

CSE 421

Introduction to Algorithms

Lecture 27: Dealing with NP-completeness:

Approximation Algorithms

Local Search

Exponential-time Algorithms



What to do if the problem you want to solve is NP-hard

2nd thing to try if your problem is a minimization or maximization problem

- Try to find a polynomial-time worst-case **approximation algorithm**
 - For a minimization problem
 - Find a solution with value $\leq K$ times the optimum
 - For a maximization problem
 - Find a solution with value $\geq 1/K$ times the optimum

Want K to be as close to 1 as possible.

Travelling-Salesperson Problem (TSP)

Travelling-Salesperson Problem (TSP):

Given: a set of n cities v_1, \dots, v_n and distance function d that gives distance $d(v_i, v_j)$ between each pair of cities

Find the shortest tour that visits all n cities.


MetricTSP:

The distance function d satisfies the triangle inequality:

$$d(u, w) \leq d(u, v) + d(v, w)$$


Proper tour: visit each city exactly once.

Minimum Spanning Tree Approximation: Factor of 2



TSP: Minimum Spanning Tree Factor 2 Approximation

Euler Tour of doubled MST:



Euler tour covers each edge twice
so $TOUR_{MST}(G) = 2 MST(G)$

Any tour contains a spanning tree
so $MST(G) \leq TOUR_{OPT}(G)$

$$\text{So } TOUR_{MST}(G) = 2 MST(G) \leq 2 TOUR_{OPT}(G)$$


This visits each node more than once, so not a proper tour.

Why did this work?

- We found an **Euler tour** on a graph that used the edges of the original graph (possibly repeated).
- The weight of the tour was the total weight of the new graph.
- Suppose now
 - All edges possible
 - Weights satisfy the triangle inequality (MetricTSP)

MetricTSP: Minimum Spanning Tree Factor 2 Approximation

Euler Tour of doubled MST:




Euler tour covers each edge twice
so $\text{TOUR}_{MST}(G) = 2 \text{MST}(G)$

Any tour contains a spanning tree
so $\text{MST}(G) \leq \text{TOUR}_{OPT}(G)$

So $\text{TOUR}_{MST}(G) = 2 \text{MST}(G) \leq 2 \text{TOUR}_{OPT}(G)$

Instead: take shortcut to next unvisited vertex on the Euler tour
By triangle inequality this can only be shorter.

MetricTSP: Minimum Spanning Tree Factor 2 Approximation



Euler tour covers each edge twice
so $\text{TOUR}_{MST}(G) = 2 \text{MST}(G)$


Any tour contains a spanning tree
so $\text{MST}(G) \leq \text{TOUR}_{OPT}(G)$

So $\text{TOUR}_{MST}(G) = 2 \text{MST}(G) \leq 2 \text{TOUR}_{OPT}(G)$

Instead: take shortcut to next unvisited vertex on the Euler tour
By triangle inequality this can only be shorter.

MetricTSP: Minimum Spanning Tree Factor 2 Approximation

Final:



Euler tour covers each edge twice
so $\text{TOUR}_{MST}(G) = 2 \text{MST}(G)$

Any tour contains a spanning tree
so $\text{MST}(G) \leq \text{TOUR}_{OPT}(G)$

$$\text{So } \text{TOUR}_{MST}(G) = 2 \text{MST}(G) \leq 2 \text{TOUR}_{OPT}(G)$$

Instead: take shortcut to next unvisited vertex on the Euler tour
By triangle inequality this can only be shorter.

Christofides Algorithm: A factor 3/2 approximation

Any subgraph of the weighted complete graph that has an Euler Tour will work also!

Fact: To have an Euler Tour it suffices to have all degrees even.


Christofides Algorithm:

- Compute an MST T
- Find the set O of odd-degree vertices in T
- Add a minimum-weight perfect matching* M on the vertices in O to T to make every vertex have even degree
 - There are an even number of odd-degree vertices!
- Use an Euler Tour E in $T \cup M$ and then shortcut as before

Theorem: $Cost(E) \leq 1.5 TOUR_{OPT}$

*Requires finding optimal matchings in general graphs, not just bipartite ones

Christofides Approximation




Any tour contains a spanning tree
so $MST \leq TOUR_{OPT}$

We just need to show that the matching M
has $cost(M) \leq TOUR_{OPT}/2$


Christofides Approximation

Any tour costs at least the cost of two matchings M_1 and M_2 on O



$$2 \text{ cost}(M) \leq \text{cost}(M_1) + \text{cost}(M_2) \leq \text{TOUR}_{OPT}$$

Christofides Approximation Final Tour



Total $\text{cost}(E) \leq 3 \text{ TOUR}_{\text{OPT}}/2$

Max-3SAT Approximation

Max-3SAT: Given a 3CNF formula F find a truth assignment that satisfies the maximum possible # of clauses of F .

Observation: A single clause on 3 variables only rules out $1/8$ of the possible truth assignments since each literal has to be false to be ruled out.

\Rightarrow a random truth assignment will satisfy the clause with probability $7/8$.

So in expectation, if F has m clauses, a random assignment satisfies $7m/8$ of them.

A greedy algorithm can achieve this: Choose most frequent literal appearing in clauses that are not yet satisfied and set it to true.

If $P \neq NP$ no better approximation is possible

Knapsack Problem

Each item has a value v_i and a weight w_i .

Maximize $\sum_{i \in S} v_i$ with $\sum_{i \in S} w_i \leq W$.

Theorem: For any $\epsilon > 0$ there is an algorithm that produces a solution within $(1 + \epsilon)$ factor of optimal for the Knapsack problem with running time $O(n^2/\epsilon^2)$

“Polynomial-Time Approximation Scheme” or PTAS

Algorithm: Maintain the high order bits in the dynamic programming solution.

Approximation Algorithms using Linear Programming

The generic approach to creating approximation algorithms for **NP**-optimization problems using Linear Programming:

1. Express the original problem as an Integer Program (ILP) or 01-Program (01-LP)
2. Keep same linear constraints but remove the integer requirement to get an LP. (Called the “LP relaxation”.)
3. Solve the LP to yield a fractional solution
4. “Round” the fractional solution to an integer solution that satisfies all constraints.

Prove a bound on the ratio of the integer solution to the fractional LP solution

Observation: The LP optimum has at least as good an objective function value as the original problem since the LP allows all the ILP solutions plus some other fractional ones.

Recall: Greedy Approximation for Vertex-Cover

On input $G = (V, E)$

$W \leftarrow \emptyset$

$E' \leftarrow E$

while $E' \neq \emptyset$

 select any $e = (u, v) \in E'$

$W \leftarrow W \cup \{u, v\}$

$E' \leftarrow E' \setminus \{\text{edges } e \in E' \text{ that touch } u \text{ or } v\}$

Claim: At most a factor **2** larger than the optimal vertex-cover size.

Proof: Edges selected don't share any vertices so any vertex-cover must choose at least one of u or v each time.

Weighted Vertex Cover

Weighted Vertex Cover:

Given graph $G = (V, E)$ with each vertex v having a weight $w_v \geq 0$.

Find a vertex cover $C \subseteq V$ of G that minimizes $\sum_{v \in C} w_v$.

The greedy approximation approach doesn't work for this weighted version because for each edge, one of the two endpoints might have much larger weight than the other.

Weighted Vertex-Cover as an Integer Program

Variables x_v for $v \in V$

Minimize $\sum_{v \in V} w_v \cdot x_v$

subject to

$x_u + x_v \geq 1$ for each edge $\{u, v\} \in E$

$x_v \in \{0, 1\}$ for each node $v \in V$

The last line is equivalent to:

$0 \leq x_v \leq 1$ for each node $v \in V$

x_v integral for each node $v \in V$

Write ***OPT*** for the optimum cover weight

LP relaxation:

Minimize $\sum_{v \in V} w_v \cdot x_v$

subject to

$x_u + x_v \geq 1$ for each edge $\{u, v\} \in E$

$0 \leq x_v \leq 1$ for each node $v \in V$

Write ***OPT_{LP}*** for the optimum LP value

How do we round a LP solution achieving this value?

LP-Rounding to Approximate Weighted Vertex Cover

1. Solve the LP Relaxation
 - a) Solution gives values $x_v \in [0, 1]$ for each $v \in V$
 - b) $x_u + x_v \geq 1$ for each edge (u, v)
2. Round: Define $C \subseteq V$ to be $\{v : x_v \geq 1/2\}$
3. Observe that C is a vertex cover:
 - By 1 b), for each edge (u, v) , at least one of $x_u \geq 1/2$ or $x_v \geq 1/2$ is true so either $u \in C$ or $v \in C$.
4. Since $x_v \geq 1/2$ for every $v \in C$, the total weight of C is
$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{v \in C} w_v &\leq \sum_{v \in C} w_v \cdot (2x_v) \\ &= 2 \sum_{v \in C} w_v \cdot x_v \leq 2 \sum_{v \in V} w_v \cdot x_v = 2 OPT_{LP} \leq 2 OPT.\end{aligned}$$

Factor 2 approximation!

More on LP and Related Approximation Methods

More sophisticated methods for rounding variables $x_i \in [0, 1]$

- Randomized: View each x_i as a probability and independently produce

$$\text{solution } y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } x_i \\ 0 & \text{with probability } 1 - x_i \end{cases}$$

- Correlated random sampling. Apply the above but “correlate” choices somehow

Instead of LP relaxations, use “Semi-Definite Programming (SDP)” relaxations.

- SDPs generalize LPs. They can also be solved efficiently using Ellipsoid and Interior Point Methods. They are a special case of convex programming.
- Currently yield the best approximations known for many **NP**-hard problems.

What to do if the problem you want to solve is NP-hard

NP-completeness is a worst-case notion...

- Try an algorithm that is provably fast “on average”.
 - To even show this one needs a model of what a typical instance is.
 - Typically, people consider “random graphs”
 - e.g. all graphs with a given # of edges are equally likely
 - In this case one can sometimes show that many NP-hard problems are easy
- Problems:
 - real data doesn't look like the random graphs
 - distributions of real data aren't analyzable

Hardness of Approximation

Polynomial-time approximation algorithms for **NP**-hard optimization problems can sometimes be ruled out unless **P = NP**.

Easy example:

Coloring: Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ find the smallest k such that G has a k -coloring.

Because **3**-coloring is **NP**-hard, no approximation ratio better than $4/3$ is possible unless **P = NP** because you would have to be able to figure out if a **3**-colorable graph can be colored in < 4 colors. i.e. if it can be **3**-colored.

- We now know a huge amount about the hardness of approximating **NP** optimization problems if **P \neq NP**.
- Approximation factors are very different even for closely related problems like **Vertex-Cover** and **Independent-Set**.

Approximation Algorithms/Hardness of Approximation

Research has classified many problems based on what kinds of polytime approximations are possible if $\mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$

- **Best:** $(1 + \epsilon)$ factor for any $\epsilon > 0$. (PTAS)
 - packing and some scheduling problems, TSP in plane
- Some fixed constant factor > 1 . e.g. $2, 3/2, 8/7, 100$
 - Vertex Cover, Max-3SAT, MetricTSP, other scheduling problems
 - Exact best factors or very close upper/lower bounds known for many problems.
- $\Theta(\log n)$ factor
 - Set Cover, Graph Partitioning problems
- **Worst:** $\Omega(n^{1-\epsilon})$ factor for every $\epsilon > 0$.
 - Clique, Independent-Set, Coloring

Heuristic Algorithms

These algorithms typically do not have proven bounds on solution quality:

The most important of these methods are based on variants of

Local search:

- Need a notion of two solutions being neighbors


Start at an arbitrary solution S

While there is a neighbor T of S that is better than S


$S \leftarrow T$

e.g., Neighboring solutions for TSP

Solution S




Solution T



Two solutions are neighbors*
iff there is a pair of edges you can
swap to transform one to the other

*These are called 2-OPT neighbors. There are other more sophisticated neighbor structures

Variants of Local Search



Basic local search (greedy)


- *Usually fast but often gets stuck in a local optimum that is far from the global optimum*
- *With some notions of neighbor structure even this can take a long time in the worst case*

Randomized local search:

Start local search several times from random starting points and take the best answer found overall.

- *More expensive than plain local search but usually much better answers. It is usual easy to control the time spent so this is almost always better to do.*

Variants of Local Search



Metropolis Algorithm

Like randomized local search except that at each step one always chooses a random neighbor but doesn't always move to it:

e.g. Always move to the neighbor if it is better but move to a worse neighbor with some fixed probability depending on how much worse it is.


(Fixed inverse temperature.) cf. CSE 312 Markov Chain Knapsack assignment.

Advantage: If local optima are not too deep/steep, will not get stuck there.

However can still get stuck

Often used in practice. Drawback: Each run can be much longer than local search but one can hope to try to make it up with solution quality. A good option to compare with randomized local search. It is unclear which will be better in a given circumstance.

Variants of Local Search



Simulated Annealing

Like Metropolis algorithm but probability of going to a worse neighbor is set to decrease with time on a “cooling schedule” as, presumably, solution is closer to optimal

(analogy with slow cooling to get to lowest energy state in a crystal (or in forging a metal))

Much slower to converge than Metropolis.

Most improvement occurs at some fixed temperature.

Answers usually not much better than Metropolis, if at all, so not generally worth the extra compute time.

What to do if the problem you want to solve is NP-hard

Maybe you only need to solve it if the solution size is small...

- What if you only need find cliques or vertex covers of constant size?
- For both **Clique** and **Vertex Cover**, the obvious brute force algorithm would have time $\Theta(n^k)$: try all subsets of size k .
- For **Clique** the best algorithms known are all $n^{\Omega(k)}$
- However, **Vertex Cover** has a much better algorithm with

The theory of **fixed parameter tractability** looks at **NP** problems using a second parameter k in addition to input size n and seeks algorithms with running times $f(k) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ where f might be exponential.

- More later

What to do if the problem you want to solve is NP-hard

Try to make an exponential-time solution as efficient as possible.

e.g. Try to search the space of possible hints/certificates in a more efficient way and hope that it is quick enough.

Backtracking search

e.g., for **SAT**, search through the 2^n possible truth assignments...

...but set the truth values one-by-one so we can be able to figure out whole parts of the space to avoid,

e.g. Given $F = (\neg x_1 \vee x_2) \wedge (\neg x_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (x_4 \vee \neg x_3) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_4)$

after setting $x_1 = 1$ and $x_2 = 0$ we don't even need to set x_3 or x_4 to know that it won't satisfy F .

Next Class: Much more clever backtracking search for **SAT** solutions

Exponential-Time Algorithms

Branch-and-bound search for optimization problems:

- **Branch:** Use backtracking search through a tree representing partial solutions
- **Bound:** In addition to keeping track of the best full solution found so far, at each step produce a bound on the quality of the best possible completion of the current partial solution
 - If that best possible completion is worse than the best full solution found so far, prune the search and backtrack instead.

Example: In backtracking search for **MetricTSP** one can use linear programming to provide lower bounds

Note: An excellent exact solver for **MetricTSP** called **Concorde** combines branch-and-bound and LP/ILP methods and will solve problems involving thousands of cities.

Other Heuristic Algorithms you might hear about

Genetic algorithms:

- View each solution as a **string** (analogy with **DNA**)
- Maintain a **population of good solutions**
- Allow **random mutations** of single characters of individual solutions
- **Combine two solutions** by taking part of one and part of another (analogy with crossover in **sexual reproduction**)
- Get rid of solutions that have the worst values and make multiple copies of solutions that have the best values (analogy with **natural selection** -- survival of the fittest).

*Usually very slow. In the rare cases when they produce answers with better objective function values than other methods they tend to produce very **brittle** solutions – that are very bad with respect to small changes to the requirements.*

Deep Neural Nets and NP-hardness?

- **Artificial neural networks**
 - based on very elementary model of human neurons
 - **Set up a circuit of artificial neurons**
 - each artificial neuron is an analog circuit gate whose computation depends on a set of **connection strengths**
 - **Train the circuit**
 - Adjust the connection strengths of the neurons by giving many positive & negative training examples and seeing if it behaves correctly
 - **The network is now ready to use**

Despite their wide array of applications, they have not been shown to be useful for NP-hard problems.

Quantum Computing and NP-hardness?

Use physical processes at the quantum level to implement “weird” kinds of circuit gates based on unitary transformations

- Quantum objects can be in a “superposition” of many pure states at once
 - Can have n objects together in a superposition of 2^n states
- Each quantum circuit gate operates on the whole superposition of states at once
 - Inherent parallelism but classical randomized algorithms have a similar parallelism: *not enough on its own*
 - Advantage over classical: **copies interfere with each other.**
- Exciting direction - theoretically able to factor efficiently.
Major practical problems wrt errors, decoherence to be overcome.
- *Small brute force improvement but unlikely to produce exponential advantage for NP.*