

# 高等演算法 HW3

許博翔

May 16, 2024

**Notation 1.** Let  $n$  be a positive integer.  $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ .

**Problem 0.**

**Problem 1.** Consider  $(x_1 \vee x_2) \wedge (x_1 \vee \neg x_2) \wedge (\neg x_1 \vee x_2) \wedge (\neg x_1 \vee \neg x_2)$ .

Equivalent ILP:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max(z_1 + z_2 + z_3 + z_4). \\ \text{subject to : } & \begin{cases} y_1 + y_2 \geq z_1 \\ y_1 + 1 - y_2 \geq z_2 \\ 1 - y_1 + y_2 \geq z_3 \\ 1 - y_1 + 1 - y_2 \geq z_4 \\ y_i, z_c \in \{0, 1\} \end{cases} . \end{aligned}$$

One can see that in LP, we can set  $y_1 = y_2 = \frac{1}{2}$ , and get  $z_1 = z_2 = z_3 = z_4 = 1$ , which maximizes  $z_1 + z_2 + z_3 + z_4 = 4$ .

But since exactly one of the 4 clauses above must be false,  $\max(z_1 + z_2 + z_3 + z_4) = 3$ .  
 $\therefore$  the integrality gap is  $\frac{3}{4}$  in this case.

Note that it can't be more than  $\frac{3}{4}$  since in the following problem, we'll find a solution  $ALG$  that satisfies  $\frac{3}{4}OPT \leq \frac{3}{4}OPT(LP) \leq ALG \leq OPT$ .

$\therefore$  MAX-SAT has integrality gap  $\frac{3}{4}$ .

**Problem 2.**

**Lemma 2.1.** Let  $f(x) = 1 - \frac{1}{4^x} - \frac{3}{4}x$ . For  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ ,  $f(x) \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* It's obvious that  $f$  is continuous and differentiable in  $\mathbb{R}$ .

$$f'(x) = \ln 4 \frac{1}{4^x} - \frac{3}{4}.$$

$$\Rightarrow f'(x) > 0 \iff \ln 4 \frac{1}{4^x} > \frac{3}{4} \iff 4^x < \frac{4 \ln 4}{3} \iff x < \log_4\left(\frac{4 \ln 4}{3}\right) \approx 0.443.$$

$\therefore f$  is increasing in  $(-\infty, \log_4(\frac{4 \ln 4}{3}))$  and decreasing in  $(\log_4(\frac{4 \ln 4}{3}), \infty)$ .

$$\Rightarrow \forall x \in [0, \log_4(\frac{4 \ln 4}{3})], x \geq f(0) = 0, \text{ and } \forall x \in [\log_4(\frac{4 \ln 4}{3}), 1], x \geq f(1) = 0.$$

$\therefore f(x) \geq 0$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ . ■

Let  $c$  be a clause.

$$\text{The probability that } c \text{ is satisfied} = 1 - \prod_{i \in S_c^+} (1 - 4^{y_i^* - 1}) \prod_{i \in S_c^-} (1 - (1 - 4^{y_i^* - 1})) \stackrel{\because 1 - 4^{y_i^* - 1} \leq 4^{-y_i^*}}{\geq}$$

$$1 - \prod_{i \in S_c^+} 4^{-y_i^*} \prod_{i \in S_c^-} 4^{y_i^* - 1} = 1 - \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{\sum_{i \in S_c^+} y_i^* + \sum_{i \in S_c^-} (1 - y_i^*)}.$$

$$\text{By the restrictions in LP, there is } \sum_{i \in S_c^+} y_i^* + \sum_{i \in S_c^-} (1 - y_i^*) \geq z_c^*.$$

$$\therefore \text{the probability that } c \text{ is satisfied} \geq 1 - \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{\sum_{i \in S_c^+} y_i^* + \sum_{i \in S_c^-} (1 - y_i^*)} \geq 1 - \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{z_c^*} \stackrel{\text{by Lemma (2.1)}}{\geq} \frac{3}{4} z_c^*.$$

$$\therefore \text{the expected number of clauses that are satisfied} \geq \frac{3}{4} \sum_c z_c^*.$$

**Problem 3.** Let  $V$  denote the vertex set, and  $E$  denote the edge set.

Algorithm:

For every vertex, color it with one of the  $k$  colors uniform randomly and independently.

$$\text{For every edge } (u, v), \Pr[(u, v) \in S] = \Pr[u, v \text{ have the different colors}] = 1 - \frac{1}{k}.$$

$\therefore$  the expected size of  $S$  is  $(1 - \frac{1}{k})|E| \geq (1 - \frac{1}{k})OPT$ , and this is a randomized  $(1 - \frac{1}{k})$ -approximation algorithm.

Derandomize:

Suppose that  $V = [n]$ .

Let  $[k]$  denote the  $k$  colors.

Run the following algorithm with parameter  $m$  to obtain the coloring  $c_m : [n] \rightarrow [k]$ .

When  $m = n$ , the algorithm is deterministic.

- for  $i = 1$  to  $m$ :
  - Choose  $j$  s.t.  $|\{1 \leq i' \leq i-1 : c_m(i') \neq j, (i', i) \in E\}|$  is maximized. – (1)
  - Set  $c_m(i) = j$  (i.e. color the vertex  $i$  with  $j$ ).
- for  $i = m+1$  to  $n$ :
  - Uniformly choose  $j$  from  $k$ .
  - Set  $c_m(i) = j$  (i.e. color the vertex  $i$  with  $j$ ).

Let the resulting  $S$  of the algorithm be  $S_m$ .

$E[|S_0|] \geq (1 - \frac{1}{k})OPT$ , which has been proved above.

$$E[|S_i|] = |\{(u, v) \in E : u < v < i, c_i(u) \neq c_i(v)\}| + |\{(u, i) \in E : u < i, c_i(u) \neq c_i(i)\}| + (1 - \frac{1}{k})|\{(u, v) \in E : u < v, v > i\}| \stackrel{\text{By (1)}}{\geq} |\{(u, v) \in E : u < v < i, c_i(u) \neq c_i(v)\}| + (1 - \frac{1}{k})|\{(u, i) \in E : u < i\}| + (1 - \frac{1}{k})|\{(u, v) \in E : u < v, v > i\}| = E[|S_{i-1}|].$$

$\therefore$  the algorithm with parameter  $m = n$ , which is a deterministic algorithm, satisfied  $|S_n| \geq |S_{n-1}| \geq \dots \geq |S_0| \geq (1 - \frac{1}{k})OPT$ .

Clearly, setting  $c_n(i) = j$  above is  $O(1)$ .

One can first store the neighborhood of each vertex, and then in (1), run through all neighbors of  $i$ .

Since each edge will be run for twice in (1), the running time of this algorithm is  $O(|V| + |E|)$ .

**Problem 4.** Let  $OPT = \sum_i f_i y_i = \sum_j \alpha_j$ . (They're equal by the strong duality theorem).

$\Rightarrow$  all slackness conditions must hold.

$\Rightarrow \alpha_j - \beta_{ij} = c_{ij}$  or  $x_{ij} = 0, \forall i, j$ .

Let  $p_j$  denote the facility that serves  $j$ ,  $q_i$  denote the chosen client  $j$  that open  $i$  in  $N_j$ , and  $B_i := \{j : p_j = i\}$ .

If  $p_j \notin N_j$ , it means that  $N_j \cap N_{q_{p_j}} \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $r_j$  denote a facility that  $\in N_j \cap N_{q_{p_j}}$ .

Else just simply set  $r_j := p_j$ .

Let  $F$  denote the set of facilities that are open.

$$\sum_{i \in F} f_i \leq \sum_{i \in F} f_i \sum_{k \in N_{q_i}} x_{kq_i} \leq \sum_{i \in F} f_i \sum_{k \in N_{q_i}} y_k \stackrel{f_i \leq f_k, \forall k \in N_{q_i}}{\leq} \sum_{i \in F} \sum_{k \in N_{q_i}} f_k y_k \stackrel{N_{q_i} \cap N_{q_k} = \emptyset, \forall i \neq k}{\leq} \sum_{i \in F} f_i y_i = OPT.$$

$$\forall j, c_{p_j j} \leq c_{r_j j} + c_{r_j q_{p_j}} + c_{p_j q_{p_j}} \text{ (by the definition of metric).}$$

Since  $q_{p_j}$  is chosen before  $j$ , there is  $\alpha_{q_{p_j}} \leq \alpha_j$ .

Since  $r_j \in N_j, r_j \in N_{q_{p_j}}, p_j \in N_{q_{p_j}}$ , by the definition of  $N$ , there is  $x_{r_j j}, x_{r_j q_{p_j}}, x_{p_j q_{p_j}}$  are all nonzero.

$\therefore$

$$c_{r_j j} \leq c_{r_j j} + \beta_{r_j j} = \alpha_j.$$

$$c_{r_j q_{p_j}} \leq c_{r_j q_{p_j}} + \beta_{r_j q_{p_j}} = \alpha_{q_{p_j}} \leq \alpha_j.$$

$$c_{p_j q_{p_j}} \leq c_{p_j q_{p_j}} + \beta_{p_j q_{p_j}} = \alpha_{q_{p_j}} \leq \alpha_j.$$

$$\Rightarrow c_{r_j j} \leq 3\alpha_j.$$

$$\therefore \sum_{i \in F} \sum_{j \in B_i} c_{p_j j} \leq \sum_{i \in F} \sum_{j \in B_i} 3\alpha_j = 3 \sum_j \alpha_j = 3OPT.$$

$$\therefore \sum_{i \in F} f_i + \sum_{j \in B_i} c_{p_j j} \leq OPT + 3OPT = 4OPT.$$

Since  $OPT$  is the optimal solution of LP relaxation, which is not greater than the optimal solution of ILP (denote as  $OPT'$ ).

$$\therefore \sum_{i \in F} f_i + \sum_{j \in B_i} c_{p_j j} \leq 4OPT \leq 4OPT'.$$

$\Rightarrow$  this is a 4-approximation.

**Problem 5.** We'll use the term "at time  $t$ " denote when the value of  $\alpha_j$  of unserved client  $j$  is set to  $t$  in the algorithm (that is, not performing 1. or 2. yet).

Let  $U^{(t)}$  denote  $U$  at time  $t$ .

Let  $p_j$  denote the facility that serves  $j$ , and  $B_i := \{j : p_j = i\}$ .

Suppose that  $f_i$  is open at time  $a_i$ .

1. (a) while there are unserved clients

i. for  $i$  in facilities

A. if  $i$  is closed, find a set of unserved clients  $S(i)$  s.t.  $val(i) := \frac{f_i + \sum_{j \in S(i)} c_{ij}}{|S(i)|}$  is minimized. (This is equivalent to 1. in the algorithm.)

B. if  $i$  is open, find an unserved client  $S(i) = \{s(i)\}$  s.t.  $val(i) :=$

$c_{is(i)}$  is minimized. (This is equivalent to 2. in the algorithm.)

ii. Let  $i^*$  be a facility s.t.  $val(i^*)$  is minimized.

iii. Open  $i^*$  if it's closed, and serve all clients in  $S(i^*)$  by  $i^*$ .

2. Lemma: if  $\alpha_j > c_{ij}$ , then  $\alpha_j \leq a_i$ .

Proof: If  $\alpha_j > a_i$ , then  $j$  is served after  $i$  is open. By 2. in the algorithm,  $\alpha_j \leq c_{ij}$ .

$\therefore$  the lemma holds.

There are 2 cases:

Case 1:  $\alpha_k = 0$ .

In this case,  $\alpha_j = c_{ij} = 0, \forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ .

$\therefore \sum_{j=x}^k (\alpha_x - c_{ij}) = 0 \leq f_i$  holds for all  $x = 1, 2, \dots, k$ .

Case 2:  $\alpha_k \neq 0$ .

$\Rightarrow \alpha_k > c_{ik}$ .

$\Rightarrow$  by the lemma,  $a_i \geq \alpha_k$ .

At time  $\alpha_x, x, x+1, x+2, \dots, k$  are unserved, by 1. in the algorithm,  $\sum_{j=x}^k (\alpha_x -$

$c_{ij}) \leq \sum_{j \in U(\alpha_x)} \max(0, \alpha_x - c_{ij}) \leq f_i. \therefore \sum_{j=x}^k (\alpha_x - c_{ij}) \leq f_i$  always holds.

3. Claim:  $\alpha_j - \alpha_x \leq c_{ix} + c_{ij}, \forall 1 \leq x \leq j \leq k$ .

Proof: If  $\alpha_j = \alpha_x$ , then the claim holds trivially.

If  $\alpha_j > \alpha_x$ , then  $\alpha_j > \alpha_x \geq a_{p_x}$  since  $p_x$  is open before  $x$  is served.

$\Rightarrow$  by the lemma,  $\alpha_j \leq c_{p_x j}$ .

$\Rightarrow \alpha_j - \alpha_x \leq c_{p_x j} - \alpha_x \stackrel{\text{metric}}{\leq} c_{ij} + c_{ix} + c_{p_x x} - \alpha_x \stackrel{x \text{ is served by } p_x}{=} c_{ij} + c_{ix}.$

$\Rightarrow \sum_{j=x}^k (\alpha_j - c_{ix} - 2c_{ij}) \stackrel{\text{the claim}}{\leq} \sum_{j=x}^k (c_{ix} + c_{ij} + \alpha_x - c_{ix} - 2c_{ij}) = \sum_{j=x}^k (\alpha_x - c_{ij}) \leq f_i.$

4.  $\sum_{j=1}^k (\alpha_1 - c_{ij}) \leq f_i.$

$\sum_{j=1}^k (\alpha_j - c_{i1} - 2c_{ij}) \leq f_i.$

Since  $\alpha_1 - c_{i1} \geq \alpha_1 - 3c_{i1} \geq 0$ .

$$\therefore \sum_{j=1}^k (\alpha_j - 3c_{ij}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^k (\alpha_1 - c_{ij} + \alpha_j - c_{i1} - 2c_{ij}) \leq 2f_i.$$

5. We need to define  $\alpha'_j, \beta'_{ij} := \max(\alpha'_j - c_{ij}, 0)$  so that  $\sum_j \beta'_{ij} \leq f_i$  can be satisfied for all  $i$ .

Let  $\alpha'_j = \frac{1}{3}\alpha_j$ , one can see that  $\sum_j \beta'_{ij} = \sum_{j:\alpha_j \geq 3c_{ij}} \alpha'_j - c_{ij} = \sum_{j:\alpha_j \geq 3c_{ij}} \frac{1}{3}(\alpha_j - 3c_{ij}) \leq \frac{2}{3}f_i \leq f_i$ .

From 1. of the algorithm,  $\sum_{j \in B_i} (\alpha_j - c_{ij}) = f_i$ .

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{j \in B_i} c_{ij} + f_i = \sum_{j \in B_i} \alpha_j \leq 3 \sum_{j \in B_i} \alpha'_j, \forall i.$$

$\therefore$  this is a 3-approximation.