

Approximating the MaxCover Problem with Bounded Frequencies in FPT Time

Piotr Skowron
University of Warsaw
Warsaw, Poland

Piotr Faliszewski
AGH University
Krakow, Poland

November 7, 2021

Abstract

We study approximation algorithms for several variants of the MaxCover problem, with the focus on algorithms that run in FPT time. In the MaxCover problem we are given a set N of elements, a family \mathcal{S} of subsets of N , and an integer K . The goal is to find up to K sets from \mathcal{S} that jointly cover (i.e., include) as many elements as possible. This problem is well-known to be NP-hard and, under standard complexity-theoretic assumptions, the best possible polynomial-time approximation algorithm has approximation ratio $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$. We first consider a variant of MaxCover with bounded element frequencies, i.e., a variant where there is a constant p such that each element belongs to at most p sets in \mathcal{S} . For this case we show that there is an FPT approximation scheme (i.e., for each β there is a β -approximation algorithm running in FPT time) for the problem of maximizing the number of covered elements, and a randomized FPT approximation scheme for the problem of minimizing the number of elements left uncovered (we take K to be the parameter). Then, for the case where there is a constant p such that each element belongs to at least p sets from \mathcal{S} , we show that the standard greedy approximation algorithm achieves approximation ratio exactly $1 - e^{-\max(pK/\|\mathcal{S}\|, 1)}$. We conclude by considering an unrestricted variant of MaxCover, and show approximation algorithms that run in exponential time and combine an exact algorithm with a greedy approximation. Some of our results improve currently known results for MaxVertexCover.

1 Introduction

We study approximation algorithms for, and parametrized complexity of, the MaxCover problem with bounded frequency of the elements. In the MaxCover problem we are given a set N of n elements, a family $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ of m subsets of N , and an integer K . The goal is to find a size-at-most- K subcollection of \mathcal{S} that covers as many elements from N as possible. In the variant with bounded frequencies of elements we further assume that there is some constant p such that each element appears in at most p sets. A particularly well-known special case of MaxCover with frequencies upper-bounded by 2 is the MaxVertexCover problem: We are given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and the goal is to find K vertices that,

jointly, are incident to as many edges as possible (i.e., the edges are the elements to be covered and the vertices are the sets; clearly, each edge “belongs to” exactly two vertices). Nonetheless, even for the frequency upper bound 2, MaxCover is considerably more general than MaxVertexCover (e.g., the former allows two sets to have more than one element in common, which is impossible in the latter¹). In addition to MaxCover with upper-bounded frequencies, we also study a variant of the problem with lower-bounded frequencies, and the general variant, without any restrictions on element frequencies.

Our paper differs from the typical approach to the design of approximation algorithms in that we do not focus on polynomial-time algorithms, but also consider exponential-time ones. For example, we are interested in FPT approximation schemes, that is, in approximation algorithms that for each desired approximation ratio β output a β -approximate solution in exponential time, but where the exponential growth is only with respect to the number K of sets that we allow in the solution (and where β is considered to be a constant when computing the running time). In that respect, our work is very close in spirit to the recent study of Croce and Paschos [7], who—among other results—give moderately exponential time (but not FPT-time) approximation schemes for the MaxVertexCover problem. (However, there is also an FPT-time approximation scheme for MaxVertexCover due to Marx [18].) Such exponential-time approximation algorithms are desirable because they can achieve much better approximation ratios than the polynomial-time ones, while still being significantly faster than the currently-known exact algorithms. We give more detailed review of related work in Section 3 and below we briefly describe our findings and the motivation behind our research.

We obtain the following results (unless we mention otherwise, we always consider our problems to be parametrized by K , the number of the sets allowed in the solution). First, building on the approach of Guo et al. [13], in Section 4 we show that the MaxCover problem with bounded frequencies is W[1]-complete. On the other hand, without the frequency upper-bound assumption, MaxCover is W[2]-hard and we show that it belongs to W[P]. We also consider several other parameters and, in particular, we show that MaxCover is W[2]-complete for the parameter that combines the number of sets we can use in the solution and the number of elements that we are allowed to leave uncovered. The core of the paper is, however, in Section 5. There, we show that for each β , $0 < \beta < 1$, there is an FPT β -approximation algorithm for the MaxCover problem with bounded frequencies. On the other hand, for the case where each element appears in *at least* p out of m sets, we show that the standard MaxCover greedy approximation algorithm (i.e., one that picks one-by-one those sets that include most not-yet-covered elements) achieves approximation ratio $1 - e^{-\frac{pK}{m}}$ (for the general case, this algorithm’s approximation ratio is $1 - \frac{1}{e}$). Finally, we consider a variant of the MaxCover problem where instead of maximizing the number of covered elements, we minimize the number of those that remain uncovered. We refer to this problem as the MinNonCovered problem. Under the assumption of upper-bounded frequencies, we show a randomized approximation algorithm that for each given β , $\beta > 1$,

¹This difference may not sound particularly significant, but due to it some algorithms for MaxVertexCover (e.g., an FPT approximation scheme of Marx [18]) do not generalize easily to the MaxCover setting.

and each given probability $1 - \epsilon$, outputs in FPT time a β -approximate solution with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$ (the FPT time is with respect to K , β , and ϵ). Finally, in Section 6 we consider two exponential-time approximation algorithms for the unrestricted MaxCover problem. Both of these algorithms solve a part of the problem in a greedy way and a part using some exact algorithm, but they differ in the order in which they apply each of these strategies. We show a smooth transition between the running times of these algorithms and their approximation ratios.

1.1 Motivation

We believe that the MaxCover problem with bounded frequencies is an interesting and important problem on its own. However, the particular reason why we study it is due to its connection to winner-determination under Chamberlin–Courant’s voting rule. Under the Chamberlin–Courant’s rule, a society of n voters chooses from a group of m candidates a committee of K representatives. The rule was originally proposed as a mean of electing parliaments [6], but recently Boutilier and Lu [17] pointed out that it might be very useful in the context of recommendation systems and Skowron et al. [23] showed its connection to resource allocation problems.

There are many variants of the rule, depending on the so-called misrepresentation function that it uses. Here, we will focus on the approval variant, though we mention that perhaps the best-studied one (though not necessarily the most practical one) is the variant that uses the Borda misrepresentation function (we omit the details of Borda misrepresentation here and point the reader to the original paper defining the rule [6]).

In the approval-based variant of Chamberlin–Courant’s rule, the voters submit ballots on which they list all the candidates that they find acceptable as their representatives (that is, the candidates that they approve of). For each size- K subset S of candidates (referred to as a *committee*), the misrepresentation score of S is the total number of voters who do not approve of any of the candidates in S . Chamberlin–Courant’s rule elects a committee S that minimizes the misrepresentation. Naturally, there may be several committees that minimize the misrepresentation and in practice one has to apply some tie-breaking. In the computational studies of voting researchers are usually interested in finding any such a committee and so do we.

The above description makes clear the connection between approval-based Chamberlin–Courant’s rule and the MaxCover problem: The voters are the elements that need to be covered, the candidates are the sets (a voter v belongs to the set defined by some candidate c if v approves of c), and the size of the committee is the number of sets one can pick. The achieved misrepresentation is the number of uncovered elements.

Given this connection, clearly winner determination under Chamberlin–Courant’s rule is an NP-hard problem for the approval misrepresentation [21] (it also is for Borda misrepresentation [17]). Further, in both cases the problem is W[2]-hard, as shown by Betzler et al. [2]. Thus if one wants to find the exact winning committee, one is restricted to exponential time algorithms, such as, e.g., solving a particular integer linear program [20] or trying all possible committees. On the other hand, at least for the Borda misrepre-

sentation function, the problem is quite easy to approximate, both theoretically (there is a polynomial-time approximation scheme due to Skowron et al. [23]) and in practice (as shown by experiments [22]). Unfortunately, the connection between the approval variant of the rule and the MaxCover problem severely limits approximation possibilities: In terms of polynomial-time algorithms the best we can get is the standard greedy $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ -approximation algorithm.

Yet, in practical elections it is somewhat unreasonable to expect that each voter would list many candidates as approved. Indeed, in some political systems that use approval-like ballots, even the law itself limits the number of candidates one can list (for example, in Polish parliamentary elections the voters can list up to three candidates). Thus it is most natural to consider the approval variant of Chamberlin–Courant’s rule for the case where each voter can approve of at most a given number p of the candidates. This variant of the rule directly corresponds to the MaxCover problem with bounded frequencies. On the other hand, it is also natural to consider settings where voters are required to approve of at least a given number of candidates (such requirement can, for example, be imposed by the election rules). This corresponds to the MaxCover problem where elements’ frequencies are *lower bounded* by some value.

In effect, our results on the MaxCover problem with bounded frequencies fill in the hole between efficient approximation algorithms for the Borda variant of Chamberlin–Courant’s rule given by Skowron et al. [23] and W[2]-hardness results of Betzler et al. [2] for the general, unrestricted approval variant of the rule.

2 Preliminaries

We assume that the reader is familiar with standard notions regarding (approximation) algorithms, computational complexity theory and parametrized complexity theory. Below we provide a very brief review. For each positive integer n , we write $[n]$ to mean $\{1, \dots, n\}$.

Let \mathcal{P} be an algorithmic problem where, given some instance I , the goal is to find a solution s that maximizes a certain function f . Given an instance I of \mathcal{P} , we refer to the value $f(s)$ of an optimal solution s as $\text{OPT}(I)$ (or, sometimes, simply as OPT if the instance I is clear from the context). Let β , $0 < \beta \leq 1$, be some fixed constant. An algorithm \mathcal{A} that given instance I returns a solution s' such that $f(s') \geq \beta \text{OPT}(I)$ is called a β -approximation algorithm for the problem \mathcal{P} . Analogously, we define $\text{OPT}(I)$ and the notion of a γ -approximation algorithm, $\gamma > 1$, for the case of a problem \mathcal{P}' , where the task is to find a solution that minimizes a given goal function g . (Specifically, given an instance I of \mathcal{P}' , a γ -approximation algorithm is required to return a solution s' such that $g(s') < \gamma \text{OPT}(I)$). Given instance I of some algorithmic problem, we write $|I|$ to denote the length of the standard, efficient encoding of I .

In this paper we focus on the following two problems.

Definition 1 *An instance $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ of the MaxCover problem consists of a set N of n elements, a collection $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ of m subsets of N , and nonnegative integer K . The goal is to find a subcollection \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{S} of size at most K that maximizes $\|\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{C}} S\|$.*

Definition 2 *The MinNonCovered problem is defined in the same way as the MaxCover problem, except the goal is to find a subcollection \mathcal{C} such that $\|N\| - \|\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{C}} S\|$ is minimal.*

In the decision variant of MaxCover (of MinNonCovered) we are additionally given an integer T (an integer T') and we ask if there is a collection of up to K sets from \mathcal{S} that cover at least T elements (that leave at most T' elements uncovered). MaxVertexCover is a variant of MaxCover where we are given a graph $G = (V, E)$, the edges are the elements to be covered, and vertices define the sets that cover them (a vertex covers all the incident edges). SetCover and VertexCover are variants of MaxCover and MaxVertexCover, respectively, where we ask if it is possible to cover all the elements (all the edges).

In terms of the optimal solutions, MaxCover and MinNonCovered are equivalent. Nonetheless, they do differ when considered from the point of view of approximation. For example, if there were a solution that covered all the n elements, then a β -approximation algorithm for MaxCover, $0 < \beta < 1$, would be free to return a solution that covered only βn of them, but a γ -approximation algorithm for the MinNonCovered problem, $\gamma > 1$, would have to provide an optimal solution that covered all the elements.

Given an instance I of MaxCover (MinNonCovered), we say that an element e has frequency t if it appears in exactly t sets. We mostly focus on the variants of MaxCover and MinNonCovered where there is a given constant p such that each element's frequency is at most p . We refer to these problems as variants with bounded frequencies.

We will focus on (approximation) algorithms that run in FPT time (see the books of Downey and Fellows [9], Niedermeier [19], and Flum and Grohe [11] for details on parametrized complexity theory). To speak of an FPT algorithm for a given problem, we declare a part of the problem as the so-called parameter. Here, for MaxCover and MinNonCovered problems, we take the parameter to be the number K of sets that we are allowed to use in the solution (in Section 4 we briefly consider MaxCover/MinNonCovered with parameters T, T' , and their combinations with K). Given an instance I of a problem with parameter k , an FPT algorithm is required to run in time $f(k)\text{poly}(|I|)$, where f is some computable function and $\text{poly}(\cdot)$ is some polynomial.

From the point of view of parametrized complexity, FPT is seen as the class of tractable problems. There is also a whole hierarchy of hardness classes, $\text{FPT} \subseteq \text{W}[1] \subseteq \text{W}[2] \subseteq \dots \text{W}[P] \subseteq \dots$. The standard definitions of $\text{W}[1], \text{W}[2], \dots$ are quite involved and so we point the reader to appropriate overviews [9, 19, 11]. However, we can also define these classes through an appropriate reduction notion and their complete problems.

Definition 3 *Let \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{P}' be two decision problems parametrized by real non-negative parameters \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{K}' , respectively. We say that \mathcal{P} reduces to \mathcal{P}' through a parametrized reduction if there exist a mapping $F: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}'$ (computable in FPT time with respect to parameter \mathcal{K}) and two computable functions, $g: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and $h: \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that (i) for each instance $(I, K) \in \mathcal{P}$ the answer to (I, K) is “yes” if and only if the answer to $F(I) = (I', K')$ is “yes”, (ii) K and K' are the values of the parameters \mathcal{K} and \mathcal{K}' respectively, (iii) $|I'| \leq g(K)\text{poly}(|I|)$, and (iv) $K' \leq h(K)$.*

W[1] is the class of all problems for which there is a parametrized reduction to the Clique problem (i.e., the problem where we ask if a given graph $G = (V, E)$ has a clique of size at least K , where K is the parameter). W[2] is the class of problems with parametrized reductions to SetCover (with parameter K). Interestingly, VertexCover is well-known to be in FPT, but MaxVertexCover is W[1]-complete [13].

One of the standard ways of showing W[1]-membership is to give a reduction to the Short-Nondeterministic-Turing-Machine-Computation problem (shown to be W[1]-complete for parameter k by Cesati [5]).

Definition 4 *In the Short-Nondeterministic-Turing-Machine-Computation problem we are given a single-tape nondeterministic Turing machine M (described as a tuple including the input alphabet, the work alphabet, the set of states, the transition function, the initial state and the accepting/rejecting states), a string x over M 's input alphabet, and an integer k . The question is whether there is an accepting computation of M that accepts x within k steps.*

The Bounded-Nondeterministic-Turing-Machine-Computation problem is defined similarly, but in addition we are also given an integer m , and we ask if M accepts its input within m steps, of which at most k are nondeterministic. Cesati has shown that this problem is W[P]-complete [5] (we omit the exact definition of W[P]; the reader can think of W[P] as the set of problems that have parameterized reductions to the Bounded-Nondeterministic-Turing-Machine-Computation problem).

3 Related Work

There is extensive literature on the complexity and approximation algorithms for the SetCover and VertexCover problems. On the other hand, the literature on MaxCover and MaxVertexCover is more scarce. The literature on MaxCover with bounded frequencies of the elements is scarcer yet. Below we survey some of the known results.

First, it is immediate that MaxCover, MinNonCovered, and MaxVertexCover are NP-complete (this follows immediately from the NP-completeness of SetCover and VertexCover). In terms of approximation, a greedy algorithm that iteratively picks sets that cover the largest number of yet uncovered elements achieves the approximation ratio $1 - \frac{1}{e}$, and this is optimal unless $P = NP$ (see, e.g., the textbook [15] for the analysis of the greedy algorithm and the work of Feige [10] for the approximation lower bound). However, our focus is on the MaxCover problem with bounded frequencies and this problem is, in spirit, closer to MaxVertexCover than to the general MaxCover problem. Indeed, MaxVertexCover can be seen as a special case of MaxCover with frequencies bounded by 2. However, we stress that even MaxCover with frequencies bounded by 2 is considerably more general than MaxVertexCover and, compared to MaxVertexCover, may require different algorithmic insights.

As far as we know, the best polynomial-time approximation algorithm for MaxVertexCover is due to Ageev and Sviridenko [1], and achieves approximation ratio of $\frac{3}{4}$. However,

in various settings, it is possible to achieve better results; we mention the papers of Han et al. [14] and of Galluccio and Nobili [12] as examples.

From the point of view of parametrized complexity, MaxVertexCover was first considered by Guo et al. [13], who have shown that it is W[1]-complete. The problem was also studied by Cai [4] who gave the currently best exact algorithm for it and by Marx, who gave an FPT approximation scheme [18]. There is also an FPT algorithm for MaxCover, for parameter T , i.e., the number of elements to cover, due to Bläser [3].

In our paper, we attempt to merge parametrized study of MaxCover with its study from the point of view of approximation algorithms. In that respect, our work is very close in spirit that of Croce and Paschos [7], who provide moderately exponential approximation algorithms for MaxVertexCover, and to the work of Marx [18]. Compared to their results, we consider a more general problem, MaxCover (with or without bounded frequencies) and, as far as it is possible, we seek algorithms that run in FPT time (the algorithm of Croce and Paschos is not FPT). Interestingly, even though we focus on a more general problem, our algorithms improve upon the results of Croce and Paschos [7] and of Marx [18], even when applied to MaxVertexCover.

4 Worst-Case Complexity Results

We start our parametrized study of the MaxCover problem by considering its worst-case complexity. We first consider MaxCover with bounded frequencies. It follows directly from the literature that the problem is W[1]-hard, and here we show that it is, in fact, W[1]-complete (unless the frequency bound p is exactly 1; then it is optimal to simply pick the sets with highest cardinalities).

Theorem 1 *For each constant p greater than 2, the MaxCover problem with frequencies upper-bounded by p is W[1]-complete (when parametrized by the number of sets in the solution).*

Proof The hardness follows directly from the W[1]-hardness of the MaxVertexCover problem [13]. We prove membership in W[1] by reducing MaxCover with bounded frequencies to the Short-Nondeterministic-Turing-Machine-Computation problem.

Let p be some fixed constant and let $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K, L)$ be our input instance, where N is a set of elements, $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ is a family of subsets of N (each element from N appears in at most p sets from \mathcal{S}), and K and L are two integers. This is the decision variant of the problem, thus we have L in the input; we ask if there is a collection of up to K sets from \mathcal{S} that jointly cover at least L elements. W.l.o.g., we assume that $K \geq m$. We form single-tape nondeterministic Turing machine M to execute the following algorithm (on empty input string); the idea of the algorithm is to employ the standard inclusion-exclusion principle:

1. Guess the indices i_1, \dots, i_K of K sets from \mathcal{S} .

2. Set $T = 0$.
3. For each subset A of $\{i_1, \dots, i_K\}$ of size up to p , do the following: If $\|A\|$ is odd, add $\|\bigcap_{i \in A} S_i\|$ to T , and otherwise subtract $\|\bigcap_{i \in A} S_i\|$ from T .
4. If $T \geq L$ then we accept and otherwise we reject.

It is easy to see that this algorithm can indeed be implemented on a single-tape non-deterministic Turing machine with a sufficiently large (but polynomially bounded) work alphabet and state space. The only issue that might require a comment is the computation of $\|\bigcap_{i \in A} S_i\|$. Since sets A contain at most p elements, we can precompute these values and store them in M 's transition function.

The correctness of the algorithm follows directly from the inclusion-exclusion principle and the fact that each element appears in at most p sets:

$$\|S_{i_1} \cup S_{i_2} \cup \dots \cup S_{i_K}\| = \sum_{\ell \in [K]} \|S_{i_\ell}\| - \sum_{\substack{\ell' \in [K] \\ \ell'' \in [K] \\ \ell' \neq \ell''}} \|S_{i_{\ell'}} \cap S_{i_{\ell''}}\| + \sum_{\substack{\ell' \in [K] \\ \ell'' \in [K] \\ \ell''' \in [K] \\ \ell' \neq \ell'' \\ \ell' \neq \ell''' \\ \ell'' \neq \ell'''}} \|S_{i_{\ell'}} \cap S_{i_{\ell''}} \cap S_{i_{\ell'''}}\| - \dots$$

In general, the above formula should include intersections of up to K sets. However, since in our case each element appears in at most p sets, the intersection of more than p sets are always empty. This shows that the algorithm is correct and concludes the proof. \square

For the sake of completeness, we mention that both the unrestricted variant of the problem and the one where we put a lower bound on each element's frequency are W[2]-hard.

Theorem 2 *For each constant p , $p \geq 1$, MaxCover where each element belongs to at least p sets is W[2]-hard.*

Proof To show W[2]-hardness, we give a reduction from SetCover. In the SetCover problem we ask whether there exist K subsets that cover all the elements (we give a reduction for the parameter K). Let $I = (N, \mathcal{S})$ be an input instance of SetCover. W.l.o.g., we can assume that each element from N belongs to at least one set in \mathcal{S} . We form an instance I' of MaxCover which is identical to I , except (a) for each $e \in N$, we modify \mathcal{S} to additionally include $p - 1$ copies of set $\{e\}$, and (b) we run the MaxCover algorithm asking whether the maximal number of the elements covered by K subsets is at least equal to $\|N\|$. Clearly, in I' each element belongs to at least p sets and I' is a yes-instance of MaxCover if and only if I is a yes-instance of SetCover. \square

So far, we were not able to show that MaxCover (even with lower-bounded frequencies) is in W[2]. Nonetheless, it is quite easy to show that the problem belongs to W[P].

Theorem 3 *For each constant p , $p \geq 1$, MaxCover where each element belongs to at least p sets is in W[P] (when parametrized by the number of sets in the solution).*

Proof We give a reduction from MaxCover to the Bounded-Nondeterministic-Turing-Machine-Computation problem. On input $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K, T)$, where N , \mathcal{S} , and K are as usual and T is the lower bound on the number of elements that we should cover, we produce a machine that on empty input executes the following algorithm:

1. It nondeterministically guesses up to K names of sets from \mathcal{S} and writes these names on the tape (each name of a set from \mathcal{S} is a single symbol).
2. Deterministically, for each name of the set produced in the previous step, the machine writes on the tape the names of those elements from this set that have not been written on the tape yet.
3. The machine counts the number of names of elements written on the tape. If there were at least T of them, it accepts. Otherwise it rejects.

It is easy to see that we can produce a description of such a machine in polynomial time with respect to $|I|$. Further, it is clear that its nondeterministic running time is bounded by some polynomial of $|I|$ and that it makes at most k nondeterministic steps. \square

It is quite interesting to also consider MaxCover with other parameters. First, recall that for parameter T , the number of elements that we should cover, Bläser has shown that MaxCover is in FPT [3]. What can we say about parameter $T' = n - T$, i.e., the number of elements we can leave uncovered (this, in essence, means considering the MinNonCovered problem, but for the worst-case setting it is more convenient to speak of the parameter T')? In this case, the problem is immediately seen to be para-NP-complete (that is, the problem is NP-complete even for a constant value of the parameter).

Corollary 4 *The MaxCover problem is para-NP-complete when parametrized by the number T' of elements that can be left uncovered. This holds even if each element's frequency is upper-bounded by some constant p , $p \geq 2$.*

Proof The following trivial reduction from SetCover suffices: Given an input instance $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$, output an instance $(N, \mathcal{S}, K, 0)$, i.e., an identical one, where we require that the number of elements left uncovered is 0. Since the reduction is clearly correct and works for the constant value of the parameter, we get para-NP-completeness. To obtain the result for upper-bounded frequencies, simply use VertexCover instead of SetCover in the reduction. \square

However, if we consider the joint parameter (K, T') , then the MaxCover problem becomes W[2]-complete.

Theorem 5 *MaxCover is W[2]-complete when parametrized by both the number K of sets that can be used in the solution and the number T' of elements that can be left uncovered.*

parameter	worst-case complexity of MaxCover
K	W[2]-hard, in W[P] W[1]-complete for upper-bounded frequencies
T	FPT [3]
(K, T)	FPT [3]
T'	para-NP-complete
(K, T')	W[2]-complete

Table 1: Parameterized worst-case complexity results for unrestricted MaxCover and MinNonCovered. The parameters are as follows: K is the number of sets we can use in the solution, T is the number of elements we are required to cover, and $T' = n - T$ is the number of elements we can leave uncovered.

Proof We obtain W[2]-hardness by simply observing that the reduction given in Corollary 4 suffices. To prove W[2]-membership, we give a reduction from MaxCover (with parameter (K, T')) to SetCover (with parameter K).

Let $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K, T')$ be an input instance of MaxCover. We form an instance $I' = (N', \mathcal{S}', K + T')$ of SetCover as follows. Let $N' = N \cup D' \cup D''$, where $D' = \{d'_1, \dots, d'_K\}$ and $D'' = \{d''_1, \dots, d''_{T'}\}$. For each set $S \in \mathcal{S}$ and each $d'_i \in D'$, we set $S(d'_i) = S \cup \{d'_i\}$. We set $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S}'_1 \cup \mathcal{S}'_2$, where (a) $\mathcal{S}'_1 = \{S(d'_i) : (S \in \mathcal{S}) \wedge (d'_i \in D')\}$, and (b) $\mathcal{S}'_2 = \{\{e, d''_i\} : e \in N, d''_i \in D''\}$.

It is easy to see that if I is a yes-instance of MaxCover then I' is a yes-instance of SetCover: If for I it is possible to cover $n - T'$ elements of N using K sets, then for I' it is possible to (a) use K sets from \mathcal{S}'_1 to cover $n - T'$ elements from N and all the elements from D' , and (b) use T' sets from \mathcal{S}'_2 to cover all the elements from D'' and the remaining T' elements from N . For the other direction, assume that I' is a yes-instance of SetCover. However, covering the elements from D' requires one to use at least K sets from \mathcal{S}'_1 (which correspond to the sets from \mathcal{S}) and covering the elements in D'' requires at least T' sets from \mathcal{S}'_2 . Since each set from \mathcal{S}'_2 covers exactly one element from N , it is easy to see that if I' is a yes-instance, then it must be possible to cover at least $\|N\| - T'$ elements from N using K sets from \mathcal{S} . \square

We summarize our worst-case complexity results in Table 1. Not surprisingly, using the parameter T' (i.e., in essence, considering the MinNonCovered problem) leads to higher computational complexity than using parameter T (i.e., in essence, considering the MaxCover problem). For the parameter K , the exact complexity of unrestricted MaxCover remains open.

Algorithm 1: The algorithm for the MaxCover problem with frequency upper bounded by p .

Parameters:

(N, \mathcal{S}, K) — input MaxCover instance

p — bound on the number of sets each element can belong to

β — the required approximation ratio of the algorithm

$\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \lceil \frac{2pK}{(1-\beta)} + K \rceil$ sets from \mathcal{S} with the highest cardinalities ;

foreach K -element subset \mathcal{C} of \mathcal{A} **do**

 | $quality[\mathcal{C}] \leftarrow$ the number of elements covered by \mathcal{C} ;

return $\operatorname{argmax}_{\mathcal{C}}(quality[\mathcal{C}])$;

5 Algorithms for the Case of Bounded Frequencies

In this section we present our approximation algorithms for the MaxCover and MinNonCovered problems, for the case where we either upper-bound or lower-bound the frequencies of the elements. We first consider the with MaxCover problem, both with upper-bounded frequencies and with lower-bounded frequencies, and then move on to the MinNonCovered problem with upper-bounded frequencies.

5.1 The MaxCover Problem with Upper Bounded Frequencies

We will now present an FPT approximation scheme for MaxCover with upper-bounded frequencies. While Marx [18] has already shown an FPT approximation scheme for MaxVertexCover, his approach cannot be directly generalized to the MaxCover problem with bounded frequencies (although there are some similarities between the algorithms). Also, our algorithm for MaxCover applied to the MaxVertexCover problem is considerably faster than the algorithm of Marx [18]. We will give a brief comparison of the two algorithms after presenting our approach.

Intuitively, our algorithm works in a very simple way. Given an instance $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ of MaxCover (with frequencies bounded by some constant p) and a required approximation ratio β , the algorithm simply picks some of the sets from \mathcal{S} with highest cardinalities (the exact number of these sets depends only on K , p , and β), tries all K -element subcollections of sets from this group, and returns the best one. This approach is formalized as Algorithm 1. The following theorem explains that indeed the algorithm achieves a required approximation ratio.

Theorem 6 *For each instance $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ of MaxCover where each element from N appears in at most p sets in \mathcal{S} , Algorithm 1 outputs a β -approximate solution in time $\operatorname{poly}(n, m) \cdot \binom{\frac{2pK}{(1-\beta)} + K}{K}$.*

Proof It is immediate to establish the running time of the algorithm. We show that its approximation ratio is, indeed, β .

Consider some input instance I . Let \mathcal{C} be the solution returned by Algorithm 1 and let \mathcal{C}^* be some optimal solution. Let c be an arbitrary function such that for each element e such that $\exists S \in \mathcal{C}^* : e \in S$, $c(e)$ is some $S \in \mathcal{C}^*$ such that $e \in S$. We refer to c as the *coverage function*. Intuitively, the coverage function assigns to each element covered under \mathcal{C}^* (by, possibly, many different sets) the particular set “responsible” for covering it. We say that S covers e if and only if $c(e) = S$. Let OPT denote the number of elements covered by \mathcal{C}^* .

We will show that \mathcal{C} covers at least βOPT elements. Naturally, the reason why \mathcal{C} might cover fewer elements than \mathcal{C}^* is that some sets from \mathcal{C}^* may not be present in \mathcal{A} , the set of the subsets considered by the algorithm. We will show an iterative procedure that starts with \mathcal{C}^* and, step by step, replaces those members of \mathcal{C}^* that are not present in \mathcal{A} with the sets from \mathcal{A} . The idea of the proof is to show that each such replacement decreases the number of covered element by at most a small amount.

Let $\ell = \|\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \mathcal{C}\|$. Our procedure will replace the ℓ sets from \mathcal{C}^* that do not appear in \mathcal{C} with ℓ sets from \mathcal{A} . We renumber the sets so that $\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \mathcal{C} = \{S_1, \dots, S_\ell\}$. We will replace the sets $\{S_1, \dots, S_\ell\}$ with sets $\{S'_1, \dots, S'_\ell\}$ defined through the following algorithm. Assume that we have already computed sets S'_1, \dots, S'_{i-1} (thus for $i = 1$ we have not yet computed anything). We take S'_i to be a set from $\mathcal{A} \setminus (\mathcal{C}^* \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_{i-1}\})$ such that the set $(\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_i\}) \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_i\}$ covers as many elements as possible. During the i 'th step of this algorithm, after we replace S_i with S'_i in the set $(\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}) \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_{i-1}\}$, we modify the coverage function as follows:

1. for each element e such that $c(e) = S_i$, we set $c(e)$ to be undefined;
2. for each element $e \in S'_i$, if $c(e)$ is undefined then we set $c(e) = S'_i$.

After replacing S_i with S'_i , it may be the case that fewer elements are covered by the resulting collection of sets. Let x_i denote the difference between the number of elements covered by $(\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_i\}) \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_i\}$ and by $(\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}) \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_{i-1}\}$ (or 0, if by a fortunate coincidence there are more elements covered after replacing S_i with S'_i). By the construction of the set \mathcal{A} and the fact that $S_i \notin \mathcal{A}$, each set from \mathcal{A} contains more elements than S_i . Thus we infer that every set from $\mathcal{A} \setminus (\mathcal{C}^* \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_{i-1}\})$ must contain at least x_i elements covered by $(\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}) \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_{i-1}\}$. Indeed, if some set $S' \in \mathcal{A} \setminus (\mathcal{C}^* \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_{i-1}\})$ contained fewer than x_i elements covered by $(\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}) \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_{i-1}\}$, S' would have to cover at least

$$\|S'\| - (x_i - 1) \geq \|S_i\| - (x_i - 1)$$

elements uncovered by $(\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}) \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_{i-1}\}$. But this would mean that after replacing S_i with S' , the difference between the number of covered elements would be at most $(x_i - 1)$.

Let \mathcal{C}_2^* denote the set obtained after the above-described ℓ iterations. Since, for each i , the set $(\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}) \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_{i-1}\}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{C}^* \cup \mathcal{C}_2^*$, we know that, for each i , each set from $\mathcal{A} \setminus (\mathcal{C}^* \cup \{S'_1, \dots, S'_\ell\})$ (there is $\|\mathcal{A}\| - K$ such sets) must contain at least x_i elements covered by $\mathcal{C}^* \cup \mathcal{C}_2^*$ (there is at most 2OPT such elements). Since each element

is contained in at most p sets, we infer that for each i , $x_i(\|\mathcal{A}\| - K) \leq 2\text{OPT}p$ and, as a consequence, $x_i \leq \frac{2\text{OPT}p}{\|\mathcal{A}\| - K} = \frac{2\text{OPT}p(1-\beta)}{2pK}$. Thus we conclude that (recall that $\ell \leq K$):

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} x_i \leq 2\text{OPT}pK \frac{(1-\beta)}{2pK} = (1-\beta)\text{OPT}$$

That is, after our process of replacing the sets from \mathcal{C}^* that do not appear in \mathcal{C} with sets from \mathcal{A} , at most $(1-\beta)\text{OPT}$ elements fewer are covered. This means that there are K sets in \mathcal{A} that together cover at least βOPT elements. Since the algorithm tries all size- K subsets of \mathcal{A} , it finds a solution that covers at least βOPT elements. \square

Our analysis is tight up to the constant factor of $\frac{3}{4}$. Below we present a family of parameters β and instances of MaxCover with upper-bounded frequencies on which our algorithm achieves approximation ratio $(\frac{3}{4} + \frac{3}{4}\beta)$

Proposition 7 *There is a family \mathcal{I} of pairs (I, β) where I is an instance of MaxCover with bounded frequencies and β is a real number, $0 < \beta < 1$, such that for each $(I, \beta) \in \mathcal{I}$, if we use Algorithm 1 to find a β -approximate solution for I , it outputs an at-most $((\frac{3}{4} + \frac{3}{4}\beta)\text{OPT}(I))$ -approximate one.*

Proof We describe how to construct pairs (I, β) from the set \mathcal{I} . We let p be the bound of the frequencies of elements in I and we let K be the number of sets that we can use in the solution. We choose p and K to be sufficiently large, and β to be sufficiently close to 1 (the exact meaning of “sufficiently large” and “sufficiently close to 1” will become clear at the end of the proof; elements of \mathcal{I} differ in the particular choices of p , K , and β). We require that $\frac{1}{1-\beta}$ is an integer and that p divides K .

We now proceed with the construction of instance $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ for our choice of p , K , and β . We set $x = \frac{2pK}{(1-\beta)} + K$; x is the number of highest-cardinality sets from \mathcal{S} that Algorithm 1 will consider on instance I . By our choice of β and K , x is an integer and is divisible by p . We form N , the set of elements to be covered, to consist of two disjoint subsets, N_1 and N_2 , such that $\|N_1\| = \binom{x}{p}$ and $\|N_2\| = \binom{x}{p} \frac{Kp}{x}$. We form the family \mathcal{S} to consist of two subfamilies, \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 , defined as follows:

1. There are x subsets in \mathcal{S}_1 , $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{S_1, \dots, S_x\}$. We form the sets in \mathcal{S}_1 so that: (a) sets from \mathcal{S}_1 are subsets of N_1 , (b) each element from N_1 belongs to exactly p different sets from \mathcal{S}_1 , and (c) no two elements from N_1 belong to the same p sets from \mathcal{S}_1 . Specifically, we build sets (S_1, \dots, S_m) as follows. Let f be some one-to-one mapping between elements in N_1 and p -element subsets of $[x]$. For each $e \in N_1$, e belongs exactly to the sets S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_p} such that $f(e) = \{i_1, \dots, i_p\}$. Note that each set $S_i \in \mathcal{S}_1$ contains exactly $\binom{x-1}{p-1} = \binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x}$ elements.
2. \mathcal{S}_2 contains K sets, each covering exactly $\binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x}$ different elements from N_2 (and no other elements) so that no two sets from \mathcal{S}_2 overlap.

This completes our description of I . It is easy to see that each optimal solution for I covers exactly $K \binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x}$ elements; each set contains exactly $\binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x}$ elements and, there are K that are pairwise disjoint (for example the K sets in \mathcal{S}_2).

Nonetheless, Algorithm 1 is free to choose any x sets from \mathcal{S} to include within \mathcal{A} , the collection of sets from which it forms the solution, and, in particular, it is free to pick the x sets from \mathcal{S}_1 .²

Let us fix some arbitrary collection \mathcal{S}' of K sets from \mathcal{S}_1 . For each j , $0 \leq j \leq K$, let $h(j)$ be the number of elements from N_1 that belong to exactly j sets in \mathcal{S}' . The number of elements covered by \mathcal{S}' is exactly $K \binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x} - \sum_{j=2}^K (j-1)h(j)$. How to compute $h(j)$? Using mapping f , it suffices to count the number of p -element subsets of $[x]$ that contain the indices of exactly j sets from \mathcal{S}' . In effect, we have $h(j) = \binom{K}{j} \binom{x-K}{p-j}$. We upper bound the number of sets covered by \mathcal{S}' with:

$$K \binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x} - h(2) = K \binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x} - \binom{K}{2} \binom{x-K}{p-2}.$$

Consequently, on instance I Algorithm 1 achieves the following approximation ratio $\frac{K \binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x} - \binom{K}{2} \binom{x-K}{p-2}}{K \binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x}}$, which is equal to:

$$1 - \frac{\binom{K}{2} \binom{x-K}{p-2}}{K \binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x}} = 1 - \frac{\binom{K}{2} \binom{x-K}{p} \frac{p(p-1)}{(x-K-p+2)(x-K-p+1)}}{K \binom{x}{p} \frac{p}{x}}.$$

Now, if x is large in comparison with p and K (which happens for sufficiently large β), then $\frac{\binom{x-K}{p}}{\binom{x}{p}} \approx 1$. Also, for sufficiently large x and p (and for $x \gg p, K$) we have $\frac{p}{x-K-p+2} \approx \frac{p}{x}$ and $\frac{p-1}{x-K-p+1} \approx \frac{p}{x}$. Finally, for sufficiently large K we have $\binom{K}{2} \approx \frac{K^2}{2}$. Thus, for large values of β , K , and p , we can approximate the above ratio with the following expression:

$$1 - \frac{\frac{K^2}{2} \cdot \frac{p^2}{x^2}}{K \frac{p}{x}} = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{Kp}{\frac{2pK}{(1-\beta)} + K} \approx 1 - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{Kp}{\frac{2pK}{(1-\beta)}} = 1 - \frac{1}{4} \cdot (1-\beta) = \frac{3}{4} + \frac{3}{4}\beta.$$

This completes our argument. □

Let us now compare our algorithm to that of Marx [18] for the case of MaxVertexCover. Briefly put, the idea behind Marx's algorithm is as follows: Consider vertices in the order of nonincreasing degrees. If the degree of the vertex with the highest degree is large enough, then K vertices with the highest degrees already cover sufficiently many edges to give a desired approximate solution. If the highest degree is not large enough, then there is an exact, color-coding based, FPT algorithm that solves the problem optimally. Our algorithm is similar in the sense that we also focus on a group of sets with highest cardinalities (sets' cardinalities in MaxCover correspond to vertex degrees in MaxVertexCover).

²We could also ensure that each set in \mathcal{S}_1 contained one of $\frac{x}{p}$ additional elements, forcing the algorithm to pick exactly the sets from \mathcal{S}_1 , but that would obscure the presentation of our argument.

Algorithm 2: The algorithm for the MaxCover problem with frequency lower bounded by p .

Parameters:

(N, \mathcal{S}, K) — input MaxCover instance

p — lower bound on the number of the sets each element belongs to

$C = \{\}$;

for $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** K **do**

$Cov \leftarrow \{e \in N : \exists_{S \in C} e \in S\}$;
 $S_{best} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{S \in \{S_1, \dots, S_m\} \setminus C} \{e \in N \setminus Cov : e \in S\}$;
 $C \leftarrow C \cup \{S_{best}\}$

return C

However, instead of simply picking K largest ones, we make a careful decision as to which exactly to take.³ Further, our algorithm has a better running time than that of Marx. To achieve approximation ratio β , the algorithm presented by Marx has running time at least $\Omega\left(\left(\frac{k^3}{1-\beta}\right)^{\left(\frac{k^3}{1-\beta}\right)}\right)$. For us, the exponential factor in the running time is $\left(\frac{2pK}{(1-\beta)^K} + K\right)$. On the other hand, we should point out that Marx's algorithm's running time stems mostly from the exact part and the algorithm given there is interesting in its own right.

5.2 The MaxCover Problem with Lower-Bounded Frequencies

Let us now move on the case of MaxCover with lower-bounded frequencies. It turns out that in this case the standard greedy algorithm, given here as Algorithm 2, can—for appropriate inputs—achieve a better approximation ratio than in the unrestricted case.

Theorem 8 *Algorithm 2 is a polynomial-time $(1 - e^{-\frac{pK}{m}})$ -approximation algorithm for the MaxCover problem with frequency lower bounded by p , on instances with m elements where we can pick up to K sets.*

Proof The algorithm clearly runs in polynomial time and so we show its approximation ratio. Let $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ be an input instance of MaxCover and let p be an integer such that each element from N belongs to at least p sets from \mathcal{S} .

We prove by induction that for each i , $0 \leq i \leq K$, after the i 'th iteration of Algorithm 2's main loop, the number of uncovered elements is at most $n(1 - \frac{p}{m})^i$. Naturally, for $i = 0$ the number of uncovered elements is exactly n , the total number of elements. Suppose that the inductive assumption holds for some $(i - 1)$, $1 \leq i < K$ and let x be the number of elements still uncovered after the $(i - 1)$ -th iteration (by the inductive assumption, we have $x \leq n(1 - \frac{p}{m})^{i-1}$). Since each element belongs to at least p sets and neither of the sets containing the uncovered elements is yet selected, by the pigeonhole principle there is a

³Indeed, it is possible to build an example where picking sets with highest cardinalities would not work. This trick works in Marx's algorithm because he considers graphs and, thus, can bound the negative effect of covering the same element by different sets; in the MaxCover problem this seems difficult to do.

not-yet-selected set that contains at least $\lceil x \frac{p}{m} \rceil$ of the uncovered elements. In consequence, the number of elements still uncovered after the i -th iteration is at most:

$$x - x \frac{p}{m} = x \left(1 - \frac{p}{m}\right) \leq n \left(1 - \frac{p}{m}\right)^i.$$

Thus after K iterations the number of uncovered elements is at most:

$$n \left(1 - \frac{p}{m}\right)^K = n \left(1 - \frac{p}{m}\right)^{\frac{m}{p} \frac{pK}{m}} \leq n e^{-\frac{pK}{m}}.$$

Since the number of covered elements in the optimal solution is at most n , the algorithm's approximation ratio is $(1 - e^{-\frac{pK}{m}})$. \square

Naturally, the standard approximation ratio of $(1 - e^{-1})$ of the greedy algorithm still applies and we get the following corollary.

Corollary 9 *Algorithm 2 gives approximation guarantee of $(1 - e^{-\max(\frac{pK}{m}, 1)})$.*

The analysis given in Theorem 8 is tight. Below we present a family of instances on which the algorithm reaches exactly the promised approximation ratio.

Proposition 10 *For each α , $\alpha \geq 1$, there is an instance $I(\alpha)$ of MaxCover (with m sets, element frequency lower-bounded by p , K sets to use, and $\frac{pK}{m} = \alpha$) such that on input $I(\alpha)$, Algorithm 2 achieves approximation ratio no better than $(1 - e^{-\frac{pK}{m}})$.*

Proof Let us fix some α , $\alpha > 1$. We choose integers p , K , and m so that: (a) $p = \frac{\alpha m}{K}$, (b) $m \gg K$ (and, thus, $p \gg K$), and (c) p , m , and K are sufficiently large (the exact meaning of “sufficiently large” will become clear at the end of the proof).

We form instance $I(\alpha) = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ as follows. We let $N = N_1 \cup \dots \cup N_K$, where N_1, \dots, N_K are pairwise-disjoint sets, each of cardinality $\binom{m-K}{p-1}$ (thus $\|N\| = K \binom{m-K}{p-1}$). The family \mathcal{S} consists of two subfamilies, \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 :

1. \mathcal{S}_1 consists of $m-K$ sets, S_1, \dots, S_{m-K} , constructed as follows. For each i , $1 \leq i \leq K$, let f_i be some one-to-one mapping from N_i to $(p-1)$ -element subsets of $[m-K]$. For each i , $1 \leq i \leq K$, if $e \in N_i$ and $f_i(e) = \{j_1, \dots, j_{p-1}\}$ then we include e in sets $S_{j_1}, S_{j_2}, \dots, S_{j_{p-1}}$. Note that for each S_ℓ in \mathcal{S}_2 , $\|S_\ell\| = K \binom{m-K}{p-2}$; for each i , $1 \leq i \leq K$, S_ℓ contains $\binom{m-K}{p-2}$ elements from N_i ; to see this, it suffices to count how many $(p-1)$ -element subsets of $[m-K]$ there are that contain j .
2. $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{N_1, \dots, N_K\}$.

Note that, by our construction, each element from N belongs to exactly p sets from \mathcal{S} ($p-1$ from \mathcal{S}_1 and one from \mathcal{S}_2).

Naturally, the K disjoint sets from \mathcal{S}_2 form the optimal solution and cover all the elements. We will now analyze the operation of Algorithm 2 on input $I(\alpha)$.

We claim that Algorithm 2 will select sets from \mathcal{S}_1 only. We show this by induction. Fix some ℓ , $1 \leq \ell \leq K$, and suppose that until the beginning of the ℓ 'th iteration the algorithm chose sets from \mathcal{S}_1 only. This means that, for each i , $1 \leq i \leq K$, each set N_i contains exactly $\binom{m-K-\ell}{p-1}$ uncovered elements. Why is this the case? Assume that the algorithm selected sets $S_{j_1}, \dots, S_{j_\ell}$. An element $e \in N_i$ is uncovered if and only if $f_i(e) \cap \{j_1, \dots, j_\ell\} = \emptyset$; $\binom{m-K-\ell}{p-1}$ is the number of $(p-1)$ -element subsets of $[m-K]$ that do not contain any members of $\{j_1, \dots, j_\ell\}$. So, if in the ℓ 'th iteration the algorithm chose some set from \mathcal{S}_2 , it would cover these additional $\binom{m-K-\ell}{p-1}$ elements. On the other hand, if it chose a set from \mathcal{S}_1 , it would additionally cover Kx elements, where $x = \binom{m-K-\ell}{p-1} - \binom{m-K-\ell-1}{p-1}$. By our choice, we have $pK > m$ and, thus, $K > \frac{m-K}{p-1}$. We can now see that the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} Kx &= K \left(\binom{m-K-\ell}{p-1} - \binom{m-K-\ell-1}{p-1} \right) = K \binom{m-K-\ell-1}{p-2} \\ &= \frac{K(p-1)}{m-K-\ell} \binom{m-K-\ell}{p-1} \geq K \frac{p-1}{m-K} \binom{m-K-\ell}{p-1} > \binom{m-K-\ell}{p-1}. \end{aligned}$$

That is, in the ℓ 'th iteration Algorithm 2 picks a set from \mathcal{S}_1 . This proves our claim.

Let us now assess the approximation ratio Algorithm 2 achieves on $I(\alpha)$. By the above reasoning, we know that it leaves $\binom{m-2K}{p-1}$ uncovered elements in each N_i , $1 \leq i \leq K$. Thus the fraction of the uncovered elements is bounded by the following expression (see some explanation below):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{K \binom{m-2K}{p-1}}{K \binom{m-K}{p-1}} &= \frac{(m-2K)!(m-p-K+1)!}{(m-K)!(m-p-2K+1)!} \\ &= \frac{(m-p-K+1)(m-p-K) \dots (m-p-2K)}{(m-K)(m-K-1) \dots (m-2K+1)} \\ &\geq \left(\frac{m-2K-p}{m-2K+1} \right)^K = \left(1 - \frac{p+1}{m-2K+1} \right)^K \approx e^{-\frac{pK}{m}}. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds by iterative application of the simple observation that if $1 \leq x \leq y$ then $\frac{x-1}{y-1} \leq \frac{x}{y}$. To obtain the final estimate, we observe that for sufficiently large p and m (where $m \gg K$), we have $\frac{p+1}{m-2K+1} \approx \frac{p}{m} = \frac{\alpha}{K}$. For sufficiently large K , $(1 - \frac{\alpha}{K})^K \approx e^{-\alpha} = e^{-\frac{pK}{m}}$ (by the fact that $p = \frac{\alpha m}{K}$). Since the optimal solution covers all the elements, we have that Algorithm 2 on input $I(\alpha)$ achieves approximation ratio no better than $1 - e^{-\frac{pK}{m}}$. \square

Theorem 8 has some interesting implications. Let us consider a version of the MaxCover problem in which the ratio $\frac{p}{m}$ between the frequency lower bound p and the number of sets m is constant. This problem arises, e.g., if we use approval-based variant of the Chamberlin-Courant's election system with a requirement that each voter must approve at least some constant fraction (e.g. 10%) of the candidates. There exists a polynomial-time approximation scheme (PTAS) for this version of the problem.

Definition 5 For each α , $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, let α -MaxCover be a variant of MaxCover for instances that satisfy the following conditions: If p is a lower-bound on the frequencies of the elements and there are m sets, then $\frac{p}{m} \geq \alpha$.

Theorem 11 For each α , $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, there is a PTAS for α -MaxCover.

Proof Fix some α , $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. Let $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ be input instance of α -MaxCover and let β be our desired approximation ratio. We let m be the number of set in \mathcal{S} and p be the lower bound on element frequencies. By definition, we have $\frac{p}{m} \geq \alpha$. If $K > -\frac{m}{p} \ln(1 - \beta)$ then we can run Algorithm 2 and, by Theorem 8, we obtain approximation ratio β . Otherwise, K is bounded by a constant and enumerating all K -element subsets of \mathcal{S} gives a polynomial exact algorithm for the problem. \square

The exact complexity of α -MaxCover is quite interesting. Using Algorithm 2, we show that it belongs to the second level of Kintala and Fisher's β -hierarchy of limited nondeterminism [16]. In effect, it is unlikely that the problem is NP-complete.

Definition 6 (Kintala and Fisher [16]) For each positive integer k , β^k is the class of decision problems that can be solved in polynomial time, using additionally at most $O(\log^k n)$ nondeterministic bits (where n is the size of the input instance).

It is easy to see that β^1 is simply the class of problems solvable in polynomial time; we can simulate $O(\log n)$ bits of nondeterminism by trying all possible combinations. However, class β^2 appears to be greater than P but smaller than NP (of course, since we do not know if $P \neq NP$, this is only a conjecture).

Theorem 12 For each α , $0 < \alpha < 1$, the decision variant of α -MaxCover is in β^2 .

Proof Fix some α , $0 < \alpha < 1$. We will give a β^2 -algorithm for α -MaxCover. Let $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K, T)$ be an instance of α -MaxCover (recall that T is the number of elements we are required to cover). We let p be the lower bound on elements' frequencies in I , we let $m = \|\mathcal{S}\|$, and we let $n = \|N\|$. By definition, we have $\frac{p}{m} \geq \alpha$. W.l.o.g., we assume that $\|I\| \geq n + m$.

Our algorithm works as follows. If $K > \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln(n)$ then we run Algorithm 2 and output its solution. Otherwise, we guess K names of the sets from \mathcal{S} and check if these sets cover at least T elements. If so, we accept and otherwise we reject on this computation path.

First, it is clear that the algorithm uses at most $O(\log^2 |I|)$ nondeterministic bits. We execute the nondeterministic part of the algorithm only if $K < \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln(n) \leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln |I|$ and each set's name requires at most $\log m \leq \log |I|$ bits. Altogether, we use at most $O(\log^2 |I|)$ bits of nondeterminism.

Second, we need to show the correctness of the algorithm. Clearly, if the algorithm uses the nondeterministic part then certainly it finds an optimal solution. Consider then that the algorithm uses the deterministic part, based on Algorithm 2. In this case we

know that $K > \frac{1}{\alpha} \ln(n)$. Thus, the approximation ratio of Algorithm 2 is greater than: $1 - e^{-\alpha K} > (1 - e^{-\ln n}) = 1 - \frac{1}{n}$. That is, the algorithm returns a solution that covers more than $\text{OPT}(1 - \frac{1}{n})$ elements and, since $\text{OPT} \leq n$ and the number of covered elements is integer, the algorithm must find an optimal solution. \square

5.3 The MinNonCovered Problem

In this section we considered the MinNonCovered problem, that is, a version of MaxCover where the goal is to minimize the number of elements left uncovered. In this case we give a randomized FPT approximation scheme (presented as Algorithm 3).

Intuitively, the idea behind our approach is to extend a simple bounded-search-tree algorithm for SetCover with upper-bounded frequencies to the case of MaxCover. An FPT algorithm for SetCover with frequencies upper-bounded by some constant p could work recursively as follows: If there still is some uncovered element e , then nondeterministically guess one of the at-most- p sets that contain e and recursively solve the smaller problem. The recursion tree would have at most K levels and p^K leaves. The same approach does not work directly for MaxCover because we do not know which element e to pick (in SetCover the choice is irrelevant because we have to cover all the elements). However, it turns out that if we choose e randomly then, in expectation, we achieve a good result.

Theorem 13 *Algorithm 3 outputs a β -approximate solution for the MinNonCovered problem with probability $(1 - \epsilon)$. The time complexity of the algorithm is*

$$\text{poly}(n, m) \cdot \left\lceil -\ln \epsilon / \left(\frac{\beta - 1}{\beta} \right)^K \right\rceil \cdot p^K$$

Proof Let $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ be our input instance of the MinNonCovered problem and fix some $\beta, \beta > 1$, and $\epsilon, 0 < \epsilon < 1$. Each element from N appears in at most p sets from \mathcal{S} .

By p_s we denote the probability that a single invocation of the function `RecursiveSearch` (from the `Main` function) returns a β -approximate solution. We will first show that p_s is at least $\left(\frac{\beta-1}{\beta} \right)^K$, and then we will invoke the standard argument that if we make $\left\lceil \frac{-\ln \epsilon}{p_s} \right\rceil$ calls to `RecursiveSearch`, then taking the best output gives a β -approximate solution with probability $(1 - \epsilon)$.

Let \mathcal{C}^* be some optimal solution for I , let $N^* \subseteq N$ be the set of elements covered by \mathcal{C}^* , and let $U^* = N \setminus N^*$ be the set of the remaining, uncovered elements. Consider a single call to `RecursiveSearch` from the “for” loop within the function `Main`. Let Ev denote the event that during such a call, at the beginning of each recursive call, at least a $\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}$ fraction of the elements not covered by the constructed solution (i.e., the solution denoted *partial* in the algorithm) belongs to N^* . Note that if the complementary event, denoted \overline{Ev} , occurs, then `RecursiveSearch` definitely returns a β -approximate solution. Why is this the case? Consider some tree of recursive invocations of `RecursiveSearch`, and some

Algorithm 3: The algorithm for the MinNonCovered problem with frequency upper bounded by p .

Parameters:

- (N, \mathcal{S}, K) — input MinNonCovered instance
- p — bound on the number of sets each element can belong to
- β — the required approximation ratio of the algorithm
- ϵ — the allowed probability of achieving worse than β approximation ratio

RecursiveSearch($s, partial$):

```

if  $s = 0$  then
  | return  $partial$ ;
else
  |  $e \leftarrow$  randomly select element not-yet covered by
  |    $partial$ ;
  |  $best \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
  | foreach  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $e \in S$  do
  |   |  $sol \leftarrow$  RecursiveSearch(( $s - 1$ ),  $partial \cup \{S\}$ );
  |   | if  $sol$  is better than  $best$  then
  |   |   |  $best \leftarrow sol$ ;
  |   return  $best$ ;

```

Main():

```

 $best = \emptyset$ ;
for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $\lceil -\ln \epsilon / \left(\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}\right)^K \rceil$  do
  |  $sol =$  RecursiveSearch( $K, \emptyset$ );
  | if  $sol$  is better than  $best$  then
  |   |  $best \leftarrow sol$ ;
return  $best$ ;

```

invocation of **RecursiveSearch** within this tree. Let X be the number of elements not covered by $partial$ at the beginning of this invocation. If at most $\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}X$ of the not-covered elements belong to N^* , then—of course—the remaining at least $\frac{1}{\beta}X$ of them belong to U^* . In other words, then we have $\frac{1}{\beta}X \leq \|U^*\|$ and, equivalently, $X \leq \beta\|U^*\|$. This means that $partial$ already is a β -approximate solution, and so the solution returned by the current invocation of **RecursiveSearch** will be β -approximate as well. (Naturally, the same applies to the solution returned at the root of the recursion tree.)

Now, consider the following random process \mathcal{P} . (Intuitively, \mathcal{P} models a particular branch of the **RecursiveSearch** recursion tree.) We start from the set N' of all the elements, $N' = N$, and in each of the next K steps we execute the following procedure: We randomly select an element e from N' and if e belongs to N^* , we remove from N' all the elements covered by the first⁴ set from \mathcal{C}^* that covers e . Let p_{opt} be the probability that a call to **RecursiveSearch** (within **Main**) finds an optimal solution for I , and let $p_{\text{opt}|Ev}$ be the same probability, but under the condition that Ev takes place. It is easy to see that p_{opt} is greater or equal than the probability that in each step \mathcal{P} picks an element from N^* . Let p_{hit} be

⁴We assume that the sets in \mathcal{C}^* are ordered in some arbitrary way.

Algorithm 4: An approximation algorithm for the unrestricted MaxCover problem.

Parameters:

(N, \mathcal{S}, K) — input MaxCover instance

X — the parameter of the algorithm

$\mathcal{A}(\cdot)$ — an exact algorithm for MaxCover (returns the set of sets to be used in the cover)

$C = \{\}$;

for $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** X **do**

$Cov \leftarrow \{e \in N : \exists S \in C e \in S\}$;
 $S_{best} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{S \in \{S_1, \dots, S_m\} \setminus C} \|\{e \in N \setminus Cov : e \in S\}\|$;
 $C \leftarrow C \cup \{S_{best}\}$

$uCov \leftarrow N \setminus \{e \in N : \exists S \in C e \in S\}$;

$C' \leftarrow \mathcal{A}(uCov, (K - X), S \setminus C)$;

return $C \cup C'$

the probability in each step \mathcal{P} picks an element from N^* , under the condition that at the beginning of every step more than $\frac{(\beta-1)}{\beta}$ fraction of the elements in N' belong to N^* . Again, it is easy to see that $p_{\text{opt}|Ev} \geq p_{\text{hit}}$. Further, it is immediate to see that $p_{\text{hit}} \geq \left(\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}\right)^K$.

Altogether, combining all the above findings, we know that the probability that **RecursiveSearch** returns a β -approximate solution is at most:

$$p_s \geq P(\overline{Ev}) + P(Ev)p_{\text{opt}|Ev} \geq p_{\text{opt}|Ev} \geq \left(\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}\right)^K.$$

(That is, either the event Ev does not take place and **RecursiveSearch** definitely returns a β -approximate solution, or Ev does occur, and then we lower-bound the probability of finding a β -approximate solution by the probability of finding the optimal one.)

To conclude, the probability of finding a β -approximate solution in one of the $x = \left\lceil -\ln \epsilon / \left(\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}\right)^K \right\rceil$ independent invocations of **RecursiveSearch** from **Main** is at least:

$$1 - \left(1 - \left(\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}\right)^K\right)^x \geq 1 - e^{-\ln \epsilon} = 1 - \epsilon.$$

Establishing the running time of the algorithm is immediate, and so the proof is complete. \square

Algorithm 3 is very useful, especially in conjunction with Algorithm 1. The former one has to provide a very good solution if it is possible to cover almost all the elements and the latter one has to provide a very good solution if in every solution many elements must be left uncovered.

6 Algorithms for the Unrestricted Variant

So far we have focused on the MaxCover problem where element frequencies were either upper- or lower-bounded. Now we consider the completely unrestricted variant of the prob-

lem. In this case we give exponential-time approximation schemes that, nonetheless, are not FPT.

The main idea, which is similar to that of Cygan et. al [8] and of Croce and Paschos [7], is to solve part of the problem using an exact algorithm and to solve the remaining part using the greedy algorithm (i.e., Algorithm 2). There are two possible ways in which this idea can be implemented: Either we can first run the exact algorithm and then solve the remaining part of the instance using the greedy algorithm, or the other way round. We consider both approaches, though a variant of the “brute-force-first-then-greedy” approach appears to be superior (at least as long as we do not have exact algorithms that are significantly faster than a brute-force approach).

We start with the analysis of Algorithm 4, which first runs the greedy part and then completes it using an exact algorithm.

Theorem 14 *Let \mathcal{A} be an exact algorithm for the MaxCover problem with time complexity $f(K, n, m)$. For each instance $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ of MaxCover and for each X , $0 \leq X \leq K$, Algorithm 4 returns an $\left(1 - \frac{X}{K}e^{-\frac{X}{K}}\right)$ -approximate solution for I and runs in time $f(K - X, n, m) + \text{poly}(n, K, m)$.*

Proof Establishing the running time of the algorithm is immediate and, thus, below we focus on showing the approximation ratio.

Let $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ be an instance of MaxCover and let X be an integer, $1 \leq X \leq K$. We rename the elements in \mathcal{S} so that $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_m\}$ and S_1, \dots, S_X are the consecutive elements selected in the first, greedy, “for loop” in Algorithm 4. For each i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $c_i = \|S_i \setminus (S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_{i-1})\|$. Let N_{OPT} denote the set of elements covered by some optimal solution and set $\text{OPT} = \|N_{\text{OPT}}\|$. Let Cov_i denote the set $S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_{i-1}$. (That is, Cov_i is the set of elements in the variable Cov in the Algorithm 4 right before executing the i 'th iteration of the “for loop”. Of course, $\text{Cov}_1 = \emptyset$.) Naturally, for each i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have $\|\text{Cov}_i\| = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_j$.

We claim that for each i , $1 \leq i \leq X$, there exist $(K - i)$ sets from $\mathcal{S} \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}$ that cover at least $\frac{K-i}{K}$ fraction of the elements from $N_{\text{OPT}} \setminus \text{Cov}_{i-1}$. Why is this the case? First, note that there are some K sets from $\mathcal{S} \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}$ that cover $N_{\text{OPT}} \setminus \text{Cov}_{i-1}$ (it suffices to take the K sets from some optimal solution, if need be, replace those that belong to $\{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}$ with some arbitrarily chosen ones from $\mathcal{S} \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}$). Let Q_1, \dots, Q_K be these K sets. Consider some arbitrary assignment of the elements from $N_{\text{OPT}} \setminus \text{Cov}_{i-1}$ to the sets Q_1, \dots, Q_K , such that each element is assigned to exactly one set. Further, consider an ordering of these sets according to the increasing number of assigned elements. If the i 'th set in the ordering is assigned at most fraction $\frac{1}{K}$ of the elements, then each of the sets preceding the i 'th one in the ordering also is assigned at most fraction $\frac{1}{K}$ of the elements. In consequence, the last $(K - i)$ sets from the ordering cover at least fraction $\frac{K-i}{K}$ of the elements. On the other hand, if the i 'th set in the order is assigned more than fraction $\frac{1}{K}$ of the elements then the following sets also are and, once again, the last $(K - i)$ elements cover at least fraction $\frac{K-i}{K}$ of the elements.

In consequence, we see that for each i , $1 \leq i \leq X$, $c_i \geq \frac{1}{K}(\text{OPT} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_j)$. The reason is that since there are $K - i$ sets among $\mathcal{S} \setminus \{S_1, \dots, S_{i-1}\}$ that cover fraction $\frac{K-i}{K}$ of elements from $N_{\text{OPT}} \setminus \text{Cov}_i$, at least one of them must cover $\frac{1}{K}(\text{OPT} - \|\text{Cov}_i\|)$. S_i is chosen as a set that covers most sets from $N - \text{Cov}_i$. It covers c_i elements from $N - \text{Cov}_i$, and, thus, $c_i \geq \frac{1}{K}(\text{OPT} - \|\text{Cov}_i\|) = \frac{1}{K}(\text{OPT} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_j)$.

We can now proceed with computing the algorithm's approximation ratio. By the above reasoning, we observe that the solution provided by Algorithm 4 covers at least $c = \sum_{i=1}^X c_i + \frac{K-X}{K}(\text{OPT} - \sum_{i=1}^X c_i) = \frac{X}{K} \sum_{i=1}^X c_i + \frac{K-X}{K} \text{OPT}$. Now, we assess the minimal value of $\sum_{i=1}^X c_i$. Minimization of $\sum_{i=1}^X c_i$ can be viewed as a linear programming task with the following constraints: for each i , $1 \leq i \leq X$, $c_i \geq \frac{1}{K}(\text{OPT} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_j)$. Since we have X variables and X constraints, we know that the minimum is achieved when each constraint is satisfied with equality (see, e.g., [24]). Thus a solution to our linear program consists of values $c_{1,\min}, \dots, c_{X,\min}$ that, for each i , $1 \leq i \leq X$, satisfy $c_{i,\min} = \frac{1}{K}(\text{OPT} - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_{j,\min})$. By induction, we show that for each i , $1 \leq i \leq X$, $c_{i,\min} = \frac{1}{K} \left(\frac{K-1}{K}\right)^{i-1} \text{OPT}$. Indeed, the claim is true for $i = 1$:

$$c_{1,\min} = \frac{1}{K} \text{OPT}$$

Now, assuming that $c_{i,\min} = \frac{1}{K} \left(\frac{K-1}{K}\right)^{i-1} \text{OPT}$, we calculate $c_{(i+1),\min}$:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{(i+1),\min} &= \frac{1}{K} \left(\text{OPT} - \sum_{j=1}^i c_{j,\min} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \text{OPT} \left(1 - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^i \left(\frac{K-1}{K} \right)^{j-1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \text{OPT} \left(1 - \frac{1}{K} \cdot \frac{1 - \left(\frac{K-1}{K}\right)^i}{1 - \left(\frac{K-1}{K}\right)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \text{OPT} \left(1 - \left(1 - \left(\frac{K-1}{K} \right)^i \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \text{OPT} \left(\frac{K-1}{K} \right)^i. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can lower-bound the number of elements covered by Algorithm 4 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \frac{X}{K} \sum_{i=1}^X c_i + \frac{K-X}{K} \text{OPT} \\ &= \text{OPT} \left(\frac{X}{K^2} \sum_{i=1}^X \left(\frac{K-1}{K} \right)^{i-1} + \frac{K-X}{K} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 5: The approximation algorithm for the MaxCover problem.

Parameters:

(N, \mathcal{S}, K) — input MaxCover instance

X — the parameter of the algorithm

$C = \{\}$;

$C_{best} = \{\}$;

foreach $(K - X)$ -element subset C of \mathcal{S} **do**

for $i \leftarrow (K - X + 1)$ **to** K **do**

$Cov \leftarrow \{e \in N : \exists S \in C, e \in S\}$;

$S_{best} \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{S \in \{S_1, \dots, S_m\} \setminus C} \{e \in N \setminus Cov : e \in S\}$;

$C \leftarrow C \cup \{S_{best}\}$

$C_{best} \leftarrow$ better solution among C_{best} and C ;

return C_{best}

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \text{OPT} \left(\frac{X}{K^2} \cdot \frac{1 - \left(\frac{K-1}{K}\right)^X}{1 - \left(\frac{K-1}{K}\right)} + \frac{K-X}{K} \right) \\
&= \text{OPT} \left(\frac{X}{K} \left(1 - \left(\frac{K-1}{K}\right)^X \right) + \frac{K-X}{K} \right) \\
&\geq \text{OPT} \left(1 - \frac{X}{K} e^{-\frac{X}{K}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

The idea of the proof of Theorem 14 is similar to the algorithm of Cygan et. al [8] for the problem of weighted set cover. Theorem 14 gives a good-quality result provided we knew an optimal algorithm with the better complexity than exhaustive search. Otherwise, we can obtain even better results using Algorithm 5, which first runs a brute-force approach and completes it using the greedy algorithm.

Theorem 15 *For each instance $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ of MaxCover and each integer X , $0 \leq X \leq K$, Algorithm 5 computes an $(1 - \frac{X}{K}e^{-1})$ -approximate solution for I in time $\binom{m}{K-X} + \text{poly}(K, n, m)$.*

Proof Let $I = (N, \mathcal{S}, K)$ be our input instance and let \mathcal{C}^* , $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, denote some optimal solution. Let \mathcal{C}_X^* denote a subset of $(K - X)$ -elements from \mathcal{C}^* that together cover the greatest number of the elements. Thus the sets from \mathcal{C}_X^* cover at least a fraction $\frac{K-X}{K}$ of all the elements covered by the optimal solution. Consider the problem of covering the elements uncovered by \mathcal{C}_X^* with X sets from $(\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{C}_X^*)$. We know that $(\mathcal{C}^* \setminus \mathcal{C}_X^*)$ is an optimal solution for this problem. On the other hand, we also know that the greedy algorithm achieves approximation ratio $(1 - \frac{1}{e})$ for the problem. Thus, the approximation ratio for the original problem is:

$$\left(\frac{K-X}{K} + \frac{X}{K} \left(1 - \frac{1}{e} \right) \right) = \left(1 - \frac{X}{K} e^{-1} \right).$$

It is immediate to establish the running time of the algorithm and so the proof is complete. \square

If we wish to solve MaxVertexCover rather than MaxCover, then in Algorithm 5 we should replace the greedy approximation algorithm with that of Ageev and Sviridenko [1].

Corollary 16 *There exists an $(1 - \frac{X}{4K})$ -approximation algorithm for MaxVertexCover problem running in time $\binom{m}{K-X} + \text{poly}(K, n, m)$*

It is quite evident that as long as algorithm \mathcal{A} used within Algorithm 4 is the simple brute-force algorithm that tries all possible solutions, then Algorithm 5 is superior; in the same time it achieves a better approximation ratio. It turns out that, for the case of MaxVertexCover, Algorithm 5 (in the variant from Corollary 16) is also better than the algorithm of Croce and Paschos [7].⁵

The idea behind the algorithm of Croce and Paschos [7] for MaxVertexCover is similar to that behind our Algorithm 5. Specifically, given two algorithms for MaxVertexCover, approximation algorithm \mathcal{A}_a and exact algorithm \mathcal{A}_e , for a given value X it first uses \mathcal{A}_e to find an optimal solution that uses $K - X$ vertices (out of the K vertices that we are allowed to use in the full solution), then it removes these $K - X$ vertices and solves the remaining part of the problem using \mathcal{A}_a . Assuming that β_a is the approximation ratio of the algorithm \mathcal{A}_a , this approach results in the approximation ratio equal to $(\frac{X}{K} + \beta_a (1 - \frac{X}{K})^2)$.

Below we compare Algorithm 5 (version from Corollary 16) with the algorithm of Croce and Paschos [7]. As the components \mathcal{A}_a and \mathcal{A}_e we use, respectively, the $\frac{3}{4}$ -approximation algorithm of Ageev and Sviridenko [1] and the brute-force algorithm that tries all possible solutions. The best known exact algorithm for MaxVertexCover is due to Cai [4] and has the complexity $O(m^{0.792K})$, but this algorithm uses exponential amount of space. Since exponential space complexity might be much less practical than exponential time complexity, we decided to use the brute-force approach (to the best of our knowledge there, there is no better exact algorithm running in a polynomial space). We present our comparison in Figure 1. The x -axis represents the parameter $\frac{K-X}{K}$, measuring the fraction of the solution obtained using the exact algorithm (for 0 we use the approximation algorithm alone and for 1 we use the exact algorithm alone). On the y -axis we give approximation ratio of each algorithm. In other words, for each point on the x -axis we set the X parameters of the algorithms to be equal, so that their running times are the same, and we compare their approximation guarantees.

We conclude that, as long as we use the brute-force algorithm as the exact one, Algorithm 5 gives considerably better approximation guarantees than that of Croce and Paschos.

⁵Algorithm 4 cannot be directly compared to the algorithm of Croce and Paschos [7] for the following reason. Algorithm 4 uses specifically a greedy algorithm which is the best known approximation algorithm for MaxCover, but which is suboptimal for MaxVertexCover. In contrast, the algorithm of Croce and Paschos [7] can use, e.g., the $\frac{3}{4}$ -approximation algorithm of Ageev and Sviridenko [1]. One could, of course, try to use the algorithm of Ageev and Sviridenko in Algorithm 4, but our analysis does not work for this case.




Figure 1: The comparison of the approximation ratios of Algorithm 5 and the algorithm of Croce and Paschos [7] for MaxVertexCover.

Figure 1 also exposes one potential weakness of the algorithm of Croce and Paschos. Apparently, for some cases increasing the complexity of the algorithm results in the decrease of its approximation guarantee.

It is quite interesting to understand the reasons behind the differing performance of Algorithm 5 and that of Croce and Paschos. In some sense, the algorithms are very similar. If we use the brute-force algorithm as the exact one in the algorithm of Croce and Paschos, then the main difference is that our algorithm runs the approximation algorithm for each possible solution tried by the brute-force algorithm, and Croce and Paschos’s algorithm only runs the approximation algorithm once, for the best partial solution. In effect, our algorithm can exploit situations where it is better when the exact algorithm does not find an optimal solution for the subproblem, but rather leaves ground for the approximation algorithm to do well. Naturally, such strategy is only possible if we have additional knowledge of the structure of the exact algorithm (here, the brute-force algorithm). The result of Croce and Paschos pays the price for being more general and being able to use any combination of the approximation algorithm and the exact algorithm.

7 Conclusions

Motivated by the study of winner-determination under Chamberlin–Courant’s voting rule (with approval misrepresentation), we have considered the MaxCover problem with bounded frequencies and its minimization variant, the MinNonCovered problem, from the point of view of approximability by FPT algorithms. We have shown that for upper-bounded frequencies there is an FPT approximation scheme for MaxCover and a randomized FPT approximation scheme for MinNonCovered. For lower-bounded frequencies we have shown that the standard greedy algorithm for MaxCover may achieve a better approximation ratio than in the unrestricted case. Finally, we have shown that in the unrestricted case there are good exponential-time approximation algorithms (though, not FPT ones) that combine exact and greedy algorithms and smoothly exchange the quality of the approximation for the

running time. Some of our results regarding MaxCover with bounded frequencies improve previously known results for MaxVertexCover. In particular, our Algorithm 1 improves upon the approximation scheme given by Marx, and our Algorithm 5 improves upon the result of Croce and Paschos [7] (provided we use brute-force algorithm as the underlying exact algorithm in the scheme proposed by Croce and Paschos; this is reasonable if we are interested in algorithms that use only polynomial amount of space).

There are several interesting directions for future research. For example, is it possible to obtain FPT approximation schemes for MaxCover with lower-bounded element frequencies? Further, what is the exact complexity of MaxCover (with or without lower-bounded frequencies)? We have quickly observed its $W[2]$ -hardness, but does it belong to $W[2]$? (It is quite easy, however, to show that it belongs to $W[P]$.) We are also interested in the exact complexity of MaxCover with lower-bounded frequencies for the case where we require the ratio of frequency lower-bound and the number of sets to be at least some given value α , $0 < \alpha < 1$? We have given a PTAS for this variant of the problem (see Theorem 11) and have shown its membership in β^2 , but we did not attempt to prove its completeness for any particular complexity class.

References

- [1] A. Ageev and M. Sviridenko. Approximation algorithms for maximum coverage and max cut with given sizes of parts. In G. Cornuéjols, R. Burkard, and G. Woeginger, editors, *Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, volume 1610 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 17–30. Springer, 1999.
- [2] N. Betzler, A. Slinko, and J. Uhlmann. On the computation of fully proportional representation. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 47:475–519, 2013.
- [3] M. Bläser. Computing small partial coverings. *Information Processing Letters*, 85(6):327–331, 2003.
- [4] L. Cai. Parameterized complexity of cardinality constrained optimization problems. *The Computer Journal*, 51(1):102–121, 2008.
- [5] M. Cesati. The Turing way to parameterized complexity. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 67(4):654–685, 2003.
- [6] B. Chamberlin and P. Courant. Representative deliberations and representative decisions: Proportional representation and the borda rule. *American Political Science Review*, 77(3):718–733, 1983.
- [7] F. Croce and V. Paschos. Efficient algorithms for the max k -vertex cover problem. *Journal of Combinatorial Optimization*, To appear (available as an online-first article).
- [8] M. Cygan, Ł. Kowalik, and M. Wykurz. Exponential-time approximation of weighted set cover. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 109(16):957–961, 2009.

- [9] R. Downey and M. Fellows. *Parameterized Complexity*. Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [10] U. Feige. A threshold of $\ln n$ for approximating set cover. *J.ACM*, 45(4):634–652, 1998.
- [11] J. Flum and M. Grohe. *Parameterized Complexity Theory*. Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- [12] A. Galluccio and P. Nobile. Improved approximation of maximum vertex cover. *Operations Research Letters*, 34(1):77–84, 2006.
- [13] J. Guo, R. Niedermeier, and S. Wernicke. Parameterized complexity of vertex cover variants. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 41(3):501–520, 2007.
- [14] Q. Han, Y. Ye, H. Zhang, and J. Zhang. On approximation of max-vertex-cover. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 143(2):342–355, 2002.
- [15] D. Hochbaum. Approximating covering and packing problems: Set cover, vertex cover, independent set, and related problems. In D. Hochbaum, editor, *Approximation Algorithms for NP-Hard Problems*, pages 94–143. PWS Publishing, 1996.
- [16] C. Kintala and P. Fisher. Refining nondeterminism in relativized polynomial-time bounded computations. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 9(1):46–53, 1980.
- [17] T. Lu and C. Boutilier. Budgeted social choice: From consensus to personalized decision making. In *Proceedings of IJCAI-2011*, pages 280–286, 2011.
- [18] D. Marx. Parameterized complexity and approximation algorithms. *The Computer Journal*, 51(1):60–78, 2008.
- [19] R. Niedermeier. *Invitation to Fixed-Parameter Algorithms*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [20] R. F. Potthoff and S. J. Brams. Proportional representation: Broadening the options. *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 10(2):147–178, 1998.
- [21] A. Procaccia, J. Rosenschein, and A. Zohar. On the complexity of achieving proportional representation. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 30(3):353–362, April 2008.
- [22] P. Skowron, P. Faliszewski, and A. Slinko. Achieving fully proportional representation is easy in practice. In *Proceedings of AAMAS-2013*, May 2013.
- [23] P. Skowron, P. Faliszewski, and A. Slinko. Fully proportional representation as resource allocation: Approximability results. In *Proceedings of IJCAI-2013*, 2013. To appear.
- [24] V. V. Vazirani. *Approximation algorithms*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 2001.