Online Min Cost Matching Overview

Koosha Jaferian Winter 2020 Instructor: Prof. Allan Borodin



General Problem's Definition

- → Complete bipartite graph $G = (R \cup S, E)$
- → Positive edge cost c_e for each $e \in E$
- → R = requests, and S = servers: $|R| \le |S|$
- → Goal: Match all the requests to a server with the minimum cost.
- $\rightarrow c_M = \sum_{e \in M} c_e$



Polynomial Time Algorithm

- Hungarian Method (Kuhn Mawr 1955)
- Uses Adjacency Matrix of the graph.

Gives $O(|V|^3)$

- Makes the smallest number in each row and column zero.
- Draw the fewest number of lines to cover all zeroes, make the smallest numbers covered by them zero.
- Choose 3 zeroes not in the same column or row, and restore values!

			-		
108	125	150		-2	15
150	135	175		15	0
122	148	250		-2	24
122	140	200			
				0	15
0	47	40	1	17	0
0	17	42		0	24
15	0	40			
0	26	128			
				0	15
				17	0
				0	24
0	17	2	1		
15	0	0			
0	26	88			
				0	15
				17	0
				0	24
0	17	2			
15	0	0			
0	26	88		108	125
	I		J	150	135
				122	148

0 0 86

0

0 86

0

86

150 175

Online Instance Definition

- Requests are unknown and they arrive one by one.
- They had to be matched to an unmatched server, and the decisions are irrevocable.

- ★ For arbitrary edge costs no optimal assignment in online instance.
- ★ α-competitive algorithm: $c(M) ≤ α \times OPT$

No α -competitive algorithm!

- Two requests
- First request's cost is 1 for both servers.
- Second request's cost is 1 for the first server and ∞ for the second.

• We don't know anything about the second request when we serve the first.

- Therefore, the competitive ratio is **unbounded**!
- Same even for randomized algorithms!

First Relaxation: Metric

- We suppose that the triangle inequality holds for all the vertices, and costs.
- Kalyanasundaram and Pruhs (1993) and independently Khuller, Mitchell, and Vazirani (1994)
- 2n 1 competitive algorithm (2n is the number of nodes)

- Gradually building Minimum partial matchings, and then using ⊕ operator and permutation.
- No competitive ratio better than 2n 1



Second Relaxation: Matching on the line

- Edge costs are induced by line metrics.
 - TSP Tour: the shortest path for a person to take to visit a list of destinations.
 - Diameter: Longest "shortest path" between any two vertices.
 - \circ μ (G) = maximum ratio of minimum TSP tour / Diameter

- Raghvendra (2016): Competitive ratio of $O(\mu(G)log^2(n))$ for general problem.
- Linear Graph $\rightarrow \mu$ (G) = 2 $\Rightarrow O(log^2(n))$
- Raghvendra (2018): Improved to $\theta(log(n))$: Approximation of the nearest free server

Big Open Problem

• Is there a constant-factor or O(1) Competitive algorithm for min cost matching on the line?



More Relaxations to achieve constant factor

- Able to change or revoke small number of decisions made.
- Match each request k number of times.

• (Megow, Nolke 2020): $(1 + \epsilon)$ -competitive if we can reassign any request at most $O(\epsilon^{-1.001})$

• Gupta et al (2019): $O(log(log(n)))^2)$ - competitive factor for online known i.i.d arrivals.

Other related problems: k-server problem

- K-server problem.
- We have k servers on the line, or a metric space. The requests will come one by one, and we should move the servers on the line to get to the request.
- K = 2 we will have 2-competitive algorithm.
- k competitive algorithm for all metric spaces with k+1 points.

- ★ Conjecture 1: For every metric space with more than k points, the competitive ratio of k-server problem is exactly k. Current positive result 2k-1
- ★ Conjecture 2: For every metric space, there is a randomized algorithm which gives the competitive ratio of O(log(k))
 - More evidence: Computer analysis for k = 3 and prove for the line and tree.
 (Chrobak 1991)

Worst Case (Adversary) vs. Average Case (Random order of arrivals)

- These analysis were for the worst case.
 - Adversary will give you some order to make you perform as bad as you can.

- Some analysis are for completely random orders for max weight matching.
 - (Kesselheim et al. 2013): (1/e competitive) deterministic algorithm.

So much room for future work

- Many instances!
 - \circ Line
 - Circle
 - \circ Tree
 - Two-dimensional space
 - Three-dimensional space
 - \circ Metric
 - \circ General

• Many Open problems and conjectures.



OPENCONJECTURE

ML Advice Relaxation

• A prediction or advice derived from Machine Learning algorithms.

- $p^* = (p_1^*, ..., p_m^*)$ Vector of predictions (m = number of requests)
- Predicts edge weight adjacent to $r \in R$
- There is an optimal bipartite matching that r is adjacent to an edge with weight p_r^*

• Threshold greedy methods \rightarrow There is a polynomial time algorithm that for some constants $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$ so that it is α -competitive with $\alpha > 1/e$ if the error is small enough, and β -competitive with $\beta < 1/e$ regardless of the error.

Different types of ML Advice

- Deterministic (Trusted)
 - We know the maximum possible difference between the advice and the optimal solution.

- Randomized (Untrusted)
 - With some probability the advice will not be within the range of the optimal solution.
 - Harder to derive results.
 - Most ML Algorithms give Untrusted advice to some extent.

So Much to Work on ...

- Different Types of spaces
 - \circ Metric
 - \circ Tree
 - \circ Line
- What is online?
 - Requests (nodes) arrive online with all their adjacent edges.
 - Edges arrive online one by one.
- → Do we have any advice?
 - Untrusted
 - Trusted
- Different instances?
 - $\circ \quad \text{K-server problem}$
 - \circ etc.



Applications (Matching in General)

- Servers and requests in networking
- Stable marriage problem
- Scheduling and planning
- Chemistry (Modeling Bonds)
- Networks and Packet switches
- Graph Coloring
- Neural nets
- etc.



Conclusion





Any Questions?



Thanks for Your attention!



References

- https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/nav.3800020109
- https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.54.2873&rep=rep1&type=pdf
- https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0304397594900426
- https://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2016/6641/pdf/LIPIcs-APPROX-RANDOM-2016-18.pdf
- http://www.cs.ox.ac.uk/people/elias.koutsoupias/Personal/Papers/paper-kou09.pdf
- https://arxiv.org/pdf/2006.01026.pdf
- https://arxiv.org/pdf/1803.07206.pdf
- http://www.thomas-kesselheim.de/science/onlinematching.pdf
- https://www.uncg.edu/cmp/faculty/srtate/papers/cowpath.pdf
- https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/3-540-60692-0_38