

Smoothed analysis of the simplex method

Sophie Huijberts

Joint work with Yin Tat Lee and Xinzhi Zhang

Once upon a time...

maximize $c^T x$


subject to $Ax \leq b$

we get $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$

$b \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$c \in \mathbb{R}^d$

we compute $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$



Different simplex methods

- most negative reduced cost
- steepest edge
- greatest improvement
- approximate steepest edge

Different simplex methods

- most negative reduced cost
- steepest edge
- greatest improvement
- approximate steepest edge
- Whatever they do in real software

Different simplex methods

- most negative reduced cost
- steepest edge
- greatest improvement
- approximate steepest edge
- Whatever they do in real software
- Shadow vertex rule (nice in theory)

LP History



75th
anniversary
celebration

The first large LP



Mathematical Tables Project

- 450 computers employed
- 1938 - 1948

The first large LP



Mathematical Tables Project

- 450 computers employed
- 1938 - 1948

You will recall that 77 foods and 9 nutrient elements were involved in this problem. The number of operations by type are as follows:

Type of Operations	No. of repetitions
Multiplication	15,315
Division	1,234
Addition of two numbers	14,561
Addition of 77 numbers	190
Addition of 9 numbers	85

To perform these computations with desk machines required 5 computers for 21 days, with 4 hours per day supervision by a mathematician.

The first large LP



Mathematical Tables Project

- 450 computers employed
- 1938 - 1948

You will recall that 77 foods and 9 nutrient elements were involved in this problem. The number of operations by type are as follows:

Type of Operations	No. of repetitions
Multiplication	15,315
Division	1,234
Addition of two numbers	14,561
Addition of 77 numbers	190
Addition of 9 numbers	85

To perform these computations with desk machines required 5 computers for 21 days, with 4 hours per day supervision by a mathematician.

- Stopped on Von Neumann's recommendation

The first large LP



Mathematical Tables Project

- 450 computers employed
- 1938 - 1948

You will recall that 77 foods and 9 nutrient elements were involved in this problem. The number of operations by type are as follows:

Type of Operations	No. of repetitions
Multiplication	15,315
Division	1,234
Addition of two numbers	14,561
Addition of 77 numbers	190
Addition of 9 numbers	85

To perform these computations with desk machines required 5 computers for 21 days, with 4 hours per day supervision by a mathematician.

- Stopped on Von Neumann's recommendation
- Hand book of Mathematical Functions (1964)

Linear Programming and Extensions

George B. Dantzig

STIGLER'S NUTRITION MODEL: AN EXAMPLE OF FORMULATION AND SOLUTION

One of the first applications of the simplex algorithm was to the determination of an adequate diet that was of least cost.¹ In the fall of 1947, J. Laderman of the Mathematical Tables Project of the National Bureau of Standards undertook, as a test of the newly proposed simplex method, the first large-scale computation in this field. It was a system with nine equations in seventy-seven unknowns. Using hand-operated desk calculators, approximately 120 man-days were required to obtain a solution.

The particular problem solved was one which had been studied earlier by G. J. Stigler [1945-1], who had proposed a solution based on the substitution of certain foods by others which gave more nutrition per dollar. He then examined a "handful" of the possible 510 ways to combine the selected foods. He did not claim the solution to be the cheapest but gave good

Linear Programming and Extensions

George B. Dantzig

STIGLER'S NUTRITION MODEL: AN EXAMPLE OF FORMULATION AND SOLUTION

J. Laderman

irst applications of the simplex algorithm was to the deter-
adequate diet that was of least cost.¹ In the fall of 1947,
the Mathematical Tables Project of the National Bureau of
Standards undertook, in seve-

y proposed simplex method, the
was a system with nine equations
erated desk calculators, approxi-

first large-scale computation in this field.

tion or certain foods by others which gave more nutrition per dollar. He then
examined a "handful" of the possible 510 ways to combine the selected
foods. He did not claim the solution to be the cheapest, but gave good



38. Mathematical Tables Project computers with adding machines

The first large LP



Mathematical Tables Project

- 450 computers employed
- 1938 - 1948

You will recall that 77 foods and 9 nutrient elements were involved in this problem. The number of operations by type are as follows:

Type of Operations	No. of repetitions
Multiplication	15,315
Division	1,234
Addition of two numbers	14,561
Addition of 77 numbers	190
Addition of 9 numbers	85

To perform these computations with desk machines required 5 computers for 21 days, with 4 hours per day supervision by a mathematician.

- Stopped on Von Neumann's recommendation
- Hand book of Mathematical Functions (1964)

Historical Takeaways



38. Mathematical Tables Project computers with adding machines

Historical Takeaways



38. Mathematical Tables Project computers with adding machines

- human computers
played an important
role in early comb.
opt. history.

Historical Takeaways



38. Mathematical Tables Project computers with adding machines

- human computers played an important role in early comb. opt. history.
- their contributions were made invisible by contemporary White men


Historical Takeaways



38. Mathematical Tables Project computers with adding machines

- human computers played an important role in early comb. opt. history.
- their contributions were made invisible by contemporary White men
- their demographics were exactly those underrepresented in our field, then & now

WHEN COMPUTERS WERE HUMAN



David Alan Grier

Consider including this history
in your classes

Let me know if you're
interested in sources or
lecture notes
(work in progress)

Sophie@Huiberts.me

Every day...

The Simplex method visits $\sim 2(n+d)$ vertices before reaching an optimal one

Only few documented cases where

$> 10(n+d)$ were needed

But one day



Theorem There exist A, b, c, x^0 with $n=2d$
such that the simplex method
visits 2^d vertices

Klee Minty '72
Amenta Ziegler '98

Because of that

Theorem if the rows of A are iid
from a rotationally symmetric distribution,
and $b = 1$ then the simplex method
visits $O(d^2 n^{d-1})$ vertices in expectation.

Yes, but



Smoothed complexity

Let $\bar{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ have rows of norm at most 1,

$$\bar{b} \in [-1, 1]^n, \quad c \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

Let \hat{A}, \hat{b} have iid $N(0, \sigma^2)$ entries.


The smoothed complexity is $\max_{\bar{A}, \bar{b}, c} \mathbb{E}[T(\bar{A} + \hat{A}, \bar{b} + \hat{b}, c)]$

where $T(A, b, c)$ is the time to solve $\max_{S.E.} c^T x$
 $Ax \leq b$

Why smoothed analysis

- independent measurement/numerical errors do not conspire against your algorithm
- interpolates between worst and average case
- shows simplex is fast on average in every large enough neighborhood

Shadow vertex simplex method



Shadow simplex method

Theorem To bound the running time of the simplex method, it suffices to consider projections of polyhedra

$$\pi_W \left(\{ x : Ax \leq b \} \right)$$

where W is the worst case 2d subspace, and count the number of vertices.

Borgwardt '87
Spielman Teng '04
Vershynin '09
Dadush Huijberts '17

Clever auxiliary LP's

Theorem it suffices to consider projections
of the form


$$\Pi_W \left(\{ x : (\bar{A} + \hat{A}) x \leq 1 \} \right)$$

where W is a fixed 2d subspace
independent of \hat{A} .

Bongوارде '87
Spielman Teng '04
Vershynin '09
Dadush Huijberts '17


Polar duality

$$S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \quad S^\circ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : y^T x \leq 1 \text{ for } y \in S\}$$



Polar duality

$$S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \quad S^\circ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : y^T x \leq 1 \text{ for } y \in S\}$$




convex body \$S \supseteq 0\$

\$S^\circ \ni 0\$ is convex body

Polar duality

$$S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \quad S^\circ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : y^T x \leq 1 \text{ for } y \in S\}$$



convex body $S \supseteq 0$
k-dimensional faces

$S^\circ \ni 0$ is convex body
 $d-k$ -dimensional faces

Clever auxiliary LP's (Polar edition)

Theorem it suffices to consider intersections of the form

$$W \cap \text{conv}(\bar{a}_1 + \hat{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n + \hat{a}_n)$$

where W is a fixed 2d subspace independent of \hat{A} .

Borgwardt '87
Spielman Teng '04

Vershynin '09
Dadush Huijberts '17

Key quantity to analyze (summary)

Theorem the smoothed complexity of
the simplex method is

$$\max_{\substack{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n \in B_2^d \\ W \in \mathbb{R}^d}} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_n}} \left[\# \text{ of vertices of } W \cap \text{conv}(\bar{a}_1 + \hat{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n + \hat{a}_n) \right]$$

Results

	Expected Number of Vertices
Spielman, Teng '04	$O(d^3 n \sigma^{-6})$
Deshpande, Spielman '05	$O(d n^2 \sigma^{-2} \log n)$
Vershynin '09	$O(d^3 \sigma^{-4} \log^7 n)$
Dadush, Huiberts '18	$O(d^2 \sigma^{-2} \log^{1/2} n)$
Huiberts, Lee, Zhang '22	$O(d^{13/4} \sigma^{-3/2} \log^{7/4} n)$
Borgwardt '87	$\Omega(d^{3/2} \sqrt{\log n})$
Huiberts, Lee, Zhang '22	$\Omega(\min(2^d, \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma d \sqrt{\log n}}}))$

Lower bound

easy construction from

ongoing work with

Eleonore Bach

Extended formulations

Theorem (Ben-Tal, Nemirovski '01)


For every k , there exists $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{k+4}$ with $2k+4$ facets such that

$$\pi_w(P)$$

is a regular 2^k -gon

By John's Theorem '48, we may assume

$$B_2^{k+4} \subseteq P \subseteq (k+4) B_2^{k+4}$$



Extended formulations

Theorem (Ben-Tal, Nemirovski '01)


For every k , there exists $P^\circ \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{k+4}$ with 2^{k+4} vertices such that

$$P^\circ \cap W$$

is a regular 2^k -gon

By John's Theorem '48, we may assume


$$\frac{1}{k+4} B_2^{k+4} \subseteq P^\circ \subseteq B_2^{k+4}$$



Edge counting

Lemma 1 if $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is a polygon and $\alpha B_2 \subseteq T \subseteq \beta B_2$
then T has $\Omega(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\beta - \alpha}})$ edges

proof by picture




$$\# \text{edges} \geq \frac{\text{Perimeter}}{\text{longest edge length}}$$

Edge counting

Lemma 1 if $T \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is a polygon and $\alpha B_2 \subseteq T \subseteq \beta B_2$
then T has $\Omega(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{\beta - \alpha}})$ edges

proof by picture



$$\# \text{edges} \geq \frac{\text{Perimeter}}{\text{longest edge length}}$$

"Close to an ellipse \rightarrow many edges"

Round intersection stays round

Lemma 2 if $r > 2\epsilon > 0$ and

$a_1, \dots, a_n, \tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfy

i) $rB_2^d \subseteq \text{conv}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$

ii) $\|a_i - \tilde{a}_i\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$

then

$$\left(1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{r}\right)\text{conv}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \subseteq \text{conv}(\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_n) \subseteq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{r}\right)\text{conv}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$$

Round intersection stays round

Lemma 2 if $r > 2\epsilon > 0$ and
constant linear in noise size

$a_1, \dots, a_n, \tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfy

i) $rB_2^d \subseteq \text{conv}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$

ii) $\|a_i - \tilde{a}_i\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$

then

$$\left(1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{r}\right)\text{conv}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \subseteq \text{conv}(\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_n) \subseteq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{r}\right)\text{conv}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$$

Round intersection stays round

Lemma 2 if $r > 2\epsilon > 0$ and
constant linear in noise size

$a_1, \dots, a_n, \tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfy

i) $rB_2^d \subseteq \text{conv}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$

ii) $\|a_i - \tilde{a}_i\|_2 \leq \epsilon$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$

then


$$\left(1 - \frac{2\epsilon}{r}\right)\text{conv}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \subseteq \text{conv}(\tilde{a}_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_n) \subseteq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{r}\right)\text{conv}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$$

"Perturbing does not affect roundness too much"


Lower bound sketch

1. the points $\overline{a_1}, \dots, \overline{a_n}$ of $\mathcal{B}\text{-T\&N}$ satisfy the conditions of the meta-theorem
2. the intersection $W \cap \text{conv}(\overline{a_1}, \dots, \overline{a_n})$ is very round.
3. adding small perturbations doesn't hurt roundness too much.
4. Lemma 1 gives the lower bound.

Our analysis is not tight wrt σ



Our analysis is not tight wrt σ



Proven:

$$O(\sigma^{-3/2})$$

$$\Omega(\sigma^{-1/2})$$

measured:

$$\sigma^{-3/4} ?$$

Upper bound is
a similar story

- expected edge lengths
- expected exterior angles

Open problems

- Tighter bounds are better
- Sparse noise would add a sense of realism
- Noise inspired by in-software perturbations

Upper bound
by analogy

Upper bound analogy

let $\bar{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n \in \mathbb{B}^2$ be fixed,

$\hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_n \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ i.i.d.

How many vertices does
 $\text{Conv}(\bar{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)$ have?

Upper bound analogy

let $\bar{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n \in \mathbb{B}^2$ be fixed,
 $\hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \hat{\alpha}_n \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ i.i.d.

How many vertices does
 $\text{Conv}(\bar{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)$ have?

Reference	Smoothed polygon complexity
Damerow, Sohler '04	$O(\log(n)^2 + \sigma^{-2} \log n)$
Schnalzger '14	$O(\log n + \sigma^{-2})$
DGGT '16	$O(\sqrt{\log n} + \sigma^{-1} \sqrt{\log n})$
Dadush, Huberts '20	$O(\sqrt{\log n} + \sigma^{-1})$
Huberts , Lee, Zhang '22	$O(\sqrt{\log n} + \frac{\sqrt[4]{\log(n)}}{\sqrt{\sigma}})$
DGGT '16	$\Omega(\min(\sqrt{\log n} + \frac{\sqrt[4]{\log(n\sqrt{\sigma})}}{\sqrt{\sigma}}, n))$

Upper bound analogy

let $\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n \in \mathbb{B}^2$ be fixed,

$\hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_n \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ i.i.d.

How many vertices does
 $\text{Conv}(\bar{a}_1 + \hat{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n + \hat{a}_n)$ have?


Reference	Smoothed polygon complexity
Damerow, Sohler '04	$O(\log(n)^2 + \sigma^{-2} \log n)$
Schnalzger '14	$O(\log n + \sigma^{-2})$
DGGT '16	$O(\sqrt{\log n} + \sigma^{-1} \sqrt{\log n})$
Dadush, Huberts '20	$O(\sqrt{\log n} + \sigma^{-1})$
Huberts, Lee, Zhang '22	$O(\sqrt{\log n} + \frac{\sqrt[4]{\log(n)}}{\sqrt{\sigma}})$
DGGT '16	$\Omega(\min(\sqrt{\log n} + \frac{\sqrt[4]{\log(n\sqrt{\sigma})}}{\sqrt{\sigma}}, n))$

Theorem $\max_{\substack{\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n \\ \hat{a}_1, \dots, \hat{a}_n}} \mathbb{E}[\# \text{vertices}] = O\left(\sqrt{\log n} + \frac{\sqrt[4]{\log n}}{\sqrt{\sigma}}\right)$

Upper bound sketch: two potentials

$$\mathbb{E}[\# \text{vertices of } \text{Conv}(\overline{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \overline{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr[\overline{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$



Upper bound sketch: two potentials


$$\mathbb{E}[\# \text{vertices of } \text{conv}(\overline{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \overline{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr[\overline{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$

Define ℓ_i is the sum length of edges
touching $\overline{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i$

Θ_i is the exterior angle at $\overline{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i$

if $\overline{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i$ is a vertex. Otherwise $\ell_i = \Theta_i = 0$.



Upper bound sketch: two potentials

$$\mathbb{E}[\# \text{ vertices of } \text{conv}(\bar{a}_1 + \hat{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n + \hat{a}_n)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr[\bar{a}_i + \hat{a}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$


Define ℓ_i is the sum length of edges touching $\bar{a}_i + \hat{a}_i$

Θ_i is the exterior angle at $\bar{a}_i + \hat{a}_i$

if $\bar{a}_i + \hat{a}_i$ is a vertex. Otherwise $\ell_i = \Theta_i = 0$.

Note: $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\ell_i] = 2 \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{perimeter of } \text{conv}(\bar{a}_1 + \hat{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n + \hat{a}_n)]$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\Theta_i] = 2\pi$$



Upper bound sketch : potentials vs probability

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i] = \mathbb{E}[\ell_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] \Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$

Upper bound sketch : potentials vs probability

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i] = \mathbb{E}[\ell_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] \Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$

\Rightarrow

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i]$$

$$\Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\ell_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]}{\mathbb{E}[\ell_i]}$$

Upper bound sketch : potentials vs probability

$$\mathbb{E}[l_i] = \mathbb{E}[l_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] \Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$

\Rightarrow

$$\mathbb{E}[l_i]$$

$$\Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[l_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]}{\mathbb{E}[l_i]}$$

Similarly,

$$\Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\theta_i]}{\mathbb{E}[\theta_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]}$$

Upper bound sketch : potentials vs probability

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i] = \mathbb{E}[\ell_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] \Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$

\Rightarrow

$$\mathbb{E}[\ell_i]$$

$$\Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\ell_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]}{\mathbb{E}[\ell_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]}$$

Similarly,

$$\Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\theta_i]}{\mathbb{E}[\theta_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]}$$


Key lemma if $\mathbb{E}[\ell_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] \leq t$

then $\mathbb{E}[\theta_i \mid \bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}] \geq \frac{c}{t \sqrt{\log n}}$

Upper bound sketch: planar geometry

Define γ_i as the distance from

$\bar{a}_i + \hat{a}_i$ to $\text{conv}(\bar{a}_j + \hat{a}_j : j \neq i)$.




Upper bound sketch: planar geometry

Define γ_i as the distance from

$\bar{a}_i + \hat{a}_i$ to $\text{conv}(\bar{a}_j + \hat{a}_j : j \neq i)$.

Get $\theta_i \geq \frac{\gamma_i}{l_i}$




Upper bound sketch: planar geometry

Define γ_i as the distance from

$\bar{a}_i + \hat{a}_i$ to $\text{conv}(\bar{a}_j + \hat{a}_j : j \neq i)$.

Get $\theta_i \geq \frac{\gamma_i}{l_i}$

Prove that $\Pr\left[\gamma_i \geq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\log n}}\right] \geq \frac{2}{3}$.




Upper bound sketch: planar geometry

Define γ_i as the distance from

$\bar{a}_i + \hat{a}_i$ to $\text{conv}(\bar{a}_j + \hat{a}_j : j \neq i)$.

$$\text{Get } \theta_i \geq \frac{\gamma_i}{l_i}$$

Prove that $\Pr\left[\gamma_i \geq \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\log n}}\right] \geq \frac{2}{3}$.



For $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ convex and $x \sim N(0, I_{2n})$,

if $\Pr[x \notin K] \geq p$ then $\Pr[\text{dist}(x, K) \geq \frac{1}{10\sqrt{np}}] \geq \frac{2}{3}$

Open problems

- Tighter bounds are better
- Sparse noise would add a sense of realism
- Noise inspired by in-software perturbations

Upper bound sketch:

$$E[\# \text{ vertices of } \text{Conv}(\overline{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \overline{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr[\overline{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$

Upper bound sketch:

$$\mathbb{E}[\# \text{vertices of } \text{Conv}(\overline{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \overline{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr[\overline{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[l_i] + \frac{t\sqrt{\log n}}{\sigma} \mathbb{E}[\Theta_i]$$

Upper bound sketch:

$$\mathbb{E}[\# \text{vertices of } \text{conv}(\bar{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[l_i] + \frac{t\sqrt{\log n}}{\sigma} \mathbb{E}[\Theta_i]$$

$$= \frac{2}{t} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{perimeter of } \text{conv}(\bar{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)] + \frac{2\pi t\sqrt{\log n}}{\sigma}$$

Upper bound sketch:

$$\mathbb{E}[\# \text{vertices of } \text{conv}(\bar{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[l_i] + \frac{t\sqrt{\log n}}{\sigma} \mathbb{E}[\Theta_i]$$

$$= \frac{2}{t} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{perimeter of } \text{conv}(\bar{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)] + \frac{2\pi t \sqrt{\log n}}{\sigma}$$

$$= \frac{2}{t} \cdot 2\pi (1 + 4\sqrt{\log n}) + \frac{2\pi t \sqrt{\log n}}{\sigma}$$

Upper bound sketch:

$$\mathbb{E}[\# \text{vertices of } \text{conv}(\bar{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^n \Pr[\bar{\alpha}_i + \hat{\alpha}_i \text{ is a vertex}]$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{t} \mathbb{E}[l_i] + \frac{t\sqrt{\log n}}{\sigma} \mathbb{E}[\Theta_i]$$

$$= \frac{2}{t} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\text{perimeter of } \text{conv}(\bar{\alpha}_1 + \hat{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n + \hat{\alpha}_n)] + \frac{2\pi t \sqrt{\log n}}{\sigma}$$

$$= \frac{2}{t} \cdot 2\pi (1 + 4\sqrt{\log n}) + \frac{2\pi t \sqrt{\log n}}{\sigma}$$

$$= O\left(\sqrt{\log n} + \frac{4\sqrt{\log n}}{\sigma}\right)$$