Combinatorics, Probability and Computing (2000) 9, 277–285. Printed in the United Kingdom
© 2000 Cambridge University Press

Fast Unimodular Counting

JOHN MOUNT†

@TheMoment, Inc., 2755 Campus Dr., Suite 145,
San Mateo, CA 94403, USA
(e-mail: ja_mount@pacbell.net)

Received 22 July 1998; revised 2 February 1999

This paper describes methods for counting the number of nonnegative integer solutions of the system $Ax = b$ when A is a nonnegative totally unimodular matrix and b an integral vector of fixed dimension. The complexity (under a unit cost arithmetic model) is strong in the sense that it depends only on the dimensions of A and *not* on the size of the entries of b. For the special case of 'contingency tables' the run-time is $2^{O(\sqrt{d}\log d)}$ (where d is the dimension of the polytope). The method is complementary to Barvinok's in that our algorithm is effective on problems of high dimension with a fixed number of (non-sign) constraints, whereas Barvinok's algorithms are effective on problems of low dimension and an arbitrary number of constraints.

1. Introduction

In this paper we are concerned with determining the number of nonnegative integer solutions, x, to the linear system $Ax = b$ where A is a nonnegative totally unimodular matrix. Even the restricted 'contingency table' version of this problem is $\sharp P$ hard in general [7]. The method applies even when the dimension is not fixed (only the number of equality constraints needs to be fixed). In the application of interest the number of equality constraints and dimension are simultaneously fixed.

It was shown by Barvinok [2, 1] that counting the number of lattice points in an *integral* polytope is solvable in polynomial time when the dimension is fixed. This method is somewhat difficult to implement (requiring the solution of fixed dimension integer programs and extensive use of triangulations) so there is still some room for specialized techniques for specific problems. We remark that the 4×4 transportation (or magic square) polytope is not simple and has a set of vertices that form a non-primitive simplex.

† Thanks: Mathematical Sciences Research Institute DMS9022140.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548300004193 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since Barvinok's algorithm is based on the additivity of valuations on *simple* cones, this means Barvinok's algorithm must triangulate and may encounter non-primitive cones.

We also would like to point out the fascinating literature on the dependencies of counting functions (algebraic relations obeyed by the number of nonnegative integer solutions to various linear systems – allowing the computation of solutions for new systems with no additional counting) [4, 17, 18]. While there is a theory of how to solve counting problems directly using algebraic information ('Todd classes' [8]), the less delicate method of using the algebraic dependencies directly on counts (and using brute force to compute the required values) seems fairly effective [13].

Throughout the paper, A is a nonnegative totally unimodular nonnegative m row by n column matrix of full row rank. Without loss of generality we will assume that there is no nonzero nonnegative vector x such that $Ax \leqslant 0$. We are interested in computing the number of nonnegative integral solutions to $Ax = b$, $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m \geqslant 0$. Set $B = \max_i b_i$, and let $\sharp(\{\ldots\})$ denote the number of items in the set $\{\ldots\}$.

2. Method

We are striving for a 'strong' solution to the counting problem; that is, an algorithm with run-time, under the unit cost arithmetic model on numbers of size commensurate with the desired answer, depending only on the order of A and not on the magnitude of the entries of b.

We show that for a fixed matrix A the function $f_A(b) : \mathbb{Z}^m \to \mathbb{Z}$ that computes the number of nonnegative integral solutions to the system $Ax = b$ is a piecewise polynomial in b with degree $n - m$ and no more than $\left(m\binom{n}{m}\right)^m$ pieces. Our method is as follows: for a given b determine the piece and derive the polynomial p on that section. We then evaluate $p(b)$ to get the desired value of $f_A(b)$. Determining which polynomial to use is simple: our decomposition is into polyhedral cones, each defined by no more than $m\binom{n}{m}$ linear inequalities. To find the cone our problem falls in we do not need to compute the entire decomposition (or 'fan'), but only inspect the $m\binom{n}{m}$ linear inequalities. The required polynomial is derived by solving $\binom{n}{m}$ counting problems involving numbers of size no more than $m^{m/2}$ and then applying an interpolation formula.

To solve the $\binom{n}{m}$ smaller problems required by the interpolation formula we exhibit two methods that have proved useful in practice. The first method is a divide and conquer approach that has proved useful for problems where b has small norm. The other method we call the 'even/odd' approach and can solve the needed sub-problems in time $2^{O(m \log m)}$ in general. For the 'magic square' case which has dimension $d = O(m^2)$ this yields a run-time of $2^{O(\sqrt{d} \log d)} \log B$ using the 'even/odd' approach directly and a run-time of $2^{O(\sqrt{d} \log d)}$ using the interpolation approach outlined above (even after allowing for the time to identify which cone we are in and perform the interpolation).

2.1. Piecewise polynomiality

Throughout this note, P will be a lattice polytope, that is, a polytope such that all vertices have integer coordinates. A famous theorem of Ehrhart is that, as k ranges over the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548300004193 Published online by Cambridge University Press




Figure 1

nonnegative integers, the number of integral points in the polytope kP is a polynomial in k with degree the dimension of the smallest affine space containing P (see [11]).

In fact the result immediately strengthens into an analogue of the so called 'mixed volumes' of convex geometry (the symbol + denotes the Minkowski sum).

Theorem 2.1 (McMullen, Bernštein). *For any lattice polytopes* $P_1,\dots,P_M \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ *and integers* $k_1,\dots,k_M \geqslant 0$,

$$\sharp(k_1P_1+\cdots+k_MP_M) = \sum_{r_1+\cdots+r_M\leqslant N} C(P_1,r_1,\dots,P_M,r_M)k_1^{r_1}\dots k_M^{r_M},$$

where the $C(P_1,r_1,\dots,P_M,r_M)$ *are constants depending only on* $P_1,r_1,\dots,P_M,r_M$.

The counting function $f_A(b)$ (mentioned above) is not itself a single polynomial for the simple reason that there are A, b_1, b_2 such that the polytopes $Ax = b_1,\ x \geqslant 0$ and $Ax = b_2,\ x \geqslant 0$ do not Minkowski sum to the polytope $Ax = b_1 + b_2,\ x \geqslant 0$. An example is the set of contingency tables given by

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \\ c_1 \\ c_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For $\sigma \subset \{1,2,\dots,n\}$ of cardinality m, let A_σ be the $m \times m$ matrix formed by the columns of A indexed by σ. Similarly, for any vector v let v_σ be the entries of v indexed by σ. Let Γ be the set of σ such that $\det(A_\sigma) \neq 0$. Let Ψ be the set of all $r \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that there exists $\sigma \in \Gamma$ such that r is a row of A_σ^{-1}. This divides the positive orthant in $\mathbb{R}^m$ into a collection of equivalence classes such that, for $b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we have $b_1 \equiv b_2$ if and only if

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548300004193 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$r \cdot b_1 \geqslant 0 \leftrightarrow r \cdot b_2 \geqslant 0 \ \forall r \in \Psi$. We are interested in the largest dimensional cones in this 'fan'. We say b_1, b_2 are in the same cone if and only if $(r \cdot b_1) \times (r \cdot b_2) \geqslant 0 \ \forall r \in \Psi$.

Theorem 2.2. *If b_1 and b_2 are in the same cone then the Minkowski sum of the polytopes $Ax = b_1,\ x \geqslant 0$ and $Ax = b_2,\ x \geqslant 0$ is equal to the polytope $Ax = b_1 + b_2,\ x \geqslant 0$.*

Sketch of proof. We shall use P_b to denote the polytope given by the linear system $Ax = b,\ x \geqslant 0$. It is easy to show that $P_{b_1} + P_{b_1} \subseteq P_{b_1+b_2}$ and that all three of these polytopes are bounded. Also, b_1 and b_2 being in the same cone implies that b_1, b_2 and $b_1 + b_2$ are all in the same cone (though this is not, in general, a transitive relationship). For $\sigma \in \Gamma$ and $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$ we define $v(\sigma, u)$ to be the vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that $v(\sigma, u)_i = 0 \ \forall i \notin \sigma$ and $v(\sigma, u)_\sigma = A_\sigma^{-1} u$. All vertices of $Ax = b$ are of the form $v(\sigma, b)$ (though $v(\sigma, b)$ is not always a vertex or even always in P_b).

Let v be an arbitrary vertex of $P_{b_1+b_2}$ and σ be such that $v = v(\sigma, b_1 + b_2)$. We note that $v(\sigma, b_1) + v(\sigma, b_2) = v(\sigma, b_1 + b_2)$ and the 'in the same cone' relationship guarantees that $v(\sigma, b_1) \in P_{b_1}$ and $v(\sigma, b_2) \in P_{b_2}$. The arbitrary choice of v completes the proof. □

There are no more than $m\binom{n}{m}$ elements in Ψ so the orthant is split into no more than $\left(m\binom{n}{m}\right)^m$ cones. By combining Theorem 2.1 with Theorem 2.2 we see that the restriction of the counting function $f_A(b)$ to any of these cones is a polynomial of degree no more than $n - m$ [4, 17, 18].

2.2. Interpolation

We now have a decomposition of the positive orthant into cones such that $f_A(b)$ restricted to any cone is an unknown polynomial of degree $n - m$. For a given cone, it remains to derive the polynomial. The method we use is to find an integral point y in the interior of the cone. The polynomial for a cone is completely determined by the values of $f_A((n-m)y + \Delta)$ where Δ runs over all $\binom{n}{m}$ nonnegative integral vectors in the simplex S_{n-m} in $\mathbb{Z}^m$ such that $1 \cdot \Delta \leqslant n - m$. We call the required $f_A((n-m)y + \Delta)$ 'small sub-problems' and describe how to solve them in the next section. With the small sub-problem solutions in hand, the interpolation can be done very quickly. We introduce the multivariate 'Lagrange polynomial' $l_{b,x,d}(\cdot)$ which allows us to perform the interpolation without having to (computationally) invert a $\binom{n}{m}$ by $\binom{n}{m}$ matrix. In this notation we call $b \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ the 'base', $x \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ is such that $x - b \in S_d$ and d is the degree. We define $l_{b,x,d}(\cdot)$ as the unique polynomial map from $\mathbb{Z}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ of degree d such that $l_{b,x,d}(x) = 1$ and $l_{b,y,d}(y) = 0$ when y is integral and $y - b \in S$ and $y \neq x$. These polynomials have a very simple explicit formula:

$$l_{b,x,d}(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \prod_{i=1}^{d} (1 + (1 \cdot b - 1 \cdot v)/i), & x = b, \\ \frac{(v_i - b_i)}{(x_i - b_i)} l_{b+E^i,x,d-1}(v), & x_i > b_i,\ x_j = b_j \ \forall j < i. \end{cases}$$

Then the desired polynomial is

$$p(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\Delta \in S} f_A((n-m)y + \Delta) l_{(n-m)y,(n-m)y+\Delta,n-m}(v).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548300004193 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The sum can be evaluated symbolically with v as an indeterminate vector or can be evaluated very quickly using almost no space if $v \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ is given explicitly.

2.3. Size of sub-problems

By Hadamard's inequality [14] the system $Cy \geqslant 0,\ y \geqslant 0$ (where the rows of C are elements of Ψ or their opposites) representing an arbitrary cone of the type mentioned above has an integral interior point y such that $y_i \leqslant m^{m/2+1}$ (remember, because A is totally unimodular all vectors in Ψ are $0, \pm 1$). Graham and Sloane studied the equality version of this problem [10] and Văn H. Vũ of Yale has shown [19] that the $m^{O(m)}$ bound is essentially best possible.

2.4. Divide and conquer

For small problems (many of those arising from magic square problems) we have devised a specialized decomposition which we call 'divide and conquer'. This method is similar to that of Chan and Robbins [3] who used it to compute the volume of the order 7 and order 8 Birkhoff polytopes. To count the number of nonnegative integral solutions to $Ax = b$ we divide the columns of A into two sets of size about n_1, n_2 ($n_1 + n_2 = n$, $n_1 = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$): A_1, A_2 and then explicitly enumerate all possible b_1, b_2 such that $A_1 x_1 = b_1,\ x_1 \geqslant 0$ and that $A_2 x_2 = b_2,\ x_2 \geqslant 0$ are feasible and $b_1 + b_2 = b$. We have a recursive expansion of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\sharp(\{x|Ax = b,\ x \geqslant 0,\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}) = \\ \sum_{b_1,b_2\ b_1+b_2=b, b_1,b_2 \in Z^m \geqslant 0} \quad & \sharp(\{x_1|A_1 x_1 = b_1,\ x \geqslant 0,\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_1}\}) \times \\ & \sharp(\{x_2|A_2 x_2 = b_2,\ x \geqslant 0,\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^{n_2}\}).\end{aligned}$$

This divides an m by n counting problem into no more than B^m sub-problems. We combine this with dynamic programming, meaning that we take care never to solve any sub-problem twice. There are no more than $n \log n B^m$ possible sub-problems, which is sufficient to yield a run-time of $n \log n B^{2m}$.

2.5. Zero/one method

Another method for small problems is the 'even/odd' decomposition given by:

$$\begin{aligned}\sharp(\{x|Ax = b,\ x \geqslant 0,\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}) = \\ \sum_{r \in R_A,\ r \leqslant b,\ r = b \bmod 2} \quad & \sharp(\{z|z \in \{0,1\}^n,\ Az = r\}) \times \\ & \sharp(\{y|Ay = (b-r)/2,\ y \geqslant 0,\ y \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}),\end{aligned}$$

where R_A is the set $\{Az|z \in \{0,1\}^n\}$. We apply this decomposition recursively to the non-zero/one problems until we have driven all the entries of b to zero. Again, for efficiency we use a dynamic programming to avoid recalculating the value of any sub-problem. We note that in this recursion a limited number of right-hand sides (of the form $(b-r)/2$) are formed. In fact we solve no more than $n^m \log B$ nonzero/one sub-problems.

The zero/one problems themselves can be solved using either a specialization of the divide and conquer counter to zero/one problems or another application of dynamic

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548300004193 Published online by Cambridge University Press

programming using the recursive formula

$$\begin{aligned}\sharp(\{z|Az = b,\ z \in \{0,1\}^n\}) = \\ \sharp(\{z_1|\tilde{A}z_1 = b,\ z_1 \in \{0,1\}^{n-1}\}) + \\ \sharp(\{z_2|\tilde{A}z_2 = b - A^1,\ z_2 \in \{0,1\}^{n-1}\}),\end{aligned}$$

where A^1 is the first column of A and $\tilde{A}$ is the matrix formed by all columns of A except the first. Either method yields a run-time no worse than $2^{O(m \log n)}$.

Combining these observations lets us conclude that the zero/one counter can be implemented in $2^{O(m \log n)} \log B$ time. Given our problem size bounds above, this is sufficient to run the entire interpolation method in time $2^{O(m \log n)}$.

3. Contingency tables

A special problem is to find the number of nonnegative matrices that sum to given row and column totals. Such matrices are called contingency tables [6]. If the matrices are square and all rows and columns are constrained to sum to the same value then the matrices are called 'magic squares' [15]. As mentioned before, counting contingency tables is $\sharp P$ hard. Counting or uniformly generating contingency tables has applications in statistics [5].

The generating function for $h \times w$ contingency tables is the following:

$$\prod_{i=1\ldots h,\ j=1\ldots w} \frac{1}{1 - x_i y_j}.$$

Even for magic squares ($h = w, B =$ each row/column total, $m = h + w - 1$, $n = (h-1)(w-1)$) the counting can be troublesome (though no complexity result is known). Complete expansion of the generating function can require B^{2h} space and similar time. Dynamic programming methods [9] can perform the calculation using hB^{h-1} space. This still yields a rough run-time of B^{2h} as each entry in the dynamic programming table depends on $O(B^h)$ previous entries. Young/Ferris diagram-based methods [12] roughly need to store all Young/Ferris diagrams on hB dots with $\leqslant h$ rows (yielding $\approx B^{h-1}$ storage). Once B is as big as order h^2 it can be shown that there are at least $(B/(2h))^{h-1}$ diagrams that are connected to roughly $(B/(2h))^{h-1}$ diagrams each yielding $\approx (B/2h)^{2h-2}$ work.

The divide and conquer approach, mentioned above, can be specialized to this problem and compares favourably to these methods, if performed with care. If A is the matrix representing the contingency table counting problem, one can always split the columns of A approximately in half in such a way that both the sub-problems are contingency table problems with either the width or height halved. By combining with the dynamic programming technique, we get a run-time of $B^{3h/2}$ using B^h storage.

This run-time is noticed by computing the work done at each stage of a dynamic programming implementation of divide and conquer. Table 1 shows how many problems occur at each level, what their width and height is, how many sub-problems each problem needs from the next level, and how much work is done at each level (nodes times connections).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548300004193 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1

level	1	2	3	4	5	6	...
nodes	1	B^h	B^h	$B^{\frac{3}{4}h}$	$B^{\frac{1}{2}h}$	$B^{\frac{3}{8}h}$	
width	h	h	h/2	$h/2$	$h/4$	$h/4$	
height	h	$h/2$	$h/2$	$h/4$	$h/4$	$h/8$	
edges/node	B^h	$B^{h/2}$	$B^{h/2}$	$B^{h/4}$	$B^{h/4}$	$B^{h/8}$	
work	B^h	$B^{\frac{3}{2}h}$	$B^{\frac{3}{2}h}$	B^h	$B^{\frac{3}{4}h}$	$B^{\frac{1}{2}h}$	

For $B \in o(h^{8/3})$ the divide and conquer counter is faster than the even/odd counter and for $B \in o(h^{4/3})$ the divide and conquer counter takes fewer steps than there are terms in the multivariate counting polynomial.

4. Computational results

4.1. Zero/one results

The following single 5×4 problem was solved in 20 minutes using the zero/one method (a previous solution by the interpolation method took just over one week). There are exactly 231964365961288975748296115319387 53 ($\approx 2.3 * 10^{34}$) nonnegative 5 by 4 integer matrices whose rows sum to [182, 778, 3635, 9558, 11110] and columns sum to [3046, 5173, 6116, 10928].

4.2. 4 by 4 contingency tables

The 4×4 contingency table problem (after some symmetries are removed) splits into 3694 cones such that the counting function restricts to a degree 9 polynomial in 7 variables in each cone. This means each polynomial is determined by 11440 coefficients so can be interpolated from 11440 sufficiently general evaluations. Each of the 3694 tasks seems to represent about 3 hours of Pmax CPU time (using the divide and conquer counter), so the total job represented about 1.5 Pmax CPU years. This task was completed in just over 6 weeks using Peter Stout's **WAX** [16] system, which effectively simulates a coarse-grain parallel supercomputer (employing the numerous idle workstations at CMU). This polynomial was stored on disk and was able to solve typical 4×4 contingency tables (with margins around a couple of hundred) in 3 seconds. This was made available on the World Wide Web in the form of an online calculator.

4.3. Magic squares

We know [15] that the number of nonnegative integral points in the $n \times n$ Birkhoff polytope (*i.e.*, the number of magic squares) is a polynomial of degree $(n-1)^2$ in r (r an integer). Denote this polytope by $H_n(r)$. In fact, the stronger result is known that

$$\sum_{r \geqslant 0} H_n(r)\lambda^r = \frac{h_0 + h_1\lambda + \cdots h_d\lambda^d}{(1-\lambda)^{(n-1)^2+1}}$$

where $d = n^2 - 3n + 2$ and the h_i are nonnegative integers such that $h_i = h_{d-i},\ i = 0, 1, \ldots d$.

This means that $H_7(r)$ is completely determined by the values of $H_7(1)$ through $H_7(15)$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548300004193 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 2

r	$H_7(r)$	$H_8(r)$
1	5040	40320
2	9135630	545007960
3	4662857360	1579060246400
4	936670590450	1455918295922650
5	94161778046406	569304690994400256
6	5562418293759978	114601242382721619224
7	215717608046511873	13590707419428422843904
8	5945968652327831925	1046591482728407939338275
9	123538613356253145400	56272722406349235035916800
10	2023270039486328373811	22331603423698255967021487 20
11	2704630655009628848323 8	68316292103293669997188919040
12	3033781419871825153429 92	16679320988627738377348230421 96
13	2920054336492521720572276	33427469280977307618866364694400
14	2456312700919522372195259 0	56279880567334201675236634418520 0
15	1833432730807009169730167 45	81152089774654048741002264925753 60
16		10185706615053029414642861591795 7029
17		11282825264050225540495573290972 52992
18		11161302946841260178530673680176000200
19		99613494890126594335550124219924540800
20		80925677061054067545465751719401868 0846
21		60311079898755627512661169019993277 10720

and $H_8(r)$ is completely determined by the values of $H_8(1)$ through $H_8(21)$. Other authors have reported similar results [3]. These values were computed by the divide and conquer technique, and are shown in Table 2.

With these valuations it is trivial to determine both the polynomials $H_7(r)$, $H_8(r)$ and all the coefficients in the numerators of the generating functions given above. To derive the polynomials we use $H_n(0) = 1$, $H_n(-1) = H_n(-2) = \cdots H_n(-n+1) = 0$ and $H_n(-n-r) = (-1)^{n-1} H_n(r)$. Note that the data given here for $H_7(r)$ and $H_8(r)$ obey conjecture (v) on page 26 of [15].

References

[1] Barvinok, A. (1993) A polynomial time algorithm for counting integral points in polyhedra when the dimension is fixed. In 34*th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, IEEE Computer Society Press.

[2] Barvinok, A. I. (1994) Computing the Ehrhart polynomial of convex lattice polytope. *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **12** 35–48.

[3] Chan, C. S. and Robbins, D. P. (1998) On the volume of the polytope of doubly stochastic matrices. eprint: `math.co/9806076`.

[4] Dahmen, W. and Micchelli, C. A. (1988) The number of solutions to linear Diophantine equations and multivariate splines. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **308** 509–532.

[5] Diaconis, P. and Efron, B. (1985) Testing for independence in a two-way table: New interpretations of the chi-square statistic. *Annals of Statistics* **13** 845–874.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548300004193 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[6] Diaconis, P. and Gangolli, A. (1994) Rectangular arrays with fixed margins. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Markov Chains*, Institute of Mathematics and its Applications, University of Minnesota. To appear.
[7] Dyer, M., Kannan, R. and Mount, J. (1997) Sampling contingency tables. *Random Struct. Alg.* **10** 487–506.
[8] Fulton, W. (1993) *Introduction to Toric Varieties*, Princeton University Press.
[9] Gail, M. and Mantel, N. (1977) Counting the number of $r \times c$ contingency tables with fixed margins. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **72** 859–862.
[10] Graham, R. L. and Sloane, N. J. A. (1984) Anti-Hadamard matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **62** 113–137.
[11] Gruber, P. and Lekkerkerker, C. (1987) *Geometry of Numbers*, 2nd edn, North-Holland.
[12] Jackson, D. M. and van Rees, H. J. (1975) The enumeration of generalized double stochastic nonnegative integer square matrices. *SIAM J. Comput.* **4** 474–477.
[13] Mount, J. (1995) Application of convex sampling to optimization and contingency table generation/counting. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon Univ., t.r. number CMU-CS-95-152.
[14] Schrijver, A. (1986) *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*, Wiley.
[15] Stanley, R. P. (1996) *Combinatorics and Commutative Algebra*, 2nd edn, Birkhäuser.
[16] Stout, P. (1994) Wax: A wide area computation system. PhD thesis, Carnegie Mellon Univ., t.r. number CMU-CS-94-230.
[17] Sturmfels, B. (1993) How to count integer matrices. Preprint.
[18] Sturmfels, B. (1995) On vector partition functions. *J. Combin. Theory, Ser. A* **72** 302–309.
[19] Vũ, V. H. (1996) Ill-conditioned $(0, 1)$ and $(-1, 1)$ matrices and their applications. Manuscript.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963548300004193 Published online by Cambridge University Press