Primal-Dual Approximation Algorithms

We just saw how the primal-dual schema permits sometimes *designing* efficient combinatorial algorithms for solving certain problems. We will now see an example of how a related technique can sometimes be used to design efficient *approximation* algorithms

The major tool that we will use will be the *RELAXED Complementary Slackness conditions*

The problem we examine will again be weighted set-cover.

Recall that given canonical primal

| minimize | $\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j x_j$ | |
|------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| subject to | $a_i'x \ge b_i,$ | $i=1,\ldots,m$ |
| | $x_j \ge 0,$ | $j = 1, \dots, n$ |

the dual is

| | m | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| maximize | $\sum b_i \pi_i$ | |
| subject to | $\substack{i=1\\ \pi A_j \le c_j,}$ | $j = 1, \ldots, n$ |
| , , | $\pi_i \ge 0,$ | $i = 1, \dots, m$ |

Theorem (Complementary Slackness):

Let x and π respectively be primal and dual feasible solutions. Then x and π are *both* optimal if and only if all of the following conditions are satisfied.

Primal Complementary Slackness conditions

 $\forall 1 \leq j \leq n$: either $x_j = 0$ or $\pi' A_j = c_j$

Dual Complementary Slackness conditions

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq m$$
 : either $\pi_i = 0$ or $a'_i x = b_i$

Theorem (RELAXED Complementary Slackness): Let x and y respectively be primal and dual feasible solutions. Suppose further that for some $\alpha > 1, x$ and y satisfy all of **Primal Complementary Slackness conditions** $\forall 1 \leq j \leq n$: either $x_j = 0$ or $\pi A_j = c_j$ **RELAXED Dual C.S. conditions** $\forall 1 \leq i \leq m$: either $\pi_i = 0$ or $\mathbf{a}'_i \mathbf{x} \leq \alpha \mathbf{b}_i$ Then $\sum_{j=1}^{m} c_j x_j \le \alpha \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \pi_i$

Proof:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j x_j = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\pi A_j) x_j = \pi A x = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (a'_i x) \pi_i \le \alpha \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \pi_i.$$

Given such an x, π we immediately know that x is within α of OPT, the minimum cost optimum solution.

Recall Weighted Set Cover problem where each set F has a weight Cost(F) = C(F), and the problem is to find a Set Cover of C of Minimum Weight, $Cost(C) = \sum_{F \in C} C(F)$.

For example $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ and \mathcal{F} contains the subsets

| F_1 | = | $\{1, 3, 5\};$ | $C(F_1) = 1$ |
|---------|---|-------------------|--------------|
| F_2 | = | $\{2, 3, 6\};$ | $C(F_2) = 1$ |
| F_3 | = | $\{2, 5, 6\};$ | $C(F_1) = 3$ |
| F_{4} | = | $\{2, 3, 4, 6\};$ | $C(F_1) = 5$ |
| F_{5} | = | $\{1,4\};$ | $C(F_5) = 1$ |

For example $C = \{F_1, F_4\}$ is a minimal cardinality solution but not a minimum weight one. $C = \{F_1, F_2, F_5\}$ is a minimum weight solution. We previously saw that weighted-set-cover is NP-Hard but developed an H_n approximation algorithm where n = |X| and $H_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i} \sim \ln n$.

This means that, for every input, our algorithm generated a cover \mathcal{C} such that

```
Cost(\mathcal{C}) \leq H_n \cdot OPT
```

where OPT is the cost of the real optimal solution. Duality theory was used in our proof to lower bound OPT.

Now let the *frequency* of element e be

 $\mathsf{freq}(e) = \{ F \in \mathcal{F} : e \in F \}.$

Let $f = \max_{e \in U} \operatorname{freq}(e)$ be the max number of sets an element can appear in. We will now use a primaldual schema based on the relaxed complementaryslackness conditions to design a *f*-approximation algorithm for set-cover. While an f-approximation algorithm for set-cover might not appear interesting, consider following application.

Let G = (V, E) be a graph.

A vertex cover of *G* is a subset $V' \subseteq V$ such that every edge in *E* has at least one endpoint in *V'*. Finding a mimimum-cardinality vertex cover is an interesting and NP-hard problem. A straightforward generaliztion of the problem is to assign a cost C(v) to every $v \in V$ and set $cost(V') = \sum_{v \in V'} c(v)$. Finding a min-weight vertex cover is also NP-hard.

Now create a weighed set cover problem with universe X = E and one set corresponding to each $v \in V$. For $e \in E$ write $e = (e_x, e_y)$ and set

 $F_v = \{e \in E : e_x = v \text{ or } e_y = v\}, \quad C(F_v) = c(v)$

Then V' is a vertex cover of G iff $\bigcup_{v \in V'} \{F_v\}$ is a set cover of X. Furthermore, c(V') is equal to the cost of the associated set-cover.

Finally, note that, since edge e appears in exactly two sets F_v , f = 2.

So, an f-approximation algorithm for set-cover yields a 2-approximation algorithm for vertex cover.

- Our general approach will be to start with some primal-infeasible and dual-feasible solution and to iterate.
- During each iteration we will improve the feasibility of the primal and the optimality of the dual (always keeping the dual solution feasible).
- At the end we will produce both a **feasible-primal** and **feasible-dual** solution that satisfy the relaxed complimentary slackness conditions.
- The cost of the dual solution will be a lower bound on the cost of OPT.
- This will then give an α -approximation algorithm for the primal problem.

Recall the set-cover LP formulations: The integer LP will be

 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Minimize } \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} C(F) x_F \\ \text{subject to conditions} \\ \forall e \in U, \qquad \sum_{e \in F} x_F \geq 1 \\ \forall F \in \mathcal{F} \qquad x_F \in \{0, 1\} \end{array}$

The relaxation of the LP is

Minimize $\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} C(F) x_F$ subject to conditions $\forall e \in U, \quad \sum_{e \in F} x_F \geq 1$ $\forall F \in \mathcal{F}, \quad x_F \geq 0$

The dual of the relaxed LP is then

Maximize $\sum_{e \in U} y_e$ subject to conditions $\forall F \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \sum_{e \in F} y_e \leq C(F)$ $\forall e \in U, \quad y_e \geq 0$

Primal:Minimize
$$\sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} C(F) x_F$$
subject to conditions $\forall e \in U, \qquad \sum_{e \in F} x_F \geq 1$ $\forall F \in \mathcal{F}, \qquad x_F \geq 0$

Dual: **Maximize** $\sum_{e \in U} y_e$ subject to conditions $\forall F \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \sum_{e \in F} y_e \leq C(F)$ $\forall e \in U, \quad y_e \geq 0$

Our schema will be to start with all of the $x_F = 0, y_e = 0$, and then iteratively change some of the x_F to 1 while also changing the y_e (but keeping y feasible). Setting $x_F = 1$ means that we put F in the cover.

At the end we will have constructed feasible solutions for both the primal and dual that satisfy the relaxed complementary slackness conditions with $\alpha = f$. Primal C.S: $\forall F \in \mathcal{F} : x_F \neq 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{e:e \in F} y_e = C(F)$ Relaxed Dual C.S: $\forall e : y_e \neq 0 \Rightarrow \sum_{F:e \in F} x_F \leq f \cdot 1 = f$

We will say that *F* is *tight* if $\sum_{e:e\in F} y_e = C(F)$. Our rule will be that we *Pick only tight sets for the cover*

Note that, by definition, every x is covered at most f times.

Primal-Dual Set-Cover1. Set $\forall F, x_F = 0, \forall e, y_e = 0.$ 2. Until all elements are covered doPick an uncovered element e, and increase y_e until some set becomes tight.Add all newly tight sets to the cover.by setting $x_F = 1$ for those sets.3. Output the cover

In the algorithm an element e is covered at a given step if, at that time, there is an F in the current cover s.t. $e \in F$.

Theorem: The algorithm generates a feasible pair x, y that satisfies the relaxed complementary slackness conditions. The algorithm is therefore a f-approximation algorithm.

Proof Sketch: Algorithm starts with feasible y and x that satisfies the primal complementary slackness conditions with $\alpha = f$. At every step, changing y_e keeps y feasible and setting the new $x_F = 1$ keeps the primal c.s. conditions satisfied. At the end, every e is covered so the primal setting has become a feasible solution.