ESD-TDR-64-171

TM-03903

THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF LINEAR DECISION FUNCTIONS TO IMPLEMENT A DECISION PROCESS

TECHNICAL DOCUMENTARY REPORT NO. ESD-TDR-64-171

DECEMBER 1964

H. Joksch

D. Liss

Prepared for

DIRECTORATE OF COMPUTERS
ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS DIVISION
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
L. G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts

707
Prepared by

THE MITRE CORPORATION
Bedford, Massachusetts
Contract AF 19(628)-2390

ESD-TDR-64-171

TM-03903

THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF LINEAR DECISION FUNCTIONS TO IMPLEMENT A DECISION PROCESS

TECHNICAL DOCUMENTARY REPORT NO. ESD-TDR-64-171

DECEMBER 1964

H. Joksch

D. Liss

Prepared for

DIRECTORATE OF COMPUTERS
ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS DIVISION
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
L. G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts

707

Prepared by

THE MITRE CORPORATION
Bedford, Massachusetts
Contract AF 19(628)-2390

ESD-TDR-64-171 TM-03903

THE MINIMUM NUMBER OF LINEAR DECISION FUNCTIONS TO IMPLEMENT A DECISION PROCESS

TECHNICAL DOCUMENTARY REPORT NO. ESD-TDR-64-171

DECEMBER 1964

H. Joksch

D. Liss

Prepared for

DIRECTORATE OF COMPUTERS
ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS DIVISION
AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
L. G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts

707
Prepared by

THE MITRE CORPORATION
Bedford, Massachusetts
Contract AF 19(628)-2390

ABSTRACT

This document determines a lower limit on the number of linear decision functions necessary to place a certain number of objects into a certain number of categories. This lower limit is a function of the number of parameters necessary to describe each object and the number of categories.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL

This technical documentary report has been reviewed and is approved.

James W. Woodward for Capt

for SEYMOUR JEFFERY
Major, USAF
Chief, Computer Division
Directorate of Computers
Deputy for Engineering & Technology

SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

A decision problem can be considered as a problem in classifying objects according to their characteristics. The following are simple examples of decisions to be made:

> Into which category shall a book be placed according to its contents?
>
> Into which category shall the outcome of a statistical test be placed depending upon the numerical result (shall the hypothesis be accepted or rejected)?
>
> Which action shall be taken in a military situation described by certain characteristics?

This list could arbitrarily be extended to demonstrate that all decision problems are basically problems of classification. For decisions under risk or uncertainty, some finer points have to be introduced, but the basic structure of the problem remains unchanged.

SECTION II

DISCUSSION

The characteristics of the objects to be classified can be either yes/no (binary valued) statements of possessing or not possessing a certain property, they can be indications of which of a discrete set (integral valued) of possibilities applies, or they can be one of a continuous set (real valued) which describes properties of the object quantitatively. For the different properties of one object, any one of the three named cases may be applicable. In this report it is assumed that each property of the object is given by a real number.

The least restrictive way of classification is to have a complete listing of all objects with an indication of the class to which each belongs. In most cases, such a listing would be extremely long, if not infinitely long, and therefore impractical or impossible to use. Classifications are rarely given in this manner. Usually, objects are classified according to functions of their parameters. Therefore, practical decisions generally consist of evaluating certain functions of the characteristics; namely a mapping of the characteristics space into a decision space.

If the classification is given by a complete listing of objects, any completely arbitrary classification is possible. If the classification is done by evaluating "reasonable" functions, then it is generally the case that classes correspond in a 1-1 manner to regions in the decision space. In many cases, it holds that with any two objects which belong to one class, all objects "between" them belong to the same class. This is the same as the mathematical statement that the classes can be described by non-intersecting convex sets in the characteristics space. One of the important properties of convex sets is that any two of them, which do not intersect, can be separated by a hyperplane. Therefore, we can separate all classes of these objects by a sufficient number of hyperplanes. Separation by a hyperplane is mathematically equivalent to the evaluation of a linear function, which is the type of function most easily handled mathematically. Therefore, under reasonable restrictions, a decision problem can be reduced from an extensive search procedure, through a complete listing or evaluation of arbitrary functions, to the evaluation of linear functions which are easily handled.

The best means of determining these linear functions is a problem which will be dealt with in a future report. This present report is concerned with the problem: How <u>many</u> linear functions are needed to represent a certain number of classes? This number is dependent upon the specific configuration of the convex sets. However, it is worthwhile to know at least upper and lower bounds for this number.

UPPER LIMIT

The upper bound is easily obtained. If, between any two out of the R regions, a separating hyperplane is used, then all classes are separated. Therefore this number is $(R/2)$. The lower bound is more difficult to obtain.

LOWER LIMIT

If the maximum number of regions $R(m, n)$ into which an n-dimensional space can be divided by m hyperplanes can be determined, then this would give a lower limit to the number m of hyperplanes required to separate $R(m, n)$ regions in an n-dimensional space.

This maximum number of regions

$$R(m, n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{m}{k} \qquad m \geq 1, \ n \geq 1 \ . \tag{1}$$

The following proof uses essentially the argument of Winder,[1] who determined the maximum number of regions N(m, n) obtained by m hyperplanes in an n-dimensional Euclidean space when all hyperplanes intersect in one point to be

$$N(m, n) = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{m-1}{k} \qquad n \geq 1, \ m \geq 1 \ . \tag{2}$$

The same result has been obtained by Cameron.[2] *

In order to obtain the maximum number of regions, the hyperplanes cannot have completely arbitrary positions. It is defined that m hyperplanes in an n-dimensional Euclidean space are in <u>independent position</u>, if every subset of $k \leq n$ of them has an n-k dimensional linear manifold as an intersection, and any intersection of n+1 is empty. For any m and n, hyperplanes exist in independent position, since this is equivalent to the statement that there are sets of m linear equations in n variables such that all subsets of $k \leq n$ equations have exactly n-k dimensional solution spaces and all subsets of n+1 have no solution.

*Cameron proves only that the maximum number cannot be larger than this expression, because he counts the combinatorial possiblities without regard to the possibilities of their geometric realization. Winder seems to be aware of this point as his definition of "general position" shows, but does not mention the problem explicitly.

Theorem:

The maximum number of regions into which an n-dimensional Euclidean space can be divided by m hyperplanes is

$$R(m, n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{m}{k} \qquad (3)$$

and this number is obtained by m hyperplanes in independent position.

Proof:

Since m points divide a line into m+1 parts, $R(m, 1) = m+1$ which equals

$$\sum_{k=0}^{1} \binom{m}{k} = \binom{m}{0} + \binom{m}{1} = m+1 \ . \qquad (4)$$

One hyperplane divides any Euclidean space into two parts, $R(1, n) = 2$, which equals

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{1}{k} = \binom{1}{0} + \binom{1}{1} = 2. \qquad (5)$$

Starting with these values, the theorem can be proved by induction. Assume that m−1 hyperplanes in independent positions are given; they divide the space into the maximal number of $R(m-1, n)$ regions. Any m^{th} hyperplane intersects at most all the other m−1 hyperplanes, and if all m are in independent position, then the m^{th} one intersects all the other m−1 in (n-2)-dimensional subspaces. These subspaces are hyperplanes in independent position with the (n-1)-dimensional space given by the m^{th} hyperplane. Each of the R(m-1, n-1) sections, into which this hyperplane is divided, divides one of the regions (determined by the m-1 hyperplanes) in the n-dimensional space into two regions, adding R(m-1, n-1) to the previous R(m-1, n) regions. The result is the recurring formula

$$R(m, n) = R(m-1, n) + R(m-1, n-1). \tag{6}$$

This formula has exactly the same structure as that obtained by Winder and Cameron. From the inductive hypothesis

$$R(m-1, n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{m-1}{k}, \tag{7}$$

$$R(m-1, n-1) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{m-1}{k} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{m-1}{k-1}, \tag{8}$$

and the identity

$$\binom{m}{k} = \binom{m-1}{k} + \binom{m-1}{k-1}, \tag{9}$$

the following is obtained

$$R(m-1, n) + R(m-1, n-1) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left[\binom{m-1}{k} + \binom{m-1}{k-1}\right] = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{m}{k} = R(m, n) . \tag{10}$$

This proves out the theorem.

SOME NUMERICAL VALUES

Table I contains the values of R(m, n) for small values of m and n. Table II contains the values of N(m, n) as given by Cameron, for some small values of m and n.

Table I: R(m, n)

m \ n	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	2	2	2	2
2	3	4	4	4	4
3	4	7	8	8	8
4	5	11	15	16	16
5	6	16	26	31	32
6	7	22	42	57	63

Table II: N(m, n)

m \ n	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	2	2	2	2
2	2	4	4	4	4
3	2	6	8	8	8
4	2	8	14	16	16
5	2	10	22	30	32
6	2	12	32	52	62

The values above the main diagonals have to be the same in both cases since, for no more than n hyperplanes in an n-dimensional space, it is not necessary that all hyperplanes go through one point.

The values below the main diagonal fit the following pattern:

$$N(m, n) = 2R(m-1, n-1) \tag{11}$$

which is explained by a comparison of the formulas (1) and (2). Furthermore,

$$R(m, n) = N(m, n) + \binom{m-1}{n} \tag{12}$$

since the parts of the schemes below the diagonal differ by a column and diagonal of one, and that the recursion formula (6) is that of Pascal's triangle. However, there seems to be no simple geometric interpretation of both these formulas.

APPROXIMATION

It may be noticed that when $n \geq m$, $R(m, n) = 2^m$. On the other hand, if $m >> n$ and for large n Cameron has developed an approximation for $N(m, n)$ which can be used to obtain a similar expression for $R(m, n)$. Under these conditions, Cameron finds that

$$N(m, n) \approxeq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi n}} \left(\frac{em}{n}\right)^n \tag{13}$$

and since

$$R(m, n) = \frac{1}{2} N(m+1, n+1) \tag{14}$$

under the same conditions

$$R(m, n) \cong \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi (n+1)}} \left(\frac{e(m+1)}{n+1}\right)^{n+1} \tag{15}$$

H. C. Joksch

D. M. Liss

REFERENCES

1. Winder, R. Threshold Logic, Ph. D dissertation, Mathematics Department, Princeton University; May 1962.

2. Cameron, S. G. An Estimate of the Complexity Requisite in a Universal Decision Network, Bionics Symposium, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, WADD 60-600, pp. 197-212; December 1960.

Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R&D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY *(Corporate author)* The MITRE Corporation Bedford, Massachusetts	2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified 2b. GROUP

3. REPORT TITLE

The Minimum Number of Linear Decision Functions to Implement a Decision Process

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES *(Type of report and inclusive dates)*

5. AUTHOR(S) *(Last name, first name, initial)*

Joksch, Hans C. and Liss, D.

6. REPORT DATE	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	7b. NO. OF REFS
December 1964	12	2

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. AF 19(628)-2390	9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) ESD-TDR-64-171
b. PROJECT NO. 707.0	
c.	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) *(Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)*
d.	TM-03903

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES

Qualified requestors may obtain from DDC. DDC release to OTS authorized

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY Directorate of Computers, Deputy for Engineering & Technology L. G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mas

13. ABSTRACT

This document determines a lower limit on the number of linear decision functions necessary to place a certain number of objects into a certain number of categories. This lower limit is a function of the number of parameters necessary to describe each object and the number of categories.

DD FORM 1 JAN 64 1473

Security Classification

14. KEY WORDS	LINK A		LINK B		LINK C	
	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT	ROLE	WT
Mathematics (1) Linear Programming (2) Functions						

INSTRUCTIONS

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address of the contractor, subcontractor, grantee, Department of Defense activity or other organization *(corporate author)* issuing the report.

2*a*. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the overall security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accordance with appropriate security regulations.

2*b*. GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Directive 5200.10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorized.

3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classification, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis immediately following the title.

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES: If appropriate, enter the type of report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.

5. AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement.

6. REPORT DATE: Enter the date of the report as day, month, year; or month, year. If more than one date appears on the report, use date of publication.

7*a*. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: The total page count should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the number of pages containing information.

7*b*. NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Enter the total number of references cited in the report.

8*a*. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER: If appropriate, enter the applicable number of the contract or grant under which the report was written.

8*b*, 8*c*, & 8*d*. PROJECT NUMBER: Enter the appropriate military department identification, such as project number, subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc.

9*a*. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S): Enter the official report number by which the document will be identified and controlled by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this report.

9*b*. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S): If the report has been assigned any other report numbers *(either by the originator or by the sponsor)*, also enter this number(s).

10. AVAILABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES: Enter any limitations on further dissemination of the report, other than those imposed by security classification, using standard statements such as:

(1) "Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."

(2) "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized."

(3) "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC users shall request through ____________."

(4) "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users shall request through ____________."

(5) "All distribution of this report is controlled. Qualified DDC users shall request through ____________."

If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indicate this fact and enter the price, if known.

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explanatory notes.

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring *(paying for)* the research and development. Include address.

13. ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual summary of the document indicative of the report, even though it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical report. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet shall be attached.

It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified reports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as *(TS)*, *(S)*, *(C)*, or *(U)*.

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

14. KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical context. The assignment of links, rules, and weights is optional