Approximation and parameterization
of Segment Set Cover

Katarzyna Kowalska, Michał Pilipczuk

University of Warsaw, MIMUW

kk371053@students.mimuw.edu.pl

21.06.2022

Overview

Problem Statement: SET COVER

Input: universe $\mathcal{U}$, family S of subsets of $\mathcal{U}$
Output: $C \subseteq S$ such that $|C|$ is minimal and $\bigcup C = \mathcal{U}$
Minimal subfamily that covers all elements in $\mathcal{U}$.

Problem Statement: GEOMETRIC SET COVER

- Universe $\mathcal{U}$ is set of points in the plane
- Sets S are some geometric shapes
- Formally, each set in S is intersection of $\mathcal{U}$ with some geometric shape.

Example for rectangles:

Problem Statement: SEGMENT SET COVER

- Universe $\mathcal{U}$ is set of points in the plane
- Sets S are segments.

Example (TODO):

δ-extension for SEGMENT SET COVER

- δ-extension for a segment is a segment which is longer by δ fraction at both ends
- We accept solution in which segments cover solution after δ-extension
- The solution is compared to optimal solution without extension.

Example:

It is based on similar concept of δ-shrinking, which helped to provide FPT algorithm and EPTAS for (originally W[1]-hard and APX-hard) MAXIMUM WEIGHT INDEPENDENT SET OF RECTANGLES.

Preliminaries: Approximation

Given:

- instance I of the optimization problem (looking for minimal solution)
- weight of the optimal solution opt(I)

p-approximation is algorithm that yields solution of weight not larger than $p \cdot$ opt(I)

PTAS – polynomial time approximation scheme

For every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $(1 + \epsilon)$-approximation algorithm running in time $n^{f(\epsilon)}$ for some computable function f.

Example: KNAPSACK.

APX-hardness

For sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, if $(1 + \epsilon)$-approximation exists, then P = NP.

Example: MAX-3-SAT (how many clauses in 3-SAT can be solved)

Approximation results for SET COVER from literature

SET COVER

- log n approximation, no $o(\log n)$ approximation assuming P $\neq$ NP

GEOMETRIC SET COVER

- with fat rectangles is APX-hard
- EPTAS for fat polygons with δ-extensions **[Har-Peled and Lee, 2012]**

Definition

Fatness of polygons τ is a ratio between a radius of circle circumscribed on this polygon and inscribed in this polygon.

MAX-(3,3)-SAT

How do we prove that there doesn't exist $(1 + \epsilon)$-approximation?

MAX-(3,3)-SAT problem

Given 3-SAT instance with n variables, n clauses and every variable appears in exactly 3 clauses, find an assignment that satisfies the maximum number of clauses (not necessarily all of them).

MAX-(3,3)-SAT is NP-complete, therefore:

NP-completeness

Distinguishing if result of MAX-(3,3)-SAT is n or less than n is NP-complete.

PCP theorem

PCP Theorem

$NP = PCP(\log n, \mathcal{O}(1))$.

Remark

Each instance of MAX-(3,3)-SAT is $\lceil \frac{7}{8}n \rceil$-satisfiable

PCP theorem implication

Distinguishing if result of MAX-(3,3)-SAT is n or at most $(\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon)n$ is NP-hard.

Therefore MAX-(3,3)-SAT does not have $(\frac{7}{8} + \epsilon)$-approximation

Approximation of SEGMENT SET COVER

> **Theorem 1**
>
> SEGMENT SET COVER is APX-hard, i.e. there exists such $\epsilon > 0$ that $(1 + \epsilon)$-approximation does not exist unless P $=$ NP.

How can we make this problem *easier*?

- Allow only segments in 2 directions (parallel to the two axes)
- Allow segments to *almost* cover the points, i.e. δ-extensions

> **Theorem [Har-Peled and Lee, 2012]**
>
> Set cover with polygons of bounded fatness (at least τ) with δ-extension has EPTAS.

Theorem 1 (rephrased)

SEGMENT SET COVER is APX-hard, even if segments are axis-parallel and problem is relaxed with $\frac{1}{2}$-extension.

Figure: Scheme of the construction.

Results for approximation of SMALL CAPS GEOMETRIC SET COVER

	exact	δ-extensions
fat polygons	APX-hard	EPTAS
	[Chan and Grant, 2014]	[Har-Peled and Lee, 2012]
segments	APX-hard*	APX-hard (Theorem 1)
any polygons	APX-hard*	APX-hard*

Results marked with * follow from results for more restricted settings.

Parameterized algorithms vs. W[1]-hardness

Given:

- parameter k (usually size of the solution)
- size of the instance n

Class	Upper Bound of Complexity	Example
W[1]-hard	$n^{O(k)}$	k-Clique, Grid Tiling
FPT	$f(k) \cdot n^{O(1)}$	Vertex Cover

Set Cover is:

- W[2]-complete
- no algorithm with running time $n^{k-\epsilon}$ for any $\epsilon > 0$

Parameterization of SEGMENT SET COVER

Theorem 2

SEGMENT SET COVER parameterized by the solution size k can be solved in time $k^k \cdot n^{O(1)}$.

Technique: Branching over at most $k + 1$ segments on the lines with more than k points on them.

Definition of WEIGHTED SEGMENT SET COVER

Input: universe $\mathcal{U}$, subfamily S of subsets of $\mathcal{U}$ and function of weights assigned to sets $w : S \to \mathbb{N}$
Output: $C \subseteq S$ such that $\sum_{c \in C} w(c)$ is minimal and $\bigcup C = \mathcal{U}$
Minimal subfamily that covers all elements in $\mathcal{U}$.

In parameterized setting: We look for the *best* solution with restricted size $|C| \leq k$.
In approximation setting: It is still APX-hard, nothing interesting

FPT results for weighted problems in literature:

- general weighted FPT framework [Shachnai and Zehavi, 2017]
- kernels for WEIGHTED SUBSET SUM, WEIGHTED KNAPSACK [Etscheid et al.,2017]
- WEIGHTED st-CUT WEIGHTED DIRECTED FEEDBACK SET [Kim et al., 2021]

Parameterization for set cover with weighted segments

Theorem 3

WEIGHTED SEGMENT SET COVER is W[1]-hard and there does not exists an algorithm running in time $n^{o(\sqrt{(k)})}$.

How can we make this problem easier?

- Allow less directions (maybe just two parallel to axes)
- Allow δ-extension

Parameterization for set cover with weighted segments

> ## Theorem 4
> WEIGHTED SEGMENT SET COVER relaxed with δ-extensions has an FPT algorithm.
> It can be solved with algorithm running in time $\mathcal{O}((2 + k/\delta)^k \cdot n^{O(1)})$.

Technique intuition: Provide a kernel where we choose k-**good** set of points of size at most $f(k, \delta)$ on each line with more than $k + 1$ points on them.

Subset of a set of collinear points S is k-**good** if no matter how we cover it with k segments, then these segments after δ-extension cover all points from the original set of points S.

Theorem 3

WEIGHTED SEGMENT SET COVER is W[1]-hard and there does not exists an algorithm running in time $n^{o(\sqrt{k})}$ even when segments are limited to 3 directions.

This result is particularly interesting, because unweighted problem has an FPT algorithm.

Future work:

- prove Theorem 3 for axis-parallel segments (2 directions);
- remove the gap between the lower bound of complexity $n^{o(\sqrt{k})}$ and algorithm in $n^{\mathcal{O}(k)}$.

Results of parameterization of Segment Set Cover

	exact	δ-extensions
unweighted	FPT (Theorem 2)	FPT*
weighted 2 directions	???	FPT*
weighted 3 directions	W[1]-hard (Theorem 3)	FPT*
weighted any directions	W[1]-hard*	FPT (Theorem 4)