Counterexamples to the Connectivity Conjecture of the Mixed Cells*

T. Y. Li¹ and X. Wang²

¹Department of Mathematics, Michigan State University,
East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

²Department of Mathematics, University of Central Arkansas,
Conway, AR 72035, USA

Abstract. In [4] a conjecture concerning the connectivity of mixed cells of subdivisions for Minkowski sums of polytopes was formulated. This conjecture was, in fact, originally proposed by Pedersen [3]. It turns out that a positive confirmation of this conjecture can substantially speed up the algorithm for the “dynamical lifting” developed in [4]. In the mean time, when the polyhedral method is used for solving polynomial systems by homotopy continuation methods [2], the positiveness of this conjecture also plays an important role in the efficiency of the algorithm. Very unfortunately, we found that this conjecture is inaccurate in general. In Section 1 a counterexample is presented for a general subdivision. In Section 2 another counterexample shows that even restricted to “regular” subdivisions induced by liftings, this conjecture still fails to be true.

1. Counterexample for General Subdivisions

For $m \leq n$, let $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m)$ be a sequence of finite subsets of R^n whose union affinely spans R^n . For $Q_i = \text{conv}(\mathcal{A}_i)$, the convex hull of $\mathcal{A}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, their *Minkowski* sum is defined by

$$Q_1 + \dots + Q_m = \{x_1 + \dots + x_m \mid x_i \in Q_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

By a *cell* of $\mathcal{A}$, we mean a tuple $C = (C_1, \dots, C_m)$ of subsets $C_i \subset \mathcal{A}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{type}(C) &:= (\dim(\text{conv}(C_1)), \dots, \dim(\text{conv}(C_m))) \in N^m, \\ \text{conv}(C) &:= \text{conv}(C_1 + \dots + C_m) \subset R^n. \end{aligned}$$

* The research of the first author was supported in part under NSF Grant DMS-9504953 and a Guggenheim fellowship. The second author's research was supported in part by a UCA summer stipend.

Here, N is the set of natural numbers. Cells of the same type are called the *mixed cells* of that type. A *face* of a cell C is a subcell $F = (F_1, \dots, F_m)$ where $F_i \subset C_i$ and some linear functional $\alpha \in (R^n)^v$ attains its minimum over C_i at F_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Such an α is called an *inner normal* of F . If F is a face of C , then $\text{conv}(F_i)$ is a face of the polytope $\text{conv}(C_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Definition. A *fine mixed subdivision* of $\mathcal{A}$ is a collection $S = \{C^{(1)}, \dots, C^{(k)}\}$ of cells such that

- (a) $\dim(\text{conv}(C^{(j)})) = n$ for all $j = 1, \dots, k$,
- (b) $\text{conv}(C^{(j)}) \cap \text{conv}(C^{(l)})$ is a proper common face of $\text{conv}(C^{(j)})$ and $\text{conv}(C^{(l)})$ when it is nonempty for $j \neq l$,
- (c) $\bigcup_{j=1}^k \text{conv}(C^{(j)}) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{A})$,
- (d) for $j = 1, \dots, k$, write $C^{(j)} = (C_1^{(j)}, \dots, C_m^{(j)})$; then, each $\text{conv}(C_i^{(j)})$ is a simplex of dimension $\#C_i^{(j)} - 1$ and, for each j , $\dim(\text{conv}(C_1^{(j)})) + \dots + \dim(\text{conv}(C_m^{(j)})) = n$.

Remark. In fact, the notation $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m)$ is just a shorthand abstraction of

$$\text{conv}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{conv}(\mathcal{A}_1 + \dots + \mathcal{A}_m). \quad (1)$$

So is a cell $C = (C_1, \dots, C_m)$ in the subdivision of $\mathcal{A}$ where $C_i \subset \mathcal{A}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$; namely, it means

$$\text{conv}(C) = \text{conv}(C_1 + \dots + C_m). \quad (2)$$

Later, when we draw figures for $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m)$ or subdivisions of $\mathcal{A}$, they actually represent (1) and (2).

For a given fine mixed subdivision S of $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m)$, let $\tilde{S} = \{B^{(1)}, \dots, B^{(l)}\} \subset S$ be the set of all mixed cells in S having the same type $(k_1, \dots, k_m)$ with $k_i > 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. Write $B^{(j)} = (B_1^{(j)}, \dots, B_m^{(j)})$ for $j = 1, \dots, l$. Two cells D and E in $\tilde{S}$ are said to be *connected* if there exists a sequence of cells $\{B^{(j_1)}, \dots, B^{(j_d)}\}$ in $\tilde{S}$ such that

- (a) $B^{(j_1)} = D$ and $B^{(j_d)} = E$, and
- (b) $\dim(\text{conv}(B_i^{(j_p)}) \cap \text{conv}(B_i^{(j_{p+1})})) \geq k_i - 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $p = 1, \dots, d - 1$.

It is conjectured in [3] and [4] that all mixed cells of the same type in $\tilde{S}$ are connected. The following example shows that this conjecture may not hold in general.

Example 1. Let

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \left\{ a = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, b = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, c = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

Fig. 1

and

$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \left\{ e = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}, g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

$Q_1 = \text{conv}(\mathcal{A}_1)$, $Q_2 = \text{conv}(\mathcal{A}_2)$, and $Q_1 + Q_2$ are shown in Fig. 1.

Consider the collection of cells $C = (C^{(1)}, C^{(2)}, C^{(3)}, C^{(4)}, C^{(5)})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} C^{(1)} &= \{(a, d), (e, f)\}, \\ C^{(2)} &= \{(b, d, c), (e)\}, \\ C^{(3)} &= \{(b, c), (e, g)\}, \\ C^{(4)} &= \{(b), (e, f, g)\}, \\ C^{(5)} &= \{(a, b, d), (f)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, C is a fine mixed subdivision of $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2)$ and cells $C^{(1)}$ and $C^{(3)}$ are the only cells of type $(1, 1)$. They are not connected because $(a, d) \cap (b, c) = \emptyset$.

2. Counterexample for Regular Subdivisions

For $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_m)$ as in Section 1, each $\mathcal{A}_i$ is a finite subset of R^n , choose real-valued functions $\omega_i: \mathcal{A}_i \rightarrow R$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. The m -tuple $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m)$ is called a *lifting function* on $\mathcal{A}$. We say that ω lifts $\mathcal{A}_i$ to its graph $\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_i = \{(q, \omega_i(q)) : q \in \mathcal{A}_i\} \subset R^{n+1}$. This notion is extended in the obvious way: $\widehat{\mathcal{A}} = (\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_m)$, $\widehat{Q}_i = \text{conv}(\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_i)$, $\widehat{Q} = \widehat{Q}_1 + \dots + \widehat{Q}_m$, etc.

Let S_ω be the set of cells C of $\mathcal{A}$ which satisfy

- (a) $\dim(\text{conv}(\hat{C})) = n$, and
- (b) $\hat{C}$ is a facet, face of dimension n , of $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ whose inner normals $\alpha \in (R^{n+1})^v$ have positive last coordinate.

In other words, $\text{conv}(\hat{C})$ is a facet of the lower hull of $\hat{\mathcal{Q}}$. It is known [1] that S_ω is a subdivision of $\mathcal{A}$ and, for a generic lifting function ω , S_ω is always a fine mixed subdivision. A subdivision induced by a lifting function is called a *regular subdivision*.

When the polyhedral method is used for solving polynomial systems by homotopy continuation methods [2], the lifting function ω provides a nonlinear homotopy for the algorithm, and its induced subdivision S_ω for the supports of the polynomials plays an essential role for the whole process of the algorithm. For the efficiency of the algorithm, it is very desirable that the mixed cells of a fixed type of this subdivision are connected. In fact, Pedersen showed [3] that when $n = 2$, mixed cells of a fixed type are indeed connected for regular subdivisions. The idea of the proof was sketched in [4]. Unfortunately, the following example shows this conjecture is incorrect when $n = 3$.

Example 2. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_1 &= \left\{ a_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, a_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, a_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_2 &= \left\{ b_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, b_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, b_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{A}_3 &= \left\{ c_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, c_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, c_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, c_4 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\},\end{aligned}$$

and its lifting

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_1 &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} a_3 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \\ \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_2 &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b_2 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b_3 \\ -4 \end{pmatrix} \right\}, \\ \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_3 &= \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} c_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} c_3 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} c_4 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

The regular subdivision of $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \mathcal{A}_3)$ induced by the above lifting is shown in Fig. 2. In this fine mixed subdivision there are eight cells, they are:

$$\begin{aligned}C^{(1)} &= \{(a_1), (b_1, b_2, b_3), (c_2, c_4)\}, & C^{(2)} &= \{(a_1), (b_2, b_3), (c_2, c_3, c_4)\}, \\ C^{(3)} &= \{(a_1), (b_1, b_3), (c_1, c_2, c_4)\}, & C^{(4)} &= \{(a_1, a_3), (b_2, b_3), (c_3, c_4)\}, \\ C^{(5)} &= \{(a_1, a_2), (b_1, b_3), (c_1, c_2)\}, & C^{(6)} &= \{(a_1, a_3), (b_3), (c_2, c_3, c_4)\}, \\ C^{(7)} &= \{(a_1, a_2), (b_3), (c_1, c_2, c_4)\}, & C^{(8)} &= \{(a_1, a_2, a_3), (b_3), (c_2, c_4)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 2

(see Fig. 3). Clearly, there are two cells of type $(1, 1, 1)$, they are $C^{(4)}$ and $C^{(5)}$. On the other hand,

$$\alpha_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

are the inner normals of $\hat{C}^{(4)}$ and $\hat{C}^{(5)}$, respectively. Obviously, $C^{(4)}$ and $C^{(5)}$ are not connected since $(c_1, c_2) \cap (c_3, c_4) = \emptyset$.

Remark. The dynamic lifting algorithm in [4] constructs *placeable* subdivisions which only require mixed cells of a certain type to be *fine*. We trust that counterexamples to the connectivity of mixed cells in placeable regular subdivisions can also be constructed.

Fig. 3

References

1. I. M. Gel'fand, M. Kapranov, and A. Zelevinsky, *Multidimensional Determinants, Discriminants and Resultants*, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1994.
2. B. Huber and B. Sturmfels, A polyhedral method for solving sparse polynomial systems. *Math. Comp.*, 64(212):1541–1555, 1995.
3. P. Pedersen, Personal communication at the occasion of the AMS–IMS–SIAM Summer Research Conference on “Continuous Algorithm and Complexity,” Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA, June 1994.
4. J. Verschelds, K. Gatemann, and R. Cools, Mixed volume computation by dynamical lifting applied to polynomial system solving, *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 16(1):69–112, 1996.

Received September 18, 1996, and in revised form February 17, 1997.