Randomized Rounding

- Brief Introduction to Linear Programming and Its Usage in Combinatorial Optimization
- Randomized Rounding for Cut Problems
- Randomized Rounding for Covering Problems
- Randomized Rounding for Satisfiability Problems
- Randomized Rounding and Semi-definite Programming

Approximate Sampling and Counting

• ...

- A (minimization) combinatorial problem $\Pi \Leftrightarrow$ an ILP
- $\bullet~$ Let $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$ be an optimal solution to the ILP
- $\bullet\,$ Relax ILP to get an LP; let \mathbf{y}^* be an optimal solution to the LP

• Then,

$$\operatorname{Opt}(\Pi) = \operatorname{cost}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \geq \operatorname{cost}(\mathbf{y}^*)$$

(If Π is maximization, reverse the inequality!)

- Carefully "round" \mathbf{y}^* (rational) to get a feasible solution \mathbf{y}^A (integral) to the ILP, such that \mathbf{y}^A is not too bad, say $cost(\mathbf{y}^A) \leq \alpha cost(\mathbf{y}^*)$
- Conclude that $\operatorname{cost}(\mathbf{y}^A) \leq \alpha \cdot \operatorname{OPT}(\Pi)$
- Thus, we get an α -approximation algorithm for Π
- If $\alpha = 1$, then we have solved Π exactly!

Definition (Set-Cover Problem)

Inputs: a collection $S = \{S_1, \ldots, S_n\}$ of subsets of $[m] = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, where S_j is of weight $w_j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Objective: find a sub-collection $C = \{S_i \mid i \in J\}$ with least total weight such that $\bigcup_{i \in J} S_i = [m]$.

ILP for Set Cover

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & w_1 x_1 + \dots + w_n x_n \\ \text{subject to} & \sum_{j:S_j \ni i} x_j \ge 1, \quad \forall i \in [m], \\ & x_j \in \{0,1\}, \quad \forall j \in [n]. \end{array}$$

$$(1)$$

Let $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ be an optimal solution to this ILP.

The relaxation of the ILP is the following LP:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min & w_1 x_1 + \dots + w_n x_n \\ \text{subject to} & \displaystyle \sum_{j:S_j \ni i} x_j \geq 1, \quad \forall i \in [m], \\ & 0 \leq x_j \leq 1 \quad \forall j \in [n]. \end{array}$$

Let \mathbf{x}^* be an optimal solution to this LP.

(2)

First Attempt at Randomized Rounding

Want: a feasible solution x^A which is *not too far* from x^{*} on average.
Make sense to try:

$$\mathsf{Prob}[x_j^A = 1] = x_j^*.$$

Solution quality:

$$\mathsf{E}[\mathsf{cost}(\mathbf{x}^A)] = \sum_{j=1}^n w_j x_j^* = \mathsf{cost}(\mathbf{x}^*) \le \mathsf{cost}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \mathsf{OPT}.$$

- Feasibility? Consider an arbitrary constraint $x_{j_1} + \cdots + x_{j_k} \ge 1$.
- ullet The probability that this constraint is not satisfied by \mathbf{x}^A is

$$(1 - x_{j_1}^*) \dots (1 - x_{j_k}^*) \le \left(\frac{k - (x_{j_1}^* + \dots + x_{j_k}^*)}{k}\right)^k \le \left(1 - \frac{1}{k}\right)^k \le \frac{1}{e}.$$

There are m constraints; thus, $Prob[\mathbf{x}^A \text{ is not feasible}] \leq m/e$. First attempt doesn't quite work!

©Hung Q. Ngo (SUNY at Buffalo)

Second Attempt at Randomized Rounding

• Should round x_j to 1 with higher probability. Let t be a parameter determined later.

$$\mathsf{Prob}[x_j^A = 0] = (1 - x_j^*)^t$$

(This is equivalent to running the first strategy independently t rounds, and set $x_i^A = 0$ only when $x_i^A = 0$ in all rounds.)

• Solution Quality

$$\mathsf{E}[\mathsf{cost}(\mathbf{x}^A)] \le t \cdot \mathsf{OPT}.$$

- Feasibility? $\operatorname{Prob}[\mathbf{x}^A \text{ does not satisfy any given constraint}] \leq (1/e)^t$.
- Thus, $\operatorname{Prob}[\mathbf{x}^A \text{ is not feasible}] \leq m(1/e)^t$.

Finishing Up

Markov inequality gives

$$\mathsf{Prob}[\mathsf{cost}(\mathbf{x}^A) > \rho \cdot \mathsf{OPT}] < \frac{\mathsf{E}[\mathsf{cost}(\mathbf{x}^A)]}{\rho \cdot \mathsf{OPT}} \le \frac{t \cdot \mathsf{OPT}}{\rho \cdot \mathsf{OPT}} = \frac{t}{\rho}.$$

• Consequently,

$$\mathsf{Prob}[\mathbf{x}^A \text{ is feasible and } \mathsf{cost}(\mathbf{x}^A) \le \rho \cdot \mathsf{OPT}] \ge 1 - m(1/e)^t - rac{t}{
ho}.$$

We can pick $t = \theta(\lg m)$ and $\rho = 4t$ so that $1 - m(1/e)^t - \frac{t}{\rho} \ge \frac{1}{2}$.

- To boost the confidence up (say, to $1 1/2^m$), run the algorithm m times!
- Basically, we got a $\Theta(\log m)\text{-approximation algorithm for weighted set cover.}$
- Asymptotically, we cannot approximate better than that!