D. Coppersmith D. T. Lee C. K. Wong

An Elementary Proof of Nonexistence of Isometries between ℓ_p^k and ℓ_q^k

For k=2, the two-dimensional coordinate spaces ℓ_1^2 and ℓ_∞^2 are isometric. Consequently, results on computational complexity for one space can be transplanted to the other in a natural way. In this note, an elementary proof is given for the nonisometry between ℓ_p^k and ℓ_q^k for general k, p, and q.

Introduction

Let Q_i , Q_j be two points in R^k with coordinates $(x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ik})$ and $(x_{j1}, x_{j2}, \dots, x_{jk})$, respectively. The distance $d_p(Q_i, Q_j)$ between these two points is defined as $d_p(Q_i, Q_j) = (|x_{i1} - x_{j1}|^p + |x_{i2} - x_{j2}|^p + \dots + |x_{ik} - x_{jk}|^p)^{1/p}$ for $p = 1, 2, \dots$ and $d_{\infty}(Q_i, Q_j) = \max(|x_{i1} - x_{j1}|, \dots, |x_{ik} - x_{jk}|)$. Following the notation used in [1, p. 374], we denote the space with such distance function by ℓ_p^k .

Recently, some attention has been given to the spaces ℓ_1^2 and ℓ_{∞}^2 because of their natural applications to computer science. (See, for example [2-4]). The isometry f((x, y)) = $((y+x)/2, (y-x)/2), (x, y) \in \ell_{\infty}^2$, between ℓ_{∞}^2 and ℓ_{1}^2 makes it sufficient to study only one of these two spaces as far as computational complexity is concerned, since the existence of a polynomial time algorithm for a problem in one space implies the existence of a polynomial time algorithm for the same problem in the other space. More recently, some other applications have been reported that require the study of ℓ_1^k and ℓ_{∞}^k (See, for example [5].) The question of their being isometric came up naturally. After a search of the literature, it seems that people always assume they are nonisometric. However, this fact usually has to be deduced by the reader from some very powerful theorems. (See, for example [6].)

The purpose of this note is to give an elementary proof of a more general fact concerning nonisometries between ℓ_p^k and ℓ_q^k . We give a very simple proof of nonisometries

between ℓ_p^k and ℓ_∞^k . In the same spirit but with a more complicated proof, we then establish the final result.

Lemma 1

It is impossible to put more than 2k points inside the unit sphere in ℓ_p^k which are separated by a distance ≥ 2 , for $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $k \geq 1$.

Proof We proceed by induction on k. Obviously, it is true for k=1. By induction hypothesis, we can put at most 2k-2 points on the intersection of the unit sphere and the hyperplane $x_1=0$. Suppose we have two points $a=(a_1,\cdots,a_k)$ and $b=(b_1,\cdots,b_k)$ in the positive half of the unit sphere: $a_1 \geq b_1 > 0$. Then define $a'=(-a_1,a_2,\cdots,a_k)$. We have

$$d_p(a, b) < d_p(a', b)$$

 $\leq d_p(a', O) + d_p(O, b)$
 $\leq 1 + 1$
 $= 2,$

where O is the origin. Note that the first inequality is strict only for $1 \le p < \infty$. The second inequality is the triangle inequality.

Consequently, there is at most one point with $x_1 > 0$ and at most one point with $x_1 < 0$. Thus, there are at most 2k points in the unit sphere in ℓ_p^k , separated by a distance > 2

Copyright 1979 by International Business Machines Corporation. Copying is permitted without payment of royalty provided that (1) each reproduction is done without alteration and (2) the *Journal* reference and IBM copyright notice are included on the first page. The title and abstract may be used without further permission in computer-based and other information-service systems. Permission to *republish* other excerpts should be obtained from the Editor.

Theorem 1

- 1. For k=1, ℓ_p^k and ℓ_∞^k are isometric for $1 \le p < \infty$. 2. For k=2, ℓ_p^k and ℓ_∞^k are isometric for p=1, but are not isometric for 1 .
- 3. For $k \ge 3$, ℓ_n^k and ℓ_∞^k are not isometric for $1 \le p < \infty$.

Proof It suffices to prove (3) and the second part of (2).

Suppose f were an isometry from ℓ_{∞}^{k} to ℓ_{p}^{k} mapping O to O. Then f maps the ℓ_{∞}^{k} unit sphere to the ℓ_{p}^{k} unit sphere. But the ℓ_{∞}^{k} unit sphere has 2^{k} points all distance 2 apart, namely, the 2^k vertices. Since f is an isometry, the images of these points must satisfy the same property. For $k \ge 3$, this is impossible by Lemma 1. For k = 2, again by Lemma 1, the only possible candidates for the four points distance 2 apart in the ℓ_p^2 unit sphere are (1, 0) (-1, 0) (0, 0)1) (0, -1) for $p < \infty$. However, they are distance 2 apart only if p = 1. Thus, here is a contradiction for 1 .

We now prove the following final result:

For $k \ge 2$, $1 \le p \le \infty$, $1 \le q \le \infty$, the spaces ℓ_p^k and ℓ_q^k are nonisometric, except that $\ell_1^2 = \ell_{\infty}^2$.

Remark For k = 1, $\ell_n^1 = \ell_q^1$.

Lemma 2 (unique midpoint)

If $1 , <math>k \ge 2$, then for $x, y \in \ell_p^k$, if d(x, y) = d(y, -x)= d(x, -x)/2, then y = 0.

Proof We have $0 = 2(d(x, -x)/2)^p - d(x, y)^p - d(y, y)^p$ $-x)^{p} = \Sigma(2|x_{i}|^{p} - |x_{i} - y_{i}|^{p} - |x_{i} + y_{i}|^{p})$. Call the summand S_i . Then $S_i = 0$ when $y_i = 0$. Its derivative $\partial S_i/\partial y_i$ is $-p\{|x_i + y_i|^{p-1} - |x_i - y_i|^{p-1}\}$ sgn (x_i) for $|y_i| < 0$ $|x_i|$. Thus, for $0 < y_i < |x_i|$, $\partial S_i/\partial y_i < 0$ so that $S_i < 0$ for 0 $< y_i \le |x_i|$. For $0 > y_i > -|x_i|$, $\partial S_i / \partial y_i > 0$ so that $S_i < 0$ for $0 > y_i \ge -|x_i|$. For $|y_i| > |x_i|$ we have $S_i < 0$ by inspection.

So each $S_i \le 0$, and for $\sum S_i = 0$ we must have each $S_i = 0$ 0; thus each $y_i = 0$, implying y = 0.

Corollary If $1 , <math>k \ge 2$, $x, y, z \in \ell_p^k$, d(x, y) = d(y, y)z) = d(x, z)/2, then y = (x + z)/2.

Proof By linearity.

Remark For p = 1 or $p = \infty$, $k \ge 2$, the lemma is not true. To see this, just consider the points:

$$x = (1, 1, 0, \dots, 0), y = (1, -1, 0, \dots, 0)$$
 for $p = 1$

and the points

$$x = (1, 0, 0, \dots, 0), y = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \text{ for } p = \infty.$$

Thus for $k \ge 2$ this property immediately separates the case $(p = 1 \text{ or } p = \infty)$ from the case (1 .

Given a space ℓ_p^k where we know k but not p, we may first test the "unique midpoint" property to see whether 1 .

If p = 1 or $p = \infty$, there are only finitely many directions in which the unique midpoint property holds. That is, fixing an arbitrary origin O, there are only finitely many $x \in$ ℓ_1^k or $x \in \ell_{\infty}^k$, such that d(O, x) = 1 and such that there is a unique point y with d(O, y) = d(y, x) = 1/2. Namely, if p = 1, there are 2k such values of x, namely those with one coordinate equal to ± 1 , the rest 0: $x = (\pm 1, 0, \dots, 0), (0, \pm 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ $\pm 1, 0, \dots, 0$, \dots , $(0, \dots, 0, \pm 1)$. If $p = \infty$, there are 2^k such values of x, namely $(\pm k^{-p}, \pm k^{-p}, \cdots, \pm k^{-p})$. For $k \ge 3$, we have $2^k > 2k$, so that this count serves to distinguish ℓ_{n}^{k} from ℓ_{∞}^{k} for $k \ge 3$. As noted above, for k = 2, the spaces are actually isometric, as they are for k = 1.

Now suppose 1 . For each point x define <math>-x to be the point z such that d(x, O) = d(z, O) = d(x, z)/2. (By Lemma 2, 0 = (x + z)/2, so that z = -x.) Now choose two points x, y on the unit sphere (d(x, O) = d(y, O) = 1)with d(x, y) = d(x, -y) = A(x, y). Choose x and y to maximize A(x, y). Let the maximum value of A(x, y) be

$$A = \sup \{ d(x, y) | x, y \in \ell_p^k, d(x, O) = d(y, O) = 1, \\ d(x, y) = d(x, -y) \}.$$

A is an invariant of the space and almost serves to distinguish ℓ_p^k and ℓ_q^k .

If $1 , then <math>A = 2^{1/p}$ and is achieved for precisely those x and y such that for each coordinate i, either $x_i = 0$ or $y_i = 0$.

Proof Set $S = d(x, y)^p + d(x, -y)^p - 2d(x, O)^p - 2d(y, y)$ $(O)^p$. For x, y such that $A(x, y) = 2^{1/p}$ we have S = 0. For $A(x, y) > 2^{1/p}$ we would have S > 0. Now $S = \Sigma(|x_i - y_i|^p)$ $+|x_i+y_j|^p-2|x_j|^p-2|y_j|^p$). Again call the summand S_i .

If
$$x_i = 0$$
 or $y_i = 0$, then $S_i = 0$.

Otherwise assume, without loss of generality, that $x_i \ge$ $y_i > 0$. We may set $x_i = 1$, $y_i = r$. If r = 1, then $S_i = 0^p + 1$ $2^{p} - 2 \cdot 1 - 2 \cdot 1 = 2^{p} - 4 < 0$ since p < 2.

If 0 < r < 1, set $t = S_i/r^p = \{(1-r)^p + (1+r)^p - 2 - 1\}$ $2r^{p}/r^{p} = \{2[1 + C(p, 2)r^{2} + C(p, 4)r^{4} + \cdots] - 2 - 2r^{p}\}/r^{p}$ $r^{p} = 2[C(p, 2)r^{2-p} + C(p, 4)r^{4-p} + \cdots -1]. \text{ As } r \to 1, t \to 1$ $2^{p} - 4 < 0$. Clearly, since t is a sum of positive multiples of positive powers of r [note that C(p, 2N), the binomial coefficient, is positive since 1], t gets smaller as rgets smaller in the range 0 < r < 1. Thus in that range, t < 10 and $S_i < 0$. So the only way for $S_i = 0$ is for $r = 0, i.e., x_i$ = 0 or $y_i = 0$. Also it is impossible to have $S_i > 0$.

697

So for S = 0 we must have, for each i, $x_i = 0$ or $y_i = 0$, and we always have $S \le 0$.

Lemma 4

If $2 , then <math>A = 2^{1-1/p}$ and is achieved when $x_i = \pm y_i$ for all i.

Proof Set $S = 2d(x, y)^p + 2d(x, -y)^p - 2^p d(x, O)^p - 2^p d(y, O)^p$. Again, if $A(x, y) = 2^{1-1/p}$, then S = 0, and if $A(x, y) > 2^{1-1/p}$, then S > 0. We rewrite S as

$$S = \sum \{2|x_i - y_i|^p + 2|x_i + y_i|^p - |2x_i|^p - |2y_i|^p\},\,$$

with the summand denoted S_i .

If $y_i = 0$, then $S_i = (2 + 2 - 2^p)|x_i|^p < 0$ unless $x_i = 0$ also.

If
$$y_i = \pm x_i$$
, then $S_i = 2 \cdot 2^p + 0 - 2^p - 2^p = 0$.

Assume $x_i > y_i > 0$, and we may assume $x_i = 1$, $0 < y_i = r < 1$. We want to show

$$2(1-r)^p + 2(1+r)^p - 2^p(1+r^p) < 0.$$

Call the left-hand expression t; then as $r \to 1$, $t \to 0$.

For 0 < r < 1, we have $\partial t/\partial r = -2p(1-r)^{p-1} + 2p(1+r)^{p-1} - 2^p p r^{p-1} = 2p \{(1+r)^{p-1} - (1-r)^{p-1} - (2r)^{p-1}\} > 0$ by the triangle inequality on ℓ_{p-1}^k . Thus for 0 < r < 1 we have t < 0.

Thus we have $S_i \le 0$, and $S_i = 0$ iff $x_i = \pm y_i$.

Thus $S \le 0$, and S = 0 iff for all $i, x_i = \pm y_i$.

Lemma 5

If p = 2, $A = 2^{1/2}$.

Proof Continuity in p.

Now, given a space ℓ_p^k of unknown p, with 1 , first find <math>A as above.

If
$$A = 2^{1/2}$$
, then $p = 2$.

If $2 > A > 2^{1/2}$, then either

$$p = 1/\log_2 A \ (1$$

$$p = 1/(1 - \log_2 A) (2$$

If $k \ge 3$, we can distinguish these two cases immediately: Try to find an x, with d(O, x) = 1, such that there are infinitely many y with d(O, y) = 1, d(x, y) = d(x, -y) = A. We will succeed iff 1 .

If $1 , then <math>x = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $y = (0, a, \dots, b)$ will work as long as d(O, y) = 1.

If $2 , for any x there are at most <math>2^k$ choices of y, namely, the k choices of sign in $y_i = \pm x_i$.

If k = 2 we still have problems. For a given value of A, with $2^{1/2} < A < 2$, we have two possible values of p, say p and q, with 1 . They are related by <math>(1/p) + (1/q) = 1.

The solutions of (x, y) which led to our maximum value of A(x, y) are (for $1) <math>x = (\pm 1, 0)$, $y = (0, \pm 1)$ or vice versa; or (for $2 < q < \infty$) $x = \pm (2^{-1/q}, 2^{-1/q})$, $y = \pm (2^{-1/q}, -2^{-1/q})$ or vice versa. In either case, by our unique midpoint lemma, we can determine the behavior of $d(x, 2^{-n}y)$ as $n \to \infty$. That is, take the midpoint of (0, y) and call it $2^{-1}y$; then find $2^{-2}y =$ midpoint $(0, 2^{-1}y)$, etc.

For
$$1 , we have $d(x, 2^{-n}y) = (1^p + (2^{-n})^p)^{1/p} = (1 + 2^{-np})^{1/p} = 1 + (1/p)2^{-np} + O(2^{-2np}).$$$

For
$$2 < q < \infty$$
, we have $d(x, 2^{-n}y) = [(2^{-1/q} + 2^{-n-1/q})^q + (2^{-1/q} - 2^{-n-1/q})^q]^{1/q} = \{(1/2)[(1 + 2^{-n})^q + (1 - 2^{-n})^q]\}^{1/q} = \{1 + C(q, 2)2^{-2n} + O(2^{-4n})\}^{1/q} = 1 + ((q - 1)/2)2^{-2n} + O(2^{-4n}).$

The leading terms differ unless q = p = 2. [Compare $(1/p)2^{-np}$ with $((q-1)/2)2^{-2n}$.] So this test distinguishes ℓ_p^2 from ℓ_q^2 for 1 .

To summarize, given an ℓ_p^2 space with $k \ge 2$, $1 \le p \le \infty$, with k known and p unknown, these tests can determine p intrinsically unless k = 2 and p = 1 or ∞ . First we distinguish among $(p = 1 \text{ or } p = \infty)$ and (1 . In the first case we count the directions along which the unique midpoint lemma holds. In the latter case we find <math>A, which narrows the possible values of p to two values, p and q, 1 , or else identifies <math>p = 2. If $k \ge 3$, we can then ask the number of solutions to the A equation for a given x, which separates p < 2 from p > 2. If k = 2, the behavior of $d(x, 2^{-n}y)$ as $n \to \infty$ distinguishes large p from small p. So the only isometries that exist are between ℓ_p^1 and ℓ_p^2 and ℓ_p^2 .

Acknowledgment

The authors are grateful to the referees for their valuable comments. The research of the second author was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant MC5-76-17321 and in part by the Joint Service Electronics Program under contract DAAB-07-72-C-0259.

References

1. N. Dunford and J. T. Schwartz, *Linear Operators*, 1. General Theory, Interscience, New York, 1958.

- M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, "The Rectilinear Steiner Tree Problem is NP-Complete," SIAM J. Appl. Math. 32, 826-834 (1977).
- R. M. Karp, A. C. McKellar, and C. K. Wong, "Near-Optimal Solutions to a 2-Dimensional Placement Problem," SIAM J. Computing 4, 271-286 (1975).
- D. T. Lee and C. K. Wong, "Voronoi Diagrams in L₁ (L_∞)
 Metrics with 2-Dimensional Storage Applications," SIAM J.
 Computing (to be published).
- A. C.-C. Yao, "Fast Algorithms for Finding Minimum Spanning Trees in K Dimensions," Proceedings of the 15th Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1977, pp. 553-556.
- L. E. Dor, "Potentials and Isometric Embeddings in L₁," Israel J. Math. 24, 260-268 (1976).

Received March 23, 1979; revised May 25, 1979

D. Coppersmith and C. K. Wong are at the IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, New York 10598, but part of this work was done while Dr. Wong was a Visiting Professor at Columbia University, Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. Prof. D. T. Lee is at the Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois 61801.