

Composition Orderings for Linear Functions and Matrix Multiplication Orderings

Susumu Kubo

Kazuhisa Makino

Souta Sakamoto

February 19, 2024

Abstract

In this paper, we consider composition orderings for linear functions of one variable. Given n linear functions $f_1, \dots, f_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$, the objective is to find a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ that minimizes/maximizes $f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(c)$, where $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. The problem is fundamental in many fields such as combinatorial optimization, computer science, and operations research. It was first studied in the area of time-dependent scheduling, and known to be solvable in $O(n \log n)$ time if all functions are nondecreasing. In this paper, we present a complete characterization of optimal composition orderings for this case, by regarding linear functions as two-dimensional vectors. We also show several interesting properties on optimal composition orderings such as the equivalence between local and global optimality. Furthermore, by using the characterization above, we provide a fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) algorithm for the composition ordering problem for general linear functions, with respect to the number of decreasing linear functions.

We next deal with matrix multiplication orderings as a generalization of composition of linear functions. Given n matrices $M_1, \dots, M_n \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and two vectors $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, where m denotes a positive integer, the objective is to find a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ that minimizes/maximizes $\mathbf{w}^\top M_{\sigma(n)} \dots M_{\sigma(1)} \mathbf{y}$. The problem is also viewed as a generalization of flow shop scheduling through a limit. By extending the results for composition orderings for linear functions, we show that the multiplication ordering problem for 2×2 matrices is solvable in $O(n \log n)$ time if all the matrices are simultaneously triangularizable and have nonnegative determinants, and FPT with respect to the number of matrices with negative determinants, if all the matrices are simultaneously triangularizable. As the negative side, we finally prove that three possible natural generalizations are NP-hard: 1) when $m = 2$, even if all the matrices have nonnegative determinants, 2) when $m \geq 3$, even if all the matrices are upper triangular with nonnegative elements, and 3) the target version of the problem, i.e., finding a permutation σ with minimum $|\mathbf{w}^\top M_{\sigma(n)} \dots M_{\sigma(1)} \mathbf{y} - t|$ for a given target $t \in \mathbb{R}$, even if the problem corresponds to the composition ordering problem for monotone linear functions.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider composition ordering for linear functions, that is, polynomial functions of degree one or zero. Namely, given a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and n linear functions $f_1, \dots, f_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, each of which is expressed as $f_i(x) = a_i x + b_i$ for some $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R}$, we find a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ that minimizes/maximizes $f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(c)$, where \mathbb{R} denotes the set of real numbers, and $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ for a positive integer n . Since composition of functions is *not* commutative even for linear functions, i.e., $f_{\sigma(2)} \circ f_{\sigma(1)} \neq f_{\sigma(1)} \circ f_{\sigma(2)}$ holds in general, it makes sense to investigate the problem. For example, let $f_1(x) = -\frac{1}{2}x + \frac{3}{2}$, $f_2(x) = x - 3$, $f_3(x) = 3x - 1$, and $c = 0$, then the identity σ (i.e., $\sigma(1) = 1$, $\sigma(2) = 2$ and $\sigma(3) = 3$) provides $f_3 \circ f_2 \circ f_1(0) = f_3(f_2(f_1(0))) = f_3(f_2(\frac{3}{2})) = f_3(-\frac{3}{2}) = -\frac{11}{2}$, while the permutation τ with $\tau(1) = 2$, $\tau(2) = 1$

and $\tau(3) = 3$ provides $f_3 \circ f_1 \circ f_2(0) = 8$. In fact, we can see that σ and τ are respectively minimum and maximum permutations for the problem. The composition ordering problem is natural and fundamental in many fields such as combinatorial optimization, computer science, and operations research.

The problem was first studied from an algorithmic point of view under the name of *time-dependent scheduling* [8–10,14,16,17]. We are given n jobs $j \in [n]$ with processing time p_j . Unlike the classical scheduling, the processing time p_j is *not* constant, depending on the starting time of job j . Here each p_j is assumed to satisfy $p_j(t) \leq s + p_j(s+t)$ for any positive reals s and t , since we should be able to finish processing job j earlier if it starts earlier. The model was introduced to deal with learning and deteriorating effects. As the most fundamental setting of the time-dependent scheduling, we consider the linear model of single-machine makespan minimization, where the makespan denotes the time when all the jobs have finished processing, and we assume that the machine can handle only one job at a time and preemption is not allowed. Linear model means that the processing time p_j is linear in the starting time s , i.e., $p_j(s) = \tilde{a}_j s + \tilde{b}_j$ for some constant \tilde{a}_j and \tilde{b}_j . Then it is not difficult to see that the model can be regarded as the minimum composition ordering problem for linear functions $f_j(x) = (\tilde{a}_j + 1)x + \tilde{b}_j$, since f_j represents the time to finish job j if it start processing at time x . Mosheiov [14] showed the makespan is independent of the schedule, i.e., any permutation provides the same composite, if $\tilde{b}_j = 0$ for any $j \in [n]$. Gawiejnowicz and Pankowska [8], Gupta and Gupta [9], Tanaev et al. [16], and Waajs [17] studied the linear deterioration model, that is, $\tilde{a}_j, \tilde{b}_j > 0$ (i.e., $a_j > 1$ and $b_j > 0$) for any $j \in [n]$. Here \tilde{a}_j and \tilde{b}_j are respectively called the *deterioration rate* and the *basic processing time* of job j . It can be shown that an optimal permutation can be obtained by arranging the jobs nonincreasingly with respect to $\tilde{a}_j/\tilde{b}_j (= (a_j - 1)/b_j)$. Ho, Leung and Wei [10] considered the linear shortening model, that is, $0 > \tilde{a}_j > -1, \tilde{b}_j > 0$ (i.e., $1 > a_j > 0$ and $b_j > 0$) for any $j \in [n]$ and showed that an optimal permutation can be obtained again by arranging the jobs nonincreasingly with respect to $\tilde{a}_j/\tilde{b}_j (= (a_j - 1)/b_j)$. Later, Kawase, Makino and Seimi [12] introduced the composition ordering problem, and showed that the maximization can be formulated as the minimization problem, and propose an $O(n \log n)$ -time algorithm if all linear f_i 's are monotone nondecreasing, i.e., $a_i \geq 0$ for any $i \in [n]$. However, it is still open whether it is polynomially computable for general linear functions. Moreover, it is not known even when constantly many functions are monotone decreasing.

We remark that the time-dependent scheduling with the ready time and the deadline can be regarded as the composition ordering problem for piecewise linear functions, and is known to be NP-hard, and Kawase, Makino and Seimi [12] also studied the composition ordering for non-linear functions as well as the related problems such as partial composition and k -composition. We also remark that the free-order secretary problem, which is closely related to a branch of the problems such as the full-information secretary problem [6], knapsack and matroid secretary problems [1,2,15] and stochastic knapsack problems [4,5], can also be regarded as the composition ordering problem [12].

Main results obtained in this paper

In this paper, we first characterize the minimum/maximum composition ordering for monotone (increasing) linear functions, in terms of their polar angles. In order to describe our result, we need to define three important concepts: counterclockwiseness, colinearity, and potential identity.

We view a linear function $f(x) = ax + b$ as the vector $\begin{pmatrix} b \\ 1 - a \end{pmatrix}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 , and its *angle*, denoted by $\theta(f)$, is defined as the polar angle in $[0, 2\pi)$ of the vector, where we define $\theta(f) = \perp$ if the

vector of f is the origin $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. For example, if $\vec{f} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\vec{g} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{3} \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}$, then we have $\theta(f) = \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\theta(g) = \frac{7}{6}\pi$ (See also Figure 1). For linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n , a permutation




Figure 1: Vector representations of $f(x) = -x$ and $g(x) = 2x - \sqrt{3}$.

$\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ is called *counterclockwise* if there exists an integer $k \in [n]$ such that $\theta(f_{\sigma(k)}) \leq \dots \leq \theta(f_{\sigma(n)}) \leq \theta(f_{\sigma(1)}) \leq \dots \leq \theta(f_{\sigma(k-1)})$, where identical functions f_i (i.e., $\theta(f_i) = \perp$) are ignored and the inequalities are assumed to be transitive. Linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n are called *colinear* if the corresponding vectors lie in some line through the origin, i.e., there exists an angle λ such that $\theta(f_i) \in \{\lambda, \lambda + \pi, \perp\}$ for all $i \in [n]$, and *potentially identical* if there exists a counterclockwise permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ such that the corresponding composite is identical, i.e., $f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(x) = x$. A permutation is called *minimum* (resp., *maximum*) if the corresponding composite is the minimum (resp., maximum). Then we have the following complete characterization of optimal permutations.

Theorem 1. *Let f_1, \dots, f_n be monotone linear functions. Then we have the following statements.*

- (i) *They are colinear if and only if any permutation is minimum.*
- (ii) *If they are not colinear, then the following statements are equivalent:*
 - (ii-1) *They are potentially identical.*
 - (ii-2) *A permutation is minimum if and only if it is counterclockwise.*
- (iii) *If they are neither colinear nor potentially identical, then a permutation is minimum if and only if it is a counterclockwise permutation such that $\theta(f^\sigma) + \pi \in [\theta(f_{\sigma(t)}), \theta(f_{\sigma(s)})]_{2\pi}$, where s and t denote the first and last integers i such that $f_{\sigma(i)}$ is non-identical.*

Here we define

$$[\theta_1, \theta_2]_{2\pi} = \{\theta \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2] \mid \lambda_1 =_{2\pi} \theta_1, \lambda_2 =_{2\pi} \theta_2, \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \in [0, 2\pi)\},$$

where for two angles $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $\theta_1 =_{2\pi} \theta_2$ if they are congruent on the angle, i.e., $\theta_1 - \theta_2 \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, where \mathbb{Z} denotes the set of integers. We note that the lexicographical orderings which Kawase et al. [12] introduced can be interpreted as counterclockwise permutations, and they showed the existence of counterclockwise minimum permutations.

We also note that (i) Theorem 1 can characterize maximum permutations by replacing “counterclockwise” by “clockwise,” which is obtained from the transformation between minimization

and maximization in [12] (See Section 2), and (ii) Theorem 1 can be generalized to characterize minimum/maximum permutations for monotone nondecreasing linear functions (See Section 4).

These results enable us to efficiently count and enumerate all minimum/maximum permutations. We also show that (i) a permutation is *globally* minimum (resp., maximum) if and only if it is *locally*¹ minimum (resp., maximum), and (ii) counterclockwise orderings are unimodal, which also reveals interesting discrete structures of composition orderings.

We then deal with the composition ordering for general linear functions. We provide several structural properties of the optimal orderings. These, together with the characterization for monotone linear functions, provide a fixed-parameter tractable (FPT) algorithm for the composition ordering problem for general linear functions, with respect to the number of monotone decreasing linear functions.

Theorem 2. *An optimal permutation for linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n can be computed in $O(k2^k n^6)$ time, where $k (> 0)$ denotes the number of monotone decreasing functions.*

Theorem 2 means that both minimum and maximum permutations can be computed in $O(k2^k n^6)$ time. We remark that the FPT algorithm can be modified to efficiently count and enumerate all optimal permutations.

In this paper, we finally consider the multiplication ordering for matrices as a generalization of the composition ordering for linear functions. The problem for matrices is to find a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ that minimizes/maximizes $\mathbf{w}^\top M_{\sigma(n)} \cdots M_{\sigma(1)} \mathbf{y}$ for given n matrices $M_1, \dots, M_n \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and two vectors $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, where m denotes a positive integer. In fact, if $\mathbf{w} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\mathbf{y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $M_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ for any $i \in [n]$, then the matrix multiplication ordering problem is equivalent to the composition ordering problem for linear functions $f_i(x) = a_i x + b_i$. Here, we consider the minimization problem, since the maximization problem for $(M_1, \dots, M_n, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y})$ corresponds to the minimization one for $(M_1, \dots, M_n, -\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y})$.

We obtain the following generalization of the results of linear functions. Matrices $M_1, \dots, M_n \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ are called *simultaneously triangularizable* if there exists a regular matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ such that $P^{-1}M_iP$ is an upper triangular matrix for any $i \in [n]$.

Theorem 3. *For the optimal multiplication ordering problem for 2×2 simultaneously triangularizable matrices, the following statements hold.*

- (i) *If all matrices have nonnegative determinants, then an optimal multiplication ordering can be computed in $O(n \log n)$ time.*
- (ii) *If some matrix has a negative determinant, then an optimal multiplication ordering can be computed in $O(k2^k n^6)$ time, where k denotes the number of matrices with negative determinants.*

We remark that Theorem 3 (i) can be regarded as a refinement of the result by Bouquard, Lenté and Billaut [3] for multiplication ordering of 2×2 upper triangular matrices in the max-plus algebra, since the objective value in the max-plus algebra is obtained by taking the limit of the one in linear algebra. They showed that the problem in the max-plus algebra is a generalization of the two-machine flow shop scheduling problem to minimize the makespan, and solvable in $O(n \log n)$ time by using an extension of Johnson's rule [11] for the two-machine flow shop scheduling. Kubo and Nishinari examined the relationship between the flow shop scheduling

¹The term “locally optimal” will be defined in Section 3.

and usual matrix multiplication [13]. We obtain the result in [3] as a corollary of our result in Section 6, .

As a negative side, we show that all possible natural generalizations turn out to be intractable unless $P=NP$.

Theorem 4. (i) *It is strongly NP-hard to compute an optimal multiplication ordering for 2×2 matrices, even if all matrices have nonnegative entries and determinants.*

(ii) *It is strongly NP-hard to compute an optimal multiplication ordering for $m \times m$ matrices with $m \geq 3$, even if all matrices are nonnegative (i.e., all the entries are nonnegative) and upper triangular.*

We also deal with the target version of the multiplication ordering problem for matrices, i.e., minimizing the value $|\mathbf{w}^\top M_{\sigma(n)} \cdots M_{\sigma(1)} \mathbf{y} - t|$ for a given target $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Unfortunately, it is also strongly NP-hard.

Theorem 5. *Given a target $t \in \mathbb{R}$, it is strongly NP-hard to compute a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ such that $|\mathbf{w}^\top M_{\sigma(n)} \cdots M_{\sigma(1)} \mathbf{y} - t| \leq c_1 \cdot \min_{\rho} |\mathbf{w}^\top M_{\rho(n)} \cdots M_{\rho(1)} \mathbf{y} - t| + c_2$ for any positive c_1 and c_2 , even if the problem corresponds to composition ordering for monotone linear functions.*

The organization of the paper

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides some notation and basic properties needed in the paper. In Section 3, we consider composition orderings for monotone linear functions. We provide the proof of Theorem 1 and structural properties such as the equivalence between local and global optimality. In Section 4, we show that the nondecreasing case is reduced to the monotone case and characterize optimal composition orderings. Section 5 proves Theorem 2 by making an FPT algorithm of the general case. In Section 6 we generalize composition of linear functions to matrix multiplication in linear and max-plus algebras, and prove Theorems 3, 4, and 5.

2 Notation and Basic Properties

In this section, we first fix notation and state several basic properties of linear functions, which will be used in this paper. We then mention that minimum and maximum compositions are polynomially equivalent.

We view a linear function $f(x) = ax + b$ as the vector $\begin{pmatrix} b \\ 1 - a \end{pmatrix}$ in \mathbb{R}^2 , and its *angle*, denoted by $\theta(f)$, is defined as the polar angle in $[0, 2\pi)$ of the vector, where we define $\theta(f) = \perp$ if the vector of f is the origin $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

For two reals ℓ and r with $\ell < r$, let $[\ell, r] = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid \ell \leq x \leq r\}$. Similarly, we denote semi-open intervals by $(\ell, r]$ and $[\ell, r)$ and open intervals by (ℓ, r) . For a linear function $f(x) = ax + b$, we respectively denote by $\alpha(f)$ and $\beta(f)$ the slope and intercept of $f(x)$, i.e., $\alpha(f) = a$ and $\beta(f) = b$. A linear function f is respectively called *monotone (increasing)*, *constant*, and *monotone decreasing* if $\alpha(f) > 0$, $\alpha(f) = 0$, and $\alpha(f) < 0$. Since the result of arithmetic operations on angles may take a value outside of $[0, 2\pi)$, we provide some notation to deal with such situations, some of which have already been used in the introduction. For two angles $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $\theta_1 =_{2\pi} \theta_2$ if they are congruent on the angle, i.e., $\theta_1 - \theta_2 \in 2\pi\mathbb{Z}$, and define

$$[\theta_1, \theta_2]_{2\pi} = \{\theta \in [\lambda_1, \lambda_2] \mid \lambda_1 =_{2\pi} \theta_1, \lambda_2 =_{2\pi} \theta_2, \lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \in [0, 2\pi)\}.$$

For example, if $\theta_1 = \frac{\pi}{6}$ and $\theta_2 = \frac{2\pi}{3}$ then

$$[\theta_1, \theta_2]_{2\pi} = \dots \cup \left[-\frac{11\pi}{6}, -\frac{4\pi}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{\pi}{6}, \frac{2\pi}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{13\pi}{6}, \frac{8\pi}{3}\right] \cup \dots$$

We similarly define open and semi-open intervals such as $(\theta_1, \theta_2)_{2\pi}$, $[\theta_1, \theta_2)_{2\pi}$, and $(\theta_1, \theta_2]_{2\pi}$. For a non-interval set S , we define $S_{2\pi} = \{\theta \mid \theta =_{2\pi} \lambda \text{ for } \lambda \in S\}$.

We next state four basic properties of linear functions. Note that Lemmas 6, 7, and 8 do not assume the monotonicity of linear functions.

Lemma 6. *Let g be the identical function, i.e., $g(x) = x$. Then for any function h , we have $h \circ g = g \circ h = h$.*

Proof. Straightforward. □

Lemma 7. *For two non-identical linear functions g and h , we have the following two equivalences.*

- (i) $h \circ g <^2 g \circ h \Leftrightarrow \theta(h) - \theta(g) \in (0, \pi)_{2\pi}$.
- (ii) $h \circ g = g \circ h \Leftrightarrow \theta(h) - \theta(g) \in \{0, \pi\}_{2\pi}$.

Proof. It follows from the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} g \circ h(x) - h \circ g(x) &= (\alpha(g)(\alpha(h)x + \beta(h)) + \beta(g)) - (\alpha(h)(\alpha(g)x + \beta(g)) + \beta(h)) \\ &= \beta(g)(1 - \alpha(h)) - \beta(h)(1 - \alpha(g)) \\ &= |\vec{g}||\vec{h}|\sin(\theta(h) - \theta(g)). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 8. *Let g and h be two linear functions, then $\overrightarrow{h \circ g} = \vec{h} + \alpha(h)\vec{g}$.*

Proof. It follows from

$$\overrightarrow{h \circ g} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(h)\beta(g) + \beta(h) \\ 1 - \alpha(h)\alpha(g) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \beta(h) \\ 1 - \alpha(h) \end{pmatrix} + \alpha(h) \begin{pmatrix} \beta(g) \\ 1 - \alpha(g) \end{pmatrix} = \vec{h} + \alpha(h)\vec{g}.$$

□

Lemma 9. *For non-identical monotone linear functions g and h , we have the following statements.*

- (i) $\theta(h) - \theta(g) \in (0, \pi)_{2\pi} \Leftrightarrow \theta(h \circ g) \in (\theta(g), \theta(h))_{2\pi} \Leftrightarrow \theta(g \circ h) \in (\theta(g), \theta(h))_{2\pi}$.
- (ii) $\theta(h) - \theta(g) \in \{0, \pi\}_{2\pi} \Leftrightarrow \theta(h \circ g) \in \{\theta(g), \theta(h), \perp\} \Leftrightarrow \theta(g \circ h) \in \{\theta(g), \theta(h), \perp\}$.
- (iii) $\theta(h) = \theta(g) \Rightarrow \theta(h \circ g) = \theta(g \circ h) = \theta(h) (= \theta(g))$.
- (iv) $\theta(h \circ g) = \perp \Leftrightarrow \theta(g \circ h) = \perp \Rightarrow \theta(h) - \theta(g) =_{2\pi} \pi$.

Proof. (i), (ii), and (iii) follow from Lemma 8, $\vec{h}, \vec{g} \neq 0$, and $\alpha(h) > 0$. (iv) follows from (ii), (iii), and Lemma 7 (ii). □

²The inequality for functions means that the inequality holds for any argument.

In fact, the equivalence of (iv) holds for general linear functions g and h .

For linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n and a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$, we denote $f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}$ by f^σ .

Before ending this section, we provide a linear-time transformation between the maximization problem and the minimization problem [12]. For a linear function $f(x) = ax + b$, we define a linear function \tilde{f} by

$$\tilde{f}(x) = ax - b. \quad (1)$$

Note that \tilde{f} is monotone if f is monotone. For linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n and a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$, we have $\beta(f^\sigma) = -\beta(\tilde{f}^\sigma)$. Since any permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ provides $\alpha(f^\sigma) = \prod_{i \in [n]} \alpha(f_i)$, we can see that the maximum composition for f_1, \dots, f_n is equivalent to the minimum composition for $\tilde{f}_1, \dots, \tilde{f}_n$. where this transformation was mentioned in [12]. Therefore, we mainly deal with the minimization problem for linear functions, and sometimes use the term ‘‘optimal’’ instead of ‘‘minimum’’.

3 Composition of Monotone Linear Functions

In this section, we consider composition orderings for monotone linear functions. Especially, we prove Theorem 1 and show structural properties of the composites.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1 (i)

We first prove Theorem 1 (i), which can be easily obtained from basic properties in Section 2.

Proof of Theorem 1(i). Let us first show the only-if part. For any $i \in [n-1]$, let $\rho_i : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be the i -th adjacent transposition, i.e., the transposition of two consecutive integers i and $i+1$. Let $\text{id} : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ denote the identity permutation. Then we have $f^{\rho_i} = f^{\text{id}}$, since $f_i \circ f_{i+1} = f_{i+1} \circ f_i$ by Lemmas 6 and 7 (ii). It is well-known that any permutation can be obtained by a product of adjacent transpositions and therefore for any permutation σ we obtain $f^\sigma = f^{\text{id}}$, which is minimum.

For the if part, suppose, without loss of generality, that f_1 and f_2 are not colinear. Then we have $f_1 \circ f_2 \neq f_2 \circ f_1$ by Lemma 7 (i), which implies that $f_1 \circ f_2 \circ (f_n \circ \dots \circ f_3) \neq f_2 \circ f_1 \circ (f_n \circ \dots \circ f_3)$, which completes the proof of the if part. \square

Note that in fact Theorem 1 (i) does not require the monotonicity, and hence it is true even if f_i 's are general linear functions.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 1 (ii)

In order to prove Theorem 1 (ii), we first define the neighborhood of a permutation and the local optimality of permutations. Let $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be a permutation. For three positive integers ℓ, m and r with $\ell \leq m < r$, define a permutation $\sigma_{\ell, m, r} : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ by

$$\sigma_{\ell, m, r}(i) = \begin{cases} \sigma(i) & (1 \leq i < \ell, r < i \leq n), \\ \sigma(i - \ell + m + 1) & (\ell \leq i < \ell - m + r), \\ \sigma(i + m - r) & (\ell - m + r \leq i \leq r) \end{cases}$$

which is illustrated in Fig. 2. In particular, $\sigma_{1, k, n}$ is abbreviated as σ_k and referred to as the k -shift of σ . The neighborhood $N(\sigma)$ of σ is defined by $N(\sigma) = \{\sigma_{\ell, m, r} \mid \ell \leq m < r\}$, that is, the




Figure 2: Permutation $\sigma_{l,m,r}$ obtained from σ by swapping two adjacent intervals.

set of permutations obtained from σ by swapping two adjacent intervals in σ . A permutation σ is *locally optimal* if $f^\sigma \leq f^\mu$ for any permutation $\mu \in N(\sigma)$.

The next lemma plays an important role throughout the paper and its proof is technical and involved.

Lemma 10. *A locally optimal permutation for non-colinear monotone linear functions is counterclockwise.*

For the proof, we provide the following four lemmas. The first lemma directly follows from the definition and Lemma 7.

Lemma 11. *For monotone linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n , a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ is locally optimal if and only if $\theta(f_{\sigma(r)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(m+1)}) - \theta(f_{\sigma(m)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(\ell)}) \in [0, \pi]_{2\pi}$ holds for any integers ℓ, m and r with $\ell \leq m < r$ such that $f_{\sigma(r)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(m+1)}$ and $f_{\sigma(m)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(\ell)}$ are non-identical.*

Proof. By definition, σ is locally optimal if and only if $f^\sigma \leq f^{\sigma_{\ell,m,r}}$ for any integers ℓ, m and r with $\ell \leq m < r$, which is equivalent to that $f_{\sigma(r)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(\ell)} \leq (f_{\sigma(m)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(\ell)}) \circ (f_{\sigma(r)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(m+1)})$. By Lemma 7, this is further equivalent to the condition in the lemma. \square

We then show three useful properties of locally optimal permutations.

Lemma 12. *For monotone linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n , let $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be locally optimal. If $\theta(f_{\sigma(j)}) - \theta(f_{\sigma(i)}) =_{2\pi} \pi$ for some $i, j \in [n]$ with $i < j$ and $\theta(f_{\sigma(\ell)}) = \perp$ for all $\ell \in [n]$ with $i < \ell < j$, then f_1, \dots, f_n are colinear.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that σ is the identity permutation. We first prove the statement when no f_i for $i \in [n]$ is identical and $\theta(f_{i+1}) \neq \theta(f_i)$ holds for all $i \in [n-1]$. Let j be a positive integer with $\theta(f_{j+1}) - \theta(f_j) =_{2\pi} \pi$. We claim that $\theta(f_{i+1}) - \theta(f_i) =_{2\pi} \pi$ for any $i \in [n-1]$.

Lemma 11 implies that $\theta(f_{j+2}) \in (\theta(f_{j+1}), \theta(f_{j+1}) + \pi]_{2\pi}$, since σ is locally optimal. If $\theta(f_{j+2}) - \theta(f_{j+1}) \neq_{2\pi} \pi$, then we have

$$\theta(f_{j+2} \circ f_{j+1}) \in (\theta(f_{j+1}), \theta(f_{j+2}))_{2\pi} \subseteq (\theta(f_{j+1}), \theta(f_{j+1}) + \pi)_{2\pi},$$

implying that

$$\theta(f_{j+2} \circ f_{j+1}) - \theta(f_j) \in (\pi, 2\pi)_{2\pi}.$$

This contradicts the local optimality of σ by Lemma 11. Therefore, we have $\theta(f_{j+2}) - \theta(f_{j+1}) =_{2\pi} \pi$, and by repeatedly applying this argument, we obtain $\theta(f_{i+1}) - \theta(f_i) =_{2\pi} \pi$ for all $i \geq j$. The case of i with $i \leq j-1$ is treated similarly. In fact, Lemma 11, together with the local optimality of σ , implies that $\theta(f_j) \in (\theta(f_{j-1}), \theta(f_{j-1}) + \pi]_{2\pi}$. If $\theta(f_j) - \theta(f_{j-1}) \neq_{2\pi} \pi$, then we have

$$\theta(f_{j+1}) - \theta(f_j \circ f_{j-1}) \in (\pi, 2\pi)_{2\pi},$$

which contradicts the local optimality of σ by Lemma 11. Again by repeatedly applying this argument, we obtain $\theta(f_{i+1}) - \theta(f_i) =_{2\pi} \pi$ for all $i \leq j$. Therefore, $\theta(f_{i+1}) - \theta(f_i) =_{2\pi} \pi$ holds for any $i \in [n-1]$.

We now turn to the general case. Let us partition $[n]$ into fewer intervals S_1, \dots, S_k such that $|\theta(S_p) \setminus \{\perp\}| = 1$ for all $p \in [k]$, where $\theta(S_p) = \{\theta(f_i) \mid i \in S_p\}$. Namely, there exist $(k+1)$ positive integers $\ell_1 = 1 < \ell_2 < \dots < \ell_k < \ell_{k+1} = n$ and reals $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2 \neq \dots \neq \lambda_k$ such that $S_p = \{j \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \ell_p \leq j < \ell_{p+1}\}$ and $\theta(S_p) \setminus \{\perp\} = \{\lambda_p\}$ for all $p \in [k]$. For an index $p \in [k]$, let $g_p = f_{\ell_{p+1}-1} \circ \dots \circ f_{\ell_p}$. Then it is not difficult to see that g_p 's are all monotone linear, the ordering (g_1, \dots, g_k) is locally optimal, and $\theta(g_{p+1}) - \theta(g_p) =_{2\pi} \pi$ for some $p \in [k-1]$. Thus by applying the proof for the first case, we obtain that g_1, \dots, g_k are colinear, which implies that f_1, \dots, f_n are colinear. \square

Lemma 13. *For monotone linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n , let $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be a local optimal permutation. If an interval $S = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \ell \leq i \leq r\}$ contains a non-identical function $f_{\sigma(i)}$ and satisfies $f_{\sigma(r)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(\ell)}(x) = x$, then $f_{\sigma(j)}$ is identical for any $j \in [n] \setminus S$, unless f_1, \dots, f_n are colinear.*

Proof. Assuming that there exists an interval S which satisfies as above and a $j \in [n] \setminus S$ such that $f_{\sigma(j)}(x) \neq x$, we show that f_1, \dots, f_n are colinear. Without loss of generality, we assume that σ is the identity permutation. Let S be a minimal interval that satisfies the condition in the lemma. By the condition and the minimality of S , Lemma 9 (iv) implies that any index $m \in S \setminus \{r\}$ satisfies $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_{m+1}) - \theta(f_m \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) =_{2\pi} \pi$. Note that an ordering $(f_1, \dots, f_{\ell-1}, f_m \circ \dots \circ f_\ell, f_r \circ \dots \circ f_{m+1}, f_{r+1}, \dots, f_n)$ is locally optimal for the functions. Thus the linear functions corresponding to

$$\{\theta(f_i) \mid i \in [n] \setminus S\} \cup \{\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_{m+1}), \theta(f_m \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \mid m \in S \setminus \{r\}\}$$

are colinear by Lemma 12. In particular,

$$\{\theta(f_i) \mid i \in [n] \setminus S\} \cup \{\theta(f_r)\} \cup \{\theta(f_m \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \mid m \in S \setminus \{r\}\}$$

are colinear. Then f_1, \dots, f_n are colinear by Lemma 9 (ii). \square

For monotone non-identical linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n , let us assume without loss of generality that the identity permutation $\text{id} : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ is locally optimal. Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ denote the smallest reals such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_i &=_{2\pi} \theta(f_i) \text{ for all } i \in [n] \\ 0 &\leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Note that they are well-defined.

Lemma 14. *Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ be defined as above. If ℓ and r in $[n]$ satisfy $\lambda_r - \lambda_\ell < 2\pi$ and $\ell \leq r$, then we have $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in [\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_r)]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$. In addition, if f_1, \dots, f_n are not colinear and $\lambda_\ell < \lambda_r$ then we have $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in (\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_r))_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$.*

Proof. Note that the identity permutation is locally optimal. By Lemma 9 (iii), we may assume without loss of generality that $\lambda_i < \lambda_{i+1}$ for any $i \in [n-1]$. Initially, we show the first claim. If $\ell = r$ then the claim clearly holds and thus we assume $\ell < r$. By Lemmas 9 (i) (ii) and 11, we have $\theta(f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell) \in [\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_{\ell+1})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$. If $\ell + 1 = r$, then it proves the statement of the first claim. On the other hand, if $\ell + 1 < r$, then we divide our discussion into two cases, whether $\theta(f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell) \in [\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_{\ell+1})]_{2\pi}$ or not. If $\theta(f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell) \in [\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_{\ell+1})]_{2\pi}$ then we note that an ordering $(f_1, \dots, f_{\ell-1}, f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell, f_{\ell+2}, \dots, f_n)$ is locally optimal for linear functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\ell-1}, f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell, f_{\ell+2}, \dots, f_n$, and $f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell, f_{\ell+2}, \dots, f_r$ satisfies the condition in the lemma.

Thus by repeatedly applying the argument above to $f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell, f_{\ell+2}, \dots, f_r$, we can obtain the proof of the first claim. If $\theta(f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell) = \perp$ then we note that an ordering $(f_1, \dots, f_{\ell-1}, f_{\ell+2}, \dots, f_n)$ is locally optimal for linear functions $f_1, \dots, f_{\ell-1}, f_{\ell+2}, \dots, f_n$, and $f_{\ell+2}, \dots, f_r$ satisfies the condition in the lemma. Thus by repeatedly applying the argument above to $f_{\ell+2}, \dots, f_r$, we can obtain the proof of the first claim.

Next, we prove the second claim by showing that $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in (\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_r)]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$ and $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in [\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_r)]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$. By Lemmas 11 and 12, $\theta(f_{i+1}) - \theta(f_i) \in (0, \pi)_{2\pi}$ for any $i \in [n-1]$.

We first show $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in (\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_r)]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$. By Lemma 9 (i), we have $\theta(f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell) \in (\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_{\ell+1}))_{2\pi}$. By the first claim of lemma, $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_{\ell+2}) \in [\theta(f_{\ell+2}), \theta(f_r)]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$. If $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_{\ell+2}) = \perp$ then it proves the statement of the second claim because $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) = \theta(f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell) \in (\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_{\ell+1}))_{2\pi}$. On the other hand, if $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_{\ell+2}) \in [\theta(f_{\ell+2}), \theta(f_r)]_{2\pi}$, then $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_{\ell+2}) - \theta(f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell) \in [0, \pi]_{2\pi}$ by Lemma 11. Therefore, we have $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in [\theta(f_{\ell+1} \circ f_\ell), \theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_{\ell+2})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\} \subseteq (\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_r)]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$, where the first relationship is followed by Lemma 9 (i).

Similarly, we show $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in [\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_r)]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$. By Lemma 9 (i), $\theta(f_r \circ f_{r-1}) \in (\theta(f_{r-1}), \theta(f_r))_{2\pi}$. By the first claim of lemma, $\theta(f_{r-2} \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in [\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_{r-2})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$. If $\theta(f_{r-2} \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) = \perp$ then it proves the statement of the second claim because $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) = \theta(f_r \circ f_{r-1}) \in (\theta(f_{r-1}), \theta(f_r))_{2\pi}$. On the other hand, if $\theta(f_{r-2} \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in [\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_{r-2})]_{2\pi}$ then $\theta(f_r \circ f_{r-1}) - \theta(f_{r-2} \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in [0, \pi]_{2\pi}$ by Lemma 11. Therefore, we have $\theta(f_r \circ \dots \circ f_\ell) \in [\theta(f_{r-2} \circ \dots \circ f_\ell), \theta(f_r \circ f_{r-1})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\} \subseteq [\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_r)]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$, where the first relationship is followed by Lemma 9 (i). \square

Proof of Lemma 10. Without loss of generality, we assume that all f_i 's are non-identical and the locally optimal permutation is the identity permutation. Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ denote the reals defined before Lemma 14. Note that the identity permutation is counterclockwise if and only if $\lambda_n \leq \lambda_1 + 2\pi$. Suppose to the contrary that $\lambda_n > \lambda_1 + 2\pi$, and define u and v by

$$\begin{aligned} u &= \min\{i \in [n] \mid \lambda_i > \lambda_1 + 2\pi\}, \\ v &= \max\{i \in [n] \mid \lambda_i \leq \lambda_u - 2\pi\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Then by definition, we have $\lambda_{v+1} > \lambda_u - 2\pi$. Since σ is locally optimal, it follows from Lemmas 11 and 12 that

$$\lambda_{v+1} < \lambda_v + \pi \leq \lambda_u - \pi < \lambda_{u-1}. \quad (4)$$

which in particular implies $v+1 < u-1$. We define φ_1 and φ_2 by

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_1 &= \theta(f_v \circ \dots \circ f_1), \\ \varphi_2 &= \theta(f_{u-1} \circ \dots \circ f_{v+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\theta(f_1), \dots, \theta(f_v) \in [\theta(f_{u-1}), \theta(f_u)]_{2\pi}$ and $\theta(f_1) \in [\theta(f_{u-1}), \theta(f_u)]_{2\pi}$ by (3) and $\theta(f_u) - \theta(f_{u-1}) \in (0, \pi)_{2\pi}$ by Lemmas 11 and 12, Lemma 9 implies that

$$\varphi_1 \in [\theta(f_{u-1}), \theta(f_u)]_{2\pi}. \quad (5)$$

Note that $0 < \lambda_{u-1} - \lambda_{v+1} < \lambda_{u-1} - \lambda_1 \leq 2\pi$ holds by (3) and (4), and thus it follows from Lemmas 13 and 14 that

$$\varphi_2 \in (\theta(f_{v+1}), \theta(f_{u-1}))_{2\pi}. \quad (6)$$

Furthermore, by the local optimality of σ , Lemma 11 implies that

$$\varphi_2 \in [\varphi_1, \varphi_1 + \pi]_{2\pi} \cap [\theta(f_u) - \pi, \theta(f_u)]_{2\pi}.$$

By this together with (5), we obtain $\varphi_2 \in [\varphi_1, \theta(f_u)]_{2\pi}$, which contradicts (5) and (6), since $\theta(f_u) \notin (\theta(f_{v+1}), \theta(f_{u-1}))_{2\pi}$. Thus we have $\lambda_n \leq \lambda_1 + 2\pi$, completing the proof. \square

By the following lemma, we can obtain the proof of Theorem 1 (ii).

Lemma 15. *Let $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be a counterclockwise permutation for monotone linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n . If it provides the identity, i.e., $f^\sigma(x) = x$, then any of the counterclockwise permutations provides the identity.*

The proof follows from the following property of the k -shifts of a permutation which produces the identity.

Lemma 16. *Let f_1, \dots, f_n be monotone linear functions. If a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ provides the identity, i.e., $f^\sigma(x) = x$, then any k -shift σ_k of σ provides the identity.*

Proof. By the equivalence of Lemma 9 (iv), $(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{k+1}) \circ (f_k \circ \dots \circ f_1) = (f_k \circ \dots \circ f_1) \circ (f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{k+1})$ for any $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. This means that $f^{\sigma_k}(x) = f^\sigma(x)$. \square

Proof of Lemma 15. We note that for any permutation $\nu : [n] \rightarrow [n]$, $\theta(f_{\nu(k)}) = \theta(f_{\nu(k+1)})$ implies that $f^\nu = f^{\nu_{k,k,k+1}}$ by Lemma 7. Since any of the counterclockwise permutations is obtained by repeatedly applying this operation and k -shifting to σ , Lemma 16 provides the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1 (ii). (ii-1) \implies (ii-2) follows from Lemmas 10 and 15.

For the converse direction, by Lemma 10 we suppose, on the contrary, that all counterclockwise permutations provide the same non-identical function g . Since f_i 's are not colinear, there exists a non-identical linear function f_i such that

$$\theta(f_i) \notin \{\theta(g), \theta(g) + \pi\}_{2\pi}. \quad (7)$$

Consider a counterclockwise permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ with $\sigma(1) = i$, and let $h = f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(2)}$. Then we have $g = h \circ f_i$. Since $\theta(h) \notin \{\theta(f_i), \theta(f_i) + \pi\}_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$ by (7) and Lemma 8, Lemma 7 (i) implies that $h \circ f_i \neq f_i \circ h$, which contradicts the assumption. \square

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1 (iii)

We prove Theorem 1 (iii) by showing the unimodality of f^σ for counterclockwise permutations σ .

For a (finite) cyclically ordered set $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ with $e_1 \prec e_2 \prec \dots \prec e_m \prec e_1$ and a weakly ordered set S , a function $g : E \rightarrow S$ is called *unimodal* if there exists two integers k and ℓ in $[m]$ such that $g(e_k) \leq g(e_{k+1}) \leq \dots \leq g(e_\ell) \geq g(e_{\ell+1}) \geq \dots \geq g(e_{k-1}) \geq g(e_k)$. For a permutation $\tau : [n] \rightarrow [n]$, we regard the set $E_\tau = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{n-1}, \tau_n (= \tau)\}$ of its k -shifts as a cyclically ordered set and let $g(\sigma) = f^\sigma$ for $\sigma \in E_\tau$.

We show that f^σ is unimodal for counterclockwise permutations σ by providing the following adjacent property of f^σ , where an illustrative example is presented in Example 19.

Lemma 17. *Let f_1, \dots, f_n be monotone linear functions. For a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$, we have*

$$f^\sigma < \min\{f^{\sigma_1}, f^{\sigma_{n-1}}\} \implies \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi \in (\theta(f_{\sigma(n)}), \theta(f_{\sigma(1)}))_{2\pi}, \quad (8)$$

$$f^\sigma > \max\{f^{\sigma_1}, f^{\sigma_{n-1}}\} \implies \theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f_{\sigma(n)}), \theta(f_{\sigma(1)}))_{2\pi}. \quad (9)$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that σ is the identity permutation. To prove (8), we assume that $f^\sigma < f^{\sigma_1}$ and $f^\sigma < f^{\sigma_{n-1}}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f^\sigma < f^{\sigma_1} &\Leftrightarrow \theta(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_2) - \theta(f_1) \in (0, \pi)_{2\pi} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f_1), \theta(f_1) + \pi)_{2\pi} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi \in (\theta(f_1) - \pi, \theta(f_1))_{2\pi}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first and second equivalences follow from Lemmas 7 (i) and 9 (i), respectively. Similarly, by Lemmas 7 (i) and 9, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f^\sigma < f^{\sigma_{n-1}} &\Leftrightarrow \theta(f_n) - \theta(f_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ f_1) \in (0, \pi)_{2\pi} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f_n) - \pi, \theta(f_n))_{2\pi} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi \in (\theta(f_n), \theta(f_n) + \pi)_{2\pi}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\theta(f^\sigma) + \pi \in (\theta(f_1) - \pi, \theta(f_1))_{2\pi} \cap (\theta(f_n), \theta(f_n) + \pi)_{2\pi} \subseteq (\theta(f_n), \theta(f_1))_{2\pi}.$$

To prove (9), assume that $f^\sigma > f^{\sigma_1}$ and $f^\sigma > f^{\sigma_{n-1}}$. Then by applying an argument similar to the proof of (8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f^\sigma > f^{\sigma_1} &\Leftrightarrow \theta(f_1) - \theta(f_n \circ \cdots \circ f_2) \in (0, \pi)_{2\pi} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f_1) - \pi, \theta(f_1))_{2\pi}, \\ f^\sigma > f^{\sigma_{n-1}} &\Leftrightarrow \theta(f_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ f_1) - \theta(f_n) \in (0, \pi)_{2\pi} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f_n), \theta(f_n) + \pi)_{2\pi}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f_1) - \pi, \theta(f_1))_{2\pi} \cap (\theta(f_n), \theta(f_n) + \pi)_{2\pi} \subseteq (\theta(f_n), \theta(f_1))_{2\pi}.$$

□

Lemma 18. *Let $\tau : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be a counterclockwise permutation for monotone linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n . Then f^σ is unimodal for permutations $\sigma \in E_\tau$.*

Proof. If linear functions are colinear or potentially identical, then the statement in the lemma holds by Theorem 1 (i) and Lemmas 10 and 15. Otherwise, by Lemma 10 we can take σ_k that is optimal and rename σ_k to σ . We will show that $(f^\sigma, f^{\sigma_1}, \dots, f^{\sigma_{n-1}})$ is unimodal.

Suppose, on the contrary, that the sequence is not unimodal. Define two positive integers ℓ and r by

$$\begin{aligned} \ell &= \min\{i \in [n-2] \mid f^{\sigma_i} > f^{\sigma_{i+1}}\}, \\ r &= \min\{i \in [n-2] \mid i > \ell, f^{\sigma_i} < f^{\sigma_{i+1}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\max\{f^\sigma, f^{\sigma_r}\} < \min\{f^{\sigma_\ell}, f^{\sigma_{r+1}}\}. \quad (10)$$

Let g_1, g_2, g_3 , and g_4 be monotone linear functions defined by

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 &= f_{\sigma(\ell)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}, \\ g_2 &= f_{\sigma(r)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\sigma(\ell+1)}, \\ g_3 &= f_{\sigma(r+1)}, \\ g_4 &= f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\sigma(r+2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} f^\sigma &= g_4 \circ g_3 \circ g_2 \circ g_1, \\ f^{\sigma_\ell} &= g_1 \circ g_4 \circ g_3 \circ g_2, \\ f^{\sigma_r} &= g_2 \circ g_1 \circ g_4 \circ g_3, \\ f^{\sigma_{r+1}} &= g_3 \circ g_2 \circ g_1 \circ g_4. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f^\sigma < f^{\sigma\ell}$, g_1, \dots, g_4 are not colinear by Theorem 1 (i). Hence it follows from Lemma 10 that (g_1, \dots, g_4) is counterclockwise. Moreover, by Lemma 17 and (10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(g_4 \circ g_3 \circ g_2 \circ g_1) + \pi &\in (\theta(g_4), \theta(g_1))_{2\pi}, \\ \theta(g_1 \circ g_4 \circ g_3 \circ g_2) &\in (\theta(g_1), \theta(g_2))_{2\pi}, \\ \theta(g_2 \circ g_1 \circ g_4 \circ g_3) + \pi &\in (\theta(g_2), \theta(g_3))_{2\pi}, \\ \theta(g_3 \circ g_2 \circ g_1 \circ g_4) &\in (\theta(g_3), \theta(g_4))_{2\pi}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

We show that (11) derives a contradiction by separately considering the following three cases.

Case 1. If $\prod_{i \in [n]} \alpha(f_i) = 1$, then we have $\theta(f^\nu) \in \{0, \pi\}$ for any permutation $\nu : [n] \rightarrow [n]$. Therefore, (11) implies that $\{0, \pi\} \cap (\theta(g_i), \theta(g_{i+1}))_{2\pi} \neq \emptyset$ for any $i \in [4]$, where we denote $g_5 = g_1$. However, this contradicts that (g_1, \dots, g_4) is counterclockwise.

Case 2. If $\prod_{i \in [n]} \alpha(f_i) < 1$, then we have $\theta(f^\nu) \in (0, \pi)$ for any permutation $\nu : [n] \rightarrow [n]$. Therefore, the following four sets are nonempty: $(\theta(g_1), \theta(g_2))_{2\pi} \cap (0, \pi)$, $(\theta(g_2), \theta(g_3))_{2\pi} \cap (\pi, 2\pi)$, $(\theta(g_3), \theta(g_4))_{2\pi} \cap (0, \pi)$, and $(\theta(g_4), \theta(g_1))_{2\pi} \cap (\pi, 2\pi)$. This again contradicts that (g_1, \dots, g_4) is counterclockwise.

Case 3. Otherwise (i.e., $\prod_{i \in [n]} \alpha(f_i) > 1$), it can be proven similarly to Case 2. In fact, $\theta(f^\nu) \in (\pi, 2\pi)$ holds for any permutation $\nu : [n] \rightarrow [n]$. Hence, we have the following four nonempty sets: $(\theta(g_1), \theta(g_2))_{2\pi} \cap (\pi, 2\pi)$, $(\theta(g_2), \theta(g_3))_{2\pi} \cap (0, \pi)$, $(\theta(g_3), \theta(g_4))_{2\pi} \cap (\pi, 2\pi)$, and $(\theta(g_4), \theta(g_1))_{2\pi} \cap (0, \pi)$, which again contradicts that (g_1, \dots, g_4) is counterclockwise. \square

Example 19 provides an instance for the unimodality. In the next subsection, we further prove a stronger property of counterclockwise permutations.

Example 19. Consider the following five monotone linear functions

$$f_1 = \frac{1}{2}x + 1, \quad f_2 = \frac{1}{3}x - 1, \quad f_3 = 2x - 2, \quad f_4 = 2x - 1, \quad \text{and} \quad f_5 = 3x.$$

Then their vectors are given as follows (See Figure 3):

$$\vec{f}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \vec{f}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \frac{2}{3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \vec{f}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -2 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \vec{f}_4 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{f}_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the identity permutation $\text{id} : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ is counterclockwise for f_i 's, and moreover, by Lemma 10, we can see that it is optimal, since

$$f^{\text{id}} = 2x - 23, \quad f^{\text{id}_1} = 2x - \frac{27}{2}, \quad f^{\text{id}_2} = 2x - \frac{19}{6}, \quad f^{\text{id}_3} = 2x - \frac{13}{3}, \quad f^{\text{id}_4} = 2x - \frac{23}{3},$$

which also shows that $(f^{\text{id}}, f^{\text{id}_1}, f^{\text{id}_2}, f^{\text{id}_3}, f^{\text{id}_4})$ is unimodal.




Figure 3: The vector representation for f_1, \dots, f_5 .

Proof of Theorem 1 (iii). Without loss of generality, we can assume that all f_i 's are non-identical. To show the only-if part, let us assume without loss of generality that an optimal permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ for f_i 's is the identity. Then σ is counterclockwise for f_i 's by Lemma 10. We also note that $\theta(f_n \circ \cdots \circ f_2)$ and $\theta(f_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ f_1)$ are both non-identical by Lemma 13. Since σ is optimal, Lemma 7 implies

$$\theta(f_n \circ \cdots \circ f_2) - \theta(f_1), \theta(f_n) - \theta(f_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ f_1) \in [0, \pi]_{2\pi}.$$

By this together with Lemma 9, we have

$$\theta(f^\sigma) \in [\theta(f_1), \theta(f_1) + \pi]_{2\pi} \cap [\theta(f_n) - \pi, \theta(f_n)]_{2\pi},$$

which is equivalent to the condition

$$\theta(f^\sigma) + \pi \in [\theta(f_1) - \pi, \theta(f_1)]_{2\pi} \cap [\theta(f_n), \theta(f_n) + \pi]_{2\pi}.$$

Therefore, we have $\theta(f^\sigma) + \pi \in [\theta(f_n), \theta(f_1)]_{2\pi}$, which completes the proof of the only-if part.

For the if-part, we assume that the identity $\sigma (= \text{id})$ is counterclockwise for f_i 's and satisfies that $\theta(f^\sigma) + \pi \in [\theta(f_n), \theta(f_1)]_{2\pi}$. We first show the following two containment relationships:

$$\theta(f_1) \in [\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma)]_{2\pi}, \quad (12)$$

$$\theta(f_n) \in (\theta(f^\sigma), \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi]_{2\pi}. \quad (13)$$

To prove (12), suppose, on the contrary, that $\theta(f_1) \in [\theta(f^\sigma), \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi]_{2\pi}$. Then it follows that

$$\theta(f^\sigma) + \pi \in (\theta(f_1), \theta(f_1) + \pi]_{2\pi} \cap [\theta(f_n), \theta(f_1)]_{2\pi}, \quad (14)$$

which implies that $\theta(f_n) \in (\theta(f_1), \theta(f_1) + \pi]_{2\pi}$. Since σ is counterclockwise, it holds that $\theta(f_i) \in [\theta(f_1), \theta(f_1) + \pi]_{2\pi}$ for any $i \in [n]$. By this together with non-colinearity of f_i 's, Lemma 7 implies that $\theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f_1), \theta(f_n))_{2\pi} \subseteq (\theta(f_1), \theta(f_1) + \pi)_{2\pi}$, which contradicts (14). Thus we have (12).

Similarly, to prove (13), we suppose, on the contrary, that $\theta(f_n) \in (\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma)]_{2\pi}$. Then it follows that

$$\theta(f^\sigma) + \pi \in [\theta(f_n) - \pi, \theta(f_n)]_{2\pi} \cap [\theta(f_n), \theta(f_1)]_{2\pi}, \quad (15)$$

which implies that $\theta(f_1) \in [\theta(f_n) - \pi, \theta(f_n)]_{2\pi}$. Since σ is counterclockwise, it holds that $\theta(f_i) \in [\theta(f_n) - \pi, \theta(f_n)]_{2\pi}$ for any $i \in [n]$. By this together with non-colinearity of f_i 's, Lemma 7 implies that $\theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f_1), \theta(f_n))_{2\pi} \subseteq (\theta(f_n) - \pi, \theta(f_n))_{2\pi}$, which contradicts (15). Thus we have (13).

Let us denote two integers ℓ and r by

$$\begin{aligned} \ell &= \min\{i \in [n] \mid \theta(f_i) \not\equiv_{2\pi} \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi\}, \\ r &= \max\{i \in [n] \mid \theta(f_i) \not\equiv_{2\pi} \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from Lemmas 6, 7, and 9 that $f^{\sigma_i} = f^\sigma$ for any i with $0 \leq i < \ell$ or $r \leq i < n$. By Lemma 18, we only need to show that $f^\sigma < f^{\sigma_\ell}$ and $f^\sigma < f^{\sigma_{r-1}}$.

By Lemma 7, we note that $f^\sigma (= f^{\sigma_{\ell-1}}) < f^{\sigma_\ell}$ if and only if $\theta(f_{\ell-1} \circ \cdots \circ f_1 \circ f_n \circ \cdots \circ f_{\ell+1}) - \theta(f_\ell) \in (0, \pi)_{2\pi}$, which is also equivalent to $\theta(f_\ell) \in (\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma))_{2\pi}$. If $\ell = 1$, then this is satisfied by (12), since $\theta(f_1) \not\equiv_{2\pi} \theta(f^\sigma) - \pi$ by the definition of ℓ . If $\ell > 1$, we again have $\theta(f_\ell) \in (\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma))_{2\pi}$ by Lemma 7, since otherwise, $\theta(f_i) \in [\theta(f^\sigma), \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi]_{2\pi}$ holds for all i , which together with their non-colinearity implies that $\theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f^\sigma), \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi)_{2\pi}$, a contradiction. Therefore, we can conclude that $f^\sigma < f^{\sigma_\ell}$.

Similarly, we note that $f^\sigma (= f^{\sigma_r}) < f^{\sigma_{r-1}}$ if and only if $\theta(f_r) - \theta(f_{r-1} \circ \dots \circ f_1 \circ f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{r+1}) \in (0, \pi)_{2\pi}$, which is also equivalent to $\theta(f_r) \in (\theta(f^\sigma), \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi)_{2\pi}$. If $r = n$, then this is satisfied by (13), since $\theta(f_n) \neq_{2\pi} \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi$ by the definition of r . If $r < n$, we again have $\theta(f_r) \in (\theta(f^\sigma), \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi)_{2\pi}$ by Lemma 7, since otherwise $\theta(f_i) \in [\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma)]_{2\pi}$ holds for all i , which together with their non-colinearity implies that $\theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma))_{2\pi}$, a contradiction. Therefore, we can conclude that $f^\sigma < f^{\sigma_{r-1}}$, which completes the proof. \square

3.4 Structural Properties of Composition of Monotone Linear Functions.

We have proved the various properties of the optimal permutations so far. Using them, we will show the local structure of composition of monotone linear functions. We obtain the following interesting properties.

Theorem 20. *For monotone linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n , a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ is optimal if and only if it is locally optimal.*

Proof. Note that the only-if part is immediate from the definitions, and moreover, the if part follows from Theorem 1 (i), if f_i 's are colinear. Thus, we only consider the if part when f_i 's are not colinear. Let $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be a locally optimal permutation for f_i 's. By lemma 10, the σ is counterclockwise. Hence Theorem 1 (ii) implies that σ is optimal for f_i 's if they are potentially identical. On the other hand, if they are not potentially identical, then by Theorem 1 (iii), for any counterclockwise permutation ν , there exists an optimal permutation $\mu \in N(\nu)$. This implies that σ must be optimal, which completes the proof. \square

For a cyclically ordered set $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ and a weakly ordered set S , a function $g : E \rightarrow S$ is called *strictly unimodal* if 1) it is unimodal and 2) $g(e_k) = g(e_{k+1})$ implies that they attain either minimum or maximum.

Theorem 21. *Let $\tau : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be a counterclockwise permutation for monotone non-identical linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n . Then f^σ is strictly unimodal for permutations $\sigma \in E_\tau$. Furthermore, if f_i 's are not potentially identical or colinear, then $f^{\sigma_k} = f^{\sigma_{k+1}}$ implies exactly one of the following two conditions.*

- (i) σ_k and σ_{k+1} are minimum permutations in their shifts (i.e., $f^{\sigma_k} = f^{\sigma_{k+1}} = \min_{0 \leq i < n} f^{\sigma_i}$) such that $\theta(f_{\sigma(k+1)}) + \pi =_{2\pi} \theta(f^{\sigma_k})$.
- (ii) σ_k and σ_{k+1} are maximum permutations in their shifts (i.e., $f^{\sigma_k} = f^{\sigma_{k+1}} = \max_{0 \leq i < n} f^{\sigma_i}$) such that $\theta(f_{\sigma(k+1)}) =_{2\pi} \theta(f^{\sigma_k})$.

Proof. Since the second statement of the theorem implies strict unimodality of f^σ for counterclockwise permutations, we only show the second one. We assume without loss of generality that σ is the identity and $k = 0$. By Lemma 7, $f^\sigma = f^{\sigma_1}$ implies that $\theta(f^\sigma)$, $\theta(f_1)$, and $\theta(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_2)$ are colinear. Hence, either $\theta(f_1) + \pi =_{2\pi} \theta(f^\sigma)$ or $\theta(f_1) = \theta(f^\sigma)$ holds. In the former case, f^σ is minimum by Theorem 1, which implies (i) in the theorem.

For the latter case, let us assume that $\theta(f_1) = \theta(f^\sigma)$. Let $\ell = \min\{i \in [n] \mid \theta(f_i) \neq \theta(f_1)\}$ and $r = \max\{i \in [n] \mid \theta(f_i) \neq \theta(f_1)\}$. Then by Lemmas 6, 7, and 9, it holds that

$$f^{\sigma_r} = \dots = f^{\sigma_{n-1}} = f^\sigma = f^{\sigma_1} = \dots = f^{\sigma_{\ell-1}}. \quad (16)$$

We shall show that $f^\sigma > f^{\sigma_\ell}$ and $f^\sigma > f^{\sigma_{r-1}}$, which completes the proof by Lemma 18.

In order to show that $f^\sigma > f^{\sigma_\ell}$, we claim that $\theta(f_\ell) \in (\theta(f^\sigma), \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi)_{2\pi}$. If it is not the case, i.e., $\theta(f_\ell) \in [\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma)]_{2\pi}$, then any $i \in [n]$ satisfies $\theta(f_i) \in [\theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_1)]_{2\pi} \subseteq [\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma)]_{2\pi}$, since σ is counterclockwise. Lemmas 6 and 9, together with non-colinearity

of f_i 's imply that $\theta(f^\sigma) \in (\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma))_{2\pi}$, which is a contradiction. Thus our claim holds. By this together with Lemma 9 and (16), we have $\theta(f_{\ell-1} \circ \dots \circ f_1 \circ f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{\ell+1}) \in (\theta(f_\ell) - \pi, \theta(f_\ell))_{2\pi}$. Therefore, Lemma 7 implies that $f^\sigma = f^{\sigma_{\ell-1}} > f^{\sigma_\ell}$.

Similarly, we can prove that $f^\sigma > f^{\sigma_{r-1}}$. In fact, we have $\theta(f_r) \in (\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma))_{2\pi}$, which together with Lemma 9 and (16) implies $\theta(f_{r-1} \circ \dots \circ f_1 \circ f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{r+1}) \in (\theta(f_r), \theta(f_r) + \pi)_{2\pi}$. Therefore, by Lemma 7, we have $f^\sigma = f^{\sigma_r} > f^{\sigma_{r-1}}$. \square

By this theorem, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 22. *Let f_1, \dots, f_n be monotone non-identical linear functions. If a counterclockwise permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ for them satisfies $f^\sigma \leq f^{\sigma_1}$, $f^\sigma \leq f^{\sigma_{n-1}}$, and $\theta(f_{\sigma(1)}) \neq \theta(f^\sigma)$, then it is optimal for them.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 1 (iii) and Theorem 21 \square

4 Composition of Nondecreasing Linear Functions

In this section, we deal with the case in which aIn this section, we characterize optimal composition orderings for monotone nondecreasing linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n , i.e., $\alpha(f_i) \geq 0$ for all $i \in [n]$. Since the monotone (increasing) case has been treated in Section 3, we assume that $\alpha(f_i) = 0$ for some i . Note that any permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ provides a constant function f^σ if some f_i is a constant. We first show that this case can be transformed to the monotone case.

For a linear function f and a real number ϵ , we define $f^{(\epsilon)}$ as follows

$$f^{(\epsilon)}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } \alpha(f) \neq 0, \\ f(x) + \epsilon x & \text{if } \alpha(f) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

We denote $f_{\sigma(n)}^{(\epsilon)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}^{(\epsilon)}$ by $(f^{(\epsilon)})^\sigma$.

Lemma 23. *For any linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n , there exists a real number $r > 0$ such that $(f^{(\epsilon)})^\sigma \leq (f^{(\epsilon)})^\rho$ implies $f^\sigma \leq f^\rho$ for any two permutations $\sigma, \rho : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ and any real ϵ with $|\epsilon| < r$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma, \rho : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be two permutations. If $f^\sigma \leq f^\rho$ holds, then the statement in the lemma clearly holds. We thus consider the case in which $f^\sigma > f^\rho$. Define δ and Δ by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta &= \min\{|\beta(f^\sigma) - \beta(f^\rho)| \mid \beta(f^\sigma) \neq \beta(f^\rho)\}, \\ \Delta &= \max\{|\alpha(f_1)|, \dots, |\alpha(f_n)|, |\beta(f_1)|, \dots, |\beta(f_n)|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Delta = 0$ implies that $f^\sigma = f^\rho = 0$, we assume that $\Delta > 0$. Note that $\beta((f^{(\epsilon)})^\sigma)$ can be expressed as a polynomial in ϵ of degree at most n with the absolute value of each coefficient at most Δ^n . In addition, $\beta(f^\sigma)$ is the constant term of a polynomial for $\beta((f^{(\epsilon)})^\sigma)$, since $\beta((f^{(0)})^\sigma) = \beta(f^\sigma)$. We thus denote $\beta((f^{(\epsilon)})^\sigma)$ by $\epsilon P_\sigma(\epsilon) + \beta(f^\sigma)$, where $P_\sigma(\epsilon)$ is a polynomial of degree at most $n-1$ with the absolute value of each coefficient at most Δ^n . Let $r = \min\{1, \frac{\delta}{2n\Delta^n}\}$ and fix ϵ to satisfy $|\epsilon| < r$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (f^{(\epsilon)})^\sigma - (f^{(\epsilon)})^\rho &= \beta((f^{(\epsilon)})^\sigma) - \beta((f^{(\epsilon)})^\rho) \\ &= \beta(f^\sigma) - \beta(f^\rho) + \epsilon(P_\sigma(\epsilon) - P_\rho(\epsilon)) \\ &\geq \delta - \epsilon(|P_\sigma(\epsilon)| + |P_\rho(\epsilon)|) \\ &\geq \delta - \epsilon(2n\Delta^n) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

\square

We remark that the lemma does not make use of nondecreasing property on f_i 's. Lemma 23 states that the optimality for $f_1^{(\epsilon)}, \dots, f_n^{(\epsilon)}$ implies the one for f_1, \dots, f_n , if $|\epsilon|$ is sufficiently small. In other words, an optimal permutation can be computed by making use of an algorithm for the monotone case.

Lemma 24. *Let f_1, \dots, f_n be linear functions. For a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, any optimal permutation for $f_i^{(\epsilon)}$'s is also optimal for f_i 's.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 23. □

However, we need to be careful about ϵ , which will be mentioned in Section 5. Furthermore, we can note that the converse of Lemma 23 does not hold in general, which can be seen in the following example.

Example 25. *Let us consider four monotone nondecreasing functions f_1, f_2, f_3 , and f_4 given by*

$$f_1 = 2x + 2, \quad f_2 = x + 2, \quad f_3 = 0x + 1, \quad f_4 = 2x - 3.$$

Note that they are non-colinear and not potentially identical. The identity permutation is counterclockwise and optimal. Since f_3 is a constant function, we have $f_3 = f_3 \circ f_2 \circ f_1 = f_3 \circ f_1 \circ f_2$, and hence $f_4 \circ f_3 \circ f_1 \circ f_2$ provided by a non-counterclockwise permutation is also optimal.

We now characterize optimal composition orderings for nondecreasing linear functions. Let f_1, \dots, f_n be nondecreasing linear functions, at least one of which is a constant. Then we first note that any permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ produces a constant function f^σ . Moreover, for a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$, let q_σ be the largest integer $q \in [n]$ such that $f_{\sigma(q)}$ is a constant, i.e., $q_\sigma = \max\{q \mid \alpha(f_{\sigma(q)}) = 0\}$. Then as seen in Example 25, we have $f^\sigma = f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(q_\sigma)}$, which implies that $f^\sigma = f^{\sigma \circ \rho}$ for any permutation ρ such that $\rho(i) = i$ for any $i \in [q_\sigma, n]$. In other words, the functions composited before the last constant function can be ordered arbitrarily.

The following two theorems respectively correspond to Theorem 1 (i) and (iii) for the monotone case, where we define

$$\beta_{\min} = \min\{\beta(f_i) \mid \alpha(f_i) = 0\}, \tag{18}$$

$$\beta_{\text{OPT}} = \min\{f^\sigma \mid \sigma \in \Sigma\}. \tag{19}$$

Here Σ denotes the set of all permutations of $[n]$.

Theorem 26. *Let f_1, \dots, f_n be monotone nondecreasing linear functions at least one of which is a constant. Then the following three statements are equivalent.*

- (i) *Any f_i satisfies $\theta(f_i) \in [\theta(\beta_{\min}) - \pi, \theta(\beta_{\min})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$.*
- (ii) $\beta_{\text{OPT}} = \beta_{\min}$.
- (iii) *Optimal permutations $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ for f_i 's are those that satisfies that $f_{\sigma(q_\sigma)}, f_{\sigma(q_\sigma+1)}, \dots, f_{\sigma(n)}$ are colinear.*

Theorem 27. *Let f_1, \dots, f_n be monotone nondecreasing linear functions at least one of which is a constant. If there exists a linear function f_i such that $\theta(f_i) \in (\theta(\beta_{\min}), \theta(\beta_{\min}) + \pi)$ (equivalently, $\beta_{\text{OPT}} < \beta_{\min}$), then the following two statements are equivalent.*

- (i) *A permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ is optimal.*

- (ii) A permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ can be composed by $\sigma = \mu \circ \rho$ for a counterclockwise permutation $\mu : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ such that $\theta(f^\mu) + \pi \in [\theta(f_{\mu(t)}), \theta(f_{\mu(s)})]_{2\pi}$, where s and t denote the first and last integers i such that $f_{\sigma(i)}$ is non-identical, and a permutation $\rho : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ such that $\rho(i) = i$ for any $i \in [q_\sigma, n]$.

We remark that there exists no case corresponding to Theorem 1 (ii), since f^σ is a constant for any permutation σ . In this section, we also show that the local optimality implies the global optimality for the nondecreasing case.

Theorem 28. For monotone nondecreasing linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n , a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ is optimal if and only if it is locally optimal.

In order to prove Theorems 26, 27 and 28, we provide a few lemmas. Recall that for a real c , the symbol $\theta(c)$ denotes the angle of the linear function $c (= 0x + c)$.

Lemma 29. For any linear function r , we have the following three equivalences.

- (i) $r(c) < c \Leftrightarrow \theta(r) \in (\theta(c), \theta(c) + \pi)_{2\pi}$.
- (ii) $r(c) = c \Leftrightarrow \theta(r) \in \{\theta(c), \theta(c) + \pi, \perp\}$.
- (iii) $r(c) > c \Leftrightarrow \theta(r) \in (\theta(c) - \pi, \theta(c))_{2\pi}$.

Proof. It follows from Lemmas 6 and 7. □

Lemma 30. Let f_1, \dots, f_n be monotone nondecreasing linear functions at least one of which is a constant. Let $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be a local optimal permutation for f_i 's. Then we have the following four statements.

- (i) $f^\sigma \leq \beta_{\min}$.
- (ii) $f_{\sigma(q_\sigma)} = \beta_{\min}$.
- (iii) $\theta(f_{\sigma(i)}) \in [\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(\beta_{\min})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$ for any $i \in [q_\sigma]$.
- (iv) $\theta(f_{\sigma(i)}) \in [\theta(\beta_{\min}), \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi] \cup \{\perp\}$ for any $i \in [q_\sigma, n]$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that σ is the identity. Let i be an index with $f_i(x) = \beta_{\min}$. If $i = n$, then we have $f^\sigma = \beta_{\min}$. On the other hand if $i < n$, then $f^{\sigma_i} = \beta_{\min}$ and σ_i is a neighbor of σ . These imply (i). To show the rest of the properties, we note that the following inequalities hold by the local optimality:

$$f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{q_\sigma+1} \circ f_i \circ f_{q_\sigma} \circ \dots \circ f_{i+1} \circ f_{i-1} \circ \dots \circ f_1 \geq f^\sigma, \quad (20)$$

$$f_i(f^\sigma) = f_i \circ f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{i+1} \circ f_{i-1} \circ \dots \circ f_1 \geq f^\sigma \quad (21)$$

for any $i \in [q_\sigma - 1]$. Since f_{q_σ} is a constant, (20) implies

$$f_i(f_{q_\sigma}) = f_i \circ f_{q_\sigma} \circ \dots \circ f_{i+1} \geq f_{q_\sigma} \circ \dots \circ f_i = f_{q_\sigma}. \quad (22)$$

Let f_i be a constant, i.e., $\alpha(f_i) = 0$. Then by the definition of q_σ , we have $i \leq q_\sigma$, which together with (22) implies (ii), since $f_i = f_i(f_{q_\sigma})$. Moreover, by (22), (21), and Lemma 29, we have

$$\theta(f_i) \in ([\theta(\beta_{\min}) - \pi, \theta(\beta_{\min})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}) \cap ([\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(f^\sigma)]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\})$$

for any $i \in [q_\sigma - 1]$. Since (i) implies $\theta(f^\sigma) \geq \theta(\beta_{\min})$, it holds that

$$\theta(f_i) \in [\theta(f^\sigma) - \pi, \theta(\beta_{\min})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\},$$

which proves (iii).

For any integer $i \in [q_\sigma, n]$, define a real v_i by $v_i = f_i \circ \dots \circ f_{q_\sigma}$. Then by the local optimality of σ , we have $v_{i+1} = f_{i+1} \circ f_i \circ \dots \circ f_{q_\sigma} \leq f_i \circ \dots \circ f_{q_\sigma} \circ f_{i+1} = v_i$. That is, the sequence $v_{q_\sigma}, v_{q_\sigma+1}, \dots, v_n$ is non-increasing. This implies that $v_i \in [v_n, v_{q_\sigma}] = [f^\sigma, \beta_{\min}]$ for any $i \in [q_\sigma, n]$. Moreover, since $v_{i+1} = f_{i+1}(v_i) \leq v_i$, Lemma 29 implies that $\theta(f_{i+1}) \in [\theta(v_i), \theta(v_i) + \pi] \cup \{\perp\} \subseteq [\theta(\beta_{\min}), \theta(f^\sigma) + \pi] \cup \{\perp\}$, which completes the proof. \square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 28.

Proof of Theorem 28. By Theorem 20, it is sufficient to prove the case where at least one of f_i 's is a constant. We assume without loss of generality that the identity σ is local optimal for f_i 's. Recall that $f_{q_\sigma} = \beta_{\min}$ by Lemma 30 and $f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{q_\sigma+1}$ is an optimal function for $f_{q_\sigma+1}, \dots, f_n$ by Theorem 20. Supposing to the contrary that $\beta_{\text{OPT}} < f^\sigma$, we construct a permutation $\tau : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ such that

- (I) $f^\tau < f^\sigma$,
- (II) $f_{\tau(q_\tau)} = \beta_{\min}$,
- (III) $\{\tau(i) \mid i > q_\sigma\} = [q_\tau + 1, n]$,

which completes the proof, since the existence of such a permutation τ contradicts $f_{q_\sigma} = \beta_{\min}$ and the optimality of $f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{q_\sigma+1}$.

Let σ^* be an optimal permutation, and let $v_i = f_{\sigma^*(i)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma^*(q_{\sigma^*})}$ for $i \in [q_{\sigma^*}, n]$. By recalling the proof of Lemma 30, we have $v_n \leq \dots \leq v_{q_{\sigma^*}} = \beta_{\min}$, and moreover there exists an optimal permutation σ^* such that $v_n < \dots < v_{q_{\sigma^*}} = \beta_{\min}$. Assume that σ^* satisfies the property. Then there exists an $\ell \in [q_{\sigma^*} + 1, n]$ such that $v_\ell < f^\sigma \leq v_{\ell-1}$. Let τ denote the ℓ -shift of σ^* , i.e., $\tau = \sigma_\ell^*$, where we define $\sigma_n^* = \sigma^*$. Note that this τ satisfies (I) and (II). Moreover, since $v_{i-1} \in [f^\sigma, \beta_{\min}]$ and $f_{\tau(i)}(v_{i-1}) < v_{i-1}$ for any $i \in [q_\tau + 1, n]$, Lemmas 29 (i) and 30 (iv) imply that $\{\tau(i) \mid i > q_\tau\} \subseteq [q_\sigma + 1, n]$. Again by Lemmas 29 and 30 (iv), any $i \in [q_\sigma + 1, n]$ satisfies at least one of the following two inequalities:

$$f_i(\beta_{\min}) \leq \beta_{\min} \quad \text{and} \quad f_i(f^\tau) \leq f^\tau, \quad (23)$$

which respectively imply that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\tau(n)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\tau(q_\tau+1)} \circ f_{\tau(j)} \circ f_{\tau(q_\tau)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\tau(1)} &\leq f^\tau \quad \text{and} \\ f_{\tau(j)} \circ f_{\tau(n)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\tau(j+1)} \circ f_{\tau(j-1)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\tau(1)} &\leq f^\tau, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

if an index $j \in [q_\tau - 1]$ satisfies $\tau(j) \in [q_\sigma + 1, n]$. In either case, a new permutation τ corresponding to the left hand sides of (24) satisfies (23). Therefore, by repeatedly applying this modification, we can obtain a permutation τ that satisfies (I), (II) and (III), completing the proof. \square

Lemma 30 and Theorem 28 state that $\theta(\beta_{\min})$ and $\theta(\beta_{\text{OPT}}) + \pi$ provide the *boundaries* of optimal permutations. The following lemma proves the equivalence of (i) and (ii) in Theorem 26.

Lemma 31. *Let f_1, \dots, f_n be monotone nondecreasing linear functions at least one of which is a constant. Then $\beta_{\text{OPT}} = \beta_{\min}$ if and only if $\theta(f_i) \in [\theta(\beta_{\min}) - \pi, \theta(\beta_{\min})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$ holds for any $i \in [n]$.*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that there exists a linear function f_j such that $\theta(f_j) \in (\theta(\beta_{\min}), \theta(\beta_{\min}) + \pi)_{2\pi}$, and let $f_i = 0x + \beta_{\min}$. Then consider a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ with $\sigma(n-1) = i$ and $\sigma(n) = j$. Since $f^\sigma = f_j(\beta_{\min})$, Lemma 29 implies that $f^\sigma < \beta_{\min}$, which concludes that $\beta_{\text{OPT}} < \beta_{\min}$.

On the other hand, if all f_i 's satisfy $\theta(f_i) \in [\theta(\beta_{\min}) - \pi, \theta(\beta_{\min})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$, then for any optimal permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ for f_i 's, we have $f^\sigma = f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\sigma(q_\sigma+1)}(\beta_{\min})$ by Lemma 30 (ii). It follows from Lemmas 6 and 9 that

$$\theta(f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\sigma(q_\sigma+1)}) \in [\theta(\beta_{\min}) - \pi, \theta(\beta_{\min})]_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\},$$

which together with Lemmas 29 and 30 (i) implies that $\beta_{\text{OPT}} = \beta_{\min}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 26. By Lemma 31, (i) and (ii) are equivalent. If $\beta_{\text{OPT}} = \beta_{\min}$, then Lemma 30 (iii) and (iv) imply that any optimal permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ for f_i 's satisfies $i < q_\sigma$ for any i with $\theta(f_{\sigma(i)}) \in (\theta(\beta_{\min}) - \pi, \theta(\beta_{\min}))_{2\pi}$. On the other hand, if a permutation σ satisfies the condition above, then we have $f^\sigma = f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\sigma(q_\sigma+1)}(\beta_{\min}) = \beta_{\min}$, where the last equality follows from Lemma 29 (ii). This implies that σ is optimal for f_i 's, proving the implication of (ii) \implies (iii).

To show (iii) \implies (i), let f_j satisfy $\theta(f_j) \in (\theta(\beta_{\min}), \theta(\beta_{\min}) + \pi)$ for some j and assume that the identity id is optimal for f_i 's. Then by Lemma 30 (iv), the inequality $j > q_{\text{id}}$ must hold, since $\theta(\beta_{\min}) \leq \theta(\beta_{\text{OPT}})$. However, (iii) does not imply this property, which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 27. By Lemmas 30 (i) and 31, we have $\beta_{\text{OPT}} < \beta_{\min}$ if and only if some f_j satisfies $\theta(f_j) \in (\theta(\beta_{\min}), \theta(\beta_{\min}) + \pi)$.

To show (i) \implies (ii), let us first assume that the identity $\text{id} : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ is optimal for f_i 's. By Lemma 30, $\theta(\beta_{\min})$ and $\theta(\beta_{\text{OPT}}) + \pi$ are the boundaries of $\{\theta(f_i) \mid i < q_{\text{id}}\}$ and $\{\theta(f_i) \mid i > q_{\text{id}}\}$. Thus we only have to prove that $f_{q_{\text{id}}+1}, \dots, f_n$ is counterclockwise. Since they are monotone, Theorem 1 implies that it is true if the following condition is not satisfied.

$$\{\psi, \psi + \pi\} \subseteq \{\theta(f_i) \mid i > q_{\text{id}}\} \subseteq \{\psi, \psi + \pi, \perp\} \quad (25)$$

for some ψ with $0 \leq \psi < \pi$. Note that $\psi = \theta(f_j)$ for some j , since $\theta(\beta_{\min}) < \theta(\beta_{\text{OPT}})$. Suppose on the contrary that (25) is satisfied. Then by repeatedly applying Lemma 9 (ii), we have

$$\theta(f_n \circ \cdots \circ f_{q_{\text{id}}+1}) \in \{\psi, \psi + \pi, \perp\}.$$

Since $\beta_{\text{OPT}} < \beta_{\min}$, Lemma 29 (i) implies that $\theta(f_n \circ \cdots \circ f_{q_{\text{id}}+1}) = \psi$. By Lemma 8, we have

$$\theta(\beta_{\text{OPT}}) \in (\theta(\beta_{\min}), \psi),$$

which contradicts that $\psi + \pi \leq \theta(\beta_{\text{OPT}}) + \pi$ by Lemma 30 (iv).

To show that (ii) \implies (i), let $\mu : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be a counterclockwise permutation that satisfies $\theta(f^\mu) + \pi \in [\theta(f_{\mu(n)}), \theta(f_{\mu(1)})]_{2\pi}$. Since $f^\mu = f^{\mu \circ \rho}$ for any permutation $\rho : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ such that $\rho(i) = i$ for any $i \in [q_\sigma, n]$, it is enough to show that μ is optimal for f_i 's. By (i) \implies (ii), which has already been proven, we can take an optimal permutation ν such that $\theta(f^\nu) + \pi \in [\theta(f_{\nu(n)}), \theta(f_{\nu(1)})]_{2\pi}$ and $\mu_k = \nu$ for some k . Suppose on the contrary that $f^\nu < f^\mu$. Then we have $\{\theta(f_{\mu(1)}), \dots, \theta(f_{\mu(k)})\} \subseteq [\theta(f^\mu) + \pi, \theta(f^\nu) + \pi] \cup \{\perp\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} f^\nu &= f_{\mu(k)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\mu(1)} \circ f_{\mu(n)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\mu(k+1)} \\ &= f_{\mu(k)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\mu(1)}(f^\mu) < f^\mu, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows because any constant function in f_i 's is in $\{f_{\mu(k+1)}, \dots, f_{\mu(n)}\}$. This together with Lemma 29 implies that

$$\theta(f_{\mu(k)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\mu(1)}) \in (\theta(f^\mu), \theta(f^\mu) + \pi), \quad (26)$$

which contradicts $\{\theta(f_{\mu(1)}), \dots, \theta(f_{\mu(k)})\} \subseteq [\theta(f^\mu) + \pi, \theta(f^\nu) + \pi] \cup \{\perp\}$. \square

We note that the equivalence of (i) and (ii) in Theorem 27 does not imply that $\beta_{\text{OPT}} < \beta_{\text{min}}$. Before concluding this section, we mention the maximization problem.

Remark 32. *As discussed in Section 2, the maximization for f_i 's is equivalent to the minimization for \tilde{f}_i 's given by (1). Thus all the results for monotone nondecreasing functions are applicable for the maximization problem. Since the mapping (1) is the reflection across the $(1-a)$ -axis in the vector representation, we can obtain the results by exchanging the term “counterclockwise” by “clockwise”.*

5 Composition of General Linear Functions

In this section, we discuss the composition for general linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n , where an example of composition for general linear functions is given in Example 33. Let k denote the number of monotone decreasing functions in them, i.e., $k = |\{i \in [n] \mid \alpha(f_i) < 0\}|$. In Sections 3 and 4, we provided structure characterizations for the composite when $k = 0$, and as their corollary we presented a polynomial-time algorithm for the minimization/maximization for monotone nondecreasing linear functions. In this section, we present several structural properties for the composites of general linear functions and show fixed-parameter tractability for the minimization problem with respect to k , whose complexity status was open [12].

In the rest of this section, we mainly restrict our attention to the case in which no linear function is identical or constant, i.e., $f_i \neq x$ and $\alpha(f_i) \neq 0$ for all $i \in [n]$. Note that the identical function plays no role in optimal composition, and Lemma 24 in Section 4 implies that the general composition problem can be transformed to this case, by using $f_i^{(\epsilon)}$'s for some $\epsilon > 0$. We remark that our algorithm does not make use of ϵ explicitly, since the orderings of angles $\theta(f_i^{(\epsilon)})$'s are only needed.

Example 33. *Let f_i ($i = 1, \dots, 7$) be linear functions defined by*

$$f_1 = \frac{1}{3}x, \quad f_2 = \frac{2}{3}x + 1, \quad f_3 = x + \frac{1}{2}, \quad f_4 = -x - 3, \quad f_5 = x - 1, \quad f_6 = \frac{3}{2}x, \quad f_7 = 2x + 1,$$

where all but f_4 are monotone. The vector representation is shown in Fig. 4. Note that the identity permutation provides an optimal function $f_7 \circ \dots \circ f_1$. Recall that $\theta(f_{\sigma(i+1)}) - \theta(f_{\sigma(i)}) \in [0, \pi]_{2\pi}$ holds for any optimal (i.e., minimum) permutation σ of monotone linear functions by Lemma 7. However, this crucial property for monotone linear functions does not hold in general. For example, the instance satisfies $\theta(f_2) - \theta(f_1) \in (\pi, 2\pi)$. Instead, we point out the following properties: $f_3 \circ f_2 \circ f_1$ is provided by a maximum permutation for f_1, f_2 , and f_3 , while $f_7 \circ f_6 \circ f_5$ is provided by a minimum permutation for f_5, f_6 , and f_7 .

To see the properties mentioned in Example 33, We define two sets L^σ and U^σ of monotone nondecreasing linear functions. For a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$, let $n_1^\sigma, \dots, n_k^\sigma$ be integers such that

$$0 (= n_0^\sigma) < n_1^\sigma < \dots < n_k^\sigma < n + 1 (= n_{k+1}^\sigma)$$




Figure 4: The vector representation for f_1, \dots, f_7 .

and $\alpha(f_{\sigma(n_j^\sigma)}) < 0$ for all $j \in [k]$. For $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, let

$$I_j^\sigma = \{i \in [n] \mid n_j^\sigma < i < n_{j+1}^\sigma\}$$

and define

$$L^\sigma = \bigcup_{k-j:\text{even}} I_j^\sigma \quad \text{and} \quad U^\sigma = \bigcup_{k-j:\text{odd}} I_j^\sigma.$$

By definition, the set of indices of all monotone nondecreasing functions $\{i \in [n] \mid \alpha(f_{\sigma(i)}) \geq 0\}$ is partitioned into L^σ and U^σ . In the example in Example 33, we have $L^{\text{id}} = I_1^{\text{id}} = \{5, 6, 7\}$ and $U^{\text{id}} = I_0^{\text{id}} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

For an integer $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, define linear functions

$$r_{i-n_j^\sigma} = f_{\sigma(i)} \quad \text{for } i \in I_j^\sigma.$$

Lemma 34. *Let $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be an optimal permutation for non-constant and non-identical linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n . For an integer $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, let r_i ($i \in I_j^\sigma$) be defined as above. Then we have the following two statements.*

- (i) *If $k-j$ is even, then the identity $\text{id} : [|I_j^\sigma|] \rightarrow [|I_j^\sigma|]$ is a minimum permutation for $r_1, \dots, r_{|I_j^\sigma|}$.*
- (ii) *If $k-j$ is odd, then the identity $\text{id} : [|I_j^\sigma|] \rightarrow [|I_j^\sigma|]$ is a maximum permutation for $r_1, \dots, r_{|I_j^\sigma|}$.*

Proof. Define $p = f_{\sigma(n)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(n_{j+1}^\sigma)}$ and $q = f_{\sigma(n_j^\sigma)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}$. Then we have $f^\sigma = p \circ r_{|I_j^\sigma|} \circ \dots \circ r_1 \circ q$. If $k-j$ is even, then p is monotone (increasing). This implies that $r_{|I_j^\sigma|} \circ \dots \circ r_1$ is provided by a minimum permutation for r_i 's. On the other hand, if $k-j$ is odd, then p is monotone decreasing. We can see that $r_{|I_j^\sigma|} \circ \dots \circ r_1$ is provided by a maximum permutation for r_i 's. \square

Lemma 34, together with Theorem 1 and Remark 32, implies that each interval I_j is permuted either counterclockwisely or clockwisely, unless all the functions in I_j are colinear. The following lemma states that not only intervals I_j 's but also L^σ and U^σ satisfy such a property if σ is optimal. Let $L^\sigma = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_{|L^\sigma|}\}$ and $U^\sigma = \{u_1, \dots, u_{|U^\sigma|}\}$, where $\ell_1 < \dots < \ell_{|L^\sigma|}$ and $u_1 < \dots < u_{|U^\sigma|}$, and let

$$p_i = f_{\sigma(\ell_i)} \quad \text{for } i \in [|L^\sigma|] \quad \text{and} \quad q_i = f_{\sigma(u_i)} \quad \text{for } i \in [|U^\sigma|].$$

Lemma 35. *Let $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be an optimal permutation for non-constant and non-identical linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n . Let p_i ($i \in [|L^\sigma|]$) and q_i ($i \in [|U^\sigma|]$) denote monotone linear functions defined as above. Then we have the following two statements.*

- (i) The identity $\text{id} : [[L^\sigma]] \rightarrow [[L^\sigma]]$ is counterclockwise for p_i 's, unless they are colinear.
(ii) The identity $\text{id} : [[U^\sigma]] \rightarrow [[U^\sigma]]$ is clockwise for q_i 's, unless they are colinear.

Proof. We first prove the case where k is even. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
f^\sigma &= \overbrace{p_{|L^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ p_{|L^\sigma| - |I_k^\sigma| + 1}}^{I_k^\sigma} \circ g_{k/2} \circ \cdots \circ g_2 \circ \overbrace{p_{|I_0^\sigma| + |I_2^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ p_{|I_0^\sigma| + 1}}^{I_2^\sigma} \circ g_1 \circ \overbrace{p_{|I_0^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ p_1}^{I_0^\sigma} \quad (27) \\
&= h_{k/2+1} \circ \overbrace{q_{|U^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ q_{|U^\sigma| - |I_{k-1}^\sigma| + 1}}^{I_{k-1}^\sigma} \circ h_{k/2} \circ \cdots \\
&\quad \circ h_3 \circ \overbrace{q_{|I_1^\sigma| + |I_3^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ q_{|I_1^\sigma| + 1}}^{I_3^\sigma} \circ h_2 \circ \overbrace{q_{|I_1^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ q_1}^{I_1^\sigma} \circ h_1, \quad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
g_j &= f_{\sigma(n_{2j}^\sigma)} \circ f_{\sigma(n_{2j-1}^\sigma)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\sigma(n_{2j-2}^\sigma)} && \text{for } j \in \left\{ 1, \dots, \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil \right\}, \\
h_j &= f_{\sigma(n_{2j-1}^\sigma)} \circ f_{\sigma(n_{2j-2}^\sigma)} \circ \cdots \circ f_{\sigma(n_{2j-3}^\sigma)} && \text{for } j \in \left\{ 1, \dots, \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

and we set $f_{\sigma(n+1)} = f_{\sigma(0)} = x$.

Since all the linear functions in the right-hand side of (27) are monotone, Theorem 1 implies (i) of the lemma. Since all the linear functions in the right-hand side of (28) but h_1 and $h_{k/2+1}$ are monotone, Theorem 1 and Remark 32 imply (ii) of the lemma.

We next prove the case where k is odd. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f^\sigma &= g_{(k+1)/2} \circ \overbrace{q_{|U^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ q_{|U^\sigma| - |I_{k-1}^\sigma| + 1}}^{I_{k-1}^\sigma} \circ g_{(k-1)/2} \circ \cdots \\
&\quad \circ g_2 \circ \overbrace{q_{|I_0^\sigma| + |I_2^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ q_{|I_0^\sigma| + 1}}^{I_2^\sigma} \circ g_1 \circ \overbrace{q_{|I_0^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ q_1}^{I_0^\sigma}. \quad (29) \\
&= \overbrace{p_{|L^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ p_{|L^\sigma| - |I_k^\sigma| + 1}}^{I_k^\sigma} \circ h_{(k+1)/2} \circ \cdots \\
&\quad \circ h_3 \circ \overbrace{p_{|I_1^\sigma| + |I_3^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ p_{|I_1^\sigma| + 1}}^{I_3^\sigma} \circ h_2 \circ \overbrace{p_{|I_1^\sigma|} \circ \cdots \circ p_1}^{I_1^\sigma} \circ h_1. \quad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that all the functions in (29) and (30) but h_1 and $g_{(k+1)/2}$ are monotone, and thus (i) and (ii) in the lemma can be proved. \square

By Lemma 35, L^σ and U^σ are permuted counterclockwisely and clockwisely, respectively. Moreover, the following crucial lemma shows that they are partitioned by two angles ψ_1 and ψ_2 (See Lemma 36 (iii)). For an set $I \subseteq [n]$, let $\theta(I) = \{\theta(f_{\sigma(i)} \mid i \in I)\}$.

Lemma 36. *There exists an optimal permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ for non-constant and non-identical linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n such that*

- (i) $f_{\sigma(\ell)}$ ($\ell \in L^\sigma$) are permuted counterclockwisely,
(ii) $f_{\sigma(u)}$ ($u \in U^\sigma$) are permuted clockwisely,
(iii) $\theta(L^\sigma) \subseteq [\psi_1, \psi_2]$ and $\theta(U^\sigma) \subseteq (\psi_2, \psi_1)_{2\pi}$ for some two angles $\psi_1 \in (0, \pi)$ and $\psi_2 \in (\pi, 2\pi)$,
(iv) $\theta(I_s^\sigma) \cap \theta(I_t^\sigma) = \emptyset$ for any distinct s and t .

In order to prove Lemma 36, we first show the following weak partitionability.

Lemma 37. *Let f_1, \dots, f_n be non-constant and non-identical linear functions, at least one of which is monotone decreasing. For any optimal solution σ for f_i 's, there exist two angles $\psi_1 \in (0, \pi)$ and $\psi_2 \in (\pi, 2\pi)$ such that $\theta(L^\sigma) \subseteq [\psi_1, \psi_2]$ and $\theta(U^\sigma) \subseteq [\psi_2, \psi_1]_{2\pi}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that the identity id is optimal for f_i 's. First, we show that if $\theta(f_i) = \pi$ then $i \in L^{\text{id}}$ and if $\theta(f_i) = 0$ then $i \in U^{\text{id}}$. Suppose on the contrary that there exists an $i \in U^{\text{id}}$ such that $\theta(f_i) = \pi$. Let $g = f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{i+1}$ then $\alpha(g) < 0$ by the definition of U . Then we have $g \circ f_i > f_i \circ g$ by Lemma 7 and $\theta(g) \in (0, \pi)$, which contradicts the optimality of id . Similarly, suppose on the contrary that there exists an $i \in L^{\text{id}}$ such that $\theta(f_i) = 0$. To obtain a contradiction, we divide the discussion into two cases, whether $\alpha(f_j) < 0$ for some j with $j > i$ or not. If such j exists, then let j be the minimum integer which satisfies the statement above and $g = f_j \circ \dots \circ f_{i+1}$. Then we have $g \circ f_i < f_i \circ g$ by Lemma 9, which contradicts the optimality of id , because $\alpha(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{j+1}) < 0$ by the definition of L^{id} . On the other hand, if no such j satisfies $\alpha(f_j) < 0$, then there exists $j < i$ such that $\alpha(f_j) < 0$ by the assumption. Let j be the maximum integer which satisfies the statement above and $g = f_{i-1} \circ \dots \circ f_j$. Then we have $f_i \circ g > g \circ f_i$ by Lemma 9, which contradicts the optimality of id , because $\alpha(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_i) > 0$ by the definition of L^{id} .

Next, we discuss a monotone f_i such that $\theta(f_i) \notin \{0, \pi\}$. For any $\ell \in L^{\text{id}}$ and $u \in U^{\text{id}}$, we claim that the following two implications are satisfied.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_u) < \pi &\Rightarrow \theta(f_\ell) \geq \theta(f_u), \\ \pi < \theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_u) < 2\pi &\Rightarrow \theta(f_\ell) \leq \theta(f_u). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

We first consider the case $\ell < u$. Let $\psi = \theta(f_{u-1} \circ \dots \circ f_{\ell+1})$. By definition of L^{id} and U^{id} , it holds that $\alpha(f_{u-1} \circ \dots \circ f_{\ell+1}) < 0$, which implies $\psi \in (0, \pi)$. Since $f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{u+1}$ is monotone decreasing (i.e., $\alpha(f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{u+1}) < 0$), the optimality of id implies that

$$\psi - \theta(f_u), \theta(f_\ell) - \psi \in [0, \pi]_{2\pi}.$$

Hence we have

$$0 < \theta(f_u) \leq \psi \leq \theta(f_\ell) < \pi \quad \text{if } 0 < \theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_u) < \pi \quad (32)$$

$$\pi < \theta(f_\ell) \leq \psi + \pi \leq \theta(f_u) < 2\pi \quad \text{if } \pi < \theta(f_\ell), \theta(f_u) < 2\pi. \quad (33)$$

On the other hand, if $u < \ell$, let $\psi = \theta(f_{\ell-1} \circ \dots \circ f_{u+1})$. Then $\psi \in (0, \pi)$ by the definition of L^{id} and U^{id} . Since $f_n \circ \dots \circ f_{\ell+1}$ is monotone and id is optimal, we have

$$\psi - \theta(f_u), \theta(f_\ell) - \psi \in [0, \pi]_{2\pi},$$

which implies (32) and (33).

Therefore, (31) holds for any $\ell \in L^{\text{id}}$ and $u \in U^{\text{id}}$, completing the proof. \square

Note that Lemmas 35 and 37 do *not* imply the polynomial solvability of optimal composition if k , the number of decreasing functions, is a constant, since it is not clear how to partition linear functions with the same angle. The following lemma states that some optimal permutation σ makes linear functions with the same angle contained in the same interval I_j^σ .

Proof of Lemma 36. Let $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ be an optimal permutation for f_i 's. Then it satisfies the conditions in Lemmas 35 and 37. For two integers s and t with $s < t$, assume that $i_s \in I_s^\sigma$ and $i_t \in I_t^\sigma$ satisfy $\theta(f_{\sigma(i_s)}) = \theta(f_{\sigma(i_t)})$. Let $g = f_{\sigma(i_t-1)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(i_s+1)}$, and consider the composition $f_{\sigma(i_t)} \circ g \circ f_{\sigma(i_s)}$. By Lemma 7 and the optimality of σ , we must have $\theta(g) \in$

$\{\theta(f_{\sigma(i_s)}), \theta(f_{\sigma(i_t)}) + \pi\}_{2\pi} \cup \{\perp\}$, which implies $f_{\sigma(i_t)} \circ g \circ f_{\sigma(i_s)} = g \circ f_{\sigma(i_t)} \circ f_{\sigma(i_s)}$. Thus the permutation corresponding to this modification is also optimal for f_i 's. By repeatedly applying this modification, we can arrive at an optimal permutation that satisfies (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) in the lemma, if no j satisfies $\theta(I_j^\sigma) = \{\lambda, \lambda + \pi\}$ for some λ . If $\theta(I_j^\sigma) = \{\lambda, \lambda + \pi\}$ for some j , then $f_{\sigma(i)}$ ($i \in I_j^\sigma$) can be permuted counterclockwisely (equivalently, clockwise) by Theorem 1 (i), which completes the proof. \square

This lemma directly implies that an optimal permutation for linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n can be computed in $O(k!n^{k+4})$ time, where k denotes the number of monotone decreasing f_i 's.

Assume first that no f_i is identical and we utilize $f_i^{(\epsilon)}$'s instead of f_i 's in Lemma 24. By Lemma 36 (iii), we essentially have n^2 possible angles ψ_1 and ψ_2 . Based on such angles, we partition the set of indices of monotone linear functions into I_0, \dots, I_k . By Lemma 36 (i), (ii), and (iv), we have at most n^{k+1} many such partitions. Since there exist $k!$ orderings of monotone decreasing functions, by checking at most $k!n^{k+3} (= n^2 \times n^{k+1} \times k!)$ permutations σ , we obtain an optimal permutation for f_i 's. Note that each such permutation σ and the composite f^σ can be computed in $O(n)$ time, after sorting $\theta(f_i^{(\epsilon)})$'s. Since $\theta(f_s^{(\epsilon)})$ and $\theta(f_t^{(\epsilon)})$ can be compared in $O(1)$ time for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ without exactly computing their angles, we can sort $\theta(f_i^{(\epsilon)})$'s in $O(n \log n)$ time. Thus in total we require $O(k!n^{k+4} + n \log n) = O(k!n^{k+4})$ time, if no f_i is identical. If some f_i 's are identical, then we can put them into I_0 , where I_0 is obtained in the procedure above for the non-identical functions. Therefore, an optimal permutation can be computed in $O(k!n^{k+4})$ time.

In order to improve this XP result, namely, to have an FPT algorithm with respect to k , we apply the dynamic programming approach to the following problem.

Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION

Input: Two sets of monotone linear functions $L = \{p_1, \dots, p_{|L|}\}$ and $U = \{q_1, \dots, q_{|U|}\}$, and monotone decreasing linear functions g_1, \dots, g_k with $k > 0$.

Output: An optimal permutation σ for linear functions in $L \cup U \cup \{g_1, \dots, g_k\}$ such that

- (i) $L^\sigma = L$ and $U^\sigma = U$,
- (ii) the restriction of σ on L produces the ordering $(p_1, \dots, p_{|L|})$, and
- (iii) the restriction of σ on U produces the ordering $(q_1, \dots, q_{|U|})$.

Note that an optimal permutation for the original problem can be computed by solving **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION** $O(n^4)$ times for $|L| + |U| \leq n - k$. Since the problem can be solved in $O(2^k k(|L| + |U| + k)^2)$ time, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 38. *An optimal permutation for linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n can be computed in $O(2^k kn^6)$ time if $k > 0$, where k denotes the number of monotone decreasing f_i 's.*

We first show that an optimal permutation for the original problem can be computed by solving **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION** $O(n^4)$ times, where the formal description can be found in **Algorithm 2**.

Lemma 39. *An optimal permutation for linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n can be computed in $O(n \log n + n^4 T^*)$ time, where T^* denotes the time required to solve **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION**.*

Proof. By the discussion before the description of **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION**, we assume without loss of generality that no f_i is constant and identical. In order to

make use of **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION**, we first arrange all monotone functions f_{i_1}, \dots, f_{i_n} by their angles, and compose $f_{i_t} \circ \dots \circ f_{i_s}$ if $\theta(f_{i_s}) = \dots = \theta(f_{i_t})$ by Lemmas 7 and 36. Let $\check{f}_1, \dots, \check{f}_{\check{n}}$ be the resulting monotone functions such that $\check{f}_i \neq \check{f}_j$ for distinct i and j in $[\check{n}]$. By Lemma 36 (iii), we consider at most n^2 many partitions (L, U) of $[\check{n}]$. For each such partition, Lemma 36 (i) (resp., (ii)) implies that L (resp., U) is permuted in at most n counterclockwise (resp., clockwise) ways. Namely, by solving **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION** at most $n^4 (= n^2 \times n \times n)$ times, we can find an optimal function $(\check{f})^\sigma$, from which an optimal permutation σ for f_i 's can be computed. These computation totally requires in $O(n \log n + n^4 T^*)$ time. \square

To apply a dynamic programming approach to **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION**, for $s \in \{0, \dots, |L|\}$, $t \in \{0, \dots, |U|\}$, and $G \subseteq [k]$, let $E(s, t, G)$ denote the set of permutations σ for p_i ($i = 1, \dots, s$), q_i ($i = 1, \dots, t$), and g_i ($i \in G$) such that

(i) L^σ satisfies

$$L^\sigma = \begin{cases} \{p_1, \dots, p_s\} & \text{if } k - |G| \text{ is even} \\ \{q_1, \dots, q_t\} & \text{if } k - |G| \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

(ii) U^σ satisfies

$$U^\sigma = \begin{cases} \{q_1, \dots, q_t\} & \text{if } k - |G| \text{ is even} \\ \{p_1, \dots, p_s\} & \text{if } k - |G| \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

(iii) the restriction of σ on $\{p_1, \dots, p_s\}$ produces the ordering (p_1, \dots, p_s) , and

(iv) the restriction of σ on $\{q_1, \dots, q_t\}$ produces the ordering (q_1, \dots, q_t) ,

and let $F[\sigma]$ denote the linear function obtained by a permutation $\sigma \in E(s, t, G)$. By definition, $E(s, t, G) = \emptyset$ if and only if either (I) $s = t = |G| = 0$, (II) $G = \emptyset$, $t > 0$, and k is even, or (III) $G = \emptyset$, $s > 0$, and k is odd. Furthermore, we define $v(s, t, G)$ by

$$v(s, t, G) = \begin{cases} \min\{F[\sigma] \mid \sigma \in E(s, t, G)\} & \text{if } k - |G| \text{ is even} \\ \max\{F[\sigma] \mid \sigma \in E(s, t, G)\} & \text{if } k - |G| \text{ is odd,} \end{cases}$$

where we define $v(s, t, G) = x$ in Case (I) of $E(s, t, G) = \emptyset$, and \perp in Cases (II) and (III) of $E(s, t, G) = \emptyset$. By definition, $v(|L|, |U|, [k])$ denotes the optimal function for **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION**. We note that $v(s, t, G)$ satisfies the following recursion if $E(s, t, G) \neq \emptyset$.

$$v(s, t, G) = \begin{cases} \min(\{p_s \circ v(s-1, t, G)\} \cup \{g \circ v(s, t, G \setminus \{g\}) \mid g \in G\}) & \text{if } k - |G| \text{ is even,} \\ \max(\{q_t \circ v(s, t-1, G)\} \cup \{g \circ v(s, t, G \setminus \{g\}) \mid g \in G\}) & \text{if } k - |G| \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

Algorithm 1 formally describes the dynamic programming approach for **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION**.

Lemma 40. **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION** can be solved in $O(2^k k n^2)$ time.

Proof. As discussed above, the function $v(|L|, |U|, [k])$ denotes the optimal function for **Problem LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION**. By (34), we can apply a dynamic programming approach to the problem. Since v has $(|L| + 1) \times (|U| + 1) \times 2^k = O(2^k n^2)$ entries and each entry can be computed in $O(k)$ time, $v(|L|, |U|, [k])$ can be computed in $O(2^k k n^2)$ time. Since the corresponding permutation can also be computed in the same amount of time, the proof is completed. \square

Proof of Theorem 38. It follows from Lemmas 39 and 40. \square

Algorithm 1 to solve LU-ORDERED OPTIMAL COMPOSITION

```
1:  $v(0, 0, \emptyset) \leftarrow$  identical function
2: for  $s = 0$  to  $|L|$  do
3:   for  $t = 0$  to  $|U|$  do
4:     for all  $G \subseteq [k]$  do
5:       if  $\Sigma(s, t, G) = \emptyset$  then
6:         continue
7:       end if
8:       if  $k - |G|$  is even then
9:          $v(s, t, G) \leftarrow +\infty$ 
10:        for  $g \in G$  do
11:           $v(s, t, G) \leftarrow \min\{v(s, t, G), g \circ v(s, t, G \setminus \{g\})\}$ 
12:        end for
13:        if  $s > 0$  then
14:           $v(s, t, G) \leftarrow \min\{v(s, t, G), p_s \circ v(s - 1, t, G)\}$ 
15:        end if
16:      else
17:         $v(s, t, G) \leftarrow -\infty$ 
18:        for  $g \in G$  do
19:           $v(s, t, G) \leftarrow \max\{v(s, t, G), g \circ v(s, t, G \setminus \{g\})\}$ 
20:        end for
21:        if  $t > 0$  then
22:           $v(s, t, G) \leftarrow \max\{v(s, t, G), q_t \circ v(s, t - 1, G)\}$ 
23:        end if
24:      end if
25:    end for
26:  end for
27: end for
28: return  $v(|L|, |U|, [k])$ 
```

6 Multiplication Ordering for Matrices

In this section, we consider matrix multiplication orderings as a generalization of composition orderings for linear functions. Recall that the problem is to find a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ that minimizes $\mathbf{w}^\top M_{\sigma(n)} \cdots M_{\sigma(1)} \mathbf{y}$ for given n matrices $M_1, \dots, M_n \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ and two vectors $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, where m denotes a positive integer. As mentioned in the introduction, if we set $\mathbf{w} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\mathbf{y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $M_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ for any $i \in [n]$, then the matrix multiplication ordering problem is equivalent to the composition ordering problem for linear functions $f_i(x) = a_i x + b_i$. We show that the results for linear functions can be extended to the matrix multiplication for $m = 2$. Furthermore, by applying max-plus algebra, we obtain the result in [3], which is an extension of Johnson's rule [11] for the two-machine flow shop scheduling, as a corollary of our result. Finally we show that possible generalizations of the problem turn out to be intractable, unless P=NP.

6.1 Matrices in linear algebra

In order to prove Theorem 3, we assume that matrices M_i in $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ are all upper triangular, i.e., $M_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & d_i \end{pmatrix}$, and claim that the problem can be reduced in linear time to the problem of the minimum multiplication problem for upper triangular matrices with nonnegative (2,2)-entry, $\mathbf{w}^\top = (1 \ 0)$, and $\mathbf{y}^\top = (0 \ 1)$.

Algorithm 2 to solve the composition ordering problem for general linear functions

```

1:  $val \leftarrow +\infty$  and  $F, G \leftarrow \emptyset$  /*Regard  $F$  and  $G$  as multisets */
2: for each  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
3:   if  $\alpha(f_i) > 0$  and  $f_i \neq x$  then
4:      $F \leftarrow F \cup \{f_i\}$ 
5:   else if  $\alpha(f_i) = 0$  then
6:      $F \leftarrow F \cup \{f_i^{(\epsilon)}\}$ 
7:   else
8:      $G \leftarrow G \cup \{f_i\}$ 
9:   end if
10: end for
11: arrange functions in  $F$  for their angles and compose functions with the same angle
    /* Denote by  $\check{F}$  the set of resulting functions */
12: for each  $\psi_1 \in \{\theta(\check{f}) \in (0, \pi) \mid \check{f} \in \check{F}\} \cup \{\pi\}$  and  $\psi_2 \in \{\theta(\check{f}) \in (\pi, 2\pi) \mid \check{f} \in \check{F}\} \cup \{\pi\}$  do
13:    $L \leftarrow \{\check{f} \in \check{F} \mid \psi_1 \leq \theta(\check{f}) \leq \psi_2\}$  and  $U \leftarrow \check{F} \setminus L$ 
14:   for each counterclockwise permutation  $\tau_L$  for  $L$  and clockwise permutation  $\tau_U$  for  $U$  do
15:      $val \leftarrow \min\{val, \text{Algorithm 1}(L, U, G)\}$ 
    /* Here functions in  $L$  and  $U$  are assumed to be arranged according to  $\tau_L$  and  $\tau_U$  */
16:   end for
17: end for
18: return  $val$ 

```

Let p denote the number of matrices M_i with negative (2,2)-entry. For a matrix M_i , define a matrix N_i by M_i if $d_i \geq 0$, and $-M_i$ otherwise. For a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(w_1 \quad w_2) N^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{pmatrix} &= w_1 y_1 (N^\sigma)_{1,1} + w_2 y_2 (N^\sigma)_{2,2} + w_1 y_2 (N^\sigma)_{1,2} \\
&= (-1)^p \left(w_1 y_1 \prod_{i=1}^n a_i + w_2 y_2 \prod_{i=1}^n d_i + w_1 y_2 (1 \quad 0) M^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{w}^\top = (w_1 \quad w_2)$ and $\mathbf{y}^\top = (y_1 \quad y_2)$. Since p , $w_1 y_1 \prod_{i=1}^n a_i$, $w_2 y_2 \prod_{i=1}^n d_i$, and $w_1 y_2$ are constant, it is enough to consider the (1,2)-th entry of M^σ , i.e., $(1 \quad 0) M^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Moreover, if $w_1 y_2 = 0$ then any permutation is optimal. Therefore, we assume that $w_1 y_2 \neq 0$, and by the following lemma, we only need to examine the minimization. This completes the claim.

For a 2×2 matrix $M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix}$, define $\tilde{M} = \begin{pmatrix} a & -b \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix}$.

Lemma 41. *For any permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$, we have*

$$(1 \quad 0) M^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = - (1 \quad 0) \tilde{M}_{\sigma(n)} \cdots \tilde{M}_{\sigma(1)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of \tilde{M} . □

We next transform the problem into the composition ordering problem for linear functions. For $M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix}$ and a real number $\epsilon \neq 0$, we define

$$M^{(\epsilon)} = \begin{cases} M & (d \neq 0), \\ M + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon \end{pmatrix} & (d = 0). \end{cases}$$

Similar to Lemma 23, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 42. For n triangular matrices $M_1, \dots, M_n \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, there exists a real number $r > 0$ such that $(1 \ 0) (M^{(\epsilon)})^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \leq (1 \ 0) (M^{(\epsilon)})^\rho \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ implies $(1 \ 0) M^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \leq (1 \ 0) M^\rho \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ for any two permutations σ, ρ and any ϵ with $|\epsilon| < r$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 23, and is left to the reader. \square

Thus we assume that given upper triangular matrices $M_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & d_i \end{pmatrix}$ have positive d_i . We then have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 \ 0) M^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^n d_i \right) (1 \ 0) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{a_{\sigma(n)}}{d_{\sigma(n)}} & \frac{b_{\sigma(n)}}{d_{\sigma(n)}} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} \frac{a_{\sigma(1)}}{d_{\sigma(1)}} & \frac{b_{\sigma(1)}}{d_{\sigma(1)}} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \left(\prod_{i=1}^n d_i \right) f^\sigma(0), \end{aligned}$$

where we define

$$f_i(x) = \frac{a_i}{d_i}x + \frac{b_i}{d_i} \quad \text{for } i \in [n].$$

This implies that matrix multiplication for upper triangular matrices can be solved by solving the composition ordering problem for linear functions.

We remark that our algorithm concerns the comparison of polar angles $\theta(f_i)$'s, but not of the vectors $\begin{pmatrix} b_i/d_i \\ 1 - a_i/d_i \end{pmatrix}$, and hence we do not need to care about the case when $d_i = \epsilon$. Therefore, we have the following lemma for 2×2 triangular matrices.

Lemma 43. For upper triangular matrices M_1, \dots, M_n in $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, we have the following statements.

- (i) If all matrices have nonnegative determinants, then an optimal multiplication ordering can be computed in $O(n \log n)$ time.
- (ii) If some matrix has negative determinant, then an optimal multiplication ordering can be computed in $O(k2^k n^6)$ time, where k denotes the number of matrices with negative determinants.

This immediately implies Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. By Lemma 43, we only reduce the problem to the one for upper triangular matrices.

Let M_1, \dots, M_n be 2×2 simultaneously triangularizable matrices. Since there exists a regular matrix $P \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ such that $P^{-1}M_iP$ is an upper triangular matrix T_i for any $i \in [n]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}^\top M^\sigma \mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{w}^\top P (P^{-1}M_{\sigma(n)}P) (P^{-1}M_{\sigma(n-1)}P) \cdots (P^{-1}M_{\sigma(1)}P) P^{-1} \mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbf{w}'^\top T^\sigma \mathbf{y}', \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{w}' = P^\top \mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{y}' = P^{-1} \mathbf{y}$. Thus we can reduce the problem to the one for triangular matrices. \square

Unfortunately, this positive results cannot be extended to 1) the nonnegative determinant case for $m = 2$, 2) the case of $m \geq 3$ and 3) the target version; See Theorems 4 (i), (ii) and 5.

Proof of Theorem 4 (i). We show that 3-PARTITION can be reduced to the problem, where 3-PARTITION is, given $n(= 3m)$ positive integers a_1, \dots, a_n with $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = mT$, to decide if there exist m disjoint sets $P_1, \dots, P_m \subseteq [n]$ such that $|P_j| = 3$ and $\sum_{i \in P_j} a_i = T$ for all $j \in [m]$.

The problem is strongly NP-complete even if each a_i satisfies $\frac{T}{4} < a_i < \frac{T}{2}$. Hereafter we assume such condition. It follows from this assumption that $\sum_{i \in P} a_i = T$ only when $|P| = 3$. Thus we do not have to care about the constraint $|P_j| = 3$.

Given an instance of 3-PARTITION, we construct $n + m - 1$ matrices $M_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ and 2 vectors $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ as follows:

$$M_i = \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_i \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, n \\ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \text{if } i = n + 1, \dots, n + m - 1, \end{cases} \quad \mathbf{w} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ and } \mathbf{y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that $\det(M_i) \geq 0$ for all M_i 's. We claim that $-T^m$ is the optimal value for the optimal multiplication ordering problem if and only if there exists a desired partition P_1, \dots, P_m of the corresponding instance of 3-PARTITION, which completes the proof. For a permutation $\sigma : [n + m - 1] \rightarrow [n + m - 1]$, define positive integers $\ell_1 < \dots < \ell_{m-1}$ by $\sigma(\ell_j) \in [n + 1, n + m - 1]$, i.e.,

$$M_{\sigma(\ell_j)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for $j \in [m - 1]$, and let $\ell_0 = 0$ and $\ell_m = n + m$. Let

$$P_j = \{i \in [n + m - 1] \mid \ell_{j-1} < i < \ell_j\} \quad \text{for } j \in [m].$$

Then we have

$$M^\sigma = \prod_{i \in P_m} M_{\sigma(i)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \prod_{i \in P_{m-1}} M_{\sigma(i)} \cdots \prod_{i \in P_2} M_{\sigma(i)} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \prod_{i \in P_1} M_{\sigma(i)}.$$

Note that $\mathbf{w}^\top M^\sigma \mathbf{y} = 0$ if some P_j is empty. On the other hand, if all P_j 's are nonempty, then M^σ can be restated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} M^\sigma &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sum_{i \in P_m} a_{\sigma(i)} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sum_{i \in P_{m-1}} a_{\sigma(i)} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sum_{i \in S'_1} a_{\sigma(i)} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sum_{i \in P_m} a_{\sigma(i)} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \sum_{i \in P_{m-1}} a_{\sigma(i)} \end{pmatrix} \cdots \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \sum_{i \in P_1} a_{\sigma(i)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sum_{i \in P_m} a_{\sigma(i)} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \prod_{j \in [2, m-1]} \sum_{i \in P_j} a_{\sigma(i)} & \prod_{j \in [m-1]} \sum_{i \in P_j} a_{\sigma(i)} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \prod_{j \in [2, m]} \sum_{i \in P_j} a_{\sigma(i)} & \prod_{j \in [m]} \sum_{i \in P_j} a_{\sigma(i)} \\ \prod_{j \in [2, m-1]} \sum_{i \in P_j} a_{\sigma(i)} & \prod_{j \in [m-1]} \sum_{i \in P_j} a_{\sigma(i)} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\mathbf{w}^\top M^\sigma \mathbf{y} = -\prod_{j \in [m]} \sum_{i \in P_j} a_{\sigma(i)}$. Therefore, it is regarded as the problem of computing a partition P_1, \dots, P_m of $[n]$ with the minimum $-\prod_{j \in [m]} \sum_{i \in P_j} a_i$. By the inequality

of arithmetic and geometric means, we have $-\prod_{j \in [m]} \sum_{i \in P_j} a_i \geq -T^m$, where the equality holds if and only if $\sum_{i \in P_j} a_i = T$ for all $j \in [m]$. Since each a_i satisfies $\frac{T}{4} < a_i < \frac{T}{2}$, $\sum_{i \in P_j} a_i = T$ implies $|P_j| = 3$. This proves the claim. \square

In order to prove Theorem 5, we next consider the problem of computing a permutation σ of monotone linear functions f_1, \dots, f_n that minimizes $|\beta(f^\sigma) - t|$ for a given target $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

We again reduce 3-PARTITION to the problem. Given an instance of 3-PARTITION, We construct $n + m (= 4m)$ linear functions f_i and a target $t \in \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$f_i(x) = \begin{cases} x + a_i & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, n \\ (c_2 + mT)(x - (i - n)T) + (i - n)T & \text{if } i = n + 1, \dots, n + m \end{cases}$$

$$t = mT,$$

Note that all f_i 's are monotone, and the following statements hold.

$$\text{any } i \in [n + m] \text{ satisfies } f_i(x) > x \text{ if } x > mT \quad (35)$$

$$\text{any } j \in [m] \text{ satisfies } f_{n+j}(jT) = jT \text{ and } f_{n+j}(x) < x \text{ if } x < 0 \quad (36)$$

Furthermore, we have the following lemmas.

Lemma 44. *Let f_1, \dots, f_{n+m} , and t be defined as above. Then there exists a partition $P_1, \dots, P_m \subseteq [n]$ such that $\sum_{i \in P_j} a_i = T$ for $j \in [m]$ if and only if there exists a permutation $\sigma : [n + m] \rightarrow [n + m]$ such that $f_{\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(n+j)-1)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(0) = jT$ for any $j \in [m]$.*

Proof. To prove only if part, let $\{P_j = \{p_{j,1}, p_{j,2}, p_{j,3}\} \mid j \in [m]\}$ be a desirable partition of $[n]$, i.e., $a_{p_{j,1}} + a_{p_{j,2}} + a_{p_{j,3}} = T$ for any $j \in [m]$. We define a permutation $\sigma : [n + m] \rightarrow [n + m]$ by

$$\sigma(i) = \begin{cases} p_{j,k} & \text{if } i = 4(j - 1) + k \text{ with } j \in [m], k \in [3], \\ n + j & \text{if } i = 4j \text{ with } j \in [m]. \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

For any $j \in [m]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\sigma(4j)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(4j-3)} &= f_{n+j} \circ (x + a_{p_{j,3}}) \circ (x + a_{p_{j,2}}) \circ (x + a_{p_{j,1}}) \\ &= f_{n+j} \circ (x + T). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the induction on j , it is not difficult to see that $f_{\sigma(4j-1)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(0) = jT$ for $j \in [m]$, which completes the only-if part, since $\sigma^{-1}(n + j) = 4j$.

To prove if part, assume that σ satisfy $f_{\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(n+j)-1)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(0) = jT$ for any $j \in [m]$. Define $v_i = f_{\sigma(i)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(0)$ for any $i \in [n + m]$ and $v_0 = 0$. Then we can see that $\sigma(i) \in [n]$ implies $v_i = v_{i-1} + a_{\sigma(i)}$. If $\sigma(i) = n + j$ for some $j \in [m]$ then we have $v_i = v_{i-1}$ by (36) and the assumption of σ . Thus v_1, \dots, v_{n+m} are nondecreasing. Let $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m \in [n + m]$ satisfy $\sigma(\ell_j) = n + j$ for $j \in [m]$. Then they are increasing, since v_1, \dots, v_{n+m} are nondecreasing. Thus again by (36) and the assumption of σ , $\{P_j = \{\sigma(i) \mid \ell_{j-1} < i < \ell_j\} \mid j \in [m]\}$ is a desirable partition of $[n]$, where $\ell_0 = 0$. \square

Lemma 45. *Let f_1, \dots, f_{n+m} , and t be defined as above. If there exists a partition $P_1, \dots, P_m \subseteq [n]$ such that $\sum_{i \in P_j} a_i = T$ for $j \in [m]$, then $\min_\rho |\beta(f^\rho) - t| = 0$ holds. Otherwise, we have $\min_\rho |\beta(f^\rho) - t| > c_2$.*

Proof. Assume that a desirable partition P_1, \dots, P_m exists. Then as shown in the proof of Lemma 45, a permutation given in (37) provides the composite f^σ such that $\beta(f^\sigma) = mT (= t)$, which proves the first half of the lemma.

On the other hand, if no desirable partition exists. Then by Lemma 45, any permutation σ has some $j \in [m]$ such that $f_{\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(n+j)-1)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(0) \neq jT$. We separately consider the following two cases.

Case 1. If $f_{\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(n+j)-1)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(0) = jT + \Delta$ for some $\Delta \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(n+j))} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(0) &= f_{n+j}(jT + \Delta) \\ &= (c_2 + mT)\Delta + jT > mT + c_2. \end{aligned}$$

By (35), $f^\sigma(0) > f_{\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(n+j))} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(0) > mT + c_2$, implying that $|f^\sigma(0) - t| > c_2$.

Case 2. If $f_{\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(n+j)-1)} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(0) = jT - \Delta$ for some $\Delta \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(n+j))} \circ \dots \circ f_{\sigma(1)}(0) &= f_{n+j}(jT - \Delta) \\ &= -(c_2 + mT)\Delta + jT < -c_2. \end{aligned}$$

By (36) and $f_i(x) = x + a_i$ for any $j \in [n]$, we can show that $f^\sigma(0) < -c_2 + mT$, which implies $|f^\sigma(0) - mT| > c_2$.

In either case, we can prove $|f^\sigma(0) - mT| > c_2$, completing the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 5. This follows from Lemma 45. \square

Theorem 4 (ii) will be proved in the next subsection since we reduce an NP-hard problem expressed using the max-plus algebra to the problem.

6.2 Matrices in the max-plus algebra

In this section, we investigate multiplication of matrices in the max-plus algebra. We obtain the result of Bouquard et al. in the case $m = 2$ as a corollary of our result, and then prove Theorem 5.

Let \mathbb{R}_{\max} be the set $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ with two binary operations max and + denoted by \oplus and \otimes respectively, i.e., for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{\max}$,

$$a \oplus b = \max\{a, b\} \quad \text{and} \quad a \otimes b = a + b.$$

$(\mathbb{R}_{\max}, \oplus, \otimes)$ is called the *max-plus algebra*. We denote by $\mathbb{0}$ the additive identity $-\infty$, and denote by $\mathbb{1}$ the multiplicative identity 0.

Since the two operations \oplus and \otimes are extended to the matrices of \mathbb{R}_{\max} as in the linear algebra, we can consider the problem to find a permutation σ that minimizes/maximizes $\mathbf{u}^\top \otimes N_{\sigma(n)} \otimes \dots \otimes N_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \mathbf{v}$, where $N_i \in \mathbb{R}_{\max}^{m \times m}$ and $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}_{\max}^m$. We denote $N_{\sigma(n)} \otimes \dots \otimes N_{\sigma(1)}$ by N^σ .

Bouquard, Lenté and Billaut [3] dealt with the problem to minimize the objective value

$$\left(\mathbb{1} \quad \mathbb{0} \quad \dots \quad \mathbb{0} \right) \otimes N_{\sigma(n)} \otimes \dots \otimes N_{\sigma(1)} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{0} \\ \vdots \\ \mathbb{0} \\ \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (38)$$

where each N_i is an upper triangular matrix in $\mathbb{R}_{\max}^{m \times m}$. They showed that the problem in the case $m = 2$ is a generalization of the two-machine flow shop scheduling problem to minimize

the makespan, and is solvable in $O(n \log n)$ time by using an extension of Johnson's rule [11] for the two-machine flow shop scheduling. We show that this result is obtained as a corollary of our result by reducing their problem to the optimal multiplication ordering problem for 2×2 triangular matrices in linear algebra. The derivation can be found in Appendix 6.2.1. They also proved that the problem in the case $m = 3$ is strongly NP-hard by reduction from the three-machine flow shop scheduling problem to minimize the makespan, which is known to be strongly NP-hard [7]. We make use of this result to prove Theorem 4 (ii).

In preparation, we show an important relation to matrices in linear algebra.

Lemma 46. *Let $\mathbf{u}^\top = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$, $\mathbf{v}^\top = (v_1, \dots, v_m)$, and N_1, \dots, N_n be matrices in $\mathbb{R}_{\max}^{m \times m}$. For a positive real γ , define $\mathbf{w}^\top = (\gamma^{u_1}, \dots, \gamma^{u_m})$, $\mathbf{y}^\top = (\gamma^{v_1}, \dots, \gamma^{v_m})$, and matrices M_i , $i \in [n]$, in $\mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ by $(M_i)_{jk} = \gamma^{(N_i)_{jk}}$. Then*

$$\mathbf{w}^\top M^\sigma \mathbf{y} = \sum_{j,k=1}^m \sum_{t \in V[\sigma]_{jk}} \gamma^{u_j + t + v_k},$$

where $V[\sigma]_{jk}$ denotes the arguments (standard sums) of the max operation of $(N^\sigma)_{jk}$.

Proof. Straightforward by induction on n . □

Example 47. For $\mathbf{u}^\top = (u_1, u_2)$, $\mathbf{v}^\top = (v_1, v_2)$, and $N_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & d_i \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}_{\max}^{2 \times 2}$ for $i \in [n]$, let $\mathbf{w}^\top = (\gamma^{u_1}, \gamma^{u_2})$, $\mathbf{y}^\top = (\gamma^{v_1}, \gamma^{v_2})$, and $M_i = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^{a_i} & \gamma^{b_i} \\ 0 & \gamma^{d_i} \end{pmatrix}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}^\top M^\sigma \mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{w}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \prod_i \gamma^{a_i} & \sum_i \gamma^{b_{\sigma(i)}} \prod_{j_1 < i} \gamma^{d_{\sigma(j_1)}} \prod_{j_2 > i} \gamma^{a_{\sigma(j_2)}} \\ 0 & \prod_i \gamma^{d_i} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ &= \mathbf{w}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^{\sum_i a_i} & \sum_i \gamma^{b_{\sigma(i)} + \sum_{j_1 < i} d_{\sigma(j_1)} + \sum_{j_2 > i} a_{\sigma(j_2)}} \\ 0 & \gamma^{\sum_i d_i} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ &= \gamma^{u_1 + \sum_i a_i + v_1} + \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma^{u_1 + b_{\sigma(i)} + \sum_{j_1 < i} d_{\sigma(j_1)} + \sum_{j_2 > i} a_{\sigma(j_2)} + v_2} + \gamma^{u_2 + \sum_i d_i + v_2}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N^\sigma &= \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n & \bigoplus_i b_{\sigma(i)} \bigotimes_{j_1 < i} d_{\sigma(j_1)} \bigotimes_{j_2 > i} a_{\sigma(j_2)} \\ 0 & d_1 \otimes \dots \otimes d_n \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \sum_i a_i & \max_i [b_{\sigma(i)} + \sum_{j_1 < i} d_{\sigma(j_1)} + \sum_{j_2 > i} a_{\sigma(j_2)}] \\ 0 & \sum_i d_i \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain $V[\sigma]_{11} = \{\sum_i a_i\}$, $V[\sigma]_{12} = \{b_{\sigma(i)} + \sum_{j_1 < i} d_{\sigma(j_1)} + \sum_{j_2 > i} a_{\sigma(j_2)} \mid i \in [n]\}$, $V[\sigma]_{21} = \{0\}$, and $V[\sigma]_{22} = \{\sum_i d_i\}$.

6.2.1 Derivation of the result of Bouquard et al. for $m = 2$

We reduce the problem of (38) to the multiplication ordering problem for 2×2 triangular matrices in linear algebra.

Lemma 48. *For an index $i \in [n]$, let $N_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & d_i \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}_{\max}^{2 \times 2}$ with $a_i, b_i, d_i \neq 0$, and M_i be a matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ defined as in Lemma 46, i.e., $M_i = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^{a_i} & \gamma^{b_i} \\ 0 & \gamma^{d_i} \end{pmatrix}$ for a positive number γ . Then*

there exists an $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $(1 \ 0) M^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \leq (1 \ 0) M^\rho \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ implies $(\mathbb{1} \ 0) \otimes N^\sigma \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} \leq (\mathbb{1} \ 0) \otimes N^\rho \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}$ for any two permutations $\sigma, \rho : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ and any γ with $\gamma > \Omega$.

Proof. By Example 47, we have

$$(1 \ 0) M^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{t \in V[\sigma]_{12}} \gamma^t,$$

$$(\mathbb{1} \ 0) \otimes N^\sigma \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix} = \max V[\sigma]_{12},$$

where $V[\sigma]_{12} = \{b_{\sigma(i)} + \sum_{j_1 < i} d_{\sigma(j_1)} + \sum_{j_2 > i} a_{\sigma(j_2)} \mid i \in [n]\}$. Let us denote $\max V[\sigma]_{12}$ simply by $v(N^\sigma)$. If $v(N^\sigma) \leq v(N^\rho)$, then the statement clearly holds. We thus consider the case in which $v(N^\sigma) > v(N^\rho)$. Define ω and Ω by

$$\omega = \min\{|v(N^\sigma) - v(N^\rho)| : v(N^\sigma) \neq v(N^\rho)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega = n^{\frac{1}{\omega}}.$$

Let us fix $\gamma > \Omega$. Since $\gamma^\omega > n$, we have $\gamma^{v(N^\sigma)+\omega} > n\gamma^{v(N^\rho)}$. For any two permutations σ, ρ such that $v(N^\sigma) < v(N^\rho)$, the inequality $v(N^\sigma) + \omega < v(N^\rho)$ holds. Moreover, the following two inequalities hold:

$$\sum_{t \in V[\sigma]_{12}} \gamma^t \leq n\gamma^{v(N^\sigma)} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma^{v(N^\rho)} \leq \sum_{t \in V[\rho]_{12}} \gamma^t.$$

Combining the four inequalities, we obtain

$$\sum_{t \in V[\sigma]_{12}} \gamma^t < \sum_{t \in V[\rho]_{12}} \gamma^t.$$

□

Since $\gamma^{d_i} > 0$ for any $i \in [n]$, we have

$$(1 \ 0) M^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \gamma^{d_i} \right) f^\sigma(0),$$

where

$$f_i(x) = \gamma^{a_i - d_i} x + \gamma^{b_i - d_i}.$$

It is guaranteed that $\theta(f_i) \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})_{2\pi}$ for any $i \in [n]$. Thus a permutation σ is minimum in both problems if $\frac{1 - \gamma^{a_{\sigma(i)} - d_{\sigma(i)}}}{\gamma^{b_{\sigma(i)} - d_{\sigma(i)}}}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) is nondecreasing.

Note that the length of M_i is exponential of the length of N_i . Thus polynomial solvability for the problem in the max-plus algebra does not immediately follow from the one in linear algebra. However, in this case, we can use the following index κ , instead of computing M_i explicitly. For a max-plus matrix $N = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix}$, we define

$$\kappa(N) = \begin{cases} (-1, b - a, d - b) & (a > d), \\ (0, 0, 0) & (a = d), \\ (1, d - b, a - b) & (a < d). \end{cases}$$

It is not difficult to see that the following equivalence holds for a sufficiently large γ

$$\kappa(N_i) \preceq \kappa(N_j) \iff \frac{\gamma^{d_i} - \gamma^{a_i}}{\gamma^{b_i}} \leq \frac{\gamma^{d_j} - \gamma^{a_j}}{\gamma^{b_j}},$$

where \preceq denotes the lexicographic order of $\kappa(N_i)$'s. Therefore we can solve the problem in the max-plus algebra by simply sorting $\kappa(N_1), \dots, \kappa(N_n)$ in the lexicographic order. In fact, we do not have to take the third entry of κ into account by the following lemma.

Lemma 49. *For an $i \in [m]$, let $N_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & d_i \end{pmatrix}$ with a_i, b_i , and d_i in $\mathbb{R}_{\max} \setminus \{0\}$. Then the operation \otimes is commutative on $\{N_1, \dots, N_m\}$ if and only if*

- (i) $a_i \geq d_i$ for any $i \in [m]$ and there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (i-1) $c = b_k - a_k$ for any k with $a_k > d_k$ and (i-2) $c \geq b_k - a_k$ for any k with $a_k = d_k$,

or

- (ii) $a_i \leq d_i$ for any $i \in [m]$ and there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (ii-1) $c = d_k - b_k$ for any k with $a_k < d_k$ and (ii-2) $c \leq d_k - b_k$ for any k with $a_k = d_k$.

Proof. Let N_1 and N_2 be commuting matrices, i.e., $N_2 \otimes N_1 = N_1 \otimes N_2$. This means that

$$a_2 \otimes b_1 \oplus b_2 \otimes d_1 = a_1 \otimes b_2 \oplus b_1 \otimes d_2. \quad (39)$$

Consider the following six cases:

- Case 1: $a_1 > d_1$ and $a_2 > d_2$. Then we have $a_1 \otimes b_2 > b_2 \otimes d_1$ and $a_2 \otimes b_1 > b_1 \otimes d_2$. Hence (39) is equivalent to the condition that $a_2 \otimes b_1 = a_1 \otimes b_2$, which implies that $b_1 - a_1 = b_2 - a_2$.
- Case 2: $a_1 > d_1$ and $a_2 = d_2$. Then we have $a_1 \otimes b_2 > b_2 \otimes d_1$. Hence (39) is equivalent to the condition that $a_2 \otimes b_1 = a_1 \otimes b_2 \oplus b_1 \otimes a_2$. Therefore, we have $a_1 \otimes b_2 \leq b_1 \otimes a_2$, i.e., $b_2 - a_2 \leq b_1 - a_1$.
- Case 3: $a_1 > d_1$ and $a_2 < d_2$. Then we have $a_1 \otimes b_2 > b_2 \otimes d_1$ and $a_2 \otimes b_1 < b_1 \otimes d_2$, which never implies (39).
- Case 4: $a_1 = d_1$ and $a_2 = d_2$. Then (39) is equivalent to the condition that $a_2 \otimes b_1 \oplus b_2 \otimes a_1 = a_1 \otimes b_2 \oplus b_1 \otimes a_2$, which is a tautology.
- Case 5: $a_1 = d_1$ and $a_2 < d_2$. Since $a_2 \otimes b_1 < b_1 \otimes d_2$, (39) is equivalent to the condition that $b_2 \otimes d_1 = d_1 \otimes b_2 \oplus b_1 \otimes d_2$. Therefore, we have $d_1 \otimes b_2 \geq b_1 \otimes d_2$, i.e., $d_1 - b_1 \geq d_2 - b_2$.
- Case 6: $a_1 < d_1$ and $a_2 < d_2$. Since $a_1 \otimes b_2 < b_2 \otimes d_1$ and $a_2 \otimes b_1 < b_1 \otimes d_2$, (39) is equivalent to the condition that $b_2 \otimes d_1 = b_1 \otimes d_2$. Therefore, we have $d_1 - b_1 = d_2 - b_2$.

This case analysis completes the proof. □

Lemma 50. *For an $i \in [m]$, let $N_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ 0 & d_i \end{pmatrix}$ with a_i, b_i , and d_i in $\mathbb{R}_{\max} \setminus \{0\}$. If*

- (1) $a_i > d_i$ for any $i \in [m]$ and there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c = b_i - a_i$ for any $i \in [m]$,

- (2) $a_i = d_i$ for any $i \in [m]$,

or

(3) $a_i < d_i$ for any $i \in [m]$ and there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c = d_i - b_i$ for any $i \in [m]$,

then the operation \otimes is commutative on the set $\{N_1, \dots, N_m\}$.

The lemma means that the third entry of κ is unnecessary, i.e., the lexicographic ordering for κ^* gives an minimum permutation, where

$$\kappa^*(N) = \begin{cases} (-1, b - a) & (a > d), \\ (0, 0) & (a = d), \\ (1, d - b) & (a < d) \end{cases}$$

for $N = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & d \end{pmatrix}$. Thus we obtain the next theorem.

Theorem 51. *The problem (38) for $m = 2$ can be solved by computing the lexicographic order for κ^* .*

We remark that the permutation above is different from the one provided by Bouquard et al. [3], which is obtained by the lexicographic ordering for κ_{BLB} , where

$$\kappa_{\text{BLB}}(N) = \begin{cases} (-1, b - a) & (a \geq d), \\ (1, d - b) & (a < d). \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 49 (1), the ordering $\tilde{\kappa}$ obtained from the lexicographic ordering for κ^* by sorting N_i 's with $a_i \geq d_i$ in nondecreasing order with respect to $b_i - a_i$ is also minimum. It is not difficult to see that $\tilde{\kappa}$ is the lexicographic ordering for κ_{BLB} . orders of optimal orderings of the minimization problem are hence optimal.

We also note that it is difficult to introduce ‘‘simultaneous triangularizability’’ in the max-plus algebra because only matrices that can be obtained from diagonal matrices by permuting the rows and/or columns are invertible.

Finally we prove Theorem 4 (ii).

Proof of Theorem 4 (ii). We first show the case of $m = 3$. We reduce the strongly NP-hard problem (38) to the problem. For an index $i \in [n]$, let N_i be a matrix in $\mathbb{R}_{\text{max}}^{3 \times 3}$ such that

$$N_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i^{(1,1)} & a_i^{(1,2)} & a_i^{(1,3)} \\ 0 & a_i^{(2,2)} & a_i^{(2,3)} \\ 0 & 0 & a_i^{(3,3)} \end{pmatrix},$$

where each $a_i^{(j,k)} \in \mathbb{Z}$. For a real γ with $\gamma > \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$, we construct n matrices $M_1, \dots, M_n \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ as follows:

$$M_i = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma^{a_i^{(1,1)}} & \gamma^{a_i^{(1,2)}} & \gamma^{a_i^{(1,3)}} \\ 0 & \gamma^{a_i^{(2,2)}} & \gamma^{a_i^{(2,3)}} \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma^{a_i^{(3,3)}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We note that the size of M_i is $O(\sum_{j,k} \log(\gamma^{a_i^{(j,k)}})) = O(\sum_{j,k} a_i^{(j,k)} \log(\gamma))$, which implies that the sum of the size of M_1, \dots, M_n is bounded by a polynomial of n and $\max_{i,j,k} a_i^{(j,k)}$ if $\gamma = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + 1$. In a manner similar to Lemma 48, it is enough to show that a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ that

minimizes $(1 \ 0 \ 0) M^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ also minimizes $(\mathbb{1} \ 0 \ 0) \otimes N^\sigma \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}$. For simplicity of notation,

we write $v(M^\sigma)$ (resp., $v(N^\sigma)$) instead of $(1 \ 0 \ 0) M^\sigma \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ (resp., $(\mathbb{1} \ 0 \ 0) \otimes N^\sigma \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}$).

Then we need to show that, for two permutations σ and ρ , $v(N^\sigma) < v(N^\rho)$ implies $v(M^\sigma) < v(M^\rho)$. By Lemma 46, we have

$$v(M^\sigma) = \sum_{t \in V[\sigma]_{13}} \gamma^t \quad \text{and} \quad v(N^\sigma) = \max V[\sigma]_{13}.$$

Note that

$$|V[\sigma]_{jk}| = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = k, \\ n & \text{if } j + 1 = k, \\ \frac{n(n+1)}{2} & \text{if } j + 2 = k, \end{cases}$$

which can be easily proved by using the induction of $i \in [n]$. Let σ and ρ be permutations such that $v(N^\sigma) < v(N^\rho)$, then we have

$$v(M^\sigma) \leq |V[\sigma]_{13}| \gamma^{v(N^\sigma)} = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \gamma^{v(N^\sigma)} < \gamma^{v(N^\sigma)+1} \leq \gamma^{v(N^\rho)} \leq v(M^\rho),$$

which proves the case of $m = 3$.

For $m \geq 4$, consider the problem to minimize the value

$$\mathbf{w}^\top \bar{M}_{\sigma(n)} \cdots \bar{M}_{\sigma(1)} \mathbf{y},$$

where

$$\mathbf{w} = \begin{pmatrix} O_{m-3,1} \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{y} = \begin{pmatrix} O_{m-3,1} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \bar{M}_i = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} O_{m-3,m-3} & O_{m-3,3} \\ \hline O_{3,m-3} & M_i \end{array} \right).$$

The symbol $O_{j,k}$ stands for the $j \times k$ zero matrix. It is clear that each \bar{M}_i is nonnegative and upper triangular, and the objective value is equal to $v(M^\sigma)$, which proves the theorem. \square

References

- [1] M. Babaioff, N. Immorlica, D. Kempe, and R. Kleinberg. A knapsack secretary problem with applications. In M. Charikar, K. Jansen, O. Reingold, and J. D. P. Rolim, editors, *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 16–28, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [2] M. Babaioff, N. Immorlica, and R. Kleinberg. Matroids, secretary problems, and online mechanisms. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '07, page 434–443, USA, 2007. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [3] J.-L. Bouquard, C. Lenté, and J.-C. Billaut. Application of an optimization problem in max-plus algebra to scheduling problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 154(15):2064–2079, 2006.

- [4] B. C. Dean, M. X. Goemans, and J. Vondrák. Adaptivity and approximation for stochastic packing problems. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, SODA '05, page 395–404, USA, 2005. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [5] B. C. Dean, M. X. Goemans, and J. Vondrák. Approximating the stochastic knapsack problem: The benefit of adaptivity. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 33(4):945–964, 2008.
- [6] T. S. Ferguson. Who Solved the Secretary Problem? *Statistical Science*, 4(3):282–289, 1989.
- [7] M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, and R. Shtih. The complexity of flowshop and jobshop scheduling. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 1:117–129, 1976.
- [8] S. Gawiejnowicz and L. Pankowska. Scheduling jobs with varying processing times. *Information Processing Letters*, 54(3):175–178, 1995.
- [9] J. N. Gupta and S. K. Gupta. Single facility scheduling with nonlinear processing times. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 14(4):387–393, 1988.
- [10] K. I.-J. Ho, J. Y.-T. Leung, and W.-D. Wei. Complexity of scheduling tasks with time-dependent execution times. *Information Processing Letters*, 48(6):315–320, 1993.
- [11] S. M. Johnson. Optimal two-and three-stage production schedules with setup times included. *Naval research logistics quarterly*, 1(1):61–68, 1954.
- [12] Y. Kawase, K. Makino, and K. Seimi. Optimal composition ordering problems for piecewise linear functions. *Algorithmica*, 2018.
- [13] S. Kubo and K. Nishinari. Applications of max-plus algebra to flow shop scheduling problems. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 247:278–293, 2018.
- [14] G. Mosheiov. Scheduling jobs under simple linear deterioration. *Computers & Operations Research*, 21(6):653–659, 1994.
- [15] S. Oveis Gharan and J. Vondrák. On variants of the matroid secretary problem. In C. Demetrescu and M. M. Halldórsson, editors, *Algorithms – ESA 2011*, pages 335–346, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [16] V. S. Tanaev, V. S. Gordon, and Y. M. Shafransky. *Scheduling Theory. Single-Stage Systems*. Springer, 1994.
- [17] W. Wajs. Polynomial algorithm for dynamic sequencing problem. *Archiwum Automatyki i Telemekhaniki*, 31:209–213, 01 1986.