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Abstract

Network coding is a new technique to transmit data through a network by letting the intermediate nodes combine the packets they receive. Given a network, the network coding solvability problem decides whether all the packets requested by the destinations can be transmitted. In this paper, we introduce a new approach to this problem. We define a closure operator on a digraph closely related to the network coding instance and we show that the constraints for network coding can all be expressed according to that closure operator. Thus, a solution for the network coding problem is equivalent to a so-called solution of the closure operator. We can then define the closure solvability problem in general, which surprisingly reduces to finding secret-sharing matroids when the closure operator is a matroid. Based on singular properties of the closure, we are able to generalise the way in which networks can be split into two distinct parts. We then investigate different properties of closure operators, thus yielding bounds on the entropy of any solution. Also, the guessing graph approach to network coding solvability is generalised to any closure operator, which yields bounds on the entropy of possible network codes. We finally prove that any nontrivial multiple unicast with two source-receiver pairs is always solvable over all sufficiently large alphabets; however, there are arbitrarily narrow bottlenecks when any closure is considered.

I. INTRODUCTION

Network coding [1] is a protocol which outperforms routing for multicast networks by letting the intermediate nodes manipulate the packets they receive. In particular, linear network coding [2] is optimal in the case of one source; however, it is not the case for multiple sources and destinations [3], [4]. Although for large dynamic networks, good heuristics such as random linear network coding [5], [6] can be used, maximizing the amount of information that can be transmitted over a static network is
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fundamental but very hard in practice. Solving this problem by brute force, i.e. considering all possible operations at all nodes, is computationally prohibitive. In this paper, we provide a new approach to tackle this problem based on a closure operator defined on a related digraph. Closure operators are fundamental and ubiquitous mathematical objects.

The guessing number of digraphs is a concept introduced in [7], which connects graph theory, network coding, and circuit complexity theory. In [7] it was proved that an instance of network coding with \( r \) sources and \( r \) sinks on an acyclic network (referred to as a multiple unicast network) is solvable over a given alphabet if and only if the guessing number of a related digraph is equal to \( r \). Moreover, it is proved in [7], [8] that any network coding instance can be reduced into a multiple unicast network. Therefore, the guessing number is a direct criterion on the solvability of network coding. One of the main advantages of the guessing game approach is to remove the hierarchy between sources, intermediate nodes, and destinations. In [9], the guessing number is also used to disprove a long-standing open conjecture on circuit complexity. In [10], the guessing number of digraphs was studied, and bounds on the guessing number of some particular digraphs were derived. The guessing number is also equal to the so-called graph entropy [7], [11]. This allows us to use information inequalities [12] to derive upper bounds on the guessing number.

In [13], a graph on all the possible configurations of a digraph is introduced, and is referred to as the guessing graph. The guessing number of a digraph is equal to the logarithm of the independence number of its guessing graph. In terms of the nature of the problem and its search space, solvability of network coding is no longer about determining the appropriate operations at each intermediate node, but is now about the possible messages that could be transmitted through the network. The operations which transmit these messages can then be easily determined. In terms of complexity, the problem of solvability of network coding is reduced to a decision problem on the independence number of undirected graphs.

Shamir introduced the so-called threshold secret sharing scheme in [14]. Suppose a sender wants to communicate a secret \( a \in A \) to \( n \) parties, but that an eavesdropper may intercept \( r - 1 \) of the transmitted messages. We then require that given any set of \( r - 1 \) messages, the eavesdropper cannot obtain any information about the secret. On the other hand, any set of \( r \) messages allows to reconstruct the original secret \( a \). The elegant technique consists of sending evaluations of a polynomial \( p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} p_i x^i \), with \( p_0 = a \) and all the other coefficients chosen secretly at random, at \( n \) nonzero elements of \( A \). The threshold scheme was then generalised to ideal secret sharing schemes with different access structures, i.e. different sets of trusted parties. Brickell and Davenport have proved that the access structure must be the family of spanning sets of a matroid; also any linearly representable matroid is a valid access structure [15].
However, there exist matroids (such as the Vámos matroid [16]) which are not valid access structures. For a given access structure (or equivalently, matroid), finding the scheme is equivalent to a representation by partitions [17].

In this paper, we introduce a closure on digraphs, and define the closure solvability problem for any closure operator. This yields the following contributions.

- First of all, this framework encompasses network coding and ideal secret sharing. In particular, network coding solvability is equivalent to the solvability of the closure of a digraph associated to the network. This framework then allows us to think of network coding solvability on a higher, more abstract level. The problem, which used to be about coding functions, is now a simplified problem about partitions. The relations with matroids unveiled in [18], [19] are also clarified.

- This approach is particularly elegant, in different aspects. Firstly, the adjacency relations of the graph, and hence its topology of the network, are not visible in the closure. Therefore, the closure filters out some unnecessary information from the graph. Secondly, it is striking that all along the paper, most proofs will be elementary, including those of far-reaching results. Thirdly, this framework highlights the relationship with matroids, via natural concepts such as flats and spans, which are new to the author’s knowledge.

- Like the guessing game approach, the closure approach also gets rid of the source-intermediate node-destination hierarchy. Then the guessing graph machinery of [13] can be easily generalised to any closure operator. In other words, the interesting aspects of the guessing game approach can all be recast and generalised in our framework.

- This approach then yields interesting results. First, we determine bounds on the entropy of a solution, which are combinatorial in essence and directly follow from the closure operator. This provides tight constraints on the shape of solvable closures. Second, it was shown in [13] that the entropy of a digraph is equal to the sum of the entropies of its strongly connected components. Thus, one can split the solvability problem of a digraph into multiple ones, one for each strongly connected component [13]. In this paper, we extend this way of splitting the problem by considering the closures induced by the subgraphs. We can easily exhibit a strongly connected digraph whose closure is disconnected, i.e. which can still be split into two smaller parts. More specifically, if the graph is strongly connected but its closure is disconnected, then we can exhibit a set of vertices which are simply useless and can be disregarded for solvability. Third, we can prove that any digraph whose closure has rank two is solvable. This means that any multiple unicast with two source-receiver pairs is solvable, unless
there exists an easily spotted bottleneck in the network.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In Section II we review some useful background. In Section III we define the closure solvability problem. We then prove that network coding solvability is equivalent to the solvability of a closure in Section IV. We investigate the properties of closure operators and provide bounds on the entropy of any solution in Section V and investigate how to combine closure operators in Section VI. We then define the solvability graph in VII and determine a new way to split the solvability problem. Closures with rank two are finally studied in Section VIII.

II. Preliminaries

A. Closure operators

Throughout this paper, \( V \) is a set of \( n \) elements. A closure operator on \( V \) is a mapping \( \text{cl} : 2^V \rightarrow 2^V \) which satisfies the following properties [20, Chapter IV]. For any \( X, Y \subseteq V \),

1) \( X \subseteq \text{cl}(X) \) (extensive);
2) if \( X \subseteq Y \), then \( \text{cl}(X) \subseteq \text{cl}(Y) \) (isotone);
3) \( \text{cl}(\text{cl}(X)) = \text{cl}(X) \) (idempotent).

A closed set is a set equal to its closure. For instance, in a group one may define the closure of a set as the subgroup generated by the elements of the set; the family of closed sets is simply the family of all subgroups of the group. Another example is given by linear spaces, where the closure of a set of vectors is the subspace they span.

The closure satisfies the following properties. For any \( X, Y \subseteq V \),

1) \( \text{cl}(X) \) is equal to the intersection of all closed sets containing \( X \);
2) \( \text{cl}(\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)) = \text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y) \), i.e. the family of closed sets is closed under intersection;
3) \( \text{cl}(X \cup Y) = \text{cl}(\text{cl}(X) \cup \text{cl}(Y)) \).
4) \( X \subseteq \text{cl}(Y) \) if and only if \( \text{cl}(X) \subseteq \text{cl}(Y) \).

We refer to

\[
    r := \min\{|b| : \text{cl}(b) = V\}
\]

as the rank of the closure operator. Any set \( b \subseteq V \) of size \( r \) and whose closure is \( V \) is referred to as a basis of \( \text{cl} \).

An important class of closures are matroids [21], which satisfy the Saunders-Mac Lane axiom: if \( X \subseteq V \), \( v \in V \) and \( u \in \text{cl}(X \cup v) \setminus \text{cl}(X) \), then \( v \in \text{cl}(X \cup u) \). A special class consists of the uniform
matroids, typically denoted as $U_{r,n}$, where

$$U_{r,n}(X) = \begin{cases} V & \text{if } |X| \geq r \\ X & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $U_{r,n}$ has rank $r$.

B. Functions and their kernels

While network coding typically works with functions assigned to vertices, it is elegant to work with partitions. Recall that a partition of a set $B$ is a collection of subsets, called parts, which are pairwise disjoint and whose union is the whole of $B$. Any function $\tilde{f} : B \to C$ has a kernel denoted as $f := \{\tilde{f}^{-1}(c) : c \in \tilde{f}(B)\}$, defined by the partition of $B$ into pre-images under $\tilde{f}$. Conversely, any partition of $B$ in at most $|C|$ can be viewed as the kernel of some function from $B$ to $C$. Note that two functions $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g}$ have the same kernel if and only if $\tilde{f} = \pi \circ \tilde{g}$ for some permutation $\pi$ of $C$. Note that the kernel of any injective function $B \to C$ is the so-called equality partition $E_B$ of $B$ (i.e. the partition with $|B|$ parts). We denote the parts of a partition $f$ as $P_i(f)$ for all $i$.

If any part of $f$ is contained in a unique part of $g$, we say $f$ refines $g$. The equality partition refines any other partition, while the universal partition (the partition with one part) is refined by any other partition.

The common refinement of two partitions $f, g$ of $B$ is given by $h := f \vee g$ with parts

$$P_{i,j}(h) = \{P_i(f) \cap P_j(g) : P_i(f) \cap P_j(g) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We shall usually consider a tuple of $n$ partitions $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ assigned to elements of a finite set $V$ with $n$ elements. In that case, for any $X \subseteq V$, we denote the common refinement of all $f_v, v \in X$ as $f_X := \bigvee_{v \in X} f_v$. For any $S, T \subseteq V$ we then have $f_{S \cup T} = f_S \vee f_T$.

C. Digraphs

Throughout this paper, we shall only consider digraphs with no repeated arcs. We shall denote the arc set as $E(D)$, since the letter $A$ will be reserved for the alphabet. However, we do allow edges in both directions between two vertices, referred to as bidirectional edges (we shall abuse notations and identify a bidirectional edge with a corresponding undirected edge). In other words, the digraphs considered here are of the form $D = (V, E)$, where $E \subseteq V^2$. For any vertex $v$ of $D$, its in-neighborhood is $v^- = \{u \in V : (u, v) \in E(D)\}$ and its in-degree is the size of its in-neighborhood. By extension, we denote $X^- = \bigcup_{v \in X} v^-$ for any set of vertices $X$. We say that a digraph is strongly connected if there is a path from any vertex to any other vertex of the digraph.
The girth of a digraph is the minimum length of a cycle, where we consider a bidirectional edge as a cycle of length 2. A digraph is acyclic if it has no directed cycles. In this case, we can order the vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ so that $(v_i, v_j) \in E(D)$ only if $i < j$. The cardinality of a maximum induced acyclic subgraph of the digraph $D$ is denoted as $\text{mias}(D)$. A set of vertices $X$ is a feedback vertex set if and only if any directed cycle of $D$ intersects $X$, or equivalently if $V \setminus X$ induces an acyclic subgraph. The minimum size of a feedback vertex set of $D$ is then equal to $n - \text{mias}(D)$.

**Definition 1:** For any digraphs $D_1$ and $D_2$ with disjoint vertex sets $V_1$ and $V_2$, we denote the disjoint union, unidirectional union, and bidirectional union of $D_1$ and $D_2$ as the graphs on $V_1 \cup V_2$ and edge sets

\[
E(D_1 \cup D_2) = E(D_1) \cup E(D_2)
\]

\[
E(D_1 \uplus D_2) = E(D_1 \cup D_2) \cup \{(v_1, v_2) : v_1 \in V_1, v_2 \in V_2\}
\]

\[
E(D_1 \bar{\uplus} D_2) = E(D_1 \bar{\uplus} D_2) \cup \{(v_2, v_1) : v_1 \in V_1, v_2 \in V_2\}.
\]

In other words, the disjoint union simply places the two graphs next to each other; the unidirectional union adds all possible arcs from $D_1$ to $D_2$ only; the bidirectional union adds all possible arcs between $D_1$ and $D_2$.

**D. Guessing game and guessing number**

A configuration on a digraph $D$ over a finite alphabet $A$ is simply an $n$-tuple $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in A^n$. A protocol $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ on $D$ is a mapping between its configurations such that $f(x)$ is locally defined, i.e. $f_v(x) = f_v(x_{v-})$ for all $v$. The fixed configurations of $f$ are all the configurations $x \in A^n$ such that $f(x) = x$. The guessing number of $D$ is then defined as the logarithm of the maximum number of configurations fixed by a protocol of $D$:

$$g(D, A) = \max_f \left\{ \log_{|A|} |\text{Fix}(f)| \right\}.$$ 

We now review how to convert a multiple unicast problem in network coding to a guessing game. Note that any network coding instance can be converted into a multiple unicast without any loss of generality \[8\], \[9\]. We suppose that each sink requests an element from an alphabet $A$ from a corresponding source. This network coding instance is solvable over $A$ if all the demands of the sinks can be satisfied at the same time. We assume the network instance is given in its circuit representation, where each vertex represents a distinct coding function and hence the same message flows every edge coming out of the same vertex. This circuit representation has $r$ source nodes, $r$ sink nodes, and $m$ intermediate nodes.
By merging each source with its corresponding sink node into one vertex, we form the digraph $D$ on $n = r + m$ vertices. In general, we have $g(D, A) \leq r$ for all $A$ and the original network coding instance is solvable over $A$ if and only if $g(D, A) = r$ [9]. Note that the protocol on the digraph is equivalent to the coding and decoding functions on the original network.

For any digraphs $D_1, D_2$ on disjoint vertex sets, we have $g(D_1 \cup D_2, A) = g(D_1 \cap D_2, A) = g(D_1, A) + g(D_2, A)$ for all alphabets $A$. The guessing number of the bidirectional union is also bounded in [13].

We illustrate the conversion of a network coding instance to a guessing game for the famous butterfly network in Figure 1. It is well-known that the butterfly network is solvable over all alphabets, and conversely it was shown that the clique $K_3$ has guessing number 2 over any alphabet. The combinations and decoding operations on the network are equivalent to the protocol on the digraph. For instance, if $v_3$ transmits the opposite of the sum of the two incoming messages modulo $|A|$ on the network, the corresponding protocol lets all nodes guess minus the sum modulo $|A|$ of their incoming elements.

E. Parameters of undirected graphs

An independent set in a (simple, undirected) graph is a set of vertices where any two vertices are non-adjacent. The independence number $\alpha(G)$ of an undirected graph $G$ is the maximum cardinality of an independent set. We also denote the maximum degree and the clique and chromatic numbers of an undirected graph $G$ as $\Delta(G)$, $\omega(G)$, $\chi(G)$, respectively (see [23] for definitions of these parameters). For a connected vertex-transitive graph which is neither an odd cycle nor a complete graph, we have [23] Corollary 7.5.2]

$$\omega(G) \leq \frac{|V(G)|}{\alpha(G)} \leq \chi(G) \leq \Delta(G).$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)
The chromatic number and the independence number of a vertex-transitive graph are related by \( \chi(G) \leq (1 + \log \alpha(G)) \frac{|V(G)|}{\alpha(G)} \).

We now review three types of products of graphs; all products of two graphs \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) have \( V(G_1) \times V(G_2) \) as vertex set. We denote two adjacent vertices \( u \) and \( v \) in a graph as \( u \sim v \).

- First, in the co-normal product \( G_1 \oplus G_2 \), we have \( (u_1, u_2) \sim (v_1, v_2) \) if and only if \( u_1 \sim v_1 \) or \( u_2 \sim v_2 \). We have
  \[ \alpha(G_1 \oplus G_2) = \alpha(G_1)\alpha(G_2). \]

- Second, in the lexicographic product (also called composition) \( G_1 \cdot G_2 \), we have \( (u_1, u_2) \sim (v_1, v_2) \) if and only if either \( u_1 = v_1 \) and \( u_2 \sim v_2 \), or \( u_1 \sim v_1 \). Although this product is not commutative, we have
  \[ \alpha(G_1 \cdot G_2) = \alpha(G_1)\alpha(G_2). \]

- Third, in the cartesian product \( G_1 \square G_2 \), we have \( (u_1, u_2) \sim (v_1, v_2) \) if and only if either \( u_1 = v_1 \) and \( u_2 \sim v_2 \), or \( u_2 = v_2 \) and \( u_1 \sim v_1 \). We have
  \[ \chi(G_1 \square G_2) = \max\{\chi(G_1), \chi(G_2)\}, \]
  \[ \alpha(G_1 \square G_2) \leq \min\{\alpha(G_1)|V(G_2)|, \alpha(G_2)|V(G_1)|\}. \]

III. CODING FUNCTIONS AND SOLVABILITY

A. Coding functions

**Definition 2:** Let \( V \) be a finite set of \( n \) elements, \( a \) be a transformation of \( 2^V \), and \( A, B \) be finite sets (\( A \) is referred to as the alphabet, \( |A| \geq 2 \)). A **coding function** for \( (a, A, B) \) is a tuple \( f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n) \) of \( n \) partitions of \( B \), where each partition is in at most \( |A| \) parts, such that \( f_a(X) = f_X \) for all \( X \subseteq V \).

The term coding function comes from the fact that \( f_i \) should be viewed as the kernel of a function \( B \to A \) for all \( i \). We shall typically view \( B \) as a cartesian product of several copies of the alphabet \( A \), but we do not need this restriction yet.

We say that two transformations \( a \) and \( a' \) of \( 2^V \) are equivalent if the following holds. Any tuple of partitions \( f \) is a coding function of \( a \) if and only if it is a coding function for \( a' \).

**Theorem 1:** Let \( a \) be a transformation of \( 2^V \), then there exists a closure operator on \( V \) which is equivalent to \( a \).
**Proof:** We take three steps. First, construct the digraph on $2^V$ with arcs $(Y, a(Y))$ for all $Y \subseteq V$. For any $X \subseteq V$, denote the connected component containing $X$ as $C(X)$. Then we claim that $b(X) := \bigcup_{Y \in C(X)} Y$ is equivalent to $a$ (note that $b$ is extensive). Indeed, if $f$ is a coding function for $a$, then $f_X = f_a(X)$ and by induction it is easy to show that for any $Y \in C(X)$, $f_Y = f_X$. Using the properties described above, we obtain that $f_{b(X)} = f_X$. Conversely, we have $b(X) = b(a(X))$ and hence if $f$ is a coding function for $b$, then $f_X = f_{b(X)} = f_{a(X)}$ for all $X$.

We now claim that $c(X) = \bigcup_{Y \subseteq X} b(Y)$ is equivalent to $b$ (note that $c$ is extensive and isotone). Indeed, if $f$ is a coding function for $b$ and $Y \subseteq X$, then $f_X$ refines $f_Y = f_{b(Y)}$. By the properties above, we obtain that $f_X$ refines $f_{c(X)}$; the converse is immediate and thus $f_X = f_{c(X)}$. Conversely, if $f$ is a coding function for $c$, then $f_X = f_{c(X)}$ refines $f_{b(X)}$ and hence is equal to $f_{b(X)}$ for all $X$.

Finally, we claim that $\text{cl}(X) = c^n(Y)$ is equivalent to $c$ (remark that $\text{cl}$ is a closure). Indeed, if $f$ is a coding function for $c$, then $f_X = f_{c(X)} = \ldots = f_{c^n(X)}$. Conversely, $f_X = f_{\text{cl}(X)}$ refines $f_{c(X)}$. \hfill $\blacksquare$

**B. Closure solvability**

For the case of closure operators, we can restrict ourselves to the case where $B = A^r$, where $r$ is the rank of the closure operator. Indeed, if there exists a coding function $f$ of partitions of $B$, where $f_V$ has $k$ parts, then for any $C$ of size $k$ there exists a coding function $g$ of partitions of $C$ with $g_V = E_C$. Note that for any coding function $f$ and any basis $b$, $f_b = f_V$ and hence $f_V$ has at most $|A|^r$ parts. Therefore, we are only interested in coding functions defined on $B = A^r$. We then say that a coding function is a solution if $f_V$ is the equality partition: $f_V = E_{A^r}$.

We now define the closure solvability problem. The instance is the ordered pair $(\text{cl}, A)$, where $\text{cl}$ a closure operator on $V$ with rank $r$, and $A$ a finite alphabet with $|A| \geq 2$. The problem is to determine whether there exists an $n$-tuple $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ of partitions of $A^r$ in at most $|A|$ parts such that

$$f_X = f_{\text{cl}(X)} \quad \text{for all } X \subseteq V,$$

$$f_V = E_{A^r}.$$

For any partition $g$ of $A^r$, we define its entropy as

$$H(g) := -r + |A|^{-r} \sum_i |P_i(g)| \log_{|A|} |P_i(g)|.$$

This corresponds to the case where the input of the function is uniformly distributed. The equality partition on $A^r$ is the only partition with full entropy $r$. Denoting $H_f(X) := H(f_X)$, we can recast the conditions
above as

\[ H_f(X) = H_f(\text{cl}(X)) \quad \text{for all } X \subseteq V, \]
\[ H_f(V) = r. \]

We denote the maximum entropy of a coding function for \( \text{cl} \) over \( A \) as \( H(\text{cl}, A) \). Therefore, \( \text{cl} \) is solvable over \( A \) if and only if \( H(\text{cl}, A) = r \).

If \( \text{cl} \) is a matroid, the solvability problem is equivalent to determining whether they form a secret-sharing matroid, i.e., whether there exists a scheme whose access structure is the family of spanning sets of that matroid. We shall prove this in a more general setting in Section \textsection \ref{sec:simplifications}; however let us give an informal proof here. Let \( f \) be a solution for a matroid \( \text{cl}_M \). Let \( \text{rk}_M \) be the rank function associated to \( \text{cl}_M \), i.e. \( \text{rk}_M(X) = \min\{|b| : \text{cl}_M(b) = \text{cl}_M(X)\} \). Then for any \( X \), we have \( H_f(X) \leq \text{rk}_M(X) \). Moreover, there exists \( Y \) such that \( \text{cl}_M(X \cup Y) = V \) and \( \text{rk}_M(Y) + \text{rk}_M(X) = r \), then \( H_f(X) \geq H_f(V) - H_f(Y) \geq \text{rk}_M(X) \). Thus, \( H_f(X) = \text{rk}_M(X) \) for all \( X \).

In particular, a solution for the uniform matroid \( U_{r,n} \) forms an \( (n, r, n - r + 1) \) \(|A|\)-ary MDS code. A solution for \( U_{2,n} \) is then equivalent to \( n - 2 \) mutually orthogonal latin squares; it exists for all sufficient large alphabets. This illustrates the complexity of this problem: representing \( U_{2,4} \) (i.e., determining the possible orders for two mutually orthogonal latin squares) was wrongly conjectured by Euler and solved in 1960 \cite{Euler}.

Combinatorial representations \cite{Combinatorial} were recently introduced in order to capture some of the dependency relations amongst functions. A solution for the uniform matroid corresponds to a combinatorial representation of its family of bases; however, in general this is not true. Indeed, any family of bases has a combinatorial representation, while we shall exhibit closure operators which are not solvable.

\textbf{C. Simplifications}

So far, we consider any possible closure operator. The purpose of this section is to reduce the scope of our study by generalising some concepts arising from matroid theory. A vertex is a \textit{loop} if it belongs to the closure of the empty set. We say that two vertices \( u, v \) are \textit{parallel} if \( \text{cl}(u) = \text{cl}(v) \); clearly parallelism is an equivalence relation. We say that \( \text{cl} \) is simple if it has no loops and no parallel vertices. Any closure \( \text{cl} \) can be converted to a simple closure operator \( \text{cl}^* \) by removing loops and only considering one element per parallel class. Lemma \cite{Lemma1} below, whose proof is straightforward, shows that we only need to consider simple closures.

\textit{Lemma 1:} \( \text{cl} \) and \( \text{cl}^* \) have the same rank and are solvable over the same alphabets.
There is a natural partial order on the family of closure operators of \( V \). We denote \( cl_1 \leq cl_2 \) if for all \( X \), \( cl_1(X) \subseteq cl_2(X) \). This is a partial order, with maximum element \( U_{0,n} \) (with \( cl(\emptyset) = V \)) and minimum element \( U_{n,n} \) (where \( cl(X) = X \) for all \( X \)). We have \( cl_1 \leq cl_2 \) if and only if the family of \( cl_1 \)-closed sets contains the family of \( cl_2 \)-closed sets.

Any tuple \( f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n) \) of partitions of \( A^r \) into at most \( |A| \) parts naturally yields a closure operator on \( V \): we define

\[
cl_f(X) := \{v \in V : f_{X \cup v} = f_X\} = \{v \in V : H_f(X \cup v) = H_f(X)\}.
\]

**Proposition 1:** \( f \) is a coding function for \( cl \) if and only if \( cl \leq cl_f \). Therefore, if \( cl_1 \leq cl_2 \) have the same rank and \( cl_2 \) is solvable over \( A \), then \( cl_1 \) is solvable over \( A \).

**Proof:** If \( f \) is a coding function for \( cl \), then \( f_{cl(X)} = f_{X \cup v} = f_X \) for all \( v \in cl(X) \) and hence \( cl \leq cl_f \). Conversely, if \( cl(X) \subseteq cl_f(X) \), then denote \( cl(X) = \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\} \) and \( f_{cl(X)} = f_{X \cup v_1 \cup \cdots \cup v_k} = f_X \cup f_{v_1} \cup \cdots \cup f_{v_k} \).

Since \( cl_2 \) is solvable, there exists a coding function \( f \) for \( cl_2 \) with entropy \( r \), where \( r \) is the rank of \( cl_1 \) and \( cl_2 \). But then \( cl_1 \leq cl_2 \leq cl_f \) and hence \( f \) is also a solution for \( cl_1 \).

Any closure \( c \) having \( B \) as family of bases satisfies \( cl_B \leq c \), where

\[
cl_B(X) = \begin{cases} V & \text{if } \exists b \in B : b \subseteq X \\ X & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\]

Since \( cl_B \leq U_{r,n} \), the uniform matroid with the same rank, \( cl_B \) is solvable. More generally, any closure operator of rank \( r \) satisfying \( cl(X) = X \) for any \( X \) with cardinality at most \( r - 1 \) is solvable.

**IV. Closure in digraphs and network coding**

**A. Definition and basic properties**

Let \( D \) be a digraph on \( V \).

**Definition 3:** The \( D \)-closure of a set of vertices \( X \) is defined as follows. We let \( c_D(X) = X \cup \{v \in V : v^- \subseteq X\} \) and the \( D \)-closure of \( X \) is \( cl_D(X) := c_D^n(X) \).

This definition can be intuitively explained as follows. Suppose we assign a function to each vertex of \( D \), which only depends on its in-neighbourhood (the function which decides which message the vertex will transmit). If we know the messages sent by the vertices of \( X \), we also know the messages which
will be sent by any vertex in \(c_D(X)\). By applying this iteratively, we can determine all messages sent by the vertices in \(c_D(X)\).

We give an alternate definition of the closure below.

**Lemma 2:** For any \(X \subseteq V\), \(Y = c_D(X) \setminus X\) is the largest set of vertices inducing an acyclic subgraph such that \(Y^+ \subseteq Y \cup X\).

**Proof:** First, it is clear that \(Y\) is a set of vertices inducing an acyclic subgraph such that \(Y^+ \subseteq Y \cup X\). Conversely, suppose \(Z\) induces an acyclic subgraph and \(Z^+ \subseteq Z \cup X\). Denoting \(Z_0 = \emptyset\) and \(Z_i = \{v \in Z : v^- \subseteq X \cup Z_{i-1}\}\) for \(1 \leq i \leq n\), we have \(Z_i \subseteq c_D(X) \setminus X\) and hence \(Z = Z_n \subseteq Y\).

**Example 1:** Some special classes of digraphs yield famous closure operators.

1) If \(D\) is an acyclic digraph, then \(c_D = U_{0,n}\), i.e. \(c_D(\emptyset) = V\). This immediately follows from Lemma 2.

2) If \(D\) is the directed cycle \(C_n\), then \(c_{C_n} = U_{1,n}\). Therefore, the solutions are \((n,1,n)\) MDS codes, such as the repetition code.

3) If \(D\) is the clique \(K_n\), then \(c_{K_n} = U_{n-1,n}\). Therefore, the solutions of \(c_{K_n}\) are exactly \((n,n-1,2)\) MDS codes, such as the single parity-check code.

4) If \(D\) has a loop on each vertex, then \(c_D = U_{n,n}\).

Since \(c_D(X) = V\) if and only if \(X\) is a feedback vertex set of \(D\), we obtain that \(c_D\) has rank \(r_D = n - \text{mis}(D)\). We remark that not all closures can arise from digraphs.

**Lemma 3:** The uniform matroid \(U_{r,n}\) is the closure of a digraph if and only if \(r \in \{0,1,n-1,n\}\).

**Proof:** The cases \(r = 0,1,n-1,n\) respectively have been illustrated in Example 1. Conversely, suppose a digraph has closure \(U_{r,n}\), where \(2 \leq r \leq n-2\). Then any set of \(n-r\) vertices induces an acyclic subgraph, while any set of \(n-r+1\) vertices induces a cycle. This implies that any set of \(n-r\) vertices induces a (directed) path. Without loss, let \(v_1, \ldots, v_{n-r}\) induce a path (in that order), then \(v_1, \ldots, v_{n-r}, v_{n-r+1}\) induce a cycle, and so do \(v_1, \ldots, v_{n-r}, v_{n-r+2}\). Therefore, in the subgraph induced by \(v_2, \ldots, v_{n-r+2}\), the vertex \(v_{n-r}\) has out-degree 2 and hence that graph is not a cycle.

**B. Equivalence of closure solvability and network coding solvability**

We consider a multiple unicast instance: an acyclic network \(N\) with \(r\) sources \(s_1, \ldots, s_r\), \(r\) destinations \(d_1, \ldots, d_r\), and \(m\) intermediate nodes, where each destination \(d_i\) requests the message \(x_i\) sent by \(s_i\). We assume that the messages \(x_i\), along with everything carried on one link, is an element of an alphabet \(A\). Also, any vertex transmits the same message on all its outgoing links. We denote the cumulative coding...
functions at the nodes as $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$, where the first $r$ indeces correspond to the destinations and the other $m$ indeces to the intermediate nodes, and $n = r + m$.

We remark that if the destination $d_i$ is able to recover $x_i$ from the messages it receives, it is also able to recover any function $\sigma(x_i)$ of that message. Conversely, if it can recover $\pi(x_i)$ for some permutation $\pi$ of $A$, then it can recover $x_i = \pi^{-1}(\pi(x_i))$ as well. We can then relax the condition and let $d_i$ request any such $\pi(x_i)$. Viewing $x_i$ as a function from $A^r$ to $A$, sending $(x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ to $x_i$, we remark that $\pi(x_i)$ has the same kernel as $x_i$ for any permutation $\pi$. Therefore, the correct relaxation is for $d_i$ to request that the partition assigned to it be the same as that of the source $s_i$.

The relaxation above is one argument to consider partitions instead of functions. The second main argument is that the dependency relations are completely (and elegantly) expressed in terms of partitions, as illustrated in the proof of Theorem 2 below.

We now convert the network coding solvability problem into a closure solvability problem. Recall the digraph $D$ on $n$ vertices corresponding to the guessing game, reviewed in Section III.

Theorem 2: $f$ is a solution to the network coding instance if and only if $\text{cl}_D$ has rank $r$ and $f$ is a solution to $\text{cl}_D$.

Proof: Let us temporarily extend $f$ to the sources as well. There are only three constraints for the coding functions: $f_v$ refines $f_v^-$ for any $v$; $f_{s_i} = f_{d_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r$; and $f_S = E_{A^r}$ for $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_r\}$. The second condition indeed implies that we only need to consider $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$, while the third one is equivalent to $f_V = E_{A^r}$, where $V$ correspond to the sources and intermediate nodes.

First, remark that the first constraint equivalent to $f_{v^-} \cup v = f_{v^-}$ for all $v \in D$. It is then easy to show that this is equivalent to $f$ being a coding function for $c_D$. Applying $c_D$ iteratively, (just like in the proof of Theorem 1) we obtain that this is equivalent to $f$ being a coding function of $\text{cl}_D$.

Note that $\text{cl}_D$ has rank $r$ if and only if the original source-receiver pairs form a basis of $D$. Therefore, the third constraint is then equivalent to $\text{cl}_D$ having rank $r$ and $f$ being a solution for it.

We remark that the closure approach differs from Riis’s guessing game approach. Although it also gets rid of the source/intermediate node/receiver hierarchy and works on the same digraph, the distinction is in the fact that now $f$ corresponds to the cumulated coding functions.

V. PROPERTIES OF CLOSURE OPERATORS

In this section, we investigate the properties of closure operators in general and we derive bounds on the entropy of their coding functions.
A. Inner and outer Ranks

First of all, we are interested in upper bounds on the entropy of coding functions.

**Definition 4:** The inner rank and outer rank of a subset $X$ of vertices are respectively given by

$$\text{ir}(X) := \min\{|b| : \text{cl}(X) = \text{cl}(b)\}$$

$$\text{or}(X) := \min\{|b| : X \subseteq \text{cl}(b)\} = \min\{|b| : \text{cl}(X) \subseteq \text{cl}(b)\}.$$ 

Although the notations should reflect which closure operator is used in order to be rigorous, we shall usually omit this dependence for the sake of clarity. Instead, if the closure operator is “decorated” by subscripts or superscripts, then the corresponding parameters will be decorated in the same fashion.

A set $i$ with $|i| = \text{ir}(X)$ and $\text{cl}(i) = \text{cl}(X)$ is called an inner basis of $X$; similarly a set $o$ with $|o| = \text{or}(X)$ and $\text{cl}(X) \subseteq \text{cl}(o)$ is called an outer basis of $X$.

The following properties are an easy exercise.

**Proposition 2:** For any $X, Y \subseteq V$,

1) $\text{or}(\text{cl}(X)) = \text{or}(X)$ and $\text{ir}(\text{cl}(X)) = \text{ir}(X)$;

2) $\text{or}(X) \leq \text{ir}(X) \leq |X|$;

3) $\text{or}(X \cup Y) \leq \text{or}(X) + \text{or}(Y)$ and $\text{ir}(X \cup Y) \leq \text{ir}(X) + \text{ir}(Y)$;

4) $\text{or}(\emptyset) = \text{ir}(\emptyset) = 0$ and $\text{or}(V) = \text{ir}(V) = r$;

5) if $X \subseteq Y$, then $\text{or}(X) \leq \text{or}(Y)$.

The closure of the empty set is the only closed set of (inner and outer) rank 0, while $V$ is not necessarily the unique closed set of (inner or outer) rank $r$.

Note that the inner rank is not monotonous, as seen in the example in Figure [Fig. 2](#). We have $\text{cl}(4) = V$ and hence $\text{ir}(V) = 1$, while $\text{ir}(123) = 2$.

If $\text{cl}_1(X) \subseteq \text{cl}_2(X)$ for some $X$, then $\text{or}_1(X) \geq \text{or}_2(X)$. Indeed, any outer basis of $X$ with respect to $\text{cl}_1$ is also an outer basis of $X$ with respect to $\text{cl}_2$. In particular, if $\text{cl}_1 \subseteq \text{cl}_2$, then $\text{or}_1(X) \geq \text{or}_2(X)$.
for all $X$.

**Lemma 4:** Let $G: 2^V \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $0 \leq G(X) \leq |X|$ and $G(\text{cl}(X)) = G(X)$. Then $G(X) \leq \text{ir}(X)$ for all $X$. Also, if $X \subseteq Y$ implies $G(X) \leq G(Y)$, then $G(X) \leq \text{or}(X)$ for all $X$.

**Proof:** First, if $i$ is an inner basis of $X$, then $G(X) = G(\text{cl}(i)) = G(i) \leq |i| = \text{ir}(X)$. Second, if $o$ is an outer basis of $X$, $G(X) \leq G(\text{cl}(o)) = G(o) \leq |o| = \text{or}(X)$.

This Lemma proves that we get subadditivity for free. Since the entropy satisfies all the conditions of Lemma 4, we obtain an upper bound on the entropy.

**Corollary 1:** For any coding function $f$ and any $X \subseteq V$, $H_f(X) \leq \text{or}(X)$.

**B. Flats and span**

Before we move on to lower bounds on the entropy, we define two fundamental concepts.

**Definition 5:** A flat is a subset $F$ of vertices for which there is no $X \supset F$ with $\text{or}(X) = \text{or}(F)$.

$	ext{cl}(\emptyset)$ is the only flat with rank 0, and $V$ is the only flat with rank $r$.

**Proposition 3:** Flats satisfy the following properties.

1) Any flat $F$ is a closed set;
2) $\text{or}(F) = \text{ir}(F)$;
3) for any $X$, there exists a flat $F \supseteq X$ with $\text{or}(F) = \text{or}(X)$.

**Proof:**

1. Since $\text{cl}(F)$ contains $F$ while having the same rank as $F$, it cannot properly contain $F$.
2. Let $o$ be an outer basis of $F$. Since $F \subseteq \text{cl}(o)$ while $\text{or}(F) = \text{or}(\text{cl}(o))$, we obtain $F = \text{cl}(o)$ and $o$ is an inner basis of $F$.
3. For any $X$, let $C$ be a set with rank $\text{or}(X)$ and containing $X$ of largest cardinality, then there exists no $G$ such that $C \subset G$ and $\text{or}(G) = \text{or}(X) = \text{or}(C)$.

It is worth noting that there are closed sets which are not flats. For example, consider the following closure operator on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, where $\text{cl}(X) = \{1, \ldots, \max(X)\}$. Then it has rank 1 and hence two flats (the empty set and $V$), while it has $n$ closed sets ($\text{cl}(i)$ for all $i$). We shall clarify the relationship between closed sets and flats below.

**Definition 6:** For any $X \subseteq V$, the union of all flats containing $X$ with outer rank equal to that of $X$ is referred to as the span of $X$, i.e.

$$\text{span}(X) := \bigcup\{F : F \text{ flat}, X \subseteq F, \text{or}(F) = \text{or}(X)\}.$$ 

**Proposition 4:** For any $X$,

1) $\text{cl}(X) \subseteq \text{span}(X)$ with equality if and only if $\text{cl}(X)$ is a flat;
2) \( \text{span}(\text{cl}(X)) = \text{span}(X) \);
3) \( \text{span}(X) := \{ v \in V : \text{or}(X \cup v) = \text{or}(X) \} \).

Proof: The first two properties follow directly from the definition. Suppose \( v \in F \), a flat containing \( X \) with \( \text{or}(F) = \text{or}(X) \), then \( \text{or}(X \cup v) \leq \text{or}(F) = \text{or}(X) \). Conversely, if \( \text{or}(X \cup w) = \text{or}(X) \), then \( X \cup w \) is contained in a flat with the same outer rank as \( X \), and hence in \( \text{span}(X) \).

The flats and spans are fundamental concepts for closure operators, as illustrated by the surprising result below.

Theorem 3: The following are equivalent:
1) \( \text{cl} \) is a matroid;
2) all closed sets are flats;
3) all closed sets are spans.

Proof: The first property clearly implies the third one. Let us now prove that the second property implies the first one. Let \( X \subseteq V, v \in V \) and \( u \in \text{cl}(X \cup v) \setminus \text{cl}(X) \), then \( \text{or}(X \cup u) = \text{or}(X) + 1 = \text{or}(X \cup v) \), and hence \( \text{cl}(X \cup u) = \text{cl}(X \cup v) \). Thus, \( \text{cl} \) satisfies the Saunders-Mac Lane exchange axiom.

We now prove that the third property implies the second. Suppose all closed sets are spans, and consider a minimal closed set \( c \) of outer rank 1, i.e. \( \text{or}(c) = 1 \) and \( \text{or}(c') = 0 \) for any closed set \( c' \subset c \). Since \( \text{span}(\emptyset) = \text{cl}(\emptyset) \), we must have \( c = \text{span}(c) \) and hence \( c \) is a flat. There can be no closed set of outer rank 1 properly containing \( c \), therefore all closed sets of outer rank 1 are flats. Now consider any minimal closed set \( c_2 \) of outer rank 2. It is equal to the span of some closed set \( X \); then \( \text{or}(X) = 2 \), by what we have previously shown, and hence \( X = c_2 \) and \( c_2 \) is again a flat. By induction on the outer rank, we prove that all closed sets are indeed flats.

We would like to explain the significance of flats in matroids for random network coding. A model for noncoherent random network coding based on matroids is proposed in [27], which generalises routing (a special case for the uniform matroid), linear network coding (the projective geometry) and affine network coding (the affine geometry). In order to combine the messages they receive, the intermediate nodes select a random element from the closure of the received messages. The model is based on matroids because all closed sets are flats, hence a new message is either in the closure of all the previously received messages (and is not informative), or it increases the outer rank (and is fully informative).

There are solvable closures which are not matroids, e.g. the undirected graph \( \bar{C}_4 \) displayed in Figure 3. It is solvable because it has rank 2 and contains \( K_2 \cup K_2 \). In that case, note that the outer rank is submodular, and hence \( \text{span}_{\bar{C}_4} = U_{2,4} \) is a matroid; however, \( \text{cl}_{\bar{C}_4} \) is not a matroid itself.
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Fig. 3. The graph $C_4$ whose closure is solvable but not a matroid.

C. Upper and lower ranks

We are now interested in lower bounds on the entropy of coding functions. Since any closure operator has a trivial coding function with entropy zero (where the universal partition is placed on every vertex), the entropy of any coding function cannot be bounded below. Therefore, most of our bounds will apply to solutions only.

Definition 7: The lower rank and upper rank of $X$ are respectively defined as

$$\text{lr}(X) := \min \{|Y| : \text{cl}(Y \cup (V \setminus X)) = V\},$$

$$\text{ur}(X) := r - \text{lr}(V \setminus X).$$

A few elementary properties of the lower and upper ranks are listed below.

Lemma 5: The following hold:

1) $\text{lr}(V) = \text{ur}(V) = r$ and $\text{lr}(\emptyset) = \text{ur}(\emptyset) = 0$.

2) For any $X \subseteq V$, $\text{lr}(X) = 0$ if and only if $\text{cl}(V \setminus X) = V$. Hence $\text{ur}(X) = r$ if and only if $\text{cl}(X) = V$.

3) For any $X \subseteq V$,

$$\text{ur}(X) = r - \min \{\text{or}(Y) : \text{cl}(X \cup Y) = V \}$$

$$= r - \min \{\text{or}(F) : F \text{ flat and } \text{cl}(X \cup F) = V \};$$

4) $\text{ur}(X) = \text{ur}(\text{cl}(X))$ and $\text{lr}(X) = \text{lr}(\text{cl}(X))$;

5) If $X \subseteq Z$, then $\text{ur}(X) \leq \text{ur}(Z)$ and $\text{lr}(X) \leq \text{lr}(Z)$.

6) $\text{lr}(X) \leq \text{ur}(X) \leq \text{or}(X)$.

Proof: All properties, except the last one, are easily proved. The inequality $\text{ur}(X) \leq \text{or}(X)$ follows from the subadditivity of the outer rank. To prove that $\text{lr}(X) \leq \text{ur}(X)$, let $b$ be a basis for $\text{cl}$. Then

$$V = \text{cl}(b) = \text{cl}\{(b \cap X) \cup (b \cap (V \setminus X))\} \subseteq \text{cl}\{(b \cap X) \cup (V \setminus X)\},$$
and hence \( \text{cl} \{(b \cap X) \cup (V\setminus X)\} = V \), thus \(|b \cap X| \geq \text{lr}(X)\). Similarly, \(|b \cap (V\setminus X)| \geq \text{lr}(V\setminus X)\), and hence \( |b| \geq \text{lr}(X) + \text{lr}(V\setminus X)\).

We remark that for any solution \( f \), we have \( r = H_f(V) \leq \text{or}(X) + \text{or}(Y) \) for any \( X, Y \) such that \( \text{cl}(X \cup Y) = V \). Therefore, we obtain

\[
H_f(X) \geq \text{ur}(X)
\]

for all \( X \subseteq V \).

**Corollary 2:** For any solution \( f \) of \( \text{cl} \) and any \( X \subseteq V \),

\[
r_f - H_f(V\setminus X) - r_f - \text{ur}(V\setminus X) = \text{lr}(X) \leq r_f - \text{lr}(V\setminus X) = \text{ur}(X) \leq H_f(X) \leq \text{or}(X).
\]

Note that a trivial lower bound on \( H_f(X) \) (where \( f \) is a solution) is given by \( r_f - H_f(V\setminus X) \). Therefore, the intermediate bounds on \( H_f(X) \) in Corollary 2 refine this trivial bound.

Some of the results above can be generalised for any coding function \( f \): denoting

\[
\text{lr}_f(X) = \min\{H_f(Y) : \text{cl}(Y \cup (V\setminus X)) = V\},
\]

\[
\text{ur}_f(X) = H_f(V) - \text{lr}_f(V\setminus X),
\]

we obtain

\[
H_f(V) - H_f(V\setminus X) \leq H_f(V) - \text{ur}_f(V\setminus X) = \text{lr}_f(X) \leq H_f(V) - \text{lr}_f(V\setminus X) = \text{ur}_f(X) \leq H_f(X) \leq \text{or}(X).
\]

**D. Inner and outer complemented sets**

**Definition 8:** We say a set \( X \) is **outer complemented** if \( \text{or}(X) = \text{ur}(X) \). Moreover, we say it is **inner complemented** if \( \text{ir}(X) = \text{or}(X) \).

Therefore, if \( X \) is outer complemented, then \( H_f(X) = \text{or}(X) = \text{ur}(X) \) for any solution \( f \).

Remark that \( X \) is outer (inner) complemented if and only if \( \text{cl}(X) \) is outer (inner) complemented.

**Proposition 5:** The following are equivalent:

1) \( X \) is outer complemented;
2) there exists \( Z \) such that \( \text{or}(X) + \text{or}(Z) = r, \text{cl}(X \cup Z) = V \) and \( X \cap Z = \emptyset \);
3) any outer basis of \( X \) is contained in a basis of \( V \).

Similar results hold for inner complemented sets. The following are equivalent:

1) \( X \) is inner complemented;
2) \( X \) is outer complemented and \( \text{ir}(X) = \text{or}(X) \);
3) any inner basis of \( X \) is contained in a basis of \( V \).
Fig. 4. The graph $\bar{C}_5$ whose closure is outer complemented and not solvable.

**Proof:** The equivalence of the first two properties is easily shown. If $X$ is outer complemented, let $o$ be an outer basis of $X$ and let $Z$ satisfy $\text{cl}(X \cup Z) = V$ and $|Z| = r - \text{or}(X)$. Then $o \cup Z$ is a basis of $V$. Conversely, if any outer basis can be extended to a basis, then any such extension is a valid $Z$ for Property 2.

The properties for an inner complemented set are easy to prove.

We saw earlier that $\text{cl}(X) \subseteq \text{cl}_f(X)$ for any coding function $f$ and any $X$. This can be refined when $f$ is a solution and $X$ is outer complemented.

**Proposition 6:** If $f$ is a solution of $\text{cl}$ then $\text{cl}(\text{span}(X)) \subseteq \text{cl}_f(X)$ for any outer complemented $X$.

**Proof:** For any outer complemented $X$, we have $H_f(X) = \text{or}(X)$. Suppose $v \in \text{span}(X)$, then $\text{or}(X) = \text{or}(X \cup v) \geq H_f(X \cup v) \geq H_f(X) = \text{or}(X)$ and hence $v \in \text{cl}_f(X)$. Since $\text{cl}_f(X)$ is a closed set of $\text{cl}$, we easily obtain that $\text{cl}(\text{span}(X)) \subseteq \text{cl}_f(X)$.

**Corollary 3:** If there exists an outer complemented set $X$ such that its span has higher outer rank and is also outer complemented, then $\text{cl}$ is not solvable over any alphabet.

By extension, we say that $\text{cl}$ is outer complemented if all sets are outer complemented.

**Theorem 4:** Suppose that $\text{cl}$ has rank $r$ and is outer complemented. Then $\text{cl}$ is solvable if and only if $\text{span}$ is a solvable matroid with rank $r$.

**Proof:** If all sets are outer complemented, then any solution $f$ of $\text{cl}$ is also a coding function of $\text{span}$ since $\text{span}(X) = \{v \in V : H_f(X \cup v) = H_f(X)\}$. Since the outer rank is equal to the entropy $H_f$, it is submodular and hence $\text{span}$ is a matroid whose rank function is given by the outer rank. Thus $\text{span}$ has rank $r$ and $f$ is a solution for it.

Conversely, if $\text{span}$ is a solvable matroid with rank $r$, then we have $\text{cl} \leq \text{span}$ and by Lemma 1 $\text{cl}$ is solvable.
For instance, for the undirected cycle $\tilde{C}_5$ in Figure 4, $\text{cl}\tilde{C}_5$ is outer complemented, though the outer rank is not submodular, hence $\text{span}$ is not a matroid. As such, $\tilde{C}_5$ is not solvable (its entropy is actually 2.5 [9]).

We would like to emphasize that if all sets are outer complemented, then the outer rank must be submodular, i.e. the rank function of a matroid. However, this does not imply that $\text{cl}$ should be a matroid itself. For instance, consider $\text{cl}$ defined on $\{1,2,3\}$ as follows: $\text{cl}(1) = 12$, $\text{cl}(2) = 2$, $\text{cl}(3) = 3$, $\text{cl}(13) = \text{cl}(23) = 123$. Then any set is inner complemented, $\text{cl}$ is solvable (by letting $f_1 = f_2$ and $f_3$ such that $f_1 \lor f_3 = E_{A^2}$) but $\text{cl}$ is not a matroid.

E. Subcomplemented sets

We now refine some of these results by using submodularity. The results in this subsection are not as elegant as those given earlier. Therefore, we shall not try to refine them any further by using more (linear or nonlinear) information inequalities.

Definition 9: The alpha rank of $X$ is defined as follows. Let $\alpha_0(X) = \text{or}(X)$ and recursively

$$\alpha_i(X) = \min\{\alpha_{i-1}(S) + \alpha_{i-1}(T) - r : \text{cl}(S \cup T) = V, \text{cl}(S \cap T) = \text{cl}(X)\}.$$ 

Finally, let $\alpha(X) = \alpha_{r2^n}(X)$.

The beta rank of $X$ is defined as follows. Let $\beta_0(X) = 0$ and for any $1 \leq i \leq r2^n$, let

$$\beta_i(X) = \max\{r - \alpha(Y) + \beta_{i-1}(X \cap Y) : \text{cl}(X \cup Y) = V\}.$$ 

Finally, denote $\beta(X) := \beta_{r2^n}(X)$.

The $\alpha_i$s form a sequence of upper bounds on the entropy $H_f(X)$, when $f$ is a solution. Conversely, the $\beta_i$s form a sequence of lower bounds on $H_f(X)$ for any coding function $f$. Remark that $\beta_1(X) \geq \text{ur}(X)$.

Proposition 7: The alpha and beta rank satisfy the following properties: for any $X, Z \subseteq V$,

1) $\alpha(X) = \alpha(\text{cl}(X))$ and $\beta(X) = \beta(\text{cl}(X))$;

2) $X \subseteq Z$ implies $\alpha(X) \leq \alpha(Z)$ and $\beta(X) \leq \beta(Z)$;

3) $\text{ur}(X) \leq \beta(X)$ and $\alpha(X) \leq \text{or}(X)$;

4) for any solution $f$, we have $\beta(X) \leq H_f(X) \leq \alpha(X)$.

Proof: We give the proofs for the alpha rank, since the proofs for the beta rank are similar. The first property is trivial, while the second and third are easily proved by induction on $i$: we have $\alpha_i(X) \leq \alpha_{i-1}(X)$ and $\alpha_i(X) \leq \alpha_i(Z)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq r2^n$. By induction on $i$, we can also prove that $H_f(X) \leq \alpha_i(X)$ as follows. For $i = 1$, we have $H_f(X) \leq H_f(S) + H_f(T) - r$ for any $S, T \subseteq V$ such that
\( \text{cl}(S \cup T) = V \) and \( \text{cl}(S \cap T) = \text{cl}(X) \). Therefore, \( H_f(X) \leq \alpha_1(X) \). The induction step is entirely similar.

The alpha and beta rank of a solvable closure must satisfy

\[
\text{ur}(X \cup Z) + \text{ur}(X \cap Z) \leq \beta(X \cup Z) + \beta(X \cap Z) \leq \alpha(X) + \alpha(Z) \leq \text{or}(X) + \text{or}(Z)
\]

for all \( X, Z \subseteq V \).

\textbf{Definition 10:} A set \( X \) is \textit{subcomplemented} if \( \alpha(X) = \beta(X) \).

Therefore, if \( X \) is subcomplemented, then \( H_f(X) = \alpha(X) \) for any solution \( f \). We can mimic the proof of Theorem 4 to refine it thus. We define the alpha-span of \( X \) as

\[
\alpha\text{span}(X) = \{ v \in V : \alpha(X \cup v) = \alpha(X) \}.
\]

\textbf{Theorem 5:} Suppose that all sets are subcomplemented with respect to cl, a closure operator with rank \( r \). Then cl is solvable if and only if \( \alpha\text{span} \) is a solvable matroid with rank \( r \).

\section*{VI. Combining Closure Operators}

In this section, we let \( S, T \subseteq V \) such that \( S \cap T = \emptyset \) and \( S \cup T = V \). For any \( X \subseteq V \), we denote \( X_S = X \cap S \) and \( X_T = X \cap T \).

\textbf{A. Disjoint and unidirectional unions}

We first generalise some definitions from matroid theory.

\textbf{Definition 11:} For any closure cl and any \( T \subseteq V \), the \textit{deletion of} \( T \) and the \textit{contraction of} \( T \) from cl are the closures defined on \( S \) by

\[
\text{cl}\vert_T(X) := \text{cl}(X) \setminus T
\]

\[
\text{cl}\vert^T(X) := \text{cl}(X \cup T) \setminus T
\]

for any \( X \subseteq S \).

Note that \( \text{cl}\vert_T \leq \text{cl}\vert^T \). We have \( r(\text{cl}\vert^T) = \text{lr}(S) \) and \( r(\text{cl}\vert_T) \geq \text{ir}(S) \) with equality if \( S \) is closed. An example when the inequality is strict is given in the three-vertex path \( P_3 \), and \( S = 13 \), as displayed in Figure 5.

We now determine the lower and upper ranks for closure operators associated to digraphs.

\textbf{Proposition 8:} If \( \text{cl}_D \) is the closure associated to the digraph \( D \), then for any \( S \subseteq D \), \( \text{cl}_{D[S]} = \text{cl}_D\vert^T \), where \( D[S] \) is the digraph induced by the vertices in \( S \). Thus \( \text{lr}(S) = |S| - \text{mias}(S) \) for any \( S \).
Proof: Let $X \subseteq S$, then any subset $Y$ of $S \setminus X = V \setminus (X \cup T)$ induces an acyclic subgraph of $D$ if and only if it induces an acyclic subgraph of $D[S]$; moreover, $Y^- \subseteq X \cup Y$ in $D[S]$ if and only if $Y^- \subseteq X \cup Y \cup T$. By Lemma 2 we obtain $c|D[S](X) = c|D(X \cup T)(X \cup T)$ and hence $c|D[T](X) = c|D[S](X)$. 

In particular, we obtain $H_f(X) \geq |X| - \text{mias}(X)$ for all $X$ and any solution $f$. Therefore, any solution must be “at least as good” as letting any subset of players play independently.

Definition 12: For two closures $c_1$ and $c_2$ defined on $S$ and $T$ respectively, we define the disjoint and unidirectional unions of these closures on $V = S \cup T$ respectively as

$$c_1 \cup c_2(X) := c_1(X_S) \cup c_2(X_T)$$

$$c_1 \triangleright c_2(X) := \begin{cases} 
S \cup c_2(X_T) & \text{if } c_1(X_S) = S \\
 c_1(X_S) \cup X_T & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases}$$

For instance, any closure can be decomposed into $c = c|\setminus(0) \cup U_{0,\setminus(0)}$. Moreover, if there is a loop on vertex $v$ in the digraph $D$, then $c_D(X) = c_D(X \setminus v) \cup (X \cap v)$, or in other words, $c_D = c_{D[\setminus v]} \cup c_{D[\setminus v]} \bar{U} U_{1,1}$. We remark that if $c_1$ and $c_2$ are matroids, then $c_1 \cup c_2 = c_1 \triangleright c_2$, which is commonly referred to as the direct sum of $c_1$ and $c_2$. 

Recall the definitions of unions of digraphs in Section II. Our definitions were then tailored such that

$$c_{D_1 \cup D_2} = c_{D_1} \cup c_{D_2}$$

$$c_{D_1 \triangleright D_2} = c_{D_1} \triangleright c_{D_2}.$$  

For any $c_1$, $c_2$ we have $c_1 \triangleright c_2 \leq c_1 \cup c_2$ and

$$r(c_1 \cup c_2) = r(c_1 \triangleright c_2) = r_1 + r_2.$$  

The disjoint and unidirectional unions are related to the contraction as follows.

Proposition 9: For any $c$ and any $T \subseteq V$, the following are equivalent

1) $c|\setminus(T) = c|\setminus(T)$;
2) $\text{cl}|^T \cap \text{cl}|^S \leq \text{cl} \leq \text{cl}|^T \cup \text{cl}|^S$;

3) There exist $\text{cl}_1, \text{cl}_2$ defined on $S$ and $T$ respectively such that

$$\text{cl}_1 \cup \text{cl}_2 \leq \text{cl} \leq \text{cl}_1 \cup \text{cl}_2.$$ 

**Proof:** The first property implies the second, due to the following pair of inequalities: For any $S$,

$$\text{cl}|^T \cap \text{cl}|^S \leq \text{cl} \leq \text{cl}|^T \cup \text{cl}|^S.$$ 

To prove the first inequality, we have

$$\text{cl}|^T \cap \text{cl}|^S(X) = \begin{cases} S \cup \text{cl}|^S(X_T) = \text{cl}(X_T \cup S) & \text{if } S \subseteq \text{cl}(X_S) \\ (\text{cl}(X_S) \cap S) \cup X_T \subseteq \text{cl}(X) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$ 

For the second inequality, we have

$$\text{cl}(X) \setminus T = \text{cl}(X_S \cup X_T) \setminus T \subseteq \text{cl}(X_\setminus T),$$
and similarly $\text{cl}(X) \setminus S \subseteq \text{cl}|^S(X_T)$, and hence $\text{cl}(X) \subseteq \text{cl}|^T \cup \text{cl}|^S(X)$.

Clearly, the second property implies the third one. Finally, if there exist such $\text{cl}_1$ and $\text{cl}_2$, then it is easy to check that $\text{cl}_1 = \text{cl}|^T = \text{cl}|^T$.

**Definition 13:** We say that $\text{cl}$ is disconnected if there exists $T$ such that $\text{cl}|^T = \text{cl}|^T$; it is connected otherwise.

The closure of a non strongly connected graph is disconnected. However, there are strongly connected graphs whose closure is disconnected, for instance if there is a loop on a vertex, or in the graph in Figure 6 where $\text{cl}|^T = \text{cl}|^T$ for $T = 45$. We can determine conditions for the closure of a digraph to be connected. However, characterising which graphs have connected closures, whether via an elementary property or by a polynomial algorithm, remains a completely open problem. We say a cycle $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ is minimal if there does not exist $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$, $(i, j) \neq (1, k)$, such that $v_i, \ldots, v_j$ is a cycle. In other words, a minimal cycle does not cover another shorter cycle.

**Proposition 10:** Suppose $D$ is strongly connected, but $\text{cl}|^T = |^T \cap \text{cl}|^T$. Then $T$ is acyclic and all minimal cycles lie in $S$.

**Proof:** We first claim that all arcs from $T$ to $S$ come from $\text{cl}|^T(\emptyset)$. Indeed, let $u \in S$ such that $u^- \cap T \neq \emptyset$. Then $u \in \text{cl}|^T(S \setminus u) = \text{cl}|^T(S \setminus u)$, and hence $u \in \text{cl}(S \setminus u)$. Since $u^- \subseteq \text{cl}(S \setminus u)$, the intersection $X := \text{cl}(S \setminus u) \cap T$ is not empty. By Lemma 2, $X$ induces an acyclic subgraph and $X^- \subseteq S \cap X$, which is equivalent to $X \subseteq \text{cl}|^S(\emptyset)$.
Fig. 6. A graph which is strongly connected but whose closure is disconnected.

Now, suppose $T$ is not acyclic, i.e. $T \neq cl_D[\emptyset](\emptyset)$. But then, by the claim above there are no arcs from $T \setminus cl_D[\emptyset](\emptyset)$ to its complement, and $D$ is not strongly connected.

We now prove that any minimal cycle lies in $S$. First of all, if $X$ induces a minimal cycle, then it cannot entirely lie in $T$. Suppose $X$ does not lie entirely in $S$ either. Since $X_S$ is acyclic, we have $X_S \subseteq cl/X_T(Y) \subseteq cl(Y)$, where $Y = S \setminus X_S$. Therefore, $X_T \subseteq X^- \subseteq cl(Y)$; gathering, we obtain $X \subseteq cl(Y)$. More precisely, $X \subseteq cl(Y) \setminus Y$ and hence $X$ is acyclic, which is a contradiction.

As a corollary, if $D$ is an undirected graph, then $cl_D$ is connected if and only if $D$ is connected.

B. Bidirectional union

Definition 14: The bidirectional union of $cl_1$ and $cl_2$ is defined as

$$cl_1 \cup cl_2(X) := \begin{cases} S \cup cl_2(X_T) & \text{if } X_S = S \\ cl_1(X_S) \cup T & \text{if } X_T = T \\ X_S \cup X_T & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easily shown that $cl_1 \cup cl_2 \subseteq cl_1 \cup cl_2$ and $r(cl_1 \cup cl_2) = \min\{r_1 + n_2, r_2 + n_1\}$ for any closure operators $cl_1$ and $cl_2$ defined on disjoint sets. Moreover, for any $cl$ and any $S \subseteq V$, we have

$$cl/X_T \cup cl/X_S \leq cl \leq cl/X_T \cup cl/X_S.$$

The bidirectional union of digraphs does correspond to the bidirectional union of closures:

$$cl_{D_1 \cup D_2} = cl_{D_1 \cup cl_{D_2}},$$

and the converse is given below.

Lemma 6: If $cl = cl_1 \cup cl_2$, defined on $S$ and $T$, respectively then $cl_1 = cl/X_T$ and $cl_2 = cl/X_S$.

Moreover, if $D$ is a loopless graph, then $cl_D$ is the bidirectional union of two closures if and only if $D$ is the bidirected union of two graphs.
Proof: The first claim is easy to prove. For the second claim, if $\text{cl}_D = \text{cl}_1 \cup \text{cl}_2$, then $\text{cl}_D = \text{cl}_{D[S]} \cup \text{cl}_{D[T]}$ and hence it is the bidirectional union of two digraph closures. Suppose the arc $(u, v)$ is missing between $S$ and $T$. Then $\text{cl}_D(V \setminus \{u, v\}) = V$ (since $v^\perp \subseteq V \setminus \{u, v\}$ and $u^\perp \subseteq V \setminus u$), while $\text{cl}_{D[T]}(V \setminus \{u, v\}) = V \setminus \{u, v\}$.

VII. SOLVABILITY GRAPH

A. Definition and main results

The solvability graph extends the definition of the so-called guessing graph to all closures. Most of this section naturally extends [13]. Therefore, we shall omit certain proofs which are very similar to their counterparts in [13].

To any coding function $f$ we denote $f(x)$ as the image of some function $A^r \to A^n$ whose kernel is $f$. To be rigorous, we should make our choice of function explicit; however this amount of rigour shall not be necessary.

Definition 15: The solvability graph $G(\text{cl}, A)$ has vertex set $A^n$ and two words $x, y \in A^n$ are adjacent if and only if there exists no coding function $f$ such that $x, y \in f(A^r)$.

Proposition 11 below enumerates some properties of the solvability graph. In particular, Property 2 provides a concrete and elementary description of the edge set which makes adjacency between two configurations easily decidable.

Proposition 11: The solvability graph $G(\text{cl}, A)$ satisfies the following properties:

1) It has $|A|^n$ vertices.
2) Its edge set is $E = \bigcup_{S \subseteq V, v \in \text{cl}(S)} E_{v, S}$, where $E_{v, S} = \{xy : x_S = y_S, x_v \neq y_v\}$.
3) It is a Cayley graph.

Property 2 confirms that the definition of the solvability graph does not depend on the choice of function to define $f(A^r)$.

The degree of any vertex in the solvability graph, which can be determined for the case of closure operators defined on digraphs, cannot be easily given in general.

The main reason to study the solvability graph is given in Theorem 6 below.

Theorem 6: A set of words in $A^n$ is an independent set of the solvability graph if and only if they are the image of $A^r$ by a coding function for the closure operator.

Proof: Let $f$ be a coding function for cl and suppose $x = f(x')$ and $y = f(y')$ are adjacent in $G$. Then $x_v \neq y_v$ and $x_S = y_S$ for some $v \in \text{cl}(S)$, and hence $x'$ and $y'$ are in the same part of $f_S$ but in
different parts of $f_v$ (and hence of $f_{S\cup v}$). Thus $f_S$ is strictly refined by $f_{S\cup v}$, and hence by $f_{\text{cl}(S)}$, which contradicts the fact that $f_S = f_{\text{cl}(S)}$.

Conversely, let $\{x^a\}_{a=1}^k$ be an independent set of $G$ and let $f_i$ be described as follows. Denote the elements of $A^r$ as $w^1, \ldots, w^{|A|^r}$; then $f_v(w^a) = x^a_v$ if $a \leq k$ and $f_v(w^a) = \lambda$ otherwise, where $\lambda$ is chosen so that there exists no $x^a_v$ with $x^a_v = \lambda$. We now prove that $f$ is indeed a coding function. We only need to show that for any $S$ and $v \in \text{cl}(S) \setminus S$, we have $f_S = f_{S\cup v}$. Take $w^a, w^b \in A^r$ and denote $f(w^a) = y^a$ and $f(w^b) = y^b$. If $y^a_S \neq y^b_S$, they are in different parts of $f_S$ and hence in different parts of $f_{S\cup v}$. Otherwise, they are in the same part of $f_S$. Note that they are both in the image of $f$ or none of them is. In either case, we have $y^a = y^b$ and they are in the same part of $f_v$ as well (and hence of $f_{S\cup v}$).

\textbf{Corollary 4:} We have $\log|A| \alpha(G) = H(\text{cl}, A)$ and hence $\alpha(G) = r$ if and only if $(\text{cl}, A)$ is solvable.

In [13], we remark that the index coding problem asks for the chromatic number of the guessing graph of a digraph. We can extend the index coding problem to any closure operator and we say that $\text{cl}$ is index-solvable over $A$ if $I(\text{cl}, A) := \log|A| \chi(G(\text{cl}, A)) = n - r$. We have $H(\text{cl}, A) + I(\text{cl}, A) \geq n$ by (1). Furthermore, asymptotically, we have

$$\lim_{|A| \to \infty} H(\text{cl}, A) + \lim_{|A| \to \infty} I(\text{cl}, A) = n$$

by (2). Therefore, although determining $H(\text{cl}, A)$ and $I(\text{cl}, A)$ are distinct over a fixed alphabet $A$, they are asymptotically equivalent. More strikingly, solvability and index-solvability are equivalent for finite alphabets too, as seen below.

\textbf{Theorem 7:} The closure operator $\text{cl}$ is solvable over $A$ if and only if it is index-solvable over $A$.

\textbf{Proof:} Let $\{x^i\}$ be an independent set of $G$ and $b$ be a basis of $\text{cl}$. Without loss, let $b = \{1, \ldots, r\}$. First, we remark that $x^i_b \neq x^j_b$ for all $i \neq j$, for otherwise $x^i_{V \setminus b} \neq x^j_{V \setminus b}$ and $x^i_b = x^j_b$ means that $x^i \sim x^j$.

Secondly, let $A = Z_{|A|}$, then for any $w \in A^{n-r}$ and any $i$, denote $x^i + w = (x^i_b, x^i_{V \setminus b} + w)$. Then it is easily shown that $S_w = \{x^i + w\}$ forms an independent set and that the family $\{S_w\}$ forms a partition of $A^n$ into $|A|^{n-r}$ independent sets.

Conversely, if $\chi(G(\text{cl}, A)) = |A|^{n-r}$, then $\alpha(G(\text{cl}, A)) = |A|^r$ by (1).}

\textbf{B. Neighbourhood and girth}

Note that the relation “having an arc from $u$ to $v$” cannot be expressed in terms of the digraph closure. Indeed, all acyclic graphs on $n$ vertices, from the empty graph to an acyclic tournament, all have the
same closure operator $U_{0,n}$. However, the closure of the in-neighbourhood of a vertex can be described by means of the digraph closure.

**Lemma 7:** For any $v$ and any $X \subseteq V \setminus \{v\}$, $v \in cl_D(X)$ if and only if $cl_D(v^-) \subseteq cl_D(X)$.

**Proof:** Suppose $v \in cl_D(X) \setminus X$, then $Y = cl_D(X) \setminus X$ induces an acyclic subgraph and $Y^- \subseteq cl_D(X)$; in particular, $v^- \subseteq cl_D(X)$. Since $v \in cl_D(v^-)$, we easily obtain the converse. ■

We remark that if there is a loop on $v$, then there exists no set $X \subseteq V \setminus \{v\}$ such that $v \in cl_D(X)$. Note that $v^-$ is not necessarily an inner basis of its own closure, for instance this is trivial in nonempty acyclic digraphs.

Based on our results about closures associated to digraphs, we can define some concepts to any closures which generalise those of digraphs.

**Definition 16:** For any vertex $v$, the degree of $v$ is

$$d_v := \min\{|X| : v \in cl(X) \setminus X\}$$

if there exists such set $X$, or by convention is equal to 0 otherwise. We denote the minimum degree as $\delta$.

Note that the degree (according to the closure $cl_D$) of a vertex of the digraph $D$ is not necessarily equal to the size of its in-neighbourhood.

**Definition 17:** We say a subset $X$ of vertices is acyclic if $lr(X) = 0$. The girth $\gamma$ of the closure as the minimum size of a non-acyclic subset of vertices.

Here, the girth of a digraph is equal to the girth of its closure.

We denote the maximum cardinality of a code over $A$ of length $n$ and minimum distance $d$ as $M(n,d)$.

**Proposition 12:** For any $cl$, we have

$$\log_{|A|} M(n, n - \delta + 1) \leq H(cl, A) \leq \log_{|A|} M(n, \gamma).$$

Since $\delta \leq r$ and $\gamma \leq n - r + 1$, we have $\gamma = n - \delta + 1$ if and only if $cl = U_{r,n}$.

**C. Combining digraphs**

**Theorem 8:** For any $cl_1$ and $cl_2$ defined on disjoint sets $S$ and $T$ of cardinalities $n_1$ and $n_2$, we have

$$G(cl_1 \cup cl_2, A) = G(cl_1, A) \oplus G(cl_2, A)$$

$$G(cl_1 \cap cl_2, A) = G(cl_1, A) \cdot G(cl_2, A)$$

$$G(cl_1 \cap cl_2, A) = G(cl_1, A) \bigtriangleup G(cl_2, A).$$
Fig. 7. The bidirectional union $E_5 \cup \bar{C}_5$. The vertices of $\bar{C}_5$ form a basis; the highlighted disjoint cliques 127, 248, 56 show that it is solvable.

Therefore,

$$H(cl_1 \cup cl_2, A) = H(cl_1 \bar{\cup} cl_2, A) = H(cl_1, A) + H(cl_2, A)$$

$$H(cl_1 \bar{\cup} cl_2, A) \leq \min\{H(cl_1, A) + n_2, H(cl_2, A) + n_1\}.$$

**Corollary 5:** The following are equivalent:

- $cl_1$ and $cl_2$ are solvable
- $cl_1 \cup cl_2$ is solvable
- $cl_1 \bar{\cup} cl_2$ is solvable.

Moreover, suppose $n_1 - r_1 \geq n_2 - r_2$, then $cl_1 \bar{\cup} cl_2$ is solvable if and only if $cl_1$ is solvable and $H(cl_2) \geq n_2 - n_1 + r_1$. In particular, if both $cl_1$ and $cl_2$ are solvable, then so is $cl_1 \bar{\cup} cl_2$.

Therefore, when studying solvability, we can only consider connected closures. Moreover, the solvability of a bidirectional union reduces to entropy problems in the two constituent parts. An example where $cl_2$ is not solvable, yet $cl_1 \bar{\cup} cl_2$ is solvable, is given in Figure 7.

**D. Combining alphabets**

Let $[k] = \{1, \ldots, k\}$ for any positive integer $k$. We define a closure on $V \times [k]$ as follows. For any $v \in V$, let $[v] = \{(v, i) : i \in [k]\}$ and for any $X \subseteq V \times [k]$, denote $X_V = \{v \in V : [v] \subseteq X\}$. Then

$$cl^{[k]}(X) := X \cup \{[v] : v \in cl(X_V)\}.$$
This closure can be intuitively explained as follows. Consider the solvability problem of \( \text{cl} \) over the alphabet \( A^k \). Each element of \( A^k \) is as a vector of length \( k \) over \( A \), then \( \text{cl}^{[k]} \) associates \( k \) according vertices \([v]\) to each \( v \in V \), each new vertex \((v, i)\) corresponding to the coordinate \( i \). If \( v \in \text{cl}(Y) \) for some \( Y \subseteq V \), then the local function \( f_v \) depends on \( f_Y \). We can view \( f_v : A^{kr} \rightarrow A^k \) (and hence all its coordinate functions) as depending on all coordinates of all vertices in \( Y \), hence the definition of the closure.

In particular, for \( D \) construct \( D^{[k]} \) as follows: its vertex set is \( V \times [k] \) and its edge set is \( \{(u, i), (v, j) : (u, v) \in E(D)\} \). Then it is easy to check that \( \text{cl}^{[k]}_D = \text{cl}_{D^{[k]}} \).

**Proposition 13:** We have the following properties:

1) \( r(\text{cl}^{[k]}) = kr(\text{cl}) \).

2) \( G(\text{cl}^{[k]}, A) \cong G(\text{cl}, A^k) \) and hence \( H(\text{cl}^{[k]}, A) = kH(\text{cl}, A^k) \).

3) If \( \text{cl} \) is simple, then for all \( k \), \( \text{cl}^{[k]} \) is simple too.

4) If \( \text{cl} \) is connected, then so is \( \text{cl}^{[k]} \) for all \( k \).

**Proof:** The proof of the first two claims is similar to that of [13 Proposition 10], while the third claim is easily proved.

We now prove the last claim. For any \( S \subseteq V \times [k] \), we denote \( |S| = \bigcup_{v \in S} [v] \), \( T = (V \times [k]) \setminus S \), and \( [T] = T \cup (S \setminus S) = (V \times [k]) \setminus S \). Note that \( S_V = |S|_V = V \setminus [T]_V \). Then we claim that if \( \text{cl}^{[k]}|_T = \text{cl}^{[k]}/[T] \), then \( \text{cl}^{[k]}|_{[T]} = \text{cl}^{[k]}/[T] \). For any \( Y \subseteq [S] \), let \( X = Y \cup (S \setminus S) \); then \( X_V = Y_V \) and \( X \cup T = Y \cup [T] \). We then have

\[
\{[v] : v \in \text{cl}(Y_V)\} \cap S = \{[v] : v \in \text{cl}(X_V)\} \cap S = \{[v] : v \in \text{cl}(X_V \cup (Y \cup T)_V)\} \cap S = \{[v] : v \in \text{cl}(X_V \cup (Y \cup T)_V)\} \cap S,
\]

and in particular, then intersections with \([S]\) are equal, thus proving the claim.

Now suppose \( \text{cl}^{[k]} \) is disconnected, then \( \text{cl}^{[k]}|_{[T]} = \text{cl}^{[k]}/[T] \) for some \( T = [T] \) (and hence \( S = [S] \) and \( V = S_V \cup T_V \)). Then for any \( X \subseteq S \), \( (X \cup T)_V = X_V \cup T_V \) and we have

\[
\{[v] : v \in \text{cl}(X_V) \cap S_V\} = \{[v] : v \in \text{cl}(X_V)\} \cap S = \{[v] : v \in \text{cl}(X_V \cup T_V)\} \cap S = \{[v] : v \in \text{cl}(X_V \cup T_V) \cap S_V\},
\]

and hence \( \text{cl}|_{T_V}(X_V) = \text{cl}|_{T_V}^{/[T]_V}(X_V) \) for all \( X_V \subseteq S_V \).

\[\blacksquare\]
VIII. CLOSURES OF RANK TWO

In this section, we prove that all digraphs with rank 2 are solvable, but that there exist closures of rank 2 which are not solvable. The property which makes digraphs special is defined below.

Definition 18: The closure operator cl is separable if for any closed set of outer rank 1 is contained in a unique flat of rank 1.

We can refer to the family of flats of rank 1 as \( \{ \text{cl}(v') : v' \in V' \} \) for some \( V' \subseteq V \). If cl is separable, then the sets \( \{ \text{cl}(v') \setminus \text{cl}(\emptyset) : v' \in V' \} \) form a partition of \( V \setminus \text{cl}(\emptyset) \). Note that a simple matroid may not be separable, as we shall see in Example 2 below.

Lemma 8: For any \( D \), \( \text{cl}_D \) is separable.

Proof: We prove that for any \( a, b \in V \) such that \( a \notin \text{cl}_D(b) \), \( b \notin \text{cl}_D(a) \), we have \( \text{cl}_D(a) \cap \text{cl}_D(b) = \text{cl}_D(\emptyset) \). Recall that for any \( v \in V \) and any \( X \subseteq V \), \( v \in \text{cl}_D(X) \) if and only if \( v \in X \) or \( v^- \subseteq \text{cl}_D(X) \).

Now consider \( a, b \in V \) such that \( a \notin \text{cl}_D(b) \) and \( b \notin \text{cl}_D(a) \). For any \( w \in c_D(a) \), either \( w^- = \emptyset \) whence \( w \in \text{cl}_D(\emptyset) \) or \( w^- = a \) and hence \( w \notin \text{cl}_D(b) \). Similarly, for any \( u \in c_D^2(a) \), \( u^- \) is not empty and contained in \( c_D(a) \), hence \( u \notin \text{cl}_D(b) \). By induction, we obtain that \( \text{cl}_D(a) \cap \text{cl}_D(b) = \text{cl}_D(\emptyset) \).

Therefore, for any \( v \in V \), the closed sets of outer rank 1 containing \( \text{cl}(v) \) must form a chain: \( \text{cl}(v) \subset \ldots \subset \text{cl}(v') \), where \( \text{cl}(v') \) is the unique flat of rank 1 containing \( \text{cl}(v) \).

Theorem 9: Let cl be a separable closure operator of rank 2. Then it is solvable over all sufficiently large alphabets.

Proof: For all sufficiently large alphabets, we can find \( |V'| \) mutually orthogonal latin squares; simply assign the same latin square to all elements of the same part of the partition illustrated above. In \( \text{cl}(\emptyset) \), simply assign the universal partition. This clearly has entropy 2; checking that it is a coding function for cl is easy.

Corollary 6: If \( n - \text{mias}(D) = 2 \), then \( \text{cl}_D \) is solvable over all sufficiently large alphabets.

However, as soon as the closure is not separable, everything collapses, as seen from the example below.

Example 2: Let cl be the closure operator defined on \{1, 2, 3, 4\} as follows: \( \text{cl}(\emptyset) = \emptyset \), \( \text{cl}(1) = 12 \), \( \text{cl}(2) = 2 \), \( \text{cl}(3) = 23 \), \( \text{cl}(4) = 4 \), \( \text{cl}(13) = \text{cl}(24) = 1234 \). Then cl has rank 2 but is not separable, since 2 is contained in two flats of rank 1: 12 and 23.

Then we claim that this closure has entropy 1.5, which is achieved over all alphabets of square cardinality.
First, let us give an upper bound on the entropy. We have

\[ H(V) = H(123) \leq H(12) + H(23) - H(2) \leq 2 - H(2) \]

\[ H(V) = H(24) \leq H(2) + H(4) \leq 1 + H(2), \]

whence \( H(V) \leq 1.5. \)

Second, suppose \( A = B^2 \) and denote any element of \( A^2 = B^4 \) as \( b = (b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4). \) For any \( 1 \leq k \leq 4, \) let \( E_k \) be the partition into \(|B|\) parts according to the \( k \)-th coordinate: \( P_i(E_k) = \{ b : b_k = i \}. \) Let \( f_1 = E_{1,2}, f_2 = E_1, f_3 = E_{1,3}, f_4 = E_{2,3}, \) then \( f \) is a coding function for \( \text{cl} \), and \( H_f(V) = 1.5. \)

The technique used in the example above can be generalised to produce “arbitrarily tight bottlenecks” for closure operators.

**Theorem 10:** For any \( r \) and any \( \epsilon \), there exists a closure operator of rank \( r \) and maximum entropy less than \( 1 + \epsilon. \)

**Proof:** We construct the closure operator as follows. Let \( k \) be an integer satisfying

\[ k > \frac{\log(1 + \epsilon) - \log \epsilon}{\log r - \log(r - 1)} - 1. \]

Consider \( r \) sets \( A_1, \ldots, A_r \) of cardinality \( r \) each. For any \( i \), we consider the set of words over the alphabet \( A_i \) of length at most \( k: V = \bigcup_{i=1}^r \bigcup_{l=0}^k A_i^l. \) We denote the empty word over \( A_i \) as \( \delta_i, \) i.e. \( A_i^0 = \{ \delta_i \}. \)

We also define a partial order on \( V, \) where \( u \leq v \) if and only if \( u \) is the initial segment of \( v. \) Note that \( \delta_i \leq v \) if and only if \( v \) is a word over \( A_i. \) For any \( X \subseteq V, \) we denote the largest size of a family of elements pairwise incomparable as \( s(X). \) The closure of a set of words \( X \) is given by

\[ \text{cl}(X) := \begin{cases} V & \text{if } s(X) \geq r \\ \bigcup_{v \in X} \{ u \in V : u \leq v \} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \]

We now give an upper bound on the maximum entropy of \( V. \) We shall denote \( S_i := \sum_{w \in A_i} H(w). \)

Suppose \( A_1 = \{1, \ldots, r\}; \) let \( v_i = (1, \ldots, 1, i) \in A_i^l \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq r \) and \( v' = (1, \ldots, 1) \in A_i^{k-1} \)

be their common initial segment. The \( v_i \)'s are all pairwise incomparable, thus they generate \( V. \) Since \( \text{cl}(v_i) \cap \text{cl}(v_j) = \text{cl}(v') \) for all \( i \neq j, \) we have

\[ H(V) = H(v_1, \ldots, v_r) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r H(v_i) - (r - 1)H(v') \]

by repeatedly applying the submodular inequality. Performing this operation for any value of the initial segment yields

\[ r^{k-1}H(V) \leq S_k - (r - 1)S_{k-1}. \]
This method was performed on words of length $k$, but it can be easily adapted to any length between 1 and $k-1$, so that

$$r^{k-2} H(V) \leq S_{k-1} - (r - 1)S_{k-2}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$H(V) \leq S_1 - (r - 1)H(\delta_1).$$

Summing up, we obtain

$$\Delta H(V) \leq r^k - (r - 1)^k H(\delta_1),$$

where

$$\Delta = r^{k-1} + (r - 1)r^{k-2} + \ldots + (r - 1)^{k-1} = r^k - (r - 1)^k.$$

Summing up for all $A_i$s, and finally using the fact that the $\delta_i$s generate $V$, i.e. $H(V) \leq \sum_{i=1}^r H(\delta_i)$, we obtain

$$(r\Delta + (r - 1)^k)H(V) \leq r^{k+1}.$$ 

An easy manipulation finally leads to

$$H(V) \leq 1 + \frac{(r - 1)^{k+1}}{r^{k+1} - (r - 1)^{k+1}} < 1 + \epsilon.$$
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