Relaxation for Set Cover

Primal:

 $\begin{array}{c|c} \min & \sum_{i \in I} w_i x_i \\ \text{s.t. } \forall u & \sum_{i: u \in S_i} x_i \ge 1 \\ & x_i \ge 0 \end{array}$

Dual:





13.2 Rounding the Dual

▲ 個 ▶ ▲ 필 ▶ ▲ 필 ▶ 288/491

Relaxation for Set Cover

Primal:

 $\begin{array}{c|c} \min & \sum_{i \in I} w_i x_i \\ \text{s.t. } \forall u & \sum_{i: u \in S_i} x_i \ge 1 \\ & x_i \ge 0 \end{array}$

Dual:





Relaxation for Set Cover

Primal:

 $\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \min & \sum_{i \in I} w_i x_i \\ \text{s.t. } \forall u & \sum_{i: u \in S_i} x_i \ge 1 \\ & x_i \ge 0 \end{array}$

Dual:

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
\max & \sum_{u \in U} \mathcal{Y}_{u} \\
\text{s.t. } \forall i & \sum_{u:u \in S_{i}} \mathcal{Y}_{u} \leq w_{i} \\
\mathcal{Y}_{u} \geq 0
\end{array}$$



Rounding Algorithm:

Let I denote the index set of sets for which the dual constraint is tight. This means for all $i \in I$

$$\sum_{u:u\in S_i} y_u = w_i$$



Lemma 3 The resulting index set is an *f*-approximation.

Proof: Every $u \in U$ is covered.

- Suppose there is a u that is not covered.
- This means $(h_{12},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{23},h_{$
- But then so, could be increased in the dual solution without violating any constraint. This is a contradiction to the fact that the dual solution is optimal.



Lemma 3 *The resulting index set is an f-approximation.*

Proof: Every $u \in U$ is covered.

Suppose there is a contraction not covered. This means (covered) for all sets (contained) for all sets (contained) but then one could be increased in the dual solution we

that the dual solution is optimal.



Lemma 3

The resulting index set is an f-approximation.

Proof:

Every $u \in U$ is covered.

- Suppose there is a *u* that is not covered.
- This means $\sum_{u:u \in S_i} y_u < w_i$ for all sets S_i that contain u.
- But then y_u could be increased in the dual solution without violating any constraint. This is a contradiction to the fact that the dual solution is optimal.



Lemma 3

The resulting index set is an f-approximation.

Proof:

Every $u \in U$ is covered.

- Suppose there is a *u* that is not covered.
- This means $\sum_{u:u\in S_i} y_u < w_i$ for all sets S_i that contain u.
- But then y_u could be increased in the dual solution without violating any constraint. This is a contradiction to the fact that the dual solution is optimal.



Lemma 3

The resulting index set is an f-approximation.

Proof:

Every $u \in U$ is covered.

- Suppose there is a *u* that is not covered.
- This means $\sum_{u:u\in S_i} y_u < w_i$ for all sets S_i that contain u.
- But then y_u could be increased in the dual solution without violating any constraint. This is a contradiction to the fact that the dual solution is optimal.



Proof:





▲ @ ▶ ▲ 클 ▶ ▲ 클 ▶ 291/491

Proof:

$$\sum_{i\in I} w_i = \sum_{i\in I} \sum_{u:u\in S_i} y_u$$



Proof:

$$\sum_{i \in I} w_i = \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{u: u \in S_i} y_u$$
$$= \sum_u |\{i \in I : u \in S_i\}| \cdot y_u$$



Proof:

$$\sum_{i \in I} w_i = \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{u: u \in S_i} y_u$$
$$= \sum_u |\{i \in I : u \in S_i\}| \cdot y_u$$
$$\leq \sum_u f_u y_u$$



▲ @ ▶ ▲ 클 ▶ ▲ 클 ▶ 291/491

Proof:

$$\sum_{i \in I} w_i = \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{u: u \in S_i} y_u$$
$$= \sum_u |\{i \in I : u \in S_i\}| \cdot y_u$$
$$\leq \sum_u f_u y_u$$
$$\leq f \sum_u y_u$$



▲ 圖 ▶ ▲ 圖 ▶ ▲ 圖 ▶
291/491

Proof:

$$\sum_{i \in I} w_i = \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{u: u \in S_i} y_u$$
$$= \sum_u |\{i \in I : u \in S_i\}| \cdot y_u$$
$$\leq \sum_u f_u y_u$$
$$\leq f \sum_u y_u$$
$$\leq f \operatorname{cost}(x^*)$$



▲ 個 ▶ ▲ 클 ▶ ▲ 클 ▶ 291/491

Proof:

$$\sum_{i \in I} w_i = \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{u: u \in S_i} y_u$$
$$= \sum_u |\{i \in I : u \in S_i\}| \cdot y_u$$
$$\leq \sum_u f_u y_u$$
$$\leq f \sum_u y_u$$
$$\leq f \operatorname{cost}(x^*)$$
$$\leq f \cdot \operatorname{OPT}$$



▲ @ ▶ ▲ 클 ▶ ▲ 클 ▶ 291/491

 $I\subseteq I'$.

- Suppose that we take 50 in the first algorithm. Leader 5 5 6 6
 This means on a 1/2
- Because of Complementary Slackness Conditions the corresponding constraint in the dual must be tight.
- Hence, the second algorithm will also choose Space



 $I \subseteq I'$.

- Suppose that we take S_i in the first algorithm. I.e., $i \in I$.
- This means $x_i \ge \frac{1}{7}$.
- Because of Complementary Slackness Conditions the corresponding constraint in the dual must be tight.
- ▶ Hence, the second algorithm will also choose *S*_{*i*}.



 $I \subseteq I'$.

- Suppose that we take S_i in the first algorithm. I.e., $i \in I$.
- This means $x_i \ge \frac{1}{f}$.
- Because of Complementary Slackness Conditions the corresponding constraint in the dual must be tight.
- ▶ Hence, the second algorithm will also choose *S*_{*i*}.



 $I\subseteq I'$.

- Suppose that we take S_i in the first algorithm. I.e., $i \in I$.
- This means $x_i \ge \frac{1}{f}$.
- Because of Complementary Slackness Conditions the corresponding constraint in the dual must be tight.
- ▶ Hence, the second algorithm will also choose *S*_{*i*}.



 $I\subseteq I'$.

- Suppose that we take S_i in the first algorithm. I.e., $i \in I$.
- This means $x_i \ge \frac{1}{f}$.
- Because of Complementary Slackness Conditions the corresponding constraint in the dual must be tight.
- ► Hence, the second algorithm will also choose *S*_{*i*}.

