CS 599: Rounding Techniques in Approximation Algorithms

Homework 2: Dependent Randomized Rounding

Fall 2024

1 Problem 1: P=NP...?

1. In the traveling salesperson problem, we are given a complete graph $G = (V, E)$ with edge costs $c: E \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that form a metric, i.e. $c_{\{u,w\}} \leq c_{\{u,v\}} + c_{\{v,w\}}$ for all u,v,w . Our goal is to find the minimum cost Hamiltonian cycle. Now where $n = |V|$ and $E(S)$ for $S \subseteq V$ is the set of edges with both endpoints in *S*, let

$$
P_{\text{sub}} = \begin{cases} \sum_{e \in E} x_e = n \\ \sum_{e \in E(S)} x_e \le |S| - 1 & \forall S \subsetneq V \\ x_e \ge 0 & \forall e \in E \end{cases}
$$

Prove that $P_{\text{sub}} \cap \{0,1\}^E$ is the set of all feasible solutions to the traveling salesperson problem, i.e. all Hamiltonian cycles in *G*.

- 2. Notice that P_{sub} is exactly the spanning tree polytope P_{st} except we have changed the $n-1$ to an *n*. So, it seems like we should be able to apply the proof from Lecture 5 to show that it has integral vertices. Either use this to prove P=NP or find a flaw in the argument from Lecture 5 when applied to P_{sub} instead of P_{st} (i.e. when we change the $n-1$ to an n).
- 3. In Lecture 3, we mentioned that it is NP-Hard to obtain a 1.001 approximation for weighted *k*-ECSS for any *k*. Either explain where the proof of the $1 + O(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{k}})$ *k*) approximation for the unweighted case fails and give an integrality gap example of $1 + \epsilon$ for some constant $\epsilon > 0$ and some $k \ge \log n$, or adapt the algorithm to prove that P=NP. **Hint:** The input may be a multigraph. Recall that the *k*-ECSS polytope is as follows:

$$
P_{k-ECSS} = \begin{cases} x(\delta(S)) \ge k & \forall S \subset V \\ 0 \le x_e \le 1 & \forall e \in E \end{cases}
$$

2 Problem 2: Scaling into Integral

Suppose *P* is a polytope in $[0,1]^n_{\geq 0}$ and \tilde{P} is the convex hull of $P \cap \mathbb{Z}^n$. Now, suppose that there is an $\alpha \geq 1$ such that given any point $x \in P$ there exists a randomized algorithm A that produces a random point $\tilde{x} \in \tilde{P}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{x}_i] \leq \alpha x_i$ for all *i* for every input, where the expectation is taken over the possible outputs \tilde{x} of *A* given *x*.

Given a polytope *P*, *P* ↑ is called the *dominant* of *P* and consists of all points *x* such that there exists $x' \in P$ for which $x - x' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$.

- 1. Prove that $\alpha \cdot P \subseteq \tilde{P}^{\uparrow}$ (where $\alpha \cdot P$ consists of all points in *x* scaled entry-wise by α).
- 2. Prove that the integrality gap of the LP min $c^T x$ subject to $x \in P$ is at most α for any $c \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$.

3 Problem 3: Randomized Pipage Rounding for Matroids

A *matroid* $M = (E, \mathcal{I})$ is defined by a collection of elements E and a collection of *independent sets* $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^E$ with $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$ and the properties:

- (i) **Downward Closed:** If $I \in \mathcal{I}$, then $I \in \mathcal{I}$ for every $I \subseteq I$.
- (ii) **Augmentation Property**: If $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|I| < |J|$ then there exists some $e \in J$ such that $I \cup \{e\} \in \mathcal{I}.$

A *basis* of a matroid is any maximal independent set. The *rank* of a collection of elements *F* ⊆ *E* is the maximum possible size of *I* ∩ *F* for any *I* ∈ *I*. Let *r* : 2^E → $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be the rank function.

In this problem, we will consider the following polytope *P^M* for a matroid *M*:

$$
P_M = \begin{cases} x(E) = r(E) \\ x(S) \le r(S) & \forall S \subseteq E \\ x_e \ge 0 & \forall e \in E \end{cases}
$$

- 1. Argue that the set of forests of a graph forms a matroid *M*, and that in this case $P_M = P_{st}$ for any connected graph.
- 2. Adapt the proof in class for the spanning tree polytope to show that for every matroid *M*, *P^M* as defined above is the convex hull of its (integral) bases, i.e. it is the base polytope of *M*. You may use that the rank function *r* is submodular, i.e. $r(S) + r(T) \ge r(S \cup T) + r(S \cap T)$ for *S*, $T \subseteq E$. Then briefly argue that randomized pipage rounding works for any matroid with the same guarantees as for spanning trees.
- 3. Use the [method of conditional expectation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Method_of_conditional_probabilities) to derandomize randomized pipage rounding so that given $x \in P_M$ and any cost function $c: E \to \mathbb{R}^E$, we can find a point of cost at most $c(x)$ in polynomial time.
- 4. When using given an independent distribution $\mu: 2^E \to \mathbb{R}^E_{\geq 0}$ with marginals x , we have used that $\mathbb{P}_{S \sim \mu}[|S \cap F| = 0] \leq e^{-x(F)}$ for any $F \subseteq E$. Show that this also holds for distributions with 0-negative correlation and thus for randomized pipage rounding.

Show that the same bound does *not* hold for all distributions μ with only negative correlation, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[\prod_{i \in S} X_i] \leq \prod_{i \in S} \mathbb{E}[X_i]$ for all $S \subseteq E$, by exhibiting a negatively correlated distribution for which this does not hold.

4 Problem 4: Lottery

Use the above to show that we can design a multi-item lottery as follows. Suppose we have a collection of *n* goods g_1, \ldots, g_n , a collection of *m* people w_1, \ldots, w_m , and a specified $0 < \epsilon < 1$. Now, we will allow people to buy up to one lottery ticket. Before they purchase a ticket, they will specify the subset of the goods that they would be happy winning, and if we sell them a ticket we must promise them that their chance of getting one of their chosen goods is at least *e*.

Using that *P^M* has a polynomial time separation oracle for every *M*, implement a polynomial time lottery system that (i) can determine when a ticket can be faithfully sold (this will depend on the subset of goods desired), (ii) will output a random assignment that respects the guarantee, and (iii) is *fair to all groups* in the sense that for any group of *k* people, the probability at least one of them wins something is at least $1 - e^{-k\epsilon}$.

5 Bonus Problems

- 1. Prove the parsimonious property from Lecture 6 using splitting off.
- 2. Show that the randomized rounding algorithm for the multi-commodity flow problem can be derandomized using the method of conditional expectation.
- 3. Give an example showing that the Chernoff bound upper tail does not hold for distributions with only *pairwise* negative correlation, i.e. $\mathbb{P}\left[e, f \in S\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[e \in S | \mathbb{P}\left[f \in S\right] \text{ (and not full)}\right]$ negative correlation as we proved for pipage rounding).
- 4. (***) Prove that pipage rounding can be used to give a 1 + *O*(1/ √ *k*) for *k*-ECSM. (Note: This is quite difficult. I think I vaguely see how to prove this but I'm not 100% sure. This could potentially even be false, although I don't think so. This could be an interesting final project.)