

Efficient Deterministic Algorithms for Maximizing Symmetric Submodular Functions

Zongqi Wan^{1,2}, Jialin Zhang^{1,2}, Xiaoming Sun^{1,2}, and Zhijie Zhang^{*3}

¹State Key Lab of Processors, Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences

²School of Computer Science and Technology, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

³Center for Applied Mathematics of Fujian Province, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Fuzhou University

Abstract

Symmetric submodular maximization is an important class of combinatorial optimization problems, including MAX-CUT on graphs and hyper-graphs. The state-of-the-art algorithm for the problem over general constraints has an approximation ratio of 0.432 [16]. The algorithm applies the canonical continuous greedy technique that involves a sampling process. It, therefore, suffers from high query complexity and is inherently randomized. In this paper, we present several efficient deterministic algorithms for maximizing a symmetric submodular function under various constraints. Specifically, for the cardinality constraint, we design a deterministic algorithm that attains a 0.432 ratio and uses $O(kn)$ queries. Previously, the best deterministic algorithm attains a $0.385 - \epsilon$ ratio and uses $O\left(kn\left(\frac{10}{9\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{20}{9\epsilon}-1}\right)$ queries [12]. For the matroid constraint, we design a deterministic algorithm that attains a $1/3 - \epsilon$ ratio and uses $O(kn \log \epsilon^{-1})$ queries. Previously, the best deterministic algorithm can also attain a $1/3 - \epsilon$ ratio but it uses much larger $O(\epsilon^{-1}n^4)$ queries [24]. For the packing constraints with a large width, we design a deterministic algorithm that attains a $0.432 - \epsilon$ ratio and uses $O(n^2)$ queries. To the best of our knowledge, there is no deterministic algorithm for the constraint previously. The last algorithm can be adapted to attain a 0.432 ratio for single knapsack constraint using $O(n^4)$ queries. Previously, the best deterministic algorithm attains a $0.316 - \epsilon$ ratio and uses $\tilde{O}(n^3)$ queries [2].

Keywords: symmetric submodular maximization; deterministic algorithm; approximation algorithm

1 Introduction

Submodular set functions have non-increasing marginal values as the set gets larger, which captures the effect of diminishing returns in reality. The maximization of submodular functions is one of the central topics in combinatorial optimization. It has found numerous applications, including viral marketing [22], data summarization [13, 34], causal inference [32, 37], facility location [1], maximum bisection [3]. The study of the submodular maximization problem has attracted a lot of attention in the literature. Currently, the best algorithm achieves a 0.401 approximation ratio under a general

*Corresponding Author. Postal address: Fuzhou University, No. 2 Xueyuan Road, Minhou, Fuzhou, Fujian, China; E-mail: zzhang@fzu.edu.cn

down-closed constraint [7]. On the other hand, no algorithm can achieve an approximation ratio better than 0.478 under the cardinality constraint [28] and the matroid constraint [20].

When the objective function enjoys additional properties, the problem often admits better approximation. A well-studied case is the monotone submodular function. With this objective, the problem admits $1 - e^{-1}$ approximation under a general down-closed constraint [10]. This ratio is optimal even under the cardinality constraint [26].

In the absence of monotonicity, symmetry can also lead to better approximation. A symmetric submodular function satisfies that any set and its complement have the same function value. Examples include cut functions over undirected graphs and mutual information functions. The study of symmetric submodular functions has received much attention in the literature [19, 29, 21, 16, 2, 11]. Currently, the best algorithm attains a 0.432 approximation ratio for maximizing symmetric submodular functions under a general down-closed constraint [16].

The algorithm in [16] is based on the continuous greedy technique that involves a sampling process [10, 17]. Consequently, it is inherently randomized and suffers from high query complexity. This hinders its applications in the real world and there is a demand for designing efficient deterministic algorithms for symmetric submodular maximization. However, most such algorithms in the literature are designed for general non-monotone submodular functions. To the best of our knowledge, we only found two deterministic algorithms that are designed for symmetric functions. One is a $1/3 - \epsilon$ approximation algorithm for matroid constraint [24], which uses $O(\epsilon^{-1}n^4)$ queries. Another is the $0.316 - \epsilon$ approximation algorithm for the knapsack constraint [2], which uses $\tilde{O}(n^3)$ queries. For the cardinality constraint, the best deterministic algorithm attains a $0.385 - \epsilon$ ratio and uses $O\left(kn\left(\frac{10}{9\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{20}{9\epsilon}-1}\right)$ queries [12]. This algorithm is designed for general non-monotone submodular functions.

1.1 Our Contributions

In this paper, we present several efficient deterministic algorithms with improved approximation ratios or query complexity for maximizing symmetric submodular functions under various constraints. Specifically,

1. For the cardinality constraint, we design a deterministic algorithm that attains an approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-2}) \approx 0.432$ and uses $O(kn)$ queries, where n is the number of elements and k is the size constraint. We also give a tight example showing that $\frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-2})$ is the best ratio that our algorithm can achieve. To accelerate the algorithm, we further design a randomized algorithm that attains an approximation ratio of $0.432 - \epsilon$ and uses $O(k^2 + n \log \epsilon^{-1})$ queries. Note that the algorithm is linear when $k = O(\sqrt{n})$.
2. For the matroid constraint, we design a deterministic algorithm that attains an approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{3} - \epsilon$ and uses $O(kn \log \epsilon^{-1})$ queries, where k is the rank of the matroid. Our algorithm achieves the same approximation ratio as the previous best deterministic algorithm [24], but with a considerably lower query complexity.
3. For the packing constraints with a large width, we present a deterministic algorithm that attains an approximation ratio of $0.432 - \epsilon$ and uses $O(n^2)$ queries. For the knapsack constraint, the algorithm can be adapted to attain an approximation ratio of 0.432 and use $O(n^4)$ queries.

For the sake of comparison, we list the previous and our results in Table 1.

Constraint	Function	Algo. Ratio	Complexity	Type
General	Non-monotone	0.401 [7]	$\text{poly}(n)$	Rand
General	Symmetric	0.432 [16]	$\text{poly}(n)$	Rand
Cardinality	Non-monotone	$0.385 - \epsilon$ [12]	$O\left(kn\left(\frac{10}{9\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{20}{9\epsilon}-1}\right)$	Det
Cardinality	Symmetric	0.432 (Thm. 1)	$O(kn)$	Det
Cardinality	Symmetric	$0.432 - \epsilon$ (Thm. 2)	$O(k^2 + n \log \epsilon^{-1})$	Rand
Matroid	Non-monotone	$0.305 - \epsilon$ [12]	$O\left(kn\left(\frac{10}{9\epsilon}\right)^{\frac{20}{9\epsilon}-1}\right)$	Det
Matroid	Symmetric	$1/3 - \epsilon$ [24]	$O(\epsilon^{-1}n^4)$	Det
Matroid	Symmetric	$1/3 - \epsilon$ (Thm. 3)	$O(kn \log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$	Det
Packing	Symmetric	$0.432 - \epsilon$ (Thm. 4)	$O(n^2)$	Det
Knapsack	Non-monotone	0.25 [31]	$O(n^4)$	Det
Knapsack	Symmetric	$0.316 - \epsilon$ [2]	$O(\frac{1}{\epsilon}n^3 \log n)$	Det
Knapsack	Symmetric	0.432 (Thm. 5)	$O(n^4)$	Det

Table 1: Approximation algorithms for (symmetric) non-monotone submodular maximization under various constraints. “Complexity” refers to query complexity. “Rand” is short for “Randomized” and “Det” is short for “Deterministic”.

1.2 Related Work

Early studies of submodular maximization, which date back to 1978, mainly focus on monotone submodular functions. It was shown that no algorithm can achieve an approximation ratio better than $1 - e^{-1}$ [26]. On the algorithmic side, a canonical greedy algorithm can achieve the optimal $1 - e^{-1}$ ratio under the cardinality constraint [27]. For the knapsack constraint, by combining the enumeration technique with the greedy algorithm, one can also achieve the $1 - e^{-1}$ approximation ratio [23, 33]. Later, for the packing constraints with a large width, there is a multiplicative-updates algorithm that achieves the $1 - e^{-1}$ approximation ratio [4]. For the matroid constraint, the greedy algorithm only attains a $1/2$ approximation ratio [18]. Vondrák [36] made a breakthrough in 2008 by proposing the famous continuous greedy algorithm, which achieves a $1 - e^{-1}$ approximation ratio under the matroid constraint. The continuous greedy algorithm was later generalized to work for general down-closed constraints [17].

For constrained non-monotone submodular maximization, no algorithm can achieve an approximation ratio better than 0.478 under the cardinality constraint [28] and the matroid constraint [20]. The continuous greedy algorithm achieves $1/e$ approximation for this problem [17]. After a series of works [8, 14, 6, 35], the best algorithm achieves a 0.401 approximation ratio under a general down-closed constraint [7]. The algorithm is randomized and suffers from high query complexity. For the cardinality constraint, Buchbinder and Feldman [5] designed a deterministic algorithm with $1/e$ -approximation ratio and uses $O(k^3n)$ queries. Recently, Chen et al. [12] provided a deterministic $(0.385 - \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm with $O(kn(\frac{10}{9\epsilon})^{\frac{20}{9\epsilon}-1})$ queries. They also provided a deterministic $(0.305 - \epsilon)$ -approximation for the matroid constraint with the same query complexity. For the knapsack constraint, the best deterministic algorithm attains a $1/4$ ratio and uses $O(n^4)$ queries [31].

Feige et al. [15] first utilize the property of symmetric submodular function, they present a $(1/2 - \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for the unconstrained maximization problem of symmetric submodular function. Lee et al. [24] show a deterministic $(1/3 - \epsilon)$ -approximation for maximizing symmetric functions over matroid constraint. Both results are attained by the local search algorithm and they

are not specially designed for the symmetric function. They only leverage the symmetric property in their analysis but do not exploit this property to modify the algorithm. Their algorithms also suffer from a high $O(\epsilon^{-1}n^4)$ query complexity. Feldman [16] was the first to design a specialized algorithm for symmetric submodular maximization over general downward close constraints. Using the continuous greedy technique, Feldman presented a 0.432-approximation algorithm. In the case of the knapsack constraint, there exists a deterministic algorithm for symmetric submodular functions that achieves a $0.316 - \epsilon$ ratio and utilizes $\tilde{O}(n^3)$ queries [2].

1.3 Paper Structure

In Section 2, we introduce the symmetric submodular maximization problem formally. In Section 3, we present our results for the problem under the cardinality constraint. In Section 4, we present our results for the problem under the matroid constraint. In Section 5, we present our results for the problem under the packing constraints. Finally, we conclude our paper in Section 6.

2 Preliminaries

Let N be a finite ground set of n elements. For each set $S \subseteq N$ and element $u \in N$, we use $S + u$ to denote the union $S \cup \{u\}$ and $S - u$ to denote the difference set $S \setminus \{u\}$. We also use \bar{S} to denote the complementary set $N \setminus S$. Let $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a set function defined over N . For any sets $S, T \subseteq N$ and element $u \in N$, we define $f(u \mid S) := f(S + u) - f(S)$ and $f(T \mid S) := f(S \cup T) - f(S)$. f is *non-negative* if for any $S \subseteq N$, $f(S) \geq 0$. f is *symmetric* if for any $S \subseteq N$, $f(S) = f(\bar{S})$. f is *submodular* if for any $S, T \subseteq N$, $f(S) + f(T) \geq f(S \cup T) + f(S \cap T)$. Equivalently, f is submodular if for any $S \subseteq T$ and $u \notin T$, $f(S \cup \{u\}) - f(S) \geq f(T \cup \{u\}) - f(T)$. Finally, we define $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

The symmetric submodular maximization problem can be formulated as $\max\{f(S) : S \in \mathcal{I}\}$, where f is the objective function and \mathcal{I} is the constraint specifying the collection of feasible sets. The function f is assumed to be non-negative, symmetric and submodular. Any algorithm for the problem can access the function via a *value oracle*, which returns the function value $f(S)$ when set $S \subseteq N$ is queried. The efficiency of the algorithm is measured by the query complexity, i.e. the number of queries to the oracle. The quantity should be polynomial in $|N| = n$. Some well-studied constraints in the literature include:

- *Cardinality* constraint. For some $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $\mathcal{I} = \{S : |S| \leq k\}$.
- *Matroid* constraint. A matroid system $\mathcal{M} = (N, \mathcal{I})$ consists of a finite ground set N and a collection $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$ of the subsets of N , which satisfies a) $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$; b) if $A \subseteq B$ and $B \in \mathcal{I}$, then $A \in \mathcal{I}$; and c) if $A, B \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|A| < |B|$, then there exists an element $u \in B \setminus A$ such that $A \cup \{u\} \in \mathcal{I}$. A matroid constraint \mathcal{I} is such that $\mathcal{M} = (N, \mathcal{I})$ forms a matroid system. For \mathcal{M} , each $A \in \mathcal{I}$ is called an *independent set*. If A is inclusion-wise maximal, it is called a *base*. All bases of a matroid have an equal size, known as the *rank* of the matroid. In this paper, we use k to denote the rank.
- *Packing* constraints. Given a matrix $A \in [0, 1]^{m \times n}$ and a vector $b \in [1, \infty)^m$, the constraint can be written as $\mathcal{I} = \{S : Ax_S \leq b\}$, where x_S represents the characteristic vector of S . When $m = 1$, the constraint reduces to the canonical *knapsack* constraint. The *width* of the constraint is defined as $W = \min\{b_i/A_{ij} : A_{ij} > 0\}$.

Algorithm 1: DELETE

Input: set $S \subseteq N$.
1 **foreach** $u \in S$ **do** $\setminus\setminus$ In arbitrary order
2 | **if** $f(u | S - u) < 0$ **then** $S \leftarrow S - u$.
3 **return** S .

2.1 Properties of Symmetric Submodular Functions

The following lemma exploits the properties of the function and plays a central role in our algorithm design. It is used for lower bounding $f(S \cup T)$ in terms of $f(T)$ in the absence of monotonicity. A similar version for the multilinear extension of the function can be found in [16].

Lemma 1. *Given a non-negative symmetric submodular function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and a set $S \subseteq N$ such that $f(R) \leq f(S)$ for any $R \subseteq S$, then $f(S \cup T) \geq f(T) - f(S)$ for any $T \subseteq N$.*

Proof. Since f is non-negative, symmetric and submodular,

$$f(T) - f(S \cup T) = f(\bar{T}) - f(\bar{S} \cap \bar{T}) \leq f(\bar{T} \setminus \bar{S}) - f(\emptyset) \leq f(\bar{T} \cap S) \leq f(S).$$

The last inequality follows from the condition of the lemma. \square

At first glance, the condition of Lemma 1 looks difficult to meet. Nonetheless, we introduce the DELETE procedure, described as Algorithm 1, to turn any set S into one that satisfies the condition. The procedure can be regarded as the “delete” operation of the local search algorithm, see e.g. [24].

Lemma 2. *Given a non-negative symmetric submodular function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and a set S returned by Algorithm 1, then $f(R) \leq f(S)$ for any $R \subseteq S$.*

Proof. Let S' be the value of S before Algorithm 1 and $S \setminus R = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_\ell\}$, where $v_{j'}$ is visited before v_j for $j' < j$ in Algorithm 1. Let S_{v_j} be the value of S' just before v_j is visited. Clearly, $S \subseteq S_{v_j} \subseteq S'$ and hence $R \cup \{v_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \dots, v_\ell\} \subseteq S - v_j \subseteq S_{v_j} - v_j$. By submodularity,

$$f(S) = f(R) + \sum_{v_j \in S \setminus R} f(v_j | R \cup \{v_{j+1}, v_{j+2}, \dots, v_\ell\}) \geq f(R) + \sum_{v_j \in S \setminus R} f(v_j | S_{v_j} - v_j).$$

Finally, observe that $v_j \in S$ implies that it is not removed in Algorithm 1. It follows that $f(v_j | S_{v_j} - v_j) \geq 0$ and therefore $f(S) \geq f(R)$. \square

By combining Lemmas 1 and 2, we have

Corollary 1. *Given a non-negative symmetric submodular function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ and a set S returned by Algorithm 1, then $f(S \cup T) \geq f(T) - f(S)$ for any $T \subseteq N$.*

3 Cardinality Constraint

In this section, we present two algorithms for maximizing symmetric submodular functions under the cardinality constraint $\mathcal{I} = \{S : |S| \leq k\}$. In Section 3.1, we present a deterministic algorithm that has an approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-2}) \approx 0.432$ and uses $O(nk)$ queries. In Section 3.2, we present a fast randomized algorithm that has an approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-2(1-\epsilon)}) \approx 0.432 - \epsilon$ and uses $O(k^2 + n \log \epsilon^{-1})$ queries. In Section 3.3, we present a tight example for our deterministic algorithm.

Algorithm 2: GREEDY-CARDINALITY

Input: ground set N , objective function f , cardinality k .

```
1  $S_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
2 for  $i = 1$  to  $k$  do
3    $u_i \leftarrow \arg \max_{u \in N} f(u \mid S_{i-1})$ .
4    $S_i \leftarrow S_{i-1} + u_i$ .
5    $S_i \leftarrow \text{DELETE}(S_i)$ .
6 return  $S_k$ .
```

3.1 The Greedy Algorithm

In this section, we present a greedy algorithm for maximizing a symmetric submodular function under the cardinality constraint. The overall procedure is depicted as Algorithm 2. Compared with the canonical greedy algorithm for maximizing *monotone* submodular functions, Algorithm 2 has an extra step that executes the DELETE procedure to update S_i immediately after the addition of u_i in each round. This helps lower bound $f(S_i \cup O)$ in the absence of monotonicity, where $O \in \arg \max\{f(S) : |S| \leq k\}$. We now analyze Algorithm 2 by a standard argument.

Lemma 3. *For every $i \in [k]$, $f(S_i) - f(S_{i-1}) \geq \frac{1}{k} \cdot (f(O) - 2 \cdot f(S_{i-1}))$.*

Proof. Let $S'_i = S_{i-1} + u_i$ be the value of S_i just before DELETE was executed. By the choice of u_i , $f(u_i \mid S_{i-1}) \geq f(o \mid S_{i-1})$ for any $o \in O$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} f(S'_i) - f(S_{i-1}) &= f(u_i \mid S_{i-1}) \geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{o \in O} f(o \mid S_{i-1}) \geq \frac{1}{k} \cdot f(O \mid S_{i-1}) \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \cdot (f(S_{i-1} \cup O) - f(S_{i-1})) \geq \frac{1}{k} \cdot (f(O) - 2 \cdot f(S_{i-1})). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from submodularity and the last inequality follows from Corollary 1, since S_{i-1} is the output of DELETE in the last round. The lemma follows by observing that the value of S_i only increases during the execution of DELETE and hence $f(S_i) \geq f(S'_i)$. \square

Theorem 1. *Algorithm 2 has an approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-2})$ and uses $O(kn)$ queries.*

Proof. For the query complexity, note that Algorithm 2 has k rounds. In each round, the selection of u_i needs $O(n)$ queries and the DELETE procedure needs $O(k)$ queries since S_i contains at most k elements. Therefore, Algorithm 2 uses $O(kn)$ queries in total.

Next, we show by induction that for $i \in [k]$,

$$f(S_i) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{2}{k} \right)^i \right) \cdot f(O).$$

The claim holds for $i = 0$ since $f(\emptyset) \geq 0$. Assume that it holds for $i' < i$. By Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned} f(S_i) &\geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{k} \right) \cdot f(S_{i-1}) + \frac{1}{k} \cdot f(O) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{2}{k} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{2}{k} \right)^{i-1} \right) \cdot f(O) + \frac{1}{k} \cdot f(O) \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 3: SAMPLE-GREEDY-CARDINALITY

Input: ground set N , objective function f , cardinality k .

```
1  $S_0 \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
2 for  $i = 1$  to  $k$  do
3    $R_i \leftarrow$  a random subset obtained by sampling  $r = \lceil \frac{n}{k} \ln \epsilon^{-1} \rceil$  random elements from
    $N \setminus S_{i-1}$ .
4    $u_i \leftarrow \arg \max_{u \in R_i} f(u \mid S_{i-1})$ .
5    $S_i \leftarrow S_{i-1} + u_i$ .
6    $S_i \leftarrow \text{DELETE}(S_i)$ .
7 return  $S_k$ .
```

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{2}{k} \right)^i \right) \cdot f(O).$$

By plugging $i = k$ and $e^x \geq 1 + x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$f(S_k) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{2}{k} \right)^k \right) \cdot f(O) \geq \frac{1}{2} (1 - e^{-2}) \cdot f(O).$$

□

3.2 The Sample Greedy Algorithm

In this section, we present a randomized algorithm for maximizing symmetric submodular functions under the cardinality constraint. By using randomness, its query complexity is reduced to $O(k^2 + n \log \epsilon^{-1})$, which is linear when $k = O(\sqrt{n})$. Our algorithm is based on the Sample Greedy algorithm [25, 9], with an extra step that executes the DELETE procedure to update S_i immediately after the addition of u_i in each round. The formal procedure is depicted as Algorithm 3.

Let $O \in \arg \max \{f(S) : |S| \leq k\}$. We now give an analysis of Algorithm 2.

Lemma 4. *For every $i \in [k]$, $\mathbb{E}[f(S_i)] - \mathbb{E}[f(S_{i-1})] \geq \frac{1-\epsilon}{k} \cdot (f(O) - 2 \cdot \mathbb{E}[f(S_{i-1})])$.*

Proof. Fix $i \in [k]$ and all the random choices of Algorithm 3 up to round $i - 1$. Then, S_{i-1} is determined. Conditioned on this, consider the random choice in round i . Let us estimate the probability that $R_i \cap (O \setminus S_{i-1}) \neq \emptyset$. By the construction of R_i ,

$$\Pr[R_i \cap (O \setminus S_{i-1}) = \emptyset] = \left(1 - \frac{|O \setminus S_{i-1}|}{|N \setminus S_{i-1}|} \right)^r \leq \exp \left(-\frac{r}{n} |O \setminus S_{i-1}| \right).$$

The inequality follows from $1 - x \leq e^{-x}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|N \setminus S_{i-1}| \leq n$. Next, by the concavity of $1 - e^{-\frac{r}{n}x}$ as a function of x and the fact that $x = |O \setminus S_{i-1}| \in [0, k]$, we have

$$\Pr[R_i \cap (O \setminus S_{i-1}) \neq \emptyset] \geq 1 - \exp \left(-\frac{r}{n} |O \setminus S_{i-1}| \right) \geq \left(1 - e^{-\frac{rk}{n}} \right) \frac{|O \setminus S_{i-1}|}{k} \geq (1 - \epsilon) \frac{|O \setminus S_{i-1}|}{k}.$$

The last inequality is due to the value of r .

Let $S'_i = S_{i-1} + u_i$ be the value of S_i just before DELETE was executed. Under the event that $R_i \cap (O \setminus S_{i-1}) \neq \emptyset$, the marginal value of u_i is at least that of a uniformly random element from $R_i \cap (O \setminus S_{i-1})$. Since R_i contains each element of $O \setminus S_{i-1}$ with equal probability, a uniformly

random element from $R_i \cap (O \setminus S_{i-1})$ is actually a uniformly random element from $(O \setminus S_{i-1})$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(S'_i) - f(S_{i-1})] &= \mathbb{E}[f(u_i | S_{i-1})] \geq \Pr[R_i \cap (O \setminus S_{i-1}) \neq \emptyset] \times \frac{1}{|O \setminus S_{i-1}|} \sum_{o \in O \setminus S_{i-1}} f(o | S_{i-1}) \\ &\geq \frac{1-\epsilon}{k} (f(S_{i-1} \cup O) - f(S_{i-1})) \geq \frac{1-\epsilon}{k} (f(O) - 2 \cdot f(S_{i-1})). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality is due to submodularity and the last follows from Corollary 1, since S_{i-1} is the output of DELETE in the last round. By taking the randomness of S_{i-1} , we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f(S'_i) - f(S_{i-1})] \geq \frac{1-\epsilon}{k} (f(O) - 2 \cdot \mathbb{E}[f(S_{i-1})]).$$

Finally, observe that the value of S_i only increases during the execution of DELETE and hence $f(S_i) \geq f(S'_i)$. By taking the randomness of S_{i-1} and u_i , we have $\mathbb{E}[f(S_i)] \geq \mathbb{E}[f(S'_i)]$. The lemma follows immediately. \square

Theorem 2. *Algorithm 3 has an approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-2(1-\epsilon)})$ and uses $O(k^2 + n \log \epsilon^{-1})$ queries.*

Proof. For the query complexity, note that Algorithm 3 has k rounds. In each round, it costs $O(\frac{n}{k} \log \epsilon^{-1})$ queries to find u_i and the DELETE Procedure needs $O(k)$ queries since S contains at most k elements. Therefore, Algorithm 2 uses $O(k^2 + n \log \epsilon^{-1})$ queries in total.

Next, we show by induction that for every $i \in [k]$,

$$\mathbb{E}[f(S_i)] \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{2(1-\epsilon)}{k} \right)^i \right) \cdot f(O).$$

The claim holds for $i = 0$ since $f(\emptyset) \geq 0$. Assume that it holds for $i' < i$. By Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[f(S_i)] &\geq \left(1 - \frac{2(1-\epsilon)}{k} \right) \cdot \mathbb{E}[f(S_{i-1})] + \frac{1}{k} \cdot f(O) \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{2(1-\epsilon)}{k} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{2(1-\epsilon)}{k} \right)^{i-1} \right) \cdot f(O) + \frac{1}{k} \cdot f(O) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{2(1-\epsilon)}{k} \right)^i \right) \cdot f(O). \end{aligned}$$

By plugging $i = k$ and $e^x \geq 1 + x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[f(S_k)] \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{2(1-\epsilon)}{k} \right)^k \right) \cdot f(O) \geq \frac{1 - e^{-2(1-\epsilon)}}{2} \cdot f(O).$$

\square

3.3 A Tight Example for Algorithm 2

In this section, we give a tight example for Algorithm 2, showing that our analysis for it is tight.

Consider an instance of MAX-CUT on a bipartite graph $G = (O, S \cup T, E)$ as follows. Assume that $k \geq 3$. Let $O = \{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_k\}$, $S = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$, and $T = \{v_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq c\}$ for some constant c satisfying

$$c = \left\lceil \frac{1 + (1 - 2/k)^k}{2(1 - 2/k)^{k-1}} \right\rceil.$$

For $i, j \in [k]$, $(o_i, u_j) \in E$ and its weight is $\frac{1}{k} (1 - \frac{2}{k})^{j-1}$. For $i \in [k]$ and $j \in [c]$, $(o_i, v_{ij}) \in E$ and its weight is $\frac{1+(1-2/k)^k}{2c}$. Then, $f(o_i) = \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{k} (1 - \frac{2}{k})^{j-1} + c \cdot \frac{1+(1-2/k)^k}{2c} = 1$. The optimal solution is O and $f(O) = \sum_{i=1}^k f(o_i) = k$. We will argue that Algorithm 2 may pick u_j in round j and finally return S . Since $f(S) = \sum_{j=1}^k (1 - \frac{2}{k})^{j-1} = \frac{k}{2} (1 - (1 - 2/k)^k) = \frac{1}{2} (1 - (1 - 2/k)^k) \cdot f(O)$, this proves our claim.

Define $S_0 = \emptyset$ and $S_j = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_j\}$ for $j \in [k]$. Assume that Algorithm 2 selects $S_{j-1} = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{j-1}\}$ before round j . In round j , for $i \geq j$, $f(u_i \mid S_{j-1}) = (1 - 2/k)^{i-1}$. For $i \in [k]$, $f(o_i \mid S_{j-1}) = 1 - 2 \sum_{j'=1}^{j-1} \frac{1}{k} (1 - 2/k)^{j'-1} = (1 - 2/k)^{j-1}$. For $i \in [k], j' \in [c]$, By the definition of c , $f(v_{ij'} \mid S_{j-1}) = f(v_{ij'}) = \frac{1+(1-2/k)^k}{2c} \leq (1 - 2/k)^{k-1} \leq (1 - 2/k)^{j-1}$. Therefore, only u_j and elements in O attain the maximum marginal gain $(1 - 2/k)^{j-1}$ in this round. Thus, Algorithm 2 may select u_j during its execution. Finally, it is easy to see that $f(u \mid S_j - u) \geq 0$ for any $u \in S_j$. Hence, S_j remains unchanged after the DELETE procedure.

4 Matroid Constraint

In this section, we present a greedy-based algorithm for maximizing a symmetric submodular function under the matroid constraint $\mathcal{I} = \{S : S \in \mathcal{I}\}$, where $\mathcal{M} = (N, \mathcal{I})$ forms a matroid system. The overall procedure is depicted as Algorithm 4.

For ease of description, we turn the original instance (N, f, \mathcal{M}) to a new one (N', f', \mathcal{M}') by adding a set D of $2k$ ‘‘dummy elements’’ in the following way.

- $N' = N \cup D$.
- $f'(S) = f(S \setminus D)$ for every set $S \subseteq N'$.
- $S \in \mathcal{I}'$ if and only if $S \setminus D \in \mathcal{I}$ and $|S| \leq k$.

Clearly, the new instance and the old one refer to the same problem. By overloading notations, we still denote by (N, f, \mathcal{M}) the instance with dummy elements. Another ingredient of Algorithm 4 is the well-known exchange property of matroids, which is stated as Lemma 5.

Lemma 5 ([30]). *If A and B are two bases of a matroid $\mathcal{M} = (N, \mathcal{I})$, there exists a one-to-one function $g : A \rightarrow B$ such that*

- $g(u) = u$ for every $u \in A \cap B$.
- for every $u \in A$, $B + u - g(u) \in \mathcal{I}$.

Algorithm 4 starts with a set of k dummy elements denoted by S_0 . It runs $K := \lceil \frac{k}{3} \ln \epsilon^{-1} \rceil$ rounds in total to update S_0 and the solution by the end of round i is denoted by S_i . At round i , it finds a base $M_i \subseteq N \setminus S_{i-1}$ whose marginal value is maximized, a mapping g_i between M_i and S_{i-1} defined in Lemma 5, and the element $u_i \in M_i$ that maximizes $f(S_{i-1} + u_i - g_i(u_i)) - f(S_{i-1})$. It then sets $S_i = S_{i-1} + u_i - g_i(u_i)$ and executes the DELETE procedure to update S_i . Finally, it returns S_K .

Algorithm 4: GREEDY-MATROID

Input: ground set N , objective function f , matroid $\mathcal{M} = (N, \mathcal{I})$.

- 1 $S_0 \leftarrow$ an arbitrary base containing only elements of D .
- 2 $K \leftarrow \lceil \frac{k}{3} \ln \epsilon^{-1} \rceil$
- 3 **for** $i = 1$ **to** K **do**
- 4 Let $M_i \subseteq N \setminus S_{i-1}$ be a base of \mathcal{M} maximizing $\sum_{u \in M_i} f(u \mid S_{i-1})$.
- 5 Let g_i be the mapping defined in Lemma 5 by plugging $A = M_i$ and $B = S_{i-1}$.
- 6 $u_i \leftarrow \arg \max_{u \in M_i} f(S_{i-1} + u - g_i(u)) - f(S_{i-1})$.
- 7 $S_i \leftarrow S_{i-1} + u_i - g_i(u_i)$.
- 8 $S_i \leftarrow \text{DELETE}(S_i)$.
- 9 **return** S_K .

Note that the task of finding M_i involves solving an additive maximization problem over a matroid. It is well known that this problem can be efficiently addressed using a simple greedy algorithm, which bears resemblance to Kruskal's algorithm. The algorithm begins by sorting the elements $\{f(u \mid S_{i-1})\}_{u \in N \setminus S_{i-1}}$ in descending order. Then, proceeding in this descending order, each element u is added to the solution set if its inclusion does not violate the matroid constraint. Note that we can always extend the subset obtained by the above procedure to a matroid base by adding some dummy elements to it. Also, g_i can be found by invoking an algorithm that finds a perfect matching in a bipartite graph.

We now give an analysis of Algorithm 4. Let $O = \arg \max\{f(S) : S \in \mathcal{I}\}$, we have

Lemma 6. *For every $i \in [K]$, $f(S_i) - f(S_{i-1}) \geq \frac{1}{k} \cdot (f(O) - 3 \cdot f(S_{i-1}))$.*

Proof. Observe that $O \setminus S_{i-1}$ plus enough dummy elements in $D \setminus S_{i-1}$ forms a valid candidate for M_i . By the construction of M_i ,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{u \in M_i} f(u \mid S_{i-1}) &\geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{u \in O \setminus S_{i-1}} f(u \mid S_{i-1}) \geq \frac{1}{k} \cdot (f(O \cup S_{i-1}) - f(S_{i-1})) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{k} \cdot (f(O) - 2 \cdot f(S_{i-1})). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The second inequality is due to submodularity. The last inequality follows from Corollary 1, since S_{i-1} is the output of DELETE in the last round. On the other hand, by submodularity and non-negativity,

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{u \in M_i} f(g_i(u) \mid S_{i-1} - g_i(u)) \leq \frac{f(S_{i-1}) - f(\emptyset)}{k} \leq \frac{f(S_{i-1})}{k}. \tag{2}$$

Let $S'_i = S_{i-1} + u_i - g_i(u_i)$ be the value of S_i just before DELETE is executed. By the choice of u_i , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(S'_i) &= f(S_{i-1} + u_i - g_i(u_i)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{u \in M_i} f(S_{i-1} + u - g_i(u)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{u \in M_i} (f(S_{i-1} + u) + f(S_{i-1} - g_i(u)) - f(S_{i-1})) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{u \in M_i} (f(S_{i-1}) + f(u \mid S_{i-1}) - f(g_i(u) \mid S_{i-1} - g_i(u))) \\
&\geq f(S_{i-1}) + \frac{1}{k} \cdot (f(O) - 2 \cdot f(S_{i-1})) - \frac{f(S_{i-1})}{k} \\
&= f(S_{i-1}) + \frac{1}{k} \cdot (f(O) - 3 \cdot f(S_{i-1})).
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality is due to submodularity. The last inequality is by Eq. (1) and (2). Finally, observe that the value of S_i only increases during the execution of DELETE and hence $f(S_i) \geq f(S'_i)$. The lemma follows immediately. \square

Theorem 3. *Algorithm 4 has an approximation ratio of $(1 - \epsilon)/3$ and uses $O(kn \log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$ queries.*

Proof. For the query complexity, note that Algorithm 4 has $K = \lceil \frac{k}{3} \ln \epsilon^{-1} \rceil$ rounds. In each round, the construction of M_i needs $O(n \log n)$ queries and the DELETE procedure needs $O(k)$ queries since S_i contains at most k elements. Therefore, Algorithm 4 uses $O(kn \log \frac{n}{\epsilon})$ queries in total.

Next, we show by induction that for $i \in [k]$,

$$f(S_i) \geq \frac{1}{3} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{3}{k} \right)^i \right) \cdot f(O).$$

The claim holds for $i = 0$ since $f(\emptyset) \geq 0$. Assume that it holds for $i' < i$. By Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned}
f(S_i) &\geq \left(1 - \frac{3}{k} \right) \cdot f(S_{i-1}) + \frac{1}{k} \cdot f(O) \\
&\geq \left(1 - \frac{3}{k} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{3} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{3}{k} \right)^{i-1} \right) \cdot f(O) + \frac{1}{k} \cdot f(O) \\
&= \frac{1}{3} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{3}{k} \right)^i \right) \cdot f(O).
\end{aligned}$$

By plugging $i = K$ and $e^x \geq 1 + x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$f(S_K) \geq \frac{1}{3} \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{3}{k} \right)^{(k \ln \epsilon^{-1})/3} \right) \cdot f(O) \geq \frac{1 - \epsilon}{3} \cdot f(O).$$

\square

5 Packing Constraints

In this section, we present a deterministic algorithm for maximizing symmetric submodular functions under the packing constraints with a large width. Our algorithm is based on the multiplicative updates approach in [4] for maximizing monotone submodular functions, with an extra step that executes the DELETE procedure to update the current solution S at the end of each iteration. The complete procedure is depicted as Algorithm 5. For ease of description, we identify N with $[n]$ and use $j \in [n]$ to denote an element.

We now give an analysis of Algorithm 5. Assume that the algorithm added $t + 1$ elements into S in total. For each $r \in [t + 1]$, let S_r be the value of S at the end of round r , j_r be the element selected in round r . For each $i \in [m]$ and $r \in [t + 1]$, let w_{ir} be the value of w_i at the end of round r and $\beta_r = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{ir}$. Let $O \in \arg \max \{ f(S) : Ax_S \leq b \}$.

We first show that the algorithm outputs a feasible solution.

Algorithm 5: MULTIPLICATIVE-UPDATES-PACKING

Input: ground set N , objective function f , $\lambda > 1$, matrix $A \in [0, 1]^{m \times n}$ and vector $b \in [1, \infty)^m$.

```

1  $S \leftarrow \emptyset$ .
2 for  $i = 1$  to  $m$  do  $w_i \leftarrow 1/b_i$ .
3 while  $\sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_i \leq \lambda$  and  $S \neq [n]$  do
4    $j \leftarrow \arg \max_{j \in N \setminus S} \frac{f(j|S)}{\sum_{i=1}^m A_{ij} w_i}$ .
5   if  $f(j|S) \leq 0$  then break.
6    $S \leftarrow S + j$ .
7    $S \leftarrow \text{DELETE}(S)$ .
8   for  $i = 1$  to  $m$  do  $w_i \leftarrow w_i \lambda^{A_{ij}/b_i}$ .
9 return  $S$  if  $S$  is feasible and  $S - j^*$  otherwise, where  $j^*$  is the last element added into  $S$ .

```

Lemma 7. *Algorithm 5 outputs a feasible solution.*

Proof. By our notations, the algorithm returns S_{t+1} if it is feasible and S_t otherwise. The lemma clearly holds in the former case. For the latter case, let ℓ be the first element whose addition into S leads to a violation in some constraint. That is, suppose ℓ was added in round t' , then $S_{t'-1}$ is feasible but for some $i \in [m]$, $\sum_{j \in S_{t'}} A_{ij} > b_i$. Then, we have

$$b_i w_{it'} = b_i w_{i0} \prod_{j \in S_{t'}} \lambda^{A_{ij}/b_i} = \lambda^{\sum_{j \in S_{t'}} A_{ij}/b_i} > \lambda.$$

Thus, the **while** loop breaks immediately at the beginning of the next round. This means that ℓ is the last element added into S and therefore $t' = t + 1$. It follows that the returned solution S_t is feasible. \square

Next, we present two useful lemmas for our analysis.

Lemma 8. *Given a set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, a collection of sets $S_0, S_1, \dots, S_t \subseteq N$ satisfying $f(S_0) \leq f(S_1) \leq \dots \leq f(S_t)$ and a set $O \subseteq N$ satisfying $f(O) > 2f(S_t)$, then*

$$\sum_{r=1}^t \frac{f(S_r) - f(S_{r-1})}{f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1})} \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{f(O) - 2f(S_0)}{f(O) - 2f(S_t)}.$$

Proof. For each $r \in [t]$, observe that

$$\frac{f(S_r) - f(S_{r-1})}{f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1})} = \int_{f(S_{r-1})}^{f(S_r)} \frac{1}{f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1})} dx \leq \int_{f(S_{r-1})}^{f(S_r)} \frac{1}{f(O) - 2x} dx.$$

The inequality holds since $1/(f(O) - 2x)$ is monotonically increasing for $x \in [0, f(O)/2)$. Consequently, we have

$$\sum_{r=1}^t \frac{f(S_r) - f(S_{r-1})}{f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1})} \leq \sum_{r=1}^t \int_{f(S_{r-1})}^{f(S_r)} \frac{1}{f(O) - 2x} dx = \int_{f(S_0)}^{f(S_t)} \frac{1}{f(O) - 2x} dx = \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{f(O) - 2f(S_0)}{f(O) - 2f(S_t)}.$$

\square

Lemma 9. For every $r \in [t]$,

$$\frac{f(S_r) - f(S_{r-1})}{\sum_{i=1}^m A_{ij_r} w_{i(r-1)}} \geq \frac{f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1})}{\beta_{r-1}}.$$

Proof. Let $S'_r = S_{r-1} + j_r$ be the value of S_r just before DELETE was executed. By the choice of j_r , for any $j \in O \setminus S_{r-1}$,

$$\frac{f(j_r | S_{r-1})}{\sum_{i=1}^m A_{ij_r} w_{i(r-1)}} \geq \frac{f(j | S_{r-1})}{\sum_{i=1}^m A_{ij} w_{i(r-1)}}.$$

By summing over $j \in O \setminus S_{r-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(S'_r) - f(S_{r-1})}{\sum_{i=1}^m A_{ij_r} w_{i(r-1)}} \sum_{j \in O \setminus S_{r-1}} \sum_{i=1}^m A_{ij} w_{i(r-1)} &\geq \sum_{j \in O \setminus S_{r-1}} f(j | S_{r-1}) \geq f(O | S_{r-1}) \\ &= f(S_{r-1} \cup O) - f(S_{r-1}) \geq f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality is due to submodularity and the last inequality follows from Corollary 1, since S_{r-1} is the output of DELETE in the last round. On the other hand,

$$\sum_{j \in O \setminus S_{r-1}} \sum_{i=1}^m A_{ij} w_{i(r-1)} = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j \in O \setminus S_{r-1}} A_{ij} w_{i(r-1)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{i(r-1)} = \beta_{r-1}.$$

The inequality holds since $O \setminus S_{r-1}$ is feasible. Combining the two inequalities,

$$\frac{f(S'_r) - f(S_{r-1})}{\sum_{i=1}^m A_{ij_r} w_{i(r-1)}} \geq \frac{f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1})}{\beta_{r-1}}.$$

The lemma follows by observing that the value of S_r only increases during the execution of DELETE and hence $f(S_r) \geq f(S'_r)$. \square

Theorem 4. Given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and assume that $W \geq \max\{\ln m, 1\}/\epsilon^2$, by setting $\lambda = e^{\epsilon W}$, Algorithm 5 has an approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-2(1-3\epsilon)})$ and uses $O(n^2)$ queries.

Proof. For the query complexity, observe that some element j must be added into S , otherwise, the main loop will break immediately. Thus, Algorithm 5 has at most n rounds. In each round, the selection of j needs $O(n)$ queries, and the DELETE procedure needs $O(n)$ queries since S contains at most n elements. Therefore, Algorithm 2 uses $O(n^2)$ queries in total.

Next, we consider the approximation ratio of the algorithm.

First consider the case where $\sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{i(t+1)} < e^{\epsilon W}$. By the reasoning of Lemma 7, we know that S_{t+1} is returned as a feasible solution. Beside, this case happens because $f(j | S_{t+1}) \leq 0$ for any $j \in N \setminus S_{t+1}$. By submodularity, $f(O | S_{t+1}) \leq \sum_{j \in O} f(j | S_{t+1}) \leq 0$. Since S_{t+1} is the output of DELETE in the last round, by Corollary 1,

$$f(O) - 2 \cdot f(S_{t+1}) \leq f(S_{t+1} \cup O) - f(S_{t+1}) \leq 0.$$

Thus, $f(S_{t+1}) \geq f(O)/2$, which proves the lemma.

Next, consider the case where $\sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{i(t+1)} \geq e^{\epsilon W}$. For every $r \in [t]$, we have

$$\beta_r = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{ir} = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{i(r-1)} \cdot (e^{\epsilon W})^{A_{ij_r}/b_i}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{i(r-1)} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon W A_{ij_r}}{b_i} + \left(\frac{\epsilon W A_{ij_r}}{b_i} \right)^2 \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{i(r-1)} + (\epsilon W + \epsilon^2 W) \sum_{i=1}^m A_{ij_r} w_{i(r-1)} \\
&\leq \beta_{r-1} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{(\epsilon W + \epsilon^2 W)(f(S_r) - f(S_{r-1}))}{f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1})} \right) \\
&\leq \beta_{r-1} \cdot \exp \left(\frac{(\epsilon W + \epsilon^2 W)(f(S_r) - f(S_{r-1}))}{f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1})} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds since $e^x \leq 1 + x + x^2$ for $x \in [0, 1]$ and $W A_{ij_r}/b_i \leq 1$ by the definition of W . The second holds again by $W A_{ij_r}/b_i \leq 1$. The third is due to Lemma 9. The last follows from the fact that $1 + x \leq e^x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$. By expanding the recurrence, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_t &\leq \beta_0 \prod_{r=1}^t \exp \left(\frac{(\epsilon W + \epsilon^2 W)(f(S_r) - f(S_{r-1}))}{f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1})} \right) \\
&\leq \exp \left(\epsilon^2 W + (\epsilon W + \epsilon^2 W) \sum_{r=1}^t \frac{f(S_r) - f(S_{r-1})}{f(O) - 2f(S_{r-1})} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality holds since $\beta_0 = m \leq \exp(\epsilon^2 W)$.

Then, we give a lower bound for β_t . By the definition of β_t ,

$$\beta_t e^\epsilon = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{it} \cdot (e^{\epsilon W})^{1/W} \geq \sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{it} \cdot (e^{\epsilon W})^{A_{ij_t}/b_i} = \sum_{i=1}^m b_i w_{i(t+1)} \geq e^{\epsilon W}.$$

The first inequality is due to the definition of W . Thus, we have $\beta_t \geq e^{\epsilon(W-1)}$.

Next, it is easy to see that $f(S_0) \leq f(S_1) \leq \dots \leq f(S_t)$ since the algorithm never added an element with a negative marginal value. Besides, we can assume that $f(O) > 2f(S_t)$ since otherwise the lemma already holds. Thus, we can apply Lemma 8 to get

$$\frac{\epsilon(W-1) - \epsilon^2 W}{\epsilon W + \epsilon^2 W} \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^t \frac{f(S_\ell) - f(S_{\ell-1})}{f(O) - 2f(S_{\ell-1})} \leq \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{f(O) - 2f(S_0)}{f(O) - 2f(S_t)}.$$

Finally, note that $(\epsilon(W-1) - \epsilon^2 W)/(\epsilon W + \epsilon^2 W) \geq (1-2\epsilon)(1+\epsilon) \geq 1-3\epsilon$. One can obtain that

$$f(S_t) \geq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - e^{-2(1-3\epsilon)} \right) \cdot f(O).$$

□

When $m = 1$, Algorithm 5 reduces to a greedy algorithm for the knapsack constraint. By the standard *enumeration* technique [23, 33], it is easy to remove the large-width assumption. We can easily obtain the following result for the knapsack constraint.

Theorem 5. *For symmetric submodular maximization under a knapsack constraint, there is an algorithm that has an approximation ratio of $\frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-2})$ and uses $O(n^4)$ queries.*

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we present efficient deterministic algorithms for maximizing symmetric submodular functions under various constraints. All of them require fewer queries and most of them achieve state-of-the-art approximation ratios. However, our fast algorithm for the cardinality constraint is randomized and linear only when $k = O(\sqrt{n})$. It is interesting to design a linear deterministic algorithm for the constraint.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China Grants No. 62325210, 62272441.

References

- [1] Alexander A. Ageev and Maxim Sviridenko. An 0.828-approximation algorithm for the uncapacitated facility location problem. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 93(2-3):149–156, 1999.
- [2] Georgios Amanatidis, Georgios Birmpas, and Evangelos Markakis. A simple deterministic algorithm for symmetric submodular maximization subject to a knapsack constraint. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 163:106010, 2020.
- [3] Per Austrin, Siavosh Benabbas, and Konstantinos Georgiou. Better balance by being biased: A 0.8776-approximation for max bisection. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 13(1):2:1–2:27, 2016.
- [4] Yossi Azar and Iftah Gamzu. Efficient submodular function maximization under linear packing constraints. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 39th International Colloquium, ICALP 2012, Warwick, UK, July 9-13, 2012, Proceedings, Part I*, volume 7391 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 38–50. Springer, 2012.
- [5] Niv Buchbinder and Moran Feldman. Deterministic algorithms for submodular maximization problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 14(3):32:1–32:20, 2018.
- [6] Niv Buchbinder and Moran Feldman. Constrained submodular maximization via a nonsymmetric technique. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 44(3):988–1005, 2019.
- [7] Niv Buchbinder and Moran Feldman. Constrained submodular maximization via new bounds for dr-submodular functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01129*, 2023.
- [8] Niv Buchbinder, Moran Feldman, Joseph Naor, and Roy Schwartz. Submodular maximization with cardinality constraints. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2014, Portland, Oregon, USA, January 5-7, 2014*, pages 1433–1452. SIAM, 2014.
- [9] Niv Buchbinder, Moran Feldman, and Roy Schwartz. Comparing apples and oranges: Query tradeoff in submodular maximization. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, January 4-6, 2015*, pages 1149–1168. SIAM, 2015.

- [10] Gruia Călinescu, Chandra Chekuri, Martin Pál, and Jan Vondrák. Maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to a matroid constraint. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 40(6):1740–1766, 2011.
- [11] Karthekeyan Chandrasekaran and Chandra Chekuri. Min-max partitioning of hypergraphs and symmetric submodular functions. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2021, Virtual Conference, January 10 - 13, 2021*, pages 1026–1038. SIAM, 2021.
- [12] Yixin Chen, Ankur Nath, Chunli Peng, and Alan Kuhnle. Guided combinatorial algorithms for submodular maximization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05202*, 2024.
- [13] Anirban Dasgupta, Ravi Kumar, and Sujith Ravi. Summarization through submodularity and dispersion. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2013, 4-9 August 2013, Sofia, Bulgaria, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 1014–1022. The Association for Computer Linguistics, 2013.
- [14] Alina Ene and Huy L. Nguyen. Constrained submodular maximization: Beyond $1/e$. In *IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2016, 9-11 October 2016, Hyatt Regency, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA*, pages 248–257. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [15] Uriel Feige, Vahab S Mirrokni, and Jan Vondrák. Maximizing non-monotone submodular functions. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(4):1133–1153, 2011.
- [16] Moran Feldman. Maximizing symmetric submodular functions. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 13(3):39:1–39:36, 2017.
- [17] Moran Feldman, Joseph Naor, and Roy Schwartz. A unified continuous greedy algorithm for submodular maximization. In *IEEE 52nd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2011, Palm Springs, CA, USA, October 22-25, 2011*, pages 570–579. IEEE Computer Society, 2011.
- [18] Marshall L Fisher, George L Nemhauser, and Laurence A Wolsey. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—ii. *Polyhedral Combinatorics*, pages 73–78, 1978.
- [19] Satoru Fujishige. Canonical decompositions of symmetric submodular systems. *Discret. Appl. Math.*, 5(2):175–190, 1983.
- [20] Shayan Oveis Gharan and Jan Vondrák. Submodular maximization by simulated annealing. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2011, San Francisco, California, USA, January 23-25, 2011*, pages 1098–1116. SIAM, 2011.
- [21] Michel X. Goemans and José A. Soto. Algorithms for symmetric submodular function minimization under hereditary constraints and generalizations. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 27(2):1123–1145, 2013.
- [22] David Kempe, Jon M. Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of the Ninth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Washington, DC, USA, August 24 - 27, 2003*, pages 137–146. ACM, 2003.

- [23] Samir Khuller, Anna Moss, and Joseph Naor. The budgeted maximum coverage problem. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 70(1):39–45, 1999.
- [24] Jon Lee, Vahab S. Mirrokni, Viswanath Nagarajan, and Maxim Sviridenko. Non-monotone submodular maximization under matroid and knapsack constraints. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2009, Bethesda, MD, USA, May 31 - June 2, 2009*, pages 323–332. ACM, 2009.
- [25] Baharan Mirzasoleiman, Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Amin Karbasi, Jan Vondrák, and Andreas Krause. Lazier than lazy greedy. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, January 25-30, 2015, Austin, Texas, USA*, pages 1812–1818. AAAI Press, 2015.
- [26] George L. Nemhauser and Laurence A. Wolsey. Best algorithms for approximating the maximum of a submodular set function. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 3(3):177–188, 1978.
- [27] George L. Nemhauser, Laurence A. Wolsey, and Marshall L. Fisher. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions - I. *Math. Program.*, 14(1):265–294, 1978.
- [28] Benjamin Qi. On maximizing sums of non-monotone submodular and linear functions. In Sang Won Bae and Heejin Park, editors, *33rd International Symposium on Algorithms and Computation, ISAAC 2022, December 19-21, 2022, Seoul, Korea*, volume 248 of *LIPICs*, pages 41:1–41:16. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [29] Maurice Queyranne. Minimizing symmetric submodular functions. *Math. Program.*, 82:3–12, 1998.
- [30] Alexander Schrijver et al. *Combinatorial optimization: polyhedra and efficiency*, volume 24. Springer, 2003.
- [31] Xiaoming Sun, Jialin Zhang, Shuo Zhang, and Zhijie Zhang. Improved deterministic algorithms for non-monotone submodular maximization. In *Computing and Combinatorics - 28th International Conference, COCOON 2022, Shenzhen, China, October 22-24, 2022, Proceedings*, volume 13595 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 496–507. Springer, 2022.
- [32] Scott Sussex, Caroline Uhler, and Andreas Krause. Near-optimal multi-perturbation experimental design for causal structure learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 777–788, 2021.
- [33] Maxim Sviridenko. A note on maximizing a submodular set function subject to a knapsack constraint. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 32(1):41–43, 2004.
- [34] Sebastian Tschatschek, Rishabh K. Iyer, Haochen Wei, and Jeff A. Bilmes. Learning mixtures of submodular functions for image collection summarization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2014, December 8-13 2014, Montreal, Quebec, Canada*, pages 1413–1421, 2014.
- [35] Murad Tukan, Loay Mualem, and Moran Feldman. Practical 0.385-approximation for submodular maximization subject to a cardinality constraint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13994*, 2024.

- [36] Jan Vondrák. Optimal approximation for the submodular welfare problem in the value oracle model. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, May 17-20, 2008*, pages 67–74. ACM, 2008.
- [37] Yuxun Zhou and Costas J. Spanos. Causal meets submodular: Subset selection with directed information. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 29: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2016, December 5-10, 2016, Barcelona, Spain*, pages 2649–2657, 2016.