

1. (20 points)

A graph  $G = (V, E)$  is called  $(k + 1)$ -clawfree if the neighbourhood  $N(u)$  of every vertex  $u$  has at most  $k$  independent vertices. Here  $N(u) = \{v \in V \mid (u, v) \in E\}$ . Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a  $k + 1$ -clawfree graph with positive node weights; say  $w_u$  is the weight of node  $u$  and let  $w(S) = \sum_{u \in S} w_u$  be the sum of weights in  $S \subseteq V$ . Consider the following local search algorithm for approximately finding a maximum weight independent subset in a  $k + 1$  clawfree graph  $G = (V, E)$ .

$S := \emptyset$

While  $\exists u \in V - S$  such that  $w_u > w(N(u) \cap S)$

$S := S \cup \{u\} - N(S)$

End While

Show the locality gap (and hence the approximation ratio) for this local-search algorithm is at most  $k$  for every weighted  $(k + 1)$ -clawfree graph.

### Solution

Let  $OPT$  be an arbitrary (say optimal solution) and let  $S$  be a local optimum. Since  $S$  is a local optimum we know that for every  $u \in V - S$ ,  $w_u \leq w(N(u) \cap S)$ . We are going to construct a mapping  $h : w(OPT) \rightarrow S$  in such a way that for every  $v \in S$ ,  $w(OPT) \cap S \leq k \cdot w_v$ . For clarity of explanation, let's assume that all node weights are positive integers. (Note: I am just making this assumption to simplify the discussion.) If we wish then to be more precise we can give names to each unit in weight  $w(OPT)$ ; say for node  $u \in OPT$ , think of its weights being comprised of weight units  $w_{u,1}, \dots, w_{u,w_u}$ . The mapping  $h(u)$  maps the weight units of  $u \in OPT$  to the vertices in  $N(u) \cap S$  never mapping more than  $w_v$  units to any node  $v \in (N(u) \cap S)$ . Suppose  $N(u) \cap S = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$ . The idea is simply to map the first  $w_{v_1}$  units to  $v_1$ , the next  $w_{v_2}$  units to  $v_2$ , etc. (until all the weight units in  $u$  have been exhausted). The local optimality insures that the mapping  $h(u)$  does not map more than  $w_{v_j}$  units on any  $v_j \in N(u) \cap S$ . (One could give an algorithm for computing  $h$  but I am hoping that this is clear.) To complete the proof, observe that the  $(k + 1)$ -clawfree property insures that for any  $v$  there are at most  $k$  nodes  $u$  such that  $v \in N(u)$  so that the total weight mapped onto any  $v \in S$  by  $h$  is at most  $k \cdot w_v$  and hence all the units comprising  $w(OPT)$  are mapped onto  $S$ , never mapping more than  $k \cdot OPT$  units onto  $S$ .

2. (20 points) Consider the following *3 to 2 frequency set cover problem* : We are given a collection of sets  $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$  for  $S_i \subseteq U$  with the property that every  $u \in U$  occurs in exactly three different sets  $S_i$  in  $\mathcal{S}$ . There is also a cost function  $c : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$  and we let  $c_i$  denote the cost of set  $S_i$ . A feasible solution is a sub-collection  $\mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  such that every  $u \in U$  occurs in at least two different sets  $S_i$  in  $\mathcal{S}'$ . The goal is to find a feasible solution  $\mathcal{S}'$  so as to minimize the cost  $c(\mathcal{S}') = \sum_{S_i \in \mathcal{S}'} c_i$ .

- (a) Formulate the 3 to 2 frequency set cover problem as a  $\{0, 1\}$  IP

**Solution**

IP minimize  $\sum c_i x_i$

subj. to  $\sum_{i:u \in S_i} x_i \geq 2$  for each  $u \in U$

$x_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m$

Here the intended meaning is that  $x_i = 1$  if and only if  $S_i$  is in the cover. Notice that the inequalities guarantee that each  $u$  will be contained in at least two sets  $S_i$  in the cover.

- (b) Show how to use LP relaxation + rounding to obtain an 2-approximation algorithm. Explain why your rounded solution is a feasible solution to the IP and why it provides a 2-approximation.

**Solution**

LP We replace  $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$  by  $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$ .

NOTE: Here as we will see we need the  $x_i \leq 1$  condition.

Let  $\{x_i^*\}$  be an LP optimum solution. We deterministically round by setting  $\bar{x}_i = 1$  iff  $x_i^* \geq 1/2$ . We claim that the  $\{\bar{x}_i\}$  are an IP solution (i.e. a solution to the given problem). Consider an arbitrary  $u$  and lets say  $u \in S_1, S_2, S_3$ . Then we have the inequality  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 \geq 2$ . Suppose at most one of these three sets is in the cover determined by the  $\{\bar{x}_i\}$ . This means that at most one  $x_1^*, x_2^*, x_3^*$  have value  $\geq 1/2$ . Then since each  $x_i \leq 1$ , the sum  $x_1^* + x_2^* + x_3^*$  is less than  $1 + 1/2 + 1/2 < 2$  which is a contradiction. Since each variable is at most doubled by the rounding it follows that the rounded solution is at most twice the LP-OPT and hence at most twice the integral OPT.

3. (20 points)

Consider the following call routing problem. There is an  $n$  node bi-directional ring network  $G = (V, E)$  upon which calls must be routed. That is  $V = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$  and  $E = \{(i, i+1 \text{ mod } n)\} \cup \{(i, i-1 \text{ mod } n)\}$  and calls  $c_j$  are pairs  $(s_j, f_j)$  originating at node  $s_j$  and terminating at node  $f_j$ . Each call can be routed in a clockwise or counter-clockwise direction. The load  $L_e$  on any directed edge  $e$  is the maximum number of calls routed on this edge. The goal is to minimize  $\max_{e \in E} L_e$ .

- (a) Formulate this problem as an IP.

Hint: Consider variables  $x_j$  and  $y_j$  that indicate the direction of call  $c_j$ . (You can also use just one indicator variable to represent the direction but I think it might be easier to think in terms of two such variables.)

## Solution

Let  $S_j$  be the set of clockwise edges that a call  $C_j$  would be routed on if the call is routed clockwise. Similarly let  $T_j$  be the set of counter-clockwise edges that a call  $C_j$  would be routed on if the call is routed counter-clockwise. Note that the sets  $S_j$  and  $T_j$  are disjoint sets determined by the call  $C_j$ .

IP: minimize  $L$

subj. to  $\sum_{j:e \in S_j} x_j \leq L$  for each edge  $e$

$\sum_{j:e \in T_j} y_j \leq L$  for each edge  $e$

$x_j + y_j = 1$  for each call  $C_j$

$x_j, y_j \in \{0, 1\}$  for each call  $C_j$

The intended meaning is that  $x_j$  (resp  $y_j$  ) is 1 if and only if  $C_j$  is routed clockwise (resp. counter-clockwise).

The conditions  $x_j + y_j = 1$  and  $x_j, y_j \in \{0, 1\}$  for each call  $C_j$  insure that each call is routed in exactly one direction. The other inequalities insure that no more than  $L$  calls are routed on any edge.

- (b) Using an LP relaxation of this problem, show how to derive a 2-approximation algorithm.

## Solution

We simply round up iff the LP-OPT variable is at least  $1/2$ . The proof that this is an IP solution is immediate. The proof that the rounded solution is at most twice the LP-OPT is also immediate.