

Operations that preserve the covering property of the lifting region

Amitabh Basu and Joe Paat*

July 21, 2022

Abstract

We contribute to the theory for minimal liftings of cut-generating functions. In particular, we give three operations that preserve the so-called covering property of certain structured cut-generating functions. This has the consequence of vastly expanding the set of undominated cut-generating functions which can be used computationally, compared to known examples from the literature. The results of this paper are not only significant generalizations of previous results from the literature on such operations, but also use completely different proof techniques which we feel are more suitable for attacking future research questions in this area. Finally, we complete the classification of two dimensional S -free convex sets when S is the intersection of a translated lattice and a polyhedron, thus settling the covering question in two dimensions for such S .

1 Introduction

Cut-Generating Pairs. Cut-generating functions are a means to have “a priori” formulas for generating cutting planes for general mixed-integer optimization problems. We make this more precise. Let S be a closed subset of \mathbb{R}^n with $0 \notin S$. Consider the following set, parametrized by matrices R, P :

$$X_S(R, P) := \left\{ (s, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k \times \mathbb{Z}_+^\ell : Rs + Py \in S \right\}, \quad (1.1)$$

where $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \ell}$ are matrices. Denote the columns of matrices R and P by r_1, \dots, r_k and p_1, \dots, p_ℓ , respectively. We allow the possibility that $k = 0$ or $\ell = 0$ (but not both). This general model contains as special cases classical optimization models. A few examples are illustrated below¹.

1. *Mixed-integer linear programming (MILP).* A mixed-integer linear program’s feasible region is defined by $\{(s, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^k \times \mathbb{Z}_+^\ell : Rs + Py = b\}$ where R, P are matrices as before and $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a vector. This is obtained from (1.1) by setting $S = \{b\}$. An interesting, and very useful, way to model MILPs is by setting $S = b - \mathbb{Z}_+^n$. This comes from the “tableaux” form of

*Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, The Johns Hopkins University, MD, USA

¹Many of these examples were borrowed from [11]. We felt including them here was better than simply referring the reader to the paper.

general MILPs: $\{(x, s, y) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^k \times \mathbb{Z}_+^\ell : Rs + Py + x = b\}$ where we think of x as the basic variables and s, y as the nonbasic variables in some simplex tableaux.

2. *Mixed-integer conic programming.* Setting S to be the translation of a closed, pointed, convex cone in (1.1) gives the standard mixed-integer conic programming problem.
3. *Mixed-integer (structured) convex programs.* Setting S to be $C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ where C is a (structured) convex set leads to a very expressive model, that is classically written as

$$\{(x, s, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^k \times \mathbb{Z}_+^\ell : Rs + Py = x, x \in C\}.$$

For example, one can write mixed-integer programs with conic constraints by setting C to be the translation of a closed, pointed, convex cone.

4. *Complementarity problems with integer constraints.* In such problems, the feasible region is given by all integer points in a polyhedron that satisfy complementarity constraints like $y_i y_j = 0$ (y_i, y_j are variables of the problem). This can be modeled using (1.1). Let $k = 0$ and $n = \ell$. Let E be a subset of $\{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, n\}$. Define $C = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : y_i y_j = 0 \ \forall (i, j) \in E\}$ and let $S = X \cap C$ where $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a polyhedron. Letting the matrix $P = I_n$ (the identity matrix of dimension n), we then obtain from (1.1) a complementarity problem with integer constraints. This can be extended to a mixed-integer problem.

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and a closed subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $0 \notin S$, a *cut-generating pair* (ψ, π) for S is a pair of functions $\psi, \pi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \psi(r_i) s_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \pi(p_j) y_j \geq 1 \tag{1.2}$$

is a valid inequality (also called a *cut*) for the set $X_S(R, P)$ for every choice of $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and for all matrices $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \ell}$. Cut-generating pairs thus provide cuts that separate 0 from the set $X_S(R, P)$ of feasible solutions (it is known that $0 \notin S$ implies 0 is not in the closed convex hull of $X_S(R, P)$ - see Lemma 2.1 in [11]). We emphasize that cut-generating pairs depend on n and S and do *not* depend on k, ℓ, R and P . There is a natural partial order on the set of cut generating pairs; namely, $(\psi', \pi') \leq (\psi, \pi)$ if and only if $\psi' \leq \psi$ and $\pi' \leq \pi$. Due to the non negativity of (s, y) , if $(\psi', \pi') \leq (\psi, \pi)$ then all the cuts obtained from (ψ, π) are dominated by the cuts obtained from (ψ', π') . The minimal elements under this partial ordering are called *minimal cut-generating pairs*. It is verified in Proposition A.2 that every valid cut-generating pair is dominated by a minimal one. Thus, one can concentrate on the minimal cut-generating pairs.

Efficient procedures for cut-generating pairs. Several deep structural results were obtained by Johnson [17] about minimal cut-generating functions for S when S is a translated lattice, i.e., $S = b + \mathbb{Z}^n$ for some $b \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{Z}^n$. However, a major drawback is that the theory developed is abstract and difficult to use from a computational perspective. A recent approach has been to restrict attention to a specific class of minimal cut-generating pairs for which we can give efficient procedures to compute the values. In particular, given some specific matrices R, P , we want to be able to compute the coefficients $\psi(r_i)$ and $\pi(p_j)$ quickly. For this purpose, a relaxed model was proposed [1, 9, 13, 11]:

$$X_S(R) := \left\{ s \in \mathbb{R}_+^k : Rs \in S \right\} \quad (1.3)$$

A *cut-generating function* for S is a function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \psi(r_i) s_i \geq 1 \quad (1.4)$$

is a valid inequality for the set $X_S(R)$ for every choice of $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and a matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$. For a given $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$, we stress the distinction between a cut-generating *pair* for S as defined in (1.2), and a cut-generating *function* for S , as defined in (1.4). The important distinction is that model (1.3) has no integer variables, as opposed to (1.1).

The notion of a minimal cut-generating function can again be defined and it can be shown along the lines of Proposition A.1 that all cut-generating functions are dominated by minimal ones. It turns out that for many specially structured S , we obtain closed-form formulas for minimal cut-generating functions. This is done via an important connection that was observed between the so-called *S -free convex sets* and minimal cut-generating functions. Given $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, a convex set B is called *S -free* if $\text{int}(B) \cap S = \emptyset$. A *maximal S -free set* is an S -free convex set that is inclusion wise maximal. When S is the intersection of a translated lattice and a polyhedron, i.e., $S = (b + \mathbb{Z}^n) \cap P$ for some vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{Z}^n$ and some rational polyhedron P , it was shown in [13, 7] that a function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a minimal cut-generating function for S if and only if there exists a maximal S -free polyhedron B containing the origin in its interior given by

$$B = \{r \in \mathbb{R}^n : a_i \cdot r \leq 1 \quad i \in I\} \quad (1.5)$$

and

$$\psi(r) = \max_{i \in I} a_i \cdot r. \quad (1.6)$$

This connection between maximal S -free sets and minimal cut-generating functions was further developed in [11]. The exciting observation is that we can compute the coefficients $\psi(r_i)$ in (1.4) very quickly using the formula (1.6). The question is: can we find similar formulas for cut-generating *pairs*?

This led Dey and Wolsey [14] to import the idea of *monoidal strengthening* into this context. Monoidal strengthening was a method introduced by Balas and Jeroslow [4] to strengthen cutting planes by using integrality information. This inspired Dey and Wolsey to define the notion of a *lifting* of a cut-generating function ψ as any function $\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that (ψ, π) together forms a cut-generating pair. Given a fixed ψ which is a cut-generating function for S , the set of all liftings of ψ is partially ordered by pointwise dominance and one can thus define *minimal liftings*. Proposition A.2 shows that for any cut-generating function ψ (not necessarily minimal) and any lifting π of ψ , π is dominated by a minimal lifting of ψ . It is not hard to observe that if ψ is a minimal cut-generating function, and π is a minimal lifting of ψ , then (ψ, π) is a minimal cut-generating pair. Thus, this becomes an approach to obtain formulas for minimal cut-generating pairs: Start with a minimal cut-generating function ψ for S which has a easily computable formula like (1.6) and find minimal liftings π for ψ . Hopefully, a formula for π can also be derived easily from the formula for ψ . This was explicitly proved to be the case under certain conditions in [3]. This provides evidence to support Dey and Wolsey's method for finding efficient procedures to compute cut-generating pairs.

Remark 1.1. Not every minimal cut-generating pair (ψ, π) for S is of the type that ψ is a minimal cut-generating function for S and π is a minimal lifting for ψ . The Dey and Wolsey approach outlined above focuses on a subset of minimal cut-generating functions so as to be able to compute with these. \square

Unique minimal liftings. There is some regularity in the structure of minimal liftings. Given an arbitrary $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ define

$$W_S := \{w \in \mathbb{R}^n : s + \lambda w \in S, \forall s \in S, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}\}. \quad (1.7)$$

Proposition A.3 shows that if ψ is a cut-generating function (not necessarily minimal) for S , then any minimal lifting π is periodic along W_S , i.e., $\pi(p + w) = \pi(p)$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $w \in W_S$.

A central object in the study of minimal liftings is the *lifting region* first introduced in [14]. Let ψ be a minimal cut-generating function for S . Define

$$R_\psi := \{r \in \mathbb{R}^n : \psi(r) = \pi(r) \text{ for every minimal lifting } \pi \text{ of } \psi\}. \quad (1.8)$$

Since every minimal lifting is periodic along W_S , if $R_\psi + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$, then ψ has a *unique* minimal lifting. It was shown in [5] that for the special case when S is a translated lattice, this is a characterization, i.e., ψ has a unique minimal lifting if and only if $R_\psi + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$. Note that when $S = b + \mathbb{Z}^n$, then $W_S = \mathbb{Z}^n$. In this situation, the question of whether ψ has a unique minimal lifting or not is equivalent to the geometric question of whether $R_\psi + \mathbb{Z}^n = \mathbb{R}^n$, i.e., whether R_ψ covers \mathbb{R}^n by integer translates.

For a general S and a cut-generating function ψ for S , if $R_\psi + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$ then not only do we have a unique minimal lifting, but we can also express this unique minimal lifting compactly in terms of ψ :

$$\psi^*(r) = \inf_{w \in W_S} \psi(r + w) \quad (1.9)$$

In fact, Proposition A.4 shows something stronger: ψ^* is a minimal lifting if $R_\psi + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$ (and thus must be the unique minimal lifting) and the infimum in (1.9) is attained by any w such that $r + w \in R_\psi$. Therefore, if an explicit description for R_ψ can be obtained, then the coefficient $\psi^*(p_j)$ for the unique lifting can be computed by finding the w such that $p_j + w \in R_\psi$, and then using the formula for $\psi(p_j + w)$ ². A central result in [5] was to show that when S is the intersection of a translated lattice and a rational polyhedron, R_ψ can be described as the finite union of full dimensional polyhedra, each of which has an explicit inequality description.

In summary, in this approach of using liftings of minimal cut-generating functions to obtain computational efficiency with cut-generating pairs, two questions are of utmost importance:

- (i) For which kinds of sets S can we find explicit descriptions of R_ψ for any minimal cut-generating function ψ for S ? The most general S that we know the answer to is when S is the intersection of a translated lattice with a rational polyhedron [5].
- (ii) For which pairs S, ψ , where ψ is a minimal cut-generating function for S , is $R_\psi + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$?

²For the special case when S is the intersection of a translated lattice and a polyhedron, a proof similar to Proposition 1.1 in [3] can be used to show that $\psi^*(p)$ can be computed in polynomial time when the dimension n is considered fixed, assuming the data is rational.

Statement of Results. In this paper, we make some progress towards the covering question (ii) stated above for the special case when S is the intersection of a translated lattice and a rational polyhedron, i.e., $S = (b + \mathbb{Z}^n) \cap P$ where $b \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \mathbb{Z}^n$ is a vector, and $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a rational polyhedron. As mentioned earlier, the minimal cut-generating functions for such S are in one-to-one correspondence with maximal S -free sets containing the origin in their interior. For any such maximal S -free set B , we refer to the lifting region R_ψ for the minimal cut-generating function ψ corresponding to B by $R(S, B)$, to emphasize the dependence on S and B . We say $R(S, B)$ has the *covering property* if $R(S, B) + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$. When S is clear from the context, we will also say B has the *covering property* if $R(S, B)$ has the covering property.

1. Let S be a translated lattice intersected with a rational polyhedron and let B be a maximal S -free set with the origin in its interior. Then $R(S, B) + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if $R(S + t, B + t) + W_{S+t} = \mathbb{R}^n$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $B + t$ also contains the origin in its interior. In other words, the covering property is preserved under translations. This is the content of Theorem 3.1. This result was first proved for the case when S is a translated lattice and B is a maximal S -free *simplicial* polytope [8]. The result was generalized to all maximal S -free sets when S is a translated lattice in [3]. Here we generalize the result to all maximal S -free sets where S is the intersection of a translated lattice and a rational polyhedron. Moreover, the proofs in [8] and [3] are based on volume arguments, whereas our proofs are based on a completely different topological argument. It makes the proof much cleaner, albeit at the expense of using more sophisticated topological tools like the “Invariance of Domain” theorem. The volume arguments are difficult to extend to tackle more general S sets, and hence we feel that our approach has a better chance of success for attacking the general covering question (ii) above.
2. In Section 4, we define a binary operation on polytopes that preserves the covering property. Namely, given two polytopes X_1 and X_2 , we define the *coproduct* $X_1 \diamond X_2$ which is a new polytope that has nice properties in terms of the lifting region. More precisely, let $n = n_1 + n_2$. For $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $S_i = P_i \cap \Lambda_i$, where $P_i \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_i}$ is a polyhedron and Λ_i is a translated lattice in \mathbb{R}^{n_i} . Theorem 4.1 shows that if B_i is maximal S_i -free such that $R(S_i, B_i)$ has the covering property for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then $\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}$ is maximal $S_1 \times S_2$ -free and $R(S_1 \times S_2, \frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu})$ has the covering property for every $\mu \in (0, 1)$. This is an extremely useful operation to create higher dimensional maximal S -free sets with the covering property by “gluing” together lower dimensional such sets. This result is a generalization of a result from [3], where this was shown when S is a translated lattice.
3. We show that if a sequence of maximal S -free sets all having the covering property, converges to a maximal S -free set (in a precise mathematical sense), then the “limit” set also has the covering property; see Theorem 5.7. This result is a generalization of a result from [3] where this was shown when S is a translated lattice.
4. For $n = 2$, we completely classify all maximal S -free sets when S is a translated lattice intersected with a polyhedron. As a result, we immediately characterize all minimal cut-generating functions that have the covering property for $n = 2$. This generalizes the original 2-dimensional result of Dey and Wolsey [14] where they consider S to be a translated lattice in two dimensions.

The importance of these results in terms of cutting planes is the following. Using 4) above, we can have a “base set” of maximal S -free sets with the covering property. By iteratively applying the three operations stated in 1), 2) and 3) above, we can then build a vast (infinite) list of maximal S -free sets (in arbitrarily high dimensions) with the covering property, enlarging this “base set”. Moreover, in [3], specific classes of maximal S -free polytopes in general dimensions were shown to have the covering property. This contributes to a larger “base set” from which we can build using the operations in 1), 2) and 3). Not only does this recover all the previously known sets with the covering property, it vastly expands this list. Earlier, ad hoc families of S -free sets were proven to have the covering property - now we have generic operations to construct infinitely many families. In our opinion, this makes a significant leap in the theory of lifting from previous investigations. From a broader perspective, we believe it makes a contribution in the modern thrust on obtaining efficiently computable formulas for computing cutting planes, by giving a much wider class of cut-generating functions whose lifting regions have the covering property. As discussed earlier, this property is central for obtaining computable formulas for minimal liftings.

2 Preliminaries

We use $\text{conv}(X)$ to denote the convex hull of a set X . We use $\text{int}(X)$, $\text{relint}(X)$, $\text{bd}(X)$ to denote the interior, the relative interior and the boundary of a set X , respectively. The recession cone and linearity space of a convex set C will be denoted by $\text{rec}(C)$ and $\text{lin}(C)$, respectively. We denote the polar of a convex set C by C^* . For sets A, B , $A + B := \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$ is the Minkowski sum of sets $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ (when B is a singleton $\{b\}$, we will use $A + b$ to denote $A + \{b\}$). For a set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mu A := \{\mu t : t \in A\}$. If $A_1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ and $A_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$, then $A_1 \times A_2$ will denote the Cartesian product $\{(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2} : a_1 \in A_1, a_2 \in A_2\}$.

A *lattice* in \mathbb{R}^n is a subset of \mathbb{R}^n of the form $\{\lambda_1 v_1 + \dots + \lambda_n v_n : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ where v_1, \dots, v_n are a set of linearly independent vectors. When these generating vectors are the standard unit vectors in \mathbb{R}^n , we get the standard integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^n . A *lattice subspace* of a lattice Λ is a linear subspace which has a basis composed of vectors from Λ . We say a set S is a *truncated affine lattice* if $S = (b + \Lambda) \cap C$ for some lattice Λ in \mathbb{R}^n , some $b \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Lambda$, and some convex set $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$; if $C = \mathbb{R}^n$ we call S an *affine lattice* or a *translated lattice*. Note that $0 \notin S$ by construction. In general, for a truncated affine lattice S , $\text{conv}(S)$ is not polyhedron; it may not even be closed [12]. If $\text{conv}(S)$ is a polyhedron, we specify further by saying S is a *polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice*. In this case, $S = (b + \Lambda) \cap \text{conv}(S)$. The following fact follows from Theorem 5 in [12].

FACT 2.1. *If $\text{conv}(S)$ is a polyhedron for a truncated affine lattice S , then $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ is a lattice subspace.*

Properties of the translation set W_S . Given any arbitrary set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we collect some simple observations about the set W_S defined in (1.7). Note that W_S is a subgroup of \mathbb{R}^n , i.e., $0 \in W_S$, $w_1 + w_2 \in W_S$ for every $w_1, w_2 \in W_S$ and $-w \in W_S$ for every $w \in W_S$. We observe below how W_S changes as certain operations are performed on S . The proofs are straightforward and are relegated to the Appendix.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *The following are true:*

- (i) $W_{\mu S} = \mu W_S$. for all sets $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\mu \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$.

(ii) $W_{S+t} = W_S$ for all sets $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

(iii) $W_{S_1 \times S_2} = W_{S_1} \times W_{S_2}$ for all sets $S_1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_1}, S_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$. Note that $S_1 \times S_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2}$.

When S is a nonempty truncated affine lattice, W_S is a lattice; in particular, we can rewrite W_S as the intersection of $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ and the lattice Λ .

PROPOSITION 2.3. *Let $S = (b + \Lambda) \cap C$ be a non-empty truncated affine lattice. Then $W_S = \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \Lambda$.*

Proof. Let $w \in W_S$. For each $y \in \text{conv}(S)$, we can write $y = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i s_i$ for $\lambda_i \in [0, 1]$, $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i = 1$, and $s_i \in S$. It follows that

$$y + w = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i s_i \right) + w = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (s_i + w) \in \text{conv}(S),$$

where the inclusion follows from the definition of W_S . Since $-w$ is also in W_S , this shows that $w \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. As S is non-empty, there exists a $s \in S$, and we can write $s = b + z_1$ and $s + w = b + z_2$ for $z_1, z_2 \in \Lambda$. Thus, $w = z_2 - z_1 \in \Lambda$. Hence, $W_S \subseteq \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \Lambda$.

Conversely, take $w \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \Lambda$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $s \in S$, it follows that $s + \lambda w \in \text{conv}(S) \subseteq C$. Furthermore, $s = b + z_1$ for $z_1 \in \Lambda$, and so $s + \lambda w = (z_1 + \lambda w) + b \in \Lambda + b$. Therefore $s + \lambda w \in S$, indicating that $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \Lambda \subseteq W_S$. \square

Polyhedrally-truncated affine lattices and an explicit description of the lifting region.

Let S be a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice. Let $B = \{r \in \mathbb{R}^n : a_i \cdot r \leq 1 \ i \in I\}$ be a maximal S -free set with the origin in its interior. For each $s \in B \cap S$, define the *spindle* $R(s)$ in the following way. Let $k \in I$ such that $a_k \cdot s = 1$; such an index exists since B is S -free, and therefore, s is on the boundary of B . Then

$$R(s) := \{r \in \mathbb{R}^n : (a_i - a_k) \cdot r \leq 0, \ (a_i - a_k) \cdot (s - r) \leq 0 \quad \forall i \in I\}.$$

Define

$$R(S, B) := \bigcup_{s \in B \cap S} R(s). \tag{2.1}$$

It was shown in [5] that when S is a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice with $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^n$, $R(S, B)$ is the lifting region R_ψ defined in (1.8) for ψ when ψ is the minimal cut-generating function corresponding to B as defined by (1.6). Since every ψ is of this form when S is of this type, this gives an explicit description of the lifting region for any minimal cut-generating function in this situation.

In the rest of the paper, we will consider polyhedrally-truncated affine lattices S and analyze the properties of $R(S, B)$ as defined in (2.1) for maximal S -free sets B given by (1.5).

Topological Facts. We collect here some basic tools from topology that will be used in our analysis.

LEMMA 2.4. *[Theorem 9.4 in [16]] Let $P_\omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, \omega \in \Omega$ be a (possibly infinite) family of polyhedra such that any bounded set intersects only finitely many polyhedra, and $\bigcup_{\omega \in \Omega} P_\omega = \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose there is a family of functions $A_\omega : P_\omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \omega \in \Omega$ such that A_ω is continuous over P_ω for each $\omega \in \Omega$, and for every pair $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in \Omega$, $A_{\omega_1}(x) = A_{\omega_2}(x)$ for all $x \in P_{\omega_1} \cap P_{\omega_2}$. Then there is a unique, continuous map $A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ that equals A_ω when restricted to P_ω for each $\omega \in \Omega$.*

The following is a deep result in algebraic topology, first proved by Brouwer [10, 15].

THEOREM 2.5. *[Invariance of Domain] If U is an open subset of \mathbb{R}^n and $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is an injective, continuous map, then $f(U)$ is open and f is a homeomorphism between U and $f(U)$.*

Structure of the lifting region $R(S, B)$. Let S be a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice given as $S = (b + \Lambda) \cap C$ and let B be a maximal S -free polyhedron given by (1.5). We now collect some facts about the lifting region $R(S, B)$ as defined in (2.1).

Define $L_B = \{r \in \mathbb{R}^n : a_i \cdot r = a_j \cdot r, \quad \forall i, j \in I\}$. The following is proved in [5] when $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^n$; the result can be seen to hold when Λ is a general lattice.

PROPOSITION 2.6. *[Theorem 1 and Proposition 6 in [5]] Let S be a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice. B is a full-dimensional maximal S -free convex set with $0 \in \text{int}(B)$ if and only if B is a polyhedron of the form (1.5) with a point from S in the relative interior of every facet. Further, B is either a halfspace, or $\text{int}(B \cap \text{conv}(S)) \neq \emptyset$. When $\text{int}(B \cap \text{conv}(S)) \neq \emptyset$, the following are true:*

- (i) $\text{rec}(B \cap \text{conv}(S)) = \text{lin}(B) \cap \text{rec}(\text{conv}(S)) \subseteq \text{lin}(B) \subseteq L_B$ and $\text{lin}(B) \cap \text{rec}(\text{conv}(S))$ is a cone generated by vectors in Λ .
- (ii) $\text{lin}(R(s)) = \text{rec}(R(s)) = L_B$ for every $s \in B \cap S$.
- (iii) $R(S, B)$ is a union of finitely many polyhedra.

PROPOSITION 2.7. *Suppose $\text{int}(B \cap \text{conv}(S)) \neq \emptyset$. $L_B \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \text{lin}(B) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ and $L_B \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ is a lattice subspace of Λ . Consequently, if $B \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is a polytope, then $L_B \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \{0\}$.*

Proof. Consider $r \in L_B \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. It suffices to show that either r or $-r$ is in $\text{lin}(B) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. Since, $r \in L_B$, for all $i \in I$, $a_i \cdot r$ have the same sign. If $a_i \cdot r \leq 0$ for all $i \in I$, then $r \in \text{rec}(B)$ and therefore, $r \in \text{rec}(B) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \subseteq \text{rec}(B) \cap \text{rec}(\text{conv}(S)) = \text{lin}(B) \cap \text{rec}(\text{conv}(S))$ (the equality follows from Proposition 2.6(i)). Therefore $r \in \text{lin}(B)$. Since $r \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$, we thus have $r \in \text{lin}(B) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. If $a_i \cdot r \geq 0$ for all $i \in I$, then $a_i \cdot (-r) \leq 0$ and so $-r \in \text{rec}(B)$. Repeating the same argument, we obtain $-r \in \text{lin}(B)$. Thus, $-r \in \text{lin}(B) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$.

The assertion that $L_B \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ is a lattice subspace follows from Proposition 2.6 (i), the fact that $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ is a lattice subspace (Fact 2.1) and $\text{lin}(B) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = (\text{lin}(B) \cap \text{rec}(\text{conv}(S))) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. \square

THEOREM 2.8. *Suppose $\text{int}(B \cap \text{conv}(S)) \neq \emptyset$. A bounded set intersects only finitely many polyhedra from $R(S, B) + W_S$.*

Proof. Let $L = L_B \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$; L is a lattice subspace by Proposition 2.7. Let V be a lattice subspace such that $V \cap L = \{0\}$ and $(V \cap \Lambda) + (L \cap \Lambda) = \Lambda$ (and so $V + L = \mathbb{R}^n$). Also define $L_1 := V \cap L_B$ and $L_2 := V \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$.

Note that $L_2 \cap L_B = \{0\}$. Indeed,

$$L_2 \cap L_B = (V \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))) \cap L_B = V \cap (L_B \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))) = V \cap L = \{0\}.$$

Furthermore, $L_2 + L = \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. In order to see this, observe that since $V + L = \mathbb{R}^n$, for every $x \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ there exists $v \in V$ and $l \in L$ such that $x = v + l$. Since $v = x - l \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$,

$x \in L_2 + L$. Thus $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \subseteq L_2 + L$. The other containment follows from the definitions of L and L_2 .

We next show that $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \Lambda = (L_2 \cap \Lambda) + (L \cap \Lambda)$. Consider some $x \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \Lambda$. Since $x \in \Lambda = (V \cap \Lambda) + (L + \Lambda)$ and $V \cap L = \{0\}$, there exists a unique $v \in V \cap \Lambda$ and $l \in L \cap \Lambda$ such that $x = v + l$. As $x \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = L_2 + L$ and $L_2 \cap L \subseteq L_2 \cap L_B = \{0\}$, there exists a unique $l_2 \in L_2$ and $l' \in L$ such that $x = l_2 + l'$. By the uniqueness of v and l , it follows that $v = l_2$ and $l = l'$. Thus $v \in L_2 \cap \Lambda$ and $l \in L \cap \Lambda$. Hence, $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \Lambda \subseteq (L_2 \cap \Lambda) + (L \cap \Lambda)$. The definitions of L_2 and L imply the \supseteq containment.

Let L' be any linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^n containing L_2 such that $L' \cap L_B = \{0\}$ and $L' + L_B = \mathbb{R}^n$; such a linear space exists since $L_2 \cap L_B = \{0\}$. Since L_B is the recession cone of each spindle in $R(S, B)$, $R(S, B) = (R(S, B) \cap L') + L_B$ and $R(S, B) \cap L'$ is a finite union of polytopes because $R(S, B)$ is a union of finitely many polyhedra. Moreover, by Proposition 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} R(S, B) + W_S &= R(S, B) + (\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \Lambda) \\ &= ((R(S, B) \cap L') + L_B) + ((L_2 \cap \Lambda) + (L \cap \Lambda)) \\ &= (R(S, B) \cap L') + (L_2 \cap \Lambda) + (L_B + (L \cap \Lambda)) \\ &= (R(S, B) \cap L') + (L_2 \cap \Lambda) + L_B, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality comes from $L \subseteq L_B$.

Observe that each bounded set D in \mathbb{R}^n intersects at most as many polyhedra in $R(S, B) + W_S$ as $D + L_B$. Since $L' \cap L_B = \{0\}$, $D + L_B$ intersects the same number of polyhedra in $R(S, B) + W_S$ as $(D + L_B) \cap L'$ intersects polyhedra in $(R(S, B) \cap L') + (L_2 \cap \Lambda)$. The complementary assumption also implies that $(D + L_B) \cap L'$ is a bounded set. Since $R(S, B) \cap L'$ is a finite union of polytopes and $L_2 \cap \Lambda$ is a lattice in $L_2 \subseteq L'$, the bounded set $(D + L_B) \cap L'$ intersects finitely many polytopes in $(R(S, B) \cap L') + (L_2 \cap \Lambda)$. \square

LEMMA 2.9. *Suppose $\text{int}(B \cap \text{conv}(S)) \neq \emptyset$. $R(S, B) + W_S$ is a closed set.*

Proof. Let $x \notin R(S, B) + W_S$. Consider the closed ball $B(x, 1)$ of radius one around x . By Theorem 2.8, $B(x, 1)$ intersects only finitely many polyhedra from $R(S, B) + W_S$. The union of these finitely many polyhedra is a closed set and therefore, there exists an open ball N around x that does not intersect any of these polyhedra. But since $N \subseteq B(x, 1)$, N does not intersect any other polyhedron from $R(S, B) + W_S$. Hence, the complement of $R(S, B) + W_S$ is open. \square

3 The covering property is preserved under translations

Let S be a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice and let B be a maximal S -free polyhedron given by (1.5). We want to understand the covering properties of the lifting region when we translate S and B by the same vector. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $B + t$ also contains the origin in its interior (i.e., $a_i \cdot (-t) < 1$ for each $i \in I$). Then $B + t$ is given by $\{r \in \mathbb{R}^n : a'_i \cdot r \leq 1 \ i \in I\}$, where

$$a'_i = \frac{a_i}{1 + a_i \cdot t} \quad \text{for each } i \in I.$$

Clearly, $B' = B + t$ is a maximal S' -free set where $S' = S + t$. For $s' \in B' \cap S'$, the spindle $R(s')$ is therefore given by

$$R(s') = \{r : (a'_i - a'_k) \cdot r \leq 0, \ (a'_i - a'_k) \cdot (s' - r) \leq 0 \quad , \forall i \in I\}.$$

The lifting region becomes $R(S', B') = \bigcup_{s' \in B' \cap S'} R(s')$. We would like to show

THEOREM 3.1. [*Translation Invariance Theorem*] $R(S, B) + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$ if and only if $R(S', B') + W_{S'} = \mathbb{R}^n$.

Intersections modulo the lattice. We show an interesting property of different spindles when they intersect after translations by vectors in W_S . In particular, two spindles from *different* facets cannot intersect in their interiors, and moreover, the “height” of the common intersection points from the different spindles is the same with respect to the respective facets.

LEMMA 3.2. [*Collision Lemma*] Let S be a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice and let B be a maximal S -free polyhedron given by (1.5). Take $s_1, s_2 \in B \cap S$, and let $i_1, i_2 \in I$ be such that $a_{i_1}s_1 = 1$ and $a_{i_2}s_2 = 1$. Let $x_1, x_2 \in R(S, B)$ such that $x_1 - x_2 \in W_S$, $x_1 \in R(s_1)$, and $x_2 \in R(s_2)$. Then $a_{i_1} \cdot x_1 = a_{i_2} \cdot x_2$. Moreover, if $x_1 \in \text{int}(R(s_1))$ and $x_2 \in \text{int}(R(s_2))$, then $a_{i_1} = a_{i_2}$.

Proof. If $|I| = 1$, then the result is trivial. So suppose $|I| > 2$. Assume to the contrary that $a_{i_1} \cdot x_1 \neq a_{i_2} \cdot x_2$. Suppose that $a_{i_1}x_1 < a_{i_2}x_2$ (for the proof of the other case, switch the indices in the following argument). Since $x_1 - x_2 \in W_S$, the point $s_2 + (x_1 - x_2)$ is contained in S . In order to reach a contradiction, it is sufficient to show that $s_2 + (x_1 - x_2) \in \text{int}(B)$. We will show this using the definition $B = \{r \in \mathbb{R}^n : a_i \cdot r \leq 1 \ i \in I\}$.

Take $i \in I$. When $i = i_1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i_1}(s_2 + (x_1 - x_2)) &= a_{i_1}(s_2 - x_2) + a_{i_1}x_1 \\ &\leq a_{i_2}(s_2 - x_2) + a_{i_1}x_1 && \text{Since } x_2 \in R(s_2) \\ &= 1 - a_{i_2}x_2 + a_{i_1}x_1 \\ &< 1 - a_{i_1}x_1 + a_{i_1}x_1 \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

When $i = i_2$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i_2}(s_2 + (x_1 - x_2)) &= 1 + a_{i_2}x_1 - a_{i_2}x_2 \\ &< 1 + a_{i_2}x_1 - a_{i_1}x_1 \\ &\leq 1 && \text{Since } x_1 \in R(s_1). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $i \notin \{i_1, i_2\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} a_i(s_2 + (x_1 - x_2)) &= a_i(s_2 - x_2) + a_ix_1 \\ &\leq a_{i_2}(s_2 - x_2) + a_ix_1 && \text{Since } x_2 \in R(s_2) \\ &= 1 - a_{i_2}x_2 + a_ix_1 \\ &< 1 - a_{i_1}x_1 + a_ix_1 \\ &\leq 1 && \text{Since } x_1 \in R(s_1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $s_2 + (x_1 - x_2) \in \text{int}(B)$, giving a contradiction. Thus $a_{i_1}x_1 = a_{i_2}x_2$.

Now suppose that $x_1 \in \text{int}(R(s_1))$ and $x_2 \in \text{int}(R(s_2))$. Assume to the contrary that $a_{i_1} \neq a_{i_2}$. We will again show that $s_2 + (x_1 - x_2) \in \text{int}(B)$. Since $a_{i_1} \neq a_{i_2}$ and $x_2 \in \text{int}(R(s_2))$,

$$a_{i_1} \cdot x_2 < a_{i_2} \cdot x_2$$

and

$$a_{i_1} \cdot (s_2 - x_2) < a_{i_2} \cdot (s_2 - x_2).$$

Let $i \in I$. If $i = i_1$ then using $a_{i_1} \cdot x_1 = a_{i_2} \cdot x_2$, it follows that

$$a_{i_1} \cdot (s_2 + (x_1 - x_2)) = a_{i_1} \cdot (s_2 - x_2) + a_{i_1} \cdot x_1 < a_{i_2} \cdot (s_2 - x_2) + a_{i_1} \cdot x_1 = 1 - a_{i_2} \cdot x_2 + a_{i_1} \cdot x_1 = 1.$$

If $i = i_2$ then

$$a_{i_2} \cdot (s_2 + (x_1 - x_2)) = a_{i_2} \cdot s_2 + a_{i_2} \cdot x_1 - a_{i_2} \cdot x_2 = 1 + a_{i_2} \cdot x_1 - a_{i_1} \cdot x_1 = 1 + (a_{i_2} - a_{i_1}) \cdot x_1 < 1,$$

where the inequality comes from $x_1 \in \text{int}(R(s_1))$. Finally, if $i \notin \{i_1, i_2\}$ then

$$a_i \cdot (s_2 + (x_1 - x_2)) = a_i \cdot (s_2 - x_2) + a_i \cdot x_1 < a_{i_2} \cdot s_2 - a_{i_2} \cdot x_2 + a_i \cdot x_1 < 1 - a_{i_2} \cdot x_2 + a_{i_1} \cdot x_1 = 1,$$

where the first inequality comes from $x_2 \in \text{int}(R(s_2))$ and the second from $x_1 \in \text{int}(R(s_1))$. Hence, $s_2 + (x_1 - x_2) \in \text{int}(B)$, yielding a contradiction. \square

Mapping $R(S, B) + W_S$ onto $R(S', B') + W_{S'}$. We now describe how one can bijectively map each spindle of $R(S, B)$ onto a spindle in $R(S', B')$ by a linear transformation. We will then be able to map $R(S, B) + W_S$ injectively onto $R(S', B') + W_{S'}$ by a piecewise affine map.

Given a particular polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice S , a maximal S -free polyhedron B described as (1.5), and a translation vector $t \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $B' = B + t$ contains the origin in its interior, we define linear transformations $T_i^{S, B, t}$ for each $i \in I$. Let r_1^i, \dots, r_{n-1}^i be any set of $n-1$ linearly independent vectors in \mathbb{R}^n satisfying $a_i \cdot r_j^i = 0$ for every $j = 1, \dots, n-1$. Let r_0^i be a vector such that $a_i \cdot r_0^i = 1$; thus, $r_0^i, r_1^i, \dots, r_{n-1}^i$ forms a basis for \mathbb{R}^n . Consider the linear transformation $T_i^{S, B, t}$ that sends r_j^i to itself for every $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ and sends r_0^i to $r_0^i + t$.

LEMMA 3.3. *Let $i \in I$. For every $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if $a_i \cdot r = 0$, then $T_i^{S, B, t}(r) = r$ and if $a_i \cdot r = 1$, then $T_i^{S, B, t}(r) = r + t$.*

Proof. Let $\mu_0, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_{n-1}$ be such that $r = \mu_0 r_0^i + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j r_j^i$. Since $a_i \cdot r = 1 = a_i \cdot r_0^i$ and $a_i \cdot r_j^i = 0$ for every $j = 1, \dots, n-1$. Thus, if $a_i \cdot r = 0$, we obtain $\mu_0 = 0$ and if $a_i \cdot r = 1$ we obtain $\mu_0 = 1$. Thus, $T_i^{S, B, t}(r) = \mu_0 T_i^{S, B, t}(r_0^i) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j T_i^{S, B, t}(r_j^i) = \mu_0(r_0^i + t) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mu_j r_j^i$. the last term is r if $\mu_0 = 0$ ($a_i \cdot r = 0$) and equals $r + t$ when $\mu_0 = 1$ ($a_i \cdot r = 1$). \square

Lemma 3.3 shows that the map $T_i^{S, B, t}$ does not depend on the particular choice of $r_0^i, r_1^i, \dots, r_{n-1}^i$; any such set of n vectors with the property that $a_i \cdot r_0^i = 1$ and $a_i \cdot r_j^i = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, n-1$ define the same transformation. In other words, $T_i^{S, B, t}$ depends only on S, B, t and $i \in I$. Moreover, the transformation is invertible with $T_i^{S', B', -t}$ as its inverse; we may choose the basis $r_0^i + t, r_1^i, \dots, r_{n-1}^i$ where $r_0^i, r_1^i, \dots, r_{n-1}^i$ is the basis used to define $T_i^{S, B, t}$. Indeed,

$$a'_i \cdot (r_0^i + t) = \frac{a_i \cdot (r_0^i + t)}{1 + a_i \cdot t} = \frac{a_i \cdot r_0^i + a_i \cdot t}{1 + a_i \cdot t} = \frac{1 + a_i \cdot t}{1 + a_i \cdot t} = 1$$

and for $j \neq 0$,

$$a'_i \cdot (r_j^i) = \frac{a_i \cdot r_j^i}{1 + a_i \cdot t} = 0.$$

In the following two lemmas, we drop the superscripts in $T_i^{S,B,t}$ to save notational baggage; the lemmas are true for any triple S, B, t such that S is a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice, B is a maximal S -free polyhedron with the origin in its interior, and t is a translation vector such that $B + t$ also contains the origin in its interior.

LEMMA 3.4. *Let $s \in B \cap S$ and let $k \in I$ be such that $a_k \cdot s = 1$. Then $T_k(R(s)) = R(s')$, where $s' = s + t$.*

Proof. We first establish the following claim:

CLAIM 1. *For any \bar{r} and $i \in I$ such that $(a_i - a_k) \cdot \bar{r} \leq 0$, we have $(a'_i - a'_k) \cdot T_k(\bar{r}) \leq 0$.*

Proof. There exist $r', r'' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\bar{r} = r' + \mu r''$ and $a_k \cdot r' = 0$ and $a_k \cdot r'' = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(a'_i - a'_k) \cdot T_k(\bar{r}) &= \left(\frac{a_i}{1+a_i \cdot t} - \frac{a_k}{1+a_k \cdot t} \right) T_k(r' + \mu r'') \\
&= \left(\frac{a_i}{1+a_i \cdot t} - \frac{a_k}{1+a_k \cdot t} \right) (r' + \mu(r'' + t)) \\
&= \frac{a_i(r' + \mu(r'' + t))}{1+a_i \cdot t} - \frac{\mu}{1+a_k \cdot t} - \frac{\mu a_k \cdot t}{1+a_k \cdot t} \\
&= \frac{a_i(r' + \mu(r'' + t))}{1+a_i \cdot t} - \mu \\
&= \frac{a_i(r' + \mu r'') + \mu a_i \cdot t - \mu(1+a_i \cdot t)}{1+a_i \cdot t} \\
&\leq \frac{a_k(r' + \mu r'') - \mu}{1+a_i \cdot t} \\
&= 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that $a_k \cdot r' = 0$ and $a_k \cdot r'' = 1$ and Lemma 3.3, the inequality follows from the fact that $r' + \mu r'' = \bar{r}$ and $(a_i - a_k) \bar{r} \leq 0$, and the last equality again uses $a_k \cdot r' = 0$ and $a_k \cdot r'' = 1$. \square

Now consider any $\hat{r} \in R(s)$. Therefore, for every $i \in I$ we have that $(a_i - a_k) \cdot \hat{r} \leq 0$ and $(a_i - a_k) \cdot (s - \hat{r}) \leq 0$. Observe that $T_k(s - \hat{r}) = T_k(s) - T_k(\hat{r}) = s + t - T_k(\hat{r}) = s' - T_k(\hat{r})$ where the second equality follows by Lemma 3.3. By Claim 1, we therefore have $(a'_i - a'_k) \cdot T_k(\hat{r}) \leq 0$ and $(a'_i - a'_k) \cdot (s' - T_k(\hat{r})) \leq 0$. Hence, $T_k(\hat{r}) \in R(s')$. This shows that $T_k(R(s)) \subseteq R(s')$. Using a similar reasoning with the transformation T_k^{-1} , one can show that $T_k^{-1}(R(s')) \subseteq R(s)$, i.e., $R(s') \subseteq T_k(R(s))$. This completes the proof. \square

LEMMA 3.5. *Let $s_1, s_2 \in B \cap S$ and $w_1, w_2 \in W_S$ such that $(R(s_1) + w_1) \cap (R(s_2) + w_2) \neq \emptyset$ and let $x \in (R(s_1) + w_1) \cap (R(s_2) + w_2)$. Let $i_1, i_2 \in I$ be two indices such that $a_{i_1} \cdot s_1 = 1$ and $a_{i_2} \cdot s_2 = 1$. Then, $T_{i_1}(x - w_1) + w_1 = T_{i_2}(x - w_2) + w_2$.*

Proof. There exist $r'_1, r''_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mu_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x - w_1 = r'_1 + \mu_1 r''_1$, and $a_{i_1} \cdot r'_1 = 0$, $a_{i_1} \cdot r''_1 = 1$. Similarly, there exist $r'_2, r''_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x - w_2 = r'_2 + \mu_2 r''_2$, and $a_{i_2} \cdot r'_2 = 0$, $a_{i_2} \cdot r''_2 = 1$. Since $(x - w_1) - (x - w_2) \in W_S$, by the Collision Lemma (Lemma 3.2) we have $a_{i_1} \cdot (x - w_1) = a_{i_2} \cdot (x - w_2)$; we thus obtain that $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{i_1}(x - w_1) &= T_{i_1}(r'_1) + \mu_1 T_{i_1}(r''_1) \\
&= r'_1 + \mu_1(r''_1 + t) \\
&= x - w_1 + \mu_1 t
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality comes from Lemma 3.3. Similarly, $T_{i_2}(x - w_2) = x - w_2 + \mu_2 t$. Using the fact that $\mu_1 = \mu_2$, we obtain that $T_{i_1}(x - w_1) + w_1 = T_{i_2}(x - w_2) + w_2$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1.

Proof. Note that if B (and B') is a halfspace, then the lifting region is all of \mathbb{R}^n , and there is nothing to show. Thus, by Proposition 2.6, we assume $\text{int}(B \cap \text{conv}(S)) \neq \emptyset$. It suffices to show that $R(S, B) + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$ implies $R(S', B') + W_{S'} = \mathbb{R}^n$, because the other direction follows by swapping the roles of S, B and S', B' and using the translation vector $-t$ instead of t .

Assume $R(S, B) + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$. For every $s \in B \cap S$ and $w \in W_S$, define the polyhedron $P_{s,w} = R(s) + w$ and define the map $A_{s,w} : P_{s,w} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ as $A_{s,w}(x) = T_k^{S,B,t}(x - w) + w$, where $k \in I$ is such that $a_k \cdot s = 1$. Since $R(S, B) + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$, we have

$$\bigcup_{s \in B \cap S, w \in W_S} P_{s,w} = R(S, B) + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n.$$

By Lemma 2.8, any bounded set intersects only finitely many polyhedra from the family $\{P_{s,w} : s \in B \cap S, w \in W_S\}$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.5, we observe that for any two pairs s_1, w_1 and s_2, w_2 we have that $A_{s_1, w_1}(x) = A_{s_2, w_2}(x)$ for all $x \in P_{s_1, w_1} \cap P_{s_2, w_2}$. Since each $A_{s,w}$ is an invertible affine linear map on $P_{s,w}$, Lemma 2.4 shows that there exists a continuous map $A : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that A restricted to $P_{s,w}$ is equal to $A_{s,w}$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} R(S', B') + W_{S'} &= R(S', B') + W_S && \text{by Proposition 2.2(ii)} \\ &= \bigcup_{s' \in B' \cap S', w \in W_S} (R(s') + w) \\ &= \bigcup_{s \in B \cap S, w \in W_S} (R(s + t) + w) \\ &= \bigcup_{s \in B \cap S, w \in W_S} A_{s,w}(R(s) + w) \\ &= A(\bigcup_{s \in B \cap S, w \in W_S} (R(s) + w)) \\ &= A(R(S, B) + W_S) \\ &= A(\mathbb{R}^n) \end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality follows from the definition of $A_{s,w}$ and Lemma 3.4. If we can show that A is injective, then by Theorem 2.5, $A(\mathbb{R}^n) = R(S', B') + W_{S'}$ is open. By Lemma 2.9, $R(S', B') + W_{S'}$ is also closed. Since \mathbb{R}^n is connected, the only non-empty closed and open subset of \mathbb{R}^n is \mathbb{R}^n itself. Thus, $R(S', B') + W_{S'} = \mathbb{R}^n$.

Therefore, it is sufficient to show that A is an injective function. Choose $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $A(x) = A(y)$. Unfolding the definition, this implies that there exists $s_1, s_2 \in S \cap B$, $w_1, w_2 \in W_S$, and $k_1, k_2 \in I$ such that $x \in R(s_1) + w_1$, $y \in R(s_2) + w_2$, and $T_{k_1}^{S,B,t}(x - w_1) + w_1 = T_{k_2}^{S,B,t}(y - w_2) + w_2 =: z^*$. By Proposition 2.2, $w_1, w_2 \in W_{S'}$. By Lemma 3.4, $z^* \in (R(s'_1) + w_1) \cap (R(s'_2) + w_2)$, where $s'_1 = s_1 + t$ and $s'_2 = s_2 + t$. Note that $R(s'_1)$ and $R(s'_2)$ are spindles corresponding to $R(S', B')$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.5, $T_{k_1}^{S',B',-t}(z^* - w_1) + w_1 = T_{k_2}^{S',B',-t}(z^* - w_2) + w_2$. Recalling that $T_i^{S',B',-t}$ is the inverse of $T_i^{S,B,t}$ for each $i \in I$, we have $T_{k_1}^{S',B',-t}(z^* - w_1) + w_1 = T_{k_1}^{S',B',-t} \left((T_{k_1}^{S,B,t}(x - w_1) + w_1) - w_1 \right) + w_1$

$$= T_{k_1}^{S',B',-t} \left(T_{k_1}^{S,B,t}(x - w_1) \right) + w_1 = x - w_1 + w_1 = x.$$

Similarly, $T_{k_2}^{S',B',-t}(z^* - w_2) + w_2 = y$, hence $x = y$ and A is injective. \square

4 Generation of S-free sets using coproducts

Here we display how the covering property is preserved under the so-called *coproduct* operation. Let $P_1 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} : a_i^1 x \leq 1, \forall i \in I_1\}$ and $P_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2} : a_j^2 x \leq 1, \forall j \in I_2\}$ be polyhedra in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} and \mathbb{R}^{n_2} , respectively. We define the *coproduct* of P_1 and P_2 to be

$$P_1 \diamond P_2 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} : (a_i^1, a_j^2) \cdot (x, y) \leq 1, \forall i \in I_1, \forall j \in I_2\}. \quad (4.1)$$

The coproduct definition is motivated by polarity: if P_1 and P_2 are polytopes containing the origin in their interiors, then $P_1 \diamond P_2 = (P_1^* \times P_2^*)^*$. In this case, our definition specializes to the operation introduced in Section 4 of [3], where the operation was also called the coproduct. Since our construction is a generalization to the case where P_1, P_2 are allowed to be unbounded polyhedra, we retain the terminology of coproduct. If each $a_i^1, i \in I_1$, gives a facet-defining inequality for P_1 and each $a_j^2, j \in I_2$, gives a facet-defining inequality for P_2 , then each inequality in the description in (4.1) is facet-defining. This follows from the fact that each $a_i^1, i \in I_1$ is a vertex of P_1^* and similarly, each $a_j^2, j \in I_2$, is a vertex of P_2^* and so $(a_i^1, a_j^2), i \in I_1, j \in I_2$ is a vertex of $P_1^* \times P_2^*$.

For $h \in \{1, 2\}$, let $S_h = (b_h + \Lambda_h) \cap P_h$ be two polyhedrally-truncated affine lattices in \mathbb{R}^{n_h} where $P_h = \text{conv}(S_i)$ is a polyhedron. Then $S_1 \times S_2 = ((b_1, b_2) + (\Lambda_1 \times \Lambda_2)) \cap (P_1 \times P_2)$ is also a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice in $\mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2}$. The following result creates $S_1 \times S_2$ -free sets from S_1 -free sets and S_2 -free sets.

THEOREM 4.1. *For $h \in \{1, 2\}$, let $B_h \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_h}$ be given by facet defining inequalities $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_h} : a_i^h x \leq 1, \forall i \in I_h\}$ and let S_h be polyhedrally-truncated affine lattices. Let $\mu \in (0, 1)$. Then*

- (i) *If B_h is S_h -free for $h \in \{1, 2\}$, then $\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}$ is $S_1 \times S_2$ -free.*
- (ii) *If B_h is maximal S_h -free for $h \in \{1, 2\}$, then $\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}$ is maximal $S_1 \times S_2$ -free.*
- (iii) *If B_h is maximal S_h -free with the covering property for $h \in \{1, 2\}$, then $\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}$ is maximal $S_1 \times S_2$ -free with the covering property.*

Proof. (i) Note that

$$\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu} = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2} : (\mu a_i^1, (1-\mu)a_j^2) \cdot (x_1, x_2) \leq 1, \forall i \in I_1, j \in I_2\}.$$

Let $(s_1, s_2) \in S_1 \times S_2$. As B_1 is S_1 free, there exists an $\bar{i} \in I_1$ such that $a_{\bar{i}}^1 \cdot s_1 \geq 1$. Similarly, there is a $\bar{j} \in I_2$ such that $a_{\bar{j}}^2 \cdot s_2 \geq 1$. This implies that $(\mu a_{\bar{i}}^1, (1-\mu)a_{\bar{j}}^2) \cdot (s_1, s_2) \geq 1$. Hence, $(s_1, s_2) \notin \text{int}(\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu})$.

- (ii) From part (i) and Proposition 2.6, it suffices to show that every facet of $\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}$ contains an $S_1 \times S_2$ point in its relative interior. As noted earlier, each inequality in $\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}$ is facet defining. Consider the facet defined by $(\mu a_{\bar{i}}^1, (1-\mu)a_{\bar{j}}^2)$. Since $a_{\bar{i}}^1$ defines a facet in B_1 , there exists some $s_1 \in S_1$ such that $a_{\bar{i}}^1 \cdot s_1 = 1$ and $a_i^1 \cdot s_1 < 1$ for $i \in I_1$ with $i \neq \bar{i}$. Similarly, there exists a $s_2 \in S_2$ such that $a_{\bar{j}}^2 \cdot s_2 = 1$ and $a_j^2 \cdot s_2 < 1$ for $j \in I_2$ with $j \neq \bar{j}$. It follows that $(\mu a_{\bar{i}}^1, (1-\mu)a_{\bar{j}}^2) \cdot (s_1, s_2) = 1$ and $(\mu a_i^1, (1-\mu)a_j^2) \cdot (s_1, s_2) < 1$ for $(i, j) \neq (\bar{i}, \bar{j})$. Hence (s_1, s_2) is in the relative interior of the facet defined by $(\mu a_{\bar{i}}^1, (1-\mu)a_{\bar{j}}^2)$.

(iii) In order to show that $\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}$ has the covering property, it is sufficient to show that $\mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2} \subseteq R + W_{S_1 \times S_2}$, where $R = R\left(S_1 \times S_2, \frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}\right)$.

Consider $s_1 \in B_1 \cap S_1$ and $s_2 \in B_2 \cap S_2$. Let $\bar{i} \in I_1$ index the facet of B_1 containing s_1 and $\bar{j} \in I_2$ index the facet of B_2 containing s_2 . Calculations similar to parts (i) and (ii) above show that (s_1, s_2) lies on the facet of $\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}$ indexed by (\bar{i}, \bar{j}) . We claim that the spindle $R(s_1, s_2)$ corresponding to $\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}$ contains the Cartesian product $R(s_1) \times R(s_2)$. Indeed, a vector $(x_1, x_2) \in R(s_1, s_2)$ if and only if

$$\left((\mu a_i^1, (1-\mu)a_j^2) - (\mu a_i^1, (1-\mu)a_j^2) \right) \cdot (x_1, x_2) \leq 0, \quad \forall i \in I_1, j \in I_2$$

and

$$\left((\mu a_i^1, (1-\mu)a_j^2) - (\mu a_i^1, (1-\mu)a_j^2) \right) \cdot ((s_1, s_2) - (x_1, x_2)) \leq 0, \quad \forall i \in I_1, j \in I_2.$$

where (\bar{i}, \bar{j}) indexes the facet containing (s_1, s_2) . Using the definition of $R(s_i)$, the latter condition follows since $x_1 \in R(s_1)$, $x_2 \in R(s_2)$, and $\mu \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, we get the containment $R(S_1, B_1) \times R(S_2, B_2) \subseteq R(S_1 \times S_2, \frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu})$.

From Proposition 2.2, we have that $W_{S_1 \times S_2} = W_{S_1} \times W_{S_2}$. Since B_1 and B_2 are assumed to each have the covering property, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^{n_1+n_2} &= \mathbb{R}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n_2} \\ &= (R(S_1, B_1) + W_{S_1}) \times (R(S_2, B_2) + W_{S_2}) \\ &= (R(S_1, B_1) \times R(S_2, B_2)) + (W_{S_1} \times W_{S_2}) \\ &\subseteq R(S_1 \times S_2, \frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}) + (W_{S_1} \times W_{S_2}) \\ &= R(S_1 \times S_2, \frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}) + W_{S_1 \times S_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\frac{B_1}{\mu} \diamond \frac{B_2}{1-\mu}$ has the covering property. □

5 Limits of maximal S-free sets with the covering property

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A^t \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a sequence of matrices and $b^t \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be a sequence of vectors such that $A^t \rightarrow A$ and $b^t \rightarrow b$ (both convergences are entrywise, i.e., convergence in the standard topology). Let $P_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : A^t \cdot x \leq b^t\}$ be the sequence of polyhedra defined A^t, b^t . We say that P_t converges to the polyhedron $P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : A \cdot x \leq b\}$ and we write this as $P_t \rightarrow P$. We make some observations about this convergence.

PROPOSITION 5.1. *Let $\{A^t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ converging entrywise to a matrix A . If the dimension of the nullspace of A^t is fixed for all t , say with value k , then the dimension of the nullspace of A is at least k .*

Proof. If $k = 0$, then the result is trivial. So assume that $k > 0$. For each value of t , there exists orthonormal vectors $\{v_1^t, v_2^t, \dots, v_k^t\}$ that span the nullspace(A^t). Let $V^t \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ be the matrix with v_i^t as the i -th column. As each v_i^t is bounded in \mathbb{R}^n , V^t is bounded in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$. Hence, we may extract a convergent subsequence converging to a matrix V . By continuity, the columns of V are orthonormal and $AV = 0$. Hence, $\dim(\text{nullspace}(A)) \geq k$. \square

PROPOSITION 5.2. *Suppose that $\{P_t\}$ is a sequence of polyhedra defined by $P_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : A^t \cdot x \leq b^t\}$. If $P_t \rightarrow P$, where P is a polytope, and $P \cap P_t \neq \emptyset$ for each t , then there exists $M \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $P \subseteq [-M, M]^n$ and the sequence $\{P_t\}$ is eventually contained in $[-M, M]^n$. Consequently, the polyhedra in the sequence eventually become polytopes.*

Proof. It suffices to show that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sufficiently large t , $P_t \subseteq P + \epsilon B(0, 1)$, where $B(0, 1)$ is the unit ball.

Assume to the contrary that this is not the case. This indicates that there exists a subsequence of points $\{x_{t_k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $x_{t_k} \in P_{t_k} \setminus (P + \epsilon B(0, 1))$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists some $z_k \in P_{t_k} \cap P$ since $P_{t_k} \cap P \neq \emptyset$. Since the distance function is continuous, there exists some point $y_k \in P_{t_k} \setminus P$ on the line segment $[x_{t_k}, z_k]$ such that $y_k \in A := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \epsilon/2 \leq d(P, x) \leq \epsilon\}$. Consider the sequence $\{y_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$. Note A is compact since P is a polytope. Therefore, there exists a subsequence $\{y_{k_j}\}$ of $\{y_k\}$ such that $y_{k_j} \rightarrow y$ in A . Let $A^t \rightarrow A$ and $b^t \rightarrow b$. Since $y \notin P$, there exists some $i^* \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $a_{i^*} \cdot y > b_{i^*}$ where a_{i^*} is the row of A indexed by i^* and b_{i^*} is the i^* -th component of b . However, this implies that

$$a_{i^*} \cdot y > b_{i^*} = \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} b_{i^*}^{t_{k_j}} \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} a_{i^*}^{t_{k_j}} \cdot y_{k_j} = a_{i^*} \cdot y,$$

where $a_{i^*}^{t_{k_j}}$ is the row of $A^{t_{k_j}}$ indexed by i^* and $b_{i^*}^{t_{k_j}}$ is the i^* -th component of $b^{t_{k_j}}$. Thus, we reach a contradiction. \square

PROPOSITION 5.3. *Suppose that $\{P_t\}$ is a sequence of polyhedra defined by $P_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : A^t \cdot x \leq b^t\}$. If $P_t \rightarrow P$ and $x \in \text{int}(P)$, then there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x \in \text{int}(P_t)$ for all $t \geq t_0$.*

Proof. As $x \in \text{int}(P)$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta \mathbf{1} < b - Ax$, where $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is the vector of all ones. Since $A^t \rightarrow A$ and $b^t \rightarrow b$, we have that $b^t - A^t x \rightarrow b - Ax$ and thus there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b^t - A^t x \geq \delta \mathbf{1}$ for all $t \geq t_0$ and so $x \in \text{int}(P_t)$ for all $t \geq t_0$. \square

We next build some tools to prove our main result of this section, which is Theorem 5.7 which is about limits of maximal S -free sets that possess the covering property. For the rest of this section, we consider an arbitrary polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice S . If B be a maximal S -free polyhedron given by (1.5), recall the definition $L_B = \{r \in \mathbb{R}^n : a_i \cdot r = a_j \cdot r, \quad \forall i, j \in I\}$.

PROPOSITION 5.4. *Let B be a maximal S -free set and assume that $B \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is a full-dimensional polytope. If B has the covering property, then $L_B + \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \mathbb{R}^n$.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that $L_B + \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \neq \mathbb{R}^n$. We claim that $R(S, B) + W_S \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, yielding our contradiction.

Since $L_B + \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \neq \mathbb{R}^n$, we may choose a subspace M of \mathbb{R}^n such that $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \subsetneq M$ and $L_B + M = \mathbb{R}^n$. Furthermore, as a consequence of Proposition 2.7, we may choose M so that $M \cap L_B = \{0\}$. Define $M(S, B) := R(S, B) \cap M$. Note that $M(S, B)$ is compact as the recession

cone of every spindle in $R(S, B)$ is L_B . Also, $R(S, B) = L_B + M(S, B)$. As $M(S, B)$ is compact, $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) + M(S, B) \subsetneq M$. Therefore, using Proposition 2.3,

$$R(S, B) + W_S = L_B + M(S, B) + (\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \cap \Lambda) \subsetneq L_B + M = \mathbb{R}^n.$$

□

PROPOSITION 5.5. *Suppose B is a maximal S -free set such that $L_B + \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $L_B \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \{0\}$. Define $M := R(S, B) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. Then the covering property $R(S, B) + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$ is equivalent to $M + W_S = \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$.*

Proof. Suppose $R(S, B) + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$. Intersecting both sides by $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$, we see that $(R(S, B) + W_S) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. It is sufficient to show that $(R(S, B) + W_S) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = M + W_S$. Take $r + w \in (R(S, B) + W_S) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ for $r \in R(S, B)$ and $w \in W_S \subseteq \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ by Proposition 2.3. As $r + w \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$, $r \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. Thus, $r \in R(S, B) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. Hence, $r \in M$ and $(R(S, B) + W_S) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \subseteq M + W_S$. The other inclusion follows immediately from $W_S \subseteq \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$.

Now suppose that $M + W_S = \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ and take $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since L_B and $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ are complementary spaces, there exists $l \in L_B$ and $s \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ such that $x = l + s$. By our assumption, there is an $m \in M$ and $w \in W_S$ so that $x = l + s = l + (m + w) = (l + m) + w$. Since $m \in R(S, B)$, m is contained in some spindle belonging to $R(S, B)$. However, L_B is the lineality space of each spindle. Hence, $l + m \in R(S, B)$. This shows that $\mathbb{R}^n \subseteq R(S, B) + W_S$. The other inclusion follows as \mathbb{R}^n is the ambient space. □

PROPOSITION 5.6. *Suppose that $\{B_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of maximal S -free sets such that $L_{B_t} + \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \mathbb{R}^n$, where $L_{B_t} = \{r : a_i^t \cdot r = a_j^t \cdot r, \quad \forall i, j \in I\}$. If $B_t \rightarrow B$, and $B \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is a full dimensional polytope, then $L_B + \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \mathbb{R}^n$, where $L_B = \{r : a_i \cdot r = a_j \cdot r, \quad \forall i, j \in I\}$.*

Proof. Suppose $\dim(\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))) = k$. As $L_{B_t} \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \{0\}$ from Proposition 2.7, it is sufficient to show that $\dim(L_{B_t}) \geq n - k$. Since $B_t \rightarrow B$, we have $B_t \cap \text{conv}(S) \rightarrow B \cap \text{conv}(S)$, and since $B \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is a full dimensional polytope, by Propositions 5.2 and 5.3 we eventually have that $B_t \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is a polytope. Thus, $L_{B_t} \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \{0\}$ by Proposition 2.7. Since $L_{B_t} + \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \mathbb{R}^n$ for each t , $\dim(L_{B_t}) = n - k$. For each $i \neq j \in I$, define the matrix A^t to have rows $a_i^t - a_j^t$ and A to have the rows $a_i - a_j$. As $L_{B_t} = \text{nullspace}(A^t)$, Proposition 5.1 implies that $\dim(\text{nullspace}(A)) \geq n - k$. Observing that $L_B = \text{nullspace}(A)$ yields the desired result. □

THEOREM 5.7. *Suppose $\{B_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of maximal S -free sets possessing the covering property. If $B_t \rightarrow B$, where B is a maximal S -free set and $B \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is a polytope, then B also possesses the covering property.*

Proof. If B is a half-space, then it is easy to check that B has the covering property. Therefore, consider when B is not a half-space and so $\text{int}(B \cap \text{conv}(S)) \neq \emptyset$ by Proposition 2.6.

From Proposition 5.2 and 5.3 we eventually have that $B_t \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is a full-dimensional polytope. By Proposition 5.4 we have $L_{B_t} + \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \mathbb{R}^n$. By Proposition 5.6, $L_B + \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, since $B \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is a polytope, we have $L_B \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \{0\}$ by Proposition 2.7. Define $M_t := R(S, B_t) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ and $M := R(S, B) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. From Proposition 5.5, it is sufficient to show that $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \subseteq M + W_S$.

Let $x \in \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. Following Proposition 5.5, for each t there exists a spindle, $R_t(s_t)$, corresponding to B_t such that $x \in D_t(s_t) + w_t$, where $D_t(s_t) = R_t(s_t) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ and $w_t \in W_S$. We claim that s_t and w_t can be chosen independently of t .

Proof of claim: From Proposition 5.2, there exists a bounded set, U , that contains $B \cap \text{conv}(S)$ and $B_t \cap \text{conv}(S)$ for sufficiently large t . Consider the tail subsequence $\{B_t\}$ that has the property $B_t \cap \text{conv}(S) \subseteq U$ for all t . As U is bounded and S is discrete, there is a finite number of points in $U \cap S$. Note that each spindle in $R(S, B_t)$ is anchored by a point in $B_t \cap S \subseteq U$. Therefore, there exists an $s \in S$ and a subsequence of $\{B_t\}$ such that $D_t(s_t) = D_t(s)$, for all t . Relabel such a subsequence by $\{B_t\}$.

Since the inner product is a continuous function on \mathbb{R}^n , $s \in B_t$ implies $s \in B$. Since $B_t \rightarrow B$, for a fixed s it also follows that $D_t(s) \rightarrow D(s)$, where $D(s) := R(s) \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$. As $L_{B_t} \cap \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \{0\}$ for each t , the set $D_t(s)$ is a polytope for each t . Similarly, $D(s)$ is a polytope. Again using Proposition 5.2, there exists a bounded set V such that $D(s) \subseteq V$ and $D_t(s) \subseteq V$ for large t (note that the origin is in each $D_t(s)$ and $D(s)$ and so the hypothesis of the Proposition 5.2 is satisfied). In the same manner as above, for large t , $w_t \in D_t(s) - x \subseteq V - x$, which is a bounded set. Since $W_S = \text{lin}(\text{conv}(S) \cap \Lambda)$ by Proposition 2.3, W_S is discrete and there exists a $w \in W_S$ and a subsequence of $\{B_t\}$ (label this subsequence as $\{B_t\}$) such that $w_t = w$ for all t . Hence, $x \in D_t(s) + w$ for all t . \square

Since the inner product is a continuous function on \mathbb{R}^n , $x \in D_t(s) + w$ implies $x \in D(s) + w$. As $D(s) \subseteq M$, it follows that $x \in M + W_S$. Hence, $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) \subseteq M + W_S$, as desired. \square

The assumption that $B \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is a polytope. We end this section with a short justification of the assumption that $B \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is a polytope that was made in Theorem 5.7. Although it may seem restrictive at first, if $B \cap \text{conv}(S)$ is not a polytope then one can reduce to that case in the following way. Let N be the linear space spanned by $\text{rec}(B \cap \text{conv}(S))$. By Proposition 2.6(i), N is a lattice subspace. Let $\bar{B}, \bar{S}, \bar{\Lambda}$ be the projection of B, S, Λ onto the orthogonal subspace N^\perp of N . By a well-known property of lattices, $\bar{\Lambda}$ is a lattice. Also, since $\text{conv}(\bar{S})$ is the projection of $\text{conv}(S)$ and $S = \text{conv}(S) \cap (b + \Lambda)$, we have $\bar{S} = \text{conv}(\bar{S}) \cap (\bar{b} + \bar{\Lambda})$ where \bar{b} is the projection of b . Hence, \bar{S} is a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice in N^\perp and \bar{B} is a maximal \bar{S} -free set. Moreover, $\bar{B} \cap \text{conv}(\bar{S})$ is a polytope, since N is the linear space spanned by $\text{rec}(B \cap \text{conv}(S))$.

6 Classification of maximal S -free sets in \mathbb{R}^2

When S is simply an affine lattice, the geometry of maximal S -free sets was studied in [18, 6, 2] and in [14], Dey and Wolsey gave a complete classification of such sets and their covering properties in 2 dimensions ($n = 2$). In this section, we classify S -free sets in \mathbb{R}^2 when S is a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice. In particular, we will describe all maximal S -free sets that are not maximal lattice-free sets. As a consequence, their covering property will also be discussed.

LEMMA 6.1. *Let S be an affine lattice in \mathbb{R}^n . Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a S -free (not necessarily maximal) polyhedron, and suppose that F_1, \dots, F_k are facets of P . Let $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ be the index set of the facets F_i that contain a point from S in its relative interior. If \tilde{P} is a maximal S -free convex set containing P , then for every F_i , $i \in I$, the corresponding inequality remains facet defining in \tilde{P} .*

Proof. Fix $i \in I$ and suppose $F_i = \{x : ax = b\} \cap P$. Let $v \in S \cap \text{relint}(F_i)$. Since $P \subseteq \tilde{P}$ and \tilde{P} is maximal S -free, v is contained in some facet $F'_j = \{x : a'x = b'\} \cap \tilde{P}$ of \tilde{P} . Furthermore, as $v \in \text{relint}(F_i)$, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $U = \{x : x \in F_i, \|x - v\| < \epsilon\}$ is relatively open in F_i .

Since F_i is of dimension $n - 1$, there exists n affinely independent points $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\} \subseteq U$. Note that $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$ defines the hyperplane $ax = b$, so if $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\} \subseteq F'_j$ then $ax = b$ defines F'_j , as desired. Suppose there is some $w_i \notin F'_j$. Since $w_i \in U$, it can be written as $w_i = v + \delta z$ for some $0 < \delta < \epsilon$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^n$. It follows from $w_i \in \tilde{P} \cap \overline{F'_j}$ that

$$a'w_i = a'(v + \delta z) = a'v + a'(\delta z) = b' + a'(\delta z) < b',$$

which implies $a'(\delta z) < 0$. It is easily checked that $v - \delta z \in F_i$. Thus, $v - \delta z \in \tilde{P}$ and so $v - \delta z$ satisfies $a'(v - \delta z) \leq b'$. However, note that

$$a'(v - \delta z) = a'v - a'(\delta z) = b' - a'(\delta z) > b',$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\} \subseteq F'_j$ and $ax = b$ defines F'_j , as desired. \square

We now state our main theorem for this section.

THEOREM 6.2. *Let $S = (b + \Lambda) \cap C$ be a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice in \mathbb{R}^2 and let $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ be a full-dimensional maximal S -free set. Then B falls into one of the following classes:*

1. Half-Space: A half-space with the boundary as a supporting hyperplane for $\text{conv}(S)$.
2. Translated cone: A polyhedron with one vertex and a nonempty recession cone. At most one facet may have more than one S -point in its relative interior.
3. Wedge: A polyhedron with three facets and a non-empty recession cone. Each facet contains exactly one S -point in its relative interior.
4. Triangle: A triangle that is maximal S -free, but contains a point from $b + \Lambda$ in its interior. Every facet has exactly one S point in its relative interior.
5. Lattice-free: B is a maximal $(b + \Lambda)$ -free set.

Proof. By Proposition 2.6 every maximal S -free convex set is a polyhedron with a point from S in the relative interior of each facet. Moreover, either B is a half space satisfying the condition of 1. in the statement, or $\text{int}(B \cap \text{conv}(S)) \neq \emptyset$. We, thus, consider the second case. Moreover,

CLAIM 2. *At most one facet of B can have more than one S point in its relative interior, unless B has only two facets that are given by two parallel hyperplanes.*

Proof. Since $\text{conv}(S)$ is a polyhedron, it is well-known that there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that we can relax the facets of $\text{conv}(S)$ by ϵ and get a polyhedron P such that $P \cap (b + \Lambda) = S$. If at least two facets of B have more than one S point in their relative interiors, then $P \cap B$ also has the same property and $P \cap B$ is a $(b + \Lambda)$ -free set. Let Q be a maximal $(b + \Lambda)$ -free set containing $P \cap B$. By Lemma 6.1, Q also has the property that two of its facets have more than one point from $b + \Lambda$ in their relative interiors. This is a contradiction to the classification of such sets by Dey and Wolsey in [14]. \square

Observe that if $s_1, s_2 \in S$ and $\frac{s_1+s_2}{2} \in b + \Lambda$, then $\frac{s_1+s_2}{2} \in S$ because C is a convex set. By a well-known parity argument, this can be used to establish that B has at most four facets. We consider the different possibilities in turn. The case of the half space is already taken care of. So we have three cases to analyze. Consider P to be the relaxed polyhedron defined in Claim 2.

1. Suppose B has 2 facets. If the two facets are parallel, we have a $(b + \Lambda)$ -free set, also commonly known as a *split*. Thus, this falls into case 5. of the statement. Otherwise, B is a polyhedron with one vertex and a nonempty recession cone. By Claim 2, B must be as described in 2. of the statement of the theorem.
2. Suppose B has 3 facets. Suppose B is bounded. If B is $(b + \Lambda)$ -free, then we are in 5. of the statement. Otherwise, B is a triangle and contains a point from $b + \Lambda$ in its interior. $P \cap B$ is a $(b + \Lambda)$ -free set and let Q be a maximal $(b + \Lambda)$ -free set containing $P \cap B$. By Lemma 6.1 and the fact that B is a triangle containing a point from $b + \Lambda$ in its interior, Q must be a maximal $(b + \Lambda)$ -free quadrilateral and by the Dey and Wolsey classification in [14], Q has exactly one point from $b + \Lambda$ in the relative interior of each facet. This immediately implies that B has at most one S point in the relative interior of each facet and we are in situation 4. of the statement of the theorem.

Suppose B is unbounded. Then we are in situation 3. of the statement by Claim 2 and an argument similar to that above.

3. Suppose B has 4 facets. $P \cap B$ is a $(b + \Lambda)$ -free set and let Q be a maximal $(b + \Lambda)$ -free set containing $P \cap B$. By Lemma 6.1, the 4 facet-defining inequalities of B remain facet-defining for Q . Moreover by the Dey and Wolsey classification, Q has at most 4 facets, and thus exactly 4 facets. This shows that $Q = B$ and we are in situation 5. of the statement of the theorem.

□

Covering Properties. In 2 dimensions, when S is a polyhedrally-truncated affine lattice, either $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \{0\}$ in which case only the half space from Theorem 6.2 has the covering property, or $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \mathbb{R}^2$ or $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ is a line. When $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S)) = \mathbb{R}^2$, we have an affine lattice and the covering property of maximal S -free sets was completely described by Dey and Wolsey in [14]. When $\text{lin}(\text{conv}(S))$ is a line, $\text{conv}(S)$ is a single half space or the intersection of two half spaces defined by parallel hyperplanes. We then have the following easy facts about the covering property.

1. In case 1, the half space always has the covering property as its lifting region is all of \mathbb{R}^2 .
2. In case 2, the translated cone B has the covering property if and only if the two S points on the boundary of B are also on the same facet of $\text{conv}(S)$. This is illustrated in Figures 1(a) and 1(b).
3. In cases 3 and 4, the wedge and the triangle never have the covering property. This is illustrated in Figures 1(c) and 1(d).




Figure 1: Regions $R(S, B)$ for some maximal S -free convex sets B in the plane. The thick dark line indicates the boundary of B . The jagged lines in a region indicate that it extends to infinity. For example, in Figure 1(a), $R(S, B)$ is the strip between lines ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 .

References

- [1] Kent Andersen, Quentin Louveaux, Robert Weismantel, and Laurence Wolsey. Inequalities from two rows of a simplex tableau. In Matteo Fischetti and David Williamson, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization. 12th International IPCO Conference, Ithaca, NY, USA, June 25–27, 2007. Proceedings*, volume 4513 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–15. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2007.
- [2] Gennadiy Averkov. A proof of Lovász’s theorem on maximal lattice-free sets. *Beitr. Algebra Geom.*, 54(1):105–109, 2013.
- [3] Gennadiy Averkov and Amitabh Basu. Lifting properties of maximal lattice-free polyhedra. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.7421>.
- [4] Egon Balas and Robert G. Jeroslow. Strengthening cuts for mixed integer programs. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 4(4):224–234, 1980.
- [5] Amitabh Basu, Manoel Campêlo, Michele Conforti, Gérard Cornuéjols, and Giacomo Zambelli. Unique lifting of integer variables in minimal inequalities. *Math. Program.*, 141(1-2, Ser. A):561–576, 2013.
- [6] Amitabh Basu, Michele Conforti, Gérard Cornuéjols, and Giacomo Zambelli. Maximal lattice-free convex sets in linear subspaces. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 35:704–720, 2010.
- [7] Amitabh Basu, Michele Conforti, Gérard Cornuéjols, and Giacomo Zambelli. Minimal inequalities for an infinite relaxation of integer programs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 24:158–168, February 2010.
- [8] Amitabh Basu, Gérard Cornuéjols, and Matthias Köppe. Unique minimal liftings for simplicial polytopes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 37(2):346–355, 2012.
- [9] Valentin Borozan and Gérard Cornuéjols. Minimal valid inequalities for integer constraints. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 34:538–546, 2009.
- [10] Luitzen EJ Brouwer. Beweis der invarianz des n -dimensionalen gebiets. *Mathematische Annalen*, 71(3):305–313, 1911.
- [11] Michele Conforti, Gérard Cornuéjols, Aris Daniilidis, Claude Lemaréchal, and Jérôme Malick. Cut-generating functions. In *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 123–132. Springer, 2013.
- [12] Santanu S. Dey and Diego A. Moran R. Some properties of convex hulls of integer points contained in general convex sets. *Mathematical Programming*, 141(1-2):507–526, 2013.
- [13] Santanu S. Dey and Laurence A. Wolsey. Constrained infinite group relaxations of mips. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(6):2890–2912, 2010.
- [14] Santanu S. Dey and Laurence A. Wolsey. Two row mixed-integer cuts via lifting. *Mathematical Programming*, 124:143–174, 2010.

- [15] Albrecht Dold. *Lectures on Algebraic Topology*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 1995.
- [16] James Dugundji. *Topology*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc, 1970.
- [17] Ellis L. Johnson. On the group problem for mixed integer programming. *Mathematical Programming Study*, 2:137–179, 1974.
- [18] László Lovász. Geometry of numbers and integer programming. In M. Iri and K. Tanabe, editors, *Mathematical Programming: State of the Art*, pages 177–201. Mathematical Programming Society, 1989.

A Minimality proofs

PROPOSITION A.1. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ be nonempty. Every valid cut-generating pair for S is dominated by a minimal cut-generating pair for S .*

Proof. Fix $s^* \in S$ which is nonempty. Note that any cut-generating pair (ψ, π) satisfies $\psi(r) + \psi(s^* - r) \geq 1$ and $\pi(r) + \pi(s^* - r) \geq 1$ for every $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let $(\bar{\psi}, \bar{\pi})$ be a cut-generating pair. Define two new functions $\phi_1(r) = 1 - \bar{\psi}(s^* - r)$ and $\phi_2(r) = 1 - \bar{\pi}(s^* - r)$. Let \mathcal{I} be the set of cut generating functions (ψ, π) such that $\psi \leq \bar{\psi}$ and $\pi \leq \bar{\pi}$. Note that any element $(\psi, \pi) \in \mathcal{I}$ satisfies $\psi(r) \geq 1 - \psi(s^* - r) \geq 1 - \bar{\psi}(s^* - r) = \phi_1(r)$ and similarly, $\pi(r) \geq \phi_2(r)$.

We show that every chain in \mathcal{I} has a lower bound in \mathcal{I} . Then by Zorn's lemma, \mathcal{I} will contain a minimal element, proving the result.

Consider any chain \mathcal{C} in \mathcal{I} . For any element $(\psi, \pi) \in \mathcal{C}$, we know that $\psi \geq \phi_1$ and $\pi \geq \phi_2$. Therefore, $\tilde{\psi}(r) := \inf\{\psi(r) : (\psi, \pi) \in \mathcal{C}\}$ and $\tilde{\pi}(r) := \inf\{\pi(r) : (\psi, \pi) \in \mathcal{C}\}$ are well-defined real-valued functions. It is easy to verify that $(\tilde{\psi}, \tilde{\pi})$ are cut-generating functions, and are therefore in \mathcal{I} . This completes the proof that each chain has a lower bound in \mathcal{I} . \square

PROPOSITION A.2. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ be nonempty and let ψ be a cut-generating function for S . Every lifting π for ψ is dominated by a minimal lifting.*

Proof. Fix $s^* \in S$ which is nonempty. For any lifting π of ψ , we must have $\psi(s^* - r) + \pi(r) \geq 1$ and therefore, if we define $\phi(r) = 1 - \psi(s^* - r)$, we have that $\pi(r) \geq \phi(r)$. The proof idea of Proposition A.1 can again be used to show that every lifting is dominated by a minimal lifting. \square

PROPOSITION A.3. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and let ψ be a cut-generating function for S . Every minimal lifting of ψ is periodic along W_S .*

Proof. Let π be a minimal lifting of ψ . Assume to the contrary that π is not periodic along W_S . Therefore, there exists some $\hat{p} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $w \in W_S$ such that $\pi(\hat{p}) \neq \pi(\hat{p} + w)$. Since $-w \in W_S$, we may assume $\pi(\hat{p}) > \pi(\hat{p} + w)$. Define a function $\tilde{\pi} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\tilde{\pi}(p) = \pi(\hat{p} + w)$ if $p = \hat{p}$, and $\tilde{\pi}(p) = \pi(p)$ otherwise. If $\tilde{\pi}$ is a lifting of ψ , then we will have π is not minimal, yielding a contradiction. Hence, it is sufficient to show that $\tilde{\pi}$ is a lifting of ψ .

Take $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $R \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$, and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times l}$. We must show that (1.2) holds for all $(s, y) \in X_S(R, P)$, so take $(s, y) \in X_S(R, P)$. Note that the columns of P may be taken to be distinct by adding the components of y that correspond to equal columns. Consider three cases.

Case 1: Suppose that P does not contain \hat{p} as one of its columns. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \psi(r_i)s_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \tilde{\pi}(p_j)y_j = \sum_{i=1}^k \psi(r_i)s_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \pi(p_j)y_j \geq 1,$$

where the inequality arises since π is a lifting of ψ .

Case 2: Suppose that P contains \hat{p} as one of its columns, but not $\hat{p} + w$. Let P^o and y^o be the columns and values of P and y , respectively, that do not correspond to \hat{p} . Let $y_{\hat{j}}$ be the component of y corresponding to \hat{p} . Using the definition of W_S and the fact that $y_{\hat{j}} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, it follows that

$$Rs + Py = Rs + P^o y^o + \hat{p} y_{\hat{j}} \in S \iff Rs + P^o y^o + \hat{p} y_{\hat{j}} + w y_{\hat{j}} = Rs + P^o y^o + (\hat{p} + w) y_{\hat{j}} \in S.$$

If we define $P' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ to be the columns of P^o adjoined with $\hat{p} + w$, then the equivalence above implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \psi(r_i)s_i + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \tilde{\pi}(p_j)y_j = \sum_{i=1}^k \psi(r_i)s_i + \sum_{j=1, j \neq \hat{j}}^{\ell} \pi(p_j)y_j + \pi(\hat{p} + w)y_{\hat{j}} \geq 1,$$

where the inequality arises since π is a lifting of ψ and we can apply the cut-generating pair (ψ, π) to $(s, (y^o, y_{\hat{j}})) \in X_S(R, P')$.

Case 3: Suppose that P contains \hat{p} and $\hat{p} + w$ as columns. Using a similar argument as above, define P' to be the columns of P without \hat{p} . This yields the same inequality as Case 2. \square

PROPOSITION A.4. *Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and let ψ be a cut-generating function for S . If $R_{\psi} + W_S = \mathbb{R}^n$, then ψ^* defined in (1.9) is a minimal lifting and $\psi^*(r) = \psi(r + w)$ for any w such that $r + w \in R_{\psi}$.*

Proof. It is not hard to verify that ψ^* is a lifting of ψ . Consider any minimal lifting π . Consider any $r \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $w \in W_S$ such that $r + w \in R_{\psi}$. By Proposition A.3, $\pi(r) = \pi(r + w) = \psi(r + w) \geq \psi^*(r)$. This implies that $\pi(r) = \psi^*(r) = \psi(r + w)$ since π is a minimal lifting. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.2. (i) Note that

$$\begin{aligned} x \in \mu W_s &\iff \frac{x}{\mu} \in W_S \\ &\iff s + \lambda \left(\frac{x}{\mu}\right) \in S, \forall s \in S, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{Z} \\ &\iff \mu s + \lambda x \in \mu S, \forall s \in S, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{Z} \\ &\iff s + \lambda x \in \mu S, \forall s \in \mu S, \lambda \in \mathbb{Z} \\ &\iff x \in W_{\mu S}. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Note that

$$\begin{aligned} x \in W_{S+t} &\iff (s + t) + \lambda x \in S + t, \forall s \in S, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{Z} \\ &\iff s + \lambda x \in S, \forall s \in S, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{Z} \\ &\iff x \in W_S \end{aligned}$$

(iii) Note that

$$\begin{aligned}(x_1, x_2) \in W_{S_1 \times S_2} &\iff (s_1 + \lambda x_1, s_2 + \lambda x_2) \in S_1 \times S_2, \forall (s_1, s_2) \in S_1 \times S_2, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{Z} \\ &\iff s_i + \lambda x_i \in S_i, \forall i \in \{1, 2\}, \forall s_i \in S_i, \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{Z} \\ &\iff (x_1, x_2) \in W_{S_1} \times W_{S_2}.\end{aligned}$$

□