



Mayank Goswami and Andreas Wiese

Winter 2015/2016

## Exercises for Approximation Algorithms

[www.mpi-inf.mpg.de/departments/algorithms-complexity/teaching/winter15/approx](http://www.mpi-inf.mpg.de/departments/algorithms-complexity/teaching/winter15/approx)

Tutorials: Andreas Schmid

Exercise Sheet 4

Due: **6.1.2016**

*Your homework must be handed in on Wednesday at the beginning of the tutorial.*

*You need to collect at least 50% of all points over all exercise sheets. You are allowed to work on these exercises in groups but every student has to hand in his/her own write-up.*

### Exercise 1 (6 points)

In class we saw an  $\Omega(n \log n)$  lower bound on the closest pair of points problem in the linear decision tree model, and a (expected) linear time algorithm that used randomness, computing the floor function and randomness. This exercise is about an  $O(n \log n)$  algorithm that does not use any of these techniques. The algorithm proceeds in a divide and conquer approach:

1. Sort all the points  $P$  using  $x$ -coordinate.
2. Split them into left and right by finding a middle line.
3. Solve the problem recursively in the left and right subsets. Let the distance of closest pair on the left be  $d_\ell$  and on the right be  $d_r$ .
4. Find the minimum distance  $d_{\ell,r}$  among the set of pairs of points where one point is to the left of the dividing line and one is to the right.
5. Output the minimum of  $d_\ell$ ,  $d_{\ell,r}$  and  $d_r$ .

Giving details for all steps, prove that this algorithm runs in  $O(n \log n)$  time. In particular, prove that Step 4 can be done in  $O(n)$  time. [Hint: Use the "grid" property— instead of comparing all left-right distances in Step 4, note that the closest pair cannot be farther than  $\min(d_\ell, d_r)$ ].

### Exercise 2 (14 points)

In class we saw how to prove lower bounds in the linear decision tree model. This exercise is on two other techniques, leaf counting and adversary arguments.

- a) [Counting leaves, 7 points] Prove that for any deterministic comparison-based sorting algorithm  $A$ , the average-case number of comparisons (the number of comparisons on average on a randomly chosen permutation of  $n$  distinct elements) is at least  $C = \lfloor \log_2 n! \rfloor$ . In other words, prove that in a decision tree, not just that there is some leaf with depth  $C$ , but in fact that the average-depth of a leaf is  $C$ .
- b) [Adversary Argument, 7 points ] Given an array of  $n$  elements ( $n$  is even), consider the problem of computing the minimum and the maximum (output both). Naively this can be done in  $2n - 3$  comparisons (how?). Give an algorithm that does this in at most  $3n/2 - 2$  comparisons. Prove that the algorithm is optimal using an adversary argument.

**Exercise 3+4 (20 points)**

In the lecture we have seen an approximation algorithm for Bin Packing by Karmakar and Karp that uses at most  $OPT + O(\log^2(OPT))$  many bins. As a reminder here is some of the notation used in the lecture. We group items of the same size (here we used  $b_1$  as the number of items of largest size  $s_1$  and  $b_m$  as the number of items of smallest size  $s_m$ ). For an instance  $I$  of Bin Packing we define:  $SIZE(I) := \sum_{i=1}^m b_i \cdot s_i$ .

- 3** (10 points) Assume that you are given a Bin Packing instance  $I$  in which every item has size at least  $\frac{1}{c}$  where  $c$  is some positive constant bigger than one. Show that in this case the algorithm by Karmakar and Karp will use at most  $OPT + O(c \cdot \log(SIZE(I)))$  many bins.
- 4** (10 points) Assume that you are given an instance  $I$  of Bin Packing. We say that an item  $i$  is big if  $a_i \geq 1/SIZE(I)$ . Assume you are given a packing of only the big items that uses  $K$  bins. Show that one can find a packing of all items that uses at most  $\max\{K, OPT + 3\}$  bins.