

Many problems of practical significance are NP-complete, yet they are too important to abandon merely because we don't know how to find an optimal solution in polynomial time. Even if a problem is NP-complete, there may be hope. We have at least three ways to get around NP-completeness. First, if the actual inputs are small, an algorithm with exponential running time may be perfectly satisfactory. Second, we may be able to isolate important special cases that we can solve in polynomial time. Third, we might come up with approaches to find *near-optimal* solutions in polynomial time (either in the worst case or the expected case). In practice, near-optimality is often good enough. We call an algorithm that returns near-optimal solutions an **approximation algorithm**. This chapter presents polynomial-time approximation algorithms for several NP-complete problems.

Performance ratios for approximation algorithms

Suppose that we are working on an optimization problem in which each potential solution has a positive cost, and we wish to find a near-optimal solution. Depending on the problem, we may define an optimal solution as one with maximum possible cost or one with minimum possible cost; that is, the problem may be either a maximization or a minimization problem.

We say that an algorithm for a problem has an **approximation ratio** of $\rho(n)$ if, for any input of size n , the cost C of the solution produced by the algorithm is within a factor of $\rho(n)$ of the cost C^* of an optimal solution:

$$\max \left(\frac{C}{C^*}, \frac{C^*}{C} \right) \leq \rho(n). \quad (35.1)$$

If an algorithm achieves an approximation ratio of $\rho(n)$, we call it a **$\rho(n)$ -approximation algorithm**. The definitions of the approximation ratio and of a $\rho(n)$ -approximation algorithm apply to both minimization and maximization problems. For a maximization problem, $0 < C \leq C^*$, and the ratio C^*/C gives the factor by which the cost of an optimal solution is larger than the cost of the approximate

solution. Similarly, for a minimization problem, $0 < C^* \leq C$, and the ratio C/C^* gives the factor by which the cost of the approximate solution is larger than the cost of an optimal solution. Because we assume that all solutions have positive cost, these ratios are always well defined. The approximation ratio of an approximation algorithm is never less than 1, since $C/C^* \leq 1$ implies $C^*/C \geq 1$. Therefore, a 1-approximation algorithm¹ produces an optimal solution, and an approximation algorithm with a large approximation ratio may return a solution that is much worse than optimal.

For many problems, we have polynomial-time approximation algorithms with small constant approximation ratios, although for other problems, the best known polynomial-time approximation algorithms have approximation ratios that grow as functions of the input size n . An example of such a problem is the set-cover problem presented in Section 35.3.

Some NP-complete problems allow polynomial-time approximation algorithms that can achieve increasingly better approximation ratios by using more and more computation time. That is, we can trade computation time for the quality of the approximation. An example is the subset-sum problem studied in Section 35.5. This situation is important enough to deserve a name of its own.

An **approximation scheme** for an optimization problem is an approximation algorithm that takes as input not only an instance of the problem, but also a value $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any fixed ϵ , the scheme is a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm. We say that an approximation scheme is a **polynomial-time approximation scheme** if for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, the scheme runs in time polynomial in the size n of its input instance.

The running time of a polynomial-time approximation scheme can increase very rapidly as ϵ decreases. For example, the running time of a polynomial-time approximation scheme might be $O(n^{2/\epsilon})$. Ideally, if ϵ decreases by a constant factor, the running time to achieve the desired approximation should not increase by more than a constant factor (though not necessarily the same constant factor by which ϵ decreased).

We say that an approximation scheme is a **fully polynomial-time approximation scheme** if it is an approximation scheme and its running time is polynomial in both $1/\epsilon$ and the size n of the input instance. For example, the scheme might have a running time of $O((1/\epsilon)^2 n^3)$. With such a scheme, any constant-factor decrease in ϵ comes with a corresponding constant-factor increase in the running time.

¹When the approximation ratio is independent of n , we use the terms “approximation ratio of ρ ” and “ ρ -approximation algorithm,” indicating no dependence on n .

Chapter outline

The first four sections of this chapter present some examples of polynomial-time approximation algorithms for NP-complete problems, and the fifth section presents a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme. Section 35.1 begins with a study of the vertex-cover problem, an NP-complete minimization problem that has an approximation algorithm with an approximation ratio of 2. Section 35.2 presents an approximation algorithm with an approximation ratio of 2 for the case of the traveling-salesman problem in which the cost function satisfies the triangle inequality. It also shows that without the triangle inequality, for any constant $\rho \geq 1$, a ρ -approximation algorithm cannot exist unless $P = NP$. In Section 35.3, we show how to use a greedy method as an effective approximation algorithm for the set-covering problem, obtaining a covering whose cost is at worst a logarithmic factor larger than the optimal cost. Section 35.4 presents two more approximation algorithms. First we study the optimization version of 3-CNF satisfiability and give a simple randomized algorithm that produces a solution with an expected approximation ratio of $8/7$. Then we examine a weighted variant of the vertex-cover problem and show how to use linear programming to develop a 2-approximation algorithm. Finally, Section 35.5 presents a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme for the subset-sum problem.

35.1 The vertex-cover problem

Section 34.5.2 defined the vertex-cover problem and proved it NP-complete. Recall that a **vertex cover** of an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ is a subset $V' \subseteq V$ such that if (u, v) is an edge of G , then either $u \in V'$ or $v \in V'$ (or both). The size of a vertex cover is the number of vertices in it.

The **vertex-cover problem** is to find a vertex cover of minimum size in a given undirected graph. We call such a vertex cover an **optimal vertex cover**. This problem is the optimization version of an NP-complete decision problem.

Even though we don't know how to find an optimal vertex cover in a graph G in polynomial time, we can efficiently find a vertex cover that is near-optimal. The following approximation algorithm takes as input an undirected graph G and returns a vertex cover whose size is guaranteed to be no more than twice the size of an optimal vertex cover.




Figure 35.1 The operation of APPROX-VERTEX-COVER. **(a)** The input graph G , which has 7 vertices and 8 edges. **(b)** The edge (b, c) , shown heavy, is the first edge chosen by APPROX-VERTEX-COVER. Vertices b and c , shown lightly shaded, are added to the set C containing the vertex cover being created. Edges (a, b) , (c, e) , and (c, d) , shown dashed, are removed since they are now covered by some vertex in C . **(c)** Edge (e, f) is chosen; vertices e and f are added to C . **(d)** Edge (d, g) is chosen; vertices d and g are added to C . **(e)** The set C , which is the vertex cover produced by APPROX-VERTEX-COVER, contains the six vertices b, c, d, e, f, g . **(f)** The optimal vertex cover for this problem contains only three vertices: b, d , and e .

APPROX-VERTEX-COVER(G)

```

1   $C = \emptyset$ 
2   $E' = G.E$ 
3  while  $E' \neq \emptyset$ 
4      let  $(u, v)$  be an arbitrary edge of  $E'$ 
5       $C = C \cup \{u, v\}$ 
6      remove from  $E'$  every edge incident on either  $u$  or  $v$ 
7  return  $C$ 

```

Figure 35.1 illustrates how APPROX-VERTEX-COVER operates on an example graph. The variable C contains the vertex cover being constructed. Line 1 initializes C to the empty set. Line 2 sets E' to be a copy of the edge set $G.E$ of the graph. The loop of lines 3–6 repeatedly picks an edge (u, v) from E' , adds its

endpoints u and v to C , and deletes all edges in E' that are covered by either u or v . Finally, line 7 returns the vertex cover C . The running time of this algorithm is $O(V + E)$, using adjacency lists to represent E' .

Theorem 35.1

APPROX-VERTEX-COVER is a polynomial-time 2-approximation algorithm.

Proof We have already shown that APPROX-VERTEX-COVER runs in polynomial time.

The set C of vertices that is returned by APPROX-VERTEX-COVER is a vertex cover, since the algorithm loops until every edge in $G.E$ has been covered by some vertex in C .

To see that APPROX-VERTEX-COVER returns a vertex cover that is at most twice the size of an optimal cover, let A denote the set of edges that line 4 of APPROX-VERTEX-COVER picked. In order to cover the edges in A , any vertex cover—in particular, an optimal cover C^* —must include at least one endpoint of each edge in A . No two edges in A share an endpoint, since once an edge is picked in line 4, all other edges that are incident on its endpoints are deleted from E' in line 6. Thus, no two edges in A are covered by the same vertex from C^* , and we have the lower bound

$$|C^*| \geq |A| \tag{35.2}$$

on the size of an optimal vertex cover. Each execution of line 4 picks an edge for which neither of its endpoints is already in C , yielding an upper bound (an exact upper bound, in fact) on the size of the vertex cover returned:

$$|C| = 2|A|. \tag{35.3}$$

Combining equations (35.2) and (35.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |C| &= 2|A| \\ &\leq 2|C^*|, \end{aligned}$$

thereby proving the theorem. ■

Let us reflect on this proof. At first, you might wonder how we can possibly prove that the size of the vertex cover returned by APPROX-VERTEX-COVER is at most twice the size of an optimal vertex cover, when we do not even know the size of an optimal vertex cover. Instead of requiring that we know the exact size of an optimal vertex cover, we rely on a lower bound on the size. As Exercise 35.1-2 asks you to show, the set A of edges that line 4 of APPROX-VERTEX-COVER selects is actually a maximal matching in the graph G . (A **maximal matching** is a matching that is not a proper subset of any other matching.) The size of a maximal matching

is, as we argued in the proof of Theorem 35.1, a lower bound on the size of an optimal vertex cover. The algorithm returns a vertex cover whose size is at most twice the size of the maximal matching A . By relating the size of the solution returned to the lower bound, we obtain our approximation ratio. We will use this methodology in later sections as well.

Exercises

35.1-1

Give an example of a graph for which APPROX-VERTEX-COVER always yields a suboptimal solution.

35.1-2

Prove that the set of edges picked in line 4 of APPROX-VERTEX-COVER forms a maximal matching in the graph G .

35.1-3 ★

Professor Bündchen proposes the following heuristic to solve the vertex-cover problem. Repeatedly select a vertex of highest degree, and remove all of its incident edges. Give an example to show that the professor's heuristic does not have an approximation ratio of 2. (*Hint:* Try a bipartite graph with vertices of uniform degree on the left and vertices of varying degree on the right.)

35.1-4

Give an efficient greedy algorithm that finds an optimal vertex cover for a tree in linear time.

35.1-5

From the proof of Theorem 34.12, we know that the vertex-cover problem and the NP-complete clique problem are complementary in the sense that an optimal vertex cover is the complement of a maximum-size clique in the complement graph. Does this relationship imply that there is a polynomial-time approximation algorithm with a constant approximation ratio for the clique problem? Justify your answer.

35.2 The traveling-salesman problem

In the traveling-salesman problem introduced in Section 34.5.4, we are given a complete undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ that has a nonnegative integer cost $c(u, v)$ associated with each edge $(u, v) \in E$, and we must find a hamiltonian cycle (a tour) of G with minimum cost. As an extension of our notation, let $c(A)$ denote the total cost of the edges in the subset $A \subseteq E$:

$$c(A) = \sum_{(u,v) \in A} c(u, v) .$$

In many practical situations, the least costly way to go from a place u to a place w is to go directly, with no intermediate steps. Put another way, cutting out an intermediate stop never increases the cost. We formalize this notion by saying that the cost function c satisfies the **triangle inequality** if, for all vertices $u, v, w \in V$,

$$c(u, w) \leq c(u, v) + c(v, w) .$$

The triangle inequality seems as though it should naturally hold, and it is automatically satisfied in several applications. For example, if the vertices of the graph are points in the plane and the cost of traveling between two vertices is the ordinary euclidean distance between them, then the triangle inequality is satisfied. Furthermore, many cost functions other than euclidean distance satisfy the triangle inequality.

As Exercise 35.2-2 shows, the traveling-salesman problem is NP-complete even if we require that the cost function satisfy the triangle inequality. Thus, we should not expect to find a polynomial-time algorithm for solving this problem exactly. Instead, we look for good approximation algorithms.

In Section 35.2.1, we examine a 2-approximation algorithm for the traveling-salesman problem with the triangle inequality. In Section 35.2.2, we show that without the triangle inequality, a polynomial-time approximation algorithm with a constant approximation ratio does not exist unless $P = NP$.

35.2.1 The traveling-salesman problem with the triangle inequality

Applying the methodology of the previous section, we shall first compute a structure—a minimum spanning tree—whose weight gives a lower bound on the length of an optimal traveling-salesman tour. We shall then use the minimum spanning tree to create a tour whose cost is no more than twice that of the minimum spanning tree's weight, as long as the cost function satisfies the triangle inequality. The following algorithm implements this approach, calling the minimum-spanning-tree algorithm MST-PRIM from Section 23.2 as a subroutine. The parameter G is a complete undirected graph, and the cost function c satisfies the triangle inequality.

APPROX-TSP-TOUR(G, c)

- 1 select a vertex $r \in G.V$ to be a “root” vertex
- 2 compute a minimum spanning tree T for G from root r
using MST-PRIM(G, c, r)
- 3 let H be a list of vertices, ordered according to when they are first visited
in a preorder tree walk of T
- 4 **return** the hamiltonian cycle H




Figure 35.2 The operation of APPROX-TSP-TOUR. (a) A complete undirected graph. Vertices lie on intersections of integer grid lines. For example, f is one unit to the right and two units up from h . The cost function between two points is the ordinary euclidean distance. (b) A minimum spanning tree T of the complete graph, as computed by MST-PRIM. Vertex a is the root vertex. Only edges in the minimum spanning tree are shown. The vertices happen to be labeled in such a way that they are added to the main tree by MST-PRIM in alphabetical order. (c) A walk of T , starting at a . A full walk of the tree visits the vertices in the order $a, b, c, b, h, b, a, d, e, f, e, g, e, d, a$. A preorder walk of T lists a vertex just when it is first encountered, as indicated by the dot next to each vertex, yielding the ordering a, b, c, h, d, e, f, g . (d) A tour obtained by visiting the vertices in the order given by the preorder walk, which is the tour H returned by APPROX-TSP-TOUR. Its total cost is approximately 19.074. (e) An optimal tour H^* for the original complete graph. Its total cost is approximately 14.715.

Recall from Section 12.1 that a preorder tree walk recursively visits every vertex in the tree, listing a vertex when it is first encountered, before visiting any of its children.

Figure 35.2 illustrates the operation of APPROX-TSP-TOUR. Part (a) of the figure shows a complete undirected graph, and part (b) shows the minimum spanning tree T grown from root vertex a by MST-PRIM. Part (c) shows how a preorder walk of T visits the vertices, and part (d) displays the corresponding tour, which is the tour returned by APPROX-TSP-TOUR. Part (e) displays an optimal tour, which is about 23% shorter.

By Exercise 23.2-2, even with a simple implementation of MST-PRIM, the running time of APPROX-TSP-TOUR is $\Theta(V^2)$. We now show that if the cost function for an instance of the traveling-salesman problem satisfies the triangle inequality, then APPROX-TSP-TOUR returns a tour whose cost is not more than twice the cost of an optimal tour.

Theorem 35.2

APPROX-TSP-TOUR is a polynomial-time 2-approximation algorithm for the traveling-salesman problem with the triangle inequality.

Proof We have already seen that APPROX-TSP-TOUR runs in polynomial time.

Let H^* denote an optimal tour for the given set of vertices. We obtain a spanning tree by deleting any edge from a tour, and each edge cost is nonnegative. Therefore, the weight of the minimum spanning tree T computed in line 2 of APPROX-TSP-TOUR provides a lower bound on the cost of an optimal tour:

$$c(T) \leq c(H^*) . \quad (35.4)$$

A **full walk** of T lists the vertices when they are first visited and also whenever they are returned to after a visit to a subtree. Let us call this full walk W . The full walk of our example gives the order

$a, b, c, b, h, b, a, d, e, f, e, g, e, d, a$.

Since the full walk traverses every edge of T exactly twice, we have (extending our definition of the cost c in the natural manner to handle multisets of edges)

$$c(W) = 2c(T) . \quad (35.5)$$

Inequality (35.4) and equation (35.5) imply that

$$c(W) \leq 2c(H^*) , \quad (35.6)$$

and so the cost of W is within a factor of 2 of the cost of an optimal tour.

Unfortunately, the full walk W is generally not a tour, since it visits some vertices more than once. By the triangle inequality, however, we can delete a visit to any vertex from W and the cost does not increase. (If we delete a vertex v from W between visits to u and w , the resulting ordering specifies going directly from u to w .) By repeatedly applying this operation, we can remove from W all but the first visit to each vertex. In our example, this leaves the ordering

a, b, c, h, d, e, f, g .

This ordering is the same as that obtained by a preorder walk of the tree T . Let H be the cycle corresponding to this preorder walk. It is a hamiltonian cycle, since ev-

ery vertex is visited exactly once, and in fact it is the cycle computed by APPROX-TSP-TOUR. Since H is obtained by deleting vertices from the full walk W , we have

$$c(H) \leq c(W) . \quad (35.7)$$

Combining inequalities (35.6) and (35.7) gives $c(H) \leq 2c(H^*)$, which completes the proof. ■

In spite of the nice approximation ratio provided by Theorem 35.2, APPROX-TSP-TOUR is usually not the best practical choice for this problem. There are other approximation algorithms that typically perform much better in practice. (See the references at the end of this chapter.)

35.2.2 The general traveling-salesman problem

If we drop the assumption that the cost function c satisfies the triangle inequality, then we cannot find good approximate tours in polynomial time unless $P = NP$.

Theorem 35.3

If $P \neq NP$, then for any constant $\rho \geq 1$, there is no polynomial-time approximation algorithm with approximation ratio ρ for the general traveling-salesman problem.

Proof The proof is by contradiction. Suppose to the contrary that for some number $\rho \geq 1$, there is a polynomial-time approximation algorithm A with approximation ratio ρ . Without loss of generality, we assume that ρ is an integer, by rounding it up if necessary. We shall then show how to use A to solve instances of the hamiltonian-cycle problem (defined in Section 34.2) in polynomial time. Since Theorem 34.13 tells us that the hamiltonian-cycle problem is NP-complete, Theorem 34.4 implies that if we can solve it in polynomial time, then $P = NP$.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an instance of the hamiltonian-cycle problem. We wish to determine efficiently whether G contains a hamiltonian cycle by making use of the hypothesized approximation algorithm A . We turn G into an instance of the traveling-salesman problem as follows. Let $G' = (V, E')$ be the complete graph on V ; that is,

$$E' = \{(u, v) : u, v \in V \text{ and } u \neq v\} .$$

Assign an integer cost to each edge in E' as follows:

$$c(u, v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (u, v) \in E , \\ \rho |V| + 1 & \text{otherwise .} \end{cases}$$

We can create representations of G' and c from a representation of G in time polynomial in $|V|$ and $|E|$.

Now, consider the traveling-salesman problem (G', c) . If the original graph G has a hamiltonian cycle H , then the cost function c assigns to each edge of H a cost of 1, and so (G', c) contains a tour of cost $|V|$. On the other hand, if G does not contain a hamiltonian cycle, then any tour of G' must use some edge not in E . But any tour that uses an edge not in E has a cost of at least

$$\begin{aligned}(\rho |V| + 1) + (|V| - 1) &= \rho |V| + |V| \\ &> \rho |V|.\end{aligned}$$

Because edges not in G are so costly, there is a gap of at least $\rho |V|$ between the cost of a tour that is a hamiltonian cycle in G (cost $|V|$) and the cost of any other tour (cost at least $\rho |V| + |V|$). Therefore, the cost of a tour that is not a hamiltonian cycle in G is at least a factor of $\rho + 1$ greater than the cost of a tour that is a hamiltonian cycle in G .

Now, suppose that we apply the approximation algorithm A to the traveling-salesman problem (G', c) . Because A is guaranteed to return a tour of cost no more than ρ times the cost of an optimal tour, if G contains a hamiltonian cycle, then A must return it. If G has no hamiltonian cycle, then A returns a tour of cost more than $\rho |V|$. Therefore, we can use A to solve the hamiltonian-cycle problem in polynomial time. ■

The proof of Theorem 35.3 serves as an example of a general technique for proving that we cannot approximate a problem very well. Suppose that given an NP-hard problem X , we can produce in polynomial time a minimization problem Y such that “yes” instances of X correspond to instances of Y with value at most k (for some k), but that “no” instances of X correspond to instances of Y with value greater than ρk . Then, we have shown that, unless $P = NP$, there is no polynomial-time ρ -approximation algorithm for problem Y .

Exercises

35.2-1

Suppose that a complete undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with at least 3 vertices has a cost function c that satisfies the triangle inequality. Prove that $c(u, v) \geq 0$ for all $u, v \in V$.

35.2-2

Show how in polynomial time we can transform one instance of the traveling-salesman problem into another instance whose cost function satisfies the triangle inequality. The two instances must have the same set of optimal tours. Explain why such a polynomial-time transformation does not contradict Theorem 35.3, assuming that $P \neq NP$.

35.2-3

Consider the following *closest-point heuristic* for building an approximate traveling-salesman tour whose cost function satisfies the triangle inequality. Begin with a trivial cycle consisting of a single arbitrarily chosen vertex. At each step, identify the vertex u that is not on the cycle but whose distance to any vertex on the cycle is minimum. Suppose that the vertex on the cycle that is nearest u is vertex v . Extend the cycle to include u by inserting u just after v . Repeat until all vertices are on the cycle. Prove that this heuristic returns a tour whose total cost is not more than twice the cost of an optimal tour.

35.2-4

In the *bottleneck traveling-salesman problem*, we wish to find the hamiltonian cycle that minimizes the cost of the most costly edge in the cycle. Assuming that the cost function satisfies the triangle inequality, show that there exists a polynomial-time approximation algorithm with approximation ratio 3 for this problem. (*Hint:* Show recursively that we can visit all the nodes in a bottleneck spanning tree, as discussed in Problem 23-3, exactly once by taking a full walk of the tree and skipping nodes, but without skipping more than two consecutive intermediate nodes. Show that the costliest edge in a bottleneck spanning tree has a cost that is at most the cost of the costliest edge in a bottleneck hamiltonian cycle.)

35.2-5

Suppose that the vertices for an instance of the traveling-salesman problem are points in the plane and that the cost $c(u, v)$ is the euclidean distance between points u and v . Show that an optimal tour never crosses itself.

35.3 The set-covering problem

The set-covering problem is an optimization problem that models many problems that require resources to be allocated. Its corresponding decision problem generalizes the NP-complete vertex-cover problem and is therefore also NP-hard. The approximation algorithm developed to handle the vertex-cover problem doesn't apply here, however, and so we need to try other approaches. We shall examine a simple greedy heuristic with a logarithmic approximation ratio. That is, as the size of the instance gets larger, the size of the approximate solution may grow, relative to the size of an optimal solution. Because the logarithm function grows rather slowly, however, this approximation algorithm may nonetheless give useful results.




Figure 35.3 An instance (X, \mathcal{F}) of the set-covering problem, where X consists of the 12 black points and $\mathcal{F} = \{S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5, S_6\}$. A minimum-size set cover is $\mathcal{C} = \{S_3, S_4, S_5\}$, with size 3. The greedy algorithm produces a cover of size 4 by selecting either the sets S_1, S_4, S_5 , and S_3 or the sets S_1, S_4, S_5 , and S_6 , in order.

An instance (X, \mathcal{F}) of the **set-covering problem** consists of a finite set X and a family \mathcal{F} of subsets of X , such that every element of X belongs to at least one subset in \mathcal{F} :

$$X = \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{F}} S.$$

We say that a subset $S \in \mathcal{F}$ **covers** its elements. The problem is to find a minimum-size subset $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ whose members cover all of X :

$$X = \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{C}} S. \quad (35.8)$$

We say that any \mathcal{C} satisfying equation (35.8) **covers** X . Figure 35.3 illustrates the set-covering problem. The size of \mathcal{C} is the number of sets it contains, rather than the number of individual elements in these sets, since every subset \mathcal{C} that covers X must contain all $|X|$ individual elements. In Figure 35.3, the minimum set cover has size 3.

The set-covering problem abstracts many commonly arising combinatorial problems. As a simple example, suppose that X represents a set of skills that are needed to solve a problem and that we have a given set of people available to work on the problem. We wish to form a committee, containing as few people as possible, such that for every requisite skill in X , at least one member of the committee has that skill. In the decision version of the set-covering problem, we ask whether a covering exists with size at most k , where k is an additional parameter specified in the problem instance. The decision version of the problem is NP-complete, as Exercise 35.3-2 asks you to show.

A greedy approximation algorithm

The greedy method works by picking, at each stage, the set S that covers the greatest number of remaining elements that are uncovered.

GREEDY-SET-COVER(X, \mathcal{F})

```

1   $U = X$ 
2   $\mathcal{C} = \emptyset$ 
3  while  $U \neq \emptyset$ 
4      select an  $S \in \mathcal{F}$  that maximizes  $|S \cap U|$ 
5       $U = U - S$ 
6       $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C} \cup \{S\}$ 
7  return  $\mathcal{C}$ 
```

In the example of Figure 35.3, GREEDY-SET-COVER adds to \mathcal{C} , in order, the sets S_1 , S_4 , and S_5 , followed by either S_3 or S_6 .

The algorithm works as follows. The set U contains, at each stage, the set of remaining uncovered elements. The set \mathcal{C} contains the cover being constructed. Line 4 is the greedy decision-making step, choosing a subset S that covers as many uncovered elements as possible (breaking ties arbitrarily). After S is selected, line 5 removes its elements from U , and line 6 places S into \mathcal{C} . When the algorithm terminates, the set \mathcal{C} contains a subfamily of \mathcal{F} that covers X .

We can easily implement GREEDY-SET-COVER to run in time polynomial in $|X|$ and $|\mathcal{F}|$. Since the number of iterations of the loop on lines 3–6 is bounded from above by $\min(|X|, |\mathcal{F}|)$, and we can implement the loop body to run in time $O(|X| |\mathcal{F}|)$, a simple implementation runs in time $O(|X| |\mathcal{F}| \min(|X|, |\mathcal{F}|))$. Exercise 35.3-3 asks for a linear-time algorithm.

Analysis

We now show that the greedy algorithm returns a set cover that is not too much larger than an optimal set cover. For convenience, in this chapter we denote the d th harmonic number $H_d = \sum_{i=1}^d 1/i$ (see Section A.1) by $H(d)$. As a boundary condition, we define $H(0) = 0$.

Theorem 35.4

GREEDY-SET-COVER is a polynomial-time $\rho(n)$ -approximation algorithm, where

$$\rho(n) = H(\max \{|S| : S \in \mathcal{F}\}) .$$

Proof We have already shown that GREEDY-SET-COVER runs in polynomial time.

$$c_x = \frac{1}{|S_i - (S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_{i-1})|}.$$
$$|\mathcal{C}| = \sum_{x \in X} c_x . \quad (35.9)$$
$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{C}^*} \sum_{x \in S} c_x \geq \sum_{x \in X} c_x. \quad (35.10)$$
$$|\mathcal{C}| \leq \sum_{S \in \mathcal{C}^*} \sum_{x \in S} c_x. \quad (35.11)$$
$$\sum_{x \in S} c_x \leq H(|S|) . \quad (35.12)$$
$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{C}| &\leq \sum_{S \in \mathcal{C}^*} H(|S|) \\ &\leq |\mathcal{C}^*| \cdot H(\max \{|S| : S \in \mathcal{F}\}), \end{aligned}$$

All that remains is to prove inequality (35.12). Consider any set $S \in \mathcal{F}$ and any $i = 1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{C}|$, and let

be the number of elements in S that remain uncovered after the algorithm has selected sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_i . We define $u_0 = |S|$ to be the number of elements

of S , which are all initially uncovered. Let k be the least index such that $u_k = 0$, so that every element in S is covered by at least one of the sets S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k and some element in S is uncovered by $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_{k-1}$. Then, $u_{i-1} \geq u_i$, and $u_{i-1} - u_i$ elements of S are covered for the first time by S_i , for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Thus,

$$\sum_{x \in S} c_x = \sum_{i=1}^k (u_{i-1} - u_i) \cdot \frac{1}{|S_i - (S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_{i-1})|}.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |S_i - (S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_{i-1})| &\geq |S - (S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_{i-1})| \\ &= u_{i-1}, \end{aligned}$$

because the greedy choice of S_i guarantees that S cannot cover more new elements than S_i does (otherwise, the algorithm would have chosen S instead of S_i). Consequently, we obtain

$$\sum_{x \in S} c_x \leq \sum_{i=1}^k (u_{i-1} - u_i) \cdot \frac{1}{u_{i-1}}.$$

We now bound this quantity as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in S} c_x &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k (u_{i-1} - u_i) \cdot \frac{1}{u_{i-1}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=u_i+1}^{u_{i-1}} \frac{1}{u_{i-1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=u_i+1}^{u_{i-1}} \frac{1}{j} && \text{(because } j \leq u_{i-1} \text{)} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\sum_{j=1}^{u_{i-1}} \frac{1}{j} - \sum_{j=1}^{u_i} \frac{1}{j} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^k (H(u_{i-1}) - H(u_i)) \\ &= H(u_0) - H(u_k) && \text{(because the sum telescopes)} \\ &= H(u_0) - H(0) \\ &= H(u_0) && \text{(because } H(0) = 0 \text{)} \\ &= H(|S|), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of inequality (35.12). ■

Corollary 35.5

GREEDY-SET-COVER is a polynomial-time $(\ln |X| + 1)$ -approximation algorithm.

Proof Use inequality (A.14) and Theorem 35.4. ■

In some applications, $\max \{|S| : S \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is a small constant, and so the solution returned by GREEDY-SET-COVER is at most a small constant times larger than optimal. One such application occurs when this heuristic finds an approximate vertex cover for a graph whose vertices have degree at most 3. In this case, the solution found by GREEDY-SET-COVER is not more than $H(3) = 11/6$ times as large as an optimal solution, a performance guarantee that is slightly better than that of APPROX-VERTEX-COVER.

Exercises**35.3-1**

Consider each of the following words as a set of letters: {arid, dash, drain, heard, lost, nose, shun, slate, snare, thread}. Show which set cover GREEDY-SET-COVER produces when we break ties in favor of the word that appears first in the dictionary.

35.3-2

Show that the decision version of the set-covering problem is NP-complete by reducing it from the vertex-cover problem.

35.3-3

Show how to implement GREEDY-SET-COVER in such a way that it runs in time $O\left(\sum_{S \in \mathcal{F}} |S|\right)$.

35.3-4

Show that the following weaker form of Theorem 35.4 is trivially true:

$$|\mathcal{C}| \leq |\mathcal{C}^*| \max \{|S| : S \in \mathcal{F}\} .$$

35.3-5

GREEDY-SET-COVER can return a number of different solutions, depending on how we break ties in line 4. Give a procedure BAD-SET-COVER-INSTANCE(n) that returns an n -element instance of the set-covering problem for which, depending on how we break ties in line 4, GREEDY-SET-COVER can return a number of different solutions that is exponential in n .

35.4 Randomization and linear programming

In this section, we study two useful techniques for designing approximation algorithms: randomization and linear programming. We shall give a simple randomized algorithm for an optimization version of 3-CNF satisfiability, and then we shall use linear programming to help design an approximation algorithm for a weighted version of the vertex-cover problem. This section only scratches the surface of these two powerful techniques. The chapter notes give references for further study of these areas.

A randomized approximation algorithm for MAX-3-CNF satisfiability

Just as some randomized algorithms compute exact solutions, some randomized algorithms compute approximate solutions. We say that a randomized algorithm for a problem has an **approximation ratio** of $\rho(n)$ if, for any input of size n , the *expected* cost C of the solution produced by the randomized algorithm is within a factor of $\rho(n)$ of the cost C^* of an optimal solution:

$$\max \left(\frac{C}{C^*}, \frac{C^*}{C} \right) \leq \rho(n). \quad (35.13)$$

We call a randomized algorithm that achieves an approximation ratio of $\rho(n)$ a **randomized $\rho(n)$ -approximation algorithm**. In other words, a randomized approximation algorithm is like a deterministic approximation algorithm, except that the approximation ratio is for an expected cost.

A particular instance of 3-CNF satisfiability, as defined in Section 34.4, may or may not be satisfiable. In order to be satisfiable, there must exist an assignment of the variables so that every clause evaluates to 1. If an instance is not satisfiable, we may want to compute how “close” to satisfiable it is, that is, we may wish to find an assignment of the variables that satisfies as many clauses as possible. We call the resulting maximization problem **MAX-3-CNF satisfiability**. The input to MAX-3-CNF satisfiability is the same as for 3-CNF satisfiability, and the goal is to return an assignment of the variables that maximizes the number of clauses evaluating to 1. We now show that randomly setting each variable to 1 with probability $1/2$ and to 0 with probability $1/2$ yields a randomized $8/7$ -approximation algorithm. According to the definition of 3-CNF satisfiability from Section 34.4, we require each clause to consist of exactly three distinct literals. We further assume that no clause contains both a variable and its negation. (Exercise 35.4-1 asks you to remove this last assumption.)

Given an instance of MAX-3-CNF satisfiability with n variables x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n and m clauses, the randomized algorithm that independently sets each variable to 1 with probability $1/2$ and to 0 with probability $1/2$ is a randomized $8/7$ -approximation algorithm.

$$Y_i = \mathbf{I} \{\text{clause } i \text{ is satisfied}\} \text{ ,}$$

so that $Y_i = 1$ as long as we have set at least one of the literals in the i th clause to 1. Since no literal appears more than once in the same clause, and since we have assumed that no variable and its negation appear in the same clause, the settings of the three literals in each clause are independent. A clause is not satisfied only if all three of its literals are set to 0, and so $\Pr\{\text{clause } i \text{ is not satisfied}\} = (1/2)^3 = 1/8$. Thus, we have $\Pr\{\text{clause } i \text{ is satisfied}\} = 1 - 1/8 = 7/8$, and by Lemma 5.1, we have $E[Y_i] = 7/8$. Let Y be the number of satisfied clauses overall, so that $Y = Y_1 + Y_2 + \cdots + Y_m$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Y] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^m Y_i\right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}[Y_i] \quad (\text{by linearity of expectation}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m 7/8 \\ &= 7m/8. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, m is an upper bound on the number of satisfied clauses, and hence the approximation ratio is at most $m/(7m/8) = 8/7$. ■

In the **minimum-weight vertex-cover problem**, we are given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ in which each vertex $v \in V$ has an associated positive weight $w(v)$. For any vertex cover $V' \subseteq V$, we define the weight of the vertex cover $w(V') = \sum_{v \in V'} w(v)$. The goal is to find a vertex cover of minimum weight.

We cannot apply the algorithm used for unweighted vertex cover, nor can we use a random solution; both methods may return solutions that are far from optimal. We shall, however, compute a lower bound on the weight of the minimum-weight

vertex cover, by using a linear program. We shall then “round” this solution and use it to obtain a vertex cover.

Suppose that we associate a variable $x(v)$ with each vertex $v \in V$, and let us require that $x(v)$ equals either 0 or 1 for each $v \in V$. We put v into the vertex cover if and only if $x(v) = 1$. Then, we can write the constraint that for any edge (u, v) , at least one of u and v must be in the vertex cover as $x(u) + x(v) \geq 1$. This view gives rise to the following **0-1 integer program** for finding a minimum-weight vertex cover:

$$\text{minimize} \quad \sum_{v \in V} w(v) x(v) \quad (35.14)$$

subject to

$$x(u) + x(v) \geq 1 \quad \text{for each } (u, v) \in E \quad (35.15)$$

$$x(v) \in \{0, 1\} \quad \text{for each } v \in V. \quad (35.16)$$

In the special case in which all the weights $w(v)$ are equal to 1, this formulation is the optimization version of the NP-hard vertex-cover problem. Suppose, however, that we remove the constraint that $x(v) \in \{0, 1\}$ and replace it by $0 \leq x(v) \leq 1$. We then obtain the following linear program, which is known as the **linear-programming relaxation**:

$$\text{minimize} \quad \sum_{v \in V} w(v) x(v) \quad (35.17)$$

subject to

$$x(u) + x(v) \geq 1 \quad \text{for each } (u, v) \in E \quad (35.18)$$

$$x(v) \leq 1 \quad \text{for each } v \in V \quad (35.19)$$

$$x(v) \geq 0 \quad \text{for each } v \in V. \quad (35.20)$$

Any feasible solution to the 0-1 integer program in lines (35.14)–(35.16) is also a feasible solution to the linear program in lines (35.17)–(35.20). Therefore, the value of an optimal solution to the linear program gives a lower bound on the value of an optimal solution to the 0-1 integer program, and hence a lower bound on the optimal weight in the minimum-weight vertex-cover problem.

The following procedure uses the solution to the linear-programming relaxation to construct an approximate solution to the minimum-weight vertex-cover problem:

```

1   $C = \emptyset$ 
2  compute  $\bar{x}$ , an optimal solution to the linear program in lines (35.17)–(35.20)
3  for each  $v \in V$ 
4      if  $\bar{x}(v) \geq 1/2$ 
5           $C = C \cup \{v\}$ 
6  return  $C$ 

```

Theorem 35.7

Proof Because there is a polynomial-time algorithm to solve the linear program in line 2, and because the **for** loop of lines 3–5 runs in polynomial time, APPROX-MIN-WEIGHT-VC is a polynomial-time algorithm.

$$z^* \leq w(C^*) . \quad (35.21)$$

Now, we consider the weight of the cover. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
z^* &= \sum_{v \in V} w(v) \bar{x}(v) \\
&\geq \sum_{v \in V: \bar{x}(v) \geq 1/2} w(v) \bar{x}(v) \\
&\geq \sum_{v \in V: \bar{x}(v) \geq 1/2} w(v) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \\
&= \sum_{v \in C} w(v) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in C} w(v) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} w(C) .
\end{aligned} \tag{35.22}$$

Combining inequalities (35.21) and (35.22) gives

$$w(C) \leq 2z^* \leq 2w(C^*) ,$$

and hence APPROX-MIN-WEIGHT-VC is a 2-approximation algorithm. ■

Exercises

35.4-1

Show that even if we allow a clause to contain both a variable and its negation, randomly setting each variable to 1 with probability $1/2$ and to 0 with probability $1/2$ still yields a randomized $8/7$ -approximation algorithm.

35.4-2

The **MAX-CNF satisfiability problem** is like the MAX-3-CNF satisfiability problem, except that it does not restrict each clause to have exactly 3 literals. Give a randomized 2-approximation algorithm for the MAX-CNF satisfiability problem.

35.4-3

In the MAX-CUT problem, we are given an unweighted undirected graph $G = (V, E)$. We define a cut $(S, V - S)$ as in Chapter 23 and the **weight** of a cut as the number of edges crossing the cut. The goal is to find a cut of maximum weight. Suppose that for each vertex v , we randomly and independently place v in S with probability $1/2$ and in $V - S$ with probability $1/2$. Show that this algorithm is a randomized 2-approximation algorithm.

35.4-4

Show that the constraints in line (35.19) are redundant in the sense that if we remove them from the linear program in lines (35.17)–(35.20), any optimal solution to the resulting linear program must satisfy $x(v) \leq 1$ for each $v \in V$.

35.5 The subset-sum problem

Recall from Section 34.5.5 that an instance of the subset-sum problem is a pair (S, t) , where S is a set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ of positive integers and t is a positive integer. This decision problem asks whether there exists a subset of S that adds up exactly to the target value t . As we saw in Section 34.5.5, this problem is NP-complete.

The optimization problem associated with this decision problem arises in practical applications. In the optimization problem, we wish to find a subset of $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ whose sum is as large as possible but not larger than t . For example, we may have a truck that can carry no more than t pounds, and n different boxes to ship, the i th of which weighs x_i pounds. We wish to fill the truck with as heavy a load as possible without exceeding the given weight limit.

In this section, we present an exponential-time algorithm that computes the optimal value for this optimization problem, and then we show how to modify the algorithm so that it becomes a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme. (Recall that a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme has a running time that is polynomial in $1/\epsilon$ as well as in the size of the input.)

An exponential-time exact algorithm

Suppose that we computed, for each subset S' of S , the sum of the elements in S' , and then we selected, among the subsets whose sum does not exceed t , the one whose sum was closest to t . Clearly this algorithm would return the optimal solution, but it could take exponential time. To implement this algorithm, we could use an iterative procedure that, in iteration i , computes the sums of all subsets of $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i\}$, using as a starting point the sums of all subsets of $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1}\}$. In doing so, we would realize that once a particular subset S' had a sum exceeding t , there would be no reason to maintain it, since no superset of S' could be the optimal solution. We now give an implementation of this strategy.

The procedure EXACT-SUBSET-SUM takes an input set $S = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ and a target value t ; we'll see its pseudocode in a moment. This procedure it-

eratively computes L_i , the list of sums of all subsets of $\{x_1, \dots, x_i\}$ that do not exceed t , and then it returns the maximum value in L_n .

If L is a list of positive integers and x is another positive integer, then we let $L + x$ denote the list of integers derived from L by increasing each element of L by x . For example, if $L = \langle 1, 2, 3, 5, 9 \rangle$, then $L + 2 = \langle 3, 4, 5, 7, 11 \rangle$. We also use this notation for sets, so that

$$S + x = \{s + x : s \in S\}.$$

We also use an auxiliary procedure $\text{MERGE-LISTS}(L, L')$, which returns the sorted list that is the merge of its two sorted input lists L and L' with duplicate values removed. Like the MERGE procedure we used in merge sort (Section 2.3.1), MERGE-LISTS runs in time $O(|L| + |L'|)$. We omit the pseudocode for MERGE-LISTS .

EXACT-SUBSET-SUM(S, t)

```

1   $n = |S|$ 
2   $L_0 = \langle 0 \rangle$ 
3  for  $i = 1$  to  $n$ 
4       $L_i = \text{MERGE-LISTS}(L_{i-1}, L_{i-1} + x_i)$ 
5      remove from  $L_i$  every element that is greater than  $t$ 
6  return the largest element in  $L_n$ 
```

To see how **EXACT-SUBSET-SUM** works, let P_i denote the set of all values obtained by selecting a (possibly empty) subset of $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i\}$ and summing its members. For example, if $S = \{1, 4, 5\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \{0, 1\}, \\ P_2 &= \{0, 1, 4, 5\}, \\ P_3 &= \{0, 1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given the identity

$$P_i = P_{i-1} \cup (P_{i-1} + x_i), \quad (35.23)$$

we can prove by induction on i (see Exercise 35.5-1) that the list L_i is a sorted list containing every element of P_i whose value is not more than t . Since the length of L_i can be as much as 2^i , **EXACT-SUBSET-SUM** is an exponential-time algorithm in general, although it is a polynomial-time algorithm in the special cases in which t is polynomial in $|S|$ or all the numbers in S are bounded by a polynomial in $|S|$.

A fully polynomial-time approximation scheme

We can derive a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme for the subset-sum problem by “trimming” each list L_i after it is created. The idea behind trimming is

that if two values in L are close to each other, then since we want just an approximate solution, we do not need to maintain both of them explicitly. More precisely, we use a trimming parameter δ such that $0 < \delta < 1$. When we *trim* a list L by δ , we remove as many elements from L as possible, in such a way that if L' is the result of trimming L , then for every element y that was removed from L , there is an element z still in L' that approximates y , that is,

$$\frac{y}{1 + \delta} \leq z \leq y. \quad (35.24)$$

We can think of such a z as “representing” y in the new list L' . Each removed element y is represented by a remaining element z satisfying inequality (35.24). For example, if $\delta = 0.1$ and

$$L = \langle 10, 11, 12, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 29 \rangle,$$

then we can trim L to obtain

$$L' = \langle 10, 12, 15, 20, 23, 29 \rangle,$$

where the deleted value 11 is represented by 10, the deleted values 21 and 22 are represented by 20, and the deleted value 24 is represented by 23. Because every element of the trimmed version of the list is also an element of the original version of the list, trimming can dramatically decrease the number of elements kept while keeping a close (and slightly smaller) representative value in the list for each deleted element.

The following procedure trims list $L = \langle y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m \rangle$ in time $\Theta(m)$, given L and δ , and assuming that L is sorted into monotonically increasing order. The output of the procedure is a trimmed, sorted list.

TRIM(L, δ)

```

1  let  $m$  be the length of  $L$ 
2   $L' = \langle y_1 \rangle$ 
3   $last = y_1$ 
4  for  $i = 2$  to  $m$ 
5      if  $y_i > last \cdot (1 + \delta)$       //  $y_i \geq last$  because  $L$  is sorted
6          append  $y_i$  onto the end of  $L'$ 
7           $last = y_i$ 
8  return  $L'$ 
```

The procedure scans the elements of L in monotonically increasing order. A number is appended onto the returned list L' only if it is the first element of L or if it cannot be represented by the most recent number placed into L' .

Given the procedure TRIM, we can construct our approximation scheme as follows. This procedure takes as input a set $S = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ of n integers (in arbitrary order), a target integer t , and an “approximation parameter” ϵ , where

$$0 < \epsilon < 1. \quad (35.25)$$

It returns a value z whose value is within a $1 + \epsilon$ factor of the optimal solution.

APPROX-SUBSET-SUM(S, t, ϵ)

```

1   $n = |S|$ 
2   $L_0 = \langle 0 \rangle$ 
3  for  $i = 1$  to  $n$ 
4       $L_i = \text{MERGE-LISTS}(L_{i-1}, L_{i-1} + x_i)$ 
5       $L_i = \text{TRIM}(L_i, \epsilon/2n)$ 
6      remove from  $L_i$  every element that is greater than  $t$ 
7  let  $z^*$  be the largest value in  $L_n$ 
8  return  $z^*$ 
```

Line 2 initializes the list L_0 to be the list containing just the element 0. The **for** loop in lines 3–6 computes L_i as a sorted list containing a suitably trimmed version of the set P_i , with all elements larger than t removed. Since we create L_i from L_{i-1} , we must ensure that the repeated trimming doesn't introduce too much compounded inaccuracy. In a moment, we shall see that APPROX-SUBSET-SUM returns a correct approximation if one exists.

As an example, suppose we have the instance

$S = \langle 104, 102, 201, 101 \rangle$

with $t = 308$ and $\epsilon = 0.40$. The trimming parameter δ is $\epsilon/8 = 0.05$. APPROX-SUBSET-SUM computes the following values on the indicated lines:

```

line 2:   $L_0 = \langle 0 \rangle$  ,
line 4:   $L_1 = \langle 0, 104 \rangle$  ,
line 5:   $L_1 = \langle 0, 104 \rangle$  ,
line 6:   $L_1 = \langle 0, 104 \rangle$  ,

line 4:   $L_2 = \langle 0, 102, 104, 206 \rangle$  ,
line 5:   $L_2 = \langle 0, 102, 206 \rangle$  ,
line 6:   $L_2 = \langle 0, 102, 206 \rangle$  ,

line 4:   $L_3 = \langle 0, 102, 201, 206, 303, 407 \rangle$  ,
line 5:   $L_3 = \langle 0, 102, 201, 303, 407 \rangle$  ,
line 6:   $L_3 = \langle 0, 102, 201, 303 \rangle$  ,

line 4:   $L_4 = \langle 0, 101, 102, 201, 203, 302, 303, 404 \rangle$  ,
line 5:   $L_4 = \langle 0, 101, 201, 302, 404 \rangle$  ,
line 6:   $L_4 = \langle 0, 101, 201, 302 \rangle$  .
```

The algorithm returns $z^* = 302$ as its answer, which is well within $\epsilon = 40\%$ of the optimal answer $307 = 104 + 102 + 101$; in fact, it is within 2%.

Theorem 35.8

APPROX-SUBSET-SUM is a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme for the subset-sum problem.

Proof The operations of trimming L_i in line 5 and removing from L_i every element that is greater than t maintain the property that every element of L_i is also a member of P_i . Therefore, the value z^* returned in line 8 is indeed the sum of some subset of S . Let $y^* \in P_n$ denote an optimal solution to the subset-sum problem. Then, from line 6, we know that $z^* \leq y^*$. By inequality (35.1), we need to show that $y^*/z^* \leq 1 + \epsilon$. We must also show that the running time of this algorithm is polynomial in both $1/\epsilon$ and the size of the input.

As Exercise 35.5-2 asks you to show, for every element y in P_i that is at most t , there exists an element $z \in L_i$ such that

$$\frac{y}{(1 + \epsilon/2n)^i} \leq z \leq y. \quad (35.26)$$

Inequality (35.26) must hold for $y^* \in P_n$, and therefore there exists an element $z \in L_n$ such that

$$\frac{y^*}{(1 + \epsilon/2n)^n} \leq z \leq y^*,$$

and thus

$$\frac{y^*}{z} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2n}\right)^n. \quad (35.27)$$

Since there exists an element $z \in L_n$ fulfilling inequality (35.27), the inequality must hold for z^* , which is the largest value in L_n ; that is,

$$\frac{y^*}{z^*} \leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2n}\right)^n. \quad (35.28)$$

Now, we show that $y^*/z^* \leq 1 + \epsilon$. We do so by showing that $(1 + \epsilon/2n)^n \leq 1 + \epsilon$. By equation (3.14), we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1 + \epsilon/2n)^n = e^{\epsilon/2}$. Exercise 35.5-3 asks you to show that

$$\frac{d}{dn} \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2n}\right)^n > 0. \quad (35.29)$$

Therefore, the function $(1 + \epsilon/2n)^n$ increases with n as it approaches its limit of $e^{\epsilon/2}$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{2n}\right)^n &\leq e^{\epsilon/2} \\
&\leq 1 + \epsilon/2 + (\epsilon/2)^2 \quad (\text{by inequality (3.13)}) \\
&\leq 1 + \epsilon \quad (\text{by inequality (35.25)}) .
\end{aligned} \tag{35.30}$$

Combining inequalities (35.28) and (35.30) completes the analysis of the approximation ratio.

To show that APPROX-SUBSET-SUM is a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme, we derive a bound on the length of L_i . After trimming, successive elements z and z' of L_i must have the relationship $z'/z > 1 + \epsilon/2n$. That is, they must differ by a factor of at least $1 + \epsilon/2n$. Each list, therefore, contains the value 0, possibly the value 1, and up to $\lfloor \log_{1+\epsilon/2n} t \rfloor$ additional values. The number of elements in each list L_i is at most

$$\begin{aligned}
\log_{1+\epsilon/2n} t + 2 &= \frac{\ln t}{\ln(1 + \epsilon/2n)} + 2 \\
&\leq \frac{2n(1 + \epsilon/2n) \ln t}{\epsilon} + 2 \quad (\text{by inequality (3.17)}) \\
&< \frac{3n \ln t}{\epsilon} + 2 \quad (\text{by inequality (35.25)}) .
\end{aligned}$$

This bound is polynomial in the size of the input—which is the number of bits $\lg t$ needed to represent t plus the number of bits needed to represent the set S , which is in turn polynomial in n —and in $1/\epsilon$. Since the running time of APPROX-SUBSET-SUM is polynomial in the lengths of the L_i , we conclude that APPROX-SUBSET-SUM is a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme. ■

Exercises

35.5-1

Prove equation (35.23). Then show that after executing line 5 of EXACT-SUBSET-SUM, L_i is a sorted list containing every element of P_i whose value is not more than t .

35.5-2

Using induction on i , prove inequality (35.26).

35.5-3

Prove inequality (35.29).

35.5-4

How would you modify the approximation scheme presented in this section to find a good approximation to the smallest value not less than t that is a sum of some subset of the given input list?

35.5-5

Modify the APPROX-SUBSET-SUM procedure to also return the subset of S that sums to the value z^* .

Problems
35-1 Bin packing

Suppose that we are given a set of n objects, where the size s_i of the i th object satisfies $0 < s_i < 1$. We wish to pack all the objects into the minimum number of unit-size bins. Each bin can hold any subset of the objects whose total size does not exceed 1.

- a.* Prove that the problem of determining the minimum number of bins required is NP-hard. (*Hint:* Reduce from the subset-sum problem.)

The *first-fit* heuristic takes each object in turn and places it into the first bin that can accommodate it. Let $S = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i$.

- b.* Argue that the optimal number of bins required is at least $\lceil S \rceil$.
- c.* Argue that the first-fit heuristic leaves at most one bin less than half full.
- d.* Prove that the number of bins used by the first-fit heuristic is never more than $\lceil 2S \rceil$.
- e.* Prove an approximation ratio of 2 for the first-fit heuristic.
- f.* Give an efficient implementation of the first-fit heuristic, and analyze its running time.

35-2 Approximating the size of a maximum clique

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph. For any $k \geq 1$, define $G^{(k)}$ to be the undirected graph $(V^{(k)}, E^{(k)})$, where $V^{(k)}$ is the set of all ordered k -tuples of vertices from V and $E^{(k)}$ is defined so that (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k) is adjacent to (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k) if and only if for $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, either vertex v_i is adjacent to w_i in G , or else $v_i = w_i$.

- a. Prove that the size of the maximum clique in $G^{(k)}$ is equal to the k th power of the size of the maximum clique in G .
- b. Argue that if there is an approximation algorithm that has a constant approximation ratio for finding a maximum-size clique, then there is a polynomial-time approximation scheme for the problem.

35-3 Weighted set-covering problem

Suppose that we generalize the set-covering problem so that each set S_i in the family \mathcal{F} has an associated weight w_i and the weight of a cover \mathcal{C} is $\sum_{S_i \in \mathcal{C}} w_i$. We wish to determine a minimum-weight cover. (Section 35.3 handles the case in which $w_i = 1$ for all i .)

Show how to generalize the greedy set-covering heuristic in a natural manner to provide an approximate solution for any instance of the weighted set-covering problem. Show that your heuristic has an approximation ratio of $H(d)$, where d is the maximum size of any set S_i .

35-4 Maximum matching

Recall that for an undirected graph G , a matching is a set of edges such that no two edges in the set are incident on the same vertex. In Section 26.3, we saw how to find a maximum matching in a bipartite graph. In this problem, we will look at matchings in undirected graphs in general (i.e., the graphs are not required to be bipartite).

- a. A **maximal matching** is a matching that is not a proper subset of any other matching. Show that a maximal matching need not be a maximum matching by exhibiting an undirected graph G and a maximal matching M in G that is not a maximum matching. (*Hint:* You can find such a graph with only four vertices.)
- b. Consider an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$. Give an $O(E)$ -time greedy algorithm to find a maximal matching in G .

In this problem, we shall concentrate on a polynomial-time approximation algorithm for maximum matching. Whereas the fastest known algorithm for maximum matching takes superlinear (but polynomial) time, the approximation algorithm here will run in linear time. You will show that the linear-time greedy algorithm for maximal matching in part (b) is a 2-approximation algorithm for maximum matching.

- c. Show that the size of a maximum matching in G is a lower bound on the size of any vertex cover for G .

d. Consider a maximal matching M in $G = (V, E)$. Let

$$T = \{v \in V : \text{some edge in } M \text{ is incident on } v\} .$$

What can you say about the subgraph of G induced by the vertices of G that are not in T ?

e. Conclude from part (d) that $2|M|$ is the size of a vertex cover for G .

f. Using parts (c) and (e), prove that the greedy algorithm in part (b) is a 2-approximation algorithm for maximum matching.

35-5 Parallel machine scheduling

In the *parallel-machine-scheduling problem*, we are given n jobs, J_1, J_2, \dots, J_n , where each job J_k has an associated nonnegative processing time of p_k . We are also given m identical machines, M_1, M_2, \dots, M_m . Any job can run on any machine. A *schedule* specifies, for each job J_k , the machine on which it runs and the time period during which it runs. Each job J_k must run on some machine M_i for p_k consecutive time units, and during that time period no other job may run on M_i . Let C_k denote the *completion time* of job J_k , that is, the time at which job J_k completes processing. Given a schedule, we define $C_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} C_j$ to be the *makespan* of the schedule. The goal is to find a schedule whose makespan is minimum.

For example, suppose that we have two machines M_1 and M_2 and that we have four jobs J_1, J_2, J_3, J_4 , with $p_1 = 2$, $p_2 = 12$, $p_3 = 4$, and $p_4 = 5$. Then one possible schedule runs, on machine M_1 , job J_1 followed by job J_2 , and on machine M_2 , it runs job J_4 followed by job J_3 . For this schedule, $C_1 = 2$, $C_2 = 14$, $C_3 = 9$, $C_4 = 5$, and $C_{\max} = 14$. An optimal schedule runs J_2 on machine M_1 , and it runs jobs J_1, J_3 , and J_4 on machine M_2 . For this schedule, $C_1 = 2$, $C_2 = 12$, $C_3 = 6$, $C_4 = 11$, and $C_{\max} = 12$.

Given a parallel-machine-scheduling problem, we let C_{\max}^* denote the makespan of an optimal schedule.

a. Show that the optimal makespan is at least as large as the greatest processing time, that is,

$$C_{\max}^* \geq \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} p_k .$$

b. Show that the optimal makespan is at least as large as the average machine load, that is,

$$C_{\max}^* \geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} p_k .$$

Suppose that we use the following greedy algorithm for parallel machine scheduling: whenever a machine is idle, schedule any job that has not yet been scheduled.

- c. Write pseudocode to implement this greedy algorithm. What is the running time of your algorithm?
- d. For the schedule returned by the greedy algorithm, show that

$$C_{\max} \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} p_k + \max_{1 \leq k \leq n} p_k.$$

Conclude that this algorithm is a polynomial-time 2-approximation algorithm.

35-6 Approximating a maximum spanning tree

Let $G = (V, E)$ be an undirected graph with distinct edge weights $w(u, v)$ on each edge $(u, v) \in E$. For each vertex $v \in V$, let $\max(v) = \operatorname{argmax}_{(u,v) \in E} \{w(u, v)\}$ be the maximum-weight edge incident on that vertex. Let $S_G = \{\max(v) : v \in V\}$ be the set of maximum-weight edges incident on each vertex, and let T_G be the maximum-weight spanning tree of G , that is, the spanning tree of maximum total weight. For any subset of edges $E' \subseteq E$, define $w(E') = \sum_{(u,v) \in E'} w(u, v)$.

- a. Give an example of a graph with at least 4 vertices for which $S_G = T_G$.
- b. Give an example of a graph with at least 4 vertices for which $S_G \neq T_G$.
- c. Prove that $S_G \subseteq T_G$ for any graph G .
- d. Prove that $w(S_G) \geq w(T_G)/2$ for any graph G .
- e. Give an $O(V + E)$ -time algorithm to compute a 2-approximation to the maximum spanning tree.

35-7 An approximation algorithm for the 0-1 knapsack problem

Recall the knapsack problem from Section 16.2. There are n items, where the i th item is worth v_i dollars and weighs w_i pounds. We are also given a knapsack that can hold at most W pounds. Here, we add the further assumptions that each weight w_i is at most W and that the items are indexed in monotonically decreasing order of their values: $v_1 \geq v_2 \geq \dots \geq v_n$.

In the 0-1 knapsack problem, we wish to find a subset of the items whose total weight is at most W and whose total value is maximum. The fractional knapsack problem is like the 0-1 knapsack problem, except that we are allowed to take a fraction of each item, rather than being restricted to taking either all or none of

each item. If we take a fraction x_i of item i , where $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$, we contribute $x_i w_i$ to the weight of the knapsack and receive value $x_i v_i$. Our goal is to develop a polynomial-time 2-approximation algorithm for the 0-1 knapsack problem.

In order to design a polynomial-time algorithm, we consider restricted instances of the 0-1 knapsack problem. Given an instance I of the knapsack problem, we form restricted instances I_j , for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, by removing items $1, 2, \dots, j-1$ and requiring the solution to include item j (all of item j in both the fractional and 0-1 knapsack problems). No items are removed in instance I_1 . For instance I_j , let P_j denote an optimal solution to the 0-1 problem and Q_j denote an optimal solution to the fractional problem.

- a. Argue that an optimal solution to instance I of the 0-1 knapsack problem is one of $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n\}$.
- b. Prove that we can find an optimal solution Q_j to the fractional problem for instance I_j by including item j and then using the greedy algorithm in which at each step, we take as much as possible of the unchosen item in the set $\{j+1, j+2, \dots, n\}$ with maximum value per pound v_i/w_i .
- c. Prove that we can always construct an optimal solution Q_j to the fractional problem for instance I_j that includes at most one item fractionally. That is, for all items except possibly one, we either include all of the item or none of the item in the knapsack.
- d. Given an optimal solution Q_j to the fractional problem for instance I_j , form solution R_j from Q_j by deleting any fractional items from Q_j . Let $v(S)$ denote the total value of items taken in a solution S . Prove that $v(R_j) \geq v(Q_j)/2 \geq v(P_j)/2$.
- e. Give a polynomial-time algorithm that returns a maximum-value solution from the set $\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n\}$, and prove that your algorithm is a polynomial-time 2-approximation algorithm for the 0-1 knapsack problem.

Chapter notes

Although methods that do not necessarily compute exact solutions have been known for thousands of years (for example, methods to approximate the value of π), the notion of an approximation algorithm is much more recent. Hochbaum [172] credits Garey, Graham, and Ullman [128] and Johnson [190] with formalizing the concept of a polynomial-time approximation algorithm. The first such algorithm is often credited to Graham [149].

Since this early work, thousands of approximation algorithms have been designed for a wide range of problems, and there is a wealth of literature on this field. Recent texts by Ausiello et al. [26], Hochbaum [172], and Vazirani [345] deal exclusively with approximation algorithms, as do surveys by Shmoys [315] and Klein and Young [207]. Several other texts, such as Garey and Johnson [129] and Papadimitriou and Steiglitz [271], have significant coverage of approximation algorithms as well. Lawler, Lenstra, Rinnooy Kan, and Shmoys [225] provide an extensive treatment of approximation algorithms for the traveling-salesman problem.

Papadimitriou and Steiglitz attribute the algorithm APPROX-VERTEX-COVER to F. Gavril and M. Yannakakis. The vertex-cover problem has been studied extensively (Hochbaum [172] lists 16 different approximation algorithms for this problem), but all the approximation ratios are at least $2 - o(1)$.

The algorithm APPROX-TSP-TOUR appears in a paper by Rosenkrantz, Stearns, and Lewis [298]. Christofides improved on this algorithm and gave a $3/2$ -approximation algorithm for the traveling-salesman problem with the triangle inequality. Arora [22] and Mitchell [257] have shown that if the points are in the euclidean plane, there is a polynomial-time approximation scheme. Theorem 35.3 is due to Sahni and Gonzalez [301].

The analysis of the greedy heuristic for the set-covering problem is modeled after the proof published by Chvátal [68] of a more general result; the basic result as presented here is due to Johnson [190] and Lovász [238].

The algorithm APPROX-SUBSET-SUM and its analysis are loosely modeled after related approximation algorithms for the knapsack and subset-sum problems by Ibarra and Kim [187].

Problem 35-7 is a combinatorial version of a more general result on approximating knapsack-type integer programs by Bienstock and McClosky [45].

The randomized algorithm for MAX-3-CNF satisfiability is implicit in the work of Johnson [190]. The weighted vertex-cover algorithm is by Hochbaum [171]. Section 35.4 only touches on the power of randomization and linear programming in the design of approximation algorithms. A combination of these two ideas yields a technique called “randomized rounding,” which formulates a problem as an integer linear program, solves the linear-programming relaxation, and interprets the variables in the solution as probabilities. These probabilities then help guide the solution of the original problem. This technique was first used by Raghavan and Thompson [290], and it has had many subsequent uses. (See Motwani, Naor, and Raghavan [261] for a survey.) Several other notable recent ideas in the field of approximation algorithms include the primal-dual method (see Goemans and Williamson [135] for a survey), finding sparse cuts for use in divide-and-conquer algorithms [229], and the use of semidefinite programming [134].

As mentioned in the chapter notes for Chapter 34, recent results in probabilistically checkable proofs have led to lower bounds on the approximability of many problems, including several in this chapter. In addition to the references there, the chapter by Arora and Lund [23] contains a good description of the relationship between probabilistically checkable proofs and the hardness of approximating various problems.

