} \left[\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \binom{m_c}{\bar{m}_c} \right] (-1)^{|\mathbf{m}| - |\bar{\mathbf{m}}|} \hat{f}_i(x; \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{w}_s, \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

plugging in this result into [\(4.12\)](#), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}{}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{K}}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{m}| - |\mathbf{s}|}}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \leq \mathbf{m}}} \left[\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \binom{m_c}{\bar{m}_c} \right] (-1)^{|\mathbf{m}| - |\bar{\mathbf{m}}|} \hat{f}_i(x; \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{w}_s, \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{x}_s) \\ &= (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}|} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{K}}} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \leq \mathbf{m}}} \left[\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{\binom{m_c}{\bar{m}_c}}{m_c} \right] (-1)^{|\bar{\mathbf{m}}|} \hat{f}_i(x; \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{w}_s, \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{x}_s)\end{aligned}$$

rearranging the two sums we get

$${}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}|} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{K}}} (-1)^{|\bar{\mathbf{m}}|} \left[\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \bar{\mathbf{m}} \\ \mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{K}}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{\binom{m_c}{\bar{m}_c}}{m_c} \right] \hat{f}_i(x; \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{w}_s, \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{x}_s)$$

we now break the first sum into

$$\sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{K}}} = \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}\bar{\mathbf{s}}) \leq \mathbf{K}}}$$

that is, we correspond a given $\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|}$ to the subset $\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}$, of its non-zero entries. Therefore, we have that $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} = \mathbf{M}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}} = \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}|}$. Note that according to this split, the condition $\mathbf{m} \geq \bar{\mathbf{m}}$ becomes $\mathbf{m}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \geq \mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}|}$. On the other hand, the condition $\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}$ becomes $\mathbf{m}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}|}$. Out of the resulting four conditions, the non redundant ones are clearly $\mathbf{m}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \geq \mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}|}$. This results in

$$\begin{aligned} & {}^b f_i^{\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{s})}(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) \\ &= (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}|} \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}\bar{\mathbf{s}}) \leq \mathbf{K}}} (-1)^{|\mathbf{M}|} \left[\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \geq \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{K}}} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \frac{\binom{m_c}{M_c}}{m_c} \prod_{d \in \mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \frac{1}{m_d} \right] \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \\ &= (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}|} \sum_{\bar{\mathbf{s}} \subseteq \mathbf{s}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{M}\bar{\mathbf{s}}) \leq \mathbf{K}}} \frac{(-1)^{|\mathbf{M}|}}{\prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} M_c} \left[\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}} \geq \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{m}\mathbf{s}) \leq \mathbf{K}}} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1} \prod_{d \in \mathbf{s} \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \frac{1}{m_d} \right] \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{M}\mathbf{w}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}, \mathbf{M}\mathbf{x}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}}) \end{aligned}$$

note that $\frac{\binom{m_c}{M_c}}{m_c} = \frac{\binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1}}{M_c}$, whenever $M_c \geq 1$.

We now show that the expression in brackets gives us the coefficients $C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{K})$, as given by (4.19). We rearrange it by breaking all the multi-indices according to the typing of their cells. That is,

$$\prod_{j \in T} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}_j} \geq \mathbf{M}_j \\ \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{s}_j \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}_j} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}_j \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}_j|} \\ |\mathbf{m}_{\bar{\mathbf{s}}_j}| + |\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{s}_j \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}_j}| \leq K_j}} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}_j} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1} \prod_{d \in \mathbf{s}_j \setminus \bar{\mathbf{s}}_j} \frac{1}{m_d}$$

from Theorem B.10, the result is proven. ■

Remark 8. Note that if $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{K}_1} \cap \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{\leq \mathbf{K}_2}$, the associated coefficients $C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{K}_1)$ and $C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{K}_2)$ will be different, however, both versions of (4.18) will apply. Moreover, note that the coefficients $C(\bar{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{K})$ diverge as $\mathbf{K} \rightarrow \infty$. □

4.4. Infinite coupling order. All the results of subsection 4.3 fall under the assumption that the oracle functions are in $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$. That is, they have finite order. There are, however, plentiful useful functions that lie outside this subspace, such as the exponential function in Example 3.5. Our goal is to create an useful extension of this theory that applies to at least some important functions, such as the exponential and the trigonometric functions. The first idea that comes to mind is to simply allow the family of basis components $\{^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ to have infinite support. There is an important issue with such an approach. When dealing with infinite sums we are actually talking about limits on a sequence of partial sums. For this to be well-defined we need to be clear about the meaning of infinite sums of the type $\sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}}$. There are plenty of possible definitions, with some of the more obvious ones being

$$\sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} a_{\mathbf{m}} := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} a_{\mathbf{m}}$$

or

$$\sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}} a_{\mathbf{m}} := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ \max(\mathbf{m})=n}} a_{\mathbf{m}}$$

However, there is no clear reason of why one definition would be preferable to the other. If we chose one of them and developed our theory based on that, we would only be restricting ourselves to that choice. A different (and better) approach is to simply choose to give up on a $\{^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}\}_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T|}}$ representation for oracle components outside $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ and use the following result instead.

Lemma 4.9. *Consider a sequence $(^N \hat{f}_i)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$, with $^N \hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, if the limit $\hat{f}_i := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} ^N \hat{f}_i$ exists, then $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$. \square*

Proof. This is direct from the fact that $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$ is closed (Lemma 2.1) and $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty} \subset \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$. \blacksquare

This provides us with a framework that allows us to build a set of oracle components with infinite order, in particular the ones in $\overline{\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}}$, the closure of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$. We illustrate this with the following example.

Example 4.5. *Consider the sequence of oracle components with finite coupling order $(^N \hat{f}_i)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that the basis components of $^N \hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ are given according to*

$${}^{bN} f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x; \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}) = \begin{cases} a_{|\mathbf{s}|} |\mathbf{s}|! \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (w_c x_c) & 0 < |\mathbf{s}| \leq N \\ f_i^0(x) & |\mathbf{s}| = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

From Example 4.2, we know that this corresponds to the oracle component

$${}^N \hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}) = f_i^0(x) + \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c x_c \right)^n$$

Note that we now can also obtain this directly through [Theorem 4.6](#). Then, if the infinite series given by

$$F(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n x^n$$

converges, we know from [Lemma 4.9](#), that $\hat{f}_i := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{f}_i$ is given by

$$\hat{f}_i(x; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = f_i^0(x) + F\left(\sum_{c \in \mathcal{S}} w_c x_c\right)$$

and it is a valid oracle component. \square

Remark 9. Note that this example covers functions such as $F(x) = \exp(x) - 1$, $F(x) = \sin(x)$ and $F(x) = \cos(x) - 1$. \square

Lemma 4.10. The set $\overline{\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}}$ is a vector space. \square

Proof. Consider $\hat{f}_i, \hat{g}_i \in \overline{\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}}$. From assumption, there are sequences $({}^N \hat{f}_i)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$, $({}^N \hat{g}_i)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ with ${}^N \hat{f}_i, {}^N \hat{g}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ such that $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{f}_i = \hat{f}_i$ and $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} {}^N \hat{g}_i = \hat{g}_i$. Then, the elements of the sequence $(\alpha {}^N \hat{f}_i + {}^N \hat{g}_i)_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ are also in $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ and the sequence converges into $\alpha \hat{f}_i + \hat{g}_i$. Therefore $\alpha \hat{f}_i + \hat{g}_i \in \overline{\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}}$ and $\overline{\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}}$ is a vector space. \blacksquare

Remark 10. Note that

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty} \subset \overline{\hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}} \subset \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i$$

\square

5. Extensions. The theory of coupled cell networks can easily be generalized so that it allows for inner cell parameters and can deal with exogenous inputs on the cells.

Consider [Definition 2.2](#), we can extend oracle components to be instead defined on

$$(5.1) \quad \hat{f}_i: \mathbb{X}_i \times \mathbb{P}_i \times \mathbb{U}_i \times \bigcup_{\mathbf{k} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|T_i}} \left(\mathcal{M}_i^{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbb{X}^{\mathbf{k}} \right) \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_i$$

where \mathbb{P}_i is the set of possible inner parameters of a cell and \mathbb{U}_i denotes the set of possible exogenous inputs.

Since these are characteristics that affect a particular cell and not the connection between them, the extension is trivial. All the basic properties and definitions of the oracle components are basically unchanged. The only thing that changes is that we use the notation $\hat{f}_i(x, p, u; \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{x})$ instead.

Similarly, the coupling components $f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ and basis components ${}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}$ are defined on

$$(5.2) \quad f_i^{\mathbf{k}}, {}^b f_i^{\mathbf{k}}: \mathbb{X}_i \times \mathbb{P}_i \times \mathbb{U}_i \times \mathcal{M}_i^{\mathbf{k}} \times \mathbb{X}^{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}_i$$

All the results in this work apply to this extended framework with essentially the same formulas. Consider the following example.

Example 5.1. Consider a single-type finite order oracle component $\hat{f}_i \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_i^{<\infty}$ with basis components $\{{}^b f_i^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ such that, for some fixed $n > 0$

$${}^b f_i^{|\mathbf{s}|}(x, p, u; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) = \begin{cases} u^{2n}! \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (w_c x_c) & |\mathbf{s}| = n \\ f_i^0(x, p, u) & |\mathbf{s}| = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $\{{}^b f_i^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ satisfy *Items 1 to 3 of Corollary 4.2*. Using the direct extension of *Theorem 4.6* to this framework, we can find the corresponding oracle component directly. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}_i(x, p, u; \mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{x}_s) &= \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c!} {}^b f_i^{|\mathbf{m}|}(x, p, u; \mathbf{m}\mathbf{w}_s, \mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}_s) \\ &= f_i^0(x, p, u) + u^{2n}! \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \frac{(w_c x_c)^{m_c}}{m_c!} \\ &= f_i^0(x, p, u) + u^2 \left(\sum_{c \in \mathbf{s}} w_c x_c \right)^n \end{aligned}$$

□

6. Conclusion. This paper makes CCN theory more useful for practical application thanks to the two decompositions here derived. These decompositions allow us to verify and model dynamical systems (or some other first-order property of a network, such as a measurement functions) in a systematic way. Multiple examples illustrating their use are provided .

REFERENCES

- [1] A. ARENAS, A. DÍAZ-GUILERA, J. KURTHS, Y. MORENO, AND C. ZHOU, *Synchronization in complex networks*, Physics reports, 469 (2008), pp. 93–153.
- [2] A. Z. BRODER, *The r-stirling numbers*, Discrete Mathematics, 49 (1984), pp. 241–259.
- [3] F. DÖRFLER AND F. BULLO, *Synchronization in complex networks of phase oscillators: A survey*, Automatica, 50 (2014), pp. 1539–1564.
- [4] M. GOLUBITSKY AND I. STEWART, *Nonlinear dynamics of networks: the groupoid formalism*, Bulletin of the american mathematical society, 43 (2006), pp. 305–364.
- [5] M. GOLUBITSKY, I. STEWART, AND A. TÖRÖK, *Patterns of synchrony in coupled cell networks with multiple arrows*, SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems, 4 (2005), pp. 78–100.
- [6] F. KUO, I. SLOAN, G. WASILKOWSKI, AND H. WOŹNIAKOWSKI, *On decompositions of multivariate functions*, Mathematics of computation, 79 (2010), pp. 953–966.
- [7] R.-M. MEMMESHEIMER AND M. TIMME, *Non-additive coupling enables propagation of synchronous spiking activity in purely random networks*, PLoS computational biology, 8 (2012), p. e1002384.
- [8] F. A. RODRIGUES, T. K. D. PERON, P. JI, AND J. KURTHS, *The kuramoto model in complex networks*, Physics Reports, 610 (2016), pp. 1–98.
- [9] P. M. SEQUEIRA, A. P. AGUIAR, AND J. HESPANHA, *Commutative monoid formalism for weighted coupled cell networks and invariant synchrony patterns*, SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems, 20 (2021), pp. 1485–1513.
- [10] I. STEWART, M. GOLUBITSKY, AND M. PIVATO, *Symmetry groupoids and patterns of synchrony in coupled cell networks*, SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems, 2 (2003), pp. 609–646.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS: Decomposition of admissible functions in weighted coupled cell networks*

Pedro Sequeira[†], João P. Hespanha[‡], and A. Pedro Aguiar[†]

This supplement presents intermediate results that are required for some proofs in the main text. In particular, the results in [Appendix A](#) are used to prove [Theorem 4.3](#). [Appendix B](#) derives [Theorem B.10](#) which is used to prove [Theorem 4.8](#).

Appendix A. Intermediate results related to Stirling numbers.

Lemma A.1. *For every $n, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have that*

$$(A.1) \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{n}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{n-1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i}$$

□

Proof. Using the fact that $|\mathbf{m}| = n$, we can rewrite the left hand side into

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{n}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{m_j}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n \\ m_j \neq 0}} \frac{1}{\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^k m_i}$$

Note that $m_j \geq 1$, therefore, the quotients are always well-defined. We perform a change of variables by removing the entry j of the multi-index \mathbf{m} . The other conditions in the sum have to be adjusted accordingly, in particular, $|\mathbf{m}| = n$ becomes $|\mathbf{m}| \leq n - 1$, that is,

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n \\ m_j \neq 0}} \frac{1}{\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^k m_i} = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n-1}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i}$$

That is, we have proven that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{n}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i}$$

*Submitted to the editors at 12 of January of 2022.

Funding: This work was supported in part by the FCT Project RELIABLE (PTDC/EEI-AUT/3522/2020), funded by FCT/MCTES and in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. ECCS-2029985. The work of P. Sequeira was supported by a Ph.D. Scholarship, grant SFRH/BD/119835/2016 from Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT), Portugal (POCH program).

[†]Faculdade de Engenharia, Universidade do Porto, Portugal (pedro.sequeira@fe.up.pt, pedro.aguiar@fe.up.pt).

[‡]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA (hspanha@ece.ucsb.edu).

This expression is valid for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, therefore, changing variable n into $n - 1$, one obtains

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{n-1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n-2}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i}$$

These two equations can be merged the in following way

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{n}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n-2}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{n-1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i} \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. ■

Lemma A.2. *For every $n, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have that*

$$(A.2) \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{n}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i!}$$

□

Proof. Using the fact that $|\mathbf{m}| = n$, we can rewrite the left hand side into

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{n}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{m_j}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} = \sum_{j=1}^k \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{1}{(m_j - 1)! \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^k m_i!}$$

Note that $m_j \geq 1$, therefore, the quotients are always well-defined. We now split the multi-index \mathbf{m} according to whenever $m_j \geq 2$ or $m_j = 1$, that is,

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ m_j \geq 2 \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{1}{(m_j - 1)! \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^k m_i!} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ m_j = 1 \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{1}{\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^k m_i!} \right)$$

On the first inner sum, we perform a change of variables so that $m_j - 1$ becomes m_j . This means that the condition $m_j \geq 2$ becomes $m_j \geq 1$. Therefore, we can compress the conditions $\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k$ and $m_j \geq 2$ in the old coordinates into just $\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k$ in the new ones.

On the second inner sum we perform a change of variables by removing the entry j of the multi-index \mathbf{m} . For both sums, the conditions $|\mathbf{m}| = n$ become $|\mathbf{m}| = n - 1$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{n}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} &= \sum_{j=1}^k \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. ■

We are now ready to introduce our new formulas for the Stirling numbers of the first and second kinds.

Theorem A.3. *The unsigned Stirling numbers of the first kind, $\mathcal{S}_1(n, k)$, with $n, k \geq 0$ are given by*

$$(A.3) \quad \mathcal{S}_1(n, k) = \frac{n!}{k!} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i}$$

□

Proof. We have to prove that the right hand side of (A.3) has the properties of Definition 4.1.

Consider $n, k = 0$, the initial condition is satisfied since the only valid argument of the sum is the empty multi-index $\mathbf{m} = []$. For both $n > 0, k = 0$ and $n = 0, k > 0$ there are no valid arguments in the sum, which results in zero and those initial conditions are also satisfied.

For the remaining values, $n, k > 0$, we have to show that they follow the recurrence relation, that is,

$$\frac{n!}{k!} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} = (n-1) \frac{(n-1)!}{k!} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} + \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i}$$

multiplying both sides by $\frac{k!}{(n-1)!}$ we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{n}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{n-1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i}$$

which is true from Lemma A.1. ■

Theorem A.4. *The Stirling numbers of the second kind, $\mathcal{S}_2(n, k)$, with $n, k \geq 0$ are given by*

$$(A.4) \quad \mathcal{S}_2(n, k) = \frac{n!}{k!} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!}$$

□

Proof. We have to prove that the right hand side of (A.4) has the properties of Definition 4.2.

Consider $n, k = 0$, the initial condition is satisfied since the only valid argument of the sum is the empty multi-index $\mathbf{m} = []$. For both $n > 0, k = 0$ and $n = 0, k > 0$ there are no valid arguments in the sum, which results in zero and those initial conditions are also satisfied.

For the remaining values, $n, k > 0$, we have to show that they follow the recurrence relation, that is,

$$\frac{n!}{k!} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} = k \frac{(n-1)!}{k!} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} + \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i!}$$

multiplying both sides by $\frac{k!}{(n-1)!}$ we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} \frac{n}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_k \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^k m_i!} + \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{k-1} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n-1}} \frac{k}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} m_i!}$$

which is true from Lemma A.2. ■

Corollary A.5. For $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}$, we have that

$$(A.5) \quad \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{m}|} \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}=\mathbf{M}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{m}|} \bar{m}_i} = \prod_{c \in s} \frac{m_c!}{M_c!} \mathcal{S}_1(M_c, m_c)$$

□

Proof. We can break the multi-index $\bar{\mathbf{m}}$ with $|\mathbf{m}|$ elements into the multi-indexes $(\bar{\mathbf{m}}^c)_{c \in s}$ such that each $\bar{\mathbf{m}}^c$ has m_c elements and is associated with M_c . In particular, this means that $\bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{M}$ becomes $|\bar{\mathbf{m}}^c| = M_c$, for every $c \in s$. Using this, the left hand side of (A.5) can be written as the product

$$\prod_{c \in s} \left(\sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}}^c \geq \mathbf{1}_{m_c} \\ |\bar{\mathbf{m}}^c|=M_c}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{m_c} \bar{m}_i^c} \right)$$

The result comes directly from applying Theorem A.3. ■

Corollary A.6. For $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|s|}$, we have that

$$(A.6) \quad \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{m}|} \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{m}=\mathbf{M}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{m}|} \bar{m}_i!} = \prod_{c \in s} \frac{m_c!}{M_c!} \mathcal{S}_2(M_c, m_c)$$

□

Proof. Using the exact same approach as in the proof of [Corollary A.5](#), the left hand side of [\(A.6\)](#) can be written as the product

$$\prod_{c \in \mathcal{S}} \left(\sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}}^c \geq \mathbf{1}_{m_c} \\ |\bar{\mathbf{m}}^c| = M_c}} \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^{m_c} \bar{m}_i^c!} \right)$$

The result comes directly from applying [Theorem A.4](#). ■

Lemma A.7. For $n \geq 0$, we have that

$$(A.7) \quad \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k \mathcal{S}_1(n, k) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } n = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

□

Proof. The first cases can easily be verified from inspection. Note that the sum is finite since $\mathcal{S}_1(n, k) = 0$ when $k > n$. For $n = 0$ this is an empty sum and for $n = 1$ we have $(-1)\mathcal{S}_1(1, 1) = -1$.

The remaining terms are proven by induction. Assume the sum to be zero for $n - 1 > 1$. We expand $\mathcal{S}_1(n, k)$ according to its recurrence relation

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k \mathcal{S}_1(n, k) &= \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k [(n-1)\mathcal{S}_1(n-1, k) + \mathcal{S}_1(n-1, k-1)] \\ &= (n-1) \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k \mathcal{S}_1(n-1, k) + \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k \mathcal{S}_1(n-1, k-1) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

The base case of the induction process, $n = 2$, is simply $\mathcal{S}_1(2, 2) - \mathcal{S}_1(2, 1) = 1 - 1 = 0$ ■

Lemma A.8. For $n \geq 0$, we have that

$$(A.8) \quad \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k (k-1)! \mathcal{S}_2(n, k) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } n = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

□

Proof. Firstly, note that for $n = 0$, the sum is trivially 0. Consider now $n > 0$. Then, from [Definition 4.2](#)

$$\sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k (k-1)! \mathcal{S}_2(n, k) = \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k k! \mathcal{S}_2(n-1, k) + \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k (k-1)! \mathcal{S}_2(n-1, k-1)$$

we perform the change of variables $\bar{k} = k - 1$ on the second sum of the right hand side, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k (k-1)! \mathcal{S}_2(n, k) &= \sum_{k \geq 1} (-1)^k k! \mathcal{S}_2(n-1, k) + \sum_{\bar{k} \geq 0} (-1)^{\bar{k}+1} \bar{k}! \mathcal{S}_2(n-1, \bar{k}) \\ &= -\mathcal{S}_2(n-1, 0) \end{aligned}$$

which is -1 for $n = 1$ and 0 for $n > 1$. ■

Corollary A.9. For $\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|}$, we have that

$$(A.9) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{m_c} \mathcal{S}_1(M_c, m_c) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}|} & \text{if } \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

□

Proof. We can write the left hand side of (A.9) as the product

$$\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \sum_{m_c \geq 1} (-1)^{m_c} \mathcal{S}_1(M_c, m_c)$$

Note that although the outer sum of (A.9) looks infinite, it only has a finite amount of non-zero elements. Therefore, there are no convergence issues when we do this rearrangement. If we consider $\mathbf{M} \neq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}$, there will be at least one $c \in \mathbf{s}$ such that $M_c \neq 1$. From Lemma A.7, that term will be zero, which means that the whole product is zero. For $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}$ the result is immediate. ■

Corollary A.10. For $\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{s}|}$, we have that

$$(A.10) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} (-1)^{m_c} (m_c - 1)! \mathcal{S}_2(M_c, m_c) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{|\mathbf{s}|} & \text{if } \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

□

Proof. We can write the left hand side of (A.10) as the product

$$\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \sum_{m_c \geq 1} (-1)^{m_c} (m_c - 1)! \mathcal{S}_2(M_c, m_c)$$

Using the exact same approach as in the proof of Corollary A.9, the result is straightforward from Lemma A.8. ■

Appendix B. Intermediate results related to Generalized Stirling numbers.

Lemma B.1 (Theorem 3 of [SM1]). The r -Stirling numbers of the first kind are related according to the cross-recurrence formula

$$(B.1) \quad \mathcal{S}_1^r(n, k) = r \mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(n, k+1) + \mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(n, k), \quad n > r$$

□

Lemma B.2. For $n > r$ and $k > 0$, we have that

$$(B.2) \quad \mathcal{S}_1^r(n, k) = (n-r) \mathcal{S}_1^r(n-1, k) + \mathcal{S}_1^{r-1}(n-1, k-1)$$

□

Proof. We take the recurrence relation in [Definition 4.4](#) and we add and subtract the term $(r-1)\mathcal{S}_1^r(n-1, k)$ to it. That is,

$$\mathcal{S}_1^r(n, k) = (n-1)\mathcal{S}_1^r(n-1, k) - (r-1)\mathcal{S}_1^r(n-1, k) + (r-1)\mathcal{S}_1^r(n-1, k) + \mathcal{S}_1^r(n-1, k-1)$$

The first two terms of the right hand side simplify into $(n-r)\mathcal{S}_1^r(n-1, k)$ while the last two, according to [Lemma B.1](#) simplify into $\mathcal{S}_1^{r-1}(n-1, k-1)$, which concludes the proof. ■

Lemma B.3. For $r, n, k \geq 0$, we have that,

$$(B.3) \quad \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^r(n+r, k+r)}{n!} = \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(N+r+1, k+r+1)}{N!}$$

□

Proof. The proof is by induction. Assume (B.3) to be satisfied for some $N-1 \geq 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^N \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^r(n+r, k+r)}{n!} &= \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^r(n+r, k+r)}{n!} + \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^r(N+r, k+r)}{N!} \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(N+r, k+r+1)}{(N-1)!} + \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^r(N+r, k+r)}{N!} \\ &= \frac{1}{N!} [N\mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(N+r, k+r+1) + \mathcal{S}_1^r(N+r, k+r)] \end{aligned}$$

we now consider [Lemma B.2](#) under the change of variables such that n becomes $N+r+1$, r becomes $r+1$ and k becomes $k+r+1$. Note that the prerequisites $n > r$ and $k > 0$ under this change of variables become $N+r+1 > r+1$ and $k+r+1 > 0$ respectively, which are always satisfied under our assumption. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{N!} [N\mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(N+r, k+r+1) + \mathcal{S}_1^r(N+r, k+r)] = \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(N+r+1, k+r+1)}{N!}$$

which concludes the induction step. For the base case $N=0$, we have that $\mathcal{S}_1^r(r, k+r) = \mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(r+1, k+r+1)$ which is always satisfied since $\delta_{r, k+r} = \delta_{r+1, k+r+1}$. ■

Lemma B.4. For $r, n, k \geq 0$, we have that,

$$(B.4) \quad \sum_{p=k}^{n-r} \binom{n-p}{r} \frac{\mathcal{S}_1(p, k)}{p!} = \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(n+1, k+r+1)}{(n-r)!}$$

□

Proof. We first consider the case where $n < k+r$. Note that in this regime the left hand side is an empty sum. Moreover, this implies that $n+1 < k+r+1$, therefore the generalized Stirling number on the right hand side is also zero.

Consider now that $n = k+r$. Then we have,

$$\binom{n-k}{r} \frac{\mathcal{S}_1(k, k)}{k!} = \frac{\mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(n+1, k+r+1)}{(n-r)!}$$

which simplifies into

$$\mathcal{S}_1(k, k) = \mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(n+1, n+1)$$

which is satisfied since both sides are one in this regime, where we have that $k \geq 0$ and equivalently, $n+1 \geq r+1$. Finally, we prove the case $n > k+r$ by induction. Assume (B.4) to be true for $n-1$. We can decompose the left hand side into

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{p=k}^{n-r} \left[\binom{n-p-1}{r-1} + \binom{n-p-1}{r} \right] \frac{\mathcal{S}_1(p, k)}{p!} \\ &= \sum_{p=k}^{(n-1)-(r-1)} \binom{(n-1)-p}{r-1} \frac{\mathcal{S}_1(p, k)}{p!} + \sum_{p=k}^{(n-1)-r} \binom{(n-1)-p}{r} \frac{\mathcal{S}_1(p, k)}{p!} \end{aligned}$$

from the induction hypothesis, this simplifies into

$$\frac{1}{(n-r)!} [\mathcal{S}_1^r(n, k+r) + (n-r)\mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(n, k+r+1)]$$

from Lemma B.2, this simplifies into the right hand side of what we want to prove as long as $n+1 > r+1$ and $k+r+1 > 0$, which are both satisfied under the current assumptions. Note that we required n to be under the regime $n > k+r$, but no such requirement was made for $n-1$. Therefore, we consider the base cases of this induction process to be the ones in the regime $n = k+r$, which was already proven. ■

Lemma B.5. For $r, n, k \geq 0$, we have that,

$$(B.5) \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n-r}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c} \binom{n-|\mathbf{m}|}{r} = \frac{|s|!}{(n-r)!} \mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}(n+1, |s|+r+1)$$

□

Proof. Split the sum in the left hand side into the two sums

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p=|s|}^{n-r} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=p}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c} \binom{n-|\mathbf{m}|}{r} &= \sum_{p=|s|}^{n-r} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=p}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c} \binom{n-p}{r} \\ &= \sum_{p=|s|}^{n-r} \binom{n-p}{r} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=p}} \frac{1}{\prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} m_c} \end{aligned}$$

from Theorem A.3 this is

$$|s|! \sum_{p=|s|}^{n-r} \binom{n-p}{r} \frac{\mathcal{S}_1(|s|, p!)}{p!}$$

the result is now straightforward from Lemma B.4. ■

The result in (B.6) is well-known and it is important for our subsequent proofs

Lemma B.6.

$$(B.6) \quad \sum_{m=k}^n \binom{m-1}{k-1} = \binom{n}{k}, \quad k \geq 1$$

□

Lemma B.7. *We have that*

$$(B.7) \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}|=n}} 1 = \binom{n-1}{|\mathbf{s}|-1}$$

□

Proof. The proof is by induction. Assume (B.7) is valid for $|\mathbf{s}|-1$, then, we can rewrite the left hand side as

$$\sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|-1} \\ |\bar{\mathbf{m}}|=n-m}} 1$$

which, from assumption, results into

$$\sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-m-1}{|\mathbf{s}|-2}$$

with the change of variables $l := n - m$, we get

$$\sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \binom{l-1}{(|\mathbf{s}|-1)-1}$$

which from Lemma B.6, results in (B.7). The base case $|\mathbf{s}| = 0$ is trivially true. ■

Corollary B.8. *We have that*

$$(B.8) \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n}} 1 = \binom{n}{|\mathbf{s}|}$$

□

Proof. This is direct from Lemma B.7 together with Lemma B.6. ■

Lemma B.9. *For $\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}$, we have that*

$$(B.9) \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{M} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n}} \prod_{c \in \mathbf{s}} \binom{m_c-1}{M_c-1} = \binom{n}{|\mathbf{M}|}$$

□

Proof. The proof is by induction. Assume (B.9) to be satisfied for some $\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|\mathbf{s}|}$. We then show that it is also satisfied for $\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{1}_c$, with $c \in \mathbf{s}$. We consider $c = 1$ without loss of generality. Furthermore, in order to simplify notation, we define $\bar{\mathbf{s}} := \mathbf{s} \setminus \{1\}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{M}}, \bar{\mathbf{m}}$ as the result of removing the first entries of \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{m} , respectively. Consider the left hand side of (B.9) applied to $\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{1}_1$. That is,

$$\sum_{\substack{m_1 \geq M_1+1 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \bar{\mathbf{M}} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n}} \binom{m_1 - 1}{(M_1 + 1) - 1} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1}$$

we now do the change of variables so that $m_1 - 1$ becomes m_1

$$\sum_{\substack{m_1 \geq M_1 \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \bar{\mathbf{M}} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n-1}} \binom{m_1}{M_1} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1}$$

we then break the sum into

$$\sum_{\substack{m_1 \geq M_1 \\ m_1 \leq n - |\bar{\mathbf{M}}| - 1}} \binom{m_1}{M_1} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \bar{\mathbf{M}} \\ |\bar{\mathbf{m}}| \leq n - m_1 - 1}} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1}$$

from (B.6) we know that $\binom{m_1}{M_1} = \sum_{l=M_1}^{m_1} \binom{l-1}{M_1-1}$. By doing a change of variables such that $m_1 - l$ becomes l , we obtain $\sum_{l=0}^{m_1-M_1} \binom{m_1-l-1}{M_1-1}$. We use this to expand our expression into

$$\sum_{\substack{m_1 \geq M_1 \\ m_1 \leq n - |\bar{\mathbf{M}}| - 1}} \sum_{l=0}^{m_1-M_1} \binom{m_1-l-1}{M_1-1} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \bar{\mathbf{M}} \\ |\bar{\mathbf{m}}| \leq n - m_1 - 1}} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1}$$

we exchange the order of the first two sums, adjusting their bounds appropriately

$$\sum_{l=0}^{n-M_1-|\bar{\mathbf{M}}|-1} \sum_{\substack{m_1 \geq M_1+l \\ m_1 \leq n - |\bar{\mathbf{M}}| - 1}} \binom{m_1-l-1}{M_1-1} \sum_{\substack{\bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \bar{\mathbf{M}} \\ |\bar{\mathbf{m}}| \leq n - m_1 - 1}} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1}$$

merging back the second and third sums gives

$$\sum_{l=0}^{n-|\mathbf{M}|-1} \sum_{\substack{m_1 \geq M_1+l \\ \bar{\mathbf{m}} \geq \bar{\mathbf{M}} \\ m_1+|\bar{\mathbf{m}}| \leq n-1}} \binom{m_1-l-1}{M_1-1} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1}$$

we now change variables such that $m_1 - l$ becomes m_1 , which simplifies the expression into

$$\sum_{l=0}^{n-|\mathbf{M}|-1} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{M} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n-l-1}} \prod_{c \in \bar{\mathbf{s}}} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1}$$

from assumption, we can simplify the inner sum according to (B.9), which gives us

$$\sum_{l=0}^{n-|\mathbf{M}|-1} \binom{n-l-1}{|\mathbf{M}|}$$

Finally, we change variables so that $n-l$ becomes l , that is,

$$\sum_{l=|\mathbf{M}+1}^n \binom{l-1}{|\mathbf{M}|} = \binom{n}{|\mathbf{M}+1}$$

which satisfies (B.9) for $\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{1}_1$. This proves the induction step.

The base cases $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{1}_{|s|}$, all simplify into (B.8) and are therefore satisfied. ■

Theorem B.10. For $\mathbf{M} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|s|}$, we have that

$$(B.10) \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{p} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|r|} \\ |\mathbf{m}| + |\mathbf{p}| \leq n}} \prod_{c \in s} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1} \prod_{d \in r} \frac{1}{p_d} = \frac{|\mathbf{r}|!}{(n - |\mathbf{M}|)!} \mathcal{S}_1^{|\mathbf{M}+1|}(n + 1, |\mathbf{r}| + |\mathbf{M}| + 1)$$

□

Proof. We first split the sum of the left hand side and reorganize it as

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|r|} \\ |\mathbf{p}| \leq n - |\mathbf{M}|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{d \in r} p_d} \left[\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \geq \mathbf{M} \\ |\mathbf{m}| \leq n - |\mathbf{p}|}} \prod_{c \in s} \binom{m_c - 1}{M_c - 1} \right]$$

using Lemma B.9, this simplifies into

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \geq \mathbf{1}_{|r|} \\ |\mathbf{p}| \leq n - |\mathbf{M}|}} \frac{1}{\prod_{d \in r} p_d} \binom{n - |\mathbf{p}|}{|\mathbf{M}|}$$

the result now follows from Lemma B.5. ■

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Z. BRODER, *The r-stirling numbers*, Discrete Mathematics, 49 (1984), pp. 241–259.