Approximation Algorithms and Quadratic Form Maximization over Convex Sets

Vijay Bhattiprolu

<□ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

Intro to Approximation Algorithms

Approximation Algorithms and Hardness of Approximation:

- Many optimization tasks of interest are believed to be impossible to solve exactly (by polytime algorithms) but can be solved approximately.

- Many optimization tasks of interest are believed to be impossible to solve exactly (by polytime algorithms) but can be solved approximately.
- Which optimization problems admit polynomial time algorithms computing a solution optimal (multiplicatively) within an absolute constant?

- Many optimization tasks of interest are believed to be impossible to solve exactly (by polytime algorithms) but can be solved approximately.
- Which optimization problems admit polynomial time algorithms computing a solution optimal (multiplicatively) within an absolute constant?

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • ○ ○ 2/13</p>

- What do such algorithms typically look like? (Today: Convex Programming)

- Many optimization tasks of interest are believed to be impossible to solve exactly (by polytime algorithms) but can be solved approximately.
- Which optimization problems admit polynomial time algorithms computing a solution optimal (multiplicatively) within an absolute constant?
- What do such algorithms typically look like? (Today: Convex Programming)
- Can one prove a certain algorithm achieves the optimal constant? (Assuming $P \neq NP$ or similar hypotheses) (related to Probabilistically Checkable Proofs)

<□ ▶ < □ ▶ < 壹 ▶ < 壹 ▶ < 壹 ▶ Ξ の Q @ 3/13

Simple 2-approximation algorithm: partitioning randomly will cut at least (1 - o(1))|E|/2 edges with high probability.

Simple 2-approximation algorithm: partitioning randomly will cut at least (1 - o(1))|E|/2 edges with high probability.

 \sim 1.14-approximation is possible using Convex Programming!

Simple 2-approximation algorithm: partitioning randomly will cut at least (1 - o(1))|E|/2 edges with high probability.

 \sim 1.14-approximation is possible using Convex Programming!

This Convex Programming algorithm achieves the optimal constant assuming the Unique Games Conjecture [Khot, Kindler, Mossel, O'Donnell, Oleszkiewicz]



Convex Relaxation + Rounding Paradigm

Given combinatorial optimization problem.

(1) "Relax" problem to convex program.



・ ロ ト ・ 一部 ト ・ 目 ト ・ 目 ・ の へ ・ 4/13

Interlude: Convex Relaxation

$$\sup_{x \in S_1} \langle a, x \rangle \leq \sup_{x \in S_2} \langle a, x \rangle$$

< □ ▶ < @ ▶ < ≧ ▶ < ≧ ▶ Ξ - クへで 5/13

Relax the complicated set S_1 to a larger convex set S_2 (with a membership oracle).

(1) "Relax" problem to convex program.

(2) Compute the exactly optimal solution to the relaxation.



<□ > < □ > < □ > < Ξ > < Ξ > Ξ · ⑦ Q @ 6/13

(1) "Relax" problem to convex program.

(2) Compute the exactly optimal solution to the relaxation.

(3) Map solution back to original region (Rounding Algorithm)



<ロ> < 母> < 量> < 量> < 量> = のへで 6/13

(1) "Relax" problem to convex program.

(2) Compute the exactly optimal solution to the relaxation.

(3) Map solution back to original region (Rounding Algorithm)

Often the best polytime approximation algorithm. (Under complexity assumptions.)



MAX-CUT reformulation:

$$OPT = \sup \sum_{ij \in E} (1 - x_i x_j)/2 \quad \text{s.t. } \forall i, \ x_i \in \{\pm 1\}$$

Natural Vector Relaxation:

$$CP = \sup \sum_{ij \in E} (1 - \langle u_i, u_j \rangle)/2 \text{ s.t. } \forall i, \|u_i\|_2 = 1,$$

MAX-CUT reformulation:

$$OPT = \sup \sum_{ij \in E} (1 - x_i x_j)/2 \quad \text{s.t. } \forall i, \ x_i \in \{\pm 1\}$$

Natural Vector Relaxation:

$$CP = \sup \sum_{ij \in E} (1 - \langle u_i, u_j \rangle)/2 \text{ s.t. } \forall i, \ \langle u_i, u_i \rangle = 1,$$

MAX-CUT reformulation:

$$OPT = \sup \sum_{ij \in E} (1 - x_i x_j)/2 \quad \text{s.t. } \forall i, \ x_i \in \{\pm 1\}$$

Natural Vector Relaxation:

$$\begin{split} \text{CP} &= \text{ sup } \sum_{ij \in E} (1 - \langle u_i, \, u_j \rangle)/2 \quad \text{s.t. } \forall i, \ \langle u_i, u_i \rangle = 1, \\ &= \text{ sup } \langle D - A, \mathbb{X} \rangle/2 \quad \text{s.t. } \mathbb{X} \succeq 0, \ \forall i, \ \mathbb{X}_{i,i} = 1 \\ &\quad (\text{Substituting } \mathbb{X}_{i,j} := \langle u_i, \, u_j \rangle) \end{split}$$

MAX-CUT reformulation:

$$OPT = \sup \sum_{ij \in E} (1 - x_i x_j)/2 \quad \text{s.t. } \forall i, \ x_i \in \{\pm 1\}$$

Natural Vector Relaxation:

$$\begin{split} \text{CP} &= \sup \ \sum_{ij \in E} (1 - \langle u_i, \, u_j \rangle)/2 \quad \text{s.t.} \ \forall i, \ \langle u_i, u_i \rangle = 1, \\ &= \sup \ \langle D - A, \mathbb{X} \rangle/2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{X} \succeq 0, \ \forall i, \ \mathbb{X}_{i,i} = 1 \\ & (\text{Substituting } \mathbb{X}_{i,j} := \langle u_i, \, u_j \rangle) \end{split}$$

Rounding Algorithm: Choose a random hyperplane through the origin and partition vectors according to it.

MAX-CUT reformulation:

$$OPT = \sup \sum_{ij \in E} (1 - x_i x_j)/2 \text{ s.t. } \forall i, x_i \in \{\pm 1\}$$

Natural Vector Relaxation:

$$\begin{split} \text{CP} &= \sup \ \sum_{ij \in E} (1 - \langle u_i, \, u_j \rangle)/2 \quad \text{s.t.} \ \forall i, \ \langle u_i, \, u_i \rangle = 1, \\ &= \sup \ \langle D - A, \mathbb{X} \rangle/2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{X} \succeq 0, \ \forall i, \ \mathbb{X}_{i,i} = 1 \\ &\quad \text{(Substituting } \mathbb{X}_{i,j} := \langle u_i, \, u_j \rangle) \end{split}$$

Rounding Algorithm: Choose a random hyperplane through the origin and partition vectors according to it. [Goemans Williamson 97]: Achieves ~ 1.14 approximation

[Raghavendra 08]

- Given a Constraint Satisfaction Problem.
- A natural Convex Programming relaxation is the best polytime apx. alg. under Khot's Unique Games Conjecture.

Goal: Polynomial time Approximation Algorithm

Input: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and an oracle computing the norm $(\| \cdot \|_X, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Compute in polynomial time (approximately):

$$\sup_{\|x\|_X \le 1} \langle x, Ax \rangle = \sum_{i,j} A_{i,j} \cdot x_i \cdot x_j$$

Quadratic Maximization

<□> < @ > < E > < E > E の Q @ 9/13

Goal: Polynomial time Approximation Algorithm

Input: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and an oracle computing the norm $(\| \cdot \|_X, \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Compute in polynomial time (approximately):

$$\sup_{\|x\|_X \le 1} \langle x, Ax \rangle = \sum_{i,j} A_{i,j} \cdot x_i \cdot x_j \qquad \text{Quadratic Maximization}$$

Very rich class. Captures tractable and highly intractable problems

<□> < @ > < E > < E > E の Q @ 9/13

- ℓ_2 : Maximum Eigenvalue. Exactly computable.

- ℓ_2 : Maximum Eigenvalue. Exactly computable.

- ℓ_{∞} for Laplacian A: MAX-CUT in a Graph. ~ 1.14 Apx. [Goemans Williamson 97]

- ℓ_2 : Maximum Eigenvalue. Exactly computable.
- ℓ_{∞} for Laplacian A: MAX-CUT in a Graph. ~ 1.14 Apx. [Goemans Williamson 97]
- ℓ_{∞} : Grothendieck's Inequality. O(1) Apx. [Grothendieck 53] ... [Braverman (Makarychev)² Naor 11].

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ ■▶ ◆ ■ ▶ ● ■ ● ○ Q ○ 10/13

- ℓ_2 : Maximum Eigenvalue. Exactly computable.
- ℓ_{∞} for Laplacian A: MAX-CUT in a Graph. ~ 1.14 Apx. [Goemans Williamson 97]
- ℓ_{∞} : Grothendieck's Inequality. O(1) Apx. [Grothendieck 53] ... [Braverman (Makarychev)² Naor 11].
- ℓ_p for p < 2: Related to Hypercontractivity. $n^{\Omega(1)}$ is best Apx.

◆□▶ ◆昼▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへで 10/13

- ℓ_2 : Maximum Eigenvalue. Exactly computable.
- ℓ_{∞} for Laplacian A: MAX-CUT in a Graph. ~ 1.14 Apx. [Goemans Williamson 97]
- ℓ_{∞} : Grothendieck's Inequality. O(1) Apx. [Grothendieck 53] ... [Braverman (Makarychev)² Naor 11].
- ℓ_p for p < 2: Related to Hypercontractivity. $n^{\Omega(1)}$ is best Apx.

◆□▶ ◆昼▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへで 10/13

- (Schatten) S_{∞} : O(1) Apx. Non-commutative Grothendieck Inequality, Quantum Information Theory, etc. [Pisier 78, Haagerup 87] [Naor Regev Vidick 12].

Goal: Extend Theory of Approximation Algorithms to Quadratic Maximization.

<ロト < 団ト < 臣ト < 臣ト E のQで 11/13

Goal: Extend Theory of Approximation Algorithms to Quadratic Maximization.

Hope: Theory can be used for both Algorithmic and Impossibility results for Continuous/Combinatorial Optimization.

- How does Approximability depend on Geometry of X? When do O(1) Approximation Algorithms exist?

< □ > < @ > < ≧ > < ≧ > ≧ の Q ↔ 11/13

- How does Approximability depend on Geometry of X? When do O(1) Approximation Algorithms exist?

- When is Convex Programming the Optimal Algorithm?

< □ ▶ < @ ▶ < ≧ ▶ < ≧ ▶ ≧ ♪ ♡ Q ↔ 12/13

Generic Framework for Quadratic Maximization:

Generic Framework for Quadratic Maximization:

- Encompasses situations where O(1)-approximation algorithms were known.

< □ ▶ < @ ▶ < ≧ ▶ < ≧ ▶ Ξ の Q ↔ 12/13

Generic Framework for Quadratic Maximization:

- Encompasses situations where O(1)-approximation algorithms were known.
- A rich family of new examples where O(1)-approximation is possible.

<□ ▶ < □ ▶ < ■ ▶ < ■ ▶ < ■ ▶ ■ 9 Q @ 12/13

Generic Framework for Quadratic Maximization:

- Encompasses situations where O(1)-approximation algorithms were known.
- A rich family of new examples where O(1)-approximation is possible.
- Characterization (under complexity assumptions) for special families:

< □ ▶ < □ ▶ < ■ ▶ < ■ ▶ < ■ ♪ ■ の へ ⁰ 12/13

- (a) Norms invariant to permutations and sign-flips
- (b) Unitarily Invariant Matrix Norms.

Thank You. Questions?

<□ ▶ < □ ▶ < ■ ▶ < ■ ▶ < ■ ▶ ● ■ • ○ へ ⁰ 13/13