

# A counterexample to a conjecture of Laurent and Poljak

Antoine Deza

Gabriel Indik

November 28, 2005

## Abstract

The metric polytope  $\text{met}_n$  is the polyhedron associated with all semimetrics on  $n$  nodes and defined by the triangle inequalities  $x_{ij} - x_{ik} - x_{jk} \leq 0$  and  $x_{ij} + x_{ik} + x_{jk} \leq 2$  for all triples  $i, j, k$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . In 1992 Monique Laurent and Svatopluk Poljak conjectured that every fractional vertex of the metric polytope is adjacent to some integral vertex. The conjecture holds for  $n \leq 8$  and, in particular, for the 1 550 825 600 vertices of  $\text{met}_8$ . While the overwhelming majority of the known vertices of  $\text{met}_9$  satisfy the Laurent-Poljak conjecture, we exhibit a fractional vertex not adjacent to any integral vertex.

## 1 Introduction and Notation

The  $\binom{n}{2}$ -dimensional *cut cone*  $\text{Cut}_n$  is usually introduced as the conic hull of the incidence vectors of all the cuts of the complete graph on  $n$  nodes. More precisely, given a subset  $S$  of  $V_n = \{1, \dots, n\}$ , the *cut* determined by  $S$  consists of the pairs  $(i, j)$  of elements of  $V_n$  such that exactly one of  $i, j$  is in  $S$ . By  $\delta(S)$  we denote both the cut and its incidence vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{\binom{n}{2}}$ , i.e.,  $\delta(S)_{ij} = 1$  if exactly one of  $i, j$  is in  $S$  and 0 otherwise for  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ . We use the term *cut* for both the cut itself and its incidence vector, so  $\delta(S)_{ij}$  are coordinates of a point in  $\mathbb{R}^{\binom{n}{2}}$ .

The cut cone  $\text{Cut}_n$  is the conic hull of all  $2^{n-1} - 1$  nonzero cuts, and the *cut polytope*  $\text{cut}_n$  is the convex hull of all  $2^{n-1}$  cuts. The cut cone and a relaxation, the *metric cone*  $\text{Met}_n$ , can also be defined in terms of finite metric spaces in the following way. For all triples  $\{i, j, k\} \subset V_n$ , we consider the following inequalities.

$$x_{ij} - x_{ik} - x_{jk} \leq 0, \quad (1)$$

$$x_{ij} + x_{ik} + x_{jk} \leq 2. \quad (2)$$

(1) specify the  $3\binom{n}{3}$  facets of the cone  $\text{Met}_n$  of *semimetrics* on  $V_n$ ; that is, of functions  $x : V_n \times V_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  satisfying  $x_{ij} = x_{ji}$ ,  $x_{ii} = 0$ , and the *triangle* inequalities (1). While  $x$  is a *metric* only when  $x_{ij} > 0$  for all  $i \neq j$ , we will follow the usual convention and call  $\text{Met}_n$  the *metric cone*.

It is well-known that  $\text{Cut}_n$  is the conic hull of all, up to a constant multiple,  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued extreme rays of  $\text{Met}_n$ . The cuts satisfy the *perimeter* inequalities (2) which can also

be obtained from (1) by the *switching* operation, see Section 4. Bounding  $\text{Met}_n$  by the  $\binom{n}{3}$  facets induced by (2), we obtain a natural relaxation of  $\text{cut}_n$ , the *metric polytope*  $\text{met}_n$ , so that  $\text{cut}_n$  is the convex hull of all  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued vertices of  $\text{met}_n$ .

One of the motivations for the study of these polyhedra comes from their applications in combinatorial optimization, the most important being the MAXCUT and multicommodity flow problems. We refer to Deza and Laurent [9] and to Poljak and Tuza [15] for a detailed study of those polyhedra and their applications in combinatorial optimization.

## 2 A counterexample to the Laurent-Poljak conjecture

Laurent and Poljak [14] conjectured that every fractional vertex of the metric polytope  $\text{met}_n$  is adjacent to some integral vertex, i.e., to a cut. Since we have  $\text{met}_3 = \text{cut}_3$  and  $\text{met}_4 = \text{cut}_4$ , the conjecture is obviously true for the 4 vertices of  $\text{met}_3$  and for the 8 vertices of  $\text{met}_4$ . The conjecture holds for the 32 vertices of  $\text{met}_5$  and the 544 vertices of  $\text{met}_6$  as well as for several classes of vertices of  $\text{met}_n$ , see [12]. The conjecture was further substantiated by the computation of  $\text{met}_7$  and  $\text{met}_8$ . The 275 840 vertices of  $\text{met}_7$  and the 1 550 825 600 vertices of  $\text{met}_8$  are adjacent a cut, see [4, 5, 6].

While the overwhelming majority of the known vertices of  $\text{met}_9$  satisfy the Laurent-Poljak conjecture we exhibit a fractional vertex not adjacent to any integral vertex.

**Proposition 2.1.** *The neighbors of the fractional vertex  $\frac{1}{9}(2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 4, 3, 5, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 5, 2, 4, 3, 5, 6, 3, 3, 6, 6, 5, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 3, 4)$  of the metric polytope  $\text{met}_9$  are all fractional.*

The vertex given in Proposition 2.1, as well as a few other vertices not adjacent to any cut, were found by an extensive computer search of the vertices of the 36-dimensional metric polytope  $\text{met}_9$ , see [3]. Note that while finding a vertex providing a counterexample to the Laurent-Poljak conjecture is computationally challenging, to verify that a given vertex is indeed not adjacent to a cut is easy if the vertex is quasi-simple, i.e., if the incidence of the given vertex is equal to the dimension plus one. For example, one can easily check, see Section 4, that the vertex given in Proposition 2.1 satisfies with equalities 37 of the 336 inequalities defining  $\text{met}_9$  and is adjacent to 37 vertices which are all fractional.

## 3 Related questions

### 3.1 The diameter of the metric polytope

Since any pair of cuts forms an edge of  $\text{met}_n$ , the Laurent-Poljak conjecture would imply that the diameter  $\delta(\text{met}_n)$  of the metric polytope satisfies  $\delta(\text{met}_n) \leq 3$ . We recall that the diameter of a polytope  $P$  is the smallest number  $\delta(P)$  such that any two vertices of  $P$  can be connected by a path with at most  $\delta(P)$  edges. We have  $\delta(\text{met}_3) = \delta(\text{met}_4) = 1$ ,  $\delta(\text{met}_5) = \delta(\text{met}_6) = 2$  and  $\delta(\text{met}_7) = \delta(\text{met}_8) = 3$ . While the diameter of the restriction of  $\text{met}_9$  to its known vertices appears to be less than 3, it is not clear that the diameter of  $\text{met}_n$  is bounded by a constant.

## 3.2 The no-cut set conjecture

**Conjecture 3.1.** [6] *For  $n \geq 6$ , the restriction of the metric polytope  $\text{met}_n$  to its fractional vertices is connected.*

Conjecture 3.1 can be seen as complementary to the Laurent-Poljak conjecture both graphically and computationally: For any pair of vertices, while Laurent-Poljak conjecture implies that there is a path made of cuts joining them, i.e., the cut vertices form a *dominating set*, Conjecture 3.1 means that there is a path made of non-cut vertices joining them, i.e., the cut vertices do not form a *cut-set*. On the other hand, while Laurent-Poljak conjecture means that the enumeration of the extreme rays of the metric cone  $\text{Met}_n$  is enough to obtain the vertices of the metric polytope  $\text{met}_n$ , Conjecture 3.1 means that we can obtain the vertices of  $\text{met}_n$  without enumerating the extreme rays of  $\text{Met}_n$ .

## 4 Counterexample generation and verification

One important feature of the metric and cut polyhedra is their very large symmetry group. We recall that the symmetry group  $Is(P)$  of a polyhedron  $P$  is the group of isometries preserving  $P$  and that an isometry is a linear transformation preserving the Euclidean distance. For  $n \geq 5$ , the symmetry groups of the polytopes  $\text{met}_n$  and  $\text{cut}_n$  are isomorphic and induced by permutations on  $V_n$  and *switching reflections by a cut*, see [8], and the symmetry groups of the cones  $\text{Met}_n$  and  $\text{Cut}_n$  are isomorphic to  $Sym(n)$ , see [7]. Given a cut  $\delta(S)$ , the switching reflection  $r_{\delta(S)}$  is defined by  $y = r_{\delta(S)}(x)$  where  $y_{ij} = 1 - x_{ij}$  if  $(i, j) \in \delta(S)$  and  $y_{ij} = x_{ij}$  otherwise.

### 4.1 Counterexample generation

The vertices of  $\text{met}_n$  are partitioned into orbits under the action of the symmetry group  $Is(\text{met}_n)$ . Using a parallel implementation of an orbitwise enumeration algorithm, 910 209 orbits of vertices of  $\text{met}_9$  were computed on a parallel cluster. Among these 910 209 orbits, 147 805 are made of vertices belonging to exactly 37 inequalities. These vertices are quasi-simple as the dimension of  $\text{met}_9$  is 36. Out of these 147 805 orbits, 477 are made of vertices providing a counterexample to the Laurent-Poljak dominating set conjecture. In addition, out of 202 573 orbits made of vertices belonging to exactly 38 inequalities, 389 provide counterexamples to the Laurent-Poljak conjecture.

### 4.2 Counterexample verification

For a quasi-simple vertex, one can easily verify that all the adjacent vertices are fractional by performing 3 elementary computations which we illustrate using the vertex given in Proposition 2.1.

- (i) Check which of the 336 inequalities of  $\text{met}_9$  are satisfied with equality by the vertex. For the vertex given in Proposition 2.1, we obtain 37 inequalities, see Section 4.3.1.

- (ii) Compute the pointed cone formed by the inequalities of  $\text{met}_9$  satisfied with equality by the vertex. For the vertex given in Proposition 2.1, we obtain a quasi-simplicial cone with 37 extreme rays.
- (iii) For each extreme ray, perform a ray shooting test from the vertex until piercing one of the facets of  $\text{met}_9$  not containing the vertex. For the vertex given in Proposition 2.1, we obtain the 37 fractional vertices given in Section 4.3.2.

Note that, while the computation (ii) can be extremely expensive for a highly degenerate vertex in high dimension, it can be done efficiently if the vertex is quasi-simple. It takes less than a second of CPU time for the vertex given in Proposition 2.1 using enumeration packages such as *lrs* [2] or *cdd* [11]. Computations (i) and (iii) are straightforward and take less than a second of CPU time.

### 4.3 Given counterexample incidence and adjacency lists

#### 4.3.1 Given counterexample incidence list

The vertex given in Proposition 2.1 satisfies with equalities the following 37 inequalities of  $\text{met}_9$ :  $\Delta_{6,7,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{5,8,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{5,7,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{5,7,8}$ ,  $\Delta_{5,6,8}$ ,  $\Delta_{4,7,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{4,6,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{4,6,8}$ ,  $\Delta_{4,6,7}$ ,  $\Delta_{4,5,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{4,5,7}$ ,  $\Delta_{3,6,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{3,6,7}$ ,  $\Delta_{3,5,8}$ ,  $\Delta_{3,4,6}$ ,  $\Delta_{2,7,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{2,6,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{2,6,8}$ ,  $\Delta_{2,6,7}$ ,  $\Delta_{2,5,8}$ ,  $\Delta_{2,4,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{2,4,8}$ ,  $\Delta_{2,4,7}$ ,  $\Delta_{2,4,6}$ ,  $\Delta_{2,3,6}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,5,8}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,4,5}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,3,8}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,3,6}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,3,5}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,3,4}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,2,9}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,2,8}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,2,7}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,2,6}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,2,5}$ ,  $\Delta_{1,2,3}$  where the triangle inequality (1) and the perimeter inequality (2) are respectively denoted by  $\Delta_{i,j,\bar{k}}$  and  $\Delta_{i,j,k}$ .

#### 4.3.2 Given counterexample adjacency list

The vertex given in Proposition 2.1 is adjacent to the following 37 fractional vertices of  $\text{met}_9$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{3}(0, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2) \\ & \frac{1}{3}(0, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2) \\ & \frac{1}{3}(1, 0, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 2, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 0, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2) \\ & \frac{1}{3}(1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 2, 0, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 0, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0) \\ & \frac{1}{3}(1, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 2, 0, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 3, 2, 1, 1, 3, 1, 2) \\ & \frac{1}{3}(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1) \\ & \frac{1}{3}(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 2, 0, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1) \\ & \frac{1}{3}(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1) \\ & \frac{1}{3}(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1) \\ & \frac{1}{3}(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1) \\ & \frac{1}{4}(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 1, 1, 2, 2, 0, 3, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 3, 3, 2, 1, 1, 3, 3, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2) \\ & \frac{1}{4}(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 1, 1, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 3, 2, 1, 1, 3, 3, 3, 1, 1, 3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2) \\ & \frac{1}{6}(1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 3, 4, 4, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 2, 2, 4, 4, 2, 2, 4, 4, 3, 2, 1, 4, 4, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3) \\ & \frac{1}{6}(1, 1, 3, 1, 3, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2, 2, 4, 4, 1, 2, 4, 2, 2, 2, 1, 4, 4, 2, 2, 3, 4, 4, 2, 1, 4, 4, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3) \end{aligned}$$

$\frac{1}{6}(1, 1, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 3, 4, 4, 2, 2, 4, 3, 2, 2, 2, 4, 4, 2, 2, 4, 4, 3, 2, 1, 4, 4, 2, 2, 3, 2, 3)$   
 $\frac{1}{6}(1, 1, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 3, 4, 4, 2, 2, 4, 3, 2, 2, 2, 4, 5, 2, 2, 4, 4, 3, 3, 1, 3, 4, 2, 2, 4, 2, 2)$   
 $\frac{1}{6}(2, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 4, 4, 3, 2, 4, 4, 4, 2, 2, 3, 3, 1, 3, 3, 3, 4, 2, 2, 4, 4, 4, 2, 2, 4, 4, 2, 2, 4, 2, 2)$   
 $\frac{1}{7}(1, 1, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 2, 3, 4, 4, 2, 2, 4, 3, 2, 2, 2, 4, 5, 2, 2, 4, 4, 3, 3, 1, 5, 4, 2, 2, 4, 2, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{7}(1, 1, 3, 2, 3, 4, 3, 3, 2, 2, 3, 4, 5, 2, 2, 4, 3, 2, 3, 2, 4, 5, 2, 3, 4, 4, 3, 2, 1, 5, 5, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{7}(1, 1, 3, 2, 3, 4, 3, 4, 2, 2, 3, 4, 5, 2, 3, 4, 3, 2, 3, 2, 5, 5, 2, 3, 4, 5, 3, 2, 1, 4, 5, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3)$   
 $\frac{1}{7}(2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 2, 5, 4, 4, 2, 5, 5, 4, 3, 2, 4, 5, 1, 4, 3, 4, 5, 3, 2, 5, 4, 4, 3, 2, 5, 5, 2, 3, 5, 2, 3)$   
 $\frac{1}{7}(2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 5, 5, 4, 2, 5, 5, 5, 3, 3, 4, 5, 1, 3, 3, 3, 5, 3, 3, 5, 5, 4, 2, 2, 4, 4, 2, 2, 4, 2, 2)$   
 $\frac{1}{9}(1, 2, 4, 2, 5, 5, 4, 4, 3, 3, 3, 6, 6, 3, 3, 6, 4, 3, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 6, 6, 5, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 3, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{9}(2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 3, 4, 3, 5, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 5, 2, 4, 3, 5, 6, 3, 3, 6, 6, 5, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 3, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{9}(2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 4, 3, 5, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 5, 2, 4, 3, 3, 6, 3, 3, 6, 6, 5, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 3, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{9}(2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 4, 3, 5, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 5, 2, 4, 3, 5, 6, 3, 3, 6, 6, 5, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 3, 6)$   
 $\frac{1}{9}(2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 4, 3, 5, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 5, 2, 4, 3, 5, 6, 3, 3, 6, 6, 3, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 3, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{9}(2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 4, 3, 5, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 5, 2, 4, 3, 5, 6, 3, 3, 6, 6, 5, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 3, 3, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{9}(2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 4, 3, 5, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 5, 2, 6, 3, 5, 6, 3, 3, 6, 6, 5, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 3, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{9}(2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 6, 5, 5, 4, 3, 5, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 5, 2, 4, 3, 5, 6, 3, 3, 6, 6, 5, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 3, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{9}(3, 2, 2, 4, 3, 3, 6, 6, 5, 3, 5, 6, 6, 3, 3, 4, 6, 1, 5, 4, 4, 6, 3, 3, 6, 6, 5, 3, 2, 6, 6, 3, 3, 5, 3, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{10}(2, 2, 4, 3, 5, 4, 5, 5, 4, 4, 5, 7, 6, 3, 3, 6, 5, 3, 4, 3, 7, 7, 3, 4, 7, 7, 6, 3, 2, 6, 7, 4, 4, 5, 3, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{10}(2, 2, 4, 3, 5, 5, 5, 6, 4, 4, 5, 7, 7, 3, 4, 6, 5, 3, 3, 3, 6, 7, 3, 3, 7, 6, 6, 4, 2, 7, 6, 4, 3, 6, 3, 5)$   
 $\frac{1}{10}(3, 3, 2, 4, 4, 3, 7, 7, 6, 3, 7, 7, 6, 4, 4, 5, 7, 1, 6, 4, 4, 6, 4, 3, 7, 7, 6, 3, 3, 7, 7, 3, 3, 6, 4, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{12}(3, 3, 3, 5, 5, 5, 7, 7, 6, 4, 8, 8, 8, 4, 4, 6, 8, 2, 6, 4, 6, 8, 4, 4, 8, 8, 8, 4, 4, 8, 8, 4, 4, 8, 4, 4)$   
 $\frac{1}{12}(3, 3, 3, 5, 5, 5, 8, 7, 6, 4, 8, 8, 8, 5, 4, 6, 8, 2, 6, 5, 6, 8, 4, 4, 7, 8, 6, 4, 3, 8, 8, 3, 4, 7, 4, 5)$   
 $\frac{1}{12}(3, 3, 3, 5, 5, 5, 8, 7, 6, 4, 8, 8, 8, 5, 4, 6, 8, 2, 6, 5, 6, 8, 4, 4, 9, 8, 8, 4, 3, 8, 8, 5, 4, 7, 4, 5)$

**acknowledgements** Research supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada under the Canada Research Chair and the Discovery Grant programs. Thanks to the Shared Hierarchical Academic Research Computing Network (SHARCNET) for a generous allocation of CPU time.

## References

- [1] Avis D.: On the extreme rays of the metric cone. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* 32-1 (1980) 126–144
- [2] Avis D.: lrs home page.  
<http://cgm.cs.mcgill.ca/~avis/C/lrs.html>

- [3] Deza A.: Metric polytope and metric cone home page.  
<http://www.cas.mcmaster.ca/~deza/metric.html>
- [4] Deza A., Deza M., Fukuda K.: On skeletons, diameters and volumes of metric polyhedra. In: Deza M., Euler R., Manoussakis Y. (eds.): *Lecture Notes in Computer Science 1120* Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York (1996) 112–128
- [5] Deza A., Fukuda K., Mizutani T. and Vo C.: In: Akiyama J., Kano M. (eds.): *On the face-lattice of the metric polytope. Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2866* Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York (2003) 118–128
- [6] Deza A., Fukuda K., Pasechnik D., Sato M.: On the skeleton of the metric polytope. In: Akiyama J., Kano M., Urabe M. (eds.): *Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2098* Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York (2001) 125–136
- [7] Deza A., Goldengorin B., Pasechnik D.: The isometries of the cut, metric and hypermetric cones. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics* (to appear)
- [8] Deza M., Grishukhin V., Laurent M.: The symmetries of the cut polytope and of some relatives. In: Gritzmann P., Sturmfels B. (eds.): *Applied Geometry and Discrete Mathematics, the "Victor Klee Festschrift" DIMACS Series in Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science 4* (1991) 205–220
- [9] Deza M., Laurent M.: *Geometry of cuts and metrics. Algorithms and Combinatorics 15* Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York (1997)
- [10] Grishukhin V.: Computing extreme rays of the metric cone for seven points. *European Journal of Combinatorics* 13 (1992) 153–165
- [11] Fukuda K.: cdd and cddplus home page.  
[http://www.ifor.math.ethz.ch/~fukuda/cdd\\_home/cdd.html](http://www.ifor.math.ethz.ch/~fukuda/cdd_home/cdd.html)
- [12] Laurent M.: Graphic vertices of the metric polytope. *Discrete Mathematics* 151 (1996) 131–153
- [13] Laurent M., Poljak S.: The metric polytope. In: Balas E., Cornuejols G., Kannan R. (eds.): *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization* (1992) 247–286
- [14] Laurent M., Poljak S.: One-third integrality in the metric polytope. *Mathematical Programming* 71 (1996) 29–50
- [15] Poljak S., Tuza Z.: Maximum cuts and large bipartite subgraphs. In: Cook W., Lovasz L., Seymour P. (eds.): *DIMACS Series 20* (1995) 181–244

Antoine Deza, Gabriel Indik

Advanced Optimization Laboratory, Department of Computing and Software,  
McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

*Email:* deza, indikg@mcmaster.ca.