

## Set Cover

Input: Universe  $U = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$

Family  $\mathcal{F}$  of Subsets  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m \subseteq U$  &  $\bigcup_{i \in [m]} S_i = U$   
Costs  $\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow$   
 $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m$

Goal: Find a Set  $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$

that minimizes  $\sum_{i \in I} C_i$  such that  $\bigcup_{i \in I} S_i = U$

Ex:  $U = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$

$S_1 = \{1, 3, 5\}$ ,  $S_2 = \{2, 3, 4\}$ ,  $S_3 = \{2, 4, 6\}$ ,

$C_1 = 1$ ,  $C_2 = 1$ ,  $C_3 = 1$

$k = 2$ ,

then  $S_1 \cup S_2 = U$ , hence it is a YES instance.

total cost = 2

Remark: Set cover is NP-Complete. [All sets are of equal cost]

[Vertex cover is a special case of Set cover]

VertexCover  $\leq_p$  SetCover

Given an instance  $(G, k)$  of Vertex cover.

We will construct an instance of the Set cover Problem.

let  $U = E(G)$  and let  $S_i$  be the set of edges that incident to vertex  $i$ .

clearly  $S_i \subseteq U$  for all  $i$ .

[For full proof Refer to Lecture notes of NP-Completeness]

## The greedy algorithm

### Algorithm 2.2 (Greedy set cover algorithm)

1.  $C \leftarrow \emptyset$
2. While  $C \neq U$  do
  - Find the set whose cost-effectiveness is smallest, say  $S$ .
  - Let  $\alpha = \frac{c(S)}{|S-C|}$ , i.e., the cost-effectiveness of  $S$ .
  - Pick  $S$ , and for each  $e \in S - C$ , set  $\text{price}(e) = \alpha$ .
  - $C \leftarrow C \cup S$ .
3. Output the picked sets.

Number the elements of  $U$  in the order in which they were covered by the algorithm, resolving ties arbitrarily. Let  $e_1, \dots, e_n$  be this numbering.

Example

$$X = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5\}$$

$$Y = \{a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6, a_7\}$$

$$Z = \{a_1, a_2, a_8, a_9, a_{10}, a_{11}, a_{12}\}$$

$$C(X) = 6, \quad C(Y) = 15, \quad C(Z) = 7$$

Choose  $Z$  :  $\alpha_Z = \frac{C(Z)}{15 - C(Z)} = \frac{7}{7} = 1$

Choose  $X$  :  $\alpha_X = \frac{C(X)}{15 - C(X)} = \frac{6}{3} = 2$

Choose  $Y$  :  $\alpha_Y = \frac{C(Y)}{15 - C(Y)} = \frac{15}{2} = 7.5$

$$\text{Total Cost} = 6 + 15 + 7 = 28$$

The greedy algorithm is not optimal.

An optimal solution would have chosen  $Y$  and  $Z$  for a cost of 22.

Lemma: For each  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\text{Price}(e_k) \leq \frac{\text{OPT}}{n-k+1}$

Proof: let the optimal set  $O_1, O_2, \dots, O_p$

$$\therefore \text{OPT} = \sum_{i=1}^p c(O_i) \quad \text{--- (1)}$$

Now, assume that the greedy algorithm has covered the elements in  $C$ , so far.

The the uncovered elements are  $U-C$  &

We have

$$|U-C| \leq |O_1 \cap (U-C)| + |O_2 \cap (U-C)| + \dots + |O_p \cap (U-C)| \quad \text{--- (2)}$$

In the greedy algorithm we select the set

with cost effectiveness  $\alpha$ , where

$$\alpha \leq \frac{c(O_i)}{|O_i \cap (U-C)|}, \quad i=1, 2, \dots, p. \quad \text{--- (3)}$$

We know this because the greedy algorithm will always choose the set with the smallest cost effectiveness, which will either be smaller than or equal to a set that the optimal algorithm chooses.

$$\therefore C(o_i) \geq \alpha |o_i \cap (U - C)| \quad \text{from } \textcircled{3}$$

$$\text{OPT} = \sum_i C(o_i) \geq \alpha \sum_i |o_i \cap (U - C)|$$

$$\geq \alpha \cdot |U - C| \quad \text{from } \textcircled{1}, \textcircled{2}, \text{ and } \textcircled{3}$$

$$\alpha \leq \frac{\text{OPT}}{|U - C|}$$

$\therefore$  The Price of the  $k^{\text{th}}$  element is

$$\alpha \leq \frac{\text{OPT}}{n - (k-1)} = \frac{\text{OPT}}{n - k + 1}$$

$= x = x =$

$\therefore$  Since the cost of each set picked is distributed among the new elements covered, the total cost of the set cover picked is

$$= \sum_{k=1}^n \text{Price}(e_k)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\text{OPT}}{n-k+1}$$

$$= \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{n}\right) \text{OPT}$$

$$= H_n \cdot \text{OPT}.$$

where

$$H_n = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \dots + \frac{1}{n}$$