
A Kolmogorov-distance based approximation of discrete random variables

Anonymous Author(s)

Affiliation

Address

email

Abstract

1 We present an algorithm that takes a discrete random variable X and a number m
2 and computes a random variable whose support (set of possible outcomes) is of
3 size at most m and whose Kolmogorov distance from X is minimal.

4 1 Introduction

5 Many different approaches to approximation of probability distributions are studied in the litera-
6 ture [12, 15, 16]. The approaches vary in the types random variables considered, how they are rep-
7 resented, and in the criteria used for evaluation of the quality of the approximations. This paper is
8 on approximating discrete distributions represented as explicit probability mass functions with ones
9 that are simpler to store and to manipulate. This is needed, for example, when a discrete distribution
10 is given as a large data-set, obtained, e.g., by sampling, and we want to represent it approximately
11 with a small table.

12 The main contribution of this paper is an efficient algorithm for computing the best possible ap-
13 proximation of a given random variable with a random variable whose complexity is not above a
14 prescribed threshold, where the measures of the quality of the approximation and the complexity of
15 the random variable are as specified in the following two paragraphs.

16 We measure the quality of an approximation by the distance between the original variable and the
17 approximate one. Specifically, we use the Kolmogorov distance which is commonly used for com-
18 paring random variables in statistical practice and literature. Given two random variables X and
19 X' whose cumulative distribution functions (cdfs) are F_X and $F_{X'}$, respectively, the Kolmogorov
20 distance between X and X' is $d_K(X, X') = \sup_t |F_X(t) - F_{X'}(t)|$ (see, e.g., [9]). We say that X'
21 is a good approximation of X if $d_K(X, X')$ is small.

22 The complexity of a random variable is measured by the size of its support, the number of values
23 that it can take, $|\text{support}(X)| = |\{x: \Pr(X = x) \neq 0\}|$. When distributions are maintained as
24 explicit tables, as done in many implementations of statistical software, the size of the support of
25 a variable is proportional to the amount of memory needed to store it and to the complexity of the
26 computations around it. In summary, the exact notion of optimality of the approximation targeted in
27 this paper is:

28 **Definition 1.** A random variable X' is an optimal m -approximation of a random variable X if
 29 $|\text{support}(X')| \leq m$ and there is no random variable X'' such that $|\text{support}(X'')| \leq m$ and
 30 $d_K(X, X'') < d_K(X, X')$.

31 The main contribution of the paper is an efficient algorithm that takes X and m as parameters and
 32 constructs an optimal m -approximation of X .

33 The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe how our work relates to other
 34 algorithms and problems studied in the literature. In Section 3 we detail the proposed algorithm,
 35 analyze its properties, and prove the main theorem. In Section 4 we demonstrate how the proposed
 36 approach performs on the problem of estimating the probability of hitting deadlines in plans and
 37 compare it to alternatives approximation approaches from the literature. We also demonstrate the
 38 performance of our approximation algorithm on some randomly generated random variables. The
 39 paper is concluded with a discussion in Section ??.

40 2 Related work

41 The most relevant work related to this paper is the papers by Cohen et. al. [5, 4]. These papers study
 42 approximations of random variables in the context of estimating deadlines. In this context, X' is
 43 defined to be a good approximation of X if $F_{X'}(t) > F_X(t)$ for any t and $\sup_t F_{X'}(t) - F_X(t)$
 44 is small. This is not a distance because it is not symmetric. The motivation given by Cohen et. al.
 45 for using this type of approximation is for cases where overestimation of the probability of missing
 46 a deadline is acceptable but underestimation is not. In Section 4, we consider the same examples
 47 examined by Cohen et. al. and show how the algorithm proposed in this paper performs relative to
 48 the algorithms proposed there when both over- and under- estimations are allowed. As expected, the
 49 Kolmogorov distance between the approximation and the original random variable is smaller by a
 50 factor of one half, on average, when using the algorithm proposed here.

51 Another relevant prior work is the theory of Sparse Approximation (aka Sparse Representation) that
 52 deals with sparse solutions for systems of linear equations, as follows.

Given a matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the most studied sparse representation problem is
 finding the sparsest possible representation $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p$ satisfying $x = D\alpha$:

$$\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|\alpha\|_0 \text{ subject to } x = D\alpha.$$

53 where $\|\alpha\|_0 = |\{i : \alpha_i \neq 0, i = 1, \dots, p\}|$ is the ℓ_0 pseudo-norm, counting the number of non-zero
 54 coordinates of α . This problem is known to be NP-Hard with a reduction to NP-complete subset
 55 selection problems.

In these terms, using also the ℓ_∞ norm that represents the maximal coordinate and the ℓ_1 norm that
 represents the sum of the coordinates, our problem can be phrased as:

$$\min_{\alpha \in [0, \infty)^p} \|x - D\alpha\|_\infty \text{ subject to } \|\alpha\|_0 = m \text{ and } \|\alpha\|_1 = 1.$$

56 where D is the all-ones triangular matrix (the entry at row i and column j is one if $i \leq j$ and zero
 57 otherwise), x is related to X such that the i th coordinate of x is $F_X(x_i)$ where $\text{support}(X) =$
 58 $\{x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_n\}$ and α is related to X' such that the i th coordinate of α is $f_{X'}(x_i)$. The
 59 functions F_X and $f_{X'}$ represent, respectively, the cumulative distribution function of X and the
 60 mass distribution function of X' . This, of course, means that the coordinates of x are assumed to
 61 be positive and monotonically increasing and that the last coordinate of x is assumed to be one. We

62 demonstrate an application for this specific sparse representation problem and show that it can be
 63 solve in $O(n^2m)$ time and $O(m^2)$ memory.

64 The presented work is also related to the research on binning in statistical inference. Consider, for
 65 example, the problem of credit scoring [21] that deals with separating good applicants from bad
 66 applicants where the Kolmogorov–Smirnov statistic KS is a standard measure. The KS comparison
 67 is often preceded by a procedure called binning where a large table is translated to a smaller one
 68 by collecting nearby values together. There are many methods for binning [11, 17, 2, 19]. In this
 69 context, our algorithm can be consider as a new binning strategy that provides optimality guarantees
 70 with respect to the Kolmogorov distance that none of the existing binning technique that we are
 71 aware of provides.

72 The present study is also related to the work of Pavlikov and Uryasev [15], where a procedure for
 73 producing a random variable X' that optimally approximates a random variable X is presented.
 74 Their approximation scheme, achieved using linear programming, is designed for a different notion
 75 of distance (called CVaR). The new contribution of the present work in this context is that our
 76 method is direct, not using linear programming, thus allowing tighter analysis of time and memory
 77 complexity. Also, our method is designed for optimizing the Kolmogorov distance that is more
 78 prevalent in applications. For comparison, in Section 4 we briefly discuss the performance of linear
 79 programming approach similar to the one proposed in [15] for the Kolmogorov distance and compare
 80 it to the algorithm proposed in this paper.

81 3 An algorithm for optimal approximation

82 In the scope of this section, let X be a given random variable with a finite support of size n , and
 83 let $0 < m \leq n$ be a given complexity bound. The section evolves by developing notations and by
 84 collecting facts towards an algorithm for finding an optimal m -approximation of X .

85 The first useful fact is that it is enough to limit our search to approximations X' 's such that
 86 $\text{support}(X') \subseteq \text{support}(X)$:

87 **Lemma 2.** *For every random variable X'' there is a random variable X' such that $\text{support}(X') \subseteq$
 88 $\text{support}(X)$ and $d_K(X, X') \leq d_K(X, X'')$.*

89 *Proof.* Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} = \text{support}(X)$, and let $x_0 = -\infty, x_{n+1} = \infty$. Consider the random
 90 variable X' whose probability mass function is $f_{X'}(x_i) = P(x_{i-1} < X'' \leq x_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$,
 91 $f_{X'}(x_n) = P(x_n - 1 < X'' < x_{n+1})$, and $F_{X'}(x) = 0$ if $x \notin \text{support}(X)$. Since X' only "pushes"
 92 the probability mass of X'' to the support of X , we have that $f_{X'}$ is a probability mass function
 93 and therefore X' is well defined. By construction, $|F_X(x_i) - F_{X'}(x_i)| = |F_X(x_i) - F_{X''}(x_i)|$
 94 for every $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. For $i = n$ we have $|F_X(x_n) - F_{X'}(x_n)| = |1 - 1| = 0$. Since
 95 $|F_X(x) - F_{X'}(x)| = |F_X(x_i) - F_{X'}(x_i)|$ for every $0 \leq i < n+1$ and $x_i < x < x_{i+1}$, we have
 96 that $d_K(X, X') = \max_i |F_X(x_i) - F_{X'}(x_i)| \leq \max_i |F_X(x_i) - F_{X''}(x_i)| \leq d_K(X, X'')$. \square

97 For a set $S \subseteq \text{support}(X)$, let \mathbb{X}_S denote the set of random variables whose supports are contained
 98 in S . In Step 1 below, we find a random variable in \mathbb{X}_S that minimizes the Kolmogorov distance
 99 from X . We denote the Kolmogorov distance between this variable and X by $\varepsilon(X, S)$. Then, in
 100 Step 2, we show how to efficiently find a set $S \subseteq \text{support}(X)$ whose size is smaller or equal to m
 101 that minimizes $\varepsilon(X, S)$. Then, in Step 3, an optimal m -approximation is constructed by taking a
 102 minimal approximation in \mathbb{X}_S where S is the set that that minimizes $\varepsilon(X, S)$.

103 **Step 1: Finding an X' in \mathbb{X}_S that minimizes $d_K(X, X')$**

104 We first fix a set $S \subseteq \text{support}(X)$ of size at most m , and among all the random variables in
 105 \mathbb{X}_S find one with a minimal distance from X . Denote the elements of S in increasing order by
 106 $S = \{x_1 < \dots < x_m\}$ and let $x_0 = -\infty$ and $x_{m+1} = \infty$. For every $1 \leq i \leq m$ let \hat{x}_i be the
 107 maximal element of $\text{support}(X)$ that is smaller than x_i . Consider the following weight function

108 **Definition 3.** For $0 \leq i \leq m$ let

$$w(x_i, x_{i+1}) = \begin{cases} P(x_i < X < x_{i+1}) & \text{if } i = 0 \text{ or } i = m; \\ P(x_i < X < x_{i+1})/2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

109 Note that $P(x_i < X < x_{i+1}) = F_X(\hat{x}_{i+1}) - F_X(x_i)$, a fact that we will use throughout this section.

110 **Definition 4.** Let $\varepsilon(X, S) = \max_{i=0, \dots, m} w(x_i, x_{i+1})$.

111 We first show that $\varepsilon(X, S)$ is a lower bound for the distance between random variable in \mathbb{X}_S and X .
 112 Then, we present a random variable $X' \in \mathbb{X}_S$ such that $d_K(X, X') = \varepsilon(X, S)$. It then follows that
 113 X' is an optimal m -approximation random variable among all random variables in \mathbb{X}_S .

114 **Proposition 5.** If $X' \in \mathbb{X}_S$ then $d_K(X, X') \geq \varepsilon(X, S)$.

115 *Proof.* By definition, for every $0 \leq i \leq m$, $d_K(X, X') \geq \max\{|F_X(\hat{x}_{i+1}) -$
 116 $F_{X'}(\hat{x}_{i+1})|, |F_X(x_i) - F_{X'}(x_i)|\}$. Note that $F_{X'}(\hat{x}_{i+1}) = F_{X'}(x_i)$ since the probability values
 117 for all the elements not in S are set to 0.

118 If $i = 0$, that is $x_i = -\infty$, we have that $F_X(x_i) = F_{X'}(x_i) = F_{X'}(\hat{x}_{i+1}) = 0$ and therefore
 119 $d_K(X, X') \geq |F_X(\hat{x}_{i+1})| = |F_X(\hat{x}_{i+1}) - F_X(x_i)| = P(x_i < X < x_{i+1}) = w(x_i, x_{i+1})$.

120 If $i = m$, that is $x_{i+1} = \infty$, we have that $F_X(\hat{x}_{i+1}) = F_{X'}(\hat{x}_{i+1}) = F_{X'}(x_i) = 1$. and therefore
 121 $d_K(X, X') \geq |1 - F_X(\hat{x}_i)| = |F_X(\hat{x}_{i+1}) - F_X(x_i)| = P(x_i < X < x_{i+1}) = w(x_i, x_{i+1})$.

122 Otherwise for every $1 \leq i < m$, we use the fact that $\max\{|a|, |b|\} \geq |a - b|/2$ for every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$,
 123 to deduce that $d_K(X, X') \geq 1/2|F_X(\hat{x}_{i+1}) - F_X(x_i) + F_{X'}(x_i) - F_{X'}(\hat{x}_{i+1})|$. So $d_K(X, X') \geq$
 124 $1/2|F_X(\hat{x}_{i+1}) - F_X(x_i)| = P(x_1 < X < x_2)/2 = w(x_i, x_{i+1})$.

125 Since $d_K(X, X') \geq w(x_i, x_{i+1})$ for every $0 \leq i \leq m$, the proof follows by the definition of
 126 $\varepsilon(X, S)$. \square

127 Next we describe a random variable $X' \in \mathbb{X}_S$ with a distance of $\varepsilon(X, S)$ from X . Thus X' is an
 128 optimal m -approximation among the set \mathbb{X}_S . The variable X' is described by its probability mass
 129 function:

130 **Definition 6.** Let $f_{X'}(x_i) = w(x_{i-1}, x_i) + w(x_i, x_{i+1}) + f_X(x_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $f_{X'}(x) = 0$
 131 for $x \notin S$.

132 We first show that X' is a properly defined random variable:

133 **Lemma 7.** $f_{X'}$ is a probability mass function.

134 *Proof.* From definition $f_{X'}(x_i) \geq 0$ for every i . To see that $\sum_i f_{X'}(x_i) = 1$, we have
 135 $\sum_i f_{X'}(x_i) = \sum_i (w(x_{i-1}, x_i) + w(x_i, x_{i+1}) + f_X(x_i)) = \sum_{x_i \in S} f_X(x_i) + w(x_0, x_1) +$
 136 $\sum_{0 < i < m} 2w(x_i, x_{i+1}) + w(x_m, x_{m+1}) = \sum_{x_i \in S} P(X=x_i) + P(x_0 < X < x_1) + \sum_{0 < i < m} P(x_i <$
 137 $X < x_{i+1}) + P(x_m < X < x_{m+1}) = 1$ since this is the entire support of X . \square

Note that X' can be constructed in time linear in the size of the support of X . Its main property, of course, the distance between the cumulative distribution functions of X and X' are bounded by $w(x_i, x_{i+1})$, as follows:

Lemma 8. *Let $x \in \text{support}(X)$ and $0 \leq i \leq m$ be such that $x_i \leq x \leq x_{i+1}$ then $-w(x_i, x_{i+1}) \leq F_X(x) - F_{X'}(x) \leq w(x_i, x_{i+1})$.*

Proof. We prove by induction on $0 \leq i < m$.

First see that $F_{X'}(j) = 0$ for every $x_0 < j < x_1$ and therefore $F_X(j) - F_{X'}(j) = F_X(j) - 0 \leq F_X(\hat{x}_1) = F_X(\hat{x}_1) - F_X(x_0) = w(x_0, x_1)$. For $j = x_1$ we have $F_X(x_1) - F_{X'}(x_1) = F_X(\hat{x}_1) + f_X(x_1) - (w(x_0, x_1) + w(x_1, x_2) + f_X(x_1)) = w(x_0, x_1) + f_X(x_1) - (w(x_0, x_1) + w(x_1, x_2) + f_X(x_1)) = -w(x_1, x_2)$.

Next assume that $F_X(\hat{x}_i) - F_{X'}(\hat{x}_i) = w(x_{i-1}, x_i)$. Then $F_X(x_i) - F_{X'}(x_i) = F_X(\hat{x}_i) + f_X(x_i) - (w(x_{i-1}, x_i) + w(x_i, x_{i+1}) + f_X(x_i)) = w(x_{i-1}, x_i) + f_X(x_i) - (w(x_{i-1}, x_i) + w(x_i, x_{i+1}) + f_X(x_i)) = -w(x_i, x_{i+1})$.

As before we have that for all $x_i < j < x_{i+1}$, we have $F_X(j) - F_{X'}(j) = F_X(j) - F_{X'}(\hat{x}_{i+1}) \leq F_X(\hat{x}_{i+1}) - F_{X'}(\hat{x}_{i+1})$. Then $F_X(\hat{x}_{i+1}) - F_{X'}(\hat{x}_{i+1}) = (F_X(x_i) + P(x_i < x < x_{i+1})) - F_{X'}(x_i) = -w(x_i, x_{i+1}) + 2w(x_i, x_{i+1}) = w(x_i, x_{i+1})$.

Finally for $x_m \leq j \leq x_{m+1}$ we have that $F_{X'}(x_m) = 1$ therefore $F_X(x_m) - F_{X'}(x_m) = (1 - P(x_m < X < x_{m+1})) - 1 = P(x_m < X < x_{m+1}) = w(x_m, x_{m+1})$, and for every $x_m < j < x_{m+1}$ we have $F_X(j) - F_{X'}(j) < (1 - P(x_m < X < x_{m+1})) - 1 < -P(x_m < X < x_{m+1}) = -w(x_m, x_{m+1})$ as required. \square

From Lemma 8, by the definition of $\varepsilon(X, S)$, we then have:

Corollary 9. $d_K(X, X') = \varepsilon(X, S)$.

From Proposition 5 we also have:

Corollary 10. $\varepsilon(X, S)$ is the distance between X and the variable closest to it in \mathbb{X}_S .

Step 2: Finding a set S that minimizes $\varepsilon(X, S)$

We proceed to finding an S that minimizes $\varepsilon(X, S)$. To obtain that we use a graph search approach motivated by a method described in [3]. We construct a directed graph with a source and a target in which each source-to-target path of length smaller or equal to m corresponds to a possible support set of the same size, and the weights along that path correspond to the weight as defined in Definition 3. Thus the problem of finding an S that minimizes $\varepsilon(X, S)$ is reduced to the problem of finding a source-to-target path \vec{p} of length smaller or equal to m in that graph such that the maximal weight of an edge in \vec{p} is minimal among all other such maximal edges in all other such paths.

More specifically, the vertexes of the graph are $V = \text{support}(X) \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$ and the edges, E , are all the pairs $(x_1, x_2) \in V^2$ such that $x_1 < x_2$. The weight of each edge is as specified in Definition 3. Note that there is a one-to-one correspondence between a set $S \subseteq \text{support}(X)$ of size m , and an $-\infty$ -to- ∞ path \vec{p}_S in G , obtained by removing the $-\infty$ and ∞ from the path in one way and by adding these elements and the sorting on the other way. With this correspondence the maximal weight of an edge on \vec{p}_S is $\varepsilon(X, S)$. We denote this maximal weight of an edge by $w(\vec{p}_S)$, and denote the set of all acyclic $-\infty$ -to- ∞ paths in G with at most m edges by $paths_m(G, -\infty, \infty)$. Thus, the problem of finding the set S with the minimal $\varepsilon(X, S)$ is now reduced to the problem of finding a path $\vec{p} \in paths_m(G, -\infty, \infty)$ such that $w(\vec{p})$ is minimal among all $\{w(\vec{p}') : \vec{p}' \in$

179 $paths_m(G, -\infty, \infty)\}$. This problem can be solved by a variant of the Bellman-Ford algorithm and
 180 by the improved algorithm described in [10].

181 **Step 3: Constructing the overall algorithm**

182 We combine Step 1 and Step 2 in the following algorithm called KolmogorovApprox (Algorithm 1)
 183 that follows naturally from the two steps. Given X and $\text{support}(X)$ we add x_0, x_{n+1} and construct
 184 the graph (line 2) as in Step 2. Then we execute a variant of the Bellman-Ford algorithm on G for m
 185 iterations, or the algorithm proposed in [10], to obtain a path $\vec{p} = (v_0, \dots, v_{m+1})$ (line 2). Finally
 186 we use Definition 6 to construct X' from \vec{p} (lines 4-5).

Algorithm 1: KolmogorovApprox(X, m)

- 1 Construct a weighted graph $G = (V, E)$ where $V = \text{support}(X) \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$,
 $E = \{(x_1, x_2) \in V^2 : x_1 < x_2\}$, and the weights are as in Definition 3.
 - 2 Find a path $\vec{p} = (x_0, \dots, x_{m+1}) \in paths_m(G, -\infty, \infty)\}$ such that
 $w(\vec{p}) = \min\{w(\vec{p}') : \vec{p}' \in paths_m(G, -\infty, \infty)\}$.
 - 3 Return a random variable whose probability mass function is
 $f_{X'}(x_i) = w(x_{i-1}, x_i) + w(x_i, x_{i+1}) + f_X(x_i)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$ and zero otherwise.
-

187 **Theorem 11.** KolmogorovApprox returns an m -optimal-approximation of X .

188 *Proof.* By the construction of G we get that the path \vec{p} obtained in line 4 of KolmogorovApprox
 189 describes a set S of support of size at most m for which $\varepsilon(S, X)$ is minimal. Then from Definition
 190 6 and Corollary 9 we construct X' in lines 4-5 of KolmogorovApprox such that $d_K(X, X') =$
 191 $\varepsilon(X, S)$. Therefore X' is an m -approximation among all random variables with support contained
 192 in $\text{support}(X)$. Finally from Lemma 2 we have that X' is m -approximation among all random
 193 variables os support of size at most m , thus X' is an m -optimal-approximation of X . \square

194 Finally we analyze the complexity of KolmogorovApprox as follows.

195 **Theorem 12.** The KolmogorovApprox(X, m) algorithm runs in time $O(mn^2)$, using $O(n^2)$ mem-
 196 ory where $n = |\text{support}(X)|$.

197 *Proof.* Constructing the graph G as described in Step 2 takes $O(n^2)$ time and memory. Comput-
 198 ing the shortest path can be achieved by the algorithm described in [10] in time $O(n^2m)$ and no
 199 additional memory allocation. \square

200 **4 Experimental results**

201 The case study examined in our experiments is the problem of task trees with deadlines [5, 4].
 202 Hierarchical planning is a well-established field in AI [6, 7, 8], and is still relevant nowadays [1,
 203 20]. A hierarchical plan is a method for representing problems of automated planning in which
 204 the dependency among tasks can be given in the form of networks, here we focus on hierarchical
 205 plans represented by task trees. The leaves in a task tree are *primitive* actions (or tasks), and the
 206 internal nodes are either *sequence* or *parallel* actions. The plans we deal with are of stochastic
 207 nature, and the task duration is described as probability distributions in the leaf nodes. We assume
 208 that the distributions are independent but *not* necessarily identically distributed and that the random
 209 variables are discrete and have a finite support.

A sequence node denotes a series of tasks that should be performed consecutively, whereas a parallel node denotes a set of tasks that begin at the same time. A *valid* plan is one that is fulfilled before some given *deadline*, i.e., its *makespan* is less than or equal to the deadline. The objective in this context is to compute the probability that a given plan is valid, or more formally computing $P(X < T)$, where X is a random variable representing the makespan of the plan and T is the deadline. The problem of finding the probability that a task tree satisfies a deadline is known to be NP-hard. In fact, even the problem of summing a set of random variables is NP-hard [13]. This is an example of an explicitly given random variable that we need to estimate deadline meeting probabilities for.

The first experiment we focus on is the problem of task trees with deadlines, and consider three types of task trees. The first type includes logistic problems of transporting packages by trucks and airplanes (from IPC2 <http://ipc.icaps-conference.org/>). Hierarchical plans of those logistic problems were generated by the JSHOP2 planner [14], one parallel node with all descendant task nodes being in sequence. The second type consists of task trees used as execution plans for the ROBIL team entry in the DARPA robotics challenge (DRC simulation phase), and the third type is of linear plans (sequential task trees). The primitive tasks in all the trees are modeled as discrete random variables with support of size M obtained by discretization of uniform distributions over various intervals. The number of tasks in a tree is denoted by N .

We implemented the approximation algorithm for solving the deadline problem with four different methods of approximation. The first two are for achieving a one-sided Kolmogorov approximation – the OptTrim [4] and the Trim [5] operators, and the third is a simple sampling scheme. We used those methods as a comparison to the Kolmogorov approximation with the suggested KolmogorovApprox algorithm. The parameter m of OptTrim and KolmogorovApprox corresponds to the inverse of ε given to the Trim operator. Note that in order to obtain some error ε , one must take into consideration the size of the task tree N , therefore, $m/N = 1/(\varepsilon \cdot N)$. We ran also an exact computation as a reference to the approximated one in order to calculate the error. The experiments conducted with the following operators and their parameters: KolmogorovApprox operator with $m = 10 \cdot N$, the OptTrim operator with $m = 10 \cdot N$, the Trim as operator with $\varepsilon = 0.1/N$, and two simple simulations, with a different samples number $s = 10^4$ and $s = 10^6$.

Task Tree	M	KolmogorovApprox	OptTrim	Trim	Sampling	
		$m/N=10$	$m/N=10$	$\varepsilon \cdot N=0.1$	$s=10^4$	$s=10^6$
Logistics ($N=34$)	2	0	0	0.0019	0.007	0.0009
	4	0.0024	0.0046	0.0068	0.0057	0.0005
Logistics ($N=45$)	2	0.0002	0.0005	0.002	0.015	0.001
	4	0	0.003	0.004	0.008	0.0006
DRC-Drive ($N=47$)	2	0.0014	0.004	0.009	0.0072	0.0009
	4	0.001	0.008	0.019	0.0075	0.0011
Sequential ($N=10$)	2	0.0093	0.015	0.024	0.0063	0.0008
	4	0.008	0.024	0.04	0.008	0.0016

Table 1: Comparison of estimated errors with respect to the reference exact computation on various task trees.

237

Table 1 shows the results of the case study experiment. The quality of the solutions provided by using the KolmogorovApprox operator are better than those provided by the Trim and OptTrim operators, following the optimality guarantees, but is interesting to see that the quality gaps happen in practice in each of the examined task trees. However, in some of the task trees the sampling method produced better results than the approximation algorithm with KolmogorovApprox. Nevertheless, the approximation algorithm comes with an inherent advantage of providing an exact quality guarantees, as opposed to the probabilistic guarantees provided by sampling.

In order to better understand the quality gaps in practice between KolmogorovApprox, OptTrim, and Trim, we investigate their relative errors when applied on single random variables with support size $n = 100$, and different support sizes of the resulting random variable approximation (m). In each instance of this experiment, a random variable is randomly generated by choosing the probabilities of each element in the support uniformly and then normalizing these probabilities so that they sum to 1.

Figure 1 present the error produced by the above methods. The depicted results are averages over several instances (50 instances) of random variables. The curves in the figure show the average error of OptTrim and Trim operators with comparison to the average error of the optimal approximation provided by KolmogorovApprox as a function of m . According to the depicted results it is evident that increasing the support size of the approximation m reduces the error, as expected, in all three methods. However, errors produced by the KolmogorovApprox are significantly smaller, a half of the error produced by OptTrim and Trim.




Figure 1: Error comparison between KolmogorovApprox, OptTrim, and Trim, on randomly generated random variables as function of m .

We also examined how our algorithm compares to linear programming as described and discussed, for example, in [15]. We ran an experiment to compare the run-time between the KolmogorovApprox algorithm with the run-time of a state-of-art implementation of linear programming. We used the “Minimize” function of Wolfram Mathematica and fed it with the equations $\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|x - \alpha\|_\infty$ subject to $\|\alpha\|_0 \leq m$ and $\|\alpha\|_1 = 1$. The run-time comparison results were clear and persuasive, for a random variable with support size $n = 10$ and $m = 5$, the LP algorithm run-time was 850 seconds, where the KolmogorovApprox algorithm run-time was less than a tenth of a second. For $n = 100$ and $m = 5$, the KolmogorovApprox algorithm run-time was 0.14 seconds and the LP algorithm took more than a day. Due to these timing results of the LP algorithm we did not proceed to examine it any further. Since it is not trivial to formally analyze the run-time of the LP algorithm, we conclude by the reported experiment that in this case the LP algorithm might not be as efficient as KolmogorovApprox algorithm whose complexity is proven to be polynomial in Theorem 12.

5 Discussion

We developed an algorithm for computing optimal approximations of random variables where the approximation quality is measured by the Kolmogorov distance. As demonstrated in the experiments, our algorithm improves on the approach of Cohen, Shimony and Weiss [5] and [4] in that it finds an optimal two sided Kolmogorov approximation, and not just one sided. Beyond the Kol-

mogorov measure studied here we believe that similar approaches may apply also to total variation, to the Wasserstein distance, and to other measures of approximations. Another direction for future work is extensions to tables that represent other objects, not necessarily random variables. To this end, we need to extend the algorithm to support tables that do not always sum to one and tables that may contain negative entries.

References

- [1] R. Alford, V. Shivashankar, M. Roberts, J. Frank, and D. W. Aha. Hierarchical planning: Relating task and goal decomposition with task sharing. In *IJCAI*, pages 3022–3029, 2016.
- [2] C. Bolton et al. *Logistic regression and its application in credit scoring*. PhD thesis, Citeseer, 2010.
- [3] A. Chakravarty, J. Orlin, and U. Rothblum. A partitioning problem with additive objective with an application to optimal inventory groupings for joint replenishment. *Operations Research*, 30(5):1018–1022, 1982.
- [4] L. Cohen, T. Grinshpoun, and G. Weiss. Optimal approximation of random variables for estimating the probability of meeting a plan deadline. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 2-7, 2018*, 2018.
- [5] L. Cohen, S. E. Shimony, and G. Weiss. Estimating the probability of meeting a deadline in hierarchical plans. In *IJCAI*, pages 1551–1557, 2015.
- [6] T. Dean, R. J. Firby, and D. Miller. Hierarchical planning involving deadlines, travel time, and resources. *Computational Intelligence*, 4(3):381–398, 1988.
- [7] K. Erol, J. Hendler, and D. S. Nau. HTN planning: Complexity and expressivity. In *AAAI*, volume 94, pages 1123–1128, 1994.
- [8] K. Erol, J. Hendler, and D. S. Nau. Complexity results for HTN planning. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 18(1):69–93, 1996.
- [9] J. D. Gibbons and S. Chakraborti. Nonparametric statistical inference. In *International encyclopedia of statistical science*, pages 977–979. Springer, 2011.
- [10] R. Guérin and A. Orda. Computing shortest paths for any number of hops. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking (TON)*, 10(5):613–620, 2002.
- [11] E. Mays. *Handbook of credit scoring*. Global Professional Publishi, 2001.
- [12] A. C. Miller and T. R. Rice. Discrete approximations of probability distributions. *Management Science*, 29(3):352–362, 1983.
- [13] R. Möhring. Scheduling under uncertainty: Bounding the makespan distribution. *Computational Discrete Mathematics*, pages 79–97, 2001.
- [14] D. S. Nau, T.-C. Au, O. Ilghami, U. Kuter, J. W. Murdock, D. Wu, and F. Yaman. SHOP2: An HTN planning system. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 20:379–404, 2003.
- [15] K. Pavlikov and S. Uryasev. CVaR distance between univariate probability distributions and approximation problems. Technical Report 2015-6, University of Florida, 2016.

- 313 [16] A. N. Pettitt and M. A. Stephens. The kolmogorov-smirnov goodness-of-fit statistic with dis-
314 crete and grouped data. *Technometrics*, 19(2):205–210, 1977.
- 315 [17] M. Refaat. *Credit Risk Scorecard: Development and Implementation Using SAS*. Lulu. com,
316 2011.
- 317 [18] E. Shufan, H. Ilani, and T. Grinshpoun. A two-campus transport problem. In *MISTA*, pages
318 173–184, 2011.
- 319 [19] N. Siddiqi. *Credit risk scorecards: developing and implementing intelligent credit scoring*,
320 volume 3. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- 321 [20] Z. Xiao, A. Herzig, L. Perrussel, H. Wan, and X. Su. Hierarchical task network planning with
322 task insertion and state constraints. In *IJCAI*, pages 4463–4469, 2017.
- 323 [21] G. Zeng. A comparison study of computational methods of kolmogorov–smirnov statistic in
324 credit scoring. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, 46(10):7744–7760,
325 2017.