

# Design and Analysis of Algorithms

## L18: Knapsack Problem

Dr. Ram P Rustagi  
Sem IV (2020-Even)  
Dept of CSE, KSIT  
[rprustagi@ksit.edu.in](mailto:rprustagi@ksit.edu.in)

# Resources

- Text book 2: Sec: 4.3
- RI: Introduction to Algorithms
  - Cormen et al.

# Example: Knapsack Problem

- A flower street vendor procures the flowers from KR Market and sells these during the day. The quantity of flowers available are limited as below.



Lilies: 8Kg

Roses: 10Kg

Jasmine: 6Kg

Daisies: 6Kg

Profit: ₹240

Profit: ₹250

Profit: ₹120

Profit: ₹210

- The vendor has a carrying bag with a capacity of 20kg,

# Example: Knapsack Problem

- A flower street vendor procures the flowers from KR Market and sells these during the day. The quantity of flowers available are limited along with respective profits are as below.
  - Roses: 10kg with a total profit of ₹ 250
  - Lilies: 8kg with a total profit of ₹ 240
  - Daisies: 6kg with a total profit of ₹ 210.
  - Jasmine: 6Kg with a total profit of ₹ 120
- The vendor has a carrying bag with a capacity of 20kg, would like to maximize the profit for the day. The vendor can buy any quantity (from 0kg to its max limit as given above) for any flower.
- **Q: Which quantity of each flower vendor should buy?**

# Flower Buying: Approach 1

- *Flowers: quantity/total profit*
  - *Roses 10Kg /Rs 250, Lilies: 8Kg / Rs 240*
  - *Daisies 6Kg / Rs 210, Jasmine: 6Kg / Rs 120*
- Equal quantity of each flower:
  - Buy same quantity of each variety of flower i.e. buy  $20/4=5$  kg of Rose, Daisies and Lilies and Jasmine
- The profit earned for the day is
  - Roses:  $5*250/10 = ₹ 125$
  - Lilies:  $5*240/8 = ₹ 150$
  - Daisies:  $5*210/6 = ₹ 175$
  - Jasmine:  $5*120/6 = ₹ 100$
- Net profit:  $₹ 125+150+175+100 = ₹ 550$

# Flower Buying: Approach 2

- *Flowers: quantity/total profit*
  - *Roses 10Kg /Rs 250, Lilies: 8Kg / Rs 240*
  - *Daisies 6Kg / Rs 210, Jasmine: 6Kg / Rs 120*
- Buy in equal proportions of their availability
  - Roses:  $20 \times 10 / 30 = 20/3 \text{Kg}$ , Lilies:  $20 \times 8 / 30 = 16/3 \text{ Kg}$
  - Daisies:  $20 \times 6 / 30 = 4 \text{Kg}$ , Jasmine  $20 \times 6 / 30 = 4 \text{Kgs}$
- The profit earned for the day is
  - Roses:  $(20/3) \times 250 / 10 = ₹ 500/3 = ₹ 166.6$
  - Lilies:  $(16/3) \times 240 / 8 = ₹ 160$
  - Daisies:  $4 \times 210 / 6 = ₹ 140$
  - Jasmine:  $4 \times 120 / 6 = ₹ 80$
- Net profit:  $₹ 166.67 + 160 + 140 + 80 = ₹ 546.67$

# Flower Buying: Approach 3

- *Flowers: quantity/total profit*
  - *Roses 10Kg /Rs 250, Lilies: 8Kg / Rs 240*
  - *Daisies 6Kg / Rs 210, Jasmine: 6Kg / Rs 120*
- Buy as per max profit known (greedy approach 1)
  - Roses: 10Kg, Lilies: 8Kg, Daisies: 2Kg, Jasmine: 0Kg
- The profit earned for the day is
  - Roses:  $10 \times 250 / 10 = ₹ 250$
  - Lilies:  $8 \times 240 / 8 = ₹ 240$
  - Daisies:  $2 \times 210 / 6 = ₹ 70$
  - Jasmine:  $0 \times 120 / 6 = ₹ 0$
- Net profit:  $₹ 250 + 240 + 70 + 0 = ₹ 560$

# Flower Buying: Approach 4

- *Flowers: quantity/total profit*
  - *Roses 10Kg /Rs 250, Lilies: 8Kg / Rs 240*
  - *Daisies 6Kg / Rs 210, Jasmine: 6Kg / Rs 120*
- Buy as per capacity from min (greedy approach 2)
  - Jasmine: 6Kg, Daisies: 6Kg, Lilies: 8Kg, Roses: 0Kg
- The profit earned for the day is
  - Jasmine:  $6 \times 120 / 6 = ₹ 120$
  - Daisies:  $6 \times 210 / 6 = ₹ 210$
  - Lilies:  $8 \times 240 / 8 = ₹ 240$
  - Roses:  $0 \times 250 / 10 = ₹ 0$
- Net profit:  $₹ 0 + 240 + 210 + 120 = ₹ 570$



# Flower Buying: Approach 5

- *Flowers: quantity/total profit*
  - *Roses 10Kg /Rs 250, Lilies: 8Kg / Rs 240*
  - *Daisies 6Kg / Rs 210, Jasmine: 6Kg / Rs 120*
- Greedy approach 3: get max profit per kg of flowers
  - Profits per Kg: R: Rs 25, L: Rs 30, D: 35, J: 20
  - Daisies: 6Kg, Lilies: 8Kg, Roses: 6Kg, Jasmine: 0Kg
- The profit earned for the day is
  - Roses:  $6 \times 250 / 10 = ₹ 150$
  - Lilies:  $8 \times 240 / 8 = ₹ 240$
  - Daisies:  $6 \times 210 / 6 = ₹ 210$
  - Jasmine:  $0 \times 120 / 6 = ₹ 0$
- Net profit:  $₹ 150 + 240 + 210 + 0 = ₹ 600$

# Flower Buying

- Profit comparisons:
  - Approach 1 (equal quantity): Rs 550/-
  - Approach 2 (in equal ratios): Rs 546.67
  - Approach 3 (Greedy: Max highest profit): Rs 560/-
  - Approach 4 (Greedy: Smallest capacities): Rs 570/-
  - Approach 5 (Greedy: max profit per kg): Rs 600/-
- Does the Greedy approach always works?
  - Yes (for fractional knapsack)
  - No (for 0-1 knapsack)
    - 0-1 knapsack: can not buy partial quantities
- Can there be multiple optimal solutions?
  - Consider that both Roses, Lilies have profit of Rs 25/Kg

# Example 2: Suitcase Packing

- You are travelling by air and airline has limit of 15Kg on the check in bag.
- You have many number of items to carry with you.
- How do you decide which items to pack and which ones to leave behind.

# Overview: Knapsack Problem

- Knapsack problem (fractional):
  - Given  $n$  objects, and a knapsack (bag) with a capacity  $m$ , fill the knapsack to maximize the value as follows
    - Each object  $i$  has weight  $w_i$  (+ve number)
    - Each object  $i$  has +ve profit  $p_i$  (+ve number)
    - If a fraction  $x_i$  ( $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$ ) of the object  $i$  is placed in the knapsack, the profit  $p_i x_i$  is earned.
  - **Objective:** Obtain a filling of the knapsack that maximizes the total profit earned. Mathematically

$$\text{Maximize } \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} p_i x_i$$

$$\text{Subject to } \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} w_i x_i \leq m \quad \text{and } 0 \leq x_i \leq 1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n$$

# Knapsack Problem

- **Example (Book II):** consider  $n=3, m=20$ ,  
 $(p_1, p_2, p_3) = (25, 24, 15)$ ,  $(w_1, w_2, w_3) = (18, 15, 10)$
- Feasible solutions are

S#	Greedy Approach	$x_1, x_2, x_3$	$\sum w_i x_i$	$\sum p_i x_i$
1	Random	$1/2, 1/3, 1/4$	16.5	24.25
2	Highest profit	$1, 2/15, 0$	20	28.2
3	Lowest weight	$0, 2/3, 1$	20	31
4	Highest $p_i / w_i$	$0, 1, 1/2$	20	31.5

# Knapsack Problem: Approach

- A problem that fits the subset paradigm
- Select  $x_i$  for each object  $i$ .
  - $w_i$ 's  $(18, 15, 10)$ ,  $p_i$ 's  $= (25, 24, 15)$
- Simple strategies: solutions with weight sum  $m$ .
- A1: Consider objects with highest profit
  - when an object doesn't fit, take its fraction
  - All objects are in full except possibly the last  
 $x_1=1, x_2=2/15, x_3=0$ ;  $p_1=25, p_2=24*2/5, P=28.5$
- A2: Consider objects with lowest weights
  - Fill knapsack as slowly as possible  
 $x_3=1, x_2=2/3, x_1=0$ ;  $p_2=24*2/3, p_3=15$ ;  $P=31$
- A3: non-increasing  $p_i/w_i$  i.e.  $p_2/w_2, p_3/w_3, p_1/w_1$   
 $x_2=1, x_3=1/2, x_1=0$ ;  $p_2=24, p_3=15*1/2$ ;  $P=31.5$

# Knapsack problem

- Greedy approach: Optimal solution
- Pick the object with highest profit per unit of weight
- Keep picking the objects in this order till an object can't be taken in full
  - Take a fraction of this object to fill the capacity
- Technique for proving optimality
  - Compare greedy approach with any optimal solution
  - Find first  $x_i$  at which two solutions differ
  - Make the  $x_i$  in optimal solution equal to that in greedy solution without any loss in total value
  - Repeated use of this transformation shows Greedy solutions is optimal as well

# Knapsack Problem

- Lemma 1:
  - In case the sum of all quantities is  $\leq m$ , then
$$x_i = 1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n$$
is an optimal solution.
  - So, let us consider that sum of weights exceed  $m$ .
    - All weight can't be included in full.
    - Some weights may not be included at all
- Lemma 2:
  - All optimal solutions will fill the knapsack exactly.
  - Note:
    - Increase the quantity of some object  $i$  by a fractional amount till the total weight becomes exactly  $m$
    - Decrease amount of other objects accordingly
- Analysis: Does it fit the subset paradigm?
  - Yes: we are selecting a subset of objects.



# Algorithm: Knapsack Problem

```
Void GreedyKnapsack(float m, int n) {  
    //p[1:n] and w[1:n] contain the profits and weights  
    //The indices are ordered as per following criteria  
    //  $p[i]/w[i] \geq p[i+1]/w[i+1]$  ,  $1 \leq i < n$ .  
    // m is knapsack size, and x[1:n] is the solution vector  
    initialize x[i] to 0.0  
    float U=m  
    for i=1 to n  
        if w[i] > U  
            break  
        x[i]=1.0  
        U=U-w[xi]  
    if i ≤ n  
        x[i] = U/w[i]
```

# Theorem: Knapsack Problem

Theorem:

If  $p_1/w_1 \geq p_2/w_2 \geq \dots \geq p_n/w_n$ , then GreedyKnapsack generates an optimal solution to the given instance of the knapsack problem.

Methodology to be used for proof:

- Compare the greedy solution with any optimal solution.
- If the two solutions differ, then first  $x_i$  at which they differ.
- Then show that  $x_i$  in the optimal solution equal to that in the greedy solution without any loss in total value.
- Repeated use of this transformation shows that greedy solution is optimal

# Proof: Greedy Approach is Optimal

- Let  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  be the solution generated by GreedyKnapsack., i.e.  $\sum w_i x_i = m$
- If all the  $x_i$  equal one, the solution is optimal.
- Let  $j$  be the least index such that  $x_j \neq 1$ .
- From the algorithm, we know that  
 $0 \leq x_j < 1$ , and  $x_i = 1$  for  $1 \leq i < j$ , and  $x_i = 0$  for  $j < i \leq n$ .
- Let  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$  be the optimal solution, Thus  
 $\sum w_i y_i = m$
- Let  $k$  be the smallest index such that  $y_k \neq x_k$
- Since two solutions differ, such  $k$  must exist. Since all  $x_k$  prior to  $x_j$ 's are 1, clearly  $y_k < x_k$ , otherwise  $\sum w_i y_i > m$
- Further,  $k \leq j$ , otherwise  $\sum w_i y_i > m$  since  $\sum w_i x_i = m$ 
  - Proof ahead

# Proof: Greedy Approach is Optimal...

$x_1$	$x_2$	...	$x_{j-1}$	<b><math>x_j</math></b>	$x_{j+1}$	...				$x_n$
1	1	1	1	<b><math>x_j</math></b>	0	0	0			0

Solution by Greedy Approach

First index where  $x_j$  is not 0



$y_1$	$y_2$	...	<b><math>y_k</math></b>	...	$y_j$	...				$x_n$
1	1	1	<b><math>y_k</math></b>	...	$y_j$	$y_{j+1}$	...			$y_n$

An optimal solution found some way

First index where  $y_k$  differs from  $x_k$



# Proof: Greedy Approach is Optimal...

case 1:  $k < j$ ,  $x_k = 1$ , hence  $y_k < x_k$

$x_1$	$x_2$	...	$x_k$	...	$x_{j-1}$	<b><math>x_j</math></b>	$x_{j+1}$	...		$x_n$
1	1	1	1	1	1	<b><math>x_j</math></b>	0	0		0

Solution by Greedy Approach

First index where  $x_j$  is not 0

$y_1$	$y_2$	...	<b><math>y_k</math></b>	...	$y_{j-1}$	$y_j$	...			$y_n$
1	1	1	<b><math>y_k</math></b>	...	$y_{j-1}$	$y_j$	...			

An optimal solution found some way

First index where  $y_k$  differs from  $x_k$

# Proof: Greedy Approach is Optimal...

case 2:  $k=j$

if  $y_k \neq x_k$ , then  $\sum w_i y_i > m$ , because  $\sum w_i x_i = m$

$x_1$	$x_2$	...	...	...	$x_{j-1}$	<b><math>x_j</math></b>	$x_{j+1}$	...		$x_n$
1	1	1	1	1	1	<b><math>x_j</math></b>	0	0		0

Solution by Greedy Approach

First index where  $x_j$  is not

$y_1$	$y_2$	...	...	...	...	<b><math>y_k</math></b>	...			$y_n$
1	1	1	...	...	1	<b><math>y_k</math></b>	...			

An optimal solution found some way

First index where  $y_k$  differs from  $x_k$

# Proof: Greedy Approach is Optimal...

case 3 :  $k > j$ , This is not possible since  $\sum w_i y_i > m$

$x_1$	$x_2$	...	...	...	$x_{j-1}$	<b><math>x_j</math></b>	$x_{j+1}$	...		$x_n$
1	1	1	1	1	1	<b><math>x_j</math></b>	0	0		0

Solution by Greedy Approach

First index where  $x_j$  is not 0

$y_1$	$y_2$	...	...	...	...	...	...	<b><math>y_k</math></b>		$y_n$
1	1	1	...	...	1	1	...	<b><math>y_k</math></b>		

An optimal solution found some way

First index where  $y_k$  differs from  $x_k$

# Proof: Greedy Approach is Optimal...

- Summary of proof:  $y_k < x_k$ , there exists 3 possibilities
  - i .  $k < j$ : since  $x_k = 1$ , and  $y_k \neq x_k$ , and so  $y_k < x_k$
  - ii .  $k = j$ : since  $\sum w_i x_i = m$ , and  $y_i = x_i$  for  $1 \leq i < j$ ,  
then either  $y_k < x_k$  or  $\sum w_i y_i > m$
  - iii .  $k > j$ : then  $\sum w_i y_i > m$ , which is not possible
- To show that  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is optimal solution.
  - Increase  $y_k$  to  $x_k$ , and
  - Decrease as many of  $(y_{k+1}, \dots, y_n)$  as necessary so that total capacity is still  $m$ .
  - This gives a new solution  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$  such that
    - $z_i = x_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$ ; (note  $z_k = x_k$ ), and
    - $\sum_{k < i \leq n} w_i (y_i - z_i) = w_k (z_k - y_k) \dots \dots \dots (1)$



# Proof: Greedy Approach is Optimal...

- Thus, we have (increased  $y_k$  and decreased remaining  $y_i$ 's)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} p_i z_i &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (p_i y_i) + (z_k - y_k) w_k \frac{p_k}{w_k} - \sum_{k < i \leq n} (y_i - z_i) w_i \frac{p_i}{w_i} \\
 &\geq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (p_i y_i) + \left[ (z_k - y_k) w_k - \sum_{k < i \leq n} (y_i - z_i) w_i \right] \frac{p_k}{w_k} \\
 &\quad \text{since } p_k / w_k \geq p_{k+1} / w_{k+1} \geq \dots \geq p_n / w_n \\
 &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (p_i y_i) \quad \text{since } \sum_{k < i \leq n} w_i (y_i - z_i) = w_k (z_k - y_k)
 \end{aligned}$$

- Thus, if  $\sum p_i z_i > \sum p_i y_i$ , then  $y$  could not have been optimal solution.
- If  $\sum p_i z_i = \sum p_i y_i$ , then either  $z = x$  and  $x$  is optimal, or  $z \neq x$ .
- If  $z \neq x$ , then repeat the process to show that  $y$  is not optimal or transform  $y$  to  $x$  and hence  $x$  is optimal.

# Summary

- Greedy approach (fractional) knapsack
- Pick the object with highest profit per unit of weight
- Keep picking the objects in this order till an object can't be taken in full
  - Take a fraction of this object to fill the capacity
- The greedy approach for fractional Knapsack gives optimal solution.