Note on Minkowski Summation and Unimodularity in Discrete Convex Analysis

Kazuo Murota* and Akihisa Tamura[†]

December 2023 / April 2024

Abstract

This short note gives an elementary alternative proof for a theorem of Danilov and Koshevoy on Minkowski summation and unimodularity in discrete convex analysis. It is intended to disseminate this fundamental theorem and make its proof accessible to researchers in optimization and operations research.

Keywords: Discrete optimization, discrete convex analysis, M[‡]-convex set, Minkowski sum, unimodular matrix

1 Introduction

Danilov–Koshevoy [3] made a fundamental contribution to our understanding of "discrete convexity" in general. For a class *C* of subsets of \mathbb{Z}^n , they first identified desired properties that allow us to call *C* a class of discrete convex sets, and clarified their mutual relations (often equivalences) among these properties. The main result of [3] is that a class subsets of \mathbb{Z}^n that is qualified to be called "discrete convexity" can be constructed from a unimodular system, and vice versa. As the name suggests, unimodular systems are closely related to unimodular matrices. A survey paper of Koshevoy [11] describes subsequent development of this approach.

Minkowski summation is an intriguing operation in discrete setting. This is fully recognized in discrete convex analysis [12] and indeed, the closedness under Minkowski summation is one of the desired properties of C discussed in [3].

For any sets $S_1, S_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote their *Minkowski sum* (or *vector sum*) by $S_1 + S_2$, that is,

$$S_1 + S_2 = \{x + y \mid x \in S_1, y \in S_2\}.$$

If S_1 and S_2 are convex, then $S_1 + S_2$ is also convex. For any (possibly non-convex) sets S_1 and S_2 we have

$$\overline{S_1 + S_2} = \overline{S_1} + \overline{S_2},\tag{1.1}$$

^{*}The Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tokyo 190-8562, Japan; and Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Tokyo 192-0397, Japan, murota@tmu.ac.jp

[†]Department of Mathematics, Keio University, Yokohama 223-8522, Japan, aki-tamura@math.keio.ac.jp

where \overline{S} denotes the convex hull of any set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. In this connection it is emphasized that for discrete sets $S_1, S_2 \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$, the relation

$$S_1 + S_2 = (\overline{S_1 + S_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \tag{1.2}$$

does not always hold, even when $S_i = \overline{S_i} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ for i = 1, 2. The following example shows this.

Example 1.1 ([12, Example 3.15]). The Minkowski sum of $S_1 = \{(0, 0), (1, 1)\}$ and $S_2 = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ is equal to $S_1 + S_2 = \{(1, 0), (0, 1), (2, 1), (1, 2)\}$. The relation (1.2) fails, since $(1, 1) \in (\overline{S_1 + S_2}) \setminus (S_1 + S_2)$.

Let *C* be a class of subsets of \mathbb{Z}^n that has "no-hole property," that is,

$$S = \overline{S} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \qquad (S \in C). \tag{1.3}$$

The following three categories of C can be distinguished with respect to the Minkowski sum of two sets in C.

- 1. $S_1 + S_2 \neq (\overline{S_1 + S_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ for some $S_1, S_2 \in C$. See Example 1.2 below.
- 2. $S_1 + S_2 = (\overline{S_1 + S_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ for all $S_1, S_2 \in C$, but $S_1 + S_2 \notin C$ for some $S_1, S_2 \in C$. See Example 1.3 below.
- 3. $S_1 + S_2 \in C$ for all $S_1, S_2 \in C$. Then, by (1.3), $S_1 + S_2 = (\overline{S_1 + S_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ is also true for all $S_1, S_2 \in C$.

In this paper we are interested in *C* in the third category, i.e., those classes *C* which are closed under Minkowski summation. As is well known in discrete convex analysis, the class of M^{\natural} -convex sets (see Section 2.3 for the definition) is such a class, and by virtue of this property, M^{\natural} -convexity finds applications in economics etc. [4, 13]. An important finding of Danilov–Koshevoy [3] is that the class of M^{\natural} -convex sets is not the unique class in the third category, but other classes can be constructed from unimodular matrices. The objective of this note is to give an elementary alternative proof for this theorem connecting Minkowski summation and unimodularity. It is intended to disseminate this fundamental theorem among researchers in optimization and operations research, together with a proof written in the language and style familiar to them.

Example 1.2. The two sets S_1 and S_2 in Example 1.1 are integrally convex sets; see [12, Section 3.4] for the definition of integral convexity. This demonstrates that the class *C* of integrally convex sets falls into the first category above.

Example 1.3 ([16, Example 3.11]). The Minkowski sum of $S_1 = \{(0, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0)\}$ and $S_2 = \{(0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1)\}$ is given by $S_1 + S_2 = \{(0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 1), (1, 1, 0), (1, 2, 1)\}$. The identity (1.2) holds. The two sets S_1 and S_2 are L^{\natural}-convex; see [12, Section 5.5] for the definition of L^{\natural}-convex sets. Their Minkowski sum $S_1 + S_2$ is not L^{\natural}-convex, since for $x = (0, 0, 0), y = (1, 2, 1) \in S$, we have $\lceil (x + y)/2 \rceil = (1, 1, 1) \notin S, \lfloor (x + y)/2 \rfloor = (0, 1, 0) \notin S$, a violation of the discrete midpoint convexity (characterization of L^{\natural}-convex sets has the weaker property (1.2). That is, the class of L^{\natural}-convex sets falls into the second category above.

Minkowski summation for other classes of discrete convex sets are summarized in Section 3.5 and Table 4 of a survey paper [14] on operations on discrete convex sets and functions.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to preliminaries on polyhedra, unimodular matrices, and M^{\ddagger} -convexity. The theorem is described in Section 3 and the elementary proof is given in Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Polyhedra

A subset *P* of \mathbb{R}^n is called a *polyhedron* if it is described by a finite number of linear inequalities, that is, $P = \{x \mid Cx \le b\}$ for some matrix *C* and a vector *b*. A subset *Q* of \mathbb{R}^n is called a *polytope* if it is the convex hull of a finite number of points, that is, $Q = \overline{S}$ for a finite subset *S* of \mathbb{R}^n , where \overline{S} denotes the convex hull of *S*. It is known that a polytope is nothing but a bounded polyhedron. The reader is referred to [7, 17, 19] for basic facts about polyhedra.

The *lineality space* of a polyhedron $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, denoted by lineal(P), is defined as

lineal(P) = {
$$d \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x + \lambda d \in P$$
 for all $x \in P, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ }, (2.1)

which admits an alternative expression

lineal(P) = {
$$d \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x + \lambda d \in P$$
 for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ } (2.2)

with an arbitrarily fixed $x \in P$. If $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Cx \leq b\}$, then $\text{lineal}(P) = \{d \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid Cd = 0\}$. We have $\text{lineal}(P) = \{0\}$ if and only if *P* has a vertex. For each face *F* of *P*, we have

$$lineal(F) = lineal(P).$$
(2.3)

A polyhedron is said to be *rational* if it is described by a finite number of linear inequalities with rational coefficients. A polyhedron P is an *integer polyhedron* if $P = \overline{P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}$, i.e., if it coincides with the convex hull of the integer points contained in it, or equivalently, if P is rational and each face of P contains an integer point.

2.2 Unimodular matrices

A square matrix consisting of integer entries is called *unimodular* if its determinant is 1 or -1. More generally, an $n \times m$ matrix A of integer entries is called *unimodular* if rank A = n (row-full rank) and each of its minor (subdeterminant) of order n is an element in $\{0, +1, -1\}$. A matrix of integer entries is called *totally unimodular* if every minor (of any order) is an element in $\{0, +1, -1\}$. When an $n \times m$ matrix A is of the form $A = [I_n | C]$, where I_n denotes the identity matrix of order n, we have equivalences:

A is unimodular \Leftrightarrow A is totally unimodular \Leftrightarrow C is totally unimodular.

Fundamental facts about (totally) unimodular matrices are available in [17, Chapters 19–21]. It is particularly important to our paper that a complete classification of totally unimodular matrices are known. Network matrices form a major class of totally unimodular matrices, whereas there exist totally unimodular matrices that are essentially different from network matrices. As is fully recognized in optimization and operations research, an integer optimization problems (IP) described by a unimodular matrix admits an LP relaxation free from integrality gap. In more general terms, unimodularity allows us to embed a discrete problem into a continuous setting. Thus unimodularity is one of the key properties from structural and computational perspectives.

2.3 M^{\\[\beta]}-convex polyhedra and M^{\\[\beta]}-convex sets

Let $N = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$. A g-polymatroid [5, 6] is a polyhedron P described as

$$P = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \mu(X) \le x(X) \le \rho(X) \ (X \subseteq N) \},$$

$$(2.4)$$

where $x(X) = \sum_{i \in X} x_i$, with a submodular function $\rho : 2^N \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and a supermodular function $\mu : 2^N \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ satisfying the condition (called *paramodularity*)

$$\rho(X) - \mu(Y) \ge \rho(X \setminus Y) - \mu(Y \setminus X) \qquad (X, Y \subseteq N).$$
(2.5)

It is assumed that $\rho(\emptyset) = \mu(\emptyset) = 0$, and $\rho(N)$ and $\mu(N)$ are finite.

What is called an M^{\ddagger} -convex polyhedron in discrete convex analysis [12] is in fact a synonym of a g-polymatroid. In this paper we rely on the following characterization of an M^{\ddagger} convex polyhedron, where $\mathbf{1}^i$ denotes the *i*th unit vector (characteristic vector of singleton set $\{i\}$) for $i \in N$.

Theorem 2.1 ([6, Theorem 17.1]). A nonempty polyhedron P in \mathbb{R}^n is a g-polymatroid (M^{\natural} convex polyhedron) if and only if for every point x in P the tangent cone of P at x is generated
by vectors chosen from $\mathbf{1}^i$, $-\mathbf{1}^i$ ($i \in N$) and $\mathbf{1}^i - \mathbf{1}^j$ ($i, j \in N$).

The content of the above assertion is easier to understand for a bounded polyhedron (polytope). In this special case the theorem states that a bounded polyhedron P is an M^{\natural}-convex polyhedron if and only if every edge of P has a direction among the vectors $\mathbf{1}^i$, $-\mathbf{1}^i$ ($i \in N$) and $\mathbf{1}^i - \mathbf{1}^j$ ($i, j \in N$).

The set of integer points in an integral g-polymatroid coincides with what is called an M^{\natural} -convex set in discrete convex analysis. An M^{\natural} -convex set $S (\subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n)$ can be characterized by the following exchange property [12, 15]:

(**B**^{\natural}-**EXC**[\mathbb{Z}]) For any $x, y \in S$ and $i \in \text{supp}^+(x - y)$, at least one of the following is true: (i) $x - \mathbf{1}^i \in S$ and $y + \mathbf{1}^i \in S$,

(ii) there exists $j \in \text{supp}^{-}(x - y)$ such that $x - \mathbf{1}^{i} + \mathbf{1}^{j} \in S$ and $y + \mathbf{1}^{i} - \mathbf{1}^{j} \in S$,

where

 $supp^+(z) = \{i \in N \mid z_i > 0\}, \qquad supp^-(z) = \{j \in N \mid z_j < 0\}$

for any vector $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.

It is known [6, 12] that the class of M^{\natural} -convex polyhedra and the class of M^{\natural} -convex sets are both closed under Minkowski summation.

Theorem 2.2. The Minkowski sum $P_1 + P_2$ of M^{\natural} -convex polyhedra $P_1, P_2 (\subseteq \mathbb{R}^n)$ is an M^{\natural} -convex polyhedron, and the Minkowski sum $S_1 + S_2$ of M^{\natural} -convex sets $S_1, S_2 (\subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n)$ is an M^{\natural} -convex set.

3 Description of the Theorem

We consider the following two conditions for a family \mathcal{P} of polyhedra in \mathbb{R}^n :

- **DCP1**: Each $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is an integer polyhedron,
- **DCP2**: For any $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $P_1 + P_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ and

$$(P_1 + P_2) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = (P_1 \cap \mathbb{Z}^n) + (P_2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^n), \tag{3.1}$$

where DC stands for Discrete Convexity and P for Polyhedron. For such \mathcal{P} , the corresponding family of subsets of \mathbb{Z}^n , denoted by

$$C = \{P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \mid P \in \mathcal{P}\},\tag{3.2}$$

satisfies the following two conditions:

- **DC1**: For any $S \in C$, \overline{S} is an integer polyhedron and $S = \overline{S} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$,
- **DC2**: For any $S_1, S_2 \in C$, we have $S_1 + S_2 \in C$.

The condition DC2 says that C is closed under Minkowski summation.

Conversely, if a family *C* of subsets of \mathbb{Z}^n satisfies DC1 and DC2, then

$$\mathcal{P} = \{ \overline{S} \mid S \in C \} \tag{3.3}$$

satisfies DCP1 and DCP2. This can be seen as follows. For any $S \in C$, its convex hull $P = \overline{S}$ is an integer polyhedron by DC1, showing DCP1. To show DCP2, let $P_i = \overline{S_i}$ for $S_i \in C$ (i = 1, 2). We have $S_i = P_i \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ (i = 1, 2) by DC1 and $S_1 + S_2 \in C$ by DC2. On noting $P_1 + P_2 = \overline{S_1} + \overline{S_2} = \overline{S_1 + S_2}$ from (1.1), we obtain $P_1 + P_2 = \overline{S_1 + S_2} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $(P_1 + P_2) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = \overline{S_1 + S_2} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = S_1 + S_2 = (P_1 \cap \mathbb{Z}^n) + (P_2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^n)$.

In the following we construct a class \mathcal{P} of polyhedra with properties DCP1 and DCP2 from a unimodular matrix. This in turn yields a class C of discrete sets satisfying DC1 and DC2. To state the theorem we need some notations. For any nonempty set $F (\subseteq \mathbb{R}^n)$, we define

$$\operatorname{linsp}(F) = \{\lambda(x - y) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid x, y \in F, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\},\tag{3.4}$$

which is the subspace of \mathbb{R}^n parallel to the minimal affine space containing *F*. Given an $n \times m$ unimodular matrix *A* (with rank A = n), we denote by \mathcal{P}_A the family of all integer polyhedra $P (\subseteq \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that for any face *F* of *P*, the subspace linsp(*F*) is generated by some column vectors of the matrix *A*. That is,

$$\mathcal{P}_{A} = \{ P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n} \mid P \text{ is an integer polyhedron, and for any face } F, \\ \text{linsp}(F) \text{ is generated by column vectors of } A \}.$$
(3.5)

In this definition it is understood that when *F* is a vertex (zero-dimensional face), $linsp(F) = \{0\}$ is generated by the empty subset of the column vectors of *A*. The corresponding family C_A of discrete sets is defined as

$$C_A = \{ P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \mid P \in \mathcal{P}_A \}.$$
(3.6)

The following theorem is a formulation of a result of Danilov–Koshevoy [3]. This theorem is expressed in the language familiar to researchers in optimization and operations research, while the original paper [3] employs abstract algebraic terms.

Theorem 3.1. For any $n \times m$ unimodular matrix A (with rank A = n), the class \mathcal{P}_A of polyhedra satisfies DCP1 and DCP2, and the class C_A of discrete sets satisfies DC1 and DC2.

Proof. As already mentioned, the statement for C_A is equivalent to that for \mathcal{P}_A . The proof for \mathcal{P}_A is given in Section 4.

Example 3.1. By Theorem 2.1, an M^{\natural} -convex polyhedron is characterized by vectors $\mathbf{1}^{i}$, $-\mathbf{1}^{i}$ $(i \in N)$ and $\mathbf{1}^{i} - \mathbf{1}^{j}$ $(i, j \in N)$ to generate tangent cones. This means that the class of M^{\natural} -convex polyhedra is given as \mathcal{P}_{A} for $A = A^{\mathsf{M}}$ consisting of column vectors $\mathbf{1}^{i}$ $(i \in N)$ and $\mathbf{1}^{i} - \mathbf{1}^{j}$ (i < j). The matrix A^{M} has *n* rows and n(n + 1)/2 columns. When n = 4, for example, we have

The matrix A^{M} is unimodular for general *n*, and, by Theorem 3.1, the class of M^{\beta}-convex polyhedra is equipped with the properties DCP1 and DCP2. Accordingly, the class of M^{\beta}-convex sets, C_A for $A = A^{M}$, has the properties DC1 and DC2. Thus Theorem 3.1 provides us with an alternative proof of Theorem 2.2 that the Minkowski sum of M^{\beta}-convex polyhedra (resp., sets) is an M^{\beta}-convex polyhedron (resp., set).

Remark 3.1. A unimodular matrix A is said to be *maximal* if it cannot be augmented by any nonzero column vector (other than $\pm a^j$ for a column vector a^j of A) without destroying the unimodularity. The matrix A^M for M^{\natural} -convex sets is maximal in this sense. According to a result of Danilov–Koshevoy [3] showing a certain converse of Theorem 3.1, the maximality of A^M implies that there is no class of discrete convexity that is a proper superclass of M^{\natural} -convex sets and closed under Minkowski summation. Maximal unimodular matrices are investigated in Danilov–Grishukhin [2].

Remark 3.2. For an $n \times m$ unimodular matrix A and an $n \times n$ square unimodular matrix T, their product A' = TA is an $n \times m$ unimodular matrix and determines a class $C_{A'}$ of discrete convex sets. This class $C_{A'}$ may be considered essentially equivalent to C_A , since $S \in C_A$ if and only if $TS \in C_{A'}$. For example, the matrix $A' = TA^M$ obtained from A^M for M^{\ddagger} -convexity with a diagonal matrix $T = \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1; -1, \dots, -1)$ corresponds to the so-called *twisted* M^{\ddagger} -convexity, which is used in the analysis of trading networks in economics [9, 10, 13]. There exist unimodular matrices that are not related to A^M by unimodular transformations. Indeed, according to the classification of totally unimodular matrices mentioned in Section 2.2,

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & | & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & | & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & | & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & | & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$
(3.8)

is a unimodular matrix that is independent of A^{M} , and hence determines another class C_{B} of discrete convex sets satisfying DC1 and DC2. Such classes of discrete convex sets, different from M^b-convex sets, are equally legitimate as discrete convexity, but they await applications.

Remark 3.3. Besides the original proof by Danilov–Koshevoy [3], alternative proofs for Theorem 3.1 can be found in Baldwin–Klemperer [1, Fact 4.9], Howard [8, Theorem 4.5], Tran–Yu [18, Lemma 4]. These proofs employ algebra or tropical geometry.

4 **Proof of the Theorem**

In this section we give an elementary proof of Theorem 3.1. We start with a general fact about the Minkowski sum of two polyhedra (independent of DCP1 and DCP2). Recall notations

lineal(\cdot) and linsp(\cdot) from (2.1) and (3.4), respectively.

Proposition 4.1. Let P_1 and P_2 be polyhedra in \mathbb{R}^n and define

$$L := \operatorname{lineal}(P_1) \cap \operatorname{lineal}(P_2). \tag{4.1}$$

For any $z \in P_1 + P_2$, there exist $x \in P_1$ and $y \in P_2$ satisfying z = x + y and

$$\operatorname{linsp}(F_1) \cap \operatorname{linsp}(F_2) = L, \tag{4.2}$$

where F_1 denotes the minimal face of P_1 containing x and F_2 is the minimal face of P_2 containing y.

Proof. Since lineal(P_i) = lineal(F_i) by (2.3) and lineal(F_i) \subseteq linsp(F_i), we have

 $L = \text{lineal}(P_1) \cap \text{lineal}(P_2) = \text{lineal}(F_1) \cap \text{lineal}(F_2) \subseteq \text{linsp}(F_1) \cap \text{linsp}(F_2).$

We shall show that if $L \neq \text{linsp}(F_1) \cap \text{linsp}(F_2)$, we can modify x and y so that $\text{dim}(\text{linsp}(F_1)) + \text{dim}(\text{linsp}(F_2))$ becomes smaller.

Suppose $L \neq \text{linsp}(F_1) \cap \text{linsp}(F_2)$, and take any

$$d \in (\operatorname{linsp}(F_1) \cap \operatorname{linsp}(F_2)) \setminus L.$$

Obviously, $d \neq 0$. Since F_1 is the minimal face of P_1 containing x, the point x lies in the relative interior of F_1 . Similarly, y is in the relative interior of F_2 . It then follows that for any $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ with sufficiently small absolute value $|\varepsilon|$, $x + \varepsilon d$ belongs to F_1 and $y - \varepsilon d$ belongs to F_2 . On the other hand, it follows from $d \notin L = \text{lineal}(F_1) \cap \text{lineal}(F_2)$ that there exists some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ for which $[x + \lambda d \in \text{bd}(F_1)$ and $y - \lambda d \in F_2]$ or $[x + \lambda d \in F_1$ and $y - \lambda d \in \text{bd}(F_2)]$ is true, where $\text{bd}(F_i)$ denotes the boundary of the face F_i for i = 1, 2. With the change of $x \leftarrow x + \lambda d$ and $y \leftarrow y - \lambda d$, we can make smaller at least one of the minimal faces F_1 and F_2 , while maintaining z = x + y, $x \in P_1$, and $y \in P_2$. Such changes decreases $\text{dim}(\text{linsp}(F_1)) + \text{dim}(\text{linsp}(F_2))$ at least by one, and eventually we arrive at (4.2).

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3.1. To be specific, we prove that \mathcal{P}_A satisfies DCP1 and DCP2 under the assumption that A is a unimodular matrix. DCP1 is obvious from the definition (3.5) of \mathcal{P}_A .

To prove the first property $P_1 + P_2 \in \mathcal{P}_A$ in DCP2, we recall a well-known fact [7, Section 1.5] that any face F of $P_1 + P_2$ can be represented as $F = F_1 + F_2$ for some face F_1 of P_1 and some face F_2 of P_2 . For each i = 1, 2, $\text{linsp}(F_i)$ is generated by columns of A since $P_i \in \mathcal{P}_A$. Therefore,

$$linsp(F) = linsp(F_1 + F_2) = linsp(F_1) + linsp(F_2)$$

is generated by columns of *A*. Thus $P_1 + P_2 \in \mathcal{P}_A$.

In the second property (3.1) in DCP2, the inclusion \supseteq is obvious. For the reverse inclusion \subseteq we will show that for any $z \in (P_1 + P_2) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, there exist $x^* \in P_1 \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $y^* \in P_2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ that satisfy $z = x^* + y^*$. Take any $z \in (P_1 + P_2) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. By Proposition 4.1 there exist $x \in P_1$ and $y \in P_2$ satisfying

$$z = x + y$$
, $\operatorname{linsp}(F_1) \cap \operatorname{linsp}(F_2) = L$,

where $L = \text{lineal}(P_1) \cap \text{lineal}(P_2)$, F_1 is the minimal face of P_1 containing x, and F_2 is the minimal face of P_2 containing y.

Since P_1 and P_2 are integer polyhedra, there exist integer points $x^{\circ} \in F_1$ and $y^{\circ} \in F_2$. Define

$$d_z := z - (x^\circ + y^\circ) = (x - x^\circ) + (y - y^\circ).$$
(4.3)

Since $z, x^{\circ}, y^{\circ} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $x - x^{\circ} \in \text{linsp}(F_1)$, and $y - y^{\circ} \in \text{linsp}(F_2)$, we have

$$d_z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$$
 and $d_z \in \operatorname{linsp}(F_1) + \operatorname{linsp}(F_2)$. (4.4)

We construct a basis of \mathbb{R}^n with reference to $\operatorname{linsp}(F_1)$ and $\operatorname{linsp}(F_2)$, while making use of the fact that both $\operatorname{linsp}(F_1)$ and $\operatorname{linsp}(F_2)$ are generated by column vectors of A. First we choose a basis of $\operatorname{linsp}(F_1)$ from the column vectors of A. Let $\{a^1, \ldots, a^s\}$ be the chosen columns vectors, where the columns are re-numbered if necessary. Next we add some other column vectors of A, say, $\{a^{s+1}, \ldots, a^t\}$ to form a basis of $\operatorname{linsp}(F_1) + \operatorname{linsp}(F_2)$, where we may assume that $\{a^{s+1}, \ldots, a^t\} \subseteq \operatorname{linsp}(F_2)$ since there exists a basis of $\operatorname{linsp}(F_2)$ consisting of column vectors of A. Finally, we add some column vectors of A, say, $\{a^{t+1}, \ldots, a^n\}$ to form a basis of \mathbb{R}^n . By construction we have

$$\{a^1, \dots, a^s\} \subseteq \operatorname{linsp}(F_1), \qquad \{a^{s+1}, \dots, a^t\} \subseteq \operatorname{linsp}(F_2). \tag{4.5}$$

Express d_z in (4.3) as a linear combination of the basis vectors, i.e.,

$$d_z = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i a^i, \tag{4.6}$$

where such representation is unique. We have

$$\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (i = 1, \dots, t), \qquad \lambda_i = 0 \quad (i = t + 1, \dots, n), \tag{4.7}$$

because $d_z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, the submatrix $[a^1, a^2, ..., a^n]$ of A formed by the basis vectors is unimodular, $d_z \in \text{linsp}(F_1) + \text{linsp}(F_2)$ as in (4.4), and (4.5) holds. Define

$$d_x := \sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i a^i, \quad d_y := \sum_{i=s+1}^t \lambda_i a^i; \quad x^* := x^\circ + d_x, \quad y^* := y^\circ + d_y.$$
(4.8)

Then we have

$$d_x \in \operatorname{linsp}(F_1) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad d_y \in \operatorname{linsp}(F_2) \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad x^* \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad y^* \in \mathbb{Z}^n,$$
(4.9)

and

$$d_z = d_x + d_y, \tag{4.10}$$

$$z = x^{\circ} + y^{\circ} + d_z = (x^{\circ} + d_x) + (y^{\circ} + d_y) = x^* + y^*.$$
(4.11)

Finally, we show that $x^* \in P_1$ and $y^* \in P_2$. It follows from $x + y = z = x^* + y^*$ that

$$x - x^* = y^* - y.$$

We have $x - x^* \in \text{linsp}(F_1)$, since $x \in F_1$, $x^* = x^\circ + d_x$, $x^\circ \in F_1$, and $d_x \in \text{linsp}(F_1)$. Similarly, we have $y^* - y \in \text{linsp}(F_2)$, since $y \in F_2$, $y^* = y^\circ + d_y$, $y^\circ \in F_2$, and $d_y \in \text{linsp}(F_2)$. Therefore,

$$x - x^* = y^* - y \in \operatorname{linsp}(F_1) \cap \operatorname{linsp}(F_2).$$

$$(4.12)$$

Recalling (4.1) and (4.2), we obtain

$$x - x^* = y^* - y \in \operatorname{linsp}(F_1) \cap \operatorname{linsp}(F_2) = L = \operatorname{lineal}(P_1) \cap \operatorname{lineal}(P_2),$$

from which follows that

 $x^* = x - (x - x^*) \in P_1 + \text{lineal}(P_1) = P_1, \quad y^* = y + (y^* - y) \in P_2 + \text{lineal}(P_2) = P_2.$ (4.13)

Combining (4.9), (4.11), and (4.13), we obtain $z = x^* + y^*$, $x^* \in P_1 \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, and $y^* \in P_2 \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, as desired. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Acknowledgement. This work was supported by JSPS/MEXT KAKENHI JP23K11001 and JP21H04979, and by JST ERATO Grant Number JPMJER2301, Japan.

References

- [1] Baldwin, E., Klemperer, P.: Understanding preferences: "demand types", and the existence of equilibrium with indivisibilities. Econometrica **87**, 867–932 (2019)
- [2] Danilov, V., Grishukhin, V.: Maximal unimodular systems of vectors. European Journal of Combinatorics **20**, 507–526 (1999)
- [3] Danilov, V.I., Koshevoy, G.A.: Discrete convexity and unimodularity, I. Advances in Mathematics 189, 301–324 (2004)
- [4] Danilov, V., Koshevoy, G., Murota, K.: Discrete convexity and equilibria in economies with indivisible goods and money. Mathematical Social Sciences **41**, 251–273 (2001)
- [5] Frank, A.: Connections in Combinatorial Optimization. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2011)
- [6] Fujishige, S.: Submodular Functions and Optimization, 2nd edn. Annals of Discrete Mathematics **58**, Elsevier, Amsterdam (2005)
- [7] Grünbaum, B.: Convex Polytopes, 2nd edn. Springer, New York (2003)
- [8] Howard, B.J.: Matroids and geometric invariant theory of torus actions on flag spaces. Journal of Algebra **312**, 527–541 (2007)
- [9] Ikebe, Y. T., Sekiguchi, Y., Shioura, A., Tamura, A.: Stability and competitive equilibria in multi-unit trading networks with discrete concave utility functions. Japan Journal of Industrial and Applied Mathematics 32, 373–410 (2015)
- [10] Ikebe, Y. T., Tamura, A.: Stability in supply chain networks: An approach by discrete convex analysis. Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan 58, 271–290 (2015)
- [11] Koshevoy, G.A.: Discrete convexity and its applications. In: Chvátal, V. (ed.) Combinatorial Optimization, pp. 135–163. IOS Press, Amsterdam (2011)
- [12] Murota, K.: Discrete Convex Analysis. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia (2003)

- [13] Murota, K.: Discrete convex analysis: A tool for economics and game theory. Journal of Mechanism and Institution Design 1, 151–273 (2016)
- [14] Murota, K.: A survey of fundamental operations on discrete convex functions of various kinds. Optimization Methods and Software 36, 472–518 (2021)
- [15] Murota, K., Shioura, A.: M-convex function on generalized polymatroid. Mathematics of Operations Research 24, 95–105 (1999)
- [16] Murota, K., Shioura, A.: Relationship of M-/L-convex functions with discrete convex functions by Miller and by Favati–Tardella. Discrete Applied Mathematics 115, 151– 176 (2001)
- [17] Schrijver, A.: Theory of Linear and Integer Programming. Wiley, New York (1986)
- [18] Tran, N.M., Yu, J.: Product-mix auctions and tropical geometry. Mathematics of Operations Research 44, 1396–1411 (2019)
- [19] Ziegler, G.M.: Lectures on Polytopes. Springer, New York (1995); Corrected and updated printing (2007)