

# Strong Self-Concordance and Sampling

Aditi Laddha\*, Yin Tat Lee†, Santosh S. Vempala‡

November 14, 2019

## Abstract

Motivated by the Dikin walk, we develop aspects of an interior-point theory for sampling in high dimension. Specifically we introduce symmetric and strong self-concordance. These properties imply that the corresponding Dikin walk mixes in  $\tilde{O}(n\bar{\nu})$  steps from a warm start in a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  using a strongly self-concordant barrier with symmetric self-concordance parameter  $\bar{\nu}$ . For many natural barriers,  $\bar{\nu}$  is roughly bounded by  $\nu$ , the standard self-concordance parameter. We show that this property and strong self-concordance hold for the Lee-Sidford barrier. As a consequence, we obtain the first walk to mix in  $\tilde{O}(n^2)$  steps for an arbitrary polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Strong self-concordance for other barriers leads to an interesting (and unexpected) connection — for the universal and entropic barriers, it is implied by the KLS conjecture.

## ■ 1 Introduction

The interior-point method is one of the major successes of optimization, in theory and in practice [12, 33, 38]. It has led to the current asymptotically fastest algorithms for solving linear and semidefinite programs, and is a popular method for the accurate solution of medium to large sized instances. Moreover, the theory supporting the method is elegant and comprehensive: Rather than walking along the boundary of a convex set, we choose a convex, self-concordant barrier function that keeps the path of the algorithm away from the boundary even as it approaches the optimum; this allows large steps whose total number is bounded by  $O^*(\sqrt{\nu})$  where  $\nu$  is the self-concordance parameter of the barrier, and each step is the solution of a linear system. The results of Nesterov and Nemirovski [31] demonstrate that  $\nu = O(n)$  is possible for any convex set using their universal barrier. For linear programming with feasible region  $\{x : Ax \geq b\}$ , the simple logarithmic barrier  $g(x) = -\sum_i \ln((Ax - b)_i)$  has  $\nu = O(m)$  for an  $m \times n$  constraint matrix  $A$ , and is efficiently computable (the universal barrier is polytime to estimate, but requires the computation of volume of a convex body). In progress over the past decade, Lee and Sidford [14, 15, 16] introduced a barrier for linear programming that achieves  $\nu = O(n \log^{O(1)}(m))$  while being efficiently computable. The interior-point method has also directly influenced the design of combinatorial algorithms, leading to faster methods for maxflow/mincut and other optimization problems [28, 4, 35, 29, 13, 32, 36].

Sampling convex bodies is a fundamental problem that has close connections to convex optimization. Indeed, convex optimization can be reduced to sampling [1]. The study of sampling has led to many new algorithmic and analysis techniques, including for the analysis of Markov chains, the development of geometric isoperimetry and efficient simulated annealing. The most general methods that lead to polynomial-time sampling algorithms are the ball walk and hit-and-run, both requiring only membership oracle access to the convex set (or evaluation access to the logconcave function) being sampled. These methods are not affine-invariant, i.e., their complexity depends on the affine position of the convex set. A tight bound on their complexity is  $O^*(n^2 R^2 / r^2)$  where the convex body contains a ball of radius  $r$  and is mostly contained in a ball of radius  $R$  [8, 25, 23, 22]. The ratio  $R/r$  can be made  $O(\sqrt{n})$  for any convex body by a suitable affine transformation, e.g., by placing the body in near-isotropic position so that it is centered at zero and the covariance of the uniform distribution is the identity. This effectively makes the complexity  $O^*(n^3)$ . In the case of the ball walk, if the body is in near-isotropic position the mixing rate can be further improved to  $O^*(n^{2.5})$  using progress on the KLS conjecture [20]. However, the rounding

\*Georgia Tech, aladdha6@gatech.edu

†University of Washington and Microsoft Research, yintat@uw.edu

‡Georgia Tech, vempala@gatech.edu

(e.g., by near-isotropic transformation) is an expensive step, and its current best complexity is  $O^*(n^4)$  [24]. Even for polytopes, this the rounding/isotropic takes  $O(mn^{4.5})$  total time for a polytope with  $m$  inequalities using an improved amortized analysis of the per-step complexity [30]; this is also the current fastest over all arithmetic complexity to get the first random sample from a polytope.

Interior-point theory offers an alternative sampling method with no need for rounding. A convex barrier function, via its Hessian, naturally defines an ellipsoid centered at each interior point of a convex body, the *Dikin* ellipsoid, which is always contained in the body. The Dikin walk, at each step, picks a uniform random point in the Dikin ellipsoid around the current point. To ensure a uniform stationary density, the new point is accepted with probability that depends on the ratio of the volumes of the Dikin ellipsoids at the two points, see Algorithm 1 below. Kannan and Narayanan [9, 11] showed that the mixing rate of this walk with the standard logarithmic barrier is  $O(mn)$  for a polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  defined using  $m$  inequalities. Each step of the walk involves computing the determinant, and can be done in time  $O(mn^{\omega-1})$ , leading to an overall arithmetic complexity of  $O(m^2n^\omega)$  (see also [34] for a shorter proof of a Gaussian variant). An attractive feature of the Dikin walk is that it is *affine-invariant*, thus eliminating the need for a rounding procedure. Using a different more continuous approach, where each step is the solution of an ODE (rather than a straight-line step), Lee and Vempala [17] showed that the Riemannian Hamiltonian Monte Carlo improves the mixing rate for polytopes to  $O(mn^{2/3})$  while keeping the same per-step complexity. This leads to the following basic questions:

- What is the fastest possible mixing rate of a Dikin walk?
- Is a mixing rate of possible while keeping each step efficient (say matrix multiplication time or less)?

These are the natural analogies to the progress in optimization, where for the first, Nesterov and Nemirovski show a convergence rate to the optimum of  $O(\sqrt{n})$ , and for the second, Lee and Sidford show  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$  for linear programming while maintaining efficiency.

These questions, in the context of sampling, lead to new challenges. Whereas for optimization, one step can be viewed as moving to the optimum of the objective in the current Dikin ellipsoid (a Newton step), for sampling, the next step is a random point in the Dikin ellipsoid; and since these ellipsoids have widely varying volumes, maintaining the correct stationary distribution takes some work. In particular, one needs to show that with large probability, the Dikin ellipsoids at the current point and proposed next point have volumes within a constant factor; this would imply that a standard Metropolis filter succeeds with large probability and there is no “local” conductance bottleneck. For global convergence, the two important ingredients are showing that one-step distributions from nearby points have large overlap, and a suitable isoperimetric inequality. Both parts depart significantly from the Euclidean set-up as the notion of distance is defined by local Dikin ellipsoids.

In this paper we address these challenges by further developing the interior-point theory, motivated by sampling. First, in place of the self-concordance parameter  $\nu$ , we have a symmetric self-concordance parameter  $\bar{\nu}$ . It is the smallest number such that for any point  $u$  in a convex body  $K$ , with Dikin ellipsoid  $E_u$ , we have

$$E_u \subseteq K \cap (2u - K) \subseteq \sqrt{\bar{\nu}}E_u.$$

In general  $\bar{\nu}$  can be as high as  $\nu^2$  but for some important barriers, it is bounded as  $O(\nu)$ . This includes the logarithmic barrier, and, as we show, the Lee-Sidford barrier. This definition and parameter allows us to show that the isoperimetric (Cheeger) constant for the Dikin distance is asymptotically at least  $1/\sqrt{\bar{\nu}}$ .

We need a further, important refinement. The notion of self-concordance itself bounds the rate of change of the Hessian of the barrier (i.e., the Dikin matrix) with respect to the local metric in the spectral norm, i.e., the maximum change in any direction. We define *strong* self-concordance as the requirement that the this derivative be bounded in *Frobenius* norm. Again, the logarithmic barrier satisfies this property, and we show that the Lee-Sidford barrier does as well.

Our main general result then is that the Dikin walk defined using any symmetric, strongly self-concordant barrier with convex Hessian mixes in  $O(n\bar{\nu})$  steps. We prove that the LS barrier satisfies all these conditions with  $\bar{\nu} = \tilde{O}(n)$  and so has a mixing rate of  $\tilde{O}(n^2)$  for polytopes, completely answering the second question, and improving on several existing bounds in [3, 6]. We also show that the Dikin walk with the standard logarithmic barrier can be implemented in time  $O(nnz(A) + n^2)$  where  $nnz(A)$  is the number of nonzero entries in the constraint matrix  $A$ . This answers the open question posed in [15, 11]. These results along with earlier work on sampling polytopes are collected in Table 1. We note that while for the Dikin walk with a logarithmic barrier, there are simple examples showing that the mixing rate of  $O(mn)$  is tight (take a hypercube and duplicate one of its facet  $m - n$  times), for

the Dikin walk with the LS barrier, we are not aware of a tight example or one with mixing rate greater than  $\tilde{O}(n)$ . For now, there is the tantalizing possibility that it mixes in nearly linear time.

| Markov Chain                       | Mixing Rate                       | Per step implementation cost |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Ball Walk* [10]                    | $n^2 R^2 / r^2$                   | $mn$                         |
| Hit-and-Run* [27]                  | $n^2 R^2 / r^2$                   | $mn$                         |
| Dikin [11]                         | $mn$                              | $mn^{\omega-1}$              |
| RHMC [19]                          | $mn^{\frac{2}{3}}$                | $mn^{\omega-1}$              |
| Geodesic Walk [18]                 | $mn^{\frac{3}{4}}$                | $mn^{\omega-1}$              |
| John's Walk [6]                    | $n^7$                             | $mn^4 + n^8$                 |
| Vaidya Walk [3]                    | $m^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{3}{2}}$ | $mn^{\omega-1}$              |
| Approximate John Walk [3]          | $n^{2.5}$                         | $mn^{\omega-1}$              |
| <b>Dikin (this paper)</b>          | $mn$                              | $\text{nnz}(A) + n^2$        |
| <b>Weighted Dikin (this paper)</b> | $n^2$                             | $mn^{\omega-1}$              |

**Table 1:** The complexity of uniform polytope sampling from a warm start. The entries marked \* are for general convex bodies presented by oracles, with  $R/r$  measuring the *roundness* of the input body; this can be made  $O(\sqrt{n})$  with a rounding procedure that takes  $n^4$  steps (membership queries). *After* rounding, the amortized per-step complexity of the ball walk in a polytope is  $\tilde{O}(m)$ .

Thus, the overall arithmetic complexity for sampling a polytope is reduced to  $m \cdot \min \{ \text{nnz}(A) \cdot n + n^3, n^{\omega+1} \}$  which improves the state of the art for all ranges of  $m$ .

We also study the notions of symmetric and strong self-concordance introduced in this paper for three well-studied barriers, namely, the classical universal barrier [31], the entropic barrier [2] and the canonical barrier [7]. While these barriers are not particularly efficient to evaluate, they are interesting because they all achieve the best (or nearly best) possible self-concordance parameter values for arbitrary convex sets and convex cones (for the canonical barrier), and have played an important role in shaping the theory of interior-point methods for optimization. For the canonical barrier, the work of Hildebrand already establishes convexity of the log determinant function (by definition of the barrier), and strong self-concordance [7]. For the entropic and universal barriers, we present an unexpected connection: the strong self-concordance is implied by the KLS isoperimetry conjecture! This suggests the possibility of more fruitful connections yet to be discovered using the notion of strong self-concordance.

In the rest of the introduction, we state all our definitions and results precisely.

## ■ 1.1 Dikin Walk

The general Dikin walk is defined as follows. For a convex set  $K$  with a positive definite matrix  $\mathbf{H}(u)$  for each point  $u \in K$ , let

$$E_u(r) = \{x : (x - u)^\top \mathbf{H}(u)(x - u) \leq r\}.$$

---

### Algorithm 1: DikinWalk

---

**Input:** starting point  $x_0$  in a polytope  $P = \{x : \mathbf{A}x \geq b\}$ .

Set  $r = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2}$ .

Repeat  $T$  times: at current point  $x$ ,

1. Pick  $y$  from  $E_x(r)$ .
2. Go to  $y$  with probability  $\min \left\{ 1, \frac{\text{vol}(E_x(r))}{\text{vol}(E_y(r))} \right\}$ .

**return**  $x$ .

---

## ■ 1.2 Strong Self-Concordance

We require a family of matrices to have the following properties. Usually but not necessarily, these matrices come from the Hessian of some convex function.

**Definition 1.1** (Symmetric self-concordance). For any convex set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , we call a matrix function  $\mathbf{H} : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is self-concordant if for any  $u \in K$ , we have

$$-2\|h\|_{\mathbf{H}(u)}\mathbf{H}(u) \preceq \frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{H}(u+th) \preceq 2\|h\|_{\mathbf{H}(u)}\mathbf{H}(u).$$

We call  $\mathbf{H}$  is a symmetric  $\bar{\nu}$ -self-concordant barrier if  $\mathbf{H}$  is self-concordant and for any  $u \in K$ ,

$$E_u(1) \subseteq K \cap (2u - K) \subseteq E_u(\sqrt{\bar{\nu}}).$$

The following lemma shows that self-concordant matrix functions also enjoy a similar regularity as the usual self-concordant functions.

**Lemma 1.2.** *Given any self-concordant matrix function  $\mathbf{H}$  on  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , we define  $\|v\|_x^2 = v^\top \mathbf{H}(x)v$ . Then, for any  $x, y \in K$  with  $\|x - y\|_x < 1$ , we have*

$$(1 - \|x - y\|_x)^2 \mathbf{H}(x) \preceq \mathbf{H}(y) \preceq \frac{1}{(1 - \|x - y\|_x)^2} \mathbf{H}(x).$$

*Proof.* Let  $h = y - x$ ,  $x_t = x + th$  and  $\phi(t) = h^\top \mathbf{H}(x_t)h$ . Then,

$$|\phi'(t)| = \left| h^\top \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}(x_t) h \right| \leq 2\|h\|_{x_t}^3 = 2\phi(t)^{3/2}.$$

Hence, we have  $\left| \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\phi(t)}} \right| \leq 1$ . Therefore, we have  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\phi(t)}} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\phi(0)}} - t$  and hence,

$$\phi(t) \leq \frac{\phi(0)}{(1 - t\sqrt{\phi(0)})^2}. \quad (1.1)$$

Now we fix any  $v$  and define  $\psi(t) = v^\top \mathbf{H}(x_t)v$ . Then,

$$|\psi'(t)| = \left| v^\top \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}(x_t) v \right| \leq 2\|h\|_{x_t} \|v\|_{x_t}^2 = 2\phi(t)\psi(t).$$

Using (1.1) at the end, we have

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \ln \psi(t) \right| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\phi(0)}}{(1 - t\sqrt{\phi(0)})}.$$

Integrating both sides from 0 to 1,

$$\left| \ln \frac{\psi(1)}{\psi(0)} \right| \leq \int_0^1 \frac{2\sqrt{\phi(0)}}{(1 - t\sqrt{\phi(0)})} dt = 2 \ln \left( \frac{1}{1 - \sqrt{\phi(0)}} \right).$$

The result follows from this,  $\psi(1) = v^\top \mathbf{H}(y)v$ ,  $\psi(0) = v^\top \mathbf{H}(x)v$ , and  $\phi(0) = \|x - y\|_x^2$ .  $\square$

Many natural barriers, including the logarithmic barrier and the LS-barrier, satisfy a much stronger condition than self-concordant. However, this is not always true, as one can construct counterexamples even in one-dimension.

**Definition 1.3.** For any convex set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , we say a matrix function  $\mathbf{H} : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is strongly self-concordant if for any  $u \in K$ , we have


$$\left\| \mathbf{H}(x)^{-1/2} D\mathbf{H}(x)[h] \mathbf{H}(x)^{-1/2} \right\|_F \leq 2\|h\|_x$$

where  $D\mathbf{H}(x)[h]$  is the directional derivative of  $\mathbf{H}$  at  $x$  in the direction  $h$ .

Similar to Lemma 1.2, we have a global version of Lemma 1.2.

**Lemma 1.4.** *Given any strongly self-concordant matrix function  $\mathbf{H}$  on  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ . For any  $x, y \in K$  with  $\|x - y\|_x < 1$ , we have*

$$\left\| \mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{H}(y) - \mathbf{H}(x)) \mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F \leq \frac{\|x - y\|_x}{(1 - \|x - y\|_x)^2}.$$



**Figure 1.1:** (a)  $E_u(1) \subseteq K \cap (2u - K) \subseteq E_u(\sqrt{v})$ . (b) Strong self-concordance measures the rate of change of Hessian of a barrier in the Frobenius norm

*Proof.* Let  $x_t = (1 - t)x + ty$ . Then, we have

$$\|\mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{H}(y) - \mathbf{H}(x))\mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_F = \int_0^1 \|\mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}(x_t) \mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_F dt.$$

We note that  $\mathbf{H}$  is self-concordant. Hence, Lemma 1.2 shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}(x_t) \mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_F^2 &= \text{Tr} \mathbf{H}(x)^{-1} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}(x_t) \right) \mathbf{H}(x)^{-1} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}(x_t) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1 - \|x - x_t\|_x)^4} \text{Tr} \mathbf{H}(x_t)^{-1} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}(x_t) \right) \mathbf{H}(x_t)^{-1} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}(x_t) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{(1 - \|x - x_t\|_x)^4} \|x - x_t\|_{x_t}^2 \\ &\leq \frac{4}{(1 - \|x - x_t\|_x)^6} \|x - x_t\|_x^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption in the second inequality and Lemma 1.2 again for the last inequality. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{H}(y) - \mathbf{H}(x))\mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_F &\leq \int_0^1 \frac{2\|x - x_t\|_x}{(1 - \|x - x_t\|_x)^3} dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{2t\|x - y\|_x}{(1 - t\|x - y\|_x)^3} dt \\ &= \frac{\|x - y\|_x}{(1 - \|x - y\|_x)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

We note that strong self-concordance is stronger than self-concordance since the Frobenius norm is always larger or equal to the spectral norm. As an example, we will verify that the conditions hold for the standard log barrier (Lemma 4.1).

## ■ 1.3 Results

Our first theorem is the following.

**Theorem 1.5.** *The mixing rate of the Dikin walk for a symmetric, strongly self-concordant matrix function with convex log determinant is  $O(n\bar{v})$ .*

This implies faster mixing and sampling for polytopes using the LS barrier (see Sec. 3.1 for the definition).

**Theorem 1.6.** *The mixing rate of the Dikin walk based on the LS barrier for any polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is  $\tilde{O}(n^2)$  and each step can be implemented in  $\tilde{O}(mn^{\omega-1})$ <sup>1</sup> arithmetic operations.*

On a related note, we show that each step of the standard Dikin walk is fast, and does not need matrix multiplication.

**Theorem 1.7.** *The Dikin walk with the logarithmic barrier for a polytope  $\{\mathbf{A}x \geq b\}$  can be implemented in time  $O(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + n^2)$  per step while maintaining the mixing rate of  $O(mn)$ .*

The next lemma results from studying strong self-concordance for classical barriers. The KLS constant below is conjectured to be  $O(1)$  and known to be  $O(n^{\frac{1}{4}})$  [20].

**Lemma 1.8.** *Let  $\psi_n$  be the KLS constant of isotropic logconcave densities in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , namely, for any isotropic logconcave density  $p$  and any set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , we have*

$$\int_{\partial S} p(x) dx \geq \frac{1}{\psi_n} \min \left\{ \int_S p(x) dx, \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus S} p(x) dx \right\}.$$

Let  $\mathbf{H}(x)$  be the Hessian of the universal or entropic barriers. Then, we have

$$\left\| \mathbf{H}(x)^{-1/2} D\mathbf{H}(x)[h] \mathbf{H}(x)^{-1/2} \right\|_F = O(\psi_n) \|h\|_x.$$

In short, the universal and entropic barriers in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are strongly self-concordant up to a scaling factor depending on  $\psi_n$ .

In fact, our proof shows that up to a logarithmic factor the strong self-concordance of these barriers is *equivalent* to the KLS conjecture.

## ■ 2 Mixing with Strong Self-Concordance

A key ingredient of the proof of Theorem 1.5 is the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For two points  $x, y \in P$ , with  $\|x - y\|_x \leq \frac{1}{8\sqrt{n}}$ , we have  $d_{TV}(P_x, P_y) \leq \frac{3}{4}$ .*

*Proof.* We have to prove two things: first, the rejection probability is small, second the ellipsoids used by the Dikin walk at  $x, y$  have large overlap. More precisely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{TV}(P_x, P_y) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \text{rej}_x + \frac{1}{2} \text{rej}_y + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\text{vol}(P_x \setminus P_y)}{\text{vol}(P_x)} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\text{vol}(P_y \setminus P_x)}{\text{vol}(P_y)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{rej}_x + \frac{1}{2} \text{rej}_y + 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\text{vol}(P_x \cap P_y)}{\text{vol}(P_x)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\text{vol}(P_x \cap P_y)}{\text{vol}(P_y)} \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\text{rej}_x$  and  $\text{rej}_y$  are the rejection probabilities at  $x$  and  $y$ .

For the rejection probability at  $x$ , we consider the algorithm pick  $z$  from  $E_x(r)$ . Let  $f(z) = \ln \det \mathbf{H}(z)$ . The acceptance probability of the sample  $z$  is

$$\min \left\{ 1, \frac{\text{vol}(E_x(r))}{\text{vol}(E_z(r))} \right\} = \min \left\{ 1, \sqrt{\frac{\det(\mathbf{H}(z))}{\det(\mathbf{H}(x))}} \right\}. \quad (2.2)$$

By the assumption that  $f$  is a convex function, we have that

$$\ln \frac{\det(\mathbf{H}(z))}{\det(\mathbf{H}(x))} = f(z) - f(x) \geq \langle \nabla f(x), z - x \rangle. \quad (2.3)$$

<sup>1</sup>We use  $\tilde{O}$  to hide factors polylogarithmic in  $n, m$ .

To simplify the notation, we assume  $\mathbf{H}(x) = \mathbf{I}$ . Since  $z$  is sampled from unit ball of radius  $r$  centered at  $x$ , we know that

$$\mathbb{P}(v^\top(z - x) \geq -\epsilon r \|v\|_2) \geq 1 - e^{-n\epsilon^2/2}.$$

In particular, with probability at least 0.99 in  $z$ , we have

$$\langle \nabla f(x), z - x \rangle \geq -\frac{4r}{\sqrt{n}} \|\nabla f(x)\|_2. \quad (2.4)$$

To compute  $\|\nabla f(x)\|_2^2$ , it is easier to compute directional derivative of  $\nabla f$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla f(x)\|_2 &= \max_{\|v\|_2=1} \nabla f(x)^\top v \\ &= \max_{\|v\|_2=1} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}(x)^{-1} D\mathbf{H}(x)[v]) \\ &= \max_{\|v\|_2=1} \text{Tr}\left(\mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} D\mathbf{H}(x)[v] \mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &\leq \max_{\|v\|_2=1} \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}} D\mathbf{H}(x)[v] \mathbf{H}(x)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_F \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where the first inequality follows from  $|\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i| \leq \sqrt{n} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^2}$  and the second inequality follows from the definition of strong self-concordance.

Combining (2.2), (2.3), (2.4) and (2.5), we see that with probability at least 0.99 in  $z$ , acceptance probability of the sample  $z$  is

$$\min\left\{1, \frac{\text{vol}(E_x(r))}{\text{vol}(E_z(r))}\right\} \geq e^{-2r} \geq 0.77 \quad (2.6)$$

where we used that  $r = \frac{1}{8}$ . Hence, the overall rejection probability  $\text{rej}_x$  (and similarly  $\text{rej}_y$ ) satisfies

$$\text{rej}_x \leq 0.24 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{rej}_y \leq 0.24. \quad (2.7)$$

Now, we bound the fraction of volume in the intersection of the ellipsoids at  $x, y$ . Again, we can assume that  $\mathbf{H}(x) = \mathbf{I}$ . Then, the strongly self-concordance and Lemma 1.4 shows that

$$\|\mathbf{H}(y) - \mathbf{I}\|_F \leq 2\|x - y\|_x \leq \frac{1}{4\sqrt{n}}. \quad (2.8)$$

In particular, we have that

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{I} \preceq \mathbf{H}(y) \preceq \frac{3}{2}\mathbf{I}. \quad (2.9)$$

We partition the eigenvalues  $\lambda_i$  of  $\mathbf{H}(y)$  into those of value at least 1 and the rest. Then consider the ellipsoid  $E$  whose eigenvalues are  $\min\{1, \lambda_i\}$ . This is contained in both  $E_x(1)$  and  $E_y(1)$ . We will see that  $\text{vol}(E)$  is a constant fraction of the volume of both  $E_x(1)$  and  $E_y(1)$ . First, we compare  $E$  and  $E_x(1)$

$$\frac{\text{vol}(E)}{\text{vol}(E_x(1))} = \prod_{i:\lambda_i < 1} \lambda_i = \prod_{i:\lambda_i < 1} (1 - (1 - \lambda_i)) \geq \exp\left(-2 \sum_{i:\lambda_i < 1} (1 - \lambda_i)\right) \quad (2.10)$$

where we used that  $1 - x \geq \exp(-2x)$  for  $0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\lambda_i \geq \frac{1}{2}$  (2.9). From the inequality (2.8), it follows that

$$\sqrt{\sum_i (\lambda_i - 1)^2} \leq \frac{1}{4\sqrt{n}}.$$

Therefore,  $\sum_{i:\lambda_i < 1} |\lambda_i - 1| \leq \frac{1}{4}$ . Putting it into (2.10), we have

$$\frac{\text{vol}(P_x \cap P_y)}{\text{vol}(P_x)} = \frac{\text{vol}(E)}{\text{vol}(E_x(1))} \geq e^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (2.11)$$

Similarly, we have

$$\frac{\text{vol}(P_x \cap P_y)}{\text{vol}(P_y)} = \frac{\prod_{i:\lambda_i < 1} \lambda_i}{\prod_{i:\lambda_i} \lambda_i} = \frac{1}{\prod_{i:\lambda_i > 1} \lambda_i} \geq \frac{1}{\exp(\sum_{i:\lambda_i > 1} (\lambda_i - 1))} \geq e^{-\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (2.12)$$

Putting (2.7), (2.11) and (2.12) into (2.1), we have

$$d_{\text{TV}}(P_x, P_y) \leq \frac{0.24}{2} + \frac{0.24}{2} + 1 - \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{2} + \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{4}}}{2} \leq \frac{3}{4}$$

□

The next lemma establishes isoperimetry. This only needs the symmetric containment assumption. The isoperimetry is for the cross-ratio distance. For a convex body  $K$ , and any two points  $u, v \in K$ , suppose that  $p, q$  are the endpoints of the chord through  $u, v$  in  $K$ , so that these points occur in the order  $p, u, v, q$ . Then, the *cross-ratio* distance between  $u$  and  $v$  is defined as

$$d_K(u, v) = \frac{\|u - v\|_2 \|p - q\|_2}{\|p - u\|_2 \|v - q\|_2}.$$

This distance enjoys the following isoperimetric inequality.

**Theorem 2.2** ([21]). *For any convex body  $K$ , and disjoint subsets  $S_1, S_2$  of it, and  $S_3 = K \setminus S_1 \setminus S_2$ , we have*

$$\text{vol}(S_3) \geq d_K(S_1, S_2) \frac{\text{vol}(S_1)\text{vol}(S_2)}{\text{vol}(K)}.$$

We now relate the cross-ratio distance to the ellipsoidal norm.

**Lemma 2.3.** *For  $u, v \in K$ ,  $d_K(u, v) \geq \frac{\|u - v\|_u}{\sqrt{\bar{v}}}$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the ellipsoid at  $u$ . For the chord  $[p, q]$  induced by  $u, v$  with these points in the order  $p, u, v, q$ , suppose that  $\|p - u\|_2 \leq \|v - q\|_2$ . Then by Lemma 1.5,  $p \in K \cap (2u - K)$ . And hence  $\|p - u\|_u \leq \sqrt{\bar{v}}$ . Therefore,

$$d_K(u, v) = \frac{\|u - v\|_2 \|p - q\|_2}{\|p - u\|_2 \|v - q\|_2} \geq \frac{\|u - v\|_2}{\|p - u\|_2} = \frac{\|u - v\|_u}{\|p - u\|_u} \geq \frac{\|u - v\|_u}{\sqrt{\bar{v}}}.$$

We can now prove the main conductance bound.

**Theorem 1.5.** *The mixing rate of the Dikin walk for a symmetric, strongly self-concordant matrix function with convex log determinant is  $O(n\bar{v})$ .*

We follow the standard high-level outline [39]. Consider any measurable subset  $S_1 \subseteq K$  and let  $S_2 = K \setminus S_1$  be its complement. Define the points with low escape probability for these subsets as

$$S'_i = \left\{ x \in S_i : P_x(K \setminus S_i) < \frac{1}{8} \right\}$$

and  $S'_3 = K \setminus S'_1 \setminus S'_2$ . Then, for any  $u \in S'_1, v \in S'_2$ , we have  $d_{\text{TV}}(P_u, P_v) > 1 - \frac{1}{4}$ . Hence, by Lemma 2.1, we have  $\|u - v\|_u \geq \frac{1}{8\sqrt{n}}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.3,

$$d_K(u, v) \geq \frac{1}{8\sqrt{n} \cdot \sqrt{\bar{v}}}.$$

We can now bound the conductance of  $S_1$ . We may assume that  $\text{vol}(S'_i) \geq \text{vol}(S_i)/2$ ; otherwise, it immediately follows that the conductance of  $S_1$  is  $\Omega(1)$ . Assuming this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{S_1} P_x(S_2) dx &\geq \int_{S'_3} \frac{1}{8} dx \geq \frac{1}{8} \text{vol}(S'_3) \\ \text{using isoperimetry (Theorem 2.2)} &\geq \frac{1}{8} d_K(S'_1, S'_2) \frac{\text{vol}(S'_1)\text{vol}(S'_2)}{\text{vol}(P)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{512\sqrt{n\bar{v}}} \min \{ \text{vol}(S_1), \text{vol}(S_2) \}. \end{aligned}$$

□

It is well-known that inverse squared conductance is a bound on the mixing rate, e.g., in the following form.



**Theorem 2.4.** [26] Let  $Q_t$  be the distribution of the current point after  $t$  steps of a Markov chain with stationary distribution  $Q$  and conductance at least  $\phi$ , starting from initial distribution  $Q_0$ . Then, with  $M = \sup_A \frac{Q_0(A)}{Q(A)}$ ,

$$d_{TV}(Q_t, Q) \leq \sqrt{M} \left(1 - \frac{\phi^2}{2}\right)^t$$

where  $d_{TV}(Q_t, Q)$  is the total variation distance between  $Q_t$  and  $Q$ .

## ■ 3 Fast Polytope Sampling with the LS barrier

### ■ 3.1 LS Barrier and its Properties

In this section, we assume the convex set is a polytope  $P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | \mathbf{A}x > b\}$ . For any  $x \in \text{int}P$ , let  $\mathbf{S}_x = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{A}x - b)$  and  $\mathbf{A}_x = \mathbf{S}_x^{-1}\mathbf{A}$ . We define the Lee-Sidford barrier [16] as follows:

**Definition 3.1** (LS Barrier). The LS barrier is defined as

$$\psi(x) = \max_{w \in \mathbb{R}^m : w \geq 0} \frac{1}{2} f(x, w) \quad \text{where } f(x, w) = \ln \det \left( \mathbf{A}_x \mathbf{W}^{1-\frac{2}{q}} \mathbf{A}_x \right) - \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q} \right) \sum_{i=1}^m w_i$$

where  $q = 2(1 + \ln m)$ .

We follow the notation in [16]:

**Definition 3.2.** For any  $x \in P$ , we define  $w_x = \arg \max_{w \geq 0} f(x, w)$ ,  $\mathbf{W}_x = \text{Diag}(w_x)$ ,  $s_x = \mathbf{A}x - b$ ,  $\mathbf{S}_x = \text{Diag}(s_x)$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_x = \mathbf{S}_x^{-1}\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_x = \mathbf{W}_x^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}} \mathbf{A}_x \left( \mathbf{A}_x \mathbf{W}_x^{1-\frac{2}{q}} \mathbf{A}_x \right)^{-1} \left( \mathbf{W}_x^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}} \mathbf{A}_x \right)^\top$ ,  $\sigma_x = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}_x)$ ,  $\Sigma_x = \text{Diag}(\sigma_x)$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_x^{(2)} = \mathbf{P}_x \circ \mathbf{P}_x$ ,  $\Lambda_x = \Sigma_x - \mathbf{P}_x^{(2)}$ ,  $\bar{\Lambda}_x = \Sigma_x^{-1/2} \Lambda_x \Sigma_x^{-1/2}$ , and  $\mathbf{N}_x = 2\bar{\Lambda}_x (\mathbf{I} - (1 - \frac{2}{q})\bar{\Lambda}_x)^{-1}$ .

**Lemma 3.3** ([16]). The function  $\psi(x)$  has the following properties:

1. (Lemma 23)  $\psi(x)$  is convex.
2. (Lemma 47.2)

$$\mathbf{P}_x^{(2)} \preceq \Sigma_x \tag{3.1}$$

3. (Lemma 31)

$$0 \leq \sigma_{x,i} = w_{x,i} \leq 1 \tag{3.2}$$

$$\mathbf{A}_x^\top \mathbf{W}_x \mathbf{A}_x \preceq \nabla^2 \psi(x) \preceq (1+q) \mathbf{A}_x^\top \mathbf{W}_x \mathbf{A}_x \tag{3.3}$$

4. (Lemma 33) For any  $x_t = x + th$  and  $s_t = \mathbf{A}x_t - b$ , we have

$$\|\mathbf{S}_t^{-1} \frac{d}{dt} s_t\|_{\mathbf{W}_t} \leq \|h\|_{\nabla^2 \psi(x_t)} \tag{3.4}$$

5. (Lemma 34) For any  $x_t = x + th$  and  $w_t = w_{x_t}$ , we have

$$\|\mathbf{W}_t^{-1} \frac{d}{dt} w_t\|_{\mathbf{W}_t} \leq q \|h\|_{\nabla^2 \psi(x_t)} \tag{3.5}$$

### ■ 3.2 Mixing Rate

**Definition 3.4.** The LS matrix for a point  $x \in P$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{H}(x) = (1+q^2)(1+q) \cdot \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}_x^{-1} \mathbf{W}_x^{1-\frac{2}{q}} \mathbf{S}_x^{-1} \mathbf{A}.$$

First, we establish the strong self-concordance in the next lemma.

**Lemma 3.5** (Strong Self Concordance). *The LS matrix is strongly self concordant, i.e., for any  $x_t$  in the polytope given by  $x_t = x + th$ , we have*

$$\|\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2}(\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{H}_t)\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2}\|_F \leq 2\|h\|_{\mathbf{H}_t}$$

*Proof.* We redefine  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}_t \mathbf{A}$  with  $\mathbf{V}_t = \mathbf{S}_t^{-1} \mathbf{W}_t^{1-2/q} \mathbf{S}_t^{-1}$  and  $\mathbf{P}_t = \sqrt{\mathbf{V}_t} \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}_t \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top \sqrt{\mathbf{V}_t}$ . Note that  $\mathbf{V}_t$  is a diagonal matrix and that  $\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t$  and  $\mathbf{H}_t$  are just off by a scaling factor. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2}(\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{H}_t)\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2}\|_F^2 &= \|\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t^{-1/2}(\frac{d}{dt}\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t)\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t^{-1/2}\|_F^2 \\ &= \text{Tr} \bar{\mathbf{H}}_t^{-1}(\frac{d}{dt}\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t)\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t^{-1}(\frac{d}{dt}\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t) \\ &= \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}_t \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{V}_t) \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{V}_t \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{V}_t) \mathbf{A} \\ &= \text{Tr} \mathbf{P}_t \frac{d \ln \mathbf{V}_t}{dt} \mathbf{P}_t \frac{d \ln \mathbf{V}_t}{dt} \\ &= \frac{d \ln v_t}{dt} \mathbf{P}_t^{(2)} \frac{d \ln v_t}{dt}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\mathbf{P}_t^{(2)} \preceq \Sigma_t$ , by (3.1). Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2}(\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{H}_t)\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2}\|_F^2 &\leq \frac{d \ln v_t}{dt} \Sigma_t \frac{d \ln v_t}{dt} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_{t,i} \left( \frac{d \ln s_{t,i}^{-2} w_{t,i}^{1-2/q}}{dt} \right)^2 \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_{t,i} \left( \left( \frac{d \ln s_{t,i}}{dt} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{d \ln w_{t,i}}{dt} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= 4 \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_{t,i} \left( \left( \frac{1}{s_{t,i}} \frac{d s_{t,i}}{dt} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{1}{w_{t,i}} \frac{d w_{t,i}}{dt} \right)^2 \right) \\ &\leq 4(1+q^2) \|h\|_{\nabla^2 \psi(x_t)}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $\sigma_t = w_t$  (3.2) at the second last equation and used (3.4) and (3.5) at the end.

Finally, (3.3) shows that  $\nabla^2 \psi(x_t) \preceq (1+q) \mathbf{A}_t^\top \mathbf{W}_t \mathbf{A}_t$ . Since  $0 \leq w_t = \sigma_t \leq 1$  by the property of leverage score, we have

$$\nabla^2 \psi(x) \preceq (1+q) \mathbf{A}_t^\top \mathbf{W}_t \mathbf{A}_t \preceq (1+q) \mathbf{A}_t^\top \mathbf{W}_t^{1-2/q} \mathbf{A}_t = (1+q) \bar{\mathbf{H}}_t.$$

Thus,  $\|h\|_{\nabla^2 \psi(x_t)}^2 \leq (1+q) \|h\|_{\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t}^2$ . Hence, we have

$$\|\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2}(\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{H}_t)\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2}\|_F^2 \leq 4(1+q^2)(1+q) \|h\|_{\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t}^2 \leq 4 \|h\|_{\bar{\mathbf{H}}_t}^2$$

where we used that  $\mathbf{H}_t = (1+q^2)(1+q) \bar{\mathbf{H}}_t$ . □

**Theorem 3.6.** *The LS-ellipsoid matrix has the following properties:*

1.  $\ln \det \mathbf{H}(x)$  is convex.
2.  $\mathbf{H}$  is a symmetric strongly  $\bar{\nu}$ -self-concordant barrier with  $\bar{\nu} = O(n \log^3 m)$ .

*Proof.* For any  $x \in \text{int}P$ , (3.2) shows that  $\sum_i w_{x,i} = \sum_i \sigma_{x,i} = \text{Tr} \mathbf{W}_x^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}} \mathbf{A}_x \left( \mathbf{A}_x \mathbf{W}_x^{1-\frac{2}{q}} \mathbf{A}_x \right)^{-1} (\mathbf{W}_x^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q}} \mathbf{A}_x)^\top = \text{Tr} \mathbf{I}_{n \times n} = n$ . Hence, the barrier is same as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) &= \max_{w \geq 0, \sum_{i=1}^m w_i = n} \frac{1}{2} \ln \det(\mathbf{A}_x^\top \mathbf{W}^{1-2/q} \mathbf{A}_x) - \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q} \right) n \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \ln \det \frac{1}{(1+q^2)(1+q)} \mathbf{H}(x) - \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q} \right) n \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $w_x$  is the maximizer of  $f(x, w)$ . Since  $\psi(x)$  is convex, so is  $\ln \det \mathbf{H}(x)$ .

We proved that  $\mathbf{H}$  is strongly self-concordant in Lemma 3.5. Hence, it suffices to show that  $\bar{v} = O(n \log^3 m)$ .

For any  $u \in P$  and any  $v \in E_u(1)$ ,  $(v - u)^\top \mathbf{A}_u \mathbf{W}_u^{1-2/q} \mathbf{A}_u (v - u) \leq \frac{1}{(1+q^2)(1+q)}$  and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{A}_u(v - u)\|_\infty^2 &= \max_{i \in [m]} \left( e_i^\top \mathbf{A}_u (\mathbf{A}_u \mathbf{W}_u^{1-2/q} \mathbf{A}_u)^{-1/2} (\mathbf{A}_u \mathbf{W}_u^{1-2/q} \mathbf{A}_u)^{1/2} (v - u) \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1+q^2)(1+q)} \max_{i \in [m]} e_i^\top \mathbf{A}_u (\mathbf{A}_u \mathbf{W}_u^{1-2/q} \mathbf{A}_u)^{-1} \mathbf{A}_u e_i \\ &\leq \max_{i \in [m]} \frac{\sigma_{u,i}}{w_{u,i}^{1-2/q}} \leq \max_{i \in [m]} \frac{\sigma_{u,i}}{w_{u,i}} = 1 \end{aligned}$$

where we used that  $w_{u,i} \leq 1$  at the end. So,  $E_u \subseteq P \cap (2u - P)$  for all  $u \in P$ .

For any  $v \in P \cap (2u - P)$ , we have  $\|\mathbf{S}_u^{-1} \mathbf{A}(u - v)\|_\infty \leq 1$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(u - v)^\top \mathbf{H}(u)(u - v)}{(1+q^2)(1+q)} &= (u - v)^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}_u^{-1} \mathbf{W}_u^{1-2/q} \mathbf{S}_u^{-1} \mathbf{A}(u - v) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m w_{u,i}^{1-2/q} (\mathbf{S}_u^{-1} \mathbf{A}(u - v))_i^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m w_{u,i}^{1-2/q} \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^m (w_{u,i}^{1-2/q})^{\frac{1}{1-(2/q)}} \right)^{1-2/q} \left( \sum_{i=1}^m 1^{q/2} \right)^{2/q} \\ &\leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^m w_{u,i} \right)^{1-2/q} m^{2/q} \leq n^{1-2/q} m^{2/q} \leq en. \end{aligned}$$

□

We now bound the complexity of implementing each step of the Dikin walk for LS matrix function. [16, Theorem 46] shows that  $w_x$  can be updated in  $\tilde{O}(mn^{\omega-1})$  per step. Using this, our Dikin walk can be implemented in time  $O(mn^{\omega-1})$  per step, since each step involves the following tasks:

1. Compute  $\mathbf{H}(x)^{-1/2}v$  for some vector  $v$
2. Compute the ratio  $\det(\mathbf{H}(y)^{-1}\mathbf{H}(x))$  for points  $x, y$ .

Computing  $\mathbf{H}(x)$ , its inverse and its determinant can all be done in time  $\tilde{O}(mn^{\omega-1})$  using  $w_x$ . This means that the time to sample a polytope from a warm start is  $\tilde{O}(mn^{\omega+1})$  as claimed in Theorem 1.6.

## ■ 4 Fast Implementation of Dikin walk

**Lemma 4.1** (Strong Self-Concordance). *With  $\mathbf{H}(x) = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}_x^{-2} \mathbf{A}$ , the Hessian of the log barrier  $\phi(x) = -\sum_{i=1}^m \log(A_i x - b_i)$ , is strongly self-concordant.*

*Proof.* Let  $x_t = x + th$  for some fixed vector  $h$ . Let  $\mathbf{S}_t = \text{Diag}(\mathbf{A}x_t - b)$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_t = \mathbf{S}_t^{-1} \mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{P}_t = \mathbf{A}_t (\mathbf{A}_t^\top \mathbf{A}_t)^{-1} \mathbf{A}_t^\top$ ,  $\sigma_t = \text{diag}(\mathbf{P}_t)$ ,  $\Sigma_t = \text{Diag}(\sigma_t)$ , and  $\mathbf{P}_t^{(2)} = \mathbf{P}_t \circ \mathbf{P}_t$ . By [16, Lemma 47.2],  $\mathbf{P}_t^{(2)} \preceq \Sigma_t \preceq \mathbf{I}$ . We are now ready to prove strong self-concordance.

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}_t \right) \mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2}\|_F^2 &= \text{Tr} \mathbf{H}_t^{-1} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}_t \right) \mathbf{H}_t^{-1} \left( \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{H}_t \right) = \text{Tr} \mathbf{P}_t \frac{d \ln s_t^{-2}}{dt} \mathbf{P}_t \frac{d \ln s_t^{-2}}{dt} \\ &= \frac{d \ln s_t^{-2}}{dt} \mathbf{P}_t^{(2)} \frac{d \ln s_t^{-2}}{dt} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \frac{d \ln s_t^{-2}}{dt} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m 4s_{t,i}^{-2} (a_i^\top h)^2 = 4h^\top \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}_t^{-2} \mathbf{A} h = 4 \|h\|_{\mathbf{H}_t}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

The  $\log \det \mathbf{H}(x)$  is called the volumetric barrier and is known to be convex.

**Lemma 4.2** ([37, Lemma 3]).  *$f(x) = \log \det \mathbf{H}(x)$  is a convex function in  $x$ .*

The main result of this section is to give an even faster implementation by noting that in fact we can avoid explicitly computing  $\mathbf{H}(x)$  or its inverse or determinant for the Dikin walk with log barrier. This resolves an open problem posed in [11, 15].

The main challenge is to avoid computing the determinant of  $\mathbf{H}(x)$ . In fact, what one needs an unbiased estimator of the ratio of two such determinants. We reduce this, first to estimating a log-det, and then to an inverse maintenance problem in the next two lemmas.

To calculate rejection probability for Dikin Walk, we want an unbiased estimate of  $\frac{\det \mathbf{H}(x)}{\det \mathbf{H}(y)}$ . We first find an unbiased estimate,  $Y$  of  $\log \det \mathbf{H}(x) - \log \det \mathbf{H}(y)$  which can be calculated in  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + n^2)$  time using 4.4. We then use 4.3 to find an unbiased estimate,  $X$  of determinant of  $\mathbf{H}(x)$  which describes an algorithm to find an unbiased estimate of a value  $r$  given access to an unbiased estimate of  $\log r$ .

**Lemma 4.3** (Determinant). *Given a random variable  $Y$  with  $\mathbb{E}(Y) = \log r$ , then the random variable  $X$  defined as*

$$X = e \cdot \prod_{j=1}^i Y_j \text{ with probability } \frac{1}{e \cdot i!}$$

with  $Y_j$  being iid copies of  $Y$  has  $\mathbb{E}(X) = r$ .

*Proof.* We know that

$$r = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\log(r))^i}{i!}.$$

Using  $X = e \cdot \prod_{j=1}^i Y_j$  with probability  $\frac{1}{e \cdot i!}$  where  $Y_j$  are iid random variables with  $\mathbb{E}(Y_j) = \log r$ . Then,

$$\mathbb{E}[X] = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbb{E}(Y)^i}{i!} = e^{\log(r)} = r.$$

□

**Lemma 4.4** (Log Determinant). *Define  $\mathbf{H}(t) = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A} + t(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{I} + t(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{I})) \mathbf{A}$ . Let  $v \sim N(0, I)$  and  $t$  be uniform in  $[0, 1]$  and*

$$Y = v^\top \mathbf{H}(t)^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{H} - I) \mathbf{A} v + \log \det \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}.$$

Then,  $\mathbb{E}(Y) = \log \det \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$ .

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \det(\mathbf{H}(1)) - \log \det(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}) &= \int_0^1 \frac{d \log \det \mathbf{H}(t)}{dt} dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}(t)^{-1} \frac{d\mathbf{H}(t)}{dt}) dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}(t)^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{A}^\top) dt \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{v \sim N(0, I)} [v^\top \int_0^1 \text{Tr}(\mathbf{H}(t)^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{A}) dt \cdot v] \\ &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}_{v \sim N(0, I)} [v^\top \mathbf{H}(t)^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{A} v] dt \end{aligned}$$

□

Note that given  $\mathbf{H}(t)^{-1}$ , we can estimate  $\mathbb{E}_{v \sim N(0, I)}[v^\top \mathbf{H}(t)^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{A} v]$ . Maintaining  $\mathbf{H}(t)^{-1}$  reduces to the inverse maintenance problem for  $\mathbf{H}$ . It is shown in [15] that a matrix inverse can be maintained efficiently in the following sense. Suppose we have a sequence of matrices of the form  $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}$  where each  $\mathbf{D}^{(k)}$  is a slowly-changing diagonal matrix. Then for each matrix in the sequence, its inverse times any given vector  $v$  can be computed in time  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + n^2)$ . We use  $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{S}_x^{-2} \mathbf{S}_y^2$  to calculate an unbiased estimate of  $\log \det \mathbf{H}(x) - \log \det \mathbf{H}(y)$ .

**Lemma 4.5** ([15, Theorem 13]). *Suppose that a sequence of matrices  $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{D}^{(k)} \mathbf{A}$  for the inverse maintenance problem satisfies the  $\sum_i \left( \frac{d_i^{(k+1)} - d_i^{(k)}}{d_i^{(k)}} \right)^2 = O(1)$ . Then there is an algorithm that with high probability maintains an  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + n^2)$ -time linear system solver in total time  $\tilde{O}(n^\omega + r(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + n^2))$  where  $r$  is the number of rounds.*

We note that the condition  $\sum_i \left( \frac{d_i^{(k+1)} - d_i^{(k)}}{d_i^{(k)}} \right)^2 = O(1)$  is satisfied since

$$\sum_i \left( \frac{d_i^{(k+1)} - d_i^{(k)}}{d_i^{(k)}} \right)^2 = \sum_i \left( \frac{(s_i^{(k+1)})^{-2} - (s_i^{(k)})^{-2}}{(s_i^{(k)})^{-2}} \right)^2 = O \left( \sum_i \left( \frac{s_i^{(k+1)} - s_i^{(k)}}{s_i^{(k)}} \right)^2 \right) = O \left( \|x^{(k+1)} - x^{(k)}\|_{x^{(k)}}^2 \right).$$

Putting these together we have the following unbiased estimator for  $\sqrt{\det \mathbf{H}(x) / \det \mathbf{H}(y)}$ :

Compute  $X = \frac{\epsilon}{2} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^i Y_j$  with probability  $\frac{1}{e \cdot i!}$  where each  $Y_j$  is an iid sample generated as follows:

1. Pick  $v \sim N(0, I)$  and  $t$  uniformly in  $[0, 1]$ .
2. Set  $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{S}_x^{-2} \mathbf{S}_y^2$ .
3. Compute  $Y = v^\top \mathbf{H}(t)^{-1} \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{H}(1) - \mathbf{I}) \mathbf{A} v$  where  $\mathbf{H}(t) = \mathbf{A}^\top (\mathbf{I} + t(\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{I})) \mathbf{A}$  using efficient inverse maintenance.

We need one more trick. In the algorithm, at each step we need to compute  $\min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(y \rightarrow x)}{p(x \rightarrow y)} \right\}$ . While we can approximate the ratio inside the min, this might make the overall probability incorrect due to the min function not being smooth. So instead we propose a smoother filter. This might have other applications.

**Lemma 4.6** (Smooth Metropolis filter). *Assume that for step  $x \rightarrow y$  of a ergodic Markov chain. Then accepting the step  $x \rightarrow y$  with probability  $\frac{p(y \rightarrow x)}{p(y \rightarrow x) + p(x \rightarrow y)}$  gives uniform stationary distribution.*

*Proof.* Let  $\tilde{p}$  be the probability density of the new Markov chain. The probability of taking a step from  $x$  to  $y$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{p}(x \rightarrow y) &= p(x \rightarrow y) \cdot \frac{p(y \rightarrow x)}{p(y \rightarrow x) + p(x \rightarrow y)} \\ &= \frac{p(x \rightarrow y)p(y \rightarrow x)}{p(y \rightarrow x) + p(x \rightarrow y)} \\ &= p(y \rightarrow x) \cdot \frac{p(x \rightarrow y)}{p(y \rightarrow x) + p(x \rightarrow y)} \\ &= \tilde{p}(y \rightarrow x) \end{aligned}$$

So,  $\tilde{p}(x \rightarrow y) = \tilde{p}(y \rightarrow x)$  for all  $x$  and  $y$ . Hence the stationary distribution is uniform.  $\square$

For the Dikin walk,  $\frac{p(y \rightarrow x)}{p(x \rightarrow y)} = \frac{\det(\mathbf{H}_x)}{\det(\mathbf{H}_y)}$ . Note that  $\frac{p(y \rightarrow x)}{p(y \rightarrow x) + p(x \rightarrow y)} = \frac{\frac{p(y \rightarrow x)}{p(x \rightarrow y)}}{1 + \frac{p(y \rightarrow x)}{p(x \rightarrow y)}}$  is increasing in

$\frac{p(y \rightarrow x)}{p(x \rightarrow y)}$ . As Dikin barrier is strongly self-concordant (Lemma 4.1) and by (2.6), we get that with probability at least 0.99, for  $y$  randomly drawn from  $E_x$ ,  $\frac{\text{vol}(E_x(r))}{\text{vol}(E_y(r))} \geq 0.77$ . Hence, the probability of not rejecting at each step at least  $\frac{0.77}{1 + 0.77}$  with large probability.

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* Implementing Dikin walk requires maintaining matrices  $\mathbf{H}_t = \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{S}_t^{-2} \mathbf{A}$  corresponding to point  $x_t$ . 4.5 shows that this can be done in  $\tilde{O}(n^\omega + r(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + n^2))$  time where  $r$  is the number of steps in the chain. Additionally, each step requires calculating the rejection probability which is a smooth function in  $\frac{\det(\mathbf{H}_t)}{\det(\mathbf{H}_{t+1})}$  and hence can be calculated in  $\tilde{O}(\text{nnz}(\mathbf{A}) + n^2)$  amortized time using lemmas 4.3 and 4.4.  $\square$

## ■ 5 Strong Self-Concordance of other barriers

Here we analyze the strong self-concordance of the universal and entropic barriers.

*Proof of Lemma 1.8.* The entropic barrier is the dual of

$$f(\theta) = \log\left(\int_{x \in K} \exp(\theta^\top x) dx\right).$$

Then, its the first three derivatives are moments [2]:

$$\begin{aligned} Df(\theta)[h_1] &= \frac{\int_{x \in K} x^\top h_1 \exp(\theta^\top x) dx}{\int_{x \in K} \exp(\theta^\top x) dx} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_\theta} x^\top h_1. \end{aligned}$$

where  $p_\theta$  is the corresponding exponential distribution with support  $K$ .

$$\begin{aligned} D^2 f(\theta)[h_1, h_2] &= \frac{\int_{x \in K} x^\top h_1 x^\top h_2 \exp(\theta^\top x) dx}{\int_{x \in K} \exp(\theta^\top x) dx} - \frac{\int_{x \in K} x^\top h_1 \exp(\theta^\top x) dx \cdot \int_{x \in K} x^\top h_2 \exp(\theta^\top x) dx}{\left(\int_{x \in K} \exp(\theta^\top x) dx\right)^2} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_\theta} h_2^\top x x^\top h_1 - h_2^\top \mu \mu^\top h_1 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_\theta} (x - \mu)^\top h_1 \cdot (x - \mu)^\top h_2 \end{aligned}$$

Next, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} D\mu[h] &= D \frac{\int_{x \in K} x \exp(\theta^\top x) dx}{\int_{x \in K} \exp(\theta^\top x) dx} [h] \\ &= \frac{\int_{x \in K} x x^\top h \exp(\theta^\top x) dx}{\int_{x \in K} \exp(\theta^\top x) dx} - \frac{\int_{x \in K} x \exp(\theta^\top x) dx}{\int_{x \in K} \exp(\theta^\top x) dx} \cdot \frac{\int_{x \in K} x^\top h \exp(\theta^\top x) dx}{\int_{x \in K} \exp(\theta^\top x) dx} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_\theta} x x^\top h - \mu \mu^\top h \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{y \sim p_\theta} (y - \mu)(y - \mu)^\top h. \end{aligned}$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^3 f(\theta)[h_1, h_2, h_3] &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_\theta} (-\mathbb{E}_{y \sim p_\theta} (y - \mu)(y - \mu)^\top h_3)^\top h_1 \cdot (x - \mu)^\top h_2 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_\theta} (x - \mu)^\top h_1 \cdot (-\mathbb{E}_{y \sim p_\theta} (y - \mu)(y - \mu)^\top h_3)^\top h_2 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_\theta} (x - \mu)^\top h_1 \cdot (x - \mu)^\top h_2 \cdot (x - \mu)^\top h_3 \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_\theta} (x - \mu)^\top h_1 \cdot (x - \mu)^\top h_2 \cdot (x - \mu)^\top h_3. \end{aligned}$$

By [31, (2.15)], we have that

$$D^2 f^*(x_\theta)[h_1, h_2] = h_1^\top \nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-1} h_2$$

and

$$D^3 f^*(x_\theta)[h_1, h_2, h_3] = -D^3 f(\theta)[\nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-1} h_1, \nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-1} h_2, \nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-1} h_3]$$

where  $x_\theta = \nabla f(\theta)$ . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla^2 f^*(x_\theta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} D^3 f^*(x_\theta)[h] \nabla^2 f^*(x_\theta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_\theta} \nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (x - \mu)(x - \mu)^\top \nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot (x - \mu)^\top \nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-1} h \\ &= -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \tilde{p}_\theta} x x^\top \cdot x^\top \nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} h \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{p}_\theta$  is the distribution given by  $\nabla^2 f(\theta)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(x - \mu)$  where  $x \sim p_\theta$ . Note that  $\tilde{p}_\theta$  is isotropic and [5, Fact 6.1] shows that

$$\max_{\|v\|_2=1} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \tilde{p}_\theta} x x^T (x^T v) \right\|_F = O(\psi_n). \quad (5.1)$$

Hence, we have that

$$\left\| \nabla^2 f^*(x_\theta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} D^3 f^*(x_\theta) [h] \nabla^2 f^*(x_\theta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_F = O(\psi_n) \left\| \nabla^2 f^*(x_\theta)^{-\frac{1}{2}} h \right\|_2 = O(\psi_n) \|h\|_{x_\theta}.$$

This proves the lemma for the entropic barrier (recall that the entropic barrier is  $f^*$  instead of  $f$ ).

For the universal barrier, first we recall that the polar of a convex set  $K$  is  $K^\circ(x) = \{z : z^\top(y - x) \leq 1 \quad \forall y \in K\}$  and the barrier function is

$$\Phi(x) = \log \text{vol}(K^\circ(x)).$$

Its derivatives have the following identities [31, Page 52]. Here the random point  $y$  is drawn uniformly from the polar  $K^\circ(x)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 \Phi(x) &= (n+2)(n+1) \mathbb{E} y y^\top - (n+1)^2 \mathbb{E} y \mathbb{E} y^\top, \\ D \nabla^2 \Phi(x) [h] &= - (n+1)(n+2)(n+3) \mathbb{E} y y^\top (y^\top h) + (n+1)^2 (n+2) \mathbb{E} y y^\top \cdot \mathbb{E} y^\top h \\ &\quad + 2(n+1)^2 (n+2) \mathbb{E} y (y^\top h) \cdot \mathbb{E} y^\top - 2(n+1)^3 \mathbb{E} y \cdot \mathbb{E} y^\top \cdot \mathbb{E} y^\top h \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\mu = \mathbb{E} y$ , we can re-write the derivatives as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^2 \Phi(x) &= (n+2)(n+1) \mathbb{E} (y - \mu)(y - \mu)^\top + (n+1) \mu \mu^\top \\ D \nabla^2 \Phi(x) [h] &= - (n+1)(n+2)(n+3) \mathbb{E} (y - \mu)(y - \mu)^\top (y - \mu)^\top h \\ &\quad - 2(n+2)(n+1) (\mathbb{E} (y - \mu)(y - \mu)^\top \mu^\top h + \mathbb{E} \mu (y - \mu)^\top (y - \mu)^\top h + \mathbb{E} (y - \mu) \mu^\top (y - \mu)^\top h) \\ &\quad - 2(n+1) \mu \mu^\top \mu^\top h. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume  $\nabla^2 \Phi(x) = I$ . Then, we have

$$(n+2)(n+1) \mathbb{E} (y - \mu)(y - \mu)^\top \preceq I \quad \text{and} \quad (n+1) \mu \mu^\top \preceq I.$$

For the first term, (5.1) shows that

$$\|(n+1)(n+2)(n+3) \mathbb{E} (y - \mu)(y - \mu)^\top (y - \mu)^\top h\|_F = O(\psi_n).$$

The Frobenius norm of next three terms are bounded by

$$2 \|\mu^\top h\| \|(n+2)(n+1) \mathbb{E} (y - \mu)(y - \mu)^\top\|_F \leq 2\sqrt{n} \|\mu\| \leq 2$$

and so is the last term:

$$2 \|(n+1) \mu \mu^\top\|_F \|\mu^\top h\| \leq 2.$$

This completes the proof on the strong self-concordance of the universal barrier.  $\square$

To conclude this section, we remark that the universal and entropic barriers do *not* satisfy our symmetry condition. Consider for example a rotational cone  $C = \{x : \sum_{i=2}^n x_i^2 \leq x_1^2, 0 \leq x_1 \leq 1\}$ . Now consider any point  $x = (x_1, 0, \dots, 0)$ . Then symmetric body around  $x$ , namely  $K = C \cap (x - C)$  has the property that (a) the John ellipsoid satisfies  $E \subset K \subset \sqrt{n}C$  (as it does for any symmetric convex body) and (b) the inertial ellipsoid has a sandwiching ratio of  $n$ , proving that  $\bar{\nu} \geq n = \Omega(\nu^2)$ . For the entropic barrier, we have a similar result as multiplying the indicator function of this symmetric convex body with an exponential function of the form  $e^{-c^\top x}$  still has the same property for the inertial ellipsoid. This example highlights the advantages of barriers with John-like ellipsoids (log barrier, LS barrier) vs Inertia-like ellipsoids (universal, entropic).

## References

## References

- [1] Dimitris Bertsimas and Santosh Vempala. Solving convex programs by random walks. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 51(4):540–556, 2004.
- [2] Sébastien Bubeck and Ronen Eldan. The entropic barrier: a simple and optimal universal self-concordant barrier. In *Proceedings of The 28th Conference on Learning Theory, COLT 2015, Paris, France, July 3-6, 2015*, page 279, 2015.
- [3] Yuansi Chen, Raaz Dwivedi, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Fast mcmc sampling algorithms on polytopes. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(1):2146–2231, 2018.
- [4] Paul Christiano, Jonathan A. Kelner, Aleksander Madry, Daniel A. Spielman, and Shang-Hua Teng. Electrical flows, laplacian systems, and faster approximation of maximum flow in undirected graphs. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2011, San Jose, CA, USA, 6-8 June 2011*, pages 273–282, 2011.
- [5] R. Eldan. Thin shell implies spectral gap up to polylog via a stochastic localization scheme. *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, 23:532–569, 2013.
- [6] Adam Gustafson and Hariharan Narayanan. John’s walk. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.02032*, 2018.
- [7] Roland Hildebrand. Canonical barriers on convex cones. *Mathematics of operations research*, 39(3):841–850, 2014.
- [8] R. Kannan, L. Lovász, and M. Simonovits. Random walks and an  $O^*(n^5)$  volume algorithm for convex bodies. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 11:1–50, 1997.
- [9] R. Kannan and H. Narayanan. Random walks on polytopes and an affine interior point method for linear programming. In *STOC*, pages 561–570, 2009.
- [10] Ravi Kannan, László Lovász, and Miklós Simonovits. Random walks and an  $o^*(n^5)$  volume algorithm for convex bodies. *Random structures and algorithms*, 11(1):1–50, 1997.
- [11] Ravindran Kannan and Hariharan Narayanan. Random walks on polytopes and an affine interior point method for linear programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 37(1):1–20, 2012.
- [12] N. Karmarkar. A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming. *Combinatorica*, 4(4):373–396, 1984.
- [13] Jonathan A Kelner, Yin Tat Lee, Lorenzo Orecchia, and Aaron Sidford. An almost-linear-time algorithm for approximate max flow in undirected graphs, and its multicommodity generalizations. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 217–226. SIAM, 2014.
- [14] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. Path finding methods for linear programming: Solving linear programs in  $o(\sqrt{\text{rank}})$  iterations and faster algorithms for maximum flow. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on*, pages 424–433. IEEE, 2014.
- [15] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. Efficient inverse maintenance and faster algorithms for linear programming. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on*, pages 230–249. IEEE, 2015.
- [16] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. Solving linear programs with  $\sqrt{\text{rank}}$  linear system solves, 2019.
- [17] Yin Tat Lee and Santosh S Vempala. Convergence rate of riemannian hamiltonian monte carlo and faster polytope volume computation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.06261*, 2017.
- [18] Yin Tat Lee and Santosh S Vempala. Geodesic walks in polytopes. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 927–940. ACM, 2017.



- [19] Yin Tat Lee and Santosh S Vempala. Convergence rate of riemannian hamiltonian monte carlo and faster polytope volume computation. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1115–1121. ACM, 2018.
- [20] Yin Tat Lee and Santosh Srinivas Vempala. Eldan’s stochastic localization and the KLS hyperplane conjecture: An improved lower bound for expansion. In *Proc. of IEEE FOCS*, 2017.
- [21] L. Lovász. Hit-and-run mixes fast. *Math. Prog.*, 86:443–461, 1998.
- [22] L. Lovász and S. Vempala. Fast algorithms for logconcave functions: sampling, rounding, integration and optimization. In *FOCS*, pages 57–68, 2006.
- [23] L. Lovász and S. Vempala. Hit-and-run from a corner. *SIAM J. Computing*, 35:985–1005, 2006.
- [24] L. Lovász and S. Vempala. Simulated annealing in convex bodies and an  $O^*(n^4)$  volume algorithm. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 72(2):392–417, 2006.
- [25] L. Lovász and S. Vempala. The geometry of logconcave functions and sampling algorithms. *Random Struct. Algorithms*, 30(3):307–358, 2007.
- [26] László Lovász and Miklós Simonovits. Random walks in a convex body and an improved volume algorithm. *Random structures & algorithms*, 4(4):359–412, 1993.
- [27] László Lovász and Santosh Vempala. Hit-and-run from a corner. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 35(4):985–1005, 2006.
- [28] Aleksander Madry. Fast approximation algorithms for cut-based problems in undirected graphs. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2010 51st Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 245–254. IEEE, 2010.
- [29] Aleksander Madry. Navigating central path with electrical flows: From flows to matchings, and back. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on*, pages 253–262. IEEE, 2013.
- [30] Oren Mangoubi and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. Faster polytope rounding, sampling, and volume computation via a sublinear “ball walk”, 2019.
- [31] Yurii Nesterov and Arkadii Nemirovskii. *Interior-point polynomial algorithms in convex programming*. SIAM, 1994.
- [32] Richard Peng. Approximate undirected maximum flows in  $o(m \text{ polylog}(n))$  time. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1862–1867. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2016.
- [33] James Renegar. A polynomial-time algorithm, based on newton’s method, for linear programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 40(1):59–93, 1988.
- [34] Sushant Sachdeva and Nisheeth K Vishnoi. The mixing time of the dikin walk in a polytope — a simple proof. *Operations Research Letters*, 44(5):630–634, 2016.
- [35] Jonah Sherman. Nearly maximum flows in nearly linear time. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS), 2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on*, pages 263–269. IEEE, 2013.
- [36] Jonah Sherman. Area-convexity,  $l_1$  regularization, and undirected multicommodity flow. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 452–460. ACM, 2017.
- [37] P. M. Vaidya. A new algorithm for minimizing convex functions over convex sets. *Mathematical Programming*, 73:291–341, 1996.
- [38] Pravin M. Vaidya. Speeding-up linear programming using fast matrix multiplication (extended abstract). In *30th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, USA, 30 October - 1 November 1989*, pages 332–337, 1989.
- [39] Santosh Vempala. Geometric random walks: a survey. *Combinatorial and computational geometry*, 52(573-612):2, 2005.