

Integer quadratic programming in fixed dimension is polynomial-time solvable

Linchuan Wei

School of Data Science, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen
linchuanwei@cuhk.edu.cn

Abstract

We give a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm for integer quadratic programming in every fixed dimension: it minimizes an arbitrary rational quadratic exactly over the integer points of a rational polyhedron, or certifies infeasibility or integer unboundedness. The core is a sign test that decides whether $d^T Q d \geq 0$ for every integer point d of a bounded symmetric rational polytope. It proceeds through a dyadic sequence of scaled copies of the polytope, starting at a scale at which the origin is its only integer point, converting nonnegativity at each scale into integer supporting inequalities on a constant-size cover of the next, and minimizing exactly by cuts through integer points of constant halfspace depth. Dyadic grouping of the constraint slacks handles general linear constraints, and an integer unboundedness test and an optimizer bound handle unbounded polyhedra. The running time is polynomial in the binary input length, with an exponent depending on the dimension.

Keywords. integer quadratic programming, fixed dimension, halfspace depth

MSC codes. 90C10, 90C20, 90C60, 68Q25

1 Introduction

We consider integer quadratic programming in the form

$$(1.1) \quad \inf\{f(x) : x \in P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n\}, \quad f(x) = x^T Q x + c^T x, \quad P = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}.$$

Here Q is rational and symmetric and A, b, c are rational. All n variables are integer and n is fixed, whereas the number of inequalities and the binary lengths of all coefficients remain part of the input. No definiteness assumption is imposed on Q , and the feasible polyhedron may be unbounded or contained in a proper affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$. When the optimum is finite, Section 6 computes a box containing an optimizer whose radius may be numerically large but has polynomial binary encoding length.

Theorem 1.1 (Integer quadratic programming in fixed dimension). *For every fixed positive integer n , there is a deterministic algorithm for (1.1), polynomial in the total binary input length, with the following outputs.*

- (i) *If $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = \emptyset$, it reports infeasibility.*
- (ii) *If $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$ and the objective is bounded below on this set, it returns an optimal point and its exact objective value.*
- (iii) *Otherwise, it returns $x^0, d \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying*

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} Ax^0 &\leq b, & Ad &\leq 0, & d &\neq 0, \\ f(x^0 + td) &\longrightarrow -\infty & (t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, t \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

All returned vectors have polynomial binary encoding length. Write L for the total binary length of the original rational input and $T_n(L)$ for the worst-case number of bit operations on n -variable instances of length at most L . For a nonnegative family $g_n(L)$, the notation $g_n(L) = L^{O_n(1)}$ means that for each fixed n there are constants $a_n, b_n > 0$, independent of L , with $g_n(L) \leq a_n L^{b_n}$ for all sufficiently large L ; in these terms $T_n(L) = L^{O_n(1)}$. This dependence is of XP form in n rather than the fixed-parameter form $F(n)L^C$ with an absolute exponent C , and it cannot be improved to the latter unless $\text{FPT} = \text{W}[1]$, because integer quadratic programming parameterized by n is $\text{W}[1]$ -hard [8, Theorem 1].

To our knowledge, Theorem 1.1 is the first exact algorithm for arbitrary integer quadratic programming whose running time is polynomial in the binary input length for every fixed dimension. The exact two-variable case was known previously [5, Theorem 1.1], while the general fixed-dimensional question was still listed as open in April 2026 [1, Section 1.1, p. 3] and August 2026 [8, Section 3, p. 7].

1.1 The central mechanism

Write $h(d) = d^\top Qd$ for the homogeneous part of the objective. For any x, y , the exact identity

$$(1.3) \quad f(y) - f(x) - (2Qx + c)^\top(y - x) = h(y - x)$$

identifies the error at y of the affine approximation based at x , whose gradient is $2Qx + c$: that error is exactly $h(y - x)$. Nonnegative curvature of the difference $y - x$ therefore yields

$$f(y) \geq f(x) + (2Qx + c)^\top(y - x).$$

We shall need this inequality only for pairs of integer points lying in a common region, whereas continuous convexity would demand it for every pair of real points of a convex domain. That gap between the two requirements is what lets the algorithm borrow from convex optimization without assuming that f is convex.

The first ingredient is a sign test for h on a bounded rational polytope K with $K = -K$. Sets of this kind recur throughout, and we call them *direction polytopes*: their points serve as differences $y - x$ of feasible points, or as moves $x \pm d$ from them, never as feasible points themselves. Such a polytope admits a cover

$$K = \bigcup_j C_j, \quad C_j - C_j \subseteq \tfrac{1}{2}K$$

by rational polytopes whose number depends only on n . If h is nonnegative on $\frac{1}{2}K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, then (1.3) supplies integer supporting inequalities on every cell C_j , and h can be minimized exactly on each cell by cuts through integer points of constant halfspace depth.

This implication drives an induction over scales. Choosing an index τ for which $2^{-\tau}K$ contains no integer point other than zero, we examine

$$2^{-\tau}K, \quad 2^{-(\tau-1)}K, \quad \dots, \quad K$$

in turn. Each step either produces a negative integer point, which ends the sign test, or establishes nonnegativity on the whole current set. The cells of a given step all draw on the single conclusion reached at the preceding, smaller set, so no cell initiates a recursive sign test. The number of scales is logarithmic in a coordinate bound for K and hence polynomial in its binary description length.

The second ingredient handles the linear constraints. After denominators are cleared, the slack $s_i(x) = b_i - a_i^\top x$ is an integer at every integer point, and we group its nonnegative values into the dyadic ranges

$$[0, 0], \quad [1, 1], \quad [2, 3], \quad [4, 7], \quad \dots$$

There may be many constraints, but in fixed dimension only polynomially many joint slack patterns are realized. For a region whose slack lower bounds are ℓ_i , the direction polytope

$$K_C = \{d : |a_i^\top d| \leq \ell_i \text{ for all } i\}$$

plays two roles at once: it contains every difference of two points of the region, and it guarantees that both moves $x + d$ and $x - d$ stay feasible for every x in the region and every $d \in K_C$. Consequently a negative integer direction excludes the entire region from global optimality, while the absence of one leaves the region with the integer supporting inequalities needed for exact optimization.

An explicit bounded-base decomposition finally reduces unbounded feasible polyhedra to bounded search regions. An unbounded feasible region need not make the objective unbounded below, so an explicit search bound is needed when the optimum is finite.

The two ideas at the core of our algorithm—the multiscale propagation principle underlying Theorem 3.3 and the integer-support cutting procedure of Proposition 2.3—were first developed in the box-constrained setting. We state and prove them here in the more general form needed for arbitrary bounded rational polytopes. Because the box-specific algorithm is subsumed by Theorem 4.3, we do not present it separately.

1.2 Related work and algorithmic dependencies

Lenstra established polynomial-time integer linear feasibility in fixed dimension [14, p. 538 and Section 1, pp. 539–541]. Khachiyan and Porkolab extended this to optimizing a coordinate objective over the integer points of a convex semialgebraic set described by a quantifier-free formula in fixed dimension [13, Theorem 1.2, p. 208]. After clearing objective denominators and adding one integer coordinate, their result also covers arbitrary rational linear objectives. These results cover important convex special cases but do not apply directly when an indefinite quadratic has nonconvex real sublevel sets. Applied with no continuous variables, the results of Del Pia, Dey, and Molinaro show that feasible integer quadratic decision instances have polynomial-size witnesses, that instances with finite optimum have polynomial-size optimizers, and that boundedness can be decided in polynomial time when the dimension is fixed [4, Theorems 1, 4, and 6]. Their fixed-dimensional exact optimization algorithm is pseudo-polynomial [4, Corollary 2]. Zemmer’s related exact algorithms likewise run in time polynomial in m , $\|A\|_\infty$, and $\|Q\|_\infty$, rather than in the binary encoding lengths of A and Q ; their dependence on the right-hand side and linear

coefficient vector is polynomial in the corresponding binary encoding lengths [17, Theorem 5.1.1, p. 64, and Theorem 5.2.5, p. 69]. For self-containment, Lemma 5.4 supplies the explicit orthant-specific formula from which the search radius used here is computed.

Testing or exploiting negative curvature is not itself new. For homogeneous indefinite quadratics, Hildebrand, Weismantel, and Zemmer give an FPTAS when Q has at most one negative or at most one positive eigenvalue [10, Theorem 1.1]; in dimension three this covers arbitrary symmetric Q [10, Corollary 1.1]. Their exact result is narrower: it applies when Q has exactly one negative eigenvalue and the optimum is nonpositive, or exactly one positive eigenvalue and the optimum is nonnegative [10, Proposition 3.1]. Their slicing framework groups affine functions into multiplicative ranges [10, Definition 2.1 and Theorem 2.1]. Lokshtanov gives a fixed-parameter algorithm for the homogeneous problem, parameterized by the dimension and the largest absolute entries of the quadratic and constraint matrices; a linear term can be introduced by homogenization, after which its coefficients enter the parameter as well [15, Theorem 2]. Ari and Hildebrand obtain explicit single-exponential bounds through curvature batching, with dependence on coefficient magnitudes and subdeterminants [1, Theorem 1.1]. Both algorithms use two-sided moves and curvature information to control branching, and Theorem 3.3 addresses a different subproblem: for an arbitrary symmetric Q , it decides whether $d^T Q d < 0$ for some $d \in K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$.

The coefficient-magnitude dependence in the preceding methods reflects their use of curvature-controlled branching over the feasible region. Our method instead tests h only at integer points of a symmetric direction polytope. Nonnegativity at one scale yields supporting inequalities on a constant-size cover of the next, and the cover is reused across $O(\log B)$ scales. Thus the running time is controlled by bit length through the number of scales, rather than by coefficient magnitudes through the number of regions. To our knowledge, neither this multiscale transfer nor its use to furnish the integer supporting inequalities required by the exact cutting procedure has appeared previously. The different parameter dependences preclude a direct running-time comparison with the preceding methods.

Three external routines are used throughout. The geometric one is the deterministic constant-depth integer-point algorithm of Basu and Oertel [3, Theorem 4.5, pp. 885–886]; an exact maximum-depth centerpoint is not needed. For unboundedness preprocessing we use polynomial-time integer-hull vertex enumeration in fixed dimension, after clearing row denominators, in the form given by Hildebrand, Oertel, and Weismantel [9, Theorem 5], together with their bounded-base construction [9, Lemma 2 and its proof]. The third is fixed-dimensional integer linear feasibility [14, p. 538 and Section 1, pp. 539–541]. Each of these results is stated precisely where it is used; all other arguments are proved below.

1.3 Conventions and outline

All polyhedra are given by explicit finite rational descriptions. A polytope is a bounded polyhedron and may be empty or lower-dimensional. For a positive integer k we write $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$. The symbol $\mathbf{1}$ denotes an all-ones vector of the dimension determined by context. For sets U, V we write $U + V = \{u + v : u \in U, v \in V\}$ and $U - V = \{u - v : u \in U, v \in V\}$, and for a scalar $\lambda \geq 0$ we write $\lambda U = \{\lambda u : u \in U\}$. The convex hull $\text{conv}(U)$ consists of finite convex combinations of points of U and the conic hull $\text{cone}(U)$ of finite nonnegative linear combinations, with $\text{cone}(\emptyset) = \{0\}$. The recession cone of a nonempty polyhedron $P = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$ is $\text{rec}(P) = \{d : Ad \leq 0\}$; the polyhedron is pointed if it contains no line. We write $\text{vert}(P)$ for its set of vertices and $\text{supp}(x) = \{i : x_i \neq 0\}$. For nonnegative functions ϕ and ψ and a fixed parameter r , the relation $\phi = O_r(\psi)$ means that $\phi \leq C_r \psi$ for some constant C_r depending only on r , once the remaining input quantities are sufficiently large.

Symmetrizing the objective matrix leaves the quadratic unchanged, multiplying the objective by a positive common denominator makes Q and c integral, and multiplying each constraint row by its own positive denominator makes A and b integral. All of these operations preserve feasibility, minimizers, and boundedness. A common denominator may be numerically large, but its binary length is at most the sum of the binary lengths of the denominators used to form it, so the normalized integral data have encoding length polynomial in L , which continues to denote the length of the original rational input; every polynomial bound below for the normalized data is therefore polynomial in L as well. The optimizer itself is not rescaled; when its value is reported, the normalized value is divided by the positive objective-scaling factor.

Section 2 proves optimization from integer supporting inequalities, Section 3 the homogeneous sign test, and Section 4 the case of bounded polyhedra with arbitrary linear constraints. Section 5 establishes two orthant estimates used only in preprocessing, Section 6 extends the algorithm to unbounded polyhedra, and Section 7 combines the components and proves Theorem 1.1.

The dependency structure of the proof is summarized in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: Dependencies among the principal internal results used to prove Theorem 1.1. Each arrow points from a component to a later result that uses it; cited external routines are omitted.

A reader interested mainly in the multiscale sign-testing argument can read Sections 2–4 before the preprocessing sections.

2 Exact optimization from integer supporting inequalities

We begin with a simpler task. Suppose that at every feasible integer point we can evaluate the objective and obtain an affine lower bound valid at all other feasible integer points. We show how to minimize the objective using only such integer queries; no continuous evaluation procedure is assumed. Later sections construct the regions on which a quadratic has this property.

2.1 Integer points of constant halfspace depth

Let $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a rational polytope and $S = D \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$. For $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, define

$$(2.1) \quad \delta_S(z) = \inf_{a \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}} \frac{|\{x \in S : a^\top(x - z) \geq 0\}|}{|S|}.$$

A depth bound $\delta_S(z) \geq \alpha$ says that every closed halfspace containing z contains at least an α fraction of S . The measure here counts integer points and is not ordinary volume. In one dimension a median of the ordered feasible integers has positive constant depth; in higher dimensions the same must hold for every direction of a possible cut. Halfspaces whose boundary passes through z suffice in (2.1), since moving the boundary of any halfspace toward z until it meets z produces a smaller halfspace that still contains z .

Theorem 2.1 (Constant-depth integer points). *For fixed n , given a rational polytope D with $D \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$, one can compute an integer point z satisfying*

$$(2.2) \quad \delta_{D \cap \mathbb{Z}^n}(z) \geq \alpha_n, \quad \alpha_n = 2^{-n^2},$$

in deterministic polynomial time in the encoding length of D .

This is the pure-integer specialization of Basu and Oertel [3, Theorem 4.5, pp. 885–886], whose mixed-integer depth guarantee $1/(2^{n^2}(d+1)^{n+1})$ becomes α_n at $d = 0$. Since n is fixed, α_n is a positive constant, and a point of maximum depth is not required.

The point returned is feasible: if $z \notin \text{conv}(S)$, strict separation from the compact convex hull gives a closed halfspace that contains z and no point of S , whose fraction in (2.1) is zero, contradicting positive depth. Hence $z \in \text{conv}(S) \subseteq D$, and the theorem also guarantees $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.

Before every depth call, integer emptiness is tested by fixed-dimensional integer linear feasibility [14, p. 538 and Section 1, pp. 539–541]. The following observation handles lower-dimensional polytopes without changing integer coordinates.

Lemma 2.2 (A full-dimensional relaxation with the same integer points). *Let $D = \{x : Gx \leq h\}$ be bounded, with integral G, h , and suppose $D \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$. Then*

$$D^+ = \{x : Gx \leq h + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}\}$$

is bounded and full-dimensional, and $D^+ \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = D \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$.

Proof. For integer x , every entry of $Gx - h$ is integral, and such an entry is at most $1/2$ if and only if it is at most zero; the relaxation therefore adds no integer point and removes none.

Choose an integer point $z \in D$. It satisfies every defining inequality of D^+ with positive slack, and there are finitely many inequalities, so a sufficiently small open ball around z satisfies them as well. Hence D^+ is full-dimensional even when D was contained in a proper affine subspace.

Changing only the right-hand sides leaves the recession cone unchanged, and both cones equal $\{v : Gv \leq 0\}$. Because D is nonempty and bounded, this cone is $\{0\}$, so the nonempty polyhedron D^+ is bounded as well. $\square$

For rational constraints, first clear the denominators in each row. This takes polynomial time and produces a polynomial-size integral description. Applying Theorem 2.1 to D^+ gives the same depth function on the same finite integer set, and the point returned belongs to D , not merely to D^+ .

2.2 The exact cutting procedure

A useful cut must do two things: preserve every objective value better than those already recorded, and remove enough integer points to give a polynomial iteration bound. The supporting inequality provides the first property and halfspace depth the second. In the proposition below, C is fixed throughout the computation, whereas the current search polytope D shrinks after each cut.

Proposition 2.3 (Optimization from integer supporting vectors). *Fix n . Let $C \subseteq [-B, B]^n$ be a rational polytope, with integral $B \geq 1$, and put $S = C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. Suppose $F : S \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ admits a procedure that, for each $z \in S$, returns $F(z)$ and $g(z) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying*

$$(2.3) \quad F(y) \geq F(z) + g(z)^\top(y - z) \quad (y \in S).$$

Let Λ denote the total binary encoding length of C , B , and all additional input data specifying F and g . Suppose the procedure runs in time polynomial in Λ , and that there is a bound H , polynomial in Λ , such that $F(z)$ and $g(z)$ have encoding length at most H for every $z \in S$. Then one can minimize F over S , or report $S = \emptyset$, in time polynomial in Λ . The number of value and supporting-vector queries is $O_n(1 + \log B)$.

Proof. Test whether S is empty. Otherwise initialize $D = C$ and a best recorded value $\eta = +\infty$. While $D \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$, compute a point z satisfying (2.2) for this integer set, evaluate $F(z)$, record z if it improves η , and set $g = g(z)$. If $g = 0$, then (2.3) proves that z is optimal on the original set S , so return it. Otherwise replace D by

$$(2.4) \quad D \cap \{x : g^\top(x - z) \leq -1\}.$$

Preservation of an optimal value. For any $y \in S$ with $F(y) < F(z)$, inequality (2.3) gives $g^\top(y - z) < 0$; this scalar product is integral, hence at most -1 , so every strictly better point satisfies the cut. Conversely, an integer point deleted by the cut cannot have value below $F(z)$. Since z is recorded before the cut is made, it is safe to delete z itself, or other minimizers of the same value: that value remains represented by a recorded feasible point. More precisely,

$$(2.5) \quad \min\{\eta, \min_{x \in D \cap \mathbb{Z}^n} F(x)\} = \min_{x \in S} F(x)$$

holds throughout the algorithm, with empty minima interpreted as $+\infty$. If the remaining integer set becomes empty, a best recorded point is optimal.

Number of queries. For integer points, the complement of (2.4) is the closed halfspace $g^\top(x - z) \geq 0$, which contains z and hence at least an α_n fraction of the current integer set. Writing N_k for the number of remaining integer points after k cuts,

$$N_k \leq (1 - \alpha_n)^k N_0, \quad N_0 \leq (2B + 1)^n,$$

so for $N_0 \geq 1$ the upper bound drops below one as soon as

$$k > \frac{\log N_0}{-\log(1 - \alpha_n)}.$$

The denominator is a positive constant for fixed n and $\log N_0 \leq n \log(2B + 1)$, so $O_n(1 + \log B)$ cuts suffice, an integer count smaller than one being zero.

Bit complexity. By hypothesis, the bound H is uniform over $z \in S$ and depends only on the fixed input data, not on the current polytope D , whose description grows as cuts are added. Since $\|z\|_\infty \leq B$, the inequality

$$g^\top x \leq g^\top z - 1$$

has coefficients of $O_n(H + \log B)$ bits, and only $O_n(1 + \log B)$ inequalities are added, so the description of D grows linearly in the number of cuts. Every intermediate polytope, integer-feasibility test, and depth call therefore has polynomial input length, and exact rational value comparisons take polynomial time by assumption. $\square$

Algorithm 2.1 SUPPORTMINIMUM(F, g, C): optimization with integer supporting vectors

Input: Rational $C \subseteq [-B, B]^n$ with integral $B \geq 1$, and a procedure returning $F(z), g(z)$ satisfying (2.3) with the complexity bounds of Proposition 2.3.

Output: A minimizer of F on $C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, or the conclusion that $C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = \emptyset$.

```

1: if  $C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = \emptyset$  then
2:   return “infeasible”.
3: end if
4:  $D \leftarrow C$ ;  $\eta \leftarrow +\infty$ ;  $z_{\text{best}}$  is initially undefined.
5: while  $D \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$  do
6:   Compute an integer point  $z$  of depth at least  $\alpha_n$  for  $D \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ .
7:   if  $F(z) < \eta$  then
8:      $\eta \leftarrow F(z)$ ;  $z_{\text{best}} \leftarrow z$ .
9:   end if
10:   $a \leftarrow g(z)$ .
11:  if  $a = 0$  then
12:    return  $z$ .
13:  end if
14:   $D \leftarrow D \cap \{x : a^\top x \leq a^\top z - 1\}$ .
15: end while
16: return  $z_{\text{best}}$ .

```

The threshold -1 is essential to the progress argument, because it removes the entire cutting hyperplane, including z ; a possibly large number of integer points on that hyperplane is thereby included in the deleted fraction.

Remark 2.4 (No continuous evaluation oracle is required). For finite $S \neq \emptyset$, the function

$$\hat{F}(x) = \max_{z \in S} \{F(z) + g(z)^\top (x - z)\}$$

is convex, being a maximum of affine functions. At a point $y \in S$ every term is at most $F(y)$ by (2.3), and the term indexed by $z = y$ equals $F(y)$, so $\hat{F}(y) = F(y)$. This is the precise sense in which the procedure is a convex-optimization method. The formula may have exponentially many terms.

3 Homogeneous sign testing

For an integral symmetric matrix $Q \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$ and a nonempty bounded rational polytope $K = -K$, define the decision-and-search problem

$$(3.1) \quad \text{SIGNTEST}(Q, K) : \quad \text{find } d \in K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \text{ with } h(d) = d^\top Q d < 0, \\ \text{or report that none exists.}$$

Symmetry here means symmetry about the origin: $x \in K$ if and only if $-x \in K$. Since K is nonempty and convex, the midpoint of x and $-x$ shows that $0 \in K$. We seek only a negative integer point, not the minimum of h on K , so any negative point found in a subset of K solves the problem. The linear coefficient c of the original objective plays no role here.

3.1 A cover whose within-cell differences are small

To use the support inequality we must control differences of points rather than the points themselves. The next lemma covers K by cells all of whose differences lie in $K/2$, using a number of cells that depends only on the dimension. A coordinate grid with a fixed Euclidean step would not give such a bound for a long or thin polytope, so we choose coordinates adapted to the shape of K . The existence and coefficient bound for the resulting maximum-determinant barycentric spanner are due to Awerbuch and Kleinberg [2, Proposition 2.2]. Because the dimension is fixed, we find a maximizing tuple by enumerating the vertices; the remaining steps turn its inner-outer comparison into the stated rational cover.

Lemma 3.1 (Small-difference cover). *Fix n . Let $K = -K$ be a nonempty bounded rational polytope, and let $r = \dim K$. If $r = 0$, then $K = \{0\}$. If $r > 0$, one can construct rational polytopes $C_1, \dots, C_N$ in polynomial time. Every cell has polynomial encoding length, and*

$$(3.2) \quad K = \bigcup_{j=1}^N C_j, \quad C_j \subseteq K, \quad C_j - C_j \subseteq \tfrac{1}{2}K, \quad N \leq (4r)^r.$$

Proof. First suppose $r = n$. We construct an outer coordinate box and an inner convex hull of signed coordinate vectors, which together control coverage and differences. Enumerate the vertices of K and, among all n -tuples of these vertices, choose $v_1, \dots, v_n$ maximizing

$$|\det V|, \quad V = [v_1 \ \cdots \ v_n].$$

The maximum is positive because the vertices span $\mathbb{R}^n$.

An outer parallelotope. We claim that

$$(3.3) \quad K \subseteq V[-1, 1]^n.$$

For $x \in K$, write $x = Vt = \sum_j t_j v_j$ and, for any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, let $V_i(y)$ be V with its i th column replaced by y . Multilinearity of the determinant gives $\det V_i(x) = t_i \det V$, since a contribution from $t_j v_j$ with $j \neq i$ repeats the column v_j and has determinant zero. The function $y \mapsto \det V_i(y)$ is linear on $\mathbb{R}^n$, so its largest absolute value over the polytope K is attained at a vertex w , as one sees by maximizing the function and its negative separately. The columns of $V_i(w)$ are all vertices of K , so $V_i(w)$ is one of the tuples considered in the choice of V , and maximality gives $|\det V_i(w)| \leq |\det V|$; if w coincides with some v_j for $j \neq i$, the determinant is zero and the inequality is trivial. Hence

$$|t_i| |\det V| = |\det V_i(x)| \leq |\det V_i(w)| \leq |\det V|,$$

and since $\det V \neq 0$, we obtain $|t_i| \leq 1$ for every i , which proves (3.3).

An inner crosspolytope. Since K is symmetric and convex,

$$(3.4) \quad V\{t : \|t\|_1 \leq 1\} = \text{conv}\{\pm v_1, \dots, \pm v_n\} \subseteq K.$$

The set with coordinate ℓ_1 -norm at most one thus lies inside K , while the set with coordinate ℓ_∞ -norm at most one contains K . It is this comparison that makes the cover independent of the aspect ratio of K .

Divide each coordinate interval $[-1, 1]$ into $4n$ closed intervals of length $1/(2n)$. The resulting $(4n)^n$ boxes R_j cover $[-1, 1]^n$, and we set

$$C_j = K \cap VR_j.$$

These cells cover K by (3.3). If $x, y \in C_j$, then the width of each coordinate interval gives

$$\|V^{-1}(x - y)\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2n},$$

and summing the n coordinate differences gives $\|V^{-1}(x - y)\|_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Hence $2V^{-1}(x - y)$ has ℓ_1 -norm at most one, and (3.4) yields $2(x - y) \in K$, that is, $x - y \in K/2$; this is what dictates the interval width $1/(2n)$.

Lower-dimensional sets. Suppose $0 < r < n$. Symmetry implies that the affine hull of K is its linear span W , and since the affine hull of a polytope is that of its vertices, the vertices of K span W . Choose r linearly independent vertices, let E be the $n \times r$ matrix with these columns, and put $L = (E^\top E)^{-1} E^\top$, a rational $r \times n$ matrix with $LE = I_r$. Then $W = \{Eu : u \in \mathbb{R}^r\}$ and $x = ELx$ for every $x \in W$, so the map $\Psi(x) = Lx$ is a linear bijection from W onto $\mathbb{R}^r$ with inverse $u \mapsto Eu$. If K is described by the inequalities $a_i^\top x \leq b_i$ for $i \in [p]$, then

$$\Psi(K) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^r : (E^\top a_i)^\top u \leq b_i \text{ for } i \in [p]\},$$

because $x \in K$ if and only if $x = Eu$ for some u satisfying these inequalities. Thus $\Psi(K)$ is a rational polytope in $\mathbb{R}^r$; it is symmetric because Ψ is linear, full-dimensional because Ψ is a bijection and K spans W , and its vertices are the images $\Psi(v)$ of the vertices v of K , so no second enumeration is needed.

Apply the determinant construction to $\Psi(K)$ in dimension r . It yields an $r \times r$ vertex matrix V' and cells $C'_j = \Psi(K) \cap V'R_j$, where $R_j \subseteq [-1, 1]^r$ ranges over the $(4r)^r$ boxes of side $1/(2r)$. Each box is described by the $2r$ rational inequalities bounding the coordinates of $V'^{-1}u$ above and below, and substituting $u = Lx$ turns each of them into a rational inequality in the original variables. Define

$$C_j = \{x \in K : V'^{-1}Lx \in R_j\},$$

that is, the original description of K together with these $2r$ substituted inequalities. The cells satisfy (3.2). They lie in K by definition, and they cover K because for $x \in K$ the point $\Psi(x)$ lies in some C'_j , whence $x \in C_j$. For the difference property, let $x, y \in C_j$ and put $u = Lx$ and $v = Ly$. Then $u, v \in C'_j$, so $2(u - v) \in \Psi(K)$ by the full-dimensional case, and applying the inverse map gives

$$2(x - y) = E(2(u - v)) \in E\Psi(K) = K,$$

using $x = Eu$ and $y = Ev$. Hence $x - y \in K/2$. If $r = 0$, symmetry gives $K = \{0\}$.

Construction and encoding lengths. Suppose the input description of K has p inequalities. For fixed n , its vertices can be enumerated by testing all choices of n linearly independent active constraint rows. This remains complete when K is lower-dimensional, because the active row normals at an extreme point must span $\mathbb{R}^n$. There are at most $\binom{p}{n}$ candidate systems, and solving the resulting rational linear systems and checking feasibility gives polynomially many vertices of polynomial encoding length. The matrices E , L , and $E^\top a_i$ of the lower-dimensional case are formed from r vertices by rational linear algebra and have polynomial encoding length. In fixed dimension there are polynomially many vertex tuples, and their determinants and inverses have polynomial encoding length, so all cell inequalities do as well. $\square$

3.2 A multiscale test for negative integer directions

Lemma 3.2 (One-step nonnegativity propagation). *Let $K, C_1, \dots, C_N$ satisfy (3.2). Suppose*

$$(3.5) \quad h(d) \geq 0 \quad (d \in \tfrac{1}{2}K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n).$$

Then:

(i) *at every $x \in C_j \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ the integral vector $2Qx$ supports h on that cell,*

$$(3.6) \quad h(y) \geq h(x) + (2Qx)^\top(y - x) \quad (x, y \in C_j \cap \mathbb{Z}^n);$$

(ii) *consequently the N cell minimizations of Proposition 2.3 either return a point $d \in K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $h(d) < 0$, or establish that h is nonnegative on $K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$.*

Proof. Part (i) is the quadratic identity. Fix integer points $x, y \in C_j$; their difference $d = y - x$ is integral and lies in $K/2$ by (3.2), so (3.5) gives $h(d) \geq 0$, and taking $c = 0$ in (1.3),

$$h(y) - h(x) - (2Qx)^\top(y - x) = h(d) \geq 0.$$

Part (ii) is where the scale is passed. At an integer point x of a cell, $2Qx$ and $h(x)$ are integral, since Q is, and their encoding lengths are polynomial because the cell lies in a bounded box; with part (i) they meet the hypotheses of Proposition 2.3, which therefore returns the exact minimum of h on $C_j \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, or reports that this set is empty. A negative minimum is an integer witness in K . If instead every nonempty cell has a nonnegative minimum, then h is nonnegative on $K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, because the cells cover K . $\square$

The hypothesis (3.5) is not a separate assumption to be discharged: the algorithm below establishes it at the smallest scale, where the origin is the only integer point, and at every later scale inherits it from part (ii) at the preceding one.

Theorem 3.3 (Homogeneous sign testing in fixed dimension). *For every fixed n , problem (3.1) is solvable in deterministic polynomial time for every integral symmetric matrix Q . If $K \subseteq [-B, B]^n$ with integral $B \geq 1$, the algorithm uses $O_n((1 + \log B)^2)$ calls to the depth routine.*

Proof. Step 1: choose the smallest scale. Find an integral $B \geq 1$ with $K \subseteq [-B, B]^n$, for instance by optimizing each coordinate over K ; its binary length is polynomial in the input length. Let τ be the least nonnegative integer with $2^\tau > B$, and put

$$K_t = 2^{-t}K \quad (t = 0, \dots, \tau).$$

Every $d \in K_\tau$ satisfies $|d_i| \leq 2^{-\tau}B < 1$ in each coordinate, and an integer vector with this property must be zero. Since $0 \in K_\tau$ and $h(0) = 0$, nonnegativity at the smallest scale is known without an optimization call. Note that scaling the set does not scale the lattice: every query still uses $\mathbb{Z}^n$.

Step 2: reuse one cover at all scales. Compute the cover $C_1, \dots, C_N$ of K from Lemma 3.1 and, for every scale t , use the scaled cells $C_{t,j} = 2^{-t}C_j$, which satisfy

$$(3.7) \quad K_t = \bigcup_j C_{t,j}, \quad C_{t,j} - C_{t,j} \subseteq K_{t+1}.$$

Step 3: move from a certified smaller set to the next larger set. Process $t = \tau - 1, \tau - 2, \dots, 0$; although the index decreases, the sets increase, since $K_{t+1} = K_t/2 \subseteq K_t$. At the beginning of the iteration with index t , the invariant is

$$(3.8) \quad h(d) \geq 0 \quad (d \in K_{t+1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^n).$$

Apply Lemma 3.2 to K_t and its cells $C_{t,j}$, whose differences lie in K_{t+1} by (3.7). By part (ii), the cell minimizations either return a point $d \in K_t \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $h(d) < 0$, which we return at once since $K_t \subseteq K$ and its value need not be the minimum over K , or establish nonnegativity on $K_t \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, which is the invariant for the next iteration. Together with the base case this completes the induction, and reaching the end of scale $t = 0$ without a negative point proves nonnegativity on $K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$.

Step 4: bound the work at all scales. There are $O(1 + \log B)$ scales, each with at most $(4n)^n$ cells, or fewer if K is lower-dimensional. Each cell lies in $[-B, B]^n$ and needs $O_n(1 + \log B)$ depth calls by Proposition 2.3. The cuts made inside one cell optimization change neither K_t nor the cover, so these three counts multiply, which proves the stated call bound.

For bit complexity, let $M = \max\{1, \max_{i,j} |Q_{ij}|\}$. Every integer query point z satisfies $\|z\|_\infty \leq B$, so

$$(3.9) \quad \|2Qz\|_\infty \leq 2nMB, \quad |(2Qz)^\top z - 1| \leq 2n^2MB^2 + 1,$$

so, with Q included among the additional input data of Proposition 2.3, its bound H is $O_n(\log M + \log B)$ and the supporting cuts and the values $h(z)$ have polynomial encoding length. An inequality $a^\top x \leq b$ for an unscaled cell becomes $a^\top x \leq 2^{-t}b$ for its scaled copy, so the binary length of each coefficient increases by at most $O(t)$ and the entire description remains polynomial in size. The cells, their scaled copies, and the cuts and values bounded above therefore give Proposition 2.3 inputs of polynomial length, which proves polynomial bit complexity. $\square$

Algorithm 3.1 SIGNTEST(Q, K): a multiscale test for negative integer directions

Input: Integral symmetric matrix Q ; nonempty bounded rational $K = -K$.

Output: A point $d \in K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $d^\top Qd < 0$, or the conclusion that $d^\top Qd \geq 0$ for every $d \in K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$.

```

1: if  $\dim K = 0$  then
2:   return “nonnegative on  $K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ ”.
3: end if
4: Compute  $B \geq 1$  with  $K \subseteq [-B, B]^n$ , and choose  $\tau$  with  $2^\tau > B$ .
5: Construct a cover  $C_1, \dots, C_N$  as in Lemma 3.1.
6: Nonnegativity is known on  $2^{-\tau}K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = \{0\}$ .
7: for  $t = \tau - 1, \tau - 2, \dots, 0$  do
8:   for  $j = 1, \dots, N$  do
9:      $z \leftarrow \text{SUPPORTMINIMUM}(h, x \mapsto 2Qx, 2^{-t}C_j)$ .
10:    if  $z$  is feasible and  $h(z) < 0$  then
11:      return  $z$ .
12:    end if
13:  end for
14:  Nonnegativity is now established on  $2^{-t}K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ .
15: end for
16: return “nonnegative on  $K \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ ”.

```

Example 3.4. Let $M \geq 2$ be integral, put $E_r = [-r, r]^2$, and define

$$q_M(u, v) = (Mu - v)^2 - u^2.$$

Its matrix has determinant -1 , and hence one positive and one negative eigenvalue. Yet q_M is nonnegative on $E_{M-1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^2$. This is immediate when $u = 0$; for $|u| \geq 1$ and $|v| \leq M - 1$,

$$|Mu - v| \geq M|u| - (M - 1) = M(|u| - 1) + 1 \geq |u|,$$

so $q_M(u, v) \geq 0$. In contrast, $q_M(1, M) = -1$; the smallest ℓ_∞ -radius of a negative integer point is therefore exactly M . The effect is lattice-specific: E_{M-1} contains the real point $((M-1)/M, M-1)$, where $q_M = -((M-1)/M)^2 < 0$, so negativity on the real box cannot replace the integer sign test.

Taking $K = E_M$, every strict dyadic rescaling $2^{-t}K$ with $t \geq 1$ is contained in E_{M-1} . Hence, the first witness appears only at the scale $t = 0$. Both the input length and the number of dyadic levels are $\Theta(\log M)$; by contrast, scanning all integer radii up to M would be pseudopolynomial.

4 Bounded polyhedra with arbitrary linear constraints

We now minimize the full objective $f(x) = x^\top Qx + c^\top x$ over the integer points of a rational polytope $P = \{x : Ax \leq b\}$. Throughout the section the number of rows of A is part of the input; only the dimension is fixed.

The sign test of Section 3 decides whether h is nonnegative on the integer points of a direction polytope, and Proposition 2.3 minimizes a function over the integer points of a polytope once integer supporting inequalities are available there. To connect the two results, we partition $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ into regions and attach to each region C a direction polytope K_C that plays two roles: as a set of differences, it contains $y - x$ for any two points x, y of C ; as a set of moves, it satisfies $x \pm d \in P$ for every $x \in C$ and every $d \in K_C$. The constraint slacks provide such a partition. We first construct the regions, then show that only polynomially many of them are nonempty, and finally assemble the bounded algorithm.

4.1 Dyadic slack regions

Normalize the constraint rows to be integral and test integer feasibility; if $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = \emptyset$ we stop. Otherwise compute, by coordinatewise linear optimization, an integer $B \geq 1$ of polynomial binary length with $P \subseteq [-B, B]^n$, and add the inequalities $-B \leq x_j \leq B$ to the description of P , and let m be the number of rows. The slack of row i is

$$s_i(x) = b_i - a_i^\top x \quad (i \in [m]).$$

At integer points of P all slacks are nonnegative integers, and on the box $[-B, B]^n$ they are bounded by the integer

$$(4.1) \quad S = \max\{1, \max_i(|b_i| + B\|a_i\|_1)\},$$

which again has polynomial binary length.

Partition the possible slack values $0, 1, \dots, S$ into the dyadic intervals

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{I}_S = \{[0, 0]\} \cup \{[2^k, \min\{2^{k+1} - 1, S\}] : 0 \leq k \leq \lfloor \log_2 S \rfloor\},$$

that is, $[0, 0], [1, 1], [2, 3], [4, 7], \dots$, with the last interval truncated at S . A choice of an interval $[\ell_i, u_i] \in \mathcal{I}_S$ for every row defines the *slack region*

$$(4.3) \quad C = \{x : \ell_i \leq s_i(x) \leq u_i \text{ for all } i\},$$

and the region is *realized* when this polytope is nonempty. Every region lies in P , because all lower endpoints are nonnegative, and every point of $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ lies in exactly one realized region, because its slacks are integers in $[0, S]$ and the intervals partition $\{0, \dots, S\}$. As real sets the regions do not cover P : a point of P with a slack strictly between 3 and 4, say, belongs to no region. Such gaps contain no integers and are harmless.

The two roles rest on two comparisons of slacks. The difference $y - x$ of two points of a region changes each slack by at most the width $u_i - \ell_i$ of its interval, because $a_i^\top(y - x) = s_i(x) - s_i(y)$. On the other hand, a direction d with $|a_i^\top d| \leq \ell_i$ for all i can be added to or subtracted from any point of the region without leaving P , because no slack drops below zero. The dyadic intervals make every difference of the first kind a direction of the second kind: each interval is $[0, 0]$ or satisfies $1 \leq \ell_i \leq u_i \leq 2\ell_i - 1$, so in all cases

$$(4.4) \quad u_i - \ell_i \leq \ell_i.$$

In the band $4 \leq s_i(x) \leq 7$, for instance, two points differ in this slack by at most 3, while moves changing it by up to 4 are feasible in both directions. The singleton band $s_i(x) = 0$ is the extreme case: its directions satisfy $a_i^\top d = 0$ and stay on the active constraint hyperplane.

We therefore associate with a realized region the direction polytope

$$(4.5) \quad K_C = \{d : |a_i^\top d| \leq \ell_i \text{ for all } i\},$$

which contains zero and is symmetric. It is bounded because the coordinate rows are among the constraints: the slacks $B - x_j$ and $B + x_j$ of the rows $x_j \leq B$ and $-x_j \leq B$ are at most $2B$ on P , so for a realized region the lower endpoints of their intervals are at most $2B$, and (4.5) gives $|d_j| \leq 2B$. Hence $K_C \subseteq [-2B, 2B]^n$, and K_C is an admissible input of the sign test.

Lemma 4.1 (Slack-based curvature dichotomy). *Let C be a realized region.*

(i) *If $h(d) < 0$ for some integer $d \in K_C$, then no point of $C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ minimizes f over $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$.*

(ii) *If $h(d) \geq 0$ for every integer $d \in K_C$, then*

$$(4.6) \quad f(y) \geq f(x) + (2Qx + c)^\top(y - x) \quad (x, y \in C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n).$$

Proof. Let $x \in C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $d \in K_C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. For every row,

$$s_i(x \pm d) = s_i(x) \mp a_i^\top d \geq \ell_i - |a_i^\top d| \geq 0,$$

so $x + d$ and $x - d$ are integer points of P . Adding the identity (1.3) for $y = x + d$ and for $y = x - d$ gives

$$(4.7) \quad f(x + d) + f(x - d) - 2f(x) = 2h(d).$$

If $h(d) < 0$, one of the two feasible neighbors has a strictly smaller objective value than x , so x is not a minimizer. This proves (i).

For (ii), let $x, y \in C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. By (4.4),

$$|a_i^\top(y - x)| = |s_i(x) - s_i(y)| \leq u_i - \ell_i \leq \ell_i$$

for every row, so $y - x$ is an integer point of K_C and $h(y - x) \geq 0$. Now (1.3) gives (4.6). $\square$

A realized region is *retained* when case (ii) applies and *discarded* otherwise. The proof uses K_C in both roles. In case (i) it is a set of moves: the better neighbor $x \pm d$ lies in P but need not lie in C . In case (ii) it is a set of differences: $y - x \in K_C$ because both x and y lie in C . A retained region may contain no integer point at all; Proposition 2.3 then reports this, and the region contributes nothing.

4.2 Enumerating the realized regions

There are $|\mathcal{I}_S|^m$ formal interval patterns, exponentially many in m . The m slacks, however, are affine functions of the same n variables, and in fixed dimension only polynomially many patterns are realized. We count the realized regions through the hyperplane arrangement formed by the interval endpoints and generate them row by row.

Lemma 4.2 (Counting and generating slack regions). *For fixed n , the number of realized regions (4.3), of all dimensions, is*

$$(4.8) \quad O_n((m(1 + \log S) + 1)^n),$$

and they can be generated in polynomial time.

Proof. The endpoint arrangement. Consider the hyperplanes $s_i(x) = t$ for every row with $a_i \neq 0$ and every endpoint t of an interval in $\mathcal{I}_S$; a zero row has constant slack and contributes nothing. There are

$$N = O(m(1 + \log S))$$

distinct ones, among them the constraint boundaries $s_i(x) = 0$. The arrangement partitions $\mathbb{R}^n$ into *faces*: two points belong to the same face when they lie on the same hyperplanes and on the same sides of all other hyperplanes. Faces have all dimensions from 0 to n .

Face count. An arrangement of N affine hyperplanes in $\mathbb{R}^n$ has $O_n((N + 1)^n)$ faces. Fix a dimension r . The affine hull of an r -dimensional face is the intersection of the hyperplanes containing it, hence of at most $n - r$ independent ones, so there are $O_n((N + 1)^{n-r})$ candidate hulls. Within a fixed r -dimensional hull, the faces having this hull are the full-dimensional cells of the arrangement restricted to the hull, and there are $O_n((N + 1)^r)$ of them: inserting the hyperplanes one at a time, each new hyperplane creates at most as many cells as the restricted arrangement on it has, so induction on the dimension applies. Multiplying the two bounds and summing over r gives the claim.

From regions to faces. Let C be the region of the pattern $[\ell_i, u_i]$, $i \in [m]$. A point x lies in C exactly when

$$s_i(x) - \ell_i \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad s_i(x) - u_i \leq 0 \quad (i \in [m]),$$

and for a row with $a_i \neq 0$ the hyperplanes $s_i(x) = \ell_i$ and $s_i(x) = u_i$ belong to the arrangement, because ℓ_i and u_i are interval endpoints, while for a zero row both conditions are constant on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Two points of the same face lie on, or on the same side of, each of these hyperplanes, so they satisfy the same conditions: either both lie in C or neither does. Hence every region is a union of faces. For the singleton interval $[0, 0]$ the two conditions force $s_i(x) = 0$, and the faces making up the region lie on that hyperplane. Next, two different patterns choose different intervals for some slack s_i , and different intervals of $\mathcal{I}_S$ are disjoint, so no point satisfies both patterns: distinct regions are disjoint, and no face lies in two of them. Choosing one face inside each realized region, which exists because the region is nonempty, therefore defines an injection from the realized regions into the faces of the arrangement, and the face count gives (4.8). The injection may send a region to a face of any dimension, which is why the face count includes all of them: a singleton interval confines a region to a hyperplane, equality constraints in the input confine it to a smaller affine subspace still, and such a region may contain every integer optimizer.

Generation. Start from P and process the rows in order: intersect each current region with each interval of $\mathcal{I}_S$ for the next row, and keep the intersections that are nonempty, which linear programming decides in polynomial time, whatever their dimension. At every stage the current regions are unions of faces of the full arrangement and pairwise disjoint, so their number is bounded

by (4.8) at every stage and not only at the end. Each region is described by the rows of P and at most two further inequalities per processed row. With m stages, $|\mathcal{I}_S| = O(1 + \log S)$ intervals per stage, and polynomially many surviving regions, the generation takes polynomial time. $\square$

4.3 The bounded algorithm

Theorem 4.3 (Bounded integer quadratic programming). *For every fixed n , minimizing an arbitrary rational quadratic over the integer points of a rational polytope can be done in polynomial time. Integer infeasibility is detected as well.*

Algorithm 4.1 BOUNDEDQUADRATIC(Q, c, P): exact minimization on a bounded polyhedron

Input: Integral symmetric matrix Q , integral vector c , and rational polytope P in fixed dimension.

Output: An exact minimizer of f on $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, or the conclusion that $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = \emptyset$.

```

1: if  $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = \emptyset$  then
2:   return “infeasible”.
3: end if
4: Normalize the constraint rows; compute  $B$  and add the bounds  $-B \leq x \leq B$ .
5: Generate the realized slack regions by Lemma 4.2.
6:  $\eta \leftarrow +\infty$ ;  $x_{\text{best}}$  is initially undefined.
7: for each realized region  $C$  do
8:   Form  $K_C$  from (4.5).
9:   if SIGNTEST( $Q, K_C$ ) returns “nonnegative on  $K_C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ ” then
10:     $z \leftarrow \text{SUPPORTMINIMUM}(f, x \mapsto 2Qx + c, C)$ .
11:    if  $z$  is a feasible point and  $f(z) < \eta$  then
12:       $\eta \leftarrow f(z)$ ;  $x_{\text{best}} \leftarrow z$ .
13:    end if
14:  end if
15: end for
16: return  $x_{\text{best}}$ .

```

Proof. By the normalization convention of Section 1, we may assume that Q is symmetric and that Q, c are integral. The procedure is Algorithm 4.1. After normalization and the integer-feasibility test, it computes B , generates the realized regions by Lemma 4.2, and runs the sign test SIGNTEST(Q, K_C) of Theorem 3.3 on each region. A negative witness discards the region. Otherwise the region is retained, (4.6) is the hypothesis (2.3) of Proposition 2.3 for $F = f$ and the integral vector $g(z) = 2Qz + c$ on $C \subseteq [-B, B]^n$, and Proposition 2.3 minimizes f over $C \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ exactly or reports that this set is empty. The best of the minimizers found is returned.

Correctness. The set $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ is finite and nonempty, so f has a minimizer x^* on it. The region containing x^* is not discarded, since by Lemma 4.1(i) a discarded region contains no global minimizer; it is retained, and the exact minimization over it returns a point with the optimal value $f(x^*)$. Every recorded point is feasible, so the best recorded point is a global minimizer.

Running time. The regions are polynomially many by Lemma 4.2, their descriptions and those of the polytopes K_C have polynomial length, and each sign test runs in polynomial time by Theorem 3.3. Put

$$M = \max\{1, \max_{i,j} |Q_{ij}|, \max_i |c_i|\}.$$

Every query point z of Proposition 2.3 is an integer point of $[-B, B]^n$, so

$$(4.9) \quad \|2Qz + c\|_\infty \leq 2nMB + M,$$

$$(4.10) \quad |(2Qz + c)^\top z - 1| \leq 2n^2MB^2 + nMB + 1,$$

$$(4.11) \quad |f(z)| \leq n^2MB^2 + nMB.$$

The supporting vectors, cuts, and objective values therefore have encoding length $H = O_n(\log M + \log B)$; here Q, c are the additional input data in Proposition 2.3. That proposition performs $O_n(1 + \log B)$ iterations on each retained region. All arithmetic is rational, and the total running time is polynomial. $\square$

In Section 7 the algorithm is applied to unbounded polyhedra clipped by a search box. The box inequalities are then ordinary rows of the input polytope, so the moves of Lemma 4.1 remain inside the box, and the preprocessing of Section 6 guarantees beforehand that the box contains a global optimizer.

5 Two orthant estimates for preprocessing

In Section 6 a feasible point of an unbounded polyhedron will be written as a bounded base point plus a nonnegative integer combination of recession generators, which turns the objective into a quadratic in the nonnegative integer coefficients. This section answers two questions about such a quadratic without calling a quadratic optimization algorithm: whether it is unbounded below, and, if it is not, how large one optimizer must be.

For this section only, write

$$(5.1) \quad \varphi(z) = z^\top H z + a^\top z, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}^k,$$

where $H \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ is symmetric, $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and the dimension k is fixed. We consider the restrictions of φ to both $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^k$ and $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^k$. For $I \subseteq [k]$, the subscripts a_I and H_{II} denote the restriction of a to I and the principal submatrix of H indexed by I , respectively. A matrix H is *copositive* when $u^\top H u \geq 0$ for every $u \geq 0$.

5.1 Boundedness and rational ray witnesses

Proposition 5.1 is the specialization to the nonnegative orthant of Eaves' boundedness and solvability criterion for quadratic programs on polyhedra [6, Theorem 3 and Corollary 4, p. 702]. We include a proof to keep the section self-contained. Necessity follows from the behaviour of φ along fixed rays. For sufficiency, where a sequence can tend to infinity while changing direction, the proof adds a small positive quadratic term, studies the minimizers of the perturbed function, and shows that any divergent component would produce a ray that the conditions forbid.

Proposition 5.1 (Eaves' criterion on the orthant). *For real H, a , the function φ is bounded below on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^k$ if and only if*

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} u^\top H u &\geq 0 \quad \text{for all } u \geq 0, \\ a^\top u &\geq 0 \quad \text{for all } u \geq 0 \text{ with } u^\top H u = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Necessity. For fixed $u \geq 0$ we have $\varphi(tu) = t^2 u^\top H u + t a^\top u$. If $u^\top H u < 0$, the quadratic term drives this to minus infinity as $t \rightarrow \infty$; if $u^\top H u = 0$ and $a^\top u < 0$, the linear term does. A bounded-below objective therefore satisfies both conditions.

Sufficiency. Assume (5.2). The argument has four steps.

Step 1: a perturbation that attains its minimum. For $\varepsilon > 0$ put $\varphi_\varepsilon(z) = \varphi(z) + \varepsilon \|z\|_2^2$. Copositivity and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality give

$$\varphi_\varepsilon(z) \geq \varepsilon \|z\|_2^2 - \|a\|_2 \|z\|_2 \quad (z \geq 0),$$

and the right-hand side tends to $+\infty$ with $\|z\|_2$. Since the orthant is closed and φ_ε is continuous, the minimum of φ_ε over the orthant is attained; let z_ε be a minimizer.

Step 2: a common support along a subsequence. Choose $\varepsilon_j \downarrow 0$. The minimizers z_{ε_j} have only 2^k possible supports, so some subsequence has a common support I ; we pass to this subsequence and keep the notation ε_j . If $I = \emptyset$, then $z_{\varepsilon_j} = 0$, so for every $z \geq 0$ optimality gives $\varphi_{\varepsilon_j}(z) \geq \varphi_{\varepsilon_j}(0) = 0$, and letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ shows that $\varphi \geq 0$ on the orthant.

Suppose instead that $I \neq \emptyset$, and put $G = H_{II}$. On the face $\{z \geq 0 : z_i = 0 \text{ for } i \notin I\}$ the function φ_{ε_j} becomes

$$y \mapsto y^\top G y + a_I^\top y + \varepsilon_j \|y\|_2^2 \quad (y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|I|}),$$

and $y = z_{\varepsilon_j, I}$ minimizes it. All coordinates of this minimizer are positive, so it is an interior minimizer: the gradient vanishes there and the Hessian is positive semidefinite. Dividing both conditions by two gives

$$(5.3) \quad (G + \varepsilon_j I_{|I|}) z_{\varepsilon_j, I} = -\frac{1}{2} a_I, \quad G + \varepsilon_j I_{|I|} \succeq 0,$$

where $I_{|I|}$ is the identity matrix. Letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ in the second condition gives $G \succeq 0$; this concerns the principal submatrix on I only, and the full matrix H need not be positive semidefinite.

Step 3: no divergence in the kernel of G . Let Π_0 be the orthogonal projector onto $\ker G$ and, for each distinct positive eigenvalue λ of G , let Π_λ be the projector onto its eigenspace. Solving the first relation in (5.3) componentwise in this orthogonal decomposition gives

$$(5.4) \quad z_{\varepsilon_j, I} = -\frac{1}{2\varepsilon_j} \Pi_0 a_I - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\lambda > 0} \frac{1}{\lambda + \varepsilon_j} \Pi_\lambda a_I.$$

The terms with $\lambda > 0$ stay bounded as $j \rightarrow \infty$, so only the kernel term can diverge. Multiplying by ε_j gives

$$(5.5) \quad \varepsilon_j z_{\varepsilon_j, I} \longrightarrow u = -\frac{1}{2} \Pi_0 a_I.$$

The vectors on the left are nonnegative, so $u \geq 0$, and $Gu = 0$. Extending u by zeros outside I gives a nonnegative vector $\tilde{u}$ with $\tilde{u}^\top H \tilde{u} = u^\top G u = 0$, so the second condition in (5.2) yields $a_I^\top u = a^\top \tilde{u} \geq 0$. On the other hand, since an orthogonal projector is symmetric and idempotent,

$$a_I^\top u = -\frac{1}{2} a_I^\top \Pi_0 a_I = -\frac{1}{2} \|\Pi_0 a_I\|_2^2 \leq 0.$$

Hence $\Pi_0 a_I = 0$, the kernel term in (5.4) vanishes, and the minimizers z_{ε_j} remain bounded.

Step 4: a common lower bound. We may assume $\varepsilon_j \leq 1$. The points z_{ε_j} and the parameters ε_j range over bounded sets, so the values $\varphi_{\varepsilon_j}(z_{\varepsilon_j})$ have a finite lower bound m . For every $z \geq 0$ and every j , optimality gives

$$\varphi_{\varepsilon_j}(z) \geq \varphi_{\varepsilon_j}(z_{\varepsilon_j}) \geq m,$$

and letting $j \rightarrow \infty$ gives $\varphi(z) \geq m$. The same m serves for every z in the orthant, which proves sufficiency. $\square$

For rational data the two conditions of (5.2) can be tested by linear programs. Murty and Kabadi proved that noncopositivity is NP-complete when k is part of the input; equivalently, copositivity is co-NP-complete [16, Theorem 3, p. 125]. Copositivity is equivalently nonnegativity of the quadratic form on the standard simplex, and classical characterizations enumerate its nonempty faces, or equivalently the associated principal submatrices [11, Proposition 1.3 and Corollary 4.5]. The corresponding enumeration below over the $2^k - 1$ nonempty supports is where fixed k enters. For every nonempty $I \subseteq [k]$ consider

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \min \quad \lambda \\ & \text{subject to} \quad H_{II}u = \lambda \mathbf{1}, \\ & \quad \mathbf{1}^\top u = 1, \quad u \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where some of the programs may be infeasible. Multiplying the first constraint by $u^\top$ shows that every feasible pair satisfies $u^\top H_{II}u = \lambda \mathbf{1}^\top u = \lambda$.

Lemma 5.2 (Two families of linear programs). *The matrix H is copositive if and only if no program in (5.6) has a negative optimum. If H is copositive, the second condition in (5.2) holds if and only if every feasible program in*

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} & \min \quad a_I^\top u \\ & \text{subject to} \quad H_{II}u = 0, \quad \emptyset \neq I \subseteq [k], \\ & \quad \mathbf{1}^\top u = 1, \quad u \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

has a nonnegative optimum.

Proof. *The first family tests copositivity.* If some program in (5.6) has a feasible pair (u, λ) with $\lambda < 0$, then $u^\top H_{II}u = \lambda < 0$, and extending u by zeros gives a nonnegative vector of negative curvature. Conversely, suppose H is not copositive. Dividing a nonnegative vector of negative curvature by its positive coordinate sum shows that the minimum of $u^\top H u$ over the simplex $\{u \geq 0 : \mathbf{1}^\top u = 1\}$ is negative. The simplex is compact; choose a minimizer and let I be its support. On the face of the simplex with this support all coordinates in I are positive, so the minimizer is stationary under the single constraint $\mathbf{1}^\top u_I = 1$, which gives $H_{II}u_I = \lambda \mathbf{1}$ for some scalar λ . By the computation above, $\lambda = u^\top H u < 0$, so the program indexed by I has a negative optimum.

The second family tests the linear term on zero-curvature rays. Assume H copositive. A feasible u of (5.7) satisfies $H_{II}u = 0$, so its extension by zeros has zero curvature, and a negative value $a_I^\top u$ violates the second condition in (5.2). Conversely, suppose $u \geq 0$ is nonzero with $u^\top H u = 0$ and $a^\top u < 0$, and let $I = \text{supp}(u)$. By copositivity, the function $y \mapsto y^\top H_{II}y$ is nonnegative on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|I|}$ and vanishes at u_I , whose coordinates are all positive; so u_I is an interior minimizer, its gradient $2H_{II}u_I$ vanishes, and $u_I/\mathbf{1}^\top u_I$ is feasible for (5.7) with negative objective value. $\square$

Corollary 5.3 (An orthant boundedness algorithm). *For fixed k and rational H, a , one can decide in polynomial time whether φ is bounded below on $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^k$. This is equivalent to boundedness on $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^k$. In the unbounded case, the algorithm returns a nonzero $w \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^k$ with $\varphi(tw) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. The two families consist of at most $2(2^k - 1)$ linear programs, each with a bounded feasible region, since u ranges over a simplex and $\lambda = u^\top H_{II}u$ is then bounded as well. Each is solved exactly in polynomial time, in fixed dimension even by enumerating basic solutions, and a negative optimum is attained at a rational vertex of polynomial encoding length. Extending its u by zeros and clearing denominators gives a nonzero integer $w \geq 0$ of polynomial encoding length with either

$w^\top Hw < 0$, or $w^\top Hw = 0$ and $a^\top w < 0$; in both cases $\varphi(tw) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ through the integers. If neither family has a negative optimum, Proposition 5.1 gives a real lower bound, which is in particular a lower bound on the integer orthant. The two cases prove the algorithm and the equivalence. $\square$

We denote this algorithm by `ORTHANTBOUNDEDNESS`(H, a). For $k = 0$ the orthant is a single point, the objective is zero, and the test reports boundedness.

5.2 A polynomial-size orthant optimizer

For $k \geq 1$ and $M \geq 1$, define

$$(5.8) \quad \mathcal{B}_k(M) = 1 + (k+1)k!((k+1)M)^k,$$

whose binary length is $O_k(1 + \log M)$ for fixed k . The bound below must hold even when the Hessian on the support of the optimizer is singular, which is why the proof passes through a pointed cone instead of inverting that Hessian.

Lemma 5.4 (A small orthant optimizer). *Let H, a be integral, let*

$$M = \max\{1, \max_{i,j} |H_{ij}|, \max_i |a_i|\},$$

and suppose φ is bounded below on $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^k$. Then φ has an optimizer $z^ \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^k$ with $\|z^*\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{B}_k(M)$.*

Proof. Because 0 is feasible and H, a are integral, the feasible objective values form a nonempty subset of $\mathbb{Z}$. This set is bounded below by assumption and therefore has a least element, so the minimum is attained. Among all optimizers choose one, z^* , of minimum ℓ_1 -norm; this is possible because $\|z\|_1$ takes nonnegative integer values on the feasible set. Put $I = \text{supp}(z^*)$ and $r = |I|$. If $r = 0$, then $z^* = 0$ and there is nothing to prove; otherwise let $G = H_{II}$.

Step 1: a bounded linear image of the optimizer. For $i \in I$ the coordinate z_i^* is at least one, so $z^* + e_i$ and $z^* - e_i$ are both feasible, and their objective values are not smaller than $\varphi(z^*)$:

$$2(Hz^*)_i + a_i + H_{ii} \geq 0, \quad -2(Hz^*)_i - a_i + H_{ii} \geq 0.$$

Since z^* vanishes outside I , together these say

$$(5.9) \quad |2(Gz_I^*)_i + a_i| \leq H_{ii} \quad (i \in I).$$

In particular $H_{ii} \geq 0$ for $i \in I$, and $2|(Gz_I^*)_i| \leq H_{ii} + |a_i| \leq 2M$, so $\|Gz_I^*\|_\infty \leq M$.

Since G may be singular, this does not yet bound z_I^* . Set

$$w = z_I^* - \mathbf{1} \geq 0, \quad t = Gz_I^* - G\mathbf{1},$$

where $w \geq 0$ because every coordinate of z_I^* is a positive integer. Then

$$(5.10) \quad Gw = t, \quad \|t\|_\infty \leq (r+1)M.$$

Adding a coordinate s turns this affine equation into a homogeneous one with bounded coefficients: the cone

$$(5.11) \quad \mathcal{K} = \{(v, s) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{r+1} : Gv - ts = 0\}$$

contains $(w, 1)$, and it is pointed, being contained in a nonnegative orthant.

Step 2: the extreme rays of $\mathcal{K}$ have small integral generators. Every entry of the matrix $R = [G, -t]$ has absolute value at most $(r+1)M$. Consider an extreme ray of $\mathcal{K}$ and let J be the support of a vector spanning it. The positive entries of that vector form an element of $\ker R_J$, and this kernel is one-dimensional: otherwise it would contain a vector not proportional to the positive one, and a sufficiently small perturbation in either sign would stay positive on J , exhibiting the ray vector as the average of two nonproportional vectors of $\mathcal{K}$, which contradicts extremality. Since R_J has r rows, $|J| - 1 \leq r$.

Choose $|J| - 1$ linearly independent rows of R_J . The signed maximal minors of this row submatrix form a nonzero integral vector in its one-dimensional kernel, which contains the positive ray vector, so after a sign change the integral vector is nonnegative, and dividing by the greatest common divisor of its entries makes it *primitive*. Each minor has order at most r and entries of absolute value at most $(r+1)M$, so every coordinate of the primitive generator is at most

$$(5.12) \quad \Delta = r!((r+1)M)^r.$$

A ray supported on a single coordinate has a unit vector as its generator and satisfies the same bound.

Step 3: the coefficients of a conic representation are at most one. The extreme rays generate $\mathcal{K}$, and conic Carathéodory gives a representation with at most $r+1$ of them:

$$(5.13) \quad (w, 1) = \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j(\rho^j, \sigma_j), \quad p \leq r+1, \quad \beta_j \geq 0,$$

where the (ρ^j, σ_j) are primitive generators, with integral coordinates between 0 and Δ . (If more than $r+1$ generators had positive coefficients, a linear dependence among them would allow the coefficients to be shifted until one vanishes.)

For a generator with $\sigma_j \geq 1$, the last coordinate of (5.13) gives

$$\beta_j \sigma_j \leq \sum_{i=1}^p \beta_i \sigma_i = 1,$$

so $\beta_j \leq 1$. The last coordinate says nothing about generators with $\sigma_j = 0$, and here the minimum-norm choice of z^* enters. Suppose $\sigma_j = 0$. Then $G\rho^j = 0$ and $\rho^j \geq 0$ is nonzero, and $a_I^\top \rho^j \geq 0$, since otherwise the integer ray obtained by extending ρ^j with zeros would have zero curvature and negative linear term, contradicting the finiteness of the optimum. Assume for contradiction that $\beta_j \geq 1$. The first r coordinates of (5.13) give

$$w - \rho^j = (\beta_j - 1)\rho^j + \sum_{i \neq j} \beta_i \rho^i \geq 0,$$

so, writing $\tilde{\rho}^j$ for the extension of ρ^j by zeros outside I , the vector $z^* - \tilde{\rho}^j$ is a nonnegative integer point. Its objective value differs from $\varphi(z^*)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(z^* - \tilde{\rho}^j) - \varphi(z^*) &= -2(z_I^*)^\top G\rho^j + (\rho^j)^\top G\rho^j - a_I^\top \rho^j \\ &= -a_I^\top \rho^j \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

A strict decrease would contradict optimality, and equality would give an optimizer of smaller ℓ_1 -norm, since a nonzero nonnegative vector was subtracted; both contradict the choice of z^* . Hence $\beta_j < 1$ whenever $\sigma_j = 0$.

Every coefficient in (5.13) is now at most one, there are at most $r + 1$ generators, and each is bounded coordinatewise by Δ . Consequently

$$\|z^*\|_\infty = \|w + \mathbf{1}\|_\infty \leq 1 + (r + 1)\Delta \leq 1 + (k + 1)k!((k + 1)M)^k = \mathcal{B}_k(M).$$

□

6 Unbounded feasible polyhedra

An unbounded feasible polyhedron need not make the objective unbounded below, and when the objective is bounded below we need a finite search region before any optimizer is known. The section proceeds in three stages: every integer feasible point is written as a bounded integer base point plus a nonnegative integer combination of at most n recession generators; finitely many orthant tests then decide integer unboundedness; and the small optimizer of Lemma 5.4 gives a search bound. Pointed polyhedra are treated first, and lines are removed at the end of the section.

6.1 A bounded set of integer base points

Let P be a nonempty pointed rational polyhedron. For fixed n , enumerating the active constraint systems of the standard homogenization of P computes in polynomial time a representation

$$(6.1) \quad P = \text{conv}(V) + \text{cone}(R),$$

with V a nonempty finite set of rational vertices and R a finite, possibly empty, set of nonzero integral recession generators. Fixed dimension bounds $|V| + |R|$ polynomially in the input length, and Cramer's rule, including the scaling of each rational ray to an integral generator, gives polynomial encoding length for every vector in $V \cup R$. Thus every point of P is a convex combination of vertices plus a nonnegative real combination of generators. An integer recession vector need not have integral coefficients in the generators, and the construction below absorbs this mismatch.

Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the family of subsets of R with at most n members, the empty subset included, and for $J \in \mathcal{J}$ let R_J be the matrix whose columns are the generators in J . Define

$$(6.2) \quad T = \text{conv}(V) + n \text{conv}(R \cup \{0\}).$$

The following bounded-base decomposition is the pure-integer specialization of Hildebrand, Oertel, and Weismantel [9, Lemma 2 and its proof], obtained by setting their continuous dimension to zero and identifying their W with R . Their coefficient-rounding argument applies equally to nonprimitive integral generators.

Lemma 6.1 (Bounded-base decomposition). *Suppose $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$. The polytope T is bounded and contained in P . Every $x \in P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ can be written as*

$$(6.3) \quad x = y + R_J z, \quad y \in T \cap \mathbb{Z}^n, \quad z \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{|J|}, \quad J \in \mathcal{J}.$$

Conversely, every point of this form belongs to $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$.

The integer-hull routine below takes T by linear inequalities. We first obtain such a description from the point representation

$$(6.4) \quad T = \text{conv}\{v + nr : v \in V, r \in R \cup \{0\}\},$$

which follows by distributing convex combinations over the sum of two convex hulls: if $p = \sum_v \lambda_v v$ and $q = \sum_r \mu_r r$, then $p + nq = \sum_{v,r} \lambda_v \mu_r (v + nr)$, and conversely every listed point lies in the sum, which is convex. The required conversion is a standard fixed-dimensional facet-enumeration result: the polynomial-time V -to- H conversion is recorded by Kaibel and Pfetsch [12, Problem 2, p. 27], and the polynomial facet-encoding bound, including for lower-dimensional rational polyhedra, follows from Grötschel, Lovász, and Schrijver [7, Lemma 6.2.4(b), p. 164]. We include a direct proof to make the affine-hull reduction and bit-complexity argument explicit in the form used below.

Lemma 6.2 (Fixed-dimensional V -to- H conversion). *For every fixed n , there is a deterministic algorithm that, given a nonempty finite set $S \subseteq \mathbb{Q}^n$, outputs a system of rational linear inequalities whose solution set is $\text{conv}(S)$. Its running time, the number of inequalities, and their encoding lengths are polynomial in the total binary encoding length of S .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \text{aff}(S)$ and put $d = \dim(\mathcal{A})$. Rational Gaussian elimination on differences of points in S computes equations for $\mathcal{A}$ and rational affine coordinates that identify $\mathcal{A}$ with $\mathbb{R}^d$. If $d = 0$, then $S = \{s_0\}$ and $\text{conv}(S) = \{s_0\}$; the $2n$ inequalities

$$x_i \leq (s_0)_i, \quad -x_i \leq -(s_0)_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

give the required description. Suppose therefore that $d \geq 1$. Every facet of $\text{conv}(S)$ relative to $\mathcal{A}$ contains d affinely independent vertices, and every vertex of $\text{conv}(S)$ belongs to S . We therefore enumerate the at most $\binom{|S|}{d}$ affinely independent d -subsets of S . In the chosen affine coordinates, each such subset spans a hyperplane. Exact rational linear algebra gives an equation $\alpha^\top u = \beta$ for that hyperplane, unique up to nonzero scaling. We evaluate $\alpha^\top u_s - \beta$ at the coordinate vector u_s of every $s \in S$. If both signs occur, the hyperplane is not supporting and we discard it; otherwise we orient the inequality so that all evaluations are nonpositive and retain it. At least one evaluation is strict because S affinely spans $\mathcal{A}$, while the equality set contains the chosen d affinely independent points. Thus every retained inequality defines a relative facet. Conversely, every relative facet contains one of the enumerated subsets, so this procedure finds all of them. Pulling the retained inequalities back to the ambient space and writing each equation defining $\mathcal{A}$ as two inequalities yields an inequality description of $\text{conv}(S)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

There are at most $\binom{|S|}{d}$ candidates, each tested against $|S|$ points, and $d \leq n$ is fixed. All linear systems involved have order at most $n + 1$ and polynomial-bit rational entries. Determinant bounds, followed if necessary by clearing denominators, therefore give polynomial encoding length for every affine-hull equation and facet inequality. Hence both the conversion time and the size of the resulting description are polynomial. $\square$

The point set in braces in (6.4) has at most $|V|(|R| + 1)$ points and has polynomial total encoding length by the bounds above. Thus Lemma 6.2 computes an inequality description of T in polynomial time.

The set T can contain exponentially many integer points, so we compute only the vertices of their convex hull.

Theorem 6.3 (Integer-hull vertex enumeration). *For every fixed n , given a bounded rational polytope T by linear inequalities, one can enumerate the vertices of $\text{conv}(T \cap \mathbb{Z}^n)$ in deterministic polynomial time in its encoding length.*

This is the pure-integer case of Hildebrand, Oertel, and Weismantel, after clearing row denominators in the inequality description of T [9, Theorem 5]. In particular, the number and the encoding lengths of these vertices are polynomially bounded.

If $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$, then $T \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$ by Lemma 6.1, so the finite set

$$(6.5) \quad Y = \text{vert}(\text{conv}(T \cap \mathbb{Z}^n))$$

is nonempty, and its members are integer points of T and hence of P . Every point of $T \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ is a convex combination of the points in Y , which is the property the next proof uses. In contrast, a vertex of the original continuous polytope T need not be integral.

6.2 An exact test for integer unboundedness

Fix $J \in \mathcal{J}$ and a base point $y \in T$. Moving from y by $R_J z$ changes the objective by a quadratic in the coefficient vector z whose quadratic part does not depend on y and whose linear part is affine in y . Define

$$(6.6) \quad F_{y,J}(z) = z^\top H_J z + a_{y,J}^\top z, \quad H_J = R_J^\top Q R_J, \quad a_{y,J} = R_J^\top (2Qy + c).$$

Expanding the objective,

$$f(y + R_J z) - f(y) = z^\top R_J^\top Q R_J z + (2Qy + c)^\top R_J z = F_{y,J}(z),$$

that is,

$$(6.7) \quad f(y + R_J z) = f(y) + F_{y,J}(z).$$

For $J = \emptyset$ the function $F_{y,J}$ is zero on the single empty vector.

Proposition 6.4 (Integer unboundedness from finitely many orthant tests). *Suppose P is pointed and $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$. The objective is bounded below on $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ if and only if every problem*

$$(6.8) \quad \inf\{F_{v,J}(z) : z \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{|J|}\}, \quad v \in Y, \quad J \in \mathcal{J},$$

is bounded below. For fixed n , these conditions can be tested in polynomial time. If f is unbounded below on $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, the tests produce the integer ray certificate (1.2).

Proof. An unbounded test gives a ray. If a problem in (6.8) is unbounded below, Corollary 5.3 returns a nonzero $w \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{|J|}$ with $F_{v,J}(tw) \rightarrow -\infty$. Put $x^0 = v$ and $d = R_J w$. Then x^0 is an integer feasible point, d is an integer recession direction, and (6.7) gives $f(x^0 + td) \rightarrow -\infty$. Moreover $d \neq 0$, since $R_J w = 0$ would make both coefficients of $t \mapsto F_{v,J}(tw)$ vanish. This proves one implication together with the ray assertion.

Bounded tests give a common bound. Suppose every problem in (6.8) is bounded below, and for each pair (v, J) let $m_{v,J}$ be a lower bound on its integer orthant. There are finitely many pairs, so

$$m = \min_{v \in Y, J \in \mathcal{J}} m_{v,J}$$

is a finite lower bound for all of them. Take any $x \in P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$ and a decomposition (6.3). Since $y \in T \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \subseteq \text{conv}(Y)$, write

$$y = \sum_{v \in Y} \theta_v v, \quad \theta_v \geq 0, \quad \sum_{v \in Y} \theta_v = 1.$$

The quadratic part of $F_{y,J}$ does not depend on the base point, and the linear part is affine in it:

$$a_{y,J} = R_J^\top (2Qy + c) = \sum_{v \in Y} \theta_v R_J^\top (2Qv + c) = \sum_{v \in Y} \theta_v a_{v,J},$$

where $\sum_v \theta_v = 1$ absorbs the constant vector c . Hence, for the integer vector z of the decomposition,

$$(6.9) \quad F_{y,J}(z) = \sum_{v \in Y} \theta_v F_{v,J}(z) \geq m.$$

The base value $f(y)$ is controlled separately, since f is not affine: f is continuous and T is compact, so $f \geq m_T$ on T for some finite m_T . By (6.7) and (6.9),

$$f(x) = f(y) + F_{y,J}(z) \geq m_T + m$$

for every $x \in P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$, with both bounds independent of x .

Running time. The representation of P , the description of T , and the set Y have polynomial size. The number of subsets J is at most

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \binom{|R|}{j} = O_n((|R| + 1)^n),$$

and every instance (6.8) has at most n variables and polynomial encoding length. Applying Corollary 5.3 to each takes polynomial time, its returned ray has polynomial encoding length, and so does the product $R_J w$. $\square$

6.3 A computable bounded search region

The aim is not to bound every optimizer but to place one optimizer in a box computed from the input. Lemma 6.1 already bounds the base point of any optimizer; Lemma 5.4 will bound a replacement coefficient vector that leaves the objective value unchanged. Assume that the integer objective on the pointed polyhedron is bounded below, and define the integers

$$(6.10) \quad V_0 = \max\{1, \lceil \max_{v \in V} \|v\|_\infty \rceil\}, \quad R_0 = \max(\{1\} \cup \{\|r\|_\infty : r \in R\}),$$

$$(6.11) \quad U = V_0 + nR_0, \quad M = \max\{1, \max_{i,j} |Q_{ij}|, \max_i |c_i|\},$$

where the convention in R_0 covers $R = \emptyset$. Every $y \in T$ satisfies $\|y\|_\infty \leq U$. Let

$$(6.12) \quad M' = \max\{1, n^2 M R_0^2, nR_0(2nMU + M)\}, \quad B = U + nR_0 \mathcal{B}_n(M').$$

All of these are computed directly from the representation (6.1) and the objective.

Proposition 6.5 (A polynomial-bit-size optimizer bound). *If P is pointed and the integer optimum is finite, there is an optimizer x^* with $\|x^*\|_\infty \leq B$, where B is given by (6.12). For fixed n , the encoding length of B is polynomial in the input length, and B is computable in polynomial time.*

Proof. The normalized objective is integer-valued, and its nonempty bounded-below set of feasible values has a minimum, so an optimizer exists. Take one and write it as $y + R_J z^*$ by Lemma 6.1. If $J = \emptyset$, its norm is at most $U \leq B$; so suppose $k = |J| > 0$.

The entries of H_J and $a_{y,J}$ are integral and uniformly bounded. Write the columns of R_J as $r_1, \dots, r_k$. The decomposition gives $y \in T \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. Since Q , c , and the columns of R_J are integral, so are H_J and $a_{y,J}$. For $i, j \in [k]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(H_J)_{ij}| &= |r_i^\top Q r_j| \\ &\leq \sum_{p,q=1}^n |(r_i)_p| |Q_{pq}| |(r_j)_q| \leq n^2 M R_0^2. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\|2Qy + c\|_\infty \leq 2nMU + M$, and for every $j \in [k]$,

$$\begin{aligned} |(a_{y,J})_j| &= |r_j^\top (2Qy + c)| \\ &\leq \sum_{p=1}^n |(r_j)_p| |(2Qy + c)_p| \leq nR_0(2nMU + M). \end{aligned}$$

Thus every entry of H_J and $a_{y,J}$ has absolute value at most M' .

A small coefficient vector with the same value. Every point $y + R_J z$ with $z \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^k$ is feasible, so by (6.7) a coefficient vector with a smaller value of $F_{y,J}$ would give a feasible point with a smaller value of f ; hence z^* minimizes $F_{y,J}$ on the integer orthant, and $F_{y,J}$ is bounded below there. Lemma 5.4 therefore provides an optimizer z' of $F_{y,J}$ with

$$\|z'\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{B}_k(M') \leq \mathcal{B}_n(M').$$

The point $x' = y + R_J z'$ is feasible, has the global optimal value by (6.7), and satisfies

$$\|x'\|_\infty \leq U + kR_0\|z'\|_\infty \leq U + nR_0\mathcal{B}_n(M') = B.$$

Encoding length. All vertices and generators have polynomial encoding length, hence so do U , R_0 , and M' , and (5.8) gives $\log \mathcal{B}_n(M') = O_n(1 + \log M')$ for fixed n . $\square$

6.4 Pointed preprocessing

Let $\text{POINTEDPREPROCESS}(Q, c, P)$ denote the following procedure for a pointed rational polyhedron. It tests integer feasibility; if $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n \neq \emptyset$, it constructs V , R , T , and Y , runs the orthant tests of Proposition 6.4, and returns an integer unboundedness certificate if one orthant objective is unbounded below and the bound B of (6.12) otherwise. By the results above the procedure runs in polynomial time, and the clipping $P \cap [-B, B]^n$ contains an optimizer.

A general polyhedron may contain a line and then is not pointed. Instead of quotienting out the lineality space, which would change the lattice, we intersect the polyhedron with the closed coordinate orthants: for each sign vector $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^n$, define

$$(6.13) \quad P_\sigma = P \cap \{x : \sigma_i x_i \geq 0 \text{ for } i \in [n]\}.$$

These 2^n closed pieces cover P , and each is pointed: if d and $-d$ were both recession directions of a piece, its sign constraints would give $\sigma_i d_i \geq 0$ and $-\sigma_i d_i \geq 0$, so $d = 0$.

For fixed n the number of pieces is constant. If f is bounded below on every integer-feasible piece, the least of these finitely many bounds is a lower bound on the union; and if f is unbounded below on one piece, its integer ray certificate is a certificate for the original problem.

7 The complete algorithm and its bit complexity

We now assemble the routines in their order of use. For each signed piece, preprocessing reports integer infeasibility, returns an unboundedness ray, or produces an optimizer-preserving search box; only in the last case do we call the bounded optimization algorithm, which creates slack regions, calls the multiscale sign test on their direction polytopes, and optimizes the retained regions using integer supporting inequalities.

The only external integer-geometric routines are fixed-dimensional integer linear feasibility, constant-depth integer-point computation, and integer-hull vertex enumeration, each of which receives an explicit rational description of polynomial size. The proof below treats correctness separately from the number and size of these calls.

Algorithm 7.1 INTEGERQUADRATIC(Q, c, A, b): fixed-dimensional integer quadratic programming

Input: Rational data for (1.1); fixed dimension n .

Output: An exact optimizer with its objective value, an integer unboundedness certificate, or the conclusion that $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n = \emptyset$.

```

1: Symmetrize  $Q$  and normalize the objective and constraint rows to be integral, recording the
   positive objective-scaling factor.
2:  $P \leftarrow \{x : Ax \leq b\}$ ;  $\eta \leftarrow +\infty$ ;  $x_{\text{best}}$  is undefined.
3: for each  $\sigma \in \{-1, 1\}^n$  do
4:   Form  $P_\sigma$  from (6.13).
5:   Run POINTEDPREPROCESS( $Q, c, P_\sigma$ ).
6:   if preprocessing reports integer infeasibility then
7:     Continue to the next sign vector.
8:   else if preprocessing returns an unboundedness pair  $(x^0, d)$  then
9:     return “unbounded below” and  $(x^0, d)$ .
10:  else
11:    Let  $B_\sigma$  be the search bound returned by preprocessing.
12:     $z \leftarrow \text{BOUNDEDQUADRATIC}(Q, c, P_\sigma \cap [-B_\sigma, B_\sigma]^n)$ .
13:    if  $f(z) < \eta$  then
14:       $\eta \leftarrow f(z)$ ;  $x_{\text{best}} \leftarrow z$ .
15:    end if
16:  end if
17: end for
18: if  $x_{\text{best}}$  is undefined then
19:   return “infeasible”.
20: end if
21: Divide  $\eta$  by the positive objective-scaling factor and return  $x_{\text{best}}$  with this value.
```

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Correctness. Each P_σ is pointed and the pieces cover P , so if all pieces are integer-infeasible, so is P . Any integer unboundedness certificate returned on a piece is valid for P , because the original inequalities are included in that piece’s description, and Proposition 6.4 shows that preprocessing returns such a certificate exactly when the objective is unbounded below on that piece’s integer points. Such a returned pair is directly verifiable using exact rational arithmetic: check $x^0, d \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $Ax^0 \leq b$, $Ad \leq 0$, and $d \neq 0$, and then check that either $d^\top Qd < 0$, or $d^\top Qd = 0$ and $(2Qx^0 + c)^\top d < 0$. In either case, the identity $f(x^0 + td) = f(x^0) + t(2Qx^0 + c)^\top d + t^2 d^\top Qd$ proves that $f(x^0 + td) \rightarrow -\infty$.

Suppose instead that the objective is bounded below on every integer-feasible piece. Each such piece has an optimizer in its computed box by Proposition 6.5, so Theorem 4.3 returns an optimizer for the entire piece rather than an arbitrary solution of its clipped problem. There are finitely many pieces, their minimum values have a smallest member, and the minimum over the union is exactly this smallest value; the best point recorded by Algorithm 7.1 is therefore a global optimizer.

Preprocessing size. The normalized integral instance can be constructed in time polynomial in L , and its total binary encoding length is polynomial in L . Positive constraint-row scalings

leave the feasible set unchanged, while multiplying the objective by a positive factor preserves its minimizers and whether it is bounded below. The number of signed pieces is 2^n , a constant for fixed n , and each piece adds only n constraint rows. The polyhedral representation, bounded-base description, integer-hull vertices, and orthant test instances have polynomial encoding length by Section 6, and there are polynomially many tests, each of dimension at most n ; their integer ray witnesses and the products forming (x^0, d) have polynomial encoding length.

Bounded search size. For a piece that passes the boundedness test, Proposition 6.5 gives $\log B_\sigma = L^{O_n(1)}$, and the input description of the clipped polytope also has polynomial length. In that description, let m_σ be the number of rows and S_σ the slack bound from (4.1); both m_σ and $1 + \log S_\sigma$ are polynomially bounded in L , so the number R_σ of realized slack regions satisfies

$$R_\sigma = O_n((m_\sigma(1 + \log S_\sigma) + 1)^n) = L^{O_n(1)}.$$

For each region, the direction polytope lies in $[-2B_\sigma, 2B_\sigma]^n$ and its sign test requires $O_n((1 + \log B_\sigma)^2)$ depth calls, while an additional $O_n(1 + \log B_\sigma)$ calls suffice to optimize a retained region. All sign tests and retained-region optimizations on this piece therefore use at most

$$(7.1) \quad O_n(R_\sigma(1 + \log B_\sigma)^2)$$

depth calls.

Bit operations. Every covering cell has polynomial encoding length by Lemma 3.1, and scaling adds only polynomially many bits. In every invocation of Proposition 2.3 on this piece, the query points are integer points of $[-2B_\sigma, 2B_\sigma]^n$ and the supporting vector is $2Qz$ or $2Qz + c$, so by (3.9) and (4.9)–(4.11) the bound H on the lengths of the cuts and objective values is $O_n(\log M + \log B_\sigma)$; since $\log M$ is polynomial in L by the normalization of Section 1 and $\log B_\sigma = L^{O_n(1)}$, we have $H = L^{O_n(1)}$ throughout. Each cell optimizer adds only logarithmically many cuts in its coordinate bound, so every integer-feasibility or depth call has polynomial input length. The imported routines run in polynomial time for fixed n . The remaining rational linear-algebra, coordinate-optimization, arrangement-generation, and exact-arithmetic operations do as well; combining these bounds over the constant number of pieces proves the total running time $L^{O_n(1)}$.

A returned optimizer lies in one of the computed boxes and has polynomial encoding length; normalization does not change this optimizer. Its value for the original objective is obtained by dividing the normalized value by the positive objective-scaling factor, and this rational value also has polynomial encoding length. This completes the proof. $\square$

7.1 Complexity accounting

The call count in (7.1) is not a bound on the total number of bit operations: a depth call has its own polynomial cost, and the vertex-tuple and hyperplane-arrangement enumerations have exponents depending on n . The result is therefore a polynomial-time algorithm for each fixed dimension, without a claimed dimension-independent polynomial exponent.

The complexity argument has two levels. First, the proof bounds the number of calls by a polynomial in the original binary input length; second, it shows that the input to each call also has polynomial length. Both statements are necessary, since a polynomial number of calls would not suffice if repeated scaling or cutting produced exponentially long coefficients, and the explicit bounds in (3.9), (4.9)–(4.11), and (6.12) prevent that growth. Because the number of calls depends on $\log B_\sigma$ and $\log S_\sigma$, and hence on the binary lengths of the numerical data, the proof establishes polynomial running time in the bit model. It does not establish a strongly polynomial bound, whose arithmetic-operation count would have to be independent of coefficient magnitudes.

8 Conclusion

We proved that integer quadratic programming with rational data is solvable in polynomial time in every fixed dimension. The algorithm either certifies infeasibility, returns an exact optimizer when the objective is bounded below, or produces an integer feasible point and an integer recession direction along which the objective tends to minus infinity.

The central intermediate result is a deterministic polynomial-time test for whether $d^T Q d$ is nonnegative on the integer points of a bounded symmetric rational polytope. This test yields exact optimization over bounded rational polytopes. For unbounded feasible polyhedra, finite orthant tests decide integer unboundedness, while a polynomial-bit bound places one optimizer in a bounded box whenever the optimum is finite. Applying the bounded algorithm to that box completes the proof of the main result.

Declarations

The author used OpenAI Codex and Anthropic Claude to assist with manuscript review, exposition, proofreading, and bibliography preparation. The author conceived and developed the multiscale propagation principle underlying the negative-curvature test and the integer-support cutting procedure, initially while studying box-constrained integer quadratic programs. These ideas form the conceptual core of the algorithm proved in this paper. The box-specific algorithm is not presented separately because it is subsumed by Theorem 4.3. Within Codex, GPT-5.6 Sol developed the constant-size cell-cover construction used in the symmetric-polytope formulation and identified relevant results concerning the boundedness of quadratic programs over the nonnegative orthant. The author reviewed and integrated all AI-assisted material and assumes full responsibility for the manuscript.

References

- [1] C. ARI AND R. HILDEBRAND, *Curvature batching gives single-exponential integer quadratic programming*, Apr. 2026, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.04851>.
- [2] B. AWERBUCH AND R. D. KLEINBERG, *Online linear optimization and adaptive routing*, J. Comput. System Sci., 74 (2008), pp. 97–114, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2007.04.016>.
- [3] A. BASU AND T. OERTEL, *Centerpoints: A link between optimization and convex geometry*, SIAM J. Optim., 27 (2017), pp. 866–889, <https://doi.org/10.1137/16M1092908>.
- [4] A. DEL PIA, S. S. DEY, AND M. MOLINARO, *Mixed-integer quadratic programming is in NP*, Math. Program., 162 (2017), pp. 225–240, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-016-1036-0>.
- [5] A. DEL PIA AND R. WEISMANTEL, *Integer quadratic programming in the plane*, in Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2014, pp. 840–846, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973402.62>.
- [6] B. C. EAVES, *On quadratic programming*, Management Sci., 17 (1971), pp. 698–711, <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.17.11.698>.

- [7] M. GRÖTSCHEL, L. LOVÁSZ, AND A. SCHRIJVER, *Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization*, vol. 2 of Algorithms and Combinatorics, Springer, Berlin, 1988, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-97881-4>.
- [8] A. HERRMANN, *Integer quadratic programming is $W[1]$ -hard parameterized by the number of variables*, Aug. 2026, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2608.17818>.
- [9] R. HILDEBRAND, T. OERTEL, AND R. WEISMANTEL, *Note on the complexity of the mixed-integer hull of a polyhedron*, Oper. Res. Lett., 43 (2015), pp. 279–282, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2015.03.002>.
- [10] R. HILDEBRAND, R. WEISMANTEL, AND K. ZEMMER, *An FPTAS for minimizing indefinite quadratic forms over integers in polyhedra*, in Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2016, pp. 1715–1723, <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch118>.
- [11] J.-B. HIRIART-URRUTY AND A. SEEGER, *A variational approach to copositive matrices*, SIAM Rev., 52 (2010), pp. 593–629, <https://doi.org/10.1137/090750391>.
- [12] V. KAIBEL AND M. E. PFETSCH, *Some algorithmic problems in polytope theory*, in Algebra, Geometry and Software Systems, M. Joswig and N. Takayama, eds., Springer, Berlin, 2003, pp. 23–47, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-05148-1_2.
- [13] L. KHACHIYAN AND L. PORKOLAB, *Integer optimization on convex semialgebraic sets*, Discrete Comput. Geom., 23 (2000), pp. 207–224, <https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00009496>.
- [14] H. W. LENSTRA, JR., *Integer programming with a fixed number of variables*, Math. Oper. Res., 8 (1983), pp. 538–548, <https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.8.4.538>.
- [15] D. LOKSHTANOV, *Parameterized integer quadratic programming: Variables and coefficients*, Apr. 2017, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.00310v2>.
- [16] K. G. MURTY AND S. N. KABADI, *Some NP-complete problems in quadratic and nonlinear programming*, Math. Program., 39 (1987), pp. 117–129, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02592948>.
- [17] K. ZEMMER, *Integer polynomial optimization in fixed dimension*, PhD thesis, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland, 2017, <https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000241796>. Diss. ETH No. 24540.