

## Seminar Approximation Algorithms

# ANSWuSVp(U)M

Zeno Adrian Weil

17th May 2023

Supervisor: Dr Giovanna Varricchio

## Abstract

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Etiam lobortis facilisis sem. Nullam nec mi et neque pharetra sollicitudin. Praesent imperdiet mi nec ante. Donec ullamcorper, felis non sodales commodo, lectus velit ultrices augue, a dignissim nibh lectus placerat pede. Vivamus nunc nunc, molestie ut, ultricies vel, semper in, velit. Ut porttitor. Praesent in sapien. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Duis fringilla tristique neque. Sed interdum libero ut metus. Pellentesque placerat. Nam rutrum augue a leo. Morbi sed elit sit amet ante lobortis sollicitudin. Praesent blandit blandit mauris. Praesent lectus tellus, aliquet aliquam, luctus a, egestas a, turpis. Mauris lacinia lorem sit amet ipsum. Nunc quis urna dictum turpis accumsan semper. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Etiam lobortis facilisis sem. Nullam nec mi et neque pharetra sollicitudin. Praesent imperdiet mi nec ante. Donec ullamcorper, felis non sodales commodo, lectus velit ultrices augue, a dignissim nibh lectus placerat pede. Vivamus nunc nunc, molestie ut, ultricies vel, semper in, velit. Ut porttitor. Praesent in sapien. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Duis fringilla tristique neque. Sed interdum libero ut metus. Pellentesque placerat. Nam rutrum augue a leo. Morbi sed elit sit amet ante lobortis sollicitudin. Praesent blandit blandit mauris. Praesent lectus tellus, aliquet aliquam, luctus a, egestas a, turpis. Mauris lacinia lorem sit amet ipsum. Nunc quis urna dictum turpis accumsan semper.

# 1 Introduction

- problem introduction & motivation
- formal problem definition
- short literature review
- results & structure of paper

**Definition 1.** Let  $\mathcal{G} := \{1, \dots, m\}$  be a set of indivisible *items* and  $\mathcal{A} := \{1, \dots, n\}$  be a set of *agents*. An *allocation* is a tuple  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G})^n$  such that each item is element of exactly one  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , that is  $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{x}_i = \mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_i \cap \mathbf{x}_{i'} = \emptyset$  for all  $i \neq i'$ . An item  $j \in \mathcal{G}$  is *assigned* to agent  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  if  $j \in \mathbf{x}_i$  holds.

⋮

**Definition 2.** Given a set  $\mathcal{G}$  of items and a set  $\mathcal{A}$  of agents with *valuations*  $v_i: \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and *agent weights*  $\eta_i$  for all agents  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ , the *Nash Social Welfare problem* (NSW) is to find an allocation maximising the weighted geometric mean of valuations, that is

$$\arg \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Pi_n(\mathcal{G})} \left\{ \left( \prod_{i \in \mathcal{A}} v_i(\mathbf{x}_i)^{\eta_i} \right)^{1/\sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \eta_i} \right\}$$

less strict  
def of val-  
uations;  
restriction  
for our  
case later  
on

where  $\Pi_n(\mathcal{G})$  is the set of all possible allocations of the items in  $\mathcal{G}$  amongst  $n$  agents. The problem is called *symmetric* if all agent weights  $\eta_i$  are equal, and *asymmetric* otherwise.

⋮

In a slight abuse of notation, we omit the brackets in a valuation function if the set of items contains only one item, that is  $v_i(j) = v_i(\{j\})$ .

⋮

Garg, Kulkarni and Kulkarni consider five different types of non-negative monotonically non-decreasing valuation functions of which we are going to consider only the following two due to space constraints:

**Additive** The valuation  $v_i(\mathcal{S})$  of an agent  $i$  for a set  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{G}$  of items  $j$  is the sum of individual valuations  $v_i(j)$ , that is  $v_i(\mathcal{S}) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} v_i(j)$ .

**Submodular** Let  $v_i(\mathcal{S}_1 \mid \mathcal{S}_2) := v_i(\mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2) - v_i(\mathcal{S}_2)$  denote the marginal utility of agent  $i$  for a set  $\mathcal{S}_1 \subset \mathcal{G}$  of items over the disjoint set  $\mathcal{S}_2 \subset \mathcal{G}$ . This valuation functions satisfies the submodularity constraint  $v_i(j \mid \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \mathcal{S}_2) \leq v_i(j \mid \mathcal{S}_1)$  for all agents  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ , items  $j \in \mathcal{G}$  and sets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2 \subset \mathcal{G}$  of items.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Etiam lobortis facilisis sem. Nullam nec mi et neque pharetra sollicitudin. Praesent imperdiet mi nec ante. Donec ullamcorper, felis non sodales commodo, lectus velit ultrices augue, a dignissim nibh lectus placerat pede. Vivamus nunc nunc, molestie ut, ultricies vel, semper in, velit. Ut porttitor. Praesent in sapien. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Duis fringilla tristique neque. Sed interdum libero ut metus. Pellentesque placerat. Nam rutrum augue a leo. Morbi sed elit sit amet ante lobortis sollicitudin. Praesent blandit blandit mauris. Praesent lectus tellus, aliquet aliquam, luctus a, egestas a, turpis. Mauris lacinia lorem sit amet ipsum. Nunc quis urna dictum turpis accumsan semper. Lorem ipsum dolor sit

amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Etiam lobortis facilisis sem. Nullam nec mi et neque pharetra sollicitudin. Praesent imperdiet mi nec ante. Donec ullamcorper, felis non sodales commodo, lectus velit ultrices augue, a dignissim nibh lectus placerat pede. Vivamus nunc nunc, molestie ut, ultricies vel, semper in, velit. Ut porttitor. Praesent in sapien. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Duis fringilla tristique neque. Sed interdum libero ut metus. Pellentesque placerat. Nam rutrum augue a leo. Morbi sed elit sit amet ante lobortis sollicitudin. Praesent blandit blandit mauris. Praesent lectus tellus, aliquet aliquam, luctus a, egestas a, turpis. Mauris lacinia lorem sit amet ipsum. Nunc quis urna dictum turpis accumsan semper. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Etiam lobortis facilisis sem. Nullam nec mi et neque pharetra sollicitudin. Praesent imperdiet mi nec ante. Donec ullamcorper, felis non sodales commodo, lectus velit ultrices augue, a dignissim nibh lectus placerat pede. Vivamus nunc nunc, molestie ut, ultricies vel, semper in, velit. Ut porttitor. Praesent in sapien. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Duis fringilla tristique neque. Sed interdum libero ut metus. Pellentesque placerat. Nam rutrum augue a leo. Morbi sed elit sit amet ante lobortis sollicitudin. Praesent blandit blandit mauris. Praesent lectus tellus, aliquet aliquam, luctus a, egestas a, turpis. Mauris lacinia lorem sit amet ipsum. Nunc quis urna dictum turpis accumsan semper.

---

**Algorithm 1:** SMatch for the Asymmetric Additive NSW problem

---

**Input:** set  $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \dots, n\}$  of agents with weights  $\eta_i \forall i \in \mathcal{A}$ , set  $\mathcal{G} = \{1, \dots, m\}$  indivisible items, additive valuations  $v_i: \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}^+$  where  $v_i(\mathcal{S})$  is the valuation of agent  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  for each item set  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{G}$

**Output:**  $\frac{1}{2n}$ -approximation  $\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$  of an optimal allocation

```
1  $\mathbf{x}_i \leftarrow \emptyset \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{A}$ 
2  $u_i \leftarrow v_i(\mathcal{G}_{i, [2n+1:m]}) \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{A}$ 
3  $\mathcal{W} \leftarrow \{ \eta_i \cdot \log(v_i(j) + \frac{u_i}{n}) \mid i \in \mathcal{A}, j \in \mathcal{G} \}$   $\triangleright$  edge weights
4  $G \leftarrow (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W})$   $\triangleright$  bipartite graph
5  $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \text{max\_weight\_matching}(G)$ 
6  $\mathbf{x}_i \leftarrow \{ j \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{M} \} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{A}$   $\triangleright$  allocate according to matching
7  $\mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \leftarrow \mathcal{G} \setminus \{ j \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{M} \}$   $\triangleright$  remove allocated goods
8 while  $\mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \neq \emptyset$  do
9    $\mathcal{W} \leftarrow \{ \eta_i \cdot \log(v_i(j) + v_i(\mathbf{x}_i)) \mid i \in \mathcal{A}, j \in \mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \}$ 
10   $G \leftarrow (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}}, \mathcal{W})$ 
11   $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \text{max\_weight\_matching}(G)$ 
12   $\mathbf{x}_i \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_i \cup \{ j \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{M} \} \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{A}$ 
13   $\mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \leftarrow \mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \setminus \{ j \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{M} \}$ 
14 end while
15 return  $\mathbf{x}$ 
```

---

---

**Algorithm 2:** RepReMatch for the Asymmetric Submodular NSW problem

---

**Input:** set  $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \dots, n\}$  of agents with weights  $\eta_i \forall i \in \mathcal{A}$ , set  $\mathcal{G} = \{1, \dots, m\}$  indivisible items, additive valuations  $v_i: \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}^+$  where  $v_i(\mathcal{S})$  is the valuation of agent  $i \in \mathcal{A}$  for each item set  $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{G}$

**Output:**  $\frac{1}{2n \log n}$ -approximation  $\mathbf{x}^{\text{III}} = (\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{III}}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^{\text{III}})$  of an optimal allocation

*Phase I:*

```
1  $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{I}} \leftarrow \emptyset \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{A}$ 
2  $\mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \leftarrow \mathcal{G}$ 
3 for  $t = 0, \dots, \lceil \log n \rceil - 1$  do
4   if  $\mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \neq \emptyset$  then
5      $\mathcal{W} \leftarrow \{ \eta_i \cdot \log(v_i(j)) \mid i \in \mathcal{A}, j \in \mathcal{G} \}$ 
6      $G \leftarrow (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W})$ 
7      $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \text{max\_weight\_matching}(G)$ 
8      $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{I}} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{I}} \cup \{j\} \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}$ 
9      $\mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \leftarrow \mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \setminus \{j \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}\}$ 
10  end if
11 end for
```

*Phase II:*

```
12  $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{II}} \leftarrow \emptyset \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{A}$ 
13 while  $\mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \neq \emptyset$  do
14    $\mathcal{W} \leftarrow \{ \eta_i \cdot \log(v_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{II}} \cup \{j\})) \mid i \in \mathcal{A}, j \in \mathcal{G} \}$ 
15    $G \leftarrow (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W})$ 
16    $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \text{max\_weight\_matching}(G)$ 
17    $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{II}} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{II}} \cup \{j\} \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}$ 
18    $\mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \leftarrow \mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \setminus \{j \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}\}$ 
19 end while
```

*Phase III:*

```
20  $\mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \leftarrow \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{I}} \quad \triangleright \text{release items allocated in first phase}$ 
21  $\mathcal{W} \leftarrow \{ \eta_i \cdot \log(v_i(\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{II}} \cup \{j\})) \mid i \in \mathcal{A}, j \in \mathcal{G} \}$ 
22  $G \leftarrow (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{W})$ 
23  $\mathcal{M} \leftarrow \text{max\_weight\_matching}(G)$ 
24  $\mathbf{x}_i^{\text{III}} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}_i^{\text{II}} \cup \{j\} \quad \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}$ 
25  $\mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \leftarrow \mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}} \setminus \{j \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{M}\}$ 
26  $\mathbf{x}^{\text{III}} \leftarrow \text{arbitrary\_allocation}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{G}^{\text{rem}}, \mathbf{x}^{\text{III}}, (v_i)_{i \in \mathcal{A}})$ 
27 return  $\mathbf{x}^{\text{III}}$ 
```

---