

A NOTION OF TOTAL DUAL INTEGRALITY FOR CONVEX, SEMIDEFINITE, AND EXTENDED FORMULATIONS

MARCEL K. DE CARLI SILVA AND LEVENT TUNÇEL

ABSTRACT. Total dual integrality is a powerful and unifying concept in polyhedral combinatorics and integer programming that enables the refinement of *geometric* min-max relations given by linear programming Strong Duality into *combinatorial* min-max theorems. The definition of total dual integrality (TDI) revolves around the existence of optimal dual solutions that are integral, and thus naturally applies to a host of combinatorial optimization problems that are cast as integer programs whose LP relaxations have the TDI property. However, when combinatorial problems are formulated using more general convex relaxations, such as semidefinite programs (SDPs), it is not at all clear what an appropriate notion of integrality in the dual program is, thus inhibiting the generalization of the theory to more general forms of structured convex optimization. (In fact, we argue that the rank-one constraint usually added to SDP relaxations is not adequate in the dual SDP.)

In this paper, we propose a notion of total dual integrality for SDPs that generalizes the notion for LPs, by relying on an “integrality constraint” for SDPs that is primal-dual symmetric. A key ingredient for the theory is a generalization to compact convex sets of a result of Hoffman for polytopes, fundamental for generalizing the polyhedral notion of total dual integrality introduced by Edmonds and Giles. We study the corresponding theory applied to SDP formulations for stable sets in graphs using the Lovász theta function and show that total dual integrality in this case corresponds to the underlying graph being perfect. We also relate dual integrality of an SDP formulation for the maximum cut problem to bipartite graphs. Total dual integrality for extended formulations naturally comes into play in this context.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the polyhedral approach to combinatorial optimization one usually starts by formulating a combinatorial problem as an integer linear program (ILP) of the form $\max\{c^T x : Ax \leq b, x \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}$, which is relaxed into a linear program (LP) and then studied in the light of LP duality. This basic approach of polyhedral combinatorics can be summarized by the following simple yet fundamental result:

Theorem 1. If $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$ is a matrix, and $b \in \mathbb{Q}^m$ and $c \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ are vectors, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sup\{c^T x : Ax \leq b, x \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{Z}^n\} & \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{(ILP)} \\ & \leq \sup\{c^T x : Ax \leq b, x \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}^n\} & \qquad \qquad \text{(LP)} \\ & \leq \inf\{b^T y : A^T y \geq c, y \geq 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^m\} & \qquad \qquad \text{(LD)} \\ & \leq \inf\{b^T y : A^T y \geq c, y \geq 0, y \in \mathbb{Z}^m\}. & \qquad \qquad \text{(ILD)} \end{aligned}$$

If (ILP) and (ILD) are both feasible, the suprema and infima are attained, and the middle (second) inequality holds with equality.

(Attainment for (ILP) and (ILD) follows from Meyer’s Theorem [29].)

Usually the feasible region of (ILP) is contained in $\{0, 1\}^n$ and some optimal solution of (ILD) lies in $\{0, 1\}^m$. For instance, if $G = (V, E)$ is a graph, A is its $V \times E$ incidence matrix, and both b and c are equal

Date: January 26, 2018.

Part of the results in this paper appeared in the PhD thesis [6] of the first author.

Research of the first author was supported in part by a Sinclair Scholarship, a Tutte Scholarship, Discovery Grants from NSERC, and by U.S. Office of Naval Research under award number N00014-12-1-0049, while at the Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, and by FAPESP (Proc. 2013/03447-6), CNPq (Proc. 477203/2012-4), CNPq (Proc. 456792/2014-7), and CAPES, while at the Institute of Mathematics and Statistics, University of São Paulo.

Research of the second author was supported in part by Discovery Grants from NSERC and by U.S. Office of Naval Research under award numbers N00014-12-1-0049 and N00014-15-1-2171. Part of this work was done while the second author was visiting the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing, supported in part by the DIMACS/Simons Collaboration on Bridging Continuous and Discrete Optimization through NSF grant #CCF-1740425.

to the vector $\mathbb{1}$ of all-ones, then (ILP) formulates the maximum cardinality matching problem and (ILD) formulates the minimum cardinality vertex cover problem. Alternatively, if A is the $E \times V$ incidence matrix of G , we obtain the maximum cardinality stable set problem and the minimum cardinality edge cover problem. If A is the clique-vertex incidence matrix of G , then (ILP) still formulates the maximum cardinality stable set problem, but now (ILD) formulates the minimum cardinality coloring problem.

What makes the conceptual framework brought forth by Theorem 1 so fundamental is the fact that, in many interesting and important cases [36], equality holds throughout in the chain from Theorem 1, which allows us to refine a *geometric* min-max relation (equality between (LP) and (LD) given by LP Strong Duality) into a *combinatorial* min-max relation (equality between (ILP) and (ILD)). For instance, equality throughout holds for the first two cases described above when G is bipartite (and has no isolated vertices in the second case), thus proving very strong, weighted forms of König’s matching theorem and the König-Rado edge cover theorem. In many cases, the combinatorial optimality conditions thus obtained are well-known to be key ingredients in the design of efficient algorithms for solving the corresponding problems, both exactly and approximately [40].

Total dual integrality is arguably the most powerful and unifying sufficient condition for equality throughout the chain from Theorem 1. A vector in \mathbb{R}^n is *integral* if each of its components is an integer, and a rational system of linear inequalities $Ax \leq b$ is called *totally dual integral (TDI)* if, for each integral vector $c \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, the linear program dual to $\sup\{c^\top x : Ax \leq b\}$ has an integral optimal solution whenever it has an optimal solution at all. In this case, if b itself is integral, then the polyhedron P determined by $Ax \leq b$ is *integral*, i.e., each nonempty face of P has an integral vector; thus, equality holds throughout in the chain from Theorem 1. This was proved in seminal work of Edmonds and Giles [12] as a consequence of the following fundamental result:

Theorem 2 (Edmonds-Giles [12]). If $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Q}^m$ satisfy $\sup\{c^\top x : Ax \leq b\} \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ for each $c \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, then the polyhedron $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}$ is integral.

Corollary 3 (Hoffman [18]). Let $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Q}^m$. If $P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}$ is bounded and $\max_{x \in P} c^\top x \in \mathbb{Z}$ for each $c \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, then P is integral.

In the past couple of decades, it has become popular to formulate combinatorial optimization problems using more general models of convex optimization, with semidefinite programs (SDPs) playing a key role. Before we can proceed with our discussion, we need to introduce some basic notation for SDPs. The real vector space of symmetric $n \times n$ matrices is denoted by \mathbb{S}^n . A matrix $X \in \mathbb{S}^n$ is *positive semidefinite* if $h^\top X h \geq 0$ for every $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ or, equivalently, if every eigenvalue of X is nonnegative. The *semidefinite cone* is $\mathbb{S}_+^n := \{X \in \mathbb{S}^n : X \text{ is positive semidefinite}\}$. The *inner product* of $X, Y \in \mathbb{S}^n$ is $\langle X, Y \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n X_{ij} Y_{ij}$. Denote $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We refer the reader to Tables 1 to 5 and Section 1.1 for the rest of the notation used throughout the text.

When a combinatorial problem is formulated as in (ILP), the combinatorial objects are usually embedded in the (geometric) space \mathbb{R}^n as incidence vectors, i.e., we consider the feasible solutions to be of the form $x = \mathbb{1}_U$, for certain subsets $U \subseteq [n]$, where for each $i \in [n]$ the i th coordinate of $\mathbb{1}_U$ is 1 if $i \in U$ and 0 otherwise. Having a correct ILP formulation for a combinatorial optimization problem typically means that the feasible solutions for (ILP) are in *exact* correspondence with the combinatorial objects of interest in the problem. One then considers the LP relaxation (LP) by dropping the nonconvex constraint “ $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ ”. Note that the “integer dual” (ILD) is obtained from the dual (LD) of (LP) by adding back the nonconvex constraint “ $y \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ ” of the same form.

When embedding combinatorial objects into matrix space \mathbb{S}^n for an SDP formulation, one may embed a subset $U \subseteq [n]$ as the rank-one matrix $X = \mathbb{1}_U \mathbb{1}_U^\top \in \mathbb{S}_+^n$. It is also common to use rank-one matrices arising from signed incidence vectors, e.g., $X = s_U s_U^\top$ where $s_U = 2\mathbb{1}_U - \mathbb{1} \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ for some $U \subseteq [n]$. (We shall argue later that there is a “better” embedding, which we shall adopt.) One then obtains the following optimization problems, partially mimicking the chain from Theorem 1:

$$\sup\{\langle C, X \rangle : \langle A_i, X \rangle \leq b_i \forall i \in [m], X \in \mathbb{S}_+^n, \text{rank}(X) = 1\} \quad (1a)$$

$$\leq \sup\{\langle C, X \rangle : \langle A_i, X \rangle \leq b_i \forall i \in [m], X \in \mathbb{S}_+^n\} \quad (1b)$$

$$\leq \inf\{b^\top y : y \in \mathbb{R}_+^m, \sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i - C \in \mathbb{S}_+^n\}, \quad (1c)$$

where $A_1, \dots, A_m, C \in \mathbb{S}^n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Here usually the feasible solutions for (1a) correspond *exactly* to the combinatorial objects of interest, as is the case for (ILP). Similarly as in Theorem 1, the SDP relaxation (1b) is obtained from (1a) by dropping the nonconvex constraint “rank(X) = 1”, (1c) is the SDP dual of (1b), and the last inequality is SDP Weak Duality. There are many instances of the chain (1) in the literature; see, e.g., [15, 16, 30]. Some of this work is in copositive programming (see, for instance, [5] and the references therein).

Conspicuously missing from (1) is a fourth optimization problem, that is, an “integer dual SDP” corresponding to (ILD). In fact, it is not even clear what the right notion of integrality is for (1c), i.e., which nonconvex constraint to add to (1c) to obtain a sensible combinatorial problem. One could argue that we may just add back the nonconvex constraint from (1a), by requiring the dual slack $\sum_{i=1}^m y_i A_i - C$ to have rank one, and it might also make sense to require the vector y to be integral. Unfortunately, as we describe in Section 2, the “integer dual SDP” thus obtained is not very satisfactory: whereas it can be made to generalize the corresponding notion for LPs, it fails to provide sensible “integer duals” for the SDP formulations of some of the most classical combinatorial problems, namely the Lovász theta function for the stable set problem and the Max Cut SDP. Thus, we require our notion of “integrality constraints in the dual” to provide meaningful combinatorial min-max theorems at least for Max Cut SDP and more importantly, for SDP formulations of the Lovász theta function.

In the late seventies, Lovász [24] solved a problem in information theory by introducing the theta function; this was one of the earliest applications of semidefinite programming to combinatorial optimization. The theta function of a graph, which can be computed efficiently (to within any desired precision), lies sandwiched between its stability and clique-covering numbers; these latter parameters are NP-hard to approximate [1, 17, 27], let alone compute. More importantly, there is a rich and elegant duality theory centred around the theta function (see, e.g., [7]) and it has been used in many different areas [13, 14, 25, 37]. This rich and elegant duality theory justifies why we take the underlying SDPs as the main test case for any generalization of TDI theory. The other SDP mentioned above, the Max Cut SDP, was famously exploited in a breakthrough approximation algorithm and its analysis by Goemans and Williamson [15] and helped popularize SDP formulations in the discrete optimization and theoretical computer science communities. This SDP remains fundamental due to its connections with pioneering work in complexity theory related to the unique games conjecture (see [20, 39]) and sums of squares [2].

In this paper, we introduce a notion of integrality for SDPs that

- (i) generalizes the usual rank-one constraint in primal SDPs;
- (ii) allows us to extend the chain (1) so as to generalize Theorem 1 for LPs in the natural, diagonal embedding of $Ax \leq b$ into matrix space \mathbb{S}^n ;
- (iii) is primal-dual symmetric;
- (iv) yields sensible “integer duals” for the SDPs for the Lovász theta function and the Max Cut SDP.

We use this integrality condition for SDPs to define the notion of *total dual integrality* for the defining system of an SDP. We connect this new notion to Corollary 3 by extending the latter to compact convex sets, using basic tools from convex analysis and ILP theory, such as the Gomory-Chvátal closure. We prove that the total dual integrality of an SDP formulation for the Lovász theta function is equivalent to the underlying graph being perfect. We also study a close relative of TDIness for the Max Cut SDP and relate it to bipartiteness of the underlying graph. Along the way, we discuss an intermediate generalization of TDIness for LPs in terms of lifted (extended) formulations. Finally, we discuss future research directions along these lines, inspired by integrality (and other exactness) notions in convex optimization.

In order to achieve this, several obstacles must be overcome. First, we must choose a specific format for SDPs that makes it natural to work with integral solutions; that is, we must settle for a specific embedding of combinatorial objects into matrix space. Note that this is not an issue in the LP case, where incidence vectors are the most natural choice of embedding. We solve this partially by restricting ourselves to binary integer programs, i.e., we only deal with integer variables taking values in $\{0, 1\}$; this is the usual case in combinatorial optimization. Our choice of embedding and our focus on the combinatorial aspects of the dual SDP require us to rewrite SDP constraints in a slightly unusual way; this happens because other works in the literature do not focus on integrality for the dual SDP. Finally, SDP formulations for combinatorial problems are usually lifted formulations, so we must generalize the (algebraic) notion of TDIness to these (geometric) extended formulations.

Some previous works on abstract notions of duality in the context of integer programming are related to this one; we highlight [8, 32].

TABLE 1. Notation for special sets.

\mathbb{Z}_+	$:= \{x \in \mathbb{Z} : x \geq 0\}$, the set of nonnegative integers
\mathbb{R}_+	$:= \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \geq 0\}$, the set of nonnegative reals
\mathbb{R}_{++}	$:= \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0\}$, the set of positive reals
$[n]$	$:= \{1, \dots, n\}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$
\mathbb{S}^V	$:= \{X \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times V} : X = X^\top\}$, the real vector space of symmetric $V \times V$ matrices
\mathbb{S}_+^V	$:= \{X \in \mathbb{S}^V : h^\top X h \geq 0 \forall h \in \mathbb{R}^V\}$, the cone of positive semidefinite matrices in \mathbb{S}^V
$\widehat{\mathbb{S}}^V$	$:= \mathbb{S}^{\{0\} \cup V}$, the lifted matrix space; see (5)
$\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V$	$:= \mathbb{S}_+^{\{0\} \cup V}$, the semidefinite cone in the lifted space; see (5)
$\mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^V$	$:= \{X \in \mathbb{S}^V : X \geq 0\}$, the cone of entrywise nonnegative matrices in \mathbb{S}^V

TABLE 2. Notation for sets.

$\mathcal{P}(V)$	$:=$ the power set of V
$\binom{V}{k}$	$:= \{U \subseteq V : U = k\}$, the collection of k -subsets of V
$\binom{V}{i \in}$	$:=$ the collection of subsets of V that contain $i \in V$
$\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}$	$:=$ the collection of subsets of V that contain $i \in V$ and $j \in V$
$f _U$	$:=$ the restriction of the function $f : V \rightarrow W$ to $U \subseteq V$
ij	$:= \{i, j\}$ or (i, j) , whichever parses

TABLE 3. Notation for a graph $G = (V, E)$.

\overline{G}	$:= (V, \overline{E})$ where $\overline{E} := \binom{V}{2} \setminus E$, i.e., the <i>complement</i> of G
$G[U]$	$:= (U, E \cap \binom{U}{2})$, i.e., the subgraph of G <i>induced</i> by $U \subseteq V$
K_U	$:=$ the complete graph on vertex set U
\mathcal{A}_G	$:= \{A \in \mathbb{S}^V : A_{ij} \neq 0 \implies ij \in E\}$, the set of <i>weighted adjacency matrices</i> of G
$\mathcal{K}(G)$	$:=$ the set of cliques of G
$\omega(G)$	$:= \max\{ K : K \in \mathcal{K}(G)\}$, i.e., the <i>clique number</i> of G
$\chi(G)$	$:= \min\{ \mathcal{P} : \mathcal{P} \text{ a partition of } V \text{ into stable sets}\}$, i.e., the <i>chromatic number</i> of G
$\alpha(G, w)$	$:=$ the (weighted) stability number of G with weights $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; see (31)
$\vartheta(G, w)$	$:=$ the Lovász theta number of G with weights $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; see (12)
$\vartheta'(G, w)$	$:=$ the variant of $\vartheta(G, w)$ defined in (13)
$\vartheta^+(G, w)$	$:=$ the variant of $\vartheta(G, w)$ defined in (14)
$\overline{\chi}(G, w)$	$:=$ the (weighted) clique covering number of G with weights $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; see (23)
\mathcal{L}_G	$:=$ the weighted Laplacian of G ; see (36)
$\delta(U)$	$:=$ the cut in G with shore $U \subseteq V$; see (33)
$\delta(i)$	$:= \delta(\{i\})$ for a vertex $i \in V$
$N(i)$	$:= \{j \in V : ij \in E\}$, i.e., the set of neighbors of i in G

TABLE 4. Notation for vectors and matrices.

$\{e_i : i \in V\}$:= the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^V
$\text{Tr}(A)$:= $\sum_{i \in V} A_{ii}$, the <i>trace</i> of $A \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times V}$
$\langle X, Y \rangle$:= $\text{Tr}(XY^\top)$, the (<i>trace</i>) <i>inner-product</i> on $\mathbb{R}^{V \times V}$
\mathcal{A}^*	:= the adjoint of a linear map \mathcal{A} between real inner-product spaces
diag	:= the linear map from $\mathbb{R}^{V \times V}$ to \mathbb{R}^V that extracts the diagonal of a matrix
Diag	:= the adjoint of diag from \mathbb{R}^V to $\mathbb{R}^{V \times V}$, which builds diagonal matrices
$X[U]$:= $X _{U \times U} \in \mathbb{R}^{U \times U}$, i.e., the <i>principal submatrix</i> of $X \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times V}$ indexed by $U \subseteq V$
$\mathbb{1}$:= the vector of all-ones in the appropriate space
$\mathbb{1}_U$:= the <i>incidence vector</i> of $U \subseteq V$ in $\{0, 1\}^V$; see (3)
I	:= the identity matrix in appropriate dimension
\geq	:= the nonnegative partial order on $\mathbb{R}^{V \times W}$, i.e., $A \geq B$ if $A_{ij} \geq B_{ij} \forall (i, j) \in V \times W$
\succeq	:= the Löwner partial order on \mathbb{S}^V , i.e., $A \succeq B \iff A - B \in \mathbb{S}_+^V$
\sqrt{w}	:= the componentwise square root of $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^V$, i.e., $(\sqrt{w})_i := \sqrt{w_i}$ for every $i \in V$
$x \oplus y$:= the direct sum of vectors $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^W$
$x \odot y$:= the <i>Hadamard product</i> of $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^V$, i.e., $(x \odot y)_i := x_i y_i$ for every $i \in V$
$\text{supp}(x)$:= $\{i \in V : x_i \neq 0\}$, the <i>support</i> of $x \in \mathbb{R}^V$
$\text{Sym}(A)$:= $\frac{1}{2}(A + A^\top)$, the orthogonal projection of $A \in \mathbb{R}^{V \times V}$ into \mathbb{S}^V

TABLE 5. Notation for (convex) optimization, with \mathcal{C} a convex subset of an Euclidean space \mathbb{E} .

$\text{conv}(X)$:= the convex hull of $X \subseteq \mathbb{E}$
$\delta^*(w \mathcal{C})$:= the support function of \mathcal{C} at $w \in \mathbb{E}$; see (26)
$\text{CG}(\mathcal{C})$:= the Gomory-Chvátal closure of \mathcal{C} ; see (27)
\mathcal{C}_I	:= $\text{conv}(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n)$, i.e., the <i>integer hull</i> of \mathcal{C}
\mathcal{C}°	:= $\{y \in \mathbb{E} : \langle y, x \rangle \leq 1 \forall x \in \mathcal{C}\}$ i.e., the <i>polar</i> of \mathcal{C}

1.1. **Notation.** We use Iverson’s notation: for a predicate P , we denote

$$[P] := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } P \text{ holds;} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

When P is false, $[P]$ is considered “strongly zero”, in the sense that $[P]$ is allowed to multiply a meaningless term and the result will be zero. The simplest example of this is that $[\alpha > 0] \frac{1}{\alpha}$ is taken to be 0 if $\alpha = 0$.

Throughout the text, V should be considered a finite set, usually taken to be the vertex set of a graph $G = (V, E)$; *all graphs in this paper are simple*. The *incidence vector* of $U \subseteq V$ is $\mathbb{1}_U \in \{0, 1\}^V$ defined as

$$(\mathbb{1}_U)_i := [i \in U] \quad \forall i \in V. \quad (3)$$

The rest of our notation is mostly standard, and it can be looked up in Tables 1 to 5.

1.2. **Organization.** The rest of this text is organized as follows. We discuss dual integrality constraints for SDPs in Section 2, including drawbacks of the rank-one constraint usually added to the primal SDP (further drawbacks are postponed to Section 6.1 and Appendix A), as well as embedding issues. There, we show that our notion of dual integrality befits nicely with the Lovász theta function. In Section 3, we generalize Corollary 3, which motivates us to define a notion of *total* dual integrality for SDPs in Section 4; we show that the latter is sufficient for *primal* integrality. In Section 5, we characterize total dual integrality for formulations of the Lovász theta function and we study dual integrality for the MaxCut SDP with nonnegative weight functions in Section 6. (Some of the limitations in our theory as applied to the MaxCut SDP, related

the use of nonnegative weight functions, are discussed in Appendix B.) We conclude our paper with several open problems and future research directions in Section 7.

2. FUNDAMENTAL FRAMEWORK AND INTEGRALITY CONSTRAINT FOR DUAL SDP

We discuss in Section 2.1 below the shortcomings of the rank constraint as an “integrality constraint” for the dual SDP (1c), and propose a replacement in Section 2.2. Along the discussion, a few, somewhat unusual choices will be made, which are not normally done in the SDP literature; e.g., we are careful when writing linear inequalities of the form $\langle A, X \rangle \leq \beta$ on a matrix variable X with an *integral symmetric* matrix A and *integer* β . The reason we insist on symmetry of A is to properly set up the dual SDP, and we want A and β to be integral so as to simplify combinatorial interpretation of the linear system; this is also the case when one studies the ILP chain from Theorem 1 in the context of classical TDIness theory.

2.1. Drawbacks of the Rank-one Constraint as a Dual Integrality Constraint. In order to discuss integrality constraints for SDPs, we must first choose a standard form to embed combinatorial objects (e.g., subsets of some finite ground set V) into matrix space \mathbb{S}^V . The format we shall choose actually embeds subsets of a finite set V as matrices in $\mathbb{S}^{\{0\} \cup V}$, i.e., the index set has one extra element, which we call 0, *assumed throughout not to be in V* . Each subset U of V is embedded as the rank-one matrix

$$\hat{X} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbb{1}_U \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbb{1}_U \end{bmatrix}^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbb{1}_U^\top \\ \mathbb{1}_U & \mathbb{1}_U \mathbb{1}_U^\top \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{S}_+^{\{0\} \cup V}; \quad (4)$$

as a convention, *we decorate matrices in this lifted space with a hat*, e.g., \hat{X} in (4). Similarly, since we use the lifted matrix space so often, we shall abbreviate

$$\widehat{\mathbb{S}}^V := \mathbb{S}^{\{0\} \cup V} \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V := \mathbb{S}_+^{\{0\} \cup V}, \quad (5)$$

and we also decorate subsets of $\widehat{\mathbb{S}}^V$ with a hat, e.g., $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{S}}^V$. By writing any matrix \hat{X} from (4) in the form

$$\hat{X} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x^\top \\ x & X \end{bmatrix} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}^V, \quad (6)$$

with $X \in \mathbb{S}^V$, one sees that it satisfies the linear constraints

$$\hat{X}_{00} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad x_j = X_{jj} \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in V, \quad (7)$$

which we shall write as

$$\langle e_0 e_0^\top, \hat{X} \rangle = 1, \quad (8a)$$

$$\langle 2 \text{Sym}(e_j(e_j - e_0)^\top), \hat{X} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall j \in V, \quad (8b)$$

$$\langle e_j e_j^\top, \hat{X} \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in V. \quad (8c)$$

The constraints (8), together with the constraint $\text{rank}(\hat{X}) = 1$, ensure that \hat{X} has the form (4) for some $U \subseteq V$. Throughout the rest of the text, one may think that every system of linear inequalities on \hat{X} arising from combinatorial problems includes the constraints (8), just as one usually considers the linear constraints $Ax \leq b$, $x \geq 0$ from (ILP) to include $0 \leq x \leq \mathbb{1}$.

Another constraint satisfied by \hat{X} of the form (4), using the notation of (6), is $X = \hat{X}[V] \geq 0$. Sometimes it will make sense to add this extra constraint to (8), leading to the following constraints:

$$\langle e_0 e_0^\top, \hat{X} \rangle = 1, \quad (9a)$$

$$\langle 2 \text{Sym}(e_j(e_j - e_0)^\top), \hat{X} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall j \in V, \quad (9b)$$

$$\langle e_j e_j^\top, \hat{X} \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in V, \quad (9c)$$

$$\langle 2 \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), \hat{X} \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall i, j \in V, \text{ such that } i \neq j. \quad (9d)$$

The embedding described above is used in some formulations of the theta function (see [16, 36]), in the lift-and-project hierarchies of Lovász and Schrijver [26] and Lasserre [22] (also see Laurent [23]), and in copositive formulations for mixed integer linear programs by Burer [5].

A simple, natural way to obtain an SDP relaxation for **(ILP)** is to formulate

$$\text{Maximize } \langle \text{Diag}(0 \oplus c), \hat{X} \rangle \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \hat{X} \text{ satisfies (9) with } V := [n], \quad (10b)$$

$$\langle \text{Diag}(-b_i \oplus A^\top e_i), \hat{X} \rangle \leq 0 \quad \forall i \in [m], \quad (10c)$$

$$\hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n. \quad (10d)$$

In this case, to obtain an exact reformulation of **(ILP)**, corresponding to **(1a)**, one may add the rank constraint $\text{rank}(\hat{X}) \leq 1$ to **(10)**. Note, however, that **(10)** is a potentially tighter relaxation for **(ILP)** than **(LP)**. The SDP dual to **(10)** may be written as

$$\text{Minimize } \eta \quad (11a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \begin{bmatrix} \eta & -u^\top \\ -u & \text{Diag}(2u) - Z \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{i \in [m]} y_i \begin{bmatrix} -b_i & 0^\top \\ 0 & \text{Diag}(A^\top e_i) \end{bmatrix} - \hat{S} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0^\top \\ 0 & \text{Diag}(c) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11b)$$

$$\hat{S} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n, \eta \in \mathbb{R}, u \in \mathbb{R}^n, y \in \mathbb{R}_+^m, Z \in \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^n. \quad (11c)$$

If **(10b)** is weakened to “ \hat{X} satisfies **(8)**”, again with $V = [n]$, then the variable Z in **(11)** would be required to take the form $Z = \text{Diag}(z)$ for some $z \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$.

It is easy to check that, if y is feasible in **(ILD)**, then $(\eta, Z, y, \hat{S}, u) := (b^\top y, \text{Diag}(A^\top y - c), y, 0, 0)$ is feasible in **(11)** with the same objective value as that of y in **(ILD)**. Thus, the rank constraint $\text{rank}(\hat{S}) \leq 1$ seems reasonable as an integrality constraint for **(11)**. In fact, we may even consider the tighter rank constraint $\text{rank}(\hat{S}) = 1$, as long as we allow η to take on real values (rather than only integral ones), possibly at the cost of nonattainment.

Now we move on to the SDP formulation for ϑ , the Lovász theta function. In fact, we will also consider variations of ϑ usually denoted by ϑ' and ϑ^+ , which were introduced independently by McEliece, Rodemich, and Rumsey [28] and Schrijver [33], and by Szegedy [38], respectively. *We shall show that the rank constraint is very inadequate for the dual SDP in this setting, for all three variants.*

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $w: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. There are several equivalent formulations for the *weighted theta number* $\vartheta(G; w)$ of G with weights w (see, e.g., [7]), and similarly for its variations $\vartheta'(G; w)$ and $\vartheta^+(G; w)$. In view of our choice of format for SDPs that includes the constraints **(8)**, we shall use the following formulation for $\vartheta(G; w)$:

$$\text{Maximize } \langle \text{Diag}(0 \oplus w), \hat{X} \rangle \quad (12a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \hat{X} \text{ satisfies (8),} \quad (12b)$$

$$\langle 2 \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), \hat{X} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall ij \in E, \quad (12c)$$

$$\hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V. \quad (12d)$$

Note that, if $U \subseteq V$ is *stable* in G , i.e., no edge of G has both endpoints in U , then the matrix \hat{X} defined in **(4)** is feasible in **(12)** with objective value $w^\top \mathbb{1}_U = \sum_{u \in U} w_u$.

We formulate $\vartheta'(G, w)$ as

$$\text{Maximize } \langle \text{Diag}(0 \oplus w), \hat{X} \rangle \quad (13a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \hat{X} \text{ satisfies (8),} \quad (13b)$$

$$\langle 2 \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), \hat{X} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall ij \in E, \quad (13c)$$

$$\langle 2 \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), \hat{X} \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall ij \in \bar{E}, \quad (13d)$$

$$\hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V, \quad (13e)$$

where $\bar{E} := \binom{V}{2} \setminus E$, and $\vartheta^+(G, w)$ is formulated as

$$\text{Maximize } \langle \text{Diag}(0 \oplus w), \hat{X} \rangle \quad (14a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \hat{X} \text{ satisfies (8),} \quad (14b)$$

$$\langle 2 \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), \hat{X} \rangle \leq 0 \quad \forall ij \in E, \quad (14c)$$

$$\hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V. \quad (14d)$$

The dual SDP of (13) is:

$$\text{Minimize } \eta \quad (15a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \begin{bmatrix} \eta & -u^\top \\ -u & \text{Diag}(2u - z) \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{ij \in \binom{V}{2}} y_{ij} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0^\top \\ 0 & 2 \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top) \end{bmatrix} - \hat{S} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0^\top \\ 0 & \text{Diag}(w) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (15b)$$

$$\hat{S} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V, \eta \in \mathbb{R}, u \in \mathbb{R}^V, z \in \mathbb{R}_+^V, y \in \mathbb{R}^E \oplus -\mathbb{R}_+^{\bar{E}}. \quad (15c)$$

Note that the dual for the formulation (12) of $\vartheta(G; w)$ is similar, except that it requires $y|_{\bar{E}} = 0$, and the dual for the formulation (14) of $\vartheta^+(G; w)$ furthermore has the sign constraint $y|_E \geq 0$.

We claim that,

$$\text{if (15) has a feasible solution with } \text{rank}(\hat{S}) \leq 1 \text{ and } w \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^V, \text{ then } G = K_V. \quad (16)$$

Indeed, suppose that $\text{rank}(\hat{S}) \leq 1$. We have $\eta > 0$ by weak duality, so $\text{rank}(\hat{S}) = 1$ and

$$\hat{S} = \begin{bmatrix} \eta & -u^\top \\ -u & \frac{1}{\eta} u u^\top \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$\text{Diag}(2u - z - w) + \sum_{ij \in \binom{V}{2}} 2y_{ij} \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top) = \frac{1}{\eta} u u^\top. \quad (17)$$

By applying diag to both sides of (17), we get $2u - z - w = u \odot u$ so $2u = (u \odot u) + z + w \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^V$. Next let $i, j \in V$ be distinct. The ij th entry of (17) is $y_{ij} = \frac{1}{\eta} u_i u_j > 0$ whence $ij \in E$. This proves (16). Hence, the dual SDPs for the formulations of all three variants of ϑ only have feasible solutions with rank-one slacks if G is complete.

One might argue that we have chosen an inappropriate formulation for the rank constraint. However, given the mandatory constraints (8), the formulation above is the most natural one. For completeness, we show in Appendix A that the rank constraint is not adequate either for the more popular formulation of the theta function with variable $X \in \mathbb{S}_+^V$ and the trace constraint $\text{Tr}(X) = 1$; in Section 6.1, we also treat the rank constraint for the dual of the MaxCut SDP, which will be introduced in Section 6.

2.2. An Improved Dual Integrality Constraint. In view of our adopted embedding (4), let us draft the complete version of the (partial) chain of inequalities (1) as

$$\sup \{ \langle \hat{C}, \hat{X} \rangle : \langle \hat{A}_i, \hat{X} \rangle \leq b_i \forall i \in [m], \hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n, \text{“}\hat{X} \text{ integral”} \} \quad (18a)$$

$$\leq \sup \{ \langle \hat{C}, \hat{X} \rangle : \langle \hat{A}_i, \hat{X} \rangle \leq b_i \forall i \in [m], \hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n \} \quad (18b)$$

$$\leq \inf \{ b^\top y : y \in \mathbb{R}_+^m, \hat{S} = \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \hat{A}_i - \hat{C} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n \} \quad (18c)$$

$$\leq \inf \{ b^\top y : y \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m, \hat{S} = \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \hat{A}_i - \hat{C} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n, \text{“}\hat{S} \text{ integral”} \}. \quad (18d)$$

Assume that the system $\langle \hat{A}_i, \hat{X} \rangle \leq b_i, i \in [m]$, includes the constraints (8).

To define the *integrality constraint* for (18d), we shall consider the dual slack $\hat{S} = \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \hat{A}_i - \hat{C}$.

Definition 4. Let \hat{S} be feasible in (18c). We say that “ \hat{S} is *integral*” if \hat{S} is a sum $\hat{S} = \sum_{k=1}^N \hat{S}_k$ of rank-one matrices $\hat{S}_1, \dots, \hat{S}_N \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n$ such that, for each $k \in [N]$, we have

$$\langle e_0 e_0^\top, \hat{S}_k \rangle = 1, \quad (19a)$$

$$\langle 2 \text{Sym}(e_j (e_j + e_0)^\top), \hat{S}_k \rangle = 0 \quad \forall j \in V. \quad (19b)$$

Note that this is almost identical to the constraints in (8), except for the sign of e_0 in (19b). Equivalently, each \hat{S}_k must have the form

$$\hat{S}_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -s_k^\top \\ -s_k & S_k \end{bmatrix}$$

and satisfy $\text{diag}(S_k) = s_k$. Since \hat{S}_k has rank-one, we must have $S_k = s_k s_k^\top$. Hence, the condition “ \hat{S} is integral” may be interpreted with a more combinatorial flavor as requiring \hat{S} to have the form

$$\hat{S} = \sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}} \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ \mathbb{1}_K \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ \mathbb{1}_K \end{bmatrix}^\top$$

for some *family* (i.e., multiset) \mathcal{K} of subsets of $[n]$. Denote the power set of a set V by $\mathcal{P}(V)$. By letting $m: \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ denote the multiplicity of each subset $K \subseteq V := [n]$ in \mathcal{K} , we may rewrite the condition “ \hat{S} is integral” as

$$\hat{S} = \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\mathbb{1}_A^\top \\ -\mathbb{1}_A & \mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{1}_A^\top \end{bmatrix} \text{ for some } m: \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (\text{DZ})$$

The *integrality constraint* for (18a) is analogous:

Definition 5. Let \hat{X} be feasible in (18b). We say that “ \hat{X} is integral” if \hat{X} is a sum $\hat{X} = \sum_{k=1}^N \hat{X}_k$ of rank-one matrices $\hat{X}_1, \dots, \hat{X}_N \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n$ such that \hat{X}_k satisfies (8) for each $k \in [N]$.

The usual rank constraint “ $\text{rank}(\hat{X}) = 1$ ”, which is the usual notion of integrality for \hat{X} , can be simply enforced by the linear constraint $\hat{X}_{00} = 1$. As before, this integrality constraint can be described as

$$\hat{X} = \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbb{1}_A^\top \\ \mathbb{1}_A & \mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{1}_A^\top \end{bmatrix} \text{ for some } m: \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+. \quad (\text{PZ})$$

With these “semidefinite integrality” conditions in mind, we can state a semidefinite analogue of Theorem 1. To make the theorems syntactically more similar, we shall adopt a more compact notation for SDPs via linear maps: define $\mathcal{A}: \hat{\mathbb{S}}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ by setting $[\mathcal{A}(\hat{X})]_i := \langle \hat{A}_i, \hat{X} \rangle$ for each $i \in [m]$, so that $\mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b$ is equivalent to $\langle \hat{A}_i, \hat{X} \rangle \leq b_i \forall i \in [m]$. Then the adjoint $\mathcal{A}^*: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{S}}^n$ satisfies $\mathcal{A}^*(y) = \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \hat{A}_i$ for each $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

Theorem 6. If $\hat{C} \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}^n$ is a matrix, $\mathcal{A}: \hat{\mathbb{S}}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is a linear map, and $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a vector, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup \{ \langle \hat{C}, \hat{X} \rangle : \mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b, \hat{X} \text{ satisfies (PZ)} \} && (\text{ISDP}) \\ & \leq \sup \{ \langle \hat{C}, \hat{X} \rangle : \mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b, \hat{X} \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n \} && (\text{SDP}) \\ & \leq \inf \{ b^\top y : y \in \mathbb{R}_+^m, \hat{S} = \mathcal{A}^*(y) - \hat{C} \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n \} && (\text{SDD}) \\ & \leq \inf \{ b^\top y : y \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m, \hat{S} = \mathcal{A}^*(y) - \hat{C} \text{ satisfies (DZ)} \}, && (\text{ISDD}) \end{aligned}$$

and the middle (second) inequality holds with equality if either one of (SDP) and (SDD) has a positive definite feasible solution and finite optimal value.

The equality in Theorem 6 follows from the usual constraint qualification for SDP, namely the fact that the SDP satisfies the *relaxed Slater condition*, i.e., the SDP has a positive definite feasible solution; see, e.g., [6, Theorem 1.1] or [3, Sec. D.2.3].

We shall refer to (ISDD) as the *integer dual SDP* of (SDP). For convenience, we shall say that a feasible solution (y, \hat{S}) for (SDD) is *integral* if it is actually feasible in (ISDD), that is, if y is integral and \hat{S} satisfies (DZ). Integrality of y in (ISDD) shows why it is important to use integral matrices \hat{A}_i .

Let us setup the integer dual SDP of the SDP formulation (10) of LPs. If we require integrality from feasible solutions of (11), that is, if we add the constraint (DZ) and further constrain η , u , y , and Z to be

integral, then (11b) becomes equivalent to

$$\eta - b^\top y = \mathbb{1}^\top m, \quad (20a)$$

$$-u = - \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \mathbb{1}_A, \quad (20b)$$

$$\text{Diag}(2u + A^\top y - c) = \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{1}_A^\top + Z. \quad (20c)$$

At each feasible solution we have $Z \geq 0$, which implies that $\text{supp}(m) \subseteq \binom{V}{1}$; we may always set $m_\emptyset := 0$. Thus, the integer dual SDP of (10) can be written as

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \mathbb{1}^\top u + b^\top y \quad (21a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad A^\top y + u \geq c, \quad (21b)$$

$$y \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m, u \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n, \quad (21c)$$

assuming A , b , and c to be integral. Hence, every feasible solution y for (ILD) yields a feasible solution for (20) with the same objective value by setting $u := 0$. In fact,

$$(21) \text{ is equivalent to (ILD) from Theorem 1 when (ILP) is } \sup\{c^\top x : Ax \leq b, 0 \leq x \leq \mathbb{1}, x \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}. \quad (22)$$

From our previous discussion after (11), our new notion of dual integrality passes the test of behaving nicely with respect to ILPs. Next we will see that it surpasses the rank-one constraint by showing that it yields the “natural” combinatorial dual for the theta function.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. A subset U of V is a *clique* in G if $G[U] = K_U$. Denote the set of cliques of G by $\mathcal{K}(G)$. Let $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. The *clique covering number* $\bar{\chi}(G, w)$ of G with respect to w is the optimal value of the optimization problem

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \mathbb{1}^\top m \quad (23a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad m : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad (23b)$$

$$\text{supp}(m) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(G), \quad (23c)$$

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{K}(G)} m_K \mathbb{1}_K \geq w. \quad (23d)$$

Any feasible solution of (23) is a *clique cover* of G with respect to w . We now show that the integer dual SDPs for each of the SDP formulations (12), (13), and (14) are essentially extended formulations for the clique covering number $\bar{\chi}(G, w)$:

Proposition 7. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, and let $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Then

- (i) if $m : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ is a clique cover of G with respect to w , then there exists an integral dual solution (\hat{S}, η, u, y, z) for (15) such that (DZ) holds for \hat{S} and $m : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\eta = \mathbb{1}^\top m$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^E \oplus 0$.
- (ii) if (\hat{S}, η, u, y, z) is an integral dual solution for (15) and (DZ) holds for \hat{S} and $m : \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$, then $\eta = \mathbb{1}^\top m$ and m is a clique cover of G with respect to w .

Proof. To restrict ourselves to integral dual solutions for (15), we (i) require the dual slack \hat{S} to satisfy (DZ), and (ii) require η , u , y , and z to be integral. In this case, (15b) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &= \mathbb{1}^\top m, \\ u &= \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \mathbb{1}_A, \\ \text{Diag}(2u - z - w) + \sum_{ij \in \binom{V}{2}} 2y_{ij} \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top) &= \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \mathbb{1}_A \mathbb{1}_A^\top. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Applying diag to both sides of (24) yields $2u - z - w = \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \mathbb{1}_A = u$. Let $i, j \in V$ be distinct. The ij th entry of (24) is

$$y_{ij} = \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij}}^\top m.$$

Hence, the integer dual SDP of (13) can be written as

$$\text{Minimize } \eta \tag{25a}$$

$$\text{subject to } m: \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+, \tag{25b}$$

$$\eta = \mathbf{1}^\top m, \tag{25c}$$

$$u = \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \mathbf{1}_A, \tag{25d}$$

$$u = w + z, \tag{25e}$$

$$y_{ij} = \mathbf{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}}^\top m \quad \forall ij \in \binom{V}{2}, \tag{25f}$$

$$\hat{S} = \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\mathbf{1}_A^\top \\ -\mathbf{1}_A & \mathbf{1}_A \mathbf{1}_A^\top \end{bmatrix}, \tag{25g}$$

$$\hat{S} \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V, \eta \in \mathbb{Z}, u \in \mathbb{Z}^V, z \in \mathbb{Z}_+^V, y \in \mathbb{Z}^E \oplus -\mathbb{Z}_+^{\bar{E}}. \tag{25h}$$

We may now prove the result. We start with (i). Suppose $m: \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ is a clique cover of G with respect to w . Set $u := \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \mathbf{1}_A$, $z := u - w \geq 0$, and $\eta := \mathbf{1}^\top m$. Define y and \hat{S} as in (25f) and (25g), respectively. Since $\text{supp}(m) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(G)$, we get $y \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E \oplus 0$. Hence, (\hat{S}, η, u, y, z) is feasible in (25) and satisfies the desired properties in (i).

For (ii), let (\hat{S}, η, u, y, z) be feasible in (25). If $ij \in \bar{E}$, then $y_{ij} \leq 0$ together with (25f) yield $m_A = 0$ for each $A \subseteq V$ such that $i, j \in V$. Hence, $m_A > 0$ and $i, j \in A \subseteq V$ imply $ij \in E$, i.e., $\text{supp}(m) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(G)$, whence m is a clique cover of G . This proves (ii). \square

Note that the result above is stated in a way to make it clear that the integer dual SDPs of ϑ , ϑ' , and ϑ^+ are all equivalent to the clique covering problem.

We have just seen that, not only the integer dual SDP has a feasible solution for every graph, but it is actually equivalent to a natural combinatorial optimization problem. In fact, the clique covering problem is the *right* dual problem for the maximum stable set problem at least for the very rich class of perfect graphs; see, e.g., [36, Ch. 67]. Recall that a graph $G = (V, E)$ is perfect if $\omega(G[U]) = \chi(G[U])$ for each $U \subseteq V$.

One may contend that the integrality constraints (PZ) and (DZ) are not quite natural, and they depend unnecessarily on having (8) as part of the constraints. Note, however, that this arises from the choice of the embedding (4); the same objection might as well be raised for ILPs, which have the arbitrary (though intuitive) embedding using incidence vectors. That is, the integrality conditions for ILP suffer from the same drawbacks arising from the dependence on the embedding. Other common drawbacks are that integrality constraints are not (and probably cannot be) scaling invariant nor coordinate-free. The latter drawbacks make it very hard to define a general integrality notion for general convex relaxations; we discuss these issues in Section 7.

Now that we have a sensible notion of integrality for the dual SDP, we go back to the chain from Theorem 6. Motivated by the notion of total dual integrality that was so powerful for proving equality throughout in the chain from Theorem 1, and which was based on Theorem 2 and Corollary 3, we shall prove a generalized version of the latter corollary in the next section.

3. INTEGRALITY IN CONVEX RELAXATIONS

In this section, we generalize Corollary 3 to compact convex sets. This shall motivate the definition of total dual integrality for SDPs in the next section. Following [31], we denote the *support function* of a convex set $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \langle w, x \rangle \in [-\infty, +\infty] \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{26}$$

Theorem 8. If $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a compact convex set, then $\mathcal{C} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : w^\top x \leq \delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) \forall w \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}$.

Proof. We may assume that $\mathcal{C} \neq \emptyset$. The inclusion ' \subseteq ' is obvious. For the reverse inclusion, we start by noting that the RHS is equal to $\mathcal{C}' := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : w^\top x \leq \delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) \forall w \in \mathbb{Q}^n\}$ by positive homogeneity of $\delta^*(\cdot | \mathcal{C})$. Let $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{C}'$. Let $\bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and let $(w_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in \mathbb{Q}^n converging to \bar{w} . Then $w_k^\top \bar{x} \leq \delta^*(w_k | \mathcal{C})$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, which in the limit yields $\bar{w}^\top \bar{x} \leq \delta^*(\bar{w} | \mathcal{C})$ by the (Lipschitz) continuity of the support function (apply Corollary 13.3.3 of [31] to the function $\delta^*(\cdot | \mathcal{C})$, where \mathcal{C} is a compact convex

set). Hence $\mathcal{C}' \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : w^\top x \leq \delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^n\} = \mathcal{C}$, where the latter equation follows from Theorem 13.1 of [31]. \square

Note that the obvious generalization of Theorem 8 to unbounded convex set is false, even when restricted to polyhedral \mathcal{C} . Consider, for instance as \mathcal{C} , any closed halfspace with a normal vector containing both rational and irrational entries.

Next we connect to the Gomory-Chvátal closure. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convex set. The *Gomory-Chvátal closure* of \mathcal{C} is

$$\text{CG}(\mathcal{C}) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : w^\top x \leq \lfloor \delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) \rfloor \forall w \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}. \quad (27)$$

The *integer hull* of \mathcal{C} is

$$\mathcal{C}_I := \text{conv}(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n). \quad (28)$$

Theorem 9 ([34]). If $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a bounded convex set, then $\text{CG}^k(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}_I$ for some natural $k \geq 1$.

We now generalize Corollary 3 (see [4, 9, 10] for recent generalizations in similar directions):

Corollary 10. If $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a nonempty compact convex set, then $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_I$ if and only if $\delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for every $w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.

Proof. Necessity is clear. For sufficiency, note that $\mathcal{C} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : w^\top x \leq \lfloor \delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) \rfloor \forall w \in \mathbb{Z}^n\} = \text{CG}(\mathcal{C})$ by Theorem 8. Hence, $\text{CG}^k(\mathcal{C}) = \mathcal{C}$ for every $k \geq 1$, so $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_I$ by Theorem 9. \square

Characterizations of exactness of convex relaxations for sets of integer points can naturally involve (convex) geometry in general, boundary structure of convex sets in particular (including polyhedral combinatorics), diophantine equations (number theory), and convex analysis and optimization. Next, we summarize some of the consequences of our geometric characterization (Corollary 10) of exactness for convex relaxations of integral polytopes. The next theorem, well-known in the special case of LP relaxations, provides equivalent characterizations of integrality in terms of the facial structure of the convex relaxation, optimum values of linear functions over the relaxation, optimal solutions of the linear optimization problems over the relaxation, diophantine equations, and gauge functions in convex optimization and analysis.

A convex subset \mathcal{F} of a convex set \mathcal{C} is a *face* of \mathcal{C} if, for every $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ such that the open line segment $(x, y) := \{\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y : \lambda \in (0, 1)\}$ between x and y meets \mathcal{F} , we have $x, y \in \mathcal{F}$. A nonempty face of \mathcal{C} which does not contain another nonempty face of \mathcal{C} is a *minimal face* of \mathcal{C} . If $w \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, we say that $\mathcal{H} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : w^\top x \leq \beta\}$ is a *supporting halfspace* of \mathcal{C} if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$; in this case we also say that $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : w^\top x = \beta\}$ is a *supporting hyperplane* of \mathcal{C} . The intersection of \mathcal{C} with any of its supporting hyperplanes is a face of \mathcal{C} ; such faces are *exposed*.

Theorem 11. Let \mathcal{C} be a nonempty compact convex set in \mathbb{R}^n . Then, the following are equivalent:

- (i) $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_I$;
- (ii) every nonempty face of \mathcal{C} contains an integral point;
- (iii) every minimal face of \mathcal{C} contains an integral point;
- (iv) for every $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have that $\max\{\langle w, x \rangle : x \in \mathcal{C}\}$ is attained by an integral point;
- (v) for every $w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, we have $\max\{\langle w, x \rangle : x \in \mathcal{C}\} \in \mathbb{Z}$;
- (vi) every rational supporting hyperplane for \mathcal{C} contains integral points;
- (vii) for each $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ and for each $w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, we have $\langle w, x_0 \rangle + \inf\{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{++} : \frac{1}{\eta}w \in (\mathcal{C} - x_0)^\circ\} \in \mathbb{Z}$;
- (viii) there exists $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ such that, for each $w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $\langle w, x_0 \rangle + \inf\{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{++} : \frac{1}{\eta}w \in (\mathcal{C} - x_0)^\circ\} \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Since \mathcal{C} is compact, it is bounded. Therefore, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_I$ implies that \mathcal{C} is a polytope. Every nonempty face of \mathcal{C} contains an extreme point of \mathcal{C} and every extreme point of $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_I$ is integral.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Immediate.

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv): Suppose every minimal face of \mathcal{C} contains an integral point. Let $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then, since \mathcal{C} is nonempty, compact and convex,

$$\arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \langle w, x \rangle =: \mathcal{F}$$

is a nonempty (exposed) face of \mathcal{C} . Every minimal face contained in \mathcal{F} contains an integral point (by part (iii)); hence, \mathcal{F} contains an integral point.

(iv) \Rightarrow (v): Suppose \mathcal{C} satisfies (iv). Let $w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Then, by (iv), there exists $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{C} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \langle w, x \rangle = \langle w, \bar{x} \rangle.$$

Since w and \bar{x} are integral, it follows that $\max_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \langle w, x \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(v) \Rightarrow (vi): Suppose \mathcal{C} has the property (v). Let $w \in \mathbb{Q}^n$. Define

$$\mathcal{F} := \arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \langle w, x \rangle.$$

Let μ be a positive rational such that $\mu w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\gcd(\mu w_1, \dots, \mu w_n) = 1$. Then, $\arg \max_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \langle \mu w, x \rangle = \mathcal{F}$. By property (v), $\beta := \max_{x \in \mathcal{C}} \langle \mu w, x \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since

$$\{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \langle \mu w, x \rangle = \beta\} \neq \emptyset \iff \gcd(\mu w_1, \dots, \mu w_n) \text{ divides } \beta,$$

and we have $\gcd(\mu w_1, \dots, \mu w_n) = 1$, we are done.

(vi) \iff (i): Suppose \mathcal{C} has property (vi). Then, for every $w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $\delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, by Corollary 10, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_I$. The converse also follows from Corollary 10.

(v) \iff (vii) \iff (viii): Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ and $w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Set $\tilde{\mathcal{C}} := \mathcal{C} - x_0$. Then

$$\delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) = \langle w, x_0 \rangle + \delta^*(w | \tilde{\mathcal{C}}) = \langle w, x_0 \rangle + \min\{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \langle w, x \rangle \leq \eta \forall x \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}\},$$

where in the last equation we use the fact that $0 \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ to add the constraint $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Finally, note that

$$\min\{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \langle w, x \rangle \leq \eta \forall x \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}\} = \inf\{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{++} : \frac{1}{\eta} w \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}^\circ\}. \quad \square$$

In the quite common case that $0 \in \mathcal{C}$, Theorem 11 shows that $\mathcal{C}_I = \mathcal{C}$ if and only if, for each $w \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, we have $\inf\{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{++} : \frac{1}{\eta} w \in \mathcal{C}^\circ\} \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Just as Theorem 2 motivates the definition of total dual integrality for LP formulations, one may use Corollary 10 to define total dual integrality more generally. In the next section, we shall define it for SDP formulations.

4. TOTAL DUAL INTEGRALITY FOR SDPs

Before we define a semidefinite notion of total dual integrality, we shall recall a few basic facts about the corresponding theory for polyhedra. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a matrix, and let $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$. We say that the system $Ax \leq b$ is *rational* if the entries of A and b are rational. The rational system of linear inequalities $Ax \leq b$ is *totally dual integral (TDI)* if, for each $c \in \mathbb{Z}^m$, the LP $\min\{b^\top y : A^\top y = c, y \geq 0\}$ dual to $\max\{c^\top x : Ax \leq b\}$ has an integral optimal solution if its optimal value is finite. If $Ax \leq b$ is TDI and b is integral, then the polyhedron $P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}$ is integral by Theorem 2. It is important to emphasize that total dual integrality is an *algebraic* notion, rather than a *geometric* one: it is not the geometric object P that is TDI, but rather the defining system $Ax \leq b$, which is not uniquely determined by P . This subtlety leads to some odd consequences, as we describe next.

A polyhedron $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is *rational* if it is determined by a rational system of linear inequalities. It is well known [35, Theorem 22.6] that every rational polyhedron P is defined by a TDI system $Ax \leq b$ with A integral, and if P is integral, then b may be chosen integral. This allows one to prove the odd fact that, for every rational system $Ax \leq b$, there is a positive integer t such that the system $(\frac{1}{t}A)x \leq \frac{1}{t}b$ is TDI.

Next we move on to define a notion of total dual integrality for SDP formulations. We want to define when the defining system $\mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b$, $\hat{X} \succeq 0$ for (SDP) is TDI, but there is a further complication. We may not need the dual SDP to have an “integral solution” for *every* integral objective function $\hat{X} \mapsto \langle \hat{C}, \hat{X} \rangle$. As the formulation (12) shows, for the Lovász ϑ function we are only interested in objective functions of the form $\hat{X} \mapsto \langle \text{Diag}(0 \oplus w), \hat{X} \rangle$, perhaps with $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ integral. The same remark can be made about the diagonal embedding (10) of LPs as SDPs. In these cases, one is interested only in the *diagonal* part of the variable \hat{X} , and the lifting $w \mapsto \text{Diag}(0 \oplus w)$ embeds in matrix space only the objective functions that matter to us. Note that this arises from the fact that we are essentially dealing with extended (lifted) formulations. However, when we look at the MaxCut SDP in Section 6, we shall only be interested in objective functions of the form $\hat{X} \mapsto \langle 0 \oplus \mathcal{L}_G(w), \hat{X} \rangle$, where $\mathcal{L}_G(w) \in \mathbb{S}^V$ is a weighted Laplacian matrix of the input graph G on vertex set V , to be defined later; as before, $\hat{X} \in \hat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V$ is the variable. In this case, one might argue the we are only interested in the *off-diagonal* (!) entries of the variable \hat{X} . Thus, when defining semidefinite TDIness, we shall need to refer to which objective functions (that is, which projection of the feasible region)

we care about. (This notion of TDIness coupled with extended formulations already leads to an interesting generalization of TDIness in the polyhedral case, as we discuss in Section 7.)

We may now define a semidefinite notion of total dual integrality. Below, the map \mathcal{L} is a lifting map, such as $w \mapsto \text{Diag}(0 \oplus w)$ and $w \mapsto 0 \oplus \mathcal{L}_G(w)$ from above. The corresponding projection, which will be the adjoint \mathcal{L}^* of the lifting \mathcal{L} , will appear in Theorem 13 below.

Definition 12. Let $\mathcal{L}: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{S}}^n$ be a linear map. The system $\mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b, \hat{X} \succeq 0$ is *totally dual integral (TDI) through \mathcal{L}* if, for every integral $c \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, the SDP dual to $\sup\{\langle \mathcal{L}(c), \hat{X} \rangle : \mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b, \hat{X} \succeq 0\}$ has an integral optimal solution whenever it has an optimal solution.

Note that, for convenience, we use the term ‘‘TDI’’ to refer to two separate notions, one for linear inequality systems of the form $Ax \leq b$, and another one for semidefinite systems of the form $\mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b, \hat{X} \succeq 0$; the context shall make it clear to which notion we are referring.

Theorem 13. Let $\mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b, \hat{X} \succeq 0$ be totally dual integral through a linear map $\mathcal{L}: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{S}}^n$. Set $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} := \{\hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n : \mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b\}$ and $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{L}^*(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$. If b is integral, \mathcal{C} is compact, and $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ has a positive definite matrix, then $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_I$.

Proof. Let $w \in \mathbb{Z}^k$. Then

$$\delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) = \max_{\hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \langle w, \mathcal{L}^*(\hat{X}) \rangle = \max_{\hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}} \langle \mathcal{L}(w), \hat{X} \rangle. \quad (29)$$

The latter SDP satisfies the relaxed Slater condition by assumption and its optimal value is finite and attained by compactness of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$. By SDP Strong Duality, the dual SDP has an optimal solution. Since $\mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b, \hat{X} \succeq 0$ is TDI through \mathcal{L} , the dual SDP has an integral optimal solution (y^*, \hat{S}^*) . Hence, $\delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) = b^\top y^*$ and so $\delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) \in \mathbb{Z}$, since b is integral. It follows from Corollary 10 that $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_I$. \square

We have established that total dual integrality is sufficient for exact (primal) representations. We next describe conditions under which the chain of inequalities in Theorem 6 holds with equality throughout, thus completing our discussion in Section 1 regarding equality throughout in Theorem 1.

Again there is a more involved setup due to our choice of embedding (4). Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [0, 1]^k$ be a convex set. Let $\mathcal{L}: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{S}}^n$ be a linear map, and let $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{S}}^n$. We say that $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ is a *rank-one embedding* of \mathcal{C}_I via \mathcal{L} if, for each $\bar{x} \in \{0, 1\}^k$ there exists $\hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ such that $\bar{x} = \mathcal{L}^*(\hat{X})$ and \hat{X} has the form (4) for some $U \subseteq V := [n]$. One may think of $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ as a convex set in (lifted) matrix space, e.g., the feasible region of an SDP, described algebraically by a linear system $\mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b, \hat{X} \succeq 0$ that includes (8). Then to have the (lifted) rank-constrained SDP formulation $\sup\{\langle \mathcal{L}(w), \hat{X} \rangle : \hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}, \text{rank}(\hat{X}) = 1\}$ be a correct relaxation for the combinatorial optimization problem $\max\{w^\top x : x \in \mathcal{C} \cap \{0, 1\}^k\}$ requires the conditions for $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ to be a rank-one embedding of \mathcal{C}_I .

In the case where $\mathcal{L}: w \in \mathbb{R}^V \mapsto 0 \oplus \text{Diag}(w)$ and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [0, 1]^V$, to say that the set $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{S}}^n$ defined by a system $\mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b, \hat{X} \succeq 0$ is a rank-one embedding of \mathcal{C}_I via \mathcal{L} requires that, for each $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{C} \cap \{0, 1\}^V$, we have

$$\mathcal{A}\left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \bar{x}^\top \\ \bar{x} & \bar{x}\bar{x}^\top \end{bmatrix}\right) \leq b.$$

Theorem 14. Let $\mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b, \hat{X} \succeq 0$ be totally dual integral through a linear map $\mathcal{L}: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{S}}^n$ such that b is integral. Suppose that $\widehat{\mathcal{C}} := \{\hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^n : \mathcal{A}(\hat{X}) \leq b\}$ has a positive definite matrix and that $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{L}^*(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}) \subseteq [0, 1]^k$ is compact. If $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ is a rank-one embedding of \mathcal{C}_I via \mathcal{L} , then for every $w \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, equality holds throughout in the chain of inequalities from Theorem 6 for $\hat{C} := \mathcal{L}(w)$, all optimum values are equal to

$$\max\{w^\top x : x \in \mathcal{C}_I\}, \quad (30)$$

and all suprema and infima are attained.

Proof. Fix $w \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ and set $\hat{C} := \mathcal{L}(w)$ throughout the proof. Note that the optimal value of (SDP) is bounded above, since each $\hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ has objective value $\langle \mathcal{L}(w), \hat{X} \rangle = \langle w, \mathcal{L}^*(\hat{X}) \rangle \leq \delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) < \infty$ by compactness. Since the relaxed Slater condition holds by assumption, SDP Strong Duality shows that (SDD) has an optimal solution, and hence is feasible. Together with the TDI assumption, this shows that (SDP), (SDD), and (ISDD) have the same optimal values and the latter two are attained.

It remains to prove that (SDP), (ISDP), and (30) have the same optimal values and are attained. Let \bar{x} be an optimal solution for $\max\{w^\top x : x \in \mathcal{C} \cap \{0, 1\}^k\}$. Then there exists $\bar{X} \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}$ that satisfies (PZ) such that $\bar{x} = \mathcal{L}^*(\bar{X})$. Then the optimal value of (30) is $w^\top \bar{x} = \langle w, \mathcal{L}^*(\bar{X}) \rangle = \langle \hat{\mathcal{C}}, \bar{X} \rangle$, which is upper bounded by the optimal value of (ISDP). On the other hand, as shown above the optimal value of (SDP) is upper bounded by $\delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}) = \delta^*(w | \mathcal{C}_I) = w^\top \bar{x}$ since $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_I$ by Theorem 13. Hence, \bar{x} is optimal in (30), and \bar{X} is optimal in (ISDP) and (SDP), all with the same objective values. \square

Naturally, any other choice of (i) embedding in some lifted space and (ii) integrality conditions would require an adaptation of the definition of ‘‘rank-one embedding’’ of \mathcal{C}_I via a lifting map, if only to ensure that the lifted representation $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ is a correct formulation of (30).

The next result characterizes TDI-ness for the diagonal embedding (10) of LPs. It shows that our notion of semidefinite TDI-ness is the same as the polyhedral notion, given the limitation in our model that only deals with binary variables:

Theorem 15. Let $Ax \leq b$ be a rational system of linear inequalities. The system defining (10) is TDI through $w \in \mathbb{R}^V \mapsto \text{Diag}(0 \oplus w)$ if and only if the system $Ax \leq b, 0 \leq x \leq \mathbb{1}$ is TDI.

Proof. Immediate from (22). \square

Together with Theorem 15, Theorem 14 yields a richer version of equality throughout in the chain from Theorem 1, since it includes the LP case via the diagonal embedding (10) as well as other, lifted formulations; see, e.g., Theorem 17 in the next section. Theorem 14 yields further results when the lifting map involves the Laplacian of a graph G , i.e., when \mathcal{L} has the form $w \mapsto 0 \oplus \mathcal{L}_G(w)$ as discussed before Definition 12. In this case, we leave it to the reader to check exactly how the set \mathcal{C} must be related to the (incidence vectors of) cuts of G .

5. INTEGRALITY IN THE THETA FUNCTION FORMULATION

In this section, we prove that the formulation (12) for the Lovász ϑ function of a graph G is TDI through the appropriate lifting if and only if G is perfect.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. We say that G is *perfect* if $\omega(G[U]) = \chi(G[U])$ for every $U \subseteq V$. For each $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the *weighted stability number* $\alpha(G, w)$ of G with respect to w is

$$\alpha(G, w) := \max\{w^\top \mathbb{1}_U : U \subseteq V \text{ stable}\}. \quad (31)$$

A subset \mathcal{C} of \mathbb{R}_+^n is a *convex corner* if \mathcal{C} is a compact convex set with nonempty interior and such that $0 \leq y \leq x \in \mathcal{C}$ implies $y \in \mathcal{C}$. Associate with each graph $G = (V, E)$ the following convex corners:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{STAB}(G) &:= \text{conv}\{\mathbb{1}_U : U \subseteq V \text{ stable}\}, \\ \text{TH}'(G) &:= \{\text{diag}(\hat{X}[V]) : \hat{X} \text{ feasible in (13)}\}, \\ \text{TH}(G) &:= \{\text{diag}(\hat{X}[V]) : \hat{X} \text{ feasible in (12)}\}, \\ \text{TH}^+(G) &:= \{\text{diag}(\hat{X}[V]) : \hat{X} \text{ feasible in (14)}\}, \\ \text{QSTAB}(G) &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^V : \mathbb{1}_K^\top x \leq 1 \forall K \in \mathcal{K}(G)\}. \end{aligned}$$

A strong form of Lovász sandwich theorem [24] is that

$$\text{STAB}(G) \subseteq \text{TH}'(G) \subseteq \text{TH}(G) \subseteq \text{TH}^+(G) \subseteq \text{QSTAB}(G). \quad (32)$$

The following result is well known; we include a sketch of its proof for completeness.

Theorem 16. Let G be a graph. The following are equivalent:

- (i) G is perfect;
- (ii) \bar{G} is perfect;
- (iii) $\text{STAB}(G) = \text{QSTAB}(G)$;
- (iv) the system $x \geq 0, \mathbb{1}_K^\top x \leq 1 \forall K \in \mathcal{K}(G)$ defining $\text{QSTAB}(G)$ is TDI;
- (v) $\alpha(G, w) = \bar{\chi}(G, w)$ for each $w : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$;
- (vi) $\text{TH}(G)$ is a polytope;

- (vii) $\text{TH}'(G)$ is a polytope;
- (viii) $\text{TH}^+(G)$ is a polytope.

Proof. Most equivalences can be seen in [16, Ch. 9], except for (vii) and (viii), involving $\text{TH}'(G)$ and $\text{TH}^+(G)$. It is clear that (iii) and (32) imply both (vii) and (viii). When proving that (vi) implies (iii), [16, Cor 9.3.27] relies on the facts that the antiblocker of $\text{TH}(G)$ is $\text{TH}(\overline{G})$ and that the nontrivial facets of $\text{TH}(G)$ are determined by the clique inequalities $\mathbb{1}_K^\top x \leq 1$ for each $K \in \mathcal{K}(G)$. It is well known that the antiblocker of $\text{TH}'(G)$ is $\text{TH}^+(\overline{G})$ and that the nontrivial facets of both $\text{TH}'(G)$ and $\text{TH}^+(G)$ are determined by the same clique inequalities above. The interested reader can find complete, unified proofs in [7, Theorem 24]. These facts are sufficient to adapt the proof from [16, Cor. 9.3.27] to show that each of (vii) and (viii), separately, implies (iii). \square

We can now characterize TDIness for ϑ via perfection. We comment in the proof below the modifications to obtain analogous results for the formulations (13) and (14), of ϑ' and ϑ^+ , respectively.

Theorem 17. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. The defining system for the SDP formulation of Lovász ϑ function in (12) is TDI through $w \in \mathbb{R}^V \mapsto \text{Diag}(0 \oplus w)$ if and only if G is perfect.

Proof. We start with sufficiency. Suppose G is perfect. Let $w: V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Let $U \subseteq V$ be a stable set of G such that $\alpha(G, w) = w^\top \mathbb{1}_U$, so that \hat{X} defined as in (4) is feasible in (12) with objective value $\alpha(G, w)$. Then by item (v) in Theorem 16 there exists a clique cover m of G with respect to w such that $\mathbb{1}^\top m = \alpha(G, w)$. Hence, Proposition 7 shows that there is an integral dual solution (\hat{S}, η, u, y, z) for the dual SDP of (12) with objective value $\eta = \mathbb{1}^\top m = \alpha(G, w)$, which is the same as the objective value of \hat{X} . Hence, (\hat{S}, η, u, y, z) is optimal for the dual SDP of (12) by weak duality. Note in fact that Proposition 7 shows that (\hat{S}, η, u, y, z) is an integer dual solution also for the dual SDPs of (13) and (14).

Now we move to necessity. Suppose the defining system is TDI through $\text{Diag}(0 \oplus \cdot)$. By Theorem 13, it follows that $\text{TH}(G) = \text{TH}(G)_I$, hence $\text{TH}(G)$ is a polytope and G is perfect by Theorem 16. Note that the equivalences (vii) and (viii) in Theorem 16 also show that the defining systems for ϑ' and ϑ^+ can only be TDI if G is perfect. \square

6. DUAL INTEGRALITY FOR THE MAXCUT SDP

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. A *cut* in G is a set of edges of the form

$$\delta(U) := \{e \in E : |e \cap U| = 1\} \quad (33)$$

for some $U \subseteq V$ such that $\emptyset \neq U \neq V$. The *maximum cut problem* (or MaxCut problem) is to find, given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and $w: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, an optimal solution for $\max\{w^\top \mathbb{1}_{\delta(U)} : \emptyset \neq U \subsetneq V\}$. (We shall discuss nonnegativity of w and related issues in Appendix B.) It is well known that, by using the embedding $U \in \mathcal{P}(V) \mapsto s_U s_U^\top \in \mathbb{S}^V$ with $s_U := 2\mathbb{1}_U - \mathbb{1}$, i.e.,

$$(s_U)_i = (-1)^{[i \notin U]} \quad \forall i \in V, \quad (34)$$

one may reformulate the MaxCut problem exactly by adding the constraint “ $\text{rank}(Y) = 1$ ” to the SDP

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize} && \langle \tfrac{1}{4} \mathcal{L}_G(w), Y \rangle \\ & \text{subject to} && \langle e_i e_i^\top, Y \rangle = 1 \quad \forall i \in V, \\ & && Y \in \mathbb{S}_+^V; \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

here, $\mathcal{L}_G: \mathbb{R}^E \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^V$ is the *Laplacian* of the graph G , defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_G(w) := \sum_{ij \in E} w_{ij} (e_i - e_j)(e_i - e_j)^\top \quad \forall w \in \mathbb{R}^E. \quad (36)$$

It is not hard to check that $\mathbb{1}_U^\top \mathcal{L}_G(w) \mathbb{1}_U = \frac{1}{4} s_U^\top \mathcal{L}_G(w) s_U = w^\top \mathbb{1}_{\delta(U)}$ for each $U \subseteq V$, with s_U defined as in (34). We call (35) the *MaxCut SDP*. It is one of the most famous SDPs, since it was used by Goemans and Williamson [15] in their seminal approximation algorithm and its analysis.

We discuss the drawbacks of the rank-one constraint for the dual SDP of (35) in Section 6.1, and in Section 6.2 we study the integer dual SDP for the MaxCut SDP with objective functions of the form $X \mapsto \langle \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{L}_G(w), X \rangle$ for every $w \in \mathbb{R}_+^E$.

6.1. Rank-One Constraint in Dual of the MaxCut SDP. In this section, we show that the dual of the MaxCut SDP has a feasible solution with a rank-one slack only if the weight function on the edges comes from a very restricted (though rather interesting) class of weight functions. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $w: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The dual of the MaxCut SDP (35) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} && \mathbb{1}^\top y \\ & \text{subject to} && S = \text{Diag}(y) - \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{L}_G(w) \\ & && S \in \mathbb{S}_+^V, y \in \mathbb{R}^V. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Proposition 18. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph without isolated vertices. Let $w: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$. If (37) has a feasible solution (S, y) such that $\text{rank}(S) \leq 1$, then $G = K_V$, and there exists $u: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $w_{ij} = u_i u_j$ for each $ij \in E$.

Proof. Set $L := \mathcal{L}_G(w)$. Suppose there exists $u \in \mathbb{R}^V$ such that $S = uu^\top$. Then, for each $i \in V$, we have $y_i - \frac{1}{4}L_{ii} = S_{ii} = u_i^2 \geq 0$; equality implies that $S_{ei} = 0$. Since G has no isolated vertices, it follows that $\text{supp}(u) = V$. Now the off-diagonal entries of the equality constraint of (37) show that $G = K_V$ and that $w_{ij} = 4u_i u_j$ for each $ij \in E = \binom{V}{2}$. \square

Instances of MaxCut of the form described by Proposition 18 are still NP-hard. Indeed, it is easy to see that they may be reformulated as $\max\{(\mathbb{1}_U^\top u)(\mathbb{1}_{V \setminus U}^\top u) : \emptyset \neq U \subsetneq V\}$. The latter problem is easily seen to include the partition problem.

6.2. Dual Integrality for the MaxCut SDP. As described in Section 2.1, our theory does not apply directly to the embedding used in the MaxCut SDP (35). To formulate (35) in our format, first rewrite it as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize} && \langle 0 \oplus \frac{1}{4}\mathcal{L}_G(w), \hat{Y} \rangle \\ & \text{subject to} && \langle e_i e_i^\top, \hat{Y} \rangle = 1 \quad \forall i \in \{0\} \cup V, \\ & && \hat{Y} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

and then perform the change of variable $\hat{Y} \mapsto \hat{B}\hat{Y}\hat{B}^\top = \hat{X}$, where

$$\hat{B} := \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0^\top \\ \mathbb{1} & I \end{bmatrix}$$

to get the equivalent SDP

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize} && \langle 0 \oplus \mathcal{L}_G(w), \hat{X} \rangle \\ & \text{subject to} && \langle e_0 e_0^\top, \hat{X} \rangle = 1, \\ & && \langle 2 \text{Sym}(e_i(e_i - e_0)^\top), \hat{X} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall i \in V, \\ & && \hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Finally, add the redundant constraints $\text{diag}(\hat{X}[V]) \geq 0$ to get the *homogeneous MaxCut SDP*:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize} && \langle 0 \oplus \mathcal{L}_G(w), \hat{X} \rangle \\ & \text{subject to} && \hat{X} \text{ satisfies (8),} \\ & && \hat{X} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Note that the change of variable is a linear automorphism of $\widehat{\mathbb{S}}^V$ that preserves rank, so we are not giving ourselves any undue advantage by choosing this embedding.

The dual SDP of (40) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} && \eta \\ & \text{subject to} && \begin{bmatrix} \eta & -u^\top \\ -u & \text{Diag}(2u - z) \end{bmatrix} - \hat{S} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0^\top \\ 0 & \mathcal{L}_G(w) \end{bmatrix}, \\ & && \hat{S} \in \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_+^V, \eta \in \mathbb{R}, u \in \mathbb{R}^V, z \in \mathbb{R}_+^V. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Upon adding the integrality constraint to (41) (and assuming integrality of $w \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E$), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Minimize} && \mathbb{1}^\top m \\
& \text{subject to} && m: \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+, \\
& && u = \sum_{A \subseteq V} m_A \mathbb{1}_A, \\
& && \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{i \in}}^\top m \leq 2u_i - \mathbb{1}_{\delta(i)}^\top w \quad \forall i \in V, \\
& && \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}}^\top m = [ij \in E] w_{ij} \quad \forall ij \in \binom{V}{2},
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

which may be finally simplified to

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \mathbb{1}^\top m \tag{43a}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad m: \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+, \tag{43b}$$

$$\text{supp}(m) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(G), \tag{43c}$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{\delta(i)}^\top w \leq \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{i \in}}^\top m \quad \forall i \in V, \tag{43d}$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}}^\top m = w_{ij} \quad \forall ij \in E. \tag{43e}$$

The next result yields a closed formula for the unique optimal solution of (43):

Theorem 19. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $w: E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then the optimization problem

$$\text{Minimize} \quad \mathbb{1}^\top m \tag{44a}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad m: \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+, \tag{44b}$$

$$\text{supp}(m) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(G), \tag{44c}$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{\delta(i)}^\top w \leq \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{i \in}}^\top m \quad \forall i \in V, \tag{44d}$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}}^\top m \leq w_{ij} \quad \forall ij \in E. \tag{44e}$$

has a unique optimal solution m^* , and it satisfies $\text{supp}(m^*) \subseteq E$ and $m^* \upharpoonright_E = w$.

Proof. Let $m_w: \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ be the zero extension of w , that is, $\text{supp}(m_w) \subseteq E$ and $m_w \upharpoonright_E = w$. It is easy to check that m_w is feasible in (44). Let $m^*: \mathcal{P}(V) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ be an optimal solution for (44); one exists since there exist feasible solutions and the objective value of every feasible solution is a nonnegative integer. We will prove that

$$m^* = m_w. \tag{45}$$

The key part of the proof is to show that

$$\text{supp}(m^*) \subseteq \binom{V}{1} \cup \binom{V}{2}. \tag{46}$$

Let $C \in \text{supp}(m^*)$. We claim that

$$\tilde{m} := m^* - e_C - (|C| - 2) \mathbb{1}_{\binom{C}{1}} + \mathbb{1}_{E[C]} \text{ is feasible for (44)}. \tag{47}$$

For every $i \in V$, we have

$$\mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{i \in}}^\top \left(e_C + (|C| - 2) \mathbb{1}_{\binom{C}{1}} \right) = [i \in C] + (|C| - 2)[i \in C] = [i \in C](|C| - 1) = \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{i \in}}^\top \mathbb{1}_{E[C]},$$

so (44d) holds for \tilde{m} . For every $ij \in E$ we have

$$\mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}}^\top \left(e_C + (|C| - 2) \mathbb{1}_{\binom{C}{1}} \right) = [ij \in E[C]] = \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}}^\top \mathbb{1}_{E[C]},$$

so (44e) holds for \tilde{m} . If C is a singleton, then $\tilde{m} = m^*$ and (44b) holds. So, in verifying (44b) for \tilde{m} , we may assume $|C| \geq 2$. We will prove that (44b) holds for \tilde{m} by showing that

$$\tilde{m} := m^* - e_C \geq (|C| - 2) \mathbb{1}_{\binom{C}{1}}; \tag{48}$$

then (44c) for \tilde{m} will also follow, thus completing the proof of (47).

Note that $\bar{m} \geq 0$. Let $i \in V$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbb{1}_{\delta(i)}^\top w &\leq \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{i \in}}^\top m^* && \text{by (44d)} \\
 &= \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{i \in}}^\top \bar{m} + [i \in C] && \text{since } m^* = \bar{m} + e_C \\
 &\leq \bar{m}_{\{i\}} + \sum_{j \in V \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}}^\top \bar{m} + [i \in C] && \text{since } \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{i \in}} \leq e_{\{i\}} + \sum_{j \in V \setminus \{i\}} \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}} \\
 &= \bar{m}_{\{i\}} + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}}^\top \bar{m} + [i \in C] && \text{by (44c)} \\
 &= \bar{m}_{\{i\}} + \sum_{j \in N(i)} \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}}^\top m^* - \sum_{j \in N(i)} \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{ij \subseteq}}^\top e_C + [i \in C] && \text{since } \bar{m} = m^* - e_C \\
 &\leq \bar{m}_{\{i\}} + \sum_{j \in N(i)} w_{ij} - |\delta(i) \cap E[C]| + [i \in C] && \text{by (44e)} \\
 &= \bar{m}_{\{i\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\delta(i)}^\top w - [i \in C](|C| - 2) && \text{since } |\delta(i) \cap E[C]| = [i \in C](|C| - 1).
 \end{aligned}$$

This proves (48), and thus completes the proof of (47).

We have

$$\mathbb{1}^\top m^* - \mathbb{1}^\top \bar{m} = \mathbb{1}^\top (e_C + (|C| - 2)\mathbb{1}_{\binom{C}{1}}) - \mathbb{1}^\top \mathbb{1}_{E[C]} = 1 + |C|(|C| - 2) - \binom{|C|}{2} = \frac{1}{2}(|C| - 1)(|C| - 2).$$

Optimality of m^* and (47) imply that $|C| \in \{1, 2\}$. This concludes the proof of (46).

By summing the vertex constraints (44d) and using (46), we obtain

$$2\mathbb{1}^\top w \leq \left(\sum_{A \subseteq V} |A| e_A \right)^\top m^* = \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{1}}^\top m^* + 2\mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{2}}^\top m^*. \quad (49)$$

By summing the edge constraints (44e) and using (46), we obtain

$$\mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{2}}^\top m^* = \left(\sum_{A \subseteq V} \binom{|A|}{2} e_A \right)^\top m^* \leq \mathbb{1}^\top w. \quad (50)$$

It follows from (46), (49), and (50) that

$$\mathbb{1}^\top m_w = \mathbb{1}^\top w \leq \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{1}}^\top m^* + \mathbb{1}_{\binom{V}{2}}^\top m^* = \mathbb{1}^\top m^*. \quad (51)$$

Equality throughout in (51) implies that each constraint in (44d) and (44e) holds with equality for m^* , so that m^* is feasible for (43). The latter fact, together with (46), easily implies that $m^* = m_w$. \square

Note that Theorem 19 does not characterize total dual integrality of the MaxCut SDP (35) since it only identifies integral dual optimal solutions when the weight function w on the edges is nonnegative. We postpone the discussion of dual integrality for not necessarily nonnegative weight functions to Appendix B.

7. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

We have introduced a primal-dual symmetric notion integrality in SDPs in Definitions 4 and 5; see also conditions (PZ) and (DZ). This enabled the statement in Theorem 6 of the SDP version of the LP-based Theorem 1. Then, by relying on our generalization of Corollary 3 in Corollary 10, and the notion of *total dual integrality* through a linear map in Definition 12, we described sufficient conditions for exactness of the (primal) SDP formulation in Theorem 13 and equality throughout the chain from Theorem 6 in Theorem 14. We also characterized the semidefinite notions of TDIness in the LP case (Theorem 15) and all variants of the theta function (Theorem 17) via natural conditions. Finally, in Theorem 19, we completely determined the optimal solutions for the integer dual SDP for the MaxCut SDP when the weight function on the edges of the graph is nonnegative.

Our approach leads to several other interesting research directions. We start with:

Problem 20. Obtain a primal-dual symmetric integrality condition for SDPs that applies to arbitrary ILPs, not just binary ones.

The theory of total dual integrality for LPs is considered well understood. Our work raises new issues, related to the interplay between total dual integrality and extended formulations in LP; the latter area has received a lot of attention recently. More concretely, one may define a system of linear inequalities $Ax \leq b$ on \mathbb{R}^n to be TDI through a linear map $L: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ if, for every integral $c \in \mathbb{Z}^k$, the LP dual to $\sup\{\langle L(c), x \rangle : Ax \leq b\}$ has an integral optimal solution if its optimal value is finite.

Problem 21. Are there compact formulations for classical combinatorial optimization problems (e.g., maximum weight r -arborescences, minimum spanning trees) that are TDI through the corresponding lifting maps? Do these lead to new min-max theorems?

Problem 22. Let $Ax \leq b$ be a system of linear inequalities on \mathbb{R}^n and $L: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ a linear map such that for $P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}$ the projection $L^*(P)$ is integral. Does there exist a TDI system $Cx \leq d$ in \mathbb{R}^n with d integral such that $L^*(P) = L^*(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Cx \leq d\})$?

The next problem is somewhat more open ended:

Problem 23. What is the relation between total dual integrality and the integer decomposition property (see [35, sec 22.10]), of which our dual integrality condition in Definition 4 is reminiscent?

In Section 6 we studied dual integrality of MaxCut SDP with nonnegative weight functions, and we discuss in Appendix B the issues that arise when we allow weights of arbitrary signs. These issues suggest further research directions. One may define a refinement of the notion of total dual integrality restricted to a rational convex cone $\mathbb{K} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^k$; there, one would only require the dual SDP to have an integral solution for primal objective functions of the form $\hat{X} \mapsto \langle \mathcal{L}(c), \hat{X} \rangle$ with $c \in \mathbb{K}$. In this context, it seems misleading to use the term *total* dual integrality; perhaps \mathbb{K} -dual integrality would seem more adequate.

Problem 24. Adapt Theorem 13 to the notion of \mathbb{K} -dual integrality; how should the set \mathcal{C} be modified using \mathbb{K} to yield an integral convex set?

Concerning the semidefinite notion of TDIness, one may ask for a characterization of total dual integrality of other SDP formulations, such as the application of lift-and-project hierarchies (see [23]) to ILP formulations of combinatorial optimization problems. One possible instance is the following:

Problem 25. Given $k \geq 1$ and the LS_+ operator of Lovász and Schrijver [26] (called N_+ in their paper), determine the class of graphs for which the k th iterate of the LS_+ operator applied to the system

$$x \geq 0, \quad x_i + x_j \leq 1 \quad \forall ij \in E \tag{52}$$

yields a TDI system through the appropriate lifting, leading to a minmax relation involving stable sets in such graphs.

Still in the realm of SDPs, one may ask for notions of *exactness* other than integrality, as well as their dual counterparts. For instance, many problems in continuous mathematics, such as control theory, lead to nonconvex optimization problems where the variable matrix is required to be rank-one or of restricted rank. However, the entries of such a matrix may define a continuous curve rather than taking on only finitely many values. For a general convex relaxation framework working with such formulations, see [21].

Problem 26. Obtain systematic, primal-dual symmetric conditions for exactness in SDP relaxations for continuous problems.

Finally, one may consider the problem of defining integrality in a systematic and primal-dual symmetric way for convex optimization problems in other forms. This is especially challenging since a dual integrality notion, even in the polyhedral case, is inherently dependent on the algebraic representation of the problem, not only on its geometry.

APPENDIX A. RANK CONSTRAINT IN DUAL SDP OF TRACE FORMULATION FOR THETA

In Section 2.1 we showed that the rank-one constraint for the dual SDP of a formulation of the theta function is not very interesting. There, the formulation we used was based on our chosen embedding into the lifted space $\widehat{\mathbb{S}}^V$, which requires the constraints (8). One might argue that the rank-one constraint might

make more sense for the dual SDP of the following, probably more popular, formulation of $\vartheta(G, w)$ for a graph $G = (V, E)$ and $w: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$:

$$\text{Maximize } \langle \sqrt{w}\sqrt{w}^\top, X \rangle \quad (53a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \langle I, X \rangle = 1, \quad (53b)$$

$$\langle \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), X \rangle = 0 \quad \forall ij \in E, \quad (53c)$$

$$X \in \mathbb{S}_+^V. \quad (53d)$$

We will show that the rank-one constraint is not very meaningful even in the dual of the following SDP formulation of $\vartheta'(G, w)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize} && \langle \sqrt{w}\sqrt{w}^\top, X \rangle \\ & \text{subject to} && \langle I, X \rangle = 1, \\ & && \langle \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), X \rangle = 0 \quad \forall ij \in E, \\ & && \langle \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), X \rangle \geq 0 \quad \forall ij \in \bar{E}, \\ & && X \in \mathbb{S}_+^V, \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where $\bar{E} := \binom{V}{2} \setminus E$ is the edge set of \bar{G} . Note that the dual SDP of (54) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} && \lambda \\ & \text{subject to} && \lambda I + \sum_{ij \in \binom{V}{2}} y_{ij} \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top) \succeq \sqrt{w}\sqrt{w}^\top, \\ & && y|_{\bar{E}} \leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} && \lambda \\ & \text{subject to} && \lambda I + A - \bar{A} - S = \sqrt{w}\sqrt{w}^\top, \\ & && S \succeq 0, \\ & && A \in \mathcal{A}_G, \\ & && \bar{A} \in \mathcal{A}_{\bar{G}} \cap \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^V. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Note that the dual of the formulation (53) for $\vartheta(G, w)$ is obtained from (55) by dropping the variable matrix \bar{A} , i.e., by setting $\bar{A} = 0$. Hence, every feasible solution for the dual SDP of (53) is feasible in (55).

One could formulate $\vartheta^+(G, w)$ similarly as (53), by replacing the equality in the edge constraints (53c) with ' \leq '. The corresponding dual SDP is obtained from (55) by setting $\bar{A} = 0$ and requiring $A \in \mathcal{A}_G \cap \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^V$. Again, the feasible region of this dual SDP is a subset of the feasible region of (55).

The embedding of stable sets in G as feasible solutions of (54) goes as follows: if $U \subseteq V$ is a stable set in G with positive weight $w^\top \mathbb{1}_U$, then $X := (w^\top \mathbb{1}_U)^{-1} (\sqrt{w} \odot \mathbb{1}_U) (\sqrt{w} \odot \mathbb{1}_U)^\top$ is feasible in (54), with objective value $w^\top \mathbb{1}_U$. The normalization factor and the square root in the definition of X already hint that this formulation does not play so well with integrality.

Proposition 27. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $w \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^V$. If there exists a feasible solution (λ, A, \bar{A}, S) for (55) such that $\text{rank}(S) \leq 1$, then \bar{G} is bipartite.

Proof. Suppose $S = ss^\top$ for some $s \in \mathbb{R}^V$. Then

$$\lambda I + A = ss^\top + \sqrt{w}\sqrt{w}^\top + \bar{A}. \quad (56)$$

Apply diag to both sides of (56) to get $\lambda \mathbb{1} = (s \odot s) + w$. Hence, $\lambda \mathbb{1} \geq w$ and there exists $U \subseteq V$ such that

$$s = \text{Diag}(2\mathbb{1}_U - \mathbb{1}) \sqrt{\lambda \mathbb{1} - w}. \quad (57)$$

Let $ij \in \bar{E}$. Specialize (56) to the ij th entry to get

$$0 = s_i s_j + \sqrt{w_i w_j} + \bar{A}_{ij} \geq (-1)^{[i \notin U] + [j \notin U]} \sqrt{(\lambda - w_i)(\lambda - w_j)} + \sqrt{w_i w_j}. \quad (58)$$

If $i, j \in U$ or $i, j \in \bar{U} := V \setminus U$, then the RHS of (58) is positive, since $w \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^V$. This contradiction shows that $G[U] = K_U$ and $G[\bar{U}] = K_{\bar{U}}$, so \bar{G} is bipartite with color classes U and \bar{U} . \square

By our previous discussion, the dual SDPs of the above formulations of ϑ , ϑ' , and ϑ^+ only have rank-one slacks when \overline{G} is bipartite (whence G is perfect).

We point out, however, that another low-rank constraint for the dual SDP for ϑ' does in fact yield a useful and almost exact formulation for the chromatic number of a graph $G = (V, E)$, via the circular chromatic number. We first describe the vector chromatic number, introduced in [19]. Suppose G has at least one edge. The *vector chromatic number* $\chi_v(G)$ of G is the optimal value of the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} && \tau \\ & \text{subject to} && \text{diag}(Y) = \mathbb{1}, \\ & && \langle \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), Y \rangle \leq -\frac{1}{\tau-1} \quad \forall ij \in E, \\ & && Y \in \mathbb{S}_+^V, \\ & && \tau \geq 2. \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

It is not hard to see that the map $(S, \lambda) \mapsto \frac{1}{\lambda-1}S$ maps bijectively the feasible region of (55) applied to \overline{G} to the feasible region of (59) and preserves the objective value. Hence, $\chi_v(G) = \vartheta'(\overline{G})$. This suggests the following alternative SDP formulation for $\chi_v(G)$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} && \sigma \\ & \text{subject to} && \text{diag}(Y) = \mathbb{1}, \\ & && \langle \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), Y \rangle \leq \sigma \quad \forall ij \in E, \\ & && Y \in \mathbb{S}_+^V, \\ & && \tau \geq 2. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Any optimal solution σ^* lies in $[-1, 0)$ and leads to the optimal value $\tau^* := 1 - 1/\sigma^*$ for (59).

Consider next the *circular chromatic number* $\chi_c(G)$ of G , which can be defined as the optimal value of the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} && \tau \\ & \text{subject to} && y: V \rightarrow S^1, \\ & && \phi_{ij} \geq \frac{2\pi}{\tau} \quad \forall ij \in E, \\ & && \tau \geq 2, \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

where S^1 denotes the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^2 and $\phi_{ij} \in [0, \pi]$ is the angle between y_i and y_j . This formulation can be seen in [11]; see [41] for further properties of χ_c . Since \cos is monotone decreasing on $[0, \pi]$, we can rewrite the latter optimization problem using Gram matrices as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} && \tau \\ & \text{subject to} && \text{diag}(Y) = \mathbb{1}, \\ & && \langle \text{Sym}(e_i e_j^\top), Y \rangle \leq \cos \frac{2\pi}{\tau} \quad \forall ij \in E, \\ & && Y \in \mathbb{S}_+^V, \\ & && \text{rank}(Y) = 2, \\ & && \tau \geq 2. \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Finally, since $f: \tau \in [2, \infty) \mapsto \cos \frac{2\pi}{\tau} \in [-1, 1)$ is a monotone increasing bijection, we see that, if σ^* is the optimal value of (60) with the extra constraint $\text{rank}(Y) = 2$, then $\chi_c(G) = f^{-1}(\sigma^*)$. One can then read off the chromatic number of G since $\chi(G) = \lceil \chi_c(G) \rceil$.

Note, however, that this dual formulation required quite a lot of *ad hoc* treatment.

APPENDIX B. THE MAXCUT PROBLEM AND NONNEGATIVE WEIGHTS

One may wonder whether Theorem 19 may be extended to arbitrary weight functions $w: E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, not just nonnegative weights. Such an extension might be used to characterize the graphs G for which the system defining the MaxCut SDP (35) is TDI through $w \in \mathbb{R}^E \mapsto 0 \oplus \mathcal{L}_G(w) =: \mathcal{L}(w)$; by Theorem 19 such graphs forms a subset of the bipartite graphs. Then we would be able to obtain the *cut polytope* $\text{conv}\{\mathbb{1}_{\delta(S)} : \emptyset \neq S \subsetneq V\}$ of any such graph G as a projection of the feasible region of (35) via \mathcal{L}^* . However, due to constraints (44e), if $w: E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ has a negative entry, problem (44) is infeasible. One may attempt to “fix” this issue by adding to (40) the redundant constraint $\mathcal{L}^*(\hat{X}) = \mathcal{L}_G^*(\hat{X}[V]) \geq 0$. Note that this is

similar to the redundant constraint (8c) added in our chosen embedding, which is fundamental for dealing with $w \in \mathbb{R}^V \setminus \mathbb{R}_+^V$ for the ϑ function; in both cases, the redundant constraint comes from the projection \mathcal{L}^* . The dual SDP is then obtained from (41) by replacing the occurrence of $\mathcal{L}_G(w)$ in the RHS with $\mathcal{L}_G(w + y)$, where $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^E$ is a new variable. Optimal solutions for the corresponding integer dual SDP are described by the next result:

Corollary 28. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and let $w: E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Then the optimization problem

$$\text{Minimize } \mathbb{1}^\top m \tag{63a}$$

$$\text{subject to } m: \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+, \tag{63b}$$

$$\text{supp}(m) \subseteq \mathcal{K}(G), \tag{63c}$$

$$y \in \mathbb{R}_+^E, \tag{63d}$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{\delta(i)}^\top (w + y) \leq \mathbb{1}_{(i \in)}^\top m \quad \forall i \in V, \tag{63e}$$

$$\mathbb{1}_{(ij \subseteq)}^\top m \leq w_{ij} + y_{ij} \quad \forall ij \in E. \tag{63f}$$

has a unique optimal solution (m^*, y^*) , and it satisfies $\text{supp}(m^*) \subseteq E$, and for each $e \in E$,

$$m_e^* = [w_e \geq 0]w_e, \quad y_e^* = -[w_e < 0]w_e.$$

Proof. Let (\bar{m}, \bar{y}) be feasible. By (63f), we have $w + \bar{y} \geq 0$ so $\bar{y} \geq y^*$. By Theorem 19, the optimization problem (63) with the extra constraint $y = \bar{y}$ has a unique optimal solution, and its optimal value is $\mathbb{1}^\top (w + \bar{y})$, which is greater than or equal to $\mathbb{1}^\top (w + y^*)$, the objective value of the feasible solution (m^*, y^*) . \square

Even though Corollary 28 shows how the dual SDP for MaxCut with an extra (redundant) constraint may have integral solutions, the optimal value is always nonnegative. The deeper problem here is that the MaxCut SDP (35) is not tight for arbitrary weights w , even if the underlying graph is bipartite. Hence, if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^E$ is the projection of the feasible region of (35) via \mathcal{L}^* , we cannot even expect $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_I$, let alone total dual integrality of the defining system.

To see this, first note that, for a graph $G = (V, E)$ and weights $w: E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we should redefine the maximum cut problem as the optimization problem $\sup\{w^\top \mathbb{1}_{\delta(U)} : \emptyset \neq U \subsetneq V\}$; when $w \geq 0$, since $\delta(\emptyset) = \delta(V) = \emptyset$, it was harmless to keep both trivial sets $U = \emptyset$ and $U = V$ in the feasible set. Correspondingly, in the MaxCut SDP (35), the feasible solution $X := \mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^\top$ shows that the optimal value is always nonnegative, *even when w is negative and G is connected!* To prevent these trivial solutions from being feasible in a modified MaxCut SDP, one may add the constraint $\langle \mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^\top, X \rangle \leq (|V| - 2)^2$; to see where the RHS comes from, note that

$$\max\{\langle \mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^\top, s_U s_U^\top \rangle : \emptyset \neq U \subsetneq V\} = (|V| - 2)^2,$$

where $s_U := 2\mathbb{1}_U - \mathbb{1}$ for each $U \subseteq V$. These considerations lead us to strengthen (35) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Maximize } \langle \tfrac{1}{4}\mathcal{L}_G(w), Y \rangle \\ & \text{subject to } \langle e_i e_i^\top, Y \rangle = 1 \quad \forall i \in V, \\ & \langle \mathbb{1}\mathbb{1}^\top, Y \rangle \leq (|V| - 2)^2, \\ & Y \in \mathbb{S}_+^V. \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

Even this strengthened formulation is not exact for connected bipartite graphs if we allow weights of arbitrary signs. Consider, for instance, the path of length 3 given by $G = ([4], \{12, 23, 34\})$, with weights $w = -\mathbb{1}$. Then MaxCut is really a minimum cut problem and the optimal value is clearly -1 . However, the feasible solution

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 1 & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & 1 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

in (64) has objective value $-3/4$.

These issues motivate the development of a theory of dual integrality for weight functions in a cone, as described in Problem 24.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Arora, C. Lund, R. Motwani, M. Sudan, and M. Szegedy. “Proof verification and the hardness of approximation problems”. In: *J. ACM* 45.3 (1998), pages 501–555 (cited on page 3).
- [2] B. Barak and D. Steurer. *Sum-of-squares proofs and the quest toward optimal algorithms*. Version 2. May 2014. arXiv: [1404.5236 \[cs.DS\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.5236). URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1404.5236> (cited on page 3).
- [3] A. Ben-Tal and A. Nemirovski. *Lectures on Modern Convex Optimization*. 2013. URL: http://www2.isye.gatech.edu/~nemirovs/Lect_ModConvOpt.pdf (visited on 10/17/2017) (cited on page 9).
- [4] G. Braun and S. Pokutta. “A short proof for the polyhedrality of the Chvátal-Gomory closure of a compact convex set”. In: *Oper. Res. Lett.* 42.5 (2014), pages 307–310 (cited on page 12).
- [5] S. Burer. “On the copositive representation of binary and continuous nonconvex quadratic programs”. In: *Math. Program.* 120.2, Ser. A (2009), pages 479–495 (cited on pages 3, 6).
- [6] M. K. de Carli Silva. “Geometric Ramifications of the Lovász Theta Function and Their Interplay with Duality”. PhD thesis. Department of Combinatorics and Optimization, University of Waterloo, 2013 (cited on pages 1, 9).
- [7] M. K. de Carli Silva and L. Tunçel. “An axiomatic duality framework for the theta body and related convex corners”. In: *Math. Program.* 162.1 (2017), pages 283–323 (cited on pages 3, 7, 16).
- [8] P. C. P. Carvalho and L. E. Trotter Jr. “An abstract linear duality model”. In: *Math. Oper. Res.* 14.4 (1989), pages 639–663 (cited on page 4).
- [9] D. Dadush, S. S. Dey, and J. P. Vielma. “The split closure of a strictly convex body”. In: *Oper. Res. Lett.* 39.2 (2011), pages 121–126 (cited on page 12).
- [10] D. Dadush, S. S. Dey, and J. P. Vielma. “On the Chvátal-Gomory closure of a compact convex set”. In: *Math. Program.* 145.1-2, Ser. A (2014), pages 327–348 (cited on page 12).
- [11] M. DeVos. *Some Chromatic Numbers*. URL: <http://www.sfu.ca/~mdevos/notes/semidef/chrom.pdf> (visited on 11/06/2017) (cited on page 22).
- [12] J. Edmonds and R. Giles. “A min-max relation for submodular functions on graphs”. In: volume 1. *Ann. Discrete Math.* Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1977, pages 185–204 (cited on page 2).
- [13] U. Feige and L. Lovász. “Two-prover one-round proof systems: their power and their problems (extended abstract)”. In: *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*. STOC ’92. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: ACM, 1992, pages 733–744 (cited on page 3).
- [14] M. X. Goemans. “Semidefinite programming in combinatorial optimization”. In: *Math. Programming* 79.1-3, Ser. B (1997). *Lectures on Mathematical Programming (ISMP 97)* (Lausanne, 1997), pages 143–161 (cited on page 3).
- [15] M. X. Goemans and D. P. Williamson. “Improved approximation algorithms for maximum cut and satisfiability problems using semidefinite programming”. In: *J. ACM* 42.6 (1995), pages 1115–1145 (cited on pages 3, 16).
- [16] M. Grötschel, L. Lovász, and A. Schrijver. *Geometric algorithms and combinatorial optimization*. Second Edition. Volume 2. Algorithms and Combinatorics. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1993, pages xii+362 (cited on pages 3, 6, 16).
- [17] J. Håstad. “Clique is hard to approximate within $n^{1-\epsilon}$ ”. In: *Acta Math.* 182.1 (1999), pages 105–142 (cited on page 3).
- [18] A. J. Hoffman. “A generalization of max flow-min cut”. In: *Math. Programming* 6 (1974), pages 352–359 (cited on page 2).
- [19] D. Karger, R. Motwani, and M. Sudan. “Approximate graph coloring by semidefinite programming”. In: *J. ACM* 45.2 (1998), pages 246–265 (cited on page 22).
- [20] S. A. Khot and N. K. Vishnoi. “The unique games conjecture, integrability gap for cut problems and embeddability of negative-type metrics into ℓ_1 ”. In: *J. ACM* 62.1 (2015), Art. 8, 39 pp. (Cited on page 3).
- [21] M. Kojima and L. Tunçel. “Cones of matrices and successive convex relaxations of nonconvex sets”. In: *SIAM J. Optim.* 10.3 (2000), pages 750–778 (cited on page 20).
- [22] J. B. Lasserre. “An explicit exact SDP relaxation for nonlinear 0-1 programs”. In: *Integer programming and combinatorial optimization (Utrecht, 2001)*. Volume 2081. *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.* Springer, Berlin, 2001, pages 293–303 (cited on page 6).

- [23] M. Laurent. “A comparison of the Sherali-Adams, Lovász-Schrijver, and Lasserre relaxations for 0-1 programming”. In: *Math. Oper. Res.* 28.3 (2003), pages 470–496 (cited on pages 6, 20).
- [24] L. Lovász. “On the Shannon capacity of a graph”. In: *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 25.1 (1979), pages 1–7 (cited on pages 3, 15).
- [25] L. Lovász. “Semidefinite programs and combinatorial optimization”. In: *Recent advances in algorithms and combinatorics*. Volume 11. CMS Books Math./Ouvrages Math. SMC. New York: Springer, 2003, pages 137–194 (cited on page 3).
- [26] L. Lovász and A. Schrijver. “Cones of matrices and set-functions and 0-1 optimization”. In: *SIAM J. Optim.* 1.2 (1991), pages 166–190 (cited on pages 6, 20).
- [27] C. Lund and M. Yannakakis. “On the hardness of approximating minimization problems”. In: *J. ACM* 41.5 (1994), pages 960–981 (cited on page 3).
- [28] R. J. McEliece, E. R. Rodemich, and H. C. Rumsey Jr. “The Lovász bound and some generalizations”. In: *J. Combin. Inform. System Sci.* 3.3 (1978), pages 134–152 (cited on page 7).
- [29] R. R. Meyer. “On the existence of optimal solutions to integer and mixed-integer programming problems”. In: *Math. Programming* 7 (1974), pages 223–235 (cited on page 1).
- [30] Y. Nesterov. “Semidefinite relaxation and nonconvex quadratic optimization”. In: *Optim. Methods Softw.* 9.1-3 (1998), pages 141–160 (cited on page 3).
- [31] R. T. Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997, pages xviii+451 (cited on pages 11, 12).
- [32] J. Ryan and L. E. Trotter Jr. “Weyl-Minkowski duality for integral monoids”. In: *Optimization* 28.3-4 (1994), pages 315–331 (cited on page 4).
- [33] A. Schrijver. “A comparison of the Delsarte and Lovász bounds”. In: *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 25.4 (1979), pages 425–429 (cited on page 7).
- [34] A. Schrijver. “On cutting planes”. In: *Ann. Discrete Math.* 9 (1980), pages 291–296 (cited on page 12).
- [35] A. Schrijver. *Theory of linear and integer programming*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 1986, pages xii+471 (cited on pages 13, 20).
- [36] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization. Polyhedra and efficiency*. Volume 24. 3 volumes. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2003. xxxviii+1881 (cited on pages 2, 6, 11).
- [37] G. Simonyi. “Perfect graphs and graph entropy. An updated survey”. In: *Perfect graphs*. Wiley-Intersci. Ser. Discrete Math. Optim. Chichester: Wiley, 2001, pages 293–328 (cited on page 3).
- [38] M. Szegedy. “A note on the theta number of Lovász and the generalized Delsarte bound”. In: *Proceedings of the 35th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. 1994 (cited on page 7).
- [39] L. Trevisan. “On Khot’s unique games conjecture”. In: *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 49.1 (2012), pages 91–111 (cited on page 3).
- [40] V. V. Vazirani. *Approximation algorithms*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2001, pages xx+378 (cited on page 2).
- [41] X. Zhu. “Circular chromatic number: a survey”. In: *Discrete Math.* 229.1-3 (2001). Combinatorics, graph theory, algorithms and applications, pages 371–410 (cited on page 22).

(Marcel K. de Carli Silva) INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA E ESTATÍSTICA, UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO
E-mail address: mksilva@ime.usp.br

(Levent Tunçel) DEPARTMENT OF COMBINATORICS AND OPTIMIZATION, UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
E-mail address: ltuncel@uwaterloo.ca