

Tight Approximation Algorithms for Geometric Bin Packing with Skewed Items

Arindam Khan*

Eklavya Sharma†

Abstract

In the *Two-dimensional Bin Packing (2BP)* problem, we are given a set of rectangles of height and width at most one and our goal is to find an axis-aligned nonoverlapping packing of these rectangles into the minimum number of unit square bins. The problem admits no APTAS and the current best approximation ratio is 1.406 by Bansal and Khan [SODA'14]. A well-studied variant of the problem is *Guillotine Two-dimensional Bin Packing (G2BP)*, where all rectangles must be packed in such a way that every rectangle in the packing can be obtained by recursively applying a sequence of end-to-end axis-parallel cuts, also called *guillotine cuts*. Bansal, Lodi, and Sviridenko [FOCS'05] obtained an APTAS for this problem. Let λ be the smallest constant such that for every set I of items, the number of bins in the optimal solution to G2BP for I is upper bounded by $\lambda \text{opt}(I) + c$, where $\text{opt}(I)$ is the number of bins in the optimal solution to 2BP for I and c is a constant. It is known that $4/3 \leq \lambda \leq 1.692$. Bansal and Khan [SODA'14] conjectured that $\lambda = 4/3$. The conjecture, if true, will imply a $(4/3+\varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for 2BP. According to convention, for a given constant $\delta > 0$, a rectangle is *large* if both its height and width are at least δ , and otherwise it is called *skewed*. We make progress towards the conjecture by showing $\lambda = 4/3$ for *skewed instance*, i.e., when all input rectangles are skewed. Even for this case, the previous best upper bound on λ was roughly 1.692. We also give an APTAS for 2BP for skewed instance, though general 2BP does not admit an APTAS.

1 Introduction

Two-dimensional Bin Packing (2BP) is a well-studied problem in combinatorial optimization. It finds numerous applications in logistics, databases, and cutting stock. In 2BP, we are given a set of n rectangular items and square bins of side length 1. The i^{th} item is characterized by its width $w(i) \in (0, 1]$ and height $h(i) \in (0, 1]$. Our goal is to find an axis-aligned nonoverlapping packing of these items into the minimum number of square bins of side length 1. There are two well-studied variants: (i) where the items cannot be rotated, and (ii) they can be rotated by 90 degrees.

As is conventional in bin packing, we focus on asymptotic approximation algorithm. For any optimization problem, the asymptotic approximation ratio (AAR) of algorithm \mathcal{A} is defined as $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{I: \text{opt}(I)=m} (\mathcal{A}(I)/\text{opt}(I))$, where $\text{opt}(I)$ is the optimal objective value and $\mathcal{A}(I)$ is the objective value of the solution output by algorithm \mathcal{A} , respectively, on input I . Intuitively, AAR captures the algorithm's behavior when $\text{opt}(I)$ is large. We call a bin packing algorithm α -asymptotic-approximate iff its AAR is at most α . An Asymptotic Polynomial-Time Approximation Scheme (APTAS) is an algorithm that accepts a parameter ε and has AAR of $(1 + \varepsilon)$.

2BP is a generalization of classical 1-D bin packing problem [22, 15]. However, unlike 1-D bin packing, 2BP does not admit an APTAS unless $P=NP$ [5]. In 1982, Chung, Garey, and Johnson [13]

*Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru, India. arindamkhan@iisc.ac.in.

†Indian Institute of Science, Bengaluru, India. eklavyas@iisc.ac.in.

gave an approximation algorithm with AAR 2.125 for 2BP. Caprara [9] obtained a $T_\infty (\approx 1.691)$ -asymptotic-approximation algorithm. Bansal, Caprara, and Sviridenko [4] introduced the Round and Approx framework to obtain an AAR of $1 + \ln(T_\infty)$ (≈ 1.525). Then Jansen and Praedel [23] obtained an AAR of 1.5. The present best AAR is $1 + \ln(1.5)$ (≈ 1.405), due to Bansal and Khan [7], and works for both the cases with and without rotations. The best lower bounds on the AAR for 2BP are $1 + 1/3792$ and $1 + 1/2196$ [11], for the versions with and without rotations, respectively.

In the context of geometric packing, guillotine cuts are well-studied and heavily used in practice [38]. The notions of *guillotine cuts* and *k-stage packing* were introduced by Gilmore and Gomory in their seminal paper [20] on cutting stock problem. In *k-stage packing* each stage consists of either vertical or horizontal (but not both) axis-parallel end-to-end cuts, also called guillotine cuts. In each stage, each of the rectangular regions obtained on the previous stage is considered separately and can be cut again by using guillotine cuts. In *k-stage packing*, the minimum number of cuts to obtain each rectangle from the initial packing is at most k , plus an additional cut to trim (i.e., separate the rectangles themselves from waste area). Note that in the cutting process we change the orientation (vertical or horizontal) of the cuts $k - 1$ times. 2-stage packing, also called *shelf packing*, has been studied extensively. In *guillotine packing*, the packing of items in each bin should be *guillotinable*, i.e., items have to be packed in alternate horizontal and vertical stages but there is no limit on the number of stages that can be used. See Appendix A for examples. Caprara et al. [10] gave an APTAS for 2-stage 2BP. Bansal et al. [8] showed an APTAS for guillotine 2BP.

The presence of an APTAS for guillotine 2BP raises an important question: can the optimal solution to guillotine 2BP be used as a good approximate solution to 2BP? Formally, let $\text{opt}(I)$ and $\text{opt}_g(I)$ be the minimum number of bins and the minimum number of guillotinable bins, respectively, needed to pack items I . Let λ be the smallest constant such that for some constant c and for every set I of items, we get $\text{opt}_g(I) \leq \lambda \text{opt}(I) + c$. Then λ is called the Asymptotic Price of Guillotinability (APoG). It is easy to show that $\text{APoG} \geq 4/3$ ¹. Bansal and Khan [7] conjectured that $\text{APoG} = 4/3$. If true, this would imply a $(4/3 + \varepsilon)$ -asymptotic-approximation algorithm for 2BP. However, the present upper bound on APoG is only T_∞ (≈ 1.691), due to Caprara’s HDH algorithm [9] for 2BP, which produces a 2-stage packing.

APTASes are known for some special cases for 2BP, such as when all items are squares [5] or when all rectangles are small in both dimensions [14] (see Lemma 28 in Appendix B). Another important class is *skewed* rectangles. We say that a rectangle is δ -large if, for some constant $\delta > 0$, its width and height are more than δ ; otherwise, the rectangle is δ -skewed. We just say that a rectangle is large or skewed when δ is clear from the context. An instance of 2BP is skewed if all the rectangles in the input are skewed. Skewed instances are important in geometric packing (see Section 1.1). This special case is practically relevant [17]: e.g., in scheduling, it captures scenarios where no job can consume a significant amount of a shared resource (energy, memory space, etc.) for a significant amount of time. Even for skewed instance for 2BP, the best known AAR is 1.406 [7]. Also, for skewed instance, the best known upper bound on APoG is $T_\infty \approx 1.691$.

1.1 Related Works

Multidimensional packing and covering problems are fundamental in combinatorial optimization [12]. Vector packing (VP) is another variant of bin packing, where the input is a set of vectors in $[0, 1]^d$ and the goal is to partition the vectors into the minimum number of parts (bins) such that in each part, the sum of vectors is at most 1 in every coordinate. The present best approximation

¹Consider a set I of items containing $2m$ rectangles of width 0.6 and height 0.4 and $2m$ rectangles of width 0.4 and height 0.6. Then $\text{opt}(I) = m$ and $\text{opt}_g(I) = \lceil 4m/3 \rceil$.

algorithm attains an AAR of $(0.807 + \ln(d + 1))$ [6] and there is a matching $\Omega(\ln d)$ -hardness [34]. Generalized multidimensional packing [27, 31] generalizes both geometric and vector packing.

In two-dimensional strip packing (2SP) [14, 37], we are given a set of rectangles and a bounded width strip. The goal is to obtain an axis-aligned nonoverlapping packing of all rectangles such that the height of the packing is minimized. The best-known approximation ratio for SP is $5/3 + \varepsilon$ [21] and it is NP-hard to obtain better than $3/2$ -approximation. However, there exist APTASes for the problem, for both the cases with and without rotations [28, 24]. In two-dimensional knapsack (2GK) [25], the rectangles have associated profits and our goal is to pack the maximum profit subset into a unit square knapsack. The present best polynomial-time (resp. pseudopolynomial-time) approximation ratio for 2GK is 1.809 [18] (resp. $4/3$ [19]). These geometric packing problem are studied for d -dimensions ($d \geq 2$) [36] as well.

Both 2SP and 2GK are also well-studied under guillotine packing. Seiden and Woeginger [35] gave an APTAS for guillotine 2SP. Khan et al. [29] have recently given a pseudopolynomial-time approximation scheme for guillotine 2GK. Recently, guillotine cuts [33] have received attention due to their connection with the maximum independent set of rectangles (MISR) problem [2]. In MISR, we are given a set of possibly overlapping rectangles and the goal is to find the maximum cardinality set of rectangles so that there is no pairwise overlap. It was noted in [30, 1] that for any set of n non-overlapping axis-parallel rectangles, if there is a guillotine cutting sequence separating αn of them, then it implies a $1/\alpha$ -approximation for MISR.

Skewed instance is an important special case in these problems. In some problems, such as MISR and 2GK, if all items are δ -large then we can solve them exactly in polynomial time. So, the inherent difficulty of these problems lies in skewed instances. For VP, hard instances are again skewed, e.g., Bansal, Eliáš and Khan [6] showed that hard instances for 2-D VP (for a class of algorithms called *rounding based algorithms*) are skewed instances, where one dimension is $1 - \varepsilon$ and the other dimension is ε . Galvez et al. [17] recently studied strip packing when all items are skewed. For skewed instances, they showed $(3/2 - \varepsilon)$ hardness of approximation and a matching $(3/2 + \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm. For 2GK, when the height of each item is at most ε^3 , a $(1 - 72\varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm is known [16].

1.2 Our Contributions

We study 2BP for the special case of δ -skewed rectangles, where $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$ is a constant.

First, we make progress towards the conjecture [7] that $\text{APoG} = 4/3$. Even for skewed rectangles, we only knew $4/3 \leq \text{APoG} \leq T_\infty (\approx 1.691)$. We resolve the conjecture for skewed rectangles, by giving lower and upper bounds of roughly $4/3$ when δ is a small constant.

Specifically, we give an algorithm for 2BP, called `skewed4Pack $_\varepsilon$` , that takes a parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ as input. For a set I of δ -skewed rectangles, we show that when δ and ε are close to 0, `skewed4Pack $_\varepsilon$` (I) outputs a 4-stage packing of I into roughly $4 \text{opt}(I)/3 + O(1)$ bins.

Theorem 1. *Let I be a set of δ -skewed items, where $\delta \in (0, 1/2]$. Then `skewed4Pack $_\varepsilon$` (I) outputs a 4-stage packing of I in time $O((1/\varepsilon)^{O(1/\varepsilon)} + n \log n)$. Furthermore, the number of bins used is at most $(4/3)(1 + 8\delta)(1 + 7\varepsilon) \text{opt}(I) + (8/\varepsilon^2) + 30$.*

A tighter analysis shows that when $\delta \leq 1/16$ and $\varepsilon \leq 10^{-4}$, then `skewed4Pack` has AAR $(76/45)(1 + 7\varepsilon) < T_\infty$, which improves upon the best-known bound on APoG for the general case.

The lower bound of $4/3$ on APoG can be extended to skewed items. We formally prove this in Appendix E. Hence, our bounds on APoG are tight for skewed items. Our result indicates that to improve the bounds for APoG in the general case, we should focus on δ -large items.

Our bounds on APoG also hold when items can be rotated. See Appendix F for details.

Our other main result is an APTAS for 2BP for skewed items. Formally, we give an algorithm for 2BP, called `skewedCPack`, and we show that for every constant $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$ such that the algorithm has an AAR of $1 + \varepsilon$ when all items in the input are δ -skewed rectangles. `skewedCPack` can also be extended to the case where items can be rotated.

The best-known AAR for 2BP is $1 + \ln(1.5) + \varepsilon$. Our result indicates that to improve upon algorithms for 2BP, one should focus on δ -large items.

In Section 3, we describe the `skewed4Pack` algorithm and prove Theorem 1. In Section 4, we describe the `skewedCPack` algorithm and prove that it has an AAR of $1 + \varepsilon$.

2 Preliminaries

Let $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For a rectangle i , its area $a(i) := w(i)h(i)$. For a set I of rectangles, let $a(I) := \sum_{i \in I} a(i)$. An *axis-aligned packing* of an item i in a bin is specified by a pair $(x(i), y(i))$, where $x(i), y(i) \in [0, 1]$, so that i is placed in the region $[x(i), x(i) + w(i)] \times [y(i), y(i) + h(i)]$. A packing of rectangles in a bin is called *nonoverlapping* iff for any two distinct items i and j , the rectangles $(x(i), x(i) + w(i)) \times (y(i), y(i) + h(i))$ and $(x(j), x(j) + w(j)) \times (y(j), y(j) + h(j))$ are disjoint. Equivalently, items may only intersect at their boundaries.

Next-Fit Decreasing Height (NFDH): The NFDH algorithm [14] is a simple algorithm for 2SP and 2BP. We will use the following results on NFDH. We defer the proofs to Appendix B.

Lemma 2. *Let I be a set of items where each item i has $w(i) \leq \delta_W$ and $h(i) \leq \delta_H$. Let there be a bin of width W and height H . If $a(I) \leq (W - \delta_W)(H - \delta_H)$, then NFDH can pack I into the bin.*

Lemma 3. *Let I be a set of rectangular items. Then NFDH uses less than $(2a(I) + 1)/(1 - \delta)$ bins to pack I when $h(i) \leq \delta$ for each item i and $2a(I)/(1 - \delta) + 3$ bins when $w(i) \leq \delta$ for each item i .*

If we swap the coordinate axes in NFDH, we get the Next-Fit Decreasing Width (NFDW) algorithm. Analogs of the above results hold for NFDW.

Slicing Items: We will consider variants of 2BP where some items can be *sliced*. Formally, slicing a rectangular item i using a horizontal cut is the operation of replacing i by two items i_1 and i_2 such that $w(i) = w(i_1) = w(i_2)$ and $h(i) = h(i_1) + h(i_2)$. Slicing using vertical cut is defined analogously. Allowing some items to be sliced may reduce the number of bins required to pack. See Fig. 1 for an example.




Figure 1: Packing two items into a bin, where one item is sliced using a vertical cut. If slicing were forbidden, two bins would be required.

Alamdari et al. [3] explored algorithms for a variant of 2SP where items can be sliced using vertical cuts, which has applications in smart-grid electricity allocation. Many packing algorithms [28, 23, 8] solve the sliceable version of the problem as a subroutine.

3 Guillotinale Packing of Skewed Rectangles

An item is called (δ_W, δ_H) -skewed iff its width is at most δ_W or its height is at most δ_H . In this section, we consider the problem of obtaining tight upper and lower bounds on APoG for (δ_W, δ_H) -skewed items. We will describe the `skewed4Pack` algorithm and prove Theorem 1.

3.1 Packing With Slicing

Before describing `skewed4Pack`, let us first look at a closely-related variant of this problem, called the *sliceable 2D bin packing problem*, denoted as S2BP. In this problem, we are given two sets of rectangular items, \tilde{W} and \tilde{H} , where items in \tilde{W} have width more than $1/2$, and items in \tilde{H} have height more than $1/2$. \tilde{W} is called the set of wide items and \tilde{H} is called the set of tall items. We are allowed to *slice* items in \tilde{W} using horizontal cuts and slice items in \tilde{H} using vertical cuts, and our task is to pack $\tilde{W} \cup \tilde{H}$ into the minimum number of bins without rotating the items. See Fig. 2 for an example that illustrates the difference between 2BP and S2BP.




Figure 2: Example illustrating 2BP vs. S2BP. There are 2 wide items (\tilde{W}) and 2 tall items (\tilde{H}). The items are squares of side length 0.6 and the bins are squares of side length 1.

We first describe a simple $4/3$ -asymptotic-approximation algorithm for S2BP, called `greedyPack`, that outputs a 2-stage packing. Later, we will show how to use `greedyPack` to design `skewed4Pack`.


We assume that the bin is a square of side length 1. Since we can slice items, we allow items in \tilde{W} to have height more than 1 and items in \tilde{H} to have width more than 1.

For $X \subseteq \tilde{W}$, $Y \subseteq \tilde{H}$, define $\text{hsum}(X) := \sum_{i \in X} h(i)$; $\text{wsum}(Y) := \sum_{i \in Y} w(i)$; $\text{wmax}(X) := \max_{i \in X} w(i)$ if $X \neq \emptyset$, and 0 if $X = \emptyset$; $\text{hmax}(Y) := \max_{i \in Y} h(i)$ if $Y \neq \emptyset$, and 0 if $Y = \emptyset$.


In the algorithm `greedyPack`(\tilde{W}, \tilde{H}), we first sort items \tilde{W} in decreasing order of width and sort items \tilde{H} in decreasing order of height. Suppose $\text{hsum}(\tilde{W}) \geq \text{wsum}(\tilde{H})$. Let X be the largest prefix of \tilde{W} of total height at most 1, i.e., if $\text{hsum}(\tilde{W}) > 1$, then X is a prefix of \tilde{W} such that $\text{hsum}(X) = 1$ (slice items if needed), and $X = \tilde{W}$ otherwise. Pack X into a bin such that the items touch the right edge of the bin. Then we pack the largest possible prefix of \tilde{H} into the empty rectangular region of width $1 - \text{wmax}(X)$ in the left side of the bin. We call this a type-1 bin. See Fig. 3a for an example. If $\text{hsum}(\tilde{W}) < \text{wsum}(\tilde{H})$, we proceed analogously in a coordinate-swapped way, i.e., we first pack tall items in the bin and then pack wide items in the remaining space. Call this bin a type-2 bin. We pack the rest of the items into bins in the same way.

Claim 4. `greedyPack`(\tilde{W}, \tilde{H}) outputs a 2-stage packing of $\tilde{W} \cup \tilde{H}$. It runs in $O(m + |\tilde{W}| \log |\tilde{W}| + |\tilde{H}| \log |\tilde{H}|)$ time, where m is the number of bins used. Furthermore, it slices items in \tilde{W} by making at most $m - 1$ horizontal cuts and slices items in \tilde{H} by making at most $m - 1$ vertical cuts.

Since items in \tilde{W} have width more than $1/2$, no two items can be placed side-by-side. Hence, $\lceil \text{hsum}(\tilde{W}) \rceil = \text{opt}(\tilde{W}) \leq \text{opt}(\tilde{W} \cup \tilde{H})$. Similarly, $\lceil \text{wsum}(\tilde{H}) \rceil \leq \text{opt}(\tilde{W} \cup \tilde{H})$. So, if all bins have



(a) A type-1 bin produced by `greedyPack`. Wide items are packed on the right. Tall items are packed on the left.



(b) A type-2 bin produced by `greedyPack`. Tall items are packed above. Wide items are packed below.

Figure 3: Examples of type-1 and type-2 bins produced by `greedyPack`.

the same type, `greedyPack` uses $\max(\lceil \text{hsum}(\widetilde{W}) \rceil, \lceil \text{wsum}(\widetilde{H}) \rceil) = \text{opt}(\widetilde{W} \cup \widetilde{H})$ bins. We will now focus on the case where some bins have type 1 and some have type 2.

Definition 1. In a type-1 bin, let X and Y be the wide and tall items, respectively. The bin is called full iff $\text{hsum}(X) = 1$ and $\text{wsum}(Y) = 1 - \text{wmax}(X)$. Define fullness for type-2 bins analogously.

We first show that full bins pack items of a large total area, and then we show that if some bins have type 1 and some bins have type 2, then there can be at most 2 non-full bins. This will help us get an upper-bound on the number of bins used by `greedyPack`($\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{H}$) in terms of $a(\widetilde{W} \cup \widetilde{H})$.

Lemma 5. Let there be m_1 type-1 full bins. Let J_1 be the items in them. Then $m_1 \leq 4a(J_1)/3 + 1/3$.

Proof. In the j^{th} full bin of type 1, let X_j be the items from \widetilde{W} and Y_j be the items from \widetilde{H} . Let $\ell_j := \text{wmax}(X_j)$ if $j \leq m_1$ and $\ell_{m_1+1} := 1/2$. Since all items have their larger dimension more than $1/2$, $\ell_j \geq 1/2$ and $\text{hmax}(Y_j) > 1/2$, for any $j \in [m_1]$.

$a(X_j) \geq \ell_{j+1}$, since X_j has height 1 and width at least ℓ_{j+1} . $a(Y_j) \geq (1 - \ell_j)/2$, since Y_j has width $1 - \ell_j$ and height more than $1/2$. Therefore, $a(J_1) = \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} (a(X_j) + a(Y_j)) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} (\ell_{j+1} + (1 - \ell_j)/2) \geq \sum_{j=1}^{m_1} ((\ell_{j+1}/2) + (1/4) + (1/2) - (\ell_j/2)) = (3m_1/4) + (1/4) - (\ell_1/2) \geq (3m_1 - 1/4)$. In the above inequalities, we used that $\ell_{j+1} \geq 1/2$ and $\ell_1 \leq 1$.

Therefore, $m_1 \leq 4a(J_1)/3 + 1/3$. □

An analog of Lemma 5 can be proven for type-2 bins. Note that Lemma 5 implies that the average area of full bins is close to $3/4$. It is possible for an individual full bin to have area close to $1/2$, but the number of such bins is small, due to the telescopic sum in Lemma 5.

Let m be the number of bins used by `greedyPack`($\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{H}$). After j bins have been packed, let A_j be the height of the remaining items in \widetilde{W} and B_j be the width of the remaining items in \widetilde{H} . Let t_j be the type of the j^{th} bin (1 for type-1 bin and 2 for type-2 bin). So $t_j = 1 \iff A_{j-1} \geq B_{j-1}$.

We first show that $|A_{j-1} - B_{j-1}| \leq 1 \implies |A_j - B_j| \leq 1$. This means that once the difference between $\text{hsum}(\widetilde{W})$ and $\text{wsum}(\widetilde{H})$ becomes at most 1, it continues to stay at most 1. Next, we show that $t_j \neq t_{j+1} \implies |A_{j-1} - B_{j-1}| \leq 1$. This means that if some bins have type 1 and some have type 2, then the difference between $\text{hsum}(\widetilde{W})$ and $\text{wsum}(\widetilde{H})$ will eventually become at most 1. In the first non-full bin, we will use up all the wide items or the tall items. We will show that the remaining items have total height or total width at most 1, so we can have at most 1 more non-full bin. Hence, there can be at most 2 non-full bins when we have both type-1 and type-2 bins.

In the j^{th} bin, let a_j be the height of items from \widetilde{W} and b_j be the width of items from \widetilde{H} . Hence, for all $j \in [m]$, $A_{j-1} = A_j + a_j$ and $B_{j-1} = B_j + b_j$.

Lemma 6. $|A_{j-1} - B_{j-1}| \leq 1 \implies |A_j - B_j| \leq 1$.

Proof. W.l.o.g., assume $A_{j-1} \geq B_{j-1}$. So, $t_j = 1$. Suppose $a_j < b_j$. Then $a_j < 1$, so we used up \widetilde{W} in the j^{th} bin. Therefore, $A_j = 0 \implies A_{j-1} = a_j < b_j \leq b_j + B_j = B_{j-1}$, which contradicts. Hence, $a_j \geq b_j$. As $0 \leq (A_{j-1} - B_{j-1}), (a_j - b_j) \leq 1$, we get $A_j - B_j = (A_{j-1} - B_{j-1}) - (a_j - b_j) \in [-1, 1]$. \square

Lemma 7. $t_j \neq t_{j+1} \implies |A_{j-1} - B_{j-1}| \leq 1$.

Proof. W.l.o.g., assume $t_j = 1$ and $t_{j+1} = 2$. Then

$$A_{j-1} \geq B_{j-1} \text{ and } A_j < B_j \implies B_{j-1} \leq A_{j-1} < B_{j-1} + a_j - b_j \implies A_{j-1} - B_{j-1} \in [0, 1]. \quad \square$$

Lemma 8. *If all bins don't have the same type, then there can be at most 2 non-full bins.*

Proof. Let there be p full bins. Assume w.l.o.g. that in the $(p+1)^{\text{th}}$ bin, we used up all items from \widetilde{W} but not \widetilde{H} . Hence, $A_{p+1} = 0$ and $\forall i \geq p+2, t_i = 2$. Since all bins don't have the same type, $\exists k \leq p+1$ such that $t_k = 1$ and $t_{k+1} = 2$. By Lemmas 6 and 7, we get $|A_{p+1} - B_{p+1}| \leq 1$, implying $B_{p+1} \leq 1$. Hence, the $(p+1)^{\text{th}}$ bin will use up all tall items, implying at most 2 non-full bins. \square

Theorem 9. *The number of bins m used by `greedyPack` is at most*
 $\max\left(\lceil \text{hsum}(\widetilde{W}) \rceil, \lceil \text{wsum}(\widetilde{H}) \rceil, \frac{4}{3}a(\widetilde{W} \cup \widetilde{H}) + \frac{8}{3}\right)$.

Proof. If all bins have the same type, then $m \leq \max(\lceil \text{hsum}(\widetilde{W}) \rceil, \lceil \text{wsum}(\widetilde{H}) \rceil)$.

Let there be m_1 (resp. m_2) full bins of type 1 (resp. type 2) and let J_1 (resp. J_2) be the items inside those bins. Then by Lemma 5, we get $m_1 \leq 4a(J_1)/3 + 1/3$ and $m_2 \leq 4a(J_2)/3 + 1/3$. Hence, $m_1 + m_2 \leq 4a(\widetilde{W} \cup \widetilde{H})/3 + 2/3$. If all bins don't have the same type, then by Lemma 8, there can be at most 2 non-full bins, so `greedyPack`($\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{H}$) uses at most $4a(\widetilde{W} \cup \widetilde{H})/3 + 8/3$ bins. \square

3.2 The skewed4Pack Algorithm

We now return to the 2BP problem. `skewed4Pack` is an algorithm for 2BP takes as input a set I of rectangular items and a parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ where $\varepsilon^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. It outputs a 4-stage bin packing of I . `skewed4Pack` has the following outline:

- A. Use linear grouping [15, 28] to round up the width or height of each item in I . This gives us a new instance \widehat{I} .
- B. Pack \widehat{I} into $1/\varepsilon^2 + 1$ shelves, after possibly *slicing* some items. Each shelf is a rectangular region with width or height more than $1/2$ and is fully packed, i.e., the total area of items in a shelf equals the area of the shelf. If we treat each shelf as an item, we get a new instance \widetilde{I} .
- C. Compute a packing of \widetilde{I} into bins, after possibly slicing some items, using `greedyPack`.
- D. Pack most of the items of I into the shelves in the bins. We will prove that the remaining items have very small area, so they can be packed separately using NFDH.

A. Item Classification and Rounding. Define $W := \{i \in I : h(i) \leq \delta_H\}$ and $H := I - W$. Items in W are called *wide* and items in H are called *tall*. Let $W^{(L)} := \{i \in W : w(i) > \varepsilon\}$ and $W^{(S)} := W - W^{(L)}$. Similarly, let $H^{(L)} := \{i \in H : h(i) > \varepsilon\}$ and $H^{(S)} := H - H^{(L)}$.

We will now use *linear grouping* [15, 28] to round up the widths of items $W^{(L)}$ and the heights of items $H^{(L)}$ to get items $\widehat{W}^{(L)}$ and $\widehat{H}^{(L)}$, respectively. By Claim 29 in Appendix C, items in $\widehat{W}^{(L)}$ have at most $1/\varepsilon^2$ distinct widths and items in $\widehat{H}^{(L)}$ have at most $1/\varepsilon^2$ distinct heights.

Let $\widehat{W} := \widehat{W}^{(L)} \cup W^{(S)}$, $\widehat{H} := \widehat{H}^{(L)} \cup H^{(S)}$, and $\widehat{I} := \widehat{W} \cup \widehat{H}$. Let $\text{fopt}(\widehat{I})$ be the minimum number of bins needed to pack \widehat{I} , where items in $\widehat{W}^{(L)}$ can be sliced using horizontal cuts, items in

$\widehat{H}^{(L)}$ can be sliced using vertical cuts, and items in $W^{(S)} \cup H^{(S)}$ can be sliced using both vertical and horizontal cuts. Then the following lemma follows from Lemma 30 in Appendix C.

Lemma 10. $\text{fopt}(\widehat{I}) < (1 + \varepsilon) \text{opt}(I) + 2$.

B. Creating Shelves. We will use ideas from Kenyon and Rémila’s 2SP algorithm [28] to pack \widehat{I} into *shelves*. Roughly, we solve a linear program to compute an optimal strip packing of \widehat{W} , where the packing is 3-stage. The first stage of cuts gives us shelves and the second stage gives us containers. From each shelf, we trim off space that doesn’t belong to any container. See Appendix D.1 for details. Let \widetilde{W} be the shelves thus obtained. Analogously, we can pack items \widehat{H} into shelves \widetilde{H} . Shelves in \widetilde{W} are called *wide shelves* and shelves in \widetilde{H} are called *tall shelves*. Let $\widetilde{I} := \widetilde{W} \cup \widetilde{H}$. We can interpret each shelf in \widetilde{I} as a rectangular item. We allow slicing \widetilde{W} and \widetilde{H} using horizontal cuts and vertical cuts, respectively. In Appendix D.1, we prove the following facts.

Lemma 11. \widetilde{I} has the following properties: (a) $|\widetilde{W}| \leq 1 + 1/\varepsilon^2$ and $|\widetilde{H}| \leq 1 + 1/\varepsilon^2$; (b) Items in \widetilde{W} have width more than $1/2$ and items in \widetilde{H} have height more than $1/2$; (c) $a(\widetilde{I}) = a(\widehat{I})$; (d) $\max(\lceil \text{hsum}(\widetilde{W}) \rceil, \lceil \text{wsum}(\widetilde{H}) \rceil) \leq \text{fopt}(\widehat{I})$.

C. Packing Shelves Into Bins. So far, we have packed \widehat{I} into shelves \widetilde{W} and \widetilde{H} . We will now use $\text{greedyPack}(\widetilde{W}, \widetilde{H})$ to pack the shelves into bins. By Claim 4, we get a 2-stage packing of $\widetilde{W} \cup \widetilde{H}$ into m bins, where we make at most $m - 1$ horizontal cuts in \widetilde{W} and at most $m - 1$ vertical cuts in \widetilde{H} . The horizontal cuts (resp. vertical cuts) increase the number of wide shelves (resp. tall shelves) from at most $1 + 1/\varepsilon^2$ to at most $m + 1/\varepsilon^2$. By Theorem 9, Lemma 11(d) and Lemma 11(c), we get $m \leq \max(\lceil \text{hsum}(\widetilde{W}) \rceil, \lceil \text{wsum}(\widetilde{H}) \rceil, \frac{4}{3}a(\widetilde{I}) + \frac{8}{3}) \leq \frac{4}{3} \text{fopt}(\widehat{I}) + \frac{8}{3}$.

D. Packing Items Into Containers. So far, we have a packing of shelves into m bins, where the shelves contain slices of items \widehat{I} . We will now repack a large subset of the items \widehat{I} into the shelves without slicing them. See Fig. 4 for an example output. We will do this using a standard greedy algorithm. See Appendix D.2 for details of the algorithm and proof of the following lemma.




Figure 4: A type-1 bin in the packing of \widehat{I} computed by skewed4Pack . The packing contains 5 tall containers in 2 tall shelves and 18 wide containers in 8 wide shelves.

Lemma 12. Let P be a packing of \widetilde{I} into m bins, where we sliced wide shelves by making at most $m - 1$ horizontal cuts and sliced tall shelves by making at most $m - 1$ vertical cuts. Then we can (non-fractionally) pack a large subset of items \widehat{I} into the shelves in P such that the unpacked items

(also called discarded items) from \widehat{W} have area less than $\varepsilon \text{hsum}(\widehat{W}) + \delta_H(1 + \varepsilon)(m + 1/\varepsilon^2)$, and the unpacked items from \widehat{H} have area less than $\varepsilon \text{wsum}(\widehat{H}) + \delta_W(1 + \varepsilon)(m + 1/\varepsilon^2)$.

We will pack the wide discarded items into new bins using NFDH and pack the tall discarded items into new bins using NFDW.

Finally, we prove the performance guarantee of $\text{skewed4Pack}_\varepsilon(I)$.

Lemma 13. *Let I be a set of (δ_W, δ_H) -skewed items. Then $\text{skewed4Pack}_\varepsilon(I)$ outputs a 4-stage packing of I in time $O((1/\varepsilon)^{O(1/\varepsilon)} + n \log n)$ and uses less than $\alpha(1 + \varepsilon) \text{opt}(I) + 2\beta$ bins, where $\Delta := \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\delta_H}{1-\delta_H} + \frac{\delta_W}{1-\delta_W} \right)$, $\alpha := \frac{4}{3}(1 + 4\Delta)(1 + 3\varepsilon)$, $\beta := \frac{2\Delta(1+\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{10}{3} + \frac{19\Delta}{3} + \frac{16\Delta\varepsilon}{3}$.*

Proof. The discarded items are packed using NFDH or NFDW, which output a 2-stage packing. Since greedyPack outputs a 2-stage packing of the shelves and the packing of items into the shelves is a 2-stage packing, the bin packing of non-discarded items is a 4-stage packing. The time taken by skewed4Pack is at most $O((1/\varepsilon)^{O(1/\varepsilon)} + n \log n)$.

Suppose greedyPack uses at most m bins. Then by Theorem 9, $m \leq 4 \text{fopt}(\widehat{I})/3 + 8/3$. Let W^d and H^d be the items discarded from W and H , respectively. By Lemma 12 and Lemma 11(d), $a(W^d) < \varepsilon \text{fopt}(\widehat{I}) + \delta_H(1 + \varepsilon)(m + 1/\varepsilon^2)$ and $a(H^d) < \varepsilon \text{fopt}(\widehat{I}) + \delta_W(1 + \varepsilon)(m + 1/\varepsilon^2)$.

By Lemma 3, the number of bins used by $\text{skewed4Pack}_\varepsilon(I)$ is less than $m + \frac{2a(W^d)+1}{1-\delta_H} + \frac{2a(H^d)+1}{1-\delta_W} \leq (1 + 4\Delta(1 + \varepsilon))m + 4\varepsilon(1 + \Delta) \text{fopt}(\widehat{I}) + 2(1 + \Delta) + 4\Delta(1 + \varepsilon)/\varepsilon^2 \leq \alpha \text{fopt}(\widehat{I}) + 2(\beta - 1) < \alpha(1 + \varepsilon) \text{opt}(I) + 2\beta$. The last inequality follows from Lemma 10. \square

Now we conclude with the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. This is a simple corollary of Lemma 13, where $\delta \leq 1/2$ gives us $\Delta \leq 2\delta$, $\alpha(1 + \varepsilon) \leq (4/3)(1 + 8\delta)(1 + 7\varepsilon)$, and $\beta \leq 4/\varepsilon^2 + 15$. \square

4 Almost-Optimal Bin Packing of Skewed Rectangles

In this section, we will describe the algorithm skewedCPack . skewedCPack takes as input a set I of items and a parameter $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$, where $\varepsilon^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. We will prove that skewedCPack has AAR $1 + 20\varepsilon$ when δ is sufficiently small. skewedCPack works roughly as follows:

1. Invoke the subroutine $\text{round}(I)$ (described in Section 4.1). $\text{round}(I)$ returns a pair $(\widetilde{I}, I_{\text{med}})$. Here I_{med} , called the set of *medium items*, has low total area, so we can pack it in a small number of bins. \widetilde{I} , called the set of *rounded items*, is obtained by rounding up the width or height of each item in $I - I_{\text{med}}$, so that \widetilde{I} has special properties that help us pack it easily.
2. Compute the optimal *fractional compartmental* bin packing of \widetilde{I} (we will define *compartmental* and *fractional* later).
3. Use this packing of \widetilde{I} to obtain a packing of I that uses slightly more number of bins.

To bound the AAR of skewedCPack , we will prove a structural theorem in Section 4.2, i.e., we will prove that the optimal fractional compartmental packing of \widetilde{I} uses close to $\text{opt}(I)$ bins.

4.1 Classifying and Rounding Items

We now describe the algorithm `round` and show that its output satisfies important properties.

First, we will find a set $I_{\text{med}} \subseteq I$ and positive constants ε_1 and ε_2 such that $a(I_{\text{med}}) \leq \varepsilon a(I)$, $\varepsilon_2 \ll \varepsilon_1$, and $I - I_{\text{med}}$ is $(\varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_1]$ -free, i.e., no item in $I - I_{\text{med}}$ has its width or height in the interval $(\varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_1]$. Then we can remove I_{med} from I and pack it separately into a small number of bins using NFDH. We will see that the $(\varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_1]$ -freeness of $I - I_{\text{med}}$ will help us pack $I - I_{\text{med}}$ efficiently. Specifically, we require $\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon$, $\varepsilon_1^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\varepsilon_2 = f(\varepsilon_1)$, where $f(x) := \frac{\varepsilon x}{104(1+1/(\varepsilon x))^{2/x-2}}$. We explain this choice of f in Appendix G.6. Intuitively, such an f ensures that $\varepsilon_2 \ll \varepsilon_1$ and $\varepsilon_2^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. For `skewedCPack` to work, we require $\delta \leq \varepsilon_2$. Finding such an I_{med} and ε_1 is a standard technique [23, 7], so we defer the details to Appendix G.1.

Next, we classify the items in $I - I_{\text{med}}$ into three disjoint classes:

- Wide items: $W := \{i \in I : w(i) > \varepsilon_1 \text{ and } h(i) \leq \varepsilon_2\}$.
- Tall items: $H := \{i \in I : w(i) \leq \varepsilon_2 \text{ and } h(i) > \varepsilon_1\}$.
- Small items: $S := \{i \in I : w(i) \leq \varepsilon_2 \text{ and } h(i) \leq \varepsilon_2\}$.

We will now use *linear grouping* [15, 28] to round up the widths of items W and the heights of items H to get items \widetilde{W} and \widetilde{H} , respectively. By Claim 29 in Appendix C, items in \widetilde{W} have at most $1/(\varepsilon\varepsilon_1)$ distinct widths and items in \widetilde{H} have at most $1/(\varepsilon\varepsilon_1)$ distinct heights. Let $\widetilde{I} := \widetilde{W} \cup \widetilde{H} \cup S$.

Definition 2 (Fractional packing). *Suppose we are allowed to slice wide items in \widetilde{I} using horizontal cuts, slice tall items in \widetilde{I} using vertical cuts and slice small items in \widetilde{I} using both horizontal and vertical cuts. For any $\widetilde{X} \subseteq \widetilde{I}$, a bin packing of the slices of \widetilde{X} is called a fractional packing of \widetilde{X} . The optimal fractional packing of \widetilde{X} is denoted by $\text{fopt}(\widetilde{X})$.*

Lemma 14. $\text{fopt}(\widetilde{I}) < (1 + \varepsilon) \text{opt}(I) + 2$.

Proof. Directly follows from Lemma 30 in Appendix C. □

4.2 Structural Theorem

We will now define compartmental packing and prove the structural theorem, which says that the number of bins in the optimal fractional compartmental packing of \widetilde{I} is roughly equal to $\text{fopt}(\widetilde{I})$.

We first show how to *discretize* a packing, i.e., we show that given a fractional packing of items in a bin, we can remove a small fraction of tall and small items and shift the remaining items leftwards so that the left and right edges of each wide item belong to a constant-sized set \mathcal{T} , where $|\mathcal{T}| \leq (1 + 1/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1)^{2/\varepsilon_1-2}$. Next, we define *compartmental* packing and show how to convert a discretized packing to a compartmental packing.

For any rectangle i packed in a bin, let $x_1(i)$ and $x_2(i)$ denote the x -coordinates of its left and right edges, respectively, and let $y_1(i)$ and $y_2(i)$ denote the y -coordinates of its bottom and top edges, respectively. Let R be the set of distinct widths of items in \widetilde{W} . Given the way we rounded items, $|R| \leq 1/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1$. Recall that $\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1/2$ and $\varepsilon_1^{-1}, \varepsilon^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 15. *Given a fractional packing of items $\widetilde{J} \subseteq \widetilde{I}$ into a bin, we can remove tall and small items of total area less than ε and shift some of the remaining items to the left such that for every wide item i , we get $x_1(i), x_2(i) \in \mathcal{T}$.*

Proof. For wide items u and v in the bin, we say that $u \prec v$ iff the right edge of u is to the left of the left edge of v . Formally $u \prec v \iff x_2(u) \leq x_1(v)$. We call u a *predecessor* of v . A sequence $[i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k]$ such that $i_1 \prec i_2 \prec \dots \prec i_k$ is called a *chain* ending at i_k . For a wide item

i , define $\text{level}(i)$ as the number of items in the longest chain ending at i . Formally, $\text{level}(i) := 1$ if i has no predecessors, and $(1 + \max_{j \prec i} \text{level}(j))$ otherwise. Let W_j be the items at level j , i.e., $W_j := \{i : \text{level}(i) = j\}$. Note that the level of an item can be at most $1/\varepsilon_1 - 1$, since each wide item has width more than ε_1 .




Figure 5: Example illustrating the \prec relationship between wide items in a bin. An edge is drawn from u to v iff $u \prec v$. Here $W_1 = \{a, e, b\}$, $W_2 = \{d, f\}$ and $W_3 = \{c\}$.

We will describe an algorithm for discretization. But first, we need to introduce two recursively-defined set families (S_1, S_2, \dots) and (T_0, T_1, \dots) . Let $T_0 := \{0\}$ and $t_0 := 1$. For any $j > 0$, define $t_j := (1 + 1/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1)^{2j}$, $\delta_j := \varepsilon\varepsilon_1/t_{j-1}$, $S_j := T_{j-1} \cup \{k\delta_j : k \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq k < 1/\delta_j\}$, $T_j := \{x + y : x \in S_j, y \in R \cup \{0\}\}$. Note that $\forall j > 0$, we have $T_{j-1} \subseteq S_j \subseteq T_j$ and $\delta_j^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define $\mathcal{T} := T_{1/\varepsilon_1-1}$.

Our discretization algorithm proceeds in stages, where in the j^{th} stage, we apply two transformations to the items in the bin, called *strip-removal* and *compaction*.

Strip-removal: For each $x \in T_{j-1}$, consider a strip of width δ_j and height 1 in the bin whose left edge has coordinate x . Discard the slices of tall and small items inside the strips.

Compaction: Move all tall and small items as much towards the left as possible (imagine a gravitational force acting leftwards on the tall and small items) while keeping the wide items fixed. Then move each wide item $i \in W_j$ leftwards till $x_1(i) \in S_j$.

Observe that the algorithm maintains the following invariant: *after k stages, for each $j \in [k]$, each item $i \in W_j$ has $x_1(i) \in S_j$ (and hence $x_2(i) \in T_j$).* This ensures that after the algorithm ends, $x_1(i), x_2(i) \in \mathcal{T}$. All that remains to prove is that the total area of items discarded during strip-removal is at most ε and that compaction is always possible.

Lemma 16. *For all $j \geq 0$, $|T_j| \leq t_j$.*

Proof. We will prove this by induction. The base case holds because $|T_0| = t_0 = 1$. Now assume $|T_{j-1}| \leq t_{j-1}$. Then $|T_j| \leq (|R| + 1)|S_j| \leq \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1} + 1\right) \left(|T_{j-1}| + \frac{1}{\delta_j}\right) \leq \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1} + 1\right)^2 t_{j-1} = t_j$. \square

Therefore, $|\mathcal{T}| \leq t_{1/\varepsilon_1-1} = (1 + 1/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1)^{2/\varepsilon_1-2}$.

Lemma 17. *Items discarded by strip-removal (across all stages) have total area less than ε .*

Proof. In the j^{th} stage, we create $|T_{j-1}|$ strips, and each strip has total area at most δ_j . Therefore, the area discarded in the j^{th} stage is at most $|T_{j-1}|\delta_j \leq t_{j-1}\delta_j = \varepsilon\varepsilon_1$. Since there can be at most $1/\varepsilon_1 - 1$ stages, we discard an area of less than ε across all stages. \square

Lemma 18. *Compaction always succeeds, i.e., in the j^{th} stage, while moving item $i \in W_j$ leftwards, no other item will block its movement.*

Proof. Let $i \in W_j$. Let z be the x -coordinate of the left edge of the strip immediately to the left of item i , i.e., $z := \max(\{x \in T_{j-1} : x \leq x_1(i)\})$. For any wide item i' , we have $x_2(i') \leq x_1(i) \iff i' \prec i \iff \text{level}(i') \leq j-1$. By our invariant, we get $\text{level}(i') \leq j-1 \implies x_2(i') \in T_{j-1} \implies x_2(i') \leq z$. Therefore, for every wide item i' , $x_2(i') \notin (z, x_1(i)]$.

In the j^{th} strip-removal, we cleared the strip $[z, z + \delta_j] \times [0, 1]$. If $x_1(i) \in [z, z + \delta_j]$, then i can freely move to z , and $z \in T_{j-1} \subseteq S_j$. Since no wide item has its right edge in $(z, x_1(i)]$, if $x_1(i) > z + \delta_j$, all the tall and small items whose left edge lies in $[z + \delta_j, x_1(i)]$ will move leftwards by at least δ_j during compaction. Hence, there would be an empty space of width at least δ_j to the left of item i (see Fig. 6). Therefore, we can move i leftwards to make $x_1(i)$ a multiple of δ_j , and then $x_1(i)$ would belong to S_j . \square




Figure 6: This figure shows a region in the bin in the vicinity of item $i \in W_j$. It illustrates how shifting tall and small items during compaction in the j^{th} stage creates a free space of width δ to the left of some wide items, including i . Wide items are shaded dark and the lightly shaded region potentially contains tall and small items. Note that some tall and small items in the region C may be unable to shift left because item k is blocking them. All other tall and small items in this figure to the right of z can shift left by δ_j .

Hence, compaction always succeeds and we get $x_1(i), x_2(i) \in \mathcal{T}$ for each wide item i . \square

Definition 3 (Compartmental packing). *Consider a bin with some items packed into it. A compartment C is defined as a rectangular region in the bin satisfying the following properties:*

- $x_1(C), x_2(C) \in \mathcal{T}$.
- $y_1(C), y_2(C)$ are multiples of $\varepsilon_{\text{cont}} := \varepsilon \varepsilon_1 / 6 |\mathcal{T}|$.
- C does not contain both wide items and tall items.
- If C contains tall items, then $x_1(C)$ and $x_2(C)$ are consecutive values in \mathcal{T} .

If a compartment contains a wide item, it is called a wide compartment. Otherwise it is called a tall compartment. A packing of items into a bin is called compartmental iff there is a set of non-overlapping compartments in the bin such that each wide or tall item lies completely inside some compartment, and there are at most $n_W := 3(1/\varepsilon_1 - 1)|\mathcal{T}| + 1$ wide compartments and at most $n_H := (1/\varepsilon_1 - 1)|\mathcal{T}|$ tall compartments in the bin. A packing of items into multiple bins is called compartmental iff each bin is compartmental.

Note that small items can be packed both inside and outside compartments.

The following two results are proved in Appendix G.2 using standard techniques.

Lemma 19. *Suppose $x_1(i), x_2(i) \in \mathcal{T}$ for each wide item i in a bin. Then by removing wide and small items of area less than ε , we can get a compartmental packing of the remaining items.*


Theorem 20. *For a set \tilde{I} of δ -skewed rounded items, define $\text{fcopt}(\tilde{I})$ as the number of bins in the optimal fractional compartmental packing² of \tilde{I} . Then $\text{fcopt}(\tilde{I}) < (1 + 4\varepsilon) \text{fopt}(\tilde{I}) + 2$.*

4.3 Packing Algorithm


We now describe the `skewedCPack` algorithm for packing a set I of δ -skewed items. Roughly, `skewedCPack` first computes $(\tilde{I}, I_{\text{med}}) := \text{round}(I)$. It then computes the optimal fractional compartmental packing of \tilde{I} by first guessing a packing of empty compartments into bins and then fractionally packing the wide and tall items into the compartments using a linear program. It then converts the fractional packing of \tilde{I} to a non-fractional packing of I with only a tiny increase in the number of bins. See Fig. 7 for a visual overview of `skewedCPack`. We defer the details to Appendices G.3, G.4, G.5 and G.6 and simply state the final result.

Theorem 21. *The number of bins used by `skewedCPack $_{\varepsilon}$` (\tilde{I}) is less than*


$$(1 + 20\varepsilon) \text{opt}(I) + \frac{1}{13} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon \varepsilon_1}\right)^{2/\varepsilon_1 - 2} + 23.$$



(a) Guess the packing of empty compartments in each bin (Appendix G.3).



(b) Fractionally pack wide and tall items into compartments. This partitions each compartment into *containers* (Appendix G.4).



(c) Pack the items non-fractionally (Appendix G.5).

Figure 7: Major steps of `skewedCPack` after rounding I .

References

- [1] Fidaa Abed, Parinya Chalermsook, José Correa, Andreas Karrenbauer, Pablo Pérez-Lantero, José A Soto, and Andreas Wiese. On guillotine cutting sequences. In *International Workshop on Approximation Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization Problems (APPROX)*, pages 1–19, 2015. doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX-RANDOM.2015.1.
- [2] Anna Adamaszek, Sarel Har-Peled, and Andreas Wiese. Approximation schemes for independent set and sparse subsets of polygons. *J. ACM*, 66(4):29:1–29:40, 2019. doi:10.1145/3326122.

²A fractional compartmental packing of \tilde{I} is a fractional packing of \tilde{I} that is also compartmental.

- [3] Soroush Alamdari, Therese Biedl, Timothy M Chan, Elyot Grant, Krishnam Raju Jampani, Srinivasan Keshav, Anna Lubiw, and Vinayak Pathak. Smart-grid electricity allocation via strip packing with slicing. In *Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures*, pages 25–36. Springer, 2013. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-40104-6_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-40104-6_3).
- [4] Nikhil Bansal, Alberto Caprara, and Maxim Sviridenko. A new approximation method for set covering problems, with applications to multidimensional bin packing. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(4):1256–1278, 2010. doi:[10.1137/080736831](https://doi.org/10.1137/080736831).
- [5] Nikhil Bansal, José R Correa, Claire Kenyon, and Maxim Sviridenko. Bin packing in multiple dimensions: inapproximability results and approximation schemes. *Mathematics of operations research*, 31(1):31–49, 2006. doi:[10.1287/moor.1050.0168](https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.1050.0168).
- [6] Nikhil Bansal, Marek Eliáš, and Arindam Khan. Improved approximation for vector bin packing. In *ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1561–1579. SIAM, 2016. doi:[10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch106](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974331.ch106).
- [7] Nikhil Bansal and Arindam Khan. Improved approximation algorithm for two-dimensional bin packing. In *SODA*, pages 13–25, 2014. doi:[10.1137/1.9781611973402.2](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611973402.2).
- [8] Nikhil Bansal, Andrea Lodi, and Maxim Sviridenko. A tale of two dimensional bin packing. In *IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 657–666. IEEE, 2005. doi:[10.1109/SFCS.2005.10](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.2005.10).
- [9] Alberto Caprara. Packing d -dimensional bins in d stages. *Mathematics of Operations Research - MOR*, 33:203–215, 02 2008. doi:[10.1287/moor.1070.0289](https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.1070.0289).
- [10] Alberto Caprara, Andrea Lodi, and Michele Monaci. Fast approximation schemes for two-stage, two-dimensional bin packing. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 30(1):150–172, 2005. doi:[10.1287/moor.1040.0112](https://doi.org/10.1287/moor.1040.0112).
- [11] Miroslav Chlebík and Janka Chlebíková. Hardness of approximation for orthogonal rectangle packing and covering problems. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 7(3):291–305, 2009. doi:[10.1016/j.jda.2009.02.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jda.2009.02.002).
- [12] Henrik I. Christensen, Arindam Khan, Sebastian Pokutta, and Prasad Tetali. Approximation and online algorithms for multidimensional bin packing: A survey. *Computer Science Review*, 24:63–79, 2017. doi:[10.1016/j.cosrev.2016.12.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosrev.2016.12.001).
- [13] Fan RK Chung, Michael R Garey, and David S Johnson. On packing two-dimensional bins. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, 3(1):66–76, 1982. doi:[10.1137/0603007](https://doi.org/10.1137/0603007).
- [14] Edward G. Coffman, Michael R. Garey, David S. Johnson, and Robert E. Tarjan. Performance bounds for level-oriented two-dimensional packing algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 9:808–826, 1980. doi:[10.1137/0209062](https://doi.org/10.1137/0209062).
- [15] W Fernandez De La Vega and George S. Lueker. Bin packing can be solved within $1+\epsilon$ in linear time. *Combinatorica*, 1(4):349–355, 1981. doi:[10.1007/BF02579456](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02579456).
- [16] Aleksei V Fishkin, Olga Gerber, and Klaus Jansen. On efficient weighted rectangle packing with large resources. In *International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation*, pages 1039–1050. Springer, 2005. doi:[10.1007/11602613_103](https://doi.org/10.1007/11602613_103).

- [17] Waldo Gálvez, Fabrizio Grandoni, Afrouz Jabal Ameli, Klaus Jansen, Arindam Khan, and Malin Rau. A tight $(3/2 + \epsilon)$ approximation for skewed strip packing. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2020)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX/RANDOM.2020.44](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX/RANDOM.2020.44).
- [18] Waldo Gálvez, Fabrizio Grandoni, Sandy Heydrich, Salvatore Ingala, Arindam Khan, and Andreas Wiese. Approximating geometric knapsack via l-packings. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 260–271. IEEE, 2017. doi:[10.1109/FOCS.2017.32](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2017.32).
- [19] Waldo Gálvez, Fabrizio Grandoni, Arindam Khan, Diego Ramirez-Romero, and Andreas Wiese. Improved approximation algorithms for 2-dimensional knapsack: Packing into multiple l-shapes, spirals and more. In *To appear in SoCG*, 2021.
- [20] Paul C Gilmore and Ralph E Gomory. Multistage cutting stock problems of two and more dimensions. *Operations research*, 13(1):94–120, 1965. doi:[10.1287/opre.13.1.94](https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.13.1.94).
- [21] Rolf Harren, Klaus Jansen, Lars Prädél, and Rob Van Stee. A $(5/3 + \epsilon)$ -approximation for strip packing. In *Workshop on Algorithms and Data Structures*, pages 475–487. Springer, 2011. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-22300-6_40](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22300-6_40).
- [22] Rebecca Hoberg and Thomas Rothvoss. A logarithmic additive integrality gap for bin packing. In *SODA*, pages 2616–2625, 2017. doi:[10.1137/1.9781611974782.172](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974782.172).
- [23] Klaus Jansen and Lars Prädél. New approximability results for two-dimensional bin packing. In *SODA*, pages 919–936, 2013. doi:[10.1007/s00453-014-9943-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-014-9943-z).
- [24] Klaus Jansen and Rob van Stee. On strip packing with rotations. In *ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 755–761, 2005. doi:[10.1145/1060590.1060702](https://doi.org/10.1145/1060590.1060702).
- [25] Klaus Jansen and Guochuan Zhang. On rectangle packing: maximizing benefits. In *SODA*, volume 4, pages 204–213, 2004.
- [26] David S Johnson. *Near-Optimal Bin Packing Algorithms*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA, 1973.
- [27] Sreenivas Karnati, Arindam Khan, and Eklavya Sharma. Geometry meets vectors: Approximation algorithms for multidimensional packing. Manuscript, December 2020.
- [28] Claire Kenyon and Eric Rémila. Approximate strip packing. In *FOCS*, pages 31–36, 1996. doi:[10.1109/SFCS.1996.548461](https://doi.org/10.1109/SFCS.1996.548461).
- [29] Arindam Khan, Arnab Maiti, Amatya Sharma, and Andreas Wiese. On guillotine separable packings for the two-dimensional geometric knapsack problem. In *To appear in SoCG*, 2021.
- [30] Arindam Khan and Madhusudhan Reddy Pittu. On guillotine separability of squares and rectangles. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques (APPROX/RANDOM 2020)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX/RANDOM.2020.47](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.APPROX/RANDOM.2020.47).
- [31] Arindam Khan, Eklavya Sharma, and K. V. N. Sreenivas. Approximation algorithms for generalized multidimensional knapsack. *ArXiv*, 2102.05854, 2021. arXiv:[2102.05854](https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.05854).

- [32] Lap Chi Lau, Ramamoorthi Ravi, and Mohit Singh. *Iterative methods in combinatorial optimization*, volume 46. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [33] János Pach and Gábor Tardos. Cutting glass. In *SoCG*, pages 360–369, 2000. doi:10.1145/336154.336223.
- [34] Sai Sandeep. Almost optimal inapproximability of multidimensional packing problems. *ArXiv*, 2101.02854, 2021. arXiv:2101.02854.
- [35] Steven S. Seiden and Gerhard J. Woeginger. The two-dimensional cutting stock problem revisited. *Mathematical Programming*, 102(3):519–530, 2005. doi:10.1007/s10107-004-0548-1.
- [36] Eklavya Sharma. Harmonic algorithms for packing d -dimensional cuboids into bins. *ArXiv*, 2011.10963, 2020. arXiv:2011.10963.
- [37] A. Steinberg. A strip-packing algorithm with absolute performance bound 2. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26(2):401–409, 1997. doi:10.1137/S0097539793255801.
- [38] Paul E. Sweeney and Elizabeth Ridenour Paternoster. Cutting and packing problems: A categorized, application-orientated research bibliography. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 43(7):691–706, 1992. doi:10.1057/jors.1992.101.

A Examples of Guillotunable and Non-Guillotinable Packing




Figure 8: Two bins that are not guillotinable.




Figure 9: Separating items using 3 stages of guillotine cuts.

B Next-Fit Decreasing Height (NFDH)

In this section, we give proofs of the results in Section 2 related to NFDH algorithm [14].

Lemma 22 ([26]). *Let I be a classical bin packing instance. Then the number of bins used by the Next-Fit algorithm [26] to pack I is less than $2 \text{size}(I) + 1$.*

Lemma 23 ([26]). *Let I be a classical bin packing instance, where each item has size at most ε . Then the number of bins used by the Next-Fit algorithm [26] to pack I is less than $\text{size}(I)/(1-\varepsilon) + 1$.*

Lemma 24 ([14]). *Let I be a set of rectangles of width at most 1. Then I can be packed (without rotation) into a rectangular bin of width 1 and height less than $2a(I) + \max_{i \in I} h(i)$ using NFDH.*

Lemma 25. *Let I be a set of rectangles of width at most ε . Then I can be packed (without rotation) into a rectangular bin of width W and height less than $a(I)/(W - \varepsilon) + \max_{i \in I} h(i)$ using NFDH.*

Proof. Let there be p shelves output by NFDH. Let S_j be the items in the j^{th} shelf. Let h_j be the height of the j^{th} shelf. Let H be the sum of heights of all the shelves.

For $j \in [p - 1]$, in the j^{th} shelf, the total width of items is more than $(W - \varepsilon)$ and each item has height more than h_{j+1} . Therefore, $a(S_j) > h_{j+1}(W - \varepsilon)$.

Let H be the sum of heights of all the shelves. Then $a(I) > \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} a(S_j) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} h_{j+1}(W - \varepsilon) \geq (W - \varepsilon)(H - h_1)$. This implies, $H < (a(I)/W - \varepsilon) + h_1$. \square

Lemma 2. *Let I be a set of items where each item i has $w(i) \leq \delta_W$ and $h(i) \leq \delta_H$. Let there be a bin of width W and height H . If $a(I) \leq (W - \delta_W)(H - \delta_H)$, then NFDH can pack I into the bin.*

Proof. NFDH packs the items into shelves of width W . Let \tilde{H} be the total height of the shelves. By Lemma 25, we get $\tilde{H} < a(I)/(W - \delta_W) + \delta_H \leq H$. Therefore, NFDH can fit I into the bin. \square

Lemma 26. *Let I be a set of rectangular items where each item has height at most δ . Then the number of bins required by NFDH to pack I is less than $(2a(I) + 1)/(1 - \delta)$.*

Proof. The bin packing version of NFDH first packs I into shelves and then packs the shelves into bins using Next-Fit. Let H be the sum of heights of all the shelves. By Lemma 24, $H < 2a(I) + \delta$. By Lemma 23, the number of bins is less than $1 + H/(1 - \delta) < (2a(I) + 1)/(1 - \delta)$. \square

Lemma 27. *Let I be a set of rectangular items where each item has width at most δ . Then the number of bins required by NFDH to pack I is less than $2a(I)/(1 - \delta) + 3$.*

Proof. The bin packing version of NFDH first packs I into shelves and then packs the shelves into bins using Next-Fit. Let H be the sum of heights of all the shelves. By Lemma 25, $H < a(I)/(1 - \delta) + 1$. By Lemma 22, the number of bins is less than $2H + 1 < 2a(I)/(1 - \delta) + 3$. \square

Lemma 28. *Let I be a set of rectangular items where each item has width at most δ_W and height at most δ_H . Then the number of bins required by NFDH to pack I is at most $a(I)/(1 - \delta_W)(1 - \delta_H) + 1/(1 - \delta_H)$.*

Proof. The bin packing version of NFDH first packs I into shelves and then packs the shelves into bins using Next-Fit. Let H be the sum of heights of all the shelves. By Lemma 25, $H < a(I)/(1 - \delta_W) + \delta_H$. By Lemma 23, the number of bins is less than $1 + H/(1 - \delta_H) < a(I)/(1 - \delta_W)(1 - \delta_H) + 1/(1 - \delta_H)$. \square

C Linear Grouping

In this section, we describe the *linear grouping* technique [15, 28] for wide and tall items.

Let ε and ε_1 be constants in $(0, 1)$. Let W be a set of items where each item has width more than ε_1 . We will describe an algorithm, called `lingroupWide` that takes W , ε and ε_1 as input and returns the set \widehat{W} as output, where \widehat{W} is obtained by increasing the width of each item in W .

`lingroupWide`($W, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_1$) first arranges the items W in decreasing order of width and stacks them one-over-the-other (i.e., the widest item in W is at the bottom). Let h_L be the height of the stack. Let $y(i)$ be the y -coordinate of the bottom edge of item i . Split the stack into sections of height $\varepsilon \varepsilon_1 h_L$ each. For $j \in [1/\varepsilon \varepsilon_1]$, let w_j be the width of the widest item intersecting the j^{th} section from the bottom, i.e.,

$$w_j := \max(\{w(i) : i \in W \text{ and } (y(i), y(i) + h(i)) \cap ((j - 1)\varepsilon \varepsilon_1 h_L, j\varepsilon \varepsilon_1 h_L) \neq \emptyset\}).$$

Round up the width of each item i to the smallest w_j that is at least $w(i)$ (see Fig. 10). Let W_j be the items whose width got rounded to w_j and let \widehat{W}_j be the resulting rounded items. (There may be ties, i.e., there may exist $j_1 < j_2$ such that $w_{j_1} = w_{j_2}$. In that case, define $W_{j_2} := \widehat{W}_{j_2} = \emptyset$. This ensures that all W_j are disjoint.) Finally, define $\widehat{W} := \bigcup_j \widehat{W}_j$.




Figure 10: Example invocation of `lingroupWide` for $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1 = 1/2$.

We can similarly define the algorithm `lingroupTall`. Let H be a set of items where each item has height more than ε_1 . `lingroupTall` that takes H , ε and ε_1 as input and returns \widehat{H} , where \widehat{H} is obtained by increasing the width of each item in H .

Claim 29. *Items in `lingroupWide`($W, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_1$) have at most $1/(\varepsilon\varepsilon_1)$ distinct widths. Items in `lingroupTall`($H, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_1$) have at most $1/(\varepsilon\varepsilon_1)$ distinct heights.*

Lemma 30. *Let W , H and S be sets of items, where items in W have width more than ε_1 and items in H have height more than ε_1 . Let $\widehat{W} := \text{lingroupWide}(W, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_1)$ and $\widehat{H} := \text{lingroupTall}(H, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_1)$. If we allow slicing items in \widehat{W} and \widehat{H} using horizontal and vertical cuts, respectively, then we can pack $\widehat{W} \cup \widehat{H} \cup S$ into less than $(1 + \varepsilon) \text{opt}(W \cup H \cup S) + 2$ bins.*

Proof. `lingroupWide`($W, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_1$) arranges the items W in decreasing order of width and stacks them one-over-the-other. Let h_L be the height of the stack. Split the stack into sections of height $\varepsilon\varepsilon_1 h_L$ each. For $j \in [1/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1]$, let W'_j be the slices of items that lie between heights $(j-1)\varepsilon\varepsilon_1 h_L$ and $j\varepsilon\varepsilon_1 h_L$. Let \widehat{W}'_j be the corresponding rounded items from W'_j . Similarly define H'_j and \widehat{H}'_j .

Consider the optimal packing of $W \cup H \cup S$. To convert this to a packing of $\widehat{W} \cup \widehat{H} \cup S - (\widehat{W}'_1 \cup \widehat{H}'_1)$, unpack W'_1 and H'_1 , and for each $j \in [1/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1 - 1]$, pack \widehat{W}'_{j+1} in the place of W'_j and pack \widehat{H}'_{j+1} in the place of H'_j , possibly after slicing the items. This gives us a packing of $\widehat{W} \cup \widehat{H} \cup S - (\widehat{W}'_1 \cup \widehat{H}'_1)$ into m_1 bins, where $m_1 \leq \text{opt}(W \cup H \cup S)$.

We can pack \widehat{H}'_1 by stacking the items side-by-side on the base of bins. We can pack \widehat{W}'_1 into bins by stacking the items one-over-the-other. Let h_L be the total height of items in \widehat{W} . Let w_L be the total width of items in \widehat{H} . This gives us a packing of $\widehat{W}'_1 \cup \widehat{H}'_1$ into $m_2 := \lceil \varepsilon\varepsilon_1 h_L \rceil + \lceil \varepsilon\varepsilon_1 w_L \rceil$ bins. Since $\text{opt}(W \cup H \cup S) \geq a(W) + a(H) \geq \varepsilon_1(h_L + w_L)$, we get $m_2 = \lceil \varepsilon\varepsilon_1 h_L \rceil + \lceil \varepsilon\varepsilon_1 w_L \rceil < \varepsilon \text{opt}(W \cup H \cup S) + 2$. Therefore, we get a packing of $\widehat{W} \cup \widehat{H} \cup S$ into $m_1 + m_2$ bins and $m_1 + m_2 < (1 + \varepsilon) \text{opt}(W \cup H \cup S) + 2$. \square

D Details of skewed4Pack

D.1 Creating Shelves

Here we will describe how to obtain shelves \widetilde{W} and \widetilde{H} from items \widehat{W} and \widehat{H} , respectively.

Since we allow horizontally slicing items in \widehat{W} , a packing of \widehat{W} into m bins gives us a packing of \widehat{W} into a strip of height m , and a packing of \widehat{W} into a strip of height h' gives us a packing of \widehat{W} into $\lceil h' \rceil$ bins. Hence, if we denote the optimal strip packing of \widehat{W} by $\text{opt}_{\text{SP}}(\widehat{W})$, then $\text{opt}(\widehat{W}) = \lceil \text{opt}_{\text{SP}}(\widehat{W}) \rceil$. We will now try to compute a near-optimal strip packing of \widehat{W} .

Define a horizontal configuration S as a tuple of $1/\varepsilon^2 + 1$ non-negative integers, where $S_0 \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{1/\varepsilon^2} S_j w_j \leq 1$. For any horizontal line at height y in a strip packing of \widehat{W} , the multiset of items intersecting the line corresponds to a configuration. S_0 indicates whether the line intersects items from $W^{(S)}$, and S_j is the number of items from $\widehat{W}_j^{(L)}$ that the line intersects. Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all horizontal configurations. Let $N := |\mathcal{S}|$.

To obtain an optimal packing, we need to determine the height of each configuration. This can be done with the following linear program.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} \quad & \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} x_S \\ \text{where} \quad & \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S_j x_S = h(\widehat{W}_j^{(L)}) \quad \forall j \in [1/\varepsilon^2] \\ \text{and} \quad & \sum_{S: S_0=1} \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^{1/\varepsilon^2} S_j w_j \right) x_S = a(W^{(S)}) \\ \text{and} \quad & x_S \geq 0 \quad \forall S \in \mathcal{S} \end{aligned}$$

Let x^* be an optimal extreme-point solution to the above LP. This gives us a packing where the strip is divided into rectangular regions called *shelves* that are stacked on top of each other. Each shelf has a configuration S associated with it and has height $h(S) := x_S^*$ and contains S_j *containers* of width w_j . Containers of width w_j only contain items from $\widehat{W}_j^{(L)}$, and we call them *type- j* containers. If $S_0 = 1$, S also contains a container of width $1 - \sum_{j=1}^{1/\varepsilon^2} S_j w_j$ that contains small items. We call this container a *type-0* container. Each container is fully filled with items. Let $w(S)$ denote the width of shelf S , i.e., the sum of widths of all containers in S . Note that if $S_0 = 1$, then $w(S) = 1$. Otherwise, $w(S) = \sum_{j=1}^{1/\varepsilon^2} S_j w_j$.

Lemma 31. x^* contains at most $1/\varepsilon^2 + 1$ positive entries.

Proof sketch. Follows by applying Rank Lemma³ to the linear program. \square

Lemma 32. $x_S^* > 0 \implies w(S) > 1/2$.

Proof. Suppose $w(S) \leq 1/2$. Then we could have split S into two parts by making a horizontal cut in the middle and packed the parts side-by-side, reducing the height of the strip by $x_S^*/2$. But that would contradict the fact that x^* is optimal. \square

Treat each shelf S as an item of width $w(S)$ and height $h(S)$. Allow each such item to be sliced using horizontal cuts. This gives us a new set \widetilde{W} of items such that \widehat{W} can be packed inside \widetilde{W} .

³Rank Lemma: the number of non-zero variables in an extreme-point solution to a linear program is at most the number of non-trivial constraints [32, Lemma 2.1.4].

By applying an analogous approach to \widehat{H} , we get a new set \widetilde{H} of items. Let $\widetilde{I} := \widetilde{W} \cup \widetilde{H}$. We call the shelves of \widetilde{W} *wide shelves* and the shelves of \widetilde{H} *tall shelves*. The containers in wide shelves are called *wide containers* and the containers in tall shelves are called *tall containers*.

Lemma 11. \widetilde{I} has the following properties: (a) $|\widetilde{W}| \leq 1 + 1/\varepsilon^2$ and $|\widetilde{H}| \leq 1 + 1/\varepsilon^2$; (b) Items in \widetilde{W} have width more than $1/2$ and items in \widetilde{H} have height more than $1/2$; (c) $a(\widetilde{I}) = a(\widehat{I})$; (d) $\max(\lceil \text{hsum}(\widetilde{W}) \rceil, \lceil \text{wsum}(\widetilde{H}) \rceil) \leq \text{fopt}(\widehat{I})$.

Proof. By Lemma 31, $|\widetilde{W}| \leq 1 + 1/\varepsilon^2$ and $|\widetilde{H}| \leq 1 + 1/\varepsilon^2$. By Lemma 32, each item in \widetilde{W} has width more than $1/2$ and each item in \widetilde{H} has height more than $1/2$.

$a(\widetilde{I}) = a(\widehat{I})$ because the shelves are tightly packed.

Since x^* is the optimal solution to the linear program for strip packing \widehat{W} , $\text{hsum}(\widehat{W}) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} x_S^* = \text{opt}_{\text{SP}}(\widehat{W})$. Therefore, $\lceil \text{hsum}(\widetilde{W}) \rceil = \text{fopt}(\widehat{W}) \leq \text{fopt}(\widehat{I})$. Similarly, $\lceil \text{wsum}(\widetilde{H}) \rceil = \text{fopt}(\widehat{H}) \leq \text{fopt}(\widehat{I})$. \square

D.2 Packing Items Into Containers

Lemma 12. Let P be a packing of \widetilde{I} into m bins, where we sliced wide shelves by making at most $m - 1$ horizontal cuts and sliced tall shelves by making at most $m - 1$ vertical cuts. Then we can (non-fractionally) pack a large subset of items \widehat{I} into the shelves in P such that the unpacked items (also called discarded items) from \widehat{W} have area less than $\varepsilon \text{hsum}(\widetilde{W}) + \delta_H(1 + \varepsilon)(m + 1/\varepsilon^2)$, and the unpacked items from \widehat{H} have area less than $\varepsilon \text{wsum}(\widetilde{H}) + \delta_W(1 + \varepsilon)(m + 1/\varepsilon^2)$.

Proof. For each $j \in [1/\varepsilon^2]$, number the type- j wide containers arbitrarily, and number the items in $\widehat{W}_j^{(L)}$ arbitrarily. Now greedily assign items from $\widehat{W}_j^{(L)}$ to the first container C until the total height of the items exceeds $h(C)$. Then move to the next container and repeat. As per the constraints of the linear program, all items in $\widehat{W}_j^{(L)}$ will get assigned to some type- j wide container. Similarly, number the type-0 wide containers arbitrarily and number the items in $W^{(S)}$ arbitrarily. Greedily assign items from $W^{(S)}$ to the first container C until the total area of the items exceeds $a(C)$. Then move to the next container and repeat. As per the constraints of the linear program, all items in $W^{(S)}$ will get assigned to some type-0 wide container. Similarly, assign all items from \widehat{H} to tall containers.

Let C be a type- j wide container and \widehat{J} be the items assigned to it. If we discard the last item from \widehat{J} , then the items can be packed into C . The area of the discarded item is at most $w(C)\delta_H$. Let C be a type-0 wide container and \widehat{J} be the items assigned to it. Arrange the items in \widehat{J} in decreasing order of height and pack the largest prefix $\widehat{J}' \subseteq \widehat{J}$ into C using NFDW (Next-Fit Decreasing Width), which is an analog of NFDH with the coordinate axes swapped.

Discard the items $\widehat{J} - \widehat{J}'$. By Lemma 2, $a(\widehat{J} - \widehat{J}') < \varepsilon h(C) + \delta_H w(C) + \varepsilon \delta_H$. Therefore, for a wide shelf S , the total area of discarded items is less than $\varepsilon h(S) + \delta_H(1 + \varepsilon)$.

After slicing the shelves in \widetilde{I} to get P , we get at most $m + 1/\varepsilon^2$ wide shelves and at most $m + 1/\varepsilon^2$ tall shelves. Therefore, the total area of discarded items from W is less than

$$\varepsilon \text{hsum}(\widetilde{W}) + \delta_H(1 + \varepsilon)(m + 1/\varepsilon^2),$$

and the total area of discarded items from H is less than

$$\varepsilon \text{wsum}(\widetilde{H}) + \delta_W(1 + \varepsilon)(m + 1/\varepsilon^2). \quad \square$$

E Lower Bound on APoG

In this section, we prove a lower bound of roughly $4/3$ on the APoG for skewed rectangles.

Lemma 33. *Let m and k be positive integers and ε be a positive real number. Let J be a set of items packed into a bin, where each item has the longer dimension equal to $(1+\varepsilon)/2$ and the shorter dimension equal to $(1-\varepsilon)/2k$. If the bin is guillotine-separable, then $a(J) \leq 3/4 + \varepsilon/2 - \varepsilon^2/4$.*

Proof. For an item packed in the bin, if the height is $(1-\varepsilon)/2k$, call it a wide item, and if the width is $(1-\varepsilon)/2k$, call it a tall item. Let W be the set of wide items in J .

The packing of items in the bin can be represented as a tree, called the *guillotine tree* of the bin, where each node u represents a rectangular region of the bin and the child nodes v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p of node u represent the sub-regions obtained by parallel guillotine cuts. The ordering of the children has a significance here: if the guillotine cuts were vertical, children are ordered by increasing x -coordinate, and if the cuts were horizontal, children are ordered by increasing y -coordinate. See Fig. 11 for an example.




Figure 11: A guillotinable packing of items into a bin and the corresponding guillotine tree.

We will now see how to rearrange the items in the bin so that the packing remains guillotine-separable but becomes more structured. We will exploit this structure to show that the packing has a large unpacked area. See Fig. 12 for an example.




Figure 12: Structuring a guillotine-separable packing.

In the guillotine tree, suppose there is a node u that has children v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p . W.l.o.g., assume that the children are obtained by making vertical cuts. At most one of these children can contain items from W . We can assume w.l.o.g. that the other children contain only one item, because otherwise we can separate them by vertical cuts. We can reorder the children (which is equivalent to repacking the guillotine partitions) so that the child containing items from W (if any) is the first child. Therefore, we can assume w.l.o.g. that at any level in the guillotine tree, only the first node has children.

Based on the argument above, we can see that the first node in each level touches the bottom-left corner of the bin. All the other nodes either contain a single wide item and touch the left edge of the bin but not the bottom edge, or they contain a single tall item and touch the bottom edge of the bin but not the left edge. In each node containing a wide item, shift the item leftwards, and in each node containing a tall item, shift the item downwards. Then each wide item touches the left edge of the bin and each tall item touches the bottom edge of the bin.

Therefore, the square region of side length $(1 - \varepsilon)/2$ at the top-right corner of the bin is empty. Hence, the area occupied in each bin is at most $3/4 + \varepsilon/2 - \varepsilon^2/4$. \square

Theorem 34. *Let m and k be positive integers and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let I be a set of $4mk$ rectangular items, where $2mk$ items have width $(1 + \varepsilon)/2$ and height $(1 - \varepsilon)/2k$, and $2mk$ items have height $(1 + \varepsilon)/2$ and width $(1 - \varepsilon)/2k$. Let $\text{opt}(I)$ be the number of bins in the optimal packing of I and $\text{opt}_g(I)$ be the number of bins in the optimal guillotinable packing of I . Then*

$$\frac{\text{opt}_g(I)}{\text{opt}(I)} \geq \frac{4}{3}(1 - \varepsilon).$$

This holds true even if items in I are allowed to be rotated.

Proof. For an item $i \in I$, if $h(i) = (1 - \varepsilon)/2k$, call it a wide item, and if $w(i) = (1 - \varepsilon)/2k$, call it a tall item. Let W be the set of wide items and H be the set of tall items. We will show that $\text{opt}(I)$ and $\text{opt}_g(I)$ have a big difference, which will give us a lower-bound on APoG.

Partition W into groups of k elements. In each group, stack items one-over-the-other. This gives us $2m$ containers of width $(1 + \varepsilon)/2$ and height $(1 - \varepsilon)/2$. Similarly, get $2m$ containers of height $(1 + \varepsilon)/2$ and width $(1 - \varepsilon)/2$ by stacking items from H side-by-side. We can pack 4 containers in one bin, so I can be packed into m bins. See Fig. 13 for an example. Therefore, $\text{opt}(I) \leq m$.




Figure 13: Packing $4k$ items in one bin. Here $k = 7$.

We will now show a lower-bound on $\text{opt}_g(I)$. In any guillotine-separable packing of I , the area occupied by each bin is at most $3/4 + \varepsilon/2 - \varepsilon^2/4$ (by Lemma 33). Note that $a(I) = m(1 - \varepsilon^2)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{opt}_g(I) &\geq \frac{m(1 - \varepsilon^2)}{3/4 + \varepsilon/2 - \varepsilon^2/4} \\ \implies \frac{\text{opt}_g(I)}{\text{opt}(I)} &\geq \frac{4}{3} \times \frac{1 - \varepsilon^2}{1 + 2\varepsilon/3 - \varepsilon^2/3} = \frac{4}{3} \times \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon/3} \geq \frac{4}{3}(1 - \varepsilon). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

F APoG for the Rotational Case

Theorem 35. *Let APoG^{nr} and APoG^{r} be the APoG for the non-rotational and rotational versions, respectively, restricted to the δ -skewed case. Then $\text{APoG}^{\text{r}} \leq \text{APoG}^{\text{nr}}$.*

Proof. For a set I of δ -skewed rectangular items, let $\text{opt}^{\text{nr}}(I)$ and $\text{opt}^{\text{r}}(I)$ be the minimum number of bins needed to pack I in the non-rotational and rotational versions, respectively. Let $\text{opt}_g^{\text{nr}}(I)$ and $\text{opt}_g^{\text{r}}(I)$ be the minimum number of guillotinable bins needed to pack I in the non-rotational and rotational versions, respectively. Assume w.l.o.g. that the bin has width and height at least 1.

Let I be any set of δ -skewed items. Let K be the corresponding rotated items in the optimal rotational packing of I , i.e., $\text{opt}^{\text{r}}(I) = \text{opt}^{\text{nr}}(K)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{opt}_g^{\text{r}}(I) &\leq \text{opt}_g^{\text{nr}}(K) \\ &\leq \text{APoG}^{\text{nr}} \text{opt}^{\text{nr}}(K) + c && (c \text{ is a constant}) \\ &= \text{APoG}^{\text{nr}} \text{opt}^{\text{r}}(I) + c. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get $\text{APoG}^{\text{r}} \leq \text{APoG}^{\text{nr}}$. □

G Details of skewedCPack

G.1 Removing Medium Items

Let $T := \lceil 2/\varepsilon \rceil$. Let $\mu_0 = \varepsilon$. For $t \in [T]$, define $\mu_t := f(\mu_{t-1})$ and define

$$J_t := \{i \in I : w(i) \in (\mu_t, \mu_{t-1}] \text{ or } h(i) \in (\mu_t, \mu_{t-1}]\}.$$

Define $r := \text{argmin}_{t=1}^T a(J_t)$, $I_{\text{med}} := J_r$ and $\varepsilon_1 := \mu_{r-1}$. Each item belongs to at most 2 sets J_t , so

$$a(I_{\text{med}}) = \min_{t=1}^T a(J_t) \leq \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T a(J_t) \leq \frac{2}{\lceil 2/\varepsilon \rceil} a(I) \leq \varepsilon a(I).$$

G.2 Creating Compartments

Lemma 36. *Let there be a set I of rectangles packed inside a bin. Then there is a polynomial-time algorithm that can decompose the empty space in the bin into at most $3|I| + 1$ rectangles by making horizontal cuts only.*

Proof. Extend the top and bottom edge of each rectangle leftwards and rightwards till they hit another rectangle or an edge of the bin. This decomposes the empty region into rectangles R . See Fig. 14.

For each rectangle $i \in I$, the top edge of i is the bottom edge of a rectangle in R , the bottom edge of i is the bottom edge of two rectangles in R . Apart from possibly the rectangle in R whose bottom edge is at the bottom of the bin, the bottom edge of every rectangle in R is either the bottom or top edge of a rectangle in I . Therefore, $|R| \leq 3|I| + 1$. □

Lemma 19. *Suppose $x_1(i), x_2(i) \in \mathcal{T}$ for each wide item i in a bin. Then by removing wide and small items of area less than ε , we can get a compartmental packing of the remaining items.*

Proof. Draw vertical lines in the bin at the x -coordinates in $\mathcal{T} - \{0\}$. This splits the bin into $|\mathcal{T}|$ columns (see Fig. 15a). Each column has 0 or more wide items crossing it. These wide items divide the column into cells. A cell is called tall iff it contains a tall item (see Fig. 15b). There can be at most $1/\varepsilon_1 - 1$ tall cells in a column, so there can be at most $(1/\varepsilon_1 - 1)|\mathcal{T}|$ tall cells in the bin.

By Lemma 36, we can use horizontal cuts to partition the space outside tall cells into at most $3(1/\varepsilon_1 - 1)|\mathcal{T}| + 1$ rectangular regions (this may slice some wide items). See Fig. 16a. If a region contains a wide item, call it a box.






Figure 14: Using horizontal cuts to partition the empty space around the 3 items into 9 rectangular regions.



(a) A packing of items in a bin. Wide items are green and tall items are blue. Draw vertical lines at x -coordinates from $\mathcal{T} - \{0\}$. They divide the bin into columns. In this figure, we have 6 columns.



(b) Wide items divide each column into *cells*. Each cell containing a tall item is called a *tall cell*. There are 9 tall cells in this figure, which are shaded gray.

Figure 15: Creating tall cells in a bin

For each box i , slice and discard some items from the bottom of the box and increase $y_1(i)$ so that it becomes a multiple of $\varepsilon_{\text{cont}}$. Then slice and discard some items from the top of the box and reduce $y_2(i)$ so that it becomes a multiple of $\varepsilon_{\text{cont}}$. The total area of items discarded is less than $2\varepsilon_{\text{cont}}$. If i continues to contain a wide item, it becomes a wide compartment. Now all wide items belong to some wide compartment (see Fig. 16b).


Each column has 0 or more wide compartments crossing it. These wide compartments divide the column into rectangular regions. Each region that contains a tall item is a tall compartment (see Fig. 16c).

Therefore, by removing wide and small items of area less than $6|\mathcal{T}|\varepsilon_{\text{cont}}/\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon$, we get a compartmental packing of items where there are at most $(1/\varepsilon_1 - 1)|\mathcal{T}|$ tall compartments and at most $3(1/\varepsilon_1 - 1)|\mathcal{T}| + 1$ wide compartments. \square

Theorem 20. For a set \tilde{I} of δ -skewed rounded items, define $\text{fcopt}(\tilde{I})$ as the number of bins in the optimal fractional compartmental packing⁴ of \tilde{I} . Then $\text{fcopt}(\tilde{I}) < (1 + 4\varepsilon) \text{fopt}(\tilde{I}) + 2$.

Proof. Consider a fractional packing of \tilde{I} into $m := \text{fopt}(\tilde{I})$ bins. By Theorem 15 and Lemma 19, in each bin, we can discard items of area at most 2ε from the bin and get a compartmental packing

⁴A fractional compartmental packing of \tilde{I} is a fractional packing of \tilde{I} that is also compartmental.



(a) Partition the space outside tall cells into rectangular regions by extending the horizontal edges of tall cells (see Lemma 36). Each rectangular region containing a wide item is called a *box*. There are 7 boxes in this figure, which are shaded gray.

(b) For each box, discard some items and shift horizontal edges to make their y -coordinates multiples of $\varepsilon_{\text{cont}}$. Boxes that continue to contain a wide item are now wide compartments.

(c) Wide compartments divide each column into rectangular regions. Each such region containing a tall item is a tall compartment. There are 9 tall compartments in this figure.

Figure 16: Obtaining compartments

of the remaining items.

Let X be the set of wide and small discarded items and let Y be the set of tall discarded items. For each item $i \in X$, if $w(i) \leq 1/2$, slice it using a horizontal cut in the middle and place the pieces horizontally next to each other to get a new item of width $2w(i)$ and height $h(i)/2$. Repeat until $w(i) > 1/2$. Now pack the items in bins by stacking them one-over-the-other so that for each item $i \in X$, $x_1(i) = 0$. This will require less than $2a(X) + 1$ bins, and the packing will be compartmental.

Similarly, we can get a compartmental packing of Y into $2a(Y) + 1$ bins. Since $a(X \cup Y) < 2\varepsilon m$, we will require less than $4\varepsilon m + 2$ bins. Therefore, the total number of compartmental bins used to pack \tilde{I} is less than $(1 + 4\varepsilon)m + 2$. \square

G.3 Enumerating Packing of Compartments

We will compute the optimal fractional compartmental packing of \tilde{I} in two steps. First, for each bin, we will guess the compartments in the bin. Each such packing of compartments into bins is called a *configuration*. Then we will fractionally pack the items into the compartments.

There can be at most $n_W := 3(1/\varepsilon_1 - 1)|\mathcal{T}| + 1$ wide compartments in a bin. Each wide compartment can have $(1/\varepsilon_{\text{cont}})^2$ y -coordinates of the top and bottom edges and at most $|\mathcal{T}|^2/2$ x -coordinates of the left and right edges, where $\varepsilon_{\text{cont}} := \varepsilon\varepsilon_1/6|\mathcal{T}|$. The rest of the space is for tall compartments. Therefore, the number of configurations is at most

$$n_C := ((1/\varepsilon_{\text{cont}})^2|\mathcal{T}|^2/2)^{n_W} \leq \left(\frac{3|\mathcal{T}|^2}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1}\right)^{6|\mathcal{T}|/\varepsilon_1} \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1}\right)^{(1+\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1})^{2/\varepsilon_1+1}}.$$

Since each configuration can have at most n bins, the number of combinations of configurations is at most $(n + 1)^{n_C}$.

Therefore, we can iterate over all possible bin packings of empty compartments in $O(n^{n_C})$ time. Let $\text{iterPackings}(\tilde{I})$ be an algorithm for this, i.e., $\text{iterPackings}(\tilde{I})$ outputs the set of all possible bin packings of empty compartments into at least $\lceil a(\tilde{I}) \rceil$ and at most n bins, where n is the number of items in \tilde{I} .

G.4 Packing Items Into Compartments

For each bin packing of empty compartments, we will try to fractionally pack the items into the bins. Formally, let P be a packing of empty compartments into bins. We will create a feasibility linear program, called $\text{FP}(\tilde{I}, P)$, that is feasible iff wide and tall items in \tilde{I} can be packed into the compartments in P . If $\text{FP}(\tilde{I}, P)$ is feasible, then small items can also be fractionally packed since P contains at least $a(\tilde{I})$ bins.

Let w'_1, w'_2, \dots, w'_p be the distinct widths of wide compartments in P . Let U_j be the set of wide compartments in P having width w'_j . Let $h(U_j)$ be the sum of heights of the compartments in U_j . By Definition 3, we know that $p \leq |\mathcal{T}|^2/2$. Let w_1, w_2, \dots, w_r be the distinct widths of items in \tilde{W} (recall that \tilde{W} is the set of wide items in \tilde{I}). Let \tilde{W}_j be the items in \tilde{W} having width w_j . Let $h(\tilde{W}_j)$ be the sum of heights of all items in \tilde{W}_j . By Claim 29, we get $r \leq 1/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1$.

Let $C := [C_0, C_1, \dots, C_r]$ be a vector, where $C_0 \in [p]$ and $C_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $j \in [r]$. C is called a *wide configuration* iff $w(C) := \sum_{j=1}^r C_j w_j \leq w'_{C_0}$. Intuitively, a wide configuration C represents a set of wide items that can be placed side-by-side into a compartment of width w'_{C_0} . Let \mathcal{C} be the set of all wide configurations. Then $|\mathcal{C}| \leq p/\varepsilon_1^r$, which is a constant. Let $\mathcal{C}_j := \{C \in \mathcal{C} : C_0 = j\}$.

To pack \tilde{W} into wide compartments, we must determine the height of each configuration. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|\mathcal{C}|}$ be a vector where x_C denotes the height of configuration C . Then \tilde{W} can be packed into wide compartments according to x iff x is a feasible solution the following feasibility linear program, named $\text{FP}_W(\tilde{I}, P)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} C_j x_C &\geq h(\tilde{W}_j) \quad \forall j \in [r] && (\tilde{W}_j \text{ should be covered}) \\ \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and } C_0=j} x_C &\leq h(U_j) \quad \forall j \in [p] && (C_j \text{ should fit in } U_j) \\ x_C &\geq 0 \quad \forall C \in \mathcal{C} \end{aligned}$$

Let x^* be an extreme point solution to $\text{FP}_W(\tilde{I}, P)$ (if $\text{FP}_W(\tilde{I}, P)$ is feasible). By Rank Lemma⁵, at most $p+r$ entries of x^* are non-zero. Since the number of variables and constraints is constant, x^* can be computed in constant time.

Let \tilde{H} be the set of tall items in \tilde{I} . Items in \tilde{H} have at most $1/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1$ distinct heights. Let there be q distinct heights of tall compartments in P . By Definition 3, we know that $q \leq 1/\varepsilon_{\text{cont}} = 6|\mathcal{T}|/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1$. We can similarly define *tall configurations* and we can similarly define a feasibility linear program for tall items, named $\text{FP}_H(\tilde{I}, P)$. \tilde{H} can be packed into tall compartments in P iff $\text{FP}_H(\tilde{I}, P)$ is feasible. Let y^* be an extreme point solution to $\text{FP}_H(\tilde{I}, P)$. Then y^* can be computed in constant time and y^* has at most $q + 1/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1$ positive entries.

Therefore, \tilde{I} can be packed into P iff the feasibility linear program $\text{FP}(\tilde{I}, P) := \text{FP}_W(\tilde{I}, P) \wedge \text{FP}_H(\tilde{I}, P)$ is feasible.

The solution (x^*, y^*) shows us how to split each compartment into *shelves*, where each shelf corresponds to a configuration C and the shelf can be split into C_j *containers* of width w_j and one container of width $w'_{C_0} - w(C)$. Let there be m bins in P . After splitting the configurations across compartments, we get at most $p + q + 2/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1 + m(n_W + n_H)$ shelves.

⁵Rank Lemma: the number of non-zero variables in an extreme-point solution to a linear program is at most the number of non-trivial constraints [32, Lemma 2.1.4].

G.5 Converting a Fractional Packing to a Non-Fractional Packing

Let there be m bins in a packing P of empty compartments into bins. Suppose it is possible to pack \tilde{I} into P . Let x^* and y^* be extreme-point solutions to $\text{FP}_W(\tilde{I}, P)$ and $\text{FP}_H(\tilde{I}, P)$, respectively. This gives us a fractional compartmental packing of \tilde{I} into m bins. We will now show how to convert this to a non-fractional compartmental packing by removing some items of small total area. Formally, we give an algorithm called $\text{greedyCPack}(\tilde{I}, P, x^*, y^*)$. It returns a pair (Q, D) , where Q is a (non-fractional) compartmental bin packing of items $\tilde{I} - D$, where the compartments in the bin are as per P . D is called the set of discarded items, and we will prove that $a(D)$ is small.

For a configuration C in a wide compartment, there is a container of width $w'_{C_0} - w(C)$ available for packing small items. Hence, there are $p + q + 2/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1 + m(n_W + n_H)$ containers available inside compartments for packing small items. By Lemma 36, we can partition the space outside compartments into at most $m(3(n_W + n_H) + 1)$ containers. Therefore, the total number of containers available for packing small items is at most

$$m_S := (p + q + 2/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1) + m(4(n_W + n_H) + 1) \leq \left(\frac{|\mathcal{T}|^2}{2} + \frac{6|\mathcal{T}|}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1} + \frac{2}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1} \right) + \frac{16|\mathcal{T}|}{\varepsilon_1}m.$$

Greedy assign small items to small containers, i.e., keep assigning small items to a container till the area of items assigned to it is at least the area of the container, and then resume from the next container. Each small item will get assigned to some container. For each container C , pack the largest possible prefix of the assigned items using the Next-Fit Decreasing Height (NFDH) algorithm. By Lemma 2, the area of unpacked items would be less than $\varepsilon_2 + \delta + \varepsilon_2\delta$. Summing over all containers, we get that the unpacked area is less than $(\varepsilon_2 + \delta + \varepsilon_2\delta)m_S \leq 3\varepsilon_2m_S$.

For each j , greedily assign wide items from \tilde{W}_j to containers of width w_j , i.e., keep assigning items till the height of items exceeds the height of the container. Each wide item will get assigned to some container. Then discard the last item from each container. For each shelf in a wide compartment having configuration C , the total area of items we discard is at most $\delta w(C)$. Similarly, we can discard tall items of area at most $\delta h(C)$ from each shelf in a tall compartment having configuration C .

Hence, across all configurations, we discard wide and tall items of area at most

$$\delta((p + q + 2/\varepsilon\varepsilon_1) + m(n_W + n_H)) \leq \delta \left(\frac{|\mathcal{T}|^2}{2} + \frac{6|\mathcal{T}|}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1} + \frac{2}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1} \right) + \frac{4\delta|\mathcal{T}|}{\varepsilon_1}m.$$

Therefore, for $(Q, D) := \text{greedyCPack}(\tilde{I}, P, x^*, y^*)$, we get

$$a(D) < \frac{52|\mathcal{T}|\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_1}m + 4\varepsilon_2 \left(\frac{|\mathcal{T}|^2}{2} + \frac{6|\mathcal{T}|}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1} + \frac{2}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1} \right), \quad (1)$$

where m is the number of bins used by P .

G.6 The skewedCPack Algorithm

We now summarize the skewedCPack algorithm for bin packing δ -skewed items I (see Algorithm 1 for a more precise description). First, use round on I , i.e., let $(\tilde{I}, I_{\text{med}}) := \text{round}(I)$. Then enumerate all packings P of compartments into bins as per Appendix G.3. For each packing P , check if \tilde{I} can be fractionally packed into P by solving the feasibility linear program (see Appendix G.4). If yes, then use a solution to the feasibility linear program to compute a (non-fractional) compartmental packing of $\tilde{I} - D$ using greedyCPack (see Appendix G.5), where D is the

Algorithm 1 $\text{skewedCPack}_\varepsilon(I)$: Packs a set I of δ -skewed rectangular items into bins without rotating the items.

```

1:  $(\tilde{I}, I_{\text{med}}) = \text{round}_\varepsilon(I)$ .
2: Initialize  $Q_{\text{best}}$  to null.
3: for  $P \in \text{iterPackings}(\tilde{I})$  do                                     // iterPackings is defined in Appendix G.3.
4:    $x^* = \text{opt}(\text{FP}_W(\tilde{I}, P))$ .                                     //  $\text{FP}_W$  and  $\text{FP}_H$  are defined in Appendix G.4.
5:   // If  $\text{FP}_W(\tilde{I}, P)$  is feasible,  $x^*$  is an extreme-point solution to  $\text{FP}_W(\tilde{I}, P)$ .
6:   // If  $\text{FP}_W(\tilde{I}, P)$  is infeasible,  $x^*$  is null.
7:    $y^* = \text{opt}(\text{FP}_H(\tilde{I}, P))$ .
8:   if  $x^* \neq \text{null}$  and  $y^* \neq \text{null}$  then                               // if  $\tilde{I}$  can be packed into  $P$ 
9:      $(Q, D) = \text{greedyCPack}(\tilde{I}, P, x^*, y^*)$ .                       // greedyCPack is defined in Appendix G.5.
10:     $Q_D = \text{NFDH}(D \cup I_{\text{med}})$ .
11:    if  $Q \cup Q_D$  uses less bins than  $Q_{\text{best}}$  then
12:       $Q_{\text{best}} = Q \cup Q_D$ .
13:    end if
14:  end if
15: end for
16: return  $Q_{\text{best}}$ 

```

set of items discarded by greedyCPack . Then pack $I_{\text{med}} \cup D$ into bins using the Next-Fit Decreasing Height (NFDH) algorithm. Output the best bin packing of I across all choices of P .

Recall the function f from Section 4.1. Since $\varepsilon_2 := f(\varepsilon_1)$, we get

$$\varepsilon_2 = f(\varepsilon_1) = \frac{\varepsilon \varepsilon_1}{104(1 + 1/\varepsilon \varepsilon_1)^{2/\varepsilon_1 - 2}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon \varepsilon_1}{104|\mathcal{T}|}. \quad (2)$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that $|\mathcal{T}| \leq (1 + 1/\varepsilon \varepsilon_1)^{2/\varepsilon_1 - 2}$.

Theorem 21. *The number of bins used by $\text{skewedCPack}_\varepsilon(\tilde{I})$ is less than*

$$(1 + 20\varepsilon) \text{opt}(I) + \frac{1}{13} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon \varepsilon_1}\right)^{2/\varepsilon_1 - 2} + 23.$$

Proof. In an optimal fractional compartmental bin packing of \tilde{I} , let P^* be the corresponding packing of empty compartments into bins. Hence, P^* contains $m := \text{fcpt}(\tilde{I})$ bins. Since $\text{iterPackings}(\tilde{I})$ iterates over all packings of compartments into bins, $P^* \in \text{iterPackings}(\tilde{I})$. Since wide and tall items in \tilde{I} can be packed into the compartments of P^* , we get that x^* and y^* are not null. By Lemma 3, the number of bins used by NFDH to pack $I_{\text{med}} \cup D$ is less than $2a(I_{\text{med}} \cup D)/(1 - \delta) + 3 + 1/(1 - \delta)$. Therefore, the number of bins used by $\text{skewedCPack}(I)$ is less than

$$\begin{aligned}
& m + \frac{2a(I_{\text{med}} \cup D)}{1 - \delta} + 3 + \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \\
& < m + \frac{2\varepsilon}{1 - \delta} a(I) + \frac{2\varepsilon_2}{1 - \delta} \left(\frac{52|\mathcal{T}|}{\varepsilon_1} m + 4 \left(\frac{|\mathcal{T}|^2}{2} + \frac{6|\mathcal{T}| + 2}{\varepsilon \varepsilon_1} \right) \right) + 3 + \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \\
& \hspace{15em} \text{(by Eq. (1) and } a(I_{\text{med}}) \leq \varepsilon a(I)) \\
& = \left(1 + \frac{104\varepsilon_2|\mathcal{T}|}{\varepsilon_1(1 - \delta)} \right) m + \frac{2\varepsilon}{1 - \delta} a(I) + 3 + \frac{1}{1 - \delta} + \frac{8\varepsilon_2}{1 - \delta} \left(\frac{|\mathcal{T}|^2}{2} + \frac{6|\mathcal{T}| + 2}{\varepsilon \varepsilon_1} \right) \\
& = \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \delta} \right) m + \frac{2\varepsilon}{1 - \delta} a(I) + 3 + \frac{1}{13(1 - \delta)} \left(\frac{\varepsilon \varepsilon_1 |\mathcal{T}|}{2} + 19 + \frac{2}{|\mathcal{T}|} \right). \hspace{5em} \text{(by Eq. (2))}
\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 20 and Lemma 14, we get

$$m = \text{fcopt}(\tilde{I}) < (1 + 4\varepsilon) \text{fopt}(\tilde{I}) + 2 < (1 + 4\varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon) \text{opt}(I) + 4 + 8\varepsilon.$$

Therefore, the number of bins used by `skewedCPack`(I) is less than

$$\begin{aligned} & \left((1 + 4\varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon) \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \delta} \right) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{1 - \delta} \right) \text{opt}(I) \\ & + (4 + 8\varepsilon) \left(1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{1 - \delta} \right) + 3 + \frac{1}{13(1 - \delta)} \left(\frac{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1|\mathcal{T}|}{2} + 19 + \frac{2}{|\mathcal{T}|} \right) \\ & \leq (1 + 20\varepsilon) \text{opt}(I) + \frac{1}{13} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon\varepsilon_1} \right)^{2/\varepsilon_1 - 2} + 23. \quad (\text{since } \delta \leq \varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon \leq 1/2) \end{aligned}$$

□