

# Polynomial-Time Approximation Schemes for the 1-D Bin Packing Problem

Pranav Swarup Kumar

November 9, 2025

## Contents

1	Introduction (1.1)	2
2	Proof of NP-hardness (1.2)	2
3	Approximation Algorithms	6
4	PTAS and FPTAS (1.4)	6
5	APTAS (1.5)	7
6	Classic APTAS: Fernández-de la Vega & Lueker (1981) (1.6)	7
7	Variants and Improvements (1.7)	7
8	Worked Example (1.8)	7
9	Comparative Discussion (1.9)	8
10	Advanced Algorithms (1.10)	8

# 1 Introduction (1.1)

The bin packing problem tries to minimize the number of unit-capacity bins required to pack  $n$  items of sizes  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n \in (0, 1]$ .

In this section, 1-D bin packing is proved to be NP-Hard by reduction from the Partition Problem. *Approximation algorithms* which are extensively used to produce near-optimal solutions, are defined and discussed.

# 2 Proof of NP-hardness (1.2)

## Optimization Problem Definition

The **one-dimensional Bin Packing Problem (BPP)** can be stated as follows.

**Instance.** A finite multiset of items

$$S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}, \quad s_i \in (0, 1].$$

Each  $s_i$  denotes the size of item  $i$ , and each bin has unit capacity.

**Objective.** Partition  $S$  into the minimum number of disjoint subsets (bins)

$$B_1, B_2, \dots, B_m$$

such that, for every bin  $B_j$ ,

$$\sum_{s_i \in B_j} s_i \leq 1.$$

The goal is to minimize  $m$ . We denote the optimal number of bins by

$$OPT(S) = \min\{ m \mid \exists B_1, \dots, B_m \text{ satisfying the above constraint} \}.$$

## Decision Problem Definition

To analyze computational complexity, the optimization problem is converted into a decision problem, which asks a yes/no question instead of minimizing a quantity.

Formally, the decision version of the 1-D Bin Packing Problem is defined as follows.

**Instance.** A multiset of items

$$S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}, \quad s_i \in (0, 1],$$

and an integer  $k > 0$ .

**Question.** Does there exist a feasible packing of the items into at most  $k$  bins such that

$$\forall j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \quad \sum_{s_i \in B_j} s_i \leq 1,$$

and every item appears in exactly one bin?

We denote this decision problem as BIN-PACK-DEC. Formally:

$$\text{BIN-PACK-DEC}(S, k) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \exists \{B_1, \dots, B_k\} \text{ with } \sum_{s_i \in B_j} s_i \leq 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Relationship between Optimization and Decision Versions.** The optimization problem and its decision version are *polynomially equivalent* in the sense that

$$OPT(S) = \min \{k \mid \text{BIN-PACK-DEC}(S, k) = \text{"YES"}\}.$$

Hence, if the decision problem could be solved in polynomial time, the optimal packing number could be obtained by binary search over  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , implying a polynomial-time algorithm for the optimization form. Therefore, the decision version is NP-complete if and only if the optimization version is NP-hard.

## Reduction from Subset-Sum to Partition to Bin-Pack-Dec

We establish the computational intractability of the one-dimensional Bin Packing problem by a chain of polynomial-time reductions. We first reduce the classical SUBSET-SUM decision problem to PARTITION, and then reduce PARTITION to the decision version of Bin Packing (BIN-PACK-DEC). By transitivity of polynomial reductions and standard NP-completeness results, this shows that BIN-PACK-DEC is NP-complete and the optimization version of Bin Packing is NP-hard.

### Reduction $\text{SUBSET-SUM} \leq_p \text{Partition}$ .

Let  $(a_1, \dots, a_n; t)$  be an instance of  $\text{SUBSET-SUM}$ , and denote  $A := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$ .

**Preprocessing.** If  $t > A$  then the instance is trivially a NO instance; return any fixed NO instance of  $\text{PARTITION}$ . Otherwise, if  $t > A/2$  replace  $t$  by  $A - t$ . This substitution is valid since a subset sums to  $t$  iff its complement sums to  $A - t$ . After this step we have  $0 \leq t \leq A/2$ .

**Construction.** Define an instance of  $\text{PARTITION}$  by appending a single integer

$$b := A - 2t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$$

to the original multiset. That is, form

$$S' = \{a_1, \dots, a_n, b\}.$$

The total sum of  $S'$  is

$$A' = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i + b = A + (A - 2t) = 2(A - t),$$

hence  $A'$  is even and  $A'/2 = A - t$ .

### Correctness.

( $\Rightarrow$ ) If there exists  $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $\sum_{i \in I} a_i = t$ , then  $I' := I \cup \{b\}$  satisfies

$$\sum_{i \in I'} s_i = t + (A - 2t) = A - t = A'/2,$$

so  $S'$  admits a partition into two equal-sum subsets.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Conversely, suppose  $S'$  admits a partition into two subsets of sum  $A'/2 = A - t$ . The element  $b$  must lie in one of the two parts; removing  $b$  from that part yields a subset of  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$  whose sum is

$$(A - t) - b = (A - t) - (A - 2t) = t,$$

hence the original  $\text{SUBSET-SUM}$  instance is a YES instance.

The mapping adds one integer and performs only arithmetic operations on the input integers; thus it runs in polynomial time and preserves YES/NO answers. Therefore  $\text{SUBSET-SUM} \leq_p \text{PARTITION}$ .

### Reduction Partition $\leq_p$ Bin-Pack-Dec.

Let  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  be an instance of PARTITION and set  $A := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$ .

**Preprocessing.** If there exists  $i$  with  $a_i > A/2$  then the PARTITION instance is immediately NO; return a fixed NO instance of BIN-PACK-DEC. Otherwise all  $a_i \leq A/2$ .

**Construction.** Create a Bin Packing instance by scaling:

$$s_i := \frac{2a_i}{A} \in (0, 1], \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

and set  $k := 2$ . Note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n s_i = \frac{2}{A} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i = 2.$$

### Correctness.

$(\Rightarrow)$  If the  $a_i$  admit a partition  $I$  with  $\sum_{i \in I} a_i = A/2$ , then the corresponding items satisfy

$$\sum_{i \in I} s_i = \frac{2}{A} \sum_{i \in I} a_i = 1,$$

so  $I$  and its complement form two bins of capacity 1 and the Bin Packing decision instance is YES.

$(\Leftarrow)$  Conversely, if the  $s_i$  can be packed into two unit bins, each bin must have total size exactly 1 (since the grand total is 2). Scaling back by  $A/2$  yields a partition of the  $a_i$  into two subsets of sum  $A/2$ .

The scaling mapping is computable in polynomial time (rational arithmetic) and preserves YES/NO answers, hence PARTITION  $\leq_p$  BIN-PACK-DEC.

### Transitivity and conclusion.

Polynomial-time reducibility is transitive. Combining the two reductions above we obtain

$$\text{SUBSET-SUM} \leq_p \text{PARTITION} \leq_p \text{BIN-PACK-DEC},$$

whence SUBSET-SUM  $\leq_p$  BIN-PACK-DEC. Since SUBSET-SUM is NP-complete (see [3]), BIN-PACK-DEC is NP-hard. As BIN-PACK-DEC is in NP (a packing into  $k$  bins is polynomially verifiable), it follows that BIN-PACK-DEC is NP-complete (see [1]). Consequently the optimization form of one-dimensional Bin Packing is NP-hard.

## Remarks on edge cases and polynomiality

The reductions above include simple preprocessing to handle degenerate inputs. In the reduction SUBSET-SUM  $\leq_p$  PARTITION we replace the target  $t$  by  $A - t$  when  $t > A/2$ ; this step is valid because a subset sums to  $t$  iff its complement sums to  $A - t$ . If  $t > A$  the SUBSET-SUM instance is trivially NO. The appended integer  $b = A - 2t$  is non-negative by construction; if  $b = 0$  the appended zero does not alter partitionability. In the reduction PARTITION  $\leq_p$  BIN-PACK-DEC we first check whether any  $a_i > A/2$ : if so, PARTITION is immediately NO and we may output a fixed NO instance of BIN-PACK-DEC. Otherwise every scaled size  $s_i = 2a_i/A$  satisfies  $0 < s_i \leq 1$ , so the constructed Bin Packing instance is valid. All arithmetic performed (sums, subtraction, a single division by  $A$ ) is polynomial-time with respect to the binary encoding of the input integers; the bit-length of intermediate integers remains polynomially bounded. Thus both mappings are polynomial-time reductions in the standard Turing model.

## 3 Approximation Algorithms

An algorithm  $A$  is a  $\rho$ -approximation if for all instances  $I$ ,

$$\frac{A(I)}{OPT(I)} \leq \rho$$

for minimization problems.

### Examples

- First-Fit (FF): uses at most  $1.7 \times OPT$  bins.
- Best-Fit (BF): similar constant-factor guarantee.

## 4 PTAS and FPTAS (1.4)

### PTAS Definition

A **Polynomial-Time Approximation Scheme (PTAS)** is a family of algorithms  $\{A_\varepsilon\}$  such that for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$A_\varepsilon(I) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) OPT(I)$$

and  $A_\varepsilon$  runs in time polynomial in  $n$  (but possibly exponential in  $1/\varepsilon$ ).

### FPTAS Definition

An **FPTAS** is a PTAS whose running time is polynomial in both  $n$  and  $1/\varepsilon$ .

### Impossibility Result

There is no FPTAS for Bin Packing unless P = NP [1].

## 5 APTAS (1.5)

### Formal Definition

An **Asymptotic PTAS (APTAS)** satisfies:

$$A_\varepsilon(I) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) OPT(I) + O(1)$$

Intuitively, the additive  $O(1)$  term is negligible for large instances, making APTAS the right notion for Bin Packing.

## 6 Classic APTAS: Fernández-de la Vega & Lueker (1981) (1.6)

**Theorem 1** (Fernández-de la Vega and Lueker, 1981). *For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists a polynomial-time algorithm  $A_\varepsilon$  such that*

$$A_\varepsilon(I) \leq (1 + \varepsilon) OPT(I) + 1.$$

*Algorithm Sketch.* 1. Classify items into large and small.

2. Round large items to few distinct sizes.
3. Enumerate all feasible bin patterns.
4. Fill remaining space with small items using First-Fit.

□

## 7 Variants and Improvements (1.7)

Briefly describe robust APTAS (Epstein & Levin), AFPTAS, variable-sized bins, and LP-based additive-gap algorithms by Hoberg & Rothvoss.

## 8 Worked Example (1.8)

Table 1: Example Bin Packing Instance

Item	Size	FF Bin	APTAS Bin
1	0.55	1	1
2	0.45	2	1
3	0.60	3	2
4	0.40	3	2

Table 2: Comparison of Algorithms

Algorithm	Approx. Ratio	Additive Gap	Typical Use
FF / BF / FFD / BFD	Constant	$O(OPT)$	Simple heuristics
APTAS	$(1 + \varepsilon)$	$+O(1)$	Theoretical + practical
Rothvoss (LP)	$(1 + \varepsilon)$	$+O(\log OPT)$	Very large $n$
KK / CKK	Heuristic	—	Partition / subset-sum

## 9 Comparative Discussion (1.9)

## 10 Advanced Algorithms (1.10)

Summarize Karmarkar–Karp (1982), Rothvoss (2014), and Hoberg–Rothvoss (2021) additive-gap LP algorithms.

## References

- [1] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, Freeman, 1979.
- [2] W. Fernandez de la Vega and G. Lueker, “Bin packing can be solved within  $1 + \epsilon$  in linear time,” *Combinatorica*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 349–355, 1981.
- [3] R. M. Karp, “Reducibility among combinatorial problems,” in *Complexity of Computer Computations*, R. E. Miller and J. W. Thatcher (eds.), Plenum Press, New York, 1972, pp. 85–103.
- [4] N. Karmarkar and R. M. Karp, “The differencing method of set partitioning,” *Computer Science Division*, Univ. of California, Berkeley, Tech. Rep. UCB/CSD 82-113, 1982.
- [5] E. G. Coffman Jr., M. R. Garey, and D. S. Johnson, “Approximation algorithms for bin packing: a survey,” in *Approximation Algorithms for NP-Hard Problems*, D. S. Hochbaum (ed.), PWS Publishing, 1996, pp. 46–93.
- [6] L. Epstein and A. Levin, “On bin packing with a constant number of bins,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1675–1697, 2012.