

# COMS E6232 - Problem Set #2

Alex Wong (asw2181) - [asw2181@columbia.edu](mailto:asw2181@columbia.edu)

March 2, 2017

## Problem 1

1. Consider an instance where we have two items:  $i$  and  $j$ . Item  $i$  has  $s_i = \epsilon$

It is obvious to see the OPT solution; the last 16 nodes of set  $L$  connect to a distinct node in set  $R$ , meaning that the OPT solution must contain at least 16 nodes. We also see that all 16 nodes of set  $R$  has edges to all the nodes in set  $L$ . This shows that the OPT solution would be selecting every node from set  $R$ . Thus, the approximation ratio of Greedy on this graph is  $33/16 = 2.0625$ .

2. Consider the graph  $G$  from part 1. We can say that set  $R$  contains  $k^2$  nodes, all of degree  $\leq k$ . We can partition set  $L$  into  $k$  sets,  $L_1, \dots, L_k$ , where each set  $L_i$  contains  $\lfloor \frac{k^2}{i} \rfloor$  nodes of degree  $i$ . From these sets, we see that  $|L_1| = |R|$ ,  $|L_2| = \frac{1}{2}|R|$ ,  $|L_3| = \lfloor \frac{1}{3}|R| \rfloor$ , and  $|L_4| = \frac{1}{4}|R|$ . Adding  $R + \frac{1}{2}R + \lfloor \frac{1}{3}R \rfloor + \frac{1}{4}R$  forms the start of the harmonic series, which shows that  $|L| \approx \ln k |R|$ . Thus, this shows that the approximation ratio of Greedy is not bounded by any constant; rather, the approximation ratio is  $\Omega(\log n)$  where  $n$  is the number of nodes.

## Problem 2

1. **Lemma 2.1** Let  $T$  be the minimum spanning tree of the weighted complete graph  $G$ . Then  $\text{cost}(T) \leq \text{OPT}$ , where  $\text{OPT}$  is the cost of the optimal  $s$ - $t$  path.

**Proof:** We can prove this by contradiction. Suppose that  $\text{cost}(T) > \text{OPT}$ . We know that  $\text{OPT}$  must visit every node to create a path. Thus, if  $\text{OPT} < \text{cost}(T)$ , it violates the very definition of a minimum spanning tree, proving that  $\text{cost}(T) > \text{OPT}$  can not be true. Thus,  $\text{cost}(T) \leq \text{OPT}$ .  $\square$

2. **Lemma 2.2** Let  $U$  be the subset of nodes consisting of the nodes of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ - $\{s, t\}$  that have odd degree in  $T$  and the nodes in  $\{s, t\}$  that have even degree in  $T$ . Then  $U$  has an even number of nodes.

**Proof:** Suppose we partition  $U$  into 2 subsets:  $U_{\text{odd}}$  and  $U_{\text{even}}$  where they contain nodes that have odd degree and nodes that have even degree, respectively. We know that in the minimum spanning tree  $T$ , there is an even number of nodes that have odd degree since  $\sum_{v \in T_{\text{odd}}} \text{degree}(v) = 2 \cdot \# \text{edges}$ . Knowing this, if  $|U_{\text{odd}}|$  is odd, that means either  $s$  or  $t$  must have an odd degree, meaning the other must have an even degree and would be contained in  $U_{\text{even}}$ , so  $|U_{\text{even}}| = 1$ . Thus,

$$|U| = |U_{\text{odd}}| + |U_{\text{even}}| = \text{odd}\# + 1 = \text{even}\#$$

which shows that  $|U|$  is even.

If  $|U_{\text{odd}}|$  is even, then  $s$  and  $t$  must both have odd degrees or both have even degrees; if both are odd, then  $|U_{\text{even}}| = 0$  which trivially shows  $|U|$  is even. If both are even, then  $|U_{\text{even}}| = 2$  and

$$|U| = |U_{\text{odd}}| + |U_{\text{even}}| = \text{even}\# + 2 = \text{even}\#$$

which shows that  $|U|$  is even. It must be noted that if  $|U_{\text{even}}| = 2$  there must be other nodes in set  $U$ ;  $U$  can never just contain  $s$  and  $t$ . Thus, the set  $U$  has an even number of nodes.  $\square$

3. **Lemma 2.3** Let  $G[U]$  be the subgraph of  $G$  induced by the subset  $U$ ,  $M$  be a minimum-cost perfect matching in  $G[U]$ , and  $P^*$  be a minimum-cost path from  $s$  to  $t$  that visits every node exactly once. Consider the nodes of  $U$  in the order that they appear on the path  $P^*$  and let  $u_i$  be the  $i$ -th node of  $U$  in this ordering:  $i = 1, \dots, |U|$ . Color red the edges of  $P^*$  on the subpath from  $u_1$  to  $u_2, \dots$ , from  $u_{2k-1}$  to  $u_{2k}$ , where  $|U| = 2k$ . Color blue the other edges of  $P^*$ . Then,  $\text{cost}(\text{red edges}) \geq \text{cost}(M)$ .

**Proof:** We can prove this by contradiction. Suppose  $\text{cost}(\text{red edges}) < \text{cost}(M)$ . We know that red edges are essentially a perfect matching on set  $U$ . If  $\text{cost}(\text{red edges})$

$< \text{cost}(M)$ , then  $M$  is not a minimum-cost perfect matching on set  $U$ , proving that  $\text{cost}(\text{red edges}) < \text{cost}(M)$  can not be true. Thus,  $\text{cost}(\text{red edges}) \geq \text{cost}(M)$ .  $\square$

4. **Lemma 2.4**  $\text{cost}(T) + \text{cost}(\text{blue edges}) \geq 2 \cdot \text{cost}(M)$ .

**Proof:** We first see that  $T \cup (\text{blue edges of } P^*)$  creates a connected Eulerian multigraph. We know this to be true because every vertex has an even degree. A Eulerian multigraph is essentially a multigraph that contains an Eulerian tour. Within a Eulerian tour, we know that we can create two disjoint perfect matchings of  $U$  and the sum of their costs  $\leq$  cost of the Eulerian tour due to triangle inequality. We also know that both of the disjoint perfect matchings can not have a cost  $< \text{cost}(M)$  or else  $M$  can't be a minimum-cost perfect matching on  $U$ . Thus,

$$2 \cdot \text{cost}(M) \leq \text{cost}(2 \text{ disjoint perfect matchings}) \leq \text{cost}(T) + \text{cost}(\text{blue edges})$$

$$\text{cost}(T) + \text{cost}(\text{blue edges}) \geq 2 \cdot \text{cost}(M)$$

$\square$

5. **Theorem 2.5** The variant of Christofides' algorithm achieves an approximation factor of  $5/3$  for the  $s$ - $t$  path metric TSP problem.

**Proof:** Combining our conclusions from Lemma 2.3 and 2.4, we can say that:

$$\text{cost}(T) + \text{cost}(\text{blue edges}) + \text{cost}(\text{red edges}) \geq 3 \cdot \text{cost}(M) \quad (1)$$

We also know that  $\text{cost}(\text{blue edges}) + \text{cost}(\text{red edges}) = P^* = \text{OPT}$  and from Lemma 2.1 that  $\text{cost}(T) \leq \text{OPT}$ . Thus, we can modify equation 1 to be:

$$\text{cost}(T) + \text{OPT} \geq 3 \cdot \text{cost}(M)$$

$$2 \cdot \text{OPT} \geq 3 \cdot \text{cost}(M)$$

$$\text{cost}(M) \leq 2/3 \text{ OPT} \quad (2)$$

Adding  $\text{cost}(T)$  to both sides of equation 2 and using Lemma 2.1 that  $\text{cost}(T) \leq \text{OPT}$ , we finally get:

$$\text{cost}(T) + \text{cost}(M) \leq \text{cost}(T) + 2/3 \text{ OPT}$$

$$\text{cost}(T) + \text{cost}(M) \leq \text{OPT} + 2/3 \text{ OPT}$$

$$\text{cost}(T) + \text{cost}(M) \leq 5/3 \text{ OPT}$$

Thus showing that the cost of the path computed by the variant of Christofides' algorithm is at most  $5/3$  times the cost of the optimal path.  $\square$

6.