

On the Tradeoff between Stability and Fit

Edith Cohen ^{*} Graham Cormode [†] Nick Duffield [†]
Carsten Lund [†]
edith@cohenwang.com {graham,duffield,lund}@research.att.com

Abstract

In computing, as in many aspects of life, changes incur cost. Many optimization problems are formulated as a one-time instance starting from scratch. However, a common case that arises is when we already have a set of prior assignments, and must decide how to respond to a new set of constraints, given that each change from the current assignment comes at a price. That is, we would like to maximize the fitness or efficiency of our system, but we need to balance it with the changeout cost from the previous state.

We provide a precise formulation for this tradeoff and analyze the resulting *stable extensions* of some fundamental problems in measurement and analytics. Our main technical contribution is a stable extension of PPS (probability proportional to size) weighted random sampling, with applications to monitoring and anomaly detection problems. We also provide a general framework that applies to top- k , minimum spanning tree, and assignment. In both cases, we are able to provide exact solutions, and discuss efficient incremental algorithms that can find new solutions as the input changes.

1 Introduction

Most textbook optimization problems have a clean statement: given a set of constraints and an optimization target, we are free to choose any feasible solution, and so can strive for the optimal result. However, when applying these techniques, we may find that we do not begin with a clean slate. Rather, we often have some (partial) assignment, perhaps resulting from a previous optimization over a prior input. This assignment is unlikely to be optimal for the current instance, but each modification to the current assignment can come with a cost. We therefore have to balance the improvement from a new assignment (the fit) with the cost of changing from the current assignment to the new one (the stability).

Consider a network operator who is leasing network connections to meet customer demand. When there are no existing leases, this can be modeled as a standard graph optimization problem. But after an initial solution is found, customer demand may change. The operator then has to solve a more complex optimization, since there is a (fixed) cost to breaking an existing lease and establishing a new one. This cannot easily be represented as an instance of the original problem, due to the mixture of pricing schemes.

Formalizing this setting, we target applications where the *input state* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ changes over time. We maintain an *output* $S \in \mathcal{S}$ that can be changed in response to changes in the input. We are interested in the tradeoff between the *fit* (or *efficiency*) of the output with respect to the current input and the *changeout cost* from the previous output. This requirement for ‘stability’ arises in a variety of different applications:

^{*}Microsoft Research, SVC (USA) and Tel Aviv University (Israel)

[†]AT&T Labs-Research, 180 Park Avenue, Florham Park, NJ, USA.

Human-interpretable output: In many settings devoted to monitoring and managing a system, there is a “dashboard” that presents information to an operator. For example, this could be details of the most congested links in a network, the heaviest users of the system, locations with anomalous activity, and so on. The underlying information may be rapidly changing, so that constantly updating the display would lead to a confusing mess of information. Instead, the operator should be presented with a view which is reasonably stable, so that they can absorb the information, and track the change in properties of items over time. At the same time, the output should be close to optimal in detailing the most important items.

The overhead of change: In a client-server assignment or a routing problem, changes in the output may correspond to cache swaps, job migration, or modifications to a routing table. In all of these cases, each change incurs a cost, and very rapid change can lead to poor performance: delays, due to routes changing midway, or low throughput due to constant reassignment of machines. We are therefore willing to settle for a solution that is sub-optimal at any instant, but which changes only slowly.

Audience-aware advertising: Consider a roadside electronic billboard that can respond to the set of road users passing by. We can choose an advertisement to display in response to demographics of the users, but constantly changing the ad will make it impossible for any of them to absorb.

Allocating Resources to Monitoring: Analysis such as change or anomaly detection requires tracking behavior of items over time. In high-throughput systems, it is feasible to collect detailed statistics on only a representative subset of active items. Picking the items to monitor that are currently the most ‘interesting’ (top- k or a random sample) may fail to keep any around long enough to build sufficient history for particular items, so we prefer to retain monitored items while they are useful. Moreover, to efficiently store historic summaries for an extended time period, we only need to record the modifications to the summary made over time, so limiting modifications means that less storage is required.

Contributions: We formalize and motivate the algorithmic problem of balancing fitness and stability. Our main results concern the *stable extension* of some fundamental problems in measurement and analytics. We first consider sampling with stability, and focus on PPS (probability proportional to size) weighted random samples. We then continue to a selection of fundamental optimization problems which includes matroids and introduce a unified model for the stable extension of top- k set, Minimum Spanning Tree, and Assignment. An empirical study of our methods demonstrates their advantages over alternative approaches. Last, we point to further classic problems with natural stable extensions.

- *Stable PPS sample:* A PPS sample is a weighted random sample where the sampling probability of each entry is proportional to its weight, but truncated to be at most 1 [11]. PPS sampling minimizes the sum of variances across all distributions with the same expected size sample. We study PPS as a method to choose a representative selection of input data (as needed in the motivating applications), and consider its stable extension. In this stable extension, the output is a vector \mathbf{p} of inclusion probabilities which sum to k and the fitness is the respective sum of variances. We also maintain a sample of entries sampled independently according to the current output distribution. We measure the changeout cost by the expectation of the set difference of samples between the two sample distributions. Under the appropriate procedure, we show that this can be kept to the minimal value, the L_1 difference between the initial and target distributions.

- *Optimization problems with additive fitness function and fixed-size output:* The simplest problem in this class, where there are no further restrictions on the output beyond having a fixed size k , is to produce the top- k set, containing the k heaviest entries. In the stable extension, a valid output is any subset of size k , where the fitness of a particular subset is the sum of values of entries included in the subset and the changeout cost is the set difference between outputs. The stable extension of top- k models monitoring of heavy users or maintaining the most effective cache. This framework also applies to assignment, i.e. minimum bipartite matching (where output must be a bipartite matching), and minimum spanning tree (output must be a spanning tree).

We establish a relation between the stable extension of an optimization problem in this class and instances of the original optimization problem on a parametrically specified modified input. This relation allows us to apply an algorithm for the original optimization problem as a black box to obtain a stable solution. Moreover, we establish a mapping between a dynamic version of the stable extension (where we must efficiently modify the output in response to incremental updates to the input) and the dynamic version of the original optimization problem. This mapping similarly allows off-the-shelf applications of existing dynamic algorithms to efficiently recompute a stable solution when the input is modified.

2 Relation to Time decay models

A natural first attempt at providing stability of output is to stabilize the input, which is commonly performed using some time-decayed average (via an exponential, polynomial, or sliding window decay function) over recent input states [1, 6]. Decay models are successful in capturing the current state when inputs can be modeled as noisy samples from a slowly changing underlying distribution. In this case, the time-decayed (moving) average better captures the “real” current state than the current input.

When using decay models directly to obtain stability of output, we can compute the best-fit output for the time-decayed average. This approach lacks, however, when similarity of the input does not guarantee similarity, or stability, of the output.

For example, the exact location of optimal cluster centers will vary even on smoothed input, and so incur the fixed changeout cost. Another example is a top- k set over an input where $2k$ values are incremented uniformly and independently at random. The top- k set has sensitivity to small perturbation, which smoothing the data will not eliminate. Ideally, we would like the output to be stable over time: the small benefit of choosing the top-ranked values does not outweigh the cost of output changes. Moreover, when the output function *is* insensitive to small perturbations in the input, we cannot fine tune the tradeoff of fit and stability by controlling the decay parameter: the stability of the output is not necessarily an increasing function of the decay parameter. Even if we could do so, we would have no analytic guarantees over the tradeoff. In contrast, our formulation shows that we can find optimal solutions for any point on the tradeoff curve.

Therefore, as we also demonstrate empirically, while time-decay can be combined with our models as a first phase, (such as to replace the input by its time-moving average when the latter better captures the current state), it is not designed to optimally trade off stability and fit, and thus, in and of itself, does not produce a satisfactory solution to our problem.

3 Model

The fit of output $S \in \mathcal{S}$ to input $\mathbf{x} \in X$ is measured by a *fitness function* $\phi : \mathcal{S} \times X \rightarrow R$. The *best-fit* $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{x})$ is the output with maximum fitness for input \mathbf{x} :

$$\text{OPT}(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \phi(S, \mathbf{x}) .$$

Output domains \mathcal{S} and corresponding best-fits can be assignments (minimum cost assignment), routing tables (shortest path routing), subsets of size k (top- k set), spanning trees (MST), or sampling distributions (PPS sampling). The *changeout cost* from output S_1 to S_2 is a distance function on $\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$: $d(S_1, S_2) \geq 0$.

When presented with a new input \mathbf{x} , and a current output S' , we are interested in a Δ -stable optimum, which is the best-fit output subject to a limit D on changeout cost, and its respective fitness:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\text{-OPT}(S', \mathbf{x}, D) &= \arg \max_{S|d(S,S') \leq D} \phi(S, \mathbf{x}) \\ \Delta\text{-}\phi(S', \mathbf{x}, D) &= \max_{S|d(S,S') \leq D} \phi(S, \mathbf{x})\end{aligned}$$

When fixing \mathbf{x} and S' , and varying the allotted change D , we obtain the optimal tradeoff between fit and changeout cost using the points $(D, \Delta\text{-}\phi(S', \mathbf{x}, D))$.

The α -stable optimum S is defined with respect to a parameter a , which specifies a relation between changeout cost and improvement in fitness:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha\text{-OPT}(S', \mathbf{x}, a) &= \arg \max_S (\phi(S, \mathbf{x}) - a d(S, S')) \\ \alpha\text{-}\phi(S', \mathbf{x}, a) &= \phi(\alpha\text{-OPT}(S', \mathbf{x}, a), \mathbf{x})\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

By sweeping the Lagrange multiplier a , we can obtain the tradeoff using the points

$$(d(S', \alpha\text{-OPT}(S', \mathbf{x}, a)), \alpha\text{-}\phi(S', \mathbf{x}, a)) .\tag{2}$$

The fitness of the α -stable output decreases with a and that of a Δ -optimal one increases with D . For $a = 0$, we allow D to be arbitrarily large, and the α -stable optimum is the current best-fit $\text{OPT}(\mathbf{x})$. When a is sufficiently large, D is forced to be small and the α -stable optimum is closer to the previous S' . Two desirable properties satisfied by the problems we consider are concavity and output monotonicity of the tradeoff. These properties simplify the computation of the tradeoff and also mean that the choice of the best tradeoff point is predictable and tunable.

Concave tradeoff: Concavity means that the function $\Delta\text{-}\phi(S', \mathbf{x}, D)$ is concave in D , so that the marginal improvement in fitness for increase in allowed changeout cost is non-increasing. When the function is continuous and differentiable in D , the marginal improvement is the first derivative $\frac{\partial \Delta\text{-}\phi(S', \mathbf{x}, D)}{\partial D}$ and concavity means $\frac{\partial^2 \Delta\text{-}\phi(S', \mathbf{x}, D)}{\partial^2 D} < 0$. In this case, when the parameters satisfy $\Delta\text{-OPT}(S', \mathbf{x}, D) = \alpha\text{-OPT}(S', \mathbf{x}, a)$, then $a = \frac{\partial \Delta\text{-}\phi(S', \mathbf{x}, D)}{\partial D}$.

Output monotonicity: When the output can be expressed as a vector, monotonicity means that each entry (inclusion, sampling probability, etc.) is monotone when sweeping a and looking at the α -stable optimum (or equivalently, when sweeping D and looking at the Δ -stable optimum). In particular, when output entries are binary, then for each $i \in S$, there is at most one threshold value τ so that $i \notin \alpha\text{-OPT}(S, \mathbf{x}, a) \iff a < \tau$ and for each $i \notin S$ there is at most one threshold value of τ so that $i \in \alpha\text{-OPT}(S, \mathbf{x}, a) \iff a < \tau$.

Problem formulations

The applications we target have a sequence of inputs. A natural aim is to seek outputs that are α -stable in each step with respect to the same parameter a — meaning that we “price” the changeout cost the same across steps. Alternatively or additionally, we may need to limit the changeout at each step.

Stable solutions and tradeoff: The underlying basic algorithmic problem is to compute, for a given input \mathbf{x} and current output S , the respective Δ -stable and the α -stable optimum solutions.

Incremental updates: When in each step the input is provided as a small update to the previous one, such as a rewrite, increment, or decrement of a single entry of the vector, we would like to efficiently compute a new α -stable optimum instead of applying the batch algorithm to compute it from scratch.

Offline problem: In the related *offline* problem, the input is a sequence $\mathbf{x}^{(j)} \in \mathcal{X}$ ($j \in [N]$) of states and the solution is a sequence $S_j \in \mathcal{S}$ ($j \in [N]$) of outputs that maximizes

$$\sum_{j \in [N]} \phi(S_j, \mathbf{x}^{(j)}) - \alpha \sum_{j \in [N]} d(S_j, S_{j-1}) . \quad (3)$$

S_0 is defined to be some initial state, or \emptyset . To maximize stability ($\alpha \rightarrow \infty$), the solution is $S_j \equiv S$ for all $j \in [N]$ where $S = \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{j \in [N]} \phi(S, \mathbf{x}^{(j)})$ ¹. For maximum fit, ($\alpha = 0$), we use the best-fit at each timestep, $S_j = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{x}^{(j)})$. This offline stable optimum is interesting when we seek to minimize global change and are willing to tolerate worse fit occasionally in some steps. We would then like an online solution which is closer to the offline stable optimum, and possibly use a model of the data to achieve this. Our formulation of computing a stable solution at each step is appropriate when the aim is to guarantee a continuously good fit, as in the motivating scenarios outlined in the introduction. Note that our model has no prediction component, which fundamentally sets it apart from other treatments of adapting to a changing or unknown state including metrical task systems[3] and regret minimization in decision theory.

4 Stable PPS sample

In this section, we consider the stable extension of PPS sampling. The input domain \mathcal{X} consists of real non-negative vectors $\mathbf{w} \in R_+^n$ and the output domain \mathcal{S} contains probability distributions specified by all vectors $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^n$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n p_i = k$. While we modify the distribution, the actual output is a random sample where entry i is sampled with probability p_i and different entries are sampled independently².

Fitness function: When a value w_i is sampled with probability p_i , the unbiased non-negative estimator with minimum variance on the weight of the entry is the Horvitz-Thompson estimator, i.e. $\frac{w_i}{p_i}$ when the entry is sampled and 0 otherwise. The variance is $w_i^2(1/p_i - 1)$.

We measure the quality of a sample distribution \mathbf{p} for input \mathbf{w} by the sum of variances $\sum_i w_i^2(1/p_i - 1)$. We can omit the additive term $-\sum_i w_i^2$ (which does not depend on \mathbf{p}) and obtain the fitness function

$$\phi(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{w}) = -\sum_i \frac{w_i^2}{p_i} .$$

The best-fit for a sample of expected size k is the distribution with minimum sum of variances. This is achieved by PPS (Probability Proportional to Size) sampling probabilities, $\mathbf{p} = \text{pps}(k, \mathbf{w})$, obtained by solving for τ the following equation, using $p_i = \min\{1, w_i/\tau\}$:

$$\sum_i \min\{1, w_i/\tau\} = k . \quad (4)$$

¹In general, this is *not* equivalent to the original optimization problem applied to the combination of all inputs.

²We comment that it is often sufficient to only require limited independence, which is easier to obtain in practice.

Algorithm 1 SUBSAMPLE procedure

```
1: procedure SUBSAMPLE( $S, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}$ )
2:   for  $i \in [n]$  do
3:     if  $i \notin S$  and  $q_i > p_i$  then
4:       if  $\text{RAND}() < \frac{q_i - p_i}{1 - p_i}$  then
5:          $S \leftarrow S \cup \{i\}$ 
6:                                      $\triangleright i$  is sampled-in with probability  $\frac{q_i - p_i}{1 - p_i}$ 
7:     if  $i \in S$  and  $q_i < p_i$  then
8:       if  $\text{RAND}() > \frac{q_i}{p_i}$  then
9:          $S \leftarrow S \setminus \{i\}$ 
10:                                     $\triangleright i$  is sampled-out with probability  $1 - \frac{q_i}{p_i}$ 
11: return  $S$ 
```

Distance function: The random sample is a set of entries and our distance function measures the *expected* set difference between the samples. The distance therefore depends on the particular *subsampling procedure* we employ to move from a sample S drawn from probability distribution \mathbf{p} to a new one drawn from \mathbf{q} . Clearly, the distance must be at least $\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1 = \sum_i |p_i - q_i|$. We can use a SUBSAMPLE procedure (pseudo-code in Algorithm 1), which has distance *exactly* $d(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1$ and is therefore minimal. Subsampling results in input and output samples that are *coordinated*, meaning they are as similar as possible subject to each conforming to a different distribution. It is possible to modify SUBSAMPLE to use a VarOpt sampling procedure [5], which can ensure that the number of inclusions and exclusions are each between the floor and ceiling of their expectation. Alternatively, we can associate a permanent random number (PRN) [4] $u_i \in U[0, 1]$ so that $i \in S \iff u_i \leq p_i$. This means that each sample is drawn from the right distribution, while the samples are coordinated across time steps.

Example 4.1 Consider sampling a set of expected size 2 from 6 entries. Suppose we have a current sample S , drawn according to a uniform distribution \mathbf{p} , where $p_i = 1/3$ for $i \in [6]$. This distribution has the best fit when the input is uniform.

Suppose that the new input weights are

$$\mathbf{w} = (2, 4, 1, 5, 6, 0) .$$

The PPS sampling probabilities for a sample of size 2, obtained with threshold $\tau = 9$, are

$$\text{pps}(2, \mathbf{w}) = \left(\frac{2}{9}, \frac{4}{9}, \frac{1}{9}, \frac{5}{9}, \frac{2}{3}, 0 \right) . \quad (5)$$

The expected changeout cost of modifying the sample from one drawn according to the uniform \mathbf{p} to one drawn according to $\text{pps}(2, \mathbf{w})$ is $\|\mathbf{p} - \text{pps}(2, \mathbf{w})\|_1 = \frac{4}{3}$.

The actual changeout to the sampling distribution $\text{pps}(2, \mathbf{w})$ depends on our initial sample S and the randomization when subsampling. Suppose $S = \{3, 4\}$, that is, contains the third and fourth entries. Entries $\{1, 6\}$ are not in S and have reduced sampling probabilities and therefore will not be included in the new sample. Entry 4 is in S and has increased inclusion probability and therefore will be included in the new sample. Entries $\{2, 5\}$ which are not in S but for which inclusion probabilities increased, need to be sampled for inclusion with respective probabilities $\{1/6, 1/2\}$. Entry 3 which is in S but has a reduced inclusion probability is sampled out with probability $2/3$. Therefore, the

new sample will include entry 4 and will not include entries $\{1, 6\}$ but may include any subset of entries $\{2, 3, 5\}$.

The stability-fit tradeoff includes distributions that are between \mathbf{p} and $\text{pps}(2, \mathbf{w})$. These distributions have higher variance but smaller expected change. In the sequel, we demonstrate how they are computed on this example.

4.1 Computing the stability/fit tradeoff

In this section we establish the following:

Theorem 4.1 *An α -stable PPS distribution, Δ -stable PPS distribution, and a description of the tradeoff mapping parameter values to fitness and vice versa, can be computed in $O(n \log n)$ time. Moreover, the tradeoff is concave and monotone.*

Let \mathbf{p} be the initial output and \mathbf{w} the current weights. The Δ -stable distribution \mathbf{q} is the solution of the following nonlinear optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} \sum_i \frac{w_i^2}{q_i} & (6) \\ & \forall i, 1 \geq q_i \geq 0 \\ & \sum_i q_i = k \\ & \sum_i |q_i - p_i| \leq D \end{aligned}$$

We are interested in efficiently solving the problem for a particular value of the changeout D and also in computing a compact representation of all solutions.

We reduce (6) to two simpler problems. BEST-INCREASE computes, for any value x , the most beneficial total increase of x to current sampling probabilities, i.e., that would bring the biggest reduction in the sum of variances. Similarly, BEST-DECREASE computes the least detrimental total decrease of x , i.e., the decrease that results in the minimum increase of the sum of variances. Both problems can be formulated as convex programs. We show that descriptions of both functions can be found in time $O(n \log n)$. Last, we show how to fully describe the Δ -stable PPS distributions and α -stable distributions in time $O(n \log n)$ by using these functions.

The most beneficial increase

The most beneficial increase for $x \in (0, \sum_i (1 - p_i)]$ is δ which solves the following convex program.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} \sum_i \frac{w_i^2}{p_i + \delta_i} & (7) \\ & \forall i, 1 - p_i \geq \delta_i \geq 0 \\ & \sum_i \delta_i = x \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.2 *For any increase $x \in (0, \sum_i (1 - p_i)]$ there is a threshold value $y \equiv \underline{\tau}(x)$ such that the solution of (7) is $\delta_i = \min\{1, \max\{p_i, w_i/y\}\} - p_i$. The function $\underline{\tau}(x)$ and its inverse $\Delta^+(y)$ are continuous and decreasing and piecewise with at most $2n$ breakpoints, where each piece is a hyperbola. Moreover, a representation of both functions can be computed in $O(n \log n)$ time.*

Algorithm 2 The function $\Delta^+(y)$ and its inverse $\underline{\tau}(x)$ for \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{p}

```

1: procedure BEST-INCREASE( $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}$ )
2:    $W \leftarrow 0$  ▷ weight of active items
3:    $D \leftarrow 0$  ▷ Contribution to difference of items that exited and negated sum of initial
   probabilities of active items
4:    $L \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ Initialize  $L$  as an empty max-heap
5:   for  $i \in [n]$  do
6:     if ( $w_i > 0$ ) then
7:       if ( $p_i < 1$ ) then
8:          $(A.v, A.t, A.i) \leftarrow (\frac{w_i}{p_i}, \text{"entry"}, i)$ 
9:         ▷ value, breakpoint type, item
10:         $L \leftarrow L \cup A$  ▷ add entry record to  $L$ 
11:        else if  $p_i = 0$  then
12:           $W \leftarrow W + w_i$ 
13:           $(A.v, A.t, A.i) \leftarrow (w_i, \text{"exit"}, i)$ 
14:          ▷ value, breakpoint type, item
15:           $L \leftarrow L \cup A$  ▷ add exit record to  $L$ 
16:         $A \leftarrow \text{GETMAX}(L)$ 
17:        ▷ Pull Record with largest  $A.v$  in  $L$ 
18:        if  $W > 0$  then
19:           $\Delta^+ \leftarrow \{([A.v, \infty), \frac{W}{y}]\}$ 
20:          ▷ "Rightmost" piece of Function  $\Delta^+(y)$ 
21:           $\underline{\tau} \leftarrow \{((0, \frac{W}{A.v}], \frac{W}{x})\}$ 
22:          ▷ "Leftmost" piece of Function  $\underline{\tau}(x)$ 
23:        else
24:           $\Delta^+ \leftarrow \emptyset, \underline{\tau} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
25:           $r \leftarrow A.v$  ▷ definition boundary so far of  $\Delta^+$ 
26:           $\ell \leftarrow \frac{W}{A.v}$  ▷ definition boundary so far of  $\underline{\tau}$ 
27:          while  $L \neq \emptyset$  do
28:             $A \leftarrow \text{GETMAX}(L)$ 
29:             $i \leftarrow A.i$ 
30:            if  $A.t = \text{"entry"}$  then
31:               $W \leftarrow W + w_i$ 
32:               $D \leftarrow D - p_i$ 
33:            else ▷  $A$  is an exit point
34:               $W \leftarrow W - w_i$ 
35:               $D \leftarrow D + 1$ 
36:             $\Delta^+ \leftarrow \Delta^+ \cup ([A.v, r], D + \frac{W}{y})$ 
37:            ▷ Function  $\Delta^+$  from  $A.v$  to next breakpoint
38:             $r \leftarrow A.v$ 
39:             $\underline{\tau} \leftarrow \underline{\tau} \cup \{((\ell, D + \frac{W}{A.v}], \frac{W}{x-D})\}$ 
40:            ▷ Function  $\underline{\tau}$  from previous to current breakpoint
41:             $\ell \leftarrow D + \frac{W}{A.v}$ 
42: return  $\Delta^+, \underline{\tau}$ 

```

Proof From convexity, the solution is unique and the Kuhn-Tucker conditions specify its form: The partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial \frac{w_i^2}{p_i + \delta_i}}{\partial \delta_i} = -\frac{w_i^2}{(p_i + \delta_i)^2}$$

are equal for all i such that $1 - p_i > \delta_i > 0$. We denote this common value of $\frac{w_i}{p_i + \delta_i}$ by $\tau(x)$. For i where $\delta_i = 0$, we have $\frac{w_i}{p_i} \leq \tau(x)$ and when $0 < \delta_i = 1 - p_i$, we have $w_i \geq \tau(x)$.

Using this, we can now consider the solution as a function of x . We first sort all items with $0 < p_i < 1$ in decreasing order of w_i/p_i and place items with $p_i = 0$ and $w_i > 0$ at the head of the sorted list. The list is processed in order: we first increase δ_1 until $\frac{w_1}{p_1 + \delta_1} = \frac{w_2}{p_2}$. We then increase both δ_1 and δ_2 so that the ratios are all equal until $\frac{w_1}{p_1 + \delta_1} = \frac{w_2}{p_2 + \delta_2} = \frac{w_3}{p_3}$ and so on (but we stop increasing a probability once it is equal to 1). At any point, the ratios $\frac{w_i}{p_i + \delta_i}$ on the prefix $1, \dots, h$ we have processed are all equal to some value y except for items where p_i reached 1. The threshold $y \equiv \tau(x)$ can be interpreted as the rate of decrease of the sum of variances per unit increase in expected sample size after implementing optimally a total increase of x . It is a decreasing function of x and satisfies $y \in (w_{h+1}/p_{h+1}, w_h/p_h]$, where h is the last processed entry on our sorted list. The new sampling probabilities $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{p} + \boldsymbol{\delta}$ satisfy $q_i(y) = \min\{1, \max\{p_i, w_i/y\}\}$. Observe that the probabilities $\mathbf{q}(y)$ are PPS of size $\sum_{i=1}^h p_i + x$ of the prefix of the list

$$(q_1, \dots, q_h) \leftarrow \text{pps}\left(\sum_{i=1}^h p_i + x, (w_1, \dots, w_h)\right),$$

and y is the threshold value of these PPS probabilities.

Consider the (at most $2n$) points defined by the ratios w_i/p_i (when $p_i < 1$ and $w_i > 0$) and the weights w_i . Consider the relation between x and $y = \tau(x)$. The function is a hyperbola $x = a + b/y$ for some constants a, b between consecutive breakpoints.

The inverse function of $\tau(x)$, which we call $\Delta^+(y)$, maps threshold values to probability increases, and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} x = \Delta^+(y) &= \sum_i q_i(y) - p_i \\ &= \sum_i \min\{1, \max\{p_i, w_i/y\}\} - p_i. \end{aligned}$$

It is continuous and decreasing with range $[\min_{i|p_i < 1} w_i, R)$, where $R = \infty$ if $\exists i$ with $w_i > 0$ and $p_i = 0$ and $R = \max_{i|p_i < 1} \frac{w_i}{p_i}$ otherwise. It is piecewise where each piece is a hyperbola.

Algorithm 2 computes a representation of the functions $\Delta^+(y)$ and $\tau(x)$ each as a sorted list of pieces of the form $(I, f(y))$ where I are intervals that partition the domain and f is the function for values on that interval. For $\Delta^+(y)$, the pieces have the form $f(y) = a + b/y$. The inverse function $\tau(x)$ is simultaneously produced by the algorithm by inverting each piece $(I, a + b/y)$ to obtain a respective interval where end point v of I is mapped to end point $f(v) = a + b/v$ (left end points are mapped to right end points and vice versa). The inverse function on the corresponding interval is $\tau(x) = f^{-1}(x) = \frac{b}{x-a}$.

For each i with $w_i > 0$ and $p_i < 1$, Algorithm 2 creates an *entry point* with value $\frac{w_i}{p_i}$ and for each item with positive w_i , creates an *exit point* with value w_i . These (at most $2n$) points are the breakpoints of $\Delta^+(y)$. The breakpoints are processed in order to compute the functions $\Delta^+(y)$ and τ . The computation is performed in linear time after sorting the breakpoints. ■

Example 4.3 Returning to our example (Example 4.1), we consider the best increase for \mathbf{w} and the uniform \mathbf{p} . Since probabilities are uniform, Algorithm 2 processes entries in order of decreasing weight. The first entry on our list is entry 5, which has weight of 6. The best increase is applied only to this entry until the ratio matches the ratio of the second entry on the list, which happens when $6/(1/3 + \delta) = 5/(1/3)$, that is, when $\delta = 1/15$. So the first piece of our function is for the interval $x \in (0, 1/15]$. The corresponding distribution has entry 5 with probability $1/3 + x$ (and all other entries with the original $1/3$). The algorithm has active weight $W = 6$ and thus produces the threshold function $\tau = 6/(1/3 + x)$. We can verify that the inclusion probability for changeout x is $q_5 = 6/\tau(x) = 1/3 + x$. The second piece of the function associates increases for both entry 5, and the second entry on our list, which is entry 4. They are increased until the ratios are equal to the third entry on our list, which is entry 2. This happens when the increase to entry 5 is $1/6$, according to $6/(1/3 + \delta) = 4/(1/3)$ and when the increase to entry 4 is $1/12$ according to $5/(1/3 + \delta) = 4/(1/3)$. The total increase from entries $\{4, 5\}$ is $1/6 + 1/12 = 1/4$ and we obtain that the second piece of the function is for $x \in (1/15, 1/4)$, and both entries $\{4, 5\}$ are increased. Algorithm 2 computes the active weight $W = 6 + 5$ and the threshold $\tau(x) = 11/(x + 2/3)$. Thus for an increase of x , entry 5 is sampled with probability $6/\tau(x) = (6/11)(x + 2/3)$ and entry 4 with probability $5/\tau(x) = (6/11)(x + 2/3)$. The third piece would have 3 active entries $\{2, 4, 5\}$ (the three largest entries.). The active weight is $W = 15$ and the threshold is accordingly $\tau(x) = 15/(x + 1)$. The interval for this third piece is $(1/4, 2/3]$.

The least detrimental decrease

We next address the complementary problem, of how to compute the best decrease to the probabilities. For $x \in [0, \sum_i p_i]$, it is the solution of the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize } & \sum_{i|w_i>0} \frac{w_i^2}{p_i - \delta_i} & (8) \\ & \forall i, p_i \geq \delta_i \geq 0 \\ & \sum_i \delta_i = x \end{aligned}$$

We first observe that any total decrease $x \leq D_0$, where $D_0 = \sum_{i|w_i=0} p_i$ can be arbitrarily applied to probabilities of items with zero weight and does not increase the sum of variances.

Lemma 4.4 For any decrease $x \in (D_0, \sum_i p_i]$, there is a threshold $y \equiv \bar{\tau}(x)$ such that the solution of (8) has the form $\delta_i = p_i - \min\{p_i, w_i/y\}$. The function $\bar{\tau}(x)$ and its inverse $\Delta^-(y)$ are increasing, continuous, and piecewise with at most n breakpoints where each piece is a hyperbola. Moreover, a representation of both functions can be computed in $O(n \log n)$ time.

Proof For any decrease $x \in (D_0, \sum_i p_i]$, the solution is unique and specified by the Kuhn-Tucker conditions. For all i where $w_i = 0$ we must have $\delta_i = p_i$. For all i such that $\delta_i \in (0, p_i)$, the partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial \frac{w_i^2}{p_i - \delta_i}}{\partial \delta_i} = -\frac{w_i^2}{(p_i - \delta_i)^2}$$

are equal and we denote the common value of $\frac{w_i}{p_i - \delta_i}$ by $\bar{\tau}(x)$. When $\delta_i = 0$, we must have $\frac{w_i}{p_i} \geq \bar{\tau}(x)$.

The solution thus has the form

$$\delta_i = p_i - \min\{p_i, w_i/y\} = \max\{0, p_i - w_i/y\} .$$

Algorithm 3 The function $\Delta^-(y) : (0, \infty)$ and its (extended) inverse $\bar{\tau} : (0, \sum_i p_i)$ for \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{p}

```

1: procedure BEST-DECREASE( $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}$ )
2:    $W \leftarrow 0$  ▷ Initial active weight  $W$ 
3:    $D \leftarrow 0$ 
4:    $\Delta^- \leftarrow \emptyset, \bar{\tau} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
5:   for  $i \in [n]$  do
6:     if ( $w_i > 0$ ) then
7:        $(A.v, A.i) \leftarrow (\frac{w_i}{p_i}, i)$  ▷ value, item
8:        $L \leftarrow L \cup A$  ▷ add entry record to  $L$ 
9:     else,  $D \leftarrow D + p_i$  ▷  $w_i = 0$ 
10:   $\bar{\tau} \leftarrow ((0, D], 0)$  ▷ Threshold function is 0 for  $y \leq D$ 
11:   $\ell = D$  ▷ Left boundary of current definition of  $\bar{\tau}$ 
12:   $r = \infty$  ▷ Right boundary of current definition of  $\Delta^{-1}$ 
13:  while  $L \neq \emptyset$  do
14:     $A \leftarrow \text{GETMIN}(L)$ 
15:    ▷ Pull out record with minimum  $A.v$ 
16:     $i \leftarrow A.i$ 
17:     $W \leftarrow W + w_i$ 
18:     $D \leftarrow D + p_i$ 
19:     $\Delta^- \leftarrow \Delta^- \cup ([A.v, r), D - \frac{W}{y})$ 
20:     $r \leftarrow D - \frac{W}{A.v}$ 
21:     $\bar{\tau} \leftarrow \bar{\tau} \cup ((\ell, D - \frac{W}{A.v}], \frac{W}{D-x})$ 
22:     $\ell \leftarrow D - \frac{W}{A.v}$ 
23: return  $\Delta^-, \bar{\tau}$ 

```

We obtain the relation

$$x = \sum_i \delta_i = \sum_{i|w_i/y < p_i} (p_i - w_i/y),$$

which defines the functions $y \equiv \bar{\tau}(x)$ and its inverse $x \equiv \Delta^-(y)$. Both $\bar{\tau}(x)$ and its inverse $\Delta^-(y)$ are continuous and decreasing. The range of $\bar{\tau}(x)$ (domain of $\Delta^-(y)$) is $[\min_{i|p_i > 0} w_i/p_i, \infty)$. Both are piecewise with at most n breakpoints which correspond to the values of the ratios w_i/p_i . Algorithm 3 computes a representation of these two functions. It first orders the items as in Algorithm 2 and the proof of Lemma 4.2, according to the ratios w_i/p_i and processes this list in reverse order, generating the pieces of the two functions. Each function is represented as a list of consecutive pieces of the form $(I, f(y))$, where I is an interval. For convenience, we define $\bar{\tau}(x) = 0$ for $x \leq D_0$. For $\Delta^-(y)$, $f(y)$ has the form $f(y) = a - b/y$. The algorithm inverts $f(y)$ to obtain the corresponding piece of the function $\bar{\tau}(x)$: an end point v of I is mapped to end point $a - b/v$ (left end points are mapped to right end points and vice versa) and the function is $b/(a - x)$.

The probabilities $\mathbf{q} \leftarrow \mathbf{p} - \delta$ computed for a given x are PPS with threshold is y :

$$(q_t, \dots, q_n) \leftarrow \text{pps}\left(\sum_{i=t}^n p_i - x, (w_t, \dots, w_n)\right).$$

■




Figure 1: The thresholds $\underline{\tau}$ and $\bar{\tau}$ as a function of changeout x for Example 4.1. PPS threshold with maximum changeout ($4/3$) is provided as a reference.

Example 4.5 We compute the best decrease for Example 4.1, as computed by Algorithm 3. We obtain that for $x \in (0, 1/3]$ we only decrease the probability for entry 6, which has weight of 0. We then decrease only the second smallest entry, which is entry 3 with weight 1. The interval of the second piece is accordingly $x \in (1/3, 1/2]$, we have active weight 1, $\bar{\tau}(x) = 1/(2/3 - x)$, and $q_6 = 0$ and $q_2 = 1/\bar{\tau}(x) = 2/3 - x$. The third piece $x \in (1/2, 2/3]$ involves entries $\{1, 3\}$. The active weight is $W = 3$ and $\bar{\tau}(x) = \frac{3}{1-x}$. Accordingly, the probabilities are $q_6 = 0$, $q_2 = 2/\bar{\tau}(x)$, and $q_1 = 1/\bar{\tau}(x)$.

Computing a Δ -stable PPS distribution

We consider computing $\Delta\text{-OPT}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, D)$, which is the distribution with maximum fitness (minimum variance) $\phi(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{w})$, amongst \mathbf{q} that are within distance D from \mathbf{p} ($\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|_1 \leq D$). The applicable values of D are in the interval $[0, \|\text{pps}(k, \mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{p}\|_1]$ and clearly $\Delta\text{-OPT}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, 0) = \mathbf{p}$ and $\Delta\text{-OPT}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, \|\text{pps}(k, \mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{p}\|_1) = \text{pps}(k, \mathbf{w})$. For general D , we obtain the distribution by combining the best increase of $D/2$ and the best decrease of $D/2$. The two are disjoint for $D \leq \|\text{pps}(k, \mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{p}\|_1$. Pseudocode is provided in Algorithm 4.

Example 4.6 On Example 4.1, the optimal PPS has changeout $4/3$ and thus we are interested in the Δ -stable distribution for $D < 4/3$. We do this by combining the best increase of $D/2$, which affects a prefix of the entries $\{5, 4, 2\}$ with the best decrease of $D/2$, which affects a prefix of the entries $\{6, 3, 1\}$. If $D = 1$, the best increase of $x = 0.5$ involves all three entries. We have $\underline{\tau} = 7.5$ and accordingly the entries $\{5, 4, 2\}$, which have weights $\{6, 5, 4\}$, have $q_5 = 6/7.5 = 0.8$, $q_4 = 5/7.5 = 2/3$, and $q_2 = 4/7.5 = 8/15$. The best decrease of $x = 0.5$ has $\bar{\tau} = 6$. Accordingly, $q_6 = 0$, $q_3 = 1/6$, and $q_1 = 2/6 = 1/3$. Therefore, the Δ -stable distribution for $D = 1$ is

$$\mathbf{q} = \left(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{8}{15}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{4}{5}, 0 \right).$$

Figure 1 illustrates the thresholds $\bar{\tau}$ and $\underline{\tau}$ as a function of the changeout x . When the changeout is $D = 4/3$, the increase and decrease are $D/2 = 2/3$ and both thresholds meet the PPS threshold, reflecting the fact that the Δ -stable solution is the best-fit PPS (5).

Lemma 4.7 A representation of $\Delta\text{-OPT}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, D)$ can be computed in $O(n \log n)$ time. The representation supports computing the output distribution for a particular value D in time linear in the number of entries with $p_i \neq q_i$.

Algorithm 4 Compute the distribution $\Delta\text{-OPT}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, D)$

```

function OPT( $\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, D$ )
   $x \leftarrow D/2$ 
   $\underline{T} \leftarrow \underline{\tau}(x)$ 
   $\overline{T} \leftarrow \overline{\tau}(x)$ 
  if  $\overline{T} = 0$  then  $R \leftarrow x$ 
  for  $i \in [n]$  do
    if  $p_i \leq \frac{w_i}{\underline{T}}$  then
       $q_i \leftarrow \frac{w_i}{\underline{T}}$ 
    else if  $\overline{T} = 0$  then
      if  $R > 0$  and  $w_i = 0$  then
         $q_i \leftarrow \max\{0, p_i - R\}$ 
         $R \leftarrow R - p_i$ 
      else if  $p_i < \frac{w_i}{\overline{T}}$  then  $\triangleright \overline{T} > 0$  and  $p_i \in [\frac{w_i}{\overline{T}}, \frac{w_i}{\underline{T}})$ 
         $q_i \leftarrow \frac{w_i}{\overline{T}}$ 
      else  $\triangleright \overline{T} > 0, p_i \in [\frac{w_i}{\underline{T}}, \frac{w_i}{\overline{T}})$ 
         $q_i \leftarrow p_i$ 
  return  $q$ 

```

Proof Algorithm 4 computes $\Delta\text{-OPT}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{p}, D)$ in $O(n)$ time after computing the thresholds $\overline{\tau}(x)$ and $\underline{\tau}(x)$ for $x = D/2$, using Algorithms 2 and 3. If we are interested in a particular D , the algorithms can be stopped once the piece of the function containing $x = D/2$ is computed. This takes $O(n \log n)$ time of Algorithms 2 and 3. The complete representation is the combination of the representations of $\underline{\tau}(x)$ and $\overline{\tau}(x)$. If it is precomputed, Algorithm 4 returns the distribution in time linear in the number of modified entries. ■

Computing an α -stable PPS distribution

For a given stable solution, we can consider its changeout D from the starting distribution and the Lagrange multiplier a , which is the rate of decrease of the sum of variances per unit change after implementing a total change of D in sampling probabilities. The relation between the two is

$$\alpha(D) \equiv a = \underline{\tau}(D/2)^2 - \overline{\tau}(D/2)^2.$$

Lemma 4.8 *A description of the function $\alpha(D)$, and a solution for an equation $\alpha(D) = a$, can be computed in $O(n \log n)$ time.*

Proof The function $\alpha(D)$ is a piecewise rational expression which is decreasing with D . Its breakpoints are the union of the breakpoints of $\underline{\tau}$ and $\overline{\tau}$. For each piece, we can compute the respective range of D values and of a values. To compute the α -stable distribution for a given a , we locate the piece in which a is in the range and solve for x the equation $a = \underline{\tau}(x)^2 - \overline{\tau}(x)^2$. Within a specified piece, this yields a quartic equation (finding the root of a polynomial of degree 4), and we take the root x that lies in the domain of the piece.

Once x is computed, we have the changeout $D = 2x$ which corresponds to a and the thresholds $\underline{\tau}(x)$ and $\overline{\tau}(x)$. We can substitute the thresholds in the initialization of Algorithm 4 and apply it to compute the α -stable distribution. ■

Combining these pieces provides the result claimed by Theorem 4.1.

4.2 Incrementally maintaining the stable PPS distribution

We now show how we can efficiently maintain an α -stable distribution when modifications to the weight vector are made one entry at a time. Consider an α -stable distribution and the set of ratios w_i/p_i . Following the notation we used in the batch case, let $\underline{\tau}$ be the largest ratio with $p_i < 1$; and let $\bar{\tau}$ be 0 if there is an entry with zero weight and positive probability and otherwise the smallest ratio with $w_i > 0$. The difference of the squares is at most a : $\underline{\tau}^2 - \bar{\tau}^2 \leq a$. When the weight of an entry i is modified, its ratio changes. If this results in a maximum difference of squares exceeding a , we need to recompute the α -stable distribution. This event can happen only when either $p_i < 1$ and $w_i/p_i > \underline{\tau}$ or $p_i = 0$, $w_i > 0$ and $\bar{\tau} > 0$ or $w_i/p_i < \bar{\tau}$. The modification that involves the modified entry itself must be at one end of the ordered ratios list and a sequence of entries from the other end of the ordered ratios. We increase $\bar{\tau}$ to simultaneously compensate for decreasing $\underline{\tau}$ or vice versa, but noticing we never need to exceed the original threshold value at the affected end. The total number of modified probabilities, however, can be large, even when we modify the weight of a single entry. On the other hand, the expectation of the change in the sample (the L_1 distance between the initial and final α -stable distributions) is at most 1 and we can ensure (as we outlined in the subsampling discussion) that there is at most one insertion and one deletion from the sample.

Our treatment of the incremental problem introduces a representation of the α -stable distribution, which allows for efficient tracking and modifications of sampling probabilities of sets of entries and also efficient maintenance of a corresponding sample. This is combined together with amortized analysis which charges the modifications to the representation to previous modifications in the input. We show the following (the details are deferred to Appendix A):

Theorem 4.2 *An α -stable PPS distribution, and a corresponding sample, can be maintained in amortized $\text{poly} \log(n)$ time per modification.*

5 Additive fitness and changeout cost

We now describe a general approach for a broad class of optimization problems. We say an optimization problem with input domain of the vectors $\mathcal{X} \subset R^n$ and outputs \mathcal{S} that are subsets $S \subset [n]$ has *additive fitness* if its objective is to maximize the fitness function $\phi(S, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \in S} x_i$:

$$\text{OPT}(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i \in S} x_i .$$

The changeout cost between two outputs is *additive* if there are constants c_i such that $d(S, S') = \sum_{i \in S' \setminus S} c_i$. The constant c_i can be interpreted as the cost of “bringing in” i to the output. When the optimization problem has additive fitness and changeout cost, the α -stable optimum w.r.t. current output S can be posed as a best-fit instance on a modified input vector with an appropriate quantity subtracted from entries in $i \notin S$:

Theorem 5.1 *Let OPT be an optimization problem with additive fitness and changeout. The α -stable optimum satisfies $\alpha\text{-OPT}(S, \mathbf{x}, a) = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{y})$, where $y_i = x_i - I_{i \notin S} c_i a$ and I is the indicator function.*

Proof From (1),

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha\text{-OPT}(S, \mathbf{x}, a) &= \arg \max_{S' \in \mathcal{S}} \left(-a \sum_{i \in S' \setminus S} c_i + \sum_{i \in S'} x_i \right) \\ &= \arg \max_{S' \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i \in S'} y_i = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{y}) .\end{aligned}$$

■

We now consider maintaining an α -stable optimum efficiently under incremental updates. We show that this can be done using an off-the-shelf dynamic OPT algorithm:

Theorem 5.2 *If fitness and changeout are additive, then when the input is modified, the α -stable solution can be maintained by applying a dynamic OPT algorithm with a corresponding number of modified entries.*

Proof For an input \mathbf{x} and current output \mathbf{S} , we consider the vector \mathbf{y} such that $y_i = x_i - I_{i \notin S} a c_i$. Recall that the α -stable optimum is the best-fit with respect to input \mathbf{y} . It therefore suffices to translate the modifications in \mathbf{x} to the modifications in \mathbf{y} . When an entry of \mathbf{x} is modified, we apply a corresponding modification to the same entry in \mathbf{y} . When the algorithm modifies the output, we increase by $a c_i$ the value of new entries inserted to S and decrease by $a c_i$ the value of entries that are deleted from S . The total number of updated entries in \mathbf{y} is the sum of the updates to the input and the set difference between the α -stable outputs. ■

Fixed-size output and uniform costs

In this section, we study problems that possess additional structure, namely *fixed-size output*, $\forall S \in \mathcal{S}, |S| = k$ and *uniform costs* $c_i = 1$. In particular, this formulation applies to matroids. We can equivalently treat changeout costs as those of excluding entries currently in the output. Examples of such problems include Top- k , MST, and assignment, which we study individually below.

Specializing Theorems 5.1 and 5.2, the α -stable optimum can be computed by applying OPT to a vector which adds a fixed value a to entries in S : $\alpha\text{-OPT}(S, \mathbf{x}, a) = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{y})$, where $y_i = x_i + I_{i \in S} a$:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha\text{-OPT}(S, \mathbf{x}, a) &= \arg \max_{S' \in \mathcal{S}} \left(-a |S' \setminus S| + \sum_{i \in S'} x_i \right) \\ &= \arg \max_{S' \in \mathcal{S}} \left(a |S' \cap S| + \sum_{i \in S'} x_i \right) \\ &= \arg \max_{S' \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{i \in S'} y_i = \text{OPT}(\mathbf{y}) .\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{x}$, our reduction can also be used when the domain of OPT is non-negative.

We can now understand the structure of the objective of α -OPT as a function of a :

Lemma 5.1 *The function $\max_{S' \in \mathcal{S}} (\sum_{i \in S'} x_i + a |S \cap S'|)$ is the maximum of at most $k + 1$ linear functions. Thus, it is convex and piecewise linear with at most k breakpoints.*

Proof The objective is a (restricted) *parametric* version of the original optimization problem [15, 13, 14, 8, 10]. In a solution with respect to a parameter a , the weight of each entry is replaced by the linear function $x_i + a$ when $i \in S$ and is fixed to x_i otherwise. The value of a particular output S' with respect to S and a is $\sum_{i \in S'} x_i + a|S \cap S'|$. The optimal solution as a function of a is the maximum over all $S' \in \mathcal{S}$. These are linear functions with at most $k + 1$ different slopes, corresponding to the intersection size $|S \cap S'|$. For each intersection size $\{0, \dots, k\}$, there is one dominant linear function. The maximum of linear functions with slopes $\{0, \dots, k\}$ is such that each function dominates in at most one piece and the slopes are increasing. ■

If we explicitly compute a representation of the objective function, we can obtain a Δ -stable optimum, by identifying a corresponding value of the parameter a : The breakpoints of the function correspond to decreasing changeouts (increasing slopes) from changeout k (slope 0) to changeout 0 (slope k). The marginal gain in fitness from each unit increase in changeout is the respective value of a at the breakpoint. Hence:

Corollary 5.2 *When the problem has additive fitness, additive and uniform changeout, and fixed-size output, the tradeoff is concave.*

There are at most $k + 1$ different α -stable solutions (eliminating duplications) and thus *all* can be specified in $O(k^2)$ space. When the tradeoff is monotone, then this description requires only $O(k)$ space. This is because there are at most $2k$ entries involved in total, and each has a single exit or entry point as we sweep the parameter. We will show that monotonicity holds for Top- k and MST but not for assignment.

5.1 Stable top- k

The top- k problem has input domain $\mathcal{X} \subset R^n$ so that \mathbf{x}_i is the ‘weight’ of i . The permitted outputs S are all subsets $S \subset [n]$ of size k , and the goal is to maximize ϕ , the sum of weights of the selected subset. The problem satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.1 and therefore the α -stable top- k with respect to input \mathbf{x} and current set S is α -top- $k(S, \mathbf{x}, a) \equiv \text{top-}k(\mathbf{y})$, where $y_i = x_i + I_{i \in S}a$.

Lemma 5.3 *The stability-fit tradeoff for stable top- k is monotone and can be found in $O(n+k \log k)$ time.*

Proof Consider the sequence of swaps made by α -top- $k(S, \mathbf{x}, a)$ while sweeping a . For sufficiently small $a \geq 0$, α -top- $k(S, \mathbf{x}, a) = S$. For sufficiently large a , α -top- $k(S, \mathbf{x}, a) = \text{top-}k(\mathbf{x})$. The total number of swaps is the set difference $d(S, \text{top-}k(\mathbf{x}))$. The swaps are between the lightest $i \in S$ and the heaviest $i \notin S$.

To compute all tradeoff points, we sort the entries in S by increasing x_i to obtain the order (i_1, \dots, i_k) , and sort the top- k entries $i \notin S$ in decreasing order (j_1, \dots, j_k) . This obtains the stated time bounds. Let $H = \arg \max_h x_{i_h} < x_{j_h}$. For $h \leq H$, the most beneficial swap of at most h items, swaps-in items j_1, \dots, j_h and swaps-out items i_1, \dots, i_h . The α -stable swap uses the maximum $h \leq H$ such that $x_{j_h} - x_{i_h} \geq a$. The tradeoff is clearly monotone, as each entry is swapped in or out at one particular value. ■

Incremental algorithm: The problem also satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.2 and therefore to obtain an incremental algorithm, we outline a simple dynamic algorithm for maintaining a top- k set. We use two heap data structures. The first heap is a min-heap of the k cached entries (we call it the “in-heap”). The second heap is a max-heap of the remaining $n - k$ entries (“out-heap”). Weight

updates are performed as updates to the weights of the corresponding elements in the heap. Swaps cause the deletion of the minimum item in the in-heap and the maximum item in the out-heap, and their reinsertion in the other heap. Swaps are performed when $x_i - x_j \geq \alpha$, where i is the maximum item in the out-heap and j is the minimum item in the in-heap. In this algorithm each update has an overhead of $O(\log n)$ — note that an update of a single value can result in at most a single swap.

The optimal offline algorithm: We now provide an optimal algorithm for offline stable top- k . The offline problem is to maximize

$$\sum_j \sum_{i \in S_j} x_i^{(j)} - a \sum_j |S_j \setminus S_{j-1}|.$$

We can obtain the offline stability-fit tradeoff by sweeping a . The same set of solutions can be obtained by sweeping the maximum number of cache swaps K , and maximizing $\sum_j \sum_{i \in S_j} x_i^{(j)}$ subject to $\sum_j |S_j \setminus S_{j-1}| \leq K$. For each item i and subsequence $[j, \ell] \subset [N]$, we compute the benefit of caching i during the subsequence:

$$b_{ij\ell} = \sum_{h=j}^{\ell} x_i^{(h)}.$$

We seek a cover with at most $K + k$ distinct intervals such that there are at most k active intervals at each step h and the cover has maximum benefit. This can be formulated as an integer program with variables $y_{ij\ell} \in [0, 1]$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize } \sum_{ij\ell} b_{ij\ell} y_{ij\ell} \\ & \text{subject to } \sum_{ij\ell} y_{ij\ell} \leq K + k \\ & \text{and } \forall h \in [n], \sum_{j \leq h} \sum_{\ell \geq h} \sum_{i \in [n]} y_{ij\ell} \leq k \end{aligned}$$

This problem can also be modeled as min-cost multi-commodity flow. It can also be solved via dynamic programming in polynomial time. For maximum stability ($K = 0$), we simply choose the top- k keys with maximum $b_{i,1,N}$.

Example: Consider an input vector $\mathbf{x} = \langle 1, 4, 7, 5 \rangle$. The top-2 set is the entries $\{3, 4\}$. Suppose $k = 2$ and at the current output is the first two entries $S = \{1, 2\}$. The best swap is $1 \leftrightarrow 3$ (swapping the smallest cached value with the largest uncached value) and the second most beneficial swap is $2 \leftrightarrow 4$ (swapping 2nd smallest cached with 2nd largest uncached). The optimal tradeoff had 3 points: performing no swap, only the first swap, or both swaps. Looking at α -stable solution, the first swap has utility gain $7 - 1 = 6$ and the second swap has utility gain $5 - 4 = 1$. Thus the first swap is performed when $\alpha \leq 6$ and both when $\alpha \leq 1$. ■

Our results carry over to fitness functions with the more general form $\phi(S, \mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i \in S} \psi_i(x_i)$, by treating $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ as the input. This generalization allows us to measure fitness by any L_p norm, using $\psi(x) = |x|^p$. The choice of p matters when processing a sequence of inputs using the same a value: Augmenting our example, consider the α -stable outputs for two inputs: $\mathbf{x} = \langle 1, 4, 7, 5 \rangle$




Figure 2: Example demonstrating non-monotonicity of assignment

and another vector $\mathbf{z} = \langle 2, 3, 8, 4 \rangle$, both starting with current output $\{1, 2\}$. The vector \mathbf{z} has the same tradeoff curve as \mathbf{x} when using the L_1 norm. If we want to use the L_2 norm for fitness, we use $\psi(x) = x^2$. In this case, the two most valuable swaps have utility gains of $7^2 - 1^2 = 48$ and $5^2 - 4^2 = 9$ on \mathbf{x} and $8^2 - 2^2 = 60$ and $4^2 - 3^2 = 7$ on \mathbf{z} . Therefore, on the same α , and looking at both vectors together, it is possible that only the first swap is performed on the \mathbf{x} ($60 \geq \alpha > 48$), only the first swaps are performed on both ($48 \geq \alpha > 9$), the two swaps on \mathbf{x} and only the first swap on \mathbf{z} ($9 \geq \alpha > 7$), or all four swaps ($\alpha \leq 7$).

5.2 Stable MST

In the stable MST problem, the inputs are a set of edge weights and the outputs are spanning trees. The fit of a tree is its negated weight. The change cost between two trees is the set difference of included edges. The problem clearly satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.1, hence, an α -stable MST can be obtained by adding a to the edge weights of edges in the current output tree and computing an MST. Applying Theorem 5.2, dynamic α -stable MST can be handled using off-the-shelf dynamic MST algorithms [12].


Lemma 5.4 *The tradeoff for stable MST is monotone.*

Proof Consider starting from an optimal MST and slowly increasing a , obtaining a sequence of α -stable MSTs. An edge is removed when it is the heaviest edge in some cycle. This can only happen if this edge is not a member of the output S (because weights of all members of S decrease by the same amount and all weights of other edges stay the same). Once this happens, weights of other edges in the cycle either keep decreasing or stay the same, so the edge remains the heaviest in that cycle and out of the MST. Similarly, an edge is inserted into the α -stable MST when it has smallest weight in some cut. Such an edge must be a member of S and its weight remains the smallest in its cut as a increases. Thus the tradeoff is monotone. ■

The tradeoff can be computed using a parametric MST algorithm [2], but the computation can be made more efficient for this special case.

5.3 Stable assignment

In the stable assignment problem, the inputs are weights of edges in a complete bipartite graph and the outputs are maximum matchings. The problem satisfies the conditions of Theorem 5.1, and hence, an α -stable solution can be computed by adding a to all the weights of edges present in the current matching and then finding a maximum-weight assignment (maximum weight bipartite matching). We also know there are at most $n + 1$ distinct stable optimal assignments (assuming



(a) Stable PPS uniformly and noticeably outperforms EWMA PPS. Permanent Random Numbers (PRN) improve both methods. (b) Similar performance for Stable and EWMA top- k , although computational aspects favor Stable top- k .

Figure 3: Tradeoff between stability and fit comparing Stable with Time Decay EWMA.

a single optimal assignment is used). From Theorem 5.2, dynamic α -stable assignment reduces to dynamic maximum bipartite matching [16].

However, unlike the previous problems, the tradeoff is non-monotone. Specifically, Figure 2 shows a simple example of an assignment problem which is non-monotone in its inclusion of edges. It shows a 10 node bipartite weighted graphs (where missing edges are assumed to have weight zero). A matching from the previous timestep causes five edges to have their (current) scores increased by a . We can find the tradeoff by considering solutions which include different numbers of the previous edges, as per Lemma 5.1. The solution that picks none of the previous edges has weight 31. The solution that picks one of the previous edges picks the top edge, and has weight $30 + a$. The solution that picks three previous edges has weight $24 + 3a$, and picks the three edges with weight $5 + a$. Lastly, the solution that picks all five previous edges has weight $15 + 5a$. The cases of two and four previous edges are dominated by these solutions. The α -OPT objective is the maximum of the four linear equations: $y = 31$, $y = 30 + 1a$, $y = 24 + 3a$, $y = 15 + 5a$, and each dominates the other three for a different range of a . Further, note that the top a edge is included for $a \in (1, 3)$ and not for $a \in (0, 1)$ and $(3, 4.5)$. Therefore, the tradeoff is not monotone in its inclusion of edges.

6 Illustration and Comparison with Time Decay

We provide a brief performance comparison of Stable PPS and Stable top- k against their time-decayed counterparts.

Experimental Set-up. The data comprises IP flow records aggregated over the 144 ten-minute periods over the span of a day, obtained from a large ISP. On average, there were 61,292 (anonymized) keys in each period t , from a total of 2,516,594. The results shown are for a summary size of $k = 1,000$ in each case.

For the time decayed version we constructed for each key i an Exponentially Weighted Moving Average (EWMA) $\tilde{x}_{i,t}$ of the process $x_{i,t}$. In EWMA PPS, at each time t , we perform PPS selection over the keys present but using EWMA weights, i.e., the weight set $\{\tilde{x}_{i,t} : x_{i,t} > 0\}$, and formed the Horvitz-Thompson estimate of the true weight as an auxiliary variable, i.e., $x_{i,t}/\tilde{p}_{i,t}$ for selected items, where $\tilde{p}_{i,t}$ is the selection probability. In EWMA Top- k we selected at each time t the set \tilde{S}_t of k items of highest EWMA weight $\tilde{x}_{i,t}$, and as measure of fit computed the corresponding sum of

original weights $\sum_{i \in \tilde{S}_t} x_{i,t}$.

PPS Sampling: Figure 3(a) shows the stability-fit tradeoffs for Stable PPS and EWMA PPS. Fit is measured as the square root of sum of weight estimation variances. Fit and changeout costs are averaged over the 144 periods. For EWMA PPS we swept the mean m of the geometric decay from 1 (no history) to 64 periods. We computed the Δ -stable PPS distributions sweeping target maximal changeout cost D between 0 and the target sample size $k = 1,000$. For both methods we compared independent (pseudo)random number generation, and permanent random numbers (PRN) for each key.

EWMA PPS with independent random numbers has much larger changeout cost (in the range 620–650) than the other methods. Using key based PRN with EWMA PPS much reduces the change cost. Stable PPS performs noticeably better, achieving very small changeout (around 50 for the PRN variant) with relatively little growth in error as changeout is reduced (about 15% growth compared with about 70% growth for EWMA). PRN has little impact on variance because, for a given input set, marginal variance is unchanged.

Top- k : Figure 3(b) shows stability-fit tradeoffs for Stable top- k and EWMA top- k , where fit is represented by the deficit between the total weight of the top- k estimate, and the true total top- k weight. Fit and changeout are again averaged over the 144 periods. The performance of both are similar, although the stable version does obtain a better tradeoff. Nevertheless, we note that stable methods are preferable to EWMA methods for computational reasons: they are generally faster, and do not require historical data to be retained to determine the output. Moreover, the stability or flexibility parameters can be modified directly at each iteration, whereas under time-decay these parameters can be controlled only indirectly through the decay parameters. Changing decay parameters requires extensive historical data to be retained, and rescanned for each change.

7 Stable Extensions of Optimization Problems

In general, we can consider the stable extension of almost any optimization problem. Theorem 5.1 shows that for a natural class of problems, α -stability reduces to a single modified instance of the original optimization problem. However, there are many other problems which do not admit such a reduction. We considered the case of PPS sampling, and showed procedures which find the optimal solution. Also of interest are those problems where the original optimization is known to be hard: then we seek approximation algorithms for the stable extension (making use of Theorem 5.1 if possible).

In this section, we provide further examples of problems that naturally admit stable extensions:

In the *0/1 knapsack problem*, items have values x_i and weights w_i , and we have a parameter W . The goal is to find a set of items of maximum value, subject to an upper bound of W on the sum of their weights, $\sum_{i \in S} w_i \leq W$. Under additive changeout cost, this fits the requirement of Theorem 5.1, and so any approximation algorithm for 0/1 knapsack provides the corresponding approximation for the α -stable version of the problem.

In *shortest-paths routing* the output is a tree routing to a single destination. The fitness is the (weighted) sum, over nodes, of the path length to the root. The changeout cost between two trees is the set difference (viewing trees as directed to the destination), which corresponds to the number of modifications to the routing table for the destination.

The *k -set cover problem* is, given a fixed collection of sets, to pick at most k to maximize coverage of x . The fitness is the sum of weights of covered items, and we consider the uniform changeout cost function. We outline a reduction from an α -stable k -cover to the optimum k -cover on a modified input. Our modified instance contains all the original items and sets. It also contains a new item

that is unique for each set in the current output S . The new items have weights a . We argue that a cover is α -stable for a if and only if it is an optimal k -cover of the modified input.

7.1 k -center Clustering

It is natural to consider the stable extension of various *clustering* problems. Here, we wish to minimize the cost of the new clustering plus the cost of switching out some of the cluster centers. In this section, we show how to find a constant factor approximation for the k -center objective in this setting.

Given the stable extension of any optimization problem, an α -optimal solution can always be computed by exhaustive search on possible outputs. A method with smaller search space is to first construct an algorithm for an extended version of the optimization problem which allows a part of the output to be fixed. This extension is a special case of the stable extension. We can then perform a smaller search over all subsets of the current output, and apply the (restricted) extended algorithm to each instance. Some problems naturally yield to such extensions: for covering problems, we remove items covered by the fixed component and apply the (approximate) covering algorithm to what remains.

A less straightforward case arises in the context of clustering. Here, we want to extend a given subset of cluster centers with some additional centers to minimize a particular cluster objective. For the k -center objective, the existing 2-approximation algorithm can be extended to handle fixed facilities (this “restricted” extension is also interesting in itself). More formally, for points in a metric space m , we have:

Lemma 7.1 *Given a fixed set of centers F and a set of n points P , we can find a set of clusters C of size s that guarantees to 2-approximate the k -center objective, i.e.*

$$\max_{p \in P} \min_{c \in C \cup F} m(p, c) \leq 2 \min_{C: |C|=s} \max_{p \in P} \min_{c \in C \cup F} m(p, c)$$

Proof Here, we adapt the 2-approximation algorithm due to Gonzalez [9]. Starting with $C = \emptyset$, we pick the point from the input that is furthest from the current centers in $C \cup F$, i.e.

$$C \leftarrow C \cup \left\{ \arg \max_{p \in P} \min_{c \in C \cup F} m(p, c) \right\}$$

and iterate until $|C| = s$. This requires $O((|F| + s)n)$ distance computations.

To see the approximation guarantee, consider the next point q that would be added to S if we continued the algorithm for one more iteration. This is some distance d from its closest center in $C \cup F$. Therefore, we have that all points in $C \cup \{q\}$ are separated by d , and further that every point in $C \cup \{q\}$ is at least d from every point in F . This can be seen by contradiction: if any point in C were closer than d , then it would not have been picked as the furthest point ahead of q .

This provides a witness for the cost of the clustering. There are two cases: (i) some point in $C \cup \{q\}$ is assigned to some center in F under the optimal clustering; or (ii) some pair of points in $C \cup \{q\}$ are assigned to the same center under the optimal clustering. If (i) holds, then immediately we have that the cost of the optimal clustering is at least d . If (ii) holds, then we have two points separated by distance d in the same cluster. Then the cost of the optimal clustering is at least $d/2$, which happens when their cluster center is distance $d/2$ from each (it cannot be closer to both without violating the triangle inequality).

On the other hand, since q is the furthest from its closest center in $C \cup F$, it follows that *all* points are within d of their closest center, and therefore the cost of the clustering found by the algorithm is d , which is at most twice the optimal cost. ■

This indicates that we can find a 2-approximation for the stable extension by considering all subsets of the current clustering, and applying the above lemma. However, for subsets larger than $k/2$, we can simply work with the (approximate) solution that switches out all k centers for the optimal k -center clustering on the current set: this at most doubles the changeout cost, while improving the clustering cost. Thus, we only need to consider subsets of size at most $k/2$.

8 Concluding Remarks

We have introduced and formalized a model of stability and fit, where the benefits of an improved solution have to be traded off against the costs of changing from the current status quo. From this motivation, we have provided stable extensions of sampling and optimization algorithms, and demonstrated their ability in practice.

Our work was inspired by the need to improve the performance of an application management system. Our ongoing work is to extend our comparison to these scenarios, and evaluate against previously deployed ad-hoc approaches.

References

- [1] *NIST/SEMATECH e-Handbook of Statistical Methods*. 2012.
- [2] P. K. Agarwal, D. Eppstein, L. J. Guibas, and M. R. Henzinger. Parametric and kinetic minimum spanning trees. In *FOCS*, 1998.
- [3] A. Borodin, N. Linial, and M. E. Saks. An optimal on-line algorithm for metrical task system. *J. ACM*, 39(4):745–763, 1992.
- [4] K. R. W. Brewer, L. J. Early, and S. F. Joyce. Selecting several samples from a single population. *Australian Journal of Statistics*, 14(3):231–239, 1972.
- [5] E. Cohen, N. Duffield, C. Lund, M. Thorup, and H. Kaplan. Efficient stream sampling for variance-optimal estimation of subset sums. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(5), 2011.
- [6] E. Cohen and M. Strauss. Maintaining time-decaying stream aggregates. *J. Algorithms*, 59:19–36, 2006.
- [7] P. M. Fenwick. A new data structure for cumulative frequency tables. *Softw. Pract. Exper.*, 24(3):327–336, 1994.
- [8] G. Gallo, M. D. Grigoriadis, and R. E. Tarjan. A fast parametric maximum flow algorithm and applications. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 18:30–55, 1989.
- [9] T. F. Gonzalez. Clustering to minimize the maximum intercluster distance. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 38(2-3):293–306, 1985.
- [10] D. Gusfield. Parametric combinatorial computing and a problem of program module distribution. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 30:551–563, 1983.
- [11] J. Hájek. Asymptotic theory of rejective sampling with varying probabilities from a finite population. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(4):1491–1523, 1964.
- [12] J. Holm, K. de Lichtenberg, and M. Thorup. Poly-logarithmic deterministic fully-dynamic algorithms for connectivity, minimum spanning tree, 2-edge, and biconnectivity. *J. ACM*, 48(4), 2001.

- [13] R. M. Karp. A characterization of the minimum cycle mean in a digraph. *Discrete Mathematics*, 23:309–311, 1978.
- [14] R. M. Karp and J. B. Orlin. Parametric shortest path algorithms with an application to cyclic staffing. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 3:37–45, 1981.
- [15] N. Megiddo. Combinatorial optimization with rational objective functions. *Math. of Oper. Res.*, 4:414–424, 1979.
- [16] P. Sankowski. Faster dynamic matchings and vertex connectivity. In *SODA*, pages 118–126, 2007.
- [17] R. E. Sleator, D. D. and Tarjan. Self-adjusting binary search trees. *J. ACM*, 32(3):652–686, July 1985.

A Incremental stable PPS

Section 4.2 provided an overview of our approach to incremental (“dynamic”) maintenance of an α -stable PPS distribution under modifications of the weight of a single entry at a time.

We now provide full details of the data structures we use. To gain intuition, we first consider the special case ($a = 0$) of maintaining a PPS distribution. Conceptually, entries are maintained in a sorted order according to their weight and we also track the respective τ value. We use a structure, such as Fenwick tree [7], that supports prefix sums, lookups, insertions and deletions in $O(\log n)$ time. When an entry is modified, it is deleted from its previous position and reinserted with its new weight. If the weight decreased (increased), the threshold can only decrease (respectively, increase). The respective new τ (new solution of (4)) can be computed with a logarithmic number of lookups. An actual sample can be maintained using permanent random numbers (PRN). This is facilitated by maintaining another sorted order according to the ratios w_i/u_i (where u_i is the PRN of entry i). The sample includes all entries with $w_i/u_i \geq \tau$. For this, we use a data structure that supports insertions, deletions, and lookups (of the smallest ratio that is larger than a value) in $O(\log n)$ time such as a self adjusting binary tree [17].

In the case of maintaining a stable sample for general a , probabilities in the stable sample only need to be modified when the ratio w_i/p_i of a modified input entry is outside the current $(\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau})$ range. In the batch algorithm we worked with the ordered list of ratios w_i/p_i . The prefix and suffix of this list formed PPS samples, and thus, within the suffix and prefix of the ordered ratios list, the ratio order corresponds to the weights order. But in the middle range, for ratios in $(\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau})$, the order of ratios may not correspond to the order of weights.

A critical observation for our analysis is that once two entries are “processed together” in a prefix or suffix of the sorted ratios list, and thus the heavier one precedes the lighter one, their relative position remains the same in the sorted ratios list, even if they are no longer members of the prefix or suffix (have ratios below $\underline{\tau}$ or above $\bar{\tau}$). This situation only changes, i.e. $w_i > w_j$ and $w_i/p_i < w_j/p_j$ when the weight of at least one of the entries is modified. Intuitively, in our analysis, we charge the cost of “correcting” this order when an entry works its way back into a prefix or suffix to the modifications in the input.

The main structure that we use to support this analysis is what we call a *stretch*, which maintains a subset of entries. The stretch supports the following operations in $O(\log n)$ time: deletion of an entry, splitting a stretch into two stretches that include all entries with weights that are respectively below and above some value, merging two stretches with non-overlapping weight ranges, performing a lookup of the smallest/largest weight above some value, and returning the weight of all entries that are below or above a certain value. Consequently, two stretches with overlapping weight ranges

can be merged in time proportional to $\log(n)$ times the number of interleaved segments in their joint sorted order.

Instead of treating entries as single entities, they are grouped to stretches. All entries currently in the same stretch share the same ratio $\tau = w_i/p_i$ (which we refer to as the threshold of the stretch) or else have $w_i > \tau$ and $p_i = 1$. We thus assign a ratio to a stretch as the range that spans its threshold and its largest weight. All stretches are maintained in a structure which supports insertion, deletion, and accessing stretches with maximum or minimum threshold in $O(\log n)$ time. This structure corresponds to the “sorted list of ratios” in the batch algorithm.

When an entry is modified, it is deleted from its current stretch and inserted as a single-entry stretch. To recompute the distribution in response to the modification, we apply an extension of our batch algorithm that can manipulate stretches: If the update produces a higher maximum ratio or lower minimum ratio and α -stability is violated, we obtain new values for $\underline{\tau}$ and $\bar{\tau}$ while processing stretches by decreasing and increasing ratios, as done (for single entries) by the batch algorithm.

As the prefix (and suffix) of the “sorted” ratios are processed in decreasing ratio order, stretches are merged into a single prefix (or a single suffix) stretch. We stop when the difference of squares is exactly a . The cost of merging stretches depends on the number of interleaved sorted segments of stretches, and each segment can be “charged” to a modification of an item.