

Randomized Rounding for the Largest Simplex Problem

Aleksandar Nikolov
 Microsoft Research
 Redmond, WA, USA

Abstract

The maximum volume j -simplex problem asks to compute the j -dimensional simplex of maximum volume inside the convex hull of a given set of n points in \mathbb{Q}^d . We give a deterministic approximation algorithm for this problem which achieves an approximation ratio of $e^{j/2+o(j)}$. The problem is known to be NP-hard to approximate within a factor of c^j for some constant $c > 1$. Our algorithm also gives a factor $e^{j+o(j)}$ approximation for the problem of finding the principal $j \times j$ submatrix of a rank d positive semidefinite matrix with the largest determinant. We achieve our approximation by rounding solutions to a generalization of the D -optimal design problem, or, equivalently, the dual of an appropriate smallest enclosing ellipsoid problem. Our arguments give a short and simple proof of a restricted invertibility principle for determinants.

1 Introduction

In the maximum volume j -simplex (j -MVS) problem we are given a set of n vectors v_1, \dots, v_n in \mathbb{Q}^d , and the goal is to find a maximum volume j -dimensional simplex in the convex hull of v_1, \dots, v_n . This problem was introduced by Gritzmann, Klee, and Larman [GKL95], and a number of applications are mentioned by Gritzmann and Klee [GK94]. It is a problem of natural interest in computational geometry, as a maximum volume simplex inside a convex body K can be seen as a simpler approximation of K . This is analogous to the John ellipsoid, i.e. the maximum volume ellipsoid contained in K , which can also be interpreted as a simple approximation of K . Depending on the geometry of K , the simplex or the ellipsoid approximation may be more appropriate.

The j -MVS problem can be easily reduced to a problem about subdeterminants of positive semidefinite matrices (see Lemma 5 for the reduction). For an $m \times n$ matrix M , let $M_{S,T}$ be the submatrix with rows indexed by $S \subseteq [m]$ and columns indexed by $T \subseteq [n]$. In the maximum j -subdeterminant problem (j -MSD) we are given an $n \times n$ positive semidefinite matrix M of rank d , and the goal is find a set S of cardinality j so that $\det M_{S,S}$ is maximized. The j -MVS problem in d dimensions can be reduced to solving n instances of the j -MSD problem for matrices of rank d , and the reduction is approximation preserving.

The j -MSD problem was also independently studied in the context of low-rank approximations. The optimal row-rank approximation of a matrix A is well understood, and for both the operator and the Frobenius norm (and in fact any unitarily invariant matrix norm) is given by the the projection of the rows and columns of A onto the top singular vectors. However, an approximation in terms of a submatrix of A often has a better explanatory value. For example, if A is a $n \times d$ matrix in which each row is a data point, and if A is well-approximated by its projection onto the span of j of its columns, we can argue that, at least intuitively, these columns represent important features in the data. Goreinov and Tyrtshnikov [GT01] gave one formalization of this intuition, which we cite next.

Theorem 1 ([GT01]). *Let $M \succeq 0$ be an $n \times n$ matrix and let $S \subseteq [n]$ be an optimal solution to the j -MSD problem for M . Then, for $T = [n] \setminus S$ we have*

$$|(M_{T,T} - M_{T,S}M_{S,S}^{-1}M_{T,T})_{i,k}| \leq (j+1)\sigma_{j+1},$$

where σ_{j+1} is the $(j+1)$ -st largest singular value of M .

To put the theorem in the context of the prior discussion, let A be an $n \times d$ matrix with row vectors $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and define $M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} AA^T$. Then the theorem says that, for all i, k , $|\langle a_i, a_k \rangle - \langle \Pi a_i, \Pi a_k \rangle| \leq (j+1)\sigma_{j+1}$, where Π is the orthogonal projection matrix onto $\text{span}\{a_i : i \in S\}$.

Another area where the j -MSD problem arises is combinatorial discrepancy theory. The *discrepancy* of a $d \times n$ matrix A is $\text{disc}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{x \in \{-1,1\}^n} \|Ax\|_\infty$; its *hereditary discrepancy* is $\text{herdisc}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{S \subseteq [n]} \text{disc}(A_S)$, where A_S is shorthand for $A_{[d],S}$. The following ℓ_2 -norm variants of these definitions were considered by Srinivasan [Sri97], Matoušek [Mat98], and, in the context of differential privacy, by the author, Talwar, and Zhang [NTZ13]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{disc}_2(A) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{x \in \{-1,1\}^n} \|Ax\|_2, \\ \text{herdisc}_2(A) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{S \subseteq [n]} \text{disc}_2(A_S). \end{aligned}$$

Hereditary discrepancy has an important application to rounding problems: roughly speaking, if the hereditary discrepancy of the matrix A is low, then any solution to a x linear system $Ax = b$ can be rounded to an integral vector \bar{x} without introducing a lot of error. In this sense, hereditary discrepancy generalizes total unimodularity, which is equivalent to $\text{herdisc}(A) = 1$ [GH62]. The following theorem, proved by Lovász, Spencer, and Vesztergombi, makes this connection precise.

Theorem 2 ([LSV86]). *For any $d \times n$ matrix A , and any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists a vector $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ so that*

$$\|Ax - Ay\|_2 \leq 2 \text{herdisc}_2(A).$$

In fact the theorem holds with hereditary discrepancy defined in terms of any norm.

Another important result by Lovász, Spencer, and Vesztergombi is a general lower bound on hereditary discrepancy. For the ℓ_2 version of hereditary discrepancy, the relevant quantity is

$$\text{detlb}_2(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sqrt{|S|} \det((A^T A)_{S,S})^{1/2|S|}.$$

The following theorem shows that $\text{detlb}_2(A)$ gives nearly-tight upper and lower bound on $\text{herdisc}_2(A)$. While not explicitly stated in this form, the theorem can be proved by modifying the arguments in [LSV86, Mat11] in a straightforward way.

Theorem 3. *There exists a constant C such that for any $d \times n$ matrix A ,*

$$\frac{1}{C} \text{detlb}_2(A) \leq \text{herdisc}(A) \leq (C \log d) \text{detlb}_2(A).$$

If for each $1 \leq j \leq d$ we have a factor $\alpha(j)$ approximation for j -MSD, then we get a factor $\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_j \alpha(j)^{1/2j}$ -approximation to $\text{detlb}_2(A)$, and, therefore, a factor $C\alpha \log d$ approximation to $\text{herdisc}_2(A)$.

1.1 Prior Work

Koutis [Kou06] showed that there exist constants $c > 1$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$ such that the αd -MVS problem is NP-hard to approximate to within a factor c^j . The analogous hardness of approximation for the j -MSD problem was proved by Çivril and Magdon-Ismail [ÇM13]. Recently, Di Summa, Eisenbrand, Faenza, and Moldenhauer [DEFM14] showed that both the d -MVS and d -MSD problems are NP-hard to approximate to within a factor of c^d , where c is again a constant bigger than 1. By a simple padding argument, this also implies that j -MVS and j -MSD are NP-hard to approximate to within a factor of 2^{c^j} for any $j \leq d$ such that $d = j^{O(1)}$. For j -MVS, for example, we can take any instance of j -MVS in \mathbb{Q}^j and embed it in any subspace of \mathbb{Q}^d : this transformation does not change the value of any solution of the original instance and is in polynomial time as long as d is polynomially related to j . We can also modify this reduction to output full-dimensional instances without changing the hardness factor substantially by adding a tiny perturbation to each point. For j -MSD, we can take any instance of j -MSD over rank j matrices, and take the direct sum of the input matrix with a tiny multiple of the $(d - j) \times (d - j)$ identity matrix. This transformation brings the rank up to d and can be performed in polynomial time as long as d is polynomially related to j .

On the algorithmic side, the best known approximation for d -MSD is $(c \log d)^d$ for a constant c , proved by Di Summa et al. [DEFM14]. They show that this approximation is achieved by a classical algorithm by Khachiyan [Kha95], for which they give a new analysis. This also implies a factor $(c \log d)^{d/2}$ approximation for d -MVS (see Lemma 5). For $j < d$, the best approximation known is of the form $(cj)^j$ for a constant c : algorithms with this guarantee were given by Packer [Pac04] for j -MVS and by Çivril and Magdon-Ismail [ÇM13] for j -MSD.

1.2 Our Contribution

In this paper we design deterministic polynomial time approximation algorithms for the j -MSD, and, therefore, also the j -MVS, problems. Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *There exists a deterministic polynomial time algorithm which approximates the j -MSD problem within a factor of $e^{j+o(j)}$. This implies that there also exists a deterministic polynomial time algorithm which approximates the j -MVS problem within a factor of $e^{j/2+o(j)}$*

This is the first approximation algorithm for j -MSD and j -MVS with an approximation factor of the form $\exp(O(j))$, which matches the known hardness results up to the constant in the exponent. It is natural to conjecture that it is NP-hard to approximate j -MSD within a factor $e^{j-\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. We leave this as an open problem.

Theorem 4 implies a factor $\sqrt{e} + o(1)$ approximation to $\det\text{lb}_2(A)$ for any $d \times n$ matrix A , and, therefore, a factor $O(\log d)$ approximation to $\text{herdisc}_2(A)$. The latter result also follows from the techniques of the author and Talwar [NT14]. However, our result gives the first constant-factor approximation to a natural variant of the determinant lower bound. It is an interesting open problem to extend this result to the determinant lower bound for $\text{herdisc}(A)$, which is equal to

$$\det\text{lb}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{j=1}^d \max_{S \in \binom{[d]}{j}} \max_{T \in \binom{[n]}{j}} |\det(A_{S,T})|^{1/j}.$$

We also use our techniques to give an elementary and short proof of a variant of the restricted invertibility principle of Bourgain and Tzafriri [BT87].

1.3 Techniques

The first step of our algorithms for j -MSD is to take the Cholesky factorization $M = V^T V$ of the input matrix M , and treat the column vectors v_1, \dots, v_n of V as points in \mathbb{R}^d . For the d -MSD problem, we then apply a simple randomized rounding algorithm to an (approximately) optimal solution of a variant of the D -optimal design problem for v_1, \dots, v_n , in which we maximize $\ln \det(\sum c_i v_i v_i^T)$ over vectors $c \geq 0$ such that $\sum_i c_i = d$. It is well-known (and not hard to see: we give two arguments in the proof of Theorem 10) that this is a convex relaxation of the j -MSD problem. We treat a feasible solution to the D -optimal design problem as a “fractional indicator vector” of a subset of v_1, \dots, v_n . Our algorithm “rounds” the optimal such vector c by simply sampling d times with replacement from the probability distribution on v_1, \dots, v_n induced by $\frac{1}{d}c$. A straightforward calculation using the Binet-Cauchy formula proves the approximation guarantee holds in expectation. Interestingly, the dual of the D -optimal design problem, the smallest enclosing ellipsoid problem (see Section 2.3), was used for approximating d -MSD in the work of Khachiyan [Kha95] and Di Summa et al. [DEFM14]. However, we are not aware of any prior work that uses our approach of rounding a solution to the D -optimal design problem directly.

Our strategy for approximating j -MSD when $j < d$ is similar, but the analysis becomes more complicated. For motivation, let us consider the $j = 1$ case, in which we simply need to compute the largest diagonal entry of the input matrix M , or, working with the columns v_1, \dots, v_n of the square root V of M , we need to compute the index i such that v_i has the largest squared Euclidean norm. Of course, this problem can be solved trivially in linear time by enumerating over the v_i , but it is instructive to solve it using an approach similar to the one we used for d -MSD. Consider the smallest enclosing ball problem for v_1, \dots, v_n : minimize r subject to v_1, \dots, v_n being contained in a Euclidean ball of radius r centered at 0. It is clear that the optimal r is equal to the norm of the longest v_i . The dual of the smallest enclosing ball problem is the problem of maximizing $\sum p_i v_i v_i^T = \sum p_i \|v_i\|_2^2$ over probability vectors p (a much more general version of this fact is proved in Theorem 15). This latter problem is our convex relaxation of 1-MSD. While this is a natural relaxation that we could have arrived at directly, without going through the smallest enclosing ball problem, our approach pays off when generalizing to the case $1 < j < d$, in which it is not clear how to come up directly with a natural convex relaxation of j -MSD. The randomized rounding algorithm applied to the relaxation samples an index i from the distribution determined by an optimal vector p ; the expected squared length of v_i is $\sum p_i \|v_i\|_2^2$, i.e. exactly the objective value of the relaxation.

We follow a similar strategy for general j . We define a minimization problem over ellipsoids centered at 0 that contain v_1, \dots, v_n . The objective of the problem is to minimize the volume of the largest j -dimensional section of the containing ellipsoid. It is not hard to show that this problem gives an upper bound on j -MSD (Lemma 13). The main technical challenge is to derive the dual of this optimization problem and to analyze the natural randomized rounding algorithm applied to it. An important difference from the $j = d$ case is that the objective of the ellipsoid optimization problem is no longer differentiable, which complicates the analysis of the dual. When $1 < j < d$, the objective of the dual “splits” into two terms, one that resembles the $j = 1$ case and another that resembles the $j = d$ case. To relate the expected value of the output of the rounding algorithm to this more complicated objective we use the theory of Schur-concave functions applied to the elementary symmetric polynomials.

We derandomize our algorithms using the method of conditional expectations. This approach and the use of the elementary symmetric polynomials to relate the eigenvalues of a matrix to its entries are inspired by the volume-sampling algorithms of Deshpande and Rademacher [DR10]. These sampling techniques together with the Schur concavity of *ratios* of elementary symmetric

polynomials were used previously in the work of Guruswami and Sinop [GS12] on low rank matrix approximations.

2 Preliminaries

We use the notation $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ for an integer n . With $\binom{S}{k}$ we denote the set of size k subsets of the set S .

We denote the reals by \mathbb{R} , the non-negative reals by \mathbb{R}_+ , and the positive reals by \mathbb{R}_{++} ; analogously, \mathbb{Q} are the rationals, \mathbb{Q}_+ the non-negative rationals, and \mathbb{Q}_{++} are the positive rationals. We use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the standard inner product in \mathbb{R}^d . For a vector x , we denote by $x_{(i)}$ the i -th largest coordinate of x . For an $m \times n$ matrix M , we use the notation $M_{S,T}$ for the submatrix with rows indexed by the set $S \subseteq [m]$ and columns indexed by the set $T \subseteq [n]$. Sometimes we will allow S and T to be multisets, in which case rows and columns are repeated as many times as the multiplicity of the corresponding element. We use M_S for the submatrix $M_{[m],S}$, i.e. the submatrix with columns indexed by $S \subseteq [n]$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we use $\text{diag}(x)$ to denote the diagonal matrix with x_1, \dots, x_n on the main diagonal. When x and y are vectors, the relation $x \geq y$ means that $x_i \geq y_i$ for each index i . For a square symmetric matrix M , the notation $M \succeq 0$ means that M is positive semidefinite, and $M \succ 0$ means that M is positive definite. We use $X \succeq Y$ (resp. $X \preceq Y$) as a shorthand for $X - Y \succeq 0$ (resp. $Y - X \succeq 0$).

2.1 From Simplices to Subdeterminants

There is a well-known approximation preserving reduction from j -MVS to j -MSD. For completeness, we give the reduction in the following lemma. Let us use the notation $\text{MVS}_j(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ for the optimal value of the j -MVS problem on input v_1, \dots, v_n , and $\text{MSD}_j(M)$ for the optimal value of the j -MSD problem on input M .

Lemma 5. *There exists a deterministic polynomial time algorithm that maps an instance $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of j -MVS to n instances M^1, \dots, M^n of j -MSD, such that each M^i is an $(n-1) \times (n-1)$ matrix of rank at most d , and $\text{MVS}_j(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \frac{1}{j!} \max_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\text{MSD}_j(M^i)}$.*

Proof. The algorithm outputs the n matrices M^1, \dots, M^n , where M^i is the Gram matrix of the vectors $v_1 - v_i, \dots, v_{i-1} - v_i, v_{i+1} - v_i, \dots, v_n$. I.e. M^i is a matrix whose rows and columns are indexed by the set $[n] \setminus \{i\}$ and whose entries are given by $m_{k,\ell}^i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle v_k - v_i, v_\ell - v_i \rangle$. It is clear from the construction that the matrices M^i have rank at most d and size $(n-1) \times (n-1)$. For any i and any $S \subseteq [n] \setminus \{i\}$, $\sqrt{\det(M_{S,S}^i)}$ is equal to the volume of $\text{conv}\{v_k : k \in S \cup \{i\}\}$. Therefore, $\text{MVS}_j(v_1, \dots, v_n) \geq \frac{1}{j!} \max_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\text{MSD}_j(M^i)}$. Moreover, a standard argument shows that there is a maximum volume simplex of dimension j in the convex hull of v_1, \dots, v_n which is the convex hull of some subset T of $j+1$ of the input vectors v_1, \dots, v_n . Therefore, for i an arbitrary element of T and $S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} T \setminus \{i\}$, $\text{MVS}_j(v_1, \dots, v_n) = \frac{1}{j!} \sqrt{\det(M_{S,S}^i)}$, and this proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 5 implies that a factor α approximation algorithm for j -MSD implies a factor $\sqrt{\alpha}$ approximation algorithm for j -MVS. For this reason, for the rest of the paper we will focus our attention on the j -MSD problem.

2.2 Convex Analysis and Optimization

A *subgradient* of a convex function $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at $x \in S$, where S is a convex open subset of \mathbb{R}^d , is a vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ so that for every $z \in S$ we have

$$f(z) \geq f(x) + \langle z - x, y \rangle.$$

The set of subgradients of f at x is denoted $\partial f(x)$ and is known as the *subdifferential*. When f is differentiable at x , the subdifferential is a singleton set containing only the gradient $\nabla f(x)$. If f is defined by $f(x) = f_1(x) + f_2(x)$, where $f_1, f_2 : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then $\partial f(x) = \partial f_1(x) + \partial f_2(x)$. A basic fact in convex analysis is that f achieves its minimum at x if and only if $0 \in \partial f(x)$. More information about subgradients and subdifferentials can be found in [Roc70].

Consider an optimization problem in the following general form:

$$\text{Minimize } f_0(x) \tag{1}$$

s.t.

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq m : f_i(x) \leq 0. \tag{2}$$

Here, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and each f_i is a function from a subset of \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R} . When f_0, \dots, f_m are all convex functions over their respective domains, we call the above program convex. A solution x is *feasible* when it satisfies the constraints $f_i(x) \leq 0$. The *optimal value* of the program is the infimum of $f_0(x)$ over feasible x . A feasible solution x is *optimal* if $f_0(x) = v^*$, and α -*optimal* (for $\alpha \geq 0$ a real number) if $f_0(x) \leq v^* + \alpha$, where v^* is the optimal value of the program.

The *Lagrange dual function* associated with (1)–(2) is defined as $g(y) = \inf_x f_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^m y_i f_i(x)$, where the infimum is over the intersection of the domains of f_1, \dots, \dots, f_m , and $y \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $y \geq 0$. Since $g(y)$ is the infimum of affine functions, it is a concave upper-semicontinuous function.

For any x which is feasible for (1)–(2), and any $y \geq 0$, $g(y) \leq f_0(x)$. This fact is known as *weak duality*. The *Lagrange dual problem* is defined as

$$\text{Maximize } g(y) \text{ s.t. } y \geq 0. \tag{3}$$

Strong duality holds when the optimal value of (3) equals the optimal value of (1)–(2). Slater's condition is a commonly used sufficient condition for strong duality. We state it next.

Theorem 6 (Slater's Condition). *Assume f_0, \dots, f_m in the problem (1)–(2) are convex functions over their respective domains, and for some $k \geq 0$, f_1, \dots, f_k are affine functions. Let there be a point x in the relative interior of the domains of f_0, \dots, f_m , so that $f_i(x) \leq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $f_j(x) < 0$ for $k + 1 \leq j \leq m$. Then the optimal value of (1)–(2) equals the optimal value of (3), and the value of (3) is achieved if it is finite.*

For more information on convex programming and duality, we refer the reader to the books by Boyd and Vandenberghe [BV04] and Rockafellar [Roc70].

2.3 Ellipsoids and John's Theorem

An *ellipsoid* is the image of the Euclidean ball $B_2^d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\|_2 \leq 1\}$ under an affine map. The ellipsoid $E = \{Ax + b : x \in B_2^d\}$, where A is a $d \times d$ matrix and $b \in \mathbb{R}^d$, can be also written as $E = \{x : ((x - b)^T y)^2 \leq y^T A A^T y \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$, and when A is invertible (i.e. E is full-dimensional), this is equivalent to $E = \{x : (x - b)^T (A A^T)^{-1} (x - b) \leq 1\}$.

The *Löwner ellipsoid* of a set of points $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the smallest volume ellipsoid E such that $v_1, \dots, v_n \in E$. John [Joh48] proved that the Löwner ellipsoid of v_1, \dots, v_n is B_2^d if and only if

there exist non-negative reals c_1, \dots, c_n such that $\sum_i c_i v_i = 0$ and $\sum_i c_i v_i v_i^T = I$. Below we state a variant of this theorem in which we fix the center of the ellipsoid to be 0.

Consider the following program, defined for $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

$$\text{Minimize } -\ln \det(W) \text{ s.t.} \tag{4}$$

$$v_i^T W v_i \leq 1 \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n, \tag{5}$$

$$W \succ 0. \tag{6}$$

This program corresponds to finding the minimum volume ellipsoid centered at 0 that contains v_1, \dots, v_n . It is a convex minimization problem over the open domain $\{W : W \succ 0\}$ with affine constraints, and, therefore, satisfies Slater's condition. The *dual problem* to (4)–(6) is

$$\text{Maximize } \ln \det\left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T\right) \tag{7}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i = d \tag{8}$$

$$c_i \geq 0 \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n \tag{9}$$

Up to scaling of the variables c_1, \dots, c_n , this is the D -optimal design problem. For a proof of the duality, see [BV04, Sect. 5.1.6, 5.2.4, 7.5.2]; it also follows from the more general Theorem 15. Since it is the dual of a convex minimization problem, (7)–(9) is a convex maximization problem. Then the following variant of John's theorem is a direct consequence of strong duality for the program (4)–(6) (which is implied by Slater's condition):

Lemma 7. *The optimal value of (4)–(6) is equal to the optimal value of (7)–(9).*

2.4 Properties of Determinants

First we recall the classical Binet-Cauchy formula for the determinant of a matrix product. For any $m \times n$ matrix A , $m \geq n$, we have

$$\det(A^T A) = \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{m}} \det(A_S)^2. \tag{10}$$

Let e_k be the degree k elementary symmetric polynomial, i.e.

$$e_k(x_1, \dots, x_n) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \prod_{i \in S} x_i.$$

Let M be an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$. It is well-known that $\det(M) = e_n(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ and $\text{tr}(M) = e_1(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$. In fact a similar identity involving the entries of M and its eigenvalues holds for all k :

$$\sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{k}} \det(M_{S,S}) = e_k(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n). \tag{11}$$

This fact is also classical and can be proved by expressing each coefficient of the characteristic polynomial of M in two different ways: as a sum of subdeterminants, and as a symmetric polynomial of its roots.

2.5 Schur Convexity

For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, recall that $x_{(i)}$ means the i -th largest entry of x . A vector $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ *majorizes* the vector $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, written $x \prec y$, if the following inequalities are satisfied:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^k x_{(i)} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k y_{(i)} \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \\ \sum_{i=1}^n x_{(i)} &= \sum_{i=1}^n y_{(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

A function $f : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is *Schur-convex* if $x \prec y \implies f(x) \leq f(y)$; if $-f$ is Schur-convex, we say that f is *Schur-concave*.

We use the following classical fact about the Schur-concavity of elementary symmetric functions, proved by Schur.

Lemma 8 ([Sch23]). *The elementary symmetric polynomial e_k of degree k , $1 \leq k \leq n$, is Schur-concave.*

3 The Full-Dimensional Case

In this section we discuss the special case $j = d$. We treat this case separately because it is a natural problem in itself, and the technical details of our algorithm are simpler, while illustrating some of the key ideas of our approach.

We first prove a simple lemma which is essential to our analysis.

Lemma 9. *Let V be a $d \times n$ matrix with column vectors v_1, \dots, v_n . Let p_1, \dots, p_n give the probabilities for a distribution on $[n]$, i.e. $p_i \geq 0$ for all i and $\sum p_i = 1$. Let S be a random multiset of d elements, each sampled independently with replacement from $[n]$ according to the distribution determined by p_1, \dots, p_n . Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \det(V_S)^2 = d! \det\left(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i v_i^T\right).$$

Proof. Let us express the expectation $\mathbb{E} \det(V_S)^2$ explicitly. If any element in S repeats, then $\det(V_S)^2 = 0$. Any other choice of S can be sampled in $d!$ ways, each with probability $\prod_{i \in S} p_i$. Therefore, the expectation is

$$\mathbb{E} \det(V_S)^2 = \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{d}} d! \prod_{i \in S} p_i \det(V_S)^2 = d! \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{d}} \det((VP^{1/2})_S)^2,$$

where $P = \text{diag}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$ is a diagonal matrix with the values p_i on the main diagonal. The right hand side is equal to $d! \det(VPV^T)$ by the Binet-Cauchy formula (10). Since $VPV^T = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i v_i^T$, this finishes the proof. \square

We present our approximation algorithm for d -MSD as Algorithm 1. The main approximation guarantee of the algorithm is given in Theorem 10.

Theorem 10. *Let the random multiset S be the output of Algorithm 1 for input M and an α -optimal c_1, \dots, c_n . Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \det(M_{S,S}) \geq \frac{d!}{d^d} e^{-\alpha} \text{MSD}_d(M) \sim \sqrt{2\pi d} e^{-d-\alpha} \text{MSD}_d(M).$$

Algorithm 1 Randomized Sampling for d -MSD

Input: Positive semidefinite $n \times n$ matrix M of rank d .

Compute a Cholesky factorization $M = V^T V$ of M , $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$. Let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the columns of V ;

Compute an α -optimal solution c_1, \dots, c_n of (7)–(9) for v_1, \dots, v_n ;

$S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset$;

for $k = 1, \dots, d$ **do**

 Sample i from $[n]$ according to the probability distribution given by $\Pr[i = \ell] = \frac{1}{d} c_\ell$;

 Add i to the multiset S ;

end for

Output: S .

Proof. Observe first that $\det(M_{S,S}) = \det(V_S^T V_S) = \det(V_S)^2$ for any S of size d . Then by Lemma 9, with $p_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{d} c_i$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \det(M_{S,S}) = \mathbb{E} \det(V_S)^2 = d! \det\left(\sum_i p_i v_i v_i^T\right) = \frac{d!}{d^d} \det\left(\sum_i c_i v_i v_i^T\right).$$

It remains to show that $\det\left(\sum_i c_i v_i v_i^T\right) \geq e^{-\alpha} \text{MSD}_d(M)$. We give two arguments: one is simpler, and the other one will be the one which we will generalize for the j -MSD problem.

For the first argument, let T be a set that achieves $\text{MSD}_d(M)$ and let $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be its indicator vector, i.e. $a_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1$ if $i \in T$, and $a_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$ otherwise. Then, since T is of size d , $\sum_i a_i = d$, so a is a feasible solution to (7)–(9). Because c is an α -optimal solution, we have that

$$\det\left(\sum_i c_i v_i v_i^T\right) \geq e^{-\alpha} \det\left(\sum_i a_i v_i v_i^T\right) = e^{-\alpha} \det(M_{T,T}) = e^{-\alpha} \text{MSD}_d(M).$$

For the second, more indirect argument, we will use Lemma 7. Let W be an optimal solution to (4)–(6); the matrix W is invertible by constraint (6). By Lemma 7, $\det\left(\sum_i c_i v_i v_i^T\right) \geq e^{-\alpha} \det(W^{-1})$. It remains to show that $\det(W^{-1}) \geq \text{MSD}_d(M)$. Let $T \in \binom{[n]}{d}$ be such that $\det(M_{T,T}) = \det(V_T)^2 = \text{MSD}_d(M)$. We have the following variant of Hadamard's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \det(V_T)^2 &= \det(V_T^T W V_T) \det(W^{-1}) \leq \left(\frac{1}{d} \text{tr}(V_T^T W V_T)\right)^d \det(W^{-1}) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i \in T} v_i^T W v_i\right)^d \det(W^{-1}) \leq \det(W^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality above follows by applying the AM-GM inequality to the eigenvalues of $V_T^T W V_T$, and the last inequality is implied by the constraints (5). What we have shown is equivalent to the intuitive geometric fact that the volume of the largest simplex with one vertex at 0 contained in the convex hull of v_1, \dots, v_n is at most the volume of the largest simplex with one vertex at 0 contained in the Löwner ellipsoid of v_1, \dots, v_n (or in fact any ellipsoid containing these points).

Putting everything together, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \det(M_{S,S}) = \frac{d!}{d^d} \det\left(\sum_i c_i v_i v_i^T\right) \geq e^{-\alpha} \frac{d!}{d^d} \text{MSD}_d(M),$$

as desired. The asymptotic estimate $\frac{d!}{d^d} \sim \sqrt{2\pi d} e^{-d}$ is a restatement of Stirling's approximation of $d!$. \square

Since (7)–(9) is a convex optimization problem, we can use the ellipsoid method to compute an α -optimal solution in time polynomial in $n, d, \log \alpha^{-1}$ [GLS81]. Khachiyan [Kha96] showed how to compute a $d \ln(1 + \epsilon)$ -optimal solution to (7)–(9) (i.e. a multiplicative $(1 + \epsilon)^d$ approximation to $\det\left(\sum_i c_i v_i v_i^T\right)$) using a polynomial in n, d, ϵ^{-1} number of real value operations. Using either method with Algorithm 1, we get an approximation factor of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi d}}((1 + \epsilon)e)^d$ in time polynomial in n, d , and ϵ^{-1} .

In Section 5 we show how to derandomize Algorithm 1 using the method of conditional expectations.

4 The General Case

A natural first attempt to extend Algorithm 1 to general $j < d$ is to simply sample j , rather than d , coordinates from the distribution induced by an optimal solution to (7)–(9). A straightforward extension of the analysis in Section 3 shows that this algorithm achieves approximation factor $\frac{d^d}{j^j}$, which is $\exp(O(j))$ for $j = \Omega(d)$ but approaches d^d for smaller j . In order to achieve $\exp(O(j))$ approximation for all j , we generalize the Löwner ellipsoid problem. The rounding algorithm remains essentially the same, but the details of the analysis become more complicated.

4.1 j -Löwner Ellipsoids

A key technical tool for our algorithm for the j -MSD problem is a generalization of the Löwner ellipsoid. For a set of points $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a positive integer $j \leq d$, we define a j -Löwner ellipsoid as an ellipsoid E that contains v_1, \dots, v_n and minimizes the quantity $\max_H \text{vol}_j(H \cap E)$, where H ranges over j -dimensional affine subspaces of \mathbb{R}^d . When $j = d$, this is just the standard Löwner ellipsoid; when $j = 1$, this is the minimum radius Euclidean ball that contains the points (or any ellipsoid contained in it that also contains the points). As we did with the classical Löwner ellipsoid, in the sequel we will fix our ellipsoids to be centered at 0, as this is what we need for our application.

It is not hard to see that $\max_H \text{vol}_j(H \cap E)$ for an ellipsoid E is proportional to the product of the lengths of the j longest major axes of E . We use this observation to formulate the problem of finding j -Löwner ellipsoid as a convex program. First we need to define the appropriate function on the space of positive definite matrices.

Definition 1. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^d$, we define $\delta_j(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\sum_{i=d-j+1}^d \ln x_{(i)}$, where $x_{(i)}$ is the i -th largest coordinate of x . For a $d \times d$ matrix $W \succ 0$ with eigenvalue vector $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$, we define $\Delta_j(W) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta_j(\lambda)$.

To show that $\Delta_j(W)$ is convex and continuous, and to characterize its subdifferentials, we will use a general result of Lewis, extending classical work by von Neumann on unitarily invariant matrix norms. Below we state a slightly specialized case of his result.

Lemma 11 ([Lew95]). For a $d \times d$ matrix $W \succeq 0$, let $\lambda(W)$ be the vector of eigenvalues of W . For a function $f : \mathbb{R}_{++}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which is symmetric with respect to permutations of its arguments, define a function F on the set of $d \times d$ positive definite matrices by $F(W) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f(\lambda(W))$. If f is convex, and continuous, then so is F . Moreover, the subdifferentials of F are given by

$$\partial F(W) = \{U \text{diag}(\mu)U^T : \mu \in \partial f(\lambda(W)), U \text{ orthonormal}, U \text{diag}(\lambda(W))U^T = W\}.$$

For a set $S \subseteq [d]$, let us use the notation 1_S for the d -dimensional indicator vector of S , i.e. the i -th coordinate of 1_S is 1 if $i \in S$ and 0 otherwise. Let us define the convex polytope $V_{j,d} \stackrel{def}{=} \text{conv}\{1_S : S \in \binom{[d]}{j}\}$. This is the basis polytope of the rank j uniform matroid. We can now prove the convexity of Δ_j and characterize its subdifferentials.

Lemma 12. *The function Δ_j is convex and continuous on the space of positive definite matrices. Moreover, for any $W \succ 0$ with eigenvalues*

$$0 < \lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_k < \lambda_{k+1} = \dots = \lambda_j = \dots = \lambda_\ell < \lambda_{\ell+1} \leq \dots \leq \lambda_d, \quad (12)$$

the subdifferential of Δ_j at W is

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\Delta_j(W) = \{ & U \text{diag}(\mu)U^T : U \text{ orthonormal, } U \text{diag}(\lambda)U^T = W \\ & \mu_i = -\lambda_i^{-1} \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ & (\mu_{k+1}, \dots, \mu_\ell) \in -\lambda_j^{-1}V_{j-k, \ell-k} \\ & \mu_{\ell+1} = \dots = \mu_d = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Because δ_j is symmetric, Lemma 11 implies that in order to show that Δ_j is convex and continuous, we only need to show that δ_j is convex and continuous. Because the function $-\ln x$ is monotone decreasing in x , we can write $\delta_j(x)$ as

$$\delta_j(x) = \max_{S \in \binom{[d]}{j}} - \sum_{i \in S} \ln x_i.$$

For each S , the function $\delta_S(x) \stackrel{def}{=} - \sum_{i \in S} \ln x_i$ is continuous and convex over \mathbb{R}_{++}^d . Then the claim follows because the pointwise maximum of a finite number of continuous convex functions is continuous and convex.

By Lemma 11, to prove the characterization of the subdifferentials of Δ_j , it is enough to show that for λ , k , and ℓ satisfying (12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\delta_j(\lambda) = \{ & \mu : \mu_i = -\lambda_i^{-1} \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq k, \\ & (\mu_{k+1}, \dots, \mu_\ell) \in -\lambda_j^{-1}V_{j-k, \ell-k} \\ & \mu_{\ell+1} = \dots = \mu_d = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta_j(\lambda) = \max\{\delta_S(\lambda) : S \in \binom{[d]}{j}\}$, and each δ_S is differentiable, we have

$$\partial\delta_j(\lambda) = \text{conv}\{\nabla\delta_S(\lambda) : S \in \arg \max_{S \in \binom{[d]}{j}} \delta_S(\lambda)\}.$$

Because $-\ln x$ is monotone decreasing in x , we have that S achieves $\max\{\delta_S(\lambda) : S \in \binom{[d]}{j}\}$ if and only if $\{1, \dots, k\} \subseteq S$ and $|S \cap \{k+1, \dots, \ell\}| = j - k$. Therefore,

$$\partial\delta_j(\lambda) = \text{conv}\{\nabla\delta_S(\lambda) : \{1, \dots, k\} \subseteq S, |S \cap \{k+1, \dots, \ell\}| = j - k\}$$

The gradient $\nabla\delta_S(\lambda)$ is given by $\frac{\partial\delta_S(\lambda)}{\partial\lambda_i} = -\lambda_i^{-1}$ for $i \in S$ and $\frac{\partial\delta_S(\lambda)}{\partial\lambda_i} = 0$ otherwise. We have

$$\partial\delta_j(\lambda) = \text{conv}\{(-\lambda_i^{-1}1_{i \in S})_{i=1}^d : \{1, \dots, k\} \subseteq S, |S \cap \{k+1, \dots, \ell\}| = j - k\}.$$

This implies the desired characterization of $\partial\delta_j(\lambda)$. □

We capture a j -Löwner ellipsoid of the points $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as an optimal solution of the following program.

$$\text{Minimize } \Delta_j(W) \text{ s.t.} \quad (13)$$

$$v_i^T W v_i \leq 1 \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad (14)$$

$$W \succ 0. \quad (15)$$

By Lemma 12, (13)–(15) is a convex optimization problem over the domain $W \succ 0$. Moreover, it satisfies Slater's condition, as the constraints are affine. The next lemma shows that the program can be used to give an upper bound on $\text{MSD}_j(M)$.

Lemma 13. *Let $M = V^T V$ be an $n \times n$ positive semidefinite matrix of rank d , and let the columns of V be $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then $\text{MSD}_j(M) \leq e^\mu$ for μ equal to the optimal value of (13)–(15).*

Proof. Geometrically, the lemma captures the following fact. Let E be an ellipsoid centered at 0 and containing v_1, \dots, v_n . Then the volume of the largest j -dimensional simplex in the convex hull of v_1, \dots, v_n with one vertex at 0 is at most the volume of the largest j -dimensional simplex in E with one vertex at 0. Moreover, the latter simplex is contained in the j -dimensional subspace whose intersection with E has the largest volume. In the formal proof below we use a linear algebraic argument.

Let W be an optimal solution to (13)–(15) for v_1, \dots, v_n , and let S be such that $\det(M_{S,S}) = \det(V_S^T V_S) = \text{MSD}_j(M)$. Let $\Pi = UU^T$ be the orthogonal projection matrix onto $\text{span}\{v_i : i \in S\}$, where U is a $d \times j$ orthonormal matrix, i.e. $U^T U = I$. Since Π acts as the identity on $\text{span}\{v_i : i \in S\}$, we have $\Pi V_S = V_S$, and, therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSD}_j(M) &= \det(V_S^T V_S) = \det(V_S^T \Pi V_S) = \det((V_S^T U)(U^T V_S)) \\ &= \det((V_S^T U)(U^T W U)(U^T V_S)) \det(U^T W U)^{-1} \\ &= \det(V_S^T \Pi W \Pi V_S) \det(U^T W U)^{-1} \\ &= \det(V_S^T W V_S) \det(U^T W U)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_d$ be the eigenvalues of W , and let $\mu_1 \leq \dots \leq \mu_j$ be the eigenvalues of $U^T W U$. By the Cauchy interlace theorem, $\lambda_i \leq \mu_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq j$, and, therefore,

$$\det(U^T W U)^{-1} = \prod_{i=1}^j \mu_i^{-1} \leq \prod_{i=1}^j \lambda_i^{-1} = e^{\Delta_j(W)} = e^\mu.$$

On the other hand, by applying the AM-GM inequality to the eigenvalues of the matrix $V_S^T W V_S$, we get

$$\det(V_S^T W V_S) \leq \left(\frac{1}{j} \text{tr}(V_S^T W V_S) \right)^j = \left(\frac{1}{j} \sum_{i \in S} v_i^T W v_i \right)^j \leq 1.$$

The final inequality above follows from the constraints (14). Combining the inequalities gives the desired bound. \square

4.2 Duality for j -Löwner Ellipsoids

As mentioned above, the program (13)–(15) that we used to capture j -Löwner ellipsoids is convex and satisfies Slater's condition. Therefore, it admits a dual characterization, which we will use in our algorithm. In this section we derive the dual characterization using the Lagrange dual function.

Before we introduce the dual, or even properly define its objective function, we need to prove a technical lemma.

Lemma 14. *Let $x_1 \geq \dots \geq x_m \geq 0$ be non-negative reals, and let $j \leq m$ be a positive integer. There exists a unique integer k , $0 \leq k \leq j - 1$, such that*

$$x_k > \frac{\sum_{i>k} x_i}{j-k} \geq x_{k+1}, \quad (16)$$

with the convention $x_0 = \infty$.

Proof. Define $x_{>k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i>k} x_i$. If $x_{>0} \geq jx_1$ holds, then (16) is satisfied for $k = 0$, and we are done. So let us assume that $x_{>0} < jx_1$. Then $x_{>1} = x_{>0} - x_1 < (j-1)x_1$, and the first inequality in (16) is satisfied for $k = 1$. If the second inequality is also satisfied we are done, so let us assume that $x_{>1} < (j-1)x_2$, which implies the first inequality in (16) for $k = 2$. Continuing in this manner, we see that if the inequalities (16) are not satisfied for any $k \in \{0, \dots, j-2\}$, then we must have $x_{>j-1} < x_{j-1}$. But the second inequality for $k = j-1$, i.e. $x_{>j-1} = x_j + x_{>j} \geq x_j$ is always satisfied because all the x_i are non-negative, so we have that if (16) does not hold for any $k \leq j-2$, then it must hold for $k = j-1$. This finishes the proof of existence.

To prove uniqueness, assume k is the smallest integer such that (16) holds, and let $\ell > k$ be arbitrary. We will prove that the strict inequality in (16) cannot hold for ℓ , i.e. $(j-\ell)x_\ell \leq x_{>\ell}$. Indeed, because $x_{>k} \geq (j-k)x_{k+1}$ by the choice of k , and because $x_{k+1} \geq \dots \geq x_\ell$ by assumption, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (j-\ell)x_\ell &\leq (j-\ell)x_{k+1} = (j-k)x_{k+1} - (\ell-k)x_{k+1} \\ &\leq \sum_{i>k} x_i - (\ell-k)x_{k+1} \\ &= \sum_{i=k+1}^{\ell} (x_i - x_{k+1}) + \sum_{i>\ell} x_i \leq \sum_{i>\ell} x_i. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of uniqueness. \square

We now introduce a function which will be used in formulating a dual characterization of (13)–(15).

Definition 2. *For $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$, we define $\gamma_j(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^k \ln x_{(i)} + (j-k) \ln \left(\frac{1}{j-k} \sum_{i=k+1}^d x_{(i)} \right)$, where k is the unique integer such that $x_{(k)} > \frac{\sum_{i>k} x_{(i)}}{j-k} \geq x_{(k+1)}$. For a $d \times d$ matrix $X \succeq 0$ with eigenvalue vector λ , we define $\Gamma_j(X) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \gamma_j(\lambda)$.*

We will prove that the dual of (13)–(15) is equivalent to the following optimization problem:

$$\text{Maximize } \Gamma_j \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T \right) \quad (17)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i = j \quad (18)$$

$$c_i \geq 0 \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n \quad (19)$$

Theorem 15. *The program (17)–(19) is a convex optimization problem, and its optimal value is equal to the optimal value of (13)–(15).*

Observe that when $j = d$, $\Gamma_j(X) = \ln \det(X)$, so that (13)–(15) in this case reduces to (7)–(9). I.e. Theorem 15 generalizes Lemma 7.

To prove Theorem 15, we need two additional technical lemmas. The first one is well-know and follows from more general results characterizing the facets of the basis polytope of a matroid [Sch03].

Lemma 16. *For any j and d , $V_{j,d} = \{x : \sum_{i=1}^d x_i = j, 0 \leq x_i \leq 1 \forall 1 \leq i \leq d\}$.*

The next lemma is the key technical ingredient in the proof of Theorem 15.

Lemma 17. *Let $X \succeq 0$ be a $d \times d$ matrix of rank at least j . Then there exists a $d \times d$ matrix $W \succ 0$ such that $X \in -\partial\Delta_j(W)$, and $\Gamma_j(X) = \Delta_j(W)$.*

Proof. Let r be the rank of X , and let $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_d$ be its eigenvalues. Let U be an orthonormal matrix such that $X = U \operatorname{diag}(\lambda) U^T$ for $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_d)$. Assume that k is a positive integer strictly smaller than j such that $\mu_k > \frac{\sum_{i>k} \mu_i}{j-k} \geq \mu_{k+1}$ and define $\nu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda_i}{j-k}$. A unique such choice of k exists by Lemma 14. Moreover, since X has rank at least j , $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{k+1} > 0$, which also implies $\nu \geq 0$. Therefore, the following vector λ is well-defined for any $\nu > \epsilon > 0$:

$$\lambda_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \mu_i^{-1} & i \leq k \\ \nu^{-1} & k < i \leq r, \\ (\nu - \epsilon)^{-1} & i > r \end{cases}$$

Let us set $W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} U \operatorname{diag}(\lambda) U^T$. By Lemma 12, to prove that $X \in -\partial\Delta_j(W)$, it suffices to show that $(\mu_{k+1}, \dots, \mu_r) \in \nu V_{j-k, r-k}$. This inclusion follows from Lemma 16 because, by the choice of ν and k , $0 \leq \lambda_i \leq \nu$ for all $k+1 \leq i \leq r$, and $\sum_{i=k+1}^r \mu_i = (j-k)\nu$.

The equality $\Gamma_j(X) = \Delta_j(W)$ follows by a calculation. By the choice of k and ν , $\mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_k > \nu$. Therefore, the j smallest eigenvalues of W are $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_j$, and we have

$$\Delta_j(W) = -\sum_{i=1}^j \ln \lambda_j = -\sum_{i=1}^k \ln \mu_k + (j-k) \ln \nu = \Gamma_j(X).$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 15. Let us define $\{W : W \succ 0\}$ to be the domain for the constraints (14) and the objective function (13). This makes the constraint $W \succ 0$ implicit. The optimization problem is convex by Lemma 12. It is also always feasible: for example, if $r = \max_{i=1}^n \|v_i\|_2^2$, then $r^{-1}I$ is a feasible solution. Slater's condition is therefore satisfied and strong duality holds. To prove the theorem, it suffices to show that the dual problem to (13)–(15) is equivalent to (17)–(19).

The Lagrange dual function for (13)–(15) is

$$g(c) = \inf_{W \succ 0} \Delta_j(W) + \sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i^T W v_i - \sum_{i=1}^n c_i.$$

A matrix $W \succ 0$ achieves the minimum above if and only if $0 \in \partial g(c)$, which, by the additivity of subgradients, is equivalent to $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T \in -\partial\Delta_j(W)$. Define $X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T$. Consider first the case in which X has rank less than j . Let $t \geq 0$ be a parameter, and let Π be an orthogonal projection matrix onto the nullspace of X . Consider the matrix $W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I + t\Pi$. The sum $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i^T W v_i = \operatorname{tr}(XW) = \operatorname{tr}(X)$ remains bounded for all t , while $\Delta_j(W)$ goes to $-\infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore $g(c) = -\infty$ in this case.

Algorithm 2 Randomized Sampling for j -MSD

Input: Positive semidefinite $n \times n$ matrix M of rank d .

Compute a Cholesky factorization $M = V^T V$ of M , $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$. Let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the columns of V ;

Compute an α -optimal solution c_1, \dots, c_n of (17)–(19) for v_1, \dots, v_n ;

$S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset$;

for $k = 1, \dots, j$ **do**

 Sample i from $[n]$ according to the probability distribution given by $\Pr[i = \ell] = \frac{1}{j} c_\ell$;

 Add i to the multiset S ;

end for

Output: S .

Next we consider the case in which X has rank at least j . Then, by Lemma 17, there exists a W such that $X \in -\partial\Delta_j(W)$, and, therefore, this W achieves $g(c)$. From Lemma 12 and $X \in -\partial\Delta_j(W)$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i^T W v_i = \text{tr}(XW) = j$. Also using the fact that, by Lemma 17, $\Delta_j(W) = \Gamma_j(X)$, we have

$$g(c) = \Delta_j(W) + j - \sum_{i=1}^n c_i = \Gamma_j\left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T\right) + j - \sum_{i=1}^n c_i.$$

To finish the proof we show that any c that maximizes the right hand side above satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i = j$, and, therefore, the optimal value of the dual problem, $\max\{g(c) : c_i \geq 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq n\}$, is equal to the optimal value of (17)–(19). Let us fix some arbitrary c such that $c_i \geq 0$ for all i and $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i = j$, and consider the function $h(t) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g(tc)$, defined over positive real numbers t . It will be enough to show that the unique maximizer of $h(t)$ is $t = 1$. Since h is a restriction of a convex function, it is also convex, and it is enough to show that 1 is the unique solution of $\frac{dh}{dt} = 0$. Let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d$ be the eigenvalues of $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T$, and let k be the unique integer with which $\Gamma_j(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T)$ is computed, i.e. k is such that $\lambda_k > \frac{\sum_{i>1} \lambda_i}{j-k} \geq \lambda_{k+1}$. The eigenvalues of $\sum_{i=1}^n t c_i v_i v_i^T$ are $t\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq t\lambda_d$, so the condition $t\lambda_k > \frac{\sum_{i>1} t\lambda_i}{j-k} \geq t\lambda_{k+1}$ is clearly satisfied, and, by Lemma 14, this choice of k is unique. Therefore, $\Gamma_j\left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T\right)$ and $\Gamma_j\left(\sum_{i=1}^n t c_i v_i v_i^T\right)$ are computed with the same k . By the basic properties of logarithms, $\Gamma_j\left(t \sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T\right) = \Gamma_j\left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T\right) + j \ln t$, and, therefore,

$$h(t) = g(c) + j \ln t - (t - 1)j.$$

The derivative $\frac{dh}{dt} = \frac{j}{t} - j$ vanishes only at $t = 1$, which implies that $h(t) = g(tc)$ is maximized at $t = 1$. This proves the claim and finishes the proof of the theorem. \square

4.3 The Rounding Algorithm

Our rounding algorithm, shown as Algorithm 2, is nearly identical to Algorithm 1, except for using probability weights proportional to an optimal solution of (17)–(19). The approximation guarantee for the algorithm is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 18. *Let the random multiset S be the output of Algorithm 1 for input M and α -optimal c_1, \dots, c_n . Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \det(M_{S,S}) \geq \frac{j!}{j^j} e^{-\alpha} \text{MSD}_j(M) \sim \sqrt{2\pi j} e^{-j-\alpha} \text{MSD}_j(M).$$

Proof. Let us define $p_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{j} c_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{diag}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$. If some element in S repeats, then $\det(M_{S,S}) = 0$. On the other hand, each set S can be sampled in $j!$ different ways, one for each ordering of its elements. We can then write the expectation of $\det(M_{S,S})$ as

$$\mathbb{E} \det(M_{S,S}) = \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{j}} j! \prod_{i \in S} p_i \det(M_{S,S}) = j! \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{j}} \det((P^{1/2} M P^{1/2})_{S,S}) = j! e_j(\lambda),$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ is the vector of eigenvalues of $P^{1/2} M P^{1/2} = P^{1/2} V^T V P^{1/2}$, and the final equality follows by (11). Let $\lambda' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the vector of eigenvalues of $V P V^T = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i v_i^T$; because all non-zero entries of λ and λ' are the same, we have $\mathbb{E} \det(M_{S,S}) = j! e_j(\lambda')$.

Let us assume, without loss of generality, that $\lambda'_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda'_d$ and let k be the unique integer guaranteed by Lemma 14 such that $\lambda'_k > \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda'_i}{j-k} \geq \lambda'_{k+1}$. Define a vector $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by $\mu_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lambda'_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, $\mu_i = \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda'_i}{j-k}$ for $k+1 \leq i \leq j$ and $\mu_i = 0$ for $i > j$. We claim that λ' is majorized by μ . Indeed, we have $\sum_{i=1}^\ell \lambda'_i = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \mu_i$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq k$ by definition; for $k+1 \leq \ell \leq j$, we have, by the choice of k ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^\ell \lambda'_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda'_i + (\ell - k) \lambda'_{k+1} \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \lambda'_i + (\ell - k) \frac{\sum_{i>k} \lambda'_i}{j-k} = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \mu_i.$$

Finally, for $\ell > j$, since $\mu_i = 0$ for $i > j$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^\ell \lambda'_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda'_i = \sum_{i=1}^j \mu_i = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \mu_i,$$

and the inequality holds with equality for $\ell = d$. This proves that $\lambda' \prec \mu$, and by the Schur-concavity of e_j (Lemma 8), we have $e_j(\lambda') \geq e_j(\mu)$. Notice that, by our construction of μ , $e_j(\mu) = \mu_1 \dots \mu_j = \exp(\Gamma_j(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i v_i)) = j^{-j} \exp(\Gamma_j(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i))$. Combining the inequalities we derived so far with Lemma 13 and Theorem 15, and since c_1, \dots, c_n is α -optimal, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \det(M_{S,S}) = j! e_j(\lambda') \geq j! e_j(\mu) = \frac{j!}{j^j} \exp\left(\Gamma_j\left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i\right)\right) \geq \frac{j!}{j^j} e^{-\alpha} \text{MSD}_j(M).$$

The asymptotic estimate $\frac{j!}{j^j} \sim \sqrt{2\pi j} e^{-j}$ is again just Sterling's approximation to $j!$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

In the proof above, we used Lemma 13 and Theorem 15 to show that the optimal value of (17)–(19) is at least $\ln \text{MSD}_j(M)$. This can also be done more directly by showing that the indicator vector of any set $S \in \binom{[n]}{j}$ is feasible for (17)–(19) and achieves value $\ln \det(M_{S,S})$. However, it is far from obvious how to derive (17)–(19) in a natural manner without going through enclosing ellipsoids!

Since (17)–(19) is a convex optimization problem, we can use the ellipsoid method to compute an α -optimal solution in time polynomial in $n, d, \log \alpha^{-1}$ [GLS81]. Together with Algorithm 2, we get an approximation factor of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi d}} ((1+\epsilon)e)^j$ in time polynomial in n, d , and $\log \epsilon^{-1}$. It is also conceivable that the barycentric coordinate descent method of Khachiyan [Kha96] can be extended to solve (17)–(19).

In Section 5 we show how to derandomize Algorithm 2 using the method of conditional expectations.

Algorithm 3 Deterministic Approximation Algorithm for j -MSD

Input: Positive semidefinite $n \times n$ matrix M of rank d ; integer $1 \leq j \leq d$.

Compute a Cholesky factorization $M = V^T V$ of M , $V \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$. Let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the columns of V ;

Compute an α -optimal solution c_1, \dots, c_n of (17)–(19) for v_1, \dots, v_n ;

$S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \emptyset$;

$C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{diag}(c_1, \dots, c_n)$;

for $k = 1, \dots, j$ **do**

For a set $T \subseteq [n]$, let $\lambda(T)$ be the vector of eigenvalues of the matrix $(C^{1/2} V^T \Pi(T) V C^{1/2})_{[n] \setminus T, [n] \setminus T}$, where $\Pi(T)$ is the projection matrix onto the orthogonal complement of $\text{span}\{v_i : i \in T\}$. Define the potential function

$$\Phi(T) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \det(M_{T,T}) e_{j-|T|}(\lambda(T)).$$

Let i^* maximize $\Phi(S \cup \{i\})$. Add i^* to the set S .

end for

Output: S .

5 Derandomizing the Algorithms

In Theorems 10 and 18 we only proved our approximation guarantees in expectation. A priori, this does not give a useful bound on the probability that the set output by Algorithm 1 or 2 is close to optimal. However, it is not hard to derandomize the algorithms using the method of conditional expectation. The deterministic algorithm is presented as Algorithm 3.

Theorem 19. *The set S output by Algorithm 3 satisfies $\det(M_{S,S}) \geq \frac{j!}{j^j} e^{-\alpha} \text{MSD}_j(M)$.*

Proof. By the method of conditional expectation [AS08], and Theorem 18, it is enough to show that

$$\Phi(T) = j^{j-|T|} \mathbb{E}[\det(M_{S,S}) | T \subseteq S],$$

where the expectation is over the distribution on the output of Algorithm 2. Expanding the expectation on the right hand side, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\det(M_{S,S}) | T \subseteq S] &= \sum_{\substack{S \in \binom{[n]}{j} \\ T \subseteq S}} \left(\prod_{i \in S \setminus T} \frac{c_i}{j} \right) \det(M_{S,S}) \\ &= j^{|T|-j} \sum_{\substack{S \in \binom{[n]}{j} \\ T \subseteq S}} \left(\prod_{i \in S \setminus T} c_i \right) \det(V_T^T V_T) \det(V_{S \setminus T}^T \Pi(T) V_{S \setminus T}) \\ &= j^{|T|-j} \det(V_T^T V_T) \sum_{\substack{S \in \binom{[n]}{j} \\ T \subseteq S}} \det((C^{1/2} V^T \Pi(T) V C^{1/2})_{S \setminus T, S \setminus T}) \\ &= j^{|T|-j} \det(M_{T,T}) e_{j-|T|}(\lambda(T)) = j^{|T|-j} \Phi(T). \end{aligned}$$

The second equality follows from the “base times height” formula for the determinant. The penultimate equality follows from (11). \square

To implement Algorithm 3, we need to be able to evaluate the elementary symmetric polynomial $e_{j-|T|}(\lambda(T))$. This can be done in polynomial time by expanding the characteristic polynomial of the matrix $(C^{1/2}V^T\Pi(T)VC^{1/2})_{[n]\setminus T, [n]\setminus T}$: $e_{j-|T|}(\lambda(T))$ is equal to $(-1)^{j-|T|}$ times the coefficient of the term of degree $d - j + |T|$.

6 Restricted Invertibility Principles

The celebrated Restricted Invertibility Principle (RIP) of Bourgain and Tzafriri [BT87] is a powerful generalization of the simple fact in linear algebra that a matrix of rank r has an invertible submatrix with at least r columns. The RIP shows that if the “robust rank” of a matrix is large, i.e. the matrix has many large singular values, then it contains a proportionally large submatrix which is well-invertible, i.e. its inverse is bounded in operator norm. The RIP has had many applications in Banach space theory, asymptotic convex geometry, statistics, and recently in discrepancy theory and private data analysis.

Our analysis of Algorithm 2 can be adapted to prove an analogue of the RIP for volume. Let us first recall a formal statement of the RIP, in a version due to Spielman and Srivastava. We use $\|\cdot\|_{HS}$ for the Hilbert-Schmidt (Frobenius) norm, and $\|\cdot\|_{2\rightarrow 2}$ for the $\ell_2 \rightarrow \ell_2$ operator norm.

Theorem 20 ([SS10]). *Let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T = I$. Let $L : \ell_2^d \rightarrow \ell_2^d$ be a linear operator. Then for any ϵ , $0 < \epsilon < 1$, there exists a subset $S \subseteq [n]$ of size $|S| \geq \left\lceil \epsilon^2 \frac{\|L\|_{HS}^2}{\|L\|_{2\rightarrow 2}^2} \right\rceil$ such that*

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in S} x_i L v_i \right\|_2 \geq \frac{(1 - \epsilon) \|L\|_{HS}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n c_i}} \|x\|_2$$

holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^S$. Moreover, such a set S can be computed in deterministic polynomial time.

The version of the RIP above was proved by Spielman and Srivastava for $c_1 = \dots = c_n = 1$. However, essentially the same proof shows the slight generalization formulated above.

Next we state our version of the RIP for determinants.

Theorem 21. *Let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{R}_+$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i v_i v_i^T = I$. Let $L : \ell_2^d \rightarrow \ell_2^d$ be a linear operator. Then for any $j \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\|L\|_{HS}^2}{\|L\|_{2\rightarrow 2}^2} \right\rfloor$, there exists a subset $S \subseteq [n]$ of size j such that the matrix $M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ((Lv_i, Lv_k))_{i,k \in S}$ satisfies*

$$\det(M) \geq \frac{j!}{j^j} \frac{\|L\|_{HS}^{2j}}{(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i)^j} \sim \sqrt{2\pi j} e^{-j} \frac{\|L\|_{HS}^{2j}}{(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i)^j}.$$

Moreover, such a set S can be computed in deterministic polynomial time.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 18. Let $X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ((Lv_i, Lv_k))_{i,k \in [n]}$. Let $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i$ and define $p_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c_i/C$. Let us sample i_1, \dots, i_j independently from $[n]$ so that for each k , $1 \leq k \leq j$, $\Pr[i_k = i] = p_i$. Define the random matrix $M = ((Lv_{i_k}, Lv_{i_\ell}))_{k, \ell \in [j]}$. If $i_k = i_\ell$ for some $k \neq \ell$, then

$\det(M) = 0$, and otherwise there are $j!$ ways to sample the same set of indexes $\{i_k : 1 \leq k \leq j\}$. We then have the following formula for the expectation of $\det(M)$:

$$\mathbb{E} \det(M) = \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{j}} j! \prod_{i \in S} p_i \det(X_{S,S}) = j! \sum_{S \in \binom{[n]}{j}} \det((P^{1/2} X P^{1/2})_{S,S}) = j! e_j(\mu),$$

where $P \stackrel{def}{=} \text{diag}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$, μ is the vector of eigenvalues of the matrix $P^{1/2} X P^{1/2}$, and the final equality follows by (11).

Let us identify L with a $d \times d$ matrix in the natural way. The matrix

$$LVPV^T L^T = L \left(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i v_i v_i^T \right) L^T = \frac{1}{C} LL^T$$

has the same non-zero eigenvalues as $P^{1/2} X P^{1/2}$. Denoting the eigenvalues of LL^T by $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_d$, we then have $\mathbb{E} \det(M) = j! e_j(\mu) = \frac{1}{C^j} j! e_j(\lambda)$.

Note that the entries of λ (i.e. the eigenvalues of LL^T) are equal to the squared singular values of L , and, therefore, $\|L\|_{HS}^2 = \|\lambda\|_1$ and $\|L\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}^2 = \lambda_1$. To complete the proof, it remains to show that $e_j(\lambda) \geq j^{-j} \|\lambda\|_1^j$. Because e_j is Schur concave, it is enough to show that $\lambda \prec \bar{\lambda} \stackrel{def}{=} \left(\frac{\|\lambda\|_1}{j}, \dots, \frac{\|\lambda\|_1}{j}, 0, \dots, 0 \right)$, where $\bar{\lambda}$ has j non-zero coordinates. Indeed, for any $k \leq j$, by the choice of j ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \leq k \lambda_1 \leq k \frac{\|\lambda\|_1}{j} = \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\lambda}_i.$$

For $j < k \leq d$, $\sum_{i=1}^k \lambda_i \leq \|\lambda\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{\lambda}_i$, with equality for $k = d$. Therefore, $\lambda \prec \bar{\lambda}$ and $e_j(\lambda) \geq e_j(\bar{\lambda}) = j^{-j} \|\lambda\|_1^j$. This finishes the proof of the main claim.

A set $S \subseteq [n]$ such that $M = X_{S,S}$ satisfies the conclusion of the theorem can be computed in deterministic polynomial time via the method of conditional expectations, as in the proof of Theorem 19. \square

Theorem 21 is incomparable with Theorem 20. On one hand, the conclusion of Theorem 20 is of a qualitatively stronger type: it implies a lower bound on the smallest singular value of the matrix $M = (\langle Lv_i, Lv_k \rangle)_{i,k \in S}$. On the other hand, the set S in Theorem 21 can be as large as the (floor function of the) robust rank $\|L\|_{HS}^2 / \|L\|_{2 \rightarrow 2}^2$, while this is in general not possible in Theorem 20.

7 Conclusion

We have given a polynomial time deterministic algorithm that approximates the j -MSD problem by a factor of $e^{j+o(j)}$, and, therefore, the j -MVS problem by a factor of $e^{j/2+o(j)}$. Our algorithms use randomized rounding with a generalization of the D -optimal design problem. The analysis relies on convex duality, Schur convexity, and elementary properties of determinants.

We conjecture that approximating the j -MSD problem within a factor of $e^{j-\epsilon}$ is NP-hard for any $\epsilon > 0$. As an easier problem, it will be interesting to construct an input for which the j -Löwner ellipsoid approximates j -MSD no better than a factor of e^j , or to give a better analysis.

We also leave open the problem of computing a constant factor approximation to the determinant lower bound on hereditary discrepancy. Finally, it will be interesting to generalize Khachiyan's barycentric coordinate descent algorithm for the D -optimal design problem to the dual of the j -Löwner ellipsoid problem.

Acknowledgements

I thank Kunal Talwar and Nikhil Bansal for useful discussions.

References

- [AS08] Noga Alon and Joel H. Spencer. *The probabilistic method*. Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, third edition, 2008.
- [Bal89] Keith Ball. Volumes of sections of cubes and related problems. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis (1987–88)*, volume 1376 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 251–260. Springer, Berlin, 1989.
- [BT87] J. Bourgain and L. Tzafriri. Invertibility of large submatrices with applications to the geometry of banach spaces and harmonic analysis. *Israel journal of mathematics*, 57(2):137–224, 1987.
- [BV04] Stephen Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [ÇM13] Ali Çivril and Malik Magdon-Ismail. Exponential inapproximability of selecting a maximum volume sub-matrix. *Algorithmica*, 65(1):159–176, 2013.
- [DEFM14] Marco Di Summa, Friedrich Eisenbrand, Yuri Faenza, and Carsten Moldenhauer. On largest volume simplices and sub-determinants. *CoRR*, abs/1406.3512, 2014. To appear in SODA 2015.
- [DR50] A. Dvoretzky and C. A. Rogers. Absolute and unconditional convergence in normed linear spaces. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 36:192–197, 1950.
- [DR10] Amit Deshpande and Luis Rademacher. Efficient volume sampling for row/column subset selection. In *51th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2010, October 23-26, 2010, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA*, pages 329–338. IEEE Computer Society, 2010.
- [GH62] Alain Ghouila-Houri. Caractérisation des matrices totalement unimodulaires. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 254:1192–1194, 1962.
- [GK94] Peter Gritzmann and Victor Klee. On the complexity of some basic problems in computational convexity: I. containment problems. *Discrete Mathematics*, 136(1-3):129–174, 1994.
- [GKL95] Peter Gritzmann, Victor Klee, and D. G. Larman. Largest j -simplices n -polytopes. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 13:477–515, 1995.
- [GLS81] M. Grötschel, L. Lovász, and A. Schrijver. The ellipsoid method and its consequences in combinatorial optimization. *Combinatorica*, 1(2):169–197, 1981.
- [GS12] Venkatesan Guruswami and Ali Kemal Sinop. Optimal column-based low-rank matrix reconstruction. In Yuval Rabani, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2012, Kyoto, Japan, January 17-19, 2012*, pages 1207–1214. SIAM, 2012.

- [GT01] S. A. Goreinov and E. E. Tyrtyshnikov. The maximal-volume concept in approximation by low-rank matrices. In *Structured matrices in mathematics, computer science, and engineering, I (Boulder, CO, 1999)*, volume 280 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 47–51. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001.
- [Joh48] Fritz John. Extremum problems with inequalities as subsidiary conditions. In *Studies and Essays Presented to R. Courant on his 60th Birthday, January 8, 1948*, pages 187–204. Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York, N. Y., 1948.
- [Kha95] Leonid Khachiyan. On the complexity of approximating extremal determinants in matrices. *J. Complexity*, 11(1):138–153, 1995.
- [Kha96] Leonid G. Khachiyan. Rounding of polytopes in the real number model of computation. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 21(2):307–320, 1996.
- [Kou06] Ioannis Koutis. Parameterized complexity and improved inapproximability for computing the largest j -simplex in a V -polytope. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 100(1):8–13, 2006.
- [Lew95] A. S. Lewis. The convex analysis of unitarily invariant matrix functions. *J. Convex Anal.*, 2(1-2):173–183, 1995.
- [LSV86] L. Lovász, J. Spencer, and K. Vesztergombi. Discrepancy of set-systems and matrices. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 7(2):151–160, 1986.
- [Mat98] Jiří Matoušek. An L_p version of the Beck-Fiala conjecture. *European J. Combin.*, 19(2):175–182, 1998.
- [Mat11] Jiří Matoušek. The determinant bound for discrepancy is almost tight. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1101.0767>, 2011.
- [NT14] Aleksandar Nikolov and Kunal Talwar. Approximating discrepancy via small width ellipsoids. To appear in SODA '15, 2014.
- [NTZ13] Aleksandar Nikolov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. The geometry of differential privacy: the sparse and approximate cases. In Dan Boneh, Tim Roughgarden, and Joan Feigenbaum, editors, *Symposium on Theory of Computing Conference, STOC'13, Palo Alto, CA, USA, June 1-4, 2013*, pages 351–360. ACM, 2013. Full version to appear in the STOC 2013 Special Issue of SICOMP.
- [Pac04] Asa Packer. Polynomial-time approximation of largest simplices in v -polytopes. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 134(1-3):213–237, 2004.
- [Roc70] R. Tyrrell Rockafellar. *Convex analysis*. Princeton Mathematical Series, No. 28. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1970.
- [Sch23] I. Schur. Über eine Klasse von Mittelbildungen mit Anwendungen auf die Determinantentheorie. *Sitzungsber. Berl. Math. Ges.* 22, 9-20 (1923)., 1923.
- [Sch03] Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization. Polyhedra and efficiency. Vol. B*, volume 24 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. Matroids, trees, stable sets, Chapters 39–69.

- [Sri97] Aravind Srinivasan. Improving the discrepancy bound for sparse matrices: better approximations for sparse lattice approximation problems. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (New Orleans, LA, 1997)*, pages 692–701. ACM, New York, 1997.
- [SS10] D.A. Spielman and N. Srivastava. An elementary proof of the restricted invertibility theorem. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, pages 1–9, 2010.
- [Ver01] R. Vershynin. John’s decompositions: selecting a large part. *Israel J. Math.*, 122:253–277, 2001.