# Steepest Descent Algorithm for M-convex Function Minimization Using Long Step Length

Taihei Oki<sup>\*</sup> Akiyoshi Shioura<sup>†</sup>

March 4, 2025

#### Abstract

We consider the minimization of an M-convex function, which is a discrete convexity concept for functions on the integer lattice points. It is known that a minimizer of an Mconvex function can be obtained by the steepest descent algorithm. In this paper, we propose an effective use of long step length in the steepest descent algorithm, aiming at the reduction in the running time. In particular, we obtain an improved time bound by using long step length. We also consider the constrained M-convex function minimization and show that long step length can be applied to a variant of steepest descent algorithm as well.

# 1 Introduction

Steepest descent algorithm is one of the most fundamental algorithms for convex function minimization in real variables, which repeatedly moves a point by a certain step length in a steepest descent direction. While choosing an appropriate step length is crucial to the efficiency of the algorithm, this presents a fundamental dilemma: longer step lengths can speed up the optimization process, but they also increase the risk of overshooting an optimal solution. Balancing these two, a number of methods to determine step lengths with provable convergence rates have been proposed [2, 3].

Choosing an appropriate step length is also crucial in discrete optimization with integer variables. While unit step length is often used in algorithms for discrete optimization problems, due to the integrality of solutions, long step length is also used by various algorithms, including those for network flow problems. We illustrate this through the successive shortest path algorithm for the minimum cost flow problem with integral capacities (see, e.g., [1, Section 9.7]).

In the successive shortest path algorithm, a shortest path from the source to the sink in the residual network is repeatedly selected, and a flow is augmented along the path by a certain amount; this amount can be viewed as step length. By augmenting a flow by a unit amount in each iteration, we obtain a pseudo-polynomial time bound that is proportional to the total

<sup>\*</sup>Institute for Chemical Reaction Design and Discovery (ICReDD), Hokkaido University, Sapporo 001-0021, Japan. oki@icredd.hokudai.ac.jp

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Department of Industrial Engineering and Economics, Institute of Science Tokyo, Tokyo 152-8550, Japan. shioura.a.aa@m.titech.ac.jp

supply value at the source. Instead, we may augment a flow by the capacity of the shortest path; while this modification does not improve the worst-case running time, it makes the algorithm faster in practice. Moreover, we can obtain a better time bound in terms of arc cost if we augment a flow by using multiple shortest paths at the same time<sup>1</sup>. In this way, we can improve the running time of the algorithm theoretically and practically with the aid of long step length.

**Our Contribution** In this paper, we extend the idea of long step length to a broad class of discrete optimization problems called *M*-convex function minimization, and propose an effective use of long step length in the steepest descent algorithm. The successive shortest path algorithm for the minimum cost flow problem can be seen as a special case of the steepest descent algorithm for M-convex function minimization (cf. Example 2.1). By using long step lengths, we obtain an improved time bound of the steepest descent algorithm, showing that if an initial point is sufficiently "close" to optimality, then an optimal point can be computed quickly.

Minimization of an M-convex function is one of the most fundamental problem in discrete convex analysis [24, 25, 27] and includes various discrete optimization problems as special cases. Indeed, examples of M-convex function minimization are the minimum weight base problem of matroids and polymatroids (see, e.g., [8, 34]), separable-convex resource allocation problem under a polymatroid constraint [17, 19], the minimum cost flow problem with multiple sources and demands [1], maximization of gross-substitute valuation [33], and so on (see also Examples 2.1–2.3 in Section 2).

M-convex function minimization can be solved in pseudo-polynomial time by the steepest descent algorithm [35]. Polynomial-time solvability of this problem is shown in [35], and various polynomial-time algorithms based on scaling approach are proposed in [23, 36, 41].

An optimality condition of M-convex function minimization is described by using directions of the form<sup>2</sup> + $\chi_i - \chi_j$ : a vector x is a minimizer of an M-convex function f if and only if the slopes of f in all such directions are non-negative [24, 25]. Hence, an optimal point can be obtained by iteratively moving a point along a steepest descent direction (i.e., a direction with the minimum slope) until the slope in the steepest descent direction becomes non-negative; this is the *steepest descent algorithm* for M-convex function minimization [28]. It is shown [22, 38] that the number of iterations in the steepest descent algorithm is exactly equal to  $(1/2) ||x^* - x_0||_1$ , where  $x_0$  is the initial point and  $x^*$  is an optimal point nearest to  $x_0$  in terms of the  $\ell_1$ -distance.

In the basic steepest descent algorithm, the unit length is always chosen as the step length. We propose a modifined version of the steepest descent algorithm, in which the step length can be taken larger as far as the slope in the direction remains the same. We first show that the trajectory of the vector generated by the modified algorithm coincides with that of a special implementation of the basic steepest descent algorithm. This modification possibly reduces the running time of the algorithm in practice, although the theoretical worst-case time bound is the same as before.

To obtain an improved theoretical time bound, in Section 3 we further modify the algorithm by selecting steepest descent directions in some specific order, and show that, under the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>This variant of the successive shortest path algorithm is often referred to as a primal-dual algorithm [1, Section 9.8].

 $<sup>{}^{2}\</sup>chi_{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n}$  denotes the *i*-th unit vector for i = 1, 2, ..., n.

assumption that f is integer-valued, the number of iterations is at most

$$\min\{n^2 |\mu(x_0)|, (1/2) \|x^* - x_0\|_1\}$$

where  $\mu(x_0)$  is the slope in the steepest descent direction at the initial point. This bound shows that the steepest descent algorithm using long step lengths terminates quickly if the slope  $\mu(x_0)$ in the steepest descent direction at  $x_0$  is sufficiently close to zero, or the initial point  $x_0$  is close to the set of optimal points (or both).

We also discuss in Section 4 application of long step length to a class of constrained Mconvex function minimization problems. In this problem, we are given an M-convex function f, an index set  $R \subseteq \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ , and an integer k, and find a minimizer of f under the constraint  $\sum_{i \in R} x(i) = k$ . This constrained problem is a generalization of the one for matroids discussed by Gabow and Tarjan [11] and Gusfield [16] and for polymatroids by Gottschalk et al. [12]. In addition, this constrained problem is used in [38] to reformulate a nonlinear integer programming problem arising from re-allocation of dock-capacity in a bike sharing system discussed by Freund et al. [7]. A more general (but essentially equivalent) constrained problem is considered by Takazawa [40] (see Section 4.3). The constrained M-convex function minimization can be also solved by a variant of the steepest descent algorithm [40], in which the value  $\sum_{i \in R} x(i)$  is iteratively increased until it reaches k. We show that long step length can be also used in this algorithm to improve its time bound.

The concept of M-convexity for functions on  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  is extended to ordinary (polyhedral) convex functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  [29, 31]. We consider in Section 5 the minimization of a polyhedral M-convex function. It is known (cf. [29]) that a steepest descent algorithm for M-convex functions on  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ is applicable to polyhedral M-convex functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . In particular, use of long step length is quite natural for polyhedral M-convex functions. While the steepest descent algorithm finds a minimizer of a polyhedral M-convex function if it terminates, it is not known so far whether the algorithm terminates in a finite number of iterations. We show that in a variant of the steepest descent algorithm with long step length, the slope in the steepest descent direction increases strictly after  $O(n^2)$  iterations. By using this property, we can obtain the first result on the finite termination of an exact algorithm for finding a global minimizer of a polyhedral M-convex functions.

**Related Work** Steepest descent algorithms using long step lengths have been proposed for another class of discrete convex functions called L-convex functions [25, 27]. L-convex functions form the conjugate class of M-convex functions with respect to the Legendre–Fenchel transformation. It is known that a minimizer of an L-convex function can be obtained by a steepest descent algorithm of a different type [26, 28], where a set of 0-1 vectors are used as moving directions of a point. For this algorithm, the long step technique is applied and similar results are obtained (see [37]; see also [9]). In particular, it is shown that a variant of long-step steepest descent algorithm that always selects a "minimal" steepest descent direction achieves a better theoretical time bound.

**Organization of This Paper** The concept of M-convex function and other related concepts are explained in Section 2. Long step length is applied to the steepest descent algorithm for

M-convex function minimization in Section 3. Application to constrained M-convex function minimization is considered in Section 4. Results for polyhedral M-convex function minimization are presented in Section 5. Omitted proofs are given in Appendix.

# 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we explain the definition of M-convex function and other related concepts.

Throughout this paper, let n be a positive integer and denote  $N = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ . We denote by  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{R}$  the sets of integers and real numbers, respectively. Also, we denote by  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  the set of non-negative integers, and  $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ . We denote  $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0, ..., 0)$ . The *i*-th unit vector for  $i \in N$  is denoted as  $\chi_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , i.e.,  $\chi_i(i) = 1$  and  $\chi_i(j) = 0$  if  $j \neq i$ ; in addition, we denote  $\chi_0 = \mathbf{0}$ . For a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , we define  $||x||_1 = \sum_{i \in N} |x(i)|, ||x||_{\infty} = \max_{i \in N} |x(i)|$ , and  $x(R) = \sum_{i \in R} x(i)$  for  $R \subseteq N$ .

A univariate function  $\psi : \mathbb{Z} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is said to be *convex* if it satisfies  $\psi(\alpha - 1) + \psi(\alpha + 1) \ge 2\psi(\alpha)$ for every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $\psi(\alpha) < +\infty$ . We assume in this paper that the value of a function  $f : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  (or  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ ) can be evaluated in constant time.

**Base polyhedron and polymatroid** Let  $\rho : 2^N \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be an integer-valued submodular function;  $\rho$  is submodular if it satisfies the submodular inequality:

$$\rho(X) + \rho(Y) \ge \rho(X \cap Y) + \rho(X \cup Y) \qquad (X, Y \in 2^N).$$

In this paper, we assume  $\rho(\emptyset) = 0$  for every submodular function  $\rho$ . An *(integral) base polyhedron*  $B(\rho)$  associated with a submodular function  $\rho$  is the set of integral vectors given by

$$B(\rho) = \{ x \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid x(Y) \le \rho(Y) \ (Y \in 2^N), \ x(N) = \rho(N) \}.$$

An integral base polyhedron is also referred to as an M-convex set [27].

A polymatroid is defined by a submodular function  $\rho : 2^N \to \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that function values are non-negative integers and  $\rho$  is monotone non-decreasing (i.e.,  $\rho(X) \leq \rho(Y)$  whenever  $X \subseteq Y$ ); such a function is called a *polymatroid rank function*. An *(integral) polymatroid* associated with a polymatroid rank function  $\rho$  is the set of non-negative integral vectors given as

$$P(\rho) = \{ x \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{n} \mid x(Y) \le \rho(Y) \ (Y \in 2^{N}) \}.$$

A vector  $x \in P(\rho)$  is called a base of the polymetroid  $P(\rho)$  if it satisfies  $x(N) = \rho(N)$ .

**M-convex and M<sup>\natural</sup>-convex function** For a function  $f : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  defined on integer lattice points, we define the effective domain of f by dom  $f = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid f(x) < +\infty\}$ . A function f with dom  $f \neq \emptyset$  is said to be *M-convex* if it satisfies the following exchange axiom:

(M-EXC) for every  $x, y \in \text{dom } f$  and  $i \in \text{supp}^+(x-y)$ , there exists some  $j \in \text{supp}^-(x-y)$  such that

$$f(x) + f(y) \ge f(x - \chi_i + \chi_j) + f(y + \chi_i - \chi_j),$$

where

$$\operatorname{supp}^+(x-y) = \{i \in N \mid x(i) > y(i)\}, \quad \operatorname{supp}^-(x-y) = \{i \in N \mid x(i) < y(i)\}.$$

We say that f is *M*-concave if -f is an M-convex function. The concept of M-convex function is an extension of valuated matroid due to Dress and Wenzel [4]; for a function f with dom  $f \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ , f is a valuated matroid if and only if it is M-concave.

The concept of M-convexity is deeply related with integral base polyhedra. For an M-convex function  $f : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , the effective domain dom f is an integral base polyhedron; in addition, the set of minimizers  $\arg \min f$  is an integral base polyhedra if  $\arg \min f \neq \emptyset$ . On the other hand, given an integral base polyhedron  $B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ , the indicator function  $\delta_B : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \{0, +\infty\}$  defined by

$$\delta_B(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{(if } x \in B), \\ +\infty & \text{(otherwise)} \end{cases}$$

is an M-convex function.

An  $M^{\natural}$ -convex function is a variant of M-convex function. The exchange axiom (M-EXC) implies that x(N) = y(N) for every  $x, y \in \text{dom } f$ , i.e., the effective domain dom f is contained in a hyperplane of the form x(N) = r with some integer r. This fact naturally leads us to consider the projection of an M-convex function with n variables to a function with n-1 variables; we call such a function an  $M^{\natural}$ -convex function [29]. More precisely, a function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is said to be  $M^{\natural}$ -convex if the function  $\tilde{f}: \mathbb{Z}^{\tilde{N}} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  given as

$$\tilde{f}(x,x_0) = \begin{cases} f(x) & (\text{if } x(N) + x_0 = 0), \\ +\infty & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases} \qquad ((x,x_0) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\tilde{N}} = \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z})$$
(2.1)

is an M-convex function, where  $\tilde{N} = N \cup \{0\}$ .

An M<sup><sup>†</sup></sup>-convex function can be characterized by the following exchange axiom:

(M<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-EXC) for every  $x, y \in \text{dom } f$  and  $i \in \text{supp}^+(x-y)$ , there exists some  $j \in \text{supp}^-(x-y) \cup \{0\}$  such that

$$f(x) + f(y) \ge f(x - \chi_i + \chi_j) + f(y + \chi_i - \chi_j).$$

Note that j can be equal to 0 in (M<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-EXC), which is not possible in (M-EXC). Hence, the class of M<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-convex functions properly contains that of M-convex functions, while they are essentially equivalent by the definition of M<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-convexity.

Gross-substitutes valuation [20] in mathematical economics and its generalization called strong-substitutes valuation [21] are essentially equivalent to the concept of M<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-convexity (see Example 2.3 for details). Note also that the indicator function  $\delta_P$  of an integral polymatroid Pis an M<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-convex function.

**Examples** We present some examples of M-convex and M<sup>\$</sup>-convex functions.

**Example 2.1** (Minimum cost flow). M-convex functions arise from the minimum cost flow problem. Let G = (V, A) be a directed graph with two disjoint vertex subsets  $S, T \subseteq V$ , where

S (resp., T) represents the set of source (resp., sink) vertices. For each arc  $a \in A$  we are given an arc capacity  $u(a) \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . A vector  $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^A$  is called a flow, and the boundary  $\partial \xi \in \mathbb{Z}^V$  of a flow  $\xi$  is given by

$$\partial \xi(v) = \sum \{\xi(a) \mid \text{arc } a \text{ leaves } v\} - \sum \{\xi(a) \mid \text{arc } a \text{ enters } v\} \qquad (v \in V).$$

A flow  $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^A$  is said to be feasible if it satisfies

$$0 \leq \xi(a) \leq u(a) \ (a \in A), \qquad \partial \xi(v) = 0 \ (v \in V \setminus (S \cup T))$$

Suppose that we are also given a univariate convex functions  $f_a : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$  for each  $a \in A$ , which represents the cost of flow on arc a. The minimum cost of a flow that realizes supply/demand values  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^{S \cup T}$  is represented by a function  $f : \mathbb{Z}^{S \cup T} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm \infty\}$  defined as

$$f(x) = \inf_{\xi \in \mathbb{Z}^A} \left\{ \sum_{a \in A} f_a(\xi(a)) \ \middle| \ \xi \text{ is a feasible flow with } (\partial \xi)(v) = x(v) \ (v \in S \cup T) \right\};$$

we define  $f(x) = +\infty$  if there exists no feasible flow  $\xi$  with  $(\partial \xi)(v) = x(v)$  ( $v \in S \cup T$ ). It can be shown that f is an M-convex function, provided that  $f(x) > -\infty$  for  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  [24, 25].

An optimal solution of the minimum cost flow problem can be obtained by a variant of the successive shortest path algorithm: starting with the zero flow, we repeatedly select a shortest path among all paths from sources to sinks in the auxiliary network and augment a flow by one unit along the selected path. This algorithm can be seen as a specialized implementation of the steepest descent algorithm for M-convex function minimization to the function f mentioned above.

**Example 2.2** (Resource allocation). The *(separable convex) resource allocation problem under a polymatroid constraint* is given as follows [6, 13, 17]:

RAP: Minimize 
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x(i))$$
 subject to  $x \in P(\rho), x(N) = \rho(N),$ 

where  $f_i : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$   $(i \in N)$  is a univariate convex function and  $\rho : 2^N \to \mathbb{Z}_+$  is a polymatroid rank function; see [8, 18, 19] for review of RAP. RAP can be regarded as a special case of M-convex function minimization since function  $f_{\text{RAP1}} : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  defined by

$$f_{\text{RAP1}}(x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x(i)) & \text{(if } x \in \mathbb{Z}^n \text{ is a feasible solution to RAP),} \\ +\infty & \text{(otherwise)} \end{cases}$$

satisfies (M-EXC) [24, 25]. We can also reformulate RAP as the minimization of function  $f_{\text{RAP2}}: \mathbb{Z}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  defined by

$$f_{\text{RAP2}}(x) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x(i)) & \text{(if } x \in P(\rho)), \\ +\infty & \text{(otherwise)} \end{cases}$$

under the constraint  $x(N) = \rho(N)$ . It can be shown that  $f_{\text{RAP2}}$  is an M<sup>\[\[\[\]</sup>-convex function (cf. [24, 25, 29]).

**Example 2.3** (Strong-substitutes valuations). The concepts of gross-substitutes and strongsubstitutes valuations in mathematical economics are known to be equivalent to  $M^{\natural}$ -concave functions [10, 39]. The gross-substitutes condition for a single-unit valuation  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ , introduced by Kelso and Crawford [20] (see also [14, 15]), is described using price vectors  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^n$  as follows:

**(GS)** 
$$\forall p, q \in \mathbb{R}^n$$
 with  $p \leq q, \forall x \in \arg \max_y \{f(y) - p^\top y\}, \exists x' \in \arg \max_y \{f(y) - q^\top y\}: x'(i) \geq x(i) \text{ for all } i \in N \text{ with } q(i) = p(i).$ 

The gross-substitutes condition is extended to multi-unit valuation functions (i.e., functions defined on integer interval  $0 \le x(i) \le u(i)$   $(i \in N)$ ) by Milgrom and Strulovici [21], which is called the *strong-substitutes* condition. We say that a multi-unit valuation function f satisfies the strong-substitutes condition if f satisfies (GS) when all units of every item is regarded as different items. Equivalence between gross-substitutes (and strong-substitutes) valuations and M<sup> $\dagger$ </sup>-concave functions is shown by Fujishige and Yang [10] (see also [39]). It is known that gross-substitutes (and strong-substitutes) valuation functions enjoy various nice properties in mathematical economics. In particular, in the auction market with multiple indivisible items, gross-substitutes condition for bidders' valuations implies the existence of a Walrasian equilibrium.

We here consider the following fundamental problem in economics: given a strong-substitutes valuation f and a price vector  $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$  for items, find an item set  $x \in \text{dom } f$  maximizing the value  $f(x) - p^{\top}x$ . This problem can be seen as a maximization of an M<sup>\(\beta\)</sup>-concave function since f is an M<sup>\(\beta\)</sup>-concave function and the class of M<sup>\(\beta\)</sup>-concave functions is closed under the addition of linear functions.

# **3** Application to M-convex Function Minimization

In this section, minimization of an M-convex function  $f : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \mathbb{R}$  is considered. We first review the basic steepest descent algorithm, and then propose algorithms using long step length. Throughout this section, we assume the boundedness of dom f; this assumption implies arg min  $f \neq \emptyset$ , in particular.

### 3.1 Review of Steepest Descent Algorithm

The steepest descent algorithm for M-convex function minimization is based on the characterization of a minimizer by local minimality condition.

**Theorem 3.1** ([24, 25, 27]). For an *M*-convex function  $f : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , a vector  $x^* \in \text{dom } f$  is a minimizer of f if and only if  $f(x^* + \chi_i - \chi_j) \ge f(x^*)$  for all  $i, j \in N$ .

In the algorithm description, we use a vector of the form  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$   $(i, j \in N)$ , which is referred to as a *direction* in this section. For  $x \in \text{dom } f$  and a direction  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$ , we denote

$$f'(x; i, j) = f(x + \chi_i - \chi_j) - f(x),$$

i.e., f'(x; i, j) is the slope of function f at x in the direction  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$ . Note that f'(x; i, i) = 0 by definition. For  $x \in \text{dom } f$ , we say that a direction  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$  is a steepest descent direction of

f at x if it minimizes the value f'(x; i, j) among all directions. We denote

$$\varphi(x) = \min_{i,j \in N} f'(x;i,j),$$

i.e.,  $\varphi(x)$  is the slope of a steepest descent direction at x. We have  $\varphi(x) \leq 0$  for every  $x \in \text{dom } f$ , and Theorem 3.1 implies that the equality holds if and only if x is a minimizer of f.

We present below a basic version of the steepest descent algorithm. In the algorithm, the vector x is repeatedly moved in a steepest descent direction until  $\varphi(x) = 0$  holds.

#### Algorithm M-SD

**Step 0:** Let  $x_0 \in \text{dom } f$  be an arbitrarily chosen initial vector. Set  $x := x_0$ . **Step 1:** Let  $i, j \in N$  be elements that minimize f'(x; i, j). **Step 2:** If f'(x; i, j) = 0 then output x and stop. **Step 3:** Set  $x := x + \chi_i - \chi_j$ , and go to Step 1.

It is easy to see that the  $\ell_1$ -distance from x to (the nearest) minimizer of f reduces at most two in each iteration, which implies that the number of iterations in the algorithm M-SD is at least  $(1/2) \min\{||y - x_0||_1 | y \in \arg\min f\}$ . It turns out that this bound is tight [38]. We denote by  $\tau(x_0)$  the  $\ell_1$ -distance between a vector  $x_0 \in \operatorname{dom} f$  and the set of minimizers  $\arg\min f$ , i.e.,

$$\tau(x_0) = \min\{\|y - x_0\|_1 \mid y \in \arg\min f\}.$$

**Theorem 3.2** ([38, Corollary 4.2]). For an *M*-convex function  $f : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  with  $\arg\min f \neq \emptyset$ , the algorithm M-SD outputs a minimizer  $x^*$  of f satisfying  $||x^* - x_0||_1 = \tau(x_0)$ , and the number of iterations is exactly equal to  $(1/2)\tau(x_0)$ .

### 3.2 Use of Long Step Length

In the algorithm M-SD, once a direction  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$  is selected, the vector x moves in the direction only by unit step length. We will modify the algorithm so that the current vector moves in the selected direction by multiple step length as far as the slope in the direction remains the same.

In each iteration of the steepest descent algorithm, the slope of f in a steepest descent direction at x (i.e., the value  $\varphi(x)$ ) is non-decreasing.

**Proposition 3.3** (cf. [38, Proposition 4.3]). Let  $y \in \text{dom } f$  be a vector with  $\varphi(y) < 0$ , and  $i, j \in N$  be distinct elements such that  $f'(y; i, j) = \varphi(y)$ . Then,  $\varphi(y + \chi_i - \chi_j) \ge \varphi(y)$  holds. Moreover, for every distinct  $h, k \in N$  it holds that  $f'(y + \chi_i - \chi_j; h, k) \ge \varphi(y)$ , and if the inequality holds with equality, then  $+\chi_h - \chi_k$  is a steepest descent direction at  $y + \chi_i - \chi_j$ .

For readers' convenience, we provide a proof of Proposition 3.3 in Section A.1 of Appendix.

This monotonicity implies that a steepest descent direction chosen in Step 1 of M-SD can be used again in the next iteration if the slope in the direction remains the same. Based on this observation, we modify the algorithm as follows: once a steepest descent direction  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$  is selected in Step 1, the vector x is updated to  $x + \bar{c}(x; i, j)(\chi_i - \chi_j)$  with the step length  $\bar{c}(x; i, j)$ given by

$$\bar{c}(x;i,j) = \max\{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \mid f(x+\lambda(\chi_i-\chi_j)) - f(x) = \lambda f'(x;i,j)\}.$$
(3.1)

This idea can be incorporated in the algorithm M-SD by replacing Step 3 with the following:

**Step 3:** Set  $x := x + \overline{c}(x; i, j)(\chi_i - \chi_j)$  and go to Step 1.

The modified algorithm, denoted as M-LSD, can be seen as a special implementation of the basic algorithm M-SD, and therefore the theoretical time bound in Theorem 3.2 can be also applied to M-LSD as well. While it is expected that M-LSD runs faster than M-SD in practice, no better theoretical time bound for M-LSD is known so far.

To obtain an alternative theoretical bound for a long-step version of the steepest descent algorithm, we further modify the algorithm by selecting steepest descent directions in some specific order. At the termination of the modified algorithm M-LSD2, the output vector xsatisfies  $\varphi(x) = 0$ , and therefore it is a minimizer of f by Theorem 3.1.

#### Algorithm M-LSD2

**Step 0:** Let  $x_0 \in \text{dom } f$  be an arbitrarily chosen initial vector. Set  $x := x_0$ . **Step 1:** If  $\varphi(x) = 0$ , then output x and stop. **Step 2:** Let x' be the output of the procedure M-INCSLOPE(x). Set x := x'. Go to Step 1.

Given a vector  $x \in \text{dom } f$ , the procedure M-INCSLOPE(x) initially sets the vector y to x, repeatedly updates y by using steepest descent directions with slope equal to  $\varphi(x)$ , and finally obtain y with  $\varphi(y) > \varphi(x)$ . The outer iteration of the procedure consists of Steps 1 and 2, and there is an inner iteration in Step 1. In Step 1 of each outer iteration, we select any  $i \in N$ first. Then, for each  $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ , we check whether the slope f'(y; i, j) is equal to  $\varphi(x)$ ; if it is true,  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$  is a steepest descent direction by Proposition 3.3, and the vector y is updated to  $y + \overline{c}(y; i, j)(\chi_i - \chi_j)$ .

#### **Procedure** M-INCSLOPE(x)

**Step 0:** Set 
$$y := x$$
 and  $N^+ := N$ .

**Step 1:** Take any  $i \in N^+$ , set  $N_i^- := N \setminus \{i\}$ , and do the following steps.

**Step 1-1:** Take any  $j \in N_i^-$ . If  $f'(y; i, j) = \varphi(x)$ , set  $y := y + \overline{c}(y; i, j)(\chi_i - \chi_j)$ .

**Step 1-2:** Set  $N_i^- := N_i^- \setminus \{j\}$ . If  $N_i^- = \emptyset$ , then go to Step 2. Otherwise, go to Step 1-1.

**Step 2:** Set  $N^+ := N^+ \setminus \{i\}$ . If  $N^+ = \emptyset$ , then output y and stop. Otherwise, go to Step 1.

The next theorem shows that  $\varphi(x)$  increases strictly in each iteration of M-LSD2. Proof is given in Section 3.3.

**Theorem 3.4.** For a vector  $x \in \text{dom } f$  with  $\varphi(x) < 0$ , the output x' of the procedure M-INCSLOPE(x) satisfies  $\varphi(x') > \varphi(x)$ .

We analyze the running time of the algorithm M-LSD2. In the following, we assume that f is an integer-valued function is given as an evaluation oracle that requires constant time for function value evaluation.

By Theorem 3.4, the algorithm M-LSD2 terminates in at most  $|\varphi(x_0)|$  iterations if f is an integer-valued function. The step length  $\bar{c}(y; i, j)$  for  $y \in \text{dom } f$  and  $i, j \in N$  can be computed in  $O(\log L_{\infty})$  time by binary search, where

$$L_{\infty} = \max\{\|y - y'\|_{\infty} \mid y, y' \in \text{dom}\,f\},\tag{3.2}$$

which is the "diameter" of dom f. The step length  $\bar{c}(y; i, j)$  is computed once for every pair of distinct  $i, j \in N$  in the procedure M-INCSLOPE(x). Therefore, M-INCSLOPE(x) runs in  $O(n^2 \log L_{\infty})$  time. The discussion above, together with Theorem 3.2, implies the following time bound for M-LSD2.

**Theorem 3.5.** Let  $f : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be an integer-valued M-convex function with bounded dom f, and assume that the function value of f can be evaluated in constant time. Then, the algorithm M-LSD2 outputs a minimizer of f in  $O(n^2(\log L_\infty) \cdot \min\{|\varphi(x_0)|, \tau(x_0)\})$  time.

## 3.3 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Let  $x \in \text{dom } f$  be a vector with  $\varphi(x) < 0$ , and x' be the output of the procedure M-INCSLOPE(x). The goal of this section is to prove the inequality  $\varphi(x') > \varphi(x)$ .

Let us consider Step 1 in some outer iteration of the procedure M-INCSLOPE(x), and let  $i \in N$  be the element taken at the beginning of Step 1. By the definition of the step length  $\bar{c}(y; i, j)$ , vector y at the end of Step 1-1 satisfies the inequality  $f'(y; i, j) > \varphi(x) (= \varphi(y))$ . We first show that this inequality is preserved until the end of the inner iterations in Step 1.

**Lemma 3.6.** Let  $y \in \text{dom } f$  be a vector with  $\varphi(y) = \varphi(x)$ , and  $i, j \in N$  be distinct elements such that  $f'(y; i, j) > \varphi(x)$ . For  $k \in N \setminus \{i, j\}$  with  $y + \chi_i - \chi_k \in \text{dom } f$ , we have  $f'(y + \chi_i - \chi_k; i, j) \ge f'(y; i, j) > \varphi(x)$ .

Proof. Let  $\tilde{y} = y + \chi_i - \chi_k + \chi_i - \chi_j$ . It suffice to show that  $f(\tilde{y}) - f(y + \chi_i - \chi_k) \ge f'(y; i, j)$ . since  $f'(y; i, j) > \varphi(x)$ . If  $f(\tilde{y}) = +\infty$  then we are done; hence we assume  $\tilde{y} \in \text{dom } f$ . By (M-EXC) applied to  $y, \tilde{y}$ , and  $j \in \text{supp}^+(y - \tilde{y})$ , it holds that

$$f(y) + f(\tilde{y}) \ge f(y - \chi_j + \chi_i) + f(\tilde{y} + \chi_j - \chi_i) = f(y - \chi_j + \chi_i) + f(y + \chi_i - \chi_k)$$

since  $\operatorname{supp}^{-}(y - \tilde{y}) = \{i\}$ . It follows that

$$f(\tilde{y}) - f(y + \chi_i - \chi_k) \ge f(y + \chi_i - \chi_j) - f(y) = f'(y; i, j).$$

Repeated application of Lemma 3.6 implies that vector y at the end of Step 1 satisfies the inequalities

$$f'(y;i,j) > \varphi(x) \qquad (j \in N \setminus \{i\}). \tag{3.3}$$

Suppose that the inequalities (3.3) for some  $i \in N$  is satisfied by the vector y at the end of Step 1 in some outer iteration. We then show that these inequalities are preserved in the following outer iterations.

**Lemma 3.7.** Let  $y \in \text{dom } f$  be vectors with  $\varphi(y) = \varphi(x)$ , and  $i \in N$  be an element satisfying  $f'(y; i, j) > \varphi(x)$  for every  $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ . Also, let  $h, k \in N$  be distinct elements such that  $f'(y; h, k) = \varphi(x)$ , i.e.,  $+\chi_h - \chi_k$  is a steepest descent direction at y. Then,  $f'(y + \chi_h - \chi_k; i, j) > \varphi(x)$  holds for every  $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ .

*Proof.* We fix  $j^* \in N \setminus \{i\}$  and denote  $\tilde{y} = y + \chi_h - \chi_k + \chi_i - \chi_{j^*}$ . It suffices to show that

$$f(\tilde{y}) - f(y + \chi_h - \chi_k) > \varphi(x).$$
(3.4)

If  $f(\tilde{y}) = +\infty$  then we are done; hence we assume  $\tilde{y} \in \text{dom } f$ .

We first consider the case with  $i \neq k$  and  $j^* \neq h$ . Since  $\operatorname{supp}^+(y - \tilde{y}) = \{k, j^*\}$ , (M-EXC) applied to  $y, \tilde{y}$ , and  $k \in \operatorname{supp}^+(y - \tilde{y})$  implies that

$$f(y) + f(\tilde{y}) \ge \min\{f(y + \chi_h - \chi_k) + f(y + \chi_i - \chi_{j^*}), f(y + \chi_i - \chi_k) + f(y + \chi_h - \chi_{j^*})\} \\\ge f(y + \chi_h - \chi_k) + \min\{f(y + \chi_i - \chi_{j^*}), f(y + \chi_i - \chi_k)\} \\> f(y + \chi_h - \chi_k) + f(y) + \varphi(x),$$

where the second inequality is by the assumption that  $+\chi_h - \chi_k$  is a steepest descent direction at y, and the last inequality is by  $f'(y; i, j) > \varphi(x)$   $(j \in N \setminus \{i\})$ . Hence, (3.4) follows.

We next consider the case where i = k or  $j^* = h$  holds. Then, we have  $\tilde{y} = y + \chi_{h'} - \chi_{k'}$  for some  $h', k' \in N$ , where it is possible that h' = k'. Since  $+\chi_h - \chi_k$  is a steepest descent direction at y, it holds that  $f'(y; h', k') \ge f'(y; h, k)$ . Therefore, we obtain the inequality (3.4) as follows:

$$f(\tilde{y}) - f(y + \chi_h - \chi_k) = f(y + \chi_{h'} - \chi_{k'}) - f(y + \chi_h - \chi_k)$$
  
=  $f'(y; h', k') - f'(y; h, k) \ge 0 > \varphi(x).$ 

By repeated application of Lemma 3.7, we obtain the inequalities  $f'(x'; i, j) > \varphi(x)$   $(i, j \in N, i \neq j)$  for the vector x' at the end of the procedure M-INCSLOPE(x), implying the desired inequality  $\varphi(x') > \varphi(x)$ .

### 3.4 Some Remarks

**Remark 3.8.** The procedure M-INCSLOPE(x) uses each direction  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$  at most once for update of the current vector. Therefore, Theorem 3.4 implies that if some direction is used twice in the algorithm M-LSD2, then its slope in that direction must be different. In contrast, it can happen that the basic algorithm M-LSD uses the same direction twice (or more) but the slope remains the same, as shown in the following example.

Let us consider the function  $f : \mathbb{Z}^4 \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  given as

dom 
$$f = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{4} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{4} x(i) = 3, x(1) \le 2, x(2) \le 2, x(3) \le 1, x(4) \le 1\} \setminus \{(0, 2, 1, 0)\},\$$
  
 $f(x) = -x(1) - x(3) \quad (x \in \text{dom } f \setminus \{(2, 0, 0, 1)\}), \qquad f(2, 0, 0, 1) = -1.$ 

This is an M-convex function; indeed, we can show this by checking (M-EXC) for f.

Suppose that the algorithm M-LSD is applied to function f with the initial vector  $x_0 = (0, 2, 0, 1)$ . A possible trajectory of the vector x generated by M-LSD is

$$(0,2,0,1) \rightarrow (1,1,0,1) \rightarrow (1,1,1,0) \rightarrow (2,0,1,0),$$

where the direction  $+\chi_1 - \chi_2 = (+1, -1, 0, 0)$  is used in the first and the third iterations, and its slope is equal to -1 in both of the iterations.

We then apply the algorithm M-LSD2 with the same initial vector  $x_0$ , and select i = 1 in Step 1 of the first iteration. Then, a possible trajectory of the vector x is

$$(0,2,0,1) \to (1,1,0,1) \to (2,1,0,0) \to (2,0,1,0),$$

where different directions are used in each iteration.

**Remark 3.9.** We have shown that the number of iterations required by M-LSD2 is at most  $|\varphi(x_0)|$  if f is integer-valued. We can also show that the number of iterations is bounded by  $\sqrt{2(f(\overline{x_0}) - \min f)}$  with  $\min f = \min\{f(x) \mid x \in \operatorname{dom} f\}$ .

Let k be the number of iterations required by M-LSD2, and for  $h = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ , let  $x_h \in$ dom f be vector x at the end of the h-th iteration of the algorithm. Then,  $x_k$  is the output of the algorithm, which satisfies  $\varphi(x_k) = 0$ .

We show that  $(1/2)k^2 \leq f(x_0) - \min f$  holds. The values  $\varphi(x_h)$   $(h = 0, 1, \dots, k)$  are integers by assumption, and strictly increasing by Theorem 3.4. This fact, together with  $\varphi(x_k) = 0$ , implies that  $|\varphi(x_h)| \ge k - h$   $(h = 0, 1, \dots, k)$ . It follows that

$$f(x_{h-1}) - f(x_h) \ge |\varphi(x_{h-1})| \ge k - h + 1 \quad (h = 1, 2, \dots, k).$$

Hence, we have

$$(1/2)k^2 \le \sum_{h=1}^k (k-h+1) \le \sum_{h=1}^k [f(x_{h-1}) - f(x_h)] = f(x_0) - f(x_k) = f(x_0) - \min f.$$

The inequality  $k \leq \sqrt{2(f(x_0) - \min f)}$  follows immediately from this.

**Remark 3.10.** Theorem 3.2 implies monotonicity of vector x in the basic steepest descent algorithm M-SD.

**Proposition 3.11.** Let  $x^*$  be the output of the algorithm M-SD. In each iteration of the algorithm, component x(i)  $(i \in N)$  of vector x is non-increasing if  $x^*(i) \leq x_0(i)$  and non-decreasing if  $x^*(i) \ge x_0(i)$ .

Indeed, if the statement does not hold, then the number of iterations required by M-SD must be strictly larger than  $(1/2)||x^* - x_0||_1$ , a contradiction. By using this monotonicity, we can speed up the algorithms practically.

Proposition 3.11 implies that if some component x(i) is increased (resp., decreased) in some iteration, then it is never decreased (resp., increased) in the following iterations. Therefore, it possible to restrict the choice of  $i, j \in N$  in Step 1 of M-SD as follows, which may reduce the running time of the steepest descent algorithm.

#### Algorithm M-SD'

**Step 0:** Let  $x_0 \in \text{dom } f$  be an arbitrarily chosen initial vector. Set  $x := x_0, N_+ := N$ , and  $N_{-} := N$ .

**Step 1:** Let  $i \in N_+$  and  $j \in N_-$  be elements that minimize f'(x; i, j).

**Step 2:** If  $f'(x; i, j) \ge 0$  then output x and stop.

**Step 3:** Set  $x := x + \chi_i - \chi_j$ ,  $N_+ := N_+ \setminus \{j\}$ ,  $N_- := N_- \setminus \{i\}$ , and go to Step 1.

In a similar way, we can also modify the procedure M-INCSLOPE(x) as follows, where a new index set  $N^-$  is used in addition to  $N^+$  and  $N_i^ (i \in N)$ .

**Procedure** M-INCSLOPE'(x)

**Step 0:** Set y := x,  $N^+ := N$ , and  $N^- := N$ .

**Step 1:** Take some  $i \in N^+$ , set  $N_i^- := N^- \setminus \{i\}$ , and do the following steps.

Step 1-1: Take some  $j \in N_i^-$ . If  $f'(y; i, j) = \varphi(x)$ , then set  $y := y + \overline{c}(y; i, j)(\chi_i - \chi_j)$ ,  $N^+ := N^+ \setminus \{j\}$ , and  $N^- := N^- \setminus \{i\}$ .

**Step 1-2:** Set  $N_i^- := N_i^- \setminus \{j\}$ . If  $N_i^- = \emptyset$ , then go to Step 2. Otherwise, go to Step 1-1. **Step 2:** Set  $N^+ := N^+ \setminus \{i\}$ . If  $N^+ = \emptyset$ , then output y and stop. Otherwise, go to Step 1.

# 4 Application to Constrained M-convex Function Minimization

The problem discussed in this section is formulated as follows:

Min(f, R, k): Minimize f(x) subject to  $x(R) = k, x \in \text{dom } f$ ,

where  $f : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is an M-convex function with bounded dom f, R is a non-empty subset of N, and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . It is known that this constrained problem can be solved by a variant of steepest descent algorithm [40], to which the idea of long step length can be naturally applied as well.

The problem  $\operatorname{Min}(f, R, k)$  with R = N is nothing but an unconstrained minimization of f since x(N) is a constant for every  $x \in \operatorname{dom} f$  (see Section 2). Hence, R is assumed to be a proper subset of N (i.e.,  $\emptyset \neq R \subsetneq N$ ). In addition, feasibility of the problem  $\operatorname{Min}(f, R, k)$  is assumed in the following;  $\operatorname{Min}(f, R, k)$  is feasible if and only if k satisfies  $\underline{k} \leq k \leq \overline{k}$  with  $\underline{k} = \min\{x(R) \mid x \in \operatorname{dom} f\}$  and  $\overline{k} = \max\{x(R) \mid x \in \operatorname{dom} f\}$  (cf. [40, Lemma 2]).

### 4.1 Review of Steepest Descent Algorithm

Given an optimal solution x of Min(f, R, k), an optimal solution of Min(f, R, k + 1) can be obtained easily by using a steepest descent direction at x. For every k with  $\underline{k} \leq k \leq \overline{k}$ , we denote by M(k) and z(k) the set of optimal solutions and the optimal value for the problem Min(f, R, k), i.e.,

$$M(k) = \arg\min\{f(x) \mid x(R) = k, \ x \in \text{dom}\, f\},\$$
  
$$z(k) = \min\{f(x) \mid x(R) = k, \ x \in \text{dom}\, f\}.$$

As in Section 3, we denote  $f'(x; i, j) = f(x + \chi_i - \chi_j) - f(x)$  for  $x \in \text{dom } f$  and a direction  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$ . We also define

$$\varphi^{R}(x) = \min_{i \in R, \ j \in N \setminus R} f'(x; i, j) \qquad (x \in \text{dom } f).$$

**Proposition 4.1** (cf. [40, Lemma 3]). Let k be an integer with  $\underline{k} \leq k < \overline{k}$ , and  $x \in M(k)$ . Suppose that  $i \in R$  and  $j \in N \setminus R$  minimize the value f'(x; i, j), i.e.,  $f'(x; i, j) = \varphi^R(x)$ . Then,  $x + \chi_i - \chi_j \in M(k+1)$  holds. Repeated application of Proposition 4.1 implies that an optimal solution of Min(f, R, k) can be obtained by the following steepest descent algorithm [40]. In the following, we assume that a vector in  $M(\underline{k})$  is given in advance; such a vector (i.e., an optimal solution of  $Min(f, R, \underline{k})$ ) can be obtained by solving an unconstrained minimization of M-convex function  $g(x) = f(x) - \Gamma \cdot x(R)$  $(x \in \mathbb{Z}^n)$  with a sufficiently large positive number  $\Gamma$  (cf. [40]), for which efficient algorithms are available.

Algorithm CONSTM-SD

**Step 0:** Let  $x_{\underline{k}} \in M(\underline{k})$  and set  $x := x_{\underline{k}}$ . **Step 1:** If x(R) = k then output x and stop. **Step 2:** Let  $i \in R$  and  $j \in N \setminus R$  be elements minimizing the value f'(x; i, j). **Step 3:** Set  $x := x + \chi_i - \chi_j$  and go to Step 1.

The algorithm outputs an optimal solution after  $k - \underline{k}$  iterations, and each iteration requires O(|R|(n - |R|)) time. Hence, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 4.2** (cf. [40, Theorem 5]). Algorithm CONSTM-SD outputs an optimal solution of Min(f, R, k) in  $O(|R|(n - |R|)(k - \underline{k}))$  time. The running time reduces to  $O(n(k - \underline{k}))$  if either |R| or  $|N \setminus R|$  is bounded by a constant.

### 4.2 Use of Long Step Length

We then propose a long-step version of the algorithm CONSTM-SD. For this purpose, we show a monotonicity property of steepest descent directions similar to Proposition 3.3.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let k be an integer with  $\underline{k} \leq k \leq \overline{k} - 2$  and  $x \in M(k)$ . Also, let  $i \in R$  and  $j \in N \setminus R$  be elements minimizing f'(x; i, j). If  $f'(x + \chi_i - \chi_j; i, j) = f'(x; i, j)$ , then we have

$$f'(x + \chi_i - \chi_j; i, j) \le f'(x + \chi_i - \chi_j; h, \ell) \qquad (h \in \mathbb{R}, \ \ell \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{R}),$$
$$x + 2\chi_i - 2\chi_j \in M(k+2).$$

Proof of this proposition is given in Section A.2 in Appendix.

A long-step version of the algorithm CONSTM-SD, denoted as CONSTM-LSD, is obtained by replacing Step 3 in CONSTM-SD with the following, where  $\bar{c}(x; i, j)$  is given by (3.1).

**Step 3:** Set  $\lambda := \min\{k - x(R), \overline{c}(x; i, j)\}, x := x + \lambda(\chi_i - \chi_j)$ , and go to Step 1.

Proposition 4.3 guarantees that this modified algorithm can also find an optimal solution of Min(f, R, k).

#### **Theorem 4.4.** Algorithm CONSTM-LSD outputs an optimal solution of Min(f, R, k).

Although the number of iterations in the algorithm CONSTM-LSD can be the same as CONSTM-SD in the worst case, it is expected that CONSTM-LSD runs faster in practice. To obtain a better theoretical time bound, we use algorithm CONSTM-LSD2 and procedure CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x), both of which are similar to (but different from) M-LSD2 and M-INCSLOPE(x) used for unconstrained M-convex function minimization.

### Algorithm CONSTM-LSD2

**Step 0:** Let  $x_k \in M(\underline{k})$  and set  $x := x_k$ .

**Step 1:** If x(R) = k then output x and stop.

**Step 2:** Let x' be the output of the procedure CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x).

Set x := x' and go to Step 1.

Input of the procedure CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x) is an optimal solution  $x \in \text{dom } f$  of the problem  $\text{Min}(f, R, \hat{k})$  for some  $\hat{k} < k$ . The procedure initially sets the vector y to x, then repeatedly updates y by using  $i \in R$  and  $j \in N \setminus R$  with  $f'(y; i, j) = \varphi^R(x)$ , and finally obtain y satisfying  $\varphi^R(y) > \varphi^R(x)$  or y(R) = k (or both).

The outer iteration of the procedure consists of Steps 1 and 2, and there is an inner iteration in Step 1. In Step 1 of each outer iteration, we select any  $i \in R$  first. Then, for each  $j \in N \setminus R$ we check if the direction  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$  has the slope equal to  $\varphi^R(x)$ ; if it is true, y is updated to the vector  $y + \lambda(\chi_i - \chi_j)$  with  $\lambda := \min\{k - y(R), \bar{c}(y; i, j)\}$ .

#### **Procedure** CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x)

**Step 0:** Set y := x and  $N^+ := R$ .

**Step 1:** Take any  $i \in N^+$ , set  $N_i^- := N \setminus R$ , and do the following steps.

Step 1-1: Take any  $j \in N_i^-$ . If  $f'(y; i, j) = \varphi^R(x)$ , set  $\lambda := \min\{k - y(R), \bar{c}(y; i, j)\}$  and  $y := y + \lambda(\chi_i - \chi_j)$ .

**Step 1-2:** Set  $N_i^- := N_i^- \setminus \{j\}$ . If  $N_i^- = \emptyset$ , then go to Step 2. Otherwise, go to Step 1-1. **Step 2:** Set  $N^+ := N^+ \setminus \{i\}$ . If  $N^+ = \emptyset$ , then output y and stop. Otherwise, go to Step 1.

Note that the vector y at the end of Step 1-1 satisfies  $f'(y; i, j) > \varphi^R(x)$  if y(R) < k, regardless of whether or not y is updated in this step. Using this inequality we can obtain the following property of CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x), which is similar to Theorem 3.4; proof is also similar and given in Section A.3 in Appendix.

**Theorem 4.5.** For a vector  $x \in M(\hat{k})$  with an integer  $\hat{k} < k$ , the output x' of CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x) satisfies  $\varphi^{R}(x') > \varphi^{R}(x)$ , provided that x'(R) < k.

By using Theorem 4.5, we can analyze the running time of the algorithm CONSTM-LSD2 in a similar way as in Section 3. The procedure CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x) runs in  $O(|R|(n-|R|) \log L_{\infty})$  time with  $L_{\infty}$  given by (3.2). By Theorem 4.5 and the equation  $\varphi^{R}(x) = z(k+1) - z(k)$  for  $x \in M(k)$  (see Proposition 4.1), the number of iterations required by the algorithm CONSTM-LSD2 is bounded by  $\zeta(k) - \zeta(\underline{k})$  with  $\zeta(h) \equiv z(h+1) - z(h)$ . Also, the number of iterations is bounded by  $k - \underline{k}$ . Hence, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 4.6.** Algorithm CONSTM-LSD2 outputs an optimal solution of Min(f, R, k) in  $O(|R|(n-|R|)(\log L_{\infty}) \min \{\zeta(k) - \zeta(\underline{k}), k - \underline{k}\})$  time. The running time reduces to  $O(n(\log L_{\infty}) \min \{\zeta(k) - \zeta(\underline{k}), k - \underline{k}\})$  if either |R| or  $|N \setminus R|$  is bounded by a constant.

# 4.3 Constrained M<sup>‡</sup>-convex Function Minimization

The results for Min(f, R, k) obtained in the previous subsection can be extended to the constrained problem  $M^{\natural}$ -Min(f, R, k) with an  $M^{\natural}$ -convex objective function f. In fact,  $M^{\natural}$ -Min(f, R, k) and Min(f, R, k) are essentially equivalent, as shown below, and the results for Min(f, R, k) can be easily translated in terms of  $M^{\natural}-Min(f, R, k)$ .

Given an instance of problem  $M^{\natural}$ -Min(f, R, k), let  $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{Z}^{\tilde{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$  be the M-convex function given by (2.1) with  $\tilde{N} = N \cup \{0\}$ . By the definition of  $\tilde{f}$ , there exists a natural one-to-one correspondence between vectors in dom  $f (\subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n)$  and those in dom  $\tilde{f} (\subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{\tilde{N}})$ ; a vector  $x \in \text{dom } f$ corresponds to the vector  $\tilde{x} \equiv (x, -x(N)) \in \text{dom } \tilde{f}$ . Moreover,  $x \in \text{dom } f$  satisfies x(R) = kif and only if  $\tilde{x}$  satisfies  $\tilde{x}(R) = k$  since  $R \subseteq N$  and  $0 \notin R$ . Hence,  $x \in \text{dom } f$  is an optimal solution of  $M^{\natural}$ -Min(f, R, k) if and only if  $\tilde{x} \in \text{dom } \tilde{f}$  is an optimal solution of Min $(\tilde{f}, R, k)$ . This observation shows that  $M^{\natural}$ -Min(f, R, k) is equivalent to the constrained problem Min $(\tilde{f}, R, k)$ .

Based on the relationship between the two problems, algorithms for Min(f, R, k) can be translated in terms of  $M^{\natural}$ -Min(f, R, k). The values f'(x; i, j) and  $\bar{c}(x; i, j)$  are defined for  $i, j \in N$  as in Section 4.1; in the case with  $i \in N$  and j = 0, define

$$f'(x;i,0) = f(x+\chi_i) - f(x),$$
  
$$\bar{c}(x;i,0) = \max\{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \mid f(x+\lambda\chi_i) - f(x) = \lambda f'(x;i,0)\}$$

Then, algorithm CONSTM<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-LSD for M<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-Min(f, R, k) can be obtained from CONSTM-LSD for Min(f, R, k) as follows; the only difference is in Step 2, where the set  $N \setminus R$  is replaced with  $(N \setminus R) \cup \{0\}$ . Note that  $\chi_0 = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\underline{k} = \min\{x(R) \mid x \in \text{dom } f\}$ .

#### Algorithm ConstM<sup>\$</sup>-LSD

Step 0: Let  $x_{\underline{k}} \in M(\underline{k})$  and set  $x := x_{\underline{k}}$ . Step 1: If x(R) = k then output x and stop. Step 2: Let  $i \in R$  and  $j \in (N \setminus R) \cup \{0\}$  be elements minimizing the value f'(x; i, j). Step 3: Set  $\lambda := \min\{k - x(R), \overline{c}(x; i, j)\}, x := x + \lambda(\chi_i - \chi_j)$ , and go to Step 1.

**Theorem 4.7.** Algorithm CONSTM<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-LSD outputs an optimal solution of M<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-Min(f, R, k) in  $O(|R|(n - |R|)(k - \underline{k}))$  time. The running time reduces to  $O(n(k - \underline{k}))$  if either |R| or  $|N \setminus R|$  is bounded by a constant.

Similarly, we can also obtain algorithm  $\text{CONSTM}^{\natural}\text{-LSD2}$  and procedure  $\text{CONSTM}^{\natural}\text{-INCSLOPE}(x)$  for  $M^{\natural}\text{-Min}(f, R, k)$ , which are the same as CONSTM-LSD2 and CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x) for Min(f, R, k), except that procedure  $\text{CONSTM}^{\natural}\text{-INCSLOPE}(x)$  is used in  $\text{CONSTM}^{\natural}\text{-LSD2}$  instead of CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x), and the set  $N \setminus R$  in Step 1 of  $\text{CONSTM}^{\natural}\text{-INCSLOPE}(x)$  is replaced with  $(N \setminus R) \cup \{0\}$ .

**Theorem 4.8.** For a vector  $x \in M(\hat{k})$  with an integer  $\hat{k} < k$ , the output x' of the procedure CONSTM<sup>\$\$]</sup>-INCSLOPE(x) satisfies  $\varphi^{R}(x') > \varphi^{R}(x)$ , provided that x'(R) < k.

**Theorem 4.9.** Algorithm CONSTM<sup>‡</sup>-LSD2 outputs an optimal solution of M<sup>‡</sup>-Min(f, R, k) in  $O(|R|(n-|R|)(\log L_{\infty}) \min \{\zeta(k)-\zeta(\underline{k}), k-\underline{k}\})$  time. The running time reduces to  $O(n(\log L_{\infty}) \min \{\zeta(k)-\zeta(\underline{k}), k-\underline{k}\})$  if either of |R| and  $|N \setminus R|$  is bounded by a constant.

In the case of R = N, the description of the algorithm CONSTM<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-LSD (and CONSTM<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-LSD2) can be simplified as follows since the element j in the algorithm is always fixed to 0.

Algorithm CONSTM<sup>\$</sup>-LSD3

Step 0: Let  $x_{\underline{k}} \in M(\underline{k})$  and set  $x := x_{\underline{k}}$ . Step 1: If x(N) = k then output x and stop. Step 2: Let  $i \in N$  be an element that minimizes f'(x; i, 0). Step 3: Set  $\lambda := \min\{k - y(R), \overline{c}(y; i, 0)\}, x := x + \lambda \chi_i$ , and go to Step 1.

**Corollary 4.10.** Algorithm CONSTM<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-LSD3 outputs an optimal solution of M<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-Min(f, N, k) in O $(n(\log L_{\infty}) \min \{\zeta(k) - \zeta(\underline{k}), k - \underline{k}\})$  time.

**Remark 4.11.** The well-known greedy algorithm for linear optimization over a polymatroid [5] can be obtained as a specialized implementation of the algorithm CONSTM<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-LSD3. Note that in this case,  $\underline{k} = 0$  holds, and  $x_k$  in Step 0 of CONSTM<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-LSD3 is given as  $x_k = \mathbf{0}$ .

We can also specialize CONSTM<sup>‡</sup>-LSD3 to the minimization of a separable-convex function over a polymatroid:

SC: Minimize  $\sum_{i \in N} f_i(x(i))$  subject to  $x \in P(\rho), x(N) = \rho(N),$ 

where  $f_i : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{R}$  is a univariate convex function for  $i \in N$  and  $\rho : 2^N \to \mathbb{Z}_+$  is a polymatroid rank function. The problem SC is formulated as  $M^{\natural}$ -Min $(f, N, \rho(N))$  with an  $M^{\natural}$ -convex function f such that

dom 
$$f = P$$
,  $f(x) = \sum_{i \in N} f_i(x(i)) \ (x \in P)$ .

By specializing CONSTM<sup> $\natural$ </sup>-LSD3 to SC, we obtain the following algorithm, which is a long step version of the incremental greedy algorithm [6, 13].

#### Algorithm GREEDY\_SC

Step 0: Let x = 0.
Step 1: If x(N) = ρ(N), then output x and stop.
Step 2: Let i ∈ N be an element that minimizes f<sub>i</sub>(x(i) + 1) − f<sub>i</sub>(x(i)) under the condition x + χ<sub>i</sub> ∈ P.

**Step 3:** Let  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  be the maximum integer satisfying  $f_i(x(i) + \lambda) - f_i(x(i)) = f_i(x(i) + 1) - f_i(x(i))$  and  $x + \lambda \chi_i \in P$ . Set  $x := x + \lambda \chi_i$  and go to Step 1.

# 5 Application to Polyhedral M-convex Function Minimization

In this section, we consider the minimization of a polyhedral M-convex functions defined on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and show that the steepest descent algorithms for M-convex functions on  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  proposed in Section 3.2 can be naturally extended to polyhedral M-convex functions. While the steepest descent algorithm finds a minimizer of a polyhedral M-convex function if it terminates, it is not known so far whether the algorithm terminates in a finite number of iterations. We show that in a variant of the steepest descent algorithm with long step length, the slope in the steepest descent direction increases strictly after  $O(n^2)$  iterations. By using this property, we can obtain the first result on the finite termination of an exact algorithm for finding a global minimizer of a polyhedral M-convex functions.

### 5.1 Definition of Polyhedral M-convex Function

The concept of M-convexity is extended to polyhedral convex functions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ; a polyhedral convex function is a function  $\mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  such that its epigraph  $\{(x, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \mid f(x) \leq \alpha\}$  is a polyhedron. By definition, a polyhedral convex function is a convex function on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

A polyhedral convex function  $\mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is said to be *M*-convex [30] if it satisfies the following exchange axiom:

(M-EXC[ $\mathbb{R}$ ]) for every  $x, y \in \text{dom}_{\mathbb{R}} f$  and  $i \in \text{supp}^+(x-y)$ , there exists some  $j \in \text{supp}^-(x-y)$  and  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that

$$f(x) + f(y) \ge f(x - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_j)) + f(y + \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_j)) \quad (\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]),$$

where dom<sub> $\mathbb{R}$ </sub>  $f = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) < +\infty\}.$ 

For a function  $f: \mathbb{Z}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  with bounded dom f, its convex closure  $\overline{f}: \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  is given by

$$\bar{f}(x) = \sup\{p^{\top}x + \alpha \mid p^{\top}y + \alpha \le f(y) \ (y \in \operatorname{dom} f)\} \qquad (x \in \mathbb{R}^n),$$

which is a polyhedral convex function. It is known [30] that if f is an M-convex function, in addition, then its convex closure  $\overline{f}$  is polyhedral M-convex; moreover,  $\overline{f}(x) = f(x)$  holds for all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  and  $\min{\{\overline{f}(x) \mid x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}} = \min{\{f(x) \mid x \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}}$ . In this sense, polyhedral Mconvex functions are regarded as an extension of M-convex functions. On the other hand, for a polyhedral M-convex function  $f: \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , its restriction on  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  is an M-convex function on  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  if f is "integral" in the following sense:  $\arg\min{\{f(x) - p^\top x \mid x \in \text{dom } f\}}$  is an integral polyhedron for every  $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

In Example 2.1 we provided an example of an M-convex function on  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  arising from the minimum cost flow problem. In a similar way, we can obtain an example of polyhedral M-convex functions from the minimum cost flow problem by replacing  $f_a$  with a piecewise-linear convex function and regarding x and  $\xi$  as real vectors [30].

### 5.2 Steepest Descent Algorithm

We propose a steepest descent algorithm for minimization of a polyhedral M-convex function, and show that it terminates after a finite number of iterations.

Let  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  be a polyhedral M-convex function such that  $\operatorname{dom}_{\mathbb{R}} f = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) < +\infty\}$  is bounded. This assumption guarantees the existence of a minimizer. It is well known that a global minimizer of an ordinary convex function in real variables can be characterized by a local minimality in terms of directional derivatives. For polyhedral M-convex functions, local minimality is characterized by directional derivatives only in  $O(n^2)$  directions. For  $x \in \operatorname{dom}_{\mathbb{R}} f$  and  $i, j \in N$ , we denote by  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j)$  the directional derivative of f at x in the direction  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$ , i.e.,

$$f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x;i,j) = \lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \frac{f(x + \alpha(\chi_i - \chi_j)) - f(x)}{\alpha}.$$

Since f is polyhedral convex,  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x;i,j)$  is well defined and there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$f(x + \alpha(\chi_i - \chi_j)) = f(x) + \alpha f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j) \qquad (0 \le \alpha \le \varepsilon).$$

**Theorem 5.1** ([30, Theorem 4.12]). For a polyhedral *M*-convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ , a vector  $x^* \in \operatorname{dom}_{\mathbb{R}} f$  is a minimizer if and only if  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x^*; i, j) \ge 0$  for all  $i, j \in N$ .

For  $x \in \operatorname{dom}_{\mathbb{R}} f$  and a direction of the form  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$ , we say that  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$  is a steepest descent direction of f at x if it minimizes the value  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j)$  among all such directions. Denote by  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$  the slope of a steepest descent direction at x, i.e.,  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x) = \min_{i,j \in N} f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j)$ . By the definition of  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$  and Theorem 5.1, we have  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x) \leq 0$  for every  $x \in \operatorname{dom}_{\mathbb{R}} f$ , and the equality holds if and only if x is a minimizer of f.

By Theorem 5.1, a minimizer of a polyhedral M-convex function can be found by the steepest descent algorithm PM-LSD, which is described in the same way as M-LSD for M-convex functions on  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ , except that x is a real vector (not necessarily integral), f'(x; i, j) is replaced with  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j)$ , and  $\bar{c}(x; i, j)$  is replaced with  $\bar{c}_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j)$  given by

$$\bar{c}_{\mathbb{R}}(x;i,j) = \max\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid f(x+\lambda(\chi_i-\chi_j)) - f(x) = \lambda f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x;i,j)\};$$

the value  $\bar{c}_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j)$  is well defined since f is a polyhedral convex function. It is not known so far whether the algorithm PM-LSD terminates in a finite number of iterations.

We can show, as in Section 3, that  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$  is monotone non-decreasing in the algorithm PM-LSD. Proof is given in Section A.4 in Appendix.

**Proposition 5.2.** Let  $y \in \text{dom } f$  be a vector with  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y) < 0$ ,  $i, j \in N$  be distinct elements such that  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; i, j) = \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y)$ , and  $\lambda > 0$  be a real number such that  $f(y + \lambda(\chi_i - \chi_j)) - f(y) = \lambda \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y)$ . (i) The vector  $\hat{y} = y + \lambda(\chi_i - \chi_j)$  satisfies  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}) \ge \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y)$ .

(ii) For distinct  $h, k \in N$ , it holds that  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; h, k) \geq \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y)$ . Moreover, if the inequality holds with equality, then  $+\chi_h - \chi_k$  is a steepest descent direction at  $\hat{y}$  and satisfies  $k \neq i$  and  $h \neq j$ .

To derive a finite bound on the number of iterations, we use algorithm PM-LSD2 and procedure PM-INCSLOPE(x), which are obtained by slight modification of M-LSD2 and M-INCSLOPE(x) for M-convex functions on  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  as in the algorithm PM-LSD. The following monotonicity property of the procedure PM-INCSLOPE(x) can be obtained.

**Theorem 5.3.** For a vector  $x \in \text{dom } f$  with  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x) < 0$ , the output x' of the procedure PM-INCSLOPE(x) satisfies  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x') > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ .

Proof is given in Section A.5 in Appendix. While the proof outline of Theorem 5.3 is the same as that of Theorem 3.4 for M-convex functions on  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ , more careful analysis is required in the proof due to the difference between domains  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  and  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of functions.

Since f is a polyhedral convex function, the directional derivative  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j)$  can take only a finite number of values, from which follows that  $\{\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x) \mid x \in \text{dom } f\}$  is a finite set. This observation and Theorem 5.3 imply the finite termination of the algorithm PM-LSD2.

**Theorem 5.4.** For a polyhedral *M*-convex function  $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$  with bounded dom<sub> $\mathbb{R}$ </sub> f, the algorithm PM-LSD2 outputs a minimizer of f in a finite number of iterations.

# Appendix

# A Omitted Proofs

# A.1 Proof of Proposition 3.3

Denote  $\hat{y} = y + \chi_i - \chi_j$ . We prove the inequality  $\varphi(\hat{y}) \ge \varphi(y)$  only since the other claims in Proposition 3.3 can be obtained easily from this inequality. Let  $h, k \in N$  be distinct elements with  $f'(\hat{y}; h, k) = \varphi(\hat{y})$ , and denote  $\tilde{y} = \hat{y} + \chi_h - \chi_k$ . We note that

$$f(\widetilde{y}) - f(y) = (f(\widehat{y}) - f(y)) + (f(\widetilde{y}) - f(\widehat{y})) = \varphi(y) + \varphi(\widehat{y}).$$
(A.1)

Suppose first that  $i \neq k$  and  $j \neq h$ . Since  $\operatorname{supp}^{-}(\tilde{y} - y) = \{j, k\}$ , the condition (M-EXC) applied to  $\tilde{y}, y$ , and  $i \in \operatorname{supp}^{+}(\tilde{y} - y)$  implies that

$$f(\tilde{y}) + f(y) \ge \min\{f(y + \chi_h - \chi_k) + f(y + \chi_i - \chi_j), f(y + \chi_h - \chi_j) + f(y + \chi_i - \chi_k)\} \\\ge 2(\varphi(y) + f(y)),$$

where the last inequality is by the definition of  $\varphi(y)$ . This inequality, combined with (A.1), implies  $\varphi(\hat{y}) \ge \varphi(y)$ .

We then assume  $i \neq k$  and j = h, implying that  $\tilde{y} = y + \chi_i - \chi_k$ . Since  $+\chi_i - \chi_j$  is a steepest descent direction at y, we have  $f(\tilde{y}) - f(y) \geq f(\hat{y}) - f(y) = \varphi(y)$ , which, combined with (A.1), implies  $\varphi(\hat{y}) = f(\tilde{y}) - f(\hat{y}) \geq 0 > \varphi(y)$ . The proof for the case with i = k and  $j \neq h$  is similar and omitted.

We finally show that the case with i = k and j = h is not possible. If i = k and j = h, then  $\tilde{y} = y$  and therefore

$$0 \ge \varphi(\hat{y}) = f(\tilde{y}) - f(\hat{y}) = f(y) - f(\hat{y}) = -f'(y; i, j) = -\varphi(y) > 0,$$

a contradiction.

#### A.2 Proof of Proposition 4.3

Proposition 4.3 can be obtained by using the fact that the optimal value function z(k) is a convex function in k, i.e., the slope of z(k) is monotone non-decreasing.

**Proposition A.1.** It holds that  $z(k) - z(k-1) \le z(k+1) - z(k)$  ( $\underline{k} < k < \overline{k}$ ).

*Proof.* We prove the inequality  $z(k-1) + z(k+1) \ge 2z(k)$ . Let  $x \in M(k-1)$  and  $\hat{x} \in M(k+1)$  be vectors that minimize the value  $||x - \hat{x}||_1$ . Note that f(x) = z(k-1) and  $f(\hat{x}) = z(k+1)$ . It suffices to show that there exists a vector  $y \in \text{dom } f$  with y(R) = k such that  $f(x) + f(\hat{x}) \ge 2f(y)$  since  $f(y) \ge z(k)$ .

Since  $\hat{x}(R) = k + 1 > k - 1 = x(R)$ , we have  $\operatorname{supp}^+(\hat{x} - x) \cap R \neq \emptyset$ . By (M-EXC) applied to  $\hat{x}, x$ , and an arbitrarily chosen  $i \in \operatorname{supp}^+(\hat{x} - x) \cap R$ , there exists some  $j \in \operatorname{supp}^-(\hat{x} - x)$  such that

$$f(\hat{x}) + f(x) \ge f(\hat{x} + \chi_i - \chi_j) + f(x - \chi_i + \chi_j).$$
(A.2)

Suppose that  $j \in N \setminus R$ . Then, we have

$$(\hat{x} + \chi_i - \chi_j)(R) = (x - \chi_i + \chi_j)(R) = k.$$

By (A.2), it holds that

$$2\min\{f(\hat{x} + \chi_i - \chi_j), f(x - \chi_i + \chi_j)\} \le f(\hat{x}) + f(x).$$

This shows that either of  $y = \hat{x} + \chi_i - \chi_j$  and  $y = x - \chi_i + \chi_j$  satisfies the desired condition.

To conclude the proof, we show that  $j \in R$  is not possible. Assume, to the contrary, that  $j \in R$ . Then, it holds that

$$(\hat{x} + \chi_i - \chi_j)(R) = \hat{x}(R) = k + 1, \qquad (x - \chi_i + \chi_j)(R) = x(R) = k - 1,$$

from which follows that  $f(\hat{x}+\chi_i-\chi_j) \ge z(k+1)$  and  $f(x-\chi_i+\chi_j) \ge z(k-1)$ . These inequalities and (A.2) imply that

$$z(k+1) + z(k-1) = f(\hat{x}) + f(x)$$
  

$$\geq f(\hat{x} + \chi_i - \chi_j) + f(x - \chi_i + \chi_j) \geq z(k+1) + z(k-1).$$

Hence, all inequalities must hold with equality, i.e., we have  $\hat{x} + \chi_i - \chi_j \in M(k+1)$  and  $x - \chi_i + \chi_j \in M(k-1)$ . This, however, is a contradiction to the choice of x and  $\hat{x}$  since  $\|(x - \chi_i + \chi_j) - \hat{x}\|_1 = \|x - \hat{x}\|_1 - 2$ .

Proof of Proposition 4.3. We have  $x + \chi_i - \chi_j \in M(k+1)$  and f'(x; i, j) = z(k+1) - z(k) by Proposition 4.1. Proposition A.1 implies that for every  $h \in R$  and  $\ell \in N \setminus R$ , it holds that

$$f'(x + \chi_i - \chi_j; h, \ell) \ge z(k+2) - z(k+1)$$
  
$$\ge z(k+1) - z(k) = f'(x; i, j) = f'(x + \chi_i - \chi_j; i, j).$$

This inequality, together with Proposition 4.1, implies that  $x + 2\chi_i - 2\chi_j \in M(k+2)$ .

### A.3 Proof of Theorem 4.5

We show that  $\varphi^R(x') > \varphi^R(x)$  holds if x'(R) < k. The proof given below is similar to the one for Theorem 3.4 for unconstrained M-convex function minimization. Let us consider Step 1 in some outer iteration of the algorithm CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x), and let  $i \in R$  be the element taken at the beginning of Step 1. The vector y at the end of Step 1-1 satisfies the inequality  $f'(y; i, j) > \varphi^R(x)$  if y(R) < k. We first show that this inequality is preserved until the end of the inner iterations in Step 1.

**Lemma A.2.** Let  $y \in \text{dom } f$  be vectors with  $\varphi^R(y) = \varphi^R(x)$ , and  $i, j \in N$  be distinct elements such that  $f'(y; i, j) > \varphi(x)$ . For  $k \in N \setminus (R \cup \{j\})$  with  $y + \chi_i - \chi_k \in \text{dom } f$ , we have  $f'(y + \chi_i - \chi_k; i, j) > \varphi^R(x)$ .

Proof. Let  $\tilde{y} = y + \chi_i - \chi_k + \chi_i - \chi_j$ . It suffices to show that  $f(\tilde{y}) - f(y + \chi_i - \chi_k) \ge f'(y; i, j)$ since  $f'(y; i, j) > \varphi(x)$ . If  $f(\tilde{y}) = +\infty$  then we are done; hence we assume  $\tilde{y} \in \text{dom } f$ . By (M-EXC) applied to  $y, \tilde{y}$ , and  $j \in \text{supp}^+(y - \tilde{y})$ , it holds that

$$f(y) + f(\tilde{y}) \ge f(y - \chi_j + \chi_i) + f(\tilde{y} + \chi_j - \chi_i) = f(y - \chi_j + \chi_i) + f(y + \chi_i - \chi_k)$$

since  $\operatorname{supp}^{-}(y - \tilde{y}) = \{i\}$ . It follows that

$$f(\tilde{y}) - f(y + \chi_i - \chi_k) \ge f(y + \chi_i - \chi_j) - f(y) = f'(y; i, j).$$

Repeated application of Lemma A.2 implies that vector y at the end of Step 1 satisfies the inequalities

$$f'(y;i,j) > \varphi^R(x) \qquad (j \in N \setminus R).$$
(A.3)

Suppose that the inequalities (A.3) for some  $i \in R$  is satisfied by the vector y at the end of Step 1 in some outer iteration. We then show that these inequalities are preserved in the following outer iterations.

**Lemma A.3.** Let  $y \in \text{dom } f$  be vectors with  $\varphi^R(y) = \varphi^R(x)$ , and  $i \in R$  be an element satisfying  $f'(y; i, j) > \varphi^R(x)$  for every  $j \in N \setminus R$ . Also, let  $h \in R$  and  $k \in N \setminus R$  be elements such that  $f'(y; h, k) = \varphi^R(x)$ . Then,  $f'(y + \chi_h - \chi_k; i, j) > \varphi^R(x)$  holds for every  $j \in N \setminus R$ .

*Proof.* We fix  $j^* \in N \setminus R$  and denote  $\tilde{y} = y + \chi_h - \chi_k + \chi_i - \chi_{j^*}$ . It holds that  $i \neq k$  and  $j^* \neq h$  since  $i, h \in R$  and  $k, j^* \in N \setminus R$ . It suffices to show that

$$f(\tilde{y}) - f(y + \chi_h - \chi_k) > \varphi^R(x).$$
(A.4)

If  $f(\tilde{y}) = +\infty$  then we are done; hence we assume  $\tilde{y} \in \text{dom } f$ . The condition (M-EXC) applied to  $y, \tilde{y}$ , and  $k \in \text{supp}^+(y - \tilde{y})$  implies that

$$f(y) + f(\tilde{y}) \ge \min\{f(y - \chi_k + \chi_h) + f(y + \chi_i - \chi_{j^*}), f(y - \chi_k + \chi_i) + f(y + \chi_h - \chi_{j^*})\} \\\ge f(y - \chi_k + \chi_h) + \min\{f(y + \chi_i - \chi_{j^*}), f(y - \chi_k + \chi_i)\} \\> f(y + \chi_h - \chi_k) + f(y) + \varphi^R(x),$$

where the second inequality is by the assumption  $f'(y;h,k) = \varphi^R(x) = \varphi^R(y)$ , and the last inequality is by  $f'(y;i,j) > \varphi^R(x)$   $(j \in N \setminus R)$ . Hence, (A.4) follows.

By repeated application of Lemma A.3, we obtain the inequalities  $f'(x'; i, j) > \varphi^R(x)$   $(i \in R, j \in N \setminus R)$  for the vector x' at the end of the algorithm CONSTM-INCSLOPE(x), provided that x'(R) < k. Hence, the desired inequality  $\varphi^R(x') > \varphi^R(x)$  follows.

### A.4 Proof of Proposition 5.2

To prove Proposition 5.2, we use the following property of polyhedral M-convex functions, stating that the value of a function f can be bounded from below by using a local information at a given vector  $x \in \text{dom } f$ .

**Proposition A.4.** For  $x, y \in \text{dom } f$ , it holds that  $f(y) - f(x) \ge (1/2) ||y - x||_1 \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ .

*Proof.* Since f is polyhedral M-convex, there exist real numbers  $\lambda_{ij} \geq 0$   $(i, j \in N, i \neq j)$  such that

$$\sum_{\substack{i,j\in N, i\neq j}} \lambda_{ij}(\chi_i - \chi_j) = y - x, \quad \sum_{\substack{i,j\in N, i\neq j}} \lambda_{ij} = (1/2) \|y - x\|_1,$$
$$f(y) - f(x) \ge \sum_{\substack{i,j\in N, i\neq j}} \lambda_{ij} f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j)$$

(cf. [30, Theorem 4.15]). We have  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j) \ge \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$  for distinct  $i, j \in N$  by the definition of  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ . Hence, the desired inequality  $f(y) - f(x) \ge (1/2) ||y - x||_1 \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$  follows.

We first prove the inequality  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}) \geq \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y)$  in the statement (i), where  $\hat{y} = y + \lambda(\chi_i - \chi_j)$ . Let  $h, k \in N$  be distinct elements such that  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; h, k) = \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y})$ , and  $\mu > 0$  be a real number with  $\mu \leq \lambda$  such that

$$f(\hat{y} + \mu(\chi_h - \chi_k)) - f(\hat{y}) = \mu \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}).$$

We denote  $\tilde{y} = \hat{y} + \mu(\chi_h - \chi_k)$ . Then, we have

$$f(\tilde{y}) - f(y) = (f(\hat{y}) - f(y)) + (f(\tilde{y}) - f(\hat{y})) = \lambda \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y) + \mu \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}).$$
(A.5)

Since  $(1/2) \|\tilde{y} - y\|_1 \leq \lambda + \mu$  and  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y) < 0$ , Proposition A.4 implies that

$$f(\tilde{y}) - f(y) \ge (1/2) \|\tilde{y} - y\|_1 \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y) \ge (\lambda + \mu) \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y).$$

It follows from this inequality and (A.5) that  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}) \geq \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y)$ .

We then prove the statement (ii). For every distinct  $h, k \in N$ , it holds that  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; h, k) \geq \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}) \geq \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y)$  by (i). If  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; h, k) = \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y)$  holds, then the two inequalities in  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; h, k) \geq \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}) \geq \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y)$  hold with equality, and therefore  $+\chi_h - \chi_k$  is a steepest descent direction at  $\hat{y}$ . Since  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}) = \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y)$ , the proof of (i) given above shows that  $(1/2) \|\tilde{y} - y\|_1 \leq \lambda + \mu$  holds with equality, from which  $k \neq i$  and  $h \neq i$  follow.

#### A.5 Proof of Theorem 5.3

We prove the inequality  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x') > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ . The proof outline is the same as that for Theorem 3.4. Hence, it suffices to show the following two lemmas that correspond to Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7.

**Lemma A.5.** Let  $y \in \text{dom } f$  be vectors with  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y) = \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ , and  $i, j \in N$  be distinct elements such that  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; i, j) > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ . For  $k \in N \setminus \{i, j\}$  and  $\lambda > 0$  with  $\hat{y} \equiv y + \lambda(\chi_i - \chi_k) \in \text{dom } f$ , we have  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; i, j) \ge f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; i, j) > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ .

Proof. It suffices to show the inequality  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; i, j) \geq f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; i, j)$  since  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; i, j) > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ . Let  $\tilde{y} = \hat{y} + \delta(\chi_i - \chi_j)$  with a sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  such that  $f(\tilde{y}) - f(\hat{y}) = \delta f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; i, j)$ . By the choice of  $\delta$ , we have

$$f(\hat{y} + \mu(\chi_i - \chi_j)) - f(\hat{y} + \mu'(\chi_i - \chi_j)) = (\mu - \mu')f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; i, j) \qquad (0 \le \mu' \le \mu \le \delta).$$
(A.6)

We have  $\operatorname{supp}^+(y - \tilde{y}) = \{j, k\}$  and  $\operatorname{supp}^-(y - \tilde{y}) = \{i\}$ . Hence, (M-EXC[ $\mathbb{R}$ ]) applied to y,  $\tilde{y}$ , and  $j \in \operatorname{supp}^+(y - \tilde{y})$  implies that there exists a sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$  with  $\varepsilon \leq \delta$  such that

$$f(y) + f(\tilde{y}) \ge f(y - \varepsilon(\chi_j - \chi_i)) + f(\tilde{y} + \varepsilon(\chi_j - \chi_i)).$$
(A.7)

Since  $\varepsilon$  is sufficiently small, we have

$$f(y - \varepsilon(\chi_j - \chi_i)) - f(y) = f(y + \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_j)) - f(y) = \varepsilon f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; i, j).$$
(A.8)

By (A.6), (A.7), and (A.8), we have

$$\varepsilon f_{\mathbb{R}}'(\hat{y}; i, j) = f(\hat{y} + \delta(\chi_i - \chi_j)) - f(\hat{y} + (\delta - \varepsilon)(\chi_i - \chi_j))$$
  
=  $f(\tilde{y}) - f(\tilde{y} + \varepsilon(\chi_j - \chi_i))$   
 $\geq f(y - \varepsilon(\chi_j - \chi_i)) - f(y) = \varepsilon f_{\mathbb{R}}'(y; i, j).$ 

Hence,  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; i, j) \ge f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; i, j)$  follows.

**Lemma A.6.** Let  $y \in \text{dom } f$  be vectors with  $\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y) = \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ , and  $i \in N$  be an element satisfying  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y;i,j) > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$  for every  $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ . Also, let  $h, k \in N$  be distinct elements such that  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y;h,k) = \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ . Then, for every  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  with  $0 < \lambda \leq \bar{c}_{\mathbb{R}}(x;i,j)$ , the vector  $\hat{y} \equiv y + \lambda(\chi_h - \chi_k)$  satisfies  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y};i,j) > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$  for every  $j \in N \setminus \{i\}$ .

*Proof.* We fix  $j^* \in N \setminus \{i\}$  and prove the inequality  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; i, j^*) > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ . We may assume that  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; i, j^*) = \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y})$  since otherwise  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; i, j^*) > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}) \ge \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y) = \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$  by Proposition 5.2 (i). This assumption implies that  $i \neq k$  and  $j^* \neq h$  by Proposition 5.2 (ii).

Since  $0 < \lambda \leq \bar{c}_{\mathbb{R}}(x; i, j)$ , we have

$$f(\hat{y}) - f(y) = \lambda f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; h, k) = \lambda \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x).$$
(A.9)

Let  $\tilde{y} = \hat{y} + \delta(\chi_i - \chi_{j^*})$  with a sufficiently small  $\delta > 0$  such that  $f(\tilde{y}) - f(\hat{y}) = \delta f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; i, j^*)$ .

Since  $\operatorname{supp}^+(\tilde{y} - y) = \{i, h\}$  and  $\operatorname{supp}^-(\tilde{y} - y) = \{j^*, k\}$ , (M-EXC[ $\mathbb{R}$ ]) applied to  $\tilde{y}$ , y, and  $i \in \operatorname{supp}^+(\tilde{y} - y)$  implies that there exists a sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$  with  $\varepsilon < \min(\lambda, \delta)$  such that

$$f(\tilde{y}) + f(y)$$

$$\geq \min\{f(\tilde{y} - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_{j^*})) + f(y + \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_{j^*})), f(\tilde{y} - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_k)) + f(y + \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_k))\}$$

$$= \min\{f(\tilde{y} - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_{j^*})) + \varepsilon f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; i, j^*), f(\tilde{y} - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_k)) + \varepsilon f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; i, k)\} + f(y)$$

$$> \min\{f(\tilde{y} - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_{j^*})), f(\tilde{y} - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_k))\} + f(y) + \varepsilon \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x), \qquad (A.10)$$

where the equality holds since  $\varepsilon$  is a sufficiently small positive number, and the strict inequality is by  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(y; i, j) > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$   $(j \in N \setminus \{i\})$ . By Proposition A.4 and the equation

$$\|(\tilde{y} - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_{j^*})) - y\|_1 = \|(\tilde{y} - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_k)) - y\|_1 = 2(\lambda + \delta - \varepsilon),$$

we have

$$\min\{f(\tilde{y} - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_{j^*})), f(\tilde{y} - \varepsilon(\chi_i - \chi_k))\} - f(y) \ge (\lambda + \delta - \varepsilon)\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(y) = (\lambda + \delta - \varepsilon)\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x),$$

which, combined with (A.10), implies  $f(\tilde{y}) - f(y) > (\lambda + \delta)\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ . It follows from this inequality and (A.9) that

$$\delta f_{\mathbb{R}}'(\hat{y}; i, j^*) = f(\tilde{y}) - f(\hat{y}) > (\lambda + \delta)\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x) - \lambda\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x) = \delta\varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x).$$

Hence, the inequality  $f'_{\mathbb{R}}(\hat{y}; i, j^*) > \varphi_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$  follows.

# Acknowledgment

This work was partially supported by JST ERATO Grant Number JPMJER2301, JST FOREST Grant Number JPMJFR232L, and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP22K17853, 23K10995, and JP24K21315.

# References

- Ahuja, R., Magnanti, T., Orlin, J.: Network Flows: Theory, Algorithms, and Applications. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ (1993)
- [2] Bazaraa, M.S., Sherali, H.D., Shetty, C.M.: Nonlinear Programming: Theory and Algorithms, 3rd edn.. Wiley, New York (2006)
- [3] Boyd, S., Vandenberghe, L.: Convex Optimization. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK (2004)
- [4] Dress, A.W.M., Wenzel, W.: Valuated matroid: A new look at the greedy algorithm. Appl. Math. Lett. 3, 33–35 (1990)
- [5] Edmonds, J.: Submodular functions, matroids and certain polyhedra. In: Guy,R., Hanani,H., Sauer,N., Schonheim,J. (eds.) Combinatorial Structures and Their Applications, pp. 69–87. Gordon and Breach, New York (1970)
- [6] Federgruen, A., Groenevelt, H.: The greedy procedure for resource allocation problems: necessary and sufficient conditions for optimality. Oper. Res. 34, 909–918 (1986)
- [7] Freund, D., Henderson, S.G., Shmoys, D.B.: Minimizing multimodular functions and allocating capacity in bike-sharing systems. Oper. Res. 70, 2715–2731 (2022)
- [8] Fujishige, F.: Submodular Functions and Optimization, 2nd edn. Elsevier, Amsterdam (2005)
- [9] Fujishige,S., Murota,K., Shioura, A.: Monotonicity in steepest ascent algorithms for polyhedral L-concave functions. J. Oper. Res. Soc. Japan 58, 184–208 (2015)
- [10] Fujishige, S., Yang, Z.: A note on Kelso and Crawford's gross substitutes condition. Math. Oper. Res. 28, 463–469 (2003)
- [11] Gabow, H.N., Tarjan R.E.: Efficient algorithms for a family of matroid intersection problems. J. Algorithms 5, 80–131 (1984)
- [12] Gottschalk, C., Lüthen, H., Peis, B., Wierz, A.: Optimization problems with color-induced budget constraints. J. Comb. Optim. 36, 861–870 (2018)
- [13] Groenevelt, H.: Two algorithms for maximizing a separable concave function over a polymatroid feasible region. Eur. J. Oper. Res. 54, 227–236 (1991)
- [14] Gul, F., Stacchetti, E.: Walrasian equilibrium with gross substitutes. J. Econ. Theory 87, 95–124 (1999)

- [15] Gul, F., Stacchetti, E.: The English auction with differentiated commodities. J. Econ. Theory 92, 66–95 (2000)
- [16] Gusfield, D.: Matroid optimization with the interleaving of two ordered sets. Discrete Appl. Math. 8, 41–50 (1984)
- [17] Hochbaum, D.S.: Lower and upper bounds for the allocation problem and other nonlinear optimization problems. Math. Oper. Res. 19, 390–409 (1994)
- [18] Ibaraki, T., Katoh, N.: Resource Allocation Problems: Algorithmic Approaches. MIT Press, Boston, MA (1988)
- [19] Katoh,N., Shioura, A., Ibaraki, T.: Resource allocation problems. In: Pardalos, P.M., Du,D.-Z., Graham,R. L. (eds.) Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization, 2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 2897–2988. Springer, Berlin (2013)
- [20] Kelso Jr.,A.S., Crawford, V.P.: Job matching, coalition formation, and gross substitutes. Econometrica 50, 1483–1504 (1982)
- [21] Milgrom, P., Strulovici, B.: Substitute goods, auctions, and equilibrium. J. Econ. Theory 144, 212–247 (2009)
- [22] Minamikawa,N., Shioura, A.: Time bounds of basic steepest descent algorithms for Mconvex function minimization and related problems. J. Oper. Res. Soc. Japan 64, 45–60 (2021)
- [23] Moriguchi, S., Murota, K., Shioura, A.: Scaling algorithms for M-convex function minimization. IEICE Trans. Fundamentals E85-A, 922–929 (2002)
- [24] Murota, K.: Convexity and Steinitz's exchange property. Adv. Math. 124, 272–311 (1996)
- [25] Murota, K.: Discrete convex analysis. Math. Program. 83, 313–371 (1998)
- [26] Murota, K.: Algorithms in discrete convex analysis. IEICE Trans. Systems and Information E83-D, 344–352 (2000)
- [27] Murota, K.: Discrete Convex Analysis. SIAM, Philadelphia (2003)
- [28] Murota, K.: On steepest descent algorithms for discrete convex functions. SIAM J. Optim. 14, 699–707 (2003)
- [29] Murota, K., Shioura, A.: M-convex function on generalized polymatroid. Math. Oper. Res. 24, 95–105 (1999)
- [30] Murota, K., Shioura, A: Extension of M-convexity and L-convexity to polyhedral convex functions. Adv. Appl. Math. 25, 352–427 (2000)
- [31] Murota, K., Shioura, A: Conjugacy relationship between M-convex and L-convex functions in continuous variables. Math. Prog. 101, 415–433 (2004)

- [32] Murota, K., Shioura, A: Exact bounds for steepest descent algorithms of L-convex function minimization. Oper. Res. Lett. 42, 361–366 (2014)
- [33] Paes Leme, R.: Gross substitutability: an algorithmic survey. Games Econ. Behav. 106, 294–316 (2017)
- [34] Schrijver, A.: Combinatorial Optimization: Polyhedra and Efficiency. Springer, Berlin (2003)
- [35] Shioura, A.: Minimization of an M-convex function. Discrete Appl. Math. 84, 215–220 (1998)
- [36] Shioura, A.: Fast scaling algorithms for M-convex function minimization with application to the resource allocation problem. Discrete Appl. Math. 134, 303–316 (2003)
- [37] Shioura, A.: Algorithms for L-convex function minimization: connection between discrete convex analysis and other research fields. J. Oper. Res. Soc. Japan 60, 216–243 (2017)
- [38] Shioura, A.: M-convex function minimization under L1-distance constraint and its application to dock re-allocation in bike sharing system. Math. Oper. Res. 47, 1566–1611 (2022)
- [39] Shioura, A., Tamura, A.: Gross substitutes condition and discrete concavity for multi-unit valuations: a survey. J. Oper. Res. Soc. Japan 58, 61–103 (2015)
- [40] Takazawa, K.: An efficient algorithm for minimizing M-convex functions under a colorinduced budget constraint. Oper. Res. Lett. 51, 128–132 (2023)
- [41] Tamura, A.: Coordinatewise domain scaling algorithm for M-convex function minimization. Math. Program. 102, 339–354 (2005)