

Submodular Maximization in Exactly n Queries

Eric Balkanski
Columbia University
New York City, New York
eb3224@columbia.edu

Steven DiSilvio
MIT
Cambridge, Massachusetts
disilvio@mit.edu

Alan Kuhnle*
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas
kuhnle@tamu.edu

May 31, 2024

Abstract

In this work, we study the classical problem of maximizing a submodular function subject to a matroid constraint. We develop deterministic algorithms that are very parsimonious with respect to querying the submodular function, for both the case when the submodular function is monotone and the general submodular case. In particular, we present a $1/4$ approximation algorithm for the monotone case that uses exactly one query per element, which gives the same total number of queries n as the number of queries required to compute the maximum singleton. For the general case, we present a constant factor approximation algorithm that requires 2 queries per element, which is the first algorithm for this problem with linear query complexity in the size of the ground set.

1 Introduction

Submodular optimization. Many objectives that we aim to optimize in machine learning, such as coverage, diversity, and entropy, satisfy the diminishing returns property required for a function to be submodular. Submodular maximization algorithms are thus employed in applications such as document summarization [27], influence maximization in networks [19], recommender systems [4], and feature selection [12]. A fundamental problem in this field is to maximize a monotone submodular function under a matroid constraint, which we refer to as MSM. For this problem, the celebrated greedy algorithm of Fisher et al. [16] achieves a $1/2$ approximation. This $1/2$ approximation was improved by Calinescu et al. [9] to $1 - 1/e$ with a continuous greedy algorithm, which is the best approximation achievable with polynomially many queries [30]. The broader problem of maximizing a, not necessarily monotone, submodular function under a cardinality constraint, which we refer to as GSM, is also known to admit constant factor approximation algorithms [24].

Fast algorithms for MSM. Due to the many applications of submodular maximization over massive datasets, a major focus has been to develop fast algorithms for submodular maximization (see, e.g., [2, 29, 14, 6, 22, 26]). Since the time required to perform function evaluations usually dominates other parts of the computation, the speed of an algorithm is often measured by its query complexity, i.e., its number of function evaluations. In particular, the query complexity of the greedy algorithm is kn , where k is the rank of the matroid and n is size of the ground set. Badanidiyuru and Vondrák [2] improved this query complexity with an algorithm with $\mathcal{O}((n/\varepsilon) \log(k/\varepsilon))$ query complexity that achieves a $1/2 - \varepsilon$ approximation for MSM. Subsequently, Chakrabarti and Kale [10] achieved a linear query complexity with a $1/4$ -approximation algorithm that makes at most $2n$ queries. On the hardness side, Kuhnle [22] showed that n queries are required to obtain an approximation of $1/2 + \varepsilon$, even for the special case of finding the maximum singleton.

*Authors are ordered alphabetically.

Fast algorithms for GSM. If the objective function is not monotone, there are no known algorithms with linear query complexity. Lee et al. [24] obtained the first constant factor approximation algorithm for GSM, with an algorithm that has query complexity $\tilde{O}(n^4)$. An algorithm of Kuhnle [21] achieves a ratio $1/4 - \varepsilon$ in $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{k}{\varepsilon}\right)$ queries for the special case of a size constraint, and this algorithm was extended to handle a matroid constraint by Han et al. [18], keeping the same ratio and query complexity. Since the rank k may be as large as n , the query complexity of these algorithms is superlinear in the size of the ground set.

The main question we ask in this paper is whether the best-known query complexity for these two problems can be improved while achieving a constant factor approximation guarantee.

What is the query complexity of achieving a constant factor approximation for MSM and GSM?

Our results. Our first main result shows that n queries are sufficient to achieve a constant factor approximation with a deterministic algorithm for MSM.

Theorem. *There is a deterministic $1/4$ -approximation algorithm for MSM with query complexity n .*

This result improves the query complexity of Chakrabarti and Kale [10] from $2n$ to n , while maintaining the same approximation. We emphasize that our algorithm, called QUICKSWAP, does a pass over the elements and performs a *single* query per element. The main idea needed to perform only a single query per element e requires maintaining an *infeasible* solution and evaluating the marginal contribution of e to this infeasible solution, whereas the vast majority of algorithms for submodular maximization only maintain a feasible solution. In fact, there have been lower bounds for submodular maximization that make the assumption that the algorithm only queries feasible sets [31, 23], and this has been considered a natural assumption. Whether our result can be achieved by only querying feasible sets is an interesting question for future work. This n query complexity matches the number of queries required to find the element e with maximum singleton value $f(\{e\})$ [22].

Our second main result is the first constant factor approximation algorithm with linear query complexity for GSM.

Theorem. *There is a deterministic $1/(6 + 4\sqrt{2}) \approx 1/11.66$ -approximation algorithm for GSM with query complexity $2n$.*

The previous best query complexity achieved by a constant factor approximation algorithm for GSM is $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n}{\varepsilon} \log \frac{k}{\varepsilon}\right)$. In addition to achieving the first linear query complexity algorithm for this problem, we emphasize that another benefit of our algorithm is that the query complexity does not depend on large constants, which is important for the practicality of the algorithm. We emphasize that the algorithm and its analysis for GSM build on the QUICKSWAP algorithm for MSM.

Finally, we empirically demonstrate the practicality of QUICKSWAP. On real and synthetic datasets, it always achieves an improved number of queries and a similar objective value as the algorithm of Chakrabarti and Kale [10] with $2n$ queries. Compared to the lazy greedy algorithm and the algorithm of Badanidiyuru and Vondrák [2], it achieves a significant improvement in the number of queries at a small cost in the objective value.

1.1 Related work

Linear-Time Algorithms for Size and Knapsack Constraints. For the special case of monotone submodular maximization under a size constraint, two works [22, 26] independently achieved an $\mathcal{O}((n/\varepsilon) \log(1/\varepsilon))$ query complexity and a nearly optimal $1 - 1/e - \varepsilon$ approximation ratio. These are the first deterministic algorithms to achieve nearly the $1 - 1/e$ ratio for size constraints with linear query complexity. Li et al. [26] also provide an $\mathcal{O}_\varepsilon(n \log n)$ algorithm for the intersection of matroid and ℓ knapsack constraints; however, for the case of a single matroid and zero knapsacks, this algorithm reduces to the $1/2 - \varepsilon$ -approximation algorithm in [2] previously discussed.

Relationship to Kuhnle [22]. For MSM under size constraint, Kuhnle [22] provides the algorithm QUICKSTREAM, a $(1/4)$ -approximation algorithm in exactly n queries. Our algorithm shares some common features with this algorithm: both algorithms query an infeasible set to determine whether to add an element. However, QUICKSTREAM uses multiple ideas that are specific to size constraint which do not generalize to matroid constraints. Most importantly, it relies upon the fact that the last k elements added to the infeasible set form a feasible set. This fact, together with the condition to add an element, is crucial for proving the $1/4$ ratio of QUICKSTREAM. Unfortunately, for the matroid constraint, one cannot find a feasible set in this way. A different strategy for maintaining a feasible subset of the infeasible set is required, together with a different strategy for adding an element.

We also note that for size constraint, Kuhnle [22] gave a technique to transform any α -approximation deterministic algorithm with query complexity q into an α/c -approximation deterministic algorithm with query complexity q/c , for any integer c . However, this technique does not work for matroid constraints. Another technique to reduce the query complexity at the cost of the approximation ratio is to run an algorithm on a randomly sampled subset of the ground set. However, the approximation guarantees with this approach only hold in expectation, instead of deterministically, and the sampling also causes a loss in approximation. In particular, for GSM, this technique cannot be used with an existing algorithm to achieve a constant approximation and a linear query complexity.

Relationship to Chakrabarti and Kale [10]. As mentioned above, Chakrabarti and Kale [10] developed a streaming algorithm for the monotone problem that achieves the same ratio as our algorithm in at most $2n$ queries. Their algorithm takes one pass through the ground set and maintains a feasible set through the following swapping logic. Each element is assigned a weight (which requires at most two queries to the oracle), and the feasible solution is updated via appealing to an algorithm of Ashwinkumar [1] for maximum (modular) weight independent set. By contrast, our monotone algorithm employs a single query to an infeasible set to determine whether two elements should be swapped. In our empirical evaluation (Section 4), we show that the two algorithms obtain a similar objective value, but our algorithm uses fewer queries.

Relationship to Feldman et al. [15]. Feldman et al. [15] developed several streaming algorithms for the general problem GSM. These algorithms also take one pass through the ground set and decide whether it makes sense to swap out an existing element for a new candidate. These algorithms employ many queries to the submodular function to determine if a swap should be made: $O(k)$ queries are required per element in the worst case, where k is the rank of the matroid. By contrast, our general algorithm makes two queries to two infeasible sets to determine if an element should be swapped. However, we should note that the graph constructions required to prove our approximation ratios are inspired by the graph constructions used in the analysis of these algorithms.

Faster algorithms that achieve optimal ratio for MSM. Several works have improved the number of queries needed to obtain the optimal $1 - 1/e$ ratio for MSM [2, 8, 20]. Very recently, a ratio of $1 - 1/e - \varepsilon$ was achieved with $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{k}n \text{ poly}(1/\varepsilon, \log n))$ queries [20].

1.2 Preliminaries

A function $f : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is *submodular* if it satisfies the following diminishing returns property: for all sets $S \subseteq T \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ and any element $a \in \mathcal{N} \setminus T$, we have $f(a|S) \geq f(a|T)$, where $f(a|S) = f(S + a) - f(S)$ is the marginal contribution of a to S . Equivalently, f is submodular if $f(S) + f(T) \geq f(S \cup T) + f(S \cap T)$ for all sets $S, T \subseteq \mathcal{N}$. It is *monotone* if $f(S) \leq f(T)$ for all sets $S \subseteq T \subseteq \mathcal{N}$.

Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{N}}$ be a collection of subsets of \mathcal{N} . Then $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{I})$ is a *matroid* if the following three properties are satisfied: (1) $\emptyset \in \mathcal{I}$, (2) for all sets $S \subseteq T \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, if $T \in \mathcal{I}$ then $S \in \mathcal{I}$ (downward-closed property), and (3) for all sets $S, T \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ such that $|S| < |T|$, there exists $e \in T \setminus S$ such that $S + e \in \mathcal{I}$ (augmentation property).

In the submodular maximization under a matroid constraint problem (*GSM*), we are given a submodular function $f : 2^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and a matroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{I})$, and the goal is to approximately solve $\max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$. In the monotone submodular maximization under a matroid constraint problem (*MSM*), the function f is assumed to also be monotone. A set $S \in \mathcal{I}$ is interchangeably called independent or feasible. We assume without loss of generality that $\{e\} \in \mathcal{I}$ for all $e \in \mathcal{N}$.

The algorithm is given access to a value oracle for f , i.e., it can query the value $f(S)$ of any set $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, as well as an independence oracle for \mathcal{M} , i.e., it can test whether $S \in \mathcal{I}$ or $S \notin \mathcal{I}$ for any set $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$. In submodular maximization, the main bottleneck for the running time is typically the function evaluations $f(S)$, so we are interested in designing algorithms for MSM and GSM with low *query complexity*, which is the worst-case number of queries made by the algorithm to the value oracle for f .

2 An approximation algorithm for MSM in exactly n queries

In this section, we present our $(1/4)$ -approximation algorithm for MSM that uses exactly n queries. Monotonicity is used in only one place in the analysis, and we also invoke the lemmata proved here in Section 3, where we develop a constant-factor algorithm for GSM with $2n$ query complexity.

Description of the algorithm. In overview, the algorithm makes a single pass through the ground set, and each element is swapped into the solution A' if it is good enough relative to the element it displaces. The novelty lies in the fact that each element is considered to be swapped into A' *only once*; and the definition of good enough relies upon a single query of the marginal gain of the element to an infeasible set $A \supseteq A'$ when it arrives.

Specifically, the algorithm maintains two sets, $A' \subseteq A$; A' is always a feasible solution, and A contains all elements that were once a member of A' . On Line 4, the weight δ_e of element e is defined as its marginal gain into A : $\delta_e = f(e|A)$. Since $f(A)$ is already known, computing the gain requires a single query: $f(A + e)$. The weight δ_e is fixed upon arrival of e and never recomputed, and is used for all processing related to e . Next, the best candidate to swap e into A' is found, according to the weights δ . This element, denoted a^* , is chosen to be a smallest weight element such that $A' \setminus a^* + e$ is feasible; that is, $a^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{a \in A' | A' \setminus a + e \in \mathcal{I}} \delta_a$. If δ_e is large enough relative to δ_{a^*} , then the swap occurs: A' is updated to $A' \setminus a^* + e$, and A is updated to $A + e$ (and the value of $f(A)$ is updated to $f(A) + \delta_e$).

Algorithm 1: QUICKSWAP: A $\frac{1}{4}$ -approximation algorithm for monotone submodular maximization under a matroid constraint

```

1 Input: Oracle to  $f$ , ground set  $\mathcal{N}$ , independence oracle for  $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{I})$ , parameter  $\beta$ 
2  $A, A' \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3 for  $e \in \mathcal{N}$  do
4    $\delta_e \leftarrow f(e|A)$ 
5   if  $A' + e \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $\delta_e \geq 0$  then
6      $A \leftarrow A + e$ 
7      $A' \leftarrow A' + e$ 
8   else
9      $a^* \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{a \in A' | A' - a + e \in \mathcal{I}} \delta_a$ 
10    if  $\delta_e \geq (1 + \beta)\delta_{a^*}$  then
11       $A \leftarrow A + e$ 
12       $A' \leftarrow A' - a^* + e$ 
13 Return  $A'$ 

```

2.1 Overview of analysis

The analysis proceeds by first relating $f(A)$ and $f(A')$ (Lemma 2.1), then $\text{OPT} = f(O)$, $f(A)$, and $f(A')$ (Lemma 2.2). We state these two lemmata, then prove the approximation ratio. Subsequently, we prove the lemmata in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, respectively. Both lemmata hold for general, submodular functions, which will be needed in Section 3. Finally, we show that the $1/4$ ratio is tight, with a set of tight examples in Section 2.4.

Lemma 2.1 relates $f(A')$ and $f(A)$; intuitively, because $A' \subseteq A$ and $\delta_e = f(e|A)$, then by submodularity and the condition to swap a^* for e , the f -value of A' increases by a constant fraction of the increase in the f -value of A , despite the loss from a^* .

Lemma 2.1. Let (f, \mathcal{M}) be an instance of GSM, and let A', A be produced by Alg. 1 on this instance. Then $f(A') \geq \frac{\beta f(A)}{1+\beta}$.

Next, Lemma 2.2 establishes a relationship between $f(O \cup A)$, $f(A)$, and $f(A')$. Intuitively, the rejected elements $O \setminus A$ can each be mapped to an element of A' responsible for the rejection. The key fact, which much of the proof is devoted to showing, is that this mapping is injective. That is, each element o of $O \setminus A$ can be mapped to a unique element of A' , which may be thought of as gatekeeper for the element o . To prove the mapping is an injection, a graph construction is employed.

Lemma 2.2. Let (f, \mathcal{M}) be an instance of GSM with optimal solution O , and let A', A be produced by Alg. 1 on this instance. Then $f(O \cup A) \leq f(A) + (1 + \beta)f(A')$.

The approximation follows directly from these two lemmata, as summarized in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. Algorithm 1 is a $(1/4)$ -approximation algorithm for MSM with query complexity n .

Proof. Let e_i , A_i , and A'_i denote the element e , the set A , and the set A' at iteration i of the algorithm. For the query complexity, note that at iteration i , the algorithm evaluates $f(e_i|A_{i-1}) = f(A_{i-1} + e_i) - f(A_{i-1})$. Let e_j be the last element added to A such that $j < i$. If there is no such j , then $A_{i-1} = \emptyset$ and $f(A_{i-1}) = 0$. Otherwise, we have $A_{i-1} = A_j = A_{j-1} + e_j$ and query $f(A_{i-1}) = f(A_{j-1} + e_j)$ was already performed at iteration j . Thus, only one query to f is needed at each iteration and the query complexity is n . For the approximation, observe that

$$f(O) \leq_{(1)} f(O \cup A) \leq_{(2)} f(A) + (1 + \beta)f(A') \leq_{(3)} \frac{(\beta + 1)^2}{\beta} f(A'),$$

where (1) is by monotonicity, (2) is by Lemma 2.2, and (3) is by Lemma 2.1. The $1/4$ ratio follows from optimizing over $\beta \in [0, \infty)$ (the ratio is optimized at $\beta = 1$). \square

2.2 Proof of Lemma 2.1

We first give a helper lemma, which relates the change in the sum of the weights of elements in A' to the same sum for A , for a single iteration.

Lemma 2.3. Let f be a submodular function (not necessarily monotone). Then, for any $i \in [n]$, we have that $\sum_{e_j \in A'_i} \delta_{e_j} - \sum_{e_j \in A'_{i-1}} \delta_{e_j} \geq \frac{\beta}{1+\beta} \left(\sum_{e_j \in A_i} \delta_{e_j} - \sum_{e_j \in A_{i-1}} \delta_{e_j} \right)$.

Proof. There are three cases. Case 1: if $A'_{i-1} + e_i \in M$ and $\delta_{e_i} \geq 0$. Then, we have $A_i = A_{i-1} + e_i$ and $A'_i = A'_{i-1} + e_i$. We get that

$$\sum_{e_j \in A'_i} \delta_{e_j} - \sum_{e_j \in A'_{i-1}} \delta_{e_j} = \delta_{e_i} \geq_{(1)} \frac{\beta \delta_{e_i}}{1 + \beta} = \frac{\beta}{1 + \beta} \left(\sum_{e_j \in A_i} \delta_{e_j} - \sum_{e_j \in A_{i-1}} \delta_{e_j} \right),$$

where (1) is since $\delta_{e_i} \geq 0$. Case 2: If $A'_{i-1} + e_i \in M$ and $\delta_{e_i} \geq 0$ do not hold and $\delta_{e_i} \geq (1 + \beta)\delta_{a^*}$ does hold. This is the main case for this proof. In this case, we have $A_i = A_{i-1} + e_i$ and $A'_i = A'_{i-1} - a^* + e_i$. We get that

$$\sum_{e_j \in A'_i} \delta_{e_j} - \sum_{e_j \in A'_{i-1}} \delta_{e_j} \stackrel{(1)}{=} \delta_{e_i} - \delta_{a^*} \stackrel{(2)}{\geq} \frac{\beta}{1 + \beta} \delta_{e_i} \stackrel{(3)}{=} \frac{\beta}{1 + \beta} \left(\sum_{e_j \in A_i} \delta_{e_j} - \sum_{e_j \in A_{i-1}} \delta_{e_j} \right).$$

where (1) is since $A'_i = A'_{i-1} - a^* + e_i$, (2) since $\delta_{e_i} \geq (1 + \beta)\delta_{a^*}$, and (3) since $A_i = A_{i-1} + e_i$. Case 3: if neither conditions hold for the two previous cases, we have that $A_i = A_{i-1}$ and $A'_i = A'_{i-1}$. This implies that $\sum_{e_j \in A'_i} \delta_{e_j} - \sum_{e_j \in A'_{i-1}} \delta_{e_j} = 0$ and $\sum_{e_j \in A_i} \delta_{e_j} - \sum_{e_j \in A_{i-1}} \delta_{e_j} = 0$, and we trivially obtain the desired claim. \square

We are now ready to prove Lemma 2.1.

Proof of Lemma 2.1. We first claim that $A'_n \cap \{e_1, \dots, e_{j-1}\} \subseteq A_{j-1}$. Consider $e_i \in A'_n \cap \{e_1, \dots, e_{j-1}\}$, so $i \leq j - 1$. Since $e_i \in A'_n$, we have $e_i \in A'_i$ by definition of the algorithm. Since $i \leq j - 1$, we have $A'_i \subseteq A_i \subseteq A_{j-1}$. Since $e_i \in A'_i$ and $A'_i \subseteq A_{j-1}$, we get $e_i \in A_{j-1}$, which proves the desired claim. We get that

$$\begin{aligned} f(A'_n) &= \sum_{e_j \in A'_n} f(e_j | A'_n \cap \{e_1, \dots, e_{j-1}\}) \\ &\geq \sum_{e_j \in A'_n} \delta_{e_j} && A'_n \cap \{e_1, \dots, e_{j-1}\} \subseteq A_{j-1} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{e_j \in A'_i} \delta_{e_j} - \sum_{e_j \in A'_{i-1}} \delta_{e_j} \right) && \text{telescoping sum} \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\beta}{1 + \beta} \left(\sum_{e_j \in A_i} \delta_{e_j} - \sum_{e_j \in A_{i-1}} \delta_{e_j} \right) && \text{Lemma 2.3} \\ &= \frac{\beta}{1 + \beta} \sum_{e_j \in A_n} \delta_{e_j} && \text{telescoping sum} \\ &= \frac{\beta f(A_n)}{1 + \beta}. && \square \end{aligned}$$

2.3 Proof of Lemma 2.2

The main lemma used to prove Lemma 2.2 is the following.

Lemma 2.4. Let f be a submodular function. For any independent set $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, there exists an injection $\phi : S \rightarrow A'$ such that $\delta_{\phi(a)} \geq \delta_a / (1 + \beta)$ for all $a \in S$.

In order to prove this lemma, we use graph constructions inspired by Chekuri et al. [11] and Feldman et al. [15]. At a high level, the proof will be divided into three parts as follows:

- 1) Construct a graph based on a run of the algorithm (Section 2.3.1).
- 2) Verify particular properties of this graph (Section 2.3.2).
- 3) Invoke a technical lemma from Feldman et al. [15] which that allows to use the graph's properties to deduce Lemma 2.4 (Section 2.3.3).

Finally, we use Lemma 2.4 to prove Lemma 2.2 in Section 2.3.4.

2.3.1 Graph construction

We initialize a directed graph G_0 with no edges and vertex set V consisting of a vertex v_i for each element e_i of \mathcal{N} . Then, we obtain $G = G_n$ by iteratively constructing G_i from G_{i-1} via the addition of directed edges. The edges to be added are determined by the behavior of PROCESS on iteration i , as follows. If $A'_{i-1} + e_i$ is found to be independent and $f(e_i|A_{i-1}) \geq 0$, so that e_i is added to the current state of A' without necessitating a swap, then no edges are added and $G_i = G_{i-1}$. Otherwise, we consider the set $U_i = \{e_i\} \cup \{a : A'_{i-1} \setminus a + e_i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ which contains e_i and the potential elements e_i could have been swapped with in this round. Then, define a_i^* to an $a \in U_i \setminus e_i$ with minimum δ_a value. Observe that exactly one of a_i^* or e_i is in A'_i (either e_i had enough marginal contribution to cause a_i^* to be swapped out, or it did not). Denote u_i to be the element of $\{a_i^*, e_i\}$ that is *not* in A'_i . Then, $G_i = G_{i-1} \cup \{(u_i, a) : a \in U_i \setminus u_i\}$. That is, we add a directed edge from u_i to all the other elements of U_i . After n iterations of this procedure, we obtain our final graph $G = G_n$.

2.3.2 Properties of the graph

Next, we give properties that are satisfied by the graph G . We first note the following folklore theorem.

Theorem 2.2 (Folklore, as in Goemans [17]). Given some matroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{I})$, if $S \in \mathcal{I}$ but $S + e \notin \mathcal{I}$ then there exists a unique circuit $C \subseteq S + e$.

From Theorem 2.2, we can show the following known proposition about circuits, whose proof we include for completeness.

Proposition 2.1. Given a matroid $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{I})$, let $S \in \mathcal{I}$ and $e \in \mathcal{N}$, such that $S + e \notin \mathcal{I}$. Then $\{a : S \setminus a + e \in \mathcal{I}\} \cup \{e\}$ is the unique circuit contained in $S + e$.

Proof. Let $B = \{a : S \setminus a + e \in \mathcal{I}\} \cup \{e\}$. First, $e \in C$ since otherwise $C \subseteq S$, and hence would be independent. So it suffices to show that $C \setminus e = B \setminus e$.

Let $a \in B \setminus e$. Notice that since $S \setminus a + e \in \mathcal{I}$, every subset of $S \setminus a + e$ is independent, and hence $C \not\subseteq S \setminus a + e$. As C is a subset of $S + e$, this implies that $a \in C$. Therefore, $B \setminus e \subseteq C \setminus e$.

Next, let $a \in C \setminus e$. Then $C' = C \setminus a$ must be independent by the inclusionwise minimality of C . While $|S| > |C'|$, we can iteratively add elements from S to C' while preserving independence by the augmentation property of matroids. Observe that we never add a to C' , as then $C \subseteq C'$ and C' would not be independent. Hence, we finally obtain $C' = S \setminus a + e$. Thus, $S \setminus a + e \in \mathcal{I}$, and $a \in B \setminus e$. Therefore, $C \setminus e \subseteq B \setminus e$. \square

We are now ready to prove the graph properties.

Property 1. All non-sinks v of G are spanned by the set $\delta^+(v) = \{x : (v, x) \in G\}$.

Proof. From the graph construction, out-edges are added to v if and only if $v = u_i$ at some iteration i . This means that $e_i + A'_{i-1}$ is not independent, although A'_{i-1} is independent. Therefore, by Proposition 2.1, $U_i = \{e_i\} \cup \{x : A'_{i-1} \setminus x + e_i \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is a circuit, and by construction each $u \in U_i \setminus u_i$ is an out-neighbor of v . Moreover, $\text{rank}(U_i \setminus u_i) = \text{rank}(U_i)$, so $U_i \setminus u_i$ spans u_i . Since $\delta^+(v) \supseteq U_i \setminus u_i$, it holds that $\delta^+(v)$ also spans v . \square

Next, by simply inspecting the behavior of the algorithm in how it chooses u_i in each iteration i , we get the following two properties.

Property 2. No element e_k can be designated as both u_i, u_j for some $i \neq j$ during the construction of G .

Proof. Once an element e_k is designated u_i at some iteration i , by construction $e_k \notin A'_i$, and $k \leq i$. Moreover, the only possible candidates to be added to A'_i are $\{e_{i+1}, \dots, e_n\}$. So $e_k \notin A'_j$, for any $j \geq i$ and hence cannot be chosen as u_j for some iteration $u > i$. \square

Property 3. An element $e_i \in A'$ implies its corresponding vertex in G is a sink. Conversely, a vertex v in G is a sink implies that it is in A' .

Proof. An element is chosen as u_i in some iteration i iff out-edges are added to its corresponding vertex in iteration i iff u_i is not a sink. By the proof of Property 2, an element s chosen as u_i in some iteration implies that $s \notin A'$. Further, if an element s was never chosen as u_i in any iteration i , necessarily $s \in A'$. \square

This leads very naturally to the following desirable property of G .

Property 4. G does not contain any cycles.

Proof. To see this is the case, simply note that out-edges are only ever added to vertices which are at some point designated as u_i for some iteration i in the construction of G . Hence, if G had a cycle, necessarily this fact and Property 2 above would imply that it would have to contain some edge (u_j, u_i) for $j > i$ where $u_i \neq u_j$. However, by inspection this clearly yields a contradiction, as u_i must have been such that it was not in A'_i , and hence clearly not in A'_j , so u_j could never have an outedge from itself to u_i (as all neighbors of u_j must be in A'_j). Thus, G cannot contain a cycle. \square

Finally, we state and prove our last property:

Property 5. Let element a be reachable in G from element e . Then $\delta_e \leq (1 + \beta)\delta_a$.

Proof. Let (y, x) be any edge in G . Observe that all edges added during the graph construction satisfy that the target vertex is in A . If also $y \in A$, it means that $y = u_j = a_j^*$ on some (unique) iteration j ; and hence by the selection of a_j^* , $\delta_y \leq \delta_x$. If it is the case that $y \notin A$, it means $y = u_j = e_j$ on some iteration j ; since y is rejected, it must hold that $\delta_y < (1 + \beta)\delta_x$.

Consider the edges on a path from e to a : $(e, x_1), (x_1, x_2), \dots, (x_{k-1}, x_k = a)$. By the above observation $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \subseteq A$, so $\delta_{x_i} \leq \delta_{x_{i+1}}$ for all $i \in 1, \dots, k-1$; also, $\delta_e \leq (1 + \beta)\delta_{x_1}$. Therefore, $\delta_e \leq (1 + \beta)\delta_a$. \square

2.3.3 Using the graph properties

We introduce a technical lemma from Feldman et al. [15].

Lemma 2.5 (Lemma 13 in [15]). Consider an arbitrary directed acyclic graph G whose vertices are elements of some matroid \mathcal{M} . If every non-sink vertex v of G is spanned by $\delta^+(v)$ in \mathcal{M} , then for every set S of vertices of G which is independent in \mathcal{M} there must exist an injective function ϕ_S such that, for every vertex $v \in S$, $\phi_S(v)$ is a sink of G which is reachable from v .

We are ready to formally prove Lemma 2.4, which we restate for convenience.

Lemma 2.4. Let f be a submodular function. For any independent set $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, there exists an injection $\phi : S \rightarrow A'$ such that $\delta_{\phi(a)} \geq \delta_a / (1 + \beta)$ for all $a \in S$.

Proof. Consider the graph G which we constructed above. By Lemma 2.5, Property 1, and Property 4 guarantee the existence, for any independent set $S \subseteq Y$, of an injective function ϕ mapping elements of S to a set T of sinks of G , such that $\phi(s)$ is reachable from s . By Property 3, $T \subseteq A'$. Finally, by Property 5, it follows that $\delta_s \leq (1 + \beta)\delta_{\phi(s)}$. \square

2.3.4 Using Lemma 2.4 to prove Lemma 2.2

Finally, we use Lemma 2.4 to prove Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 2.2. Let (f, \mathcal{M}) be an instance of GSM with optimal solution O , and let A', A be produced by Alg. 1 on this instance. Then $f(O \cup A) \leq f(A) + (1 + \beta)f(A')$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, there exists an injection $\phi : O \rightarrow A'$ such that $\delta_{\phi(e_j)} \geq \delta_{e_j}/(1 + \beta)$ for all $e_j \in O$. We get that

$$\begin{aligned}
f(O \cup A) - f(A) &\leq \sum_{e_j \in O \setminus A} \delta_{e_j} && \text{submodularity} \\
&\leq \sum_{e_j \in O \setminus A} (1 + \beta) \delta_{\phi(e_j)} \\
&= \sum_{\substack{e_i \in A': e_i = \phi(e_j) \\ \text{for some } e_j \in O \setminus A}} (1 + \beta) \delta_{e_i} && \phi(e_i) \in A' \text{ for } e_j \in O \\
&\leq \sum_{e_i \in A'_n} (1 + \beta) \delta_{e_i} && \delta_{e_i} \geq 0 \text{ for } e_i \in A_i \\
&\leq \sum_{e_i \in A'_n} (1 + \beta) f(e_i | A'_{i-1}) && \text{submodularity} \\
&= (1 + \beta) f(A'_n). && \square
\end{aligned}$$

2.4 Tight examples

In this section, we describe a set of instances for which QUICKSWAP gets a ratio arbitrarily close to $1/4$, which shows that the analysis of the preceding sections is tight. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. We construct an instance where the set A' returned by QUICKSWAP is less $\text{OPT}/(4 - \varepsilon)$. Let m be an integer greater than $\log_2(1/\varepsilon) + 1$, and let $\mathcal{N} = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_m, x_{m+1} = o\}$ be an ordered set of $m + 2$ elements. For each $i < m + 1$, let $g(x_i) = 2^i$. Let $g(o) = 2^{m+2} - 2$. For any $S \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, define $g(S) = \sum_{s \in S} g(s)$; thus, g is a modular function. Finally, define $f(S) = \min\{g(S), g(o)\}$; then f is a monotone, submodular function. Then, consider a size constraint of $k = 1$. The optimal solution on this instance is clearly $\{o\}$.

Consider the run of QUICKSWAP on this instance, where the elements of \mathcal{N} are processed in the given ordering (for convenience, number the iterations of the **for** loop from 0). Suppose inductively at iteration $i - 1$, $A_{i-1} = \{x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}\}$, and $A'_{i-1} = \{x_{i-1}\}$; this is satisfied at iteration 1 since $\{x_0\}$ is feasible at iteration 0. Then, at iteration $i < m + 1$,

$$g(A_{i-1} + x_i) = \sum_{j=0}^i g(x_j) = \sum_{j=0}^i 2^j = 2^{i+1} - 1 < g(o).$$

Therefore, $f(A_{i-1} + x_i) = g(A_{i-1} + x_i)$ and thus $\delta_{x_i} = g(x_i) = 2^i$. Since inductively, $A'_{i-1} = \{x_{i-1}\}$, and $\delta_{x_i} \geq 2\delta_{x_{i-1}}$, a swap is made: $A'_i = A'_{i-1} \setminus x_{i-1} + x_i$ and $A_i = A_{i-1} + x_i$, which was to be shown.

Now, consider iteration $m + 1$, by the above argument $A_m = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and $A'_m = \{x_m\}$. By definition $f(A_m + o) = g(o) = 2^{m+2} - 2$. Hence

$$\Delta(o | A_m) = 2^{m+2} - 2 - (2^{m+1} - 1) = 2^{m+1} - 1 < 2\delta_{x_m} = 2^{m+1}.$$

Thus o is rejected, and the algorithm terminates with $A' = \{x_m\}$. Moreover,

$$\frac{f(o)}{f(x_m)} = \frac{2^{m+2} - 2}{2^m} = 4 - 2^{1-m} > 4 - \varepsilon,$$

since $m \geq \log_2(1/\varepsilon) + 1$.

3 Approximation algorithm for GSM with linear query complexity

In this section, we present the first constant-factor algorithm with linear query complexity for general submodular objectives under a matroid constraint. Specifically, Alg. 3 achieves ratio $\approx 1/11.67$ with exactly

$2n$ queries to f . First, we discuss why our algorithm QUICKSWAP does not achieve a ratio for general, submodular objectives; Lemmata 2.1,2.2 establish a relationship between $f(O \cup A)$ and $f(A')$, where O is an optimal solution. Since f is non-monotone, it may hold that $f(O \cup A)$ is smaller than $f(O)$ and may have no non-trivial lower bound.

Description of the algorithm. To deal with this challenge, at a high level, we run two copies of QUICKSWAP concurrently, making sure all of the sets maintained are disjoint between the two versions. The first copy maintains sets $A' \subseteq A$ as before, and the second copy maintains sets $B' \subseteq B$. To ensure the sets $A \cap B$ are disjoint, an element e is processed only by the copy that would assign a larger weight δ_e to the element; that is, the copy that determines a larger marginal gain to its infeasible set (A or B). Making this determination requires two queries to f , which are the only queries required for processing the element.

Algorithm 2: The PROCESS subroutine

```

1 Input: function  $f$ , matroid  $M$ , element  $e$ , sets  $S$ , set  $S'$ , contributions  $\{\delta_a\}_{a \in S'}$ ,  $\delta_e$ , parameter  $\beta$ 
2 if  $S' + e \in M$  and  $\delta_e \geq 0$  then
3    $S \leftarrow S + e$ 
4    $S' \leftarrow S' + e$ 
5 else
6    $a^* \leftarrow \operatorname{argmin}_{a \in S': S' - a + e \in M} \delta_a$ 
7   if  $\delta_e \geq (1 + \beta)\delta_{a^*}$  then
8      $S \leftarrow S + e$ 
9      $S' \leftarrow S' - a^* + e$ 
10 return  $S, S'$ 

```

Algorithm 3: QUICKSWAPNM

```

1 Input: function  $f$ , matroid  $M$ , ground set  $N = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ , parameter  $\beta$ 
2  $A, A', B, B' \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3 for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
4   if  $f(e|A) > f(e|B)$  then
5      $\delta_e \leftarrow f(e|A)$ 
6      $A, A' \leftarrow \text{PROCESS}(f, M, e, A, A', \{\delta_a\}_{a \in A'}, \delta_e, \beta)$ 
7      $B, B' \leftarrow B, B'$ 
8   else
9      $\delta_e \leftarrow f(e|B)$ 
10     $B, B' \leftarrow \text{PROCESS}(f, M, e, B, B', \{\delta_a\}_{a \in B'}, \delta_e, \beta)$ 
11     $A, A' \leftarrow A, A'$ 
12 Return  $\operatorname{argmax}\{f(A'), f(B')\}$ 

```

The analysis. Let $N_A = \{e : f(e|A_{i-1}) > f(e|B_{i-1})\}$ and $N_B = N \setminus N_A$. Consider $e_i \in N$, then Algorithm 3 either calls PROCESS over A or over B for e_i . In the first case, we say that e_i is processed by A and in the other we say that it is processed by B . Let O_A and O_B be the optimal elements O that are processed by A and B , respectively. The main observation that allows utilizing parts of the analysis of the monotone algorithm for the analysis of the above algorithm for non-monotone functions is that Algorithm 3 is equivalent to running Algorithm 1 twice, once over N_A and once over N_B , to obtain A' and B' respectively. However, note that N_A and N_B are not initially known and that whether $e_i \in N_A$ or $e_i \in N_B$ crucially depends on A_{i-1} and B_{i-1} , which is why we cannot simply call Algorithm 1 over N_A and N_B .

Lemma 3.1. Let A'_{nm} and B'_{nm} be the sets A' and B' computed by Algorithm 3 over an arbitrary function f , matroid \mathcal{M} . Let A'_m and B'_m be the sets computed by Algorithm 1 over f, \mathcal{M}, N_A and f, \mathcal{M}, N_B , respectively. Then, we have that $A'_{nm} = A'_m$ and $B'_{nm} = B'_m$

Proof. Observe that the PROCESS subroutine is identical to Lines 5-12 of Algorithm 1. \square

Since all the previous lemmas hold for non-monotone functions (monotonicity was only used in the proof of the main theorem for monotone functions), the above lemma implies that previous lemmas apply to A' and B' over ground sets N_A and N_B . The only new lemma needed is the following.

Lemma 3.2. For any submodular function f , consider A_n, B_n, A'_n, B'_n from Algorithm 3, we have $\max\{f(O \cup B_n) - f(B_n), f(O \cup A_n) - f(A_n)\} \leq (1 + \beta)(f(B'_n) + f(A'_n))$.

Proof. Since $O = O_A \cup O_B$, we get that

$$f(O \cup A_n) - f(A_n) = f(O_B \cup O_A \cup A_n) - f(O_A \cup A_n) + f(O_A \cup A_n) - f(A_n).$$

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f(O_B \cup O_A \cup A_n) - f(O_A \cup A_n) \\ \leq & \sum_{e_j \in O_B} f(e_j | O_A \cup A_n) && \text{submodularity} \\ \leq & \sum_{e_j \in O_B} f(e_j | A_{i-1}) && \text{submodularity, } A_i \subseteq O_A \cup A_n, \\ \leq & \sum_{e_j \in O_B} f(e_j | B_{i-1}) && \text{definition of } O_B \text{ and Algorithm 3} \\ < & \sum_{e_j \in O_B} (1 + \beta) f(e_{\phi_{O_B}(e_j)} | B_{\phi_{O_B}(e_j)-1}) && \text{Lemma 2.4} \\ \leq & \sum_{\substack{e_i \in B'_n: \\ i = \phi_{O_B}(e_j) \\ \text{for some } e_j \in O_B}} (1 + \beta) f(e_i | B_{i-1}) && e_{\phi_{O_B}(e_i)} \in B'_n \text{ for } e_i \in O_B \\ \leq & \sum_{e_i \in B'_n} (1 + \beta) f(e_i | B_{i-1}) && f(e_i | B_{i-1}) \geq 0 \text{ for } e_i \in B_i \\ \leq & \sum_{e_i \in B'_n} (1 + \beta) f(e_i | B'_{i-1}) && \text{submodularity} \\ = & (1 + \beta) f(B'_n) \end{aligned}$$

It is important to note that to apply submodularity for the second inequality, we have that $e_j \notin O_A \cup A_n$ for $e_j \in O_B$. This holds since elements in $O_A \cup A_n$ are processed by A and elements in O_B are processed by B . We also note that $f(e_i | B_{i-1}) \geq 0$ for all $e_i \in B_i$ is by definition of PROCESS subroutine.

Next, observe that by submodularity we have

$$f(O_A \cup A_n) - f(A_n) \leq \sum_{e_j \in O_A \setminus A_n} f(e_j | A_n) \leq \sum_{e_j \in O_A \setminus A_n} f(e_j | A_{i-1})$$

We get, similarly as above,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{e_j \in O_A \setminus A_n} f(e_j | A_{i-1}) \\
& < \sum_{e_i \in O_A \setminus A_n} (1 + \beta) f(e_{\phi_{O_A}(e_i)} | A_{\phi_{O_A}(e_i)-1}) && \text{Lemma 2.4} \\
& \leq \sum_{\substack{e_i \in A'_n: \\ i = \phi_{O_A}(e_j) \\ \text{for some } e_j \in O_A \setminus A_n}} (1 + \beta) f(e_i | A_{i-1}) && e_{\phi_{O_A}(e_i)} \in A'_n \text{ for } e_i \in O_A \\
& \leq \sum_{e_i \in A'_n} (1 + \beta) f(e_i | A_{i-1}) && f(e_i | A_{i-1}) \geq 0 \text{ for } e_i \in A_i \\
& \leq \sum_{e_i \in A'_n} (1 + \beta) f(e_i | A'_{i-1}) && \text{submodularity} \\
& = (1 + \beta) f(A'_n)
\end{aligned}$$

By combining the four previous series inequalities, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
f(O \cup A_n) - f(A_n) &= f(O_B \cup O_A \cup A_n) - f(O_A \cup A_n) + f(O_A \cup A_n) - f(A_n) \\
&< (1 + \beta) f(B'_n) + (1 + \beta) f(A'_n).
\end{aligned}$$

We also have that $f(O \cup B_n) - f(B_n) < (1 + \beta) f(B'_n) + (1 + \beta) f(A'_n)$, which follows identically as for the bound on $f(O \cup A_n) - f(A_n)$. We conclude that $\max\{f(O \cup B_n) - f(B_n), f(O \cup A_n) - f(A_n)\} \leq (1 + \beta)(f(B'_n) + f(A'_n))$. \square

We are now ready to prove the main result for non-monotone functions.

Theorem 3.1. For GSM, Algorithm 3 has query complexity $2n$ and achieves a $1/(6 + 4\sqrt{2}) \approx 1/11.66$ approximation.

Proof. At iteration i , the algorithm evaluates $f(e_i | A_{i-1}) = f(A_{i-1} + e_i) - f(A_{i-1})$ and $f(e_i | B_{i-1}) = f(B_{i-1} + e_i) - f(B_{i-1})$. Since queries $f(A_{i-1})$ and $f(B_{i-1})$ have already been evaluated in a previous iteration, the algorithm performs two queries at iteration i , $f(A_{i-1} + e_i)$ and $f(B_{i-1} + e_i)$, and the total number of queries is thus $2n$. For the approximation, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
f(O) &= f(O \cup (A_n \cap B_n)) && A_n \cap B_n = \emptyset \\
&\leq f(O \cup A_n \cup B_n) + f(O \cup (A_n \cap B_n)) && \text{non-negativity} \\
&\leq f(O \cup A_n) + f(O \cup B_n) && \text{submodularity} \\
&\leq 2(1 + \beta)(f(B'_n) + f(A'_n)) + f(A_n) + f(B_n) && \text{Lemma 3.2} \\
&\leq 2(1 + \beta)(f(B'_n) + f(A'_n)) + (1 + \beta)f(A'_n)/\beta + (1 + \beta)f(B'_n)/\beta && \text{Lemma 2.1} \\
&\leq 2(2(1 + \beta) + (1 + \beta)/\beta) \max\{f(A'_n), f(B'_n)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, $2(2(1 + \beta) + \frac{1+\beta}{\beta})$ is minimized at $\beta = 1/\sqrt{2}$, where $2(2(1 + \beta) + \frac{1+\beta}{\beta}) = 6 + 4\sqrt{2}$. \square

4 Experimental results

Benchmarks. We experimentally compare QUICKSWAP to other algorithms with low query complexity for MSM. The algorithm of Chakrabarti and Kale [10], which we refer to as **CK**, achieves a $1/4$ -approximation in $2n$ queries by also making a single pass over the elements. **Lazy greedy** ([28]) achieves the same $1/2$ approximation and $n \cdot \text{rank}(\mathcal{M})$ query complexity as greedy, but achieves a smaller number of queries in




Figure 1: The numbers of queries and objective values achieves by the four algorithms for MSM as a function of rank of the matroid. For the objective value plots, lazy greedy and threshold greedy achieve nearly identical objective values and their lines overlap. For the same reason, the lines for QUICKSWAP and CK also overlap for these plots.

practice than greedy by lazily evaluating the marginal contributions. The algorithm of Badanidiyuru and Vondrák [2], which we refer to as **threshold greedy**, achieves a $1/2 - \varepsilon$ approximation in $\mathcal{O}((n/\varepsilon) \log(k/\varepsilon))$ queries by iteratively decreasing a threshold and adding elements with marginal contribution over the current threshold to the current solution. Additional details on these algorithms and their implementation are provided in Appendix A.

Given some fixed ordering with which elements of the ground set are considered, these algorithms are all deterministic. Thus, for each problem instance, we choose 5 random orderings of the ground set, and then run each algorithm on each of these 5 orderings for each matroid, plotting the corresponding average results over these runs.

Problem instances. We consider instances of influence maximization subject to a partition matroid constraint on various graphs, similarly to the experiment setting in [5] and [13]. In particular, given some graph $G = (V, E)$, we measure influence as defined by the coverage function $f : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ where $f(S) = |\{v \in V \mid \exists s \in S \text{ such that } (s, v) \in E\}|$. The three graphs over n nodes and m edges, and the partition matroids, are as follows (additional details in Appendix A):

- **email-Eu-core:** The SNAP network email-Eu-core [25] is a real-world directed social network with $n = 1005$ and $m = 25571$. The dataset also includes which of 41 possible departments each individual belongs to, with these sets forming the parts of the partition matroid.
- **Erdos-Renyi:** An Erdos-Renyi graph with $n = 1000$ and edge-formation probability $p = \frac{1}{500}$. The partition is generated by assigning each node to one of 20 parts uniformly at random.
- **Stochastic Block Model:** A randomly generated graph according to the stochastic block model (SBM) with 100 communities that have uniformly random size between 10 and 50. The parts of the partition matroid are the 100 sets corresponding to these 100 communities.

Results. For the objective value plots, lazy greedy and threshold greedy achieve nearly identical objective values and their lines overlap. For the same reason, the lines for QUICKSWAP and CK also overlap for these plots. As shown in Figure 1, QUICKSWAP always achieves the least number of queries of all algorithms tested

(exactly n in each instance). QUICKSWAP significantly improves on the number of queries compared to lazy greedy and threshold greedy, at a small loss in objective value. More precisely, QUICKSWAP always achieves at least 80%, and often significantly over 90%, of the objective value achieved by lazy greedy and threshold greedy. For the performance of QUICKSWAP against the CK algorithm, it always requires fewer queries (and typically 20 to 30% less for larger size constraints), while simultaneously achieving nearly identical objective values.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we provide a deterministic algorithm for MSM that achieves a constant approximation factor with exactly n queries to the oracle for the submodular function. However, our ratio of $1/4$ is smaller than the optimal ratio of $1 - 1/e \approx 0.63$. An interesting question for future work is what is the best ratio achievable with $\mathcal{O}(n)$ queries – in particular, is it possible to achieve the $1 - 1/e$ ratio, or even the $1/2$ ratio of the greedy algorithm with linear query complexity? For the general, non-monotone problem GSM, similar questions apply. We provided the first constant-factor approximation with linear query complexity, but our approximation ratio of ≈ 0.085 in this setting is far from the best known ratio of 0.401 [7] in polynomial time.

Furthermore, in this paper we consider the value query model, and measure the efficiency of an algorithm by the number of queries made to the oracle. We do not consider other metrics, such as the number of arithmetic operations or independence queries to the matroid. While computing the value of f typically dominates other parts of the computation in most applications of submodular optimization, this may not hold true for all applications. In addition, there are other aspects related to computational efficiency, such as the ability to optimize marginal gain queries. We believe our algorithm would be able to be highly optimized in such settings (as it only queries the marginal gain into a nested sequence of sets), but we did not attempt to evaluate this explicitly.

Acknowledgements

Eric Balkanski was supported by NSF grants CCF-2210502 and IIS-2147361. The work of Alan Kuhnle was partially supported by Texas A&M University.

References

- [1] B. V. Ashwinkumar. Buyback Problem - Approximate matroid intersection with cancellation costs. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Colloquium Conference on Automata, Languages and Programming*, volume 6755, pages 379–390, 2011. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-22006-7_32.
- [2] Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru and Jan Vondrák. Fast algorithms for maximizing submodular functions. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1497–1514. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, January 2014. ISBN 978-1-61197-338-9 978-1-61197-340-2. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611973402.110.
- [3] Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru and Jan Vondrák. *Fast algorithms for maximizing submodular functions*, pages 1497–1514. 01 2014. ISBN 978-1-61197-338-9. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611973402.110.
- [4] Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Baharan Mirzasoleiman, Amin Karbasi, and Andreas Krause. Streaming submodular maximization: Massive data summarization on the fly. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 671–680, 2014.
- [5] Eric Balkanski, Adam Breuer, and Yaron Singer. Non-monotone submodular maximization in exponentially fewer iterations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31 (NeurIPS 2018)*, 2018.
- [6] Adam Breuer, Eric Balkanski, and Yaron Singer. The FAST Algorithm for Submodular Maximization. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1134–1143. PMLR, November 2020.
- [7] Niv Buchbinder and Moran Feldman. Constrained Submodular Maximization via New Bounds for DR-Submodular Functions, arXiv, November 2023.
- [8] Niv Buchbinder, Moran Feldman, and Roy Schwartz. Comparing Apples and Oranges: Query Tradeoff in Submodular Maximization. In *ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, 2015. doi: 10.1137/1.9781611973730.77.
- [9] Gruia Calinescu, Chandra Chekuri, Martin Pal, and Jan Vondrák. Maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to a matroid constraint. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 40(6):1740–1766, 2011.
- [10] Amit Chakrabarti and Sagar Kale. Submodular maximization meets streaming: Matchings, matroids, and more. *Mathematical Programming*, 154(1):225–247, December 2015. ISSN 1436-4646. doi: 10.1007/s10107-015-0900-7.
- [11] Chandra Chekuri, Shalmoli Gupta, and Kent Quanrud. Streaming Algorithms for Submodular Function Maximization. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming (ICALP)*, 2015.
- [12] Abhimanyu Das and David Kempe. Submodular meets spectral: Greedy algorithms for subset selection, sparse approximation and dictionary selection. In *Proc. 28th Int. Conf. on Machine Learning (ICML’11)*, pages 1057–1064, 2011.
- [13] Paul Dütting, Federico Fusco, Silvio Lattanzi, Ashkan Norouzi-Fard, and Morteza Zadimoghaddam. Deletion robust submodular maximization over matroids. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5671–5693. PMLR, 2022.
- [14] Alina Ene and Huy L. Nguyen. A Nearly-linear Time Algorithm for Submodular Maximization with a Knapsack Constraint. In *ICALP*, pages 1–24, 2019.

- [15] Moran Feldman, Amin Karbasi, and Ehsan Kazemi. Do Less, Get More: Streaming Submodular Maximization with Subsampling. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc., 2018.
- [16] Marshall L Fisher, George L Nemhauser, and Laurence A Wolsey. *An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions—II*. Springer, 1978.
- [17] Michel Goemans. Matroid optimization notes. <https://math.mit.edu/~goemans/18433S13/matroid-notes.pdf>.
- [18] Kai Han, Zongmai Cao, Shuang Cui, and Benwei Wu. Deterministic Approximation for Submodular Maximization over a Matroid in Nearly Linear Time. In *NeurIPS*, pages 1–12, 2020.
- [19] David Kempe, Jon Kleinberg, and Éva Tardos. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of the ninth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 137–146, 2003.
- [20] Yusuke Kobayashi and Tatsuya Terao. Subquadratic Submodular Maximization with a General Matroid Constraint. In *arXiv:2405.00359*. arXiv, May 2024.
- [21] Alan Kuhnle. Interlaced Greedy Algorithm for Maximization of Submodular Functions in Nearly Linear Time. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [22] Alan Kuhnle. Quick Streaming Algorithms for Maximization of Monotone Submodular Functions in Linear Time. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2021.
- [23] Ron Kupfer, Sharon Qian, Eric Balkanski, and Yaron Singer. The adaptive complexity of maximizing a gross substitutes valuation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:19817–19827, 2020.
- [24] Jon Lee, Vahab S Mirrokni, Viswanath Nagarajan, and Maxim Sviridenko. Non-monotone submodular maximization under matroid and knapsack constraints. In *Proceedings of the forty-first annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 323–332, 2009.
- [25] Jure Leskovec and Andrej Krevl. Snap dataset: email-eu-core. <https://snap.stanford.edu/data/email-Eu-core.html>, Stanford Network Analysis Project (SNAP), 2014.
- [26] Wenxin Li, Moran Feldman, Ehsan Kazemi, and Amin Karbasi. Submodular Maximization in Clean Linear Time. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17473–17487, December 2022.
- [27] Hui Lin and Jeff Bilmes. A class of submodular functions for document summarization. In *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*, pages 510–520, 2011.
- [28] Michel Minoux. Accelerated greedy algorithms for maximizing submodular set functions. In J. Stoer, editor, *Optimization Techniques*, pages 234–243, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1978. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [29] Baharan Mirzasoleiman, Ashwinkumar Badanidiyuru, Amin Karbasi, Jan Vondrak, and Andreas Krause. Lazier Than Lazy Greedy. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2015. ISBN 978-1-57735-701-8.
- [30] George L Nemhauser and Laurence A Wolsey. Best algorithms for approximating the maximum of a submodular set function. *Mathematics of operations research*, 3(3):177–188, 1978.
- [31] Ashkan Norouzi-Fard, Jakub Tarnawski, Slobodan Mitrovic, Amir Zandieh, Aidasadat Mousavifar, and Ola Svensson. Beyond 1/2-approximation for submodular maximization on massive data streams. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3829–3838. PMLR, 2018.

A Additional details about experimental setup

A.1 Additional details about the algorithms

Below we provide specific details regarding the implementations of our algorithms from the experimental setup, including how queries were counted as well as specific data structures and parameter settings used. Note that in all implementations, once a given set has been queried for its value and causes the query count to increase by 1, this set will never again contribute to an increase in query count for any repeated computation which requires its evaluation.

- **QUICKSWAP:** Implemented exactly as in Algorithm 1, with $\beta = 1$.
- **CK Algorithm:** This algorithm by Chakrabarti and Kale [10] takes one pass through the ground set and maintains a feasible set through the following swapping logic. Each element is assigned a weight (which requires at most two queries to the oracle), and the feasible solution is updated via appealing to an algorithm of Ashwinkumar [1] for maximum (modular) weight independent set. In particular, the weight of an element e at the time of its consideration is set as its marginal contribution to the current maintained feasible, and it maintains this weight assignment throughout the entire duration of the algorithm. If e can be added to this feasible set while maintaining its feasibility, it is added. Otherwise, it checks to see if the weight of e is at least twice the weight of the minimum-weight element in the current feasible set which can be swapped with e while maintaining feasibility. If this is the case, the swap occurs, and otherwise e is not added to the feasible set and it remains unchanged.
- **Lazy Greedy:** Initially, the value of each singleton set is queried, with these corresponding values being assigned as priorities to each corresponding element and pushed onto a max heap. The initial query count is thus set to n , and the top element of the heap is popped and added to the maintained independent set S . From this point on, in each iteration the top element e is popped from the max heap and we check if e is the same element that was most recently popped. If so, we add e to S . Otherwise, we check if $S + e$ is independent. If so, e is pushed back onto the heap with priority $f(e|S)$ (and the query count is incremented by 1, not 2, as $f(S)$ must have already been queried as this computation only requires we newly query $f(S + e)$), and otherwise e is not pushed onto the heap nor queried for its marginal contribution and we continue. This process continues until the heap is empty, i.e. no new element can be added to S while maintaining its independence.
- **Threshold Greedy:** Two instances of threshold greedy were tested, for corresponding values of $\varepsilon = 0.1$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{6}$. The value $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{6}$ was chosen as it corresponds to the threshold value guaranteeing a $\frac{1}{4}$ -approximation ratio. The value $\varepsilon = 0.1$ was chosen to improve solution quality, at the potential risk of increasing the number of required queries. As these two parameters led to nearly identical performance (visually indistinguishable behavior in the plots), the version of threshold greedy implemented in this paper is for $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{6}$. Our implementation is based on that of Algorithm 1 in Badanidiyuru and Vondrák [3], which is a threshold greedy algorithm for monotone submodular maximization subject to a cardinality constraint, except that in each instance the algorithm checks $S + e$ satisfies the cardinality constraint we instead check that the appropriate matroid constraint is satisfied, and the lower-limit on the threshold at which point we stop checking is set to $\frac{\varepsilon}{r}$ where r is the rank of the matroid. Furthermore, when we count queries, for each element we lazily store its last queried marginal contribution, so that it is only reevaluated should it be at least as large as the current threshold (as otherwise submodularity guarantees it must still be less than the current threshold).

A.2 Additional details about the problem instances

For each graph G , the partition matroid constraints considered are defined by a fixed partition of V into sets P_1, \dots, P_m (whose union is V and pairwise intersection is always empty) and corresponding nonnegative integers k_1, \dots, k_m such that any set $I \subset V$ is independent if and only if $I \cap P_i \leq k_i$ for each i . For our

experiments, we consider partition matroids with fixed size constraints, i.e. such that $k_1 = \dots = k_m$. For the instances, we consider partition matroids with positive integer size constraints from 1 up to 15, 25 and 12 respectively. The three graphs and the partition matroids are as follows:

- **email-Eu-core:** The SNAP network email-Eu-core [25] representing email exchanges between members of a large European research institution, where each node corresponds to a member of the institution and each edge points from email senders to their recipients. The dataset also includes which of 41 possible departments each individual belongs to, with these sets forming the parts of the partition underlying each partition matroid considered. There are 1005 nodes and 25571 edges in this graph. Note that this dataset is released under the BSD license on SNAP, meaning it is free for both academic and commercial use.
- **Erdos-Renyi:** An Erdos-Renyi graph of 1000 nodes with edge-formation probability $p = \frac{1}{500}$, and a partition generated by assigning each node to one of 20 parts uniformly at random.
- **Stochastic Block Model:** A randomly generated graph according to the stochastic block model (SBM), with 100 communities set to have sizes chosen uniformly random from 10 to 50 inclusive, with edge formation probability of 0 between nodes in different communities and $\frac{1}{30}$ between nodes in the same community. The parts of the underlying partition are the 100 sets corresponding to these 100 communities.

A.3 Mean \pm standard deviation tables

As each data point plotted corresponds to a mean of 5 trials, the corresponding standard deviations were computed. However, each was too small to be visible on the plots, with most standard deviations being less than 1% of their corresponding mean. Thus, these values, along with the exact value of the mean, are provided in Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

A.4 Compute resources

All code was run in a Jupyter Notebook, and took no more than 3 hours total to run on a standard Mac with an M1 chip.

Table 1: Mean \pm Standard Deviation of Queries on email-Eu-core

Matroid Rank	QuickSwap	CK	Lazy Greedy	Threshold Greedy
42	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1032.4 \pm 3.1	1840.0 \pm 0.0	1815.4 \pm 15.5
82	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1070.0 \pm 7.8	2439.0 \pm 0.0	2368.0 \pm 33.4
121	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1107.0 \pm 12.0	2661.6 \pm 0.5	2620.4 \pm 25.6
158	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1159.8 \pm 15.7	2782.8 \pm 1.2	2749.4 \pm 25.0
193	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1225.2 \pm 29.0	2907.2 \pm 0.7	2824.4 \pm 29.5
227	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1264.0 \pm 21.7	2998.8 \pm 1.3	2877.0 \pm 26.6
259	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1292.4 \pm 22.1	3074.4 \pm 1.6	2905.2 \pm 26.5
291	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1309.4 \pm 16.5	3124.0 \pm 1.1	2935.6 \pm 26.5
321	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1321.6 \pm 18.0	3182.8 \pm 0.7	2956.8 \pm 30.6
349	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1341.0 \pm 21.3	3215.2 \pm 2.0	2971.8 \pm 32.6
375	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1366.4 \pm 24.7	3245.8 \pm 0.7	2981.2 \pm 30.9
401	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1376.2 \pm 24.4	3277.2 \pm 1.3	2990.4 \pm 32.5
426	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1376.6 \pm 28.2	3311.2 \pm 0.4	2995.0 \pm 34.1
448	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1382.8 \pm 30.7	3336.2 \pm 0.4	2998.0 \pm 34.2
469	1005.0 \pm 0.0	1388.0 \pm 28.3	3366.2 \pm 2.0	3001.8 \pm 35.8

Table 2: Mean \pm Standard Deviation of Queries on ER

Matroid Rank	QuickSwap	CK	Lazy Greedy	Threshold Greedy
25	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1026.6 \pm 2.7	1032.4 \pm 1.9	1033.0 \pm 2.6
50	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1049.2 \pm 3.6	1084.8 \pm 3.4	1085.8 \pm 4.1
75	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1067.8 \pm 7.0	1145.8 \pm 5.2	1152.6 \pm 6.4
100	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1090.2 \pm 8.0	1222.2 \pm 7.9	1238.8 \pm 14.6
125	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1102.6 \pm 6.9	1304.2 \pm 5.8	1329.0 \pm 10.4
150	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1112.0 \pm 8.2	1386.0 \pm 9.6	1449.0 \pm 14.1
175	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1127.0 \pm 5.8	1493.2 \pm 7.0	1551.0 \pm 15.7
200	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1143.4 \pm 4.5	1584.0 \pm 12.1	1648.4 \pm 14.4
225	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1157.4 \pm 1.9	1658.6 \pm 16.7	1739.6 \pm 11.0
250	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1171.6 \pm 6.2	1736.8 \pm 9.9	1820.0 \pm 9.8
275	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1181.4 \pm 8.1	1794.6 \pm 12.4	1899.6 \pm 10.5
300	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1191.4 \pm 9.0	1868.2 \pm 15.7	1967.0 \pm 13.3
325	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1204.6 \pm 7.5	1948.4 \pm 10.0	2030.2 \pm 14.0
350	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1216.8 \pm 6.6	2011.8 \pm 14.2	2083.0 \pm 9.1
375	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1233.0 \pm 7.8	2084.4 \pm 7.1	2133.2 \pm 10.9
400	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1256.8 \pm 8.7	2144.2 \pm 11.9	2175.6 \pm 15.6
425	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1274.4 \pm 10.3	2218.6 \pm 14.4	2215.6 \pm 15.3
450	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1291.4 \pm 19.4	2275.0 \pm 11.4	2245.8 \pm 13.4
475	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1308.0 \pm 19.7	2319.6 \pm 10.7	2271.4 \pm 6.7
500	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1325.4 \pm 17.0	2359.4 \pm 12.7	2293.4 \pm 7.6
525	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1336.0 \pm 13.0	2401.8 \pm 9.3	2308.6 \pm 5.5
550	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1347.4 \pm 13.2	2439.8 \pm 6.8	2315.4 \pm 5.3
575	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1353.8 \pm 11.6	2472.2 \pm 3.3	2319.4 \pm 5.0
600	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1345.8 \pm 12.0	2500.2 \pm 4.3	2323.0 \pm 3.4
625	1000.0 \pm 0.0	1342.8 \pm 10.2	2525.2 \pm 4.3	2324.0 \pm 3.6

Table 3: Mean \pm Standard Deviation of Queries on SBM

Matroid Rank	QuickSwap	CK	Lazy Greedy	Threshold Greedy
100	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3150.0 \pm 8.9	3091.0 \pm 0.0	3110.0 \pm 0.0
200	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3287.0 \pm 16.2	3210.8 \pm 2.5	3232.4 \pm 1.4
300	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3410.8 \pm 7.6	3359.4 \pm 2.0	3394.2 \pm 3.5
400	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3525.2 \pm 13.1	3524.8 \pm 8.1	3563.4 \pm 6.6
500	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3625.2 \pm 25.0	3726.0 \pm 6.3	3736.8 \pm 13.1
600	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3684.0 \pm 33.0	3892.6 \pm 6.0	3902.6 \pm 7.5
700	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3733.6 \pm 29.5	4071.2 \pm 4.1	4071.8 \pm 5.3
800	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3781.6 \pm 25.0	4249.2 \pm 13.5	4236.6 \pm 8.5
900	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3823.0 \pm 23.7	4428.0 \pm 19.0	4373.6 \pm 15.0
1000	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3842.8 \pm 14.7	4606.6 \pm 15.7	4501.8 \pm 11.8
1096	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3858.8 \pm 11.1	4757.0 \pm 12.4	4636.0 \pm 11.4
1191	2992.0 \pm 0.0	3873.2 \pm 8.6	4919.2 \pm 10.1	4766.8 \pm 13.6

Table 4: Mean \pm Standard Deviation of Objective Values on email-Eu-core

Matroid Rank	QuickSwap	CK	Lazy Greedy	Threshold Greedy
42	706.6 \pm 20.5	708.4 \pm 18.7	829.0 \pm 0.0	822.4 \pm 4.5
82	817.0 \pm 6.1	819.2 \pm 4.9	896.0 \pm 0.0	893.0 \pm 1.3
121	866.0 \pm 4.2	868.6 \pm 4.4	927.0 \pm 0.0	925.8 \pm 1.7
158	893.8 \pm 2.5	896.6 \pm 3.1	945.0 \pm 0.0	944.6 \pm 1.4
193	912.4 \pm 3.8	915.2 \pm 4.8	957.0 \pm 0.0	957.0 \pm 0.6
227	928.0 \pm 5.4	929.2 \pm 6.4	965.0 \pm 0.0	963.8 \pm 1.5
259	938.6 \pm 2.9	939.8 \pm 4.0	971.0 \pm 0.0	970.2 \pm 1.0
291	949.0 \pm 2.9	949.0 \pm 3.0	976.0 \pm 0.0	975.8 \pm 1.7
321	954.4 \pm 3.1	954.8 \pm 2.9	980.0 \pm 0.0	979.6 \pm 2.1
349	960.0 \pm 3.1	960.8 \pm 2.9	984.0 \pm 0.0	982.8 \pm 1.7
375	964.4 \pm 4.1	965.8 \pm 4.3	986.0 \pm 0.0	985.0 \pm 1.1
401	969.2 \pm 3.9	969.6 \pm 4.2	987.0 \pm 0.0	986.2 \pm 0.4
426	971.8 \pm 2.6	972.4 \pm 3.3	988.0 \pm 0.0	987.2 \pm 0.7
448	975.4 \pm 2.8	975.6 \pm 2.9	989.0 \pm 0.0	988.2 \pm 0.7
469	978.8 \pm 2.2	979.0 \pm 2.3	990.0 \pm 0.0	989.0 \pm 0.9

Table 5: Mean \pm Standard Deviation of Objective Values on ER

Matroid Rank	QuickSwap	CK	Lazy Greedy	Threshold Greedy
25	114.8 \pm 1.9	116.0 \pm 2.8	142.6 \pm 1.0	142.4 \pm 1.0
50	216.8 \pm 3.8	216.2 \pm 3.9	251.8 \pm 1.2	253.0 \pm 0.6
75	297.8 \pm 3.1	298.6 \pm 3.8	345.0 \pm 1.1	344.0 \pm 1.7
100	360.6 \pm 5.7	372.2 \pm 9.0	428.2 \pm 0.4	423.8 \pm 1.0
125	414.6 \pm 2.8	423.4 \pm 2.7	492.8 \pm 1.7	493.2 \pm 2.0
150	459.8 \pm 7.5	467.4 \pm 6.9	551.0 \pm 4.4	549.0 \pm 3.1
175	506.6 \pm 5.4	515.0 \pm 2.6	597.2 \pm 2.5	598.6 \pm 2.8
200	553.8 \pm 6.5	562.0 \pm 5.9	640.0 \pm 2.3	639.8 \pm 3.2
225	595.2 \pm 5.8	606.0 \pm 3.6	678.8 \pm 2.1	679.4 \pm 2.4
250	630.8 \pm 6.0	642.0 \pm 4.0	711.2 \pm 2.0	712.4 \pm 1.9
275	665.0 \pm 5.9	673.6 \pm 3.0	742.6 \pm 1.9	743.2 \pm 1.0
300	693.4 \pm 4.4	701.0 \pm 3.7	770.8 \pm 1.9	769.6 \pm 1.4
325	717.2 \pm 4.2	724.2 \pm 6.5	793.4 \pm 2.1	792.4 \pm 1.4
350	740.2 \pm 7.7	746.6 \pm 8.8	813.0 \pm 3.8	811.0 \pm 2.6
375	758.2 \pm 8.2	765.8 \pm 7.4	829.6 \pm 3.3	826.6 \pm 4.3
400	775.8 \pm 6.0	780.8 \pm 3.2	843.2 \pm 3.2	840.4 \pm 4.0
425	793.2 \pm 5.2	795.6 \pm 4.4	853.6 \pm 1.6	851.6 \pm 3.7
450	807.4 \pm 4.8	809.6 \pm 3.9	861.6 \pm 1.5	860.0 \pm 3.0
475	823.0 \pm 3.9	824.0 \pm 3.9	867.6 \pm 2.1	866.4 \pm 3.1
500	837.2 \pm 3.7	837.6 \pm 3.1	871.4 \pm 1.0	870.6 \pm 2.3
525	846.8 \pm 2.0	847.0 \pm 1.9	873.6 \pm 0.5	873.0 \pm 2.1
550	855.8 \pm 2.6	856.4 \pm 2.7	875.4 \pm 0.5	874.2 \pm 1.5
575	861.6 \pm 2.8	862.0 \pm 2.6	876.0 \pm 0.0	875.4 \pm 0.8
600	866.4 \pm 1.5	866.6 \pm 1.4	876.0 \pm 0.0	876.0 \pm 0.0
625	870.4 \pm 1.4	870.6 \pm 1.5	876.0 \pm 0.0	876.0 \pm 0.0

Table 6: Mean \pm Standard Deviation of Objective Values on SBM

Matroid Rank	QuickSwap	CK	Lazy Greedy	Threshold Greedy
100	273.2 \pm 3.5	274.4 \pm 3.0	316.0 \pm 0.0	316.0 \pm 0.0
200	488.6 \pm 8.5	494.8 \pm 7.2	569.0 \pm 0.0	569.0 \pm 0.0
300	672.4 \pm 9.8	682.6 \pm 11.9	777.0 \pm 0.0	776.2 \pm 0.4
400	837.4 \pm 4.6	845.4 \pm 9.0	959.6 \pm 1.0	959.4 \pm 1.0
500	978.0 \pm 8.2	985.4 \pm 9.1	1107.0 \pm 0.9	1106.8 \pm 1.3
600	1109.6 \pm 9.5	1116.6 \pm 8.3	1235.4 \pm 1.0	1234.6 \pm 1.9
700	1222.8 \pm 6.5	1230.6 \pm 6.8	1346.2 \pm 1.2	1345.6 \pm 2.2
800	1323.4 \pm 4.5	1332.8 \pm 2.8	1447.4 \pm 1.2	1446.0 \pm 2.4
900	1413.0 \pm 3.0	1421.2 \pm 3.2	1532.0 \pm 0.6	1530.6 \pm 2.3
1000	1485.0 \pm 8.3	1497.4 \pm 5.3	1607.0 \pm 1.1	1605.8 \pm 2.3
1096	1550.0 \pm 10.3	1564.8 \pm 10.4	1672.4 \pm 1.6	1670.4 \pm 1.7
1191	1606.4 \pm 10.4	1620.6 \pm 13.3	1728.8 \pm 1.5	1726.6 \pm 1.6