

Polynomial Time Algorithms for Integer Programming and Unbounded Subset Sum in the Total Regime

Divesh Aggarwal* Antoine Joux† Miklos Santha‡ Karol Węgrzycki§

Abstract

The Unbounded Subset Sum (UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM) problem is an NP-hard computational problem where the goal is to decide whether there exist non-negative integers x_1, \dots, x_n such that $x_1 a_1 + \dots + x_n a_n = b$, where $a_1 < \dots < a_n < b$ are distinct positive integers with $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ dividing b . The problem can be solved in pseudopolynomial time, while specialized cases, such as when b exceeds the Frobenius number of a_1, \dots, a_n simplify to a total problem where a solution always exists.

This paper explores the concept of totality in UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM. The challenge in this setting is to actually find a solution, even though we know its existence is guaranteed. We focus on the instances of UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM where solutions are guaranteed for large b . We show that when b is slightly greater than the Frobenius number, we can find the solution to UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM in polynomial time.

We then show how our results extend to INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING WITH EQUALITIES, highlighting conditions under which INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING WITH EQUALITIES becomes total. We investigate the *diagonal Frobenius number*, which is the appropriate generalization of the Frobenius number to this context. In this setting, we give a polynomial-time algorithm to find a solution of INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING WITH EQUALITIES. The bound obtained from our algorithmic procedure for finding a solution almost matches the recent existential bound of Bach, Eisenbrand, Rothvoss, and Weismantel (2024).

1 Introduction

In the UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM (in short notation USS) problem we are given n distinct positive integers $a_1 < \dots < a_n$ with $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 1$ and a target b . The task is to find non-negative integers x_1, \dots, x_n such that $x_1 a_1 + \dots + x_n a_n = b$, whenever such an n -tuple exists. The decision version of the problem is a variant of integer KNAPSACK and is well known to be NP-complete, making USS NP-hard. It is a notoriously hard problem and no algorithm which runs in time $2^{O(n)}(\log b)^{O(1)}$ is known for it. The currently known fastest algorithm which solves USS, due to Reis and Rothvoss [RR23], and runs in time $(\log n)^{O(n)}(\log b)^{O(1)}$. This algorithm solves the general integer programming problem of which USS is a special case. Various pseudopolynomial time algorithms using dynamic programming were also given for USS. Supposing constant time arithmetic operations, Bringmann’s algorithm [Bri17] works in time $O(b \log b)$, and the one of Jansen and Rohwedder [JR19] in time $O(a_n \log a_n \log(a_n + b))$. For the setting of small a_1 , we have algorithms in time $O(a_1^2 + n)$ by [HR96], in time $O(n a_1)$ by [BL07] and in time $O(a_1^{2-o(1)})$ by [Kle22]. These results are essentially tight assuming widely believed fine-grained hypotheses [ABHS22, JR19, Kle22]. For constant n , the problem can be solved in polynomial time in the size of the input numbers by generic integer programming techniques [Len83, RR23].

Another case when the decision problem is easy to solve, and in fact trivializes, is when b is sufficiently large. Indeed, for every a_1, \dots, a_n , there exists a largest integer denoted by $g(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ for which there is no solution, implying that for every $b > g(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, the problem always has a

*Centre for Quantum Technologies and Department of Computer Science, NUS. This work was supported by the NRF investigatorship grant, NRF-NRFI09-0005.

†CISPA Helmholtz Center for Information Security, Germany. This work has been supported by the European Union’s H2020 Programme under grant agreement number ERC-669891.

‡Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore and CNRS, IRIF, Université de Paris. This research is supported by the National Research Foundation, Singapore and A*STAR under its CQT Bridging Grant.

§Saarland University and Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarbrücken, Germany. This work is part of the project TIPEA that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 850979).

solution. This integer is called the Frobenius number of a_1, \dots, a_n , in honour of Frobenius [Bra42] who first raised the problem of computing or estimating $g(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. There is a substantial literature dedicated to this problem, including [HL64, HL65, HV87, Kan92, AJ05]. For $n = 2$ the Frobenius number $g(a_1, a_2) = a_1 a_2 - a_1 - a_2$ was determined by Sylvester [Syl82] and relatively sharp estimates are known for $n = 3$ [BZ03, Ust09]. In the general case the essentially sharpest upper bound of $g(a_1, \dots, a_n) \leq 2a_{n-1} \lfloor \frac{a_n}{n} \rfloor - a_n$ is due to Erdős and Graham [EG72] which is within a constant factor of the actual value. Variants and for some instances improvements of this bound can be found in [Vit76, Sel77, Dix90]. The exact computation of the Frobenius number is known to be NP-hard [RA96].

Total Problems As we said, the decision version of USS is trivial when $b > g(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ because the answer is always ‘yes’. This makes the search problem total in the sense that there is always a solution. It is worth to emphasize that the totality does not arise from a promise but rather from a mathematical property of the input. Furthermore, totality doesn’t make the search problem necessarily easy to solve, and the complexity of UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM in such instances is an interesting research topic. In fact, given any polynomial-time computable upper bound $u(a_1, \dots, a_n) > g(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, it is easy to verify that $b \geq u(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Thus, in this situation, the problem belongs to the complexity class TFNP.

Let us recall that, the class TFNP, introduced by Megiddo and Papadimitriou [MP91], consists of NP-search problems with total relations. It is known that no problem in TFNP can be NP-hard unless NP equals co-NP [JPY85, MP91]. TFNP is believed not to have any complete problems. Research on TFNP has mostly concentrated on sub-classes that can (also) be defined by interesting complete problems. Examples include pure Nash Equilibrium in a congestion game for PLS [FPT04], Nash Equilibrium in a two-player game [CDT09] or Multichromatic Simplex for a Sperner coloring [CD09] for PPAD, and Constrained Short Integer Solution for PPP [SZZ18]. However, for some important problems in TFNP, such as factoring or discrete logarithm, which are not believed to be complete in any of these subclasses, the research focus is on finding the fastest possible algorithm. Our results are examples of this line of work.

Generalization of the Unbounded Subset Sum INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING WITH EQUALITIES (in short ILPE) is the natural generalization to higher dimensions of USS. In this problem, we are given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and the task is to find $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ if there exists such an \mathbf{x} . In a variant, INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING (in short ILP) on the same input asks for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$. The two problems are easily inter-reducible in polynomial time.

Similarly to USS, the complexity of ILPE has been thoroughly studied. All known algorithms are exponential either in n or in $\log L$, where by definition L is the size of the maximum input number, that is $L = \max\{\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\infty}, \|\mathbf{b}\|_{\infty}\}$. The first algorithm of the former category was given by Lenstra [Len83] whose algorithm runs in time $2^{O(n^3)} \text{poly}(d \log L)$. This algorithm provides a polynomial time solution when the number of variables is constant. In a sequence of works [Kan87, FT87, VD12] the polynomial for n in the exponent was substantially improved, and as it was mentioned for USS, the currently known fastest algorithm due to Reis and Rothvoss [RR23], works in time $2^{O(n \log \log n)} \text{poly}(d \log L)$. The first algorithm of the second category, which runs in time $n^{O(d)} (dL)^{O(d^2)}$, was presented by Papadimitriou [Pap81]. The currently fastest algorithm here, due to Jansen and Rohwedder [JR19], uses $O(d \|\mathbf{A}\|_{\infty})^d + O(dn)$ arithmetic operations.

Inspired by the existence of large targets which make USS a total problem and by the relatively fast algorithms we could find in that case, we ask the analogous question for the general ILPE. Our second result specifies conditions on \mathbf{b} under which ILPE becomes total and we are able to give a polynomial time solution for it.

Total Regime of Integer Linear Programming The natural idea to generalize the Frobenius number to INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING WITH EQUALITIES would be to say that when an integer \mathbf{b} (i) lies “deep inside” a positive cone, and (ii) is in the lattice generated by \mathbf{A} then the answer to INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING WITH EQUALITIES is always positive. This, however, is not true in general. Consider the following example:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 10 & 9 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2 \times 3} \text{ and } \mathbf{b} = \begin{pmatrix} M \\ M \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{Z}^2.$$

Note that the lattice generated by \mathbf{A} is \mathbb{Z}^2 and \mathbf{b} lies “deep-inside” the positive quarter for a large enough $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Nevertheless, no matter how large the integer M is, the target \mathbf{b} cannot

be obtained as a positive integral combination of columns of the matrix \mathbf{A} . Hence, we need a more elaborate condition to properly generalize the Frobenius number. The generalization we will consider, and which is arguably the appropriate one, is the *diagonal Frobenius number* $g(\mathbf{A})$ introduced by Aliev and Henk [AH10].

Consider the following three sets of points: $\text{cone}(\mathbf{A}) = \{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n\}$, $\text{intcone}(\mathbf{A}) = \{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{> 0}^n\}$, and $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{A})$ the lattice generated by $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$. The diagonal Frobenius number $g(\mathbf{A})$ is the smallest non-negative integer t such that

$$\text{for every } \mathbf{z} \in \{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \geq t \cdot \mathbf{1}\} \cap \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{A}) \text{ implies } \mathbf{z} \in \text{intcone}(\mathbf{A}).$$

Recently, the existential statements of diagonal Frobenius numbers have been used by Cslovjecsek et al. [CKL⁺24] to solve two-stage stochastic programs and by Guttenberg et al. [GRE23] to study geometric properties of the Vector Addition Systems. The exact bounds are usually studied with respect to the $\det(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T)$ parameter. For example, Aliev and Henk [AH10] show that the diagonal Frobenius number of \mathbf{A} is at most:

$$g(\mathbf{A}) \leq \frac{(n-m)}{2} \sqrt{n \cdot \det(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T)}.$$

Very recently, Bach et al. [BERW24] considered the diagonal Frobenius number parameterized by $\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty$. In that setting, they improve the result of [AH10] and show that:

$$g(\mathbf{A}) \leq d \cdot (2d \cdot \|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty + 1)^d. \quad (1)$$

Note that this bound is independent of n .

Several other generalizations of the Frobenius problem are already known in the literature, for example, the s -Frobenius number [FS11], semigroups [Fel06], and higher dimensions [hFRZ15] (see [Sha08] for references). Also, other restricted versions of ILP with polynomial-time solutions have been considered in the literature. Perhaps the best-known example is the case where the constraint matrix of the program is totally unimodular. In this case, the linear programming relaxation is naturally integral. Artmann, Weismantel, and Zenklusen [AWZ17] extended this setting and gave a polynomial-time algorithm for bimodular ILP, where all minors of the constraint matrix are bounded in absolute value by 2. Many algorithms obtained in the FPT context work in polynomial time when the respective parameter is constant. Such examples include n -fold ILP [LHOW08, HOR13, JLR20], three-fold ILP [CM18], and more generally, ILP with block structure [CEH⁺21, KKL⁺23].

1.1 Our contribution

Our first result addresses the USS problem for a series of functions $u_t(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, where the target b is at least $u_t(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. These functions are at least as big as the Erdős and Graham bound of $\frac{a_n^2}{n-1}$, but less than a_n^2 .

Theorem 1.1. *Let k be a non-negative integer. There is a $\text{poly}(n, \log b) \cdot (\log k)^{O(k)}$ time algorithm that given an UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM instance (n, a_1, \dots, a_n, b) such that $b \geq \frac{a_i^2}{i-1}$, for all $k < i \leq n$, and $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ divides b , finds $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i = b$.*

This means that when b is only greater than u_n then the running time is the ILP bound of [RR23] which we have anyhow without totality, but when b is greater than u_0 , or as a matter of fact u_c , for some $c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, then the running time is polynomial, see Corollary 3.2. Additionally, the complexity of our algorithm smoothly transitions between these two extremes. The algorithm itself is constructed by induction on the number of items, see Section 3.

Inspired by the existence of large targets that make USS a total problem and by the relatively fast algorithms we discovered in that case, we ask the analogous question for ILPE. Our second result specifies conditions on \mathbf{b} under which ILPE become total, allowing us to provide a polynomial-time solution for them.

Theorem 1.2 (Weaker version of Theorem 4.2). *Given target $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and constraint matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$ with column vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ and $\Delta = \max_{i=1}^n \lceil \|\mathbf{a}_i\| \rceil$. If*

$$t \geq (n-d) \cdot \Delta^d \text{ and } \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{y} \mid \mathbf{y} \geq t \cdot \mathbf{1}\}$$

then we can find $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}$ in polynomial time.

The proof idea for this result is as follows. We first use linear programming to find a real vector $\mathbf{y} \geq t \cdot \mathbf{1}$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{y}$. We then let $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}$, where $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{z}$ for an integer vector \mathbf{z} , and $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{u}$, where each coordinate of \mathbf{u} is between 0, and 1. We know that $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{v}$ is in the lattice $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{A})$. Then we iteratively find the smallest non-negative integers $\beta_n, \dots, \beta_{d+1}$ such that for any $i \in \{d+1, \dots, n\}$, $\mathbf{w} - \sum_{j=i}^n \beta_j \mathbf{a}_j$ is in $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{i-1})$. Finally, there is a unique choice for β_1, \dots, β_d . To conclude the proof, we show that $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d \geq -t$.

We note that Theorem 1.3 implies that $g(\mathbf{A}) \leq (n-d) \cdot \Delta^d$, hence it offers an alternative bound on the diagonal Frobenius number. Our result matches (up to the polynomial factors in n) the currently best bound (1) of [BERW24]. Moreover, our result is algorithmic and allows us to find a solution in polynomial time.

We also give a closely matching lower bound for the diagonal Frobenius number. In Theorem 5.1, we show that our bound on $g(\mathbf{A})$ is tight up to polynomial factors in n .

Theorem 1.3 (Theorem 5.1 simplified). *For every $d \geq 2$ let $t = \frac{\Delta^d}{20d}$. There exists $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and constraint matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$ with column vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ and $\Delta = \max_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{a}_i\|$ with the following property:*

$$\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{A}) \cap \{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \geq t \cdot \mathbf{1}\}$$

but there does not exist $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{x}$.

As a consequence, Theorem 1.3 implies that $g(\mathbf{A}) \geq \Omega(\Delta^d/d)$ and the bound (1) of [BERW24] is tight (up to polynomial factor in d). We note, that Aliev et al. [AH10] also show a lower-bound on diagonal Frobenius number, but their result is presented in terms of the $\det(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}^T)$ parameter (see also [AHH11]).

2 Preliminaries

Notation We denote by \mathbb{Z} the set of integers and by $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ the set of non-negative integers. For a real number α , we denote by $\lfloor \alpha \rfloor$, the largest integer less than or equal to α , by $\lceil \alpha \rceil$, the smallest integer greater than or equal to α , and by $\{\alpha\}$, the fractional part of α , i.e., $\alpha - \lfloor \alpha \rfloor$.

For $d \leq n$, a lattice $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the set of all integer linear combinations of n vectors $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L} = \{z_1 \mathbf{a}_1 + z_2 \mathbf{a}_2 + \dots + z_n \mathbf{a}_n : z_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We also use the notation $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$ for \mathcal{L} . A basis of the lattice \mathcal{L} is $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n'}$ such that the column vectors of \mathbf{B} , $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n'}$ are linearly independent and

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n'}).$$

This is equivalent to saying that each of the vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ can be written as integer combinations of $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n'}$. An important geometric quantity associated with a lattice $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the determinant, $\det(\mathcal{L}) := \det(\mathbf{B}^T \mathbf{B})^{1/2}$. The determinant of the lattice is not dependent on the basis. If the basis is full rank, i.e., $n' = d$, then it is easy to see that $\det(\mathcal{L}) = |\det(\mathbf{B})|$. Throughout the paper, $\|\mathbf{x}\| := (x_1^2 + \dots + x_d^2)^{1/2}$ denotes the Euclidean norm of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Definition of the Problems

Definition 2.1 (INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING (ILP)). *On input $d, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, define the polytope $\mathcal{K} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}\}$. The task is to find $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ or output \perp if $\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n = \emptyset$.*

If we replace the constraints by equality constraints, we get the following variant of the integer linear programming problem.

Definition 2.2 (INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING WITH EQUALITIES (ILPE)). *On input $d, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, define the polytope $\mathcal{K} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}\}$. The task is to find $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ or output \perp if $\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n = \emptyset$.*

Notice that the two variants of ILP mentioned above are computationally equivalent.

- An ILPE $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$ with d equality constraints can be reduced to an ILP with $2d$ inequality constraints $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$ and $-\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq -\mathbf{b}$.

- An ILP with d inequality constraints on n variables $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ given by $\mathbf{Ax} \leq \mathbf{b}$ can be reduced an ILP with d equality constraints on $n+d$ variables $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_d)$ given by $\mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{b}$.

The UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM problem is a special case of ILPE where $d = 1$, and \mathbf{A} has non-negative entries.

Definition 2.3 (UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM (USS)). *The (search version) of USS is defined as follows: On input $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, a_1, \dots, a_n, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, find $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i = b$.*

Finally, we may have a combination of equality and inequality constraints to get the following variant.

Definition 2.4 (HETEROGENEOUS INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING (HILP)). *On input $d_1, d_2, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \mathbf{A}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_1 \times n}, \mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_2 \times n}, \mathbf{b}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$ and $\mathbf{b}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_2}$, define the polytope $\mathcal{K} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}_2\}$. The task is to find $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ or output \perp if $\mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n = \emptyset$.*

Known Results We will use the following simplified version of a result due to Erdős and Graham [EG72], which was later improved by Dixmier [Dix90].

Theorem 2.5. *The USS instance (a_1, \dots, a_n, b) has a solution if $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ divides b , and $b \geq \frac{a_n^2}{n-1}$.*

Additionally, we will need the following algorithm due to [RR23] which is the state of the art algorithm for the ILP problem, and hence for all the variants mentioned above.

Theorem 2.6. *There is an algorithm for the ILP problem that runs in time $(\log n)^{O(n)} \cdot \text{poly}(|\mathcal{I}|)$, where n is the number of unknown variables, and $|\mathcal{I}|$ is the total bitlength of the input instance $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{b}, n, d$.*

It is folklore that the LLL algorithm can also be run on the generating families [Kan83]. In particular, it is implemented in [FPL24]. For more recent discussion see [BGPS23].

Theorem 2.7. *There is a polynomial time algorithm that given $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ finds a basis of the lattice generated by all integer combinations of $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$.*

3 Algorithm for Unbounded Subset Sum

We will need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $n, a_1 < \dots < a_n, b$ be positive integers such that $b \geq \frac{a_n^2}{n-1}$, and $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n) = d$. Then*

$$d(b - a_n \cdot (b \cdot a_n^{-1} \pmod{d})) > b.$$

Proof. Note that since a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} are distinct multiples of d , and $a_n > a_{n-1} > \dots > a_1$, we have that $a_n/(n-1) > d$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} d(b - a_n \cdot (b \cdot a_n^{-1} \pmod{d})) - b &= (d-1)b - a_n d (b \cdot a_n^{-1} \pmod{d}) \\ &\geq (d-1)b - a_n d (d-1) = (d-1)(b - a_n d) \\ &\geq (d-1) \left(\frac{a_n^2}{n-1} - a_n d \right) > (d-1)(a_n d - a_n d) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

as needed. □

We now present the main result of this section, which is an algorithm that finds a solution for the UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM problem when we have a stronger hypothesis on the input than the Erdős-Graham condition which already guarantees the existence of a solution. The stronger the condition, the faster the running time of the algorithm.

Theorem 1.1. *Let k be a non-negative integer. There is a $\text{poly}(n, \log b) \cdot (\log k)^{O(k)}$ time algorithm that given an UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM instance (n, a_1, \dots, a_n, b) such that $b \geq \frac{a_i^2}{i-1}$, for all $k < i \leq n$, and $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ divides b , finds $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i = b$.*

Proof. A solution always exists because of Theorem 2.5. We assume without loss of generality that $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 1$ since if this is not the case, then it is equivalent to find a solution to an instance where we replace a_1, \dots, a_n, b by $\frac{a_1}{\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)}, \dots, \frac{a_n}{\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)}, \frac{b}{\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)}$ since $\frac{b}{\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)} \geq \frac{a_i^2}{(i-1)\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)^2}$ if $b \geq \frac{a_i^2}{i-1}$.

Let $d = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$.

The algorithm \mathcal{A} does the following. If $n \leq k$, the algorithm makes a call to the algorithm from Theorem 2.6. Otherwise, we proceed by setting $x_n = b \cdot a_n^{-1} \pmod{d}$ (i.e., the unique integer in $\{0, 1, \dots, d-1\}$ such that d divides $b - a_n x_n$) and

$$(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \mathcal{A}\left(\frac{a_1}{d}, \dots, \frac{a_{n-1}}{d}, \frac{b - x_n a_n}{d}\right).$$

Notice that d is relatively prime to a_n since $\gcd(d, a_n) = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 1$ and hence $a_n^{-1} \pmod{d}$ exists. The correctness of the recursive step follows from Lemma 3.1, which implies that for any i , such that $k < i \leq n$,

$$\frac{b - x_n a_n}{d} > \frac{b}{d^2} \geq \frac{(a_i/d)^2}{i-1}.$$

Notice that in the case of $d = 1$, the recursive call simply sets $x_n = 0$ and proceeds to solve the problem $\mathcal{A}(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, b)$ with one variable fewer. \square

The following corollary is an immediate of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a fixed constant. There is a polynomial time algorithm that given an instance (a_1, \dots, a_n, b) of UNBOUNDED SUBSET SUM such that $b \geq \varepsilon \cdot a_n^2$ and $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ divides b , finds $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i a_i = b$.*

4 Algorithm for Solving Variants of the ILP

In this section, we focus on solving the INTEGER LINEAR PROGRAMMING WITH EQUALITIES problem, which we restate here for the ease of the reader. Given n distinct vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, find $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ (if they exist) such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{a}_i x_i = \mathbf{b}$. We denote by $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$ the matrix whose column vectors are $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$. Thus, the problem can equivalently be stated as finding $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$.

Remark. *We will restrict our attention to the assumption that \mathbf{A} is a rank d matrix. This is without loss of generality, since if \mathbf{A} has rank $d' < d$, then we can use Gaussian elimination to find a subset of d' rows that forms a matrix $\mathbf{A}' \in \mathbb{Z}^{d' \times n}$ (and let \mathbf{b}' be \mathbf{b} restricted to the same rows), and then it suffices to find a solution to $\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}'$. This is because the rows of \mathbf{A} are in the linear span of the rows of \mathbf{A}' , i.e., $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{M}\mathbf{A}'$ for some $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d'}$. For a valid solution to exist, we must have that $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{b}' = \mathbf{b}$, which implies that $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$.*

Additionally, we also assume that the first d columns of \mathbf{A} are linearly independent. This can be easily achieved by appropriately permuting the columns.

Definition 4.1. *Given an integer $V > 0$, we say that the matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$ satisfies the V -bounded property if*

- *for all subsets $\{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{d-1}\}$ of $d-1$ vectors out of the first d column vectors of \mathbf{A} , the determinant of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{d-1})$ is at most V .*
- *The first d columns of \mathbf{A} are linearly independent.*

Recall that Δ is the largest Euclidean norm among the vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$, rounded up to the next integer, i.e., $\Delta = \lceil \max_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{a}_i\| \rceil$.

Theorem 4.2. *There is an algorithm that takes as input a V -bounded matrix $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$, and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, runs in time $\text{poly}(n, \log \Delta, \log \|\mathbf{b}\|)$, and does the following. Let $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ be the n column vectors of \mathbf{A} . If there exist real $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \geq (n-d) \cdot V \cdot \Delta$, and $\alpha_{d+1}, \dots, \alpha_n \geq 0$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{a}_i$, and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$, then the algorithm finds $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{a}_i$.*

Proof. Let $M = (n - d) \cdot V \cdot \Delta$. The algorithm begins by computing V and Δ , and then using linear programming to find some $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \geq (n - d) \cdot V \cdot \Delta$, and $\alpha_{d+1}, \dots, \alpha_n \geq 0$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{a}_i$. Also, the algorithm finds a basis of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$ using any efficient algorithm (for example, [BGPS23]) and checks whether $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$. The algorithm then decomposes \mathbf{b} as $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}$, where $\mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lfloor \alpha_i \rfloor \mathbf{a}_i$ and $\mathbf{w} = \sum_{i=1}^n \{\alpha_i\} \mathbf{a}_i$. Since $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$, and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$, we have that $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$. It is sufficient to find integers $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d \geq -M$, and $\beta_{d+1}, \dots, \beta_n \geq 0$ and

$$\mathbf{w} = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{a}_i .$$

In the following, we show how to find such integers β_1, \dots, β_n . The desired solution is then given by $x_i = \lfloor \alpha_i \rfloor + \beta_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Let V_i denote the volume of the fundamental parallelepiped of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_i)$.

Claim 4.3. *There exists a polynomial time algorithm that finds $\beta_n, \dots, \beta_{d+1}$ such that for any $i \in \{d+1, \dots, n\}$, we have that $0 \leq \beta_i < V_{i-1}$, and $\mathbf{w} - \sum_{j=i+1}^n \beta_j \mathbf{a}_j \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_i)$.*

Proof. We prove this claim by induction. To see this, let $k \geq d+1$ be any positive integer. Suppose we have already found $\beta_n, \dots, \beta_{k+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ that satisfy the above conditions for $i \geq k+1$. Let $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{w} - \sum_{j=k+1}^n \beta_j \mathbf{a}_j \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k)$. Our goal is to find $\beta_k \in \{0, 1, \dots, V_{k-1} - 1\}$ such that $\mathbf{w}' - \beta_k \mathbf{a}_k \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k-1})$.

Recall that the rank of the first $k-1$ vectors is d because the first d vectors are linearly independent. We first find a basis $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times d}$ of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k-1})$ using any efficient algorithm for computing a lattice basis given vectors generating the lattice, for example, [BGPS23]. Note that \mathbf{B} is an invertible matrix. Also, $|\det(\mathbf{B})| = V_{k-1}$.

If $\mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k-1})$, i.e., $\mathbf{B}^{-1} \mathbf{a}_k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, then choosing $\beta_k = 0$ satisfies the desired condition.

Otherwise, we must have that for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbf{w}' - \gamma \mathbf{a}_k \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k-1})$. This implies that $\mathbf{B}^{-1}(\mathbf{w}' - \gamma \mathbf{a}_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

We know that $\mathbf{B}^{-1} = \frac{\text{adj}(\mathbf{B})}{\det(\mathbf{B})}$, where $\text{adj}(\mathbf{B})$, the adjugate of the matrix \mathbf{B} , is a $d \times d$ integer matrix, and $\det(\mathbf{B})$ is also an integer. This implies that all d entries of

$$\text{adj}(\mathbf{B})(\mathbf{w}' - \gamma \mathbf{a}_k)$$

are multiples of $\det(\mathbf{B})$. Moreover, \mathbf{w}' and $\gamma \mathbf{a}_k$ are integer vectors. This leads to d modular equations of the form

$$x_i = \gamma y_i \pmod{\det(\mathbf{B})} ,$$

where x_i, y_i are the i -th coordinate of $\text{adj}(\mathbf{B})\mathbf{w}'$ and $\text{adj}(\mathbf{B})\mathbf{a}_k$, respectively.

Notice that there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$ that satisfies these d modular equations (since $\mathbf{w}' \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k)$) and we want to find any γ that satisfies these d modular equations. The existence of such a γ implies that $\gcd(y_i, \det(\mathbf{B}))$ divides x_i . Then, we can divide $x_i, y_i, \det(\mathbf{B})$ by $\gcd(y_i, \det(\mathbf{B}))$ to obtain

$$x'_i = \gamma y'_i \pmod{z'_i} ,$$

where z'_i is a factor of $\det(\mathbf{B})$, and y'_i, z'_i are coprime. This gives

$$\gamma = y_i'^{-1} x'_i \pmod{z'_i} .$$

for $i \in [d]$. This gives γ modulo $\text{lcm}(z'_1, \dots, z'_d)$, and any integer that is γ modulo $\text{lcm}(z'_1, \dots, z'_d)$ is such that $\mathbf{w}' - \gamma \mathbf{a}_k \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k-1})$. We can find such a $\gamma \in \{0, 1, \dots, \text{lcm}(z'_1, \dots, z'_d) - 1\}$ using a variant of the Chinese Remainder Theorem that does not require the moduli to be coprime (see, for example [CRT]). Since $\text{lcm}(z'_1, \dots, z'_d)$ divides V_{k-1} for any γ , we have that $\gamma \pmod{V_{k-1}}$ is also $\gamma \pmod{\text{lcm}(z'_1, \dots, z'_d)}$.

Then let $\beta_k = \gamma$. We have that, $\mathbf{w}' - \beta_k \mathbf{a}_k \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k-1})$. □

We now turn to find β_1, \dots, β_d . Let

$$\mathbf{w}^* := \mathbf{w} - \sum_{j=d+1}^n \beta_j \mathbf{a}_j = \sum_{i=1}^d \{\alpha_i\} \mathbf{a}_i + \sum_{j=d+1}^n (\{\alpha_j\} - \beta_j) \mathbf{a}_j .$$

We know by Claim 4.3 that $\mathbf{w}^* \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d)$. Notice, that since $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d$ are linearly independent, there is a unique linear combination of $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d$ that is equal to \mathbf{w}^* , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{w}^* = \sum_{i=1}^d \beta_i \mathbf{a}_i ,$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^d (\beta_i - \{\alpha_i\}) \mathbf{a}_i = \sum_{j=d+1}^n (\{\alpha_i\} - \beta_j) \mathbf{a}_j. \quad (2)$$

Also, $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ since $\mathbf{w}^* \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d)$. It is easy to compute $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d)^{-1} \mathbf{w}^*$.

To argue for correctness, it is enough to prove that $\beta_i \geq -M$. By symmetry, it is sufficient to prove that $\beta_d \geq -M$. Let the projection of \mathbf{a}_d orthogonal to $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d-1}$ be $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_d$. We project both sides in the direction of $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_d$. Let $\pi_{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_d}(\mathbf{u})$ be the projection of any vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ in the direction of $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_d$. We get by projecting both sides of Equation 2 in the direction of $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_d$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |\beta_d - \{\alpha_d\}| \|\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_d\| &= \|\pi_{\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_d}(\sum_{j=d+1}^n (\{\alpha_i\} - \beta_j) \mathbf{a}_j)\| \\ &\leq \|\sum_{j=d+1}^n (\{\alpha_j\} - \beta_j) \mathbf{a}_j\| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=d+1}^n V_{j-1} \Delta, \end{aligned}$$

using triangle inequality, and that $\beta_j \in \{0, 1, \dots, V_{j-1} - 1\}$, and hence $\{\alpha_j\} - \beta_j \in [-V_{j-1} + 1, 1)$. Notice that for any $j \geq d + 1$, $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j-1})$ is a superlattice of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d)$, and hence $V_{j-1} \leq V_d$.

Also,

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_d\| = \frac{V_d}{V_{d-1}}.$$

Thus,

$$|\beta_d - \{\alpha_d\}| \leq \frac{\sum_{j=d+1}^d V_{j-1} \Delta}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_d\|} \leq \frac{(n-d)V_d}{V_d/V_{d-1}} = \Delta \cdot V_{d-1} \cdot (n-d) \leq \Delta \cdot V \cdot (n-d),$$

using that $V_{d-1} \leq V$. This implies that $\beta_d \geq \{\alpha_d\} - (n-d)\Delta V \geq -(n-d)\Delta V$, since $\{\alpha_d\} \geq 0$. \square

Remark. The algorithm in Theorem 4.2 relies on being given a V -bounded matrix \mathbf{A} . In time $n^d \cdot \text{poly}(n, \log \Delta)$, we can try all possible combination of d vectors to find d linearly independent column vectors in \mathbf{A} , say $\mathbf{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{i_d}$ that for some value of V satisfy the following two conditions.

- The volume of the lattice generated by any $d - 1$ of these d vectors is at most V .
- There exist non-negative real numbers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ with $\alpha_{i_1}, \dots, \alpha_{i_d} \geq (n-d) \cdot V \cdot \Delta$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{a}_i$.

If such indices i_1, \dots, i_d exist, then the algorithm finds a non-negative integer solution by permuting the columns so that the first d columns are $\mathbf{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{i_d}$, and then running the algorithm from Theorem 4.2.

Given any $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$ of rank d with column vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$, it is easy to find via Gaussian elimination, d linearly independent vectors $\mathbf{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{i_d}$, and the corresponding value of V is at most $(\max_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{a}_i\|)^d$. Our main theorem is thus an immediate corollary of Theorem 4.2

Theorem 4.4. There is an algorithm is given $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$ with column vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$, and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$ such that there exist $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d \geq (n-d) \cdot (\max_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{a}_i\|)^d$, and $\alpha_{d+1}, \dots, \alpha_n \geq 0$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \mathbf{a}_i$, and vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_d$ are linearly independent. The algorithm finds $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \mathbf{a}_i$, and runs in time $\text{poly}(n, \log \Delta, \log \|\mathbf{b}\|)$.

As stated earlier, a standard ILP with inequalities, or more generally, a heterogeneous ILP can be reduced to an ILP with equalities. As it turns out, Theorem 4.4 gives a better bound for an ILP, or heterogeneous ILP, when solved via this reduction.

Corollary 4.5. There is an algorithm that does the following. Given $d_1, d_2, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathbf{A}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_1 \times n}$, $\mathbf{A}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_2 \times n}$ with column vectors $\mathbf{a}_1^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n^{(2)} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_2}$, $\mathbf{b}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_1}$ and $\mathbf{b}_2 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n^{(2)})$. Let polytope $\mathcal{K} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}_2\}$, and let $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_1+d_2}$ be vectors formed by concatenating the column vectors of \mathbf{A}_1 and \mathbf{A}_2 such that the first d_2 vectors are linearly independent, and let $\Delta = \max_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{a}_i\|$. The algorithm runs in time $\text{poly}(n, \log \Delta, \log \|\mathbf{b}\|)$ and finds $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ assuming the following condition holds. There exist $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d_2}, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{d_1} \geq (n - d_1 - d_2) \cdot \Delta^{d_2+1}$, and $\alpha_{d_2+1}, \dots, \alpha_n \geq 0$ such that $\mathbf{A}_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)^T + (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{d_1})^T = \mathbf{b}_1$ and $\mathbf{A}_2(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)^T = \mathbf{b}_2$.

Proof. We do a standard reduction from heterogeneous ILP to ILP with equalities by introducing variables $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_{d_1})^T$ such that the equations then become $\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{A}_1 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}_1$, $\mathbf{A}_2 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}_2$. These set of equations can be represented by the following matrix equation.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{d_1} & \mathbf{A}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{x} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{b}_1 \\ \mathbf{b}_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We thereby obtain the result by observing that the volume of any $d_1 + d_2 - 1$ out of the first $d_1 + d_2$ columns is upper-bounded by $\max(\Delta^{d_2} \cdot 1^{d_1-1}, \Delta^{d_2-1} \cdot 1^{d_1}) = \Delta^{d_2}$. \square

Notice that if all the constraints are inequality constraints, then we get the following.

Corollary 4.6. *There is an algorithm that runs in time polynomial in the size of the input and does the following. The algorithm is given $d, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times n}$ such that $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ are column vectors of \mathbf{A} and the first d of them are linearly independent. Let $\Delta = \max_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{a}_i\|$ and let polytope $\mathcal{K} := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}\}$. The algorithm finds $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{K} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ assuming the following conditions hold: There exist $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d \geq (n-d) \cdot \Delta$, and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \geq 0$ such that $\mathbf{A}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)^T + (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d)^T = \mathbf{b}$.*

5 Lower Bound for the Totality Condition for ILP with Equalities

In the previous section, in Theorem 4.4, we showed a sufficient condition under which an ILP always has a solution, i.e., it is a total problem. Furthermore, we gave a polynomial-time algorithm for finding such a solution. In this section, we show that the condition we obtained in Theorem 4.4 is almost tight.

Theorem 5.1. *For any $d \geq 2$, there exist $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d \times (d+1)}$ with column vectors $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d+1}$, and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d+1})$ such that there exist $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d+1} > \frac{(\max_{i=1}^{d+1} \|\mathbf{a}_i\|)^d}{20\sqrt{d}}$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \alpha_i \mathbf{a}_i$ but there do not exist non-negative integers $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{d+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \beta_i \mathbf{a}_i$.*

Proof. By [HB88], there exist $c > 0$ such that there are at least d distinct primes between cd^2 , and $cd^2(1-1/d)$. Let $c \geq 5$. Let p_1, \dots, p_d be d distinct primes between d^* , and $d^*(1-1/d)$. Let $P = p_1 \cdots p_d$. Let $\Delta = \max_{i=1}^d p_i$. Then for all $i \in [d]$, $p_i \geq \Delta(1-1/d)$. Also, let p_{d+1} be a prime such that $\frac{\Delta}{2\sqrt{d}} \leq p_{d+1} \leq \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{d}}$.

For $i = 1, \dots, d$, let $\mathbf{a}_i = p_i \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, i.e., a vector with p_i in i -th coordinate and 0, otherwise. Also, let $\mathbf{a}_{d+1} = (p_{d+1}, \dots, p_{d+1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Note that for all $i \in [d+1]$, $\|\mathbf{a}_i\| \leq \Delta$. We first observe that $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d+1}) = \mathbb{Z}^d$. To see this, consider any vector $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. This vector can be written as an integer combination of $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{d+1}$ as follows. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, there is a unique integer γ_{d+1} in $\{0, 1, \dots, P-1\}$ such that $\gamma_{d+1} \equiv p_{d+1}^{-1} c_i \pmod{p_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. For $1 \leq i \leq d$, let $\gamma_i = \frac{c_i - \gamma_{d+1} p_{d+1}}{p_i}$. Note that by the above reasoning $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d$ are integers. Moreover, it holds that $\mathbf{c} = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \gamma_i \mathbf{a}_i$.

Now, let $\mathbf{b} = (p_{d+1}(P-1) - p_1, p_{d+1}(P-1) - p_2, \dots, p_{d+1}(P-1) - p_d)^T \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We first show that there exist large real $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d+1}$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \alpha_i \mathbf{a}_i$. Let $\alpha_{d+1} = \frac{P}{2}$, and for $1 \leq i \leq d$, $\alpha_i = P \cdot \frac{p_{d+1}}{2p_i} - 1 - \frac{p_{d+1}}{p_i}$. Then $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \alpha_i \mathbf{a}_i$, and for all $i \in [d]$,

$$\alpha_i \geq \frac{\Delta}{2\sqrt{d}} \cdot \frac{\Delta^{d-1}(1-1/d)^{d-1}}{2} - 2 \geq \frac{\Delta^d}{4e\sqrt{d}} - 2 \geq \frac{\Delta^d}{20\sqrt{d}},$$

where we use the fact that for $d \geq 2$, $(1-1/d)^{d-1} \geq \frac{1}{e}$, and that $\Delta \geq 5d^2(1-1/d) \geq 10$.

We now show that there does not exist non-negative integers $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{d+1}$ such that $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \beta_i \mathbf{a}_i$. Suppose there exist such non-negative integers. Then, we must have that for $i \in [d]$

$$\beta_i p_i + \beta_{d+1} p_{d+1} = P p_{d+1} - p_i - p_{d+1},$$

which implies that $\beta_{d+1} \equiv -1 \pmod{p_i}$ for all $i \in [d]$. By Chinese Remainder Theorem, this implies $\beta_{d+1} \equiv -1 \pmod{P}$. Since β_{d+1} is non-negative, we must have that $\beta_{d+1} \geq P-1$. This implies that for $1 \leq i \leq d$, $\beta_i p_i \leq P p_{d+1} - p_i - p_{d+1} - (P-1) p_{d+1} < 0$, which is a contradiction. \square

References

- [ABHS22] Amir Abboud, Karl Bringmann, Danny Hermelin, and Dvir Shabtay. Scheduling lower bounds via AND subset sum. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 127:29–40, 2022.
- [AH10] Iskander Aliev and Martin Henk. Feasibility of integer knapsacks. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 20(6):2978–2993, 2010.
- [AHH11] Iskander Aliev, Martin Henk, and Aicke Hinrichs. Expected Frobenius numbers. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 118(2):525–531, 2011.
- [AJ05] Ramírez Alfonsín and L. Jorge. The Diophantine Frobenius problem. 2005.
- [AWZ17] Stephan Artmann, Robert Weismantel, and Rico Zenklusen. A strongly polynomial algorithm for bimodular integer linear programming. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2017*, pages 1206–1219. ACM, 2017.
- [BERW24] Eleonore Bach, Friedrich Eisenbrand, Thomas Rothvoss, and Robert Weismantel. Forall-exist statements in pseudopolynomial time, 2024.
- [BGPS23] Huck Bennett, Atul Ganju, Pura Peetathawatchai, and Noah Stephens-Davidowitz. Just How Hard Are Rotations of \mathbb{Z}^n ? Algorithms and Cryptography with the Simplest Lattice. In *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2023 - 42nd Annual International Conference on the Theory and Applications of Cryptographic Techniques, Proceedings, Part V*, volume 14008 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 252–281. Springer, 2023.
- [BL07] Sebastian Bocker and Zsuzsanna Lipták. A fast and simple algorithm for the money changing problem. *Algorithmica*, 48(4):413–432, 2007.
- [Bra42] Alfred Brauer. On a problem of partitions. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 64(1):299–312, 1942.
- [Bri17] Karl Bringmann. A near-linear pseudopolynomial time algorithm for subset sum. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2017*, pages 1073–1084. SIAM, 2017.
- [BZ03] Matthias Beck and Shelemyahu Zacks. Refined upper bounds for the linear Diophantine problem of Frobenius. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, 32:454–467, 2003.
- [CD09] Xi Chen and Xiaotie Deng. On the complexity of 2D discrete fixed point problem. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 410(44):4448–4456, 2009.
- [CDT09] Xi Chen, Xiaotie Deng, and Shang-Hua Teng. Settling the complexity of computing two-player nash equilibria. *J. ACM*, 56(3):14:1–14:57, 2009.
- [CEH⁺21] Jana Cslovjecssek, Friedrich Eisenbrand, Christoph Hunkenschröder, Lars Rohwedder, and Robert Weismantel. Block-structured integer and linear programming in strongly polynomial and near linear time. In Dániel Marx, editor, *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 10 - 13, 2021*, pages 1666–1681. SIAM, 2021.
- [CKL⁺24] Jana Cslovjecssek, Martin Koutecký, Alexandra Lassota, Michał Pilipczuk, and Adam Polak. Parameterized algorithms for block-structured integer programs with large entries. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2024*, pages 740–751. SIAM, 2024.
- [CM18] Lin Chen and Dániel Marx. Covering a tree with rooted subtrees - parameterized and approximation algorithms. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018*, pages 2801–2820. SIAM, 2018.
- [CRT] Chinese Remainder Theorem. <https://cp-algorithms.com/algebra/chinese-remainder-theorem.html>. [Online; accessed 24-June-2024].
- [Dix90] Jacques Dixmier. Proof of a conjecture by Erdős and Graham concerning the problem of Frobenius. *Journal of Number Theory*, 34(2):198–209, 1990.

- [EG72] Paul Erdős and Ronald Graham. On a linear Diophantine problem of Frobenius. *Acta Arithmetica*, 1(21):399–408, 1972.
- [Fel06] Leonid G. Fel. Frobenius problem for semigroups. *Functional Analysis and Other Mathematics*, 1(2):119–157, 2006.
- [FPL24] The FPLLL Development Team. FPLLL, a lattice reduction library, Version: 5.4.2. Available at <https://github.com/fplll/fplll>, 2024.
- [FPT04] Alex Fabrikant, Christos H. Papadimitriou, and Kunal Talwar. The complexity of pure Nash equilibria. In *Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, 2004.
- [FS11] Lenny Fukshansky and Achill Schürmann. Bounds on generalized Frobenius numbers. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 32(3):361–368, 2011.
- [FT87] András Frank and Éva Tardos. An application of simultaneous diophantine approximation in combinatorial optimization. *Combinatorica*, 7:49–65, 1987.
- [GRE23] Roland Guttenberg, Mikhail A. Raskin, and Javier Esparza. Geometry of Reachability Sets of Vector Addition Systems. In *34th International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2023*, volume 279 of *LIPICs*, pages 6:1–6:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
- [HB88] D.R. Heath-Brown. The number of primes in a short interval. 1988.
- [hFRZ15] Ai hua Fan, Hui Rao, and Yuan Zhang. Higher dimensional Frobenius problem: Maximal saturated cone, growth function and rigidity. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 104(3):533–560, 2015.
- [HL64] B.R. Heap and M.S. Lynn. A graph-theoretic algorithm for the solution of a linear diophantine problem of Frobenius. *Numerische Mathematik*, 6:346–354, 1964.
- [HL65] B.R. Heap and M.S. Lynn. On a linear diophantine problem of Frobenius: an improved algorithm. *Numerische Mathematik*, 7:226–231, 1965.
- [HOR13] Raymond Hemmecke, Shmuel Onn, and Lyubov Romanchuk. N-fold integer programming in cubic time. *Math. Program.*, 137(1-2):325–341, 2013.
- [HR96] Paul Hansen and Jennifer Ryan. Testing integer knapsacks for feasibility. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 88(3):578–582, 1996.
- [HV87] Mihály Hujter and Béla Vizvári. The exact solutions to the Frobenius problem with three variables. *Journal of the Ramanujan Mathematical Society*, pages 117–143, 1987.
- [JLR20] Klaus Jansen, Alexandra Lassota, and Lars Rohwedder. Near-Linear Time Algorithm for n -Fold ILPs via Color Coding. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 34(4):2282–2299, 2020.
- [JPY85] David S. Johnson, Christos H. Papadimitriou, and Mihalis Yannakakis. How easy is local search? *26th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (sfcs 1985)*, pages 39–42, 1985.
- [JR19] Klaus Jansen and Lars Rohwedder. On Integer Programming and Convolution. In *10th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS 2019*, volume 124 of *LIPICs*, pages 43:1–43:17. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- [Kan83] Ravi Kannan. Improved Algorithms for Integer Programming and Related Lattice Problems. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, 25-27 April, 1983, Boston, Massachusetts, USA*, pages 193–206. ACM, 1983.
- [Kan87] Ravi Kannan. Minkowski’s convex body theorem and integer programming. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 12:415–440, 1987.
- [Kan92] Ravi Kannan. Lattice translates of a polytope and the Frobenius problem. *Combinatorica*, 12(2):161–177, 1992.
- [KKL⁺23] Dusan Knop, Martin Koutecký, Asaf Levin, Matthias Mnich, and Shmuel Onn. High-multiplicity N-fold IP via configuration LP. *Math. Program.*, 200(1):199–227, 2023.

- [Kle22] Kim-Manuel Klein. On the Fine-Grained Complexity of the Unbounded SubsetSum and the Frobenius Problem. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2022*, pages 3567–3582. SIAM, 2022.
- [Len83] Hendrik W. Lenstra. Integer programming with a fixed number of variables. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 8(4):538–548, 1983.
- [LHOW08] Jesús A. De Loera, Raymond Hemmecke, Shmuel Onn, and Robert Weismantel. N-fold integer programming. *Discret. Optim.*, 5(2):231–241, 2008.
- [MP91] N. Megiddo and C. H. Papadimitriou. On total functions, existence theorems and computational complexity. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 81(2):317–324, 1991.
- [Pap81] Christos H. Papadimitriou. On the complexity of integer programming. *J. ACM*, 28(4):765–768, 1981.
- [RA96] Jorge L Ramírez-Alfonsín. Complexity of the Frobenius problem. *Combinatorica*, 16:143–147, 1996.
- [RR23] Victor Reis and Thomas Rothvoss. The subspace flatness conjecture and faster integer programming. In *64th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2023, Santa Cruz, CA, USA, November 6-9, 2023*, pages 974–988. IEEE, 2023.
- [Sel77] Ernst S. Selmer. On the linear diophantine problem of Frobenius. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 0293_0294:1–17, 1977.
- [Sha08] Jeffrey Shallit. The Frobenius problem and its generalizations. In *International Conference on Developments in Language Theory*, pages 72–83. Springer, 2008.
- [Syl82] J. J. Sylvester. On subvariants, i.e. semi-invariants to binary quantics of an unlimited order. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 5(1):79–136, 1882.
- [SZZ18] Katerina Sotiraki, Manolis Zampetakis, and Giorgos Zirdelis. PPP-Completeness with Connections to Cryptography. In *59th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2018*, pages 148–158. IEEE Computer Society, 2018.
- [Ust09] Alexey V. Ustinov. The solution of Arnold’s problem on the weak asymptotics of Frobenius numbers with three arguments. *Sbornik: Mathematics*, 200(4):597–627, April 2009.
- [VD12] Santosh S. Vempala and Daniel Dadush. Integer programming, lattice algorithms, and deterministic volume estimation. 2012.
- [Vit76] Yehoshua Vitek. Bounds for a Linear Diophantine Problem of Frobenius, II. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 28(6):1280–1288, 1976.