## An Algorithm for Constraint/Generator Removal from Double Description of Polyhedra

Sergey Bastrakov ${ }^{\text {a }}$, Nikolai Zolotykh ${ }^{a, b}$<br>a Lobachevsky State University of Nizhni Novgorod<br>${ }^{b}$ HSE Branch in Nizhny Novgorod

NET 2015

## Contents

## (1) Convex Polyhedra

2 Double Description Method

## (3) Constraint/Generator Removal

## Convex Polyhedra

## Definition

Convex polyhedron in $\mathbb{R}^{d}$ is a set of solutions to a finite system of linear inequalities:

$$
P=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: A x \geq b\right\}
$$

Each polyhedron can be represented in two ways:

- Facet representation as a set of constraints:

$$
P=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: A x \geq b\right\}
$$

- Vertex representation as a set generators:

$$
P=\operatorname{conv}\left(v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{n}\right)+\operatorname{cone}\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{m}\right)
$$

## Example: Facet and Vertex Representations

Facet representation:

$$
P=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{2}: A x \geq b\right\}
$$

Vertex representation:

$$
\begin{gathered}
P=\operatorname{conv}\left(v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}, v_{4}\right)+ \\
\operatorname{cone}\left(u_{1}, u_{2}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$



## Converting Between Representations

- Vertex enumeration problem: given facet representation, find vertex representation:

$$
A x \geq b \longrightarrow \begin{gathered}
v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{n} \\
u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{m}
\end{gathered}
$$

- Facet enumeration problem: given vertex representation, find facet representation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{n} \\
& u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{m}
\end{aligned} \longrightarrow A x \geq b
$$

Facet/vertex enumeration problems can be reduced to one another using duality $\Rightarrow$ essentially the same problem of computing dual representation

## Applications

Vertex and facet representations are equivalent descriptively, but not computationally

- Graphical applications in 2D and 3D
- Cutting plane algorithms, e.g. in ILP and DC programming
- Polyhedral method of loop nest optimization in compilers (e.g. Graphite for gcc, Polly for LLVM)
- Dynamic Groebner basis construction algorithms
- Many others


## Double Description Method

- DDM [Motzkin, etc., 1953] is one of the most widely used algorithms for computing dual representation
- Operates with polyhedral cones. Homogenization:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: A x \geq b\right\} \longrightarrow \\
& \quad C=\left\{\left(x_{0}, x\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}: A x-b x_{0} \geq 0, x_{0} \geq 0\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Input: $C=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: A x \geq 0\right\}$
- Output: $\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{n}\right\}: C=\operatorname{cone}\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{n}\right)$
- Incremental algorithm: start with a subsystem of inequalities, process one inequality per step.


## Step of DDM

- Input: $C=\{x: A x \geq 0\}=\operatorname{cone}(U)$
- Output: $U^{\prime}:\{x \in C: a x \geq 0\}=$ cone $\left(U^{\prime}\right)$
- Classify extreme rays of $C$ onto three groups:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& U_{+}=\{u \in U: a u>0\}-\text { feasible } \\
& U_{0}=\{u \in U: a u=0\}-\text { boundary } \\
& U_{-}=\{u \in U: a u<0\}-\text { infeasible }
\end{aligned}
$$

- For each edge $\left(u_{+}, u_{-}\right) \in U_{+} \times U_{-}$make a combination $u_{ \pm}=\left(-a u_{-}\right) u_{+}+\left(a u_{+}\right) u_{-}$
- $U^{\prime}=U_{+} \cup U_{0} \cup U_{ \pm}$, where $U_{ \pm}$is all combinations


## Adjacency Tests

- The key operation is finding all edges $\left(u_{+}, u_{-}\right)$.
- It is done using the incidence sets $J_{+}$, $J_{-}$: indices of inequalities that are satisfied as equalities
- Pairwise tests:
- Necessary condition $\left|A\left(J_{+} \cap J_{-}\right)\right| \geq \operatorname{rank}(A)-2$
- Algebraic test: $\operatorname{rank}\left(A\left(J_{+} \cap J_{-}\right)\right)=\operatorname{rank}(A)-2$
- Combinatorial test:

$$
\nexists w \in U: w \neq u_{+}, w \neq u_{-}, J_{+} \cap J_{-} \subseteq J_{w}
$$

- Using trees to avoid pairwise enumeration
- k-d trees: Terzer \& Stelling'2008
- We use a modification of their approach


## qskeleton

- Open source implementation of DDM and Fourier-Chernikov elimination algorithm
- Hybrid DDM with ideas of Quickhull [Bastrakov \& Zolotykh, 2011]
- Graph modification, $k$-d trees for adjacency in DDM and Fourier-Chernikov elimination
- Support for parallel computing
- https://github.com/sbastrakov/qskeleton/


## Constraint/Generator Removal Problem

- Given irreducible facet and vertex representations (double description) of a polyhedron $P$
- Constraint removal problem: find vertex representation of a polyhedron $Q$ defined by a subset of constraints of $P$.
- Generator removal problem: find facet representation of a polyhedron $Q$ generated by a subset of generators of $P$.
- The problems are dual to one another, consider generator removal problem
- Important for polyhedral loop optimization


## Constraint Removal Algorithms

## Naive algorithm

- Solve vertex representation problem for $Q$
- Ignore the given double description of $P$


## Incremental algorithm

- Suggested by Amato, Scozzari \& Zaffanella'2014
- Main idea: solve vertex representation problem for a subset of constraints of $Q$ using DDM
We present a new algorithm
- Does not involve solving vertex representation problem
- Uses facet and ray adjacency information of $P$


## A new constraint removal algorithm

- Use homogenization to transform from polyhedron to a polyhedral cone
- Remove constraints one by one:

$$
\{x: A x \geq 0, \alpha x \geq 0\} \longrightarrow\{x: A x \geq 0\}
$$

- Due to irreducibility, each inequality defines a facet of the cone


## Removing a Constraint

Input: $C=\{A x \geq 0, a x \geq 0\}=\operatorname{cone}(U)$
Output: $U^{\prime}: C^{\prime}=\{A x \geq 0\}=\operatorname{cone}\left(U^{\prime}\right)$

- $U_{+}:=\{u \in U: a u>0\}, U_{0}:=\emptyset, U_{-}:=\emptyset$
- $F_{\text {adj }}:=\{$ facets of $C$ adjacent to the removed facet $\}$
- $E_{a d j}:=$ \{edges of $C$ that intersect the removed facet $\}$
- For each $(u, v) \in E_{a d j}: a u=0, a v>0$
- Consider a ray that is a continuation to $a x<0$
- If it intersects a facet from $F_{a d j}$, add the first intersection point to $U_{-}$
- Otherwise add $u$ to $U_{0}$
- Return $U_{+} \cup U_{0} \cup U_{-}$


## Proof of Correctness (Sketch)

- Consider inverse operation: a step of DDM from $C^{\prime}=\{A x \geq 0\}$ to $C=\{A x \geq 0, a x \geq 0\}$
- During DDM $U^{\prime}=U_{+}^{\prime} \cup U_{0}^{\prime} \cup U_{-}^{\prime}$
- Need to show that $U_{+}=U_{+}^{\prime}, U_{0}=U_{0}^{\prime}, U_{-}=U_{-}^{\prime}$
- $U_{+}=U_{+}^{\prime}$ is obvious
- Proof of $U_{0}=U_{0}^{\prime}$ and $U_{-}=U_{-}^{\prime}$ relies on rules for making combinations in DDM, adjacency conditions and irreducibility of the double description of $C$.


## Complexity

$C=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d}: A x \geq 0\right\}=\operatorname{cone}\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, \ldots, u_{n}\right), A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$
Suppose we find $F_{\text {adj }}$ and $E_{\text {adj }}$ using pairwise Algebraic test, all arithmetic operations take $O(1)$

## Theorem

The complexity of removing a constraint of $C$ is $O\left(m^{2} n^{2}\right)$ for every fixed $d$.

## Theorem

The complexity of sequential removing $k$ constraints of $C$ is $O\left(k m^{2+2\lfloor(d-1) / 2\rfloor}\right)$ for every fixed $d$.

## Comparison to the Incremental Algorithm

- Complexity of the proposed algorithm:
- $O\left(m^{2} n^{2}\right)$ for removing a single constraint
- $O\left(k m^{2+2\lfloor(d-1) / 2\rfloor}\right)$ for removing $k$ constraints
- Incremental algorithm mainly performs DDM on $F_{\text {adj }}$.
- For standard DDM with pairwise Algebraic adjacency test the complexity of the incremental algorithm is

$$
O\left(\left|F_{a d j}\right|^{2+2\lfloor(d-1) / 2\rfloor}\right)
$$

- If $\left|F_{a d j}\right| \approx m$ the naive algorithm is probably the best


## Computational Evaluation

Polyhedron ccc6 ccc6
sampleh8
sampleh8
trunc10
trunc10
C4(20) $\times$ C4(20)
C4(20) $\times$ C4(20)
sphere6
sphere6
$\mathbf{n}_{\text {del }} \quad \mathbf{T}_{\text {naive }}[\mathrm{s}] \quad \mathbf{T}_{\text {incr. }}[\mathrm{s}] \quad \mathbf{T}_{\text {proposed }}[\mathrm{s}]$
0.01
1.6
4.8
7.3
0.1
4.3
2.4
45.7
0.7
5.1

## Summary \& Future Work

- A new algorithm for constraint/generator removal
- Possible enhancements:
- Use trees to speed up adjacency tests
- Use some accelerating data structure to find the first intersection points between continuations of edges and facets of $F_{\text {adj }}$
- Computational evaluation results:
- The proposed algorithm is competitive to the incremental
- Naive algorithm is worse, but not nearly as bad as in Amato, Scozzari \& Zaffanella paper

