

# EMBEDDING DIVISOR AND SEMI-PRIME TESTABILITY IN $f$ -VECTORS OF POLYTOPES

ERAN NEVO

ABSTRACT. We obtain computational hardness results for  $f$ -vectors of polytopes by exhibiting reductions of the problems DIVISOR and SEMI-PRIME TESTABILITY to problems on  $f$ -vectors of polytopes. Further, we show that the corresponding problems for  $f$ -vectors of simplicial polytopes are polytime solvable. The regime where we prove this computational difference (conditioned on standard conjectures on the density of primes and on  $P \neq NP$ ) is when the dimension  $d$  tends to infinity and the number of facets is linear in  $d$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The  $f$ -vector  $(f_0(P), f_1(P), \dots, f_{d-1}(P))$  of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  records the number of faces  $P$  has:  $f_i(P)$  faces in dimension  $i$ . The  $f$ -vectors of polytopes of dimension at most 3 were characterized by Steinitz, and the conditions, which are linear equalities and inequalities on the entries of the  $f$ -vector, are then easy to check; see e.g. [7, Sec.10.3]. In contrast, the  $f$ -vectors of  $d$ -polytopes for  $d \geq 4$  are not well understood; see e.g. [7, Sec.10.4] and the fatness parameter [17] for  $d = 4$ , while the case  $d > 4$  is even less understood. The set of  $f$ -vectors of the important subfamily of *simplicial* polytopes is characterized by the  $g$ -theorem, conjectured by McMullen [9] and proved by Stanley [14] and Billera-Lee [3]. While this well-understood set may be regarded as complicated from some viewpoints (e.g. it is not a semi-algebraic set of lattice points, for any  $d \geq 6$ , see [13]), yet deciding membership in it is computationally easy, see [10, Thm.1.4]. The analogous computational problem for the set of  $f$ -vectors of  $d$ -polytopes is unsolved, see [10, Problem 1.5], and we conjecture it to be NP-hard. It is known to be decidable in time double exponential in the input size.

We exhibit two variants of the above membership problem and show that they are computationally hard for  $f$ -vectors of polytopes (given standard conjectures in complexity theory), but are efficiently solvable for  $f$ -vectors of simplicial polytopes.

**Problem 1.1.** (Fiber Count) Given  $d$ , a subset of integers  $S \subseteq [0, d - 1]$ , and values  $f_i$  for all  $i \in S$ , let  $\text{fc} = \text{fc}(d, (f_i)_{i \in S})$  be the number of

---

Partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation grant ISF-2480/20 and by ISF-BSF joint grant 2016288.

$f$ -vectors of  $d$ -polytopes with the given values for the  $S$ -coordinates. What is the computational complexity:

- (i) of computing  $fc$  as a function of the input size  $N$ ?
- (ii) of deciding whether  $fc = 1$ ?

The problem of computing the number of divisors of a given integer, or even of deciding if a given integer is the product of exactly two primes (Semiprime Testability), is believed to be as hard as FACTORING, namely, as factoring the integer into a product of primes; see e.g. Terry Tao's answer at MathOverflow [12]. From a structural result of McMullen on  $d$ -polytopes with  $d + 2$  facets [8], specialized to the case  $f_0 = 2d + 1$  (see also [11]), we conclude:

**Lemma 1.2.** (i) *The number of  $f$ -vectors of  $d$ -polytopes with  $f_0 = 2d + 1$  and  $f_{d-1} = d + 2$  equals  $\lceil \frac{D(d)}{2} \rceil$ , where  $D(d)$  is the number of divisors of  $d$  in the interval  $[2, d - 1]$ .*

(ii) *In particular,  $fc(d, f_0 = 2d + 1, f_{d-1} = d + 2) = 1$  iff  $d$  is either a semiprime or equals  $p^3$  for some prime  $p$ .*

As a corollary, we can reduce Semiprime Testability to a decision problem on fiber count, namely Problem 1.1(ii). Here the bit length of the input is  $O(\log d)$ , while the full  $f$ -vector clearly has bit length of size  $\Omega(d)$  (in fact  $\Omega(d \log d)$ ). Nevertheless, the corresponding problem for  $f$ -vectors of simplicial polytopes can be solved efficiently:

Let  $fc_s = fc_s(d, (f_i)_{i \in S})$  be the number of  $f$ -vectors of *simplicial*  $d$ -polytopes with the given values for the  $S$ -coordinates.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Given as input positive integers  $d, a, b$  of total bit length  $O(\log d)$ , and  $b$  of order  $O(d)$ :*

(i) *It can be decided in  $\text{polylog}(d)$ -time whether  $fc_s(d, f_0 = a, f_{d-1} = b) = 1$ .*

(ii) *Deciding whether  $fc(d, f_0 = a, f_{d-1} = b) = 1$  is at least as hard as Semiprime Testability for  $d$ .*

The problem DIVISOR, asking whether given three integers  $L < U < d$ ,  $d$  has a divisor in the interval  $[L, U]$ , is believed to be NP-complete, see e.g. Sudan's survey [15]. In fact, it is NP-complete if for any large enough real number  $x$  there exists a prime in the interval  $[x, x + \text{polylog}(x)]$ , see e.g. Peter Shor and Boaz Barak answers at StackExchange [4] to a question by Michaël Cadilhac. Cramér conjecture [5, 6] implies that for any  $\epsilon > 0$  the interval  $[x, x + (1 + \epsilon) \log^2(x)]$  suffices for  $x$  large enough. DIVISOR remains NP-complete if we require  $\sqrt{d} \in [L, U]$  (under the assumption above on the existence of primes in short intervals), by a reduction from a variant of SUBSET SUM of real numbers where the target sum is approximately *half* the sum of all input numbers.

**Lemma 1.4.** *Given three integers  $L < U < d$ , with  $\sqrt{d} \in [L, U]$ , denote  $M = M(L, U, d) = \max(L + \frac{d}{L}, U + \frac{d}{U})$ . Then there exists a*

divisor  $x$  of  $d$  such that  $L \leq x \leq U$  iff there exists a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  whose  $f$ -vector satisfies  $f_0(P) = 2d + 1$ ,  $f_{d-1}(P) = d + 2$  and  $f_1(P) \in [d^2 + \frac{d}{2}(1 + d - M), d^2 + \frac{d}{2}(1 + d - 2\sqrt{d})]$ .

Again, we show that the corresponding problem for simplicial polytopes is polytime-solvable, despite the fact that the input is of size logarithmic in  $d$ , the number of coordinates in the  $f$ -vector. Combined, it read as follows.

**Theorem 1.5.** *Given as input positive integers  $d, a, b, L, U$  of total bit length  $O(\log d)$ , such that  $L \leq U$  and  $b$  is of order  $O(d)$ , then:*

(i) *It can be decided in  $\text{polylog}(d)$ -time whether there exists a simplicial  $d$ -polytope  $P$  whose  $f$ -vector satisfies  $f_0(P) = a$ ,  $f_{d-1}(P) = b$  and  $f_1(P) \in [L, U]$ .*

(ii) *Deciding whether there exists a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  whose  $f$ -vector satisfies  $f_0(P) = a$ ,  $f_{d-1}(P) = b$  and  $f_1(P) \in [L, U]$  is at least as hard as DIVISOR for  $d$ .*

Let us remark that Sjöberg and Ziegler characterized the pairs  $(n, m)$  such that there exists a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  with  $(f_0(P), f_{d-1}(P)) = (n, m)$  for even  $d$  in the regime  $n + m \geq \binom{3d+1}{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor}$  (and they proved similar but weaker results for  $d$  odd); however our interest is in the regime  $m+n \in O(d)$  where the behaviour is different and not well understood.

**Outline.** Section 2 sets notation and collects the background results we need on  $f$ -vectors of polytopes. In Section 3 we prove the computational hardness results above, for general polytopes, namely Theorems 1.3(ii) and 1.5(ii). In Section 4 we prove the computational efficiency results above, for simplicial polytopes, namely, Theorems 1.3(i) and 1.5(i). Section 5 ends with open problems.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

For the basics on face enumeration and on polytopes needed here we refer to e.g. the textbooks by Grünbaum [7] and Ziegler [16].

**2.1. Faces of polytopes.** A  $d$ -polytope is a polytope of dimension  $d$ . Its faces of dimension  $k$  are called  $k$ -faces. Faces of dimension 0, 1,  $d-1$  are called *vertices*, *edges*, *facets*, respectively. A polytope is *simplicial* if all its proper faces are simplices.

Denote by  $f_k(P)$  the number of  $k$ -faces of a  $d$ -polytope  $P$ . The  $f$ -vector of  $P$  is  $f(P) = (1 = f_{-1}(P), f_0(P), f_1(P), \dots, f_{d-1}(P))$ .

The following lower bound result of McMullen is crucial for our computational hardness results: let

$$\Phi_j(v, d) = \min\{f_j(P) : P \text{ is a } d\text{-polytope, } f_0(P) = v\}$$

**Theorem 2.1.** [8, Thm.2]

- (1)  $\Phi_{d-1}(d+1, d) = d+1$ , achieved by the  $d$ -simplex only.

- (2) If  $d + 2 \leq v \leq \lfloor \frac{d(d+8)}{4} \rfloor$ , then either (i)  $\Phi_{d-1}(v, d) = d + 2$ , and a  $d$ -polytope that achieves this must be of the form  $T^{r,s,t} :=$  a  $t$ -fold pyramid over the cartesian product of an  $r$ -simplex and an  $s$ -simplex. Thus  $v = (r + 1)(s + 1) + t$ ,  $d = r + s + t$ ,  $t \geq 0$  and  $r, s \geq 1$  for some integers  $r, s, t$  in this case. (ii) Or else,  $\Phi_{d-1}(v, d) = d + 3$ .

**2.2. Face numbers of simplicial polytopes.** Assume that the  $d$ -polytope  $P$  is *simplicial*. Then the  $f$ -vector and  $h$ -vector of  $P$  determine each other by a polynomial equation in the ring  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ :

$$\sum_{i=0}^d f_{i-1} x^{d-i} = \sum_{i=0}^d h_i (x+1)^{d-i}.$$

Define the  $g$ -vector  $g(P) = (g_0, \dots, g_{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor})$  by setting  $g_0 = 1$  and  $g_i = h_i - h_{i-1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$ . The celebrated  $g$ -theorem [3, 14] asserts:

**Theorem 2.2.** (*g-theorem*)  $f = (1, f_0, \dots, f_{d-1})$  is the  $f$ -vector of a simplicial  $d$ -polytope iff

(i) the corresponding  $h$ -vector satisfies Dehn-Sommerville relations:  $h_i = h_{d-i}$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$ ; and

(ii) the corresponding  $g$ -vector is an  $M$ -sequence, namely  $0 \leq g_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$  and it satisfies Macaulay inequalities  $g_i^{\langle i \rangle} \geq g_{i+1}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor d/2 \rfloor - 1$ .

### 3. REDUCTIONS

Here we prove our computational hardness results, Theorems 1.3(ii) and 1.5(ii), via Lemmas 1.2 and 1.4 resp.

As observed in [11], plugging  $v = 2d + 1$  into Theorem 2.1 gives the following, as then  $d = sr$ .

- Corollary 3.1.** (1) If  $d$  is a prime then  $\Phi_{d-1}(2d + 1, d) = d + 3$ .  
 (2) If  $d$  is the product of exactly two primes, or equals a prime cubed, then  $\Phi_{d-1}(2d + 1, d) = d + 2$ , achieved by a unique minimizer polytope.  
 (3) If  $d$  is the product of more than two primes, and not a prime cubed, then  $\Phi_{d-1}(2d + 1, d) = d + 2$ , and is achieved by  $\lceil \frac{D}{2} \rceil > 1$  minimizer polytopes, where  $D$  is the number of divisors of  $d$  in the interval  $[2, d - 1]$ . Each of these minimizers have a different number of edges, hence a different  $f$ -vector.

The only part of Corollary 3.1 that is not immediate from Theorem 2.1 is the claim on the different  $f_1$  in part (3). However, a routine computation gives that

$$f_1(T^{r,s,t}) = d^2 + \frac{d(t+1)}{2}$$

in this case (which is indeed an integer!), hence fixing  $f_1$  determines  $t$  which in turn determines  $r$  and  $s$  as  $rs = d$  and  $r + s = d - t$ .

Lemma 1.2 immediately follows. Theorem 1.3(ii) follows by plugging  $a = 2d + 1$  and  $b = d + 2$ , and recalling that deciding if a given  $d$  equals a prime cubed is polytime solvable: first one checks if  $d^{1/3}$  is an integer in  $O((\log d)^{1+\epsilon})$ -time (for any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ ), see e.g. [2], and if the answer is Yes, then one checks primality of  $d^{1/3}$  in  $O(\text{polylog}(d))$ -time by [1].

To prove Lemma 1.4 we use again the expression for  $f_1(T^{r,s,t})$ : recall we assume that  $\sqrt{d} \in [L, U]$ . Note that the function  $x \mapsto x + \frac{d}{x}$  has a unique extremal point for  $x \geq 0$ , which is a local minimum, at  $x = \sqrt{d}$ . Thus, there exists a divisor  $r$  of  $d$  with  $L \leq r \leq U$  iff there exists  $T^{r,s,t}$  with  $d - t = r + s = r + \frac{d}{r} \in [2\sqrt{d}, M]$  for  $M = M(d, L, U) := \max\{L + \frac{d}{L}, U + \frac{d}{U}\}$ , equivalently with  $t \in [d - M, d - 2\sqrt{d}]$ . This happens, using Corollary 3.1, iff there exists a  $d$ -polytope  $P$  with  $f_0(P) = 2d + 1$ ,  $f_{d-1}(P) = d + 2$  and  $f_1(P) \in [d^2 + \frac{d}{2}(1 + d - M), d^2 + \frac{d}{2}(1 + d - 2\sqrt{d})]$ ; as claimed.

As before, Theorem 1.5(ii) follows from the case  $a = 2d + 1$  and  $b = d + 2$ .

#### 4. EFFICIENT COMPUTATIONS FOR SIMPLICIAL POLYTOPES

Here we prove our computational efficiency results, Theorems 1.3(i) and 1.5(i) using the  $g$ -theorem.

By a direct computation, the number of facets is expressed in terms of the  $g$ -vector as follows: for  $d = 2k$  even

$$f_{d-1} = (d + 1) + (d - 1)g_1 + (d - 3)g_2 + \dots + 3g_{k-1} + g_k,$$

and for  $d = 2k + 1$  odd

$$f_{d-1} = (d + 1) + (d - 1)g_1 + (d - 3)g_2 + \dots + 4g_{k-1} + 2g_k.$$

Now, combined with the  $g$ -theorem, if  $f_{d-1}(P) = b \in O(d)$  then there exists a constant  $C > 0$  s.t.  $g_i(P) = 0$  for all  $i > C$  and  $0 \leq g_i(P) \leq C$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor d/2 \rfloor$ ; hence, there are only finitely many potential  $g$ -vectors to check. In each of them the Macaulay inequalities  $g_i^{\langle i \rangle} \geq g_{i+1}$  need to be checked only for  $i < C$ , so each such inequality is checked in constant time. Altogether, in constant time all the  $g$ -vectors whose  $f_{d-1}$  equals  $b$  are found.

In particular, one checks in constant time if there exists exactly one such  $g$ -vector; this proves Theorem 1.3(i).

Now, for each  $g$ -vector which passed the test above we compute  $f_1 = g_2 + dg_1 + \binom{d+1}{2}$  in  $O(\text{polylog}(d))$ -time and then check whether  $f_1 \in [L, U]$  in  $O(\log(d))$ -time, proving Theorem 1.5(i).

## 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

For fixed dimension we conjecture the following, which may be viewed as an explanation why when  $d \geq 4$  the  $f$ -vectors of  $d$ -polytopes are poorly understood.

**Conjecture 5.1.** *Let  $d \geq 4$  be fixed. Then it is NP-hard to decide if a given  $N$ -bit vector  $f = (1, f_0, \dots, f_{d-1})$  of positive integers is the  $f$ -vector of a  $d$ -polytope.*

Regarding the computational efficiency results,

**Problem 5.2.** Can the assumption  $b \in O(d)$  in Theorems 1.3(i) and 1.5(i) be dropped and the same conclusions there hold?

This means  $b$  is polynomial (rather than linear) in  $d$ , as the entire input is of size  $O(\log d)$ .

**Acknowledgements.** I deeply thank Nathan Keller for pointing me to [2] and [12], and to Guillermo Pineda Villavicencio for helpful comments on an earlier version.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Manindra Agrawal, Neeraj Kayal, and Nitin Saxena. PRIMES is in P. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 160(2):781–793, 2004.
- [2] Daniel J. Bernstein. Detecting perfect powers in essentially linear time. *Math. Comp.*, 67(223):1253–1283, 1998.
- [3] Louis J. Billera and Carl W. Lee. A proof of the sufficiency of McMullen’s conditions for  $f$ -vectors of simplicial convex polytopes. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory*, 31(3):237–255, 1981.
- [4] asked: M. Cadilhac, answered: B. Barak, and P. Shor. An np-complete variant of factoring. *Stack Exchange*, <https://cstheory.stackexchange.com/questions/4769/an-np-complete-variant-of-factoring>, 2011.
- [5] H. Cramér. On the order of magnitude of the difference between consecutive prime numbers. *Acta Arith.*, 2:396–403, 1936.
- [6] Andrew Granville. Harald Cramér and the distribution of prime numbers. Number 1, pages 12–28. 1995. Harald Cramér Symposium (Stockholm, 1993).
- [7] Branko Grünbaum. *Convex polytopes*, volume 221 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2003. Prepared and with a preface by Volker Kaibel, Victor Klee and Günter M. Ziegler.
- [8] P. McMullen. The minimum number of facets of a convex polytope. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 3:350–354, 1971.
- [9] P. McMullen. The numbers of faces of simplicial polytopes. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 9:559–570, 1971.
- [10] Eran Nevo. Complexity yardsticks for  $f$ -vectors of polytopes and spheres. *Disc. Comput. Geom.*, online first 2019.
- [11] Guillermo Pineda-Villavicencio, Julien Ugon, and David Yost. Lower bound theorems for general polytopes. *European J. Combin.*, 79:27–45, 2019.
- [12] asked: . Rune and answered: T. Tao. How hard is it to compute the number of prime factors of a given integer? *Math Overflow*, <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/3820/how-hard-is-it-to-compute-the-number-of-prime-factors-of-a-given-integer/10062#10062>, 2009.

- [13] Hannah Sjöberg and Günter M. Ziegler. Semi-algebraic sets of  $f$ -vectors. *arXiv.1711.01864*, 2017.
- [14] Richard P. Stanley. The number of faces of a simplicial convex polytope. *Advances in Mathematics*, 35(3):236–238, 1980.
- [15] Madhu Sudan. The p vs. np problem. available at <http://people.csail.mit.edu/madhu/papers/2010/pnp.pdf>, 2010.
- [16] Günter M. Ziegler. *Lectures on polytopes*, volume 152 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [17] Günter M. Ziegler. Face numbers of 4-polytopes and 3-spheres. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. III (Beijing, 2002)*, pages 625–634. Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002.