

Approximation Algorithms for Smallest Intersecting Balls

Jiaqi Zheng*

Tiow-Seng Tan*

June 18, 2024

Abstract

We study a general smallest intersecting ball problem and its soft-margin variant in high-dimensional Euclidean spaces, which only require the input objects to be compact and convex. These two problems link and unify a series of fundamental problems in computational geometry and machine learning, including smallest enclosing ball, polytope distance, intersection radius, ℓ_1 -loss support vector machine, ℓ_1 -loss support vector data description, and so on. Two general approximation algorithms are presented respectively, and implementation details are given for specific inputs of convex polytopes, reduced polytopes, axis-aligned bounding boxes, balls, and ellipsoids. For most of these inputs, our algorithms are the first results in high-dimensional spaces, and also the first approximation methods. To achieve this, we develop a novel framework for approximating zero-sum games in Euclidean Jordan algebra systems, which may be useful in its own right.

1 Introduction

Given a set of convex objects, the *smallest intersecting ball* (SIB) problem is to find a ball with the smallest radius that intersects all these objects. It is often considered a variant of the smallest enclosing ball (SEB) problem to find the smallest ball that encloses all the input objects. Nevertheless, our understanding of the SIB problem lags behind that of the SEB problem in several aspects. One is diversity: SEB has been studied for various types of inputs, such as points, balls and ellipsoids; whereas SIB has only been explored for several specific input objects. One is application: SEB has found applications in the domains of computer graphics, machine learning, metrology, and so on; while SIB has attracted much less attention and the studies mainly remain in theory. Another is algorithm design: numerous algorithms have been proposed for solving the SEB problems, including exact and approximation algorithms, using optimization or coresets techniques, and in parallel or streaming settings; but for SIB, most algorithms are merely designed for solving the problems in fixed dimensions.

In this paper, we study two general problems, one is the original SIB problem where the input convex objects are *compact* (i.e. closed and bounded), and the other is its soft-margin variant designed to handle the presence of outliers. Both problems are in high-dimensional Euclidean spaces. Throughout this work, we use SIB to refer to the original problem that finds the smallest ball intersecting every input object, and term the soft-margin variant as soft-margin SIB or Soft-SIB. The general setup allows various types of input objects including points, line segments, convex polytopes, reduced polytopes, axis-aligned bounding boxes (AABBs), balls, ellipsoids, and so on. It links and unifies many important problems in the literature. For example, when the input objects are just points (singleton sets), SIB is equivalent to SEB and Soft-SIB is a variant of the ℓ_1 -loss support vector data description (ℓ_1 -SVDD) problem [10]; when line segments are used to simulate network links, the result is the smallest regional disaster that hits all links, which has found applications in backbone network planning [37]; when AABBs and balls are used to represent imprecise input points in geometric measurement tasks, SIB provides the best lower bound on the radius of SEB [26]; since ellipsoids can model confidence regions for a family of probability distributions [27], elliptical inputs to the problems can guarantee robustness in uncertain scenarios.

As a special case, when the input contains only two convex objects, SIB corresponds to the problem of finding the minimum distance between them (assuming these two objects do not intersect). The dual problem of the latter is to find the optimal hyperplane that separates two convex sets [16], which is a fundamental idea of many classification models in machine learning. Specifically, when the objects are convex polytopes generated from finite point sets, the distance problem is often referred to as the polytope distance (PD) problem, and the separation problem corresponds to the hard-margin support vector machine (SVM) problem [19]; when the

*Department of Computer Science, National University of Singapore.

Table 1: Summary of the problems and the main results

SIB Variant	n	m_i	Problem	Prior Work	This Paper
Convex Polytopes §4.1	Any	Any	SIB of Convex Polytopes	$O(M)^\ddagger$ [22]	$\tilde{O}(\frac{R^2(N+nd)}{\varepsilon^2})$
	2	Any	Polytope Distance (Hard-SVM)	$\tilde{O}(\frac{R^2(M+d)}{\varepsilon^2})$ [12]	$O(\frac{R^2(N+d)}{\varepsilon^2})$
	Any	1	Smallest Enclosing Ball (Hard-SVDD)	$\tilde{O}(\frac{n}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{d}{\varepsilon})$ [12]	$\tilde{O}(\frac{nd}{\varepsilon^2})$
	Any	2	Intersecting Radius of Line Segments	$O(n)^\ddagger$ [6]	$\tilde{O}(\frac{R^2nd}{\varepsilon^2})$
Reduced Polytopes §4.2	Any	Any	SIB of Reduced Polytopes	-	$\tilde{O}(\frac{R^2(N+nd)}{\varepsilon^2})$
	2	Any	Soft-SVM (C -SVM, ν -SVM)	$\tilde{O}(\frac{R^2(M+d)}{\varepsilon^2})$ [21]	$O(\frac{R^2(N+d)}{\varepsilon^2})$
AABBs §4.3	Any	-	SIB of AABBs (Imprecise Points)	$O(n)^\ddagger$ [26]	$\tilde{O}(\frac{R^2nd}{\varepsilon^2})$
Balls §4.4	Any	-	SIB of Balls (Imprecise Points)	$O(\frac{n}{\varepsilon^{(d-1)/2}})$ [35]	$\tilde{O}(\frac{R^2nd}{\varepsilon^2})$
Ellipsoids §4.5	Any	-	SIB of Ellipsoids (Distributions)	-	$\tilde{O}(nd^\omega + \frac{R^2nd^2}{\varepsilon^2})$
Soft-Margin [†] §5.1	Any	1	SEB with Outliers (ℓ_1 -SVDD)	-	$\tilde{O}(\frac{R^2nd}{\varepsilon^2})$

Note: d is the dimensionality. n is the number of input objects. m_i is number of points in each set. $M = \sum_i m_i$ is the total number of points. N is the number of non-zeros in the input. R is an instance-dependent parameter. ω is the matrix multiplication exponent. We use the notation $\tilde{O}(f) = O(f \cdot \text{polylog}(\frac{Md}{\varepsilon}))$ or $O(f \cdot \text{polylog}(\frac{nd}{\varepsilon}))$ if M is absent.

[†] Results for Soft-SIB with other inputs are omitted here since they are similar to the hard-margin counterparts.

[‡] Running times of exact algorithms for problems in fixed dimensions.

inputs are reduced polytopes, the separation problem is equivalent to the ℓ_1 -loss SVM models [5, 15]; when they are ellipsoids, the separating hyperplane corresponds to a classifier that minimizes the maximum probability of misclassification of data points sampled from distributions with known means and covariances [25].

We model both problems (SIB and Soft-SIB) as convex optimization problems, and propose two deterministic approximation algorithms to solve them respectively. Both algorithms compute approximate solutions in general dimensions with an approximation ratio of $(1 + \varepsilon)$. Implementation details are given for specific types of inputs such as convex polytopes, reduced polytopes, AABBs, balls, and ellipsoids (points and line segments are considered special cases of polytopes). For most of these problems, our algorithms are the first results in high-dimensional spaces, and the first fully polynomial-time approximation schemes (FPTAS). Moreover, the main procedure of the algorithms (except for the pre-processing of ellipsoids) can be directly implemented in parallel settings (for example, in the work-depth or PRAM model). See Table 1 for a summarization of the main results of this paper.

The theoretical foundations of our algorithms are from Euclidean Jordan algebras (EJA). Inspired by the seminal work of Arora et al. [3] and Clarkson et al. [12], we fit the geometric optimization problems into a general framework of zero-sum games in a specific EJA space, and propose an algorithm to compute nearly optimal strategies for both players. The algorithm is based on a recent extension of the multiplicative weights update method to symmetric cones [9], and our analysis uses the Golden-Thompson inequality for EJA exponentials [36]. The algorithmic framework of zero-sum games can be directly extended to other EJA spaces and symmetric cones, which may have broader applications in algorithm design.

Related Work. The SIB problem is also referred in the literature as intersection radius, smallest ball (or disk) stabber, smallest possible smallest enclosing ball (or circle), etc. Bhattacharya et al. [6] proposed the first algorithm for the SIB problem, where the input objects is a set of line segments on the plane (in which case the intersecting ball is a disk). Their algorithm uses the prune-and-search strategy of Dyer and Megiddo [17, 28], and finds an exact solution in linear time. The technique is later extended by Jadhav et al. [22] to devise a linear-time algorithm for input sets of two-dimensional convex polygons. Löffler and van Kreveld [26] investigated the scenario when the input objects are squares and discs. Nam et al. [29] formulated the SIB problem as an unconstrained optimization problem in reflective Banach spaces and analyzed its properties. They also showed that a subgradient algorithm will converge to the optimal set, which is the first algorithm for SIB in high dimensions. However, the convergence rate of the subgradient method has not been proved, and computing a subgradient itself could be a difficult problem (for example, when the input objects are convex polytopes). Son and Afshani [35] proposed the first streaming and approximation algorithms for SIB when the input is a set of *disjoint* Euclidean balls in \mathbb{R}^d , but the running time has a dependency of $O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{(d-1)/2}})$ on the error ε if an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation is required.

SEB (a.k.a. SVDD) and SVM (a.k.a. PD) are two important problems that are closely related to SIB, there is a long history of research on their approximation algorithms. Bădoiu and Clarkson [8] showed that it is possible to find a small *coreset* (a subset of the input points) for SEB that yields an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution. Coresets has been used in the development of many approximation algorithms for SEB [7, 24, 41, 11]. Among these works, Yildirim’s algorithm [41] is probably the most representative one, which returns a coreset of size $O(1/\varepsilon)$ and solves the problem approximately in linear time. There are also algorithms that focus on solving the SEB problem using pure optimization techniques, which do not rely on the coresets [20, 42, 1]. Gärtner and Jaggi [19] gave the first result on coreset for the PD problem and summarized the relationship between PD and the most used SVM variants. They presented a geometric algorithm that outputs a $O(1/\varepsilon)$ coreset and an approximate solution in linear time. Clarkson et al. [12] proposed an elegant framework for solving several machine learning problems in sublinear running time, including SEB and hard-margin SVM. They also gave lower bounds on these two problems and showed that their algorithms are nearly the best possible in the unit-cost RAM model. The framework is later extended by Hazan et al. [21] to develop the first sublinear time algorithm for ℓ_1 -loss SVM.

Comparisons of running times of our algorithms and previous methods are also presented in Table 1.

Outline. Section 2 provides preliminaries on Euclidean Jordan algebras and symmetric cones. Section 3 introduces a zero-sum game over symmetric cones and an algorithm for approximately solving it. Section 4 presents the approximation algorithm for the general SIB problem and states the detailed running times for inputs of convex polytopes, reduced polytopes, AABBs, balls, and ellipsoids. Section 5 extends the SIB algorithm to the soft-margin variant. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the necessary tools and concepts of Euclidean Jordan algebras and symmetric cones that will be used in our algorithm design. Readers who are interested in EJA and symmetric cones can find more in [18, 30, 39]. All the vector spaces and algebras in this work are over the real field.

2.1 Euclidean Jordan algebras Let \mathbb{J} be a finite-dimensional vector space, and let $\circ : \mathbb{J} \times \mathbb{J} \rightarrow \mathbb{J}$ be a bilinear binary operation on \mathbb{J} such that for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{J}$, we have $\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{J}$. We call any bilinear binary operation \circ a *Jordan product* on \mathbb{J} if for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{J}$, it satisfies the following two properties:

1. (Commutativity) $\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y} \circ \mathbf{x}$,
2. (Jordan identity) $\mathbf{x}^2 \circ (\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x} \circ (\mathbf{x}^2 \circ \mathbf{y})$.

A finite-dimensional vector space \mathbb{J} equipped with a Jordan product is a (finite-dimensional) *Jordan algebra*, and is denoted as (\mathbb{J}, \circ) . For convenience, we will sometimes use \mathbb{J} to denote (\mathbb{J}, \circ) if the Jordan product \circ is clear from the context. An element $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{J}$ that satisfies $\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e} \circ \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{J}$ is the *identity element* of \mathbb{J} . The power of an element $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{J}$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{x}^0 \triangleq \mathbf{e}, \quad \mathbf{x}^k \triangleq \mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{x}^{k-1}, \quad \forall k \geq 1.$$

The degree of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{J}$ is defined as the smallest $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that the vectors $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^k$ are linearly dependent. The *rank* of a Jordan algebra \mathbb{J} is then defined as the largest degree of all elements in \mathbb{J} .

We call a Jordan algebra (\mathbb{J}, \circ) Euclidean if there exists a inner product $\bullet : \mathbb{J} \times \mathbb{J} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on \mathbb{J} that satisfies

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbf{x} \bullet (\mathbf{y} \circ \mathbf{z}) = (\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y}) \bullet \mathbf{z}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{J}.$$

Let $(\mathbb{J}, \circ, \bullet)$ (or \mathbb{J} when the Jordan product \circ and the inner product \bullet are clear from the context) be an Euclidean Jordan algebra (EJA), and let r be its rank. Any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{J}$ admits a spectral decomposition, that is $\mathbf{x} = \sum_{k=1}^r \lambda_k(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{q}_k$, where $\lambda_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \lambda_r(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$ are the eigenvalues of \mathbf{x} , and $\{\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_r\} \subseteq \mathbb{J}$ is a complete system of primitive orthogonal *idempotents*, which satisfies the following three properties:

1. (Idempotents and primitiveness) $\mathbf{q}_k^2 = \mathbf{q}_k$ and $\mathbf{q}_k \bullet \mathbf{q}_k = 1, \forall k \in [r]$,
2. (Orthogonality) $\mathbf{q}_i \circ \mathbf{q}_j = 0, \forall i \neq j, i, j \in [r]$,
3. (Completeness) $\sum_{k=1}^r \mathbf{q}_k = \mathbf{e}$.

The system $\{\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_r\}$ is called a *Jordan frame* in \mathbb{J} . Based on the spectral decomposition, the trace, determinant and exponential of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{J}$ are defined as:

$$\mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^r \lambda_k(\mathbf{x}), \quad \mathbf{det}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \prod_{k=1}^r \lambda_k(\mathbf{x}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{exp}(\mathbf{x}) \triangleq \sum_{k=1}^r \exp(\lambda_k(\mathbf{x})) \mathbf{q}_k.$$

Moreover, we have $\sum_{k=1}^r \lambda_k^2(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{q}_k = \mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}^2$. We define the infinity norm of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{J}$ as the maximum magnitude of its eigenvalues:

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \max_{k \in [r]} |\lambda_k(\mathbf{x})|.$$

A Jordan algebra \mathbb{J} is Euclidean if and only if the symmetric bilinear form $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mapsto \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y})$ is an inner product on \mathbb{J} that satisfies (2.1). As such, throughout this work we fix the inner product of an EJA as:

$$\mathbf{x} \bullet \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y}), \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{J}.$$

This is called the *canonical trace inner product*. Based on this inner product, the Golden-Thompson inequality can be generalized to the EJA systems [36]. For all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{J}$, the following inequality holds:

$$(2.2) \quad \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{exp}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})) \leq \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{exp}(\mathbf{x}) \circ \mathbf{exp}(\mathbf{y})) = \mathbf{exp}(\mathbf{x}) \bullet \mathbf{exp}(\mathbf{y}).$$

2.2 Symmetric cones A *symmetric cone* \mathcal{K} can be characterized as the *cone of squares* of an EJA \mathbb{J} , namely $\mathcal{K} = \{\mathbf{x}^2 : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{J}\}$. This is called the *Jordan algebraic characterization* of symmetric cones, which provides a convenient way to study symmetric cones.

Let \mathcal{K} be the cone of squares of an EJA \mathbb{J} and let r be its rank. It is easily seen that

$$\mathcal{K} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{J} : \lambda_k(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, \forall k \in [r]\},$$

namely \mathcal{K} consists of all the elements in \mathbb{J} with nonnegative eigenvalues. Therefore, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{J}$, its exponential $\mathbf{exp}(\mathbf{x})$ is in the cone of squares \mathcal{K} . The cone \mathcal{K} induces partial orders in \mathbb{J} . For all elements $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{J}$, we say $\mathbf{x} \succeq_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbf{y}$ (resp. $\mathbf{x} \preceq_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbf{y}$) if and only if $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{K}$ (resp. $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}$). A useful property of symmetric cones is that they are self-dual. For any symmetric cone \mathcal{K} , we have $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}^*$, where \mathcal{K}^* is the dual cone of \mathcal{K} defined as:

$$\mathcal{K}^* = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{J} : \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K}, \mathbf{x} \bullet \mathbf{y} \geq 0\}.$$

Based on this property, for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{K}$, we have $\mathbf{x} \bullet \mathbf{y} \geq 0$. Particularly, for any $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{J}$, if $\mathbf{x} \succeq_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbf{y}$ (resp. $\mathbf{x} \preceq_{\mathcal{K}} \mathbf{y}$), then $\mathbf{x} \bullet \mathbf{z} \geq \mathbf{y} \bullet \mathbf{z}$ (resp. $\mathbf{x} \bullet \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{y} \bullet \mathbf{z}$), $\forall \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{K}$.

Famous examples of symmetric cones include the nonnegative orthant \mathbb{R}_+^n , the cone of $n \times n$ Hermitian positive-semidefinite (PSD) matrices \mathcal{S}_+^n , and the second-order cone \mathbb{Q}^{d+1} . Let $\mathcal{K}_1, \dots, \mathcal{K}_n, n \geq 1$, be n symmetric cones, where $\mathcal{K}_i \subseteq \mathbb{J}_i, \forall i \in [n]$. The Cartesian product $\mathcal{K}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{K}_n$ is a symmetric cone in the vector space $\mathbb{J}_1 \times \dots \times \mathbb{J}_n$. In this work, we focus on a symmetric cone that is the Cartesian product of n second-order cones with equal dimensionalities, namely

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{C} \triangleq \underbrace{\mathbb{Q}^{d+1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Q}^{d+1}}_n.$$

In what follows, we provide some algebraic facts on \mathbb{Q}^{d+1} and the product cone \mathcal{C} for later reference.

Second-order cone. The second-order cone \mathbb{Q}^{d+1} is a symmetric cone in the vector space $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$. For any $\mathbf{x} = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{y} = (\bar{\mathbf{y}}, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$, the Jordan product \circ is defined as:

$$\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y} \triangleq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x_0 \bar{\mathbf{y}} + y_0 \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y}),$$

and the identity element $\mathbf{e} = (\mathbf{0}, \sqrt{2}) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$. The rank of \mathbb{Q}^{d+1} is 2, and for an element $\mathbf{x} = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$, the eigenvalues and the corresponding idempotents are:

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_1(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x_0 + \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|), & \mathbf{q}_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\mathbf{u}, 1), \\ \lambda_2(\mathbf{x}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(x_0 - \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|), & \mathbf{q}_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(-\mathbf{u}, 1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u} = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|}$ if $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \neq \mathbf{0}$, otherwise \mathbf{u} can be any unit ℓ_2 -norm vector. From the spectral decomposition, it is easily seen that the second-order cone \mathbb{Q}^{d+1} can also be characterized as:

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbb{Q}^{d+1} \triangleq \{\mathbf{x} = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} : \|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\| \leq x_0\}.$$

The inner product of $\mathbf{x} = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}, x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbf{y} = (\bar{\mathbf{y}}, y_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ is then given by:

$$\mathbf{x} \bullet \mathbf{y} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{y}.$$

Product cone. Let $(\mathbb{V}, \diamond, \blacklozenge)$ be the underlying EJA of the product cone \mathcal{C} , where

$$\mathbb{V} \triangleq \underbrace{(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}) \times \cdots \times (\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R})}_n.$$

Let $\mathbf{x}_1 = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1, x_{1,0}), \dots, \mathbf{x}_n = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_n, x_{n,0})$ be vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$. We denote the concatenation of $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ as

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \triangleq \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, x_{i,0}) = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1, x_{1,0}, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_n, x_{n,0}).$$

For any $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, x_{i,0}) \in \mathbb{V}$ and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i, y_{i,0}) \in \mathbb{V}$, the Jordan product \diamond is given by:

$$\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \right) \diamond \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i \right) \triangleq \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_i \circ \mathbf{y}_i),$$

and the identity element $\mathbf{e} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{0}, \sqrt{2}) \in \mathbb{V}$. The rank of \mathcal{C} is $2n$, and for any $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, x_{i,0}) \in \mathbb{V}$, the eigenvalues and the corresponding idempotents are:

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda_{2j-1} \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \right) &= \lambda_1(\mathbf{x}_j), & \mathbf{q}_{2j-1} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(j-1)(d+1)}, \mathbf{u}_j, 1, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(n-j)(d+1)} \right), \\ \lambda_{2j} \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \right) &= \lambda_2(\mathbf{x}_j), & \mathbf{q}_{2j} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(j-1)(d+1)}, -\mathbf{u}_j, 1, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{(n-j)(d+1)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{u}_j = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j}{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j\|}$ if $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j \neq \mathbf{0}$, otherwise \mathbf{u}_j can be any unit ℓ_2 -norm vector. Based on the spectral decomposition, the trace of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, x_{i,0}) \in \mathbb{V}$ equals the sum of the traces of its components, namely, $\text{tr}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr}(\mathbf{x}_i)$, and its inner product with another element $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i, y_{i,0}) \in \mathbb{V}$ is given by:

$$\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \right) \blacklozenge \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{y}_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_i \bullet \mathbf{y}_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{y}_i.$$

The exponential of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i, x_{i,0}) \in \mathbb{V}$ is the concatenation of the exponentials of its components:

$$(2.7) \quad \exp\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \right) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \exp(\mathbf{x}_i).$$

3 Approximate a zero-sum game

In this section, we introduce a zero-sum game in an EJA system and present a method to solve it approximately. This game forms the basis for designing our algorithms for the SIB problems. Although our focus is in the EJA space of the product cone (2.3), our results can be directly extended to other EJAs and symmetric cones.

Let \mathcal{C} be the product cone defined in (2.3) and let $(\mathbb{V}, \diamond, \blacklozenge)$ be the underlying EJA. Let \mathbb{U} be a finite-dimensional vector space and let $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ be a linear transformation that maps a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{U}$ to \mathbb{V} . Let \mathcal{A} be a closed convex subset of \mathbb{U} and let \mathcal{B} be the set of all trace-one elements in \mathcal{C} , namely $\mathcal{B} \triangleq \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C} : \text{tr}(\mathbf{y}) = 1\}$. Consider a zero-sum game between two players Alice and Bob as follows: Alice plays a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}$, and Bob plays a point $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}$. For a pair of points $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ played by Alice and Bob, the payoff gained by Alice

(and the loss Bob incurs) is given by $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \mathbf{y}$. Since the function $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \mathbf{y}$ is linear with respect to both \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , a generalized version of von Neumann's minimax theorem [34] implies:

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \mathbf{y} = \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \mathbf{y} = \lambda^*,$$

where the common value λ^* is known as the value of this game. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an error parameter. We want to approximately solve this game up to an additive error ε , namely, find $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{B}$ such that:

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \diamond \mathbf{y} &\geq \lambda^* - \varepsilon, \\ \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \tilde{\mathbf{y}} &\leq \lambda^* + \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We assume that for any given $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}$, there is an efficient algorithm that provides the best response for Alice, i.e. the algorithm outputs a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}$ that maximizes $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \mathbf{y}$. We call this algorithm the ORACLE. Moreover, we assume that for all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}$, the best response $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}$ always satisfies $\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\|_\infty \leq \rho$. The quantity ρ is designated as the *width* of the ORACLE.

THEOREM 3.1. *Suppose the linear map $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ can be computed in $O(F)$ time. Given an error parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 2\rho]$, there is an algorithm that approximately solves the zero-sum game up to an additive error ε using $O(\rho^2 \log(n)/\varepsilon^2)$ calls to the ORACLE, with an additional processing time of $O(F + nd)$ per call.*

Proof. Let $T = \lceil \frac{4\rho^2 \ln(2n)}{\varepsilon^2} \rceil$ and $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{\ln(2n)}{T}}$ (note that $\eta \leq 1$). Consider a multi-round process as follows: Bob plays first, with the initial strategy $\mathbf{y}^{(1)} = \frac{\mathbf{e}}{2n}$, where \mathbf{e} and $2n$ are the identity element and the rank of \mathbb{V} respectively. In each round $t = 1, \dots, T$, Alice chooses $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ to be the best response to $\mathbf{y}^{(t)}$ by calling the ORACLE, and consequently Bob plays the following point in the next round:

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbf{y}^{(t+1)} = \frac{\exp(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}))}{\text{tr}(\exp(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(\tau)})))}.$$

It is easily seen that every $\mathbf{y}^{(t)}$ (including $\mathbf{y}^{(1)}$ and those produced by (3.2)) is in \mathcal{B} because its eigenvalues are strictly positive (which means it is in the product cone \mathcal{C}) and its trace is 1. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{y}^{(t)}$. By convexity of the sets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , we know that $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathcal{B}$. Furthermore, we claim that:

$$(3.3) \quad \lambda^* \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \diamond \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \diamond \mathbf{y} + \varepsilon \stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} \lambda^* + \varepsilon.$$

Thus $(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}})$ is a pair of points that satisfies condition (3.1).

The inequalities (i) and (iv) are because

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \geq \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}} \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \mathbf{y} = \lambda^*, \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \diamond \mathbf{y} \leq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \mathbf{y} = \lambda^*.$$

Let \mathbf{x}^* be any point in the set \mathcal{A} . Since $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ is the point that maximizes the payoff in each round, we know that

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*) \diamond \tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*) \diamond \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \diamond \mathbf{y}^{(t)}.$$

Replacing \mathbf{x}^* with $\arg\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \diamond \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ in the above, we obtain inequality (ii). In what follows, we justify the correctness of inequality (iii) thus the proof of (3.3) is completed.

Let $\mathbf{w}^{(1)} = \mathbf{e}$ and $\mathbf{w}^{(t)} = \mathbf{exp}\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(\tau)})\right)$ for $t = 2, \dots, T+1$. By the generalized Golden-Thompson inequality (2.2), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(T+1)}) &= \mathbf{tr}\left(\mathbf{exp}\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\right)\right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{tr}\left(\mathbf{exp}\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\right) \diamond \mathbf{exp}\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})\right)\right) \\ &= \mathbf{w}^{(T)} \blacklozenge \mathbf{exp}\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})\right) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\sum_{k=1}^{2n} \lambda_k\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})\right) \mathbf{q}_k$ be the spectral decomposition of $-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})$. Since $\eta \leq 1$, and by our assumption that $\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})\|_\infty \leq \rho$, we have $\lambda_k\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})\right) \in [-1, 1]$, $\forall k \in [2n]$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{exp}\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})\right) &= \sum_{k=1}^{2n} \mathbf{exp}\left(\lambda_k\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})\right)\right) \mathbf{q}_k \\ &\stackrel{(3.4)}{\leq} \sum_{k=1}^{2n} \left(1 + \lambda_k\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})\right) + \lambda_k^2\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})\right)\right) \mathbf{q}_k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{2n} \mathbf{q}_k - \frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{k=1}^{2n} \lambda_k(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})) \mathbf{q}_k + \frac{\eta^2}{\rho^2} \sum_{k=1}^{2n} \lambda_k^2(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})) \mathbf{q}_k \\ &= \mathbf{e} - \frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}) + \frac{\eta^2}{\rho^2} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}))^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the generalized inequality is because $e^x \leq 1 + x + x^2$, $\forall x \in [-1, 1]$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(T+1)}) &\leq \mathbf{w}^{(T)} \blacklozenge \mathbf{exp}\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)})\right) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbf{w}^{(T)} \blacklozenge \left(\mathbf{e} - \frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}) + \frac{\eta^2}{\rho^2} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}))^2\right) \\ &= \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(T)}) - \frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{w}^{(T)} + \frac{\eta^2}{\rho^2} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}))^2 \blacklozenge \mathbf{w}^{(T)} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(T)}) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(T)} + \frac{\eta^2}{\rho^2} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}))^2 \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(T)}\right) \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(T)}) \cdot \mathbf{exp}\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(T)} + \frac{\eta^2}{\rho^2} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(T)}))^2 \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(T)}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Here (a) follows from (3.4) and the self-duality of \mathfrak{C} ; (b) uses the fact that $\mathbf{y}^{(T)} = \frac{\mathbf{w}^{(T)}}{\mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(T)})}$; and (c) is because $1 + x \leq e^x$, $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$. By induction, we see that

$$\mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(T+1)}) \leq 2n \cdot \mathbf{exp}\left(-\sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\eta}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{\eta^2}{\rho^2} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}))^2 \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(t)}\right),$$

where $2n = \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(1)}) = \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{e})$. Moreover, since $\|\frac{1}{\rho} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|_\infty \leq 1$, we also have $\|\frac{1}{\rho^2} (\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}))^2\|_\infty \leq 1$. Together with the fact that $\|\mathbf{y}^{(t)}\|_\infty \leq 1$, we obtain an upperbound on $\mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(T+1)})$:

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(T+1)}) \leq 2n \cdot \mathbf{exp}\left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \eta^2 T\right).$$

On the other hand, we can also establish a lowerbound on $\mathbf{w}^{(T+1)}$. Let $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ (resp., $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$) be the minimum (resp., maximum) eigenvalue, we have:

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{w}^{(T+1)}) &= \sum_{k=1}^{2n} \lambda_k \left(\mathbf{exp} \left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right) \right) \geq \lambda_{\max} \left(\mathbf{exp} \left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right) \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\lambda_{\max} \left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right) \right) = \exp \left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \lambda_{\min} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combine the upperbound (3.5) and the lowerbound (3.6), we have:

$$2n \cdot \exp \left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \diamond \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \eta^2 T \right) \geq \exp \left(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \lambda_{\min} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right) \right).$$

Taking logarithmic on both sides and scaling by $\frac{\rho}{\eta T}$ gives:

$$\frac{\rho \ln(2n)}{\eta T} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \diamond \mathbf{y}^{(t)} + \eta \rho \geq -\frac{1}{T} \lambda_{\min} \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \right) = -\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})).$$

Substitute $T = \lceil \frac{4\rho^2 \ln(2n)}{\varepsilon^2} \rceil$ and $\eta = \sqrt{\frac{\ln(2n)}{T}}$ in the above, and rearrange the terms, we have:

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \diamond \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) + \varepsilon.$$

To show that inequality (iii) in (3.3) is true, it remains to prove that $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) \leq \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \diamond \mathbf{y}$. Let \mathbf{y}^* be any point in the set \mathcal{B} , and let $\sum_{k=1}^{2n} \lambda_k(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) \mathbf{q}_k$ be the spectral decomposition of $\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \diamond \mathbf{y}^* &= \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \diamond \mathbf{y}^*) = \mathrm{tr} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{2n} \lambda_k(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) \mathbf{q}_k \diamond \mathbf{y}^* \right) = \sum_{k=1}^{2n} \lambda_k(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) \cdot \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{q}_k \diamond \mathbf{y}^*) \\ &\geq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) \sum_{k=1}^{2n} \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{q}_k \diamond \mathbf{y}^*) = \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) \cdot \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{e} \diamond \mathbf{y}^*) = \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing \mathbf{y}^* with $\mathop{\mathrm{argmin}}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) \diamond \mathbf{y}$ in the above inequality completes the proof of (3.3).

Running time. We now analyze the processing time between two consecutive ORACLE calls. Consider the $(t+1)$ -th round of the process, let $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ be the past strategies of Alice, the algorithm generates $\mathbf{y}^{(t)}$ by performing (3.2). Assuming that $\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(\tau)})$ is recorded, we need to compute the linear map $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})$ and $-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(\tau)})$, which takes $O(F+nd)$ time, and perform an exponentiation and normalization step. By (2.7) and the definition of $\mathbf{exp}(\cdot)$, the computation of $\mathbf{exp}(-\frac{\eta}{\rho} \sum_{\tau=1}^t \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(\tau)}))$ follows from the spectral decompositions of its constituent parts, where each of the latter lies in the EJA space of \mathbb{Q}^{d+1} . Because there are n components, this takes $O(nd)$ time (recall (2.6) and (2.4)). The normalization is a simple scaling of the results, which also takes $O(nd)$ time. In summary, the additional processing time in each round is $O(F+nd)$. \square

4 Smallest intersecting balls

Let $\Omega_i, i = 1, \dots, n, n > 1$, be nonempty compact (i.e. closed and bounded) convex sets in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d . The SIB problem is to find a ball $B(\mathbf{z}, r)$ with the smallest radius $r \geq 0$ such that $B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap \Omega_i \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in [n]$. It can be modeled as the following optimization problem:

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} &\underset{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r}{\text{minimize}} && r \\ &\text{subject to} && \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| \leq r, \forall i \in [n], \\ &&& \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i, \forall i \in [n]. \end{aligned}$$

PROPOSITION 4.1. Let $\Omega_i, i = 1, \dots, n, n > 1$, be closed bounded convex sets in \mathbb{R}^d .

- (i) Consider the optimization problem (4.1). Then $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ is an optimal solution of this problem if and only if $B(\mathbf{z}, r)$ is a smallest intersecting ball satisfies $B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap \Omega_i \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in [n]$.
- (ii) $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ is an optimal solution of problem 4.1 only if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$.
- (iii) The optimization problem (4.1) is a convex program and a solution always exists.
- (iv) In general, the solution of problem (4.1) may not be unique.

Proof. (i) Let $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ be an optimal solution of problem (4.1), so r is the optimal value. Then the ball $B(\mathbf{z}, r)$ intersects every Ω_i with radius r . Assume there exists a ball $B(\mathbf{z}', r')$ with a smaller radius $r' < r$ that also intersects every Ω_i . For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let \mathbf{v}'_i be a point in $B(\mathbf{z}', r') \cap \Omega_i$, so $\|\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{v}'_i\| \leq r'$ and $\mathbf{v}'_i \in \Omega_i$. Then $(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{v}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}'_n, r')$ is a feasible solution of the optimization problem (4.1) and its objective value r' is smaller than r , which is a contradictory result.

We now justify the converse. Let $B(\mathbf{z}, r)$ be a smallest intersecting ball, so $B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap \Omega_i \neq \emptyset, \forall i \in [n]$, and r is the smallest radius. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let \mathbf{v}_i be a point in $B(\mathbf{z}, r) \cap \Omega_i$. Then $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ is a feasible solution of (4.1) and its objective value is r . Assume that (4.1) has a solution $(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{q}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}'_n, r')$ with smaller objective value $r' < r$. Then $B(\mathbf{z}', r')$ intersects every Ω_i and its radius is smaller than $B(\mathbf{z}, r)$, which is a contradiction.

(ii) Let \mathcal{D} be the convex hull $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$. Assume there exists a solution $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ such that $\mathbf{z} \notin \mathcal{D}$. Let $\mathbf{z}' = \Pi(\mathbf{z}, \mathcal{D})$ be the Euclidean projection from \mathbf{z} to \mathcal{D} . We have $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\| > 0$. For every $i \in [n]$,

$$r^2 \geq \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}'\|^2 + \|\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z}\|^2 + 2\langle \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z} \rangle.$$

From the projection theorem [4, Theorem 9.8], we know $\langle \mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z} \rangle \geq 0, \forall i \in [n]$. Therefore, $\|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}\|^2 > \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}'\|^2, \forall i \in [n]$. Let $r' = \max_{i \in [n]} \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}'\|$. Then $r' < r$, and $(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r')$ is a better solution.

(iii) Since the objective function is linear and Ω_i are closed convex sets, to see that the problem is a convex problem, it suffices to show the constraint functions $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| - r$ are convex. Let $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}, r) = \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}\| - r$. Then \mathbf{g} is linear w.r.t. r . Since the ℓ_2 distance function $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}\|$ is convex, \mathbf{g} is a convex function. Consequently, every constraint $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_i, r) \leq 0$ generates a convex region.

From (ii) we know that introducing an additional constraint $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ will not change the optimal set. Moreover, $r \geq 0$ is an implicit constraint from $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| \leq r$. Problem (4.1) is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r}{\text{minimize}} && r \\ & \text{subject to} && \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| \leq r, \forall i \in [n], \\ & && \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i, \forall i \in [n], \\ & && \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n), \\ & && r \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{R}^d \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$. The feasible region of the above problem is:

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r) \in \mathbb{U} : \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| \leq r, \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i, \forall i \in [n], \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n), r \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ and $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) = r$. Let $r^* = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x})$. Define a minimizing sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t)}\} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \rightarrow r^*$. Since \mathcal{F} is closed and bounded for $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$, and r is closed and bounded from below, the sequence $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t)}\}$ is bounded. The Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem [31, Theorem 3.6] guarantees that there exists a subsequence $\{\mathbf{x}^{(t_s)}\}$ converging to some point $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathcal{F}$. Finally, $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}^{(t_s)}) \rightarrow \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}^*) = r^*$, i.e. \mathbf{x}^* is an optimum.

(iv) Let $n = 2$ and $d = 2$. Consider the problem generated by the convex sets

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq x \leq 1, y = 0\}, \\ \Omega_2 &= \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \leq x \leq 1, y = 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $x \in [0, 1]$, $\mathbf{z} = (x, \frac{1}{2}), \mathbf{v}_1 = (x, 0), \mathbf{v}_2 = (x, 1), r = \frac{1}{2}$ is a solution of this problem. \square




Figure 1: *Left*: the feasibility test problem. *Right*: the corresponding piercing problem.

Throughout this work, we assume $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \Omega_i = \emptyset$. Consequently, the optimal value r^* of problem (4.1) satisfies $r^* > 0$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an error parameter. We say $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ is an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution of (4.1) (and accordingly $B(\mathbf{z}, r)$ is an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB of the convex sets) if it is feasible and satisfies $r \leq (1 + \varepsilon)r^*$. To find an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution, we first consider a decision version of this problem. Given $\hat{r} > 0$, we want to either determine $\hat{r} < r^*$ or verify that $(1 + \varepsilon)\hat{r} \geq r^*$. For the latter case, we find a feasible solution of (4.1) with objective value at most $(1 + \varepsilon)\hat{r}$. We call this decision problem a *feasibility test problem (FTP)*:

$$(4.2) \quad \text{Given } \hat{r} > 0 \text{ and } \varepsilon > 0, \text{ find } \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r \text{ such that}$$

$$\begin{aligned} r &\leq (1 + \varepsilon)\hat{r}, \\ \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| &\leq r, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ \mathbf{v}_i &\in \Omega_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ \mathbf{z} &\in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n). \end{aligned}$$

The FTP can be interpreted as finding an intersecting ball whose center is in $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ and radius is at most $(1 + \varepsilon)\hat{r}$. Define the distance function generated by a set Ω as $\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{p}, \Omega) = \inf\{\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{v}\| : \mathbf{v} \in \Omega\}$ and the α -neighborhood of Ω as $\mathcal{N}(\Omega, \alpha) = \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{p}, \Omega) \leq \alpha\}$, where α is a nonnegative value. The FTP problem can also be viewed as finding a point in the region:

$$\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{N}(\Omega_i, (1 + \varepsilon)\hat{r}) \right) \cap \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n).$$

The problem is known as the piercing (or stabbing) problem, and the point in the intersecting region is called a piercing point. See Figure 1 for an illustration of the FTP and the corresponding piercing problem.

Let D be the diameter of $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ (note that we neither explicitly construct the convex hull nor compute its diameter, as will be explained later). It is easily seen that $r^* \leq D$. Henceforth, we assume the parameter \hat{r} of the FTP satisfies $\hat{r} \leq D$. An algorithm for solving the FTP is presented in the following theorem.

THEOREM 4.1. *Let D be the diameter of $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$. Assume an ORACLE with running time $O(S)$. Given $\hat{r} \in (0, D]$ and an error parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{4\sqrt{2}D}{\hat{r}}]$, there is an iterative algorithm that solves the feasibility test problem (4.2) in $O(\frac{D^2 \log n}{\varepsilon^2 \hat{r}^2})$ iterations, with a processing time of $O(S + nd)$ per iteration.*

Proof. The proof is organized as follows: we first discuss how the FTP can be reduced to a zero-sum game and how to employ the algorithm introduced in Theorem 3.1 to solve it, then we present the implementation details and compute the width of the ORACLE. In the end, we state the running time of this method.

(i) *Reduction to zero-sum game.* Let $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{R}^d \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$, and let $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ be a linear map defined as

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i, r).$$

By the characterization of second-order cones (2.5), the constraint $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| \leq r$ is equivalent to $(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i, r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{d+1}$. Then $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ is a feasible solution of (4.2) only if $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r) \in \mathcal{C}$, where \mathcal{C} is the product cone defined in (2.3). Let $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{y}) = 1\}$ be the set of trace-one elements in \mathcal{C} . By self-duality of \mathcal{C} , we know that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r) \in \mathcal{C}$ only if

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y} \geq 0, \quad \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}.$$

Let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ and let $\mathcal{O}^* \subseteq \mathbb{U}$ be the optimal set of the optimization problem (4.1). Then for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{O}^*$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}$ we have $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y} \geq 0$. Define the convex set

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r) \in \mathbb{U} : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n), \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i, \forall i \in [n], r \leq \hat{r} \right\}.$$

From Proposition 4.1, we know that $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ is an optimal solution of (4.1) only if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$. Therefore, if $\hat{r} \geq r^*$, we have $\mathcal{O}^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, and consequently

$$(4.5) \quad \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y} \geq 0,$$

which means the value λ^* of the zero-sum game with \mathbf{f} and \mathcal{A} as defined is nonnegative. Conversely, if $\lambda^* < 0$, we have $\mathcal{O}^* \cap \mathcal{A} = \emptyset$ and $\hat{r} < r^*$.

Assume an ORACLE with width ρ that provides the best response $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}$ to every $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}$. We employ the algorithm described in Theorem 3.1 to solve the zero-sum game up to an additive error of $\varepsilon \hat{r} / \sqrt{2}$. During the process of the algorithm, if there is a certain round t such that $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(t)} < 0$, then the value of the game $\lambda^* < 0$ and $\mathcal{O}^* \cap \mathcal{A} = \emptyset$. In which case we terminate the algorithm and conclude that $\hat{r} < r^*$. Conversely, if we have $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \geq 0$ for all $t = 1, \dots, T$, then $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \geq 0$ and inequality (3.7) implies $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) + \varepsilon \hat{r} / \sqrt{2} \geq 0$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_n, \tilde{r})$. Consequently,

$$(4.6) \quad \lambda_{\min} \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i, \tilde{r}) \right) + \frac{\varepsilon \hat{r}}{\sqrt{2}} \geq 0 \implies \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i, \tilde{r}) + \frac{\varepsilon \hat{r}}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbf{e} \in \mathcal{C} \implies \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i, \tilde{r} + \varepsilon \hat{r}) \in \mathcal{C},$$

where $\mathbf{e} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{0}, \sqrt{2})$ is the identity element of \mathcal{C} . Since $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_t \mathbf{z}^{(t)}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_t \mathbf{v}_i^{(t)}$ are the mean of points in convex sets, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i \in \Omega_i, \forall i \in [n]$. Moreover, $\tilde{r} + \varepsilon \hat{r} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_t r^{(t)} + \varepsilon \hat{r} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \hat{r}$. Together with (4.6), we conclude that in this case $(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_n, \tilde{r} + \varepsilon \hat{r})$ is a solution of the FTP (4.2).

(ii) *Implementation of ORACLE.* For any given $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}$, the ORACLE finds $\mathbf{x} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}$. Let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r) \in \mathbb{U}$ and $\mathbf{y} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i, y_{i,0}) \in \mathbb{V}$, the problem can be formatted as:

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \text{maximize}_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r} && \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \right)^T \mathbf{z} - \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^T \mathbf{v}_i + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} \right) r \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n), \\ & && \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ & && r \leq \hat{r}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that in the above problem the constraints on \mathbf{z} , each \mathbf{v}_i , and r are independent. The problem can be decomposed into smaller sub-problems and be solved separately. For r , since the coefficient $\sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, the optimum is always $r = \hat{r}$. For each \mathbf{v}_i , the corresponding sub-problem is $\min \{ \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^T \mathbf{v}_i : \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i \}$. Let $\mathbf{h} = \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i$. The sub-problem for \mathbf{z} is $\max \{ \mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{z} : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n) \}$. Since the sets Ω_i are compact, we have

$$\max \left\{ \mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{z} : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n) \right\} = \max_{i \in [n]} \left(\max \{ \mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{z} : \mathbf{z} \in \Omega_i \} \right).$$

To summarize, the sub-problems for $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v}_i$ and \mathbf{z} can both be addressed by solving a sequence of n linear optimization problems as follows:

$$(4.8) \quad \max \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} \in \Omega_i \right\}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $\mathbf{h}_i = \sum_i \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i$ for \mathbf{z} , and $\mathbf{h}_i = -\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i$ for \mathbf{v}_i . Therefore, if there is an algorithm that solves (4.8) in $O(S')$ time, then there is an ORACLE that solves (4.7) in $O(S' + nd)$ time, where the additional processing time of $O(nd)$ is for computing the vector $\sum_i \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i$.

(iii) *Width of ORACLE.* Let $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ be the output of the ORACLE. The width ρ is an upperbound on the infinity norm of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i, r)$ over all possible inputs $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ and $\mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i$, we have $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| \leq D$, $\forall i \in [n]$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i, r) \right\|_{\infty} &= \max_{k \in [2n]} \left| \lambda_k \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i, r) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [n]} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| + r \\ &\leq D + r \\ &\leq 2D. \end{aligned}$$

For the last inequality, we used the fact that $r \leq \hat{r} \leq D$. Therefore, the ORACLE has a width of $2D$.

(iv) *Running time analysis.* By our assumption that $\varepsilon \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}D}{\hat{r}}$, the additive error $\varepsilon\hat{r}/\sqrt{2}$ is at most 2ρ thus satisfies the condition in Theorem 3.1. The number of iterations for solving the zero-sum game up to an additive error of $\varepsilon\hat{r}/\sqrt{2}$ is $T = \lceil \frac{32D^2 \ln(2n)}{\varepsilon^2 \hat{r}^2} \rceil$. In each iteration, the algorithm computes (3.2) and calls the ORACLE to solve (4.7). Because the computation of the linear map (4.3) takes $O(nd)$ time (i.e. $O(F) = O(nd)$), the running time for computing (3.2) is $O(nd)$. Suppose there is an ORACLE with running time $O(S)$. The running time of each iteration is $O(S + nd)$. In particular, if we use the ORACLE described in (ii), the running time of each iteration becomes $O(S' + nd)$, where $O(S')$ is the time for solving (4.8). \square

Given the algorithm for solving FTPs, one can obtain an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation solution to the optimization problem (4.1) via binary search. However, this leads to an additional factor of $O(\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ in the running time. Moreover, the diameter D is yet to be determined and computing the exact quantity could be a challenging problem. In the following theorem, we propose general approaches to address these problems.

THEOREM 4.2. *Let $R = \frac{D}{r^*}$, where D is the diameter of $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ and r^* is the optimal value of (4.1). Assume an ORACLE with running time $O(S)$. Given an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm that computes an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution of problem (4.1) in $O(\frac{R^2(S+nd)\log n}{\varepsilon^2})$ time.*

Proof. (i) *From FTP to optimization.* Let $L_0 = 0$, $U_0 = D$, $\hat{r}_1 = L_0 + \frac{1}{3}(U_0 - L_0)$ and $\varepsilon_1 = \frac{1}{3\hat{r}_1}(U_0 - L_0)$. Employ the algorithm described in Theorem 4.1 to solve an FTP with the parameters \hat{r}_1 and ε_1 (note that \hat{r}_1 and ε_1 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 4.1). Then we can either conclude $\hat{r}_1 < r^*$ or find a feasible solution $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ with $r \leq (1 + \varepsilon_1)\hat{r}_1$. For the former case, we let $L_1 = L_0 + \frac{1}{3}(U_0 - L_0)$ and $U_1 = U_0$; and for the latter case, we let $L_1 = L_0$ and $U_1 = L_0 + \frac{2}{3}(U_0 - L_0)$. Then for both cases, we have:

$$L_1 < r^* \leq U_1, \text{ where } (U_1 - L_1) = \frac{2}{3}(U_0 - L_0).$$

Repeat this process by setting $\hat{r}_\tau = L_{\tau-1} + \frac{1}{3}(U_{\tau-1} - L_{\tau-1})$ and $\varepsilon_\tau = \frac{1}{3\hat{r}_\tau}(U_{\tau-1} - L_{\tau-1})$ for $\tau \geq 2$, until the resultant L_τ and U_τ satisfy $U_\tau \leq (1 + \varepsilon)L_\tau$. The last solution $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r)$ we obtained from this process has value $r \leq U_\tau \leq (1 + \varepsilon)L_\tau < (1 + \varepsilon)r^*$, thus is an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution of (4.1). For the parameters \hat{r}_τ and ε_τ , we have $\varepsilon_\tau \hat{r}_\tau = \frac{1}{2}(U_\tau - L_\tau)$. Since $(U_\tau - L_\tau)$ shrinks by a constant fraction in each step, the quantity $\varepsilon_\tau \hat{r}_\tau$ also decreases geometrically. The total running time will be dominated by the time for solving the last FTP (with the smallest $\frac{1}{4}\varepsilon r^* \leq \varepsilon_\tau \hat{r}_\tau \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon r^*$), which is $O(\frac{R^2(S+nd)\log n}{\varepsilon^2})$.

(ii) *Working with unknown diameter.* To make the algorithm work, it remains to determine the diameter D of the convex hull $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$. The quantity D serves two purposes in our algorithm. Firstly, it is an upperbound on the optimal value r^* ; and secondly, it is related to the width of the ORACLE. For the first purpose, there are many alternative approaches to obtain an initial upperbound on r^* . Instead of using the exact value of D , we can pick a point \mathbf{v}_i in each Ω_i (which should be straightforward in most cases) and compute $E = \max_{i \in [n]} \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_1\|$.

It is clear that the ball $B(\mathbf{v}_1, E)$ intersects each Ω_i . Thus E is a suitable upperbound on r^* and we use $U_0 = E$ when employing the searching strategy described in (i).

For the second purpose, to ensure the algorithm's running time retains the same asymptotic order, it suffices to compute a constant approximation of the ORACLE width ρ , which in the current context is to compute a constant approximation of the diameter D . Nevertheless, it could be a challenging problem itself (e.g. when Ω_i are boxes, ellipsoids, etc.). Here we introduce a doubling trick to address this scenario. Recall that the width ρ is an upperbound on $\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\|_\infty$ for all possible output \mathbf{x} of the ORACLE. The purpose of introducing ρ is to ensure that the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})/\rho$ consistently fall within the range $[-1, 1]$, thereby all the inequalities in the proof of Theorem 3.1 can work appropriately. Therefore, instead of bounding the infinity norm of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ for all possible \mathbf{x} , it suffices to find an upperbound on $\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|_\infty$ for all $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ that appear in the runtime. Let $\rho_1 = 2E$ be a foresight estimation on the upperbound. We first run the algorithm described in (i) with the estimated width ρ_1 . Note that since we take E as the initial U_0 , we have $\frac{\varepsilon_1 \hat{r}_1}{\sqrt{2}} < E \leq D < 2\rho_1$ and the condition on the error parameter in Theorem 4.1 is always satisfied. During the runtime, if there exists a certain iteration t such that the value of $\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|_\infty$ exceeds ρ_1 , we terminate the algorithm and set $\rho_2 = 2\rho_1$. Repeat this process by setting $\rho_\tau = 2\rho_{\tau-1}$ for $\tau \geq 2$, until we reach a sufficiently large value ρ_{final} so that the algorithm can complete its full process and compute an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution of (4.1) using the width ρ_{final} . Since $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_{\text{final}}$ form a geometric series, the total running time of this approach is dominated by $O(\frac{\rho_{\text{final}}^2(S+nd)\log n}{(\varepsilon r^*)^2})$. Moreover, if $\rho_{\text{final}} \neq \rho_1$, there must exist an ORACLE output $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ such that $\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)})\|_\infty > \rho_{\text{final}}/2$, in which case we have $\rho_{\text{final}}/2 < \rho$ and consequently $\rho_{\text{final}} < 2\rho \leq 4D$. Otherwise, if $\rho_{\text{final}} = \rho_1 = 2E$, we have $\rho_{\text{final}} \leq 2D$. For both cases, the total running time is of the same asymptotic order as before. \square

In the remainder of this section, we present the implementation details of the ORACLE for specific examples of the SIB problem and state the corresponding running times of our algorithms.

4.1 Convex polytopes Let $\mathcal{P}_i, i = 1, \dots, n, n > 1$, be non-empty finite point sets in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d , where \mathcal{P}_i consists of m_i points. For each $i \in [n]$, the convex hull $\mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P}_i)$ is a convex polytope. Let $\Omega_i = \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P}_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the SIB problem becomes finding a smallest ball that intersects every polytope Ω_i . SIB of convex polytopes covers many important problems in the literature. For example, when each point set \mathcal{P}_i contains only one point (in which Ω_i are singletons), the problem becomes the smallest enclosing ball problem; when there are only two polytopes (i.e. $n = 2$), it becomes the polytope distance problem, which is also known to be the dual problem of hard-margin SVM if the polytopes are linearly separable [19]; when the polytopes are line segments (i.e. $m_i = 2, \forall i \in [n]$), the problem is to find the intersection radius for a set of line segments [6].

Employing the algorithm described in Theorem 4.2 to find an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB for the set of convex polytopes, the ORACLE problem (4.7) becomes:

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r}{\text{maximize}} && \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \right)^T \mathbf{z} - \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^T \mathbf{v}_i + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} \right) r \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i=1}^n), \\ & && \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P}_i), \forall i \in [n], \\ & && r \leq \hat{r}. \end{aligned}$$

From Theorem 4.1, we see that the above problem can be reduced to a sequence of linear optimization problems in the form of (4.8), which in the current context becomes:

$$(4.10) \quad \max \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P}_i) \right\}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

For each $i \in [n]$, the above problem can be solved by computing the function value $\mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w}$ for every point $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{P}_i$ because $\max \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P}_i) \right\} = \max \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{P}_i \right\}$. Therefore, let N be the number of non-zero coordinates in the input sets $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_n$, problem (4.10) can be solved in $O(N)$ time, and there is an ORACLE that solves problem (4.9) in $O(N + nd)$ time.

COROLLARY 4.1. *Given an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm that computes an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB for a set of convex polytopes with a running time of $O(\frac{R^2(N+nd)\log n}{\varepsilon^2})$.*




Figure 2: *Left*: the original convex polytope. *Middle*: the reduced polytopes (with $\nu_1 = \nu_2 = \frac{1}{2}$), the SIB and the optimal separating hyperplane thereof. *Right*: the corresponding soft-margin SVM.

REMARK 4.1. *Here we present the running times of our algorithm for several important special cases.*

- *Smallest enclosing ball (SEB).* When Ω_i are singletons, the SIB problem is identical to SEB. Let D be the diameter of $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$. The optimal radius r^* satisfies $r^* \geq \frac{D}{2}$, and consequently the ratio $R = \frac{D}{r^*} \leq 2$. Moreover, we have $N \leq nd$. The running time can be simplified to $O(\frac{nd \log n}{\varepsilon^2})$.
- *Polytope distance.* In this case, we have $n = 2$ and the running time is $O(\frac{R^2(N+d)}{\varepsilon^2})$.
- *SIB of line segments.* In this case, $m_i = 2$ for all $i \in [n]$, and consequently $O(N)$ is at most $O(nd)$. The running time can be simplified to $O(\frac{R^2 nd \log n}{\varepsilon^2})$.

4.2 Reduced polytopes Given a point set $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_m\}$ in \mathbb{R}^d , every point in $\mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P})$ can be represented by a convex combination of the points in \mathcal{P} . In other words, $\mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P}) = \{\sum_{j=1}^m b_j \mathbf{p}_j : \mathbf{b} \in \Delta^{m-1}\}$, where $\Delta^{m-1} = \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+^m : \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{b} = 1\}$ is the $(m-1)$ -dimensional *simplex*. For a given point $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P})$, we say \mathbf{b} is a *barycentric coordinate* of \mathbf{v} if $\mathbf{b} \in \Delta^{m-1}$ and $\sum_j b_j \mathbf{p}_j = \mathbf{v}$.

Let $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_n$, $n > 1$, be non-empty finite point sets in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d , where \mathcal{P}_i consists of m_i points. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, let \mathbf{V}_i be a $d \times m_i$ matrix such that the entries in its j -th column corresponds to the coordinates of the j -th point in \mathcal{P}_i . Then the convex polytopes generated by \mathcal{P}_i can be characterized as $\mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P}_i) = \{\mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{b}_i : \mathbf{b}_i \in \Delta^{m_i-1}\}$. Let ν_1, \dots, ν_n be parameters satisfying $\nu_i \in [\frac{1}{m_i}, 1]$. We say Ω_i is a *reduced polytope* generated by \mathcal{P}_i and ν_i if

$$\Omega_i = \left\{ \mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{b}_i : \mathbf{b}_i \in \Delta^{m_i-1}, \mathbf{b}_i \leq \nu_i \right\}.$$

Let $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n$ be convex sets defined as above. Then the SIB problem becomes finding the smallest ball that intersects the reduced polytopes. Note that if $\nu_i = 1$ for all $i \in [n]$, the problem is identical to the SIB problem for convex polytopes in Section 4.1. In general, the radius r^* of an SIB that intersects $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n$ may be larger than the one that intersects $\mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P}_1), \dots, \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{P}_n)$. On the other hand, the diameter D of $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ may be smaller than the diameter of $\mathbf{conv}(\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i=1}^n)$. As a special case, when there are only two reduced polytopes (i.e. $n = 2$), the problem becomes computing the distance between them, which is known to be the dual problem of the famous ℓ_1 -loss C -SVM and ν -SVM problems [5, 15]. See Figure 2 for an illustration of their relationship.

Employing the algorithm described in Theorem 4.2 to find an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB for the set of reduced polytopes, the ORACLE problem (4.7) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.11) \quad & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r}{\text{maximize}} && \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \right)^T \mathbf{z} - \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^T \mathbf{v}_i + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} \right) r \\
& \text{subject to} && \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n), \\
& && \mathbf{v}_i \in \{\mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{b}_i : \mathbf{b}_i \in \Delta^{m_i-1}, \mathbf{b}_i \leq \nu_i\}, \forall i \in [n], \\
& && r \leq \hat{r}.
\end{aligned}$$

The sub-problem (4.8) becomes:

$$(4.12) \quad \max \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_i \in \Delta^{m_i-1}, \mathbf{b}_i \leq \nu_i \right\}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

For each $i \in [n]$, if we substitute the variable \mathbf{w} by $\mathbf{V}_i \mathbf{b}_i$ and let $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_i = \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{h}_i$, then the above problem becomes $\max \{ \bar{\mathbf{h}}_i^T \mathbf{b}_i : \mathbf{b}_i \in \Delta^{m_i-1}, \mathbf{b}_i \leq \nu_i \}$, which is optimizing a linear function w.r.t. the barycentric coordinate over the “reduced” simplex. Let $k = \lceil \frac{1}{\nu_i} \rceil$. The problem can be solved by identifying the top- k largest entries in $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_i$. Let j_1, \dots, j_k be the indices of these entries, where $\bar{h}_{i,j_1} \geq \bar{h}_{i,j_2} \geq \dots \geq \bar{h}_{i,j_k}$. Then the optimum is given by:

$$b_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \nu_i, & \text{for } j = j_1, \dots, j_{k-1}, \\ 1 - \nu_i(k-1), & \text{for } j = j_k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Employing the median-of-medians algorithm [14, Sec. 9.3] to find the k -th largest entry in \mathbf{h}_i , the above solution can be computed in $O(m_i)$ time. As a consequence, let $M = \sum_i m_i$ and let N be the number of non-zeros in the input, the sub-problem (4.12) can be solved in $O(M)$ time, with an additional time of $O(N)$ to compute $\bar{\mathbf{h}}_i = \mathbf{V}_i^T \mathbf{h}_i$. Assuming each point set \mathcal{P}_i contains at most one origin point (otherwise we remove duplications), the time is dominated by $O(N)$. Therefore, there is an ORACLE that solves (4.11) with a running time of $O(N + nd)$.

COROLLARY 4.2. *Given an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm that computes an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB for a set of reduced polytopes with a running time of $O(\frac{R^2(N+nd) \log n}{\varepsilon^2})$.*

REMARK 4.2. *The running time of our algorithm for a set of reduced polytopes is no worse than the one for the original convex polytopes because the ratio $R = \frac{D}{r^*}$ can only decrease. For the special case of soft-margin SVM where there are only two reduced polytopes (i.e. $n = 2$), the running time of our algorithm is $O(\frac{R^2(N+d)}{\varepsilon^2})$.*

4.3 Axis-aligned bounding boxes (AABBs) AABBs are frequently used as approximations of point sets, and are also being used to model imprecise input points [26]. Let $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n$, be non-empty AABBs in the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^d . Then the SIB problem becomes finding an SIB for a set of AABBs. To solve this problem, we can represent each AABB as a convex polytope and apply the algorithm described in Section 4.1. The same idea is used by Löffler and van Kreveld [26] to solve the problem in two dimensions, where they applied the algorithm of Jadhav et al. [22]. Nevertheless, it is inefficient in high dimensions because the number of vertices of an AABB grows exponentially with the dimensionality. Therefore, instead of viewing each AABB as a convex polytope, we represent it by the minimal and maximal value of its coordinates in each dimension. That is,

$$\Omega_i = \left\{ \mathbf{v}_i : \boldsymbol{\ell}_i \leq \mathbf{v}_i \leq \mathbf{u}_i \right\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\ell}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\ell}_n$ and $\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n$ are vectors in \mathbb{R}^d satisfying $\boldsymbol{\ell}_i \leq \mathbf{u}_i, \forall i \in [n]$.

Employing the algorithm described in Theorem 4.2 to find an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB for the set of AABBs, the ORACLE problem (4.7) becomes:

$$(4.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r}{\text{maximize}} && \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \right)^T \mathbf{z} - \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^T \mathbf{v}_i + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} \right) r \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n), \\ & && \boldsymbol{\ell}_i \leq \mathbf{v}_i \leq \mathbf{u}_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ & && r \leq \hat{r}. \end{aligned}$$

The sub-problem (4.8) becomes:

$$(4.14) \quad \max \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \boldsymbol{\ell}_i \leq \mathbf{w} \leq \mathbf{u}_i \right\}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

For each $i \in [n]$, the above problem can be solved by identifying the sign of $h_{i,j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$. That is,

$$w_j = \begin{cases} \ell_{i,j}, & \text{if } h_{i,j} < 0, \\ u_{i,j}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The above solution can be computed in $O(d)$ time, and consequently problem (4.14) can be solved in $O(nd)$ time. Therefore, there is an ORACLE that solves (4.13) with a running time of $O(nd)$.

COROLLARY 4.3. *Given an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm that computes an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB for a set of AABs with a running time of $O(\frac{R^2 nd \log n}{\varepsilon^2})$.*

4.4 Balls Another important example is to find an SIB for a set of balls. This problem is considered by Löffler and van Kreveld [26] when they use balls to model imprecise input points in two-dimensional Euclidean space. Later, Nguyen et al. [29] showed that a subgradient algorithm applied to this problem in a Banach space will converge. Son and Afshani [35] investigated this problem in Euclidean spaces in the streaming setting and proposed the first approximation algorithm. In this section, we consider Euclidean balls defined as follows:

$$\Omega_i = B(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i) = \left\{ \mathbf{v}_i : \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{c}_i\| \leq r_i \right\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are the centers of the balls, and $r_1, \dots, r_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$ are the corresponding radii.

Employing the algorithm described in Theorem 4.2 to find an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB for the set of Euclidean balls, the ORACLE problem (4.7) becomes:

$$(4.15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r}{\text{maximize}} && \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \right)^T \mathbf{z} - \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^T \mathbf{v}_i + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} \right) r \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{z} \in \text{conv} \left(\{B(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i)\}_{i=1}^n \right), \\ & && \mathbf{v}_i \in B(\mathbf{c}_i, r_i), \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ & && r \leq \hat{r}. \end{aligned}$$

The sub-problem (4.8) becomes:

$$(4.16) \quad \max \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \|\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{c}_i\| \leq r_i \right\}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

For each $i \in [n]$, the above problem has an analytical solution $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{c}_i + r_i \frac{\mathbf{h}_i}{\|\mathbf{h}_i\|}$, which can be computed in $O(d)$ time. Therefore, there is an ORACLE that solves (4.15) with a running time of $O(nd)$.

COROLLARY 4.4. *Given an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm that computes an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB for a set of Euclidean balls with a running time of $O(\frac{R^2 nd \log n}{\varepsilon^2})$.*

4.5 Ellipsoids A natural extension following balls is ellipsoids. They have been frequently used to model confidence regions of multivariate probability distributions [27] and provide good approximations for compact convex sets [23]. The problem of finding the smallest enclosing ball (SEB) for a set of ellipsoids is well-studied in the literature (see, e.g. [40, 41]). Nonetheless, to the best of our knowledge, the SIB problem for a set of ellipsoids has not been explored. The existing algorithms for SEB usually involve solving semidefinite programs as a subroutine and exhibit running times scale at least cubically w.r.t. the dimensionality. However, as we will see in the following, this can be avoided in our algorithm. Consider the SIB problem where Ω_i are d -dimensional ellipsoids defined as:

$$\Omega_i = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{c}_i, \Sigma_i) = \left\{ \mathbf{v}_i : (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{c}_i)^T \Sigma_i (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{c}_i) \leq 1 \right\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_n$ are $d \times d$ symmetric and positive-definite matrices.




Figure 3: *Left*: the SIB that intersects the convex hulls of two sets of ellipsoids. *Right*: the corresponding linear classifier that separates the two sets of ellipsoids with the largest margin.

Employing the algorithm described in Theorem 4.2 to find an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB for the set of ellipsoids, the ORACLE problem (4.7) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.17) \quad & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, r}{\text{maximize}} && \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \right)^T \mathbf{z} - \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^T \mathbf{v}_i + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} \right) r \\
 & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv} \left(\{ \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{c}_i, \Sigma_i) \}_{i=1}^n \right), \\
 & && (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{c}_i)^T \Sigma_i (\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{c}_i) \leq 1, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\
 & && r \leq \hat{r}.
 \end{aligned}$$

The sub-problems (4.8) becomes:

$$\max \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{c}_i)^T \Sigma_i (\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{c}_i) \leq 1 \right\}, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

For each $i \in [n]$, the above problem has an analytical solution $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{c}_i + \frac{\Sigma_i^{-1} \mathbf{h}_i}{(\mathbf{h}_i^T \Sigma_i^{-1} \mathbf{h}_i)^{1/2}}$. Let ω be the exponent of matrix multiplication. The matrix inverses $\Sigma_1^{-1}, \dots, \Sigma_n^{-1}$ can be computed in $O(nd^\omega)$ time. Therefore, assuming a pre-processing time of $O(nd^\omega)$ and an auxiliary space of $O(nd^2)$ to compute and store the matrix inverses, the ORACLE that solves (4.17) only involves matrix-vector multiplications and some simple arithmetic operations, which exhibits a running time of $O(nd^2)$.

COROLLARY 4.5. *Given an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm that computes an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate SIB for a set of ellipsoids with a running time of $O(nd^\omega + \frac{R^2 nd^2 \log n}{\varepsilon^2})$.*

4.6 Extensions Besides the above examples, our algorithm can be extended to solve the SIB problem with various types of input objects (e.g. half-ellipsoids), as long as they are compact and convex and there is an algorithm to solve linear optimization problems over their regions. In addition, our algorithm not only works for the *pure* settings (where the input objects are of the same type) but is also applicable for *mixed* settings (where the input can be a mixture of the primitive objects, e.g. polytopes, balls, ellipsoids, etc.).

It is worth noting that Ω_i can also be convex hulls of compact (not necessarily convex) objects. That is, let $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_n, n > 1$, be collections of objects, where $\mathcal{S}_i = \{ \mathcal{G}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{i,m_i} \}$ and every $\mathcal{G}_{i,j}$ is compact, we can set each Ω_i to be the convex hull of \mathcal{S}_i , namely $\Omega_i = \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{S}_i)$, which can be viewed as a generalization of convex polytopes. With this setup, for each $i \in [n]$, the sub-problem in (4.8) becomes $\max \{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{S}_i) \}$. Moreover, because every $\mathcal{G}_{i,j}$ is compact, we have:

$$\max \left\{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{S}_i) \right\} = \max_{j \in [m_i]} \left(\max \{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{G}_{i,j} \} \right).$$

Therefore, if we can solve linear optimization problems over each $\mathcal{G}_{i,j}$ ($i \in [n], j \in [m_i]$), we can also solve the ORACLE problem (4.7) and consequently find an approximate SIB. As a concrete example, let $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{ \mathcal{G}_{1,1}, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{1,m_1} \}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{ \mathcal{G}_{2,1}, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{2,m_2} \}$, where each $\mathcal{G}_{i,j}$ ($i \in [2], j \in [m_i]$) is an ellipsoid denoted as $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{c}_{i,j}, \Sigma_{i,j})$, and let $\Omega_1 = \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{S}_1)$, $\Omega_2 = \mathbf{conv}(\mathcal{S}_2)$. Assuming $\Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 = \emptyset$, then problem (4.1) becomes finding




Figure 4: *Left*: the original SIB. *Right*: the corresponding soft-margin SIB.

an SIB that intersects the convex hulls of two sets of ellipsoids. Accordingly, the ORACLE problem (4.7) can be reduced to a sequence of problems in the form of $\max \{ \mathbf{h}_i^T \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{c}_{i,j}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{i,j}) \}$, which has an analytical solution. In Section 4.1, we saw that an SIB that intersects two convex polytopes implies a hard-margin SVM that separates the two corresponding point sets. Similarly, here an SIB that intersects Ω_1 and Ω_2 also corresponds to a linear classifier that separates two sets of ellipsoids with the largest margin. The latter coincides with Shivaswamy et al. [33, Sec. 3.3], where they used ellipsoids to model uncertain data points in classification problems. A simplified model using balls is proposed by Trafalis and Alwazzi [38], which is also covered by this example when $\mathcal{G}_{i,j}$ are just balls. Figure 3 illustrates the SIB and linear classification problems for two sets of ellipsoids.

5 A soft-margin variant

Real-world datasets are often noisy and contain outliers. For the SIB problem, it is easily seen that even one outlier object can lead to completely different results. We are therefore motivated to investigate a more robust version of the SIB problem that handles the presence of outliers. One possible approach is to choose an integer parameter $k \in [n]$ and find the smallest ball that intersects at least k objects in the input, in which case the objects that are not intersected by the ball can be considered outliers. Nevertheless, this problem is shown to be strongly NP-hard even when the input objects are just points, and there is no fully polynomial-time approximation scheme (FPTAS) for this problem unless $P=NP$ [32]. Therefore, in this section, we propose a non-combinatorial variant to handle the outliers, which is inspired by ℓ_1 -loss SVDD. Formally, we consider the optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.1) \quad & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r}{\text{minimize}} && r + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \\
 & \text{subject to} && \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| \leq r + \xi_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\
 & && \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\
 & && \boldsymbol{\xi} \geq 0, \quad r \geq 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

where each ξ_i is a slack variable (or a “penalty” for each input object), and $C > 0$ is a user-specified parameter that controls the total penalty. We call this problem the soft-margin SIB problem or Soft-SIB. Figure 4 illustrates an instance of the problem with an appropriate choice of C .

PROPOSITION 5.1. *Let $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_n$ be compact convex sets in \mathbb{R}^d , and let D be the diameter of $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$.*

- (i) $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r)$ is an optimal solution of problem (5.1) only if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$, $\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq D$, and $r \leq D$.
- (ii) Problem (5.1) is a convex program and a solution always exists.
- (iii) If $C > 1$, then $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r)$ is an optimal solution of (5.1) only if $\boldsymbol{\xi} = 0$.
- (iv) If $C < \frac{1}{n}$, then $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r)$ is an optimal solution of (5.1) only if $r = 0$.

Proof. (i) Let \mathcal{D} be the convex hull $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$. Assume there exists a solution $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r)$ such that $\mathbf{z} \notin \mathcal{D}$. Let $\mathbf{z}' = \Pi(\mathbf{z}, \mathcal{D})$ be the Euclidean projection from \mathbf{z} to \mathcal{D} . Similar to (ii) in Proposition 4.1, we have

$$\|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}'\| < \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}\| \leq r + \xi_i, \quad \forall i \in [n].$$

If $r = 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we let $\xi'_i = \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}'\|$. Then $\xi'_i < \xi_i, \forall i \in [n]$, and $(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}', r)$ is a better solution. Otherwise if $r > 0$, let $r' = \max_{i \in [n]} \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{z}'\| - \xi_i$ and let $r'' = \max\{r', 0\}$. Then we have $0 \leq r'' < r$, and $(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r'')$ is a better solution.

Let $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r)$ be an optimal solution of (5.1). Because $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathcal{D}, \forall i \in [n]$, we have $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| \leq D, \forall i \in [n]$. As a consequence, $r + \xi_i$ is at most D and the optimum will have $\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq D$ and $r \leq D$.

(ii) The proof of convexity is almost identical to (iii) in Proposition 4.1, thus is omitted here. From the above (i) we know that introducing the additional constraints $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$, $\boldsymbol{\xi} \leq D$ and $r \leq D$ will not change the optimal set of (5.1). The problem is equivalent to:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r}{\text{maximize}} && r + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \\ & \text{subject to} && \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| \leq r + \xi_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ & && \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ & && \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n), \\ & && 0 \leq \boldsymbol{\xi} \leq D, \\ & && 0 \leq r \leq D. \end{aligned}$$

Since the objective function is continuous and the feasible region of the above problem is closed and bounded, by the Weierstrass theorem [4, Theorem 2.30], an optimal solution must exist.

(iii) Suppose $C > 1$. Assume by contradiction that $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r)$ is a solution with $\boldsymbol{\xi} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Let $\xi_{\max} = \max_{i \in [n]} \xi_i$ and $r' = r + \xi_{\max}$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| &\leq r + \xi_i \leq r + \xi_{\max} = r' + 0, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ r' + C \cdot 0 &= r + \xi_{\max} < r + C\xi_{\max} \leq r + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \mathbf{0}, r')$ is a better solution.

(iv) Suppose $C < \frac{1}{n}$. Assume by contradiction that $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r)$ is a solution with $r > 0$. Let $\xi'_i = \xi_i + r$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| &\leq r + \xi = 0 + \xi'_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ 0 + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi'_i &= C \sum_{i=1}^n (\xi_i + r) = Cnr + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i < r + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}', 0)$ is a better solution. \square

REMARK 5.1. From Proposition 5.1, we know that if the parameter $C > 1$, an optimal solution will have $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \mathbf{0}$, in which case problem (5.1) is equivalent to the hard-margin problem (4.1). If $C < \frac{1}{n}$, an optimal solution must have $r = 0$, in which case problem (5.1) is to find a point \mathbf{z} such that the sum of $\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \Omega_i)$ is minimized. When the input sets Ω_i are singletons, the latter becomes the Geometric Median (a.k.a. Fermat-Weber) problem [13].

In what follows, without loss of generality, we assume that the parameter C satisfies $\frac{1}{n} \leq C \leq 1$. Let α^* be the optimal value of the optimization problem (5.1), and let $\varepsilon > 0$ be an error parameter. We say $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r)$ is an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution of (5.1) if it is feasible and its objective value satisfies $r + C \sum_i \xi_i \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\alpha^*$. Similar to Section 4, we first consider a feasibility test problem (FTP):

$$(5.2) \quad \text{Given } \hat{\alpha} > 0 \text{ and } \varepsilon > 0, \text{ find } \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r \text{ such that}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & r + C \sum_i \xi_i \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\hat{\alpha}, \\ & \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i\| \leq r + \xi_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ & \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ & \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n), \\ & 0 \leq \boldsymbol{\xi} \leq D, \\ & 0 \leq r \leq D. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, there is a feasible solution of problem (5.1) such that $\boldsymbol{\xi} = 0$ and $r = D$ (which can be directly obtained from a feasible solution of (4.1)). So $D + C \cdot 0 = D$ is an upperbound on the optimal value α^* . Without loss of generality, we assume that the input parameter $\hat{\alpha}$ of the FTP (5.2) satisfies $\hat{\alpha} \leq D$.

THEOREM 5.1. *Let D be the diameter of $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$. Assume an ORACLE with running time $O(S)$. Given $\hat{\alpha} \in (0, D]$ and an error parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{6\sqrt{2}D}{\hat{\alpha}}]$, there is an iterative algorithm that solves the feasibility test problem (5.2) in $O(\frac{D^2 \log n}{\varepsilon^2 \hat{\alpha}^2})$ iterations, with a processing time of $O(S + nd)$ per iteration.*

Proof. (i) *Reduction to zero-sum game.* Let $\mathbb{U} = \mathbb{R}^d \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$, and let $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ be the linear map:

$$(5.3) \quad \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{v}_i, r + \xi_i).$$

Then $(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r)$ is feasible to (5.1) only if $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y} \geq 0$, $\forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{B}$, where $\mathfrak{B} = \{\mathbf{y} : \mathbf{tr}(\mathbf{y}) = 1\}$. Define the convex set

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r) \in \mathbb{U} : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n), \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i, \forall i \in [n], r + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \leq \hat{\alpha}, 0 \leq \boldsymbol{\xi} \leq D, 0 \leq r \leq D \right\}.$$

Let \mathfrak{O}^* be the set of optimal solutions of (5.1). Then for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{O}^*$ we have $\min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{B}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y} \geq 0$. From Proposition 5.1, we know that if $\hat{\alpha} \geq \alpha^*$, then $\mathfrak{O}^* \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Consequently, the value λ^* of the zero-sum game

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \min_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{B}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}$$

is nonnegative. Conversely, if $\lambda^* < 0$, we have $\mathfrak{O}^* \cap \mathcal{A} = \emptyset$ and $\hat{\alpha} < \alpha^*$.

Assume an ORACLE with width ρ . We employ the algorithm described in Theorem 3.1 to solve the zero-sum game up to an additive error $\varepsilon \hat{\alpha} / \sqrt{2}$. During the process of this algorithm, if there is certain round t such that $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(t)} < 0$, then the value of the game $\lambda^* < 0$. In this case, we terminate the algorithm and conclude that $\hat{\alpha} < \alpha^*$. Conversely, if we have $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \geq 0$ for all $t = 1, \dots, T$, then $\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{(t)}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}^{(t)} \geq 0$ and inequality (3.7) implies $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}})) + \varepsilon \hat{\alpha} / \sqrt{2} \geq 0$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_n, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}, \tilde{r})$. Consequently,

$$\lambda_{\min} \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i, \tilde{r} + \tilde{\xi}_i) \right) + \frac{\varepsilon \hat{\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}} \geq 0 \implies \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i, \tilde{r} + \tilde{\xi}_i) + \frac{\varepsilon \hat{\alpha}}{\sqrt{2}} \mathbf{e} \in \mathfrak{C} \implies \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i, \tilde{r} + \tilde{\xi}_i + \varepsilon \hat{\alpha}) \in \mathfrak{C},$$

where $\mathbf{e} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{0}, \sqrt{2})$. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_t \mathbf{z}^{(t)}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_t \mathbf{v}_i^{(t)}$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_t \boldsymbol{\xi}^{(t)}$ are the mean of points in convex sets, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$, $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i \in \Omega_i, \forall i \in [n]$, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \geq 0$. Let $\tilde{r}' = \tilde{r} + \varepsilon \hat{\alpha}$. We have $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i, \tilde{r}' + \tilde{\xi}_i) \in \mathfrak{C}$. Moreover, $\tilde{r}' + C \sum_i \tilde{\xi}_i = \tilde{r} + \varepsilon \hat{\alpha} + C \sum_i \tilde{\xi}_i \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \hat{\alpha}$. Therefore, $(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_n, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\xi}}, \tilde{r}')$ is a solution of (5.2).

(ii) *Implementation of ORACLE.* Given any point $\mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{B}$, the ORACLE finds $\mathbf{x} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \blacklozenge \mathbf{y}$. Let $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r) \in \mathbb{U}$ and $\mathbf{y} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\bar{\mathbf{y}}_i, y_{i,0}) \in \mathbb{V}$, the problem can be formatted as:

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r}{\text{maximize}} && \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \right)^T \mathbf{z} - \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^T \mathbf{v}_i + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} \right) r + \sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} \xi_i \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n), \\ & && \mathbf{v}_i \in \Omega_i, \forall i \in [n], \\ & && r + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \leq \hat{\alpha}, \\ & && 0 \leq \boldsymbol{\xi} \leq D, \\ & && 0 \leq r \leq D. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the problem can be decomposed into small sub-problems for \mathbf{z} , $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v}_i$ and $(\boldsymbol{\xi}, r)$. For \mathbf{z} and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{v}_i$, the sub-problems are identical to (4.7), where the solutions can be obtained by solving the linear optimization

problems (4.8). For ξ and r , the problem can be simplified to:

$$(5.5) \quad \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}r + \sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0}\xi_i : r + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \leq \hat{\alpha}, 0 \leq \xi \leq D, 0 \leq r \leq D \right\},$$

which is optimizing a linear function over the intersection of a halfspace and an AABB. Observe that the optimum will be an extreme point of the intersected region, and if the solution has nonzero ξ_i 's, the values should be preferentially allocated to ξ_i 's with larger $y_{i,0}$'s in the objective. Moreover, on the other hand, the maximum value for any ξ_i is $\min\{D, \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{C}\}$. Consider a simplex-like process as follows: Let $\beta = \min\{D, \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{C}\}$, $k = \lceil \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{C\beta} \rceil$ and let $y_{i_1,0}, \dots, y_{i_k,0}$ be the k largest values in $\{y_{1,0}, \dots, y_{n,0}\}$, where $y_{i_1,0} \geq \dots \geq y_{i_k,0}$. Let $\mathcal{J}_k = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$ be the set of indices. Consider the following point:

$$(5.6) \quad r = 0, \quad \xi_i = \begin{cases} \beta, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J}_k \setminus \{i_k\}, \\ \frac{\hat{\alpha}}{C} - (k-1)\beta, & \text{if } i = i_k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The point is an extreme point of the feasible region of (5.5) because it is feasible and is the intersection point of the hyperplanes $r = 0$, $\xi_i = \beta, \forall i \in \mathcal{J}_k \setminus \{i_k\}$, $\xi_i = 0, \forall i \in [n] \setminus \mathcal{J}_k$, and $r + C \sum_i \xi_i = \hat{\alpha}$. Its objective value is $(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} y_{i_j,0}) \cdot \beta + y_{i_k,0} \cdot (\frac{\hat{\alpha}}{C} - (k-1)\beta)$. Consider another point by setting $\xi_{i_k} = 0$ and $r = \hat{\alpha} - (k-1)C\beta$ (which simulates a pivoting step of the simplex method). Its objective value is $(\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} y_{i_j,0}) \cdot \beta + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{\alpha} - (k-1)C\beta)$. If $\frac{y_{i_k,0}}{C} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, then the new objective value is larger and we move to the new point. Continue to check the value of $y_{i_j,0}$ for $j = k-1, k-2, \dots, 1$, one can find that if $\frac{y_{i_j,0}}{C} < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, then setting $\xi_{i_j} = 0$ and increase the value of r by $C\beta$ correspondingly gives a better result. Once we reach $\frac{y_{i_j,0}}{C} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ or all the ξ_i are set to zero (in which case $r = \hat{\alpha}$), the solution cannot be further improved and is therefore optimal.

Fortunately, due to the nice property of the final solution, it is not necessary to perform the above simplex method in the actual implementation. Let $\mathcal{J}_L \subseteq [n]$ be the set of all indices i satisfying $\frac{y_{i,0}}{C} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. From the above discussion, we see that if $|\mathcal{J}_L| \geq k$ (in which case $\frac{y_{i_k,0}}{C} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$), then the solution of (5.5) is given by (5.6), which can be computed in $O(n)$ time using the median-of-medians algorithm. Otherwise, if $|\mathcal{J}_L| < k$, the solution is:

$$(5.7) \quad r = \hat{\alpha} - |\mathcal{J}_L| \cdot \beta, \quad \xi_i = \begin{cases} \beta, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{J}_L, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which can also be computed in $O(n)$ time. In summary, if there is an ORACLE that solves problem (4.7) for the original FTP (4.2), then with slight modification it can also solve (5.4). Following (ii) of Theorem 4.1, if there is an algorithm that solves the linear optimization problems (4.8) in $O(S')$ time, then there exists an ORACLE that solves (5.4) with a processing time of $O(S' + nd + n) = O(S' + nd)$.

(iii) *Width of ORACLE.* Let $(z, v_1, \dots, v_n, \xi, r)$ be the solution of (5.4). The width ρ of the ORACLE is an upperbound on the infinity norm of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n (z - v_i, r + \xi_i)$ over all possible inputs $y \in \mathcal{B}$. Since $z \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ and $v_i \in \Omega_i$, we have $\|z - v_i\| \leq D, \forall i \in [n]$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (z - v_i, r + \xi_i) \right\|_{\infty} &= \max_{k \in [2n]} \left| \lambda_k \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n (z - v_i, r + \xi_i) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [n]} \|z - v_i\| + r + \xi_i \\ &\leq D + r + \beta \\ &\leq 3D. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is because $r \leq D$ and $\beta \leq D$. Therefore, the ORACLE width is $3D$.

(iv) *Running time analysis.* By our assumption that $\varepsilon \leq \frac{6\sqrt{2}D}{\hat{\alpha}}$, the additive error $\varepsilon\hat{\alpha}/\sqrt{2}$ is at most 2ρ and satisfies the condition in Theorem 3.1. The number of iterations for approximating the zero-sum game up to

an additive error of $\varepsilon\hat{\alpha}/\sqrt{2}$ is $T = \lceil \frac{72D^2 \ln(2n)}{\varepsilon^2 \hat{\alpha}^2} \rceil$. In each iteration, the algorithm computes (3.2) and calls the ORACLE to solve (5.4). Because the computation of the linear map (5.3) takes $O(nd)$ time (i.e. $O(F) = O(nd)$), the running time for computing (3.2) is $O(nd)$. Suppose there is an ORACLE with running time $O(S)$. Then the running time of each iteration is $O(S + nd)$. In particular, if we use the ORACLE described in (ii), the running time of each iteration becomes $O(S' + nd)$, where $O(S')$ is the time for solving (4.8). \square

THEOREM 5.2. *Let $R = \frac{D}{\alpha^*}$, where D is the diameter of $\mathbf{conv}(\{\Omega_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ and α^* is the optimal value of (5.1). Assume an ORACLE with running time $O(S)$. Given an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm that computes an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution of problem (5.1) in $O(\frac{R^2(S+nd) \log n}{\varepsilon^2})$ time.*

Proof. (i) *From FTP to optimization.* We can use the same strategy as introduced in (i) of Theorem 4.2 to search the optimal value α^* and find an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution for (5.1). Because $\alpha^* \leq D$, the initial lowerbound $L_0 = 0$ and upperbound $U_0 = D$ are still applicable. Setting the values of $\hat{\alpha}_\tau$ and ε_τ correspondingly and solve the FTPs using the algorithm described in Theorem 5.1, the total running time will be $O(\frac{R^2(S+nd) \log n}{\varepsilon^2})$.

(ii) *Working with unknown diameter.* The roles of D are the same as in the hard-margin version: used as an initial upperbound and to compute the ORACLE width. For both purpose, the method introduced in (ii) of Theorem 4.1 still applies. Firstly, pick a point \mathbf{v}_i in each Ω_i and let $E = \max_{i \in [n]} \|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_1\|$. Because E is an upperbound on the optimal value of (4.1) and the optimal value of (5.1) can only be smaller, E is also an upperbound on α^* and can be used as U_0 in the above (i). Secondly, since $3E \leq 3D$, we can set $\rho_1 = 3E$ as an initial estimation on the ORACLE width, and employing the doubling trick. The total running time will retain the same asymptotic order. \square

In general, given an input set of compact convex objects, if the algorithm introduced in Section 4 is capable of solving the original SIB problem (4.1), then with slight modification it can also solve the Soft-SIB problem (5.1). Specifically, the algorithms introduced in Section 4.1 – 4.5 can all be adapted to solve the corresponding soft-margin problems with input objects of convex polytopes, reduced polytopes, AABBs, balls, or ellipsoids. The running times will be similar as the corresponding hard-margin problems, except that the ratio R is defined differently here. In the following subsection, we discuss details of the Soft-SIB algorithm for the most basic case where the input objects are just points.

5.1 ℓ_1 -loss SVDD When the input objects are points, the Soft-SIB problem becomes a variant of the ℓ_1 -loss SVDD problem [10]. SVDD is a model which aims at finding spherically shaped boundaries around data sets. It is useful for abnormal detection and has been applied to a variety of application domains including biometrics, surveillance, and social network [2]. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n\}$ be a point set in \mathbb{R}^d , and let $\Omega_i = \{\mathbf{p}_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the optimization problem (5.1) becomes:

$$(5.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r}{\text{maximize}} && r + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \\ & \text{subject to} && \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{p}_i\| \leq r + \xi_i, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ & && \boldsymbol{\xi} \geq 0, \quad r \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here the variables \mathbf{v}_i are fixed to \mathbf{p}_i so are omitted. Note that the above problem is different from the commonly used formulation of ℓ_1 -loss SVDD [10, Equation (7)], where the latter uses squared distance in the constraints, i.e. $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{p}_i\|^2 \leq r + \xi_i, \forall i \in [n]$. The reason behind the preference for the squared distance is its differentiability, due to which the Lagrange dual problem can be easily derived and existing optimization tools can be used to solve the problem. However, square distance provides less geometric intuition and it is difficult to analyze its behavior. Conversely, our formulation (5.8) possesses a clear geometric interpretation but is difficult to solve using general optimization methods. Employing the algorithm stated in Theorem 5.2 to solve problem (5.8), the

ORACLE problem (5.4) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (5.9) \quad & \underset{\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, r}{\text{maximize}} && \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i \right)^T \mathbf{z} - \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i^T \mathbf{p}_i + \left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} \right) r + \sum_{i=1}^n y_{i,0} \xi_i \\
 & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{conv}(\{\mathbf{p}_i\}_{i=1}^n), \\
 & && r + C \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i \leq \hat{\alpha}, \\
 & && \boldsymbol{\xi} \geq \mathbf{0}, r \geq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here the second term in the objective is a constant. The optimum of $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ and r is given by either (5.6) or (5.7), and both can be computed in $O(n)$ time. Take a processing time of $O(nd)$ to compute $\mathbf{h} = \sum_i \bar{\mathbf{y}}_i$, the sub-problem for \mathbf{z} reduces to $\max_{i \in [n]} \mathbf{h}^T \mathbf{p}_i$, which can be computed in $O(N)$ time, where N is the number of non-zero entries in the input point set. Because $N \leq nd$, the complexity of the ORACLE is $O(N + nd + n) = O(nd)$.

COROLLARY 5.1. *Given an error parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an algorithm that computes an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution of (5.8) with a running time of $O(\frac{R^2 nd \log n}{\varepsilon^2})$.*

6 Discussion

The main results of this paper are two approximation algorithms, for the general smallest intersecting ball (SIB) problems and its soft-margin variant respectively. The input objects of the problems are only required to be compact and convex, which greatly expands the application domain of the problems and our methods. A two-player zero-sum game in Euclidean Jordan algebraic spaces is introduced as a general algorithmic framework in this paper, which may benefit other optimization problems.

Looking forward, it would be interesting to see if the results can be extended to more general vector spaces such as Hilbert spaces (which are equipped with inner products and generalizes Euclidean spaces) and Banach spaces (which are equipped with norm functions and generalizes Hilbert spaces). Together with advanced sampling techniques, it is promising that some of our algorithms could be improved to have sublinear running times. Kernelized versions of and dual methods for the problems would also be valuable topics to investigate.

References

- [1] Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Zhenyu Liao, and Yang Yuan. Optimization Algorithms for Faster Computational Geometry. In *43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP 2016)*, volume 55, pages 53:1–53:6, 2016.
- [2] Shervin Rahimzadeh Arashloo. ℓ_p -norm support vector data description. *Pattern Recognition*, 132:108930, 2022.
- [3] Sanjeev Arora, Elad Hazan, and Satyen Kale. The multiplicative weights update method: a meta-algorithm and applications. *Theory of computing*, 8(1):121–164, 2012.
- [4] Amir Beck. *Introduction to Nonlinear Optimization*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, PA, 2014.
- [5] Kristin P. Bennett and Erin J. Bredensteiner. Duality and geometry in SVM classifiers. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 57–64, 2000.
- [6] Binay K. Bhattacharya, Sreesh Jadhav, Asish Mukhopadhyay, and Jean-Marc Robert. Optimal algorithms for some smallest intersection radius problems. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, SCG '91, pages 81–88, New York, NY, USA, 1991.
- [7] Mihai Bădoiu and Kenneth L. Clarkson. Smaller core-sets for balls. In *SODA*, volume 3, pages 801–802, 2003.
- [8] Mihai Bădoiu and Kenneth L. Clarkson. Optimal core-sets for balls. *Computational Geometry*, 40(1):14–22, 2008.

- [9] Ilayda Canyakmaz, Wayne Lin, Georgios Piliouras, and Antonios Varvitsiotis. Multiplicative updates for online convex optimization over symmetric cones. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03136*, 2023.
- [10] Wei-Cheng Chang, Ching-Pei Lee, and Chih-Jen Lin. A revisit to support vector data description. *Dept. Comput. Sci., Nat. Taiwan Univ., Taipei, Taiwan, Tech. Rep*, 2013.
- [11] Kenneth L. Clarkson. Coresets, sparse greedy approximation, and the frank-wolfe algorithm. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms (TALG)*, 6(4):1–30, 2010.
- [12] Kenneth L. Clarkson, Elad Hazan, and David P. Woodruff. Sublinear optimization for machine learning. *J. ACM*, 59(5), 2012.
- [13] Michael B Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, Gary Miller, Jakub Pachocki, and Aaron Sidford. Geometric median in nearly linear time. In *Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 9–21, 2016.
- [14] T.H. Cormen, C.E. Leiserson, R.L. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, Fourth Edition*. MIT Press, 2022.
- [15] David Crisp and Christopher J. C. Burges. A geometric interpretation of ν -SVM classifiers. In S. Solla, T. Leen, and K. Müller, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 12. MIT Press, 1999.
- [16] Achiya Dax. The distance between two convex sets. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 416(1):184–213, 2006.
- [17] Martin E. Dyer. Linear time algorithms for two-and three-variable linear programs. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 13(1):31–45, 1984.
- [18] Jacques Faraut and Adam Korányi. *Analysis on Symmetric Cones*. Oxford mathematical monographs. Clarendon Press, 1994.
- [19] Bernd Gärtner and Martin Jaggi. Coresets for polytope distance. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 33–42, 2009.
- [20] Bernd Gärtner and Sven Schönherr. An efficient, exact, and generic quadratic programming solver for geometric optimization. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual symposium on Computational geometry*, pages 110–118, 2000.
- [21] Elad Hazan, Tomer Koren, and Nati Srebro. Beating sgd: Learning svms in sublinear time. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 24, 2011.
- [22] Shreesh Jadhav, Asish Mukhopadhyay, and Binay Bhattacharya. An Optimal Algorithm for the Intersection Radius of a Set of Convex Polygons. *Journal of Algorithms*, 20(2):244–267, 1996.
- [23] Fritz John. Extremum problems with inequalities as subsidiary conditions. In *Studies and Essays Presented to R. Courant on his 60th Birthday, January 8, 1948*, pages 187–204. Interscience Publishers, New York, 1948.
- [24] Piyush Kumar, Joseph SB Mitchell, and E Alper Yildirim. Approximate minimum enclosing balls in high dimensions using core-sets. *Journal of Experimental Algorithmics (JEA)*, 8:1–1, 2003.
- [25] Gert RG Lanckriet, Laurent El Ghaoui, Chiranjib Bhattacharyya, and Michael I Jordan. A robust minimax approach to classification. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Dec):555–582, 2002.
- [26] Maarten Löffler and Marc van Kreveld. Largest bounding box, smallest diameter, and related problems on imprecise points. *Computational Geometry*, 43(4):419–433, 2010.
- [27] Albert W Marshall and Ingram Olkin. Multivariate chebyshev inequalities. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pages 1001–1014, 1960.

- [28] Nimrod Megiddo. Linear-time algorithms for linear programming in \mathbb{R}^3 and related problems. *SIAM journal on computing*, 12(4):759–776, 1983.
- [29] Nguyen Mau Nam, Nguyen Thai An, and Juan Salinas. Applications of convex analysis to the smallest intersecting ball problem. *Journal of Convex Analysis*, 19:497–518, 2012.
- [30] Michael Orlitzky. *Euclidean Jordan algebras*. 2022.
- [31] W. Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis, Third Edition*. International series in pure and applied mathematics. McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- [32] Vladimir Shenmaier. Complexity and approximation of the smallest k-enclosing ball problem. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 48:81–87, 2015.
- [33] Pannagadatta K Shivaswamy, Chiranjib Bhattacharyya, and Alexander J Smola. Second order cone programming approaches for handling missing and uncertain data. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1283–1314, 2006.
- [34] Maurice Sion. On general minimax theorems. *Pacific J. Math.*, 8:171–176, 1958.
- [35] Wanbin Son and Peyman Afshani. Streaming Algorithms for Smallest Intersecting Ball of Disjoint Balls. In *Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*, pages 189–199, 2015.
- [36] Jiyuan Tao, GQ Wang, and L Kong. The Araki-Lieb-Thirring inequality and the Golden-Thompson inequality in Euclidean Jordan algebras. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 70(19):4228–4243, 2022.
- [37] János Tapolcai, Lajos Rónyai, Balázs Vass, and László Gyimóthi. Fast Enumeration of Regional Link Failures Caused by Disasters With Limited Size. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 28(6):2421–2434, 2020.
- [38] Theodore B Trafalis and Samir A Alwazzi. Support vector machine classification with noisy data: a second order cone programming approach. *International Journal of General Systems*, 39(7):757–781, 2010.
- [39] Lieven Vandenberghe. Symmetric cones. Lecture notes, Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, UCLA, Spring, 2016.
- [40] Lieven Vandenberghe and Stephen Boyd. Semidefinite programming. *SIAM review*, 38(1):49–95, 1996.
- [41] E Alper Yildirim. Two algorithms for the minimum enclosing ball problem. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(3):1368–1391, 2008.
- [42] Guanglu Zhou, Kim-Chuan Toh, and Jie Sun. Efficient algorithms for the smallest enclosing ball problem. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 30:147–160, 2005.