

Optimization on Matroids and Independence Systems

1. Given a finite set E with element weights $w(e)$, $e \in E$,
 a family \mathcal{F} of subsets of E find $F \in \mathcal{F}$ with
- $\max \sum_{e \in F} w(e)$ | $\text{or } \min \sum_{e \in F} w(e)$
- When does greedy algorithm work? ↓ don't need this
↓ Basin (E, B) more approx

Gale optimality

Let elements of E be ordered: $e_1 \geq e_2 \geq \dots$

Let $F = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_k\}$, $G = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_\ell\}$

where $F, G \in \mathcal{F}$. If $k \geq \ell$, and

$$f_1 \geq g_1, f_2 \geq g_2, \dots, f_\ell \geq g_\ell$$

then we say F is "better" than G .

Q: Is there an $F^* \in \mathcal{F}$ such that F^* is better than $G \forall G \in \mathcal{F}$?

Such a F^* is called Gale optimal solution

Greedy algorithm:

See next page

Let E be a finite set; with ~~edge~~ ^{element} weights $w(e)$ $e \in E$. (2)

Let elements of E be arranged so that

$$w(e_1) \geq w(e_2) \geq \dots \geq w(e_k) > 0 \geq w(e_{k+1}) \geq \dots \geq w(e_n)$$

where $|E| = n$. We may be interested in one of two problems assuming (E, \mathcal{F}) is a matroid. (E, \mathcal{B})

1. Find $\text{Max} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{F}} w(e)$

2. Find $\text{Max} \sum_{B \in \mathcal{B}} w(B)$

These are "slightly" different.

New matroid results

For (1) we ~~ignore~~ ^{delete} elements e_{k+1}, \dots, e_n . We need not (and will not) select any of them.

For (2) we may be "forced" to include some of these elements in order to get a $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

We can convert (2) to (1) as follows. [1 \rightarrow 2 is also possible]

Since $|B|$ is same for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$ (matroid axioms), we can change $w(e)$ to $w'(e) = w(e) + k$

$k > 0$ large without affecting the result.

So we will look at (1) from now on.

Now opt. solution falls is a basis

Algorithm: [forall] [Greedy algorithm]

(3)

Process these elements up to e_k . Start with $F_0 = \emptyset$.

At any stage j , ($j \leq k$) we have $F_j \in \mathcal{F}$ and

are about to consider element e_{j+1} .

If $F_j \cup \{e_{j+1}\} \in \mathcal{F}$, let $F_{j+1} = F_j \cup \{e_{j+1}\}$.

If not let $F_{j+1} = F_j$ and proceed to process

e_{j+2} .

Theorem (Gale): Let $M = (E, \mathcal{F})$ be a matroid

Let elements of E be ordered: $e_1 \geq e_2 \geq \dots \geq e_n$
(assume w.l.o.g. \geq on E)

F a Gale optimal member in \mathcal{F} .

Pf: Apply greedy algorithm to determine a
the lexico-maximum member F^* of \mathcal{F} . Claim
 F^* is Gale optimal.

Pf of claim: Let $F^* = \{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m\}$ $f_i \in E$
with $f_1 \geq f_2 \geq \dots \geq f_m$

Let $G \in \mathcal{F}$ be any member of \mathcal{F}

$$G = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n\}$$
$$g_1 \geq g_2 \geq \dots \geq g_n$$

Suppose $g_k > f_k$ (with k min)

$$\Rightarrow g_1, g_2, \dots, g_{k-1} > f_k$$

Consider $F_{k-1}^* = \{f_1, \dots, f_{k-1}\} \in \mathcal{F}$

$$G_k = \{g_1, \dots, g_k\} \in \mathcal{F}$$

$$|G_k| > |F_{k-1}^*| \therefore \exists g_i \in G_k - F_{k-1}^* \text{ such}$$

that $F_{k-1}^* \cup \{g_i\} \in \mathcal{F}$.

$F_{k-1}^* \cup \{g_i\}$ is lexico-larger than F^*

— a contradiction.

Hence $g_i \leq f_i \quad i=1, \dots, n$. [implying $m \geq n$].

$\therefore F^*$ is a ^(maximal) Gale opt. ~~set~~ member of \mathcal{F}
(one that is also maximum in size)

And hence \swarrow a basis of M .

Hence greedy alg. $\max_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{e \in F} w(e)$ (assuming

$w(e) \geq 0 \quad \forall e \in E$; else truncate so $w(e) \geq 0$

Now the converse.

Theorem 2. If $M = (E, \mathcal{F})$ is an ind. system such that greedy alg. correctly computes $\max_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{e \in F} w(e)$ for all w , then M is a matroid.

Pf: Need to show that if $F \in \mathcal{F}$, $G \in \mathcal{F}$, and $|G| > |F|$, $\exists g \in G - F$ such that $F \cup \{g\} \in \mathcal{F}$.

$$\text{Let } w(e) = \begin{cases} 1 & e \in F \\ 1 - \epsilon & e \in G - F \\ 0 & e \notin G \cup F \end{cases}$$

The greedy algorithm first selects F ; but

$$\sum_{e \in G} w(e) > |F| \quad \text{if} \quad |G - F| \cdot (1 - \epsilon) > |F - G|$$

$$\text{i.e. } (1 - \epsilon) > \frac{|F - G|}{|G - F|}$$

We can choose such an ϵ since $\frac{|F - G|}{|G - F|} < 1$

\therefore Alg. must continue to select more elements from $G - F$ after selecting F and we are done.

Edmonds' Proof via LP duality

(6)

1. Matroid optimization:

Ref.: Matroids and The Greedy Algorithm

Jack Edmonds, Mathematical Programming,
Vol 1 (1970) pp 127-136

Consider: $x_j \geq 0 \quad j \in E = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$

$y(s) \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\sum_{j \in S} x_j \leq r(S) \quad \forall S \subseteq E.$$

rank function of M .

$$\textcircled{P} \quad \text{Max} \sum_{j=1}^n w_j x_j$$

Since $r(\{j\}) \in \{0, 1\}$, $0 \leq x_j \leq 1 \quad \forall j = 1 \dots n$

Integer solutions to P (necessarily 0/1 solution)
is an indicator function of $F \in \mathcal{F}$.

$$\textcircled{D} \quad y(S) \geq 0 \quad \forall S \subseteq E$$

$$\sum_{S: j \in S} y(S) \geq w_j \quad j = 1 \dots n$$

$$\text{Min} \sum_{S \subseteq E} r(S) \cdot y(S)$$

is the LP dual of \textcircled{P} .

Now let elements of E be ordered so that

(7)

$$w_1 \geq w_2 \geq \dots \geq w_m \geq 0 \geq w_{m+1} \dots \geq w_n.$$

$$\text{Let } E' = \{1, 2, \dots, m\} \subseteq E.$$

$$\text{Let } A_k = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$$

$$\text{Let } x^0 = (x_1^0, x_2^0, \dots)$$

$$\text{Where } x_1^0 = r(A_1); \quad x_j^0 = r(A_j) - r(A_{j-1}) \quad j=2, \dots, m$$

$$\text{And } x_j^0 = 0 \quad j > m.$$

[This is the solution produced by the greedy algorithm]

It is easy to verify that x^0 is the indicator vector of a set F which is a M -basis of E' .

Let $\{y^0(s)\}$ be defined as follows:

$$y^0(A_j) = w_j - w_{j+1} \quad j=1, \dots, m-1$$

$$y^0(A_m) = w_m$$

$$y^0(A) = 0 \quad \text{for all other } A \subseteq E.$$

Consider any element $j \in E$. If $j > m$

$$\text{then } \sum_{j \in S} y^0(S) = 0 > w_j$$

$\forall j \leq m$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{j \in A} y^0(j) &= \sum_{k=j}^m y^0(A_k) = \\
 &= \sum_{j=1}^m (w_j - w_{j+1}) \\
 &= \left(\sum_{k=j}^{m-1} (w_k - w_{k+1}) \right) + w_m \\
 &= w_j \geq 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence y^0 is feasible to the dual.

Check to see (x^0, y^0) satisfy Complementary Slackness and hence optimal to (P) and (D) respectively.

[see page 279 of Cook, Cunningham, P and S]

Now to Matroid intersection and other problems