

Two Results on Slime Mold Computations

Ruben Becker¹, Vincenzo Bonifaci², Andreas Karrenbauer¹,
Pavel Kolev^{*1}, and Kurt Mehlhorn²

¹Max-Planck-Institut für Informatik, Saarbrücken,
{ruben,karrenba,pkolev,mehlhorn}@mpi-inf.mpg.de

²Institute for the Analysis of Systems and Informatics, National Research Council of Italy
(IASI-CNR), Rome, Italy, vincenzo.bonifaci@iasi.cnr.it

Abstract

In this paper, we present two results on slime mold computations. The first one treats a biologically-grounded model, originally proposed by biologists analyzing the behavior of the slime mold *Physarum polycephalum*. This primitive organism was empirically shown by Nakagaki et al. to solve shortest path problems in wet-lab experiments (Nature'00). We show that the proposed simple mathematical model actually generalizes to a much wider class of problems, namely undirected linear programs with a non-negative cost vector.

For our second result, we consider the discretization of a biologically-inspired model. This model is a directed variant of the biologically-grounded one and was never claimed to describe the behavior of a biological system. Straszak and Vishnoi showed that it can ε -approximately solve flow problems (SODA'16) and even general linear programs with positive cost vector (ITCS'16) within a finite number of steps. We give a refined convergence analysis that improves the dependence on ε from polynomial to logarithmic and simultaneously allows to choose a step size that is independent of ε . Furthermore, we show that the dynamics can be initialized with a more general set of (infeasible) starting points.

*This work has been funded by the Cluster of Excellence “Multimodal Computing and Interaction” within the Excellence Initiative of the German Federal Government.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	4
2.1	Finite Basis Theorem	5
2.2	The Minimum Energy Solution	5
2.3	Existence of a Solution to the Undirected Physarum Dynamics	6
2.4	Generalizing the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem through LP Duality	6
3	Convergence Results for Undirected Linear Programs	7
3.1	Convergence to Dominance and Resulting Simple Bounds	7
3.2	The Equilibrium Points	8
3.3	Convergence	9
3.4	Details of the Convergence	10
4	Improved Convergence Analysis of Discrete Directed Physarum Dynamics	11
4.1	Convergence to Dominance	11
4.2	$x^{(k)}$ is Close to a Non-Negative and Kernel-Free Vector	12
4.3	$x^{(k)}$ is ε -Close to an Optimal Solution	12
4.4	Proof of Theorem 1.4	12
A	Omitted Proofs for Section 2	14
A.1	Finite Basis Theorem	14
A.2	The Minimum Energy Solution	14
A.3	Existence of a Solution to the Undirected Physarum Dynamics	17
A.4	Generalizing the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem through LP Duality	18
B	Omitted Proofs for Section 3	19
B.1	Convergence to Dominance and Resulting Simple Bounds	19
B.2	Convergence	21
B.3	Details of the Convergence	22
C	Omitted Proofs for Section 4	24
C.1	Useful Lemmas	24
C.2	Convergence to Dominance	25
C.3	$x^{(k)}$ is Close to a Non-Negative and Kernel-Free Vector	25
C.4	$x^{(k)}$ is ε -Close to an Optimal Solution	26




Figure 1: The experiment in [NYT00] (reprinted from there): (a) shows the maze uniformly covered by Physarum; yellow color indicates presence of Physarum. Food (oatmeal) is provided at the locations labeled AG. After a while the mold retracts to the shortest path connecting the food sources as shown in (b) and (c). (d) shows the underlying abstract graph. The video [Phy] shows the experiment.

1 Introduction

We present two results on slime mold computations, one on the biologically-grounded model and one on the biologically-inspired model.

Physarum polycephalum is a slime mold that apparently is able to solve shortest path problems. Nakagaki, Yamada, and Tóth [NYT00] report about the following experiment; see Figure 1. They built a maze, covered it by pieces of Physarum (the slime can be cut into pieces which will reunite if brought into vicinity), and then fed the slime with oatmeal at two locations. After a few hours the slime retracted to a path that follows the shortest path in the maze connecting the food sources. The authors report that they repeated the experiment with different mazes; in all experiments, Physarum retracted to the shortest path.

The paper [TKN07] proposes a mathematical model for the behavior of the slime and argues extensively that the model is adequate. Physarum is modeled as an electrical network with time varying resistors. We have a simple *undirected* graph $G = (N, E)$ with distinguished nodes s_0 and s_1 modeling the food sources. Each edge $e \in E$ has a positive length c_e and a positive capacity $x_e(t)$; c_e is fixed, but $x_e(t)$ is a function of time. The resistance $r_e(t)$ of e is $r_e(t) = c_e/x_e(t)$. In the electrical network defined by these resistances, a current of value 1 is forced from s_0 to s_1 . For an (arbitrarily oriented) edge $e = (u, v)$, let $q_e(t)$ be the resulting current over e . Then, the capacity of e evolves according to the differential equation

$$\dot{x}_e(t) = |q_e(t)| - x_e(t), \quad (1)$$

where \dot{x}_e is the derivative of x_e with respect to time. In equilibrium ($\dot{x}_e = 0$ for all e), the flow through any edge is equal to its capacity. In non-equilibrium, the capacity grows (shrinks) if the absolute value of the flow is larger (smaller) than the capacity. In the sequel, we will mostly drop the argument t as is customary in the treatment of dynamical systems.

We refer to the dynamics above as *biologically-grounded* as it was introduced by biologists to model the behavior of a biological system. Miyaji and Ohnishi were the first to analyze convergence for special graphs (parallel links and planar graphs with source and sink on the same face) in [MO08]. In [BMV12] convergence was proven for *all* graphs. We state the result from [BMV12] for the special case that the shortest path is unique.

Theorem 1.1 ([BMV12]). *Suppose the undirected shortest path P^* from s_0 to s_1 w.r.t. the cost vector c is unique. Then $x(t)$ in (1) converges to P^* . Namely, $x_e(t) \rightarrow 1$ for $e \in P^*$ and $x_e \rightarrow 0$ for $e \notin P^*$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

In this paper, we extend this result to *non-negative undirected linear programs*

$$\min\{c^T x : Af = b, |f| = x\}, \quad (2)$$

where $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and $c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$. Absolute values are taken componentwise. Observe that n denotes the number of rows of A , m denotes the number of columns, and c is required to be non-negative. We assume $b \neq 0$ as otherwise the problem has the trivial solution $x = 0$. A vector f is *feasible* if $Af = b$. We assume that the system $Af = b$ has a feasible solution and that there is no non-zero f in the kernel of A with $c_e f_e = 0$ for all e . A vector f lies in the kernel of A if $Af = 0$. The unique vector q in (1) is now the *minimum energy feasible solution*

$$q(t) = \operatorname{argmin}_f \left\{ \sum_{e: x_e \neq 0} \frac{c_e}{x_e(t)} f_e^2 : Af = b \wedge f_e = 0 \text{ whenever } x_e = 0 \right\}. \quad (3)$$

In the network case, A is the signed incidence matrix of a graph, and (2) is a transshipment problem, with flow sources and sinks encoded by the vector b . In that setting, $q(t)$ as defined by (3) coincides with the electrical flow induced by resistors of value $c_e/x_e(t)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $c \geq 0$ satisfy $c^T |f| > 0$ for every nonzero f in the kernel of A . Let x^* be an optimum solution of (2) and let X^* be the set of optimum solutions. The following holds for the dynamics (1) with q as in (3):*

- The cost $c^T x(t)$ converges to $c^T x^*$ as t goes to infinity.
- The vector $x(t)$ converges to X^* . For all e with $c_e > 0$, $x_e(t) - |q_e(t)|$ converges to zero as t goes to infinity. If x^* is unique, $x(t)$ and $q(t)$ converge to it as t goes to infinity.

We stress that the dynamics (1) is biologically-grounded. It was proposed to model a biological system and not as an optimization method. Nevertheless, it can solve this non-trivial class of LPs.

Ito et al. [IJNT11] initiated the study of the dynamics

$$\dot{x}(t) = q(t) - x(t). \quad (4)$$

This dynamics is *biologically-inspired* – the similarity to (1) is the inspiration. It is not biologically-grounded as it was never claimed to model the behavior of a biological system. Rather, it was introduced as a biologically-inspired optimization method. The work in [IJNT11] shows convergence of this directed dynamics (4) for the directed shortest path problem and [JZ12, SV16c, Bon16] show convergence for general positive linear programs, i.e., linear programs with positive cost vector $c > 0$ of the form

$$\min\{c^T x : Ax = b, x \geq 0\}. \quad (5)$$

The *discrete versions* of both dynamics define sequences $x^{(t)}$, $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ through

$$x^{(t+1)} = (1 - h)x^{(t)} + hq^{(t)} \quad \text{discrete directed dynamics} \quad (6)$$

$$x^{(t+1)} = (1 - h)x^{(t)} + h|q^{(t)}| \quad \text{discrete undirected dynamics,} \quad (7)$$

where h is the step size and $q^{(t)}$ is the minimum energy feasible solution as in (3). For the discrete dynamics we can ask complexity questions. This is particularly relevant for the discrete directed

dynamics.¹ Straszak and Vishnoi [SV16c] showed its convergence for positive LPs (5) and proved an efficiency bound depending on $\mathcal{D} := \max\{|\det(A')| : A' \text{ is square sub-matrix of } A\}$. Let us denote with opt the cost of an optimal solution to (5).

Theorem 1.3 ([SV16c]). *Let $c > 0$. Suppose the Physarum dynamics (6) is initialized with a feasible point $x^{(0)} > 0$ of (5) such that $M^{-1} \leq x_i^{(0)} \leq M$ for all i and $c^T x^{(0)} \leq M \cdot \text{opt}$, for some $M \geq 1$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and a step size $h \leq \varepsilon / (6\|c\|_1 \mathcal{D}^2)$, after $k = O((\varepsilon^{-1}\|c\|_1 \mathcal{D})^4 \cdot \ln M)$ steps, $x^{(k)}$ is feasible solution with $c^T x^{(k)} \leq (1 + \varepsilon)\text{opt}$.*

We strengthen their result in two directions. First, we show that the Physarum dynamics (6) can be initialized with strongly dominating points $\mathcal{X}(\alpha)$, and not only feasible points. Informally, $x \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 0$ implies the existence of a feasible vector f such that $0 \leq f \leq \alpha x$, see Subsection 2.4 for the precise definition. Second, we give a refined convergence analysis that improves the dependence on ε from polynomial to logarithmic and simultaneously allows to choose a step size independent of ε . Let $\Psi^{(0)} := \max\{m\mathcal{D}^2\|b\|_1, \|x^{(0)}\|_\infty\}$ and let f^* be an optimal solution to (5).

Theorem 1.4. *Let $c > 0$. Suppose $\alpha, \beta > 0$, $\beta \mathbf{1} \leq x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. For any $h \leq c_{\min}^2 / (2c^T f^* \cdot \mathcal{D}^4 \|c\|_1^2)$, $t \leq 3h^{-1} \max\{1, \alpha^2\}$ and $k \leq 4h^{-1} \mathcal{D}^3 \|c\|_1 \|b\|_1 \ln(8m\mathcal{D}^3 \|b\|_1 \Psi^{(0)} / \varepsilon \beta)$, the Physarum dynamics (6) initialized with $x^{(0)}$ outputs a vector $x^{(t+k)} > 0$ such that $\|x^{(t+k)} - f^*\|_\infty < \varepsilon / \mathcal{D}$. The step size of the first t iterations is $h \cdot \min\{1, 1/\alpha^2\}$, whereas the subsequent k iterations allow a larger step size equal to h .*

Theorem 1.4 subsumes the result in [SV16b, Theorem 1.2] for the transshipment problem and it provides a tighter asymptotic convergence rate, since for flow problems A is a vertex-edge incidence matrix satisfying $\mathcal{D} = 1$ (in this case A is a totally unimodular matrix).

Organization of the paper: In Section 2, we treat preliminaries and derive important properties of the minimum energy solution. In Section 3, we show that the continuous undirected dynamics solves undirected non-negative linear programs. In Section 4, we give the improved convergence bound for the discrete directed dynamics which solves positive linear programs. Sections 3 and 4 are inspired by [Bon13, BMV12, SV16a, SV16b, SV16c]. The general structure of the arguments is similar, but many details differ and are significantly more involved. Due to space constraints, we defer the proofs of several results to the appendix.

2 Preliminaries

Note that we may assume that A has full row-rank since any equation that is linearly dependent on other equations can be deleted without changing the feasible set. We continue to use n and m for the dimension of A . Thus A has rank n . We continue by fixing some terms and notation. A *basic feasible solution* of $Af = b$ is a vector $f = (f_B, f_N)$, where $f_B = A_B^{-1}b$, where A_B is a square $n \times n$ non-singular sub-matrix of A , and $f_N = 0$ is the vector indexed by the coordinates

¹For the undirected shortest path problem, the convergence of the discrete undirected dynamics (7) was shown in [BBD⁺13]. The convergence proof gives an upper bound on the step size and on the number of steps required until an ε -approximation of the optimum is obtained. In [SV16b], this was extended to the transshipment problem. Finally, [SV16a] shows convergence of the discrete undirected dynamics (7) for the one-norm minimization problem $\min\{\|x\|_1 : Ax = b\}$. This is the special case of (2) when $c = \mathbf{1}$. Thus this paper is related to our first result. It shows convergence of the discretized undirected dynamics (7), we show convergence of the continuous undirected dynamics (1) for a more general cost vector.

not in B . A feasible solution f is *kernel-free* or *non-circulatory* if it is contained in the convex hull of the basic feasible solutions.² For a given capacity vector x and a vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^m$ with $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq \text{supp}(x)$, we use $E(f) = \sum_e (c_e/x_e) f_e^2$ to denote the *energy* of f . The energy of f is infinite, if $\text{supp}(f) \not\subseteq \text{supp}(x)$. We use $\text{cost}(f) = \sum_e c_e |f_e| = c^T |f|$ to denote the *cost* of f . Note that $E(x) = \sum_e c_e x_e = \text{cost}(x)$; recall that $x \geq 0$ and $f_e = 0$ if $x_e = 0$. We say that a vector f' is *sign-compatible* with a vector f (of the same dimension) or *f-sign-compatible* if $f'_e \neq 0$ implies $f'_e f_e > 0$. In particular, $\text{supp}(f') \subseteq \text{supp}(f)$. We use the following two constants $c_{\max} = \|c\|_\infty$ and $c_{\min} = \min_{e:c_e>0} c_e$.

2.1 Finite Basis Theorem

The following lemma is useful and probably known. Their proofs as well as many other proofs from this section are omitted due to space constraints and can be found in Appendix A.

Lemma 2.1. *Let f be a feasible solution to $Af = b$. Then f is the sum of a convex combination of at most n basic feasible solutions plus a vector in the kernel of A . Moreover, all elements in this representation are sign-compatible with f .*

Note that the above lemma also yields that a feasible solution to the directed linear program, i.e., a solution f with $Af = b$ and $f \geq 0$ admits a decomposition into *non-negative* basic feasible solutions and a *non-negative* vector in the kernel of A .

2.2 The Minimum Energy Solution

Lemma 2.2. *If every nonzero vector in the kernel of A has positive cost, the minimum energy feasible solution is kernel-free and unique.*

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that every nonzero vector in the kernel of A has positive cost. Let q be the minimum energy feasible solution. Then $|q_e| \leq \|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}$ for every e .*

In [SV16c], the bound $|q_e| \leq \mathcal{D}^2 m \|b\|_1$ was shown. We will now derive explicit formula for the minimum energy solution q . We will express q in terms of a vector $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which we refer to as the *potential*, by analogy with the network setting, in which p can be interpreted as the electric potential of the nodes. The energy of the minimum energy solution is equal to $b^T p$. We also derive a local Lipschitz condition for the mapping from x to q . Note that for $c > 0$ most of these facts are well-known.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume that every nonzero vector in the kernel of A has positive cost. Let $r_e = c_e/x_e$ and let R denote the corresponding diagonal matrix. Let us split $[m]$ into $Z = \{e : c_e = 0\}$ and $P = E \setminus Z$, similarly A into A_P and A_Z and q into q_P and q_Z . Then the minimum energy feasible solution satisfies*

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_P & A_Z \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_P \\ q_Z \end{bmatrix} = b \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} R_P & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_P \\ q_Z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_P^T \\ A_Z^T \end{bmatrix} p. \quad (8)$$

² For the undirected shortest path problem, we assume that we drop the equation corresponding to the sink. Then b becomes the negative indicator vector corresponding to the source node. Note that n is one less than the number of nodes of the graph. The basic feasible solutions are the simple undirected source-sink paths. A circulatory solution contains a cycle on which there is flow.

Since A_Z has linearly independent columns, we may assume that the first $|Z|$ rows of A_Z form a square non-singular matrix. We can thus write $A = \begin{bmatrix} A'_P & A'_Z \\ A''_P & A''_Z \end{bmatrix}$ with invertible A'_Z . The above equation system (8) has a unique solution that satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} q_Z \\ q_P \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} [A'_Z]^{-1}(b' - A'_P q_P) \\ R_P^{-1} A_P^T p \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} p' \\ p'' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -[A'_Z]^{-T} [A''_Z]^T p'' \\ MR^{-1} M^T (b'' - A''_Z [A'_Z]^{-1} b') \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where $M = A''_P - A''_Z (A'_Z)^{-1} A'_P$ and p is split into p' and p'' analogously to A_Z .

We next observe that the equality $E(q) = b^T p$ holds also in the case where the cost vector might have vanishing entries.

Lemma 2.5. *Let q be the minimum energy feasible solution and let f be any feasible solution. Then $E(q) = b^T p = f^T A^T p$.*

In the following lemma, we show that the mapping $x \mapsto q$ is locally Lipschitz. Our analysis builds upon Cramer's rule and the Cauchy-Binet formula. We note that for the undirected shortest path problem, the Cauchy-Binet formula yields the famous Kirchhoff's spanning tree theorem, which was used in [BMV12].

Lemma 2.6. *Assume $c \geq 0$, no non-zero vector in the kernel of A has cost zero, and that A , b , and c are integral. Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$. Then for any $e \in [m]$ and any two vectors x and \tilde{x} in \mathbb{R}^m with $\alpha \mathbf{1} \leq x, \tilde{x} \leq \beta \mathbf{1}$, define $M = 2m^n (\beta/\alpha)^n c_{\max}^n \mathcal{D}^2 \|b\|_1$. Then, it holds that $||q_e(x) - q_e(\tilde{x})|| \leq M \|x - \tilde{x}\|_\infty$.*

2.3 Existence of a Solution to the Undirected Physarum Dynamics

We use Grönwall's Lemma to derive bounds on a function from a differential inequality.

Lemma 2.7 (Grönwall's Lemma). *1. Let $u(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ be functions satisfying $\dot{u}(t) \leq \beta(t)u(t)$. Then $u(t) \leq u(0) \cdot \exp(\int_0^t \beta(s) ds)$. In particular, choosing $\beta(t) := -1$ and $u(t) := -v(t)$ yields that $v(t) \geq v(0) \cdot \exp(-t)$, if $\dot{v}(t) \geq -v(t)$.*

2. Let $Y(t)$ be a function satisfying $\dot{Y} \geq a - Y$ for some constant a . Then $Y(t) \geq a + (Y(0) - a) \exp(-t)$. Similarly, if $\dot{Y} \leq a - Y$, then $Y(t) \leq a + (Y(0) - a) \exp(-t)$.

Lemma 2.8. *The solution to the undirected dynamics in (1) has domain $[0, \infty)$. Moreover, $x(0)e^{-t} \leq x(t) \leq \max(\|b\|_1 \mathcal{D} \cdot \mathbf{1}, x(0)e^{-t} - \|b\|_1 \mathcal{D} \cdot \mathbf{1}(1 - e^{-t}))$ for all t .*

2.4 Generalizing the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem through LP Duality

The max-flow min-cut theorem plays an essential role in the analysis in [BMV12]. We use instead linear programming duality that generalizes the max-flow min-cut argument to general LPs.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$. The following linear programs are feasible and*

$$\max\{\alpha : Af = \alpha b, |f| \leq x\} = \min\{|y^T A| : b^T y = -1\}. \quad (10)$$

Moreover, there is a finite set $D = \{d^1, \dots, d^K\}$ of vectors $d^i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ that are independent of x such that the minimum above is equal to $C_\star = \min_{d \in D} d^T x$. In particular, there is a feasible f with $|f| \leq x/C_\star$.

Next, we give a similar result for the directed case. Let $\alpha > 0$, we define an α -weakly dominating set by $\mathcal{X}^W(\alpha) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \exists \text{ feasible } f : 0 \leq f \leq \alpha x\}$. Note that for every $x > 0$ there exist $\alpha > 0$ and a feasible vector f such that $0 \leq f \leq \alpha x$. Moreover, the set of feasible points is a subset of $\mathcal{X}^W(1)$. Thus, as α increases, we obtain a gradually looser relaxation of the notion of feasible point.

Lemma 2.10. *Let $x > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\alpha > 0$. It follows that*

$$\min\{0 : Af = b, 0 \leq f \leq \alpha x\} = \max\{b^T y - \alpha x^T \max\{0, A^T y\} : y \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

Let D' be the finite set of vertices of $\mathcal{P} := \{(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : z \geq \max\{0, A^T y\}, \|y\|_\infty \leq 1, b^T y \geq 0\}$. Then, $x \in \mathcal{X}^W(\alpha)$ if and only if $b^T y \leq \alpha x^T \max\{0, A^T y\}$ for every $(y, z) \in D'$.

Inspired by this lemma, we define an α -strongly dominating set by $\mathcal{X}(\alpha) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m : \alpha y^T A x \geq b^T y \text{ for every } (y, z) \in D'\}$. By Lemma 2.10, $\mathcal{X}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{X}^W(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{X}(\alpha) \subseteq \mathcal{X}(\beta)$ for any $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$.

3 Convergence Results for Undirected Linear Programs

In this section, we generalize [BMV12, SV16b] in two directions. First, we treat general undirected LPs and not just the undirected shortest path problem, respectively, the transshipment problem. Second, we substitute the condition $c > 0$ with $c \geq 0$ and every nonzero vector in the kernel of A has positive cost.³

3.1 Convergence to Dominance and Resulting Simple Bounds

In the network setting, an important role is played by the set of edge capacity vectors that support a feasible flow. In the LP setting, we generalize this notion to the set of *dominating states*, which is defined as

$$\mathcal{X}_{\text{dom}} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : \exists \text{ feasible } f : |f| \leq x\}.$$

An alternative characterization, using the set D from Lemma 2.9, is

$$\mathcal{X}_1 := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m : d^T x \geq 1 \text{ for all } d \in D\}.$$

We prove that $\mathcal{X}_{\text{dom}} = \mathcal{X}_1$ and that the set \mathcal{X}_1 is attracting in the sense that the distance between $x(t)$ and \mathcal{X}_1 goes to zero, as t increases.

Lemma 3.1. *1. It holds that $\mathcal{X}_{\text{dom}} = \mathcal{X}_1$. Moreover, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x(t), \mathcal{X}_1) = 0$, where $\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{X}_1)$ is the Euclidean distance between x and \mathcal{X}_1 .*

2. If $x(t_0) \in \mathcal{X}_1$, then $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_1$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Finally, $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_{1/2} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m : d^T x \geq 1/2 \text{ for all } d \in D\}$ for all sufficiently large t , and if $x \in \mathcal{X}_{1/2}$ then there is a feasible f with $|f| \leq 2x$.

The following lemma summarizes simple bounds on the values of resistors, potentials, and states that eventually hold for large enough t .

³For the undirected shortest path problem, the latter condition states that the underlying undirected graph has no zero-cost cycle.

- Lemma 3.2.** 1. For sufficiently large t , it holds that $r_e \geq c_e/(2\|b\|_1\mathcal{D})$, $b^T p \leq 8c_{\max}\|b\|_1\mathcal{D}$ and $|A_e^T p| \leq 8c_{\max}\|b\|_1\mathcal{D}^2$ for all e .
2. For all e , it holds that $\dot{x}_e/x_e \geq -1$ and for all $e \in P$, it holds that $\dot{x}_e/x_e \leq 8\frac{c_{\max}}{c_{\min}}\|b\|_1\mathcal{D}^2$.
3. There is a positive constant C such that for all $t \geq t_0$, there is a feasible f (depending on t) such that $x_e(t) \geq C$ for all edges e in the support of f .

3.2 The Equilibrium Points

We next characterize the equilibrium points $F = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : |q| = x\}$. Let us first elaborate on the special case of the undirected shortest path problem. Here the equilibria are the flows of value one from source to sink in a network formed by undirected source-sink paths of the same length. This can be seen as follows. Consider any $x \geq 0$ and assume $\text{supp}(x)$ is a network of undirected source-sink paths of the same length. Call this network N . Assign to each node u , a potential p_u equal to the length of the shortest undirected path from the sink s_1 to u . These potentials are well-defined as all paths from s_1 to u in N must have the same length. For an edge $e = (u, v)$ in N , we have $q_e = x_e/c_e(p_u - p_v) = x_e/c_e \cdot c_e = x_e$, i.e., $q = x$ is the electrical flow with respect to the resistances c_e/x_e . Conversely, if x is an equilibrium point and the network is oriented such that $q \geq 0$, we have $x_e = q_e = x_e/c_e(p_u - p_v)$ for all edges $e = (u, v) \in \text{supp}(x)$. Thus $c_e = p_u - p_v$ and this is only possible if for every node u , all paths from u to the sink have the same length. Thus $\text{supp}(x)$ must be a network of undirected source-sink paths of the same length. We next generalize this reasoning.

Theorem 3.3. If $x = |q|$ is an equilibrium point and the columns of A are oriented such that $q \geq 0$, then all feasible solutions f with $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq \text{supp}(x)$ satisfy $c^T f = c^T x$. Conversely, if $x = |q|$ for a feasible q , A is oriented such that $q \geq 0$, and all feasible solutions f with $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq \text{supp}(x)$ satisfy $c^T f = c^T x$, then x is an equilibrium point.

Proof. If x is an equilibrium point, $|q_e| = x_e$ for every e . By changing the signs of some columns of A , we may assume $q \geq 0$, i.e., $q = x$. Let p be the potential with respect to x . For every edge e of positive cost in the support of x , we have $q_e = \frac{x_e}{c_e} A_e^T p$ and hence $c_e = A_e^T p$. For the edges of zero cost in the support of x , we also have $c_e = 0 = A_e^T p$ due to the second block of equations on the right hand side in (8). Let f be any feasible solution whose support is contained in the support of x . Then the first part follows by

$$\sum_{e \in \text{supp}(f)} c_e f_e = \sum_{e \in \text{supp}(f)} f_e A_e^T p = b^T p = E(q) = E(x) = \text{cost}(x).$$

For the second part, we misuse notation and use A to also denote the submatrix of the constraint matrix indexed by the columns in the support of x . We may assume that the rows of A are independent. Otherwise, we simply drop redundant constraints. We may assume $q \geq 0$; otherwise we simply change the sign of some columns of A . Then x is feasible. Let A_B be a square non-singular submatrix of A and let A_N consist of the remaining columns of A . The feasible solutions f with $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq \text{supp}(x)$ satisfy $A_B f_B + A_N f_N = b$ and hence $f_B = A_B^{-1}(b - A_N f_N)$. Then

$$c^T f = c_B^T f_B + c_N^T f_N = c_B A_B^{-1} b + (c_N^T - c_B^T A_B^{-1} A_N) f_N.$$

Since, by assumption, $c^T f$ is constant for all feasible solutions whose support is contained in the support of x , we must have $c_N = A_N^T A_B^{-T} c_B$. Let $p = A_B^{-T} c_B$. Then it follows that

$A^T p = \begin{bmatrix} A_B^T \\ A_N^T \end{bmatrix} A_B^{-T} c_B = \begin{bmatrix} c_B \\ c_N \end{bmatrix}$ and hence $Rx = A^T p$. Thus the pair (x, p) satisfies the right hand side of (8). Since x is feasible, it also satisfies the left hand side of (8). Therefore, x is the minimum energy solution with respect to x . \square

Corollary 3.4. *Let g be a basic feasible solution. Then $|g|$ is an equilibrium point.*

Proof. Let g be a basic feasible solution. Orient A such that $g \geq 0$. Since g is basic, there is a $B \subseteq [m]$ such that $g = (g_B, g_N) = (A_B^{-1}b, 0)$. Consider any feasible solution f with $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq \text{supp}(g)$. Then $f = (f_B, 0)$ and hence $b = Af = A_B f_B$. Therefore, $f_B = g_B$ and hence $c^T f = c^T g$. Thus $x = |g|$ is an equilibrium point. \square

This characterization of equilibria has an interesting consequence.

Lemma 3.5. *The set $L := \{c^T x : x \in F\}$ of costs of equilibria is finite.*

Proof. If x is an equilibrium, $x = |q|$, where q is the minimum energy solution with respect to x . Orient A such that $q \geq 0$. Then by Theorem 3.3, $c^T f = c^T x$ for all feasible solutions f with $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq \text{supp}(x)$. In particular, this holds true for all basic feasible solutions f . Thus L is a subset of the set of costs of all basic feasible solutions, which is a finite set. \square

We conclude this subsection by showing that the optimal solutions of the undirected linear program (2) are equilibria.

Theorem 3.6. *Let x be an optimal solution to (2). Then x is an equilibrium.*

Proof. By definition, there is a feasible f with $|f| = x$. Let us reorient the columns of A such that $f \geq 0$ and let us delete all columns e of A with $f_e = 0$. Consider any feasible g with $\text{supp}(g) \subseteq \text{supp}(x)$. We claim that $c^T x = c^T g$. Assume otherwise and consider the point $y = x + \lambda(g - x)$. If $|\lambda|$ is sufficiently small, $y \geq 0$. Furthermore, y is feasible and $c^T y = c^T x + \lambda(c^T g - c^T x)$. If $c^T g \neq c^T x$, x is not an optimal solution to (2). The claim now follows from Theorem 3.3. \square

3.3 Convergence

In order to show convergence, we construct Lyapunov functions. The following functions play a crucial role in our analysis. Let $C_d = d^T x$ for $d \in D$, and recall that $C_\star = \min_{d \in D} d^T x$ be the optimum. Moreover, we define by

$$h(t) := \sum_e r_e |q_e| \frac{x_e}{C_\star} - E \left(\frac{x}{C_\star} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad V_d := \frac{c^T x}{C_d} \text{ for every } d \in D.$$

Theorem 3.7. (1) *For every $d \in D$, $\dot{C}_d \geq 1 - C_d$. Thus, if $C_d < 1$ then $\dot{C}_d > 0$.*

(2) *If $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_1$, then $\frac{d}{dt} \text{cost}(x(t)) \leq 0$ with equality if and only if $x = |q|$.*

(3) *Let $d \in D$ be such that $C_\star = d^T x$ at time t . Then it holds that $\dot{V}_d \leq h(t)$.*

(4) *It holds that $h(t) \leq 0$ with equality if and only if $|q| = \frac{x}{C_\star}$.*

We show now convergence against the set of equilibrium points. We need the following technical Lemma from [BMV12].

Lemma 3.8 (Lemma 9 in [BMV12]). *Let $f(t) = \max_{d \in D} f_d(t)$, where each f_d is continuous and differentiable. If $\dot{f}(t)$ exists, then there is a $d \in D$ such that $f(t) = f_d(t)$ and $\dot{f}(t) = \dot{f}_d(t)$.*

Theorem 3.9. *All trajectories converge to the set F of equilibrium points.*

Proof. We distinguish cases according to whether the trajectory ever enters \mathcal{X}_1 or not. If the trajectory enters \mathcal{X}_1 , say $x(t_0) \in \mathcal{X}_1$, then $\frac{d}{dt}\text{cost}(x) \leq 0$ for all $t \geq t_0$ with equality only if $x = |q|$. Thus the trajectory converges to the set of fixpoints. If the trajectory never enters \mathcal{X}_1 , consider $V = \max_{d \in D}(V_d + 1 - C_d)$. We show that \dot{V} exists for almost all t . Moreover, if $\dot{V}(t)$ exists, then $\dot{V}(t) \leq 0$ with equality if and only if $|q_e| = x_e$ for all e . It holds that V is Lipschitz-continuous, as the maximum of a finite number of continuously differentiable functions. Since V is Lipschitz-continuous, the set of t 's where $\dot{V}(t)$ does not exist has zero Lebesgue measure (see for example [CLSW98, Ch. 3]). If $\dot{V}(t)$ exists, we have $\dot{V}(t) = \dot{V}_d(t) + \dot{C}_d(t)$ for some $d \in D$ according to Lemma 3.8. Then, it holds that $\dot{V}(t) \leq h(t) - (1 - C_d) \leq 0$. Thus $x(t)$ converges to the set

$$\{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : \dot{V} = 0\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : |q| = x/C \text{ and } C = 1\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : |q| = x\}. \quad \square$$

At this point, we know that all trajectories $x(t)$ converge to F . Our next goal is to show that $c^T x(t)$ converges to the cost of an optimum solution of (2) and that $|q| - x$ converges to zero. We are only able to show the latter for all edges of positive cost.

3.4 Details of the Convergence

In the argument to follow, we will encounter the following situation several times. We have a non-negative function $f(t) \geq 0$ and we know that $\int_0^\infty f(t)dt$ is finite. We want to conclude that $f(t)$ converges to zero for $t \rightarrow \infty$. This holds true if f is Lipschitz continuous. Note that the proof of the following lemma is very similar to the proof in [BMV12, Lemma 11]. However, in our case we apply the Local Lipschitz condition that we showed in Lemma 2.6.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $f(t) \geq 0$ for all t . If $\int_0^\infty f(t)dt$ is finite and $f(t)$ is Lipschitz-continuous, i.e., for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $|f(t') - f(t)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $t' \in [t, t + \delta]$, then $f(t)$ converges to zero as t goes to infinity. Thus, the functions $t \mapsto x^T R |q| - x^T R x = c^T |q| - c^T x$ and $t \mapsto h(t)$ are Lipschitz continuous.*

Lemma 3.11. *For all e of positive cost, it holds that $|x_e - |q_e|| \rightarrow 0$ as t goes to infinity.*

Note that the above does not say anything about the edges of cost zero. Recall that $A_P q_P + A_Z q_Z = b$ and that the columns of A_Z are independent. Thus, q_Z is uniquely determined by q_P . For the undirected shortest path problem, the potential difference $p^T b$ between source and sink converges to the length of a shortest source-sink path. If an edge of positive cost is used by some shortest undirected path, then no shortest undirected path uses it with the opposite direction. We prove the natural generalizations.

Let OPT be the set of optimal solutions to (2) and let $E_{opt} = \cup_{x \in OPT} \text{supp}(x)$ be the set of columns used in some optimal solution. The columns of positive cost in E_{opt} can be consistently oriented as the following Lemma shows.

Lemma 3.12. *Let x_1^* and x_2^* be optimal solutions to (2) and let f and g be feasible solutions with $|f| = x_1^*$ and $|g| = x_2^*$. Then there is no e such that $f_e g_e < 0$ and $c_e > 0$.*

Proof. Assume otherwise. Then $|g_e - f_e| = |g_e| + |f_e| > 0$. Consider $h = (g_e f - f_e g)/(g_e - f_e)$. Then $Ah = (g_e A f - f_e A g)/(g_e - f_e) = b$ and h is feasible. Also, $h_e = \frac{g_e f_e - f_e g_e}{g_e - f_e} = 0$ and for every

edge e' , it holds that $|h_{e'}| = \frac{|g_e f_{e'} - f_e g_{e'}|}{|g_e - f_e|} \leq \frac{|g_e||f_{e'}| + |f_e||g_{e'}|}{|g_e| + |f_e|}$ and hence

$$\text{cost}(h) < \text{cost}(f) + \text{cost}(g) = \frac{|g_e|}{|g_e| + |f_e|} \text{cost}(x_1^*) + \frac{|f_e|}{|g_e| + |f_e|} \text{cost}(x_2^*) = \text{cost}(x_1^*),$$

a contradiction to the optimality of x_1^* and x_2^* . \square

By the preceding Lemma, we can orient A such that $f_e \geq 0$ whenever $|f|$ is an optimal solution to (2) and $c_e > 0$. We then call A *positively oriented*. The proof of the following lemma can be found in the appendix.

Lemma 3.13. *It holds that $p^T b$ converges to the cost of an optimum solution of (2). If A is positively oriented, then $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} A_e^T p \geq 0$ for all e .*

Corollary 3.14. *$E(x)$ and $\text{cost}(x)$ converge to $c^T x^*$, whereas x and $|q|$ converge to OPT . If the optimum solution is unique, x and $|q|$ converge to it. Moreover, if $e \notin E_{opt}$, x_e and $|q_e|$ converge to zero.*

Proof. The first part follows from $E(x) = \text{cost}(x) = b^T p$ and the preceding Lemma. Thus x and q converge to the set of equilibrium points that are optimum solutions to (2). Since every optimum solution is an equilibrium point by Theorem 3.6, x and q converge to OPT . For $e \notin E_{opt}$, $f_e = 0$ for every $f \in F \cap OPT$. Since x and $|q|$ converge to $F \cap OPT$, x_e and $|q_e|$ converge to zero for every $e \in E_{opt}$. \square

4 Improved Convergence Analysis of Discrete Directed Physarum Dynamics

In this section, we give a proof sketch of Theorem 1.4. Due to space constraints, we defer all intermediate proofs to Appendix C.

4.1 Convergence to Dominance

In [BBD⁺13, SV16b, SV16c], the authors implicitly show that the discrete Physarum dynamics (6) can be initialized with a point in $\mathcal{X}(\alpha)$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. We demonstrate that the dynamics initialized with an arbitrary starting point in $\mathcal{X}(\alpha)$, for any $\alpha > 1$, converges to a point in $\mathcal{X}(1+o(1))$ after at most $O(\alpha \mathcal{D} \|c\|_1)$ non-adaptive steps each of size $h = c_{\min}/(2\alpha \mathcal{D} \|c\|_1)$. Moreover, similarly to \mathcal{X}_1 for the continuous undirected dynamics, see Section 3, we show that $\mathcal{X}(1)$ is an attracting set for the discrete directed Physarum dynamics (6).

Lemma 4.1. *(Attracting Set) Let $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $\alpha^{(t)} > 0$ and $x^{(t)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha^{(t)})$ are arbitrary. Then for any $k \geq 1$ and $h \leq \min\{1, 1/\alpha^{(t)}\} \cdot c_{\min}/(2\mathcal{D} \|c\|_1)$, it holds that $x^{(t+k)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha^{(t+k)})$, where $\alpha^{(t+k)} = [1 - (1 - h)^k (1 - 1/\alpha^{(t)})]^{-1}$.*

The above lemma motivates the following two-phase process. Phase one occurs only if $\alpha > 2$, it takes an $x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha)$ and it outputs an $x^{(t)} \in \mathcal{X}(2)$. Then, phase two takes the point $x^{(t)}$ and it outputs a near optimal solution $x^{(t+k)}$ of (5), as indicated in Theorem 1.4.

4.2 $x^{(k)}$ is Close to a Non-Negative and Kernel-Free Vector

In this subsection, we generalize [SV16b, Lemma 5.4].

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose a matrix $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times m}$ has full row rank and vector $b \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Let g be a feasible solution to $Ag = b$ and $S \subseteq [n]$ be a subset of the variables such that $\sum_{i \in S} |g_i| < 1/\mathcal{D}$. Then there is a feasible solution f such that $g_i \cdot f_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in [n]$, and $f_i = 0$ for all $i \in S$. In particular, it holds that $\|g - f\|_\infty < 1/\mathcal{D}$.*

Lemma 4.3. *Let $q \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $N = \{e \in E : q_e \leq 0 \text{ or } p^T A_{:,e} \leq 0\}$. Suppose $\sum_{e \in N} |q_e| < 1/\mathcal{D}$. Then there is a feasible kernel-free vector f such that $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq E \setminus N$ and $\|f - g\|_\infty < 1/\mathcal{D}$.*

Building on Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3, we obtain the following generalization of [SV16b, Lemma 5.4].

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose $x^{(t)} \in \mathcal{X}(2)$, $h \leq c_{\min}/(4\mathcal{D}\|c\|_1)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then, for any $k \geq h^{-1} \ln(4\varepsilon^{-1}m\mathcal{D}^3\|b\|_1\Psi^{(0)})$ there is a feasible kernel-free vector f with $\|x^{(t+k)} - f\|_\infty < \varepsilon/\mathcal{D}$.*

4.3 $x^{(k)}$ is ε -Close to an Optimal Solution

We will now establish an optimality criterion for a feasible kernel-free vector.

Lemma 4.5. *Let f be a feasible kernel-free vector and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ a parameter. Suppose for every non-optimal basic feasible solution g , there exists an index $e \in E$ such that $g_e > 0$ and $f_e < \varepsilon\phi/(2\mathcal{D}^2m\|b\|_1)$. Then $\|f - f^*\|_\infty < \varepsilon/\mathcal{D}$ for some optimal f^* .*

Let \mathcal{B} be the set of all basic feasible solutions of (5) and $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ be the set of the optimal ones. We define by $\phi = \min_{g \in \mathcal{B}} \min_{e \in \text{supp}(g)} g_e$ and $\Phi = \min_{g \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{O}} c^T g - c^T f^*$. Furthermore, we show in Lemma C.9 that $\phi \geq 1/\mathcal{D}$ and $\Phi \geq 1/\mathcal{D}^2$, for any linear program with integral A, b, c . Hence, since Cramer's rule yields that $\|f\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{D}\|b\|_1$, a natural choice for the parameters $\alpha, \beta > 0$ in the assumption $\beta\mathbf{1} \leq x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha)$, is $\beta = \phi$ and $\alpha = \mathcal{D}^2\|b\|_1$.

In the next lemma, we extend the analysis in [SV16b, Lemma 5.6] to general linear programs.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$ be parameters. Suppose g is a non-optimal basic feasible solution, $\beta\mathbf{1} \leq x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha)$, $h \leq (\Phi/2\text{opt}) \cdot (c_{\min}/\mathcal{D}\|c\|_1)^2$, $t = (3/h) \max\{1, \alpha^2\}$ and $h^{(\ell)} = h \cdot \min\{1, \alpha^{-2}\}$ if $0 \leq \ell \leq t$ or $h^{(\ell)} = h$ when $\ell > t$. Then, the Physarum dynamics (6) initialized with $x^{(0)}$, step size $h^{(\ell)}$ and number of iterations $k \geq 4(h\Phi)^{-1}c^T g \ln(\Psi^{(0)}/\varepsilon\beta)$, guarantees the existence of an index $e \in E$ such that $g_e > 0$ and $x_e^{(t+k)} < \varepsilon$.*

4.4 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Let g be an arbitrary non-optimal basic feasible solution. By Cramer's rule we have $c^T g \leq \mathcal{D}\|c\|_1\|b\|_1$. Then, by Lemma 4.6 applied with $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon\phi/(8m\mathcal{D}^2\|b\|_1)$, it follows that the Physarum dynamics (6) for every $k \geq 4\mathcal{D}\|c\|_1\|b\|_1/(h\Phi) \cdot \ln(8m\mathcal{D}^2\|b\|_1\Psi^{(0)})/(\varepsilon\phi\beta)$ guarantees the existence of an index $e \in E$ such that $g_e > 0$ and

$$x_e^{(t+k)} < \varepsilon\phi/(8\mathcal{D}^2m\|b\|_1). \quad (11)$$

By Lemma 4.4 applied with $\varepsilon' = \varepsilon\phi/(8m\mathcal{D}^2\|b\|_1)$ and h , we obtain that for any

$$z \geq \frac{1}{h} \ln \left(2^5 m^2 \mathcal{D}^5 \|b\|_1^2 \Psi^{(0)} / \varepsilon \phi \right)$$

there is a feasible kernel-free vector f such that $\|x^{(z+t)} - f\|_\infty < \varepsilon\phi/8\mathcal{D}^2m\|b\|_1$. Note that $k \geq z$ and hence we also have $\|x^{(t+k)} - f\|_\infty < \varepsilon\phi/8\mathcal{D}^2m\|b\|_1$. Thus, by (11), it follows that

$$f_e \leq x_e^{(t+k)} + \varepsilon\phi/(8\mathcal{D}^2m\|b\|_1) < \varepsilon\phi/(4\mathcal{D}^2m\|b\|_1).$$

We have established that $g_e > 0$ and $f_e < \varepsilon\phi/(4\mathcal{D}^2m\|b\|_1)$. Then, by Lemma Lemma 4.5 it holds that $\|f - f^*\|_\infty < \varepsilon/(2\mathcal{D})$. The statement follows by triangle inequality.

References

- [BBD⁺13] Luca Becchetti, Vincenzo Bonifaci, Michael Dirnberger, Andreas Karrenbauer, and Kurt Mehlhorn. Physarum can compute shortest paths: Convergence proofs and complexity bounds. In *ICALP*, volume 7966 of *LNCS*, pages 472–483, 2013.
- [BMV12] Vincenzo Bonifaci, Kurt Mehlhorn, and Girish Varma. [Physarum can compute shortest paths](#). *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 309(0):121–133, 2012. A preliminary version of this paper appeared at SODA 2012 (pages 233-240).
- [Bon13] Vincenzo Bonifaci. Physarum can compute shortest paths: A short proof. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 113(1-2):4–7, 2013.
- [Bon16] Vincenzo Bonifaci. On the convergence time of a natural dynamics for linear programming. *CoRR*, abs/1611.06729, 2016.
- [CLSW98] F. H. Clarke, Yu. S. Ledyaev, R. J. Stern, and P. R. Wolenski. *Nonsmooth Analysis and Control Theory*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA, 1998.
- [IJNT11] Kentaro Ito, Anders Johansson, Toshiyuki Nakagaki, and Atsushi Tero. Convergence properties for the physarum solver. arXiv:1101.5249v1, January 2011.
- [JZ12] A. Johansson and J. Zou. A slime mold solver for linear programming problems. In *CiE*, pages 344–354, 2012.
- [MO08] T. Miyaji and Isamu Ohnishi. Physarum can solve the shortest path problem on Riemannian surface mathematically rigourously. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 47:353–369, 2008.
- [NYT00] T. Nakagaki, H. Yamada, and Á. Tóth. Maze-solving by an amoeboid organism. *Nature*, 407:470, 2000.
- [Phy] <http://people.mpi-inf.mpg.de/~mehlhorn/ftp/SlimeAusschnitt.webm>.
- [Sch86] A. Schrijver. *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*. Wiley, 1986.
- [SV16a] Damian Straszak and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. IRLS and slime mold: Equivalence and convergence. *CoRR*, abs/1601.02712, 2016.
- [SV16b] Damian Straszak and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. Natural algorithms for flow problems. In *SODA*, pages 1868–1883, 2016.
- [SV16c] Damian Straszak and Nisheeth K. Vishnoi. On a natural dynamics for linear programming. In *ITCS*, pages 291–291, New York, NY, USA, 2016. ACM.

[TKN07] A. Tero, R. Kobayashi, and T. Nakagaki. A mathematical model for adaptive transport network in path finding by true slime mold. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, pages 553–564, 2007.

A Omitted Proofs for Section 2

A.1 Finite Basis Theorem

Lemma 2.1 (from page 5). *Let f be a feasible solution to $Af = b$. Then f is the sum of a convex combination of at most n basic feasible solutions plus a vector in the kernel of A . Moreover, all elements in this representation are sign-compatible with f .*

Proof. We may assume $f \geq 0$. Otherwise, we flip the sign of the appropriate columns of A . Thus the system $Af = b$, $f \geq 0$ is feasible and f is the sum of a convex combination of at most n basic feasible solutions plus a vector in the kernel of A by the finite basis theorem [Sch86, Corollary 7.1b]. By definition, the elements in this representation are non-negative vectors and hence sign-compatible with f . \square

A.2 The Minimum Energy Solution

Lemma A.1. *If every nonzero vector in the kernel of A has positive cost, the minimum energy feasible solution is kernel-free and unique.*

Proof. Let q be a minimum energy feasible solution. Since q is feasible, it can be written as $q_n + q_r$, where q_n is a convex combination of basic feasible solutions and q_r lies in the kernel of A . Moreover, all elements in this representation are sign-compatible with q by Lemma 2.1. If $q_r \neq 0$, the vector $q - q_r$ is feasible and has smaller energy, a contradiction. Thus $q_r = 0$.

We next prove uniqueness. Assume for the sake of a contradiction that there are two distinct minimum energy feasible solutions $q^{(1)}$ and $q^{(2)}$. We show that the solution $(q^{(1)} + q^{(2)})/2$ uses less energy than $q^{(1)}$ and $q^{(2)}$. Since $h \mapsto h^2$ is a strictly convex function from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} , the average of the two solutions will be better than either solution if there is an edge e with $r_e > 0$ and $q_e^{(1)} \neq q_e^{(2)}$. The difference $z = q^{(1)} - q^{(2)}$ lies in the kernel of A and hence $\text{cost}(z) = \sum_e c_e |z_e| > 0$. Thus there is an e with $c_e > 0$ and $z_e \neq 0$. We have now shown the uniqueness. \square

Lemma A.2. *Assume that every nonzero vector in the kernel of A has positive cost. Let q be the minimum energy feasible solution. Then $|q_e| \leq \|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}$ for every e .*

Proof. Since q is a convex combination of basic feasible solutions, $|q_e| \leq \max_z |z_e|$ where z ranges over basic feasible solutions. Any basic feasible solution is of the form $(z_B, 0)$, where $z_B = A_B^{-1}b$ and A_B is a $n \times n$ non-singular submatrix of A . Thus every component of z is bounded by $\|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}$. \square

Lemma 2.4 (from page 5). *Assume that every nonzero vector in the kernel of A has positive cost. Let $r_e = c_e/x_e$ and let R denote the corresponding diagonal matrix. Let us split $[m]$ into $Z = \{e : c_e = 0\}$ and $P = E \setminus Z$, similarly A into A_P and A_Z and q into q_P and q_Z . Then the minimum energy feasible solution satisfies*

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_P & A_Z \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_P \\ q_Z \end{bmatrix} = b \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} R_P & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_P \\ q_Z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_P^T \\ A_Z^T \end{bmatrix} p. \quad (8)$$

Since A_Z has linearly independent columns, we may assume that the first $|Z|$ rows of A_Z form a square non-singular matrix. We can thus write $A = \begin{bmatrix} A'_P & A'_Z \\ A''_P & A''_Z \end{bmatrix}$ with invertible A'_Z . The above equation system (8) has a unique solution that satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} q_Z \\ q_P \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} [A'_Z]^{-1}(b' - A'_P q_P) \\ R_P^{-1} A_P^T p \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} p' \\ p'' \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -[A'_Z]^{-T} [A''_Z]^T p'' \\ MR^{-1} M^T (b'' - A''_Z [A'_Z]^{-1} b') \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where $M = A''_P - A''_Z (A'_Z)^{-1} A'_P$ and p is split into p' and p'' analogously to A_Z .

Proof. Clearly $Aq = b$ becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_P & A_Z \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_P \\ q_Z \end{bmatrix} = b. \quad (12)$$

Note that the matrix A_Z has independent columns as otherwise there would be a non-zero vector in the kernel of A with zero cost. The KKT conditions state that q must satisfy $Rq = A^T p$ for some p .⁴ We may absorb the factor 2 in p . The equation $Rq = A^T p$ becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} R_P & \\ & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_P \\ q_Z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_P^T \\ A_Z^T \end{bmatrix} p. \quad (13)$$

We show next that the linear system composed of equations (8) has a unique solution. Using the partition $A = \begin{bmatrix} A'_P & A'_Z \\ A''_P & A''_Z \end{bmatrix}$ with invertible A'_Z , the first part of (8) becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} A'_P & A'_Z \\ A''_P & A''_Z \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} q_P \\ q_Z \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} b' \\ b'' \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where A'_P , A'_Z and b' have $|Z|$ rows and A''_P , A''_Z , and b'' have $n - |Z|$ rows. Note that $M = A''_P - A''_Z (A'_Z)^{-1} A'_P$ as defined in the statement of the lemma denotes the Schur complement of the block A'_Z of the matrix A . The top $|Z|$ rows of (14) give

$$q_Z = [A'_Z]^{-1} (b' - A'_P q_P). \quad (15)$$

Substitution of (15) into the bottom $n - |Z|$ rows of (14) yields

$$M q_P = b'' - A''_Z (A'_Z)^{-1} b'.$$

From the top $|P|$ rows of (13) it holds that $q_P = R_P^{-1} A_P^T \cdot p$. Thus

$$M R_P^{-1} A_P^T \cdot p = b'' - A''_Z [A'_Z]^{-1} \cdot b'. \quad (16)$$

Now considering the partition of p into p' and p'' where p' has $|Z|$ components gives that the last $n - |Z|$ rows of (13) yield $0 = A_Z^T p = (A'_Z)^T p' + (A''_Z)^T p''$ and hence

$$p' = -[A'_Z]^{-T} [A''_Z]^T p''. \quad (17)$$

⁴Note that $2Rf$ is the gradient of the energy $E(f)$ with respect to f and that the $-A^T p$ is the gradient of $p^T (b - Af)$ with respect to f .

Substituting (17) into (16) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
b'' - A_Z''(A_Z')^{-1}b' &= MR_P^{-1} \left([A_P']^T p' + [A_P'']^T p'' \right) \\
&= MR_P^{-1} \left([A_P'']^T - [A_P']^T (A_Z')^{-T} (A_Z'')^T \right) p'' \\
&= MR_P^{-1} M^T p''.
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

It remains to show that the matrix $MR_P^{-1}M^T$ is non-singular. Since R_P^{-1} is a positive diagonal matrix, $\ker(MR_P^{-1}M^T) = \ker(MM^T)$. Thus it suffices to show that the rows of matrix M are linearly independent. Consider (14). Multiplying the first $|Z|$ rows by $(A_Z')^{-1}$ and then subtracting A_Z'' times the resulting rows from the last $n - |Z|$ rows turns A into the matrix $Q = \begin{bmatrix} [A_Z']^{-1}A_P' & I \\ M & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. By assumption, A has independent rows. Moreover, the preceding operations guarantee that $\text{rank}(A) = \text{rank}(Q)$. Therefore, M has independent rows.

There is a shorter proof that the system (8) has a unique solution. However, the argument does not give an explicit expression for the solution. In the case of a convex objective function and affine constraints, the KKT conditions are sufficient for being a global minimum. Thus any solution to (8) is a global optimum. We have already shown in Lemma 2.2 that the global minimum is unique. \square

Lemma A.3. *Let q be the minimum energy feasible solution and let f be any feasible solution. Then $E(q) = b^T p = f^T A^T p$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 2.4, we split q into q_P and q_Z , R into R_P and R_Z , and A into A_P and A_Z . Then, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
E(q) &= q_P^T R_P q_P && \text{by the definition of } E(q) \text{ and } R_Z = 0 \\
&= p^T A_P q_P && \text{by the upper block of equations in (13)} \\
&= p^T (b - A_Z q_Z) && \text{by (12)} \\
&= b^T p && \text{by the lower block of equations in (13)}.
\end{aligned}$$

For any feasible solution f , we have $f^T A^T p = b^T p$. \square

Lemma 2.6 (from page 6). *Assume $c \geq 0$, no non-zero vector in the kernel of A has cost zero, and that A , b , and c are integral. Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$. Then for any $e \in [m]$ and any two vectors x and \tilde{x} in \mathbb{R}^m with $\alpha \mathbf{1} \leq x, \tilde{x} \leq \beta \mathbf{1}$, define $M = 2m^n (\beta/\alpha)^n c_{\max}^n \mathcal{D}^2 \|b\|_1$. Then, it holds that $||q_e(x)| - |q_e(\tilde{x})|| \leq M \|x - \tilde{x}\|_\infty$.*

Proof. First assume that $c > 0$. Recall that Cramer's rule yields

$$(AR^{-1}A^T)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\det(AR^{-1}A^T)} ((-1)^{i+j} \det M_{-j,-i})_{ij},$$

where $M_{-i,-j}$ is obtained from $AR^{-1}A^T$ by deleting the i -th row and the j -th column. For a subset S of $[m]$ and an index $i \in [n]$, let A_S be the $n \times |S|$ matrix consisting of the columns selected by S and let $A_{-i,S}$ be the matrix obtained from A_S by deleting row i . If D is a diagonal matrix of size m , then $(AD)_S = A_S D_S$. The Cauchy-Binet theorem expresses the determinant of a product of two matrices (not necessarily square) as a sum of determinants of square matrices. It yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\det(AR^{-1}A^T) &= \sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n} (\det((AR^{-1/2})_S))^2 \\
&= \sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n} \left(\prod_{e \in S} x_e / c_e \right) \cdot (\det A_S)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\det(AR^{-1}A^T)_{-i,-j} = \sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n-1} \left(\prod_{e \in S} x_e/c_e \right) \cdot (\det A_{-i,S} \cdot \det A_{-j,S}).$$

Thus using $p = (AR^{-1}A^T)^{-1}b$, we obtain

$$p_i = \frac{\sum_{j \in [n]} (-1)^{i+j} \sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n-1} \left(\prod_{e \in S} x_e/c_e \right) \cdot (\det A_{-i,S} \cdot \det A_{-j,S}) b_j}{\sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n} \left(\prod_{e \in S} x_e/c_e \right) \cdot (\det A_S)^2}, \quad (19)$$

and using $q = R^{-1}A^T p$, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} q_e &= \frac{x_e}{c_e} A_e^T p \\ &= \frac{x_e}{c_e} \sum_i A_{i,e} \cdot \frac{\sum_{j \in [n]} (-1)^{i+j+2n} \sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n-1} \left(\prod_{e' \in S} x_{e'}/c_{e'} \right) \cdot (\det A_{-i,S} \cdot \det A_{-j,S}) b_j}{\sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n} \left(\prod_{e' \in S} x_{e'}/c_{e'} \right) \cdot (\det A_S)^2} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n-1} \left(\left(\prod_{e' \in S \cup e} x_{e'}/c_{e'} \right) \cdot \sum_{i \in [n]} (-1)^{i+n} A_{i,e} \det A_{-i,S} \cdot \sum_{j \in [n]} (-1)^{j+n} b_j \det A_{-j,S} \right)}{\sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n} \left(\prod_{e' \in S} x_{e'}/c_{e'} \right) \cdot (\det A_S)^2} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n-1} \left(\prod_{e' \in S \cup e} x_{e'}/c_{e'} \right) \cdot \det(A_S|A_e) \cdot \det(A_S|b)}{\sum_{S \subseteq [m]; |S|=n} \left(\prod_{e' \in S} x_{e'}/c_{e'} \right) \cdot (\det A_S)^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $(A_S|A_e)$, respectively $(A_S|b)$, denotes the $n \times n$ matrix whose columns are selected from A by S and whose last column is equal to A_e , respectively b . A more detailed derivation of (20) can be found in the appendix.

We are now ready to estimate the derivative $\partial q_e / \partial x_i$. Assume first that $e \neq i$. By the above, $q_e = \frac{x_e}{c_e} \frac{F+Gx_i/c_i}{H+Ix_i/c_i}$, where F, G, H and I are given implicitly by (20). Then

$$\left| \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial x_i} \right| = \left| \frac{x_e}{c_e} \frac{FI/c_i - GH/c_i}{(H + Ix_i/c_i)^2} \right| \leq \frac{2 \cdot \binom{m}{n-1} \beta^n \mathcal{D}^2 \|b\|_1}{(\alpha/c_{\max})^n} \leq M.$$

For $e = i$, we have $q_e = \frac{Gx_e/c_e}{H+Ix_e/c_e}$, where G, H , and I are given implicitly by (20). Then

$$\left| \frac{\partial q_e}{\partial x_e} \right| = \left| \frac{GH/c_e}{(H + Ix_e/c_e)^2} \right| \leq \frac{\binom{m}{n-1} \beta^n \mathcal{D}^2 \|b\|_1}{(\alpha/c_{\max})^n} \leq M.$$

Finally, consider x and \tilde{x} with $\alpha \mathbf{1} \leq x, \tilde{x} \leq \beta \mathbf{1}$. Let $\bar{x}_\ell = (\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_\ell, x_{\ell+1}, \dots, x_m)$. Then

$$\left| |q_e(x)| - |q_e(\tilde{x})| \right| \leq |q_e(x) - q_e(\tilde{x})| \leq \sum_{0 \leq \ell < m} |q_e(\bar{x}_\ell) - q_e(\bar{x}_{\ell+1})| \leq M \|x - \tilde{x}\|_1.$$

In the general case where $c \geq 0$, we first derive an expression for p'' similar to (19). Then the equations for p' in (9) yield p' , the equations for qp in (9) yield qp , and finally the equations for qz in (9) yield qz . \square

A.3 Existence of a Solution to the Undirected Physarum Dynamics

Lemma A.4 (Grönwall's Lemma). *1. Let $u(t)$ and $\beta(t)$ be functions satisfying $\dot{u}(t) \leq \beta(t)u(t)$. Then $u(t) \leq u(0) \cdot \exp(\int_0^t \beta(s) ds)$. In particular, choosing $\beta(t) := -1$ and $u(t) := -v(t)$ yields that $v(t) \geq v(0) \cdot \exp(-t)$, if $\dot{v}(t) \geq -v(t)$.*

2. Let $Y(t)$ be a function satisfying $\dot{Y} \geq a - Y$ for some constant a . Then $Y(t) \geq a + (Y(0) - a) \exp(-t)$. Similarly, if $\dot{Y} \leq a - Y$, then $Y(t) \leq a + (Y(0) - a) \exp(-t)$.

Proof. The first part is a classical result, we only show the second part here. We have

$$\frac{d}{ds} Y(s)e^s = \dot{Y}(s)e^s + Y(s)e^s = (\dot{Y}(s) + Y(s))e^s \geq a \cdot e^s,$$

and hence by integrating on both sides from 0 to t , we get $Y(t)e^t - Y(0) \geq a(e^t - 1)$. and the bound on $Y(t)$ follows. \square

Lemma A.5. *The solution to the undirected dynamics in (1) has domain $[0, \infty)$. Moreover, $x(0)e^{-t} \leq x(t) \leq \max(\|b\|_1 \mathcal{D} \cdot \mathbf{1}, x(0)e^{-t} - \|b\|_1 \mathcal{D} \cdot \mathbf{1}(1 - e^{-t}))$ for all t .*

Proof. Consider any $x_0 > 0$ and any $t_0 \geq 0$. We first show that there is a positive δ' (depending on x_0) such that a unique solution $x(t)$ with $x(t_0) = x_0$ exists for $t \in (t_0 - \delta', t_0 + \delta')$. By the Picard-Lindelöf Theorem, this holds true if the mapping $x \mapsto |q| - x$ is continuous and satisfies a Lipschitz condition in a neighborhood of x_0 . Continuity clearly holds. Let $\varepsilon = \min_i (x_0)_i / 2$ and let $U = \{x : \|x - x_0\|_\infty < \varepsilon\}$. Then for every $x, \tilde{x} \in U$ and every e

$$||q_e(x)| - |q_e(\tilde{x})|| \leq M \|x - \tilde{x}\|_1,$$

where M is as in Lemma 2.6. Local existence implies the existence of a solution which cannot be extended. Since q is bounded (Lemma 2.3), x is bounded at all finite times, and hence the solution exists for all t . The lower bound $x(t) \geq x(0)e^{-t} > 0$ holds by Grönwall's Lemma. Since $|q_e| \leq \|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}$, $\dot{x} = |q| - x \leq \|b\|_1 \mathcal{D} \mathbf{1} - x$. Thus, by the second part of Lemma 2.7, we have $x(t) \leq \|b\|_1 \mathcal{D} \mathbf{1} + \max(\mathbf{0}, x(0) - \|b\|_1 \mathcal{D} \cdot \mathbf{1})e^{-t}$. \square

A.4 Generalizing the Max-Flow Min-Cut Theorem through LP Duality

Lemma 2.9 (from page 6). *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$. The following linear programs are feasible and*

$$\max\{\alpha : Af = \alpha b, |f| \leq x\} = \min\{|y^T A| x : b^T y = -1\}. \quad (21)$$

Moreover, there is a finite set $D = \{d^1, \dots, d^K\}$ of vectors $d^i \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^m$ that are independent of x such that the minimum above is equal to $C_\star = \min_{d \in D} d^T x$. In particular, there is a feasible f with $|f| \leq x/C_\star$.

Proof. It holds that $\alpha, f = 0$ is a feasible solution for the maximization problem. Since $b \neq 0$, there exists y with $b^T y = -1$ and thus both problems are feasible. The dual of $\max\{\alpha : Af - \alpha b = 0, f \leq x, -f \leq x\}$ has unconstrained variables $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and non-negative variables $z^+, z^- \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and reads

$$\min\{x^T(z^+ + z^-) : -b^T y = 1, A^T y + z^+ - z^- = 0, z^+, z^- \geq 0\}. \quad (22)$$

From $z^- = A^T y + z^+$, $z^+ \geq 0$, $z^- \geq 0$ and $x > 0$, we conclude $\min(z^+, z^-) = \mathbf{0}$ in an optimal solution. Thus $z^- = \max(\mathbf{0}, A^T y)$ and $z^+ = \max(\mathbf{0}, -A^T y)$ and hence $z^+ + z^- = |A^T y|$ in an optimal dual solution. Thus (22) is equivalent to the right hand side of (21).

We next show that the feasible set of the dual contains no line. Assume the dual contains a line. Then there are vectors $d = (y_1, z_1^+, z_1^-)$, d non-zero, and $p = (y_0, z_0^+, z_0^-)$ such that $p + \lambda d$ is feasible for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies $z_1^+ = z_1^- = 0$ as otherwise the dual would be unbounded

which is impossible since the primal is feasible. Hence $A^T y_1 = 0$. Since A has full row rank, we have $y_1 = 0$. Thus the dual contains no line and the minimum is attained at a vertex of its feasible region. Furthermore, the feasible region does not depend on x .

Let (y^1, z_1^+, z_1^-) to (y^K, z_K^+, z_K^-) be the vertices of (22), and let $D = \{|A^T y^1|, \dots, |A^T y^K|\}$. Notice that for

$$x' = \frac{x}{\min_{d \in D} d^T x} > 0 \quad \text{we have} \quad \min_{d \in D} d^T x' = 1,$$

and thus the LP at the RHS of (21) has objective value 1. Hence, there is a feasible f with $|f| \leq x'$. \square

Lemma 2.10 (from page 7). *Let $x > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $\alpha > 0$. It follows that*

$$\min\{0 : Af = b, 0 \leq f \leq \alpha x\} = \max\{b^T y - \alpha x^T \max\{0, A^T y\} : y \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

Let D' be the finite set of vertices of $\mathcal{P} := \{(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m} : z \geq \max\{0, A^T y\}, \|y\|_\infty \leq 1, b^T y \geq 0\}$. Then, $x \in \mathcal{X}^W(\alpha)$ if and only if $b^T y \leq \alpha x^T \max\{0, A^T y\}$ for every $(y, z) \in D'$.

Proof. The minimization problem can be written as

$$\min \left\{ 0 : \begin{bmatrix} A & 0 \\ I & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f \\ s \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} b \\ \alpha x \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } f, s \geq 0 \right\}. \quad (23)$$

Hence, its dual has unconstrained variables $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and reads

$$\max \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} b \\ \alpha x \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} y \\ z \end{bmatrix} : \begin{bmatrix} A^T & I \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} y \\ z \end{bmatrix} \leq 0 \right\} = \max \{b^T y - \alpha x^T z : z \geq \max\{0, A^T y\}\}. \quad (24)$$

The lower bound on z is fulfilled with equality in any optimal solution since $x > 0$. Thus the maximization problem can be written as $\max\{b^T y - \alpha x^T \max\{0, A^T y\} : y \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$, which establishes the first part of the lemma. For the second conclusion, notice that $x \in \mathcal{X}^W(\alpha)$ if and only if the optimum value of the primal-dual (23,24) equals 0, or equivalently

$$\max\{b^T y - \alpha x^T z : z \geq \max\{0, A^T y\}, \|y\|_\infty \leq 1, b^T y \geq 0\} = 0. \quad (25)$$

Since the polyhedron \mathcal{P} does not contain a line and the optimum is finite, it follows that (25) has an extreme point that is optimal. \square

B Omitted Proofs for Section 3

B.1 Convergence to Dominance and Resulting Simple Bounds

Lemma 3.1 (from page 7).

1. *It holds that $\mathcal{X}_{\text{dom}} = \mathcal{X}_1$. Moreover, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x(t), \mathcal{X}_1) = 0$, where $\text{dist}(x, \mathcal{X}_1)$ is the Euclidean distance between x and \mathcal{X}_1 .*
2. *If $x(t_0) \in \mathcal{X}_1$, then $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_1$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Finally, $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_{1/2} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : d^T x \geq 1/2 \text{ for all } d \in D\}$ for all sufficiently large t , and if $x \in \mathcal{X}_{1/2}$ then there is a feasible f with $|f| \leq 2x$.*

Proof. 1. If $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$, then $d^T x \geq 1$ for all $d \in D$ and hence Lemma 2.9 implies the existence of a feasible solution f with $|f| \leq x$. Conversely, if $x \in \mathcal{X}_{\text{dom}}$, then there is a feasible f with $|f| \leq x$. Thus $d^T x \geq 1$ for all $d \in D$ and hence $x \in \mathcal{X}_1$. By the proof of Lemma 2.9, for any $d \in D$, there is a y such that $d = |A^T y|$ and $b^T y = -1$. Let $Y(t) = d^T x$. Then

$$\dot{Y} = |y^T A| \dot{x} = |y^T A| (|q| - x) \geq |y^T A q| - Y = |y^T b| - Y = 1 - Y.$$

Thus for any t_0 and $t \geq t_0$, $Y(t) \geq 1 + (Y(t_0) - 1)e^{-(t-t_0)}$ by Lemma 2.7. In particular, $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} Y(t) \geq 1$. Thus $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \min_{d \in D} d^T x \geq 1$ and hence $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{dist}(x(t), \mathcal{X}_1) = 0$.

2. Moreover, if $Y(t_0) \geq 1$, then $Y(t) \geq 1$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Hence $x(t_0) \in \mathcal{X}_1$ implies $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_1$ for all $t \geq t_0$. Since $x(t)$ converges to \mathcal{X}_1 , $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_{1/2}$ for all sufficiently large t . If $x \in \mathcal{X}_{1/2}$ there is f such that $Af = \frac{1}{2}b$ and $|f| \leq x$. Thus $2f$ is feasible and $|2f| \leq 2x$. \square

Lemma 3.2 (from page 8).

1. For sufficiently large t , it holds that $r_e \geq c_e/(2\|b\|_1 \mathcal{D})$, $b^T p \leq 8c_{\max}\|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}$ and $|A_e^T p| \leq 8c_{\max}\|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}^2$ for all e .
2. For all e , it holds that $\dot{x}_e/x_e \geq -1$ and for all $e \in P$, it holds that $\dot{x}_e/x_e \leq 8\frac{c_{\max}}{c_{\min}}\|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}^2$.
3. There is a positive constant C such that for all $t \geq t_0$, there is a feasible f (depending on t) such that $x_e(t) \geq C$ for all edges e in the support of f .

Proof. 1. By Lemma 2.8, $x_e(t) \leq 2\|b\|_1 \cdot \mathcal{D}$ for all sufficiently large t . It follows that $r_e = c_e/x_e \geq c_e/(2\|b\|_1 \cdot \mathcal{D})$. Due to Lemma 3.1, for large enough t , there is a feasible flow with $|f| \leq 2x$. Together with $x_e(t) \leq 2\|b\|_1 \cdot \mathcal{D}$, it follows that

$$b^T p = E(q) \leq E(2x) = 4c^T x \leq 8c_{\max}\|b\|_1 \cdot \mathcal{D}.$$

Now, orient A according to q and consider any edge e' . Recall that for all edges e , $A_e^T p = 0$ if $e \in Z$ and $q_e = (x_e/c_e) \cdot A_e^T p$ if $e \in P$. Thus $A_e^T p \geq 0$ for all e . If $e' \in Z$ or $e' \in P$ and $q_{e'} = 0$, the claim is obvious. So assume $e' \in P$ and $q_{e'} > 0$. Since q is a convex combination of q -sign-compatible basic feasible solutions, there is a basic feasible solution f with $f \geq 0$ and $f_{e'} > 0$. Since f is basic feasible, $f_{e'} \geq 1/\mathcal{D}$. Therefore

$$f_{e'} A_{e'}^T p \leq \sum_e f_e A_e^T p = b^T p \leq 8c_{\max}\|b\|_1 \cdot \mathcal{D}$$

for all sufficiently large t . The inequality follows from $f_e \geq 0$ and $A_e^T p \geq 0$ for all e . Thus $A_{e'}^T p \leq 8c_{\max}\|b\|_1 \cdot \mathcal{D}^2$ for all sufficiently large t .

2. We have $\frac{\dot{x}_e}{x_e} = \frac{|q_e| - x_e}{x_e} \geq -1$ for all e . For e with $c_e > 0$

$$\frac{\dot{x}_e}{x_e} = \frac{|q_e| - x_e}{x_e} \leq \frac{|A_e^T p|}{c_e} \leq \frac{8 \cdot c_{\max}}{c_{\min}} \cdot \|b\|_1 \cdot \mathcal{D}^2.$$

3. Let t_0 be such that $d^T x(t) \geq 1/2$ for all $d \in D$ and $t \geq t_0$. Then for all $t \geq t_0$, there is f such that $Af = \frac{1}{2}b$ and $|f| \leq x(t)$; f may depend on t . By Lemma 2.1, we can write $2f$ as convex combination of f -sign-compatible basic feasible solutions (at most m of them) and a f -sign-compatible solution in the kernel of A . Dropping the solution in the kernel of A leaves us with a solution which is still dominated by x .

It holds that for every $e \in E$ with $f_e \neq 0$, there is a basic feasible solution g used in the convex decomposition such that $|f_e| \geq |g_e| > 0$. Every non-zero component of g is at least $1/D$. We conclude $x_e \geq 1/(2nD)$ for every e in the support of g . \square

B.2 Convergence

Theorem 3.7 (from page 9).

- (1) For every $d \in D$, $\dot{C}_d \geq 1 - C_d$. Thus, if $C_d < 1$ then $\dot{C}_d > 0$.
- (2) If $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_1$, then $\frac{d}{dt} \text{cost}(x(t)) \leq 0$ with equality if and only if $x = |q|$.
- (3) Let $d \in D$ be such that $C_\star = d^T x$ at time t . Then it holds that $\dot{V}_d \leq h(t)$.
- (4) It holds that $h(t) \leq 0$ with equality if and only if $|q| = \frac{x}{C_\star}$.

Proof. 1. Recall that for $d \in D$, there is a y such that $b^T y = -1$ and $d = |A^T y|$. Thus

$$\dot{C}_d = d^T (|q| - x) \geq |y^T Aq| - C_d = 1 - C_d \quad \text{thus } \dot{C}_d > 0, \text{ whenever } C_d < 1.$$

2. Remember that $E(x) = \text{cost}(x)$ and that $x(t) \in \mathcal{X}_1$ implies that there is a feasible f with $|f| = x$. Thus $E(q) \leq E(f) \leq E(x)$. Let R be the diagonal matrix of entries c_e/x_e . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \text{cost}(x) &= c^T (|q| - x) && \text{by (1)} \\ &= x^T R^{1/2} R^{1/2} |q| - x^T R x && \text{since } c = R x \\ &\leq (q^T R q)^{1/2} (x^T R x)^{1/2} - x^T R x && \text{by Cauchy-Schwarz} \\ &\leq 0 && \text{since } E(q) \leq E(x). \end{aligned}$$

If the derivative is zero, both inequalities above have to be equalities. This is only possible if the vectors $|q|$ and x are parallel and $E(q) = E(x)$. Let λ be such that $|q| = \lambda x$. Then $E(q) = \sum_e \frac{c_e}{x_e} q_e^2 = \lambda^2 \sum_e c_e x_e = \lambda^2 E(x)$. Since $E(x) > 0$, this implies $\lambda = 1$.

3. By definition of d , $C_\star = C_d$. By the first two items, we have $\dot{C}_\star = d^T |q| - C_\star$ and $\frac{d}{dt} \text{cost}(x) = c^T |q| - \text{cost}(x)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\text{cost}(x)}{C_\star} &= \frac{C_\star \frac{d}{dt} \text{cost}(x) - \dot{C}_\star \text{cost}(x)}{C_\star^2} = \frac{C_\star (c^T |q| - \text{cost}(x)) - (d^T |q| - C_\star) \text{cost}(x)}{C_\star^2} \\ &= \frac{C_\star \cdot c^T |q| - d^T |q| \cdot c^T x}{C_\star^2} \leq \sum_e r_e |q_e| \frac{x_e}{C_\star} - \sum_e r_e \left(\frac{x_e}{C_\star}\right)^2 = h(t), \end{aligned}$$

where we used $r_e = c_e/x_e$ and hence $c^T |q| = \sum_e r_e x_e |q_e|$, $c^T x = E(x)$, and $d^T |q| \geq |y^T Aq| = 1$ since $d = |y^T A|$ for some y with $b^T y = -1$.

4. We have

$$\sum_e r_e \frac{x_e}{C_\star} |q_e| = \sum_e r_e^{1/2} \frac{x_e}{C_\star} r_e^{1/2} |q_e| \leq \left(\sum_e r_e \left(\frac{x_e}{C_\star}\right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_e r_e q_e^2 \right)^{1/2} = E\left(\frac{x}{C_\star}\right)^{1/2} E(q)^{1/2}$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz. Since $h(t) = \sum_e r_e |q_e| \frac{x_e}{C_\star} - E(\frac{x}{C_\star})$ by definition, it follows that

$$h(t) \leq E(\frac{x}{C_\star})^{1/2} \cdot E(q)^{1/2} - E(\frac{x}{C_\star}) = E(\frac{x}{C_\star})^{1/2} \cdot (E(q)^{1/2} - E(\frac{x}{C_\star})^{1/2}) \leq 0$$

since x/C_\star dominates a feasible solution and hence $E(q) \leq E(x/C_\star)$. If $h(t) = 0$, we must have equality in the application of Cauchy-Schwarz, i.e., the vectors x/C_\star and $|q|$ must be parallel, and we must have $E(q) = E(x/C_\star)$ as in the proof of part 2. \square

B.3 Details of the Convergence

Lemma 3.10 (from page 10). *Let $f(t) \geq 0$ for all t . If $\int_0^\infty f(t)dt$ is finite and $f(t)$ is Lipschitz-continuous, i.e., for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $|f(t') - f(t)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $t' \in [t, t+\delta]$, then $f(t)$ converges to zero as t goes to infinity. Thus, the functions $t \mapsto x^T R |q| - x^T R x = c^T |q| - c^T x$ and $t \mapsto h(t)$ are Lipschitz continuous.*

Proof. If $f(t)$ does not converge to zero, there is $\varepsilon > 0$ and an infinite unbounded sequence t_1, t_2, \dots such that $f(t_i) \geq \varepsilon$ for all i . Since f is Lipschitz continuous there is $\delta > 0$ such that $f(t'_i) \geq \varepsilon/2$ for $t'_i \in [t_i, t_i + \delta]$ and all i . Hence, the integral $\int_0^\infty f(t)dt$ is unbounded.

Since x_e is continuous and bounded (by Lemma 2.8), x_e is Lipschitz-continuous. Thus, it is enough to show that q_e is Lipschitz-continuous for all e . Since q_Z (recall that $Z = \{e : c_e = 0\}$) and $P = [m] \setminus Z$ is an affine function of q_P , it suffices to establish the claim for $e \in P$. So let e be an edge of positive cost. First, we claim that $x_e(t + \varepsilon) \leq (1 + 2K\varepsilon)x_e$ for all $\varepsilon \leq K/4$, where $K = 8c_{\max}/c_{\min} \cdot \|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}$. Assume that this is not the case. Let

$$\varepsilon = \inf\{\delta \leq 1/4K : x_e(t + \delta) > (1 + 2K\delta)x_e(t)\},$$

then $\varepsilon > 0$ (since $x_e(t) \leq Kx_e(t)$ by Lemma 3.2) and, by continuity, $x_e(t + \varepsilon) \geq (1 + 2K\varepsilon)x_e(t)$. There must be $t' \in [t, t + \varepsilon]$ such that $x_e(t') = 2Kx_e(t)$. On the other hand,

$$x_e(t') \leq Kx_e(t') \leq K(1 + 2K\varepsilon)x_e(t) \leq K(1 + 2K/4K)x_e(t) < 2Kx_e(t),$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, $x_e(t + \varepsilon) \leq (1 + 2K\varepsilon)x_e$ for all $\varepsilon \leq 1/4K$. Similarly, $x_e(t + \varepsilon) \geq (1 - 2K\varepsilon)x_e$. Now, let $\alpha = (1 - 2K\varepsilon)x_e$ and $\beta = (1 + 2K\varepsilon)x_e$. Then

$$\||q_e(t + \delta)| - |q_e(t)|\| \leq M\|x(t + \delta) - x(t)\|_1 \leq Mm(4K\varepsilon)x_e \leq 8MmK\|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}\varepsilon,$$

since $x_e \leq 2\|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}$ for sufficiently large t and where M is as in Lemma 2.6. Since C_\star is at least $1/2$ for all sufficiently large t , the division by C_\star and C_\star^2 in the definition of $h(t)$ does not affect the claim. \square

Lemma 3.11 (from page 10). *For all e of positive cost, it holds that $|x_e - |q_e|| \rightarrow 0$ as t goes to infinity.*

Proof. For a trajectory ultimately running in \mathcal{X}_1 , we showed $\frac{d}{dt}\text{cost}(x) \leq x^T R |q| - x^T R x \leq 0$ with equality if and only if $x = |q|$. Also, $E(q) \leq E(x)$, since x dominates a feasible solution. Furthermore, $x^T R |q| - x^T R x$ goes to zero using Lemma 3.10. Thus

$$\sum_e r_e (x_e - |q_e|)^2 = \sum_e r_e x_e^2 + \sum_e r_e q_e^2 - 2 \sum_e r_e x_e |q_e| \leq 2 \left(\sum_e r_e x_e^2 - \sum_e r_e x_e |q_e| \right)$$

goes to zero. Next observe that there is a constant C such that $x_e(t) \leq C$ for all e and t as a result of Lemma 2.8. Also $c_{\min} > 0$ and hence $r_e \geq c_{\min}/C$. Thus $\sum_e r_e(x_e - |q_e|)^2 \leq \frac{C}{c_{\min}} \cdot \sum_e (x_e - |q_e|)^2$ and hence $|x_e - |q_e|| \rightarrow 0$ for every e with positive cost. For trajectories outside \mathcal{X}_1 , we argue about $||q_e| - \frac{x}{C_*}|$ and use $C_* \rightarrow 1$, namely

$$\sum_e r_e \left(\frac{x_e}{C_*} - |q_e| \right)^2 \leq 2 \left(\sum_e r_e \left(\frac{x_e}{C_*} \right)^2 - \sum_e r_e \frac{x_e}{C_*} |q_e| \right) \rightarrow 0. \quad \square$$

Lemma 3.13 (from page 11). *It holds that $p^T b$ converges to the cost of an optimum solution of (2). If A is positively oriented, then $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} A_e^T p \geq 0$ for all e .*

Proof. Let x^* be an optimal solution of (2). We first show convergence to a point in L and then convergence to $c^T x^*$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrary. Consider any time $t \geq t_0$, where t_0 and C as in Lemma 3.2 and moreover $||q_e| - x_e| \leq \frac{C\varepsilon}{c_{\max}}$ for every edge e of positive cost. Then $x_e \geq C$ for all edges e in the support of some basic feasible solution f . For every $e \in P$, we have $q_e = \frac{x_e}{c_e} A_e^T p$. We also assume $q \geq 0$ by possibly reorienting columns of A . Hence

$$\left| c_e - A_e^T p \right| = \left| 1 - \frac{q_e}{x_e} \right| c_e = \left| \frac{x_e - q_e}{x_e} \right| c_e \leq \frac{c_{\max}}{C} |q_e - x_e| \leq \varepsilon.$$

For edges e of zero cost, we have $A_e^T p = 0 = c_e$. Thus, we conclude

$$c^T f - p^T b = \sum_{e \in \text{supp}(f)} (c_e - p^T A_e) f_e \leq \varepsilon \sum_e |f_e| \leq \varepsilon \cdot m \|b\|_1 \mathcal{D}.$$

Since the set L is finite, we can let $\varepsilon > 0$ be smaller than half the minimal distance between elements in L . By the preceding paragraph, there is for all sufficiently large t , a basic feasible solution f such that $|c^T f - b^T p| \leq \varepsilon$. Since $b^T p$ is a continuous function of time, $c^T f$ must become constant. We have now shown that $b^T p$ converges to an element in L . We will next show that $b^T p$ converges to the optimum cost. Let x^* be an optimum solution to (2) and let $W = \sum_e x_e^* c_e \ln x_e$. Since $x(t)$ is bounded, W is bounded. We assume that A is positively oriented, thus there is a feasible f^* with $|f^*| = x^*$ and $f_e^* \geq 0$ whenever $c_e > 0$. By reorienting zero cost columns, we may assume $f_e^* \geq 0$ for all e . Then $Ax^* = b$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{W} &= \sum_e x_e^* c_e \frac{|q_e| - x_e}{x_e} \\ &= \sum_{e; c_e > 0} x_e^* \left| A_e^T p \right| - \text{cost}(x^*) && \text{since } q_e = \frac{x_e}{c_e} A_e^T p \text{ whenever } c_e > 0 \\ &= \sum_e x_e^* \left| A_e^T p \right| - \text{cost}(x^*) && \text{since } A_e^T p = 0 \text{ whenever } c_e = 0 \\ &= \sum_e x_e^* \left(\left| A_e^T p \right| - A_e^T p \right) + b^T p - \text{cost}(x^*) \end{aligned}$$

and hence $b^T p - \text{cost}(x^*)$ must converge to zero; note that $b^T p$ is Lipschitz continuous in t .

Similarly, $\left| A_e^T p \right| - A_e^T p$ must converge to zero whenever $x_e^* > 0$. This implies $\liminf A_e^T p \geq 0$. Assume otherwise, i.e., for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $A_e^T p < -\varepsilon$ for arbitrarily large t . Since p is Lipschitz-continuous in t , there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $A_e^T p < -\varepsilon/2$ for infinitely many disjoint intervals of length δ . In these intervals, $\left| A_e^T p \right| - A_e^T p \geq \varepsilon$ and hence W must grow beyond any bound, a contradiction. \square

C Omitted Proofs for Section 4

C.1 Useful Lemmas

This is a set of lemmas that are necessary to prove the main results in Section 4. We denote with $p^{(k)}$ the unique solution of $L^{(k)}p^{(k)} = b$, where matrix $L^{(k)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} A[R^{(k)}]^{-1}A^T$ is invertible. We omit the superscript $\cdot^{(k)}$ when it is clear from the context.

Lemma C.1. [SV16c, Lemma 5.2] Suppose $x > 0$, R is a positive diagonal matrix and $L = AR^{-1}A^T$. Then for every $e \in [m]$, it holds that $\|A^T L^{-1}A_{:,e}\|_\infty \leq \mathcal{D} \cdot c_e/x_e$.

Lemma C.2. [SV16b, extension of Corollary 5.3] Let p be the unique solution of $Lp = b$, where $L = AR^{-1}A^T$, and suppose there is $x \in \mathcal{X}^W(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 0$. Then $\|A^T p\|_\infty \leq \alpha \mathcal{D} \|c\|_1$.

Proof. Since there is $x \in \mathcal{X}^W(\alpha)$, there exists f with $Af = b$ and $0 \leq f \leq \alpha x$. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|A^T p\|_\infty &= \|A^T L^{-1}b\|_\infty = \|A^T L^{-1}Af\|_\infty = \left\| \sum_e f_e A^T L^{-1}A_{:,e} \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sum_e f_e \|A^T L^{-1}A_{:,e}\|_\infty \stackrel{(\text{Lem. C.1})}{\leq} \mathcal{D} \sum_e f_e \frac{c_e}{x_e} \leq \alpha \mathcal{D} \|c\|_1. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma C.3. For any $x \geq 0$ and f satisfying $Af = b$, it holds that $\|q\|_\infty \leq m\mathcal{D}^2 \|b\|_1$.

Proof. By definition $q_e = (x_e/c_e)[A_{:,e}]^T L^{-1}b$ and $b = Af = \sum_u A_{:,u} f_u$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |q_e| &= \left| \frac{x_e}{c_e} [A_{:,e}]^T L^{-1}b \right| = \left| \frac{x_e}{c_e} \sum_u [A_{:,e}]^T L^{-1}A_{:,u} f_u \right| \\ &\leq \frac{x_e}{c_e} \sum_u |f_u| \cdot \left| [A_{:,e}]^T L^{-1}A_{:,u} \right| \leq \mathcal{D} \|f\|_1, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by

$$\left| [A_{:,e}]^T L^{-1}A_{:,u} \right| = \left| [A_{:,u}]^T L^{-1}A_{:,e} \right| \leq \|A^T L^{-1}A_{:,e}\|_\infty \stackrel{(\text{Lem. C.1})}{\leq} \mathcal{D} c_e/x_e.$$

Therefore, by Cramer's Rule, we have $|q_e| \leq \mathcal{D} \|f\|_1 \leq m\mathcal{D}^2 \|b\|_1$. \square

Lemma C.4. Let $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$. We denote by

$$\bar{q}_e^{(t,k)} = \sum_{i=t}^{k+t-1} \frac{h(1-h)^{k+t-1-i}}{1-(1-h)^k} q_e^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{p}_e^{(t,k)} = \sum_{i=t}^{k+t-1} p_e^{(i)}.$$

Then, for every $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $t+k \geq 1$ it holds that

$$x_e^{(t)} \prod_{i=t}^{k+t-1} [1 + h(c_e^{-1}[A_{:,e}]^T p^{(i)} - 1)] = x_e^{(t+k)} = (1-h)^k x_e^{(t)} + [1 - (1-h)^k] \bar{q}_e^{(t,k)}.$$

Lemma C.5. Let $\Psi^{(0)} = \max\{m\mathcal{D}^2 \|b\|_1, \|x^{(0)}\|_\infty\}$. Then $\|x^{(k)}\|_\infty \leq \Psi^{(0)}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. We prove the statement by induction. The base case $\|x^{(0)}\|_\infty \leq \Psi^{(0)}$ is clear. Suppose the statement holds for some $k > 0$. Then, triangle inequality and Lemma C.3 yield

$$\|x^{(k+1)}\|_\infty \leq (1-h)\|x^{(k)}\|_\infty + h\|q^{(k)}\|_\infty \leq (1-h)\Psi^{(0)} + h\Psi^{(0)} \leq \Psi^{(0)}. \quad \square$$

C.2 Convergence to Dominance

Lemma 4.1 (from page 11). *Let $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose $\alpha^{(t)} > 0$ and $x^{(t)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha^{(t)})$ are arbitrary. Then for any $k \geq 1$ and $h \leq \min\{1, 1/\alpha^{(t)}\} \cdot c_{\min}/(2\mathcal{D}\|c\|_1)$, it holds that $x^{(t+k)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha^{(t+k)})$, where $\alpha^{(t+k)} = [1 - (1-h)^k(1 - 1/\alpha^{(t)})]^{-1}$.*

Proof. By (6), Lemma C.2 and the definition of $q^{(t)}$ and $R^{(t)}$, we have for every $t \in \mathbb{N}$ that

$$x^{(t+1)} = (1-h)x^{(t)} + h \cdot [R^{(t)}]^{-1}A^T p^{(t)} = x^{(t)}(1 + h \cdot [C^{-1}A^T p^{(t)} - 1]) > 0.$$

Recall that $x^{(t)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha^{(t)})$ if and only if $\alpha^{(t)} \cdot y^T A x^{(t)} \geq b^T y$ for every vertex $(y, z) \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $(y, z) \in \mathcal{P}$ be an arbitrary vertex. Then Lemma C.4, $x^{(t)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha^{(t)})$ and $A\bar{q}^{(t,k)} = b$ yield

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{(t)} \cdot y^T A x^{(t+k)} &= \alpha^{(t)} \cdot y^T A \left[(1-h)^k x_e^{(t)} + [1 - (1-h)^k] \bar{q}_e^{(t,k)} \right] \\ &\geq (1-h)^k \cdot b^T y + \alpha^{(t)} \cdot [1 - (1-h)^k] \cdot b^T y = (\alpha^{(t)}/\alpha^{(t+k)}) \cdot b^T y. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

C.3 $x^{(k)}$ is Close to a Non-Negative and Kernel-Free Vector

Lemma C.6. *Suppose a matrix $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times m}$ has full row rank and vector $b \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Let g be a feasible solution to $Ag = b$ and $S \subseteq [n]$ be a subset of the variables such that $\sum_{i \in S} |g_i| < 1/\mathcal{D}$. Then there is a feasible solution f such that $g_i \cdot f_i \geq 0$ for all $i \in [n]$, and $f_i = 0$ for all $i \in S$. In particular, it holds that $\|g - f\|_\infty < 1/\mathcal{D}$.*

Proof. W.l.o.g. we may assume that $g \geq 0$ as we could change the signs of the columns of A accordingly. Let $\mathbf{1}_S$ be the indicator vector of S . Consider the linear program $\min\{\mathbf{1}_S^T x : Ax = b, x \geq 0\}$ and let opt be its optimum value. Notice that $0 \leq opt \leq \mathbf{1}_S^T g < 1/\mathcal{D}$. Since the feasible region does not contain a line and the minimum is bounded, the optimum is attained at a basic feasible solution, say f . Suppose that there is an index $i \in S$ with $f_i > 0$. By Cramer's rule, this implies that $f_i \geq 1/\mathcal{D}$. This is a contradiction to the optimality of f and hence $f_i = 0$ for all $i \in S$. \square

Lemma C.7. *Let $q \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be given. If $\sum_{e \in N} |q_e| < 1/\mathcal{D}$, with $N = \{e \in E : q_e \leq 0 \text{ or } p^T A_{:,e} \leq 0\}$, then there is a feasible kernel-free vector f such that $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq E \setminus N$ and $\|f - q\|_\infty < 1/\mathcal{D}$.*

Proof. Let $v \neq 0$ be a non-negative vector in the kernel of A . By definition, $0 = p^T A v = \sum_{e \in E} p^T A_{:,e} v_e$ and since $v \geq 0$ and $v \neq 0$, it follows that there is an index $e \in E$ satisfying

$$v_e > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad p^T A_{:,e} \leq 0. \quad (26)$$

We apply Lemma 4.2 to q with $S = N$. Then, there is a feasible vector f such that $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq E \setminus N$ and $\|f - q\|_\infty < 1/\mathcal{D}$. Note that $f \geq 0$, by the definition of N . We will now show that f is kernel-free. By Lemma 2.1, it holds that f is the sum of a convex combination of basic feasible solutions plus a vector w in the kernel of A . Moreover, all elements in this representation are sign compatible with f , i.e., they are non-negative.

Suppose for contradiction that $w \neq 0$. By (26) there is an index $e \in N$ such that $w_e > 0$. By construction, $e \in N$ implies $f_e = 0$. Since all basic feasible solutions in the convex combination of f are sign-compatible with f , i.e. non-negative, this leads a contradiction and thus $w = 0$. \square

Lemma C.8. *Suppose $x^{(t)} \in \mathcal{X}(2)$, $h \leq c_{\min}/(4\mathcal{D}\|c\|_1)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then, for any $k \geq h^{-1} \ln(4\varepsilon^{-1}m\mathcal{D}^3\|b\|_1\Psi^{(0)})$ there is a feasible kernel-free vector f with $\|x^{(t+k)} - f\|_\infty < \varepsilon/\mathcal{D}$.*

Proof. Let $\beta^{(k)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 - (1 - h)^k$. By Lemma C.4, vector $\bar{q}^{(t,k)}$ satisfies $A\bar{q}^{(t,k)} = b$ and thus Lemma C.5 yields

$$\|x^{(t+k)} - \beta^{(k)}\bar{q}^{(t,k)}\|_\infty = (1 - h)^k \cdot \|x^{(t)}\|_\infty \leq e^{-hk} \cdot \Psi^{(0)} < \varepsilon/(4m\mathcal{D}). \quad (27)$$

By Lemma 4.1, $x^{(t+k)} \in \mathcal{X}(2)$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and in particular $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} x^{(t+k)} \in \mathcal{X}(1)$. Let $F_k = Q_k \cup P_k$, where $Q_k = \{e \in E : \bar{q}_e^{(t,k)} \leq 0\}$ and $P_k = \{e \in E : [A_{:,e}]^T \bar{p}^{(t,k)} \leq 0\}$. Then, for every $e \in Q_k$ we have

$$|\bar{q}_e^{(t,k)}| \leq [\beta^{(k)}]^{-1} \cdot |x_e^{(t+k)} - \beta^{(k)}\bar{q}_e^{(t,k)}| \leq \varepsilon/(4\beta^{(k)}\mathcal{D}m) \leq \varepsilon/(3m\mathcal{D}). \quad (28)$$

Note that $\|x^{(\cdot)}\| \leq \Psi^{(0)}$, by Lemma C.5. Moreover, by Lemma C.4 for every $e \in P_k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_e^{(t+k)} &= x_e^{(t)} \prod_{i=t}^{k+t-1} \left[1 + h \left(c_e^{-1} [A_{:,e}]^T p^{(i)} - 1 \right) \right] \\ &\leq x_e^{(t)} \cdot \exp \left\{ \frac{h}{c_e} \left(-k + [A_{:,e}]^T \bar{p}^{(t,k)} \right) \right\} \\ &\leq \Psi^{(0)} \cdot \exp \{-kh\} \\ &\leq \varepsilon/(4m\mathcal{D}^3\|b\|_1), \end{aligned}$$

and by combining triangle inequality with (27), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{q}_e^{(t,k)}| &\leq [\beta^{(k)}]^{-1} \cdot \left[|x_e^{(t+k)} - \beta^{(k)}\bar{q}_e^{(t,k)}| + |x_e^{(t+k)}| \right] \\ &\leq [\beta^{(k)}]^{-1} \cdot \left[\varepsilon/(4m\mathcal{D}) + \varepsilon/(4m\mathcal{D}^3\|b\|_1) \right] \\ &\leq \varepsilon/(3m\mathcal{D}). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Therefore, (28) and (29) yields that

$$\sum_{e \in F_k} |\bar{q}_e^{(t,k)}| \leq (m\varepsilon)/(3m\mathcal{D}) \leq \varepsilon/(3\mathcal{D}). \quad (30)$$

By Lemma 4.3 applied with $\bar{q}_e^{(t,k)}$ and $N = F_k$, it follows by (30) that there is a feasible kernel-free vector f such that $\text{supp}(f) \subseteq E \setminus N$ and $\|f - \bar{q}^{(t,k)}\|_\infty < \varepsilon/(3\mathcal{D})$. By Lemma C.3, we have $\|\bar{q}^{(t,k)}\|_\infty \leq m\mathcal{D}^2\|b\|_1$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^{(t+k)} - f\|_\infty &= \|x^{(t+k)} - \beta^{(k)}\bar{q}^{(t,k)} + \beta^{(k)}\bar{q}^{(t,k)} - f\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|x^{(t+k)} - \beta^{(k)}\bar{q}^{(t,k)}\|_\infty + \|f - \bar{q}^{(t,k)}\|_\infty + (1 - h)^k \|\bar{q}^{(t,k)}\|_\infty \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4\mathcal{D}m} + \frac{\varepsilon}{3\mathcal{D}} + \frac{\varepsilon \cdot m\mathcal{D}^2\|b\|_1}{4m\mathcal{D}^3\|b\|_1} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\mathcal{D}}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

C.4 $x^{(k)}$ is ε -Close to an Optimal Solution

Lemma C.9. *Suppose A, b, c have integer values. Then $\phi \geq 1/\mathcal{D}$ and $\Phi \geq 1/\mathcal{D}^2$.*

Proof. Let $g \in \mathcal{B}$ be arbitrary. By Cramer's rule, $g_e = \sum_{i \in E} b_i (\mathcal{D}_i / \mathcal{D})$ for any index $e \in E$, where \mathcal{D}_i is the determinant of a square submatrix of A . Since A has integer values, we have $|\mathcal{D}_e| \geq 1$ for all $e \in E$. Moreover, as $g_e > 0$ for any $e \in \text{supp}(g)$ and b has integer values, it follows that $\phi \geq 1/\mathcal{D}$. On the other hand, since g and f^* are rational vectors, each vector has a common denominator bounded by \mathcal{D} , i.e., $g_e \in \mathbb{Z} \cdot G^{-1}$ and $f_e \in \mathbb{Z} \cdot F^{-1}$ for all e and some $G, F \leq \mathcal{D}$. Thus $\Phi \geq 1/\mathcal{D}^2$. \square

Lemma 4.5 (from page 12). *Let f be a feasible kernel-free vector and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ a parameter. Suppose for every non-optimal basic feasible solution g , there exists an index $e \in E$ such that $g_e > 0$ and $f_e < \varepsilon\phi/(2\mathcal{D}^2 m \|b\|_1)$. Then $\|f - f^*\|_\infty < \varepsilon/\mathcal{D}$ for some optimal f^* .*

Proof. Since f is kernel-free, by Lemma 2.1 it can be expressed as a convex combination of basic feasible solutions $f = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \alpha_i f^{(i)} + \sum_{i=\ell+1}^m \alpha_i f^{(i)}$, where $f^{(1)}, \dots, f^{(\ell)}$ denotes the optimal solutions. Note that $g_e > 0$ implies $g_e \geq \phi$, since g is basic. By the hypothesis, for every non-optimal $f^{(i)}$, i.e., $i \geq \ell + 1$, there exists an index $e(i) \in E$ such that $f_{e(i)}^{(i)} \geq \phi$ and $f_{e(i)} < \varepsilon\phi/(2\mathcal{D}^2 m \|b\|_1)$. By Cramer's Rule, we have for every $w \in E$ and $j \in [m]$ that $0 \leq f_w^{(j)} \leq \mathcal{D} \|b\|_1$. Moreover, for every $i \geq \ell + 1$ we have

$$\alpha_i \phi \leq \alpha_i f_{e(i)}^{(i)} \leq \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j f_{e(i)}^{(j)} = f_{e(i)} < \varepsilon\phi/(2\mathcal{D}^2 m \|b\|_1),$$

and hence $\sum_{i=\ell+1}^m \alpha_i < \varepsilon/(2\mathcal{D}^2 \|b\|_1)$. By triangle inequality, it follows that

$$\left\| \sum_{i=\ell+1}^m \alpha_i \cdot f^{(i)} \right\|_\infty \leq \sum_{i=\ell+1}^m \alpha_i \|f^{(i)}\|_\infty < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot \mathcal{D} \|b\|_1}{2\mathcal{D}^2 \|b\|_1} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\mathcal{D}}. \quad (31)$$

Let $\gamma \geq 0$ be an arbitrary vector such that $\sum_{i=1}^\ell \gamma_i = \sum_{i=\ell+1}^m \alpha_i$. Let $f^* = \sum_{i=1}^\ell \beta_i f^{(i)}$, where $\beta_i = \alpha_i + \gamma_i$ for every $i \in [\ell]$. Then,

$$\left\| f^* - \sum_{i=1}^\ell \alpha_i f^{(i)} \right\|_\infty = \left\| \sum_{i=1}^\ell \gamma_i f^{(i)} \right\|_\infty \leq \max_{i \in [\ell]} \|f^{(i)}\|_\infty \sum_{i=1}^\ell \gamma_i < \frac{\varepsilon \cdot \mathcal{D} \|b\|_1}{2\mathcal{D}^2 \|b\|_1} = \frac{\varepsilon}{2\mathcal{D}} \quad (32)$$

The statement follows by combining (31), (32) and triangle inequality. \square

Lemma 4.6 (from page 12). *Let $\alpha, \beta > 0$ be parameters. Suppose g is a non-optimal basic feasible solution, $\beta \mathbf{1} \leq x^{(0)} \in \mathcal{X}(\alpha)$, $h \leq (\Phi/2\text{opt}) \cdot (c_{\min}/\mathcal{D} \|c\|_1)^2$, $t = (3/h) \max\{1, \alpha^2\}$ and $h^{(\ell)} = h \cdot \min\{1, \alpha^{-2}\}$ if $0 \leq \ell \leq t$ or $h^{(\ell)} = h$ when $\ell > t$. Then, the Physarum dynamics (6) initialized with $x^{(0)}$, step size $h^{(\ell)}$ and number of iterations $k \geq 4(h\Phi)^{-1} c^T g \ln(\Psi^{(0)}/\varepsilon\beta)$, guarantees the existence of an index $e \in E$ such that $g_e > 0$ and $x_e^{(t+k)} < \varepsilon$.*

Proof. Let $\alpha^{(0)} = \alpha$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{B}_g^{(k)} = \sum_{e \in E} g_e c_e \ln x_e^{(k)}$. By definition, $\rho = X^{-1}q = C^{-1}A^T p$ implies $x_e^{(\ell+1)} = x_e^{(\ell)} (1 + h^{(\ell)} [c_e^{-1} \cdot [p^{(\ell)}]^T A_{:,e} - 1])$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_g^{(\ell+1)} - \mathcal{B}_g^{(\ell)} &= \sum_e g_e c_e \ln \frac{x_e^{(\ell+1)}}{x_e^{(\ell)}} = \sum_e g_e c_e \ln \left(1 + h^{(\ell)} \left[\frac{[p^{(\ell)}]^T A_{:,e}}{c_e} - 1 \right] \right) \\ &\leq h^{(\ell)} \sum_e g_e c_e \left[\frac{[p^{(\ell)}]^T A_{:,e}}{c_e} - 1 \right] = h^{(\ell)} [-c^T g + [p^{(\ell)}]^T A g] = h^{(\ell)} [-c^T g + b^T p^{(\ell)}]. \end{aligned}$$

We use the following inequality $\ln(1+x) \geq x - x^2$, for all $x \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$. By Lemma C.2 we have $\|A^T p^{(\ell)}\|_\infty \leq \alpha^{(\ell)} \mathcal{D} \|c\|_1$. Moreover, by Lemma 4.1 and the choice of $h^{(\ell)}$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{f^*}^{(\ell+1)} - \mathcal{B}_{f^*}^{(\ell)} &= \sum_e f_e^* c_e \ln \frac{x_e^{(\ell+1)}}{x_e^{(\ell)}} = \sum_e f_e^* c_e \ln \left(1 + h^{(\ell)} \left[\frac{[p^{(\ell)}]^T A_{:,e}}{c_e} - 1 \right] \right) \\ &\geq \sum_e f_e^* c_e \left(h^{(\ell)} \left[\frac{[p^{(\ell)}]^T A_{:,e}}{c_e} - 1 \right] - [h^{(\ell)}]^2 \left[\frac{[p^{(\ell)}]^T A_{:,e}}{c_e} - 1 \right]^2 \right) \\ &\geq h^{(\ell)} \left(b^T p^{(\ell)} - \text{opt} - \frac{\Phi}{2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where the last inequality follows by

$$\sum_e f_e^* c_e [(c_e^{-1} [p^{(\ell)}]^T A_{:,e}) - 1] = [p^{(\ell)}]^T A f^* - \text{opt} = b^T p^{(\ell)} - \text{opt}$$

and

$$h^{(\ell)} \sum_e f_e^* c_e \cdot (c_e^{-1} [p^{(\ell)}]^T A_{:,e} - 1)^2 \leq h \min\{1, \alpha^{-2}\} \cdot c_{\min}^{-2} \alpha^2 \mathcal{D}^2 \|c\|_1^2 \cdot \text{opt} \leq \Phi/2.$$

Since $c^T g - \text{opt} \geq \Phi$ for every non-optimal basic feasible solution g , by (33) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{f^*}^{(\ell+1)} - \mathcal{B}_{f^*}^{(\ell)} &\geq h^{(\ell)} (b^T p^{(\ell)} - c^T g) + h^{(\ell)} \left(c^T g - \text{opt} - \frac{\Phi}{2} \right) \\ &\geq \mathcal{B}_g^{(\ell+1)} - \mathcal{B}_g^{(\ell)} + \frac{h^{(\ell)} \Phi}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Hence, by (34) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{f^*}^{(t+k)} - \mathcal{B}_{f^*}^{(0)} &= \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{t-1} \mathcal{B}_{f^*}^{(\ell+1)} - \mathcal{B}_{f^*}^{(\ell)} \right) + \left(\sum_{\ell=t}^{k+t-1} \mathcal{B}_{f^*}^{(\ell+1)} - \mathcal{B}_{f^*}^{(\ell)} \right) \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{t-1} \mathcal{B}_g^{(\ell+1)} - \mathcal{B}_g^{(\ell)} + \frac{h^{(\ell)} \Phi}{2} \right) + \left(\sum_{\ell=t}^{k+t-1} \mathcal{B}_g^{(\ell+1)} - \mathcal{B}_g^{(\ell)} + \frac{h^{(\ell)} \Phi}{2} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{B}_g^{(t+k)} - \mathcal{B}_g^{(0)} + \frac{\Phi}{2} \left[\sum_{\ell=0}^{t-1} h^{(\ell)} + \sum_{\ell=t}^{k+t-1} h^{(\ell)} \right] \\ &\geq \mathcal{B}_g^{(t+k)} - \mathcal{B}_g^{(0)} + k \cdot \frac{h\Phi}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Lemma C.5 for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $g \in \mathcal{B}$, it holds that $\mathcal{B}_g^{(k)} \leq c^T g \ln \Psi^{(0)}$. Hence,

$$\mathcal{B}_g^{(t+k)} \leq -k \cdot \frac{h\Phi}{2} + 2c^T g \ln \frac{\Psi^{(0)}}{\beta}.$$

Suppose for contradiction that for every $e \in E$ with $g_e > 0$ it holds $x_e^{(t+k)} > \varepsilon$. Then, $\mathcal{B}_g^{(t+k)} > c^T g \ln \varepsilon$ and hence

$$k < \frac{4c^T g}{h\Phi} \ln \frac{\Psi^{(0)}}{\varepsilon\beta}, \quad (35)$$

a contradiction to the choice of k . \square