

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

European Journal of Combinatorics

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ejc

Approximating set multi-covers

Márton Naszódi^a, Alexandr Polyanskii^b

 ^a ELTE, Department of Geometry, Lorand Eötvös University, Pázmány Péter Sétány 1/C, Budapest 1117, Hungary
^b Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Technion, Institute for Information Transmission Problems

^o Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Technion, Institute for Information Transmission Problems RAS, Russian Federation

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 23 November 2016 Accepted 1 August 2017 Available online 29 August 2017

ABSTRACT

Johnson and Lovász and Stein proved independently that any hypergraph satisfies $\tau \leq (1 + \ln \Delta)\tau^*$, where τ is the transversal number, τ^* is its fractional version, and Δ denotes the maximum degree. We prove $\tau_f \leq 3.153\tau^* \max\{\ln \Delta, f\}$ for the *f*-fold transversal number τ_f . Similarly to Johnson, Lovász and Stein, we also show that this bound can be achieved non-probabilistically, using a greedy algorithm.

As a combinatorial application, we prove an estimate on how fast τ_f/f converges to τ^* . As a geometric application, we obtain an upper bound on the minimal density of an *f*-fold covering of the *d*-dimensional Euclidean space by translates of any convex body.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction and preliminaries

A hypergraph is a pair (X, \mathcal{F}) , where X is a finite set and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^X$ is a family of some subsets of X. We call the elements of X vertices, and the members of \mathcal{F} edges of the hypergraph. When a vertex is contained in an edge, we may say that 'the vertex covers the edge', or that 'the edge covers the vertex'.

Let *f* be a positive integer. An *f*-fold transversal of (X, \mathcal{F}) is a multiset *A* of *X* such that each member of \mathcal{F} contains at least *f* elements (with multiplicity). The *f*-fold transversal number τ_f of (X, \mathcal{F}) is the minimum cardinality (with multiplicity) of an *f*-fold transversal. A 1-transversal is called a transversal, and the 1-transversal number is called the transversal number, and is denoted by $\tau = \tau_1$.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejc.2017.08.001



European Journal of Combinatorics

E-mail addresses: marton.naszodi@math.elte.hu (M. Naszódi), alexander.polyanskii@yandex.ru (A. Polyanskii).

^{0195-6698/© 2017} Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

A fractional transversal is a function $w : X \longrightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\sum_{x:x \in F} w(x) \ge 1$ for all $F \in \mathcal{F}$. The fractional transversal number of (X, \mathcal{F}) is

$$\tau^* = \tau^*(\mathcal{F}) := \inf \left\{ \sum_{x:x \in X} w(x) : w \text{ is a fractional transversal} \right\}.$$

Clearly, $\tau^* \leq \tau$. In the opposite direction, Johnson [10], Lovász [11] and Stein [16] independently proved that

$$\tau \le (1 + \ln \Delta)\tau^*,\tag{1}$$

where Δ denotes the maximum degree of (X, \mathcal{F}) , that is, the maximum number of edges containing a vertex. They showed that the greedy algorithm, that is, picking vertices of X one by one, in such a way that we always pick one that is contained in the largest number of uncovered edges, yields a transversal set whose cardinality does not exceed the right hand side in (1). For more background, see Füredi's survey [9].

Our main result is an extension of this theorem to *f*-fold transversals.

Theorem 1.1. Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and let f be a positive integer. Then, with the above notation,

$$\tau_f \le \frac{1 - \lambda^f}{1 - \lambda} \tau^* (1 + \ln \Delta - (f - 1) \ln \lambda), \tag{2}$$

moreover, for rational λ , the greedy algorithm using appropriate weights, yields an *f*-fold transversal of cardinality not exceeding the right hand side of (2).

Substituting $\lambda = 0.287643$ (which is a bit less than 1/e), we obtain

Corollary 1.2. With the above notation, we have

$$\tau_f \le 3.153\tau^* \max\{\ln \Delta, f\}.\tag{3}$$

This result may be interpreted in two ways. First, it gives an algorithm that approximates the integer programming (IP) problem of finding τ_f , with a better bound on the output of the algorithm than the obvious estimate $\tau_f \leq f \tau \leq f \tau^* (1 + \ln \Delta)$.

A similar result was obtained by Rajagopalan and Vazirani in [14] (an improvement of [3]), where the (multi)-set (multi)-cover problem is considered, that is, the goal is to cover vertices by sets. This is simply the combinatorial dual (and therefore, equivalent) formulation of our problem. In [14], each set can be chosen at most once. They present generalizations of the greedy algorithm of [10,11] and [16], and prove that it finds an approximation of the (multi)-set (multi)-cover problem within an $\ln \Delta$ factor of the optimal solution of the corresponding linear programming (LP) problem. Moreover, they give parallelized versions of the algorithms.

The main difference between [14] and the present paper is that there, the optimal solution of an IP problem is compared to the optimal solution of the LP-relaxation of the same IP problem, whereas here, we compare τ_f with τ^* , where the latter is the optimal solution of a weaker LP problem: the problem with f = 1.

We note that, using the fact that $f\tau^* \leq \tau_f$, (3) also implies that the *performance ratio* (that is, the ratio of the value obtained by the algorithm to the optimal value, in the worst case) of our algorithm is constant when $\ln \Delta \leq f$. Compare this with [2, Lemma 1 in Section 3.1], where it is shown that, even for large f, the standard greedy algorithm yields a performance ratio of $\Omega(\ln m)$, where m is the number of sets in the hypergraph. Further recent results on the performance ratio of another modified greedy algorithm for variants of the set cover problem can be found in [8]. See also Chapter 2 of the book [17] by Vazirani.

The second interpretation of our result is the following. It is easy to see that $\frac{\tau_f}{f}$ converges to τ^* as f tends to infinity. Now, (3) quantifies the speed of this convergence in some sense. In particular, it yields that for $f = \ln \Delta$ we have $\frac{\tau_f}{f} \leq 3.153\tau^*$. We have better approximation for larger f.

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5777339

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/5777339

Daneshyari.com