

# ADS – proofs goal 1 & goal 2

Tim Grimbergen & Timo Post

October 2023

## 1 Goal 1: No Algorithm can be Constant-Competitive

Consider the Strike problem as outlined by the lecture notes:

$$n, m \in \mathbb{N} \tag{1.1a}$$

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\} : p_i \in \mathbb{N} \wedge h_i, s_i, f_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \tag{1.1b}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m s_i \geq n \tag{1.1c}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m f_i = n \tag{1.1d}$$

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\} : f_i \leq s_i \tag{1.1e}$$

**Lemma 1.** *Under the above constraints no online algorithm exists that does not buy the first  $n$  available seats.*

Assume an online algorithm exists that does not buy all of the first  $n$  available seats. Now consider the instance  $n = 1$ ,  $m = 2$ ,  $s_1 = n$ ,  $s_2 = 0$  and  $p_1, p_2, h_1, h_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . In this instance the algorithm cannot buy the seat offered at day 1, because this would break our assumption. On the second day the algorithm cannot buy a seat due to constraint 1.1e. As a result of our assumption we thus break constraint 1.1d, proving lemma 1:

$$f_1 + f_2 = 0 + 0 \neq 1$$

## 2 Goal 2: Algorithms and proofs

### 2.1 Setting

1.  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,<sup>1</sup>
2.  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,
3.  $s_i = n$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,
4.  $p_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p_{\max}\}$  with  $p_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$ ,
5.  $h_i = 0$  with for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .
6. Every online algorithm ALG knows  $n$ ,  $m$  and  $p_{\max}$ .

### 2.2 Algorithm

Consider the following algorithm  $\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}$ :

---

**Algorithm 1** The  $\lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor$ -threshold algorithm  $\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}$

---

```

 $Q \leftarrow \lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor$ 
for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $m$  do
  if  $(p_i \leq Q \vee i = m)$  then
    Buy  $n$  tickets.
  end if
end for

```

---

### 2.3 Results

**Theorem 2.** *For all  $p_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$  the algorithm  $\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}$  is an optimal deterministic algorithm for the setting described in 2.1.*

For the proof of Theorem 2 we will use Lemma 3 below.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $p_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then write  $p_{\max} = k^2 + \ell$  for  $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $0 \leq \ell < 2k + 1$ . Then the algorithm  $\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}$  is*

- $\lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor$ -competitive if  $0 \leq \ell \leq k$ ,
- $\frac{k^2 + \ell}{k + 1}$ -competitive if  $k < \ell < 2k + 1$ .

*Proof.* Consider an arbitrary instance  $I$  satisfying the restrictions above. If  $m = 1$ , then the problem is trivial since both ALG and OPT buy  $n$  tickets on the first day for the same price so the competitive ratio is 1. We then make the observation that both ALG and OPT always buy all tickets on a single day by design. This means that the number of people  $n$  is irrelevant for the competitive ratio  $c$  since

$$c = \frac{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}(I)}{\text{OPT}(I)} = \frac{p_{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}} \cdot n}{p_{\text{OPT}} \cdot n} = \frac{p_{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}}}{p_{\text{OPT}}},$$

where  $p_{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}}$  and  $p_{\text{OPT}}$  are the prices for which  $\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}$  and OPT buy the tickets respectively.

We now distinguish two more cases in which  $m > 1$ :

---

<sup>1</sup>In this research  $\mathbb{N}$  is the set of all strictly positive integers  $1, 2, \dots$

- **i)**  $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, p_i > \lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor$  : In this case we have that  $p_{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}}, p_{\text{OPT}} \geq \lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor + 1$ . The competitive ratio  $c$  is then maximal if  $p_{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}}$  is as large as possible and  $p_{\text{OPT}}$  as small as possible, so

$$c = \frac{p_{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}}}{p_{\text{OPT}}} \leq \frac{p_{\max}}{\lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor + 1}.$$

- **ii)**  $\exists i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, p_i \leq \lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor$  : In this case we have that  $p_{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}}, p_{\text{OPT}} \leq \lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor$ . Maximizing the competitive ratio yields

$$c = \frac{p_{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}}}{p_{\text{OPT}}} \leq \frac{\lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor}{1} = \lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor.$$

Now we write  $p_{\max} = k^2 + \ell$  with  $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 \leq \ell < 2k + 1$ .

If  $0 \leq \ell < k$  then notice that

$$\begin{aligned} k > \ell &\implies k^2 + k > k^2 + \ell \implies k(k+1) > k^2 + \ell \\ &\implies k > \frac{k^2 + \ell}{k+1} \implies \lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor > \frac{p_{\max}}{\lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor + 1}. \end{aligned}$$

So, in this case, the competitive ratio is determined by the value  $k$ . We have that the analysis is tight if we consider the instance  $I^1 = (p_1^1, p_2^1) = (k, 1)$ .

If  $k \leq \ell < 2k + 1$  then by analogous reasoning we find  $\lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor \leq \frac{p_{\max}}{\lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor + 1}$ . So, in this case, the competitive ratio is determined by the value  $\frac{k^2 + \ell}{k+1}$ . We have that the analysis is tight if we consider the instance  $I^1 = (p_1^1, p_2^1) = (k+1, k^2 + \ell)$ .

Thus we conclude that we have indeed found the competitive ratios as stated in the Lemma.  $\square$

We can now prove Theorem 2.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Let  $p_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$ . We distinguish three cases.

1.  $p_{\max} = k^2$  **for**  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  : In this case, we have  $c_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}} = \sqrt{p_{\max}} = k$  (by Lemma 3). Now assume that  $c_{\text{ALG}} < k$ . Consider the instances  $I^1 = (p_1^1, p_2^1) = (k, 1)$  and  $I^2 = (p_1^1, p_2^1) = (k, k^2)$  with  $n = 1$  and  $m = 2$ . Since  $c_{\text{ALG}} < k$ , it is not allowed to buy the ticket on the first day because this would result in a competitive ratio of  $k$  in  $I^1$ . However, for  $I^2$  it would then have to buy the tickets on the last day which still results in a competitive ratio of  $k$ . Thus we have reached a contradiction.
2.  $p_{\max} = k^2 + \ell$  **for**  $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$  **with**  $1 \leq \ell \leq k$  : In this case, we have  $c_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}} = \sqrt{p_{\max}} = \lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor = k$  (by Lemma 3). Now assume that  $c_{\text{ALG}} < k$ . Consider the instances  $I^1 = (p_1^1, p_2^1) = (k, 1)$  and  $I^2 = (p_1^1, p_2^1) = (k, k^2 + \ell)$  with  $n = 1$  and  $m = 2$ . So ALG is not allowed to buy the ticket on the first day in instance  $I^1$  because this would result in a competitive ratio of  $k$ . But again, if ALG buys the ticket on the second day then this results in a competitive ratio of  $\frac{k^2 + \ell}{k} > k$  for instance  $I^2$ . Thus we again reach a contradiction.
3.  $p_{\max} = k^2 + \ell$  **for**  $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$  **with**  $k < \ell < 2k + 1$  : In this case, we have  $c_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}} = \frac{p_{\max}}{\lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor + 1} = \frac{k^2 + \ell}{k+1}$  (by Lemma 3). Assume that  $c_{\text{ALG}} < \frac{k^2 + \ell}{k+1}$ . Consider the instances  $I^1 = (p_1^1, p_2^1) = (k+1, 1)$  and  $I^2 = (p_1^1, p_2^1) = (k+1, k^2 + \ell)$  with  $n = 1$  and  $m = 2$ . Now if ALG waits on day 1 with buying the tickets, then in  $I^2$  this would lead to a competitive ratio of  $\frac{k^2 + \ell}{k+1} = c_{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}}$ . So it should buy the ticket on day 1 for a competitive ratio of  $k+1$ . But notice that since  $\ell < 2k + 1$  we have

$$(k+1)^2 = k^2 + 2k + 1 > k^2 + \ell \implies k+1 > \frac{k^2 + \ell}{k+1},$$

thus we again reach a contradiction.

Hence, we can conclude that for all  $p_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$  every feasible online algorithm ALG has competitive ratio  $c_{\text{ALG}} > c_{\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* The fact that  $\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}$  is an optimal algorithm for all possible  $p_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$  now follows from Lemmas 3 and ???. First of all, no online deterministic algorithm can be better than  $\sqrt{p_{\max}}$ -competitive, which is proven in Lemma ??. Together with the fact that  $\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}$  is  $\sqrt{p_{\max}}$ -competitive, which is proven in Lemma 3, this implies that  $\text{ALG}_{\sqrt{p_{\max}}}$  is indeed an optimal deterministic algorithm.  $\square$

## 2.4 Setting 3

1.  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ ,
2.  $s_i = n$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,
3.  $p_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p_{\max}\}$  with  $p_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$ ,
4.  $h_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .
5. Every online algorithm ALG knows  $n, m, p_{\max}$ .

## 2.5 Algorithm

Consider the following algorithm.

---

**Algorithm 2** The double threshold algorithm  $\text{ALG}_2$

---

```

 $Q \leftarrow \lfloor \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rfloor$ 
 $H \leftarrow \lceil \sqrt{p_{\max}} \rceil - 1$ 
for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $m$  do
  if  $\left( i = m \vee p_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} h_j \leq Q \vee \sum_{j=1}^i h_j \geq H \right)$  then
    Buy  $n$  tickets.
  end if
end for

```

---

## 2.6 Results

**Theorem 4.** *The algorithm  $\text{ALG}_2$  is at most  $\left( \sqrt{p_{\max}} + 1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_{\max}}} \right)$ -competitive.*