

# On the diameter of lattice polytopes

Alberto Del Pia\*

Carla Michini†

September 17, 2018

## Abstract

In this paper we show that the diameter of a  $d$ -dimensional lattice polytope in  $[0, k]^n$  is at most  $\lfloor (k - \frac{1}{2})d \rfloor$ . This result implies that the diameter of a  $d$ -dimensional half-integral polytope is at most  $\lfloor \frac{3}{2}d \rfloor$ . We also show that for half-integral polytopes the latter bound is tight for any  $d$ .

## 1 Introduction

The 1-*skeleton* of a polyhedron  $P$  is the graph whose nodes are the vertices of  $P$ , and that has an edge joining two nodes if and only if the corresponding vertices of  $P$  are adjacent on  $P$ . Given vertices  $u, v$  of  $P$ , the *distance*  $\delta^P(u, v)$  between  $u$  and  $v$  is the length of a shortest path connecting  $u$  and  $v$  on the 1-skeleton of  $P$ . We may write  $\delta(u, v)$  instead of  $\delta^P(u, v)$  when the polyhedron we are referring to is clear from the context. The *diameter*  $\delta(P)$  of  $P$  is the smallest number that bounds the distance between any pair of vertices of  $P$ .

In this paper, we investigate the diameter of *lattice polytopes*, i.e. polytopes whose vertices are integral. Lattice polytopes play a crucial role in discrete optimization and integer programming problems, where the variables are constrained to assume integer values. Our goal is to define a bound on the diameter of a lattice polytope  $P$ , that depends on the dimension of  $P$  and on the parameter  $k = \max\{\|x - y\|_\infty : x, y \in P\}$ , in order to apply such bound to classes of polytopes for which  $k$  is known to be small. A similar approach has been followed by Bonifas et al. [4], who showed that the diameter of a polyhedron  $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}$  is bounded by a polynomial that depends on  $n$  and on the parameter  $\Delta$ , defined as the largest absolute value of any sub-determinant of  $A$ . Note that, while  $\Delta$  is related to the external description of  $P$ ,  $k$  is related to its internal description. However, both  $\Delta$  and  $k$  are in general not polynomial in  $n$  and in the number of the facet-defining inequalities of  $P$ .

For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , a  $(0, k)$ -polytope  $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is a lattice polytope contained in  $[0, k]^n$ . Naddef [10] showed that the diameter of a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, 1)$ -polytope is at most  $d$ , and this bound is tight for the hypercube  $[0, 1]^d$ . Kleinschmidt and Onn [8] extended this result by proving that the diameter of a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope cannot exceed  $kd$ . However, their bound is not tight for  $k \geq 2$ .

Our main contribution is establishing an upper bound for the diameter of a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope, which refines the bound by Kleinschmidt and Onn.

**Theorem 1.** *For  $k \geq 2$ , the diameter of a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope is at most  $\lfloor (k - \frac{1}{2})d \rfloor$ .*

The proof of Theorem 1 is elementary, as it combines an induction argument with basic tools from linear programming and polyhedral theory. Our proof is also constructive, since it shows how to build a path between two given vertices of  $P$ , whose length does not exceed our bound.

For  $(0, 2)$ -polytopes, we show that the upper bound given in Theorem 1 is tight for any  $d$ .

**Corollary 2.** *The diameter of a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, 2)$ -polytope is at most  $\lfloor \frac{3}{2}d \rfloor$ . Moreover, for any natural number  $d$ , there exists a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, 2)$ -polytope attaining this bound.*

The lower bound of Corollary 2 follows by an easy construction based on the cartesian product of polytopes of dimension one and two. It is well-known that, given two polytopes  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , their cartesian product  $P_1 \times P_2$  satisfies  $\delta(P_1 \times P_2) = \delta(P_1) + \delta(P_2)$ . Now, let  $H_1 = [0, 2]$  and  $H_2 = \text{conv}\{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (2, 1), (1, 2), (2, 2)\}$ . For even  $d$ , let  $H_d = (H_2)^{d/2}$ , and for odd  $d$ , let  $H_d = H_{d-1} \times H_1$ . Thus for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $H_d$  is a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, 2)$ -polytope, with  $\delta(H_d) = \lfloor \frac{3}{2}d \rfloor$ .

\*Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Email: [delpia@wisc.edu](mailto:delpia@wisc.edu)

†Wisconsin Institute for Discovery, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Email: [michini@wisc.edu](mailto:michini@wisc.edu)

Corollary 2 has important implications for the diameter of half-integral polytopes. *Half-integral polytopes* are polytopes whose vertices have components in  $\{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$ , and they are affinely equivalent to  $(0, 2)$ -polytopes. The class of half-integral polytopes is very rich, as many half-integral polytopes appear in the literature as relaxations of  $(0, 1)$ -polytopes arising from combinatorial optimization problems. In some cases, while the  $(0, 1)$ -polytope defined as the convex hull of the feasible solutions to the combinatorial problem has exponentially many facets, there is a linear relaxation, defined by a polynomial number of constraints, that yields a half-integral polytope.

There are several classes of polytopes that are known to be half-integral, such as the fractional matching polytope and the fractional stable set polytope [2], the linear relaxation of the boolean quadric polytope and the rooted semimetric polytope [12] (see also [14] and [9]). An interesting class of half-integral polytopes arises from totally dual half-integral systems, such as the fractional stable matching polytope [1, 6], and the fractional matroid matching polytope [13, 7].

The rest of the paper is devoted to proving Theorem 1.

## 2 Proof of main result

In order to bound the diameter of a non full-dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope  $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , we define the *projection of  $P$  onto the  $i$ -coordinate hyperplane* as the polytope

$$\{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : \exists x \in P \text{ with } x_j = \bar{x}_j \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, i-1, x_j = \bar{x}_{j-1} \text{ for } j = i+1, \dots, n\}.$$

That is, we simply drop the  $i$ -th coordinate from all vectors in  $P$ . Since integral vectors are mapped into integral vectors, the next lemma follows from Theorem 3.3 in [11].

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $P$  be a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  with  $d \geq 1$ . Then there exists a full-dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with the same 1-skeleton as  $P$ .*

For  $d, k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define  $\delta_k^d$  to be the maximum possible diameter of a  $(0, k)$ -polytope of dimension at most  $d$ , i.e.

$$\delta_k^d = \max\{\delta(P) : P \text{ is a } (0, k)\text{-polytope of dimension at most } d\}.$$

Note that the maximum in the definition of  $\delta_k^d$  always exists. In fact, it follows from Lemma 1 that the number of vertices of a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope is at most  $(k+1)^d$ , thus also its diameter is upper bounded by  $(k+1)^d$ , which is a number independent on the dimension of the ambient space of  $P$ . Moreover, for fixed  $k$ , the value  $\delta_k^d$  is clearly non-decreasing in  $d$ .

We now present some lemmas that will be used to prove Theorem 1. These results follow by applying the ideas introduced by Kleinschmidt and Onn in [8]. The next lemma shows how to bound the distance  $\delta(u, F)$  between a vertex  $u$  of a lattice polytope  $P$  and a face  $F$  of  $P$ , that is defined as  $\delta(u, F) = \min\{\delta(u, v) : v \text{ is a vertex of } F\}$ . We say that two vertices  $u, v$  of a polytope are *neighbors* if  $\delta(u, v) = 1$ . We denote by  $e^i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , the  $i$ -th vector of the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $P$  be a lattice polytope, and let  $u$  be a vertex of  $P$ . Let  $c$  be an integral vector,  $\gamma = \min\{cx : x \in P\}$ , and  $F = \{x \in P : cx = \gamma\}$ . Then  $\delta(u, F) \leq cu - \gamma$ .*

*Proof.* We show that there exists a vertex  $v$  of  $F$  such that  $\delta(u, v) \leq cu - \gamma$ . We prove this statement by induction on the integer value  $cu - \gamma \geq 0$ . The statement is trivial for  $cu - \gamma = 0$ , as we can set  $v = u$ . Assume  $cu - \gamma \geq 1$ . Since  $F$  is nonempty, there exists a neighbor  $u'$  of  $u$  with  $cu' < cu$  (see, e.g., [5]). The integrality of  $c$ ,  $u'$  and  $u$ , implies  $cu' \leq cu - 1$ . As  $cu' - \gamma \leq cu - \gamma - 1$ , by the induction hypothesis there exists a vertex  $v$  of  $F$  such that  $\delta(u', v) \leq cu' - \gamma$ . Therefore  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta(u, u') + \delta(u', v) \leq 1 + cu' - \gamma \leq cu - \gamma$ .  $\square$

Given two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  and a face  $F$  of a lattice polytope  $P$ , we have  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta(u, F) + \delta(v, F) + \delta(F)$ . By applying Lemma 2 to both  $u$  and  $v$ , we obtain an upper bound on  $\delta(u, v)$  that depends on  $F$ :

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $P$  be a lattice polytope, and let  $u, v$  be vertices of  $P$ . Let  $c$  be an integral vector,  $\gamma = \min\{cx : x \in P\}$ , and  $F = \{x \in P : cx = \gamma\}$ . Then  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta(F) + cu + cv - 2\gamma$ .*

Let  $P$  be a  $(0, k)$ -polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and let  $l = \min\{x_i : x \in P\}$  and  $h = \max\{x_i : x \in P\}$  for some  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We can bound the distance between any two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  of  $P$  by bounding their distances from the faces  $L = \{x \in P : x_i = l\}$  and  $H = \{x \in P : x_i = h\}$ . If  $u_i + v_i \leq l + h$ , Lemma 3 applied with  $F = L$ ,  $c = e^i$  and  $\gamma = l$  implies  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta(L) + (h - l)$ . If  $u_i + v_i \geq l + h$ , Lemma 3 applied with  $F = H$ ,  $c = -e^i$  and  $\gamma = -h$  implies  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta(H) + (h - l)$ . Since  $L$  and  $H$  are  $(0, k)$ -polytopes of dimension at most  $n - 1$ , we have that both  $\delta(L)$  and  $\delta(H)$  are at most  $\delta_k^{n-1}$ .

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $P$  be a  $(0, k)$ -polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and suppose that there exists  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $x_i \in [l, h]$  for every  $x \in P$ . Then  $\delta(P) \leq \delta_k^{n-1} + (h - l)$ .*

Given a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope  $P$ , Kleinschmidt and Onn prove the bound  $\delta(P) \leq kd$  by essentially applying Lemma 1, and then Lemma 4 inductively. Therefore, their bound uses Lemma 2 only with vectors  $c = \pm e^i$ . To prove our refined bound, we will use Lemma 2 also with different vectors  $c$ . We are now ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Let  $P$  be a  $d$ -dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope, with  $k \geq 2$ . The proof is by induction on  $d$ . The base cases are  $d = 0$  and  $d = 1$ . The diameter of a 0-dimensional polytope is clearly zero, and the diameter of a 1-dimensional polytope is at most one, thus also bounded by  $\lfloor k - \frac{1}{2} \rfloor = k - 1$  since  $k \geq 2$ .

We now assume  $d \geq 2$ . Let  $u, v$  be vertices of  $P$ . By the induction hypothesis we assume that Theorem 1 is true for  $(0, k)$ -polytopes of dimension at most  $d - 1$ . In particular,  $\delta_k^{d-1} \leq \lfloor (k - \frac{1}{2})(d - 1) \rfloor$ , and  $\delta_k^{d-2} \leq \lfloor (k - \frac{1}{2})(d - 2) \rfloor$ . Thus, in order to prove the inductive step, it is sufficient to show one of the following two inequalities:

$$\delta(u, v) \leq \delta_k^{d-1} + k - 1, \quad (1)$$

$$\delta(u, v) \leq \delta_k^{d-2} + 2k - 1. \quad (2)$$

**Claim 1** *We can assume that  $P$  is full-dimensional.*

*Proof of claim.* By Lemma 1, there exists a full-dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with the same 1-skeleton as  $P$ .  $\diamond$

**Claim 2** *We can assume that  $P$  intersects all facets of the hypercube  $[0, k]^d$ .*

*Proof of claim.* If there exists a facet  $G$  of the hypercube  $[0, k]^d$  with  $P \cap G = \emptyset$ , then let  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  be such that  $l \leq x_i \leq h$ , with  $l \geq 1$  or  $h \leq k - 1$ . By Lemma 4,  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta_k^{d-1} + k - 1$ , i.e. (1) is satisfied.  $\diamond$

In the remainder of the paper, we will denote by  $k^d$  the  $d$ -dimensional vector with all entries equal to  $k$ .

**Claim 3** *We can assume that  $u + v = k^d$ .*

*Proof of claim.* If  $u + v \neq k^d$ , there exists an index  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  such that  $u_i + v_i \leq k - 1$  or  $u_i + v_i \geq k + 1$ . By Lemma 3 applied with  $c = e^i$  or  $c = -e^i$ , respectively, we obtain  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta(F) + k - 1$ , where  $F$  is the face of  $P$  that minimizes  $cx$ . As  $F$  is a  $(0, k)$ -polytope of dimension at most  $d - 1$ , we have  $\delta(F) \leq \delta_k^{d-1}$ , therefore  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta_k^{d-1} + k - 1$ , i.e. (1) is satisfied.  $\diamond$

**Claim 4** *We can assume that  $u \in \{0, k\}^d$ .*

*Proof of claim.* Assume that  $u$  has one component  $u_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ , with  $1 \leq u_i \leq k - 1$ . In this case we show that (2) is satisfied. Since the set  $\{x \in P : x_i = 0\}$  is nonempty, there exists a neighbor  $s$  of  $u$  with  $s_i < u_i$  (see, e.g., [5]). By the integrality of  $s$  and  $u$ , this implies  $s_i \leq u_i - 1$ . Symmetrically, since the set  $\{x \in P : x_i = k\}$  is nonempty,  $u$  has a neighbor  $t$  with  $t_i \geq u_i + 1$ . If  $s_j = t_j = u_j$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ,  $j \neq i$ , then by setting  $\lambda = \frac{t_i - u_i}{t_i - s_i}$  we have  $\lambda s + (1 - \lambda)t = u$ , contradicting the fact that  $u$  is a vertex of  $P$ . Thus, there exists an index  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  with  $j \neq i$  such that either  $s_j \neq u_j$  or  $t_j \neq u_j$ . Therefore there exists a neighbor  $w$  of  $u$  such that  $w_i \neq u_i$  and  $w_j \neq u_j$ , for distinct indices  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  (see Fig. 1(i)).

We assume without loss of generality that  $w_i < u_i$  (if not, we can perform the change of variable  $\tilde{x}_i = k - x_i$ ). Analogously, we assume  $w_j < u_j$ . As  $u + v = k^d$ , we have  $w_i + w_j + v_i + v_j \leq 2k - 2$ . Let  $\gamma = \min\{x_i + x_j : x \in P\}$  and  $F = \{x \in P : x_i + x_j = \gamma\}$ . By Lemma 3 (with  $c = e^i + e^j$ ),  $\delta(w, v) \leq \delta(F) + w_i + w_j + v_i + v_j - 2\gamma \leq \delta(F) + 2k - 2 - 2\gamma$  (see Fig. 1(ii)).

We now show that  $\delta(F) \leq \delta_k^{d-2} + \gamma$ . Let  $\bar{F}$  be the projection of  $F$  onto the  $j$ -coordinate hyperplane.  $\bar{F}$  is a  $(0, k)$ -polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$  and, by Lemma 1,  $\bar{F}$  has the same 1-skeleton of  $F$ . Note that, for any  $x \in F$ ,  $x_i = \gamma - x_j$  and  $x_j \geq 0$  imply  $x_i \leq \gamma$ . Therefore,  $x_i \leq \gamma$  for any  $x \in \bar{F}$ . Then, by Lemma 4,  $\delta(\bar{F}) \leq \delta_k^{d-2} + \gamma$ , thus  $\delta(F) \leq \delta_k^{d-2} + \gamma$ .

This implies  $\delta(w, v) \leq \delta_k^{d-2} + 2k - 2 - \gamma$  and, since  $\gamma \geq 0$  and  $\delta(u, w) = 1$ , finally  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta(u, w) + \delta(w, v) \leq \delta_k^{d-2} + 2k - 1$ , i.e. (2) is satisfied.  $\diamond$

By possibly performing the change of variable  $\tilde{x}_1 = k - x_1$ , we can further assume without loss of generality that  $u_1 = k$ , and  $v_1 = 0$ .

Let  $F$  be the face of  $P$  defined by  $F = \{x \in P : x_1 = 0\}$ .  $F$  is a  $(0, k)$ -polytope of dimension at most  $d - 1$ , thus  $\delta(F) \leq \delta_k^{d-1}$ . By Lemma 2 (with  $c = e^1$ ), there exists a vertex  $u'$  of  $F$  such that  $\delta(u, u') \leq k$ . Observe that both  $u'$  and  $v$  lie in  $F$  and therefore  $\delta(u', v) \leq \delta_k^{d-1}$ .

If  $u' = (0, u_2, \dots, u_d)$ , then  $u$  and  $u'$  are adjacent vertices of the hypercube  $[0, k]^d$ , implying that  $\text{conv}\{u, u'\}$  is an edge of  $[0, k]^d$  (see Fig. 2(i)). As  $P$  is convex and it is contained in  $[0, k]^d$ , it follows that  $\text{conv}\{u, u'\}$  is also an edge of  $P$ . Therefore,  $\delta(u, u') = 1$  and consequently  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta_k^{d-1} + 1$ . As  $k \geq 2$ , it follows  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta_k^{d-1} + k - 1$ , i.e. (1) is satisfied.

Thus we now assume  $u' \neq (0, u_2, \dots, u_d)$  (see Fig. 2(ii)). Then, there exists an index  $i \in \{2, \dots, d\}$  such that  $u'_i + v_i \leq k - 1$  or  $u'_i + v_i \geq k + 1$ . We assume without loss of generality that  $u'_i + v_i \leq k - 1$  (if not, we can perform the change of variable  $\tilde{x}_i = k - x_i$ ). Let  $\gamma = \min\{x_i : x \in F\}$ ,  $F' = \{x \in F : x_i = \gamma\}$ .  $F'$  is a  $(0, k)$ -polytope, and it has dimension at most  $d - 2$  because it is contained in the intersection of the two linearly independent hyperplanes  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_1 = 0\}$  and  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i = \gamma\}$ . It follows that  $\delta(F') \leq \delta_k^{d-2}$ . Then, by applying Lemma 3 to the polytope  $F'$  and the vertices  $u'$  and  $v$ , we have  $\delta(u', v) \leq \delta(F') + u'_i + v_i \leq \delta_k^{d-2} + k - 1$ . This implies  $\delta(u, v) \leq \delta(u, u') + \delta(u', v) \leq \delta_k^{d-2} + 2k - 1$ , i.e. (2) is satisfied.  $\square$

### 3 Further directions

Both our upper bound and the one by Kleinschmidt and Onn are not tight for  $k \geq 3$ . As an example,  $\delta_3^2 = 4$ , as the maximum diameter of a lattice polygon in  $[0, 3]^2$  is realized by the octagon. It seems that our approach cannot be easily refined to obtain a tight upper bound for general  $k$ .

An interesting direction of research is to study the asymptotic behavior of the function  $\delta_k^d$ . It is known that the maximum number of vertices of a 2-dimensional  $(0, k)$ -polytope is in  $\Theta(k^{2/3})$  [3], which implies the asymptotically tight bound  $\delta_k^2 \in \Theta(k^{2/3})$ . Using cartesian products of polytopes, it follows that  $\delta_k^d \in \Omega(k^{2/3}d)$ . This provides an asymptotic lower bound on  $\delta_k^d$  that is a fractional power with respect to  $k$  and linear in  $d$ . However, the best upper bound on  $\delta_k^d$  is linear both in  $k$  and in  $d$ . In other words, there is still a significant gap between the lower and the upper bound.

## References

- [1] H.G. Abeledo and U.G. Rothblum. Stable matchings and linear inequalities. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 54:1–27, 1994.
- [2] M.L. Balinski. Integer programming: methods, uses, computation. *Management Science Series A*, 12:253–313, 1965.
- [3] A. Balog and I. Bárány. On the convex hull of the integer points in a disc. In *Proceedings of the seventh annual symposium on Computational geometry*, SCG '91, pages 162–165, New York, NY, USA, 1991. ACM.
- [4] N. Bonifas, M. Di Summa, F. Eisenbrand, N. Hähnle, and M. Niemeier. On sub-determinants and the diameter of polyhedra. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, pages 1–14, 2014.
- [5] A. Brønsted. *An Introduction to Convex Polytopes*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1983.
- [6] X. Chena, G. Ding, X. Hu, and W. Zang. The maximum-weight stable matching problem: Duality and efficiency. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 26(3):1346–1360, 2012.
- [7] D. Gijswijt and G. Pap. An algorithm for weighted fractional matroid matching. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, series B*, 103:509–520, 2013.
- [8] P. Kleinschmidt and S. Onn. On the diameter of convex polytopes. *Discrete Mathematics*, 102:75–77, 1992.
- [9] M. Laurent. *Geometry of Cuts and Metrics*. Algorithms and Combinatorics. Springer, 1997.
- [10] D.J. Naddef. The Hirsch conjecture is true for  $(0, 1)$ -polytopes. *Mathematical Programming*, 45:109–110, 1989.

- [11] D.J. Naddef and W.R. Pulleyblank. Hamiltonicity in  $(0, 1)$ -polyhedra. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 37(1):41–52, 1984.
- [12] M. Padberg. The boolean quadric polytope: Some characteristics, facets and relatives. *Mathematical Programming*, 45:139–172, 1989.
- [13] A. Schrijver. *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*. Wiley, Chichester, 1986.
- [14] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization. Polyhedra and Efficiency*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 2003.




Figure 1: In Claim 4, (i) we construct a neighbor  $w$  of  $u$  with  $w_i < u_i$ , and  $w_j < u_j$ , (ii) we use Lemma 3 with  $c = e^i + e^j$  to show that  $\delta(w, v) \leq \delta_k^{d-2} + 2k - 2$ .




Figure 2: To bound the distance between vertices  $u \in \{0, k\}^d$  with  $u_1 = k$  and  $v = k^d - u$ , we construct a path from  $u$  to a vertex  $u'$  with  $u'_1 = 0$ . There are two cases: (i)  $u' = (0, u_2, \dots, u_d)$ , thus  $\delta(u, u') = 1$  and  $\delta(u', v) \leq \delta_k^{d-1}$ ; (ii)  $u' \neq (0, u_2, \dots, u_d)$ , thus  $\delta(u, u') \leq k$  and  $\delta(u', v) \leq \delta_k^{d-2} + k - 1$ .