

# Stochastic Packing Integer Programs with Few Queries

Takanori Maehara<sup>\*1</sup> and Yutaro Yamaguchi<sup>†2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project

<sup>2</sup>Osaka University

## Abstract

We consider a stochastic variant of the integer linear programming problem, which contains random variables in the objective vector. We are allowed to reveal each entry of the objective vector by conducting a query, and the task is to find a good solution by conducting a small number of queries. We propose adaptive and non-adaptive algorithms for this problem, and provide a general technique for analyzing the performance of the algorithms. We also demonstrate our framework by applying it to a variety of stochastic combinatorial optimization problems such as matching, matroid, and stable set problems.

---

<sup>\*</sup>Supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 16K16011. Email: takanori.maehara@riken.jp

<sup>†</sup>Supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 16H06931 and JST ACT-I Grant Number JP-MJPR16UR. Email: yutaro.yamaguchi@ist.osaka-u.ac.jp

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Problem Formulation . . . . .	1
1.2	Our Contributions and Technique . . . . .	1
1.3	Related Work . . . . .	3
1.4	Organization . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>General Framework</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Two Algorithms . . . . .	4
2.2	Performance Analysis . . . . .	5
2.3	Proofs of Main Theorems . . . . .	6
<b>3</b>	<b>Constructing Witness Cover</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Totally Dual Integral Case . . . . .	9
3.2	Non-TDI Case . . . . .	9
3.3	Exponentially Many Constraints . . . . .	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Applications</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Matching Problems . . . . .	11
4.1.1	Bipartite Matching . . . . .	11
4.1.2	Non-bipartite Matching . . . . .	12
4.1.3	$k$ -Hypergraph Matching . . . . .	14
4.1.4	$k$ -Column Sparse Packing Integer Programming . . . . .	15
4.2	Matroid Problems . . . . .	16
4.2.1	Maximum Independent Set . . . . .	16
4.2.2	Matroid Intersection . . . . .	17
4.2.3	$k$ -Matroid Intersection . . . . .	18
4.2.4	Matroid Matching . . . . .	19
4.2.5	Degree Bounded Matroid . . . . .	20
4.3	Stable Set Problems . . . . .	22
4.3.1	Stable Set in Some Perfect Graphs . . . . .	22
4.3.2	Stable Set in $t$ -Perfect Graphs . . . . .	23
<b>5</b>	<b>Vertex Sparsification Lemma</b>	<b>24</b>
5.1	Vertex Sparsification Lemma . . . . .	24
5.2	Usage of Vertex Sparsification Lemma . . . . .	26

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Problem Formulation

We study a stochastic variant of linear programming (LP) with the integral constraint, the *stochastic packing integer programming problem* defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \tilde{c}^\top x \\ & \text{subject to} && Ax \leq b, \\ & && x \in \{0, 1\}^m, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where  $A \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{n \times m}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$ , and  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  denotes the set of nonnegative integers. We assume that  $b \geq 1$  without loss of generality, and that  $Ax \leq b$  and  $x \geq 0$  imply  $x \leq 1$  for simplicity<sup>1</sup>. The objective vector  $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$  is *stochastic* in the sense that the entries  $\tilde{c}_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$ ) are independent random variables such that, for all  $j$ ,

- the domain of  $\tilde{c}_j$  is an interval  $\{c_j^-, c_j^- + 1, \dots, c_j^+\}$  given by  $c_j^-, c_j^+ \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , and
- the probability that  $\tilde{c}_j = c_j^+$  is at least  $p \in (0, 1]$ , which is also given.

We are allowed to conduct queries for  $j$  to reveal the realized values of  $\tilde{c}_j$ , and our aim is to find a feasible solution with a large objective value by conducting a small number of queries. Note that we can definitely obtain an optimal solution by solving the corresponding non-stochastic problem after conducting queries for all  $j$ . Our interest is therefore in the trade-off between the number of queries and the quality of the obtained solution.

## 1.2 Our Contributions and Technique

**Contributions** We propose general adaptive and non-adaptive algorithms for the stochastic packing integer programming problem. Here, an algorithm is *non-adaptive* if it reveals all queried items simultaneously, and *adaptive* otherwise.

The adaptive algorithm shown in Algorithm 1 iteratively computes an optimal solution  $x \in [0, 1]^m$  to the *optimistic LP* (the LP relaxation of (1.1) in which all the unrevealed  $\tilde{c}_j$  are supposed to be  $c_j^+$ ), and reveals each element  $j$  with probability  $x_j$ . After the iterations, the algorithm returns an integral feasible solution to the *pessimistic LP* (in which all the unrevealed  $\tilde{c}_j$  are supposed to be  $c_j^-$ ).

Similarly, the non-adaptive algorithm shown in Algorithm 2 iteratively computes an optimal solution  $x$  to the optimistic LP, and rounds down each element  $j$  (i.e., supposes  $\tilde{c}_j$  to be  $c_j^-$ ) with probability  $x_j$ . After the iterations, the algorithm reveals all the rounded-down elements and returns an integral feasible solution to the pessimistic LP.

---

<sup>1</sup>This holds for most of applications, and the generalizability to remove this assumption is discussed in Section 4.1.4 with a specific application.

Table 1.1: Results obtained for the adaptive algorithm. We omit factors of  $(1 - \epsilon)$  in the approximation ratio column and  $O(\cdot)$  in the iteration column. Also, all the coefficients are assumed to be  $O(1)$ . For the non-adaptive algorithm, the approximation ratio is halved.

Problem	Approximation Ratio	Iterations
Bipartite Matching	1	$\log(1/\epsilon p)/\epsilon p$
Non-bipartite Matching	1	$\log n/\epsilon p$
$k$ -Hypergraph Matching	$k/(k^2 - k + 1)$	$(k \log(k/\epsilon p) + 1/\epsilon)/\epsilon p$
$k$ -Column Sparse PIP	$1/2k$	$(k \log(k/\epsilon p) + 1/\epsilon)/\epsilon p$
Matroid	1	$\log n/\epsilon p$
Matroid Intersection	1	$\log n/\epsilon p$
Matroid Matching	$2/3$	$\log n/\epsilon p$
$k$ -Matroid Matching	$2/k$	$\log n/\epsilon p$
Degree Bounded Matroid	$1 \left( \begin{array}{l} \text{each constraint is} \\ \text{violated by } +O(1) \end{array} \right)$	$\log n/\epsilon p$
Stable Set in Chordal Graphs	1	$\log n/\epsilon p$
Stable Set in t-Perfect Graphs	1	$(\log n + 1/\epsilon)/\epsilon p$

In application, the performance of these algorithms depends on the combinatorial structure of each specific problem, so our analysis must exploit this structure. Our main contribution is a *proof technique* for analyzing the performance of the algorithms. Using this technique, we obtain results for the problem classes summarized in Table 1.1.

**Technique** Our technique is based on *LP duality* and *enumeration*. A brief overview of the technique follows, where we focus on the adaptive algorithm.

Let  $\mu$  be the optimal value of the *omniscient LP* (in which all  $\tilde{c}_j$  are revealed). Note that  $\mu$  is a random variable depending on the realization of  $\tilde{c}_j$ . Our goal is to show that, after  $T$  iterations, the optimal value of the pessimistic LP is at least  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$  with high probability. Then, if we have an LP-relative  $\alpha$ -approximation algorithm [28] (which outputs an integral feasible solution whose objective value is at least  $\alpha$  times the LP-optimal value), we obtain a  $(1 - \epsilon)\alpha$ -approximate solution to the problem with high probability.

To prove this claim, we consider the dual of the pessimistic LP. By strong duality, it is sufficient to prove that the dual pessimistic LP has no feasible solution whose objective value less than  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$  with high probability.

Here, we introduce a set  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$  of dual vectors, called a *witness cover*, that satisfies the following property: if all  $y \in W$  are infeasible, there is no feasible solution whose objective value is less than  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$ . Intuitively,  $W$  represents all the “candidates” for dual feasible solutions whose objective values are less than  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$ . We evaluate the probability that each  $y \in W$  becomes infeasible after  $T$  iterations, and then estimate the sufficient number of iterations by using the union bound for  $W$ .

### 1.3 Related Work

Our stochastic packing integer programming problem generalizes the *stochastic (unweighted) matching problem* [3, 4, 7] and the *stochastic (unweighted)  $k$ -hypergraph matching problem* [7], which have recently been studied in EC (Economics and Computation) community. These problems are motivated to find an optimal strategy for kidney exchange [15, 30].

For the stochastic unweighted matching problem, Blum et al. [7] proposed adaptive and non-adaptive algorithms that achieve approximation ratios of  $(1 - \epsilon)$  and of  $(1/2 - \epsilon)$ , respectively, *in expectation*, by conducting  $O(\log(1/\epsilon)/p^{2/\epsilon})$  queries per vertex. Their technique is based on the existence of disjoint short augmenting paths. Assadi et al. [3] proposed adaptive and non-adaptive algorithms that achieve the same approximation ratios as the above *with high probability*, by conducting  $O(\log(1/\epsilon p)/\epsilon p)$  queries per vertex. Their technique is based on the Tutte–Berge formula and vertex sparsification. Our proposed algorithms coincide with those of Assadi et al. when they are applied to the stochastic unweighted matching problem, and our analysis looks similar to theirs since they both use duality. However, our analysis is simpler, and can also be used for the weighted and capacitated situation. On the other hand, our analysis shows that  $O(\log(n/\epsilon)/\epsilon p)$  queries per vertex are required, which is worse than their analysis.

Very recently, Assadi et al. [4] proposed a non-adaptive algorithm that achieves an approximation ratio of strictly better than  $1/2$  *in expectation*. However, this technique is tailored to the unweighted matching problem, so we could not generalize it to our problem.

For the stochastic unweighted  $k$ -hypergraph matching problem, Blum et al. [7] proposed adaptive and non-adaptive algorithms that find  $(2 - \epsilon)/k$ - and  $(4 - \epsilon)/(k^2 + 2k)$ -approximate matchings, respectively, *in expectation*, by conducting  $O(s_{k,\epsilon} \log(1/\epsilon)/p^{s_{k,\epsilon}})$  queries per vertex, where  $s_{k,\epsilon}$  is a constant depending on  $k$  and  $\epsilon$ . Their technique is based on the local search method of Hurkens and Schrijver [21]. For the adaptive case, our algorithm has a worse approximation ratio than theirs because the same is true of the LP-based algorithm versus the local search. On the other hand, our algorithm requires an exponentially smaller number of queries and runs in polynomial time both in  $n$  and  $1/\epsilon$ ; In addition, our algorithm can be used for the weighted case. For the non-adaptive case, our algorithm outperforms theirs, all in terms of approximation ratio, the number of queries, and running time.

Other variants of the stochastic packing integer programming problem with queries have been studied. However, many of them employ the *query-commit model* [11, 13, 14, 26], in which the queried elements must be a part of the output. Some studies [1, 5, 10] also impose additional budget constraints on the number of queries. In the *stochastic probing problem* [2, 19, 20], both the queried and realized elements must satisfy given constraints. Blum et al. [8] studied a stochastic matching problem without query-commit condition, but with a budget constraint on the number of queries.

---

**Algorithm 1** Adaptive algorithm.

---

- 1: **for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
  - 2:     Find an optimal solution  $x$  to the optimistic LP.
  - 3:     Reveal  $\tilde{c}_j$  with probability  $x_j$  for each  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .
  - 4: **end for**
  - 5: Find an integral feasible solution  $x$  to the pessimistic LP.
- 

## 1.4 Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe our adaptive and non-adaptive algorithms for the stochastic packing integer programming problem, and explain a general technique for providing a bound on the number of iterations. In Section 3, we outline how to construct a small witness cover. In Section 4, we apply the technique to a variety of specific combinatorial problems. In Section 5, we provide a vertex sparsification lemma that can be used to improve the performance of the general algorithms.

## 2 General Framework

### 2.1 Two Algorithms

To describe our algorithms, we first define two auxiliary problems, the *optimistic LP* and the *pessimistic LP*. We define the *optimistic vector*  $\bar{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$  and the *pessimistic vector*  $\underline{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$  as follows:

$$\bar{c}_j = \begin{cases} c_j & j \text{ has been revealed,} \\ c_j^+ & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \underline{c}_j = \begin{cases} c_j & j \text{ has been revealed,} \\ c_j^- & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $c_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$  denotes the realized value of  $\tilde{c}_j$ . The optimistic and pessimistic LPs are obtained from the original stochastic problem (1.1) by replacing the objective vector  $\tilde{c}$  with  $\bar{c}$  and with  $\underline{c}$ , respectively, and by relaxing the constraint  $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$  to  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ , which is equivalent to  $x \in [0, 1]^m$  under the assumption that  $Ax \leq b$  and  $x \geq 0$  imply  $x \leq 1$ . Note that these problems are no longer stochastic, i.e., contain no random variables.

First, we describe the *adaptive algorithm* shown in Algorithm 1. In this algorithm, we iteratively compute an optimal solution  $x \in [0, 1]^m$  to the optimistic LP, and reveal each  $\tilde{c}_j$  with probability  $x_j$ . After  $T$  iterations, we find an integral feasible solution to the pessimistic LP (by treating it as a non-stochastic version of the original problem).

Next, we describe the *non-adaptive algorithm* shown in Algorithm 2. As with the adaptive algorithm, the algorithm solves the optimistic LP at each step. To be non-adaptive, the algorithm tentatively assigns values to  $\tilde{c}_j$  pessimistically instead of revealing their values. After the iterations, it reveals all these values and then computes an integral feasible solution to the pessimistic LP.

---

**Algorithm 2** Non-adaptive algorithm.

---

- 1: **for**  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  **do**
  - 2:     Find an optimal solution  $x$  to the optimistic LP.
  - 3:     Suppose  $\tilde{c}_j = c_j^-$  with probability  $x_j$  for each  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .
  - 4: **end for**
  - 5:   Reveal all  $\tilde{c}_j$  that have been supposed to be  $c_j^-$  in the process.
  - 6:   Find an integral feasible solution  $x$  to the pessimistic LP.
- 

## 2.2 Performance Analysis

We now analyze the performance of our algorithms. First, we consider the adaptive algorithm (Algorithm 1). Let  $\mu$  be the optimal value of the *omniscient LP*, which is obtained by revealing all  $\tilde{c}_j$  and by relaxing  $x \in \{0, 1\}^m$  to  $x \in [0, 1]^m$ . Note that  $\mu$  is a random variable depending on the realization of  $\tilde{c}_j$ . Our goal is to show that the optimal value of the pessimistic LP after  $T$  iterations is at least  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$  with high probability.

The performance of this algorithm is evaluated by the following three factors.

- (1) *Expected number of revealed entries at Line 3.* If this number is large, the algorithm may reveal all relevant  $\tilde{c}_j$  in a few iterations, and making the algorithm trivial.
- (2) *LP-relative approximation ratio at Line 5.* We only prove that the optimal values of the pessimistic and omniscient LPs are almost the same. This *does not* guarantee that this is also true of the integral optimal values.
- (3) *Required number of iterations  $T$  at Line 1.* If  $T$  is very large then, as in (1), the algorithm may reveal all relevant  $\tilde{c}_j$ , making the algorithm trivial.

Essentially, factors (1) and (2) are properties of the original problem and its LP formulation. Thus, we focus on factor (3) in this study.

To evaluate the number of iterations  $T$ , we consider the dual of the pessimistic LP:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && y^\top b \\ & \text{subject to} && y^\top A \geq \underline{c}^\top, \\ & && y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

By strong duality, it is sufficient to evaluate the probability that the dual LP has no feasible solution whose objective value less than  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$ .

Now we introduce the notion of a *witness cover*, which is the most important concept in this study. Intuitively, a witness cover is a set of “representatives” of all the dual feasible solutions with objective values of at most  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$ .

**Definition 2.1.** A finite set  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$  of dual vectors is an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -*witness cover* for  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$  if it satisfies the following two properties.

1. If all  $y \in W$  are infeasible, the dual pessimistic LP (2.2) has no feasible solutions with objective values of at least  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$ .
2.  $y^\top b \leq (1 - \delta)\mu$  for all  $y \in W$ .

During the iterations, the constraints in the dual pessimistic LP become successively stronger, so each  $y \in W$  eventually becomes infeasible. By evaluating the probability that all  $y \in W$  become infeasible after  $T$  iterations, we obtain a bound on the required number of iterations.

For the non-adaptive algorithm (Algorithm 2), by conducting a similar analysis with a case analysis, we can obtain the required number of iterations with a provable approximation ratio.

The following two are the main theorems in this study. The proofs are given separately in the next section.

**Theorem 2.2.** Suppose that there exists an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -witness cover of size at most  $M^\mu$  for all  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Then, by taking  $T \geq \Delta c \log(M/\epsilon)/\delta p$ , the pessimistic LP at Line 5 of Algorithm 1 has a  $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$ , where  $\Delta c = \max_j (c_j^+ - c_j^-)$ .

**Theorem 2.3.** Suppose that there exists an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -witness cover of size at most  $M^\mu$  for all  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Then, by taking  $T \geq \Delta c \log(M/\epsilon)/\delta p$ , the pessimistic LP at Line 6 of Algorithm 2 has a  $(1 - \epsilon)/2$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$ .

These theorems show that if there exists a small witness cover, Algorithms 1 and 2 will find good solutions in a reasonable number of iterations. It is worth emphasized that we only have to prove the existence of such a witness cover, i.e., we do not have to construct it algorithmically. We discuss how to prove the existence of such witness covers in Sections 3 and 4.

## 2.3 Proofs of Main Theorems

### Proof of Theorem 2.2

Let  $\mu$  be the optimal value of the omniscient LP, and  $W$  be an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -witness cover of size  $|W| \leq M^\mu$ . We first evaluate the probability that each  $y \in W$  is feasible after  $T$  iterations.

**Claim 2.4.** For each  $y \in W$ , the probability that  $y$  is feasible to the dual pessimistic LP (2.2) after  $T$  iterations is at most  $\exp(-\delta\mu p T/\Delta c)$ .

*Proof.* We consider the feasibility of  $y$  at each step. Since some  $\tilde{c}_j$  have newly been revealed, some constraints may be violated. Once  $y$  has become infeasible, it never returns to feasible due to the monotonicity of  $\underline{c}$  throughout Algorithm 1. Therefore,  $y$  is feasible after  $T$  iterations only if all the possibly violated constraints are not revealed to be  $c_j^+$ .



Suppose that  $y$  is feasible at the beginning of a step. We can evaluate the number of possibly violated constraints at this step using the following inequality:

$$\bar{c}^\top x \leq \bar{c}^\top x + y^\top (b - Ax) = y^\top b + (\bar{c}^\top - y^\top A)x. \quad (2.3)$$

Since the optimistic vector  $\bar{c}$  dominates the actual vector  $\tilde{c}$  (irrespective of which values are realized), we have  $\bar{c}^\top x \geq \mu$ . Since  $y \in W$ , we have  $y^\top b \leq (1 - \delta)\mu$ . Therefore,

$$\delta\mu \leq \sum_j (\bar{c}_j - (y^\top A)_j)x_j \leq \Delta c \sum_{j: \text{violated}} x_j, \quad (2.4)$$

where we say that  $j$  is *violated* if  $(y^\top A)_j < c_j$  for the realized value  $c_j$  of  $\tilde{c}_j$ , which is at least  $c_j^+ - \Delta c$ . Since the left-hand side is positive, there must exist possibly violated constraints in the support of  $x$ , and if one of them, say  $\tilde{c}_j$ , is revealed (with probability  $x_j$ ) as  $c_j^+$  (with probability at least  $p$ ), then  $y$  becomes infeasible. To evaluate this probability, let us define

$$X_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{with probability } x_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

Then the probability that  $y$  is still feasible is at most

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{j: \text{violated}} (1 - pX_j) \right] = \prod_{j: \text{violated}} (1 - px_j) \leq \exp \left( -p \sum_{j: \text{violated}} x_j \right) \leq \exp \left( \frac{-p\delta\mu}{\Delta c} \right). \quad (2.6)$$

By repeating this  $T$  times, we obtain the required result.  $\square$

By this claim with the union bound, the probability that  $W$  has at least one feasible solution to the dual pessimistic LP (2.2) after  $T$  iterations is at most  $|W| \exp(-\delta\mu pT/\Delta c)$ , which is at most  $\exp(\mu \log M - \delta\mu pT/\Delta c)$ . By taking  $T \geq \Delta c \log(M/\epsilon)/\delta p$ , the latter value is bounded by  $\epsilon$ . By the definition of witness cover and strong duality, we conclude that the optimal value of the pessimistic LP at Line 5 of Algorithm 1 is at least  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$  with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$ .

### Proof of Theorem 2.3

The following proof is a simple extension of Theorem 5.1 in Assadi et al. [3] for the stochastic matching problem.

Let  $\mu$  be the optimal value of the omniscient LP. In the above analysis of Algorithm 1, it is ensured that there exists a solution  $x$  with  $\bar{c}^\top x \geq \mu$ , which ensured that the last pessimistic LP in Algorithm 1 has an optimal value of at least  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$ . However, in the non-adaptive case, we may not be able to find such a solution because each  $\tilde{c}_j$  is rounded-down.

To overcome this issue, we define  $\mu' \in \mathbb{R}_+$  as the minimum objective value obtained at Line 2 of Algorithm 2. Note that, since the optimal value of the optimistic LP solved at Line 2 is monotonically non-increasing,  $\mu'$  is the objective value obtained at the  $T$ -th step. By using  $\mu'$  instead of  $\mu$  in the proof of Claim 2.4, we obtain the following claim.

**Claim 2.5.** Suppose that there exists an  $(\epsilon, \delta)$ -witness cover of size at most  $M^{\mu'}$  for  $\mu'$ . By taking  $T \geq \Delta c \log(M/\epsilon)/\delta p$  in Algorithm 2, the optimal value of the pessimistic LP is at least  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu'$  with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$ .  $\square$

If  $\mu' \geq \mu/2$ , we can immediately prove the theorem. Thus, we consider the case  $\mu' < \mu/2$ , obtaining the following claim.

**Claim 2.6.** If  $\mu' < \mu/2$ , the optimal value of the pessimistic LP at Line 6 of Algorithm 2 is at least  $\mu/2$ .

*Proof.* We use the subscripts  $R$  and  $N$  to denote the revealed and unrevealed entries in the primal vector, respectively. Let  $x^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  be an optimal solution to the (primal) omniscient LP. Then we have

$$c_R^\top x_R^* + \tilde{c}_N^\top x_N^* = \mu, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $c_R$  denotes  $\tilde{c}_R$  with all entries revealed. Since  $(0, x_N^*) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$  is a feasible solution to the optimistic LP at the last iteration, we have

$$c_N^{+\top} x_N^* \leq \mu' < \mu/2. \quad (2.8)$$

Therefore, the objective value for  $x^*$  in the pessimistic LP at Line 6 is bounded by

$$\underline{c}^\top x^* \geq c_R^\top x_R^* \geq c_R^\top x_R^* + (\tilde{c}_N^\top - c_N^{+\top}) x_N^* > \mu/2, \quad (2.9)$$

where  $\tilde{c}_N \leq c_N^+$  is used. This means that the optimal value of the pessimistic LP is at least  $\mu/2$ .  $\square$

This concludes the theorem.

### 3 Constructing Witness Cover

Our technique requires us to prove the existence of a small witness cover. Here, we describe strategies for constructing small witness covers.

### 3.1 Totally Dual Integral Case

A system  $Ax \leq b$ ,  $x \geq 0$  is *totally dual integral* (TDI) if, for every integral objective vector  $c \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , the dual problem  $\min\{y^\top b : y^\top A \geq c^\top, y \geq 0\}$  has an integral optimal solution  $y \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$  (unless it is infeasible). Note that a TDI system has an integral optimal solution, i.e., it is *integral*. See, e.g., [31] for more detail.

If the system is TDI, we can construct a witness cover by enumerating all possible integral vectors as follows.

**Lemma 3.1.** The following set  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$  is an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ -witness cover for  $\mu > 0$  such that  $|W| = e^{O(\mu \log(1+n/\mu))}$ :

$$W = \{y \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n : y^\top b \leq (1 - \epsilon)\mu\}. \quad (3.1)$$

*Proof.* It is clear that  $W$  is an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ -witness cover for  $\mu$ , so it only remains to evaluate the cardinality of  $W$ . Since  $b \geq 1$ , we have  $\sum_i y_i < \mu$ . If  $\mu \leq 1$ , this holds only for  $y = 0$  and hence  $|W| = 1$ . Otherwise (i.e., if  $\mu > 1$ ),  $|W|$  is at most the number of nonnegative vectors whose entries sum to less than  $\mu$ , which can be counted by distributing  $k$  ( $< \mu$ ) tokens among  $n$  entries, giving

$$|W| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \mu \rfloor} \binom{n+k-1}{k} = \binom{n+\lfloor \mu \rfloor}{\lfloor \mu \rfloor} \leq \left( \frac{e(n+\lfloor \mu \rfloor)}{\lfloor \mu \rfloor} \right)^{\lfloor \mu \rfloor} = e^{O(\mu \log(1+\frac{n}{\mu}))}. \quad \square \quad (3.2)$$

Note that the same counting technique can be used when the system is totally dual  $1/k$ -integral (TDI/ $k$ ), i.e., the existence of a dual optimal solution where each entry is a multiple of  $1/k$  is guaranteed.

### 3.2 Non-TDI Case

If the system is not TDI, we have to deal with fractional dual vectors. To enumerate these fractional vectors, we discretize the dual vectors, requiring the discretization to have the following property: if there exists a feasible  $y$  such that  $y^\top b \leq (1 - \epsilon)\mu$ , there exists a feasible discretized  $y'$  such that  $y'^\top b \leq (1 - \epsilon/2)\mu$ . Here, we consider two possible situations: (1) Dual Sparse Case, and (2) General Case.

**Dual Sparse Case** If there exists a sparse dual optimal solution, we can simply discretize the dual vectors to obtain a good discretized solution as follows.

**Lemma 3.2.** If there exists  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  such that  $y^\top b \leq (1 - \epsilon)\mu$ ,  $y^\top A \geq c$ , and  $|\text{supp}(y)| \leq \gamma\mu$ , then there exists  $y' \in \prod_{i=1}^n (\epsilon/2b_i\gamma)\mathbb{Z}_+$  such that  $y'^\top A \geq c$  and  $y'^\top b \leq (1 - \epsilon/2)\mu$ .

*Proof.* A suitable  $y'$  can be obtained by rounding up the  $i$ -th entry of  $y$  to the next multiple of  $\epsilon/2b_i\gamma$  for each  $i$ .  $\square$

Now that the existence of a discretized dual vector that is almost optimal has been guaranteed, we can construct a witness cover by enumerating all the discretized vectors as follows.

**Lemma 3.3.** Under the assumption given in Lemma 3.2, the following set  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$  is an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon/2)$ -witness cover for  $\mu > 0$  such that  $|W| = e^{O\left(\mu\left(\gamma \log \frac{n}{\gamma\mu} + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right)}$ :

$$W = \left\{ y \in \prod_{i=1}^n (\epsilon/2b_i\gamma)\mathbb{Z}_+ : y^\top b \leq (1 - \epsilon/2)\mu, |\text{supp}(y)| \leq \gamma\mu \right\}. \quad (3.3)$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.2,  $W$  is an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon/2)$ -witness cover for  $\mu$ . We evaluate the cardinality of  $W$  as follows. We first select  $s$  ( $\leq \gamma\mu$ ) entries for the support of  $y$ , and then distribute  $k$  ( $< 2\mu/\epsilon$ ) tokens among these entries, where each token contributes  $\epsilon/2$  to the objective value. In the nontrivial case when  $\gamma\mu > 1$  and  $2\mu/\epsilon > 1$ , the number of these patterns is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |W| &\leq \sum_{s=1}^{\lfloor \gamma\mu \rfloor} \binom{n}{s} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor 2\mu/\epsilon \rfloor} \binom{s+k-1}{k} \\ &\leq \lfloor \gamma\mu \rfloor \left( \frac{en}{\lfloor \gamma\mu \rfloor} \right)^{\lfloor \gamma\mu \rfloor} \lfloor 2\mu/\epsilon \rfloor \left( \frac{e(\lfloor \gamma\mu \rfloor + \lfloor 2\mu/\epsilon \rfloor)}{\lfloor 2\mu/\epsilon \rfloor} \right)^{\lfloor 2\mu/\epsilon \rfloor} \\ &\leq \lfloor \gamma\mu \rfloor \left( \frac{en}{\lfloor \gamma\mu \rfloor} \right)^{\lfloor \gamma\mu \rfloor} \lfloor 2\mu/\epsilon \rfloor e^{\lfloor \gamma\mu \rfloor + \lfloor 2\mu/\epsilon \rfloor} = \exp \left( O \left( \mu \left( \gamma \log \frac{n}{\gamma\mu} + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right) \right) \right). \quad \square \quad (3.4) \end{aligned}$$

**General Case** When the optimal dual solutions are not sparse, the results of simple discretization are useless. However, even in such a case, there is a good discretized solution. Let  $y$  be a feasible dual vector. Then by applying *randomized rounding* [29] to  $y$ , we obtain a suitable discretized vector  $y'$ . Formally, the following theoretical guarantee is obtained.

**Theorem 3.4** (Kolliopoulos and Young [23]). There exists a  $(1+\epsilon/2)$ -approximate solution  $y'$  whose entries are multiples of  $\theta = \Theta\left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{\log m}\right)$ , where  $m$  is the number of constraints for  $y'$ .

We use this theorem as an existence theorem. If there is an optimal dual solution with objective value of at most  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu$ , this theorem shows that there exists a dual feasible solution whose entries are multiples of  $\theta$  with an objective value of at most  $(1+\epsilon/2)(1-\epsilon)\mu \leq (1-\epsilon/2)\mu$ . By enumerating the dual vectors whose entries are multiples of  $\theta$ , we can obtain a witness cover.

**Lemma 3.5.** Let  $\theta = \Theta\left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{\log m}\right)$ . The following set  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$  is an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon/2)$ -witness cover for  $\mu > 0$  such that  $|W| = e^{O\left(\frac{\mu}{\epsilon^2} \log m \log \left(1 + \frac{n}{\mu}\right)\right)}$ :

$$W = \left\{ y \in \theta\mathbb{Z}_+^n : y^\top b \leq (1 - \epsilon/2)\mu \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.4,  $W$  is an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon/2)$ -witness cover for  $\mu$ . We evaluate the cardinality of  $W$  as follows. The number of ways of distributing  $k$  ( $< \mu/\theta$ ) tokens among  $n$  entries is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} |W| &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \mu/\theta \rfloor} \binom{n+k-1}{k} \leq \lfloor \mu/\theta \rfloor \left( \frac{e(n + \lfloor \mu/\theta \rfloor)}{\lfloor \mu/\theta \rfloor} \right)^{\lfloor \mu/\theta \rfloor} \\ &\leq \lfloor \mu/\theta \rfloor e^{\lfloor \mu/\theta \rfloor (1 + \log(1 + n/\lfloor \mu/\theta \rfloor))} = \exp \left( O \left( \frac{\mu \log m}{\epsilon^2} \log \left( 1 + \frac{n}{\mu} \right) \right) \right). \quad \square \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

### 3.3 Exponentially Many Constraints

Some problems, such as the non-bipartite matching problem and matroid problems, have exponentially many constraints. In such cases, it is impossible to enumerate all the candidates naively as we have done in the previous sections.

Sometimes, this difficulty is overcome by identifying the granularity of the dual solution (i.e., TDI, dual sparse, or general), and then bounding the number of possible dual patterns by exploiting the combinatorial structure; see next section for concrete examples.

## 4 Applications

In this section, we demonstrate our proposed framework by applying it to several stochastic packing problems. We only describe the results for the adaptive algorithm (Algorithm 1) as the results for the non-adaptive algorithm (Algorithm 2) can easily be obtained from a similar analysis.

### 4.1 Matching Problems

#### 4.1.1 Bipartite Matching

We first demonstrate how to use our technique for the bipartite matching problem. Let  $(V, E)$  be a bipartite graph and  $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E$  be a stochastic edge weight. The bipartite matching problem can then be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize} && \sum_{e \in E} \tilde{c}_e x_e \\ &\text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in \delta(u)} x_e \leq 1 \quad (u \in V), \\ &&& x \in \{0, 1\}^E, \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\delta(u) = \{e \in E : u \in e\}$ . The König–Egerváry theorem [17, 24] shows that the LP relaxation of this system is TDI, so Algorithm 1 has an approximation ratio of  $(1 - \epsilon)$  with high probability for sufficiently large  $T$ . Moreover, if the algorithm finds an integral

solution to the optimistic problem in Line 2, it reveals  $O(T)$  edges per vertex in total since it reveals a matching in each iteration. Finally, as discussed in Section 3.1, there exists an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ -witness cover of size  $e^{O(\mu \log n)}$  for each  $\mu$ . We can therefore obtain the following result.

**Corollary 4.1.** For the bipartite matching problem, by taking  $T = \Omega(\Delta c \log(n/\epsilon)/\epsilon p)$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a  $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - O(\epsilon)$ .

This result can be improved by using the vertex sparsification lemma in Section 5.

#### 4.1.2 Non-bipartite Matching

Next, we consider the non-bipartite matching problem. Let  $(V, E)$  be a graph and  $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E$  be a stochastic edge weight. The non-bipartite matching problem can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{e \in E} \tilde{c}_e x_e \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in \delta(u)} x_e \leq 1 \quad (u \in V), \\ & && x \in \{0, 1\}^E. \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

It is known that the LP relaxation of this system is TDI/2 (totally dual half-integral) and has an integrality gap of  $3/2$  [31]. Therefore, by the same argument as in the bipartite matching problem, we can show that Algorithm 1 has an approximation ratio of  $(2 - \epsilon)/3$  with high probability if  $T = \Omega(\Delta c \log(n/\epsilon)/\epsilon p)$ .

To improve this approximation ratio, we consider a strengthened formulation by adding the blossom inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{e \in E} \tilde{c}_e x_e \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in \delta(u)} x_e \leq 1 \quad (u \in V), \\ & && \sum_{e \in E(S)} x_e \leq \left\lfloor \frac{|S|}{2} \right\rfloor \quad (S \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{odd}}), \\ & && x \in \{0, 1\}^E, \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

where  $E(S) = \{e \in E : e \subseteq S\}$  and  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{odd}} = \{S \subseteq V : |S| \text{ is odd and at least } 3\}$ . Cunningham and Marsh [12] showed that this system is TDI, so our algorithm has an approximation ratio of  $(1 - \epsilon)$  with high probability for sufficiently large  $T$ . Moreover, the number of revealed edges is  $O(T)$  per vertex since it reveals a matching in each iteration.

The only remaining issue is the number of iterations. Since the system (4.3) has exponentially many constraints, we have to exploit its combinatorial structure to reduce the

number of possibilities. The dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{u \in V} y_u + \sum_{S \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{odd}}} \left\lfloor \frac{|S|}{2} \right\rfloor z_S =: \tau(y, z) \\
& \text{subject to} && y_u + y_v + \sum_{\substack{S \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{odd}}: \{u, v\} \subseteq S}} z_S \geq \tilde{c}_e \quad (e = \{u, v\} \in E), \\
& && y \in \mathbb{R}_+^V, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{V}_{\text{odd}}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

For  $\mu > 0$ , let us define a set  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^V \times \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{V}_{\text{odd}}}$  by

$$W = \left\{ (y, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^V \times \mathbb{Z}_+^{\mathcal{V}_{\text{odd}}} : \tau(y, z) \leq (1 - \epsilon)\mu \right\}. \tag{4.5}$$

It is clear that  $W$  is an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ -witness cover, and we can evaluate the size of  $W$  as follows.

**Claim 4.2.**  $|W| = e^{O(\mu \log n)}$ .

*Proof.* We count the candidates for  $y$  and  $z$  separately.

Since  $\sum_i y_i < \mu$ , the number of candidates for  $y$  is at most

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \mu \rfloor} \binom{n}{k} \leq (\lfloor \mu \rfloor + 1) \binom{en}{\lfloor \mu \rfloor}^{\lfloor \mu \rfloor} = e^{O(\mu \log n)}. \tag{4.6}$$

To count the number of candidates for  $z$ , we regard  $z$  as a multiset, e.g., if  $z_S = 2$  then we think there are two  $S$ . Let  $s_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ) be the size of each set contained in  $z$ . Then we have

$$s_1 + \dots + s_k \leq 3 \left( \left\lfloor \frac{s_1}{2} \right\rfloor + \dots + \left\lfloor \frac{s_k}{2} \right\rfloor \right) < 3\mu. \tag{4.7}$$

Therefore, the number of candidates for  $z$  is given by

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \mu \rfloor} \sum_{\substack{s_1 + \dots + s_k \leq 3\mu \\ s_1, \dots, s_k \geq 3}} \binom{n}{s_1} \cdots \binom{n}{s_k} \leq \sum_k \binom{3\mu + k - 1}{k} n^\mu = e^{O(\mu \log n)}. \tag{4.8}$$

By multiplying the number of candidates for  $y$  and  $z$ , we obtain the required result.  $\square$

Therefore, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.3.** For the non-bipartite matching problem, by taking  $T = \Omega(\Delta c \log(n/\epsilon)/\epsilon p)$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a  $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - O(\epsilon)$ .

The same analysis can be applied to the (simple)  $b$ -matching problem.

**Relationship to the analysis of Assadi et al** Assadi et al. [3] analyzed Algorithms 1 and 2 for the unweighted non-bipartite matching problem using the Tutte–Berge formula. They showed that the required number of iterations is  $O(\log(n/\epsilon\mu)/\epsilon p)$ , and it is reduced to  $O(\text{poly}(p, 1/\epsilon))$  by using the vertex sparsification lemma.

For the unweighted problem, our analysis gives a weaker result than theirs. However, since no simple alternative to the Tutte–Berge formula for the weighted problem is known, our analysis is more general than theirs.

### 4.1.3 $k$ -Hypergraph Matching

Let  $(V, E)$  be a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph, i.e.,  $E$  is a set family on  $V$  whose element  $e \in E$  has size exactly  $k$ . Let  $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E$  be a stochastic edge weight. The  $k$ -hypergraph matching problem can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{e \in E} \tilde{c}_e x_e \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in \delta(u)} x_e \leq 1 \quad (u \in V), \\ & && x \in \{0, 1\}^E, \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where  $\delta(u) = \{e \in E : u \in e\}$ . Chan and Lau [9] proved that the LP relaxation of the above system has an integrality gap of  $\alpha := 1/(k - 1 + 1/k)$ , and they also proposed an LP-relative  $\alpha$ -approximation algorithm. The expected number of revealed hyperedges per vertex is  $O(T)$  since at most one edge per vertex is revealed in expectation due to the constraint  $\sum_{e \in \delta(u)} x_e \leq 1$ .

The only remaining issue is the number of iterations. Since the system (4.9) has polynomially many constraints and is not TDI, we have to discretize the dual variables. The corresponding dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \sum_{u \in V} y_u \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{u \in e} y_u \geq \tilde{c}_e \quad (e \in E), \\ & && y \in \mathbb{R}_+^V. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Here, we show that the dual optimal solution is sparse.

**Claim 4.4.** If the optimal value is less than  $\mu$ , then there exists a dual optimal solution  $y \in \mathbb{R}_+^V$  such that  $|\text{supp}(y)| < k\mu$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^E$  be a primal optimal solution. We can assume that  $x_e > 0$  only if  $\tilde{c}_e \geq 1$ . Therefore, we have  $\sum_e x_e \leq \sum_e \tilde{c}_e x_e < \mu$ . Since each hyperedge consists of exactly



$k$  elements, we have

$$\sum_{u \in V} \sum_{e \in \delta(u)} x_e = k \sum_{e \in E} x_e < k\mu. \quad (4.11)$$

This shows that less than  $k\mu$  inequalities can hold in equality. Therefore, by complementary slackness, the corresponding dual optimal solution  $y$  satisfies  $|\text{supp}(y)| < k\mu$ .  $\square$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.5.** For the  $k$ -hypergraph matching problem, by taking  $T = \Omega(\Delta c(k \log(n/\epsilon) + 1/\epsilon)/\epsilon p)$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a  $(1 - \epsilon)/(k - 1 + 1/k)$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - O(\epsilon)$ .

This result is improved by using the vertex sparsification lemma in Section 5.

**Comparison with Blum et al.** Blum et al. [7] provided adaptive and non-adaptive strategies for unweighted  $k$ -hypergraph matching problem based on local search of Hurkens and Schrijver [21]. Their adaptive algorithm has approximation ratio of  $(2 - \epsilon)/k$  in expectation by conducting a constant number of queries per vertex.

For unweighted problem, our algorithm has a worse approximation ratio than theirs. However, our algorithm has four advantages: it requires exponentially smaller number of queries; it runs in polynomial time both in  $n$  and  $1/\epsilon$ ; it is applied to the weighted problem with the same approximation ratio; and it has a stronger stochastic guarantee, i.e., not in expectation but with high probability.

**Remark 4.6.** For unweighted  $k$ -hypergraph matching problem, Chan and Liu [9] showed that there is a packing LP with an integrality gap of  $2/(k + 1)$ . Note that the rounding algorithm for this LP is not known. Using this formulation, we obtain a  $(2 - \epsilon)/(k + 1)$  approximation algorithm which conducts  $O_{\epsilon,p}(\log^2 n)$  queries and runs in non-polynomial time (i.e., it performs exhaustive search).

#### 4.1.4 $k$ -Column Sparse Packing Integer Programming

The  $k$ -column sparse packing integer programming problem is a common generalization of the  $k$ -hypergraph matching problem and the knapsack problem, and can be represented as follows (the formulation itself just rewrites (1.1) by using the entries of the matrix and of the vectors):

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{j=1}^m \tilde{c}_j x_j \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij} x_j \leq b_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, n), \\ & && x \in \{0, 1\}^m, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where “ $k$ -sparse” means that  $|\{j : a_{ij} \neq 0\}| \leq k$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $a_{ij} \leq b_i$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .

The main difference from the other problems is that the system  $\sum_j a_{ij}x_j \leq b_i$  does not imply  $x_j \leq 1$ . Instead, we have  $x_j \leq w$  where  $w = \min_{i,j} b_i/a_{ij}$ . By modifying Algorithm 1 to reveal each  $x_j$  with probability  $x_j/w$ , we obtain the same approximation guarantee with  $w$  times larger number of iterations.

Parekh [27] proposed an LP-relative  $(1/2k)$ -approximation algorithm for general  $k$  and a  $(1/3)$ -approximation algorithm for  $k = 2$ , which encompasses the *demand matching problem* [32]. The expected number of revealed elements for each constraint  $i$  is  $O(\min\{b_i, kw\}T)$  since we have

$$\sum_{j: a_{ij} \neq 0} x_j \leq \sum_j a_{ij}x_j \leq b_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j: a_{ij} \neq 0} x_j \leq \sum_{j: a_{ij} \neq 0} w \leq kw. \quad (4.13)$$

The only remaining issue is the number of iterations. Using the same approach as for the  $k$ -hypergraph matching problem, we obtain the following result.

**Corollary 4.7.** For the  $k$ -column sparse packing integer programming problem, by taking  $T = \Omega(\Delta cw(k \log(n/\epsilon) + 1/\epsilon)/\epsilon p)$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a  $(1-\epsilon)/(2k)$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - O(\epsilon)$ .

## 4.2 Matroid Problems

### 4.2.1 Maximum Independent Set

Now we apply our technique to matroid-related optimization problems. Let  $(E, \mathcal{I})$  be a matroid on a finite set  $E$ , and let  $r : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be its rank function. A set  $S \subseteq E$  is a *flat* if  $r(S \cup e) = r(S)$  for all  $e \in E \setminus S$ , and the *closure* of  $S \subseteq E$  is the smallest flat containing  $S$ . We assume that the rank of the matroid is relatively small to ensure that Algorithm 1 does not reveal all the elements.

Let  $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E$  be a stochastic weight. The maximum independent set problem can be represented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{e \in E} \tilde{c}_e x_e \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in S} x_e \leq r(S) \quad (S \subseteq E), \\ & && x \in \{0, 1\}^E. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

Edmonds [16] showed that the LP relaxation of the above system is TDI, so our algorithm has an approximation ratio of  $(1-\epsilon)$  with high probability. Moreover, the number of revealed elements is  $O(rT)$ , where  $r = r(E)$  is the rank of the matroid in question.

The only remaining issue is the number of iterations. Since the system has exponentially many constraints, we have to exploit the combinatorial structure of the problem to reduce the number of possibilities. The dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \sum_{S \subseteq E} r(S) y_S \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{S \subseteq E: e \in S} y_S \geq \tilde{c}_e \quad (e \in E), \\ & && y \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2^E}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Since the closure of each  $S \subseteq E$  contributes the objective value by  $r(S)$  and contains all elements in  $S$ , we can restrict the supports of  $y$  to the families of flats. Then, for  $\mu > 0$ , let us define a set  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^{2^E}$  by

$$W = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2^E} : \sum_S r(S) y_S \leq (1 - \epsilon)\mu, \text{ supp}(y) \text{ is a set of flats} \right\}. \tag{4.16}$$

It is clear that  $W$  is an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ -witness cover, and we can evaluate the size of  $W$  as follows.

**Claim 4.8.**  $|W| = e^{O(\mu \log m)}$ .

*Proof.* To evaluate the size of  $W$ , as for the non-bipartite matching problem, we regard  $y$  as a multiset. Let  $r_1, \dots, r_k$  be the sizes of each set in  $y$ . Then we have  $r_1 + \dots + r_k < \mu$ . Since each flat is the closure of some independent set, the number of flats of rank  $r$  is at most the number of independent sets of size  $r$ , which is at most  $\binom{n}{r}$ . Therefore, the number of dual candidates for  $y$  is given by

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \mu \rfloor} \sum_{\substack{r_1 + \dots + r_k \leq \mu \\ r_1, \dots, r_k \geq 1}} \binom{n}{r_1} \dots \binom{n}{r_k} \leq e^{O(\mu \log m)}. \quad \square \tag{4.17}$$

Therefore, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.9.** For the maximum independent set problem on a matroid, by taking  $T = \Omega(\Delta c \log(n/\epsilon)/\epsilon p)$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a  $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - O(\epsilon)$ .

#### 4.2.2 Matroid Intersection

The same technique we used for the matroid maximization problem can also be applied to the matroid intersection problem. Let  $(E, \mathcal{I}_j)$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) be two matroids whose rank

functions are  $r_j: 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ , and let  $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E$  be a stochastic weight. The weighted matroid intersection problem can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{e \in E} \tilde{c}_e x_e \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in S} x_e \leq r_j(S) \quad (S \subseteq E, j \in \{1, 2\}), \\ & && x \in \{0, 1\}^E. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

Edmonds [16] showed that the LP relaxation of the above system is TDI, so our algorithm has an approximation ratio of  $(1-\epsilon)$  with high probability for sufficiently large  $T$ . Moreover, the number of revealed elements is  $O(rT)$ , where  $r$  is the maximum rank of a common independent set in the two matroids.

The only remaining issue is the number of iterations. By the same argument as the matroid maximization problem, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.10.** For the matroid intersection problem, by taking  $T = \Omega(\Delta c \log(n/\epsilon)/\epsilon p)$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a  $(1-\epsilon)$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - O(\epsilon)$

#### 4.2.3 $k$ -Matroid Intersection

Let  $(E, \mathcal{I}_j)$  ( $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ) be  $k$  matroids whose rank functions are  $r_j: 2^E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ , and let  $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E$  be a stochastic weight. The  $k$ -matroid intersection problem can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{e \in E} \tilde{c}_e x_e \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in S} x_e \leq r_j(S) \quad (S \subseteq E, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}), \\ & && x \in \{0, 1\}^E. \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

The important difference between the 2-intersection and  $k$ -intersection ( $k \geq 3$ ) problems is that the latter is NP-hard in the non-stochastic case. Moreover, the LP relaxation of the system is not a kind of TDI.

Adamczyk et al. [2] proposed an LP-relative  $(1/k)$ -approximation algorithm. The expected number of revealed elements is  $O(rT)$ , where  $r$  is the maximum of the ranks of the  $k$  matroids.

The only remaining issue is the number of iterations. Since the LP relaxation of (4.19) is not TDI, we have to discretize the dual variables. Moreover, since we could not prove the dual optimal solution is sparse, we use Theorem 3.4.

For  $\theta = \Theta\left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{\log m}\right)$  and  $\mu > 0$ , let us define a set  $W \subseteq \left(\mathbb{R}_+^{2^V}\right)^k$  by

$$W = \left\{ (y^1, \dots, y^k) \in \left(\theta \mathbb{Z}_+^{2^V}\right)^k : \sum_{j, S} r_j(S) y_S^j \leq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \mu, \text{ all } \text{supp}(y^j) \text{ are sets of flats} \right\}. \tag{4.20}$$

By Theorem 3.4,  $W$  is an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon/2)$ -witness cover, and we can evaluate its size as follows.

**Claim 4.11.**  $|W| = e^{O(\mu k \log^2 m / \epsilon^2)}$ .

*Proof.* To evaluate the size of  $W$ , as for the maximum independent set problem, we count each  $y^j$  separately. As same as the matroid case, we regard  $y^j$  as a multiset in which each set  $S$  contributes  $\theta$ . Let  $r_1, \dots, r_k$  be the size of each set in  $y^j$ . Then we have  $r_1 + \dots + r_k < \mu/\theta$ . By the same argument as for the matroid case, the number of dual candidates for  $y^j$  is at most  $e^{O(\mu \log^2 m / \epsilon^2)}$ . By multiplying the numbers of candidates for the  $k$  coordinates, we obtain the required result.  $\square$

Therefore, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.12.** For the  $k$ -matroid intersection problem, by taking  $T = \Omega(\Delta ck \log^2 m / \epsilon^3 p)$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a  $(1 - \epsilon)/k$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - O(\epsilon)$ .

#### 4.2.4 Matroid Matching

The matroid matching problem is a common generalization of the matching problem and the matroid intersection problem. Let  $(V, E)$  be a graph,  $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^E$  be a stochastic edge weigh, and  $(V, \mathcal{I})$  be a matroid whose rank function is  $r: V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ . The task is to find a maximum-weight subset of edges such that the endpoints form an independent set of the matroid. Vande Vate [34] proposed the following LP formulation:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{e \in E} \tilde{c}_e x_e \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in E} a(S, e) x_e \leq r(S) \quad (S \subseteq V), \\ & && x \in \{0, 1\}^E, \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

where  $a(S, e) = |S \cap e|$ . Gijswijt and Pap [18] showed that the system is TDI/2, and proposed a polynomial-time algorithm for obtaining a fractional optimal solution. A  $(2/3)$ -approximate integral solution can be obtained by rounding this solution by the procedure of Lee, Sviridenko, and Vondrák [25]<sup>2</sup>. The expected number of revealed edges is  $O(T)$  per vertex since  $\sum_{e \in \delta(u)} x_e = \sum_{e \in E} a(\{u\}, e) x_e \leq r(\{u\}) \leq 1$ .

The only remaining issue is the number of iterations. Since it has exponentially many constraints, we have to exploit its combinatorial structure to reduce the number of possi-

---

<sup>2</sup>Lee, Sviridenko and Vondrák [25] proposed a rounding procedure for a slightly different formulation. However, since the solution to the present formulation can be easily converted to the Lee et al.'s formulation, we can use the rounding procedure.

bilities. The dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{S \subseteq V} r(S) y_S \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{S \subseteq V: e \in S} a(S, e) y_S \geq \tilde{c}_e \quad (e \in E), \\
& && y \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2^V}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.22}$$

Since  $a(S, e)$  is monotonically nondecreasing in  $S$ , we can restrict the support of  $y$  to the set of flats. We define a witness cover by

$$W = \left\{ y \in \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{Z}_+^{2^V} : \sum_{S \subseteq V} r(S) y_S \leq (1 - \epsilon) \mu, \text{ supp}(y) \text{ is a set of flats} \right\}. \tag{4.23}$$

By the same argument as for the matroid maximization problem, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.13.** For the matroid matching problem, by taking  $T = \Omega(\Delta c \log(n/\epsilon)/\epsilon p)$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a  $(2 - \epsilon)/3$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - O(\epsilon)$ .

#### 4.2.5 Degree Bounded Matroid

Let  $(V, E)$  be a hypergraph whose maximum degree is  $d = \max_{u \in V} |\delta(u)|$ , and  $b: E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  give a capacity of each hyperedge. Let  $(V, \mathcal{I})$  be a matroid whose rank function is  $r: 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ , and  $\tilde{c} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^V$  be a stochastic weight. The degree bounded matroid problem can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{maximize} && \sum_{u \in V} \tilde{c}_u x_u \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{u \in e} x_u \leq b(e) \quad (e \in E), \\
& && \sum_{u \in S} x_u \leq r(S) \quad (S \subseteq V), \\
& && x \in \{0, 1\}^V.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

Király et al. [22] proposed an algorithm that finds a (possibly infeasible) solution whose objective value is at least the LP optimal value and which violates each capacity constraint by at most  $d - 1$ . The expected number of revealed elements is  $O(rT)$  since  $\sum_{u \in V} x_u \leq r(V)$ .

The only remaining issue is the number of iterations. Since this system has exponentially many constraints, we have to exploit its combinatorial structure to reduce the number

of possibilities. The dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{e \in E} b(e)y_e + \sum_{S \subseteq V} r(S)z_S =: \tau(y, z) \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in \delta(u)} y_e + \sum_{S \subseteq V: u \in S} z_S \geq \tilde{c}_u \quad (u \in V), \\
& && y \in \mathbb{R}_+^E, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}_+^{2^V}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

Since the system is not TDI, we have to discretize the dual variables. We could not prove the sparsity of  $z$  but, by observing the sparsity of  $y$  and using the matroid property, we can see that there exists a good discretization.

**Claim 4.14.** Let  $(y, z) \in \mathbb{R}_+^E \times \mathbb{R}_+^{2^V}$  be an optimal solution to (4.25) with  $\tau(y, z) < \mu$ . Then, there exists a feasible solution  $(y', z')$  with  $\tau(y', z') < (1 - \epsilon/2)\mu$  whose entries are multiple of  $\epsilon/2d$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^V$  be a primal optimal solution. By complementary slackness,  $y_e > 0$  only if the constraint  $\sum_{u \in e} x_u \leq b(e)$  holds in equality. Thus, by summing up, we have

$$\sum_{e: y_e > 0} b(e) = \sum_{e: y_e > 0} \sum_{u \in e} x_u \leq \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{u \in e} x_u \leq d \sum_{u \in V} x_u < d\mu. \tag{4.26}$$

Now we round up each entry of  $y$  to the minimum multiple of  $\epsilon/2d$  to obtain  $y'$ . This increases objective value at most  $(\epsilon/2d) \sum_{e: y_e > 0} b(e) < \epsilon\mu/2$ . Therefore the objective value of  $(y', z)$  is at most  $(1 - \epsilon/2)\mu$ . To discretize  $z$ , we consider the minimization problem with respect to  $z$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{S \subseteq V} r(S)z_S \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{S \subseteq V: u \in S} z_S \geq \tilde{c}_u - \sum_{e \in \delta(u)} y'_e \quad (u \in V).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

This problem is the dual of the maximum independent set problem whose cost vector is a multiple of  $\epsilon/2d$ . Therefore, by the TDIness of the maximum independent set problem, there exists an optimal solution  $z'$  whose entries are multiples of  $\epsilon/2d$ . Thus,  $(y', z')$  is feasible by construction and has an objective value of at most  $(1 - \epsilon/2)\mu$ .  $\square$

As for the other matroid problems, we can assume that  $\text{supp}(z)$  is a set of flats. For  $\mu > 0$ , let us define a set  $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^E \times \mathbb{R}_+^{2^V}$  by

$$W = \left\{ (y, z) \in \frac{\epsilon}{2d} \left( \mathbb{Z}_+^E \times \mathbb{Z}_+^{2^V} \right) : \tau(y, z) \leq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \mu, \text{ supp}(z) \text{ is a set of flats} \right\}. \tag{4.28}$$

By construction,  $W$  is an  $(\epsilon, \epsilon/2)$ -witness cover, and we can evaluate its size as follows.

**Claim 4.15.**  $|W| = e^{O(d\mu \log(n/\epsilon))}$ .

*Proof.* To evaluate the size of  $W$ , we separately count  $y$  and  $z$ . The number of candidates for  $y$  is  $e^{O(d \log(n/\mu) + 1/\epsilon)}$ , which is counted as for Lemma 3.2. The number of candidates for  $z$  is  $e^{O(d\mu \log n/\epsilon)}$ , which is counted as for matroid maximization problem. By multiplying these two numbers of candidates, we obtain  $e^{O(d\mu \log n/\epsilon)}$ .  $\square$

Therefore, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.16.** For the degree bounded matroid problem with maximum degree  $d$ , by taking  $T = \Omega(\Delta c d \mu \log(n/\epsilon)/\epsilon^2 p)$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a  $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate solution that violates each constraint at most  $d - 1$  with probability at least  $1 - O(\epsilon)$ .

### 4.3 Stable Set Problems

#### 4.3.1 Stable Set in Some Perfect Graphs

Finally, we apply our technique to stable set problems. We assume that the stability number  $\alpha$  (maximum size of stable sets) is relatively small to ensure that Algorithm 1 does not reveal all the vertices. By the Turán theorem [33], the average degree is required to be relatively large.

Let  $(V, E)$  be a graph and  $\tilde{c}: V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$  be a stochastic vertex weight. The maximum stable set problem can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{u \in V} \tilde{c}_u x_u \\ & \text{subject to} && x_u + x_v \leq 1 \quad ((u, v) \in E), \\ & && x \in \{0, 1\}^V. \end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

The LP relaxation of this system is half-integral. However, this is not helpful because the number of revealed vertices can be large: there is a solution  $x_u = 1/2$  for all  $u \in V$ , which corresponds to revealing half of the vertices in expectation.

We instead consider the following formulation, which introduces the *clique inequalities*:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \sum_{u \in V} c_u x_u \\ & \text{subject to} && \sum_{u \in C} x_u \leq 1 \quad (C \in \mathcal{C}), \\ & && x_u \in \{0, 1\}^V, \end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of maximal cliques. A graph is *perfect* if the LP relaxation of the above system is TDI. If we assume that the graph is perfect, Algorithm 1 has an approximation ratio of  $(1 - \epsilon)$  with high probability for sufficiently large  $T$ , and the number of revealed vertices is  $O(\alpha T)$  in expectation.



The dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} y_C \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}: u \in C} y_C \geq c_u \quad (u \in V), \\
& && y \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{C}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

If the number of maximal cliques is  $O(n^k)$  for some fixed constant  $k$ , we immediately see that the required number of iterations is  $O(k \log(n/\epsilon)/\epsilon p)$ . A perfect graph may have exponentially many maximal cliques in general, but the following graph classes have at most polynomially many maximal cliques.

- If a graph is chordal, it has only linear number of maximal cliques.
- If a graph has a bounded clique number (i.e., the size of cliques are bounded by a constant  $k$ ), the number of cliques is at most  $\binom{n}{k} = O(n^k)$ . This includes a graph class that can be characterized by forbidden minors and subgraphs.

#### 4.3.2 Stable Set in t-Perfect Graphs

Another tractable graph class for the stable set problem is t-perfect graphs. A graph  $(V, E)$  is *t-perfect* if the relaxation of the following formulation is integral, i.e., it has an integral optimal solution:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{maximize} && \sum_{u \in V} \tilde{c}_u x_u \\
& \text{subject to} && x_u + x_v \leq 1 \quad ((u, v) \in E), \\
& && \sum_{u \in C} x_u \leq \left\lfloor \frac{|C|}{2} \right\rfloor \quad (C \in \mathcal{C}), \\
& && x_u \in \{0, 1\}^V,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  is the set of odd cycles. We assume that the graph is t-perfect. Then, Algorithm 1 has an approximation ratio of  $(1 - \epsilon)$  with high probability for sufficiently large  $T$ , and the number of revealed vertices is  $O(\alpha T)$ .

The only remaining issue is the number of iterations. Since the system is not TDI<sup>3</sup>, we have to discretize the dual variables. We use Theorem 3.4. Let  $\theta = \Theta\left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{\log m}\right)$ . The

---

<sup>3</sup>A graph is *strongly t-perfect* if the system in (4.32) is TDI. Any strongly t-perfect graph is t-perfect, but the converse is open.

---

**Algorithm 3** Vertex sparsification

---

- 1: Assign a random color in  $\{1, \dots, \frac{\beta k^2 s}{2\epsilon}\}$  where  $\beta = \frac{2k \log(1/\epsilon)}{\epsilon^2(1-\epsilon/2k)}$  for each vertex.
  - 2: Return all colorful sets.
- 

corresponding dual problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{minimize} && \sum_{e \in E} y_e + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \left\lfloor \frac{|C|}{2} \right\rfloor \tilde{z}_C \\
& \text{subject to} && \sum_{e \in \delta(u)} y_e + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}: u \in C} z_C \geq \tilde{c}_u \quad (u \in V), \\
& && y \in \mathbb{R}_+^E, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}_+^{\mathcal{C}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.33}$$

We regard  $z_C$  as a multiset in which each odd cycle  $C$  contributes  $\theta$ . Let  $c_1, \dots, c_k$  be the sizes of each odd cycles. We then have  $c_1 + \dots + c_k < \mu/\theta$ . We define the witness cover by

$$W = \left\{ (y, z) \in \theta \left( \mathbb{Z}_+^E \times \mathbb{Z}_+^{2^{\mathcal{C}}} \right) : \sum_{e \in E} y_e + \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \left\lfloor \frac{|C|}{2} \right\rfloor z_C \leq \left(1 - \frac{\epsilon}{2}\right) \mu \right\} \tag{4.34}$$

**Lemma 4.17.**  $|W| \leq e^{O(\mu \log n)}$ .

*Proof.* To evaluate the size of  $W$ , we count  $y$  and  $z$  separately. The number of candidates for  $y$  is clearly  $e^{O(\mu \log m/\theta)}$ , while the number of candidates for  $z$  is bounded by

$$|W| = \sum_{c_1 + \dots + c_k \leq \mu/\theta} (n)_{c_1} \cdots (n)_{c_k} \leq e^{O(\mu \log n/\theta)} \tag{4.35}$$

where  $(n)_c = n(n-1) \cdots (n-c+1)$ . □

Therefore, we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.18.** For the t-stable set problem, by taking  $T = \Omega(\Delta c \log^2 n \log(1/\epsilon)/\epsilon^3 p)$ , Algorithm 1 outputs a  $(1 - \epsilon)$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - O(\epsilon)$ .

## 5 Vertex Sparsification Lemma

### 5.1 Vertex Sparsification Lemma

For the (unweighted) stochastic matching problem, Assadi et al. [3] proposed a procedure called *vertex sparsification*, which reduces the number of vertices proportional to the maximum matching size  $\mu$  while approximately preserving any matchings of size  $\nu = \omega(1)$  with high probability. This procedure is very useful as a preprocessing step for this problem since it makes  $n/\mu = O(1)$ , and so the required number of iterations becomes constant.

Here, we extend this procedure to an independence system on a  $k$ -hypergraph and improve the result to preserve *any* independence set with high probability without assuming  $\nu = \omega(1)$ . In next section, we improve the performances of the algorithms for the bipartite matching problem,  $k$ -hypergraph matching problem, and  $k$ -column sparse packing integer programming problem by using this lemma.

Let  $(V, E)$  be a  $k$ -hypergraph and  $(E, \mathcal{I})$  be an independence system. Let  $r = \max\{|I| : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$  be the rank of the independence system and  $s \geq r$  be an upper bound on  $r$ . Our procedure is shown in Algorithm 3, which is a kind of color coding. It first assigns a random color in  $\{1, \dots, n^\circ\}$  to each vertex, where  $n^\circ = \beta k^2 s / 2\epsilon$  with  $\beta = 2k \log(1/\epsilon) / (\epsilon^2(1 - \epsilon/2k))$ . It then returns all “colorful” hyperedges that consists entirely of differently colored vertices. This yields an independence system on a color class, consisting of  $n^\circ = \Theta(s)$  vertices.

**Lemma 5.1** (Vertex sparsification lemma). Algorithm 3 maps any independent set  $I \in \mathcal{I}$  in the original instance to an independent set of size  $(1 - \epsilon)|I|$  in the sparsified instance with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\nu = |I|$ . We now make the following case analysis.

**Case 1:  $\nu \leq \beta$  (the rank of  $I$  is small).** If all vertices incident to  $I$  have different colors, the size of  $I$  is preserved after the mapping. Since the number of the incident vertices is  $k\nu$ , the probability that this has occurred is at most

$$\frac{n^\circ(n^\circ - 1) \cdots (n^\circ - k\nu + 1)}{n^{\circ k\nu}} \geq \exp\left(-\frac{k^2\nu^2}{2n^\circ}\right) \geq \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon\nu^2}{\beta s}\right) \geq e^{-\epsilon}. \quad (5.1)$$

Here, the first inequality follows from the falling factorial approximation (Lemma 5.2 below), and the second inequality follows from  $\nu \leq s$  and  $\nu \leq \beta$ .

**Lemma 5.2** (Falling Factorial Approximation).

$$\frac{n(n-1) \cdots (n-k+1)}{n^k} \geq \exp\left(-\frac{k^2}{2n}\right). \quad (5.2)$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $\log(1-x) \geq -x/(1-x)$  for all  $x \in (0, 1)$ . The logarithm of the above is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \log\left(1 - \frac{i}{n}\right) \geq -\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{i}{n-i} \geq -\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{i}{n-k} = -\frac{k(k-1)}{2(n-k)} \geq -\frac{k^2}{n}. \quad \square \quad (5.3)$$

**Case 2:  $\nu \geq \beta$  (the rank of  $I$  is large).** We further reduce the number of colors by mapping each color class to  $\{1, \dots, k^2\nu/\epsilon\}$ . We say that a color class  $c$  is *good* if some vertex in color  $c$  is covered by some  $e \in I$ . Let  $X_c = 1[c \text{ is good}]$ . Then  $P(X_c = 1) =$

---

**Algorithm 4** Speedup by vertex sparsification

---

- 1: Estimate the size  $s$  of maximum independent set such that  $\alpha s \leq r \leq s$ .
  - 2: Sparsify the instance by Algorithm 3.
  - 3: Run Algorithm 1 or Algorithm 2.
- 

$1 - (1 - \epsilon/k^2\nu)^{k\nu} \geq 1 - e^{-\epsilon/k}$ . Therefore  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_c X_c] \geq (1 - e^{-\epsilon/k})k^2\nu/\epsilon \geq (1 - \epsilon/2k)k\nu$ . Since  $X_k$  are negatively correlated, we can apply the Chernoff bound:

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\sum X_k \leq (1 - \epsilon/k)k\nu\right) &\leq P\left(\sum X_k \leq (1 - \epsilon/2k)(1 - \epsilon/2k)k\nu\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2k}(1 - \epsilon/2k)\nu\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2k}(1 - \epsilon/2k)\beta\right) \leq \epsilon, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

where the last inequality is the definition of  $\beta$ . Therefore, we obtain at least  $(1 - \epsilon/k)k\nu$  good color classes with high probability.

For each good color class, we select one covered vertex and remove all other vertices. The number of removed vertices is at most  $\epsilon\nu$ , so at most  $\epsilon\nu$  hyperedges in the independent set are removed. The remaining hyperedges form an independent set of size at least  $(1 - \epsilon)\nu$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.3.** The second part is a simple extension of Assadi et al. [3]. Since they only analyzed this case,  $\nu = \omega(1)$  was required.

## 5.2 Usage of Vertex Sparsification Lemma

Here, we describe how to use the vertex sparsification lemma to improve the performance of Algorithms 1 and 2. For simplicity, we only describe the result for Algorithm 1, as Algorithm 2 can be handled using the same argument.

Let  $(V, E)$  be a hypergraph and  $(E, \mathcal{I})$  be an independence system. We consider a stochastic packing integer programming problem on the independence system. We assume the following.

1. There exists an LP-relative  $\alpha$ -approximation algorithm.
2. The number of iterations required to guarantee  $(1 - \epsilon)\alpha$ -approximation with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon$  is bounded by  $h(n/\mu)$ .

The method is shown in Algorithm 4. We first estimate the maximum size  $s$  of the independent sets such that  $\alpha s \leq r \leq s$ , which is computed via LP relaxation. We then apply Algorithm 3 to obtain a sparsified instance, and finally apply Algorithm 1 to obtain a solution. We now analyze the performance of this procedure.

**Theorem 5.4.** The above procedure finds a  $(1 - (1 + c_{\max})\epsilon)\alpha$ -approximate solution with probability at least  $1 - 3\epsilon$  if  $T = \max\{h(\beta k^2/\epsilon p), h(\alpha(\beta k^2/2\epsilon)^2)\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $r^\circ$  be the rank of the sparsified instance, and  $\mu^\circ$  be the optimal value of the sparsified instance. Then, with probability at least  $1 - 2\epsilon$ , we have  $r^\circ \geq (1 - \epsilon)r$  and  $\mu^\circ \geq (1 - c_{\max}\epsilon)\mu$ , where  $r$  is the rank of the original instance and  $\mu$  is the optimal value of the original instance.

By using Algorithm 1, we obtain a solution whose objective value is at least  $(1 - \epsilon)\mu^\circ \geq (1 - (c_{\max} + 1)\epsilon)\mu$ . To evaluate the number of iterations, we make a case analysis under this event.

**Case 1.**  $r^\circ \geq 8\log(1/\epsilon)/p$  (the rank of the sparsified instance is large). Since  $\mu^\circ \geq r^\circ$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[\mu^\circ] \geq pr^\circ$ . Thus, by Chernoff inequality, we have

$$P(\mu^\circ \geq pr^\circ/2) \geq 1 - e^{-pr^\circ/8} \geq 1 - \epsilon. \quad (5.5)$$

In this case,  $n^\circ/\mu^\circ \leq \beta k^2/\epsilon p$ .

**Case 2.**  $r^\circ \leq 8\log(1/\epsilon)/p$  (the rank of the sparsified instance is small). We have  $n^\circ \leq \beta k^2 \alpha r^\circ / (1 - \epsilon) \leq \alpha(\beta k^2 / 2\epsilon)^2$ .  $\square$

The sizes of witness covers of non-bipartite matching,  $k$ -hypergraph matching, and  $k$ -column-sparse packing integer programming depend on  $n/\mu$ . Thus these are improved by using this technique.

**Remark 5.5.** Assadi et al. [3] only analyzed Case 1, so they assumed that  $\mu^* = \omega(1/p)$ . Here, we have successfully removed this assumption.

## References

- [1] Marek Adamczyk. Improved analysis of the greedy algorithm for stochastic matching. *Information Processing Letters*, 111(15):731–737, 2011.
- [2] Marek Adamczyk, Maxim Sviridenko, and Justin Ward. Submodular stochastic probing on matroids. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 41(3):1022–1038, 2016.
- [3] Sepehr Assadi, Sanjeev Khanna, and Yang Li. The stochastic matching problem with (very) few queries. In *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 43–60. ACM, 2016.
- [4] Sepehr Assadi, Sanjeev Khanna, and Yang Li. The stochastic matching problem: Beating half with a non-adaptive algorithm. *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, page To Appear, 2017.
- [5] Nikhil Bansal, Anupam Gupta, Jian Li, Julián Mestre, Viswanath Nagarajan, and Atri Rudra. When lp is the cure for your matching woes: Improved bounds for stochastic matchings. *Algorithmica*, 63(4):733–762, 2012.

- [6] Aharon Gavriel Bege-Dov. Lower and upper bounds for the number of lattice points in a simplex. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 22(1):106–108, 1972.
- [7] Avrim Blum, John P Dickerson, Nika Haghtalab, Ariel D Procaccia, Tuomas Sandholm, and Ankit Sharma. Ignorance is almost bliss: Near-optimal stochastic matching with few queries. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, pages 325–342. ACM, 2015.
- [8] Avrim Blum, Anupam Gupta, Ariel Procaccia, and Ankit Sharma. Harnessing the power of two crossmatches. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 123–140. ACM, 2013.
- [9] Yuk Hei Chan and Lap Chi Lau. On linear and semidefinite programming relaxations for hypergraph matching. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1500–1511. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2010.
- [10] Ning Chen, Nicole Immorlica, Anna R Karlin, Mohammad Mahdian, and Atri Rudra. Approximating matches made in heaven. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 266–278. Springer, 2009.
- [11] Kevin Costello, Prasad Tetali, and Pushkar Tripathi. Stochastic matching with commitment. *Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 822–833, 2012.
- [12] William H Cunningham and AB Marsh. A primal algorithm for optimum matching. *Polyhedral Combinatorics*, pages 50–72, 1978.
- [13] Brian C Dean, Michel X Goemans, and Jan Vondrák. Adaptivity and approximation for stochastic packing problems. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 395–404. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2005.
- [14] Brian C Dean, Michel X Goemans, and J Vondrdk. Approximating the stochastic knapsack problem: The benefit of adaptivity. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 2004. Proceedings. 45th Annual IEEE Symposium on*, pages 208–217. IEEE, 2004.
- [15] John P Dickerson and Tuomas Sandholm. Organ exchanges: A success story of ai in healthcare. 2016.
- [16] Jack Edmonds. Submodular functions, matroids, and certain polyhedra. *Edited by G. Goos, J. Hartmanis, and J. van Leeuwen*, 11, 1970.
- [17] Eugene Egerváry. *On combinatorial properties of matrices*. 1931.
- [18] Dion Gijswijt and Gyula Pap. An algorithm for weighted fractional matroid matching. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 103(4):509–520, 2013.

- [19] Anupam Gupta and Viswanath Nagarajan. A stochastic probing problem with applications. In *International Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 205–216. Springer, 2013.
- [20] Anupam Gupta, Viswanath Nagarajan, and Sahil Singla. Adaptivity gaps for stochastic probing: Submodular and xos functions. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1688–1702. SIAM, 2017.
- [21] Cor A. J. Hurkens and Alexander Schrijver. On the size of systems of sets every t of which have an sdr, with an application to the worst-case ratio of heuristics for packing problems. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 2(1):68–72, 1989.
- [22] Tamás Király, Lap Chi Lau, and Mohit Singh. Degree bounded matroids and submodular flows. *Combinatorica*, 32(6):703–720, 2012.
- [23] Stavros G Kolliopoulos and Neal E Young. Approximation algorithms for covering/packing integer programs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 71(4):495–505, 2005.
- [24] D König. Graphs and matrices. *Math. Fiz. Lapok*, 38:116–119, 1931.
- [25] Jon Lee, Maxim Sviridenko, and Jan Vondrák. Matroid matching: the power of local search. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 42(1):357–379, 2013.
- [26] Marco Molinaro and R Ravi. The query-commit problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1110.0990*, 2011.
- [27] Ojas Parekh. Iterative packing for demand and hypergraph matching. In *International Conference on Integer Programming and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 349–361. Springer, 2011.
- [28] Ojas Parekh and David Pritchard. Generalized hypergraph matching via iterated packing and local ratio. In *International Workshop on Approximation and Online Algorithms*, pages 207–223. Springer, 2014.
- [29] Prabhakar Raghavan and Clark D Tompson. Randomized rounding: a technique for provably good algorithms and algorithmic proofs. *Combinatorica*, 7(4):365–374, 1987.
- [30] Alvin E Roth, Tayfun Sönmez, and M Utku Ünver. Kidney exchange. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(2):457–488, 2004.
- [31] Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, volume 24. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [32] F Bruce Shepherd and Adrian Vetta. The demand-matching problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 32(3):563–578, 2007.

- [33] Paul Turán. On the theory of graphs. In *Colloquium Mathematicae*, volume 3, pages 19–30. Institute of Mathematics Polish Academy of Sciences, 1954.
- [34] John H Vande Vate. Fractional matroid matchings. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 55(1):133–145, 1992.