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[^0]Abstract In a recent paper, the following theorem was proved by the author. Given an arbitrary $n$-dimensional simplex

$$
P=\left\{x \in R^{n} \mid A x \leq c\right\}
$$

where $\Lambda=\left(a_{i j}\right)$ is an $n+1$ by $n$ integer matrix and $c=\left(c_{1}, \cdots, c_{n+1}\right)^{\top}$ is an integer vector in the ( $n+1$ )-dimensional Euclidean space $R^{n+1}$, then there exists an $n \times n$ unimodular matrix $U$ such that the matrix $B=\left(b_{i j}\right)=A U$ has the following properties:
(1) $b_{i i}>0$ for all $i=1, \cdots, n$;
(2) for each $i=1, \cdots, n$, it holds that $b_{i j} \leq 0$ and $\left|b_{i j}\right|<b_{i i}$ for all $j \neq i ;$
(3) $b_{(n+1) j} \leq 0$ for $j=1, \cdots, n$.

The above theorem extends an carlier result of Scarf for $n=2$. In this note a constructive proof of the theorem is proposed.

Keywords: Simplices, unimodular transformation, combinatorial theorem, integer lincar programming.

## 1 Main results

Let $R^{n}$ denote the $n$-dimensional Euclidean space. $Z^{n}\left(Z_{+}^{n}\right)$ denotes the set of all (nonnegative) integer vectors in $R^{n}$. Moreover, we denote the identity matrix of rank $n$ by $I_{n}$. Throughout the paper we consider an $n$-dimensional simplex

$$
P=\left\{x \in R^{n} \mid A x \leq c\right\}
$$

where $A=\left(a_{i j}\right)$ is an $(n+1) \times n$ integer matrix, and $c=\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{n+1}\right)^{\top}$ is an integer vector of $R^{n+1}$.

A matrix $U$ is unimodular if the entries of $U$ are integral and the determinant of $U$ is equal to 1 or -1 .

Matrices which transform $A$ as described by the following elementary column operations are unimodular:
(i) Interchange two columns.
(ii) Reverse the sign of a column.
(iii) Add an integral multiple of one column to another.

In [4], the following basic theorem was proved. This theorem extends an earlier result of Scarf [2] for $n=2$ and has an important application in integer linear programming and economies with indivisibilities (sec Scarf [2] and Yang [4]). $\Lambda$ weaker version of an equivalent form of this theorem can be found in White $[3]^{\dagger}$. Here a constructive proof of the following theorem is given.
${ }^{\dagger}$ Formally White proves by induction that for any given $n$-dimensional simplex

$$
\prime^{\prime}=\left\{x \in R^{\prime \prime} \mid A x \leq c\right\},
$$

there exists an $n \times n$ unimodular matrix $U$ such that the matrix $B=A U=\left(b_{i j}\right)$ satisfies
(1) $b_{1 i} \leq 0$ for all $i=1, \cdots, n$;
(2) $b_{(i+1) i}>0$ for all $i=1, \cdots, n$;

## Theorem 1.1

For any given $n$-dimensional simplex

$$
P=\left\{x \in R^{n} \mid \Lambda x \leq c\right\}
$$

there exists an $n \times n$ unimodular matrix $U$ such that the matrix $B=A U=\left(b_{i j}\right)$ satisfics.
(1) $b_{i i}>0$ for all $i=1, \cdots, n$;
(2) for each $i=1, \cdots, n$, it holds $b_{i j} \leq 0$ and $\left|b_{i j}\right|<b_{i i}$ for all $j \neq i$;
(3) $b_{(n+1) j} \leq 0$ for all $j=1, \cdots, n$.

Proof:
Let $a_{i}$ denote the $i$-th row of the matrix $\Lambda$ for $i=1, \cdots, n+1$. Notice that the origin of $R^{n}$ is in the interior of the convex hull of the vectors $a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n+1}$. It implies that there are $n+1$ strictly positive convex combination coefficients $\lambda_{1}, \ldots$, $\lambda_{n+1}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_{i} u_{i}=0 . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, the corresponding convex combination coefficients remain unchanged under any unimodular transformation of $\Lambda$. The subsequent proof consists of four phases.

Phase $I$ :
We first implement the procedure $I$ for $A$ :

Step (0) Sel $i=n+1$.
Step (1) Set $j=i-1$. If $a_{i j}=0$, choose $a_{i l} \neq 0$ for some $1 \leq l \leq j-1$ and switch column $j$ with columu $l$. Sel $k=j-1$.
(3) for each $i=1, \cdots, n$, it holds $b_{(i+1) j} \leq 0$ for all $j \neq i$.

Step (2) If $a_{i k}=0$, do nothing. Otherwise use the Euclidean algorithm to find the greatest common divisor of $a_{i j}$ and $a_{i k}$, denoted by $r=g \cdot c . d\left(a_{i j}, a_{i k}\right)$, and $p, q$ relatively prime such that $p a_{i j}+q a_{i k}=r$. Set $\Lambda^{\prime}=\Lambda I$, where $D$ is the indentity matrix $I_{n}$ in all but columns $k$ and $j$. In column $k$, we have $d_{j k}=-a_{i k} / r, d_{k k}=a_{i j} / r$, and $d_{s k}=0$ otherwise. In column $j$, we have $d_{j j}=p, d_{k j}=q$, and $d_{s j}=0$ otherwise. If $k>1$, return to Step (2) with $k=k-1$. Otherwise check whether $a_{i j} \leq 0$. If not, reverse the sign of column j. Set $i=i-1$ and $A=A^{\prime}$. Go to Step (3).

Step (3) If $i=1$, stop. Otherwise go to Step (1).
Let us consider Step (2) where $A^{\prime}=\left(a_{s t}^{\prime}\right)=A D$. Note that

$$
d\left(c(1)=p a_{i j} / r+q a_{i k} / r=1 .\right.
$$

Hence $l$ ) is a unimodular matrix. Morcover, for $s=1, \cdots, n+1$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a_{s t}^{\prime}=a_{s t}, t \neq j, k \\
& a_{s j}^{\prime}=p a_{s j}+q a_{s k}
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
a_{s k}^{\prime}=-a_{i k} a_{s j} / r+a_{i j} a_{s k} / r
$$

In particular, $a_{i j}^{\prime}=r$ and $a_{i k}^{\prime}=0$. It is clear that all other operations are also unimodular transformations. Therefore, after a finite number of steps, the procedure $I$ brings $A$ into the form:

$$
\left(a_{i j}\right)=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
+ & ? & \cdots & ? & ?  \tag{1.2}\\
- & ? & \cdots & ? & ? \\
0 & - & \cdots & ? & ? \\
\vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & - & ? \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -
\end{array}\right]
$$

where " + " stands for a positive entry, and " - " for a zero or negative entry. Notice that in the above matrix entries " - " can not be zero.

For $k=2, \cdots, n+1$, we denote the submatrix of $A$ obtained by taking rows I through $k$ and columns 1 through $k-1$ of $A$ by $A_{k}$, i.e.,

$$
A_{k}=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
+ & ? & \cdots & ? & ?  \tag{1.3}\\
- & ? & \cdots & ? & ? \\
0 & - & \cdots & ? & ? \\
\vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & - & ? \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -
\end{array}\right]
$$

being a $k \times(k-1)$ matrix.
Phase $I I$ :
Suppose that for some $k, 2 \leq k \leq n$, we have unimodularly transformed $A_{k}$ into $A_{k}^{\prime}$ satisfying (1), (2), and (3). It implies that $\Lambda_{k+1}$ is brought into the form:

$$
\bar{A}_{k+1}=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
+ & - & \cdots & - & ? \\
- & + & \cdots & - & ? \\
\vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\
- & - & \cdots & + & ? \\
- & - & \cdots & - & ? \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -
\end{array}\right]
$$

of which the first $k$ rows and $k-1$ columns form the matrix $\Lambda_{k}^{\prime}$ and the last column is the last columen of $\Lambda_{k+1}$. Let $a_{i}^{\prime}$ denote the $i$ th row of $\Lambda_{k}^{\prime}$ for $i=1, \cdots, k$. Note that the zero row vector of $R^{k-1}$ is in the interior of the convex hull of all rows of $\Lambda_{k}^{\prime}$. More precisely, the corresponding convex combination coefficients are $\lambda_{i}^{\prime}=\lambda_{i} / \sum_{h=1}^{k} \lambda_{h}$ for $i=1, \cdots, k$. It is known that $\Lambda_{k}^{\prime}$ is a productive Leontief matrix. Thus there exists a positive integral combination of columns one through $k-1$ of $\bar{A}_{k+1}$ for which the last element is zero, the $k$-th element is strictly negative
and the other elements are strictly positive. These positive integral combination coefficients are solutions of the following system of linear equations:

$$
\begin{align*}
& a_{1}^{\prime} x \geq 1  \tag{1.4}\\
& \vdots \\
& a_{k-1}^{\prime} x \geq 1 \\
& x \in Z_{+}^{k-1}
\end{align*}
$$

A solution of system (1.4) can be found by the basic algorithm in [1] within a finite number of steps from any starting point $v$ in $Z_{+}^{k-1}$. More preciscly, we adopt the following labeling rule:

To $y \in Z^{k-1}$, we assign $y$ with the label $l(y)=i$ if $i$ is the smallest index for which

$$
a_{i}^{\prime} y-1=\min \left\{a_{h}^{\prime} y-1 \mid a_{h}^{\prime} y-1<0, h \in\{1, \cdots, k-1\}\right\} .
$$

If $a_{h}^{\prime} y-1 \geq 0$ for all $h=1, \cdots, k-1$, then the label $l(y)=0$ is assigned to $y$.
Furthermore, we define

$$
q(i)=E(i), \quad i=1, \cdots, k-1
$$

where $E(i)$ is the $i$-th unit vector of $R^{k-1}$.
By subtracting a large positive integral multiple of the above combination from the last column of $\bar{\Lambda}_{k+1}$, we can therefore transform $\Lambda_{k+1}$ (hence $\Lambda_{k+1}$ ) into the form:

$$
\hat{A}_{k+1}=\left(\hat{a}_{i j}\right)=\left[\begin{array}{ccccc}
+ & - & \cdots & - & -  \tag{1.5}\\
- & + & \cdots & - & - \\
\vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\
- & - & \cdots & + & - \\
- & - & \cdots & - & + \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -
\end{array}\right] .
$$

Phase III:
Next we shall give a procedure to transform the matrix $\hat{A}_{k+1}$ to the form satisfying (1), (2) and (3). The procedure is described as follows:

Step (a) If there are indices $i$ and $j(i \neq j)$ for some $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ with $\hat{a}_{i i} \leq\left|\hat{a}_{i j}\right|$, we can find a positive integer $e$ and an integer $d \in\left\{0,1, \ldots, \hat{a}_{i i}-1\right\}$ such that $\left|\hat{a}_{i j}\right|=e \hat{a}_{i i}+d$, where $e$ is the lower integer part of $\left|\hat{a}_{i j}\right| / \hat{a}_{i i}$, and then add $e$ multiple of column $i$ to column $j$.

Step (b) Repeat Step (a) until there are no indices $i$ and $j(i \neq j)$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ with $\hat{a}_{i i} \leq\left|\hat{a}_{i j}\right|$.

It is easy to see that the above operation is a unimodular transformation. It is shown in [4] that the above procedure will bring $\hat{A}_{k+1}$ to the desired form satisfying (1), (2) and (3), denoted by $A_{k+1}^{\prime}$, within a finite number of steps.

Phase IV:
Step (0) Implement Phase $I$ and obtain $A$ as in (1.2). Set $k=2$ and $\Lambda_{2}^{\prime}=\Lambda_{2}$ as in (1.3).

Step (1) Implement Phase $I I$ for $A_{k}^{\prime}$ and obtain $\hat{A}_{k+1}$ as in (1.5). Implement Phase $I I I$ for $\hat{A}_{k+1}$ and obtain $A_{k+1}^{\prime}$. Set $k=k+1$.

Step (2) If $k=n+1$, set $B=\Lambda_{n+1}^{\prime}$ and stop. Otherwise, go to Step (1).
It is obvious that $\Lambda_{2}$ has the desired form and Step (1) always brings $\Lambda_{k+1}$ to the desired form $A_{k+1}^{\prime}$ within a finite number of steps.

Hence the procedure produces the matrix $B=A U$ satisfying all conditions in the theorem where $l$ is a umimodular matrix. This completes the proof.

We shall conclude this note with three examples to illustrate the proof. In the sequel, $(d) f \rightarrow g,(-1) f$, and $f \leftrightarrow g$ denote the addition of $d$ multiple of column $f$
to column $g$, the reversal of the sign of column $f$, and the interchange of columns $f$ and $g$, respectively.

Example 1. We are given

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
5 & 7 & -1 \\
-4 & 3 & 2 \\
3 & -12 & 1 \\
-4 & 2 & -2
\end{array}\right]
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (1) 3 \rightarrow 2: A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
5 & 6 & -1 \\
-4 & 5 & 2 \\
3 & -11 & 1 \\
-4 & 0 & -2
\end{array}\right] \\
& (-2) 3 \rightarrow 1: A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
7 & 6 & -1 \\
-8 & 5 & 2 \\
1 & -11 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -2
\end{array}\right] \\
& 1 \leftrightarrow 2: A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
6 & 7 & -1 \\
5 & -8 & 2 \\
-11 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -2
\end{array}\right] \\
& (11) 2 \rightarrow 1: \Lambda=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
83 & 7 & -1 \\
-83 & -8 & 2 \\
0 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -2
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (-1) 2: A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
83 & -7 & -1 \\
-83 & 8 & 2 \\
0 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -2
\end{array}\right] \\
& (-1) 1 \rightarrow 2: A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
83 & -90 & -1 \\
-83 & 91 & 2 \\
0 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -2
\end{array}\right] \\
& (1) 1 \rightarrow 2: A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
83 & -7 & -1 \\
-83 & 8 & 2 \\
0 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -2
\end{array}\right] \\
& (10) 2 \rightarrow 1: A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
13 & -7 & -1 \\
-3 & 8 & 2 \\
-10 & -1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & -2
\end{array}\right] \\
& (-1) 1 \rightarrow 3: A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
13 & -7 & -14 \\
-3 & 8 & 5 \\
-10 & -1 & 11 \\
0 & 0 & -2
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally,

$$
(-1) 2 \rightarrow 3: B=A U=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
13 & -7 & -7 \\
-3 & 8 & -3 \\
-10 & -1 & 12 \\
0 & 0 & -2
\end{array}\right]
$$

where

$$
U=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & -1 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & -1 \\
-1 & 2 & 0
\end{array}\right]
$$

Example 2. We are given

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
-7 & 3 & 10 & -6 \\
-8 & -2 & 1 & -5 \\
9 & -6 & -7 & 6 \\
-1 & 6 & -3 & 1 \\
7 & -1 & -1 & 1
\end{array}\right]
$$

Then

$$
U_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
-5 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
-31 & 6 & 0 & 0 \\
165 & -31 & -1 & 0 \\
169 & -32 & -1 & -1
\end{array}\right]
$$

brings $A$ to

$$
F_{1}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
578 & -107 & -1 & 6 \\
-578 & 109 & 1 & 5 \\
0 & -2 & 1 & -6 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & -4 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1
\end{array}\right] .
$$

Then

$$
U_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 4 & 0 & 0 \\
10 & -11 & -1 & 0 \\
9 & -14 & -1 & -1
\end{array}\right]
$$

brings $A$ to

$$
F_{2}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
43 & -21 & -4 & 6 \\
-33 & 43 & 4 & 5 \\
-10 & -22 & 1 & -6 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & -1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1
\end{array}\right]
$$

Then

$$
U_{3}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\
-1 & 4 & -3 & 0 \\
10 & -11 & 0 & 0 \\
9 & -14 & 4 & -1
\end{array}\right]
$$

brings $A$ to

$$
F_{3}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
43 & -21 & -26 & 6 \\
-33 & 43 & -6 & 5 \\
-10 & -22 & 33 & -6 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & -4 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1
\end{array}\right]
$$

We now have to solve the following system of equations:

$$
\begin{array}{cl}
43 x_{1}-21 x_{2}-26 x_{3} & \geq 1 \\
-33 x_{1}+43 x_{2}-6 x_{3} & \geq 1 \\
-10 x_{1}-22 x_{2}+33 x_{3} & \geq 1 \\
x \in Z_{+}^{3}
\end{array}
$$

Some solutions of equation (1.6) found by the algorithm in [4] (see its computer code in [1]) are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Some solutions of equation (1.6) found by the algorithm.

| starting point | solution | number of stcps |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(0,0,0)$ | $(23,21,21)$ | 72 |
| $(20,19,18)$ | $(23,21,21)$ | 9 |
| $(21,20,19)$ | $(23,21,21)$ | 6 |
| $(18,20,19)$ | $(23,21,21)$ | 9 |
| $(18,19,20)$ | $(23,21,21)$ | 9 |
| $(-10,5,10)$ | $(23,21,21)$ | 65 |
| $(39,1,-77)$ | $(39,35,36)$ | 171 |
| $(20,-43,33)$ | $(39,35,36)$ | 104 |
| $(55,31,16)$ | $(56,51,51)$ | 69 |
| $(-10,5,-10)$ | $(23,21,21)$ | 89 |
| $(34,19,-21)$ | $(34,31,31)$ | 72 |
| $(-10,-20,10)$ | $(23,21,21)$ | 94 |
| $(10,-20,-30)$ | $(23,21,21)$ | 126 |
| $(-100,-100,-100)$ | $(23,21,21)$ | 401 |
| $(-100,100,-200)$ | $(110,100,101)$ | 533 |
| $(200,300,-200)$ | $(328,300,300)$ | 642 |
| $(200,300,500)$ | $(539,484,500)$ | 553 |
| $(600,300,500)$ | $(600,536,540)$ | 293 |
| $(700,300,1)$ | $(700,625,629)$ | 1170 |
| $(1000,1000,1000)$ | $(1661,1490,1542)$ | 9492 |

We choose $(23,21,21)$. Then

$$
U_{4}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\
-1 & 4 & -3 & 6 \\
10 & -11 & 0 & 3 \\
9 & -14 & 4 & 8
\end{array}\right]
$$

brings $A$ to

$$
F_{4}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
43 & -21 & -26 & 0 \\
-33 & 43 & -6 & -49 \\
-10 & -22 & 33 & -9 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 59 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1
\end{array}\right]
$$

Finally,

$$
U=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\
-1 & 4 & -3 & 10 \\
10 & -11 & 0 & -8 \\
9 & -14 & 4 & -6
\end{array}\right]
$$

brings $A$ to

$$
B=A U=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
43 & -21 & -26 & -21 \\
-33 & 43 & -6 & -6 \\
-10 & -22 & 33 & -31 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 59 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1
\end{array}\right]
$$

Example 3. We are given

$$
A=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
-1 & -1 & -1 \\
3 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 3 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 3
\end{array}\right]
$$

Then

$$
U=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 \\
-1 & -1 & -1
\end{array}\right]
$$

such that

$$
B=\Lambda U=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
-1 & 2 & 0 \\
-1 & 0 & 2 \\
-3 & -2 & -2
\end{array}\right]
$$
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