

25 April 2018 Approximation Algorithms (Chapter 11)

Efficient algorithms for (typically NP-Hard) optimization problems that may fail to produce an optimal solution, but one can prove they produce something "close to optimal".

Optimization Problem. Problems where the goal is to maximize or minimize some function of the input instance & the output called the objective function.

E.g. MAX INDEPENDENT SET problem: output is a subset of vertices of graph with no edge between any pair, objective function is cardinality of the set.

An approximation algorithm with approximation factor α (a.k.a. α -approximation algorithm) is an algorithm that outputs a solution $ALG(x)$ to input instance x , s.t.

$$\begin{array}{l} \forall x \quad ALG(x) \leq OPT(x) \leq \alpha \cdot ALG(x) \quad [\text{maximization}] \\ \forall x \quad OPT(x) \leq ALG(x) \leq \alpha \cdot OPT(x) \quad [\text{minimization}] \end{array}$$

\nwarrow def'n of OPT \nwarrow approximation guarantee

Note $\alpha \geq 1$ for both maximization & minimization.

E.g. 2-approximation is "at least half of the opt" for maximization
"at most twice the opt" for minimization.

Examples of Greedy App Algorithms and How to Analyze

Commentary 1: Typically what makes it hard to analyze an approximation algorithm is that in the end you must prove $OPT \leq \alpha \cdot ALG$ or $ALG \leq \alpha \cdot OPT$ but **you don't know how to find OPT!!**

Trick is to avoid directly comparing with this mystery quantity by comparing instead with some "surrogate value" that can easily be shown to be lower bound (or upper bound) on OPT.

E.g. $OPT \leq |V(G)|$ for graph problems that require maximizing cardinality of a vertex set, e.g. IND SET.

Commentary 2. Although today's lecture is "introductory" the proofs in this lecture are the most ad hoc, hence hardest to come up with.

Example 1. Load Balancing.

Given jobs of sizes s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n
and m identical machines.

Partition jobs into sets J_1, \dots, J_m (J_i = jobs assigned to machine i)
to minimize max load on any machine.

$$\text{minimize } \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \left\{ \sum_{j \in J_i} s_j \right\}.$$

This is NP-hard, even when $m=2$.

Reduction from SUBSET SUM: given n_1, \dots, n_K is there a subset that adds up to W ?

Assume WLOG $W \leq \frac{1}{2}N$. Else replace W with $N-W$.

$$s_1 = n_1 \quad s_2 = n_2 \quad \dots \quad s_K = n_K$$

$$s_{K+1} = N - 2W$$

$$(N := \sum_{i=1}^K n_i)$$

Can we partition the jobs into two sets J_1, J_2 st.

$$\max \left\{ \sum_{j \in J_1} s_j, \sum_{j \in J_2} s_j \right\} \leq N - W$$

If such a partition exists, the two sums must both be equal to $N - W$. Because $s_1 + \dots + s_{K+1} = 2N - 2W$,

$$\text{so } \sum_{j \in J_1} s_j + \sum_{j \in J_2} s_j = 2N - 2W$$

$$\max \{ \text{these 2 sums} \} \geq \frac{1}{2} (2N - 2W) = N - W.$$

Only way for $\max \{ \text{two sums} \} = N - W$ is if the 2 sums are equal.
If the 2 sums are equal, then the jobs that

accompany s_{K+1} in its piece of the partition sum up to W .
Converse: if $\sum_{j \in J} s_j = W$ then $J_1 = J \cup \{K+1\}$, $J_2 = \overline{J_1}$

and this attains max load $N - W$.

Greedy approx alg for load balancing

Initialize $J_i = \emptyset$, $L_i = 0 \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, m$

for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$

assign j to machine i with smallest load L_i .
(break ties arbitrarily.)

$J_i \leftarrow J_i \cup \{j\}$

$L_i \leftarrow L_i + s_j$

endfor

Example where this is suboptimal: $(m=2) \quad s_1 = \frac{1}{2} \quad s_2 = \frac{1}{2} \quad s_3 = 1.$

OPT = 1

$J_1 = \{1, 2\}$

$J_2 = \{3\}$

Greedy instead does:

	Machine 1	Machine 2
Iteration 1	$\frac{1}{2}$	
2		$\frac{1}{2}$
3	1	

Ends with loads $\{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\}$ ALG = $\frac{3}{2}$ while OPT = 1.

Theorem. For all input instances, GREEDY $\leq 2 \cdot$ OPT.

Proof. Suppose machine i is the max loaded machine when you run GREEDY, and j is the last job that gets put into J_i .