

Submodular Function Maximization via the Multilinear Relaxation and Contention Resolution Schemes

Chandra Chekuri*

Jan Vondrák[†]Rico Zenklusen[‡]

February 23, 2019

Abstract

We consider the problem of maximizing a non-negative submodular set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ over a ground set N subject to a variety of packing type constraints including (multiple) matroid constraints, knapsack constraints, and their intersections. In this paper we develop a general framework that allows us to derive a number of new results, in particular when f may be a *non-monotone* function. Our algorithms are based on (approximately) solving the multilinear extension F of f [6] over a polytope P that represents the constraints, and then effectively rounding the fractional solution. Although this approach has been used quite successfully in some settings [7, 27, 29, 14, 4], it has been limited in some important ways. We overcome these limitations as follows.

First, we give constant factor approximation algorithms to maximize F over an arbitrary down-closed polytope P that has an efficient separation oracle. Previously this was known only for monotone functions [42]. For non-monotone functions, a constant factor was known only when the polytope was either the intersection of a fixed number of knapsack constraints [29] or a matroid polytope [43, 36]. Second, we show that *contention resolution schemes* are an effective way to round a fractional solution, even when f is non-monotone. In particular, contention resolution schemes for different polytopes can be combined to handle the intersection of different constraints. Via LP duality we show that a contention resolution scheme for a constraint is related to the *correlation gap* [2] of weighted rank functions of the constraint. This leads to an optimal contention resolution scheme for the matroid polytope.

Our results provide a broadly applicable framework for maximizing linear and submodular functions subject to independence constraints. We give several illustrative examples. Contention resolution schemes may find other applications.

1 Introduction

We consider the meta-problem of *maximizing* a non-negative submodular set function subject to independence constraints. Formally, let N be a finite ground set of cardinality n , and let $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a submodular set function over N .¹ Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$ be a downward-closed family² of subsets of N . Our problem is then $\max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$. We are interested in independence families induced by natural and useful constraints such as matroid constraints, knapsack constraints, related special cases and their intersections. Throughout this paper we assume that f is given via a value oracle; that is, given a set $S \subseteq N$ the oracle returns $f(S)$. The function f could be monotone or non-monotone³; monotone functions typically allow better approximation results.

Submodular function maximization has recently attracted considerable attention in theoretical computer science. This is for a variety of reasons including applications, recognition of interesting algorithmic and structural properties, as well as the use of submodular functions as utility functions in algorithmic game theory. A number of well-known

*Dept. of Computer Science, Univ. of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801. Partially supported by NSF grants CCF-0728782 and CCF-1016684. E-mail: chekuri@cs.illinois.edu.

[†]IBM Almaden Research Center, San Jose, CA 95120. E-mail: jvondrak@us.ibm.com.

[‡]Dept. of Mathematics, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139. E-mail: ricoz@math.mit.edu. Supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation, grant number: PBEZP2-129524.

¹A set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is submodular iff $f(A) + f(B) \geq f(A \cup B) + f(A \cap B)$ for all $A, B \subseteq N$.

²A family of sets $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$ is downward-closed if for any $A \subset B \subseteq N$, $B \in \mathcal{I}$ implies that $A \in \mathcal{I}$.

³ f is *monotone* if $f(A) \leq f(B)$ whenever $A \subseteq B$.

problems can be seen as special cases of submodular function maximization. For example, the APX-hard Max-Cut problem can be seen as (unconstrained) maximization of the cut function $f : 2^V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$. (Note that f here is non-monotone.) Another well-known special case of our problem is the Max- k -Cover problem, which can be viewed as $\max\{f(S) : |S| \leq k\}$ where $f(S) = |\bigcup_{j \in S} A_j|$ is the coverage function for a collection of sets $\{A_i\}$. Max- k -Cover is hard to approximate to within a factor of $(1 - 1/e + \varepsilon)$ for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, unless $P = NP$ [17]. Hence we focus on approximation algorithms.⁴

Classical work in submodular function maximization was based on combinatorial techniques such as the greedy algorithm and local search. We mention the work of Cornuejols, Fisher, Nemhauser and Wolsey [15, 35, 21, 34] from the late 70's which showed a variety of approximation bounds when f is monotone submodular and \mathcal{I} is induced by multiple matroid constraints. Recent algorithmic work has considerably extended and improved the classical results. Local-search methods have been identified as particularly useful, in particular, for non-monotone functions. This has led to the first constant factor approximation for the unconstrained submodular function maximization problem [18], and a variety of approximation results for knapsack and matroid constraints [29, 30]. The greedy algorithm has also been modified and made applicable to non-monotone functions [24].

Despite the above-mentioned results, combinatorial techniques have some limitations: (i) they have not been able to achieve optimal approximation results, except in the basic case of a single cardinality or knapsack constraint [35, 39]; (ii) they are not very flexible in terms of the ability to combine constraints and develop more general techniques (e.g., a $(1 - 1/e)$ -approximation was known for maximizing a monotone submodular function subject to 1 knapsack constraint [39], but little was known even for 2 knapsack constraints). A new approach which overcomes some of these obstacles and brings submodular function maximization closer to the world of polyhedral techniques is via the *multilinear relaxation*, introduced in this context in [6].

Multilinear relaxation. In this paper we focus on an algorithmic approach that is based on defining an extension of a set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ to a continuous function $g : [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. The Lovász extension [32] of a submodular function f is one such candidate; however, being a convex function, it is suitable for problems involving *minimization* of submodular functions. For maximization of submodular functions, the following *multilinear* extension was introduced in [6], inspired by the work in [1]. $F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{S \subseteq N} f(S) \prod_{i \in S} x_i \prod_{j \notin S} (1 - x_j)$. The value $F(\mathbf{x})$ is equivalently the expected value of $f(R)$ where R is a random set obtained by picking each element i independently with probability x_i . We observe that if f is modular⁵ then F is simply a linear function.

Continuous extensions offer some advantages in the design of approximation algorithms. Suppose we have a polytope $P_{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq [0, 1]^N$ that is a relaxation for $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$ in the sense that $\{\mathbf{1}_I \mid I \in \mathcal{I}\} \subset P_{\mathcal{I}}$. Moreover suppose there is a polynomial-time separation oracle for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ (we call such polytopes solvable). Then we can hope to (approximately) solve the continuous problem $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}} F(\mathbf{x})$ to find a fractional solution $\mathbf{x}^* \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$ and then round \mathbf{x}^* to an integral solution. This is a standard paradigm in approximation via linear and convex programming relaxations. Two natural questions arise in applying this paradigm to submodular functions, both due to the fact that the extension F is neither a convex nor concave function. First, can we (approximately) solve the problem $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}} F(\mathbf{x})$? Second, can we round a fractional solution effectively?

Recent work has addressed the above questions in several ways. First, Vondrák [42] gave a continuous greedy algorithm that gives an optimal $(1 - 1/e)$ -approximation for the problem $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in P} F(\mathbf{x})$ when f is monotone submodular and P is a solvable polytope. When f is non-monotone, the picture is less satisfactory. Lee et al. [29] gave a local-search based algorithm that gives a $(1/4 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation to maximize F over the polytope induced by a fixed number of knapsack constraints. Vondrák [43] obtained a 0.309-approximation for maximizing F over a single matroid polytope, and this ratio has been recently improved to 0.325 [36]. However, no approximation algorithm was known to maximize F over a general solvable polytope P .

In terms of rounding a fractional solution \mathbf{x} , a natural strategy to preserve the value of $F(\mathbf{x})$ is to independently round each coordinate i to 1 with probability x_i . However, this rounding strategy does not typically preserve the constraints imposed by \mathcal{I} . Various dependent rounding schemes have been proposed. It was shown in [6] that "pipage rounding" can be used to round solutions in the matroid polytope without losing in terms of the objective function $F(\mathbf{x})$ ([14] achieves the same via "swap-rounding"). In [27, 29, 4, 28], randomized rounding coupled with alteration was

⁴If f is not assumed to be non-negative, even the unconstrained problem is inapproximable since deciding whether the optimum value is positive or zero requires an exponential number of queries.

⁵A function is modular if $f(A) + f(B) = f(A \cup B) + f(A \cap B)$ for all $A, B \subseteq N$. If f is modular then $f(A) = w_0 + \sum_{i \in A} w_i$ for some weight function $w : N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

used for knapsack constraints. More recently, [14] showed concentration properties for rounding in a single matroid polytope when f is monotone, and [44] showed concentration for independent rounding even when f is non-monotone. These led to a few additional results. Despite this progress, the “integrality gap” of $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ has been so far unknown even when f is monotone and P the intersection of two matroid polytopes. (We remark that for pure intersections of matroids, combinatorial algorithms are known to yield good approximations [29, 30].) However, even for modular functions, combining constraints such as matroids and knapsack constraints has been difficult, and no general result was known that matched the best bounds one can get for them separately.

Our contribution at a high level: In this paper we overcome existing limitations by obtaining a general framework via the following results.

- We give the first constant factor approximation for the problem $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ where P is any down-monotone solvable polytope and F the multilinear extension of any non-negative submodular function.
- We propose a general (dependent) randomized rounding framework for modular and submodular functions under independence constraints via what we call *contention resolution schemes* (CR schemes). A key advantage is the ability to easily combine schemes for different constraints to obtain a scheme for their intersection.
- We give an *optimal* $(1 - 1/e)$ -factor CR scheme for any matroid. Previously this was known only for the uniform matroid of rank 1 [19, 20]. More generally, we give a tight connection between CR schemes and the *correlation gap* of the associated weighted rank functions.

The above ingredients can be put together to give a variety of new results that we discuss in more detail in Section 2. We summarize some of our results in Table 1.

Constraint type	Linear maximization	Monotone submod. max.	Non-negative submod. max.
$O(1)$ knapsacks	$[1 - \varepsilon]$	$[1 - 1/e - \varepsilon]$	0.325 [0.25]
k matroids & $\ell = O(1)$ knapsacks	$0.6/k$	$0.38/k$ $[\Omega(1/(k + \ell))]$	$0.19/k$ $[\Omega(1/(k + \ell))]$
k -matchoid & ℓ -sparse PIP	$\Omega(1/(k + \ell))$	$\Omega(1/(k + \ell))$ $[\Omega(1/k\ell)]$	$\Omega(1/(k + \ell))$ $[\Omega(1/k\ell)]$
Unsplittable flow in paths and trees	$[\Omega(1)]$	$\Omega(1)$	$\Omega(1)$

Table 1: Approximation factors for different types of constraints and objective functions. Results in brackets were previously known.

1.1 Maximizing the multilinear extension over a general polytope

We now give a more detailed description of our technical results and the general framework. First, we give a constant factor approximation for the problem $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$, where F is the multilinear extension of a non-monotone submodular function f and P is a down-monotone solvable polytope; the monotone case admits a $(1 - 1/e)$ -approximation [42] as we mentioned already. The condition of down-monotonicity of the polytope is necessary for the non-monotone case; it follows from [43] that no constant factor approximation is possible for the matroid base polytope which is not down-monotone.

The main algorithmic technique for non-monotone functions is local search. Fractional local search with additional ideas has been the tool to solve the continuous problem in special cases of polytopes [29, 43, 36]. Previous fractional local search methods for a constant number of knapsack constraints ([29] and [43]) improved a current solution \mathbf{x} by considering moves along a small number of coordinates of \mathbf{x} . The analysis took advantage of the combinatorial structure of the underlying discrete structure (knapsacks or matroids) which was sufficiently simple that swaps along a few coordinates sufficed. How do we obtain an algorithm that works for *any* polytope P ?

A new insight: Our key high-level idea is simple yet insightful. Any point $\mathbf{x} \in P$ can be written as a convex combination of the vertices of P . We view the problem of $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ as optimizing a submodular function over the ground set consisting of the (exponentially many) vertices of P (duplicated many times in the limit). From

this viewpoint we obtain a new fractional local search procedure: given a current point \mathbf{x} , a local swap corresponds to removing a vertex in the convex combination of \mathbf{x} and adding a new vertex of P (with appropriate scalar multipliers). To implement this efficiently we can use linear optimization over P . (We remark that the continuous greedy algorithm for the monotone case [42] can also be interpreted with this insight.)

Our algorithms are derived using the above high-level idea. We note that when specialized to the matroid polytope or knapsack polytope which have combinatorial structure, our algorithms become simpler and in fact resemble previous algorithms. Our algorithms and proofs of approximation guarantees are in fact simpler than the previously given proofs for particular polytopes [29, 43, 36]. We present three algorithms of varying complexity. The first algorithm is close in spirit to the local-search algorithm of Lee et al. for knapsack constraints [29] and gives a 0.25-approximation. The second algorithm uses some ideas of [43] for the case of a matroid polytope and gives a 0.309-approximation with respect to the best *integer* solution in P . The most involved algorithm is a generalization of a recent algorithm inspired by simulated annealing [36] which gives a 0.325-approximation, also with respect to the best integer solution in P . We remark that a known limit on the approximability of $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ is a hardness of 0.478-approximation in the value oracle model, even in the special case of a matroid polytope, also due to [36]. We summarize our results in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *For any nonnegative submodular function f and a solvable down-monotone polytope P , there is a 0.25-approximation algorithm for the problem $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ where F is the multilinear extension of f . There is also an algorithm for this problem which returns a solution $\mathbf{y} \in P$ of value $F(\mathbf{y}) \geq 0.325 \cdot \max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P \cap \{0, 1\}^N\}$.*

1.2 Contention resolution schemes

We show that a certain natural class of rounding schemes that we call *contention resolution schemes* (CR schemes) provides a useful and general framework for rounding fractional solutions under submodular objective functions. For a ground set N , let $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ be a convex relaxation of the constraints imposed by $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$, and let $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$. From the definition of F , a natural strategy to round a point \mathbf{x} is to independently round the coordinates; however, this is unlikely to preserve the constraints imposed by \mathcal{I} . Let $R(\mathbf{x}) \subseteq N$ be a random set obtained by including each element $i \in N$ independently with probability x_i . The set $R(\mathbf{x})$ is not necessarily feasible. We would like to remove (randomly) some elements from $R(\mathbf{x})$, so that we obtain a feasible set $I \subseteq R(\mathbf{x})$. The property we would like to achieve is that every element i appears in I with probability at least cx_i for some parameter $c > 0$. We call such a scheme “ c -balanced contention resolution” for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$. We stress that the scheme needs to work for all $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$. In several settings we need to first scale down the fractional solution, which calls for a more general definition below.

Definition 1.2. *A (b, c) -balanced CR scheme for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ is a scheme such that for any $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$, the scheme selects an independent subset $I \subseteq R(b\mathbf{x})$ with the following property: $\Pr[i \in I \mid i \in R(b\mathbf{x})] \geq c$ for every element i . The scheme is said to be *monotone* if $\Pr[i \in I \mid R(b\mathbf{x}) = R_1] \geq \Pr[i \in I \mid R(b\mathbf{x}) = R_2]$ whenever $i \in R_1 \subseteq R_2$. A scheme is said to be *strict* if $\Pr[i \in I \mid i \in R(b\mathbf{x})] = c$ for every i .*

I.e., a c -balanced scheme is the same as a $(1, c)$ -balanced scheme. Furthermore, a (b, c) -balanced CR scheme can easily be transformed into a bc -balanced CR scheme as follows. Let $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$ and let $R(\mathbf{x})$ be a random set obtained from independent rounding of coordinates of \mathbf{x} . In a first step, for each element $i \in R(\mathbf{x})$, we remove i from $R(\mathbf{x})$ with probability $1 - b$, hence obtaining a set $R' \subseteq R(\mathbf{x})$. Notice that the set R' corresponds to a random set where each element i appears in R' independently with probability bx_i . Hence, we are now in the setting where we can apply a (b, c) -balanced CR scheme leading to an independent set I where each element i is present with probability at least cbx_i .

Monotonicity is needed in the context of submodular function maximization for the following reason. It is easy to see that if $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ has a c -balanced CR scheme then it implies a c -approximation for maximizing a linear function over $P_{\mathcal{I}}$. If \mathbf{x} is a fractional solution then its value is $\sum_i w_i x_i$ for some (non-negative) weights w_i ; since each element i is present in the final solution produced by a c -balanced CR scheme with probability at least cx_i , by linearity of expectation, the expected weight of a solution is at least $c \sum_i w_i x_i$. More generally, we would like to prove such a bound for any submodular function f via F . However, this is no longer obvious since elements do not appear independently in the rounding scheme; recall that $F(\mathbf{x})$ is the expected value of f on a set produced by independently including each i with probability x_i . Monotonicity is the property that is useful in this context, because elements of smaller sets contribute more to a submodular function than elements of larger sets. Moreover, we use the strictness

property in the case of non-monotone submodular functions. The strictness property is not very restrictive, because any non-strict (b, c) -balanced CR scheme can be transformed into a (b, c) -balanced CR scheme that is sufficiently close to being strict for our purposes. We discuss this further in Section 4.

The theorem below proves that under a contention resolution scheme with suitable properties, one can claim an expectation bound for submodular functions. A similar lemma was shown in [4]. We state and prove ours in a form suitable for our context.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a non-negative submodular function and \mathbf{x} be a point in $P_{\mathcal{I}}$, a convex relaxation for $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$. Let $I(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{I}$ be the random output of a monotone (b, c) -balanced CR scheme on $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$. If f is non-monotone, let us assume in addition that the CR scheme is strict. Then*

$$\mathbf{E}[f(I(\mathbf{x}))] \geq c \mathbf{E}[f(b\mathbf{x})].$$

In Section 4, we furthermore show how one can remove the strictness condition in the above theorem by performing a simple pruning operation on the set output by the CR scheme. A possible drawback of the pruning operation is that it depends on the submodular function f , whereas the above theorem based on strict CR schemes is oblivious of f .

We emphasize that a CR scheme is defined with respect to a specific polyhedral relaxation $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ of \mathcal{I} . We observe that several previous rounding procedures for packing (and also covering) problems rely on the well-known technique of *alteration* of a set obtained via independent rounding and are examples of CR schemes (see [38, 5, 8, 13, 4]). However, these schemes are oblivious in that they do not depend on \mathbf{x} itself (other than in picking the random set R), and the alteration is also deterministic. Our definition is inspired by the “fair contention resolution scheme” in [19, 20] which considered the special case of contention for a single item. The dependence on \mathbf{x} is necessary (even in this case) if we want to obtain an optimal scheme.

Contention resolution via correlation gap and an optimal scheme for matroids: A natural question is how one proves the existence of a contention resolution scheme. As we mentioned, several existing rounding schemes are based on deterministic and oblivious alteration to a set obtained via independent rounding. Most of these schemes have been applied to constraint systems induced by linear inequalities of the form $A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$ where A is a non-negative matrix. Until recently there was no contention resolution scheme for the matroid polytope; an optimal $(b, \frac{1-e^{-b}}{b})$ -balanced scheme was previously known for the very special case of the uniform matroid of rank one [19, 20]. We note that the recent work of Chawla et al. [10, 11] implicitly contains a $(b, 1 - b)$ -balanced scheme for matroids, although their motivation was different. In this paper we develop an optimal scheme for an arbitrary matroid.

Theorem 1.4. *There is an optimal $(b, \frac{1-e^{-b}}{b})$ -balanced contention resolution scheme for any matroid polytope. Moreover the scheme is monotone and efficiently implementable.*

We use randomized schemes and view them abstractly as a convex combination of deterministic schemes. This allows us, via LP duality, to show that the best contention resolution scheme for a constraint system is related to the notion of correlation gap for weighted rank functions of the underlying constraint. We reiterate that the scheme depends on the fractional solution \mathbf{x} that we wish to round; the alteration of the random set $R(\mathbf{x})$ is itself a randomized procedure that is tailored to \mathbf{x} , and is found by solving a linear program. We are inspired to make the general connection to correlation gap due to the recent work of Yan [45]; he applied a similar idea in the context of greedy posted-price ordering schemes for Bayesian mechanism design, improving the bounds of [10, 11].

1.3 A framework for rounding via contention resolution schemes

We now describe our framework for the problem $\max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$. The framework assumes the following: (i) there is a polynomial-time value oracle for f , and (ii) that there is a polytope $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ that contains the set $\{\mathbf{1}_S | S \in \mathcal{I}\}$ and moreover that there is a polynomial-time separation oracle for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$, and (iii) there is a strict and monotone (b, c) -balanced contention resolution scheme for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$. Then we have the following simple algorithm:

1. Using an approximation algorithm, obtain in polynomial time a point $\mathbf{x}^* \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$ such that

$$F(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq \alpha \cdot \max\{F(\mathbf{x}) \mid \mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}} \cap \{0, 1\}^N\} \geq \alpha \cdot \max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S).$$

2. Use a strict and monotone (b, c) -balanced contention resolution scheme for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ to find a random set $I(\mathbf{x}^*) \in \mathcal{I}$.

Theorem 1.5. *The above algorithm is a randomized $(0.325 bc)$ -approximation algorithm for $\max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$. If f is monotone then the approximation ratio is $(1 - 1/e)bc$. If f is modular then the ratio is bc and the contention resolution scheme is not restricted to be monotone.*

Proof. We have $F(\mathbf{x}^*) \geq \alpha \text{OPT}$ with $\text{OPT} = \max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$. Theorem 1.3 shows that if we apply a strict and monotone (b, c) -balanced contention resolution scheme to \mathbf{x}^* then the random set I output by it has the property that $\mathbf{E}[f(I)] \geq bcF(\mathbf{x}^*)$, hence we have that $\mathbf{E}[f(I)] \geq \alpha \cdot (bc)\text{OPT}$.

For non-monotone submodular functions, Theorem 1.1 gives $\alpha = 0.325$. For monotone submodular functions, [42] gives $\alpha = 1 - 1/e$. For modular f , $F(\mathbf{x})$ is a linear function, and hence $\alpha = 1$ can be obtained by linear programming. Moreover, if $F(\mathbf{x})$ is a linear function, then by linearity of expectation, $\mathbf{E}[f(I)] \geq bcF(\mathbf{x}^*)$ without any monotonicity assumption on the scheme. \square

Combining schemes for different constraints: We are particularly interested in the case when $\mathcal{I} = \bigcap_{i=1}^h \mathcal{I}_i$ is the intersection of several different independence systems on N ; each system corresponds to a different set of constraints that we would like to impose. Assuming that we can apply the above framework to each \mathcal{I}_i separately, we can obtain an algorithm for \mathcal{I} as follows.

Lemma 1.6. *Let $\mathcal{I} = \bigcap_{i=1}^h \mathcal{I}_i$ and $P_{\mathcal{I}} = \bigcap_i P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$. Suppose each $P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$ has a monotone (b, c_i) -balanced CR scheme. Then $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ has a monotone $(b, \prod_i c_i)$ -balanced CR scheme. In the special case that each element of N participates in at most k constraints and $c_i = c$ for all i then $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ has a monotone (b, c^k) -balanced CR scheme. Moreover, if the scheme for each $P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$ is implementable in poly-time time then the combined scheme for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ can be implemented in poly-time.*

Therefore, we can proceed as follows. Let $P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$ be a polytope that is the relaxation of \mathcal{I}_i . In other words $\{\mathbf{1}_S : S \in \mathcal{I}_i\}$ is contained in $P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$. Let $P_{\mathcal{I}} = \bigcap_i P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$. It follows that $\{\mathbf{1}_S : S \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is contained in $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ and also that there is a polynomial-time separation oracle for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ if there is one for each $P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$. Now suppose there is a monotone (b, c_i) -balanced contention resolution scheme for $P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$ for some common choice of b . It follows from Lemma 1.6 that $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ has a monotone $(b, \prod_i c_i)$ -balanced contention resolution scheme. We can then apply Theorem 1.5 to obtain a randomized $(\alpha b \prod_i c_i)$ -approximation for $\max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$ where α depends on whether f is modular, monotone submodular or non-monotone submodular.

In this paper we focus on the framework with a small list of high-level applications. We have not attempted to optimize for the best possible approximation for special cases. We add two remarks that are useful in augmenting the framework.

Remark 1.7. *The framework involves approximately solving the problem $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}} F(\mathbf{x})$ to obtain a fractional solution \mathbf{x}^* and then using a (b, c) -balanced CR scheme on \mathbf{x}^* . The first step in a (b, c) -balanced CR scheme is to obtain a random set R by independently picking each i with probability bx_i^* . More directly, we can find a solution \mathbf{y}^* to $\max_{\mathbf{y} \in bP_{\mathcal{I}}} F(\mathbf{y})$ where $bP_{\mathcal{I}} = \{b\mathbf{x} \mid \mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}\}$, and obtain a random set R by picking each i with probability y_i^* . This may be advantageous if the problem $\max_{\mathbf{y} \in bP_{\mathcal{I}}} F(\mathbf{y})$ admits a better approximation than the problem $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}} F(\mathbf{x})$. A useful fact here is that the continuous greedy algorithm for monotone submodular functions [43, 7] finds for every $b \in [0, 1]$ a point $\mathbf{y} \in bP_{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $F(\mathbf{y}) \geq (1 - e^{-b}) \max_{\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}} F(\mathbf{x})$.*

Remark 1.8. *A non-negative submodular set function f is also subadditive, that is, $f(A) + f(B) \geq f(A \cup B)$. In some settings when considering the problem $\max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$, it may be advantageous to partition the given ground set N into N_1, \dots, N_h and separately solve the problem on each N_i . This loses a factor of h in the approximation but one may be able to obtain a good CR scheme for each N_i separately while it may not be straightforward to obtain one for the entire set N .*

Organization: The rest of the paper is divided into three parts. Some illustrative applications of our framework are discussed in Section 2. Constant factor approximation algorithms for maximizing F over a solvable polytope are described in Section 3. The connection between contention resolution schemes and correlation gap and its use in deriving optimal schemes for matroids are discussed in Section 4, as well as contention resolution schemes for knapsack constraints, sparse packing systems, and UFP in paths and trees.

2 Applications

In this section we briefly outline some concrete results that can be obtained via our framework. The meta-problem we are interested in solving is $\max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$ where \mathcal{I} is a downward-closed family over the given ground set N and f is a non-negative submodular set function over N . Many interesting problems can be cast as special cases depending on the choice of N , \mathcal{I} and f . In order to apply the framework and obtain a polynomial-time approximation algorithm, we need a solvable relaxation $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ and a corresponding (b, c) -balanced CR scheme. Note that the framework is essentially indifferent to f as long as we have a polynomial-time value oracle for it. We therefore focus on some broad classes of constraints and corresponding natural polyhedral relaxations, and discuss CR schemes that can be obtained for them. These schemes are formally described in Section 4.

Matroids and matchoids: Let $\mathcal{M} = (N, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid constraint on N . A natural candidate for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ is the integral matroid polytope $\{x \in [0, 1]^n \mid x(S) \leq r(S), S \subseteq N\}$ where $r : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+$ is the rank function of \mathcal{M} . We develop an optimal $(1 - 1/e)$ -balanced CR scheme for the matroid polytope. More generally, for any $b \in (0, 1]$ we design a $(b, \frac{1-e^{-b}}{b})$ -balanced CR scheme, which lends itself well to combinations with other constraints. The CR scheme for the matroid polytope extends via Lemma 1.6 to the case when \mathcal{I} is induced by the intersection of k matroid constraints on N . A more general result is obtained by considering k -uniform matchoids, a common generalization of k -set packing and intersection of k matroids [31], defined as follows. Let $G = (V, N)$ be a k -uniform hypergraph; we associate the edges of the hypergraph with our ground set N . For each $v \in V$, there is a matroid $\mathcal{M}_v = (N_v, \mathcal{I}_v)$ over N_v , set of hyperedges in N that contain v . This induces an independence family \mathcal{I} on N where $\mathcal{I} = \{S \subseteq N \mid S \cap N_v \in \mathcal{I}_v, v \in V\}$. k -uniform matchoids generalize the intersection of k matroids in that they allow many matroids in the intersection as long as a given element of the ground set participates in at most k of them. A natural solvable relaxation for \mathcal{I} is the intersection of the matroid polytopes at each v . Via the CR scheme for the single matroid we obtain a $(b, (\frac{1-e^{-b}}{b})^k)$ -balanced CR scheme for any $b \in (0, 1]$ for k -uniform matchoids. The choice of $b = \frac{2}{k+1}$ gives a $\frac{2}{e(k+1)}$ -balanced CR scheme for every k -uniform matchoid.

Knapsack / linear packing constraints: Let $N = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Given a non-negative $m \times n$ matrix A and non-negative vector \mathbf{b} , let $\mathcal{I} = \{S \mid A\mathbf{1}_S \leq \mathbf{b}\}$ where $\mathbf{1}_S$ is the indicator vector of set $S \subseteq N$. It is easy to see that \mathcal{I} is an independence family. A natural LP relaxation for the problem is $P_{\mathcal{I}} = \{\mathbf{x} \mid A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}, x \in [0, 1]^n\}$. The *width* of the system of inequalities is defined as $W = \lfloor \min_{i,j} b_i/A_{i,j} \rfloor$. Some special cases of interest are (i) A is a $\{0, 1\}$ -matrix, (ii) A is column-restricted, that is, all non-zero entries in each column are the same and (iii) A is k -column sparse, that is at most k non-zero entries in each column. Several combinatorial problems can be captured by these, such as matchings and independent sets in graphs and hypergraphs, knapsack and its variants, and maximum throughput routing problems. However, the maximum independent set problem in graphs, which is a special case as mentioned, does not allow a $n^{1-\varepsilon}$ -approximation for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, unless P=NP [25]. Therefore attention has focused on restricting A in various ways and obtaining upper bounds on the integrality gap of the relaxation $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ when the objective function is linear. Several of these results are based on randomized rounding of a fractional solution and one can interpret the rounding algorithms as CR schemes. We consider a few such results below.

- For a constant number of knapsack constraints ($m = O(1)$), by guessing and enumeration tricks, one can “effectively” get a $(1 - \varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)$ -balanced CR scheme for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$.
- When A is k -column sparse, there is a $(b, 1 - 2kb)$ -balanced CR scheme. If A has in addition width $W \geq 2$, there is a $(b, 1 - k(2eb)^{W-1})$ CR scheme for any $b \in (0, 1)$. These results follow from [4].
- When A is a $\{0, 1\}$ -matrix induced by the problem of routing unit-demand paths in a capacitated path or tree, there is a $(b, 1 - O(b))$ CR scheme implicit in [5, 8, 13]. This can be extended to the unsplittable flow problem (UFP) in capacitated paths and trees via grouping and scaling techniques [26, 13, 12].

Section 4 has formal details of the claimed CR schemes. There are other rounding schemes in the literature for packing problems, typically developed for linear functions, that can be reinterpreted as CR schemes. Our framework then can be used to obtain algorithms for non-negative submodular set functions. See [9] for a recent and illuminating example.

Approximation algorithms. The CR schemes mentioned above when instantiated with suitable parameters and plugged into our general framework yield several new randomized polynomial-time approximation algorithms for

problems of the form $\max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$, where f is non-negative submodular. We remark that these results are for somewhat abstract problems and one can obtain more concrete results by specializing them and improving the constants. We have not attempted to do so in this paper.

- If \mathcal{I} is the intersection of a fixed number of knapsack constraints, we achieve a 0.325-approximation, improving the $(0.2 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation from [29] and a recent $(0.25 - \varepsilon)$ -approximation [28]. This is obtained via the $(1 - \varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)$ -balanced CR scheme for a fixed number of knapsack constraints.
- If \mathcal{I} is the intersection of a k -uniform matchoid and ℓ knapsack constraints with ℓ a fixed constant, we obtain an $\Omega(\frac{1}{k})$ -approximation (constant independent of ℓ), which improves the bound of $\Omega(\frac{1}{k+\ell})$ from [23]. We remark that this is a new result even for linear objective functions. We obtain this by choosing $b = \Omega(1/k)$ and using the $(b, (\frac{1-e^{-b}}{b})^k)$ -balanced CR scheme for k -uniform matchoids and the $(1 - \varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)$ -balanced CR scheme for a fixed number of knapsack constraints (this requires a separate preprocessing step).
- If \mathcal{I} is the intersection of a k -uniform matchoid and an ℓ -sparse knapsack constraint system of width W , we give an $\Omega(\frac{1}{k+\ell^{1/W}})$ -approximation, improving the $\Omega(\frac{1}{k\ell})$ approximation from [23]. This follows by combining the CR schemes for k -uniform matchoid and ℓ -column sparse packing constraints with a choice of $b = \Omega(\frac{1}{k+\ell^{1/W}})$.
- We obtain a constant factor approximation for maximizing a non-negative submodular function of routed requests in a capacitated path or tree. Previously an $O(1)$ approximation was known for linear functions [5, 8, 13, 12] but no prior approach that we are aware of could obtain a constant factor for non-monotone submodular functions.

3 Solving the multilinear relaxation for non-negative submodular functions

In this section, we address the question of solving the problem $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ where F is the multilinear extension of a submodular function. As we already mentioned, due to [42, 7], there is a $(1 - 1/e)$ -approximation for the problem $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ whenever F is the multilinear extension of a monotone submodular function and P is any solvable polytope. Here, we consider the maximization of a possibly *non-monotone submodular function* over a down-monotone solvable polytope. We assume in the following that $P \subseteq [0, 1]^N$ is a down-monotone solvable polytope and $F : [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the multilinear extension of a submodular function. We present three algorithms for this problem. As we noted in the introduction, there is no constant factor approximation for maximizing non-monotone submodular functions over general solvable polytopes [43]. The approximation that can be achieved for matroid base polytopes is proportional to $1 - 1/\nu$ where ν is the fractional packing number of bases, and in fact this trade-off generalizes to arbitrary solvable polytopes; we discuss this in Section 3.4.

3.1 Continuous local-search 0.25-approximation

First we consider the following natural local-search algorithm.

Algorithm 3.1. *Initialize $\mathbf{x} := 0$. As long as there is $\mathbf{y} \in P$ such that $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ (which can be found by linear programming), move \mathbf{x} continuously in the direction $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$. If there is no such $\mathbf{y} \in P$, return \mathbf{x} .*

Naturally, a polynomial-time implementation of this algorithm would move in discrete steps and continue only as long as the improvements are sufficiently large. We defer these technicalities to Section 3.5. For now, we assume that when the algorithm terminates, we have $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$ for every $\mathbf{y} \in P$. The basic lemma in the analysis of this algorithm as well as the improved algorithms is the following.

Lemma 3.2. *For any two points $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^N$: $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) + F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}) - 2F(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof. By submodularity, F is concave along any line with a nonnegative direction vector, such as $(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{x} \geq 0$. Therefore,

$$F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) - F(\mathbf{x}) \leq ((\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}), \text{ and similarly}$$

$$F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}) - F(\mathbf{x}) \leq ((\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}),$$

because of the concavity of F along $(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{x} \leq 0$. Adding up these two inequalities, we get $F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) + F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}) - 2F(\mathbf{x}) \leq ((\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) + (\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}) - 2\mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x})$. It remains to observe that $(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) + (\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$, which proves the lemma. \square

Corollary 3.3. *If \mathbf{x} is a local optimum such that $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$, then $2F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) + F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y})$.*

Next, we show that if we combine this local optimum with a suitable ‘‘complementary solution’’, we get a $1/4$ -approximation to the global optimum. The following is our algorithm.

Algorithm 3.4. *Using Algorithm 3.1, find a local optimum \mathbf{x} in P . Then define $Q = \{\mathbf{y} \in P : \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{x}\}$ and again using Algorithm 3.1, find a local optimum \mathbf{z} in Q . If $F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{z})$ return \mathbf{x} , otherwise return \mathbf{z} .*

We use the following property of the multilinear extension of a submodular function. Let us replace each coordinate by a $[0, 1]$ interval and let us represent a certain value x_i of the i 'th coordinate by a subset of $[0, 1]$ of the corresponding measure.

Definition 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{L}^N$, where \mathcal{L} denotes the set of all measurable subsets of $[0, 1]$. We say that \mathcal{X} represents a vector $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^N$, if \mathcal{X}_i has measure x_i for each $i \in N$.*

From a ‘‘discrete point of view’’, we can imagine that each coordinate is replaced by some large number of elements M and a value of x_i is represented by any subset of size Mx_i . This can be carried out if all the vectors we work with are rational. In the following, we consider functions on subsets of this new ground set. We show a natural property, namely that a function derived from the multilinear extension of a submodular function is again submodular. (An analogous property in the discrete case was proved in [33, 29].)

Lemma 3.6. *Let $F : [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a multilinear extension of a submodular function f . Define a function F^* on \mathcal{L}^N , by $F^*(\mathcal{X}) = F(\mathbf{x})$, where $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^N$ is the vector represented by \mathcal{X} . Then F^* is submodular:*

$$F^*(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}) + F^*(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}) \leq F^*(\mathcal{X}) + F^*(\mathcal{Y}),$$

where the union and intersection is interpreted component-wise.

Proof. We have $F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{E}[f(\hat{\mathbf{x}})]$ where $\hat{x}_i = 1$ independently with probability x_i . An equivalent way to generate $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is to choose any set $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{L}^N$ representing \mathbf{x} , generate uniformly and independently a number $r_i \in [0, 1]$ for each $i \in N$, and set $\hat{x}_i = 1$ iff $r_i \in \mathcal{X}_i$. Since the measure of \mathcal{X}_i is x_i , $\hat{x}_i = 1$ with probability exactly x_i . Therefore,

$$F^*(\mathcal{X}) = F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{E}[f(\hat{\mathbf{x}})] = \mathbf{E}[f(\{i : r_i \in \mathcal{X}_i\})].$$

Similarly,

$$F^*(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathbf{E}[f(\{i : r_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i\})].$$

This also holds for $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}$: since $(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y})_i = \mathcal{X}_i \cup \mathcal{Y}_i$ and $(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y})_i = \mathcal{X}_i \cap \mathcal{Y}_i$, we get

$$F^*(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}) = \mathbf{E}[f(\{i : r_i \in \mathcal{X}_i\} \cup \{i : r_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i\})]$$

and

$$F^*(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}) = \mathbf{E}[f(\{i : r_i \in \mathcal{X}_i\} \cap \{i : r_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i\})].$$

Hence, by the submodularity of f ,

$$\begin{aligned} F^*(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}) + F^*(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Y}) &= \mathbf{E}[f(\{i : r_i \in \mathcal{X}_i\} \cup \{i : r_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i\}) + f(\{i : r_i \in \mathcal{X}_i\} \cap \{i : r_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i\})] \\ &\leq \mathbf{E}[f(\{i : r_i \in \mathcal{X}_i\}) + f(\{i : r_i \in \mathcal{Y}_i\})] \\ &= F^*(\mathcal{X}) + F^*(\mathcal{Y}). \end{aligned}$$

\square

From here, we obtain our main lemma - the average of the two fractional local optima is at least $\frac{1}{4}$ OPT.

Lemma 3.7. Let $\text{OPT} = \max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$. Let \mathbf{x} be a local optimum in P , and \mathbf{z} a local optimum in $Q = \{\mathbf{y} \in P : \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{x}\}$. Then $2F(\mathbf{x}) + 2F(\mathbf{z}) \geq \text{OPT}$.

Proof. Let $\text{OPT} = F(\mathbf{x}^*)$ where $\mathbf{x}^* \in P$. By Corollary 3.3, the local optimum $\mathbf{x} \in P$ satisfies

$$2F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{x}^*) + F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{x}^*). \quad (1)$$

In the restricted polytope $Q = \{\mathbf{y} \in P : \mathbf{y} \leq \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{x}\}$, consider the point $\mathbf{z}^* = (\mathbf{x}^* - \mathbf{x}) \vee \mathbf{0} \in Q$. Again by Corollary 3.3, the local optimum $\mathbf{z} \in Q$ satisfies

$$2F(\mathbf{z}) \geq F(\mathbf{z} \vee \mathbf{z}^*) + F(\mathbf{z} \wedge \mathbf{z}^*). \quad (2)$$

Now we use a representation of vectors by subsets as described in Def. 3.5. We choose $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}^*, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}^* \in \mathcal{L}^N$ to represent $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}^*$ as follows: for each $i \in N$, $\mathcal{X}_i = [0, x_i]$, $\mathcal{Z}_i = [x_i, x_i + z_i]$ (note that $x_i + z_i \leq 1$), $\mathcal{X}_i^* = [0, x_i^*]$ and $\mathcal{Z}_i^* = [0, z_i^*] = [0, \max\{x_i^* - x_i, 0\}]$. Note that $(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Z})_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in N$.

Defining F^* as in Lemma 3.6, we have $F^*(\mathcal{X}) = F(\mathbf{x})$, $F^*(\mathcal{X}^*) = F(\mathbf{x}^*) = \text{OPT}$, $F^*(\mathcal{Z}) = F(\mathbf{z})$ and $F^*(\mathcal{Z}^*) = F(\mathbf{z}^*)$. Using relations like $[0, x_i] \cup [0, x_i^*] = [0, \max\{x_i, x_i^*\}]$, we also get $F^*(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*) = F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{x}^*)$ and $F^*(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^*) = F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{x}^*)$. Furthermore, we have $(\mathcal{X}_i^* \setminus \mathcal{X}_i) \cup \mathcal{Z}_i = [x_i, \max\{x_i^*, x_i + z_i\}] = [x_i, x_i + \max\{z_i^*, z_i\}]$. This is an interval of length $\max\{z_i^*, z_i\} = (\mathbf{z} \vee \mathbf{z}^*)_i$ and hence $F^*((\mathcal{X}^* \setminus \mathcal{X}) \cup \mathcal{Z}) = F(\mathbf{z} \vee \mathbf{z}^*)$, where $(\mathcal{X}^* \setminus \mathcal{X}) \cup \mathcal{Z}$ is interpreted component-wise.

The property of the first local optimum (1) can be thus written as $2F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F^*(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*) + F^*(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^*)$. The property of the complementary local optimum (2) can be written as $2F(\mathbf{z}) \geq F^*((\mathcal{X}^* \setminus \mathcal{X}) \cup \mathcal{Z})$ (we discarded the nonnegative term $F(\mathbf{z} \wedge \mathbf{z}^*)$ which is not useful in the following). Therefore, $2F(\mathbf{x}) + 2F(\mathbf{z}) \geq F^*(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*) + F^*(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^*) + F^*((\mathcal{X}^* \setminus \mathcal{X}) \cup \mathcal{Z})$. By Lemma 3.6, F^* is submodular. Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} F^*(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^*) + F^*((\mathcal{X}^* \setminus \mathcal{X}) \cup \mathcal{Z}) &\geq F^*((\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^*) \cup ((\mathcal{X}^* \setminus \mathcal{X}) \cup \mathcal{Z})) \\ &= F^*(\mathcal{X}^* \cup \mathcal{Z}) \end{aligned}$$

(we discarded the intersection term). Finally, using the fact that $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{Z} = \emptyset$ and again the submodularity of F^* , we get

$$F^*(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*) + F^*(\mathcal{X}^* \cup \mathcal{Z}) \geq F^*((\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*) \cap (\mathcal{X}^* \cup \mathcal{Z})) = F^*(\mathcal{X}^*)$$

(we discarded the union term). To summarize,

$$\begin{aligned} 2F(\mathbf{x}) + 2F(\mathbf{z}) &\geq F^*(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*) + F^*(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^*) + F^*((\mathcal{X}^* \setminus \mathcal{X}) \cup \mathcal{Z}) \\ &\geq F^*(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{X}^*) + F^*(\mathcal{X}^* \cup \mathcal{Z}) \\ &\geq F^*(\mathcal{X}^*) = \text{OPT}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.8. For any down-monotone polytope $P \subseteq [0, 1]^N$ and multilinear extension of a submodular function $F : [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, Algorithm 3.4 is a $\frac{1}{4}$ -approximation to the problem $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$.

3.2 Restricted local-search 0.309-approximation

Next, we present a modified local-search algorithm which is a generalization of the algorithm for matroid polytopes from [43]. We remark that this algorithm is in fact simpler than the $\frac{1}{4}$ -approximation from the previous section, in that it does not require a second-stage complementary local search.

Algorithm 3.9. Initialize $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{0}$ and fix a parameter $t \in [0, 1]$. As long as there is $\mathbf{y} \in P \cap [0, t]^N$ such that $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ (which can be found by linear programming), move \mathbf{x} continuously in the direction $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$. Return \mathbf{x} .

This algorithm also works for any down-monotone polytope P . With the choice of $t = \frac{1}{2}(3 - \sqrt{5})$, it achieves a $\frac{1}{4}(-1 + \sqrt{5}) \simeq 0.309$ -approximation (with respect to the optimal 0-1 solution; we are not sure currently whether the analysis extends to optimal fractional solutions).

Lemma 3.10. Let \mathbf{x} be a local optimum in $P \cap [0, t]^N$, in the sense that $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$ for any $\mathbf{y} \in P \cap [0, t]^N$. Define $\mathbf{t} \in [0, 1]^N$ by $t_i = t$ if $x_i = t$ and $t_i = 1$ if $x_i < t$. Let \mathbf{z} be any point in P and let $\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{z} \wedge \mathbf{t}$. Then

$$2F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}') + F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{z}').$$

We remark that the above inequality would be immediate from Corollary 3.3, if $\mathbf{z}' \in P \cap [0, t]^N$. However, \mathbf{z}' is not necessarily constrained by $[0, t]^N$.

Proof. Consider $\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{z} \wedge \mathbf{t}$ as defined above. By down-monotonicity, $\mathbf{z}' \in P$. Also, the coordinates where $z'_i > t$ are exactly those where $x_i < t$. So there is $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mathbf{x} + \epsilon(\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{x}) \in P \cap [0, t]^N$. By the condition of a local optimum,

$$(\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0.$$

The rest follows from Lemma 3.2. □

In the rest of the analysis, we follow [43].

Definition 3.11. For $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^N$ and $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, we define the associated “threshold set” as $T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) = \{i : x_i > \lambda\}$.

Lemma 3.12. Let $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^N$. For any partition $N = C \cup \bar{C}$,

$$F(\mathbf{x}) \geq \mathbf{E}[f((T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cap C) \cup (T_{>\lambda'}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \bar{C}))]$$

where $\lambda, \lambda' \in [0, 1]$ are independently and uniformly random.

This appears as Lemma A.5 in [43]. We remark that the right-hand side with $C = \emptyset$ or $C = N$ gives the Lovász extension of f and the lemma follows by comparing the multilinear and Lovász extension. For a non-trivial partition (C, \bar{C}) , the lemma follows by two applications of this fact. The next lemma is exactly as in [43] for the special case of a matroid polytope; we rephrase the proof here in our more general setting.

Lemma 3.13. Assume that $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}(3 - \sqrt{5})]$. Let \mathbf{x} be a local optimum in $P \cap [0, t]^N$ and let $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}_C$ be any solution in $P \cap \{0, 1\}^N$. Then

$$F(\mathbf{x}) \geq \left(t - \frac{1}{2}t^2\right) f(C).$$

Proof. Define $A = \{i : x_i = t\}$ and let $\mathbf{t} = t\mathbf{1}_A + \mathbf{1}_{\bar{A}}$, $\mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{z} \wedge \mathbf{t}$ as in Lemma 3.10. Since $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{1}_C$, we have $\mathbf{z}' = t\mathbf{1}_{A \cap C} + \mathbf{1}_{C \setminus A}$. By Lemma 3.10, we get

$$2F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}') + F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{z}'). \quad (3)$$

First, let's analyze $F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{z}')$. Since $\mathbf{z}' = t\mathbf{1}_{A \cap C} + \mathbf{1}_{C \setminus A}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in [0, t]^N$, we have $\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{z}' = \mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{1}_C$. We apply Lemma 3.12, which states that

$$F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{z}') = F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{1}_C) \geq \mathbf{E}[f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cap C)].$$

Due to the definition of $T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$, with probability t we have $\lambda < t$ and $T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$ contains $A = \{i : x_i = t\}$. Then, $f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cap C) + f(C \setminus A) \geq f(C)$ by submodularity. We conclude that

$$F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{z}') \geq t(f(C) - f(C \setminus A)). \quad (4)$$

Next, let's analyze $F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}')$. We apply Lemma 3.12. We get

$$F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}') \geq \mathbf{E}[f((T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}') \cap C) \cup (T_{>\lambda'}(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}') \cap \bar{C}))].$$

The random threshold sets are as follows: $T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}') \cap C = T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{1}_{C \setminus A}) \cap C$ is equal to C with probability t , and equal to $C \setminus A$ otherwise. $T_{>\lambda'}(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}') \cap \bar{C} = T_{>\lambda'}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \bar{C}$ is empty with probability $1 - t$. (We ignore the contribution when $T_{>\lambda'}(\mathbf{x}) \cap \bar{C} \neq \emptyset$.) Because λ, λ' are independently sampled, we get

$$F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}') \geq (1 - t)(tf(C) + (1 - t)f(C \setminus A)).$$

Provided that $t \in [0, \frac{1}{2}(3 - \sqrt{5})]$, we have $t \leq (1 - t)^2$. Then, we can write

$$F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}') \geq t(1 - t)f(C) + tf(C \setminus A). \quad (5)$$

Combining equations (3), (4) and (5), we get

$$2F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{z}') + F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{z}') \geq t(1 - t)f(C) + tf(C \setminus A) + t(f(C) - f(C \setminus A)) = (2t - t^2)f(C).$$

□

Corollary 3.14. For $t = \frac{1}{2}(3 - \sqrt{5})$, Algorithm 3.9 achieves a $\frac{1}{4}(-1 + \sqrt{5})$ -approximation with respect to $\max\{F(x) : x \in P \cap \{0, 1\}^N\}$.

3.3 Simulated annealing 0.325-approximation

Finally, we present the algorithm with the best ratio, based on the ideas of simulated annealing and the recent work of [36]. This algorithm can be seen as an extension of the 0.309-approximation, where local search is applied to a restricted polytope $P \cap [0, t]^N$. Here, we vary the "temperature parameter" t continuously from 0 to 1, while performing local search in the restricted polytope.

Algorithm 3.15. Initialize $\mathbf{x} := 0$ and $t := 0$. As long as $t \leq 1$, repeat the following:

1. Run a local search inside $P \cap [0, t]^N$, until $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in P \cap [0, t]^N$.
2. Generate λ uniformly at random in $[0, t]$, let $T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) = \{i : x_i > \lambda\}$ and $Q = \{\mathbf{z} \in P : \forall i \in T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}); z_i = 0\}$. Initialize $\mathbf{z} := 0$ and run a local search inside Q , to find an auxiliary local optimum $\mathbf{z} \in Q$. Remember the best auxiliary local optimum, maximizing $F(\mathbf{z})$.
3. Find $\mathbf{y} \in P$ maximizing $\mathbf{y} \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x})$, modify $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x} + \frac{\delta}{1-t}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})$, $t := t + \delta$, and go to step 1.

Eventually, return the better of \mathbf{x} and the best auxiliary local optimum \mathbf{z} .

Note that the point \mathbf{x} evolves throughout the process, while the search for \mathbf{z} starts separately in each iteration. In Step 3, we look for a point \mathbf{y} in the full polytope P rather than the restricted polytope $P \cap [0, t]^N$. Since $\mathbf{x} \in [0, t]^N$ and $\mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^N$, the modified point $\mathbf{x} + \frac{\delta}{1-t}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})$ has coordinates $x_i + \frac{\delta}{1-t}(y_i - x_i) \leq t + \delta$, and so it is contained in $P \cap [0, t + \delta]^N$. Coming back to Step 1, we continue local search from this point.

Since the analysis of this process is somewhat involved and much of it overlaps with the analysis of [36], we present the key lemmas and point out where we differ from [36]. As in [36], suppose that $\mathbf{1}_C$ is an optimal solution of $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P \cap \{0, 1\}^N\}$, and define the following function:

$$G(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{1}_C - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}).$$

First, we have the following lemma characterizing the improvement in Step 3, similar to Lemma 4.3 in [36] (note that our proof here is much simpler).

Lemma 3.16. If $\mathbf{x}(t)$ denotes the solution at temperature t before Step 1, we have

$$\frac{1-t}{\delta}[F(\mathbf{x}(t+\delta)) - F(\mathbf{x}(t))] \geq G(\mathbf{x}(t)) - O(n^2\delta).$$

Proof. Let \mathbf{x} be the solution before Step 3. In Step 1, the value of $F(\mathbf{x})$ cannot decrease, so we have $F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{x}(t))$. In Step 3, we optimize $\mathbf{y} \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x})$ over $\mathbf{y} \in P$. Since $\mathbf{1}_C$ is a feasible solution,

$$(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \geq (\mathbf{1}_C - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) = G(\mathbf{x}).$$

Step 3 modifies the current solution as follows: $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} + \frac{\delta}{1-t}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})$. Using the first-order approximation of F in the vicinity of \mathbf{x} , we have

$$F(\mathbf{x}') = F(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{\delta}{1-t}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \pm O(n^2\delta^2) \geq F(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{\delta}{1-t}G(\mathbf{x}) - O(n^2\delta^2)$$

(for more detailed estimates of the error term, see [36]). As we argued, we have $F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{x}(t))$ and $F(\mathbf{x}(t + \delta)) = F(\mathbf{x}')$. To conclude:

$$F(\mathbf{x}(t + \delta)) - F(\mathbf{x}(t)) \geq F(\mathbf{x}') - F(\mathbf{x}) \geq \frac{\delta}{1-t} G(\mathbf{x}(t)) - O(n^2 \delta^2).$$

□

The next lemma relates $G(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{1}_C - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x})$ to the optimum $\text{OPT} = f(C)$.

Lemma 3.17. *If \mathbf{x} is a local optimum in $P \cap [0, t]^N$ and \mathbf{z} is a local optimum in $Q = \{\mathbf{z} \in P : z_i = 0 \forall i \in T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})\}$ for a random $\lambda \in [0, t]$, then*

$$G(\mathbf{x}) + 2F(\mathbf{x}) + 2t\mathbf{E}[F(\mathbf{z})] \geq \text{OPT}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, we have

$$G(\mathbf{x}) + 2F(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{1}_C - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) + 2F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{1}_C) + F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{1}_C).$$

By the threshold lemma (Lemma 3.12), we get

$$G(\mathbf{x}) + 2F(\mathbf{x}) \geq \mathbf{E}_\lambda[f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cup C)] + \mathbf{E}_\lambda[f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cap C)].$$

Since $\mathbf{x} \in [0, t]^N$, the set $T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$ is empty whenever $\lambda \geq t$, which happens with probability $1 - t$. Therefore,

$$G(\mathbf{x}) + 2F(\mathbf{x}) \geq (1-t)f(C) + t\mathbf{E}_\lambda[f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cup C) + f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cap C) \mid \lambda < t]. \quad (6)$$

To extract some value from the conditional expectation, we use the auxiliary optimum \mathbf{z} . By Corollary 3.3,

$$2F(\mathbf{z}) \geq F(\mathbf{z} \vee \mathbf{1}_{C \setminus T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})}) + F(\mathbf{z} \wedge \mathbf{1}_{C \setminus T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})}) \geq F(\mathbf{z} \vee \mathbf{1}_{C \setminus T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})}) \quad (7)$$

because $\mathbf{1}_{C \setminus T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})} \in Q$. (Recall that Q is equal to P restricted to the complement of $T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$.) Now, by definition of F , for a fixed λ we have $F(\mathbf{z} \vee \mathbf{1}_{C \setminus T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})}) = \mathbf{E}_Z[f((Z \cup C) \setminus T_\lambda(\mathbf{x}))]$ where Z is some random set related to \mathbf{z} . (It is not important now what exactly this set is; the important fact is that both \mathbf{z} and $\mathbf{1}_{C \setminus T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})}$ are nonzero only on the complement of $T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})$.) Using submodularity,

$$\begin{aligned} & f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cap C) + f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cup C) + F(\mathbf{z} \vee \mathbf{1}_{C \setminus T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})}) \\ &= \mathbf{E}_Z[f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cap C) + f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cup C) + f((Z \cup C) \setminus T_\lambda(\mathbf{x}))] \\ &\geq f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cap C) + f(C \setminus T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})) \\ &\geq f(C). \end{aligned}$$

This holds for any fixed λ . Combining with (6) and (7), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & G(\mathbf{x}) + 2F(\mathbf{x}) + 2t\mathbf{E}[F(\mathbf{z}) \mid \lambda < t] \\ &\geq (1-t)f(C) + t\mathbf{E}_\lambda[f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cap C) + f(T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x}) \cup C) + F(\mathbf{z} \vee \mathbf{1}_{C \setminus T_{>\lambda}(\mathbf{x})}) \mid \lambda < t] \\ &\geq (1-t)f(C) + tf(C) = f(C). \end{aligned}$$

□

Combining Lemma 3.16 and 3.17, we get the following.

Corollary 3.18. *If $\mathbf{x}(t)$ denotes the solution at temperature t before Step 1, and $\mathbf{z}(t)$ the auxiliary solution found in Step 2, then*

$$\frac{1-t}{\delta} [F(\mathbf{x}(t + \delta)) - F(\mathbf{x}(t))] \geq \text{OPT} - 2F(\mathbf{x}(t)) - 2t\mathbf{E}[F(\mathbf{z}(t))] - O(n^2 \delta).$$

We can assume that $\mathbf{E}[F(\mathbf{z}(t))] \leq \beta$ where β is some target value we want to achieve. (If $\mathbf{E}[F(\mathbf{z}(t))] > \beta$ at some point, then we are done.) We consider the behavior of the algorithm when $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Denoting $\Phi(t) = F(\mathbf{x}(t))$, this yields the following differential equation:

$$(1-t)\Phi'(t) \geq \text{OPT} - 2\Phi(t) - 2t\beta.$$

This is the same differential equation that appears in the analysis of the matroid constraint in [36]. It can be shown that if we solve the differential equation for $\beta = 0.325$ and initial conditions $t_0 = \frac{1}{2}(3 - \sqrt{5})$, $\Phi(t_0) \geq \frac{1}{4}(-1 + \sqrt{5})\text{OPT} \simeq 0.309 \cdot \text{OPT}$ (the properties of a local optimum that we proved in the previous section), then we obtain a solution which achieves $\Phi(t) \geq 0.325 \cdot \text{OPT}$ for $t \simeq 0.53$. This proves the second part of Theorem 1.1.

3.4 Approximation for general polytopes

In this section, we formulate an approximation result for the problem $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ when P is a general solvable polytope (not necessarily down-monotone). This result is included only for the sake of completeness; we do not have any concrete applications for it. Our result generalizes (while losing a factor of 4) the result for matroid base polytopes from [43], which states that a $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \frac{1}{\nu} - o(1))$ -approximation can be achieved, provided that the fractional base packing number is at least $\nu \in [1, 2]$. As observed in [43], the fractional base packing number being at least ν is equivalent to the condition $P \cap [0, \frac{1}{\nu}]^N \neq \emptyset$. This is the condition we use for general polytopes.

Algorithm 3.19. *Let $t \in [0, 1]$ be a parameter such that $P \cap [0, t]^N \neq \emptyset$. Initialize $\mathbf{x} \in P \cap [0, t]^N$ arbitrarily. As long as there is $\mathbf{y} \in P \cap [0, \frac{1}{2}(1+t)]^N$ such that $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ (which can be found by linear programming), move \mathbf{x} continuously in the direction $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$. If there is no such $\mathbf{y} \in P \cap [0, \frac{1}{2}(1+t)]^N$, return \mathbf{x} .*

Note that even though we require $P \cap [0, t]^N \neq \emptyset$, the local search works inside a larger polytope $P \cap [0, \frac{1}{2}(1+t)]^N$. This is necessary for the analysis.

Theorem 3.20. *For any solvable polytope such that $P \cap [0, t]^N \neq \emptyset$, Algorithm 3.19 approximates the problem $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ within a factor of $\frac{1}{8}(1-t)$.*

Proof. The algorithm maintains the invariant $\mathbf{x} \in P \cap [0, \frac{1}{2}(1+t)]^N$. Suppose that the algorithm returns a point \mathbf{x} . Then we know that for every $\mathbf{y} \in P \cap [0, \frac{1}{2}(1+t)]^N$, $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$. We use a particular point \mathbf{y} defined as follows: Let \mathbf{x}^* be the optimum, i.e. $F(\mathbf{x}^*) = \max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$, and let \mathbf{x}_0 be any point in $P \cap [0, t]^N$, for example the starting point. Then we define $\mathbf{y} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{x}^*)$. By convexity, we have $\mathbf{y} \in P$, and since $\mathbf{x}^* \in [0, 1]^N$, we also have $\mathbf{y} \in [0, \frac{1}{2}(1+t)]^N$. Therefore, by the local-search condition, we have $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$. By Lemma 3.2,

$$2F(\mathbf{x}) \geq F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) + F(\mathbf{x} \wedge \mathbf{y}) \geq F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}).$$

Let $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}$. The point \mathbf{x}' has the following properties: $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} \vee \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{x}^*) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^*$, and also $\mathbf{x}' \in [0, \frac{1}{2}(1+t)]^N$. Considering the ray $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^* + \xi(\mathbf{x}' - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^*)$ parameterized by $\xi \geq 0$. Observe that this ray has positive direction in all coordinates, and it is possible to go beyond $\xi = 1$ and still stay inside $[0, 1]^N$: in particular, for $\xi = \frac{2}{1+t}$ we get a point $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^* + \frac{2}{1+t}(\mathbf{x}' - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{2}{1+t}\mathbf{x}' \in [0, 1]^N$. Using this fact, we can express \mathbf{x}' as a convex combination:

$$\mathbf{x}' = \frac{1+t}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^* + \frac{2}{1+t}(\mathbf{x}' - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^*) \right) + \frac{1-t}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^*$$

(the reader can verify that this is an identity). By the concavity of F in positive directions, we get

$$F(\mathbf{x}') \geq \frac{1+t}{2} F\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^* + \frac{2}{1+t}(\mathbf{x}' - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^*)\right) + \frac{1-t}{2} F\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^*\right).$$

As we argued, $\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^* + \frac{2}{1+t}(\mathbf{x}' - \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^*) \in [0, 1]^N$, so we can just lower-bound the respective value by 0, and we obtain

$$F(\mathbf{x}') \geq \frac{1-t}{2} F\left(\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{x}^*\right) \geq \frac{1-t}{4} F(\mathbf{x}^*).$$

Finally, our solution satisfies

$$F(\mathbf{x}) \geq \frac{1}{2}F(\mathbf{x} \vee \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{2}F(\mathbf{x}') \geq \frac{1-t}{8}F(\mathbf{x}^*) = \frac{1-t}{8}\text{OPT}.$$

□

3.5 Technical details of continuous local search

Finally, we address the question of polynomial running time for our local-search procedures. One possible implementation, which is in line with our intuitive description in Section 1, would be as follows.

Let $M = \max_{S,i} |f_S(i)|$ be the maximum absolute marginal value of any element. This implies easily that $|\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i}| \leq M$ and $|\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}| \leq 2M$ for all i, j (see [43]). We pick a parameter $q = n^a$ for some sufficiently large constant a and maintain a convex combination $\mathbf{x} = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^q \mathbf{v}_i$, where \mathbf{v}_i are certain vertices of P (with possible repetition). Each discrete step corresponds to replacing a vertex in the convex combination by another. A typical local-search step that we used is: If there is $\mathbf{y} \in P$ such that $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) > 0$, then move in the direction $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}$. We implement this as follows: We find a point \mathbf{y} by solving a linear optimization problem $\max_{\mathbf{y} \in P} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x})$, where the coordinates of ∇F are estimated by random sampling (within additive errors $\ll M/n^a$). The optimal solution \mathbf{y} can be assumed to be a vertex of P . Then, if $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \geq 3M/n^{a-1}$, we remove a random vertex \mathbf{v}_i from the current convex combination and replace it by \mathbf{y} . Denote the new fractional solution by \mathbf{x}' . The expected effect of this change is

$$\mathbf{E}[F(\mathbf{x}') - F(\mathbf{x})] = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^q \left(F\left(\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{q}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{v}_i)\right) - F(\mathbf{x}) \right) = \frac{1}{q^2} \sum_{i=1}^q (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{v}_i) \cdot \nabla F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i$ is some point between \mathbf{x} and $\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{q}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{v}_i)$. Since $q = n^a$, we get by standard bounds that $\|\nabla F(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|_1 \leq \frac{n}{q} \cdot 2M = \frac{2M}{n^{a-1}}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{E}[F(\mathbf{x}') - F(\mathbf{x})] \geq \frac{1}{q^2} \sum_{i=1}^q \left((\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{v}_i) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{2M}{n^{a-1}} \right) = \frac{1}{q} \left((\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{2M}{n^{a-1}} \right) \geq \frac{1}{q} \cdot \frac{M}{n^{a-1}}$$

assuming that $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) \geq \frac{3M}{n^{a-1}}$. Therefore, if we exchange \mathbf{y} for the vertex \mathbf{v}_i which maximizes our gain, we get $F(\mathbf{x}') - F(\mathbf{x}) \geq \frac{M}{qn^{a-1}} = \frac{M}{n^{2a-1}}$. In other words, each step gains at least $\frac{M}{n^{2a-1}}$, and also we have the trivial bound $\text{OPT} \leq nM$; therefore the number of steps is bounded by n^{2a} . When the local search stops, we have $(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}) \cdot \nabla F(\mathbf{x}) < \frac{3M}{n^{a-1}}$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in P$. It is straightforward to verify that the analysis of each of our algorithms can be carried out with this error term, which induces an $M/\text{poly}(n)$ additive loss in the performance of the algorithm.

In case of a down-monotone polytope $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ that corresponds to an independence family \mathcal{I} , we can assume that each singleton is feasible (otherwise we can remove it from the instance). Therefore, $\text{OPT} \geq \max_i f(\{i\})$, and OPT is also at least $\frac{1}{n}M$ where M is the maximum absolute marginal value of any element. This means that the additive loss in the performance of our algorithms is at most $\text{OPT}/\text{poly}(n)$. Additional care is needed when considering general polytopes that are not necessarily down-monotone as in Section 3.4 (for example when considering the matroid base constraint as in [43]). However, in this paper our focus is on down-monotone polytopes.

4 Contention resolution schemes

In this section we prove our results on the existence of contention resolution schemes and their application to submodular maximization problems. First, we supply the missing proofs from Section 1.

4.1 Contention resolution basics

The inequality that relates contention resolution to submodular maximization is given in Theorem 1.3. This inequality also appears in [4]; we give the proof here for completeness.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We decompose the expectation of $f(I)$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{E}[f(I)] = f(\emptyset) + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}[f(I \cap [i]) - f(I \cap [i-1])].$$

We estimate the expectation of each marginal value separately. By submodularity,

$$\mathbf{E}[f(I \cap [i]) - f(I \cap [i-1])] = \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in I} f_{I \cap [i-1]}(i)] \geq \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in I} f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)]$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{i \in I}$ is the indicator variable which is 1 if $i \in I$ and 0 otherwise. Let us take the expectation in two steps, first over I conditioned on R , and then over R :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[f(I \cap [i]) - f(I \cap [i-1])] &\geq \mathbf{E}_R[\mathbf{E}_I[\mathbf{1}_{i \in I} f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i) \mid R]] \\ &= \mathbf{E}_R[\Pr[i \in I \mid R] f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\Pr[i \in I \mid R]$ can be nonzero only if $i \in R$, therefore we can restrict our attention to this event:

$$\mathbf{E}[f(I \cap [i]) - f(I \cap [i-1])] \geq \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\Pr[i \in I \mid R] f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i) \mid i \in R].$$

On the product space associated with the distribution of R conditioned on $i \in R$, both $\Pr[i \in I \mid R]$ and $f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)$ are non-increasing functions, due to I being monotone with respect to R , and f being submodular. Therefore, the FKG inequality (see [3]) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_R[\Pr[i \in I \mid R] f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i) \mid i \in R] &\geq \mathbf{E}_R[\Pr[i \in I \mid R] \mid i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}_R[f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i) \mid i \in R] \\ &= \Pr[i \in I \mid i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)]. \end{aligned}$$

since the marginal value $f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)$ does not depend on $i \in R$. By the (b, c) -balanced property, $\Pr[i \in I \mid i \in R] \geq c$; in addition, f is either monotone or we assume that $\Pr[i \in I \mid i \in R] = c$. In both cases, $\Pr[i \in I \mid i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)] \geq c \cdot \mathbf{E}[f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)]$. We summarize:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[f(I \cap [i]) - f(I \cap [i-1])] &\geq \Pr[i \in R] \cdot c \mathbf{E}[f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)] \\ &= c \mathbf{E}[f(R \cap [i]) - f(R \cap [i-1])]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{E}[f(I)] = f(\emptyset) + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}[f(I \cap [i]) - f(I \cap [i-1])] \geq f(\emptyset) + c \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}[f(R \cap [i]) - f(R \cap [i-1])] \geq c \mathbf{E}[f(R)].$$

□

In the following, we will see how the strictness assumption on the CR scheme in Theorem 1.3 can be dropped by post-processing the solution I obtained by a (possibly non-strict) (b, c) -balanced CR scheme, to obtain a set $J \subseteq I$ which we call the *pruned* version of I . To prune I , an arbitrary ordering of the elements of N is fixed: $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Starting with $J = I$, the final set J is constructed by going through all elements of I in the order induced by N , and when considering an element i , J is replaced by $J \setminus \{i\}$ if $f(J \setminus \{i\}) \geq f(J)$. Using pruning, we obtain the following variation of Theorem 1.3, which does not anymore rely on strictness.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a non-negative submodular function and \mathbf{x} be a point in $P_{\mathcal{I}}$, a convex relaxation for $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$. Let $I = I(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{I}$ be the random output of a monotone (b, c) -balanced CR scheme on $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$, and J be a pruned version of I . Then*

$$\mathbf{E}[f(J)] \geq c \mathbf{E}[f(b\mathbf{x})].$$

Proof. Let $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ be the ordering of the elements used by the pruning. By definition of the pruning operation we hence have

$$f_{J \cap [i-1]}(i) > 0 \text{ if and only if } i \in J. \tag{8}$$

Again we decompose $f(J)$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{E}[f(J)] = f(\emptyset) + \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}[f(J \cap [i]) - f(J \cap [i-1])],$$

and analogous to the proof of Theorem 1.3 it suffices to prove that for any fixed $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\mathbf{E}[f(J \cap [i]) - f(J \cap [i-1])] \geq c \mathbf{E}[f(R \cap [i]) - f(R \cap [i-1])]. \quad (9)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[f(J \cap [i]) - f(J \cap [i-1])] &= \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in J} f_{J \cap [i-1]}(i)] \\ &= \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in J} f_{J \cap [i-1]}(i) \mid i \in R] \\ &\stackrel{(8)}{=} \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in J} \max\{0, f_{J \cap [i-1]}(i)\} \mid i \in R] \\ &\stackrel{(8)}{=} \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in I} \max\{0, f_{J \cap [i-1]}(i)\} \mid i \in R] \\ &\geq \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in I} \max\{0, f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)\} \mid i \in R] \\ &= \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in I} \max\{0, f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)\} \mid R] \mid i \in R] \\ &= \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in I} \mid R] \max\{0, f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)\} \mid i \in R]. \end{aligned}$$

On the product space associated with the distribution of R conditioned on $i \in R$, both of the terms $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in I} \mid R]$ and $\max\{0, f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)\}$ are non-increasing functions, because of the monotonicity of the CR scheme used to obtain I from R and f being submodular, respectively. Hence, by the FKG inequality we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in I} \mid R] \max\{0, f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)\} \mid i \in R] \\ &\geq \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\mathbf{1}_{i \in I} \mid i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\max\{0, f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)\} \mid i \in R] \\ &= \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \Pr[i \in I \mid i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\max\{0, f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)\} \mid i \in R] \\ &\geq c \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[\max\{0, f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)\} \mid i \in R] \\ &\geq c \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i) \mid i \in R] \\ &= c \Pr[i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}[f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)] \\ &= c \mathbf{E}[f(R \cap [i]) - f(R \cap [i-1])], \end{aligned}$$

where in the second to last equality we use again the property that $f_{R \cap [i-1]}(i)$ is independent of $i \in R$. Hence, this shows (9) as desired, and completes the proof. \square

Next, we discuss how to combine contention resolution schemes for different constraints. We consider a constraint $\mathcal{I} = \cap_{i=1}^h \mathcal{I}_i$ and its polyhedral relaxation $P_{\mathcal{I}} = \cap_i P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$, such that $P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$ has a monotone (b, c_i) -balanced CR scheme. We produce a contention resolution scheme for \mathcal{I} which works with respect to the natural combination of constraint relaxations — an intersection of the respective polytopes $P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$. This ensures that the relaxed problem is still tractable and we can apply our optimization framework.

The combined contention resolution scheme performs the first stage—generating a random set R —without considering the different constraints, and then removes elements as needed, independently for each constraint. A straightforward union bound would state that if we have a $(b, 1 - c_i)$ -scheme for each $P_{\mathcal{I}_i}$ then the combined scheme is $(b, 1 - \sum_i (1 - c_i))$ -balanced for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$. Using the FKG inequality, we obtain a stronger result, a $(b, \prod_i c_i)$ -balanced scheme in this setting. Moreover, if each constraint admits a (b, c) -balanced scheme and each element participates in at most k constraints, then we obtain a (b, c^k) -balanced scheme. This is the statement of Lemma 1.6 which we prove here.

Proof of Lemma 1.6. The desired scheme for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ is as follows. Given $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$, let R be a random subset of N obtained by picking each $i \in N$ independently with probability bx_i . For each $1 \leq i \leq h$, independently run the (b, c_i) -balanced scheme on the set R and let $I_i \in \mathcal{I}_i$ be the set output by this scheme. For each constraint \mathcal{I}_i , we work only with the elements that participate in \mathcal{I}_i ; the other elements always remain in I_i . Output $I = \bigcap_i I_i$. We claim that this is a monotone $(b, \prod_i c_i)$ -balanced scheme for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$.

Let us consider the k constraints that element i participates in. For simplicity we assume $k = 2$; the general statement follows by induction. Conditioned on R , the choices of I_1, I_2 are independent, which means that

$$\Pr[i \in I_1 \cap I_2 \mid R] = \Pr[i \in I_1 \ \& \ i \in I_2 \mid R] = \Pr[i \in I_1 \mid R] \Pr[i \in I_2 \mid R].$$

Taking an expectation over R conditioned on $i \in R$, we get

$$\Pr[i \in I_1 \cap I_2 \mid i \in R] = \mathbf{E}_R[\Pr[i \in I_1 \cap I_2 \mid R] \mid i \in R] = \mathbf{E}_R[\Pr[i \in I_1 \mid R] \Pr[i \in I_2 \mid R] \mid i \in R].$$

Both $\Pr[i \in I_1 \mid R]$ and $\Pr[i \in I_2 \mid R]$ are non-increasing functions of R on the product space of sets containing i , so by the FKG inequality,

$$\mathbf{E}_R[\Pr[i \in I_1 \mid R] \Pr[i \in I_2 \mid R] \mid i \in R] \geq \mathbf{E}_R[\Pr[i \in I_1 \mid R] \mid i \in R] \cdot \mathbf{E}_R[\Pr[i \in I_2 \mid R] \mid i \in R].$$

Since these expectations are simply probabilities conditioned on $i \in R$, we conclude:

$$\Pr[i \in I_1 \cap I_2 \mid i \in R] \geq \Pr[i \in I_1 \mid i \in R] \Pr[i \in I_2 \mid i \in R].$$

Monotonicity of the above scheme is also easily implied. Consider $j \in T_1 \subset T_2 \subseteq N$:

$$\Pr[j \in I \mid R = T_1] = \prod_i \Pr[j \in I_i \mid R = T_1] \geq \prod_i \Pr[j \in I_i \mid R = T_2] = \Pr[j \in I \mid R = T_2].$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that each of the schemes is monotone. The polynomial time implementability of the composed scheme is trivial to see. \square

4.2 Connection with the correlation gap

In this section we highlight a close connection between CR schemes and a concept known as *correlation gap* [2], and discuss how to obtain an asymptotically optimal (b, c) -balanced CR scheme for matroids.

Definition 4.2. For a set function $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, the correlation gap is defined as

$$\kappa(f) = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in [0,1]^N} \frac{\mathbf{E}[f(\hat{\mathbf{x}})]}{f^+(\mathbf{x})},$$

where $f^+(\mathbf{x}) = \max\{\sum_S \alpha_S f(S) : \sum_S \alpha_S \mathbf{1}_S = \mathbf{x}, \sum_S \alpha_S = 1, \alpha_S \geq 0\}$ is the maximum possible expectation of f over distributions of expectation \mathbf{x} , and $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ is the product distribution with expectation \mathbf{x} . Furthermore, for a class of functions \mathcal{C} , the correlation gap $\kappa(\mathcal{C})$ is the infimum of correlation gaps over all functions in \mathcal{C} .

In other words, the correlation gap is the worst-case ratio between the multilinear extension $F(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{E}[f(\hat{\mathbf{x}})]$ and the concave closure $f^+(\mathbf{x})$. We define the correlation gap as a number $\kappa \in [0, 1]$, to be in line with the parameter c in our notion of a c -balanced CR scheme (the higher the better). The definition in [2] uses the inverse ratio.

Relation between CR schemes and the correlation gap: The relationship between CR schemes and correlation gap arises as follows. Let $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$ denote the set of feasible solutions. Consider a product distribution on 2^N with expectation $\mathbf{p} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$, in other words a random set R which contains elements independently with probabilities p_i . Let Π be the family of all deterministic CR schemes π , i.e. ways to choose a subset $\pi(R) \subseteq R$ such that $\pi(R) \in \mathcal{I}$. (Although the scheme is deterministic, there is randomness here due to R .) Any randomized CR scheme can be written as a convex combination of such deterministic schemes; let us denote the coefficients by λ_π . Define $q_{i,\pi} = \Pr_R[i \in \pi(R)]$, the probability that element i is chosen in the scheme π . Hence, when executing a randomized CR scheme with coefficients λ , first with probability λ_π a deterministic CR scheme π is chosen, and then $\pi(R)$ is returned. The goal of our randomized scheme is to achieve the property that every element i appears in $\pi(R)$ with overall probability at least cp_i . Let us write down a linear program describing the optimal randomized CR scheme, and its dual.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(LP1)} \quad & \max \quad c \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} q_{i,\pi} \lambda_\pi \geq p_i c \quad \forall i \in N \\ & \quad \quad \sum_{\pi \in \Pi} \lambda_\pi = 1 \\ & \quad \quad \lambda_\pi \geq 0 \quad \forall \pi \in \Pi \\ \text{(DP1)} \quad & \min \quad \mu \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i \in N} q_{i,\pi} y_i \leq \mu \quad \forall \pi \in \Pi \\ & \quad \quad \sum_{i \in N} p_i y_i = 1 \\ & \quad \quad y_i \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in N \end{aligned}$$

We can interpret the dual as follows. Given an assignment to the variables y_i , the value of the dual is $\max_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_i q_i \pi y_i = \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_i y_i \Pr_R[i \in \pi(R)] = \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbf{E}_R[\sum_{i \in \pi(R)} y_i]$. Since π can choose an arbitrary feasible subset for each R , the optimal π is given by choosing for each R the maximum-weight subset $\pi(R)$ under the weights y_i , and the dual value is $\mathbf{E}_R[\max_{S \subseteq R, S \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{i \in S} y_i]$. In words, this is the expected value one can extract from a random set R with marginals p_i , when the weights are normalized by $\sum_i p_i y_i = 1$. Minimizing over the choices of weights y_i , we obtain what we call the correlation gap of the solution set \mathcal{I} ,

Definition 4.3. For $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$, we define the correlation gap as $\kappa(\mathcal{I}) = \inf_{\mathbf{p} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathbf{y} \geq 0} \frac{1}{\sum_i p_i y_i} \mathbf{E}[\max_{S \subseteq R, S \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{i \in S} y_i]$, where R contains element i independently with probability p_i .

Theorem 4.4. The correlation gap of \mathcal{I} is equal to the maximum c such that \mathcal{I} admits a c -balanced CR scheme.

Proof. As discussed above, the correlation gap of \mathcal{I} is equal to the optimum value of the dual LP. By LP duality, this is equal to the optimum of the primal LP, which is the best value of c for which there is a c -balanced CR scheme. \square

The following lemma shows a close connection between the correlation gap of a solution set \mathcal{I} and the correlation gap of the respective rank function. More precisely, the correlation gap of \mathcal{I} corresponds to the worst (i.e. smallest) correlation gap of the respective rank function over all weight vectors.

Lemma 4.5. For $\mathcal{I} \subseteq 2^N$ and weight vector $\mathbf{y} \geq 0$, let $r_{\mathbf{y}}(R) = \max_{S \subseteq R, S \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{i \in S} y_i$ denote the associated weighted rank function. Then $\kappa(\mathcal{I}) = \inf_{\mathbf{y} \geq 0} \kappa(r_{\mathbf{y}})$.

Proof. Using the notation $r_{\mathbf{y}}(R)$ for the weighted rank functions with weights \mathbf{y} , the correlation gap of \mathcal{I} can be rewritten as $\kappa(\mathcal{I}) = \inf_{\mathbf{p} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathbf{y} \geq 0} \frac{\mathbf{E}[r_{\mathbf{y}}(R)]}{\sum_i p_i y_i}$, where R contains elements independently with probabilities p_i . We first observe that for any $\mathbf{p} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$, we have $r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_i p_i y_i$. Consider a convex combination $\mathbf{p} = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_S \mathbf{1}_S$, $\sum \alpha_S = 1$, $\alpha_S \geq 0$ with $r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_S y(S)$. Since the weighted rank function of a feasible set $S \in \mathcal{I}$ is simply its weight we obtain

$$r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_S y(S) = \mathbf{y} \cdot \sum_{S \in \mathcal{I}} \alpha_S \mathbf{1}_S = \mathbf{y} \cdot \mathbf{p} = \sum_i p_i y_i,$$

and hence $\kappa(\mathcal{I}) = \inf_{\mathbf{p} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathbf{y} \geq 0} \frac{\mathbf{E}[r_{\mathbf{y}}(R)]}{\sum_i p_i y_i} = \inf_{\mathbf{p} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathbf{y} \geq 0} \frac{\mathbf{E}[r_{\mathbf{y}}(R)]}{r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p})}$. To prove the claim it remains to show that

$$\inf_{\mathbf{p} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathbf{y} \geq 0} \frac{\mathbf{E}[r_{\mathbf{y}}(R)]}{r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p})} = \inf_{\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^N, \mathbf{y} \geq 0} \frac{\mathbf{E}[r_{\mathbf{y}}(R)]}{r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p})}. \quad (10)$$

Let $\mathbf{y} \geq 0$. We will prove (10) by showing that for any point $\mathbf{p} \in [0, 1]^N$ there is a point $\mathbf{p}' \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$ with $\mathbf{p}' \leq \mathbf{p}$ (coordinate-wise), and satisfying $r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p}') \geq r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p})$. Since $r_{\mathbf{y}}$ is monotone, we then obtain $\mathbf{E}[r_{\mathbf{y}}(R)]/r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p}) \geq \mathbf{E}[r_{\mathbf{y}}(R)]/r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p}')$, showing that the infimum over \mathbf{p} on the right-hand side of (10) can indeed be restricted to the polytope $P_{\mathcal{I}}$. Let $\mathbf{p} = \sum_{S \subseteq N} \alpha_S \mathbf{1}_S$, $\sum_{S \subseteq N} \alpha_S = 1$, $\alpha_S \geq 0$ be a convex combination of \mathbf{p} such that $r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p}) = \sum_{S \subseteq N} \alpha_S r_{\mathbf{y}}(S)$. For every $S \subseteq N$, let $I(S) \subseteq S$ be a maximum weight independent set, hence $r_{\mathbf{y}}(S) = y(I(S))$. The point $\mathbf{p}' = \sum_{S \subseteq N} \alpha_S \mathbf{1}_{I(S)}$ clearly satisfies $\mathbf{p}' \leq \mathbf{p}$, and furthermore

$$r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p}') \geq \sum_{S \in \mathcal{I}} \left(\sum_{W \subseteq N, I(W)=S} \alpha_S \right) r_{\mathbf{y}}(S) = \sum_{S \subseteq N} \alpha_S r_{\mathbf{y}}(S) = r_{\mathbf{y}}^+(\mathbf{p}).$$

\square

Monotonicity, efficiency and strictness: In the discussion above, we have ignored two issues: the monotonicity of our CR scheme, and the question whether we can find it efficiently. These issues can be also related to the concept of correlation gap, using LP duality.

If we want to obtain a monotone CR scheme, we can simply define Π to be the family of all deterministic monotone CR schemes. (It is not true that all monotone randomized CR schemes can be obtained as convex combinations of deterministic ones, but certainly this construction yields monotone randomized CR schemes.) LP duality implies that

if there is a family of *monotone CR schemes* $\Pi' \subset \Pi$ that certifies that (DP1) is lower-bounded by c , i.e. for any weight $\mathbf{y} \geq 0$ with $\sum_{i \in N} p_i y_i = 1$ we have $\max_{\pi \in \Pi'} \sum_{i \in N} q_i \pi y_i \geq c$, then there exists a monotone c -balanced CR scheme which is a convex combination of schemes in Π' . Rephrased in the context of correlation gaps, Π' is a family certifying that the correlation gap of \mathcal{I} is lower-bounded by c , since $\kappa(\mathcal{I}) \geq \inf_{\mathbf{p} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}, \mathbf{y} \geq 0} \frac{1}{\sum_i p_i y_i} \max_{\pi \in \Pi'} \mathbf{E}[y(\pi(R))] \geq c$ where the first inequality follows from $r_{\mathbf{y}}(R) \geq \mathbf{E}[y(\pi(R))]$ for all $\pi \in \Pi$.

Similarly, the question of efficiency translates into the dual as follows. If for each weight vector \mathbf{y} we have an efficient procedure to compute an efficient CR scheme $\pi : 2^N \rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ with $\sum_{i \in N} q_i \pi y_i \geq c$, then we can use this procedure to approximately separate over the dual. This allows us to find efficiently a polynomial-sized collection of constraints that certify that the dual optimum is at least c . Hence, by solving (LP1) only over the variables corresponding to those constraints, a c -balanced CR scheme can be obtained efficiently. Notice that the thus obtained CR scheme is efficient, since it is a mixture of a polynomial number of efficient schemes. Without further details, we formulate these extensions in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.6. *There is an efficient c -balanced CR scheme for \mathcal{I} iff there is an efficient algorithm which for any weight vector $\mathbf{y} \geq 0$, and a set R containing elements independently with probabilities $\mathbf{p} \in P(\mathcal{I})$, returns a feasible subset $\pi(R) \subseteq R$ such that $\mathbf{E}_R \left[\sum_{i \in \pi(R)} y_i \right] \geq c \sum_i y_i p_i$. In addition, if the algorithm can be chosen so that $\pi(R)$ is a monotone function of R (i.e., if $i \in R_1 \subseteq R_2$, and $i \in \pi(R_2)$, then $i \in \pi(R_1)$), then there is an efficient monotone c -balanced CR scheme for \mathcal{I} .*

Finally, we comment on the issue of strictness (i.e. obtaining an exact conditional probability $\Pr[i \in I \mid i \in R] = c$), which is useful in the case of non-monotone submodular functions. If we have a contention resolution scheme guaranteeing a lower bound $\Pr[i \in I \mid i \in R] \geq c$, then we can simulate this scheme for a given distribution of R and estimate the actual probability for each element, $c'_i = \Pr[i \in I \mid i \in R] \geq c$, within a polynomially small error (assuming that c is a constant). Then we can modify the contention resolution scheme by removing element i with probability $1 - c/c'_i$. The resulting scheme is arbitrarily close to being strict, and the approximation factor will not be affected significantly. We omit the details.

The above framework easily extends to (b, c) -balanced CR schemes by restricting \mathbf{p} to be in the scaled-down polytope $b \cdot P_{\mathcal{I}}$. In the following, we discuss how for any fixed $b > 0$ an asymptotically optimal $(b, \frac{1-e^{-b}}{b})$ -balanced and monotone CR schemes for matroids can be obtained using the above approach.

4.3 Contention resolution for matroids

Let $\mathcal{M} = (N, \mathcal{I})$ be a matroid, $b \in (0, 1]$, and let $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$ be the given point for which we want to find a (b, c) -balanced CR scheme for c as large as possible. We denote by $\mathbf{p} = b \cdot \mathbf{x}$ the scaled-down point, which puts us notation-wise in the same setting as discussed above. Let $R(b)$ be the random set including each element $i \in N$ independently with probability $p_i = b x_i$. Consider the separation problem for (DP1), which asks for a given weight vector $\mathbf{y} \geq 0$ with $\sum_i p_i y_i = 1$ and some μ , whether $\max_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_i q_i \pi y_i \leq \mu$. As discussed above, the maximum is achieved for any CR scheme π that returns for any set $R(b)$ a maximum weight subset with respect to \mathbf{y} . However, in the case of matroids, such a CR scheme π corresponds exactly to the greedy algorithm $\pi_{\mathbf{y}}$ for finding a maximum weight independent set with respect to the weights \mathbf{y} . Hence, to separate over the dual, it suffices to compute $q_{i, \pi_{\mathbf{y}}}$ for $i \in N$ and check whether $\sum_{i \in N} q_{i, \pi_{\mathbf{y}}} y_i \leq \mu$. Using sample average approximations we can, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, check with high probability whether $\sum_{i \in N} q_{i, \pi_{\mathbf{y}}} y_i \leq \mu + \varepsilon$ in time polynomial in the input and $1/\varepsilon$ ⁶. Using this approximate separation oracle for the dual we get the following result due to the ellipsoid method, where we get rid of the “with high probability” statement by absorbing the small probability of an unsuccessful estimate in the ε of the claimed $(b, c - \varepsilon)$ -balanced CR scheme.

Theorem 4.7. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any matroid \mathcal{M} that admits a (b, c) -balanced CR scheme, we can obtain a $(b, c - \varepsilon)$ -balanced and monotone CR scheme for \mathcal{M} running in time polynomial in the input and $1/\varepsilon$.*

A consequence of the fact that it is sufficient to consider greedy algorithms for dual separation, is that all constraints in the dual, that do not correspond to greedy algorithms, are redundant. Hence, for the case of matroids, convex

⁶Exact computation of the $q_{i, \pi_{\mathbf{y}}}$ can be shown to be $\#P$ -hard even for graphic matroids by a reduction from the s - t reliability problem.

combinations of greedy algorithms lead to the strongest CR schemes. Since all greedy CR schemes $\pi_{\mathbf{y}}$ are monotone, this implies that only considering monotone CR schemes is not restrictive in the case of matroids.

To convert Theorem 4.7 into a concrete statement about the value c , it suffices to prove the existence of a good (b, c) -balanced CR scheme. The existence of a $(1 - 1/e)$ -balanced CR scheme for matroids follows by the fact that the correlation gap of monotone submodular functions is $1 - 1/e$ [6]: by Lemma 4.5 this implies that the correlation gap of the independent sets of any matroid is bounded by $1 - 1/e$, and the result follows by applying Theorem 4.4. The result about the correlation gap of monotone submodular functions can be refined to obtain the following statement about the existence of (b, c) -balanced CR schemes for matroids.

Theorem 4.8. *For any matroid \mathcal{M} on n elements, $b \in (0, 1]$, and $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$, there exists a $\left(b, \frac{1 - e^{-b} + \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}\right)}{b}\right)$ -balanced CR scheme.*

The proof is based on the following lemma which can be seen as an extension of the property that the correlation gap for monotone submodular functions is $1 - 1/e$ [6].

Lemma 4.9. *If $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a monotone submodular function, $F : [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ its multilinear extension, and $f^+ : [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ its concave closure, then for any $b \in [0, 1]$,*

$$F(b\mathbf{y}) \geq (1 - e^{-b})f^+(\mathbf{y}).$$

Proof. We use another extension of a monotone submodular function, defined in [6]:

$$f^*(\mathbf{y}) = \min_S \left(f(S) + \sum_i y_i f_S(i) \right).$$

It is shown in [6] that $f^*(\mathbf{y}) \geq f^+(\mathbf{y})$ for all $\mathbf{y} \in [0, 1]^N$. Consider the function $\phi(t) = F(t\mathbf{y})$ for $t \in [0, 1]$, i.e. the multilinear extension on the line segment between $\mathbf{0}$ and \mathbf{y} . We prove that $\phi(t)$ satisfies a differential equation similar to the analysis of the continuous greedy algorithm [7], which leads immediately to the statement of the lemma. We have

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = \mathbf{y} \cdot \nabla F(t\mathbf{y}) = \sum_i y_i \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i} \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=t\mathbf{y}}.$$

By properties of the multilinear extension, we have $\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i} \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=t\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{E}[f(R + i) - f(R - i)] \geq \mathbf{E}[f_R(i)]$, where R is a random set sampled independently with probabilities $x_i = ty_i$ (see [7] for more details). Therefore,

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = \sum_i y_i \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_i} \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=t\mathbf{y}} \geq \sum_i y_i \mathbf{E}[f_R(i)] = \mathbf{E}\left[\sum_i y_i f_R(i)\right] \geq \mathbf{E}[f^*(\mathbf{y}) - f(R)]$$

by the definition of $f^*(\mathbf{y})$. Finally, $\mathbf{E}[f(R)] = F(t\mathbf{y}) = \phi(t)$, hence we obtain the following differential inequality:

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} \geq f^*(\mathbf{y}) - \phi(t)$$

under the initial condition $\phi(0) \geq 0$. We solve this as follows: $\frac{d}{dt}(e^t \phi(t)) = e^t \phi(t) + e^t \frac{d\phi}{dt} \geq e^t f^*(\mathbf{y})$ which implies that

$$e^b \phi(b) \geq e^0 \phi(0) + \int_0^b e^t f^*(\mathbf{y}) dt \geq (e^b - 1)f^*(\mathbf{y}).$$

Considering that $\phi(b) = F(b\mathbf{y})$ and $f^*(\mathbf{y}) \geq f^+(\mathbf{y})$, this proves the lemma. \square

The proof of the above Lemma can be refined using ideas employed in the analysis of the continuous greedy algorithm in [42] to obtain the following slightly stronger statement.

Lemma 4.10. *If $f : 2^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a monotone submodular function, $F : [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ its multilinear extension, and $f^+ : [0, 1]^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ its concave closure, then for any $b \in [0, 1]$,*

$$F(b\mathbf{y}) \geq \left(1 - e^{-b} + \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}\right)\right) f^+(\mathbf{y}).$$

Corollary 4.11. For any matroid $\mathcal{M} = (N, \mathcal{I})$, if $r_w(S) = \max\{\sum_{i \in I} w_i : I \subseteq S, I \in \mathcal{I}\}$ is the corresponding weighted rank function for some weights w_i , $\mathbf{p} \in b \cdot P(\mathcal{M})$ for some $b \in [0, 1]$, and R is sampled independently with probabilities p_i , then

$$\mathbf{E}[r_w(R)] \geq \frac{1 - e^{-b} + \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}\right)}{b} \sum_i w_i p_i.$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{p} \in b \cdot P(\mathcal{M})$, we have $\mathbf{p} = b\mathbf{z}$ where \mathbf{z} is a convex combination of vertices of $P(\mathcal{M})$. By the definition of concave closure, $r_w^+(\mathbf{z}) \geq \sum w_i z_i$. The multilinear extension of r_w evaluated at $\mathbf{p} = b\mathbf{z}$ is $\mathbf{E}[r_w(R)]$. By Lemma 4.10,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}[r_w(R)] &\geq \left(1 - e^{-b} + \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}\right)\right) r_w^+(\mathbf{z}) \geq \left(1 - e^{-b} + \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}\right)\right) \sum w_i z_i \\ &= \frac{1 - e^{-b} + \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}\right)}{b} \sum w_i p_i. \end{aligned}$$

□

The above corollary implies Theorem 4.8, since it implies that (DP1) is lower-bounded by $\frac{1 - e^{-b} + \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}\right)}{b}$: consider the constraints of (DP1). For any $\mathbf{p} \in b \cdot P_{\mathcal{I}}$ and weight vector $\mathbf{y} \geq 0$ with $\sum_{i \in N} p_i y_i = 1$, we have by Corollary 4.11

$$\max_{\pi \in \Pi} \sum_{i \in N} q_{i, \pi} y_i = \mathbf{E}[r_{\mathbf{y}}(R)] \geq \frac{1 - e^{-b} + \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\text{poly}(n)}\right)}{b},$$

where R is a random set containing each element $i \in N$ independently with probability p_i . □

By combining Theorem 4.7 and 4.8, and choosing $\varepsilon = O\left(\frac{1}{b \cdot \text{poly}(n)}\right)$, we obtain our main result for CR schemes in the context of matroids.

Corollary 4.12. For any matroid \mathcal{M} , $b \in (0, 1]$, and $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$, we can efficiently construct an efficient $(b, \frac{1 - e^{-b}}{b})$ -balanced and monotone CR scheme.

As shown by the following theorem, the CR schemes that can be obtained according to Corollary 4.12 are, up to an additive ε , asymptotically optimal.

Theorem 4.13. For any $b \in (0, 1]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is no $(b, \frac{1 - e^{-b}}{b} + \varepsilon)$ -balanced CR scheme for uniform matroids of rank one.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M} = (N, \mathcal{I})$ be the uniform matroid of rank 1 over $n = |N|$ elements, and consider the point $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{I}}$ given by $x_i = 1/n$ for $i \in N$. Let R be a random set containing each element $i \in N$ independently with probability x_i . The expected rank of R is given by

$$\mathbf{E}[r(R)] = 1 - \Pr[R = \emptyset] = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{b}{n}\right)^n. \quad (11)$$

Moreover, any (b, c) -balanced CR scheme returning a set $I \in \mathcal{I}$ satisfies

$$\mathbf{E}[|I|] = \sum_{i \in N} \Pr[i \in I] \geq \sum_{i \in N} \frac{bc}{n} = bc. \quad (12)$$

Since I is an independent subset of R we have $\mathbf{E}[r(R)] \geq \mathbf{E}[|I|]$, and the claim follows by (11), (12) and by considering the limit case $n \rightarrow \infty$. □

4.4 Contention resolution for knapsacks

Here we sketch a contention resolution scheme for knapsack constraints. This essentially follows from known techniques; we remark that Kulik, Shachnai and Tamir [28] showed how to round a fractional solution to the problem $\max\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in P\}$ for any constant number of knapsack constraints and any non-negative submodular function, while losing a $(1-\varepsilon)$ factor for an arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$. Our goal is to show that these techniques can be implemented in a black-box fashion and integrated in our framework. We prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.14. *For any $\delta, \varepsilon > 0$ and a knapsack constraint $\mathcal{F} = \{S : \sum_{i \in S} a_i \leq 1\}$ such that $a_i \leq \delta$ for all i , there is a monotone $(1 - \varepsilon, 1 - e^{-\Omega(\varepsilon^2/\delta)})$ -balanced contention resolution scheme.*

Proof. The CR scheme works as follows: given $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{F}} = \{\mathbf{x} \geq 0 : \sum a_i x_i \leq 1\}$, we sample R with probabilities $(1 - \varepsilon)x_i$. Then we set $I = R$ if $\sum_{i \in R} a_i \leq 1$ and $I = \emptyset$ otherwise. This is obviously a monotone scheme. To prove the balance guarantee, we use a Chernoff bound: Since $\mathbf{x} \in P_{\mathcal{F}}$, we have $\sum_i a_i x_i \leq 1$ and $\mu = \mathbf{E}[\sum_{i \in R} a_i] = (1 - \varepsilon) \sum_i a_i x_i \leq 1 - \varepsilon$. If $\mu \geq 1/2$, then $\varepsilon \leq 1/2$ and by the Chernoff bound (using $a_i \in [0, \delta]$)

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i \in R} a_i > 1 \right] \leq \Pr \left[\sum_{i \in R} a_i > (1 + \varepsilon)\mu \right] \leq e^{-\varepsilon^2 \mu / 3\delta} \leq e^{-\varepsilon^2 / 6\delta}.$$

If $\mu < 1/2$, then again by the Chernoff bound,

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{i \in R} a_i > 1 \right] \leq \Pr \left[\sum_{i \in R} a_i > 2\mu \right] \leq e^{-\Omega(1/\delta)} \leq e^{-\Omega(\varepsilon^2/\delta)}.$$

□

This contention resolution scheme is directly applicable only if the item sizes are relatively small compared to the knapsack capacity. However, standard enumeration tricks allow us to apply this scheme to general instances as well. This can be done for any constant number of knapsack constraints. We formulate this as follows.

Corollary 4.15. *For any constant $k \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a constant n_0 (that depends only on ε) such that for any submodular maximization instance involving k knapsack constraints (and possibly other constraints), there is a set F of at most n_0 elements and a residual instance on the remaining elements such that*

- Any α -approximate solution to the residual instance together with F is an $\alpha(1 - k\varepsilon)$ -approximate solution to the original instance.
- In the residual instance, each knapsack constraint admits a $(1 - \varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)$ -balanced CR scheme.

Proof. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, let $\delta = O(\varepsilon^2 / \log(1/\varepsilon))$ and $n_0 = 1/(\delta\varepsilon)$. Select F greedily from the optimal solution, by picking elements as long as their marginal contribution is at least $\delta\varepsilon \text{OPT}$; note that $|F| \leq n_0$. We define the residual instance so that S is feasible in the residual instance iff $S \cup F$ is feasible in the original instance. In addition, in the residual instance we remove all elements whose size for some knapsack constraint is more than $\delta \times$ residual capacity. The number of such elements in a knapsack can be at most $1/\delta$ and hence they can contribute at most εOPT ; we forgo this value for each knapsack. We obtain a residual instance where all sizes are at most $\delta \times$ capacity. By Lemma 4.14, each knapsack admits a $(1 - \varepsilon, 1 - e^{-\Omega(\varepsilon^2/\delta)}) = (1 - \varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon)$ -balanced CRS. □

An advantage of this black box approach is that knapsack constraints can be combined arbitrarily with other types of constraints. They do not affect the approximation ratio significantly. However, the enumeration stage affects the running time by an $O(n^{n_0})$ factor.

4.5 Sparse packing systems

We now consider packing constraints of the type $Ax \leq \mathbf{b}$, where $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^N$ is the indicator vector of a solution. We can assume without loss of generality that the right-hand side is $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{1}$. We say that the system is k -sparse, if each column of A has at most k nonzero entries (i.e., each element participates in at most k linear constraints). The approximation algorithms in [4] can be seen to give a contention resolution scheme for k -sparse packing systems.

CR scheme for k -sparse packing systems:

- We say that element j participates in constraint i , if $a_{ij} > 0$. We call an element j *big* for this constraint, if $a_{ij} > 1/2$. Otherwise we call element j *small* for this constraint.
- Sample R with probabilities bx_i .
- For each constraint i : if there is exactly one big element in R that participates in i , mark all the small elements in R for this constraint for deletion; otherwise check whether $\sum_{j \in R} a_{ij} > 1$ and if so, mark all elements participating in i for deletion.
- Define I to be R minus the elements marked for deletion.

Based on the analysis in [4], we obtain the following.

Lemma 4.16. *For any $b \in (0, \frac{1}{2k})$, the above is a monotone $(b, 1 - 2kb)$ -balanced CR scheme for k -sparse packing systems.*

Proof. Consider a fixed element j^* . It appears in R with probability bx_{j^*} . We analyze the probability that it is removed due to some constraint where it participates. First, note that whether big or small, element j^* cannot be removed due to a constraint i if the remaining elements have size less than $1/2$, i.e. if $\sum_{j \in R \setminus \{j^*\}} a_{ij} < 1/2$. This is because in this case, there is no other big element participating in i , and element j^* is either big in which case it survives, or it is small and then $\sum_{j \in R} a_{ij} \leq 1$, i.e. the constraint is satisfied.

Thus it remains to analyze the event $\sum_{j \in R \setminus \{j^*\}} a_{ij} \geq 1/2$. Note that this is independent of item j^* appearing in R . By the feasibility of the fractional solution, $\mathbf{E}[\sum_{j \in R \setminus \{j^*\}} a_{ij}] = \sum_{j \neq j^*} bx_j a_{ij} \leq b$. By Markov's inequality, $\Pr[\sum_{j \in R \setminus \{j^*\}} a_{ij} \geq 1/2] \leq 2b$. So an element is removed with probability at most $2b$ for each constraint where it participates. By the union bound, it is removed by probability at most $2kb$. \square

Recall the notion of width for a packing system: $W = \lfloor \frac{1}{\max_{i,j} a_{ij}} \rfloor$, where a_{ij} are the entries of the packing matrix (recall that we normalize the right-hand side to be $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{1}$). Assuming that $W \geq 2$, one can use a simpler CR scheme and improve the parameters.

CR scheme for k -sparse packing systems of width W :

- Sample R with probabilities bx_i .
- For each constraint i for which $\sum_{j \in R} a_{ij} > 1$, mark all elements participating in i for deletion.
- Define I to be R minus the elements marked for deletion.

Lemma 4.17. *For any $b \in (0, \frac{1}{2e})$, the above is a monotone $(b, 1 - k(2eb)^{W-1})$ -balanced CR scheme for any k -sparse system of packing constraints of width $W \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let us consider an element j' and a constraint $\sum_{i \in S} a_{ij'} \leq 1$ that j' participates in. If we condition on j' being present in R , we have $\mu_i = \mathbf{E}[\sum_{j \in R \setminus \{j'\}} a_{ij} \mid j' \in R] = \sum_{j \neq j'} a_{ij} bx_j \leq b$. By the width property, we have $a_{ij'} \leq 1/W \leq 1/2$. We use the Chernoff bound for $[0, 1]$ random variables, $\Pr[X > (1 + \delta)\mu] \leq (e^\delta / (1 + \delta)^{1 + \delta})^\mu \leq (e / (1 + \delta))^{(1 + \delta)\mu}$, with $1 + \delta = (1 - a_{ij'}) / \mu_i \geq 1 / (2b)$. Since our random variables are bounded by $[0, \max a_{ij}]$, we obtain by scaling

$$\Pr \left[\sum_{j \in R} a_{ij} > 1 \mid j' \in R \right] = \Pr \left[\sum_{j \in R \setminus \{j'\}} a_{ij} > 1 - a_{ij'} \right]$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{e}{1+\delta} \right)^{(1+\delta)\mu_i / \max a_{ij}} \leq (2eb)^{(1-a_{ij'}) / \max a_{ij}} \leq (2eb)^{W-1}.$$

Therefore, each element is removed with probability at most $(2eb)^{W-1}$ for each constraint where it participates. \square

4.6 UFP in paths and trees

We consider the following routing/packing problem. Let $T = (V, E)$ be a capacitated tree with u_e denoting the capacity of edge $e \in E$. We are given k node pairs $s_1 t_1, \dots, s_k t_k$ with pair i having a non-negative demand d_i ; we assume $d_{\max} = \max_i d_i \leq u_{\min} = \min_e u_e$ (the no-bottleneck assumption). Let $N = \{1, \dots, k\}$. We say that $S \subseteq N$ is routable if for each $i \in S$ a demand d_i is routed along the unique path from s_i to t_i , and the total flow on any edge e is at most u_e . Previously a constant factor approximation has been given for the problem of finding a maximum weight subset of routable demands [13]; the problem is APX-hard even for unit-demands and unit-weights [22]. Let $\mathcal{I} = \{S \subseteq N \mid S \text{ is routable}\}$. Here we consider $\max_{S \in \mathcal{I}} f(S)$ for a non-negative submodular function f . A natural (packing) LP relaxation for $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ has a variable $x_i \in [0, 1]$ for each pair i and a constraint $\sum_{i: e \in Q_i} d_i x_i \leq u_e$ for each edge e where Q_i is the unique s_i - t_i path in T .

CR scheme for unit-demands:

- Root T arbitrarily. Let depth of pair $s_i t_i$ be the depth of the least common ancestor of s_i and t_i in T .
- Sample R with probabilities bx_i . Let $I = \emptyset$.
- Consider pairs in R in increasing order of depth.
- Add i to I if $I \cup \{i\}$ is routable, otherwise reject i .
- Output I .

The techniques in [8, 13] give the following lemma.

Lemma 4.18. *For any $b \in (0, \frac{1}{3e})$ the above is a $(b, 1 - \frac{2eb}{1-eb})$ -balanced CR scheme.*

Proof. Consider a fixed pair i^* and let v be the least common ancestor of s_{i^*} and t_{i^*} in the rooted tree T ; note that v could be one of s_{i^*} or t_{i^*} . Let P be the unique path in T from v to s_{i^*} and P' be the path from v to t_{i^*} . Without loss of generality assume that $v \neq s_{i^*}$ and hence P is non-empty. We wish to upper bound $\Pr[i^* \notin I \mid i^* \in R]$, that is, the probability that i^* is rejected conditioned on it being included in the random set R . The reason that i^* gets rejected is that at least one edge $e \in P \cup P'$ is already full from the pairs that have been accepted into I prior to considering i^* . We upper bound the probability of this event happening for some edge in P and use a symmetric argument for P' .

Let e_1, e_2, \dots, e_h be the edges in P from v to s_{i^*} . Let \mathcal{E}_j be the event that i^* gets rejected at e_j , that is, the capacity of e_j is full when i^* is considered for addition to I . Note that these events are correlated. We claim the following: if $j > h$ and $u_{e_j} \geq u_{e_h}$ then \mathcal{E}_j happens only if \mathcal{E}_h happens. The reason for this is the order in which the pairs in R are considered for insertion. When i^* is considered, the only pairs inserted in I prior to it are those whose depth is no larger, and hence the total capacity used on an edge decreases as we traverse the path P from v to s_i . Thus, to analyze the probability of rejection it suffices to consider a subsequence of e_1, e_2, \dots, e_h starting with e_1 such that the capacity of the next edge in the sequence is strictly smaller than the previously added one. For notational simplicity we will therefore assume that $u_{e_1} > u_{e_2} > \dots > u_{e_h} \geq 1$.

Let $S_j = \{i \neq i^* \mid e \in Q_i\}$ be the set of pairs other than i^* that contain e in their path Q_i . Let \mathcal{E}'_j be the event that $|R \cap S_j| \geq u_{e_j}$. It is easy to see that $\Pr[\mathcal{E}_j] \leq \Pr[\mathcal{E}'_j]$. Since \mathbf{x} is a feasible solution to the LP relaxation we have $\sum_{i \in S_j} x_i < u_{e_j}$ and hence $\sum_{i \in S_j} bx_i < bu_{e_j}$. Letting X_i be the event that $i \in R$, and $X = \sum_{i \in S_j} X_i$, we have $\Pr[\mathcal{E}'_j] = \Pr[X \geq u_{e_j}]$. Since X is the sum of independent $[0, 1]$ random variables X_i , and has expectation bu_{e_j} , we obtain by standard Chernoff bounds:

$$\Pr[\mathcal{E}'_j] = \Pr[X \geq u_{e_j}] \leq (e^\delta / (1 + \delta))^{1+\delta} \mu \leq (e / (1 + \delta))^{(1+\delta)\mu},$$

where $\mu = bu_{e_j}$ and $\delta = 1/b - 1$. Hence, $\Pr[\mathcal{E}'_j] \leq (eb)^{u_{e_j}}$. Taking the union bound over all edges in the path, the probability of rejection of i^* on some edge in P is at most $\sum_{j=1}^h (eb)^{u_{e_j}} \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} (eb)^\ell = \frac{eb}{1-eb}$, where the inequality is due to the fact that the edge capacities are strictly decreasing and lower bounded by 1, and the equality is due to the fact that $eb < 1$ (recall that $b \in (0, \frac{1}{3e})$). By a union bound over P and P' we have that the probability of i^* being rejected conditioned on it being in R is at most $\frac{2eb}{1-eb}$. \square

CR scheme for general demands: A CR scheme for general demands can be obtained as follows. The linear program $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ is a packing LP of the form $Ax \leq \mathbf{b}$, $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]$ where A is column-restricted (all the non-zero values in a column have the same value). For such column-restricted packing integer programs (CPIPs), when demands satisfy the no-bottleneck assumption, one can use grouping and scaling techniques first suggested by Kolliopoulos and Stein [26] (see also [13]) to show that the integrality gap for a CPIP with matrix A is at most a fixed constant factor worse than that of the underlying 0-1 matrix A' (obtained from A by placing a 1 in each non-zero entry). Note that in the context of the UFP problem, the matrix A corresponds to the problem with arbitrary demands while the matrix A' corresponds to the one with unit-demands. One can use the same grouping and scaling techniques to show that a monotone $(b, 1 - b')$ -balanced CR scheme for A' can be used to obtain a monotone $(b/6, (1 - b')/2)$ -balanced CR scheme for A . We give a proof in the Section 4.7, see Theorem 4.19. Using this general conversion theorem and Lemma 4.18, one can obtain a (b, b') -balanced CR scheme for UFP in trees for some sufficiently small but absolute constants b and b' . This suffices to obtain a constant factor approximation for maximizing a non-negative submodular function of routable requests in a capacitated tree. However, the $(b/6, (1 - b')/2)$ -balanced CR scheme does not allow composition with other constraints via Lemma 1.6 since $(1 - b')/2$ does not tend to zero even if b' does. However, Theorem 4.19 gives a more refined statement that is helpful in applications in light of Remark 1.8.

Without the no-bottleneck assumption, the linear program has an $\Omega(n)$ integrality gap even for UFP on paths [8]. One can still apply the grouping and scaling techniques without the no-bottleneck assumption under a mild restriction; we refer the reader to [12].

4.7 Column-restricted packing constraints

Here we consider CR schemes for CPIPs. We follow the notation from [13]. Let A be an arbitrary $m \times n$ $\{0, 1\}$ -matrix, and d be an n -element non-negative vector with d_j denoting the j th entry in d . Let $A[d]$ denote the matrix obtained by multiplying every entry of column j in A by d_j . A CPIP is a problem of the form $\max w\mathbf{x}$, subject to $A[d]\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$, $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Note that all non-zero entries in $A[d]$ for any given column have the same value and hence the name column-restricted. Here we are interested in submodular objective functions and the goal is obtain a CR scheme for the polytope $P_{\mathcal{I}}$ induced by the relaxation $A[d]\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$, $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$. Instead of focusing on the polytope for a given d and b , we consider the class of polytopes induced by all d, b .

Theorem 4.19. *Suppose there is a monotone $(\beta, 1 - \beta')$ CR scheme for the polytope $Ax \leq \mathbf{b}$, $x \in [0, 1]^n$ for every $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ where A is $\{0, 1\}$ -matrix. Then there is a monotone $(\beta/6, (1 - \beta')/2)$ -balanced CR scheme for the polytope $A[d]\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$, $x \in [0, 1]^n$ for all d, b such that $d_{\max} = \max_j d_j \leq b_{\min} = \min_j b_j$. Moreover there is a monotone $(\beta/6, 1 - \beta')$ -balanced CR scheme if all $d_j \leq b_{\min}/3$ or if all $d_j \geq b_{\min}/3$.*

We sketch the proof of the above theorem which follows the grouping and scaling ideas previously used in [26, 13]. We have chosen some specific constants in the theorem for simplicity. One can obtain some generalizations and variations of the above theorem via the same ideas.

Let $N = \{1, \dots, n\}$ be a ground set corresponding to the columns. Given d , for integer $h \geq 0$ we let $N_h = \{j \in N \mid d_j \in (d_{\max}/3^{h+1}, d_{\max}/3^h)\}$. We think of the columns in N_0 as *large* and the rest as *small*. The overall idea is to focus either on the large demands or the small demands. Moreover, we will see that small demands can be treated independently within each group N_h . Let \mathbf{z} be a feasible solution to the system $A[d]\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$, $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$. For integer $h \geq 0$ we let \mathbf{z}^h denote the vector obtained from \mathbf{z} as follows: $\mathbf{z}^h_j = \mathbf{z}_j/6$ if $j \in N_h$ and $\mathbf{z}^h_j = 0$ otherwise. The vector \mathbf{z}^h restricts the solution \mathbf{z} to elements in N_h and scales it down by a small constant factor. We also define a corresponding vector \mathbf{b}^h where $b_i^h = \lceil A_i \mathbf{z}^h \rceil$ for each row i . We have the following lemma which is a restatement of corresponding statements from [26, 13].

Lemma 4.20. *For $h \geq 0$, let $\mathbf{y}^h \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be a feasible integral solution to $Ax \leq \mathbf{b}^h$, $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^n$ such that $\mathbf{y}_j = 0$ if $\mathbf{z}^h_j = 0$. Then $A[d]\mathbf{y}^0 \leq \mathbf{b}$ and $\sum_{h \geq 1} A[d]\mathbf{y}^h \leq \mathbf{b}$.*

Proof. Fix some h and consider the i -th row of $A[d]\mathbf{y}^h$ which is equal to $\sum_{j \in N_h} d_j A_{ij} y_i^h$. We upper bound this quantity as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j \in N_h} d_j A_{ij} y_i^h &\leq \frac{d_{\max}}{3^h} \sum_{j \in N_h} A_{ij} y_i^h && \text{(from definition of } N_h) \\
&\leq \frac{d_{\max}}{3^h} b_i^h && \text{(feasibility of } \mathbf{y}^h) \\
&\leq \frac{d_{\max}}{3^h} \left(1 + \sum_{j \in N_h} A_{ij} z_i^h \right) && \text{(definition of } \mathbf{b}^h \text{ and using } [a] \leq 1 + a) \\
&\leq \frac{d_{\max}}{3^h} \left(1 + \sum_{j \in N_h} A_{ij} z_j / 6 \right) && \text{(from definition of } \mathbf{z}^h) \\
&\leq \frac{d_{\max}}{3^h} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in N_h} A_{ij} d_j z_j && (d_j > d_{\max}/3^{h+1} \text{ for } j \in N_h).
\end{aligned}$$

For $h = 0$ we need a slight variant of the above where we replace \mathbf{b}_i^h by $\max\{1, 2 \sum_{j \in N_0} A_{ij} z_i^h\}$ since $[a] \leq \max\{1, 2a\}$. Then we obtain that

$$\sum_{j \in N_0} d_j A_{ij} y_i^0 \leq \max\{d_{\max}, \sum_{j \in N_0} A_{ij} d_j z_j\} \leq b_i,$$

since $d_{\max} \leq b_{\min}$ and \mathbf{z} is feasible. Thus $A[d]\mathbf{y}^0 \leq \mathbf{b}$.

For the second part of the claim, consider a row i .

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{h \geq 1} \sum_{j \in N_h} d_j A_{ij} y_i^h &\leq \sum_{h \geq 1} \left(\frac{d_{\max}}{3^h} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in N_h} A_{ij} d_j z_j \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{h \geq 1} \frac{d_{\max}}{3^h} + \sum_{h \geq 1} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in N_h} A_{ij} d_j z_j \\
&\leq \frac{d_{\max}}{2} + \frac{b_i}{2} \\
&\leq b_i.
\end{aligned}$$

The penultimate inequality is from the feasibility of \mathbf{z} , and the last inequality is from the assumption that $d_{\max} \leq b_{\min}$. \square

With the above claim in place we can describe the CR scheme claimed in the theorem. Let \mathbf{z} be a feasible solution and let \mathbf{z}^h for $h \geq 0$ be constructed from \mathbf{z} as described above.

CR scheme:

- For each $h \geq 0$ *independently* run the $(\beta, 1 - \beta')$ -balanced CR scheme for the polytope $Ax \leq \mathbf{b}^h, x \in [0, 1]^n$ with fractional solution \mathbf{z}^h to obtain integral vectors $\mathbf{y}^h, h \geq 0$.
- With probability $1/2$ output \mathbf{y}^0 , otherwise output $\sum_{h \geq 1} \mathbf{y}^h$.

We claim that the above scheme is a monotone $(\beta/6, (1 - \beta')/2)$ -balanced CR scheme. Note that we use the unit-demand scheme in a black-box fashion. First, we observe via Lemma 4.20 that the output of the scheme is a feasible integral solution. An alternative description of the scheme is as follows. Obtain a set $R \subseteq N$ by independently sampling each $j \in N$ with probability $\beta/6 \cdot z_j$. Let $R_h = R \cap N_h$. For each h obtain $I_h \subseteq R_h$ as the output of the scheme for $Ax \leq \mathbf{b}^h, x \in [0, 1]^n$ given the random set R_h . With probability $1/2$ output $I = I_0$ otherwise output

$I = \cup_{h \geq 1} I_h$. For $j \in N_h$ we have that $\Pr[j \in I_h \mid j \in R_h] \geq 1 - \beta'$. Further, $\Pr[j \in I \mid j \in I_h] = 1/2$ by the choice of the algorithm in the second step. Therefore $\Pr[j \in I \mid j \in R] \geq (1 - \beta')/2$. It is easy to verify the scheme is monotone.

Further, if we only have large demands or only small demands then the second step is not necessary and hence we obtain a $(\beta/6, (1 - \beta'))$ -balanced CR scheme.

Acknowledgments: We thank Mohit Singh for helpful discussions on contention resolution schemes for matroids.

References

- [1] A. Ageev and M. Sviridenko. Pipage rounding: a new method of constructing algorithms with proven performance guarantee. *J. of Combinatorial Optimization*, 8:307–328, 2004.
- [2] S. Agrawal, Y. Ding, A. Saberi and Y. Ye. Correlation robust stochastic optimization. *Proc. of 21st ACM-SIAM SODA*, 1087–1096, 2010.
- [3] N. Alon and J. Spencer. *The Probabilistic Method*. 2nd Edition, John Wiley & Sons, 2000.
- [4] N. Bansal, N. Korula, V. Nagarajan and A. Srinivasan. On k -column sparse packing programs. *Proc. of 14th IPCO*, 369–382, 2010.
- [5] G. Calinescu, A. Chakrabarti, H. Karloff and Y. Rabani. Improved approximation algorithms for resource allocation. In *Proc. of 8th IPCO*, 439–456, 2001.
- [6] G. Calinescu, C. Chekuri, M. Pál and J. Vondrák. Maximizing a submodular set function subject to a matroid constraint. *Proc. of 12th IPCO*, 182–196, 2007.
- [7] G. Calinescu, C. Chekuri, M. Pál and J. Vondrák. Maximizing a monotone submodular set function subject to a matroid constraint. To appear in *SIAM J. on Computing* special issue for *ACM STOC 2008*.
- [8] A. Chakrabarti, C. Chekuri, A. Gupta and A. Kumar. Approximation algorithms for the unsplittable flow problem. *Algorithmica*, 47(1):53–78, 2007.
- [9] T. Chan and S. Har-Peled. Approximation algorithms for maximum independent set of pseudo-disks. Full version of a paper that appeared in *Proc. of ACM SoCG*, 2009. Available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1103.1431>.
- [10] S. Chawla, J. Hartline, D. Malec and B. Sivan. Sequential posted pricing and multi-parameter mechanism design. Manuscript, 2009, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/0907.2435v1>.
- [11] S. Chawla, J. Hartline, D. Malec and B. Sivan. Sequential posted pricing and multi-parameter mechanism design. *Proc. of 42nd ACM STOC*, 311–320, 2010.
- [12] C. Chekuri, A. Ene and N. Korula. UFP in paths and trees and column-restricted packing integer programs. *Proc. of 12th APPROX*, 42–55, 2009.
- [13] C. Chekuri, M. Mydlarz and F. B. Shepherd. Multicommodity demand flow in a tree and packing integer programs. *ACM Trans. on Algorithms*, 3(3), 2007. Preliminary version in *Proc. of ICALP*, 410–425, 2003.
- [14] C. Chekuri, J. Vondrák and R. Zenklusen. Dependent randomized rounding via exchange properties of combinatorial structures. *Proc. of 51st IEEE FOCS*, 575–584, 2010.
- [15] G. Cornuejols, M. L. Fisher and G. Nemhauser. Location of bank accounts to optimize float: An analytic study of exact and approximate algorithms. *Management Science*, 23:789–810, 1977.
- [16] S. Fadaei, M. Fazli and M. Safari. Maximizing non-monotone submodular set functions subject to different constraints: combined algorithms. arXiv:1101.2973, January 2011.

- [17] U. Feige. A threshold of $\ln n$ for approximating set cover. *Journal of the ACM*, 45(4):634–652, 1998.
- [18] U. Feige, V. Mirrokni and J. Vondrák. Maximizing non-monotone submodular functions. To appear in *SIAM Journal on Computing*. Preliminary version in *Proc. of 48th IEEE FOCS*, 461–471, 2007.
- [19] U. Feige and J. Vondrák. Approximation algorithms for allocation problems: Improving the factor of $1 - 1/e$. *Proc. of 47th IEEE FOCS*, 667–676, 2006.
- [20] U. Feige and J. Vondrák. The submodular welfare problem with demand queries. *Theory of Computing*, 247–290, 2010.
- [21] M. L. Fisher, G. L. Nemhauser and L. A. Wolsey. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions - II. *Math. Prog. Study*, 8:73–87, 1978.
- [22] N. Garg, V. V. Vazirani, M. Yannakakis. Primal-dual approximation algorithms for integral flow and multicut in trees. *Algorithmica* 18(1):3–20, 1997. Preliminary version in *Proc. of ICALP*, 1993.
- [23] A. Gupta, V. Nagarajan and R. Ravi. Thresholded covering algorithms for robust and max-min optimization. *Proc. of 37th ICALP*, 262–274, 2010. A more detailed version available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1003.0722>.
- [24] A. Gupta, A. Roth, G. Schoenebeck and K. Talwar. Constrained non-monotone submodular maximization: Offline and secretary algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/1003.1517, 2010.
- [25] J. Håstad. Clique is hard to approximate within $n^{1-\epsilon}$. *Acta Mathematica*, 182:105–142, 1999.
- [26] S. G. Kolliopoulos and C. Stein. Approximating disjoint-path problems using greedy algorithms and Packing Integer Programs. *Math. Programming A*, (99):63–87, 2004. Preliminary version in *Proc. of IPCO*, 1998.
- [27] A. Kulik, H. Shachnai and T. Tamir. Maximizing submodular set functions subject to multiple linear constraints. *Proc. of 20th ACM-SIAM SODA*, 545–554, 2009.
- [28] A. Kulik, H. Shachnai and T. Tamir. Approximations for monotone and non-monotone submodular maximization with knapsack constraints. Manuscript, 2010.
- [29] J. Lee, V. Mirrokni, V. Nagarajan and M. Sviridenko. Maximizing nonmonotone submodular functions under matroid and knapsack constraints. *SIAM J. on Disc. Math.*, 23(4): 2053–2078, 2010. Preliminary version in *Proc. of 41st ACM STOC*, 323–332, 2009.
- [30] J. Lee, M. Sviridenko and J. Vondrák. Submodular maximization over multiple matroids via generalized exchange properties. To appear in *Math. of Operations Research*. Preliminary version in *Proc. of 12th APPROX*, 244–257, 2009.
- [31] J. Lee, M. Sviridenko and J. Vondrák. Matroid matching: the power of local search. *Proc. of 42th ACM STOC*, 369–378, 2010.
- [32] L. Lovász. Submodular functions and convexity. *Math. Prog.—the state of the art (Bonn 1982)*, 235–257, 1983.
- [33] V. Mirrokni, M. Schapira and J. Vondrák. Tight information-theoretic lower bounds for welfare maximization in combinatorial auctions. *Proc. of 9th ACM EC*, 70–77, 2008.
- [34] G. L. Nemhauser and L. A. Wolsey. Best algorithms for approximating the maximum of a submodular set function. *Math. Oper. Research*, 3(3):177–188, 1978.
- [35] G. L. Nemhauser, L. A. Wolsey and M. L. Fisher. An analysis of approximations for maximizing submodular set functions - I. *Math. Prog.*, 14:265–294, 1978.
- [36] S. Oveis Gharan and J. Vondrák. Submodular maximization by simulated annealing. *Proc. of 22nd ACM-SIAM SODA*, 1098–1116, 2011.

- [37] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization - Polyhedra and Efficiency*. Springer, 2003.
- [38] A. Srinivasan. New approaches to covering and packing problems. *Proc. of 12th ACM-SIAM SODA*, 567–576, 2001.
- [39] M. Sviridenko. A note on maximizing a submodular set function subject to knapsack constraint. *Operations Research Letters* 32, 41–43, 2004.
- [40] L.G. Valiant. The complexity of enumeration and reliability problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 8(3):410–421, 1979.
- [41] J. Vondrák. Submodularity in combinatorial optimization. *PhD Thesis*, Charles University, 2007.
- [42] J. Vondrák. Optimal approximation for the submodular welfare problem in the value oracle model. *Proc. of 40th ACM STOC*, 67–74, 2008.
- [43] J. Vondrák. Symmetry and approximability of submodular maximization problems. *Proc. of 50th IEEE FOCS*, 251–270, 2009.
- [44] J. Vondrák. A note on concentration of submodular functions. Manuscript, 2010, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1005.2791>.
- [45] Q. Yan. Mechanism design via correlation gap. *Proc. of 22th ACM-SIAM SODA*, 710–719, 2011.