

Extreme points and polytopes

Alexander Polyanskii
<http://polyanskii.com>

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology

Extreme points

A point $\mathbf{a} \in A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is called an **extreme** point of A provided that if $(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c})/2 = \mathbf{a}$ for two points $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in A$, then $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c}$. **Notation:** The set of all extreme points of A is denoted by $\text{ex } A$.

Extreme points

A point $\mathbf{a} \in A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is called an **extreme** point of A provided that if $(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c})/2 = \mathbf{a}$ for two points $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in A$, then $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c}$. **Notation:** The set of all extreme points of A is denoted by $\text{ex } A$.

Lemma

Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a non-empty convex set and $f(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x} \rangle$ be a linear functional such that \mathbf{c} is distinct from the origin.

1. If f attains maximum on A at a point $\mathbf{a} \in A$ (that is, $f(\mathbf{a}) > f(\mathbf{b})$ for any $\mathbf{b} \in A \setminus \{\mathbf{a}\}$), then \mathbf{a} is an extreme point of A .
2. (**Homework problem.**) If f attains maximum equal to α on A and $B = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : f(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha\} \cap A$ is a set with an extreme point $\mathbf{a} \in \text{ex } B$, then \mathbf{a} is an extreme point of A .

Proof of Lemma (part 1)

Suppose that $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2)/2$ for some $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in A$. Since

$$\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} (\langle \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{c} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{c} \rangle)$$

Proof of Lemma (part 1)

Suppose that $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2)/2$ for some $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in A$. Since

$$\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\langle \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{c} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{c} \rangle) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \rangle),$$

we have $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{c} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{c} \rangle$.

Proof of Lemma (part 1)

Suppose that $\mathbf{a} = (\mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2)/2$ for some $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in A$. Since

$$\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\langle \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{c} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{c} \rangle) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \rangle),$$

we have $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{c} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{c} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{b}_2, \mathbf{c} \rangle$. Therefore, $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{b}_2$.

Krein–Milman theorem

Krein–Milman theorem

If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex compact set, then $K = \text{conv}(\text{ex } K)$.

Krein–Milman theorem

Krein–Milman theorem

If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex compact set, then $K = \text{conv}(\text{ex } K)$.

Proof by induction on the dimension. The proof is obvious for $d = 1$ because in this case K is a segments, and its endpoints are the only extreme points of K .

Krein–Milman theorem

Krein–Milman theorem

If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex compact set, then $K = \text{conv}(\text{ex } K)$.

Proof by induction on the dimension. The proof is obvious for $d = 1$ because in this case K is a segments, and its endpoints are the only extreme points of K . Let $d = n > 1$. Suppose that $\dim \text{aff } K = d$.

Krein–Milman theorem

Krein–Milman theorem

If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex compact set, then $K = \text{conv}(\text{ex } K)$.

Proof by induction on the dimension. The proof is obvious for $d = 1$ because in this case K is a segments, and its endpoints are the only extreme points of K . Let $d = n > 1$. Suppose that $\dim \text{aff } K = d$. Show that $\text{int } K \neq \emptyset$. (It is a **homework problem**.)

Krein–Milman theorem

Krein–Milman theorem

If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex compact set, then $K = \text{conv}(\text{ex } K)$.

Proof by induction on the dimension. The proof is obvious for $d = 1$ because in this case K is a segments, and its endpoints are the only extreme points of K . Let $d = n > 1$. Suppose that $\dim \text{aff } K = d$. Show that $\text{int } K \neq \emptyset$. (It is a **homework problem**.)

1) If $\mathbf{x} \in \partial K$, then consider a supporting hyperplane at \mathbf{x} and $K' = K \cap h$. Clearly, K' is a compact convex set. Therefore, $\mathbf{x} \in \text{conv ex } K'$.

Krein–Milman theorem

Krein–Milman theorem

If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex compact set, then $K = \text{conv}(\text{ex } K)$.

Proof by induction on the dimension. The proof is obvious for $d = 1$ because in this case K is a segments, and its endpoints are the only extreme points of K . Let $d = n > 1$. Suppose that $\dim \text{aff } K = d$. Show that $\text{int } K \neq \emptyset$. (It is a **homework problem**.)

1) If $\mathbf{x} \in \partial K$, then consider a supporting hyperplane at \mathbf{x} and $K' = K \cap h$. Clearly, K' is a compact convex set. Therefore, $\mathbf{x} \in \text{conv ex } K'$. By Lemma (part 2), $\text{ex } K' \subset \text{ex } K$, and thus, $\mathbf{x} \in \text{conv ex } K$.

Krein–Milman theorem

Krein–Milman theorem

If $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex compact set, then $K = \text{conv}(\text{ex } K)$.

Proof by induction on the dimension. The proof is obvious for $d = 1$ because in this case K is a segments, and its endpoints are the only extreme points of K . Let $d = n > 1$. Suppose that $\dim \text{aff } K = d$. Show that $\text{int } K \neq \emptyset$. (It is a **homework problem**.)

- 1) If $\mathbf{x} \in \partial K$, then consider a supporting hyperplane at \mathbf{x} and $K' = K \cap h$. Clearly, K' is a compact convex set. Therefore, $\mathbf{x} \in \text{conv ex } K'$. By Lemma (part 2), $\text{ex } K' \subset \text{ex } K$, and thus, $\mathbf{x} \in \text{conv ex } K$.
- 2) If $\mathbf{x} \notin \partial K$, then consider any line through \mathbf{x} that intersects the ∂K at points \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} . By 1), we have $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \text{conv ex } K$ and thus $\mathbf{x} \in \text{conv ex } K$.

Polyhedra and polytopes

Let $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are non-zero vectors and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{R}$. The set

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_i \rangle \leq \beta_i\}$$

is called a **polyhedron**.

Polyhedra and polytopes

Let $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are non-zero vectors and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{R}$. The set

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n \{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_i \rangle \leq \beta_i \}$$

is called a **polyhedron**. An extreme point of a polyhedron is called a **vertex**.

Polyhedra and polytopes

Let $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are non-zero vectors and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathbb{R}$. The set

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^n \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{c}_i \rangle \leq \beta_i\}$$

is called a **polyhedron**. An extreme point of a polyhedron is called a **vertex**. Let $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The set $\text{conv}(\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n)$ is called a **polytope**.

Polyhedron/polytope theorem

A bounded polyhedron is a polytope. A polytope is a bounded polyhedron.

Proof of P/P theorem

A bounded polyhedron is a polytope. By the Krein–Milman theorem, the bounded polyhedron lies is the convex hull of its extreme points.

Proof of P/P theorem

A bounded polyhedron is a polytope. By the Krein–Milman theorem, the bounded polyhedron lies is the convex hull of its extreme points.

To finish the proof, we will show a bounded polyhedron has a **finite** number of vertices. For that, we show the following lemma.

Proof of P/P theorem

A bounded polyhedron is a polytope. By the Krein–Milman theorem, the bounded polyhedron lies is the convex hull of its extreme points.

To finish the proof, we will show a bounded polyhedron has a **finite** number of vertices. For that, we show the following lemma.

Lemma

Let

$$P = \bigcap_{i=1}^m \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq \beta_i \right\}$$

be a polyhedron, where $\mathbf{c}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{o}\}$ and $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. For $\mathbf{u} \in P$, let

$$C(\mathbf{u}) = \{ \mathbf{c}_i : \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \beta_i \}.$$

Then \mathbf{u} is a vertex of P iff $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans the vector space \mathbb{R}^d .

Proof of P/P theorem

First, let us finish the proof of theorem.

Proof of P/P theorem

First, let us finish the proof of theorem.

We claim that any two distinct vertices \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} of P have distinct sets $C(\mathbf{u})$ and $C(\mathbf{v})$.

Proof of P/P theorem

First, let us finish the proof of theorem.

We claim that any two distinct vertices \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} of P have distinct sets $C(\mathbf{u})$ and $C(\mathbf{v})$. Indeed, suppose $C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v})$ and consider the system of linear equations.

$$\left\{ \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \beta_i \quad \text{for } \mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v}), \right.$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vectors of variables.

Proof of P/P theorem

First, let us finish the proof of theorem.

We claim that any two distinct vertices \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} of P have distinct sets $C(\mathbf{u})$ and $C(\mathbf{v})$. Indeed, suppose $C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v})$ and consider the system of linear equations.

$$\left\{ \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \beta_i \quad \text{for } \mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v}), \right.$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vectors of variables.

Since \mathbf{u} is a vertex, the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d .

Proof of P/P theorem

First, let us finish the proof of theorem.

We claim that any two distinct vertices \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} of P have distinct sets $C(\mathbf{u})$ and $C(\mathbf{v})$. Indeed, suppose $C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v})$ and consider the system of linear equations.

$$\left\{ \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \beta_i \quad \text{for } \mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v}), \right.$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vectors of variables.

Since \mathbf{u} is a vertex, the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d . Thus the dimension of the solutions is at most 0.

Proof of P/P theorem

First, let us finish the proof of theorem.

We claim that any two distinct vertices \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} of P have distinct sets $C(\mathbf{u})$ and $C(\mathbf{v})$. Indeed, suppose $C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v})$ and consider the system of linear equations.

$$\left\{ \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \beta_i \quad \text{for } \mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v}), \right.$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vectors of variables.

Since \mathbf{u} is a vertex, the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d . Thus the dimension of the solutions is at most 0.

Since $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{v}$ are solutions of this system, these points \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} must coincide (otherwise, the dimension of the solutions of the system of equations at least 1).

Proof of P/P theorem

First, let us finish the proof of theorem.

We claim that any two distinct vertices \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} of P have distinct sets $C(\mathbf{u})$ and $C(\mathbf{v})$. Indeed, suppose $C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v})$ and consider the system of linear equations.

$$\left\{ \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \beta_i \quad \text{for } \mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v}), \right.$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vectors of variables.

Since \mathbf{u} is a vertex, the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d . Thus the dimension of the solutions is at most 0.

Since $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{v}$ are solutions of this system, these points \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} must coincide (otherwise, the dimension of the solutions of the system of equations at least 1).

Therefore, any vertex \mathbf{u} of P has a unique set $C(\mathbf{u}) \subset \{\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_m\} = C$.

Proof of P/P theorem

First, let us finish the proof of theorem.

We claim that any two distinct vertices \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} of P have distinct sets $C(\mathbf{u})$ and $C(\mathbf{v})$. Indeed, suppose $C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v})$ and consider the system of linear equations.

$$\left\{ \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \beta_i \quad \text{for } \mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u}) = C(\mathbf{v}), \right.$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vectors of variables.

Since \mathbf{u} is a vertex, the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d . Thus the dimension of the solutions is at most 0.

Since $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{v}$ are solutions of this system, these points \mathbf{u} and \mathbf{v} must coincide (otherwise, the dimension of the solutions of the system of equations at least 1).

Therefore, any vertex \mathbf{u} of P has a unique set $C(\mathbf{u}) \subset \{\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_m\} = C$. Since the set C has finitely many subsets, there are finitely many vertices. We are done.

Proof of Lemma

Suppose the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ does not linearly span \mathbb{R}^d .

Proof of Lemma

Suppose the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ does not linearly span \mathbb{R}^d .

Thus there exist $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ orthogonal to every vectors in $C(\mathbf{u})$

Proof of Lemma

Suppose the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ does not linearly span \mathbb{R}^d .

Thus there exist $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ orthogonal to every vectors in $C(\mathbf{u})$

Let us show that \mathbf{u} is not a vertex of P .

Proof of Lemma

Suppose the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ does not linearly span \mathbb{R}^d .

Thus there exist $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ orthogonal to every vectors in $C(\mathbf{u})$

Let us show that \mathbf{u} is not a vertex of P .

It is enough to prove that for $|\varepsilon| \leq \delta(P)$, where $\delta(P) > 0$ is sufficiently small, the point $\mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{u} + \varepsilon\mathbf{w} \in P$, that is

$$\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \varepsilon \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle \leq \beta_i \quad (*)$$

for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C$. There are two possible cases:

Proof of Lemma

Suppose the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ does not linearly span \mathbb{R}^d .

Thus there exist $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ orthogonal to every vectors in $C(\mathbf{u})$

Let us show that \mathbf{u} is not a vertex of P .

It is enough to prove that for $|\varepsilon| \leq \delta(P)$, where $\delta(P) > 0$ is sufficiently small, the point $\mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{u} + \varepsilon\mathbf{w} \in P$, that is

$$\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \varepsilon \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle \leq \beta_i \quad (*)$$

for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C$. There are two possible cases:

- If $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, then $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \beta_i$ and $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle = 0$, and thus, (*) holds.

Proof of Lemma

Suppose the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ does not linearly span \mathbb{R}^d .

Thus there exist $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ orthogonal to every vectors in $C(\mathbf{u})$

Let us show that \mathbf{u} is not a vertex of P .

It is enough to prove that for $|\varepsilon| \leq \delta(P)$, where $\delta(P) > 0$ is sufficiently small, the point $\mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{u} + \varepsilon\mathbf{w} \in P$, that is

$$\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \varepsilon \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle \leq \beta_i \quad (*)$$

for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C$. There are two possible cases:

- If $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, then $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \beta_i$ and $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle = 0$, and thus, (*) holds.
- If $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, then $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle < \beta_i$, and thus one can choose $\delta_i > 0$ such that for $|\varepsilon| \leq \delta_i$ the condition (*) holds.

Proof of Lemma

Suppose the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ does not linearly span \mathbb{R}^d .

Thus there exist $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ orthogonal to every vectors in $C(\mathbf{u})$

Let us show that \mathbf{u} is not a vertex of P .

It is enough to prove that for $|\varepsilon| \leq \delta(P)$, where $\delta(P) > 0$ is sufficiently small, the point $\mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{u} + \varepsilon\mathbf{w} \in P$, that is

$$\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \varepsilon \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle \leq \beta_i \quad (*)$$

for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C$. There are two possible cases:

- If $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, then $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \beta_i$ and $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle = 0$, and thus, (*) holds.
- If $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, then $\langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \rangle < \beta_i$, and thus one can choose $\delta_i > 0$ such that for $|\varepsilon| \leq \delta_i$ the condition (*) holds.

Choosing $\delta(P) = \min \delta_i$, we have that (*) holds for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C$.

Proof of Lemma

Suppose the set of vectors $C(\mathbf{u})$ does not linearly span \mathbb{R}^d .

Thus there exist $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ orthogonal to every vectors in $C(\mathbf{u})$

Let us show that \mathbf{u} is not a vertex of P .

It is enough to prove that for $|\varepsilon| \leq \delta(P)$, where $\delta(P) > 0$ is sufficiently small, the point $\mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) = \mathbf{u} + \varepsilon\mathbf{w} \in P$, that is

$$\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle + \varepsilon \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle \leq \beta_i \quad (*)$$

for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C$. There are two possible cases:

- If $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, then $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \beta_i$ and $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{w} \rangle = 0$, and thus, (*) holds.
- If $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, then $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle < \beta_i$, and thus one can choose $\delta_i > 0$ such that for $|\varepsilon| \leq \delta_i$ the condition (*) holds.

Choosing $\delta(P) = \min \delta_i$, we have that (*) holds for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C$. Therefore, $\mathbf{u}(\varepsilon) \in P$ for $|\varepsilon| \leq \delta(P)$, and hence, \mathbf{u} is not a vertex.

Proof of Lemma

Now suppose that for a point $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d . Let us show that \mathbf{u} is a vertex, that is, an extreme point of P .

Proof of Lemma

Now suppose that for a point $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d . Let us show that \mathbf{u} is a vertex, that is, an extreme point of P .

Assume that $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b})/2$ for some $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in P$. Since for $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(u)$, we have

$$\beta_i = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{a} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} \beta_i + \frac{1}{2} \beta_i = \beta_i.$$

Proof of Lemma

Now suppose that for a point $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d . Let us show that \mathbf{u} is a vertex, that is, an extreme point of P .

Assume that $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b})/2$ for some $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in P$. Since for $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, we have

$$\beta_i = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{a} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} \beta_i + \frac{1}{2} \beta_i = \beta_i.$$

Hence $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{a} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{b} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \beta_i$ for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$.

Proof of Lemma

Now suppose that for a point $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d . Let us show that \mathbf{u} is a vertex, that is, an extreme point of P .

Assume that $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b})/2$ for some $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in P$. Since for $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, we have

$$\beta_i = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{a} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} \beta_i + \frac{1}{2} \beta_i = \beta_i.$$

Hence $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{a} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{b} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \beta_i$ for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$.

Consider the system of linear equations

$$\left\{ \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \beta_i, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u}), \right.$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector of variables.

Proof of Lemma

Now suppose that for a point $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d . Let us show that \mathbf{u} is a vertex, that is, an extreme point of P .

Assume that $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b})/2$ for some $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in P$. Since for $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, we have

$$\beta_i = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{a} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} \beta_i + \frac{1}{2} \beta_i = \beta_i.$$

Hence $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{a} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{b} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \beta_i$ for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$.

Consider the system of linear equations

$$\left\{ \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \beta_i, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u}), \right.$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector of variables. Since $C(\mathbf{u})$ spans \mathbf{R}^d , the dimension of the solutions is at most 0. But $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$ are solutions of this system.

Proof of Lemma

Now suppose that for a point $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have that $C(\mathbf{u})$ linearly spans \mathbb{R}^d . Let us show that \mathbf{u} is a vertex, that is, an extreme point of P .

Assume that $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b})/2$ for some $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in P$. Since for $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$, we have

$$\beta_i = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{a} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{b} \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} \beta_i + \frac{1}{2} \beta_i = \beta_i.$$

Hence $\langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{a} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{b} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{u} \rangle = \beta_i$ for all $\mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u})$.

Consider the system of linear equations

$$\left\{ \langle \mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle = \beta_i, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{c}_i \in C(\mathbf{u}), \right.$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector of variables. Since $C(\mathbf{u})$ spans \mathbf{R}^d , the dimension of the solutions is at most 0. But $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}$ are solutions of this system. Hence $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$.

Proof of P/P theorem

A polytope is a bounded polyhedron. It is obvious that a polytope $K = \text{conv}\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is bounded.

Proof of P/P theorem

A polytope is a bounded polyhedron. It is obvious that a polytope

$K = \text{conv}\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is bounded. WLOG we assume that

- $\dim \text{aff } K = d$. Hence the interior of K is not empty.

Proof of P/P theorem

A polytope is a bounded polyhedron. It is obvious that a polytope

$K = \text{conv}\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is bounded. WLOG we assume that

- $\dim \text{aff } K = d$. Hence the interior of K is not empty.
- The origin lies in the interior of K , that is, there is, $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon \mathbf{B} \subset K$, where \mathbf{B} is a unit ball.

Proof of P/P theorem

A polytope is a bounded polyhedron. It is obvious that a polytope

$K = \text{conv}\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is bounded. WLOG we assume that

- $\dim \text{aff } K = d$. Hence the interior of K is not empty.
- The origin lies in the interior of K , that is, there is, $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon \mathbf{B} \subset K$, where \mathbf{B} is a unit ball.

By 6-th property of polar sets, we have

$$K^\circ = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq 1\}$$

is a polyhedron.

Proof of P/P theorem

A polytope is a bounded polyhedron. It is obvious that a polytope

$K = \text{conv}\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is bounded. WLOG we assume that

- $\dim \text{aff } K = d$. Hence the interior of K is not empty.
- The origin lies in the interior of K , that is, there is, $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon \mathbf{B} \subset K$, where \mathbf{B} is a unit ball.

By 6-th property of polar sets, we have

$$K^\circ = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq 1\}$$

is a polyhedron. Moreover, it is bounded because

$$K^\circ \subset (\varepsilon \mathbf{B})^\circ = \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{B}^\circ = \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{B}.$$

Hence K° is a bounded polyhedron, and therefore it is a polytope (as we proved earlier), that is, $K^\circ = \text{conv}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m\}$.

Proof of P/P theorem

A polytope is a bounded polyhedron. It is obvious that a polytope

$K = \text{conv}\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ is bounded. WLOG we assume that

- $\dim \text{aff } K = d$. Hence the interior of K is not empty.
- The origin lies in the interior of K , that is, there is, $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon \mathbf{B} \subset K$, where \mathbf{B} is a unit ball.

By 6-th property of polar sets, we have

$$K^\circ = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq 1\}$$

is a polyhedron. Moreover, it is bounded because

$$K^\circ \subset (\varepsilon \mathbf{B})^\circ = \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{B}^\circ = \varepsilon^{-1} \mathbf{B}.$$

Hence K° is a bounded polyhedron, and therefore it is a polytope (as we proved earlier), that is, $K^\circ = \text{conv}\{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m\}$. Using 6th property of polar sets and the Bipolar theorem, we finally obtain that

$$K = (K^\circ)^\circ = \bigcap_{j=1}^m \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \langle \mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{x} \rangle \leq 1\}$$

is a bounded polyhedron.