
A Short Proof that the Extension Complexity of the Correlation Polytope Grows Exponentially

Volker Kaibel · Stefan Weltge

December 4, 2014

Abstract We establish that the extension complexity of the $n \times n$ correlation polytope is at least 1.5^n by a short proof that is self-contained except for using the fact that every face of a polyhedron is the intersection of all facets it is contained in. The main innovative aspect of the proof is a simple combinatorial argument showing that the rectangle covering number of the unique-disjointness matrix is at least 1.5^n , and thus the nondeterministic communication complexity of the unique-disjointness predicate is at least $.58n$. We thereby slightly improve on the previously best known lower bounds 1.24^n and $.31n$, respectively.

Keywords correlation polytope · extended formulations · unique disjointness · communication complexity

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000) 52Bxx · 90C57 · 94Axx

1 Introduction

The concept of extended formulations aims at writing polytopes as affine images of polyhedra of lower complexity. In particular, for a polytope P , one is interested in its *extension complexity*, i.e., the smallest number of facets of any polyhedron whose affine image is P . As the first explicit example of a 0/1-polytope whose extension complexity is not bounded by a polynomial in its dimension, Fiorini et al. [3] showed that the extension complexity of the *correlation polytope*

$$\text{CORR}(n) := \text{conv} \{y \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n} : y_{ij} = x_i x_j \forall i, j \in [n], x \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$$

Part of this research was funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG): “Extended Formulations in Combinatorial Optimization” (KA 1616/4-1)

Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Germany
E-mail: {kaibel,weltge}@ovgu.de

grows exponentially in n . Since $\text{CORR}(n)$ can be found as an affine image of a face of many other combinatorial polytopes of similar dimension, this result has been used to show that the extension complexities of polytopes such as traveling salesman polytopes [3], certain stable set polytopes [3], certain knapsack polytopes [1,6], and other polytopes associated with NP-hard optimization problems [1] are also not bounded polynomially. Independently of the correlation polytope, Rothvoß [8] recently even established an exponential lower bound on the extension complexity of the perfect matching polytope.

The proof of the statement on $\text{CORR}(n)$ given in [3] follows a strategy developed in [10] and uses a lower bound on the rectangle covering number of the unique-disjointness matrix obtained in [9], which essentially is due to [7]. This amounts to a rather involved proof in total, leaving it unclear how “deep” the result actually is (while its great relevance is out of discussion, of course).

The aim of this paper is to provide a short combinatorial, self-contained (except for using the fact that every face of a polyhedron is the intersection of all facets containing it) proof showing that the extension complexity of $\text{CORR}(n)$ is at least 1.5^n . The main new contribution of the proof is a simple combinatorial argument (see the half-a-page proof of Thm. 1) instead of using [9,7]. Furthermore, the lower bound 1.5^n improves slightly upon the previously best known one 1.24^n following from [2].

2 The Main Proof

For a nonnegative integer n we set $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ and, as usual, denote by $2^{[n]}$ its power set. The Euclidian scalar product of two vectors v, w is denoted by $\langle v, w \rangle = \sum_i v_i w_i$. Further, for a set $a \subseteq [n]$ let $\chi(a) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be its characteristic vector, i.e., $\chi(a)_i = 1$ if and only if $i \in a$. For a set $b \subseteq [n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ let $y^b \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$ be the 0/1-matrix with $y_{ij}^b = 1$ if and only if $i \in b$ and $j \in b$ hold. With this notation, we have that $\text{CORR}(n) = \text{conv}\{y^b : b \subseteq [n]\}$.

We first extract the single combinatorial property of $\text{CORR}(n)$ that is relevant for the proof and then, by a few polyhedral arguments, establish a general lower bound on the extension complexity of $\text{CORR}(n)$ in terms of sizes of so-called coverings. This part is basically a compact reformulation of known arguments.

Lemma 1 *For every $a \subseteq [n]$ there is a face F_a of $\text{CORR}(n)$ such that*

$$y^b \in F_a \iff |a \cap b| = 1$$

holds for all $b \subseteq [n]$.

Proof For a set $a \subseteq [n]$, let $\pi_a(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x_i : i \in [n]]$ be the quadratic polynomial $(\langle \chi(a), x \rangle - 1)^2$ with variable vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Denote by $\Pi_a(y) \in \mathbb{R}[y_{ij} : i, j \in [n]]$ the linear polynomial arising from $\pi_a(x)$ by substituting each monomial $x_i x_j$ by y_{ij} and each monomial x_i by y_{ii} . Due to $y_{ij}^b = \chi(b)_i \chi(b)_j$

and $y_{ii}^b = \chi(b)_i$ we have $\Pi_a(y^b) = \pi_a(\chi(b)) \geq 0$ for each $b \subseteq [n]$. This implies that the linear inequality $\Pi_a(y) \geq 0$ is valid for $\text{CORR}(n)$ and hence defines a face F_a of $\text{CORR}(n)$. Note that a point y^b is contained in F_a if and only if $\langle \chi(a), \chi(b) \rangle = 1$, i.e., $|a \cap b| = 1$ holds. \square

Let us define the set $\mathcal{D}(n) := \{(a, b) \in 2^{[n]} \times 2^{[n]} : a \cap b = \emptyset\}$ of pairs of disjoint subsets of $[n]$. A set $R \subseteq \mathcal{D}(n)$ is called *valid* if it satisfies

$$\forall (a, b), (a', b') \in R : |a \cap b'| \neq 1. \quad (1)$$

Further, we say that a set R_1, \dots, R_k of valid sets for $\mathcal{D}(n)$ is a *covering* of $\mathcal{D}(n)$ of size k if

$$\mathcal{D}(n) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^k R_i$$

holds.

Lemma 2 *Let Q be a polyhedron having f facets such that $\text{CORR}(n)$ is an affine image of Q . Then there exists a covering of $\mathcal{D}(n)$ of size f .*

Proof Let p be an affine map such that $p(Q) = \text{CORR}(n)$. For every facet G of Q let us define the set

$$R_G := \{(a, b) \in \mathcal{D}(n) : p^{-1}(F_a) \subseteq G, y^b \notin p(G)\}.$$

First, note that R_G is valid: For $(a, b), (a', b') \in R_G$ we observe that $|a \cap b'| = 1$ is equivalent to $y^{b'} \in F_a$, which, in case of $p^{-1}(F_a) \subseteq G$ implies $y^{b'} \in F_a \subseteq p(G)$.

Second, we claim that $\{R_G : G \text{ facet of } Q\}$ is a covering of $\mathcal{D}(n)$. Towards this end, let $(a, b) \in \mathcal{D}(n)$. Observe that $p^{-1}(F_a)$ is a face of Q and let G_1, \dots, G_k be the facets of Q containing $p^{-1}(F_a)$. Since $p^{-1}(F_a) = \bigcap_{i=1}^k G_i$ holds, we have

$$y^b \notin F_a = p\left(\bigcap_{i \in [k]} G_i\right) \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in [k]} p(G_i).$$

Hence there is some $i \in [k]$ with $y^b \notin p(G_i)$, thus we obtain $(a, b) \in R_{G_i}$ (due to $p^{-1}(F_a) \subseteq G_i$). \square

We are now ready to prove our main result:

Theorem 1 *The extension complexity of $\text{CORR}(n)$ is at least 1.5^n .*

Proof By Lemma 2, it suffices to show that any covering of $\mathcal{D}(n)$ has size of at least 1.5^n . To this end, observe that we have $|\mathcal{D}(n)| = 3^n$, as when constructing the pairs in $\mathcal{D}(n)$ one has for each $i \in [n]$ independently to choose between three possibilities (the only forbidden one being $i \in a \cap b$). Let $\varrho(n)$ be the largest cardinality of any valid subset of $\mathcal{D}(n)$. Since any covering of $\mathcal{D}(n)$ must have size of at least $\frac{|\mathcal{D}(n)|}{\varrho(n)}$, it remains to be shown that $\varrho(n) \leq 2^n$, which

we will establish by showing that $\varrho(n) \leq 2\varrho(n-1)$ holds for all $n \geq 1$. (Note that $\varrho(0) = 1$ since the only valid subset of $\mathcal{D}(n)$ is $\{(\emptyset, \emptyset)\}$.)

Towards this end, let $R \subseteq \mathcal{D}(n)$ be valid (with $n \geq 1$) and let us define the following two sets:

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &:= (\{(a, b) \in R : n \in a\} \cup \{(a, b) \in R : (a \cup \{n\}, b) \notin R\}) \cap ([n] \times [n-1]) \\ R_2 &:= (\{(a, b) \in R : n \in b\} \cup \{(a, b) \in R : (a, b \cup \{n\}) \notin R\}) \cap ([n-1] \times [n]) \end{aligned}$$

Further, let us define the function $f: R \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(n-1)$ with $f(a, b) := (a \setminus \{n\}, b \setminus \{n\})$. Since $R_1 \subseteq R$ is valid and since $R_1 \subseteq [n] \times [n-1]$, $f(R_1)$ is valid. Similarly, $f(R_2)$ is also valid. Further, by the definition of R_i , f is injective on R_i for $i = 1, 2$. By induction, we hence obtained that

$$|R_1| + |R_2| = |f(R_1)| + |f(R_2)| \leq 2\varrho(n-1) \leq 2^n.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that $R \subseteq R_1 \cup R_2$: Let $(a, b) \in R$. Since $a \cap b = \emptyset$, we have that $(a, b) \in ([n] \times [n-1]) \cup ([n-1] \times [n])$. Thus, if $n \in a \cup b$, we clearly have that $(a, b) \in R_1 \cup R_2$. It remains to show that for any $(a, b) \in R$ with $n \notin a \cup b$, we cannot have that $(a \cup \{n\}, b) \in R$ and $(a, b \cup \{n\}) \in R$. Indeed, this is true since, otherwise, the validity of R would imply

$$1 \neq |(a \cup \{n\}) \cap (b \cup \{n\})| = |\{n\}| = 1,$$

a contradiction. □

3 Remarks on Related Results

From the Perspective of Communication Complexity

Using the terminology from the theory of communication complexity, the proof of Theorem 1 shows that the *rectangle covering number* of the *unique-disjointness matrix* $\text{UDISJ}(n)$ (see, e.g., [4]) is at least 1.5^n . To see this, observe that our notion of valid sets corresponds to sets of 1-entries in $\text{UDISJ}(n)$ which can be covered simultaneously by one rectangle. In particular, this implies that the *nondeterministic communication complexity* of the *unique-disjointness* predicate is at least $\log_2(1.5^n) \geq .58n$. For the background of these remarks, we refer to [5] or [4].

Applicability to the Matching Polytope

Most superpolynomial lower bounds on the extension complexities of combinatorial polytopes are a direct consequence of the fact that the extension complexity of the correlation polytope grows exponentially and hence can also be derived from our argumentation. In contrast to this, Rothvoß' [8] result on an exponential lower bound on the extension complexity of the (perfect) matching polytope of the complete graph seems to be of a considerably more

complicated nature. It follows already from [10] that this result cannot be deduced from the results on the correlation polytope in a manner similar to that of the TSP polytope. In fact, Rothvoß' approach exploits more than the mere combinatorial structure of the matching polytopes. The ideas underlying the proof presented in this paper seem to be of little use in that context, leaving wide open the question of a similarly simple proof of the fact that the extension complexity of the perfect matching polytope cannot be bounded polynomially.

Acknowledgements We thank Yuri Faenza and Kanstantsin Pashkovich for their helpful remarks on an earlier version of this paper.

References

1. Avis, D., Tiwary, H.R.: On the extension complexity of combinatorial polytopes. In: F.V. Fomin, R. Freivalds, M.Z. Kwiatkowska, D. Peleg (eds.) *Automata, Languages, and Programming, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 7965, pp. 57–68. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2013). DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-39206-1_6. URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-39206-1_6
2. Braun, G., Pokutta, S.: Common information and unique disjointness. In: FOCS (to appear) (2013)
3. Fiorini, S., Massar, S., Pokutta, S., Tiwary, H.R., de Wolf, R.: Linear vs. semidefinite extended formulations: exponential separation and strong lower bounds. In: STOC, pp. 95–106 (2012)
4. Jukna, S.: *Boolean function complexity: advances and frontiers*. Springer (2012)
5. Kushilevitz, E., Nisan, N.: *Communication complexity*. Cambridge University Press (2006)
6. Pokutta, S., Vyve, M.V.: A note on the extension complexity of the knapsack polytope. *Oper. Res. Lett.* **41**(4), 347–350 (2013). DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2013.03.010>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167637713000394>
7. Razborov, A.A.: On the distributional complexity of disjointness. *Theoretical Computer Science* **106**(2), 385–390 (1992)
8. Rothvoß, T.: The matching polytope has exponential extension complexity. arXiv:1311.2369 (2013). URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.2369>
9. de Wolf, R.: Nondeterministic quantum query and communication complexities. *SIAM J. Comput.* **32**(3), 681–699 (2003)
10. Yannakakis, M.: Expressing combinatorial optimization problems by linear programs. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* **43**(3), 441–466 (1991)