

# ON FEASIBILITY OF INTEGER KNAPSACKS

ISKANDER ALIEV AND MARTIN HENK

ABSTRACT. Given a matrix  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  satisfying certain regularity assumptions, we consider the set  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  of all vectors  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  such that the associated *knapsack polytope*

$$P(A, \mathbf{b}) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}\}$$

contains an integer point. When  $m = 1$  the set  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  is known to contain all consecutive integers greater than the Frobenius number associated with  $A$ . In this paper we introduce the *diagonal Frobenius number*  $g(A)$  which reflects in an analogous way feasibility properties of the problem and the structure of  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  in the general case. We give an optimal upper bound for  $g(A)$  and also estimate the asymptotic growth of the diagonal Frobenius number on average.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RESULTS

Let  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$ ,  $1 \leq m < n$ , be an integral  $m \times n$  matrix satisfying

- (1.1)    i)  $\gcd(\det(A_{I_m}) : A_{I_m} \text{ is an } m \times m \text{ minor of } A) = 1$ ,  
ii)  $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}\} = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ .

For such a matrix  $A$  and a vector  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  the so called *knapsack polytope*  $P(A, \mathbf{b})$  is defined as

$$P(A, \mathbf{b}) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}\}.$$

Observe that on account of (1.1) ii),  $P(A, \mathbf{b})$  is indeed a polytope (or empty).

The paper is concerned with the following integer programming feasibility problem:

- (1.2)    Does the polytope  $P(A, \mathbf{b})$  contain an integer vector?

The problem is often called the *integer knapsack problem* and is well-known to be NP-complete (Karp [25]). Let  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  be the set of integer vectors  $\mathbf{b}$  such that the instance of (1.2) is feasible, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{F}(A) = \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^m : P(A, \mathbf{b}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset\}.$$

A description of the set  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  in terms of polynomials that can be regarded as a discrete analog of the celebrated *Farkas Lemma* is obtained in Lasserre [28]. The test Gomory and Chvátal functions for  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  are also given in Blair

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 90C10, 90C27, 11D07 ; Secondary: 11H06.

*Key words and phrases*. Knapsack problem; Frobenius numbers; successive minima; inhomogeneous minimum; distribution of lattices.

and Jeroslow [13] (see also Schrijver [37, Corollary 23.4b]). In this paper we investigate the geometric structure of the set  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  which, apart from a few special cases, remains unexplored. Results of Knight [27], Simpson and Tijdeman [39] and Pleasants, Ray and Simpson [32] suggest that the set  $\mathcal{F}(A)$  may be decomposed into the set of all integer points in the interior of a certain translated *feasible* cone and a complementary set with complex combinatorial structure. We give an optimal, up to a constant multiplier, estimate for the position of such a feasible cone and also prove that a much stronger asymptotic estimate holds on average.

Before formally stating our main results, we will briefly address the special case  $m = 1$  which is also our guiding case. In this case the matrix  $A$  is just an input vector  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^T \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  and (1.1) i) says that  $\gcd(\mathbf{a}) := \gcd(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = 1$ . Due to the second assumption (1.1) ii) we may assume that all entries of  $\mathbf{a}$  are positive, and the largest integral value  $b$  such that the instance of (1.2) with  $A = \mathbf{a}^T$  and  $\mathbf{b} = (b)$  is infeasible is called the *Frobenius number* of  $\mathbf{a}$ , denoted by  $F(\mathbf{a})$ . Thus

$$(1.3) \quad \text{int} \{F(\mathbf{a}) + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\} \cap \mathbb{Z} \subset \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{a}),$$

where  $\text{int} \{\cdot\}$  denotes the interior of the set.

Frobenius numbers naturally appear in the analysis of integer programming algorithms (see, e.g., Aardal and Lenstra [2], Hansen and Ryan [22], and Lee, Onn and Weismantel [29]). The general problem of finding  $F(\mathbf{a})$  has been traditionally referred to as the *Frobenius problem*. This problem is NP-hard (Ramírez Alfonsín [33, 34]) and integer programming techniques are known to be an effective tool for computing Frobenius numbers (see Beihoffer et al [12]).

Since computing  $F(\mathbf{a})$  is NP-hard, good upper bounds for the Frobenius number itself and for its average value are of particular interest. In terms of the Euclidean norm  $\|\cdot\|$  of the input vector  $\mathbf{a}$ , all known upper bounds for  $F(\mathbf{a})$  can be represented in the form

$$(1.4) \quad F(\mathbf{a}) \ll_n \|\mathbf{a}\|^2,$$

where  $\ll_n$  denotes the Vinogradov symbol with the constant depending on  $n$  only. It is also known that the exponent 2 on right hand side of (1.4) cannot be lowered (see, e. g., Arnold [8], Erdős and Graham [18] and Schlage-Puchta [35]).

The limiting distribution of  $F(\mathbf{a})$  in the 3-dimensional case was derived in Shur, Sinai, and Ustinov [38], and for the general case, see Marklof [30]. Upper bounds for the average value of  $F(\mathbf{a})$  have been obtained in Aliev and Henk [5] and Aliev, Henk and Hinrichs [6]. In terms of  $\|\mathbf{a}\|$  the bounds have the form

$$(1.5) \quad \sim \|\mathbf{a}\|^{1+1/(n-1)},$$

where the exponent  $1 + 1/(n - 1)$  cannot be lowered [6].

The main goal of the present paper is to obtain results of the types (1.4) and (1.5) for the general integer knapsack problem. Our interest was also

motivated by the papers of Aardal, Hurkens and Lenstra [1] and Aardal, Weismantel and Wolsey [3] on algorithmic aspects of the problem.

First we will need a generalization of the Frobenius number which will reflect feasibility properties of problem (1.2). Let  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  be the columns of the matrix  $A$  and let

$$C = \{\lambda_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + \dots + \lambda_n \mathbf{v}_n : \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \geq 0\}$$

be the cone generated by  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$ . Let also  $\mathbf{v} := \mathbf{v}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{v}_n$ . By the *diagonal Frobenius number*  $g(A)$  of  $A$  we understand the minimal  $t \geq 0$ , such that for all  $\mathbf{b} \in \{t\mathbf{v} + C\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^m$  the problem (1.2) is feasible. Then, in particular, (cf.(1.3))

$$(1.6) \quad \{g(A)\mathbf{v} + C\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^m \subset \mathcal{F}(A).$$

In Section 2 we show that the diagonal Frobenius number is well-defined. In particular, we see that  $g(A) = 0$  if and only if the column vectors  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$  form a so called Hilbert basis for the cone  $C$  (cf. [37, Sec. 16.4]). From this viewpoint, roughly speaking, the smaller  $g(A)$  the closer the collection of vectors  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$  to being a Hilbert basis of  $C$ .

The diagonal Frobenius number  $g(A)$  appears in work of Khovanskii ([26, Proposition 3]), and the vector  $g(A)\mathbf{v}$  is also a special choice of a so called *pseudo-conductor* as introduced in Vizvári [40] (cf. [34, Sec. 6.5]). Moreover,  $g(A)$  can be easily used in order to get an inclusion as in (1.6) for an arbitrary  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int } C \cap \mathbb{Z}^m$  instead of  $\mathbf{v}$ .

**Lemma 1.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int } C \cap \mathbb{Z}^m$ . Then*

$$\{t\mathbf{w} + C\} \cap \mathbb{Z}^m \subset \mathcal{F}(A)$$

for all  $t \geq \sqrt{\frac{\det(AA^T)}{n-m+1}} g(A)$ .

To the best of our knowledge this generalized Frobenius problem had been investigated in the literature only in the case  $n = m + 1$  (see, e. g., Knight [27], Simpson and Tijdeman [39] and Pleasants, Ray and Simpson [32]). However, even in this special case the results of the types (1.4) and (1.5) were not known.

Here we prove with respect to the diagonal Frobenius number

**Theorem 1.1.** *The inequality*

$$(1.7) \quad g(A) \leq c_{m,n} \sqrt{\det(AA^T)}$$

holds. For  $c_{m,n}$  one can take

$$c_{m,n} = \frac{(n-m)2^{n-m-1}}{\omega_{n-m}},$$

where  $\omega_k$  denotes the volume of the  $k$ -dimensional unit ball.

In the special case  $m = 1$ , Theorem 1.1 together with Lemma 1.1 gives the best possible upper bound (1.4) on the Frobenius number  $F(\mathbf{a})$ .

The next result shows optimality of the upper bound (1.7) up to a constant factor in general.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $1 \leq m < n$ . There exists an infinite sequence of matrices  $A_t \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  and a constant  $c'_{m,n} > 0$  such that*

$$g(A_t) > c'_{m,n} \sqrt{\det(A_t A_t^T)}.$$

In fact we show that the sequence  $A_t$  can be chosen in a somewhat generic way. In the special case  $m = 1$  Theorem 6.1 shows that, roughly speaking, cutting off special families of input vectors cannot make the order of upper bounds for the Frobenius number  $F$  smaller than  $\|\mathbf{a}\|^2$ . We discuss this result in detail in Appendix 6.

The next natural question is to derive upper bounds for the diagonal Frobenius number of a “typical” integer knapsack problem. Our approach to this problem is based on Geometry of Numbers for which we refer to the books [15, 20, 21].

By a *lattice* we will understand a discrete submodule  $L$  of a finite-dimensional Euclidean space. Here we are mainly interested in primitive lattices  $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ , where such a lattice is called *primitive* if  $L = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(L) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ .

Recall that the Frobenius number  $F(\mathbf{a})$  is defined only for integer vectors  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$  with  $\gcd(\mathbf{a}) = 1$ . This is equivalent to the statement that the 1-dimensional lattice  $L = \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{a}$ , generated by  $\mathbf{a}$  is primitive. This generalizes easily to an  $m$ -dimensional lattice  $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$  generated by  $a_1, \dots, a_m \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ . Here the criterion is that  $L$  is primitive if and only if the greatest common divisor of all  $m \times m$ -minors is 1. This is an immediate consequence of Cassels [15, Lemma 2, Chapter 1] or see Schrijver [37, Corollary 4.1c].

Hence, by our assumption (1.1) i), the rows of the matrix  $A$  generated a primitive lattice  $L_A$ . The determinant of an  $m$ -dimensional lattice is the  $m$ -dimensional volume of the parallelepiped spanned by the vectors of a basis. Thus in our setting we have

$$\det L_A = \sqrt{\det A A^T}.$$

In Section 2 we will see that  $g(A)$  depends only on the lattice  $L_A$  and not on the particular basis given by the rows of  $A$ . Hence we may also write  $g(L_A)$  instead of  $g(A)$ . Now for  $T \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $1 \leq m \leq n - 1$  let

$$G(m, n, T) = \{L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n : L \text{ is an } m\text{-dimensional primitive lattice with } \det(L) \leq T\},$$

and let  $\text{Prob}_{m,n,T}(\cdot)$  be the uniform probability distribution on  $G(m, n, T)$ .

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $1 \leq m \leq n - 1$ . Then*

$$\text{Prob}_{m,n,T} \left( \frac{g(L)}{(\det(L))^{1/(n-m)}} > t \right) \ll_{m,n} t^{-2}.$$

The next theorem gives an upper bound for the average value of the diagonal Frobenius number.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $1 \leq m \leq n - 1$ . Then*

$$\sup_T \frac{\sum_{L \in G(m,n,T)} \frac{g(L)}{(\det(L))^{1/(n-m)}}}{\#G(m,n,T)} \ll_{m,n} 1.$$

Thus the asymptotic growth of the diagonal Frobenius number on average has order

$$\sim (\det(L))^{1/(n-m)}.$$

which is significantly slower than the growth of the maximum diagonal Frobenius number as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we will study basic properties of  $g(A)$ , its relation to Geometry of Numbers and we will prove Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 1.1. Section 3 contains the proof of Theorem 1.2 showing that our bound on  $g(A)$  is best possible. For the study of the average behaviour of  $g(L_A)$  and, in particular, for the proofs of Theorem 1.3 and 1.4 in Section 5, we will need some facts on the distribution of sublattices of  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  which will be collected in Section 4. Finally, in the last section we will give a refinement of Theorem 1.2 for the special case  $m = 1$ .

## 2. DIAGONAL FROBENIUS NUMBER AND GEOMETRY OF NUMBERS

Following the geometric approach developed in Kannan [23] and Kannan and Lovasz [24], we will make use of tools from the Geometry of Numbers. To this end we need the following notion: For a lattice  $L \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  and a compact set  $S \subset \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} L$  the *inhomogeneous minimum*  $\mu(S, L)$  of  $S$  with respect to  $L$  is defined as the smallest non-negative number  $\sigma$  such that all lattice translates of  $\sigma S$  with respect to  $L$ , i.e.,  $L + \sigma S$  cover the whole space  $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} L$ . Or equivalently, we can describe it as

$$\mu(S, L) = \min\{\sigma > 0 : (\mathbf{x} + \sigma S) \cap L \neq \emptyset, \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} L\}.$$

Now let  $L_A \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$  be the  $m$ -dimensional lattice generated by the rows of the given matrix  $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  satisfying the assumptions (1.1). Furthermore let

$$L_A^\perp = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^n : A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0}\}$$

be the  $(n - m)$ -dimensional lattice contained in the orthogonal complement of  $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(L)$ . Observe that (cf. [31, Proposition 1.2.9])

$$(2.1) \quad \det L_A^\perp = \det L_A = \sqrt{\det A A^\top}.$$

By our assumption (1.1) ii) we know that for any right hand side  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  the set  $P(A, \mathbf{b})$  is bounded (or empty); hence  $P(A, \mathbf{v})$  is a polytope.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $1 \leq m \leq n - 1$ . Then*

$$g(A) \leq \mu(P(A, \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{1}, L_A^\perp),$$

where  $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  denotes the all 1-vector, i.e.,  $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $t \geq \mu(P(A, \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{1}, L_A^\perp)$ , and let  $\mathbf{b} \in (t\mathbf{v} + C) \cap \mathbb{Z}^m$ , i.e., there exists a non-negative vector  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  such that  $\mathbf{b} = A(t\mathbf{1} + \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ . On the other hand, by (1.1) i) we know that the columns of  $A$  form a generating system of the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^m$  (cf. [37, Corollary 4.1c]). Thus there exists a  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  such that

$$\mathbf{b} = A(t\mathbf{1} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}) = A\mathbf{z}.$$

So we have that  $P(A, \mathbf{b}) - \mathbf{z} \subset \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(L_A^\perp)$  and it suffices to prove that  $P(A, \mathbf{b}) - \mathbf{z}$  contains an integral point of  $L_A^\perp$ , for which it is enough to verify

$$\mu(P(A, \mathbf{b}) - \mathbf{z}, L_A^\perp) \leq 1.$$

Since the inhomogeneous minimum is invariant with respect to translations and since  $P(A, t\mathbf{v}) + \boldsymbol{\alpha} \subseteq P(A, \mathbf{b})$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(P(A, \mathbf{b}) - \mathbf{z}, L_A^\perp) &= \mu(P(A, \mathbf{b}) - (t\mathbf{1} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}), L_A^\perp) \\ &\leq \mu(P(A, t\mathbf{v}) - t\mathbf{1}, L_A^\perp) = \mu(t(P(A, \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{1}), L_A^\perp) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{t} \mu(P(A, \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{1}, L_A^\perp) \leq 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Thus the diagonal Frobenius number is well defined. Next we want to point out that  $g(A)$  depends only on the lattice  $L_A$  and not on the specific basis of that lattice as given by the rows of  $A$ . If the rows of a matrix  $\bar{A}$  also build a basis of  $L_A$ , then there exists an unimodular matrix  $U \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times m}$  such that  $A = U\bar{A}$ , which implies  $g(A) = g(\bar{A})$ . Thus it is justified to denote the diagonal Frobenius (also) by  $g(L_A)$ .

For the proof of Theorem 1.1, which will be based on Lemma 2.1 and an upper bound on the inhomogeneous minimum, we need one more concept from Geometry of Numbers, namely Minkowski's successive minima. For a  $k$ -dimensional lattice  $L$  and a 0-symmetric convex body  $K \subset \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} L$  the  $i$ -successive minimum of  $K$  with respect to  $L$  is defined as

$$\lambda_i(K, L) = \min\{\lambda > 0 : \dim(\lambda K \cap L) \geq i\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k,$$

i.e., it is the smallest factor such that  $\lambda K$  contains at least  $i$  linearly independent lattice points of  $L$ . We will need here only two results on the successive minima. One is Minkowski's celebrated theorem on successive minima which states (cf. [20, Theorem 23.1])

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{2^k}{k!} \det L \leq \lambda_1(K, L) \lambda_2(K, L) \cdots \lambda_k(K, L) \text{vol}(K) \leq 2^k \det L,$$

where  $\text{vol}(K)$  denotes the volume of  $K$ . The other one is known as Jarnik's inequalities which give bounds on the inhomogeneous minimum in terms of the successive minima, namely (cf. [21, p. 99, p. 106])

$$(2.3) \quad \frac{1}{2}\lambda_k(K, L) \leq \mu(K, L) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1(K, L) + \lambda_2(K, L) + \cdots + \lambda_k(K, L)).$$

We remark that both inequalities can be improved in the special case of a ball, but since we are mainly not interested in constants depending on the dimension we do not apply these improvements.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $B_{n-m}$  be the  $(n-m)$  dimensional ball of radius 1 centered at the origin in the space  $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}L_A^\perp$ . By definition of  $\mathbf{v}$  we have  $\mathbf{1} + B_{n-m} \subset P(A, \mathbf{v})$  and so with Lemma 2.1

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} g(A) &\leq \mu(P(A, \mathbf{v}) - \mathbf{1}, L_A^\perp) \leq \mu(B_{n-m}, L_A^\perp) \\ &\leq \frac{n-m}{2}\lambda_{n-m}(B_{n-m}, L_A^\perp), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from (2.3). All vectors of the lattice  $L_A^\perp$  are integral vectors, thus  $\lambda_i(B_{n-m}, L_A^\perp) \geq 1$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n-m$ . Hence from (2.2) we get

$$(2.5) \quad \lambda_{n-m}(B_{n-m}, L_A^\perp)\text{vol}(B_{n-m}) \leq 2^{n-m} \det L_A^\perp$$

and with (2.4) we conclude (cf. (2.1))

$$g(A) \leq \frac{n-m}{2} \frac{2^{n-m}}{\text{vol}(B_{n-m})} \sqrt{\det(AA^T)}.$$

□

Finally we come to the proof of Lemma 1.1.

*Proof of Lemma 1.1.* On account of Lemma 2.1 it suffices to show that for any  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int } C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$  the vector  $\sqrt{\frac{\det AA^T}{n-m+1}} \mathbf{w}$  is contained in  $\mathbf{v} + C$ . For short we set  $\gamma = \sqrt{\det(AA^T)/(n-m+1)}$ .

Let  $\mathbf{w} \in \text{int } C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ . Then  $P(A, \mathbf{w})$  is an  $(n-m)$ -dimensional polytope, and in the following we show that there exists a point  $\mathbf{c} \in P(A, \mathbf{w})$  with components

$$(2.6) \quad c_i \geq \frac{1}{\gamma}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Each vertex  $\mathbf{y}$  of the polytope  $P(A, \mathbf{w})$  is the unique solution of a linear system consisting of the  $m$  equations  $Ax = \mathbf{w}$  and  $n-m$  equations of the type  $x_{k_j} = 0$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n-m$ . Hence, for each vertex  $\mathbf{y}$  we can find a subset  $I_{\mathbf{y}} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  of cardinality  $m$  such that  $A_{I_{\mathbf{y}}}(y_j : j \in I_{\mathbf{y}})^\top = \mathbf{w}$  and  $y_j = 0$  for  $j \notin I_{\mathbf{y}}$ . Here  $A_{I_{\mathbf{y}}}$  denotes the  $m \times m$ -minor of  $A$  consisting of the columns with index in  $I_{\mathbf{y}}$ . Thus each non-zero coordinate  $y_i$  of a vertex satisfies

$$(2.7) \quad y_i \geq \frac{1}{\det A_{I_{\mathbf{y}}}}.$$

Taking the barycenter  $\mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{\#V} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in V} \mathbf{y}$ , where  $V$  denotes the set of all vertices of  $P(A, \mathbf{w})$ , we get a relative interior point of  $P(A, \mathbf{w})$ , i.e., all coordinates of  $\mathbf{c}$  are positive. By the inequality of the arithmetic and geometric mean we have for any sequence of positive numbers  $a_1, \dots, a_l$

$$\sum_{i=1}^l \frac{1}{a_i} \geq \frac{l^2}{\sum_{i=1}^l a_i},$$

and so we get by (2.7)

$$c_i \geq \frac{\#V}{\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in V} \det A_{I_{\mathbf{y}}}}.$$

Hence together with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the Cauchy-Binet formula we get

$$\begin{aligned} c_i &\geq \frac{\sqrt{\#V}}{\sqrt{\sum_{\mathbf{y} \in V} (\det A_{I_{\mathbf{y}}})^2}} \geq \frac{\sqrt{\#V}}{\sqrt{\sum_{m \times m \text{ minors } A_{I_m} (\det A_{I_m})^2}}} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{\#V}}{\sqrt{\det A A^T}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\#V \geq n - m + 1$  we obtain (2.6) which shows that the vector  $\gamma \mathbf{w}$  can be written as a positive linear combination of the columns of  $A$ , where each scalar is at least 1. Thus  $\gamma \mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{v} + C$ .  $\square$

We want to point out that the assumption in Lemma 1.1 on  $\mathbf{w}$  to be an interior point is necessary. For instance take  $\mathbf{w} = (1, 0)^T$  and

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then all points of the form  $(2l + 1) \mathbf{w}$ ,  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , are not representable as non-negative integral combination of the columns.

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

We will construct a sequence  $A_i \in \mathbb{Z}^{m \times n}$  as follows. Let us choose any  $(n - m)$ -dimensional subspace  $S$  such that the lattice  $M = S \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$  has rank  $n - m$  and the polyhedron  $Q_S = \{\mathbf{1} + S\} \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  is bounded. Let  $B^n$  be the  $n$ -dimensional unit ball of radius 1 centered at the origin. Put  $\lambda_i = \lambda_i(B^n \cap S, M)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n - m$ , and choose  $n - m$  linearly independent integer vectors  $\mathbf{b}_i$  corresponding to  $\lambda_i$ , i.e.,  $\|\mathbf{b}_i\| = \lambda_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n - m$ . Put

$$\xi = \frac{2^{n-m-1}}{(n-m)! \omega_{n-m} \text{diam}(Q_S) \prod_{i=1}^{n-m-1} \lambda_i}.$$

Here  $\text{diam}(Q_S)$  denotes the diameter of  $Q_S$ , i.e., the maximum distance between two points of  $Q_S$ . Let  $P$  be the  $(m + 1)$ -dimensional subspace orthogonal to the vectors  $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n-m-1}$ , so that  $S^\perp \subset P$ , where  $S^\perp$  denotes the orthogonal complement of  $S$ .



There exists a sequence of  $m$ -dimensional subspaces  $P_t \subset P$ ,  $t = 1, 2, \dots$ , with the following properties:

- (P1) the lattice  $M_t = P_t \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$  has rank  $m$  and  $\det(M_t) > t$ ;
- (P2) Putting  $S_t = P_t^\perp$  and  $L_t = S_t \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ , the diameter of the polyhedron  $Q_t = \{\xi \det(L_t) \mathbf{1} + S_t\} \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  satisfies the inequality

$$(3.1) \quad \text{diam}(Q_t) < \frac{3}{2} \xi \det(L_t) \text{diam}(Q_S).$$

**Remark 3.1.** *The sequence  $P_t$  clearly exists as it is enough to consider a sequence of approximations of a fixed basis of  $S^\perp$  by  $m$  integer vectors from  $P$  and then observe that there exists only a finite number of integer sublattices of bounded determinant.*

Let  $\lambda_i(t) = \lambda_i(B^n \cap S_t, L_t)$  and let  $\mathbf{b}_i(t)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n - m$ , be linearly independent integer vectors corresponding to the successive minima  $\lambda_i(t)$ . We will now show that for sufficiently large  $t$

$$(3.2) \quad \lambda_i(t) = \lambda_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n - m - 1.$$

Since  $P_t \subset P$ , the lattice  $L_t$  contains the vectors  $\mathbf{b}_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n - m - 1$ . Noting that  $\det(L_t) = \det(M_t) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , the lower bound in Minkowski's second theorem (2.2) implies that  $\lambda_{n-m}(t) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . This, in turn, implies that for sufficiently large  $t$  the first  $n - m - 1$  successive minima  $\lambda_i(t)$  are attained on vectors  $\mathbf{b}_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n - m - 1$ , so that (3.2) holds. Hence by (2.2) and (3.2) we may write for sufficiently large  $t$

$$\frac{2^{n-m} \det(L_t)}{(n-m)! \omega_{n-m}} \leq \lambda_1(t) \lambda_2(t) \cdots \lambda_{n-m}(t) = \lambda_{n-m}(t) \prod_{i=1}^{n-m-1} \lambda_i.$$

Thus, when  $t$  is large enough we have

$$(3.3) \quad \lambda_{n-m}(t) \geq \frac{2^{n-m} \det(L_t)}{(n-m)! \omega_{n-m} \prod_{i=1}^{n-m-1} \lambda_i}$$

Now choose any basis  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  of the lattice  $M_t$  and let  $A_t$  be the matrix with rows  $\mathbf{a}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m^T$ . Noting that the subspace  $P^\perp$  has codimension 1 in  $S$ , take a vertex  $\mathbf{p}_t$  of  $Q_t$  such that  $\mathbf{p}_t + P^\perp$  does not intersect the interior of  $Q_t$ . Choose a supporting hyperplane  $H$  of the convex cone  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  at the point  $\mathbf{p}_t$  such that  $\{\mathbf{p}_t + P^\perp\} \subset H$ . Next we take a point  $\mathbf{z}_t \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  with following properties:

- (Z1)  $H$  separates  $\mathbf{z}_t$  and  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ ;
- (Z2) with respect to the maximum norm  $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ ,  $\mathbf{z}_t$  is the closest point to  $\mathbf{p}_t$  that satisfies (Z1).

Then we clearly have

$$(3.4) \quad \|\mathbf{z}_t - \mathbf{p}_t\|_\infty \leq 1,$$

Consider the polytope  $Q_{\mathbf{z}_t} = \{S_t + \mathbf{z}_t\} \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ . By (3.4), the diameter of  $Q_{\mathbf{z}_t}$  satisfies

$$\text{diam}(Q_{\mathbf{z}_t}) \leq \text{diam}(Q_t) + 2\sqrt{n}.$$

Thus, together with (3.1), (3.3) and by the choice of the number  $\xi$ , for all sufficiently large  $t$

$$(3.5) \quad \text{diam}(Q_{\mathbf{z}_t}) < \lambda_{n-m}(t).$$

Note that, by the choice of the point  $\mathbf{z}_t$ , the affine subspace  $\mathbf{z}_t + P^\perp$  does not intersect the cone  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  and, on the other hand, for all sufficiently large  $t$  the first  $n - m - 1$  successive minima of the lattice  $L_t$  are attained on the vectors  $\mathbf{b}_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n - m - 1$ , that belong to the subspace  $P^\perp$ . The inequality (3.5) now implies that  $Q_{\mathbf{z}_t}$  does not contain integer points when  $t$  is large enough.

By (3.4),  $\mathbf{z}_t \in \{(\xi \det(L_t) - 1)\mathbf{1} + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n\}$ , so that  $A_t \mathbf{z}_t \in \{(\xi \det(L_t) - 1)\mathbf{v} + C\}$ . Thus for all sufficiently large  $t$  we have

$$g(A_t) \geq \xi \det(L_t) - 1.$$

The theorem is proved.

#### 4. DISTRIBUTION OF SUBLATTICES OF $\mathbb{Z}^n$

This section which will collect several results due to W. Schmidt [36] on the distribution of integer lattices essentially coincides with Section 3 of Aliev and Henk [5]. However we include it for completeness. Two lattices  $L, L'$  are similar if there is a linear bijection  $\phi: L \rightarrow L'$  such that for some fixed  $c > 0$  we have  $\|\phi(\mathbf{x})\| = c\|\mathbf{x}\|$ . Let  $\tilde{O}_m$  be the group of matrices  $K = (\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_m) \in GL_m(\mathbb{R})$  whose columns  $\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_m$  have  $\|\mathbf{k}_1\| = \dots = \|\mathbf{k}_m\| \neq 0$  and inner products  $\langle \mathbf{k}_i, \mathbf{k}_j \rangle = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ . It is the product of the orthogonal group  $O_m$  and the group of nonzero multiples of the identity matrix. When  $X = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \in GL_m(\mathbb{R})$ , we may uniquely write the matrix  $X$  in the form

$$(4.1) \quad X = KZ,$$

where  $K \in \tilde{O}_m$  and

$$(4.2) \quad Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_{12} & \cdots & x_{1m} \\ 0 & y_2 & \cdots & x_{2m} \\ \vdots & & & \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & y_m \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $y_2, \dots, y_m > 0$ . The matrices  $Z$  as in (4.2) form the generalized upper half-plane  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_m$ . For  $Z \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $M \in GL_m(\mathbb{R})$ , we may write  $ZM$  in the form (4.1), that is we uniquely have  $ZM = KZ_M$  with  $K \in \tilde{O}_m$  and  $Z_M \in \mathcal{H}$ . Thus  $GL_m(\mathbb{R})$  acts on  $\mathcal{H}$ ; to  $M$  corresponds the map  $Z \mapsto Z_M$ . In particular,  $GL_m(\mathbb{Z})$ , as a subgroup of  $GL_m(\mathbb{R})$ , acts on  $\mathcal{H}$ . We will denote

by  $\mathcal{F}$  a fundamental domain for the action of  $GL_m(\mathbb{Z})$  on  $\mathcal{H}$ . We will also write  $\mu$  for the  $GL_m(\mathbb{R})$  invariant measure on  $\mathcal{H}$  with  $\mu(\mathcal{F}) = 1$ .

Suppose now that  $1 < m \leq n$ . There is a map (see p. 38 of Schmidt [36] for details) from lattices of rank  $m$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  onto the set  $\mathcal{H}/GL_m(\mathbb{Z})$  of orbits of  $GL_m(\mathbb{Z})$  in  $\mathcal{H}$ . The lattices  $L, L'$  are similar precisely if they have the same image in  $\mathcal{H}/GL_m(\mathbb{Z})$ , hence the same image in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Similarity classes of lattices are parametrized by the elements of a fundamental domain  $\mathcal{F}$ .

A subset  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{H}$  is called *lean* if  $\mathcal{D}$  is contained in some fundamental domain  $\mathcal{F}$ . For  $a > 0, b > 0$ , let  $\mathcal{H}(a, b)$  consists of  $Z \in \mathcal{H}$  (in the form (4.2)) with

$$y_{i+1} \geq ay_i, \quad 1 \leq i < m, \quad |x_{ij}| \leq by_i, \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq m.$$

Here we assume  $y_1 = 1$ .

Clearly, there is one-to-one correspondence between primitive vectors  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  and the primitive  $(n-1)$ -dimensional sublattices of  $\mathbb{Z}^n$ . This correspondence was used in [5] to investigating the average behavior of  $F(\mathbf{a})$ .

Let now  $P(\mathcal{D}, T)$ , where  $\mathcal{D}$  is lean, be the number of primitive lattices  $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$  with similarity class in  $\mathcal{D}$  and determinant  $\leq T$ .

**Theorem 4.1** (Schmidt [36, Theorem 2]). *Suppose  $1 < m < n$  and let  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{H}(a, b)$  be lean and Jordan-measurable. Then, as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$(4.3) \quad P(\mathcal{D}, T) \sim c_2(m, n)\mu(\mathcal{D})T^n$$

with

$$c_2(m, n) = \frac{1}{n} \binom{n}{m} \frac{\omega_{n-m+1} \cdots \omega_n}{\omega_1 \omega_2 \cdots \omega_m} \cdot \frac{\zeta(2) \cdots \zeta(m)}{\zeta(n-m+1) \cdots \zeta(n)}.$$

Here  $\omega_l$  is the volume of the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^l$  and  $\zeta(\cdot)$  is the Riemann zeta-function.

Thus, roughly speaking, the proportion of primitive lattices with similarity class in  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\mu(\mathcal{D})$ .

As before we denote by  $B^n \subset \mathbb{R}^m$  the  $n$ -dimensional ball of radius 1. Given a vector  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{m-1})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m-1}$  with  $u_i \geq 1$  ( $1 \leq i < m$ ), the  $m$ -dimensional sublattices  $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$  with

$$\frac{\lambda_{i+1}(B^n \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(L), L)}{\lambda_i(B^n \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(L), L)} \geq u_i$$

form a set of similarity classes, which will be denoted by  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u})$ .

**Theorem 4.2** (Schmidt [36, Theorem 5 (i)]). *The set  $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u})$  may be realized as a lean, Jordan-measurable subset of  $\mathcal{H}$ . We have*

$$(4.4) \quad \mu(\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u})) \ll_{m,n} \prod_{i=1}^{m-1} u_i^{-i(m-i)}.$$

Here  $\ll_{m,n}$  denotes the Vinogradov symbol with the constant depending on  $m$  and  $n$  only.

## 5. THE AVERAGE BEHAVIOUR

We recall that by (2.4) we have

$$g(A) \leq \frac{n-m}{2} \lambda_{n-m}(B^n \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(L_A^\perp, L_A^\perp))$$

where  $B^n$  is the  $n$ -dimensional ball of radius 1 centered at the origin. Thus with  $L = L_A$ ,  $\Gamma = (\det(L))^{-\frac{1}{n-m}} L^\perp$  we may write

$$(5.1) \quad g(L) \leq \frac{(n-m)(\det(L))^{\frac{1}{n-m}}}{2} \lambda_{n-m}(B^n \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\Gamma), \Gamma).$$

Observe, that  $\det(L) = \det(L^\perp)$  (cf. (2.1)) and that the determinant of  $\Gamma$  is 1. We consider the sequence of discrete random variables  $X_T : G(m, n, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  defined as

$$X_T(L) = \frac{g(L)}{(\det(L))^{\frac{1}{n-m}}}.$$

Recall that the *cumulative distribution function* (CDF)  $F_T$  of  $X_T$  is defined for  $t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  as

$$F_T(t) = \text{Prob}_{m,n,T}(X_T \leq t).$$

In order to apply Schmidt's result stated in the previous section, let for a real number  $u \geq 1$ ,  $\delta_i(u) = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{n-m-1})$  be the vector with  $u_i = u$  and  $u_j = 1$  for all  $j \neq i$ . Define the set  $\mathcal{D}(u)$  of similarity classes as (cf. Section 3)

$$\mathcal{D}(u) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n-m-1} \mathcal{D}(\delta_i(u)).$$

By (4.4) the measure of this set satisfies

$$(5.2) \quad \mu(\mathcal{D}(u)) \ll_{m,n} \frac{1}{u^{n-m-1}}.$$

Let  $Y_T : G(m, n, T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$  be the sequence of random variables defined as

$$Y_T(L) = \sup\{v \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0} : L \in \mathcal{D}(c_1 v^{2/(n-m-1)})\},$$

where the constant  $c_1 = c_1(m, n)$  is given by

$$c_1 = \omega_{n-m}^{\frac{2}{(n-m)(n-m-1)}} / (n-m)^{2/(n-m-1)}.$$

Since the set  $\mathcal{D}(1)$  contains all similarity classes we have for all  $L \in G(m, n, T)$

$$(5.3) \quad Y_T(L) \geq c_1^{-(n-m-1)/2}.$$

Next we need the following observation

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $\lambda_i := \lambda_i(B^n \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\Gamma), \Gamma)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n - m$ , and let  $\lambda_{n-m} > \lambda > 0$ . Then there exists an index  $i \in \{1, \dots, n - m - 1\}$  with*

$$\frac{\lambda_{i+1}}{\lambda_i} > c_2(m, n) \lambda^{2/(n-m-1)},$$

where  $c_2(m, n) = 2^{-\frac{2}{n-m-1}} \omega_{n-m}^{\frac{2}{(n-m)(n-m-1)}}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose the opposite, i.e.,

$$\frac{\lambda_{i+1}}{\lambda_i} \leq c_2(m, n) \lambda^{2/(n-m-1)},$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq n - m - 1$ . Then,  $\lambda_{n-m} \leq (c_2(m, n) \lambda^{2/(n-m-1)})^{n-m-i} \lambda_i$ , and by Minkowski's second fundamental theorem (2.2)

$$(5.4) \quad \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_{n-m} \leq \frac{2^{n-m}}{\omega_{n-m}}.$$

Thus we obtain the contradiction

$$\lambda_{n-m} \leq (c_2(m, n) \lambda^{2/(n-m-1)})^{\frac{(n-m-1)}{2}} \frac{2}{\omega_{n-m}^{1/(n-m)}} = \lambda.$$

□

Let now  $\tilde{F}_T$  be the CDF of the random variable  $Y_T$ .

**Lemma 5.2.** *For any  $T \geq 1$  and  $t \geq 0$  we have*

$$\tilde{F}_T(t) \leq F_T(t).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\lambda_i := \lambda_i(B^n \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\Gamma), \Gamma)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n - m$ . By (5.1), we have

$$\frac{g(L)}{(\det(L))^{\frac{1}{n-m}}} \leq \frac{(n-m)}{2} \lambda_{n-m}.$$

Hence, if for some  $t$  holds

$$X_T(L) = \frac{g(L)}{(\det(L))^{\frac{1}{n-m}}} > t$$

then clearly  $\lambda_{n-m} > \frac{2t}{(n-m)}$ . By Lemma 5.1, applied with  $\lambda = \frac{2t}{(n-m)}$ , we get

$$\frac{\lambda_{i+1}}{\lambda_i} > c_1(m, n) t^{2/(n-m-1)}.$$

Consequently, the lattice  $\Gamma$  belongs to a similarity class in  $\mathcal{D}(c_1 t^{2/(n-m-1)})$ , so that  $Y_T(L) > t$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}_{m,n,T}(X_T \leq t) &= 1 - \frac{\#\{L \in G(m,n,T) : g(L)/(\det(L))^{\frac{1}{n-m}} > t\}}{\#G(m,n,T)} \\ &\geq 1 - \frac{\#\{L \in G(m,n,T) : Y_T(L) > t\}}{\#G(m,n,T)} \\ &= \text{Prob}_{m,n,T}(Y_T \leq t). \end{aligned}$$

□

The proofs of Theorem 1.3 and 1.4 are now an easy consequence of Lemma 5.2 and Schmidt's results on the distribution of sublattices.

*Proof of Theorem 1.3.* By Lemma 5.2 and Theorem 4.1 we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}_{m,n,T}(g(L)/(\det(L))^{\frac{1}{n-m}} > t) &= 1 - F_T(t) \leq 1 - \tilde{F}_T(t) \\ &= \frac{\#\{L \in G(m,n,T) : Y_T(L) > t\}}{\#G(m,n,T)} \\ &\ll_{m,n} \mu(\mathcal{D}(c_1 t^{\frac{2}{n-m-1}})) \ll_{m,n} t^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Theorem 1.4.* Let also  $E(\cdot)$  denote the mathematical expectation. Since for any nonnegative real-valued random variable  $X$

$$(5.5) \quad E(X) = \int_0^\infty (1 - F_X(t)) dt,$$

Lemma 5.2 implies that  $E(X_T) \leq E(Y_T)$  and, consequently,

$$(5.6) \quad \sup_T E(X_T) \leq \sup_T E(Y_T).$$

Next, by Theorem 4.1 we also have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \tilde{F}_T(t) &= \frac{\#\{L \in G(m,n,T) : Y_T(L) > t\}}{\#G(m,n,T)} \\ &\ll_{m,n} \mu(\mathcal{D}(c_1 t^{\frac{2}{n-m-1}})) \ll_{m,n} t^{-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by (5.5), (5.6) and observation (5.3), we obtain

$$\sup_T E(X_T) \ll_{m,n} \int_{c_1^{-(n-m-1)/2}}^\infty t^{-2} dt \ll_{m,n} 1,$$

which proves the theorem. □

## 6. APPENDIX: ON UPPER BOUNDS FOR THE FROBENIUS NUMBER

From the viewpoint of analysis of integer programming algorithms, upper bounds for the Frobenius number  $F(\mathbf{a})$  in terms of the input vector  $\mathbf{a}$  are of primary interest. All known upper bounds are of order  $\|\mathbf{a}\|^2$  and, as it was shown in Erdős and Graham [18], the quantity  $\|\mathbf{a}\|^2$  plays a role of a limit for estimating the Frobenius number  $F(\mathbf{a})$  from above. For  $n = 3$  Beck and Zacks [11] conjectured that, except of a special family of input vectors, the Frobenius number does not exceed  $c(a_1 a_2 a_3)^\alpha$  with absolute constants  $c$  and  $\alpha < 2/3$ . This conjecture has been disproved by Schlage-Puchta [35]. As a special case, the latter result implies that, roughly speaking, cutting off special families of input vectors cannot make the order of upper bounds for  $g_3$  smaller than  $\|\mathbf{a}\|^2$ .

In this appendix we consider the general case  $n \geq 3$  and show that the order  $\|\mathbf{a}\|^2$  cannot be improved along any given “direction”  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Although the proof of this result follows the general line of the proof of Theorem 1.2, in this special setting it can be significantly simplified.

For  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^n$  and  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ , let

$$V_{\mathbf{a}}(t) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} = t\}$$

and  $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}(t) = V_{\mathbf{a}}(t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ . Here and throughout the rest of the paper we consider  $V_{\mathbf{a}}(t)$  as a usual  $(n-1)$ -dimensional Euclidean space. Denote by  $S_{\mathbf{a}}(t)$  the  $(n-1)$ -dimensional simplex  $V_{\mathbf{a}}(t) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ . For convenience we will also use the notation  $V_{\mathbf{a}} = V_{\mathbf{a}}(0)$  and  $\Lambda_{\mathbf{a}} = \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}(0)$ . With respect to that notation Kannan [23] showed that

$$(6.1) \quad F(\mathbf{a}) - \|\mathbf{a}\|_1 = \mu(S_{\mathbf{a}}(1), \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}(1)).$$

Fix a point  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, 1)$ ,  $n \geq 3$ , with  $0 \leq \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_{n-1} \leq 1$ .

**Theorem 6.1.** *There exists a sequence of integer vectors  $\mathbf{a}(t)$  and a constant  $c_3 = c_3(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ , such that*

$$(6.2) \quad F(\mathbf{a}(t)) > c_3 \|\mathbf{a}(t)\|^2 + \|\mathbf{a}(t)\|_1 \quad t = 1, 2, \dots$$

and for any  $\epsilon > 0$  we have

$$(6.3) \quad \left\| \boldsymbol{\alpha} - \frac{\mathbf{a}(t)}{\|\mathbf{a}(t)\|_\infty} \right\| < \epsilon$$

for all sufficiently large  $t$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$  and

$$(6.4) \quad 0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots < \alpha_{n-1} < 1.$$

Let us choose an integer number  $q$  such that  $\mathbf{a} := q\boldsymbol{\alpha}$  is a primitive integer vector in  $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^n$ . Put  $\lambda_i = \lambda_i(B^n \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}}, \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}})$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ , and choose  $n-1$  linearly independent integer vectors  $\mathbf{a}_i$  corresponding to  $\lambda_i$ . Then we clearly have  $\|\mathbf{a}_i\| = \lambda_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ .

Next let  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  be the two-dimensional plane orthogonal to the vectors  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{n-2}$ . The plane  $P_{\mathbf{a}}$  can be considered as a usual Euclidean two-dimensional plane. Thus one can choose a sequence  $\mathbf{a}(t)$  of primitive vectors of the lattice  $P_{\mathbf{a}} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$  with the following properties:

(A1)  $\mathbf{a}(t) \neq \mathbf{a}$  for  $t = 1, 2, \dots$ ;

(A2) For any  $\epsilon > 0$  the inequality (6.3) holds for all sufficiently large  $t$ .

Let  $\lambda_i(t) = \lambda_i(B^n \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}(t)}, \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}(t)})$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ , and let  $\mathbf{a}_i(t)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ , be linearly independent integer vectors corresponding to the successive minima  $\lambda_i(t)$ . Similarly to (3.2) we have

$$(6.5) \quad \lambda_i(t) = \lambda_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n-2$$

for all sufficiently large  $t$ .

By (6.5) and the Minkowski second fundamental theorem (2.2)

$$\frac{2^{n-1} \|\mathbf{a}(t)\|}{(n-1)! \omega_{n-1}} \leq \lambda_1(t) \lambda_2(t) \cdots \lambda_{n-1}(t) = \lambda_{n-1}(t) \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} \lambda_i,$$

so that

$$(6.6) \quad \lambda_{n-1}(t) \geq \frac{2^{n-1} \|\mathbf{a}(t)\|}{(n-1)! \omega_{n-1} \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} \lambda_i}$$

for all sufficiently large  $t$ .

The vectors  $\mathbf{a}(t)$  are primitive and by (6.4) for all sufficiently large  $t$  we have  $\mathbf{a}(t) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^n$ . Thus the Frobenius numbers  $F(\mathbf{a}(t))$  are well-defined when  $t$  is large enough. Observe also that by (6.1)

$$F(\mathbf{a}(t)) - \|\mathbf{a}(t)\|_1 = \mu(S_{\mathbf{a}(t)}(1), \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}(t)}(1)).$$

In view of (6.3) and (6.4) one can choose some constant  $r = r(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$  such that for all sufficiently large  $t$  a translate of  $S_{\mathbf{a}(t)}(1)$  lies in  $\frac{r}{\|\mathbf{a}(t)\|} B_1^n$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{a}(t)) - \|\mathbf{a}(t)\|_1 &> \mu\left(\frac{r}{\|\mathbf{a}(t)\|} B^n(t) \cap V_{\mathbf{a}(t)}, \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}(t)}\right) \\ &= \frac{\|\mathbf{a}\|}{r} \mu(B^n \cap V_{\mathbf{a}(t)}, \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}(t)}). \end{aligned}$$

By the lower bound in Jarnik's inequalities (2.3), we have

$$\mu(B_1^n \cap V_{\mathbf{a}(t)}, \Lambda_{\mathbf{a}(t)}) \geq \frac{\lambda_{n-1}(t)}{2}$$

and with (6.6) we finally get

$$F(\mathbf{a}(t)) - \|\mathbf{a}(t)\|_1 > \frac{2^{n-2}}{(n-1)! \omega_{n-1} r(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} \lambda_i} \|\mathbf{a}(t)\|^2$$

for all sufficiently large  $t$ . □



## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Aardal, C. A. J. Hurkens, A. K. Lenstra, *Solving a system of linear Diophantine equations with lower and upper bounds on the variables*, Math. Oper. Res. **25** (2000), no. 3, 427–442.
- [2] K. Aardal, A. Lenstra, *Hard equality constrained integer knapsacks*, Math. Oper. Res. **29** (2004), no. 3, 724–738.
- [3] K. Aardal, R. Weismantel, L. A. Wolsey, *Non-standard approaches to integer programming*, Workshop on Discrete Optimization, DO'99 (Piscataway, NJ). Discrete Appl. Math. **123** (2002), no. 1-3, 5–74.
- [4] I. Aliev, P. M. Gruber, *An optimal lower bound for the Frobenius problem*, J. Number Theory **123** (2007), no. 1, 71–79.
- [5] I. Aliev and M. Henk, *Integer knapsacks: average behavior of the Frobenius numbers*, Mathematics of Operations Research, Mathematics of Operations Research **34** (3), 2009, 698–705.
- [6] I. Aliev, M. Henk and A. Hinrichs, *Expected Frobenius numbers*, arXiv:0910.2620.
- [7] V.I. Arnold, *Weak asymptotics of the numbers of solutions of Diophantine equations*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **33** (1999), no. 4, 65–66.
- [8] V.I. Arnold, *Geometry and growth rate of Frobenius numbers of additive semigroups*, Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. **9** (2006), no. 2, 95–108.
- [9] V.I. Arnold, *Arithmetical turbulence of selfsimilar fluctuations statistics of large Frobenius numbers of additive semigroups of integers*, Mosc. Math. J. **7** (2007), no. 2, 173–193.
- [10] M. Beck, R. Diaz, S. Robins, *The Frobenius problem, rational polytopes, and Fourier-Dedekind sums*, J. Number Theory, **96** (2002), no. 1, 1–21.
- [11] M. Beck, S. Zacks, *Refined upper bounds for the linear Diophantine problem of Frobenius*, Adv. in Appl. Math. **32** (2004), no. 3, 454–467.
- [12] D. Beihoffer, J. Hendry, A. Nijenhuis, S. Wagon, *Faster algorithms for Frobenius numbers*, Electron. J. Combin. **12** (2005), Research Paper 27, 38 pp. (electronic).
- [13] C. E. Blair, R. G. Jeroslow, *The value function of an integer program*, Math. Programming **23** (1982), 237–273.
- [14] J. Bourgain, Ya. G. Sinai, *Limit behavior of large Frobenius numbers*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **62** (2007), no. 4(376), 77–90.
- [15] J. W. S. Cassels, *An introduction to the Geometry of Numbers*, Springer-Verlag 1971.
- [16] J. L. Davison, *On the linear Diophantine problem of Frobenius*, J. Number Theory, **48** (1994), no. 3, 353–363.
- [17] D. Einstein, D. Lichtblau, A. Strzebonski, S. Wagon, *Frobenius numbers by lattice point enumeration*, Integers **7** (2007), A15, 63pp.
- [18] P. Erdős, R. Graham, *On a linear Diophantine problem of Frobenius*, Acta Arith., **21** (1972), 399–408.
- [19] L. Fukshansky, S. Robins, *Frobenius problem and the covering radius of a lattice*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **37** (2007), no. 3, 471–483.
- [20] P. M. Gruber, *Convex and discrete geometry*, Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [21] P. M. Gruber, C. G. Lekkerkerker, *Geometry of Numbers*, North-Holland, Amsterdam 1987.
- [22] P. Hansen, J. Ryan, *Testing integer knapsacks for feasibility*, European Journal of Operational Research, **88**, 1996, no. 3, 578–582.
- [23] R. Kannan, *Lattice translates of a polytope and the Frobenius problem*, Combinatorica, **12**(2)(1992), 161–177.
- [24] R. Kannan, L. Lovász, *Covering minima and lattice-point-free convex bodies*, Ann. of Math. (2) **128** (1988), no. 3, 577–602.

- [25] R. M. Karp, *Reducibility among combinatorial problems*, in Complexity of Computer Computations, R. E. Miller and J. W. Thatcher, Eds, Plenum, New York, 1972, 85–103.
- [26] A. G. Khovanskii, *The Newton polytope, the Hilbert polynomial and sums of finite sets*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **26** (1992), no. 4, 57–63.
- [27] M. J. Knight, *A generalization of a result of Sylvester’s*, J. Number Theory **12** (1980), no. 3, 364–366.
- [28] J-B, Lasserre, *A discrete Farkas lemma*, Discrete Optimization **1** (2004), 67 – 75.
- [29] J. Lee, S. Onn, R. Weismantel, *Nonlinear optimization over a weighted independence system*, submitted.
- [30] J. Marklof, *The asymptotic distribution of Frobenius numbers*, arXiv:0902.3557, (2009), 14 pages.
- [31] J. Martinet, *Perfect lattices in Euclidean spaces*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. **327** (2003), Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [32] P. Pleasants, H. Ray, J. Simpson, *The Frobenius problem on lattices*, Australas. J. Combin. **32** (2005), 27–45.
- [33] J. L. Ramírez Alfonsín, *Complexity of the Frobenius problem*, Combinatorica, **16** (1996), no. 1, 143–147.
- [34] J. L. Ramírez Alfonsín, *The Diophantine Frobenius problem*, Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and Its Applications, 2005.
- [35] J-C. Schlage-Puchta, *An estimate for Frobenius’ Diophantine problem in three dimensions*, J. Integer Seq. **8** (2005), no. 1, Article 05.1.7, 4 pp. (electronic).
- [36] W. M. Schmidt, *The distribution of sublattices of  $Z^m$* , Monatsh. Math. **125** (1998), no. 1, 37–81.
- [37] A. Schrijver, *Theory of linear and integer programming*, Wiley, Chichester, 1986.
- [38] V Shur, Ya Sinai, and A Ustinov, *Limiting distribution of Frobenius numbers for  $n = 3$* , J. Number Theory **129** (2009), 2778–2789.
- [39] R. J. Simpson, R. Tijdeman, *Multi-dimensional versions of a theorem of Fine and Wilf and a formula of Sylvester*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **131** (2003), no. 6, 1661–1671.
- [40] B. Vizvari, *Beiträge zum Frobenius Problem*, D. Sc. Nat. Dissertation, Technische Hochschule Carl Schorlemmer, Leuna-Merseburg, Germany (1987).

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND WALES INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCES, CARDIFF UNIVERSITY, SENGHENNYDD ROAD, CARDIFF, WALES, UK

*E-mail address:* `alievi@cf.ac.uk`

INSTITUT FÜR ALGEBRA UND GEOMETRIE, OTTO-VON-GUERICKE UNIVERSITÄT MAGDEBURG, UNIVERSITÄTSPLATZ 2, D-39106-MAGDEBURG, GERMANY

*E-mail address:* `henk@math.uni-magdeburg.de`