## Testing the Existence of a Supporting Plane

Oleg Pikhurko\*
DPMMS, Centre for Mathematical Sciences
Cambridge University, Cambridge CB3 0WB, England
E-mail: 0.Pikhurko@dpmms.cam.ac.uk

November 21, 2018

## Abstract

We present an algorithm testing wheather, for given four vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , there is a plane through the origin such that all four vectors fall into the same open halfspace.

The following problem was communicated to me by Igor Komarov. Suppose we are given four vectors  $\overline{x}_1, \ldots, \overline{x}_4 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . How to test if there is a *supporting plane*, that is, a plane P such that all four vectors lie in the same open halfspace with respect to this plane? (When we talk about planes or lines, we mean *linear subspaces*, that is, containing the origin.)

This was needed for Komarov's survey paper [1]: the carbon atoms in a molecule are classified there into two types depending on the existence of a supporting plane (with respect to the four vectors corresponding to the four ties at the carbon atom).

We did not find an explicit algorithm in the literature and, in order to keep [1] short, we wrote the present note with the description of the algorithm and the proof of its correctness.

Let each  $\overline{x}_i$  be represented by its Cartesian coordinates, viewed as a column vector:  $\overline{x}_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, x_{i3})^T$ . Clearly, the existence a supporting plane is equivalent to the existence of a linear function  $f(\overline{y}) = \sum_{j=1}^3 f_j y_j$  with  $f(\overline{x}_i) > 0$  for all  $1 \le i \le 4$ .

It is obvious how to extend the above notions to the general case of k vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Here is a criterion that we will use.

**Lemma 1** Let  $\overline{x}_1, \ldots, \overline{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . A supporting (d-1)-dimensional hyperplane does not exist if and only if there are weights  $w_i \geq 0$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , not all zero, with  $\sum_{i=1}^k w_i \overline{x}_i = \overline{0}$ .

<sup>\*</sup>Supported by a Research Fellowship, St. John's College, Cambridge.

*Proof.* If a supporting plane does not exist, then the system of linear inequalities  $\sum_{j=1}^{d} f_i x_{ij} \geq 1$  has no solution in the f's. Now the existence of weights is precisely the conclusion of the Farkas Lemma. (For example, apply Proposition 1.7 from [2] with  $A_{ij} = -x_{ij}$  and  $z_i = -1$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq d$ .)

On the other hand, if we have weights, then for any f we have  $\sum_{i=1}^k w_i f(\overline{x}_i) = f(\sum_{i=1}^k w_i \overline{x}_i) = \overline{0}$ , so  $f(\overline{x}_i) \leq 0$  for some i.

Return to our  $\overline{x}_1, \ldots, \overline{x}_4 \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . First, we handle the case when some three vectors are coplanar.

**Theorem 2** Let  $\overline{x}_1$ ,  $\overline{x}_2$  and  $\overline{x}_3$  lie on a plane P. There exists a supporting plane if and only if the set  $\{\overline{x}_1, \ldots, \overline{x}_4\} \cap P$  admits a supporting line in P.

*Proof.* If  $\overline{x}_4 \in P$ , then both weight conditions of Lemma 1 are identical. If  $\overline{x}_4 \notin P$ , then a supporting plane does not exist iff  $\sum_{i=1}^4 w_i \overline{x}_i = \overline{0}$  for some weights, which is the case iff  $\sum_{i=1}^3 w_i \overline{x}_i = \overline{0}$  for some weights because  $\overline{x}_4$  does not lie in the linear span of  $\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2, \overline{x}_3$ .

Testing in a plane is probably done easiest through the following observation: a supporting line for vectors  $\overline{x}_1, \ldots, \overline{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^2$  exists iff there is a relabelling of subscripts such that  $\angle(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_k) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \angle(\overline{x}_i, \overline{x}_{i+1})$  and  $\angle(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_k) < \pi$ , where  $0 \le \angle(\overline{x}, \overline{y}) \le \pi$  is the angle between vectors  $\overline{x}$  and  $\overline{y}$ .

It remains to consider the case when no three vectors are coplanar. Let  $P(\overline{x}_i, \overline{x}_j)$  be the plane passing through  $\overline{x}_i$  and  $\overline{x}_j$ . Here is a corollary to Lemma 1.

**Corollary 3** A supporting plane exists if and only if, for some  $1 \le i < j \le 4$ , the remaining two vectors lie in the same open halfspace with respect to the plane  $P(\overline{x}_i, \overline{x}_j)$ .

*Proof.* Suppose we have a supporting plane P. We can rotate P until it hits some  $\overline{x}_i$ . If P does not contain other  $\overline{x}$ 's, rotate it further, along the axis  $\overline{0}\overline{x}_i$ , until it hits for the first time some  $\overline{x}_j$ . Now,  $P(\overline{x}_i, \overline{x}_j)$  is clearly the required plane.

Conversely, suppose that a supporting plane does not exist, that is, by Lemma 1 we can find weights. Let f=0 be the equation of the plane  $P(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2)$ . We have  $f(\overline{x}_3) \neq 0$  and  $f(\overline{x}_4) \neq 0$  and the equality  $\sum_{h=1}^4 w_h f(\overline{x}_h) = 0$  implies that  $f(\overline{x}_3) \cdot f(\overline{x}_4) < 0$ , as required.

So, the algorithm would be to take all six pairs  $1 \le i < j \le 4$ , write an equation of the plane  $P(\overline{x}_i, \overline{x}_j)$ , which is

$$f(\overline{y}) = \det(\overline{x}_i, \overline{x}_i, \overline{y}) = 0,$$

and check the signs of f on the remaining two vectors. However, this procedure is not very economical as the determinant of a matrix, say  $(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2, \overline{x}_3)$ , is computed essentially three times. Here is a better algorithm.

Theorem 4 Compute the signs of

$$\det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2, \overline{x}_3), \ \det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_4, \overline{x}_2), \ \det(\overline{x}_3, \overline{x}_2, \overline{x}_4), \ \det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_3, \overline{x}_4).$$

A supporting plane does not exist if and only if all four signs are the same.

*Proof.* Suppose that a supporting plane does not exist. Assume  $\det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2, \overline{x}_3) > 0$ . Then applying Corollary 3 to  $P(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2)$  we obtain that  $\det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2, \overline{x}_4) < 0$ , that is,  $\det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_4, \overline{x}_2) > 0$  as required. Similarly,  $\det(\overline{x}_3, \overline{x}_2, \overline{x}_4) > 0$  and  $\det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_3, \overline{x}_4) > 0$ .

The converse also follows by an easy application of Corollary 3: e.g.  $\overline{x}_3$  and  $\overline{x}_4$  are separated by  $P(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2)$  because

$$\det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2, \overline{x}_3) \cdot \det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2, \overline{x}_4) = -\det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_2, \overline{x}_3) \cdot \det(\overline{x}_1, \overline{x}_4, \overline{x}_2) < 0. \quad \blacksquare$$

## References

- [1] I. Komarov, Higly deformed organic molecules, in preparation.
- [2] G. M. Ziegler, Lectures on polytopes, Springer-Verlag, 1995.