

# Heuristics - HW 1

Felipe Coutinho  
Foundations of Mathematics

October 8, 2024

**Representation:** binary matrix  $A$  with  $a_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$ , and  $i = 1, \dots, n$  representing number of elements, and  $j = 1, \dots, m$  representing number of subsets. Each column (subset) has a cost  $c_j > 0$ . The solution  $s$  is a list with indices for included columns.

**Constructive heuristic:** start with empty set, add elements progressively until full coverage

**Check if solution is feasible:**  $\sum_{j \in s} a_{ij} = 1, \forall i$  (quick to compute)

**Evaluation functions:**

1. At step  $t$ , pick a column  $j^*$  such that  $j^* = \arg \max_j N^{(t)}$ , where  $N^{(t)}$  is the number of *new* elements that adding  $j$  to  $s$  would cover.
2. At step  $t$ , pick a column  $j^*$  such that  $j^* = \arg \max_j \frac{N^{(t)}}{c_j}$ . Same as previous, but take into account column cost, as we've discussed in the Knapsack problem.
3. Define threshold  $\gamma$  and probability  $p$ . At step  $t$ , sample  $u^{(t)} \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ .
  - If  $u^{(t)} > p$ , pick a column  $j^*$  such that  $j^* = \arg \max_j \frac{N^{(t)}}{c_j}$ .
  - Otherwise, build set  $J = \left\{ j : \frac{N^{(t)}}{c_j} \geq \gamma \times \frac{N^{(t)}}{c_j^*} \right\}$ . Then, pick a random sample from  $J$ . The idea is to add randomness to try to escape from local optima (this was inspired by Stochastic Gradient Descent, as my background is ML...)

**Post-processing:** the redundancy elimination (RE) step does not improve approach 1, because by construction *there is no redundant element* in the final solution. However, for approaches 2 and 3, RE improves the answer *basically every time*.

**Average deviation from best known solutions:** Approach 1 fails miserably, on average x6 larger cost than baseline. Approaches 2 and 3 are *pretty successful*, only 11.1% and 12.5% above optimal *before post-processing*. After RE, they are pushed to 7.5% and 8.2%, respectively. Hence, post-processing *reduces cost* by around 35%.

**Conclusions:** approach 2 is the best, but perhaps there is still hope for approach 3 if I tinker with the values of  $(\gamma, p)$  enough. One option would be to perform a grid-search on the parameter space, to fine tune the solution.