

# Trigonometric approximation of the Max-Cut polytope is star-like

Romain Ageron \*

October 31, 2021

## Abstract

The Max-Cut polytope appears in the formulation of many difficult combinatorial optimization problems. These problems can also be formulated as optimization problems over the so-called *trigonometric approximation* which possesses an algorithmically accessible description but is not convex. Hirschfeld conjectured that this trigonometric approximation is star-like. In this article, we provide a proof of this conjecture.

Keywords: Max-Cut polytope, Trigonometric Approximation  
MSC 2020: 90C20, 90C27

## 1 Introduction

A common problem in combinatorial optimization is the maximization of a quadratic form over  $\{-1, 1\}^n$

$$\max_{x \in \{-1, 1\}^n} x^T A x = \max_{\substack{X = x x^T \\ x \in \{-1, 1\}^n}} \langle A, X \rangle \quad (1)$$

where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  denotes the usual scalar product on real symmetric matrices of size  $n$ .

The decision problem associated to this optimization problem is NP-complete. Indeed the Max-Cut problem, one of Karp's 21 NP-complete problems, can be reduced in polynomial time to the maximization of a quadratic form over  $\{-1, 1\}^n$  [2]. The reformulation in the form of (1) of several common hard combinatorial optimization problems such as vertex cover, knapsack, traveling salesman, etc, can be found in [3].

Consider the set

$$\mathcal{SR} = \{X \succeq 0 \mid \text{diag } X = 1\}$$

in the space of real symmetric  $n \times n$  matrices, where  $X \succeq 0$  means that  $X$  is a positive semidefinite matrix. It serves as a simple and convex outer approximation of the *Max-Cut polytope*

$$\mathcal{MC} = \text{conv}\{X \in \mathcal{SR} \mid \text{rk } X = 1\},$$

where  $\text{conv}$  denotes the convex envelope and  $\text{rk } X$  denotes the rank of  $X$ .

Note that  $\{X \in \mathcal{SR} \mid \text{rk } X = 1\} = \{X \mid \exists x \in \{-1, 1\}^n, X = x x^T\}$ . Indeed a positive semidefinite matrix  $X$  has rank 1 if and only if there exists a nonzero vector  $x$  such that  $X = x x^T$ . Then the condition  $\text{diag } X = 1$  implies that  $x_i^2 = 1$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , i.e.,  $x_i = \pm 1$ , and conversely.

The maximal value of a linear functional  $\langle A, \cdot \rangle$  over a set  $E$  does not change if the set  $E$  is replaced by its convex envelope  $\text{conv } E$ . Therefore

$$\max_{\substack{X = x x^T \\ x \in \{-1, 1\}^n}} \langle A, X \rangle = \max_{X \in \mathcal{MC}} \langle A, X \rangle.$$

However, the Max-Cut polytope is a difficult polytope. Indeed, it has an exponential number of vertices and is defined by even more linear constraints. A good review of results on the Max-Cut polytope can be found in [1].

---

\*Paris-Saclay University, CentraleSupélec, 91190 Gif-sur-Yvette, France ([romain.ageron@student-cs.fr](mailto:romain.ageron@student-cs.fr)).

Maximizing  $\langle A, X \rangle$  over  $\mathcal{SR}$  instead of  $\mathcal{MC}$  for  $A \succeq 0$  approximates the exact solution of the problem with relative accuracy  $\mu = \frac{\pi}{2} - 1$  [4]:

$$\frac{2}{\pi} \max_{X \in \mathcal{SR}} \langle A, X \rangle \leq \max_{X \in \mathcal{MC}} \langle A, X \rangle \leq \max_{X \in \mathcal{SR}} \langle A, X \rangle.$$

Define a function  $f : [-1, 1] \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  by  $f(x) = \frac{2}{\pi} \arcsin x$ . Let  $\mathbf{f}$  be the operator which applies  $f$  element-wise to a matrix. A non-convex inner approximation of  $\mathcal{MC}$  is given by the *trigonometric approximation*

$$\mathcal{TA} = \{\mathbf{f}(X) \mid X \in \mathcal{SR}\}.$$

Nesterov proved in [4, Theorem 2.5] that

$$\max_{X \in \mathcal{TA}} \langle A, X \rangle = \max_{X \in \mathcal{MC}} \langle A, X \rangle.$$

Although not convex,  $\mathcal{TA}$  is simpler than  $\mathcal{MC}$  in the sense that checking whether a matrix  $X$  is in  $\mathcal{TA}$  can be done in polynomial time by computing  $\mathbf{f}^{-1}(X)$  and checking whether  $\mathbf{f}^{-1}(X)$  is in  $\mathcal{SR}$ . This allows to reformulate the initial difficult problem (1) as an optimization problem over the algorithmically accessible set  $\mathcal{TA}$ . The complexity of the problem in this form arises solely from the non-convexity of this set.

Hirschfeld studied  $\mathcal{TA}$  in [2, Section 4]. In this work, we prove that  $\mathcal{TA}$  possesses an additional beneficial property. Namely, we prove the conjecture of Hirschfeld that it is starlike, i.e., for every  $X \in \mathcal{TA}$  and every  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , the convex combination  $\lambda X + (1 - \lambda)I$  of  $X$  and the central point  $I$ , the identity matrix, is in  $\mathcal{TA}$ .

## 2 Hirschfeld's conjecture

In this section, we describe the conjecture and related results which have been obtained by Hirschfeld in his thesis [2, Section 4.3].

In order to show that  $\mathcal{TA}$  is star-like, one has to prove that

$$\forall X \in \mathcal{SR}, \mathbf{f}^{-1}(\lambda \mathbf{f} X + (1 - \lambda)I) \in \mathcal{SR}.$$

Note that the operator acting on  $X$  is nearly an element-wise one, defined by the function

$$\begin{aligned} f_\lambda : [-1, 1] &\longrightarrow [-1, 1] \\ x &\longmapsto f^{-1}(\lambda f(x)) = \sin(\lambda \arcsin x) \end{aligned}$$

acting on the off-diagonal elements, while the diagonal elements remain equal to 1, contrary to  $f_\lambda(1) = f^{-1}(\lambda) = \sin \frac{\pi \lambda}{2}$ . Thus one has to show that

$$\forall x \in \mathcal{SR}, \mathbf{f}_\lambda(X) + \left(1 - \sin \frac{\pi \lambda}{2}\right) I \succeq 0.$$

A sufficient condition is that  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda(X) \succeq 0$  for all  $X \in \mathcal{SR}$ , i.e., the element-wise operator  $\mathbf{f}_\lambda$  is positivity preserving. Hirschfeld conjectured that this sufficient condition is verified [2, Conjecture 4.9].

**Lemma 2.1.**

$$\forall X \in \mathcal{SR}, \mathbf{f}_\lambda(X) \succeq 0$$

A sufficient (and necessary) condition for an operator of this type to be positivity preserving is that all of the Taylor coefficients of  $f_\lambda$  are nonnegative [5].

Lemma 2.1 proves the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.2.**  $\mathcal{TA}$  is star-like.

### 3 Proof of the conjecture

In this section, we prove Lemma 2.1.

PROOF. Let  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$  and write  $f_\lambda$  as a power series

$$f_\lambda(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a_n(\lambda) x^n.$$

The first two derivatives of  $f_\lambda$  are given by

$$f'_\lambda(x) = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} \cos(\lambda \arcsin x)$$

and

$$f''_\lambda(x) = \frac{x}{1-x^2} \frac{\lambda \cos(\lambda \arcsin x)}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} - \frac{\lambda^2}{1-x^2} \sin(\lambda \arcsin x).$$

Hence  $f_\lambda$  is a solution on  $(-1, 1)$  of the differential equation

$$(1-x^2)f''_\lambda - x f'_\lambda + \lambda^2 f_\lambda = 0.$$

Therefore, the Taylor coefficients of  $f_\lambda$  verify the recurrence relation

$$(n+2)(n+1)a_{n+2}(\lambda) - n(n-1)a_n(\lambda) - \lambda^2 a_n(\lambda) = 0$$

which can be re-expressed as

$$a_{n+2}(\lambda) = \frac{n^2 - \lambda^2}{(n+2)(n+1)} a_n(\lambda) \tag{2}$$

with initial conditions

$$\begin{cases} a_0(\lambda) &= 0 \\ a_1(\lambda) &= \lambda \end{cases}.$$

Given that  $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ , a trivial induction shows that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, a_n(\lambda) \geq 0.$$

□

Recursion (2) also proves that the roots of the polynomials  $a_n(\lambda)$  are located at  $0, \pm 1, \dots, \pm n$  and are given by the polynomials  $\tilde{P}_n(\lambda)$  [2, eq. 4.23], as also conjectured by Hirschfeld.

### References

- [1] Michel Deza and Monique Laurent. *Geometry of Cuts and Metrics*. 1997.
- [2] B. Hirschfeld. Approximative Lösungen des Max-Cut-Problems mit semidefiniten Programmen. 2004.
- [3] Andrew Lucas. Ising formulations of many NP problems. *Frontiers in Physics*, 2, 2014.
- [4] Yu Nesterov. Semidefinite relaxation and nonconvex quadratic optimization. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 9(1-3):141–160, 1998.
- [5] I. J. Schoenberg. Positive definite functions on spheres. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 9(1):96 – 108, 1942.