



A comment on performance guarantees of a greedy algorithm for minimizing a supermodular set function on comatroid

Journal Article

Author(s):

[Karaca, Orçun](#) ; [Guo, Baiwei](#); [Kamgarpour, Maryam](#) 

Publication date:

2021-04-01

Permanent link:

<https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000428692>

Rights / license:

[Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International](#)

Originally published in:

European Journal of Operational Research 290(1), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2020.07.047>

Funding acknowledgement:

678945 - Control of Large-scale Stochastic Hybrid Systems for Stability of Power Grid with Renewable Energy (EC)

A comment on performance guarantees of a greedy algorithm for minimizing a supermodular set function on comatroid

Orcun Karaca^{a,*}, Baiwei Guo^b, Maryam Kamgarpour^a

^a*Automatic Control Laboratory, D-ITET, ETH Zürich, Switzerland*

^b*Automatic Control Laboratory, EPFL, Switzerland.*

Abstract

We provide a counterexample to the performance guarantee obtained in the paper “Il’ev, V., Linker, N., 2006. Performance guarantees of a greedy algorithm for minimizing a supermodular set function on comatroid”, which was published in Volume 171 of the European Journal of Operational Research. We point out where this error originates from in the proof of the main theorem.

Keywords: Combinatorial optimization, Greedy algorithm, Matroid theory

1. Problem formulation

Let U be a finite set with $|U| = n$. Let hereditary system $\mathcal{H} = (U, \mathcal{D})$ denote a comatroid, where the family \mathcal{D} denotes the dependence system, and let $f : 2^U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ denote a set function. Il’ev & Linker (2006) consider solving

$$\min\{f(X) : X \in \mathcal{C}\}, \tag{1}$$

where \mathcal{C} is the family given by all circuits of a comatroid $\mathcal{H} = (U, \mathcal{D})$ with girth p , and f is supermodular, nonincreasing, and $f(U) = 0$. We refer to (Il’ev & Linker, 2006) and (Il’ev, 2003) for the definitions relating to comatroids and hereditary systems.

This problem is known to be NP-hard since the well-known p -median problem can be captured as a special case. As a heuristic, Il’ev & Linker (2006) propose the greedy descent algorithm (also known as reverse greedy or stingy algorithm), which proceeds as follows:

Greedy descent algorithm:

Step 0: Set $X_0 = U$. Go to Step 1.

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: okaraca@ethz.ch (Orcun Karaca), baiwei.guo@epfl.ch (Baiwei Guo), maryamk@ethz.ch (Maryam Kamgarpour)

Step i : ($i \geq 1$): Select $x_i \in X_{i-1}$ such that

$$d_{x_i}(X_{i-1}) = \min_{\substack{x \in X_{i-1} \\ X_{i-1} \setminus \{x\} \in \mathcal{D}}} d_x(X_{i-1}), \quad (2)$$

where $d_x(X) = f(X \setminus \{x\}) - f(X)$ is the marginal increment in f when removing $\{x\}$ from the set X . Set $X_i = X_{i-1} \setminus \{x_i\}$. If $i = n - p$, then stop. Otherwise go to Step $i + 1$.

End.

The paper contained the following theorem regarding the suboptimality bound of the greedy heuristic when applied to (1).

Theorem 1. (*Il'ev & Linker, 2006, Theorem 1*) Let OPT be an optimal solution to (1) on an arbitrary comatroid and GR be the solution returned by the greedy descent algorithm. Then,

$$\frac{f(GR)}{f(OPT)} \leq \frac{1}{t} \left(\left(1 + \frac{t}{q} \right)^q - 1 \right),$$

where $q = n - p$, $t = s/1 - s$, and s is the solution to the following problem

$$s = \max_{\substack{x \in U, \\ f(\{x\}) < f(\emptyset)}} \frac{(f(\emptyset) - f(\{x\})) - (f(U \setminus \{x\}) - f(U))}{(f(\emptyset) - f(\{x\}))}.$$

In the following, we provide a counterexample showing that the guarantee in Theorem 1 does not necessarily hold. Then, we point out the mistake found in (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, Lemma 1), which is utilized in constructing the linear program (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, equation (8)) in the proof of Theorem 1.

2. Counterexample

Set $n = 4$, $U = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Consider the following nonincreasing supermodular function:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\emptyset) &= 6, \quad f(\{1\}) = 4, \quad f(\{2\}) = 5, \quad f(\{3\}) = 4, \quad f(\{4\}) = 4, \\ f(\{3, 4\}) &= 2, \quad f(\{1, 2\}) = 3, \quad f(\{2, 4\}) = 3, \quad f(\{2, 3\}) = 3, \quad f(\{1, 4\}) = 2, \quad f(\{1, 3\}) = 2, \\ f(\{1, 2, 3\}) &= 1, \quad f(\{2, 3, 4\}) = 1, \quad f(\{1, 3, 4\}) = 1, \quad f(\{1, 2, 4\}) = 1, \\ f(\{1, 2, 3, 4\}) &= f(U) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Compute the steepness s of function f :

$$s = \frac{(6 - 4) - (1 - 0)}{(6 - 4)} = 0.5.$$

Hence, $t = 1$. Define the comatroid $\mathcal{H} = (U, \mathcal{D})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D} = & \{U = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \\ & \{2, 3, 4\}, \{1, 3, 4\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \\ & \{1, 2\}, \{1, 4\}, \{2, 3\}, \{3, 4\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that girth is given by $p = 2$, thus $q = 2$. This comatroid was previously studied in (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, Remark 3). Clearly, the family given by all circuits of this comatroid is $\mathcal{C} = \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 4\}, \{2, 3\}, \{3, 4\}\}$.

Consider (1) with the comatroid $\mathcal{H} = (U, \mathcal{D})$ and the objective f . The greedy descent algorithm can find the solution $\text{GR} = \{1, 2\}$, whereas an optimal solution is given by $\text{OPT} = \{3, 4\}$. Theorem 1 claims

$$\frac{3}{2} = \frac{f(\text{GR})}{f(\text{OPT})} \leq \frac{1}{t} \left(\left(1 + \frac{t}{q}\right)^q - 1 \right) = \frac{1}{1} \left(\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 - 1 \right) = 1.25,$$

which is not correct. As a remark, observe that in this example the selection done in Step 1 by (2) is not unique. We can obtain $\text{GR} = \{1, 2\}$ (or $\text{GR} = \{2, 3\}$) if $X_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ is chosen in Step 1. If $X_1 = \{1, 3, 4\}$, greedy descent can find an optimal solution. This statement also holds for $X_1 = \{2, 3, 4\}$ and $X_1 = \{1, 2, 4\}$.

3. The error in the proof of the main theorem

Denote the complements by $\overline{X} = U \setminus X$. The proof of (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, Theorem 1) relies on (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, Lemma 1). This lemma exploits the following inequality in its proof.

Inequality 1.

$$\sum_{b \in \overline{\text{OPT}} \setminus \overline{X}_{i-1}} d_b(X_{i-1}) \geq |\overline{\text{OPT}} \setminus \overline{X}_{i-1}| d_{x_i}(X_{i-1}).$$

The above inequality and the resulting (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, Lemma 1) is then utilized in constructing the linear program in (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, equation (8)). However, Inequality 1 is not necessarily true. For instance, in the above counterexample, $x_2 = 3$, $X_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\text{OPT} = \{3, 4\}$, and $\overline{\text{OPT}} \setminus \overline{X}_1 = \{1, 2\}$. For $i = 2$, inserting $d_1(X_1) = 2$, $d_2(X_1) = 1$, and $d_3(X_1) = 2$ into Inequality 1, we obtain

$$d_1(X_1) + d_2(X_1) = 2 + 1 \geq 2 \times 2 = 2 \times d_3(X_1),$$

which is not correct.

As an insight, the authors conclude Inequality 1 using the following statement:

“By (2), for every $b \in \overline{\text{OPT}} \setminus \overline{X}_{i-1}$, it holds that $d_b(X_{i-1}) \geq d_{x_i}(X_{i-1})$.”

This is equivalent to

$$d_b(X_{i-1}) \geq d_{x_i}(X_{i-1}), \forall b \in X_{i-1} \setminus \text{OPT}.$$

For the above inequality to hold by (2), for any $b \in X_{i-1} \setminus \text{OPT}$, we should have $X_{i-1} \setminus b \in \mathcal{D}$. This is not necessarily true. For instance, in the above example, $X_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\text{OPT} = \{3, 4\}$, but $2 \in X_{i-1} \setminus \text{OPT}$ is not considered by the step found in (2), since $X_1 \setminus \{2\} \notin \mathcal{D}$. As a remark, the above inequality is correct for p -uniform comatroids, that is, $\mathcal{D} = \{D \subset U : |D| \geq p\}$. Note that from the point of view of applications this is an important case because the well-known p -median problem is a particular case of the considered problem just on p -uniform comatroids.

4. Correction to the error in Inequality 1

In our works (Guo et al., 2019b,a), we studied a greedy heuristic for a problem similar to (1) where the constraint set is instead the base of a matroid, and the objective is neither supermodular nor submodular but characterized by the notions of curvature and submodularity ratio. Invoking ideas from (Guo et al., 2019b, Lemma 4), it is possible to revise and correct Inequality 1.

Inequality 2.

$$\sum_{b \in \overline{\text{OPT}} \setminus \overline{X}_{i-1}} d_b(X_{i-1}) \geq (q - (i - 1))d_{x_i}(X_{i-1}).$$

PROOF. From the properties of comatroids derived originally in (Il'ev, 2003, Theorem 2: Statement (D2)), it can be verified that there exist $|X_{i-1}| - |\text{OPT}|$ distinct elements from $X_{i-1} \setminus \text{OPT}$ such that after the exclusion of these elements from X_{i-1} , we still obtain a set that lies in the comatroid. Let $R \subseteq X_{i-1} \setminus \text{OPT}$ denote one such subset with exactly $|X_{i-1}| - |\text{OPT}| = n - (i - 1) - p = q - (i - 1)$ elements. We then obtain the following,

$$\sum_{b \in \overline{\text{OPT}} \setminus \overline{X}_{i-1}} d_b(X_{i-1}) = \sum_{b \in X_{i-1} \setminus \text{OPT}} d_b(X_{i-1}) \geq \sum_{b \in R} d_b(X_{i-1}) \geq (q - (i - 1))d_{x_i}(X_{i-1}).$$

The first equality comes from $\overline{\text{OPT}} \setminus \overline{X}_{i-1} = X_{i-1} \setminus \text{OPT}$. The first inequality follows since function d maps to nonnegative real numbers. The fact that $X_{i-1} \setminus \{x\} \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $x \in R$ and the definition in (2) conclude the last inequality. \blacksquare

In contrast to Inequality 1, Inequality 2 involves a factor that is independent of the greedy and the optimal solutions. However, this factor is smaller since $(q - (i - 1)) \leq |\overline{\text{OPT}} \setminus \overline{X}_{i-1}|$. Revisiting our counterexample, for $i = 2$ inserting $d_1(X_1) = 2$, $d_2(X_1) = 1$, and $d_3(X_1) = 2$ into Inequality 2, we obtain

$$d_1(X_1) + d_2(X_1) = 2 + 1 \geq 1 \times 2 = 1 \times d_3(X_1),$$

which is correct. As a future work, it would be interesting to refine (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, Theorem 1) according to Inequality 2. We would like to point out that we believe (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, Theorem 2) is correct for general comatroids. (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, Theorem 3) is also correct for general comatroids, since this theorem can be proved by another method similar to the method of proving (Il'ev, 2003, Theorem 5). Finally, (Il'ev & Il'eva, 2018) provides another bound on the worst-case behaviour of the reverse greedy algorithm for the considered problem. This bound $(1 + t)$ is often better than the bound in (Il'ev & Linker, 2006, Theorem 1), see (Il'ev & Il'eva, 2018, Remark 4).

Acknowledgments

The work of O. Karaca and M. Kamgarpour was gratefully funded by the European Union ERC Starting Grant CONENE. The authors would like to thank Prof. Victor Il'ev for the helpful comments.

References

- Guo, B., Karaca, O., Summers, T., & Kamgarpour, M. (2019a). Actuator placement for optimizing network performance under controllability constraints. In *58th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*.
- Guo, B., Karaca, O., Summers, T., & Kamgarpour, M. (2019b). Actuator placement under structural controllability using forward and reverse greedy algorithms. Working paper: arXiv:1912.05149.
- Il'ev, V. (2003). Hereditary systems and greedy-type algorithms. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, *132*, 137–148.
- Il'ev, V., & Il'eva, S. (2018). On minimizing supermodular functions on hereditary systems. In: *Eremeev A. et al. (eds.) OPTA 2018. Communications in Computer and Information Science*, *871*, 1–13.
- Il'ev, V., & Linker, N. (2006). Performance guarantees of a greedy algorithm for minimizing a supermodular set function on comatroid. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *171*, 648–660.