

**BIT-COMPLEXITY ESTIMATES IN GEOMETRIC  
PROGRAMMING, AND APPLICATION TO THE  
POLYNOMIAL-TIME COMPUTATION OF THE SPECTRAL  
RADIUS OF NONNEGATIVE TENSORS**

S. FRIEDLAND AND S. GAUBERT

ABSTRACT. We show that the spectral radius of nonnegative tensors can be approximated within  $\varepsilon$  error in polynomial time. This implies that the maximum of a nonnegative homogeneous  $d$ -form in the unit ball with respect to  $d$ -Hölder norm can be approximated in polynomial time. These results are deduced by establishing bit-size estimates for the near-minimizers of functions given by suprema of finitely many log-Laplace transforms of discrete nonnegative measures on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Hence, some known upper bounds for the clique number of hypergraphs are polynomially computable.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Motivation.** Multidimensional arrays with  $d \geq 3$  indices, which are natural generalization of matrices  $d = 2$ , are ubiquitous in data science [18], machine learning [12], DNA analysis [22], mathematics [13], numerical analysis [17], optimal transport [4], quantum information [5], as well as other fields. Many computational problems, concerning tensors, are NP-hard [11].

In this paper we show that the spectral radius of partially symmetric, weakly irreducible tensor [6] is polynomially computable within precision of  $\varepsilon > 0$ , in the Turing model of computation. In particular, an  $\varepsilon$ -approximation of the maximum of a nonnegative  $d$ -homogeneous form in the unit ball with respect to  $d$ -Hölder norm is polynomially computable. These results apply to higher-order Markov chains [21], first eigenvalue of nonnegative symmetric tensor [3] and spectral radius of  $d$ -uniform weighted hypergraphs [25, 24, 27]. To prove these results, we show that a basic problem in geometric programming, consisting in finding an  $\varepsilon$ -minimizer of a function given as the supremum of a finite number of log-Laplace transforms of discrete nonnegative measures on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  can be found in polynomial-time.

Whereas it is generally understood that geometric programs are “easy”, being a remarkable subclass of convex programs, proving that a specific geometric program is actually polynomial-time solvable in the Turing model of computation requires to establish bit-length estimates. Such estimates

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C50,05C65,15A69,68W25.

*Key words and phrases.* Nonnegative tensors, spectral radius, minimum of convex functions, spectral radius and clique number of hypergraphs .

for a different class of geometric programs were recently obtained using other methods in [15] — in which applications are also given. It is also interesting here to keep in mind the analogy with semi-definite programming, in which only “well conditioned” problems are known to be polynomial-time solvable [32]. We hope that our results will be applied to other interesting problems.

**1.2. Short summary of the paper content.** In Section 2, we discuss the notion of a nonnegative homogeneous polynomial of degree  $d$ , and its maximum in the unit ball with respect to the  $p$ -Hölder norm; nonnegative homogeneous maps of  $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ ; the spectral radius  $\rho(\mathbf{F})$  of such maps; the Collatz-Wielandt characterization of  $\rho(\mathbf{F})$ , the notion of weak irreducibility of  $\mathbf{F}$ ; the minimization of the maximum of convex function  $f(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{i \in [N]} f_i(\mathbf{x})$ , with  $[N] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ , where each  $f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_i} f_{\mathbf{a}} \exp(\mathbf{a}_i^\top \mathbf{x})$ , and each  $f_{\mathbf{a}}$  is positive; generalizations to quasi-homogeneous polynomials and maps.

In Section 3, we discuss the coercivity of  $f(\mathbf{x})$ : necessary and sufficient conditions for  $f$  to have compact sublevel sets:  $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq t$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . In Section 4, we discuss various properties of  $K_{\min}(f)$ : the set of the minimal points of  $f$  under the coerciveness condition.

In Section 5, we introduce a compact convex set  $K(f, R) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  and its needed properties.

Section 6 is the main technical section of this paper, where we prove the polynomial complexity of computing  $f_{\min}$ : the minimum of  $f$ . After introducing a lift variable, this turns out to be equivalent to minimizing a linear function over  $K(f, R)$ . Then, by applying the classical ellipsoid method, elaborated in [10], we prove our result.

In Section 7, we show the polynomial time approximability of  $\rho(\mathbf{F})$ . To establish this result, we exploit the coerciveness of the function  $f(\mathbf{w})$ ,  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{n+1})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  restricted to the  $n$ -dimensional subspace  $w_{n+1} = 0$ .

Section 8 discusses applications of our results to the following cases. In Subsections 8.2 and 8.3 we show that the maximum  $\mu_d(g)$  is polynomially computable. Subsection 8.4 discusses the spectral radius of uniform hypergraphs. Proposition 8.5 gives a lower bound on the spectral radius of uniform hypergraphs using the clique number of the hypergraphs. This bound is closely related to the bounds in [24, 27]. Since the spectral radius of uniform hypergraph is polynomially computable, the above bound gives a computable upper bound for the clique number of a hypergraph. Subsection 8.5 shows polynomial computability of the spectral radius of weakly irreducible nonnegative quasi-homogeneous maps, and  $\mu_d(g)$  of  $d$ -quasi-homogeneous form. Subsection 8.6 shows the polynomial computability of  $\mu_p(g)$  for  $p \geq d + 1$  for  $d$ -quasi-homogeneous form.

## 2. NOTATIONS AND PRELIMINARY RESULTS

**2.1. Cone of homogeneous polynomials.** Denote by  $P_+(d, n+1)$  the cone of homogeneous polynomials of degree  $d$  in  $n+1$  real variables with nonnegative coefficients. Assume that  $g(\mathbf{x})$  is a nonnegative  $d$ -form, i.e.,  $\in P_+(d, n+1)$ , and consider the maximization problem:

$$(2.1) \quad \mu_p(g) := \max_{\|\mathbf{z}\|_p \leq 1} g(\mathbf{z}), \quad p \in [1, \infty].$$

(Here  $\|(z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})^\top\|_p = (\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} |z_i|^p)^{1/p}$  is the  $\ell_p$  norm for  $p \in [1, \infty]$ .) Clearly, the maximum is achieved for  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{n+1})^\top \geq \mathbf{0}$  and  $\|\mathbf{w}\|_p = 1$ . Observe that  $\mu_\infty(g) = g(\mathbf{1})$ . In this paper we will study the case  $p \in [1, \infty)$ .

Note that the function  $g(\mathbf{z})\|\mathbf{z}\|_p^{-d}$  has a maximum at  $\mathbf{w}$ . Hence, [19, 16]

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{1}{d} \nabla \phi(\mathbf{w}) = g(\mathbf{w}) w_i^{p-1}, \quad i \in [n+1], \quad \mathbf{w} \geq 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} w_i^p = 1, \quad p \in (1, \infty).$$

(See for more details Subsection 8.1.)

The classical case is  $d = p = 2$ . Then  $g(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{z}^\top A \mathbf{z}$ , where  $A$  is a nonnegative symmetric matrix of order  $n+1$ . In this case  $\mu_2(g) = \rho(A)$ , the spectral radius of  $A$ . If all the entries of  $A$  are rational numbers, then, an  $\varepsilon$ -approximation of the spectral radius of  $A$  can be obtained in a time that is polynomial in the input size and in  $|\log \varepsilon|$ , see e.g. [28].

It is known that for  $d = 2$  and  $p = 1$  the value of  $\mu_1(\mathbf{z}^\top A \mathbf{z})$  can be NP-hard to compute. For example, the classical result of Motzkin-Straus [20], claims that if  $A$  is the adjacency matrix of a simple undirected graph  $G$  on  $n+1$  vertices with the clique size  $\omega(G)$ , then

$$(2.3) \quad \mu_1(\mathbf{z}^\top A \mathbf{z}) = 1 - \frac{1}{\omega(G)}.$$

Proposition 8.2 shows that  $\mu_p(g)$  can be NP-hard to compute for some  $g \in P_+(d, n+1)$ , where  $p \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $d = 2mp$  for  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .

One of the aims of this paper is to show that if  $g$  is a nonnegative  $d$ -form with rational coefficients then  $\mu_d(g)$ , can be  $\varepsilon$ -approximated in polynomial time in the coefficients of  $g$  and  $\varepsilon$ . This result applies to the spectral radius of weighted  $d$ -uniform hypergraphs on  $[n+1] = \{1, \dots, n+1\}$  vertices. Assume that  $d \in [n+1]$ . Denote by  $2_d^{[n+1]}$  the set of all subsets of  $[n+1]$  of cardinality  $d$ . For  $\mathcal{E} \subset 2_d^{[n+1]}$  let  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}) = ([n+1], \mathcal{E})$  be a  $d$ -uniform hypergraph on  $n+1$  vertices, with the set of edges  $\mathcal{E}$  [25]. Attach a positive weight  $w_{\{i_1, \dots, i_d\}}$  to  $\{i_1, \dots, i_d\} \in \mathcal{E}$ . Then the weighted  $d$ -uniform hypergraph induces a nonnegative  $d$ -multilinear form

$$(2.4) \quad g(\mathbf{z}) = d! \sum_{\{i_1, \dots, i_d\} \in \mathcal{E}} w_{\{i_1, \dots, i_d\}} z_{i_1} \cdots z_{i_d}.$$

We call  $\mu_d(g)$  the *spectral radius of weighted  $d$ -uniform hypergraph*  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E})$ . We show that if all  $w_{\{i_1, \dots, i_d\}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{++} = \{q \in \mathbb{Q}, q > 0\}$  then  $\mu_d(g)$  can be  $\varepsilon$ -approximated in polynomial time.

**2.2. Homogeneous polynomial maps.** Consider a polynomial map  $\mathbf{F} = (F_1, \dots, F_{n+1})^\top : \mathbb{C}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ , where each  $F_i(\mathbf{z})$  is a homogeneous polynomial of degree  $d-1 \in \mathbb{N}$ . Recall that  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{F}$  if there exists a nonzero vector  $\mathbf{u}$ , called an eigenvector such that

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}) = \lambda \mathbf{u}^{\circ(d-1)}, \quad \mathbf{u}^{\circ(d-1)} = (u_1^{d-1}, \dots, u_{n+1}^{d-1})^\top.$$

Assume that each  $F_i$  has nonnegative coefficients. We call such  $\mathbf{F}$  a nonnegative map. Then  $\mathbf{F}$  has a nonnegative eigenvalue, denoted by  $\rho(\mathbf{F})$ , with a corresponding nonnegative eigenvector, such that any eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{F}$  satisfies the inequality  $\rho(\mathbf{F}) \geq |\lambda|$ . The Collatz-Wielandt formula (see [6, (3.10)], and also [29]):

$$(2.6) \quad \rho(\mathbf{F}) = \inf_{\mathbf{z} > \mathbf{0}} \max_{i \in [n+1]} \frac{F_i(\mathbf{z})}{z_i^{d-1}}.$$

With a nonnegative  $\mathbf{F}$  we denote by  $\vec{G}(\mathbf{F})$  the following digraph on the set of vertices  $[n+1]$  with the set of diedges  $D \subset [n+1] \times [n+1]$ : The diedge  $\vec{i}j$  is in  $D$  if and only if  $\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j}(\mathbf{z}) > 0$  for each  $\mathbf{z} > \mathbf{0}$ . We say  $\mathbf{F}$  is *weakly irreducible* if the digraph  $\vec{G}(\mathbf{F})$  is strongly connected. Assume that  $\mathbf{F}$  is weakly irreducible. Then  $\rho(\mathbf{F}) > 0$ , and it has a unique positive eigenvector  $\mathbf{z}$ . Furthermore,  $\rho(\mathbf{F})$  has the following min max and max min characterization [6, (3.13)]:

$$(2.7) \quad \rho(\mathbf{F}) = \min_{\mathbf{z} > \mathbf{0}} \max_{i \in [n+1]} \frac{F_i(\mathbf{z})}{z_i^{d-1}} = \max_{\mathbf{z} \geq \mathbf{0}} \min_{i \in [n+1], z_i > 0} \frac{F_i(\mathbf{z})}{z_i^{d-1}}.$$

Assume that each nonzero coefficient of  $F_i$  is a positive rational number. The aim of this paper is to show that the approximation of  $\rho(\mathbf{F})$  up to an accuracy  $\varepsilon > 0$  is polynomial in the bitsize of the input and in  $|\log \varepsilon|$ . To prove this result, we show a polynomial-time approximation result for a more general problem.

**2.3. Minimization a function given by the supremum of finitely many log-Laplace transforms of discrete nonnegative measures.** Let

$$(2.8) \quad f_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}) = \log \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}} f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}} \exp(\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x}),$$

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n, \quad f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}} > 0, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}.$$

The function  $f_{\mathcal{A}}$  is the logarithm of the Laplace transform of the (discrete) nonnegative measure  $\sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}} f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}} \exp(\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x}) \delta_{\mathbf{a}}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Log-Laplace transforms of nonnegative measure have been widely studied in large deviations theory and in convex geometry, see e.g. [30]. It is a standard result that  $f_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a

convex function. Indeed, this follows by a straightforward application of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, or this can be deduced along the lines of [14].

Assume that  $\mathcal{A}_j \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is a nonempty finite set for  $j \in [N]$ . Define the convex function

$$(2.9) \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{j \in [N]} f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}),$$

and consider the infimum problem

$$(2.10) \quad f_{\min} := \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n} f(\mathbf{x}).$$

We will show that the infimum problem 2.6 is a particular case of the above problem.

We say that  $f$  is *coercive* if the sublevel set  $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq t$  is compact in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . We next give a simple necessary and sufficient conditions for coerciveness:

$$(2.11) \quad \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x} \leq 0 \text{ for } \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j, j \in [N]\} = \{\mathbf{0}\}.$$

We show that a weakly irreducible  $\mathbf{F}$  corresponds to a coercive  $f$  on a subspace of codimension one.

The main result of this paper is to show that for a coercive  $f$ , the infimum (2.10) is achieved, and an  $\epsilon$ -approximation of its value together with an  $\epsilon$ -minimizer are polynomially computable, provided

$$(2.12) \quad \mathcal{A}_j \subset \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}_j} \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j, \quad j \in [N].$$

We remark that the assumption that  $f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$  can be replaced by  $f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{++}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$  respectively.

#### 2.4. Generalizations to quasi-homogeneous polynomials and maps.

For  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  let  $\mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{a}} = z_1^{a_1} \cdots z_{n+1}^{a_{n+1}}$ . We assume  $0^0 = 1$ . For a real  $d \geq 1$  denote

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(d, n+1) &= \{\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1})^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}, \|\mathbf{a}\|_1 = d\}, \\ \mathcal{L}'(d, n+1) &= \{\mathbf{0}\} \cup \left( \bigcup_{t \in [1, d]} \mathcal{L}(t, n+1) \right), \\ \mathcal{N}(d, n+1) &= \{\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1})^\top, \\ & a_i \in \{0\} \cup [1, d], i \in [n+1], \|\mathbf{a}\|_1 = d\}. \end{aligned}$$

A nonnegative quasi-homogeneous polynomial  $g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$  of degree  $d \geq 1$  is given by

$$(2.14) \quad g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} g_{\mathbf{a}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{a}}, \quad g_{\mathbf{a}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \geq 0, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathcal{N}(d, n+1),$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$  is a finite set. Observe that  $g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$  and  $\nabla g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathbf{z})$  are continuous on  $\mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ . Moreover for  $t \geq 0$  we have the equality  $g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}(t\mathbf{z}) = t^d g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}(\mathbf{z})$ . Let  $\mu_p(g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}})$  be defined by (2.1). We will show that if  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathbb{Q}^{n+1}$ , and the coefficients of  $g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$  are rational, then one can compute with  $\epsilon$ -precision  $\mu_d(g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}})$  for a rational  $d \geq 2$ .

A quasi-homogeneous polynomial map  $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  of degree  $d-1 > 0$  is given by

$$(2.15) \quad F_i(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i} F_{i,\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{a}}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i \subset \mathcal{L}(d-1, n+1), i \in [n+1].$$

We claim that the results established for the polynomial maps in Subsection 2.2 apply to this case too. Furthermore we show that for a rational  $p \geq d+1$ , and a quasi-homogeneous form of the form (2.14) of degree  $d \geq 2$  with rational coefficients, one can compute  $\mu_p(g)$  in polynomial time.

### 3. COERCIVENESS CONDITION

Denote

$$\mathbf{B}_p(\mathbf{o}, r) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{o}\|_p \leq r\}$$

a closed ball of radius  $r \geq 0$  centered at  $\mathbf{o}$  in  $\ell_p$  norm.

We set

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} t_{\min}(f) &:= \min\{\log f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}_j}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j, j \in [N]\}, \\ \nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) &= \min_{\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\infty}=1} \max\{\mathbf{a}^{\top} \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j, j \in [N]\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $f(\mathbf{y})$  be defined by (2.9). The following conditions are equivalent*

- (a) *The set  $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq t$  is compact for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .*
- (b) *The set  $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{0})$  is compact.*
- (c) *The condition (2.11) hold.*
- (d) *The convex hull of  $\cup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}_j$  contains a neighborhood of  $\mathbf{0}$ .*
- (e) *We have  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) > 0$  and*

$$(3.2) \quad f(\mathbf{x}) \geq t_{\min}(f) + \nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) \|\mathbf{x}\|_{\infty}.$$

*Proof.* (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b): Trivial

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c). Assume to the contrary that there exist  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  such that  $\mathbf{a}^{\top} \mathbf{x}_0 \leq 0$  for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j$  and  $j \in [N]$ . Then for each  $t > 0$  we have  $\mathbf{a}^{\top} (t\mathbf{x}_0) \leq 0$  for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j$  and  $j \in [N]$ . Therefore  $f(t\mathbf{x}_0) \leq f(\mathbf{0})$ . Hence the sublevel  $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{0})$  is not compact.

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (d). Assume that  $M = \sum_{j=1}^N |\mathcal{A}_j|$ . Let  $A = [a_{ik}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times M}$  where the columns of  $A$  are the vectors  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j$  for  $j \in [N]$ . Hence the system of inequalities  $\mathbf{a}^{\top} \mathbf{x} \leq 0, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j, j \in [N]$  is equivalent to  $A^{\top} \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{0}$ . Denote by  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  the polytope spanned by  $\cup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}_j$ . Assume that is either  $\mathbf{0} \notin K$  or  $\mathbf{0} \in \partial K$ . Then there exists  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  such that  $A^{\top} \mathbf{x}_0 \leq \mathbf{0}$ , which contradicts (2.11). Hence  $\mathbf{0}$  is in the relative interior of  $K$ . Assume that the dimension of  $K$  is less than  $n$ . As  $\mathbf{0} \in K$ , there exists  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  such that  $A^{\top} \mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ . This contradicts (2.11). Hence  $\dim K = n$ , and  $\mathbf{0}$  is an interior point of  $K$ .

(d)  $\Rightarrow$  (c). Assume to the contrary that there exists  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  such that  $A^{\top} \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{0}$ . As a neighborhood of  $\mathbf{0}$  is contained in  $K$ , there exists a

probability vector  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $A\mathbf{z} = r\mathbf{x}$  for some  $r > 0$ . Therefore  $\mathbf{z}^\top A^\top \mathbf{x} = r\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{x} > 0$  contradicting the assumption that  $A^\top \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{0}$ .

(c)  $\Rightarrow$  (e). Assume to the contrary that  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) \leq 0$ . Hence, there exists  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|\mathbf{x}_0\|_\infty = 1$  such that  $\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x}_0 \leq 0$  for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j$  and  $j \in [N]$ . This contradicts (c). Hence  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) > 0$ .

Assume that  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = r > 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) &\geq t_{\min}(f) + \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \max\{\mathbf{a}^\top((1/r)\mathbf{x}), \\ \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j, j \in [N]\} &\geq t_{\min}(f) + \nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

(e)  $\Rightarrow$  (a). Let  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . Clearly, if

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty > \frac{t - t_{\min}(f)}{\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)},$$

Then  $f(\mathbf{x}) > t$ . Hence  $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq t$  is a compact set. □

**Corollary 3.2.** *Assume that  $f$  is defined by (2.9) is coercive. Then the cardinality of the set  $\cup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}_j$  is at least  $n + 1$ .*

#### 4. MINIMAL POINTS

The Hessian of the log-Laplace transform of a nonnegative measure can be interpreted as the covariance matrix of a random variable with the same support as this measure (see e.g. proof of [30, Prop 7.2.1]). Hence, as soon as this support contains an affine generating family, this Hessian is positive definite. In particular, we have the following standard result.

**Lemma 4.1** (See e.g. [31, Prop. 1]). *The function  $f_{\mathcal{A}}$  is strictly convex if, and only if, the vectors  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}$  constitute an affine generating family of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .*

Denote by  $K_{\min}(f) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  the set of minimal points of  $f := f_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Then  $f$  does not achieve its minimum in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  if and only if  $K_{\min}(f) = \emptyset$ . The following is a standard property of the set of minimizers of a coercive and convex function.

**Lemma 4.2** ([33, Prop. 1.2 p. 35]). *Suppose that  $f$  is coercive. Then,  $K_{\min}(f)$  is a non-empty compact convex set.*

We now discuss the characterization of  $K_{\min}(f)$ . For each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  define the nonempty set  $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}) \subseteq [N]$ :

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}) &= f(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for } j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}), \\ f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}) &< f(\mathbf{x}) \text{ for } j \notin \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.3.** *Assume that  $K_{\min}(f) \neq \emptyset$ . Then  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K_{\min}(f)$  if and only if the following condition hold: the system of linear inequalities*

$$(4.2) \quad \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0)^\top \mathbf{y} < 0, j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}_0)$$

*has no solution.*

*Moreover, the following conditions are equivalent*

- (a) The dimension of  $K_{\min}(f)$  is at least 1.  
 (b) Assume that  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K_{\min}(f)$ . There exists  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  such that the inequality

$$(4.3) \quad \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0)^\top \mathbf{y} \leq 0, j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}_0)$$

holds. Furthermore, let

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}) = \{j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}_0), f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0)^\top \mathbf{y} = 0\}.$$

Then for each  $j \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y})$  one has the equality

$$(4.4) \quad \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{y} = 0, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j, j \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}).$$

More precisely,  $\dim K_{\min}(f) = d \geq 1$  if and only if the following conditions hold: For each  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K_{\min}(f)$  the set of  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  satisfying the condition (b) together with  $\mathbf{0}$  is a cone  $K(\mathbf{x}_0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  of dimension  $d$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K_{\min}(f)$ . Suppose to the contrary that there exists  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  that satisfies (4.2). Clearly,  $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$ . Take the directional derivative of each  $f_{\mathcal{A}_j}, j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}_0)$  at  $\mathbf{x}_0$  in the direction of  $\mathbf{y}$  to deduce that  $\mathbf{x}_0 \notin K_{\min}(f)$ , which contradicts our assumption.

Assume that the system of inequalities (4.2) is unsolvable. We claim that  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K_{\min}(f)$ . Assume to the contrary that there exists  $\mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $f(\mathbf{x}_1) < f(\mathbf{x}_0)$ . In particular,

$$\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_1) := \max\{f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_1), j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}_0)\} \leq f(\mathbf{x}_1) < f(\mathbf{x}_0).$$

Set  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0$ . The assumption that (4.2) is unsolvable means that there exists  $j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}_0)$  such that  $\nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0)^\top \mathbf{y} \geq 0$ . Consider the convex function  $g(t) = f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0 + t\mathbf{y})$ . Our assumption yields that  $g'(0) \geq 0$ . Since  $g(t)$  is smooth and convex we deduce that  $g'(t) \geq 0$  for  $t \geq 0$ . Hence  $f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_1) = g(1) \geq g(0) = f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0) = f(\mathbf{x}_0)$ , which contradicts our assumption that  $f(\mathbf{x}_1) < f(\mathbf{x}_0)$ .

Assume the assumption (b) of the Lemma. Then there exists  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K_{\min}(f)$  and  $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$  which satisfy (4.3) and (4.4). Let  $g_j(t) = f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0 + t\mathbf{y})$  for  $j \in [N]$ . Assume that  $j \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}_0) \setminus \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y})$ . Then  $h'_j(0) < 0$ . Therefore, there exists  $r > 0$  such that  $h_j(t) \leq h_j(0) = f(\mathbf{x}_0)$  for  $t \in [0, r]$ . Assume that  $j \notin \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}_0)$ . As  $f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0) < f(\mathbf{x}_0)$  for we can assume that  $r > 0$  is small enough so that  $h_j(t) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_0)$  for  $t \in [0, r]$ . The assumption that the system (4.2) is unsolvable implies that  $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y})$  is nonempty. The assumption (4.4) means that  $h_j(t) = f(\mathbf{x}_0)$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $j \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y})$ . Hence  $f(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}_0)$  for  $\mathbf{x} \in [\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_0 + r\mathbf{y}]$ , and  $\dim K_{\min} \geq 1$ .

To show part (a) of the lemma, it is enough to prove the last claim of the lemma. Assume now that  $\dim K_{\min}(f) = r \geq 1$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K_{\min}(f)$  let  $K(\mathbf{x}_0)$  be the cone generated by  $\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}_0$  for  $\mathbf{z} \in K_{\min}(f) \setminus \{\mathbf{x}_0\}$ . Clearly,  $\mathbf{y} \in K(\mathbf{x}_0) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  is of the form  $s(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x}_0)$  for some  $s > 0$  and  $\mathbf{z} \in rK_{\min}(f)$ . Without loss of generality we can consider all  $\mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$  of the above form where  $s = 1$ . It is straightforward to show that  $\mathbf{y}$  satisfies (4.3). Assume that  $j \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y})$ . Let  $h_j(t) = f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}_0 + t\mathbf{y})$ . As  $h_j(t) \leq h_j(0) =$



$f(\mathbf{x}_0)$ , and  $h'_j(0) = 0$  we deduce that  $h_j(t) = h_j(0)$  for  $t \in [0, 1]$ . Thus  $h_j(t)$  is not strictly convex. Apply Lemma 4.1 to deduce (4.4).

Vice versa, assume that for  $\mathbf{x}_0 \in K_{\min}(f)$  the set of  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  satisfying the condition (b) together with  $\mathbf{0}$  is a cone  $K(\mathbf{x}_0) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  of dimension  $d$ . Then the arguments in the beginning of proof of this lemma shows that  $\dim K_{\min}(f) \geq d$ . If  $\dim K_{\min}(f) > d$  we will deduce that  $\dim K(\mathbf{x}_0) > d$ , which contradicts our assumptions.  $\square$

It is easy to give an example showing that  $\dim K_{\min}(f)$  can take any value in  $\{0, \dots, n\}$  by taking each function  $f_{\mathcal{A}_j}$  to be affine, i.e.  $\mathcal{A}_j = \{\mathbf{a}_j\}$  for  $j \in [N]$ . In this case  $K_{\min}(f)$  is a polyhedron. For example,

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{\mathcal{A}_1} &= 0, f_{\mathcal{A}_{2i}} = -x_i - b_i, f_{\mathcal{A}_{2i+1}} = x_i - c_i, b_i \leq c_i, i \in [n] \\ f(\mathbf{x}) &= \max(0, -x_1 - b_1, \dots, x_n - c_n) \text{ for } \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\ K_{\min}(f) &= [b_1, c_1] \times \dots \times [b_n, c_n]. \end{aligned}$$

### 5. A BOUND ON $K_{\min}(f)$ FOR COERCIVE $f$

**Lemma 5.1.** *Assume that  $f$  is coercive. Let  $t_{\min}(f)$  and  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$  be defined by (3.1). Let*

$$(5.1) \quad R \geq \frac{f(\mathbf{0}) - t_{\min}(f)}{\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)}.$$

Then  $K_{\min}(f) \subseteq B_\infty(\mathbf{0}, R)$ .

*Proof.* Clearly,  $\min\{f(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \leq f(\mathbf{0})$ . Use (3.2) to deduce that  $f(\mathbf{x}) > f(\mathbf{0})$  for  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty > R$ . Hence,  $K_{\min}(f) \subseteq B_\infty(\mathbf{0}, R)$ .  $\square$

We now show that the expression  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$  can be computed by solving  $2n$  linear programs.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Assume that the condition (2.11) holds. For  $i \in [n]$  define*

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu_{i,+}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) &= \min\{t, \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x} - t \leq 0, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j, j \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \mathbf{x} &= (x_1, \dots, x_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n, x_i = 1, -1 \leq x_j \leq 1, j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}\}, \\ \nu_{i,-}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) &= \min\{t, \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x} - t \leq 0, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j, j \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \mathbf{x} &= (x_1, \dots, x_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n, x_i = -1, -1 \leq x_j \leq 1, j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}\}, \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$(5.3) \quad \nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) = \min_{i \in [n]} \min(\nu_{i,+}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N), \nu_{i,-}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)).$$

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\nu_{i,+}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) = \min_{x_i=1, -1 \leq x_j \leq 1, j \neq i} \max_{\mathbf{a} \in \cup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}_j} (\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x}).$$

We next observe that  $\nu_{i,+}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) \geq \nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$ . Indeed, the minimum in the characterization  $\nu_{i,+}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$  is stated for all  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = 1$ .

Similarly,  $\nu_{i,-}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) \geq \nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$ . Hence the left hand side of (5.3) is not bigger than the right hand side of (5.3).

Assume that the minimum  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$  is achieved at  $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*)^\top$ . Observe that  $\mathbf{x}_i^* \in \{-1, 1\}$  for some  $i \in [n]$ . Hence,  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) \in \{\nu_{i,-}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N), \nu_{i,+}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)\}$ .  $\square$

Observe that the characterization of  $\nu_{i,-}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$  and  $\nu_{i,+}(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$  are solution to linear programming problems. Hence their values are computable in polynomial time if  $\mathcal{A}_j \subset \mathbb{Q}^n$  for  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore, the value  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$  are computed in polynomial time.

In order to apply the ellipsoid method to the minimization of  $f$ , we next show that the latter problem is equivalent to the minimization of the ‘‘altitude’’  $t$  on a suitable compact convex section  $K(f, R)$  of the epigraph of  $f$ .

**Lemma 5.3.** *Assume that  $R \geq 0$ . Let*

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} a(f) &= \max\{\|\mathbf{a}\|_1, \mathbf{a} \in \cup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}_j\}, \\ t_{\max}(f, R) &= f(\mathbf{0}) + (a(f) + 1)R, \quad \bar{t}(f, R) = f(\mathbf{0}) + \frac{(a(f) + 1)R}{2}, \\ R_{\max} &= (a(f) + 1)R + f(\mathbf{0}) - t_{\min}(f), \\ K(f, R) &= \{(\mathbf{x}, t), \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in \mathbb{R}, f(\mathbf{x}) \leq t, \\ &\quad \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq R, t \leq t_{\max}(f, R)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then  $K(f, R)$  is a compact convex set satisfying

$$(5.5) \quad B_\infty((\mathbf{0}, \bar{t}(f, R)), R/2) \subset K(f, R) \subset B_\infty((\mathbf{0}, \bar{t}(f, R)), R_{\max}).$$

Assume that  $f$  is coercive, and  $R$  satisfies (5.1). Then

$$(5.6) \quad f_{\min} = \min\{t, (\mathbf{x}, t) \in K(f, R)\}.$$

*Proof.* Clearly,  $K(f, R)$  is compact. As  $f$  is convex it follows that  $K(f, R)$  is convex. Let  $f_{\mathcal{A}}$  be defined by (2.8). As  $\exp(\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x}) \leq \exp(\|\mathbf{a}\|_1 \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty)$  we deduce

$$f_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}) \leq f_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{0}) + \max\{\|\mathbf{a}\|_1, \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}\} \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty.$$

Combine the above inequality with (3.2) to deduce

$$(5.7) \quad t_{\min}(f) \leq f(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{0}) + a(f)R \text{ for } \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq R.$$

Assume that  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq R/2$ . The above inequality shows that  $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{0}) + a(f)R/2$ . Hence,

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq R/2, f(\mathbf{0}) + a(f)R/2 \leq t \leq t_{\max}(f, R) \Rightarrow (\mathbf{x}, t) \in K(f, R).$$

As

$$-R/2 \leq t - \bar{t}(f, R) \leq (a(f)/2 + 1)R$$

we deduce the first containment of (5.5). Assume next that  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq R$ . Then (5.7) yields that  $t_{\min}(f) \leq f(\mathbf{x}) \leq f(\mathbf{0}) + a(f)R$ . Thus, for  $(\mathbf{x}, t) \in K(f, R)$  we have the inequalities

$$-((a(f) + 1)R/2 + f(\mathbf{0}) - t_{\min}(f)) \leq t - \bar{t}(f, R) \leq (a(f) + 1)R/2.$$

This yields that second containment of (5.5).

We now show the characterization (5.6). The inequality (5.7) yields that for each  $\mathbf{x} \in B_\infty(\mathbf{0}, R)$  the point  $(\mathbf{x}, f(\mathbf{x})) \in K(f, R)$ . Clearly, for a fixed  $\mathbf{x} \in B_\infty(\mathbf{0}, R)$  the minimum of  $t$  in  $K(f, R)$  is  $f(\mathbf{x})$ . As  $R$  satisfies (5.1) we deduce (5.6).  $\square$

### 6. POLYNOMIAL TIME COMPUTATION OF $f_{\min}$

We denote by  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  the bit-length of a rational number. The main result of this section is:

**Theorem 6.1.** *Assume that the conditions (2.12) and (2.11) hold. Let  $f$  be defined by (2.9). Assume that  $\varepsilon$  is a given positive rational number. Then one can compute a rational number  $t^*$  in polynomial time in*

$$(6.1) \quad \langle \varepsilon \rangle + \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_k} \langle \mathbf{a} \rangle + \langle f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}_k} \rangle,$$

such that  $f_{\min} \in [t^* - \varepsilon, t^* + \varepsilon]$ .

The proof of this theorem is based on the ellipsoid method [10]. The main point in applying this result is to get an a priori bound on the approximate minimizers, and this will be done thanks to [?]. Our approach is partly inspired by the proof of [1, Theorem 15], concerning a special geometric program arising from entropy games, in which the bound on minimizers was obtained by an argument from Perron-Frobenius theory.

**6.1. Lower estimate of  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$ .** In this subsection we assume that  $f$  is coercive and

$$\mathcal{A}_j \subset \mathbb{Q}^n, f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}_j} \in \mathbb{Q}_{++} \text{ for } \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j, j \in [N].$$

Assume that the common denominators of all rational numbers in each coordinate of  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{A}_j$  and of  $f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}_j}$  for  $j \in [N]$  are positive integers  $D_1$  and  $D_2$  respectively. Set  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_j = D_1 \mathcal{A}_j, g_{\mathbf{a}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_j} = D_2 f_{\mathbf{a}, \mathcal{A}_j}$  for  $j \in [N]$ . Thus  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_j \in \mathbb{Z}^n, g_{\mathbf{a}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_j} \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbf{a} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_j$  for  $j \in [N]$ . Then for  $j \in [N]$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{x}) &= -\log D_2 + g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_j}(\mathbf{x}/D_1), \\ g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_j}(\mathbf{x}) &= \log \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_j} g_{\mathbf{a}, \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_j} \exp(\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $g(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{j \in [N]} g_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_j}(\mathbf{x})$  for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Clearly,  $g$  is coercive, and  $f_{\min} = -\log D_2 + g_{\min}$ . Thus, to find the complexity of  $f_{\min}$  we can assume without loss of generality that the condition (2.12) holds.

We next estimate from below  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$ .

**Lemma 6.2.** *Assume that  $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ . Suppose that the condition (2.11) holds. Let  $|\cup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}_j| = M (\geq n + 1)$ , and assume that*

$$(6.2) \quad \cup_{j=1}^N \mathcal{A}_j = \{\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_M\}, \quad \|\mathbf{b}_1\|_2^2 \geq \dots \geq \|\mathbf{b}_M\|_2^2.$$

Let  $\nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$  be defined by (3.1). Then

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) &\geq \frac{1}{\omega(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)}, \\ \omega(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N) &= \prod_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\|\mathbf{b}_i\|^2 + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Assume that

$$t^* = \nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_1) = \max_{\mathbf{b}_k, k \in [M]} \mathbf{b}_j^\top \mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*)^\top, \|\mathbf{x}^*\|_1 = 1.$$

We choose  $\mathbf{x}^*$  with the maximum coordinates equal to  $\pm 1$ . Recall that  $t^* > 0$ . Suppose that  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ . Then  $t^*$  is a positive integer, hence  $t^* \geq 1$ . Clearly, the inequality of (6.3) holds. We now assume that  $\mathbf{x}^*$  has a minimum number of coordinates  $l \in [n-1]$  which are not equal to  $\pm 1$ . Among all such  $\mathbf{x}^*$  we choose one for which the set  $\mathcal{I} = \{k \in [M], \mathbf{b}_k^\top \mathbf{x}^* = t^*\}$  is maximal. Let  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^l$  be the vector whose coordinates are all coordinates of  $\mathbf{x}^*$  that are not equal to  $\pm 1$ . Then  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{y}^\top, t^*)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{l+1}$  are satisfying  $|\mathcal{I}|$  linear equations of the form  $\mathbf{c}_k^\top \mathbf{y} - t^* = d_k$  for  $k \in \mathcal{I}$ . We claim that the system  $\mathbf{c}_k^\top \mathbf{w} - t = d_k$  for  $k \in \mathcal{I}$  has a unique solution  $(\mathbf{y}^\top, t^*)^\top$ . Otherwise there exists a nontrivial solution  $(\mathbf{w}, t) \in \mathbb{R}^{l+1}$  satisfying  $\mathbf{c}_k^\top \mathbf{w} - t = 0$  for  $k \in \mathcal{I}$ . If  $t \neq 0$  it is straightforward to deduce that  $t^* > \nu(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$ , which contradicts our assumption. Assume that  $t = 0$ . As  $\mathbf{w} \neq 0$  we deduce that either  $l$  is not minimal or  $\mathcal{I}$  is not maximal, contrary to our assumptions. Hence the system  $\mathbf{c}_k^\top \mathbf{w} - t = d_k$  for  $j \in \mathcal{I}$ . has a unique solution  $(\mathbf{y}, t^*)$ . Thus  $|\mathcal{I}| \geq l + 1$  and we can choose  $l + 1$  equation from the system  $\mathbf{c}_k^\top \mathbf{w} - t = d_k$  which gives the unique solution  $(\mathbf{y}, t^*)^\top$ . Next observe that  $d_k$  are integers and  $\mathbf{c}_k$  are obtained for  $\mathbf{a}_k$  by deleting the coordinates of  $\mathbf{a}_k$  corresponding to the coordinates of  $\mathbf{x}^*$  equal or  $\pm 1$ . Next we use Cramer's rule to determine the value of  $t^*$ . Note the  $t^* > 0$  is a quotient of two determinants with integer entries. As  $t^* > 0$  we can assume take the absolute values of these two determinants. Clearly the absolute value of the numerator is at least 1. The maximum value of the denominator is estimated from above by using the Hadamard determinant inequality on the rows of the denominator. Recall that each row of the denominator is a vector of the form  $(\mathbf{c}_k^\top, -1)$ . Note that

$$\|(\mathbf{c}_k^\top, -1)\|_2 = \sqrt{\|\mathbf{c}_k\|_2^2 + 1} \leq \sqrt{\|\mathbf{a}_k\|^2 + 1}.$$

Hence, the absolute value of the denominator is at most  $\omega(\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_N)$ . This proves the inequality in (6.3).  $\square$

In what follows we assume the nontrivial case

$$(6.4) \quad f(\mathbf{0}) > t_{\min}(f) (\Leftrightarrow \lceil f(\mathbf{0}) \rceil - \lfloor t_{\min}(f) \rfloor > 0).$$

(Otherwise  $f_{\min} = f(\mathbf{0}) = t_{\min}(f)$ .) In this case  $R(f) \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $R(f)$  satisfies the condition (5.1).

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.5) \quad & \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\|_1, \|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty, \|\mathbf{x}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{x}\|_2 \text{ for } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \\
 & B_1(\mathbf{c}, r) \subset B_2(\mathbf{c}, r) \subset B_\infty(\mathbf{c}, r), \\
 & B_\infty(\mathbf{c}, r) \subset B_2(\mathbf{c}, \sqrt{nr}), \quad B_2(\mathbf{c}, r) \subset B_1(\mathbf{c}, \sqrt{nr}).
 \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 6.3.** *Assume that conditions (2.12) and (2.11) hold. Let*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6.6) \quad & R(f) = (\lceil f(\mathbf{0}) \rceil - \lfloor t_{\min}(f) \rfloor) \lceil \sqrt{\prod_{k=1}^n (\|\mathbf{b}_k\|_2^2 + 1)} \rceil, \\
 & t_{\max}(f) = \lceil f(\mathbf{0}) \rceil + (a(f) + 1)R(f), \\
 & t(f) = \lceil f(\mathbf{0}) \rceil + \frac{(a(f) + 1)R(f)}{2}, \\
 & R_2(f) = \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil ((a(f) + 1)R(f) + \lceil f(\mathbf{0}) \rceil - \lfloor t_{\min}(f) \rfloor), \\
 & K(f) = \{(\mathbf{x}, t), \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in \mathbb{R}, f(\mathbf{x}) \leq t, \|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty \leq R(f), t \leq t_{\max}(f)\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$(6.7) \quad B_2((\mathbf{0}, t(f)), R(f)/2) \subset K(f) \subset B_2((\mathbf{0}, t(f)), R_2(f)),$$

$$(6.8) \quad f_{\min} = \min\{t, (\mathbf{x}, t) \in K(f)\}.$$

*Proof.* The arguments of the proof of Lemma 5.3 yield

$$(6.9) \quad B_\infty((\mathbf{0}, t(f)), R(f)/2) \subset K(f) \subset B_\infty((\mathbf{0}, t(f)), R_2(f)/(\lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil)).$$

Use the inequalities (6.5) to deduce (6.7). Combine Lemma 6.2 with the proof of (5.6) to deduce (6.8).  $\square$

## 6.2. Weak separation and minimization of linear functionals.

**Definition 6.4.** Let  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  be a compact convex set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . A *weak separation oracle* for  $K$ , taking an input number  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{++}$  and  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ , and concludes one of the following:

- (i) Asserting that  $\mathbf{y}$  is at Euclidean distance at most  $\varepsilon$  from  $K$ .
- (ii) Finding an *approximate separating half space of precision  $\varepsilon$* , i.e. , a linear form  $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}$ , with  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ , and  $\|\mathbf{c}\|_2 \geq 1$ , such that for every  $\mathbf{x} \in K$  the inequality  $\phi(\mathbf{x}) \leq \phi(\mathbf{y}) + \varepsilon$  holds.

We now recall the main complexity result of the ellipsoid method [10]. For  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$  denote by  $\langle r \rangle$  the number of bits needed to encode  $r$ , under standard binary recording. For instance, if  $r$  is a nonzero integer then  $\langle r \rangle = \lceil \log_2 |r| \rceil + 1$ , and if  $r = p/q \in \mathbb{Q}$  then  $\langle r \rangle = \langle p \rangle + \langle q \rangle$ , if  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_n)^\top \in \mathbb{Q}^n$  then  $\langle \mathbf{r} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle r_i \rangle$ , and if  $\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{x}$  a linear rational form on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then  $\langle \psi \rangle = \langle \mathbf{r} \rangle$ . In what follows, the length of an input refers to the binary coding.

The ellipsoid method can be used to find the minimum of a linear rational form  $\psi$  on the compact convex set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  within  $\varepsilon$  precision. This means

finding  $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{Q}^n$  such that  $\text{dist}_2(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{K}) \leq \varepsilon$  and  $\psi(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}} \psi(\mathbf{x}) + \varepsilon$ . (Here  $\text{dist}_2(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{K}) = \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}} \|\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}\|_2$ .)

A main assumption on  $\mathbf{K}$  is the containment

$$(6.10) \quad \mathbf{B}_2(\mathbf{c}, R_1) \subseteq \mathbf{K} \subset \mathbf{B}_2(\mathbf{c}, R_2), \quad \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Q}^n, R_1 \leq R_2, R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{Q}_{++}.$$

In this case, the size of the input approximate minimization is measured by  $\langle \psi \rangle + \langle \mathbf{c} \rangle + \langle R_1 \rangle + \langle R_2 \rangle + \langle \varepsilon \rangle$ .

It is shown in [10, Theorem 3.1] that if a compact convex set  $\mathbf{K}$  satisfying (6.10) admits a polynomial time weak separation oracle, the ellipsoid method computes an  $\varepsilon$ -approximation of the minimization problem of a linear rational form in a polynomial time in the size of the input.

**Proposition 6.5.** *Assume that conditions (2.12) and (2.11) hold. Let  $\mathbf{K}(f)$  be defined by (6.6). Then  $\mathbf{K}(f)$  admits a weak separation oracle which runs in polynomial time in the expression (6.1).*

To prove this proposition we recall the following consequence of a result of [34] on the approximation of the log and exp maps.

**Lemma 6.6** ([1, Lemma 26]). *Let  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{++}$  and  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ .*

- (i) *For  $t \leq 0$ , a rational  $\varepsilon$ -approximation of  $\exp(t)$  can be computed in a polynomial time in  $\langle t \rangle$  and  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$ .*
- (ii) *For  $t > 0$  a rational  $\varepsilon$ -approximation of  $\log t$  can be computed in a polynomial time in  $\langle t \rangle$  and  $\langle \varepsilon \rangle$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 6.5.* Assume that  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{++}$  is given. For  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  denote by  $\phi_{\mathbf{c}}$  the linear functional on  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  given by  $\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{w}$ , for  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . Let  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{y}^\top, s)^\top \in \mathbb{Q}^{n+1}$ .

- (a) Suppose that  $\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty \geq R(f)$ . Assume that  $|y_i| \geq R(f)$  for some  $i \in [n]$ . Denote by  $\text{sgn } y_i \in \{-1, 1\}$  the sign of  $y_i$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  a standard  $j$ -th basis element in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , whose  $j$ -th coordinate is 1 and all other coordinates are 0 for  $j \in [n+1]$ . Set  $\mathbf{c} = \text{sgn}(y_i) \mathbf{e}_i$ . Note that  $\|\mathbf{c}\|_2 = 1$ . Clearly,  $\phi_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{w}) \leq R(f)$  for  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{K}(f)$ , and  $\phi_{\mathbf{c}}(\mathbf{z}) \geq R(f)$ . Hence  $\phi_{\mathbf{c}}$  separates between  $\mathbf{K}(f)$  and  $\mathbf{z}$ .
- (b) Suppose that  $\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty < R(f)$ . Assume first that  $s \geq t_{\max}(f)$ . Clearly,  $\phi_{\mathbf{e}_{n+1}}(\mathbf{w}) \leq t_{\max}(f)$ , and  $\phi_{\mathbf{e}_{n+1}}(\mathbf{z}) \geq t_{\max}(f)$ . Hence  $\phi_{\mathbf{e}_{n+1}}$  separates between  $\mathbf{K}(f)$  and  $\mathbf{z}$ .

Assume second that  $f(\mathbf{y}) - \varepsilon \leq s < t_{\max}(f)$ . Choose  $t \in [f(\mathbf{y}), t_{\max}(f)]$  which is closest to  $s$ . Then  $|s - t| \leq \varepsilon$ . Set  $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{y}^\top, t)^\top$ . Note that  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbf{K}(f)$ . Clearly,  $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{w}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$ . Hence  $\text{dist}_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{K}(f)) \leq \varepsilon$ .

Assume third that  $s < f(\mathbf{y}) - \varepsilon$ . We now need to find a weakly separating  $\phi_{\mathbf{c}}$ , where  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Q}^{n+1}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{c}\|_2 \geq 1$ , between  $\mathbf{K}(f)$  and  $\mathbf{z}$ . Assume that  $f(\mathbf{y}) = f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y})$  for some  $k \in [N]$ . As  $f_{\mathcal{A}_k}$  is a smooth convex function it follows that

$$f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{x}) \geq f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y}) + \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y})^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) &\geq f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y}) + \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y})^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \Rightarrow \\ -f(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{x} &\leq -f(\mathbf{y}) + \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{y} \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that  $(\mathbf{x}^\top, t)^\top \in \mathbf{K}(f)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} -t + \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{x} &\leq -f(\mathbf{x}) + \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{x} \leq \\ -f(\mathbf{y}) + \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{y} &< -s + \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{y} - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\tilde{\phi} = \phi_{(\nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_k}(\mathbf{y})^\top, -1)^\top}$  separates  $\mathbf{K}(f)$  and  $\mathbf{z}$ . We now need to make a good rational approximation of  $\nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{y})$ . Clearly, if  $\nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$  then  $\tilde{\phi}$  has rational coefficients. It is left to discuss the case where  $\nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ . Use Lemma 6.6 to deduce that we can find in a polynomial time in the expression (6.1) a vector  $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$  such that

$$\|\nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{e}\|_1 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2R(f)}.$$

Hence,

$$-t + \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{x} \leq -s + \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{y} + (\mathbf{e} - \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{y}))^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) - \varepsilon.$$

Recall that

$$|(\mathbf{e} - \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{y}))^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})| \leq \|\mathbf{e} - \nabla f_{\mathcal{A}_j}(\mathbf{y})\|_1 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2R(f)} (2R(f)).$$

Let  $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{e}^\top, -1)^\top$ . Then  $\phi_{\mathbf{c}}$  separates between  $\mathbf{K}(f)$  and  $\mathbf{z}$ . □

*Proof of Theorem 6.1.* Use Proposition 6.5 and [10, Theorem 3.1] to deduce the ellipsoid algorithm for the minimum of the linear functional  $\phi_{\mathbf{e}_{n+1}}$  on  $\mathbf{K}(f)$  finds  $\mathbf{z}^* = ((\mathbf{x}^*)^\top, t^*)^\top \in \mathbb{Q}^{n+1}$  such that  $\text{dist}_2(\mathbf{z}^*, \mathbf{K}(f)) \leq \varepsilon$ , and  $t^* = \phi_{\mathbf{e}_{n+1}}(\mathbf{z}^*) \leq f_{\min} + \varepsilon$ . Assume that  $\text{dist}_2(\mathbf{z}^*, \mathbf{K}(f)) = \|\mathbf{z}^* - \mathbf{w}\|_2$  for some  $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{x}^\top, t)^\top \in \mathbf{K}(f)$ . Hence  $|t^* - t| \leq \varepsilon$ . Thus

$$t^* \geq t - \varepsilon \geq f(\mathbf{x}) - \varepsilon \geq f_{\min} - \varepsilon. \quad \square$$

## 7. POLYNOMIAL TIME APPROXIMATION OF $\rho(\mathbf{F})$

**7.1. Conversion to finding  $f_{\min}$ .** Let  $\mathcal{M}_{d-1, n+1} \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^{n+1}$  be the set of all vectors  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1})^\top$  with nonnegative integer coordinates whose sum is  $d - 1$ . Recall that  $|\mathcal{M}_{d-1, n+1}| = \binom{n+d-1}{d-1}$ . To each  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{M}_{d-1, n+1}$  we correspond the monomials  $\mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{a}} = z_1^{a_1} \dots z_{n+1}^{a_{n+1}}$  of degree  $d - 1$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{P}(d - 1, n + 1) \supset \mathbf{P}_+(d - 1, n + 1)$  the vector space of homogeneous polynomials of degree  $d - 1$ , and the cone of polynomials with nonnegative coefficients. A homogeneous polynomial  $g(\mathbf{z})$  of degree  $d - 1$  is of the form

$$g(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{M}_{d-1, n+1}} g_{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{a}},$$

The support of  $g$  is given by  $\text{supp } g = \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{M}_{d-1, n+1}, g_{\mathbf{a}} \neq 0\}$ . Assume that  $g \in \mathbb{P}_+(d-1, n+1)$ . For  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{n+1})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  denote  $\exp \mathbf{w} = (\exp(w_1), \dots, \exp(w_{n+1}))^\top \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ . Observe that  $\log g(e^{\mathbf{w}})$  is either a convex function of the form (2.8) or  $-\infty$  if  $g$  is identically 0.

Let  $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  be a homogeneous polynomial map of degree  $d-1 \geq 1$  of the form

$$(7.1) \quad F_i(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{M}_{d-1, n+1}} F_{i, \mathbf{a}} \mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{a}}, \quad F_{i, \mathbf{a}} \geq 0, \quad i \in [n+1].$$

In what follows we assume that  $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  is weakly irreducible. In the maximal characterization (2.7) we can restrict to the condition

$$(7.2) \quad \mathbf{z} = \exp(\mathbf{w}) = (\exp(\mathbf{x}^\top), 1)^\top, \quad \mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{x}^\top, 0)^\top, \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let  $\mathcal{M}'_{d-1, n+1} \subset \mathbb{Z}_+^n$  be all vectors  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$  obtained from  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{M}_{d-1, n+1}$  by deleting the last coordinate of  $\mathbf{a}$ . Thus  $\|\mathbf{c}\|_1 \in \{0, \dots, d\}$ . Observe

$$(7.3) \quad \begin{aligned} f_{\mathcal{A}_i}(\mathbf{x}) &:= \log F_i(\exp((\mathbf{x}^\top, 0)^\top) \exp(-(d-1)x_i), \\ \text{for } i \in [n+1], \quad \mathbf{x} &= (x_1, \dots, x_n)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n, x_{n+1} = 0, \\ \mathcal{A}_i &\subseteq \{\mathbf{c} - (d-1)\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{M}'_{d-1, n+1}\} \text{ for } i \in [n], \\ \mathcal{A}_{n+1} &\subseteq \{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{M}'_{d-1, n+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n$  is the standard basis in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\mathbf{e}_{n+1} = \mathbf{0}$ . Thus, for  $i \in [n+1]$  a vector  $\mathbf{a}$  is in  $\mathcal{A}_i$  if and only if  $\mathbf{a} + (d-1)\mathbf{e}_i$  is obtained from  $\mathbf{a}' \in \text{supp } F_i$  by deleting the last coordinate. Then  $f(\mathbf{x})$  given by (2.9) equal to

$$(7.4) \quad f(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{i \in [n+1]} \log (F_i(\exp((\mathbf{x}^\top, 0)^\top) e^{-(d-1)x_i}), \quad x_{n+1} = 0.$$

We now show that we can apply the results of the previous sections.

**Lemma 7.1.** *Assume that  $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  is weakly irreducible, where each  $F_i$  is of degree  $d-1 > 1$ . Let  $f(\mathbf{x})$  be defined by (7.4). Then  $f(\mathbf{x})$  is coercive on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .*

*Proof.* It will be more convenient to revert to  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{n+1})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . Define

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i}(\mathbf{w}) &= \log F_i(\exp(\mathbf{w}) \exp(-(d-1)w_i), \\ \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i + (d-1)\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_i &\subset \mathcal{M}_{d-1, n+1}, i \in [n+1], \\ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{w}) &= \max_{i \in [n+1]} f_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i}(\mathbf{w}). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{e}}_{n+1}$  is a standard basis in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{a} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i$  if and only if  $\mathbf{c} := \mathbf{a} + (d-1)\tilde{\mathbf{e}}_i \in \text{supp } F_i$  for  $i \in [n+1]$ . Consider the system of linear inequalities

$$(7.5) \quad \mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{w} \leq 0, \quad \mathbf{a} \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i, \quad i \in [n+1], \quad \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}.$$

We claim that the solution of this system consists of the line spanned by  $\mathbf{1}_{n+1} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . Clearly, for  $\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{M}_{d-1, n+1}$  we have equality



$(\mathbf{c} - (d - 1)\mathbf{e}_i)^\top \mathbf{1}_{n+1} = 0$ . It is left to show that the line generated by  $\mathbf{1}_{n+1}$  is the only solution of (7.5).

Define a stochastic matrix  $C \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$  such that its  $i$ -th row is

$$\frac{1}{(d - 1)|\text{supp } F_i|} \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in \text{supp } F_i} \mathbf{c}^\top, \quad i \in [n + 1].$$

The assumption that  $\mathbf{F}$  is weakly irreducible yields that  $C$  is an irreducible matrix. Hence, 1 is an eigenvalue of  $C$  of algebraic multiplicity one, and  $\mathbf{1}_{n+1}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^{n+1}$  are the unique eigenvectors of  $C$  and  $C^\top$  respectively, corresponding to the eigenvalue 1.

Observe that the system (7.5) yields the inequality  $C\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w} \leq \mathbf{0}$ . Clearly,  $\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{v}^\top(C\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}) \leq \mathbf{0}$ . Hence,  $C\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}$ . Therefore  $\mathbf{w} = t\mathbf{1}_n$ . Hence, the system (7.5) for  $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{x}^\top, 0)^\top$  has a unique solution  $\mathbf{x} = 0$ . Thus, the condition (2.11) holds., and  $f(\mathbf{x})$  is coercive.  $\square$

**7.2. Proof of polynomial computability of  $\rho(\mathbf{F})$ .** The main result of this section is:

**Theorem 7.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  be a homogeneous polynomial map of degree  $d - 1 > 1$  of the form (7.1), where each  $F_{i,\mathbf{a}} \in \text{supp } F_i$  is a positive rational number. Assume that  $\mathbf{F}$  is weakly irreducible. Then the spectral radius of  $\mathbf{F}$  can be approximated within  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{++}$  in polynomial time in*

$$(7.6) \quad \langle \varepsilon \rangle + \langle n \rangle + \langle d \rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \text{supp } F_i} \langle F_{i,\mathbf{a}} \rangle.$$

The above theorem follows from Theorem 6.1. We want to point out the values of constants appearing in the proof of Theorem 6.1. Clearly for  $c \in \mathbb{Q}_{++}$  we have the equality  $\rho(c\mathbf{F}) = c\rho(\mathbf{F})$ . Hence, we can assume that each  $F_{i,\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a} \in \text{supp } F_i$  is a positive integer.

Let  $t_{\min}(f), a(f), R(f), R_2(f), t(f), t_{\max}(f)$ , be given by (3.1),(5.4) and (6.6) respectively. Then we can choose the quantities appearing in the above expressions as:

$$(7.7) \quad \begin{aligned} t_{\min}(f) &= \min\{\log F_{i,\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a} \in \text{supp } F_i, i \in [n + 1]\}, \\ \log f(\mathbf{0}) &= \log \max_{i \in [n+1]} F_i(\mathbf{1}_{n+1}), \quad a(f) = 2(d - 1), \\ R(f) &= (\lceil f(\mathbf{0}) \rceil - \lfloor t_{\min}(f) \rfloor) \lceil (2(d - 1)^2 + 1)^{n/2} \rceil, \\ t_{\max}(f) &= \lceil f(\mathbf{0}) \rceil + (a(f) + 1)R(f), \\ t(f) &= \lceil f(\mathbf{0}) \rceil + \frac{(a(f) + 1)R(f)}{2}, \\ R_2(f) &= \lceil \sqrt{n} \rceil ((a(f) + 1)R(f) + \lceil f(\mathbf{0}) \rceil - \lfloor t_{\min}(f) \rfloor), \end{aligned}$$

**7.3. Entropic characterization of  $\rho(\mathbf{F})$ .** We now recall the entropic characterization of  $\rho(\mathbf{F})$  [6, Section 6.3]. Assume that  $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  as above. As in [6] we associate with  $\mathbf{F}$  a nonnegative tensor  $\mathcal{F} = [f_{i_1, \dots, i_d}] \in \otimes^d \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  as

follows. The coordinates  $f_{i_1, \dots, i_d}$  are symmetric with respect to the last  $d-1$  indices:  $f_{i_1, \sigma(i_2), \dots, \sigma(i_d)} = f_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d}$  for any bijection  $\sigma : [n+1] \rightarrow [n+1]$ . Furthermore

$$(7.8) \quad F_i(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_d} f_{i, i_2, \dots, i_d} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_d}.$$

Equivalently

$$(7.9) \quad f_{i, i_2, \dots, i_d} = \frac{F_{i, \mathbf{a}}}{a_1! \cdots a_n!} \text{ where } \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}} = x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_d}.$$

We denote by  $\mathbb{R}_{ps}^{(n+1) \times d} \subset \otimes^d \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  the subspace of partially symmetric tensors with respect to the last  $d-1$  coordinates, and by  $\mathbb{R}_{ps,+}^{(n+1) \times d} \subset \mathbb{R}_{ps}^{(n+1) \times d}$  the cone of nonnegative partially symmetric tensors.

A tensor  $\mu = [\mu_{i_1, \dots, i_d}] \in \mathbb{R}_{ps,+}^{(n+1) \times d}$  is called an *occupation measure* if

$$(7.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{i_1 \in [n+1], \dots, i_d \in [n+1]} \mu_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d} &= 1, \\ \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_d \in [n+1]} \mu_{j, i_2, \dots, i_d} &= (d-1) \sum_{(i_1, i_3, \dots, i_d) \in [n+1]} \mu_{i_1, j, i_3, \dots, i_d} \quad \forall j \in [n+1]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in view of the partial symmetry of  $\mu$  the condition (7.10) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{(i_2, \dots, i_d) \in [n+1]} \mu_{j, i_2, \dots, i_d} = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d \in [n+1], j \in (i_2, \dots, i_d)} \mu_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \quad \forall j \in [n+1].$$

We denote by  $\Omega((n+1)^{\times(d-1)}) \subset \mathbb{R}_{ps,+}^{(n+1) \times d}$  the set of occupation measures. For  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{R}_{ps,+}^{(n+1) \times d}$  we denote by  $\Omega(n^{\times(d-1)}, \text{supp } \mathcal{T}) \subseteq \Omega((n+1)^{\times(d-1)})$  the set of occupation measures whose support is contained in  $\text{supp } \mathcal{T}$ .

Assume that  $\mathbf{F}$  is weakly irreducible. Then there exists a unique positive eigenvector  $\mathbf{u} > \mathbf{0}$  (up to rescaling) such that

$$(7.11) \quad \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{u}) = \rho(\mathbf{F})\mathbf{u}^{\circ(d-1)}, \quad \mathbf{u} > \mathbf{0}.$$

Let  $D(\mathbf{F})(\mathbf{x}) = [\frac{\partial F_i(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j}]$  be the Jacobian matrix of  $\mathbf{F}$ . Set

$$(7.12) \quad A := \text{diag}(\mathbf{u})^{-(d-2)} D(\mathbf{F})(\mathbf{u}), \quad \text{diag}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{diag}(u_1, \dots, u_{n+1}).$$

Recall that  $A$  is a nonnegative irreducible matrix that satisfies [6, (3.18)]:

$$(7.13) \quad A\mathbf{u} = (d-1)\rho(\mathbf{F})\mathbf{u}, \quad A^\top \mathbf{w} = (d-1)\rho(\mathbf{F})\mathbf{w}, \quad \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{u} = 1.$$

Theorem 19 in [6] states:

**Theorem 7.3** (Entropic characterization of the spectral radius). *The spectral radius of a nonzero nonnegative  $\mathbf{F} = (F_1, \dots, F_{n+1})^\top$ , has the following*

characterization

$$(7.14) \quad \log \rho(\mathbf{F}) = \max_{\mu \in \Omega((n+1)^{\times(d-1)})} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d \in [n+1]} \mu_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \log \left( \frac{(\sum_{k_2, \dots, k_d} \mu_{i_1, k_2, \dots, k_d}) f_{i_1, \dots, i_d}}{\mu_{i_1, \dots, i_d}} \right).$$

Assume that  $\mathbf{F}$  is weakly irreducible. Let  $\mathbf{u} > \mathbf{0}$  be the unique positive eigenvector  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfying (7.11) and let  $\mathbf{w} > \mathbf{0}$  be defined as in (7.13). Let  $\mu = [\mu_{i_1, \dots, i_d}] \in \mathbb{R}_{ps,+}^{(n+1)^{\times d}}$  be the tensor given by

$$(7.15) \quad \mu_{i_1, \dots, i_d} = \frac{1}{\rho(\mathbf{F})} w_{i_1} u_{i_1}^{-(d-2)} f_{i_1, \dots, i_d} u_{i_2} \cdots u_{i_d} \text{ for } i_1, \dots, i_d \in [n+1].$$

Then  $\mu$  is an occupation measure whose support is  $\text{supp } \mathbf{F}$ . Furthermore,

$$(7.16) \quad \log \rho(\mathbf{F}) = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d \in [n]} \mu_{i_1, \dots, i_d} \log \left( \frac{(\sum_{k_2, \dots, k_d} \mu_{i_1, k_2, \dots, k_d}) f_{i_1, \dots, i_d}}{\mu_{i_1, \dots, i_d}} \right).$$

**Corollary 7.4.** (Theorem 7.2) Let  $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  be a homogeneous polynomial map of degree  $d-1 \geq 1$  with nonnegative coefficients. Denote by  $\mathcal{F} = [f_{i_1, \dots, i_d}] \in \mathbb{R}_{ps,+}^{(n+1)^{\times d}}$  the partially symmetric tensor corresponding to  $\mathbf{F}$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{F}$  is weakly irreducible. Then for a given  $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{++}$ , the maximum given in (7.14) can be computed within  $\varepsilon$  precision in polynomial time given by (7.6).

## 8. POLYNOMIAL TIME APPROXIMATION OF $\mu_d(g)$ AND APPLICATIONS

Define the  $p$ -sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ :

$$(8.1) \quad \mathbb{S}_p^n = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \|\mathbf{z}\|_p = 1\}, \quad p \in [1, \infty].$$

Let  $g(\mathbf{z})$  be a nonzero homogeneous polynomial of degree  $d$  in  $n+1$  variables with nonnegative coefficients:

$$(8.2) \quad g(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{M}(d, n+1)} g_{\mathbf{a}} \mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{a}}.$$

A point  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{B}_p(\mathbf{0}, 1)$  is called a local maximum of  $g$  if there exists an open set  $O \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  such that  $\mathbf{w} \in O$ , and for  $\mathbf{z} \in O \cap \mathbb{B}_p(\mathbf{0}, 1)$  one has the inequality  $g(\mathbf{z}) \leq g(\mathbf{w})$ . Assume that  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{B}_p(\mathbf{0}, 1) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  is a local maximum of  $g$ . Clearly,  $\|\mathbf{w}\|_p = 1$  and  $g(\mathbf{w}) > 0$ .

### 8.1. The maximum $\mu_p(g)$ .

**Lemma 8.1.** Assume that  $p \in [1, \infty)$  and  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{n+1})^{\top} \geq \mathbf{0}, \|\mathbf{w}\|_p = 1$  is a local maximum point of  $g(\mathbf{z})$  for  $\|\mathbf{z}\|_p \leq 1$ .

(a) Suppose that  $w_j > 0$ . Then

$$\frac{1}{d} \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{w}) = g(\mathbf{w}) w_j^{p-1}.$$

- (b) Assume that  $p > 1$ . Then (2.2) holds.  
(c) Assume that  $p = 1$  and  $\mathbf{w}_j = 0$ . Then

$$-g(\mathbf{w}) \leq \frac{1}{d} \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{w}) \leq g(\mathbf{w}).$$

*Proof.* Consider the 0-homogeneous function  $h(\mathbf{z}) = g(\mathbf{z})\|\mathbf{z}\|_p^{-d}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . Then  $g(\mathbf{w}) = h(\mathbf{w})$  is a local maximum of  $h(\mathbf{z})$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ . Suppose that  $w_j > 0$ . Hence  $\frac{\partial h}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{w}) = 0$ . This proves (2.2) for  $i = j$  in part (a).

Assume now that  $w_j = 0$ . Consider the one variable function  $\phi(t) = h(\mathbf{w} + t\mathbf{e}_j)$ . Note that  $\phi(t)$  is differentiable on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ . As  $\phi(0)$  is the maximum value of  $\phi(t)$  it follows that  $\phi'(0+) \leq 0 \leq \phi'(0-)$ .

Assume that  $p > 1$ . We deduce that  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{w}) = 0$ . Combine this result with part (a) to deduce part (b).

Assume that  $p = 1$ . Then

$$\phi'(0+) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{w}) - dg(\mathbf{w}), \quad \phi'(0-) = \frac{\partial g}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{w}) + dg(\mathbf{w}),$$

which implies part (c).  $\square$

We now recall the classical characterization of Motzkin-Straus [20], which gives an example of a quadratic form  $g$ , where the computation of  $\mu_1(g)$  is an NP-complete problem. Let  $A = [a_{ij}] \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$  be the adjacency matrix of a graph  $G$  on  $n+1$  vertices. Denote by  $\omega(G)$  the clique number of  $G$ , whose value is an NP-complete problem. Let  $g(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i=j=1}^{n+1} a_{ij} z_i z_j$ . Then (2.3) holds.

The following proposition gives examples of  $g$  for which  $\mu_p(g)$  is an NP-complete problem:

**Proposition 8.2.** *Let  $g_G(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{z}^\top A \mathbf{z}$ , where  $A \in \mathbb{R}_+^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$  is an adjacency matrix of a simple graph  $G$ . Denote:  $g_{p,G}(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i=j=1}^{n+1} a_{ij} z_i^p z_j^p$ . Then  $\mu_p(g_{p,G}^m)$  is an NP-complete problem, for each pair  $(m, p)$  of positive integers.*

*Proof.* Recall that  $\mu_1(g_G) = 1 - 1/\omega(G)$ . Clearly, for  $m, p \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mu_p(g_{p,G}) = \mu_1(g_G), \quad \mu_p(g_{p,G}^m) = \mu_1(g_G)^m.$$

$\square$

**8.2. Symmetric tensors and homogeneous polynomials.** A partially symmetric tensor  $\mathcal{G} = [g_{i_1, \dots, i_d}] \in \mathbb{R}_{ps}^{(n+1) \times d}$  is called symmetric if  $g_{i_1, \dots, i_d}$  is invariant under the permutation of indices:  $g_{i_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, i_{\sigma(d)}} = g_{i_1, \dots, i_d}$  for each bijection  $\sigma : [d] \rightarrow [d]$ . We denote by  $S^d \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  the subset of symmetric tensors in  $\mathbb{R}_{ps}^{(n+1) \times d}$ . For  $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  denote by  $\mathbf{z}^{\otimes d}$  the symmetric tensor, rank-one tensor for  $\mathbf{z} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , whose  $(i_1, \dots, i_d)$  entry is

$z_{i_1} \cdots z_{i_d}$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{G} = [g_{i_1, \dots, i_d}]$ ,  $\mathcal{H} = [h_{i_1, \dots, i_d}] \in \mathbb{S}^d \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . The inner product on symmetric tensors is defined by

$$\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H} \rangle = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_d \in [n+1]} g_{i_1, \dots, i_d} h_{i_1, \dots, i_d}.$$

Observe that  $g(\mathbf{z}) = \langle \mathcal{G}, \mathbf{z}^{\otimes d} \rangle$  is a homogeneous polynomial of degree  $d$ , and

$$(8.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d} \nabla g(\mathbf{z}) &= \mathbf{F} = (G_1(\mathbf{z}), \dots, G_{n+1}(\mathbf{z}))^\top, \\ G_i(\mathbf{z}) &= \sum_{i_2, \dots, i_d \in [n+1]} g_{i, i_2, \dots, i_d} z_{i_2} \cdots z_{i_d}. \end{aligned}$$

Banach's theorem yields that the spectral norm of  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{S}^d \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  is given by [8]:

$$\|\mathcal{G}\|_\sigma := \max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \|\mathbf{z}\|_2=1} |\langle \mathcal{G}, \mathbf{z}^{\otimes d} \rangle|.$$

Assume that  $\mathcal{G}$  is a nonnegative tensor, i.e.,  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{S}^d \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$ . Then

$$(8.4) \quad \|\mathcal{G}\|_\sigma := \max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \|\mathbf{z}\|_2=1, \mathbf{z} \geq \mathbf{0}} \langle \mathcal{G}, \mathbf{z}^{\otimes d} \rangle = \mu_2(g), \quad \mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{S}^d \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}.$$

Proposition 8.2 yields that for  $d = 4m$ ,  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , the computation of  $\|\mathcal{G}\|_\sigma$ , for  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathbb{S}^d \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  with rational coefficients, can be NP-hard.

One of the main results of this paper, which will be proven in the next subsection, is:

**Theorem 8.3.** *Let  $g$  be a nonnegative  $d$ -form with rational coefficients for an integer  $d \geq 2$ . Then a  $\varepsilon$ -approximation of  $\mu_d(g)$  can be computed in polynomial time in  $\varepsilon$  and the coefficients of  $g$ .*

It is of interest to bound  $\mu_q(g)$  in terms of  $\mu_d(g)$  for  $q \in [1, d]$ .

**Proposition 8.4.** *Assume that  $d \geq 2$  is an integer, and  $q \in [1, d]$ . Let  $g$  be a nonnegative  $d$ -form. Then*

$$(8.5) \quad \mu_q(g) \leq \mu_d(g) \leq (n+1)^{d-q} \mu_q(g).$$

*Proof.* It is well known that for  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  and  $r \geq q$  one has the inequalities  $\|\mathbf{z}\|_r \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|_q \leq (n+1)^{1-q/r} \|\mathbf{z}\|_r$ . Let  $r = d$ . The inequality  $\|\mathbf{z}\|_d \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|_q$  yields the first inequality in (8.5). Assume that  $\mu_d(g) = g(\mathbf{w})$  for  $\mathbf{w} \geq \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{w}\|_d = 1$ . Let  $\mathbf{u} = \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{w}\|_q} \mathbf{w}$ . Then

$$\mu_q(g) \geq g(\mathbf{u}) = \|\mathbf{w}\|_q^{-d} g(\mathbf{w}) \geq (n+1)^{-d(1-q/d)} \mu_d(g),$$

which yields the second inequality in (8.5).  $\square$

**8.3. Proof of Theorem 8.3.** Clearly, it is enough to consider the case where  $g$  is a nonzero polynomial, and is not a polynomial in a subset of  $[n+1]$  variables. That is  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial z_i} > 0$  for  $\mathbf{z} > \mathbf{0}$ . Next we assume that  $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{d} \nabla \phi(\mathbf{z})$  is a weakly irreducible polynomial map. Assume that  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{S}_d^n \cap \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  is a maximum point of  $g$  on  $\mathbb{B}_d(\mathbf{0}, 1)$ . Lemma 8.1 claims that

$$\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{w}) = g(\mathbf{w})\mathbf{w}^{\circ(d-1)}.$$

Hence,  $g(\mathbf{w})$  is an eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{G}$ . As  $\mathbf{G}$  is weakly irreducible then the maximum eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{G}$  is the spectral radius  $\rho(\mathbf{G}) \geq g(\mathbf{w})$ , with the corresponding eigenvector  $\mathbf{u} > \mathbf{0}$  such that

$$\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{u}) = \rho(\mathbf{G})\mathbf{u}^{\circ(d-1)}$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_d = 1$ . Let  $\mathbf{z} \circ \mathbf{y} = (z_1 y_1, \dots, z_{n+1} y_{n+1})$  be a coordinatewise product in  $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ . Then  $\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{u}) = \rho(\mathbf{G})\mathbf{u}^{\circ d}$ . Recall the Euler identity  $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} u_i G_i(\mathbf{u}) = g(\mathbf{u})$ . Hence  $g(\mathbf{u}) = \rho(\mathbf{G}) \leq g(\mathbf{w})$ . Therefore,  $g(\mathbf{u}) = \mu_d(g)$ . Use Theorem 7.2 to deduce Theorem 8.3.

Assume now that  $g$  is not weakly irreducible. Consider the simple graph  $G$  on  $[n+1]$  vertices such that the undirected edge  $\{i, j\}$ , for  $i \neq j$ , is in  $G$  if  $\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial z_i \partial z_j} > 0$  for  $\mathbf{z} > \mathbf{0}$ . Then  $G$  is a finite union of connected components  $G = \cup_j^m G_j$ , where  $2 \leq m \leq n+1$ . That is  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{z}_m^\top)^\top$  where  $\mathbf{z}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j}$  and  $g(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{j=1}^m g_j(\mathbf{z}_j)$ , where each  $g_j$  is a nonzero nonnegative weakly irreducible polynomial. Hence we can compute with  $\varepsilon$  precision each  $\mu(g_j)$ .

Next observe that

$$g(\mathbf{z}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_d(g_j) \|\mathbf{z}_j\|_d^d \leq \left( \max_{j \in [m]} \mu_d(g_j) \right) \|\mathbf{z}\|_d^d.$$

Hence,

$$\mu_d(g) = \max_{j \in [m]} \mu_d(g_j).$$

This proves Theorem 8.3 in this case.

**8.4. Uniform hypergraphs.** Let  $2_d^{[n+1]}$  denote all subsets of  $[n+1]$  of cardinality  $d \in [n+1]$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{E} \subset 2_d^{[n+1]}$ . A simple  $d$ -uniform hypergraph corresponding to the set of hyperedges  $\mathcal{E}$  is given by a symmetric tensor  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}) = [h_{i_1, \dots, i_d}] \in \mathbb{S}^d \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ , where

$$h_{i_1, \dots, i_d} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{i_1, \dots, i_d\} \in \mathcal{E}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A weighted  $d$ -uniform hypergraphs corresponding to  $\mathcal{E}$  is given by

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E}) = [f_{i_1, \dots, i_d}] \in \mathbb{S}^d \mathbb{R}^{n+1}, \quad f_{i_1, \dots, i_d} > 0 \iff \{i_1, \dots, i_d\} \in \mathcal{E}.$$

Theorem 8.3 shows that  $\rho(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E})) = \mu_d(\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E})) \times \otimes^d \mathbf{z}$  is polynomially computable.

A clique  $\mathcal{C}$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  is subset of  $[n + 1]$  such that  $2_d^{\mathcal{C}} \in \mathcal{E}$ . Denote by  $\omega(\mathcal{E})$  the maximum cardinality of a clique in  $\mathcal{E}$ .

**Proposition 8.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{E} \subset 2_d^{[n+1]}$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}) \in S^d \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$  the symmetric tensor induced by  $\mathcal{E}$ . Then the following computable upper bound holds:*

$$(8.6) \quad \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} (\omega(\mathcal{E}) - i) \leq \rho(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E})).$$

*This inequality is sharp if  $\mathcal{E}$  is a union of disjoint cliques in  $2_d^{[n+1]}$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $g(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E}) \times \otimes^d \mathbf{z}$ . Then  $\rho(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E})) = \mu_d(g)$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{C} \subset [n + 1]$  is a clique in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Let

$$\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_{n+1})^\top = \begin{cases} z_i = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|^{1/d}} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{C}, \\ z_i = 0 & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{C}. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$g(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{d! \binom{|\mathcal{C}|}{d}}{|\mathcal{C}|} = \prod_{i=1}^{d-1} (|\mathcal{C}| - i) \leq \mu_d(g) = \rho(\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{E})).$$

Choose  $\mathcal{C}$  to satisfy  $|\mathcal{C}| = \omega(\mathcal{E})$  to deduce (8.6).

Assume that  $\mathcal{E} = \cup_{j=1}^k 2_d^{\mathcal{C}_j}$ , where  $\cup_{j=1}^k \mathcal{C}_j \subset [n + 1]$ , and  $\mathcal{C}_i \cap \mathcal{C}_j = \emptyset$  for  $i \neq j$ . Then  $g = \sum_{j=1}^k g_j(\mathbf{z}_j)$  is a decomposition of  $g$  to its irreducible components. The proof of Theorem 8.3 shows that it is enough to show the sharpness of (8.6) when  $\mathcal{E} = 2_d^{\mathcal{C}}$ . Furthermore we can assume that  $\mathcal{C} = [n + 1]$ . Then

$$\frac{g(\mathbf{x})}{d!} = \sigma_d(\mathbf{z}) =: \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_d \leq n+1} z_{i_1} \dots z_{i_d}.$$

Use Maclaurin's and Hölder's inequalities to deduce

$$\sigma_d(\mathbf{z}) \leq \binom{n+1}{d} (\|\mathbf{z}\|_1 / (n+1))^d \leq \binom{n+1}{d} (n+1)^{-1} \|\mathbf{z}\|_d^d.$$

Assume that  $\|\mathbf{z}\|_d = 1$  to deduce the equality for  $\mathcal{E} = 2_d^{[n+1]}$ . □

We remark that for  $d = 2$ , the inequality  $\omega(G) \leq 1 + \rho(G)$  is follows from a stronger inequality [26]

$$\chi(G) \leq 1 + \rho(G),$$

where  $\chi(G)$  is the chromatic number of  $G$ , as  $\chi(G) \geq \omega(G)$ . For  $d \geq 3$  the above inequality is closely related to the inequalities in [24, 27].

We now recall some results in [24]. Let  $G = ([n + 1], E)$  be a simple graph. Assume that  $\omega(G) \geq d$  for  $2 < d \in [n + 1]$ . Denote by  $E_d \subset 2_d^{[n+1]}$  the set of all  $d$ -vertices  $\{i_1, \dots, i_d\}$  that form a clique in  $G$ . Clearly,  $\omega(E_d) = \omega(G)$ . Apply the inequality (8.6) for  $\mathcal{E} = E_d$ . Use this inequality to find an upper bound on  $\omega(G)$ . It is shown in [24] that in many cases this inequality is

better than  $\omega(G) \leq 1 + \rho(G)$ . More precisely, it is conjectured in [24] that the upper for  $\omega(G)$  using (8.6) is decreasing with  $d$ .

### 8.5. Polynomial computation of $\rho(\mathbf{F})$ and $\mu_d(g)$ for quasi-homogeneous maps and functions.

Let  $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^{n+1}$  be a quasi-homogeneous map of degree  $d - 1 \geq 1$  as given by (2.15). We define  $\vec{G}(\mathbf{F})$  as in subsection 2.2. That is, the diedge  $\vec{ij}$  is in  $\vec{G}(\mathbf{F})$  if and only if  $\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j}(\mathbf{z}) > 0$  for each  $\mathbf{z} > \mathbf{0}$ . This is equivalent to  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_i(\mathbf{1}_{n+1} + t\mathbf{e}_j) = \infty$ . We say  $\mathbf{F}$  is weakly irreducible if  $\vec{G}(\mathbf{F})$  is strongly connected. Observe that the map  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}) = (F_1(\mathbf{z})^{1/(d-1)}, \dots, F_{n+1}(\mathbf{z})^{1/(d-1)})^\top$  is homogeneous of degree 1 and monotone:  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{z}) \geq \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{y})$  for  $\mathbf{z} \geq \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$ . Furthermore, the condition  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F_i(\mathbf{1}_{n+1} + t\mathbf{e}_j) = \infty$  implies the condition  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} H_i(\mathbf{1}_{n+1} + t\mathbf{e}_j) = \infty$ . Hence, the graph  $\vec{G}(\mathbf{H})$  as defined in [9] is  $\vec{G}(\mathbf{F})$ . Therefore,  $\vec{G}(\mathbf{H})$  is strongly connected. Theorem 2 in [9] yields that  $\mathbf{H}$  has a positive eigenvector. The arguments in the end of the section 2 in [7] shows that  $\mathbf{F}$  has a positive eigenvector  $\mathbf{u}$  satisfying (2.5) with  $\lambda = \rho(\mathbf{F})$ . Furthermore, the Collatz-Wielandt characterizations (2.6) and (2.7) hold. Therefore, the eigenvalue corresponding to a unique positive  $\mathbf{u}$ , denoted as  $\rho(\mathbf{F})$  is indeed greater or equal to any other eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{F}$  corresponding to a nonnegative vector. Use Theorem 6.1 to show that Theorem 7.2 holds for a rational  $d \geq 2$  and quasi-homogeneous map  $\mathbf{F}$  if all the data in  $\mathbf{F}$  is rational.

Next assume that  $g$  a quasi-homogeneous function of rational degree  $d \geq 2$ . Now repeat the proof of Theorem (8.3) to deduce the validity of Theorem (8.3) in this case.

### 8.6. The polynomial computability of $\mu_p(g)$ for $p \geq d + 1$ .

Assume that  $g(\mathbf{z})$  a nonzero nonnegative quasi-homogeneous polynomial of rational degree  $d \geq 2$ , which is a function of a subset of  $z_1, \dots, z_{n+1}$  variables. Let  $d + 1 \leq p \in \mathbb{Q}$ . Set  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = (\mathbf{z}^\top, z_{n+2})^\top$ . Define

$$\tilde{g}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) := z_{n+2}^{p-d} g(\mathbf{z}), \quad \mathbf{z} \geq \mathbf{0}.$$

Clearly,  $\tilde{g}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})$  is quasi-homogeneous of degree  $p$ . Set  $\mathbf{F} = \frac{1}{p} \nabla \tilde{g}$ . Observe that in the simple graph  $\vec{G}(\mathbf{F})$ , all vertices are connected to the vertex  $n + 2$ . Hence  $\tilde{g}$  is weakly irreducible. Theorem (8.3) for  $\tilde{g}$  yields that we can approximate the value of  $\mu_p(\tilde{g})$  in polynomial time. It is left to show that this implies that we can find an approximation of  $\mu_p(g)$  in polynomial time. Observe that  $\mu_p(\tilde{g})$  achieved for  $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^*$  where  $z_{n+2}^* \in (0, 1)$ . Fix  $t \in (0, 1)$  and consider the maximum of  $\tilde{g}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})$  for  $\|\mathbf{z}\|_p^p = (1 - t^p)$ . This maximum is  $\mu_p(g)t^{p-d}(1 - t^p)^{d/p}$ . Set

$$\alpha_{d,p} = \max_{t \in [0,1]} t^{p-d}(1 - t^p)^{d/p}.$$



This maximum is achieved at:

$$t_{d,p}^* = \left(1 - \frac{d}{p}\right)^{1/p}.$$

Thus  $\mu_p(\tilde{g}) = \alpha_{d,p}\mu_p(g)$ . Thus we can approximate  $\mu_p(g)$ .

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Marianne Akian, Stéphane Gaubert, Julien Grand-Clément, and Jérémie Guillaud, The operator approach to entropy games, *Theor. Comp. Sys.* 63(5), 1089–1130, July 2019.
- [2] S. Banach, Über homogene Polynome in  $(L^2)$ , *Studia Math.*, **7** (1938), pp. 36–44.
- [3] C.-F. Cui, Y.-H. Dai, and J. Nie, All real eigenvalues of symmetric tensors, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 35 (2014), no. 4, 1582–1601.
- [4] S. Friedland, Tensor optimal transport, distance between sets of measures and tensor scaling, arXiv:2005.00945, 2020.
- [5] S. Friedland, M. Eckstein, S. Cole, K.l Życzkowski, Quantum Monge-Kantorovich problem and transport distance between density matrices, *Physical Review Letters* 129, Issue 11, 110402 - Published 7 September 2022.
- [6] S. Friedland and S. Gaubert, Inequalities for the spectral radius and spectral norms of nonnegative tensors, *Vietnam Journal of Mathematics*, Vietnam J. Math. 48 (2020), no. 4, 893–928.
- [7] S. Friedland, S. Gaubert and L. Han, Perron-Frobenius theorem for nonnegative multilinear forms, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 438 (2013), 738–749.
- [8] S. Friedland and L. Wang, Spectral norm of a symmetric tensor and its computation, *Mathematics of Computation*, 89 (2020), 2175–2215.
- [9] [3] S. Gaubert, J. Gunawardena, The Perron–Frobenius theorem for homogeneous, monotone functions, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 356 (2004) 4931–4950.
- [10] M. Grötschel, L. Lovász and A. Schrijver, The ellipsoid method and its consequences in combinatorial optimization, *Combinatorica* 1 (1981), no. 2, 169–197.
- [11] C.J. Hillar and L.-H. Lim, Most tensor problems are NP-hard, *Journal of the ACM*, 60 (2013), no. 6, Art. 45, 39 pp.
- [12] Y. Ji, Q. Wang, X. Li and J. Liu, A Survey on Tensor Techniques and Applications in Machine Learning, *IEEE*, vol. 7, pp. 162950–162990, 2019.
- [13] J.M. Landsberg, *Tensors: geometry and applications*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 128, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012. xx+439 pp.
- [14] J. F. C. Kingman, A convexity property of positive matrices, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* 12 (1961), 283–284.
- [15] J. Leake and N.K. Vishnoi, On the computability of continuous maximum entropy distributions with applications, *STOC 2020: Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, June 2020, pp. 930–943.
- [16] L.-H. Lim, Singular values and eigenvalues of tensors: a variational approach, *Proceedings of the IEEE International Workshop on Computational Advances in Multi-Sensor Adaptive Processing (CAMSAP '05)*, 1 (2005), pp. 129–132.
- [17] L.-H. Lim, Tensors in computations, *Acta Numerica*, 30 (2021), pp. 555–764.
- [18] Y. Liu, *Tensors for Data Processing Theory, Methods, and Applications*, Academic Press, 2022.
- [19] L. Lyusternik and L. Schnirelman, Topological methods in variational problems and their application to the differential geometry of surfaces, (Russian), *Uspehi Matem. Nauk (N.S.)* 2, (1947). no. 1(17), 166–217.
- [20] T. S. Motzkin and E. G. Straus, Maxima for graphs and a new proof of a theorem of Túrán, *Canadian J. Math.*, **17** (1965), pp. 533–540.

- [21] M. Ng, L.Qi, and G. Zhou, Finding the largest eigenvalue of a nonnegative tensor, *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 31 (2009), no. 3, 1090-1099.
- [22] L. Omberg, G.H. Golub, and O. Alter, A tensor higher-order singular value decomposition for integrative analysis of DNA microarray data from different studies, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 104 (47) 18371-8376.
- [23] L. Qi, Eigenvalues of a real supersymmetric tensor, *J. Symb. Comput.*, 40 (2005) 1302-1324.
- [24] S. Rota Buló and M. Pelillo, New Bounds on the Clique Number of Graphs Based on Spectral Hypergraph Theory, In: Stütze, T. (eds) Learning and Intelligent Optimization, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 5851.,Springer 2009.
- [25] V. Sós and E.G.S traus, Extremal of functions on graphs with applications to graphs and hypergraphs, *J. Combin. Theory Series B* 63, 189-207 (1982).
- [26] H. S. Wilf, The eigenvalues of a graph and its chromatic number, *J. London Math. Soc.* 42 (1967), 330-332.
- [27] J.Xie and L.Qi, The clique and coclique numbers' bounds based on the H-eigenvalues of uniform hypergraphs, *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Model.* 12 (2015) 318-327.
- [28] A. Schönage, The Fundamental Theorem of Algebra in Terms of Computational Complexity, 1982, report available from [citeseerx](https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&url=confer/1982/01-01-01).
- [29] R. D. Nussbaum. Convexity and log convexity for the spectral radius. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 73:59–122, 1986.
- [30] S. Brazitikos, A. Giannopoulos, P. Valettas, and B.-H. Vritsiou, *Geometry of Isotropic Convex Bodies*. AMS, 2014.
- [31] Giuseppe C. Calafiore, Stéphane Gaubert, and Corrado Possieri. A universal approximation result for difference of log-sum-exp neural networks. *IEEE Trans. Neural Networks Learn. Syst.*, 31(12):5603–5612, 2020.
- [32] de Klerk, E., Vallentin, F., 2016. On the Turing model complexity of interior point methods for semidefinite programming. *SIAM J. Optim.* 26 (3), 1944–1961.
- [33] Ivar Ekeland and Roger Témam, *Convex Analysis and Variational Problems*, SIAM, 1999.
- [34] J. M. Borwein and P. B. Borwein. On the complexity of familiar functions and numbers. *SIAM Review*, 30(4):589–601, 1988.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STATISTICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60607-7045, USA, [FRIEDLAN@UIC.EDU](mailto:FRIEDLAN@UIC.EDU),

INRIA AND CENTRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES APPLIQUÉES (CMAP), ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE, IP PARIS, UMR 7641 CNRS, 91128 PALAISEAU CÉDEX, [STEPHANE.GAUBERT@INRIA.FR](mailto:STEPHANE.GAUBERT@INRIA.FR)