

Lecture 30 (Nov. 23): Submodular Functions

Lecturer: Zachary Friggstad

Scribe: Arnoosh Golestanian

Part of this lecture proved the min-max theorem for Matroid Partitioning. The proof was moved to the matroid partitioning notes in Lecture 28.

We moved on to submodular functions and submodular maximization.

30.1 Submodular functions

Definition 1 For a finite set X , a function $f : 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is **submodular** if $\forall A, B \subseteq X, f(A) + f(B) \geq f(A \cup B) + f(A \cap B)$.

Examples:

- Matroid rank: have been discussed earlier in this course.
- Cardinality function: $f(A) = |A|$
- Cut function: Let A be a subset of vertices in a directed graph, then $f(A) = |\delta^{out}(A)|$
- Coverage function: For $X = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n\}$ being a collection of subsets of some ground set Z , the coverage function $f(A) = |\bigcup_{S \in A} S|$, $A \subseteq 2^X$ is submodular.
- Max function: $\max\{z \in A\}$ if $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and $A \subseteq X$.
- $s - t$ cut function on graph $G(V, E)$: Let $X = V - \{s, t\}$, $f(A) = |\delta^{out}(A \cup \{s\})|$.
- Flow function on digraph $G(V, E)$ with capacity $\forall e \in E, \mu_e$: Let $r \in V$ and $A \subseteq V - r$, $f(A) =$ maximum flow from r into A in G .

We will assume that $f(A)$ can be evaluated efficiently for any $A \subseteq X$. In this case, say that the function is presented by a **value oracle**. For example, if f is the cut function then for any subset of vertices A we calculate $f(A)$ by checking to see which edges start in A and end outside of A .

Finding a set A with minimum value can be done in polynomial time in the sense that the algorithm uses a polynomial number of queries to the oracle computing f and, apart from these calls, runs in polynomial time. However, it is a fairly complicated algorithm. We will sketch it next lecture. For now, we discuss some simpler maximization algorithms.

The problem we consider is the following,

Definition 2 Find $A \subseteq X$ such that $f(A)$ has the maximum possible value.

This is **NP-hard**, as it generalizes the maximum-cut problem. So we will consider some approximation algorithms. The only assumption we will make in our first algorithm is that $f(A) \geq 0$ for each $A \subseteq X$. This holds in many natural problems, such as coverage functions or cut functions.

Our first algorithm is quite oblivious. It picks a set without **ever** querying the value oracle! So it is really more of a structural statement about submodular functions. Still, it can be interpreted as a randomized approximation algorithm.

Approximation Algorithm for Submodular Maximization

1. $A \leftarrow \emptyset$
2. for each $i \in X$
3. add i to A with probability $\frac{1}{2}$
4. return A

Theorem 1 *If $f(A) \geq 0$ for all $A \subseteq X$, then $E[f(A)] \geq \frac{1}{4} \max_{B \subseteq X} f(B)$.*

To prove this theorem, we need to use the following two lemmas. Before doing this, we briefly mention the following easy-to-check fact.

Fact

If $f : 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is submodular and $A, B \subseteq X$ are disjoint, then $f' : 2^{X-(B \cup A)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $f'(T) = f(T \cup A)$ is also submodular.

Lemma 1 $E_{A \subseteq X'} [f'(A)] \geq \frac{1}{2} [f'(\emptyset) + f'(X')]$ for any submodular function f' over X' .

Proof.

We prove this by induction on $|X'| = n$. The base case is when $n = 1$; so, in the algorithm either we choose \emptyset or X' meaning that:

$$E_{A \subseteq X'} [f'(A)] = \frac{1}{2} [f'(\emptyset) + f'(X')]$$

Now when $n \geq 1$, assume that the claim is true for any subset of set X' and we want show that this is also true for set X' . Let $z \in X'$, then

$$\begin{aligned} E_{A \subseteq X'} [f'(A')] &= \frac{1}{2} E_{A' \subseteq X' - z} [f'(A')] + \frac{1}{2} E_{A' \subseteq X' - z} [f'(A' + z)] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} [f'(\emptyset) + f'(X' - z)] \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} [f'(z) + f'(X')] \right) \geq \frac{1}{2} [f'(\emptyset) + f'(X')]. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality used the induction hypothesis on the two submodular functions f_1, f_2 over $X - \{z\}$ obtained from f' where $f_1(A') = f'(A')$ and $f_2(A') = f'(A' + z)$ (see the **fact** above). The second inequality follows directly from the definition of submodularity. ■

Lemma 2 $\forall B \subseteq X', E_{A \subseteq X'} [f'(A)] \geq \frac{1}{4} [f'(\emptyset) + f'(B) + f'(X' - B) + f'(X')]$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_{A \subseteq X}[f'(A)] &= E_{A' \subseteq B}[E_{\overline{A'} \subseteq X-B}[f'(A' \cup \overline{A'})]] \geq E_{A' \subseteq B}[\frac{1}{2}f'(A') + \frac{1}{2}f'(A' \cup (X' - B))] \\
 &= \frac{1}{2}E_{A' \subseteq B}[f'(A') + \frac{1}{2}E_{A' \subseteq B}[f'(A' \cup (X' - B))]] \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2}[\frac{1}{2}f'(\emptyset) + \frac{1}{2}f'(B)] + \frac{1}{2}[\frac{1}{2}f'(X' - B) + \frac{1}{2}f'(X')]
 \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used Lemma 1 repeatedly. ■

Proof.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.

By using Lemma 2, letting f' to be f , and assuming that B maximizes f ,

$$E_{A \subseteq X}[f(A)] \geq \frac{1}{4} [f(\emptyset) + f(B) + f(X - B) + f(X)] \geq \frac{1}{4}f(B)$$

and the reason for the last inequality is because we assumed that f is non negative. ■

Say that f is **symmetric** if $f(A) = f(X - A)$ for each $A \subseteq X$. For example, if f is the cut function of an undirected graph.

Corollary 1 *If f is symmetric and $f(A) \geq 0$ for all $A \subseteq X$, then $E[f(A)] \geq \frac{1}{2} \max_{B \subseteq X} f(B)$.*

Proof. We know

$$E_{A \subseteq X}[f(A)] \geq \frac{1}{4} [f(\emptyset) + f(B) + f(X - B) + f(X)] \geq \frac{1}{2}f(B)$$

for any B , in particular for the B that maximizes $f(B)$. ■

The analysis of both the general and the symmetric versions are tight. For example, let $X = \{1, 2\}$ and $f(\{1\}) = 1$ and $f(A) = 0$ for all other $A \subseteq X$. For the symmetric case let $f(A) = 1$ if $|A| = 1$ and otherwise $f(A) = 0$.