

# PATTERN RECOGNITION ON ORIENTED MATROIDS: SYMMETRIC CYCLES IN THE HYPERCUBE GRAPHS. VI

ANDREY O. MATVEEV

ABSTRACT. We briefly discuss linear algebraic, combinatorial, and applied aspects of an exact model representation of binary arrays. As an illustration, we present two linear algebraic portraits of a string of characters.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let

$$\mathbf{F} := \begin{pmatrix} T^1 \\ T^2 \\ \vdots \\ T^\tau \end{pmatrix} := ((F^1)^\top \ (F^2)^\top \ \dots \ (F^\tau)^\top) \in \{1, -1\}^{\tau \times t} \subset \mathbb{R}^{\tau \times t} \quad (1.1)$$

be a  $\tau \times t$  matrix (such that  $t \geq 3$ )<sup>1</sup> whose entries are real numbers 1 and  $-1$ , and whose rows

$$T^i := (T^i(1), T^i(2), \dots, T^i(t)) \quad (1.2)$$

and columns

$$(F^j)^\top := (F^j(1), F^j(2), \dots, F^j(\tau))^\top$$

are indexed starting with 1. We regard the rows  $T^i$  of the matrix  $\mathbf{F}$  as vectors of the real Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^t$ . It is also convenient to interpret the row vectors (1.2) as vertices of the *hypercube graph*  $\mathbf{H}(t, 2)$ . A pair of vertices  $\{T', T''\} \subset \{1, -1\}^t$  is an *edge* of the graph  $\mathbf{H}(t, 2)$  if and only if the *Hamming distance*  $d(T', T'') := |\{k \in [t]: T'(k) \neq T''(k)\}|$  between  $T'$  and  $T''$  is 1; here  $[t]$  denotes the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, t\}$ .

In this note, we briefly discuss linear algebraic, combinatorial, and applied aspects of an exact model representation of binary matrices/arrays (1.1) and of their  $\{0, 1\}$ -analogues. As an illustration, we present two linear algebraic portraits of a string of characters.

---

<sup>1</sup>We are mostly interested in the situation where  $\tau \ll t$ , that is, the matrix (1.1) has a very large number of columns.

2. COMPUTATION-FREE LINEAR ALGEBRAIC DECOMPOSITIONS OF VERTICES IN THE HYPERCUBE GRAPH  $\mathbf{H}(t, 2)$  WITH RESPECT TO ITS DISTINGUISHED SYMMETRIC CYCLE

We are interested in a distinguished *symmetric cycle*  $\mathbf{R} := (R^0, R^1, \dots, R^{2t-1}, R^0)$  of the hypercube graph  $\mathbf{H}(t, 2)$ , with its *vertex sequence*

$$\vec{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{R}) := (R^0, R^1, \dots, R^{2t-1})$$

described as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} R^0 &:= (1, 1, \dots, 1), \\ R^s &:= (\underbrace{-1, -1, \dots, -1}_s, \underbrace{1, 1, \dots, 1}_{t-s}), \quad 1 \leq s \leq t-1, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$R^{k+t} := -R^k, \quad 0 \leq k \leq t-1. \quad (2.2)$$

For any row  $T^i$  of the matrix (1.1) there is a *unique inclusion-minimal* subset  $\mathbf{Q}(T^i, \mathbf{R})$  of the vertex sequence  $\vec{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{R})$  such that

$$T^i = \sum_{Q \in \mathbf{Q}(T^i, \mathbf{R})} Q. \quad (2.3)$$

Since the sequence  $\vec{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{R})$  is an (ordered) *maximal positive basis* of the space  $\mathbb{R}^t$ , the decomposition set  $\mathbf{Q}(T^i, \mathbf{R})$  of the vertex  $T^i$  of the graph  $\mathbf{H}(t, 2)$  with respect to the cycle  $\mathbf{R}$  is *linearly independent*; its cardinality

$$q(T^i) := |\mathbf{Q}(T^i, \mathbf{R})|$$

is *odd*.

Thanks to Proposition 5.9 in [2] (see [3, Prop. 2.4]), in practice, explicit decompositions of the form (2.3) need no any computations, and thus they are fast. Moreover, since the decomposition mechanism is based solely on the inspection of the interval structure of the *negative part*  $\{e \in [t] : T^i(e) = -1\}$  of the vertex  $T^i$  of the graph  $\mathbf{H}(t, 2)$ , the decomposition set  $\mathbf{Q}(T^i, \mathbf{R})$  can be created even on-the-fly if the entries of the row  $T^i$  of the matrix (2.3) themselves are revealed ‘sequentially’.

No instances of vectors of the maximal positive basis  $\vec{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{R})$  need to be stored into the operational memory of a ‘device’. The reason is that the vectors  $R^k \in \vec{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{R})$  have a simply-organized inner structure: the negative part of  $R^k$  constitutes one (empty, in the case of the vector  $R^0$ ) interval of the set  $[t]$ . As a consequence, any component of the vector  $R^k$  can be instantly retrieved, when needed, via the mechanism of *lazy generation* based on definition (2.1)(2.2).

We see that, in practice, a report on the results of the decomposition procedure given in (2.3) should not consist necessarily in the set  $\mathbf{Q}(T^i, \mathbf{R})$  described explicitly. Instead, if

$$\mathbf{Q}(T^i, \mathbf{R}) := \{R^{k_0(T^i)}, R^{k_1(T^i)}, \dots, R^{k_{q(T^i)-1}(T^i)}\} \subset \vec{\mathbf{V}}(\mathbf{R}), \quad (2.4)$$

for some indices-superscripts  $k_0(T^i) < k_1(T^i) < \dots < k_{q(T^i)-1}(T^i)$ , then it suffices to return to the user the set of those indices

$$\{k_0(T^i), k_1(T^i), \dots, k_{q(T^i)-1}(T^i)\}. \quad (2.5)$$

If  $T^i \in \vec{V}(\mathbf{R})$ , then  $q(T) = 1$ . If  $T^i \notin \vec{V}(\mathbf{R})$ , then it is shown between the lines in (the proof of) [1, Theorem 1.17(i)] that

$$q(T^i) \leq \begin{cases} t, & \text{if } t \text{ odd,} \\ t - 1, & \text{if } t \text{ even.} \end{cases}$$

To put it simply, Proposition 5.9 in [2] ([3, Prop. 2.4]) explains that the greater the number of inclusion-maximal intervals composing the negative part of  $T^i$ , the larger the size of its decomposition set  $\mathbf{Q}(T^i, \mathbf{R})$ , and vice versa. Hence, we obtain the following bounds on the total number of integers (that provide us, as basic linear algebra guarantees, with a precise portrait of the matrix  $\mathbf{F}$  defined in (1.1)) appearing in the sets (2.5), for all of the vectors  $T^i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \tau$ :

**Theorem 2.1.** *For the tuple*

$$\left( \begin{array}{l} t, \quad \tau, \\ \{k_0(T^1), k_1(T^1), \dots, k_{q(T^1)-1}(T^1)\}, \\ \{k_0(T^2), k_1(T^2), \dots, k_{q(T^2)-1}(T^2)\}, \\ \dots, \\ \{k_0(T^\tau), k_1(T^\tau), \dots, k_{q(T^\tau)-1}(T^\tau)\} \end{array} \right), \quad (2.6)$$

*consisting of the dimensionality parameters  $t$  and  $\tau$ ,<sup>2</sup> and of the sequence of sets of integers described in (2.4)(2.5), that allows us to restore, in a precise manner, the matrix  $\mathbf{F}$  given in (1.1), we have*

$$\tau \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\tau} q(T^i) \leq \begin{cases} \tau \cdot t, & \text{if } t \text{ odd,} \\ \tau \cdot (t - 1), & \text{if } t \text{ even.} \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

Although the exact lower and upper bounds given in (2.7) seem to be the encouraging and discouraging ones, respectively, it would be interesting to imagine how a specific practice of preprocessing an ML-data might look like; see Appendix.

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that the parameter  $\tau$  is somewhat redundant, because the tuple (2.6) includes exactly  $\tau$  sets of indices.





## REFERENCES

- [1] *Matveev A.O.* Pattern recognition on oriented matroids. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017.
- [2] *Matveev A.O.* Symmetric cycles. Singapore: Jenny Stanford Publishing, *to appear*.
- [3] *Matveev A.O.* Pattern recognition on oriented matroids: Symmetric cycles in the hypercube graphs. II. Preprint [arXiv:1801.02601], 2021.

*Email address:* `andrey.o.matveev@gmail.com`

*URL:* `https://github.com/andreyomatveev`