

# GPU-based Graver Basis Extraction for Nonlinear Integer Optimization

Wenbo Liu<sup>1</sup>, Akang Wang<sup>2,3</sup>, and Wenguo Yang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

<sup>2</sup> Shenzhen Research Institute of Big Data, Shenzhen, China

<sup>3</sup> The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China

**Abstract.** Nonlinear integer programs involve optimizing nonlinear objectives with variables restricted to integer values, and have widespread applications in areas such as resource allocation and portfolio selection. One approach to solving these problems is the augmentation procedure, which iteratively refines a feasible solution by identifying augmenting steps from the Graver Basis—a set of test directions. While this method guarantees termination in polynomially many steps, computing the Graver Basis exactly is known to be  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard. To address this computational challenge, we propose Multi-start Augmentation via Parallel Extraction (MAPLE), a GPU-based heuristic designed to efficiently approximate the Graver Basis. MAPLE extracts test directions by optimizing non-convex continuous problems, leveraging first-order methods to enable parallelizable implementation. The resulting set of directions is then used in multiple augmentations, each seeking to improve the solution’s optimality. The proposed approach has three notable characteristics: (i) independence from general-purpose solvers, while ensuring guaranteed feasibility of solutions; (ii) high computational efficiency, achieved through GPU-based parallelization; (iii) flexibility in handling instances with shared constraint matrices but varying objectives and right-hand sides. Empirical evaluations on QPLIB benchmark instances demonstrate that MAPLE delivers performance comparable to state-of-the-art solvers in terms of solution quality, while achieving significant gains in computational efficiency. These results highlight MAPLE’s potential as an effective heuristic for solving nonlinear integer programs in practical applications.

**Keywords:** Nonlinear integer programs · Graver basis.

## 1 Introduction

*Nonlinear integer programs* entail optimizing nonlinear objective functions where the decision variables are constrained to integer values. In this work, we are particularly concerned with problems that are subject to linear constraints, which

can be formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n} \quad & f(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax = b \\ & l \leq x \leq u, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a real-valued function and  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}, b \in \mathbb{Z}^m, l, u \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  are integer coefficients. For the sake of simplicity, let  $S := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n : Ax = b, l \leq x \leq u\}$  denotes the feasible region of model (1).

These problems have roots in real-world applications, such as portfolio selection [17] and resource allocation [16]. Furthermore, integer linear programs (ILPs), which have been developed over decades with mature solvers, are a special case of this framework. Despite the widespread applications, these problems present significant challenges due to their  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard complexity. General-purpose solvers typically utilize *branch-and-cut* methods, which involve systematic enumeration of candidate solutions.

An alternative approach for tackling nonlinear integer programs of form (1) involves the augmentation scheme, where an incumbent solution  $\bar{x}$  is iteratively improved by moving along feasible directions. To certify optimality, a precomputed *test set* is required, which either declares  $\bar{x}$  to be optimal or provides an available direction  $g$  such that  $\bar{x} + g$  becomes the better incumbent. While  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A) := \{g \in \mathbb{Z}^n : Ag = 0\}$  clearly serves as such a test set, a more compact alternative is the *Graver Basis* [7], which consists of all  $\square$ -minimal elements in  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A) \setminus \{0\}$ . Using the Graver Basis, the augmentation procedure is shown to achieve an optimal solution within polynomially many steps for separable convex objectives [19]. Furthermore, the Graver Basis is applicable to various nonlinear integer programs including convex integer maximization [5] and minimization of quadratic or higher degree polynomial functions lying in suitable cones [14].

An immediate question is: *How can the Graver basis be computed?* In fact, the exact computation of the Graver basis is extremely challenging and has not been extensively explored. In this paper, we propose approximating the Graver basis by optimizing unconstrained, non-convex continuous problems. The objective function is carefully designed through an isomorphism to  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ , and first-order methods are employed for parallel optimization, initiated from diversified starting points. During this process, near-minimal elements of  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$  are progressively extracted to form an approximation of the Graver basis. The approximated test set is then applied in multiple augmentations, each striving for optimality. We refer to this entire process as Multi-start Augmentation via Parallel Extraction (MAPLE), a fully GPU-based algorithm for solving nonlinear integer programs. MAPLE exhibits three notable characteristics: (i) it does not rely on general-purpose solvers, while ensuring the feasibility of solutions; (ii) it is highly parallelizable and can be fully implemented on GPUs; (iii) it is versatile, as the parallel extraction needs to be performed only once to handle instances with identical constraint matrices but varying objectives and right-hand sides.

The distinct contribution of our work can be summarized as follows:

- We approximate the Graver basis by optimizing unconstrained problems, demonstrating how continuous techniques can be applied to discrete problems.
- We introduce MAPLE, a fully GPU-based algorithm for solving nonlinear integer programs, enhanced by the approximated Graver test set.
- We conduct extensive computational experiments on QPLIB instances, with results showing that our approach performs comparably to state-of-the-art general-purpose solvers.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide a brief introduction to the background and basic techniques that will be employed in our method. Section 3 introduces the classical augmentation scheme along with its theoretical results. In Section 4, we present MAPLE, which approximates the Graver test set and subsequently solves nonlinear integer programs. Section 5 presents experiments to evaluate the performance of our method, and we conclude in Section 6.

### 1.1 Related Works

A classical method for computing the Graver basis was proposed by Pottier [21], which starts with a generating set of  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$  and iteratively computes remainders modulo the sign-compatible collected bases. This method can be viewed as a generalization of the Euclidean algorithm to higher-dimensional spaces. Building upon Pottier’s work, the project-and-lift method [9] was developed, significantly accelerating the process by fully exploiting  $\sqsubseteq$ -minimality in a lower-dimensional space. This approach remains the fastest exact algorithm for computing the Graver basis. However, the sequential nature of these algorithms limits their potential for parallelization, thus restricting their computational efficiency.

Recently, the authors of [1,12] proposed approximating the Graver basis via quantum annealing algorithms. In these works, the constraints of integer linear systems are reformulated into *quadratic unconstrained binary optimization* (QUBO) problems, allowing a large number of elements in  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$  to be obtained via a quantum annealer (e.g., D-Wave [2]). However, this method still relies on Pottier’s algorithm to further identify  $\sqsubseteq$ -minimality, and it requires the use of advanced quantum computers.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the concept of the Graver Basis and explore its relevance to our approach. We also provide an overview of lattice theory and present several techniques that will be leveraged in the development of our proposed method.

### 2.1 Graver Basis

**Definition 1.** Given  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we say that  $x \sqsubseteq y$  if  $x_i y_i \geq 0$  and  $|x_i| \leq |y_i|$  hold for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ .

It is shown that  $x \sqsubseteq y$  means  $x$  and  $y$  are sign-compatible (i.e., they lie in the same orthant), with  $x$  being the shorter vector. This partial ordering relation can then be used to define the Graver Basis.

**Definition 2.** Given  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ , the Graver Basis  $\mathcal{G}(A)$  is the set of all  $\sqsubseteq$ -minimal elements in  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A) \setminus \{0\}$ .

The Graver Basis  $\mathcal{G}(A)$  is a subset of  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ , and it can be shown that  $\mathcal{G}(A)$  is finite [4]. We now provide an alternative characterization of  $\mathcal{G}(A)$  by introducing its analogue.

**Definition 3.** Given a pointed rational polyhedral cone  $C$ , the Hilbert basis  $\mathcal{H}(C)$  of  $C$  is defined as

$$\mathcal{H}(C) := \{x \in C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\} : \nexists y, z \in C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\} \text{ such that } x = y + z\}$$

*Remark 1.*  $\mathcal{G}(A) = \bigcup_{\mathbb{O}} \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{O} \cap \text{Ker}(A))$  where the subscript  $\mathbb{O}$  traverses all the  $2^n$  orthants of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

## 2.2 Lattice

**Definition 4.** Given a matrix  $B = (B_1, \dots, B_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$  with full column rank, let  $\mathcal{L}(B) := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i B_i : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$  denote the lattice with basis  $B$ .

**Definition 5.** A matrix  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  with  $m \leq n$  is said to be in Hermite normal form (HNF) if it is of the form  $(H|0)$ , where  $H$  is a lower-triangular square matrix with strictly positive diagonal entries and non-negative off-diagonal entries such that  $h_{ij} < h_{ii}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ .

Next we show that HNF can be obtained via integer elementary column operations, and the computation can be further proven to be in polynomial time [11].

**Proposition 1 ([4]).** For  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  with  $\text{rank}(A) = m$ , there exists a unimodular matrix  $C \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$  such that  $AC = (H|0)$  is of the Hermite normal form.

Given a lattice  $\mathcal{L}(B)$ , then  $B = (B_1, \dots, B_d)$  is a basis but not the unique one, and we aim to find an appropriate basis that is nearly orthogonal with short base vectors. While the vectors  $\{B_i^*\}_{i=1}^d$  obtained from Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization (GSO)  $B_i^* = B_i - \sum_{j < i} \frac{\langle B_i, B_j^* \rangle}{\langle B_j^*, B_j^* \rangle} B_j^*$  enjoy favorable properties, they do not form a basis. Alternatively, we define the *reduced basis*.

**Definition 6.** A basis  $B = (B_1, \dots, B_d)$  of a lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  is called reduced if it satisfies the following conditions, where  $B^*$  denotes the corresponding Gram-Schmidt vectors:

- (i)  $\left| \frac{\langle B_i, B_j^* \rangle}{\langle B_j^*, B_j^* \rangle} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ ;  
(ii)  $\|B_j^*\|^2 \leq 2\|B_{j+1}^*\|^2$ .

Algorithm 1 presents the classic basis reduction algorithm proposed by [15], which is known as the *LLL algorithm* and runs in polynomial time [22]. For the sake of simplicity, let  $\lceil \mu \rceil$  denote the integer nearest to  $\mu$ .

---

**Algorithm 1** The LLL algorithm

---

**INPUT:** a basis  $B = (B_1, \dots, B_d)$  of the lattice  $\mathcal{L}$   
**OUTPUT:** the reduced basis  $B$  of  $\mathcal{L}$

- 1:  $B_i^* = B_i - \sum_{j < i} \mu_{ij} B_j^*$  with  $\mu_{ij} = \frac{\langle B_i, B_j^* \rangle}{\langle B_j^*, B_j^* \rangle}$  #compute GSO
- 2:  $i \leftarrow 2$
- 3: **while**  $i \leq d$  **do**
- 4:   **for**  $j = i - 1, i - 2, \dots, 1$  **do**
- 5:      $B_i \leftarrow B_i - \lceil \mu_{ij} \rceil B_j$ , update GSO
- 6:     **if**  $i > 1$  and  $\|B_{i-1}^*\|^2 > 2\|B_i^*\|^2$  **then**
- 7:       Exchange  $B_i, B_{i-1}$ , update GSO,  $i \leftarrow i - 1$
- 8:     **else**
- 9:        $i \leftarrow i + 1$
- 10:    **return**  $B$


---

### 3 The Augmentation Framework

In this section, we present a framework for solving nonlinear integer programs using an augmentation scheme based on the Graver Basis. We also provide theoretical results that support the effectiveness of the augmentation procedure. The crucial question of “*How to compute the Graver Basis?*” is deferred to the next section.

#### 3.1 The Augmentation Scheme

Given problem (1), the augmentation procedure begins with an initial feasible solution and iteratively seeks improving directions until the optimal solution is reached, as illustrated in Fig 1. At each step, a *test set* is used to either confirm the optimality of the current solution or identify improving directions for further augmentation. We formally define the procedure as follows.



**Fig. 1.** Augmentation

**Definition 7.** A set  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$  is called a *test set* (or *optimality certificate*) for model (1) if, for any non-optimal  $\bar{x} \in S$ , there exists  $g \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that:

- (i)  $\bar{x} + \lambda g \in S$ ;
- (ii)  $f(\bar{x} + \lambda g) < f(\bar{x})$ .

Various constructions for a finite *test set* are possible. A straightforward choice is  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ , with finiteness ensured by restricting the set within  $M := [l - u, u - l]$ . However, this approach is inefficient as it essentially enumerates all feasible solutions in  $S$ . Alternatively, we consider the more compact set  $\mathcal{G}(A) \subseteq \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ , known as the Graver Basis. With the Graver Basis as the test set, the augmentation procedure repeatedly selects the best augmenting step from  $\mathcal{G}(A)$ , along with the corresponding step size. We outline this Graver-best augmentation procedure in Algorithm 2.

---

**Algorithm 2** Graver-best augmentation
 

---

**INPUT:** An optimization problem in model (1), a finite test set  $\mathcal{T}$  and an initial feasible solution  $\bar{x} \in S$   
**OUTPUT:** The optimal solution  $x^* \in S$ .

- 1: **while**  $\mathcal{A} := \{(g, \lambda) : g \in \mathcal{T}, \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \bar{x} + \lambda g \in S, f(\bar{x} + \lambda g) < f(\bar{x})\} \neq \emptyset$  **do**
- 2:      $(\bar{g}, \bar{\lambda}) \leftarrow \arg \min_{(g, \lambda) \in \mathcal{A}} f(\bar{x} + \lambda g)$
- 3:      $\bar{x} \leftarrow \bar{x} + \bar{\lambda} \bar{g}$ .
- 4: **return**  $\bar{x}$

---

### 3.2 Theoretical Guarantees

First we provide the fundamental property of Graver Basis in Proposition 2.

**Proposition 2 ([4]).** *Let  $x, \bar{x} \in S$  denote any two feasible solutions to model (1).*

- (i)  $d := x - \bar{x} \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$  can be expressed as the sign-compatible non-negative linear combination of at most  $2n - 2$  elements in  $\mathcal{G}(A)$ . That is,  $d = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i g_i$  with  $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+, g_i \in \mathcal{G}(A), g_i \sqsubseteq d$  and  $r \leq 2n - 2$ ;
- (ii) For any  $\mu_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $0 \leq \mu_i < \lambda_i$  we have  $\bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^r \mu_i g_i \in S$ .

*Remark 2.* We refer to the two properties described in Proposition 2 as (i) Graver expression and (ii) bounded trajectory.

Based on these properties, we can demonstrate that the Graver Basis serves as a test set for nonlinear integer programs with separable convex objectives.

**Proposition 3 ([4]).**  $\mathcal{G}(A)$  is a test set for model (1) for any  $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m, l, u \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  and for any separable convex functions  $f$ , that is,  $f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^n f_j(x^j)$  with  $x = (x^1, \dots, x^n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $f_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  being convex.

*Proof.* Let  $\bar{x}, x^* \in S$  denote the current and optimal solution, respectively. From Proposition 2,  $d := x^* - \bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i g_i$  with  $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+, g_i \in \mathcal{G}(A), g_i \sqsubseteq d$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &> f(x^*) - f(\bar{x}) \\ &= f(\bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i g_i) - f(\bar{x}) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left[ f_j(\bar{x}^j + \sum_{i=1}^r \lambda_i g_i^j) - f_j(\bar{x}^j) \right] \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^n \left[ \sum_{i=1}^r \left( f_j(\bar{x}^j + \lambda_i g_i^j) - f_j(\bar{x}^j) \right) \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r [f(\bar{x} + \lambda_i g_i) - f(\bar{x})] \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for at least one index  $i$ , we have  $f(\bar{x} + \lambda_i g_i) - f(\bar{x}) < 0$ . Additionally,  $\bar{x} + \lambda_i g_i \in S$  due to the bounded trajectory, and thus  $(g_i, \lambda_i)$  represents an augmenting step at  $\bar{x}$ .  $\square$

A subsequent question is *How many steps are needed?*. For Algorithm 2, the number of augmentation steps required to reach the optimal solution is polynomially bounded in the binary encoding length of the input data. Interested readers are referred to [4] for a detailed proof.

## 4 MAPLE: Multi-start Augmentation via Parallel Extraction

In this section, we focus on efficiently computing the Graver Basis, aiming for the approximated test set to certify near-optimality to the great extent. First, we outline the following four key conditions (C1) – (C4) for constructing an appropriate test set.

- (C1)  $Ag = 0$
- (C2)  $l - u \leq g \leq u - l$
- (C3)  $g \in \mathbb{Z}^n$
- (C4)  $g$  is  $\sqsubseteq$ -minimal

Notably, the first three conditions correspond to  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A) \cap M$ , a redundant test set as discussed in Section 3.1, while (C4) leads to  $\mathcal{G}(A)$ , the Graver basis. In the work of [1], conditions (C2) and (C3) are first ensured through quantum bit encoding, and the authors aim to satisfy (C1) by optimizing  $g^T A^T Ag$  within the QUBO framework using quantum annealing. Subsequently, the Pottier algorithm is applied to further satisfy (C4).

In contrast to the scheme that guarantees (C2) and (C3) while aiming to satisfy (C1) and (C4), we propose an alternative scheme that guarantees (C1) and (C3), while aiming to satisfy (C2) and (C4). Specifically, to guarantee (C1) and

(C3), we first introduce the g-z isomorphism in Section 4.1. Following that, Section 4.2 discusses the GPU-based extraction, which aims to satisfy (C2) and (C4). The approximated Graver test set is subsequently applied to solve nonlinear integer programs through multiple augmentations, as introduced in Section 4.3. This entire process is referred to as MAPLE.

#### 4.1 The g-z Isomorphism

Conditions (C1) and (C3) correspond to  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ , a lattice of dimension  $d := n - m$ . The goal of this section is to characterize any element  $g \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ . Specifically, by Proposition 1, we have  $AC = (H \mid 0)$  with a unimodular matrix  $C \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$ . Let  $C = (D \mid B) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times (m+d)}$ , and then  $(AD \mid AB) = (H \mid 0)$ . The following theorem shows that  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A) = \mathcal{L}(B)$ , and therefore any  $g \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$  can be characterized by  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  as the coordinates with respect to  $B$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Consider the mapping  $\phi_B : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, z \mapsto Bz$ . Then we have the followings:*

- (i)  $\phi_B : \mathbb{R}^d \cong \text{Ker}(A)$  (w.r.t. vector space isomorphism)
- (ii)  $\phi_B|_{\mathbb{Z}^d} : \mathbb{Z}^d \cong \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$  (w.r.t. group isomorphism)

*Proof.* It is clear that  $\mathbb{R}^d \cong \text{Ker}(A)$  since  $AB = 0$  and the columns of  $B$  are linearly independent. For the integer case, since  $AB = 0$  and  $B \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times d}$ , we have  $Bz \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$  for any  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , and thus  $\phi_B|_{\mathbb{Z}^d}(\mathbb{Z}^d) \subseteq \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ . On one hand, the  $d$  columns of  $B$  are linearly independent since  $C$  is invertible, and therefore  $\phi_B|_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$  is injective. On the other hand, for each  $g \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ , we have  $0 = Ag = ACC^{-1}g$ . Since  $C$  is unimodular, let  $y := C^{-1}g \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , and  $0 = ACy = (H \mid 0)y$ . Let  $y = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ z \end{pmatrix}$  with  $w \in \mathbb{Z}^m, z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ , then  $0 = Hw + 0z$ , and thus  $w = 0$  since  $H$  is invertible. Finally, we have  $g = Cy = Dw + Bz = Bz$ , which shows that  $\phi_B|_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$  is surjective. Therefore, we conclude that  $\phi_B|_{\mathbb{Z}^d}$  is an isomorphism.  $\square$

*Remark 3.* The inverse of  $\phi_B$  is given by  $\phi_B^{-1} : \text{Ker}(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, g \mapsto (B^{\top}B)^{-1}B^{\top}g$ . For convenience, let  $B^{-1} := (B^{\top}B)^{-1}B^{\top}$  denote the pseudoinverse of  $B$  and we have  $\phi_B^{-1} = \phi_{B^{-1}}$ .

Theorem 1 is referred to as the ‘‘g-z isomorphism’’, allowing us to characterize any  $g \in \text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$  using  $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  as the coordinates. Furthermore, the isomorphism also allows us to characterize Graver properties via  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Let  $b_1^{\top}, b_2^{\top}, \dots, b_n^{\top}$  represent the  $n$  rows of  $B$ . Define the set  $R_s := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d : s_i b_i^{\top} z \geq 0, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , where  $s \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  is a sign vector. This results in two partitions  $\mathbb{R}^d = \bigcup_{s \in \{-1, 1\}^n} R_s$  and  $\text{Ker}(A) = \bigcup_{s \in \{-1, 1\}^n} \mathbb{O}_s \cap \text{Ker}(A)$ . The following proposition implies that these partitions are preserved through the isomorphism between  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\text{Ker}(A)$ .

**Proposition 4.** *Consider the mapping  $\phi_B : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \text{Ker}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n, z \mapsto Bz$ , then  $\phi_B$  induces the following one-to-one mappings:*



- (i)  $R_s \longleftrightarrow \mathbb{O}_s \cap \text{Ker}(A)$   
(ii)  $\mathcal{H}(R_s) \longleftrightarrow \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{O}_s \cap \text{Ker}(A))$

*Proof.* (i) We can easily show that

$$z \in R_s \iff s_i b_i^\top z \geq 0 \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n \iff Bz \in \mathbb{O}_s \iff Bz \in \mathbb{O}_s \cap \text{Ker}(A).$$

(ii) For any  $z \in \mathcal{H}(R_s)$ , let  $g = Bz$ . Then  $g \in \mathbb{O}_s \cap \text{Ker}(A)$  by (i). Moreover, it is clear that  $g \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  since  $z$  and  $B$  are integers. Suppose  $g \notin \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{O}_s \cap \text{Ker}(A))$ . Then, there exist  $\hat{g}, \tilde{g} \in \mathbb{O}_s \cap \text{Ker}(A) \cap (\mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\})$  such that  $g = \hat{g} + \tilde{g}$ . This implies  $z = B^{-1}g = B^{-1}\hat{g} + B^{-1}\tilde{g} := \hat{z} + \tilde{z}$ , with  $\hat{z}, \tilde{z} \in R_s \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ , a contradiction.

On the other hand, for all  $g \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{O}_s \cap \text{Ker}(A))$ , we can also prove that  $z := B^{-1}g \in \mathcal{H}(R_s)$  by the same reasoning.  $\square$

Notably, as  $\mathcal{G}(A) = \bigcup_{s \in \{-1,1\}^n} \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{O}_s \cap \text{Ker}(A))$ , Proposition 4 implies that for any  $g \in \mathbb{O}_s \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $g$  is a Graver base if and only if  $z := B^{-1}g$  is a Hilbert base of  $R_s$ .

## 4.2 The Parallel Extraction of the Graver Basis

In Section 1.1 we discussed the sequential nature of Pottier’s algorithm which significantly limits its speed. To tackle these issues, we explore an alternative heuristic approach that enables a highly parallelizable implementation. Specifically, we guarantee (C1) by encoding  $g = Bz$ , where  $B$  is the reduced basis of  $\text{Ker}_{\mathbb{Z}}(A)$ , obtained from computing the Hermite normal form of  $A$  along with the *LLL-algorithm*. Additionally, Theorem 1 implies that (C3) can be ensured by simply rounding  $z$ . On the other hand, for (C4), the exact computation for  $\sqsubseteq$ -minimality is impractical. However, as demonstrated in the proof of Proposition 3, it is the Graver expression and bounded trajectory properties that certifies optimality. Practically, we focus on identifying those “short” directions to retrieve the two crucial properties, and therefore we combine (C2) and (C4) with a single criterion. We formulate the corresponding optimization problem as

$$\min_{z \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}} \|Bz\| \quad (2)$$

Problem (2) formulates the shortest vector problem which has been shown to be  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard [18]. However, rather than solely focusing on finding the shortest vector, our goal is to collect a diverse set of “short” vectors using highly parallelizable implementations. Specifically, we optimize the non-convex continuous surrogate of model (2), which can be reformulated as model (3). In this formulation, we adopt the  $\ell_1$ -norm, leveraging the demonstrated success of LASSO [23] in identifying sparsity. The two additional terms in model (3) are designed to promote the convergence of  $z$  to integer points in  $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{0\}$ , with  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  serving as the hyper-parameters.

$$\min_{z \in \mathbb{R}^d} \|Bz\|_1 + \lambda_1 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d (z_i - \lfloor z_i \rfloor)(\lceil z_i \rceil - z_i) + \lambda_2 \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\|z\|_\infty} - 1, 0 \right\} \quad (3)$$

Given model (3), the idea behind parallel extraction is to optimize the model simultaneously from multiple, diverse initial points, with each parallel procedure returning a near-optimal solution. Specifically, to ensure a diverse sampling of initial points, we first generate  $N$  random points  $g \sim \text{Uniform}(l-u, u-l)$ . These points are then transformed as  $z := B^{-1}g$ , which serves as the starting points for optimizing model (3). To optimize model (3), we use first-order methods such as Adam [13], which are computationally efficient and can be parallelized on GPUs. For each initial point, the optimization process iteratively refines the solution to model (3). Along the way, intermediate solutions are collected as  $B\lceil z \rceil$ , generating a more comprehensive set of directions. The parallel extraction of the Graver Basis is outlined in Algorithm 3.

---

**Algorithm 3** Parallel Extraction
 

---

**INPUT:**  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ , number of epochs  $T$ , number of initial points  $N$   
**OUTPUT:** the collected direction set  $\mathcal{G}$

- 1:  $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2: Compute Hermite normal form of  $A$  with  $AC = (H|0)$
- 3:  $B \leftarrow LLL(C_{:,m+1:n})$
- 4: Generate  $N$  samples  $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^N \sim \text{Uniform}(l-u, u-l)$
- 5:  $z_i \leftarrow B^{-1}g_i$
- 6: **for**  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$  **do**      #performs in parallel
- 7:     **for**  $t \in [T]$  **do**
- 8:         run a single step of gradient descent using Adam on Problem (3)
- 9:         **if**  $B\lceil z_i \rceil \in [l-u, u-l]$  **then**
- 10:              $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \mathcal{G} \cup \{B\lceil z_i \rceil\}$
- 11: **return**  $\mathcal{G}$

---

### 4.3 Multi-start Augmentation via Parallel Extraction

Section 4.2 provides a GPU-based approach for Graver Basis extraction. Building upon this, we introduce the MAPLE algorithm for solving nonlinear integer programs. In particular, as the parallel extraction yields an approximate Graver test set that does not definitely certify optimality, MAPLE compensate for this by performing multiple augmentations in parallel. The initial feasible solutions to model (1) are obtained by solving the following program:

$$\min_{x \in [l,u]^n} \|Ax - b\|_2^2 + \lambda_3 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \lfloor x_i \rfloor)(\lceil x_i \rceil - x_i) \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\lambda_3$  is a hyper-parameter that balances integrality and the satisfaction of linear constraints. It can be easily shown that any optimal solution to this quadratic problem corresponds to a feasible solution to model (1). Furthermore, model (4) can be efficiently optimized from diversified initial points using Adam, as discussed in Section 4.2. Let  $S_0 \subseteq S$  denote the collected feasible solutions to

model (1). Starting from each  $\bar{x} \in S_0$ , MAPLE performs  $|S_0|$  parallel augmentations via the extracted Graver test set, and finally returns the best solution found.

## 5 Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the performance of our proposed algorithm and compare it with other methods. The code will be made publicly available upon publication.

### 5.1 Setup

**Datasets** The datasets used in the experiment are sourced from QPLIB [6], a comprehensive library of diverse quadratic programming instances encompassing both convex and non-convex problem types. For this study, we select 30 instances from QPLIB, all expressed in the form of model (1), with variable sizes ranging from 75 to 676 and constraint sizes ranging from 1 to 309. Notably, 93% of these instances involve non-convex objective functions.

**Baselines** In the experiments, we denote our algorithm by MAPLE and compare it with state-of-the-art nonlinear integer programming solvers, including (i) Gurobi 12.0.0 [8]; (ii) CPLEX 22.1.1 [10]; (iii) SCIP 9.1.1 [3]; and (iv) CP-SAT 9.11 [20]. Specifically, MAPLE performs 100 multi-start augmentations via 100,000 parallel extractions. The hyper-parameters  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  and  $\lambda_3$  are set to 0.85, 1 and 0.1, respectively. The baseline solvers are run with a time limit of 3,600 seconds and utilize up to 8 threads, with all other parameters set to their default values.

**Evaluation Configuration** All our experiments were conducted on an Nvidia GeForce RTX 3090 GPU and an 12th Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i9-12900K CPU, using Python 3.11.5 and PyTorch 2.1.0.

### 5.2 Results and Analysis

In this section, we compare our proposed MAPLE with advanced solvers. The results are exhibited in Table 1.

**Metric** The columns labeled “Inst.,” “(n, m),” “Cvx.,” and “Opt.” display, respectively, the instance name, the number of variables and constraints, whether the objective function is convex, and the optimal value for each instance. For MAPLE, we report three key metrics: (i) computational time for the multi-start augmentation (“MA”) procedure, which includes the time for computing initial solutions, (ii) computational time for the parallel extraction (“PLE”), and (iii)

Table 1. Computational results on QPLIB instances

Inst.	(n, m)	Cvx.	Opt.	MAPLE			GUROBI		CPLEX		SCIP		CP-SAT	
				MA	PLE	Obj	Perf.	Win	Perf.	Win	Perf.	Win	Perf.	Win
0633	(75, 1)	×	79.561	1.8	4.1	79.561	0.0	×	(80.916)	✓	(83.261)	✓	126.3	✓
2492	(196, 28)	×	2724.0	1.7	10.2	2724.0	(2744.0)	✓	(2742.0)	✓	(2744.0)	✓	32.7	✓
2512	(100, 20)	×	135028.0	0.9	4.8	135028.0	0.9	×	107.7	✓	130.9	✓	11.0	✓
2733	(324, 36)	×	5358.0	3.9	17.9	5370.0	(5400.0)	✓	(5466.0)	✓	(5462.0)	✓	(5370.0)	✓
2880	(625, 50)	×	1178894.0	12.7	36.7	1245568.0	(1199166.0)	×	(1314720.0)	✓	(1275718.0)	✓	(1198642.0)	×
2957	(484, 44)	×	3596.0	10.7	27.7	3724.0	(3622.0)	×	(3894.0)	✓	(3756.0)	✓	(3644.0)	×
3307	(256, 32)	×	1240.0	3.1	13.7	1240.0	(1262.0)	✓	(1318.0)	✓	(1270.0)	✓	31.1	✓
3347	(676, 52)	×	3819920.0	9.1	40.4	3862616.0	(3825733.0)	×	(3909889.0)	✓	(3844548.0)	×	(3825782.0)	×
3402	(144, 24)	×	224416.0	0.8	6.9	224416.0	249.7	✓	(236436.0)	✓	187.0	✓	1471.5	✓
3413	(400, 40)	×	2192.0	20.7	22.6	3000.0	12.7	×	(2224.0)	×	(2432.0)	×	12.7	×
3703	(225, 30)	×	388214.0	2.5	11.9	392318.0	(391170.0)	×	(396364.0)	✓	(408322.0)	✓	(388250.0)	×
3714	(120, 40)	×	1183.0	0.5	4.9	1183.0	0.0	×	6.6	✓	120.5	✓	0.5	✓
3750	(210, 70)	×	6348.0	1.7	10.1	6348.0	0.0	×	764.7	✓	(6637.0)	✓	2.4	✓
3751	(150, 50)	×	2312.0	0.8	6.6	2312.0	0.0	×	132.0	✓	359.8	✓	0.9	✓
3775	(180, 60)	×	3990.0	1.2	8.2	3990.0	0.0	×	1030.8	✓	746.0	✓	1.5	✓
3815	(192, 64)	×	-65.0	1.1	8.9	-65.0	0.6	×	1.2	✓	16.5	✓	2.7	✓
3834	(50, 1)	×	3760.715	0.9	2.7	3760.715	0.0	×	849.9	✓	785.3	✓	44.4	✓
3913	(300, 61)	✓	42.925	8.0	16.2	44.1	2.0	×	(50.5)	✓	(52.125)	✓	(44.0)	×
3923	(395, 80)	×	64.1	14.8	21.9	65.15	160.3	×	(65.95)	✓	(67.0)	✓	(64.125)	×
3931	(316, 80)	×	79.93	7.4	16.4	80.899	3.8	×	(80.9)	✓	(81.166)	✓	(79.944)	×
3980	(235, 48)	✓	6.325	5.2	12.5	6.55	0.5	×	(12.75)	✓	(13.375)	✓	(6.45)	×
6324	(640, 16)	×	159.0	8.2	39.4	175.0	3.9	×	149.0	×	741.5	×	63.2	×
6487	(618, 309)	×	344592.0	0.9	27.3	344592.0	172.9	✓	(350628.0)	✓	(348725.0)	✓	(345008.0)	✓
6597	(600, 60)	×	6491721.0	65.4	36.9	6523307.0	(6828054.0)	✓	(7876257.0)	✓	(7046700.0)	✓	(6826223.0)	✓
7139	(180, 100)	×	621.0	4.0	6.9	621.0	1.2	×	36.5	✓	13.9	✓	13.0	✓
7144	(220, 121)	×	813.0	3.7	8.6	813.0	0.4	×	167.0	✓	139.0	✓	29.8	✓
7149	(264, 144)	×	959.0	3.9	10.6	959.0	2.5	×	399.1	✓	123.4	✓	107.3	✓
7154	(312, 169)	×	1159.0	4.6	12.5	1159.0	0.9	×	2387.3	✓	1730.2	✓	41.0	✓
7159	(364, 196)	×	1363.0	5.9	15.2	1363.0	1.3	×	(1373.0)	✓	3314.7	✓	134.6	✓
7164	(420, 225)	×	1551.0	15.2	17.8	1577.0	117.5	×	(1631.0)	✓	(1587.0)	✓	418.6	×
								6/30			28/30			19/30
											27/30			

the best objective achieved (“Obj”). Specifically, for “Obj.,” lower values indicate better performance, as the instances correspond to minimization problems. The last eight columns present the performance (“Perf.”) for each solver, alongside a comparison with MAPLE. For “Perf.,” values without curly brackets represent the computational time taken by the solver to find a solution with an objective value equal to “Opt.” (but not necessarily with proven optimality), while “(·)” indicates timeouts, with bracketed values denoting the best objectives achieved in those cases. Moreover, “Win” indicates whether MAPLE outperforms the baseline solver in terms of both solution quality and computational time. It is important to note that the computational time for MAPLE includes only the “MA” procedure, as the PLE procedure will be reused when solving multiple problems with identical constraint matrices but varying right-hand sides and objectives.

**Analysis** Table 1 highlights the speed and solution quality of each approach. In terms of computational efficiency, MAPLE demonstrates strong performance. The MA procedure typically completes within 20 seconds, while the PLE procedure takes no longer than 40 seconds on the tested instances—problems that baseline solvers often struggle with and may time out on. Regarding solution quality, MAPLE successfully attains optimal objectives on approximately half of the tested problems, showcasing its ability to efficiently identify optimal solutions, even for non-convex problems.

We compare MAPLE against the baseline solvers. Compared to CPLEX and SCIP, MAPLE consistently outperforms these solvers on over 90% of the instances. The exceptions occur when MAPLE delivers near-optimal solutions, while the exact solvers take longer to reach better solutions. Compared to CP-SAT, MAPLE remains superior on more than 63% of the instances. For the remaining instances, CP-SAT often times out after an hour, while MAPLE terminates much faster, providing slightly inferior solutions. We find that Gurobi delivers optimal solutions for more than half of the instances within seconds. However, MAPLE still outperforms Gurobi on 20% of the instances and prominently surpasses all baseline solvers on instances “2492”, “2733”, “3307”, “6487” and “6597”. Notably, while these general-purpose solvers rely on sophisticated pre-processing techniques, MAPLE employs a straightforward implementation with only a few hundred lines of Python code, efficiently yielding high-quality solutions to nonlinear integer programs. We conclude that MAPLE is a competitive alternative to advanced solvers and shows great potential for further enhancement.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose MAPLE, a heuristic approach designed to efficiently approximate the Graver Basis and solve nonlinear integer programs through a multi-start augmentation procedure. Unlike traditional approaches that struggle with sequential processing, MAPLE excels in parallelism, enabling faster execution. Experimental results on public datasets demonstrate MAPLE’s ability

to swiftly deliver near-optimal solutions, outperforming state-of-the-art solvers. Finally, MAPLE does not rely on any general-purpose solver or sophisticated presolving procedures, and is fully GPU-accelerated. Future work could further enhance MAPLE’s performance by integrating it with CPU-based solvers.

## References

1. Alghassi, H., Dridi, R., Tayur, S.: Graver bases via quantum annealing with application to non-linear integer programs. arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.04215 (2019)
2. Berwald, J.J.: The mathematics of quantum-enabled applications on the d-wave quantum computer. *Not. Am. Math. Soc* **66**(832), 55 (2019)
3. Bolusani, S., Besançon, M., Bestuzheva, K., Chmiela, A., Dionísio, J., Donkiewicz, T., van Doornmalen, J., Eifler, L., Ghannam, M., Gleixner, A., Graczyk, C., Halbig, K., Hedtke, I., Hoen, A., Hojny, C., van der Hulst, R., Kamp, D., Koch, T., Kofler, K., Lentz, J., Manns, J., Mexi, G., Mühmer, E., Pfetsch, M.E., Schlösser, F., Serrano, F., Shinano, Y., Turner, M., Vigerske, S., Weninger, D., Xu, L.: The SCIP Optimization Suite 9.0. Technical report, Optimization Online (February 2024), <https://optimization-online.org/2024/02/the-scip-optimization-suite-9-0/>
4. De Loera, J.A., Hemmecke, R., Köppe, M.: Algebraic and geometric ideas in the theory of discrete optimization. SIAM (2012)
5. De Loera, J.A., Hemmecke, R., Onn, S., Rothblum, U., Weismantel, R.: Convex integer maximization via graver bases. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* **213**(8), 1569–1577 (2009)
6. Furini, F., Traversi, E., Belotti, P., Frangioni, A., Gleixner, A., Gould, N., Liberti, L., Lodi, A., Misener, R., Mittelmann, H., et al.: Qplib: a library of quadratic programming instances. *Mathematical Programming Computation* **11**, 237–265 (2019)
7. Graver, J.E.: On the foundations of linear and integer linear programming i. *Mathematical Programming* **9**(1), 207–226 (1975)
8. Gurobi Optimization, LLC: Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual (2023), <https://www.gurobi.com>
9. Hemmecke, R.: On the computation of hilbert bases of cones. In: *Mathematical software*, pp. 307–317. World Scientific (2002)
10. IBM: Ibm ilog cplex optimization studio (2022), <https://www.ibm.com/products/ilog-cplex-optimization-studio>
11. Kannan, R., Bachem, A.: Polynomial algorithms for computing the smith and hermite normal forms of an integer matrix. *siam Journal on Computing* **8**(4), 499–507 (1979)
12. Karahalios, A., Tayur, S., Tenneti, A., Pashapour, A., Salman, F.S., Yıldız, B.: A quantum-inspired bilevel optimization algorithm for the first responder network design problem. *INFORMS Journal on Computing* (2024)
13. Kingma, D.P.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980 (2014)
14. Lee, J., Onn, S., Romanchuk, L., Weismantel, R.: The quadratic graver cone, quadratic integer minimization, and extensions. *Mathematical programming* **136**, 301–323 (2012)
15. Lenstra, A.K., Lenstra, H.W., Lovász, L.: Factoring polynomials with rational coefficients. *Mathematische annalen* **261**, 515–534 (1982)

16. Li, D., Sun, X., et al.: Nonlinear integer programming, vol. 84. Springer (2006)
17. Markowitz, H.M., Markowitz, H.M.: Portfolio selection: efficient diversification of investments. J. Wiley (1967)
18. Micciancio, D., Goldwasser, S.: Shortest vector problem. In: Complexity of Lattice Problems: A Cryptographic Perspective, pp. 69–90. Springer (2002)
19. Murota, K., Saito, H., Weismantel, R.: Optimality criterion for a class of nonlinear integer programs. Operations Research Letters **32**(5), 468–472 (2004)
20. Perron, L., Didier, F.: Cp-sat, [https://developers.google.com/optimization/cp/cp\\_solver/](https://developers.google.com/optimization/cp/cp_solver/)
21. Pottier, L.: The euclidean algorithm in dimension  $n$ . In: Proceedings of the 1996 international symposium on Symbolic and algebraic computation. pp. 40–42 (1996)
22. Schrijver, A.: Theory of linear and integer programming. John Wiley & Sons (1998)
23. Tibshirani, R.: Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology **58**(1), 267–288 (1996)