

# Smoothed Analysis of Interior-Point Algorithms: Condition Number

John Dunagan\*  
Microsoft Research

Daniel A. Spielman †  
Department of Mathematics  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Shang-Hua Teng ‡  
Department of Computer Science  
Boston University and  
Akamai Technologies Inc.

## Abstract

A linear program is typically specified by a matrix  $A$  together with two vectors  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$ , where  $A$  is an  $n$ -by- $d$  matrix,  $\mathbf{b}$  is an  $n$ -vector and  $\mathbf{c}$  is a  $d$ -vector. There are several canonical forms for defining a linear program using  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ . One commonly used canonical form is:

$$\max \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x} \text{ s.t. } A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b} \text{ and its dual } \min \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{y} \text{ s.t. } A^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}.$$

In [Ren95b, Ren95a, Ren94], Renegar defined the condition number  $C(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  of a linear program and proved that an interior point algorithm whose complexity was  $O(n^3 \log(C(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})/\epsilon))$  could solve a linear program in this canonical form to relative accuracy  $\epsilon$ , or determine that the program was infeasible or unbounded. In this paper, we prove that for any  $(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$  such that  $\|\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}\|_F \leq 1$ , where  $\|\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}\|_F$  denotes the square root of the sum of squares of the entries in the  $(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$ , if  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  is a Gaussian perturbation of  $(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$  of variance  $\sigma^2$ , then

$$\mathbf{E} [\log(C(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}))] = O(\log n/\sigma).$$

Moreover, we show that this smoothed bound holds for the condition number of linear programs in the each of the four commonly used canonical forms.

Consequently, we show that the smoothed complexity of Renegar's interior point algorithm for finding  $\epsilon$ -accurate solutions to linear programs is  $O(n^3(\log(n/\sigma) + \log(1/\epsilon)))$  arithmetic operations. In contrast, the best known worst-case bound on the complexity of a linear programming algorithm for finding  $\epsilon$ -accurate solutions is  $O(n^3(L + \log(1/\epsilon)))$ , where  $L$  is the "bit-length" of the program and is typically larger than  $d$ . Since linear programs in real applications are often subjected to a small degree of random noise, our result may explain the fast convergence of interior point methods observed in practice.

---

\*Supported in part by NSF Grant CCR-9875024. [jdunagan@microsoft.com](mailto:jdunagan@microsoft.com). Part of the work was done while the author was at MIT.

†Partially supported by an Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Fellowship, and NSF Grant CCR-0112487. [spielman@math.mit.edu](mailto:spielman@math.mit.edu)

‡Partially supported by an Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Fellowship, and NSF Grants CCR-9972532, and CCR-0112487. [steng@cs.bu.edu](mailto:steng@cs.bu.edu)

# 1 Introduction

In [ST01], Spielman and Teng introduced the smoothed analysis of algorithms as an alternative to worst-case and average-case analyses in the hope that it would provide a measure of the complexity of algorithms that would agree better with practical experience. The smoothed complexity of an algorithm is the maximum over its inputs of the expected running time of the algorithm under slight perturbations of that input. In this paper, we study the smoothed complexity of interior point algorithms for linear programming. Interior point algorithms for linear programming are exciting both because they are known to run in polynomial time [Kar84] in the worst case and because they have been used to efficiently solve linear programs in practice. In fact, the speed of interior point methods in practice is much better than that proved in their worst-case analyses [IL94, LMS90, EA96].

In this paper, we prove that the smoothed complexity of an interior point algorithm *iteration* step is much lower than its worst-case complexity and much closer to that observed experimentally. Our main result is that the smoothed complexity of interior point algorithms for finding  $\epsilon$ -accurate solutions to linear programs is  $O(n^3 \log(n/\sigma\epsilon))$  arithmetic operations, where  $\sigma$  is the magnitude of the perturbation. Specifically, for each  $(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$  and  $\sigma \geq 0$ , let  $G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)$  denote the space of Gaussian perturbations of  $(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$  of variance  $\sigma^2$ ; let  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \leftarrow G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)$  denote that  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  is drawn from distribution  $G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)$ ; let  $\|\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}\|_F$  denote the square root of the sum of squares of the entries in  $\bar{A}$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{b}}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$ ; and let  $I((A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}), \epsilon)$  be the number of interior point iterations required by Renegar's interior point algorithm for finding  $\epsilon$ -accurate solutions of the linear program defined by  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  or determining that the program is infeasible or unbounded. We will show that

$$\max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{E}_{(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \leftarrow G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)} [I((A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}), \epsilon)] = O(\sqrt{n} \log(n/\sigma\epsilon)),$$

We thereby trade the term of  $L$ , which is typically  $\Omega(d)$ , in the worst-case complexity of interior point algorithms, for the term  $\log(n/\sigma)$  in their smoothed-complexity. As each interior point iteration requires time  $O(n^{5/2})$ , this implies the stated running time bound. We also establish similar results for other interior point algorithms whose running time has been analyzed using condition numbers.

Our analysis uses a two-step approach to bound the smoothed complexity of the interior point algorithms:

1. Bound the running time of an algorithm in terms of a condition number.
2. Perform a smoothed analysis of this condition number.

Step 1 has already been done by Renegar [Ren95b, Ren95a, Ren94] and several other researchers [CP01, FV00, Ver96]. This paper accomplishes step 2. Combining step 2 with prior work yields the main result of this paper.

## 1.1 Prior Work on Linear Programming Algorithms

A linear program is typically specified by a matrix  $A$  together with two vectors  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$ . If  $A$  is an  $n$  by  $d$  matrix, then  $\mathbf{b}$  is an  $n$ -vector and  $\mathbf{c}$  is a  $d$ -vector. There are several canonical forms for defining a linear program from  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ . The following are four commonly used canonical forms:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x} \text{ s.t. } A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b} & \text{and its dual} & \min \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{y} \text{ s.t. } A^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0} & (1) \\ \max \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x} \text{ s.t. } A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0} & \text{and its dual} & \min \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{y} \text{ s.t. } A^T \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0} & (2) \\ \max \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x} \text{ s.t. } A\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0} & \text{and its dual} & \min \mathbf{b}^T \mathbf{y} \text{ s.t. } A^T \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{c} & (3) \\ \text{find } \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0} \text{ s.t. } A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{0} & \text{and its dual} & \text{find } \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0} \text{ s.t. } A^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0} & (4) \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that  $n \geq d$  for the remainder of the paper. The worst-case complexity of solving linear programs has traditionally been stated in terms of  $n$ ,  $d$ , and  $L$ , where  $L$  is commonly called the “bit-length” of the input linear program, but is rarely defined to actually be the number of bits necessary to specify the linear program. For integer  $A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}$ , Khachiyan [Kha79] and Karmarkar [Kar84] defined  $L$  as the logarithm of the maximum determinant over all  $d$ -by- $d$  square submatrices of  $A$  plus the logarithm of the maximum absolute entry of  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$ . This definition of  $L$  is hard to compute from  $A, \mathbf{b}$ , and  $\mathbf{c}$ . Simpler quantities for defining  $L$  also appear in the literature. In the most commonly used definition,  $L$  is the maximum number of bits needed to specify a row of  $A$ , and hence is at least  $d$ . With a more generous spirit, Wright [Wri96] defines  $L$  to actually be the input size of the linear program, which is at least  $nd$ . For each of these definitions, most inputs  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  yield an  $L$  that is at least  $d$ . In particular, if one randomly perturbs the least significant bit of every entry in an integer matrix, then the resulting  $L$  value is typically at least  $d$  for each of the above definitions.

The quantity  $L$  tends to change drastically under other ways of specifying the input to the linear programming algorithm. If  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  is specified as a series of rational numbers, then under each of the above definitions of  $L$ , the transformation to an integral  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  can yield an  $L$  of value  $\Omega(d^2)$ . If  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  is specified in floating-point format, as is commonly the case in computer systems, the transformation to integral  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  can yield an exponentially large  $L$ .

In part to address these difficulties, Renegar introduced the condition number  $C$  of a linear program. We will define  $C$  precisely in Section 1.2. Both  $L$  and the condition number  $C$  are instance-based measures of the difficulty of a linear programming problem, but  $C$  possesses a number of desirable properties that  $L$  does not. For strictly feasible linear programs specified with integral  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ ,  $C$  is absolutely bounded by  $L$ . For a linear program specified with integral  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  that is a-priori perturbed to be strictly feasible, the resulting linear program has  $C$  upper bounded by  $L$ . Additionally,  $C$  is well-defined for arbitrary real inputs, including irrational numbers. Our work uses the understanding of  $C$  developed by Renegar and others, but we will present the historical development of linear programming algorithms using the notation  $L$  that continues to be standard.

The most popular methods for solving linear programs are simplex methods and interior point methods. The focus of this paper is interior point methods. At a high level, an interior point

algorithm solves a linear program in three steps: In the first step, which is often referred as the *initialization* step, it determines whether or not the program is infeasible or unbounded. If the program is feasible and bounded, the initialization step will also produce a feasible point  $\mathbf{x}_0$  and enter the second step, the *iteration* step. In this step, the algorithm iteratively computes a sequence of feasible solutions  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$  with increasing qualities. For primal interior-point algorithms, a typical measure of quality of a feasible point is the *optimality gap* between the objective function at the point and the optimal; for primal-dual algorithms, which maintains at each iteration a feasible primal point as well as a feasible dual point, the quality is measured by the *duality gap* between the primal and dual feasible points. In either case, one can prove that the number of iterations needed to reduced the gap from initial  $R$  to  $\epsilon$  is  $O(\sqrt{n} \log R/\epsilon)$  [Ren88, Vai90, Ye97]. In addition, each of these iterations can be performed with  $O(n^{5/2})$  operations [Gon88]. As many applications of linear programming require only an approximate solution to the linear program, one can then skip the third step: the *termination* step. In the case when an exact solution of a linear program is needed, the termination step combinatorially rounds a “good enough” approximate feasible point to the exact solution. It follows from Khachiyan [Kha79] and Karmarkar [Kar84] that one can always round a solution with gap  $\epsilon = 2^{-O(L)}$  to the exact solution. Because setting  $\epsilon = 2^{-O(L)}$  does not increase the asymptotic number of operations required by more than a constant factor, worst-case complexity bounds for linear programming often state only the number of arithmetic operations needed to obtain an exact answer.

The best bounds on the worst-case complexity of interior point methods, and for linear programming in general, were first obtained by Gonzaga [Gon88] and Vaidya [Vai90], who showed how to solve linear programs in  $O(n^3 L)$  arithmetic operations<sup>1</sup>. The initial step of these algorithms produces a feasible point with gap  $2^{O(L)}$ . Therefore, these interior-point algorithms need  $O(\sqrt{n}L)$  iterations to either solve or approximately solve a linear program. It is not known how to obtain an asymptotic improvement on these bounds by requiring the algorithm output an  $\epsilon$ -approximate solution rather than an exact solution to the linear program. As  $L$  is typically larger than  $d$ , the presence of  $L$  in the worst-case complexity bound increases the bound by at least a linear factor.

## 1.2 Analyzing Linear Programming using Condition Number

In [Ren95b, Ren95a, Ren94], Renegar defined the condition number  $C(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  of a linear program and proved that an interior point algorithm whose complexity was  $O(n^3 \log(C(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})/\epsilon))$  could solve a linear program to relative accuracy  $\epsilon$ , or determine that the program was infeasible or unbounded. Because condition number is a normalized measure, this guarantee is as strong as the absolute  $\epsilon$  offered by earlier algorithms.

For a linear program in the canonical form (1), we follow Renegar [Ren94, Ren95a, Ren95b] in defining the primal condition number,  $C_P^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{b})$ , of the program to be the normalized reciprocal of the distance to ill-posedness. A program is ill-posed if the program can be made both feasible and infeasible by arbitrarily small changes to the pair  $(A, \mathbf{b})$ . The distance to ill-posedness of the pair  $(A, \mathbf{b})$  is the distance to the set of ill-posed programs under the Frobenius norm. We similarly define the dual condition number,  $C_D^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{c})$ , to be the normalized reciprocal of

---

<sup>1</sup>Vaidya’s algorithm is theoretically faster for some inputs as its complexity is  $O((nd^2 + n^{1.5}d)L)$

the distance to ill-posedness of the dual program. The condition number,  $C^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ , is the maximum of  $C_P^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{b})$  and  $C_D^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{c})$ .

We can equivalently define the condition number without introducing the concept of ill-posedness. For programs of form (1), define  $C_P^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{b})$  by

**Definition 1.2.1 (Primal Condition Number).**

(a) if  $A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$  is feasible, then

$$C_P^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{b}) = \|A, \mathbf{b}\|_F / \sup \{ \delta : \|\Delta A, \Delta \mathbf{b}\|_F \leq \delta \text{ implies } (A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} \leq (\mathbf{b} + \Delta \mathbf{b}) \text{ is feasible} \},$$

(b) if  $A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$  is infeasible, then

$$C_P^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{b}) = \|A, \mathbf{b}\|_F / \sup \{ \delta : \|\Delta A, \Delta \mathbf{b}\|_F \leq \delta \text{ implies } (A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} \leq (\mathbf{b} + \Delta \mathbf{b}) \text{ is infeasible} \}$$

It follows from the definition above that  $C_P^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{b}) \geq 1$ . We define the dual condition number,  $C_D^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{c})$ , analogously.

To reader's already familiar with condition numbers in contexts outside of linear programming, the above definition may be surprising: the condition numbers for numerous other problems (i.e., matrix inversion,  $\mathbf{x} = A^{-1}\mathbf{b}$ ) are defined as the sensitivity of the output to perturbations in the input, and then shown to be equivalent to the distance to ill-posedness. Renegar inverts this scheme by defining the condition number for linear programming to be distance to ill-posedness, and then showing that the condition number does bound the sensitivity of the output to perturbations in the input [Ren94, Ren95a].

Any linear program may be expressed in form (1); however, transformations among linear programming formulations do not in general (and commonly do not) preserve condition number [Ren95a]. We will therefore have to define different condition numbers for each normal form we consider. For linear programs with canonical forms (2), (3), and (4) we define their condition numbers,  $C^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ ,  $C^{(3)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  and  $C^{(4)}(A)$ , analogously. We follow the convention that  $\mathbf{0}$  is not considered a feasible solution to (4). Just as for  $C_P^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{b})$ ,  $C^{(i)} \geq 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ .

For linear programs given in form (2), Renegar [Ren95b, Ren95a, Ren94] developed an algorithm for the initialization step that returns a feasible point with initial optimality gap  $R \leq O(nC(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}))$  for a linear program  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  or determines that the program is infeasible or unbounded, in  $O(n^3 \log(C(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})))$  operations. By applying  $O(\sqrt{n} \log(nC(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}))/\epsilon)$  iterations of a primal interior point method, for a total of  $O(n^3 \log(nC(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}))/\epsilon)$  arithmetic operations, Renegar proved:

**Theorem 1.2.2 (Renegar).** *For any linear program  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  and parameter  $\epsilon$ , Renegar's interior-point algorithm, in  $O(n^3 \log(nC(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}))/\epsilon)$  operations, finds a feasible solution  $\mathbf{x}$  with optimality gap  $\epsilon \|A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\|_F$ , or determines that the program is infeasible or unbounded.*

Subsequently, Vera [Ver96] developed efficient condition number based algorithms for forms (1) and (3) and Cucker and Peña [CP01] developed algorithms for form (4). The complexity of their

results are similar to that of Renegar's. In [FV00], Freund and Vera give a unified approach which both efficiently estimates the condition number and solves the linear programs in any of these forms.

Part of the reason for the volume of work is that every linear programming formulation requires a separate condition number analysis. This point is made by [Ren94, Ren95a, Ren95b, Ver96, CP01] in their work developing interior point methods that have good dependence on the condition number. In addition to bounding the time necessary to optimize in terms of the condition number, there has been work on quickly estimating the condition number [FV99], a well-known question for the condition numbers of other problems. A bound on the smoothed complexity of all of these algorithms follows from theorem 1.3.2 given below.

Note that Renegar's algorithm does not attempt to round the  $\epsilon$ -close solution to the optimal vertex. However, one can use Renegar's algorithm to recover the worst-case iteration complexity bound of  $O(\sqrt{n}L)$  for interior-point method iterations: provided that the input program is not ill-posed, Renegar's condition number is upper bounded by  $2^{O(L)}$ , and  $\|A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\|_F$  is trivially bounded by  $L$ . If one then finds a solution with  $\epsilon = 2^{-O(L)}$  accuracy, it can be combinatorially rounded to the exact solution using previously developed techniques.

Condition numbers have recently been used to shed light on issues outside the theoretical study of interior point methods for linear programming. For example, the notion of condition number for linear programs has been extended to semi-definite programs [FN01]. Also, in an experimental study of the distribution of condition numbers that occur in practice, Ordóñez and Freund [OF02] found that 42% of the variation in the number of iterations taken by interior point algorithms in CPLEX 7.1 to solve problems in the NETLIB suite could be accounted for by the condition number of the problem.

### 1.3 Smoothed Analysis of Condition Number: Our Results

In smoothed analysis of this paper, we assume that inputs to linear programming algorithms are subject to slight Gaussian perturbations. Recall that the probability density function of a Gaussian random variable with mean  $\bar{x}$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  is given by

$$\mu(x) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-(x-\bar{x})^2/(2\sigma^2)}.$$

A Gaussian perturbation of a vector  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  of variance  $\sigma^2$  is a vector whose  $i$ th element is a Gaussian random variable of variance  $\sigma^2$  and mean  $\bar{x}_i$ . A Gaussian perturbation of a matrix may be defined similarly. The probability density function of a  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian perturbation of  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  of variance  $\sigma^2$  is given by

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{(\sigma\sqrt{2\pi})^d} e^{-\|\mathbf{x}-\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|^2/(2\sigma^2)}.$$

For each  $(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$  and  $\sigma \geq 0$ , let  $G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)$  denote the space of Gaussian perturbations of  $(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}})$  of variance  $\sigma^2$ . Let  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \leftarrow G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)$  denote that  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  is drawn from distribution  $G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)$ .

Our main result is:

**Theorem 1.3.1 (Smoothed Complexity of IPM).** *Let  $T((A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}), \epsilon)$  be the time complexity of Renegar’s interior point algorithm for finding  $\epsilon$ -accurate solutions of the linear program defined by  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  or determining that the program is infeasible or unbounded. Then for any  $\sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{nd}$ ,*

$$\max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{E}_{(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \leftarrow G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)} [T((A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}), \epsilon)] = O\left(n^3 \log\left(\frac{n}{\sigma\epsilon}\right)\right),$$

where  $\bar{A}$  is an  $n$ -by- $d$  matrix.

This theorem follows immediately from Renegar’s analysis (Theorem 1.2.2) and the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.3.2 (Smoothed Complexity of Renegar’s Condition Number).** *For any  $\sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{nd}$ , and*

$$\max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}\|_F \leq 1} \Pr_{(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \leftarrow G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)} \left[ C^{(i)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) > \frac{2^{17} n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \left( \log^2 \frac{2^{14} n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) \right] < \delta,$$

and

$$\max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{E}_{(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \leftarrow G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)} \left[ \log C^{(i)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \right] \leq 15 + 4.5 \log \frac{nd}{\sigma},$$

where  $\bar{A}$  is an  $n$ -by- $d$  matrix.

Theorem 1.3.2 implies a bound on the smoothed complexity of Renegar’s algorithm as well as a bound on the smoothed complexity of the interior point methods that were developed for the other canonical forms. Note that in the theorem, we abuse the notation  $C^{(4)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  for  $C^{(4)}(A)$ . The first bound of the theorem means that with high probability, the condition number of a perturbed linear program (with variance  $\sigma^2$ ) is polynomial in  $n$ ,  $d$ , and  $1/\sigma$ .

Note that in this paper, we will not consider the smoothed complexity of the termination step of an interior point method. Very recently, Spielman and Teng[ST02a] proved that the smoothed number of iterations needed, from a feasible point with  $O(1)$ -gap, to terminate correctly is  $O(\sqrt{n} \log(n/\sigma))$  for canonical form (2). These two results together yield a smoothed analysis of the complexity of finding exact solutions to linear programs specified in form (2). We will discuss this result and remaining open questions further in Section 5.

Our smoothed complexity bound is derived from a smoothed analysis of the condition number. We address the question of “what are likely values for the condition number?” In particular, for a very natural model of noise in the input data as considered in smoothed analysis, we show that the condition number is likely to be low. This addresses a question outside the scope of previous work on the condition number for linear programs. The body of work on how condition number influences running time is an extensive foundation, and we hope to build another layer underneath, on how noisy data leads to bounded condition number.

In order to analyze Renegar’s condition number for the primal and dual of each of the four canonical forms, we found it necessary to develop several extensions to the theory of condition numbers that may be of independent interest. For example, Lemma 2.3.2 generalizes the geometric condition on distance to ill-posedness developed independently in [CC01] by incorporating an arbitrary non-pointed convex cone that is not subject to perturbation, and this generalization is necessary for the application of our techniques. Additionally, Lemmas 2.4.2, 3.3.1, and 3.3.2 all provide geometric conditions on the distance to ill-posedness that are on a par of importance for us to Lemma 2.3.2.

## 1.4 Organization of the Paper

In our analysis, we divide the eight condition numbers  $C_P^{(i)}$  and  $C_D^{(i)}$ , for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , into two groups. The first group includes  $C_P^{(1)}$ ,  $C_P^{(2)}$ ,  $C_D^{(2)}$ ,  $C_D^{(3)}$ , and with some additional work,  $C_P^{(4)}$ . The remaining condition numbers belong to the second group. We will refer to a condition number from the first group as a *primal condition number* and a condition number from the second group as a *dual condition number*.

Section 2 is devoted to establishing a smoothed bound on the primal condition number. We remark that the techniques used in Section 2 do not critically depend upon  $A$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  being Gaussian distributed, and similar theorems could be proved using slight modifications of our techniques if these were smoothly distributed within spheres or cubes. It follows from the result of Section 2 alone that Theorem 1.3.2 holds for linear program given in Form (2).

In Section 3, we establish the smoothed bound on the dual condition number. Our bounds in this section do critically make use of the Gaussian distribution on  $A$ ,  $\mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$ .

In Section 4, we prove our Main Theorem 1.3.2 using the smoothed bounds of the previous two sections; this handles the three remaining canonical forms. We conclude the paper in Section 5 with some open questions.

In the remainder of this Section, we review some of the previous work on smoothed analysis, some earlier results on the average-case analysis of interior-point algorithms, and lower bounds on the complexity of interior-point algorithms.

## 1.5 Prior Smoothed Analysis of Linear Programming Algorithms

In [ST01], Spielman and Teng introduced the smoothed analysis of algorithms as a hybrid of the average-case and worst-case analyses of algorithms. In smoothed analysis, one proves a bound on the performance of an algorithm that holds for most inputs in every neighborhood of every input. In [ST01], they showed that the shadow-vertex simplex method takes an expected polynomial number of steps on the slight Gaussian perturbation of every problem instance.

Shortly thereafter, Blum and Dunagan [BD02] performed a smoothed analysis of the perceptron algorithm for linear programming. They showed that the probability the perceptron algorithm would take more than a polynomial in the input size times  $k$  steps was inversely proportional to  $\sqrt{k}$ . Their analysis had the advantage of being significantly simpler than that of [ST01], and



it is their analysis that we build upon in this work. Blum and Dunagan’s analysis used the fact that the number of steps taken by the perceptron algorithm can be bounded by the reciprocal of the “wobble room” in its input, and the bulk of their analysis was a bound on the probability that this “wobble room” was small. The “wobble room” turns out to be a condition number of the input to the perceptron algorithm.

## 1.6 Prior Average-Case Analyses of Interior Point Algorithms

There has been an enormous body of work on interior point algorithms, some of which has addressed their average-case complexity. Anstreicher, Ji, Potra and Ye [AJPY93, AJPY99], have shown that under Todd’s degenerate model for random linear programs [Tod91], a homogeneous self-dual interior point method runs in  $O(\sqrt{n} \log n)$  iterations with high probability. The performance of other interior point methods on random inputs have been heuristically analyzed through “one-step analyses”, but it is not clear that these analyses can be made rigorous [Nem88, GT92, MTY93].

## 1.7 Lower Bounds for Interior Point Algorithms

The best known lower bound on the complexity of interior point methods is  $\Omega(n^{1/3})$  iterations due to Todd [Tod94] and Todd and Ye [TY96]. However, the programs for which these lower bounds hold are very ill-conditioned. There are no known bounds of the form  $\Omega(n^\epsilon)$  for well-conditioned linear programs. Establishing such a lower bound or demonstrating that interior point algorithms require fewer iterations in the well-conditioned case is an important open problem, and one that we return to in Section 5.

## 2 Primal Condition Number

In this section, we show that, with high probability, the smoothed value of the primal condition numbers is polynomial in  $n$ ,  $d$ , and  $1/\sigma$ . To unify the study, we transform the feasibility constraints of the primal condition number to conic form. This operation has appeared in previous work on condition number [Peñ00].

The primal program of form (1) can be put into conic form with the introduction of the homogenizing variable  $x_0$ . Letting  $\mathbf{C} = \{(\mathbf{x}, x_0) : x_0 > 0\}$ , the homogenized primal program of form (1) is

$$[-A, \mathbf{b}](\mathbf{x}, x_0) \geq \mathbf{0}, (\mathbf{x}, x_0) \in \mathbf{C}.$$

By letting  $\mathbf{C} = \{(\mathbf{x}, x_0) : x_0 > 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}\}$ , one can similarly homogenize the primal program of form (2). The dual program of form (2) and form (3) can be homogenized by letting  $\mathbf{C} = \{(\mathbf{y}, y_0) : y_0 > 0\}$  and  $\mathbf{C} = \{(\mathbf{y}, y_0) : y_0 > 0 \text{ and } \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}\}$ , respectively, and

$$[-A^T, \mathbf{c}](\mathbf{y}, y_0) \geq \mathbf{0}, (\mathbf{y}, y_0) \in \mathbf{C}.$$

We will comment on  $C_P^{(4)}$  below. Note that in all the transformations above,  $\mathbf{C}$  is a non-pointed convex cone after transformation (we elaborate on this in Section 2.1).

**Fact 2.0.1 (Preserving feasibility).** *Each of the homogenized programs is feasible if and only if its original program is feasible.*

*Proof.* Suppose there exists a feasible solution to the original program. Setting the homogenizing variable equal to 1 yields a feasible solution to the homogenized program.

Now suppose there exists a feasible solution to the homogenized program. Since the homogenizing variable must be strictly positive, we can divide the entire solution by it, obtaining a new feasible solution to the homogenized program where the homogenizing variable is equal to 1. This is then also a feasible solution to the original program.  $\square$

In Section 2.2, we extend the notion of distance to ill-posedness and condition number to conic linear programs and show that the transformation by homogenization does not alter the distance to ill-posedness. The rest of the section will be devoted to analyzing the condition number of the conic program; this will imply the result on the condition number of the original program.

## 2.1 Notation and Basic Geometric Definitions

Throughout this paper we use the following notational conventions. The material up to this point has obeyed these conventions.

- lower case letters such as  $a$  and  $\alpha$  denote scalars,
- bold lower case letters such as  $\mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{b}$  denote vectors, and for a vector  $\mathbf{a}$ ,  $a_i$  denotes the  $i$ th entry of  $\mathbf{a}$ .
- capital letters such as  $A$  denote matrices, and
- bold capital letters such as  $\mathbf{C}$  denote convex sets.

If  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  are column vectors, we let  $[\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n]$  denote the matrix whose columns are the  $\mathbf{a}_i$ s. For a vector  $\mathbf{a}$ , we let  $\|\mathbf{a}\|$  denote the standard Euclidean norm of the vector. We will make frequent use of the Frobenius norm of a matrix,  $\|A\|_F$ , which is the square root of the sum of squares of the entries in the matrix. We extend this notation to let  $\|A, \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k\}\|_F$  denote the square root of the sum of squares of the entries in  $A$  and in  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k$ . Different choices of norm are possible; we use the Frobenius norm throughout this paper. The following proposition relates several common choices of norm:

**Proposition 2.1.1 (Choice of norm).** *For an  $n$ -by- $d$  matrix  $A$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|A\|_F}{\sqrt{dn}} &\leq \|A\|_\infty \leq \|A\|_F, \text{ and} \\ \frac{\|A\|_F}{\sqrt{d}} &\leq \|A\|_{OP} \leq \|A\|_F, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\|A\|_{OP}$  denotes the operator norm of  $A$ ,  $\max_{x \neq 0} \frac{\|Ax\|}{\|x\|}$ .

We let  $\log$  denote the logarithm to base 2 and  $\ln$  denote the logarithm to base  $e$ .

We also make use of the following geometric definitions:

**Definition 2.1.2 (Ray).** For a vector  $\mathbf{p}$ , let  $\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{p})$  denote  $\{\alpha\mathbf{p} : \alpha > 0\}$ .

**Definition 2.1.3 (Non-pointed convex cone).** A non-pointed convex cone is a convex set  $\mathbf{C}$  such that for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}$  and all  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\alpha\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}$ , and there exists a vector  $\mathbf{t}$  such that  $\mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{x} < 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}$ .

**Definition 2.1.4 (Positive half-space).** For a vector  $\mathbf{a}$  we let  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a})$  denote the half-space of points with non-negative inner product with  $\mathbf{a}$ .

For example  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x})$  are not non-pointed convex cones, while  $\{\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x}_0 > 0\}$  and  $\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{p})$  are non-pointed convex cones. Note that a non-pointed convex cone cannot contain the origin. All of the cones that we introduce through the process of homogenization are non-pointed convex cones.

These definitions enable us to express the feasible  $\mathbf{x}$  for the linear program

$$A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0} \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}$$

as

$$\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i),$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  are the rows of  $A$ . Throughout this paper, we will call a set *feasible* if it is non-empty, and *infeasible* if it is empty. Thus, we say that the set  $\mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i)$  is feasible if the corresponding linear program is feasible.

## 2.2 Linear Programs in Conic Form and Basic Convex Probability Theory

The general conic linear program in its feasibility version can be given as

$$A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C},$$

where  $\mathbf{C}$  is a non-pointed convex cone in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $A$  is an  $n$  by  $d$  real matrix. Note that because  $\mathbf{C}$  is a non-pointed convex cone,  $\mathbf{0}$  cannot be a feasible solution of this program. The following definition generalizes distance to ill-posedness by explicitly taking into account the non-pointed convex cone,  $\mathbf{C}$ .

**Definition 2.2.1 (Generalized distance to ill-posedness).** For a non-pointed convex cone,  $\mathbf{C}$ , that is not subject to perturbation, and a matrix,  $A$ , we define  $\rho(A, \mathbf{C})$  by

a. if  $A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}$  is feasible, then

$$\rho(A, \mathbf{C}) = \sup \{ \epsilon : \|\Delta A\|_F < \epsilon \text{ implies } (A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C} \text{ is feasible} \};$$

b. if  $A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in C$  is infeasible, then

$$\rho(A, C) = \sup \{ \epsilon : \|\Delta A\|_F < \epsilon \text{ implies } (A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \in C \text{ is infeasible} \}.$$

We note that this definition makes sense even when  $A$  is a column vector. In this case,  $\rho(\mathbf{a}, C)$  measures the distance to ill-posedness when we only allow perturbation to  $\mathbf{a}$ . Even though transformations among linear programming formulations in general do not preserve condition number, the following lemma shows that homogenization does not alter the distance to ill-posedness. This lemma also appears in [Peñ00]. For simplicity, we will only explicitly state and prove the lemma for form (1), although a similar statement holds for  $C_P^{(2)}$ ,  $C_D^{(2)}$ ,  $C_D^{(3)}$ .

**Lemma 2.2.2 (Preserving the condition number).** *Let*

$$\max \mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$$

be a linear program. Let  $C = \{(\mathbf{x}, x_0) : x_0 > 0\}$ , and

$$[-A, \mathbf{b}](\mathbf{x}, x_0) \geq \mathbf{0}, (\mathbf{x}, x_0) \in C$$

be its conic form homogenization. Then  $C_P^{(1)}(A, \mathbf{b}) = \|A, \mathbf{b}\|_F / \rho([-A, \mathbf{b}], C)$ .

*Proof.* By Fact 2.0.1,  $(A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} \leq (\mathbf{b} + \Delta \mathbf{b})$  is feasible if and only if

$$[-(A + \Delta A), \mathbf{b} + \Delta \mathbf{b}](\mathbf{x}, x_0) \geq \mathbf{0}, (\mathbf{x}, x_0) \in C$$

is feasible. Therefore, if  $A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$  is feasible,

$$\rho([-A, \mathbf{b}], C) = \sup \{ \delta : \|\Delta A, \Delta \mathbf{b}\|_F \leq \delta \text{ implies } (A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} \leq (\mathbf{b} + \Delta \mathbf{b}) \text{ is feasible} \},$$

and if  $A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$  is infeasible,

$$\rho([-A, \mathbf{b}], C) = \sup \{ \delta : \|\Delta A, \Delta \mathbf{b}\|_F \leq \delta \text{ implies } (A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} \leq (\mathbf{b} + \Delta \mathbf{b}) \text{ is infeasible} \}.$$

Note also that the transformation into conic form leaves the Frobenius norm unchanged from which the lemma follows.  $\square$

The primal program of form (4) is not quite in conic form; to handle it, we need

**Definition 2.2.3 (Alternate generalized primal distance to ill-posedness).** *For a convex cone that is not non-pointed,  $C$ , and a matrix,  $A$ , we define  $\rho(A, C)$  by*

a. if  $A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in C$  is feasible, then

$$\rho(A, C) = \sup \{ \epsilon : \|\Delta A\|_F < \epsilon \text{ implies } (A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \in C \text{ is feasible} \}$$

b. if  $A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{x} \in C$  is infeasible, then

$$\rho(A, C) = \sup \{ \epsilon : \|\Delta A\|_F < \epsilon \text{ implies } (A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \in C \text{ is infeasible} \}$$

This definition would allow us to prove the analog of Lemma 2.2.4 for primal programs of form (4). We omit the details of this variation on the arguments in the interest of simplicity.

For each  $\bar{A}$  and  $\sigma \geq 0$ , let  $G(\bar{A}, \sigma)$  denote the space of Gaussian perturbations of  $\bar{A}$  of variance  $\sigma^2$ . The following two Lemmas are the main result of this section. For example, a simple union bound over  $C_P^{(2)}$  and  $C_D^{(2)}$  using Lemma 2.2.4 yields Theorem 1.3.2 for Form (2).

**Lemma 2.2.4 (Condition number is likely polynomial).** *For any non-pointed convex cone  $\mathbf{C}$  and a matrix  $\bar{A}$  satisfying  $\|\bar{A}\|_F \leq 1$ , for  $\sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{nd}$ ,*

$$\Pr_{A \leftarrow G(\bar{A}, \sigma)} \left[ \frac{\|A\|_F}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} \geq \frac{2^{12} n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \log^2 \left( \frac{2^9 n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) \right] \leq \delta.$$

**Lemma 2.2.5 (Smoothed complexity of log of primal condition number).** *For any non-pointed convex cone  $\mathbf{C}$  and a matrix  $\bar{A}$  satisfying  $\|\bar{A}\|_F \leq 1$ , for  $\sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{nd}$ ,*

$$\mathbf{E}_{A \leftarrow G(\bar{A}, \sigma)} \left[ \log \frac{\|A\|_F}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} \right] \leq 14 + 4.5 \log \frac{nd}{\sigma}.$$

We will prove Lemma 2.2.4 by considering the cases that the program is feasible and infeasible separately. In Section 2.3, we show that it is unlikely that a program is feasible and yet can be made infeasible by a small change to its constraints (Lemma 2.3.1). In Section 2.4, we show that it is unlikely that a program is infeasible and yet can be made feasible by a small change to its constraints (Lemma 2.4.1). In Section 2.5, we combine these results to show that the primal condition number is polynomial with high probability (Lemma 2.2.4). In Section 2.6 we prove Lemma 2.2.5.

The thread of argument in these sections consists of a geometric characterization of those programs with poor condition number, and then a probabilistic argument demonstrating that this characterization is rarely satisfied. Throughout the proofs in this section,  $\mathbf{C}$  will always refer to the original non-pointed cone, and a subscripted  $\mathbf{C}$  (i.e.,  $\mathbf{C}_0$ ) will refer to a modification of this cone.

The key probabilistic tool used in the analysis is Lemma 2.2.7, which we will derive from the following result of [Bal93]. A slightly weaker version of this lemma was proved in [BD02], and also in [BR76].

**Theorem 2.2.6 (Ball [Bal93]).** *Let  $\mathbf{K}$  be a convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\mu$  be a Gaussian measure of variance 1. Then,*

$$\int_{\partial \mathbf{K}} \mu \leq 4d^{1/4}.$$

**Lemma 2.2.7 ( $\epsilon$ -Boundaries are likely to be missed).** *Let  $\mathbf{K}$  be an arbitrary convex body in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and let  $\text{bdry}(\mathbf{K}, \epsilon)$  denote the  $\epsilon$ -boundary of  $\mathbf{K}$ ; that is,*

$$\text{bdry}(\mathbf{K}, \epsilon) = \{ \mathbf{x} : \exists \mathbf{x}' \in \partial \mathbf{K}, \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'\| \leq \epsilon \}$$

*For any  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a Gaussian perturbation of  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  of variance  $\sigma^2$ . Then,*

$$\Pr [\mathbf{x} \in \text{bdry}(\mathbf{K}, \epsilon) \setminus \mathbf{K}] \leq \frac{4\epsilon d^{1/4}}{\sigma}, \quad (\text{outside boundary})$$

$$\Pr [\mathbf{x} \in \text{bdry}(\mathbf{K}, \epsilon) \cap \mathbf{K}] \leq \frac{4\epsilon d^{1/4}}{\sigma} \quad (\text{inside boundary})$$

*Proof.* We derive the result assuming  $\sigma = 1$ . The result for general  $\sigma$  follows by scaling all of space uniformly.

To derive the first inequality, we let  $\mathbf{K}_\epsilon$  denote the points outside  $\mathbf{K}$  of distance at most  $\epsilon$  from  $\mathbf{K}$ , and observe that  $\mathbf{K}_\epsilon$  is convex.

Integrating by shells, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathbf{x} \in \text{bdry}(\mathbf{K}, \epsilon) \setminus \mathbf{K}] &\leq \int_{t=0}^{\epsilon} \int_{\partial \mathbf{K}_t} \mu \\ &\leq \epsilon 4d^{1/4}, \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 2.2.6.

We similarly derive the second inequality by defining  $\mathbf{K}^\epsilon$  to be the set of points inside  $\mathbf{K}$  of distance at least  $\epsilon$  from the boundary of  $\mathbf{K}$  and observing that  $\mathbf{K}^\epsilon$  is convex for any  $\epsilon$ .  $\square$

In this section and the next, we use the following consequence of Lemma 2.2.7 repeatedly.

**Lemma 2.2.8 (Feasible likely quite feasible, single constraint).** *Let  $\mathbf{C}_0$  be any convex cone in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and for any  $\bar{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $\mathbf{a}$  be a Gaussian perturbation of  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}$  of variance  $\sigma^2$ . Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{C}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}) \text{ is feasible and } \rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{C}_0) \leq \epsilon] &\leq \frac{4\epsilon d^{1/4}}{\sigma}, \text{ and} \\ \Pr_{\mathbf{a}}[\mathbf{C}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}) \text{ is infeasible and } \rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{C}_0) \leq \epsilon] &\leq \frac{4\epsilon d^{1/4}}{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{K}$  be the set of  $\mathbf{a}$  for which  $\mathbf{C}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a})$  is infeasible. Observe that  $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{C}_0)$  is exactly the distance from  $\mathbf{a}$  to the boundary of  $\mathbf{K}$ . Since  $\mathbf{K}$  is a convex cone, the first inequality follows from the first inequality (the outside boundary inequality) of Lemma 2.2.7, which tells us that the probability that  $\mathbf{a}$  has distance at most  $\epsilon$  to the boundary of  $\mathbf{K}$  and is outside  $\mathbf{K}$  is at most  $\frac{4\epsilon d^{1/4}}{\sigma}$ . The second inequality similarly follows from the second inequality (the inside boundary inequality) of Lemma 2.2.7.  $\square$

### 2.3 Primal condition number, feasible case

In this subsection, we analyze the primal condition number in the feasible case and prove:

**Lemma 2.3.1 (Feasible is likely quite feasible, all constraints).** *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a non-pointed convex cone in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\bar{A}$  be any  $n$ -by- $d$  matrix. Then for any  $\sigma \geq 0$ ,*

$$\Pr_{A \leftarrow G(\bar{A}, \sigma)}[(A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C} \text{ is feasible}) \text{ and } (\rho(A, \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon)] \leq \frac{4\epsilon n d^{5/4}}{\sigma}.$$

To prove Lemma 2.3.1, we first establish a necessary geometric condition for  $\rho$  to be small. This condition is stated and proved in Lemma 2.3.2. In Lemma 2.3.6, we apply Helly's Theorem [LDK63] to simplify this geometric condition, expressing it in terms of the minimum of  $\rho$  over individual constraints. This allows us to use Lemma 2.2.8 to establish Lemma 2.3.9, which

shows that this geometric condition is unlikely to be met. Lemma 2.3.1 is then a corollary of Lemmas 2.3.9 and 2.3.2.

A result similar to Lemma 2.3.2 was independently proved in [CC01].

**Lemma 2.3.2 (Bounding  $\rho$  by a max of min of inner products).** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a non-pointed convex cone and let  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  be vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for which  $\mathcal{C} \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i)$  is feasible. Then*

$$\rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n], \mathcal{C}) \geq \max_{\substack{p \in \mathcal{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i) \\ \|p\|=1}} \min_i \mathbf{a}_i^T p.$$

*Proof.* Lemma 2.3.2 follows directly from Lemmas 2.3.3, 2.3.4, and 2.3.5 below. These three lemmas develop a characterization of  $\rho$ , the distance to ill-posedness, in the feasible case.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.3 ( $\rho$  of a ray and single constraint as an inner product).** *For every vector  $\mathbf{a}$  and every unit vector  $p$ ,*

$$\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{Ray}(p)) = |\mathbf{a}^T p|$$

*Proof.* If  $\mathbf{a}^T p = 0$ , then  $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{Ray}(p)) = 0$ , and if  $\mathbf{a}^T p > 0$  then  $\mathbf{Ray}(p) \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a})$  is feasible. In addition, if  $\mathbf{a}^T p \neq 0$ , then  $\mathbf{Ray}(p) \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a})$  is feasible if and only if  $\mathbf{Ray}(-p) \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a})$  is infeasible; so, it suffices to consider the case where  $\mathbf{Ray}(p) \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a})$  is feasible. So, we assume  $\mathbf{a}^T p > 0$ . We first prove that  $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{Ray}(p)) \geq \mathbf{a}^T p$ . For every vector  $\Delta \mathbf{a}$  of norm at most  $\mathbf{a}^T p$ , we have

$$(\mathbf{a} + \Delta \mathbf{a})^T p = \mathbf{a}^T p + \Delta \mathbf{a}^T p \geq \mathbf{a}^T p - \|\Delta \mathbf{a}\| \geq 0.$$

Thus  $p \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a} + \Delta \mathbf{a})$ . As this holds for every  $\Delta \mathbf{a}$  of norm at most  $\mathbf{a}^T p$ , we have  $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{Ray}(p)) \geq \mathbf{a}^T p$ .

To show that  $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{Ray}(p)) \leq \mathbf{a}^T p$ , note that setting  $\Delta \mathbf{a} = -(\epsilon + \mathbf{a}^T p)p$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , yields

$$(\mathbf{a} + \Delta \mathbf{a})^T p = \mathbf{a}^T p + \Delta \mathbf{a}^T p = \mathbf{a}^T p - (\epsilon + \mathbf{a}^T p)p^T p = \mathbf{a}^T p - (\epsilon + \mathbf{a}^T p) = -\epsilon;$$

so,  $\mathbf{Ray}(p) \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a} + \Delta \mathbf{a})$  is infeasible. As this holds for every  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{Ray}(p)) \leq \mathbf{a}^T p$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.4 (Lower bounding  $\rho$  by rays).** *Let  $\mathcal{C}_0$  be a non-pointed convex cone and let  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  be vectors for which  $\mathcal{C}_0 \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i)$  is feasible. Then,*

$$\rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n], \mathcal{C}_0) \geq \max_{p \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i)} \rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n], \mathbf{Ray}(p)).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\Delta \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \Delta \mathbf{a}_n$  be such that  $\mathcal{C}_0 \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\Delta \mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{a}_i)$  is infeasible. Then,  $\mathbf{Ray}(p) \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\Delta \mathbf{a}_i + \mathbf{a}_i)$  is also infeasible.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.5 ( $\rho$  of a ray as a min over constraints).** *For every set of vectors  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  and  $p$  such that  $\mathbf{Ray}(p) \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i)$  is feasible,*

$$\rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n], \mathbf{Ray}(p)) = \min_i \rho(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{Ray}(p)).$$

*Proof.* Observe that  $\mathbf{Ray}(p) \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i + \Delta \mathbf{a}_i)$  is feasible if and only if  $\mathbf{Ray}(p) \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i + \Delta \mathbf{a}_i)$  is feasible for all  $i$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.6 (Bounding the max of min of inner products).** *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a non-pointed convex cone and let  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  be vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for which  $\mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i)$  is feasible. Then*

$$\max_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i): \|\mathbf{p}\|=1} \min_i \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{p} \geq \min_i \rho \left( \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{j \neq i} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j) \right) / d.$$

We prove two Lemmas before proving Lemma 2.3.6.

**Lemma 2.3.7 (Quite feasible region implies quite feasible point, single constraint).** *For every  $\mathbf{a}$  and every non-pointed convex cone  $\mathbf{C}_0$  for which  $\mathbf{C}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a})$  is feasible,*

$$\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{C}_0) = \max_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}) \\ \|\mathbf{p}\|=1}} \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{p}.$$

*Proof.* The “ $\geq$ ” direction follows from Lemmas 2.3.4 and 2.3.3; so, we concentrate on showing

$$\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{C}_0) \leq \max_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}) \\ \|\mathbf{p}\|=1}} \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{p}.$$

We recall that, as  $\mathbf{C}_0$  is non-pointed, there exists a vector  $\mathbf{t}$  such that  $\mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{x} < 0$  for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}_0$ . We now divide the proof into two cases depending on whether  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{C}_0$ .

If  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{C}_0$ , then we let  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{a} / \|\mathbf{a}\|$ . It is easy to verify that

$$\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{p} = \|\mathbf{a}\| = \max_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}) \\ \|\mathbf{p}\|=1}} \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{p}.$$

Moreover,  $\mathbf{C}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{a} + \epsilon \mathbf{t}))$  is infeasible for every  $\epsilon > 0$ . So,  $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{C}_0) \leq \|\mathbf{a}\|$ .

If  $\mathbf{a} \notin \mathbf{C}_0$ , let  $\mathbf{q}$  be the point of  $\mathbf{C}_0$  that is closest to  $\mathbf{a}$ . As  $\mathbf{C}_0 \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a})$  is feasible,  $\mathbf{q}$  lies inside  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a})$  and is not the origin. Let  $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{q} / \|\mathbf{q}\|$ . As  $\mathbf{C}_0$  is a cone,  $\mathbf{q}$  is perpendicular to  $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{q}$ . Thus, the distance from  $\mathbf{a}$  to  $\mathbf{q}$  is  $\sqrt{\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 - (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{p})^2}$ . Conversely, for any unit vector  $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{C}_0$  the distance from  $\text{Ray}(\mathbf{r})$  to  $\mathbf{a}$  is  $\sqrt{\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 - (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{r})^2}$ . Thus, the unit vector  $\mathbf{r}$  maximizing  $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{r}$  must be  $\mathbf{p}$ .

As  $\mathbf{C}_0$  is convex, there is a plane through  $\mathbf{q}$  separating  $\mathbf{C}_0$  from  $\mathbf{a}$  and perpendicular to the line segment  $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{q}$  and thus  $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{C}_0) \leq \|\mathbf{q}\| = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{p}$ .

□

**Lemma 2.3.8 (Quite feasible individually implies quite feasible collectively).** *Let  $\mathbf{C}_0$  be a non-pointed convex cone and let  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  be vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . If there exist unit vectors  $\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_n \in \mathbf{C}_0$ , such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{p}_i &\geq \epsilon, \text{ for all } i, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{p}_j &\geq 0, \text{ for all } i \text{ and } j, \end{aligned}$$

*then there exists a point  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C}_0$  of unit norm such that*

$$\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{p} \geq \epsilon/d, \text{ for all } i.$$



*Proof.* We prove this using Helly's Theorem [LDK63] which states: if every subcollection of  $d+1$  convex sets in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  has a common point, then the entire collection has a common point. Let

$$SS_i = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}_0 : \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x} / \|\mathbf{x}\| \geq \epsilon/d\}.$$

We begin by proving that every  $d$  of the  $SS_i$ s contain a point in common. Without loss of generality, we consider  $SS_1, \dots, SS_d$ . Let  $\mathbf{p} = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{p}_i/d$ . Then, for each  $1 \leq j \leq d$ ,

$$\mathbf{a}_j^T \mathbf{p} = \mathbf{a}_j^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbf{p}_i/d \right) \geq \mathbf{a}_j^T (\mathbf{p}_j/d) \geq \epsilon/d.$$

Moreover,  $\mathbf{p}$  has norm at most one, so  $\mathbf{a}_j^T \mathbf{p} / \|\mathbf{p}\| \geq \mathbf{a}_j^T \mathbf{p}$ , and  $\mathbf{p}$  is contained in each of  $S_1, \dots, S_d$ .

As  $\mathbf{C}_0$  is non-pointed, there exists  $\mathbf{t}$  such that  $\mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{x} < 0, \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}_0$ . Let  $SS'_i = SS_i \cap \{\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{x} = -1\}$ . Then,  $\mathbf{x} \in SS_i$  implies  $-\mathbf{x}/\mathbf{t}^T \mathbf{x} \in SS'_i$ . So, every  $d$  of the  $SS'_i$  have a point in common. As these are convex sets lying in a  $d-1$  dimensional space, Helly's Theorem tells us that there exists a point  $\mathbf{p}$  that lies within all of the  $SS'_i$ s. As  $SS'_i \subset SS_i$ , this point lies inside all the  $SS_i$ s.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.3.6.* For each  $i$ , letting  $C_0 = \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{j \neq i} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j)$ , we have

$$C_0 \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i) = \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^n \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j) \neq \emptyset.$$

By Lemma 2.3.7, for each  $i$  there is a unit vector  $\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^n \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j)$  such that

$$\mathbf{p}_i^T \mathbf{a}_i = \rho \left( \mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{j \neq i} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j) \right).$$

As  $\mathbf{p}_i \in \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_j \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j)$ , we also have

$$\mathbf{p}_i^T \mathbf{a}_j \geq 0$$

for all  $j$ . Applying Lemma 2.3.8, we find a unit vector  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{j=1}^n \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j)$  satisfying

$$\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{p} \geq \min_i \rho(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{j \neq i} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j))/d,$$

for all  $i$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.9 (Max of min of inner products is likely large).** *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a non-pointed convex cone in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_n$  be vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  be Gaussian perturbations of  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_n$  of variance  $\sigma^2$ . Then,*

$$\Pr \left[ C \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i) \text{ is feasible and } \max_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \in C \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i) \\ \|\mathbf{p}\|=1}} \min_i \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{p} < \epsilon \right] \leq \frac{4\epsilon n d^{5/4}}{\sigma}.$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.3.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[ C \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i) \text{ is feasible and } \max_{\substack{\mathbf{p} \in C \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i) \\ \|\mathbf{p}\|=1}} \min_i \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{p} < \epsilon \right] \\ \leq \Pr \left[ C \cap \bigcap_i \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i) \text{ is feasible and } \min_i \rho \left( \mathbf{a}_i, C \cap \bigcap_{j \neq i} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j) \right) < d\epsilon \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying first a union bound, and then Lemma 2.2.8, we bound this by

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \Pr \left[ C \cap \bigcap_j \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j) \text{ is feasible and } \rho \left( \mathbf{a}_i, C \cap \bigcap_{j \neq i} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_j) \right) < d\epsilon \right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{4(\epsilon d)d^{1/4}}{\sigma} = \frac{4n\epsilon d^{5/4}}{\sigma}.$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 2.3.1.* Follows immediately from Lemmas 2.3.2 and 2.3.9. □

This concludes the analysis that it is unlikely that the primal program is both feasible and has small distance to ill-posedness. Next, we show that it is unlikely that the primal program is both infeasible and has small distance to ill-posedness.

## 2.4 Primal number, infeasible case

The main result of this subsection is:

**Lemma 2.4.1 (Infeasible is likely quite infeasible).** *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a non-pointed convex cone in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\bar{A}$  be any  $n$ -by- $d$  matrix such that  $\|\bar{A}\|_F \leq 1$ . Then for any  $0 < \sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{d}$  and  $\epsilon < 1/2$ ,*

$$\Pr_{A \leftarrow G(\bar{A}, \sigma)} [(A\mathbf{x} \geq 0, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C} \text{ is infeasible}) \text{ and } (\rho(A, \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon)] \leq \frac{361 \epsilon n^2 d^{1.5} \log^{1.5}(1/\epsilon)}{\sigma^2}.$$

To prove Lemma 2.4.1, we consider adding the constraints one at a time. If the program is infeasible in the end, then there must be some constraint, which we call the *critical* constraint, that takes it from being feasible to being infeasible. Lemma 2.4.2 gives a sufficient geometric condition for the program to be quite infeasible when the critical constraint is added. We then prove Lemma 2.4.1 by showing that this condition is met with good probability. The geometric condition is that the program is quite feasible before the critical constraint is added and that every previously feasible point is far from being feasible for the critical constraint.

**Lemma 2.4.2 (The feasible-to-infeasible transition).** *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a non-pointed convex cone in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C}$  be a unit vector, and  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k+1}$  be vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{p} &\geq \alpha \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{a}_{k+1}^T \mathbf{x} &\leq -\beta \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i), \|\mathbf{x}\| = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k+1}], \mathbf{C}) \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{2}, \frac{\alpha\beta}{4\alpha + 2\|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|} \right\}.$$

We first establish a basic geometric lemma, Lemma 2.4.3 below, which is an analog of Lemmas 2.3.4 and 2.3.3 for a single constraint in the infeasible case.

**Lemma 2.4.3 ( $\rho$  bound on inner product).** *Let  $\mathbf{C}$  be a non-pointed convex cone and let  $\mathbf{a}$  be a vector for which  $\mathbf{C} \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a})$  is infeasible. Then,*

$$\max_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C}, \|\mathbf{p}\|=1} \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{a} \leq -\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{C}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{p}$  be the unit vector in  $\mathbf{C}$  maximizing  $\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{a}$ . If we set

$$\Delta \mathbf{a} = (\epsilon - \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{a}) \mathbf{p},$$

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , then we can see that  $\mathbf{C} \cap \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a} + \Delta \mathbf{a})$  is feasible from

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}^T(\mathbf{a} + \Delta \mathbf{a}) &= \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{a} + (\epsilon - \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{a}) \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{p} \\ &= \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{a} + (\epsilon - \mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{a}) \\ &= \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

So, we may conclude  $\rho(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{C}) \leq |\mathbf{p}^T \mathbf{a}|$ . □

*Proof of Lemma 2.4.2.* The conditions of the lemma imply that  $\mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^{k+1} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i)$  is infeasible. So, we may prove the lemma by demonstrating that for all  $\epsilon$  satisfying

$$\epsilon \leq \alpha/2, \text{ and} \tag{5}$$

$$\epsilon < \frac{\beta}{4 + \frac{2\|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|}{\alpha}}, \tag{6}$$

and  $\{\Delta \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \Delta \mathbf{a}_{k+1}\}$  satisfying  $\|\Delta \mathbf{a}_i\| < \epsilon$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k+1$ , we have

$$\mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^{k+1} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i + \Delta \mathbf{a}_i) \text{ is infeasible.}$$

Assume by way of contradiction that

$$\mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^{k+1} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i + \Delta \mathbf{a}_i) \text{ is feasible.}$$

Then, there exists a unit vector  $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^{k+1} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i + \Delta \mathbf{a}_i)$ . We first show that

$$\mathbf{x}' + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} \mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i).$$

To see this consider any  $i \leq k$  and note that

$$(\mathbf{a}_i + \Delta \mathbf{a}_i)^T \mathbf{x}' \geq 0 \implies \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x}' \geq -\Delta \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x}' \geq -\|\Delta \mathbf{a}_i\| \|\mathbf{x}'\| \geq -\epsilon.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbf{a}_i^T \left( \mathbf{x}' + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} \mathbf{p} \right) \geq \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{a}_i^T \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} \mathbf{p} \geq -\epsilon + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} \alpha \geq 0.$$

Also,

$$\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbf{C}, \quad \mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C} \implies \mathbf{x}' + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} \mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C}$$

Let  $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}' + \frac{\epsilon}{\alpha} \mathbf{p}$ . Then  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i)$  and  $\mathbf{x}$  has norm at most  $1 + \epsilon/\alpha$  and at least  $1 - \epsilon/\alpha$ . To derive a contradiction, we now compute

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{a}_{k+1} + \Delta \mathbf{a}_{k+1})^T \mathbf{x}' &= (\mathbf{a}_{k+1} + \Delta \mathbf{a}_{k+1})^T (\mathbf{x} - (\epsilon/\alpha) \mathbf{p}) \\ &= \mathbf{a}_{k+1}^T \mathbf{x} + \Delta \mathbf{a}_{k+1}^T \mathbf{x} - (\epsilon/\alpha) \mathbf{a}_{k+1}^T \mathbf{p} - (\epsilon/\alpha) \Delta \mathbf{a}_{k+1}^T \mathbf{p} \\ &\leq -\beta \|\mathbf{x}\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{a}_{k+1}\| \|\mathbf{x}\| + (\epsilon/\alpha) \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\| + (\epsilon/\alpha) \|\Delta \mathbf{a}_{k+1}\| \\ &\leq -\beta(1 - \epsilon/\alpha) + \epsilon(1 + \epsilon/\alpha) + (\epsilon/\alpha) \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\| + (\epsilon^2/\alpha) \\ &= -\beta(1 - \epsilon/\alpha) + \epsilon((1 + \epsilon/\alpha) + \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|/\alpha + \epsilon/\alpha) \\ &\leq -\beta/2 + \epsilon(2 + \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|/\alpha), \text{ by (5)} \\ &< 0 \text{ by (6),} \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts  $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^{k+1} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i + \Delta \mathbf{a}_i)$ .  $\square$

We now prove that the geometric condition of Lemma 2.4.2 holds with high probability and hence establish our main Lemma 2.4.1 of this section. First, we establish two basic statements.

**Proposition 2.4.4.** *For positive  $\alpha, \beta$  and any vector  $\mathbf{a}_{k+1}$ ,*

$$\frac{\alpha\beta}{2\alpha + \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha\beta}{2 + \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|}, \frac{\beta}{2 + \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* For  $\alpha \geq 1$ , we have

$$\frac{\alpha\beta}{2\alpha + \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|} = \frac{\beta}{2 + \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|/\alpha} \geq \frac{\beta}{2 + \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|},$$

while for  $\alpha \leq 1$  we have

$$\frac{\alpha\beta}{2\alpha + \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|} \geq \frac{\alpha\beta}{2 + \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|}.$$

$\square$

**Proposition 2.4.5.** *If  $\mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i)$  is infeasible, then*

$$\rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k], \mathbf{C}) \leq \rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n], \mathbf{C}).$$

*Proof.* Adding constraints cannot make it easier to change the program to make it feasible.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2.4.1.* Let  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  be the rows of  $A$ , and let

$$\mathbf{C}_0 = \mathbf{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{C}_k = \mathbf{C} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{a}_i).$$

Note that  $\mathbf{C}_n$  is the final program. Let  $E_k$  denote the event that  $\mathbf{C}_{k-1}$  is feasible and  $\mathbf{C}_k$  is infeasible. Using Proposition 2.4.5 and the fact that  $\mathbf{C}_n$  infeasible implies that  $E_k$  must hold for some  $k$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\mathbf{C}_n \text{ is infeasible and } \rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n], \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon] &\leq \\ &\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \Pr[E_{k+1} \text{ and } \rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n], \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon] \leq \\ &\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \Pr[E_{k+1} \text{ and } \rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k+1}], \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon]. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

If  $E_{k+1}$  occurs, then  $\mathbf{C}_k$  is feasible, and we may define

$$\kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) = \max_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbf{C}_k: \|\mathbf{p}\|=1} \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{p}.$$

Then,  $E_{k+1}$  implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{p} &\geq \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k), \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{a}_{k+1}^T \mathbf{x} &\leq -\rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \text{ for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}_k, \|\mathbf{x}\| = 1 \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.4.3. So, we may apply Lemma 2.4.2 and Proposition 2.4.4 to show that  $E_{k+1}$  implies

$$\begin{aligned} \rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k+1}], \mathbf{C}) &\geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k)}{2}, \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k)}{4 + 2 \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|}, \frac{\rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k)}{4 + 2 \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|} \right\} \\ &\geq \frac{\min \{ \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k), \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k), \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \}}{4 + 2 \|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We now proceed to bound the probability that the numerator of this fraction is small.

We first note that

$$\kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \leq \lambda$$

implies that either  $\kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \leq \lambda$ ,  $\rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \leq \lambda$ , or there exists an  $l$  between 1 and  $\lceil \log(1/\lambda) \rceil$  for which

$$\kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \leq 2^{-l+1} \text{ and } \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \leq 2^l \lambda.$$

We apply Lemma 2.2.8 to bound

$$\Pr[E_{k+1} \text{ and } \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \leq \lambda] \leq \frac{4\lambda d^{1/4}}{\sigma}, \quad (9)$$

and Lemma 2.3.9 to bound

$$\Pr_{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k} [\mathbf{C}_k \text{ is feasible and } \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \leq \lambda] \leq \frac{4\lambda nd^{5/4}}{\sigma}. \quad (10)$$

So, for  $1 \leq l \leq \lceil \log(1/\lambda) \rceil$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr_{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k+1}} [E_{k+1} \text{ and } \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \leq 2^{-l+1} \text{ and } \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \leq 2^l \lambda] \\ &= \Pr_{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k} [\mathbf{C}_k \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \leq 2^{-l+1}] \cdot \\ & \quad \Pr_{\mathbf{a}_{k+1}} [\mathbf{C}_{k+1} = \emptyset \text{ and } \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \leq 2^l \lambda \mid \mathbf{C}_k \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \leq 2^{-l+1}] \\ &\leq \Pr_{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k} [\mathbf{C}_k \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \leq 2^{-l+1}] \frac{2^l 4\lambda d^{1/4}}{\sigma}, \text{ by (9)} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{-l+1} 4nd^{5/4}}{\sigma} \frac{2^l 4\lambda d^{1/4}}{\sigma}, \text{ by (10),} \\ &= \frac{32\lambda nd^{1.5}}{\sigma^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over the choices for  $l$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr [E_{k+1} \text{ and } \min \{ \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k), \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k), \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \} < \lambda] \\ &\leq \frac{4\lambda nd^{5/4}}{\sigma} + \frac{4\lambda d^{1/4}}{\sigma} + \lceil \log(1/\lambda) \rceil \frac{32\lambda nd^{1.5}}{\sigma^2} \\ &\leq \lambda \left( \frac{4nd^{3/4} + 4 + 32\lceil \log(1/\lambda) \rceil nd^{1.5}}{\sigma^2} \right), \text{ by } \sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{d}, \\ &\leq \lambda \left( \frac{(32\lceil \log(1/\lambda) \rceil + 8)nd^{1.5}}{\sigma^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

This concludes our analysis of the numerator of (8). We can bound the probability that the denominator of (8) is small by observing that  $\mathbf{a}_{k+1}$  is a Gaussian centered at a point  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{k+1}$  of norm at most 1; so, Corollary A.0.5 implies

$$\Pr [4 + 2\|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\| \geq 6 + 2\sigma\sqrt{2d\ln(e/\epsilon)}] \leq \epsilon. \quad (12)$$

We now set  $\lambda = \epsilon(6 + 2\sigma\sqrt{2d\ln(e/\epsilon)})$  and observe that if we had

$$\frac{\min \{ \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k), \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k), \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \}}{4 + 2\|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\|} \leq \epsilon$$

this would imply

$$\min \{ \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k), \kappa(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_k) \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k), \rho(\mathbf{a}_{k+1}, \mathbf{C}_k) \} < \lambda \text{ or } 4 + 2\|\mathbf{a}_{k+1}\| \geq 6 + 2\sigma\sqrt{2d\ln(e/\epsilon)}.$$

So, we may apply (11) and (12) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr [E_{k+1} \text{ and } \rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{k+1}], \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon] \\
& \leq \epsilon + \epsilon \left(6 + 2\sigma\sqrt{2d\ln(e/\epsilon)}\right) \left(\frac{(32\lceil\log(1/\epsilon(6 + 2\sigma\sqrt{d\log(e/\epsilon)})\rceil) + 8)nd^{1.5}}{\sigma^2}\right) \\
& \leq \epsilon + \epsilon \left(6 + 3\sqrt{\ln(e/\epsilon)}\right) \left(\frac{(32\lceil\log(1/(6\epsilon))\rceil + 8)nd^{1.5}}{\sigma^2}\right), \text{ using } \sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{d} \text{ in the first term} \\
& \leq \epsilon + \epsilon \left(9\sqrt{\ln(e/\epsilon)}\right) \left(\frac{(32\lceil\log(1/(6\epsilon))\rceil + 8)nd^{1.5}}{\sigma^2}\right) \\
& \leq \epsilon + \epsilon \left(\frac{360\log^{1.5}(1/\epsilon)nd^{1.5}}{\sigma^2}\right), \text{ since } (\sqrt{\ln(e/\epsilon)})(\lceil\log(1/6\epsilon)\rceil + 1/4) \leq \log^{1.5}(1/\epsilon) \text{ for } \epsilon < 1/2 \\
& \leq \epsilon \left(\frac{361\log^{1.5}(1/\epsilon)nd^{1.5}}{\sigma^2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this in to (7), we get

$$\Pr [\mathbf{C}_0 \text{ is infeasible and } \rho([\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n], \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon] \leq \frac{361\epsilon n^2 d^{1.5} \log^{1.5}(1/\epsilon)}{\sigma^2}.$$

□

## 2.5 Primal condition number, putting the feasible and infeasible cases together

We combine the results of Sections 2.3 and 2.4 to prove Lemma 2.2.4, that the primal condition number is probably low.

*Proof of Lemma 2.2.4.* In Lemma 2.3.1, we show that

$$\Pr [(A\mathbf{x} \geq 0, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C} \text{ is feasible}) \text{ and } (\rho(A, \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon)] \leq \frac{4\epsilon nd^{5/4}}{\sigma},$$

while in Lemma 2.4.1, we show

$$\Pr [(A\mathbf{x} \geq 0, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C} \text{ is infeasible}) \text{ and } (\rho(A, \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon)] \leq \frac{361\epsilon \log^{1.5}(1/\epsilon)n^2 d^{1.5}}{\sigma^2}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr [\rho(A, \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon] &= \Pr [(A\mathbf{x} \geq 0, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C} \text{ is feasible}) \text{ and } (\rho(A, \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon)] \\
&\quad + \Pr [(A\mathbf{x} \geq 0, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C} \text{ is infeasible}) \text{ and } (\rho(A, \mathbf{C}) \leq \epsilon)] \\
&\leq \frac{4\epsilon nd^{5/4}}{\sigma} + \frac{361\epsilon \log^{1.5}(1/\epsilon)n^2 d^{1.5}}{\sigma^2} \\
&\leq \frac{365\epsilon \log^{1.5}(1/\epsilon)n^2 d^{1.5}}{\sigma^2}
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Setting  $\epsilon = \delta/(3\alpha \log^{1.5}(\alpha/\delta))$  where  $\alpha = 365 \frac{n^2 d^{1.5}}{\sigma^2}$  (note that this satisfies  $\epsilon < 1/2$ ), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[ \frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} \geq \frac{1100 n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \log^{1.5} \left( \frac{365 n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) \right] &\leq \frac{\alpha \delta \log^{1.5} \left( \frac{3\alpha}{\delta} \log^{1.5} \left( \frac{\alpha}{\delta} \right) \right)}{3\alpha \log^{1.5} \left( \frac{\alpha}{\delta} \right)} \\ &\leq 0.74 \delta, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

as  $\alpha/\delta \geq 365$ .

At the same time, Corollary A.0.5 tells us that

$$\Pr \left[ \|A\|_F \geq 1 + \sigma \sqrt{nd} \sqrt{2 \ln(4e/\delta)} \right] \leq \delta/4.$$

The lemma now follows by applying this bound,  $\sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{nd}$ , and (14), to get

$$\Pr \left[ \frac{\|A\|_F}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} \geq \frac{(1 + \sqrt{2 \ln(4e/\delta)}) 1100 n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \log^{1.5} \left( \frac{365 n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) \right] \leq (0.74 + 0.25)\delta < \delta$$

To derive the lemma as stated, we note

$$\frac{(1 + \sqrt{2 \ln(4e/\delta)}) 1100 n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \log^{1.5} \left( \frac{365 n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) \leq \frac{2^{12} n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \log^2 \left( \frac{2^9 n^2 d^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right).$$

□

## 2.6 Log of the Primal Condition Number

In this section, we prove we prove Lemma 2.2.5.

*Proof of Lemma 2.2.5.* First notice that

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \log \frac{\|A\|_F}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} \right] = \mathbf{E} \left[ \log \|A\|_F + \log \frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} \right].$$

We first focus on  $\mathbf{E} [\log \|A\|_F]$ . Because logarithm is a convex function, we have

$$\mathbf{E} [\log \|A\|_F] \leq \log(\mathbf{E} [\|A\|_F]).$$

As  $\mathbf{E} [B] \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{E} [B^2]}$ , and it is known [Seg00, p. 277] that the expected value of  $B^2$ —the non-central  $\chi^2$ -distribution with non-centrality parameter  $\|\bar{\mathbf{b}}\|^2$ —is  $d + \|\bar{\mathbf{b}}\|^2$ , we have

$$\mathbf{E} [\|A\|_F] \leq \sqrt{\mathbf{E} [\|A\|_F^2]} \leq \sqrt{nd + \|\bar{A}\|_F^2} \leq \sqrt{nd + 1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{E} [\log \|A\|_F] \leq \log \sqrt{nd + 1}.$$

We will use the following simple fact which is easy to verify numerically:



**Fact 2.6.1.** For  $\alpha \geq 100$ , for all  $x \geq 2 \log \alpha$ ,  $x - 1.5 \log x \geq x/2$ .

Let

$$\alpha = \frac{365n^2d^{1.5}}{\sigma^2},$$

as before. By Equation (13) in the proof of Lemma 2.2.4,

$$\Pr \left[ \frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} \geq x \right] \leq \frac{\alpha \log^{1.5} x}{x}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[ \log \frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} \right] &= \int_0^\infty \Pr \left[ \log \frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} > x \right] dx = \int_0^\infty \Pr \left[ \frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} > e^x \right] dx \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty \min \left( 1, \frac{\alpha x^{1.5}}{e^x} \right) dx \\ &\leq \int_0^{2 \log \alpha} dx + \int_{2 \log \alpha}^\infty \frac{\alpha x^{1.5}}{e^x} dx \\ &= 2 \log \alpha + \alpha \int_{2 \log \alpha}^\infty e^{-x+1.5 \log x} dx \\ &\leq 2 \log \alpha + \alpha \int_{2 \log \alpha}^\infty e^{-x/2} dx \\ &\leq 2 \log \alpha + 2. \end{aligned}$$

The second to last inequality follows from Fact 2.6.1.

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[ \log \frac{\|A\|_F}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} \right] &= \mathbf{E} \left[ \log \|A\|_F + \log \frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{C})} \right] \leq \log \sqrt{nd+1} + 2 \log \alpha + 2 \\ &\leq 14 + 4.5 \log \frac{nd}{\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

□

## 2.7 Smoothed Complexity of Renegar's Condition Number of Form (2)

We now conclude this section by proving Theorem 1.3.2 for linear programs of Form (2). For the convenience of the reader, we restate the Theorem 1.3.2 for Form (2) below.

**Theorem 2.7.1 (Smoothed Complexity of Renegar's Condition Number: Form (2)).**

For any  $\sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{dn}$ ,

$$\max_{\substack{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \\ \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1}} \Pr_{A, b, c} \left[ C^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) > \frac{2^{13} (n+1)^2 (d+1)^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \left( \log^2 \frac{2^{10} (n+1)^2 (d+1)^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) \right] < \delta,$$

and

$$\max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{E}_{A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \left[ \log C^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \right] \leq 15 + 4.5 \log \left( \frac{nd}{\sigma} \right).$$

*Proof.* It follows from an analogous statement of Lemma 2.2.2 for linear programs in Form (2) that, after homogenization, both the primal and dual condition number of a linear program in Form (2) can be transformed to a conic form of dimensions  $n$  by  $d+1$  and  $d$  by  $n+1$ , respectively.

By Lemma 2.2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{Pr}_{A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \left[ C^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) > \frac{2^{13} (n+1)^2 (d+1)^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \left( \log^2 \frac{2^{10} (n+1)^2 (d+1)^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) \right] \\ \leq & \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{Pr}_{A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \left[ C_P^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{b}) > \frac{2^{12} n^2 (d+1)^{1.5}}{(\delta/2) \sigma^2} \left( \log^2 \frac{2^9 n^2 (d+1)^{1.5}}{(\delta/2) \sigma^2} \right) \right] + \\ & \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{Pr}_{A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \left[ C_D^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{c}) > \frac{2^{12} (n+1)^2 d^{1.5}}{(\delta/2) \sigma^2} \left( \log^2 \frac{2^9 (n+1)^2 d^{1.5}}{(\delta/2) \sigma^2} \right) \right] \\ \leq & \delta/2 + \delta/2 = \delta. \end{aligned}$$

To bound the log of the condition number, we use Lemma 2.2.5.

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{E}_{A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \left[ \log C^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \right] \\ \leq & \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{E}_{A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \left[ \log \left( C_P^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{b}) + C_D^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{c}) \right) \right] \\ \leq & \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \max \left( \mathbf{E}_{A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \left[ \log \left( 2C_P^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{b}) \right) \right], \mathbf{E}_{A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} \left[ \log \left( 2C_D^{(2)}(A, \mathbf{c}) \right) \right] \right) \\ \leq & 15 + 4.5 \log \left( \frac{nd}{\sigma} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The second to the last inequality used that fact that for positive random variables  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ ,

$$\mathbf{E} [\log(\beta + \gamma)] \leq \max(\mathbf{E} [\log(2\beta)], \mathbf{E} [\log(2\gamma)]).$$

□

### 3 Dual Condition Number

In this section, we consider linear programs of the form

$$A^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}, \quad \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}.$$

The dual program of form (1) and the primal program of form (3) are both of this type. The dual program of form (4) can be handled using a slightly different argument than the one we present.

As in section 2, we omit the details of the modifications necessary for form (4). We begin by defining distance to ill-posedness appropriately for the form of linear program considered in this section:

**Definition 3.0.2 (Dual distance to ill-posedness).** For a matrix,  $A$ , and a vector  $\mathbf{c}$ , we define  $\rho(A, \mathbf{c})$  by

- a. if  $A^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}$ ,  $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$  is feasible, then  $\rho(A, \mathbf{c}) =$   
 $\sup \{ \epsilon : \|\Delta A\|_F + \|\Delta \mathbf{c}\|_F < \epsilon \text{ implies } (A + \Delta A)^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \Delta \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0} \text{ is feasible} \}$
- b. if  $A^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}$ ,  $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$  is infeasible, then  $\rho(A, \mathbf{c}) =$   
 $\sup \{ \epsilon : \|\Delta A\|_F + \|\Delta \mathbf{c}\|_F < \epsilon \text{ implies } (A + \Delta A)^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c} + \Delta \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0} \text{ is infeasible} \}$

The main result of this section is:

**Lemma 3.0.3 (Dual condition number is likely low).** Let  $\bar{A}$  be an  $n$ -by- $d$  matrix and  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$  be a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  such that  $\|\bar{A}\|_F \leq 1$  and  $\|\bar{\mathbf{c}}\| \leq 1$ . Then for any  $\sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{nd}$ ,

$$\Pr_{(A, \mathbf{c}) \leftarrow G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)} \left[ \frac{\|A, \mathbf{c}\|_F}{\rho(A, \mathbf{c})} > \frac{50000 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\epsilon \sigma^2} \log^2 \left( \frac{200 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\epsilon \sigma^2} \right) \right] \leq \epsilon.$$

In addition,

$$\mathbf{E}_{(A, \mathbf{c}) \leftarrow G((\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}), \sigma)} \left[ \log \frac{\|A, \mathbf{c}\|_F}{\rho(A, \mathbf{c})} \right] \leq 14 + 4 \log \frac{nd}{\sigma}.$$

We begin by giving several common definitions that will be useful in our analysis of the dual condition number (Section 3.1). We define a change of variables (Section 3.2), and we then develop a sufficient geometric condition for the dual condition number to be low (Section 3.3). In Section 3.4, we use Lemma 3.2.3 to prove Lemma 3.0.3, thereby establishing that this geometric condition is met with good probability.

### 3.1 Geometric Basics

**Definition 3.1.1 (Cone).** For a set of vectors  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ , let  $\mathbf{Cone}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$  denote  $\{\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} = \sum_i \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i, \lambda_i \geq 0\}$ .

**Definition 3.1.2 (Hull).** For a set of vectors  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ , let  $\mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$  denote  $\{\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} = \sum_i \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_i, \lambda_i \geq 0, \sum_i \lambda_i = 1\}$ .

**Definition 3.1.3 (Boundary of a set).** For a convex set  $SS$ , let  $\mathbf{bdry}(SS)$  denote the boundary of  $SS$ , i.e.,  $\{\mathbf{x} : \forall \epsilon > 0, \exists \mathbf{e}, \|\mathbf{e}\| \leq \epsilon, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e} \in SS, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{e} \notin SS\}$ .

**Definition 3.1.4 (Point-to-set distance).** Let  $\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{x}, SS)$  denote the distance of  $\mathbf{x}$  to  $SS$ , i.e.,  $\min \{ \epsilon : \exists \mathbf{e}, \|\mathbf{e}\| \leq \epsilon, \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e} \in SS \}$ .

Note that  $\mathbf{Cone}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$  is not a non-pointed convex cone, while  $\mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)$  is the standard convex hull of  $\{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n\}$ .

### 3.2 Change of variables

We observe that there exists a solution to the system  $A^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}$ ,  $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$  if and only if

$$\mathbf{c} \in \mathbf{Cone}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n),$$

and that for  $\mathbf{c} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , this holds if and only if

$$\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) \text{ intersects } \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n).$$

The main idea we need beyond the ideas of section 2 is to perform an illuminating change of variables. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z} &= (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{a}_i, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{x}_i &= \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{z}, \text{ for } i = 1 \text{ to } n - 1. \end{aligned}$$

For notational convenience, we let  $\mathbf{x}_n = \mathbf{a}_n - \mathbf{z}$ , although  $\mathbf{x}_n$  is not independent of  $\{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{n-1}\}$ .

We can restate the condition for the linear program to be ill-posed in these new variables:

**Lemma 3.2.1 (Ill-posedness in new variables).**

$$A^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{c} \neq \mathbf{0} \text{ is ill-posed if and only if } \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)).$$

*Proof.* We observe

$$\begin{aligned} A^T \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0} \text{ is feasible} &\iff \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) \text{ intersects } \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n) \\ &\iff \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) \text{ intersects } \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \\ &\iff \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n). \end{aligned}$$

For  $\mathbf{c} \neq \mathbf{0}$ ,  $\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  is a continuous mapping from  $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$  to subsets of Euclidean space, and so for  $\mathbf{z}$  in the set and not on the boundary, a sufficiently small change to all the variables simultaneously will always leave  $\mathbf{z}$  in the set, and similarly for  $\mathbf{z}$  not in the set and not on the boundary.

To establish the other direction, if  $\mathbf{z}$  is on the boundary, we can just perturb  $\mathbf{z}$  to bring it in or out of the set. Although  $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$  are determined by the  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$ , we can perturb the  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  so as to change the value of  $\mathbf{z}$  without changing the values of any of the  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ . This can be done because each  $\mathbf{x}_i$  is a relative offset from the average  $\mathbf{z}$ , while each  $\mathbf{a}_i$  is an absolute offset from the origin; the proof of lemma 3.2.2 below establishes formally that the change of variables permits this.

The lemma is also true for  $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0}$ , but we will not need this. □

Note that  $\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  is a convex set. The following lemma will allow us to apply lemma 2.2.7 to determine the probability that  $\mathbf{z}$  is near the boundary of this convex set.

**Lemma 3.2.2 (Independence of mean among new variables).** Let  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_n$  be  $n$  vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  be a Gaussian perturbation of  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_n$  of variance  $\sigma^2$ . Let

$$\mathbf{z} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{a}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{z}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Then,  $\mathbf{z}$  is a Gaussian perturbation of

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \bar{\mathbf{a}}_i,$$

of variance  $\sigma^2/n$  and is independent of  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ .

*Proof.* As  $\mathbf{z}$  is the average of Gaussian perturbations of variance  $\sigma^2$  of  $n$  vectors  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_n$ , it is a Gaussian perturbation of variance  $\sigma^2/n$  of the average of these  $n$  vectors, that is, of

$$\bar{\mathbf{z}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \bar{\mathbf{a}}_i.$$

We have that  $\mathbf{z}$  is independent of  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$  because the linear combination of  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  used to obtain  $\mathbf{z}$  is orthogonal to the linear combinations of  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  used to obtain the  $\mathbf{x}_i$ s.  $\square$

We proceed to apply lemma 2.2.7.

**Lemma 3.2.3 (Mean is likely far from ill-posedness).** Let  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_n$  be  $n$  vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$  be a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  be a Gaussian perturbation of  $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_n$  of variance  $\sigma^2$  and let  $\mathbf{c}$  be a Gaussian perturbation of  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$  of variance  $\sigma^2$ . Let

$$\mathbf{z} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{a}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{z}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Then,

$$\Pr [\text{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \text{bdry}(\text{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \text{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n))) \leq \epsilon] \leq \frac{8\epsilon d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\sigma}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{c}$  be arbitrary. By lemma 3.2.2, we can choose  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$  and then choose  $\mathbf{z}$  independently. Having chosen  $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ , we fix the convex body  $\text{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \text{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  and apply lemma 2.2.7. The factor of 2 arises because  $\mathbf{z}$  must miss an  $\epsilon$  boundary on either side of the convex body.  $\square$

### 3.3 A geometric characterization of dual condition number

We now give a geometric characterization of the dual condition number that uses both the original and the new variables. In the next subsection, we will use this characterization to establish a probabilistic bound to prove Lemma 3.0.3.

**Lemma 3.3.1 (Reciprocal of distance to ill-posedness).** Let  $\mathbf{c}$  and  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n$  be vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Let

$$\mathbf{z} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{a}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{z}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

$$k_1 = \text{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \text{bdry}(\text{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \text{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)))$$

$$k_2 = \|\mathbf{c}\|$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{c})} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{8}{k_1}, \frac{4}{k_2}, \frac{24 \max_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|}{k_1 k_2} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* This lemma can be derived as a consequence of Lemma 3.3.2 given below.

By the definition of  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  and Lemma 3.3.2, we can tolerate any change of magnitude up to  $k_1/4$  in  $\mathbf{z}, \{\mathbf{x}_i\}$  and any change of up to  $\frac{k_1 k_2}{2k_1 + 4(\|\mathbf{z}\| + \max \|\mathbf{x}_i\|)}$  in  $\mathbf{c}$  without the program becoming ill-posed. We show that this means we can tolerate any change of up to  $k_1/8$  in  $\mathbf{a}_i$  without the program becoming ill-posed. Formally, we need to show that if  $\|\Delta \mathbf{a}_i\| \leq k_1/8$  for all  $i$ , then  $\|\Delta \mathbf{z}\| \leq k_1/4$  and  $\|\Delta \mathbf{x}_i\| \leq k_1/4$ . Since  $\Delta \mathbf{z} = (1/n) \sum \Delta \mathbf{a}_i$ ,  $\|\Delta \mathbf{z}\| \leq k_1/8$ . Since  $\Delta \mathbf{x}_i = \Delta \mathbf{a}_i - \Delta \mathbf{z}$ ,  $\|\Delta \mathbf{x}_i\| \leq k_1/8 + k_1/8 = k_1/4$ . Thus

$$\rho(A, \mathbf{c}) \geq \min \left\{ \frac{k_1}{8}, \frac{k_1 k_2}{2k_1 + 4(\|\mathbf{z}\| + \max \|\mathbf{x}_i\|)} \right\}$$

which implies

$$\frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{c})} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{8}{k_1}, \frac{4}{k_2}, \frac{8(\|\mathbf{z}\| + \max \|\mathbf{x}_i\|)}{k_1 k_2} \right\}$$

Since  $\mathbf{z} = (1/n) \sum \mathbf{a}_i \Rightarrow \|\mathbf{z}\| \leq \max \|\mathbf{a}_i\|$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{z} \Rightarrow \|\mathbf{x}_i\| \leq \|\mathbf{a}_i\| + \|\mathbf{z}\| \leq 2 \max \|\mathbf{a}_i\|$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{c})} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{8}{k_1}, \frac{4}{k_2}, \frac{24 \max \|\mathbf{a}_i\|}{k_1 k_2} \right\}$$

This concludes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.2. (Geometric condition to be far from ill-posedness in new variables.)**  
If

$$\text{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \text{bdry}(\text{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \text{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n))) > \alpha \tag{15}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta \mathbf{x}_i\| &\leq \alpha/4, \\ \|\Delta \mathbf{z}\| &\leq \alpha/4, \\ \|\Delta \mathbf{c}\| &\leq \frac{\alpha \|\mathbf{c}\|}{2\alpha + 4(\|\mathbf{z}\| + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\|)}, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\mathbf{z} + \Delta \mathbf{z} \notin \text{bdry}(\text{Ray}(\mathbf{c} + \Delta \mathbf{c}) - \text{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1 + \Delta \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n))$$

*Proof.* Assume for the purpose of showing a contradiction that

$$\mathbf{z} + \Delta \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c} + \Delta \mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1 + \Delta \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n))$$

Consider the case that  $\mathbf{z} \notin \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$ . We will show that  $\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n))) \leq \alpha$ , contradicting our lemma assumption (15). Since  $\mathbf{z} + \Delta \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c} + \Delta \mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1 + \Delta \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n + \Delta \mathbf{x}_n))$ ,

$$\mathbf{z} + \Delta \mathbf{z} = \lambda(\mathbf{c} + \Delta \mathbf{c}) - \sum_i \gamma_i(\mathbf{x}_i + \Delta \mathbf{x}_i),$$

for some  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n \geq 0, \sum_i \gamma_i = 1$ . We establish an upper bound on  $\lambda$  by noting that

$$\lambda = \frac{\|\mathbf{z} + \Delta \mathbf{z} + \sum_i \gamma_i(\mathbf{x}_i + \Delta \mathbf{x}_i)\|}{\|\mathbf{c} + \Delta \mathbf{c}\|}.$$

We lower bound the denominator by  $\|\mathbf{c}\|/2$  by observing that

$$\|\Delta \mathbf{c}\| \leq \frac{\alpha \|\mathbf{c}\|}{2\alpha + 4(\|\mathbf{z}\| + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\|)} \leq \|\mathbf{c}\|/2.$$

We upper bound the numerator by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbf{z} + \Delta \mathbf{z} + \sum_i \gamma_i(\mathbf{x}_i + \Delta \mathbf{x}_i) \right\| &\leq \|\mathbf{z}\| + \alpha/4 + \sum_i \gamma_i(\|\mathbf{x}_i\| + \|\Delta \mathbf{x}_i\|) \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{z}\| + \alpha/4 + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\| + \alpha/4 \\ &= \|\mathbf{z}\| + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\| + \alpha/2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\lambda \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\| + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\| + \alpha/2}{\|\mathbf{c}\|/2}$$

Since

$$\mathbf{z} + \Delta \mathbf{z} - \lambda \Delta \mathbf{c} + \sum_i \gamma_i \Delta \mathbf{x}_i = \lambda \mathbf{c} - \sum_i \gamma_i \mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$$

We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n))) &\leq \left\| \Delta \mathbf{z} - \lambda \Delta \mathbf{c} + \sum_i \gamma_i \Delta \mathbf{x}_i \right\| \\ &\leq \|\Delta \mathbf{z}\| + \lambda \|\Delta \mathbf{c}\| + \sum_i \gamma_i \|\Delta \mathbf{x}_i\| \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{4} + \left( \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\| + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\| + \alpha/2}{\|\mathbf{c}\|/2} \right) \left( \frac{\alpha \|\mathbf{c}\|}{2\alpha + 4(\|\mathbf{z}\| + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\|)} \right) + \frac{\alpha}{4} \\ &= \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

This establishes a contradiction in the case that  $\mathbf{z} \notin \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$ . Now consider the case that  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$ . Since

$$\mathbf{z} + \Delta\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c} + \Delta\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1 + \Delta\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n + \Delta\mathbf{x}_n))$$

there exists a hyperplane  $H$  passing through  $\mathbf{z} + \Delta\mathbf{z}$  and tangent to the convex set  $\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c} + \Delta\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1 + \Delta\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n + \Delta\mathbf{x}_n)$ . By the assumption that  $\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n))) > \alpha$ , there is some  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that, for every  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$ , every point within  $\alpha + \delta$  of  $\mathbf{z}$  lies within  $\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$ . Choose  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0)$  that also satisfies  $\delta \leq \|\mathbf{z}\| + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\|$ . Let  $\mathbf{q}$  be a point at distance  $\frac{3\alpha}{4} + \delta$  from  $\mathbf{z} + \Delta\mathbf{z}$  in the direction perpendicular to  $H$ . Since  $\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z} + \Delta\mathbf{z}) \leq \frac{\alpha}{4}$ , and  $\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{z} + \Delta\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{q}) \leq \frac{3\alpha}{4} + \delta$ ,

$$\mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$$

At the same time,

$$\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c} + \Delta\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1 + \Delta\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n + \Delta\mathbf{x}_n)) > \frac{3\alpha}{4}$$

Because  $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$ , there exist  $\lambda \geq 0$  and  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n \geq 0, \sum_i \gamma_i = 1$  such that

$$\mathbf{q} = \lambda\mathbf{c} - \sum_i \gamma_i \mathbf{x}_i.$$

We upper bound  $\lambda$  as before,

$$\lambda = \frac{\|\mathbf{q} + \sum_i \gamma_i \mathbf{x}_i\|}{\|\mathbf{c}\|} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\| + \alpha + \delta + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\|}{\|\mathbf{c}\|} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{z}\| + \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\| + \alpha/2}{\|\mathbf{c}\|/2}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q} + \lambda\Delta\mathbf{c} - \sum_i \gamma_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i &= \lambda(\mathbf{c} + \Delta\mathbf{c}) - \sum_i \gamma_i (\mathbf{x}_i + \Delta\mathbf{x}_i) \\ &\in \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c} + \Delta\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1 + \Delta\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n + \Delta\mathbf{x}_n) \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c} + \Delta\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1 + \Delta\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n + \Delta\mathbf{x}_n)) &\leq \left\| \lambda\Delta\mathbf{c} - \sum_i \gamma_i \Delta\mathbf{x}_i \right\| \\ &\leq \lambda \|\Delta\mathbf{c}\| + \max_i \|\Delta\mathbf{x}_i\| \\ &\leq \alpha/2 + \alpha/4 \\ &\leq 3\alpha/4 \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. This concludes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$



### 3.4 Dual condition number is likely low

*Proof of Lemma 3.0.3.* Let

$$\mathbf{z} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{a}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{a}_i - \mathbf{z}, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

$$k_1 = \mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n))) \text{ and } k_2 = \|\mathbf{c}\|.$$

We will apply the bound of lemma 3.3.1. We first lower bound  $\min\{k_1, k_2, k_1 k_2\}$ . We begin by noting that if

$$\min\{k_1, k_2, k_1 k_2\} < \epsilon,$$

then either

$$\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n))) < \epsilon, \tag{16}$$

or

$$\|\mathbf{c}\| < \epsilon, \tag{17}$$

or there exists some integer  $l$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq \lceil \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rceil$ , for which

$$\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n))) < 2^l \epsilon \text{ and } \|\mathbf{c}\| \leq 2^{-l+1}. \tag{18}$$

The probabilities of events (16) and (17) will also be bounded in our analysis of event (18). By corollary A.0.6, for  $d \geq 2$ , we have

$$\Pr[\|\mathbf{c}\| \leq \epsilon] \leq \frac{e\epsilon}{\sigma},$$

which translates to

$$\Pr[\|\mathbf{c}\| \leq 2^{-l+1}] \leq \frac{e2^{-l+1}}{\sigma},$$

while lemma 3.2.3 implies

$$\Pr[\mathbf{dist}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{bdry}(\mathbf{Ray}(\mathbf{c}) - \mathbf{Hull}(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n))) < 2^l \epsilon] \leq \frac{8 \cdot 2^l \epsilon d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\sigma}.$$

Thus, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\min\{k_1, k_2, k_1 k_2\} < \epsilon] &\leq \frac{8 \epsilon d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\sigma} + \frac{e\epsilon}{\sigma} + \sum_{l=1}^{\lceil \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} \rceil} \frac{e2^{-l+1}}{\sigma} \frac{8 \cdot 2^l \epsilon d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\sigma} \\ &= \frac{8 \epsilon d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\sigma} + \frac{e\epsilon}{\sigma} + \frac{16e\epsilon d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\sigma^2} \lceil \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \rceil \\ &\leq \frac{55 \epsilon d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\sigma^2} \log \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We re-write this as

$$\Pr \left[ \max \left\{ \frac{1}{k_1}, \frac{1}{k_2}, \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \right\} > \frac{200 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\delta \sigma^2} \log \left( \frac{200 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) \right] < \frac{\delta}{2}. \quad (19)$$

By Lemma 3.3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{c})} &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{8}{k_1}, \frac{4}{k_2}, \frac{24 \max_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|}{k_1 k_2} \right\} \\ &\leq 24 \max(\max_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|, 1) \max \left\{ \frac{1}{k_1}, \frac{1}{k_2}, \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using corollary A.0.5 yields

$$\Pr \left[ \max(\|A, \mathbf{c}\|_F, 1) > 3 + \sigma \sqrt{(d+1)n 2 \ln(4e/\delta)} \right] < \frac{\delta}{4}, \quad (20)$$

and  $\max(\|A, \mathbf{c}\|_F, 1) \geq \max(\max_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|, 1)$ .

Thus, by a union bound using inequalities 19 and 20, we obtain

$$\Pr \left[ \frac{\|A, \mathbf{c}\|_F}{\rho(A, \mathbf{c})} > \frac{24 \cdot 200 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\delta \sigma^2} \log \left( \frac{200 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) (3 + \sigma \sqrt{(d+1)n 2 \ln(2e/\delta)})^2 \right] \leq \delta.$$

To derive the lemma as stated, we conclude with

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{24 \cdot 200 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\delta \sigma^2} \log \left( \frac{200 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) (3 + \sigma \sqrt{(d+1)n 2 \ln(2e/\delta)})^2 \leq \\ &\frac{50000 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\delta \sigma^2} \log^{1.5} \left( \frac{200 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used the assumption  $\sigma \leq 1/\sqrt{dn}$ .

This concludes the proof for the high probability bound of the Lemma. We now establish the smoothed bound on the log of expectation. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \left[ \log \frac{\|A, \mathbf{c}\|_F}{\rho(A, \mathbf{c})} \right] &= \mathbf{E} [\log \|A, \mathbf{c}\|_F] + \mathbf{E} \left[ \log \frac{1}{\rho(A, \mathbf{c})} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} [\log \|A, \mathbf{c}\|_F] + \mathbf{E} \left[ \log \max \left\{ \frac{1}{k_1}, \frac{1}{k_2}, \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \right\} \right] + \mathbf{E} \left[ \log(24 \max(\max_i \|\mathbf{a}_i\|, 1)) \right] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E} [\log \max(\|A, \mathbf{c}\|_F, 1)] + \mathbf{E} \left[ \log \max \left\{ \frac{1}{k_1}, \frac{1}{k_2}, \frac{1}{k_1 k_2} \right\} \right] + \mathbf{E} [24 \log \max(\|A\|_F, 1)] \\ &\leq \log \sqrt{n(d+1)+1} + 2 \log \frac{55 d^{1/4} n^{1/2}}{\sigma^2} + 2 + \log 24 + \log \sqrt{nd+1} \\ &\leq 14 + 4 \log \frac{nd}{\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

where the bound is derived using the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.2.5.  $\square$

## 4 Combining the Primal and Dual Analyses

We can now apply the same argument as presented in the proof of Theorem 2.7.1 to establish our main theorem.

*Proof-of-theorem 1.3.2.* Note that the transformation of each canonical form into the conic form leaves the Frobenius norm unchanged. Also, a random Gaussian perturbation in the original form maps to a random Gaussian perturbation in the conic form. Therefore, the smoothed bound on the primal and dual condition numbers of the conic form implies, using Lemma 2.2.2, a smoothed bound on each of the condition numbers  $C_P^{(1)}$ ,  $C_P^{(2)}$ ,  $C_D^{(2)}$ ,  $C_D^{(3)}$ .

By Lemmas 2.2.4 and Lemma 3.0.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \Pr_{A, b, c} \left[ C^{(i)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) > \frac{2^{13} (n+1)^2 (d+1)^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \left( \log^2 \frac{2^{10} (n+1)^2 (d+1)^{1.5}}{\delta \sigma^2} \right) \right] \\
\leq & \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \Pr_{A, b, c} \left[ C_P^{(i)}(A, \mathbf{b}) > \frac{2^{12} n^2 (d+1)^{1.5}}{(\delta/2) \sigma^2} \left( \log^2 \frac{2^9 n^2 (d+1)^{1.5}}{(\delta/2) \sigma^2} \right) \right] + \\
& \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \Pr_{A, b, c} \left[ C_D^{(i)}(A, \mathbf{c}) > \frac{2^{12} (n+1)^2 d^{1.5}}{(\delta/2) \sigma^2} \left( \log^2 \frac{2^9 (n+1)^2 d^{1.5}}{(\delta/2) \sigma^2} \right) \right] \\
\leq & \delta/2 + \delta/2 = \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

To bound the log of the condition number, we use Lemmas 2.2.5 and Lemma 3.0.3.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{E}_{A, b, c} \left[ \log C^{(i)}(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) \right] \\
\leq & \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \mathbf{E}_{A, b, c} \left[ \log \left( C_P^{(i)}(A, \mathbf{b}) + C_D^{(i)}(A, \mathbf{c}) \right) \right] \\
\leq & \max_{(\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}): \|\bar{A}, \bar{b}, \bar{c}\|_F \leq 1} \max \left( \mathbf{E}_{A, b, c} \left[ \log \left( 2C_P^{(i)}(A, \mathbf{b}) \right) \right], \mathbf{E}_{A, b, c} \left[ \log \left( 2C_D^{(i)}(A, \mathbf{c}) \right) \right] \right) \\
\leq & 15 + 4.5 \log \left( \frac{nd}{\sigma} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The second to the last inequality used that fact that for positive random variables  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ ,

$$\mathbf{E} [\log(\beta + \gamma)] \leq \max(\mathbf{E} [\log(2\beta)], \mathbf{E} [\log(2\gamma)]).$$

$\square$

## 5 Open Problems and Conclusion

One obvious question left open by this work is the smoothed complexity of obtaining the exact answer to the linear program. While it is possible that writing this as a rational number could require a large number of bits, for most applications it suffices to identify the set of constraints that are tight at the optimal solution.

Recently, Spielman and Teng [ST02a] performed a smoothed analysis of the termination condition of the interior-point algorithms for form (2). They studied a particular termination algorithm and defined  $\delta(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  to be the greatest number such that the termination algorithm is successful from a feasible point  $\mathbf{x}$  whenever the optimality gap of  $\mathbf{x}$  is no more than  $\delta(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$ . They proved,

**Theorem 5.0.1 (Spielman-Teng).** *Let  $\bar{A}$  be an  $n$ -by- $d$  matrix,  $n \geq d$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{b}}$  an  $n$ -vector, and  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$  an  $d$ -vector for which  $\|\bar{A}\|, \|\bar{\mathbf{b}}\|, \|\bar{\mathbf{c}}\| \leq 1$ , and let  $A, \mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  be a Gaussian random matrix and two Gaussian random vectors of variance  $\sigma^2$  centered at  $\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$ , respectively. Then, for  $\sigma^2 \leq 1$ ,*

$$\mathbf{E} \left[ \max \left( 1, \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})} \right) \right) \right] \leq O(\log(n/\sigma)).$$

Thus, combining with the Main Result (Theorem 1.3.1) of this paper, one could obtain the following smoothed analysis result for interior-point algorithms to find the *exact* answer to a linear program.

**Theorem 5.0.2 (Smoothed Complexity of IPM of Form (2)).** *Let  $\bar{A}$  be an  $n$ -by- $d$  matrix for  $n \geq d$ ,  $\bar{\mathbf{b}}$  an  $n$ -vector, and  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$  an  $d$ -vector for which  $\|\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{c}}\|_F \leq 1$ , and let  $A, \mathbf{b}$  and  $\mathbf{c}$  be the Gaussian perturbations of  $\bar{A}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{c}}$  of variance  $\sigma < 1/\sqrt{nd}$ . Let  $T(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  denote the complexity of Renegar's interior point algorithm with the periodic application of the termination procedure described in [ST02a] for solving the linear program defined by  $(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$  of form (2). Then,*

$$\mathbf{E}_{A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}} [T(A, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})] \leq O(n^3 \log(n/\sigma)).$$

The best known lower bound on the complexity of interior point methods is  $\Omega(n^{1/3})$  iterations due to Todd [Tod94] and Todd and Ye [TY96]. However, the programs for which these lower bounds hold are very ill-conditioned. There are no known bounds of the form  $\Omega(n^\epsilon)$  for well-conditioned linear programs. We conjecture that the smoothed number of iterations of interior-point algorithms for solving linear programs is  $o(n^{1/3} \log(n/\sigma\epsilon))$ .

Another open question is whether the main results of this paper as well as the main result of [ST02a] can be proved under the model of property-preserving perturbations, introduced in [ST02b], in which one considers perturbations that preserve the feasibility or infeasibility of the perturbed program and its dual. A related question is whether these results can be proved under zero-preserving perturbations in which only non-zero entries of  $A$  are subject to perturbations. Unfortunately, the following example shows that in this model of zero-preserving perturbations, it is not possible to bound the condition number by  $\text{poly}(n, d, \frac{1}{\sigma})$  with probability at least  $1/2$ . Therefore, if such a result were to hold in the model of zero-preserving perturbations, it would not be because of a polynomial bound on the condition number.

Let  $A$  be a zero perserving Gaussian perturbation of  $\bar{A}$  with variance  $\sigma^2$ . For ease of exposition, we will normalize  $\|\bar{A}\|_F$  to be 1 at the end of formulation. Define the matrix

$$\bar{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & \epsilon & & \\ & -1 & \epsilon & \\ & & \dots & \\ & & & -1 & \epsilon \end{bmatrix}$$

where  $\epsilon$  is a parameter to be chosen later, and consider the linear program  $A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}$  where  $\mathbf{C} = \{\mathbf{x} : \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}\}$ . The  $i^{\text{th}}$  constraint of  $\bar{A}\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$  is exactly

$$\epsilon x_{i+1} \geq x_i$$

We apply fact A.0.4 with  $c = \delta^2/\sigma^2$  assumed to be at least 6 (so that  $(1 - c + \ln c) \leq -c/2$ ). This yields

$$\Pr[|a_{i,i} - 1| \geq \delta] \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2} + \ln \frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2})} \leq e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{4\sigma^2}} \quad (21)$$

$$\Pr[|a_{i,i+1} - \epsilon| \geq \delta] \leq e^{-\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2} + \ln \frac{\delta^2}{\sigma^2})} \leq e^{-\frac{\delta^2}{4\sigma^2}} \quad (22)$$

Setting  $\delta = \sigma\sqrt{8\log n}$  yields that none of the events (21), (22) happen for any  $i$  with probability at least  $1/2$  (by a union bound). Assuming that none of the events (21), (22) occur, and that  $\epsilon > \delta$  (which we will ensure later), we have that  $A\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}$  is feasible;

$$\mathbf{x} = \left[ \left( \frac{\epsilon - \delta}{1 + \delta} \right)^n, \left( \frac{\epsilon - \delta}{1 + \delta} \right)^{n-1}, \dots, 1 \right]$$

is one such feasible solution. We also have that  $(\epsilon + \delta)x_{i+1} \geq (1 - \delta)x_i$  for every  $i$ . Define

$$\Delta A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 & -\left(\frac{\epsilon + \delta}{1 - \delta}\right)^{n-2} \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ & \dots & & \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We now show that  $(A + \Delta A)\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}$  is infeasible, and hence  $\rho(A, \mathbf{C}) \leq \|\Delta A\|_F = \left(\frac{\epsilon + \delta}{1 - \delta}\right)^{n-2}$ . To see infeasibility, note that the constraint given by the top row of  $(A + \Delta A)$  is

$$-x_1 + \epsilon x_2 - \left(\frac{\epsilon + \delta}{1 - \delta}\right)^{n-2} x_n \geq 0$$

while we simultaneously have that  $x_2 \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon + \delta}{1 - \delta}\right)^{n-2} x_n$ . Assuming  $\epsilon \leq 1$  (which we ensure later), this constraint is impossible to satisfy for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}$ .

Letting  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{n}$  and  $\sigma = \frac{1}{n^2}$  (and hence  $\delta = \frac{\sqrt{8\log n}}{n^2}$ ) yields  $\rho(A, \mathbf{C}) = \left(\frac{\epsilon + \delta}{1 - \delta}\right)^{n-2} = \left(\frac{O(1)}{n}\right)^{n-2}$ , which is exponentially small and also satisfies the requirements on  $\epsilon$ . We can upper bound  $\|A\|_F$  by  $\|A\|_F \leq \sqrt{n(1 + \delta)^2 + n(\epsilon + \delta)^2} \leq 2\sqrt{n}$ . Thus the condition number, which is equal to  $\|A\|_F / \rho(A, \mathbf{C})$ , is at least  $\Omega(n)^{n-3}$ .

If we had normalized  $\|\bar{A}\|_F = 1$  at the beginning of the proof, the corresponding normalization would have been  $\epsilon \approx \frac{1}{n\sqrt{n}}$ ,  $\sigma \approx \frac{1}{n^2\sqrt{n}}$ , which still shows the negative result. This analysis also shows the impossibility of a theorem like theorem 1.3.2 for another natural model of perturbation, *relative perturbation*, that is also zero-preserving: multiplying each entry of  $\bar{A}$  by an  $N(1, \sigma^2)$  Gaussian random variable. This concludes our discussion of impossibility results for smoothed analysis.

We would like to point out that condition numbers appear throughout Numerical Analysis and that condition numbers may be defined for many non-linear problems. The speed of algorithms for optimizing linear functions over convex bodies (including semidefinite programming) has been related to their condition numbers [Fre02, FV00], and it seems that one should be able to extend our results to these algorithms as well. Condition numbers have also been defined for non-linear programming problems, and one could attempt to perform a smoothed analysis of non-linear optimization algorithms by relating their performance to the condition numbers of their inputs, and then performing a smoothed analysis of their condition numbers.

The approach of proving smoothed complexity bounds by relating the performance of an algorithm to some property of its input, such as a condition number, and the performing a smoothed analysis of this quantity has also been recently used in [ST02b, SST02]. Finally, we hope that this work illuminates some of the shared interests of the Numerical Analysis, Operations Research, and Theoretical Computer Science communities.

## References

- [AJPY93] K. M. Anstreicher, J. Ji, F. A. Potra, and Y. Ye. Average performance of a self-dual interior-point algorithm for linear programming. In P. M. Pardalos, editor, *Complexity in Numerical Optimization*, pages 1–15. World Scientific Publishing Co., London, United Kingdom, 1993.
- [AJPY99] K. M. Anstreicher, J. Ji, F. A. Potra, and Y. Ye. Probabilistic analysis of an infeasible-interior-point algorithm for linear programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 24(1):176–192, 1999.
- [Bal93] K. Ball. The reverse isoperimetric problem for gaussian measure. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 10(4):411–420, 1993.
- [BD02] Avrim Blum and John Dunagan. Smoothed analysis of the perceptron algorithm for linear programming. In *Proceedings of the 13th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA '02)*, 2002. Available at <http://theory.lcs.mit.edu/~jdunagan/>.
- [BR76] Bhattacharya and Rao. Normal approximation and asymptotic expansion. pages 23–38, 1976.
- [CC01] D. Cheung and F. Cucker. A new condition number for linear programming. *Math. Programming*, 91(1 (Ser. A)):163–174, 2001.

- [CP01] F. Cucker and J. Peña. A primal-dual algorithm for solving polyhedral conic systems with a finite-precision machine. Submitted to *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 2001.
- [DG99] S. Dasgupta and A. Gupta. An elementary proof of the johnson-lindenstrauss lemma. *International Computer Science Institute, Technical Report 99-006*, 1999.
- [EA96] C. Mezaros X. Xu E. Andersen, J. Gondzio. Implementation of interior point methods for large scale linear programming. In T. Terlaky, editor, *Interior point methods in mathematical programming*. Kluwer Academic Publisher, 1996.
- [FN01] Robert Freund and Manuel Nunez. Condition-measure bounds on the behavior of the central trajectory of a semi-definite program. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 11(3):818–836, 2001.
- [Fre02] R. Freund. Complexity of convex optimization using geometry-based measures and a reference point. Technical Report OR358-01, MIT Operations Research Center Working Paper, 2002. submitted to *Mathematical Programming*.
- [FV99] Robert Freund and Jorge Vera. On the complexity of computing estimates of condition measures of a conic linear system. Operations Research Center Working Paper, MIT, 1999, submitted to *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 1999.
- [FV00] Robert Freund and Jorge Vera. Condition-based complexity of convex optimization in conic linear form via the ellipsoid algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 10(1):155–176, 2000.
- [Gon88] Clovis C. Gonzaga. *An Algorithm for Solving Linear Programming Problems in  $O(n^3L)$  Operations*, pages 1–28. Springer-Verlag, 1988. Progress in Mathematical Programming, N. Megiddo ed..
- [GT92] C. C. Gonzaga and M. J. Todd. An  $O(\sqrt{n}L)$ -iteration large-step primal-dual affine algorithm for linear programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 2:349–359, 1992.
- [IL94] D. Shanno I. Lustig, R. Marsten. Interior point methods: computational state of the art. *ORSA Journal on Computing*, 6(1):1–14, 1994.
- [Kar84] N. Karmarkar. A new polynomial time algorithm for linear programming. *Combinatorica*, 4:373–395, 1984.
- [Kha79] L. G. Khachiyan. A polynomial algorithm in linear programming. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, pages 1093–1096, 1979.
- [LDK63] B. Grunbaum L. Danzer and V. Klee. Helly’s theorem and its relatives. In *Convexity ( Proceedings of the Symposia on Pure Mathematics 7 )*, pages 101–180. American Mathematical Society, 1963.
- [LMS90] I. J. Lustig, R. E. Marsten, and D. F. Shanno. The primal-dual interior point method on the Cray supercomputer. In T. F. Coleman and Y. Li, editors, *Large-Scale Numerical Optimization, Papers from the Workshop held at Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA, October 1989*, volume 46 of *SIAM Proceedings in Applied Mathematics*,

pages 70–80. Society of Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, USA, 1990.

- [MTY93] S. Mizuno, M. J. Todd, and Y. Ye. On adaptive-step primal-dual interior-point algorithms for linear programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 18:964–981, 1993.
- [Nem88] A. S. Nemirovskii. An new polynomial algorithm for linear programming. *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR*, 298(6):1321–1325, 1988. Translated in: *Soviet Mathematics Doklady* 37(1): 264–269, 1988.
- [OF02] F. Ordóñez and R. Freund. Ipm practical performance on lps and the explanatory value of complexity measures. Technical Report OR361-02, MIT Operations Research Center Working Paper, 2002. Submitted to SIAM Journal on Optimization.
- [Peñ00] J. Peña. Understanding the geometry of infeasible perturbations of a conic linear system. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 10:534–550, 2000.
- [Ren88] J. Renegar. A polynomial-time algorithm, based on Newton’s method, for linear programming. *Math. Programming*, 40(1 (Ser. A)):59–93, 1988.
- [Ren94] J. Renegar. Some perturbation theory for linear programming. *Math. Programming*, 65(1, Ser. A):73–91, 1994.
- [Ren95a] J. Renegar. Incorporating condition measures into the complexity theory of linear programming. *SIAM J. Optim.*, 5(3):506–524, 1995.
- [Ren95b] J. Renegar. Linear programming, complexity theory and elementary functional analysis. *Math. Programming*, 70(3, Ser. A):279–351, 1995.
- [Seg00] Yoav Seginer. The expected norm of random matrices. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 9:149–166, 2000.
- [SST02] Arvind Sankar, Daniel A. Spielman, and Shang-Hua Teng. Smoothed analysis of the condition numbers and growth factors of matrices. available at <http://math.mit.edu/~spielman/SmoothedAnalysis>, 2002.
- [ST01] Daniel Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Smoothed analysis of algorithms: Why the simplex algorithm usually takes polynomial time. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC ’01)*, pages 296–305, 2001. Available at <http://math.mit.edu/~spielman/SmoothedAnalysis/>.
- [ST02a] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Smoothed analysis of interior point algorithms: Termination. Submitted to Journal, available at <http://math.mit.edu/~spielman/SmoothedAnalysis>, 2002.
- [ST02b] Daniel A. Spielman and Shang-Hua Teng. Smoothed analysis of property testing. Submitted to STOC, available at <http://math.mit.edu/~spielman/SmoothedAnalysis>, 2002.



- [Tod91] M. J. Todd. Probabilistic models for linear programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 16(4):671–693, 1991.
- [Tod94] M. J. Todd. A lower bound on the number of iterations of primal-dual interior-point methods for linear programming. In G. A. Watson and D. F. Griffiths, editors, *Numerical Analysis 1993*, pages 237–259. Longman Press, Harlow, 1994.
- [TY96] M. J. Todd and Y. Ye. A lower bound on the number of iterations of long-step and polynomial interior-point methods for linear programming. *Annals of Operations Research*, 62:233–252, 1996.
- [Vai90] P. M. Vaidya. An algorithm for linear programming which requires  $O((m+n)n^2 + (m+n)^{1.5}nL)$  arithmetic operations. *Mathematical Programming*, 47:175–201, 1990. Condensed version in: *Proceedings of the 19th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, 29–38, 1987*.
- [Ver96] Jorge Vera. Ill-posedness and the complexity of deciding existence of solutions to linear programs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 6(3), 1996.
- [Wri96] S. Wright. *Primal-Dual Interior-Point Methods*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, Pa, 1996.
- [Ye97] Yinyu Ye. *Interior Point Algorithms*. Wiley-Interscience, 1997.

## A Gaussian random variables

We now derive particular versions of well-known bounds on the Chi-Squared distribution. These bounds are used in the body of the paper, and bounds of this form are well-known. We thank DasGupta and Gupta [DG99] for this particular derivation.

**Fact A.0.3 (Sum of gaussians).** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_d$  be independent  $N(0, \sigma)$  random variables. Then*

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^d X_i^2 \geq \kappa^2\right] \leq e^{\frac{d}{2}\left(1 - \frac{\kappa^2}{d\sigma^2} + \ln \frac{\kappa^2}{d\sigma^2}\right)}$$

*Proof.* For simplicity, we begin with  $Y_i \sim N(0, 1)$ . A simple integration shows that if  $Y \sim N(0, 1)$  then  $E[e^{tY^2}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-2t}}$  ( $t < \frac{1}{2}$ ). We proceed with

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^d Y_i^2 \geq k\right] &= \\
\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^d Y_i^2 - k \geq 0\right] &= \quad (\text{for } t > 0) \\
\Pr\left[e^{t(\sum_{i=1}^d Y_i^2 - k)} \geq 1\right] &\leq \quad (\text{by Markov's Ineq.}) \\
\mathbf{E}\left[e^{t(\sum_{i=1}^d Y_i^2 - k)}\right] &= \\
\left(\frac{1}{1-2t}\right)^{d/2} e^{-kt} &\leq \quad (\text{letting } t = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{d}{2k}) \\
\left(\frac{k}{d}\right)^{d/2} e^{-\frac{k}{2} + \frac{d}{2}} &= e^{\frac{d}{2}(1 - \frac{k}{d} + \ln \frac{k}{d})}
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^d Y_i^2 \geq k\right] = \Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^d X_i^2 \geq \sigma^2 k\right]$$

we set  $k = \frac{\kappa^2}{\sigma^2}$  and obtain  $e^{\frac{d}{2}(1 - \frac{k}{d} + \ln \frac{k}{d})} = e^{\frac{d}{2}(1 - \frac{\kappa^2}{d\sigma^2} + \ln \frac{\kappa^2}{d\sigma^2})}$  which was our desired bound.  $\square$

**Fact A.0.4 (Alternative sum of gaussians).** *Let  $X_1, \dots, X_d$  be independent  $N(0, \sigma)$  random variables. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^d X_i^2 \geq cd\sigma^2\right] &\leq e^{\frac{d}{2}(1-c+\ln c)} & c \geq 1 \\
\Pr\left[\sum_{i=1}^d X_i^2 \leq cd\sigma^2\right] &\leq e^{\frac{d}{2}(1-c+\ln c)} & c \leq 1
\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The first inequality is proved by setting  $k = cd$  in the last line of the proof of fact A.0.3. To prove the second inequality, begin the proof of fact A.0.3 with  $\Pr[\sum_{i=1}^d Y_i^2 \leq k]$  and continue in the obvious manner.  $\square$

**Corollary A.0.5.** *Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian random vector of variance  $\sigma^2$  centered at the origin. Then, for  $d \geq 2$  and  $\epsilon \leq 1/e^2$ ,*

$$\Pr\left[\|\mathbf{x}\| \geq \sigma\sqrt{d(1+2\ln(1/\epsilon))}\right] \leq \epsilon$$

*Proof.* Set  $c = 1 + 2\ln(1/\epsilon)$  in fact A.0.4. We then compute

$$e^{\frac{d}{2}(1-c+\ln c)} \leq e^{1-c+\ln c} \leq e^{-2\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \ln(1+2\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon})} = \epsilon e^{-\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \ln(1+2\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon})}$$

We now seek to show

$$\begin{aligned}
e^{-\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \ln(1 + 2 \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon})} &\leq 1 \\
\Leftrightarrow -\ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \ln(1 + 2 \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}) &\leq 0 \\
\Leftrightarrow 1 + 2 \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}
\end{aligned}$$

For  $\epsilon = 1/e^2$ , the left-hand side of the last inequality is 5, while the right-hand side is greater than 7. Taking derivatives with respect to  $1/\epsilon$ , we see that the right-hand side grows faster as we increase  $1/\epsilon$  (decrease  $\epsilon$ ), and therefore will always be greater.  $\square$

**Corollary A.0.6.** *Let  $\mathbf{x}$  be a  $d$ -dimensional Gaussian random vector of variance  $\sigma^2$  centered at the origin. Then, for  $d \geq 2$ ,*

$$\Pr [\|\mathbf{x}\| \leq \epsilon] \leq \frac{e\epsilon}{\sigma}$$

*Proof.* If  $\epsilon \leq \sigma$ , set  $c = \frac{\epsilon^2}{d\sigma^2}$  in fact A.0.4.

$$e^{\frac{d}{2}(1-c+\ln c)} \leq e^{1-c+\ln c} \leq e^{1+\ln c} = \frac{e\epsilon^2}{d\sigma^2} \leq \frac{e\epsilon}{\sigma}$$

If  $\epsilon > \sigma$ , the statement is vacuously true.  $\square$