

 Open access • Journal Article • DOI:10.1007/BF02123011

## Computational Complexity of Norm-Maximization — [Source link](#)

Hans L. Bodlaender, Peter Gritzmann, Victor Klee, J. van Leeuwen

**Institutions:** Utrecht University, Augsburg College, University of Washington

**Published on:** 01 Jun 1990 - Combinatorica (Springer-Verlag)

**Topics:** Quasiconvex function, Norm (mathematics), Positive-definite matrix, Maximization and Euclidean distance

Related papers:

- [Computational complexity of inner and outer  \$j\$ -radii of polytopes in finite-dimensional normed spaces](#)
- [Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization](#)
- [Geometric Optimization Problems Likely Not Contained in APX](#)
- [On the complexity of some basic problems in computational convexity: I.: containment problems](#)
- [Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness](#)

Share this paper:    

View more about this paper here: <https://typeset.io/papers/computational-complexity-of-norm-maximization-yyuuirnlsf>

**COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY  
OF NORM-MAXIMIZATION**

By

**H.L. Bodlaender**

**P. Gritzmann**

**V. Klee**

and

**J. Van Leeuwen**

**IMA Preprint Series # 528**

June 1989

---

**COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY  
OF NORM-MAXIMIZATION**

By

**H.L. Bodlaender**

**P. Gritzmann**

**V. Klee**

and

**J. Van Leeuwen**

**IMA Preprint Series # 528**

June 1989

# COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY OF NORM-MAXIMIZATION\*

H.L. BODLAENDER† P. GRITZMANN‡ V. KLEE# J. VAN LEEUWEN†

**Abstract.** This paper discusses the problem of maximizing a quasiconvex function  $\varphi$  over a convex polytope  $P$  in  $n$ -space that is presented as the intersection of a finite number of halfspaces. The problem is known to be **NP**-hard (for variable  $n$ ) when  $\varphi$  is the  $p^{\text{th}}$  power of the classical  $p$ -norm. The present reexamination of the problem establishes **NP**-hardness for a wider class of functions, and for the  $p$ -norm it proves the **NP**-hardness of maximization over  $n$ -dimensional *parallelotopes* that are centered at the origin or have a vertex there. This in turn implies the **NP**-hardness of  $\{-1, 1\}$ -maximization and  $\{0, 1\}$ -maximization of a positive definite quadratic form. On the “good” side, there is an efficient algorithm for maximizing the Euclidean norm over an arbitrary *rectangular* parallelootope.

**Introduction.** We are concerned with the computational complexity of the decision problem that arises in attempting to maximize a quasiconvex function  $\varphi$  over an  $\mathcal{H}$ -presented polytope  $P$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  (for variable  $n$ ), where “ $\mathcal{H}$ -presented” means that the polytope is given as the intersection of a finite number  $m$  of closed halfspaces. For this problem, an instance consists of an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , an integral  $\mathcal{H}$ -presentation of  $P \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , and an integer  $\beta$ , and the question is whether there exists  $y \in P$  such that  $\varphi(y) \geq \beta$ . The search for a maximum is simplified by the fact that  $P$ ’s vertex-set  $V$  contains a maximizing point, but complicated by the fact that the maximum possible cardinality of  $V$  is not bounded by any polynomial in  $n$  and  $m$ . In the case of greatest interest, there exists  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\varphi(x) = (\|x\|_p)^p = \sum_{i=1}^n |\xi_i|^p$  for each  $x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . In this case, **NP**-completeness has been established by Freund and Orlin [FO] for  $p = 2$  and by Mangasarian and Shiau [MS] for general  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ .

After some geometric preliminaries in Section 1, our reexamination of norm-maximization leads to the following main conclusions, listed according to the sections in which they are established or discussed.

(Section 2) For the decision-theoretic version of the problem of maximizing a function over an  $\mathcal{H}$ -presented polytope, **NP**-hardness persists for a class of quasiconvex functions  $\varphi$  significantly broader than the  $p^{\text{th}}$  powers of  $p$ -norms — roughly speaking, for the  $\varphi$  whose level sets admit strictly inscribed full-dimensional parallelotopes. This includes, in particular, each function  $\varphi$  of the form  $\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \|x_i\|_{p_i}^{q_i}$ , where the  $\alpha_i$ ’s and  $q_i$ ’s are positive integers, each  $p_i$  is  $\infty$  or a divisor of  $q_i$ , and not all  $p_i$ ’s are  $\infty$ . (When all  $p_i$ ’s are  $\infty$ ,

---

\*The authors are indebted to J. O’Rourke, P. Pardalos and R. Freund for useful references. The second and third authors are indebted to the Institute for Mathematics and its Applications in Minneapolis, where much of this paper was written; they acknowledge additional support from the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung and the National Science Foundation, respectively.

†Department of Computer Science, University of Utrecht

‡Fachbereich Mathematik, Universität Trier

#Department of Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle

the maximization of  $\varphi$  can be accomplished in polynomial time by linear programming.) NP-hardness is established by a transformation from the known NP-complete problem, PARTITION [Ka'].

(Section 2) It is conjectured that norm-maximization over  $\mathcal{H}$ -presented polytopes is NP-hard in all cases except those in which the unit ball is itself a polytope with a number of facets that is bounded by a polynomial in the dimension of the space. However, this probably cannot be proved by the present methods, for it is also conjectured that in a certain precise sense, almost no high-dimensional convex body admits an inscribed full-dimensional parallelotope.

(Section 3) For the  $p^{\text{th}}$  powers of  $p$ -norms, the known NP-hardness can be sharpened by restricting  $P$  to be either of the following very special sorts of polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ :

a parallelotope that is given as a vector sum of the form  $\sum_{i=1}^m [-x_i, x_i]$ , where the  $m$  points  $x_i$  are linearly independent and their coordinates are all  $-1, 0$  or  $1$ ;

an  $n$ -dimensional parallelotope that is centered at the origin or has a vertex there.

Here the NP-hardness is established by a series of transformations that begins with the known NP-complete problem, NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT [Sc].

(Section 4) The problems of  $\{-1, 1\}$ -maximization and  $\{0, 1\}$ -maximization of a positive definite quadratic form are NP-complete.

(Section 4) For maximizing the *Euclidean* norm over a *rectangular* parallelotope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , there is an algorithm that uses only  $n$  inner-product computations and  $n - 1$  comparisons.

The exposition assumes some familiarity with the classes P and NP, and with the rudiments of the theory of NP-completeness ([Co],[Ka'],[GJ2]). A problem  $Y$  is said to be NP-hard if for each member  $X$  of NP there is a *transformation* of  $X$  to  $Y$  — that is, a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm which, when applied to an arbitrary instance of  $X$ , produces an equivalent instance of  $Y$ . (Here *equivalent* means merely that both are “yes” instances or both are “no” instances). The problem  $Y$  is NP-complete if it is NP-hard and belongs to the class NP. The class of all NP-complete (NP-hard) problems is denoted here by NPC (NPH).

## 1. Polytopes, Zonotopes, and Parallelotopes.

This section supplies the definitions and notation that are used in the rest of the paper.

A function  $\varphi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is *quasiconvex* if for each pair of points  $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , it is true that

$$\sup_{y \in [x, z]} \varphi(y) = \max\{\varphi(x), \varphi(z)\},$$

where  $[x, z]$  denotes the line segment joining  $x$  and  $z$ . Equivalently, for each real  $\lambda$  the *level set*  $\{x: \varphi(x) \leq \lambda\}$  is convex.

For  $x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the  $\infty$ -norm  $\|x\|_\infty$  is defined by

$$\|x\|_\infty = \max\{|\xi_1|, \dots, |\xi_n|\}.$$

and the  $p$ -norm is defined for  $1 \leq p < \infty$  by

$$\|x\|_p = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |\xi_i|^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

These norms, or certain positive linear combinations of powers of them, will be the quasi-convex (in fact, convex) functions of greatest concern here.

A *polytope* is a bounded subset of  $\mathbf{R}^n$  (for some finite  $n$ ) that is the intersection of a finite number of closed halfspaces. The *faces* of a polytope are its intersections with supporting hyperplanes. Prefixes indicate dimension, and the 0-faces, 1-faces and  $(n-1)$ -faces of an  $n$ -polytope are respectively its *vertices*, *edges* and *facets*.

Each polytope  $P$  is the convex hull of its finite vertex-set  $V$ , and it is well-known [HH] that the maximum over  $P$  of any quasiconvex function is attained at some point of  $V$ . Thus when  $P$  is presented in terms of  $V$ , maximizing the norm over  $P$  presents no difficulties that are not already encountered in attempting to compute the norm at a particular point. However, the picture changes when the  $n$ -polytope  $P$  is presented as an intersection of  $m$  halfspaces, because then, although  $P$ 's dimension is at most  $n$  and  $P$  has at most  $m$  facets, the number of vertices may be as large as

$$\binom{m - \lfloor (n+1)/2 \rfloor}{m-n} + \binom{m - \lfloor (n+2)/2 \rfloor}{m-n}.$$

(see [Mc]). This sum is  $O(m^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor})$  for each fixed  $n$ , but for variable  $n$  and  $m$  it is not polynomially bounded. The exponential growth in the maximum size of  $V$  is reflected in the NP-hardness results proved here. We shall be concerned especially with  $n$ -parallelotopes, which have  $2n$  facets and  $2^n$  vertices.

Some definitions are required in order to deal with presentations of polytopes. An  $\mathcal{H}$ -*presentation* of a polytope  $P$  consists of integers  $m$  and  $n$  with  $m > n \geq 1$ , an  $m \times n$  matrix  $A$ , and an  $m$ -vector  $b$  such that  $P = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}$ . ( $\mathcal{H}$  is for *halfspace*.) It is convenient to refer to  $P$  as an  $\mathcal{H}$ -*polytope* to indicate that  $P$  is presented in this way. In dealing with such a presentation, we adopt the notational convention that  $b = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)^T$  and  $A = [\alpha_{ij}]$ . When all the entries of  $A$  and  $b$  are integers (rationals), we speak of an *integer* (rational) *presentation*. The *size*  $L$  of an integer presentation is defined as the number of bits required for the natural binary encoding of the data—that is,

$$\begin{aligned} L = & (2 + \lceil \log m \rceil) + (2 + \lceil \log n \rceil) \\ & + (2mn + \sum_{\alpha_{ij} \neq 0} \lceil \log |\alpha_{ij}| \rceil) + (2m + \sum_{\beta_i \neq 0} \lceil \log \beta_i \rceil), \end{aligned}$$

where the logarithms are to the base 2. The size of a rational presentation is defined similarly, taking into account the denominators as well as the numerators of the input data.

Note that each rationally presented polytope also admits an integer presentation. Note also that if the polytope is *full-dimensional* (of dimension  $n$  in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ ) and the presentation is *irredundant* (the intersection

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^m \{x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)^T : \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{ij} \xi_j \leq \beta_i\}$$

is enlarged when any one of the  $m$  halfspaces is omitted), then the hyperplanes

$$\{x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)^T : \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{ij} \xi_j = \beta_i\}$$

are precisely the affine hulls of the facets of  $P$ .

A *zonotope* is the vector sum (Minkowski sum) of a finite number of line segments. When the segments are  $S_1, \dots, S_m$  and their centers are  $c_1, \dots, c_m$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^m S_i = \left( \sum_{i=1}^m c_i \right) + \sum_{i=1}^m (S_i - c_i)$$

where the point  $\sum_{i=1}^m c_i$  is the center of symmetry of the set  $\sum_{i=1}^m S_i$  and each segment  $S_i - c_i$  is centered at the origin. Hence it is convenient to define an  $\mathcal{S}$ -*presentation* ( $\mathcal{S}$  for *segment*) of a zonotope in  $\mathbf{R}^n$  as a sequence  $(c; z_1, \dots, z_m)$  of points in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ , where  $c$  is the center and the  $z_i$ 's are the ends of segments centered at the origin 0, with one end listed for each segment. This sequence represents the zonotope

$$c + \sum_{i=1}^m [-z_i, z_i] = c + \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i z_i : |\varepsilon_i| \leq 1 \text{ for all } i \right\}.$$

We speak of *integer* and *rational*  $\mathcal{S}$ -presentations (and define their sizes) in the natural way. Of course each zonotope is a polytope, but in general neither the vertices nor the facets of a zonotope are immediately accessible from an  $\mathcal{S}$ -presentation.

A zonotope  $Z = c + \sum_{i=1}^m [-z_i, z_i]$  is called a *parallelotope* when the points  $z_1, \dots, z_m$  are linearly independent. In contrast to the case of general zonotopes, the facial structure of a parallelotope is immediately accessible from an  $\mathcal{S}$ -presentation. In particular, the vertices of the  $m$ -parallelotope  $c + \sum_{i=1}^m [-z_i, z_i]$  are the  $2^m$  points of the form

$$c + \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i z_i \quad \text{with } |\varepsilon_i| = 1 \text{ for all } i$$

and the facets are the  $2m$   $(m-1)$ -parallelotopes of the form

$$c - z_j + \sum_{i \neq j} [-z_i, z_i] \quad \text{or} \quad c + z_j + \sum_{i \neq j} [-z_i, z_i].$$

Also, the passage between  $\mathcal{S}$ -presentations and irredundant  $\mathcal{H}$ -presentations can be accomplished in polynomial time in the case of parallelotopes.

As the term is used here, a *body* is a compact convex set that has nonempty interior. A polytope  $P$  is *inscribed* ( *strictly inscribed* ) in a body  $C$  if  $P$ 's intersection with  $C$ 's boundary contains ( consists of )  $P$ 's vertex-set. When  $C$  is *rotund* (meaning that the boundary  $\partial C$  contains no line segment), each polytope  $P$  that is inscribed in  $C$  is strictly inscribed. When  $C$  is itself a polytope, the strict inscription of  $P$  in  $C$  implies that each facet of  $C$  includes at most one vertex of  $P$  and hence  $C$  has at least as many facets as  $P$  has vertices. In particular, if  $n \geq 3$  and  $C$  is itself an  $n$ -parallelotope, then no  $n$ -parallelotope  $P$  is strictly inscribed in  $C$ .

## 2. Convex Functions and Inscribed Parallelotopes.

Suppose that for each  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ ,  $\varphi_n$  is a real-valued function whose domain is  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is a collection of polytopes in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots)$  and  $\mathfrak{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots)$ . Then  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P}$  will denote the following decision problem:

Instance: Positive integer  $n$ , integer  $\beta$ ; integral

$\mathcal{H}$ -presentation of a member  $P$  of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ .

Question: Does there exist  $x \in P$  such that  $\varphi_n(x) \geq \beta$ ?

Here the size of the instance is defined as the size of the presentation plus the size  $2 + \lceil \log \beta \rceil$  of  $\beta$ .

The present paper is concerned with the following general problem:

*For which sequences  $\Phi$  and  $\mathfrak{P}$  does the problem  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P}$  belong to the class  $\mathbf{P}$ ? to  $\mathbf{NP}$ ? to  $\mathbf{NPC}$ ? to  $\mathbf{NPH}$ ?*

The problem is too general to admit a meaningful general answer, but several subproblems are of interest. Note that, for a specific choice of  $\Phi$ , an assertion  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P} \in \mathbf{NPH}$  is strengthened when the  $\mathcal{P}_n$ 's are replaced by smaller collections of polytopes, while an assertion  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P} \in \mathbf{P}$  or  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P} \in \mathbf{NP}$  is strengthened when the  $\mathcal{P}_n$ 's are replaced by larger collections of polytopes.

**2.1 THEOREM.** *Suppose that each of the functions  $\varphi_n : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  in the sequence  $\Phi$  is quasiconvex, and that there is a polynomial-time algorithm which, for arbitrary input  $(n, x)$  with  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ , outputs  $\varphi_n(x)$ . Then  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P} \in \mathbf{NP}$  for each choice of  $\mathfrak{P}$ .*

**Proof.** This is just a more general formulation of a well-known observation—see, e.g., [FO] and [MS]. For each  $\mathcal{H}$ -presentation of a polytope  $P$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the  $P$ -maximum of  $\varphi_n$  is



attained at a vertex of  $P$ . When the presentation is rational, the vertex belongs to  $\mathbb{Q}^n$  and its size is bounded by a polynomial in the size of the presentation. Each vertex  $v$  of  $P$  is the unique point of intersection of some  $n$  of the hyperplanes bounding the halfspaces that appear in the presentation, and the equations of these hyperplanes can be solved to find  $v$ . The “guessing algorithm” needed to establish membership in  $\mathbf{NP}$  consists of guessing a set  $\{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$  of  $n$  hyperplanes of the mentioned sort. The “checking algorithm” processes each guess as follows:

(i) Determine whether the intersection  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n H_i$  is empty or consists of more than one point; if either of these conditions is satisfied, stop; otherwise, find the unique point  $w \in \bigcap_{i=1}^n H_i$ .

(ii) Check to see whether  $w$  lies in the other halfspaces of the presentation (in which case it is a vertex of  $P$ ), and whether  $\varphi_n(w) \geq \beta$ ; if both of these conditions are satisfied, return a “yes” answer.  $\square$

The conclusion of 2.1 continues to hold under an approximative assumption that is weaker than the requirement that  $\varphi_n(x)$  can be computed in polynomial time. It is enough to assume that  $\varphi_n(x)$  can be approximated in polynomial time and that the distance of  $\varphi_n(x)$  from any integer is either 0 or is bounded away from 0 by a positive rational of polynomial size. Here is a precise statement of the result:

*Suppose that the functions  $\varphi_n$  in the sequence  $\Phi$  are quasiconvex and satisfy the following separation condition: There is a polynomial  $\pi$  in  $L$  such that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , each  $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$  of size at most  $L$ , and each integer  $\tau$  it is true that*

$$\varphi_n(x) = \tau \quad \text{or} \quad |\varphi_n(x) - \tau| > 2^{-\pi(L)}.$$

*Suppose also that there is a polynomial  $\kappa$  in  $L$  such that for each  $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$  of size at most  $L$ ,  $\varphi_n(x)$  can be approximated in time  $\kappa(L)$  with error less than  $2^{-\pi(L)}$ . Then  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P} \in \mathbf{NP}$  for each choice of  $\mathfrak{P}$ .*

The proof is essentially unchanged, except that at the end, the approximation oracle is used to compute a rational number  $\delta$  such that  $|\varphi_n(w) - \delta| \leq 2^{-\pi(L)}$ . Then

$$\varphi_n(w) \geq \beta \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \delta \geq \beta - 2^{-2\pi(L)}.$$

**2.2 THEOREM.** *With hypotheses as in theorem 2.1, suppose in addition that the sequence  $\Phi$  is such that the number of vertices of any member  $P$  of  $\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_n$  is bounded by a polynomial in the size of  $P$ 's presentation. Then  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P} \in \mathbf{P}$ .*

*Proof.* In this case, the vertex-set can be found in polynomial time (see [Dy], [Sw], [Se]). Given  $P \in \mathcal{P}_n$  and the threshold  $\beta$ , evaluate  $\varphi_n$  at the various vertices of  $P$  and thus decide whether  $\max \varphi_n P \geq \beta$ .  $\square$

**2.3 THEOREM.** *If each of the functions  $\varphi_n$  in the sequence  $\Phi$  is concave and quadratic, then  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P} \in \mathbf{P}$  for each choice of  $\mathfrak{P}$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from the fact that problems of convex quadratic minimization (subject to linear inequality constraints) can be solved in polynomial time by the ellipsoid method [KTH], and also by interior-point methods ([KMY], [MA], [YT]).  $\square$

The following theorem and its proof are due to Mangasarian and Shiau [MS], a closely related result to Freund and Orlin [FO], and weaker related results to Sahni [Sa] and Murty and Kabadi [MK].

**2.4 THEOREM [MS].** *For each positive integer  $p$ , the following problem is NP-complete:*

*Instance:* Positive integers  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ .

*Question:* Does there exist a point  $x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} -1 \leq \xi_i \leq 1 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \xi_i = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n |\xi_i|^p \geq n?$$

*Proof.* The set defined by the inequality constraints is precisely  $\{-1, 1\}^n$ , the vertex-set of the cube  $[-1, 1]^n$ . Hence the following assertions are equivalent for each instance  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  of the problem:

- (i)  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  is a “yes” instance;
- (ii) there exists  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \xi_i = 0$ ;
- (iii) the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  can be partitioned into two sets  $I$  and  $J$  such that  $\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i = \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j$ .

In other words, the problem of 2.4 is equivalent to Karp’s NP-complete problem, *PARTITION* [Ka’], which has the same instances as 2.4 and has as its question whether assertion (iii) is true.  $\square$

**2.5 COROLLARY.** *Suppose that  $p$  is a positive integer, and for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $\varphi_n$  be the  $p^{\text{th}}$  power of the  $p$ -norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then*

$$\text{MAX}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots)\mathfrak{P} \in \text{NPC}$$

when each  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is the class of all polytopes centered at the origin in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

In the proof of Theorem 2.4, some of the intersections  $[-1, 1]^n \cap H$  are  $(n-1)$ -parallelotopes, but for  $n \geq 3$  the affine type of the intersection varies with the choice of the positive sequence  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ . For example, when  $n = 3$  hexagons as well as parallelograms appear, and for larger values of  $n$  the intersections are not all zonotopes. See Naumann [Na] for additional information about sections of  $n$ -cubes.

Although the results 2.4–2.5 and their proofs are extremely simple, three aspects seem worthy of further study:

- (a) What is the geometric essence of the proof of Theorem 2.4?
- (b) To what extent does the method of proof of 2.4 apply to functions more general than the  $p^{\text{th}}$  power of the  $p$ -norm?
- (c) To what extent can the class  $\mathfrak{P}$  of polytopes in Corollary 2.5 be further restricted?

Question (b) is discussed later in the present section, question (c) in Section 3. The following theorem answers question (a) by showing that the geometric essence of the proof of 2.4 is the fact that a suitable level set of the objective function admits a strictly inscribed parallelotope.

**2.6 THEOREM.** *Suppose that for each  $n$ ,  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is the class of all centrally symmetric  $(n-1)$ -polytopes in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and suppose that the following are given:*

- (i) a quasiconvex function  $\varphi_n : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ;
- (ii) a number  $\lambda_n$  whose size is bounded by a polynomial in  $n$ ;
- (iii) a rational  $\mathcal{S}$ -presentation  $(c; z_1, \dots, z_n)$  of an  $n$ -parallelotope that is strictly inscribed in the body  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \varphi_n(x) \leq \lambda_n\}$ , the size of the presentation being bounded by a polynomial in  $n$ .

Then with  $\mathfrak{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots)$ , the problem  $\text{MAX}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots) \mathfrak{P}$  is **NP-hard**. If, in addition,

- (iv) there is an algorithm which, for an arbitrary point  $q \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ , decides in polynomial time whether  $\varphi_n(q) \geq \lambda_n$ ,

then the problem  $\text{MAX}(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots) \mathfrak{P}$  is **NP-complete**.

*Proof.* Let  $B$  denote the  $n \times n$  matrix whose  $j^{\text{th}}$  column lists the coordinates of the point  $z_j$  ( $1 \leq j \leq n$ ). Then  $B$  is invertible and the size of  $B^{-1}$  is bounded by a polynomial in  $n$ . For each point  $x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$  there is a unique  $y = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$x = c + \eta_1 z_1 + \dots + \eta_n z_n.$$

This is equivalent to saying that  $x = c + By$ , or  $y = B^{-1}x - B^{-1}c$ . Now consider an arbitrary instance  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  of **PARTITION**, and let  $P$  consist of all points  $x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  for which

$$-1 \leq \eta_i \leq 1 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \eta_i = 0.$$

Equivalently, if  $e$  denotes the  $n$ -vector all of whose coordinates are 1 and  $R$  is the row-vector  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)B^{-1}$ , then  $P$  is defined by the system of inequalities

$$-e + B^{-1}c \leq B^{-1}x \leq e + B^{-1}c$$

in conjunction with the equality  $Rx = Rc$ . Since the  $\mathcal{S}$ -presented parallelotope  $(c; z_1, \dots, z_n)$  is strictly inscribed in the level set  $\{x : \varphi_n(x) \leq \lambda_n\}$ , the following two statements are equivalent for an arbitrary point  $x$  satisfying the above system of inequalities:

(a)  $\varphi_n(x) \geq \lambda_n$ ;

(b) the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  can be partitioned into two sets  $I$  and  $J$  such that  $\eta_i = -1$  for all  $i \in I$  and  $\eta_j = 1$  for all  $j \in J$ .

Under the additional condition that  $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \eta_i = 0$ , (b) is equivalent to requiring that the set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  can be partitioned into two sets  $I$  and  $J$  such that  $\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i = \sum_{j \in J} \alpha_j$ . Thus we have a transformation of PARTITION to  $MAX(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots)\mathfrak{P}$ .

(Since the size of  $\lambda_n$  is bounded by a polynomial in  $n$ , the above instance of  $MAX(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots)\mathfrak{P}$  can be constructed in polynomial time. Recall that an instance of  $MAX(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots)\mathfrak{P}$  consists of the dimension  $n$ , a bound  $\beta$ , and an integral  $\mathcal{H}$ -presentation of  $P$ ; in particular, the functions  $\varphi_i$  are not part of the input but are given in advance.)  $\square$

**2.7 COROLLARY.** *Suppose that for each  $n$ ,  $p_n$  is a positive integer and  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is the class of all polytopes in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Let*

$$\Phi = (\| \cdot \|_{p_1}^{p_1}, \| \cdot \|_{p_2}^{p_2}, \dots) \text{ and } \mathfrak{P} = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots).$$

*Then the problem  $MAX\Phi\mathfrak{P}$  is NP-hard. If, in addition, the  $p_n$ 's are bounded by a polynomial in  $n$ , then  $MAX\Phi\mathfrak{P}$  is NP-complete.*

*Proof.* Observe that with  $\varphi_n = \| \cdot \|_{p_n}^{p_n}$  and  $\lambda_n = n$ , the cube  $[-1, 1]^n$  is strictly inscribed in the body

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_{p_n}^{p_n} \leq n^{1/p_n}\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \varphi_n(x) \leq \lambda_n\}.$$

Hence the assumptions (i), (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 2.6 are satisfied. If, in addition, the sequence  $(p_1, p_2, \dots)$  is uniformly bounded by a polynomial in  $n$ , then for rational vectors  $q = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_n)$  and positive integers  $\beta$  it can be decided in polynomial time whether

$$\|q\|_{p_n}^{p_n} = \sum_{i=1}^n |\kappa_i|^{p_n} \geq \beta.$$

Hence the stated conclusions follow from Theorem 2.6.  $\square$

We believe that norm-maximization over general  $\mathcal{H}$ -presented polytopes is likely to be **NP**-hard for any sequence of norms except those in which the unit ball is a polytope with a number of facets that is bounded by a polynomial in the dimension of the space. In this exceptional case, the problem of maximizing the norm over a rationally  $\mathcal{H}$ -presented polytope  $P$  can be solved in polynomial time by means of linear programming, using either the ellipsoid method [Kh] or an interior-point method [Ka]. In particular (as noted by [MS]) a polynomial-time maximization algorithm for the  $\infty$ -norm consists of maximizing each coordinate functional and its negative over  $P$ , and noting that the maximum of the numbers obtained in this way is the maximum of the norm on  $P$ . Here the unit ball is a polytope with only  $2n$  facets. On the other hand, the unit ball with respect to the 1-norm, though a polytope, has an exponential number of facets, and the **NP**-hardness result does apply to the 1-norm.

Concerning the existence of inscribed parallelotopes in situations more general than that of Corollary 2.7, we can offer only the following.

**2.8 THEOREM.** *Suppose that the function  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  satisfies the following three conditions:*

- (i)  $\varphi$  is quasiconvex and lower semicontinuous;
- (ii)  $\varphi$  is not bounded above on any line through the origin;
- (iii) for each point  $x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ , the value of  $\varphi(x)$  is unchanged when any coordinate  $\xi_i$  of  $x$  is replaced by its negative.

Then  $\varphi$  attains its minimum value at the origin 0. For each  $\lambda > \varphi(0)$  and for each point  $y$  whose coordinates are all nonzero, some positive multiple of  $y$  is a vertex of an  $n$ -parallelotope that is centered at the origin and inscribed in the body  $B_\lambda = \{x : \varphi(x) \leq \lambda\}$ .

*Proof.* Condition (iii) implies that  $\varphi(-x) = \varphi(x)$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . From this in conjunction with conditions (i) and (ii) it follows that for each line  $L$  through the origin,

$$\sup \varphi L = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \inf \varphi L = \varphi(0).$$

For each  $\lambda > \varphi(0)$ , the set  $B_\lambda$  is certainly closed and convex, and if it were unbounded condition (iii) could be used to produce a line through 0 on which  $\varphi$  is bounded. Since that contradicts (ii), the set  $B_\lambda$  is a body. Now for  $y = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  of the sort described, let the positive multiplier  $\mu$  be such that  $\mu y \in \partial B$ . Then the set

$$P_y = \{x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) : |\xi_i| \leq \mu \eta_i \text{ for all } i\}$$

is an  $n$ -parallelotope centered at the origin, and it follows from condition (iii) that  $P_y$  is inscribed in  $B_\lambda$ .  $\square$

**2.9 COROLLARY.** *Suppose that for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $\alpha_i$  and  $q_i$  are positive integers and  $p_i$  is  $\infty$  or a positive divisor of  $q_i$ . For each  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ , define*

$$\varphi_n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i \|x\|_{p_i}^{q_i} \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbf{R}^n,$$

and let  $\Phi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots)$ . If all the  $p_i$ 's are  $\infty$ , then  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P} \in \mathbf{P}$  when each  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is the collection of all polytopes in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ . In all other cases,  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P} \in \mathbf{NPC}$  when  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is the collection of all  $(n - 1)$ -polytopes centered at the origin in  $\mathbf{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* Since the objective functions are convex, membership in  $\mathbf{NP}$  follows from Theorem 2.1. If there is an  $i$  for which  $2 \leq p_i < \infty$ , then the level sets of the objective functions are rotund and hence the inscribed parallelotopes guaranteed by Theorem 2.8 are strictly inscribed. If all  $p_i$ 's are equal to 1, the level sets of the objective functions are just balls with respect to the 1-norm, and again there are strictly inscribed parallelotopes. In these cases it follows with the aid of Theorem 2.6 that  $\text{MAX}\Phi\mathfrak{P} \in \mathbf{NPH}$ .

In the remaining case, all the  $p_i$ 's are  $\infty$  and each objective function is a positive combination of positive powers of the  $\infty$ -norm. Hence maximizing the objective function over a polytope  $P$  is equivalent to maximizing the  $\infty$ -norm. That was discussed in the paragraph preceding Theorem 2.8.  $\square$

We end this section with some additional remarks about inscribed parallelotopes. It is known that each body in  $\mathbf{R}^2$  admits many inscribed rectangles and inscribed rhombi, and at least one inscribed square [Zi] [Ch]. Each body  $C$  in  $\mathbf{R}^3$  admits an inscribed 3-parallelotope whose volume is at least two-ninths that of  $C$  [BR], but there is a 3-dimensional body that does not admit any inscribed *rectangular* 3-parallelotope [Bi]. It would be interesting to know what can be said about the existence of inscribed parallelotopes in higher-dimensional bodies. Note that if a centrally symmetric  $n$ -body  $C$  admits an inscribed  $n$ -parallelotope, then it admits one whose center coincides with  $C$ 's. Note also that if each  $(n - 1)$ -body admits an inscribed parallelotope, then each centrally symmetric  $n$ -body  $C$  admits many inscribed  $n$ -parallelotopes; indeed, each hyperplane that intersects  $C$ 's interior but misses  $C$ 's center  $c$  contains a facet of an  $n$ -parallelotope that is inscribed in  $C$  and centered at  $c$ . In particular, each symmetric 4-body admits an inscribed 4-parallelotope. Nevertheless, we conjecture that when the dimension  $n$  is large enough most symmetric  $n$ -bodies do not admit inscribed  $n$ -parallelotopes. To make the conjecture precise, let  $B_n$  denote the unit ball of Euclidean  $n$ -space, and for each  $\tau > 1$  let  $\mathcal{K}(n, \tau)$  denote the collection of all symmetric bodies  $K$  such that  $K$  is centered at the origin and  $B_n \subseteq K \subseteq \tau B_n$ . With respect to the Hausdorff metric,  $\mathcal{K}(n, \tau)$  is a compact metric space. Let

Consider an arbitrary instance  $(n, \gamma; x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of  $[0, 1]PARMAX_p$ , and let  $P = \sum_{i=1}^n [0, x_i]$ . Set

$$\delta = 2^p \gamma + 1,$$

$$y_i = x_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad y_{n+1} = u_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^n x_i.$$

Then the given instance of  $[0, 1]PARMAX_p$  is equivalent to the instance  $(n+1, \delta; y_1, \dots, y_n, y_{n+1})$  of  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$ . Indeed, for each nonzero vertex  $v$  of  $P$  it is true that  $2v + u_{n+1}$  is a vertex of the parallelotope  $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} [-y_i, y_i]$ , and that

$$\|2v + u_{n+1}\|_p^p = 2^p \|v\|_p^p + 1.$$

From this it follows that  $(n, \gamma; x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is a “yes” instance of  $[0, 1]PARMAX$  if and only if there exists  $w \in u_{n+1} + 2P$  such that  $\|w\|_p^p \geq \delta$ . Further, it follows from the symmetry properties of the norm and of the parallelotope  $\sum_{i=1}^n [-y_i, y_i]$  that the maximum of the norm on this parallelotope is attained at a vertex of the set  $u_{n+1} + 2P$ . That establishes the stated claim.

Now suppose, on the other hand, that  $(n, \gamma; x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is an instance of  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$ , and let  $P = \sum_{i=1}^n [-x_i, x_i]$ . Set

$$\alpha = 2^{(p+2)L} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \gamma + \alpha,$$

where  $L$  is the size of encoding of the input data. Set

$$y_i = 2x_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad y_{n+1} = \alpha u_{n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^n x_i,$$

and  $Q = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} [0, y_i]$ . Then the given instance of  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$  is equivalent to the instance  $(n+1, \delta; y_1, \dots, y_n, y_{n+1})$  of  $[0, 1]PARMAX_p$ . To justify this claim, note that each vertex of  $Q$  belongs to one of the two parallel facets

$$P - y_{n+1} + \alpha u_{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad P + \alpha u_{n+1}$$

and that  $P + \alpha u_{n+1}$  is  $Q$ 's intersection with the hyperplane  $\{x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n+1}) : \xi_{n+1} = \alpha\}$ . Observe, further, that each point  $x \in P$  is equal to  $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i$  for some  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in [-1, 1]$ , and with  $y_i = (\eta_i^{(1)}, \dots, \eta_n^{(i)})^T$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|x\|_p^p &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i \right\|_p^p = \sum_{j=1}^n \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \eta_j^{(i)} \right|^p \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n |\eta_j^{(i)}|^p \leq n^2 2^{pL} \leq 2^{(p+1)L} < \frac{1}{2} \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $P - y_{n+1} + \alpha u_{n+1} \subset 2P$ , it follows that all vertices of  $Q$  that are farthest from the origin must belong to the facet  $P + \alpha u_{n+1}$ . Hence the given instance of  $[-1, 1]PARMAX$  is a “yes” instance if and only if there is a vector  $q \in Q$  such that  $\|q\|_p^p \geq \gamma + 2^{(p+2)L}$ . Thus we have transformed  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$  to  $[0, 1]PARMAX_p$ .  $\square$

In the sequel, we use only the second of the two transformations described in the proof of Theorem 3.1. The first is included to illustrate the fact that, in constructing the points that generate the respective parallelotopes, control over the magnitudes of coordinates is much firmer in the first transformation than in the second. That may be relevant to a question about strong **NP**-completeness that is mentioned at the end of this section.

Our next goal is to establish the **NP**-hardness of the problem  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$ . We begin with a transformation from the following problem 3SPLIT:

Instance: A finite set  $M$  and a collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $M$ , each member of  $\mathcal{C}$  being of cardinality 2 or 3.

Question: Can  $M$  be partitioned into two sets, both of which intersect each member of  $\mathcal{C}$ ?

The **NP**-completeness of 3SPLIT was established (in a slightly different but clearly equivalent formulation) by Schaefer [Sc], who called the problem NOT-ALL-EQUAL 3-SAT. We use the term 3SPLIT for brevity. The **NP**-completeness of a closely related problem, HYPERGRAPH 2-COLORING, was recognized by Lovasz [Lo].

Our first transformation of 3SPLIT establishes the **NP**-hardness of the problem of maximizing  $\| \cdot \|_p^p$  over  $m$ -dimensional parallelotopes centered at the origin in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Since  $m < n$  is permitted here, additional transformations are needed to arrive at the problem  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$ .

**3.2 THEOREM.** *For each fixed positive integer  $p$ , the following problem  $PAR\{-1, 0, 1\}MAX_p$  is **NP**-complete:*

Instance: Positive integers  $n$ ,  $m \leq n$ , and  $\alpha$ , and  $m$  linearly independent vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  in  $\{-1, 0, 1\}^n$ .

Question: Do there exist  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m$  in  $\{-1, 1\}$  such that  $\| \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i x_i \|_p^p \geq \alpha$ ?

Proof. Clearly the problem belongs to **NP**. Simply guess  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m$ , and let  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m)^T = \sum_{i=1}^m \epsilon_i x_i$ , so that



where the condition (\*) is that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{either } j \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\lceil j/3 \rceil} \subseteq [1, i] \\ & \text{or } j \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\lceil j/3 \rceil} \subseteq [i, m] \\ & \text{or } \begin{cases} j \equiv 2 \pmod{3} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{\lceil j/3 \rceil} \text{ includes both} \\ \text{members of } S \text{ that are greater than } i \text{ and} \\ \text{members of } S \text{ that are less than } i. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

(Here  $[1, i] = \{h \in M : 1 \leq h \leq i\}$  and  $[i, m] = \{h \in M : i \leq h \leq m\}$ .)

For  $3r < j \leq n$ , the coordinate  $\xi_j^{(i)}$  of  $x_i$  is specified to be

$$\begin{aligned} & 0 \text{ if } i \notin C_{j-2r}, \\ & -1 \text{ if } i \in C_{j-2r} \subseteq [i, m], \\ & 1 \text{ if } i \in C_{j-2r} \subseteq [1, i]. \end{aligned}$$

(Since  $|C_{j-2r}| = 2$  in this case, when  $i \in C_{j-2r}$  it must be true that either  $C_{j-2r} \subseteq [i, m]$  or  $C_{j-2r} \subseteq [1, i]$ .)

Before proving that the  $m$  vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  have the desired property, we illustrate the construction of the  $x_i$ 's by an example. With  $p = 2$ , suppose that

$$M = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C} = \{\{1, 2, 4\}, \{3, 4, 5\}, \{1, 5\}, \{2, 4\}\}.$$

Then  $m = 5, r = 2, s = 2$ ,

$$n = 3r + s + m = 13 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha = (3^p + 2)r + 2^p s + m = 35.$$

The points  $y_1, \dots, y_5$  of  $\{-1, 0, 1\}^{13}$  are the columns of the matrix below, where the division into blocks is indicated.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} -1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ \hline -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{array}$$

Now consider an arbitrary sequence  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m$  in  $\{-1, 1\}$ , and let

$$x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)^T = \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i x_i.$$

If  $1 \leq i \leq r$  and  $c_i = \{a, b, c\}$  with  $a < b < c$ , then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \xi_{3i-2} \\ \xi_{3i-1} \\ \xi_{3i} \end{pmatrix} = \varepsilon_a \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon_b \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon_c \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

From this it follows that

$$3 \leq |\xi_{3i-2}|^p + |\xi_{3i-1}|^p + |\xi_{3i}|^p \leq 3^p + 2,$$

with equality on the right if and only if  $\varepsilon_a \neq \varepsilon_b$  and  $\varepsilon_a \neq \varepsilon_c$ . Similarly, if  $1 \leq i \leq s$  and  $C_{r+i} = \{d, e\}$  with  $d < e$ , then

$$\xi_{3r+i} = \varepsilon_d(-1) + \varepsilon_e(1),$$

from which it follows that  $0 \leq |\xi_{3r+i}|^p \leq 2^p$ , with equality on the right if and only if  $\varepsilon_d \neq \varepsilon_e$ .

To complete the proof, verify that the following four statements are equivalent:

- (i)  $\|x\|_p^p \geq (3^p + 2)r + 2^p s + m;$
  - (ii)  $|\xi_{3i-2}|^p + |\xi_{3i-1}|^p + |\xi_{3i}|^p = 3^p + 2$  for each  $i \in [1, r]$
- and
- $|\xi_{3r+i}|^p = 2^p$  for each  $i \in [1, s];$
  - (iii) for each 3-pointed member  $\{a, b, c\}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $a < b < c$ ,

$$\varepsilon_a \neq \varepsilon_b \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_a \neq \varepsilon_c,$$

and for each 2-pointed member  $\{d, e\}$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  with  $d < e, \varepsilon_d \neq \varepsilon_e$ ,

- (iv) each member of  $\mathcal{C}$  intersects both the set  $G = \{i : \varepsilon_i = -1\}$  and the set  $H = \{i : \varepsilon_i = 1\}$ .  $\square$

Note that in the case of  $PAR\{-1, 0, 1\}MAX_p$ , the  $\{-1, 0 - 1\}$  notation indicates that only  $-1, 0$  and  $1$  are permitted as coordinates of the vectors  $x_i$  arising in an instance of the problem. However, in the cases of  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$  and  $[0, 1]PARMAX_p$ , the  $[-1, 1]$  and  $[0, 1]$  merely indicate how the parallelotopes are related to the origin.

We want next to transform  $PAR\{-1, 0, 1\}MAX_p$  to  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$ . To do this in the Euclidean case ( $p = 2$ ), it might be simplest to proceed as follows: (i) find the  $(n - m)$ -dimensional subspace  $S$  of  $\mathbb{Q}^n$  that is orthogonal to the linear span of the  $m$   $x_i$ 's appearing in  $PAR\{-1, 0, 1\}MAX_p$ ; (ii) find a rational basis  $y_1, \dots, y_m$  for  $S$  that is approximately

orthonormal; (iii) for an appropriately chosen multiplier  $\mu$ , let  $y_i = \mu x_{i-m}$  for  $m < i \leq n$ , and then work with the  $n$ -parallelotope  $\sum_{i=1}^n [-y_i, y_i]$ . However, in order to deal with an arbitrary positive integer  $p$  we transform  $PAR\{-1, 0, 1\}MAX_p$  to  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$  in two stages, where the intermediate stage involves a full-dimensional zonotope that is not in general a parallelotope.

**3.3 THEOREM.** *For each positive integer  $p$ , the following problem  $[-1, 1]ZONMAX_p$  is **NP**-complete:*

*Instance: Positive integers  $n$ ,  $t \geq n$ , and  $\beta$ , and vectors  $y_1, \dots, y_t$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  is the standard basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and each of  $y_{n+1}, \dots, y_t$  belongs to  $\{-(n+1)^p, 0, (n+1)^p\}^n$ .*

*Question: Do there exist  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$  in  $\{-1, 1\}$  such that  $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i y_i\|_p^p \geq \beta$ ?*

*Proof.* Membership in **NP** is obvious. To establish **NP**-hardness, consider an arbitrary instance  $(n, m, \alpha; x_1, \dots, x_m)$  of  $PAR\{-1, 0, 1\}MAX_p$  and let  $y_1, \dots, y_n$  be the standard basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Set

$$t = n + m, \quad \mu = n + 1, \quad \beta = \mu^p \alpha, \quad y_i = \mu x_{i-n} \quad \text{for } n < i \leq t.$$

We claim that  $(n, m, \alpha; x_1, \dots, x_m)$  is a “yes” instance of  $PAR\{-1, 0, 1\}MAX_p$  if and only if  $(n, t, \beta; y_1, \dots, y_t)$  is a “yes” instance of  $[-1, 1]ZONMAX_p$ .

If  $(n, m, \alpha; y_1, \dots, y_m)$  is a “yes” instance of  $PAR\{-1, 0, 1\}MAX_p$  there exist  $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_m$  in  $\{-1, 1\}$  such that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_i x_i \right\|_p^p \geq \alpha,$$

whence

$$\left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^t \delta_i y_i \right\|_p^p \geq \mu^p \alpha = \beta.$$

Since the function  $\|\cdot\|_p^p$  is convex and the point  $\sum_{i=n+1}^t \delta_i y_i$  is the average of the  $2^n$  points of the form  $\sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i y_i + \sum_{i=n+1}^t \delta_i y_i$  with  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n \in \{-1, 1\}$ , there is a point of this form for which

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i y_i + \sum_{i=n+1}^t \delta_i y_i \right\|_p^p \geq \left\| \sum_{i=n+1}^t \delta_i y_i \right\|_p^p.$$

Hence  $(n, t, \beta; y_1, \dots, y_t)$  is a “yes” instance of  $[-1, 1]ZONMAX_p$ .

If, on the other hand,  $(n, m, \alpha; x_1, \dots, x_m)$  is a “no” instance of  $PAR\{-1, 0, 1\}MAX_p$ , then for each choice of  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_t \in \{-1, 1\}$  it is true that  $\|\sum_{i=n+1}^t \varepsilon_i z_i\|_p^p \leq \alpha - 1$ . But then

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \varepsilon_i y_i \right\|^p \leq n^p + \mu^p(\alpha - 1) = \beta - (\mu^p - n^p) < \beta$$

and hence  $(n, t, \beta; y_1, \dots, y_t)$  is a “no” instance of  $[-1, 1]ZONMAX_p$ . That completes the proof.  $\square$

The following lemma will aid in proving Theorem 3.5.

**3.4 LEMMA.** *Suppose that  $p, n, t$  and  $\psi$  are positive integers with  $n < t$ , and let  $u_1, \dots, u_t$  denote the standard basis for  $\mathbb{R}^t$ . With  $\mathbb{R}^n$  canonically embedded in  $\mathbb{R}^t$ , suppose that  $y_i = z_i = u_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and that  $y_{n+1}, \dots, y_t$  are points of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , each of  $p$ -norm at most  $\psi$ . Suppose that  $\delta$  and  $\varepsilon$  are positive real numbers with*

$$\varepsilon(t - n) \leq 2^{1/p} - 2^{1/2p} \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon(t - n) \leq \frac{\delta}{2p(t\psi)^{p-1}}$$

and let  $z_i = y_i + \varepsilon u_i$  for  $n < i \leq t$ . Let  $\mu(Y)$  and  $\mu(Z_\varepsilon)$  denote the maximum of the  $p^{\text{th}}$  power of the  $p$ -norm on the zonotopes  $Y$  and  $Z_\varepsilon$  respectively, where

$$Y = \sum_{i=1}^t [-y_i, y_i] \subset \mathbb{R}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^t \quad \text{and} \quad Z_\varepsilon = \sum_{i=1}^t [-z_i, z_i] \subset \mathbb{R}^t.$$

Then

$$\mu(Y) \leq \mu(Z_\varepsilon)$$

and if  $\mu(Y) \geq 2$  it is true also that

$$\mu(Z_\varepsilon) \leq \mu(Y) + \delta.$$

*Proof.* The first inequality follows from the fact that the  $p$ -norm of any point of  $\mathbb{R}^t$  increases whenever one of its coordinates is increased in absolute value while the other coordinates are unchanged. For the second inequality, assume that  $\mu(Y) \geq 2$  and let  $v$  be a vertex of  $Z_\varepsilon$  such that  $\|v\|^p = \mu(Z_\varepsilon)$ . Then there exist  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_t$  in  $\{-1, 1\}$  such that

$$v = \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i z_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i y_i + \varepsilon \sum_{i=n+1}^t \lambda_i u_i.$$

Set

$$\sigma = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i y_i \right\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^t \|y_i\| \leq t\psi$$

and note that  $\|\sum_{i=n+1}^t \lambda_i u_i\| = t - n$ .

Then

$$2 \leq \mu(Z_\varepsilon) = \|v\|^p \leq (\sigma + \varepsilon(t - n))^p.$$

From this in conjunction with the first condition on the choice of  $\varepsilon$ , it follows that

$$\alpha \geq 2^{1/p} - \varepsilon(t - n) \geq 2^{1/2p}.$$

A routine computation shows that if

$$\sigma \geq 2^{1/2p} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \tau \leq 2^{1/p} - 2^{1/2p}$$

then

$$(\sigma + \tau)^p \leq \sigma^p + 2p\sigma^{p-1}\tau.$$

Hence this last inequality holds when  $\tau = \varepsilon(t - n)$ , and we have

$$(\sigma + \varepsilon(t - n))^p \leq \sigma^p + 2p\sigma^{p-1}\varepsilon(t - n).$$

To complete the proof that  $\mu(Z_\varepsilon) \leq \mu(Y) + \delta$ , note that  $\sigma^p \leq \mu(Y)$  and apply the second condition on the choice of  $\varepsilon$  to the second summand on the right.  $\square$

**3.5 THEOREM.** *For each positive integer  $p$ , the problems  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$  and  $[0, 1]PARMAX_p$  are NP-complete.*

*Proof.* In view of Theorems 3.1 – 3.3, it suffices to transform  $[-1, 1]ZONMAX_p$  to  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$ . For notational simplicity, we work with the variant of  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$  in which the generating points  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  are permitted to have rational coordinates while the threshold  $\beta$  is an integer. This is permissible, for if  $(n, \beta; z_1, \dots, z_n)$  is an instance of this problem and  $\lambda$  is the product of the denominators of the coordinates of the  $z_i$ 's, then the instances  $(n, \beta; z_1, \dots, z_n)$  and  $(n, \lambda^p \beta; \lambda x_1, \dots, \lambda x_n)$  are equivalent.

Now consider an arbitrary instance  $(n, t, \beta; y_1, \dots, y_t)$  of  $[-1, 1]ZONMAX_p$ . If  $t = n$ , it is already an instance of  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$ . When  $t > n$ , proceed as follows:

(i) Set

$$\psi = (n + 1)^{p+1} > \max\{\|y_1\|, \dots, \|y_t\|\},$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that each of the  $n$  coordinates of each point  $y_i$  is at most  $(n + 1)^p$  in absolute value.

(ii) Set  $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$ , and choose a positive rational

$$\varepsilon < \min\{2^{1/p} - 2^{1/2p}, \delta/(2pn^{p-1}\psi^{p-1})\}.$$

This can be done in polynomial time.

(iii) Form the points  $z_1, \dots, z_t$  as described in Lemma 3.4. The sequence  $(n, \beta; z_1, \dots, z_t)$  describes an instance of  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$ .

(iv) By Lemma 3.4,

$$\mu(Y) \leq \mu(Z_\epsilon) \leq \mu(Y) + \frac{1}{2}.$$

We do not know that  $\mu(Z_\epsilon)$  is an integer. However, both  $\mu(Y)$  and  $\beta$  are integers, and hence  $\mu(Y) \geq \beta$  if and only if  $\mu(Z_\epsilon) \geq \beta$ . Thus we have transformed the instance of  $[-1, 1]ZONMAX_p$  to an equivalent instance of the variant of  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$ .  $\square$

Though PARTITION and 3SPLIT are both **NP**-complete, the former can be solved by a *pseudopolynomial* algorithm — one which, for each fixed upper bound  $B$  on the integers in the sequence that is to be partitioned, does admit a polynomial upper bound on running time (with the bound depending on  $B$ ). In other words, the **NP**-hardness of PARTITION depends on the admissibility of instances involving integers that are very large relative to the underlying combinatorics. That is not true of 3SPLIT or  $\{-1, 0, 1\}PARMAX_p$ . In the terminology of Garey and Johnson [GJ1,2], these two problems are *NP-complete in the strong sense* while PARTITION is not. We do not know whether  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$  and  $[0, 1]PARMAX_p$  are **NP**-complete in the strong sense.

**3.6 PROBLEM.** *For a positive integer  $p$ , are the problems  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_p$  and  $[0, 1]PARMAX_p$  **NP**-complete in the strong sense?*

#### 4. EUCLIDEAN NORMS.

As was mentioned in connection with Theorem 2.3, there are polynomial-time algorithms for maximizing a concave quadratic function over an  $\mathcal{H}$ -polytope. For a survey concerning the much more difficult problem of maximizing a convex function, see [PR87]. As we saw in Section 3, the latter problem is **NP**-hard, even for the very special case in which the objective function is the square of the Euclidean norm and the polytope is a full-dimensional parallelotope that is centered at the origin or has a vertex there. However, the next result shows that the standard Euclidean norm can be maximized in polynomial time over an arbitrary *rectangular* parallelotope.

**4.1 THEOREM.** *For maximizing the Euclidean norm over a rectangular parallelotope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , there is an algorithm that uses at most  $n$  inner-product computations and  $n - 1$  comparisons.*

*Proof.* If  $(c; x_1, \dots, x_m)$  is an  $\mathcal{S}$ -presentation of a rectangular parallelotope  $P$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $m \leq n$  and the  $x_i$ 's are pairwise orthogonal. Set  $y = c - \sum_{i=1}^m x_i$ , and let  $s_i = 2x_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Set  $S_0 = \{0\}$  and for  $1 \leq k \leq m$  define

$$S_k = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i s_i : \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in [0, 1] \right\}$$

Then  $y$  is a vertex of  $P$ , the  $s_i$ 's are pairwise orthogonal, and  $P = y + s_m$ .

Here is the algorithm:

**begin**

$q \leftarrow y$ ;

**for**  $i \leftarrow 1$  **until**  $n$  **do**

**if**  $\langle q + s_i, q + s_i \rangle > \langle q, q \rangle$  **then**  $q \leftarrow q + s_i$ ;

    print "The norm is maximized by the vertex"  $q$

**end.**

Let  $y_0 = y$ , and for  $1 \leq k \leq n$  let  $y_k$  denote the value of  $q$  after the  $k^{\text{th}}$  pass through the **do** loop. Then  $y_k$  is of course a vertex of the  $k$ -parallelotope  $y + S_k$ , and we claim that  $y_k$  maximizes the norm over  $y + S_k$ . That is obviously true when  $k = 0$ . For the inductive step from  $k - 1$  to  $k$ , note that the vertices of  $y + S_k$  are precisely the points of the form  $y + v$  or  $y + v + s_k$  where  $v$  belongs to the vertex-set  $V_{k-1}$  of  $S_{k-1}$ . For each  $v \in V_{k-1}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y + v + s_k, y + v + s_k \rangle &= \langle y + v, y + v \rangle + \langle s_k, s_k \rangle + 2\langle y + v, s_k \rangle \\ &= \langle y + v, y + v \rangle + \langle s_k, s_k \rangle + 2\langle y, s_k \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses the fact that  $\langle v, s_k \rangle = 0$ . From this it follows that for each  $v, w \in V_{k-1}$ ,

$$\langle y + v, y + v \rangle \geq \langle y + w, y + w \rangle$$

if and only if

$$\langle y + v + s_k, y + v + s_k \rangle \geq \langle y + w + s_k, y + w + s_k \rangle.$$

Since  $y_{k-1}$  maximizes the norm over  $y + S_{k-1}$ , we conclude that  $y_{k-1}$  or  $y_{k-1} + s_k$  maximizes the norm over  $y + S_k$ , and that leads to the desired conclusion.  $\square$

**4.2 PROBLEM.** For a positive integer  $p \neq 2$ , what is the complexity of the problem of maximizing the  $p$ -norm over a parallelotope of the form

$$\{x = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : \alpha_i \leq \xi_i \leq \beta_i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n\},$$

where the  $\alpha_i$ 's and  $\beta_i$ 's are integers?

We turn, finally, to the subject of *pseudoboolean programming*, which is concerned with the optimization of real- or rational-valued functions over the vertex-set  $\{0, 1\}^n$  of the  $n$ -cube  $[0, 1]^n$ . Because of the importance of this subject, and the wide range of problems that can be naturally formulated in these terms, it is of interest to identify classes of functions that can be maximized over  $\{0, 1\}^n$  in polynomial time. Some such classes of

quadratic functions are identified in [PQ], [Ba], [H'S], [GKP] and [CHJ]. Also, a result for a rather narrow class can be deduced from Theorem 4.1: *For each point  $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , a point of  $\{0, 1\}^n$  at maximum Euclidean distance from  $q$  can be found in polynomial time.* Other discussions of quadratic pseudoboolean programming appear in [Ko], [Ph], and [PR].

In addition to identifying classes of quadratic functions for which pseudoboolean maximization is easy, it is of interest to identify classes for which it is **NP**-hard. Hammer and Simeone [HS] show that such a class is formed by functions of the form  $x^T Ax$ , where  $A$  is an upper triangular matrix that has at most one negative entry in each row. Here we do the same for  $x^T Ax$  when the matrix  $A$  is positive definite. In this case, the function  $x^T Ax$  is just the square of a norm with respect to which  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is linearly isometric to the standard Euclidean  $n$ -space.

**4.3 THEOREM.** *The following problems  $POSDEF\{-1,1\}MAX$  and  $POSDEF\{0,1\}MAX$  are **NP**-complete:*

*Instance: Positive integers  $n$  and  $\lambda$ ; positive definite symmetric  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  with integer entries.*

*Question for  $POSDEF\{-1,1\}MAX$ : Does there exist a  $\{-1, 1\}$ -vector  $x$  such that  $x^T Ax \geq \gamma A$ ?*

*Question for  $POSDEF\{0,1\}MAX$ : Does there exist a  $\{0, 1\}$ -vector  $x$  such that  $x^T Ax \geq \gamma$ ?*

*Proof.* Membership in **NP** is obvious. To establish **NP**-hardness, we describe a transformation of the  $[-1, 1]PARMAX_2$   $\langle [0, 1]PARMAX_2 \rangle$  problem of Theorem 3.5 to  $POSDEF\{-1, 1\}MAX$   $\langle POSDEF\{0, 1\}MAX \rangle$ . An instance of a  $PARMAX_2$  problem consists of positive integers  $n$  and  $\beta$ , and  $n$  linearly independent integer vectors  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $A$  denote the Gramian matrix formed by the inner products of the  $x_i$ 's — i.e.,  $A = [\alpha_{ij}]$ , where  $\alpha_{ij} = x_i^T x_j$ . Clearly  $A$  is a symmetric matrix whose entries are integers, and it is well known that  $A$  is positive definite when the  $x_i$ 's are linearly independent. Hence  $(n, \beta; A)$  is an instance of a  $POSDEFMAX$  problem. Each point  $x$  of  $\mathbb{Q}^n$  has a unique representation in the form  $x = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i$  with rational  $\lambda_i$ 's, and

$$\|x\|^2 = x^T x = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n (x_i^T x_j) \lambda_i \lambda_j.$$

This is equal to  $y^T Ay$  with  $y = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)^T$ . Hence  $\|x\|^2$  attains a value  $\geq \beta$  for  $\lambda_i$ 's in  $\{-1, 1\}$   $\langle \{0, 1\} \rangle$  if and only if  $y^T Ay$  attains a value  $\geq \beta$  on the vertex-set of the cube  $\{-1, 1\}^n$   $\langle [0, 1]^n \rangle$ . Thus the  $PARMAX_2$  problems have been transformed to the respective  $POSDEFMAX$  problems and the latter, like the former, are **NP**-complete.  $\square$

An alternative proof of Theorem 4.3 can be drawn from the papers [GK1] and [GK2]. [GK2] shows by a transformation from  $PARTITION$  that the following problem,  $SIMPLEX-WIDTH$ , is **NP**-hard:



Instance: an  $n$ -simplex  $T$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , a positive integer  $\rho$ .

Question: In the Euclidean norm for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , is the square of the width of  $T$  less than or equal to  $\rho$ ?

(The *width* of a body  $C$  is the minimum of the distances between pairs of parallel supporting hyperplanes of  $C$ .) [GK1] outlines an argument showing that the problems  $POSDEF\{0,1\}MAX$  and  $SIMPLEX-WIDTH$  are *polynomially equivalent* in the sense that there is a one-to-one transformation (polynomial-time in both directions) between the instances of one problem and those of the other. Hence the NP-hardness of  $POSDEF\{0,1\}MAX$  follows from that of  $PARTITION$  by way of  $SIMPLEX-WIDTH$ . This provides a different proof of Theorem 4.3 and also, in view of the following paragraphs, a different proof of Theorem 3.5 for the case  $p = 2$ .

By a construction similar to that in the first part of the proof of Theorem 3.1,  $POSDEF\{0,1\}MAX$  can be transformed to  $POSDEF\{-1,1\}MAX$ . In closing, we shall describe a transformation of  $POSDEF\{-1,1\}MAX$  to  $[-1,1]PARMAX_2$ . Consider an instance  $(n, \lambda; A)$  of  $POSDEF\{-1,1\}MAX$ , where  $A$  is an  $n \times n$  symmetric positive definite matrix with integer entries. In polynomial time we can compute a permutation matrix  $J$ , a lower triangular matrix  $L$ , a diagonal matrix  $D$ , and an upper triangular matrix  $U$  such that  $JA = LDU$ . Let us assume (without loss of generality) that  $J$  is the  $n \times n$  identity matrix. Since  $A$  is symmetric and the  $LDU$  factorization is unique, we have  $L = U^T$ . Thus the computation of the factorization is essentially Gaussian elimination. Observe that the entries of  $D$  and  $U$  are rationals whose numerators and denominators are polynomially bounded in the size of the input.

Since  $A$  is positive definite, the diagonal entries of  $D$  are all positive. Let  $S$  denote the diagonal matrix obtained from  $D$  by taking the square roots of  $D$ 's diagonal entries. The entries of  $S$  may of course be irrational, but it will become clear that suitable rational approximations are available. For simplicity we first work with real arithmetic. Let  $W = SU$ . Then  $A = W^T W$ , and with  $C = [-1, 1]^n$  the following four statements are equivalent:

- there exists  $x \in C$  such that  $x^T A x \geq \lambda$ ;
- there exists  $x \in C$  such that  $(Wx)^T (Wx) \geq \lambda$ ;
- there exists  $y \in WC$  such that  $y^T y \geq \lambda$ ;
- there exists  $y \in P$  such that  $\|y\|_2^2 \geq \lambda$ , where  $P$  is the  
parallelotope given by  $P = \sum_{i=1}^n [-w_i, w_i]$  and the  $w_i$ 's are  
the columns of the matrix  $W$ .

The preceding discussion shows that in real arithmetic,  $POSDEF\{-1,1\}MAX$  transforms polynomially to  $[-1,1]PARMAX$ . To deal with the binary (Turing machine) model of computation, observe that  $x^T A x$  is an integer for each vertex  $x$  of the cube  $C = [-1, 1]^n$ .

Hence the following two statements are equivalent whenever  $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1$ :

there exists  $x \in C$  such that  $x^T Ax \geq \lambda$ ;

there exists  $x \in C$  such that  $x^T Ax \geq \lambda - \varepsilon$ .

From this equivalence it follows that rounding the entries of  $S$  to a suitable number of significant digits (bounded by a polynomial in the size of the input) can be accomplished without destroying the transformation of  $POSDEF\{-1, 1\}MAX$  to  $[-1, 1]PARMAX$ . Hence the two problems are polynomially equivalent for the binary model of computation.

#### REFERENCES

- [Ba] F. BARAHONA, *A solvable case for quadratic 0-1 programming*, Discrete Appl. Math., 13 (1986), pp. 23–26.
- [Bi] A. BIELECKI, *Quelques remarques sur la note précédente*, Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, Sect. A, 8 (1954), pp. 101–103.
- [BR] A. BIELECKI AND K. RADISZEWSKI, *Sur les parallelepipèdes inscrits dans les corps convexes*, Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, Sect. A, 8 (1954), pp. 97–100.
- [Ch] C. CHRISTENSEN, *Kvadrat inskrevet i konveks figur*, Mat. Tidsskrift, B 1950 (1950), pp. 22–26.
- [Co] S.A. COOK, *The complexity of theorem-proving procedures*, Proc. Third Ann ACM Symp on Theory of Computing, Association for Computing Machinery (1971), pp. 151–158, New York.
- [CHJ] Y. CRAMA, P. HANSEN AND B. JAUMARD, *The basic algorithm for pseudo-Boolean programming revisited*, preprint, (1988).
- [Dy] M.E. DYER, *The complexity of vertex enumeration methods*, Math of Operations Res., 8 (1983), pp. 381–402.
- [FO] R.M. FREUND AND J.B. ORLIN, *On the complexity of four polyhedral set containment problems*, Math. Programming, 33 (1985), pp. 139–145.
- [GJ1] M.R. GAREY AND D.S. JOHNSON, *Strong NP-completeness results: motivation, examples, and implications*, J. Assoc. Comp. Mach., 25 (1978), pp. 499–508.
- [GJ2] M.R. GAREY AND D.S. JOHNSON, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, W.H. Freeman, San Francisco.
- [GKP] G. GEORGAKOPOULOS, D. KAVVADIAS AND C.H. PAPADIMITRIOU, *Probabilistic satisfiability*, J. of Complexity, 4 (1988), pp. 1–11.
- [GK1] P. GRITZMANN AND V. KLEE, *On the 0–1 maximization of positive definite quadratic forms*, Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Operations Research, Berlin (1988) (to appear).
- [GK2] P. GRITZMANN AND V. KLEE, *Computational complexity of inner and outer  $j$ -radii of polytopes in finite-dimensional normed spaces*, in preparation.
- [Gr] B. GRÜNBAUM, *Measures of symmetry for convex sets*, in *Convexity*, (V. Klee, ed.), Amer. Math. Soc. Proc. Symp. Pure Math, 7 (1963), pp. 233–270.
- [HLM] H. HADWIGER, D.G. LARMAN AND P. MANI, *Hyperrhombus inscribed to convex bodies*, J. Combinatorial Theory, B 24 (1978), pp. 290–293.
- [HS] P.L. HAMMER AND B. SIMEONE, *Quasimonotone boolean functions and bistellar graphs*, Ann. Discrete Math., 8, pp. 107–119.
- [H’S] P. HANSEN AND B. SIMEONE, *Unimodular functions*, Discrete Appl. Math., 14 (1986), pp. 269–281.
- [HH] W.M. HIRSCH AND A.J. HOFFMAN, *Extreme varieties, concave functions and the fixed charge problem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 14 (1961), pp. 355–369.
- [Ka] N. KARMARKAR, *A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming*, Combinatorica, 4 (1984), pp. 373–397.
- [Ka’] R.M. KARP, *Reducibility among combinatorial problems*, in *Complexity of Computer Computations*, (R.E. Miller and J.W. Thatcher, eds.), (1972), pp. 85–103, Plenum Press, New York.

- [Kh] L.G. KHACHIAN, *Polynomial algorithms in linear programming*, USSR Comp. Math. and Math. Phys., 20 (1980), pp. 53–72.
- [KMY] M. KOJIMA, S. MIZUNO AND A. YOSHISHE, *A primal–dual interior point algorithm for linear programming, quadratic minimization*, (to appear).
- [Ko] H. KONNO, *Maximization of a convex quadratic function over a hypercube*, J. Oper. Res. Soc. Japan, 23 (1980), pp. 171–189.
- [KTH] M.K. KOZLOV, S.P. TARASOV AND L.G. KHACHIAN, *Polynomial solvability of convex quadratic programming*, Soviet Math. Doklady, 20 (1979), pp. 1108–1111.
- [Lo] LOVÁSZ, *Coverings and colorings of hypergraphs*, in Proceedings of the Fourth Southeastern Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing, Utilitas Mathematica, Winnipeg (1973), pp. 3–12.
- [Ma] A.M. MACBEATH, *A compactness theorem for affine equivalence classes of convex regions*, Canad. J. Math., 3 (1951), pp. 54–61.
- [Ma'] K. MAHLER, *Ein Übertragungsprinzip für konvexe Körper*, Casopis pro Pestovani Mat. a. Fys., 68 (1939), pp. 93–102.
- [MS] O.L. MANGASARIAN AND T.-H. SHIAU, *A variable complexity norm maximization problem*, SIAM J. Algebraic and Discrete Methods, 7 (1986), pp. 455–461.
- [Mc] P. McMULLEN, *The maximum number of faces of a convex polytope*, Mathematika, 17 (1970), pp. 179–184.
- [MA] R.D.C. MONTEIRO AND I. ADLER, *Interior path following primal-dual algorithms – Part II: Convex quadratic programming*, Math. Programming, 44 (1989,) (to appear).
- [MK] K.G. MURTY AND S.N. KABADI, *Some NP-complete problems in quadratic and nonlinear programming*, Math. Programming, 39 (1987), pp. 117–129.
- [Na] H. NAUMANN, *Beliebige konvexe Polytope als Schnitte und Projektionen höherdimensionaler Würfel, Simplexe und Masspolytope*, Math. Z., 65 (1956), pp. 91–103.
- [PR] P.M. PARDALOS AND J.B. ROSEN, *Constrained Global Optimization*, Lecture Notes in Comp. Sci. (G. Goos and J. Hartmanis, eds.), 268, Springer, Berlin, (1987).
- [Ph] D.T. PHAM, *Algorithmes de calcul du maximum de formes quadratiques sur la boule unie de la forme du maximum*, Numer. Math., 45 (1984), pp. 377–401.
- [PQ] J.C. PICARD AND M. QUEYRANNE, *Selected applications of min cut in networks*, INFOR, 20 (1982), pp. 395–422.
- [Pu] C. PUCCI, *Sulla inscrivibilita di un ottaedro regolare in un insieme convesso limitato dello spazio ordinaria*, Atti. Acad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur., 8 (1956), pp. 61–65.
- [Sa] S. SAHNI, *Computationally related problems*, SIAM J. Comput., 3 (1974), pp. 262–279.
- [Sc] T.J. SCHAEFER, *The complexity of satisfiability problems*, Proc. Tenth Ann. ACM Symp. on Theory of Computing, Association for Computing Machinery, New York (1978), pp. 216–226.
- [Se] R. SEIDEL, *Output-Size Sensitive Algorithms for Constructive Problems in Computational Geometry*, Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. (1987).
- [Sw] G. SWART, *Finding the convex hull facet by facet*, J. of Algorithms, 6 (1985), pp. 17–48.
- [YT] Y. YE AND E. TSE, *A polynomial-time algorithm for convex quadratic programming*, Dept. of Engineering-Economic Skystems, Stanform Univ., Tech. Rep. (1986).
- [Zi] K. ZINDLER, *Über konvexe Gebilde*, Monatshefte für Math., 31 (1921), pp. 25–57.

## Recent IMA Preprints

#	Author/s	Title
464	Yisong Yang	Existence, Regularity, and Asymptotic Behavior of the Solutions to the Ginzburg-Landau Equations on $\mathbb{R}^3$
465	Chjan. C. Lim	On Symplectic Tree Graphs
466	Wilhelm I. Fushchich, Ivan Krivsky and Vladimir Simulik,	On Vector and Pseudovector Lagrangians for Electromagnetic Field
467	Wilhelm I. Fushchich,	Exact Solutions of Multidimensional Nonlinear Dirac's and Schrödinger's Equations
468	Wilhelm I. Fushchich and Renat Zhdanov,	On Some New Exact Solutions of Nonlinear D'Alembert and Hamilton Equations
469	Brian A. Coomes,	The Lorenz System Does Not Have a Polynomial Flow
470	J.W. Helton and N.J. Young,	Approximation of Hankel Operators: Truncation Error in an $H^\infty$ Design Method
471	Gregory Ammar and Paul Gader,	A Variant of the Gohberg-Semencul Formula Involving Circulant Matrices
472	R.L. Fosdick and G.P. MacSithigh,	Minimization in Nonlinear Elasticity Theory for Bodies Reinforced with Inextensible Cords
473	Fernando Reitich,	Rapidly Stretching Plastic Jets: The Linearized Problem
474	Francisco Bernis and Avner Friedman,	Higher Order Nonlinear Degenerate Parabolic Equations
475	Xinfu Chen and Avner Friedman,	Maxwell's Equations in a Periodic Structure
476	Avner Friedman and Michael Vogelius	Determining Cracks by Boundary Measurements
477	Yuji Kodama and John Gibbons,	A Method for Solving the Dispersionless KP Hierarchy and its Exact Solutions II
478	Yuji Kodama,	Exact Solutions of Hydrodynamic Type Equations Having Infinitely Many Conserved Densities
479	Robert Carroll,	Some Forced Nonlinear Equations and the Time Evolution of Spectral Data
480	Chjan. C. Lim	Spanning Binary Trees, Symplectic Matrices, and Canonical Transformations for Classical N-body Problems
481	E.F. Assmus, Jr. and J.D. Key,	Translation Planes and Derivation Sets
482	Matthew Witten,	Mathematical Modeling and Computer Simulation of the Aging-Cancer Interface
483	Matthew Witten and Caleb E. Finch,	Re-Examining The Gompertzian Model of Aging
484	Bei Hu,	A Free Boundary Problem for a Hamilton-Jacobi Equation Arising in Ions Etching
485	T.C. Hu, Victor Klee and David Larman,	Optimization of Globally Convex Functions
486	Pierre Goossens,	Shellings of Tilings
487	D. David, D. D. Holm, and M.V. Tratnik,	Integrable and Chaotic Polarization Dynamics in Nonlinear Optical Beams
488	D. David, D.D. Holm and M.V. Tratnik,	Horseshoe Chaos in a Periodically Perturbed Polarized Optical Beam
489	Laurent Habsieger,	Linear Recurrent Sequences and Irrationality Measures
490	Laurent Habsieger,	MacDonald Conjectures and The Selberg Integral
491	David Kinderlehrer and Giorgio Vergara-Caffarelli,	The Relaxation of Functionals with Surface Energies
492	Richard James and David Kinderlehrer,	Theory of Diffusionless Phase Transitions
493	David Kinderlehrer,	Recent Developments in Liquid Crystal Theory
494	Niky Kamran and Peter J. Olver,	Equivalence of Higher Order Lagrangians 1. Formulation and Reduction
495	Lucas Hsu, Niky Kamran and Peter J. Olver,	Equivalence of Higher Order Lagrangians II. The Cartan Form for Particle Lagrangians
496	D.J. Kaup and Peter J. Olver,	Quantization of BiHamiltonian Systems
497	Metin Arik, Fahrünisa Neyzi, Yavuz Nutku, Peter J. Olver and John M. Verosky,	Multi-Hamiltonian Structure of the Born-Infeld Equation
498	David H. Wagner,	Detonation Waves and Deflagration Waves in the One Dimensional ZND Model for High Mach Number Combustion
499	Jerrold R. Griggs and Daniel J. Kleitman,	Minimum Cutsets for an Element of a Boolean Lattice
500	Dieter Jungnickel,	On Affine Difference Sets
501	Pierre Leroux,	Reduced Matrices and q-log Concavity Properties of q-Stirling Numbers
502	A. Narain and Y. Kizilyalli,	The Flow of Pure Vapor Undergoing Film Condensation Between Parallel Plates
503	Donald A. French,	On the Convergence of Finite Element Approximations of a Relaxed Variational Problem

## Recent IMA Preprints (Continued)

#	Author/s	Title
504	Yisong Yang,	Computation, Dimensionality, and Zero Dissipation Limit of the Ginzburg-Landau Wave Equation
505	Jürgen Sprekels,	One-Dimensional Thermomechanical Phase Transitions with Non-Convex Potentials of Ginzburg-Landau Type
506	Yisong Yang,	A Note On Nonabelian Vortices
507	Yisong Yang,	On the Abelian Higgs Models with Sources
508	Chjan. C. Lim,	Existence of Kam Tori in the Phase Space of Vortex Systems
509	John Weiss,	Bäcklund Transformations and the Painlevé Property
510	Pu Fu-cho and D.H. Sattinger,	The Yang-Baxter Equation for Integrable Systems
511	E. Bruce Pitman and David G. Schaeffer,	Instability and Ill-Posedness in Granular Flow
512	Brian A. Coomes,	Polynomial Flows on $C^n$
513	Bernardo Cockburn, Suchung Hou and Chi-Wang Shu,	The Runge-Kutta Local Projection Discontinuous Galerkin Finite Element Method for Conservation Laws IV: The Multidimensional Case
514	Peter J. Olver,	Invariant Theory, Equivalence Problems, and the Calculus of Variations
515	Daniel D. Joseph and Thomas S. Lundgren with an appendix by R. Jackson and D.A. Saville,	Ensemble Averaged and Mixture Theory Equations
516	P. Singh, Ph. Caussignac, A. Fortes, D.D. Joseph and T. Lundgren,	Stability of Periodic Arrays of Cylinders Across the Stream by Direct Simulation
517	Daniel D. Joseph,	Generalization of the Foscolo-Gibilario Analysis of Dynamic Waves
518	A. Narain and D.D. Joseph,	Note on the Balance of Energy at a Phase Change Interface
519	Daniel D. Joseph,	Remarks on inertial radii, persistent normal stresses, secondary motions , and non-elastic extensional viscosities
520	D. D. Joseph,	Mathematical Problems Associated with the Elasticity of Liquids
521	Henry C. Simpson and Scott J. Spector,	Some Necessary Conditions at an Internal Boundary for Minimizers in Finite Elasticity
522	Peter Gritzmann and Victor Klee,	On the 0-1 Maximization of Positive Definite Quadratic Forms
523	Fu-Cho Pu and D.H. Sattinger,	The Yang-Baxter Equations and Differential Identities
524	Avner Friedman and Fernando Reitich,	A Hyperbolic Inverse Problem Arising in the Evolution of Combustion Aerosol
525	E.G. Kalnins, Raphael D. Levine and Willand Miller, Jr.,	Conformal Symmetries and Generalized Recurrences for Heat and Schrödinger Equations in One Spatial Dimension
526	Wang Jinghua and Gerald Warnecke,	On Entropy Consistency of Large Time Step Godunov and Glimm Schemes
527	C. Guillopé and J.C. Saut,	Existence Results for the Flow of Viscoelastic Fluids with a Differential Constitutive Law
528	H.L. Bodlaender, P. Gritzmann, V. Klee and J. Van Leeuwen	Computational Complexity of Norm-Maximization
529	Li Ta-tsien (Li Da-qian) and Yu Xin,	Life-Span of Classical Solutions to Fully Nonlinear Wave Equations
530	Jong-Shenq Guo,	A Variational Inequality Associated with a Lubrication Problem
531	Jong-Shenq Guo,	On the Semilinear Elliptic Equation $\Delta w - \frac{1}{2}y \cdot \nabla w + \lambda w - w^{-\beta}$ in $R^n$
532	Andrew E. Yagle,	Inversion of the Bloch transform in magnetic resonance imaging using asymmetric two-component inverse scattering
533	Bei Hu,	A Fiber Tapering Problem
534	Peter J. Olver,	Canonical Variables for BiHamiltonian Systems
535	Michael Renardy,	A Well-Posed Boundary Value Problem for Supercritical Flow of Viscoelastic Fluids of Maxwell Type
536	Michael Renardy,	Ill-Posedness Resulting from Slip As a Possible Explanation of Melt Fracture
537	Michael Renardy,	Compatibility Conditions at Corners Between Walls and Inflow Boundaries for Fluids of Maxwell Type
538	Rolf Rees,	The Spectrum of Restricted Resolvable Designs with $r = 2$
539	D. Lewis and J.C. Simo,	Nonlinear stability of rotating pseudo-rigid bodies
540	Robert Hardt and David Kinderlehrer,	Variational Principles with Linear Growth
541	San Yih Lin and Yisong Yang,	Computation of Superconductivity in Thin Films
542	A. Narain,	Pressure Driven Flow of Pure Vapor Undergoing Laminar Film Condensation Between Parallel Plates
543	P.J. Vassiliou,	On Local Equivalence for Vector Field Systems