FACULTY
OF MATHEMATICS
AND PHYSICS
Charles University

MASTER THESIS

Daniel Jahn

Generalized Random Tessellations

Department of Probability and Mathematical Statistics

Supervisor of the master thesis:	prof. RNDr. Viktor Beneš, DrSc.
Study programme:	Mathematics
Study branch:	Probability, mathematical statistics and econometrics

Prague 2019

I declare that I carried out this master thesis independently, and only with the cited sources, literature and other professional sources.

I understand that my work relates to the rights and obligations under the Act No. 121/2000 Sb., the Copyright Act, as amended, in particular the fact that the Charles University has the right to conclude a license agreement on the use of this work as a school work pursuant to Section 60 subsection 1 of the Copyright Act.

In .... date .... signature of the author

Benes A Nohic Dereudre Volker Matej SE Colin Family

Title: Generalized Random Tessellations

Author: Daniel Jahn

Department: Department of Probability and Mathematical Statistics

Supervisor: prof. RNDr. Viktor Beneš, DrSc., Department of Probability and Mathematical Statistics

Abstract: Abstract.

Keywords: key words

Contents

Introduction

An achievement is also the first chapter Creating a standalone text about Laguerre tetrihedrization that does utilize the duality to Laguerre tessellatino, which is the usual approach in many texts.

1. Geometric preliminaries

Are graphs geometric? I mean, geometric graphs are geometric. But graphs in general? Are potentials part of this?

Before diving into the mathematics of Gibbs-Laguerre-Delaunay tetrihedrization models, we must first lay out the fundamentals of their geometric and combinatorial structure. The key geometric component is the empty sphere property [...] which determines the edge structure, which is in turn analyzed in terms of hypergraphs.

$\mathcal{F}$ or $\mathcal{N}$

Let $\mathcal{F}_{lf}$ be the set of locally finite sets on $\mathbb{R}^3$, and $\mathcal{F}_f \subset \mathcal{F}_{lf}$ the set of all finite sets on $\mathbb{R}^3$. An elements of F_{lf} will be usually denoted $\mathbb{x}$ and called a *configuration* and its subset η. If $|\eta| = 4$, as will be the case for the majority of this text, then η will be called *tetrahedron*.

1.1 Tetrahedrizations

The aim of this section is to introduce the geometric concepts necessary for the definition of the hypergraph structures in the following section. Definitions might be postponed. Note that although this text focuses solely on the three dimensional case, most ideas remain valid for a triangulation in any dimension. Furthermore, many facts have an analogous result in the case of Delaunay and Laguerre tessellations. This text is concerned with two types of tetrihedrizations.

Say this better and reference where to read about them

We introduce the notion of (reinforced) general position. This requirement will be later relaxed.

Definition 1. Let $\mathbb{x} \in \mathcal{F}_{lf}$. We say $\mathbb{x}$ is in **general position** if

$$\eta \subset \mathbb{x}, 2 \leq |\eta| \leq 3 \Rightarrow \eta \text{ is affinely independent.}$$

Denote $\mathcal{F}_{gp} \subset \mathcal{F}_{lf}$ the set of all locally finite configurations in general position.

Commment on measurability of the set of locally finite sets in general position. This comes from cite[Zessin2008] and the $\mathcal{F}$ $\mathcal{M}$ equivalence?

Also comment on the fact that we need a vector space with measurable inner product etc?

It's sufficient to check only subsets with $d + 1$ points

Definition 2. Let $\mathbb{x} \in \mathcal{F}_{gp}$. We say $\mathbb{x}$ is in **reinforced general position** if

$$\eta \subset \mathbb{x}, 3 \leq |\eta| \leq 4 \Rightarrow \eta \text{ is non-circular.}$$

Denote $\mathcal{F}_{rgp}$ the set of all locally finite configurations in reinforced general position.

Define cocircular in general

Again, only need to check $d + 2$

1.1.1 Delaunay tetrihedrization

This section will shortly introduce the well known Delaunay tetrihedrization. There is vast literature on the topic, e.g. [ref].

Marks..

Definition 3. Let $\mathbb{x} \in \mathcal{F}_{gp}$, $\eta \subset \mathbb{x}$. An open ball $B(\eta, \mathbb{x})$ such that $\eta \subset \partial B(\eta, \mathbb{x})$ is called a *circumball of* η. The boundary $\partial B(\eta, \mathbb{x})$ is called a *circumsphere*. Let $\eta \subset \mathbb{x}$, $|\eta| = 4$, be a tetrahedron. Then we will denote its (uniquely defined) circumball as $B(\eta)$ as its definition does not depend on $\mathbb{x}$.

Note that the circumball is uniquely defined by η.

Definition 4. Let $\mathbb{x} \in \mathcal{F}_{lf}$ and $\eta \subset \mathbb{x}$. We say that $(\eta, \mathbb{x})$ satisfies the *empty sphere property* if $B(\eta) \cap \mathbb{x} = \emptyset$.

Definition 5. Let $\mathbb{x} \in \mathcal{F}_{lf}$. Define the set

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{x}) := \{\eta \subset \mathbb{x} : \eta \text{ satisfies the empty sphere property } \}.$$

and its subsets

$$\mathcal{D}_k(\mathbb{x}) := \{\eta \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{x}) : |\eta| = k\}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, 4.$$

We then define the *Delaunay tetrihedrization of* $\mathbb{x}$ as the set $\mathcal{D}_4$.

The set $\mathcal{D}_4$ contains the structure we would expect from the name tetrihedrization, namely it contains sets of 4-tuples of points whose convex hull are the tetrahedra forming the Delauany tetrihedrization. It will however be useful to also consider subsets with a different number of points.

Talk about how we defined it, cause this ain't normal, man

Existence and uniqueness

1.1.2 Laguerre tetrihedrization

A point $p = (p', p'') \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times S$ can be seen as an open ball $B(p', \sqrt{p''})$. We will call $B_p = B(p', \sqrt{p''})$ the *ball defined by* p. We define the sphere $S_p = \partial B_p$.

Probably link to credenbach or something for the properties of this

Definition 6. Define the *power distance* of the unmarked point $q' \in \mathbb{R}^3$ from the point $p = (p', p'') \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times S$ as

$$d(q', p) = \|q' - p'\|^2 - p''$$

Much intuition can be gained from properly understanding the geometric interpretation of the power distance.

Remark 1 (Geometric interpretation of the power distance). We split the interpretation into two cases and use the Pythagorean theorem.

- $d(q', p) \geq 0$. The point q' lies outside of B_p. The quantity $\sqrt{d(p, q')}$ can be understood as the length of the line segment from q' to the point of tangency with B_p [fig]. The power distance is equal to zero precisely when q' lies on the boundary B_p.

- $d(q', p) < 0$. The point q' lies inside of B_p. The quantity $\sqrt{d(p, q')}$ now describes the length of .

Describe using a fig

Figures

Definition 7. For two (marked) points $p = (p', p'')$ and $q = (q', q'')$, define their *power product*[1] by

$$\rho(p, q) = \|p' - q'\|^2 - p'' - q''.$$

Notice that $\rho(p, q) = d(p, q') - q'' = d(q, p') - p''$ and that $\rho(p, (q', 0)) = d(p, q')$.

Similarly to the power distance, the power product has a geometric interpretation that is vital to the understanding of the geometry of Laguerre tessellations.

Let $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times S$ be two points. The following observations follow immediately from the definiton.

- $B_p \cap B_q = \emptyset$. We obtain $\|p' - q'\|^2 \geq (\sqrt{p''} + \sqrt{q''})^2 = p'' + q'' + 2\sqrt{p''}\sqrt{q''}$ and thus $\rho(p, q) \geq 2\sqrt{p''q''}$.
- $B_p \subset B_q$. We obtain $\|p' - q'\| + \sqrt{p''} \leq \sqrt{q''}$. Squaring the inequality yields $\rho(p, q) \leq -2\sqrt{p''q''}$.
- $B_p \cap B_q \neq \emptyset$ and neither is a proper subset of the other. This case is the most important for us. In this case, the spheres S_p and S_q intersect at two points. Denote a' the point of their intersection (it does not matter which one) and θ the angle $\angle p'a'q'$. We then obtain from the law of cosines.

$$-2\sqrt{p''q''} \cos\theta = \|p' - q'\|^2 - p'' - q'' = \rho(p, q)$$

Some diagram to visualise the proposition?

The above observations allow us to interpret the power product as a kind of distance of two marked points. The case $\rho(p, q) = 0$ is crucial for the Laguerre geometry. If p and q satisfy this equality then they are said to be *orthogonal*.

We are now well-equiped to define the central terms necessary for the definition of the Laguerre tetrihedrization.

Definition 8. Let $\eta \in \mathcal{F}_{gp}$. Define the *characteristic point* of η as the point $p_\eta = (p'_\eta, p''_\eta)$ which is orthogonal to every $p \in \eta$. If such point exists, we call η *Laguerre-coocircular.*

Possibly add the characterization through power distance

The characteristic point can thus be interpreted as a sphere that intersects each sphere $S_p, p \in \eta$ at a right angle. Note also that for each $p \in \eta$, we have

$$d(p'_\eta, p) = p''_\eta.$$

[1] The motivation for calling the quantity $\rho(p, q)$ a product is most fascinating. It was first introduced by G. Darboux in 1866 as a generalization of the power distance. However it was later discovered that the spheres can be represented as vectors in a pseudo-Euclidean space where the power product plays the role of the quadratic form that defines the space. The resulting space is then the Minkowski space — the setting in which the special theory of relativity is formulated. The positions of the sphere centres are then the positions in space, whereas the radius denotes a position in time. More can be found in e.g. Kocik [2007].

The following proposition looks at the existence and uniqueness of the characteristic point. Its proof is crucial.

Existence and uniqueness

Proposition 1 (Existence and uniqueness of the characteristic point)**.** *Let* $\eta \in \mathcal{F}_{gp}$*. Then the following holds for the characteristic point* p_η*.*

1. *If* $|\eta| < 4$*, then the* p_η *exists and is not unique.*

2. *If* $|\eta| = 4$*, then the* p_η *exists and is unique.*

3. *If* $|\eta| > 4$*, then the* p_η *exists if and only if* η *is Laguerre-cocircular.*

define the term

Proof. Possibly rewrite this, or add a lemma that shows general position =¿ full row rank (for $\leq$ 4 rows)

We will look at the case $|\eta| = 4$, from which the rest will follow. Let $\eta = \{p_1, \dots, p_4\}$ and denote the coordinates of p'_i as $x_i, y_i, z_i, i = 1, \dots 4$. The characteristic point p_η must satisfy the set of equations

Not really follow, more like be directly observable

$$\|p'_\eta - p'_i\|^2 - p''_\eta - p''_i = 0 \quad i = 1, \dots, 4$$

If we denote $\alpha = x_\eta^2 + y_\eta^2 + z_\eta^2 - p''_\eta$, where (x_η, y_η, z_η) are the coordinates of p'_η, we obtain the equations

$$\alpha - 2x_i x_\eta - 2y_i y_\eta - 2z_i z_\eta = w_i - x_i^2 - y_i^2 - z^2,$$

a system of equations which is linear with respect to $(\alpha, x_\eta, y_\eta, z_\eta)$. In an augmented matrix form, the system is written as

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc|c} 1 & -2x_1 & -2y_1 & -2z_1 & p''_1 - x_1^2 - y_1^2 \\ 1 & -2x_2 & -2y_2 & -2z_2 & p''_2 - x_2^2 - y_2^2 \\ 1 & -2x_3 & -2y_3 & -2z_3 & p''_3 - x_3^2 - y_3^2 \\ 1 & -2x_4 & -2y_4 & -2z_4 & p''_4 - x_4^2 - y_4^2 \end{array}\right) \tag{1.1}$$

The fact that $\eta \in \mathcal{F}_{gp}$ implies that $p'_1, \dots, p'_4$ are affinely independent, i.e. not coplanar. This means that the homogenous system of linear equations defined by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_1 & y_1 & z_1 \\ 1 & x_2 & y_2 & z_2 \\ 1 & x_3 & y_3 & z_3 \\ 1 & x_4 & y_4 & z_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

does not have a solution, that is, the matrix has full rank. If it did, the points $p'_1, \dots, p'_4$ would all satisfy the equation $Ax + By + Cz + D = 0$ for some $A, B, C, D \in \mathbb{R}$. The matrix 1.1.2 has the same column space as the left hand side of 1.1 and therefore the system has a unique solution.

If $|\eta| < 4$, we would obtain an underdetermined system, having either infinitely many or no solutions. Here, again, the general position property gives us full row rank of the left side of the augumented matrix, implying that there are infinitely many solutions. For $|\eta| = 2$, general position implies that the points are unequal. For $|\eta| = 3$, general position implies that the points are not collinear.

Write better later

If $|\eta| > 4$, the system is overdetermined and has no solution, unless the whole augumented matrix has rank 4. For e.g. $|\eta| = 5$, this means that the homogenous system given by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_1 & y_1 & z_1 & x_1^2 + y_1^2 + z_1^2 - p_1'' \\ 1 & x_2 & y_2 & z_2 & x_2^2 + y_2^2 + z_2^2 - p_2'' \\ 1 & x_3 & y_3 & z_3 & x_3^2 + y_3^2 + z_3^2 - p_3'' \\ 1 & x_4 & y_4 & z_4 & x_4^2 + y_4^2 + z_4^2 - p_4'' \\ 1 & x_5 & y_5 & z_5 & x_5^2 + y_5^2 + z_5^2 - p_5'' \end{pmatrix}$$

However, this is equivalent to saying that there exists p_η such that $\rho(p_\eta, p_i) = 0$, i.e. that η is Laguerre-cocircular. □

Connect this to incircle?

Definition 9. Let $x \in \mathcal{F}_{gp}$ be a configuration, $\eta \subset \mathbb{x}$ and p_η its characteristic point. We say that the pair $(\eta, \mathbb{x})$ is *regular*, or that η is *regular in* $\mathbb{x}$, if $\rho(p_\eta, p) \geq 0$ for all $p \in \mathbb{x}$. For convenience, for $\mathbb{x} \in \mathcal{F}_{lf} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{gp}$, we define any $\eta \subset \mathbb{x}$ that does not satisfy the assumptions of general position as not regular.

The definition can also be equivalently stated as

$$\text{There is no point } q \in \mathbb{x} \text{ such that } d(p'_\eta, q) < p''_\eta$$

The regularity property ensures that no point of $\mathbb{x}$ is closer to the characteristic point p_η in the power distance than the points of η. This is analogous to the empty sphere property in Delaunay tetrihedrization, where the circumball plays the role of the characteristic point.

c.f. remark that comes later

Definition 10. Let $\mathbb{x} \in \mathcal{F}_{lf}$. Define the set

$$\mathcal{LD}(\mathbb{x}) := \{\eta \subset \mathbb{x} : \eta \text{ is regular}\}.$$

and its subsets

$$\mathcal{LD}_k(\mathbb{x}) := \{\eta \in \mathcal{LD}(\mathbb{x}) : |\eta| = k\}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, 4.$$

We then define the *Laguerre tetrihedrization of* $\mathbb{x}$ as the set $\mathcal{LD}_4$.

Talk about how cocircular points create multiplicities in the cliques - no they don't, since we're limiting k to max 4

Remark 2 (Invariance in weights). Notice that adding or subtracting weights to all points in $\mathbb{x}$ does not change regularity of any $\eta \subset \mathbb{x}$. This implies that the Laguere tetrihedrization is invariant under this operation.

Why? Also write a bit more

Remark 3 (Delaunay as a special case of Laguerre). **TO BE DONE**

Redundant points

A major difference of the Laguerre tetrihedrization is the fact that some points may not play any role in the resulting structure.

Definition 11. We call a point $p \in \mathbb{x}$ *redundant in* $\mathbb{x}$ if $\mathcal{LD}(\mathbb{x}) = \mathcal{LD}(\mathbb{x} \setminus \{p\})$.

To find more about redundant points, it is useful to introduce the notion of a Laguerre cell.

Definition 12. Let $p \in \mathbb{x}$. We then define the *Laguerre cell of p in $\mathbb{x}$*, denoted C_p, as the set

$$C_p := \{x' \in \mathbb{R}^3 : d(x', p) \leq d(x', q) \; \forall q \in \mathbb{x}\}.$$

Proposition 2. *A point p is redundant if and only if $C_p = \emptyset$.*

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$) Assume p is not redundant. That means there exists a regular $\eta \subset \mathbb{x}$ with a characteristic point p_η such that $\rho(q, p_\eta) = 0$ for all $q \in \eta$ and $\rho(q, p_\eta) \geq 0$ for all $q \in \mathbb{x}$. This however means that $d(p'_\eta, p) = p''_\eta \leq d(p'_\eta, q)$ for all $q \in \mathbb{x}$, implying $p'_\eta \in C_p$.
($\Rightarrow$) Assume $C_p \neq \emptyset$. There exist $x' \in C_p$ and $q \in \mathbb{x}, q \neq p$, such that $d(x', q) = d(x', p)$, due to continuity of the power distance. But this implies that the point $p_\eta = (x', d(x', p))$ is the characteristic point of $\eta = \{p, q\}$ and that η is regular. □

Apart from the empty Laguerre cell, there is, to our knowledge, no simple geometric characterization of a redundant point. There is however a necessary condition.

Proposition 3. *If p is redundant in $\mathbb{x}$, then the sphere B_p is completely contained in the balls of other points in $\mathbb{x}$, that is*

$$B_p \subset \bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{x} \setminus \{p\}} B_q.$$

Proof. Assume there exists $x' \in B_p$ such that $x' \notin B_q$ for any $q \neq p$. Then $x' \in C_p$, since $d(x', p) \leq 0$, while $d(x', q) \geq 0$ for all $q \in \mathbb{x}, q \neq p$. □

To interpret this fact intuitively see fig. [fig].

Perhaps talk a bit more about the interpretation, e.g. why it's not sufficient

Restrict on non-redundant points? Measurability?

1.2 Hypergraph structures

Both Delaunay and Laguerre tetrihedrizations can be seen as graphs where two points $p, q \in \mathbb{x}$ are joined if they are part of the same tetrahedron. For the purposes of this text, a more natural structure will be the hypergraph.

satisfying ESP or sth

1.2.1 Tetrihedrizations as hypergraphs

Definition 13. A *hypergraph structure* is a measurable subset $\mathcal{E}$ of $(F_f \times N, \mathcal{F}_f \otimes \mathcal{F})$ such that $\eta \subset \mathbb{x}$ for all $(\eta, \mathbb{x}) \in \mathcal{E}$. We call η a *hyperedge* of $\mathbb{x}$ and write $\eta \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{x})$, where $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{x}) = \{\eta : (\eta, \mathbb{x}) \in \mathcal{E}\}$. For a given $\mathbb{x} \in \mathcal{F}_{lf}$, the pair $(\mathbb{x}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{x}))$ is called a *hypergraph*.

A hypergraph is thus a generalization of a graph in the sense that edges are now allowed to "join" any number of points. A hypergraph structure can be thought of as a rule that turns a configuration $\mathbb{x}$ into the hypergraph $(\mathbb{x}, \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{x}))$.

The subset $\eta \subset \mathbb{x}$ now plays the role of a hyperedge. e.g. tetrahedron.

The beauty in this approach is that we do not need to impose any additional structure on $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{x})$ or $\mathcal{LD}(\mathbb{x})$ — they already directly define a hypergraph structure!

Definition 14 (Delaunay and Laguerre-Delaunay hypergraph structures).

- $\mathcal{D} = \{(\eta, \mathbb{x}) : \eta \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{x})\}$
- $\mathcal{D}_k = \{(\eta, \mathbb{x}) : \eta \in \mathcal{D}_k(\mathbb{x})\}, k = 1, \dots, 4$
- $\mathcal{LD} = \{(\eta, \mathbb{x}) : \eta \in \mathcal{LD}(\mathbb{x})\}$
- $\mathcal{LD}_k = \{(\eta, \mathbb{x}) : \eta \in \mathcal{LD}(\mathbb{x})\}, k = 1, \dots, 4$

$\mathcal{LD}$ only makes sense now, when it's Laguerre-Delaunay. Comment on it before or sth.

Hyperedge potentials

The set $\mathcal{E}$ defines the structure of the hypergraph. What we are ultimately interest in is assigning a numeric value to each hyperedge and thus to (a region of) the hypergraph. To this end, we define the *hyperedge potential*. kkk

Definition 15. A *hyperedge potential* is a measurable function $\varphi : \mathcal{E} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$.

Hyperedge potential is *shift-invariant* if

Define ϑ_x

$$(\vartheta_x \eta, \vartheta_x \mathbb{x}) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ and } \varphi(\vartheta_x \eta, \vartheta_x \mathbb{x}) = \varphi(\eta, \mathbb{x}) \text{ for all } (\eta, \mathbb{x}) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $\vartheta_x(\mathbb{x}) = \{(x', x'') \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times S : (x' + x, x'') \in \mathbb{x}\}$ is the translation of the positional part of the configurations by the vector $-x \in \mathbb{R}^3$.

For notational convenience, we set $\vartheta = 0$ on $\mathcal{E}^c$.

The fact that the hyperedge potential contains $\mathbb{x}$ as a second argument suggests that it is allowed to depend on points of $\mathbb{x}$ other than those in η.

Example (Hyperedge potentials). The hyperedge potential can take various forms. As we will see later, its specification radically alters the distribution of the resulting Gibbs measure thus alowing a great freedom in the types of hypergraphs we can obtain.

Volume of tetrahedron: $\eta \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{x})$ on $\mathcal{D}_4$ or $\mathcal{LD}_4$

$$\varphi(\eta, \mathbb{x}) = |\mathrm{conv}(\eta)|.$$

Where $\mathrm{conv}(\eta)$ is the convex hull of η.

Hard-core exclusion: $\eta \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{x})$ on $\mathcal{D}_4$ or $\mathcal{LD}_4$, $\alpha > 0$

$$\varphi(\eta, \mathbb{x}) = \delta(\eta) \quad \text{if } \delta(\eta) \le \alpha$$

$$\varphi(\eta, \mathbb{x}) = \infty \quad \text{if } \delta(\eta) < \alpha$$

Where $\delta(\eta) = \mathrm{diam} B(\eta)$ is the diameter of the circumscribed ball. Notice that this potential becomes infinite on tetrahedra with circumdiameter larger than α. As we will see later, this allows us to restrict the resulting tetrahedronization only those tetrahedra η for which $\varphi(\eta, \mathbb{x}) \le \alpha$.

Laguerre cell interaction: For $\eta \in \mathcal{E}(x)$ on $\mathcal{LD}_2$ such that $\eta = \{p, q\}$ and $|C_p| < \infty, |C_q| < \infty$, $\theta \neq 0$.

$$\varphi(\eta, \mathbb{x}) = \theta \left(\frac{\max(Vol(C_p), Vol(C_q))}{\min(Vol(C_p), Vol(C_q))} - 1 \right)$$

where the potential now depends on the size of neighboring Laguerre cells. Notice that θ can be negative, yielding a negative potential.
Tetrahedral interaction: In the present setting, we cannot specify interaction between tetrahedra in $\mathcal{D}_4$ or $\mathcal{LD}_4$ as easily as between Laguerre cells. This can be solved by for example defining a new hypergraph structure

$$\mathcal{LD}_4^2 = \{(\eta, \mathbb{x}) : \exists \eta_1, \eta_2 \in \mathcal{LD}_4(\mathbb{x}), |\eta_1 \cap \eta_2| = 3, \eta = \eta_1 \cup \eta_2\}$$

Which contains the quintuples of points which form adjacent tetrahedra in $\mathcal{LD}_4(\mathbb{x})$. $\blacksquare$

For a given hypergraph structure $\mathcal{E}$, the *energy* of a finite configuration $\mathbb{x} \in \mathcal{F}_f$ is defined as the function[2]

$$H(\mathbb{x}) = \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{x})} \varphi(\eta, \mathbb{x}).$$

However, in our case, we will typically deal with $\mathbb{x} \in \mathcal{F}_{lf}$, for this such potentials would typically be equal to $\pm\infty$. We will therefore be interested in the energy for only a bounded window $\Delta \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Currently, we don't have the necessary terms to describe such energy function precisely, thus we will postpose its definition to the next section.

The words *potential* and *energy* suggest a connection with statistical mechanics, which gave rise to many of the concepts used in this text. Gibbs measure and concepts related to them continue to be an area with a rich interplay between statistical mechanics and probability theory. [3].

1.2.2 Hypergraph potentials and locality

A natural question to ask is "How do the points of $\mathbb{x}$ influence each other?". We've seen that there is a type of locality at play, for example in $\mathcal{D}_4$ the empty sphere property of a tetrahedron η is dependent solely on presence of points of $\mathbb{x}$ inside $B(\eta)$. The question is further complicated by the presence of the hyperedge potential. This section will refine the question by definining different locality properties.

As we will see in chapter [ref], this locality is essential for the existence of our models and Gibbs measures in general.

Definition 16. A set $\Delta \in \mathcal{B}_0$ is a *finite horizon* for the pair $(\eta, \mathbb{x}) \in \mathcal{E}$ and the hyperedge potential φ if for all $\tilde{\mathbb{x}} \in N, \tilde{\mathbb{x}} = \mathbb{x}$ on $\Delta \times S$

$$(\eta, \tilde{\mathbb{x}}) \in \mathcal{E} \text{ and } \varphi(\eta, \tilde{\mathbb{x}}) = \varphi(\eta, \mathbb{x}).$$

The pair $(\mathcal{E}, \varphi)$ satisfies the *finite-horizon property* if each $(\eta, \mathbb{x}) \in \mathcal{E}$ has a finite horizon.

The finite horizon of $(\eta, \mathbb{x})$ delineates the region outside which points can no longer violate the regularity (or the empty sphere property) of η.

[2]The letter H is often used for the energy in statistical mechanics, possibly stemming from the fact that it is also often called the Hamiltonian

[3]In fact, Gibbs measures beginning of statistical mechanics -, name after Josiah Willard Gibbs, who coined the term statistical mechanics

Remark 4 (Finite horizons for $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{LD}$). For $\mathcal{D}$, the closed circumball $\bar{B}(\eta, \mathbb{x})$ itself is a finite horizon for $(\eta, \mathbb{x})$.

For $\mathcal{LD}$, the situation is slightly more difficult. For one, $B(p'_\eta, \sqrt{p''_\eta})$ does not contain the points of η. To see this, take two points p, q with $p'', q'' > 0$ such that $\rho(p, q) = 0$. Then $q'' = d(q', p) < \|q' - p'\|^2$ and thus $\sqrt{q''} < \|q' - p'\|$. More importantly, however, any point s outside of $B(p'_\eta, \sqrt{p''_\eta})$ with a sufficiently large weight can violate the inequality $\rho(p_\eta, s) = \|p'_\eta - x'\|^2 - p''_\eta - s'' \geq 0$.

To obtain a finite horizon for $\mathcal{LD}$, we need to use the fact that the mark space is bounded, $S = [0, W]$. If $s'' \leq W$, then $\Delta = B(p'_\eta, \sqrt{p''_\eta + W})$ is sufficient as a horizon, since any point s outside Δ satisfies

$$\rho(p_\eta, s) = \|p'_\eta - s'\|^2 - p''_\eta - s'' \geq (\sqrt{p''_\eta + W})^2 - p''_\eta - W = 0.$$

From a practical perspective, the maximum weight W limits the resulting tessellation in the sense that the difference of weights can never be greater than W. Marks greater than W are not necessarily a problem, as we can always find an identical tessellation with marks bounded by W, as long as there no two points p, q with $|p'' - q''| > W$ (see remark on invariance).

Let us now return again to the task of defining an energy function H that depends on the configuration in some bounded window $\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}_0$. To that end, we must define the set of hyperedges for which the hyperedge potential depends on the configuration inside Λ.

Definition 17.

$$\mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\mathbb{x}) := \{\eta \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{x}) : \varphi(\eta, \zeta \cup \mathbb{x}_{\Lambda^c}) \neq \varphi(\eta, \mathbb{x}) \text{ for some } \zeta \in N_\Lambda\}$$

Later in the text, these are exactly the sets of tetrahedra used for the calculation, connect those two

Recall that we defined $\varphi = 0$ on $\mathcal{E}^c$. This means that for $\eta \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{x})$ such that $\varphi(\eta, \mathbb{x}) \neq 0$ we have

$$\eta \notin \mathcal{E}(\zeta \cup \mathbb{x}_{\Lambda^c}) \text{ for some } \zeta \in \mathcal{F}_\Lambda \Rightarrow \eta \in \mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\mathbb{x})$$

Notice that $\mathbb{x}_\Lambda$ does not play any role in the definition. The configuration $\mathbb{x}$ thus only plays the role of a boundary condition.

With this definition, we are now ready for the desired definition of the energy function.

Definition 18. The *energy of* ζ *in* Λ *with boundary condition* $\mathbb{x}$ is given by the formula

$$E_{\Lambda,\mathbb{x}}(\zeta) = \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\zeta \cup \mathbb{x}_{\Lambda^c})} \varphi(\eta, \zeta \cup \mathbb{x}_{\Lambda^C})$$

for $\zeta \in \mathcal{F}_\Lambda$, provided the sum is well-defined.

Remark 5 ($\mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\mathbb{x})$ for $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{LD}$). For $\mathcal{D}$, $\eta \in \mathcal{D}_\Lambda(\mathbb{x}) \iff B(\eta, \mathbb{x}) \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset$. For $\mathcal{LD}$, $\eta \in \mathcal{LD}_\Lambda(\mathbb{x}) \iff d(p'_\eta, \Lambda) \leq \sqrt{p''_\eta + W}$, where $d(p'_\eta, \Lambda) = \inf\{\|p'_\eta - x\| : x \in \Lambda\}$ is the distance of p'_η from Λ.

Explain why

Confusing notation, d is reserved for the power distance

The final basic term again characterizes a type of finite-range property, this time as a property of the configuration $\mathbb{x}$.

Definition 19. Let $\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}_0$ be given. We say a configuration $\mathbb{x} \in N$ *confines the range of φ from Λ* if there exists a set $\partial\Lambda(\mathbb{x}) \in \mathcal{B}_0$ such that $\varphi(\eta, \zeta \cup \tilde{\mathbb{x}}_{\Lambda^c}) = \varphi(\eta, \zeta \cup \mathbb{x}_{\Lambda^c})$ whenever $\tilde{\mathbb{x}} = \mathbb{x}$ on $\partial\Lambda(\mathbb{x}) \times S$, $\zeta \in N_\Lambda$ and $\eta \in \mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\zeta \cup \mathbb{x}_{\Lambda^c})$. In this case we write $\mathbb{x} \in N^\Lambda_{\mathrm{cr}}$. We denote $r_{\Lambda,\mathbb{x}}$ the smallest possible r such that $(\Lambda + B(0,r)) \setminus \Lambda$ satisfies the definition of $\partial\Lambda(\mathbb{x})$. We will use the abbreviation $\partial_\Lambda \mathbb{x} = \mathbb{x}_{\partial\Lambda(\mathbb{x})}$.

While the set $\mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\mathbb{x})$ contains hyperedges η which can be influenced by points in Λ, the set $\partial_\Lambda \mathbb{x}$ contains those points of $\mathbb{x}$ that influence the value of those η. This allows us to express $H_{\Lambda,\mathbb{x}}$ truly locally.

Proposition 4. *Let $\mathbb{x} \in N^\Lambda_{cr}$. Then*

$$H_{\Lambda,\mathbb{x}}(\zeta) = \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\zeta \cup \partial_\Lambda \mathbb{x})} \varphi(\eta, \zeta \cup \partial_\Lambda \mathbb{x}).$$

Proof. The definition of N^Λ_{cr} implies the hyperedge potential does not depend on the points $\mathbb{x} \setminus \partial_\Lambda \mathbb{x}$ and $\mathcal{E}_\Lambda(\mathbb{x})$ inherits this property by its definition. □

Comment on the definition and what it means for $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{LD}$.

Measurability

2. Stochastic geometry

Ultimately we want to study the behaviour of hypergraph structures and hyperedge potentials under some probabilistic assumptions on the distribution of the configuration $\mathbb{x}$. This chapter introduces the theory of point processes and random tessellations, both examples of the area of stochastic geometry, the concepts that will allow us to introduce randomness into hypergraphs. The main goal of this chapter is to introduce the Gibbs-type tessellation, where the location of the points are allowed to interact with the geometric properties of the tesssellation, giving us a great freedom in the specification of our models.

2.1 Point processes

Follow Schneider and Weil. Introduce basic concepts and theorems as well as point out useful calculation techniques.

2.1.1 Random measures and point processes

Random measure, σ-algebra, point process, σ-algebra, introduce simple pp as configurations by abuse of notation, comment on $\mathcal{N}_{gp}$ (zessin), Intensity, factorial measure,..

Introduce some basic theorems and relations so we can function, e.g. rewriting campbell-like stuff

Poisson point process

Poisson process and basic properties, mainly connection to binomial pp and the way we can use it to calculate

Before we define the Poisson point process, we first define a process closely related it.

Definition 20. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be independent and uniformly distributed random variables on B, that is

$$P(X_i \in A) = \frac{|A|}{|B|}.$$

Then we define the *binomial point process* of n points in B as

$$\Phi_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{X_i}.$$

Proposition 5. *Let $\Phi_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{X_i}$ be a binomial point process on $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$. Then for a non-negative measurable f we have*

$$Ef(X_1, \dots, X_k) = \frac{1}{|B|^k} \int_B \cdots \int_B f(x_1, \dots, x_k) dx_1 \cdots dx_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, n \quad (2.1)$$

Proof. From the definition of Φ_n, we have for Borel $A_i \subset B, i = 1, \dots, k$ that

$$\begin{aligned} P(X_1 \in A_1, \dots, X_k \in A_k) &= P(X_1 \in A_1) \cdots P(X_k \in A_k) \\ &= \frac{1}{|B|^k} \int_B \cdots \int_B 1_{A_1}(x_1) \cdots 1_{A_k}(x_k) dx_1 \cdots dx_k \end{aligned}$$

That is 2.1 for $f(x_1,\dots,x_k) = 1_{A_1}(x_1)\dots 1_{A_k}(x_k)$. By a standard argument, we first extend this to a general set $C \in \mathcal{B}^k, C \subset B^k$ using the Dynkin system

$$\{C \in \mathcal{B}^k : E1_C(x_1,\dots,x_k) = \int \cdots \int 1_C(x_1,\dots,x_k)dx_1 \cdots dx_k\}$$

and then from indicators to any non-negative measurable function. $\square$

The $\mathcal{B}^k$ is weird there, considering that we have $\mathcal{B}^3 = \mathcal{B}$ elsewhere

Definition 21. Let ν be a diffuse measure on E. A point process Φ satisfying

1. $\Phi(B)$ has a Poisson distribution with parameter $\nu(B)$ for each $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$,
2. Conditonally on $\Phi_B = n, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Phi|_B$ is the Binomial point process of n points in B, $B \in \mathcal{B}_0$.

Specially if $\nu = z|\cdot|$, then we call the Poisson point process *homogenous*.

2.1.2 Point processes with density

Analogy with random variables, why Poisson is the best, stability

Gibbs measure and Gibss point process

Talk about hereditarity too, mention Markov processes and connection maybe.

2.2 Random tessellations

In general x Gibbs-type

3. Existence of Gibbs-type models

In this chapter, the theorem from Dereudre and Lavancier [2007] will be presented and then we will proceed to check its assumptions for our models.

3.1 Existence theorem

In this section we first state the two existence theorems from Dereudre and Lavancier [2007] and then proceed to introduce its assumptions.

Theorem 1. *For every hypergraph structure $\mathcal{E}$, hyperedge potential φ and activity $z > 0$ satisfying **(S)**, **(R)** and **(U)** there exists at least one Gibbs measure.*

Theorem 2. *For every hypergraph structure $\mathcal{E}$, hyperedge potential φ and activity $z > 0$ satisfying **(S)**, **(R)** and **(Û)** there exists at least one Gibbs measure.*

Proofs of both theorems can be found in Dereudre and Lavancier [2007].

3.1.1 Stability

A standard assumption without which it is impossible to define the Gibbs measure is the stability assumption.

(S) *Stability.* The hyperedge potential φ is called *stable* if there exists a constant $c_S \geq 0$ such that

$$H_{\Lambda,\mathbb{x}}(\zeta) \geq -c_S \#(\zeta \cup \partial_\Lambda \mathbb{x})$$

for all $\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}_0, \zeta \in N_\Lambda, \mathbb{x} \in N_{\text{cr}}^\Lambda$.

The first thing to note that when φ is non-negative, then we can simply choose $c_S = 0$. The interesting cases therefore is when φ can attain negative values.

Stability in $\mathbb{R}^2$

TO BE DONE

Stability in $\mathbb{R}^3$

TO BE DONE

3.1.2 Range condition

As stated previously, the fact that the hyergraph structures posses a type of locality property is crucial for the existence of Gibbs measures. The simplest such assumption is the *finite range* assumption, see e.g. [intro def7], which roughly states that there exists $R > 0$ such that the energy of $\mathbb{x}$ in Δ only depends on points in $\Delta + b(0,R)$. This is a strong assumption and one that is not fulfilled by our models.

This is reflected in part in the range condition introduced here and later in the uniform confinement condition [ref].

(R) *Range condition.* There exist constants $\ell_R, n_R \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta_R < \infty$ such that for all $(\eta, \mathbb{x}) \in \mathcal{E}$ there exists a finite horizon Δ satisfying: For every $x, y \in \Delta$ there exist ℓ open balls $B_1, \dots, B_\ell$ (with $\ell \le \ell_R$) such that

- the set $\cup_{i=1}^{\ell} \bar{B}_i$ is connected and contains x and y, and
- for each i, either $\mathrm{diam} B_i \le \delta_R$ or $|\mathbb{x}_{B_i}| \le n_R$.

3.1.3 Upper regularity

In order to present the upper regularity conditions, we introduce the notion of *pseudo-periodic* configurations.

Let $M \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ be an invertible 3×3 matrix with column vectors (M_1, M_2, M_3). For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ define the cell

$$C(k) = \{Mx \in \mathbb{R} : x - k \in [-1/2, 1/2)^3\}.$$

These cells partition $\mathbb{R}$ into parallelotopes. We write $C = C(0)$. Let $\Gamma \in \mathcal{N}'_C$ be non-empty. Then we define the *pseudo-periodic* configurations $\bar{\Gamma}$ as

$$\bar{\Gamma} = \{\mathbb{x} \in N : \vartheta_{Mk}(\mathbb{x}_{C(k)}) \in \Gamma \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}^3\},$$

the set of all configurations whose restriction to $C(k)$, when shifted back to C, belongs to Γ. The prefix pseudo- refers to the fact that the configuration itself does not need to be identical in all $C(k)$, it merely needs to belong to the same class of configurations.

(U) *Upper regularity.* M and Γ can be chosen so that the following holds.

(U1) *Uniform confinement*: $\bar{\Gamma} \subset N_{\mathrm{cr}}^{\Lambda}$ for all $\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}_0$ and

$$r_\Gamma := \sup_{\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}_0} \sup_{\mathbb{x} \in \bar{\Gamma}} r_{\Lambda, \mathbb{x}} < \infty$$

(U2) *Uniform summability*:

$$c_\Gamma^+ := \sup_{\mathbb{x} \in \bar{\Gamma}} \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{x}) : \eta \cap C \neq \emptyset} \frac{\varphi^+(\eta, \mathbb{x})}{\#(\hat{\eta})} < \infty,$$

where $\hat{\eta} := \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^3 : \eta \cap C(k) \neq \emptyset\}$ and $\varphi^+ = \max(\varphi, 0)$ is the positive part of φ.

(U3) *Strong non-rigidity*: $e^{z|C|}\Pi_C^z(\Gamma) > e^{c_\Gamma}$, where c_Γ is defined as in (U2) with φ in place of φ^+.

Notice that (U1) is very close to the classic finite range property mentioned at the beginning of section 3.1.2. The major difference is that here the property is only required of the pseudo-periodic configuration.

Check how I treat PP and random sets. Maybe use the duality between them?

As long as $\Pi_C^z(\Gamma) > 0$, (U3) will always hold for all z exceeding some threshold $z_0 \geq 0$. This is because the left hand side is an increasing function of z, as can be seen from the equality

$$e^{z|C|}\Pi_C^z(\Gamma) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{k!} \int_C \cdots \int_C 1_\Gamma \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \delta_{X_i} \right) dx_1, \ldots, dx_k,$$

which can be derived using proposition 5. Indeed, let $\Phi \sim \Gamma_C^z$ be a Poisson point process with intensity z, restricted to C, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_C^z(\Gamma) = P(\Phi \in \Gamma) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P(\Phi \in \Gamma | \Phi(C) = k) P(\Phi(C) = k) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(z|C|)^k}{k!} e^{-z|C|} P(\Phi^{(k)} \in \Gamma) \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{k!} e^{-z|C|} \int_C \cdots \int_C 1_\Gamma (\sum_{i=1}^{k} \delta_{X_i}) dx_1, \ldots, dx_k
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi^{(k)} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \delta_{X_i}$ denotes the Binomial point process of k points in C and $\Phi^{(0)} = \delta_\emptyset$.

Remark about U3 monotonicity, possibly some other remarks about the assumptions

Get more intuition about U3 and comment on why Û is useful

For some models it is possible to replace the upper regularity assumptions by their alternative and prove the existence for all $z > 0$.

(**Û**) *Alternative upper regularity.* M and Γ can be chosen so that the following holds.

- (Û1) *Lower density bound*: There exist constants $c, d > 0$ such that $\#(\zeta) \geq c|\Lambda| - d$ whenever $\zeta \in N_f \cap N_\Lambda$ is such that $H_{\Lambda,\mathbb{x}}(\zeta) < \infty$ for some $\Lambda \in \mathcal{B}_0$ and some $\mathbb{x} \in \bar{\Gamma}$.
- (Û2) = (U2) *Uniform summability.*
- (Û3) *Weak non-rigidity*: $\Pi_C^z(\Gamma) > 0$.

3.2 Checking the assumptions

3.2.1 The choice of Γ and M for Laguerre-Delaunay models

Fix some $A \subset C \times S$ and define

$$\Gamma^A = \{\zeta \in N_C : \zeta = \{p\}, p \in A\},$$

the set of configurations consisting of exactly one point in the set A. The set of pseudo-periodic configurations $\tilde{\Gamma}$ thus contains only one point in each $C(k), k \in \mathbb{Z}^3$.

Let M be such that $|M_i| = a > 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $\angle(M_i, M_j) = \pi/3$ for $i \neq j$.

In **?**, A is chosen to be $B(0, b)$ for $b \leq \rho_0 a$ for some sufficiently small $\rho_0 > 0$.

The vagueness about ρ_0 is not satisfactory, though it's the way DDG did it. If possible, change this

We will use this form for the positions of the points as well - the question, however, is how to choose the mark set. It would be convenient to choose $A = B(0, b) \times \{w\}$ for some $w \in S$ and then only deal with a Delaunay triangulation, but this would mean that $\Pi^z_C(\Gamma) = 0$, conflicting with both $(U3)$ and $(\hat{U}3)$.

Only true if μ is non-atomic. But we could use an atomic μ for working with Delaunay.

The choice $A = B(0, b) \times S$ could, for a small enough a, result in some spheres being fully contained in their neighboring spheres, possibly resulting in redundant points, thus changing the desired properties of Γ. It is thus necessary to choose the mark space dependent on a. For given a, ρ_0, the minimum distance between individual points is $a - 2\rho_0 a = a(1 - 2\rho_0)$. We therefore choose $A = B(0, b) \times [0, \sqrt{\frac{a}{2}(1 - 2\rho_0)}]$ in order for spheres to never overlap .

This is perhaps unnecessarily conservative, we could widen it

4. Simulation

4.1 MCMC

4.2 Practical implementation

4.3 Results

5. Estimation

5.1 Results

Conclusion

Bibliography

D. Dereudre and F. Lavancier. Campbell equilibrium equation and pseudo-likelihood estimation for non-hereditary Gibbs point processes. *ArXiv e-prints*, September 2007.

Jerzy Kocik. A theorem on circle configurations, 2007.

List of Figures

List of Tables

A. Appendix

A.1 Section

List of Abbreviations