



Chapter 7

Approximation Algorithms

Algorithm Theory
WS 2013/14

Fabian Kuhn

Approximation Algorithms

- Optimization appears everywhere in computer science
- We have seen many examples, e.g.:
 - scheduling jobs
 - traveling salesperson
 - maximum flow, maximum matching
 - minimum spanning tree
 - minimum vertex cover
 - ...
- Many discrete optimization problems are NP-hard
- They are however still important and we need to solve them
- As algorithm designers, we prefer algorithms that produce solutions which are provably good, even if we can't compute an optimal solution.

Approximation Algorithms: Examples



We have already seen two approximation algorithms

- **Metric TSP:** If distances are positive and satisfy the triangle inequality, the greedy tour is only by a log-factor longer than an optimal tour
- **Maximum Matching and Vertex Cover:** A maximal matching gives solutions that are within a factor of 2 for both problems.

Approximation Ratio

An **approximation algorithm** is an algorithm that computes a solution for an optimization with an objective value that is provably within a bounded factor of the optimal objective value.

Formally:

- $OPT \geq 0$: optimal objective value
 $ALG \geq 0$: objective value achieved by the algorithm
- **Approximation Ratio α :**

$$\text{Minimization: } \alpha := \max_{\text{input instances}} \frac{ALG}{OPT}$$

$$\text{Maximization: } \alpha := \max_{\text{input instances}} \frac{OPT}{ALG}$$

Example: Load Balancing

We are given:

- m machines M_1, \dots, M_m
- n jobs, processing time of job i is t_i

Goal:

- Assign each job to a machine such that the **makespan** is **minimized**

makespan: largest total processing time of any machine

The above load balancing problem is **NP-hard** and we therefore want to get a good approximation for the problem.

Greedy Algorithm

There is a simple **greedy algorithm**:

- Go through the jobs in an arbitrary order
- When considering job i , assign the job to the machine that currently has the smallest load.

Example: 3 machines, 12 jobs



Greedy Assignment:



Optimal Assignment:



Greedy Analysis

- We will show that greedy gives a 2-approximation
- To show this, we need to compare the solution of greedy with an optimal solution (that we can't compute)
- Lower bound on the optimal makespan T^* :

$$T^* \geq \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n t_i$$

- Lower bound can be far from T^* :
 - m machines, m jobs of size 1, 1 job of size m

$$T^* = m, \quad \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n t_i = 2$$

Greedy Analysis

- We will show that greedy gives a 2-approximation
- To show this, we need to compare the solution of greedy with an optimal solution (that we can't compute)
- Lower bound on the optimal makespan T^* :

$$T^* \geq \frac{1}{m} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^n t_i$$

- Second lower bound on optimal makespan T^* :


$$T^* \geq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} t_i$$

Greedy Analysis

Theorem: The greedy algorithm has approximation ratio ≤ 2 , i.e., for the makespan T of the greedy solution, we have $T \leq 2T^*$.

Proof:

- For machine k , let T_k be the time used by machine k
- Consider some machine M_i for which $T_i = T$
- Assume that job j is the last one scheduled on M_i :



- When job j is scheduled, M_i has the minimum load

Greedy Analysis

Theorem: The greedy algorithm has approximation ratio ≤ 2 , i.e., for the makespan T of the greedy solution, we have $T \leq 2T^*$.

Proof:

- For all machines M_k : load $T_k \geq T - t_j$

Can We Do Better?

The analysis of the greedy algorithm is almost tight:

- Example with $n = m(m - 1) + 1$ jobs
- Jobs $1, \dots, n - 1 = m(m - 1)$ have $t_i = 1$, job n has $t_n = m$

Greedy Schedule:

M_1 : 1111 ... 1 $t_n = m$

M_2 : 1111 ... 1

M_3 : 1111 ... 1

⋮ ⋮

M_m : 1111 ... 1

Improving Greedy

Bad case for the greedy algorithm:
One large job in the end can destroy everything

Idea: assign large jobs first

Modified Greedy Algorithm:

1. Sort jobs by decreasing length s.t. $t_1 \geq t_2 \geq \dots \geq t_n$
2. Apply the greedy algorithm as before (in the sorted order)

Lemma: If $n > m$: $T^* \geq t_m + t_{m+1} \geq 2t_{m+1}$

Proof:

- Two of the first $m + 1$ jobs need to be scheduled on the same machine
- Jobs m and $m + 1$ are the shortest of these jobs

Analysis of the Modified Greedy Alg.

Theorem: The modified algorithm has approximation ratio $\leq 3/2$, i.e., we have $T \leq 3/2 \cdot T^*$.

Proof:

- As before, choose machine M_i with $T_i = T$
- Job t_j is the last one scheduled on machine M_i
- If there is only one job t_j on M_i , we have $T_i = t_j = T^*$
- Otherwise, we have $j \geq m + 1$
 - The first m jobs are assigned to m distinct machines

Metric TSP

Input:

- Set V of n nodes (points, cities, locations, sites)
- Distance function $d: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, i.e., $d(u, v)$: dist. from u to v
- Distances define a metric on V :

$$d(u, v) = d(v, u) \geq 0, \quad d(u, v) = 0 \iff u = v$$

$$d(u, v) \leq d(u, w) + d(v, w)$$

Solution:

- Ordering/permutation v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n of vertices
- Length of TSP path: $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d(v_i, v_{i+1})$
- Length of TSP tour: $d(v_n, v_1) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} d(v_i, v_{i+1})$

Goal:

- Minimize length of TSP path or TSP tour

Metric TSP

- The problem is **NP-hard**
- We have seen that the **greedy** algorithm (always going to the nearest unvisited node) gives an **$O(\log n)$ -approximation**
- Can we get a constant approximation ratio?
- We will see that we can...


TSP and MST

Claim: The length of an optimal TSP path is lower bounded by the weight of a minimum spanning tree

Proof:


- A TSP path is a spanning tree, it's length is the weight of the tree

Corollary: Since an optimal TSP tour is longer than an optimal TSP path, the length of an optimal TSP tour is also lower bounded by the weight of a minimum spanning tree.



The MST Tour

Walk around the MST...




The MST Tour

Walk around the MST...

$$\text{Cost (walk)} = 2 \cdot \text{weight(MST)}$$

$$\text{Cost (tour)} < 2 \cdot \text{weight(MST)}$$



Approximation Ratio of MST Tour

Theorem: The MST TSP tour gives a **2-approximation** for the metric TSP problem.

Proof:

- Triangle inequality \rightarrow length of tour is at most $2 \cdot \text{weight}(\text{MST})$
- We have seen that $\text{weight}(\text{MST}) < \text{opt. tour length}$

Can we do even better?


Metric TSP Subproblems

Claim: Given a metric (V, d) and (V', d) for $V' \subseteq V$, the optimal TSP path/tour of (V', d) is at most as large as the optimal TSP path/tour of (V, d) .

Optimal TSP tour of nodes 1, 2, ..., 12

Induced TSP tour for nodes 1, 2, 5, 8, 10, 12

blue tour \leq green tour



TSP and Matching

- Consider a metric TSP instance (V, d) with an even number of nodes $|V|$
- Recall that a perfect matching is a matching $M \subseteq V \times V$ such that every node of V is incident to an edge of M .
- Because $|V|$ is even and because in a metric TSP, there is an edge between any two nodes $u, v \in V$, any partition of V into $|V|/2$ pairs is a perfect matching.
- The weight of a matching M is the sum of the distances represented by all edges in M :


$$w(M) = \sum_{\{u,v\} \in M} d(u, v)$$

TSP and Matching

Lemma: Assume we are given a TSP instance (V, d) with an even number of nodes. The length of an optimal TSP tour of (V, d) is at least twice the weight of a minimum weight perfect matching of (V, d) .

Proof:

- The edges of a TSP tour can be partitioned into 2 perfect matchings



Minimum Weight Perfect Matching

Claim: If $|V|$ is even, a minimum weight perfect matching of (V, d) can be computed in polynomial time

Proof Sketch:

- We have seen that a maximum matching in an unweighted graph can be computed in polynomial time
- With a more complicated algorithm, also a maximum weighted matching can be computed in polynomial time
- In a complete graph, a maximum weighted matching is also a (maximum weight) perfect matching
- Define weight $w(u, v) := D - d(u, v)$
- A maximum weight perfect matching for (V, w) is a minimum weight perfect matching for (V, d)

Algorithm Outline

Problem of MST algorithm:

- Every edge has to be visited twice

Goal:

- Get a graph on which every edge only has to be visited once (and where still the total edge weight is small compared to an optimal TSP tour)

Euler Tours:

- A tour that visits each edge of a graph exactly once is called an **Euler tour**
- An Euler tour in a (multi-)graph exists if and only if **every node** of the graph has **even degree**
- That's definitely not true for a tree, but can we modify our MST suitably?

Euler Tour


Theorem: A connected (multi-)graph G has an Euler tour if and only if every node of G has even degree.

Proof:

- If G has an odd degree node, it clearly cannot have an Euler tour
- If G has only even degree nodes, a tour can be found recursively:
 1. Start at some node
 2. As long as possible, follow an unvisited edge
 - Gives a partial tour, the remaining graph still has even degree
 3. Solve problem on remaining components recursively
 4. Merge the obtained tours into one tour that visits all edges


TSP Algorithm

1. Compute MST T
2. V_{odd} : nodes that have an odd degree in T ($|V_{\text{odd}}|$ is even)
3. Compute min weight perfect matching M of (V_{odd}, d)
4. $(V, T \cup M)$ is a (multi-)graph with even degrees



TSP Algorithm

5. Compute Euler tour on $(V, T \cup M)$
6. Total length of Euler tour $\leq \frac{3}{2} \cdot \mathbf{TSP}_{\mathbf{OPT}}$
7. Get TSP tour by taking shortcuts wherever the Euler tour visits a node twice



TSP Algorithm

- The described algorithm is by Christofides

Theorem: The Christofides algorithm achieves an approximation ratio of at most $3/2$.

Proof:

- The length of the Euler tour is $\leq 3/2 \cdot \text{TSP}_{\text{OPT}}$
- Because of the triangle inequality, taking shortcuts can only make the tour shorter

Knapsack

- n items $1, \dots, n$, each item has **weight** $w_i > 0$ and **value** $v_i > 0$
- Knapsack (bag) of capacity W
- Goal: pack items into knapsack such that **total weight** is at most W and **total value is maximized**:

$$\max \sum_{i \in S} v_i$$

$$\text{s. t. } S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ and } \sum_{i \in S} w_i \leq W$$

- E.g.: jobs of length w_i and value v_i , server available for W time units, try to execute a set of jobs that maximizes the total value

Knapsack: Dynamic Programming Alg.



We have shown:

- If all item weights w_i are integers, using dynamic programming, the knapsack problem can be solved in time $O(nW)$
- If all values v_i are integers, there is another dynamic programming algorithm that runs in time $O(n^2V)$, where V is the max. value.

Problems:

- If W and V are large, the algorithms are not polynomial in n
- If the values or weights are not integers, things are even worse (and in general, the algorithms cannot even be applied at all)

Idea:

- Can we adapt one of the algorithms to at least compute an approximate solution?

Approximation Algorithm

- The algorithm has a parameter $\varepsilon > 0$
- We assume that each item alone fits into the knapsack
- We define:

$$V := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} v_i, \quad \forall i: \hat{v}_i := \left\lceil \frac{v_i n}{\varepsilon V} \right\rceil, \quad \hat{V} := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \hat{v}_i$$

- We solve the problem with **integer** values \hat{v}_i and weights w_i using dynamic programming in time $O(n^2 \cdot \hat{V})$

Theorem: The described algorithm runs in time $O(n^3 / \varepsilon)$.

Proof:

$$\hat{V} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \hat{v}_i = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\lceil \frac{v_i n}{\varepsilon V} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{V n}{\varepsilon V} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \frac{n}{\varepsilon} \right\rceil$$

Approximation Algorithm

Theorem: The approximation algorithm computes a feasible solution with approximation ratio at most $1 + \varepsilon$.

Proof:

- Define the set of all feasible solutions (subsets of $[n]$)

$$\mathcal{S} := \left\{ S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} : \sum_{i \in S} w_i \leq W \right\}$$

- $v(S)$: value of solution S w.r.t. values v_1, v_2, \dots
 $\hat{v}(S)$: value of solution S w.r.t. values $\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2, \dots$
- Let S^* be an optimal solution and \hat{S} be the solution found by the approximation algorithm.
- Weights are not changed at all, hence, \hat{S} is a feasible solution

Approximation Algorithm

Theorem: The approximation algorithm computes a feasible solution with approximation ratio at most $1 + \varepsilon$.

Proof:

- We have

$$v(S^*) = \sum_{i \in S^*} v_i = \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i \in S} v_i,$$

$$\hat{v}(\hat{S}) = \sum_{i \in \hat{S}} \hat{v}_i = \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i \in S} \hat{v}_i$$

- Because every item fits into the knapsack, we have

$$\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}: v_i \leq V \leq \sum_{j \in S^*} v_j$$

- Also: $\hat{v}_i = \left\lceil \frac{v_i n}{\varepsilon V} \right\rceil \implies v_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon V}{n} \cdot \hat{v}_i$, and $\hat{v}_i \leq \frac{v_i n}{\varepsilon V} + 1$

Approximation Algorithm

Theorem: The approximation algorithm computes a feasible solution with approximation ratio at most $1 + \varepsilon$.

Proof:

- We have

$$\sum_{i \in S^*} v_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon V}{n} \cdot \sum_{i \in S^*} \hat{v}_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon V}{n} \cdot \sum_{i \in \hat{S}} \hat{v}_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon V}{n} \cdot \sum_{i \in \hat{S}} \left(1 + \frac{v_i n}{\varepsilon V}\right)$$

- Therefore

$$v(S^*) = \sum_{i \in S^*} v_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon V}{n} \cdot |\hat{S}| + \sum_{i \in \hat{S}} v_i \leq \varepsilon V + v(\hat{S})$$

- V is a lower bound on both solutions $v(S^*)$ and $v(\hat{S})$:
$$v(S^*) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)v(\hat{S})$$

Approximation Schemes

- For every parameter $\varepsilon > 0$, the knapsack algorithm computes a $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation in time $O(n^3 / \varepsilon)$.
- For every fixed ε , we therefore get a polynomial time approximation algorithm
- An algorithm that computes an $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation for every $\varepsilon > 0$ is called an **approximation scheme**.
- If the running time is polynomial for every fixed ε , we say that the algorithm is a **polynomial time approximation scheme (PTAS)**
- If the running time is also **polynomial in $1/\varepsilon$** , the algorithm is a **fully polynomial time approximation scheme (FPTAS)**
- Thus, the described alg. is an FPTAS for the knapsack problem