

Fine Grained Lower Bounds for Multidimensional Knapsack

Ilan Doron-Arad*

Ariel Kulik†

Pasin Manurangsi‡

July 16, 2024

Abstract

We study the d -dimensional knapsack problem. We are given a set of items, each with a d -dimensional cost vector and a profit, along with a d -dimensional budget vector. The goal is to select a set of items that do not exceed the budget in all dimensions and maximize the total profit. A polynomial-time approximation scheme (PTAS) with running time $n^{\Theta(d/\varepsilon)}$ has long been known for this problem, where ε is the error parameter and n is the encoding size. Despite decades of active research, the best running time of a PTAS has remained $O(n^{\lceil d/\varepsilon \rceil - d})$. Unfortunately, existing lower bounds only cover the special case with two dimensions $d = 2$, and do not answer whether there is a $n^{o(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})}$ -time PTAS for larger values of d . The status of exact algorithms is similar: there is a simple $O(n \cdot W^d)$ -time (exact) dynamic programming algorithm, where W is the maximum budget, but there is no lower bound which explains the strong exponential dependence on d .

In this work, we show that the running times of the best-known PTAS and exact algorithm cannot be improved up to a polylogarithmic factor assuming Gap-ETH. Our techniques are based on a robust reduction from 2-CSP, which embeds 2-CSP constraints into a desired number of dimensions, exhibiting tight trade-off between d and ε for most regimes of the parameters. Informally, we obtain the following main results for d -dimensional knapsack.

- No $n^{o(\frac{d}{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{1}{(\log(d/\varepsilon))^2})}$ -time $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation for every $\varepsilon = O(\frac{1}{\log d})$.
- No $(n + W)^{o(\frac{d}{\log d})}$ -time exact algorithm (assuming ETH).
- No $n^{o(\sqrt{d})}$ -time $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation for constant ε .
- $((d \cdot \log W)^{O(d^2)} + n^{O(1)})$ -time $\Omega(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}})$ -approximation and a matching $n^{O(1)}$ -time lower bound.

1 Introduction

In the 0/1-Knapsack problem, we are given a set of items each with a cost and a profit, together with a budget. The goal is to select a subset of items whose total cost does not exceed the budget while maximizing the total profit. Knapsack is one of the most well-studied problems in combinatorial optimization. Indeed, a *polynomial-time approximation scheme* (PTAS) for the problem [Joh73, Sah75] was among the first PTASes to have ever been discovered in the field, and is often the first PTAS taught in computer science courses (see e.g. [WS11, Section 3.1] and [CLRS09, Chapter 35.5]). While such a PTAS has been known to exist since the 70s [Joh73, Sah75], the problem remains an active topic of research to this day [IK75, Law79, KP99, KP04, Rhe15, Cha18, Jin19, DJM23, Mao23, CLMZ23], with the best known PTAS that gives a $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation

*ilan.d.a.s.d@gmail.com

†kulik@cs.technion.ac.il

‡Google Research, Thailand. Email: pasin@google.com

in time $\tilde{O}(n + 1/\varepsilon^2)$ [Mao23, CLMZ23]. This running time is essentially tight assuming $(\min, +)$ -convolution cannot be solved in truly sub-quadratic time [CMWW19, KPS17].

Numerous generalizations of Knapsack have been considered over the years. One of the most natural and well-studied versions is the so-called *d-dimensional knapsack* problem. Here each cost is a d -dimensional vector. The problem remains the same, except that the total cost must not exceed the budget in every coordinate. The problem is defined more formally below.

Definition 1.1. (*d*-Dimensional Knapsack)

Input: An instance $\mathcal{I} = (I, p, c, B)$ consisting of:

- a set of items I ,
- a profit function $p : I \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$,
- a d -dimensional cost function $c : I \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^d$,
- a d -dimensional budget $B \in \mathbb{N}^d$.

Solution: A subset $S \subseteq I$ such that for all $j \in [d]$ it holds that $c_j(S) := \sum_{i \in S} c_j(i) \leq B_j$.

Objective: Find a solution of maximum profit, where the profit of S is $p(S) := \sum_{i \in S} p(i)$

Multidimensional (vector) knapsack is the family of d -dimensional knapsack problems for all $d \geq 1$. The study of d -dimensional knapsack dates back to the 50s [LS55, MM57, WN67] and it has been used to model problems arising in many contexts, including resource allocation, delivery system, budgeting, investment, and voting (see the survey [Fré04] for a more comprehensive review). Given its importance, there have been several algorithms and hardness results devised for the problem over the years. We will summarize the main theoretical results below. We note that many heuristics for the problems have been proposed (e.g., [ASG04, BYFA08, BEEB09, KFRW10, LB12, SC14, ARF14, YCLZ19, RBEDB19]), although these do not provide theoretical guarantees and thus will be omitted from the subsequent discussions.

On the hardness front, the decision version of the Knapsack problem ($d = 1$) generalizes the Subset Sum problem, which is one of Karp’s 21 NP-complete problems [Kar72]. The $d = 1$ case admits a *fully polynomial time approximation scheme* (FPTAS), i.e., a PTAS that runs in time $(n/\varepsilon)^{O(1)}$. In contrast, for $d = 2$, it has also long been known that no FPTAS exists unless $P = NP$ [KS81, MC84]. This has more recently been strengthened in [KS10], who show that, even when $d = 2$, the problem does not even admit an efficient PTAS (EPTAS), i.e., one that runs in time $f(\varepsilon) \cdot n^{O(1)}$ time, assuming $W[1] \neq FPT$. This in turn was improved by [JLL16] to rule out any PTAS that runs in time $n^{o(1/\varepsilon)}$ even for $d = 2$, assuming ETH.

Meanwhile, on the algorithmic front, a PTAS for d -dimensional knapsack with running time $n^{O(d/\varepsilon)}$ was first described by Chandra et al. [CHW76]¹, not long after a PTAS for Knapsack was discovered in [Joh73, Sah75]. The d -dimensional knapsack has been a challenging research topic ever since: Over the past nearly 50 years, all improvements on Chandra et al.’s PTAS come just in the constant in the exponent [FC84, CKPP00], with the best running time known being $O(n^{\lceil d/\varepsilon \rceil - d})$ [CKPP00]. Unfortunately, this barrier cannot be explained by aforementioned existing lower bounds. For example, they do not rule out $n^{O(d+1/\varepsilon)}$ -time PTAS. This brings us to the main question of this paper:

¹Strictly speaking, Chandra et al.’s algorithm is for the *unbounded* version where each item can be picked multiple times. However, it can be extended to the bounded case too [OM80].

Is there a PTAS for d -dimensional knapsack with running time $n^{o(d/\varepsilon)}$?

1.1 Our Results

Our main result is the resolution of the above question in the negative, up to a polylogarithmic factor in the exponent. Unlike previous lower bounds [KS10, JLL16] which focused on two dimensions $d = 2$, or a non-parametrized number of dimensions [CK04], our lower bound gives a nearly tight *trade-off* between d and $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. In the following results, n denotes the encoding size of the instance.

Theorem 1.2. *Assuming Gap-ETH, there exist constants $\zeta, \chi, d_0 > 0$ such that for every integer $d > d_0$ and every $\varepsilon \in \left(0, \frac{\chi}{\log d}\right)$, there is no $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation algorithm for d -dimensional knapsack that runs in time $O\left(n^{\frac{d}{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\zeta}{(\log(d/\varepsilon))^2}}\right)$.*

For example, **Theorem 1.2** implies that there is no algorithm which for every d and $\varepsilon < 0.1$ returns a $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution for a d -dimensional knapsack instance in time $n^{O(d + \frac{1}{\varepsilon})}$, or $n^{O\left(\frac{d^{1-\delta}}{\varepsilon}\right)}$, or even $n^{O\left((d + \frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{2-\delta}\right)}$ for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$ (by setting $d = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$). Additionally, as the lower bound in **Theorem 1.2** considers specific values of d and ε , the result also rules out algorithms with running time of the form $f(d, \varepsilon) \cdot n^{\frac{d}{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\chi}{(\log(d/\varepsilon))^2}}$ for an arbitrary function f . (A similar statement is also true for each of the following lower bounds.)

Exact Algorithms It is fairly easy to attain an exact algorithm for d -dimensional knapsack via dynamic programming. Such an algorithm runs in time $O(n \cdot W^d)$, where $W = \max_{j \in [d]} B_j$ is the maximum budget in one of the dimensions of the instance (see, .e.g., [KPP04]). However, no existing lower bounds can explain the exponential increase in the running time as d increases. Interestingly, our techniques can be used to obtain hard d -dimensional knapsack instances with small W (with respect to the number of items), which we use to lower bound the running time of exact pseudo-polynomial algorithms. The following theorem indicates that the naive dynamic programming cannot be significantly improved.

Theorem 1.3. *Assuming ETH, there exist constants $\zeta, d_0 > 0$, such that for every integer $d > d_0$ there is no algorithm that solves d -dimensional knapsack exactly in time $O\left((n + W)^{\zeta \cdot \frac{d}{\log(d)}}\right)$.*

Constant-Factor Hardness. The hardness results above deal with the case where the (in)approximation factor is $(1 - \varepsilon)$ for some small $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. It remains an intriguing question as to whether better approximation algorithms exist for smaller approximation factors. Making progress towards this question, we show that for any constant approximation ratio, the running time of $n^{\Omega(\sqrt{d})}$ is still required, as stated below. Note that as ε is a constant here, the upper bound on the running time remains $n^{O(d)}$ [CHW76, FC84, CKPP00] and thus this is not yet tight.

Theorem 1.4. *Assuming Gap-ETH, for any constant $\rho \in (0, 1)$, there exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds: for any constant $d \geq d_0$, there is no ρ -approximation algorithm for d -dimensional knapsack that runs in time $O(n^{\delta\sqrt{d}})$.*

$\Theta(1/\sqrt{d})$ -Factor Hardness and Approximation. Next, we consider the other extreme where we want the running time to be $O(n^C)$ where C is independent of d (in other words, d can be considered to be given as part of the input). In the special case where all costs and budgets are boolean (i.e. $B_j = 1$ for all $j \in [d]$)², there is a polynomial-time $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm

²In fact, the algorithm works for a more general case; see **Theorem 6.1**.

[Sri95] and a nearly-tight NP-hardness result of inapproximability factor $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{d^{1/2-\varepsilon}}\right)$ for any constant $\varepsilon > 0$ [CK04]. However, this lower bound only holds when $d = n^{\Omega(1)}$ and does not exclude *fixed parameter tractable (FPT)* algorithms³ with the parameter d . In this work, we strengthen this result by showing that $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -factor hardness holds even for sufficiently large constants d . As mentioned after [Theorem 1.2](#), such a lower bound also rules out any FPT (in d) algorithm with $\omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation ratio.

Theorem 1.5. *Assuming Gap-ETH, for any constant $C \geq 1$, there exist $\rho > 0$ and $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds: for any $d \geq d_0$, there is no $\left(\frac{\rho}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm for d -dimensional knapsack that runs in $O(n^C)$ time.*

We stress that the lower bound in [Theorem 1.5](#) does *not* hold for boolean instances. Indeed, such a case can be easily solved (exactly) in time $O(n \cdot 2^d)$. Thus, our reduction is quite different compared to that of [CK04]. In the non-boolean case, the best known upper bound, assuming d is given as part of the input, is an $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{d}\right)$ -approximation [Sri95, CKPP00]. To complement this result, we give an $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm that runs in polynomial time as long as $W \leq \exp(O(n^{1/d^2}))$, as stated more precisely below.

Theorem 1.6. *For every $d \geq 1$, there is a $\left((d \cdot \log W)^{O(d^2)} + n^{O(1)}\right)$ -time $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm for d -dimensional knapsack.*

Since we only require $W = O(\log n)$ in the above hardness ([Theorem 1.5](#)), this algorithm matches our lower bound for a large regime of parameters.

1.2 Technical Contribution

Existing lower bounds for d -dimensional knapsack can be roughly partitioned into two categories. First, lower bounds for $d = 2$ dimensions [KS81, MC84, KS10, JLL16]. The basic technique in this setting is to reduce Subset Sum to 2-dimensional knapsack. In broad terms, each number in the Subset Sum instance corresponds to an item. One dimension imposes an upper bound by the target value on the original sum, while the second dimension guarantees that the original sum is higher than the target value using clever cost construction. However, these constructions are only useful for $d = 2$ using an extremely small ε , and cannot be used to reveal the asymptotic hardness of d -dimensional knapsack for larger values of d . The second category of lower bounds considers the setting where d is arbitrarily large [CK04, Sri95]; as mentioned previously, the existing lower bounds break down if one allows coefficients that exponentially depend on d . Therefore, to reach our desired results, we need different techniques.

In contrast, we resort to a reduction from *2-constrained satisfaction problem with rectangular constraints (R-CSP)* (see the definition in [Section 2](#)). The problem is a variant of the *2-constraint satisfaction problem (2-CSP)* in which the input is a graph G , alphabets Σ and Υ , and mappings $\pi_{e,u}, \pi_{e,v} : \Sigma \rightarrow \Upsilon$ for every $e = (u, v) \in E$. Informally, a solution is a *partial* assignment φ which assigns a letter in Σ to *some* of the vertices in G . The assignment must satisfy the property that $\pi_{e,u}(\varphi(u)) = \pi_{e,v}(\varphi(v))$ for every $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$ such that φ assigns values for both u and v . The goal is to find a partial assignment which assigns values to a maximum number of vertices.

Our starting point is a reduction from R-CSP to d -dimensional knapsack using small (polynomial) weights. Roughly speaking, each constraint (edge) of the R-CSP instance is expressed by

³That is, the running time is bounded by $f(d) \cdot n^C$, where C is independent of d and f is an arbitrary function.

a pair of dimensions, obtaining an important property that every dimension can contain up to 2 items with non-zero cost in the dimension, yielding a reduction that preserves the approximation guarantee. This construction is sufficient to obtain the lower bound presented in [Theorem 1.3](#) in conjunction with existing lower bounds for Max 2-CSP [[Mar10](#), [CMPS23](#)]. However, this construction is not versatile enough to give a strong lower bound where both d and ε play a significant role. For instance, it cannot attain a $n^{O(d+\frac{1}{\varepsilon})}$ running time lower bound for a PTAS.

Our main technical contribution is a robust reduction from R-CSP to d -dimensional knapsack in which d is (essentially) given as a parameter to the reduction. In an intuitive level, this reduction can be seen as a *dimension embedding* of an instance with d many dimensions to an instance with $\tilde{d} \ll d$ dimensions. Shrinking the number of dimensions increases almost at the same rate the *depth* of each dimension - the maximum number possible of items with non-zero cost in the dimension that can be taken to a solution. As the depth increases, it requires having an increasingly smaller error parameter ε to preserve the approximation guarantee of the reduction. This trade-off between d and ε is the key insight which eventually gives the very fine bound of [Theorem 1.2](#).

We remark that as a component of the reduction, we write a strengthened version of the Max 2-CSP lower bound of [[Mar10](#), [CMPS23](#)] yielding inapproximability up to a certain factor based on Gap-ETH. (See [Theorem A.7](#).) Although our proof is completely based on the constructions of [[Mar10](#), [CMPS23](#)], the inapproximability result itself may be of an independent interest, since the work of [[Mar10](#)] has been a classic technique in proving (exact) parametrized lower bounds (e.g., [[MP22](#), [JKMS13](#), [CDM17](#), [CX15](#), [BM20](#), [BKMN15](#), [PW18](#), [CFM21](#), [LRSZ20](#), [BS17](#)]).

Finally, our approximation algorithm [Theorem 1.6](#) is based on a simple discretization of the cost together with a bruteforce algorithm. As usual, the cost is discretized geometrically based on some scaling factor. The main difference compared to previous work is that we also discretize the *complement* of the costs (i.e. $B_j - c(i)_j$); our main structural lemma shows that such a discretization preserves the cost of the optimal solution up to $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -factor.

Organization: We start with some preliminary definitions in [Section 2](#). In [Section 3](#) we present our simple reduction from R-CSP to d -dimensional knapsack and use it to prove [Theorem 1.3](#). Then, in [Section 4](#) we give our second and more elaborate reduction from R-CSP to VK. In [Section 5](#) we prove our remaining main lower bounds ([Theorem 1.2](#), [Theorem 1.4](#), and [Theorem 1.5](#)). [Section 6](#) describes the approximation algorithm presented in [Theorem 1.6](#). We conclude in a discussion in [Section 7](#). We defer the proofs on 2-CSP to [Appendix A](#).

2 Preliminaries

Basic definitions For an instance \mathcal{I} of a maximization problem Π , let $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})$ be the optimum value of \mathcal{I} and let $|\mathcal{I}|$ denote the encoding size of \mathcal{I} . For a set S , a function $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and a subset $X \subseteq S$ we use the abbreviation $f(X) = \sum_{x \in X} f(x)$. For some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, an α -*approximate* solution for \mathcal{I} is a solution for \mathcal{I} of value at least $\alpha \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})$. For all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ let $[t] = \{1, 2, \dots, t\}$.

d -dimensional knapsack For short, for any $d \geq 1$ we use d -VK to denote an instance of d -dimensional (vector) knapsack (see the formal definition of d -VK in [Definition 1.1](#)). We also use VK to denote the collection of d -VK instances over all $d \geq 1$. For some $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and a d -VK instance $\mathcal{I} = (I, p, c, B)$, let $W(\mathcal{I}) = \max_{j \in [d]} B_j$ be the maximum budget of the instance. For any $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tilde{d} \in [d]$, we may assume w.l.o.g. that every \tilde{d} -dimensional knapsack instance is also a d -dimensional knapsack instance by adding extra $d - \tilde{d}$ dimensions with zero budgets and zero costs for all items.

Graph Theory definitions For every graph G let $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ denote the set of vertices and edges of G , respectively. We assume that all graphs G considered in this paper are simple directed graphs with no antisymmetric edges, such that edges $(u, v) \in E(G)$ are always oriented

according to $u \prec v$, where \prec denotes that u is smaller than v according to the lexicographic order. This assumption is purely technical as our reduction requires a fixed order of the endpoints of the edges. For a vertex $v \in V(G)$ we use $\text{Adj}_G(v)$ to denote the set of adjacent edges to v in G . For some $r \in \mathbb{N}$, a graph G is r -regular if the degree of each vertex is exactly r .

2-CSP with rectangular constraints We prove the hardness of VK via a reduction from 2-CSP with *rectangular constraints* (*R-CSP*) defined formally below.

Definition 2.1. 2-CSP with rectangular constraints (R-CSP)

- **Input:** $\Pi = (G, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,u}, \pi_{e,v}\}_{e=(u,v) \in E(G)})$ consisting of
 - A constraint graph G .
 - Alphabet sets Σ, Υ , where $\Upsilon = \{1, \dots, m\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$.
 - For each edge $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$, two functions $\pi_{e,u} : \Sigma \rightarrow \Upsilon$ and $\pi_{e,v} : \Sigma \rightarrow \Upsilon$.
- **Satisfied edges:** For $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$, we say that e is satisfied by $(\sigma_u, \sigma_v) \in \Sigma \times \Sigma$ if and only if $\pi_{e,u}(\sigma_u) = \pi_{e,v}(\sigma_v)$.
- **Partial Assignment:** A partial assignment is a function $\varphi : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\perp\}$.
- **Consistency:** A partial assignment φ is consistent if for all $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$ such that $\varphi(u) \neq \perp$ and $\varphi(v) \neq \perp$ it holds that e is satisfied by $(\varphi(u), \varphi(v))$.
- **Size:** The size of the partial assignment φ is defined as $|\varphi| := |\{v \in V(G) \mid \varphi(v) \neq \perp\}|$.
- **Objective:** Find a consistent partial assignment of maximum size. We define $\text{Par}(\Pi)$ to be the maximum size of a consistent partial assignment for Π .

Using techniques from [Mar10, CMPS23], we can show the following hardness result for R-CSP. We note that the objective in R-CSP as defined here is different than the usual “Max 2-CSP” objective (i.e. maximizing the number of edges satisfied). A similar result can also be shown for this objective. We defer the full details to [Appendix A](#).

Theorem 2.2. *Assuming Gap-ETH, there exist constants $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, for any constant $k \geq k_0$, there is no algorithm that given an R-CSP instance Π with a 3-regular constraint graph H such that $|V(H)| \leq k$, runs in time $O\left(|\Pi|^{\alpha \cdot \frac{k}{\log(k)}}\right)$ and distinguish between:*

- **(Completeness)** $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$.
- **(Soundness)** $\text{Par}(\Pi) < \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |V(H)|$.

We also use the following result, which is analogous to [Theorem 2.2](#) but uses the weaker assumption of ETH rather than Gap-ETH. The proofs is analogous to [Theorem 2.2](#), which follows from the work of [CMPS23] combined with our reduction from Gap-ETH to R-CSP (see [Appendix A](#)).

Theorem 2.3. *Assuming ETH, there exist constants $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, for any constant $k \geq k_0$, there is no algorithm that takes in an R-CSP instance Π with a 3-regular constraint graph H such that $|V(H)| \leq k$ variables, runs in time $O\left(|\Pi|^{\alpha \cdot \frac{k}{\log(k)}}\right)$ and decides if $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$.*

3-SAT, ETH, and Gap-ETH:

Our lower bounds are conditioned on Gap-ETH and ETH. Before we state these, recall the standard 3-SAT problem.

Definition 2.4. 3-SAT(D)

- **Input:** $\phi = (V, C)$, where V is a set of variables and C is a set of disjunction clauses of three variables or negation of variables in V , such that each variable appears in at most D clauses.
- **Assignment:** A function $s : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$.
- **Objective:** Find an assignment satisfying a maximum number of clauses. Let $\text{SAT}(\phi)$ be the maximum number of clauses in C satisfied by a single assignment to ϕ .

We first state ETH [IP01].

Conjecture 2.5. Exponential-Time Hypothesis (ETH) *There is a constant $\xi > 0$ such that there is no algorithm that given a 3-SAT formula ϕ on n variables and m clauses can decide if $\text{SAT}(\phi) = m$ in time $O(2^{\xi \cdot n})$.*

The Gap Exponential Time Hypothesis (Gap-ETH) [Din16, MR16] is stated below. Note that the bounded degree assumption is w.l.o.g. (see e.g. [MR16, Footnote 5]).

Conjecture 2.6 (Gap Exponential-Time Hypothesis (Gap-ETH)). *There exist constants $D \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\delta, \varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ such that there is no algorithm that is given a 3-SAT(D) instance ϕ on n variables and m clauses distinguishes between $\text{SAT}(\phi) = m$ and $\text{SAT}(\phi) < (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot m$ in time $O(2^{\delta \cdot n})$.*

3 A Simple Reduction from R-CSP to d -Dimensional Knapsack

In this section, we give our first reduction from R-CSP to d -VK and prove [Theorem 1.3](#). Then, in the next section we give a more involved reduction between the two mentioned problems in order to prove our second main result ([Theorem 1.2](#)).

Given an R-CSP instance $\Pi = (G, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,u}, \pi_{e,v}\}_{e=(u,v) \in E(G)}, \perp)$, the reduction creates a d -VK instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi) = (I, p, w, B)$ where $d = |V(G)| + 2|E(G)|$; namely, there is a dimension for every vertex and every endpoint of an edge. The items will be pairs $(v, \sigma) \in V(G) \times \Sigma$ of a vertex and a symbol from the alphabet. The vertex-dimensions guarantee that we can take at most one *copy* of each vertex - corresponding to an assignment of at most one symbol to the vertex. The edge-dimensions guarantee consistency. For each edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$, we have two dimensions (e, u) and (e, v) . We define the costs of items that are copies of u, v accordingly so that any two items (u, σ_u) and (v, σ_v) satisfy together the budget constraints in both (e, u) and (e, v) if and only if $\pi_{e,u}(\sigma_u) = \pi_{e,v}(\sigma_v)$. The reduction is stated and proven as follows.

Lemma 3.1. *There is a reduction simple, which given an R-CSP instance $\Pi = (G, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,u}, \pi_{e,v}\}_{e=(u,v) \in E(G)})$, returns in time $O(|\Pi|^3)$ an instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi) = (I, p, w, B)$ of d -VK such that the following holds.*

1. *There is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$ of profit q iff there is a consistent partial assignment for Π of size q .*
2. $d = |V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)|$.
3. $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)| \leq O(|\Pi|^3)$.

4. $W(\mathcal{I}(\Pi)) \leq |\Pi|$.

Proof. We define the instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi) = (I, p, w, B)$ as follows:

- Let $I = V(G) \times \Sigma$.
- Define $p(i) = 1$ for all $i \in I$.
- Let $d = |V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)|$. For notational convenience, we assume that each dimension is associated with an element in $V(G) \cup \{(e, v) \mid v \in V(G), e \in \text{Adj}_G(v)\}$.
- Let $m = |\Upsilon|$ and let the budget B_j be m for all dimensions j .
- Finally, let the cost be as follows:
 - For all $v \in V(G)$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, let $w_v(v, \sigma) = m$
 - For all $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, let

$$\begin{aligned} w_{(e,u)}(v, \sigma) &= m - \pi_{(e,v)}(\sigma), \\ w_{(e,v)}(v, \sigma) &= \pi_{(e,v)}(\sigma), \\ w_{(e,u)}(u, \sigma) &= \pi_{(e,u)}(\sigma), \\ w_{(e,v)}(u, \sigma) &= m - \pi_{(e,u)}(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

- Cost of all items in all other coordinates are set to zero.

It is clear that the reduction runs in $O(|\Pi|^3)$ time and the encoding size is $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)| \leq O(|\Pi|^3)$. Also, by definition it holds that $W(\mathcal{I}(\Pi)) = m \leq |\Pi|$. We next prove the completeness and soundness.

(Completeness) Let $\varphi : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\perp\}$ be a consistent partial assignment for Π . Define a solution $S = \{(v, \varphi(v)) \mid \varphi(v) \neq \perp\}$. Clearly, $p(S) = |S| = |\varphi|$. To prove the feasibility of S , note that for all $v \in V(G)$ it holds that $w_v(S) \leq m = B_v$. For every $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$ one of the following cases holds.

- $\varphi(u) = \perp$ or $\varphi(v) = \perp$. Then, it can be easily verified that $w_{(e,u)}(S) \leq m = B_{(e,u)}$ and $w_{(e,v)}(S) \leq m = B_{(e,v)}$.
- $\varphi(u) \neq \perp$ and $\varphi(v) \neq \perp$. then

$$w_{(e,u)}(S) = \pi_{(e,u)}(\varphi(u)) + m - \pi_{(e,v)}(\varphi(v)) = m = B_{(e,u)},$$

where the second equality follows from the consistency of φ . Similarly, it holds that

$$w_{(e,v)}(S) = \pi_{(e,v)}(\varphi(v)) + m - \pi_{(e,u)}(\varphi(u)) = m = B_{(e,v)}.$$

Thus, S is a feasible solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$.

(Soundness) Let $S \subseteq I$ be a solution of $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$. For every $v \in V(G)$ let $\Sigma_{v,S} := \{\sigma \in \Sigma \mid (v, \sigma) \in S\}$. Since S is a feasible solution, for every $v \in V(G)$ it holds that $w_v(S) = |\Sigma_{v,S}| \cdot m \leq m$. Thus, $|\Sigma_{v,S}| \leq 1$. Construct an assignment $\varphi : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\perp\}$ such that for all $v \in V(G)$ set $\varphi(v) = \perp$ if $\Sigma_{v,S} = \emptyset$, and otherwise set $\varphi(v)$ as the unique element in $\Sigma_{v,S}$. Since $|\Sigma_{v,S}| \leq 1$ for all $v \in V(G)$, it follows that $|\varphi| = |S| = p(S)$. To see that φ is a consistent partial assignment, suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$ such that $\varphi(u), \varphi(v) \neq \perp$ and $\pi_{(e,u)}(\varphi(u)) \neq \pi_{(e,v)}(\varphi(v))$. Suppose w.l.o.g. that $\pi_{(e,u)}(\varphi(u)) > \pi_{(e,v)}(\varphi(v))$. Since S contains both $(v, \varphi(v))$ and $(u, \varphi(u))$ we have

$$w_{(e,u)}(S) \geq w_{(e,u)}(u, \varphi(u)) + w_{(e,u)}(v, \varphi(v)) = \pi_{(e,u)}(\varphi(u)) + m - \pi_{(e,v)}(\varphi(v)) > m = B_{(e,u)}.$$

It follows that S is not a valid solution to $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$, a contradiction. \blacksquare

The above reduction, together with [Theorem 2.3](#), suffices to prove [Theorem 1.3](#).

Proof of [Theorem 1.3](#)

Assume that ETH holds. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the promised constants by [Theorem 2.3](#). Define a parameter $\zeta = \frac{\alpha}{1000}$. Let $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds.

1. $\alpha \cdot \frac{\lfloor \frac{d_0}{10} \rfloor}{\log\left(\lfloor \frac{d_0}{10} \rfloor\right)} \geq 3$.
2. $d_0 \geq \max\{10 \cdot k_0, 40\}$.

Assume towards a contradiction that there is $d > d_0$ and an algorithm \mathcal{A} that given a d -dimensional knapsack instance returns an optimal solution in time $O\left((n + W)^{\zeta \cdot \frac{d}{\log(d)}}\right)$, where n and W are the encoding size and maximum number in the instance, respectively. Let $k = \lfloor \frac{d}{10} \rfloor$. We define the following algorithm \mathcal{B} that decides if an R-CSP instance Π on 3-regular constraint graph H where $|V(H)| \leq k$ satisfies $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$ or $\text{Par}(\Pi) < |V(H)|$. Let

$$\Pi = (H, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,u}, \pi_{e,v}\}_{e=(u,v) \in E(G)})$$

be an R-CSP instance with $|V(H)| \leq k$ vertices such that H is 3-regular. Define \mathcal{B} on input Π by:

1. Compute the VK instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi) = (I, p, w, B)$ by the reduction simple described in [Lemma 3.1](#).
2. Execute \mathcal{A} on $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$. Let S be the returned solution.
3. If $p(S) = |V(H)|$: return that $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$.
4. If $p(S) < |V(H)|$: return that $\text{Par}(\Pi) < |V(H)|$.

First, by [Lemma 3.1](#) observe that the number of dimensions of $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$ is

$$|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)| \leq k + 3 \cdot 2 \cdot k \leq 7 \cdot k \leq d. \tag{1}$$

The first inequality holds since $|V(H)| \leq k$ and since H is 3-regular. Let $W = W(\mathcal{I}(\Pi))$ be the maximum weight of the instance. By [Lemma 3.1](#) it holds that $W \leq |\Pi|$.

By [Lemma 3.1](#), there is a constant $C \geq 3$ such that $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)| \leq C \cdot |\Pi|^3$ if $|\Pi| > C$. If $|\Pi| \leq C$, then the running time of \mathcal{B} on the input Π is bounded by a constant. Otherwise, assume for the following that $|\Pi| > C$ thus $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)| \leq |\Pi|^4$. Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)| + W \leq |\Pi|^4 + |\Pi| \leq |\Pi|^5. \tag{2}$$

The first inequality holds since $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)| \leq |\Pi|^4$. In addition, we have

$$5 \cdot \zeta \cdot \frac{d}{\log(d)} = \frac{5 \cdot \zeta \cdot (10 \cdot (\frac{d}{10} - 1) + 10)}{\log(d)} \leq 5 \cdot \zeta \cdot \frac{(10 \cdot k + 10)}{\log(k)} \leq 5 \cdot \zeta \cdot \frac{20 \cdot k}{\log(k)} \leq \frac{\alpha \cdot k}{\log(k)}. \quad (3)$$

The first inequality holds since $k = \lfloor \frac{d}{10} \rfloor$; thus, $k \leq d$ and $k \geq \frac{d}{10} - 1$. The second inequality holds since $k \geq \frac{d}{10} - 1 \geq \frac{d_0}{10} - 1 \geq 1$. The last inequality follows from the selection of ζ . Then, by the running time guarantee of \mathcal{A} and since the running time of computing $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$ can be bounded by $O(|\Pi|^3)$, executing \mathcal{B} on Π can be done in time

$$O\left((|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)| + W)^{\zeta \cdot \frac{d}{\log(d)}} + |\Pi|^3\right) \leq O\left(|\Pi|^{5 \cdot \zeta \cdot \frac{d}{\log(d)}} + |\Pi|^3\right) \leq O\left(|\Pi|^{\frac{\alpha \cdot k}{\log(k)}} + |\Pi|^3\right) \leq O\left(|\Pi|^{\frac{\alpha \cdot k}{\log(k)}}\right)$$

The first inequality follows from (2). The second inequality uses (3). The last inequality holds since $\frac{\alpha \cdot k}{\log(k)} \geq 3$ by the assumption on d_0 using that $d \geq d_0$.

It remains to prove the two directions of the reduction. First, assume that $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$. Thus, there is a consistent partial assignment for Π of size $|V(H)|$. Then, by Lemma 3.1 there is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$ of profit $|V(H)|$. Therefore, since \mathcal{A} returns an optimal solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$, the returned solution S by \mathcal{A} has profit $|V(H)|$. Thus, \mathcal{B} correctly decides that $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$. Conversely, assume that $\text{Par}(\Pi) < |V(H)|$. Thus, every consistent partial assignment for Π has size strictly less than $|V(H)|$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.1 there is no solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$ of profit $|V(H)|$. Hence, the returned solution S by \mathcal{A} has profit strictly less than $|V(H)|$. It follows that \mathcal{B} returns that $\text{Par}(\Pi) < |V(H)|$ as required. By the above, \mathcal{B} is decides correctly if $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$ in time $O\left(|\Pi|^{\alpha \cdot \frac{k}{\log(k)}}\right)$. This is a contradiction to Theorem 2.3 and the proof follows. \blacksquare

4 A reduction from R-CSP to VK with Varying Dimensions

In this section, we give our main reduction from R-CSP to VK. As we will see in the next section, this implies our main result (Theorem 1.2). We observe the result cannot be attained from Lemma 3.1 since the VK instances generated by Lemma 3.1 can be solved exactly in time $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)|^d$ using an exhaustive enumeration in time $|\Pi|^{|E(G)|}$ on the original R-CSP instance. For example, this implies that the reduction cannot be used to rule out approximation schemes for VK which run in time $n^{d+\frac{1}{\epsilon}}$.

The reduction considers an additional integer parameter F besides the R-CSP instance Π . This parameter is used to control the three key aspects of the reduced d -VK instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$. First, the number of dimensions is roughly $d \approx \frac{|V(G)|}{F}$, where G is the constraint graph of Π ; we therefore coin this reduction as the *dimension embedding reduction*. Second, the approximation guarantee loses a factor of $2 \cdot F$; thus, there is an almost tight trade-off between the number of dimensions and the approximation guarantee. The main properties of the reduction are given in Lemma 4.1.

Lemma 4.1. Dimension Embedding Reduction: *There is a reduction R-CSP \rightarrow VK that, given an R-CSP instance Π whose constraint graph G is 3-regular and $F \in [|V(G)|]$ returns in time $|\Pi|^{O(1)}$ an instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F) = (I, p, c, B)$ of d -VK such that the following holds.*

1. The number of dimensions is $d = 2 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{|V(G)| + |E(G)|}{F} \right\rceil$.
2. $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)| = O(|\Pi|^4)$.
3. **(Completeness)** If $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(G)|$, then there is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ with profit $|V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)|$.

4. **(Soundness)** For every $q \in \mathbb{N}$, if there is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ of profit at least $|V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)| - q$, then $\text{Par}(\Pi) \geq |V(G)| - 2 \cdot q \cdot F$.

The above reduction considers an R-CSP instance $\Pi = (G, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,u}, \pi_{e,v}\}_{e=(u,v) \in E(G)})$ and some integer parameter $F \in [|V(G)|]$. The reduction outputs a d -VK instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F) = (I, p, c, B)$ that in a high level constructed as follows. We let $D = V(G) \cup E(G)$ be the set of *constraints*, resembling the use of the vertices and edges as constraints in the reduction of [Section 3](#). We define an arbitrary partition D_1, \dots, D_r of D with F constraints in each set (with possibly fewer constraints in the last set). For each $\ell \in [r]$, we make an *embedding* of D_ℓ into only two dimensions, thus having overall $d = 2 \cdot r$ dimensions.

The items of the constructed instance are $I = V(G) \times \Sigma$ - as in the previous reduction. For each $\ell \in [r]$ the reduction defines two dimensions $(\ell, 1)$ and $(\ell, 2)$, which can be viewed as $(2 \cdot F + 1)$ -digit numbers on a basis of a very large number \mathcal{Q} . Each of the constraints in D_ℓ is encoded into one of the first F digits in both dimension. The encoding of each constraint into its digit resembles the encoding used in [Lemma 3.1](#). The highest digit is only used in $(\ell, 2)$, and its goal is to bound the total number of selected items which participate in one of the constraints in D_ℓ . The remaining digits are not used. The reduction is formally stated as follows.

Definition 4.2. Let $\Pi = (G, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,u}, \pi_{e,v}\}_{e=(u,v) \in E(G)})$ be an R-CSP instance, where G is 3-regular, and let $F \in [|V(G)|]$. We define the output d -VK instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F) = (I, p, c, B)$ as follows.

- The items are pairs of a vertex and a symbol in Σ , i.e., $I = \{(v, \sigma) \mid v \in V(G), \sigma \in \Sigma\}$.
- Define $D = V(G) \cup E(G)$.
- Let D_1, \dots, D_r be an arbitrary partition of D such that $|D_\ell| \leq F$ for all $\ell \in [r]$.
- Define the number of dimensions as $d = 2 \cdot r$.
- For all $\ell \in [r]$ and $v \in V(G)$ define

$$J(\ell, v) = \begin{cases} |\text{Adj}_G(v) \cap D_\ell| + 1, & \text{if } v \in D_\ell \\ |\text{Adj}_G(v) \cap D_\ell|, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Intuitively, $J(\ell, v)$ can be interpreted as the number of constraints in D_ℓ in which v participate.

- For all $\ell \in [r]$ define $N_\ell = \sum_{v \in V(G)} J(\ell, v)$ and $I_\ell = \{(v, \sigma) \in I \mid J(\ell, v) > 0\}$.
- Define $p : I \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by $p((v, \sigma)) = \sum_{\ell \in [r]} J(\ell, v)$ for all $(v, \sigma) \in I$.
- Let $m = |\Upsilon|$.
- Define $\mathcal{Q} = 3 \cdot F^2 \cdot m \cdot |V(G)| \cdot |\Sigma|$.
- Define $M = \mathcal{Q}^{2 \cdot F}$.
- For all $\ell \in [r]$ let $\text{ord}_\ell : D_\ell \rightarrow [|D_\ell|]$ be an arbitrary bijection.
- Define $w : I \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^D$ such that for all $(v, \sigma) \in I$ and $j \in D$:

$$w_j((v, \sigma)) = \begin{cases} m, & \text{if } j = v, \\ \pi_{e,v}(\sigma), & \text{if } j = e, \text{ where } e = (v, u) \text{ and } e \in E(G), \\ m - \pi_{e,v}(\sigma), & \text{if } j = e, \text{ where } e = (u, v) \text{ and } e \in E(G), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- Define $c : I \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^{[r] \times \{1,2\}}$ such that for all $i = (v, \sigma) \in I$ and $(\ell, t) \in [r] \times \{1, 2\}$ define

$$c_{(\ell,t)}(i) = \begin{cases} \sum_{j \in D_\ell} w_j(i) \cdot \mathcal{Q}^{\text{ord}_\ell(j)}, & \text{if } i \in I_\ell \text{ and } t = 1, \\ M \cdot J(\ell, v) - \sum_{j \in D_\ell} w_j(i) \cdot \mathcal{Q}^{\text{ord}_\ell(j)}, & \text{if } i \in I_\ell \text{ and } t = 2, \\ 0, & \text{if } i \notin I_\ell. \end{cases}$$

- Define the budget $B \in \mathbb{N}^{[r] \times \{1,2\}}$ for all $(\ell, t) \in [r] \times \{1, 2\}$ by

$$B_{\ell,t} = \begin{cases} \sum_{j \in D_\ell} m \cdot \mathcal{Q}^{\text{ord}_\ell(j)}, & \text{if } t = 1, \\ M \cdot N_\ell - \sum_{j \in D_\ell} m \cdot \mathcal{Q}^{\text{ord}_\ell(j)} & \text{if } t = 2. \end{cases}$$

Henceforth, for every R-CSP instance Π with a graph G and $F \in [|V(G)|]$, we use $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ to denote the VK instance described in [Definition 4.2](#). To simplify the presentation, when Π, F are clear from the context, we may discard Π, F from the notations. We give an illustration of the construction in [Figure 1](#).




Figure 1: An illustration of the reduction [Definition 4.2](#). The figure shows the cost of item $i = (v, \sigma) \in I$ in dimensions $(\ell, 1)$ and $(\ell, 2)$ for some $\ell \in [r]$. The constraints in D_ℓ are $D_\ell = \{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4\}$ where $j_1 = v$, $j_3 = e = (u, v)$ which is adjacent to v , and j_2, j_4 are constraints not involving i . Thus, $J(\ell, v) = 2$. The constraints are ordered by j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4 so that $\text{ord}_\ell(j_1) = 1$, $\text{ord}_\ell(j_2) = 2$, etc. The cost of i in dimension $(\ell, 1)$ is $w_v(i) + w_e(i) \cdot \mathcal{Q}^3$. Considering this cost as a base- \mathcal{Q} number, the first digit is m and the third digit is $\pi_{(e,u)}(\sigma)$. This is illustrated as the gray area in the figure upper rectangle, depicting the 4-digit number in base- \mathcal{Q} . The cost of i in dimension $(\ell, 2)$ is $2 \cdot M - c_{(\ell,1)}(i)$ (since $J(\ell, v) = 2$) depicted as the gray area in the lower rectangle. Note that the two rectangles are not in their true proportions.

Clearly, given an R-CSP instance Π with a constraint graph G and $F \in [|V(G)|]$, the instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ can be constructed in time $|\Pi|^{O(1)}$. We state the following observation (which follows directly from definitions) regarding the costs and profits. This observation will be helpful throughout this section.

Observation 4.3. *For any $S \subseteq I$ and $\ell \in [r]$, we have*

- (i) $c_{\ell,1}(S) = \sum_{j \in D_\ell} w_j(S) \cdot \mathcal{Q}^{\text{ord}_\ell(j)}$.
- (ii) $c_{\ell,2}(S) = M \cdot \sum_{(v,\sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v) - \sum_{j \in D_\ell} w_j(S) \cdot \mathcal{Q}^{\text{ord}_\ell(j)}$.

$$(iii) \ p(S) = \sum_{\ell \in [r]} \sum_{(v, \sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v).$$

Next, we prove some basic properties of the reduction.

Lemma 4.4. *For any R-CSP instance $\Pi = (G, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,u}, \pi_{e,v}\}_{e=(u,v) \in E(G)}, \perp)$ and $F \in [|V(G)|]$ the following holds.*

1. $\sum_{\ell \in [r]} N_\ell = |V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)|.$
2. *For all $\ell \in [r]$ it holds that $N_\ell \leq 2 \cdot F.$*
3. $d = 2 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{|V(G)| + |E(G)|}{F} \right\rceil.$
4. $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)| \leq O(|\Pi|^4).$

Proof. The first property of the lemma follows from

$$\sum_{\ell \in [r]} N_\ell = \sum_{\ell \in [r]} \sum_{v \in V(G)} J(\ell, v) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} \sum_{\ell \in [r]} J(\ell, v) = \sum_{v \in V(G)} (|\text{Adj}_G(v)| + |\{v\}|) = |V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)|.$$

For the second property of the lemma, for all $\ell \in [r]$, it holds that

$$N_\ell = \sum_{v \in V(G)} J(\ell, v) = |V(G) \cap D_\ell| + 2 \cdot |E(G) \cap D_\ell| \leq 2 \cdot |D_\ell| \leq 2 \cdot F. \quad (4)$$

The third property clearly holds in [Definition 4.2](#). By [Definition 4.2](#), the largest number in the instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ is bounded by $M \cdot N_\ell$. Thus,

$$W(\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)) \leq M \cdot N_\ell \stackrel{(4)}{\leq} 2 \cdot F \cdot M = 2 \cdot F \cdot \mathcal{Q}^{2 \cdot F} = 2 \cdot F \cdot (3 \cdot F^2 \cdot m \cdot |V(G)| \cdot |\Sigma|)^{2 \cdot F} \leq (3 \cdot F \cdot |\Pi|)^{6 \cdot F}.$$

Therefore, the reduced instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ can be encoded in space

$$O(|I| \cdot d \cdot \log W(\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F))) = O\left(|V(G)| \cdot |\Sigma| \cdot \frac{|V(G)| + |E(G)|}{F} \cdot F \cdot \log |\Pi|\right) \leq O(|\Pi|^4), \quad \blacksquare$$

which shows the last property.

We give below the completeness and soundness of the reduction. We start with the former, which is (relatively) straightforward.

Lemma 4.5. (Completeness) *For any R-CSP instance $\Pi = (G, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,u}, \pi_{e,v}\}_{e=(u,v) \in E(G)})$ and $F \in [|V(G)|]$, if $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(G)|$ then there is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ of profit $|V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)|.$*

Proof. Let $\varphi : V(G) \rightarrow (\Sigma \cup \{\perp\})$ be a consistent partial assignment to Π of size $|V(G)|$. Let $S = \{(v, \varphi(v)) \mid v \in V(G)\}$. From the third item of [Observation 4.3](#) and the first item of [Lemma 4.4](#), the profit is equal to

$$p(S) = \sum_{\ell \in [r]} \sum_{v \in V(G)} J(\ell, v) = \sum_{\ell \in [r]} N_\ell = |V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)|.$$

To conclude, it remains to prove that S is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$, i.e. that all budget constraints are satisfied. To see this, first notice that for any $v \in V(G)$, we have $w_v(S) = w_v((v, \varphi(v))) = m$. Moreover, for every $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$, we have

$$w_e(S) = w_e(u, \varphi(u)) + w_e(v, \varphi(v)) = \pi_{e,u}(\varphi(u)) + m - \pi_{e,v}(\varphi(v)) = m,$$

where the last equality is from consistency of φ . In other words, we have

$$w_j(S) = m \quad \forall j \in D. \quad (5)$$

Let $(\ell, t) \in [r] \times \{1, 2\}$ be a budget constraint. Consider the two cases depending on the value of t :

- $t = 1$. In this case, (5) and the first item of **Observation 4.3** immediately yield $c_{(\ell, t)}(S) = B_{\ell, t}$.
- $t = 2$. In this case, by (5), the second item of **Observation 4.3** and the definition of N_ℓ , we have

$$c_{(\ell, t)}(S) = M \cdot \sum_{v \in V(G)} J(\ell, v) - \sum_{j \in D_\ell} m \cdot Q^{\text{ord}_\ell(j)} = M \cdot N_\ell - \sum_{j \in D_\ell} m \cdot Q^{\text{ord}_\ell(j)} = B_{\ell, t}.$$

Thus, S is a feasible solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ and this completes the proof. \blacksquare

For the soundness, we prove that given a solution to the reduced instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$, we can construct a consistent partial assignment for Π with roughly the same size/profit. Before that, we give a couple of useful properties over the weights w of any solution of $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$:

Lemma 4.6. *Let S be any solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$. Then, for any $\ell \in [r]$, the following holds:*

(i) $\sum_{(v, \sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v) \leq N_\ell.$

(ii) *If $\sum_{(v, \sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v) = N_\ell$, then $w_j(S) = m$ for all $j \in D_\ell$.*

To prove this, we use the following fact that an integer can be uniquely represented in base- N .

Fact 4.7. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n, A \in \{0, \dots, N-1\}$ be such that $\sum_{i \in [n]} a_i \cdot N^i = \sum_{i \in [n]} A \cdot N^i$. Then, for all $i \in [n]$ it holds that $a_i = A$.*

Proof of Lemma 4.6. Since S is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$,

$$M \cdot N_\ell = B_{\ell, 1} + B_{\ell, 2} \geq c_{\ell, 1}(S) + c_{\ell, 2}(S) = M \cdot \sum_{(v, \sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v), \quad (6)$$

where the last equality follows from the first two items of **Observation 4.3**. Thus, **Item (i)** holds. For **Item (ii)**, note that for (6) to be an equality, we must have $B_{\ell, 1} = c_{\ell, 1}(S)$ otherwise violating the feasibility of S . This means that

$$\sum_{j \in D_\ell} m \cdot Q^{\text{ord}_\ell(j)} = B_{\ell, 1} = c_{\ell, 1}(S) = \sum_{j \in D_\ell} w_j(S) \cdot Q^{\text{ord}_\ell(j)}. \quad (7)$$

Observe that $w_j(S) \leq |I| \cdot m < Q$ by our setting of parameters. From this, (7) and **Fact 4.7**, we can conclude that $w_j(S) = m$ for all $j \in D_\ell$ as desired. \blacksquare

Using **Lemma 4.6**, we can give the second direction of the reduction.

Lemma 4.8. (Soundness) *For any R-CSP instance Π , $F \in [|V(G)|]$, and $q \in \mathbb{N}$, if there is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ of profit at least $|V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)| - q$, then $\text{Par}(\Pi) \geq |V(G)| - 2 \cdot q \cdot F$.*

Proof. For every $j \in D$, let $\ell(j) \in [r]$ be such that j belongs to $D_{\ell(j)}$. In addition, let

$$T = \left\{ \ell \in [r] \mid \sum_{(v,\sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v) = N_\ell \right\}$$

be the set of *tight constraints* of S . Define

$$V^* = \left\{ v \in V(G) \mid \ell(x) \in T \ \forall x \in (\text{Adj}_G(v) \cup \{v\}) \right\}. \quad (8)$$

The set V^* satisfies the following crucial property.

Claim 4.9. *For every $v \in V^*$ there is exactly one $\sigma_v \in \Sigma$ such that $(v, \sigma_v) \in S$.*

Proof. By (8), $\ell(v)$ must be *tight*, i.e., $\sum_{(u,\sigma) \in S} J(\ell(v), u) = N_{\ell(v)}$. Thus, by **Item (ii)** of **Lemma 4.6**,

$$m = w_v(S) = m \cdot |\{\sigma \in \Sigma \mid (v, \sigma) \in S\}|,$$

which implies the statement of the claim. \square

For all $v \in V^*$ denote by $\sigma_v \in \Sigma$ the unique symbol satisfying that $(v, \sigma_v) \in S$; by **Claim 4.9** it holds that σ_v is well defined for every $v \in V^*$. Define $\varphi : V(G) \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\perp\}$ by

$$\varphi(v) = \begin{cases} \sigma_v, & \text{if } v \in V^* \\ \perp, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

for all $v \in V(G)$. We first prove the consistency of φ .

Claim 4.10. *φ is a consistent partial assignment for Π .*

Proof. Let $e = (u, v) \in E(G)$ such that $\varphi(u) \neq \perp$ and $\varphi(v) \neq \perp$. Since $\varphi(u) \neq \perp$ and $\varphi(v) \neq \perp$ it follows from the definition of φ that $u, v \in V^*$. Therefore, by (8) it holds that $\ell(e) \in T$ implying that $\sum_{(x,\sigma) \in S} J(\ell(e), x) = N_{\ell(e)}$. Thus, by **Item (ii)** of **Lemma 4.6**, we have

$$m = w_e(S) = w_e((u, \sigma_u)) + w_e((v, \sigma_v)) = \pi_{e,u}(\varphi(u)) + m - \pi_{e,v}(\varphi(v)).$$

It follows that $\pi_{e,u}(\varphi(u)) = \pi_{e,v}(\varphi(v))$. Thus, φ is a consistent partial assignment for Π . \square

It remains to give a lower bound on the size of φ . To do so, we will need the following bound on the number of non-tight indices.

Claim 4.11. $|[r] \setminus T| \leq q$.

Proof. First, from the third item of **Observation 4.3**, we have

$$p(S) = \sum_{\ell \in [r]} \sum_{(v,\sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v) = \sum_{\ell \in T} \sum_{(v,\sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v) + \sum_{\ell \in [r] \setminus T} \sum_{(v,\sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v) = \sum_{\ell \in T} N_\ell + \sum_{\ell \in [r] \setminus T} \sum_{(v,\sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v)$$

Now, for every $\ell \in [r] \setminus T$, it holds that $\sum_{(v,\sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v) \neq N_\ell$; **Item (i)** of **Lemma 4.6** and the fact that J assigns only integral value then implies that $\sum_{(v,\sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v) \leq N_\ell - 1$. Plugging this into the above, we get

$$p(S) \leq \sum_{\ell \in T} N_\ell + \sum_{\ell \in [r] \setminus T} (N_\ell - 1) = \sum_{\ell \in [r]} N_\ell - |[r] \setminus T| = |V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)| - |[r] \setminus T|,$$

where the last equality follows from [Lemma 4.4](#). Finally, the claim follows since we assume that $p(S) \geq |V(G)| + 2 \cdot |E(G)| - q$. \square

To conclude the soundness proof, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
|V(G) \setminus V^*| &= \left| \left\{ v \in V(G) \mid \exists x \in (\text{Adj}_G(v) \cup \{v\}) \text{ s.t. } \ell(x) \in [r] \setminus T \right\} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell \in [r] \setminus T} \sum_{(v, \sigma) \in S} J(\ell, v) \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell \in [r] \setminus T} N_\ell \\
&\leq \sum_{\ell \in [r] \setminus T} 2 \cdot F \\
&= |[r] \setminus T| \cdot 2 \cdot F \\
&\leq 2 \cdot q \cdot F.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

The first inequality holds since for each $v \in V(G)$ such that there is $x \in (\text{Adj}_G(v) \cup \{v\})$ satisfying $\ell(x) \in [r] \setminus T$, it also holds that $J(\ell(x), v) \geq 1$. The second inequality is due to [Item \(i\)](#) of [Lemma 4.6](#). The third inequality follows from [Lemma 4.4](#). The last inequality uses [Claim 4.11](#). Hence,

$$|\varphi| = |V^*| = |V(G)| - |V(G) \setminus V^*| \stackrel{(9)}{\geq} |V(G)| - 2 \cdot q \cdot F. \tag{10}$$

By [Claim 4.10](#) and the above inequality, the soundness proof follows. \blacksquare

The above lemmas give the statement of the reduction.

Proof of [Lemma 4.1](#):

The proof follows from [Lemma 4.4](#), [Lemma 4.5](#), and [Lemma 4.8](#). \blacksquare

5 Proofs of the Remaining Lower Bounds

In this section, we prove our remaining lower bounds. We start by proving [Theorem 1.2](#) relying on the reduction presented in [Section 4](#). Then, we give the hardness results for larger approximation ratio ([Theorem 1.4](#) and [Theorem 1.5](#)). These proofs are easier and based on the simpler reduction presented in [Section 3](#).

Proof of [Theorem 1.2](#):

Assume that Gap-ETH holds. Let $\alpha, \beta \in (0, 1)$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be the promised constants by [Theorem 2.2](#). Let $C \geq 1$ be a constant such that for any R-CSP instance Π it holds that the reduction $\text{R-CSP} \rightarrow \text{VK}$ (described in [Lemma 4.1](#)) runs in time $O(|\Pi|^C)$. Define constants $\zeta = \frac{\alpha \cdot \beta}{10,000}$ and $\chi = \frac{\beta}{4,000}$. Let $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds $\alpha \cdot \frac{d_0}{\log(d_0)} \geq \max\{k_0, 6, C\}$, $\frac{1}{\log(d_0)} \leq 00.1$, and $\frac{\log(\log(d_0))}{\log(d_0)} \leq \chi$.

Assume towards a contradiction that there are an integer $d > d_0$, an $\varepsilon \in \left(0, \frac{\chi}{\log d}\right)$, and an algorithm \mathcal{A} that returns a $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution for every d -dimensional knapsack instance in time $O\left(n^{\frac{d}{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\zeta}{(\log(d/\varepsilon))^2}}\right)$, where n is the encoding size of the instance.

Define $k = \left\lceil \frac{d \cdot \beta}{1000 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})} \right\rceil$. Observe that

$$\varepsilon \cdot \log\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}\right) = \varepsilon \cdot \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) + \varepsilon \cdot \log(d) \leq \frac{1}{\log(d)} \cdot \log\left(\frac{1}{\log(d)}\right) + \frac{\chi}{\log(d)} \cdot \log(d) \leq 2 \cdot \chi. \quad (11)$$

The first inequality holds since the function $x \cdot \log(\frac{1}{x})$ is increasing in the domain $x \in [0, 0.01]$; thus, since $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{\chi}{\log(d)} \leq \frac{1}{\log(d)} \leq \frac{1}{\log(d_0)} \leq 0.01$, it follows that $\varepsilon \cdot \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \leq \frac{1}{\log(d)} \cdot \log(\frac{1}{\log(d)})$. Moreover, the second expression follows easily since $\varepsilon \leq \frac{\chi}{\log(d)}$. The second inequality follows since $d \geq d_0$ and since $\frac{\log(\log(d_0))}{\log(d_0)} \leq \chi$. Thus,

$$k = \left\lceil \frac{d \cdot \beta}{1000 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})} \right\rceil \geq \frac{d \cdot \beta}{1000 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})} - 1 \geq \frac{d \cdot \beta}{1000 \cdot 2 \cdot \chi} - 1 \geq 2 \cdot d - 1 \geq d. \quad (12)$$

The second inequality holds by (11). The third inequality follows from the selection of χ . Therefore, by (12) it follows that $k \geq d \geq d_0 \geq k_0$.

We define the following algorithm \mathcal{B} for R-CSP on 3-regular graphs with at most k constraints. Namely, given an R-CSP instance Π with at most k variables (vertices) with a 3-regular constraint graph H , Algorithm \mathcal{B} decides if $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$ or $\text{Par}(\Pi) < \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |V(H)|$. Let

$$\Pi = (H, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,u}, \pi_{e,v}\}_{e=(u,v) \in E(G)})$$

be an R-CSP instance with $|V(H)| \leq k$ vertices such that H is 3-regular. Define \mathcal{B} on input Π by:

1. Define $F = \lceil \frac{24 \cdot k}{d} \rceil$.
2. Compute the VK instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F) = (I, p, c, B)$ by 2-CSP \rightarrow VK.
3. Execute \mathcal{A} on instance $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$. Let S be the returned solution.
4. If $p(S) \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot (|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|)$: return that $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$.
5. If $p(S) < (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot (|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|)$: return that $\text{Par}(\Pi) < \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |V(H)|$.

For the correctness, we first argue that $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ is of a smaller (or equal) dimension than d .

$$3 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{|V(H)| + |E(H)|}{F} \right\rceil \leq 3 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{k + 3 \cdot k}{F} \right\rceil \leq 3 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{4 \cdot k}{\frac{24 \cdot k}{d}} \right\rceil = 3 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{d}{6} \right\rceil \leq 3 \cdot \left(\frac{d}{6} + 1\right) \leq 3 \cdot 2 \cdot \frac{d}{6} = d. \quad (13)$$

The first inequality holds since $|V(H)| \leq k$ and since H is 3-regular. The second inequality follows from the selection of F . The last inequality holds since $d \geq d_0 \geq 6$. Therefore, by (13) and Lemma 4.1 it holds that the number of dimensions of $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ is at most d ; hence, $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ is well defined (recall that instances of a smaller dimension are considered to be also of dimension d). Consider the following inequality for the running time analysis.

$$5 \cdot \zeta \cdot \frac{d}{\varepsilon \cdot \log^2(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})} = 5 \cdot \zeta \cdot \left(\frac{d \cdot \beta}{\varepsilon \cdot \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon}) \cdot 1000}\right) \cdot \frac{1000}{\beta \cdot \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})} \leq 5 \cdot \zeta \cdot 2 \cdot k \cdot \frac{1000}{\beta \cdot \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})} \leq \frac{\alpha \cdot k}{\log(k)}. \quad (14)$$

The first inequality holds since $2 \cdot k \geq \frac{d \cdot \beta}{1000 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})}$ as $k = \left\lfloor \frac{d \cdot \beta}{1000 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})} \right\rfloor$ and $k \geq d_0 \geq 6$.

The last inequality follows from the selection of ζ and since $k \leq \frac{d}{\varepsilon}$ (using the monotonicity of the function $\log(x)$). By [Lemma 4.1](#), there is a constant $E > 0$ such that $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)| \leq E \cdot |\Pi|^4$. If $|\Pi| < E$, then the running time of \mathcal{B} on the input Π is bounded by a constant. Otherwise, assume for the following that $|\Pi| \geq E$ thus $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)| \leq |\Pi|^5$. Then, by the running time guarantee of \mathcal{A} and since the running time of computing $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ can be bounded by $O(|\Pi|^C)$, executing \mathcal{B} on Π can be done in time

$$O\left(|\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)|^{\zeta \cdot \frac{d}{\varepsilon \cdot \log^2(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})}} + |\Pi|^C\right) \leq O\left(|\Pi|^{5 \cdot \zeta \cdot \frac{d}{\varepsilon \cdot \log^2(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})}} + |\Pi|^C\right) \leq O\left(|\Pi|^{\frac{\alpha \cdot k}{\log(k)}} + |\Pi|^C\right) \leq O\left(|\Pi|^{\frac{\alpha \cdot k}{\log(k)}}\right)$$

The first inequality holds since $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)| \leq |\Pi|^5$. The second inequality follows from [\(14\)](#). The third inequality holds since $\alpha \cdot \frac{k}{\log(k)} \geq \alpha \cdot \frac{d_0}{\log(d_0)} \geq C$ by the assumption on d_0 . It remains to prove the two directions of the reduction. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} 10 \cdot F \cdot \varepsilon &= 10 \cdot \left\lfloor \frac{24 \cdot k}{d} \right\rfloor \cdot \varepsilon \leq 10 \cdot 2 \cdot 24 \cdot \frac{k}{d} \cdot \varepsilon \leq 500 \cdot \frac{\frac{d \cdot \beta}{1000 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})}}{d} \cdot \varepsilon \\ &= 500 \cdot \frac{\beta}{1000 \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})} \cdot \varepsilon < \frac{\beta}{\log(\frac{d}{\varepsilon})} \leq \frac{\beta}{\log(k)} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The first inequality holds since $k \geq d$ using [\(12\)](#). The last inequality holds since $k \leq \frac{d}{\varepsilon}$.

For the first direction, assume that $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$. Thus, there is a consistent partial assignment for Π of size $|V(H)|$. Then, by [Lemma 4.1](#) there is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ of profit $(|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|)$. Therefore, since \mathcal{A} returns a $(1 - \varepsilon)$ -approximate solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$, the returned solution S by \mathcal{A} has profit at least $(1 - \varepsilon) \cdot (|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|)$. Thus, \mathcal{B} correctly decides that $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$.

Conversely, assume that $\text{Par}(\Pi) < \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |V(H)|$. Thus, every consistent partial assignment for Π is of size strictly less than $\left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |V(H)|$. Therefore, by the above in conjunction with [Lemma 4.1](#), there is no solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ of profit at least

$$\begin{aligned} &(|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|) - \frac{\beta}{\log(k) \cdot 2 \cdot F} \cdot |V(H)| \\ &= (|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|) - \frac{\beta}{\log(k) \cdot 2 \cdot F \cdot 5} \cdot 5 \cdot |V(H)| \\ &\leq (|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|) - \frac{\beta}{\log(k) \cdot 2 \cdot F \cdot 5} \cdot (|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|) \\ &< (|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The first inequality holds since H is 3-regular; thus, it holds that $|E(H)| \leq 2 \cdot |V(H)|$ implying $|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)| \leq 5 \cdot |V(H)|$. The second inequality follows from [\(15\)](#). Thus, by [\(16\)](#) there is no solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi, F)$ of profit at least $(|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon)$. Hence, the returned solution S by \mathcal{A} has profit strictly less than $(|V(H)| + 2 \cdot |E(H)|) \cdot (1 - \varepsilon)$. It follows that \mathcal{B} returns that $\text{Par}(\Pi) < \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |V(H)|$ as required. By the above, \mathcal{B} correctly decides if $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$ or $\text{Par}(\Pi) < \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |V(H)|$ in time $O\left(|\Pi|^{\frac{\alpha \cdot k}{\log(k)}}\right)$. This is a contradiction to [Theorem 2.2](#) and the proof follows. \blacksquare

5.1 Proofs based on the reduction from Section 3

We need an initial hardness for R-CSP with a larger factor than in [Theorem 2.2](#). Specifically, we use the following result from [\[CCK⁺17\]](#), which shows that R-CSP is “inherently enumerative”; putting it differently, the result states that, to distinguish the two cases, the best algorithm is essentially to straightforwardly enumerate all possible assignments to r variables (which runs in time $|\Gamma|^{O(r)}$).

Theorem 5.1 ([\[CCK⁺17\]](#)). *Assuming Gap-ETH, there exist constants $\zeta > 0$ and $r_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, for any constants $k \geq r \geq r_0$, there is no algorithm that takes in an R-CSP instance Π with a constraint graph H with $|V(H)| = k$, runs in time $O(|\Pi|^{\zeta \cdot r})$ and distinguish between:*

- **(Completeness)** $\text{Par}(\Pi) = k$, and,
- **(Soundness)** $\text{Par}(\Pi) < r$.

Since the exact statement in [\[CCK⁺17\]](#) is slightly different than ours, we provide a proof of [Theorem 5.1](#) in [Appendix A.2](#) for completeness. [Theorem 1.4](#) and [Theorem 1.5](#) now follow directly from our reduction ([Lemma 3.1](#)) and [Theorem 5.1](#) by setting appropriate parameters.

Proof of [Theorem 1.4](#). Assume that Gap-ETH holds. Let ζ, r_0 be the promised constants from [Theorem 5.1](#). Since r_0 can be chosen to be arbitrarily large, assume that $\zeta \cdot r_0 \geq 3$. Suppose that there is $\rho \in (0, 1)$ and a ρ -approximation algorithm \mathcal{A} for d -dimensional knapsack that runs in $O(n^{\delta \sqrt{d}})$ time, where n is the encoding size of the instance, $\delta = \frac{\zeta \rho}{20}$, $d_0 = \left\lceil \left(\frac{8 \cdot r_0}{\rho} \right)^2 \right\rceil$, and $d \geq d_0$.

We can use \mathcal{A} to distinguish the two cases in [Theorem 5.1](#) for $k = \lceil \sqrt{d} \rceil$ and $r = \lfloor k \cdot \rho \rfloor$ as follows. Let Π be an R-CSP instance with $k = |V(H)|$ vertices, where H is the constraint graph of Π . Define an algorithm \mathcal{B} on input Π as follows.

1. Compute $\mathcal{I}(\Pi) = (I, p, w, B)$ using the reduction from [Lemma 3.1](#).
2. Execute \mathcal{A} on $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$. Let S be the returned solution.
3. Return that $\text{Par}(\Pi) = k$ if and only if $p(S) \geq r$.

Observe that $\delta \cdot \sqrt{d} \leq \frac{\zeta \rho}{20} \cdot k \leq \frac{\zeta r}{5}$ and recall that $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)| \leq O(|\Pi|^3)$ and that $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$ can be computed from Π in time $O(|\Pi|^3)$ by [Lemma 3.1](#). Therefore, algorithm \mathcal{B} runs in time $O(|\Pi|^{\zeta \cdot r})$. If $\text{Par}(\Pi) = k$ then by [Lemma 3.1](#) there is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$ of profit k . Therefore, since \mathcal{A} is a ρ -approximation algorithm it follows that the profit of S is at least $\rho \cdot k \geq r$; conversely, if $\text{Par}(\Pi) < r$, then by [Lemma 3.1](#) the profit of S is strictly less than r . Hence, \mathcal{B} correctly decides if $\text{Par}(\Pi) = k$ or $\text{Par}(\Pi) < r$ in time $O(|\Pi|^{\zeta \cdot r})$. This violates Gap-ETH by [Theorem 5.1](#). ■

The proof of the next theorem is similar to the above proof with different selection of parameters.

Proof of [Theorem 1.5](#). Assume that Gap-ETH holds. Let ζ, r_0 be the promised constants from [Theorem 5.1](#). Assume towards a contradiction that there is $C \geq 1$ and $d \geq d_0$ such that there is a $\left(\frac{\rho}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm \mathcal{A} for d -dimensional knapsack that runs in $O(n^C)$ time, where n is the encoding size of the instance, $r = \max\{r_0, 3C/\zeta\}$, $\rho = 2 \cdot r$, and $d_0 = 4 \cdot \rho^2$. We use \mathcal{A} to construct an algorithm \mathcal{B} that distinguishes the two cases in [Theorem 5.1](#) with value $k = \lceil \sqrt{d} \rceil$. Let Π be an R-CSP instance with $k = |V(H)|$ vertices, where H is the constraint graph of Π . Define algorithm \mathcal{B} on input Π as follows.

1. Compute $\mathcal{I}(\Pi) = (I, p, w, B)$ using the reduction from [Lemma 3.1](#).
2. Execute \mathcal{A} on $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$. Let S be the returned solution.
3. Return that $\text{Par}(\Pi) = k$ if and only if $p(S) \geq 2 \cdot r$.

Observe that $3 \cdot C = \frac{3\zeta \cdot C}{\zeta} \leq \zeta \cdot r$. In addition, recall that $|\mathcal{I}(\Pi)| \leq O(|\Pi|^3)$ and that $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$ can be computed from Π in time $O(|\Pi|^3)$ by [Lemma 3.1](#). Therefore, algorithm \mathcal{B} runs in time $O(|\Pi|^{\zeta \cdot r})$. If $\text{Par}(\Pi) = k$ then by [Lemma 3.1](#) there is a solution for $\mathcal{I}(\Pi)$ of profit k . Thus, since \mathcal{A} is a $\left(\frac{\rho}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm it follows that the profit of S is at least $\frac{k \cdot \rho}{\sqrt{d}} \geq \rho = 2 \cdot r$; conversely, if $\text{Par}(\Pi) < r$, then by [Lemma 3.1](#) the profit of S is strictly less than r . Hence, in both cases \mathcal{B} decides correctly if $\text{Par}(\Pi) = k$ or $\text{Par}(\Pi) < r$ in time $O(|\Pi|^{\zeta \cdot r})$. This violates Gap-ETH by [Theorem 5.1](#). \blacksquare

6 $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -Approximation Algorithm

In this section, we provide our $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm and prove [Theorem 1.6](#). To do this, let us first introduce a concept of bounded/unbounded instances. For $\tau > 1$, we say that an instance is τ -bounded if we have $c(i)_j \leq B_j/\tau$ for all $i \in I$ and $j \in [d]$. Furthermore, an instance is τ -unbounded if, for every $i \in I$, there exists $j \in [d]$ such that $c(i)_j > B_j/\tau$. We note that (due to the quantifiers) there are instances that are neither τ -bounded nor τ -unbounded. Nevertheless, we will show a (simple) reduction that splits the instance into bounded and unbounded parts.

Bounded instances have been known to be easier to approximate. When τ is at least 2, a $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm is already known for τ -bounded instances from previous work, based on the randomized rounding framework of Raghavan and Thompson [[RT87](#)]. A derandomized (and slightly improved) version of this is given in [[Sri95](#)], which we state below.

Theorem 6.1 ([[Sri95](#)]). *There is a polynomial-time $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm \mathcal{A}_{LP} for d -dimensional knapsack on 2-bounded instances.*

Our main contribution in this section is to give a $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm on 2-unbounded instances, which runs in $\left((d \cdot \log W)^{O(d^2)} + n^{O(1)}\right)$ time.

Lemma 6.2. *There is a $\left((d \cdot \log W)^{O(d^2)} + n^{O(1)}\right)$ -time $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm $\mathcal{A}_{2\text{-unbounded}}$ for d -dimensional knapsack on 2-unbounded instances.*

Using the above two results, it is now easy to obtain [Theorem 1.6](#). Throughout this section, recall that $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})$ denotes the optimum profit among all solutions for the instance \mathcal{I} .

Proof of [Theorem 1.6](#). On input $\mathcal{I} = (I, p, c, B)$, the algorithm works as follows:

- Partition I into $I_{2\text{-bounded}} \cup I_{2\text{-unbounded}}$ where

$$I_{2\text{-bounded}} = \{i \in I \mid \forall j \in [d], c(i)_j \leq B_j/2\},$$

and

$$I_{2\text{-unbounded}} = \{i \in I \mid \exists j \in [d], c(i)_j > B_j/2\}.$$

- Run \mathcal{A}_{LP} from [Theorem 6.1](#) on $\mathcal{I}_{2\text{-bounded}} = (I_{2\text{-bounded}}, p, d, c, B)$ to get a solution $S_{2\text{-bounded}}$
- Run $\mathcal{A}_{2\text{-unbounded}}$ from [Lemma 6.2](#) on $\mathcal{I}_{2\text{-unbounded}} = (I_{2\text{-unbounded}}, p, d, c, B)$ to get a solution $S_{2\text{-unbounded}}$.
- Output the best solution S among the two.

The running time claim is obvious from [Theorem 6.1](#) and [Lemma 6.2](#). As for the approximation guarantee, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
p(S) &= \max\{p(S_{2\text{-bounded}}), p(S_{2\text{-unbounded}})\} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (p(S_{2\text{-bounded}}) + p(S_{2\text{-unbounded}})) \\
&\geq \Omega(1/\sqrt{d}) \cdot (\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}_{2\text{-bounded}}) + \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}_{2\text{-unbounded}})) \\
&\geq \Omega(1/\sqrt{d}) \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is from the approximation guarantees in [Theorem 6.1](#) and [Lemma 6.2](#). This completes our proof. \blacksquare

6.1 Algorithm for 2-Unbounded Instances: Proof of [Lemma 6.2](#)

We now give our algorithm for 2-unbounded instances and prove its guarantees ([Lemma 6.2](#)). On an input 2-unbounded d -dimensional knapsack instance $\mathcal{I} = (I, p, c, B)$, the algorithm works as follows.

- Let $\gamma := 1 + \frac{0.1}{d}$.
- Let $\varpi^{\text{up}}, \varpi^{\text{down}} : \{0, \dots, B\} \rightarrow [0, B]$ be the following discretization functions⁴:

$$\varpi^{\text{down}}(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ \gamma^{\lfloor \log_\gamma(x) \rfloor} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \varpi^{\text{up}}(x) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = 0 \\ \gamma^{\lceil \log_\gamma(x) \rceil} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, let $F : \{0, \dots, B\}^d \rightarrow [0, B]^d$ be the following discretization function:

$$F(x) := \min\{\varpi^{\text{up}}(x_j), B_j - \varpi^{\text{down}}(B_j - x_j)\} \quad \forall j \in [d].$$

- Apply the following reduction rule until it cannot be applied: If there exists two items $i, i' \in I$ such that $F(c_i) = F(c_{i'})$, remove the item with smaller profit.
- Use the bruteforce algorithm, where we enumerate all subsets of size at most d , to find the best solution among the remaining items.

Let us first note that the possible different values of $F(c)$ is at most $(\log_\gamma(B))^d \leq O(d \cdot \log W)^d$. Thus, after applying the reduction rule, there are at most $O(d \cdot \log W)^d$ items left. As a result, the bruteforce algorithm in the last step takes at most $(d \cdot \log W)^{O(d^2)}$ time. Thus, in total, the running time is at most $(d \cdot \log W)^{O(d^2)} + n^{O(1)}$ as desired.

The next lemma is the main ingredient for our approximation guarantee proof. It shows that our discretization scheme decreases the optimum by a factor of at most $O(\sqrt{d})$.

⁴Since we only use the discretization to apply the reduction rule in the next step, it suffices to just represent the exponent $\lfloor \log_\gamma(x) \rfloor$ or $\lceil \log_\gamma(x) \rceil$ which is an integer instead of the real number $\gamma^{\lfloor \log_\gamma(x) \rfloor}$ or $\gamma^{\lceil \log_\gamma(x) \rceil}$.

Lemma 6.3. For any 2-unbounded instance \mathcal{I} , there is a solution S such that the following holds:

- (i) $|S| \leq d$.
- (ii) $p(S) \geq \Omega\left(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})/\sqrt{d}\right)$.
- (iii) $\sum_{i \in S} F(c(i))_j \leq B_j$ for all $j \in [d]$.

Before we prove [Lemma 6.3](#), let us see how to finish the approximation guarantee. Let $S = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ for $m \leq d$ be the solution as guaranteed in [Lemma 6.3](#), and let I' denote the set of items that remains after the reduction rule. From the reduction rule, there must exist (distinct) items $i'_1, \dots, i'_m \in I$ such that $p(i'_q) \geq p(i_q)$ and $F(c(i_q)) = F(p(i'_q))$ for all $q \in [m]$. The latter implies that

$$c(i'_1)_j + \dots + c(i'_m)_j \leq F(c(i'_1))_j + \dots + F(c(i'_m))_j = \sum_{i \in S} F(c(i))_j \leq B_j \quad \forall j \in [d],$$

where the last inequality is due to the third item of [Lemma 6.3](#). This means that $\{i'_1, \dots, i'_m\}$ is a feasible solution. Since we use brute force in the last step and $m \leq d$, we must output a solution of profit at least

$$p(\{i'_1, \dots, i'_m\}) \geq p(S) \geq \Omega\left(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})/\sqrt{d}\right)$$

where the last inequality is due to the second item of [Lemma 6.3](#). Thus, the algorithm achieves $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation as claimed, which completes the proof of [Lemma 6.2](#). \blacksquare

Finally, we prove [Lemma 6.3](#).

Proof of [Lemma 6.3](#). We assume w.l.o.g. that each item's cost is within the budget (otherwise we can simply discard it). Let $p_{\max} = \max_{i \in I} p(i)$. Consider two cases based on whether $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}) \leq 10\sqrt{d} \cdot p_{\max}$. If $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}) \leq 100\sqrt{d} \cdot p_{\max}$, then the solution S that simply picks just the item with maximum profit already satisfies all the three constraints.

The remainder of the proof is dedicated to the case $\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}) > 10\sqrt{d} \cdot p_{\max}$. In this case, let S^* denote the optimum solution of \mathcal{I} . Note that, since this is a 2-unbounded instance, we have⁵ $|S^*| \leq d$. Let S denote a random subset of S^* where each element is included independently with probability $\theta := 0.5/\sqrt{d}$. We will show that with positive probability S satisfies all the three properties. First, note that $|S| \leq |S^*| \leq d$ always. Thus, it suffices to consider the remaining two items. In the following, we will show that

$$\Pr\left[p(S) < \frac{\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})}{4\sqrt{d}}\right] \leq 0.4 \tag{17}$$

and, for all $j \in [d]$,

$$\Pr\left[\sum_{i \in S} F(c(i))_j > B_j\right] \leq \frac{0.25}{d} \tag{18}$$

Taking the union bound over these $(d+1)$ events then implies that S satisfies all the three items with positive probability as desired.

⁵This is because in each coordinate $j \in [d]$, there can be at most one item $i \in S^*$ such that $c(i)_j > B_j/2$.

For (17), note that $\mathbb{E}[p(S)] = \theta \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}) = \frac{\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I})}{2\sqrt{d}}$. Meanwhile,

$$\text{Var}(p(S)) = \sum_{i \in S} \theta(1-\theta) \cdot p(i)^2 \leq \theta \cdot p_{\max} \cdot \text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}) \leq \frac{(\text{OPT}(\mathcal{I}))^2}{200d},$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption of this case. Applying the Chebyshev's inequality then yields (17).

Next, we will prove (18). To do this, consider a fixed $j \in [d]$ and let i_1, \dots, i_m be the elements of S^* sorted in descending order by $c(i)_j$, tie broken arbitrarily. We first prove the following claim.

Claim 6.4. *If $\sum_{i \in S} F(c(i))_j > B_j$, then both i_1, i_2 must belong to S .*

Proof. Suppose contrapostively that either i_1 or i_2 do not belong to S . Then, we have

$$\sum_{i \in S} F(c(i))_j \leq F(c(i_1))_j + F(c(i_3))_j + \dots + F(c(i_m))_j.$$

Now, by our choice of F , we have $F(x)_j \leq \gamma \cdot x$ and $F(x)_j \leq B_j - \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot (B_j - x)$ for all $x \in \{0, \dots, B_j\}$. Plugging this into the above, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in S} F(c(i))_j &\leq B_j - \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot (B_j - c(i_1)_j) + \gamma \cdot (c(i_3)_j + \dots + c(i_m)_j) \\ &\leq B_j - \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot (c(i_2)_j + \dots + c(i_m)_j) + \gamma \cdot (c(i_3)_j + \dots + c(i_m)_j) \\ &\leq B_j - \frac{1 + \frac{1}{m-2}}{\gamma} \cdot (c(i_3)_j + \dots + c(i_m)_j) + \gamma \cdot (c(i_3)_j + \dots + c(i_m)_j) \\ &\leq B_j - \frac{1 + \frac{1}{d}}{\gamma} \cdot (c(i_3)_j + \dots + c(i_m)_j) + \gamma \cdot (c(i_3)_j + \dots + c(i_m)_j) \leq B_j. \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact that S^* is a feasible solution, the third follows from $c(i_2)_j \geq c(i_3)_j, \dots, c(i_m)_j$ and the last follows from our choice of γ . \square

By the above claim, we have

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i \in S} F(c(i))_j > B_j \right] \leq \Pr [i_1 \in S \wedge i_2 \in S] = \theta^2 \leq \frac{0.25}{d},$$

proving (18). This completes our proof. \blacksquare

7 Discussion and Open Questions

In this work, we prove several hardness results for the d -dimensional knapsack problem, via reductions from 2-CSP. In particular, our main result implies that the PTASes that have been known for decades [CHW76, FC84, CKPP00] cannot be improved up to a polylogarithmic factor (assuming Gap-ETH). We also show that the best-known exact algorithm of running time $O(n \cdot W^d)$ is the best possible up to a logarithmic factor (assuming ETH).

An obvious open question is to close the quantitative gaps in our main theorem (Theorem 1.2) compared to the aforementioned PTASes. Namely, can we prove a similar hardness for ε that is an absolute constant (independent of d)? And can we improve the running time lower bound to

$n^{\Omega(d/\varepsilon)}$? These are closely related to similar questions for 2-CSP, which are themselves important in the quest to obtain a more complete understanding of parameterized (in)approximability.

It is also intriguing to see whether the running time in our approximation algorithm ([Theorem 1.6](#)) can be improved. As mentioned earlier, the best polynomial-time algorithm only achieves $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{d}\right)$ -approximation [[Sri95](#), [CKPP00](#)]. Is there a polynomial-time $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation algorithm? An intermediate goal here would be to remove the $(\log W)^{O(d^2)}$ term in the running time of our approximation algorithm; this would yield an $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$ -approximation FPT (in d) algorithm for the problem.

Both 2-CSP and R-CSP is closely related to the (parameterized) maximum clique problem. There have been numerous developments in parameterized inapproximability of clique in recent years; it is now known that these results can be obtained under ETH or even $W[1] \neq \text{FPT}$ (instead of Gap-ETH) [[Lin21](#), [LRSW22](#), [KK22](#), [LRSW23](#), [CFLL23](#)]. However, the running time lower bounds here are still too weak (e.g. $n^{\Omega(\log \log k)}$ [[LRSW23](#)]) to give strong lower bounds for d -dimensional knapsack. It remains an interesting question whether we can get near-tight running time lower bounds for approximating d -dimensional knapsack using these weaker assumptions.

References

- [ARF14] Md. Abul Kalam Azad, Ana Maria A. C. Rocha, and Edite M. G. P. Fernandes. Improved binary artificial fish swarm algorithm for the 0-1 multidimensional knapsack problems. *Swarm Evol. Comput.*, 14:66–75, 2014.
- [ASG04] Inès Alaya, Christine Solnon, and Khaled GHÉDIRA. Ant algorithm for the multidimensional knapsack problem. In *BIOMA*, pages 63–72, 2004.
- [BEEB09] Vincent Boyer, Moussa Elkihel, and Didier El Baz. Heuristics for the 0–1 multidimensional knapsack problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 199(3):658–664, 2009.
- [BKMN15] Karl Bringmann, László Kozma, Shay Moran, and NS Narayanaswamy. Hitting set for hypergraphs of low vc-dimension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.00481*, 2015.
- [BM20] Édouard Bonnet and Tillmann Miltzow. Parameterized hardness of art gallery problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 16(4):1–23, 2020.
- [BS17] Édouard Bonnet and Florian Sikora. The graph motif problem parameterized by the structure of the input graph. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 231:78–94, 2017.
- [BYFA08] Stefan Balev, Nicola Yanev, Arnaud Fréville, and Rumen Andonov. A dynamic programming based reduction procedure for the multidimensional 0–1 knapsack problem. *European journal of operational research*, 186(1):63–76, 2008.
- [CCK⁺17] Parinya Chalermsook, Marek Cygan, Guy Kortsarz, Bundit Laekhanukit, Pasin Manurangsi, Danupon Nanongkai, and Luca Trevisan. From gap-eth to fpt-inapproximability: Clique, dominating set, and more. In *FOCS*, pages 743–754, 2017.
- [CDM17] Radu Curticapean, Holger Dell, and Dániel Marx. Homomorphisms are a good basis for counting small subgraphs. In *STOC*, pages 210–223, 2017.
- [CFLL23] Yijia Chen, Yi Feng, Bundit Laekhanukit, and Yanlin Liu. Simple combinatorial construction of the $k^{o(1)}$ -lower bound for approximating the parameterized k -clique. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07516*, 2023.

- [CFM21] Rajesh Chitnis, Andreas Emil Feldmann, and Pasin Manurangsi. Parameterized approximation algorithms for bidirected steiner network problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 17(2):1–68, 2021.
- [Cha18] Timothy M. Chan. Approximation schemes for 0-1 knapsack. In *SOSA*, pages 5:1–5:12, 2018.
- [CHW76] Ashok K. Chandra, Daniel S. Hirschberg, and C. K. Wong. Approximate algorithms for some generalized knapsack problems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 3(3):293–304, 1976.
- [CK04] Chandra Chekuri and Sanjeev Khanna. On multidimensional packing problems. *SIAM journal on computing*, 33(4):837–851, 2004.
- [CKPP00] Alberto Caprara, Hans Kellerer, Ulrich Pferschy, and David Pisinger. Approximation algorithms for knapsack problems with cardinality constraints. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 123(2):333–345, 2000.
- [CLMZ23] Lin Chen, Jiayi Lian, Yuchen Mao, and Guochuan Zhang. A nearly quadratic-time FPTAS for knapsack. *CoRR*, abs/2308.07821, 2023.
- [CLRS09] Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, 3rd Edition*. MIT Press, 2009.
- [CMPS23] Karthik C. S., Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, and Uéverton Souza. Conditional lower bounds for sparse parameterized 2-csp: A streamlined proof. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2311, 2023.
- [CMWW19] Marek Cygan, Marcin Mucha, Karol Wegrzycki, and Michal Włodarczyk. On problems equivalent to (min, +)-convolution. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 15(1):14:1–14:25, 2019.
- [CX15] Radu Curticapean and Mingji Xia. Parameterizing the permanent: Genus, apices, minors, evaluation mod $2k$. In *FOCS*, pages 994–1009, 2015.
- [Din16] Irit Dinur. Mildly exponential reduction from gap-3sat to polynomial-gap label-cover. In *ECCC*, 2016.
- [DJM23] Mingyang Deng, Ce Jin, and Xiao Mao. Approximating knapsack and partition via dense subset sums. In *SODA*, pages 2961–2979, 2023.
- [DM18] Irit Dinur and Pasin Manurangsi. Eth-hardness of approximating 2-csps and directed steiner network. In *ITCS*, pages 36:1–36:20, 2018.
- [FC84] A.M. Frieze and M.R.B. Clarke. Approximation algorithms for the m-dimensional 0–1 knapsack problem: Worst-case and probabilistic analyses. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 15(1):100–109, 1984.
- [Fré04] Arnaud Fréville. The multidimensional 0-1 knapsack problem: An overview. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 155(1):1–21, 2004.
- [GRS23] Venkatesan Guruswami, Xuandi Ren, and Sai Sandeep. Baby PIH: parameterized inapproximability of min CSP. *CoRR*, abs/2310.16344, 2023.
- [IK75] Oscar H. Ibarra and Chul E. Kim. Fast approximation algorithms for the knapsack and sum of subset problems. *J. ACM*, 22(4):463–468, 1975.

- [IP01] Russell Impagliazzo and Ramamohan Paturi. On the complexity of k-sat. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 62(2):367–375, 2001.
- [Jin19] Ce Jin. An improved FPTAS for 0-1 knapsack. In *ICALP*, pages 76:1–76:14, 2019.
- [JKMS13] Klaus Jansen, Stefan Kratsch, Dániel Marx, and Ildikó Schlotter. Bin packing with fixed number of bins revisited. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 79(1):39–49, 2013.
- [JLL16] Klaus Jansen, Felix Land, and Kati Land. Bounding the running time of algorithms for scheduling and packing problems. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 30(1):343–366, 2016.
- [Joh73] David S. Johnson. Approximation algorithms for combinatorial problems. In *STOC*, pages 38–49, 1973.
- [Kar72] Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In *Proceedings of a symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations*, pages 85–103, 1972.
- [KFRW10] Liangjun Ke, Zuren Feng, Zhigang Ren, and Xiaoliang Wei. An ant colony optimization approach for the multidimensional knapsack problem. *Journal of Heuristics*, 16:65–83, 2010.
- [KK22] Karthik C. S. and Subhash Khot. Almost polynomial factor inapproximability for parameterized k-clique. In *CCC*, pages 6:1–6:21, 2022.
- [KP99] Hans Kellerer and Ulrich Pferschy. A new fully polynomial time approximation scheme for the knapsack problem. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 3(1):59–71, 1999.
- [KP04] Hans Kellerer and Ulrich Pferschy. Improved dynamic programming in connection with an FPTAS for the knapsack problem. *J. Comb. Optim.*, 8(1):5–11, 2004.
- [KPP04] Hans Kellerer, Ulrich Pferschy, and David Pisinger. *Multidimensional Knapsack Problems*. 2004.
- [KPS17] Marvin Künnemann, Ramamohan Paturi, and Stefan Schneider. On the fine-grained complexity of one-dimensional dynamic programming. In *ICALP*, pages 21:1–21:15, 2017.
- [KS81] Bernhard Korte and Rainer Schrader. On the existence of fast approximation schemes. In *Nonlinear Programming 4*, pages 415–437. Academic Press, 1981.
- [KS10] Ariel Kulik and Hadas Shachnai. There is no EPTAS for two-dimensional knapsack. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 110(16):707–710, 2010.
- [Law79] Eugene L. Lawler. Fast approximation algorithms for knapsack problems. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 4(4):339–356, 1979.
- [LB12] Soh-Yee Lee and Yoon-Teck Bau. An ant colony optimization approach for solving the multidimensional knapsack problem. In *ICIS*, pages 441–446, 2012.
- [Lin21] Bingkai Lin. Constant approximating k-clique is w[1]-hard. In *STOC*, pages 1749–1756, 2021.

- [LRSW22] Bingkai Lin, Xuandi Ren, Yican Sun, and Xiuhan Wang. On lower bounds of approximating parameterized k-clique. In *ICALP*, pages 90:1–90:18, 2022.
- [LRSW23] Bingkai Lin, Xuandi Ren, Yican Sun, and Xiuhan Wang. Improved hardness of approximating k-clique under ETH. In *FOCS*, pages 285–306, 2023.
- [LRSZ20] Daniel Lokshtanov, MS Ramanujan, Saket Saurab, and Meirav Zehavi. Parameterized complexity and approximability of directed odd cycle transversal. In *SODA*, pages 2181–2200, 2020.
- [LS55] James H Lorie and Leonard J Savage. Three problems in rationing capital. *The journal of business*, 28(4):229–239, 1955.
- [Mao23] Xiao Mao. $(1-\epsilon)$ -approximation of knapsack in nearly quadratic time. *CoRR*, abs/2308.07004, 2023.
- [Mar10] Dániel Marx. Can you beat treewidth? *Theory Comput.*, 6(1):85–112, 2010.
- [MC84] Michael J. Magazine and Maw-Sheng Chern. A note on approximation schemes for multidimensional knapsack problems. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 9(2):244–247, 1984.
- [MM57] Harry M Markowitz and Alan S Manne. On the solution of discrete programming problems. *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 84–110, 1957.
- [MP22] Dániel Marx and Michał Pilipczuk. Optimal parameterized algorithms for planar facility location problems using voronoi diagrams. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 18(2):1–64, 2022.
- [MR16] Pasin Manurangsi and Prasad Raghavendra. A birthday repetition theorem and complexity of approximating dense csps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.02986*, 2016.
- [OM80] Osman Oguz and MJ Magazine. A polynomial time approximation algorithm for the multidimensional 0/1 knapsack problem. *Univ. Waterloo Working Paper*, 1980.
- [PW18] Marcin Pilipczuk and Magnus Wahlström. Directed multicut is w [1]-hard, even for four terminal pairs. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT)*, 10(3):1–18, 2018.
- [RBEDB19] Abdellah Rezoug, Mohamed Bader-El-Den, and Dalila Boughaci. *Hybrid Genetic Algorithms to Solve the Multidimensional Knapsack Problem*, pages 235–250. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019.
- [Rhe15] Donguk Rhee. *Faster fully polynomial approximation schemes for knapsack problems*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2015.
- [RT87] Prabhakar Raghavan and Clark D. Thompson. Randomized rounding: a technique for provably good algorithms and algorithmic proofs. *Comb.*, 7(4):365–374, 1987.
- [Sah75] Sartaj Sahni. Approximate algorithms for the 0/1 knapsack problem. *J. ACM*, 22(1):115–124, 1975.
- [SC14] Sara Sabba and Salim Chikhi. A discrete binary version of bat algorithm for multidimensional knapsack problem. *Int. J. Bio Inspired Comput.*, 6(2):140–152, 2014.

- [Sri95] Aravind Srinivasan. Improved approximations of packing and covering problems. In *STOC*, pages 268–276, 1995.
- [WN67] H Martin Weingartner and David N Ness. Methods for the solution of the multidimensional 0/1 knapsack problem. *Operations Research*, 15(1):83–103, 1967.
- [WS11] David P. Williamson and David B. Shmoys. *The Design of Approximation Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [YCLZ19] Hong-Fang Yan, Ci-Yun Cai, De-Huai Liu, and Min-Xia Zhang. Water wave optimization for the multidimensional knapsack problem. In *ICIC*, volume 11644, pages 688–699, 2019.

A Hardness Results on CSPs

In this section, we give a reduction from 3-SAT to 2-CSP, which is used in the proofs of [Theorem 2.2](#) and [Theorem 5.1](#). Both of these proofs will use the same generic reduction, but with different instantiation of target constraint graphs and subsets associated with vertices (i.e. which specifies the “embedding”). We stress here that both of these proofs essentially follow from previous works, [[Mar10](#), [CMPS23](#)] and [[CCK⁺17](#)] respectively. In the former case, we include the proof here since their proof only deals with *exact* hardness and we extend it to hardness of approximation. In the latter case, we include the proof here for completeness since their statement is in a slightly different form.

We first define 2-CSP.

Definition A.1. 2-Constrained Satisfaction Problem (2-CSP)

Input: $\Gamma = (H, \Sigma, X)$ consisting of a constraint graph H , an alphabet set Σ , and constraints $X = \{X_{(u,v)}\}_{(u,v) \in E(H)}$ such that for all $(u, v) \in E(H)$ it holds that $X_{(u,v)} \subseteq \Sigma \times \Sigma$ and $X_{(u,v)} \neq \emptyset$.

- **Assignment:** A function $\lambda : V(H) \rightarrow \Sigma$. An edge $(u, v) \in E(H)$ is said to be satisfied by an assignment λ if and only if $(\lambda(u), \lambda(v)) \in X_{(u,v)}$.
- **Objective:** Find an assignment satisfying a maximum number of edges. Let $\text{CSP}(\Gamma)$ be the maximum number of satisfied edges by an assignment for Γ .

To state the reduction, we also need the following notation: given a formula $\phi = (V, C)$, for every clause $c \in C$, let $\text{var}_\phi(c)$ denote the set of variables appearing in c , and for every subset $C' \subseteq C$, let $\text{var}_\phi(C') := \bigcup_{c \in C'} \text{var}_\phi(c)$. When ϕ is clear from context, we may drop it from the subscript.

We state the generic reduction, which takes in an embedding from the clause set C to vertex set of the target constraint graph H , below in [Reduction A.2](#). We note that this is a standard reduction used in numerous prior works on the topic (e.g. [[Mar10](#), [CCK⁺17](#), [DM18](#), [CMPS23](#), [GRS23](#)]) and can be viewed as a derandomized variant of the direct product test. The main distinction between these previous works is how the embeddings (i.e. the collection \mathcal{C}) are chosen. Indeed, we will see later that the embeddings used in [[Mar10](#), [CMPS23](#)] and [[CCK⁺17](#)] are very different, leading to the different hardness results ([Theorem 2.2](#) and [Theorem 5.1](#)).

Reduction A.2 (3-SAT \rightarrow R-CSP Reduction). Given a 3-SAT instance $\phi = (C, V)$, a graph H , and a collection of sets $\mathcal{C} = (C_x)_{x \in V(H)}$ where $C_x \subseteq C$, the reduction produces a R-CSP

instance $\Pi(\phi, H, \mathcal{C}) = (G, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,x}, \pi_{e,y}\}_{e=(x,y) \in E(G)})$ as follows:

- $G = H$,
- $\Sigma = \Upsilon = [2^{3 \cdot \max_{x \in V(H)} |C_x|}]$,
- For every $x \in V(H)$, let Φ_x denote the set of partial assignments^a on $\text{var}(C_x)$ that satisfy all clauses in C_x .
- For every edge $e = (x, y)$, we associate Σ with Φ_x and Υ with $\{0, 1\}^{\text{var}(C_x) \cap \text{var}(C_y)}$. Then $\pi_{e,x}$ is defined as^b $\pi_{e,x}(g) = g|_{\text{var}(C_x) \cap \text{var}(C_y)}$. Finally, we define $\pi_{e,y}$ similarly.

^aA partial assignment on $S \subseteq V$ is simply a function $g : S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$.

^bNote that $g|_T$ is the restriction of function g on subset T .

We list a couple of useful observations. First is on the output instance size and the running time:

Observation A.3. $|\Pi(\phi, H, \mathcal{C})| \leq 2^{O(\max_{x \in V(H)} |C_x|)} \cdot |V(H)|$, the reduction runs in time $|\Pi(\phi, H, \mathcal{C})|^{O(1)}$.

Next is the completeness, which holds regardless of the graph H and the subsets C_v 's. This can be seen by simply letting $\psi(x) = s|_{\text{var}(C_x)}$ where s denote the satisfying assignment of ϕ .

Observation A.4. If $\text{SAT}(\phi) = m$, then $\text{Par}(\Pi(\phi, H, \mathcal{C})) = |V(H)|$.

A.1 Proof of **Theorem 2.2**

In this section, we prove **Theorem 2.2**, which will imply the proof of **Theorem 2.3** as a corollary. Our reduction is the same as that of [CMPS23], but we need an additional (simple) argument to show that the gap between the completeness and soundness is $1 - \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\log(k)}\right)$. We summarize the main properties of the desired reduction below.

Lemma A.5. For every $D \in \mathbb{N}$, there are constants $\mu, \theta > 0$, and a reduction $3\text{-SAT}(D) \rightarrow \text{R-CSP}$ that, given a $3\text{-SAT}(D)$ instance $\phi = (V, C)$ with n variables and m clauses, and a parameter $k > 6$ such that $k \leq \frac{n}{\log(n)}$, returns an instance $\Pi = (H, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,x}, \pi_{e,y}\}_{e=(x,y) \in E(H)})$ of R-CSP which satisfies the following properties.

1. **(Completeness)** If $\text{SAT}(\phi) = m$ then $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$.
2. **(Soundness)** For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, if $\text{SAT}(\phi) < (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot m$, then $\text{Par}(\Pi) < \left(1 - \frac{\theta \cdot \varepsilon}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |V(H)|$.
3. **(Instance Size)** $|\Gamma(\phi, k)| \leq 2^{\mu \cdot \frac{n}{k} \cdot \log k}$.
4. **(Number of Variables)** $|V(H)| \leq k$ and H is 3-regular.
5. **(Runtime)** The reduction runs in $2^{\mu \cdot \frac{n}{k} \cdot \log k} + n^{O(1)}$ time.

Before we prove **Lemma A.5**, we note that it easily implies our hardness result for R-CSP.

*Proof of **Theorem 2.2**.* Let ε, δ be the constants from **Conjecture 2.6** and μ, θ be as in **Lemma A.5**. We let $\zeta = \delta/\mu, \beta = \theta \cdot \varepsilon$, and $k_0 = \max\{6, \lceil \mu/\delta \rceil\}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is an algorithm \mathcal{A} with guarantees as in **Theorem 2.2**. We use this to solve the (gap version of) 3-SAT as follows: On input ϕ with n variables and m clauses, runs the reduction from **Lemma A.5** to get an output Π , and then runs algorithm \mathcal{A} on Π . For any sufficiently large n , our choice of parameters ensure that it runs in $O(2^{\delta n})$ time. Furthermore, **Lemma A.5** ensures that the algorithm can distinguish $\text{SAT}(\phi) = m$ from $\text{SAT}(\phi) < (1 - \varepsilon)m$. This contradicts Gap-ETH. ■

Assuming ETH rather than Gap-ETH and using symmetrical arguments this also gives the proof of [Theorem 2.3](#).

To prove [Lemma A.5](#), we will instantiate the reduction using a *graph embedding* of [[CMPS23](#)]. We recall some definitions here for completeness. Let $H = (V(H), E(H))$ be some graph. For some $S \subseteq V(H)$ the *vertex-induced subgraph* of S in H is the graph $H[S] = (S, E[S])$ such that

$$E[S] = \{(u, v) \in E(H) \mid u, v \in S\}.$$

We say that H' is a *subgraph* of H if there is some $S \subseteq V(H)$ such that $H' = H[S]$. Let H be some graph and let $H_1 = (V(H_1), E(H_1)), H_2 = (V(H_2), E(H_2))$ be connected subgraphs of H . We say that H_1 and H_2 *touch* if one of the following holds.

- $V(H_1) \cap V(H_2) \neq \emptyset$, or,
- There are $v_1 \in V(H_1)$ and $v_2 \in V(H_2)$ such that $(v_1, v_2) \in E(H)$ or $(v_2, v_1) \in E(H)$.

A *connected embedding* of a graph G in a graph H is a function $\psi : V(G) \rightarrow 2^{V(H)}$ that maps every $u \in V(G)$ to a nonempty subset of vertices $\psi(u) \subseteq V(H)$ in H such that $H[\psi(u)]$ is a connected subgraph of H and for every edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$ the subgraphs $H[\psi(u)]$ and $H[\psi(v)]$ touch. For every $x \in V(H)$ define

$$V_x(\psi) = \{u \in V(G) \mid x \in \psi(u)\}$$

as all vertices in $V(G)$ mapped to a subgraph that contains x . The *depth* of an embedding ψ , denoted by $\Delta(\psi)$, is the maximum cardinality of one of the above sets: $\Delta(\psi) = \max_{x \in V(H)} |V_x(\psi)|$. We use the following result of [[CMPS23](#)].

Lemma A.6 ([Theorem 3.1 in [[CMPS23](#)]]). *There are constants $Z, L > 1$ and an algorithm **Embedding** that takes as input a graph G and an integer $k > 6$, and outputs a bipartite 3-regular simple graph H with no isolated vertices and a connected embedding $\psi : V(G) \rightarrow 2^{V(H)}$ such that the following holds.*

- **(Size)** $|V(H)| \leq k$.
- **(Depth Guarantee)** $\Delta(\psi) \leq Z \cdot \left(1 + \frac{|V(G)| + |E(G)|}{k}\right) \cdot \log(k)$.
- **(Runtime)** Embedding runs in time $(|V(G)| + |E(G)|)^L$.

With all the tools in place, we are ready to prove [Lemma A.5](#).

Proof of [Lemma A.5](#). We use [Reduction A.2](#) with $H, \mathcal{C} = (C_x)_{x \in V(H)}$ that are chosen as follows:

- Define the graph G_{clause} such that $V(G) = C$ and $E(G) = \{(c, c') \mid \text{var}(c) \cap \text{var}(c') \neq \emptyset\}$.
- First, run the **Embedding** algorithm from [Lemma A.6](#) to produce a graph H and a connected embedding $\psi : C \rightarrow 2^{V(H)}$.
- Let $C_x = V_x(\psi)$ for all $x \in V(H)$.
- Let $\Pi = (H, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,x}, \pi_{e,y}\}_{e=(x,y) \in E(H)})$ be the output instance from [Reduction A.2](#) with the above choices.

Note that since ϕ is an instance of 3-SAT(D), we have $n/3 \leq m \leq D \cdot n$. The completeness of the reduction follows immediately from [Observation A.4](#), as does the size from [Observation A.3](#). The runtime follows from [Observation A.3](#) and [Lemma A.6](#).

Finally, we will prove the soundness. Suppose contrapositively that $\text{Par}(\Pi) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\theta \cdot \varepsilon}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |V(H)|$ for $\theta = 0.01/Z$ (where Z is from [Lemma A.6](#)) and any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let $\varphi : V(H) \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\perp\}$ denote the consistent partial assignment such that $|\varphi| = \text{Par}(\Pi)$.

Let $V(H)_{\text{assigned}} := \{x \in V(H) \mid \varphi(x) \neq \perp\}$ and $C_{\text{assigned}} := \{c \in C \mid \psi(c) \subseteq V(H)_{\text{assigned}}\}$. We define an assignment $s : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by assigning each $s(v)$ as follows:

- If there exists $c \in C_{\text{assigned}}$ such that $v \in \text{var}(c)$, then pick one such c_v and $x_v \in \psi(c_v)$ (arbitrarily) and let⁶ $s(v) = (\varphi(x_v))(v)$.
- Otherwise, assign $s(v)$ arbitrarily.

Consider any clause $c \in C_{\text{assigned}}$ and let v_1, v_2, v_3 denote its variable. Pick any $x \in \psi(c)$ arbitrarily; by definition of the alphabet of x , we have that $\varphi(x)$ satisfies c . We claim that $(\varphi(x))(v_j) = s(v_j)$ for all $j \in [3]$. This is true because, by our definition of s , we have $s(v_j) = (\varphi(x_{v_j}))(v_j)$. Meanwhile, (c, c_{v_j}) is an edge in G_{clause} ; thus, the [Embedding](#) algorithm ensures that $E[\psi(c) \cup \psi(c_{v_j})]$ is connected. Therefore, since φ is consistent, we must have $(\varphi(x))(v_j) = (\varphi(x_{v_j}))(v_j) = s(v_j)$. Thus, the claim holds. This implies that the clause c is satisfied by s . As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{SAT}(\phi) &\geq |C_{\text{assigned}}| = m - |\{c \in C \mid \psi(c) \not\subseteq V(H)_{\text{assigned}}\}| \\
&\geq m - \sum_{x \in V(H) \setminus V(H)_{\text{assigned}}} |\{c \in C \mid x \in \psi(c)\}| \\
&= m - \sum_{x \in V(H) \setminus V(H)_{\text{assigned}}} |V_x(\psi)| \\
&\geq m - (|V(H)| - |\varphi|) \cdot \Delta(\psi) \\
&\geq m - \frac{\theta \cdot \varepsilon}{\log(k)} \cdot |V(H)| \cdot \Delta(\psi) \\
&\geq m - \frac{\theta \cdot \varepsilon}{\log(k)} \cdot k \cdot \left(Z \cdot \left(1 + \frac{n+m}{k} \right) \cdot \log(k) \right) \geq m - \varepsilon \cdot m,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from our choices of parameters and from $n \leq m/3$. This implies that the soundness holds, which completes our proof. \blacksquare

A.1.1 From R-CSP to 2-CSP

As stated in the introduction, our result can be easily adapted to the standard Max-2-CSP version. We obtain the following result for 2-CSP.

Theorem A.7. *Assuming Gap-ETH, there exist constants $\zeta, \chi > 0$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, such that, for any constant $k \geq k_0$, there is no algorithm that takes in an 2-CSP instance Γ with a 3-regular constraint graph H such that $|V(H)| \leq k$ variables, runs in time $O\left(|\Gamma|^{\zeta \frac{k}{\log(k)}}\right)$ and distinguish between:*

- **(Completeness)** $\text{CSP}(\Gamma) = |E(H)|$, and,
- **(Soundness)** $\text{CSP}(\Gamma) < \left(1 - \frac{\chi}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |E(H)|$.

⁶Recall that $\varphi(x_v)$ can be viewed as a partial assignment on $\text{var}(C_{x_v})$

Proof of Theorem A.7. Let ζ, β, k_0 be as in Theorem 2.2. We let $\chi = 2\beta/3$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is an algorithm \mathcal{A} with guarantees as in Theorem A.7. We claim that \mathcal{A} can solve the problem in Theorem 2.2 as well. To see that it is correct, note that the completeness is obvious (i.e. $\text{Par}(\Pi) = |V(H)|$ iff $\text{CSP}(\Gamma) = |E(H)|$). As for the soundness, suppose contrapositively that $\text{CSP}(\Gamma) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\chi}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |E(H)|$, i.e. there is an assignment $\lambda : V(H) \rightarrow \Sigma$ that violates at most $\frac{\chi}{\log(k)} \cdot |E(H)|$ edges. Define $\varphi : V(H) \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\perp\}$ by $\varphi(v) = \lambda(v)$ iff all edges adjacent to v are satisfied by λ . Otherwise, we let $\varphi(v) = \perp$. It is clear from the definition that φ is consistent. Furthermore, we have $|\varphi| \geq |V(H)| - \frac{\chi}{\log(k)} \cdot |E(H)| = \left(1 - \frac{\beta}{\log(k)}\right) \cdot |V(H)|$ where the last equality is due to the fact that H is 3-regular. As such, the algorithm is correct. From Theorem 2.2, this violates Gap-ETH. ■

A.2 Proof of Theorem 5.1

To prove Theorem 5.1, we use the reduction from [CCK⁺17], restated slightly to fit in our terminologies. The guarantees of the reduction are stated below.

Lemma A.8. *For every $D \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there are constants $\mu > 0$ and $r_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds: For any constants $k \geq r \geq r_0$, there is a reduction $3\text{-SAT}(D) \rightarrow \text{R-CSP}$ that, given a $3\text{-SAT}(D)$ instance $\phi = (V, C)$ with n variables and m , returns an instance $\Pi = (H, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,x}, \pi_{e,y}\}_{e=(x,y) \in E(H)})$ of R-CSP which satisfies the following properties.*

1. **(Completeness)** *If $\text{SAT}(\phi) = m$ then $\text{Par}(\Pi) = k$.*
2. **(Soundness)** *If $\text{SAT}(\phi) < (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot m$, then $\text{Par}(\Pi) < r$.*
3. **(Instance Size)** *$|\Gamma(\phi, k)| \leq 2^{\mu \cdot \frac{n}{r}}$.*
4. **(Constraint Graph)** *H is a complete graph on k vertices.*
5. **(Runtime)** *The reduction runs in $2^{\mu \cdot \frac{n}{k} \cdot \log k} + n^{O(1)}$ time.*

Before we prove Lemma A.8, we note that it easily implies Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Let ε, δ be the constants from Conjecture 2.6 and μ, r_0 be as in Lemma A.8. We let $\zeta = \delta/\mu$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is an algorithm \mathcal{A} with guarantees as in Theorem 5.1. We use this to solve the (gap version of) 3-SAT as follows: On input ϕ with n variables and m clauses, runs the reduction from Lemma A.8 to get an output Π , and then runs algorithm \mathcal{A} on Π . For any sufficiently large n , our choice of parameters ensure that it runs in $O(2^{\delta n})$ time. Furthermore, Lemma A.8 ensures that the algorithm can distinguish $\text{SAT}(\phi) = m$ from $\text{SAT}(\phi) < (1 - \varepsilon)m$. This contradicts Gap-ETH. ■

To describe the reduction of [CCK⁺17], we need the notion of a *dispenser*. An (m, k, ℓ, r) -dispenser (w.r.t. universe U of size m) is a collection of ℓ -size subsets $I_1, \dots, I_k \subseteq m$ such that, for any distinct $i_1, \dots, i_r \in [k]$, we have $|I_{i_1} \cup \dots \cup I_{i_r}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)m$.

Lemma A.9 ([CCK⁺17]). *There exist constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that the following holds: For any $m \geq C_1 r \ln k$, a (m, k, ℓ, r) -dispenser exist for $\ell \leq \lceil 3m/(\varepsilon r) \rceil$. Moreover, such a dispenser can be computed in time $(2^{r k \log k} + m)^{C_2}$.*

We are now ready to prove Lemma A.8.

Proof of Lemma A.8. We use Reduction A.2 with $H, \mathcal{C} = (C_x)_{x \in V(H)}$ that are chosen as follows:

- Let H be the complete graph on k vertices.
- Let $(C_x)_{x \in V(H)}$ be an (m, k, ℓ, r) -dispenser (w.r.t. universe C) computed using [Lemma A.9](#).
- Let $\Pi = (H, \Sigma, \Upsilon, \{\pi_{e,x}, \pi_{e,y}\}_{e=(x,y) \in E(H)})$ be the output instance from [Reduction A.2](#) with the above choices.

Note that since ϕ is an instance of $3\text{-SAT}(D)$, we have $n/3 \leq m \leq D \cdot n$. The completeness of the reduction follows immediately from [Observation A.4](#), as does the size from [Observation A.3](#). The runtime follows from [Observation A.3](#) and [Lemma A.9](#) (assuming that n is sufficiently larger than k).

Finally, we will prove the soundness. Suppose contrapositively that $\text{Par}(\Pi) \geq r$. Let $\varphi : V(H) \rightarrow \Sigma \cup \{\perp\}$ denote the consistent partial assignment such that $|\varphi| = \text{Par}(\Pi) \geq r$.

Let $V(H)_{\text{assigned}} := \{x \in V(H) \mid \varphi(x) \neq \perp\}$ and⁷ $C_{\text{assigned}}^{\text{relaxed}} := \bigcup_{x \in V(H)_{\text{assigned}}} C_x$. We then define an assignment $s : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by assigning each $s(v)$ as follows:

- If there exists $c \in C_{\text{assigned}}^{\text{relaxed}}$ such that $v \in \text{var}(c)$, then pick one such c_v and $x_v \in (\psi(c_v) \cap V(H)_{\text{assigned}})$ (arbitrarily) and let⁸ $s(v) = (\varphi(x_v))(v)$.
- Otherwise, assign $s(v)$ arbitrarily.

Consider any clause $c \in C_{\text{assigned}}^{\text{relaxed}}$ and let v_1, v_2, v_3 denote its variable. Pick any $x \in \psi(c) \cap V(H)_{\text{assigned}}$ arbitrarily; by definition of the alphabet of x , we have that $\varphi(x)$ satisfies c . We claim that $(\varphi(x))(v_j) = s(v_j)$ for all $j \in [3]$. This is true because, by our definition of s , we have $s(v_j) = (\varphi(x_{v_j}))(v_j)$. Meanwhile, since H is a complete graph and φ is consistent, we must have $(\varphi(x))(v_j) = (\varphi(x_{v_j}))(v_j) = s(v_j)$. Thus, the claim holds. This implies that the clause c is satisfied by s . As a result, we have

$$\text{SAT}(\phi) \geq |C_{\text{assigned}}^{\text{relaxed}}| = \left| \bigcup_{x \in V(H)_{\text{assigned}}} C_x \right| \geq (1 - \varepsilon) \cdot m,$$

where the last inequality follows from $|V(H)_{\text{assigned}}| \geq r$ and that $(C_x)_{x \in V(H)}$ is an (m, k, ℓ, r) -dispenser. This implies that the soundness holds, which completes our proof. \blacksquare

⁷Note that this is different from C_{assigned} defined in the proof of [Lemma A.5](#). In particular, $C_{\text{assigned}}^{\text{relaxed}}$ contains all clauses c that belongs to C_x for *some* $x \in V(H)_{\text{assigned}}$. Meanwhile C_{assigned} contains only the clauses c where $x \in V(H)_{\text{assigned}}$ for *all* $x \in V(H)$ such that $c \in C_x$.

⁸Recall that $\varphi(x_v)$ can be viewed as a partial assignment on $\text{var}(C_{x_v})$