

FEBRUARY 1 NOTES FROM CSE 599: ONLINE ALGORITHMS

We continue with the i.i.d. model with unknown distributions.

1. BUDGETED ALLOCATION PROBLEM

Last time, we worked on Bipartite Matching. A suggested exercise was to extend the technique to the Budgeted Allocation problem. We now discuss how this works.

First, we change the problem from Bipartite Matching to Budgeted Allocation:

- affine side L , where we have a budget B_i for each $i \in L$ (each advertiser)
- There's a probability distribution with support \hat{R}
 - $j \in \hat{R}$ (query) is a “vertex” identified by its neighbors in L with bids b_{ij}
 - $p(j)$ is the probability of j
 - $\sum_{j \in \hat{R}} p(j) = 1$

Continuing, the LP for $\overline{\text{OPT}}$ (defined on the “expected instance”) changes slightly to:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{OPT}} &= \max \sum_{i,j} b_{ij} x_{ij} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &\sum_j b_{ij} x_{ij} \leq B_i, \quad \forall i \\ &\sum_i x_{ij} \leq mp_j, \quad \forall j \\ &x_{ij} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

The lemma from before ($\overline{\text{OPT}} \geq \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}]$) still holds, and the proof is only slightly altered.

Proof Sketch. X_{ij} = number of times a copy of j is matched to i
 $x_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[X_{ij}]$

$$\forall i, \sum_j b_{ij} X_{ij} \leq B_i \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_j b_j x_{ij} \leq B_i$$

etc. ...

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j} b_{ij} x_{ij} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i,j} b_{ij} X_{ij} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\text{OPT}] \leq \overline{\text{OPT}} \end{aligned}$$

□

The theorem (greedy is $1 - 1/e$ competitive) still holds, but the details change.

2. RESOURCE ALLOCATION PROBLEM

We return to the Resource Allocation Problem and give a new algorithm.

- Resources: $i \in L$, capacity C_i , $|L| = n$
- Requests: j arrive online with set of feasible options given by \mathcal{F}_j
- Options: for each option $k \in \mathcal{F}_j$, $\forall i$, consumption is $a(i, j, k)$ and profit is $w(j, k)$

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & \sum_{j,k} w_{jk} x_{jk} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_k x_{jk} \leq 1, \quad \forall j \\ & \sum_{j,k} a(i, j, k) x_{jk} \leq C_i, \quad \forall i \\ & x_{jk} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the i.i.d. model, we have a distribution on j 's (requests), say with support \hat{R} . For simplicity, assume as before that $p(j) = \frac{1}{m} \forall j \in \hat{R}$.

This time,

Goal: Design algorithm s.t. $\forall \epsilon, \delta > 0$, w.p. $1 - \delta$, $\text{ALG} \geq (1 - \epsilon)\text{OPT}$.

Assume:

- know m
- (for simplicity) know $\overline{\text{OPT}}$
- $\forall i, j, k, \frac{C_i}{a(i, j, k)} \geq \kappa \geq \frac{c \lg(\frac{m}{\delta})}{\epsilon^2}$ for some universal constant c
- $\frac{\overline{\text{OPT}}}{w(j, k)} \geq \kappa$

First, consider Pure Random Algorithm

- knows \hat{R}
- knows optimal solution to LP, x
- non-adaptive (makes decisions ahead of time)
- will satisfy goal

Algorithm:

Given j , pick option k w.p. $\frac{x_{jk}}{1+\epsilon}$ (a scaling of the LP solution)

X_i = total consumption of resource i

$= \sum_{t=1}^m X_{it}$ (they are independent)

$\forall i, \forall t, \mathbb{E}[X_{it}] = \sum_j \frac{1}{m} \sum_k \frac{x_{jk}}{1+\epsilon} a(i, j, k) \leq \frac{C_i}{m(1+\epsilon)}$

$\mathbb{E}[X_i] \leq \frac{C_i}{1+\epsilon}$

want to conclude that $\Pr[X_i \geq C_i] \leq \frac{\delta}{2n}$ (with high probability, we are not over capacity)

for simplicity,

$$\begin{aligned} a(i, j, k) &\in [0, 1] & C_i &\geq \kappa \\ w(j, k) &\in [0, 1] & \overline{\text{OPT}} &\geq \kappa \end{aligned}$$

This follows from Chernoff bounds, but we prove them.

2.1. **Chernoff Bounds.**

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X_i \geq C_i] &= \Pr[(1 + \epsilon)^{X_i} \geq (1 + \epsilon)^{C_i}] \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[(1 + \epsilon)^{X_i}]}{(1 + \epsilon)^{C_i}} \end{aligned}$$

The inequality is due to Markov's Inequality: $\Pr[X \geq a] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[x]}{a}$

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad \mathbb{E}[(1 + \epsilon)^{X_i}] &= \mathbb{E}\left[(1 + \epsilon)^{\sum_{t=1}^m X_{it}}\right] \\ (2) \quad &= \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_t (1 + \epsilon)^{X_{it}}\right] \\ (3) \quad &= \prod_{t=1}^m \mathbb{E}[(1 + \epsilon)^{X_{it}}] \\ (4) \quad &\leq \prod_{t=1}^m \mathbb{E}[1 + \epsilon X_{it}] \\ (5) \quad &\leq \prod_{t=1}^m \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon C_i}{m(1 + \epsilon)}\right) \\ (6) \quad &\leq \prod_{t=1}^m e^{\frac{\epsilon C_i}{m(1 + \epsilon)}} \\ (7) \quad &= e^{\frac{\epsilon C_i}{1 + \epsilon}} \end{aligned}$$

Line 3 is because of the independence of the X_{it} s. Line 4 is because $(1 + \epsilon)^x \leq (1 + \epsilon x) \forall x \in [0, 1]$. Line 6 is because $1 + x \leq e^x$, based on the Taylor series of e^x .

$$\begin{aligned} (8) \quad \Pr[X_i \geq C_i] &\leq \frac{e^{\frac{\epsilon C_i}{1 + \epsilon}}}{(1 + \epsilon)^{C_i}} \\ (9) \quad &= \left[\frac{e^\epsilon}{(1 + \epsilon)^{1 + \epsilon}}\right]^{\frac{C_i}{1 + \epsilon}} \\ (10) \quad &\leq e^{\frac{-\epsilon^2 C_i}{2(1 + \epsilon)}} \\ (11) \quad &\leq e^{\frac{-\epsilon^2 C_i}{4}} \\ (12) \quad &\leq e^{-\log(\frac{2n}{\delta})} \\ (13) \quad &= \frac{\delta}{2n} \end{aligned}$$

Line 10 is because $\frac{e^x}{(1+x)^{1+x}} \leq e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}$. Line 12 is because $\frac{\epsilon^2 C_i}{4} \geq \log \frac{2n}{\delta}$ (see inequality in assumptions).

2.2. **Back to Pure Random.** Let W be the profit of Pure Random, $\sum_t W_t$.

$$\mathbb{E}[W_t] = \sum_j \frac{1}{m} \sum_k \frac{X_{jk}}{1 + \epsilon} w(j, k) = \frac{\overline{\text{OPT}}}{m(1 + \epsilon)}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[W] = \frac{\overline{\text{OPT}}}{1 + \epsilon}$$

$$\Pr \left[W \leq \frac{\overline{\text{OPT}}}{1 + \epsilon} (1 - \epsilon) \right] \leq \frac{\delta}{2n}$$

Therefore, w.p. $1 - \delta$,

- no capacity is exceeded
- $w \geq \frac{\overline{\text{OPT}}(1-\epsilon)}{1+\epsilon} \geq \text{OPT}(1-2\epsilon)$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[W \leq \frac{\overline{\text{OPT}}}{1 + \epsilon} (1 - \epsilon) \right] &= \Pr[(1 - \epsilon)^w \geq (1 - \epsilon)^{\dots}] \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[(1 - \epsilon)^W]}{(1 - \epsilon)^{\dots}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(1 - \epsilon)^W] &= \mathbb{E}[(1 - \epsilon)^{\sum_t W_t}] \\ &= \prod_t \mathbb{E}[(1 - \epsilon)^{W_t}] \\ &\leq \prod_t \mathbb{E}[1 - \epsilon^{W_t}] = \prod_t \left(1 - \epsilon \frac{\overline{\text{OPT}}(1 - \epsilon)}{m(1 + \epsilon)} \right) \\ &\leq \prod_{t=1}^m e^{-\frac{\epsilon \dots}{m}} = e^{-\frac{\epsilon \overline{\text{OPT}}(1 - \epsilon)}{(1 + \epsilon)}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\Pr \left[W \leq \frac{\overline{\text{OPT}}(1 - \epsilon)}{1 + \epsilon} \right] \leq \frac{e^{-\frac{\epsilon \overline{\text{OPT}}(1 - \epsilon)}{1 + \epsilon}}}{(1 - \epsilon)^{\frac{\overline{\text{OPT}}(1 - \epsilon)}{1 + \epsilon}}} \dots \leq \frac{\delta}{2n}$$

The last dots are where we should do a similar approximation. □

2.3. An Alternative.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[X_i \geq C_i] &\leq \Pr[(1 + \epsilon)^{X_i} \geq (1 + \epsilon)^{C_i}] \\ &= \Pr[(1 + \epsilon)^{\frac{K X_i}{C_i}} \geq (1 + \epsilon)^K] \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[(1 + \epsilon)^{\frac{K X_i}{C_i}}]}{(1 + \epsilon)^K} \leq \frac{\delta}{2n} \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we showed

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \mathbb{E}[(1 + \epsilon)^{\frac{KX_i}{C_i}}] &\leq (1 + \epsilon)^K \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \mathbb{E}[\max_i (1 + \epsilon)^{\frac{KX_i}{C_i}}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\sum_i (1 + \epsilon)^{\frac{KX_i}{C_i}}] \\ &\leq (1 + \epsilon)^K \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \Pr[\max_i \frac{KX_i}{C_i} \geq K] &\leq \frac{\delta}{2} \\ \Pr[\max_i \frac{X_i}{C_i} \geq 1] &\leq \frac{\delta}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, Pure Random can be thought of as minimizing

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= \frac{\sum_i (1 + \epsilon)^{\frac{KX_i}{C_i}}}{(1 + \epsilon)^K} + \frac{(1 - \epsilon)^{\frac{KW}{\text{OPT}}}}{(1 + \epsilon)^K} \\ \mathbb{E}[\Phi^P] &\leq \delta \end{aligned}$$

We will show that $\mathbb{E}[\Phi^t] \leq \delta$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^t &= A_1 \dots A_t P_{t+1} \dots P_m \\ \mathbb{E}[\phi^{\mathcal{H}^t} | A_1 \dots A_{t-1}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\phi^{\mathcal{H}^{t-1}} | A_1 \dots A_{t-1}] \end{aligned}$$