

Dual Bounded Generation: Polynomial, Second-order Cone and Positive Semidefinite Matrix Inequalities

Khaled Elbassioni*

Abstract

In the monotone integer dualization problem, we are given two sets of vectors in an integer box such that no vector in the first set is dominated by a vector in the second. The question is to check if the two sets of vectors cover the entire integer box by upward and downward domination, respectively. It is known that the problem is (quasi-)polynomially equivalent to that of enumerating all maximal feasible solutions of a given monotone system of linear/separable/supermodular inequalities over integer vectors. The equivalence is established via showing that the dual family of minimal infeasible vectors has size bounded by a (quasi-)polynomial in the sizes of the family to be generated and the input description. Continuing in this line of work, in this paper, we consider systems of polynomial, second-order cone, and semidefinite inequalities. We give sufficient conditions under which such bounds can be established and highlight some applications.

1 Introduction

We consider a monotone system of inequalities of the form:

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq t_i, \quad \text{for } i \in [r] := \{1, \dots, r\}, \quad (1)$$

over a vector of integer variables $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, where $f_i : \mathbb{Z}_+^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is a *monotone* (non-decreasing) non-negative function on \mathbb{Z}_+^n , that is, $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ and $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{y}$ imply that $f_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq f_i(\mathbf{y})$, for all $i \in [r]$. A vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ is said to be a *maximal feasible vector* (or solution) for (1) if \mathbf{x} is feasible for (1) and $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}^j$ is not feasible for all $j \in [n]$, where throughout we use $\mathbf{1}^j$ to denote the j -unit n -dimensional vector. Likewise, a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ is said to be a *minimal infeasible vector* for (1) if \mathbf{x} is infeasible for (1) and $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{1}^j$ is feasible for all $j \in [n]$ such that $x_j > 0$. Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{I} be respectively the families of maximal feasible and minimal infeasible vectors for (1). We are interested in incrementally generating the family \mathcal{F} :

GEN(\mathcal{F}'): Given a monotone system (1), and a subfamily $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of its maximal feasible vectors, either find a new maximal vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{F}'$, or provide an evidence that $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F}$.

Clearly, the entire family \mathcal{F} can be generated by initializing $\mathcal{F}' = \emptyset$ and iteratively solving the above problem $|\mathcal{F}| + 1$ times. It was shown in [BEG⁺02] that, when each f_i is a *linear* function, problem GEN(\mathcal{F}') can be solved in *quasi-polynomial* time $k^{o(\log k)}$ time, where $k = \max\{n, r, |\mathcal{F}'|\}$, while the similar incremental generation problem for the family of minimal infeasible solutions is NP-hard. This result was extended to the case when each function f_i can be written as the sum $f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^n f_{ij}(x_j)$ of *single-variable* monotone functions f_{ij} , and more generally to the case when each f_i is the sum of products of *constant number* of single-variable monotone functions. A particularly interesting example of the latter case is when each f_i is a polynomial

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_i} a_H \prod_{j \in H} x_j^{d_{H,j}}, \quad (2)$$

*Khalifa University of Science and Technology, Abu Dhabi, UAE; (khaled.elbassioni@ku.ac.ae)

where $\mathcal{H}_i \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a given multiset family with $d_{H,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $a_H > 0$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}_i$.

It will be convenient to restrict the domain of each variable x_j to a subset $\mathcal{C}_j = \{0, 1, \dots, c_j\}$ of \mathbb{Z}_+ . Such a bound c_j of *polynomial bit-length* can be assumed in all the examples considered in this paper. For instance, if each function f_i is a polynomial of the form (2), then any feasible solution for (1) satisfies¹ $x_j \leq c'_j := \min_i \frac{t_i}{\min_{H \in \mathcal{H}_i: j \in H} a_H}$. Thus, we may set $c_j := \lfloor c'_j \rfloor$, for all $j \in [n]$. Keeping this in mind, we will assume in the rest of the paper that the variable vector \mathbf{x} is chosen from an integer box $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 \times \mathcal{C}_2 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_n = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{c}\}$, where $\mathcal{C}_j = \{0, 1, \dots, c_j\}$ for $j \in [n]$.

For an *antichain* (that is, a subset of pairwise incomparable elements) $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, denote by $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ the set of *minimal non-dominated* elements of \mathcal{A} , i.e., the set of those elements $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ that are minimal with respect to the property that $\mathbf{x} \not\leq \mathbf{a}$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}$. It is easy to see that the mapping $\mathcal{I} : \text{Antichains}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{Antichains}(\mathcal{C})$ is one-to-one, and hence, the families \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ can be thought of *dual* to each other. In particular, if \mathcal{F} is the family of maximal feasible solutions for (1), then the dual $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$ represents the family of *minimal* vectors of \mathcal{C} which do not satisfy (1).

Let $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, be a real-valued function over \mathcal{C} . f is said to be *supermodular* if

$$f(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) + f(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + f(\mathbf{y}) \quad (3)$$

holds for all $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}$, where \vee and \wedge denote, respectively, the component-wise maximum and minimum operators over \mathcal{C} : $(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y})_j = \max\{x_j, y_j\}$ and $(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y})_j = \min\{x_j, y_j\}$, for $j \in [n]$. It was shown in [BEGK03] that if all the functions f_i in (1) are *integer-valued supermodular* functions, then $GEN(\mathcal{F}')$ can be solved in quasi-polynomial time $k^{o(\log k \cdot \log R)}$ time, where $k = \max\{n, r, |\mathcal{F}'|\}$ and $R = \max_{i \in [r]} f_i(\mathbf{c})$. In particular, if all functions have *quasi-polynomially bounded integral range* then all maximal feasible vectors for the system can be enumerated in quasi-polynomial time. This, as well as all the above-mentioned results, were established via a (quasi-)polynomial time reduction to the following *dualization* problem on integer boxes:

DUAL($\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$): *Given an integer box \mathcal{C} , an antichain of vectors $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and a subset $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ of its minimal non-dominated vectors, either find a new minimal non-dominated vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \mathcal{B}$, or provide an evidence that no such vector exists, i.e., $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$.*

It is known that problem $DUAL(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ can be solved in $poly(n) + m^{o(\log m)}$ time, where $m = |\mathcal{A}| + |\mathcal{B}|$ (see [BEG⁺02, FK96]). However, it is still open whether $DUAL(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ has a polynomial-time algorithm. To recall (at a high level) the reduction from problem $GEN(\mathcal{F}')$ to problem $DUAL(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, let us follow [BGKM01] in calling the family \mathcal{F} *uniformly dual-bounded*, if for every subfamily $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ we have

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) \quad (4)$$

for some (quasi-)polynomial $q(\cdot)$, where \mathcal{L} is the total length of the binary encoding of the parameters defining the system (1). It was shown in [BEG⁺02] (extending the similar result in [BI95, GK99], for binary case) that the incremental *joint* generation problem of enumerating (in a *non-controlled* order) the union family $\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$ can be reduced in polynomial time to the dualization problem $DUAL(\mathcal{C}, \cdot, \cdot)$ over an integer box \mathcal{C} . It follows then that for uniformly dual-bounded families \mathcal{F} , problem $GEN(\mathcal{F}')$ can be reduced in (quasi-)polynomial time to the dualization problem by performing joint generation and discarding the elements of the unwanted family $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$. Since the number of discarded elements is bounded by a (quasi-)polynomial $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|)$ in the input-output size, the overall running time for enumerating \mathcal{F} is dominated by a (quasi-)polynomial in $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|)$ and the time T_{DUAL} needed to solve the dualization problem, resulting in an overall quasi-polynomial time, if the family \mathcal{F} is uniformly dual-bounded.

We now state some of the known bounds of the form (4) for families \mathcal{F} of maximal feasible vectors for (1):

¹assuming that $x_j \neq \infty$.

- (B1) When the all the functions f_i are integer-valued supermodular of range $\{0, 1, \dots, R\}$, we have $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) \leq r|\mathcal{F}'|^{o(\log(R-t))}$, where $t := \min\{t_1, \dots, t_r\}$ [BEGK03].
- (B2) If each f_i is linear, that is, $f_i(x) = (\mathbf{a}^i)^\top \mathbf{x}$, for some non-negative vector \mathbf{a}^i , then $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) \leq rn|\mathcal{F}'|$ [BEG⁺02]. In fact, this is also true for the case when each $f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^n f_{ij}(x_j)$ is the sum of *single-variable* monotone functions [KBE⁺07].
- (B3) More generally, if each f_i is the sum of at most s terms each of which is the product of at most p single-variable monotone functions, then $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) \leq rsp(2|\mathcal{F}'| + 1)^p$ [KBE⁺07]. This is true, in particular, for a system of polynomial inequalities of the form (2), when the *dimension* of each hypergraph (that is, the maximum size of a hyperedge) is bounded by a constant.

Main results. We extend the above results (B1)-(B3) as follows:

- (B4) We consider *real*-valued supermodular functions with range $[0, R]$ and obtain a bound $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) \leq r|\mathcal{F}'|^{o(\log \frac{R-t}{\tau})}$ that depends on the minimum *traction* (i.e., minimum possible positive change) τ of the functions f_i . In particular, when $\frac{R-t}{\tau} = \text{quasi-poly}(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|)$, we obtain a quasi-polynomial time enumeration algorithm.
- (B5) As a direct application of the result in (B4), we consider the case when each function f_i is a product of real-valued *affine* functions with rational coefficients and the objective is to enumerate the the family of all *minimal feasible* solutions of the system $f_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq t_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. We derive a bound of $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) \leq |\mathcal{F}'|^{o(\log \mathcal{L})}$ on the size of the dual family, implying that the problem of enumerating all minimal feasible solutions of such systems can be solved in quasi-polynomial time.
- (B6) We show that, if each f_i is an integer-valued polynomial function (as in (2)) of range $\{0, 1, \dots, R\}$ having at most s terms in which each variable has degree at most d , then $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) \leq r|\mathcal{F}'|(R - \min_i t_i, s + 2^{d+2}n \max_i t_i)|\mathcal{F}'|$. In particular, if $d = \text{polylog}(\mathcal{L})$ and, for all i , either $t_i \geq R_i - \text{quasi-poly}(\mathcal{L})$ or $t_i \leq \text{quasi-poly}(\mathcal{L})$, then all maximal feasible vectors for (1) can be enumerated in quasi-polynomial time. In contrast to the result in (B3), this does not require the hypergraphs defining the polynomials in (2) to have fixed dimension.
- (B7) We consider the case when (1) is a system of *second-order cone* inequalities, that is, when each f_i is a real-valued function of the form $f_i(\mathbf{x}) := \|A^i \mathbf{x}\| + (\mathbf{b}^i)^\top \mathbf{x}$, where $A^i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{d \times n}$ and $\mathbf{b}^i \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ are given matrices and vectors, and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the ℓ_2 -norm. We show in this case that $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) \leq O(n)^{2d+1}r|\mathcal{F}'|$. In particular if $d = \text{polylog}(\mathcal{L})$ then problem $GEN(\mathcal{F}')$ can be solved in quasi-polynomial time.
- (B8) Finally, we consider the case when each f_i is a real-valued function of the form $f_i = \lambda_{\max}(\sum_{j=1}^n A^{i,j} x_j)$ where $A^{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{d \times d}$ is a *positive semidefinite* matrix, and $\lambda_{\max}(X)$ denotes the maximum eigenvalue of the matrix X . This gives rise to a semidefinite inequality system. We show in this case that $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) \leq O(n)^{2d+1}r|\mathcal{F}'|$, and consequently, if $d = \text{polylog}(\mathcal{L})$ then problem $GEN(\mathcal{F}')$ can be solved in quasi-polynomial time.

We give some motivating applications of these results in the next section. Proofs of the bounds claimed in (B4), (B5), (B6), (B7) and (B8) are given in Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, respectively. To simply our presentation, it will be enough to establish the bound for a single inequality:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) \leq t, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (5)$$

where we assume w.l.o.g. that $0 \leq t \leq f(\mathbf{c})$. Indeed, given a system (1), let us denote by \mathcal{F}_i is the set of maximal feasible solutions of the inequality $f_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq t_i$. Suppose that we manage to show that

$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_i)| \leq q_i(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|)$ for any $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}_i$. Then, for any subset $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of maximal feasible solutions of the system, a union bound can be applied to obtain

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| = \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^r (\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_i)) \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^r |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_i)| \leq \sum_{i=1}^r q_i(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|).$$

Thus, in deriving the stated bounds, we will focus on a single inequality in the system (1).

2 Some Applications

Fair allocation of goods. Consider a set of m agents and n types of indivisible goods (or items). We assume there is *unlimited* supply of each item. Each agent i demands at least t_i items to be allocated to it and its utility for receiving an allocation $\mathbf{x}^i := (x_{ij} \mid j \in [n])$ is given by the linear function $u_i(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_j a_{ij}x_{ij}$, where $x_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ is the number of goods of type j allocated to agent i . Given a threshold parameter t , we are interested in finding all minimal allocations satisfying the demand constraints and achieving a *Nash social welfare* of value at least t :

$$\left(\prod_{i=1}^m u_i(\mathbf{x}) \right)^{1/m} \geq t, \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_j x_{ij} \geq t_i, \quad \text{for } i \in [m], \quad (7)$$

$$\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{mn}.$$

This gives rise to a monotone system of inequalities, each of which is involving either a linear function or a product of linear functions. It follows from the result in (B5) that the family of minimal feasible solutions for this system is uniformly dual-bounded and hence can be enumerated in incremental quasi-polynomial time.

Chance-constrained multi-dimensional knapsack inequalities. Consider a system (1) where each $f_i(\mathbf{x}) := (\mathbf{w}^i)^\top \mathbf{x}$ is a linear function defined by a non-negative weight vector $\mathbf{w}^i \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The elements of $[n]$ can be interpreted as items to be packed into r knapsacks of capacities t_1, \dots, t_r , where w_j^i represents the size requirement of item j in knapsack i . In the stochastic version, each vector \mathbf{w}^i is drawn from a *multivariate normal* distribution with mean $\mathbf{a}^i \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma^i \in \mathbb{S}_+^{n \times n}$, i.e., $\mathbf{w}^i \sim N(\mathbf{a}^i, \Sigma^i)$. The requirement is to pack the items into the the knapsacks, such that the i th capacity constraint is satisfied with probability at least $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$:

$$\Pr[(\mathbf{w}^i)^\top \mathbf{x} \leq t_i] \geq \alpha_i, \quad \text{for } i \in [r], \quad (8)$$

$$\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n.$$

As $(\mathbf{w}^i)^\top \mathbf{x} \sim N((\mathbf{a}^i)^\top \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^\top \Sigma^i \mathbf{x})$, we can reformulate the constraints (8) as:

$$(\mathbf{a}^i)^\top \mathbf{x} + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \sqrt{\mathbf{x}^\top \Sigma^i \mathbf{x}} \leq t_i, \quad \text{for } i \in [r] := \{1, \dots, r\}, \quad (9)$$

$$\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n,$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ represents the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution. While the complexity of enumerating the family of maximal feasible solutions for (9), in general, remains open at this point, we can efficiently solve the problem in two special cases described below. In both cases, we assume that $\alpha_i \geq 0.5$ and hence $\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \geq 0$.

- **Fixed-rank case:** this is the case when the covariance matrices Σ^i have *completely positive* (cp) rank d_i , i.e., we can find matrices $A^i \in \mathbb{R}_+^{d_i \times n}$ such that $\Sigma^i = (A^i)^\top A^i$ (this is, for example, the

case when $\mathbf{w}^i = (A^i)^\top z + \mathbf{a}^i$, where $z_1, \dots, z_{d_i} \sim N(0, 1)$ are i.i.d.'s. In such a case, we can rewrite (9) as a second order cone program:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{a}^i)^\top \mathbf{x} + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \|A^i \mathbf{x}\| &\leq t_i, \quad \text{for } i \in [r] := \{1, \dots, r\}, \\ \mathbf{x} &\in \{0, 1\}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

It follows then from the result in (B7) that, when $\max_i d_i = O(1)$, then the maximal feasible solutions of (8) can be enumerated in quasi-polynomial time.

- **Ordered independent case:** this is the case when item sizes are independent: $A^i = D^i := \text{Diag}(d_1^i, \dots, d_n^i)$ is a full-rank *diagonal* matrix, and in addition, we are given permutations $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ s.t. for each $i \in [r]$:

$$a_{\sigma_i(1)}^i \geq \dots \geq a_{\sigma_i(n)}^i \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\sigma_i(1)}^i \geq \dots \geq d_{\sigma_i(n)}^i, \quad (11)$$

that is, in each knapsack, the means and standard deviations of the item sizes can be ordered in the same way (this is true, for example, when $w_j^i \sim N(a_j^i, 1)$ are independent). In this case, we can verify that the function $f_i(\mathbf{x}) := (\mathbf{a}^i)^\top \mathbf{x} + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \|A^i \mathbf{x}\| = (\mathbf{a}^i)^\top \mathbf{x} + \Phi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \sqrt{\sum_j (d_j^i)^2 x_j}$ is *2-monotonic* with permutation σ_i ; see the definition in Section 6. Indeed, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ and $k, j \in [n]$ with $k < j$, $\mathbf{x}_{\sigma_i(k)} = 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_{\sigma_i(j)} = 1$, it holds by (11) that

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}^{\sigma(k)} - \mathbf{1}^{\sigma(j)}) - f_i(\mathbf{x}) &= \\ &= a_{\sigma_i(k)}^i - a_{\sigma_i(j)}^i + \frac{\Phi^{-1}(\alpha_i) \left[(d_{\sigma_i(k)}^i)^2 - (d_{\sigma_i(j)}^i)^2 \right]}{\sqrt{\sum_{j' \neq j, k} (d_{j'}^i)^2 x_{j'} + (d_{\sigma_i(k)}^i)^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{j' \neq j, k} (d_{j'}^i)^2 x_{j'} + (d_{\sigma_i(j)}^i)^2}} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can use Lemma 7 below to derive the bound $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq rn |\mathcal{F}'|$ for any subset $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of the maximal feasible solutions for (9), and hence conclude that the latter family can be enumerated in quasi-polynomial time in this case. Note that the same argument does not work if the ordering property (11) does not hold.

Chance-constrained covering binary programs. In a similar setting as in the previous example, we are given n -dimensional normally distributed random vectors $\mathbf{w}^i \sim N(\mathbf{a}^i, \Sigma^i)$, for $i \in [r]$, and demands $t_1, \dots, t_r \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Here, w_j^i can be interpreted as the coverage value for the j th item with respect to the i th demand. The requirement is to select a subset of the items, such that the i th demand constraint is satisfied with probability at least $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[(\mathbf{w}^i)^\top \mathbf{x} \geq t_i] &\geq \alpha_i, \quad \text{for } i \in [r], \\ \mathbf{x} &\in \{0, 1\}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

As before, we can reformulate the constraints (8) as a second-order cone program:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{a}^i)^\top \mathbf{x} + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha_i) \sqrt{\mathbf{1}^\top \Sigma^i \mathbf{x}} &\geq t_i, \quad \text{for } i \in [r] := \{1, \dots, r\}, \\ \mathbf{x} &\in \{0, 1\}^n. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In the special case when the random variables are independent, that is, when $\Sigma^i := (D^i)^2 := \text{Diag}((d_1^i)^2, \dots, (d_n^i)^2)$ is a full-rank *diagonal* matrix, we can enumerate the family \mathcal{G} of minimal feasible solutions for the system (12) by using the result in (B4). Indeed, let

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}) := R_i - (\mathbf{a}^i)^\top (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{x}) - \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha_i) \|D^i (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{x})\|,$$

where $R_i := (\mathbf{a}^i)^\top \mathbf{1} + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha_i) \sqrt{\mathbf{1}^\top \Sigma^i \mathbf{1}}$, and $\mathbf{1}$ is n -dimensional the vector of all ones. Assume that $\alpha_i < 0.5$ and hence $\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha_i) > 0$. Then, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$ s.t. $x_j = 0$,

$$f_i(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}^j) - f_i(\mathbf{x}) = a_j^i + \frac{\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha_i) (d_j^i)^2}{\sqrt{\sum_{j' \neq j} (d_{j'}^i)^2 (1 - x_{j'}) + (d_j^i)^2} + \sqrt{\sum_{j' \neq j} (d_{j'}^i)^2 (1 - x_{j'})}}, \quad (14)$$

which is monotone increasing \mathbf{x} . Supermodularity follows. Next we bound the traction τ_i and maximum range R_i of each f_i . From (14), we get $\tau_i \geq \min \left\{ a_{\min}, \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha_i) \frac{d_{\min}^2}{2\sqrt{nd_{\max}}} \right\}$, where $a_{\min} = \min_{i,j} \{a_j^i \mid a_j^i > 0\}$, $d_{\min} = \min_{i,j} \{d_j^i \mid d_j^i > 0\}$ and $d_{\max} = \max_{i,j} d_j^i$. Similarly, we have $R_i \leq na_{\max} + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha_i) \sqrt{nd_{\max}}$. It follows from the result in (B4) that if $\frac{a_{\max}}{a_{\min}}$, $\frac{d_{\max}}{d_{\min}}$ and $\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha_i)$ are bounded by polynomials in n , then all minimal feasible solutions of the system (12) can be enumerated in quasi-polynomial time.

Quantum hypergraph covers. A quantum hypergraph [AW02, WX08] is a pair $\mathcal{H} = (V, E)$ where $V \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d$ is a d -dimensional Hilbert space and $E := \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ is a finite set of Hermitian matrices, such that $0 \preceq A_j \preceq \mathbf{I}_d$, where \mathbf{I}_d is the d -dimensional identity matrix in \mathbb{C}^d and " \succeq " is the Löwner (partial) order on matrices: $A \succeq B$ if and only if $A - B$ is positive semidefinite. A *cover* of \mathcal{H} is a subset $E' \subseteq E$ of edges such that $\sum_{j \in E'} A_j \succeq \mathbf{I}_d$. This notion arises in the area of quantum information theory [AW02]. Note that a minimal quantum hypergraph cover is a minimal feasible solution for the inequality:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n A_j x_j \succeq \mathbf{I}_d, \quad (15)$$

$$\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n.$$

Assuming feasibility of (15), we must have $T := \sum_{j=1}^n A_j x_j - \mathbf{I}_d \succeq 0$. It follows then that the minimal quantum hypergraph covers are in one-to-one correspondence with the maximal feasible binary solutions for the inequality $\sum_{j=1}^n A_j x_j \preceq T$, which is of the form considered in (B8). It is not difficult to see that the result in (B8) can be extended to the case when the matrices $A^{i,j}$ are Hermitian positive semidefinite, while only increasing the dual bound by a factor of at most 2 in the exponent (that is, we get $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) \leq O(n)^{4d+1} r^{|\mathcal{F}'|}$). We conclude that, if the dimension d is fixed, then all minimal covers for a quantum hypergraph can be enumerated in quasi-polynomial time.

3 Supermodular Inequalities

Given a function $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, one can check if f is supermodular using the following statement, generalizing the well-known characterization of supermodular functions over the Boolean cube [Lov83].

Proposition 1. *A function $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is supermodular if and only if, for any $j \in [n]$, for any $z \in \mathcal{C}_j \setminus \{c_j\}$, and for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_{j-1} \times \{z\} \times \mathcal{C}_{j+1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_k$, the difference*

$$\partial_f(\mathbf{x}, j, z) := f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}^j) - f(\mathbf{x}),$$

is monotone in \mathbf{x} .

We include the proof in the appendix for completeness. Define the "traction" of f , denoted by $\tau(f)$, to be the minimum possible positive increase in f corresponding to a minimal change in the variables:

$$\tau(f) := \min_{\substack{j \in [n], \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}, x_j < c_j \\ f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}^j) > f(\mathbf{x})}} f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}^j) - f(\mathbf{x}). \quad (16)$$

Consider a monotone inequality (5), where the function f is supermodular, and let \mathcal{F} denote the family of all its maximal vectors. We can extend the result in [BEGK03] as follows.

Theorem 1. *Consider the inequality (5) and suppose that $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is a monotone supermodular function with traction τ and maximum range $R := f(\mathbf{c})$. Then for any subset $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of size $|\mathcal{F}'| \geq 2$, it holds that*

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq |\mathcal{F}'|^{\mathcal{O}(\log \frac{R-t}{\tau})}. \quad (17)$$

Proof. Given $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$, we follow the proof in [BEGK03] by constructing a binary tree \mathbf{T} , in which each leaf $l \in L(\mathbf{T})$ is mapped to an element $\mathbf{x}^l \in \mathcal{X}$, and each internal node v is associated with the element $\mathbf{x}^v = \bigvee_{l \in L(\mathbf{T}(v))} \mathbf{x}^l$; here, $\mathbf{T}(v)$ denotes the binary sub-tree of \mathbf{T} rooted at node v , and $L(\mathbf{T}')$ denotes the set of leaves of the subtree \mathbf{T}' . Such a mapping $\phi : L(\mathbf{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ is said to be *proper* if it assigns different elements to different leaves, and if $f(\mathbf{x}^u \wedge \mathbf{x}^v) \leq t$ whenever u and v are incomparable nodes of \mathbf{T} (that is, when the sub-trees $\mathbf{T}(u)$ and $\mathbf{T}(v)$ are disjoint). As shown in [BEGK03], a sufficiently large binary tree admitting a proper mapping can always be constructed:

Lemma 2 (Lemma 11 in [BEGK03]). *Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be an antichain of size $|\mathcal{A}| \geq 2$ in integral box \mathcal{C} and let $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$. Then there exists a binary tree \mathbf{T} and a proper mapping $\phi : L(\mathbf{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that $|L(\mathbf{T})| \geq |\mathcal{B}|^{1/o(\log |\mathcal{A}|)}$.*

To prove the theorem, we consider a partition of $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}' \cup \mathcal{X}''$, where $\mathcal{X}' := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} : f(\mathbf{x}) \geq t + \frac{\tau}{2}\} \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}')$ and $\mathcal{X}'' := \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}' \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}')$, and proper mappings $\phi' : L(\mathbf{T}') \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$ and $\phi'' : L(\mathbf{T}'') \rightarrow \mathcal{X}''$ as guaranteed by Lemma 2. Consequently, the theorem follows from the following extension of Lemma 1 in [BEGK03].

Lemma 3. *Given binary trees \mathbf{T}' and \mathbf{T}'' and proper mappings ϕ' and ϕ'' as above, we have*

$$|L(\mathbf{T}')| \leq \frac{2(R-t)}{\tau} \text{ and } |L(\mathbf{T}'')| \leq \frac{2(R-t)}{\tau} + 1. \quad (18)$$

Proof. Consider first the tree \mathbf{T}' and the mapping ϕ' . We show by induction that

$$f(\mathbf{x}^w) \geq t + \frac{\tau}{2}|L(\mathbf{T}'(w))|. \quad (19)$$

holds for every node w of the binary tree \mathbf{T}' . Since $f(\mathbf{x}^w) \leq R$, it follows that

$$|L(\mathbf{T}'(w))| \leq \frac{2(R-t)}{\tau}$$

which, if applied to the root of \mathbf{T}' , proves the first part of the lemma. To see (19), let us apply (backward) induction on the level of the node w in \mathbf{T}' . Clearly, if $w = l$ is a leaf of \mathbf{T}' , then $|L(\mathbf{T}'(l))| = 1$, and (19) follows by the assumption that $\mathbf{x}^l \in \mathcal{X}'$. Let us assume now that w is a node of \mathbf{T}' with u and v as its immediate successors. Then $|L(\mathbf{T}'(w))| = |L(\mathbf{T}'(u))| + |L(\mathbf{T}'(v))|$, and $\mathbf{x}^w = \mathbf{x}^u \vee \mathbf{x}^v$. By our inductive hypothesis, and since f is supermodular and $f(\mathbf{x}^u \wedge \mathbf{x}^v) \leq t$, we have the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}^u \vee \mathbf{x}^v) &\geq f(\mathbf{x}^u) + f(\mathbf{x}^v) - f(\mathbf{x}^u \wedge \mathbf{x}^v) \\ &\geq t + \frac{\tau}{2}|L(\mathbf{T}'(u))| + t + \frac{\tau}{2}|L(\mathbf{T}'(v))| - t \\ &= t + \frac{\tau}{2}|L(\mathbf{T}'(w))|. \end{aligned}$$

Consider next the tree \mathbf{T}'' and the mapping ϕ'' . We prove by induction that

$$f(\mathbf{x}^w) \geq t - \frac{\tau}{2} + \frac{\tau}{2}|L(\mathbf{T}''(w))|. \quad (20)$$

holds for every node w of the binary tree \mathbf{T}'' . If $w = l$ is a leaf node, then (20) holds as $|L(\mathbf{T}''(l))| = 1$, and $f(\mathbf{x}^l) > t$. If w is a node of \mathbf{T}'' with as immediate successors u and v , then (as $f(\mathbf{x}^u) > t$ and $f(\mathbf{x}^v) > t$ while $f(\mathbf{x}^u \wedge \mathbf{x}^v) \leq t$), there must exist a $j \in [n]$ such that $\mathbf{x}^u \wedge \mathbf{x}^v \leq \mathbf{x}^v - \mathbf{1}^j$. The definition of τ and the fact that $\mathbf{x}^v \in \mathcal{X}''$ imply that $f(\mathbf{x}^v - \mathbf{1}^j) \leq f(\mathbf{x}^v) - \tau < t + \frac{\tau}{2} - \tau = t - \frac{\tau}{2}$. It follows from this and the inductive hypothesis that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}^u \vee \mathbf{x}^v) &\geq f(\mathbf{x}^u) + f(\mathbf{x}^v) - f(\mathbf{x}^u \wedge \mathbf{x}^v) \\ &\geq f(\mathbf{x}^u) + f(\mathbf{x}^v) - f(\mathbf{x}^v - \mathbf{1}^j) \\ &\geq t - \frac{\tau}{2} + \frac{\tau}{2}|L(\mathbf{T}''(u))| + t - \frac{\tau}{2} + \frac{\tau}{2}|L(\mathbf{T}''(v))| - (t + \frac{\tau}{2}) \\ &= t - \frac{\tau}{2} + \frac{\tau}{2}|L(\mathbf{T}''(w))|. \end{aligned}$$

Applying (20) to the root of \mathbf{T}'' establishes the second part of the lemma. \square

It follows from the above two lemmas that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| &= |\mathcal{X}'| + |\mathcal{X}''| \leq |L(\mathbf{T}')|^{o(\log |\mathcal{F}'|)} + |L(\mathbf{T}'')|^{o(\log |\mathcal{F}'|)} \\ &\leq 2 \left(\frac{2(R-t)}{\tau} + 1 \right)^{o(\log |\mathcal{F}'|)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

4 Products of Affine Functions

Let $p_1, \dots, p_m : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ be affine functions given in the form: $p_k(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{a}^k)^\top \mathbf{x} + a_0^k$, where $\mathbf{a}^k \in \mathbb{Q}_+^n$ are given vectors and $a_0^k \in \mathbb{Q}_+$ are given numbers. Given $t \in \mathbb{Q}_+$, we are interested in enumerating the family \mathcal{G} of all *minimal feasible* vectors for the inequality $g(\mathbf{x}) \geq t$ over $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, where $g(\mathbf{x}) := \prod_{k=1}^m p_k(\mathbf{x})$. We may assume without loss of generality that $\mathbf{a}_j^k, t \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for all k, j . Although $g(\mathbf{x})$ defines a polynomial, we cannot (directly) apply the result in (B6) since the number of terms s (and possibly also the maximum degree d) is exponential in m . Instead, we consider the function

$$f(\mathbf{x}) := R - \sum_{k=1}^m \log \bar{p}_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}),$$

where $R := \sum_{k=1}^m \log \bar{p}_k(\mathbf{c})$, $\bar{p}_k(\mathbf{x}) := p_k(\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon$, and

$$\epsilon := \frac{1}{2m(1 + \max_k p_k(\mathbf{c}))^{m-1}} \quad (21)$$

is a sufficiently small perturbation parameter that is needed to insure that the range of the function f remains bounded (which might fail to hold without perturbation when $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{c}$). It is not difficult to see that the family \mathcal{F} of maximal feasible solutions for the inequality $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq t' := R - \log t$ is in one-to-one correspondence with \mathcal{G} . Indeed, given \mathbf{x} such $g(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}) \geq t$, it is immediate that $R - \sum_{k=1}^m \log \bar{p}_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}) \leq t'$, as $\bar{p}_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}) \geq p_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x})$. Conversely, given \mathbf{x} such that $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq t'$, it holds that $\prod_{k=1}^m \bar{p}_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}) \geq t$. As

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{k=1}^m \bar{p}_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}) &= \prod_{k=1}^m p_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}) + \epsilon \cdot \sum_{S \subseteq [m] : |S| < m} \epsilon^{m-1-|S|} \prod_{k \in S} p_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}) \\ &\leq \prod_{k=1}^m p_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}) + \epsilon \cdot m(\epsilon + \max_k p_k(\mathbf{c}))^{m-1}, \end{aligned}$$

we get by our choice (21) of ϵ that $\prod_{k=1}^m p_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}) \geq t - \frac{1}{2}$, which in turn implies that $g(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x}) \geq t$ by the integrality assumption.

To enumerate the elements of \mathcal{F} in quasi-polynomial time, it would be enough by (B4) to show that the function f is supermodular and to bound both the inverse of the traction τ of f and the difference $f(\mathbf{c}) - t'$ by polynomials in the input size. To see that f is supermodular, we apply Proposition 1. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ with $x_j < c_j$, we have

$$f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}^j) - f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_k \log \frac{\bar{p}_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x})}{\bar{p}_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{1}^j)} = \log \left(1 + \frac{a_j^k}{p_k(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{1}^j) + \epsilon} \right), \quad (22)$$

which is monotone increasing in \mathbf{x} .

It follows also from (22) that the traction of f can be bounded from below by

$$\min_{k, j \mid a_j^k > 0} \log \left(\frac{a_j^k}{(\mathbf{a}^k)^\top \mathbf{c} + a_0^k + \epsilon} \right) \geq \frac{1}{\mathcal{L}},$$

where \mathcal{L} is the total encoding length of the coefficients of the given functions. It remains to bound the difference $f(\mathbf{c}) - t'$, which can be done as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{c}) - t' &= \log t - \sum_k \log(p_k(0) + \epsilon) \leq \log t + m \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \\ &\leq \log t + m^2 \log(2m(1 + \max_k p_k(\mathbf{c}))) = O(\mathcal{L}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we arrive at the following result.

Corollary 1. *Consider an inequality $\prod_{k=1}^m p_k(\mathbf{x}) \geq t$ where each $p_k : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_+$ is an affine function. Then for any subset $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ of the family \mathcal{G} of minimal feasible solutions of size $|\mathcal{G}'| \geq 2$, it holds that*

$$|\mathcal{I}^{-1}(\mathcal{G}') \cap \mathcal{I}^{-1}(\mathcal{G})| \leq |\mathcal{G}'|^{o(\log \mathcal{L})}, \quad (23)$$

where \mathcal{L} is the total encoding length of the coefficients of the given functions.

It is worth noting that the enumeration of minimal feasible solutions for a single inequality involving a product of linear functions over binary vectors is as hard as (and hence polynomially equivalent to) the well known *hypergraph transversal problem* for which the best currently known algorithm is quasi-polynomial [FK96]. Indeed minimal transversals of a given hypergraph $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ correspond (one-to-one) to the minimal feasible solutions of the inequality $\prod_{H \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i \in H} x_i \geq 1$, over $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

5 Separable Monotone Functions and Polynomial Inequalities

A monotone function $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be *separable* if $f(\mathbf{x})$ can be written as the product of single-variable non-negative monotone functions. For instance, a polynomial function of the form (2) is the sum of separable monotone functions. A single-variable function $g : \{0, 1, \dots, u\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is said to be *discretely convex* if for all $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,

$$\lambda g(x) + (1 - \lambda)g(y) \geq \min_{u \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : |\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y - u| \leq 1} g(u).$$

A sufficient condition and necessary condition for discrete convexity is that (see, e.g., [Yüc02]) the difference $\partial_g(x) = g(x + 1) - g(x)$ is monotone in x .

Let $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the sum of separable monotone functions, that is,

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} a_H \prod_{j \in H} f_j^H(x_j), \quad \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}, \quad (24)$$

where $\mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is a given multiset family (repetitions allowed), $f_j^H : \mathbb{Z}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ are non-negative discretely convex monotone functions and $a_H > 0$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

Applying Proposition 1 to the function f defined in (24), we see that a sufficient condition for f to be supermodular is that the difference function $\partial_{f_j^H}(x_j, j, z)$ is monotone in x_j , or equivalently, f_j^H is discretely convex, for all $j \in [n]$, as

$$\partial_f(\mathbf{x}, j, z) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid j \in H} a_H (f_j^H(x_j + 1) - f_j^H(x_j)) \prod_{j' \in H \setminus \{j\}} f_{j'}^H(x_{j'})$$

is monotone whenever $\partial_{f_j^H}(x_j, j, z) = f_j(x_j + 1) - f_j(x_j)$ is monotone in x_j . As a corollary of this and the bound mentioned in (B1) above, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 2. *Consider the inequality (5) and suppose that the function $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ has traction τ and maximum value $R := f(\mathbf{c}) \geq t$, and is the sum of discretely convex separable monotone functions of the form (24), defined by a multiset family \mathcal{H} . Then for any $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ of size $|\mathcal{F}'| \geq 2$, it holds that*

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq |\mathcal{F}'|^{o(\log \frac{R-t}{\tau})}. \quad (25)$$

When the function f is integer-valued, we can drop the requirement of discrete convexity. In fact, in this case, the bound in Proposition 2 can be improved as follows.

Theorem 4. *Consider the inequality (5) and suppose that $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, R\}$ is the sum of separable monotone functions $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} a_H \prod_{j \in H} f_j^H(x_j)$ defined by a multiset family \mathcal{H} , such that each $f_j^H : \mathcal{C}_j \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, R\}$ is monotone for all $j \in H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $a_H \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Then for any non-empty subset $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, it holds that*

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq (R - t)|\mathcal{F}'|. \quad (26)$$

To prove Theorem 4, we consider the class of functions having non-negative Möbius coefficients. Recall that the Möbius function $\mu : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \mapsto \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is given by (see, e.g., [Bud88]):

$$\mu(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{|S|} & \text{if } \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{1}^S \text{ for some } S \subseteq [n] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

for $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{C}$, where $\mathbf{1}^S \in \{0, 1\}^n$ is the vector having $\mathbf{1}_j^S = 1$ if and only if $j \in S$. Given a function $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ and an $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$, the Möbius inversion formula enables us to express $f(\mathbf{x})$ as the sum of Möbius coefficients $\hat{f}(\mathbf{y})$ of all elements $\mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{x}$:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{x}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}) \iff \hat{f}(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{y}} f(\mathbf{z})\mu(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}). \quad (28)$$

Proposition 3. *Suppose $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, R\}$ is the sum of separable monotone functions: $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} a_H \prod_{j \in H} f_j^H(x_j)$, where $f_j^H : \mathcal{C}_j \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, R\}$ is a monotone function and $a_H \geq 0$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Then $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Consider a term $g_H(\mathbf{x}) := \prod_{j \in H} f_j^H(x_j)$. If $x_j > 0$ for some $j \notin H$, we have $\hat{g}_H(\mathbf{x}) = 0$. Otherwise,

$$\hat{g}_H(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S \subseteq H} (-1)^{|S|} g_H(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{1}^S) = \sum_{S \subseteq H} (-1)^{|S|} \prod_{j \in H} f_j^H(x_j - \mathbf{1}^S_j) = \prod_{j \in H} [f_j^H(x_j) - f_j^H(x_j - 1)],$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$, where we assume $f_j^H(-1) := 0$ for all $j \in H$. The non-negativity of $\hat{g}_H(\mathbf{x})$ follows from the monotonicity of f_j^H . By the linearity of the Möbius transform, it follows then that $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_i} a_H \hat{g}_H(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. The theorem follows from the following intersection inequality from [BGKM04]:

Lemma 5 (Intersection Lemma [BGKM04]). *Let $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \subseteq 2^U$ be two families of subsets of a given set U , and let $w : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a given non-negative weight function on U . Suppose \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} are threshold separable, i.e., there are real thresholds $t_1 < t_2$, such that $w(T) \leq t_1$, for all $T \in \mathcal{T}$, and $w(S) \geq t_2$, for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$, where $w(X) = \sum_{v \in X} w(v)$ for $X \subseteq U$. Suppose further that $|\mathcal{S}| \geq 2$ and \mathcal{T} covers all pairwise intersections of \mathcal{S} , i.e., for all $S, S' \in \mathcal{S}$, $S \neq S'$, there exists a $T \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $S \cap S' \subseteq T$. Then*

- (i) $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} |U \setminus T|$,
- (ii) $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \frac{w(U) - t_1}{t_2 - t_1} |\mathcal{T}|$.

The proof of part (i) of Lemma 5 was given in [BGKM04]. The proof of part (ii) for the unweighted case (i.e., $w(u) = 1$ for all $u \in U$) was given (for a weaker inequality) in [BGKM00]. We include the proof of the weighted case of part (ii) in the appendix for completeness.

Now to prove Theorem 4, we let $\mathcal{Y} := \mathcal{F}'$, $\mathcal{X} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Y}) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$, and consider the (one-to-one) monotonic mapping $\phi : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathcal{C}^2$ defined by: $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{C} \mid \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{x}\}$. Let $U := \mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{S} := \{\phi(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in$

\mathcal{X} }, and $\mathcal{T} := \{\phi(\mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. Thus with respect to the non-negative weight function $w \equiv \hat{f} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, we obtain the threshold separability

$$\begin{aligned} w(\phi(\mathbf{x})) &= \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{x}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{z}) = f(\mathbf{x}) \geq t_2 := t + 1, \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X}; \\ w(\phi(\mathbf{y})) &= \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{y}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{z}) = f(\mathbf{y}) \leq t_1 := t, \text{ for all } y \in \mathcal{Y}, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} . If $|\mathcal{X}| = |\mathcal{S}| = 1$, then $|\mathcal{X}| \leq (f(\mathbf{u}) - t)|\mathcal{Y}|$ holds, for otherwise we get the contradiction $t + 1 \leq f(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{u}) \leq t$, for the element $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$. Let us assume therefore that $|\mathcal{S}| \geq 2$, and observe that \mathcal{T} covers all pairwise intersections of \mathcal{S} : for any two distinct elements $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}$, it follows by $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Y})$ that there is a $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{x}' \leq \mathbf{y}$, and therefore, we get

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) \cap \phi(\mathbf{x}') = \phi(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{x}') \subseteq \phi(\mathbf{y}).$$

Now we apply Lemma 5(ii) to get

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| = |\mathcal{S}| \leq \left(\sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{u}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{z}) - t_i \right) |\mathcal{T}| = (f(\mathbf{u}) - t)|\mathcal{Y}|.$$

□

Theorem 4 implies that, if the threshold t is sufficiently close to the maximum value of f , then the enumeration problem can be solved in quasi-polynomial time. In the other extreme case, when each $t = \text{poly}(\mathcal{L})$ is sufficiently far from the maximum value, we can improve the bound in Theorem 4 (with slightly some more restrictions on the functions f_j^H) as follows.

Theorem 6. Consider the inequality (5) and suppose that $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, R\}$ is the sum of separable monotone functions $f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} a_H \prod_{j \in H} f_j^H(x_j)$ defined by a (non-empty) multiset family \mathcal{H} , such that each $f_j^H : \mathcal{C}_j \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, R\}$ is monotone with $f_j^H(0) = 0$ and $f_j^H(1) \geq 1$, for all $j \in H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $a_H \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Then for any non-empty subset $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, it holds that

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq (|\mathcal{H}| + (1 + (1 + \Delta)n)(t + 1)|\mathcal{F}'|) |\mathcal{F}'|, \quad (30)$$

where $\Delta := \max_{j \in H \in \mathcal{H}, x \in \mathcal{C}_j \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\partial_{f_j^H}(x)}{f_j^H(x)}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{Y} := \mathcal{F}'$, $\mathcal{X} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Y}) \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$. We consider a partition of $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2$, where $\mathcal{X}_1 := \mathcal{X} \cap \{0, 1\}^n$ and $\mathcal{X}_2 := \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_1$, and define $\mathcal{Y}_1 := \{\mathbf{y} \wedge \mathbf{1} \mid \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}\}$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is the vector of all ones. We first bound the size of \mathcal{X}_1 . Let $U := \mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{S} := \{\phi(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_1\}$, and $\mathcal{T} := \{\phi(\mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_1\}$, where the monotonic mapping $\phi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{H}}$ is defined by: $\phi(\mathbf{x}) := \{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid \mathbf{1}^H \leq \mathbf{x}\}$. Note that our assumptions imply that, for $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$,

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}} a_H \prod_{j \in H} f_j^H(1) \prod_{j \in H} x_j = \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} : \mathbf{1}^H \leq \mathbf{x}} a_H \prod_{j \in H} f_j^H(1).$$

Thus with respect to the non-negative weight function $w : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, defined by $w(H) := \prod_{j \in H} f_j^H(1)$ for $H \in \mathcal{H}$, we obtain the threshold separability

$$w(\phi(\mathbf{x})) = f_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq t + 1, \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{X}_1; \quad w(\phi(\mathbf{y})) = f_i(\mathbf{y}) \leq t, \text{ for all } y \in \mathcal{Y}_1,$$

of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} . Observe that \mathcal{T} covers all pairwise intersections of \mathcal{S} : for any two distinct elements $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{X}_1$, it follows by $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Y}) \cap \{0, 1\}^n$ that there is a $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_1$ such that $\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{x}' \leq \mathbf{y}$, and therefore, we get

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}) \cap \phi(\mathbf{x}') = \phi(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{x}') \subseteq \phi(\mathbf{y}). \quad (31)$$

Threshold separability together with (31) also implies that $|\mathcal{S}| = |\mathcal{X}_1|$. If $|\mathcal{S}| = |\mathcal{X}_1| = 1$, then $|\mathcal{S}| \leq |\mathcal{H}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}|$ holds by the non-emptiness of \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{Y} . Let us assume therefore that $|\mathcal{S}| \geq 2$, and apply Lemma 5(i) to get

$$|\mathcal{X}_1| = |\mathcal{S}| \leq \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_1} |\mathcal{H} \setminus \phi(\mathbf{y})| \leq |\mathcal{H}| \cdot |\mathcal{Y}|. \quad (32)$$

Next, we will show that

$$|\mathcal{X}_2| \leq (1 + (1 + \Delta)n)(t + 1)|\mathcal{Y}|^2, \quad (33)$$

which together with (32) would imply the theorem. To see (33), we consider the monotonic mapping $\phi : \mathcal{C} \mapsto 2^{\mathcal{C}}$ defined by: $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{C} \mid \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{x}\}$. Let $\mathcal{S} := \{\phi(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_2\}$ and $\mathcal{T} := \{\phi(\mathbf{y}) \mid \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}\}$. By definition of \mathcal{X}_2 , for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_2$, there exists a $j = j^{\mathbf{x}} \in [n]$ such that $x_j > 1$. As $\mathcal{X}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{Y})$, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_2$, there is a $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{Y}$ satisfying $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{1}^{j^{\mathbf{x}}} \leq \mathbf{y}$. It is important for the following argument to note that $y_j^{\mathbf{x}} \geq 1$ (and hence $f_j^H(y_j^{\mathbf{x}}) \geq 1$), for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_2$ and $j = j^{\mathbf{x}}$, as this implies that, for $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{x}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{1}^j) &= f(\mathbf{y}) + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid j \in H} a_H (f_j^H(y_j + 1) - f_j^H(y_j)) \prod_{j' \in H \setminus \{j\}} f_{j'}^H(y_{j'}) \\ &= f(\mathbf{y}) + \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid j \in H} a_H \frac{f_j^H(y_j + 1) - f_j^H(y_j)}{f_j^H(y_j)} \prod_{j' \in H} f_{j'}^H(y_{j'}) \\ &\leq f(\mathbf{y}) + \Delta \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H} \mid j \in H} a_H \prod_{j' \in H} f_{j'}^H(y_{j'}) \leq f(\mathbf{y}) + \Delta f(\mathbf{y}) \leq (1 + \Delta)t. \end{aligned}$$

Define $\mathcal{Y}_2 := \{\mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{x}} + \mathbf{1}^{j^{\mathbf{x}}} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_2\}$, and $U := \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{C} \mid \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{y} \text{ for } \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y} \cup \mathcal{Y}_2\}$. The definition of U and the monotonicity of the mapping ϕ imply that $\phi(\mathbf{x}), \phi(\mathbf{y}) \subseteq U$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}_2$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}$. Note also that $|\mathcal{Y}_2| \leq n|\mathcal{Y}|$.

Now we proceed in a way similar to the proof of Theorem 4. We apply Lemma 5(ii) using the non-negative weight function $w \equiv \hat{f} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, and the threshold separability (29) of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} . If $|\mathcal{X}_2| = |\mathcal{S}| = 1$, then (33) holds trivially. Thus we may assume that $|\mathcal{S}| \geq 2$, and observe again that \mathcal{T} covers all pairwise intersections of \mathcal{S} . Applying the lemma, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{X}_2| = |\mathcal{S}| &\leq \left(\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in U} \hat{f}(\mathbf{z}) - t_i \right) |\mathcal{T}| \leq \left(\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{y}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{z}) + \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_2} \sum_{\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{z} \leq \mathbf{y}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{z}) - t \right) |\mathcal{T}| \\ &= \left(\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}} f(\mathbf{y}) + \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}_2} f(\mathbf{y}) - t \right) |\mathcal{T}| \leq (t|\mathcal{Y}| + (1 + \Delta)t|\mathcal{Y}_2| - t) |\mathcal{T}| \\ &\leq ((1 + (1 + \Delta)n)|\mathcal{Y}| - 1)t|\mathcal{Y}|, \end{aligned}$$

establishing (33). □

Applying Theorem 6 to a polynomial function of the form (2) with $f_j^H(x_j) := x_j^{d_{H,j}}$ and noting that $\max_{x \in \mathcal{C}_j \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\partial_j^H(x)}{f_j^H(x)} \leq \max_{x \geq 1} \frac{(x+1)^{d_{H,j}}}{x^{d_{H,j}}} - 1 = 2^{d_{H,j}} - 1$, we arrive at the following result.

Corollary 2. *Consider the inequality (5) and suppose that the function $f : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, R\}$ is a polynomial of the form (2) defined by a (non-empty) multiset family \mathcal{H} , and coefficients $a_H \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ for $H \in \mathcal{H}$. Then for any non-empty subset $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, it holds that*

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq \min \left\{ R - t, |\mathcal{H}| + (1 + 2^d n)(t + 1)|\mathcal{F}'| \right\} |\mathcal{F}'|. \quad (34)$$

where $d := \max_{j \in H \in \mathcal{H}} d_{H,j}$.

Note that, unlike the result in Corollary 2, the result in (B3) requires the *total* degree in each monomial to be bounded by a constant (but without any restriction on t) to guarantee quasi-polynomial enumeration.

We complement Corollary 2 with the following negative result, which shows that the polynomial dependence on $|\mathcal{H}|$ in the bound (34) is necessary.

Proposition 4. *There exists a polynomially computable polynomial function $f : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, for which problem $\text{GEN}(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}')$ of incrementally generating the maximal feasible solutions of the inequality $f(x) \leq 0$ is NP-hard.*

Proof. The result follows from the following reduction from the so-called *relay cuts* enumeration problem in a relay circuit with two terminals. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with vertex set V and edge set E , and two distinguished vertices $s, t \in V$. To each edge in $e \in E$, is assigned a relay $j(e) \in [n]$ from a given set of relays $[n]$ (two or more distinct edges may be assigned identical relays). Let \mathcal{F} be the family of all minimal s - t *relay cuts*, i.e., minimal subsets of relays that disconnect s and t . It is known that the problem of incrementally generating \mathcal{F} is NP-hard, see [GK99]. We define a polynomial $f : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ as follows. Let \mathcal{P} be the set of (not necessarily simple) paths between s and t of length $|V|$ in G . We associate a variable x_j to each relay $j \in [n]$, and for $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, we let

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \prod_{e \in P} x_{j(e)}. \quad (35)$$

Given $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$, we can compute $f(\mathbf{x})$ in polynomial time (this requires only computing the n^{th} power of the adjacency matrix of the graph $G(\mathbf{x})$ obtained from G by deleting all edges e with $x_{j(e)} = 0$). In fact, checking the feasibility of \mathbf{x} is equivalent to checking if there is an s - t path in $G(\mathbf{x})$. This gives a polynomial time evaluation oracle for f . Finally, note that minimal s - t relay cuts are exactly the complements of the maximal feasible solutions \mathcal{F} of the polynomial inequality $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$. \square

Note that the value of $|\mathcal{H}|$ in the NP-hardness construction above is exponential in n . Whether a bound of the form (34) that is independent of t (as in the Boolean case [BGKM04], where it is known that $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq |\mathcal{H}| \cdot |\mathcal{F}'|$) exists remains an interesting open question.

6 Second-order Cone Inequalities

For a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, denote by $\|\mathbf{v}\|$ the ℓ_2 norm of \mathbf{v} . Consider the monotone second-order cone inequality:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) := \|A\mathbf{x}\| + \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{x} \leq t, \quad (36)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{d \times n}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ are given matrix and vector. In the special case when $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$, we can derive the following bound using (B3) as (36) reduced to a quadratic inequality.

Proposition 5. *Let \mathcal{F} be the set of maximal feasible vectors for (36), where $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$. Then, for any non-empty $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, it holds that*

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq 2n^2(2|\mathcal{F}'| + 1)^2. \quad (37)$$

Proof. When $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$, we can write the inequality in (36) as $(f(\mathbf{x}))^2 \leq t^2$, where $(f(\mathbf{x}))^2 = \mathbf{x}^\top A^\top A \mathbf{x}$ is a quadratic function with non-negative coefficients. It follows from (B3) (with $s = n^2$ and $p = 2$) that $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq 2n^2(2|\mathcal{F}'| + 1)^2$. \square

When some $\mathbf{b} \neq \mathbf{0}$, the above argument does not work². To bound the number of infeasible vectors for (36), we use a different argument based on a *semi-infinite linear* formulation of (36).

Denote by $\mathbb{B}_+^d(0, 1) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^d : \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1\}$ the non-negative half of the d -dimensional unit ball centered at the origin. We can rewrite (36) in the following equivalent form:

$$f_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{u}^\top A\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{x} \leq t, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}_+^d(0, 1). \quad (38)$$

As (38) is a (semi-infinite) monotone system of linear inequalities, we may be tempted to apply the result in (B2) for a single inequality and then take a union bound. However, as the number of inequalities in (38) is infinite and the union is taken over an *uncountable* set, the union bound does not hold³. Instead, we argue that we can take the union bound only over $O(n^d)$ inequalities. To see this, we first recall the following definition and a lemma.

A monotone function $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is called *2-monotonic* if there exists a permutation $\sigma : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ such that, for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}$ and $k, j \in [n]$ with $k < j$, $\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(k)} < c_{\sigma(k)}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{\sigma(j)} > 0$, it holds that $f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}^{\sigma(k)} - \mathbf{1}^{\sigma(j)}) \geq f(\mathbf{x})$. For instance, if $f(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_j^n w_j x_j$ is a linear function with non-negative coefficients (i.e., $\mathbf{w} \geq 0$), then f is 2-monotonic (with $\sigma = \sigma_{\mathbf{w}}$ being a permutation satisfying $w_{\sigma(1)} \geq w_{\sigma(2)} \geq \dots \geq w_{\sigma(n)}$).

Lemma 7 ([Cra87, BEG⁺02]). *Consider the system (1) and suppose that each function $f_i : \mathcal{C} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is a 2-monotonic function as verified by a permutation $\sigma_i : [n] \rightarrow [n]$. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of maximal feasible vectors for (1). Then for any non-empty subset $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, it holds that*

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq r' \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}'} q(\mathbf{y}), \quad (39)$$

where r' is the number of distinct permutations among $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$ and $q(\mathbf{y}) := |\{j \in [n] : y_j < c_j\}|$.

We give the proof in the appendix for completeness. We will also need the following geometric fact.

Fact 1 (see, e.g., [Mat02]). *Any arrangement of m d -dimensional hyperplanes partitions \mathbb{R}^d into at most $\Phi_d(m) := \sum_{i=0}^d \binom{m}{i} \leq \left(\frac{em}{d}\right)^d$ maximal connected regions not intersected by any of the hyperplanes (called *cells of the arrangement*).*

We are now ready to prove Theorem 8.

Theorem 8. *Let \mathcal{F} be the set of maximal feasible vectors for (36). Then for any non-empty subset $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, it holds that*

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq \Phi_d(n(n-1)/2)n|\mathcal{F}'| = O(n)^{2d+1}|\mathcal{F}'|. \quad (40)$$

Proof. For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}_+^d(0, 1)$, let $\mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{u}} := A^\top \mathbf{u} + \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}$ be the set of maximal feasible solutions for the inequality $f_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{u}})^\top \mathbf{x} \leq t_i$. By Lemma 7, it is enough to show that the number of distinct permutations defined by the set of weights $\{\mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}_+^d(0, 1)\}$ is at most $\Phi_d(n(n-1)/2)$. More precisely, to each vector $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, let us assign a permutation $\sigma = \sigma_{\mathbf{w}}$ satisfying $w_{\sigma(1)} \geq w_{\sigma(2)} \geq \dots \geq$

²Indeed, squaring does not yield an equivalent problem as taking the square root results in two possibilities (e.g., consider $\sqrt{x_1 + x_2 + 2x_1} \leq 1$; squaring yields $x_1 + x_2 \leq 1$ which is not an equivalent inequality). Moreover, squaring both sides of an inequality like (36) may yield a term with a negative coefficient (indeed we get $\mathbf{x}^\top A^\top A\mathbf{x} + 2t\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{b}^\top \mathbf{x})^2 \leq t^2$), where the result in (B3) cannot be applied (e.g., consider $\sqrt{x_1 + x_2} + x_1 + x_2 \leq 2$; squaring yields $2x_2 + 2x_2 - x_1x_2 \leq 2$ which is an equivalent inequality but with a negative coefficient).

³In fact, a simple but incorrect proof via the union bound can go as follows. Using the notation in the proof of Theorem 8, we have $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| = |\bigcup_{i \in [r], \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}_+^d(0, 1)} \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}, i})| \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{B}_+^d(0, 1)} |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}, i})| d\mathbf{u} \leq n|\mathcal{F}'| \sum_{i=1}^r \text{vol}(\mathbb{B}_+^d(0, 1)) \sim \frac{n|\mathcal{F}'|}{\sqrt{d\pi}} \left(\frac{2\pi e}{d}\right)^{d/2}$, if $d_i = d$ for all i . This (incorrect) bound is counter-intuitive in the sense that it decreases with d (for large d).

$w_{\sigma(n)}$ (note that there may be multiple permutations σ satisfying this, in which case $\sigma_{\mathbf{w}}$ is chosen arbitrarily among them). Then we claim that

$$|\{\sigma_{\mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{u}}} \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}_+^d(0, 1)\}| \leq \Phi_d(n(n-1)/2). \quad (41)$$

To see (41), let us write $A = [\mathbf{a}^1, \dots, \mathbf{a}^n]$ where $\mathbf{a}^j \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ is the j th column of A . Then $w_j = w_j^{\mathbf{u}} = (\mathbf{a}^j)^\top \mathbf{u} + b_j$. Let us consider the system of inequalities $w_j \leq w_{j'}$ for $j, j' \in [n]$ (considering \mathbf{u} as a variable in \mathbb{R}^d):

$$\left(\mathbf{a}^j - \mathbf{a}^{j'}\right)^\top \mathbf{u} \leq b_{j'} - b_j, \quad \text{for } j \neq j' \in [n]. \quad (42)$$

The inequality-defining hyperplanes in (42) form a hyperplane arrangement that, by Fact 1, partitions \mathbb{R}^d into at most $\Phi_d(n(n-1)/2)$ cells. Consider any such cell C . Any point $\mathbf{u} \in C$ decides, for each pair $j \neq j'$, whether $w_j^{\mathbf{u}} \leq w_{j'}^{\mathbf{u}}$ or $w_j^{\mathbf{u}} > w_{j'}^{\mathbf{u}}$, and hence can be associated with a total order on the weights $w_1^{\mathbf{u}}, \dots, w_n^{\mathbf{u}}$. Moreover, all points in C give rise to the same total order, while any two points belonging to two different cells give rise to two different orders. It follows that the number of such orders is exactly equal to the number of cells. This establishes (41) and the theorem. \square

7 Positive Semidefinite Matrix Inequalities

We denote by \mathbb{S}^m the set of all $m \times m$ real symmetric matrices and by $\mathbb{S}_+^m \subseteq \mathbb{S}^m$ the set of all $m \times m$ positive semidefinite matrices. Consider the monotone positive semidefinite inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) &\preceq T, \\ \mathbf{x} &\in \mathbb{Z}_+^n, \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

where $f(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^n A^j x_j$, $A^j \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$, for $j \in [n]$, and $T \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ are given positive semidefinite matrices, and " \succeq " is the Löwner (partial) order on matrices: $A \succeq B$ if and only if $A - B$ is positive semidefinite.

Let \mathbf{I}_m be the $m \times m$ identity matrix. For two matrices $A \succeq B \succeq 0$, we use the standard notation: $A \bullet B = \text{Tr}(AB) := \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m a_{k,j} b_{k,j}$, where $a_{k,j}$ denotes the kj th entry of the matrix A . We recall the following well-known facts; see, e.g., [HJ90]:

Fact 2. *Let $A \in \mathbb{S}^m$. Then*

- (i) $A \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ iff $A \bullet B \geq 0$ for all $B \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$;
- (ii) if $A \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ then for any $i \in [m]$, $a_{ii} \geq 0$ with $a_{ii} = 0$ implying that the entire i th row and columns of A are zero;
- (iii) $A \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ iff for any invertible matrix $B \in \mathbb{S}^m$, $BAB^\top \succeq 0$;
- (iv) if $A \in \mathbb{S}_+^m$ and $\text{rank}(A) = k$, then there exists a (unique) orthonormal matrix U (that is, $UU^\top = \mathbf{I}_m$) such that, upto a permutation of the rows and columns of A , we can write

$$UAU^\top = \bar{\mathbf{I}}_k := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (44)$$

By Fact 2(i), if \mathbf{x} satisfies (43), then $\mathbf{I}_m \bullet f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbf{I}_m \bullet A^j x_j \leq \mathbf{I}_m \bullet T$, which in turn implies that $x_j \leq c'_j := \frac{\text{Tr}(T)}{\text{Tr}(A^j)}$. Thus we may restrict the set of solutions for (43) to the integer box $\mathcal{C} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid 0 \leq \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{c}\}$, where $c_j := \lfloor c'_j \rfloor$. Suppose that $\text{rank}(T) = d$. By Fact 2(iv), we can write $UTU^\top = \bar{\mathbf{I}}_d$, for an orthonormal matrix U . Fact 2(iii) then implies that we can left-multiply by U and right-multiply by U^\top both sides of the i th inequality in (43) without changing the set of feasible

solutions. In other words, after possibly permuting the rows and columns of the matrices A^j , we can write (43) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n B^j x_j &\preceq \bar{\mathbf{I}}_d, \\ \mathbf{x} &\in \mathcal{C}, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where $B^j := UA^jU^\top$. We further note by Fact (1)(ii) that, if $b_{kk}^j > 0$ for some $k > d$, then any feasible solution \mathbf{x} to (43) must have $x_j = 0$. Let $N := \{j \in [n] \mid b_{kk}^j > 0 \text{ for all } k \in [d]\}$. Then, Fact (1)(ii) also implies that, for all $j \in N$, B^j can be written as:

$$B^j := \left[\begin{array}{c|c} C^j & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \end{array} \right], \quad (46)$$

where $C^j \in \mathbb{S}_+^d$. Hence, we may consider the following inequality, equivalent to (45):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in N} C^j x_j &\preceq \mathbf{I}_d, \\ \mathbf{x} &\in \mathcal{C}. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Let \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} be the sets of maximal feasible vectors for (43) and (47), respectively. Then, $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{G}|$ (as $\mathcal{F} = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}^{[n] \setminus N}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}\}$ where $\mathbf{0}^{[n] \setminus N}$ denotes a vector of zeros in positions $i \in [n] \setminus N$), while $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq |\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G})| + n - |N|$ (as $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}) = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}^{[n] \setminus N}) : x \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G})\} \cup \{\mathbf{1}_i : i \in [N] \setminus [n]\}$).

We will use the following fact, which is a generalization of Fact 1.

Fact 3 (see, e.g., [Mat02]). *Let $p_1, \dots, p_m : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be real polynomials of maximum degree D , and denote by $Z_i := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid p_i(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$ the zero set of p_i . Then the number of cells (and, in fact, all the faces) in the arrangement of the surfaces Z_1, \dots, Z_m is at most $\Psi_{d,D}(m) := 2(2D)^d \sum_{i=0}^d 2^i \binom{4m+1}{i}$, which is bounded by $(\frac{50Dm}{d})^d$, form $\geq d \geq 2$.*

Theorem 9. *Let \mathcal{F} be the set of maximal feasible vectors for (43). Then for any non-empty subset $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, it holds that*

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq \Psi_{d,2}(n(n-1)/2)n|\mathcal{F}'| = O(n)^{2d+1}|\mathcal{F}'|, \quad (48)$$

where $d := \text{rank}(T)$.

Proof. By the argument preceding the theorem, we may consider the equivalent inequality (47). Indeed, if we show the bound $|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{G})| \leq \sum_{i=1}^r \Psi_d(|N|(|N|-1)/2)|N| \cdot |\mathcal{G}'|$ for any $\mathcal{G}' \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, we get, for $\mathcal{F}' = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}^{[n] \setminus N}) : \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{G}'\}$,

$$|\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})| \leq \Psi_{d,2}(|N|(|N|-1)/2)|N| \cdot |\mathcal{G}'| + n - |N| \leq \Psi_{d,2}(n(n-1)/2)n|\mathcal{F}'|.$$

Thus, for simplicity we will consider (43) and assume w.l.o.g. in the following that $N = [n]$, $T = \mathbf{I}_d$ (and hence, $d = m$).

To show (48), we proceed in a way similar to the proof of Theorem 8. Denoting by $\mathbb{B}^d(0, 1) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq 1\}$ the d -dimensional unit ball centered at the origin, we can rewrite (43) in the following equivalent form:

$$f_{\mathbf{u},i}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^n (A^{i,j} \bullet \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top) x_j \leq 1, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}^d(0, 1). \quad (49)$$

For $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}^d(0, 1)$, let $\mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{u},i} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be the vector whose j th component is $w_j := A^{i,j} \bullet \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}$ be the set of maximal feasible solutions for the inequality $f_{\mathbf{u}}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{u}})^\top \mathbf{x} \leq 1$. Then, as in the proof of

Theorem 8, it is enough to bound the number of distinct permutations defined by the set of weights $\{\mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{u}} \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}^d(0, 1)\}$:

$$|\{\sigma_{\mathbf{w}^{\mathbf{u}}} \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}^d(0, 1)\}| \leq \Psi_{d,2}(n(n-1)/2). \quad (50)$$

Consider the system of inequalities $w_j \leq w_{j'}$ for $j, j' \in [n]$ (considering \mathbf{u} as a variable in \mathbb{R}^d):

$$(A_j - A_{j'}) \bullet \mathbf{u}\mathbf{u}^\top \leq 0, \quad \text{for } j \neq j' \in [n]. \quad (51)$$

The inequality-defining polynomials in (51) form an arrangement satisfying the conditions in Fact 3 with $D := 2$ and $m := n(n+1)/2$, and hence partitions \mathbb{R}^d into $\Psi_{d,2}(n(n-1)/2)$ cells. The theorem follows. \square

8 Some Open Questions

We conclude with some open questions that naturally arise from the preceding work:

- (O1) For a polynomial inequity (5), where the function f is of the form (2), can we show a dual bound of the form $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) = \text{poly}(n, |\mathcal{H} - i|, |\mathcal{F}'|, d)$, independent of t , R and polynomial in $d := \max_{H,J} d_{H,j}$ (in comparison to the bound in (34))?
- (O2) For a single linear inequality of the form (5), it is known that all maximal feasible solutions can be enumerated in polynomial time [BEG⁺02, Cra87, PS94]. If f is a polynomial of constant degree, then (B3) implies that all maximal feasible solutions can be enumerated in quasi-polynomial time via a dual-boundedness argument. It remains open whether a polynomial-time enumeration algorithm exists for a single polynomial inequality with fixed degree.
- (O3) For a SOC inequity of the form (36), can one show a dual bound of the form $q(\mathcal{L}, |\mathcal{F}'|) = \text{poly}(n, d, |\mathcal{F}'|)$, as opposed to the bound in Theorem 8 that depends exponentially on d ?
- (O4) Is there a polynomial time algorithm for enumerating all maximal feasible solutions for a single SOC inequity (36), when the number of rows d is fixed (in comparison to a quasi-polynomial time algorithm that we currently know)?
- (O5) Similar questions as (O3) and (O4) arise for a PSD inequality of the form (43), considering the rank d of the matrix T as a parameter that can be either fixed or a part of the input.

References

- [AW02] R. Ahlswede and A. Winter. Strong converse for identification via quantum channels. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 48(3):569–579, 2002.
- [BEG⁺02] E. Boros, K. Elbassioni, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan, and K. Makino. Dual-bounded generating problems: All minimal integer solutions for a monotone system of linear inequalities. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 31(5):1624–1643, 2002.
- [BEGK03] E. Boros, K. Elbassioni, V. Gurvich, and L. Khachiyan. An inequality for polymatroid functions and its applications. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 131:255–281, 2003.
- [BGKM00] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan, and K. Makino. Dual-bounded generating problems: Partial and multiple transversals of a hypergraph. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 30(6):2036–2050, 2000.
- [BGKM01] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan, and K. Makino. Dual-bounded generating problems: Partial and multiple transversals of a hypergraph. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 30(6):2036–2050, 2001.

- [BGKM04] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan, and K. Makino. Dual-bounded generating problems: weighted transversals of a hypergraph. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 142(1-3):1–15, 2004.
- [BI95] J. C. Bioch and T. Ibaraki. Complexity of identification and dualization of positive boolean functions. *Information and Computation*, 123(1):50–63, 1995.
- [Bud88] L. Budach. *Algebraic and Topological Properties of Finite Partially Ordered Sets*. Teubner-Texte zur Mathematik. B.G. Teubner, 1988.
- [Cra87] Y. Crama. Dualization of regular boolean functions. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 16(1):79–85, 1987.
- [FK96] M. L. Fredman and L. Khachiyan. On the complexity of dualization of monotone disjunctive normal forms. *Journal of Algorithms*, 21:618–628, 1996.
- [GK99] V. Gurvich and L. Khachiyan. On generating the irredundant conjunctive and disjunctive normal forms of monotone Boolean functions. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 96–97(1):363–373, 1999.
- [HJ90] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [KBE⁺07] L. Khachiyan, E. Boros, K. Elbassioni, V. Gurvich, and K. Makino. Dual-bounded generating problems: Efficient and inefficient points for discrete probability distributions and sparse boxes for multidimensional data. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 379(3):361–376, 2007.
- [Lov83] L. Lovasz. Submodular functions and convexity. In M. Grotschel A. Bachem and B. Korte, editors, *Mathematical Programming: The State of the Art*, pages 235–257, New York, 1983. Springer-Verlag.
- [Mat02] J. Matousek. *Lectures on Discrete Geometry*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002.
- [PS94] U. N. Peled and B. Simeone. An $o(nm)$ -time algorithm for computing the dual of a regular boolean function. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 49(1-3):309–323, 1994.
- [WX08] A. Wigderson and D. Xiao. Derandomizing the ahlswede-winter matrix-valued chernoff bound using pessimistic estimators, and applications. *Theory Comput.*, 4(1):53–76, 2008.
- [Yüc02] Ü. Yüceer. Discrete convexity: convexity for functions defined on discrete spaces. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 119(3):297–304, 2002.

A Omitted Proofs

Proof of Proposition 1. Suppose that f is supermodular. Consider $j \in [k]$, $z \in \mathcal{C}_j \setminus \{c_j\}$, and $\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}'' \in \mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_{j-1} \times \{z\} \times \mathcal{C}_{j+1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_k$ such that $\mathbf{x}' \leq \mathbf{x}''$. To show that $\partial_f(\mathbf{x}', j, z) \leq \partial_f(\mathbf{x}'', j, z)$, we take $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x}' \vee \mathbf{1}^j$ and $\mathbf{y} := \mathbf{x}''$ in (3) to get

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}'' \vee \mathbf{1}^j) + f(\mathbf{x}') &= f((\mathbf{x}' \vee \mathbf{1}^j) \vee \mathbf{x}'') + f((\mathbf{x}' \vee \mathbf{1}^j) \wedge \mathbf{x}'') \\ &\geq f(\mathbf{x}' \vee \mathbf{1}^j) + f(\mathbf{x}''), \end{aligned}$$

giving the desired inequality. On the other hand, suppose that $\partial_f(\mathbf{x}, j, z)$ is monotone in $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C}_1 \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_{j-1} \times \{z\} \times \mathcal{C}_{j+1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{C}_k$, for any $j \in [n]$ and $z \in \mathcal{C}_j \setminus \{c_j\}$. Consider $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}$. We need to show that (3) holds. Let $S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \{j \in [k] : x_j > y_j\}$. The proof is by induction on the size of $S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$. If $S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \emptyset$ (meaning that $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$) then (3) holds as an equality and there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, taking any $j \in S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ and using monotonicity of $\partial_f(\cdot, j, z)$ for $z := (\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y})_j + (\ell - 1)\mathbf{1}^j = y_j + (\ell - 1)\mathbf{1}^j$ and $\ell \in \{1, \dots, x_j - y_j\}$, we obtain

$$f(\mathbf{y} + \ell\mathbf{1}^j) - f(\mathbf{y} + (\ell - 1)\mathbf{1}^j) \geq f(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y} + \ell\mathbf{1}^j) - f(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y} + (\ell - 1)\mathbf{1}^j). \quad (52)$$

Summing (52) over all $\ell \in \{1, \dots, x_j - y_j\}$, we get

$$f(\mathbf{y}') - f(\mathbf{y}) \geq f(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y} + (x_j - y_j)\mathbf{1}^j) - f(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}). \quad (53)$$

where $\mathbf{y}' := \mathbf{y} + (x_j - y_j)\mathbf{1}^j$. As $|S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')| < |S(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})|$, we get by induction that

$$f(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}') + f(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}') \geq f(\mathbf{x}) + f(\mathbf{y}'). \quad (54)$$

Summing (53) and (54) and noting that $\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y} + (x_j - y_j)\mathbf{1}^j = \mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}'$ and $\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}$ yields the claim. \square

Proof of Lemma 5(ii). The proof is by induction on $|U| \geq 1$ with the base case, $|U| = 1$, being trivial.

For $u \in U$, let $\mathcal{S}(u) := \{S \in \mathcal{S} : u \in S\}$ and $\mathcal{T}(u) := \{T \in \mathcal{T} : u \in T\}$. Let $U_1 := \{u \in U : |\mathcal{S}(u)| \leq 1\}$ and $U_2 = U \setminus U_1$. We may assume without loss of generality that $|\mathcal{T}(u)| = 0$ for all $u \in U_1$.

For any $u \in U_2$, letting $U'(u) := U \setminus \{u\}$, $\mathcal{S}'(u) := \{S \setminus \{u\} : S \in \mathcal{S}(u)\}$ and $\mathcal{T}'(u) := \{T \setminus \{u\} : T \in \mathcal{T}(u)\}$, the sets $\mathcal{S}'(u)$ and $\mathcal{T}'(u)$ satisfy the preconditions of the lemma with respect to the weight function $w : U'(u) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and thresholds $t'_1 := t_1 - w(u)$ and $t'_2 := t_2 - w(u)$. Thus, we get by induction that

$$|\mathcal{S}(u)| = |\mathcal{S}'(u)| \leq \frac{w(U'(u)) - t'_1}{t'_2 - t'_1} |\mathcal{T}'(u)| = \frac{w(U) - t_1}{t_2 - t_1} |\mathcal{T}(u)|. \quad (55)$$

Let $\alpha = \max_{T \in \mathcal{T}} w(T)$. Then $w(U_1) \leq w(U) - \alpha$. Multiplying both sides of (55) by $w(u)$ and summing up the resulting inequalities over $u \in U_2$, we get by the threshold separability of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T}

$$\begin{aligned} t_2 |\mathcal{S}| &\leq \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} w(S) \leq w(U_1) + \sum_{u \in U_2} w(u) |\mathcal{S}(u)| \leq w(U_1) + \sum_{u \in U_2} w(u) \frac{w(U) - t_1}{t_2 - t_1} |\mathcal{T}(u)| \\ &= w(U_1) + \frac{w(U) - t_1}{t_2 - t_1} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} w(T) \leq w(U_1) + \frac{w(U) - t_1}{t_2 - t_1} \alpha |\mathcal{T}| \\ &\leq w(U) - \alpha + \frac{w(U) - t_1}{t_2 - t_1} \alpha |\mathcal{T}|, \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where $\alpha \leq t_1$. Note that the right hand side of (56) is monotone increasing in α and hence is maximized at $\alpha = t_1$. It follows that

$$|\mathcal{S}| \leq \frac{w(U) - t_1}{t_2} + \frac{w(U) - t_1}{t_2 - t_1} \cdot \frac{t_1}{t_2} |\mathcal{T}|. \quad (57)$$

Using $t_1 < t_2$ in (57), we obtain the stated claim. \square

Proof of Lemma 7. For a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ let us denote by $j_i^{\mathbf{x}}$ the index of the last component, in the order given by σ_i , which is larger than 0, i.e., $j_i^{\mathbf{x}} = \max\{j \in [n] \mid x_{\sigma_i(j)} > 0\}$. For a vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{C}$ and a permutation σ , denote by $\mathbf{y}^{\sigma, j}$ the vector \mathbf{y}' with components:

$$y'_{\sigma(j')} = \begin{cases} y_{\sigma(j')} & \text{for } j' < j, \\ y_{\sigma_i(j')} + 1 & \text{for } j' = j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (58)$$

Let \mathcal{F}_i be the set of maximal feasible solutions of the inequality $f_i(\mathbf{x}) \leq t_i$. We claim that for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} := \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$ there exists an $i \in [r]$ and a $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}'$ such that $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y}^{\sigma_i, j_i^{\mathbf{x}}}$. To see this claim, let us consider $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$ and observe that $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ because $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F})$ and $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$. As $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}) = \bigcup_{i=1}^r (\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_i))$, there exists an $i \in [r]$ such that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X} := \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}') \cap \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_i)$. Let $j := j_i^{\mathbf{x}}$. Then, as $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}')$, there exists a $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}'$ such that $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{1}^j$. For any $j' < j$, we must have $x_{\sigma_i(j')} = y_{\sigma_i(j')}$, since if $x_{\sigma_i(j')} < y_{\sigma_i(j')}$ for some $j' < j$, then $f_i(\mathbf{y}) \geq f_i(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{1}^{\sigma_i(j')} - \mathbf{1}^{\sigma_i(j)}) \geq$

$f(\mathbf{x}) > t_i$ would follow by the 2-monotonicity of f , and yielding a contradiction with $f_i(\mathbf{y}) \leq t_i$ (which follows from $y \in \mathcal{F}$). Finally, the definition of $j = j_i^{\mathbf{x}}$ implies that $x_{\sigma_i(j')} = 0$ for all $j' > j$. Hence, our claim and the equality (58) follow.

The above claim implies that

$$\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{\mathbf{y}^{\sigma_i, j} \mid \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{F}', i \in [r'], j \in [n], y_{\sigma_i(j)} < c_{\sigma_i(j)}\},$$

and hence (39) and thus the lemma follow. □